PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 97—PART 11

JANUARY 3, 1951, TO MARCH 15, 1951

(PAGES A1 TO A1448)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1951

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

The Spirit, Soul, and Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of requesting that a very fine work by Mr. Thomas J. Brooks, assistant commissioner of agriculture for the State of Florida, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is entitled "The Spirit, Soul, and Voice of America," and is the type of reading in which every citizen should be interested. It follows:

THE SPIRIT, SOUL, AND VOICE OF AMERICA

(By Thomas J. Brooks)

The author, Thomas J. Brooks, is assistant commissioner of agriculture for the State of Florida, in charge of the bureau of immigration. Mr. Brooks was born in Tennessee and during a colorful career served that State as Senator. He made a speech in the Senate which the United States Senate thought of enough importance to have printed, as a Senate document, and sent it all over the country. When Mississippi State College created the chair of markets and rural economics, Mr. Brooks was chosen to fill that chair. In this capacity, his work was outstanding and he was recognized and appointed by President Woodrow Wilson upon the recommendation of William Jennings Bryan, then serving as Secretary of State, to represent the United States at the International Institute of Agriculture in Rome, Italy. He was also chosen to be a member of the delegation sent from the United States to study rural credits in Europe. Upon that occasion he was honored by having diplomatic courtesies extended to him by every European country visited. He was chosen by the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Banking and Currency of the United States Congress as consultant at the time of the construction of the Federal Reserve Act. He was called again, by the same committee, as consultant at the time of the construction of the rural credit law. Mr. Brooks is the author of numerous works of prose and poetry. His textbook on Markets and Rural Economics was the first college textbook on the subject. Among his other notable works are two philosophical treatises—March of Mind and Victory Over Doubt. Mr. Brooks is also the author of hundreds of bulletins on agriculture and economics.

Individuals, nations, and races have characteristics; crisis brings them out.

1776: The first test of the soul of America: The Boston tea party; Washington's response; the Declaration of Independence.

1812: The pirates.

1812: The second war with England.

1823: The Monroe Doctrine.

1846: Texas and Mexico.

1861: The Civil War.

1898: The war with Spain.

1914: The First World War: What each nation wanted; American flag and uniform at the peace conference.

1918: Alvin York.

1927: Charles Lindbergh.

1941: Second World War: The ideals involved; the disappointed; Russia; punishing war criminals.

1950: The third world war: A new flag? Battles round the world: The sun never sets on the graves of American soldiers; last messages; empty chairs; help for the fallen foe. The forgotten man—feudalism; our civilization—philanthropies; "so long as that flag"; Uncle Sam's legacy to the future.

THE SOUL OF AMERICA

Individuals have distinguishing characteristics. Under ordinary circumstances you will notice nothing particularly unusual about them; but in emergencies inherent traits will flare up, revealing the real soul of the individual.

Nations have their personalities, their outstanding characteristics, their traits, habits of thought, and manner of conduct. While pursuing the even tenor of their way there may not be a marked difference in their general conduct on questions of national policy or of ethical standards; but when a great crisis comes and the hammer of fate strikes the conscience bell in the campanile of the soul, then we get the overtones of the higher life latent in the mind of the Nation. There may not be many instances when a nation reaches the ideal which it cherishes; but sooner or later it will show its real self to the eyes of the world.

The first test of the soul of America was when it made a protest against the governmental policy of "taxation without representation" and raised a flag of its own, dedicated to the fundamental principle that: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." That was the soul of the new Republic.

George Washington, of Virginia, proposed to equip a thousand men at his own expense to defend that principle and exemplified the superiority of that kingliness that rules in human hearts, in contradistinction to that of tinseled royalty, based on fear and braced by bayonets. When he became President of the new Republic he refused to accept his salary—that was the soul of America. When Patrick Henry thundered the challenge to tyranny with his declaration: "Give me liberty or give me death"—that was the voice of America.

When Nathan Hale said: "I only regret that I have but one life to give to my country." That was the spirit of America.

When freezing soldiers at Valley Forge did not desert, when the snows were stained with blood from their frostbitten feet, that was the spirit of America.

The next striking example of the American spirit was when it defied the pirates of the Barbary States of north Africa and refused to purchase immunity from their depredations on the high seas. Other nations, older and more powerful, were paying tribute to be exempt from molestation of the pirates in their ocean commerce—not so the young nation of the west. Stephen Decatur was sent out with a crew of marines to challenge the desperadoes. He cleaned them out and that was the end of their robberies or collecting tributes from any country. That was the soul of America.

Although the United States of America had been recognized by Great Britain, the dogma was still held to that "once an Englishman always an Englishman" and the mother country still claimed the right to enter American ships, in search of Englishmen to impress into English service.

Again the spirit of America glowed and war ensued (1812–14), which ended triumphantly for America. The soul of America rang true to the ideals which have inspired every turn in the progress of liberty, independence, and self-reliance.

When the Nation became firmly established and recognized internationally, the nations of Europe looked with covetous eyes on the Latin-American states and made gestures in that direction. From Washington there emanated the famous Monroe Doctrine, to the effect that no crowned head should set up a kingdom in the Western Hemisphere (attempted in 1865 by Maximillian). As late as the Presidency of Grover Cleveland, England proposed to send battleships to Venezuela to force the payment of debts to England. President Cleveland sounded the warning that such an act would be considered a declaration of war and the United States would take part. Needless to say, nothing was done to forcefully collect the English debt. This doctrine represents the soul of America.

Citizens from the United States went to Mexico, established a colony and applied for a State charter from the Mexican Government. It was refused. This led the Colonists to declare Texas a republic. Of course, war followed. The President of Mexico was captured and made to sign an agreement, acknowledging the independence of the Lone Star Republic of Texas. There ensued a dispute as to just where the line between Texas and Mexico should be. In the meantime, Texas applied for admission to the United States of America as a State, and was admitted. This made the dispute as to boundary a question for the United

States and Mexico to settle and war followed. Old Glory waved over the proud heights of the castles of Montezuma. Mexico ceded a vast territory, mostly deserts, and the United States paid cash for part of it. The use of that has since been made of this country amply justifies the change of ownership.

When the original colonies were being settled slavery was recognized throughout Africa and in many parts of the world. The slave trade became profitable. The colony of South Carolina was the first to attempt to outlaw the trade, but England forbade its being stopped. A verse from Pope's Essay on Man comes to mind:

"Evil is a monster of so frightful a mein
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But, seen too oft, familiar with its face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

South Carolina was the first State to fire a gun in its defense. For 4 years the Union was baptized in fire and blood. The earth was billowed with the graves of hundreds of thousands and the soil moistened with the tears of sorrowing kindred shed o'er the fallen brave. The true soul of the Nation was not in the tones that rang out from the tower of conscience on either side. There was a jargon of discordant notes. When it was all over the Union was not divided. Slavery was abolished. It was the test of time that brought out the feeling of a common heritage and each respected the other for his valor. This feeling of mutual respect represented the soul of America and since then, the blue and the gray have fought side by side 'round the world:

"Against the wrongs that need resistance
For the cause that needs assistance
For the future in the distance
And the good that they might do."

Spain at one time laid claim to more than half of the Western Hemisphere. It was the custom during the days of exploration to claim all lands discovered for the country represented. (How would those Europeans have viewed the claims, if a ship load of Indians had landed on their shores and claimed the country by right of discovery?) The newly discovered lands were held as conquered, but not annexed boundaries. The remarkable fact is that no country practiced taking in any of its discoveries as a part of its own nation but held them as contributory dependencies. The United States of America is the first to set the example of making no discrimination between new territory and the Original Thirteen States as to rights and privileges under the Constitution. We have always practiced the declaration set forth in the beginning—Government should be by consent. Thirty-five States have been organized since the original 13 and all have the same status and rights.

Holding peoples as conquered vassals in discovered lands is still practiced on far-eastern islands by European nations. England learned a lesson when she threw away a pearl richer than all her tribe, and lost the American colonies. She does not tax her dominions beyond the seas but holds them by trade and national sentiment.

Spain was practicing the feudalistic system as of old and had lost all of her American holdings but Cuba. She was ruling by rank tyranny. A revolt occurred and the United States looked on with increasing disgust, horror, and resentment. Viewing this struggle of the people to free themselves, the United States declared war on Spain in the interest of Cuba. When the war was over, the United States purchased the Philippines from Spain and gave those islands territorial status with the promise of freedom. For these acts this Government did not ask one dollar of indemnity, one bit of land, or promise of any favors. What other nations ever fought a "good samaritan" war? When the Philippines were set free and then invaded by Japan, we drove them out and asked no favors for that. These deeds were exemplification of the principle that patriotism did not stop at boundary lines, but extended in defense of a principle 'round the world.

When World War I broke out there was no intention on the part of this country to take part. The war dragged on. American vessels were sunk by Germany. The purpose of the aggressor was conquest, with no limit as to boundaries. The only interest this country had in the struggle was to oppose aggression, and to join those fighting in self-defense. Monarchies, republics, despotisms, and neutrals were involved.

The immediate cause of the conflict was Austria's strife with one of the Balkans. The outcome of the world-wide antagonisms was of vast concern to the United States in its ultimate results. All contending forces seemed evenly balanced, when suddenly Russia withdrew to fight a civil war. This brought a crisis. Autocracy and conquest were on the aggressive and bid fair to win. At this point the United States entered on the side of the defensive—another instance of helping those who were right and needed support. The hammer of fate struck the conscience bell in the campanile of the soul of America. War on land, on the sea, under the sea, and in the air spread 'round the world.

The only flag that waved along the battle line from the North Sea to the Mediterranean that did not seek a dollar of indemnity nor a foot of land as reward of victory was the Stars and Stripes. The only uniform worn by the 25,000,000 soldiers mustered into service that sought no material gain was the uniform of the soldiers of Uncle Sam. Germany wanted expansion, Austria wanted the Balkans, Bulgaria wanted territory, Turkey wanted anything she could get, Russia was jealous of the Central Powers encroaching on the Asiatic countries which she coveted, Italy wanted territory, France wanted Alsace-Lorraine, England wanted the German colonies, the United States wanted nothing—but peace. That was the soul of America—the success of a righteous cause.

Patriotism has assumed a wider meaning than mere love of country; to America it means love of principle and liberty throughout the world.

At the peace conference every government represented its claims and grievances. The United States was the only nation represented that asked for nothing—refused to accept anything. The President of the United States was there to defend the weaker nations, and incurred the lasting enmity of some of the stronger ones who wanted to treat the smaller ones ruthlessly.

"Other nations fought bravely
For their land and their line
But thou hast fought for a stranger
In hate of a wrong not thine."

That is the soul of America.

Individuals show forth the principle of lofty human character, and interpret for the Nation and the world the ideals of true nobility of soul. To the extent that we have a citizenry led by these spirits the future is safe from the forces of evil, but should we cease to have such leadership an evil retribution will claim its own.

When Lindbergh, the Columbus of the air, made his memorable trip across the Atlantic from the United States to France—alone—he was lionized on two continents; but it did not turn his head. Gentle, unassuming, unspoiled, he took the praise of his heroism with becoming modesty. Large offers to go into the movies did not tempt him—that typified the soul of America. When Alvin York performed the most remarkable feat in the annals of warfare, breaking up two machine-gun nests, capturing and bringing into camp 132 prisoners at one time, he aroused the admiration of all the Allies. He was acclaimed so widely that he was bewildered, but it did not change his attitude or kindle a vain pride. At a banquet at the Waldorf Astoria, listening to the eulogies proclaimed by men of note, he felt no elation but remarked afterward that he would have much rather been at home in the mountains of east Tennessee. When offered fabulous sums to sign advertisements or to go into the movies, he replied "No; this uniform that I wear shall never be commercialized. It cost too much to be measured in gold." That typified the soul of America.

The Second World War came only a quarter of a century later and was instigated by the same nation as that of the first, Germany. Again the war dragged on and finally the United States entered it on the side of the defenders as before. And of all the wars of recorded history this was the most world-wide and devastating in property and loss of life. Unprecedented carnage decimated most of Europe and much of the Far East. No aggressor ever made as much headway before being stopped as did Germany in this war. Again it appeared that Germany would conquer all Europe when the United States joined forces with the Allies against the Germanic powers. This time Germany was crushed.

Strange to relate, one of the more powerful allies then boldly announced that a capitalist and communistic regime could not both survive in the same world. Russia began operations showing that she would undertake the same thing that Germany had tried—world conquest. But the methods followed were different. Russian saboteurs create confusion in other countries. Russia has vetoed peace measures 45 times in the United Nations and keeps an iron curtain around her empire where she practices slavery on millions, to keep production up and military progress in full swing.

Urging satellite countries to start trouble with the United Nations resulted in war in Korea. For the first time in all history there is a flag symbolizing the United Nations, now flying in Korea led by the Stars and Stripes.

Old Glory has been carried around the world in defense of the principles on which this Government was founded. It was bowed to at Yorktown by the army of the most powerful nation in the world at that time. It drove piracy from the high seas when older nations were paying tribute for immunity to their commerce. For the second time it humbled British arms for invading American ships in search of seamen. It waved triumphantly above the proud heights of the Montezumas in Mexico. It stood the acid test of 4 years of civil strife. It sent tyranny back across the sea to crouch at the feet of throne-ruled Europe and freed Cuba and the Philippines. It wrote history on the battlefields of the Argonne and the Marne in the First World War. It attested the same zeal for liberty in World War II in Algiers, in Italy, in France, in Belgium, in Holland, in Germany, in the far-off Pacific Islands, in the jungles of the Far East, and in Japan. The sun never sets on the graves of American soldiers who gave the last full measure of devotion to the principles of the Government as established by its founders. A million girls and women took part in the military shops and shared the hardships of army life in these two wars. Many a dying soldier spoke his last message to a faithful nurse, who took down his message and his address as she brushed the death damp from his brow. Many an orphan at home no more hears an answer to the call for daddy. That is the soul of America.

Peacetime vigilance is as necessary as is alertness in war. Depression reached a climax in this country in 1933. The worst period of economic paralysis in our history put millions out of work. The Government turned to the "forgotten man" and extended aid to the millions out of work and willing

to earn an honest living. None was too poor or insignificant to be recognized—that was the soul of America.

Who has been the forgotten man down through the ages? He on whose shoulders rests the burdens of the material world. He is typified by the toilers of all time who have fed, clothed, and sheltered the teeming millions of all lands, but who has been scorned by those who profited by his labor.

This forgotten man built the Pyramids of Egypt, the walls and swinging gardens of Babylon, the palaces of Nineveh, the temples of Palestine, the Parthenon of Athens, the Colosseum of Rome, and the castles of feudalistic Europe.

Once in a great while this forgotten man speaks with the voice of desperation, and governments of class rule quake and tremble. This voice was heard in France and monarchy crumbled in the great "reign of terror" and the Bastile, symbol of feudalism, fell.

It was the voice of the forgotten man that brought forth the Magna Carta in England as organic law, superior to the whims of kings and feudal lords. He tore authority from the castles on the hill and placed it by the fireside of the cabin in the valley.

It was the voice of the forgotten man that inspired the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America.

It was the voice of the forgotten man that wrought havoc with the royal despotism of Russia; but, he only exchanged one despotism for another and which is disturbing the peace of the world and causing preparations for another war. A new dictatorship promised security, only to lead to subjugation. A new coterie is reaching for the conquest of the world. A distracted world looks on in bewilderment and horror. The fate of civilization swings in the balance.

The men who used to be forgotten are not forgotten in this country. The man and woman who are in the humble home, behind the plow, by the forge, in the mine, on the highways, in factories, colleges, and in the Government are not forgotten. He speaks in all lawmaking bodies, in administrative offices, in institutions of learning and guides the destiny of the country. That is the voice of America.

What have we to show the world of those things for which we are proud? What kind of civilization have we built that we can point to as an example of progress and achievement, as compared with those of any and all parts of the globe?

We have reached up and harnessed the lightning from the skies and made a whispering gallery of the world. We build broadcasting stations and talk to every nation and people in the uttermost parts of the earth. We build a civilization with the highest standard of living that has ever existed on this planet. We enjoy more of the equipment of a cultured life than ever before. We dig ores from the mountains and lo, iron monsters roll on tracks of steel across continents, carrying those who rush to and fro, and the burdens of the commercial world. The oceans are flecked with floating palaces carrying people across the seas and the products of every clime from zone to zone. The continents are made to blossom with magnificent cities where the cornucopia of progress pours its bounties into the lap of civilization. Nor does man stop here; the very planet is made to tremble to the vibrant touch of the genius of man. Nor does he stop with the earth; out through space he dares to investigate. From analyzing the atom with hidden powers to exploring the boundless realms of space, with lens, mystic signs and numbers he accurately calculates an eclipse of the sun or moon a thousand years hence. Nor does he pause at solar walk or milky way; on through space he goes balancing galaxies and systems of creation on pivots of thought.

"Let blank defeat, and scorn, and shame
Be his who strives to bind
The onward, leaping waves of thought
The free tide of the mind."

After World War II, for the first time an international civil court tried the instigators of wars of aggression as common criminals. That was a new procedure in jurisprudence. The future of the human race depends on the rational statesmanship exercised by the governments of the world. This Nation set the example of taking a vanquished foe by the hand and helping to restore him to normal life.

We have fought more wars for the liberation of others than all the nations of the past or present. We have given more for philanthropy than all the rest of the world. Are we not jeopardizing our solvency to pour out so many billions of money to resuscitate the bankrupt nations of the eastern continent?

If failure lies in wait, it will be because the Nation and its future citizens have lost the inspiration of the ideals as recited here. The torch of our liberty was lit at the sacred altar of high resolve. The youth of the land should hold to no standard short of the ideal that one is not worthy of the proud title of man, unless he is willing to work for the happiness of unborn generations who may never know that he ever lived. Only by this inspiration can the torch of liberty and justice be passed on to those who follow the vision of unfolding glory. Thus will our country be:

"Like the eagle whose gaze
Feeds on the noontide beams;
Whose golden plume floats aloft
Above the mountains and the crags."

In the language of Gen. Sam Houston in the United States Senate:

"Sirs, so long as that flag bears aloft its glittering stars, bearing them victoriously in the din of battle and waving them triumphantly above the storms of the ocean, so long, I trust, shall the rights and liberties of the American people be preserved and transmitted as a sacred legacy from one generation to another, till discord shall wreck the spheres, the grand march of time shall cease and not one fragment of all creation is left to chafe on the bosom of eternities' waves."

If the legacy we leave to the future rings true to a cultured conscience, then shall the Nation's spiritual glory call for emulation and blend with that which shone from the martyrs of truth in all ages and with the torchbearers of progress who have led the peoples of the earth from savagery to civilization.

Capitalism and the Modern Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward T. McCormick, Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission, gave the following talk to the Calvin Bullock Forum in New York City on December 12, 1950. I feel that this is a very timely subject and one that gives some very basic and fundamental facts regarding capitalism and corporations as they exist today. Under leave to extend, I include the above-mentioned:

CAPITALISM AND THE MODERN CORPORATION
(By Edward T. McCormick)

Mr. Chairman, guests of the forum, when the time came for the Temporary National Economic Committee (popularly known as the TNEC) to plan its report on the concentration of economic power it hired a word expert. You would all recognize his name if I were at liberty to reveal it.

For a very fancy price he wrote a confidential memorandum on the wording of the report. His main idea was that certain words were irritation centers and should be avoided. One of his "bad" words, one of the words he cautioned against, was "capitalism." Instead he recommended using sugar-coated variants.

In recent years there seems to have been a considerable reluctance to use the word "capitalism"—as though there was something in its implications of which we might be ashamed. I have never understood that reluctance. To me it is a good word—grand in its history and meaning.

Within the space of a few generations we have, under capitalism, changed our world so thoroughly in its technology, its economic structure, and the amount and forms of its wealth that it is not too much to say that we have been living through a revolution. It has brought about, by peaceful means, a spread of opportunity and of the real goods of life which bloody revolution has never been able to achieve. By natural development it has changed the face of our economy without shock to our social ideals or social values. Nevertheless, like any change, it has brought problems with it, and has created the need for vigilance in preserving those ideals and values.

Essentially, capitalism is a system of private productive enterprise, based on the profit incentive. It includes the local blacksmith who has saved enough to set himself up in business, and the giant corporation that organizes the savings of thousands of investors and the work of thousands of employees into productive, profit-making enterprise.

However, it is the corporation that is the outstanding characteristic of our business life and it is my view that the development of capitalism to the present high level of productive efficiency would have been impossible without the creation of the corporate form of organization. In other words, it is this unique, artificial personality which has made it possible to bring together the enormous pools of funds, labor, and management so necessary to create our modern productive and distributive machinery, and to keep it moving forward.

I may note, at this point, that when we talk today about the small-business man, we can no longer refer only to the blacksmith and small shopkeeper. Millions of American investors, whose savings are pooled to make giant corporate enterprise possible, are the small-business men of our economic generation.

Perhaps the simplest way of understanding the importance and the special nature of the modern corporation is to see it as a government within a government; to recognize that the job of organizing the vast sums of investment, and the huge labor forces under corporate control are problems of government. When we see the corporation as a business government we can see in perspective many of its developments, and understand many aspects of modern corporate regulation.

We think of the concepts of democracy, bureaucracy, oligarchy, etc., as being related exclusively to established civil governments. In fact, all of us know from experience that government is a necessary attribute of any efficient collective action, whether it is civic, social, military, or economic, and in all these

forms of collective endeavor as the venture becomes larger and more complex the premium on centralized and efficient government becomes greater and the difficulty of preserving the direct contact of the individual with the affairs of the venture becomes magnified, and entrenched and irresponsible control, based on apathy, ignorance, and misuse of the franchise machinery is a possibility in any group action—corporate or otherwise.

Furthermore, in each situation, the full participation of the individual, based on information and a fair opportunity to exercise his voting rights is the only democratic answer to entrenched and irresponsible control.

Many of us are strangely double-minded about the problems of government. We accept as basic to our system a set of constitutional guaranties of our civil rights and civil liberties. We are proud of the entire machinery of justice that works to preserve those rights. Yet, when our Congress belatedly recognized in the 1930's that the very same guaranties should apply to the government of our business enterprises in which the public had a financial interest, cries of anger went up. We were, it was confidently observed, departing from the American tradition.

Understandably, one seldom hears that sort of criticism of our Federal securities laws today. Along with our acceptance of the corporation as a system of business government has come an acceptance of the notion that the citizens of that government—that is, the investors—should have access to material information and the right to make an intelligent and informed use of their votes.

We tend today to accept the corporation and rules for corporate conduct as matters of course. It is natural that we should. Practically every type of business endeavor is now carried on through the corporate device and it is well-nigh impossible to state an accurate figure for the number of corporations—industrial, commercial, charitable, etc.—operating in this country. But according to recent figures released by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, about 526,000 corporations filed income-tax returns in a recent tax year. Some idea of their significance can be gained from the fact that their total compiled receipts for that year amounted to the enormous figure of $290,000,000,000.

These statistics are staggering. They tell us how much of a change has taken place in historical methods of business organization when we compare them with the past. The aggregate wealth of publicly subscribed corporations in England in the middle of the sixteenth century was only about £10,000, and at the height of the speculative fever in 1720, in the days when the South Sea bubble grew and burst, their wealth amounted to but £50,000,000—an aggregate for the whole of England that would make one good-sized enterprise today.

Historically in England and many other countries, a businessman had to petition the sovereign or the legislature for a special patent or a special statute in the event he desired to organize a corporation. There were several reasons for that. In early days the corporate form was often associated with monopoly privilege and the crown or the state was likely to grant that privilege only if adequately compensated for it. However, even though the appeal of limited liability drew more and more ventures of a competitive type into the corporate form, special acts of legislature continued until several of our States, in the last century, passed what the lawyers call general incorporation statutes—laws under which any legal venture might be incorporated, with more or less freedom in the promoters to write their own ticket in setting up the venture and dividing powers between the investors and the management.

Unfortunately, the turn of this century brought with it a race among the States to liberalize their corporation laws in order to attract the revenues that come from incorporation fees. Almost as quickly as lawyers' ingenuity could figure out ways of making the sale of securities, the payment of dividends, the manipulation of participations easy and legal, the laws were amended. In analogy to another type of competition among States, the phrase "Corporation Reno" was widely used as a description of places where the law was bent to serve the promoters' aims.

Any survey of the corporate charters and practices which mushroomed on these liberalized laws will convince even the most dubious that while the laws certainly encouraged promotions in corporate form, they were also making possible such overreaching and abuse that if left unattended would soon have seriously threatened the very foundation of our capitalistic system.

An over-all survey of the ills that resulted from these abuses is beyond my scope. But we have had an excellent sample of some of the financial consequences of this liberalization in the history of our public utility holding company empires. Here was an industry which by its nature should have withstood changes in economic cycles better than almost any other. Yet the standardless and unchecked pyramiding of these empires, the creation of overburdening and complex financial structures, the manipulation of accounts and of public investors' rights that characterized some of these enterprises, most of them legal under the enabling corporation laws of the States, made the structures so vulnerable that they levered adverse changes in the underlying companies into tremendous losses for public investors.

The frequency with which the corporation had historically been used to avoid contract obligations, defraud creditors, evade covenants, and perform skulduggery generally, led people like Woodrow Wilson, who was certainly no rabid radical, to condemn the lawyers for letting loose on society this instrument for the subversion of individual obligations.

With the growth of corporations, with the widespread of public ownership in corporations, operating in many States, with the ever-increasing importance of public capital, something had to be done to preserve the integrity of the investment in corporate securities and the proper relation between the management and investors.

Federal regulation in this field was inevitable.

There are two lines of development in corporate standards and methods of financial regulation exemplified in the Federal laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. One line is purely regulatory. It aims directly at precribing the types of securities that can be issued, the conditions of issuance, the standards that are to be followed in dividend and other policies. That type of regulation is exemplified in the Public Utility Holding Company Act. However, it is limited in its field of application and has been, so far, incidental to major utility system reorganization programs prescribed by the law.

The other type is exemplified by the Securities Act of 1933 and the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934—a pattern whose primary emphasis is on disclosure.

That we have, under our Federal legislation, made great strides in improving standards of disclosure is obvious. But the obvious is sometimes worth repeating. Not only the requirements of Federal law under the securities acts, but great strides in the development of accounting technique have ended, we hope for good, the good old days. The good old days were the days when the Banker's magazine took corporations to task for financial statements "notoriously incorrect, and in many cases made so systematically, for the purpose of concealing from the stockholders and the public violations of law and want of fidelity to their trusts," and when Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review complained "Why should these officers be allowed to carry on their trust in secret, to keep from the public all knowledge of the changes in the value of the property? Indeed it is very much owing to the lack of such information that investors shun these securities." They were the days when William Z. Ripley called the disclosure practices of the 1920's "impublicity."

A securities act and an SEC were necessary because it was deemed wiser and more beneficial to buyer and seller alike to prevent loss at the outset through proper advance disclosure than to let mistake or design cause harm which litigation seldom cures. Yet the standards of disclosure under the Securities Acts are basically not new.

Companies which by inadvertence or design skate too closely to the limits of proper disclosure required by Federal law are likely to attribute the SEC's concern with correct disclosure to bureaucratic idiosyncrasies. But the obligation of one who sells securities to tell the whole truth about what he is selling predates the Securities Act. Lord Kilsant can tell you that. He was jailed by a British court because the company of which he was president sold securities under a prospectus which correctly stated average earnings of his company over a period of years but failed to disclose that there were losses in the later years and that profits in the earlier years were war profits. Our Supreme Court awarded heavy damages under common law against an underwriter whose prospectus failed to fix clearly the boundaries of areas in which the issuer had timber rights. That is the kind of disclosure that is sometimes branded as "technical" when required by the SEC. But these cases were decided by courts and not by bureaucrats, and they were not decided under the Securities Act.

As a result of these laws and the increase in public confidence in our system of business enterprise, the corporate security has emerged as one of the most significant forms of modern wealth. Laws which protect the integrity of a security, as one of my colleagues in the SEC once remarked, are as basic as ancient laws against clipping gold coins which were so necessary in maintaining the stability of early gold economies.

But I wish to add that protecting the integrity of the security is not merely a job of policing the relation between the stockholder and his management. One of the prime attributes of the modern security is its liquidity. Liquidity depends on fair and orderly markets. Therefore, protecting the integrity of a security involves also a surveillance of the market in which the security is traded.

To the SEC has been delegated this responsibility.

Markets at their best are indexes of values. The aim of our current system of market regulation is to keep them such. We must achieve this objective, for our securities markets are more than mere barometers of business conditions. They are direct causative factors as well. They not only record the weather, they make it. Businessmen are as sensitive to the behavior of the securities markets as they are to other business factors. Not only are plans of financing likely to be dropped or modified in response to market

conditions (thus affecting the expenditure of funds for working capital or plant and equipment) but the general mood of businessmen, their willingness to risk expansion and to maintain full employment may be affected by securities market conditions.

Our activity in regulating the markets places its whole emphasis in keeping the markets from becoming an instrument of any particular person's or group of persons' idea of what price should be. A manipulator and an honest economist may join in believing that the market at any given time is underpricing a security. But neither the economist nor the manipulator is allowed to tamper with the market as a reflection of the collective judgment of buyers and sellers.

I wish to emphasize, however, that our antimanipulative activities, coupled with the information requirements of the Securities Acts and the periodic publication of reliable information by listed companies, are not intended to guarantee that markets will not fluctuate sharply. We have been observing such fluctuations within the past few weeks. But these activities and widespread information are invaluable aids in keeping the long-run markets geared and anchored to reality.

It is hard to measure our success in the policing of our markets and in tempering market behavior with information and disclosure. I believe that we have had a great deal of success, and that the old-fashioned rigs are largely things of the past. One measure of our performance has been the uninterrupted continuity of our markets. During the existence of the SEC they suffered shocks from world events that could, in an era of unregulated high-binding, have driven them into such extreme disorder as to require shutting them down for a period. That has never happened under the SEC and we will have to see events of unprecedented magnitude before it ever becomes a matter of serious consideration.

To keep markets free and open so that this vital barometer and causal factor in our economy shall not be a prey to manipulation, to keep markets orderly within reasonable limits by the best and most reasonable forms of regulation we could provide, are more than technical challenges. I hope that my discussion has shown that they are jobs of top priority in our economic system.

In view of the fundamental role of the corporation in our economy it follows that those who operate our corporations have a high responsibility for the maintenance of our capitalistic system. Unlike the big names of the last generation, the names of bankers whose primary emphasis was on finance and on operating the engines of finance, today's big names are those of the corporate managers who have the job of day-to-day running of these business empires.

How these managers treat with labor, how they react to the public needs, to Government policies affecting the economy, and to the rights of investors will directly affect our strength.

As time goes on and we realize the depth of our commitment to a stable world national morale becomes a top-drawer concern. In measuring the responsibility and performance of the management of American big business, I do not think it too far fetched to suggest that management has as much to do with the national morale as it does with the national economy. The way of life which we defend is in large part defined by our corporate system, and the managements of big business cannot help but bear direct responsibility for the system and the values that Americans are called on to fight for.

I think that the signs are encouraging. More than ever before, management is forward looking, responsive to the needs of those affected by business, and willing to look at its problems in broad perspective.

Great tasks lie ahead of all of us, and without that kind of management we may fail. With it all our united efforts can be pitched toward a better America in a better world.

Change of House Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1949, when the resolution changing the rules of the House was presented, I was a new Member just freshly sworn in. While I had had considerable training in the law prior to that time, I was not too familiar with the rules of the House of Representatives and parliamentary law generally. I had no opportunity then, as a new Member, to draw any conclusions as to how the change of rules would operate on legislation. I was in the same position at that time as many of you Members who are sitting in the House for the first time today.

I voted for the change of rules on January 3, 1949, because at that time I felt with the very meager information I had concerning the effect of the change, that it would actually further true representative government. After sitting in the House for 2 years, and watching the operation of the rules change, I find that I was mistaken in my idea that the change would promote truly representative government. I find, on the other hand, that the rules change actually blocks the legislative processes, and in addition, gives additional dictatorial powers to one Member of the House of Representatives. I therefore shall vote for this amendment today, and urge all my colleagues who may or may not be well informed as to the operation of this rule, to do likewise.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a defense measure.

It has long been recognized by the Defense Establishments of the United States Government, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Resources Board as well as the Army and Navy, that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will be a substantial addition to the industrial mobilization requirements of this country. In this view the Canadian Government authorities as well as the Canadian-American Joint Board of Defense concur.

The recent developments in international conditions emphasize again the fact that the defense of the American way of life and of individual freedom all over the world will fall upon the manpower and resources of the United States and its northern neighbor, Canada. When we contemplate the disparity in the population resources between ourselves and our enemies, it is obvious that the only way we can overcome this handicap is by the utilization of power, improved technology, and natural resources.

One of these basic resources is the steel industry which is at the foundation of our industrial civilization. The continued operation of the steel industry and its expansion requires very large amounts of iron ore. It is now recognized that this country must utilize, in addition to Minnesota and Michigan, new sources of iron ore which must be brought to our middle western steel mills. This is at the very foundation of our strength and we cannot tamper with it without inviting disaster.

It is important that this vital raw material be secured from our own sources in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and from other continental sources such as Ontario and Labrador in order to save our supplies, our ships, and our seamen from the danger of enemy submarines. Viewed in this light the St. Lawrence seaway has become a national necessity.

The present conditions make it obvious that whether we engage in defensive mobilization or we are plunged into war we are in a long period of emergency and of danger. This period must be viewed in a longer span of years than World War II, which lasted from 1939 to 1945. We must in fact think of the development and mobilization of this country in terms of 10 or more years because the struggle for survival will be a long one.

Recent newspaper reports indicate that Soviet Russia, which undertook a gigantic water development program connecting the Volga River with the Don River to create through navigation from the Black Sea to the Caspian Sea and from the Caspian to the White Sea and from the White Sea to the Baltic Sea, which was started in 1946, is nearing completion and it is being given high priority as a part of their war mobilization program. In connection with this development the Russians are diverting water from the Arctic watershed to the Caspian Sea and in the process are generating huge amounts of power.

It is essential, therefore, that we in this country consider the continental developments in Canada as well as in the United States for mutual defense of the

whole Northern Hemisphere. This project, more than any other, will add to the joint capacity of our two countries to wage a successful struggle over the difficulties ahead.

Comparison of 1950 Political Polls With Election Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD relative to a series of predictions made by a number of political prognosticators and poll-takers on the congressional elections of 1950 in comparison with the actual results.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the pollsters and the politicial prophets are to be given publicity and attention prior to an election, they also deserve and should be given an equal amount of attention and publicity after an election. Having the pleasure of knowing personally most of the galaxy of predictors whom I shall quote, I am sure they are all more than willing to have their past predictions and prophecies spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the generations to come after us may have the benefit of their wisdom and their clairvoyant powers, as so well displayed in the weeks and months prior to the congressional elections of November 1950.

So, in the desire to be of service to posterity, I hereby submit the following report of recent political prophecies:

1950 ELECTION PREDICTIONS BY DEMOCRATIC PARTY OFFICIALS AND SOME POLLS AND SURVEYS

1. LESLIE BIFFLE, SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

At Miami, Fla., on October 12, 1950, Leslie Biffle, Secretary of the Senate, predicted that the Democrats would keep control of the House and gain strength in the Senate. Biffle said "without any ifs, ands, or buts" we will beat TAFT in Ohio, CAPEHART in Indiana, and MILLIKIN in Colorado. (UP New York Times, October 13, 1950.)

Result: Senator TAFT defeated Joseph T. Ferguson by 431,184 votes; Senator CAPEHART defeated Alex M. Campbell by more than 103,000 votes; Senator MILLIKIN defeated John A. Carroll by 27,000 votes; the Democrats lost strength in the Senate, their margin whittled to two seats.

On November 2, 1950, Biffle said reports reaching him indicate the Democrats will increase their Senate margin by one or two seats. (Washington Star, November 2, 1950.)

Result: Democrats lost 5 Senate seats (net), decreasing their margin of control to 2 seats—Democrats 49 seats, Republicans 47 seats.

2. WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR., CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Claims of prospective Democratic victories across the Nation's bread basket in November were made today by William M. Boyle, Jr., Democratic National Chairman.

Reporting to party workers in the closed door strategy session held here last month, Mr. Boyle said that State leaders predicted gains in Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Illinois, and Indiana, including the election of Democratic Senators from Iowa and Indiana.

Mr. Boyle wrote that Jake More, Iowa State chairman, had predicted the defeat of Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, and election of at least four Democratic Congressmen. (New York Times, March 4, 1950.)

Result: Republicans swept Iowa, Kansas, South Dakota, and North Dakota in both the House and Senate; Republicans also gained one House seat in Nebraska to sweep that State; Republicans picked up four House seats in Illinois; Republicans picked up five House seats in Indiana and reelected the Republican Senator.

Boyle contended the outlook for his party had not been better for a long while in an off year. He said he was certain Democrats would control the Eighty-second Congress, registering gains in both Houses. (New York Times, October 26, 1950.)

Result: Democrats retained control of both House and Senate by slim margins losing seats in each:

Republicans:	
House	199
Senate	47
Democrats:	
House	236
Senate	49
Democratic margin:	
House	37
Senate	2

The Democratic Party is assured of continued control of Congress with good prospects of picking 2 to 4 Senate seats and gains in the House. Indications of another smashing Democratic victory. (Baltimore Sun, November 4, 1950.)

Result: Democrats lost 5 Senate seats and 27 House seats.

3. SENATOR CLINTON ANDERSON, OF NEW MEXICO, CHAIRMAN OF SENATE DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Democrats will pick up at least two Senate seats and do no worse than break even in the House. (AP, Washington Star, November 7, 1950.)

Result: Democrats lost 6 Senate seats, picking up one, and lost 29 House seats, picking up two.

4. PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

(Regarding Senator Millard Tydings): His 3-to-1 victory in the Maryland primary was interpreted by the President as a victory for the administration. The President reckoned the outcome a good election omen. (Newsweek, October 2, 1950.)

At a press conference on October 19, 1950, Truman predicted a Democratic landslide on election day that would surprise as many Republicans as his victory of 1948. (New York Times, October 20, 1950.)

In his speech in Kansas City on November 4, 1950, Truman stated, "Tonight the Democratic Party is on its way to victory again." (New York Times, November 5, 1950.)

Result: Senator Tydings was defeated by Republican JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER by 43,000 votes. Elsewhere Democrats lost 29 House seats and 5 Senate seats (in addition to Tydings), picking up only 1 Senate and 2 House seats.

5. VICE PRESIDENT ALBEN BARKLEY

Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY predicted October 19 that the Democrats would keep both Houses and might pick up a few seats. (Congressional Quarterly, October 20, 1950.)

Result: While the Democrats kept control of both Houses, they lost 29 House seats and 6 Senate seats, picking up only one Senate and two House seats.

The Vice President told newsmen that Democratic prospects in Kansas were "very good." (Baltimore Sun, October 8, 1950.)

Result: Republicans swept Kansas in both House and Senate.

6. REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OF OHIO, CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Decisive gains for Democrats. (Washington Daily News, November 4, 1950.)

Result: Democrats picked up only two Republicans' House seats and only one in the Senate.

7. WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT, A. F. OF L.

Green told the crowd at Peoria's armory that he is convinced Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, will be defeated November 7 by Democrat Joseph Ferguson. (Washington Post, October 10, 1950.)

Result: Senator TAFT defeated Ferguson by a margin of 431,184 votes.

8. JACK KROLL, DIRECTOR OF CIO POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Democrats will gain 3 or 4 in Senate and 15 to 30 in House. (AP, Washington Star, November 7, 1950)

Result: Democrats lost 6 in Senate, picking up only 1, and lost 29 in House, picking up only 2 Republican seats.

9. DREW PEARSON, NOVEMBER 5, 1950, 6 P. M., ABC NETWORK

"I predict that Anna Frohmiller will be elected Governor of Arizona."

Result: J. Howard Pyle, Republican gubernatorial candidate, was elected.

"In Illinois I predict that Senator Lucas, Democrat, will win."

Result: EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican senatorial candidate, defeated Lucas by 275,000 votes.

"In Utah, Senator Elbert Thomas—I also predict he will win."

Result: WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican senatorial candidate, defeated Thomas by 22,000 votes.

"In Iowa I predict that Senator HICKENLOOPER, who has one of the worst absentee records in Congress, will lose."

Result: Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican, defeated Democratic Candidate Albert J. Loveland by 87,000 votes.

"In Colorado I predict that Senator MILLIKIN, Republican, will be defeated."

Result: Senator MILLIKIN, Republican, defeated Democratic Candidate John A. Carroll by 27,000 votes.

"In the second Idaho race, isolationist HENRY DWORSHAK will also lose."

Result: Senator DWORSHAK defeated Claude J. Burtenshaw, Democratic candidate, by 10,000 votes.

"I predict that Senator TAFT will win by a very slender margin."

Result: Senator TAFT defeated candidate Ferguson by 431,184 votes.

"I predict that Senator Tydings will be elected, also Governor Lane."

Result: Senator Tydings was defeated by candidate BUTLER by 43,000 votes; Governor Lane was defeated by Theodore R. McKeldin by 94,000 votes.

"I predict that Judge Ferdinand Pecora will be elected."

Result: Candidate Impellitteri, acting mayor, was elected.

"Governor Dewey, for the first time in his life, will lose."

Result: Governor Dewey, Republican, defeated gubernatorial candidate Walter Lynch by 572,000.

"In California, I predict Mrs. Douglas will win."

Result: Republican candidate RICHARD NIXON defeated Mrs. Douglas by 680,000 votes.

10. NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE

February 13, 1950: Democratic strategists see a fair chance to pick up the House seats

from Maine held by ROBERT HALE and CHARLES NELSON.

Result: Both HALE and NELSON were reelected.

October 9, 1950: Experienced observers now think Senator ROBERT TAFT is running behind in Ohio. His main troubles are the all-out union activity and a big registration of new young voters who lean Democratic, according to surveys.

Result: Senator TAFT won by 431,184 votes.

October 16, 1950: The Democrats are supremely confident of the outcome. They are, in fact, warning each other against overconfidence. "Things look so good we're worried," said an aide in Lucas' Stevens Hotel headquarters in Chicago. Jake Arvey, the shrewd Cook County Democratic boss, who has been taking polls outside Chicago theaters, estimates on the basis of the results that Lucas will carry Cook County by 400,000 votes and Illinois as a whole by 270,000, even if rural precincts turn in their usual Republican majorities—to Arvey this discontent is a myth. People never vote against the party in power when they're as prosperous as they are now, he contends. And to this he adds a statement which the Republicans of Illinois believe as firmly as he does: "The election will be a referendum on the Truman administration. If Lucas loses here, the Republicans will sweep the country and win the Congress."

Result: Republican Senatorial candidate EVERETT M. DIRKSEN defeated Lucas by 275,000 votes.

November 6, 1950: Correspondents' election preview (50 newspaper reporters and columnists):

Republicans:	
House	198
Senate	45
Democrats:	
House	237
Senate	51
Result:	
Republicans (House)	199
Democrats (House)	236
Republicans (Senate)	47
Democrats (Senate)	49

11. TIME MAGAZINE, OCTOBER 23, 1950

They expected these Democrats to win:

Illinois: Majority Leader Scott Lucas who has forged ahead of ex-Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN since the landing at Inchon.

Maryland: Senator Millard Tydings over JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.

Result: Senator Lucas was defeated by DIRKSEN by 275,000 votes; Senator Tydings was defeated by BUTLER by 43,000 votes.

12. WASHINGTON POST, NOVEMBER 5, 1950, ROBERT C. ALBRIGHT

Between Senator Lucas and former Representative DIRKSEN appears just as close, with the odds fractionally favoring Lucas.

One Senate seat formerly considered "safe" by Republicans, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER's Iowa chair, seems in last-minute serious trouble from Democratic nominee Albert J. Loveland.

Result: Senator Lucas was defeated by DIRKSEN by 275,000 votes; Senator HICKENLOOPER defeated Loveland by 67,000 votes.

13. THE GALLUP POLL, NOVEMBER 6, 1950

In a poll dated November 5, 1950, Gallup (American Institute of Public Opinion) predicted a national vote division for the House, excluding 5 percent undecided, of Democratic 51 percent, Republican 49 percent. The release stated that the survey points to continued Democratic control of the House. The survey stated that party percentages cannot be translated into House seats. But the figures show a shift of sentiment toward the GOP which would indicate moderate seat gains for the Republicans. (Washington Post, November 6, 1950.)

Result: An AP story dated December 24, 1950, gives the Republican percentage of national total vote for House as 49.08, Democratic as 48.95, and others as 2.02. (Boston Herald, December 25, 1950.)

14. THE DUNN SURVEY

Headline: "Predicts GOP will fumble and lose again."

The Republican Party this year has the greatest opportunity it has had to beat the New Deal, but, nevertheless, will receive its worst set-back since 1936 in the National, State, and local elections in November. (Chicago Tribune, September 28, 1950.)

Result: Nationally, the Republicans gained 27 House seats (net) and 5 Senate seats (net). In the States, Republicans gained 6 Governor seats (net).

15. LOUIS H. BEAN, LOOK MAGAZINE, AUGUST 29, 1950

Colorado: Democratic Representative John A. Carroll has a better than even chance to replace Republican Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN.

Result: Senator MILLIKIN defeated Carroll by 27,000 votes.

Connecticut: A reasonably certain sweep for the GOP over Democratic Senators McMahon and Benton and Gov. Chester Bowles as well.

Result: Senators MCMAHON and BENTON were reelected, and Governor Bowles was defeated by John Davis Lodge, Republican.

Nevada: Despite a Democratic tradition, there's been a strong swing to the Republicans in this State, Democratic Senator PAT MCCARRAN will probably lose.

Result: Senator MCCARRAN defeated Republican Senatorial Candidate George E. Marshall.

Ohio: In extremely close battle, with indications as of now that Democratic candidate Joseph T. Ferguson will nose out Republican Senator TAFT.

Result: Senator TAFT defeated Ferguson by 431,184 votes.

Here are the safe Senate seats for November:

Democrats: Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina (2), and Utah.

Result: Maryland and Utah elected Republican Senators.

As to the 16 doubtful senatorial seats, according to Bean:

Probable Democrat: Colorado, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Washington.

Result: Colorado and Ohio reelected Republican Senators.

Probable Republican: Connecticut (2), Idaho (2), Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin.

Result: Connecticut and Nevada reelected their Democratic Senators. No prediction California—the outcome is anybody's guess.

Result: The Republican senatorial victory was overwhelming—by 680,000 votes.

Louis H. Bean, the midterm battle

In the gubernatorial races, the Democrats would normally face a midterm loss of two or three of their present governors, but unusually strong candidates may limit Republican net gains to only one.

Result: Republicans made net gains of six.

16. WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR.

Headline: "Boyle asks State Democratic chiefs to explain why their rosy forecasts missed the mark."

William M. Boyle, Jr., Democratic national chairman, as puzzled as anyone, called on party leaders in the States to tell him wherein their forecasts had been in error. State leaders made reports on which he and President Truman based their landslide predictions.

17. NEW YORK TIMES, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1950

Arizona: Mrs. Frohmiller is expected to become Arizona's first woman Governor.

Result: J. Howard Pyle, Republican gubernatorial candidate, was elected.

California: The Democrats are given a good chance to gain one House seat and thus win a majority in the State's delegation.

Result: The Republicans gained one House seat in California.

Colorado: Mr. Carroll is rated slightly ahead.

Result: Senator MILLIKIN, Republican, defeated Democrat John A. Carroll by 27,000 votes.

Illinois: Since the tide turned in Korea, Mr. Lucas may have pulled ahead slightly.

Result: EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican senatorial candidate, defeated Lucas by 275,000 votes.

Iowa: Mr. Loveland is given a fair chance in the Senate race.

Result: Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican, defeated Democrat Albert J. Loveland by 67,000 votes.

Maryland: The race for Senator and Governor may be close, with Democrats given the edge.

Result: Senator Tydings was defeated by Republican BUTLER by 43,000 votes. Governor Lane was defeated by Republican McKeldin by 94,000 votes.

New Mexico: The Democrats are expected to win the governorship.

Result: Republican Edwin L. Mechem was victorious.

Oregon: The Democrats have a good chance of unseating two of the Republican Congressmen.

Result: All four Republican incumbents were reelected.

Utah: Senator Thomas is favored to win.

Result: WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, defeated Thomas by 22,000 votes.

West Virginia: Three of the Democratic seats are considered safe, Republicans, including Mr. Holt, are given a good chance in the other three contests.

Result: Republicans did not win any seats in West Virginia.

Wyoming: The Republicans are expected to lose their House seat.

Result: WILLIAM H. HARRISON, Republican candidate, was victorious by 8,382 votes.

Wisconsin: Mr. Thompson is given a good chance to become the first Democrat-elected Governor since 1932. Mr. Fairchild is also considered strong.

Result: Republican Walter J. Kohler, Jr., defeated Mr. Thompson in the gubernatorial race by 82,000 votes. Senator WILEY, Republican, defeated Mr. Fairchild by 60,000 votes.

18. CAPITAL COMMENT: SEPTEMBER 30, 1950

On the basis of these figures, of known trends, and of the quality of our candidates, Democrats in Wisconsin are confident that, with a continued all-out effort, they can elect a Governor and a Senator, and pick up at least two, and maybe four, seats in Congress.

Result: The Republican candidates for Governor and Senator were both successful. The Democrats lost one House seat to the Republicans.

The Democratic trend throughout the Nation is stronger today than it was in 1948, according to reports coming in from all parts of the country.

Result: The division of the total national vote in 1950 as compared with 1948 was: Republicans (1948) 45.1 percent, (1950) 49.03 percent; Democrats (1948) 49.4 percent, (1950) 48.95 percent; others (1948) 5.5 percent, (1950) 2.02 percent.

19. WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR., DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

Thus, the Maine election results, which always serve in some degree as a barometer

of political sentiment in the country, this year indicated that we can expect a big total vote and increased Democratic strength in November.

I have analyzed the figures carefully, and they indicate without question that the underlying trend toward the Democratic Party is still running strongly. * * * The Maine voting is the best indication we have had—although there have been others—that the trend is continuing unabated.—(Capital Comment, September 16, 1950.)

Result: Democrats had a net loss of 27 seats in the House and 5 in the Senate. They also lost a net of 6 Governors.

20. WASHINGTON POST, NOVEMBER 5, 1950, ROBERT ALBRIGHT

Officially, Democrats are saying they expect to hold their own and stand a good chance of increasing their House and Senate majorities. Privately, Capt. Victor Hunt Harding, Democratic congressional expert, fixes his range between a net House gain of 10 Democratic seats and a net loss of 20. He thinks the net change in the Senate won't shift more than 2 seats either way.

Because of the widespread attention which Mr. Louis Bean has received as a prognosticator, it is worth noting that his prognostications in 1948 were also worthless. The following is taken from the postelection issue of Newsweek magazine, November 15, 1948, page 29:

THE SEERS—UP THE BEAN POLL

While poll takers Elmo Roper, George Gallup, and Archibald Crossley were holding their heads last week as a result of erroneous election forecasts, a determined advertising and newspaper campaign was launched to prove that one scientific expert—Louis H. Bean, a Government economist—had actually forecast President Truman's amazing victory.

Two days after the election, on Thursday, November 4, Alfred A. Knopf, publisher of Bean's book How To Predict Elections, ran advertisements headed: "Oh, Mr. Gallup! Oh, Mr. Roper! Obviously, you don't know Bean's How To Predict Elections—the book that shows how to accurately predict elections. At all book stores, $2.50."

The following day, the International Latex Corp. of Dover, Del., which has made a practice of running public-service ads on political issues, bought two-column, page-length space to quote from Bean's book under the headline: "Was there an election mystery?"

On Sunday, in its weekly review section, under the headline: "The 'Bean Poll' was right," the New York Herald Tribune carried a Washington story by a staff member, Frederick Gutheim, declaring Bean had predicted as far back as last April that the Democrats not only would retain the Presidency but would recapture control of Congress as well.

Short-sighted hindsight: What everyone had evidently overlooked last week was Bean's own forecast just 3 days before the election. Although Bean in his book had correctly held that the swing from the Democrats had reached bottom after the 1946 GOP landslide, his forecast made to Peter Edson, Scripps-Howard columnist on October 30 (and to Drew Pearson on October 17), was as wrong, if not more wrong, than those of Roper, Gallup, and Crossley:

"President Truman will need an all-out turn-out of nearly 60,000,000 voters to win the election," Bean told Edson. "That is what he is fighting for—to get out the vote and turn the tide which all polls have indicated are against him.

"There are some interesting trends in this election. Many voters who seem to be Democrats when thinking about the congressional election are Republicans when thinking about the Presidential race."

Tracing the total votes in past elections and noting that the polls indicated the vote might go no higher than 51,000,000, Bean forecast to Edson that Mr. Truman would carry only 9 States and that even if it reached 55,000,000 he would carry only 16. Bean, like the other experts, failed to estimate the outcome on the unexpectedly low 47,000,000-vote total. But if his reasoning had been carried out, he would have given Mr. Truman even fewer States than the 9 he accorded him on the basis of a 51,000,000 total vote.

In brief, Bean had never completely dismissed the possibility of Democratic victory, but Bean in October evidently had forgotten Bean in April. (Roper and Gallup also forgot Roper and Gallup of earlier date. Gallup in January and Roper in February had shown Mr. Truman ahead.)

Although Newsweek is silent as to what Drew Pearson actually said on October 17, 1948, inquiry at his office discloses that Mr. Pearson quoted Mr. Louis Bean as predicting that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey would get 27,500,000 votes, Mr. Truman 24,500,000 votes, making Mr. Dewey the winner by a plurality of 3,000,000 votes.

Actual results: Mr. Dewey, 21,969,170; Mr. Truman, 24,105,695.

The Low Ebb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, at the request of Mr. V. A. Hutton, adjutant of American Legion Post, No. 8, an editorial from the Daily Herald at Fredonia, Kans. In a letter accompanying this editorial, Mr. Hutton states that at a regular Legion meeting a resolution was unanimously passed requesting that this editorial be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

THE LOW EBB

We have not lost confidence in the American people, yet we are forced to admit that, today, we are ashamed of our Nation, rather are we ashamed of our Government.

There have been many times when we, as Americans, have criticized our Government; we pride ourselves in that right, but when we arrive at that point when we are ashamed of our Government, as that feeling is prevalent today in the hearts of nearly all, then we are indeed at low ebb.

We are ashamed of a President, who through his pettiness, has brought us to the brink of a new war, with all nations on earth our critics, in spite of the food and clothing and money we have lavished on them.

We are ashamed of a Secretary of State who apes Chamberlain of Munich and permits our enemies to dictate our policies.

We are ashamed of an Army staff that permits our sons and our brothers to go into battle with a vicious enemy, without previous knowledge of that enemy's disposition, equipment, or strength, and that our troops should meet these fanatics illy equipped and led.

We are ashamed of a commander who sends our troops into certain defeat when by judicious use of accepted military tactics many thousands of lives could have been spared.

We are ashamed of a Nation of businessmen who will sell to our certain enemies needed supplies and equipment definitely planned to be used against our own boys, and a supine Government that is equally guilty in permitting such blood transactions.

And we heartily are ashamed of a Congress that will busy itself with petty problems as the disgusting spectacle continues. Indeed, have we sunk to new depths and there seems no way out.

Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on this the first day of the Eighty-second Congress I have reintroduced a bill to suspend the import tax on copper. During both sessions of the Eightieth Congress and in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress legislation of this type was enacted into law. Sectional opposition in the other body prevented its enactment in the session just concluded. It is regrettable, but true, that a group of national legislators were more concerned with regional self-interest than with the national welfare.

Since June 30, 1950, an import tax of 2 cents per pound has been imposed upon copper ore brought to this country from other nations of the world. The natural effect of this tax imposition has been to lessen the supply of copper available to fabricators. This in spite of the protestations of domestic producers that a sufficient supply of copper would be produced without imports from foreign sources.

The reduction of copper for civilian use as ordered by the National Production Authority is evidence of the short supply of this metal. Without assurances of increased amounts of copper ore, cutbacks in production and employment are inevitable in industrial areas of our Nation. This at a time of national emergency, when all our efforts should be directed toward the future security of the United States.

The military stockpile of copper is inadequate to assure even the continuing production of weapons and other war matériel. It is a disgraceful situation in which we find ourselves.

This Congress must face up to the problem of assuring increased imports of copper ore for the national defense. The bill introduced today provides that the import tax shall be suspended from April 1, 1951, until the termination of the national emergency. This tenure is used in preference to a specific cutoff date, as I realize that our need for copper will increase rather than decrease for the duration of the national emergency.

Let us legislate for the best interests of our Nation rather than on a regional basis. The people of America look to this new Congress for faith in our system of government and the preservation of world peace. Let our only consideration in our duties be that what we do is good for America. I trust that this most important legislation will not be the ob-

ject of partisan wrangling, but rather that public hearings will be scheduled as soon as possible and House approval obtained shortly thereafter.

Physically Handicapped Persons and Disabled Veterans in the Federal Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by Dr. Verne K. Harvey, M. D., Chief of the Medical Division of the Civil Service Commission. Dr. Harvey and the Medical Division of the Civil Service Commission have done outstanding work with respect to the rehabilitation and placement of physically handicapped persons, particularly veterans, in the Federal service. The statement by Dr. Harvey follows:

ROLE OF DISABLED IMPORTANT IN FEDERAL SERVICE, ASSERTS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION MEDICAL DIRECTOR

To consider ability rather than disability is what the handicapped program of the Civil Service Commission tries to do, Dr. Verne K. Harvey, M. D., Medical Director of the Commission, told the Exchange recently.

The Commission designs its tests with the knowledge that a man can be physically handicapped without being job handicapped.

Dr. Harvey stated the two basic concepts that guide the Commission's program: (1) Is the handicapped person qualified to do the job? (2) Can he efficiently perform the duties of the job without hazard to himself or others?

The Medical Division sets the physical requirements for all jobs. It is responsible for seeing that when an exam is arranged, the physical requirements are those for doing the job efficiently.

"Civil service is on a competitive basis," Dr. Harvey said. "We are out to see that the physical requirements are realistic. It is not realistic to say a job needs a man with two arms when a man with one arm can perform it just as well."

HANDICAPS ARE VALUABLE

The doctor feels that at present hiring officials are much more aware of the value of handicapped employees than they were several years ago.

"There are still some people who are afraid physically handicapped people will be disability retirement risks," Dr. Harvey said. "But this is not the case. The whole basis they are hired on is whether or not they can do the work efficiently and safely."

Explaining the Commission's role, the doctor said, "The Commission does not rehabilitate. Others do that. We are interested in seeing that Uncle Sam gives them equal opportunity after they are rehabilitated."

SECTION HAS AUTHORITY

When agencies are not obeying the Veterans' Preference Act or Public Law 617, the Commission has power to make them do so. Public Law 617 (80th Cong.) reads in part: "No person shall be discriminated against in any case because of physical handicap, with respect to any position the duties of which, in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission, may be efficiently performed by a person with such a physical handicap."

The medical section is also interested in the technique of exams. If a written test is too difficult they will provide help. For example, if a spastic has difficulty writing, it will provide a person to write down the answers he decides.

The medical section also works with appointing officers to help place the handicapped.

PROPERLY PLACED IMPORTANT

"It is important that they are placed properly," Dr. Harvey said. "We emphasize this. We don't believe in taking safety risks."

The handicapped program received its first real impetus under Dr. Harvey. In 1942 the Commission surveyed thousands of jobs from coast to coast to see what jobs existed that could be filled by handicapped. This report was published and made available to departments and agencies. In 1943 a booklet, Untapped Manpower, was issued, telling appointing officers how they could ease their manpower shortage by hiring handicapped.

STUDY BEGUN IN 1943

Then, late in 1943, the Medical Section launched a vast performance study. They took 3,000 handicapped employees and compared their services against 5,000 nonhandicapped. They compared them on production and efficiency, accident experience, sick absenteeism, and turnover. The result showed: (1) Physically handicapped employees compared favorably in the first four items and (2) figures in the study of turnovers showed them to be far superior as stable employees.

This study was first published in the American Medical Journal and later issued as a handbook.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND IN FEDERAL SERVICE

Figures show that from 1942–49 over 100,000 severely handicapped people were placed in the Federal service. Dr. Harvey feels there has been a large increase in handicapped employment since the Korean conflict, though no figures are available.

Asked if he thought the handicapped would play an important role if there is another big increase in hiring due to the present crisis, Dr. Harvey said, "Definitely. An employer who gets a trained handicapped person is fortunate. It's important to know he won't be running around after another job or subject to draft. The tighter the labor market, the better it is to hire handicapped.

"There is another side I'd like to emphasize. I think the handicapped people themselves have a big responsibility to see they maintain their enviable record."

The mild-voiced, 52-year-old doctor has been with the Commission since 1940. A native of Indianapolis, Ind., he took his medical degree at the University of Indiana and did postgraduate work at Johns Hopkins under a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship. He was with the Indiana State Board of Health, and was State health commissioner for 7½ years before coming to the Civil Service Commission.

Statement by Hon. Louis B. Heller, of New York, Against Repeal of 21-Day Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the battle for democracy is never finally won, either on the field of conflict in foreign lands or in the Halls of Congress itself. A year ago this House defeated a coalition campaign to repeal the 21-day rule by a vote of 236 to 183. That was a great victory for democracy in Congress and for the control of legislative action by the House itself instead of by a small committee clique. Now that victory is threatened with reversal, just as our hard-won gains on the battlefields of far-off Korea have been reversed by the forces of communism.

I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to rise and strike down once again this reactionary resolution. This move to restore autocratic control over legislation to the Committee on Rules is not an isolated phenomenon. It is an episode in a world-wide contest of ideas whose outcome will determine whether government by the few or by the many shall finally prevail—whether democracy or oligarchy shall rule our lives and our legislative processes.

If here in the citadel of democracy, we continue to surrender to the forces of filibuster and pigeonhole in our midst—as we have on civil rights and on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and on home rule for Washington—then the faith of the people in representative government will receive another vital blow and mankind everywhere will know that we do not practice the democracy we preach.

Our enemies abroad have been capitalizing with telling effect upon the failures of American democracy here at home. Our foreign relations have been gravely embarrassed by filibusters against civil rights and statehood in the other body, as well as by the failure of this House to grant elementary rights of local self-government to the people of Washington. The fabric of democracy is weakened by the exclusion of any group from its participation and protection.

If there ever was a time, Mr. Speaker, when we should hold to past gains—and further democratize the internal organization and procedures of Congress—this is that time. For on foreign fields of battle democracy almost everywhere is in bitter retreat and it is much later than we think.

So let us not surrender in this fateful hour to the little men of no vision. Let us not surrender to those who would use the closet of the Rules Committee as a pigeonhole for progressive legislation and a deep freeze for the legitimate aspirations of the American people. Let us not yield our victory of yesteryear to those pusillanimous men who would erect their petty prejudices and sectional selfishness into national policies. Rather, let us seize the democratic torch, men of Congress, and carry it on to new heights of legislative achievement.

The 21-day rule served us well during the Eighty-first Congress. It brought the anti-poll-tax bill and the rivers and harbors bill to the floor of the House in 1949. The threat of its use forced action on the housing and minimum wage bills. During 1950 it was, thanks to the 21-day rule, that we were able to work our will on the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills and the national science foundation

bill. Without this rule, these and other important measures—which had been favorably reported by the legislative committees of the House—would still be buried in the graveyard of the Rules Committee.

Let us not clog the legislative highways of democracy with reactionary road blocks. Let us teach the Rules Committee that it is a traffic director, not a barricade. Let us keep the 21-day rule.

[From the Washington Post of January 3, 1951]

LEGISLATIVE GRAVEYARD

The House of Representatives will be asked today to surrender its power to legislate into the hands of a small group of men who have often demonstrated that they do not know how to use it wisely. Technically stated, the question will be whether the 21-day rule shall be repealed. Everyone familiar with congressional procedure knows, however, that this is the rule which permits the chairmen of legislative committees to lay their bills before the House (after a waiting period of 21 days) if the bill has been pigeonholed by the Rules Committee contrary to the wishes of a majority of House Members. If the repeal resolution is adopted, as Congressman HELLER pointed out when a similar attempt was made a year ago, "the Rules Committee will become a graveyard where the policies of both political parties and the hopes of the American people will be buried."

Sponsors of this reactionary movement seem to be appealing especially to inexperienced new Members and to the partisan interests of the enlarged Republican minority. In our opinion, repeal of the 21-day rule would be unfortunate from the viewpoint of both groups. The one hope that new Members have of getting their proposals accepted lies in working with the legislative committees, in which bills are analyzed on their merits. New Members would gravely handicap their own efforts if they should restore a Rules Committee veto over what the legislative committees do. And how could they face their constituents 2 years hence and admit that their first significant vote in the House was against democratic procedure in lawmaking?

No doubt, many Republicans will be tempted to favor restoration of the Rules Committee graveyard as a means of frustrating the administration. But there are two powerful reasons why they should not yield to this temptation. First, this is a period in which the arbitrary stalling of our legislative machinery might bring disaster. The House cannot resign into the hands of seven men the power to decide whether or not it can act on any given measure without leaving the whole Nation at the mercy of an unrepresentative and often arbitrary faction. In the second place, of course, the Republicans would find the restoration of a Rules Committee dictatorship a critical handicap if they should come to power in 1952. If they should repeal the 21-day rule now, they could not restore it with the advent of a Republican administration without making themselves ridiculous.

The Rules Committee ought to function as a legislative traffic director, working in close cooperation with the House leadership. But experience shows that it will never confine itself to that task unless compelled to do so. It seems to us that every Member of the House, with the possible exception of the 12 Rules Committeemen themselves, has an interest in retaining a check on the autocratic power the committee once wielded. This can be accomplished only by keeping the 21-day rule intact.

How Much Longer Shall American Men Be Compelled by Their Government To Fight and Die Without the Help, Both Direct and Diversionary, of the Strongest Anti-Communist Forces in Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the last of three factual articles on the strongest allies America has in Asia, and which, for no discoverable good reason, have been imprisoned on Formosa by our Government, giving the Chinese Reds full opportunity to concentrate their strength against our forces in Korea. It is not only madness; it is murder. How long, Mr. Acheson, how long?

[From the Washington Daily News of January 3, 1951]

CHINESE NATIONALISTS DON'T LACK MEN OR DETERMINATION

(NOTE.—This is the last of three articles by Clyde Farnsworth answering the question raised in some quarters as to whether the Chinese Nationalists can and will fight. Mr. Farnsworth returned to this country recently from an 8-year tour of duty in the Orient.)

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

Of all the things the Chinese Nationalists need to turn Formosa into a counteroffensive base for deliverance to China, the least is manpower and determination to fight their way home again.

These assets they have in impressive quantity, but that is not all.

They have, most importantly, a new know-how for government and national well-being. Formosa has been a refresher course for the Chinese Nationalist movement. Success there may indeed contain the seeds of Nationalist rebirth in China.

The Government, now rid of the economic mess that plagued it on the mainland and insulated against Communist infiltration and sabotage, has wrought virtual miracles of economic stabilization and political reform.

MORE TALENT

It is true that the Nationalists on Formosa have had a greater concentration of administrative talent than ever before. But they have been carrying a proportionally greater weight in the military establishment.

On Formosa the Nationalists have gathered and trained or retrained 500,000 about whom a great deal has already been written—their religious life, their physical condition, their supply problems, their homemade burp guns and reconditioned Japanese rifles.

Less has been heard of Nationalist economic achievements on Formosa.

LONG-TERM PROJECTS

Since the State Department first started publicly doubting that the Nationalists had any morale or self-confidence left the Taipeh Government has invested more than $20,000,000 of its overstrained foreign-exchange balances on a dozen major, long-term economic projects aimed at rice, sugar, and electrical production, transport and industrial growth.

It also invested a considerable talent for engineering and administration. The following, which I have from an American engineer in position to check on Nationalist statistics, are some of the results:

Electrical power production in excess of the peak achieved under Japan's intensive development of Formosa.

JUST SHORT

Railway tonnages just short of the Japanese wartime peak.

Restoration of war-battered railways and rolling stock without the importation of a single piece of equipment.

Threefold increase in the production of chemical fertilizers, with a corresponding reduction of fertilizer imports.

Rice and sugar production approaching the Japanese peak of 1,400,000 and 940,000 tons, respectively, for 1937. This year's crop reports may equal or exceed those figures.

Effective control of prices and currency.

RENTS FORCED DOWN

Meanwhile, the Government also has put through a thoroughgoing reduction of land rents for the predominantly agricultural island, and has expanded democratic processes to municipal election levels.

There is no Communist problem in Formosa and little violence or any movement for Formosan independence.

I witnessed widespread celebrations among both the native and mainland populations when the Government initiated a limited army conscription program on Formosa.

The population of the island exceeds 7,000,000 counting an approximate 1,000,000 Chinese mainlanders. Millions more would have come, if permitted, but Formosa could not have survived.

The 500,000 Nationalist troops on the island by no means represents the maximum manpower at the disposal of Chiang Kai-shek, but with the civilians from the mainland provide the maximum weight of population that Formosa can reasonably support.

Under the direction of talented, American-educated Gen. Sun Li-jen, the half-million soldiers have been molded into a hard core of military strength which could be multiplied by accretion of anti-Communist guerrillas and regulars on the mainland.

The most recent official breakdown of anti-Communist guerrilla strength on the mainland came under a total of 1,614,000 announced in November by the Ministry of National Defense in Taipeh. The bulk of this strength lay in southwest, central, southeast, and south China—more than 1,400,000.

No one can confirm the figure. On the other hand, no one can deny it. Under able leadership and properly supplied it could be a major force in the Asiatic war against communism.

Ambassador Myron M. Cowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Manila Star Reporter of Friday, December 8, 1950:

AMBASSADOR COWEN

The decision of the State Department in Washington to retain Ambassador Myron M.

Cowen in Manila, despite an underground move on the part of certain local political elements who wanted another man so they could again do monkey business with the forthcoming United States aids, is dictated by the highest American concern over the welfare of the people of the Philippines in whose interest Mr. Cowen has consistently worked since he became Ambassador here.

The Washington announcement should sober up the elements here who pulled underground wires to have Mr. Cowen replaced, and failed. Mr. Cowen is coming back—to assume responsibility for the supervision of American aid in the Philippines contemplated under the Bell mission recommendations.

This announcement, while disastrous to the back of the cranium designs of many politicians, the manner of whose election is a tragic chapter in our contemporary history, is heartening to the rank and file of the people of the Philippines.

The continuing interest of the American people in the well-being of the people of the Philippines, no matter who happens to be the temporary trustees of public power here, is best manifested in the decision to keep Cowen in Manila.

It is a wise decision. It is better to have a man here who enjoys the confidence of the Filipino people because he has shown profound concern for their welfare, than a new man who, because of ignorance or lack of prestige, specially if he is a "lame duck," is likely to be hand in glove with the present regime whose fumigation has been repeatedly urged by Mr. Cowen, for the good of the Philippines as a bastion of democracy and free institutions.

And it is an assurance that American aid will go direct to the people, and not into the waiting pockets of known grafters and other undesirable elements who have given the Filipino people a black eye, at home and abroad.

Water Resources Development in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, M. C. Hermann, quartermaster adjutant of the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is an outstanding veteran leader in California.

"Sam" Hermann has earned a place as a leader in the national veteran movement and is so recognized in veteran circles.

No veteran leader has given closer study to the effect that a national water policy will have upon the lives of veterans than has he. For many years he has been in the forefront of the fight for water policy in the Central Valley that will serve the men who fought for us.

On December 19, 1950, Mr. Hermann made a statement before a subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee meeting in Sacramento, Calif.

Because it is so pertinent to this vital subject I take pleasure in making it available to my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

STATEMENT OF M. C. HERMANN, QUARTERMASTER-ADJUTANT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE AT SACRAMENTO, DECEMBER 19, 1950

Mr. Chairman and members of the congressional committee, my name is M. C. Hermann, and I am quartermaster-adjutant of the department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization representing the interests of around 100,000 veterans, all of them with a record of service overseas in the Armed Forces. My business address is 107 Veterans Building, San Francisco, Calif.

In 1944 the Veterans of Foreign Wars made its first public declaration on water resource development in California. At that time special interests were attempting to break down the protections of reclamation law against water monopoly and speculation. We began by saying we do not want the 160-acre water limitation repealed, undermined, or weakened. We want veterans to have the greatest chance possible to make a home for their families on lands supplied with water by the Federal investment. Our position has had fullest support of resolutions by the National Encampments of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. From 1944 to this day, we have made statement after statement before committees of the Congress, asking for the complete, early and unified development of water resources in Central Valley under the Federal reclamation law.

We do not want the water of Central Valley developed as "flood control" projects under "flood control" law, and as separated projects. The Central Valley Basin is a unified watershed, and under a unified reclamation project for irrigation and power generation, we shall not worry about floods, for there will be no damaging floods.

This is a good time to set some of the record straight. This Nation faces an impending crisis, and it is no time to cover up the record when it serves the national interest better to expose it to the light. I have no intention of questioning the motives of any person or organization or official of whom I shall speak. But neither do I shrink from calling a spade a spade when the public record proves that it is a spade.

Certain interests in this State have gone to the greatest lengths to defeat reclamation law, particularly its eminently fair provision that says no one landowner is entitled to water for more than 160 acres of land. The VFW wants that provision enforced, and the American people want it enforced, as the fate of every attempt to repeal it after public hearings has shown.

These interests, carrying a banner inscribed "flood control," have been prepared to risk even damaging floods like the current ones, in order to destroy that protection in the reclamation laws against private water monopoly and speculation. While they complain of floods, they complain of equal treatment under the 160-acre water limitation even more.

On this, the record, as they have made it, is clear. In order to escape the 160-acre water limitation (perhaps for other special purposes as well) certain interests, whom I shall identify from their own public record in a moment, have gone to extraordinary lengths to persuade Congress that reclamation projects are not really reclamation projects but flood-control projects instead. The absurdity of this has been documented recently by a study made for, and published by, the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. That study shows how the Army engineers, during the period while it seemed necessary to persuade Congress that Kings River and Tulare Lake project was not a reclamation project but a flood-control project, estimated the ratio of flood-control benefits to irrigation benefits at 1.19 to 1; but after authorization to the Army engineers was secured and appropriations for construction were made and work was begun, then the estimate fell to a ratio of only 0.63 to 1. In other words, to call the project "flood control" was phony; time brought the truth that the project is really for reclamation, which most people knew from the beginning.

I speak of this particular project on Kings River and in Tulare Lake Basin, because it is a good illustration, and is causing the Veterans of Foreign Wars serious trouble in our effort to obtain farming opportunities for qualified veterans. There are 300 square miles in Tulare Lake Basin with virtually no homes and no towns, more than half of it owned by 25 individuals or corporations, and we are afraid it will stay that way unless reclamation law is enforced and the project is integrated into the great reclamation program for the Central Valley Basin. That is our long run interest in Kings River and the Tulare Lake Basin—and on Kern River as well. At the present time Pine Flat dam on the Kings River is under construction by the Army engineers; that is where the cofferdam recently gave way, and where upper Kings River water users, especially those around Centerville, were flooded. I am not blaming the engineers for the collapse of the cofferdam under unusual stress; simply identifying the project in relation to current flood conditions.

The Tulare Lake Basin water-storage district and the Kings River Water Association, for their purposes, have been willing to impose long delays on construction of the very dams and reservoirs that would prevent the floods that are now occurring. They have been successful in imposing these delays. They have also succeeded so far in breaking the unity of the State water plan for Central Valley and in evading the equitable provisions of the reclamation law, including the provisions for repayment of the public investment. As the study made for the Hoover Commission says: "It may well be that the Federal Government will never turn a thin dime for a large part of the irrigation benefits provided by this project, and the benefits will accrue to the present owners of land rather than to the small independent farmer around whom the whole philosophy of Federal reclamation has been built."

I hope that this committee in its fuller deliberations will examine into this record of the collapse of public policy on the Kings River and Tulare Lake project. It is long, detailed, and documented. I have joined in presenting that record to Congress upon other occasions, notably before the Senate Committee on Army Civil Functions Appropriations for 1951, pages 745–749. Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, of the Fifth San Francisco District, supported my statement, and our position was carried to the Senate floor on August 1 and 4, 1950, by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, himself a distinguished veteran thoroughly aroused to the stake of veterans and of the public in reclamation and the 160-acre water limitation; Senator DOUGLAS' documentation of the record of evasion on Kings River appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 9, pages 11482–11485 and pages 11816–11817. Full discussion of Senator DOUGLAS' contentions at that time was prevented only on the point of order that his proposal involved legislation. In other words, rectification of the Kings River and Tulare Lake situation is possible only through the work of legislative committees. As the appropriate

legislative committee of the House of Representatives, I respectfully request that you examine into this condition and that you take appropriate action. As a first step, I recommend that you integrate Kings River and Tulare Lake project into the basin-wide program of the Bureau of Reclamation for Central Valley.

The record is a long one, and I am refraining from repeating it here in the interest of economy of your time. I trust you will interpret my restraint in that light, and will not underestimate the seriousness of my purpose in calling it, with the places in the public record where it may be found, to your attention.

Today our press carries numerous statements about the necessity for flood control. For example, our new junior Senator was quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle of November 28, 1950, as saying: "If anybody needed to be convinced of the need for flood control, he ought to take a flight over the flood area. Having seen the damage caused by the current flood conditions, it will give me and other California Representatives a very potent argument to get appropriations for flood-control projects." From my preceding remarks to this committee, I am sure that you will understand that it is not flood control that Central Valley needs, but reclamation. Do not be misled by the double meaning of the words "flood control."

Today some men are claiming hindsight, from whom we have had reason to expect more foresight. According to the San Francisco News of November 21, 1950, Mr. Charles L. Kaupke, Kings River watermaster, was quoted as saying: "If dam and reservoir were in operation, Kings River water users wouldn't be flooded." According to the San Francisco Chronicle on December 14, 1950, Mr. Edward Hyatt, formerly State engineer, told the Commonwealth Club that controversies between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have delayed needed work. He said: "Authorized projects which should have been built years ago could have helped to prevent the recent floods which caused $20,000,000 worth of damage in northern California."

If these men, and others similarly responsible for public water policy in the Central Valley over past years could only have foreseen what now we all see—that we need not only controlled floods but also water for irrigation and for all the power we can get to run our defense industries—we should all be much better off. It is even possible that there might be no flood damage at all on the Kings River.

The story of delay and obstruction is simple and it is a matter of public record. As early as 1940 the Bureau of Reclamation held legal authorization to proceed with construction of Pine Flat Dam. True, some delay was caused by World War II, but that was not the only, or perhaps the main, delaying factor in getting a dam at Pine Flat that would control floods and generate power. On March 14, 1940, for example, the Tulare Lake Basin water storage district, instead of getting behind an appropriation to the Bureau to commence construction promptly, passed a resolution requesting Congressman Gearhart to introduce a bill providing an alternative authorization to the Army engineers. With an authorization to the Bureau of Reclamation already in hand, more than 4 years passed by while Kings River and Tulare Lake interests did their work getting an Army engineer authorization, and an additional year before an appropriation could be got to start construction. As a telegram from the Tulare Lake water storage district, placed in the hearings of a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee by Mr. Kaupke on May 27, 1945, said: "Over the several past years we have been required to incur much expense in order to assist in preventing this project from being undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation." The telegram does not give reasons why the district felt required to obstruct the very construction that would control flooding over its lands.

It would be incorrect to saddle the Tulare Lake Basin interests with entire responsibility for the program of delay. The record of a House Appropriations Subcommittee about the same time in 1945, shows southern San Joaquin Valley interests blocking appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation on Kings River on the expressed grounds that the Bureau program would provide for prompt generation of hydroelectric power, and that this would not occur if the Army engineers should be authorized to construct the project. (Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1946, pp. 1373–1386.)

During these years of delay and construction of a dam that would control floods, serve irrigation, and generate power on the Kings River, I have found no public statement by Mr. Hyatt, then State engineer, urging prompt appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation to get the Kings project going. Later on, however, he became very active when there was a chance to get an appropriation for the Army engineers. Following a gesture of impartiality between Reclamation and Army engineers as agencies of construction, his representative in Washington said, "If appropriations are postponed now, the delay in getting flood relief will be a year or a year and a half. The need is urgent." He did not say why the urgency of need for flood relief did not move the State engineer to support earlier appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation that would have afforded the same relief sooner.

The position of the State engineer's office is all the harder to understand because the State water plan, drawn up by the engineer's office, declares Pine Flat Dam to be an integral part of basin development. The State engineer's report of 1931 says "It was concluded that Pine Flat Reservoir should be included as a unit for ultimate development of the State water plan for the San Joaquin River Basin." Unless the State engineer's office has changed its mind from the days when the State water plan was drafted, we should be entitled to expect now, as a minimum, that it will give its full support to the complete integration of Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin project into the Central Valley Basin development. The truth is, the only way to provide stable and adequate water supply conditions and flood control on that 300 square miles of Tulare Lake Basin is to do as the State water plan originally required—make Kings River and Tulare Lake project a unified part of the Central Valley project, and enforce the reclamation law. This will support family farms and thriving towns.

Speaking of the need for unity of development of Central Valley water resources—legal unity, administrative unity, economic unity—California wants full development, and most Californians know that without unified development we will never get full development. We all know that the more profitable has to help pay for the less profitable, in order to make the full development economically sound. The Governor of this State has spoken the wishes of the people when he said "California needs to make the fullest use of its water resources." The State water plan was drawn to accomplish that purpose. Do not be misled, therefore, when the State engineer's office forgets the high purpose of its own great, unified plan, and appears willing to lend a hand in the destruction of unity, as on Kings and Kern Rivers.

Similarly, do not be misled by the declaration of the State director of public works, who told the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in June 1950 that "each unit should be analyzed as to its economic justification at the time of the need for construction." For I am confident that the Governor knows, even if his director does not, that economic unity is the best and probably the only way ever to secure the fullest use of our Central Valley waters.

Do not be misled by the endless repetition of spokesmen on Kings River that the Bureau of Reclamation is going to deprive any water users of their water rights. There is purpose behind the repetition, but the statement, on the face of it is false. Reclamation law specifically requires the Bureau to respect those water rights, and the courts of the United States are open to anybody who thinks his rights are not being protected as required by law. I have not lost faith in the integrity of either the American Congress or the American courts, and I see no reason why that faith should be undermined by any differences of opinion on the Kings River or in Tulare Lake or anywhere else.

Finally, do not be misled by the outcries about socialism and about Federal bureaucrats and Federal domination into thinking that the people of California do not want Federal assistance. The acreage limitation and public power protections against monopoly and speculation are the real target of those who seek to stir a false antagonism between State and Federal Governments.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars knows full well that veterans' opportunities for employment in our factories and on the land depend on full development under the reclamation law. We have not witnessed the benefits of land openings to veterans by reclamation in northern California, the curtailment of employment in the San Francisco Bay area in 1948 because of power shortage, and the decision of industries to locate elsewhere because of unfavorable power quantities and rates here, without a growing conviction in the soundness of the Federal reclamation program for Central Valley, which is just the elaboration of the State's own water plan.

We ask you to consider the reclamation plan for the Central Valley Basin, printed as Senate Document No. 113 of the Eighty-first Congress, and then to take the earliest steps you can to put it into operation. It will serve the needs of the veterans and the people, the West, and the Nation in peace or in war.

The New Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the recent speech of former President Herbert Hoover on foreign policy is being widely discussed throughout America. While I do not agree with all that Mr. Hoover said, I believe his address was timely and that he said some things which very much needed to be said at this time. I feel sure that his address has done much to clear the atmosphere of uncertainty which has prevailed in the field of foreign affairs and that it will do much to bring about the development of a sound American foreign policy.

One reason the Hoover proposal sounds good to so many people is because it seems clear and definite as contrasted with the weakness and vagueness of the policy that has been followed since the

end of World War II. Millions of Americans feel that our diplomats have lost everything we gained through World War II. They know that we have neither the military or economic strength to continue the policy of globalism which involves trying to put out the fires of communism wherever they break out.

While I feel that a continuation of our present reckless foreign policy, which is being carried out without any apparent consideration of its costs or its results, would be a fatal mistake, I am just as much opposed to a return to a policy of isolationism which is what a literal acceptance of Mr. Hoover's proposal would mean. Somewhere between globalism and isolationism there is room for a sound, realistic American foreign policy.

In a recent issue of the Hutchinson News Herald, of Hutchinson, Kans., there is contained an excellent editorial which points out in a most effective way the weaknesses of the Hoover proposal. Believing that this editorial will be of interest to every Member of Congress and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including it herewith under leave to extend my remarks. It follows:

THE NEW ISOLATIONISM

The new isolationism, for which Herbert Hoover is major spokesman, proposes we voluntarily withdraw from Europe and Asia and pin our survival hopes on building a fortress America.

It is a defeatist policy. The loss of ground—of staging areas and allies—spells defeat whether we retreat willingly or are beaten back.

The Hoover policy is based on three assumptions:

1. That we can live, economically, cut off from the rest of the world.

2. That we can keep alive cherished political liberties and social goods, cooped up in a fortress.

3. That eventually we will win because communism is bound to rot from within and be overthrown.

First, in theory, the Western Hemisphere is self-sufficient. World War II proved that for a short period we can get along without world trade. Over the long pull we couldn't do it without a completely changed and controlled economy. Once we reached the plateau of full armament, the economy would have to be locked into place.

Second, living for years behind fortress walls could only mean the security measures the term suggests. No one comes in. No one goes out. Security police become the rulers. Liberty could survive a short period of war emergency. Could it survive decades of being on guard?

Finally, will Communist dictatorship die of its own evil? What dictatorship ever did? The Romans, Napoleon, Hitler, were not overthrown from within; they were defeated or softened up by aggressive forces from without.

The Russian Communists have perfected a control system old dictators never dreamed of. Terror has become a scientifically administered drug, designed to paralyze those who would revolt.

The Roman Empire was weakened by overexpansion. The Russians might suffer the same. If they get too many puppets, sooner or later one will get out of hand. But if the Kremlin needn't worry about us, snug behind our fortress, it can easily put down any dissenters.

If we no longer even offer to help the Titos, Russia will not let the Titos live long.

This is the weakest assumption in Hoover's argument—that Russia will fall soon enough to prevent us falling victim to our isolation.

The whole policy is spoken and acclaimed because we interpret the Korean defeat as a general defeat.

Actually Korea is a result of the success of our foreign policy, not of its failure. We whipped the Communists in France, Italy, Berlin, Greece, and nursed the breach in Yugoslavia. From 1947 on, Russia lost steadily in the west. She had to turn East to find a victory.

We lost in Korea. Should we give up now all we have won elsewhere? We might well take a cue from our enemy who doesn't run howling to the dugout when he has a bad inning.

Gallup Polls

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to two Gallup polls, one dated December 20 and one dated December 22, 1950, which for some reason or other failed to appear in the Washington Post, the local Washington paper that carries the Gallup polls. I feel that the Members of the Congress should avail themselves of these polls.

Mr. Speaker, being a newspaper publisher myself, I am very sure that inasmuch as these polls were issued just prior to the Christmas season or to Christmas itself that probably—in fact I am sure—the only reason why they were not printed was because of the heavy lineage of advertising at that particular season of the year.

These polls follow:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC CRITICAL TOWARD ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY IN ASIA, SURVEY SHOWS—MAJORITY CALL IT POOR JOB; WIDE VARIETY OF MISTAKES CITED BY VOTERS IN OPINION STUDY

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 19.—An overwhelming majority of Americans think that the United States Government has done a poor job in handling our foreign policy in Asia.

A wide variety of mistakes are named by voters interviewed on the question in a national opinion survey, with no one item getting more than 20 percent of the vote.

The largest number criticize the military on the grounds of poor preparation and inadequate intelligence in Korea. Others say we were too easygoing in our attitude toward Asiatic Communists.

Still others insist that our main mistake was in abandoning Chiang Kai-shek and ignoring the Chinese Nationalists.

Some also say that our major error was in going into Korea in the first place.

All persons questioned in this survey were asked:

"Do you think our Government in Washington has been doing a good job or a poor job of handling our foreign policy in Asia—that is, in Korea, China, etc.?"

The national vote is:

	Percent
Good job	17
Fair job	21
Poor job	50
No opinion	12
Total	100

Opinion splits along partisan lines, with Republicans more critical of our Asiatic policy than Democrats are. But even among Democrats the weight of opinion is unfavorable, as the following table shows:

	Democrats	Republicans	Independents
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Good	26	10	13
Fair	24	18	21
Poor	39	62	51
No opinion	11	10	15
Total	100	100	100

MAJOR MISTAKES NAMED

All voters in the sample were next asked: "What mistakes, if any, would you say our Government has made in handling the situation in Asia?"

Here is a summary of the results:

	Percent
Military situation criticized, poor preparation	18
Too lenient with Reds, too soft	11
Intervention in Asia a mistake, should have stayed out of Korea	9
Failure to back Chiang	9
Lack of foresight, should have anticipated fighting China	6
Inconsistency in Asia policy	4
Miscellaneous	12
No mistakes made	7
Don't know	25
	101

The table adds to more than 100 percent because some voters named more than one mistake.

Here are some voters' comments typifying the point of view of those who criticise the military aspects of our Asiatic policy:

"Our intelligence was weak in not finding out what the Chinese would do."

"We should have handled Manchuria better. No foresight."

"Our defense was on paper; we weren't prepared."

"Our mistake was not having enough men and equipment now to fight with."

Other comments:

"We ignore Chiang but we don't recognize Red China; we've fallen between two chairs."

"It all goes back to Roosevelt and the deals he made with Russia."

"The mistake was in not giving MacArthur full power."

"Our whole policy was fickle and inconsistent. First we encouraged the Reds in China and now we find they're fighting us."

"The blunder was in thinking the Chinese Reds were only agrarian reformers and wouldn't do what Moscow told them."

"We bungled, gambled—and lost."

WEIGHT OF OPINION FOUND UNFAVORABLE TO ACHESON; VIEWS SPLIT BY PARTY LINES—SURVEY FINDS REPUBLICANS 3 TO 1 FOR HIS RESIGNATION, WHILE DEMOCRATS FAVOR HIM

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 21.—Despite continual attacks against Secretary of State Dean Acheson and demands for his resignation, public sentiment is divided on the question of whether he should step down from office.

More voters say they are against him than for him—but opinion divides to a considerable extent along partisan lines.

Republicans want him to go, by a vote of about 3 to 1. But among Democrats the weight of opinion rests in the Secretary's favor by a small margin.

In answer to the question, "Will you tell me who Dean Acheson is?" approximately one-third were not able to identify the name.

These facts are revealed in an opinion survey among a balanced cross section of

the voting population. The study was conducted by the Institute using methods which enabled it to forecast the recent congressional elections with an error of only 1 percentage point.

All persons who could correctly identify Mr. Acheson were asked:

"In general, is your opinion of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State favorable or unfavorable?"

	Percent
Favorable	20
Unfavorable	31
No opinion	15
	66
Could not identify	34
	100

Here is the national vote on the final survey question:

"What do you, yourself, think—should Dean Acheson stay on in his present position, or should he be replaced?"

	Percent
Stay on	21
Replaced	30
No opinion	15
	66
Could not identify	34
	100

PARTY SPLIT

Virtually all the attacks on the Secretary have come from Republicans, both in and out of Congress. Democratic leaders, from the President down, have stanchly defended him.

In fact, when the Secretary flew to Brussels this last weekend to a meeting of the 12 Atlantic Pact nations, the President in a public statement declared:

"Secretary Acheson goes to this meeting with my complete confidence."

The partisan nature of attitudes toward Secretary Acheson can be seen from the following vote in the survey:

	Republicans	Democrats	Independents
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Stay on	13	26	23
Replaced	43	19	31
No opinion	14	14	19
	70	59	73
Could not identify	30	41	27
Total	100	100	100

To a considerable extent Secretary Acheson's own popularity as a Cabinet member is linked with the popularity of President Truman. In recent months this has been at a comparatively low point in surveys by the institute.

Questions Face Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Review, of Hayward, Calif., published a pertinent editorial under date of December 22, 1950.

These are soul searching days in which the American people must choose the right course to follow or jeopardize the future of our democracy that is our vaunted way of life.

The Nation needs more editorials like this, not the rantings of the Monday-morning-quarterback-type of armchair strategist or the self-anointed foreign affairs expert.

I am happy to have permission to include this down-to-earth editorial by a typical American newspaper man in the RECORD. It follows:

QUESTIONS FACE US

If former President Herbert Hoover has done nothing else in this time of national emergency, he has placed before the American people the problem of determining our foreign policy.

For some years we have been handed a foreign policy from the national administration without any explanatory notes. Oftentimes we found our policy was not really what we had thought it, or had been changed since previous information.

In short, we were without a policy except, perhaps, in the highest of policy forming groups within the State Department.

We can't agree with the conclusion of our distinguished former President 100 percent. Even before he spoke we imagined there would be difference of opinion on his suggestions. That is natural. This is our democracy; each of us has varying ideas of how it should be run. Now is the time for us to compromise our differences after discussion.

One thing is sure: We must make our Nation the "Gibraltar of western civilization." No other people are in a position to lead the fight against communism.

But should we build up our Navy and Air Force without vastly increasing the size of our Army? Should we make England and Japan our frontier of defense, or should we try to hold Western Europe and free portions of Asia?

Should we try to build up our forces to a set point, then balance the budget and build up our economy? Or should we continue to strengthen our forces until all threat of Communist invasion ends?

Should we cut off dollar and military aid to Europe, leaving that area to its own resources, or should we try to aid in building them while building ourselves?

These are the questions. We, the people, must give the answers in our hearts so representative government in Washington can be truly representative.

Lowell's First Amputee of the Korean Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lowell Sun, telling the story of Lowell's first double amputee of the Korean conflict. It is well worth reading, for it shows clearly the fine attitude of the young veteran, his cheery hopeful outlook for the future, and his bravery in facing that future with his physical handicap of two artificial legs. The article follows:

LOWELL'S FIRST AMPUTEE OF THIS WAR SAYS STOP COMMIES IN KOREA—PFC. ROBERT E. DIXON LOST BOTH LEGS IN TAEGU BATTLE

(By Thomas C. Gallagher)

LOWELL.—A pink-cheeked boy of 18, who lost both legs while fighting with the First Marine Division at Taegu, believes that Communist aggression must be stopped in Korea, if it is to be stopped at all.

Expressing this conviction in an interview at his home today was Pfc. Robert E. Dixon, United States Marine Corps, son of Mr. and Mrs. Bertrand E. Dixon of 24 Barcley Street in the Highlands. Lowell's first amputee of the Korean conflict, he is currently on leave from United States Naval Hospital in Oakland, Calif.

RED TIDE WILL SPREAD

"If we pull out of Korea the Communists will not only take over there, but will quickly move on to Formosa and eventually into Japan" young Dixon pointed out, adding:

"With a Communist fifth column already hard at work in Japan, I don't think the Communists would have too much difficulty enveloping the country."

He freely admitted, however, that some of his fellow marines held divergent views. Although morale was high, the young marine stated, not a few fighting men felt that they were fighting and dying "for nothing" and asked the question:

"What are we out here for, anyway, and what are we fighting for?"

ENLISTED AT 17

The war was a brutally short one for Private First Class Dixon, who, at the age of 17, left Lowell High School to enter the Marine Corps. His parents signed the necessary papers after he "pestered them for weeks." A brother, Bertrand, Jr., only other child of the Dixons, had been a marine in World War II.

Intent on making the Marine Corps his career, young Dixon went through the normal training and, in October of 1949, was shipped to Hawaii.

On September 1, with a contingent of replacements, Private First Class Dixon landed at the port of Pusan, Korea.

Early on the morning of September 4 he was asleep in a fox hole at Taegu. A general advance against the North Koreans was scheduled to begin that day—an advance which was ultimately to push the Korean Reds to the Manchurian border and bring the Chinese Communist hordes pouring into Korea.

EXPLODES MYTH

This is the way he tells it:

"I was awakened by the sound of artillery. It was the Commies. A shell came whining over. There was a blast, and I must have passed out.

"Once I read where you never have to worry when you hear the whine of a shell, because you never hear the one that hits you. Take it from me, it just isn't so."

All the details of what happened thereafter are not clear to Private First Class Dixon. He does remember that three buddies managed to get him into a jeep and move him back to an aid station, where a hospital corpsman administered blood plasma.

GETS PLASMA

He was bleeding badly, and considerable plasma was required to keep him alive. After a period of hospitalization in Japan he was transferred Stateside. Frequent blood transfusions over a 2-month period made his excellent recovery possible.

"I just couldn't keep count of all the blood they gave me, but it was enough so I guess there just isn't very much of my own blood left," he said with a grin.

In connection with his many blood transfusions, he had this to say about the Red Cross:

"The Red Cross undoubtedly saved my life. Blood was made available to me not only in Japan and in the Oakland hospital, but on the battlefield in Korea, when I needed it most. I learned that all of it was blood collected by the Red Cross."

He had an interesting observation to make on the Japanese.

"The great majority of the Japanese look up to General MacArthur, and have an extremely high regard for him," young Dixon said. "They feel this way because they believe he has done a great deal for them."

"DOESN'T MAKE SENSE"

On one of the burning questions of the day, he made the following comment:

"I can't figure out why the Chinese Nationalists, who are able and willing to fight on the side of the United N tions, aren't allowed to do so. It just doesn't make sense."

PET HATE

Like everyone else, fighting men have their pet hates. The major one, says Private First Class Dixon, is "the guy who started the movement to abolish the soldier's beer ration."

Soldiers in the field are rationed canned beer, where possible. It is rationed in such a conservative manner as to be considered humorous under ordinary circumstances. However, to a combat soldier, his can of beer is an almost unbelievable luxury.

Recently, there was a movement afoot to stop such rationing of beer, and it was news of this movement that threw every soldier in the Pacific into a rage, Private First Class Dixon said.

LOOKS TO FUTURE

What are his plans for the future?

Young Dixon points out that the immediate future is pretty well taken care of. His leave expires January 15, and he will return to Oakland by plane, the same way he came home.

He faces 9 months of hospitalization, during which he will be fitted with artificial limbs, and carefully taught how to use them.

After that, he intends to return to Lowell High School, and pick up where he left off.

"I haven't made up my mind what kind of a job I want to learn," he said.

"There are a lot of things I want to do, and eventually I'm going to be able to do them."

Purchasing Power of Dollar Reaches New Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot nowadays about the reduced purchasing power of the inflated American dollar. We are told that taxes of all kinds, and particularly war taxes, from now on will be excessively high, chiefly because of this reduced purchasing power. Because inflation, and the certainty of further inflation, will be an important factor in framing further tax legislation, it is vitally necessary for us to know just where the dollar stands now.

With this in mind, I have prepared some figures, calculated to show truthfully the purchasing power of the dollar today, as compared with its purchasing power in some past years.

The general index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, covering 28 commodities in the spot primary markets of the United States, as of December 22, 1950, stood at 364.1. This means that on that date, it took $3.64 to buy the same amount of goods that $1 would have bought in August 1939, the date on which the comparison is based.

Thus inflation caused the actual purchasing power of the dollar to drop to 27.46 cents in December 1950, as compared with August 1939.

The August 1939 index stood at 75. This means that for 75 cents, the purchaser could have bought commodities which had a value of $1 in 1926.

By means of a simple arithmetical calculation, with which every statistician is familiar, it appears that the 1950 dollar, compared with the 1926 dollar, has dropped to 36.6 cents. And it should be remembered that 1926 was a year of severe inflation.

Since December 1950 a further rise in spot commodity prices has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar to a new low of almost exactly 27 cents flat.

In view of this situation, one is compelled to wonder when the administration intends to stop talking and making political gestures about inflation, and get busy applying the really effective powers it possesses, through the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, to curb the further creation of credit currency, and put an end to this era of easy money.

The Congressional School of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, just across the Potomac River from Washington, D. C., stands a unique and very interesting coeducational institution called the Congressional School.

It is an outstanding example of the great American experiment that private initiative can furnish unequaled service to the public welfare. The metropolitan Washington area is indeed fortunate in having among its educational institutions this famous private school which is providing the very best teaching from kindergarten years up through junior high school.

The growth of Congressional has been truly phenomenal. Ten years ago it was realized that there existed a particular need for a superior school, where the children of many families who are required to reside in the Nation's Capital for a short period of time—not only in the Government services but also in the Congress and diplomatic corps—could receive specialized training. These boys and girls will some day return to the most varied types of school systems in this country and other parts of the world, and it is a vital concern to these families that the years spent in Washington shall not be a period in which their children's education is neglected.

The Congressional School was founded in an attempt to meet that challenge. How well the challenge was met is best measured by the response of the public who have sent their children year after year in increasing numbers. The tremendous response necessitated three changes of location to larger accommodations, the building of additional edifices, and the establishment of a second school at Alexandria, Va. The school is now located on Fort Myer Hill, in Arlington, overlooking the Potomac and the Capital.

Another indication of the school's success is the ease with which the boys and girls of families, who have moved away have fitted into the educational systems available in their new homes. The reputation of Congressional has been spread in this manner over the Nation and it has become a routine matter for parents who have recently moved to Washington from thousands of miles away to call at the school to seek enrollment for their children because friends had recommended the school that their children had attended while they lived in the metropolitan area.

Every economic group is represented and there is absolutely no distinction to be found between the children of families of means and those of modest income. These families have one great ideal in common—they sought and are obtaining the very best in education for their children.

The Congressional School is providing the basic training in education at a vital and important period of a child's life and at a most moderate cost in comparison with other institutions which lack the facilities to provide comparable services.

The school faculty represents an outstanding group of educators, skilled in the profession of teaching and working with children of all age groups. The grounds and buildings are beautiful and equipped with the most modern facilities. Best of all, the boys and girls who make up the student body are as attractive and happy a group as can be found in any school in America. They are receiving an unusual amount of individual study and consideration and are being taught the great joy of becoming useful members of groups of their own age and abilities.

Each child is studied very carefully from every standpoint—not only in the classrooms but on the many playgrounds in an endeavor to correct any existing peculiarities or deficiencies—in the hope of bringing out hidden talents and developing finer and more attractive personalities.

Congressional has a qualified and prominent psychologist on its staff who devotes the entire day in close cooperation with respective teachers.

There is a modern remedial reading department which also guarantees that every child will receive a good educational foundation. This section is made up of specialized teachers that assist a child in overcoming certain reading and speech difficulties.

A unique feature of the school allows every child to be placed in a group which will permit him to advance according to his own ability to acquire higher education.

The institution maintains a qualified and experienced dietitian who plans and

selects proper and healthful menus for a growing child.

It also features an outstanding athletic program. It is one of the few schools in the Nation made up of children below junior high school level that has a tackle football team and teaches major sports both for male and female. The junior high school provides for an unusual amount of sampling in diversified subjects. Students enjoy French, music, art, glee club, shop, home economics, courtesy classes, and a broad athletic program of volley ball, football, fencing, tumbling, badminton, basketball, and swimming.

The Congressional School obviously exists because there is a tremendous need for a superior school and because private initiative has realized that need and is supplying the facilities that are wanted by parents who are determined that their children shall grow and develop in an atmosphere which provides for their happiness, and for directed understanding guidance to assure their maximum potentialities.

Malcolm B. Devers is the founder and president of the school, and his wife, Mrs. Evelyn Devers, is the educational director.

Important Questions of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wiconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a series of questions that appeared in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel:

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

Question. Is it true that the United States is at war?

Answer. Yes; the United States is at war, fighting for the United Nations in Korea.

Question. What is the United States?

Answer. It is hard to say. The United States used to be an independent Nation, but now it seems to be only a fragment of the United Nations.

Question. What is the United Nations?

Answer. The United Nations is an expensive, socialistic, and impracticable scheme of world government.

Question. Expensive? Who pays for it?

Answer. You do, if you are an American citizen.

Question. Well, if Americans pay for the United Nations, do not Americans run the United Nations?

Answer. No; indeed. The United Nations runs the United States.

Question. Is that not a funny situation—that we let somebody else run our affairs and we pay the bills?

Answer. It is very funny. The Socialists in Europe and the Communists in Russia are laughing their shaggy heads off.

Question. What is it going to cost us?

Answer. Who knows? Except that it will bankrupt us.

Question. Well, do we get anything out of it?

Answer. Sure; we get foreign wars to fight alone, as in Korea.

Question. Where is Korea?

Answer. About 7,000 miles away, on the coast of Asia.

Question. Then why are we fighting a foreign war in Korea?

Answer. Because the White House, the State Department, and the United Nations arranged it.

Question. What does Congress think about that?

Answer. Under the New Deal, Congress has no right to think.

Question. What do free American citizens think about it?

Answer. Under the New Deal, there are no free American citizens; this is a Nation of taxpayers, nothing else.

Question. Have these taxpayers anything to say about our foreign policies and our fighting United Nations wars?

Answer. Certainly not. Our State Department takes care of all that; and see what it is doing. It has already put us in the Korean War, and with the help of the United Nations it will never run out of foreign wars for us to fight.

Question. How did the State Department get us into war in Korea?

Answer. Ask Harry Truman and Dean Acheson and Owen Lattimore. Why do you employ experts unless you want them to expert?

Question. Isn't it their business to keep us out of wars?

Answer. Ask them.

Question. What is the war in Korea going to cost us, anyway?

Answer. Ask Truman—or Acheson. Apparently it is going to cost us our Regular Army and Marine Corps. Then in making a new Army we will be in one awful fix. But why bother about that? Haven't you got Truman and Acheson—and Lattimore?

Question. Apparently we are in a mess.

Answer. We are.

Question. Maybe we should do something about the State Department?

Answer. Should we? What do you suggest? And how about the White House, too?

The Omnibus Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely article by the distinguished chairman of the full House Committee on Appropriations, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, published in the Tax Review for December 1950, with an editorial from the Washington Star commenting on the article:

THE ARSENAL AGAINST INFLATION—USE OF CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION MEASURE, BEST WEAPON, MUST BE CONTINUED

The greatest internal threat to our Government and to the mode of life it represents has been the absence of effective restraints on individual and group pressure for Government expenditures. And the most effective weapon yet devised to combat that threat is the consolidated appropriation procedure followed by the Congress this year for the first time.

Deficit spending is a menace second only to the danger of invasion from abroad, and Congress and the public must marshal forces to assure continued use of this most effective weapon in the arsenal against it and against the accompanying inflation which it fosters.

This menace to American stability and strength has been growing each year, particularly in the last two decades, as the size and scope of Government functions and activities have accelerated. When the Federal Government was small and its activities limited, the facilities of the Congress to review and determine expenditure needs of the Government on a piecemeal basis were considered sufficient. But the continued growth of the Government and the expansion of its services have been accompanied by (and have generated) a tremendous increase in the areas of economic pressure. Government intervention in the economy of individuals and groups has multiplied and mushroomed Federal subsidies and contributions. Government largess affecting one group has inevitably resulted in clamor by other groups, and each class expenditure of Federal funds has generated new pressures.

The only constitutional check on these importunities for spending is the constitutional power of the Congress to appropriate funds, but the piecemeal appropriation process used by the Congress throughout most of its history has too often broken down in the face of pyramiding demands.

The individual appropriation bills were individual sticks, easily broken by the concentrated force of minority pressures. But gathered together in a single bundle, as in the consolidated appropriation measure, they have been able to withstand group raids on the Federal Treasury to a greater degree than ever before. Demands directed to specific chapters can no longer be supported by glib statements that they are too small to materially affect the total, or by nebulous promises that corresponding cuts can be made in a later bill. Each need and demand must be weighed in the light of all needs and demands, and concessions in one area must be matched by simultaneous reductions in another if the over-all objective is to be achieved. The strength thus gained by consolidation has provided the Congress with an opportunity to appropriate adequate funds needed for the legitimate purposes of government, while resisting ever-growing demands for Federal bounty.

TRIAL RUN SUCCESSFUL

An increasing appreciation of the problem by the House Appropriations Committee early this year led to the adoption of the simple but effective expedient of consolidating all appropriations into a single bill. The "trial run" of the omnibus measure during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, admittedly an experiment, can be regarded as highly successful, although there are perhaps defects which continued use of the new procedure may be expected to remedy.

In general, the obvious advantages of the new technique are that the Congress and the taxpaying public were given a more comprehensive view of the entire budget and of its impact on the national economy; that the areas of economic pressure were disclosed and arrayed, one against the other, in a single bill that showed their relation to each other and their effect on the over-all totals; and that the Congress was able to effect not only the specific reductions deemed essential to the public interest but also an over-all reduction in total expenditures.

NINE SPECIFIC ADVANTAGES

The specific advantages of the consolidated appropriation procedure are many and important:

1. Promptness: The new method permits an earlier report of appropriations to the House. All annual appropriations were reported to the House this year on March 21, the earliest date in the history of the Appropriations Committee.

2. Thoroughness: It contributes to a more thorough consideration and processing of estimates and appropriations. Under the old system each member of the committee had to analyze in detail from two to four bills, and the committee staffs were similarly handicapped, with the result that time

and attention were divided proportionately. Under the new system each member of the committee and each member of the staff gives undivided attention to one chapter of the bill with the result that the bill is studied in greater detail and more thoroughly processed than ever before.

3. Increases: Consolidation protects the bill against amendments, increasing appropriations or adding new appropriations. For example, this is the first year the committee has been able to fight off amendments increasing appropriations for civil functions, the "pork barrel" section of the bill. This year the bill as messaged to the Senate carried practically no important increases except the committee amendments for national defense.

4. Attendance: The consideration of all appropriations in one bill tends to keep Members on the floor. Under the old system large bills were frequently passed with a scant two dozen Members present, and proponents of increases in appropriations, by timing their attendance, could put through amendments which would not have been agreed to with more Members present. In fact, one of the few objections voiced against the omnibus bill is that it irks Members by keeping them on the floor.

5. Retronchment: The plan unquestionably retrenches expenditures. The bill as it passed the Congress was far below the budget estimates and was many millions of dollars below what it would have been had the departmental appropriations been reported in a dozen separate bills.

As a matter of fact, the over-all economy amendment intended to decrease total authorizations carried by the bill would not have been possible except for the omnibus plan of consideration. And the vote in favor of the amendment would not have been so overwhelming had not this plan of operation been in use at the time.

6. Logrolling: It prevents logrolling. We had been told this was one of the defects of the new plan: that there would be more logrolling between interests wishing to trade votes in order to add amendments increasing appropriations. But in the practical operation of the plan every attempt of special interests to increase the bill was defeated, and when the last roll call came on reducing the amounts appropriated in the bill, the groups which had been unable to secure increases which they urged for themselves said in effect, "If we cannot get an increase, no one shall have an increase," and instead of logrolling to increase the bill they cooperated to reduce the bill.

7. Responsibility: The one bill visualizes at a glance the outline of national income and expenditures, and centers the attention of the country on the national fiscal program. It was the pitiless limelight of national attention concentrated on these final votes that offset the pleas and importunities of the pressure groups and special interests. The omnibus appropriation bill has made the entire country definitely deficit conscious, has contributed greatly to citizen understanding of the Government's fiscal operations, and has increased citizen capacity and opportunity to influence the course of the national economy. With all appropriations in one bill, accompanied by the figures on Federal income, there is no escape from the responsibility for deficit spending.

One of the great disadvantages of the old system, with a dozen or more separate bills, was that each subcommittee, working in its own segregated corner of the budget, was spending in the dark. Not until the last bill was passed and sent to the President at the end of the session, frequently long after the expiration of the fiscal year, did anyone have any definite idea of how much had been appropriated for the year and what the relation of the various individual bills was to the fiscal program as a whole.

8. Duplications: The handling of all appropriations in the omnibus bill provides for elimination of conflicts, duplications, and overlapping expenditures. The consolidation in one bill supplies opportunity and facilities for identification of all sources of funds allocated to individual agencies, some of them difficult of ready determination. It was sometimes necessary to trace appropriations through a dozen or more items in a number of different bills under the old system. And as a result, inevitably there were from time to time provisions for expenditures which would not have been made had the subcommittee in charge of one bill had jurisdiction of all the items which appropriated money for the activity.

9. Riders: It discourages the practice of attaching irrelevant riders either in committee or by amendment from the floor. Too frequently legislation has been tacked on the several appropriation bills under the guise of limitations or by the admission of germane amendments. In the general attention focused on the bill all such attempts were turned back and the bill was passed singularly free of these impositions on the budget system and covert infringements on the jurisdiction of the Congress' legislative committees.

NO BACKWARD STEP

As against these advantages, no constructive criticism has been lodged against the adoption or continuation of the omnibus appropriation bill procedure. It has vindicated every promise, justified every expectation. And no cogent reason has been advanced for a return to the old system. Indeed, it is inconceivable that the Congress should consider taking a backward step reverting to multiple supply bills. They are the quill pen and the three-legged stool in an adding-machine age. They are the ox-cart and the kyak in a jet-plane era.

Not one of the general objections mentioned in opposition to the omnibus bill presents any substantial reason for returning to the old practice from which the House has been struggling to free itself and the country for the past 30 years. The claim that the Senate must mark time until the bill comes over from the House is unfounded. On the contrary, the Senate under the new system may begin work on any of the annual appropriations within a week or two after the session opens and much sooner than before. During the recently concluded session, the Senate had practically completed hearings on all chapters of the omnibus bill by the time the measure had passed the House. Under the new procedure, the committees of the two Houses are in effect sitting simultaneously, thereby saving time formerly lost in waiting for individual bills.

It has been contended also that it took too long to pass the bill, but the facts do not support the charge. Of course, much of the delay was avoidable. The bill was reported March 21, but could not be called up in the House until April 3. This delayed the measure past the Easter holidays and it was not sent to the Senate until May 10. But even with the delays, the total number of days, in whole or in part, consumed by the House in considering the bill was 21 days, compared with 37 days in 1938, 31 days in 1939, and 20 days in 1948. With ordinary good management in the subcommittees, the committee, and the House, the omnibus bill can be messaged to the Senate each year before Easter, with time to spare, and can be passed in the Senate and sent to the President in ample time to meet the deadline at the end of the fiscal year—greatly facilitating early adjournment.

A further criticism is that there has been lack of interest in the bill and that it has been difficult to keep a quorum on the floor. That is an old complaint. When efforts were being made to secure the consent of Speaker Joe Cannon to the erection of the first House Office Building, he insisted that once offices and committee rooms were provided for Members, it would be impossible to keep a quorum on the floor. His predictions have been frequently vindicated, especially during general debate on the individual appropriation bills when Members burdened with committee hearings and departmental work have waited for the bells to answer roll call. The adoption of the consolidated bill has effected no difference per se in this respect.

However, under the old system, general debate was not confined to the bill before the House and Members usually talked on subjects foreign to the pending measure. And those interested in the appropriations had no reason to neglect other business when the debate was on other and unrelated matters. But under the omnibus bill all debate is confined to the bill before the House and attendance is correspondingly heavier. For every instance cited to indicate a light attendance on the floor during debate on the omnibus bill, more instances can be given showing a still lighter attendance during consideration of the individual bills under the old system.

But the most untenable of all the objections to the omnibus bill is that it is unwieldy. The experience of every major nation in the world and every State in the Union belies such a proposed criticism. England, France, Sweden, and other leading nations have for centuries considered their budgets in one-package bills. Every State in the Union submits its annual budget in an omnibus bill. The United States is the notable exception to the rule. In any nation or any State the suggestion today that it abandon its time-tried method of considering its fiscal program in one bill and resort to the piecemeal expedient of separate bills would be regarded as absurd. None of them find it unwieldy—whatever that means. And the House did not find it unwieldy this time. No one finds it unwieldy except those who oppose sanity and caution in formulating the greatest fiscal program on earth.

SOME IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

What, specifically, were the results of the use of the omnibus bill procedure in the Eighty-first Congress? There were many, but three appear to be outstanding:

1. Legislators aware of the prospect of a large annual deficit ina period of economic prosperity succeeded in whittling more than $2,000,000,000 from budget requests;

2. The consolidation of all supply bills permitted the over-all cut of $550,000,000 that the Congress felt was required by the fiscal situation; and

3. The fiscal unity achieved by the omnibus bill facilitated the transposition from a peacetime to a defense economy after the start of the Korean incident; instead of having money already appropriated, allocated, and spent under individual supply bills, the Congress found it possible to readjust the entire budget to meet the new emergency.

What improvements can be made in the consolidated appropriation method? Certainly, continued use of the new technique by the Congress will smooth out the growing pains and speed the handling of the omnibus measure. Members of the House and Senate will have every opportunity to propose specific suggestions for improved efficiency and effectiveness contributing to national economy and solvency.

An additional improvement can be anticipated as a result of the enactment of the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1950, which presages greater clarity and uniformity in Government accounting procedures. In the report of the House Appropriations Committee on the 1950 omnibus bill, it was noted that the Congress would be able to appropriate more intelligently and provide funds more nearly in line with actual requirements if it had access to more accurate and understandable accounting data. It is expected

that part of the improvement anticipated under the new statute will relate to accounting entering into the appropriation process.

The consolidated approach has been opposed, not so much because it failed as because it was successful. Its success has been attested by untenable criticisms on the part of the Washington bureaus on which the bill economizes and the lobbying interests which found it harder to slip through appropriations they want and more difficult to defeat appropriations which they are paid to oppose.

The future of the consolidated appropriation method may well lie in the support of an informed public opinion, aware that the new weapon is essential in the fight against inflationary spending. The need is pressing under any circumstance, but with the United States facing years of heavy spending under the stepped-up military preparedness program, the need becomes one of the greatest urgency. The added fiscal control resulting from consolidation of appropriations can play an important part in preserving the strength of the Nation and the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Star is an interesting commentary on the article:

CURB ON NONESSENTIAL SPENDING

Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, has made a good defense of the single-package appropriation bill in an article for Tax Review, published by the Tax Foundation of New York. No defense of the plan should be necessary, of course, for any appropriating system that lops $2,000,000,000 off the Federal budget without damaging national security and that effects further reductions by nondefense agencies in times like these ought to receive unanimous acclaim. Yet there has been occasional sniping at the omnibus plan, despite its manifest accomplishments.

Mr. CANNON is right in his belief that much of the opposition arises because of the demonstrated success of one-shot appropriations. By lumping 11 major departmental appropriation bills into one measure, the chances for behind-the-scenes logrolling by pressure groups in or outside the Government are reduced. These groups generally met defeat when they tried to prevent certain budget cuts from becoming law. The money was saved and the country is the better off administratively and economically by reason of the savings.

The need for a road block on nonessential spending is more acute today than it was when Congress last year began consideration of the budget requests. No method or device for holding nondefense appropriations to a minimum should be overlooked by the new Congress. Certainly the omnibus appropriation bill is a device that has proved itself under test and that has earned the right to show what it can do in time of national emergency.

General Walker Never Died

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "General Walker Never Died," written by Mr. Charles W. Loveland, of Shelby, N. C., and which appeared in a recent issue of the Shelby Daily Star.

This poem pays high tribute to a great American who died in the heroic discharge of his duty.

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

GENERAL WALKER NEVER DIED

They put him on a transport flying eastward to the States,
With military honors due the greatest of the greats;
But strange things sometimes happen shaped by mystic hands unknown,
So it was in mid-Pacific with the distance halfway flown.

In his flag-draped, measured coffin General Walton Walker lay,
Heading for his land of freedom, back to home in U. S. A.
Like a steady heartbeat pounding was the motor's constant roar
Bringing back a tested soldier from the battlefields of war.

Then, the engines throbbed more loudly and the casket seemed to move
As the lid, though fastened tightly, parted from its molded groove,
All the guard, in solemn silence, sat alert at death's command
And a figure, stanch and somber, rose in strong, determined stand.

Now, they say the general's buried in the land he held so dear,
But the men who flew that run with him have feelings quaint and queer;
One said he dreamed the general rose to toss his shroud aside,
And someone else proclaimed he dreamed the general had not died.

Oh, they didn't bury Walker as was stated in the press
For in bitter cold Korea still he stands in battle dress
And wherever men are dying, comrades see him in the fight—
His spirit couldn't leave his men upon a one-way flight!

—*Charles W. Loveland.*

Getting Fire Losses Under Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to present for the information of the House an important editorial from the Forest Farmer of October 1950, by Herman Work. It is entitled "Getting Fire Losses Under Control." I recommend it for the valuable information which it contains.

GETTING FIRE LOSSES UNDER CONTROL

(By Herman Work)

The far-sighted editor, in the August issue of the Forest Farmer, called on all his readers to stop and take a look into the future of the woods, further than has been our custom, because we now have to consider the new demands that will come for materials required for war. With foresight sharpened by our experience in War II, owners, operators, and all concerned have the strongest reason to plan now for handling the woods work in ways that will produce the goods with the least possible damage to the great resource on which we all depend for the long future, as well as for today.

It is no news to Americans that war calls for the best we have, and lots of it. It is painfully true also that war is by nature a most wasteful business. Emergency conditions do not encourage careful use of material. Then, too, in war, time is what must be saved. Indeed, when priceless men are being spent in combat, a new scale of values is created for temporary use, a scale in which our people have learned to use material lavishly to save lives, by gaining victory as quickly as possible. The quick victory is the economical one, on every count, including the vital one of saving our selected men.

CUTTING TO SAVE AND SAVING TO CUT

The August editorial stressed the need for planning production in the woods, to assure future supplies. That, of course, is essential. But there is another way we can provide for our future. And it is something to which almost everyone in the country will lend a hand, and gladly, when all understand the problem.

It has been said many times that we have burned up more timber than we have used, in this new land of ours. The era of fires has been destructive over many generations, because it has cut off untold millions of little trees that never had a chance to grow into useful sizes.

Since most of the trees that perished were too small for sawlogs, most people took the loss lightly.

There has been a vast change in attitude, however, as we have approached the end of the virgin stands. This change has come slower in the South than elsewhere, partly because much of the southern lumber has had to seek distant markets and the poorer grades could not stand the shipping charges over long hauls. Now, new industries in the South have created large home markets for trees of small size and ordinary quality.

FIGURES SHOW SOUTH LAGS

A recent American Forest Products Industries compilation of official figures shows that 569,000,000 acres have been covered by some form of organized protection against fire. Of the 82,000,000 acres now lacking protection, 75,000,000 acres are in the Southern States. It also shows that of the total area burned in 1949, 82 percent was on unprotected land, mostly in the South. Could anything be plainer than that?

COMPLETE COVERAGE AND LOW LOSSES GO HAND IN HAND

The last five States, in the table which follows, like most of the others not named, have some degree of protection for all their forest lands. Where the entire area is under guard, the losses on protected land are lower than in the States that have been unable as yet to provide complete coverage. The United States average of 0.46 percent burn on 569,000,000 acres can be reduced to 0.12 percent or 0.14 percent, like Washington and Virginia, respectively.

Newest figures on fire protection in the South

	Unprotected areas (in thousands of acres)	Percentage of protected area burned in average year, last 5 years
Alabama	1,209	2.02
Arkansas	5,943	.54
Florida	12,065	2.11
Georgia	7,622	.95
Kentucky	6,819	.05
Louisiana	5,095	1.47
Mississippi	5,296	2.23
Missouri	8,664	1.47
North Carolina	2,251	1.14
Oklahoma	6,620	1.57
South Carolina	0	1.06
Tennessee	6,759	1.13
Texas	6,418	1.77
Virginia	0	.14
Total above	74,742	

OTHER STATES FOR COMPARISON

West Virginia	0	0.58
Michigan	0	.15
Oregon	0	.20
Washington	0	.12
Maine	0	.32

It should be mentioned here that destructive fires have occurred in States that are now fully protected. An example is the State of Maine, where a dry season brought on some fires a few years ago that got completely out of control. The recent spring season in South Carolina provided another example of extensive losses in a fully organized State. So we cannot afford anywhere to sit back and assume that because all the area is covered there is no need for concern. In fact we should not be satisfied until uncontrolled woods fires are as rare as they are in Europe. Almost all fires spring from human action. They are not normal and natural.

In spite of the examples of fires on protected areas, it is clear from the tabulation that the neglected areas take the big losses, both in the unorganized parts and in those where protection has been arranged. This points to the important fact that the fire problem is worse where the people have not yet accepted the idea that fires are bad and that they can be prevented.

THOSE WHO UNDERSTAND HAVE A CLEAR DUTY

The broadest kind of public education is needed. A great deal of this work is being done in the South today. The unprotected area is being reduced, as for instance in Georgia and Florida. However, there appears to be need for wider participation in the educational effort so that everyone will be reached, not necessarily by the officials charged with the duty, but by anyone who realizes the need for improvement and wants to serve his country in a way that will have far-reaching results.

Many voluntary organizations are working in this field, including Forest Farmers. Does it not appear that the time has arrived for greater efforts by more people and by more organizations, so that the story can be carried by neighbors, to everyone in the country, in the towns, and along the roads? The simple story is that wildfires are depriving the South of income and materials that it should rightfully expect for the future. Now that there are large markets for small trees, it should not be too hard to show owners, operators, business people, and neighbors that tangible benefits can come to them every day from trees that once had values only for the distant future.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN THE SOUTH

The South has had two other problems of its own, in addition to the earlier lack of markets for the lower grades of wood. Perhaps the less important factor has been the belief that fire makes the grazing better and tends to rid the woods of ticks and other pests. Another problem stems from the fact, well known to the people of the southern woods, that fire may be a useful as well as a destructive agent.

When fire is rigidly excluded from pinelands in the South there is likely to be an invasion by brush and by tree species that have generally been less wanted than pine. Again, frequent light fires prevent the accumulation of litter that would provide fuel for fires hot enough to kill many of the larger trees as well as the little ones.

Here a distinction must be made between the wildfires, set by anyone on anyone's land, and the newer idea of controlled or prescribed burning, to give the advantages of fire, without permitting it to burn the whole countryside. People interested in protection have been understandably cautious about accepting the beneficial use of fire, because few people as yet know what is needed to keep a controlled fire in check, and many have not been converted as yet to the need for doing away with wild fire.

The war situation should spur all citizens to a greater effort to convert everyone to the idea that wild fire is really out of place in times like these.

FIRE LAWS O. K.?

After most of the thoughtful and right-thinking people have concluded that fire is bad, there will still be a small number who for one reason or another will not go along with a good cause. Here the law must come in. This might be a good time for members of the Forest Farmers Association to examine the laws in their own States to see if they are as good as they should be to meet present conditions. It is not necessary to try something new, for among the 48 States many kinds of laws have been tested, and this experience should be used to the full.

Owners and operators especially have a chance to point out the needs in their own localities and to advocate reasonable laws to protect the many from the losses that have come from thoughtless actions of a few.

Amendment of Railway Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1950, the House passed S. 3295, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements for union membership and deductions from wages of carriers' employees. This bill is substantially the same as H. R. 7789 in the Eighty-first Congress.

The legislation has the effect of forcing carrier employees to join a union in order to work and hold their jobs. It also forces them to pay dues to the union and directs the carrier employer to deduct the dues from the pay checks of the employees.

I believe in unions for workers and laborers and if I were an employee of a railroad or other carrier I would want to belong to one of the brotherhoods in the craft or the class of the work that I did. However, I believe in the right to belong or not to belong to a union or any other organization. I feel that membership is something that should be left entirely to the choice of the worker. This is in keeping with the general democratic rights of American people and the freedoms which belong to them. Therefore, I did not support S. 3295 which has the effect of forcing workers to join a union and forcing them to pay dues where the shop in which they work is unionized. That choice should be left to each individual worker.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a letter which was received by our State delegation from a man who is a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, and whose sentiment is in keeping with that I have expressed above. The letter follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *December 27, 1950.*

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN.
Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON.
Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.
Hon. ARTHUR WINSTEAD.
Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER.
Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

HONORABLE SIRS: As a district chairman of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks representing 257 members transferred here from the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and above all a southerner, I am appealing to you gentlemen to vote and exert your influence against H. R. 7789, which would amend the Railway Labor Act to permit negotiations for a union shop on the railroads. While I and my coworkers here on the Louisville & Nashville Railroad believe in the necessity for unions, as our voluntary membership proves, we do not believe in forced membership in either a union, club, lodge, church, or anything else, feeling that such in any form is un-American and should be left to Russia.

This legislation is being sought by the national leaders and the opinion of the people has not been asked for nor considered. They seek such power to further their political ideas which for the greater part are of the FEPC and civil-rights variety, as is evidenced by the propaganda for such in labor papers.

Food for thought is that there are over 300,000 new members of the railway clerks alone and with the passage of this bill would be added some 60,000 forced members. Assess each of these members even the small sum of $5 each, which the law as written provides can be done, and it is easy to see what a power would be unleashed in support of the above political ideas. This alone should warn any southerner against such.

We as railroad employees have made great progress by the expression of the freedom of choice and the Railway Labor Act. Keep this act intact and let us continue to do so, but, either progress or failure, let us be as freemen and not by orders under force from a few. Help us preserve this freedom.

Yours very truly,

W. T. HARRISON.

Impossible for United States To Do Business With Russia on Any Normal Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle of December 26, 1950:

IMPOSSIBLE FOR UNITED STATES TO DO BUSINESS WITH RUSSIA ON ANY NORMAL PLANE

When the holiday season is over we can expect the new defense programs to get rolling in earnest. It has been said that the public generally is more willing to accept the expected restrictions than Washington is to invoke them. That may be true in some instances, but we are a bit inclined to believe that both Congress and the President are much more aware of the situation than they have been given credit for.

Our information is that the long-run and over-all controls are so tough that the men

in Washington feel the people have to be conditioned first for their acceptance.

A confirmation of this attitude rests on the strong speech Governor Dewey made the night before President Truman addressed the Nation on the need of declaring a state of emergency.

The first reactions to the Dewey speech was that the New York Governor was beating Truman to the punch and bolstering Republican political policy. It has come out since from a reliable source that Mr. Dewey cleared his talk with the White House before he delivered it and that the President was pleased to have the Governor break the ice with a plea for the most stringent kind of a program.

While the general feeling among the public seems to be one of willing anticipation of a hard schedule, the fact remains that we have traditionally been slow to resign ourselves to any kind of Government control except in time of actual warfare.

When or if war is to come, no one at the present time can accurately foretell. We have been pushed into such a position, however, that we must be fully and unconditionally prepared to meet any contingency.

We can be sure of some very definite facts. The dangers and threats which are being thrust upon the free nations come not from the local places where hostilities have erupted. The core and center of the evil is in Soviet Russia. Secondly, the Kremlin will not tip its hand to us as to its future moves. It will strike when and where it believes we are least prepared to offset the onslaught.

Finally—and this is a truth that even some seemingly intelligent leaders have not yet learned—there is not the slightest possibility of doing business with the Soviet on any normal plane. The nature of communism gives indisputable proof of that assertion. We might as well make up our minds that dealing with the Reds as we would other normal persons is a delusion.

We must break relations with the Soviet regardless of the consequences. To be a bit more accurate, we should say Russia has long ago broken with the rest of the world and we must acknowledge the facts in the case. It means the Nation must go on a wartime program, not knowing when, where, or if the clash of arms on a global scale will occur. Nor has anyone the least idea how long the crisis will last. It may be a few years, 5, 10, 20. The only thing that can change the picture is a complete and about-face change in communism. We see no hope of that for a long time.

We, as a nation, are to be tested in the years ahead as we have never been tried before. It will take all that we have, every resource we possess—politically, socially, industrially, spiritually—to survive the trial. Individually we can sum up our role in one word—sacrifice. Our heritage of the past and the promises of the future depend on how well we measure up to that word.

Defense Should Begin at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend two letters to the Members of this body for reading. Even in the center of these United States the people are deeply concerned over the present foreign situation. One does not have to read the metropolitan press of our largest cities in order to find constructive thinking.

These two letters emphasize most strongly the feeling among the people—that defense like charity should begin at home:

[From the Concordia (Kans.) Blade-Empire of December 21, 1950]

IN THE MAIL BAG

To the BLADE:

That America stands at the threshold of grave and momentous times every sane man and woman must admit.

Ancient history tells us of Emperor Nero who fiddled while Rome burned. If Nero were alive today his fiddling wouldn't hold a candle to the fiddling that is going on in Washington, D. C. The Pentagon fiddles while the whole world burns.

If America doesn't wake up and change her ways, we are headed for the paths taken by Babylon, Greece, and Rome. The fall of these empires was preceded by an era of wanton luxury and extravagance. These nations fondly imagined their wealth and power would last forever but history has proven their error. They realized this only after it was too late. And history has a habit of repeating itself.

Let's pull our boys out of Korea. Let's bring them home to protect our own shores. We can't play Santa Claus to the whole world. Let's keep our main Pacific bases and build an impregnable defense around America proper. We've spent so many billions on both Western Europe and Eastern Asia it makes us dizzy even to contemplate. And what do we get out of it? A kick in the pants, mostly. We get nations, countries, and peoples who are ready to bite the hand that feeds them. Look what America has done for China the past 100 years. Look what China is now doing for us.

You can imagine what Western Europe would do to us should the hordes of Russia and China, and, yes, India, come sweeping across the eastern plains to invade their countries. In this writer's opinion, they would tamely submit to these invaders rather than have their own countries made a vast battlefield of blood and carnage. In a way you cannot blame them too much, for they went through World War II, and know what it means.

Rather than have their own countries made this vast field of carnage, they would turn on America if we intervened and tried to help them. In spite of all we have done for these countries, no people are hated by them more than Americans.

There is another story of an ancient philosopher who out of the kindness of his heart, picked up a nearly frozen viper and placed it in his bosom. He warmed it back to life and the viper promptly stung him to death.

America has taken many countries of Western Europe and several of Eastern Asia, to its maternal bosom and has warmed them back to life. Will we get the same reward as this ancient philosopher?

Let's spend our billions for home defense.

Let's get out of Asia, for the sleeping giant has wakened and, armed to the teeth with Russian weapons, she can almost whip the world.

Truly we are facing grave and perilous times. Let's recognize this fact before it is everlastingly too late.

C. D. W.

OPPOSES FOOLISH FOREIGN COMMITMENTS

Philip Doyle, World War II veteran and successful farmer, viewing present world conditions, boils over and takes his pencil in hand to express himself in the following screed:

DECEMBER 11, 1950.

DEAR FRIENDS AND READERS: Several years have passed since last I wrote in this manner. At that time I was a GI, a member of that vast military organization recruited to stamp tyranny and oppression from all those parts of the earth, downtrodden by those three monsters, namely, Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini. At that time we were told that if only we could but win the war we would go home and enjoy the fruits of peace and plenty, everyone would love the United States and all she stood for, and admire us for the sacrifices we had made for straightening out the oppressors and binding up the wounds of those who had suffered.

Five years have passed since the cessation of World War II and where do we stand today?

In a few short words I think it can be summed up thus: The diplomatic, political, and military bunglers that represent the head of those departments have lost the peace obtained, at the price of the lives and blood of those youthful Americans who left home and country to wrestle with foreign oppression and hypocrisy. (In passing, lest we forget, let us also remember those maimed and crippled veterans who inhabit the hospitals and sanitariums of our Nation today who are in a state of living death.) I ask you, When we view the state of the Nation and the world as a whole, can there be an alternative except the dismal knowledge that it was only all in vain?

Where can a good American citizen stand and point with pride to any one shining example of success in the foreign policy of our Government agencies. We, the Nation, stand on the brink of inflation and bankruptcy. Our so-called allies, while grasping all the money, supplies, and munitions they can euchre out of our dim-witted diplomatic representatives will not eagerly volunteer their own aid when we ourselves are involved in a national catastrophe, as our ill-advised fiasco in Korea has been. In other words, they insist on dragging their feet on any project that obviously cannot be maneuvered into filling their own pockets with good, hard, United States money.

Where have our statesmen and our old-style, hardheaded diplomats disappeared to?

Now, at the hour when we as a Nation, are at the cross roads where, oh, where, are the men upon whom the people can look for deliverance from the futile and insane policies of those in high places today.

Where is to be found individuals of the caliber similar to those of the Washingtons, the Lincolns, the Ben Franklins, and their like who lived in the days when this wonderful country was launched. Stock from solid, freedom-loving people who came to this wilderness to start a land of their own, where taxation, tyranny, and socialism were not to be the yoke of the coming generations.

I ask you, dear reader, how do you like the outlook for your children? Washington uttered words of prophecy when he said:

"We must, as a Nation, steer clear of foreign entanglements and alliances, or as a free Nation we will cease to exist." We, as a Nation in the past 33 years, have ceased to regard this advice, and I believe most of our present-day troubles can be placed on the doorsteps of these entanglements and alliances. International politics, if continued at the present rate, will cause the downfall of our democratic way of life.

In my opinion, the Government agencies are so infested with the termites of communism that we are being sold down the river to our enemies. Inflation and bankruptcy are two weapons they will use to advantage. The American standard of living will fall, dissatisfaction and disbelief in our leaders will result, and then, brother, life as we have known will be on the toboggan slide to dissolution and despair.

Why do we weaken ourselves by pouring our blood in the form of young men, munitions, food, machinery, and money into the dead corpse of Europe, wherein there is not the will to live in any democratic way of

life? The history of Europe has always been one of wars waged by one country or group of countries upon the other. Their jealousies are paramount. In our effort to aid each one of them our efforts have, to a large part, been penalized because all of them were afraid they would not get a lion's share of the feast. They sit like vultures waiting to pounce upon any scrap we might throw them. Our foreign policy, as I see it, since the early forties was but one giant jackpot give-away program. Soon our resources and national wealth will be stripped away from us. Where will we turn and what nation will come to our rescue? I prophesy our plenty-loving friends across the seas will desert us like rats from a sinking ship.

Friendship, among nations as among individuals, cannot be bought by money or gifts of any kind. Friendship is given, not bought. If friendship is not to be given voluntarily, all the financial bribery in the world will not make one iota of difference. When the chips are down the fair-weather friends will fade away.

I fear that in case of a Russian war and things were to start looking bad for us Great Britain, France, Italy, and all those others would desert us like rats from a sinking ship. The Korean deal should be a good example of that. Whose armies have been doing the lion's share of the fighting and dying in that trap? Another of the examples of how much a far cry our diplomats are from the hard-headed horse-trading Yankee statesmen of our past glorious history. When those admirable individuals made a deal they got their money's worth. In spite of our Marshall plan aid on all the other prodigious amounts of philanthrophy bestowed upon our allies it would seem there were no binding clauses which required their unlimited cooperation when we ourselves are in a jam.

Perhaps, we would not be in that jam if the original plans of our fathers still existed. Their idea for government consisted of the Constitution, to be carried out by three branches of government, legislative, executive, and judicial. According to that this war would not be declared or peace made without express act of Congress. I have yet to find anywhere any proof where the present debacle has been the result of being a war declared by Congress. Perhaps that ancient body has been replaced by the President, United Nations, and MacArthur.

It seems strange that our executive branch should be manned by the type of individual who would seem to become much more enraged by a slighting remark made by a critic concerning the quality of his daughter's singing, than he does about the facts of the barbarous butchery and torture of our American troops in a foreign theater, by the Chinese Reds. Am I right?

Perhaps many of the troubles of our times are a direct result of our (the United States public) tending to be lax in supervising the activities of our lawmakers and executives. If we, each and everyone of us, would trouble ourselves to find how our public servants served us in Washington and took them to task by letter or telegram whenever we doubted their decisions they might be slower to be careless with their public trust.

If we as a Nation pass out of existence it will be, in my estimation due largely to three causes: first the involvement by the United States in foreign alliances and the subsequent wasting away of our economy in all the give-away foreign relief it entailed; second, the refusal of the people of the United States to hold their own executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government under constant accountability for their actions plus the fact that we as a Nation fail to concern themselves in the problems confronting their Congressmen; third, the tending of our Government to lean toward and favor socialism or at best a "pink capitalism" if one wishes to be kind. Wake up America. "It's later than you think."

Almost as an afterthought let me say that the two most dangerous aspects in our futile foreign-aid programs are: 1. That perhaps a lot of the aid has gone into the hands and pockets of unscrupulous politicians and organizations in those countries instead of the common people who needed the help and for whom the aid was really intended. 2. The fact that we are building up those areas and that Russia is only waiting for us to fatten up said countries, then come in and take them over to be used in a war against us. With the international situation in those countries as they are, I wonder if that is an impossibility?

I wonder sometimes if it would not have been far better to have cut ourselves off from those decadent countries and made a new world for ourselves here at home. If we had taken a fraction of that money and spent it on our next-door neighbors in Canada and our South American neighbors on the south, they might be forever our friends. At the present rate we will soon be a manufacturing, raw-material-importing Nation. We could manufacture, and they could furnish us raw materials. They would buy our automobiles, refrigerators, tractors, and such like mad. What better set-up could a nation want? It seems odd that we should support those European nations that are in direct competition to us. I maintain that those countries that today depend upon us for charity are for the most part waiting on the day when we can no longer be the No. 1 nation of them all, and they themselves can assume that status. Woe be to us then. We would be shocked at the provisions thrust upon us then.

O. K. United States of America, where do we go from here? Remember, wherever we go from here that the blame or glory, whichever it may be, will rest upon your shoulders. Politicians, diplomats, and agencies of one kind or another are calling the shots and standing in the limelight, but remember you, John Q. Citizen, are the guy who pays and pays and pays.

We have had the New Deal and the Fair Deal—are we ever going to get the Square Deal? Our only chance of survival is for our citizens to plant their feet in United States soil and refuse to budge or be bullied into making any more foolish foreign commitments.

We are being stripped of our wealth and material as the sharper at the fair strips the simple country boy.

Sincerely,

PHILIP J. DOYLE.

Lost Horizons—From Gettysburg to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne of Huntington, W. Va., has for years taken a lively interest in many important public questions. Recently she wrote an article on the subject of Lost Horizons—From Gettysburg to Korea.

I am asking the privilege of having this article printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

LOST HORIZONS FROM GETTYSBURG TO KOREA

Less than one score years ago Franklin Roosevelt brought forth on this continent a false concept of liberty, borrowed from Karl Marx, and dedicated to the proposition that by violating every American principle and tradition—at home and abroad—we could prove that all men are created equal and destined to live in leisure in a welfare world. Those experiments, continued by Mr. Truman, have wrecked our security, economy, and peace at home and our friendships abroad; because of them we engage in many wars proving that this Nation, or any other nation so dedicated, cannot long endure. Because we forgot "The rock from whence we are hewn" we are met on battlefields all over the earth to dedicate them to our sons who fought so valiantly and hopelessly in idealistic wars they could not win; it is not altogether fitting nor proper that they should have done this.

In a realistic sense we cannot condone the maladministration and misguided idealists who allowed these planned attacks on our free institutions to warp, change and undermine the very foundations of this Republic and remake it in their own image. The little men, both living and dead, who through gullibility or design, executed this advance into utopia have wrecked the ship of state far beyond our poor powers to add or detract as long as they are in office.

The world now little notes the miracle of freedom our forefathers wrought here, but it will long remember, because of needless blood, sweat, and tears, what the combined forces of evil under false leadership, did here. The prophets of doom who now predict we must live always in war and confusion belie the premise of repentance for wrong-doing and are only trying desperately to cover up their sins against this Nation.

We can stop the desecration of the faith of our fathers and survive. Therefore, it is for the living, rather to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us to reinstate the fundamental American principles which brought the greatest good to the greatest number, and that from this terrible debacle in Korea we take increased devotion to those Christian precepts and concepts which made and kept us a Nation. Wherever we are involved and whatever the sacrifice, it will be in vain unless we reach these objectives, as we strive once again to rebuild a strong defense for one God, one flag, and one country, lest this Nation, as the symbol and demonstration of liberty for people everywhere, perish from the earth.

Let us resolve now to be practical Christians and make our calling and election sure. Let us resolve to work, pray, and vote for men and women who still believe that the Bible, the Constitution, Ray's arithmetic, and the McGuffey readers made a great and good country, whose people were God-fearing, independent, free-enterprising Americans.

Old fashioned? Yes. So are the Ten Commandments.

Fish Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, members of the Public Lands Committee are interested in the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife and every wise move to bring about that conservation. It has been called to my attention that the National Park Service has recently taken steps to control fishing in the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida. An editorial in the Miami Herald for Thursday, November 16 last, rather fully explains this conservation

effort and why it was necessary. Under leave to print, I extend herewith the editorial as follows:

HEARING CALLED TO CONSERVE FISH VALUES

It is commonly known among sports fishermen, commercial fishermen, and resort operators along the Florida Keys and nearby areas that the use of heavy drag seines has reduced the fish population of fertile Florida Bay in Monroe County.

A loophole in the State law which defines legal nets and seines permits any size to be used in the taking of mullet.

State conservation officers who have apprehended fishermen with huge nets have, time after time, failed to make a case because the fishermen claimed that they were taking mullet. Large, small—mesh nets collect any fish that happens to be in the area—big, little sports fish, commercial fish, and everything else. This has resulted in a waste of fish—a waste that all who know the waters freely admit has been a destroying effect.

Long before Everglades National Park was created, the National Park Service in consultation with commercial and sports fishermen decided that commercial fishing would be allowed to continue in the proposed park on what might be termed a "sustained yield" basis.

Just as in the national forests where timber is cut as a scientifically controlled crop, the fish would be taken from the waters of the park in such a way as to allow seed stock to remain and perpetuate forever this important commercial and recreational resource.

Later, when the Legislature of Florida was holding hearings on the proposed park, the Secretary of the Interior reiterated this proposal in a telegram to Representative Burnie C. Papy at Key West.

Before World War II, commercial fishermen in Florida Bay made their living with gill nets. These nets had a relatively large mesh which permitted small fishes to go through. The nets were "set" by a few men and hauled usually by hand. They did not drag and disrupt the fertile bottom of the bay. The commercial fishermen made a good living and the sports fishermen had plenty of excellent catches.

Then someone decided if they could employ a very large net or seine dragged by a power boat, they could increase the yield of fish. They did, and others followed, taking literally millions of pounds of fish from the waters.

Soon the resident fisherman with his gill nets could not catch enough in the nearly clean-swept waters to make a decent living. It is small wonder that he, too, if he could afford it, turned to the drag seines.

While the majority of commercial fishermen opposed the drag seines and wanted to return to gill nets, they were unwilling to do so as long as others were employing these big nets and reducing the available take for the others.

"We'll quit if everybody else does," they said. Nobody could give them assurance that the others would quit, too.

When Florida Bay was added to Everglades National Park last February, National Park Service officials went the rounds of the sportsmen clubs, commercial fishing houses, talked with law enforcement and judicial officials and discussed the merits of outlawing the drag seines.

They were met with an eagerness they had not expected to find. The proposed regulations were drawn up and many of the "bugs" were worked out.

Now the Secretary of the Interior has published the proposed special fishing regulations for Everglades National Park and has appointed a special committee to hold a public hearing on them at park headquarters in Homestead beginning at 10 a. m. today.

One of the State's foremost economic resources, commercially and as a sports and recreation attraction, is at stake. The importance of the hearing merits the attendance of all who are interested.

Bitter Results of Recent United States Decisions Must Be Faced Without Fear or Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert M. Grannis in the Brooklyn Eagle of December 8, 1950:

ONE MAN SAYS

(By Robert M. Grannis)

BITTER RESULTS OF RECENT UNITED STATES DECISIONS MUST BE FACED WITHOUT FEAR OR RETREAT

Decent people have a habit of making precipitate decisions based on anger of the moment and then, after thoughtful consideration, they water them down to eliminate any suggestion of ruthlessness—not to mention a will to preserve the status quo in their daily lives. The spirit of decent compromise is deep in our natures.

We are decent people, no matter what the Maliks, the Vishinskys, the General Wus, or the Daily Workers may say about us. We don't like to see people killed needlessly, whether it is a Long Island railroad wreck or a war. We believe that the individual is important and that the state is subject to the will of the people.

We believe that we possess most of the ingredients for an orderly world and acknowledge that there are certain imperfections in the American system that must be worked out through the years by trial and error.

Our job is far from finished

Our spiritual conscience is strong and is a safe barometer to remind us that the job we started more than 170 years ago is far from finished. Our spiritual understanding of other people led us to reject isolationism and accept the fact that we have no monopoly on the right of free choice. To wall ourselves in and hide from the sufferings of others who lack our strength and resources has been recognized as uncharitable and as a device that some day might leave us standing alone against a conquered world.

Now, I believe we have reached a point where the bitter consequences of some of our recent decisions as a nation must be faced without fear, without retreat, and without self-flagellation because our first reaction might be one of horror due to discovery of the strength of our determination.

What we do in the next few months could be the turning point in history and involve the choice between a slave world and a free world. Some of our allies already are wavering. Prime Minister Attlee is expected to ask a settlement with Red China at any cost. Mention of the atom bomb has caused others to raise their hands in horror.

Kremlin sneers at human understanding

We have got to realize we are dealing with people who have no conscience, no respect for the spiritual side of life, and no wish to compromise except on their own terms. The master plan has been written and the people who have been selected to implement it are as small and unimportant in the eyes of the authors as the slaves were when they toiled and died to erect temples to graven images and false gods centuries ago.

Our human understanding is sneered at and rejected by the lords of the Kremlin and their puppets. The truth about Korea, the truth about the world's troubles is not in any Red portfolio carried into the halls of UN. There is one underlying thought and one underlying motive: conquest by infiltration and conquest by force. The simple church, humble people kneeling at prayer, children dropping pennies into boxes to feed the hungry, are factors that stand in the path of the monstrous scheme directed by Moscow.

General MacArthur says that if we lose in Korea we will have to fight it out in Europe and probably lose there. He understands the nature of the Communist threat and the lengths to which its agents will go.

Malik's views are those of a savage

Buried deep in the text of a UN address by Jacob Malik, the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, there is a quote that probably escaped the attention of millions. I repeat it here as the words of a savage to whom all religion is repugnant.

"We all know," said Malik, "that missionaries have always been a weapon of aggression and that they have served to promote the conquests of the ruling circles and to enslave peoples who were a source of income. Missionaries have always been followed by traders and soldiers."

When the word of God is ruled out of our lives it is no time for appeasement. When an altar cannot be raised among men without fear of death or imprisonment the strong must seek the cure or face death slowly with frightened faces.

Beaming our prayers to Moscow is not the answer. We must let them see the strength of our cold steel and understand that decent people are as resolute as the savage fabricators of a gangster plot against all humanity.

Air and Sea Power Our Hope in World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, at various times, since the start of hostilities in Korea, I have presented some of my own ideas, concerning the course this Nation should take, in meeting the world-wide emergency, brought about by Russian imperialistic expansionism.

I have recognized, as surely as you have recognized, in this emergency, the most terrible threat to our national existence ever encountered, since the founding of the Republic.

All of us have come to realize, I think, even as Lenin and Stalin earlier realized, that in no real sense are we living in one world, as the internationalists would have it.

We know that we are living on a globe that is divided into two worlds. One is the free world of democratic republicanism; the other, the slave world of socialistic communism.

We understand now, that they cannot long continue to exist, side by side.

Never did we seek to have it this way. We fought and won the First World War, as we thought, to make the world safe for democracy. But after it was over, we found that the Allied victory meant only a change in the European balance of power.

We fought the Second World War and won it, as we thought, to end all wars. But since that time, we have found that even as World War I gave rise to World War II, the Second World War only spawned a lot of little wars, in a world divided beyond any peaceful adjustment of its conflicting ideologies.

Compromise no longer is possible.

That all of these little wars, and world war III, of which they are merely the opening skirmishes, could have been avoided is undeniable.

The peace after World War I was lost by international politicians, masquerading as statesmen, in a metaphorically smoke-filled room at the Palace of Versailles.

The peace after World War II was lost in the political horse-trading atmosphere of similar rooms at Tehran, Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam. Lost, it should be noted, even before the war had ended.

Now, through the partisan-political-minded opportunism, the crass blunders and weaknesses of little men in offices of great power both in our own administrations over the past 17 years, and in the chancelries of Europe, the Russian imperialists rule nearly half the land mass of the world and more than a third of the human race.

The Red gangsters of the Kremlin call the tune for a lot of little wars, while the piper is paid in the wealth and blood of America and of the slave satellites of Russia.

With his own forces unimpaired, the bloody handed tyrant of communism sits in the Kremlin planning the Armageddon so soon to come.

The situation now is such that Soviet Russia holds the initiative. Occupying most of Asia and half of Europe, with 12,000,000 men under arms and with tremendous supplies of slave-manufactured weapons and war equipment, the Kremlin still has an effective manpower reserve of nearly 75,000,000 men.

American troops, without the initiative and with the half-hearted support of allies who seem to have lost the will to fight, engage the enemy wherever and whenever the Kremlin wills.

Such well-trained troops as we have are scattered about the world, garrisoning nations which show little desire to defend themselves. At the present moment virtually all of our striking power is tied down in Korea. There the very men who should be training our new armies are fighting and dying in a little war that already is lost.

In 5 years the Congress has appropriated $50,000,000,000 for the armed services, to say nothing of nearly as much for our bread-and-butter allies. Yet we lack the military power, it seems, to win anywhere in the world. Our allies are in worse case.

But in spite of this position, so close to ultimate disaster, the Congress is told—the American people are told—that we must not reexamine the foreign policies which brought it about.

We are urged to rally behind the President and the Secretary of State. We are told to forget the weaknesses and blunders of the past, if they were nothing worse, so that we may blind ourselves to those the future may bring—all in the name of unity.

And what, may I ask, would that kind of unity be? Unity without leadership; a nation united in futility and defeat.

The voices calling for this kind of unity are the voices of a folly so vast as to exceed the bounds of sane thinking. The unity we need now is a unity in bringing those who profess to lead us, and who ask us to follow them blindly, back once more to their senses.

Either that, or unity in creating new leaders, who are not given to vacillation because of petty political considerations; leaders who have a program, born of the wisdom and strength of the American people, and not of their weaknesses.

I refer to the perversion of the administration's socialistic ideal, whereby Americans have been advised, not to share with each other, but each in every instance, to get his own share; and a bit more, if he votes aright.

As a long-time member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have enjoyed the opportunity such membership provides for studying in detail the various factors of national defense.

It was on the basis of this hard-won knowledge that nearly 6 months ago I voiced the conclusion that the United States cannot hope to win a land war against the hordes of foot soldiers the Red colossus ultimately can muster in Europe and Asia.

Our hope of victory, as I said then, and believe now, lies in domination of the sea and air.

I continued to believe this, even when American troops stood at the Manchurian border. I did so because it seemed to me that Russia's necessity of keeping face in Asia would send the Chinese Communists into Korea. Obviously we lacked the military manpower to stay permanently in Korea.

For this reason, and for others connected with the imminent invasion of Yugoslavia by Bulgarian and Rumanian satellite troops, in a radio broadcast several weeks ago I offered some further conclusions.

It seemed to me imperative that we should withdraw all of our troops from the Asiatic mainland; that we should proceed as quickly as possible to arm Japan and the Philippines; that we should redouble the blockade before Formosa, and extend it to cover the entire Chinese coast; that we should give additional arms and economic aid to Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Army; and that so far as possible, we should support with arms and money the nearly 2,000,000 Nationalist guerrillas on the Chinese mainland.

It seemed to me imperative, too, that we must reach a realistic understanding with our Western European allies; that we should make it clear to them that we will not single-handedly defend their territory, but that we will help them defend themselves. They have the manpower, and lack only the arms.

I pointed out by implication that under present circumstances, should Soviet Russia move into Western Europe, even England would become quite untenable as a base for American operations. I pointed out further, that in such event, Spain alone would be available to us.

I did not urge that we desert our Western European allies. I did urge that we force them to realize and act upon the situation as it really exists.

Still further, it seemed imperative to me that we should permit nothing to delay the most complete preparations for the defense of the Western Hemisphere; that we make of the Americas, as Herbert Hoover said later, a veritable Gibraltar of military power.

And again it seemed to me that we must find some effective means of rapprochement with the Latin American Republics; that we must find some way of ending the present rude treatment accorded them by our State Department and by our delegates in the United Nations.

Most of us have heard of the fact that United States delegates declined an invitation to a cocktail party given by the delegates of a powerful South American country, on the score that they were too busy with the Korean situation. We have heard, too, that Vishinsky attended, and made friends by saying he never was too busy to fraternize with important people from South America.

It should be noted here, too, that some of the better informed commentators are saying that another even more powerful Latin American Republic is ready to ally itself with the Russians, in the event of a new world war.

Just before the Christmas holidays, I was gratified to hear former President Herbert Hoover, on a Nation-wide hookup, express ideas closely resembling my own.

In his position of eminence, as the greatest living American, it followed naturally that he should be attacked by the apologists for the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. They smeared him as an isolationist.

Parenthetically, I might ask: If Herbert Hoover is an isolationist, then what is wrong with isolationism?

The apologists, and particularly the former Republican, John Foster Dulles, in a radio speech said that we must continue to bear the burden for our Western European allies at any cost, because we must have bases in Europe, in order to retain domination of the sea and air. For the same reason, he advocated fighting on to the last man in Korea.

Dulles said we must be in a position to counterattack anywhere in the world, and thus keep the Russians off balance, running from point to point on the Soviet defense perimeter.

Now just what does Mr. Dulles think we did in Korea? And does he overlook the fact that our counterattack in Korea has proved the contention that we cannot hope to win land wars against the hordes of Asia, either in the Far East or in Western Europe? The latter, of course, unless and until the Western

European countries take steps to utilize their vast military manpower.

We can help them to arm, but we cannot do all of their fighting for them. We are 7 percent of the world's population, and we lack the manpower to fight everywhere.

Dulles, and others like him, seem to forget that our counterattack by land has left Korea a peninsula of scorched earth, where millions will starve. They forget that Russia now is in a position to take all of Western Europe within a few weeks' time.

From the battle front the American people are fed with optimistic communiqués, telling of the orderly withdrawals, the success of the amphibious operation at Inchon, and the possibilities of holding on in Korea indefinitely.

Yet the newspapers and the air networks are filled with letters and statements by returned soldiers describing Inchon as another Dunkerque, and telling the full horror of the so-called orderly withdrawals. It is my conviction that the American people realize the essential untruth and insincerity of those communiqués.

They sound too much like something dreamed up by the State Department. They sound too much like those communiqués from Berlin when Germany was losing in World War II—communiqués which said that German troops, as a matter of strategy, were advancing to the rear.

Nevertheless, Dulles and the other administration apologists, go on saying that we must have continental European and Asian bases, in order to retain control of the sea and air. Why is that so?

We already control the sea and air. We shall retain this control, unless we dissipate our wealth, and sacrifice the lives of millions of the flower of American youth—sacrifice our wealth and our youth in land wars initiated by the Kremlin and fought against overwhelming odds on the Kremlin's own terms.

To make such a sacrifice would be to court national degeneration and ultimate destruction of the last bastion of freedom on earth. And this sacrifice is unnecessary.

We have adequate bases for sea and air power in Japan, the Philippines, Formosa, and the isles of the western Pacific. Spain can be made available to us.

France and England show signs of understanding what they must do. And without any doubt Herbert Hoover's radio address, more than anything else, brought the understanding home to them. There is just a chance they may be able to act in time.

We cannot and must not—we have no need—to sacrifice millions of our ablest and best. Above all, Russian imperialistic communism must be contained by sea and air. It must be kept from our shores, until it falls of its own rottenness, as all dictatorships eventually fall.

And when all is said and done, the fact remains that this third world war, which is so close upon us, cannot be from our viewpoint a war for the survival of any particular nation, other than our own. It will be a battle for the entire world, and the chips of national destruction must fall where they may.

TVA's 17 Years of Progress Is Inspiring Story of Progress Toward National Security and General Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege in the past endeavor to keep this body abreast of the vast progress which annually is recorded in the yearly report of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Today I wish to comment once more upon the growth of the TVA as demonstrated in its seventeenth annual report. In reviewing the latest account of TVA activities it is more than ever apparent to me that the statesmen of other years whose vision made possible the building of this great public project were gifted with prophetic foresight. It is almost as though these men were able to see into the future and the tremendous war needs which only such a development as the TVA could meet—needs stemming from mobilization and the building of a vast and powerful military machine. TVA's contribution to our war needs in World War II is an inspiring story in our history. Today, when TVA is stronger than ever—stronger, even, than in World War II—we may gain added security in the knowledge that its contributions to our national defense will be great and essential in our present hour of national crisis.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean of January 1, 1950, entitled "Seventeen Years of Progress."

The editorial is as follows:

SEVENTEEN YEARS OF PROGRESS

Like a favorite book that retains its original appeal no matter how many times it is read, the Tennessee Valley Authority's annual reports never fail to reward us with a feeling of satisfaction. The seventeenth such review, made public yesterday, is no exception.

As always the report is a story of progress—past, present, and future. It is an account of the amazing transformation that has been, is being and will be wrought in this great Tennessee Valley of which we are a part. It is an inspiring record of accomplishments that skeptics once said were impossible.

"The valley region today is stronger than it was in 1933, or than it was in 1940 when the Nation began to mobilize for World War II, or than it was when the war ended in 1945," the report tells us. "It is stronger in the control the people exercise over their natural resources. It is stronger in its own institutions."

Even those of us who have watched this strength grow during the last 17 years find its comparative measurements almost unbelievable. Yet, the facts and figures are there for all to see:

The region's power supply is 12 times as great as it was in 1933. River freight tonnage has increased from 33,000,000 ton-miles to 508,000,000 ton-miles. Flood damage along the Tennessee has been reduced by $45,000,000. Total power consumers have been boosted from 275,000 to 1,100,000. Electrification of 82 percent of all the farms in the valley has been accomplished, compared with only 3 percent in 1933. Fertilizer production research has revolutionized America's fertilizer industry. A long-term trend of erosion and soil depletion has been reversed. A great reforestation and timber management program has been inaugurated. And recreational resources have been developed into one of the Nation's greatest playgrounds.

The value of these gains is inestimable; the cost has been low. They have not been bought, as so many charge, with socialism, inefficiency, and ill-considered spending.

"Contrary to the widely disseminated notion that efficient management in the electric business is the exclusive attribute of private ownership, the publicly owned and locally managed distribution systems in the valley show cost of service averaging somewhat lower than those of the entire electric-utility industry, whether or not the cost of wholesale power is included," the report says. And it adds financial statistics which show an average 4-percent annual return on power investment for the 17 years of TVA operation.

Despite the progress already made, the report notes that the region is still far from attaining maximum development of its many resources.

"The broad programs launched 17 years ago need to be continued. But today the State and local agencies, supported by an improved economic base are better able to carry them on. They can carry on with less assistance from TVA, either material or technical and advisory, than they have in the past."

There is only one dark spot in the whole picture. Although the Authority's power system capacity has been multiplied nearly four times since 1940, the region is still far short of the power needed to meet expanding national defense demands.

"Further construction is underway on a fast schedule to keep abreast of the demand for power," says the report. It emphasizes the urgency of this construction by correctly pointing out that electric energy is the heart of the defense effort, without which the need for airplanes, guns, munitions, clothing, chemicals, and atomic weapons cannot be met.

In addition to expanding its own facilities, the TVA has urged development of the vast resources of the Cumberland River to help provide the vital power this Nation needs for its defense.

This power shortage is a challenge. Challenges, however, are nothing new to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Looking back on its nearly two decades of magnificent progress, we have no doubt that—given the congressional support it needs—the TVA will serve the Nation as well in this crisis as it has in times past.

Truman Drives United States to Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has been obvious to the most casual observer that the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policies would ultimately drive the American people to a hands-off policy of isolationism. Mr. David Lawrence has clearly expressed the views of many who believe that our present for-

eign policies are leading to a national disaster. Mr. Lawrence's article appeared in the Washington Star, January 2, 1951, and I am including this article as part of my remarks:

ISOLATIONISM LIKE AN EPIDEMIC

(By David Lawrence)

Isolationism is a very troublesome word in American politics and the sentiment which it represents is never overcome merely by denouncing its exponents. Nor is isolationism confined only to Republicans.

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt was at one time an exponent of isolationist doctrine. Although a candidate for Vice President in 1920 on a platform that favored American entry into the League of Nations, he reversed himself in 1932 to gain isolationist support for his nomination for the Presidency. When he became President he broke up the International Economic Conference being held in London in 1933 which might have laid the foundation for a sort of Marshall plan that might have buttressed Europe against World War II.

Isolationism is like an epidemic—it penetrates everywhere and within both political parties. As one who has consistently opposed it ever since the 1920's, the observation may be advanced now that isolationist policies are never defeated by denouncing their sponsors.

The real way to fight isolationism is to get at its causes and debate the issues vigorously The momentum given to isolationism here in recent weeks came from Europe—not America. The sooner the Truman administration and those Republicans who are anti-isolation wake up to the fact that to millions of Americans it looks as if our allies have forsaken us, the sooner will the European peoples be told the blunt truths they need to know.

Another motivating reason for the growth of isolationism recently in America is the attitude of the United Nations itself. Failure to declare Russia an aggressor, failure to declare Communist China an aggressor, failure to deal firmly with the many violations of international law of which the Communists are guilty has weakened faith in the UN.

The American people, moreover, don't like double talk. They are not in a mood to listen to excuses and rationalizations as to why Communist China should have a seat in the UN. When the UN on June 26 moved against aggression and when the Red Chinese began to assist the North Korean aggressors the American people expected the UN to call a spade a spade. They don't expect certain UN member governments to flirt with the enemy and to encourage them by discussing the prospects of admission to the UN through negotiations. The British Prime Minister, after his visit to President Truman, made a fatal error in publicly reiterating Britain's interest in admitting Red China to the UN at the very moment when American boys were being slaughtered by an aggressor—Red China's armies in Korea. The way to combat isolationism is to unite behind principles and to uphold them sincerely, irrespective of expediency and material considerations. The moment a moral cause becomes tainted with materialism it loses its spiritual quality and begets selfishness, which is the main ingredient of the isolationist attitude.

Politicians, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, watch the trends of public opinion. The Associated Press survey last week end telling about the avalanche of letters to editors of newspapers shows how widespread is the dissatisfaction with European governments that have failed to send their proper proportion of troops to Korea. European isolationism has provoked American isolationism.

Politically speaking, isolationism in this country thrives on the oft-repeated remark that "Europe is playing America for a sucker." The best way to refute it is by facts. Unhappily, Europe's record of mobilizing manpower in her own defense in the last few years is bad. As long as Europe fails to perceive her own failures, isolationism will grow in America. But once Europe puts her shoulder to the wheel and stops talking about the idea that we are going to get bogged down in the Far East with American troops and money wanted by Europe, the sooner will American public opinion rally behind Europe's defense as it has done twice before in our history.

To say that aggression should be appeased in the Far East because we are powerless to fight it there is to admit a weakness that really doesn't exist. All our troops now committed in the Far East, in what may for some time to come have to be a holding operation rather than an offensive, would not be enough to defend even a small part of Europe if they were transferred there at once. If American air and naval resources cannot fight a holding operation in the Pacific while we assist in carrying on a major operation in Europe, it must be because Europe expects America to do the whole job and furnish the bulk of the manpower. That simply isn't in the cards, and many of the isolationists of today are those who feel that Europe hasn't done her duty toward the UN resolution on intervention in Korea, and if that's to be the course of history America had better protect herself by waiting within her own defense line for Europe to show a will to help us as allies.

The misunderstanding—for such it really is—can be cleared away. But the Truman administration is handicapped in not being able to proclaim American purposes persuasively to the world because at this moment European governments have not shown their willingness to make genuine sacrifices to resist Communist aggression no matter where it launches its attack.

Why the Shortage of Copper, Scrap Iron, and Other Materials?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving urgent requests from industries in the district, which I have the honor to represent, for copper, aluminum, iron, and steel scrap. Men are being thrown out of work because of the scarcity of material necessary to operate the industries.

The Truman administration has lost all sense of its responsibility to the people of the United States. I have listed heretofore in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the copper and other materials needed to keep our economy sound, which the administration has suffered and permitted to be shipped to foreign nations through the ECA. The tragedy of this inane program, however, is the reshipment of the copper and other materials by our supposed allies to Russia and Red China.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks a bulletin furnished by the able economist, Paul O. Peters, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS BULLETIN EXTRA,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1951.

On December 27, 1950, the National Production Authority issued notice No. 1, listing certain materials designated as scarce.

Among the materials listed were the following:

Building materials, including cast iron soil pipe, insulating materials, and cement.

Chemicals including benzene, glycerin, and methanol.

Iron and steel including pig iron and iron and steel scrap.

Lumber, plywood, and pulpwood.

Metals and minerals, including scrap.

Paper and paperboard materials and products.

The whole list is available in detail at page 9398 of the Federal Register for Friday, December 29, 1950.

On December 30, 1950, the National Production Authority issued an order prohibiting the use of copper in a long list of items used by civilians. The order according to Mr. William H. Harrison, NPA Administrator, was issued to provide copper for defense and defense-supporting needs. So American manufacturers and the consumers who buy and use their products will be denied the use of copper for such items as builders' hardware, gutters and downspouts, roofing nails, weather stripping, and numerous other small items in everyday use by the ordinary home owner.

Now comes the pay-off.

On January 2, 1951, ECA procurement authorization press release No. 1963 announced the following new authorizations, which will be paid for with charity dollars wrung from the American taxpayers in the merciless process which is demoralizing and bankrupting this Nation.

For the Netherlands 920,000 charity dollars will be available to contract for copper and copper products in the United States between now and next May 31, with deliveries not later than next August 31. The money, at present prices, should supply nearly 3,000,000 pounds of copper and copper products. If this were not enough, another $255,000 in American charity dollars will be supplied the Netherlands to procure copper and copper products from Latin-American countries.

When will the Congress start an investigation of the agencies and offices of the Government that are siphoning off our scarce and critical materials, always of course being paid for with taxes levied on the American free competitive enterprise system?

PAUL O. PETERS.

Cut Down Official Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a timely editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News. The editorial follows:

CUT DOWN OFFICIAL WASTE

With the declaration of the national emergency we are taking leave for the indefinite future of easy peacetime ways.

We are leaving behind even the half-war, half-peace state of affairs that was our scheduled lot, before the belated dawning of realization that not years, but only months, may be left to us in which to prepare for a world war.

As we go on a war footing, in the hope that readiness for it yet may avert war, there is not one of us unaware of the sacrifices this must entail, for our young men first of all, but in terms of living standards, for everyone.

We are entering this period still burdened by debt incurred in the recent struggle to preserve our freedoms. We dare not add to that staggering burden of $256,000,000,000, (two hundred and fifty-six thousand million) the cost of the new mobilization. The price now set on our national security must be a cash price, to be paid in taxes heavier than we have yet known.

As we clear the decks for action, therefore, it becomes overwhelmingly compelling that the Government clear its own decks. On a war footing the Nation cannot afford a peacetime government.

National security will be a delusion except as it is built on the safe foundation of national solvency. Thus, apart from simple fairness to citizens who must bear the load, the Government's responsibility is plain. It cannot from now on in good conscience divert a single available dollar from the vital requirements of swift preparation for defense.

President Truman recognized the need to revamp the budget, which, he said, must be held to "the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort."

To state that proposition and to give it effect are two different things, however. It is the nature of government that every effort to drop the excess baggage of peacetime spending will be resisted, by the President's associates in the bureaucracy, by some Members of Congress and even by interested citizens themselves.

It is against appeals that this or that spending activity is in fact needed to support the defense effort that the people demand concentration of our precious fiscal resources on defense and nothing but defense.

To put government on a war footing—to pare away every dispensable bureau and outlay—is, in fact, the very beginning of defense. We cannot do less, to the jeopardy of our national solvency, without lending aid and comfort to the potential enemy.

Communist Goon Squads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I addressed to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, yesterday, and the article written by Victor Riesel, of the New York Daily Mirror, referred to therein:

JANUARY, 3, 1951.

Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: Your attention is invited to the attached photostatic copy of a clipping taken from the New York Daily Mirror entitled "Inside Labor," by Victor Riesel. It would appear that Communist goon squads are operating in our city streets in a manner reminiscent of Hitler's seizure of power in Germany. If permitted to continue, this movement would sabotage a vital part of our labor force, fasten a stranglehold upon the means of logistical support of our troops and allies abroad, and pose a threat to our national life.

I cannot urge too strongly upon you the necessity of taking immediate action to apprehend those persons responsible for endangering the national security. I am introducing a resolution in the House of Representatives for the creation of an investigating committee. It is intended that the committee study the situation and recommend to the House such measures, in addition to those now on the statute books, as are necessary to safeguard the national interest and at the same time preserve our heritage of freedom for the individual.

The transportation system and the ports are key factors in our defense. They must not be controlled by Communists and fellow travelers.

Sincerely,

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of December 18, 1950]

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

I can produce for the Federal intelligence agencies a band of merchant seamen who had to arm themselves recently with shotguns and stand off a night-long siege of Communist action squads, 500 strong, operating European style right in these United States.

And I know other good waterfront union Joes whom we'll have to visit in the hospital if we want to talk to them. They got their ribs smashed by a 25-man Red goon squad.

There's a method in all this mauling. If it continues we may yet see hundreds of ships tied up between our west coast and London, when we need every cargohold to carry arms to the world.

There is also a group of railway workers who say they can prove one of their regional chiefs signed the Cominform's international Stockholm peace petition. They'd like to know why he's still in a spot from which he can paralyze the hauling of steel, destined for emergency items.

My labor friends can point out some southwestern Communist leaders who used their union headquarters as a secret communication link with Mexico, Cuba, Los Angeles, etc.

In that night siege by 500, they were Harry Bridges' huskies. The sailors they hemmed in a wild night of window smashing, car slashing, and brickbat slinging belonged to the AFL's tough, but clean, Sailors Union of the Pacific. They were caught in their union hall, 440 Avalon Boulevard, Wilmington, Calif.

Through a night the 14 men and their leader stood guard with shotguns at windows, while Red squads smashed the front of the building, rushed to the adjacent parking lot and cut up tires, and gave up breaking into the hall when the sailors shouted they would shoot to kill.

The attackers were recruited on the water front by Bridges' specialists in rioting. The feud started when Bridges, for reasons known to the convicted perjurer himself, suddenly decided to challenge the 65-year-old right of sailors on certain coastwise vessels to unload lumber from decks to the docks.

Whatever else he is, Bridges is not stupid. He knew that attempting to seize jurisdiction of that bit of work could come off only through bloody violence. He knew his roving action committees, with from 25 to 300 sluggers assigned each detachment, would breed counterviolence as he sent them chasing sailors as far up as Oregon.

He knew a war between the AFL seamen and his pro-Soviet longshoremen could freeze many key ports.

But our loyal AFL sailors' chiefs, lanky Harry Lundeberg and husky Paul Hall, refrained from flying in their own special protective squads. They did not want water front civil war disjointing activity at ports which face the Orient.

Comrade Bridges understood the international implications of his maneuver, knew sailors' union officials the world over, especially in London and Western Europe, would rush to the defense of the American AFL water front workers; that the European dock wallopers would boycott ships of United States owners who yielded to Bridges.

He knew foreign seamen would refuse to sail vessels into those western United States ports where Bridges might win. Such pledges have been cabled in from London.

Bridges knew what he was starting.

That lefty railroad union leader who signed one of Moscow's peace petitions is in the Pittsburgh area. Those southwestern comrades lead a section of Bridges' new pro-Russian labor federation. Arizona phone records will prove they used their union headquarters as a communications link in a Red international network.

All this as we strive to meet a crisis that threatens our national existence.

Hoover, Kennedy, and United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of December 26, 1951:

HOOVER, KENNEDY, AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Former President Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy, a former ambassador to England, have espoused the adoption of a foreign policy that would have the United States withdraw its military forces from Asia and Europe and conserve them entirely for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Both men merit the attention of the American people when they speak on such matters. But in this particular instance, it is our belief that it would be folly and perhaps eventual national suicide, if their recommendations were followed.

Moreover, we disagree vigorously with Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy and all others who would have the United States pull out of Korea without a fight.

It may well be that the situation in Korea is not hopeless. Furthermore, we can only agree with Gen. MacArthur when he said that if the Communists are not stopped in Korea, then the chance of stopping them on the future battlefields of Europe becomes just that much more remote. On the other hand, it is likely that if the march of Communist aggression is stopped cold in Korea, the prospect of meeting it in Europe will be that much less, for Russia, with its eastern borders then vulnerable to attack by a combination of Nationalist Chinese, Koreans, American and possibly even Japanese military forces, would be much more hesitant about taking on a war in Western Europe.

Furthermore, if we yield Korea, Formosa will go before long and all Asia, including India and then the East Indies, will be ripe for a plucking by the Moscow-directed Reds. And then, it is only common sense that a Chinese Red army, freed from the necessity of further combat in Asia, would be moved under orders of Stalin to Western Europe to fight there for Russia.

It is possible that the situation in respect to Korea is not as bad as it looks, and that perhaps we should not be as afraid of the Chinese Reds as many of us are. By American standards they are poorly armed and trained, and while all of us appreciate the enormous size of the Chinese population, how many men the Chinese Reds can place in the field as effective fighting men is a big question.

If we are killing them off at the rate of 10 to 1, and if we have killed 100,000 of them up to now, as the battle reports in Korea indicate, then it might be our best policy to continue the battle in Korea, but only with the full-scale assistance of the 500,000 troops Nationalist China claims it can and will put in the field, if only permitted to do so. Not all Chinese are Communists by any means, and that is something that we should never lose sight of.

The present world crisis that is centered in Korea is not a battle between nations. It is a war of wholly opposite ideologies—on one side, communism and slavery; no the other, freedom and human dignity. We are living in an era reminiscent of the days of the Crusades. That is why we cannot adhere to the isolationism advocated by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy.

Mr Hoover and Mr. Kennedy said we should pull out of Europe, but possibly maintain the defense of Britain as an Atlantic outpost. How long could Britain, although bolstered by all the aid that we could give her, hold out against Red hordes poised on the other side of the channel? And after Britain fell, or even before it, the Red aggressors would be on the march in Iceland, Ireland, and Greenland, down through the peninsula of Spain and Portugal, to the Azores and north Africa, and next in the line of march would be the West Indies, South and Central America.

In the Pacific, with the Asiatic mainland under its domination, the Reds would concentrate on Japan, Australia, and the Philippines and, to the north, the Aleutians and even Alaska, which Moscow says the Czar never had any right to sell to the United States. How well would we fare under those circumstances?

As tragic as is the situation in which we now find ourselves, we have no alternative but to help all who are, or would be, our friends fight the Communists in both Asia and Europe. But we agree with Mr. Hoover that aid to Europe should be conditioned on the determination of the Western European nations to fight to the bitter end for their own survival.

And while we need all the aid we can get, we should not snub Spain. This nation fought the Reds once and is willing and equipped to fight them again. In respect to the Spanish dictatorship, we were not at all reluctant to take all the dictatorial aid we could get from Russia in the last war, and while we have no love for the present form of government in Spain, it does, at least, hate communism violently.

One salutary and very desirable effect of the Hoover and Kennedy speeches, however, is that they should awaken free Europe and other UN powers to the need of giving us more aid on the battlefield. Considerable less attention to the remarks of both men would have been paid here in the United States if the feeling existed that we, in this country, were not being let down in Korea by our UN allies, who give us plenty of support at Lake Success. And that certainly includes Canada, through which Russian armies would almost have to march to reach the United States.

Revolt Against Foreign Policy Inevitable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including an article by Dorothy Thompson that appeared in the Washington Star of last night:

REVOLT IN POLICY INEVITABLE
(By Dorothy Thompson)

The overwhelmingly favorable response to ex-President Hoover's speech does not surprise this columnist. A swing toward isolationism was, in our opinion, bound to occur, the more violently because of the obdurate opposition of the administration and its Republican fellow-travelers to any discussion, even, of past and present foreign policy.

Some weeks ago, while I was traveling in the Middle East, I picked up a week-old paper containing an attack by Mr. Acheson on the "reexaminists," as disguised isolationists "incapable of any constancy of purpose." According to Mr. Acheson the desire "to reexamine our programs and to see whether we should have started them, was like a farmer who pulls up his crops in the morning to see how they have done during the night."

Well, many nights have passed since the spring of 1945 when the present foreign policy was seeded. The crop is now visibly above ground, and obviously it sprung from dragon's teeth. If fault can be attributed to the American people, it is that they postponed their "reexamination" too long, and that the articulate international clique howled down every critic—as this columnist has had occasion to know.

Even while the present United Nations was in the formative stage of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, to bring any criticism of its structure, or to speculate that far from assuring peace with justice it was more likely to lead to a series of private wars of unlimited objectives, essentially purposeless, was practically to commit lese majesty.

Yet, it was in March 1945, that I made my own predictions of the postwar world: "A grand scale Macedonia of Komitaji politicians, a perpetual devil's brew of desperatism and desperadoism; open to interventions by foreign-controlled parties, crossed and rent by ideological conflicts not of armies in the conventional sense, but of armed bands * * * given over to social convulsions, forced and voluntary migrations, separatisms, throwing up petty contenders with revolutionary followers * * * an era of perpetual wars, all fought in the name of peace."

This, and much else, I wrote in my diary then—and got it published only in January 1948, in that superior weekly of small circulation, The Commonweal.

The fact is that there has been no constancy of purpose because in 5 years nothing has been related to principles. Everything that has happened was, therefore, bound to happen.

It is the fruit of the seed: In the first step the assumption of peace based on a three-power alliance to keep late enemies and all future rebels suppressed; unconditional surrender—meaning the rejection of all restraints; the partition of Poland, Germany, Korea, and Palestine; the total disarmament of Germany and Japan and the disastrous weakening of Italy, within no framework of real collective security, thus creating vacuums of fatal weakness in the very heartland of the Eurasian land complex. In the second, the inevitable rift in the grand alliance and the attempt, then, to make the United Nations what it was never designed to be, and for the United States to accept, on behalf of this fiction, commitments beyond the power of any nation to carry out.

From the beginning every warning voice was accused of rocking the boat, threatening the peace, or being defeatist—as this column was defeatist about Korea. A little ordinary honesty, some frank confessions of error—these would have cleared the air and would have done far more to increase confidence than the policy of keeping skeletons locked in closets and insisting that behind all the improvisations was some wise, far-seeing plan.

There has been no wisdom and no foresight and now there is a popular revolt—also without wisdom or foresight—the blind revolt of the people who, at long last, know they have been morally betrayed.

Price Ceilings on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BURT, IOWA, *December 28, 1950.*
Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: Reports indicate the Government is considering the imposition of ceilings on meat. I farm and feed livestock, and therefore venture to give my views on this proposal.

There are now no governmental supports whatever to prices of beef and lamb. The old law of supply and demand establishes the price. Meat is now being produced in unprecedented amounts, and the supply is increasing. Possibly no other nation is so abundantly supplied with meats as the United States.

To many people meat prices seem high, but so is most everything else. Wages and other incomes are high. In 1949 our people spent only 5.5 percent of its disposable income for meats. The most they ever did spend was 7.1 percent in 1918.

The National Industrial Conference Board finds that, "in terms of dollars and cents," the price of round steak in 1948 was 370.6 percent higher than in 1914. Yet, in terms of work hours or work minutes, the 1948 round steak was 40 percent cheaper than its 1914 counterpart. Since then both wages and prices have advanced a little.

The producers of meat in this country are not unionized. There is no collective bargaining. When a farmer or feeder sells his meat animals he competes with each and every other farmer doing the same thing. He is in the same position as other laborers would be if there were no unions and each individual engaged in cutthroat competition with every other worker in selling his services.

It should always be remembered that the buying public regulates the price of meat. The farmer and feeder must accept as his portion what is left after marketing, processing, and distributing costs have been deducted.

In view of these facts, why should the Government attempt to steal, by means of ceilings, his products?

The consuming public demonstrates with its purchases that it is willing and able to pay for its food. There is no justification for the Government in stealing the farmers' products in order to give the consumer cheap meats. Such attempts immediately discourage the production of meats and soon effect to greatly reduce the meat supply.

We suffered that harmful experience during and after World War II. We had ceilings. Black markets sprang up. Legitimate meat all but disappeared from the retail stores. Many efficient packing firms were on the verge of closing down. The Nation's meat situation degenerated into a discouraging mess. Some leaders in their stupidity urged the President to go out into the country and forcibly take possession of all the livestock in the Nation, slaughter it, and thus placate a horde of voters with an orgy of low-priced meats.

The President publicly stated at that time he seriously considered committing such a shameful and brazen theft. The idea was abandoned only when it was pointed out that the Government had no adequate force and experience to perform that gigantic task of rounding up and caring for all those animals.

There are those who say we should cooperate and assist the Government after it has decided on a certain undertaking. I do not agree. If you were to see a stubborn and stupid person at the wheel of an automobile loaded with innocent people and attempting to drive off a 1,000-foot cliff, there is no point in cooperating with and assisting him. The sensible course is to either dissuade him or change drivers.

The livestock men of this country produce vast quantities of good meats. They are a minority group. Other people determine the price of their products. No good can come from despotic attempts to filch their produce by means of ceilings. That is one sure way to discourage production and reduce the supply. We tried that shameful steal once and failed miserably. Must we wallow in that morass of disillusion again?

Without ceilings and rationing, we already have at hand two very effective means of holding down meat prices:

1. Allow the producers to continue to increase the meat supply.

2. Reduce the consumers' expendable income—the Internal Revenue Bureau is about to do this by new and additional tax levies.

Very truly yours,

G. W. PATTERSON.

Within Proper Limits Wire Tapping Evidence Must Be Legalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, near the close of the last session I introduced a bill to permit the use of evidence obtained by wire tapping in cases involving treason, espionage, sabotage, and other crimes involving disloyalty to the country. I have now reintroduced this measure.

In my judgment, this is one of the most important steps in the field of civil defense which can possibly be taken. Under existing law, traitors, spies, saboteurs, and those who would destroy our Nation are permitted to use telephones widely in their nefarious activities, while the FBI and other investigative agencies are precluded from using evidence against them which has been obtained by interception of their messages. This is certainly carrying the right of privacy to an absurd and ridiculous length. No nation can survive which does not meet problems threatening its very existence with more realism than this.

Protection is afforded by this bill against abuse through the requirement that a Federal judge must grant permission for the wiretapping in order to make the evidence obtained thereby admissible. This is to prevent an overzealous investigator from infringing on the legitimate rights of innocent and loyal citizens so jealously guarded under the American system guaranteeing freedom of expression.

If we are to cope successfully, however, with the Communist menace in this country, we must untie the hands of those charged with the responsibility of apprehending traitors or enemy agents who unfortunately infest our precious land. No time is to be lost. We should act at once.

It has been suggested in editorial comment, like that in the Washington Evening Star which follows below, that the bill should be broadened to include kidnaping and other crimes involving human life. I am not opposed to that modification; indeed would be inclined to favor it. The important thing at the moment, however, is haste and no argument over details should be allowed to delay the early enactment of legislation so vitally needed to save our country.

I have urged that an early hearing be granted on this bill and earnestly solicit those Members who agree to express their views emphatically to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the leadership which will accord priority to the various measures necessary to protect our country.

Also under permission granted, I include a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star, which forcefully expresses the imperative need for this legislation:

WIRE-TAP BILL

If this "lame duck" Congress has done nothing else during its recent term, by its unanimous passage of a bill to give "the FBI the authority to make arrests without warrants in cases of felonies, especially those involving espionage, sabotage, and the national defense," it has earned its salary and the everlasting praise of loyal Americans everywhere.

Now, if the coming new Congress will match this in January by passing the Keating bill, or some similar bill, to allow the FBI to use wire tapping for certain purposes and under proper authority, it will provide one of the most vital defense measures that America has ever had.

No loyal, law-abiding American citizen need fear that the FBI will ever destroy his priceless rights or liberties. On the contrary, these rights and liberties are made all the more secure because of the FBI, as the record will prove.

We cannot expect FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and his men to give America the maximum security so vitally needed now if we are going to keep them handcuffed and shackled while we protect and defend Red spies, saboteurs, traitors, etc., with technicalities, red tape, and smart lawyers.

CHARLES F. MARTIN.

MINNEAPOLIS.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

TO LEGALIZE WIRE-TAP EVIDENCE

Although its sponsors assert that the pending bill to control wire tapping in Washington would permit use of wire-tap evidence in court, the fact is that the amended bill does not specifically authorize such use. Since introduction in court of evidence obtained by tapping communications has been definitely ruled out by the Supreme Court under the Federal Communications Act, there is need for Congress to spell out a positive grant of such authority to law-enforcement agencies.

The Neely-Darby bill, as amended by a subcommittee of the House District Committee, would outlaw all wire tapping in the District except that done by District or Federal officers in compliance with an order or warrant of District court. That is a step in the right direction. But the bill speaks only of interception of messages by law-enforcement officers. The subcommittee, in its report, said the measure "makes it clear that divulgence or any use of any information so obtained (by tapping wires) is not an element of the crime and thereby corrects existing law." It would have been clearer, however, to have written this authority into the bill in so many words, in view of the fact that the FCC statute bars divulgence of information obtained by wire tapping. The courts have held that divulgence includes use of intercepted messages in a criminal prosecution.

Representative KEATING, Republican, of New York, has introduced a bill which would abolish the absurd restriction on use of wire-tap evidence in cases involving the national security. This measure would legalize wire tapping and, of equal importance, evidence derived from wire tapping, where there is due cause to suspect enemy espionage. Permission first would have to be secured from a Federal judge.

The two bills cover different fields and both have worth-while objectives. The local bill is designed to ban indiscriminate wire tapping in the District while the national measure would authorize wire tapping anywhere in national security cases. The local bill should be amended, however, to leave no doubt as to the right of District police and other law-enforcement officers to divulge intercepted communications in court. And it would be advisable to amend the Keating bill to include kidnaping and other crimes involving human life.

Mrs. Norton Ends 26 Years in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I take great

pleasure in calling to the attention of the House an Associated Press article which appeared in yesterday's editions of the New York Times. It represents only the briefest review of the distinguished career of our beloved colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable Mary T. Norton.

I know that the regret is general in this House that she decided to bring her long and notable service here to a close. Our best wishes go with her in whatever she decides to undertake, for we feel confident her record of achievement has not been closed.

MRS. NORTON ENDS 26 YEARS IN HOUSE—LED WAGE-HOUR BILL FIGHT—MENTIONED FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POST

WASHINGTON, January 1.—"Fighting Mary" is taking down from her office walls the array of news cartoons that portrayed the high spots of her 26 years in Congress.

The dean of women lawmakers—Representative Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey—won't be answering "aye" when the roll call opens the incoming Eighty-second Congress Wednesday.

After winning 13 consecutive terms beginning in 1924, Mrs. Norton did not run for reelection in November. She was the Democrats' first Congresswoman.

She speaks of retiring and writing her memoirs. Accordingly, her office staff chipped in for a large new filing case. But the idea that Mrs. Norton really means retirement calls for a grain of salt.

Her eyes still flash as they did in those hectic days when as chairman of the powerful House Labor Committee she piloted the wage-and-hour bill to victory. And she is being mentioned for Presidential appointment as a member of the District of Columbia Commission.

LADY MAYOR OF WASHINGTON

That would not be a new field for Mrs. Norton, for she served 7 years as Lady Mayor of Washington when, the first woman to head a congressional committee, she was chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee.

It is difficult to imagine Mrs. Norton at a typewriter pounding out the memories of her lifetime of 75 years, for it is hard to keep her long in a reminiscent mood. She wants to talk about the present.

Fearless when convinced of her course, she introduced in 1928 the first resolution in Congress to repeal the eighteenth amendment when many politicians side-stepped the prohibition question.

A turning point in her career came in 1937 when the chairmanship of the important Labor Committee became vacant.

William P. Connery, Jr., of Massachusetts, chairman of the Labor Committee, had died and some rather worried men lawmakers found that Mrs. Norton, as the next Democratic ranking member, was in line for the top spot.

Despite the pleas and flattery of William B. Bankhead, the late Speaker, she refused to remain as District Committee chairman.

As hers was an industrial district she said she felt she owed it to her constituents not to side-step the responsibility.

Taking the Labor Committee chairmanship, instead, she championed the wage-and-hour bill, sponsored by the former chairman. It won after a 7-day fight on the floor.

Mrs. Norton—"Aunt Mary" as through the years she has become known to the press—has a record of firsts. Besides being the Democrats' first Congresswoman, she was the first woman chairman of a State political convention and first woman chairman of a State party.

It was her interest in welfare that got her into politics. Her only child, a son, died in infancy. To lessen her grief, friends suggested she help with an enterprise, then new in Jersey City, the Day Nursery Association, that cared for children while their mothers worked.

Her interest in civic affairs attracted the attention of political leaders.

The Tidelands Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Louisiana-Texas tidelands cases points up the necessity for immediate legislation by Congress. This is so because admittedly the opinion does not settle the issues involved.

The Supreme Court is composed of nine judges, two having recused themselves. While four out of the seven remaining jurists, in effect, held against the States, they did not finally determine the question of boundaries, title, and right to explore for the minerals. Here we have the anomalous situation of four members, less than a majority, of the highest Court of the land, announcing a previously unheard of doctrine of paramount rights of the Government to minerals without adjudicating exactly in what off-shore area the minerals are located, really without solving the question of the title to the minerals and admitting that under the judgment of the Court Congress must act before the Federal Government can exploit the minerals.

The boys in Korea may cry for oil, but they can have none under this decision. The States have proven that they are ready, willing, and able to continue to provide oil for the prosecution of the war, but the bureaucrats stand in the way. The irony of it is that these same bureaucrats are likely to use the war hysteria as a soap box to plead with Congress to implement the Supreme Court's decision with legislation authorizing the Federal Government to develop the tidelands area. The truth is that it would take years to survey and delineate the so-called marginal belt, to develop a leasing policy by the Federal Government, and to set up the necessary facilities to produce oil, while the States are prepared to continue operations without interruption, if the bureaucrats will only step aside.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of the Democratic members as well as a majority of the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee reported out a bill during the Eighty-first Congress to quiet the title of the States, and I believe that a large majority and probably two-thirds of the Members of this body were prepared to vote for the bill. For some reason or another the bill was not scheduled for action on the floor last year.

I intend to promptly bring up the bill again before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and I am calling the matter to the attention of the House on the very first business day of this new Congress to alert my colleagues to this most important and far-reaching legislation.

In this connection, I make a part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the December 14, 1950, edition of the Times-Picayune, entitled "Federal Tidelands Grab":

FEDERAL TIDELANDS GRAB

Last Monday's decision by the Federal Supreme Court in the Louisiana-Texas tidelands cases was not unexpected. Since a power-hungry agency of the Federal Government initiated the tidelands grab several years ago, majority rulings by the high Court have favored Federal seizure of those areas to which the coastal States have held and exercised title since the birth of the Republic. Transfer of that title by judicial interpretation and decree at this late day amounted to a reversal of precedent and national usage so novel and unexpected that the National Government finds it cannot exploit the grab unless and until Congress enacts enabling legislation.

Thus far the Federal lawgivers not only have refused to pass the miscalled compromise proposal to consummate the seizure, but both Houses once passed a bill restoring the tidelands to their original owners, the respective coastal States. That measure, vetoed by President Truman late in a busy session, might have been passed over the veto, but action was deferred and the opportunity to end the controversy in the right way was lost for the time being.

As the matter stands now, Congress alone can restore the rights of the States and prevent further encroachments upon those rights if the precedent therefor should be established in the tidelands case. A vigorous effort to restore the constitutional division and balance of State and Federal powers already is promised in the next Congress by Members of the Senate and House alike.

Highly significant in this connection was the adoption by the National Association of Attorneys General Tuesday of a resolution pledging support to the coming fight for a Federal bill restoring the tidelands to ownership and control of the States. Representatives from 43 States voted for the resolution despite long efforts of the Federal expansionists to break the solid front of the defense of their rights. The Governors and attorneys general, with few exceptions, recognize the tidelands grab as an encroachment which, once established, can be expanded toward ultimate breakdown of the State powers and rights whose progressive seizure by the Federal Government is the objective foreshadowed by the tidelands grab.

Adoption of the Rules of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adopt the rules of the Eighty-first Congress a debate developed upon the retention of the so-called 21-day rule which had been adopted for the first time by the Eighty-first Congress. The 21-day rule is the

provision whereby upon recognition by the Speaker the chairman of any committee may ask that a bill which has received committee approval and been referred to the Rules Committee and remained in the Rules Committee unacted upon for 21 days be brought before the House for debate and vote.

The advocates of the retention of the 21-day rule through parliamentary maneuver forced a vote on the main motion without granting to the opponents of the measure an opportunity to present and explain their amendment. The advocates of the retention of the rule were defeated and an amendment to the rules of the Eighty-first Congress was presented which reestablished the rule as it was, before the Eighty-first Congress changed it.

The advocates of the retention of the 21-day rule argued that the old system placed arbitrary and dictatorial powers in the hands of the Rules Committee which permitted the committee to block any legislation the majority of the Rules Comm'ttee did not wish to see passed. Furthermore, it was argued the Rules Committee through this great power served as a cloak behind which Members hid so that they would not have to express their views by vote on certain measures which were controversial and would hurt them before their constituents. The advocates further argued that abolishment of the 21-day rule was an attack on our basic democratic system and it thwarted the will and rule of the majority. The advocates pointed out eight measures passed by the Eighty-first Congress which the Rules Committee had not reported out, which were brought to vote through the exercise of the 21-day rule.

The opponents of the 21-day rule pointed out that it was passed in a highly questionable procedure by the Eighty-first Congress whereby all debate upon the matter was shut off and that actually the membership of that Congress had never had the opportunity to even read the 21-day rule amendment to the rules of the Eightieth Congress because Congressman SABATH, the administration leader, proposing the change, had not prepared printed copies of the proposed amendment, but submitted a typewritten copy which had been drawn up just shortly beforehand; also that the administration leaders of the Eighty-first Congress, with the flush of the 1948 victory and their substantial majority, did not even consult their own party members in forcing the amendment through.

The opponents pointed out that the author of the previous rule which had successfully operated for the past many years was none other than that great liberal George Norris, and was passed for the purpose of cutting down the arbitrary powers of the Speaker, as built up by "Czar" Cannon, for many years Speaker of the House, and placing these powers in the hands of a 12-man committee, the Rules Committee.

The opponents of the 21-day rule pointed out that far from having arbitrary power under the old rule there were three basic methods whereby the House membership could overrule the Rules Committee:

First. By petition of one-half the House membership.

Second. By the majority of the committee which had approved the bill taking the bill up on Calendar Wednesday. Calendar Wednesday comes twice each month the House is in session.

Third. By vote to discharge.

The opponents of the 21-day rule argued that far from being an undemocratic rule thwarting the wishes of the majority, the 21-day rule gave power to the Speaker, who could recognize whatever committee chairman he chose, and gave added power, and substantial power, to the chairman of the various committees, instead of to the majority of the committee.

The opponents further pointed out that the Rules Committee was composed of twice the number of members of the majority party as there are minority party members.

Both advocates and proponents agreed that a Rules Committee or policy committee, whatever terminology one cared to use, was necessary to the proper functioning of the House, inasmuch as the House committees approved three and four times the amount of legislation that the House membership could consider and vote upon intelligently in a session, and it was necessary for some committee to consider and study for decision what legislation should take precedence for consideration.

Congressman SABATH, again leading the advocates of the 21-day rule, argued that the rule should be kept because the President of the United States should enjoy the privilege of having the legislation he considered important and pressing considered first and that the membership of the Rules Committee, as constituted, would thwart the will of the President, the leader of the majority party.

Other advocates of the 21-day rule expressed concern over particular bills which they had sponsored and which the Rules Committee had not given the priority they thought the bills deserved.

I listened intently to all these arguments. The analysis of the arguments advanced, of course, has been put in my own words, and some of those who advanced the arguments will perhaps not agree with the construction I have placed upon them. I feel I have been fair, however, in my interpretation.

I voted against the 21-day rule knowing full well that the administration had already carried their arguments through the so-called liberal press to the people and that already they had succeeded in getting across the impression to certain persons that, first, anyone voting against the 21-day rule was illiberal, a reactionary, and desirous of thwarting the will of the people; second, that any Republican voting against the 21-day rule was thereby playing footsie with the southern Democrats. As a matter of fact, the advocates of the rule actually accused the Republicans of being a tail wagged by said advocates' colleagues from the South.

First of all, let me state that these arguments are in my opinion false and have been made to intentionally deceive the public. Actually, had the majority leader desired to bring matters before the House confined to the Rules Committee, he could have done so by bringing the matter up on Calendar Wednesday. As a matter of fact, the majority leader of the House has deliberately destroyed the effectiveness of Calendar Wednesday over a period of time through devious parliamentary methods. Not once did the advocates of the 21-day rule attempt to answer the argument of using Calendar Wednesday.

Second, the Constitution provides for a separation of legislative, judicial, and executive powers. Mr. SABATH's argument that the President, not the Congress, should decide what legislation it should enact is as dangerous as Mr. Truman's predecessor's remark to a Congressman to the effect that he should disregard any thoughts he might have upon the constitutionality of the measure the President was then anxious to have passed by the Congress.

Yesterday we Members of Congress all took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against domestic as well as foreign enemies. Too long have our recent Congresses been guided by expediency, forgetting what is good for the long pull in order to gain the immediate advantage. Too little have we heard discussion in these halls as to whether a particular piece of legislation is constitutional or otherwise. And, yes; I will say it, in the past Congress a bill of attainder which is expressly forbidden by the Constitution, was passed in hysteria without any real voice raised against it on the ground that it was a violation of the Constitution.

And the move to establish and retain the 21-day rule was more rule by expediency, more rule by person instead of rule by law. The advocates of the 21-day rule are not motivated by the thought that that is a better way to run Congress. They are motivated by the thought that they do not like the personnel of the Rules Committee.

What rule they really object to is the rule of seniority but they do not care to sincerely face the question of, "Well, what system is better?"

There is an old legal adage that "hard cases make poor law." As far as I am concerned, it applies here. On civil rights matters I, too, do not like the personnel of the Rules Committee. But I still respect orderly procedure and I am willing to fight my battles out fairly with the long view guiding me. I also respect the individual Members of this Congress and the individual members of the Rules Committee.

In essence, what we have here is a cheap, but cleverly hidden, political trick. The Democratic Party has been fooling the people entirely too long. The Truman administration publicly cusses out the southern Democrats and privately works with them and together they divide up the tremendous political spoils of this top-heavy Federal bureaucracy. What is the true thinking of the northern Truman Democrat, coming, as he frequently does, from the big cities where the gangster-gambler allied political machine dominates the scene and his political existence? Yes, in St. Louis it

is Shenker-Callanan, and before that Bev Brown, Gully Owen, and Bob Hannegan, and in Kansas City it is Jim Pendergast going good at last, since his predecessor Binaggio was murdered in his Democratic ward headquarters, and before him Tom Pendergast. Nor is it Missouri alone—it is Kelly-Nash or Jake Arvey in Chicago, Crump in Memphis, and it was Hague in Jersey, Tammany in New York, Curley in Boston, and on and on.

Are these political machines interested in the civil rights of the citizens of this country? The basic civil right is the right to vote and have that vote counted fairly and equally with the votes of other citizens. These northern Democrats from these big cities, with these gangster ridden machines, reek of stolen votes. Votes is their god and they will apparently do anything to get them, including wreck the country. The leader of the Democratic Party coming from the Pendergast machine of Kansas City has not just once, but several times, expressed in action his views toward this basic civil right. He did so again the other day when he pardoned the boy wonder of Kentucky, Pritchard, who had been fairly and truly found guilty of the most reprehensible crime that can be committed in a republic, or a democracy—stealing votes.

No; this little by-play of the 21-day rule is a political stunt to make it appear to the public that the southern Democrats and the Republicans are in complete alliance, on all issues, not just on the issues of local self-government and economy, and battling socialism, on which I personally hope we are allied, but on the issue of civil rights upon which we are not allied. And, so long as I and other Republicans believe in the principles of Abraham Lincoln we will never, never be allied.

Safety Conditions for Natural Gas Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter I have received from the president of the Northeastern Gas Transmission Co. and my reply.

For the information of my colleagues I also wish to state that I have again filed the bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety conditions for natural-gas companies. It is H. R. 88.

The correspondence follows:

NORTHEASTERN GAS TRANSMISSION CO.,
Springfield, Mass., December 29, 1950.

The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HESELTON: On December 21, 1950, the Springfield, Mass., papers carried an account of your introduction of a bill in Congress designed to prescribe safety regulations governing the operation of natural-gas pipelines.

As you know, Northeastern Gas Transmission Co. is now actively engaged in constructing facilities which will bring natural gas to parts of the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. It has also filed with the Federal Power Commission an application for authority to extend its authorized facilities so as to enable it to make natural gas available to the remainder of the New England area.

In view of the sentiments expressed by you at the time of introduction of the afore-mentioned bill, I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to explain briefly the safety precautions which are and will be taken by us in connection with the construction of our pipeline.

We do not, in any phase of our operation, lose sight of the fact that a major consideration must always be the safety of those who live or work near any of our lines, or who have occasion to pass over their locations.

All of our lines will be constructed of welded steel pipe. From the time such pipe is first rolled in the mills it is subjected to a series of rigorous and exacting engineering tests by the mill to determine its ability to meet prescribed specifications and to withstand the pressures which it will carry. Pipe is not shipped from the mills until we receive an inspection report by an independent engineering firm employed by us. Trained engineers supervise its installation and testing. Experienced personnel plan its route so that its proximity to dwellings and other buildings will be reduced to the fullest possible extent. In areas where it is impossible to route the line at great distances from dwellings thicker pipe than tests show are necessary to meet all safety standards is installed as an added precaution. At highway and other public crossings we install two pipes, one within the other. Once in operation, the line is continuously supervised by a staff trained in pipeline operation.

During the last war, a number of oil pipelines were hurriedly constructed under conditions of emergency. Some of these lines were converted to gas pipelines after the war, and a majority of the accidents in the industry may be traced to them. For obvious reasons, no accurate parallel may be drawn between such lines and those which are initially designed and constructed for the transportation of gas.

I should also like to call your attention to the fact that the pipeline accidents which have lately been so widely publicized are usually those which occurred during construction or testing and before the line was actually in use. While a certain amount of danger may exist during these testing periods, in order that the purpose of the test may be accomplished, it is possible to take every precaution for the safety of those concerned.

As a matter of fact, we cannot conceive of any safety precaution which is not now being taken by us. I shall be pleased to answer any questions you may have concerning any of these precautions or any other phase of our operations.

Respectfully yours,
NORTHEASTERN GAS TRANSMISSION CO.,
W. C. NORMAN, *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1951.

Mr. W. C. NORMAN,
President, Northeastern Gas Transmission Co., Springfield, Mass.

DEAR MR. NORMAN: Thank you for your thoughtful letter of December 29. I am very glad to have this placed in the RECORD today, with a copy of my reply. You have furnished me with most useful information and I am glad to know of the precautions taken by your company in connection with this very important problem.

I am not very clear as to your reference to the oil pipelines which were hurriedly constructed during the last war and which were thereafter converted to gas pipelines. It is my impression that none of these lines are operated by your company. However, their very existence today does seem to me to support the advisability of establishing a sound system for maintaining safe operating conditions and furnishes an added factual argument for the bill I have introduced.

I have no doubt but that your company has kept factual data with reference to any accidents which have occurred. I am requesting the Federal Power Commission to furnish me with all factual information it has and I had in mind the advisability of following up their report with requests to the individual companies for such information. I think it would be most important for these data to be analyzed in connection with any consideration of the bill I have introduced. It is my present intention to turn any such reports I receive over to the committee staff. It may well be that they or I will have further questions to ask after we have examined the information furnished.

I greatly appreciate your courtesy in writing to me.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

Amend Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can get more democracy by less democracy. Hence, I am voting today as in former sessions against the motion ordering the previous question, which would foreclose all amendments and further debate. How can anyone call it liberal to vote for such a motion shutting off the democratic process at the start? To use one gag procedure is not the right way to eliminate another gag procedure.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is something between the two extremes of possible obstruction of meritorious legislation by the Rules Committee; and authority for one man, the chairman of a committee, to bring before the House whatever pet schemes he has managed to get through his committee. A workable middle ground could be obtained in two ways. One would be to amend the discharge petition rule so the number of signatures required to bring out a bill approved by a committee would be reduced from 218 to 150, as was the case before the Democratic Congress of 1931–33. The other way would be to amend the Calendar Wednesday rule so that no dilatory motions could be entertained by the chair.

Either method would limit the power of the Rules Committee of control rather than guide legislation, and yet prevent confusion and waste of time in dilatory procedures in considering bills not desired or thought good for the country by a substantial number of the House Members. I regret that the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] to modify the Calendar Wednesday rule was not considered. I would have voted to abolish the 21-day rule of the Eighty-first Congress and go back to the previous rule with such an amendment.

As the matter stands, I must vote to retain the 21-day rule—it is the lesser evil of the only two alternatives we are permitted to choose between. But it is not an adequate answer, nor is return to the unamended rules of Congresses prior to the Eighty-first. We must continue to search for a better solution to the problem of eliminating gag rule by a few, without permitting either the ardent advocates or the bitter opponents of a measure to make a spectacle of this body and weaken public confidence in the legislative process.

America's Foreign Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able and interesting article written by Mr. Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of Sunday, December 31.

This article is very timely and will be pertinent to the impending discussion of the very vital question of our foreign commitments and the best means to provide for our security.

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

FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE IS CLARIFYING THE ISSUES—FUNDAMENTAL DISAGREEMENT APPEARS OVER NATURE OF OUR COMMITMENT TO GO TO THE DEFENSE OF WEST EUROPE—CONGRESS HAS A PART TO PLAY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 30.—The mounting public dispute over the most effective measures to insure the security of the United States from the threat of militant world communism, and over the relation to that security of the land defense of Western Europe by pooled forces of the North Atlantic Treaty nations (which include the United States), is a useful reminder that this country is not yet committed to any detailed program.

The debate—recently stimulated by speeches from former President Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy on the one hand and by John Foster Dulles and administration spokesmen on the other—reveals some areas of agreement and also some important differences. For example:

(1) The disputants agree that, as Secretary of State Acheson said to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 27, 1948, Senate approval of the North Atlantic Treaty commits this Nation to the principles of "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid * * * to an obligation to help, but the extent, the manner and the timing is up to the honest judgment of the parties" to the treaty.

(2) All agree that the subsequent approval by Congress of the military assistance pact and the first appropriation therefor binds this Nation to provide its treaty partners with matériel, dollars for the purchase of more and at least as many members of our Armed Forces as may be required to supervise the allocation and use of this equipment.

NO PARTICULAR PROGRAM

(3) All agree that—again in the words of Secretary Acheson on the same occasion—the treaty does not bind the United States to any particular assistance program; or require it to furnish units for a Western European army in advance of aggression. (In fact, this subject did not arise in the hearings or congressional debates which dealt with the treaty and the arms pact.)

But the meeting of minds ends there and the serious disagreements begin, among them:

(1) The President, on his concept of his constitutional authority, has made a conditional commitment to the North Atlantic partners that is founded on the treaty "principle of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid." The condition is—once more the words of Mr. Acheson—that "no party can rely on others for its defense unless it does its utmost to defend itself and contribute toward the defense of the others."

(2) It is believed by many that, on this same concept of Executive power, the President intends to be the judge of when and whether this condition has been met or whether he can rely on its being met; and that he has the unilateral authority in any case to order the dispatch to Europe of such troops as he and his military advisers (chiefly Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whom the President has authorized to act as supreme commander) believe to be required.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

(3) But, since the integration of these troops into a land defense of Western Europe was not pledged either in the treaty or the arms pact, and Congress must supply funds for their maintenance, many in Congress and outside contend that the President cannot legally dispatch them for such a purpose without the formal approval of Congress. One passage in the record bears on this difference of opinion. It occurs in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations favoring the North Atlantic Treaty, but it was concerned only with military action following an aggression against one of the partners. This passage reads:

"Nothing in the treaty * * * including the provision that an attack against one shall be considered an attack against all, increases or decreases the constitutional power of either the President or the Congress or changes the relationship between them."

This disagreement over Presidential powers could become a very grave issue between Mr. Truman and Congress; and those who are questioning the practicability of the land defense of Western Europe with American assistance would undoubtedly challenge the exercise of this power if the President decided to exercise it without prior reference to Congress for its approval.

OTHER BASES OF DISCORD

(4) Another basic disagreement between the debaters is the land defense project itself. Considerable public and congressional doubt now existing would surely be removed if General Eisenhower pronounced the project feasible and necessary, and no one believes the President would proceed with it otherwise. But there still would be influential voices raised in the country for a defense program addressed primarily to United States security, somewhat like the program which was outlined by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy.

(5) There is also fundamental dispute over American policy in the Far East, particularly with respect to measures for dealing with the Chinese Communists. Many, including Republican leaders, urge that the Chinese Nationalists be given military and other assistance to renew active war against the Peiping Government; that our troops in Korea be withdrawn to assure holding an American security line from Alaska, through Japan and Formosa, to Hawaii. The administration thus far has opposed both proposals.

These, plus the movement sparked by Mr. Hoover to demand stronger courses at Lake Success in dealing with Communist China, are the principal divisions on foreign policy being argued before the American people. The discussion is of as great importance as any in our history. The very listing of the issues establishes that. Also, the debate is of the essence of our democracy.

CHALLENGE TO CRITICS

But it has another indispensable value. Critics of Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy have charged they are preaching abandonment of a sacred commitment by the United States, the major premise being that the United States is pledged outright to participate in a land defense of Western Europe. If this misconception were not challenged, and General Eisenhower should conclude that the land-defense program is not feasible, the United States would stand before the world as a dishonored welcher on a firm pledge.

The facts, however, all clear in the record, refute the existence of such a commitment. By the treaty and the arms pact the United States Government, which necessarily includes Congress, is committed to its best effort to defend the North Atlantic area. Insofar as the Executive alone can pledge action by the United States, he has made a strictly conditional commitment to send such military contributions to the land defense of Western Europe as he may conclude to be practicable and serve the primary interests of national security.

That is all. But it does mark a revolutionary change in the foreign policy of the Republic up to 1950.

Inaugural Address by Governor Dewey, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the inaugural address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, delivered at the inauguration ceremonies held in the assembly chamber, State capitol, Albany, N. Y., on January 1, 1951.

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

This is the third time I have had the honor of taking the oath as governor of New York. Eight years ago when I first assumed the responsibility of governing our State, our country was desperately engaged in a war for survival. Only a year before much of our fleet had been sunk at Pearl Harbor; disaster had followed disaster and the forces of freedom were beleaguered throughout the world.

By God's grace the forces of freedom triumphed. But 4 years ago when I took this

oath for the second time it was only an uneasy peace which had settled upon the world. Signs were already visible to all who would see that our late Russian ally was moving to take Hitler's place in a scheme of world conquest. Our National Government had just committed itself to the disastrous course of appeasement of Communists in China and abandonment of our Chinese allies. The Nation rushed for a normal life and escape from reality while the Federal Government allowed the mightiest force on earth, our naval, air, and ground forces, to disintegrate.

Once again we find ourselves at the start of a new State administration with heavy hearts and under the shadow of war. We are in a period of the gravest world tension. In the last 6 months, in conjunction with others in the United Nations, we came perilously close to losing a military action against a tenth-rate power, North Korea. When victory had been snatched from the jaws of defeat in Korea, we then found our gallant forces almost overwhelmed by the eruption of the hordes of Red China into open warfare.

Soviet diplomacy has today achieved one of its cardinal objectives in placing America in opposition to her traditional Chinese ally, while sowing seeds of dissension between us and other free nations of the world. Meanwhile, without engaging a single Russian regiment since the end of World War II, the Red conqueror has extended his domination beyond his own 200,000,000 people to include 800,000,000 people, one-third of all the people in the world. Today the Red Empire reaches more than half-way around the world, from the Baltic Sea and the middle of Germany, to the Pacific Ocean and the China Sea.

Once again within these 8 years the cause of freedom is beleaguered. Once again the call should be plain to freemen everywhere to band together and bravely live else they will fall apart and ignobly die.

This time the enemy who wars against us has new weapons in his arsenal. He and his satellites boast of land armies the size of which the world has never seen before. He has the largest air force in the world and vast power under the sea. He boasts of secret allies in every nation—hunger, poverty, confusion, war weariness—and in all too many lands, a lack of brave or inspiring leadership. He also has unprecedented underground armies in every nation, highly skilled in creating internal disunity and armed with propaganda, sabotage, fanaticism and treason.

The Red conqueror has still another advantage in the economic weakness of many free nations and in their desperate lack of arms.

One thing and one thing alone seems to stay the hand of the aggressor from waging an immediate, all-out war of conquest—our possession of the atom bomb. We believe we still have the lead in atomic warfare and apparently he shares that belief. How long that superiority will last no one knows.

One thing above all others is clear—the atom bomb will not continue to deter aggression unless we grimly maintain our priceless superiority in atomic warfare and also maintain invulnerable bases around the world from which to send the bomb.

If our own ideals of freedom in the world did not require it, the stark necessities of self-preservation would demand that we develop and keep strong, brave allies. We shall make united and mighty the forces of the free world, and swiftly, or we shall be soon isolated and left to die.

If as a Nation we continue our present course of self-indulgence, weakness, and vacillation, we shall have no one but ourselves to blame for the loss of our liberties and our national existence. All is not lost but all is in the gravest peril.

With only 7 percent of the population of the world we in America are outnumbered 14 to 1. But the free world still outnumbers the slave world by 2 to 1. If we provide the leadership in sacrifice, in hard work and in building overwhelming military force, others will again rally to our cause. We can start again rebuilding toward the powerful physical and moral position we held at the end of World War II.

In this unparalleled crisis, there is only one course for free men and women. There is only one road to survival. That is the road of hard-headed realism, of toil and more toil, of sacrifice and greater sacrifice.

We still have the mightiest industrial plant in the world and it is more powerful today than ever before. Much of the industrial might of Germany and Japan can also be mobilized—this time on the side of freedom—if we are swift and strong enough in action. The resources of the free world vastly exceed those of the slave world. There is no weakness of our cause which courage, hard work, and strong leadership cannot cure.

The physical resources to preserve freedom and even perhaps to save the peace are at hand. Only the will, the courage, and the clear purpose are needed. The duty to mobilize our strength before it is too late should be clear to all. For a decade the cause of freedom has echoed the tragic words "too little and too late." Let not these words be the epitaph of America and of our civilization. There is still time for action, but the hour is very late.

Here in New York we have a high obligation and unmeasured opportunity. By laying aside partisanship and selfishness we can set an example for the States and the Nation in self-denial and in hard work for the greater good.

I propose to you and to the people of New York a Spartan course for our State which I prayerfully hope will be followed here and in the Nation.

I pledge to you a State administration devoted to the primary objective of the defense of liberty.

I pledge to you a single-minded purpose in production for defense, in mobilization of manpower, and in preparation for civil defense.

We have done it before and we will do it again.

During these recent years we have blazed trails in social welfare, in slum clearance, and in public housing, in education, in advancing the rights of man, in medical care, in mental and tuberculosis hospitals, in modern highway transportation, and in recreation.

Foreseeing the tragic emergency in which we find ourselves, we have blazed trails, too, in leading the Nation in civil defense, in building a strong National Guard, and in preparation for a State guard, in vigorous economy in nonessentials, and in strong preparation in essentials. Just as we have led the way in peace and in preparation for defense, so we can move ahead now in preparing for the more perilous times ahead in total defense.

What we can do as citizens of New York we have a right to expect that others will do as citizens of the United States and of the free world. We have a right to insist that policies of vacillation, weakness, and cowardice be abandoned. We have a right to insist on courageous action and Spartan living. As citizens of the United States we want our Nation to live bravely, to resume at whatever cost our position of strength and leadership to preserve the rights of man.

Never in recorded history was the whole concept of decency and human freedom under such total challenge. Never was any people presented with a call to duty so clear or with so great a challenge to live nobly.

The blessings of freedom have brought to our land a potential power so vast that with strong leadership and high courage we can once again gather to our side the minds and hearts of free men everywhere. Once again we can, if we will, develop the overpowering force to stay the hand of the aggressor and make possible the lasting peace we have so long been denied.

There is within the soul of every free man the courage to achieve which 10,000 slaves can never match. With the inspiration of a just God and the courage to do His will we can live bravely and again secure the highest cause on earth, the freedom of mankind.

Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] regarding multiple sclerosis, as discussed in an article entitled "Reprieve," by Miriam Zeller Gross, which the Senator from Washington desires to have printed in the RECORD. I present the statement of the Senator from Washington and the article, and ask that they be printed in the Appendix.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

I am particularly proud to present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the article Reprieve, by Miriam Zeller Gross, which appears in the December 1950 issue of McCall's magazine.

I take great pride in calling this article to the attention of my colleagues because, first of all, it brings national recognition to a courageous effort in behalf of hundreds of suffering people, being carried on in my home city Tacoma, Wash.

Secondly, I am particularly proud because Dr. Hinton Jones has given his time and effort to establish a clinic at St. Joseph's Hospital in Tacoma, for the treatment of a disease heretofore considered hopeless, multiple sclerosis. This clinic is supported by private voluntary funds, and Dr. Jones volunteers his services in behalf of the clinic and the hundreds of sufferers who have found relief there. There has been no State or Federal assistance in establishing and running this clinic which, so far as I have been able to determine, is the only one devoted exclusively to the treatment of multiple sclerosis in the world.

REPRIEVE FROM A SENTENCE OF TORTURE AND DEATH

(By Miriam Zeller Gross)

Imagine yourself doomed to die from a mysterious, incurable disease. Your doctor has told you the blunt truth as he believes it: "There isn't any hope. Soon you will be in a wheelchair. As the condition progresses—and it always does—you can only take to your bed and wait for death."

Not a pretty picture, is it? Yet, only by putting yourself in the place of someone stricken by the terrible nerve-killer multiple sclerosis can you understand the despair it causes or appreciate the full significance of

the fight being waged against it at the M. S. clinic of St. Joseph's Hospital in Tacoma, Wash.

At St. Joseph's, multiple sclerosis is being arrested in one victim in six. Others get blessed relief. Many leave their beds for the first time in years. One man unable to move so much as a toe for 7 years walked again within a week after entering the hospital.

No cures are claimed. But a revolutionary new concept of the disease enables its hellish symptoms to be controlled, and promises a new lease on life for its victims.

Dr. Hinton D. Jonez, director of the multiple sclerosis clinic, says that attempting to cure this disease is similar to trying to revive a drowning person. Far advanced cases—like people who have been in the water too long—may be difficult or impossible to save. On the other hand, there is surprising hope for victims of multiple sclerosis provided, of course, that important nerves are not dead.

Nerves that appear dead can sometimes be revitalized. Two of Dr. Jonez' patients, for example, had been diagnosed as totally blind. One had even received insurance benefits on the basis of total disability. Today both enjoy normal vision. Most of the more than 100 patients with whom I talked at the clinic told stories that hold the drama of people suddenly reprieved from a death sentence.

Take Mrs. Alice Meinert. This young mother was stricken shortly after New Year's Day in 1947. By May she could not get out of bed. For a year she grew steadily worse. Her father, who had made it his business to learn everything possible about the disease, heard about the new clinic in Tacoma. He urged that his daughter be sent there. But the attending physician pooh-poohed the idea, and, acting on his advice, Mrs. Minert's husband refused.

The father took legal action and gained custody of his daughter—a step accomplished through the far-seeing wisdom of Judge Chester A. Batchelor, of the King County Court, Seattle.

Four days after she reached the Tacoma clinic, Mrs. Meinert took her first steps in more than a year. One week later she walked from the house to the street and got into an automobile unaided.

Shortly after this, Mrs. Meinert's husband, angry because of what he considered high-handed interference by his father-in-law, brought suit to get the guardianship of his little boy.

Judge Batchelor again presided. The husband told the court that his wife's illness made it impossible for her to care for their child. She was bedridden and incapable of doing anything for herself, let alone the child. His statement was just completed when a door opened at the back of the courthouse. Alice Meinert entered, walked the full length of the room and took a seat near the front.

Mrs. Meinert told her story at the judge's direction, and she now has full custody of her little boy. Her condition has improved steadily. She does her own housework, looks after the child and appears in every way to be a well, happy woman.

Few people knew anything about multiple sclerosis (also called creeping paralysis or simply M. S.) until it took the life of the great baseball star Lou Gehrig. Today the disease is understood to be fairly common and far more prevalent than poliomyelitis, which its crippling effects resemble.

Most M. S. victims are between 20 and 40, in otherwise highly productive years. They may suffer a few weeks only or linger for years, constantly growing worse, helpless burdens to themselves and to their families. Often they are shunted into depressing institutions for incurables.

Symptoms vary but usually include a staggering gait, double vision, tremors and speech defects—which often unfairly label the victims as psychotics or alcoholics. Deafness, blindness, paralysis and mental changes occur as the condition progresses. Like some fiendish hit-and-run killer, M. S. may strike, allow the victim to recover partially, then strike again, repeating this performance over and over. The victim is weaker each time, until he no longer rises.

Jack Franklin's experience indicates the unhappy misunderstanding these people encounter. Jack was stationed at Dutch Harbor in the Aleutians when he suddenly noticed a numb spot on one leg. The numbness left, only to return in a larger area. Soon half his body lacked sensation. "I could have cut myself in two," he says. "One half had no feeling."

The examining physicians found nothing wrong. "Nothing but nerves," they reported. When his eyes failed, Jack was sent to an eye specialist at Kodiak. This man said, "Snow blindness plus nerves," and referred him to yet another island to consult a specialist for glasses. When Jack couldn't walk without staggering, he was discharged as a mental case and sent to a veterans' hospital. Happily, he is now at Tacoma and steadily getting better.

The miserable symptoms of multiple sclerosis sufferers are caused by damage to the myelin sheaths, or fatty coverings, which normally protect all nerve fibers. These sheaths are like the insulation around an electric wire. Just as damaged insulation causes short circuits, so injured sheaths prevent nerves from delivering brain messages properly. Messages distorted and weakened may finally stop entirely. The many scars caused by the body's attempts to repair the sheaths suggested the name "multiple sclerosis."

Doctors generally classify the condition among "nervous and mental diseases," although nobody has actually proved why nerve coverings disintegrate. Several years ago Dr. Bayard T. Horton, well-known allergist of the famed Mayo Clinic, became convinced that multiple sclerosis is caused by allergic reactions. Acting on Dr. Horton's advice, Dr. Jonez, also an allergist, followed the suggested treatment with a few private patients, with most gratifying results. When Sister Celine Magdeline inquired about the treatment, Dr. Jonez offered to donate his services if the Sisters of St. Francis, operating St. Joseph's Hospital, would provide clinic facilities. Thus the clinic started.

Dr. Jonez explains the new approach to multiple sclerosis in this way: Strawberries and other substances cause some people to get hives on the skin. The multiple sclerosis victim gets his hives on the central nervous system. Obviously hives on the brain or spinal cord—housed in bony boxes without much room for expansion—can cause terrific damage. Blood flow is cut, and nerves are robbed of oxygen and other life-sustaining materials. Small wonder that the sheaths and finally the nerves themselves sicken and die.

Whether this concept is correct or not, it seems to work. All who stick to the treatment for as long as 3 months show definite, measurable improvement, if not dramatic come-backs. Any improvement, however, can be evaluated only in terms of the previous condition.

You might wonder what Sylvia Fisher has accomplished if you saw her confined to her wheel chair day after day. But her happy brother will show you four crocheted doilies, each of finer thread and more intricate design.

"Maybe they wouldn't look like much to some folks," he says, "but they look mighty wonderful to me. For 10 years my sister couldn't even hold a crochet hook. Her hands were completely paralyzed when she came."

Such progress comes about through a four-way attack on the disease. Careful tests detect substances causing allergic reactions so that they may be avoided. Muscles wasted by disuse are rehabilitated through a combination of moist hot polio packs and especially designed exercises developed at the clinic. Distorted body parts are relaxed, and disease symptoms are controlled by two potent drugs. Last—and equally important to all the rest—is what Dr. Jonez calls "lots of TLC," or tender loving care.

Use of histamine in multiple sclerosis may well prove epochal, since this drug controls multiple sclerosis symptoms much as insulin controls diabetes. Like insulin, histamine is an important body chemical. It occurs in human blood and most tissues. While supplies remain constant in normal individuals, histamine varies greatly in allergy sufferers. Histamine, incidentally, must not be confused with antihistamine, the popular cold remedy, since it is the exact opposite.

Doses of the drug histamine, synthesized by industrial laboratories, increase the efficiency of blood flow and rush repair materials to wounded sheaths and nerves. Extra oxygen becomes available, and vital forces generally are stepped up, much like adding fighters to an exhausted army.

Men and women enjoying its benefits say that histamine makes them feel as if they could fly, instead of barely drag one foot before the other. If the prescribed dose is forgotten they get hungry for it, just as for food or water. The drug is dangerous if improperly used. Too much gives the worst headache known. Larger doses kill. Yet over 30,000 doses have been given at Tacoma, and a larger number at the Mayo Clinic (where histamine is used for a number of conditions), without bad results. At both places, however, doses are carefully tailored according to individual needs.

Proper dosage enables many who thought there was nothing ahead but invalidism and death to return to jobs and live normal lives.

Mrs. Albert Parker had been told her husband would never be able to leave his bed. But, through the help of histamine, Mr. Parker is now busily completing preliminaries for law study at the University of Washington.

Wayne Nelson is another. This ski instructor was having bad attacks of staggers and double vision—seeing two trees where there was only one. Sometimes he couldn't get out of bed, and altogether he feared he was through. Maintained by histamine, he is back at his chosen work in the mountains and participates once more in ski races and tournaments. "I'm fine so long as I take the histamine," he said.

Ordinarily administered by hypodermic needle, the drug can now be taken more easily by an electrical device. Dr. Harold A. Abramson, a New York City allergist, recently developed a method whereby histamine is driven through the skin by a galvanic current and absorbed into the blood. The necessary apparatus is inexpensive and so simple that a 14-year-old boy made a set for his mother now under treatment in Tacoma.

The clinic provides a place where people may learn to live comfortably with M. S. Here they discover curare—a drug with the unique quality of softening twisted, gnarled muscles and bestowing a blessed feeling of relaxation. Many enjoy their first night of refreshing sleep in months or years after the first dose. This drug, like quinine, comes from trees in the South American jungles. In addition to relaxing muscles, curare helps overcome one of the most distressing of M. S. complaints—incontinence of bladder and bowels.

Three years ago, before the clinic's great contribution was recognized, the unorthodox treatment pursued there was openly censured. At one point the mother superior was told no more interns would be assigned

to the hospital unless the clinic was discontinued. The physician who related this story says the magnificent woman calmly replied that the hospital would have to get along without interns; the clinic would continue. She added: "Dr. Jones gives these miserable people dry beds to sleep in, and that unprecedented attainment alone is enough for me."

The all too prevalent skepticism and hopelessness regarding M. S. is illustrated by an experience of the clinic's physical therapist, Mrs. Anita W. Preston. On assuming duties, Mrs. Preston wrote the head of an internationally recognized organization concerned with physical rehabilitation and asked for guidance. The reply expressed surprise that anyone would consider trying to revitalize M. S.-ridden muscles.

So, like Dr. Jones, Mrs. Preston started pioneering. Her reward came a few weeks ago, when other physical therapists throughout the Northwest gathered to observe with astonishment the feats performed by men and women for whom they had been taught nothing could be done.

Only extraordinary achievement has kept the clinic alive in the face of a formidable wall of disbelief. But even the most stubborn diehards are impressed by recoveries like that of Mrs. Ezra Jennings.

Neurosurgeons were not certain whether Mrs. Jennings had advanced multiple sclerosis or a brain tumor. One specialist urged drastic brain surgery as her only hope. Her left side was completely paralyzed, and she was taken to the clinic in a wheel chair. After less than a month she was walking normally and gave the chair away. All traces of paralysis were gone. Mrs. Jennings called on the doctor who had urged a brain operation, and carefully grasped his hand with her previously paralyzed left hand.

Doubting Thomases like to say that the St. Joseph's treatment is largely psychotherapy. "Nothing but mental suggestion," they insist. This amuses Dr. Jones. "Certainly we are guilty of mental suggestion," he says, "if that means we fight to uphold morale and prevent fits of depression."

Without doubt the director does inspire hope and confidence. There is no defeatism at Tacoma. One man said, "The very way Jones greets you when you arrive seems to say, 'How wonderful that you have come to me. Maybe you're in pretty bad shape, but between the two of us we'll lick this thing.' He makes you feel like a very important person and that he's more interested in you than in any other individual—and you're certain you'll get well."

Happily, prominent physicians are now convinced multiple sclerosis victims have a chance at St. Joseph's Hospital, and are sending them there. The same holds true for Veterans' Bureau administrators, county medical society executives, and a host of welfare organizations. Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON, of Washington, has introduced a measure in Congress which would provide Federal aid for the clinic.

No case is considered too advanced, and no person is refused, for lack of money. One of the wealthiest men in the Northwest took his treatment alongside of charity cases, without any distinction in care. Dr. Jones himself has not accepted one cent, not even Christmas gifts, from clinic patients. Furthermore, he devotes most of his time to the clinic.

Pitiful stories are told by many who sought treatment elsewhere before going to the multiple sclerosis clinic.

Mr. and Mrs. Edwards saved $750—just enough to keep him for 1 month at a certain institution in California. Mrs. Edwards told me that they traveled 2,000 miles to this hospital only to be informed nobody as crippled as Mr. Edwards was admitted. Then they heard of Tacoma.

"What a relief," she said, with tears in her eyes. "We reached St. Joseph's Hospital, and Dr. Jones said, 'Come right in.'"

One woman told of preparing to commit suicide after she was refused at one hospital after another. Only by great effort could she drag herself from one piece of furniture to another. She realized she would be bedridden shortly, and dreaded being a burden. When she heard about the place where nobody was refused, she found it hard to believe, but decided to investigate.

"After all," she said, "it didn't matter greatly in my condition whether I died at once or waited a while." That she can look back upon her near suicide in a matter-of-fact manner indicates the progress this woman has made.

The Brodeur family heard about the clinic one Saturday afternoon shortly after Mrs. Brodeur had undergone one more disheartening medical examination. The clinic sounded too good to be true, but anything was worth a trial. By Wednesday the husband had sold his business in Providence, R. I., and the family took its first plane ride, bound for Tacoma.

"Smartest thing I ever did," Mr. Brodeur says. "My wife hasn't made any startling recovery, but she's 500 percent better. I'm the nurse, and I ought to know. She'd been in bed 7 years. At least she's in a wheelchair now. We don't ask for miracles."

Sister Margaret Angeline may never walk again, but her feeling is of deepest gratitude. Anyone trying to evaluate events, she says, must remember that multiple sclerosis has been the despair of medical science ever since it was first recognized a hundred years ago. The mortifying nature of the disease makes people feel sensitive and apart. Soon they become social outcasts. "It seems almost too much that I am privileged to be in the one place where progress is being made," she says. And she feels privileged to put in long hours performing the secretarial duties of the clinic.

Father Robinson is a source of great inspiration to all at the hospital. Former president of Gonzaga University and provincial of the Jesuit Order for the four Western States and Alaska, this religious leader was advised 12 years ago that his condition was without hope. His consultant was a neurosurgeon of international reputation. And, indeed, the disease progressed without abatement until Father Robinson sadly performed what he feared was his last mass.

Crippling continued until he could neither sit nor lie in a normal position, and he reached the hospital kneeling in a car, the only way he could make the trip. Yet that same night he slept comfortably. Today, just a few months later, Father Robinson again says masses and goes forward with church activities.

For some unknown reason, multiple sclerosis appears to be activated by infections, pregnancy, accidents, or emotional upheavals—particularly the latter. One man became ill immediately after his wife ran away with all of his savings. Another suffered early symptoms when a beloved grandchild was threatened by a kidnaper.

A student at the University of Washington chartered a plane and flew home one week end to surprise the family. She reached the remotely situated ranch late at night, only to find it deserted. The family also had chartered a plane and flown to surprise her. Shortly following that experience she became ill.

Multiple sclerosis is more common and severe in cold, damp climates.

Barbara Shields, a 17-year-old freshman at College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, was exceedingly anxious to be a good athlete. Despite the fact she found it difficult to keep warm, she slept in a cold room and took cold showers. One night after an icy shower her legs became paralyzed. Other indications soon proved that multiple sclerosis had struck. The cause was quickly determined, and there is every reason to believe Barbara will hold the complete recovery she has apparently made. Her experience should be a warning to those who try to buck the natural inclination to keep warm.

It is difficult to report events at Tacoma. Even after you have visited St. Joseph's Hospital—observed everything with what you believe is a critical eye, and talked with the people—you still find the truth unbelievable when you try to write it. You feel like the research director of one of two industrial laboratories that had contributed close to half a million dollars in histamine and curare to the clinic. As he was leaving the clinic this scientist said in an awed tone, "I have seen it all, and reason tells me things must be as I have seen them. Still I can't believe it."

Defense of Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Robert P. Patterson relating to the defense of Western Europe which was published in the New York Times December 31, 1950.

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

DEFENDING THE WEST—WITHDRAWAL FROM LEADERSHIP IN CHECKING COMMUNISM OPPOSED

(The writer of the following letter was formerly Secretary of War.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The news of the Korean retreat of the United Nations forces, composed in the main of United States forces, has brought on an insistence in some quarters in this country that we should withdraw our troops, not only from Korea but from everywhere overseas.

The reality of the peril from Soviet Russia is admitted, but the odds are said to be so heavily against us that from now on we should confine our defense efforts to the Western Hemisphere and the oceans on both sides. Otherwise, it is argued, nothing but disaster is in store for forces committed overseas, whereas it is claimed that we can make the Western Hemisphere an impregnable fortress, a Gibraltar.

The proposals for retreat vary a little in details. Mr. Hoover urges that we should not land another man or another dollar in Western Europe until the nations there have themselves raised and equipped armies in such numbers "as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood." In other words, we should not render assistance to Western Europe until such time as our assistance would not be needed. On the other hand, he would have us help defend Britain provided the British will cooperate.

But defense of Britain in the face of Soviet domination of the Continent 20 miles away would be a military impossibility in these days of guided atomic missiles. The reservation of Britain for special favors, therefore, would seem to have no meaning.

In substance the several proposals come to the same: evacuate and rally on our own shores. It is argued that the best place to wage war, if we must wage it, is on our own soil.

Consider the case of Western Europe. With the hostile intentions of Soviet Russia an acknowledged fact, is abandonment of Western Europe the best policy for defense of the United States? I submit that it is not.

PACT REPUDIATION

In the first place, the suggested abandonment would be a flat repudiation of the North Atlantic Defense Treaty. By that treaty the United States and Canada and 10 countries of Western Europe pledged their faith to give continuous mutual aid and to come to one another's assistance in the event of attack against any of them. Our Senate ratified the treaty in July 1949 by an overwhelming vote, Democrats and Republicans concurring.

Are we to turn our backs on that treaty? Would any people ever again put reliance on the pledged word of the United States?

Apart from treaty, apart from breaking faith with little Denmark, Norway, and the other nations which took a bold stand in signing the treaty in the face of threats from the Kremlin, a stand taken because of their trust in us, it requires no detailed argument to prove that on military grounds the defense of Western Europe is of vital value to our defense.

The nations of Europe that have not been flattened by the Soviet juggernaut—divided though they are by national boundaries and speaking different tongues—have in the aggregate 200,000,000 people. They are vigorous, productive people. They have an industrial plant of huge capacity, second only to that of this country. It is a workshop far superior to that of Russia and Russia's satellites, and the men in Moscow have yearned for years to seize it.

If those people and that industrial plant should be taken over by the Soviet Union and added to their present strength in men and materials, the United States would be in a position hopelessly inferior in virtually everything it takes to wage war. With Western Europe overrun, the fall of Africa and the rest of Asia would be a certainty. Africa's uranium, apparently the most abundant so far discovered, would no longer be shipped here to the United States. It would go to feed Russian atomic energy plants.

With the rest of the world arrayed against us, we could not maintain ourselves for long on sea, air, or land. Our military position would be desperate.

INVITING CONQUEST

In short, abandonment of Western Europe would be nothing but an invitation to conquest of our own country by Soviet Russia. It would play directly into the hands of Stalin, with his plan of divide and conquer, with his strategy of knocking off his opponents one by one. No wonder that Pravda printed the speeches of Mr. Hoover and Mr. Kennedy in full.

Impatience over the slowness of the free people of Europe in strengthening their armed forces in face of imminent peril is understandable, though even here we must, in candor, make the acknowledgment that our own speed in mustering our military power has been nothing remarkable so far.

But a long step forward in the direction of combined defense of Western Europe was recently taken at the Brussels conference. General Eisenhower has been appointed supreme commander of the Allied Forces in Europe. Mr. Hoover's speech made no mention of these favorable developments.

It gets us nowhere to wring our hands and talk of retreating. If the United States, the leader of the free nations, the nation least exposed, talks and acts that way, who could blame the countries in Europe if they should fall away from the alliance?

The key to the situation, I submit, is the possession of military strength. We must attain it as swiftly as possible, at whatever cost. Our long lead in atom bombs, plus our power to deliver them by long-range air power, has deterred Soviet Russia from attacking directly so far, but no one can say how long the deterrent effect will continue.

What we need now is to supplement that strong asset with still more air power, also with more power to hold the lines of defense on the ground. With military strength in being and not merely on paper, we will find that most of our other problems so far as they concern Soviet Russia will be solved without undue difficulty.

In addition, we should collect as many allies as possible—Spain, a rearmed Western Germany, a rearmed Japan. Far from running away, we should extend our alliance to include all who have reason to fear conquest by Soviet Russia and have the will to resist.

For the peril from Soviet Russia is a mortal peril to free people the world over. Stalin will not stop until he is stopped. Bear in mind what he wrote in Problems of Leninism.

It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable.

In the dark days of the Revolution there were those who advised retreat. In the Civil War the Democratic platform of 1864 declared the war a failure, and that party went into the wilderness for 20 years as a penalty—a just penalty—for its lack of faith in the Nation.

Napoleon was defeated by a coalition. So was the Kaiser; so was Hitler. Stalin can be held in check by a coalition of the nations still free; or if he insists on war he can be defeated. But if the United States, the strongest member of the coalition, should pull out, then his prospects for conquest of the world, this country included, would indeed be the brightest they have ever been.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON.

The American Brand of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a striking statement made by Mr. Paul F. Watkins, the editor of the Herald-Progress of Ashland, Va., and which was republished in the Cosmopolitan magazine.

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

If you don't like the fighting and feuding that goes with our American brand of democracy, there are two places you can go to find unanimity and peace. One of them is a land where everybody agrees on everything every time—or else. Where there is no candidate except the official candidate; no opinion except the official opinion; no policy, philosophy, or religion that is not prescribed for you. You are told what to think on government and world affairs, on art, music, literature, and science. And nobody ever grumbles or disagrees out loud twice. That's Russia. The other place where there is eternal peace and quiet and harmony is Wood Lawn Cemetery. The editor is in no hurry to go to either. (Paul F. Watkins, In My Opinion, Herald-Progress, Ashland, Va.)

Production of Nickel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Too Much Complacency," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 1, 1951. The editorial deals with the report of the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services. The subcommittee is headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The editorial comments on the report of the committee on the nickel problem as it confronts us today.

I want to say in passing that the Senate is aware of the great work which is being done by the Subcommittee on National Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services. However, I think it is quite proper that I should comment on the floor of the Senate today on the courage, fearlessness, absolute fairness, and impartiality of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The committee under his leadership has been carrying out the promise we made at the outset of our work that we would be entirely impartial and fearless, and that we would let the chips fall where they may. I think the editorial comment on the subcommittee's report is deserving of the very careful attention of every Member of the Senate.

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

TOO MUCH COMPLACENCY

With nickel an indispensable item in our military stockpiling program, and most of our sources of supply outside the country, it is hard to account for the complacency which the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee encountered during an inquiry. Our experience in World War II showed the urgency of manitaining a large stockpile of this critical metal. At no time during that war were we able to keep more than a 2 months' supply on hand. Yet, with a new war under way in the Far East and a world-wide conflict threatened, the Senate group found that the Nation faces a serious shortage of nickel, with little immediate prospect of an increased supply. The nickel stockpiling program, the subcommittee asserted in a report, "has been conducted with far too much complacency."

Nickel has assumed even more importance in this emergency than during the late war, because of the development of jet fighters and bombers. Nickel is an essential ingredient of the tough steel needed to withstand the high temperatures of jet power plants. We are the world's largest consumer of nickel,

yet we produce hardly any worth speaking of. Our chief reliance is on a foreign monopoly, the International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd., which produces 85 percent of the world's supply of the metal. Efforts to induce this firm to expand production capacity to care for emergency demands have thus far brought no results. The Canadian supply seems to have reached a fixed level at a time when our war plants are seeking more and more nickel for planes and guns.

With this bleak situation staring us in the face, it would be natural to assume that every other possible source of nickel supply would be exploited to the limit. But Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S subcommittee was "shocked to discover" that the United States owns one of the largest nickel-producing plants in the world in Cuba, but it is idle. Built during the past war, the plant was declared surplus, and efforts were made to sell it—without success. Today, 6 months after the outbreak of the Korean War, plans for reactivating the plant still have "not advanced beyond the point of paper preparedness." Even more alarming is the fact that it will take about a year to repair the plant, staff it, and begin production of nickel in substantial quantities. The danger is that our enemies may not give us the time we need to do the things that we have neglected to do up to now.

Nickel is but one of a number of war materials which we have failed to stockpile in quantities sufficient to the needs of the present emergency. The subcommittee puts the blame not only on the Munitions Board but on the Budget Bureau, Congress, and the people as a whole. Senator JOHNSON aptly summed it up when he reported that the country's most critical shortage "is not one of nickel or wool or rubber or any other such commodity, but rather a shortage of bold planning." It will take bold planning from now on to rectify past shortcomings and meet the needs which loom so large ahead.

The Situation in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capital, issue of December 23, 1950.

This is a guest editorial written by Henry A. Bubb, Topeka, retiring president of the United States Savings and Loan League. It expresses the views of many of our citizens.

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

SPEAK UP, AMERICA

Following is a guest editorial by Henry A. Bubb, Topeka, president of the National Savings and Loan Association, presented as his opinion of the current crisis and what to do about it:

"Up until a few months ago most of us had high hopes for the success of the United Nations.

"We now know that when the United Nations originally agreed to resist aggression and uphold law and justice, it was only oratory. Most members did not mean what they said. All the time General MacArthur and his troops were driving northward in Korea, the general was being told through diplomatic channels, not to antagonize the enemy, not to liberate Korea, and not to complete his mission. His orders prevented him from sending planes to reconnoiter above the Chinese border. The general has described these restrictions as 'an enormous handicap without precedence in military history.'

"Possibly our brave men have not died in vain on the bloody battlefields of Korea, if in this critical hour the people of America will awaken to the irresoluteness of our allies and change our course to an impregnable United States at home, armed and ready to challenge any aggressor. If we build such a United States of America there will be no attack. If we continue to send all of our men to Europe and Asia, we are preparing for the greatest defeat ever suffered by a country dedicated to freedom and Christianity.

"Our allies, unfortunately, are weak, divided, and either socialistic or with a large part of their people communistic. As such, they will give up easily and then our boys will be overrun. Thus all men and material sent to foreign shores will be lost and the United States will be left an easy prey for the communistic armies of the world.

"Why not arm the Chinese Nationalists, the Turks, the Spaniards, and others who have been willing to stand up and fight communism—buy off Chinese Communist generals, who will in turn create civil war in China? By those methods the Communists of Asia and Europe will be kept busy while we build a strong United States, keep our boys at home, and protect the private-enterprise system which has made us the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

"To do this we must change our leadership. Unfortunately we have a President, at the most crucial time in the history of the world, who not only shows poor judgment, but is also showing signs of instability.

"I suggest that his own party surround him with a policy committee of the top men in our country. That committee should immediately clean out the State Department, starting with Secretary Dean Acheson, who has charted the suicidal course the United States has followed. Also General Marshall, whose policy led to Communist domination of China, should be retired along with other men who have been good generals in their time. The committee should enlist the services of great Americans, regardless of political affiliations, to save what we have left before we lose all.

"Tomorrow may be too late. It can happen here. Speak up, America—demand of your Congress to take immediate action."

Address by Ex-President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, Janucry 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "It Seems to Me" written by Charles A. Sprague, and published in a recent issue of the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman. The article presents a point of view on the subject of our foreign policy which is considerably different from the point of view presented today by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I find myself in complete agreement with the point of view presented in this article.

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

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The policy recommended by ex-President Hoover Wednesday night has an appeal. He would have the United States avoid entanglement in Asia and make no commitments in Europe until Western Europe recruits its own sizable force. He would have the United States build up its defenses behind the moats of the Atlantic and Pacific to secure this as a Gibraltar of freedom.

That policy appeals to the same instinct which prompts a child to put his head under the pillow. He thinks to escape danger or discovery by hiding. In this age of planes and submarines the oceans are an imperfect security.

I fear that adoption of the course recommended by Mr. Hoover would give the world another Munich on even a greater scale. The forces of disunity in France and Germany and Italy would get such an impetus as to make impossible the recruitment which Hoover demands and the United States Government has been strongly urging. Desertion of Europe would invite a Communist overrun either by military action or political infiltration. All that Russia needs to round out world dominion on a scale not even dreamed of by Alexander and Caesar and Napoleon, but only by the mad Hitler is to obtain the industrial plant of West Germany and France and the Low Countries. Britain would be exposed to a greater menace than it was in 1941 and would exist largely by Russian suffrance.

This would leave the United States isolated, not only militarily but politically, economically, and morally. Its connection with the world community would be cut off. The nations of the Southern Hemisphere would be an inadequate and uncertain substitute for those of Western Europe for our association.

In the past I have warned against too wide a spread of our guaranties, not only for conserving our military strength but also for employing it in a vital area. For the United States that is first in Western Europe. We must not cast off Europe with an abrupt ultimatum such as Mr. Hoover offers.

Shipment of Rubber to Russia by Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an International News dispatch dated London, December 21, 1950, entitled "Britain Will Ship Russia $10,000,000 Worth of Rubber."

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

BRITAIN WILL SHIP RUSSIA $10,000,000 WORTH OF RUBBER

LONDON, December 21.—Ten million dollars worth of Malayan rubber now piled on the London docks is scheduled to be shipped to

Russia next month aboard the British steamer *Stanrealm*.

The transaction was confirmed today by a spokesman for the shipping company, J. A. Billmeir, which has chartered the ship to the Soviets. The spokesman told International News Service:

"It's just an ordinary business deal."

The rubber, a vital war material, will be loaded soon aboard the *Stanrealm*, which will sail for Odessa in January.

The spokesman added:

"There is nothing to prevent Russia from buying British rubber. We are not at war with them."

Hoover Commission Recommendations on Organization of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Halfway To Go," dealing with the recommendations of the Hoover report. I am, of course, pleased that the Citizens Committee finds that about half the program has already been embodied in 20 public laws and 26 reorganization plans. I suggest to the Congress, however, that although we may be one-half of the way along the route, judged numerically, I do not think we are halfway along judged from the standpoint of political difficulty. I believe many of the easiest plans came first. The pressures on the Congress will be even greater to defeat some of the plans still to come, as the implications of this editorial indicate.

In this year of crisis, with our very survival perhaps depending on our efficiency, I hope the Congress will more resolutely face up to some of the distasteful political decisions which must be made if we are to achieve the economy and efficiency in our Government recommended by the Hoover Commission.

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

HALFWAY TO GO

The work already accomplished by Congress and by the Executive in putting into effect recommendations of the Hoover report is at once a cause for satisfaction and a challenge. Some very notable improvements have been made in the organization of government; in fact, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report says that about half the program has already been embodied in 20 public laws and 26 reorganization plans for strengthening the Federal structure. Most notable among them is the Military Unification Act, benefits of which have perhaps been felt sooner than anticipated. The Reorganization Act of 1949 enabled modernization of some 17 major agencies. Creation of the General Services Administration has vastly simplified governmental housekeeping problems. Many other major and minor reforms have been adopted. And, as the Citizens Committee points out, not the least beneficial effect of the report has been a reawakening of public interest in Government unprecedented in our times. In 21 States little Hoover commissions have been established, and the process is going on even in some major cities, including New York (the Gulick survey), and Los Angeles.

The challenge lies in the work still cut out for Congress and the administration if the full benefits implicit in the Hoover report are to be realized. Some important recommendations have not yet been acted upon: the proposal to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, for instance. Efforts that were made in this direction last spring were defeated. Some major improvements have been made in the Post Office Department; but the No. 1 problem here, mixture of politics with the appointment of postmasters, has not yet been solved. The Veterans' Administration requires a going-over. Unification of all Federal medical facilities should not be longer delayed. A crying need is establishment of greater control, from the standpoint of the general welfare, over water-development projects, with particular reference to the work of the Bureau of Reclamation and to the civil functions of the Army Corps of Engineers. There are many other equally important battles to be fought and won. Constant vigilance and constant pressure will be necesary to see them through to victory.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me a letter which appeared in the editorial column of the Anderson (S. C.) Independent on January 1, 1951, which was written by a South Carolina boy now serving with the American forces in Korea.

The author of this letter makes one statement that should awake all of us as well as all citizens of the United States. That statement is:

I guess a great general like Mr. MacArthur knows what he's doing, leavin' us here like this. But I sure wish I knew what it is all about. All I can say, whatever it is, it must be pretty doggone important to be worth so many lives, and so much suffering and all.

Such a letter as this should be a warning to all that petty politics and individual wars among the American people be brought to a stop. It should also be sufficient notice for this country to lay the cards on the table and prepare for the worst. I am glad to see that we are now starting our defense mobilization, and I personally advocate all-out preparedness. Let us quit playing around and work together for the sake of survival. If we are going to have to fight Russia, let us be prepared.

I see no need in continuing a half war. The lives of our young Americans are being exchanged for the lives of Chinese Communists inspired by Russia. Our soldiers could kill 10,000 Chinese a day for 10 years, and the Chinese population would still continue to increase. As I see it these side wars are not worth the price we will pay. Let us come home and build a defense that no country will dare attack.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Anderson Independent of January 1, 1951 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FOXHOLE PHILOSOPHER

William C. Arbery, who is general manager of Carolina Detergents, Inc., brought to us yesterday a letter from a soldier in Korea; a boy by the name of Ben. We think this letter reflects the general tempo of thinking in these critical days; tells a story which everyone should know.

This is the letter:

"DEAREST MOM: Well old 1950 is about over and things are fairly quiet right now, but it sure is cold. Forty degrees below zero would freeze good old South Carolina right off the map, wouldn't it, Mom? But don't worry about me gettin' cold. We've been on the move for several weeks and up to about a week ago I didn't have my clothes off or have a bath or sleep much for over 3 weeks.

"They say we'll get warmer clothes sometime soon. Gee, I sure hope so, because this kind of weather just freezes your legs and arms if you stop movin'. I hear one fellow had to have both arms and both legs cut off. Boy, am I lucky. Of course, that wouldn't happen if we had the right kind of clothes, but you see Mom, they thought we'd all be out of here before Christmas. But something sure went wrong. Nobody around here seems to know just what. I'll tell you the Gospel truth, Mom, if I can't talk to you, I can't talk to anybody, and I've just got to get this off my chest. Why, I don't know who we're fightin' even. Is it the Russians, the North Koreans, or the Chinese? And who are we fightin' for? Some say we're in the American Army and others say we're in the UN Army. What is this UN, anyhow, Mom? I never gave it much thought as long as I thought we'd all be eatin' Christmas turkey together at home. We thought it was just about over, and then all of a sudden it seemed like millions of these crazy, screaming yellow men came at us from every direction. Seems like somebody would have known about it and warned us, but we kept heading right up to the border like there wasn't anything on the other side of it but pine trees. Seems to me that it would have been a good idea for somebody to have sort of scouted up ahead, though, don't you think so, Mom?

"Looks like we're outnumbered a pretty smart amount, and though we don't aim to move an inch, we just can't expect our lines to hold up against these thousands and thousands of doped-up maniacs. It's always the same, they come at us laughing, crying, yelling, screaming—they are not brave, Mom, they're just crazy drunk. I wish I was home. I guess a great general like Mr. MacArthur knows what he's doing, leavin' us here like this. But I sure wish I knew what it is all about. All I can say, whatever it is, it must be pretty doggone important to be worth so many lives, and so much suffering and all.

"You can hear anything over here. Some of the fellows got it out that Mr. Truman has been writing silly letters to people at home about things that would be silly even in peacetime. But Mom, I don't believe that kind of stuff. I know one thing, if I thought the President of the United States didn't have any more to do than that, in times like these, I'd sure be scared for my skin.

It's like Pa says, 'You can't run a ship without a good captain.' I don't know how these stories get started.

"But I know one thing, Mom, when I get old enough to vote I'm sure going to be careful who I send to Washington.

"Love to everybody, and don't worry; I feel fine.

"Your loving son,

"BEN."

Editorial Comment on Address by Ex-President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invitation to Disaster," published in Washington, D. C., Sunday Star of December 24, 1950.

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

INVITATION TO DISASTER

The fact that Secretary Acheson has seen fit to call upon the National Security Council as a rebuttal witness is a measure of the seriousness with which the administration views Herbert Hoover's call for a retreat from Western Europe. (The Security Council says such a retreat could lead only to surrender or defeat.)

Mr. Acheson and the others have good reason to be deeply concerned with the Hoover speech. For it was an appealing statement—a speech which was bound to evoke a warm and enthusiastic response from millions of Americans. But it was also a speech which may well have contained within it the seeds of our own destruction, and it is proper, therefore, to examine and reexamine it.

When Mr. Hoover said that he spoke "with a sense of deep responsibility," he was wholly sincere. He has passed that point in life when men may be tempted by some hope of personal advantage, when partisanship seems worth while merely for the sake of partisanship. In the Star's opinion, Mr. Hoover spoke as an American citizen whose sole concern in these dark times is to serve the best interests of his country. Nevertheless, this newspaper believes that the course which the former President has advocated is a course which, if followed at this time, can lead us only to disaster.

When the speech is boiled down to its essence, Mr. Hoover is saying that we should pull back from Europe unless the western Europeans build for themselves a defense capable of turning back a Russian attack. If anything is certain, it is that Europe, without our vigorous assistance and support, will never erect such a defense. And the alternative in Mr. Hoover's opinion, is to arm ourselves to the teeth and maintain our own defense, with the Atlantic and the Pacific as our outward bastions.

The first trouble with the advocacy of such a point of view is that it tends to frighten the Europeans into doing nothing. Without our help, they cannot and will not fight in any effective manner. If they do not fight, if they do not erect what Mr. Hoover calls a sure dam against Communist aggression, the overwhelming probability is that Russia will take over Western Europe. What then?

Mr. Hoover does not advocate that we fight in such an eventuality, but rather that, while pursuing our own rearmament, we adopt a wait-and-see policy.

What we should expect to see is a Russian exploitation and development of the skilled manpower and the industrial resources of Western Europe. Instead of having 160,000,000 people allned with us, they would be working for the Russians. Mr. Hoover says there is no more danger that the Russians could invade Washington than that we, with land armies, could reach Moscow. That is quite true. But what about the ability of Russia, once the resources of Western Europe are at her disposal, to launch an all-out, devastating atomic attack on this country? All that Mr. Hoover says on this point is that the atomic bomb is a far less dominant weapon than it was once thought to be. Maybe so. But the prospect of living for an indefinite future under the constant dread of an overpowering atomic attack is not an attractive one. At best it leaves with the enemy the initiative, the choice of the time and means of attack. And at worst, it invites the prospect that this country might be destroyed without any effective chance to fight back.

Mr. Hoover seems to think that his proposal offers hope, after the initial preparation, of reduced expenditures, a balanced budget, and freedom from the dangers of inflation and economic degradation. The Star fears that this is the sheerest wishful thinking. We would be faced, for one thing, with a loss of our foreign trade. That might not be too important. What is important is that, as the Russians increased their military strength after the conquest of Western Europe, we would have to increase ours. We would never reach the point where we could sit back and say that we are strong enough, that we do not need more and newer weapons. Instead, we would have to live indefinitely in an armed camp, and that, even without actual war, would sap our resources, cancel out our freedoms, and, finally, bring on the economic degradation against which Mr. Hoover warns.

Mr. Hoover cautions in eloquent terms against appeasement. But that which he proposes actually would be the greatest act of appeasement of all. It is true that if Western Europe does not take every possible step to insure its own defense, we probably will have to fall back to the line which Mr. Hoover wants us to occupy. But it would be a ghastly mistake to beat such retreat unless and until it becomes clearly necessary. The sensible thing for us to do is to try by every feasible means to encourage and help the Europeans to stand up to the common enemy. If they refuse to do that, then we must fall back. But let us not abandon this battle until we have really tried to fight it.

Many of the people who respond favorably to Mr. Hoover's counsel are also admirers of General MacArthur. Perhaps this is a good time to recall some advice that he has given.

More than a decade ago, when another ruthless enemy threatened the civilized world, General MacArthur wrote to a friend: "The history of failure in war can almost be summed up in two words, 'too late'—too late in comprehending the deadly purpose of a potential enemy; too late in realizing the mortal danger; too late in preparedness; too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance; too late in standing with one's friends."

That is the advice of one of our ablest military commanders. So let us not be too quick to abandon our friends and prospective allies in favor of standing alone.

Russia's Plan for World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Russia's Plan for World Conquest," written by Joseph Stalin, with introductory comments by the editors of Coronet as printed in the January 1951 issue of that magazine. This article gives the Russian dictator's nine-point program for world conquest as revealed by his recorded writings in the archives of the National War College in Washington, D. C.

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

RUSSIA'S PLAN FOR WORLD CONQUEST

(By Joseph Stalin)

(Just like Adolf Hitler, the dictator of Soviet Russia has a carefully prepared plan for winning world supremacy. And just as Hitler did in his notorious book, Mein Kampf, so has Joseph Stalin written, in clear and unmistakable words, his blueprint for aggressive conquest—the Communist blueprint that is being followed, down to the smallest detail, in the Far East and elsewhere around the globe. Ironically, however, few people in the United States have taken the trouble to explore Stalin's writings and weigh their significance to the citizens of a free world. In order that there be no further unawareness of his long-range aims for the forcible spread of communism, here is the Russian Dictator's nine-point program for world conquest, taken from his recorded writings, which are now on file in the Stalin Archives of the National War College in Washington, D. C. Sentences in brackets have been inserted throughout the article in order to point up Stalin's plan in the light of today's critical events.—THE EDITORS)

Now that the Soviet Union has become a major power, the world is severed into two camps. The capitalist world is being disintegrated by internal antagonisms which are paralyzing it; on the other hand, our Socialist world is steadily growing stronger.

Lenin told us that once the Communist Party triumphed in our own land, the epoch of world revolution would begin, an epoch full of conflicts and wars, of victories and defeats—an epoch which would, in the end, lead to victory over the chief capitalistic countries.

This epoch covers a strategic period of years or even decades. In the course of this period, there must occur ebbs and flows in the revolutionary tide.

The Communist revolution does not develop along a continuous and upward line, but along a zig-zag path, by means of forward and backward marches. Our possibilities of success depend upon the relative strengths and weaknesses of friends and enemies abroad.

The weaknesses of the capitalistic world which we can use are its insuperable antagonisms—antagonisms which dominate the whole international situation.

The first group of antagonisms consists of those between the workers and the middle

class in the capitalist countries; the second consists of those between imperialism and the liberation movement in colonies and dependent countries; the third consists of those between the war victors and the conquered countries; the fourth consists of those which have arisen among the victorious states; the fifth consists of those which have developed between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist countries as a whole.

The trend of our foreign policy is determined by the conflicts and antagonisms of these five groups.

I

[The Korean war offers convincing proof that Soviet Russia has a long-range plan for attacking capitalism through its weakest point—the Far East.]

In 1917 the weakest part of the capitalist world front was Russia. Where is the front breakable next? Again at the weakest point. In India there are young and combative revolutionaries allied with the powerful movement for liberation. The forces of the revolutionary movement in China are immeasurable. They have not yet come into anything like full operation, but the future will show how vast they are.

The immediate task confronting the revolutionary movement in colonial lands is (1) to win over the best elements among the workers to communism and to form independent Communist Parties; (2) to set up a nationalist and revolutionary coalition of workers, peasants, and revolutionary intellectuals; and (3) to guarantee that leadership of the revolutionary coalition shall be in the hands of the workers.

It is obvious that each of these countries will need separate treatment. We must study all the special characteristics of the revolutionary development in these lands, and must educate the students from these countries in such a way as to be sure they will fulfill all the tasks assigned to them.

II

[Even though America is investing billions in Europe under the Marshall plan, Russia is convinced that capitalism abroad will inevitably collapse.]

Our country, a vast domain with very extensive markets and enormous supplies of raw materials, has been detached from the capitalist system. The loss of one-sixth of the world signified for capitalist Europe a restriction of production and a profound disturbance. Meanwhile, the European powers are threatened with the loss of their most important hinterland, the colonies.

Europe has been compelled to increase the burden of taxation, and to make the condition of the workers much worse than before. The temporary stabilization of capitalism has been mainly effected with the aid of United States capital. The European countries, while continuing to exploit their own colonies, have themselves become financially dependent upon the United States. Thus, the center of financial power in the capitalist world has been shifted from Europe to America.

III

[The recent history of internecine labor warfare in the United States reveals how cleverly Communist agents use unions to achieve their revolutionary aims.]

No country can, in these times, carry on war without the workers. If workers refuse to make war against our Soviet Republic, then such war becomes impossible.

Communists must go into the unions, work in them for 5 or more years if necessary—see to it that every Communist, without exception, becomes a member of an appropriate trade-union, there to work patiently and systematically for the solidarity of the working class in its fight against capitalism.

The support of our revolution by the workers of all lands, and, even more, by the victory of workers in a few countries at least, are indispensable preliminaries without which the final triumph of socialism cannot be assured. Should an attack on Russia materialize, we should be prepared to use every and any means in order to open the floodgates of revolution throughout the world, rallying the workers of capitalist countries and the people of colonial lands to the aid of the Soviet Union.

IV

[The fact that Communists try to take over American liberal organizations is not an accident; it is all part of Stalin's master plan.]

How will we bring the masses of a nation into the Communist program? We have fashioned a number of organizations without which we could not wage war on capitalism: Trade unions, cooperatives, workshop committees, labor parties, women's associations, a labor press, educational leagues, youth societies.

As often as not, these are nonparty organizations and only a certain proportion of them are linked with the party. But under special conditions, every one of these organizations is necessary; for, lacking them, it is impossible to consolidate the class positions of the workers in the various spheres of the struggle.

There is a veritable ant heap of independent organizations, commissions, and committees comprising millions of nonparty members. Who decides upon the direction that all these organizations take? Where is the central unit of organization that wields sufficient authority to keep them within prescribed lines in order to achieve unity of command and to avoid confusion?

The central unit is the Communist Party.

V

[Communists are always eager to support political "reforms," but their real purpose is not reform but the capture of America's apparatus of government.]

Among the masses of the people, we Communists, as Lenin said, are but drops in the ocean. We have a style of work that is peculiar to the practice of Leninism; it creates a special type of worker, a special type of party or state official, a special kind of style in public office.

Our task is to assign party members to the key points in the state apparatus, and to see to it that the apparatus is thus subjected to party leadership.

For the revolutionist, the revolution is everything, and "reforms" are only a means to an end. What we are concerned with are not the reforms, but the uses they can be put to. A revolutionist may sponsor a "reform" because he sees in it a means for linking up constitutional action with unconstitutional action—because he feels he can make use of it as a screen behind which he can strengthen his secret work.

VI

[The natural radicalism of America's younger people, especially students, makes them a major target for Communist indoctrination and manipulation.]

What is our youth technique? It is the education of young workers and young farmers in the spirit of Leninism, strengthening their conviction that our workers' state is the base from which the revolution in all countries will develop. Young people must be inspired with confidence in the leadership of the Communist Party of Russia.

Young Communists must be active in all domains of socialist construction work—in industry, agriculture, cooperatives, educational organizations, and the like. It is essential that the young folk should learn that our revolution not be regarded as an end in itself, but as a means toward the victory of the proletarian revolution in all lands.

VII

[The Communists encourage both monopolies and cooperatives under capitalism, because they can be more easily socialized than individual enterprises.]

The measures for strengthening socialism are: State monopoly of foreign trade, agricultural taxes, state purchase and sale of agricultural production, and an all-embracing plan for nationalization of industry, transport, and credit.

The state and the cooperatives, as well as the capitalists, are "traders," and when they have learned how to trade, they will get the upper hand over private trade (they are doing so already). Those who cannot understand this are not Leninists but liberals.

Great banks, as Lenin has said, are the state apparatus which we need for the realization of socialism, and which we take over ready-made from capitalism. When we do so, a unified state bank of the most comprehensive kind, with branches in every district and factory, will control production as well as distribution of products.

No, we are not liberals. We put the interest of the party above the interests of formal democracy. For us Communists, formal democracy is a trifle.

VIII

[The performance of the Soviet delegates at the United Nations is proof of how Russia likes to talk about peace, while actually promoting aggression.]

We Communists create slogans for the masses. Treaties embodying fresh groupings of forces with an eye to war are termed "peace treaties." The signing of them is always effected to the accompaniment of the pipings of peaceful alliances. Our preparations for a war are conducted under cover of paeans to peace. The opposition will not accept our proposals: that shows how genuine is their love of peace.

The Peace of Brest-Litovsk [1] is a model instance of this strategy. This peace enabled the party to take advantage of the discussions, to disintegrate the enemy forces, and to gather strength for an attack on the White Russians. Even the dullest have now come to see that the Peace of Brest-Litovsk was a concession which strengthened us while it wrecked the forces of international capitalism.

IX

[In Stalin's blueprint, war between Russia and the capitalistic world is inevitable: the only thing left to chance is the actual date of hostilities.]

As Lenin has said, a terrible clash between Soviet Russia and the capitalist states must inevitably occur. The forces of united capitalism and all their military technique are a mighty power, a very real power. Therefore we must try to take the enemy by surprise, seize a moment when his forces are dispersed.

We may consider that the time is ripe for the decisive struggle when all the class forces arrayed against us are in a state of confusion; when all are sufficiently embroiled with each other and have been sufficiently weakened in combats; when all the vacillating elements have exposed themselves before the people and paraded their utter bankruptcy. The ruling classes must be in the throes of a major government crisis, so that the government is so enfeebled the revolutionists can speedily overthrow it.

It is inconceivable, as Lenin has written, that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist side by side with capitalist states.

---

[1] The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed March 3, 1918, between the new Bolshevik Government and the Central Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria) at Brest-Litovsk, Poland, and marked the withdrawal of Russia from World War I.

Ultimately one or the other must conquer. A conflict is inevitable.

The main forces of the revolution must, at the decisive moment, be concentrated for an attack on the enemy's most vulnerable spot, at a moment when conditions are ripe. Always we have a clear and precise aim toward which we strive, for one of the great merits of communism is that nothing is left to chance.

Continued Advance of the American Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very provocative editorial published in the New Yorker of December 30, 1950.

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

Year's end and year's beginning are the same moment in time. The lack of a decent interval at midnight never fails to produce a feeling of headlong and unrelieved adventure; the moment is completely elusive, has no reality. You could strike a gong, but the waves of sound would belong fractionally either to 1950 or to 1951. The in-between is soundless. Even a kiss is impossible to manage between years, and always takes place in either the long past or the uncertain future, or extends from one to the other. At the end of the windy year 1950, we are glad to report that the young tree that took hold and grew on the stone coping ouside our window, well above ground and with only odds and ends for soil, withstood the hurricane; several nearby television antennas, with a much greater outward show of firmness, went down before the blast. It was a matter of being correctly rooted.

On awakening the other morning, we found in our Tribune an article by the brothers Alsop headed "Decline of this Republic," but after reading the article we did not think the headline fitted, or that the Republic is in a decline, or that such a headline serves a good purpose. The article should have been called Queer Goings On in Senate and House Regarding Acheson, or some such. The Alsops found that the bloodthirsty activities of the Republicans indicated a decay of American politics. But it seems to us that a Republic is not necessarily declining because a faction is busy trying to pry a public servant loose from his job. The governments that are in a serious decline, always, are those that do not possess either the machinery or the will to correct and alter their leadership and whose Secretaries of State are held safe against criticism. There lies the real decay. Name us the number of years a dictator has been in power and we will name you the number of years his regime has been in decline. A Republic like ours may, and often does, show tremendous confusion under stress and make colossal blunders, but it is the confusion of free choice and speech, and this is not decline but steady (though tumultuous) ascent. We look for a continued ascent of this Republic during the year 1951.

The headline of decadence is repeated in press and radio every day. It is an unnecessary additional burden that we saddle ourselves with. For 1951, we recommend that publishers ask their copy desks not to overwrite and ask their commentators for great accuracy and a philosophical stance. So many things that seem new are old. The Republicans want Acheson's head because of the need for a scapegoat—one of the earliest of cravings. Politically, this is annoying and aboriginal, but not decadent. We shall presumably always have a few early men in Congress, as in any well-run museum.

For ourself we shall resolve not to overwrite in the New Year, and to defend and exalt those principles and quirks that have carried the Nation slowly up the long hill since it started: its gaiety, its resilience, its diversity, its tolerance of the divergent or the harassing idea, its respect for all men. Who is to say we are not greatly ascendant still? Because of fear Americans have lately compromised their essential position—have published blacklists, have permitted legislative committees to presuppose what is "American," have watched them hang innocent men and women on the gallows of the newspaper headline, have winked at the meddling of Congressmen in the conduct of the movies, have made the natural loyalty of the citizen ever so much more difficult by removing loyalty itself from the realm of free choice, have hinted that jobs belong chiefly to the confessed orthodox. For us 1950 will be memorable above all other years because it was the year we once found ourself hesitating to throw something in the wastebasket, from a fleeting dread that it might be seen and misconstrued. In that one blinding moment of hesitation the fresh air of America suddenly seemed contaminated with evil. The incident was absurd, and the feeling passed, but nothing is quite absurd that happens.

Insofar as orthodoxy has gained strength, our republic has lost strength. But the loss is neither irreparable nor unusual. It is the product of war clouds—a sort of terrible mist that gathers. Luckily, many of our strongest skippers see through it. For 1951 we wish our readers health, faith, the sure eye that sees through mists, and the patience and muscle for the ascent of the most beautiful hill there is.

Voice of America Programs Regarding Christmas Observance Throughout the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very glad to receive from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, the Honorable Edward Barrett, a release describing Voice of America programs to the world on the subject of Christmas observance throughout the United States.

I am perfectly delighted to note this splendid subject matter of the Voice of America programs, because it has long been my contention, as expressed in numerous addresses on the Senate floor and in articles and releases, that it is by utilizing the vital power of spiritual light and truth that we can best contact the masses of the world. In other words, we have in dynamic Christianity the finest possible basis on which to antidote the efforts of the fanatic and godless Communist philosophy.

These Christmas programs beamed by the Voice of America apparently well reflected the diverse approaches with which the various Christian faiths approach the Christmas holiday and the diversity in which various nationality groups similarly approach that inspiring occasion. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the State Department release on this subject.

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

The Voice of America will give listeners around the world a full picture of Christmas observance in the United States, the Department of State disclosed today.

Throughout the holiday week end special Christmas programs of music and features will be beamed in a score of languages to Latin America, the Near East, and to both sides of the iron curtain in Europe and Asia.

In the English service, programs will include the annual Christmas message by the President, traditional music by the Trinity Choir, sidelights of Christmas observances throughout the United States, documentary on American Yuletide celebration, music by American composers and vocalists, and dramatization of the Bible story.

Broadcasts in Arabic will include a statement by Mayor Issa Bey Bandak, of Bethlehem, special music, and a feature describing Christmas in America.

To Austria the Voice of America will broadcast greetings from Cardinal Spellman, Bruno Walter, Rudolf Bing, Mayor Impellitteri, and the Austrian Minister, Dr. Kleinwaechter; Christmas songs, greetings from Austrian exchange students now in the United States, a Christmas story, dramatization of The Littlest Angel by Tasewell, and a Christmas talk by Koganovsky.

Special music and features will be broadcast to Bulgaria, with additional programs scheduled on January 7, the date on which Christmas is observed in Bulgaria.

Broadcasts to Czechoslovakia will include interviews with Americans of Czech and Slovak origin, as well as special music and stories, a 15-minute recording from Bethlehem, Pa., and a feature of the observance of Christmas by displaced persons in the United States.

To France, the Voice of America will broadcast carols by the Barnard College Choir, special events from around New York, a cross-country montage stressing the religious aspects of Christmas, and special music.

German programs will include a dramatization of The Little Angel Without a Name, carols by the New York Liederkranz Choir, and a Christmas question-and-answer feature.

The Hungarian broadcasts will include special Christmas messages by Msgr. Fulton Sheen and the Reverend Samuel Shoemaker; Hungarian Christmas Mass held by Monsignor Mihalovics, Christmas songs by the Hungarian Displaced Persons Children's Choir of Bethlen Home, Ligonier, Pa., and a feature on Cardinal Mindszenty, including his last pastoral letter, on December 26, the second anniversary of his arrest.

Italian broadcasts will feature Christmas stories, special event recordings from the Italian colony at Stamford, Conn., an American farm, Bethlehem, Pa., and New York; Christmas dramatizations and music.

Broadcasts to Poland will feature invocation by the Right Reverend Felix Burant,

Christmas music and features, a Yule puppet show, and a dramatic presentation of Christmas in modern Bethlehem.

Rumanian programs will include a message from the Reverend Vasile Hategan and special features.

To the Soviet Union, the Voice of America will broadcast a message by the Right Reverend Bishop John, of the Russian Orthodox Church of Brooklyn, features on Christmas in America, and church music by the Russian Metropolitan Choir, and the Capella Choir.

Broadcasts to Yugoslavia will include a dramatized musical program and features on Christmas observance by Americans of Croat, Slovene, and Serbian origin, with music by orchestras of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Chicago.

Programs for Spain will feature Christmas narration, greetings, and music.

Ukrainian programs will include a statement by Archbishop Mstylav, of the Greek Orthodox Church of Philadelphia, carols, and a Christmas sketch.

To Latin America, the Voice of America will broadcast special features and music in Spanish, Portuguese, and English.

The Greek broadcasts will include two dramatic presentations and special Christmas features

The Turkish program will feature a sketch of a Christmas visit to an American home by a Turkish student.

To the Far East, the Voice of America will broadcast Christmas music, dramatizations and features in English, Indonesian, Korean, and Vietnamese.

Do We Abandon Rome?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Do We Abandon Rome?" published in the Pilot, of Boston, Mass., on December 30, 1950, as a reprint from the Boston Herald of December 22, 1950, on the subject of the Hoover speech concerning Europe.

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

The following editorial is reprinted from the Boston Herald of December 22, 1950:

"DO WE ABANDON ROME?

"What is this Europe that Kennedy and Hoover are willing to write off? It is 300,000,000 people. It is the mining and industrial facilities of the Ruhr, the wine of France, the cheeses of Holland, the olives of Italy. It is the Alps and the Riviera. It is the railroads and highways, farms and factories and schools. It is the Louvre and the canals of Venice.

"All these are tangible things. They can in a rough way be weighed against the calculated risk of American forces thrown into their defense.

"But what of the intangible things, the culture that is Europe's and that was our source? What specifically, of the Catholic Church?

"If communism takes over Italy, the Holy See will suffer a far worse fate than it did under fascism. Mussolini at least gave lip service to the church; communism is a new, intolerant atheism, with an old and unappeasable hatred for catholicism.

"The church would, of course, survive, But what of her millions of communicants? The church has outlived many tyrants and will outlive many others. But the loss of Rome would be an unthinkable tragedy, not alone for Catholics, but for everyone throughout the world who stands in danger of communism. With all its great spiritual and temporal powers, the church has fought the world's great fight. Whether we are Catholics or not, it is here our mighty ally.

"It is difficult to believe that the Kennedy-Hoover-Hearst school has given full appreciation to the implications of the surrender of Europe to Stalin's hordes. Europe is more than people or geography or works of man. It is the civilization from which we sprang; it is the faith in the dignity and freedom of man."

Excess-Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, by request, that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a discussion of the excess-profits tax, which took place on the American Forum of the Air on December 10, 1950.

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

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

(By Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming; Dr. Allen B. DuMont, president, DuMont Television Co.; Theodore Granik, founder and moderator, the American Forum of the Air)

ANNOUNCER. Should we have an excess-profits tax?

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the continental room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. On Tuesday of this week, the House passed the excess-profits-tax bill. It is now awaiting report to the Senate from its Finance Committee.

Designed to curb "windfall" profits related directly or indirectly to the defense program and to produce at least $3,000,000,000 annually in new revenue, the bill calls for a 75-percent tax on corporation earnings classified as excessive. It would be retroactive to July 1.

Proponents of the measure say it is intended to reap money for defense, ease inflationary pressures, and take extraordinary profits out of war.

Opponents, however, have denounced excess-profits taxation as "an evil brew of inequity, exception, exemption, and privilege."

So the American Forum of the Air has invited two outstanding authorities on the subject to give us their views. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, one of the original sponsors of the proposal, and Dr. Allen B. DuMont, president of the Allen B. DuMont Laboratories, Inc., and chairman of the National Conference of Growth Companies.

Senator O'MAHONEY, how does an excess-profits tax take the profits out of war?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me first say, Mr. Granik, that the bill passed by the House of Representatives will not take the profits out of war. That is a weak and timid bill. It proposes, as you have just said, to raise about $3,000,000,000 in revenue.

In 1944 the World War II tax bill raised about $10,000,000,000 in a single year. The excess-profits-tax principle, in my judgment, is misnamed. It should be called a high-profits tax.

If I can show your radio and television audience the chart which I have brought here this afternoon, I think it will demonstrate precisely what I mean.

Mr. GRANIK. Senator, do you want to show the chart?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Here we have a chart which shows corporate profits, taxes, and dividends from 1939 to 1950. Back in 1939, corporate profits before taxes amounted to a little over $5,000,000,000. During the war, in spite of the excess-profits tax, they rose to $25,000,000,000. After the reconversion period, following World War II, corporate profits before taxes reached a peak of $35,000,000,000 in 1948. And now they are ballooning to $42,000,000,000 in the third quarter of 1950. Corporate profits for the year 1950 will amount to about $37,000,000,000.

Mr. GRANIK. Let's hear from Dr. DuMont.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I just say this word, Doctor, first?

Chairman GRANIK. Go ahead.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The profits tax bill which passed the House merely provides that on that portion of the corporate profits about 75 percent of the best 3 years the corporations have experienced in '46, '47, '48, and '49, shall bear a tax of 75 percent, provided, however, that the total tax shall not exceed 67 percent.

Chairman GRANIK. Dr. DuMont, do you want to use the chart, too?

Dr. DUMONT. I would just like to comment on this chart that Senator O'MAHONEY has shown here. I think it doesn't really show the condition that exists because during this period of time, if you want to take 1939, for instance, the corporate income of the United States was $33,000,000,000. Well, we have had an expansion of business since 1939; and instead of the $30,000,000,000 corporate income we have, if you take, for instance, 1948, $189,000,000,000 of corporate income. So that, percentage-wise, this increase is not great.

If you take a look at it in another way, you will find that, percentage-wise, the dividends paid in this period were only 4 percent of the national gross income whereas they were 5 percent here. So that actually your curves should be way up here, and percentage-wise, this isn't important.

There was one thing that the Senator said that I was very happy to hear him say in that this should really not be called an excess-profits tax, if I get it right. We feel very strongly on that subject because growth companies are going to have to pay an excess-profits tax no matter what they do and they are being penalized for success. But certainly it would be very helpful if the designation "excess profits" were taken off the tax—and if Secretary Snyder in proposing it called it a "profits tax" rather than an excess-profits tax.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator, do you agree that growth companies are being penalized for success?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I haven't read the bill as it came from the House yet, because

I am not a member of the Finance Committee. But I will say this: That with respect to growth, the draft law pays no attention to the growth of the young men who are being drafted; and for the life of me I am unable to understand why the corporate owners of profit seem to be unwilling to permit profits to go to war with the soldiers.

Now, this bill that was passed by the House—and I am not speaking now of the growth companies, but I am speaking of the alternative that is permitted—provides that no excess-profits tax shall fall upon any part of the revenue which does not exceed 12-percent interest upon their invested capital provided that income is not above $5,000,000.

Now, I submit in all reason that a 12-percent income on invested capital is a very generous allowance to corporations which are now making the greatest profits that they ever made in all history.

Chairman GRANIK. Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. Well, I will agree with the Senator that the companies are making substantial profits. But, as I pointed out before, percentagewise these are very much in line. I will go back again. I don't know whether most people realize, but the average corporation in this country, in 1950, made about 5 cents on a dollar sales or 5 percent. If we go back to 1929 we find that they made 6 cents on a dollar sale. It doesn't seem to me that that is an unreasonable amount for a company to make on the basis of the ratio of the profits to the sales.

I would like to get into this excess-profits tax from the standpoint of the growth companies.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Before you do that, Dr. DuMont, may I make this comment? It has been a favorite device of corporate management in defending its profits to try to compute the profits on the sales dollar instead of on the invested capital dollar. Now that results in complete distortion because you may make only 5 cents on your sales dollar, but if you sell enough people you may be making 25 percent on your invested capital. All in the world those of us who are supporting the theory of an excess-profits tax contend is this: That corporations which are now, as Dr. DuMont acknowledges, making the most extraordinary profits in history shall pay a portion of that for the defense of the country which makes it possible for them to make that profit.

Chairman GRANIK. Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. Senator, I attended some of the hearings before the House and also appeared before the Senate Finance Committee, and I didn't hear any of the corporations there objecting to the payment of taxes. The general consensus of the people was that we had an emergency, that very great additional funds would be needed, and nobody questioned the amount of money that the Government set up.

The question and the problem is the application of a tax, and the excess-profits tax falls on a relatively small number of companies. In other words, it falls on approximately one company in eight. And primarily the companies that are hit by the excess-profits tax are the new companies, the growing companies, and the companies that have helped to a large extent in the expanding of our economy.

Chairman GRANIK. You feel that a flat levy on corporations will be more efficient?

Dr. DUMONT. That is correct.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the first place, Mr. Granik, I do not agree with the statement that Dr. DuMont has just made.

I have here before me a table showing the excess-profits-tax returns for the year 1944, the last full year in which they were collected under World War II. Fifty-five thousand nine hundred and twelve corporations made excess-profits-tax returns. Of this almost 56,000 corporations, 43,719 had excess-profits-tax incomes less than $100,000, but they had only 7.8 percent of the total tax liability.

At the other end of the scale there were only 1,880 corporations with excess-profits-tax income above a million dollars, and they had 68.5 percent of the corporate tax liability.

It is the big corporations with excess-profits-tax income which, of course, is figured only after many credits are allowed in excess of $1,000,000 who are filling the country with propaganda against sending the profit dollar to war.

As for this suggestion about a flat tax, I want to point out that the corporations having an income of less than $50,000 pay 25 percent of its income in tax and surtax rates under the present law. The biggest corporation in the land pays only 45 percent. Of course, the flat tax is a boon to the big companies, and it is a burden on the little companies.

Chairman GRANIK. How about that, Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. I would like to start from the last question and work forward. I don't see where the little company is penalized by a flat increase. The company that makes or has an excess-profits-tax credit or makes less than $25,000 a year only pays a 25-percent normal tax. So the proposed increase would be in the surtax of 20 percent. So any company making less than $25,000 a year would not be affected whatsoever.

I don't know what the definition of a small company is, but if you take a company making, for instance, $50,000, he will make out much better by an increase in the surtax than he would with an excess-profits tax. If the surtax is increased to, say, 30 percent, making a total tax of 55 percent, he will pay that on what he has over $25,000. But if you go to a 75-percent excess-profits tax, he is going to be hit a lot worse than he would on the increase in surtax. So it all depends exactly on the size of the company how this affects them. But I think, generally speaking, the smaller company will do much better on an increase in the surtax than by having an excess-profits tax.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I ask Dr. DuMont a question on that?

Dr. DUMONT. Yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The company with $100,000 income under the present law pays a tax of 40 percent. That is the normal and the surtax combined.

Dr. DUMONT. 42½. I think it is.

Senator O'MAHONEY. This is from the Finance Committee report that I am reading.

Dr. DUMONT. All right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now, the individual with exactly the same income, $100,000, pays a rate of 52.8 percent. Can you tell me why a corporation with a $100,000 income should pay a profits tax, an income tax, at a smaller rate than the individual having the same income?

Dr. DUMONT. Well, I would rather turn it the other way and I would say, why should the individual only pay 42.5 percent? There is just as much logic in that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The answer to that, Dr. DuMont, is that we are in the middle of the twentieth century, the century of world wars. We are entering the third world war, and we must have the revenue if we are going to protect the capitalistic system.

Dr. DUMONT. There is no question, as far as the corporations are concerned, as to the amount of revenue the Government needs. It is simply a question of whether you are going to have this excess-profits tax that particularly hits growth companies. It is a tax on success and not a tax on excess profits.

I would like to show you here, before it is too late, the effect of this profits tax on a particular growth company.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to use the chart, there, Dr. DuMont?

Dr. DUMONT. I will go through it very rapidly. This chart happens to show the sales increase of the company that I am associated with. It has increased from 1946, $2.5 million——

Chairman GRANIK. Will you use the hand microphone for a moment?

Dr. DUMONT. To $80,000,000 in 1950.

Now, the assumption of a lot of people that talk about this is that the excess-profits tax and the tax bill only take into consideration a base period of from 1947 to 1949.

So, in effect, it is saying that there should be no growth in the United States past 1949.

Now, in the case of this particular company, during this period of time—may I have the next chart?

Chairman GRANIK. The next chart.

Dr. DUMONT. This is the profit for the company before taxes. Now, after taxes the company made between 1946 and 1950—the next chart, please—approximately $12,000,000.

Now, during that period of time, it wasn't a question of increasing the price of the product because the profits went up. It was because of an increase of facilities and an increase of manpower. This shows the growth of the people working for the company from 998 in 1946 to 5,000 in 1951.

The next chart, please. During this period of time when this $12,500,000 was made after taxes, let's see what caused it to be made. There was $22,000,000 invested in the business. We expanded our plant and equipment to the tune of $8,000,000. We increased the inventory by $10,000,000 and increased our accounts receivable by $4,000,000. So we had to go out and get additional funds of approximately $10,000,000 in order to do this.

Well, obviously, when you increase your plans and increase your number of employees, you are going to increase your sales. And it follows through that if you double your sales your profits should increase.

But with this bill they just practically clean out after 1949. May I have the next chart, please?

This last chart shows the condition where you have three companies, A, B, and C. They all made the same profit during the years 1947 to 1949. But company A made more money in 1950, and they are hit by the 64 percent tax. Company B went right along straight. They pay a 52-percent tax. Company C, which was on the downgrade, has paid no excess profits tax at all.

Now, the point is that you are picking out the companies which have increased, that have grown, and unnecessarily taxing them. If you are going to expand, you need funds just the same as the Government needs funds for this war. We cannot operate without funds, and if you are going to take them all away from us it is going to mean that these growth companies are not only going to fail to increase in size but they are going to have to curtail size, and I say it is not a good thing.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I say, in all sincerity and without the slightest degree of intent of being emotional about it, that casualties in Korea, the latest figures, amount to 32,000, of which 5,000 represent dead Americans. They have no possibility of growing. They have no possibility of achieving anything in the future. Their record is their heroism in defense of America.

Now, the excess-profits tax of which Dr. DuMont talks falls only upon profits, only upon the profits, not upon capital. We don't take the body of the corporation.

In this bill passed by the House, if the equity capital is less than $5,000,000, why then you are allowed a profit of 12 percent on that equity capital before there is a penny of tax. If it is up to $10,000,000, then you are allowed a profit of 10 percent, and if it

is above that, a profit of 8 percent. That is why I say it is a tender bill.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take a question from the audience?

Dr. DUMONT. I would just like to answer the subject that the Senator has just spoken about. The one thing that is going to help this whole war situation is the increase of production, the increase of the tools for war. The reason that we did as well as we did in the last war was because of the great industrial strength of the country.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I agree with you.

Dr. DUMONT. If you are talking about the people that may be killed in the future, if you are cutting down your production——

Senator O'MAHONEY. There is nothing in this that cuts down the production.

Dr. DUMONT. There certainly is.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Witness the result of World War II. We outproduced the whole world with an excess-profits tax law very much more rigid than this.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take a question from the audience?

Mr. MOYNAHAN. My name is Moynahan of the National Association of Life Underwriters.

Chairman GRANIK. You are president. Go ahead.

Mr. MOYNAHAN. Senator, do you feel that it is possible to have an excess-profits tax that will not be inflationary?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, I do.

Chairman GRANIK. How do you feel about that quick answer that the Senator gave?

Dr. DUMONT. Obviously, an excess-profits tax is inflationary. The very fact that it has a tendency to cut down production means that goods are more scarce and that prices are going to go up, obviously.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The facts of World War II completely refute that statement.

Dr. DUMONT. I don't agree with that.

Chairman GRANIK. We will take another question.

Mr. MCNAMARA. My name is McNamara. I am an accountant. My question is for Dr. DuMont.

In Time magazine of November 27, 1950, you are quoted as follows:

"I resent the threat of my Government taking legislative action that will stigmatize our profits under a completely false label. If this fictional legislation goes through I should feel that it would be my duty to myself, my company, and its stockholders, to see that there would be no excess profits on which such a tax might be levied."

Do you mean you would keep prices of your products and services at such a low level that no such profits would be produced or, if not, how would you accomplish it?

Dr. DUMONT. Certainly we don't aim to pay the highest excess-profits tax of any corporation in the country.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt? I would like to know first whether you actually said that.

Dr. DUMONT. Yes; I did say that, Senator. I feel that we would be forced, either by reducing prices or something along that line, to cut down our excess profits because I certainly wouldn't like to see it on my statement.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you mean by that statement that you would increase your expenses beyond what they ought to be?

Dr. DUMONT. No, by decrease of prices.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, the charge that an excess-profits tax is inflationary is based wholly upon the assumption that business management will spend money wastefully. Now, do you mean that your company would spend money wastefully rather than pay an excess-profits tax?

Dr. DUMONT. No; absolutely not.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I am glad to have you say that.

Dr. DUMONT. I meant that we would be forced to bring our prices down, and possibly because we didn't have the funds we couldn't produce as much.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Couldn't produce as much what, television sets?

Dr. DUMONT. No; war production. We were 100 percent war production during the last war.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Government will pay you a good price for everything you produce for war.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take a question from the distinguished Congressman there from your part of the country, Senator, Congressman John Carroll, of Colorado.

Congressman CARROLL. I am asking Senator O'MAHONEY, in the face of constantly expanding national income, the highest in the peacetime history of the country, in the face of the greatest employment in the peacetime history of the Nation, when we appropriated $17,000,000,000, 3 or 4 months ago and an additional $18,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment whether it is not vitally essential that we have an excess-profits tax for three reasons: (1) On the doctrine of equality; (2) for revenue; and (3) as an anti-inflationary measure?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is my judgment, and I feel very strongly that corporations, like individuals, should pay according to their ability to pay, and the excess-profits tax does precisely that.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that?

Dr. DUMONT. I don't agree that the excess-profits tax does that. I have looked over some of the largest corporations in this country, and I find that there is a very considerable number of them that are not going to pay a dime in excess profits.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Will you give me the specifications, Doctor, and we will put them into an amendment which will stop that.

Dr. DUMONT. Well, I am not offering any amendments along this line, but I think the straight increase in the surtax rate will pretty well take care of it. You don't hear any complaint of excess-profits tax from the larger corporations.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, I have heard about it. But what I know is that the profits before taxes have risen in this era of prosperity at a rate greater than either salaries or wages or the gross national product.

Dr. DUMONT. Not percentagewise.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes, percentagewise, too.

Dr. DUMONT. No.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, may we take our summaries now? Dr. DuMont, your summary, please.

Dr. DUMONT. I would simply like to summarize this way, that I believe the so-called excess-profits tax is an unsatisfactory way of raising additional revenue because—No. 1, it penalizes growth; two, it tends to keep small companies small, and protects larger companies; three, it distributes taxes unfairly; four, it is unnecessarily complicated; five, it is just an additional tax, and not fundamentally a tax on excess profits; six, it assumes all growth stopped in 1949; seven, it is inflationary and unfairly places a stigma of profiteering on many companies.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Dr. DuMont.

Senator O'MAHONEY?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Most of the reasons given by Dr. DuMont, I think, are without any basis at all. The reason we need an excess profits tax is because the Nation is in its greatest crisis. The Communist system seeks to destroy the system of private property. And if the owners of private property are unwilling to contribute substantially of their profit while the boys of this country are contributing their bodies and their lives, then it will be very difficult, indeed, to defend our way of life. We need the revenue to hold back the tides of Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

The dictators in the Kremlin expect the capitalistic system to wreck itself because of unwillingness to face the facts.

We must face the facts now and levy the taxes that will be necessary, first, to pay the expenses of defense; second, to absorb all free money so as to prevent inflation—and that is what such a tax will do—and, third, to prove to the boys who are fighting that profit dollars are standing by their side.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not a Moral Issue," from the Coos Bay Times.

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

NOT A MORAL ISSUE

Possibilities of a negotiated settlement of the Korean situation, however tenuous they may be, have for the moment taken the spotlight from the possible use of the atomic bomb. But the question is not dead any more than peace is an actuality in Korea. Whatever settlement may be negotiated with the Communists now or in the immediate future, it is not likely to last any longer than it suits their convenience or the democratic nations hold ready strength enough to ward off new aggressions. When that time comes, or if the fighting is to continue now, the question of the atomic bomb will again come to the fore. Then we hope people will recall words such as the following, written by Bruce Biossat of the Newspaper Enterprise Association:

"A prominent church organization declares that maybe it would be all right for us to use the atomic bomb if it is dropped on our cities first.

"This statement unquestionably represents a decision taken after prolonged soul-searching by leading churchmen. But unfortunately it falls into the standard misconception that the atomic bomb involves a great moral issue.

"It clearly does not. Except for the killing effects of radiation, the A-bomb differs from other bombs chiefly in the magnitude of its impact. The ways in which it kills are the ways all bombs kill. It simply strikes down many more people at one time.

"It is no more immoral to use an A-bomb than to use a pistol if the weapon is employed in pursuit of aggressive aims. That's the point; the real moral offense is aggression, for it is this crime which lets down the bars to violence.

"Once we are in war, it must be left to the discretion of our high command what weapons to use and when. That must be so whether we are fighting the Russians or the Chinese or anybody. There can be no rule that we are free to use the A-bomb against one enemy but not against another. Nor should we have to get anyone's permission to use it.

"And we certainly should not have to wait until the enemy employs it, for by that time

it might well be too late for us to drop it with the most telling effect.

"Suppose for argument's sake that we should become embroiled in full-scale war with Red China. Our leaders should not yield to frantic calls that the A-bomb be promptly dumped on major Chinese cities. On the other hand, neither should they be deterred from using the weapon by heartfelt cries that it is 'inhuman.' So is a bullet.

"Their decision should be made on the basis of the military realities they then confront. The A-bomb is costly. We don't have an unlimited store. Is the advantage to be gained through dropping it sufficient to offset these factors?

"Can the same result be achieved more efficiently by other means? Or is the disposition of enemy resources such that the A-bomb's terrific concentration of force can be applied effectively?

"These are the types of questions military men would ask themselves in any big war. A final decision likely would have to be made by the President as Commander in Chief. But the ingredients of that decision should be military, not moral."

We hope the time will never come when the United States will feel compelled to use the atomic bomb. But should that time come, we may well be thankful that we have it and hope that it will be used in time.

W. J. C.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 3), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the recent convention of the North Dakota Funeral Directors Association, held at Bismarck, N. Dak., on May 26, 1950. I ask that, in printing, the names of the officers, executive committee, and district chairmen be also printed, together with the letter of transmission.

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

NORTH DAKOTA FUNERAL DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,
McVille, N. Dak., June 29, 1950.

Mr. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator From North Dakota, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: At the recent convention of the North Dakota Funeral Directors Association held at Bismarck, the enclosed resolution was adopted and the secretary instructed to forward the same to you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,
T. A. WONDER,
Secretary.

(Officers: Harold T. Anderson, president, Rugby; Almon B. Strong, first vice president, Devils Lake; Truman A. Dahle, second vice president, Mohall; T. A. Wonder, secretary, McVille; Russell A. Lee, treasurer, Lisbon. Executive committee: Alvin Berg, McClusky; Truman Knott, New Rockford; Frank Mischel, Dickinson. District chairman: northeast district, W. C. Adams, Crafton; northwest district, Oscar Hanson, Williston; southwest district, Alvin Klick, Glen Ullin; southeast district, Selmer Quam, Cooperstown.)

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance wherever tried has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards, and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance wherever tried has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the patient-physician relationship has proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American man, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Funeral Directors Association does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designated for national bureaucratic control; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of North Dakota, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are therefore respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

THE NORTH DAKOTA FUNERAL DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,
ALMON B. STRONG, *President.*
T. A. WONDER, *Secretary.*
MAY 26, 1950.

Pro-Reds in Our War Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, concerning this column by Mr. Victor Riesel, it certainly should be a warning to our Communist-softie administration. Surely, they will awaken to this threat, and I trust that they have been reading the newspapers of late about the man whom they have so stanchly supported, known to them as Mr. Remington, formerly a prominent official in the Commerce Department.

[From the Hollywood (Calif.) Citizen-News of December 29, 1950]

PRO-REDS IN OUR WAR PLANTS

(By Victor Riesel)

Add a prayer to the wing of the B-50 bombers soon to fly our GI's high in the sky. For the supersecret "Selzyn" fire control unit was installed in these new flying forts by members of a pro-Communist union some of whose leaders have sneeringly said of the Korean War:

"Anyone with eyes can see only the hand of Wall Street in Korea—making cannon-fodder of American youth in a distinctly un-American cause. The Korean people * * * tried * * * to establish unity without a shooting war, but they were stopped by the American military government (operating as a branch of J. P. Morgan & Co.) and the so-called United Nations Commission for Korea * * * (let's) withdraw troops thrown hastily into Korea."

For years, I've monitored the Soviet world propaganda broadcasts and those words parallel almost line for line what Moscow's Red radio jams into the air waves every day.

Yet this union, the pro-Communist United Electric Workers, has its men in a score of hush-hush secret weapons departments of big plants punching out bomber fire controls, guided missiles, and jets.

A list of these departments reads like a classified military production dossier on General Marshall's desk. This pro-Stalinist union has its people in the guided missile, jet propulsion, heavily curtained "Hermes" project. Its followers work on automatic gun sights for B-36 bombers; turbogenerators for Navy vessels, where, according to CIO experts, "a slight deviation by changing the tolerances of the turbovanes" affects the machine's usefulness.

They have access to plants where control panels for aircraft carrier communications are built; where remote control turrets are put together; where electronic radar and sonar tubes and electrical equipment for aircraft bomb elevators and platform hoists are intricately woven into the very rhythmic pulsebeat of atomic-age war.

So now, let's get behind the scenes in at least one plant:

That's a secret atomic energy installation in Schenectady. There, in research laboratory Knolls I, right next to the ultra secret Knolls II, works one of this union's national leaders and shop stewards. Frequently, work for Knolls II is done in Knolls I—right under his nose. He has free access to everything—and I'm not here impugning the security system of the firm, nor the honesty and patriotism of any man. I just know that a pro-commie, whose union believes that the Soviet had nothing to do with the invasion of Korea where our GI's are being killed, works in such a plant.

Then there's an avowed commie who has drummed door to door for Daily Worker subscriptions and party petitions and has run commie meetings. He's in the maintenance division. Therefore, he has access to most of the atomic installations.

There are others, identified before congressional hearings as party members—and they can roam anywhere, including the punch-press division, often punching out highly secret feeder parts for other sections. This could be drawn on and on—with building numbers, department sections, names, and addresses listed. But the story is the same everywhere.

Now, all this is in the General Electric Co. plants. But it exists in many other heavily guarded electronic centers. Why? Most certainly the General Electric Co. (head of which is Charles Wilson, the Nation's chief mobilizer) writhes just as uncomfortably under the procommies as does the CIO's electrical union which has been exposing this critical situation.

The answer in part comes to me from a high company spokesman, who says quite bluntly that GE "follows religiously the instructions of the competent Government agencies—including the exclusion or removal of certain persons from areas of contact with secret or classified research and production."

And this spokesman, Lemuel Boulware, company vice president, says:

"Consequently we feel it may be fairly concluded that anyone criticizing the employment of alleged Communists or others nearly equally dangerous to national safety, or anyone criticizing the act of recognizing, or willingness to bargain with any union certified to any employer, is criticizing not the employer but the competent Government agencies under whose legally authorized direction the employer is operating."

Now let's hear from the Government. It's certainly the boss.

The Significant Role Played by Civil Aviation in Air Transportation in the Korean Fight Against Communism Has Proven It To Be Our Second Line of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on innumerable occasions I have spoken on the floor of the House of the necessity for these United States to achieve absolute supremacy in the air with respect to civil as well as in military aviation. In addressing the House on Thursday, November 30, 1950, I said in part:

More than ever I am convinced that the only thing which has contained the Russians to date and prevented them from outright and direct attack has been our possession of a stockpile of atom bombs and our unquestioned ability to deliver them by air with precision and with dispatch.

Air power is truly peace power. Air power is everything within our Nation that has to do with the air. It includes our aviation production line, air education, commercial transport, private flying, maintenance facilities, and research laboratories as well as all branches of the Military Establishment for Air.

Mr. Speaker, a recent joint meeting of the Rotary and the Exchange Clubs and the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Mobile was addressed by J. H. Carmichael, president of the Capital Airlines, one of the major air transport companies in these United States. In this interesting and informative talk made with respect to air transportation this distinguished airman and leader of the aviation industry graphically told of the contribution being made by the air carriers of our country in providing planes necessary for the successful operation of the Korean airlift.

In discussing this secondary line of military defense with our former colleague, the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, now executive vice president of the Air Transport Association, he informed me that the initial contribution of the airlines of this country to the Korean airlift alone had already equaled about 70 percent of the total daily service of all commercial planes used during World War II.

Mr. Ramspeck further stated that during the first 4 months of the conflict the aircraft of the scheduled carriers made 596 round trip flights across the Pacific in operating almost 37,000,000 ton miles of lift and in doing so had transported upwards of 5,600 tons of military cargo.

CAPITAL SENDS ITS PLANES

Capital Airlines placed two of its four-engine ships into the lift in July last. They were returned in November but approximately 5 weeks later they were again doing service in the Pacific. These were aircraft which were converted in the company's hangars at the Washington National Airport. Wing and fuselage tanks were installed in order to increase the fuel capacity of the C–54's—standard commercial DC–4 equipment—from 1,800 to 3,700 gallons and their range from 1,650 to 3,300 miles. Over-ocean navigation sets were installed, as well as auxiliary oil tanks.

How well I recall participating in the exercises at the time Capital Airlines began operating in Mobile in April 1948. The increased use of its splendid service, both in passenger and cargo by our people daily contributes to the ever-expanding economy of our great Southland.

Mr. Speaker, because of the splendid contribution made by civil aviation to national defense in this present emergency, I am extending my remarks and including the outstanding speech by J. H. Carmichael, president of the Capital Airlines entitled "Air Transportation—Our Second Line of Defense."

Mr. Carmichael spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and you of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, and Exchange Clubs, it is needless for me to tell you that there are those who have opposed the investment which you, through your Government, have made in the development of the present air-transport system of our country. Many of those who objected to this investment were interested in protecting some special interest. Others, with the best of intentions, were motivated by an honest conviction that Government should not participate in private enterprise. During the many years of controversy on the issue of Federal-local funds in the air-transport industry, the opposition, well-intentioned or otherwise, have made their case before the court of public opinion with words. Today the air-transport industry is making its reply with action. In every 24-hour period 101,000 pounds of vital war material reaches our fighting forces in Korea as a direct result of the participation of the air-transport industry in the Pacific airlift.

We in Capital, as part of the air-transport industry, are proud of the part we are playing in supporting the Armed Forces in the present emergency. Nothing would please me more than to tell you today about Capital Airlines, because it is the subject we know best and in which I am sure you can appreciate I am most interested. However, as there is represented here today an important segment of those who form public opinion in Mobile, I feel it incumbent to make sure that you are aware of the contribution that the air-transport industry is making to the national defense—a contribution made possible by your partnership in the development of air transportation.

BUILDING A BRIDGE OF SUPPLIES

It is not exaggeration to say that your dollars and your interest in commercial aviation are helping to build a bridge of supplies from Mobile to Korea. Perhaps you're not conscious of the job you are doing. Sometimes we go along in a work-a-day world scarcely aware of the fact that we are contributing another link in the chain of national defense.

There are certain fundamental starting points on the road to possible world peace and national security. To begin with, transportation is the keynote of all modern society and enterprise. There would be no real advancement of commerce, of standard of living, no national wealth and certainly no national defense, without our modern systems of transportation.

We cannot take for granted the existence of our finest and most efficient transportation in the world. We must appreciate the fact that we have these great water, rail, highway, and air systems only because of the initiative and daring, the investment and risk, management and labor, which are possible under our free competitive enterprise. And we have them, too, because of public support.

Your investment in your airport has made it possible to join Mobile with the other great communities of the Nation. The airport here is a link in the chain of national defense. It is part of an airport system, now numbering 6,500, that has made possible the tremendous growth of commercial aviation in this country which today is proving its worth to the Nation's security in the Korean airlift.

Let's take a look at the record and see what the commercial airlines with your support are doing to aid the Armed Forces. On June 30, 3 days after the Red aggression, the military service requested the civilian airlines to temporarily step into the breach while the Military Air Transport Service could build its forces to take over the complete job.

The Korean emergency required immediate air transportation of personnel and critical materials to the far eastern theater and later evacuation of dependents and hospital patients to the United States.

When the Reds moved across the thirty-eighth parallel, MATS had fewer than 60 four-engine planes assigned to the Pacific division. The service immediately assigned 40 additional transport planes to the Pacific division and called upon the civilian airlines for participation and support.

COMMERCIAL AIRLINES WERE READY

Three days after the military called upon the commercial airlines the first civilian carrier left the United States for the Far East.

Since then the airlines have sent 66 planes and many well-trained and experienced crewmen into action. Capital placed one of the first domestic transports into the airlift. The readying of these aircraft took priority over all other phases of our operations. Personnel operated on an around-the-clock basis to convert these airplanes for long-range military transport. The know-how of commercial air transport and its reservoir of trained manpower again backed up the military until its machinery could be geared to this emergency. This lag is the penalty we in a democracy pay.

Responding to the emergency, the commercial planes poured into the west coast with highly trained crews and began operations immediately. The military was not in a position to activate its planes with this dispatch as recent economies in the military services had skeletonized the personnel of the Military Air Transport Service of our country.

The value of this immediate availability is best evidenced by the statement made the

other day by Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, commander of the military Air Transport Service. The general revealed that the 66 commercial planes moved as much tonnage in man and matériel across the Pacific as 148 military transports of the same types. He explained that this almost 3-to-1 ratio was due to lack of trained flight personnel in the military services for this highly specialized job. The recall of 1,100 Reserve flight officers will in the near future permit the military to assume full responsibility for this operation.

When the handful of American troops in Korea were trading space for time, time was priceless. The maintenance of the American beachhead was dependent on the ability of the transport services of the Nation to produce reinforcements in men and matériel before space ran out. Air transport met this immediate need for emergency materials when it brought this theater of war within 30 hours of our production centers.

Another miracle of transportation, admittedly less spectacular, has been the mobilization of our surface carriers and shipping. All of us, I know, were thrilled and those of you coming from a great port city such as Mobile must have taken particular pride in the participation in the Inchon invasion of the armada of over 300 surface vessels. The integrated mobilization of air, surface, and water transportation in the national emergency proves conclusively that the well-being of this country is dependent on the maintenance of all forms of transportation in a sound condition.

The combined efforts of the commercial airlines and military transport planes have produced amazing results. The lift is responsible for more than 100 arrivals and departures a day at Haneda Airport outside Tokyo. Airlift pilots are flying about 200,000 pounds of strategic materials a day across 10,000 miles of ocean.

GENERAL KUTER EXPLAINS USES

General Kuter has outlined the specific value of the support given by the commercial airlines to the Korean airlift. He has given three reasons why MATS called upon civilian air transport to supplement the military.

First, the use of commercial planes permits MATS to support the global mobility of the Armed Forces and retain transport facilities to overseas bases.

Second, it enables MATS to support movements of units of the strategic air command with aircraft drawn from MATS operations in other than the Pacific area. General Kuter pointed out that MATS aircraft has carried strategic air command personnel and cargo from the home base to new locations in both the Far East and Great Britain.

Third, it enables the military to meet the airlift requirements of the far eastern theater immediately while MATS is being built up.

General Kuter commented on the commercial airlines' part in the Korean airlift in these words:

"The civil air carriers responded instantly and wholeheartedly to the emergency and they have done a magnificent job." He added that they have demonstrated they are in fact a true air transport reserve and an auxiliary to the Armed Forces.

The participation of the air transport industry was in accordance with carefully drawn plans for wartime use of civil transport facilities in the interest of national security.

Korea has provided the answer to the critics of the public investment in air transport. Public opinion is best reflected in the editorial columns of our great newspapers. The verdict of how wisely the public's money has been expended in the development of its air transport system is evidenced by this excerpt from one of our country's great newspapers:

"Once again, as happened in World War II, it has been demonstrated that the people's money, well spent in developing our vast pattern of air transport, is paying a dividend of inestimable value.

"Once again, it is being shown that the American spirit of enterprise in competition, kept vigorously in the time of peace, spontaneously becomes a source of great power when united in the common cause.

"America is very fortunate indeed, in these days of doubt and anxiety, to have at her service a versatile and devoted facility like the pilots and crews of her commercial airlines."

Korea is a localized emergency and the headlines of today show that it is being contained. However, we cannot afford to adopt an ostrich-like attitude. The forces of aggression pose their threat to world peace over all the face of the globe. Unpleasant as the thought may be, we cannot discount the possibility of world-wide upheaval.

If the small group of men in the Kremlin who make Russian policy should decide tomorrow on further aggression by force elsewhere, we may be faced with the reality of global conflict. In this event, the value of air transport would again make itself felt as it was in World War II. The contribution of the commercial airlines made toward victory in World War II have been overshadowed by the more spectacular performance of combat planes. Much of the role was entirely withheld for security reasons.

CONTRIBUTED IN WORLD WAR II

One week after Pearl Harbor the War Department called on the air transport industry for an immediate secret movement of troops. Within 5 minutes after this official notification, airlines pilots in the air were ordered to land their planes, discharge their passengers, and proceed to military installations to pick up Army troops. These were flown to a South American country where enemy action was feared. All this was done without incident and without publicity and in accordance with a plan laid down in peacetime.

Rommel was stopped in Africa with tank ammunition flown to General Montgomery in airline planes. The Japs were prevented from securing a foothold in Alaska by men and supplies flown there by planes and pilots furnished by the airlines. From these unpublicized accomplishments in the early critical days of World War II grew the tremendous contribution of the air transport industry when the airlines flew the equivalent of 26,000 times around the world, including 8,000,000,000 passenger miles, and 850,000,000 ton miles of cargo. To reduce these astronomical figures, the movement of personnel alone would be the equivalent of moving the population of Mobile seven times to London. The contribution of the airlines in World War II was made by an infant and pioneering industry. In the present war emergency, the capacity of the airlines of today is many, many times that of 1941.

Among the employees of the airlines today are thousands of veterans of the last war. They were trained for the military service at the cost of $300,000,000. It would take more than 29,000 man-hours of training to duplicate their skills. Had it not been for the utilization of this manpower by the air transport industry, these skills would have been lost.

Acting under the impetus of public opinion, Congress has been zealous in promoting civil aviation. It is through this support—your investment in airports, your patronage of the airlines, and your interest that the air transport industry is the vital force in national defense that it is today. All of us—the airlines, the public, and your Government, local as well as Federal—are partners in welding and making strong this second line of national defense. Your investment in air transport has paid another dividend in Korea.

Shortage of Aluminum, Copper, and Other Essential Materials Closing Industries and Throwing Employees Out of Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, labor organizations in my district, as well as heads of industries are complaining bitterly because aluminum, copper, and other strategic materials needed to keep men employed in industry are being shipped to foreign countries. Moreover, they are incensed when they know that these materials, so essential to our economic stability, are finding their way into Russia and Red China.

The amount of aluminum, copper, and any other materials that could keep our industries moving along in a normal pace, as well as prevent unemployment, can be found in the bulletins which I am inserting as a part of my remarks.

We are following the same line of procedure that brought about Pearl Harbor and the sacrifices that our boys had to make in the war of the Pacific in World War II. I hope that those who are wondering why there is all this shortage of essential materials will read the figures which I am submitting. I may add that already the Truman propagandists are appealing to the children of the country to save copper pennies instead of using them for the purchase of candy.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting two revealing bulletins prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters:

[From the Washington News Bulletin of December 26, 1950]

CIVILIAN USE OF COPPER TO COME UNDER NPA CONTROLS SOON

In Washington it has been announced that within the next few days controls will be slapped on the domestic use of copper, cobalt, and cadmium. It has been generally known for many months that our supplies of copper would not be adequate for civilian demands and an expanded rearmament program. During World War II, the War Production Board reporting on the use of copper in 1944, stated among other things, that under a controlled materials plan direct military and export requirements had absorbed 90, 69, and 71 percent, respectively, of the brass-mill, wire-mill, and foundry-copper and copper-base alloy products.

Recently the price of copper has advanced to 24½ cents a pound, comparable with a price of 29.19 cents the highest price in 1917.

In spite of the domestic shortages, it appears that over a long period of time it has been the policy of the European Cooperation Administration to issue procurement authorization to the Marshall plan countries for

My Brother's Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Dr. W. T. Smith, pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Peoria, Ill., entitled "My Brother's Keeper," and appearing in the January 5 issue of the Herald, published by the First Methodist Church:

MY BROTHER'S KEEPER

(By Dr. W. G. Smith)

The great debate is on. Mr. Hoover, in his now celebrated Gibraltar of the West speech, seems to have given expression to the feelings and viewpoint of many millions of American people.

Two facets of the matter stand out in importance. One involves the moral responsibility of America toward the people of Europe. The charge has been made that to follow Mr. Hoover's proposal would be to abandon people who desperately need our help. This, of course, involves the age-old question: "Am I my brother's keeper?" To which there is only one answer and that, of course, is the Christian answer. We are responsible for our brother's welfare. We are responsible, insofar as possible, for the well-being of people everywhere. And it is just as true of a nation as it is of an individual that he who seeks to save his life shall lose it and he that loses his life in sacrificial service shall find it.

But into this matter comes the question of sagacity and wisdom. What is the best way to help the people toward whom we feel a great moral responsibility? Is it to pour more men and resources, including military arms, into a part of the world where we are unable to maintain and defend them—where it is admitted that Russia can overrun them and capture them within 3 weeks if she so desires? Or is it the part of wisdom to shorten our lines, consolidate our strength, and prepare bases from which we can carry on the kind of contest for which we are best equipped?

The question also has to be faced as to the extent to which the people of Europe are ready and willing to help themselves. Thus far they have shown no vigorous interest in that phase of the matter.

The ultimate defeat of communism must be in the realm of ideology. The ideas which are embraced in and connoted by the word "Christianity" must be brought into head-on conflict with the ideas which are connoted by the word "communism." When that takes place and as that takes place, there can be no question about the gradual and final disintegration of communism.

It is for that we must strive, the while we do the so-called practical things which will prevent the maximum aggression of communism.

One other aspect of this matter deserves attention. It is rumored that Mr. Hoover's speech was made only after wide consultation with high military leaders and authorities, and that what he has said really represents their point of view, a point of view which is obviously at variance with that of the State Department and the White House. It is well known that military leaders do not express their own viewpoints. (Witness General MacArthur's recent attempt to do so.) It is their function to execute orders of their Government—

"Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die."

Mr. Hoover is not only a great statesman; he is a great Christian. He does not suggest the abandonment of the Christian philosophy or the Christian position. He rather points to the only way in which it may be possible for the Christian point of view to survive in this world.

Once again let it be said that that is realism. If there be those who care to call it isolationism, so be it.

Editorial Tributes to James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, two editorials from the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of November 21 and 23, 1950, relating to the visit to Tampa, for the purpose of addressing the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, of Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General.

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

[From the Tampa Tribune of November 21, 1950]

TODAY'S GUEST OF HONOR

Tampa, thanks to the State chamber of commerce, has as its guest of honor today a justly famous American, James A. Farley. Ever since his leadership in 1932 made Franklin D. Roosevelt the Democratic nominee and President, Mr. Farley has been both a national and international figure. His successful management of the campaigns of 1932 and 1936 stamped him as an able and resourceful party executive. He refused to go along in the third-term movement and there came a "parting of the ways" with his erstwhile political hero—but the fact remains that, but for Farley, Mr. Roosevelt probably would never have been President. All that, however, is now history. Relieved of the detail of party leadership, Mr. Farley has concerned himself with broader concepts of principle and policy.

Both his utterances and activities have been in promotion of a greater United States and a better world. Wisely conservative, he has deprecated undemocratic trends toward a socialistic state and consistently fought the advance of Communist and totalitarian ideologies and developments. In his foreign travels he has been a one-man "voice of America" whose sound advice has been heeded in many influential international circles. Tampa and Florida are happy and proud to greet and hear today "Jim" Farley, typical American.

[From the Tampa Tribune of November 23, 1950]

A SOUND THINKER

That eminent American, James A. Farley, was never on more solid ground than in his analysis of the recent election results, made in his notable address at the State chamber of commerce dinner.

Mr. Farley greeted with approval the trend shown by the election in registering the opposition of the voter to socialistic movements and proposals, to splinter parties and un-American alliances, to the political activities of labor leaders and to objectionable features of the Fair Deal. He was particularly impressive in his comments on the Truman civil-rights program.

"Most of the problems raised by the so-called civil-rights program," he said, "are gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South. The gates of economic opportunity for all races are opening wider and wider, the right to vote is spreading to all, and disorders that once resulted in lynchings have been brought under control by the States and communities. To threaten the South with drastic Federal legislation is the last way to approach these problems. And we are a long way from that last way. To pass a law, especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice. I say to those anxious people who are too ready to lift the threat of authority to leave recovery to the spirit of liberty."

More of the sound thinking evidenced by James A. Farley would serve the people well in Washington.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which was broadcast by me recently under the sponsorship of the Polish-American Congress, on the subject of justice for Poland.

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

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN)

I am happy to speak to this radio audience today under the sponsorship of the Polish-American Congress.

For many years, I have taken a special interest in the activities of Polish-American groups and organizations and in the notable contributions which these groups have made and are making to American citizenship and to the American tradition.

I am especially pleased to speak to you today on the subject of justice for Poland. There is no subject closer to the hearts of all of use who today are devoting every effort of mind and body to the great world cause of freedom, justice, and security.

Basically, of course, the question of justice for Poland cannot be separated from the question of justice for all freedom-loving peoples, both for those already under the tyrannical heel of the Kremlin, and for those threatened with such a fate. We know that justice must be won for all peoples enslaved by totalitarian regimes which exist not by the consent of the people and for the sake of the people, but by naked force for the purpose of controlling and enslaving the people.

Poland, of course, has a special claim to our consideration in the great undertaking upon which we are now engaged. Since time immemorial, the light of liberty has burned as fiercely in Poland as in any country in the world. Surrounded and overshadowed by nations historically bent on stamping out freedom and on repressing the outpourings of the human spirit, the Polish people have struggled unceasingly in behalf of freedom.

This Polish tradition of liberty found brilliant expression in the 3d of May constitution of 1791, the most democratic constitution to have been promulgated in the Old World up to that time. This constitution, expressing the genius and the tradition of the Polish people, recognized the equality of all men, proclaimed religious liberty and

established by basic law the freedoms of thought and speech. This constitution, this charter of human liberty, was promulgated in Poland on the very heels of the American and French Revolutions. Thus Poland joined with the new American Republic in enshrining in basic law the ideals of human dignity and liberty.

The association between the American Constitution and the Polish Constitution, of Polish liberty and American liberty, was not one of mere coincidence in time. Historic contributions to American independence and to victory in our war of liberation were made by Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and by other Poles less renowned, who rushed to these shores as soon as they heard the thrilling call of men to arms in the battle for liberty.

We have not forgotten, and must not forget this circumstance. The least we Americans owe to these Polish heroes is to do all we can in this dark day to bring justice and freedom to the descendants of Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and their heroic comrades.

The Polish Constitution to which I have referred did not, of course, long endure. The tyrants of Prussia, Russia, and Austria could not tolerate this bold flowering of the human spirit. They could not permit, in close proximity to their territory, the spectacle of human dignity, worth, and freedom, this cultivation of the dangerous doctrine of democracy. And so Poland was extinguished as a nation.

Not until 1918 was Poland again free. But during all those years the Polish people continued to struggle, to revolt, to endure jail, torture, and death in the high cause of freedom. Thus for more than a century, the Polish people cherished the traditions of liberty, although they knew its practices only remotely, by memory and by reference.

Today Polish-Americans in this country have a double heritage of freedom. They share in the ideals of freedom common to every American and are at the same time heirs of the magnificent Polish tradition of freedom and the dignity of man. The Polish people, like the American people, have held aloft the torch of liberty throughout the years and through the centuries.

Today that torch does not burn openly in Poland. But I am sure it burns brightly in the hearts of the vast majority of the Polish people. That flame which has survived the attempts to extinguish it by the tyrants of the past—by Catherine of Russia, Frederick of Prussia, and the Hapsburg emperors of Austria—will continue to defy the efforts of Stalin and his minions in Warsaw.

We in America believe in freedom and in independence for all the nations of the world. We have never deviated from our support of the position, first expressed as official doctrine by our great President Woodrow Wilson, that every people has the inherent right to determine its own national destiny. We believe this as firmly today as we did in 1916. And today we, as well as all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world, face the greatest threat to freedom and to our national survival we have ever known.

We are meeting that challenge. We are going to overcome the present dangers. True, these are only words. Our determination must be translated into action on many fronts, not only by the strength of our arms but by the strength of our ideas. It is and always has been my profound belief that the idea of freedom and of justice is the strongest idea ever conceived by man.

In all the history that we know, slavery has never been able to prevail over freedom. Tyranny has won temporary victories, but never the ultimate victory.

The present world challenge will require unlimited sacrifices from all of us. Victory in this struggle cannot be won by business as usual, politics as usual, or life as usual. We must be ready to struggle on every front and with every means at our disposal. But we shall prevail. I have no doubt of it.

Polish-Americans and all Americans—and all freedom-loving people everywhere—are united in a determination to dispel the black clouds of fear and aggression which now overshadow us. All of us wish to live in peace. Most nations wish, each in its own way and according to its own genius, to work out its own destiny in justice and in security.

In order to achieve a world order in which this will be possible, we must direct our every effort and our every energy toward the task of bringing freedom and justice to the world.

We shall achieve justice for Poland as we shall achieve it for all mankind.

Fewer Strikes for More People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, a most interesting editorial appeared recently in the magazine Partners, by its editor, Maurice R. Franks, who is also president of the National Labor-Management Foundation. Mr. Franks, himself a union member, presents an interesting suggestion under the heading "Fewer strikes for more people." I hope this article will lead to the presentation of an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act that will be highly beneficial both to labor and management. To assure the freedom we have enjoyed through the years, we should aim at unity and cooperation during these serious days.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FEWER STRIKES FOR MORE PEOPLE

(By Maurice R. Franks)

One of the big questions of the day is: When are all these strikes going to stop? Well I, for one, don't know when all the strikes are going to stop. I don't even believe all strikes should stop. There are occasions when strikes are highly justified. But I'm convinced that about 90 percent of the kind we suffer from today would never even start if we had a little different approach.

Some day when you have nothing else to do, you might look into a strike in progress. Talk to the strikers. Ask them their reason for hitting the bricks. I'll bet that not more than a handful will be able to give you a comprehensive answer. The fact is they simply don't know. You may ask this one and that one if he voted for the strike. Some will say "Yes"; others will say "No."

UNION MEMBERS HANDICAPPED

The simple answer to this is that a goodly number of folks on strike have no means of knowing just why they are out, and many of their fellow workers are given a poor opportunity to vote for or against a strike.

Few union halls are equipped to accommodate the entire membership. It is physically impossible for all the union members to foregather at one time. Day meetings can be attended only by night-shift workers and vice versa.

This is just one handicap. Another is that, even though it were possible to assemble the entire local membership in one hall at one time, it would still be impossible for this membership to arrive at a sensible conclusion for the simple reason that in such an environment they are given the means of hearing only one side of the story—the union's side—and that side is, quite naturally, biased.

To look for an intelligent vote on a strike issue under such conditions is just plain silly. It isn't in the cards. Until something is done that will afford the membership the opportunity to hear both sides of the story—management's as well as labor's—we can only look forward to more and more labor trouble, much of it unnecessary.

When I examine the present labor law—the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly referred to as the Taft-Hartley law—I find nothing specific in it that will enable the worker to use his analytical ability on matters affecting his very livelihood. This is a glaring deficiency in the law. For until something is done to allow union members to consider both sides of the question before casting their strike votes, one way or the other, we can hardly look forward to a greater measure of industrial peace.

A PLAN FOR IMPROVED BALLOTING

If it is legally possible, I should like to see the Taft-Hartley law amended to the point of making it mandatory that, before a strike shall be instituted, the workers involved shall be accorded full means of analyzing both sides of the controversy.

In line with this, I suggest that the law be amended to require that before a strike vote could be taken, a period of 10 days must elapse from the date the union duly files its grievance claim. This would allow the union and the employer ample opportunity to present their particular arguments on the issue at hand to the workers involved. This period would enable both parties to make their presentation on paper, which could be mailed right to the home of the worker. This would automatically give the workers an opportunity to study the full situation as it exists and to decide for themselves whether a strike is or is not called for. At home and in sober consultation with the members of his family—each one of whom very likely would be directly affected by the calling of a strike—the worker would stand a better chance of judging the total situation before casting his vote for or against a strike.

Within a reasonable period after this was done, the union would be permitted to send out a strike ballot by registered United States mail, return receipt requested, to each and every person to be affected by a strike. This ballot would be returnable to a designated post-office box accessible only to a duly authorized representative of the union, a duly authorized representative of the employer and a duly authorized representative of the National Labor Relations Board.

The mechanics of the secret ballot would operate somewhat as follows: A member would receive an envelope addressed to his home and containing instructions as to casting his ballot. These instructions would tell him to execute the ballot according to his personal desire, voting simply yes or no on the strike issue.

The marked ballot would be sealed in a blank envelope and returned in the envelope addressed to the post-office box. On the back of the envelope bearing the post-office box number would be space for the worker's original signature, thus making possible a check against the registered mail return receipts in order to establish eligibility of the ballot so returned.

The secret ballots contained in blank envelopes would have to be opened and counted

in the presence of the duly authorized representative of the union, the employer, and the NLRB.

After counting the votes in the duly authorized manner, the result of the balloting would be immediately made known through suitable notice.

If the vote is in favor of a strike, no work stoppage could yet be instituted. The law would require that a period of 50 days must elapse from the date the results of the strike are posted. This waiting period could be utilized by the disputants for the purpose of endeavoring further to resolve their differences.

UNION LEADERS MAY OBJECT

There is no doubt in my mind that this suggested plan of mine will create some controversy. Some people will assert that such a system of voting infringes upon the rights of the union worker—and especially upon the rights of the union leader. Labor bosses may put forth the argument that if such a system as this be required of the unions, it should likewise be required of all chartered organizations not coming under the Taft-Hartley Act—organizations such as the Masonic order, the Knights of Columbus, Rotary, and other clubs.

My answer to this argument is simple: Such organizations are not by their very nature expressions of economic power. They do not pull strikes or in any way injure the public. Their activities do not deprive you and me of our right to use the telephone or ride a train or street car. They don't throw picket lines around business establishments. No child, because of them, has ever been deprived of milk, no home of heat, no human body of nourishment.

This plan of mine, if enacted into law as an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, would, I believe, immediately provide the American worker with the possibility of using the powers of analysis the good Lord endowed him with. It would offer him the opportunity of carefully examining both sides of a potential strike issue in an atmosphere safely removed from the turmoil and confusion of a heated union meeting. Its immediate practical result would be fewer strikes for more people.

"American Superiority in A-Bombs, Taken Together With Our Long-Range Strategic Air Force, Probably Constitutes the Most Important Single Factor That Has Thus Far Deterred the Kremlin From Precipitating an All-Out War"—Editorial, Washington (D. C.) Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of last evening carried a most significant editorial under the heading "Russia and A-Weapons," having to do with United States Air Force superiority in the field of strategic bombing.

American, and the world's, leading military authorities have now come to regard the ability of the United States Air Force—with its long-range bombing planes land-based here at home—to deliver the atom bomb to any part of Russia as the greatest existing single determent to world-wide war.

Mr. Speaker, time, however, is now running out.

It is nearly 2 years since the Air Force brought the B–36 bomber into production. In the meantime, we have seen better weapons, as well as tactics, worked out for the defense of our country, and—it is only prudent to assume that the Russian Communists have also made improvements in both their offensive and defensive weapons and tactics.

I was glad to see the dispatch with which this House voted the new $20,000,000,000 supplemental appropriations for defense, and hope and pray that, in what appears today to be normal America—"doing business as usual"—the workers in the defense plants and on production lines will not forget that the country now stands on the brink of imminent and all-out global warfare.

The passage of increased appropriations for military defense by the Congress will not meet the situation. Neither will it be met by enacting "material controls" or "wage and hour controls"—necessary as these might be.

The only one answer to this problem—is the increased production of all materials necessary to prosecute modern war against Russia and all of her satellites, plus an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force, of sufficient strength to insure our defenses— with or without the benefit of any help whatever from the United Nations or any other source whatever.

Let us speed defense production on every industrial front.

It is because of the timeliness and logic of the editorial clipped from the Washington Star of yesterday that I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial reads as follows:

RUSSIA AND A-WEAPONS

It is a reasonably safe assumption that the United States still maintains a large lead over the Soviet Union in the field of atomic weapons, both as regards quantity and quality. As far as the immediate world situation is concerned, this particular American superiority—taken together with our long-range strategic air force—probably constitutes the most important single factor that has thus far deterred the Kremlin from committing an act of aggression direct and heinous enough to precipitate an all-out war calling for instantaneous and massive counterattack from us.

But how long will that deterrent really serve to deter? No one can be sure of the answer. The only thing anybody can be sure of is that there is not the slightest reason for complacency on the part of our own country or the rest of the free world. For the fact is that time is not on our side in this matter. As pointed out to the Senate Appropriations Committee by Chairman Gordon Dean, of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Russians undoubtedly are making an intensive effort to produce a big stockpile of A-weapons as fast as possible; nor would it be sensible to suppose that they are not capable of doing so. Further than that—and the authority for this statement is the distinguished Dr. Vannevar Bush, chief of our wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development—we should regard it pretty much as a certainty that they have been sparing no effort to develop radar, anti-aircraft artillery, jet-plane interception and ground-to-air guided missiles along lines calculated to nullify whatever counterattacking superiority we may have at the present moment.

In other words, in terms of their ability both to deliver atomic attacks on American cities and to defend themselves from such attacks by us, the Russians are not letting the grass grow under their feet. As time passes, they are growing stronger and stronger in this respect, although now they may be highly vulnerable. It would be folly of the worst kind to assume otherwise. In quantity and quality, our arsenal of A-weapons may continue to be far superior to theirs, but this is a field in which the margin of superiority—after the competitors reach a certain point—tend to diminish in significance. Our military preparedness and strategy must be governed accordingly.

Lobbying: Its Nature, History, and Causes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the December 1950 issue of Rural Electrification magazine.

The article is as follows:

LOBBYING: ITS NATURE, HISTORY, AND CAUSES

(By Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, United States Representative, Pennsylvania, chairman, House Committee on Lobbying)

"It should be remembered that the advantage will always lie with those interests which are best organized, best financed, and have the easiest access to radio, newspapers, and other mass media. For this reason, organized business has always gained the most from lobbying because it had all these requirements. Organized business has had another advantage. It has sought to prevent rather than encourage action by popular government and it is far easier to obstruct legislative processes than it is to create."

In a democracy, it is essential that individuals or factions have some lawful means by which they can lay their needs before their government. At core, the purpose of any free government, as opposed to that of totalitarian rule, is that people should be able to reach it; and at core, the purpose of what is called lobbying is that they should be able to reach their government with maximum impact and possibility of success. This, then, is basically what lobbying is.

For the past 100 years, the term "lobbying" has been in common use, and during that time the term has been given many definitions. Eighty years ago, "lobbying" meant direct, private pressure on legislators, and the word had a corrupt sound. Lobbying in the 1880's demanded this kind of definition but lobbying in the 1950's requires a new one.

DEFINITIONS DON'T FIT

The reason most present-day definitions don't fit is that they fail to recognize that modern pressure on legislative bodies is corrupt only in extremely rare cases, that it is, moreover, not direct but indirect, and that by and large it is the effort of a group rather than individual effort.

To our kind of government, lobbying is as natural as breathing is to the human being, and just about as complex. With so many voices with conflicting views clamoring to

be heard, the only means of securing a full hearing has been constantly to devise new methods and techniques by which the views of one group can be presented more effectively than those of that group's competitors. Thus, vigorous competition has made the science of lobbying an ever-developing profession.

For while modern-day lobbying is being streamlined with new techniques and methods being added, the old ones are not being abandoned. As an example, buttonholing of legislators by direct contact is still common practice. Groups, as well as individuals, very properly seek to acquaint legislators directly with their views on public issues.

But the present-day variations on this old theme of buttonholing a legislator are without end. Lobbying practice today has some groups making their views known by letters, telegrams, and phone calls. While some depend largely on personal contact with Members of Congress, still others think that they can best depict their particular cause of informing Congress by organizing delegations for marching in groups on that legislative body.

From the individual congressional side, Members are quite accustomed to being sought out not only in their offices, in the corridors of the office buildings, in their homes, but also in the cloakrooms and restaurants of the Capitol itself. Their attitude toward these approaches is realistic. They wish to be informed of all sides in a public issue, not only from constituents but from those outside their districts as well, so they welcome letters, telegrams, and telephone calls on a pending legislative matter. In an age where the actions of Congress directly affect the lives of so many congressional members are aware that these means of communications from the public at large constitute the lifelines, as well as the pipelines, of our kind of representative government.

HEARINGS DISPEL SUSPICION

And with the institution of open committee hearings in 1911, much of the suspected skullduggery on committee members by the old lobby barons, was banished. As in all democratic processes, open hearings dispel suspicion of bribery of committee members and at the same time affect the appeals of a lobbyist testifying before such a committee, where he would and is obliged, in the glare of the public scrutiny, to argue largely on merit.

Today, organized lobby groups perform a service function in many different forms to Members of Congress. As a first example of this service, lobbies furnish, in presenting their own views before congressional committees, the very raw material needed for representative legislative action. What human being serving as an elected Member of Congress, could be informed on all phases of the many questions of public interest that come before that body in the course of even a single session?

But in addition to the information services organized lobby groups give Congress on public issues, they perform other services. In the drafting of bills and amendments to bills, the preparation of speeches and other materials for Members, lobby groups perform not only a high service to the legislative process but further their own ends as well.

CAUSES EXPLORED

In the final analysis, lobbying remains a very practical problem with a number of very practical causes. First among these very practical causes is our splendid tradition of free assembly. We Americans are free to band together when and where we choose by constitutional guaranty. This tradition of free association has provided the essential materials from which our present system of lobbying has been built.

SYSTEM CALLED COMPLEX

Our system of government is, of necessity, complex with its separations of powers and this has also contributed to the growth of lobbying. We have all heard of the bottlenecks existent in government. But what is not generally known is that it is to these bottlenecks that pressure can be quietly and effectively applied. By research into the subject it was discovered that the aim of most lobbies is the prevention of governmental action and for that reason pressure exerted at every critical spot—such as a bottleneck—has meant a relatively easy amount of success for the lobbies under these circumstances.

Finally, lobbying has reached its present stature because our Government has always been sensitive to private demands. One piece of special pleading bred another with the result that the entire system of special interests has developed.

The theory that special interests applying pressure to Congress will cancel out another such group has been disproved. Instead it appears that rather than canceling out, the pressures on government have been piling up. Today there are 2,300 registered lobbyists and approximately 200 organizations filing financial reports under the Lobbying Act.

ADVANTAGE DESCRIBED

In addition, it should be remembered that the advantage will always lie with those interests which are best organized, best financed, and have the easiest access to radio, newspapers, and other mass media. For this reason, organized business has always gained the most from lobbying because it had all these requirements. Organized business has had another advantage. It has sought to prevent rather than encourage action by popular government and it is far easier to obstruct legislative processes than it is to create.

But it is not conceivable that responsible public policy would result if government yielded only to the strongest pressure. There remain today several vital questions concerning lobbies. What of those, which serve as a "front" for other groups whose true contributors are not always known? And what of those lobbies which spend large sums of money to influence elections?

RESPONSIBILITY NEEDED

Absolute responsiveness to group interests is part of our Government. But truly responsible representative government is quite another thing indeed.

While lobbying is natural in our system of government and should not be curbed, the outer limits beyond which lobbying is an offense against the welfare of the whole community have not begun to be charted.

Resolve To Go All Out for Freedom in 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, of Monday, January 1, 1951. This editorial was written by Jack Gore, the editor, who will be remembered as the writer of an editorial placed in the RECORD last year, Let's Remember the Sea Gulls.

The following editorial entitled "Resolve To Go All Out for Freedom in 1951" is timely and most convincing and I recommend it to the consideration of not only the Members of the Congress but to all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It will also be remembered that the Fort Lauderdale Daily News published a booklet containing a number of editorials and which was distributed to some of the Members of Congress. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

RESOLVE TO GO ALL OUT FOR FREEDOM IN 1951

What we American must resolve this New Year's day is abundantly clear. We must make ourselves as strong militarily as our resources in men and material will allow. For only in the full marshalling of our strength is there any hope of peace.

We must not quail at the hard sacrifices this task will impose upon us. No sacrifice, even that of our lives, is too great to make to save our liberties. Should the moment ever come when we would rather have bread than freedom, then our great advanture in human endeavor will be over.

We cannot thus abandon the field to the barabaric, unmoral totalitarians who today wear the dress of communism but are still the tyrants of old. We cannot forsake all that America has built, all that western civilization has been moving toward for centuries.

We must stand here, where we are. And we must stand now. To wait longer might mean we will never be able to stand against the force that could be arrayed opposite us.

It seems cruelly unfair that with the expenditure of so must treasure and so much blood in World War II, we were able to buy so litle peace and happiness. Five short years, years of booming prosperity to be sure, but years marred by the dislocations of a war just ended and the fears of another that could start at a dictator's whim.

This may seem small recompense indeed for great sacrifices already made. But it must not be forgotten that we did save our freedom. We are not today the slaves of Hitler and Mussolini.

If we and all others in the free world are not to become the slaves of Stalin, we therefore must plunge ahead and do again—on a bigger scale—all the onerous and painful tasks that together spell the preservation of liberty.

None can escape this responsibility, nor tell himself his energy and ability are not required. Total effort is needed.

The quality of a nation's life is always measured by the sum of millions of individual contributions to its well-being. Nothing is lost in this accounting. Never is this more true or more meaningful than when a country is struggling, as ours now is, for its very survival.

Yuletide Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the spe-

cial Christmas column written by A. L. Shultz, long-time political and feature writer and columnist of my State.

This article appeared in a host of Kansas newspapers and carries a message as well as a challenge for all of us at the beginning of this new legislative year.

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

TOPEKA, KANS., December 20.—Yuletide prayers will be on millions of trembling lips throughout this usually happy holiday time in fervent supplication for deliverance from the chaos that threatens our beloved land and cherished heritage.

In all this Nation there is somber, serious meditation. It has supplanted the spirit of traditional Christmas cheer in the hearts of mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters everywhere. They sense an impending national tragedy. They are aware of the threatened loss of things they hold dear. Instinctively, dulled senses warn that for all practical purposes of sound leadership, Government in Washington has fallen apart.

This isn't anything new. Evidences of decay and deterioration have been increasingly apparent for months. Not until the walls of public confidence in Washington buckled and collapsed was there general awareness of the seriousness of it all.

Now there is a stark, barren spectacle of impending ruin. It is a horrible holiday thought. You don't like it. Nobody likes it. Yet at the approach to the new year, it is time for people to speak calmly, frankly, and truthfully to themselves and to each other. Never in the history of God-fearing people was tragedy displayed more starkly at an hour which so significantly calls for supplication for deliverance fror impending catastrophe—possibly destruction of civilization itself.

In the hearts and minds of people everywhere there is sudden realization that small men have been called to great tasks for which they are not trained or equipped. There is awareness that selfish, greedy individuals with lust for position and power hold personal ambitions above the welfare of their country. Much of the failure should be charged to sheer ignorance and inability to appraise grave problems. It is all glaringly apparent now.

Tragic days in Korea brought the true story to every community in the land. Lives of American boys sacrificed in frozen passes in a strange land spelled the price of stupid mismanagement of our foreign affairs. Swaggering, self-satisfied, incompetent subordinates executed decrees of power-drunk policy makers. A supine public selected this leadership. All too late there is realization of the betrayal of that trust—through ignorance rather than design—perhaps. Yet the cost is the same.

Something in the indomitable faith and courage of the average American reflects a confidence that there still is opportunity to regain the world prestige and high standing which has been undermined. This awakening makes crystal clear that the men guilty of tragic bungling in Washington are not now capable of leading the country out of danger. Maybe through divine direction and a surge of public determination, the path to a new future may be opened. At this Christmas season and the turn of the year, millions of people will pray that the deliverance, which today seems so far away, may still be within reach.

There is one hope, maybe one hope alone. It is in the leadership of the new Congress which assembles in a few days. Solemn, serious acceptance of responsibility to stop this mad plunge to disaster may produce new, inspired, and capable men in this hour of danger. Those men who meet in Washington to write the Nation's laws face opportunity and responsibility. They alone can restore the heritage of honest, capable, courageous, and unselfish National Government. Those men can perform the miracle that will save America.

This column is in the same boat with 150,000,000 other citizens. We are bewildered and confused. In facing the impending crisis, we appealed for words of wisdom and the benefits of sound thinking by a man whose contacts throughout the Nation and around the world make possible a profound understanding of existing problems. A few paragraphs from his letter seem deeply appropriate.

"We are probably confronted with the greatest crisis in our national history," this man wrote in a summary that was free from rancor, but candidly tinged with a despair that burned at his heart. "The executive branch of our Government is in a state of almost complete collapse. What they will do through ignorance and viciousness, only God knows."

Then, in clear, thinking appraisal of possible remedies, such as only a man of great wisdom and deep understanding can offer, he added:

"Obviously, the key to the solution of all our ills depends on the Congress taking back its powers and assuming its responsibilities. It is absurd to vote vast sums of money to the administration without Congress being organized to supervise the expenditures. Congress is made up of 531 men, mostly well-meaning, but totally uninformed. The administration merely takes their money, is devoid of any sense of responsibility toward the Congress, and tells them to go to hell when they ask for information. The whole thing is just nuts."

There is no question as to congressional authority. But Congress must reclaim the things which once were that body's accepted prerogatives. It must hold those privileges high. Ruthless abuse of authority must never again occur under the White House roof. Secret agreements, trade pacts, and military and financial commitments must never again be made with foreign powers without congressional sanction. Congress which surrendered its authority, must reclaim its rights. It may have to fight for them, but an outraged and awakened America will be behind those 531 men and women. If they don't restore to themselves the right to safeguard against pillaging of human liberty and the economic stability of the Nation, the ideals of a great America are lost. That tremendous, but not impossible, responsibility will be on the shoulders of the new Congress which convenes almost with the turn of the year.

Keenly aware of the fact that freedom and economic security go hand-in-hand, this very clear thinking friend supplies another thought. This new Congress, he points out, may properly and wisely, set aside 2 percent of its appropriations for a screening of Government spending. Experts in all the fields of Government endeavor should be independently retained to supervise expenses—even to and including the military. That staff of commercial and financial experts would become the scrutinizing eyes of Congress.

Surely there is a way out of this dilemma. National collapse is no mere phrase with which to frighten voters and taxpayers. We are on the verge of it. Never since the days of Valley Forge has the Nation's future been so dark. It is this realization of impending calamity that will bring millions of holiday supplications for deliverance. The hope of salvation depends on the courage, clear thinking, and patriotic leadership of representatives of the people themselves—the new Congress.

Iowa Was a Better Place to Live in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bulletin of the Iowa Development Commission:

IOWA WAS A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE IN 1950

Life was a little better in Iowa, in 1950.

On the surface, it looked about the same. Babies were born, youngsters trudged to school, young couples were married and some of them divorced, paydays came as frequently as they ever do, people bought homes and cars and farm equipment. Life went on much as it always has.

But life was a little better than usual, it appears in the summing up.

More babies were born in Iowa, this year—680 more than last year, and 2,000 more than the year before. An estimated 63,577 infants joined the Iowa population during 1950. The 1949 and 1950 birth rates were 24.2 babies born per thousand population; 1948 births were 23 7 per 1,000 population.

The 1950 Iowa babies had a better chance to live through the dangerous first year of their lives, too. Iowa's infant mortality rate runs about 20 percent below the national average, and it dropped still another notch in 1950. Of every 2,000 babies born in Iowa, 1,953 happily celebrated their first birthday in 1950.

More Iowa youngsters went to school in 1950, but fewer of them trudged. Some 477,720 Iowans between 5 and 18 years of age were in public schools this year—an increase of 2½ percent. Six and a half percent more country pupils were riding school buses to town or consolidated schools—67,586 this year, compared to 63,318 last year. And at least 10 percent more were eating hot lunches at school: Nearly 1,000 Iowa schools are serving hot lunches to some 137,500 pupils this winter.

Cupid was out-batting the gremlins in Iowa marriages, in 1950. An estimated 26,732 couples took out Iowa licenses to love and to cherish, this year—1,200 more than in 1949. Only 5,195 couples took their troubles to the divorce judge—250 fewer than in the year before.

Paydays were no closer than usual, in 1950, but they came more regularly and the paychecks were bigger. Unemployment dropped to a 2-year low, and the average weekly paycheck was the biggest on record, in October of 1950. Average factory wage in Iowa, for instance, rose to $1.40 an hour, and employees put in an hour or two overtime, most weeks, to give them an average paycheck of $59.26.

More Iowans were becoming homeowners, in 1950. Sixteen thousand more residents filed for homestead exemption in 1950 than in 1949—475,122 of our citizens now hold deeds to their homes.

More Iowans owned automobiles, too. Motor vehicle registrations topped the million mark in Iowa in 1950, and by the end of the year totaled 1,193,000. Of them, 878,606 were passenger cars, and more than 129,000 had been purchased in 1950.

As usual, Iowa farms were the most mechanized in 1950. Iowa continued to rank first in the number of tractors and other labor-saving farm equipment.

And while life was a little better in Iowa in 1950, it was also a litle longer. Iowans departing this life in 1950 averaged nearly 72 years of age, and had enjoyed at least

2 years more life than their friends who preceded them in 1950. Iowans can now look forward to a longer life than the residents of 44 other States—from 2½ to 3 years longer than the Nation-wide average.

IOWA GAINED A NEW INDUSTRY FOR EACH WEEK OF 1950

Iowa gained 52 new industries during 1950, the Iowa Development Commission announced this week, in summing up the year's activities.

Six hundred Iowa cities and towns now have industrial plants to help balance their surrounding agriculture, the Commission said.

Two years ago, when the last industrial survey was made, 566 Iowa cities and towns could boast industries.

This geographic spread of industry through Iowa is an indication of the continuing growth of manufacturing in the Tall Corn State.

Some 3,500 more Iowans went to work in industrial plants in 1950. In 1949, the number of industrial workers averaged 144,512. For the first 10 months of 1950, the average was more than 148,000. In October, the latest month so far reported, 149,400 Iowans were employed in industry.

Weekly payrolls in industry grew to $8,853,444 by October of 1950. The year previous, industrial payrolls were running $300,000 less: $8,532,523. Ten years ago, the weekly payroll in Iowa industry was $2,380,000.

Proof of the value of industry to a community came with the 1950 census. Ten industrial counties gained 89,000 resident population, which was 6,000 more than the 83,000 gain reported for the entire state. The 10 counties and their gains were: Polk, 24,844; Linn, 13,095; Scott, 13,369; Black Hawk, 16,565; Clinton, 4,714; Webster, 2,597; Pottawattamie, 2,617; Dubuque, 4,655; Wapello, 2,364; Des Moines, 4,252.

According to the 1950 survey of industrial plants, those counties have a total of 1,375 industrial plants. The breakdown: Polk, 371; Linn, 189; Scott, 140; Black Hawk, 152; Clinton, 81; Webster, 75; Pottawattamie, 87; Dubuque, 142; Wapello, 65; Des Moines, 73.

IOWA BUSINESS SETS RECORDS IN 1950; RETAIL SALES $100,000,000 OVER 1949

Nineteen hundred and fifty was a bustling year for Iowa business, the Iowa Development Commission commented today.

As the midcentury year was closing, it looked as if retail sales would be from $110,000,000 to $115,000,000 ahead of 1949's record volume. Bank debits (transactions by check) were running 9.5 percent larger than in 1949. Life-insurance sales were the largest in Iowa history—11 percent above the average of the previous 5 years.

Construction in Iowa was adding up to 27 percent more than last year, and seemed likely to top 1948's record. Cash farm income was expected to surpass the 1949 total. Earnings in industry—both by employees and owners—were at an all-time high.

Iowa merchants' cash registers rang up $2,774,000,000 in the first 11 months of 1950, according to computations by the development commission's statistical staff. This total was $51,765,000 better than Iowa business in the same period last year.

In addition, Iowans bought $447,000,000 worth of merchandise outside the State—$50,000,000 more than in 1949.

The 11-month totals showed 1950 business $102,000,000 better than 1949, in Iowa. Christmas sales were expected to boost the differences somewhere over $110,000,000.

Sales-tax collections through November of 1950 totaled $49,653,589, an increase of a million and a half dollars, and 3 percent, over the same 11 months in 1949. Use-tax collections were $8,942,434, a million dollars and 12.6 percent above 1949.

Life insurance sales—a good sign that Iowans have money to save—were running 8 percent above the 1949 volume, which totaled $443,000,000. At best guess, 1950 sales were expected to top the 1947 record of $463,000,000. Life insurance sales in Iowa have been steadily increasing the last 35 years from a volume of $76,722,000 in 1914. Iowans now have $3,250,000,000 worth of life insurance in force.

In the first 10 months of 1950, Iowans spent more than twice as much on new houses—112 percent more than the 1949 10-month total. New industrial building added up to 33 percent more than 1949, in the same 10 months. All construction was 27 percent ahead of 1949, and was holding a lead over 1948, in which building activities set a record in Iowa.

Iowa had an undisputed lead in the annual farm-income race, as 1950 drew to a close. After finishing second in 1948 and a close third in 1949, Iowa farmers took an early lead in 1950 and maintained it through third-quarter reports. Iowa topped the billion-dollar mark in farm income at the end of 7 months. At the end of September, Iowa farm pocketbooks held $1,413,758. This was slightly below total income for the first 9 months of 1949, but economists expect better farm prices in the last quarter to push the 1950 total ahead of 1949. If Iowa's 1950 farm income is more than two billion, as anticipated, it will be the fourth straight year in that bracket.

IOWA IN THE 1950 HEADLINES—A BRIEF REVIEW OF FOOTPRINTS ON THE ECONOMIC SANDS

Iowa stepped into second place in farm machinery manufacture: Iowa factories turned out more than a quarter million dollars worth of farm equipment.

Best customers in United States grow on Iowa farms: In 72 of Iowa's 99 counties farm families spend $12,000,000 or more a year. That is the heaviest concentration of top-spending counties in any one State.

Iowa dominates export of hybrid corn: More than 400,000 bushels of seed corn from Iowa exporters was planted in Europe this year. Seedsmen said that is easily nine-tenths of the total export.

Iowa's not the range, but it's the cattle country: Iowans found they feed and sell more cattle than any other State and realize more income from beef.

Iowa a "white" State in unemployment map: Iowa's unemployment average dropped to 2 percent and less, while the national average was running 5 to 7 percent of all those employed. Iowa's variety of employment deserves the credit.

Farm income averages from $4.50 to $5 a month per acre: Iowa's total cash farm income, divided by number of acres under cultivation, revealed acre earnings of from $54 to $60 per year.

Iowa industries pay $5,000,000 a year in taxes: Iowa cities and towns have $5,000,000 more tax money each year from the $200,000,000 capital investment made by Iowa's 350 new postwar industries.

Iowa's highways on pay-as-you-go financing: Last of Iowa's primary road bonds were retired November 1. Iowa now is operating on a $60,000,000 a year road fund out of current tax income.

Iowa manufacturing grew 50 percent in 10 years: Iowa factories are employing more than 148,000 Iowans; 160 percent as many as in 1939 and 152 percent as many as in 1940. About one-fourth of all workers outside agriculture are now in industry.

Iowa leads the meat-packing field: Iowa packers handled 11.7 percent of all meat animals slaughtered in the United States through October of 1950.

Prejudiced Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of Max Lowenthal's book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, written by N. J. L. Pieper, entitled "Prejudiced Smear," and appearing in the December 23, 1950, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature.

Mr. Pieper was head of the San Francisco field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during World War II when I worked out of that office in the Counter-Espionage Division. He was my boss then and I still hold him in highest respect for his past accomplishments and for the work he is carrying on this very day. I know that you will enjoy reading Mr. Pieper's review as he expresses very well the feelings of those who really know what the Federal Bureau of Investigation stands for. The review follows:

PREJUDICED SMEAR

(By N. J. L. Pieper)

Biased, slanted, and patently prejudiced, Max Lowenthal's book is a base smear. It is the antithesis of an objective picture of the FBI by an author conservative in the most profound sense as heralded by his publishers.

Belaboring the FBI for imaginary violations of civil liberties for its alleged failure to protect the American people from spies, saboteurs, and criminals Lowenthal would have his readers believe the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover, guilty of dire acts, either by omission or commission. In his treatment of the FBI the author employs the technique of selecting quotes from public sources which best suit his own purpose but ignore the real record of the FBI and its accomplishments—accomplishments so sound and extensive that even the most prejudiced FBI-hater would admit them to be above question or reproach.

Lowenthal devotes two-thirds of his book to the Department of Justice's Investigative Unit from 1908 through 1924. This is all before Mr. Hoover became director. Yet Lowenthal implies that the activities of these years were chargeable to Mr. Hoover and G-men of present-day stature.

Lowenthal's misuse of numerous quotations from a great variety of sources—speeches, congressional committee hearings, and news clips—would have one believe that here is a factual picture of the FBI. Lowenthal must know that his tricky placement of material out of context, omissions of qualifying sentences or statements, even his padded reference pages, have had to be so presented to get over an implication where truth would not sustain his insinuations and accusations.

To answer the distortions of fact, half truths, false representations and inaccuracies in the book would require a new book. Let us, however, consider briefly the following examples.

Lowenthal dwells at great length on the Palmer raids, attempting to create the false impression that Mr. Hoover was responsible. A Senate Judiciary Committee absolved Mr. Hoover of any responsibility. Attorney General Harlan Stone, later Chief Justice,

was one of the first to denounce the Palmer raids. It will be recalled that the Palmer raids occurred in 1919–20. Mr. Hoover was then only a special assistant to the Attorney General and was not assigned to the Bureau until 1921. He was named Director by Attorney General Stone in 1924. Had he felt that Mr. Hoover was accountable for the raids it is hard to conceive that the late Chief Justice Stone would have named him Director as he did.

Criticism of the manner in which arrests were made in the Detroit recruiting groups of Spanish loyalists gets considerable space. Notably omitted, however, is Attorney General (now Justice) Jackson's statement after investigation that the FBI had violated no civil liberties.

There is perhaps no greater authority on civil liberties in this country than Morris L. Ernst, who has appeared as counsel for the Civil Liberties Union in many important cases. One need but read Mr. Ernst's article published in the December Reader's Digest to see why Lowenthal avoids quoting this authoritative source.

Lowenthal makes a cheap implication when he holds out that the FBI wants to tap wires because it is too lazy to do its investigative work. He cites a California kidnaping. The facts here are clear in my mind. I was responsible for handling this case. The kidnaper was apprehended and the child was returned unharmed, because no single effort was spared. I asked Mr. Hoover for authority to monitor the telephone. Mr. Hoover went immediately to Attorney General Jackson. Here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoting Representative Hobbs, of Alabama: "Our great Attorney General did not hesitate. He immediately authorized the interception of the call. He assumed full responsibility."

Should the possibility of a solution by wire-tapping have been ignored in this case? Would a parent agree with Lowenthal? He makes so much of wire-tapping. Let us consider it. The FBI does not make policy; its job is fact-finding. The President and Attorney General make policy. The FBI's wire-tapping policy was established by Franklin D. Roosevelt in a 1940 directive, wherein he authorized and directed in such cases as the Attorney General might approve the use of wire-tapping in instances involving internal security. Attorneys General Jackson, Biddle, Clark, and McGrath have since adhered to this policy, which was reaffirmed by President Truman after he entered the White House. Some lawyers who should know better, including Lowenthal, raise the issue of illegality in the interception of telephone calls. Mr. Justice Jackson when he was Attorney General, in a widely published statement of March 20, 1941, stated: "There is no Federal statute which prohibits or punishes wire-tapping alone. * * * The courts do not stop people from tapping wires—no one has ever been or under present law could be convicted of that by itself. What has been stopped is the use of the evidence to enforce the laws against criminals."

The FBI has never attempted to conceal that it taps telephones. But each installation must be authorized by the Attorney General; the authority does not rest with the FBI. Its wire-tapping is not indiscriminate, and evidence obtained in this manner is not used in court. Lowenthal would have the reader believe differently, as would other critics of the FBI.

No one has fought harder against a national police than J. Edgar Hoover, yet Lowenthal falsely and without justification accuses him of aspiring to head such an organization. In May 1950 Mr. Hoover described the Communists as the most dangerous and one of the most powerful forces in the United States. But, says Lowenthal, "some informed authorities believe otherwise today as in the past." Events refute them.

After reading this book no fair-minded person can but ask the question: Why? Why should any individual write this way? What would impel someone to go so far from truth to smear another individual or organization, and why, as has been charged on the floor of Congress, should the author level his smear in 1950 as we are arming to repel communism?

I shall not answer that question, but the author raises one that I will answer: is the FBI "good enough, right enough, efficient enough to carry out its job?" It is.

A Bill To Outlaw the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me today and letters with regard thereto:

A bill to outlaw the Communist Party

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of the approval of this act it shall be unlawful for any individual knowingly and willfully to become or remain a member of the Communist Party. As used in this section, the term "Communist Party" means the political party now known as the Communist Party of the United States of America, whether or not any change is hereafter made in such name.

SEC. 2. Any alien who is found to be a member of the Communist Party shall, without delay, be taken into custody and deported from the United States.

SEC. 3. Whoever violates any provision of the first section of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., December 20, 1950.

Re H. R. 3290, Eighty-first Congress.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: The fifty-first national encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Chicago, Ill., August 27 to September 1, 1950, endorsed the provisions of H. R. 3290, Eighty-first Congress, copy of which is enclosed.

It is hoped you will reintroduce this bill when the Eighty-second Congress convenes and should you find that our organization can be of assistance toward its advancement, please feel free to call upon us.

With best wishes for a happy holiday season, I am

Sincerely yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

JANUARY 2, 1951.

Director OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COMMANDER: I am very grateful to you for your letter of December 20, endorsing the provisions of H. R. 3290 as introduced by me in the Eighty-first Congress. It is my purpose to reintroduce this bill in the Eighty-second Congress.

Let me commend you and your associates upon the splendid work you are doing and ask that you call upon me for any special service that I may render.

Very respectfully,
JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Address of Mr. B. M. McKelway at Welcome to Washington Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by B. M. McKelway at the Welcome to Washington dinner, January 4, 1951, Statler Hotel:

The opportunity within grasp of a speaker on this occasion is unique. It finds no duplicate anywhere in the world.

The opportunity is one that permits an ordinary, taxpaying citizen to address an audience which gains its distinction from the presence of so many newly elected and returning Members of a new Congress of the United States.

Many of these Members are fresh from triumphs won at the polls. They come bearing new mandates from the people. They come to assume awesome responsibilities of government, in a time of great trial.

It is possible that this prospect places them in a humble mood, a mood from which no doubt they will quickly recover, but which may make them momentarily receptive to advice.

In these circumstances, ladies and gentlemen, the temptations of a speaker are well-nigh overpowering. There you sit. Here I stand. There are available to you none of those wisely conceived provisions of parliamentary rule by which you can stop the speaker. You cannot note the absence of a quorum and demand a roll call. You cannot request that I yield. I have you, in other words, in a position that any one of millions of citizens of this country would pay a king's ransom to obtain.

Please take note, therefore, of the extent of the speaker's forbearance in sticking to the pleasant role with which he has been honored.

It is the role of one who, in behalf of citizens of the District of Columbia and the members of the Washington Board of Trade, congratulates you upon the discriminating judgment of the electorate and welcomes you to this, your own, city.

This role permits of no admonitions, no advice. We have no favors to ask, no projects to promote, and nothing to sell. What we hope for is your friendship, your understanding, your interest in the wise conduct of a local government of which, under our Constitution, you are exclusive legislative trustees. And what we look for is an opportunity to be of service to you as neighbors who share with you residence in our Nation's Capital.

You come to a city where, as Members of Congress, our local legislature, you are held in high respect. As citizens, with unexcelled opportunity to observe at close range the workings of Congress, we have developed a genuine appreciation of your problems, your labors, your methods, and the conscientious

effort that underlies great legislative achievement.

If we at times seem indifferent, or even apathetic to the changing tides of political sentiment so quickly reflected in the changing personnel of Congress, it is because we have learned the curiously repetitive patterns of history.

We have learned to recover quickly from our grief at the defeat of old friends, for we know that the ultimate wisdom of the people will either send them back or provide substitutes in the form of new friends.

We have, likewise, learned to restrain our enthusiasm when that same wisdom of the people removes from Congress an occasional thorn in the side of the body politic; for we have learned that with every change of season, nature provides new thorns.

Every 2 years we stand here on the sidelines—silent witnesses to the phenomenon of a national election, and await the result with fatalistic fortitude.

We read the returns, we say to ourselves: "What hath God wrought!" And with this reverent ejaculation bid farewell to old faces and warm welcome to those who return or who, for the first time, have won their spurs in free and fair elections.

Experience has taught us that the people send good men and women, by and large, to Congress, men and women above the average in intelligence, accomplishment, and in their jealous regard for the public welfare and the institutions established to advance it.

Our experience, in this connection, goes back a long way in the life of our Nation, however brief it may be in the history of the world.

Last summer we passed the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the decision by Congress, reached on July 16, 1790, to establish in this area a seat of government, under exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress. It was a close decision, reached by the narrow margin of 32 to 29 in the House and 14 to 12 in the Senate. But it was a decision that held. And 10 years later Congress came to Washington.

Just a few weeks ago we passed the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that first meeting of Congress in Washington. On that day, November 22, 1800, 138 members of the second session of the sixth Congress met for the first time in the new Capitol. Only a part of the Capitol building had been made ready for this event.

Members of that Congress lacked such bare necessities of life in legislative Halls as foam rubber cushioned seats, the soft glow of indirect lighting, the man-made miracle of regulated accoustics and the g'amour imparted by graceful draperies of fetching hue, hung from roofs that fabricated steel will not permit to fall down on the heads of those below.

President John Adams, who welcomed this Congress to Washington doubtless had this in mind when he said with prophetic optimism: "Although there is cause to apprehend that accommodations are not now so complete as might be wished, yet there is great reason to believe that this inconvenience will cease."

Ladies and gentlemen, those of you who have visited the newly decorated Chambers of House and Senate so recently prepared for your illustrious presence will agree, I believe, that inconvenience has indeed ceased. Period.

President Adams left to the Members of this Congress decision whether they would immediately exercise the powers over the District of Columbia vested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States.

"If in your opinion," he said, "this important trust ought now to be exercised, you cannot fail, while performing it, to take into view the future probable situation of the Territory for the happiness of which you are about to provide. You will consider it as the Capital of a great Nation advancing with unexampled rapidity in arts and commerce, in wealth, and in population; and possessing, within itself, those energies and resources which, if not thrown away or lamentably misdirected, will assure to it a long course of prosperity and self-government."

That first Congress which met in Washington did not choose to exercise the trust imposed by the Constitution. There were other things to think about. Many years passed before Congress began to think of Washington as the Capital of a great Nation, or to provide for its development in accordance with that concept. But it is that concept which has grown deeper with the years. We find, in the beautiful city we know today, increasing evidence that Congress shares the pride of all good Americans in their Capital and is motivated by a desire to make its development symbolic of the achievements, the strength, and aspirations of a great Nation.

We, who live here, share with the Members of Congress responsibility for making this desire our living guide. I ask your indulgence in briefly examining some of the attributes of the unusual partnership which brings us together in that great enterprise.

Under the terms of the Constitution, it is you who make all the decisions. You tell us, for example, in addition to the Federal taxes that all Americans pay, the sort of local taxes we must pay. In this respect you have shown great ingenuity. We pay personal- and business-income taxes, real- and tangible-property taxes, sales taxes, use taxes, cigarette taxes, gasoline taxes—taxes on the oil with which we are anointed at birth and taxes on the casket in which we are laid to rest when, tired of paying taxes, we seek that total exemption found only in the grave.

More than 50 percent of the District's real property is exempt from any taxation, because of its ownership by Government and other privileged institutions, and other means must be found to make up in revenue what is lost through this extraordinary and increasing proportion of real property exemption.

The different sections of the country from which you gentlemen come prefer different kinds of taxes. So, when all of you are together in the legislative Chambers on Capitol Hill, there seems to be an irresistible temptation to apply here everything that each one of you has learned about back home.

The amount of money from these taxes has become quite substantial. This year, sitting as our local legislature, you will be called on to appropriate about $135,000,000 to support our local government and its undertakings. More than 90 percent of this money is raised through purely local taxes.

In addition to the decisions regarding local expenditures, you must enact all the legislation which enables the money to be spent, and in the course of a long session of Congress this legislation takes the form of scores of separate bills, dealing in minute detail with the many problems that enter into the conduct of a great metropolitan community.

This responsibility can be an onerous one, and we of Washington appreciate that fact. You are elected to Congress by the people of your districts, or your States. You naturally feel that it is to them you owe your primary allegiance. If your activities in connection with the constitutionally imposed duty of legislating exclusively for this Capital City appears to the voters back home to take too much of the time they feel belongs to them, you may be criticized for it. At least that is the theory, though in practice there are few men indeed whose constructive work for the Nation's Capital has gone unappreciated, here or back home. As evidence of that let me cite the happy circumstance which finds every member of the House District Committee of the Eighty-first Congress returned to the Eighty-second. There was one casualty in the Senate District Committee. But I do not remember that Senator Pepper ever attributed his defeat to anything he did for the District of Columbia. My recollection is that he attributed his defeat to Senator SMATHERS. No Member of Congress in recent years worked more conscientiously and more conspicuously for the District than EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois. What does he do? Goes back home and gets himself elected to the Senate. Do you need any further proof that work for the District of Columbia carries its own reward?

Members of Congress are subject to the often conflicting pressures of groups of voters back home, working through the industrious agents of these groups in Washington. These groups are forever seeking to have things done, or left undone, in Washington because of the possible effect on things they wish to have done, or left undone, back home. And you must often walk a tightrope between these pressures from abroad and the best interests of the people for whose Government you—and only you—are responsible.

We of Washington understand these things. It is because we understand them so well that we place extraordinary value on the services of Members who are assigned to the committees charged with direct responsibility for local government.

But the Members of Congress who win our undying gratitude are those who do not look for the hazards, but who seek the opportunities of service to the Nation which lie in serving the best interests of the Nation's city. Many of the great men in Congress have found that opportunity and have left with us cherished memories, permanently engraved on the cornerstones of the Capital's history.

As we understand you, so those whose service lengthens in Congress come to understand us.

They know we live under one of the most curious political contradictions to be found anywhere in the world—men and women whose accidental residence in the Capital of a Nation dedicated to the principles of self government are denied all means of participation in that Government.

They know that often we do not agree among ourselves. One of the sources of occasional annoyance on Capitol Hill is this inability to agree. In this respect, of course, we are not unlike other Americans, one of whose prized possessions is the right to disagree. The difference is that we lack here the normal means of resolving disagreement by electing representatives of our own choosing to speak for us in Congress. For as long as Congress remains in exclusive control of the American seat of government—a provision which I believe most citizens agree is wise—Congress is our local government and it is in Congress, rather than in one of its agencies, that we need representation.

Experienced Members of Congress know that there are two Washingtons.

There is the political Washington, the Washington that is a figure of speech or a state of mind rather than a physical entity. This is the Washington that governs a great Nation and which has become a sort of Capital of the world. It provides an arena in which there is a continuing struggle for power between antagonistic interests and ideas and where an occasional Christian is thrown to the lions to enliven the interest of the vast audience.

Being a great public spectacle, it attracts the usual retainers and concessionaires—the lobbyists, the pressure groups, the socially and politically ambitious, the climbers, the schemers, all staging their own little sideshows or hawking their wares on the fringes

of the big show. This is the Washington most often pictured to the country—a confused, quarrelsome, gossipping, backbiting, meddlesome Washington, plunging from crisis to disaster, then climbing back to crisis again.

But there is the other Washington—the Washington of faithful public servants, of self-respecting American men and women in private employment. In this Washington there are more wage earners off than on the Government payroll. But whether off or on, they are found working loyally together at their jobs, proud of their city, proud of their country, ambitious for their children, supporting their churches, working for better homes, better schools, better libraries, better playgrounds, all of the things that go to make a better community and a better understanding of how to live together.

You will quickly learn to know that first Washington, for it is the Washington that you hear most about. It is the Washington which your people back home may resent and even fear, and you will want no suggestion from any source that it has infected you.

What we want you to know is that second Washington. For you will find that this is the real Washington—the Washington that is made up of your kind of folks, the sort of people you know back home and whose votes sent you here to Congress. The people of this real Washington make their homes here. They do not change with each new political crisis or election, here today, and gone tomorrow. They do not think of Congress as an unwieldy, unpredictable, or undependable organism of big government. They think of it as a group of men and women chosen by the people to solve the increasingly complex problem of making successful a great experiment in representative government.

The people of this real Washington respect you. They want you to know them. For they believe that when you learn to know them you will think of them as friends and neighbors whose interests and whose destiny as a community are very closely bound up with your own.

Heartbreak Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 7, 1951:

HEARTBREAK HIGHWAY

Eighth Army troops retiring southward below Seoul are traveling a road they know—and hate. Down this thoroughfare last summer passed the battered regiments thrown into a doomed battle to check the North Korean advance. They retreated under a killing sun and in clouds of dust. The weeks went by and the reinforced United Nations troops marched victoriously forward. Now in the deadly cold of winter they are again being driven south. The dust is still there. As an Associated Press dispatch spoke of it, it is dust that "coated the face, clogged the nostrils, turned eyes into watery red slits, and filled the mouth with so much sand you felt your teeth were wearing away." Beside this tragic route lie the graves of many dead. American casualties alone have now passed 40,000, with a death toll, not yet brought down to date, of 6,761. No wonder the GI's call the passage south from Seoul Heartbreak Highway.

The Korean veteran in the bitterness which accompanies even an orderly retreat in the presence of overwhelming numbers of the enemy may well ask himself whether these dead have died in vain. It is hard for us at home who have not borne the burden of the battle to find any words to answer him. But if the time comes when the United Nations is strong in honor and in power to enforce its decisions, if the time comes when no weak nation is exposed to aggression, if the time comes when there is a world law of freedom and justice—then surely the nations will look back to the graves in Korea through an atmosphere no longer obscured by the dust of conflict and will say with certainty that the blood spilled in Korea was not wasted, and that out of it, even after long torment, there did come "a new birth of freedom."

Who Is Fighting the UN War?—United States Gets No More Aid Against Fresh Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the President deliver his first address to the Eighty-second Congress on the state of the Nation. Surely these are troubled days in which we live. Our people back home seem more alert and more appreciative of our plight than do Members of Congress or the President. While it is a fact that technically as a Nation we are not at war, in reality we are at war. Strictly speaking we are one of the members of the United Nations making our commitments in Korea; but, as a matter of fact, we seem to be practically the only member of the United Nations supplying either men or material in Korea. As members of the United Nations, we are, in a sense, partners in an undertaking. Partnership agreements are serious. Partners can make or break you. While we have hoped and prayed for the success of the United Nations, unless other members of this compact give immediate evidence of their intentions to carry a greater portion of the load, prospects are not bright. Attached hereto I enclose, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from the January 12 issue of the United States News and World Report:

WHO IS FIGHTING THE UN WAR?—UNITED STATES GETS NO MORE AID AGAINST FRESH ENEMY

United States troops can't count on much more outside help for the next phase in Korea. Others have put up about all they plan.

Communists, in fighting men, hold almost a 2-to-1 advantage. And there are millions more where those came from.

On the other side, United States casualties alone are more than twice the total troops sent in by other UN allies.

The start of one more inning in Korea finds the line-up changed greatly on the Communist side, but virtually unchanged on the side of the United States and the UN.

A whole new team is thrown in by the Communists. Chinese now make up two-thirds of the Communist forces. North Koreans, mainstay of the Communist side in the first 6 months of fighting, take second place.

Communists, in land forces, have 444,000 men involved, as shown on the accompanying map They have little artillery, few tanks, little air support. Their air arm has Russian planes with pilots of unknown nationality, probably Chinese.

UN combat troops total a little under 275,000. The bulk of these is provided by the United States. American combat forces in Korea number around 150,000. South Koreans come next with a strength of probably 100,000. American casualties are around 50,000 so far, and South Korean losses are very heavy.

No new troops are being supplied by UN countries, although Colombia is preparing to send a battalion later. Canada, which organized a brigade to fight in Korea, proposes to send most of it to Europe, instead. The Canadian battalion already in Korea still is undergoing training.

Britain is leaving her ground strength in Korea at 10,000, pointing out that her far eastern fleet has been serving as part of the UN naval forces almost since the outbreak of the Korean trouble. Australia has a ground unit of 1,500 in action. Turkey's force, originally 4,500, has suffered severe losses.

France has 1,400 soldiers in Korea. She says she cannot furnish more because of the war she is fighting against Communists in Indochina. Siam's unit numbers about 1,200, as does that of the Philippine Republic. Forces of Belgium and Luxemburg, New Zealand, Greece, and the Netherlands are smaller.

No other countries have furnished ground forces for the war in Korea, although some are giving naval or air support. India, with the third largest population in the world, has sent a medical unit, but no fighting men. A medical unit, not combat troops, has been furnished by Sweden.

Latin America is not represented at all among the UN ground forces at this time. Argentina, which spends a large part of her budget on a big and well-trained army, is keeping her soldiers at home. Brazil and Mexico, the two other big countries in Latin America, have good-sized armies, but no troops fighting in Korea. While some small countries have offered recruits, these offers have not been accepted because of the time required to train inexperienced men.

The United States thus, is furnishing the major part of the ground troops fighting the Communists in Korea. Although General MacArthur pleaded for help from other members of the UN, the 24,300 soldiers he actually has received from them amount to less than half the casualties suffered so far by American Ground Forces.

Change of Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, much misleading information has been put forth from administration sources on the action of the House in restoring to its Committee on Rules the

control it formerly had to direct the flow of legislation before the House. Radio commentators and newspaper columnists who follow the Fair Deal line would have us believe that this action gives the committee autocratic power over all legislation. This is not true, for it merely restores the rule that was adopted after the historic fight spearheaded by Senator George W. Norris, when he was a Member of the House, to take dictatorial powers away from the Speaker. The rule was in effect until the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress.

In operation it gives the Committee on Rules the power to consider the relative importance of all bills reported by legislative committees and schedule for action those that the responsible leadership of both parties believe should be considered. When the motion was made 2 years ago to change the rule by permitting committee chairmen to bring a bill before the House if the Rules Committee had not reported it within 21 days, I voted for it. Experience has convinced me that the change has not only proved costly to the taxpayers but could bring disaster to the Government's financial structure. As an illustration, I would point out that in the Eightieth Congress legislative committees reported bills that would have cost the taxpayers $20,000,000,000 more than the revenue estimated to be received by the Government in those 2 years.

In spite of the false propaganda on this subject there are two effective ways to bring legislation before the House without the approval of the Rules Committee. On Calendar Wednesday, which occurs twice each month, chairmen of legislative committees may bring up bills for consideration of the House that have been reported by their committees. Any Member who desires to have a bill considered may prepare a petition to have the committee discharged from further consideration of it and, when he has secured the signatures of 218 Members, a majority of the House, it will automatically come up for action. I am not willing to go back on the handiwork of Senator George W. Norris. It was his efforts which finally resulted in a change of the rules that took from the Speaker dictatorial powers. I am not willing that we should go back to that rule or to permit a small handful of radicals to disturb normal legislative procedures. While I did vote for the change in the rule 2 years ago, I now realize that experience has shown that it does not work. It was for that reason that I voted to restore the rule.

The Wisdom of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, this editorial from a recent issue of the Tidings, official weekly publication of the archdiocese, of Los Angeles. I concur wholeheartedly in the deductions therein. The editorial follows:

THE WISDOM OF THE PEOPLE

There is still the torrent of words in correct syntax and measured cadence, phrased impeccably. There is still the air of detachment, the aloofness of an ivory tower, the sustained calm as the columns crumble. There is still the icy disdain of the commonsense of the American people as it awakes in the swift surge of disaster. And Secretary Acheson pursues grimly the undeviating course which, with the shame of further appeasement, can only increase the gathering peril.

There must be no reexamination of policy, no searching of the national soul as our diplomacy scrupulously adheres to the evil commitments of Yalta, never revealed fully to the American people, never approved by our elected representatives in plenary session. How can the Nation hope for the blessings of peace from such perfidy, such dishonor? The friends we favored fast fade away in our plight, bored by our cynicism and sophistry. Only the brave souls of leaders, to whom we refused the badge of valor and the bond of fellowship, stand ready to aid us even in their helplessness of our own making.

The President must heed the will of the people as it rises in unanimous chorus over the land. This is the voice of a people inflamed with love for this land of sanctuary, in dread lest the noble temple of America be leveled in the dust, who know our roots in the story of the conquest of a continent, and who in the aid of freedom have by talent and enterprise and hard work and competence and wholesome living builded this Nation wisely and well. There are no echoes in this voice of traffic with an evil thing, of concession to cunning and injustice, of fellowship with the face of cruelty and slaughter, of unconcern with the fate of heroes, saints, and martyrs. This is the voice of the real America which must again prevail in the councils of the Nation.

For it is our mounting determination that our leaders must shake off the dust that has marred the noble facade of the temple of America since our disastrous recognition of Soviet Russia in 1933. We confess now that our own moral eclipse and lack of political insight and interest, made easy the infiltration by artful propaganda of something foreign to the American scene, and we reel toward disaster as the dizzying pattern staggers to its fateful culmination. It is not too late to purge the poison. There is yet time to return to the well-springs of strength. Repudiation of the evil is our high resolve and with it the calm appraisal of guilt both at home and abroad.

We can now make only spiritual reparation for our abandonment of the Baltics, our betrayal of the valor of the Poles and its glorious Christian traditions of a thousand years, our unconcern with the faith and freedom of the Balkans as they slipped into a new night of terror and tyranny. We take meager comfort in the fact that their fate was never submitted for approval to the generous heart of America, and can only wonder how supposedly Christian statesmen could have been bewitched by the illusory smile on the face of an atheistic despotism. As a people we begin to make spiritual reparation for the shame of Yalta and Tehran and Potsdam.

The people too look about to see what can be salvaged of the national honor. We give aid to Tito in the forlorn hope that tyranny will crush tyranny, unmindful of the democratic hopes and aspirations of the vast majority of the suffering Slavs and Croats. These in their sorrow cry out to us that tears water no crop, and that if there is drought that fills the land with famine, it is because a despotism no less crushing than the Kremlin's quenches the fires of hope and even of life.

We make as yet only hesitant approaches to enlist in our cause the valor of Spain. Poised below the Pyrenees is a people, alone in Europe, which has the will and the courage to defend the culture of Europe and the Christian faith, with scythes if necessary, and aid voted by Congress 6 months ago has been deliberately withheld by the President who has callously remarked that; even with the withdrawal in part of United Nations sanctions against Spain, it will be a long time before there is an exchange of ambassadors.

And our leaders ignore the will of the people in the Far East. Even while the hordes of Mao are dealing decimation and death to our forces in Korea, we still neutralize Formosa and immobilize the half million hardened campaigners of Chiang who, by a diversionary maneuver in south China, could not only relieve the pressure in Korea, but with the help of querrillas on the mainland and aided by internal unrest, could rewin China to the circle of free nations. With China slave, not only Asia but the world is imperiled. With China free, the Red march is ended.

These are the deep-seated findings of the wisdom of the people as it searches its soul in the fearful crisis, and with neither recrimination nor hysteria America looks to its leaders for a clearer vision and a newer strength.

An Impossible Job for the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news column by Father James Gillis, C. S. P., who calls attention to a situation that is impossible for the United States. I include it at this point and commend it to the membership of this House:

IMPOSSIBLE FOR ONE NATION TO REDRESS WRONGS OF WORLD—WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE WORLD

(By Father James Gillis, C. S. P.)

Some weeks ago in this column, under the caption "Resist aggression everywhere?" I discussed the obligation of the United States to remedy the wrongs and cure the ills of the world. On December 7, Walter Lippmann wrote on virtually the same subject.

If I had written after, instead of before him, I might have borrowed a quotation he made from a memorandum of Gladstone to Queen Victoria. It seems that in their day there were some Englishmen who thought that England should do for the world what some Americans now think we should do. Gladstone, though somewhat of an idealist, refused to take on any such impossible task. Lippmann quotes from what the Prime Minister wrote to the Queen in 1869:

"Is England so uplifted in strength above every other nation that she can with prudence advertise herself as ready to undertake the general redress of wrongs? Would not the consequence of such professions and promises be either the premature exhaustion of her means, or a collapse in the day of performance? Is any power at this time of today warranted in assuming to itself this comprehensive obligation?"

England was not strong enough in 1869 to undertake the general redress of wrongs.

Neither is America strong enough to do so in 1950.

The familiar sonnet by Emma Lazarus which was placed on the Statue of Liberty runs, in part:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me."

That could be said in good heart in 1895. I doubt if we would dare ask Europe and Asia to send us all their tired, poor, huddled masses today.

As far back as 1814 Thomas Jefferson, commonly considered the father of American democracy, wrote to John Adams his suspicion that the Canaille of the cities of Europe if permitted to come to our shores would pervert our American freedom to the demolition and destruction of everything public. Elsewhere he spoke with contempt and apprehension of the mobs of great cities which he said "would do to our form of government what sores do to the human body."

But that danger is as nothing compared with what will happen to us if, not waiting for the poor, tired, huddled masses to come to us, we go overseas to find them, feed them, clothe them, fight their battles for them, free them from the tyrants that oppress them.

It is beautiful, no doubt, to have a heart as big as the world, and it is understandably Christian to share one's goods with others. But I wonder what a parish priest would say, or a member of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, if a family in the parish were to impoverish itself by giving away more than it could afford, and if the father of that family borrowed money which he could never pay back, just to make himself a good fellow by handing out to others what he had borrowed, let us say from the church. Is charity synonymous with improvidence?

The civil law takes the control of money or the administration of an estate away from an incompetent trustee. But a government also can be extravagant and irresponsible. If it runs up a debt of $250,000,000,000 and keeps on pouring out other billions and tens of billions, scattering all over the world the resources which it is supposed to hold in trust for its own citizens, that government might well be declared unfit to function.

Such, I suppose, was in effect what Gladstone told Queen Victoria: "England is rich and powerful"—she was in 1869—"but she is not in a position to pay the debts of all the countries of the world, build their armies and navies, and fight their battles."

Mr. Lippmann suggests that Mr. Truman and Mr. Attlee take advantage of the principle handed down from Gladstone. I would go further and say that we at least should take counsel from common sense, not dissipate our resources and waste the lives of our young men in the mad effort to do what no other nation in all history ever attempted to do and what no nation is called upon to do—the impossible.

Moral Requirements in a Three-Pronged Peace Offensive—By the Reverend Dr. O. Frederick Nolde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. K. ARMSTRONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, there was held yesterday in the Washington Cathedral a service of prayer and dedication for the Members of the Eighty-second Congress, sponsored by the Washington Cathedral and the Washington Federation of Churches. At this significant service, an address was delivered by the Reverend Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, Dean of the Graduate School of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, and director of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. I am sure many Members of this Congress will desire that this address be made available for their use and, therefore, I include Dr. Nolde's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MORAL REQUIREMENTS IN A THREE-PRONGED PEACE OFFENSIVE

As we move into the second half of the twentieth century, the horizon of a peaceful world seems far-distant and the path leading to it is darkened by low-hanging clouds of war. The hearts of many are gripped by despair, for they find no secure chart or compass for the road they must travel. For them two alternatives seem inescapable. The one leads to total global war and the prospect is terrifying. The other requires appeasement and, while the timid find it tempting, the courageous revolt against it and the wise reject it because they know that it merely postpones the evil day. Men are disposed to say with the Preacher of Old: "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity."

A mood such as this does not befit the Christian. In yielding to defeatism, men deny the faith of Christianity. The world picture is dark and no effort to relieve it by shallow panaceas is justified. Nevertheless, to every individual Christian there is available the eternal gospel of Jesus Christ with its assurance of forgiveness, of comfort, and of strength. Moreover, the truth of Christianity has meaning for every situation which man faces, be it in his personal experience or in the context of world relationships.

The greatest danger before us, too often unperceived, is that in frustration and fear we become preoccupied solely with personal and national well-being. On bended knee, our people and their representatives in government should pray Almighty God, not for safety and security as ultimate good, but for a new vision of service. Our national policy ought to flow from a profound concern for people—for all people in every land—with a penetrating understanding that our interests are best served when we serve the interests of others. With full recognition to our shortcomings, we must remember that the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, not to condemn but to save the world. These are eternal truths, and in them the moral imperatives which can give direction to a peace offensive find their source and their impulse.

THE CONTEMPORARY SCENE

The effective application of Christian truth for the healing of the nations requires its interpretation in the light of immediate realities. In a vast upsurging which began long before the First World War, peoples of every race, color, and creed are clamoring for equality of personal status and for a fair share of this world's material goods. We are caught in the swirl of a world-wise revolution. While some societies have been reinvigorated and over 700,000,000 people have attained political independence, the upsurge continues with undiminished force.

Competing to meet the demands of this world-wide revolution are two major systems—the one requiring uniformity of thought and practice under governmental coercion, and the other seeking to preserve individual freedom with responsibility. Whereas about one-third of the human race is currently under Soviet domination, it is significant to note that there is no country where the people have voluntarily accepted the system of Soviet communism. The United States, having lent economic assistance to a degree unequaled in history, is viewed with mingled feelings of gratitude for its generosity, jealousy because of its power, and suspicion as to its future intentions or demands.

The competition between the two systems of life—which could and should be peaceful—became an imminent and open threat to the peace with Russia's apparent willingness to use or to encourage force in expanding the area of Communist control in Korea. The United Nations authorized an international police action which has, on varying grounds and in various ways, been opposed and resisted by North Korea, by the peoples' government of China, and by the U. S. S. R. To the ideological conflict has been added a conflict of military power wherein the authority of the United Nations is challenged and flouted.

In response to the threat of Soviet military power the United States as well as other countries have undertaken a far-flung program of military preparation. The reality of the situation is that the world is divided into two armed camps and that governments which oppose the expansion of communism are making strenuous effort to build a military power sufficient for any emergency.

Moral decision as to the course we should follow in face of this explosive situation requires at least an attempt to forecast its prospects and dangers. Two possibilities seem to lie ahead. The first is that Russia will in the very near future start a third world war by direct or indirect aggessive action. The second possibility is that Russia, following known tactics of advance and retreat, will for a period of time so modify its effort to expand by force as to seem to make our military preparations foolish or unnecessary. I respectfully submit that grave peril awaits us if we do not reckon with both possible eventualities.

THE MORAL IMPERATIVE

The outlook is precarious, whether of global conflict in the near future or of long-drawn-out tension. Yet we dare not shrink from it. To us in our day comes the awesome and searching question which the Prophet Micah addressed to the people of Israel: "What doth the Lord require of thee?" Our national tradition and our profession, if not always our practice, make an evasion of that question unthinkable.

Two presuppositions provide the background from which our answer must be projected. The first is the conviction that God in His goodness makes available strength in proportion to the needs of the hour. Christianity was born and bred in adversity, and Christians have risen to greatest heights when confronted by the most critical tests. God will provide strength at this moment of history if we will only use what he places at our disposal. In the second place, we hold to the belief that even in this trying hour a third world war is not inevitable, and we must act accordingly. In accepting that view we do not delude ourselves. Recent events have considerably diminished the margin of possibility. We are on the brink of a precipice. To avoid being plunged into the abyss, we must exploit to the full every possibility which that thin margin affords us.

Conscious of our true strength and discerning the goal of our immediate striving, what shall we now do? The full text of Micah's question offers a clue to the moral imperative as we face the dilemma of today. "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thy God?" In order to derive this timeless message a directive which relates to present need, I venture to propose that the people of the United States and their representatives in Government are called upon to manifest a dignified humility,

born of purposeful strength and not of weakness, dedicated to the service of all men in building economically healthy and morally free societies, and committed to the peaceful solution of world problems through international cooperation under the United Nations.

A THREE-PRONGED PEACE OFFENSIVE

Our task is merely begun when we frame a sweeping statement of our moral obligation. If the exposition of God's requirement is to be really helpful, it must be characterized by far greater precision and definiteness. At this point the Christian invariably encounters serious difficulty. He seeks to remain faithful to his highest principles and yet he knows that an evil situation thwarts their full application. Shall he risk an accommodation of Christian idealism to immediate problems in order to encourage and support attainable steps toward the ultimate goal? While some are loath to do this, I am convinced that we have no tenable alternative. We must fight the battle for peace in the context of an imperfect and evil world.

With this point of view, I propose for your consideration a balanced three-pronged peace offensive, where emphasis is laid on our moral obligations in relation to actually existing military, economic-social, and political conditions. In doing so, I claim that while we cannot at this time hope to get sympathetic audience from Soviet-controlled areas, we can so govern our own actions by justice and good will as progressively to extend the area of our influence and ultimately win a hearing from those who now oppose us. Be assured that my propositions grow out of an appreciation of the heavy burden which our governmental officials are carrying in our behalf and the desire of our churches to share that burden with them in any appropriate manner.

I. Our military strength must be sincerely and steadfastly devoted to the cause of peace

We have to face facts unflinchingly. The United States and countries allied with it are bent upon building a military strength unparalleled in their history. With what attitude shall we as Christians view this effort? While there are some who believe that force should never be used, the preponderant majority reluctantly accepts the necessity of military strength to serve as a deterrent to aggression and, wherever aggression occurs, as a means of opposing it.

In taking my stand with the preponderant majority, I insist that we must clearly recognize the dangers in a situation where the world is divided into two armed camps, and particularly the dangers for which we may be responsible. If Russia should start a third world war—whether for purposes of expansion or in fear of our growing strength—the decisions is out of our hands. However, if Russia on strategic grounds exercises restraint for a prolonged period of time, we may through lack of forethought become an actual threat to the peace. In this latter event, knowing that the danger of aggression lingers even though dormant, we would nevertheless have no clear justification for using the military strength we have built. In our impatience and with our society geared to military action, we may then be tempted increasingly to risk or even to create situations which would give rise to global conflict.

Under these circumstances, the churches have an important, perhaps a determining, part to play. They must cultivate in our people the moral restraints which will keep military strength under control and indicate the direction to be followed in order that strength may contribute to peace. On moral grounds, participation in military preparations ought to be measured by the sincerity with which the following six commitments are made and the fidelity with which they are honored in practice.

1. We must not be the instrumentality of starting war—now or in the future, openly or under the wicked pretense of self-righteousness. If war should come, and God forbid that it may, it must be irrevocably thrust upon us by others than ourselves and every alternative recourse which our interpretation of God's will for man can entertain must first have been honestly explored.

2. We must keep military measures at every point to the absolute minimum which circumstances will allow. Those who resist the decisions of the United Nations should be denied the comfort and assurance of a pledge not to resort to drastic measures if their actions leave no reasonable alternative. At the same time, the hysteria which calls for the use of atomic bombs without full account of attending moral and political consequences must be curbed in season and out of season. All share in this responsibility to preserve calm determination—Government officials, press and radio, as well as people in every walk of life.

3. We must invite and encourage the use of the United Nations Peace Observation Commission at every potential danger spot throughout the world to deter aggression or to identify the aggressor when it occurs. The United States has expressed and must indicate readiness to expose its actions to impartial scrutiny.

4. In determining when military action shall be taken, we must accept a moral judgment to the extent that it is reflected by majority opinion in the United Nations. One hopeful factor in the United Nations decision to recommend military measures against aggression by North Korea was the emergency for the first time in history of international police action, imperfect though that recognizedly was. That new factor must be retained and improved. The day when any one country has the right by itself to declare war on another is past.

5. We must accept as a provisional goal a sufficient balance of military power-in-being to permit the peaceful competition of conflicting ideologies. Such a situation would be obviously precarious. Nevertheless, as an intermediate objective of military preparations, its preference to war justifies the risk.

6. We must work toward the ultimate objective—now and continuingly—of bringing all national armaments under international regulation and control. The United Nations has voted to merge its approaches to the international control of conventional and atomic weapons. It is not fantastic to hold that the futility of a progressively accelerated armaments race may at some point convince all parties that international jurisdiction is the only solution. At all events the effort must be made.

What does God require of us? If we accept the necessity of military strength—and that decision I insist is ours as human beings—our actions will more nearly reflect Christian principles by accepting such restraints and directives as I have proposed. Should they not be accepted, the unity of the American people in support of a military program will on grounds of conscience be difficult to achieve and to maintain.

II. In opposing totalitarian communism we must willingly constitute ourselves a continuing servant of the world in helping to build economically healthy and morally free societies

Military strength may give reassurance and time, but it will not in itself win the victory of social health and freedom. Over the past 5 years we employed the strategy of reinvigorating societies so that communism might not look attractive from within and that infiltration and subjection from without would involve the likelihood of popular resistance. That strategy was measurably successful, perhaps so successful as to prompt Russia's recourse to force. Shall we now forsake the very means which proved effective and put all our eggs in a military basket?

What will we have gained if, in increased military strength in Western Europe, standards of living over a period of time are so lowered that the prospect of communism again becomes inviting to the masses who do not reckon with ultimate costs? Or, if in giving air and naval protection to countries in the Far East, they continue to endure unaided the devastations of famine and the irritating knowledge that social conditions remain unimproved? We must constantly be alert to the danger of preoccupation with military measures to the exclusion or at least the neglect of affirmative measures which are right in themselves and, because of their inherent rightness, stand as a bulwark against Soviet communism.

ECONOMIC HEALTH

Insofar as economic health goes the problem obviously is to find resources for building the necessary military strength and, at the same time, to have available the means for economic aid. I trust you will not consider me unrealistic when I suggest a specific illustration, allowing that the mode and timing of its application require further study.

The Hebrews in Old Testament times practiced tithing, and many Christians have with modifications followed in that tradition. Our Nation has a religious heritage. Ought we not now as a people, inextricably caught in the web of military necessity, designate over and beyond what we are currently doing one-tenth of our military appropriation for specifically affirmative peace measures? This would mean that if we are willing to spend an extra $30,000,000,000 for negative means to secure the peace we would also be ready to spend an extra $3,000,000,000 for positive measures. The proportion may be too small, but the possibilities almost baffle the imagination. The United Nations technical-assistance program could be considerably strengthened and expanded. United Nations Peace Observation Commissions, adequate in manpower and literally scattered over the face of the earth, could be financed. Many other areas of useful expenditure could be cited, and, above all, we would be giving to the world at least a substantial indication as to our future intent.

To finance such a venture new or modified patterns which appropriately correlate military and economic enterprises should be imaginatively explored. If these prove unfeasible, I believe the American people would be ready to carry the added burden and may in fact be more prepared thereby to support military preparations.

MORAL FREEDOM

Insofar as freedom and human rights are concerned, we must steadfastly strengthen our domestic observance. In addition to long-standing problems, we encounter in the concentration of emergency powers the danger of approaching the totalitarian practices which we condemn in Soviet countries. Our people should flock to their churches to derive inspiration and strength from worship and study. They should freely but responsibly exercise their right of opinion and expression. They should above all respect the rights and freedoms of their neighbors. Our Government, in a manner far more impressive than heretofore, should lead the way in establishing international jurisdiction for the protection of human rights. Recognizing a common bond, be it of humanity or of faith, we should exhaust every means to get close to people behind the iron curtain, even giving consideration to a wholesale infiltration of the next session of the People's Peace Congress no matter where it may be held. We should support and enlarge a truth campaign that really rings true.

What does the Lord require of His people? One need have no qualm of conscience in

calling for the fullest possible use of our resources, commensurate with other needs, in building economically healthy and morally free societies.

III. We must steadfastly seek such avenues of negotiation as will command the confidence of our allies and give to those who oppose us every opportunity for the just settlement of outstanding issues

Recent experiences show that negotiation tends to be successful, as in the case of the Berlin blockade, when a de facto settlement has already been achieved or is fairly certain of achievement. As we grow stronger, we must be careful to increase rather than to diminish our readiness to negotiate.

If we are to be diplomatically effective, domestic unity is an urgent requirement. The democratic right of criticism and dissent must be preserved, but opinion must be formed on the basis of merit. Our people want a bipartisan foreign policy, where representation characterizes both the formation and the administration of that policy. They have too much at stake to permit international issues to become the football of party politics and welcome the growing restraint which is sensitive to a condition of emergency.

Pride and face-saving tendencies must be rejected if negotiation is to produce results. We are grateful for the exercise of restraint and dignity in the administration of our foreign affairs. We must be constantly ready, on our own part and on our own initiative, to revise policies and decisions if sound reason therefor is at hand. Observation of international deliberations reveals how important are the tact and delicacy of method whereby a reversal of policy is publicly sponsored.

Beyond the domestic scene, the process of taking political and military decisions requires an alertness to the interests and self-respect of those who honestly support the United Nations. For example, without minimizing the responsibilities which ought to be met by western European countries, we must see the respects wherein their problems differ from ours. Is it not sensible to seek to heal the social sores in West Germany and to win friendship as a prerequisite to their cooperation in opposing communism? Have we reckoned fully enough with the implications of a divided Germany—as a replica of Korea and in face of what five more years of Soviet indoctrination will mean to its youth—and have we given sufficient thought to ways whereby as a minimum lines of communication could be opened between East and West Germany? Countries of the Far and Middle East, many of which have recently gained political stature, merit increasing responsibility for decisions, subject to their heeding our points of view as we show willingness to heed their points of view.

In my references to political negotiation, I have intentionally avoided the suggestion of technical solutions and have stressed factors of dignified human relations. Reconciliation is a fundamental principle of Christianity and reconciliation must become operative at the international political level through negotiations which are prompted by justice, mercy, and good will.

PRAYER FOR PEACE

It is my conviction that Christian testimony to the world of nations can move only in the arena where the issues are fought. Catastrophe not of our making may break upon us at any time and for that we must be prepared. Nevertheless, so long as there remains even a marginal possibility of averting total global war, we must wage an inclusive peace offensive where our spiritual as well as our material strength is devoted to the promotion of peace, dedicated to service in building economically healthy and morally free societies, and committed to international cooperation through the United Nations.

We must remain steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labor in the Lord is not in vain. In our churches and in our homes, let supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

At this time, let us pray together the prayer for peace which the World Council of Churches has enjoined upon churches and Christians throughout the world:

Almighty God our heavenly father guide we beseech Thee the nations of the world into the way of justice and truth and establish among them that peace which is the fruit of righteousness. Amen.

A Momentous Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 7, 1951:

A MOMENTOUS SPEECH

Mr. TAFT'S great speech in the Senate on Friday may have momentous consequences.

Most political speeches are quickly forgotten, but once or twice in a century a public man gets on his feet to say something which has a profound influence on the course of events. That happened, we know, when Lincoln in 1858 applied the momentous phrase from the Bible about the house divided against itself to the current political controversy. That text destroyed old parties and created new ones.

There is no parallel phrase in Mr. TAFT'S speech. Taken as a whole, however, the speech may well shake men from their traditional party loyalties and shake the parties themselves to their foundations.

The great question dividing Americans today is concerned with the role of America in the world. There are those who hold it to be America's duty to devote all its resources and men and wealth to the task of world salvation. In pursuit of that idea we have fought two fruitless wars and are now engaged in another in Korea.

There are others, for whom Mr. TAFT speaks, who hold that the primary duty of the American Government is to employ our men and resources for the safety of our own people and the preservation of their liberties.

There are men of both views in both our political parties. The Dewey and VANDENBERG Republicans properly belong in Mr. Truman's camp. The KENNEDY Democrats properly belong in Mr. TAFT'S camp. The question is how long members of the old parties can allow their traditional partisanship to bind them to the transcendent political issue of our times, the issue, as we said before, of determining America's role in the world.

The Republicans and the Democrats, alike, will have to make their choices. In Lincoln's day, the Democrats tried to be on both sides of the question and thereby lost the North and the country.

Just such a situation is developing again today. The people all over the country are aroused, as they have not been in many years, over the Korean fiasco and they see that it is the direct consequence of the Truman-Acheson-Dewey line of policy. They see, also, that unless the policy is altered, a much bigger and much more destructive war lies ahead.

Political parties, once established, are sturdy and it would be foolish, indeed, to suppose that they can be pulverized by a speech. It would be equally foolish to suppose that parties can survive which do not take a position on the transcendent issue of their times. On the decision which must soon be reached, everything we are and everything we have are at stake; and everybody who is of military age, everybody who has a son, and all of us who pay taxes know it. Parties which hide from this issue are certain to be discredited and must expect to disintegrate.

Mr. TAFT'S speech will satisfy all Republicans except the more extreme world savers who follow Dewey. It went a little further in the direction of interventionism than some of us would go, but his doctrine is, if not wholly satisfactory, then so nearly so and so immensely preferable to Mr. Truman's that the choice is an easy and obvious one.

All in both parties who now recognize the folly of the Roosevelt-Truman line can and, indeed must, if they are honest, rally around Mr. TAFT. For the others, there is Truman.

Red Iron Curtain, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Communists who have been parading under the guise of being an American political party having any justifiable claim to such title have forfeited any such standing through the iron-curtain conduct of their fifteenth annual convention just completed in New York City.

In striking contrast to the open and public manner in which the two present-day major political parties carry on their conventions, the American Red conspirators have just concluded a conclave under supersecret conditions.

Circumstances under which the convention was held should convince some of our gullible Americans who tend to shed crocodile tears of sympathy when our authorities seek to crack down on the Red party, that this Red organization is a plot and not a party.

At the recent Republican and Democrat national conventions the press, radio, and television were able to give full coverage and place the sessions under the public eye. But not so with this Red convention.

The New York Times reports that it was not until the end of the first-day sessions that newspapermen were even advised as to the location of the secret convention but they were not permitted to attend. Their only source of news was from such press releases as the Communist Party chiefs had prepared by their henchmen. The convention moved on with utmost secrecy. So goes the conspiracy.

Reporters for the New York Mirror learned that the 200 delegates were dispatched to small secret meetings the night before the convention and given directions as to their security conduct during the sessions. They were not to use names in making notations about the convention deliberations. They were never to tear up and discard their notes in the vicinity of the convention hall. They were not to use telephones in the convention hall. Luggage could not be carried into the hall by delegates. Obviously, the Reds feared hidden microphones or concealed recording apparatus.

All of the Red officers who have been indicted and convicted in our Federal courts of conspiracy to advocate the violent overthrow of our Government were highly praised by the convention, according to the Red press releases. Furthermore, they were unanimously reelected. Special recognition was given the national secretary of the party, who has not only been convicted of the conspiracy but could not attend the convention because he is in jail for contempt of Congress.

Communists have long since lost any claim as an American political party, and we will do well to take a warning from this recent iron-curtain convention and recognize the organization for the conspiracy that it is.

Our Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

GREENWOOD, S. C., *January 4, 1951.*

Hon. BRYAN DORN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are deeply concerned over present world conditions, and particularly the role that the United States is now called upon to take. We realize that the United States must have friends, and we are proud of the friends that we have. We deeply feel, however, that our Representatives in Congress and our United States Senate should be most careful in their votes and actions so as not to commit the Armed Forces of this Nation piecemeal throughout the world. Unless we are careful such a policy will dissipate our strength and might possibly render us impotent when and if we as a people are attacked. We would respectfully present that money, munitions, or armament might be replaced, but manpower cannot be replaced. We do not mean that friendly countries should not be helped for they constitute real defenses for this Nation. We do feel, however, that such aid should be given for the most part to those nations who seek along with our help to do something for themselves.

We respectfully present that we are for peace and for this country always. We should arm now, and keep our Armed Forces at such strength as to be able to defend this Nation at all times. We do feel, however, that we should be most careful in the commitment of our Armed Forces piecemeal on the field of battle in places throughout the world for such a policy might dissipate the Armed Forces of this Nation and leave us with inadequate forces to protect ourselves in time of need.

Yours very truly,
GREENWOOD COUNTY GRAND JURY,
By E. W. MILFORD, *Foreman.*

Articles by Arthur Krock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Mr. Arthur Krock, distinguished reporter, which appeared in the New York Times of January 4 and 5, 1951:

IN THE NATION—A WINDWARD ANCHOR FOR A POSSIBLE STORM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 3.—The anxiety in Congress over the constitutional issue which is presented by the Executive's conditional promise to help garrison Western Europe in advance of aggression found its first expression today in a resolution offered by Representative COUDERT, of New York City. The obvious objective, by asserting the constitutional view that Congress has the power to forbid the dispatch of American troops abroad, is to prevent a solely Executive decision with respect to Western Europe.

The simple and direct means invoked in the Coudert resolution to require the prior approval of Congress flows from the power of the purse. This is granted to Congress exclusively in section 8, article I, of the Constitution, that also empowers Congress to raise and maintain the Armed Forces. Mr. COUDERT proposes that no military appropriation, existing or hereafter made, shall be used to send additional troops abroad without the prior and specific approval of the national legislature.

A respected line of legal opinions supports the thesis that "Congress can forbid troops being sent out of the country"—the words of Elihu Root in a Senate debate on August 14, 1912. But Root also contended that, if Congress did not forbid, full authority for such an action was lodged in the President. Any action by Congress to forbid sending additional troops to Western Europe for its land defense (which, if the President had already ordered this, would create a constitutional crisis and irrevocably destroy the anti-Communist front) would be forestalled by approval of the real point of the Coudert resolution. It also has the merit of providing a method for the two coordinate branches of the Government concerned—the executive and the legislative—to act as one in the matter, and hence make affirmative action truly that of the United States Government.

THE PROSPECT OF JOINT ACTION

Joint affirmation is the extreme likelihood if General Eisenhower advises the President that Western Europe has met the condition of his commitment—that it must fully cooperate in its own defense—and that the project is feasible and essential to our own defense. Few think the President would agree to send the troops in any other circumstance, and few doubt that Congress would dispute a decision thus reached. But if the President sent troops for the land defense of Western Europe in advance of aggression without asking Congress for its approval, a growing number fear a violent and destructive dispute over jurisdiction.

The President has given no indication that he would take this step unilaterally; also, none that he would not. However, since the project was not even mentioned in the debates on the North Atlantic treaty and the first arms assistance bill, and yet Mr. Truman has made the conditional commitment, many in Congress are disturbed lest he might find the order within his concept of the powers of the Commander in Chief and the implied obligations of the treaty.

That is certainly possible, in view of the fact that the national peril is so much more plain than it was when the treaty and the arms pact were debated in Congress. And, if the President should conclude that the garrisoning of Western Europe in advance of aggression is necessary under his oath-bound liability for national security, and within his constitutional authority, history has made it very clear to Congress that its post facto challenge could be issued only in terms of refusing to maintain the additional troops, or by process of impeachment, or both. And surely there are few if any Members who would urge either move or count on the support, of the Nation if they did.

WHEN LEGAL SANCTION IS WANTED

The jurisdictional conflict reflected in Mr. COUDERT's proposal is embedded in the Constitution. Lawyers can and have argued it both ways. But Presidents who have asserted implied powers as Commanders in Chief have prevailed by making their interpretations faits accomplis. And most Presidents have expected Government lawyers to find the cover of the law for them and rarely have been disappointed.

When, in 1940, President Roosevelt decided to transfer 50 over-age destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for air and naval bases his power to do so was plainly limited by a law which required prior certification from armed service authorities that such material is not essential to the defense of the United States. But four prominent lawyers—C. C. Burlingham, T. D. Thacher, George Rublee, and Dean Acheson—removed the obstacle of the language. If, they said, the armed services authorities should certify that national defense would be served rather than hurt by the transfer it would be legal. Though Admiral Stark, then Chief of Naval Operations, had previously said that defense requirements would not permit the Navy to surrender even a rowboat, the President got the certificate the lawyers suggested and acted without prior reference to Congress.

Mr. Roosevelt used to complain—like many of his predecessors—of Government attorneys who told him why he couldn't do things instead of how he could—a grievance he asserted in 1933 by dismissing Mr. Acheson, then Under Secretary of the Treasury, for holding illegal the gold purchase plan. And once, when the War Shipping Administration declined a British request for ships on the ground that the law forbade it, the President asked, "If the Attorney General says it is legal, will you agree?" The desired opinion came next morning.

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW OF HIS POWERS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 4.—It is one thing to say, as the President did at his press conference today, that he does not need the specific approval of Congress to send additional troops to Europe. It is quite another to assume from this broad reply to a general question that Mr. Truman will assign such troops for the land defense of Western Europe, in advance of Russian aggression, without seeking this prior approval.

He may act unilaterally, if or when the project of a Western European army with American units is approved by General Eisenhower on the basis of the surveys the General is about to make abroad as supreme commander of what as yet is a paper force. Or, because the project was not forecast in the Senate debates on the North Atlantic Treaty or in congressional consideration of the first arms assistance appropriation, and because there are evidences that Congress believes its prior approval is a legal requirement, the President may ask for it. A resolution submitted yesterday by Representive COUDERT, of New York City, requiring that no part of the current or future military budget be used for the dispatch or maintenance of additional American troops abroad, presupposes wide support of this position in the Eighty-second Congress.

If that shall prove true, and the test may be hastened by the casual appraisal of his constitutional powers which the President made today, it would seem to be the part of wisdom for Mr. Truman to associate Congress specifically with the land defense of Western Europe, in advance of aggression, as projected. If he goes to the Capitol on this errand with the backing of General Eisenhower, and few think he would execute the project otherwise, as few see any possibility that his program would be rejected.

THE DIFFERENT APPROACH

That is for the President to decide. World events, the response of our North Atlantic allies to General Eisenhower's notice today that they must make equal sacrifices with the United States, and the mood displayed meanwhile by Capitol committees which after all, control military expenditures will undoubtedly influence this decision. Wisely handled, the constitutional argument raised at the Capitol can be dissipated. Less wisely handled, it can be rejected by the President in the knowledge that Executives can and have often presented Congress with faits accomplis which have so deeply involved the Nation that Congress perforce has accepted them. Badly mishandled, the eventual procedure could evoke a constitutional crisis which would add to the national peril.

The form of the question asked the President left all this in doubt. Additional troops to Europe could be replacement in the Army of Occupation, supervising cadres of arms aid distribution and other units on similarly restricted errands. No tenable doubt exists that the President can do these things, and they are not covered in the Coudert resolution by any reasonable construction. Mr. Truman may have viewed the question in these terms On the other hand, he may have accepted as a fact that his questioner was referring to the precise issue raised by Mr. COUDERT and others and intended his answer to be both general and specific, and a denial of Elihu Root's construction of the Constitution when he said, on August 14, 1912, that "Congress could by law forbid" sending troops out of the country. The future will resolve this opaqueness. A press conference, doomed to loosely phrased questions and off-the-cuff answers, is not the forum for ultimate clarification.

OTHER OBSCURITIES

Like everything connected with the twilight area of the Constitution which the current dispute once again discloses, even Root's confident declaration is subject to reservations. When the eminent New York lawyer said this in the Senate he could not have foreseen the day when the United States would enter by treaty into a peacetime military alliance with nations of Europe, as it did when the Senate in 1949 approved the North Atlantic compact. Also, no Senate in his day had bound the nation by treaty to such an instrument as the Charter of the United Nations, which requires each member if called on to furnish armed forces for service anywhere against aggression, after the making of certain military agreements. These agreements have never been made, but, if or when the American executive and legislative branches assent to them, Congress could not exercise as broad a power as Root conceded to it.

Incidentally, it is not generally understood that, in the absence of these military agreements, the United States was not legally obligated under the Charter to send anti-aggression forces to Korea or to send them anywhere else hereafter. This is the reservation made plain in article 43, chapter VII. In reply to another question today the President said that in Korea we are carrying out an obligation to the United Nations which we assumed when we signed (ratified) the Charter. But it is still a moral obligation, at the most. In June the Council was careful only to "recommend" the Korean action.

All of these points seem certain to be vigorously debated in this Congress, the vigor accentuated by the Coudert resolution and the President's off-the-cuff statements today. But they do not alter the historic fact that the Constitution has a twilight zone in which Presidents can unilaterally put the Nation irrevocably at war before Congress formally declares it.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to President Truman's message, I must say that there is one thing on which all Americans can agree, and that is that we had better build up our defenses at home and prepare to take care of the United States in case of a world conflict.

We are told that Russia is speeding up the construction of the waterway linking the Don and the Volga Rivers, providing water connection between the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, the Baltic Sea, and the White Sea. That development will be of tremendous value to Russia in case of a conflict.

It will probably be constructed with some of the lend-lease or Marshall plan money supplied by the United States.

We have a similar and more important project in our own country, already authorized and partially constructed but which is being blocked by certain selfish interests. I refer to the slack water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, usually referred to as the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway. Leading Members of Congress, in both the House and the Senate, are urging the immediate and speedy construction of this waterway, on the ground that it is needed for national defense.

There can be no doubt that this is true.

This project will cut the water distance between our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the Gulf of Mexico by more than 800 miles, and at the same time, provide an extra outlet to the sea. It will provide a slack water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes and all points on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Tennessee, the Illinois, and the Missouri Rivers, and at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

Perhaps the main reason for building the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is in connection with the transportation of iron ore from Venezuela to the steel mills at Pittsburgh, Chicago, and other present centers of the steel industry.

A little known fact is that the present supply of rich iron ore from the Mesabi range in Minnesota is rapidly nearing depletion. It is not expected that present grades will last as much as 10 years longer. Some say it will be gone in three more years. Hence a new source of supply must be found. The American steel mills have feverishly searched for a new supply, expending millions of dollars in the quest. Only two sources have been found where the ore of the required richness can be obtained in large enough supply. They are:

First. Newly discovered iron ore in Labrador. This supply is in the coldest, most bleak, uninhabited section of the North American Continent. An expensive railroad 350 miles long will have to be built to exploit it, and in addition the St. Lawrence seaway will have to be built before presently operating steel mills can avail themselves of this supply. And, as everyone knows, the St. Lawrence waterway would be frozen up about 6 months of every year, while the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway would not be frozen at all, but would be open for traffic the year around.

Second. The other available new supply, which is said to be a far larger supply, and richer deposit, is in Venezuela. Both the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the United States Steel Corp. have staked out claims and purchased interests here. They have acquired large concessions. Experts state that known deposits of iron ore in Venezuela will supply American demands for a hundred years. The ore has already been carried to steel mills in Birmingham, Ala., and elsewhere, for smeltering and found to meet all requirements. So we know the Venezuela deposits will be used.

Here is where the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway comes in. The United States Steel Corp., Bethlehem, Republic, Jones & Laughlin, and other similar concerns have billions of dollars invested in presently operating steel plants at Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Wheeling, Gary, Ind., Chicago, and other points which will be practically useless and obsolete unless a newer and cheaper method of transportation is found. They will have to get this foreign ore, if they continue to operate. Railway transportation is too expensive, even if the railways had the facilities to handle this tremendous new tonnage. Waterways can haul bulk tonnage of this character—iron ore—at approximately one-tenth the cost of railway transportation. The Tennessee-Tombigbee is a natural for such transportation. The steel mills, most of them, are already alongside the Ohio River and other streams and lakes reached by this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway. In addition, it is a slack-water route—no swift river currents to fight.

If this ore were to be shipped on the Mississippi River, it would not only require approximately 1,000 additional miles to traverse, but the barges would have to fight the swift and treacherous currents of the Mississippi River for a distance of 869 miles. It woud cost considerably more to push these barges against this current, and slow down the progress of the two, possibly a week of additional time as compared with the Tennessee-Tombigbee route. In the Tombigbee there is a succession of locks and dams from Mobile to the Tennessee River, impounding water behind the dams in vast pools, almost as still as a millpond. When the Tennessee River is reached, the barges will float downstream from Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee to Paducah, Ky., on the Ohio. From that point upstream on the Ohio River to Pittsburgh, Pa., the Ohio River is controlled by locks and dams, providing more pools and still water for the barges to navigate in. Thus there will be slack water, or downstream navigation for these barges loaded with iron ore from Venezuela all the way to Pittsburgh, Pa.

From Paducah it is downstream 47 miles to Cairo, Ill., on the Mississippi River. Therefore, we will have a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Tennessee River, then a downstream route of 262 miles from there to Cairo, which will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all points between.

The same thing is true for vast tonnages of bauxite, the ore from which aluminum is made, coming from deposits in Dutch Guinea in South America to processing plants at Alcoa, Tenn., Lister Hill, Ala.—on the Tennessee River—and other aluminum plants in St. Louis, Mo.; Louisville, Ky.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and other points in that area.

The Aluminum Co. of America is today getting 95 percent of its bauxite from South America, and this project would greatly facilitate its transportation to the great aluminum plants along the Tennessee, the Ohio, the Mississippi Rivers, and the Great Lakes.

I appeal to the Bureau of the Budget to submit to Congress a request for sufficient funds to speed up the construction of this great project with all possible haste, and to the Committee on Appropriations to include an ample amount for this purpose in its next bill. We cannot afford to wait until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb.

Communist China Aggression in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended are the editorials from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, both published this date, referred to in my remarks made on the House floor and appearing in the RECORD today:

[From the New York Times of January 8, 1951]

UN PUT TO THE TEST

In urging members of the United Nations to take a firm stand against Chinese Communist aggression in Korea and to call that aggression by its rightful name the United States is acting in the interest of the United Nations. The positions that the world organization takes and the degree to which it is willing to stand by its professions of principles will largely determine whether it can and will survive. If it surrenders its integrity now in the name of a supposititious expediency, it will have betrayed the purposes for which it was conceived and in its confession of impotence invited its own dissolution.

The reasons for hesitation on the part of many countries are quite understandable and they should be viewed sympathetically. They are deeply concerned lest the organization, or one of its major members, become involved in a war with Communist China. Some are likewise concerned lest a large United States commitment in Asia leave too little for purposes of commitment in Europe. The first of those two feelings is the more praiseworthy, but they are both very real.

The United States shares both of those feelings. This country does not want to see the battle for Korea develop into a war with the Communist Chinese or with anyone else. This country certainly does not want an overcommitment in any theater to the detriment of another point of need. Because of those attitudes the United States has expressed its willingness to explore all possibilities for a peaceful settlement of the Korean struggle. But that exploration must be realistic, both in the physical and in the moral sense.

Some of the delay in United Nations action has been caused by just such an exploration. There is a hopeful waiting to see if a successful peace formula can be devised. Some parts of the various formulas thus far advanced have been anything but realistic. Both the Asian-Arab bloc and the three-man truce committee, as well as Prime Minister Nehru in London, have suggested that as part of a general settlement there should be the establishment of a free and united Korea with nation-wide elections under United Nations auspices. There is nothing in the record to suggest that the North Koreans, the Chinese Communists, or the Soviet Union would consent to such a plan for the fraction of a second. To put it forward therefore as an objective to be gained, perhaps, by negotiation with Peiping (contingent, of course, upon Peiping's admission to the United Nations) is pure fantasy.

The Chinese Communists are in Korea today, more than a million strong, precisely to prevent the establishment of a free and unified Korea under United Nations auspices. They are fighting the United Nations on the battlefield, just as the Soviet Union has steadily fought the United Nations in the diplomatic arena, to keep the United Nations from carrying out, in Korea, the very purposes to which it is honorably committed. To assume that their admission to the councils of the United Nations will reverse this objective is to lose touch with reality. No Communists. Korean, Chinese, Russian, or American want a free Korea, and they are willing to risk a war to prevent it.

Likewise, they not merely risk but boldly demand the complete moral disintegration of the United Nations. The United Nations is told upon what terms it can capitulate in the face of aggression. It can admit its grievous and "illegal" error in denouncing that aggression in the first place and take the sponsors, abettors, and finally the partners in that aggression into its humbled bosom. The alternative is to be driven into the sea. If the United Nations does so capitulate it will have announced to the world that there is one moral principle of resistance to aggression when the aggressor is small and quite another and quite opposite principle of resistance when the aggressor is sufficiently powerful and arrogant. To make that admission is to put an end to the moral value of the United Nations Charter. If aggression against the free Republic of Korea was wrong last June it is wrong now and a million Chinese Communists can't make it right.

The United Nations, thanks to Soviet obstruction, does not have the physical force to counter any and all aggression. But it does have the moral obligation to remain committed against it. The present United Nations forces may be defeated in the field and obliged to retreat. That is no reason why the United Nations need be defeated in the world of morals and forced into oblivion.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 8, 1951]

THE UN MUST ACT

Spurred by growing bewilderment and doubt throughout the country, the State Department has undertaken a vigorous diplomatic offensive to get from the United Nations a statement that China has been guilty of aggression in Korea. Less could hardly be asked of an international organization which is, among other things, the standard bearer of the world's concept of right and wrong An argument was possible directly after the Chinese intervention, and before the thirty-eighth parallel had been crossed, to the effect that the branding of China as aggressor would hamper efforts to achieve a truce. Even then, however, it seemed to us the proper course to keep the facts on the record straight, calling aggression by its obvious name, and proceeding to deal with the situation with patience and statesmanlike magnanimity.

Some hope apparently persists among non-Communist nations that, in spite of all, cease-fire arrangements can be worked out. Some fear exists that to name China as aggressor will be a prelude to all-out war. The hope is so slim as to be negligible; moreover, if the Chinese were to find it in their interests to call a truce, the charge of aggression would hardly deter them. As for the fear of all-out war, the definition of China's offense does not in any way commit the UN or the United States to such an engagement. With the aggressor recognized for what he is, it then becomes the task of policymakers to decide by what means and to what extent he is to be checked and punished.

Originally the charge of aggression was to be made by the Security Council; but the inevitability of a Russian veto where any of its satellites or minions are involved led to the provision which makes it possible for the veto-free Assembly to take up the issue. For the Assembly not to act would be a shock indeed. For it to act unconvincingly, with numerous abstentions, would be almost as bad. The need is for a decisive move—for an unequivocal statement which will have the effect of restoring to the international scene a reality of which protracted evasions have robbed it. For lack of such a statement the free world remains divided and confused, and the Chinese breach retains a shadow of wholly improper justification. For lack of it, too, the UN declines daily in men's opinion. The State Department, in presenting forcefully the United States point of view, is serving not only the interests of our country but of law and freedom everywhere.

A Program for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of Thursday, January 4, 1951:

A PROGRAM FOR UNITY

In this time of stress and danger our country needs a program on which the American people can unite.

Many notable Americans have made constructive contributions to the current foreign policy debate. None of them has questioned the gravity of the world situation. None has denied the necessity of rearmament. Few, if any, have shown the slightest disposition toward appeasement of aggression.

The serious differences that do exist concern the adequacy of the measures being taken to meet the Russian challenge and the wisdom—or lack of wisdom—with which America's world policies have been conceived and carried forward

The grave misgivings that do obstruct unity arise in major part from lack of confidence in the State Department.

This newspaper believes that the debate has helped to develop the essential outlines of a program which could have, because it would deserve, united and nonpartisan support.

American rearmament comes first in such a program. Defense officials should make fewer speeches worrying about how large, how fast a mobilization effort the people will support and concentrate on pushing forward the largest, fastest effort possible.

The State Department should fully consult the military and Congress before it makes any more basic strategic decisions with respect to such areas as Spain and Formosa. The diplomats have had too free a rein on matters of that kind.

We need allies, but we cannot safely continue to take it for granted that our allies will do the things necessary to become dependable partners in a crisis.

Our Government's commitments should be honored, where there is reasonable compliance with the terms of contracts by other nations party to them. But the record to date has not been reassuring and, at least until there is a new Secretary of State, the degree of compliance should be kept under survey by a congressional watchdog committee.

The administration can avoid future mistakes by submitting all agreements which have the force of treaties to the Senate for ratification, as the Constitution provides. Secret diplomacy has been responsible for many of our troubles.

Since the Chinese Communists insist on fighting, we should lower the barriers and let Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists fight them, and arm the anti-Red guerrillas on the Chinese mainland, as well. Placed on the defensive, the Red Chinese might look less tough. Our present policy tends to protect their rear while they attack Americans in Korea.

To avoid another Korea in Western Europe, we should insist that our allies go along step by step with us in forming the European defense force. Unless and until we have reliable allies in Europe and Asia, was should not consider sending American armies to fight on either continent.

Spain should be helped to arm and to build air bases behind the Pyrenees, without more delay. Japan should be permitted to begin rearming now.

No more money should be sent abroad during this crisis which does not contribute to containment of communism by military strength. Few of the point 4 projects thus far suggested can meet that test. They can wait while we strive to save the world from war, if that is possible, or to save our country if Russia forces war upon us.

And confidence in the State Department should be restored.

To restore that confidence, Secretary Acheson should go.

He has returned empty-handed from every international conference he has attended in the 2 years he has been in office.

His policy is caught on dead center between the Chinese Communists and the Chinese Nationalists.

He has opposed Dutch colonialism in Indonesia while supporting French colonialism in Indochina. By encouraging the British to recognize Red China, he has placed the United States at odds with Britain on China policy. By first giving away our bargaining power, he has placed the United States at odds with France on German policy.

He has just touched the Japanese problem, but that touch was enough to get us all snarled up with India and the Philippines. Where misunderstanding doesn't exist, he produces it It must be a gift.

All of the money he has spent in Europe hasn't produced a single new division. Not one of the "situations of strength" he talks about has been built.

He is regarded as a soft touch abroad and has lost public confidence at home.

He inherited a sound bipartisan relationship with Congress and destroyed it by his inability to understand the meaning of teamwork.

The wave of "McCarthyism" which swept the Nation was a direct reaction to the exhibitionism he displayed when he refused to turn his back on Alger Hiss.

Our retreat in Asia dates from his appointment as Under Secretary of State in 1945, when he initiated our disastrous China policy.

Having made himself the principal obstacle to national unity, he has disqualified himself for further public service.

We need a Secretary of State in whose wisdom and ability the American people and Congress can feel it safe to place their trust.

Inflation Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith letter addressed to me by Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, together with a certain resolution approved by the voting delegates to the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation held in Dallas, Tex., December 11–14, 1950:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1951.
Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOEVEN: The inflationary threat created by our present defense program has become a matter of common knowledge. Firm and effective action is necessary to counter this threat. Counter measures obviously are being taken. The grave danger facing us on the economic front is the possibility that the laudable desire to check inflation will lead to adoption of the wrong measures.

Price, wage, and ration controls cannot prevent inflation. If we put our faith in such measures, we not only will fail to prevent inflation, but we will also sell the defense program short by curbing the productive power, which is our greatest source of strength. In an emergency of long duration, such controls could destroy our free-choice economic system.

A part of the agitation for controls appears to stem from a misunderstanding of the situation we are in today. We are in a period of international tension which may last for several years. Our national policy is still (1) to present the outbreak of a third world war, and (2) to build up our national military and economic strength as rapidly as possible so that we will be able to win such a war if it proves unavoidable. We cannot estimate the probable duration of the present tension, or calculate when we may face the greatest test of our strength. Accordingly, we must adopt policies which will not only serve our present needs, but contribute to the rapid development of a much greater national strength.

Price and wage controls would hamper the development of the increased production we so badly need. This can easily be illustrated by reference to livestock and meat, although similar results can be expected if price and wage ceilings are applied in other areas of the economy.

Meat production is at a high level, but ever greater production is needed. The production of meat—particularly pork—can be substantially increased in the coming year if hampering restrictions are avoided. We have a large hog population to supply brood sows; we have the second largest supply of corn in our history; and we have the equipment and know-how.

Production, both of feed and of livestock, can be stepped up on an enduring basis. This is what we need in America. Farmers are ready to produce. The most effective steps which could be taken by Government to assure an adequate production of livestock would be to (1) make the fullest use of the outlook material of the United States Department of Agriculture indicating probable firm demand, (2) assure farmers that price and ration controls are not going to be put on meat, and (3) suspend corn acreage allotments for the 1951 crop.

Price and ration controls on livestock and meat inevitably will mean less meat. Farmers must make many decisions which influence the quantity of meat they will produce. Price and ration controls cannot help but tip the balance on many of these decisions toward less production. Stepped-up production on an enduring basis is the consumer's best hope for adequate meat supplies and reasonable prices. Under a control system, meat might seem to be cheap in the butcher shops, but it would not be in the shops.

Experience has demonstrated that ceilings on meat invite black markets. Under OPA, black markets resulted in enormous waste of labor in legitimate plants; reduced volume for such plants and consequent reductions in the taxes paid by them; loss of valuable by-products which were vitally needed; and creation of a public health hazard by the sale of uninspected meat.

Experience under OPA definitely proved that, even if more effective measures can be developed to cope with the black market, an army of administrative personnel would be required, both in Government and in the industry. Manpower is one of our most serious shortages; we cannot afford to divert thousands of workers from the production of goods to the administration of unnecessary and unworkable regulations.

In this time of national emergency, we are calling on you to support measures—such as (1) the elimination of all nonessential governmental expenses, (2) increased efficiency in government, (3) pay-as-we-go taxation, and (4) necessary steps in the field of monetary, credit, and fiscal policy—which action will really control inflation. In addition, it is only reasonable that we make greater use of techniques which have enabled our economic system to outstrip every other system of production and distribution.

It is because price controls are clumsy and inefficient substitutes for the automatic functioning of market prices, that we oppose such controls. Our policy in this regard is not taken with the idea of serving the special interests of farmers as a group; instead, we have firm conviction that our recommendations are in the general interest of all Americans. Price, wage, and ration controls have more in common with totalitarian principles than with the principles which support our free American system. Such measures cannot prevent inflation, but certainly would impair our national strength by interfering with production.

Our position on these vital matters is set forth more completely in the enclosed copy of a resolution Inflation Control, which was approved by the elected delegates from our member State Farm Bureaus at our annual meeting in Dallas, Tex., last month.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN B. KLINE, *President*.

RESOLUTION ENTITLED "INFLATION CONTROL," APPROVED BY THE VOTING DELEGATES TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, HELD IN DALLAS, TEX., DECEMBER 11–14, 1950

The American Farm Bureau Federation has long urged that aggressive steps be taken in the monetary, credit, and fiscal policy fields to bring greater stability to the general price level. Since the control of monetary, credit, and fiscal policy rests in the hands of the Federal Government, under the Constitution, the problem is not one of delegating authority to the Federal Government in new areas. It is a matter of reshaping and coordinating policies in a field in which Government policy now largely prevails so that such policies will make a greater contribution to the development of a more stable price level.

Monetary, credit, and fiscal policies which affect the general stability of prices are in direct and impersonal as contrasted with the direct and personal controls that are required by specific programs designed to rectify the dislocations and injustices resulting from an unstable price level. Greater stability of the general price level offers the only opportunity for greater economic security without programs which require specific and direct controls on each farm, business, or individual.

The inflationary pressures generated by our present national-defense program make effective action to stabilize the purchasing power of the American dollar more urgent now than ever before.

Inflation cannot be stopped by price, wage, and ration controls. Such measures deal with symptoms rather than fundamental causes. They interfere with production; impair the flexibility of our economy; reduce our capacity to expand output; require huge administrative staffs; and invite black markets. We face an emergency of indefinite duration. In such a situation the premature adoption of price, wage, and ration controls could strangle our economy to the point of impairing our ability to fight an all-out war should such a conflict prove unavoidable.

American farmers have produced beyond belief in times of need and we pledge ourselves to ample production now. We believe that if we are given full information as to production desired, and if productive aids are made available to us, we can produce more food and fiber more efficiently if controls are held to an absolute minimum. We insist that we be given an opportunity to demonstrate our productive capacity without controls. If total war forces the application of price and wage ceilings, we will insist that they be applied on an across-the-board basis.

The present situation calls for a bold attack on the fundamental cause of inflation, which cause is an increase in the supply of money in relation to the supplies of goods and services available to consumers.

Most importantly, we must pay the bill. There is no possibility of controlling inflation without taxes high enough to get on a pay-as-we-go basis.

We must strive to meet increased demand with increased production wherever possible. To do this we must enhance the opportunity of individuals to be productive, and increase the length of the workweek. Strict Government economy is a must. Nonessential Government expenditures must be eliminated. Necessary Government borrowing must be planned so as to prevent an increase in the Government debt to the banks, because such an increase would both directly and indirectly increase the supply of money. To this end we urge that efforts to sell E bonds be intensified; that careful consideration be given to the desirability of offering additional inducement for holders to reinvest the proceeds of maturing E bonds in Government securities; and that steps be taken to prevent a further shift of non-bank-held negotiable bonds to the banking system.

The national debt should be so handled as to make the maximum contribution to price and economic stability, rather than to finance the debt at a minimum cost.

Monetary and credit policies carried on by the Federal Reserve System cannot alone achieve a stable level of prices. Yet they are an important factor and should be geared toward that objective. The Federal Reserve's authority to vary the member bank reserve requirments should be increased. If the inflation threat continues, reserve requirements for banks should be raised, with appropriate adjustments in the bank holdings eligible to be counted as reserves.

The Government's present policy of restricting the expansion of housing and installment credit should be continued in effect, with such adjustments as may be necessary from time to time to keep these restrictions consistent with the requirements of an effective program to control inflation.

We reiterate our recommendation that the Congress establish a bipartisan joint congressional monetary study commission, charged with the responsibility of making studies and submitting recommendations to the Congress on means of bringing greater stability to the purchasing power of money.

Why You Buy Books That Sell Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the January 1951 issue of the American Legion Magazine:

WHY YOU BUY BOOKS THAT SELL COMMUNISM

(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

One day recently John Smith went into a Manhattan book store and asked for a copy of Seeds of Treason, the comprehensive, objective study of the perjury trials of Alger Hiss. The clerk, without looking up, said they didn't carry it. Why? She shrugged her shoulders. How should she know? They just didn't carry it. Not for sale and not in the lending library. What about that other book: the one by the fellow Senator MCCARTHY got before the Tydings committee?

"Oh, you mean Prof. Owen Lattimore's Ordeal by Slander. Sure. Just a minute." She fell over herself in her eagerness to haul out a fresh copy. "Such a wonderful man. It's a marvelous book. You'll be glad you bought it."

Smith was impressed by her salesmanship, but after leafing through the book he left without buying it. The next day Smith had some business in a small suburban community. He wandered into one of those pretty little greeting-card-gift-shoppe book stores owned and run by a middle-aged widow, used to better days. The shop is her complete livelihood, and she has to buy carefully so as not to be caught with a stock she can't sell. All this our man Smith learned quickly. He's a friendly soul, the shop wasn't busy, and the owner was glad to have someone to talk to.

HOW A REVIEW AFFECTS BOOK SALES

No; she didn't have Seeds of Treason either. Why? Well, she depended on the book-review sections in the New York papers, the Times and Herald Tribune mostly—and the reviewers in those papers hadn't seemed to think much of the book. She guided her purchases of books, especially reorders, by what the reviewers said. She felt the "experts" those big important newspapers chose to review for them knew more about books than she did.

John Smith listened. Did she have a copy of that other book—Ordeal by Slander, by Owen Lattimore? Oh, yes, indeed, she had that in stock. The New York Times Sunday book section and the Herald Tribune both had given it all of page 1 and space inside, too; and both papers had reviewed it again on Monday. So, of course, she had ordered it. It must be a very important book, she continued, and she was planning to read it herself.

John Smith could be anybody. These two experiences have been duplicated with other books in other cities and towns for a good many years now. They represent only two techniques in the Communist master plan that embraces every known means of influencing and dominating the human mind.

In what that courageous long-time fighter against communism, author Eugene Lyons has called the Red decade—the 1930's—the people's or popular front phase of Communist activity outside Russia achieved phenomenal success. Our own American popular front, though never officially in power as it was in France and, briefly, in Spain, bored deep into the Federal Government and penetrated in various degrees the labor movement, education, the churches, youth movements, the theater, movies, the arts, publishing in all its branches. At its highest point, about 1938, the Comintern (it's now the Cominform), as the international Communist organization was known, had mobilized the deliberately conscious or the starry-eyed innocent collaboration of thousands of influential American educators, New Deal officials, social workers, social registerites, novelists, script writers, directors, publishers, editors, and the literati generally. Each phase of American life and activity could be explored almost endlessly for proof of the success of this sinister foreign propaganda that has but one aim: the destruction of free, capitalist

society and the conversion of thinking, independent men and women into plodding mindless slaves.

It is with but one phase of this intellectual cuckoldry of the Kremlin that we can deal in this article—the penetration of the book-publishing field and its essential attribute, literary reviewing and criticism. And in order to explore two subdivisions of the master plan, we invite the reader to return to John Smith and his experiences with the clerk in the Manhattan book shop and the suburban widow.

Books are published to be sold as merchandise, like shoes or sardines. Ironically, however, the avidity of the American mind for knowledge and information, the American passion for advancement and improvement, factors which stimulated mass production of books and made publishing big business, have also provided our enemies with one of their most valuable weapons. Books have become transmission belts for insidious propaganda for treason.

The American with something to sell gets it to his buying public chiefly through advertising and modern sales methods. It is as true of books as it is of candy, cosmetics, and cigarettes. But books, although they are frankly material, are also food for the mind and spirit. But unlike a new brand of soap which has to depend on paid advertising to sell it to the public, a book gets extra special free treatment. This is the review by the newspaper and magazine, the radio, and TV critics. The reviewer stands between the public and the publisher's product in almost the same way that a capricious or haughty head waiter mans the barricade and the plush rope at a swank eating place and decides what table he'll let you have, or whether he'll bother to let you in at all. The reviewer can hang garlands or garbage on an author's work. On the reviewer's integrity, even more than on his technical skill, depend on author's reputation and livelihood.

The importance of the reviewer then is evident, since the only news the public gets of a book is through the reviews and paid advertising; and paid advertising, more often than not, depends on the amount, kind and quality of the reviews. If the reviews are poor, the publisher won't put money into paid advertising. He can't afford to. He can afford it less if the book gets no reviews, which often happens. Depending also on the reviews is the extent of the sales effort expended on the book. Before the reviewer has given his verdict, the bookseller has had information about the book only from the publisher's representative, the naturally prejudiced salesman and a few other trade sources. No bookseller, not even the most industrious and conscientious ones, can read all the 8,000 to 10,000 new books that come out every year. He has to depend on reviewers' estimates of books more than on his own judgment and experience.

Proof of the importance of this is to be found in the recent victory of the American Legion in a controversy with the officials of the Brookline (Mass.) Public Library over circulating an anti-Communist book dealing with the Alger Hiss case—Seeds of Treason.

Local Legion officials had charged that the library had banned the book, which has been on best-seller lists since the start of its publication last April.

Recently, Arthur L. Endicott, chairman of the board of trustees, announced that the book had been made available to library patrons.

In explaining the library's earlier stand on the book Mr. Endicott said: "The selection of books was in large measure dependent upon the reviews which we have learned from past experience to be a satisfactory guide. Several of the reviews were not such as to induce the committee of our staff, which makes a preliminary recommendation, to purchase the book. The trustees are the final authority to decide upon the purchase of any controversial book."

However, Mr. Endicott revealed that following the Legion's determined stand on the matter, the trustees had decided to purchase the book for the Brookline Library.

This explains why book reviewers are important to the Communists, too. Their influence, if it can be won, can be used to enormous advantage.

The Communists were the first to see this, naturally, so it was imperative that if they were to control or dominate this important field of communications they spot their agents or sympathizers among the reviewers. Thorough strategists that they are, they don't rely on partial or even complete coverage of a single arm; they make use of the whole body of publishing.

LEFT-WING LITERARY NETWORK

In addition to spotting their own agents or sympathizers among the reviewers, they actually get active party members or cooperative fellow-travelers into publishing houses as editors or editorial assistants; they put their people into retail book outlets, in department stores, and bookshops.

And they have set up and control book-selling clubs, related trade-unions, etc. And, of course, the party has plenty of members and sympathizers among the authors themselves, always ready to follow the line in fiction or nonfiction work; to logroll for the other faithful and to be hatchet-men against anti-Communist writers.

Thus organized, they are able to work a parallel course of intensive propaganda for their aims and sabotage of everyone and everything opposed to those aims.

Whenever a book comes along that is potentially damaging to the Communist effort the entire strength of their forces is marshaled against it. They go beyond just book reviews; they bear down on the faithful and the naive in all other specialized types of writing; syndicated columns, editorials, etc., for it is through this group that public opinion is formed, convictions cemented, prejudices solidified, and hatreds whipped up.

Just this past summer, the syndicated columnist, Bob Considine, one of the country's best and most prolific writers, and a fearless one who calls the shots as he sees them, spoke about this field of specialized writing, which is his own, on a national radio network. He described it as the one which wields the greatest power; one, therefore, which should have a corresponding sense of responsibility. By and large he said these writers who are given such wide latitude of expression are with scant exception, fair-minded men and women. But he added:

"If there is any apparent antireligious feeling among these specialists in journalism, it will be found chiefly among the book reviewers of certain leading New York newspapers and literary publications.

"Here a rather shocking situation prevails," he went on. "If you write a book which steps on the toes of our home-grown left-wingers, bamboozled liberals or outright Communists, or their idols abroad, you can almost count on receiving a number of sour reviews—where the reviews hurt most.

"There are, of course, outstanding exceptions to this rule. But the average big city book critic sets himself up as a defender and champion of the legend that those who speak out against Communists and their pale pink carbon copies are automatically cheap sensationalists, warmongers, and unctuous serfs of Wall Street.

"Some of these book reviewers get away with murder, even though their reviews appear in newspapers and magazines which could not possibly exist—nor could the reviewers—under communism. Yet the reader of a fat Sunday newspaper can digest an editorial denouncing communism or shudder through such stories as the tortured confessions of clergymen and businessmen behind the iron curtain—and then turn to the book review sections and encounter some inbred critic beating to a pulp a book author who is trying to say the same thing.

"They seem to produce nothing, these critics. Their role is simply to belt one over any writer who has the industry and knowledge to produce an anti-Communist tome. Deplorably, few authors have any way of retorting, rebutting, or suing the critic for pulling the rug from under years of devoted work.

"We have book publishers, too, among them, some grown quite fat under our capitalistic system, who will not touch an anti-Communist book. Among these are some shrewd fellows who have sense enough to know that such books will be solidly battered by the critics and probably lose money. But there are others who seem to believe with the critics, and like them are Russia-firsters.

"I can speak with a little personal experience in this latter respect," Considine continued. "I had something to do with the editing of a book named The Rape of Poland, written by the exiled democratic Premier of Poland, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk. He gave a most detailed account of how Communists were able to seize that predominantly Catholic country with hardly the firing of a shot—except in the prisons of the secret police. The publisher who originally planned to produce the book actually asked Mikolajczyk to tone down his accounts of the tortures and murders inflicted on Polish patriots during the destruction of that country's hard-won liberties.

"Mikolajczyk, of course, refused to go along with this treacherous suggestion. He found another publisher—one with the courage to let the truth be told."

Mikolajczyk's book, the Rape of Poland, subtitled "Pattern of Soviet Aggression," was published, without censorship or distortion, by Whittlesey House, a division of the McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

Poland was the first country on Russia's schedule of seizures by force—force of lying propaganda, fifth-column tactics, boring from within, all the techniques of oppression and suppression with the trade mark of the hammer and sickle, masquerading under the sickening euphemism of liberation. The Communists therefore ordered the heaviest attacks on books by Poles or about Poland that attempted to reveal the truth.

Still another notable book which fell into this category, was Defeat in Victory, by Jan Ciechanowski, published in 1947, a dramatic and moving account of Poland's last free days before the Communists took over. This died of neglect; deliberate, planned neglect.

THEY DIDN'T LIKE FLYNN

Sometimes the attack centers on the author, regardless of the book. John T. Flynn is one such victim, and the violence of the attack on him was all the greater because experience had shown that Mr. Flynn, with a long-established reputation as a writer, editor, critic, and fighter for principle, didn't scare easily and never quit. He also knew all the tricks and anticipated a great many of the moves charted and planned for his professional destruction. When he wrote the Roosevelt Myth, he submitted the manuscript to several publishers and discussed it with still others. This was the first time in his more than 40 years' experience as a well-known writer-editor that he had had to peddle a book manuscript. Some of the publishers were old friends and most of them who read the manuscript expressed great interest and approval—but—their lists were full; they couldn't get the book out in time really to profit from it; the paper situation was bad, etc., etc., ad nauseam. The excuses were as transparent as they were lame and weak.

Mr. Flynn found a courageous publisher in young Devin Garrity, head of the firm of Devin-Adair, that up to then had specialized chiefly in Irish books and other fine works in the general field. They published Mr. Flynn's book; and he was dodging the dead cats and over-ripe fruit of scurrilous and vicious criticism for months thereafter. Nothing daunted, he wrote another book, The Road Ahead. In this work Mr. Flynn says: "The real enemy we must identify and fight at every crossroad and at all points is the American edition of the British Fabian Socialist, who is engaged in a sneak attack here, as his comrades were in England, who denies that he is a Socialist and who operates behind a mask which he calls national planning." Mr. Flynn is eminently qualified by experience and study to hold and expound such views. There are not many Americans who know more about our history and politics than Mr. Flynn. And few of those who qualify can match him for his intellectual honesty. He believes, with millions of others not so articulate, that communism is merely socialism in a hurry. And he has not hesitated to say so and to fight this threat to our established American system. This is the key to his book, a warning that whereas the Communists are numerically weak here, millions who say they hate Communists are actually helping them at every turn. The Communist Party has been able to use the professional liberals to do their dirty work.

Mr. Flynn's book, The Road Ahead, by all the criteria applied to books should have had the widest attention from reviewers, especially in the nationally circulated Sunday book review supplements.

At this point Mr. Devin Garrity reports:

"We published the book and waited for the reviews, especially the Sunday New York Herald Tribune After 2 months, when it seemed fairly certain there would be no review, I instituted some inquiries and learned that the review copy had been received and was on file, but that it had been marked for the silent treatment. No review was scheduled for it. We then bought advertising space in the Herald Tribune's Sunday book section and ran the excellent and fair review of Mr. Flynn's book which had been written by John Chamberlain and published in Human Events, a small Washington, D. C., publication of exceptionally high standing but limited circulation. The ad was set up purposely and deliberately, on our orders, to look like a legitimate review—which it was, although from another paper—and legal requirements were complied with by printing 'Advt' at the bottom. We paid, I believe, $700 for the ad.

"The Herald Tribune then changed its position, probably as a result of the ad, because in 3 weeks, just barely enough time to hire someone to read the book and write a review—a review did appear—a smear job to counteract the effect of the favorable Chamberlain review we had bought the space to run."

THE ALL-OUT JOB ON WHITE

For a perfect example of the all-out, four-alarm attack on an anti-Communist book by another well-known anti-Communist author, W. L. White's Report on the Russians is probably the classic example.

W. L. White is the son of the William Allen White, the "sage of Emporia," an American newspaper editor in the best tradition of our country and his craft. Bill White has inherited the fighting heart of his father and his crusading spirit for justice and right. To his inheritance of craftsmanship, he has added a rich talent of his own that has grown with the years. He is the author of several books, among them the poignant Journey for Margaret, the stirring They Were Expendable, and Queens Die Proudly, all successful war books, widely read and acclaimed.

In the summer of 1944, when Soviet Russia was fighting Hitler and Nazi Germany, and we were fighting Nazi Germany and Japan, Mr. White, accompanied Eric Johnston, then president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, on a 6 weeks' trip to Russia. It was decidedly to Russian advantage to put aside its long-standing rule of secrecy and allow these American visitors to go about the country. It was wartime; Russia was being hailed as our great ally, and a real and extraordinary effort was being put forth by all Americans, even those of vast and bitter experience with the Soviets, to be fair and impartial in their judgment. Wasn't Russia fighting Hitler, too? Forgotten, far too quickly and easily by most, was the Hitler-Stalin pact, that cynically political marriage of convenience between two totalitarian despots. Forgotten were the bloody Moscow purges, the long record of sinister events under Stalin.

The White Book, recounting his trip through Russia, was published by Harcourt Brace, after condensation in the Reader's Digest, in March 1945. Where the publishers had confidently expected and with good reason, that it would sell 120,000 copies, the total was some 40,000 less. The book was first attacked by David Zaslavsky in Pravda and sniped at by the local American leftist press incessantly before publication. Before the review copies were out, Bennett Cerf predicted in the Saturday Review of Literature, that it would be the worst book of the year. It was then covered for that publication by a symposium of five writers. Three of these reviews, according to Mr. White, were amplifications of the line laid down by Comrade Zaslavsky and Mr. Cerf. The other two reviewers, Louis Fischer and William Henry Chamberlin, both of whom had spent more time in Russia than the other three, not only liked the book, but dared to say so in their reviews.

However, the book was so abused and the Stalinist operation against it so comprehensive, that reviewers for libraries and church organizations were suggesting, "Don't read this; it's a prejudiced book."

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., a Red outfit subsequently declared subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, led the attack with an elaborate, expensive, 32-page two-color brochure, which boldly purported to be "the truth." Ironically, the only paid advertisement this publication carried was "an official United States Treasury advertisement—prepared under the auspices of the Treasury Department and the War Advertising Council." Thus, the taxpayers' money helped pay for this widely distributed attack on a distinguished American author for his effrontery in telling the truth as he saw it on his tour of Russia.

The brochure itself merits close examination. It is black with a 2-inch margin of red down the right side. The cover is particularly interesting. A great blob of white with jagged edges like a burst of light, is overprinted with the legend, "The Book the Nazis Like," and all this is superimposed on a facsimile of the dust jacket of White's book, exposing it only enough to identify it and reveal his name clearly. Underneath this is another facsimile—a reproduction of part of the front page of Der Westkampfer (the West Front Fighter), the issue of January 30, 1945, with a dispatch from Lisbon about White's description of forced labor in the Soviet Union.

Now the interesting thing about all this is that Der Westkampfer was the front journal of Hitler's army—the German equivalent of the Stars and Stripes, which we circulated to our soldiers at the front. This was January 1945—the date is plainly seen on the facsimile—and the German paper was barred in the United States at the time. How was it that a copy of this publication was available to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship for just this kind of propagandizing in the United States?

GANGING UP TO KILL A BOOK

The booklet is also noteworthy for the fact that on page 3 it carried the petition signed by 16 correspondents, newspaper, magazine, and radio, excoriating White for writing the book. Never before, to my knowledge, have writers joined in public condemnation of a colleague. Curiously enough, several weeks before the book was published, the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship cabled the Anglo-American Correspondents' Association in Moscow, asking them as a body, to join in a petition denouncing the book. George Moorad, who died in the 1949 plane disaster in India which took the lives of 13 newsmen, wrote to White from Moscow in March 1945 and sent the letter via diplomatic pouch so that it would be safe from inspection and confiscation by the Russian censor. In it he detailed the story of that cable. Here it is as he told it: The correspondents in Moscow met after receiving Edwin Smith's telegram from the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (hereinafter referred to as NCASF) and voted down the request—an action which considering their situation (they knew the Soviet Foreign Office had read the cable) took real courage. However, of the 18 correspondents present at the Moscow meeting, 7 cabled their individual willingness to sign a denunciation of a book they had not read. By writing, telephoning, and cabling all over the world to each of the many scores of correspondents who at some time had been in Moscow since the war began, the NCASF was able to collect 9 more names and released the list as "16 American Moscow correspondents" who denounced the book. Of the 16, several were British, Canadian, or New Zealanders. Others were journalistic curiosities who wrote sporadically for obscure Communist or fellow-traveler publications and could be called war correspondents only by stretching the term considerably. However, also on the list were several well-known names, including Edgar Snow and Richard Lauterbach, of whom more later.

The book was even reviewed by the Reverend Dr. William Howard Melish in the Churchman, although it is difficult to see what powers of clairvoyance the Dr. Melish, of Brooklyn, possessed that would enable him to judge the accuracy of reporter White's facts from trained first-hand observation in Russia. This is the same Dr. Melish who is notorious for his support and defense of Red fronts and fronters. He was assistant to his father, the elderly rector of the Episcopal Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn, N. Y. Recently the vestrymen demanded the resignation of the Melishes. The rector, Dr. John Howard Melish, was removed by the Bishop of Long Island, James P. de Wolfe, after he had concurred; but the Melishes refused to obey the bishop's edict and have been stubbornly resisting the ouster in a series of legal moves in the courts and extra-legal ones outside.

White's book was immediately followed by a spate of reporters' books on Russia, all ballyhooed either by their publishers or the NCASF, the Daily Worker, or the authors themselves as the answers to the dreadfully prejudiced White book.

MR. SNOW WIELDS THE AX

One of the hatchet men on Mr. White's book was Edgar Snow, long-time writer-editor for the Saturday Evening Post, and a signer of the petition condemning White's book. Mr. Snow has long been on good terms with the left. He was chief correspondent in the Far East in 1938 for the London Daily Herald (official daily newspaper of the British Socialist Party). The Saturday Review of Literature chose Mr. Snow to do the job on George Creel's latest book, Russia's Race for Asia, and Snow produced a highly unfair review.

Mr. Creel reports on his experience: "I took the matter up with the SRL and they

printed my letter along with another column of rebuttal by Snow. Although the book was selling fairly well, the publishers went panicky and would not put out another edition."

What Mr. Creel wrote to the editor of the Saturday Review of Literature follows:

"Edgar Snow, in what purported to be a review of my book, Russia's Race for Asia, started off with an ugly sneer at my conduct of the Committee on Public Information in the First World War and then proceeded to berate me for 'errors of fact, judgment, and understanding,' the 'use of quotations out of context,' and other dishonesties. * * * I have always assumed it was the right of an author to have his work reviewed objectively, or at least with some reasonable degree of impartiality and dispassion. Also, that the purpose of a review was not controversy but critical assessment, with criticism based on firmer and higher ground than prejudice. If these are justifiable assumptions then what could be more unfair than to turn a book over to another author whose own writings give plain warning of a bias that will impel him to use his own review either for attack or attempts at rebuttal?

"When you handed Russia's Race for Asia over to Mr. Snow, you cannot have been unaware that for years, both in books and articles, he has specialized in presenting a favorable picture of the Chinese Communists. You must have foreseen the violence of his dissent to my charge that the Chinese Communist party was organized and financed by Russian agents, and that for a full 30 years it has been under Moscow's direction and control for the conquest of China and the subsequent communization of Asia.

"It could have been no secret to you," Mr. Creel continued, "that he would particularly resent my denunciation of those 'credulous liberals and fellow travelers' who have labored so faithfully to persuade American opinion that the Chinese Communist party is a purely native movement, led by agrarian reformers and born of a people's spontaneous revolt against corruption and oppression. All propaganda that I branded as the ultimate lie.

"True, certain metropolitan dailies have made a practice of this type of reviewing; the New York Times, for example, put Gen. Claire Chennault's book at the mercy of Annalee Jacoby, coauthor of Thunder Out of China." (Another apologia for the Chinese Communists.)

Mr. Creel in his last sentence, as much as in his entire letter reveals a common practice in book reviewing circles—a well-known Communist technique whether the practitioners know it or not. It is the double-action attack, the double-jointed double-cross, logrolling on the one hand, logjamming on the other. In short, a pro-Communist author gets a friendly, even fulsome review by a pro-Communist reviewer who may himself be an author, or by a fellow-traveling professor or self-styled expert. The author who is not in that company, who is writing against the Communist line, will usually be subjected to a reviewer who sneers, belittles, derides, and generally macerates both book and author.

REVIEWERS FOR THE NEW CHINA

Mr. Creel had another sample of this when the New York Times turned his Russia's Race for Asia over for review to Professor Nathaniel Peffer, of Columbia University, a frequent contributor to the Times Sunday magazine section and its Sunday book section. Professor Peffer has been an unremitting foe of Nationalist China and Chiang Kai-shek in virtually everything he has written since the Japanese surrender, in 1945. The New Republic gave Mr. Creel's book for review to the late Richard Lauterbach, former Times-Life correspondent and a consistent apologist for Russia.

When it became apparent to patriotic, clear-headed Americans who have made a lifetime study of communism that our hard-won victory in the Pacific might be lost by defaulting to propagandists, they tried to sound a warning. The war which China had waged alone against Japan from 1931 until our entry in 1941, was one which cost the United States the lives of thousands of young men and millions of dollars, which the young men who survived will be paying for during the whole of their lives. The Commie-hep American writers and others knew that the Chinese Communist leaders were Moscow-trained and Moscow-directed stooges bent on delivering their country over to Communist domination in return for the gauleitering privileges, if they could get them. These anti-Communist writers began to talk and write the warning.

But the organized Communist opposition got there first. All the resources of the Cominform were thrown into the battle for China. It was a battle that was waged in every country with cells, grouping into units, regrouping into cadres, moving relentlessly and purposefully, with diabolically effective propaganda to blanket the truth and kidnap the American mind, the anti-Communist mind, wherever it showed and smother all opposition by any and every means.

No better illustration of the effectiveness of that campaign can be found than a look backwards at China now from the tragically clear perspective of hindsight; and at our terrible adventure in Korea, all the more heartrending because it should never have been necessary. And while we're looking at the wreckage, let's take a look at the battle of the books, a battle which the Communists won through their involuntary helpers as much as through their dedicated party comrades.

The American people had no real knowledge of China. The leftists filled the vacuum with their own books, reviewed favorably by each other; and by deriding and denouncing all others who had a kind word to say for the lawful Nationalist Government of China or its leader and sworn enemy of communism, Chiang Kai-shek.

Who are some of these authors and reviewers?

We have just seen George Creel's estimate of Edgar Snow. In 1944, even before the war was over, Mr. Snow wrote People On Our Side, which Random House brought out.

He is the author of several other books and numerous magazine articles all tuned to the same note, one he has played for years since his journalistic tour de force when he went into Red China and emerged with the manuscript of Red Star Over China which Random House published in 1938.

Another of these authors is Guenther Stein, who in 1945 brought out the Challenge of Red China. This book was reviewed in the New York Times by the aforesaid Nathaniel Peffer. It was a glowing review. Thus: "The distinguishing characteristic of Communist China is not ideological, political or economical but psychological. There is something in Communist China that captures the imagination of all sorts and conditions of men. Emotional radicals, objective intellectuals, neutral correspondents, diplomatic officials, military officers, hardly given to excessive sympathy for radicalism regardless of occupation or class or previous attitudes and social convictions, they all come away from Yenan (then the capital of Communist China) ardent defenders if not enthusiasts. There is no record of any Occidental visitor who came away hostile." That is the effusive review; covering three columns in the Sunday book section of the New York Times for October 28, 1945, which Peffer gave a book written by a man who, with the recently deceased Agnes Smedley, was named by General MacArthur's intelligence officer in Japan as a spy for the Soviet Union.

As for the late Agnes Smedley, who wrote numerous flattering reviews of comradely books, she herself delivered a hefty volume which Knopf brought out in 1943 titled "Battle Hymn of China." The Chinese Communists were glorified in this one, not only in the text, but in artful juxtapositions of photos-and-captions. On one page, for instance, is a heart-moving photograph of a Chinese war orphan and a flattering portrait of Chu Teh, captioned "Father of the Red Army."

It was not until after the war was over, however, that the bumper crop of books on China and the Far East appeared, most if not all reviewed in a way that must have been highly pleasing to Moscow.

THE PROFESSOR FROM HARVARD

There was John K. Fairbank, Harvard professor, for instance. In 1948, Professor Fairbank wrote a book titled "The United States and China," published by the Harvard University Press. On the jacket of this book are comments that were secured by the publisher before publication for use in impressing the public with advance views of the experts. Blurbs such as these are aimed at knocking over the prospective reader.

The publisher's hope and intent is that the casual browser will be awed into buying the work. This is a common technique for heavy or serious books. On the jacket of Professor Fairbank's tome was Theodore H. White's assertion that this was "the best one-volume job on China I've ever read." Mr. White, formerly Time-Life correspondent, was only 32 years of age at the time, with 9 years' residence in wartime Chungking and no time at all in China when it wasn't at war. With Annalee Jacoby, a young women who was given a job in China after the death of her husband, a Time-Life man, he wrote Thunder Out of China. This was the first all-out attack on Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Government and the first big victory for Communist propaganda. Through almost 300 of its 325 pages runs the red streak of bias. As soon as the authors charge that "America's war had cut blindly across the course of the greatest revolution in the history of Asia," the bias is apparent.

Professor Fairbank's book was praised equally highly by the late Richard Lauterbach with a really fulsome statement, and by Owen Lattimore, with more brevity but with the same enthusiasm.

Now for Fairbank the reviewer, as we logroll along.

He was given three books on China to review for the Sunday book section of the New York Times. He returned the White-Jacoby compliment when he reviewed their book, Thunder Out of China. This was given the lead spot in the issue of October 27, 1946. Harvard Professor Fairbank thought the authors stated the issue very well when they said that if China were to go Communist, it would be because "Chinese Communist democracy" had succeeded in appealing to the people more effectively than the Kuomintang. Bitterly hostile to Patrick Hurley, our wartime Ambassador to China, and an admirer of the late Gen. Joseph Stilwell, Fairbank stated it as his opinion, in agreement with the Thunder authors, that the issue was not one of communism, but merely of good government. "Readers who believe that communism is an uncalled-for conspiratorial subversion," Mr. Fairbank wrote, "will have apoplexy from Thunder Out of China." Obviously, Mr. Fairbank is not one of those. Further, he says, "we have let our fears of Russia and communism, on which the right Kuomintang plays so skillfully, drive the Chinese revolution further into dependence on China and communism." This book, incidentally, was given very high praise as well by Edgar Snow, which should be enough to finish the description of it and make one

wonder why it got the favored treatment it did in the New York Times.

PHILIP JAFFE ON STAGE

On February 9, 1947, Mr. Fairbank reviewed two other books for the Times: China's Destiny, by Chiang Kai-shek, an edition authorized by the author; and an edited, unauthorized edition of the same book prepared by Philip Jaffe. Fairbank reviewed these together and managed to say nothing about Jaffe's known bias for the pro-Communist case in China, nor of his involvement in the Amerasia case in which Jaffe was fined for participation in the theft of secret documents from the State Department. The quality and political tone of the review is set by Fairbank's remark that what distinguishes the Communists from others in China is the former's emphasis on a better life.

For more log jamming Mrs. Jacoby appeared in the New York Times Sunday book section on December 16, 1946, as the reviewer of My Twenty-five Years in China, by John B. Powell, an American of unquestioned integrity who lost both his feet in a Japanese prison. Here she takes sharp issue with the author, who persists in calling the Chinese Communists "bandits." Mrs. Jacoby berates the author as a "reactionary" and insists that peace in China's civil war depends on "progress in negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communists." She is especially contemptuous of Mr. Powell's suggestions that there is a "Red menace."

When another non-Communist book, this time on Japan, Japan and the Son of Heaven, by Willard De Mille Price, was reviewed in the Times of October 14, 1945, the reviewer was none other than Owen Lattimore, who criticized the book unfavorably.

When Lattimore's own book, Solution in Asia, was reviewed in the February 25, 1945, issue Edgar Snow was given the task. Between them they sold the readers of the Times book section the perfect appeasement-of-Russia program. Snow found the book "penetrating and comprehensive, yet a succinct and logical exposition of the main dilemmas which face us."

Two weeks later, in the issue of March 11, 1945, the Times again lent the book-review columns to that annoyingly persistent combination: a pro-Commite book on China reviewed, of course, by Edgar Snow. This time more than a full page was devoted to Harrison Forman's book, Report From Red China. This was obviously nothing but a propaganda pamphlet for the Soviet Union, which Snow calmly treated as a serious and objective report. Harrison Forman, the author of this book, is an explorer, lecturer, and newsreel man who has made films of the Chinese Communists. Typical of Snow's review of it was this appraisal of the Chinese civil war—"an internal struggle between the Kuomintang one-party regime of Chiang Kai-shek and all the anti-Japanese and anti-Fascist people's organizations * * * under the general leadership of the Chinese Communist Party." Typical of the book's bias was Forman's "testimony" that he had seen nothing to link the Chinese Communist Party with Russia. Snow could then declare the book to be of "considerable historic as well as contemporary value" and consider it a good day's work well done.

Neglected almost entirely, when it wasn't slammed and damned, was Freda Utley's Last Chance in China, which attempted to awaken the American people to the dangers that would face us if communism succeeded in capturing China. Mrs. Utley, as a very young woman, was a member of the British Communist Party and lived in Moscow for 6 years as the wife of a Russian citizen who was not a Communist. She worked as a specialist on far eastern questions at the Moscow Institute of World Economy and Politics. Her rapid disillusionment and why she came to regard the Soviet Government as a tyranny as bad if not worse than Hitler's, is related in her book, The Dream We Lost. Needless to say, the book was equally, if not more, lost than her later one on China.

Is it possible that Mrs. Utley is getting a "treatment"? As one who knows intimately and at first-hand the viciousness of the Soviet system, and the broad reaches of their policy for world domination, she represents a potent enemy to Communists, Russian and home-grown.

EUGENE LYONS KNEW TOO MUCH

As a matter of fact, the studied practice of ignoring, neglecting, or damning with faint praise books that sought to show the danger from Communist infiltration, began far back, the Red Decade, by Eugene Lyons, published in 1941 and mentioned earlier in this article, was the first really authoritative and informative book on the Stalinist penetration of America. At the time he wrote it, Mr. Lyons was editor of a national magazine and had behind him a successful record of best sellers in books and an equally distinguished record as a foreign correspondent and magazine writer. He speaks Russian, worked in Moscow for the United Press, and was the first American newspaperman to interview Stalin. The Red Decade, even more than his earlier work, Assignment in Utopia, earned the title of "Red baiter" for him and got him damned high and low by the intellectuals, the liberals, and the Russophiles. Most reviewers were displeased because Mr. Lyons' probing in the Red Decade revealed the infection among their friends, the intellectuals.

The fact that the New York Times book reviewing activities have been specifically examined at some length in this article should not be construed as an indictment of that paper alone. The New York Herald Tribune in both its daily section and in its Sunday supplement, Books, presents abundant evidence of favoritism of the left. In the late summer or early autumn of last year there appeared a perfect instance of the misuse of its columns to get over two gratuitous comments that are strictly Communist party-line propaganda of the hit-and-run variety whether the reviewer, the editor, or the unfortunate author realizes it or not.

(The current party-line is to sneer at all ex-Communists, to deny and insult their repentance. This is particularly necessary to the Communists because they must try to offset the damage done their cause by such sincere and repentant men as Whittaker Chambers, who testified against Hiss, and Louis Budenz, whose testimony helped convict the 11 top Communists in the United States. Another section of the current line, one which is always current as a matter of fact, is to encourage disrespect for simple morality; to glorify attacks on decency and suggest it is bourgeois and old-fashioned and so to be avoided.)

Buried back in the Sunday Book Section of the Herald Tribune was a review by an obscure reviewer, one Edgar L. Acken, of David Loughlin's novel, A Private Stair.

In a 50-line review these two bits appear: "At first we think we understand De Gastro, the seaman-electrician. After all, he is only trying to make some money in a slightly illegal way, a project an American reader can understand and even sympathize with." And this: "As for Allpike, the able seaman, except for his pathological lying, in which he reminds us of an ex-Communist who has seen the light, there is nothing about him which we can identify."

Or for another example, the Herald Tribune book section on September 3, carried a review of Public Opinion in Soviet Russia, by Alexander Inkeles, published by the Harvard University Press. The review was written by Clyde R. Miller.

NO RACIAL PREJUDICE IN RUSSIA

Miller is known for his pro-Soviet views. The most revealing passage in the review is this:

"Racial prejudice, once exploited in the propaganda of the Czarist regime (and of course, later by Hitler) has no place in the Soviet Union. This, in large measure, explains the fanatical zeal of the North Koreans and the Soviet's exploitation of the Korean situation among the colored peoples of the world."

This off-hand acceptance of the myth of race equality in the U. S. S. R. is a dead give-away. The supremacy of the Russian people in the racial melange of the country is by this time an article of faith; Russian culture and the Russian language are musts for other nationalities; excessive national sentiment on the part of any of the minor racial groups is treated as counter-revolutionary separatism. Actually, there has been a notable growth of antisemitism, under the official label of cosmopolitanism.

In any case, why did Miss Irita Van Doren, who runs the Herald Tribune book section, pick on Miller, of all people, to deal with a book on Russia? There are any number of American writers who have lived in Russia and are better able to appraise a book on Soviet propaganda.

Lewis Gannett, the book review editor and literary critic of the Herald Tribune, is himself an excellent writer, an experienced reviewer who is also an influential voice in the expression of Herald Tribune policy and a protagonist of many causes. He is mentioned 17 times in appendix 9 in the records of the Congressional Committee on Un-American activities.

Apropos of that it is interesting to read Mr. Gannett in his regular space in the Herald Tribune for January 1, 1948. In an easy mood, reviewing the literary scene at year's end, he says:

"Meanwhile, I hope that the old year has seen some competent talents—not geniuses—at work on two books which I should like to read in 1948. One would be a study of the history of congressional committees—how and when they arose, how they came to be outside the ordinary rules of law, what good—or evil—they have accomplished under what circumstances. I would also like to read a careful study of the invasions of civil liberties in and after World War I—the ousting of the Socialists, the deportations, the Palmer raids. It would give us a standard by which to gage our present moods. It would also be a colorful study. It could include the occasion when a noble senator shook his finger at a witness, Louise Bryand, and refused to let her tell what she had seen in Russia until she first swore that she believed in his 'God.'"

THE RUSSIANS GO FOR HOWARD FAST

On March 1, 1948, Mr. Gannett wrote: "They read American books even in the Russian zone of Germany. Eva Putnam reports in the New Republic that Howard Fast's Freedom Road, is being serialized in the Russian-licensed Berlin Vorwärts and that in response to an inquiring reader, the editor recommended other examples of 'progressive American literature'."

Mr. Fast is the red frontist who drew 3 months and a $500 fine for contempt of Congress not too long ago for refusing to state whether he was or was not a Communist Party member. Fast is "must" reading, the Daily Worker says. Last year he was in Paris at one of those phony Communist peace rallies telling the French that "the reign of terror is only beginning in America."

Mr. Gannett has never reviewed Seeds of Treason, the Victor Lasky-Ralph de Toledano book on the trials of Alger Hiss, although its value and importance and distinct literary merit and interest are unquestioned and its prepublication publicity was extraordinary.

The book has been on the best-seller lists despite this and other attempts to keep it out of the public eye.

On the other hand, Ordeal by Slander, by Owen Lattimore, a quickie done by the man Senator JOE MCCARTHY accuses of being the chief architect of our disastrous far eastern policy, got extra-special treatment from both the Herald Tribune and New York Times.

The two papers published on two successive days, Sunday, July 30, and Monday, July 31, a big blast of favorable publicity vindicating Mr. Lattimore and damning JOE MCCARTHY. This was not done in the news columns; the book columns obliged. Both gave Ordeal by Slander all of page 1 of their Sunday book review section, plus a breakover; and each followed this with a lavish plug for the defense with another burst of cheering next morning in the daily review columns.

The Herald Tribune Sunday review was done by John K. Fairbank, whom we have discussed before. His choice to review Ordeal by Slander is particularly brazen, because on page 203 of the book Lattimore related how Fairbank aided him in advance of his appearance before the congressional committee. "John Fairbank of Harvard sent out telegrams to a long list of far-eastern experts all over the country suggesting that they write Senator Tydings, the chairman of the committee," protesting naturally.

In any discussion of Communist infiltration of the book trade, the name of the Boston publishing firm of Little, Brown & Co. inevitably arises. The Lattimore book is advertised as an "Atlantic Monthly Press Book," but beneath this line is another, as follows: "Little, Brown & Co., Boston." The two are the same. They are the publishers of Howard Fast, and Albert Maltz, another well-known leftist, as well as others. The editor in chief is Angus Cameron, listed in Who's Who in the East as Donald Angus Cameron but better known simply as Angus Cameron. Since 1938 Mr. Cameron has been associated with Little, Brown, first as their New York editorial representative and then moving along into other jobs with them until today he is not only the top editor but a member of the board of directors and secretary of the corporation.

Mr. Cameron was a member of the National Committee for Wallace for President in March 1948, when Wallace had the backing of the Communists. The program of the Progressive Citizens of America which launched the Wallace candidacy, dated October 25, 1947, names Cameron as a sponsor. The New Masses, a Communist magazine, in its issue of October 14, 1947, reports that Cameron was a speaker at a protest meeting on behalf of Howard Fast.

Cameron was named in the 1945 catalog of the Samuel Adams School for Social Studies in Boston as one of the trustees. This school was cited on the official list of the Attorney General as Communist and subversive. He was a sponsor of the March 1949 conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. He was also a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt (anti-Communist) Bill as late as April 1950.

Recently, Little, Brown & Co. added to its staff one Edwin Seaver, a real pink soulmate. Mr. Seaver was head of a department of the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, the official Communist newspaper in New York, in 1935. Earlier in that year he had been managing editor of Soviet Russia Today. Mr. Seaver's Communist ties go away back, as far as May 19, 1930, when the New York Times listed him as one of the signers of a protest circulated by the John Reed Clubs. This makes him a pioneer in the Communist movement in America. Like Mr. Cameron, Mr. Seaver was a sponsor of the March 1949 conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Like Mr. Cameron, he was publicly for Henry Wallace when Wallace was the Communists' darling.

The lesson for the thoughtful reader? Q. E. D.

Report on Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an outstanding address delivered by W. H. Jasspon, of Memphis, Tenn., before the Memphis Rotary Club on September 12, 1950. Mr. Jasspon is an able and experienced observer and long familiar with European conditions. This speech was made upon his return from a European trip of several weeks duration during which he had access to many sources of information not ordinarily available.

I regard this address as a very constructive criticism of our past and present European policy, and although made 4 months ago, it is still pertinent and up-to-date. I believe that every Member of Congress will find something of value in this address and it is for that reason that I am inserting it in the RECORD.

REPORT ON EUROPE

We are exposed today to two deadly perils—Russian imperialism and internal inflation. Korea dramatized the danger of the one, but we have not been shocked as yet into taking effective action to avoid the other. I mention it only because the two are tied together, and in its own way, each can be equally disastrous.

Since the war we have given away billions of dollars in credits and grants in a sincere desire to speed recovery everywhere. We played no favorites. We sought no exclusively selfish benefit, except to the extent that we, like everyone everywhere, would gain from a rebuilt world at peace. We wasted billions in China and the Philippines. Even Russia has so far refused even a token settlement of its $11,000,000,000 lend-lease obligation. We loaned England nearly $4,000,000,000 upon the mistaken assumption it would restore their economic health, only to find that a large part of these funds were absorbed in liquidating old sterling balances, having little or no bearing on their own postwar recovery. Then came ECA. Even with all this help and other assistance besides, we have failed to make friends or influence people, anywhere in the world. I am to speak to you today about my reactions as to the position of Europe. My major interest over the postwar years has been mostly with the commercial consequences of all this postwar turmoil, but in view of existing conditions, I shall adhere largely to the political and social aspects which, at this moment, are of greatest significance.

The Marshall plan was a historic milestone in international relations. On the whole, it has been well administered, considering the political limitations to its operations. It assisted the rebuilding of industry which provided jobs for idle men and women. It distributed food in huge quantities to people who were hungry. Its efforts gave hope once more to millions who had lost hope. It realized the weaknesses of age-old and outmoded customs of trade, and the implications inherent in unenlightened employer-to-worker relations, so common in Europe. It urged certain desirable and essential economic, social, and political reforms, in accordance with our own experience, only to be met with the insurmountable barrier that we were interfering with national sovereignty. Even the Communists joined in this political opposition. It played into their hands at that time.

ECA aid did buy some breathing space. It deserves the credit for having arrested the growing spread of communism, and halted its political progress. Unfortunately, this time has been wasted, insofar as building a defense against subversion, or in trying to correct the underlying causes which bring it about. In the United States, communism is as yet only an embarrassing nuisance, which has to be policed and held within strict limits. It can become a menace here only if and when our free institutions become crippled and impotent as a result of unwise management at the top political level. It is a real and continuing threat, however, in many countries of Europe. There are many reasons for this.

Vested interests exercise selfish and unwarranted power in many governments. They control production and prices through the cartel system, which eliminates competition while it maintains low wages, high prices, and higher profits at the expense of all the people. Very little social welfare and agrarian reforms have been undertaken. Tax evasion is often the rule rather than the exception, by those most able to pay (in some areas), again at the expense of the masses. Public office is too often a private, rather than a public, trust. Political leadership is frequently unstable, vascillating, and without the courage to make the changes they know are vital. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand, under such conditions, why poverty and low living standards exist and supply the fuel to feed the fires of communistic propaganda. Empty stomachs make poor political advisers. It is neither new nor novel in history, where such circumstances have prevailed, for a people to surrender their political freedom for the promise of economic security, only to find that they have lost both in the end. Woodrow Wilson once said, "The history of liberty is the history of limitations of government power, not the increase of it."

When I left Europe at the end of July, I saw very little change in the attitude of the average citizen, or among government officials, from what it was before the outbreak in Korea. If anything, there was a thicker atmosphere of hopelessness, but there seemed to be no particular alarm. There was certainly no evidence anywhere of a will to fight. In the First World War, France had a magnificent army and a great spirit. The soldiers were fighting for freedom and a better life. In the Second World War, there was a tragic and strange reversal of form. It began at the top, and filtered down through the ranks. The people had become disillusioned. Their status had not improved in the interval; if anything it had deteriorated. Today, 5 years after this second struggle, the workers are still the forgotten men. They want no part of another war. They cannot be good soldiers if they are forced to fight. They do not know who is for or against them, within their own ranks, thanks to Communist infiltration. It is well to understand their present frame of mind, in order to know why their lethargy continues even in the face of possible invasion. Yes, we constructed industry and made jobs, as I have said, but we could not rebuild the spirit of the men and women. This has to come from within. It is not strange, when you have seen all of this, to appreciate why our contribution to recovery

has been so sadly discounted or misunderstood.

I have been told on several occasions in France, we only helped to replace what we destroyed. The argument about liberation leaves the average Frenchman cold. He will tell you that Germany was already defeated. Many feel that if there is to be another war, it is our war, not theirs. They claim they have nothing to fight for. They have lost some of their love of country, because their country has done so little for them. They recall, that the period following the Armistice was not too bad. France saved lives. It had a sort of peace. It retained its colonies. No huge war debt was incurred. Oh, there were some inevitable inconveniences from the German occupation army, but on the whole it was not too hard to take. They might want to sit out another war, if they can, some of them believe, and some of them hope. One of my friends told me he housed a dozen Germans in his home in Normandy. They lived and ate with the family, drank wine along with their hosts, and conducted themselves in a most orderly manner. When the Americans came in, they took the place over, and the wine cellar was consumed in less than 2 weeks. This is the type of incident one hears. France may not be able to stay out of war, if it comes, but they will go a long ways to avoid it. Their help, whatever it may be, unless it becomes organized in advance along with other nations, will be too little and too late. Sabotage and fifth column damages are to be expected, and can be serious, especially in connection with factory production and transport. Some or all of these tendencies apply to many of the Western European bloc. It is not a happy prospect for us. We are only fooling ourselves if we count too strongly on European help. They want to be on the receiving end.

In England the situation is somewhat different. Here you witness an empire breaking up, under the surge of nationalism, which is evident in many thickly populated areas of the world. There has been altogether too much exploitation of the masses, for the interest and profit of absentee ownerships. England lives on international trade. It must import raw materials and food, to be liquidated by exports of manufactured goods. The Labor Government came into power because the people were restless under the impact of postwar confusion and disappointment. Socialism pledged itself to divide accumulated wealth into fair shares for all. It insisted there would be full employment regardless, something which is not entirely feasible in any dynamic society. It began to nationalize certain industries, and announced it would carry this policy into effect until practically all large industries were state-owned and managed. Capital was squeezed until it had very little more to give. Taxes were raised to a point where there was not much incentitve to earn and create. But austerity still prevailed. The people continued to queue up for their food rations, such as they were and are. After 5 years of this noble experiment, the great middle class sensed the fact that they are paying for such doles as medical services, and food subsidies; and still their situation had not improved. In the last election the Socialist Party did not even poll a popular majority—quite a change from their mandate 5 years earlier. The people, however, had not surrendered all of their political freedom to the Socialists and Labor, so they could again express themselves in a free election. Any one of you who has ridden on English or continental trains has seen what happens in a noncompetitive system. England is stagnant. A fine people have lost much of their initiative under socialism, which has achieved nothing that a properly directed free economy could not provide better and cheaper. Some will argue with merit that the status of the lowest classes has improved. But this trend was on the way even before the war, and would have had to be carried on by any government that was in power after the war. Here, too, we do not find the will to make further sacrifices, at the expense of their present poor living standard. The men and women are understandably tired of war and scarcity; they, too, do not want to fight. Until they think their homeland may be threatened you cannot expect much to be done. It is no accident that England continues to ship machine tools to Russia, nor is it a mere coincidence that Shinwell and Strachey were chosen to the two top political posts concerned with military affairs. They are not the types who can be expected to prepare in anticipation of a possible emergency, nor is their ideology too far removed from the philosophy of the Communist principle. At that, they probably echo the thoughts of the man in the street, who wants to be left alone, and who says, "It would be good for the Yanks to be taken down a peg."

We have a right to be disturbed when we continue month after month to talk about German rearmament, knowing it is a "must" in any organized European plan for a united defense. Informed sources no longer fear the possibility of creating another Hitler war machine. On the contrary, we may be forced to build a defense mechanism capable of facing a military force which might make the old German Army look like a police guard. France understands this and is not afraid of German rearming under any union of European nations. Commercial selfishness plays a part in the delay. Heavy industries want to make peacetime goods while there is such a large demand, rather than reconvert to defense production as long as their Governments do not seem anxious to force the issue. One would think indeed that the danger is remote rather than imminent. Some political leaderships fear the political effect of the strain on their own economy, if they prepare for protection. As if they would have any economy to save if invasion occurred. Everyone is aware that Eastern Germany has created a large so-called police force, trained and willing to march whenever the signal is given. The situation in Germany bears all the earmarks of a possible European Korea. The Russian zone is systematically and purposely ignoring the steady emigration of over 9,000,000 inhabitants up to now, to the west. This increases the critical unemployment and feeding problems in the allied zones. Russia rids itself of those who are not easily indoctrinated, and is able to filter into the west spies and saboteurs at will, ready to do their lethal work when the time is ripe. I hope we have put a stop to the dismantling process, but I am not sure. Some of our funds have gone into new plants, replacing those which have been moved out since our aid program has been operative, and is explained away by the statement that the removals were prior commitments. Does this make sense?

I think it is fair appraisal to say at this time that Europe, including England, seems more interested in trying to drive a hard bargain as to how much preparedness they can force us to provide and pay for, than to use the intervening time in getting that much ahead of the job. They are not even doing much to awaken public opinion as to what may be in store.

For the first time, we find Americans awakened and trying to compel the Government to take urgent action. In Europe nowhere is there a sense of hurry. Business is too good, and free governments seldom move faster than the people. This country should stop further aid for recovery. It should get hard-boiled. If we are not going to have real partners, let us find it out now. I think it is well to know that some of the hesitancy in Europe is due not only to ineffective leadership, but also to some uncertainty as to how far they can depend on us. They remember we stayed out of the two world wars until our own security and welfare were threatened. They are inclined to forget it was our blood and resources which finally brought victory. If they have misused it, we are not to blame, though a scapegoat covers up a lot of mistakes. We went to Europe's rescue after the First World War, creating a false prosperity here, and ending in the debacle of 1929. We helped them again after the last war, and we are still doing it, yet we are consistently needled for more. We know there is a limit, but the feeling persists we can be argued out of an unfair share now because we appear to be scared. This is not the sort of situation which makes for effective and forthright teamwork in a common cause. We need forceful statesmanship now—men who will make it crystal clear, what we have a right to expect. Europe is in greater immediate jeopardy than we are but because the danger is mutual, there must be a fair distribution of the burdens of defense.

In considering the gloomy picture in Europe, as I see it, the question of Spain ought to be touched on, briefly. It is difficult to become enthusiastic over Franco, but who can defend Tito, except that for the moment he opposes Russia? So does Franco. We play ball with one and condemn the other at the same time. This does not seem very realistic. It is part of the fuzzy thinking that has been prevalent in the State Department. Even Congress is tired of this sort of idealism, if you wish to call it such. They passed an unprecedented law recently authorizing a loan to Spain, as you know. One cannot approve of this method of making foreign policy, but it does illustrate a lack of confidence which is most deplorable. I am more than ever opposed to further loans or gifts without some return commitment. We have been played for suckers long enough. The cold fact remains, Spain may be the only place we can get a toe-hold in Europe some day. If you wish to argue you cannot trust them, I should agree, but I would answer by asking a question, Whom can you trust in the game of power politics? And I would answer that question—only those whose self-interests demand that they work with us. That is all alliances are anyway.

Much has been said upon the question of a western European union. The situation in Western Europe today is analagous to what would conironi us, if some of our States were free to act in foreign policy, on their own. Desirable as this union is, and it must come some day, it is a vision for the future, the far distant future. Many differences—in language, even a detail such as weights and measures, and many more—make this proposal a hard nut to crack. The real stumbling block is England, without whose cooperation little can be accomplished. Their opposition is not one of just being stubborn. It is a matter entirely of a fundamental conflict of interests, which both the Labor and Conservative Parties recognize. On the other hand, however, all these countries, including England, would gladly join an Atlantic union, in my judgment, in which Canada and the United States would participate, provided we put up most of the money. But until this emergency passes there are more immediately practical tasks to perform.

Communism and a free society cannot continue to live together in peace. Russia and the United States had enjoyed what had been regarded as a traditional friendship over a long period. Their interests were complementary, rather than conflicting—until communism came into power. Their intensive campaign of hate is being directed principally against us. This is due only to the fact that the United States represents the most extreme example of a free and competitive society, which has actually improved the status of all its citizens. This

gives the Russian rulers grave concern for their own hides. Our living standards are the envy of the whole world, even though you and I know some part of it has been based on borrowed money and Government doles in various forms. The struggle to determine which type of society shall ultimately prevail is now under way. It may bring about war, or it could continue for some time in the form of economic attrition—the process which is now being forced on a free world. They have an idea that Americans cannot "take it," that we are too soft. We are soon to be put to the real test to determine if we will accept some austerity and forego some luxury without whimpering. We have come of age, but we wish to be treated accordingly. We want to be told the hard facts of life. We must stop, or be restrained from, living in a fool's paradise today, not tomorrow. We must demand resolute action from our political leaders, and the adjournment of politics for the duration. This is no time for such extravagance.

We are the most misunderstood Nation in the world, even though we have always done more than we promised. I have tried to state some of the reasons why Russian assurances continue to appeal to so many, in spite of the facts, which millions do not know—that all Russia has even given to the nations they have taken over are the shackles that have bound the masses into a modern form of physical and mental slavery.

We have been assailed as imperialists, and many believe it. Yet we voluntarily gave up Cuba. We voted independence to the Philippines, and then gave them over $2,000,000,000, which they have recklessly wasted. Has Russia ever released a dependency, or anything else but misery under a police state? Yet it presses on and on for more victims, more sources of production and manpower, in an endeavor to keep the Russian people contented with their lot. If they succeed, that little group in the Kremlin may remain in undisputed power, while they chuckle to themselves and marvel at the sight of a world in chaos, for which their evil genius is responsible. If we can make them fail, the Russian people will rebel against the yoke which binds them. We need political missionaries to fight lies with self-evident facts and truths. Communism is a force of ideas—terrible ideas, but with a nostalgic appeal to under-privileged everywhere. It can only be met by the practical application of other, and more personal ideas—ideals I should like to call them—which will create a superior life under individual freedom. This is the only sure way to conquer the menace which overhangs the world. Then we can hope to restore the dignity of the human being in a better society to be ruled by men, freely chosen, rather than enslaved by ruthless masters, whoever they may be.

Who Is on America's Side?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for America to find out who are her friends. Britain not only has recognized the Red Government of China, but apparently she is using our dollars to help build up Russia's war machine.

Not only is it appropriate to ask if Britain is on our side—we might ask are the Truman policy makers on America's side. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including an article written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in the Washington Times-Herald for January 7, 1951:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

This will give you a bounce. President Truman is nicking us another $8,800,000,000 to supply arms and ammunition to the Atlantic Pact nations. The British are coming in for a huge chunk of this. They'll get hundreds of trucks, tanks, mobile guns, and everything else that their army, navy, and air force needs

Untold thousands of tons of finished rubber goods will, of course, go into the weapons we ship to them: Tires, inner tubes, all kinds of rubber mats, buffers for radar, and other devices.

To help the British along, little Mr. Big is switching from the American market all the natural rubber he can get his hands on. Under date of December 28, the National Production Administration ordered a halt on all buying and distribution of natural rubber so the stepped-up military demands for the British and others could be met.

Next will come the scrap-rubber drives, wherein you'll be asked to toss on the street corner your old hot-water bottles and used tires that are too old for retreading with synthetics. In short, the standard routine.

Today, reposing on the docks of the Thames River near London is $10,000,000 worth of natural rubber. It will be loaded into the British steamer *Stanreal* It was shipped to London from Malaya and would come in handily in the United States right now in making the tires, etc, we are going to send to Britain. But don't get the idea we are going to get it.

Not a chance. The British are loading it for shipment to the Soviet port of Odessa. The Russians are stockpiling natural rubber for war purposes, the potential war against us, and presumably the British themselves.

But British traders are not bashful about picking up a fast ruble. To Russia goes this immense load of the all-important stuff on which modern armies move.

For a new high in gall the British Government on December 28 asked the United States to share our stockpile of strategic metals to ease her shortage. We have been trying to stockpile rubber for 2 years.

While you are juggling that one let's take a look at the Government's idea of mutual help in building up strong defenses against Russia—which is the key gagline in the North Atlantic Pact. Since the end of the war British Malaya has been shipping tons of crude rubber to the Soviet Union.

United States rubber authorities have protested this time and again, but consistently get a brush-off.

The economic planners in the Truman administration, instead of using some sense, tucked British Malaya into the Marshall-plan-aid set-up and thousands of American dollars have helped restore crude rubber production in this and other British rubber-producing possessions.

In fact, John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co., says 80 percent of the world's crude rubber production is either financed to a large extent by Marshall-plan funds direct, or by those of other American funds, indirectly, through other Marshall-plan countries.

The British statement that shipments of natural rubber to Russia are O. K. since we are not at war with the Soviet Union must sound a bit discordant to British troops fighting Soviet-directed Chinese Communists in Korea and it certainly is a worthy topic for a quiz program here at home.

If we aren't now fighting the rim of Russia and getting ready for the main bout, how come the Blair House boss wants us to spend $8,800,000,000 shipping guns and butter all over the globe? And how come also, those emergency rubber curtailments for continental United States?

These are simple questions of fact, the British decline to answer. In view of the wartime billions we sent to Britain for lend-lease, the postwar billions for economic aid and the billions for armaments now on the way, it would seem the British owe us a little something.

By choice I avoid the moral issues involved to point out in the space available here that maybe former President Herbert Hoover had something when he said we should hold up our men and arms for Europe until they show some signs of building up their own defenses and acting smart about Russia.

In the United States everyone is worried about France.

But at least the French Government, in November, banned the shipment of all strategic goods to Russia, especially natural rubber.

Background of the Twenty-eighth Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Background of the Twenty-eighth Division," written by Ray Carpenter, division historian, and published in the Red Keystone for December 1950.

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

BACKGROUND OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION

(By Ray Carpenter)

TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION COMMANDERS SINCE SINGLE DIVISION REORGANIZATION OF 1878

Maj. Gen. John F. Hartranft, Maj. Gen. George R. Snowden, Maj. Gen. Charles Miller, Maj. Gen. J. P. S. Gobin, Maj. Gen. John W. Schall, Maj. Gen. John A. Wiley, Brig. Gen. Charles B. Dougherty, Maj. Gen. Wendell P. Bowman, Maj. Gen. Charles Dougherty, Maj. Gen. Charles M. Clement, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Muir (World War I combat), Maj. Gen. William H. Hay, Maj. Gen. William G. Price, Jr., Maj. Gen. Edward C. Shannon, Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Maj. Gen. J. Garesche, Ord., Maj. Gen. Lloyd D. Brown (World War II combat), Brig. Gen. James E. Wharton (killed after commanding division several hours, One Hundred and Twelfth Infantry Headquarters), Maj. Gen. Norman D. Cota, (World War II combat), Maj. Gen. Daniel B. Strickler (present commander).

NOTE.—Gen. George C. Marshall was an officer in Twenty-eighth Division unit in 1906.

HISTORICAL BATTLE CREDITS OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY DIVISION

The Twenty-eighth Infantry Division is the oldest division in the Armed Forces of the United States.

1. War of the Spanish Succession of 1747: (a) Colonial service under the King of England.

2. French and Indian War of 1763: (a) Colonial service under the King of England.

3. Revolutionary War of 1775: (a) Brandywine; (b) Germantown; (c) New Jersey, 1775; (d) Pennsylvania, 1778–81.

4. War of 1812: (a) Federal service before Washington.

5. Mexican War of 1846: (a) Vera Cruz; (b) Cerro Gordo.

6. Civil War of 1861: (a) Wilderness; (b) Spottsylvania; (c) Cold Harbor; (d) Petersburg, (e) Shenandoah Valley; (g) Maryland, 1864; (h) Peninsula; (i) Manassa; (j) Antietam; (k) Fredericksburg; (l) Chancellorsville; (m) Gettysburg; (n) Virginia, 1861–64; (o) Vicksburg; (p) Appomattox.

7. Spanish-American War of 1898: (a) Manila; (b) Malolos; (c) Porto Rico.

8. World War I of 1917: (a) Champagne; (b) Champagne-Marne; (c) Aisne Marne; (d) Oise-Aisne; (e) Lorraine; (f) Meuse-Argonne; (g) Ypres-Lys.

9. World War II of 1941: (a) Normandy; (b) Northern France; (c) Rhineland; (d) Ardennes; (e) Central Europe; (f) Central Pacific; (g) Western Pacific); (h) Eastern Mandate Islands.

10. Korean War of 1950: (a) Federal service.

UNITED STATES ARMY RECORD

Listed below are the record number of nine enemy divisions that attacked the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division on a 25-mile front during the opening engagements of the Battle of the Bulge, December 16, 1944. No division in American history had ever before engaged this total of enemy divisions at one time. By its holding actions, the Twenty-eighth Division performed one of the greatest feats in the history of the United States Army at a cost of 6,000 casualties.

1. One hundred and Sixteenth Panzer Division
2. Second Panzer Division.
3. Eleventh Panzer Division.
4. One Hundred and Thirtieth Panzer Lehr Division.
5. Five Hundred and Sixtieth Volks Grenadier Division.
6. Twenty Sixth Volks Grenadier Division.
7. Three Hundred and Fifty-second Volks Grenadier Division
8. Two Hundred and Seventy-second Volks Grenadier Division.
9. Fifth Parachute Division.

WE MET THEM ALL

In the European theater of operations the German Wehrmacht launched only four major attacks and the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division had a large hand in stopping and defeating each of them. Our beloved division fought strongly on the left flank of the Thirtieth (Old Hickory) Infantry Division at the first major German attack at Mortain when the panzers attempted to cut off Patton's Third Army by reaching the sea. The second major attack battered the Twenty-eighth in the Hurgan Forest inflicting nearly 6,000 casualties but the division retained much of the precious ground previously gained and stopped the One Hundred and Sixteenth Panzer and two German infantry divisions plus many small Kraut combat units.

The Twenty-eighth was the center in the largest German attack in the Ardennes when the division set an American record by single-handedly fighting nine enemy divisions at a cost of 6,000 casualties. Precious time was gained that allowed reinforcements to form behind the Twenty-eighth to eventually stop the Krauts. The German fourth attack at Colmar occurred at this time, and after regrouping the Twenty-eighth, recaptured Colmar and regained lost territory. From D-day to the end of the war, 90 German divisions made four major attacks on the western front. In its tours of combat along the front with the United States First Army, Third Army, Seventh Army, Fifteenth Army, and the First French Army, the Twenty-eighth Infantry Division fought half of the enemy divisions on the front and participated brilliantly in stopping all four German attacks. The Twenty-eighth Division says it again, "We met them all."

The 48 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a report containing factual information of the 48 States, which was prepared by John F. Nave, national commander of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and sent out to all national, State, and local officers, posts, departments, and executive committeemen, including ladies' auxiliary.

The report follows:

NATIONAL DEPARTMENT,
ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF UNITED STATES, INC.,
Syracuse, N. Y., January 3, 1951.

Subject: Area, population, capital, flower, motto, nickname, and legislative session of the 48 States in the United States of America

To: All national, State, and local officers, posts, departments, and executive committeemen, including ladies' auxiliary:

1. Alabama (the Cotton State): Capital, Montgomery; area, 51,279 square miles; population, 2,832,961; motto, "We dare defend our rights"; flower, goldenrod; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on even years (example, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

2. Arizona (the Grand Canyon State): Capital, Phoenix; area, 113,909 square miles; population, 499,261; motto, "Ditat Deus" (God enriches); flower, saguaro cactus; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

3. Arkansas (the Wonder State): Capital, Little Rock; area, 53,102 square miles; population, 1,949,387; motto, "Regnat populus" (the people rule); flower, apple blossom; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

4. California (the Golden State): Capital, Sacramento; area, 156,803 square miles; population, 9,300,000; motto, "Eureka" (I have found it); flower, golden poppy; legislative session, meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

5. Colorado (the Centennial State): Capital, Denver; area, 104,247 square miles; population, 1,159,102; motto, "Nil sine numine" (nothing without the Deity); flower, blue columbine; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

6. Connecticut (the Constitution State): Capital, Hartford; area, 5,004 square miles; population, 1,995,263; motto, "Qui transtulit sustinet" (he who transplanted still sustains); flower, mountain laurel; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

7. Delaware (the Diamond State): Captal, Dover; area, 2,399.2 square miles; population, 266,505; motto, "Liberty and independence"; flower, peach blossom; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example: 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

8. Florida (the Sunshine State): Capital, Tallahassee; area, 54,861 square miles; population, 2,250,061; motto, "In God we trust"; flower, orange blossom; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example: 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

9. Georgia (Empire State of the South): Capital, Atlanta; area, 58,876 square miles; population, 3,123,723; motto, "Wisdom, justice, and moderation"; flower, Cherokee rose; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example: 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

10. Idaho (the Gem State): Capital, Boise; area, 83,354 squares miles; population, 550,000; motto, "Esto perpetua" (mayest thou endure forever); flower, syringa; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example: 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

11. Illinois (the Sucker State): Capital, Springfield, area, 55,947 square miles; population, 7,897,241; motto, "State sovereignty—national union"; flower, native violet; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc).

12. Indiana (the Hoosier State): Capital, Indianapolis; area, 36,291 square miles; population, 3,427,796; motto, "The crossroads of America"; flower, "zinnia; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc).

13. Iowa (the Hawkeye State): Capital, Des Moines; area, 55,586 square miles; population, 2,538,268; motto, "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain"; flower, wild rose; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc).

14. Kansas (Jayhawker): Capital, Topeka; area, 82,158 square miles; population, 1,774,447; motto, "Ad astra per aspera (to the stars through difficulty)"; flower, native sunflower; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

15. Kentucky (the Blue Grass State): Capital, Frankfort; area, 40,109 square miles; population, 2,845,627; motto, "United we stand, divided we fall"; flower, goldenrod; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

16. Louisiana (the Pelican State): Capital, Baton Rouge; area, 45,409 square miles; population, 2,363,880; motto, "Union, justice, and confidence"; flower, magnolia; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

17. Maine (the Pine Tree State): Capital, Augusta; area, 26,998 square miles; population, 847,226; motto, "Dirigo" (I direct or guide); flower, pine cone and tassel; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

18. Maryland (the Old Line State): Capital, Annapolis; area, 12,327 square miles; population, 1,821,244; motto, "Scuto bonae voluntatis tuae coronasti nos" (with the shield of thy good will thou hast covered us); flower, black-eyed susan; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

19. Massachusetts (the Bay State): Capital, Boston; area, 7,838.7 square miles; population, 4,493,281; motto, "Ense petit placidum sub libertate quietem" (by the sword we seek peace, but peace only under liberty); flower, mayflower; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

20. Michigan (the Wolverine State): Capital, Lansing; area, 96,770 square miles; population, 5,256,106; motto, "Si quaeris peninsulam amoenam circumspice" (If you seek a pleasant peninsula, look about you); flower, apple blossom; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

21. Minnesota (the Gopher State): Capital, St. Paul; area, 84,286.53 square miles; population, 2,792,300; motto, "L'Etoile du nord" (Star of the north); flower, moccasin flower; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

22. Mississippi (the Magnolia State): Capital, Jackson; area, 47,716 square miles; population, 2,180,905; motto, "Virtute et armis" (By valor and arms); flower, magnolia; legislative session meets once every 2 years on even years (example: 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, etc.).

23. Missouri (the Show Me State): Capital, Jefferson City; area, 69,270 square miles; population, 3,784,664; motto, "Salus populi suprema les esto" (the welfare of the people shall be the supreme law); flower, hawthorne; legislative session, meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

24. Montana (the Treasure State): Capital, Helena; area, 146,316 square miles; population, 559,456; motto, "Ora y plata" (gold and silver); flower, bitterroot; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (examples, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

25. Nebraska (the Cornhusker State): Capital, Lincoln; area, 76,653 square miles; population, 1,315,834; motto, equality before the law; flower, goldenrod; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

26. Nevada (the Sagebrush State): Capital, Carson City; area, 110,623 square miles; population, 156,445; motto, all for our country; flower, sagebrush; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

27. New Hampshire (the Granite State): Capital, Concord; area, 9,024 square miles; population, 491,524; motto, live free—or die; flower, purple lilac; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

28. New Jersey (the Garden State): Capital, Trenton; area, 8,204.37 square miles; population, 4,160,165; motto, liberty and prosperity; flower, violet; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc).

29. New Mexico (the Sunshine State—Land of Enchantment): Capital, Santa Fe; area, 121,666 square miles; population, 531,818; motto, "Crescit Eundo" (it grows as it goes); flower, yucca; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

30. New York (the Empire State): Capital, Albany; area, 49,576 square miles; population, 13,479,142; motto, "Excelsior" (higher); flower, rose; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

31. North Carolina (the Tar Heel State): Capital, Raleigh; area, 52,712 square miles; population, 3,571,623; motto, "Esse quam videre" (to be, rather than to seem); flower, dogwood; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

32. North Dakota (the Sioux State): Capital, Bismarck; area, 70,837 square miles; population, 520,935; motto, "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable;" flower, wild prairie rose; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

33. Ohio (the Buckeye State): Capital, Columbus; area, 41,122 square miles; population, 6,907,612; motto, none; flower, scarlet carnation; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

34. Oklahoma (the Sooner State): Capital, Oklahoma City; area, 69,414 square miles; population, 2,336,034; motto, "Labor omnia vincit" (labor conquers all things); flower, mistletoe; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

35. Oregon (the Beaver State): Capital, Salem; area, 96,981 square miles; population, 1,089,684; motto, "The Union"; flower, Oregon grape; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

36. Pennsylvania (the Keystone State): Capital, Harrisburg; area, 45,045 square miles; population, 9,900,180; motto "Virtue, liberty, and independence"; flower, mountain laurel; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

37. Rhode Island (Little Rhody): Capital, Providence; area, 1,214, square miles; population, 713,346; motto, "Hope"; flower, violet; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

38. South Carolina (the Palmetto State): Capital, Columbia; area, 30,495 square miles; population, 1,899,804; motto, "Animus opibusque parati" (prepared in spirit and wealth); flower, yellow jessamine; legislative session meets once every year (example, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, etc.).

39. South Dakota (the Coyote State): Capital, Pierre; area, 77,615 square miles; population, 589,920; motto, "Under God the people rule"; flower, Pasque flower; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

40. Tennessee (the Volunteer State): Capital, Nashville; area, 42,246 square miles; population, 2,915,841; motto, "Agriculture, commerce"; flower, iris; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

41. Texas (the Lone Star State): Capital, Austin; area 267,339 square miles; population, 7,500,000; motto, "Friendship"; flower, bluebonnet; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

42. Utah (the Beehive State): Capital Salt Lake City; area, 84,900 square miles; population, 550,310; motto, "Industry"; flower, sego lily; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

43. Vermont (the Green Mountain State): Capital, Montpelier; area, 9,528 square miles; population, 359,231; motto, "Freedom and unity"; flower, red clover, legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

44. Virginia (the Old Dominion): Capital, Richmond; area, 39,899 square miles; population, 2,677,773; motto, "Sic semper tyrannis (thus ever to tyrants)"; flower, American dogwood (cornus Florida); legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

45. Washington (the Evergreen State): Capital, Olympia; area, 66,977 square miles; population, 2,088,574; motto, "Alki" (bye and bye); flower, western rhododendron; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

46. West Virginia (the Panhandle State): Capital, Charleston; area, 24,282 square miles; population, 1,901,974; motto, "Montani semper liberti" (mountaineers are always free); flower, big rhododendron; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odds years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

47. Wisconsin (the Badger State): Capital, Madison; area, 54,715 square miles; population, 3,137,587; motto, "Forward"; flower, violet; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

48. Wyoming (the Equality State): Capital, Cheyenne; area, 97,914 square miles; population, 245,000; motto, "Cedant arma togae" (let arms yield to the grown); flower, Indian paint brush; legislative session meets once every 2 years on odd years (example, 1951, 1953, 1955, 1957, etc.).

Yours in comradeship,

JOHN F. NAVE,
National Commander, 1950–51.

Year of Responsibility and Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent accorded me by the House, I am including herewith a New Year's letter to the personnel in the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, from Mr. H. H. Bennett, who is the head of that agency. It is entitled "Year of Responsibility and Opportunity."

Mr. Bennett has spent a number of years in the Soil Conservation Service. He is highly respected in that position. The letter calls upon employees to join with him in doing a better and finer job in the coming year.

Mr. Bennett has set an example that could well be followed by the heads of other agencies in our Government. I think the membership of the House will be interested in reading the letter, which follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., January 1, 1951.

Memorandum to all Soil Conservation Service personnel.
From: H. H. Bennett.
Subject: Year of responsibility and opportunity.

This is New Year's Day.

Just a few years ago we all celebrated the victorious ending of a war. All of us hoped that it might be the last fighting between nations. We fought to preserve our liberty against the ambitions of men in other nations who wanted to impose absolute dictatorship over our thoughts, our actions, and our aspirations. We fought, as thousands of Americans had fought before—since colonial days—to preserve our right to govern ourselves as the majority of us saw fit without coercion, reprisals, or acts of violence to ourselves and our families.

Now our country is faced with another emergency. An alien system—one that is completely opposed to self-government and the freedom of the individual—is in action against us. You know what is happening in Korea and at the meetings of the United Nations. You know that General Eisenhower has had to return to uniform. You have heard or read what the President and our leaders in Congress have said about the gravity of the present situation.

Once again we are confronted with the imperative need to defend ourselves, our liberty, and everything that Americans hold dear.

This is no time for debate. American men are in action now, as they were yesterday and will be tomorrow.

No one knows how long the present emergency may last or what proportions it may reach. But we do know that we must prepare ourselves for any development. To meet the increased requirements of ourselves and our allies we are going to need greater production of food, fiber, vegetable fats and oils, and wood products—all of which come from the soil. The surest way of increasing production and holding it at the necessary high levels year after year for as long as may be required is by sound conservation farming over wide areas. Along with the cooperating farmers in soil conservation districts all over the country we in the Soil Conservation

Service demonstrated the value of conservation farming during the last war. Wisely planned and carefully applied systems of conservation farming not only resulted in large increases in production but protected the land at the same time. Farmers and ranchers were able to get larger yields with less labor, equipment, and fertilizer.

In war, as in peace, the land continues as our most vital and basic resource. Everything we do, all we share, and whatever we amount to as a great and vigorous people begins with and rests on the sustained productivity of our agricultural lands. Any undermining of this base undermines and weakens our Nation and all of its people. So during the year ahead—1951—you have a greater responsibility and a greater opportunity than ever before. Soil-conservation work must be speeded up. Once again it becomes an indispensable part of the basic defense operations of the Nation. And you and your job, important in peacetime, now become doubly important to the Nation as it begins mobilizing for the emergency with every resource we possess. What you are able to accomplish this year will not only bring results this year but next year and on into 1955 and 1960, when the need may be even greater.

We in the Soil Conservation Service have an unusual and indispensable service to give to the country. We have the knowledge and the experience necessary to work with farmers and ranchers on the land to protect it, use it wisely, and make it yield more year after year. In our work with soil conservation districts we are also helping to build and strengthen the American system of self-government at the very sustaining foundation.

Our land, our liberty, our self-respect, and our system of self-government—these are what we have fought for in the past and are determined to protect in the future. Every man in the Soil Conservation Service can help and help best by studying his job, sticking to it, and putting even more of his enthusiasm and determination into it than ever before. For my part I will be working with you and for you to the best of my ability all the way.

H. H. BENNETT.

Winning the Peace—The Economic Front—An Address Delivered by Paul G. Hoffman, ECA Consultant, Before National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., New York, N. Y., November 1, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted me, I am privileged to submit for the considered attention ard thinking of the Members of this Eighty-second session of the United States Congress, the text of what appeared to me at the time I first read it, several weeks ago, as a written analysis I wished every colleague, yes, every American, to also read. The good and sound and international works by the author, already performed, make it unnecessary for me to say more about him. In his speech delivered as aforesaid, Mr. Hoffman said, as follows:

I am extraordinarily gratified to receive the Robert Dollar award this year for two very special reasons. California is my home State although for the past 5 years I have spent not over 2 weeks a year there. Capt. Robert Dollar is a legendary figure in California. His name is a symbol of high adventure. He was also a man of exemplary habits. He neither smoked nor drank, a fact to which my father frequently made reference.

At long last, I am heading home and I am bringing home the bacon in the form of the Robert Dollar award. You have no idea how impressed my fellow Californians will be.

Another reason why I am deeply appreciative of this award is that it is being given me by the National Foreign Trade Council because, rightly or wrongly, you have decided that I have made a contribution to the betterment of world trade. I hope you are right because I admit to a very deep interest in the restoration of world trade to a high level. I do not need to tell this audience how important world trade is to friendship and understanding between the diverse people who inhabit this earth. Nor how important friendship and understanding is to our chances of winning the one thing for which people throughout the world today are yearning—and that is a just and lasting peace.

I do not, however, propose to devote my remarks this evening to world trade. In the latter part of last June I underwent a serious operation. I realize that few people—if any—are particularly concerned about other people's operations, but I propose, nevertheless, to talk about mine tonight—or, rather, some of its after effects.

One of the important—to me—results of that operation was that I was compelled to lie flat on my back for 30 days—not even being permitted to read. I tried the daytime radio but gave it up. Reading and the radio both being out, I found myself in the unhappy position of having nothing to do but think.

At the time the Korean War had just broken out. No one knew what might come of it. World war III actually seemed a possibility.

Quite naturally, I started thinking why it was that we, the United States, always won wars but lost the peace.

The reason why we lost the peace after World War I seemed quite clear. True, we did toy with the idea of the League of Nations but most of us failed entirely to grasp the fact that if we were to win the peace we would have to fight for it with the same boldness, imagination, vigor, and dedication with which we had fought the war. Our failure to grasp that fact lost us the peace we might easily, then, have won.

The situation was somewhat different in World War II. Even while the war was being fought a great many people realized that if we were to win the peace we would have to wage a peace. The United Nations, the World Bank, the World Fund, UNRRA were the result of that thinking but even there we made one assumption that turned out incorrect. We thought that all nations wanted peace and would help to make that peace. We learned the hard way that this was not so. We learned that one nation—Russia—wanted not peace but the conquest of the free world.

The most persuasive question facing the world today is whether, under these conditions, it is possible to wage a peace and win it.

Even those who feel peace can be won hold divergent views as to how the peace should be waged. There are those who believe we can sit down with the Soviets and, talking things over, arrive at a workable compromise.

I have no objections to talking things over with anyone at any time. But I see no hope for a workable compromise now for the simple reason that Russia's aim today is not peace but chaos and confusion in the free world.

There is, I believe, ample evidence to support my views. Every peace offensive staged by Russia has been nothing more or less than a tactical move in a program to enslave the world.

There are those who believe that one way to win the peace is to engage in a preventive war. Here, again, I find myself in disagreement. I can conceive of nothing more damaging to the prestige of the United States than for us to engage in aggression no matter how much aggression seems to be justified. Furthermore, even from the standpoint of practicability, such a move, at the present time, could invite only disaster. We could drop bombs on Russia and, very probably, damage her extensively but Russia could set her 200 divisions marching toward the Atlantic with nothing to stop them but the 14 divisions now in existence. We would then face the task of liberating Europe at some later date.

There is a middle course offering, I believe, a reasonable hope of success.

We, the free nations, must unite in building up our armed forces to such strength Russia will not dare start marching.

While this is being done we must, concurrently on the political, economic, and informational fronts, take vigorous action aimed, first, at protecting the free world against internal aggression and, second, at keeping the Kremlin continually off balance.

The Marshall plan gave the Kremlin a shock. So did the toy balloons recently released in Western Europe to land in Poland, Germany, and the satellite states. So did the recent action of the United Nations to give the Assembly power to move to preserve peace even when the Security Council was rendered inactive by the use of the veto.

Just what is involved in building up our military defenses and the military defenses of our allies to the point where our united strength can keep the Kremlin from marching, I do not know. I have been told it will take, perhaps one hundred and twenty billions over the next 3 years with the amount declining considerably thereafter.

Included in this over-all figure there would be some thirteen billions to assist our allies in building up their war facilities and in meeting certain other military expenses.

In this connection my recent trip to Europe, where I conversed with numerous foreign ministers, left me with one very definite impression If we are to have the whole-hearted cooperation of the western Europeans in such a program we must leave no doubts in their minds that in building up our military strength and in helping them to build up theirs, we have one aim and one only in mind—to prevent a war and not to wage a war. They do not want to have to go through another liberation.

On the economic front we must continue to extend economic aid to those countries whose continued economic strength is vital to the interest of the United States economy. This means not only those natio s of Western Europe who need help but the Philippines, Korea, and certain other Asiatic countries.

The Marshall plan called for huge expenditures the first year but it must be remembered that the program was primarily designed to repair damages due to the ravages of war. Each year the program has cost us progressively less. In most of the Asiatic countries now being served by ECA the program is largely limited to the agricultural field where much can be done with very little money. The total program for this fiscal year for Indonesia, Burma, French Indochina and Thailand is less than $100,000,000. My guess is that economic aid to the countries whose economy is of vital interest to the United States should not exceed $3,000,000,000.

Success of the campaign on the political front demands, I think, great skill rather than many dollars. The same situation prevails in the case of the informational program. Here dollars are important but dollars alone will not be effective unless the

program is carried out with imagination and boldness.

The total dollar cost of all three programs, economic, political, and informational, should not exceed $3,500,000,000 a year, or less than 10 percent of the funds proposed for defense purposes. But if the campaign is not waged effectively on these three nonshooting fronts, we may find we have left the back door open to aggression even if the front door is closed through military expenditures.

There are two questions which many of you, with good reason, are, no doubt, asking yourselves. You may have wondered why Russia does not start marching now * * * before we have time to build up our defenses.

That is a good question. I asked it of all the foreign ministers with whom I talked. The consensus of opinion was that Russia had no present intent of engaging in a general war. First, because we have better and bigger atom bombs. Second, because Russia still adheres to the Marxist doctrine that capitalism contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction. They have been watching the United States economy hopefully since 1946. They now feel quite certain that our proposed high defense expenditures and our aid to the other free nations will be our undoing.

I happen not to agree with that thesis. I even believe that the defense load may be the making of Western Europe.

Another reason given me by the ministers in support of their belief that the Kremlin would not, at the present time, march, is that the masters of the Kremlin are not sure they could digest the countries they would have to overrun—and to rule. It is probable that Stalin figures, too, that if he started a major war he and his pals might lose their jobs and, perhaps, their lives. They know what happened to Hitler and Mussolini.

Of course, there is always the possibility that Russia might blunder into world war III. She was close to it this summer, when she so completely misunderstood the attitude of the United States toward Korea. She just could not believe we would send our boys into Korea when, obviously, there was no material advantage for us in so doing. In their own peculiar amoral manner they reasoned that unless there was some material advantage to us in protecting Korea, we would salve our conscience by having the United Nations pass a few pious resolutions condemning the action of the North Koreans after they had taken control of the peninsula.

The second question in most of your minds is, I am sure, what will follow this stepped-up cooperative program, military, economic, political, and informational. Are we to live in a state of siege indefinitely? Is there any hope that Russia will change its course?

The answer is not clear. Winston Churchill believes that, negotiating from strength, we can, in a reasonably short time, work out a compromise with even the present masters of the Kremlin. Others pin their hopes on the situation in Russia today * * * as it is known to be. With 15,000,000 people behind barbed wire, they do not think the situation can continue indefinitely. They believe that in 3 years, 6, or maybe even longer, there will be a new regime in Russia, which will cooperate with the West * * * that the present men in the Kremlin will be replaced by those who will want to devote their attention and energies to building up their own country rather than to destroying others.

To sum it all up, the consensus of opinion was that there is a good chance that the Kremlin will not start its armies marching within the next 3 years. And that, as a consequence, we will have time in which to achieve, at a minimum, a workable compromise, and, as a maximum, a new and more liberal regime in Russia with which we can live in peace.

Russia's Challenge and United States Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Korean campaign may lead to a final struggle between Russia and the United States unless the United States quickly rebuilds its military strength sufficiently to persuade Russia to discontinue her aggressive manifestation of her rivalry.

I shall not attempt here to discuss all factors bearing upon this rivalry and our ability to cope with it short of war but I quote herewith some statements of historians, statesmen, and military leaders of a century or more ago to show an awareness at that time of the growing rivalry between Russia and the United States and noting the characteristics of the peoples of these two countries.

Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, in 1831, visited the United States to inquire into what was then hailed as the great experiment in constitutional liberty. Coming to North America shortly after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, De Tocqueville was acquainted with the major currents of national developments in Europe which, in view of subsequent events, he described with remarkable precision.

Writing about 1835 in his Democracy in America—P. F. Collier & Son, 1900, volume I, page 441—he summarized his views with unusual clarity:

There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points: I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place amongst the nations; and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth; all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the other by the sword.

The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm; the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Just before the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853 between France and England on the one hand and Russia on the other, Lord Palmerston, British Foreign Minister for many years and Prime Minister for nearly 10 years, spoke of the czardom and its methods as follows:

The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance. In furtherance of this policy, the Russian Government has always had two strings to its bow, moderate language and disinterested professions at Petersburg and London; active aggression by its agents on the scene of operations.

During his famous Asiatic cruise, our eminent naval officer, Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned. I am herewith quoting from a paper written by him and read by him before the American Geographical and Statistical Society at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, and published by D. Appleton & Co., 1856, page 28:

It requires no sage to predict events as strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

A review of these historical statements will undoubtedly be of interest today because of the great importance of full understanding of present issues in our foreign policy.

While most of the modern wars have been between "have-not" nations and "have" nations, indications point strongly to the possible final clash between Russia and the United States—the two greatest "have" nations. It will be very difficult to determine when or whether the "have-not" nations may have made their last great challenge to the "have" nations and when or whether the basic rivalry between Russia and the United States may precipitate war between them. It is, indeed, highly important that we avoid such dissipation of our resources as may reduce us even temporarily to the status of a "have-not" nation or any commitment that may deprive us of our power to control our

own resources as was done by the Harriman Commission report in November 1947, in placing the so-called Marshall plan on strategic grounds and as was done in the debate on the Greek-Turkish loans in the spring of 1947 in pronouncing our purpose to fence Russia in. Those policies not only committed us beyond our power to control our own resources but they swiftly and violently brought the rivalry between Russia and the United States to a head.

I sincerely hope we can still prove Commodore Perry's prediction wrong but it will require all the wisdom and good judgment we can muster to guide our Nation out of our present situation with success and without the disaster of Commodore Perry's prediction. I sincerely hope that the decisions of our leaders will be made with full understanding of the factors and characteristics recognized long ago by Alexis de Tocqueville, Lord Palmerston, and Commodore Perry.

The Basis for Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of December 26, 1950:

THE BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

What should be the basis for the foreign policy of the United States?

President Truman, in what has come to be known as the Truman doctrine, says that it should be the containment of communism, that this Nation should fight communism anywhere, and if necessary everywhere, that it threatens the peace.

Former President Herbert Hoover says that the foundation of our policy must be to preserve this Nation and the Western Hemisphere.

There is an important difference between these two points of view. That difference is now being openly and widely debated for the first time in a silent decade.

The two views need not, of course, conflict always or in every particular. To fight Communist power in particular places can be an essential part of our own defense. The defense of the Western Hemisphere does not preclude, and may require, fighting Soviet power outside the Western Hemisphere. The two viewpoints can converge.

There is, moreover, similarity of purpose in the two views. The advocates of containment everywhere advocate it to save America. The objective of the others is also to stop communism from engulfing the whole world, including ourselves. They are all honorable men.

Nevertheless, the difference is vital, not for what is intended but for what results.

The Truman doctrine begins by accepting United States responsibility for defending all parts of the world from Soviet encroachment; this becomes primary policy. In effect, the United States becomes a nation without differentiated frontiers. The frontier becomes one gigantic circle around Russia's present sphere. And since the doctrine is to defend that circle everywhere, the relative values of the various points on the circle become lost. All points become more or less of equal value.

The next progression, an unintended one, is that the responsibility of other peoples to defend themselves gradually becomes secondary.

Their self-defense is, of course, definitely desirable. But since containment everywhere is viewed as essential to our ultimate safety, we soon think we must defend other countries regardless of their own efforts. And the other countries soon begin to think they do us a favor to let us defend them.

At this stage decision becomes confused. Korea, let us say, cannot be weighed on any balance. It is a point on the circle; it is a part of the general responsibility we have assumed; and so we fight for it whether or not it has great value in terms of the larger fight.

So long as the policy is to contain everywhere there is simply no standard to distinguish among Korea, Indochina, or the Rhine—all become Koreas if the Communists choose to make them so.

From this kind of thinking there is another progression—also unintended but also inevitable.

Unconsciously we begin to make the defense of this Nation a subordinate consideration in weighing any proposed action.

If the policy is to contain everywhere and there is a threat anywhere, what room is there to debate whether to fight this particular threat will strengthen or weaken our own defenses? Unless we are to abrogate the policy there is no choice but to fight the threat anywhere. Action is automatic. The United States has then no choice but to intervene in Korea—or any other place.

The Truman doctrine thus puts the defense of this Nation second in the minds of the men whose trust is the defense of this Nation.

With the defense of this Nation as the paramount policy all this is changed. From this premise, the cost of any action would be measured against the gain; the risks of intervention in any Korea would be measured against the risks of abstention.

Men would still differ in judgment. They would still debate the intervention in Korea, the rearmament of Germany, the reinforcement of Europe. All these things would still be difficult matters to decide. Even from the Hoover premise, men would differ on the Hoover proposals as to what is best or prudent in a particular place.

But in the debate men would have a common plane of reference—the safety and preservation of this country. There would then be something to measure against, there would be a standard for making value judgments, a balance on which to weigh military and political opinions.

The policy of containment leaves us no choices. By trying to contain everywhere we become vulnerable everywhere and we can be truly strong nowhere. In the name of saving the world this policy deprives us of the freedom to seek out what is best to save America.

The policy of putting the safety of this Nation first is the only one which offers us a way of wisely measuring our strength against the task—or, indeed, offers any way of measuring at all. Therefore it, and not the policy of containment everywhere, ought to be paramount in the foreign policy of the United States.

It may be argued by honorable men that this reversal of emphasis ignores morality. For in its application there may come a time when the United States, measuring what is best for her own safety, may have to make the harsh decision of abandoning temporarily some cherished bastion. And the greater obligation, it is truly said, is to preserve the world from barbarism.

To this we can only reply that there is in the world today only one power that stands in the way of that barbarism. So long as the United States stands, the way is barred. So soon as it falls, the whole world will be engulfed.

It will profit neither ourselves nor civilization to risk the destruction of that power in the name of saving civilization. To pursue in the name of morality a course which weakens the power of the United States would be the true immorality.

A foreign policy which puts anything ahead of the preservation of this Nation betrays the Nation and civilization.

Who's Being Isolationist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Who's Being Isolationist?" which appeared in the Pantagraph, of Bloomington, Ill., of January 5.

The editorial emphasizes the extensive aid, both economic and military, which the United States has already extended our allies to stem the tide of communism. And it raises the very important question whether those whom we have been helping have really sought to help make themselves strong. It is this failure of our allies to do their part that is forcing the United States to question the wisdom of our foreign policy.

At an early date I plan to say something at some length on this subject. I urge a reading of this editorial. It is thought-provoking, to say the least:

WHO'S BEING ISOLATIONIST?

Most Europeans and many Americans are accusing those who question our foreign policy of being isolationists. Such accusations are red herrings. This country's foreign policy always has been and always should be pursued with the welfare of this country foremost in mind. Any other policy is naive and absurd in this realistic world.

Have we been isolationist in the pursuit of that policy? In the last decade we have given Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Turkey, Canada, Greece, Australia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Ethiopia, Iceland, and India just under $52,000,000,000 to help them restore their economy and to try to assure them that they should be our allies. That does not include millions given to China, the Philippines, and South American countries. It does not include recent loans to Spain and Yugoslavia. It does not include billions poured into Germany and Japan.

Last June some 53 nations pledged to go along with us in a firm United Nations stand to stop aggression in Korea. These nations promised manpower and equipment to help stop the Korean Reds and to show the world that liberty-loving people would not tolerate international gangsterism. They first promised 33,000 men and later increased the promised number as the task in Korea grew more difficult.

To date we have thrown 140,000 men into Korea to help the 100,000 South Korean force. And to date these countries have supplied 20,000 men and some equipment. Just to keep the record straight, here is the latest published report of what countries have supplied what:

Australia: 1,000 men, two destroyers, one 75-plane Mustang fighter squadron.

Belgium-Luxemburg: 750 men, en route.

Canada: 1,000 men, three destroyers, one air transport squadron.

Colombia: one frigate, en route.

France: 1,000 men, one frigate.

Great Britain: 6,000 men, 2 patrol squadrons of Sunderland flying boats, 2 aircraft carriers with planes, 2 light cruisers, 5 destroyers, 3 frigates, 1 auxiliary vessel.

Greece: 800 to 1,000 men, 6 transport planes.

New Zealand: 1,100 men, en route, 2 corvettes.

The Netherlands: 650 men, 1 destroyer.

The Phillipines, 1,200 men.

Siam: 1,200 men, 2 corvettes.

South Africa: One fighter squadron.

Turkey: 5,200 men.

When President Truman hinted at using the atom bomb in Korea and when the UN policy in Korea brought resistance from China, these same allies began in effect to desert us both in and outside UN. We stand virtually alone in our policy toward Red China The same nations not living up to their pledges in supplying men and equipment in Korea continue to recognize Red China, to supply her and to urge that she be seated in UN councils even though she defies every moral principle of UN.

This country is not isolationist. Its allies are becoming isolationists by abandoning the United Nations effort to halt aggression. And those are the allies to whom we have given nearly $52,000,000,000 in the last decade.

It is no wonder that our foreign policy is being questioned. It will continue to be questioned until it is revised to make more effective a close alliance with other nations who see the dangers of Communist enslavement of the world

The wish of the American people is to have a strong alliance with strong free nations. Our foreign policy has not produced such an alliance. It has instead been a one-way street. It has resulted in a Europe dependent upon our aid but apparently unwilling to buckle down to save itself.

The question is not how we shall withdraw into ourselves, but how we can prevent other free nations from forcing us to have to take such a course as a final and extremely hazardous risk. If we make such a choice—and there is every reason to hope that we can work out an effective alliance capable of defending and willing to defend liberty—it will not be our choice, but Europe's.

Availability of Hunters for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JOHNSON CITY, N. Y., *January 4, 1951.*

Hon. ED HALL,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.

HI ED: I was going to write you before this time but for some reason or other I did not.

Say, Ed, I saw in the press about us hunters to defend our country in case of need or help on manpower.

In today's press I saw where some man down there opposed such a movement. You can tell that gentleman that I am 56 years old but still can kill a woodchuck at 300 yards. I ought to be able to kill a Red or rat at 500 as I can handle the rifle, the revolver, or shotgun and in very good shape.

I hunted in all parts of Broome, Chenango, and Tioga Counties and know every bit of the grounds thoroughly.

You tell that opposer not to get in front of me with my 30-06 at 500 yards or he will be a dead duck.

Do not forget to call on me on anything you like, and I will be there like Johnny on the spot. I like to hear from you.

Yours very respectfully,

PETER COURLAS.

P. S.—I have plenty of ammunition, too.

Citizenship Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, during these days when democracy is called upon to block the ambitious encroachments of communism, it is fitting that we should strive not only to preserve our democracy but also to improve and perfect it. In introducing today a bill to remove the restrictions which bar some aliens entitled to permanent residence from obtaining citizenship, I am seeking to accomplish what I know is the will of the majority of the Congress, and which surely would have been accomplished by the last Congress except for technical legal difficulties involving amendments to the proposal I have submitted today, and the Internal Security Act which was then pending in the Senate.

Many of our resident aliens now ineligible for citizenship are the parents of children who served with great distinction in the last war. The largest numbers are of Japanese descent, and if reason to bar them from citizenship ever existed, that reason most certainly does not exist today. Under the able guidance of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the Japanese people have been able to find an outlet for their previously suppressed desire to become and remain one of the peaceful members of the family of nations. The bonds of friendship between the new Japan and the United States are growing in strength, and it is to our mutual advantage that we continue to strengthen our friendly relations with each other.

Of course, the international situation is not as important as our desire to demonstrate our attachment to the principles of justice by dealing justly with the almost 100,000 loyal Americans who have resided among us for many years, who have worked and lived as good Americans, sharing our benefits and our burdens, but who are, nevertheless, technically barred from ever being able to proudly say, "I am a citizen of the United States." I am sure this Congress will want to make it possible for these people to obtain their citizenship without further delay.

Senator Johnson Given More Power To Speed Up Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Daily Times-Herald of January 5, 1951:

SENATOR JOHNSON GIVEN MORE POWER TO SPEED UP DEFENSE PROGRAM

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S aggressiveness and ability have won for him two high party honors in the new Congress, those of chairman of the delegation from Texas and assistant majority leader in the Senate.

These positions and his chairmanship of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness make the junior Senator from Texas one of the principal leaders in Congress. His fellow Texans have cause to be proud of him.

But Senator JOHNSON has already made it clear that at this time his mind is occupied with something more than attainment of personal honors and that his chief aim is to speed up the steps that are being taken to prepare this Nation to meet the greatest crisis in its history.

The assistant majority leader in the Senate is known popularly as the whip, for it is his job to rally party members and spur them to action. The qualifications of Senator JOHNSON for this post are obvious and the fact that he has been chosen for it is gratifying to all citizens who appreciate the need for action. When he gives the word "go" he will speak as a Member of Congress who was preaching preparedness for war when almost all others leaders were thinking in terms of a minimum defense establishment and when the public was demanding cuts in Army, Navy, and Air Force expenditures.

There are still wishful thinkers in this country and abroad who are trying to convince themselves and others that the thunder of a gathering world war is only a false alarm and that we shall be exempt from harm if we only boost production, attend strictly to our own business, and vote regularly. But, as a matter of fact, the very life of this sovereign Nation is threatened and Senator JOHNSON is among those who are not blind to realities.

Many obstacles now stand in the way of steps to meet the world emergency. They include: Confusion in the councils of leadership; thoughts about the next presidential election; hesitancy on the part of many citizens to make patriotic sacrifice; the difficulty of making reductions in Federal, State, county, and city expenditures that have no relation to the armament program; and the wave of isolationism that is sweeping the country because of the timidity and false hopes of our professed allies in Europe.

All these obstacles will retard the action of the new Congress. They will cause long and acrimonious debate while men die in battle and while our foes grow stronger and more arrogant. Maneuvers for advantage in the next presidential election will cause valuable time to be wasted. At least, all this neglect of the Nation's safety will prevail unless foresighted, courageous men in the Senate and the House do all they can to prevent it. It is a comfort to know that LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas is one of the key men in the Senate.

Reapportionment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Committee on Reapportionment of Congress of the American Political Science Association:

The Constitution of the United States requires the seats in the House of Representatives to be redistributed after each decennial census. The American Political Science Association's Committee on Reapportionment of Congress has been considering what may desirably be done in consequence of the census of 1950. The members reached six conclusions, as follows:

First, the size of the House of Representatives, which has been 435 for 40 years and is fixed at that number by the present law, should not be changed except as the possible admission of Alaska or Hawaii as States may require a few more seats for their Representatives. In order to prevent any States from losing Congressmen under the recent census, 74 new seats would have to be put in the Chamber. A House of 509 seems impracticable. The personal relationships between a Congressman and his constituents would be much the same, whether an average district is 295,000 (with 509 seats) or 345,000 (with 435 seats). And any slight gain in human contacts would be vastly offset by losses in effectiveness and operation which would result from a considerably bigger House.

Second, there is no reason for changing at this time from the mathematical formula in the present Apportionment Act of 1941, namely, the method of equal proportions. Mr. Willcox dissents from this conclusion because he believes that the results of the method of equal proportions do not meet the requirements of the constitutional provision according to their respective numbers as well as do the results of the method of major fractions. The other Members are satisfied that the present method of equal proportions is the best method of meeting the constitutional provision.

Third, all Members of Congress to which any State is entitled should be elected by single-Member districts, rather than at large. At present, if we disregard the four smallest States which have only one Representative, six Congressmen are elected at large. New Mexico and North Dakota choose all their Members in this way (two each). And two States with large populations, Ohio and Connecticut, have each one Congressman at large.

These are merely examples of a practice which has occurred in other States in the past and may be used more extensively in the redistricting just ahead, unless prohibited by Congress. Whatever the motives for it, the device of Congressmen at large is very objectionable. Sometimes it may enable a political party having a slight lead in the State as a whole to get more seats in Congress than it could obtain if all the Members were chosen by districts; this deprives the minority party of its just amount of representation. In any event, there is the gravest sort of inequality when most Congressmen represent an average district of roughly 350,000, but a Congressman at large from a State like Ohio or Connecticut represents millions of people.

In all the apportionment statutes from 1842 to 1911 inclusive, Congress required every State to divide itself into single-Member districts. This provision was omitted from the act of 1929 and subsequent legislation. The committee recommends that Congress enact new legislation reincorporating this desirable requirement

Fourth, the committee is agreed that wide variations in the size of congressional districts inside any State are objectionable in principle and should be remedied in new legislation. The committee has noted with concern the great disparities in the 1950 populations of existing congressional districts. Take 350,000 as roughly the average in a district. In one State, there is a district under 175,000; 6 others under 250,000; 3 between 500,000 and 700,000; and 1 exceeding 900,000. In many States, the spread between 1950 populations in the smallest and the largest existing district in the State is two or three hundred thousand. Such situations, if continued, will seriously violate a basic principle of democracy, that every vote should have the same weight, as nearly as possible.

Therefore, the committee earnestly suggests new legislation containing certain express standards of equality and fairness, as hereinafter described, which each State is to follow in its redistricting legislation. In many previous apportionments through that of 1911, Congress has imposed such standards on the States by requiring the districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory and containing as nearly as practicable the same number of individuals. Such provisions about districting are authorized by the Constitution (art. I, sec. 4), which gives Congress a comprehensive power to "make or alter * * * regulations" of the "times, places, and manner of holding elections for * * * Representatives," and the Supreme Court has repeatedly dealt with these provisions without expressing the slightest doubt as to their validity.

Unfortunately, these standards were omitted from the statutes which governed the apportionments after the censuses of 1930 and 1940. The committee concludes that it would be desirable to reinstate them, and to express the standard of approximate equality among the districts with greater definiteness than hitherto.

The two concrete suggestions are:

1. That the standard requiring districts to be compact and contiguous, found in the 1911 apportionment statute and omitted in the 1929 statute, should be included in a new law.

2. That the statute should include a standard limiting to a certain percentage the deviation of any district within the State upward or downward from the average of all districts for the State; and that an effort should be made to keep the deviation of any district from the average of all districts for the State within a limit of 10 percent; but in any event such deviation should not be permitted to exceed 15 percent.

The practical effect of recommendation 3 would be to allow districts to vary over a range of about 100,000. This seems to make fair allowance for the practical difficulties which State legislators must face.

The particular percentages suggested are, of course, not essential, but the committee believes that some such specification of the permissible variations from equality is very desirable.

Fifth. The committee believes that the standards of approximate equality should be enforceable through an express sanction administered by Congress.

We feel that the statement of standards in the law will usually cause them to be observed. Our confidence in the legislatures and other appropriate authorities in the States leads to the expectation that they will, for the most part, faithfully obey the law of the land and establish districts for the next decade as Congress has directed them to do. Yet violations may occur, as has sometimes been the case under previous apportionment statutes containing standards. In these earlier statutes, Congress did not say what would happen to a State which divided itself in plainly unequal districts. Consequently, the unjust districting stood unchanged. Leaving any questions of gerrymandering to our sixth conclusion, we believe that departures from the percentage tests of approximate equality which we have just stated ought to be corrected and can practicably be corrected.

We rejected as undesirable several kinds of sanctions which have been proposed: (a) Any citizen might be given the right to question the districting inside his State, by a suit in a United States court. But the courts have shown great unwillingness to undertake the task of supervising congressional districts, and might deny any constitutional power to do so. Even if they consented to do the job, we do not think that judges are well suited to weigh the political factors which inevitably affect districting. Finally, litigation might easily drag out for some years, whereas the new districts ought to be settled before the spring primaries in 1952. (b) A State which violated the standards of approximate equality laid down by Congress might be penalized by a refusal to seat its Representatives until this State made its districting conform to those standards and held new congressional elections on that basis. This would probably make that State totally unrepresented in the House during one or more sessions of the Eighty-third Congress. Such a drastic punishment might be unconstitutional, and it was disapproved by the committee. (c) The State might be required to elect all its Congressmen at Large until it redistricted itself in accordance with the statutory standards. But the very same people who were responsible for the unequal districting might rejoice in having their Congressmen elected at large, because their party would thus choose the entire representation from this State in the House. And in any event, the committee considered this sanction to be wholly inconsistent with our condemnation of Congressmen at Large (in the third conclusion).

The only proper remedy for bad single-member districts is good single-member districts. The determination of approximately equal single-member districts is a political task, which ought to be performed by a legislative body. If the legislature of the State refuses to do the job, the only suitable alternative is for Congress to do it. Therefore, the committee agreed that the task of supervising and correcting districting inside the State should be in the hands of Congress.

This led to the formation of a detailed plan for the imposition of sanctions. Its main features are: First, the States should be required to do their own redistricting soon after Congress passes the Apportionment Act; this will give Congress ample time to consider whether this action by the States complies with the statutory standards of approximate equality. Second, the President should transmit the results of State redistricting to Congress and to all the States, with information showing how any particular State has violated the statutory standards of approximate equality. Since the President's statement will appear in the press, unequal districting will be subjected to the powerful sanction of publicity. Third, Congress may then take such action as it deems proper. Congress may order the State to do the job over again. Or Congress may redistrict the State itself.

In order to accomplish this plan, the committee recommends a schedule of steps to be included in Federal law, as follows:

1. January 3, 1951, to January 10 (1 week): The President reports to Congress factual data furnished by the Bureau of the Census indicating the apportionment of Representa-

tives among the several States under the 1950 census and according to the formula of equal proportions.

2. January 10 to late January (15 calendar days): Congress considers the President's report, and unless it enacts a different apportionment within 15 calendar days, each State shall automatically be entitled to the number of Representatives indicated in the President's report to Congress. The Clerk of the House shall so apprise the executive of each State; and the President will transmit to the States the data concerning populations supplied by the Bureau of the Census. The members of the committee hope that, during the same period or very soon thereafter, Congress will enact legislation regulating districting inside the several States, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of this report.

3. Late January to late April (90 days): A period of 90 days will then be allowed for the necessary redistricting in State legislatures. In most States the legislatures will be regularly in session, and experience indicates that 90 days are a sufficient time for the enactment of the necessary redistricting laws.

4. Late April to late May (30 days): The President, on the basis of objective data furnished by the Bureau of the Census about the populations of the congressional districts newly established by the State legislatures, will report to Congress and to the States as to conformity to or violation of the standards regulating the size of a district.

5. After late May: Congress will take such action as it deems proper to correct unequal districting wherever it is shown by the President's report to exist.

The committee anticipates that it will seldom be necessary for Congress to redistrict a State. The possibility of such redistricting by Congress and the publicity given to grossly unequal State action will, we hope, be powerful incentives to make the States comply with the statutory standards.

Sixth, the committee discussed the problem of gerrymandering. It recognized that some gerrymandering is a serious evil, but decided against the recommendation of further sanctions at this time.

The members of the committee share the hope that the reestablishment of the statutory standards of compactness and contiguity, and the publicity of the report to Congress on the action taken by State legislatures, will restrain those legislatures from seriously abusing the power to redistrict for purely partisan purposes.

Zechariah Chafee; Bertram M. Gross; John W. Lederle; Robert S Rankin; Laurence F. Schmeckebier; Walter F. Willcox; Arthur N. Holcombe, Chairman; James K. Pollock, President, Ex officio; Edward H. Litchfield, Executive Director, Ex officio.

In addition to President Pollock (chairman, department of political science, University of Michigan, former member Hoover Commission, and former adviser to United States military governor and high commissioner in Germany) and Chairman Holcombe (professor of government at Harvard University, former chairman of Appeals Board of the War Production Board, and author of numerous well-known volumes on American political life), the committee consisted of: Zechariah Chafee (Langdell professor of la · at Harvard University, and long-time contributor to reapportionment literature), Bertram M. Gross (executive secretary, President's Council of Economic Advisers), John W. Lederle (director, Institute of Public Administration, University of M.chigan), Edward H. Litchfield (executive director of the American Political Science Association, professor at Cornell University, and former United States director of civil affairs in Germany), Robert S. Rankin (professor of political science, Duke University), Laurence F. Schmeckebier (former chairman, Institute for Government Research, Brookings Institution, and author of standard reference works on reapportionment questions), Walter F. Willcox (professor emeritus, Cornell University, former president, American Economic Association and American Statistical Association, and longtime contributor to reapportionment literature).

False Rumors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Day I was very much impressed with an editorial in the Galveston News. It read as follows:

The public man's most useful possession is a thick skin, which will keep him imperturbable amid attacks just and unjust. For the private citizen in these days a most valuable attribute is skepticism about rumors.

Plenty of rumors are flying about, and there will be more. Tales will be told that the losses in Korea are several times greater than those revealed, or that persons high up in our military organization are Communist tools. These are rumors of the kind which in 1940 helped fill the roads of France and Holland with refugees, blocking the armies which would have defended them. Rumors were then the weapons of Hitler, as now they are of Stalin. Rumors and their cousin, slander, baselessly alleging treason in the innermost Government circles, have weakened national unity in a time of crisis, have discouraged our friends, and encouraged our enemies.

If you hear a rumor, pin the speaker down. "Where did you hear that? From whom? If you read it, just where did you read it? Are you sure exactly what the radio man or the magazine writer said?" If your informant cannot answer these questions positively, assume that the story is not true. Whether it is a willful lie or a mistaken idea is not the issue. Don't believe it until it is proved.

I used the foregoing in a radio program of my own and have subsequently mentioned it briefly on another program. How timely the admonition of the editor has proven is demonstrated in the following article which appeared in the same paper on January 3:

RUMOR OF SCRAP IRON FOR RED CHINA EXCITES ISLAND

(By Larry Deister)

"There's a Chinese Communist vessel in Galveston loading scrap iron for China." That rumor was widely circulated here Tuesday.

But little of it proved to be true.

There was a Chinese ship docked in Galveston, but it did not fly the Communist flag. The *Haitee* was at pier 16–18, displaying the Nationalist Chinese flag.

The vessel was loading big white bales of cotton with not a sign of scrap in sight. As for its destination, it is going to the Far East, but its port was Kobe, Japan.

Officials on the water front checked the rumor, but found no traces of scrap iron in any of the warehouses or dockside piers. Not even an expected shipment to Galveston of scrap iron could be located.

The last scrap iron shipped out of the Galveston area was loaded in Texas City, and that mainland city no longer has facilities to handle scrap iron.

The local manager of a shipping agency said that instead of exporting scrap iron, most steel companies and the Government are carrying on a concentrated program of importation of scrap iron for making steel.

Montgomery County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an editorial published in the Washington (D. C.) Star on Sunday, December 31, 1950. I also wish to include an editorial in the Washington Post of the same date. Both of these articles are relative to the honor come to Montgomery County which was selected as 1 of 11 all-American communities that are well governed.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of December 31, 1950]

MONTGOMERY EARNED THE HONOR

Montgomery County well deserves the honor which has come to it with its selection as 1 of 11 all-American communities that are well governed. There is good reason to include this thriving Maryland neighbor of Washington among outstanding cities composing the 1950 good-government team picked by the National Municipal League. (The annual award idea was suggested a year ago by the Minneapolis Tribune.) Maryland's first and only county to adopt a charter form of self-government stands out as an example of what can be accomplished when the aroused citizens of a community decide to throw off outmoded governmental methods and reorganize along modern business lines.

Governmental reform is not easy to achieve, and Montgomery County was no exception. Resistance to change is to be expected from an entrenched regime. But the enlightened citizens of Montgomery County persisted in their fight, despite obstacles and disappointments, and victory finally was theirs at the polls, thanks to a fine display of civic consciousness and nonpartisanship. Today the county has an elected council that is responsive to the people who elected it and that is giving the city-like county a type of efficient government that other communities would do well to emulate. The business affairs of the growing county are administered by a county manager whose responsibilities and duties are similar to those of a city manager. The citation accompanying the award points out that Montgomery has readjusted the tax load, established a 5-year capital improvement program and a $20,000,000 school building program, improved the road system, raised teachers' pay and established citizens' advisory committees for various departments. Still further improvements are planned.

The progress already made has made the dire predictions of opponents of the charter movement look exceedingly silly. Fortunately, there is an increasing spirit of unity in the county behind the new government that is an augury of still further progress along the home-rule path. Montgomery's

neighbors share in the pleasure which the award brings to the county's citizens.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of December 31, 1950]

MONTGOMERY AN ALL-AMERICAN COUNTY

Montgomery County, Md., and Richmond, Va., today were placed on a team of All-American cities for 1950.

The "team" was named by a jury of veteran municipal experts at a national conference on government of the National Municipal League held recently at Buffalo.

The selections will be announced in the Minneapolis Tribune today in a copyrighted story by Rolf Felstad. Felstad writes:

"The fight for good city government is like a war. If you quit, the other side wins.

"Eleven communities whose citizens refused to quit, in some cases after years of failure, have been named to a team of All-American cities for 1950.

"The stories of the 11 are stories of rich men, poor men, housewives, lawyers, and pick-swingers, who got mad enough to stand up and fight for government by the people.

"All are proof that the American people can have good, honest, efficient government if they're willing to raise their fists instead of sitting on their hands.

"It's no coincidence, according to such league officials as Charles Edison, president; Alfred Willoughby, executive secretary; and John E. Bebout, assistant secretary, that more than half of the All-American cities have a city council-manager form of government.

"A particular 'baby' of the league, the city manager system now governs more than 1,000 cities, towns and counties.

"But even good city fathers can't prevent a city from becoming a political orphan, many experts pointed out. It also takes city uncles and city aunts—businessmen, housewives, lawyers, doctors, laborers—to keep government and the people heading in the same direction.

"Said Edison, 'Honest and patriotic citizens must be elected to minor political offices.' Unless these men, who form the backbone of local political organizations, are in power, properly qualified statesmen will not be elected to top national government positions.

" 'Too many of our leaders,' he said, 'are nothing more than third-ward boys blown up to look like statesmen.'

"Edison said he feared that the tradition of public responsibility has become rusty with disuse.

"Too many cities, the experts declared, still are paying a heavy toll for inefficiency, or winked-at booty to racketeers. But 11 cities, and many more which deserve honorable mention, are living proof that a citizens' army can win any war it wants to."

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.

For the first time, a county makes the all-American team.

Montgomery County, Md., in many respects is like no other place in the country.

For one thing, the county government rules both urban and rural areas. The two most heavily populated places, Silver Spring and Bethesda-Chevy Chase, are not incorporated and don't want to be.

For another thing, Montgomery County is a dormitory for Washington, D. C. If you work in Washington, it's quite possible you sleep in Montgomery County.

At one time, many of the residents weren't sleeping well.

For many, the partisan ruling machine had failed to pay off its bonds as they came due. Instead, it borrowed new money to pay old debts.

In 1938, aroused citizens, led by the League of Women Voters and the Civic Federation, got Brookings Institution to make a study. The institution recommended a home-rule charter.

A charter reform board was named in the early 1940's and got a new charter on the ballot in 1944. The voters rejected it.

The board tried again in 1948, put the charter over and sent both Republican and Democratic parties into such a state of shock that they didn't even put up a slate in the 1949 elections. The charter board's slate of seven swept into office and became Montgomery County's celebrated Cadillac council.

As county manager, the council named Irving G. McNayr, a tall, friendly southern drawler who looks like a former football player, and is.

The county's credit, McNayr found, was shot.

McNayr and the council:

Raised taxes and balanced the budget; set up a 5-year building program and a $20,000,000 school-building program; built 26 miles of new roads in 1950 where the top of any previous year was 8 miles; raised teacher pay; established citizens' advisory committees for various departments; put 6,000 off-street parking spaces in Silver Spring and planned 4,000 for Bethesda-Chevy Chase in 1951.

Two years ago, businessmen in Silver Spring started a move to incorporate as a city. The University of Maryland studied the proposal and asked in effect: "Are you crazy?"

The voters like their county government. They elected another Cadillac council.

Abandon Europe to Conquest Is Taft's Policy Once More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of January 7, 1951:

ABANDON EUROPE TO CONQUEST IS TAFT'S POLICY ONCE MORE

Senator TAFT has only added more confusion to the debate on American foreign policy. He scorns the title of isolationist. He declares that "our battle against communism is in fact a world-wide battle, and must be fought on the world stage." Yet in the next breath he refuses to face any situation that might require any extensive use of American land forces. He opposes our butting in by sending any troops to Europe. Recently he asserted that keeping the peace by holding three and a half million American men under arms for 10 years would cost as much as a Soviet victory.

TAFT speaks with an air of calm reason, but through his speech runs a torrent of contradictions. He finds no evidence that the Russians plan a military conquest in Western Europe, yet he admits the possibility of Communist infiltration or attack by Soviet satellites. His mind apparently makes no connection between this sort of conquest and direct Russian aggression.

He proposes an alliance with Britain, France, Holland, Australia, and Canada to develop an all-powerful sea-air weapon. He overlooks the fact that we already have an alliance with those countries, under the North Atlantic Pact, to do whatever is necessary to prepare against aggression. There are seven other members of that alliance. TAFT would evidently dump them out of the boat.

The Ohio Senator insists that we must honor our pledges, including the one to go to war if any Atlantic Pact nation is attacked. In other words, he is willing for us to come to the aid of Western Europe after it has been overrun, but not before. That is not good news for our European allies. It is not good sense. It gives Stalin the opportunity Hitler always sought, to divide and conquer.

TAFT expresses doubt that the projected army of a million men in Western Europe could defeat Russia, citing the failure of Napoleon and Hitler to turn the trick with larger forces. This is the same straw man Herbert Hoover set up and demolished in his recent speech. Hitler and Napoleon invaded Russia and tried to capture Moscow with vast land armies. Nobody at any time has suggested that the western allies should invade Russia with land troops. The army planned for Western Europe is entirely a defense force, as everybody seems to understand except TAFT, Hoover, and the Kremlin leaders.

The main flaw in TAFT's thinking arises from his willful ignorance on the subject of Europe. He has no understanding of the state of mind of the Western Europeans, who need confidence above all else. Nothing breeds confidence there like the presence of American troops. The people of Western Europe have no heart for forming great armies to fight off Russia if all America offers is a hail of atom bombs on their cities after they are occupied by the enemy. They want the assurance that American troops will be in there fighting by their sides to prevent a Soviet occupation.

Mr. TAFT goes always on the assumption that Europe is something we can take or leave. He "does not see any conclusive evidence that the Soviets expect to start a war with the United States." He fails to see that Western Europe is the one area of the world we cannot afford to let fall into the hands of the Soviets. With that great arsenal of production and skilled manpower at their disposal, the Soviets would soon be ready to start their war against the United States, and ready to win it.

It is well to remember what Mr. TAFT said about Europe on July 15, 1941: "I believe in the end that we could have a negotiated peace, but probably with a Hitler dominant on the Continent. Europe must work out its own salvation, and we have no power, even if we have the will, to be its savior." Today TAFT is ready to deliver the European Continent to Stalin as he was ready to deliver it to Hitler, with the false hope that we could hold bases in Britain under the fire of Russian guided missiles 20 miles across the English Channel.

Senator Martin Sensed Red Peril Early

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Observer, Washington, Pa., entitled "Senator MARTIN Sensed Red Peril Early." The

article shows clearly the discerning foresight of the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, in recognizing and taking action against communistic activities and infiltration in our Government many years ago.

SENATOR MARTIN SENSED RED PERIL EARLY

United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Washington, deserves a place on the scroll bearing the names of those Americans who early sensed the peril of communism and entered the lists to fight against its insidious growth in our homeland.

Always an ardent champion of those principles and traditions upon which our Nation was built, Senator MARTIN has fought to the utmost against the efforts to weaken the foundation stones of our Government.

The Senator has stated that his real awakening to the aims of the Reds dates back to the years immediately following the recognition of the Soviet regime in Russia by the United States.

He was brought face to face with the stern realities of the scope of the Soviet aims through the discovery that Communists were infiltrating into the armed services of the United States, including the Pennsylvania National Guard. Then, as now, the advocates of communism in uniform were using peace as the cloak to hide their real purpose—destruction of our American form of government.

Loyal Americans in the armed services of America tried to their utmost to offset the propaganda of the agents of Moscow but the task was difficult due to the fact communism had just been recognized and its advocates were being popularly received in many circles at Washington.

As a result of his support of 100 percent Americanism, Senator MARTIN was among those dubbed by the Reds, pinks, and their friends as reactionaries.

In the Aesopian language of the Communist cult, a reactionary is one who opposes the ideology of statism. Statism, in final analysis, is a return to Dark Ages, the era in which despotic kings and their followers used peasants to provide them with wealth and power. In that era people were pawns of the rulers as they are today of the ruling clique in Soviet Russia.

A descendant of pioneer settlers of America and a veteran of three wars, Senator MARTIN is a real patriot. He has refused to yield on the issue of Americanism to gain popular favor with radical groups.

His loyalty and faithful service to his State and Nation has met with the approval of Pennsylvanians. He has received the highest offices at their disposal, United States Senator and Governor. His record will bear comparison with that of any other public official of his time.

Dr. Nutt, Congressman Rich, War Heroes Get Grit Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN R. BUSH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from sharing with others the wonderful tribute that was paid to my friend and predecessor, Bob Rich, who recently received the Grit Publishing Co. award for meritorious community service, along with Dr. John B. Nutt, of Williamsport, Pa., and 12 Lycoming County, Pa., young men who have given their lives for their country during the period of hostilities in Korea. Mr. Rich is the first person outside of Williamsport to receive one of the individual awards. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following from Grit, one of America's greatest family newspapers:

DR. NUTT, CONGRESSMAN RICH, WAR HEROES GET GRIT AWARDS

Awards for meritorious community service which Grit Publishing Co. has presented annually since 1933 go this year to Dr. John B. Nutt, of 1102 Woodmont Avenue, Representative Robert F. Rich, of Woolrich, and 12 Lycoming County young men who have given their lives for their country during the period of hostilities in Korea.

The certificate presented Dr. Nutt pays him this tribute:

"For your selfless concern for your fellowmen, inspiration to co-workers, unheralded deeds in your profession, and solicitude for draftees."

Representative Rich is the first person outside of Williamsport to receive one of the individual awards. He is being honored because of his untiring work in behalf of this community and county, as well as his district and the Nation generally, during his long and faithful service in Congress. The citation on Mr. Rich's award reads:

"For 18 years of service to your fellow citizens as a conscientious and courageous Member of the Congress of the United States."

Presentation of certificates to Lycoming County youths who made the supreme sacrifice continues a policy which Grit adopted in the Second World War. Citations on the awards given to the nearest of kin read:

"In recognition of your patriotism, valor, and supreme sacrifice in the war against the forces of evil and aggression."

Resolution of Mayor and Council of Hagerstown, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following telegram I received from the mayor and council of Hagerstown, Md.:

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *January 4, 1951.*

Hon. J. GLENN BEALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas we are appalled and distressed at the conditions existing in Korea, and the maiming and killing of the members of the Armed Forces defending democracy against impossible odds; and

Whereas we hold Dean Acheson responsible for the disastrous circumstances in which our Armed Forces and our Nation find themselves; and

Whereas it is our opinion that conditions will become progressively alarming and disastrous unless the said Dean Acheson be removed as Secretary of State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and council of Hagerstown, Md., That it is vital for the preservation of our democracy that the said Dean Acheson be impeached as Secretary of State, and that Herman L. Mills, of Hagerstown, Md., be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey the sentiments of the said mayor and council to United States Senators O'CONOR and BUTLER and Congressman BEALL for immediate action.

HERMAN L. MILLS,
Mayor.

Texas and the United States Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one organization I came into frequent contact with on my trip abroad was the Foreign Service of the United States. In these days of international complications and foreign policy problems, it is a good organization to know something about.

The Foreign Service, of course, is the organization that staffs and runs our American embassies, legations, and consulates abroad. Whether you are in Tehran or Paris, in Belgrade or Stockholm, in fact, almost any place in the world, and you see a building with an American flag sticking up over it, you can be pretty sure you are looking at a Foreign Service post. It is the State Department's overseas arm, and has rightly been called the eyes and ears abroad of the American people.

One thing that surprised me about the Foreign Service was how many Texans there seemed to be in it. I have long known, of course, how Texans get around—though many of them give the impression that they would not live anywhere but in Texas. As I made the rounds of the capitals in Europe and western Asia, and touched base at the local American Embassy or Legation, I kept running into Texans. Charlie Gidney, second secretary and consul in Tehran, introduced himself to me and said he came from Granger. Well, Granger is up near Wichita Falls, so I said he was practically an Oklahoman, but he said an inch was as good as a mile if it was in Texas, so we shook on it.

When I got up to Copenhagen, there was a Third Secretary and Vice Consul who said he came from Brownwood. Ted Adams was his name. Said he graduated from Howard Payne. In London is one of the few career Foreign Service officers who are women. Miss Kathleen Molesworth from Montell. I am told there are only 24 women career officers in the Foreign Service out of more than a thousand. The number of unhealthy posts, the marriage risks, the fact that if a Foreign Service officer marries an alien, he or she has to hand in his or her resignation; these factors have contributed to making it difficult for women to pass the strict entrance requirements. Miss Molesworth is one of the few.

I checked when I got back to Washington and found that there are 214 Texans in the Foreign Service. Some of

them are top men, like John D. Hickerson, from Crawford, a career officer who is now Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations Affairs; Fletcher Warren, from Wolfe City, former American Ambassador to Paraguay, now director of the State Department's office of South American Affairs. Some are just beginning as career officers, like Douglass Balentine, from Bigflat, now Vice Consul in Guatemala; John Burnett, from Bowie, Vice Consul in Kobe; Jack Howison, from Bogata, vice consul in Istanbul. There are more Texans in the Foreign Service staff corps, the noncareer officers and the essential clerical and stenographic clerks that staff our posts overseas. All together, 214 men and women from our State in an organization of approximately 7,000 Americans, plus an additional 8,000 local alien employees.

Before I went abroad, I knew something about the Foreign Service, of course, from my work with the House Committee on Armed Services. But on my travels I wanted to know more about how Foreign Service people live overseas, how they educate their children, how often they get home to the United States, and so forth. Also, just what they did in their jobs. So I got hold of a State Department pamphlet called The Foreign Service of the United States.

The pamphlet defines the Foreign Service as the field arm of the Department of State. It defines the service best by listing its functions. It represents the United States abroad; advises, protects, assists American citizens residing, traveling, or having interests abroad; negotiates treaties; observes, analyzes, and reports on trends of significance in the countries in which assigned; promotes and protects the foreign trade of the United States. The pamphlet also lists consular functions that might be more familiar to American citizens. The Foreign Service is responsible for the issuance of passports to American citizens abroad; the registration of births and deaths of Americans in their consular districts; the examination of foreign visa applicants; the protection of American shipping and seamen; the custody, administration, and settlement of the estates of American citizens or seamen who die abroad; the handling of extradition cases for the American Government; the supervision of quarantine and disinfection rules for foreign goods being shipped to the American market. In short, there is a lot of hard, routine work in taking part in what has been called America's first line of defense in peacetime.

A number of well-known Americans have served in our Foreign Service. Benjamin Franklin was our first Ambassador to France. Washington Irving wrote Tales of the Alhambra while stationed at the American Legation in Madrid. William Eaton, our consul in Tunis years ago led an army of 500 Greeks, Italians, and Arabs across the desert to capture Derna during our war with Tripoli in 1798. Howard Payne, who wrote Home, Sweet Home, was our consul in Tunis in 1842. After meeting Foreign Service officers living in Tehran, Belgrade, and other places, and hearing about some who had not been home in 6 or 8 years, I can understand how Howard Payne came to write that song. Nathaniel Hawthorne, author of the Scarlet Letter, and other great novels, was consul in Liverpool for many years; he is said to have written the Marble Faun while stationed there. Joel Poinsett was our first Minister to Mexico and brought back the plant now called after him, the Poinsettia.

Today there are 15,000 Foreign Service employees stationed in 294 posts in more than 70 different countries. It is difficult to give exact figures for the Foreign Service today. Seven posts have been closed in China during the past year due to Communist control of the mainland. At the same time we have opened new posts in Burma, Siam, and French Indochina. As a general redeploys his troops according to the situation, the State Department closes and opens posts. There may be 294 posts today but 293 or 295 tomorrow.

Some Foreign Service posts are in prominent places like Paris, London, Moscow. There are others, and these are in the majority, in less well-known spots, such as Tehran, Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan; Accra, on the African Gold Coast; Dares-Salaam, Tanganyika; Elizabethville, the Belgian Congo; Belim, Brazil. Tihwa, China, was the most remote of all our Foreign Service posts until it was closed this year. You may have read of the 1,600-mile trek over the Himalayan mountains that Consul Hall Paxton led in order to escape from the Chinese Communists into India. The party included six women and five children, and took 3 months. You may also have read of the tragic death of Vice Consul Douglas Mackiernan, shot by Tibetian border guards while following Paxton a few weeks later.

What kind of life do our fellow Americans live in the Foreign Service? It varies, of course, from post to post. In London or Paris, I found living conditions to be not much different from my own in Washington. But London or Paris are not average posts. A Foreign Service family will be assigned to a post like Paris or London only after many years in the less popular posts in the world. Let us examine the conditions in which American Foreign Service families live in a more average post, Tehran, the capital of Iran, which I visited on my trip.

Tehran sits on a barren plateau of the Elbruz Mountains at an altitude of 4,000 feet. It has a dry climate with a rainfall of about 10 inches per year, about the same as some parts of west Texas, and the temperature rises to above 100° Fahrenheit in the summer and goes down to near freezing temperature during the winter nights. The climate is generally pleasant and offers no particular hardship beyond possible respiratory troubles due to the prevalence of dust in the air. Serious health hazards do exist for American families, however, and the State Department's post report on Tehran lists the following prevalent diseases: typhoid and partyphoid, bacillary and amoebic dysentery, malaria, smallpox, whooping cough, measles, diphtheria, trachoma, typhus fever, tuberculosis, sandfly fever, and the insect-borne infection known as the "Baghdad boil."

The common distribution of water in Tehran is through a series of wells with connecting tunnels. The water is brought down from the mountains through these tunnels and brought to the surface just north of the city. It then passes down each street through a series of open gutters known as "jubes." Individual households obtain water by periodically damming the "jubes" to divert a sufficient supply into private cisterns. The water has, of course, been contaminated as it runs through the open gutters and thickens noticeably as it runs through the city.

Most Americans buy drinking water for their families from roving water carts or take home water from the chlorinated well in the Embassy compound. Jube water is used, however, for general house cleaning, the laundry, and the bathroom.

Most diseases caused by contaminated water can also be acquired from the food. It is the common practice of Iranian vegetable vendors to "freshen" their produce with jube water. All vegetables therefore have to be washed and either thoroughly cooked or disinfected before serving. In some parts of Iran, vegetables and fruits are still fertilized with "night soil" or handled by persons with infectious diseases. This also invites preventive measures.

The only American doctors in Iran are a medical officer assigned to the United States military mission in the country, a Rockefeller Foundation research worker, and a few medical missionaries who work some distance from Tehran. Since none of these doctors is officially available for Foreign Service personnel, local doctors have to provide whatever care is needed. There are, of course, no dentists or occulists other than native Iranians.

Housing facilities are few and expensive. Henry E. Grady, our present Ambassador to Iran, lives in part of the Embassy set aside for the Ambassador's residence but the majority of the staff have to locate quarters in the city itself. Rents average $150 a month for a small, unfurnished flat, and $250 a month for an unfurnished, three-bedroom house. Furnished quarters, when available, average 20 percent higher.

Church facilities for American Foreign Service personnel are plentiful. The American Presbyterian Mission maintains a community church in Tehran at which Protestant services of various denominations are conducted. There are also a number of Catholic churches, and several synagogues.

Education for the children of Foreign Service families is largely provided by the American Presbyterian Mission. For many years, the mission has maintained an English-speaking community school. Most of the teachers are American and instruction can be obtained from the second to the twelfth grades—in other words, through high school. There were about 200 students in the school when I visited it, including all

American children in Tehran of school age. They have no football team, of course, but they play soccer among themselves and baseball and do plenty of hiking.

Recreational facilities for Foreign Service families are both good and bad. Motion-picture entertainment is practically nonexistent. The theaters are dilapidated buildings of questionable cleanness and show very old American pictures. One practice which does not help matters much is the practice of breaking into the showing at frequent intervals with slides flashed on the screen translating the spoken American words into Persian and Russian. These interruptions always come at the most exciting parts, I am told, so that the local audience will understand what is going on. In-between times, the audience drowns out the sound on the screen with a buzz of conversation and conjecture.

Other than movies, however, recreational facilities for Embassy personnel are plentiful. That is, if you like sports. There is plenty of open space for hiking and picnicking and hunting. Game is plentiful in the mountains and on the plateau, particularly wild boar, gazelle, duck, pheasant, snipe, and quail. For fishing there are a few mountain trout streams and a small amount of offshore fishing down in the Caspian Sea, a day's drive from Tehran. In the city itself there is an 18-hole golf course lying on the outskirts. The only trouble with it that I could see was that the terrain was pretty rugged and the course was totally bare of grass.

All in all, Tehran is a pretty average Foreign Service post Living conditions are not so good as in Paris or London, nor so bad as they would have been had I visited more remote posts. The greatest draw-back that I could see was its distance from America. It takes 20 to 30 days to go out by boat to the Persian Gulf and then overland to Tehran. If you are shipping your furniture and heavy baggage on ahead of you, Embassy officials say it takes from 4 to 6 months to arrive. Once there, a Foreign Service employee might as well forget about getting home till his next home leave, 3 years hence.

The Foreign Service people I met, however, seem to like the deal. They are used to traveling around. To them Tehran is just another post among many. It may be the sixth or seventh in a long series of posts before 30 years' service rolls around and a Foreign Service officer can retire. Meanwhile, the family must get used to living in many countries and under all kinds of conditions. The children must become accustomed to being picked up every 3 or 4 years and carried on to another country, to another school, with another language to learn. The wife must become used to packing, unpacking, learning new marketing customs and how to get along with another set of servants. It is a traveling salesman's life in a way, with the whole family acting as salesmen for the United States. From what I saw of them, they are doing a good job.

Detroit's Two Hundred and Fiftieth Birthday Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, commencing January 1, 1951, Detroit will be the site of a year-long commemoration of that city's history. The celebration, which will be civic and cultural in character, has been planned by thousands of Detroit citizens during the past 2 years. In the present period of international unrest and recurring crises, the Detroit two hundred and fiftieth birthday festival will constitute one of the greatest public demonstrations of democracy and faith ever staged.

Detroit is one of the six oldest major cities on the North American Continent, and its cultural and economic importance to this Nation have long been realized. The citizens of Detroit are taking this occasion to dedicate themselves again to the principles of democratic living.

Originally, the Detroit festival was planned not only as a civic and cultural demonstration, but also to encompass a large industrial fair. As soon as the United States became embroiled in the Korean War, however, plans were cast to mobilize industrial units for the emergency. The people of Detroit immediately revised their festival schedule. Rather than a visual demonstration of Detroit's industrial progress through the years, they determined to show the world the vast potential American industry by means of production figures increased to meet the current emergency.

Detroit is the world's greatest production center and the arsenal of democracy. Here is concentrated the greatest force of mechanical and scientific production in the world. It is more than that, for within the city of Detroit over which we rejoice there is a feeling of friendship, brotherly love, peace, and contentment among the prosperous and productive people. Every phase of human activities, every great nationality and color are found within the boundary confines of this great city for which it has been known, not only as being dynamic but the city "where life is worth living."

The cultural and civil aspects of the festival have been enlarged. During the coming year, Detroit will present one of the greatest sports programs ever conceived. It will be the host for the National Open Golf Tournament, the big-league all-star baseball game, the American Legion junior baseball tournament, the men's and women's national AAU swimming championships, the men's and women's national gymnastic championships, and many other events of national importance.

During the summer, many events of international importance will take place in Detroit. The Detroit Institute of Arts will present a special exhibit titled "The French in America," for which materials are being sent from the greatest collections in France and England; a series of special concerts will be given featuring the music of France, England, and the United States; and, among the many other special events to be presented, there will be an international folk festival which will display the many cultures that have contributed to what is now the native American culture.

Ours is a great and wealthy country, devoted to the belief that freedom and democracy are necessary to progress. Detroit is a living example of the results of freedom and democracy. During 1951, the eyes of the world will be on that city. I believe that each of us, as Representatives of our individual States, should strongly endorse the Detroit Two Hundred and Fiftieth Birthday Festival and the principles upon which it is built.

The New Year in the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, from the January 7, 1951, issue of Atlantis, which I commend to the attention of the Members of the House:

THE NEW YEAR IN THE WORLD SITUATION
(By Soterios Nicholson)

WASHINGTON.—The year 1951 comes at a time when the free world is poised on the brink of decision: Whether or not it shall give the supreme effort to preserve its liberty from the danger of totalitarianism. As the world situation grows darker, the hopes of the peace-loving peoples in the world rekindle with a brighter and more anxious flame. The new year is a time to look forward and not back. The errors made in the past can be studied and acknowledged, but we can't waste time deliberating over them. If in the past we have failed to speed up our defenses in such areas as the Greek-Balkan region, or in Iran or in Western Germany, now is the time to make our resolution to foster preparedness throughout the world—at every key spot likely to be attacked by the Kremlin hordes.

New Year's Day in the United States is highly celebrated as the day which ushers in a new goal in life toward which we can set our sights. It is the day when resolutions, firm and resolute, are formed, the day when dancing and merrymaking continue into the early hours of the new year. It also is a day which marks the passing of an outworn, already experienced year. Thus, the sense of the new, the untried, is what spurs Americans to do the unusual, the difficult, yes, even the untried. And in Greece, the new year is the culmination of the period which begins in Christmas. It

is the day when gifts are passed among relatives and friends, a practice indulged in Christmas time.

This Balkan Nation, saddened many a New Year's Day by the burdens of war or hunger, finds itself this 1951 a country on the outpost, guarding democracy's frontier. That job is not an easy one, for, in addition, Greece must assure its people that they will have food to eat, a roof over their heads at night, and a future to look forward to—at a time when few hopes are alive in central Europe.

The road back for Greece has been a long and difficult one. That road has a turn in it which now is being reached. The coming year should tell whether the Greek people will have taken the right turn or perhaps taken a detour. Which road is the correct can be guideposted by the leading western countries, such as the United States and Great Britain. A year is almost a past friend. To all of us, 1929 and also 1930 were years which we remember as the depression acquaintances. The first was to have been celebrated as the greatest 12 months in the American history of prosperity. But, as it happened, the prosperity did not linger the full time but deteriorated into the famous economic crash and the beginning of the great depression. People wondered in 1930 whether that year would bring revolution and crisis in the United States.

But by the same token, the years 1918 and 1945 are remembered as having a peculiarly sweet and fond aroma. Those were the years when two separate and great world wars ended on a note of high optimism. It was to be the end of world conflict and bloodletting.

It is—and should be—our sincere desire that this year of 1951 will be the turning point of history, wherein the curse on humanity called communism is trampled under the boots of the masses of people who have been subjugated by the twentieth century tyrants.

The goal in every man's life is happiness and a measure of success for himself and for his family. And it is those thoughts which are asserted on the new year. Man, a strange creature even unto himself, is ever curious what tomorrow may bring. But, as it is in the world and as it ever will be in the history of mankind, the individual can have a part in what is to come. Greece's populace, whose roots sprang from the fertile forebearers who nurtured civilization and who has been one of its greatest champions, in this way can play a role in the history of the future world. With the aid of the free and unfettered world, the Greek Nation can look forward to many more years of peace and perhaps even eventual prosperity. But should the many resourceful and bastion nations fail to bulwark Greece morally, spiritually, and materially, and without delay, the days, months, and perhaps years will be heavily shadowed.

Courage—and faith—can topple the odds being stacked against the free Western World. The set-back to the United Nations that has been suffered in Korea can have mixed blessings by preparing us for the very worst. The New Year is being celebrated throughout the world with a trace of foreboding. For peoples the world over are asking one another the big question of: Are we great enough, do we have the know-how to meet the aggressor at the council table or on the field of battle and defeat him?

The answer to this indeterminable can only be in the affirmative; Democratic ways of life must give emphasis to the note being sounded by our leaders—freedom must not fail.

With the aid of God, the freedom-loving workers, businessmen, professionals and intellectuals, the diplomats and the politicians will forego the usual and normal luxuries which have become part of their way of life, and work together to make 1951 the most memorable year of all time. Only we—the free peoples of the earth—can make an ideal come true. Only we—the best fed people on the earth—can assure other nations, such as Greece, that they and their future generations are not being forgotten. Unstinted effort on every individual's part must follow the recapitulation made on New Year's Day. Ring in the New Year, ring out the old, we are crossing the threshold. May we have prosperity and peace.

World Government—Think It Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as part of my remarks an article by Col. Albert G. Hulett, of East Orange, N. J., which appeared in the December 1950 issue of Sojourner. The threat to our Government through the program of world federalism must be brought to the attention of all the American people. The article in question is as follows:

BE OBJECTIVE IN YOUR THINKING ABOUT WORLD GOVERNMENT

Can we not derive inspiration and guidance for our thoughts and our inclinations regarding world government, as now being so adroitly advocated by United World Federalists, Inc., from the parable of the 10 talents which is contained in the New Testament of the Christian Bible? If anyone has forgotten that parable, I admonish him or her to reread it at once and then to think upon its implications. The lesson is very clear, namely, that only after succeeding in lesser things are we entitled to undertake larger and greater endeavors and responsibilities. Could anyone expect that one of our colleges would accept as a student any pupil who had failed to graduate from high or preparatory school? And, if any college were so foolish, would you expect such pupil to succeed in such higher educational endeavor?

Even a casual and superficial survey of human history will reveal that socially, morally, educationally, linguistically, and religiously, the world of today is as hopeless a mess of conflicting strata, beliefs, practices, and systems as it was 2,000 years ago. We may have made some progress, but certainly not enough to achieve a disappearance of these basic and vital differences and disagreements. Not only have we these differences, but we have a total incomprehension and misunderstanding of the mores of one group by those of any other.

We may talk grandiosely of democracy and prate that a long list of countries have embraced and practice democracy. But are we aware of the fallacy of such presumption? Upon the record, it appears that the United States, France, Great Britain, Finland, Italy, the nations of Central and South America, China, Japan, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and even Russia are democracies. Yet have they a similar constitution, political or social order, or comparable standards of procedure in government, or identical rights of the individuals therein?

Christianity has existed for well-nigh 2,000 years, and yet is it united today, or even making apparent progress toward such union? Protestantism, both in Europe and these United States, has been cognizant of the need and the vast advantage of achieving a single Christian church into which all believers in Christ might be joined. But has such been even approached, let alone attained, to this date? To some observers it may even seem that the more we try to attain union the more minority groups are born and the more bitter becomes the partisan wall between them.

Right within our own country, do we have a singleness of mind in legal matters, or governmental, social, or civic realms? Yet our 48 States and the District of Columbia are supposed to be existing and to be functioning under a single Constitution. Whether it be divorce laws, criminal procedure, property rights, or any other corner into which we inquire, we shall discover that we have not a single standard, but 49 different and widely dissimilar standards of right and of procedure amongst us.

These are examples of what mankind has achieved as to one talent, or—shall we say—as to successive single talents.

Yet the idealists, dreamers, impractical thinkers, and superficial persons who now vociferously and financially are supporting and promoting the program of United World Federalists, Inc., with its objective of immediate, single world government, would have you and me believe that mankind—though dismally unsuccessful in these simpler, and yet vitally basic undertakings—can now and immediately make a complete success of the establishment of a single government for all mankind.

To me, and to others who adopt a factual and objective approach to life and its living, such a grandiose and illogical proposition is wholly repugnant and disturbing. That such scheme is of Russian Communist origination requires much study to determine by actual proofs. A few who have the time and the facilities have certainly done so, but the mass of our citizens have neither such ability nor the leisure in which to parallel that research; nor have they been told all that might be said upon this score—and chiefly because of lack of money which would be requisite for such widespread dissemination of the truths.

Yet is such study or such dissemination necessary for our citizens to appreciate the impossibility of the successful achievement—at this time or at any forseeable future date within the lives of those now existing upon this earth—of a single world government, unless such be a despotism which is forced upon its nations and peoples as was the Roman Empire and other subsequent "fatuous answers to the yearning for universal peace"?

Can we not cause our people to recognize that, having failed in these necessary preliminary steps in the progression toward world unity, nor even now having the knowledge or means to their attainment, we would be fools indeed to consider for a moment the vastly larger, more intricate, and far more dangerous attempt to speedily bring about the creation of a single government for mankind?

Upon a dispassionate analysis of human accomplishment to date, the observer must become an apologist for the failures thereby disclosed, and also must conclude that mankind is not universally and generally ready for the college undertaking of world government, because the nations and peoples of this earth have not yet even finished the grammar school of their education in solution of domestic problems, let alone the high school of sufficient and proper collaboration between national governments and social systems, or religious sects.

Hence, avoiding any and all considerations of the details of this world government project, should we not label it as wholly impos-

sible of attainment? And, even though we might yearn for some such eventual attainment at some far-distant future date, can we honestly aver that we can or should advocate any such scheme which must inevitably result in chaos and recession for mankind, should it be now undertaken?

ALBERT G. HULETT,
National Commander, Herocs of '76.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, I introduced House Joint Resolution 3 for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway in the interest of national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada.

Although this proposition has been before Congress for some time, the critical developments during the past 6 months have emphasized the necessity for immediate construction of this project. There is a vital and pressing need for the production of low-cost hydro power for our defense industries. This project will supply it in an area which has suffered from power shortages since the beginning of World War II. The Government is today making contracts for the establishment of defense plants in which it is forced to make allowance for high cost of power. Canada is in dire need of additional sources of power energy and if she is to make a large contribution for our mutual defense she must be permitted to take part in the development of the St. Lawrence River.

Through the development of this deep water navigation all materials needed for our expanded industries can be made available from continental sources without exposing our supply lines to enemy submarine action as in 1942.

Our expanded steel industry will require large amounts of iron ore imports. The Bureau of Mines estimates that for an annual steel production capacity of 125,000,000 tons, we shall need to import 64,000,000 tons of iron ore. It is inconceivable that this country should allow almost one-half of its steel capacity in the next 10 to 20 years to be dependent upon off-shore imports and made available only by our Atlantic seaboard and subject to attack by undersea craft.

There are certain vital materials that we must obtain from overseas, such as bauxite, petroleum, copper, and uranium ore which will tax our merchant marine resources and convoy duty. It would be folly to make one-half of our steel production and scores of other vital and critical essentials needed in war and peacetime dependent upon off-shore resources thousands of miles removed from the continent of North America.

There are sources of ore development on the continent in addition to Minnesota, Labrador, and eastern Quebec and Ontario. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway is an absolute necessity to bring Quebec and Labrador inland ore to our Great Lakes steel industry as well as to our eastern mills in large quantities.

The resolution I have introduced differs only slightly from the one I sponsored in the Eighty-first Congress and upon which the House Public Works Committee held extensive hearings.

There are certain revisions in section 2, which takes cognizance of the fact that the Niagara Treaty of Canada takes care of the expense of casual interest in the negotiation of this treaty.

In section 3, relating to tolls, passenger traffic is included along with cargo in the application of tolls. A maximum of 50 cents a short ton is passed upon bulk agricultural and mineral cargoes. The reason for this is that very large amounts of iron ore, coal, grain, and petroleum are expected to use the seaway and the revenues at a maximum of 50 cents a short ton would be enough to meet all the costs of the seaway including interest and amortization of principal.

In section 5, which calls for the transfer of the power facilities to the State of New York upon payment of the cost of the powerhouse, plus a share of the joint cost of power and navigation, one of the conditions of transfer has been expanded to spell out a policy that has been understood in administration circles that New England would share in the St. Lawrence power. It must be understood that any arrangement worked out by the executive departments will have to be submitted to the Congress for approval.

I call upon my colleagues from New York and New England, regardless of party, to support this bill because there is cheap power for them in it. I call upon my colleagues from the Middle West and the agricultural States because it is essential for continued prosperity and expansion of agriculture and industry.

I know that certain selfish and influential groups are opposed to this project. Eastern railroads, particularly those serving Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore are opposed to it because they hope to gain by stopping this low-cost competitive transportation project. I know that the power companies, too, in New York and New England are opposed to it because of the competitive effect of this low-cost power. I am sure, however, that my colleagues from those areas conscious of the source of this opposition will put national interest and the welfare of their constituents above misplaced fears of these eastern power and railroad companies.

Let me emphasize that completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway will not only make of the Great Lakes States deep seaports of international importance, but will guarantee the permanence and growth of industry. More than that, it will preserve and make possible the expansion of the great defense potential so essential to our national existence. Significantly, the national interest, and more particularly that of the Lake States, is not centered upon power development or navigation alone, contiguous States, particularly those producing farm products of various kinds, cattle and grain, and even minerals, will be assured of cheap competitive freight rates which will project their products of mills, factories, and mines along with the fruits of our agricultural States into the markets of the world.

It will add prosperity to industry, banks, railroads, and to the millions of workers throughout the length and breadth of the land. It will stimulate not alone industry and agriculture but railroads and other forms of transportation.

A Mother's Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leav to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from a South Bend, Ind., mother, which is typical of the mail I am receiving from distraught parents in my district who are deeply concerned over the present foreign situation:

SOUTH BEND, IND., *January 4, 1951.*
Hon. Congressman CRUMPACKER:

We mothers of this country want this needless slaughter of our sons to cease.

Don't they have a right to happiness, education, and marriage, as you and I?

I have two wonderful sons who I have cared for tenderly, and love, and if you could sit for 1 hour and hear them talk of the dismal, hopeless future which is no fault of their own but is caused by the blundering present adult generation.

If our own country was attacked, we would all want to fight, but to keep sending our fine boys across the ocean every few years to fight their battles is sheer madness.

What has it ever gained? People are growing very, very bitter.

One commentator I heard recently said, and I quote, "We have made commitments which we must live up to; we must not lose faith with the rest of the world." To which I say, What utter nonsense.

I ask you, How much have other countries considered us? They want our money and our protection, but what have they done, or are doing? They haven't even tried to protect themselves. But, of course, our American boys must spill their lifeblood over Europe, sent over like cattle to be slaughtered.

My husband and I agree with former President Hoover, and many people believe as we do. My husband is a physician and talks to many people in the course of a day and, believe me, people want something drastic done about this present foreign policy.

Do not give the President any more power. He already has had too much; and what terrible mistakes he has caused. What a pity for this Nation that we could not have a real man and statesman as our leader.

I ask you, Congressman CRUMPACKER, as our Representative, to do all in your power to prevent these past foolish policies from being carried out further.

We mothers are praying for you and are looking to you for help.

Sincerely,

Mrs. D. W. FRASH.

Heil, Dewey!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column by Mr. Walter Winchell published in this morning's Washington Post. It is, I believe, a most thoughtful and intelligent discussion of Governor Dewey's request for emergency powers:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK
HEIL, DEWEY!

Governor Dewey has asked the State legislature to declare immediately a defense emergency, which would give him the most dictatorial powers in American history. The Governor's request is marred by only two defects, both constitutional. Firstly, he hasn't the right to receive such powers; and, secondly, the legislature hasn't the authority to give them. All of the gentlemen involved swore to uphold the Constitution—and that old document was designed to stop any new-fangled dictatorship, however sugar-coated.

Getting right down to cases, the United States Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that after Congress has acted, in any given matter, the various States can't. Congress has passed a Civil Defense Act—and the State of New York is as much bound by it as any private citizen. The subject of civil defense is a national problem. Governor Dewey can no more declare a state of national emergency in New York State than he can conclude a separate treaty of peace with Russia or withdraw the New York National Guard from the Atlantic alliance.

New York State still being a democracy, it is proper for citizens to ask questions. Here are a few: The Governor's counsel states that the bill doesn't give the Governor any new powers he doesn't have. Then why pass it? The Governor's counsel states that the new bill simply defines the emergency. Does anyone seriously urge that an atomic attack has to be described by the State legislature before the United States Army can act?

The Governor, a very able lawyer, knows very well that the 15,000,000 citizens of New York State are also United States citizens. The United States Constitution protects a citizen from all governments, including the United States Government itself. The Governor asks the right to seize private property, including homes. The United States Constitution Bill of Rights and the New York State Bill of Rights prohibit it. The Governor's action not only supersedes the acts of Congress and usurps the President's power, but supersedes both Bills of Rights while doing it.

The Governor's bill constitutes the most amazing request ever made by an American executive. No President ever asked or even dreamed of asking for these powers. Americans will have difficulty believing their eyes. The Governor wants these powers: To confiscate all communications systems, newspapers, radio stations, public utilities, and transportation, to evacuate persons or compel them to remain, to conscript men and women into work battalions, to confiscate private property including homes, to take over the banks, to demolish or prevent demolishing of private buildings. The Governor can greatly simplify his request by asking that New York State be fenced with barbed wire. The only request not made is that all newspapers—on the day before seizure—print one uniform headline: "Heil, Dewey."

Even the most conservative newspapers in the State report that Governor's defense bill leaves New York State on the edge of martial law. Constitutionally, Governor Dewey cannot declare martial law in New York State except in case of actual invasion or rioting or rebellion within the State. It is beyond his powers to put New York under bayonet because of what he thinks is going on in international affairs. As a citizen he is entitled to his own opinion. But as Governor of the State he is absolutely bound by the rulings of the United States Government. This was decided not only in Philadelphia in 1789 but at Gettysburg in 1863.

Again constitutionally, there is only one Government of the American people in international affairs and that is the United States Government. To the extent that the Governor's bill contradicts the Federal bill, New York State is defying the Federal Government in 1951 as completely as South Carolina did in 1861. There is this big difference: The people of South Carolina backed their State government. The people of New York will fight Governor Dewey's bill through every court in the land—and a lot of other places which needn't be mentioned now.

The constitutional defects of the Governor's proposals are not the most outrageous aspect of the bill. The tragedy is that any American official would dare ask for such powers. No Trujillo has them; no Franco wields them; no President ever asked for them. Yet one governor out of 48 deems the emergency so great that he alone asks for them. Thus, New Jersey and Connecticut could be enjoying a free press under this law—while all New York dailies were seized by Governor Dewey. New York citizens could be working in compulsory labor battalions—while the rest of the Union was pursuing its normal life. And for even questioning the order of the Civil Defense Office a New Yorker, under the law, could be sent to prison

This is more than a problem for the people of New York State. It is a challenge to every United States citizen and to the Government of the United States. The people of New York should not only protest—but the Congress of the United States should reprimand the Governor. Dewey has no more right to preempt the rights of the Federal Government than he has the right to grab control of the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The Governor's bill is, of course, die-hard Republican isolationism at its tragic worst. Senator TAFT says we haven't the right to protect ourselves abroad. Herbert Hoover says we should fight only in the Western Hemisphere. Now, Governor Dewey thinks national defense is narrowed to New York State. The grim fact is that if this country had 48 different systems of civil defense—instead of one national and coordinated plan—the job of licking us would be 96 times easier for the Communists. For instance, Governor Dewey claims the right to draft all New York men and women. What happens to the Federal Government's powers? Does this mean the Governor, following Senator TAFT'S isolationism to its logical conclusion, claims the United States Government can't use New York citizens for the civil defense of California? Or Minnesota? Or Louisiana? Nonsense, Governor, nonsense.

The shocking fact is that both New York parties are reported ready to call it a bipartisan bill. This would be laughable if it weren't so insane. Just where the legislature and the Governor think they get the power to make the rights of the people the subject of a political trade is something for which the New York voters are going to call them to account.

The Governor has been a good governor—but after this bill the country will sigh its deepest sigh of relief that he wasn't elected President. Whew! As President Truman frequently grins, the Democrats can look pretty bad until some Republicans open their mouths

Here We Go Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, indicating that we learn little, no matter what the cost to us in manpower may be, I submit herewith the following from Collier's of November 25, 1950:

NEW TAILOR, SAME OLD SUIT

The chief purpose of this editorial—or, perhaps, this postscript—is to call attention to the report from two members of Collier's European team, which appears on page 22, under the title of "The Nazis March Again—This Time for Stalin." It is an illuminating and a disturbing account, and if you haven't read it already, you ought to now. Then if you are interested in our further thoughts on the matter, you can read on from here.

It is quite natural that most of us, in and out of government, have been thinking and talking about Korea and the Far East in recent months. But that preoccupation should not make Americans forget that Germany is potentially another Korea, only on a bigger and more dangerous scale. The situation is much the same as it was in the cozy period of the Hitler-Stalin agreement back in 1939, only then the Russians and the Germans were strong and mutually suspicious neighbors. Today Stalin is the undisputed boss of half of Germany, and he has been trying by every means short of war to control the whole country. One of those means is the increasing use of the remnants of Hitler's party.

The Russians aren't bothered by scruples. With a cynical disregard for consistency, they have perverted the Nazi philosophy to their own advantage. They flatter and pamper the former Nazis, and use them to subjugate the people of Soviet Germany.

Probably this strange performance doesn't strike the majority of Germans as being so very inconsistent, at that. For there isn't much difference between Russian communism and German nazism. In spite of superficial variations, they were cut from the same bolt of authoritarian cloth. The citizen of Soviet Germany is living in much the same sort of political world as the one that Hitler created, although physically it is much less comfortable. It is still a world of slogans and parades and uniforms, of phony elections, of strict discipline, spies, and secret police.

The American Government's tough job is to block the Russians' intention of seizing all of Germany, and at the same time to foster democracy and root out the still vigorous growth of nazism in its own zone. In trying to do this job the Government is at something of a disadvantage because it is honest.

American authorities are trying to create a unified, democratic Germany by legitimate means. They are trying to fulfill a promise to the Germans of eventual self-government, individual freedom, and a chance to win back

their country's place in the community of peace-loving nations. They are trying to fulfill that promise in spite of Russian opposition, the indifference and hostility of many Germans, and their own uncertainties and mistakes. It is a discouraging assignment, but the American authorities have not compromised with principles.

There doesn't seem to be any answer to America's long-range problem in Germany except to continue the country's education in democracy, even if it means an indefinite occupation. But it does seem that our Government might take more positive action against the immediate dangers that confront it. We think it ought to crack down on the neo-Nazi parties that have sprung up in the West. And we think it should arm Western Germany unless the Russians agree to disarm their so-called police forces in the eastern zone.

Earlier we said that Germany was potentially another Korea. But the problem of Western Germany, unlike the problem of South Korea, can't be settled simply by giving it tanks, guns, and planes. There is a grave risk in arming the West Germans—the risk that they might not fight well in a civil war for a free government that many of them apparently don't want, or the risk that they might go over to the Russian side.

But it is a calculated risk which, we believe, should be taken. A defenseless Western Germany is a rich prize which the covetous Russians are training their Nazi stooges to pluck for them. We can see no virtue in tempting further Soviet aggression by the same inaction that brought on the Korean War.

Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Monday, January 8, 1951:

INSURANCE SHOULD BE SURE

With the start of the new year 10,000,000 more persons than were covered before have become part of the social-security system of old-age insurance in the United States, this under legislation passed last August.

This means that 10,000,000 more persons, making a total of 45,000,000, have a direct, tangible concern in the financial stability of the system set up to pay the retirement benefits they have been promised.

The principal feature of that set-up today is a trust fund of more than $13,000,000,000 invested in United States Government bonds. That is a very large sum, accumulated during 15 years' operation of the Social Security Act.

But before the end of this century, Government actuaries estimate, it will take more than $11,000,000,000 a year to pay the old-age benefits established by the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act. In other words, every year there will be needed almost as large a sum as has been saved up during 15 years.

At one time it was thought that it would be difficult to find investment for a large enough trust fund to make old-age insurance actuarially sound. But there is no difficulty on that score now. Even if the trust account tomorrow could be built up to the $74,000,000,000 maximum it should reach in 1990, that would fund less than one-third of the Nation's public debt.

The trust fund, of course, is raised by payroll taxes on employers and employees. Those taxes started in 1937 at 1 percent on each. It was intended then that the rate should rise gradually to 3 percent each by 1949.

Actually the rate increases were postponed by various Congresses until the rise to 1½ percent on employer and employee was only made in 1950. The amendments passed last year extended that rate through 1953 and put off the reaching of a 3 percent rate until 1965

What happens if the latter years of this century find the United States without a large enough trust fund to pay the old-age insurance benefits which workers have been told they were building up for themselves while they and their employers contributed payroll taxes?

In that case, workers and employers of that generation, besides meeting payroll taxes of 3 percent or more, will be asked to pay additional general taxes to meet the cost of retirement benefits which today's generation has promised to itself but been unwilling in practice to provide.

Is that playing fair with the next or the third generation? We do not think so. On the contrary, we think Congress and the Nation—while they are revising taxes for defense this year—ought to have the stamina and economic courage to raise the payroll tax to 2 percent for 1951, or at latest 1952, instead of waiting till 1954 for that set-up to take effect. Then, increases for succeeding years ought to be advanced instead of postponed.

This would be in keeping with the purposes of absorbing excess purchasing power to prevent inflation during the rearmament effort. It would pick up more of the burden in a period of maximum employment, and if it is not done now, when will it be done?

If America is in earnest about its promises of old-age insurance, it should take genuine financial steps to make that insurance sound.

It seems to us that a quickened rate of advance in the payroll taxes to assure old-age benefits is in the interests of a sound defense economy, will provide more surely for the retirement of present-day workers, and is the course of honor to be chosen rather than sloughing these obligations onto children now in the nursery.

The Situation as We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Hon. J. B. Snider, former Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi and now editor of the Natchez (Miss.) Times, has undertaken the tremendous task of informing the readers of his newspaper regarding the brutal facts now facing the American people through a column entitled "The Situation As We See It."

In an article in the January 2 issue of the Times he warns the public that 5 years of war financing and limited civilian production are ahead of us. Mr. Snider is neither an alarmist nor a pessimist. He is realistic to the point of bluntness. If our diplomats for the past 40 years had been endowed with a small part of Mr. Snider's straightforwardness and old-fashioned Americanism, I have little doubt but that there would still be peace in the world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the afore-mentioned article. It follows:

THE SITUATION AS WE SEE IT

(By J. B. Snider)

The new Congress will be organized Wednesday. Since June, when the present Korean War started, the retiring Congress has voted $37,000,000,000 for national defense. This in addition to the $14,000,000,000 that was appropriated by the 1949 Congress for the expansion of the military and naval machine in 1950.

Fifty-four billion dollars is lots of money. It is equivalent to $334 for every man, woman, and child, white and colored, in the United States. If a mother and father have two children their thought will be, well we certainly didn't pay four times $334. But that is only what you think—you did—or rather you will. Your family's part is $1,336 and will be paid by you. Of course the actual cash may be collected from General Motors, United States Steel, General Electric, Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Sears, Roebuck, and 1,000,000 other concerns but brother and sister you will pay it.

You pay it when you plank down 20 cents for a dime loaf of bread; or when you pay $16 for a pair of $4 shoes, or $300 for a $200 refrigerator, or $1,800 for a $900 automobile.

Just remember you pay it and will continue to pay it for the remainder of your life and your children will probably be paying for it all of their lives.

And this $54,000,000,000 is just a starter. It will probably be $80,000,000,000 in 1951 for 1952 and $100,000,000,000 in 1952 for 1953 and on and on. You can't figure out how the Nation can pay it? Well, you are no different from the bankers in Wall Street, members of the Federal Reserve Board or the 10,000 top bankers, financial authorities, and economists of this Nation.

Of course there are a great many people right here in Natchez who do not believe we are going to have a war. And they advance some pretty good arguments about it. They are certainly entitled to their views on the matter, and they have the advantage in an argument in that all of us devoutly hope they are right. Anything is better than a war provided the substitute leads to a lasting peace. We are not willing to go along with the idea of peace in an armed state always awaiting and expecting war. To us there would be no point in living under conditions of that kind. Unless a permanent peace plan can be worked out, we think we should get the thing behind us and then pray that we shall not forget the lesson we have just learned. That we will never again turn this Nation over to wild-eyed, long-hair visionary idiots who no doubt mean well but are responsible for this terrible mess we now find ourselves involved in.

But whether there is to be war or not, the little man on the street, the man who works with his hands, whether he drives nails, builds tires, makes paper pulp, sews garments, makes wallboard, sells groceries, shoes or drugs, automobiles or candy, can get himself set for a minimum of 5 years of war conditions.

It will take from 2 to 3 years to get the defenses perfected and will take at least 2 years to reconvert if we escape a general world war. So we have a minimum of 5 years of war financing and limited civilian production either way it goes.

But it is not going to be as bad—anything like as bad—as it could be. Remember that in 1945 more than half of the people of the world were hungry and at least two-thirds of

them were naked or at best in rags. The people of this Nation will always have plenty to eat, plenty to wear, and far more comfortable places to sleep than 90 percent of the other people of the world. We will always have more amusements.

We shall maintain our right to free speech and a free press, free religion, and the right to peaceful assembly and petition regardless of what happens anywhere else in the world. Along with these privileges we have the ability to produce the things that enables a nation to win a war far beyond the ability of any other nation. So on January 2, 1951, as we face an unknown future we have an assurance that we are capable of taking care of ourselves if given the right kind of leadership in Washington.

We are said to be the world's greatest Christian nation. When you look around you, of course, you can't help but wonder what goes on in other nations that we rate any such title. Because if we are to be rated by our individual observance of the commandments laid down and the teaching of the Lord Christ we lack a great deal of being a Christian nation. All of your life you have heard the statement that "in every national emergency the Lord raises up a leader." There is no question we need a leader right now—we need one desperately. But are we as a nation of people in position to ask the Lord to deliver us? What have we done to merit His support and protection? We are not trying to preach a sermon. This writer knows, and his friends know, that he is no better than any of the rest of you. We don't want to be hypocritical. We are not approaching this from a religious angle. We are merely thinking out loud. We believe that all of us are agreed that we need a leader and quickly. We need help and badly. The only thing that could intervene right now would be the work of a merciful Father who could take this bitter cup from our lips. But as we look around us, just as you can look around you right at this moment, we wonder what right we have to expect Him to intervene in our behalf? Perhaps you know. This writer doesn't.

Without this intervention you can prepare now for 5 or 10 years of the most intensive effort of your life, and we will be a lucky people if, when it is over, we have any vestige of freedom left.

How Right You Were, Mr. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday night in Passaic, N. J., in an address before the Passaic Dante Club and yesterday on the floor of the House, after the President's appeal for unity, I proposed that he immediately draft into the services of the Nation former President Herbert Hoover and Bernard M. Baruch. Today I find in my morning paper the timely appraisal of Mr. Baruch by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, International News Service economic commentator. Under the caption "How right you were, Mr. Baruch," Mr. Rukeyser says:

Bernard M. Baruch was a preeminently useful consultant to Presidents largely because of his remarkable sense of timing.

Unlike the academic mind—the so-called brain truster—Mr. Baruch has always had a facility for knowing the score early.

Not having a professorial mind, Mr. Baruch never waits until after the event to realize what has happened.

In the famous leak investigation in World War I, Mr. Baruch made it clear that in stock-market action he did not act on inside information about a peace maneuver but was motivated by his sixth sense in interpreting the significance of the word "but" in a published State paper.

Outnumbered by the Communist hordes, we must survive by recognizing human quality, not quantity.

The so-called academic mind is less creative, and is less nimble.

Survival in the competitive world and in stock-market speculation when turning points come requires a swiftness of decision and a special alertness.

It should be remembered that months ago Mr. Baruch issued a strong clarion call for all-out mobilization.

Mr. Baruch's argument was that at worst full mobilization will cost some money, whereas the alternative of possibly losing a war would be an irrecoverable loss and might end our tradition as a free nation.

With his maturity of judgment, Mr. Baruch this month became a stronger potential political influence than he has been in many years.

This situation springs from two factors.

First, recent events have demonstrated how right he was.

Second, the dominant position in the Eighty-second Congress of the Southern Democrats, who respect Mr. Baruch, over the Fair Deal Democrats indicates that Mr. Baruch's advice will be more actively sought. Certainly he is also respected by most Republicans.

As principal atomic adviser, Mr. Baruch tested the intentions of the Russians. When the Soviet Union turned down the Baruch formula for sharing atomic energy on a protected basis through provision for inspection behind the iron curtain, it was a signal that the United States of America had to prepare to rely on its own physical power. There was no justification for backing and filling in policy after that.

In recent months, routineers have whined at the high prices paid for tin, rubber, and wool from British Empire sources. But Mr. Baruch's approach was different. He publicly advocated buying England's wool and other raw materials when prices were low.

In taking such a practical and well-timed position, he was acting in accordance with his long experience as a Wall Street speculator. This fact should be underscored.

Mr. Baruch exemplifies the possibility of using intelligence to tie today to tomorrow.

He is an expert on the economics of survival, and he should be promptly summoned by a congressional committee to provide a blueprint for survival, including a business-like set-up for importing and exporting.

Mr. Baruch is very much in favor with the men in the Eighty-second Congress who control the Nation's purse strings.

The World Is Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting a short poem entitled "The World Is Mine." I do not know the author, but I do know that it carries a powerful message, and one that all Americans should heed. It reads as follows:

Today, upon a bus, I saw
A pretty girl with golden hair.
I envied her, she seemed so gay,
I wished that I could be so fair.
But then, when she arose to leave,
I saw her hobble down the aisle,
She had one leg and used a crutch.
And yet, she passed me with a smile.
Oh, God, forgive me when I whine,
I have two legs, the world is mine.

And then I stopped to buy some sweets,
The lad who sold them had such charm;
I talked with him—he seemed so glad—
If I were late 'twould do no harm.
And as I left he said to me,
"Please come again, you've been so kind,
"It's nice to talk with folks like you,
"Because, you see," he smiled, "I'm blind."
Oh, God forgive me when I whine,
I have two eyes, the world is mine.

Then, walking down the street I saw
A pretty child with eyes of blue.
He stood and watched the others play,
It seemed he knew not what to do.
I stopped a moment, then I asked,
"Why don't you join the others, dear?"
He looked ahead without a word,
And then I knew he could not hear.
Oh, God forgive me when I whine,
I have two ears, the world is mine.

With legs to take me where I'd go,
With eyes to see the sunset glow,
With ears to hear what I would know—
Oh, God forgive me when I whine,
I'm blessed indeed, the world is mine.

Where Are the Troops of Our Fellow Nations in the So-Called United Nations Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. "Where are the troops of our fellow nations in the so-called UN Army?" is the caption of a timely and challenging editorial in the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of Monday, January 8, 1951. This editorial reflects the heartfelt sentiments of hundreds of my constituents who are parents of the boys in our armed services. The editorial follows:

WHERE ARE THE TROOPS OF OUR FELLOW NATIONS IN THE SO-CALLED UN ARMY?

David Lawrence in his famous column on Saturday backed up the Call's position in the now calamitous Korean campaign of the United Nations Army which except for our British ally is practically an all-American expedition of ill-fated retreat and slaughter, when he said: "The people know very little about the Korean War. They know only that tens of thousands of troops are engaged in war, and that while it is called a UN operation the troops of the United States comprise almost all of the UN forces in Korea. The American people have not been told why the other members of the UN have failed to send troops in large numbers since last June."

The fact of this failure is that there is no good or justifiable reason. Therefore the Truman administration, whose diplomats

failed to get troop commitments from the forty-some nations which voted to send a United Nations Army to the assistance of South Korea, seek to cover up the blunder with silence.

Now as a result of this failure to our democratic allies to reinforce our United States troops—as was naturally expected and would have been done had our delegates to the UN insisted upon it—we see our heroic but sadly outnumbered American boys being put to rout in far-off Korea, tortured and wounded and giving up their lives. And in the meantime not a single son of our wealthy South American neighbors or of our European allies, once again enjoying prosperity through the billions of recovery program dollars handed out by United States taxpayers, is on the way to relieve and refill the battered ranks of our so-called United Nations Army.

With the bloody slaughter of our stranded troops still mounting, it is high time for our United States delegates to the UN to start shouting bloody murder and demand that every member nation which voted in favor of Korean intervention by the United Nations contribute their proportionate share of troops to pull victory out of defeat in Korea. If the majority are unwilling to do that much now, after our Nation has borne the brunt of the onslaught for 7 months, and immediately, to rebuild the shattered UN Army, then they have no right to expect our country to send one more man, let alone the million necessary, to drive back the countless hordes of North Korean and Chinese Reds out of the smoking rubble of what was once the South Korean Republic.

There is no justice, there is no sense in making our boys go it alone, and before more thousands of them are killed in the attempt, we call upon our President and his self-appointed UN delegates to demand that reinforcements for the United Nations Army be mustered in at once from the other members of the United Nations; that a vote for such reinforcements be promptly moved in the UN Assembly; and if the majority vote against such troop participation that we then pull our own forces out of the cauldron of slaughter and save thousands of our finest sons from further military suicide 6,000 miles away from home.

Isn't it better to pull out now under such go-it-alone conditions, as we did from the Philippines early in World War II, and conserve our strength for the bigger crisis ahead, than to let ourselves be bled white in already ruined Korea and thus play right into Stalin's grasping hands?

The Call believes the majority of our citizens, if given a vote on the question, would agree with us overwhelmingly that it is.

Farm Production in the Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week members of the Maryland Agricultural Society Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., and affiliated organizations were privileged to hear the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] discuss matters of interest to the farming element of our country.

As a former Secretary of Agriculture, where his work was outstanding in the Nation's interests, the Senator from New Mexico is held in highest regard and respect by the farm people of our State, who greeted his remarks on this occasion with the utmost interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by the able Senator be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

When I accepted the invitation to come here today, I recognized that the Eighty-second Congress would be meeting in a sober mood to deal with serious problems. I had just reached a firm decision that I would not leave Washington for a speaking engagement while the Congress was in session. But I accepted your invitation for the reason that Baltimore is so close to Washington that I could cancel at the last moment if I had to and for the additional reason that when so much attention is being paid to industrial mobilization it might be worth while occasionally for a few friends of the farmer to examine at a meeting of farm organizations some of the problems that may lie ahead in the agricultural field.

I admit that I like to speak to conventions of State farm bureau members. You belong to a giant farm organization. The latest available figures which I have received indicate that upon the basis of farm families there are about 1,450,000 families in the American Farm Bureau Federation, possibly 420,000 farm families in the grange and 220,000 farm families in the farmers union. You represent, therefore, a tremendously significant segment of American rural life and an important part of America's mobilization for defense.

The hardest task these days is to read newspapers and magazines and not become slightly confused by conflicting information. For example, just as 1950 was drawing to a close there appeared in the Washington Daily News under date of December 28 an editorial which started off this way:

"The Defense Production Act of 1950—the law authorizing Government price-wage controls—actually forbids effective control of food prices.

"Farm-bloc Congressmen saw to that."

I was surprised and displeased by that statement. I was not conscious that farm-bloc Congressmen had had a thing to do with those sections of the Defense Production Act to which objection was being taken. I clipped the editorial, attached it to a sheet of paper, and said, "I'm going to comment on that when I speak in Baltimore."

A few nights later I picked up the issue of Newsweek for January 8 and read that one of the hottest fights in the new Congress will be over food-price controls. The article stated that "existing law frustrates such controls by exempting farm prices from ceilings until they reach parity. All but 9 of the 40 chief crops are thus legally entitled to healthy rises—up to 100 percent for potatoes, grapefruit, lemons—instead of the checks that might be indicated to stem inflation." I was tempted to take some pretty strong exception to that or at least to point out that if lemons were entitled to raise 100 percent because of the operation of the parity concept it was only evidence that parity does not work perfectly in every case. It doesn't work for grapefruit; it doesn't work for a number of other items, but by and large it is a useful yardstick.

Then I came to the next sentence in the item, and it read this way: "Congressmen representing industrial areas will battle with the farm bloc to amend the law so as to hold down food ceilings." When I read that I knew that I was going to have something to say about it at this convention. I rarely get in the mood to fight with the Congressmen from industrial areas, because I regard myself as representing every section of my State, industrial as well as agricultural. I hate to see a pitched battle take place between Congressmen who represent purely industrial areas and Congressmen who represent strictly agriculture areas. I say that because four-fifths of the population of the United States lives in towns and cities, and the one-fifth living on farms carry the burden of supplying food for all the rest of us. Any battle that puts four-fifths of the population against one-fifth is an unequal battle to start, and if it is not a necessary battle, it certainly is one that should not be undertaken or encouraged.

With that introduction, let's see how much truth there is to the steadily repeated assertion that farm-bloc Congressmen wrote into the Defense Production Act of 1950 a lot of language which makes it impossible to control food prices or hold them within reasonable limits. I wondered what the attitude had been of the farm organizations, particularly the American Farm Bureau Federation, so I checked back into my files and found that president Allan B. Kline, speaking in behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 3936, the companion bill to H. R. 9176 which is the act referred to, testified on July 26, 1950. His formal remarks were confined to section 412 of the bill which was a proposition to modify the existing sales policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation with reference to the sale of Government-owned farm commodities. President Kline spoke in opposition to that section and pointed to the basic rules of the present policy on the sale of Government-owned commodities as they were carried in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. I was to some degree at least, an author of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and, therefore, I appreciated the fact that your president had believed it better to hold to those provisions than to introduce new and revolutionary ideas about the sale of Commodity Credit stocks.

Right there before I go any farther, I want to insert the thought that I have had some convictions on these Government-owned stocks for quite a little while. I spoke at the Western Region Farm Bureau Conference at Fort Collins, Colorado on June 17, 1950, and I started right out talking about farm surpluses. I reminded my Farm Bureau friends in the West that newspaper and radio accounts of Government price-support operations had tended to create the impression that agriculture was confronted with huge, unmanageable stocks of deteriorating farm commodities. So I tried to give my friends a few facts. I told them (and I am quoting now):

"Our so-called surpluses are not nearly as large as the public apparently thinks they are. We do have relatively large stocks of some farm commodities, but these stocks are not all surpluses. * * * We need reserves of food, feed, and fiber to meet unexpected requirements and to tide us over in years when we may have short crops due to unfavorable weather or other conditions. It is only when we have more than we need for current use and reasonable reserves that we can say we have a surplus. This situation prevails today for a very few commodities.

"Our present supply of corn exceeds a normal supply by only enough to last our population for 67 days. Our cotton supply exceeds normal by only enough to meet our domestic and export needs for 93 days. Our wheat stocks are above normal by only enough to meet our needs for 112 days.

"Reasonable reserves of storable farm commodities are the best insurance consumers can have against shortages and unreasonable

prices, because the prices of farm products skyrocket when supplies fall short of needs.

"A single year of the kind of weather we had in 1947 would wipe out our present reserve stocks of corn. The short 1947 corn crop caught us without adequate reserves. I am sure that everyone can remember the resulting difficulties. We had a feed conservation program. Even so the production of meat and other livestock products went down and prices went up. We had meatless days and poultryless days. Both farmers and consumers suffered. This was only 2 years ago—our memories are short, aren't they?"

That is the end of my long quotation.

That talk was made before Korea.

It has been interesting to me to note the changes in the words used to describe the Government-owned stocks of most price-supported commodities. At first they were labeled "surpluses"; then, "so-called surpluses"; later, "reserves"; still later "stockpiles," and now they have become "storehouses of strength."

From time to time we hear it charged that the farm program is forcing consumers to pay unreasonable prices for the necessities of life. These charges originate with the uninformed, with those who would abolish all price supports, and with those who want to convince consumers that they would get a better deal if some other system were substituted for price supports. Regardless of where they originate, the charges that the farm program is keeping food prices high in America are false. As a matter of fact, food is relatively cheap in this country.

It takes fewer hours of work to earn the money to pay for food in America than in any other major country in the world. In 1935–39, consumers spent 23 percent of their disposable income for food. Currently, they are spending 26 percent; however, they are eating better. If the American people ate the same varieties and per capita quantities they ate in 1935–39, that food which cost consumers 23 percent of their income in those years would cost them only 19 percent of their income today.

The fact that food prices are higher in dollars and cents today than before World War II is evidence that the value of the dollar went down during the inflation which resulted from the war. It is not evidence that consumers are worse off. As a matter of fact, when the increase in consumer incomes is considered, consumers are better off.

Consumers should expect to pay a fair price for food—just as they expect farmers to pay a fair price for the things they buy.

Now to return to the claim that farm-bloc Congressmen saw to it that it was impossible to establish effective control on food prices. This matter came to the floor of the Senate on December 19 last and Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, testified that the committee, not any lobby, unanimously agreed on the price control provisions relating to agricultural commodities. That checks with my own observation. I know that I did not urge the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to take any action. I know that Senator AIKEN, the ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Committee, did not. I'm sure that Senator Thomas of Oklahoma, who was chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, made no special plea and so far as I could learn at the time, not a single representative of what might be called the farm bloc appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and asked that committee to do anything on prices.

The only time that any legislative proposal that appeared to be inflationary came before the Senate was when Senator YOUNG introduced an amendment fixing rigid 90-percent supports. I'm going to deal with that in a minute, but before I do, I want to add a few particulars concerning Mr. MAYBANK'S testimony. Senator MAYBANK pointed out that he had requested the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to look into the law and facts so that whatever he stated was absolutely correct in every detail. He then read a prepared statement which is carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 12, at page 16743, and in that statement pointed out that all the committee tried to do was get a fair relationship between agricultural prices and other prices as they existed during the period from May 24 to June 24, 1950. The statement carries this rather important reasoning: "It would be manifestly unfair, for example, to fix a price on a farm commodity at a price existing today when that price had changed hardly at all over the last 6 months, while the prices of numerous other nonfarm commodities had been moved up from 25 to 50 percent in some cases."

The statement pointed out that in June 1948 when wheat was selling for $2.81, a 1-pound loaf of bread was selling for 13.8 cents. By October 1950 when wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel the same loaf of bread was selling for 14.7 cents. In other words, bread was selling about a penny higher and wheat was down nearly a dollar a bushel. The question naturally arose, who was reaping the profit out of inflation—the farmer, the distributor, or the processor?

I deal with this because I hope this audience will realize and in time make other audiences aware of the fact that an increase in the cost of living is not always caused by an increase in the price of farm commodities.

There is in the Defense Production Act a provision relating to the establishment of fair and equitable margins of profit for processors. That was a provision carried in the old OPA law and picked up in the new legislation. It is not there to protect farmers, and it was not put there by the farm bloc. It was inserted by Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia. I happened to be presiding over the Senate at the time this amendment was adopted, and I can recall that those who were urging and pressing it and particularly interested in it were not then concerned with the welfare of the farmer but were aiming at protection for the packing houses and produce dealers and the people who handled and processed the goods which the farmer grows. So I say to you that the things that are in the law which might be regarded as inflationary were not put there by farmers or at the request of farmers or at the request of the farm bloc or by the instrumentality of the farm bloc in the Senate or House of the United States.

I referred a moment ago to the amendment which was offered, which would have required rigid supports up to 90 percent of parity. I said I wanted to comment on that again, and I do. It just happens that when this particular amendment came to the floor of the Senate it seemed to have a good deal of support. That discussion is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 10, page 12888. I want to give these page references so that there can be no question as to what farmers' friends and members of the so-called farm bloc were doing at that time. One of the Members of the United States Senate asked Senator YOUNG a good many questions, and it looked as though the amendment might be accepted. For instance, I give you these words from one of the Senators because he used some different words later on. This particular Senator said: "Mr. President, I think the amendment is splendid, and I shall support it."

A few moments after he said that, I obtained the floor and raised a point of order against the amendment. I tried to point out that in my opinion the object of the bill was to control the cost of living and the object of the amendment was to raise the cost of living. I called attention to the fact that the bill started with proposals to protect consumers, wage earners, persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes and I insisted that the amendment was not designed to protect them but it was designed to do the complete reverse of that. While I was talking the Senator who had said the amendment was splendid and he was going to support it went through some papers on his desk and discovered that he had a telegram from the president of the Farm Bureau of his State. That telegram opposed the 90 percent rigid mandatory price support on basic commodities. The Senator was prompted to reread the telegram. The result was that when I had finished speaking against the amendment, that same Senator put into the RECORD the telegram from the president of the Farm Bureau of his State and that Senator voted against the amendment because he understood then that it was probably inflationary and had no place in the law.

I mention that as specific proof that Senators who are identified with farm legislation, and I am certainly one of them, were not trying to load down the law with inflationary items designed to increase the cost of living and push farm prices out of sight. I mention it also to bring out the fact that the State units of the American Farm Bureau Federation were going down the line trying their very best to keep the bill from being an inflationary bill, that way back there, long before many people were fighting inflation the farm organizations—particularly and sometimes single handedly the American Farm Bureau Federation—tried to hold down inflation.

I can just hear you saying to yourselves, "Why so much fuss about a little item in a newspaper story." Well, I think it's important that we hit these things as early as they show their head. I think it's important that the farmers of this country fight back when they are unjustly accused. I think it's important that the farm organizations let friend and foe alike know where they stand on these public questions and that they steadily say to every newspaper writer and radio commentator and Member of Congress that when the record is written they want to be sure that the man who writes it lives up to the divine commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

During the week end I read carefully the address of President Kline delivered at Dallas, Tex., on December 12. I like a great deal of what he said. There are some things in his address that I wouldn't agree to, just as there will be things in mine to which he would take exception. I don't mention his address in order to endorse it all but I mention it to make this point, that no one can read it and not be impressed with the fact that the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation is against inflation and is standing vigorously for those things which he thinks will help control inflation. I call your attention to the fact that as head of your organization he speaks out vigorously in favor of large production.

In that connection, I want to commend the Department of Agriculture for its action of the past few days in taking production controls off corn and wheat. It is probable that the action of the Department may result in the accumulation of extra large stocks of either corn or wheat and that this country may take some substantial losses because of that but there is no other safe way to play the situation. We cannot take a chance on being short of corn or wheat in days of emergency like these and the Department in my opinion was abundantly right in asking for increased production of corn and wheat, not only from the imperative consideration of our national defense and our need to have sufficient food on hand to take care of our economy, but also from the standpoint of our war against inflation because the very presence of large stocks of corn and wheat will do more to hold down

the prices of corn and wheat than all the laws passed by the Congress of the United States.

I want to remind this audience that I had a little something to do with the agricultural program at the time we were moving out of World War II. I know how hard it was to enforce price ceilings when we were actually in the war and when every patriotic impulse moved good people to live up to the law of the land, but I know also how impossible price ceilings became the very day that we had accomplished our purpose and the Japanese had followed the Germans into surrender. I heard stories and made personal investigations of what people had done who were violating the ceilings on cattle prices. I called particular attention one time to an individual operating in the State of Ohio who seemed able despite ceilings to buy every cow that was offered in an auction ring anywhere in that State. He paid higher prices consistently than everybody and is little slaughtering establishment was buying cattle away from every major packer in the United States. An investigator was sent out to check on this individual. The investigator came back to report that the little butcher was the stupidest person he had ever met, that he didn't keep a book, he didn't keep a record, he had no idea what his cattle were costing him, he had no idea how much he was getting for his meat and he couldn't begin to tell him whether he had or had not violated the OPA ceilings. I thought that the man running the little packing plant wasn't quite as stupid as the person who had investigated him, but anyhow his plant finally closed down, because we later proved he was violating the law of the land. The tragedy was that every time one plant was closed down for violations, two or three other plants stepped into existence and went even further with their violations. That is why many of us have believed that abundant production of agriculture commodities is the best price policeman we could have on our economic front.

I get off my subject once in a while in my enthusiasm to talk about some phase of this situation, and I suppose I ought to return to the address of President Kline to which I was directing my comments a few moments ago. Actually, however, leaders of farm organizations and Members of the Congress of the United States might be far apart on the question of when controls should be put upon agricultural prices. The one thing that I want to remind you is that there are very few commodities now that would be influenced by the imposition of price controls as the law now stands on the statute books. The two spots where controls would right now become effective would be (1) cotton and cottonseed and (2) livestock, principally cattle, lambs and veal calves.

I'm sure we all remember the difficulties of the last war. Every effort was made to work out an easy, fair, and equitable basis for ceilings on cattle and livestock products. We toyed with the idea of ceilings upon cattle on the hoof and we had to discard it because of the extreme difficulty of grading cattle in the stockyards of this country, to say nothing of their grading by thousands of butchers in smaller communities all over the United States. When we began putting the ceilings on dressed meat, the question always arose as to whether those ceilings were adequate to permit the fattening of beef in the feed lots of Kansas, Iowa, Indiana, and Ohio. I sat in conference after conference in the office of the economic stabilizers as they struggled with this problem of where to set the ceiling on beef in order that it might reflect an adequate profit to the individual who was fattening that beef and preparing it for the market.

One of the dangers always ahead is what happens if the margin is too low. You and I know that the skeleton of an animal and the hide around that skeleton are not beef. If the animal is sold thin, the American public buys little energy and food. But when that skeleton is put upon our pastures and allowed to pack a few hundred pounds of flesh around its bones and then is brought into a feed lot and crammed with nutritious corn, it makes beef and makes it rapidly. The skeleton weighs about as much one time as another. The gain made by the animal in the pasture and in the feed lot represents the production of beef.

If there isn't a price margin that permits that type of meat production to go on, then we only reduce the amount of beef available in the markets, and when we reduce it we make it subject to all the pressures of black-market operators everywhere in the land. It is only when we have a large number of cattle on the feed lots of this country being fed to substantial weights that we are able to take care of our demand for good red meat. I realize that the imposition of ceilings on livestock might for a time help in the control of prices in a few retail stores, but if the ceilings result in the elimination of feed lots and the marketing of beef that has not been brought to maturity, then we shortly will be worse off than we are at present. So we need to exercise great care in trying to put ceilings on meat.

Now, just a word about cotton. We are at a point in this country where it is necessary to restrict the exportation of our present cotton stocks. We surely need a crop of 16,000,000 bales in 1951. We could harvest 17,000,000 bales and not hurt anything. The probabilities are that we will be fortunate if we get 14,000,000 bales. We may have to carry over into 1952 and succeeding years the necessity of filling up the cotton reservoir which has been drained in these last few months.

What will produce a great crop of cotton is a price incentive. Already the farmers in my part of the world are pleading with me about fertilizer and insecticides and they are saying that they are not going to plant cotton if they are not assured a better supply of insecticides and fertilizer than now seems likely. The one thing that will tempt them to plant even if the insecticide market is still uncertain when planting time comes is the possibility of a good price and the probability that even if the crop is short the price will be good and that good price times low production will produce a total income which will still permit them to break even If the price of cotton drops to a point that barely covers the cost of production, the farmer will shift to another crop that offers a better financial return. You can't expect him to gamble with the weather, gamble with the supply of machinery, gamble with insecticides, gamble with fertilizer, gamble with manpower, and then face the prospect of a price that barely permits him a chance to break even. He'll be looking for those commodities which present a chance to make reasonable and fair profits. He will be stimulated to supply the things we need most if prices on those things are attractive.

So I say that there are many items to be considered in connection with the imposition of restrictive limitations on agricultural prices. You don't get production unless you pay for it. When the Government asks for more steel or copper or automobiles or trucks or tanks or guns or planes, it negotiates a contract that gives a fair return for high endeavor. Production starts quickest and rolls fastest when the price is adequate. That same thing applies to the farmers of this Nation as well.

This talk is already reaching a length which I neither desired nor intended, so I will be brief in the things I have to say from here on. I had hoped today that I might discuss with you what type of legislation farmers might support. I can't do that in any detail but I can suggest to you a field for thought.

The Congress during World War II passed the Stabilization Act of 1942. It provided that the basic commodities—corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts for nuts—would be supported at 90 percent and cotton at 92½ percent for two full calendar years following the cessation of hostilities. That meant a period terminating December 31, 1948. But to that was attached additional Steagall legislation requiring that commodities where larger production had been requested be supported through loans, purchases, and other operations at not less than 90 percent of parity or a comparable price. That brought under the 90 percent requirement hogs, eggs, chickens over three and a half pounds, turkeys, milk, and butterfat, dry peas of a certain variety, dry edible beans, soybeans, flaxseed, and peanuts for oil, American Egyptian cotton and potatoes, including sweet potatoes. Certain other commodities, such as wool in naval stores, blackeyed peas and beans found their way into the list of commodities to be supported.

I voted for the Steagall legislation but I would want to look at it with a very cold and appraising eye if it came before the Congress again We got ourselves in all sorts of complications because of the Steagall guarantees and I am not so sure that I would not this time prefer to give more in the marketplace during the emergency and not depend so generously upon loan and purchase programs after the emergency is ended. When I think of the troubles we went through because of the guarantee on potatoes alone, I shudder at facing it again.

Which brings me to the subject of agricultural subsidies. You will remember that we had certain subsidies on foods during the Second World War and the days that followed it. I had the unpleasant task of trying to take off some of those subsidies. A burnt child fears the fire and my fingers were burned many, many times by the events in the first few months after the termination of World War II.

The milk subsidies were particularly difficult. We were paying out millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for subsidies on milk in order that the price might stay low. Simultaneously we were piling up the cost of those subsidies in the shape of Federal debt to be paid after the war in the flush periods that were to follow. Well, the war has been over a good many years (or has it?) and we have not been paying back this subsidy cost. This very year we will accumulate an additional deficit. Next year the budget may be eighty-five or ninety billions of dollars. There are people who estimate that government income may be so low as to leave a deficit of thirty or thirty-five billions of dollars, maybe $40,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

All the time that we were paying out subsidies on milk to hold down the cost of living, we had economists telling us that we should have been skimming off more money in the form of higher taxes so that the war would have been to a greater degree on a pay-as-you-go basis. They wanted us to pay our war costs out of current earnings, wages, and profits. But we were granting subsidies and piling up a debt while we only talked about skimming it off through taxation. The trouble was we never got the skim and all we did was pay.

I remember that I saw some figures showing the cost of subsidies paid to farmers during the war years. I knew that no such expenditure had ever been made for any of the farm programs and I challenged the statement. I was assured that the figures came from the Comptroller General of the United States. When we pursued the matter, I learned the figures represented consumer subsidies on flour, milk, and cheese. Those

were charged against the farm programs and to the farmer, when actually they were purely subsidies for the consumer. That's why I hesitate to see subsidies now. I hate to see the farm programs charged with the cost of consumer subsidies as though consumer subsidies were devices by which the farmer gouged the consumer.

Therefore, I hope this time that it may be possible to go very sparingly on any agricultural subsidies. We should pay a great deal of the war cost as we go and not store up for future generations part of the food costs during this present emergency like we did during the war concluded only a few years ago.

I was in a gathering in Washington in the past 10 days at which high and responsible officials discussed the possibility that there would be such a gap between receipts and expenditures in our budget that we would have to resort to a Nation-wide sales tax designed to bring in ten or fifteen billions of dollars annually. I don't know whether that will come or not, but I say it's a possibility. If it does come, then I suggest to you that it would be foolish in the extreme to be paying out a billion dollars or $2,000,000,000 a year in subsidies on food in order to hold down the cost of living for the working classes of this country and then put back a transactions tax to bring in $10,000,000,000 when, generally speaking, the burden of a sales tax or transaction tax falls most heavily upon the working classes. It just doesn't seem to me to make sense to subsidize the cost of food to the extent of a billion or two billion dollars a year and then go back and add a tax of five or ten billion dollars a year of a type that would fall most heavily upon working people.

Therefore, I hope the farmers may have the support of working classes generally in opposing food subsidies and trying to make certain that the cost of food to the consumer is fully represented by the price obtained in the market place and that part of it does not come to the farmer from the Federal Treasury.

But farmers should continue to take the lead in demanding greatly increased taxation as a positive means to control inflation and to put our defense effort on a pay-as-you-go basis. The President in his address to the Congress on the State of the Union yesterday put this as the final point in his program: "A major increase in taxes to meet the cost of the defense effort." You should take pride in the fact that your Dallas convention 3 weeks ago led in that direction with these words:

"There is no possibility of controlling inflation without taxes high enough to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. Strict economy will reduce the total amount that must be raised by taxes, but increased taxes will still be necessary to balance the Federal budget. We stand ready to support necessary increases."

I congratulate you upon that stand.

Yesterday President Truman asked for extension and revision of the Selective Service Act. I hope that when that is done there will be adequate attention to the need for providing deferments and exemptions for key skilled workers on farms.

Right here I want to call your attention to another request contained in the President's message of yesterday. He asked for "improvement of our agricultural laws to help obtain the kinds of farm products we need for the defense effort." I am uncertain as to what he has in mind. I think the present law provides many ways to obtain the farm products we need. But as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I promise him the fullest cooperation to that end, and I am certain that you will join in that pledge.

Perhaps it might be proper to repeat a paragraph from the resolutions of your Dallas convention. I quote it to you:

"In the year ahead, the emphasis will be on increased production, and farm prices will be supported by the firm demand of a mobilizing economy. Under such conditions, the need for price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas on certain commodities is greatly reduced. We believe that such programs should be suspended, as the law provides, and as conditions permit, but will insist that they be reactivated whenever the need for this type of program reappears."

If we hold down or eliminate farm program costs, our protection will be preserved for the days that follow defense mobilization, the days when we really need help.

Finally, I hope that farmers will set increased production goals. We need great crops of corn, wheat, oats, rye, barley, rice, and soybeans. We need 16,000,000 bales of cotton. We need to produce 105,000,000 hogs in 1951. We need to increase the number of cattle and calves on farms and see that beef production moves steadily upward. I doubt if we can anticipate in the near future any help out of Mexico. The recent report of another outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, while not serious, indicates that the border probably will not be open for some time and that the possibility of obtaining a half million cattle from Mexico to move onto our ranges for a summer and then to our feed lots will not exist for many years to come. We are going to have to raise our own calves and produce our own beef. It will take aid and encouragement from the Government if the farmers of this country provide red meat in the quantities we need.

Records are not achieved by Government edict. They can only be obtained by the planning and performance of the farmer. They require the leadership of the county extension agents, the State PMA committees, every official in the Department of Agriculture concerned with the production of crops, and the steady, persistent, persuasive influence of the great farm organizations of this land. The President told us yesterday: "Only by increasing our output can we carry the burden of preparedness for an indefinite period in the future." That means your farm output just as much as it does the product of the Nation's most vital factory.

Many times I have taken off my hat in tribute to the farmers and farm leaders of America. I hope this current emergency may give additional and everlasting proof that the farm organization, speaking for farmers, carrying to farmers the true story of the needs of this country, can make certain that the farm production pattern will measure up to our grave national responsibilities and place back of our Armed Forces and our factory workers the reserve of food which has won previous wars and can help in this hour to win a just and lasting peace.

Principles for Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me Tuesday evening, January 9, on the Capitol Cloakroom program of the Columbia Broadcasting System. In this statement I present some of the principles which I believe should be used in guiding us in making our foreign policy.

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

Mr. Chairman, may I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the Columbia Broadcasting System?

Three and a half minutes on this great radio network is precious time. But I am sure that a half minute of it will not be wasted if I point out that our greatest safeguard against fatal errors is the opportunity we have in the American system to debate the policies of our Government, foreign and domestic.

Today tragic events are sweeping us onward to fateful decisions. The fearful questions before us are how can we avoid another world war and how can we win through to a just peace?

We know now that international communism seeks to conquer the world and that Soviet Russia has embarked upon an aggressive course. The tide of communism has already made great progress in Europe and Asia. More than 800,000,000 people are yoked in Communist harness.

Much of this Communist success was made possible by unwise policies followed during and after the war by the United States and our allies. Time does not permit detailed analysis of these measures, but our experiences in Korea and elsewhere have cast honest doubt on the wisdom and effectiveness of our recent policies. The question before the whole country now is what are we going to do about it?

I am not prepared tonight to offer any final conclusions. But I can state some of the principles which ought to guide us in making policies.

1. We cannot go to the extremes either of barricading ourselves in America behind a Chinese wall, or spreading ourselves so thinly throughout the world that we are committed everywhere and prepared nowhere.

2. With our limited manpower and resources, we cannot alone defend the free world. Other nations must cherish their liberties and their security highly enough to play a substantial part in their own defense.

3. We shall have to stop regarding world politics as a game of chance, and devise a practical strategy—political, economic, psychological and military—capable of meeting the Soviet threat in the most effective way. We do not have such a policy now.

4. We must end the dangerous neglect of our home defenses. Sea and air power are our strongest striking weapons and we should build both into mighty fleets.

5. We must make certain that we keep America financially and economically sound. This means a realistic rearrangement of our national budget so that we do not spend ourselves into ruinous inflation or tax our system into national bankruptcy.

6. Finally, our people are demanding an end to foreign policy by secret agreements and by Executive authority. Secret agreements and snap decisions by the President (as in the case of Korea) are responsible for our present difficulties. The people want no more of them. They want no more diplomatic double talk. The people know they are paying too high a price in blood and treasure for rosy dreams and wishful thinking.

The great national debate now in progress seeks a plan of action which makes sense and is within our capacity to carry out. The agreements we make with other nations must be clear and open. The administration must consult with Congress before fateful decisions are made and not afterward.

These are a few of the basic principles I think we must use to guide us in the dark days ahead. If we build upon them, I have full confidence in our ability to defend ourselves and lead the world to a just peace.

Declaration on Manpower by Association of American Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a declaration on manpower adopted by the Association of American Colleges at their annual meeting at Atlantic City, N. J., January 10, 1951.

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

DECLARATION ON MANPOWER BY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES ANNUAL MEETING, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., JANUARY 10, 1951

PREAMBLE

The present national emergency is without parallel in our entire history. It will extend over a long period. It will require great sacrifice. Both from within and from without, it threatens our basic heritage of freedom.

The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the crisis and is actively aware that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations. It is recognized that there is a present and presumably continuing requirement that essentially all able-bodied young men give service of a proper length of time in the Nation's military forces. As representatives of higher education, we recognize the importance of meeting this requirement to the full. We believe that all young men should share equitably the responsibility of national defense.

It is our conviction that the key to ultimate national survival is the wise use of manpower. In the immediate pressure to have now the men we need in the places where they seem needed, we must not lose sight of the long-range importance of providing a constant flow of trained persons to fill critical places 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, or more hence. Leadership of all types, political, economic, military, educational, and religious, will be even more necessary in the years ahead than today. Further, in a democratic nation we deal with men as individuals not as units in the mass. No effective manpower program will treat men in the mass without concern for their dignity as human beings and their individual differences. If we lose sight of this truth, the battle with totalitarianism has been lost at the start.

The American colleges and universities are and have been a vital source of leadership and spiritual strength. Hence these institutions are more necessary today than ever before. Their strength is the strength of our democracy from the largest university to the smallest liberal arts college. They must make a continuous contribution to the national welfare in every field of learning. Thus it is in the national interest that higher education be viewed as essential to the development of manpower resources.

PROPOSALS

The Association of American Colleges, representing more than 650 institutions of higher learning, therefore, strongly recommends to the Federal Government the following considerations concerning the relationship between military manpower and higher education:

I

In the education and training for the armed services and for the civilian war effort there should be no duplication of existing educational facilities. Before new educational facilities are developed by the armed services or other Government agencies a thorough survey should be made to see whatever existing facilities could more readily be converted and adapted to meet the particular need. Every effort should be made to bring the facilities of as large a number of educational institutions as possible into the defense efforts, both by increasing the existing number of ROTC's and by allotting other training programs to non-ROTC institutions.

II

We request that appropriate authorities take immediate steps to assure that students whose induction is now postponed will be permitted to apply for entrance, at the termination of their postponement or deferment, in any branch of the armed services in which voluntary enlistment is now permitted, regardless of any intervening action by the Selective Service System.

III

Since the shortage of trained personnel is becoming acute, and womanpower is an ever more important source of leadership in civilian service and in the professions, we urge adequate and immediate comprehensive planning to ensure the constructive utilization of the ability and training of all college women.

IV

A. In setting the age for entering military training and service we believe that the age for induction should be 19. A lower age should be adopted only when and as long as an emergency manpower shortage requires such lower age.

B. We endorse the present policy of deferring ROTC students until the completion of their college courses. We recommend that the number of ROTC units be increased. We endorse the legislation now before Congress to place on the same basis stipends and educational allowances for men enrolled in all ROTC programs.

V

Certain groups of students now enrolled in colleges and universities have progressed so far with their studies, that it is in the national interest to allow them to complete their course. Among the students to be deferred during the present transitional period should be:

A. Students in professional schools of theology, of medicine, dentistry, and related health fields, and in the graduate schools in mathematics, engineering, and physical and biological sciences.

B. All students who will have completed 2 years of undergraduate study in any curriculum by July 1951 and who are eligible to continue because of satisfactory standing in accredited 4-year colleges.

VI

An enrolled college student who reaches the age of induction while successfully pursuing a course of study, should have his induction postponed to the end of his academic year.

VII

If 18 year olds are to be subject to universal military service, we assume that it is unlikely that more than half could be inducted in the first year of the new legislation. To reduce to a minimum the uncertainty in the minds of prospective and present college students, it is highly desirable that those who are not to be inducted before the opening of an academic year should be notified that they will be able to complete that year before induction.

VIII

To maintain a flow of educated personnel as an important element of national strength, we recommend that after basic training a substantial number of properly qualified young men be furloughed to colleges of their choice for further education in all areas of learning before completing their required military service. In implementing this plan, special consideration should be given to a Federal scholarship or loan program, in order that no one who qualifies may be deprived of this educational opportunity for lack of means. We recommend that the administration of this program and the testing and other procedures of selection under it be entrusted to competent civilians.

IX

We recommend that the board of directors appoint a committee to take steps to present the views of the association to the appropriate officers and committees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government and to cooperate with other educational organizations having similar objectives.

X

As an association in which the majority of member institutions are small independent colleges, we recognize the fact that the present emergency seriously threatens the very existence of many of these institutions which represent a vital element in American life. While the foregoing recommendations are intended to provide full participation by these colleges, we are aware that their problems will be severe for a minimum of 2 or 3 years. We therefore urge governmental agencies, philanthropic foundations, and the American public to consider seriously the need to preserve these institutions for continued service beyond the period of the immediate manpower crisis.

Reduction in Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Friday, December 22, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I had addressed to the President of the United States, making recommendations for a reduction in nondefense spending.

I now ask for the inclusion in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the President in reply.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 2, 1951.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: I appreciated most highly your letter of the 22d.

I've always tried my best to make the revenue meet the expenses of the Government and had it not been for the action of the Eightieth Congress there never would have been a deficit in any year for which I have sent a budget to the Congress. Present conditions are such now, however, that it is necessary to tax until it hurts. Expenditures for the general Government have never been excessive or extravagant. It has been my privilege to help with the making of 10 budgets while I was in the Senate and I've made 5 since I've been President. I am now working on another and there is never

a figure goes into the budget message that I am not familiar with.

I am very highly pleased with your pledge of support in the present emergency. I don't think there has ever been any serious difference of opinion between us on the operations of the Government except maybe in some policy approaches on which we naturally would not agree.

Thanks very much for your kind letter.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

The UN Should Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The UN Should Act," published in the Christian Science Monitor of Tuesday, January 9, 1951. I believe this editorial expresses the opinion of the most temperate school of thought in America on the subject discussed in the editorial.

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

THE UN SHOULD ACT

The United Nations was built to stop aggression. That, in the service of maintaining peace, security, and justice, was its primary purpose.

If the UN is to be effective as a deterrent to militarism it must recognize aggression when it sees it and be willing to call aggression by its name.

Right now, with reference to the attack of Communist China on UN forces in Korea, there would be not levity but grim candor in reminding the members of the UN through paraphrase of Gertrude Stein, Aggression is aggression is aggression is aggression.

If the Chinese are not aggressors, why are British, Turkish, Australian, and other troops as well as American resisting them in Korea? Those forces need the backing of a UN declaration of position in the matter.

A declaration of position does not necessarily bind the UN members to any particular course of action, any specific sanctions against the offender. But it does put the world's moral conviction on record. And it lays the foundation for whatever effective action can be taken thereafter.

Some nations, notably Great Britain, understandably draw back from proposals of blockade, which might result in war on a broader scale. India, a member of the British Commonwealth, apparently still cherishes hope of a truce.

But if Chinese Communists have any disposition to negotiate instead of fight they will be just as ready to talk with a realistic UN as with an unrealistic one. Indeed Communists generally have shown more respect for an antagonist who calls a spade a spade than for one who shilly-shallies.

The UN Political Committee, or "little assembly," should proceed at once with adoption of a resolution designating the so-called Chinese People's Government as an aggressor for its intervention in Korea.

Thereafter, the matter of sanctions, such as blockade, embargoes, or nonrecognition of territorial gains, can be debated and determined on the basis of their wisdom and effectiveness.

There is need for Britons to understand the depth of American feeling on this subject, just as many Americans at times have argued with their compatriots for understanding of British feelings and responsibilities. It would become very difficult indeed to marshal any enthusiastic American sentiment for the UN if the UN now should allow Korea to go the way Manchuria, Ethiopia, and the Spanish Republic went in the 1930's.

We earnestly hope the membership of the UN will see the necessity of keeping the record honest and clear by calling aggression aggression.

West Europe's Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article written by a distinguished foreign correspondent of the Associated Press, Mr. Wes Gallagher, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 10. Mr. Gallagher has just returned from 10 years of foreign-service assignments.

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

WEST EUROPE'S MORALE CALLED HARDER PROBLEM THAN ARMS

(By Wes Gallagher)

NEW YORK, January 10.—Rearming Europe today is fundamentally a question of morale, not guns and planes.

A large part of Europe hasn't the will to defend itself.

On a grand scale, General Eisenhower is in the position of a football coach trying to instill the "will to win" in his team.

General Eisenhower must try to instill the "will to fight." Without it the United States can pour arms into Europe from now until doomsday without the slightest result.

This colors the way Europeans look on the East-West conflict and the way Americans look at it.

Europeans are no less conscious than Americans of the menace of Soviet aggression. The vast majority of French, Germans, British, Italians, and other Europeans have no more liking than Americans for communism.

They dislike the Kremlin rulers, poke jibes at Stalin privately and wish Russia never existed.

But they don't see that they can do much about the situation except commit suicide. And this is more than a figure of speech; I know Germans who keep poisons on hand and swear they will take them if overrun by the Soviet army again.

From the Baltic to Spain, Europe has been ravaged and bled white by recent wars. The torrents of blood shed touching every family have drained away that intangible called morale.

They know that any Soviet attack must be met in the heart of Europe. Whether the attack is held or not they know their homes will be devastated by battle and bombings. They and their sons and daughters will die by the thousands.

DIFFICULT TO CONVINCE

By experience they know that there are no winners in war. Even if they are on the winning side they know they will be too prostrate to enjoy it.

They still believe in freedom and wish with all their hearts they can keep it but have difficulty convincing themselves they can do it.

They want to stop the Russians, but without morale the dangers and sacrifices of rearming seem almost too much to bear.

There are scores of other factors complicating the rearming of Europe. But most of them would fade if the morale problem were settled.

This is General Eisenhower's big task. Tanks and guns are no good unless the soldiers and peoples behind them have the will to fight and use them.

There are exceptions, of course, among the European nations. Great Britain can be counted on to fight bravely, as she has in the past. British and American Army cooperation in Germany is wholehearted and unstinting on either side. Some of the smaller countries like the Norwegians also are prepared to stand and fight. Unfortunately they are not strong enough to tip the scales in the west's favor.

BRITISH POWER DIVIDED

Britain is forced to divide her might among sea, air, and land forces She cannot make a large enough land contribution on the Continent to deter the Russians even with American and small-country aid.

European defense depends primarily on France and Germany and to a lesser extent on Italy. These are the only nations with the manpower and the strategic position among the Atlantic Pact powers to make a successful defense of the Continent possible

France is depended on under the Atlantic pact program to supply the bulk of the ground forces needed in Europe.

France was beaten in the war of 1870. She was virtually beaten and bled white in the 1914–1918 war. In 1940 she was overrun in 6 weeks and put a resistance that at best must be described as feeble. Four years of morale-sapping occupation followed.

These scars cannot be removed overnight and they are still visible today. French morale is, perhaps, the lowest in Europe when it comes to rearming to the hilt and making a firm stand against the Russians.

GOVERNMENT IS SHAKY

France's position is further complicated by (1) a weak, divided government which is seldom able to hold power more than a few months, and (2) an estimated 6,000,000 Communists in the country.

In contrast to the other political parties the French Communists are a hard, disciplined core. They are ruthless. In a crisis they probably could seriously cripple any war effort with sabotage, resistance, strikes, and overt acts.

Just how large an infiltration the Communists have in the French armed forces remains to be seen. For the moment there are not many armed forces to count.

The French have three divisions in their army of occupation but only a fraction of these are ready to fight. Their present reserves in France proper are negligible and poorly equipped. The professional heart of the army is fighting in Indochina and cannot be counted on for European defense.

ITALIAN POSITION SIMILAR

France has plans to raise an army of nearly a million in the next 2 or 3 years. Even if the west has this long, the question remains: Will these forces have the will to fight?

Italy is in a similar position. During the last war the morale of the Italian soldier was notoriously bad under fascism. No one knows whether it would be any better under

democracy. There is no doubt the Italian people are war weary and politically cynical. Although the Government is stable, there is a large and vigorous Italian Communist Party which has proven its ability to torture the country with disabling strikes when opportunity offers.

As an ex-enemy nation, Italy also has been largely disarmed and it will take time and money to rebuild her armed forces.

Western Germany with its 48,000,000 people and large reservoir of trained soldiers is eyed enviously by military men.

THE GERMAN ATTITUDE

I have been asked frequently: "Is it true the Germans really do not want to fight or are they just trying to get some concessions?"

After fighting the Germans in two World Wars and having a terrible time in beating them, western nations find it difficult to believe the Germans really don't want to go back into uniform again.

But the fact is the people as such do not. Those, particularly between the ages of 20 and 40, have had a stomach full of war. There is scarcely a family that has not lost at least two close relatives in the last war. Virtually all have lost their homes, their money, and their security.

On top of this, they are an occupied country, treated as second-class citizens, and largely through French fears they are being asked to rearm as second-class soldiers—pawns of nations that defeated them.

AWARE OF WEAK DEFENSES

The Germans are also military realists. They know the sad state of western defenses in Europe, compared to the six Soviet armies that rattle their tanks in the middle of Germany along the occupation border. They know that there is no such thing as a little rearming such as the Atlantic Pact has thus far proposed for them.

A little rearming would provide no defense and only leave them at the mercy of the Russians as an enemy, should the Soviets attack. They also know any attack would begin in the middle of Germany and devastate a country just now getting back on its feet.

There is no doubt a vote now for rearming would be overwhelmingly defeated if the West Germans were polled.

West German politicians are riding this antirearming tide to gain concessions from the west. Even if they got all the concessions they are asking it is doubtful if they could pull the voters on their side and convince them they must arm.

Should the west become stronger, offering some protection against the threat of attack, and should the west Germans feel themselves equal partners of the western nations, they might vote to rearm. No one can say for sure.

This does not mean the Germans would favor the Russians. With millions of dead and hundreds of thousands of brothers, sons, and daughters having disappeared into Russia as prisoners, the Germans hate the Soviets.

It is axiomatic that the closer the Europeans are to the Russians, the more they dislike them.

Germans say if the west really wants someone to fight the Soviets they should recruit eastern Germans who live under Soviet rule. It is true that west Berlin, which is completely surrounded by the Soviet Army, is the most belligerent and outspoken against them.

The Germans, like the rest of the continent, must be convinced that what they have is worth fighting for and if they prepare to fight they have a chance of winning without being wiped out in the process.

Under these conditions it is well not to be misled or interpret some European political statements as appeasement or collaboration with communism or just silly unjustified optimism.

It is probable the speaker does not really believe what he is saying but is like the small boy whistling in the graveyard. He hopes for the best but fears the worst.

A Slap on the Wrist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Slap on the Wrist," from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., of January 10, 1951.

This editorial recites the finding of the National Labor Relations Board as to the policy of intimidation and violence practiced by the United Mine Workers against nonunion members in the coal strike of 1949, which discloses the method employed by the forces of John L. Lewis in bludgeoning nonunion miners into joining the union.

The National Labor Relations Board finds them guilty, but claims that it has no power to enforce any penalty. This Board always seems to have great difficulty in finding any authority to take definite and vital action when the unions violate the law. Certainly Congress should provide a remedy so that infractions of a law of this kind could be properly dealt with. Otherwise, the freedom and independence of the average worker is destroyed.

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

A SLAP ON THE WRIST

During last fall's election campaign in Ohio, John L. Lewis, with much huffing and puffing, announced that he would shut down the coal mines if Senator TAFT tried to talk to the miners. His men, he announced, were not going to serve as captive audiences for anybody.

Mr. Lewis takes a different view of captive audiences, however, when he or his lieutenants are trying to bludgeon nonunion miners into joining the United Mine Workers.

Here are some of the things the UMW goon squads were doing to nonunion men during the coal strike in 1949:

At about 8 o'clock on the morning of June 29 some 2,000 UMW men went to the East Diamond mine in Kentucky, where 165 nonunion men were at work. A sheriff and a State policeman at the scene said they could not "try to handle" the union mob. So the nonunion workers were rounded up, some by force. Any who tried to leave were seized and compelled to stay at the scene. Then union officials addressed the workers, demanding that they join the union. He called for a show of hands from those who would sign up, and the men who did not raise their hands were cursed and threatened by the mob. Finally all of the nonunion men were coerced into indicating that they would join.

That afternoon the UMW caravan, 2,000 strong, went to the Homestead mine. Company officials asked the police to prevent the mob from coming on company property, but the officers said they were helpless. So the union men rounded up the outnumbered nonunion workers and held them under guard until the organizing speeches began. Again there was the demand for a show of hands, and when none of the nonunion men responded "an angry roar and booing arose from the massed throng of UMW men surrounding the employees, and cries of 'We'll make them hold up their hands' and 'We'll come back and see these—,' were heard."

These incidents are taken from the report of the National Labor Relations Board trial examiner who took testimony in the cases, and essentially the same procedure was repeated by the UMW at one mine after another in Kentucky and West Virginia. The picture is clear. The weapons of the United Mine Workers are terrorism, mob violence, threats, and, in some instances, physical injury. Yet John L. Lewis has the effrontery to threaten a strike to keep his men from being held as a captive audience for Senator TAFT.

More to the point, however, is the attitude of the National Labor Relations Board. It has now upheld in substance the findings of its trial examiners, agreeing that the UMW and certain of its subordinate groups and officials are guilty of unfair labor practices. A cease and desist order has been issued, which means that the union has been told not to do it again. But beyond that there is no penalty—just a slap on the wrist. Board member Reynolds would have compelled the union to reimburse the nonunion men for time lost when they were driven from their jobs. But the majority would not agree to this, contending that the board lacked the authority to impose such a penalty.

It does not follow, however, that no useful purpose is served by a proceeding of this kind. At least a record has been made. And the next time Mr. Lewis begins to talk about his oppressed and downtrodden men, the facts as to how the UMW really operates will be on the record for the benefit of any one who cares to look at them.

Neoisolationism Is Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-written and lucid editorial from the Miami Daily News. This editorial presents the other side of the argument to the one recently made by former President Herbert Hoover concerning our foreign policy. It merits the attention of those who desire a better understanding of all points of view on the momentous problem: What should our future policy be?

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

NEOISOLATIONISM IS SURRENDER

Former President Hoover's pronouncement this week on foreign policy—in effect a call for a new foreign policy—has been named

neoisolationism. It is still closely akin to isolationism if the word has meaning. It is also surrender in advance of vast areas of the world to aggressive communism.

The Hoover thesis of concentration upon defense of the Western Hemisphere would surrender the entire Eurasian land mass to the Kremlin. There is a qualification: If West Europe first erected a sure dam against the Red flood, then Mr. Hoover would be willing to commit American soldiers and dollars further there. In other words, take the gamble out of the gamble in West Europe and Mr. Hoover will give it his blessing. This amounts to no qualification at all. The Hoover thesis virtually boils down to this: Holding the Atlantic Ocean with Britain as one frontier, and the Pacific Ocean with an armed Japan and other islands as the other frontier.

What does surrender of the Eurasian continents to aggressive communism mean? This is the home of 1,600,000,000 people, and it is the source of virtually all the raw materials the Kremlin-Peiping axis needs for eventual conquest of the United States.

At present Russia needs some materials to wage a war of conquest against the United States. At the end of its current 5-year plan, Russia is still expected to be one-third behind the United States in annual production of steel; one-half behind in coal. Most authoritative figures recently obtainable indicated that Russia intended by 1960 to attain a goal in steel and coal which would still be below our prewar output. This would no longer be a problem if we give the Eurasian continents to Russia. Most important weakness of Russian war matériel is oil. Ample oil can be found in Iran, Iraq, and elsewhere in the Eurasian land mass. Agriculture, transportation, go down the list of geopolitical assets which we would surrender with Eurasia, and it is incalculable.

But these raw materials would not only be assets to the Russians, but also they would be losses to the United States. Hoover made a point of the expectation that the United States could maintain supply lines to his island outposts in the Atlantic and Pacific frontiers. But could he be as hopeful of maintaining supply lines from these frontiers—supplies which would be badly needed to maintain the United States on an extraordinary war economy? The World War II search for the substitutes for rubber, hemp, and many other things previously imported from abroad would be duplicated in an even more desperate effort to match the enemy's boundless supplies.

Of course Western Europe—if we abandon it—offers Russia more than a storehouse of raw materials. Even more prized, perhaps the greatest prize of all Russian strategy for world conquest, Western Europe is the greatest concentration of industrial power outside the United States. There are the shipbuilding facilities, aircraft factories, arsenals, large cities, resources and expendable trained manpower for great armies that would swell the Communist hordes. The Middle East and the rest of Asia not now in the grasp of the Moscow-Peiping tentacles would contribute their own vast potential to the eventual show-down between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. Even discounting this fantastically rich windfall to the Communists, which Mr. Hoover would do in order to concentrate on defense of the Atlantic and Pacific, consider the position of the United States, friendless save in the Western Hemisphere. This country would be without its powerful allies in World War II, unless it could hold an island fortress in Britain and one in Japan. But the latter consideration is hardly tenable. Neutralizing of Britain and Japan would not be difficult for the colossus of the Eurasian continents, not with the potential with which Mr. Hoover would endow it.

This brings up the final, and in some ways, most important default of all. In the degrading process of deserting Western Europe, we would become an amoral colossus pitted against another amoral colossus. We would have shorn ourselves of our honor and integrity as well as of our friends and allies. In running out on the plainly implied commitments of the Atlantic Treaty, the United States would have expended the last of what Wendell Willkie called the reservoir of good will throughout the world for America.

The superficial appeal of the Hoover thesis is understandable. It will attract superficial debate by superficial minds among both the Republican and Democratic Members of the Eighty-second Congress. It fits into the scurrilous attack on the foreign policy, now focused on Secretary of State Acheson. It will do as yet incalculable harm to the chances for a West European defense force under General Eisenhower.

But there is every reason to believe that the American people will not swallow neoisolationism any more than they swallowed isolationism in similarly attractive packages. President Truman said, following the Brussels conference, that the spirit shown there has justified our confidence. In answer to Hoover, he added, "Let there be no mistake about it—the unity of the nations of Western Europe and of the North Atlantic area is vital to their security and ours."

The President need not fear.

There is no mistake about it in the minds of the vast majority of Americans. Despite the failure of the United Nations forces in Korea to stem the Communist tide of conquest, they know the challenge has met its challenger in the President of the United States. They will respond to his leadership.

Perhaps former President Hoover has done us a favor in pulling aside the curtain on a vision corresponding to a nightmare, a scene borrowed from the pulp-magazine conceptions of Armageddon. It will attract lively debate in Congress, in public forums, and in the corner stores of America. It will do its measure of damage to the cause of unity of all free people everywhere.

But when debate has run its course—as assuredly it shall—Americans and free people everywhere will return to the grim reality and what to do about it. They will be immensely fortified by relief from the vision of a future that might have been.

Hemisphere Integration Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Mr. Harry F. Guggenheim at the University of Florida on December 8, 1950.

Mr. Guggenheim was formerly Ambassador to Cuba, where he served with great distinction. For many years he has been a student of conditions in the Western Hemisphere.

In my judgment, Mr. Guggenheim has made in this speech a very valuable and constructive contribution to the thought of the day—looking toward a solution of the great problems which confront us.

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

HEMISPHERE INTEGRATION NOW

A foreign policy for the United States, which includes the political, economic, and military integration of this hemisphere is essential to our well-being, and possibly even our survival, as a free Nation.

The integration of the Western Hemisphere now is not suggested as a policy of isolationism or insulation from the rest of the world, or as a substitute for the role that we should play, say, in the North Atlantic Pact or the movement for a united Europe. It is an anchor that we should let go now to windward, in the best holding ground, before the storm breaks.

I speak as a citizen of the United States without office, and as a seeker of truth. My thesis rests on the following premises:

1. War is bestial and inhuman. It is a curse on the people of the world. There is, however, a greater curse, and that is national enslavement, which is the danger from a lost war.

2. Nationalist communism as presently practiced by the Politburo of Soviet Russia is an international conspiracy to overthrow non-Communist governments throughout the world. Should Soviet Russia be successful in this conspiracy, sovereign states will disappear under the dictatorship of Russia's imperialist Politburo.

3. The transition from the sea age of transportation to the air age has now developed to a stage where all nations are susceptible to attack and many to destruction from the air.

4. Neutrality is a luxury that weak states can only indulge in with the approval of strong states.

5. The United Nations and the organization of American states are aids, but not yet substitutes for foreign policy.

Franklin D. Roosevelt warned us in 1939 that our frontiers were on the Rhine. Europe still may be our first line of defense, but this hemisphere is our last line of defense. It is our inner citadel, and it must be made impregnable.

The age of the air has made this citadel vulnerable. In World Wars I and II we succeeded in keeping the lands of this hemisphere free from attack. That was only because we were in a transition period from the sea age to the air age.

Now we can no longer expect to keep this hemisphere from assault by air. We must prepare for its defense now before it is too late.

In our haste to accept world responsibility and assume world leadership, we have neglected our nearest neighbors in the Americas. Isolationism has kept us from them in the past, and our new foreign policy, which plummets us into Europe and Asia, keeps us from them now.

II

Before elaborating on the proposal to integrate this hemisphere, it is essential to examine briefly the present over-all foreign policy of the United States. The first purpose of any such policy is to maintain our integrity as a sovereign power. The second is, with enlightenment and consideration of others, to promote our national interests.

What is the new foreign policy that has been developing since the close of World War II? It is vague, confusing, and headed in three different directions at the same time:

1. We are attempting to assume, in a measure, the old role of Great Britain in maintaining the balance of power in Europe and in the protection of British trade routes in the Mediterranean and Near East.

2. The second course of our foreign policy flowed from the first. When we assumed

Great Britain's place in Greece, President Truman enunciated his doctrine in which he said, in part: "I believe it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." This is the policy of containing Russia.

3. There is a third part of our foreign policy which Edgar Mowrer has called the moralistic fallacy. "This is the belief," he says, "that in its dealings with foreign states or groups, the United States should be guided by the degree to which said states or groups conform internally to American standards." In other words, we are attempting to reform the world. Mowrer, describing how it worked in China, came to the conclusion that our diplomats were more eager to promote what they called the revolt of Asia than to secure a China impervious to Russian influence.

The first part of our foreign policy, an attempt to maintain the balance of power in Europe, is logical. Today, with our frontiers still on the Rhine, the balance of power in Europe is of vital importance to us.

The North Atlantic Pact, and the movement for a United Europe, stand in the way of Russian aggression. The United States has taken the leadership in the North Atlantic Pact. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that this leadership is not where it traditionally belongs—with England and France. We can only help Europe; we cannot save her from Russian ideology or force. If Europe no longer has the will to make desperate and supreme efforts to preserve the essential freedoms the democratic world has cherished, she will succumb to the tyrants of Russia, no matter what we may try to do.

The second part of our foreign policy is the Truman doctrine—which is physically and financially beyond our abilities, and morally wrong in its implied righteousness. The Truman doctrine commits us to a world-wide policy of assistance, financial or military, on a scale we cannot possibly support.

The third course of our foreign policy, in which we require other states to conform to United States standards if they would have relations with us, is inevitably doomed to failure in the future as it has so notably failed in the past in dealing with such diverse ideologies as those of Spain, the Argentine, Guatemala, and China. The reductio ad absurdum of this doctrine would be to have no relations with any states unwilling to re-form themselves in our own image of white, male, Anglo-Saxon democratic Protestant perfection.

There is a lack of understanding of our long-distance economic goals. We drift into situations and international political crises which may be quite contrary to our national interests. For example, during the crisis between Arabs and Jews over Israel our policy shifted from quarter to quarter like a weathervane in a storm. At that time the public had an intimation for the first time that oil in the Middle East was one of the considerations of our foreign policy. How vital are these oil fields to us? Is a keystone of our foreign policy to prevent Russia's access to the oil reserves of the Middle East? If such a policy is necessary to our survival and national interests, and within the power of our resources, the public should be informed and made ready to approve such a policy.

We no longer believe that our national interests can best be served by an overbearing, selfish nationalism. In the principle of point 4 President Truman has proposed a plan for us to help less advanced nations to increase their productivity and well-being. But are resources for this purpose to be prodigally expended for all peoples over the earth who need our aid? Obviously, even our great wealth could not stand such a strain. Yet at the present time point 4 is an instrument of the Department of State, to be bartered for day-to-day diplomatic needs.

Our foreign policy is muddled because our national interests are obscure. Furthermore, while we are committing ourselves to financial and military aid all over the world, we do not know whether our resources are great enough for our commitments.

What we require is a new, bipartisan agency composed of the executive and legislative branches of Government, coordinated with the State Department, to carry on a continuous appraisal of our national interests and national resources. Instead, in this time of crisis, we are staggering along with 59 major Government departments and agencies, of which 46 have interests in the field of foreign affairs. There are 32 interdepartmental committees coordinating work. It is an impossible and unworkable arrangement.

At a moment in history when the United States must undertake, through foreign policy, to lead the world away from wars toward peace, we have not set a course that even our own people can follow with understanding and approval.

III

The United States has a last line of defense in this hemisphere to which she will be forced back if our first line of defense in Europe fails. This line consists of our neighboring American states.

To disregard this line of defense and neglect the Americas may be our greatest national folly.

Our policy toward Latin America has been uncertain and vacillating. We have gone through periods of manifest destiny, imperialism, the big stick, dollar diplomacy, a tutorial policy, and an intervention policy. Finally, under President Hoover a nonintervention policy was practiced which Franklin D. Roosevelt put into words, expanded, and sold as the good-neighbor policy. The present administration adheres to the letter of the good-neighbor policy, but has no kinship with it in spirit. There is an apathy toward Latin America. As a result, we no longer enjoy the warm relationships built up during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

What course should our policy in Latin America take? I repeat that it should be directed toward the most complete political, economic, and military integration among all the states in this hemisphere that can be effected by diplomacy. We should make this our cornerstone of foreign policy, because this hemisphere is our last line of defense, and within it are deep national interests which have been neglected.

Latin America is an undeveloped and excellent area for essential industry. It is our only source of many strategic and critical materials. Of the 12 materials listed as strategic in 1948, 11—copper, manganese, chromium, tungsten, tin, antimony, platinum, mercury, iodine, sodium nitrate, and bauxite are available in Latin America. Nickel, the twelfth, comes from our friend and neighbor Canada. In addition, Latin America also produces oil, iron ore, fibers, foodstuffs, drugs, woods, natural rubber, meats, hides, and wool.

The population of the United States will reach its peak about 1970 according to students of population trends. Latin America, with a present population equal to our own, will still be growing in 1970. It may well outgrow the Russians, particularly if we are able, by the right sort of assistance, to raise Latin American standards of public health to match our own.

Potential industry, population, strategic materials and food are all here in our own hemisphere, for the survival of all of us, if we have the wit and the will to use them. Up to now, unfortunately, we have not shown an evidence of such acumen.

Take the case of Chile, which has almost 30 percent of the world's copper. In view of her importance to us, what has our diplomatic policy been toward Chile? Regrettably, one of friendly apathy. Yet Chile, right now, like much of the world is suffering from the destroying germ of inflation. Like so many other countries in Latin America, her social soil is fertile for Communist infiltration. If we let Chile lapse into confusion through our own neglectfulness, then it is possible that Communists could take over the state. If Chile should then agree to send her copper and nitrates to Russia by commercial treaty, what would be the policy of our Department of State? We must never allow ourselves to be confronted by such a dilemma. We must bind Chile and all Latin American countries so closely to us that communism will cease to be a threat.

We need sugar from Cuba, oil and iron ore from Venezuela, coffee from Brazil, tin and tungsten from Bolivia, copper, lead, and zinc from Mexico; hides and tungsten from the Argentine, vanadium from Peru, and platinum from Colombia. In emergencies we may have to rely on Latin America for rubber, hemp, cocoa, tung oil, and quinine.

The United States can, in my opinion, bring about integration in three ways: by diplomacy, economic union, and military alliances.

First, by diplomacy: We must acknowledge the importance of good relations between the United States and the other states within this hemisphere. The Division of Latin American Affairs within our Department of State should be raised in dignity and expanded in organization, to cope with the diverse problems so vital to all the Americas. To accomplish our great aims now in this hemisphere we must sweep the embassies and legations of Latin America clean of misfits and incompetents, while encouraging the many able men who also represent us there.

Our diplomacy in Latin America should be rigidly directed to respect the sovereignty of all of the states of this hemisphere. Sovereignty can only be respected by strict adherence to the policy of nonintervention, including direct action or intrigue.

Finally, in our diplomacy, we should return to our ancient policy of recognition of sovereign states with absolute impartiality, not as a weapon to force reform. That policy includes:

"(1) the new regime must appear to have control of the governmental machinery of state; (2) it must have the assent of the people without 'substantial resistance to its authority'; and (3) it must be in a position to fulfill all its international obligations and responsibilities."

At the present time we are in the inconsistent position of carrying on full diplomatic relations with Communist Russia, Socialist England, and several dictators in Latin America—but we draw the line at dictatorship in Spain. A short time ago we withheld recognition of Peron because we disapproved of his Third Position in the Argentine.

If we are not to intervene or meddle in the internal affairs of the Latin-American States, neither can we tolerate intervention in this hemisphere by outside states—the basic policy of the Monroe Doctrine.

Russian intervention by intrigue to spread communism should be forestalled by rigid security measures and by the exchange of information between the agencies of the various nations entrusted with the task of maintaining domestic tranquillity.

Second. We must bind together the economic resources of this hemisphere to protect all of us against military or economic aggression. We should be prepared and eager in this hemisphere to go as far as the rest of the world in breaking down all the bars to a free economy. In fact we should lead wherever possible, but we must protect

ourselves so long as restrictions are a part of the world economic order.

Specifically I propose that the United States, by bilateral agreements with other states of this hemisphere and through tariff adjustments, make possible now the sale of at least part of their surplus exportable raw products and eventually all of the surplus that we can consume.

The United States must reexamine its tariffs on the importation of raw products from this hemisphere and make concessions to further the end of hemisphere integration.

I further propose that the capital of the Export-Import Bank be increased so that economically sound enterprises in this hemisphere can be stimulated and expanded.

Third. We must forge the most comprehensive kind of military alliance for the protection of the countries of this hemisphere. Results from our foreign policy in the Eastern Hemisphere carried on at colossal sacrifice, are still uncertain. But leadership in a new foreign policy for the Western Hemisphere can achieve success at comparatively little sacrifice.

The policy for military integration has been so weakly pursued that today, 8 years after the Rio Conference, we are pitifully ill prepared to defend this hemisphere.

Within the last month events in Korea have reached a state of crisis. A week ago President Truman stated: "We are fighting in Korea for our national security and survival."

Does this mean that we have no alternative other than throwing all of our resources into the struggle in Asia? The time is late but perhaps not too late even now to reassess our foreign policy and change its course. Great Britain and France have clearly indicated their belief that we should do so, at least so far as Asia is concerned.

We must evolve from our present method of making policy to meet current crises. Foreign policy is not like a grain crop that is sown in the spring and harvested in the summer; it is like an orchard that must be carefully guarded and cultivated for years before it can bear good fruit. I feel certain that a careful reassessment of our foreign policy will reveal that our great national interests lie in this hemisphere.

IV

Today the national interests of the states of this hemisphere are naturally linked together. We are in mortal peril unless we bind ourselves together for mutual protection. Here in this hemisphere we can only escape the Russian menace by the most complete integration of our sovereign states that can be made practicable.

We no longer have the luxury of the Americas isolated by oceans, protected by the British Navy and illumined by the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. The luxury of making and hurling resounding phrases in order to arouse the people to anger and bitterness, now no longer may merely achieve personal or political advantage; it may be a danger to the sovereignty of the state. The chorus cry of "Yankee imperialism" by South American demagogues and professional Latin-American intellectual "experts" from the north may have in the future a far more tragic consequence than creation of international disharmony. We can no longer permit ourselves flag-waving orgies, discriminations, trade barriers, and uneconomic policies under the name of nationalism when our urgent need is continentalism. In Latin America just and economic land reforms are overdue as are tax systems that support privilege and stifle progress. This is a late hour to kill by expropriation any more capitalistic geese that lay golden eggs before a new brand of golden-egged geese can be hybridized. And there is still time to establish the rights of the laborer before he receives the Communist kiss of death.

The integration of this hemisphere is feasible. It is practical. It can be almost wholly accomplished through bilateral treaties later to be supplemented by multilateral treaties when desirable.

The hope of humanity in today's bellicose world lies in international understanding, good will, and cooperation. We must extend the solidarity of family and community and nation beyond our borders. We must make a new approach to human relations among nations. I believe that this can be best achieved through first building a community of interests. Where can there be better ground to build this community than in this hemisphere, as a guiding light to world unity?

From the northern reaches of Canada to the tip of Tierra del Fuego people have settled this continent to escape injustice and seek opportunity. They are united in spirit but separated by artificial boundaries of a past age. Break down these barriers so that the people of the Americas can rise to a new level of human understanding and progress!

One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of B'nai Jeshurin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on December 19, 1950, at the jubilee dinner of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurin, by Charles H. Silver, a very distinguished resident of New York City.

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

I consider it an unusual privilege to greet you here this evening as chairman of the committee. We are celebrating an occasion of historic significance. The series of events which have taken place during recent weeks have been part of a continuous program marking the attainment of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of B'nai Jeshurin. I want to express my deep gratitude to my fellow members on the committee who gave of their time and effort in planning this event.

It has been said that 125 years is but a fleeting moment in eternity, but to us, mere mortals who think in terms of the Biblical threescore and ten, a century and a quarter represents a vast expanse of time. Indeed, the world has moved so rapidly and violently in this period that happenings in even 1 week seemed like an eternity in themselves.

B'nia Jeshurin came into existence 125 years ago. Throughout the years it has grown steadily and flourished magnificently. Like a mighty oak it has weathered the storms of wars and depressions. The boundless faith of our people, the courage of the Jewish pioneers in this country, the willingness to absorb the spirit of democracy have been the powerful forces which have enabled American Jews to hold to the teachings of their forefathers and their prophets; but at the same time they have never wavered in their loyalty and devotion to their country.

Recently a distinguished American writer, a historian, of our faith referred to the Jews as a pilgrim people. It is my understanding that a pilgrim is a wanderer, often seeking a haven where he may worship his God according to his conscience. Judge Brandeis once said, "The pilgrims had faith; we should have it, for the pilgrims had this noble and steadfast spirit."

It seems to me, my friends, that Judge Brandeis has summed up in one sentence the philosophy of our people. We have faith in our God, we have faith in the land of our adoption, we have faith in democracy and, above all, we have faith in the goodness and decency of human beings.

When we gave to the world the message "Love thy neighbor as thyself," we laid down the basic philosophy and teachings of dignified and honorable relations between individuals. We urge compassion, charity, and brotherly love. Had the world followed these teachings, there would have been no religious persecutions, no hatred, no wars, no atom bombs.

I say these things because we are celebrating the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of a congregation, whose sons and daughters have been part of the daily life of our city and our country, decade after decade, and whose spiritual leaders have poured out their eloquence and given their unstinted efforts not only for Judaism but also in behalf of a better understanding between people of all faiths.

That is the real significance of this anniversary. We are happy because today the congregation serves 1,000 families; that within the walls of its noble structure there gather men and women to worship their God and absorb the meaning of our religious belief.

It is indeed a noble and beautiful structure. It gives one a feeling of uplift to be there, yet we know that even if this structure were destroyed by the physical elements the spirit of Jewish teachings and ethics can never die. That is eternal.

On this anniversary we are not celebrating the existence of a splendid structure but the maintenance, over 125 years, of the Jewish ideal, an ideal that has held aloft the torch of brotherhood and love and that kept intact our people for centuries. Let us not forget that we gave to the world a system of ethics which has influenced the thinking and actions of all peoples down through the centuries. I say this not in a boastful spirit, but with a sense of humility and deep obligation.

B'nai Jeshurin is more than a congregation of the Jewish faith. Its interests are not confined to its own people. Its spiritual leaders and memberships have shown a deep interest in the affairs of the community and I am glad to say that this is also true of other Jewish congregations. We, who belong to B'nai Jeshurin, feel that we also belong to our city and to our neighbors. We extend to them the warm handgrasp of friendship and wholehearted cooperation.

And may I, finally, express the hope that we shall no longer be a "pilgrim people." Those of us who have enjoyed the blessings of this country know that our fathers who came here found a real haven. Perhaps it may be said that it marked the end of their pilgrimage. Others, however, were not so fortunate; the land of milk and honey was closed to them and the terror of Nazi persecution wiped out millions of our people. And those who were left became pilgrims wandering over the face of the earth, homeless, hungry, but still imbued with that beautiful faith which never left them. They were a sad but hopeful and gentle people.

And then there was opened to them the doors of a new republic—yet a country that was old and sacred and steeped in the traditions and customs and history of the Jews. The pilgrims moved on slowly toward this land, in endless lines—they are still moving—and this time they passed through the

doors and were greeted with smiles and warmth by their kith and kin. They beheld with joy the faces of those who welcomed them to this refuge and they sought no more for they are a grateful and gentle people.

Is it too much to expect that the pilgrimage of our people is at an end? We as good Americans hope that it is. We who have had some share in the growth of B'Nai Jeshurin shall pray for them. We shall give to them cooperation and also full support to the new republic which has taken in these pilgrims by the thousands, the newest member of the democratic society of nations—The Republic of Israel.

And now, my friends, I come to a very pleasant part of my task, for I am about to present the man who will preside at this dinner and introduce the brilliant speakers whom we are to have the pleasure of hearing.

He is, shall I say, a product of B'Nai Jeshurin, and that in itself is something to be proud of. When he was elected a member of the board of trustees 37 years ago he was then the youngest member of the board, and he is the only member now alive who voted to elect Dr. Goldstein rabbi of the congregation.

That in itself, my friends, is a great distinction, for we know how well and wisely the board acted. In the intervening years our rabbi has become one of the outstanding leaders of the Jewish people.

You may begin to wonder, my friends, how old your toastmaster is, and I will let you make your own guess. But this I can tell you very definitely, when it comes to activity he has the stamina and courage and energy of a college freshman. American Jews may well be proud of him, for he has done splendid work not only in behalf of our own people but the entire community.

I have a very strong affection for him and I am very happy to present, as your toastmaster, Mr. Samuel Blumberg.

Washington Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with Secretary Acheson, entitled "Washington Front," written by Wilfrid Parsons, and published in the December 30, 1950, issue of America.

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

WASHINGTON FRONT

(By Wilfrid Parsons)

The railroad yard workers went out on what their leaders called a wildcat strike, and the papers which carried this news also carried the story of the Republican congressional caucuses which voted for firing Secretary Acheson. There was more than mere coincidence in this. For one thing, there was the timing of both events. The yard workers went out just as millions were mailing Christmas parcels. The Republicans went after Acheson 2 days before he was to leave for Brussels for a conference which may well prove the most critical of our time. The yard workers apparently expected that the inconvenienced public would raise a howl of protest in their favor. The howl came, but against them. The Republicans apparently imagined they would rouse public opinion enough to keep Mr. Acheson from going to Brussels. Public opinion was immediate and sharp, in condemnation of the move, and Mr. Acheson went to Brussels.

The parallel between the two events is not so farfetched as it might seem at first sight. They are both parts of a new and alarming pattern. The yard workers struck against the Government (which now runs the railroads), in complete disregard of the public's comfort and of national safety. The action of the anti-Acheson Republicans (23 out of 43 in the Senate) was more complex, but was in the same direction.

One Washington paper called the anti-Acheson vote irresponsible, another called it reckless. It was both, of course, and very hard to explain. It is not yet clear why the Republicans acted as they did, especially since, as America noted last week (p. 355), their leaders had seemed to squelch the Ives resolution, timed as it was to appear just as the President and Prime Minister Attlee were sitting in with Mr. Acheson on delicate negotiations.

The easiest explanation, and maybe the best, is that the vote against Acheson was one of those backward-and-forward-looking things; backward to the last elections, forward to the next; in other words, partisan politics at the expense of the national welfare. But then, why the precise timing? Even if he had yielded, how would the President find a Secretary in 2 days, and be able to brief him for Brussels in time? As it was, Mr. Acheson left with his own and the Nation's prestige very gravely impaired.

An even greater puzzle is this: just what is the foreign policy of the 23 Senators? To be more tough with Russia than even Mr. Acheson has been? Or, to reverse present policy, on the ground that it is leading us to war with Russia? You can take your choice, but you can't have both. It begins to look as if too many Senators, in both parties, are, by intellect and training, incapable of handling foreign affairs.

Review of United States Shipping Events of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Review of Passing United States Shipping Events of 1950," appearing in the London shipping news. The article was prepared by the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., and it reviews the events in the American merchant marine for the past year.

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

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SHIPPING, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1951.

Hon. WARREN G MAGNUSON,
Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Matters,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Because it gives a running story of some of the high lights of events of interest in American shipping for 1950, I am enclosing herewith copy of an article which we have prepared for the British press at their request and will appear in London shipping journals in January. Obviously, these do not constitute all such events but just the high lights thereof.

In many of these events the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Matters played an outstanding part and the accomplishments would have been substantially less but for the constructive work of yourself and the other subcommittee members for which the shipping industry is duly grateful.

Very truly yours,

FRAZER A. BAILEY.

REVIEW OF PASSING UNITED STATES SHIPPING EVENTS OF 1950

A review of the passing events of interest to American shipping during 1950 shows some substantial accomplishments, a number of interesting developments, and generally speaking, more activity and more general interest in the field of shipping than has been the case in recent years. This should be considered on the plus side, as a public or governmental awakening to the part which ocean shipping plays in the economic welfare and defensive armament of the Nation can only be stimulating and helpful.

The latest official reports showing that more than 80 percent of all military and troop-support supplies landed in Korea for United Nations forces were delivered by privately operated American shipping (14 percent by United States Government and 6 percent foreign) should constitute convincing evidence of the defense value of this industry.

For the past 2 years the principal shipowning associations have been advocating a long-range shipping legislative program which would stimulate the further building and operation of a merchant fleet under the United States flag, of a character considered compatible with the economic, commercial, and national-defense interests of the Nation; and with the prominent part which it must play in world affairs in concert with other great powers and the United Nations. It is felt in maritime circles, and shared largely in other quarters, that the United States should have a merchant marine of size and characteristics sufficient to carry all of its domestic, and not less than one-half of its own import and export trade, on a fair competitive basis. While the United States has a substantial merchant fleet compared with recent decades, it does not yet measure up to standards which it is felt are required by this country in the present and foreseeable future. We are particularly deficient in vessels of passenger-carrying type, having only approximately half the number which we possessed at the beginning of World War II. These are the vessels which are to serve as convertible troop transports in an emergency. The long-range program was designed to aid in the achievement of these aspirations within the framework of existing law and strictly within the parity philosophy of equal economic opportunity, through Government aid in the foreign trades. While this bill was favorably reported by the appropriate shipping committees of both Houses of Congress, it unfortunately ran into opposition by the administration as to certain of its tax provisions, and the prospects of its passage before the end of the present session of Congress, is problematical.

Legislation was enacted requiring the reorganization of the administration of the Panama Canal, a separation of its transit and transportation activities from those of the military and of civil government; and an adjustment of the toll rate to cover only expenses which are incident to the transit of vessels. While it is not expected that the toll rate will be substantially lowered, this should forestall any increase which

otherwise might occur. The toll tariff will be equally applicable to vessels of all flags, including United States Government vessels, and the benefit will, therefore, accrue to all maritime countries.

Legislation was passed authorizing the Government to provide war-risk insurance when such insurance is not available in the private market. This is in the nature of a standby provision to permit Government insurance of this character when required and is highly desirable in these uncertain times.

Legislation extending the Marshall-plan and military-aid programs were enacted, and these contain the provision that 50 percent of such Government-aid cargoes shall be forwarded in United States vessels. There has been some criticism of this modest patronage by our Government. However, when it is realized that these aid-program commodities represent the generosity of the American people; that they largely displace commercial cargoes and that very little business would be offering to sustain the American services unless permitted reasonable participation, as was to be expected, the opposition has died down.

An act was passed known as the Port Security Act, under which the Coast Guard, by authority of the President, will take all necessary measures to avoid sabotage and subversive acts on vessels and in harbors, ports, and along water-front facilities of the United States. The importance of this measure at these uncertain times is obvious.

The merchant marine subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted probably the most extensive study of all problems relating to shipping which has yet been conducted by the Congress of the United States. Space will not permit us to enumerate the various subjects and phases which were explored. It is interesting, however, to note a few of the conclusions reached.

"That legislative measures and executive administration dealing with merchant marine matters be directed toward the progressive fostering and building up of the privately owned component of the merchant marine.

"That there be no fundamental changes in the 1936 act except such as are required to—

"(a) extend construction-differential subsidy aid to all vessels in the foreign trade;

"(b) to tramp vessels, on condition they engage primarily in foreign trade to and from the United States under such rules and regulations as will insure the unimpaired continuance of established berth liner cargo operations; and

"(c) clarify, through amendment to titles V and VI, those legislative standards necessary to insure the just determination of construction and operating subsidies and national-defense allowances.

"That for national-defense purposes, reliance be placed on a well-balanced American merchant marine.

"That in time of emergency, the fullest use possible be made of privately operated shipping organizations and maritime labor on such terms and conditions as will insure a return of just compensation for services rendered."

Shipping men felt that the report of the congressional committee was friendly and helpful.

During May of 1950, the President saw fit to reorganize the United States Maritime Commission under the Reorganization Act, and created a Federal Maritime Board of three members, and a Maritime Administration, both in the Department of Commerce. The Maritime Administration, broadly speaking, will have jurisdiction over all of the operational and administrative functions, and the Federal Maritime Board, again speaking broadly, will deal with the regulatory, judicial, and quasi-judicial functions. The Administrator is also a member and the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, thus tying the two organizations effectively together. The President also appointed to the chairmanship of the Board and as Maritime Administrator, Admiral Edward L. Cochrane, a retired naval officer of considerable reputation and well-established ability. While the new organization has only been functioning for a few months, there is evidence of an accelerated tempo and the expectation of smooth and efficient coordination and cooperation with the industry.

The President also created the Office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and appointed to this important position, Gen. Philip B. Fleming, former Chairman of the old Maritime Commission, and authorized the establishment of a Transportation Council composed of all of the heads of transportation agencies under the chairmanship of the new Under Secretary.

During March 1950 the President requested the former Secretary of the Army, Mr. Gordon Gray, to make certain recommendations for charting our course in the field of foreign relations primarily on the economic side. While the President's request was not specific on the point, it was understood that Mr. Gray's report would be directed primarily, if not exclusively, to ways and means of closing the dollar gap with the Marshall-plan nations when United States Government aid under this program ceases. Inasmuch as United States imports now exceed exports, and the dollar gap is therefore, to all intents and purposes, closed, there was some surprise in the United States when the Gray report was recently released. Certain of the recommendations relating to shipping such as (a) that Government aid to shipping was justified only for national defense; (b) that preference to American ships of a patronage character should be withdrawn; (c) that even Army and Navy stores and supplies should under certain circumstances be transported by foreign-flag vessels; met with strong and almost violent objection in many parts of the country. Almost immediately a rebuttal statement was issued, signed jointly by a labor-management-veteran coalition.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, fired the first salvo at the Gray report. In an address to the Senate he said:

"As chairman of the Senate committee dealing with merchant marine legislation, I wish to serve notice that our committee will be alert, and will act to block any attempt by anybody to cripple such a vital industry as our merchant marine.

"The repeal of laws requiring that 50 percent of all Marshall-plan shipments move in American vessels would repudiate a sound congressional mandate."

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, also a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, joined Chairman JOHNSON in attacking the Gray report:

"I wish here and now to add my emphatic support to any action that may be taken by our chairman or by our committee."

Mr. Gray's recommendations regarding shipping are so far afield with respect to public sentiment in this country that it is not felt that they will have any important repercussions.

The federation has arranged by cable with the directors of the Suez Canal Co. for a meeting in Paris on December 7 to discuss the existing toll tariff at the Suez Canal. Increased oil production in the Middle East, and other resurgence of shipping in the area, has brought about unprecedented traffic and financial prosperity of the Suez Canal Co. Inasmuch as the Suez Co. has a publicly announced policy that its prosperity will be shared between its stockholders and its patrons, and inasmuch as the published statements of the canal company demonstrate the exceedingly prosperous earnings now being enjoyed, it is hoped and believed that the patrons may anticipate a reasonable reduction in Suez Canal tolls applicable to the ships of all nations. A delegation from the federation, headed by Admiral Edmond J. Moran, United States Navy, retired, met with the management of the canal company in Paris to explore this subject and to put forward the suggestions of the American shipping industry. The results are not yet known.

The new maritime administrator has just announced the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction by the United States Government, under authority of title 7 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, of a number of new fast cargo vessels which may be needed for national defense. These vessels are understood to be around 13,000 tons deadweight and of 20-knot speed. Bids will be asked shortly from American shipbuilders, and President Truman has requested Congress to make available contract authorization in the amount of approximately $126,000,000.

Admiral Cochrane has also announced that in cooperation with the industry, a small planning task force is at work under his direction to prepare an organization which would be required, similar to the British Ministry of Transport and the old United States War Shipping Administration, to take over and handle merchant shipping in the event of an emergency. Admiral Cochrane has also appointed 11 outstanding American shipping executives as an advisory committee to consult with him primarily concerning the plan so evolved, and in the selection of the highest type American shipping personnel which it is understood will be drafted from the industry by the admiral when the emergency occurs, and with the full support and consent of the American shipping companies.

There was a recent meeting in Washington of the North Atlantic Planning Board for Ocean Shipping, the understood purpose being to pool the shipping resources of these nations for their joint and mutual benefit in an emergency. Through initiation by the industry, and the good offices of Admiral Cochrane, the Secretary of State was prevailed upon to appoint three prominent American shipping executives as technical advisers to the American Government representative on the Planning Board. No details are available as the matter is considered of a confidential nature, but inasmuch as the industry's experience and talent was available in these discussions, it is to be assumed that the country's and the industry's interests were amply protected.

There are many other matters of importance concerning shipping which transpired during the very active year of 1950. Congress was in session for the whole year except for the fall election period; there was great international tension, and altogether the American shipping industry was extremely busy. What we have said hereinbefore may be considered only some of the highlight subjects dealt with during these extremely busy times.

Sales of Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "From the RECORD," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Thursday, December 28, 1950. The Cleveland Plain Dealer is one of the most widely read newspapers of the Midwest. The editorial concerns a speech delivered by our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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

FROM THE RECORD

"After listening to the patriotic appeals on the part of the President and other administration leaders, I was shocked this week to find that the administration, while calling upon the American people for greater sacrifices and expressing great concern with the threatening rising cost of living, was at the same time launching one of the greatest international bargain day sales of the twentieth century. * * *

"I wish to call particular attention to the fact that included in the bulletin (which advertised the sale) are 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, 100,000,000 bushels of corn, and millions of bushels of other grains. They are all listed as surplus. At the same time that they are being classified as surplus and nonessential, the Department of Agriculture is asking for greater production, and the Price Administrator has said this week he would consider setting price controls on such commodities in order to hold down the price.

"At a time when our country is being threatened by an outside aggressor, with the cost of living reaching an all-time high, with price controls being considered on all food and agricultural products, and at a time when every sensible and loyal American recognizes that we must conserve our resources, there is absolutely no possible justification for the existing policy of treating these inventories as surplus and nonessential.

"It is inexcusable that this administration, through the Department of Agriculture, while under the threat of war clouds, should continue stripping the American cupboard bare and distributing our resources to the far corners of the earth. * * *

"It is estimated that there are about 110 freight cars to the mile. If they were all put into one train they would make a solid train of surplus commodities reaching from Independence, Mo., to the White House. Instead of calling it the Missouri mule train, it should be called the international gravy train." (From a speech by United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 12, pages 16902 and 16903.)

In the same speech Senator WILLIAMS revealed that more than 50,000,000 pounds of American cotton, worth about $20,000,000, has been shipped directly from New Orleans to Communist China since the outbreak of the Korean War last June, and that other quantities have gone to Hong Kong, with Red China as the ultimate destination. WILLIAMS said he got these and other facts from Government sources.

This is a serious situation, inasmuch as cotton is one of the staples that are currently in short supply, due to a bad guess made by the Department of Agriculture.

What is more disturbing, however, is that WILLIAMS identified the seller of the cotton as the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This gives us the strange feeling of being on the threshold of a madhouse. Are we going to combat communism by arming and supplying our enemies as well as our friends?

The Constitution, Guardian of People's Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of an address delivered by a student of the University of South Carolina, Eugene Brantley, of Chester, S. C., at the annual fall rally of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, last year. Since that time his ability to speak, as well as the text of this particular speech, have received much favorable comment. The address is entitled "The Constitution, Guardian of People's Rights." I think it would be well for the people of this Nation to read and reread the Constitution and realize every time it is read that the freedoms set forth must not be taken for granted.

I ask unanimous consent that young Mr. Brantley's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE CONSTITUTION, GUARDIAN OF PEOPLE'S RIGHTS

I stand before you today and speak freely and frankly about a Government document because my God-fearing forefathers won for me this cherished right and handed it down to me inviolate. I can criticize my country's faults and weaknesses, its merits, and its virtues, because of a piece of paper, the most significant in the lives of the American citizens today, the Constitution of the United States.

Because of this Constitution, I today enjoy the precious liberties enumerated in the Bill of Rights. These rights perhaps mean more to the citizens of this country than the Constitution itself, which provides for our governmental machinery.

For instance, you may change the Constitution by amendments, but our citizens would not allow the Bill of Rights to be altered. Take away one and you weaken all; take away freedom from your neighbor and enslave yourself; as the late William Allen White once said: "Freedom is the only thing that you cannot have unless you are willing to share it with others."

These constitutional rights are our fundamental articles of faith. They are the supreme law of the land. Yet anyone can understand this simple Bill of Rights.

Take article 1, for example, which sets forth in one sentence enough freedoms to make a dictatorship impossible. It states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to peaceably assemble and to petition their Government for redress of grievances." This is a sound statement of sound fact.

Let's take the first part of this article: It says that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This statement gives the people their freedom of religion. Many years ago, a famous man was persecuted because he believed that the church and state should be separate. This man was Roger Williams, a New England minister.

The second part of this article gives us our freedom of speech. You men and women of this country may criticize the Congress, the President, or even the Supreme Court, provided you do not slander or libel individual persons. Benjamin Franklin once said: "Freedom of speech is the principal pillar of a free government. When this support is taken away, the constitution of a free society is dissolved and tyranny is erected on its ruins." Better words could not be found stating the importance that this freedom plays in a free democracy.

Another part of this article gives us our freedom of the press. It is hard for a country to call itself a free democracy, when its press cannot print true facts, criticizing its government. Americans have slowly built up this civil liberty.

No confiscation of your property, says the Bill of Rights, unless you are indemnified for it; no searching of your home without a warrant; no accusations by witnesses unless they can be produced in open court; and no subjecting you to trial twice for the same accusation.

The Bill of Rights promises you freedom from excessive bail, freedom from torture to obtain confessions, and freedom from unusual and cruel punishment. It gives you the right to a speedy trial, to a definite written accusation if you are being tried, and it gives you the right to have counsel.

The Bill of Rights promises much, but it is up to the American people to make those promises good. When people think and say what they think, this Government obeys, and the people should always have the courage to speak out.

Somewhere in this country almost every day, the Bill of Rights is being violated. Its most dangerous foes are not foreign dictatorships, but those of us who deny democratic liberties to others and do not carry out the duties that these precious liberties bring us.

In a study of the Constitution, we note the system of checks and balances which keeps the power always in the hands of the people. At times, Government machinery seems ponderous; it moves slowly, and, as is true of all great democratic nations, grave mistakes are made; but, the voice of the people, through their power of the vote—their constitutional right—corrects these mistakes, makes their wishes known, and remains the ultimate and final authority in our great land.

The voice of the people. These few words, in many respects, summarize the very essence and heart of the Constitution itself.

A careful study of the Constitution reveals the tremendous wisdom and foresight of the founders of this country. They looked into the future, dreamed visions and wonders of a great land to be, and thus constructed a conception of democratic government, with its individual powers, its States powers and its Federal powers, all relegated to their proper places, yet each working in harmony with the other for the good of all. Even the executive, judicial, and legislative bodies are so stated that no single one can function alone or with too much authority. The one single control to the changes and additions to this great Government document is the voice of the people.

Today, this very same freedom, guaranteed to us by our Constitution, can become a weakness if allowed to be abused as some of the internal enemies of our country are attempting. Hiding under the cloak of free speech, enemies of the Constitution have taught and scattered seeds of communism

and socialism, have planted weeds of distrust, fear, and abusive practices among our people. These rank and horrible weeds, enemies of a free people, must be pruned swiftly wherever and whenever they are found.

The Communists prey primarily on the minority, the so-called down-trodden, and the less informed of our citizens. Thus, we who appreciate democratic government, must realize that active participation in government institution, and a deep sense of responsibility to our country, our State and our community, are the best means of stamping out any subversive tendencies that might show their evil heads.

The citizens of this country are all kinds of people. The foundation of our democracy, with the Constitution as its basis, rests upon the individual. Each individual must be taught the history of this country, its traditions, its democratic systems; for, upon this and this alone, rests the source of our strength as a free nation.

Let us study more, let us worship more, let us keep our priceless jewel, the Constitution, untarnished. We must protect this heritage of ours. The Constitution should have a special meaning for each of us.

To the worker in Carolina's cotton mills, to the farmer in the Kansas wheat field, to the longshoreman on the Great Lakes, to the miner in Pennsylvania's dark mines, to the clerk in the 5-and-10, to the broker on Wall Street, to the Congressman in Washington, to the lawyer in his office, to the fisherman on Maine's windy winter coast, to the trucker in California's sunny fields, and to the busy housewife in her bright cheerful kitchen—to each of these, the Constitution should have a special meaning. To every beating, pulsing heart in this great teeming Nation of ours, the Constitution speaks a special language. It is the last best hope on earth for a democratic way of life. It is the lighted torch, the way of life, that has long been the hope and dream of all mankind.

In the immortal words of Kipling: "Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget—lest we forget."

The Ordeal of Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Ordeal of Dean Acheson," written by Francis Downing and published in the December 29, 1950, issue of the Commonweal.

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

THE ORDEAL OF DEAN ACHESON

(By Francis Downing)

It may be a fact that Dean Acheson has, in the words of the Republicans, "lost the confidence of the country," and it may be that the removal of Mr. Acheson is in the cards. It may be admitted that if Mr. Acheson is compelled to leave office the Republicans will have won a victory.

What kind of victory they will have won, that their victory will be our victory, that the victory will have enhanced the prestige and valor of the United States, that our position in world affairs, our foreign policy, will be wiser, safer, sounder, more significant—all these are things not made plain to me.

They are not made plain to me because the attacks of the Republicans—including the latest resolution of the otherwise sensible Senator IVES—proceed from partisanship and a fundamental dishonesty. To put it clearly, they proceed from no criticism that rests on any plain bill of indictment. Stripped of the frenzied and floating vocabulary in which they are made, the criticisms come down to this: We are "in a mess"; Mr. Acheson is "soft on communism"; Mr. Acheson did not, or does not "get tough." I did not invent these charges. The first two are the words of Senator TAFT. The first phrase, "in a mess"—surely a subtle description of things, the obvious product of a careful and dispassionate, unvulgar mind—Mr. TAFT used on a CBS broadcast. Replying to the question put by the reporters on "Capital Cloakroom": "What can we do now?" Senator TAFT said, "I don't know." Preferring to discuss the mistake of stopping General Patton in Europe, or the mistakes made at Yalta (things for which, even granting TAFT's case, Mr. Acheson was not responsible) and being brought back to the question: How do we get out of our present situation? Senator TAFT said, "I don't know."

This is the position on foreign policy of a man so seemingly distinguished that he is one of the leaders of the Republican Party, is called "Mr. Republican," and is seriously regarded among the candidates for the presidency. What does he offer? Remove Mr. Acheson. What then? "I don't know." I submit that this is irrational, irresponsible, and undistinguished. I submit that no intelligent political party has a right to call on Mr. Truman for consultation with it, to call for a bipartisan foreign policy, and say that it is as free from knowledge about what we ought to do—as free even from ideas—as this man indicates it is.

On another network, Mr. Harold Stassen, also a flying contender for the Republican nomination, attacked "blundering internationalists" without naming them. He made it clear, however, that he did not mean the Republicans since he called them "freedomists," and alleged they have "a common-sense foreign policy." What does this consist in? Stassen would reverse the administration's Asiatic policy. What does that mean? How do you reverse it? What do you do that Mr. Acheson did not do, or not do that Mr. Acheson has done? Mr. Stassen gave no reply to that. He was making a speech to Republicans and they applauded. But nobody asked him these questions. He did say that he was in favor of the open door in China; and he did say that that meant we should not open the back door of China to Russia. He did say that we should "make essential decisions," and that we should develop "a dynamic opposition to communism," at the same time as he said we should stop "handouts at home and abroad." All these confusing and conflicting and undefined things Mr. Stassen added to Mr. TAFT'S self-confessed ignorance.

But I point out that none of these things, nor all of them, is the basis of a foreign policy, and that all of them and none of them is a bill of particulars against Dean Acheson.

All the Republicans, including these two, have kind words for General MacArthur, or they did until recently, but there is no evidence that Dean Acheson has ever opposed General MacArthur, much less attacked him.

I have no professional brief for Mr. Acheson. If he ought to be removed, all I insist is that somebody make out an honest, documented case against him. Neither Mr. TAFT, nor Stassen, nor IVES, not to speak of KNOWLAND—none of these men is clear enough, nor quiet enough, nor legal enough to make out the copy. Any American on trial, whose words and conduct are impeached, has a legal and a moral right to more than rhetoric; he has a right to the indictment to which he is expected, and indeed required, to plead.

American soldiers have been moving slowly and perilously out of a Chinese trap in Korea. Does someone become so bold, or so morally crass, as to blame Dean Acheson for that?

But given that situation, Mr. Attlee flies to Washington to try to temper impulse, or anger, to oppose even a limited war lest we aggravate the Chinese into remaining Russia's ally. Mr. Attlee wanted, according to James Reston of the Times, "a negotiated settlement on all outstanding questions including Formosa, recognition, representation in the United Nations, etc."

And who, do you suppose, opposed the British Prime Minister on all this? Why Mr. Acheson opposed him. Obviously this is one more sign that our Secretary of State is "soft on communism."

What arguments did Mr. Acheson make to the British proposal? Let Mr. Reston answer:

"Mr. Acheson replied that he did not necessarily differ from Mr. Attlee's estimate of the future relations between Peiping and Moscow. Maybe one day they would split. He profoundly hoped so. The next 3 years, however, were the critical years, and therefore he did not believe it was wise to enter into negotiations under which he might merely exchange the important strategic island of Formosa for a few Communist promises in Korea that probably wouldn't be kept."

The fact of the matter is that we moved into Korea wholly unprepared for the consequences which are now upon us, and morally supported with some reluctance by our allies, and by them physically supported with very little because they had very little to give. Senator TAFT and his anti-Acheson Republicans, the fact is, had been unwilling to rearm South Korea, had sniped at the economics which the Marshall plan required, and had been hostile to our State Department's military assistance plan, ambiguous in their attitude toward German rearmament while attacking Acheson—as Time still is doing—for failure to get the Germans rearmed, though France's hostility to it was almost a declaration of open warfare.

This, I submit, is a statement of the facts, and a description of the total atmosphere in which Mr. Acheson was working.

That Mr. Acheson's estimate of the meaning of the Communist movement in China may have been wrong is, and will continue to be, a matter of historical dispute. But that this proved something loosely called softness toward communism is certainly not valid. It was not Dean Acheson who recognized Peiping; it was the British. The British, among others, wanted the Peiping government recognized and seated in the UN. It was Mr. Acheson who, up until this moment, at any rate, opposed this. It was Mr. Acheson who suggested that we should devise a foreign policy whose essence would be that we should lead from strength. But the strength from which he had to lead could not tumble over a chattering child.

It was not Mr. Acheson who swaggered irresponsibly and stridently through a delicately suspended diplomatic universe, nor proceeded in the belief that any bluster could, in the last analysis, depend for support on the atom and hydrogen bombs. Whatever else he did he acted as a diplomat is supposed to act; he thought that some things could be negotiated in a world in which Republicans attacked him for not being tough while Wallaceites, Communists, and alleged liberals attacked him for failing to negotiate, a world in which a division among the western powers was building up, in which what is now, at last, out in the open, was then being softly whispered. All this had the effect of making the actions of Mr. Acheson provocative.

So that now such a reliable reporter as Mr. Reston can write that, "Indeed, the hard truth of it is—whether it is fair or not—that the United States is being charged by influential officials within the western coalition with having adopted a provocative diplomacy toward Peiping, with having stirred up forces that the United States could not handle and with proposing now to enter into a policy of limited war after limited negotiations.

Mr. Acheson is being blamed for our going into Korea as he would have been blamed had we stayed out of it. MacArthur's personal intelligence officer makes a fatal mistake in Korea, the Chinese pour in, we sadly and grimly retreat, and no one of the anti-Acheson crowd—not a single solitary one of them—rebukes MacArthur, or calls for Major General Willoughby's scalp, while their spiritual adviser and helpmate, Time magazine, after admitting the fact, and even calling it blameworthy, decides that the Willoughby lapse was not crucial.

This whole attack on Mr. Acheson, now put on the presumed ground that he has lost our confidence, is so ruthless and shameful in character that it has won even the recent rebuke of Governor Dewey.

Dean Acheson will fall, I have no doubt of that, pecked at by the cawing and soundfilled crows. But that he deserves better enemies in a more honorable contest I have no doubt of either.

The Pay-As-You-Go Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 9, 1951.

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

THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO DEBATE

Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, senior Republican on the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee, has taken issue with Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on the question whether an $80,000,000,000 budget for 1951–52 could be financed out of taxes.

When a nation is suddenly precipitated into a fighting war without adequate time to prepare itself, pay-as-you-go from the start is, it is true, a luxury that can't be afforded. As Russell Leffingwell once put it, it would be "utter nonsense" for a country to send its boys off "to fight with their bare fists in order to finance a war prudently." In such a situation a country raises the money to equip its fighting men by the quickest and easiest means—which is usually by inflationary borrowing. Similarly, when a war or rearmament effort is undertaken at a time when the economy is depressed, as ours was at the outbreak of the Second World War, borrowing may be a virtue as a desirable instrument of reflation.

But neither of those conditions obtains today. We are not plunging into all-out war in one leap, but moving into a stage of preparedness from which we could quickly proceed to full mobilization. And we are doing so when the domestic foe most to be feared is inflation. The only real approach to inflation at this stage of economic expansion is on the demand side, through a reduction of purchasing power. And the most effective means for applying this remedy is through increased taxes. We should proceed without delay to round out the tax program on which we have thus far made only a beginning. If we do this we can keep tax receipts not only abreast of but ahead of Government expenditures, at least through the calendar year 1951, even with no rise in the national gross product.

It is academic to talk about an $80,000,000,000 rate of spending before 1952 at the earliest It will be time to worry about that problem when it arrives. Meanwhile it is worth recalling that under the impact of the Second World War defense effort the gross national product, whose dimensions determine the yield of any given tax structure, expanded from $101,000,000,000 in 1940 to $194,300,000,000 3 years later. Our job now, fiscally speaking, is to get tax receipts out in front of expenditures at the start of the rearmament effort, and to keep them there so long as humanly possible.

Condemnation of Communist Chinese as Aggressors in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the need for such action on the part of the United Nations continues very urgent in the interests of all those who support and are deeply concerned with its effectiveness and future usefulness. The moral force of the UN and the preservation of this force so very important to world peace are further dealt with in the most realistic terms in the appended editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., January 9, 1951:

WITHDRAW FROM KOREA?

If Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, has made a correct evaluation in declaring that the position of our American and allied United Nations forces in Korea has now become "strategically futile," then Senator TAFT is on sound ground in advocating—as Tito also has advocated—that those forces be withdrawn from the country and assigned to tasks of a more fruitful nature.

The case for such a withdrawal—again assuming that the UN position is in fact "strategically futile"—can be argued very persuasively. Certainly, if nothing of value can be accomplished by a slow, fighting retreat to a defensive line designed to hold a bridgehead for a protracted period, the speedy evacuation of our troops would seem to be called for as a matter of common sense. They can be employed to good effect elsewhere. Our American divisions, for example, still are essential to the security of Japan, and elements of them can be used effectively in connection with the training of the Army we are now beginning to build up here at home.

With that said, however, certain reservations must be added. In the first place, there is at least some reason to believe that it may not be "strategically futile" for the United Nations to try to hold on in Korea as long as possible. True enough, short of an all-out war with Red China—which the free world does not want and which probably would set off a global explosion—there is virtually no hope that the UN can roll back the numerically superior Communists and unify the Korean people under an independent and democratic government of their own choosing. Even so, in both a political and military sense, a strong argument can be made against the idea that our allied forces should be withdrawn forthwith, regardless of whether or not they are capable of fighting a long delaying action at minimum cost to themselves.

In support of this argument, as against the Taft-Tito view, such considerations as the following may be cited: (1) If it can hold on by a slow, fighting retreat involving relatively small casualties, the United Nations ought to do so in order to win enough time to provide a safe haven for the great numbers of free Koreans who are in flight from the aggressors and whose fate will be grim if they are abandoned in a swift and sudden allied withdrawal. (2) There is a possibility—though exceedingly remote—that a long delaying action, inflicting heavy losses on the enemy, might persuade Peiping to reconsider its rejection of a cease-fire aimed at promoting an honorable negotiated settlement. (3) Before it quits Korea—if it must quit—the UN should punish the aggression there to the greatest extent possible. And (4) the longer the Chinese Communists can be pinned down in that theater, and the more their losses in men and material, the better the chance of upsetting their timetable of attack elsewhere in Asia, notably in Indochina.

Needless to say, if these and similar political-military considerations make sense, or if the UN command under General MacArthur and our own security agencies in this country regard them as valid, then it is too early to dismiss as strategically futile the effort of our allied forces to retreat slowly and hold on as long as they can in Korea. Actually, of course, the pressures being exerted by Red China's massive armies may make this whole subject rather academic by obliging us in the near future to undertake a hasty evacuation in order to avoid a disastrous Dunkirk. In that case, however, the world will have reason to recognize the withdrawal as a fighting withdrawal made with honor against odds too heavy, and in a theater relatively not important enough, to justify a battle to the finish.

Finally, if this withdrawal must be made—whether soon or a considerable time from now—the United States and the United Nations as a whole should carry it out in a way that will serve notice on all peoples that it represents a lost battle, not a lost war, and that the struggle to uphold freedom, decency, and the rule of law in the world will continue unabated regardless of the set-back in Korea. To that end, one of the first things that the UN ought to do—and it can hardly delay much longer without stultifying itself—is to brand Red China as a criminal aggressor. That, at least, will keep the historical record straight.

Father Louis J. Mendelis: Citation for Mission Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, selection of any citizen as the outstanding figure nationally in any worth while field

of endeavor is always a matter for heartfelt commendation. Such an honor has come to one of Maryland's best known and best loved clergymen, the Reverend Louis J. Mendelis, pastor of St. Alphonsus Catholic Church in downtown Baltimore.

A National Catholic News Service story in the last issue of the Catholic Review, quoting from an article in the Priest magazine, published in Huntington, Ind., summarizes the extraordinary record Father Mendelis has compiled in contributing to the dissemination of religious teachings during the past 10 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the news item from the Catholic Review be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PRIEST IS CITED FOR CHARITIES

HUNTINGTON, IND.—During the past 10 years St. Alphonsus parish in downtown Baltimore has contributed more than $500,000 to the missions.

The 1950 total of $66,608.66 breaks down to $2,563 43 for the general mission fund; $44,270.23 for specific causes, $19,775 in mass stipends. The $50,000 mark has been passed every year since 1943–44. The peak was reached in 1945–46, with $80,785.18. The $500,000 figure, throughout the decade, is divided as follows: Ordinary, $28,192.15; specific causes, $329,382.03; mass intentions, $176,849.

The editors of the Priest magazine, published here, which carries this information in its current issue, believe that St. Alphonsus Parish has set a national record. "If we could give an annual award to one of America's priests in the name of the Priest," they state, "we would certainly nominate Father Louis J. Mendelis, pastor of St. Alphonsus, Baltimore, as its first winner."

Truman Blasts Specious Reasoning We Can Become Island to Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Tuesday, January 9, 1951:

TRUMAN BLASTS SPECIOUS REASONING WE CAN BECOME ISLAND TO OURSELVES

President Truman in his State of the Union message summons the spiritual and material resources of the American people to meet one of the darkest crises in the history of the Republic. He demands that the new challenge to the free world be met in a way that conforms to the Nation's traditions—honorably and courageously—that there shall be no concessions to the aggressors, and no evasions of duty.

The tone of the President's message was one of confidence. It reflected none of the doubts and qualms and the fears that have been finding such disturbing expression in Congress and elsewhere since the war in Korea changed from triumph to disaster.

The Nation's enemy and the enemy of freedom throughout the world is Russia. President Truman has no hesitancy in placing upon Russia the brand of an aggressor nation and the responsibility for the fear of war and the necessity of preparing for full-scale war. He left no doubt as to the course we must follow for our own security and that of the free world.

All of the genius and the energy of the American people must be devoted to the purpose of building invincible power with two possible results in view. One is the possibility that Russia, witnessing this development of strength, may be restrained from taking the risks involved in war. The other is effective resistance if Russia, in an hour of rashness, decides to strike.

The means to the desired ends are familiar. There is to be no departure from the charted course, although Congress is urged to debate the issues in a responsible way, to maintain unity of purpose without any lessening of the vitality of the two-party system.

We bring to the new challenge to our security our traditional assets—moral courage, our sincere concern for the preservation of peace, absence of any desire for national advantage, and a production capacity unequaled by any nation on earth. There is no reason why we should retreat before the threat of world conquest by Russia.

President Truman demolished the specious reasoning of those who still cling to the delusion that we can become an island to ourselves, made safe by two oceans and island defense lines. With the continent of Europe under hostile control and its mines and fields and industries producing for Russia, our own survival would hang delicately in the balance and, at best, our economy and way of life would be transformed. We cannot, either as a matter of honor or of expediency, throw our allies to the wolves, regardless of whether they are in Europe or in Asia.

In its general outlines, the Nation's program for the crisis remains unchanged. Basic is the accumulation of the strength which alone impresses the aggressor. The President concedes that the members of the North Atlantic Alliance, including the United States, have not been sufficiently effective in preparing for war.

Europe is a part of our own defensive system. It must continue to be helped in the building of its defenses. In Asia, freedom is equally sacred and must be safeguarded. Korea remains as a tragic symbol of both the danger to freedom and the obligation to defend it.

It was to be anticipated that issues concerned with war and security would be of transcendent importance in the President's message. It dealt also with such domestic issues as improved agricultural laws, labor laws to "make sure that we have steady production in this emergency, housing, the training of doctors and nurses and the needs of elementary and secondary education."

The message dealt adequately with the demands of the crisis. It is to be hoped that it will have the effect of causing the American people to close ranks in the face of the effort by the Russian Communist dictatorship to take over the world step by step.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the question of United States foreign policy, entitled "Giant in a Snare," appearing in the current issue of Time magazine.

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

GIANT IN A SNARE

Despite the skill, authority, and sincerity of the participants, the great debate on United States foreign policy still rang hollow. Through last week all sides had been more clear and forceful about what they didn't want than about what they did want. The "internationalists" warned of the dire consequences of losing allies, and the "isolationists" of the dire consequences of trying to save allies. Nobody held out any happier hope than averting the worst. There seemed to be no architects of foreign policy around—just building inspectors.

On every wall calamity teetered: Korea, the strained United States budget, laggard Western European defense, the danger of German rearmament, the weakness of the Middle East and Africa, the limitations of United States atomic bombing, the possibility of atomic attacks on the United States. No doubt the inspectors were right. Disaster lurked in all these places, and in others too. The United States horizon, however, could not be ringed with nothing but catastrophe. Some of that smoke was in the eyes of the beholders.

THAT HELPLESS FEELING

Odd, perhaps unparalleled in history, was this obsession with danger by leaders of a nation as strong as the United States. The beaten and the besieged naturally think in terms of survival, not of opportunity. For them, there is good reason to forget that, in human affairs, to concentrate on survival is an almost sure way not to survive. No such excuse is available for the unbeaten, for those with wide freedom of action, for those who stand at the summit of power and responsibility. The United States still stands there.

Five years ago, none doubted the United States strength. Now doubts are everywhere. No neighborhood saloon lacks a master strategist who can prove that the United States is helpless against the Reds in Korea or Indochina, or Iran, or France. Such calamity-howling Clausewitzes are twice as thick in the Senate as in the saloons, twice as thick in the State Department as in the Senate, and twice as thick in the Pentagon as in the State Department.

Has the relative strength of the United States in the world changed that much in 5 years? Actually, communism has made two—and only two—major gains; the atomic bomb and China. These two gains, great as they are, do not cut the United States down from the world's first power to impotence. The United States has made some gains of its own during the past 5 years. Basic national unity has never been stronger. Mounting production has benefited all sections of the United States people (not a conclusive argument for capitalism, but certainly a timely reminder that capitalism is not finished). United States grants have helped put Western Europe on its postwar feet. And the United States has finally made up its mind about communism, which it had not done 5 years ago.

The United States is still a giant. What makes it feel helpless? The answer might be to find what is wrong with the great debate.

THE ABSENTEE PIED PIPER

In recent decades, the United States has taken more and more pride in not wanting much from the rest of the world. It gives thanks that it is not as other great powers were, exploiters, conquerors, oppressors. In the case of the United States, the boast is not altogether pharisaical. Nor is it altogether virtuous. The peculiar history of the United

States accounts for its lack of drive to dominate other lands. It expanded by picking up (rather easily) almost empty areas on its borders. Its rise is a story of internal growth, which now shows no sign of slackening—thus confounding the European economists, both Marxist and conservative, who are certain that industrialized nations must reach out for foreign markets. For better or worse, United States business just hasn't reached out.

The United States also lacks another kind of drive that has marked some great nations. Having absorbed on the basis of mutual tolerance the people of so many lands and creeds, the United States has not and cannot have a master-race complex or a lawgiver complex.

Nevertheless, the United States is very much in the world. The made-in-America tag is on the revolution of mass production that is disturbing the world far more profoundly than the reaction of Soviet communism. Two hundred years ago, only a few individuals could achieve material comfort. After the industrial revolution, only a few nations could achieve it. But the techniques of mass production unleashed by the Americans 40 years ago promise comfort for all—and the promise is an honest one, technically redeemable. This promise runs through the world (especially through Asia) like a Pied Piper, leading men to drop ancient ways of life and follow it. But the American is not on the ground to organize the energy released by this promise. Neither hope of profit nor love of domination takes the American to the spot. He is content to be a Pied Piper on television.

The Communist, however, is on the ground; he leads those lured by the absentee Pied Piper back to misery and slavery.

The United States, without meaning to, has let loose the most dynamic force in the world. The United States cannot silence the Pied Piper of progress. It can only try to redeem the promise of his pipes.

Failure to understand this at home and abroad frustrates the making of United States policy and accounts for both the wave of antiforeign sentiment sweeping the United States and the wave of anti-American sentiment in Europe and Asia.

THE HAND WASHERS

Though foreigners would gasp to hear it, the American thinks of himself as a stable, passive element in a disturbed world. The foreigner knows better: He knows that America is a prime mover in the world's convulsions. When the American takes a step in international economic affairs the non-American, who does not understand the peculiar United States economic background, suspects him of hypocritically looking for profit or trying to impose the American way of life. Similarly, the United States from time to time gets into these unreal great debates over internationalism versus isolationism, because the American is caught between his own feeling of passivity and the dynamic reality: That Americanism is a highly explosive force acting on the world.

Thus the great debate of 1918–20 frittered out in an ignominious United States withdrawal from responsibility. The great debate of 1933–41 was getting nowhere when it was adjourned—but not really settled—by Pearl Harbor. Even before that war was over United States leaders at Yalta were washing their hands of responsibility. They agreed to lines that excluded from United States influence millions of Poles, Czechs, Germans, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and Chinese. Franklin Roosevelt, who grew up in the tradition of the high-walled American citadel, wanted to call World War II "The Survival War."

The symbol of the citadel, the wall, the defensive line, dominates the thought of even the most thoroughgoing American internationalists. The American does not see himself leaping the seas, like the Athenian or the Briton, to bring order and progress to distant lands, and from there look on to other distant opportunities. When the American leaps the seas he digs a ditch. He makes a perimeter and says, "Don't step over this."

This accounts for an ingrained habit of United States foreign policy makers: Drawing loops on maps to show what we will hold. Last week the United States political air was fuller of loops than a Wyoming rodeo. Secretary Acheson had the biggest loop, although it was frayed and limp and the knot kept slipping. It went around Western Europe, but maybe not Germany, and maybe not Spain, and probably not Africa. A separate strand encircled Greece and Turkey. All of Secretary Acheson's friends agreed that Iran should be inside the loop, but nobody was doing much about putting it there. India was probably inside, although it had not been persuaded that it ought to be. China, including Formosa, never had been there. Japan was. Korea wasn't until the Communists attacked it, and then it was and now most of it isn't again.

Ex-President Hoover's loop is smaller. It leaves out continental Europe, takes in England and Formosa and Japan. Ex-Ambassador Kennedy's takes in only the Western Hemisphere.

Instead of a big loop, Senator TAFT has a lot of little loops, each protecting an island. Senator TAFT even has some doubts that Malaya, which is only about 200 miles across and has some 1,000 miles of coastline, can be protected by sea power. No reasonable American will argue against Senator TAFT's main thesis that the United States should emphasize its sea and air power. But TAFT's definition of sea power is the most modest since Noah's. The British Empire, based on sea power, managed to hold secure great land masses as much as 1,500 miles from salt water, because the British regarded the sea not as a moat, but as a road.

THE BORDERERS

The citadel or loop mentality also explains the present confusion at Lake Success over what to do about the Korean War. The trouble goes back to the drafting of the UN charter. UN's goal should have been to establish and maintain international justice. Instead of this bold positive program, UN's goal became the prevention of aggression, narrowly defined. Aggression, for instance, did not include the undermining of one state by the arms and agents of another state, as in the Chinese civil war. It meant only the crossing of a border by the official army of the aggressor.

The North Koreans were defiant enough to transgress even this restricted legal loop. The UN instantly reacted. But when MacArthur was chasing the Korean Reds toward the thirty-eighth parallel, an outcry arose that showed how deeply the border-crossing fetish had sunk into the western mind. MacArthur, it was held, would himself become an aggressor if he crossed the parallel in pursuit of the criminal force.

Here was a conception brand new to the long and fruity annals of jurisprudence. Under this conception, if the policeman finds that the dagger has penetrated the victim's flesh, it is permitted that he seize the criminal by the wrist and force him to withdraw the knife but he may not take the dagger away, much less arrest the criminal.

At the time, the UN did not fall for this—quite. But worse was to come. As MacArthur approached the Chinese-Korean border, some of the border-minded began to howl as if the whole Eighth Army was marching up their spines. Then the Chinese poured over the border—but that did not count because it was not official; the Chinese Communist Government said that there was nobody killing Americans in Korea but us volunteers.

Since then, the Korean war has been well looped up. There was the heroic and brilliant loop around Hungnam, and the less brilliant one around Seoul, and next, apparently, will be a loop around Pusan. Perimeters, however, even brilliant and heroic ones, have only two military purposes: to get out of and to move forward from. Where is the United States going to move from its Pusan perimeter (or from any of the other perimeters drawn by the participants in the great debate)?

THE NONPROVOKERS

When its forces were hit in Korea, the UN reacted as no law-enforcement agency ever had before. It politely invited the Chinese Government to come to Lake Success. Then appeared the unforgettable General Wu the only man in history (so far) to have the exquisite pleasure of telling a world organization of 60 nations representing 1,845,000,000 people to go climb a flagpole. General Wu was not much interested in borders, loops, or perimeters. He placed his government in the vanguard of "all the oppressed nations and peoples of the East," who are strugling either against foreign rule or their own governments. He clearly implied Chinese Communist help to the Reds of Japan, Indochina, and the Philippines.

General Wu's country is flat on its back. It has no heavy industry and not enough food for its people. But Wu, unlike the participants in the United States great debate, did not seem worried about his country overextending itself. He was looking for opportunities, not for survival. What's more, the free world's analysts conceded to China a very good chance of making good on Wu's threats to Japan and southeast Asia.

Since then, the UN and the United States have totally ignored the plain military and political opportunity to hit lawbreaker China in the flank with air and sea power. To do so would be to cross the border of China, just seized by a gang of cuthroats who have no respect for anybody else's borders. The UN has been concentrating on the danger of provoking the Communists. Judging by the Communist reaction to UN politeness, nothing provokes a Red as much as nonprovocation.

Another factor inhibiting action against the mainland of China is that it is not included in anybody's conception of the free world's citadel, or perimeter, or loop. In other words, the loops do not keep the enemy out; they keep the forces of the free world in.

The United States seems to be trying to adjust to the world as it is, instead of leading the world where it wants to go and striking at the enemy who stands in the way. As long as the United States is passive, every specific problem from Indonesia to France is "impossible." If the United States takes the initiative, most of the problems will be seen as opportunities. The closest Secretary Acheson has come to recognizing this is to say that the United States is trying to create "situations of strength." But a situation of strength needs to be used to create new and greater situations of strength.

SAMPLES OF ACTION

Here are some specific examples of how the passive United States attitude paralyzes policy:

Item: The Berlin airlift was a heaven-sent situation of strength. The United States accepted the gratitude and enthusiasm of the Germans, made no real effort to develop these into permanent assets. The airlift has become in German minds just a sentimental folk memory, like Santa Claus. Everybody is in favor of Santa Claus, but how many divisions can he raise?

Item: Marshall plan aid to France (as to other countries) created a magnificent situation of strength. The passivists stood back and admired it, a monument of American generosity, and made no effective political use of it. United States policy in France has failed and is still failing to get what the United States wants—a France that can

and will defend itself. A weak-kneed French Government is the obstacle. Weak-kneed United States policy actually supports that Government.

Item: Greatest situation of strength of all is in the Anglo-American alliance. This endures but it does not advance. At the moment, it is beset by suspicion and recriminations on both sides of the Atlantic. The British hang back because they cannot see just what, if anything, the Americans are trying to do.

Item: Spain is anti-Communist and has the largest army (372,000) in Western Europe. It guards the Mediterranean and is a bridge to Africa. The passivists ignore Spain because it creates no crisis. If Spain had a Communist revolution, the country would suddenly seem all important to Washington. But as an asset? No interest.

Item: Iran stands between the Russians and the Middle East oil they would like to have and which Western Europe must have to live. The passivists look sadly at Iran's internal weakness and shake their heads. That is not the only way for an American to look at Iran. Last month a Time correspondent talked to United States engineers in Iran. Some spoke in glowing terms of a future in which Iran could support 50,000,000 people and be a breadbasket for the whole Middle East. One said, "Damn, I wish I were 35 instead of 55. Then I'd have 20 good years left in me to see this country bloom the way our own West has done." A man who can look at poverty-stricken Iran and see the Imperial Valley of California in the future obviously has not got his mind on mere survival or perimeters.

OPPORTUNITIES EVERYWHERE

No matter how long or short the loops on the map are doodled, they will never be the right size for a United States fire brigade to put out all the fires the enemy can start on them.

The United States and its allies, however, have the power—if they have the will—to move forward and build up the strength and resolution of the anti-Communist world. Who can draw a loop around that world? It runs up to the iron curtain. It runs behind the iron curtain. Scores of millions belong to it in Poland and in Hungary, in China and in Russia. All of them are potential allies. All of them are opportunities.

Sermon by Rev. John T. Jasper on "De Sun Do Move"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last week the President and other Government officials attended a morning service in a local Presbyterian Church to pray for peace. That evening at the Statler Hotel a similar service was led by the Reverend Billy Graham, of North Carolina.

Implicit in those services is the Christian faith that if God could help Joshua and the children of Israel in their efforts to possess the Promised Land, He can likewise help the true believers of the present age to achieve the goal of peace.

But one difference between Joshua, when he appealed to the Lord for help and some of us who now appeal to Him for help, is the fact that in Joshua's mind there was not the least doubt about the ability of the Lord to render help, even to the extent of commanding the sun to stand still in order that the children of Israel would have more daylight in which to win a complete victory.

In verse 12, chapter 10, of Joshua, we read, "Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gideon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon'."

That incident in the history of the children of Israel furnished a theme for a powerful sermon by one of the greatest Negro preachers the South has ever produced, John Jasper, of Richmond. My father as a student at Richmond College heard John Jasper preach his famous sermon, "De Sun Do Move."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Sunday, December 31, in which that famous sermon is discussed.

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

"DE SUN DO MOVE," JOHN JASPER'S DEFIANT CLAIM, IS RECALLED IN ANOTHER YOUNG PREACHER'S THESIS

(By Betty Sessler)

One Sunday in 1878 a Negro preacher, powerful in voice and build, told his people that the sun had moved and proved it by the Bible.

That sermon was to become one of the most controversial ever delivered in Richmond. The Reverend John T. Jasper, a former slave, whose great oratory and conviction in God was known far and wide, preached it 253 times before his death in 1901.

"De Sun Do Move," which also showed that the earth is square, is coming into its own again.

For the first time in 40 years, the sermon, supposedly in the dialect as Jasper delivered it, has been reprinted in book form. Taken from a book by William E. Hatcher, it has just been published by Dietz Press.

And a young minister, whose own life in some respects parallels that of John Jasper, has written his bachelor of divinity thesis on the eloquent preacher of the nineteenth century.

AS A STUDENT, HE SHINES

Isaac James, a 36-year-old porter at Hotel John Marshall, has been working his way through school most of his life. Ever since grammar grades, shoeshining has helped him gain an education. Last June he received his bachelor of divinity degree from Virginia Union University.

At present, James is assistant pastor at Sixth Mount Zion Baptist Church, the same church that Jasper founded in 1887 at the height of his fame. But, as in Jasper's earlier days, James' preaching activities are not full time. He still works at the John Marshall on weekdays.

Also, like his predecessor, James is a tall man with a strong voice. Jasper was over 6 feet; James stands 6 feet 3.

Here the resemblance ends. People who heard Jasper say that his conviction in God transcended mere grammar—that his whole being became a burning flame. But Jasper was poorly educated and his grammar bad. James is a college-trained man.

In the thesis on the man he admires, James uses Immanuel Velikovsky's Worlds in Collision to indicate that Jasper might have found some support today in his contention that the sun had moved.

JASPER'S CITATIONS

Jasper said, and James has rewritten the sermon without dialect:

"Joshua showed in the sight of all Israel that the sun do move because he stopped it; that proved that the sun was moving and moving over Joshua and the Amorites and, of course, they were nowhere else than on this here earth; and consequently it was moving around the earth and after the battle was over, it began moving again in its regular course. There it is proved that the sun do move around the earth."

[The Dietz version quotes Jasper as saying "I doan't read when it wuz dat Joshwer hitch up an' drove on, but I spose it wuz when de Lord tol' him ter go. Ennybody knows dat de sun didn' stay dar all de time. It stopt fur bizniz an' went on when it got thru. Dis is 'bout all dat I has ter do wid dis pertic'r case. I dun sho'd yer dat dis part uv de Lord's word teaches yer dat de sun stopt, which show dat he wuz movin' befo' dat, an' dat he went on art'rwuds. I toll yer dat I wud prove dis an' I's dun it, an' I derfies ennybody to say dat my p'int ain't made."]

"Now the great fact of the sun's rotation may be illustrated by many powerful texts in the Bible. I shall confine myself to the most striking ones.

"Notice Malachi, chapter 1, verse 11, and that comes from God's own mouth and there can be no better authority than God's authority. With His own lips He said, 'For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name shall be great among the Gentiles.' What strikes us here is that the 'sun do move.'

"And take Ecclesiastes, first chapter, fifth verse: 'The sun also riseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to His place where He arose.' There's evidence that He arose"—

And so on.

CONCERNING THOSE "CORNERS"

From Revelations, chapter 7, verse 1, Jasper said: "And after these things I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any trees. Now the four angels that stood on the four corners of the earth are an evidence that the earth is square, and not round, for anything that has four corners is not round but square."

[From the Dietz version: "I envite yer to heer de fust vers in de sev'th chaptur uv de book uv Reverlasuns. What do John, und'r de pow'r uv de Spirit, say? He say he saw fo' anguls standin' on de fo' corners uv de earth, holdin' de fo win's uv de earth, an' so fo'th. 'Low me ter ax ef de earth is roun', whar do it keep its corners? Er flat, squar' thing has corners, but tell me whar is de cornur uv er appul, ur a marbul, ur a cannun ball, ur a silver dollar.

["Ef dar is enny one uv dem furloserfurs whar's been takin' so many cracks at my ole haid 'bout here, he is korjully envited ter step for'd an' squar' up dis vexing bizniss. I here tell you dat yer karn't squar' a circul, but it looks lak dese great scolurs dun learn how ter circul de squar. * * *"]

In explaining the sermon, James points out that Worlds in Collision, of recent publication, gives scientific justification for many heretofore unexplainable events in the Old Testament. Dr. Velikovsky, the author, spent 10 years in research on the book, during which time he studied excavated history, the ancient texts, the folklore, and the sacred writings of people all over the world.

Says James, the author "has marshalled facts to prove, for instance, that the sun did stand still while Joshua routed the foe, that rivers did turn to blood, and that the waters of the Red Sea rolled up on one side.

"He also points out that our planet now rotates from west to east. Ancient charts, however, seem to suggest that this was not always so. The change in the direction of the earth, as well as the other cataclysmic happenings in the universe were caused, the author suggests, by another planet or comet coming too close to the earth."

James adds, however, that Velikovsky does not say, as Jasper did, that the sun moved. Rather he states that the earth slowed down on its orbit, causing the phenomena recorded in the Bible.

"De Sun Do Move" shocked many of the colored ministers in Richmond. The Reverend Richard Wells, pastor of the Ebenezer Baptist Church, led a group which denounced Jasper and his theory very bitterly in a letter in the Richmond Dispatch. The Reverend Wells expressed concern over sermons on "the sun running around the earth and the earth standing still."

Jasper answered the attacks firmly. In the following Sunday's sermon, he said, "I'm not afraid to speak what I have to say, if I was going to be killed for it 2 minutes afterward. I stick to the Bible. I have taken nothing from it and added nothing to it."

The minister preached the sermon 253 times, "journeying to Charlottesville, speaking before the Virginia Legislature, which adjourned to hear him, and making a brief and not too successful trip to the North."

According to James, "De Sun Do Move" is considered by churchmen one of Jasper's weakest sermons. Unusually long, it ran 90 minutes. The first part was exceptionally dull. The text selected, "The Lord God is a man of war; the Lord God is His name," had little bearing on what Jasper was to say later. He used the sermon to prove God had power over the earth and sun and could do what He wished in regard to the elements.

The sermon was preached after one of Jasper's members and another man had brought the question to him. The two had been discussing whether or not the sun moved and could not settle it between them.

JASPER'S EARLY LIFE

John Jasper was born July 4, 1812, in Fluvanna County, the twenty-fourth child of Philip and Tina Jasper, who were slaves on the plantation of the Peachy family. His father sometimes conducted funeral services for slaves. Later John was transferred to Williamsburg.

In 1825, at the age of 13, Jasper was sent to Richmond and hired out to Peter McHenry for a year. He then worked for a year for a Dr. Wooldridge in Chesterfield County in the coal mines. The next year he returned to Richmond and was hired out to Samuel Cosby to work in a tobacco factory at Sixteenth and Cary Streets. He worked there for 6 or 7 years.

Following Cosby's death, Jasper went to work for Samuel Hargrove, a member of First Baptist Church and a deeply religious man. He later had a large influence in Jasper's life.

About this time came Jasper's first marriage which was annulled. He wed three other times, the second marriage ending in divorce and the third in death of his wife. His fourth wife survived him.

In his early life Jasper was described as living a gay and reckless life. He was popular with the women. There was no indication that he was inclined toward religion.

JASPER'S CONVERSION

James explains that Jasper's twenty-seventh birthday coincided with a celebration for the Fourth of July and all factory workers were given a holiday. In the midst of festivities in the Capitol Square, Jasper was seized with a conviction of his sins. For several weeks he fought the feeling and suffered from despondency.

Following the conversion, Jasper became a preacher but still was a slave. Illiterate until the conversion, he was taught to spell by an old slave named William Jackson and made rapid headway in reading the Bible. He could recite it almost word for word. The Bible, says James, became the source of all his knowledge and final arbiter of all his judgment.

Slave owners wished their slaves to be Christianized but insisted upon supervision by white preachers. Jasper first became known as a funeral preacher. Those who invited him to preach had to pay Hargrove $1 for each day he was away from the factory, with the exception of Sundays.

One time Jasper was invited to preach in Henrico County. Upon reaching the place, he was informed that he could not preach because of his race. Dr. Winfree, who had invited him, stated he wanted Jasper to preach and would stand the consequences of the law.

The white preacher also invited to participate, however, was so shocked to learn he was to share the pulpit with a Negro that he consumed 2 hours of the 2½ hours allotted for the service, leaving little time for Jasper.

James reports that people sat patiently during the first long talk. Jasper then spoke for 15 or 20 minutes, and greatly moved his audience. He was invited to preach many, many times after that.

FREEMAN AND PASTOR

Before the outbreak of the Civil War, Jasper was called to the Third Baptist Church in Petersburg to preach, on the third and fourth Sundays of each month. Under the law, however, he could not be an ordained minister; so a white man had to be named the official pastor of the church.

The end of the Civil War brought freedom for Jasper, but he was broke and jobless. For several months he worked on the streets of Richmond, cleaning bricks and helping with reconstruction.

He again was called to the Petersburg church, and a year later went to Weldon, N. C., where he organized the First Baptist Church, still in existence.

In 1866 Jasper came back to Richmond to start a church among his own people. The first was a shanty on Browns Island in the James River. Nine members of the church paid him $9 a week. People from all over the city came to hear him preach, and hundreds were baptized in the waters of the James.

Jasper moved his church several times, once to a stable and once to an abandoned carpenter's shop. Finally he found a church at St. John and Duval Streets, large enough to hold 300 people. The building had belonged to Presbyterians who sold it for $2,025 when the neighborhood changed from white to Negro. The debt was paid off in 3 years.

The membership grew so fast that in a short time an annex, costing $5,050, was built in the rear. As soon as the debt was paid the old part of the building was remodeled at a cost of $1,200. That debt, too, was paid off in a hurry.

Even this building was inadequate. When Jasper was more than 70 he started building a new church on West Duval Street at the cost of $20,000. This was Sixth Mount Zion Church, finished in 1890. The church had a membership of over 2,000.

Jasper died on March 31, 1901, the same day the old Jefferson Hotel burned down. Hundreds of people attended his funeral. Among those heard at the service was the Rev. W. E. Hatcher, a white minister from whose biography of Jasper the Dietz printing is taken.

So well known was Jasper that groups of all kinds paid their respects. According to James, Dr. F. W. Boatwright, chancellor of the University of Richmond, recalls that so many Richmond College men attended his services that the nickname "Jasper" was given to all ministerial students at the college.

The Strong Right Arm of Air Power—Report by Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the able and energetic Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, spoke at a regional meeting of the Aviation Writers Association held at the Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex. It was appropriate that Mr. Zuckert should have spoken before such a group, and in the great State of Texas. Texas is an air-minded State and a defense-minded State, and it is represented in this Congress by defense-minded men. The junior Senator from Texas, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, heads the "watchdog subcommittee" of the Senate Committee on Armed Services that is set up to find flaws, if any, in our spending program. The gentleman from Texas, Congressman GEORGE MAHON, is the chairman of the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations that screens the request for funds of the military services. No one ever questions the defense-mindedness of men of Texas.

There are many Air Force installations in Texas, and a number of important items of Air Force equipment are made in Texas. The big B–36, which carries the Sunday punch of our Air Force is made there. The B–36 is the intercontinental bomber that can deliver the retaliatory counterattack if an enemy dares to strike us. It is the backbone of our strategic Air Force which is our best hope of survival.

Mr. Zuckert spoke at Waco on December 2, at the end of the week that had seen the battle turn in Korea and the forces of the United Nations begin their withdrawal. It was a week of tension and of fear. It was the beginning of a grim period.

It is late to say what should have been done, but not too late to recognize what we must now do. The Air Force budget for the fiscal year 1951 is $14,000,000,000. This is more than the entire defense budget for the last fiscal year.

What this money will buy the Air Force is a start toward the fulfillment of the 84-group program. In the words of Mr. Zuckert:

This budget request provides for the procurement of the most modern planes designed to equip the Air Force. Even in last year's budget 31 percent was allocated to aircraft—47 percent of the new budget is given to aircraft and related procurement. Fifty-six percent of all our funds will go into

all the major procurement needed for our job.

Our 1950 budget provided for the ordering of 1,251 planes for about 1.3 billion. Under the new program we will have slightly more than five times that amount of money or 6.6 billion new money for aircraft and related procurement; more than the total Air Force budget last year.

Mr. Zuckert went on to name other items in the Air Force budget that are just as important as aircraft procurement. There will be 651,095 military people in the Air Force by June 30, 1951, in comparison with 411,277 on the same date this year. Paying them will call for an increase of 50 percent in the budget for that purpose.

There is a fivefold increase in the budget for industrial mobilization—for industrial studies and production tools.

There is a hundred-percent increase in the budget for research and development programs.

The sound principles of cost control through management control, established by Mr. Symington and Mr. Zuckert and maintained under the leadership of the new Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter, will serve the Air Force well in meeting problems presented by an increased budget and a rapidly increasing Military Establishment. It is the job of the Air Force to make every tax dollar count. Only by doing so can we make up for lost time.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all Members of this Congress may have the opportunity to review Mr. Zuckert's able presentation of the Air Force budget, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As Mr. Zuckert said:

The Air Force has not been deluded by Korea. Korea is neither the test nor the major problem. The Air Force knows that strategic air power is still the hope of survival. The great need is to be poised against the major force.

Maintaining that posture of readiness places on all of us tremendous responsibilities, Mr. Zuckert pointed out:

As individuals and as groups we must be willing to place less emphasis on our ideas about economic security; security now must be measured in the fundamental terms of life, liberty, and protection.

The remarks by Mr. Zuckert are as follows:

No other week in recent history has been as crucial as the week which draws to a close tonight.

We have watched three vital focal points: Korea, the United Nations, and Washington. Being in the latter city, I have felt the tension, known the dangers, and feared the worst.

We are in what we can call, without in any way being trite, a grim period. It is a period we have seen coming, you and I. But too many refused to admit 2 years ago, a year ago, or even 6 months ago, that it would come.

It is now upon us.

But we are not helpless. Certainly the week now ending has made even the most blind among us realize our danger. It has, even though that fact may have been forgotten in the hours of concern, brought us closer together.

It has given us a unity that, so very unfortunately, we apparently only reach in times of disaster, in times of danger. A unity which, if we could achieve it in untroubled times, would drive this Nation forward to the greatest period of wealth, prosperity, and happiness ever achieved in modern civilization.

It is ironic when you recall that just about 9 years ago we were plunged into World War II—9 years ago next Thursday. Think of that. And think, too, that this war has been over more than 5 years. Yet today we find we are in the same position, in many ways, as we were during that war.

And in one most important way we are in a position much more perilous. During the war we had a recognized enemy, we could vent our anger and channel our strength against that enemy. We were locked in combat, and that combat was the test as to whether we, and our way of life, would survive.

But in recent days we have been bounced around like a rubber ball. We are built up to one crisis, then we are lulled; we bound, then rebound.

And the hard cruel fact is that we may be in this position for 10, for 20, yes, even for 25 years.

We find no peace.

Yet you and I and all other people in this country still have faith. The same faith that inspired those men 9 years ago to fight on—even when so often outnumbered.

Lacking faith we would have, long ago, made one of two simple choices: either to blindly say there is no threat to our way of life and live accordingly; or, admitting the threat, immediately strike at its heart with only our fear for provocation.

Having faith we choose neither of those courses. Instead we have begun to build our strength and at the same time explore every possible avenue which might lead to peace; avenues which, during the last few weeks, have become fewer.

Our faith, however, has kept the most important peaceful means of achieving peace open to us, the United Nations. And, during the year which is coming to an end, we have seen the United Nations take long strides toward becoming a determined, quick-acting force for world peace.

We have learned, with a finality which should serve as a guidepost for generations to come, the fallacy of what Defense Secretary Marshall calls the feast and famine cycles in our military strength.

We are now paying the price of the post-World War II famine. And the price will not be painless and, as we look to Korea, we know it isn't bloodless.

The price, sacrifice, in blood and in dollars and cents, will go up—not come down.

We have, thankfully, refused to allow the Korean War or even the catastrophic Chinese situation to take our eyes from the focal point of world unrest. We know, and the evidence is ample to bear us out, that Communist Korea would never have started its aggression unless it had been needled by an imperialistic power bent on world conquest.

We know today that we are facing a real menace. It was this that brought forth the supplemental budget request of the Defense Department announced by the President this week.

The request to Congress asked for $18,000,000,000. Of this the Air Force's portion is approximately a little over $4,500,000,000. This brings the Air Force budget for the fiscal year of 1951 to $14,000,000,000. This is more than the entire defense budget for the last fiscal year.

As you are vitally interested in air power and the Air Force, I know you want to know what this Air Force request means.

In fiscal year 1950, we had 48 groups. Today, because of the Korean emergency we have additional groups in operation, plus, as was revealed in Washington yesterday, a program for 68 groups by the end of fiscal year 1951 and 84 groups by the end of fiscal year 1952.

This budget request provides for the procurement of the most modern planes designed to equip the Air Force. Even in last year's budget 30 percent was allocated to aircraft—47 percent of the new budget is given to aircraft and related procurement. Fifty-six percent of all our funds will go into all the major procurement needed for our job.

Our 1950 budget provided for the ordering of 1,251 planes for about one and three-tenths billions. Under the new program we will have slightly more than five times that amount of money, or six and six-tenths billions new money for aircraft and related procurement; more than the total AF budget last year.

Because of this comparison the budget request for aircraft procurement may seem high, but compare the rate of output under this program with 1944, during the height of World War II. In that year we were turning out eight to ten thousand planes a month; deliveries for all of last year would have been less than a week's production at the peak World War II rate. Under our program, if it is approved by Congress, the output will still be only a small percentage of the World War II figure.

The other items in this Air Force budget are just as important as aircraft procurement. The total 1951 budget, including the new request, contains a 40 percent increase for pay and allowances for Air Force personnel, necessitated, of course, by our growth. We will have next June 30, 651,095 military people in the Air Force compared with the 411,277 with which we started the fiscal year in July.

We cannot overlook the fivefold increase in 1951 budget for industrial mobilization. This breaks down into two parts: industrial studies and production tools.

The industrial studies are an integral part of the development of any modern industry or of any modern air force, it is, to phrase it simply, necessary planning for the contingency of an all-out mobilization. What will X number of factories need to turn out Y number of turrets, guns, or life rafts? We cannot plan for Air Force development while ignoring the capacity and the capabilities of the industries upon which we must depend.

And we cannot, certainly, ask them to assume the task of appraising their potential based on our own needs. We must help them with their planning and their development. We will have to concentrate on our tooling. Some special-purpose tools take 2 to 4 years to build. If we were forced into total mobilization next September or a year from September, we could not, overnight, build these tools. As for our general-purpose tools, our tool reserve saved from World War II cannot meet our plans.

Now we will have a start on building them. If they are never needed, will anyone condemn us for having been prepared? If they should be needed—and had not been ordered—what then?

We are in much the same position with our research and development programs. The budget for the current fiscal year, including our latest request, increases our spending on research and development by more than 100 percent over last year.

This is because air power, as you know, is in a peculiarly fast moving phase: the phase of jets, supersonic speeds, electronics and atomic warfare. Research is advancing into fields undreamed of a decade ago.

I have been talking about specific items. Now I'd like to say just a word on the overall budget. We have devoted a lot of time in the Air Force since 1946 toward better management of our resources. We are going to continue to work to make every tax dollar

count: We are, with all the training and ability at our command, going to make up for lost time.

The burden will be so great that we must drive ourselves to make sure that every dollar spent buys a dollar's worth of protection.

Let us not overlook that the money we are to be appropriated does not include funds for arming our allies under the Military Defense Assistance Pact. There are still policy problems to be settled at the international level before we will know the cost in dollars and cents.

Even with the evolution of the military assistance program we should not lull ourselves into a false sense of security. Even if our allies, or our potential allies, were fully equipped, fully trained and fully conditioned, psychologically, the defense of this country would still be primarily our job.

We must never forget that we can never match the hordes of communism, man for man. What we must do instead, is to make up for quantity with quality.

A program of this magnitude and I have talked mostly about the Air Force part of it—places tremendous responsibilities. As individuals and as groups, we must be willing to place less emphasis on our ideas about economic security; security now must be measured in the fundamental terms of life, liberty, and protection.

We will have to call upon more men and women for Government service, both in uniform and out of uniform. We are going to have to call for the help of more and more able men on specialized jobs. I don't need to tell you how hard it is to get the right men to fill even jobs that carry the prestige of Presidential appointment.

But, just as important, in many instances, are the jobs on down the line. We need ability in supply, we need it in maintenance, in procurement—we will need outside help particularly in the many activities on the business side of the Air Force.

Modern warfare has made obsolete the day when 50,000 men could go to battle with only a skeleton force of civilians completing the military structure behind them

The very complexity of modern war, the very rapid change of weapons, demands the highly trained men and women in the factory, at the planning board and untaping the red tape around the stacks of paper work.

We need them, if I may repeat myself, as part of our drive to make up for quantity with quality.

On this same subject I'd like to pay tribute to a couple of fine men from this great State of Texas. The first is your junior Senator, LYNDON JOHNSON. Under Senator JOHNSON'S hard-hitting leadership the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is already doing a wonderful job finding the flaws in our spending program.

This may seem strange coming from me. After all, I'm one of the men who, in the end, has to take the rap for some of the mistakes the Senator's committee uncovers, and will uncover.

But I can't duck responsibility. We can't delude ourselves; certainly some of the mistakes Senator JOHNSON'S committee has turned up are too ludicrous to seem believable.

There have been mistakes, there will undoubtedly be more. But as far as it is humanly possible they will be avoided and, once pointed out they will be corrected.

The Air Force today, the whole preparedness effort is too big to be perfect. Every week, I and a lot of other people have to make decisions which add up to millions and millions of dollars, often under terrific time pressure. Sometimes we make mistakes; sometimes we act on other's mistakes.

Because of this a committee such as Senator JOHNSON'S is invaluable. Our Government was built on the system of checks and balances; during this present defense emergency the Johnson subcommittee will, I believe, prove to be a worthy successor to the Truman committee, a great money-saving check and balance.

The other Texan I'd like to mention along the same line is Congressman GEORGE MAHON. He is the hard-working and quietly efficient chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which screens the request for funds of the military services. We respect, and his fellow Members of both Houses respect, his vigorous fairness born of his wholehearted desire to make our country strong at the least possible cost.

I would like to touch briefly on some particular phases of the work of the Air Force in Korea. From General MacArthur on down the Air Force has been praised for its all-out effort. Without Air Power we would have been pushed into the sea during the early days of that struggle.

That is not my statement. That is the statement of military men on the scene—men in services other than the Air Force.

Today we have evaluation teams on the scene to determine how well we did our job.

If these teams report mistakes, we'll accept their recommendations. The Air Force is flexible in its leadership and thinking, it can change and bend with the situation. It can move quickly to adopt new and better methods.

There has been criticism of tactical air support. But even many making criticism fail to realize tactical air support is divided into three phases: Air superiority—the air has to be cleared of the enemy so our fighters can live; interdiction of the battlefield; the cutting off of supply and communications. This is something the average front line infantryman doesn't see—because it happens in back of enemy lines—but it is what saves lives, and wins wars.

And finally, the third phase, which is, close support. That we do too. And we think we have done a good job of it. There are a lot of infantrymen in Korea who have said so, too. We believe that when the full report on our job is made the country will say "well done."

The Air Force has not been deluded by Korea. Korea is neither the test nor the major problem. The Air Force knows that strategic air power is still the hope of survival. The great need is to be poised against the major force

A strategic air force with its atomic threat is our greatest defense factor today.

There is not now—nor is there in the foreseeable future—a sure, push-button defense for this continent. To say that there is would be false—and being false—it would be dangerous. We are constructing the best defense that research modern electronics and aircraft can buy. Our best defense is the strong right arm, the potential striking power of strategic air represented by the B-29, the B-50, the B-47 to come and the B-36 made here in Texas.

Nothing has happened in Korea to change that fact.

In conclusion let me voice a warning. I may not have been too optimistic tonight—but these are not optimistic times.

I must say this. There is no easy way out.

Right now we are only buying time.

How long we have to buy time, none of us here in this room knows.

If this were the war we might speculate. We could say, "Well, if we can gain objective X, then the war won't last more than 3 months or 6 months after."

We are deprived of the luxury of speculation.

The test, then, is whether we are willing to keep up the pace without the war to keep the pace for us.

With the help of God and the unity of our people, I feel that it can be done so that men may be free in a world without fear.

The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

I. KOREA

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, President Truman had authority and power under section 2 of article II of our Constitution to order American troops into Korea. The power given to Congress in section 8 of article I of the Constitution to raise and support armies and to make rules for their government and regulation undoubtedly authorizes Congress to limit the use of troops, especially through restrictions on the expenditure of funds appropriated for their maintenance and their transportation, but there were no such limitations imposed by Congress prior to President Truman's sending of American troops into Korea. The President's obligation and liability for national security as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces necessarily leaves to him the matter of determining how far he must go within his powers to fulfill that obligation unless so limited by Congress.

The action of the North Koreans in sending armed forces across the thirty-eighth parallel in June constituted aggression in violation of agreements to which the United States was a party and President Truman could consider his action necessary to stop such aggression.

The lack of adequate logistical preparation for his move and the subsequent moving in of Chinese Communists did not cause his original move to exceed his power.

II. EUROPE

Unless Congress places restrictions and limitations on the use to be made of the Armed Forces of the United States before additional troops are sent to Europe the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces undoubtedly has power to send additional armed forces to Europe even though he intends them to operate there as part of a great international army. His part in building a large armed force in Western Europe in advance of aggression may be considered by him as necessary under his responsibility for our national security, especially in view of the comparative size and strength of Russia and her method of operation.

III. WAR

The power of Congress extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of a war with vigor and success, except such as interferes with the command of

the forces and the conduct of the campaigns—*Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 2 139); *Swaim* v. *United States* (165 U. S. 553).

Calling the war in Korea a police action should not change this principle.

IV. PUBLIC OPINION

Whatever remonstrance is made by Congress or the people against any decision made or action taken by the President within his lawful powers can only serve to influence him in his further decisions as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. The exercise of such influence by Congress and by the people can be far-reaching and quite effective and the views and the influence of the people are generally sound and very helpful. But there have been some noted results of the exercise of such influence that were not helpful in building our national security, for example, the rapid demobilization of our Armed Forces at the end of World War II and the rapid disposal of our supply of arms and ammunition in the years following. The error of judgment by the people in 1945 however should not be considered as proof that the people are today wrong who advocate withdrawal from Korea and concentration on the more rapid and extensive building of our Armed Forces. Be that as it may, the power to make the final decision is the President's and he can either accept or decline to accept suggestions.

V. AUTHORITATIVE VIEWS REGARDING PRESIDENT'S POWER

There has been surprisingly little authoritative writing on the matter of the power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces but I gathered together a few statements of interest and included them in my debate in Congress on the proposed compulsory service legislation, August 14, 1940. I shall here repeat a portion of my 1940 discussion in the hope that it may be helpful to those who are interested.

Charles Warren, in his book The Making of the Constitution, at page 530, makes the following statement:

On August 27, 1787, another power suggested by the committee was granted to the President, without debate (so far as appears from Madison's notes) that of "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States." Such a power had been vested in the State governors in practically all the State constitutions; and in some the governor had few powers or functions other than military.

The foregoing statement explains why they did not debate the matter very thoroughly in the Constitutional Convention. So going back to the Constitutional Convention you cannot find any very great light on the division of power between the President and the Congress in the matter of national defense. The wording of the Constitution, of course, is quite general.

The annotations of the Constitution of the United States have few references therein to discussions by our Supreme Court of the peacetime power of the President. In some of these cases the statement is made that Congress has the power not only to raise and support armies and to make rules for their government and regulation but to declare war and that it has therefore the power to provide by law for carrying on war. The Court in these cases states further that the command of forces and the conduct of campaigns are powers derived from the Constitution, but inasmuch as neither is defined by that instrument, their extent must be determined by their nature and by the principles of our institutions. The Court states also that the power to make the necessary laws is in Congress and the power to execute is in the President, and each includes all authority essential to its due exercise "but neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President"—*Ex parte Milligan* .4 Wall. 2, 139 (1866)); *Swaim* v. *United States* (28 C. Cls. 173, 221 (1893), affirmed 1C5 U. S. 553 (1897)).

Prof. Edward S. Corwin, on the President's control of foreign relations, states:

I conclude that the Presidential power under survey (the right to perform acts of war without congressional authorization where the question is as to his right to take measures which are technically acts of war in protection of American rights abroad) is somewhat analogous to the so-called right of self-preservation at international law. Theoretically the power is a defensive power and reserved for grave and sudden emergencies. Practically, the limit to it is to be found in the powers of Congress and public opinion.

Elihu Root, in a famous debate in the Senate in 1912, made the following statement:

In my judgment, there is no law which forbids the President to send troops of the United States out of this country into any country where he considers it to be his duty as Commander in Chief of the Army to send them, unless it be for the purpose of making war, which, of course, he cannot do.

Doubtless, Congress could by law forbid the troops being sent out of the country; doubtless Congress has not done it; and I apprehend that any Congress which undertook to do it would find a general protest from the people of the United States against depriving the Commander in Chief of the Army of the power to protect our citizens under those circumstances which exist widely throughout the world, in countries whose governments have not the power to maintain order within their jurisdiction. From time immemorial it has been the practice of civilized nations to send troops into those countries whose governments were too feeble or too ill-organized, too deficient in power to enforce their laws and protect foreigners.

This has primarily to do, of course, with protecting our own citizens abroad.

Prof. Clarence A. Berdahl, in his book, War Powers of the Executive in the United States, has the following to say:

An eminent authority [Elihu Root] thinks that Congress could probably by law forbid the troops being sent out of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of peace; but in time of war the authority of the President is recognized as being absolute as to where the war is to be conducted, whether to await the onslaughts of the enemy and wage a purely defensive war within the boundaries of the United States, or to send the Armed Forces of the United States out of the country to carry on an offensive war in the enemy territory, in the territory of an ally, or perhaps even in the territory of a neutral.

William Howard Taft, in one of his lectures on Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, had the following to say:

The President is the Commander and Chief of the Army and Navy, and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes, gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. Under the Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and the Navy, the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or to recognize its existence. This was the charge made against President Polk in beginning the Mexican War. War as a legal fact, it was decided by the Supreme Court in prize cases, can exist by invasion of this country by a foreign enemy or by such an insurrection as occurred during the Civil War, without any declaration of war by Congress at all, and it is only in the case of a war of our aggression against a foreign country that the power of Congress must be affirmatively asserted to establish its legal existence.

What constitutes an act of war by the land or naval forces of the United States is sometimes a nice question of law and fact. It really seems to differ with the character of the nation whose relations with the United States are affected. The unstable condition as to law and order of some of the Central American Republics seems to create different rules of international law from those that obtain in governments that can be depended upon to maintain their own peace and order. It has been frequently necessary for the President to direct the landing of naval marines from United States vessels in Central America to protect the American consulate and American citizens and their property. He has done this under his general power as Commander in Chief. It grows not out of any specific act of Congress but out of that obligation, inferable from the Constitution, of the Government to protect the rights of an American citizen against foreign aggression, as in the Kotza incident, cited by Mr. Justice Miller in the Neagle case. In practice the use of the naval marines for such a purpose has become so common that their landing is treated as a mere local police measure, whereas if troops of the Regular Army are used for such a purpose, it seems to take on the color of an act of war.

Thus it would be difficult to explain the landing of our Army in Vera Cruz by force as anything but an act of war to punish the government of Huerta in Mexico for its refusal to render what was deemed by President Wilson as a proper apology for a violation of our international rights in the arrest of some of our sailors. This act was committed before authority was given by Congress, but the necessary authority for it had passed one House and was passing another at the time, and the question as to the right of the Executive to take the action without congressional authority was avoided by full and immediate ratification.

In Nicaragua in my administration an insurrection had led to the immurement of American citizens by insurrectos and the threatened destruction of American property. The President of Nicaragua, whom we had recognized and whose minister we had

received, called upon us to protect our own citizens and their property because he was unable to render them the protection which their treaty rights gave them. This led to the landing of marines, and quite a campaign, which resulted in the maintenance of law and order and the elimination of the insurrectos. This was not an act of war because it was done at the request and with the consent of the lawful authorities of the territory where it took place.

Food Is a Weapon of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in voicing the opinion of a constituent of mine, as well as many of the service clubs of Nevada, urgently contacting my office, I strongly recommend that all possible action be taken to draw attention and action of the administration to the immediate use of surplus food as an important weapon of war.

In time of war, food supplies are one of the most valuable tools for victory. Many wars have been won or lost on the single issue of food supplies. We are told that the Russians have been feverishly storing vast stocks of foodstuffs ever since 1945. And, if we become involved in a great war, the ultimate decision may well hinge on the extent of our reserves of food.

It so happens that our Government, in its tremendous price support and stabilization programs in recent years, has acquired vast stocks of all kinds of foods. We have purchased this food and now own it. Food commodities held in storage by the Federal Government are estimated as follows:

	Pounds
Dried milk	320,700,000
Cheese	106,100,000
Butter	191,800,000
Dried eggs	110,595,296
Beans, dry, edible	942,700,000
Peas, dry, edible	76,600,000
Rice, rough	7,500,000
Mexican meat	52,623,504
Grain sorghum	3,052,500,000

These stocks are spread in a hit or miss fashion throughout the Nation. They exceed food storage capacities and we have the incredible situation in which thousands of tons of grain lie unprotected from the weather and subject to spoilage. We also have the unbelievable situation in which one of the prime sinews of war—foodstuffs—is allowed to stand in great concentration without protection from sabotage. At this time much of this material is not under guard of any kind. Certainly food storage has always been a legitimate objective in wartime, and surely our food stocks will be one of the first aims of Communist sabotage in this country. This material should be placed under guard immediately. The damage could start at any hour.

We have been told that Russia may have the power to overrun much of Europe. Whether true or not, certainly it is the part of wisdom to have large stocks of food in Europe before warfare breaks and before submarine activity may sink much of it en route. This American surplus food might well be stored in Britain, and behind the Pyrenees Mountains in Spain. The outbreak of open warfare, if it comes, will place great premium on shipping space. The saving in time and space of having huge food storage already in Europe would be highly practical. It should of course be properly protected against sabotage and weather.

We are now preparing a vast civil-defense program on a Nation-wide basis. Certainly reserve food storage, using this surplus food, should be a part of this program. The dispersal of this food throughout the Nation would seem wise. The placement of it for use by communities most likely to be subject to attack, or along routes most likely to be used for civilian evacuation would be most timely. It should of course, be protected from the weather, animals, deterioration, and sabotage.

It is vital that we demand that our surplus food supply be protected immediately from sabotage, waste, and deterioration. We must further demand that large stocks of our food supply be shipped abroad immediately to those spots deemed most strategic by our military—not diplomatic—authorities, and given the same protection before mentioned. We must also demand that large stocks of our food supply be shipped and stored under protection in those areas of our own Nation deemed by our military authorities to be most likely to be subjected to enemy action, or to be used as routes and staging areas in possible evacuation of large elements of our population. Food as a weapon of war must be taken into consideration in our program of defense.

The Good Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is mentally refreshing and invigorating in these days of national and international stress and strain, when so many persons are voicing complicated procedures by which we may be able to escape from the dangers lurking around us, to be able to read an editorial direct from the grass roots of American thinking—an editorial so simple and fundamental that it can easily be understood and appreciated by all, and, an editorial which presents a most constructive way by which the people of America can protect their priceless heritage in the enjoyment of our inherent freedoms.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Eagle Valley Enterprise, Eagle, Colo., of January 4, 1951:

THE GOOD LIFE

For the first time since the American Revolution, with the exception of the War Between the States, the people of our country are faced with a stark test of faith. The conflict with world communism now is not to save the world for democracy, but to repel an enemy who is determined to destroy in our own land the Christian ideal of human dignity and individual liberty and the political system which upholds that ideal. Our faith and our strength is this ideal.

As a Nation, we came through World War II with little discomfort. Living standards have risen to record levels. So has the public debt, which is exacting its toll in depreciating money. However, it is evident that devalued dollars have not yet cramped our style. Last year, according to the Commerce Department, United States citizens spent a staggering $178,832,000,000. The fabulous American way is well illustrated in a current joke which defines a pedestrian as a motorist who has found a place to park his car. The list of American "haves" could go on indefinitely. Already there are 8,000,000 television sets in our homes—homes which are equipped with tens of millions of deep freezes, refrigerators, electric stoves, radios, washing machines, etc.

In retrospect after nearly two centuries of freedom and the boundless progress that only freedom could have achieved, it would be a wonder if we were not confused when suddenly confronted with the prospect of a fight for actual survival. But the time when we can afford confusion has nearly run out. These words of Lenin, uttered 30 years ago, are to be considered: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment and veiling of the truth."

This is the ruthless concept, backed by vast military force which is confronting America and the world. To meet it we will need more than arms and men. We will have to lay our sights on primary objectives and keep them there. We must forget the adolescent notion that material security is an unqualified right. The rights embodied in the American ideal are few and elemental. They include equality of opportunity, freedom of speech and religion, and the protection of private property. They are the tools with which the individual may achieve life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Our country was not founded to furnish glamorous offices for politicians, or to produce goods and services, or hand-outs of easy money—this country was founded to make men free. In the wealth of material comfort we have enjoyed so long, we have tended to forget the truth—we must return to the fundamental—this country was founded to make men free.

We must fight with all we have against our enemies outside. And, while we are undergoing all the sacrifices and trials that may involve, we must keep our people free. One of the greatest dangers from within is that we may grant so much unlimited authority to the Government that the system of check and balance which stands between us and tyranny will be permanently destroyed; economic controls should be imposed only if they are clearly necessary in the war effort—not control for control's sake, which is the essence of dictatorship. Control only tends to cripple productive capacity, and what is far more important, we will no longer

be a free people, we have lost the battle at home, through our own Government.

We cannot go on under the full Government control which had its birth 20 years ago—the aftermath of a world-wide war—and which has been nourished by the Second World War to be fattened on a third.

We Americans have come to a climactic phase in the history of the good life. It is our duty to hold together for future generations the framework of freedom which made that good life possible. We must push aside our selfish wish for greenback-lined pockets, presented to us by Government dole and return to the initiative of our forebears who established this country on a firm foundation of free enterprise, with the right of self-control.

Result, Minus Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year, by availing myself of a parliamentary device, I delayed for some time an additional appropriation of funds for the so-called House District Crime Subcommittee on the grounds that the chief legal counsel employed by them, a Hyman Fischback, of New York, was not doing a good job and that his past history indicated that he would not do a good job.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Thursday, January 11, 1951, which indicates that my fears at that time have been borne out.

I will have more to say about Mr. Fischback and the results of his alleged crime investigation at a later date.

The editorial follows:

RESULT, MINUS NOTHING

The Kefauver committee investigating Nation-wide crime pays its counsel, Rudolph Halley, $6,066 a year. The special House District Subcommittee which made an abortive investigation into a relatively limited phase of local crime has already paid its counsel, Hyman I. Fishback, $10,000 for services from October 23, 1949, to September 18, 1950.

In addition, Mr. Fischback was reimbursed $1,700 for money spent here on lodging, meals, taxis, telephone calls, and travel back and forth to New York, where he continued to conduct his private law practice. And he has presumably submitted another bill for $5,000 for professional services from September 18 to December 31, 1950, when the subcommittee made its report.

The Kefauver committee has smoked out a good many of the notorious underworld leaders and will send some of them to jail for contempt, if nothing else.

The Davis subcommittee smoked out a lot of warmed-over statistics and a goodly crop of platitudes about District crime conditions.

It quickly dropped its investigation into gambling when things began to get really hot.

There is reason to believe that the loose way the investigation was conducted scared off witnesses who gave confidential information. They backed away when they discovered their confidences had been abused.

In any event, the Davis subcommittee's final report turned out to be nothing but high-sounding double talk.

Net effect of this costly investigation seems to be that police department morale is at an even lower level than it was when the subcommittee first set up shop.

The subcommittee's own laxity is forcefully high-lighted by the slaying of the underworld "finger man," George Paul Harding, in the Hide-Away Club. This was one of the after-hours clubs investigated by the subcommittee as far back as last February.

Police officials admitted at the time that these places were "breeding places of crime." Yet, the subcommittee let 10 months go by without doing anything about it. Then it proposed a law to permit police to deal with these clubs as public nuisances.

That legislation is now before the new Congress, and it will take several months to enact into law.

The subcommittee—if it had been on its toes—could have pushed through such a law last year, and perhaps headed off yesterday's flare-up of gangsterism.

Vital Importance of the Community Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEOGH Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the opening rally for the Good Samaritan Hospital building fund at Suffern, N. Y., on January 4, 1951:

VITAL IMPORTANCE OF THE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

Again and again, we Americans have heeded the sacred injunction that we be our brothers' keepers. Without question, we extend this doctrine to our fellow men of other races and other continents. We expend billions of dollars to sustain and rehabilitate whole nations of men—even those who were but yesterday our dread enemies. How much more ready should we be to do the simple needful things for our families, friends, and neighbors, to give unstinting support, for example, to those institutions which serve our common well-being—and especially our hospitals.

Too often, most of us know too little about our community hospital. Consciously or unconsciously, we may look upon our hospital as a place to stay as far away from as possible. But this is an old-fashioned attitude. All is not suffering in our hospitals today.

The modern hospital's purpose has been extended far beyond the alleviation of sickness or injury. So far, in fact, have its functions broadened that today they range from the prevention of diseases to the rehabilitation of the disabled and chronically ill. They are centers of health in our communities, invigorating the entire population of the areas they serve. It is up to all of us to see that they have everything they need to keep us healthy.

How the principle of preventive medicine works is illustrated by a story I heard recently, from a great author, about a 12-year-old boy who had developed a slight hoarseness, a mild impairment of his voice. The boy, though nervous, seemed perfectly well. At first his parents thought he had merely overstrained his throat shouting at a ball game. They were treating the condition with simple home remedies when, on a fortunate impulse following the suggestion of a neighbor, they took the child to the out-patient department of the local hospital. Here in the friendliest possible way, in a manner calculated to allay his timidity, the young patient was subjected to a variety of highly scientific tests. The diagnosis was serious—it was determined beyond doubt that the boy was suffering from incipient tuberculosis. Fortunately adequate steps were taken immediately and in 6 months he was cured. But for that timely visit to the hospital the infection probably would have spread and taken firm root, with perhaps fatal results.

It is not long since this new concept of preventive hospital care has caught on. Formerly, the hospital took care of the ill and injured who were taken to it. Today, it even takes care of those who haven't the sense to go to the hospital. Through its clinics and in cooperation with the medical profession, it goes out to schools and factories to prevent sickness and accidents. The hospital is, therefore, more than a building. It is a force working for the conservation of life and health throughout a wide area. The well-being of thousands of people and whole communities are its responsibility.

The doctors, the nurses, the latest technical equipment, the instruments of amazing delicacy and perception, the great stores of the modern "wonder" drugs, the numerous laboratories equipped to make elaborate and exacting tests, and last but not least, the faithful service and housekeeping departments are all part of your hospital armament—all important factors in the unceasing battle for your better health.

Better health for all is the goal we should all keep before us. It is the vision which medical progress and our modern hospitals are bringing to the present and future generations. In the glow of this vision, we should all readjust our own personal attitude and think of our own hospital not as a place of fear, not as a hostile stranger in our lives—but as a warm hearth and true friend.

Today, hospitals are also serving our communities as civilian rehabilitation centers. Until recently, the hospital had considered it had done its job for the bed patient when he was discharged and able to go home. The work of restoring him to the best possible health and vigor was left to nature and his family physician. In recent years, hospitals have recognized the need for special equipment and techniques to restore discharged patients to productive living, and, if possible, to their jobs. They are becoming aware of their community responsibilities in this new phase of medicine.

The Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine has approved the following recommendations with regard to the rehabilitation of the patient after his discharge from the hospital:

1. There is a crying need for a community rehabilitation service and center program. Large, highly specialized urban rehabilitation centers are necessary but are not enough, and in order to carry opportunity to the isolated disabled, a system of mobile consultant clinics in rural communities, and similar services must be set up, comparable to those which have been utilized in the care of crippled children and in the cancer program.

2. Certain activities can be carried on in smaller communities using the facilities that are available, but rehabilitation clinics, geographically located, must be established to carry out the specialized procedures that are necessary to the rehabilitation of those severely handicapped.

The best place for doing a direct and effective job of restoring the severely handicapped to usefulness is the modern hospital.

It is ideally equipped to perform the function of bridging the gap from the bed to the job. It can turn patients who formerly would become public charges into self-supporting citizens.

And, if this country is plunged once more into the darkness of war, hospitals located near areas which may be strategic targets for "A" or other bombs will be vital links in the chain of civil defense. Our physicians, our nurses and technicians will know what to do for the sick and the injured. They will be able to care for large numbers from small but properly equipped bases beyond the bombed-out areas. This trained personnel is the most important single factor in defense against the total results of atomic bombardment, but they must have the tools to work with. Therefore, in preparing for the possible onslaught of war, our small city, suburban, and rural hospitals take on more than a local significance—they are vital to the defense of the Nation.

In the hospital the quality of service to all the people is basic. As bricks and mortar do not make good hospitals, neither does a sufficiency of beds. Medicine has come a long way since the "horse and buggy" days. Today a doctor requires the facilities of a modern hospital to give full and proper care. Essential to his work are the hospital's costly laboratory, X-ray, and other diagnostic facilities and equipment. He depends on its trained nurses and technicians. Today's medicine is a tripod. Remove any leg—the physician, the facilities, or the trained nursing and technical aides—and the structure of modern medicine collapses.

Hospitals that serve the small, urban community and the surrounding area bear the brunt of the constant attacks which disease and accident bring upon our population. Upon their number, capacity, and, above all, their quality, the health and safety of a large proportion of our people depend. Victims of acute illness and accident rarely choose a hospital—they go or are taken to the nearest. If that hospital is a good one, the victim has a much better chance of quick recovery.

It is said that every citizen is reached by service of his community hospital at least once every 8 years. It would appear to be good business to safeguard ourselves by seeing to it that the hospital which will serve us when we need it is up to date.

And speaking of good business, it may interest all of you to know that hospitals are our Nation's fifth largest industry. Like all the other leading industries, our hospitals when first established were largely financed by a few people. But even as industry generally is now recruiting capital from thousands of small investors, so have hospitals become dependent upon the gifts of all citizens in order to continue to serve their communities.

Some of you may wonder how I can speak to you with even a superficial knowledge of such a complex subject and one with which I am not usually identified. Well, for the past few years I have been devoting considerable time to the great New York University-Bellevue Medical Center development, a $32,000,000 project which is rapidly becoming one of the greatest medical centers in the world. It has been a good school and a refreshing experience. In the main, however, this center's services are comparable to those of the small community hospital. The difference is one of size and not of quality or scope of work.

If we all agree that what the hospital does for us is worthy and vital and irreplaceable, let us try to do something in return for the hospital. Let us see that the hospital has everything it must have to keep you and me and all those we love in as good health as it is possible to be in this last half of the twentieth century.

The Russian Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as a public service the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., reprinted in the New York Times on Thursday, January 11, 1951, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Russian Fear."

The International Latex Corp. in my opinion, is rendering a valuable service by calling public attention to expressions of opinion on important public issues.

The editorial is as follows:

THE RUSSIAN FEAR

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.)

A man may attack what he fears and destroy it, if he thinks he has the strength to do so.

But even a man who has that strength still does not like to be confronted by what he fears; a person who could easily destroy a mouse still may not like to meet up with a mouse.

There are many signs that what the men in the Kremlin fear most is an armed Germany; apparently they fear that more than the atomic bomb or the industrial strength of the United States. Considering what armed Germans have done to the Russians the fear is understandable.

One of the signs of the Russian state of mind is that they have issued a warning which intimates that they will retaliate against German rearmament; they have not otherwise made any threats to throw their military machine into action.

Our own diplomatic officials seem inclined to minimize the Russian warning. Those who may know the Russian mind better take the warning a great deal more seriously.

Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, who certainly is in position to know how the masters in the Kremlin think, in an interview with the United Press, counsels that the western powers think again on the German rearmament proposal.

The French have similar misgivings. It is true that the French are not enthusiastic about German rearmament for many reasons but that is not to discount their views on the Russian reaction. After all they have been dealing with the Russians both as friend and enemy for some centuries.

The Germans who have lived next door to the Russians for a long time also think the Russians will not stand idly by if rearmament takes place.

Once you know what a man fears you have a lever to move him. You can cause him to act hurriedly and irrationally. You can also by different procedure cause him to back up. Is it not then within the realm of possibility that the Russians would give something not to have Germany armed? We don't know. We do suggest that the idea may be worth consideration.

There are two ideas about the Russian intentions. One is that they mean to attack Western Europe. The other is that they believe their own propaganda which teaches that the non-Communist world will finally explode from its own internal stresses but not before these stresses seek an outlet in an attack on communism.

If the first view is right, that is if the Russians intend to attack, they will be moving shortly and it is highly improbable that the Germans could be armed in time to present any considerable obstacles to them.

But if the second view is right, that is if they expect an attack, we have a great deal of evidence that they might consider an armed Germany the provocation, the final evidence that their theories were indeed correct.

What can be gained from hurried rearming of the Germans we fail to see. The Germans are not ready for it and the United States and its associates are not ready, indeed not fully agreed.

We also fail to see what could be lost by a diplomatic probing operation to determine whether the Russians will trade something for an unarmed Germany and what they will trade.

It may very well be that they will trade nothing, that they are so confident of their power that they believe they can forbid German arming without giving anything in return. But even if that is their state of mind, the situation would still be better in that we would know more about Russian intentions.

The Western World, particularly the United States, has come to believe that the Russians hold all the trumps and that state of mind reveals all the weaknesses and the fears to the Russians. We have come almost to the absurd notion that the Russians have no weaknesses or fears of their own. Of course they have many.

We know that the Russians fear the Germans and we know that they have wholly misjudged the regenerative powers of the Western World.

Is it not possible to exploit the fear to win a truce in which the regenerative powers can do their work?

Repatriation of Army Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the editor of the New York Times on January 5, 1951:

TO REPATRIATE ARMY FAMILIES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

There are many thousand families of service personnel in the European and other overseas commands who not only are in a dangerous spot for themselves but are a liability to the troops who must protect and evacuate them in case of trouble.

They should all be sent home willy-nilly, and many of them are desirous of going anyway, except that they have no place to go. Very few of the service families have any homes of their own. Very few could find space to live with relatives. The majority, if sent home ahead of their "sponsors," or heads of families, would be forced to go into the rental market at a most unpropitious time, and they can ill afford to pay the rents now demanded for the few vacancies available. The result is that they want to remain overseas as long as possible, regardless of the danger to themselves and to the United States troops protecting them.

Since the President has declared a state of emergency and has asked for all-out devotion to the war effort, would it be out of place for the Government to take over a sufficient number of recreation spots and make

ible living space for dependents of per-
l now overseas? Under the usual rule
arging the full rental allowance for ade-
quarters, regardless of the actual worth
apartment, the Government would not
on the deal, the dependents would be
care of within their means, and the
losers would be the wealthy individuals
would be somewhat restricted in their
s of places to play.
at I am proposing is, in effect, the es-
ishment of dependent communities
r Government operation, similar to the
unities in which the dependents now
verseas. These communities would oc-
apartment, court, or hotel space now
only part-time by vacationers who have
ment homes elsewhere. The persons
le to occupy the centers would be fam-
now overseas, who are returned to the
of the interior in order to clear the
eas theaters of noncombatants.
urious quarters and surroundings are
er required nor desirable, but adequate
space is a necessity and should be made
ible by the Government, since it cer-
will never be provided any other way.
nething like this is done, we overseas
anders will be relieved of a tremendous
n and worry.

Colonel, EUCOM.

RSEAS, *December 21, 1950.*

ere New Hope for the People in the Eighty-second Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
ION. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speak-
ere is a courageous editor in the
State of Oklahoma. He is Richard
Jones, of the Tulsa Tribune. In
itorial on January 6, 1951, Mr. Jones
some questions and makes some
nents that every Member of Con-
should read. I commend it to
ttention and insert it at this place
e RECORD:

OUTWIT THE MADMEN OF THE WORLD
(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

ew Congress meets. The people hope.
ovember repudiation of the New Deal
'air Deal rascality must be put into
mance. Our sons must be saved from
rtures of increasing wars through the
ity and arrogance of men who have
ntrusted with our country's fate.
new Congress meets. And the new
ess must know that the American peo-
e tired of being lied to, tired of being
ented, tired of being pushed around,
of taxes, and they are not going to lie
and die. The dilemma we face has
made for us by crackpot economists,
l welfare leaders who have no con-
n of the nobilities and the integrities
alone can establish a sustaining social
e.
impossible for even our bureaucratic
ers to imagine George Washington,
as Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln los-
eir courage and their character in any
conviviality with a Stalin.
y-three billion dollars. We wasted
time of it on the European Continent.
's that they are, the more we gave those
ies, the less they liked us, and they all
ur benevolence to build more powerful
our enemies. Much of our loss of respect by the European nations we attempted to pacify by purchase was due to the fact that what we did do, we did so badly. Our economic bureaucrats were slovenly in their attempted performance of their fuzzy-minded thinking. Fuzzy-mindedness became a popular pastime of those who have professed to be smart, and genuine intellects who were smart enough to comprehend the political fakery were so intimidated they had no courage to reveal the fakes.

So we rocked along with incompetency, and we had treachery, which in many incidences crossed the threshold into treason.

Culture is no more a matter of mathematics, irregular verbs, and parsed poetry than is the alphabet literature. Culture is measured by one's ability to participate in the refinements of human relations. For the last 15 years or more culture has not been the aim of our educators. Youth has been taught to admire men who sneer at nobility and who smear those who comprehend and would conserve our country.

Five years ago not one among us would have ever guessed that our country would meet its first defeat in Korea. Five years ago people would have asked, "Where is Korea?" We bought and paid for a peace agreement with Russia. Russia was to let Korea alone. Russia turned her guns on us in Korea. Russia does not know how to tell the truth, to trade honestly, or to have decent relations with any peoples. Yet she sits in the United Nations with power to veto human rights.

We have turned the new year. A new Congress now sits in our Capitol. We have thrown out a lot of the political fakers who were there. Have we enough Americans in this Congress to save us from the evil forces that we have condoned?

Who would have thought 5 years ago that the hillsides of Korea would be consecrated with crosses to commemorate the total sacrifice of our sons who were placed there by no wish of their own but by the flippant bartering of human rights at Tehran and at Yalta?

And now the political frauds who caused these crosses to consecrate Korean hillsides are trying to throw the blame on Gen. Douglas MacArthur. More meanness. Smear. He wasn't at Tehran or at Yalta. He asked for no backing of our billions to bungle the badly directed Marshall plan. He went into Korea because he was ordered to go there. And when he got there he had no weapons with which to fight. The money that was appropriated to supply those weapons had already been spent in the scandals of Fair Deal corruption. And so, to hide their shame, these bunglers now try to pass the blame to the man who was never permitted to go beyond orders and who, when ordered, was directed by the United Nations. We find its word worthless, its support worthless. We have let Russia make it powerless.

Our Department of State would not let the Chinese Nationalists fight with us. General Hurley could have saved this Korean disaster. But Marshall was sent to take his place and botch it up. So we gave the Reds the green light to make our cemeteries on Korean hills.

The new Congress is handed the accumulated bunk and betrayals to unravel. Some courts seem little impressed with treason. A strong America would have a field day with impeachments. Never did a Congress face a more exacting test than that which met last Wednesday.

Remember Lindbergh? When he visited Russia the iron curtain was not as tight as now. He saw all Russia's factories and foundries busy making war weapons. He came home to warn us. Then our officials began to throw mud at him. Smear patriotism.

Congress meets to cope with the confiscations that have been made on the private purses of the people. We are all going to get our income-tax blanks in a few days. And we are warned that about one-third of our honestly earned income has got to go to pay for the debts of the wars that were made by Roosevelt and Truman. Wars that could have been prevented. Shall we have more preventable wars? Or is there enough character and stamina in the new Congress to save the people from further liquidation?

The fumblers of the last Congress have warned us that we must be cheerfully prepared to accept a lower level of life than has been America's glory for a hundred and fifty years. We lived increasingly better, generation after generation, until Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Hopkins, Alger Hiss, and a lot of exalted "scholars" threw the switch and buried us under an avalanche of taxes. Now we are told to like it because there is going to be a lot more of it. And our colleges are now dishing out that fatality as if a lower level of living were an exalted attainment.

The American people have no will to lower the level of their lives. We need educators who have the intelligence and courage to repudiate such infamies. It is up to the Congress to stop that concession to calamity.

The earth still turns upon its axis. The sun shines and the rains fall on fertile fields. Man's ingenuity has felled forests and tapped mines and scattered seeds on furrowed fields. He has reaped sewing machines, telephones, refrigerators, automobiles. We have shown the world how honest men can live. We have gone far in the material attainments. But we have gone back spiritually. The character caliber that made this exalted life has been smeared, corrupted. Its debauch has been bought and paid for. Paid for by the raid upon the taxpayers of the country.

Those who raid the people's private purses by usurious taxes are the foes of freedom. They are the enemies who are determined to lower the level of our lives.

But we have sent to Congress some men who have told us, "We are not going to lower the level of our living."

Only by sustaining our high level of living can we rid ourselves of our tax wasters in Washington and make again the great spiritual and physical power that the corruptible capitals of other countries will respect and fear.

Only by ever seeking a higher level of life can we hope to outwit the madmen of the world.

Resolution Adopted by Sunbury (Pa.) American Legion Post and Auxiliary Following the President's Declaration of State of Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted by Milton Jarrett Norman Post, No. 201, American Legion, of Sunbury, Pa., and the post's auxiliary, following the President's declaration of a state of emergency:

Whereas on Friday night, December 15, 1950, the President of the United States announced on the radio that he was declaring

a state of emergency to exist in this country, which declaration was made official Saturday morning, December 16, 1950; and

Whereas the 1,700 members of this Milton Jarrett Norman Legion Post, No. 201, of Sunbury, Pa., and the 700 members of the auxiliary of this post, believe it to be part of their duties as citizens to express to the President their loyalty and their desire to be of service to the country; and

Whereas the said post believes that it is necessary to arouse the American people to a full realization of the seriousness of the problems at hand: Now, therefore, at a meeting assembled, be it hereby

Resolved, as follows:

1. The President of the United States should be permitted to assume the leadership of the country and politics and partisanship should be set aside in this time of emergency. In assuming such leadership, the President should call upon the very best qualified citizens of this country, who should be statesmen and leaders of public opinion and not merely followers. Any future recommendations for appointments to public office should be limited to loyal citizens and not those about whom there is any tinge of communism, no matter how small.

2. The scope and importance of the state of emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950, should be made plain to all. There should be a definite statement of purpose of what is to be accomplished and what the leaders of this country are going to do as a definite national policy. Without details, there should at least be a national program that can be understood and followed by all who are willing to do so. If the condition of national affairs is as serious as indicated, every means of communication available should be utilized to emphasize the necessity for an unselfish and patriotic approach to this problem.

3. Our fighting men in Korea should have the complete support of every citizen in this country. No person's individual rights or wishes must be allowed in any way to interfere with the united support that these fighting men are entitled to.

4. It is time to turn to God for spiritual guidance in helping to solve our national problems and the President, as the leader of our Nation, should call for a united religious action in this regard.

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States and to our Senators from Pennsylvania and to our Congressmen from this congressional district, and be made public in the local newspapers.

Stop, Look, and Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, both the Congress and the American people are being confused by the conflicting statements, actions, and policies now coming from the top-ranking officials in the executive branch of the Government.

The Economic Stabilization Director and other administration spokesmen now tell us there will be no temporary or permanent across-the-board freeze of prices and wages any time soon, and indicate the present situation is not sufficiently serious to justify such an action.

The Secretary of National Defense tells us that it will be necessary to draft 18-year-olds, and to increase the period of forced military service to 27 months, as a part of a long-range program of building up our national defenses. Other leaders tell us we will be in a semi-war economy for 10 or 15 years, even though world war III does not come.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder and the President now tell Congress we must quickly enact another new tax bill—and raise at least $15,000,000,000 in additional revenue to balance the budget. It is generally predicted the President's budget requests next week will total at least $70,000,000,000, and probably more.

In the last few months Federal taxes have been increased by an estimated $7,700,000,000. This is in addition to the $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000, or even $25,000,000,000 more in taxes Mr. Snyder wants voted immediately. There is a growing demand for balancing the budget and paying as you go for the expanded defense effort, and, of course, if we are to balance a $70,000,000,000 budget at least fifteen to twenty billion dollars in additional Federal revenue must be obtained. If the budget is higher than $70,000,000,000, and some say that, regardless of what the President's budget message may contain, in the coming fiscal year we will have Federal expenditures of seventy-five or eighty billion dollars; and probably $100,000,000,000 in the fiscal year to follow. Then to balance the budget and pay as you go additional Federal revenues must be raised.

But, with President Truman, Secretary of Defense Marshall, General Eisenhower, and others telling the Congress and the country that it will take a long, hard pull for America and the other free nations of the world to build up their defenses against aggression, and in consideration of the slowness with which the funds already voted for military purposes can be spent, why all the present great rush and haste about enacting additional tax legislation? Why does the Secretary of the Treasury insist that we must hurry so much in levying and collecting new taxes when those in charge of holding down the inflationary trend and the cost of living by controlling prices and wages say there is no need to hurry?

Certainly before a new tax burden of another $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 or $25,000,000,000 is to be added to the $7,700,000,000 tax boost just voted, we should stop, look, and listen and be sure that we are doing the right thing in the right way.

First of all we should attempt to reduce or eliminate every unnecessary governmental expenditure. We should cut the fat out of the governmental structure. We should eliminate every civilian activity not absolutely essential to the health and safety of the American people. We should reduce the cost of our Federal Government to the very minimum. While that is being done, we should attempt to determine what is necessary and what is not necessary in the way of expenditures to meet the national emergency. Once that is done—but not until it is done—can we determine how much money must be raised to operate our Government and to meet the cost of our national defense program.

We should make certain that any tax legislation which is enacted will be in such a form and make only such levies as our economy can stand. A hasty, ill-conceived tax bill can easily wreck our national economy and do irreparable damage to our productive capacity and our national defense effort. We must not enact tax legislation which will interfere with, rather than benefit, our main objective—a strong national defense.

Before Congress acts on additional tax legislation, we must know for a certainty what further levies on individual and corporate earnings can be made without destroying incentive or lessening our productive capacity—for there is a limit on the tax burden any people can long pay or carry. We may find, as the majority floor leader of this House, Mr. McCORMACK, pointed out, that we cannot raise sufficient Federal revenue from income taxes on individuals and corporations, but will be forced to consider some sort of Federal manufacturers' or sales tax, or some method other than the income-tax plan to raise the revenues we need.

But certainly, above all else, this Congress has no moral right to increase the tax burden on the American people again and to compel them to make greater sacrifices unless the Federal Government itself first proves its good faith by eliminating every needless expenditure. If we are to have an austerity program for the American people, we should have an austerity program for the Federal Government. We should not increase taxes just to give the tax spenders more tax money to spend, but only to raise the funds absolutely necessary for the defense and security of those to whom this country and this Government actually belong—the more than 150,000,000 citizens who together constitute the United States of America.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor on the Justice for Poland radio series:

It is now completely clear that there can be no justice for Poland as long as it is kept behind the iron curtain.

In all the long history of oppression of the Polish people during the bitter years of occupation by the Russian czars and the German emperors, never were they so enslaved, never were they so cut off from the free world as they are today under the smothering dictatorship of communism.

I am thoroughly convinced that the people of Poland, in whom the spirit of freedom and

liberty has always burned brightly, cannot and will not submit indefinitely to the rule of their Communist oppressors. I am confident that whenever the opportunity presents itself, the Polish people will throw off the yoke of dictatorship and again seek the freedom and independence which is their right and their ultimate destiny.

Of course, right now there is very little the people of Poland can do to regain their freedom except to keep their hopes alive, and to maintain their moral and spiritual integrity against the onslaughts of Communist propaganda. Especially is this true of the younger generations who are compelled to attend schools where they are indoctrinated with Communist teachings which sneer at religion, make a mockery of human freedom, and glorify Soviet criminality.

In fact the only chance the imprisoned people of Poland have of learning the truth is from outside broadcasts which they are forbidden to listen to and from letters they receive from friends and relatives who have escaped from the iron curtain and are now living in exile in America and in the free nations of Europe.

It is therefore of the utmost importance that the exiled citizens of Poland never give up fighting for freedom for their beloved land and give encouragement to their countrymen at home to keep their faith and hope for eventual justice.

According to information received by the American Federation of Labor on conditions within Poland today, information that comes to us from secret but reliable sources, Polish workers are indeed enslaved to the Soviet war machine.

In the past, the American Federation of Labor had many opportunities to meet with and to work with the representatives of free Polish workers at international meetings for the advancement of labor standards and living standards throughout the world. We were deeply impressed on every occasion by the progressive policies and liberal viewpoint of organized labor in Poland. But today those leaders have been killed, imprisoned, or forced into exile, first by the Nazi invaders and then by the Russian oppressors who succeeded Hitler as the rulers of Poland.

As a result, Polish workers today have no free organization to represent their interests. They are compelled to work at jobs assigned to them by the puppet Communist government, at wages fixed for them by that government, and they have no voice in determining their own working conditions.

Of course, the Communists brazenly declaim that under their regime the workers are the masters. They even require the workers to belong to unions. But it should be emphasized that Communist unions are not free trade-unions. They are not unions freely chosen by the workers to represent them. The unions are imposed upon the workers by the Communist regime. Instead of defending the rights of the workers, the unions are used to police the workers and to enforce harsh discipline on any individuals who do not live up to the prescribed conditions.

A simple illustration of the effects of such perverted unionism can be found in comparing the workday in Poland with the standard prevailing in this country. In America the law says that workers cannot be required to work more than 8 hours a day, unless overtime is paid. In Poland, the law says workers must work at least 8 hours a day before they can be paid at all. The emphasis, you see, is completely reversed. Working conditions under Communist rule are just the opposite to what they are in a free land. Free workers, represented by free unions, decide for themselves the conditions of employment they will accept. But enslaved workers, herded into Communist unions, are told what conditions they must conform to under threat of heavy penalties for violation.

Those penalties are so dreadful that I hesitate to describe them. We have received detailed information on the forced-labor camps maintained by the Communists. Millions of captive human beings, whose only sin is unwillingness to bow down to Communist dictatorship, are consigned to those camps where the most brutal conditions prevail. The unfortunates who occupy the forced-labor camps rarely live long. They are killed off by hunger, by cruel punishments, and by sheer overwork.

The workers who manage to satisfy their masters and escape being sent to slave-labor camps have little to show for their hard work. Wages are pitifully low and living standards far below what the free world regards as decent; nor is the production of Polish workers being used to rebuild Poland or to strengthen its national economy. Most of the manufactured goods and farm products are siphoned off by the Communist dictatorship for use by Soviet Russia's war machine in its mad quest for world conquest.

Today even those nations which once were duped or intimidated into accepting Communist propaganda at face value now realize how counterfeit it is. By fomenting war while preaching peace for others, the Communists have exposed the cruel purpose behind their hypocritical mask. The whole free world is uniting against them.

Therein lies the greatest hope for the advent of justice to Poland. The Communist dictatorship cannot survive without constant transfusions of new wealth and new production gained from military conquest. As the free nations of the world unite to resist Communist aggression, the prospects of additional acquisitions to the Soviet orbit by revolution or military intervention become nullified.

In my opinion the Communist regime, if forced to rely upon its own production, wrung from unwilling workers, is bound to crumble and fall apart before too long. The defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet Union is a portent of what will happen in the future. When the time comes, the people of Poland, too, must be ready to liberate themselves from the Moscow noose.

Today Stalin is still able to suppress justice for Poland by sheer power. But the Polish people will never be converted into substituting communism for their faith in God. They believe, as they always have believed, in a God of justice, a God of mercy, an everlasting God who tramples the tyrants of a moment into the dust.

The free men and women of America and their compatriots in exile are praying today with the oppressed people of Poland that God, in His wisdom, will soon help them to overturn the tyrants and regain justice.

Criticism of Our National Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, every mail brings a number of letters to my office from people scattered all over the United States, and especially from my district, in which is expressed a sincere desire on the part of the public that Secretary Acheson be relieved of his position as Secretary of State, and that if President Truman should not see fit to request the resignation of the Secretary of State, the President be impeached on the grounds of incompetency or dereliction of duty.

Criticism of our national leadership is heard on all hands, and from people of all political faiths and religious convictions. The following letter from one of my constituents of Tulsa, Okla., is illustrative of the sentiments expressed in hundreds of letters I have received on this subject and to the same effect.

I quote the entire letter of my constituent to the benefit of those who may read the same. The letter follows:

Recent world developments seem to me to to be of such serious import that all Americans who are truly concerned with the welfare of their country should consider themselves under obligation to convey their thoughts relative to certain aspects thereof to their representatives in Congress with a view to urging them to use their best efforts to place our country in the strongest possible position to survive the crisis which is now upon us and which will undoubtedly assume vastly graver proportions in the not too distant future. Accordingly, I respectfully submit herewith for your consideration the following thoughts relative to certain conditions in the conduct of our national and international affairs which I believe place us in a disadvantageous and very dangerous position:

1. Our national administration continues to use units of our Navy to prevent the armies of the Chinese Nationalists on the island of Formosa from making an invasion on the Chinese mainland to oppose the Chinese Communists. How can it be anything but utter foolhardiness to withhold our permission for the Nationalists to undertake such a venture and for us not to give them every assistance possible in transporting their troops and equipment to the mainland for such an operation? Our present policy is in effect rejecting the material assistance of a willing ally and is actually using our fleet to assist an enemy who is now exacting a heavy toll in American lives in Korea.

2. The present Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, by his part in helping to place the Chinese Communists in power, by his espousal of the policy above-mentioned in item 1, and by numerous similar instances has raised serious doubts in the minds of his countrymen as to whether or not he recognizes communism as the enemy to all free countries which it obviously is. Mr. Acheson's motives are obscure, and it is difficult to understand if he is, in fact, a loyal American. In any event, he has lost the confidence of a great majority of the American people and refuses to take action which obviously is called for at the earliest possible moment for a firm handling of the Communist attacks in Korea and elsewhere. It is our opinion that if the President cannot be persuaded to remove him, action should be brought to impeach him.

3. Our policy in the United Nations and in regard to our principal European allies is still too soft spoken and too tolerant of deals, compromises, and appeasement in dealings with Communists. Our representatives should be instructed to state before the United Nations and to the several governments of Europe that this country does not regard this as a suitable time for them to continue "business as usual" dealings with Soviet Russia and Communist China, and that if they expect our assistance in defending their own countries against Communist engulfment, they must so demonstrate immediately by suitable actions, which in addition to the immediate withholding of any additional supplies to the Communist aggressors would also be pointed toward the immediate arming of their countries to the fullest extent of which they are capable.

4. The half-hearted and insufficient efforts toward rearming our own Nation should at once be superseded by complete mobilization, including activation at the earliest possible moment of the industrial capacity necessary to support an all-out military effort.

Doubtless you are receiving similar letters from many other loyal Americans who are sorely disappointed with our national leadership at this critical time and who are looking to our Congress to see that our Government will take steps necessary to insure our survival as a free people. I feel sure that we can count on you to do what you can to place the actions of our Government once again on a basis of sanity and honor.

Truman Incorrect—Canada Does Not Have Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message last Monday, President Truman made the following claim: "Our North Atlantic treaty partners have strict systems of universal military training."

This statement is seriously misleading.

Our North Atlantic treaty partner, Canada, does not now, and never has had, universal military training.

Our partner, little Iceland, has no military organization whatever.

Mr. Speaker, misleading and distorted statements of fact are often found in political speeches. But it is deeply regrettable to find such inaccuracy in a state of the Union message, where every line is most certainly checked and rechecked for factual accuracy. I am constrained to believe that the President was not aware of the deceptive nature of this passage in his message.

Address of Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States defined the opposing world forces as those believing in a moral code and the individual dignity of man on the one hand; and on the other, those who look upon man as a mere, soulless component of the material universe. This broad definition is excellent because it excludes the narrow view that only Christians have a moral code. We Christians who have studied the ancient origins of our faith are appreciative of the great religious concepts which our Christianity borrowed from some of the more ancient religions, among them the great concept of the one Almighty God, which was and is part of the Jewish religion.

It is therefore logical that great Jewish leaders should see in the dialectics of materialism preached by Marxian Communists a threat to their ancient faith. This has recently been so eloquently expressed by Rabbi Dubin, of Los Angeles, that I should like to include in our RECORD a letter of transmittal from Mr. Harry M. Warner, one of California's most distinguished citizens, and a copy of excerpts from a talk of Rabbi Dubin, which Mr. Warner has been kind enough to send to us:

WARNER BROS. PICTURES
DISTRIBUTING CORP.,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1950.
Hon. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YORTY: On behalf of Mr. Harry M. Warner, president of Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., I am happy to present you with a recording of an address delivered by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin, of Los Angeles.

Mr. Warner was so inspired by this patriotic anti-Communist message that he wants to make it available to all America if possible. He especially wants every Government official and legislator to hear it. A copy of the text is enclosed for your convenience, but we hope you will listen to the recording as the delivery adds to the power of the message.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge this directly to Mr. Harry M. Warner, Warner Bros Pictures, Inc, Burbank, Calif.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. DORSEY.

CONDENSED VERSION OF TALK DELIVERED BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN, WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TEMPLE, BEFORE THE CONGREGATION ON ROSH HASHANA, THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

Last night we ushered in the new year. In Jewish life this period is called the Yomin Neroim, the awesome days, the days when the fate of the individual, so Jewish tradition tells us, is determined by God for the entire year.

It seems to me that there is a Yomin Neroim atmosphere, an awesome days atmosphere, for the entire civilized world today, but the fate of all civilization lies in the balance trembling and mankind is awaiting the decision.

Now this is not the place and there is not time to detail all the mistakes that the democratic nations and peoples made during the past 5 years since the war ended. But I do want to consider with you one of them, because it is the crux of the problem.

The first and the most fatal error that the democratic world made was our absolute failure to understand the true meaning of communism and the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia. We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality. We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for law and order that would have respect for its international promises and commitments and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands.

We Jews knew from the outset that all those statements and claims made by Soviet Russia were not true. We Jews knew the truth about the Communists and about Soviet Russia and we knew it through years of bitter experience and pain and blood and suffering and terrible horrors. We paid a bitter price for that knowledge. We know that the Jews of Russia, the millions of Jews who lived there when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals, they were sent out to Siberia, and they died—by the hundreds of thousands—because the thing for which the Jews stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia.

We knew the truth, but no one listened to us. When the Jews, during the rise of the Nazis, told the world that the burning of those synagogues in Germany was only a prelude to that which eventually led to the bombing of Westminster Abbey and the other English churches, nobody listened to us. So no one listened to the Jew when he warned the world against the aims and the ambitions of Soviet Russia. We warned the world even during the honeymoon period when Russia was working with us, not an ally—she never was an ally—we just happened to have had the same common enemy, that's all; we warned the world to be careful and to be wary, but no—we were just a voice crying in the wilderness. So Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word, we had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. And what was the result? We are facing it now. Russia violated every promise to the Western World. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world, and poisoned the minds of millions of peoples against their native governments.

Well, 5 years too late, we of America realize and the world realizes the bitter mistake that was made. We have to rid ourselves, to rid every aspect of our lives, social and political and industrial and economic, of the Communist infiltration

So we are at the brink of momentous days, you and I. The destiny of a world is in the scales and no one can tell of a certainty what is going to happen.

Officially, we are not at war because Congress has not said there is a war. But, factually, there is a war at this moment. There is a war, Russian-inspired, Russian-led, Russian-equipped, in Korea. Right now on Rosh Ha-Shono morning when I am talking to you, boys of this congregation—I know of two who are at this moment in battle with the marines in Korea—American boys are dying, newspapers are carrying casualty lists, homes are being broken, hearts of parents are being torn. Reserves are being called.

We are at war, and that war is being waged on two fronts. I am not concerned so much about the war in Korea if it does not spread, and, please God, it may not spread. That does not worry me very much because I know that that front is going to be cleaned up before long. But there is another front, the home front, and that front worries me. Because on this home front war has been declared on us by Soviet Russia. And that has to concern us. And it has to concern every man, woman, and child in America. Because you see, my friends, the whole character of war has changed. Wars are no longer fought only on the battlefield; and wars are fought not only by men, and yes, even women in uniform. You and I who are not in uniform, you and I today are just as much in the service as though we actually wore a uniform. Wars today are fought at home. Wars are fought in the laboratories, wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze, her aim is to sabotage, her aim is to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

In the days ahead you and I have to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going to be asked

to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing and if you do not know, ask. There are Government agencies to enlighten you.

Remember that this terrible scourge that we call communism must be stopped wherever we are going to meet it. And in that connection we have a twofold duty, you and I. We have a duty to our country, to America—and we have a duty to our faith, to Judaism, and to our coreligionists as Jews, and to all faiths, whatever they may be.

I returned recently from 3 months abroad. You have heard Americans returning from abroad recite the trite, the very trite words, but nonetheless true words, that America is the best, the most fortunate land in the world. And it is. Both materially and spiritually, there is not another land in the world as fortunate as America. The best proof of that is that people everywhere abroad, no matter where one goes, want to come to America.

Everyone wants to come here and few people want to leave America. Your best proof of that is that whenever a Communist agent is ordered to be deported from America to Europe, listen to the fuss that he makes about going back to his paradise of a homeland. He doesn't want to leave, he wants to remain here.

Now, here in America labor is better protected and better treated than anywhere else in the world, even in Socialist England. Labor enjoys more governmental benefits in America than it enjoys in Socialist England. That irks Russia, because Russia is supposed to be the fatherland of the proletariat. Russia is supposed to be the land where the working people have everything, Russia, and not America. Therefore Russia does not like us. For that reason every person who loves America, every person who makes a living here, every person who enjoys the way of life that is America, must protect it in the danger that now faces it.

As for the Jews, let us not forget this, my friends: That wherever Communist Russia has come to power, Jewish life has been destroyed. There is not a vestige of Jewish religious, economic, social, or cultural life left in Russia today, not a vestige; and even in Moscow the Yiddish daily, Heint, which was nothing but a Yiddish translation of Pravda, has been eliminated. Yiddish writers have been sent out to Siberia. There is not a vestige of Jewish life in Russia today, and those few Jews who have been able to steal out from behind the iron curtain in Europe—from Rumania and Hungary and Czechoslovakia and all the rest of the Balkan countries—they tell us that the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated behind the iron curtain by the Communists.

Now, remember this: Should—God forbid—the horrible thing happen and communism spread its influence over this country, then I say to you that the American Jewish community, which is today the largest, the most influential, the most powerful Jewish community in the world, will go down and will be destroyed even as have been the Jewish communities of Europe.

Therefore, for these reasons, we must be on guard. We must pledge ourselves to wipe out communism wherever and whenever we find it, even if it means cutting deep into our own family and social circles. My friends, there was in Jewish life, particularly amongst the orthodox Jews in days gone by, a weapon that was used to control the community. It is a weapon which, of course, we of the liberal Jewish group do not have and never have had, but it was a weapon in Jewish life. It was a weapon that was so horrible that even those who watched it being inflicted in the synagogue were terror-stricken, not to speak of the one who was subjected to that weapon. It was called the charem—ex-communication. So we, today, must take a page out of the book of those old Jews and apply that same weapon, that same punishment today—the punishment of ex-communication, of ostracism, of complete isolation from the community of any Jew who has become infected with the Communist virus.

The fate of humanity is lying in the balance and the slightest hair may tip those scales in one direction or another. It is a fact—a fact that faces you and you and you and me every moment of our existence today.

So we pray for life this morning. We pray that God may inscribe us and inscribe our dear ones and inscribe the world in the Book of Life. But there can be no certainty of life, there can be no certainty of a future for any of us if this dread thing continues to go on. It will affect you and you and you and every single member of your family and mine. So we pray to God this morning for life. We pray that this catastrophe may be averted; that untold millions of people may not be condemned to death through the horrors of another war. Grant us then, O God, Thy protection. Grant that this year that we have ushered in may be, for us and for all humanity, a year of life and not of death, a year of peace and not of war, a year of happiness and not of misery. Amen.

Genuine American Sentiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, in the President's address to the joint assembly to the two Houses of Congress on last Monday, January 8, the President appealed to the Congress and to the public at large for unity. He invited debate, but requested every man among us to weigh his words and deeds.

It is my understanding that many of the leading citizens of the country were invited to attend a White House meeting with businessmen and Government officials to be held yesterday, January 11, to discuss problems facing the Nation.

Among those invited to the White House conference of yesterday was an illustrious citizen of the State of Texas, Mr. H. R. Cullen, of Houston. Apparently Mr. Cullen was unable to attend the conference. Instead, he addressed a letter to the Honorable John M. Steelman, Assistant to the President, under date of January 3, 1951, and it is my understanding that Mr. Cullen furnished each Member of Congress and many of the leading newspapers of this country a copy of his letter. I have heard many of my colleagues say that the letter of Mr. Cullen expresses their sentiments. It is a letter which demonstrates in no uncertain terms what the Members of Congress are hearing from the people in every mail. It is an expression of genuine American sentiments. The letter is timely and should be read by everyone interested in the future of this country and our Government. The Cullen letter follows:

HON. JOHN M. STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEELMAN: I regret that doctor's orders prevent my accepting the invitation with which you have honored me, to attend the White House meeting with businessmen and Government officials on January 11, to discuss problems facing the Nation.

The administration does well to call upon men of affairs of the Nation for counsel in the present crisis, for it desperately needs sound advice. If fact, if there is not a distinct change of course soon, I fear it may lead to catastrophe. Candor impels me to say, however, that I think our best hope in that direction lies with the new Congress, in asserting its constitutional authority and leadership in reference to making war, and wisely restraining the Government from excessive preemption of power.

One of the most urgent needs for the security of the United States is that you restrain the Communist fifth columnists who are working to destroy us and may do so any day in event of a Russian Pearl Harbor. Those who have been convicted of communistic treason are now running loose on technicalities obligingly agreed to by the courts, and are, no doubt, plotting more treason with others in or out of the Government.

At great expense to the American taxpayers, we provided the foreign Reds with a base of spying operations and a sounding-board, in the United Nations. There they have reviled us so violently and so repeatedly, without resistance or restraint on our part, getting world-wide publicity which they could not have gained otherwise, that many people over the earth have come to believe them.

It is time this Government stopped operating in favor of Communists at home, while getting our boys slaughtered by Communists abroad in a senseless fight which the United States entered in violation of the constitutional provision that only Congress may declare war.

Instead of knocking ourselves out fighting Reds wherever old Joe Stalin may decide to set them upon us, why don't we reverse the charges and try playing his game? Why not spend some of our money and effort arming and equipping the anti-Communists who are in the great majority in the countries now under the Soviet heel and thumb? With weapons and supplies which we should be able to get to them, I think we could induce some of the so-called satellite peoples to turn on their enslavers, and thereby promote an upheaval that would put Russia on the defensive, as we are now. Then Russia would have her hands full and would no longer be a menace to us.

We might have more effect against the Chinese Communists, at less cost of American lives, by supporting Chiang Kai-shek's trained Formosa army and his huge guerrilla following on the mainland; and by arming Japan.

These are some of the suggestions I would have respectfully offered at your White House meeting, if given the opportunity, for extricating the Nation from the perilous plight into which the administration's disastrous course has plunged us. If in order, I should be glad for you to read them to the group for consideration, in lieu of my personal appearance.

Because every Member of Congress and every American citizen is vitally interested in the statements that I have just made in this letter, I am sending a copy to all Members of Congress and to our leading newspapers.

Thanking you for the invitation, I am,
Sincerely yours,

H. R. CULLEN.

Bruce Barton Says: "Universal Military Training; We Should Stop, Look, and Listen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 7, 1951, Omaha World-Herald, entitled "Universal Military Training; We Should Stop, Look, and Listen."

BRUCE BARTON SAYS: "UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING; WE SHOULD STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN"

During World War II all of the trustees of New York's privately supported hospitals were summoned to an evening meeting where the Surgeon General of the United States Army told us why the Army must draft our nurses.

We had been warned in advance and, while each of us knew how desperate was the nursing need in our own institutions, we felt there was nothing we could do but go along.

But just before the end of the meeting we were given a big surprise. The commissioner of New York City's hospitals stood up and, addressing himself directly to the Surgeon General, said: "I have no patience with your position. You and your folks are responsible for your own troubles. You won't relax an iota your ridiculous age and educational requirements. Your management is wasteful and devoid of ingenuity or imagination. If you would take a trip through our city institutions and see how we have had to compromise and improvise and adapt our program to the demands of the times, you would be ashamed of yourselves. Go back and do half as good a job as we are doing, and you won't need this draft."

The Surgeon General had no answer. We never heard from him again.

Our military services are inefficient users of manpower. When Russia drafts five men, four of them show up in the fighting lines. When the United States drafts five, one or two of them fight; the others stay behind to wind and unwind red tape, fill out questionnaires, write memorandums, run mimeograph machines, etc.

The services, too, are lavishly extravagant with money and materials. The American people were shocked when Korea revealed that all the billions appropriated for national defense since the war's end had bought practically nothing in terms of planes, tanks, guns, or other fighting equipment. If the generals and admirals had been presidents of corporations the stockholders would have risen in their wrath and thrown them all out. But taxpayers are more tolerant than stockholders, and more lazy-minded.

All of the above is written, not in criticism or hope of effecting any change. War's business is to kill and destroy; and warriors throughout all history have been, and often have to be, careless of money and life.

I am writing simply to ask the American people to stop, look, and listen before they are stampeded into universal military training.

Many wise and patriotic men and women believe UMT is not only a powerful constituent of national defense, but a valuable contribution to the moral fiber of our people. To my mind it means putting the education of our boys, for a year or more, into the hands of men whose professional background is:

Don't question. Don't argue. Don't talk. Don't think. Never mind the cost. Do what you're told.

All I ask is full and free debate—not decision by fear or default, or by manifesto from Washington. If UMT is all to the good, why did so many of our forebears flee from Europe to escape it?

The Spiritual Significance of the World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following sermon entitled "The Spiritual Significance of the World Crisis," by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., Sunday, January 7, 1951:

"For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant"—I Corinthians 7: 22.

I

When I go to church I want to find God. I do not want a reflection of the latest edition of the newspaper or the ideas of the most persuasive commentator. And when I hear a sermon I don't want a "pulpitorial"; I want to hear the word of God. It is to proclaim the word of God that the pulpit is installed. But the word of God is to be interpreted and proclaimed, remembering the injunction of the writer, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The word of God as more than the mere words contained in the Bible are to be proclaimed. To that end this pulpit is established and to that purpose we shall ever be faithful.

We do want to find God in church and we sometimes say, we want peace of mind. There is a peace of mind or more accurately a peace of soul which rightly belongs to the Christian. It is the peace which comes from reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ our Lord. It is the peace which comes because the guilt and condemnation of sin are gone through faith in Jesus Christ our Lord. But there is another sense in which peace of mind would be immoral for the Christian. Should we mean by this phrase, release from striving or emancipation from wrestling with the great problems of our times, we would be denying our faith. Peace of mind in the sense of freedom from concern for the world does not belong to the Christian. Peace of mind as an escape from reality cannot be the possession of the Christian in the tradition of classical Christianity.

It may be that early Christians who were a subjugated people living in an occupied province of a vast empire in whose government they did not participate could for a while be detached from the concerns of their faith as it related to the world about them. Since they had no responsibility for government, they did not bear the obligations of maintaining law and order in any manner comparable to the modern American Christian.

In our Nation, whose roots are in the Hebrew-Christian tradition and especially since they are so largely the product of the Protestant Reformation, we must understand that there are spiritual values at stake in the present world crisis. There are spiritual values which we cherish, which are at the root of our very existence and which are in mortal peril. That we have not always been successful salesmen of these realities to the rest of the world, only emphasizes our need for understanding them and proclaiming them in this hour. The Honorable Charles Malik (not the Russian Jacob Malik), but the other Mr. Malik in the United Nations who is the minister of Lebanon, and a product of Presbyterian missions, has well said in referring to the United States, "If your only export is the silent example of flourishing political institutions and happy human relations, you cannot lead. If your only export is a distant reputation for wealth and prosperity and order, you cannot lead. Nor can you really lead if you send forth to others only expert advice and technical assistance. To be able to lead and to save yourself and others, you must, above everything else, address your mind and soul. Your tradition rooted in the glorious Graeco-Roman-Hebrew-Christian-Western-European humane outlook supplies you with all the necessary presuppositions for leadership. All you have to do is to be the deepest you already are." That is the challenge of the hour. These are not new challenges requiring new hypotheses. The basic need is understanding ourselves and clearly discriminating between our life and the counter forces arrayed against us.

I have raised these issues in such sermons as Freedom Under God, Do We Deserve Democracy, The Church and Military Measure for Peace, and Alternatives to Communism, which have, without solicitation, found their way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in reprints have gone around the world. Too often the church has remained silent when it should have spoken. Pastor Martin Neimuller asserted that the Evangelical Church in Germany remained silent too long and was unable to assist the best citizens of that country in dealing dynamically with moral realities in the last decade. The time is already here when we Americans, especially we Evangelical Christians must realize our peril. It is because I am a Christian and it is because I am an American I want my country in this hour to be a great spiritual bastion. The time is short for the spiritual awakening that is so necessary if we are to take the other physical actions which are imperative. As I understand the conflict of our age, I want to make it quite clear that I would rather die fighting the materialistic, atheistic forces now set against our freedom than to die under it.

II

We are driven by the exigencies of this hour to reappraise the spiritual issues in the present crisis.

Many have become so accustomed to thinking of communism as a Christian heresy which might be made orthodox, that they really haven't understood that it is in fact a heresy. Too many have been blind to the irreconcilability of the two philosophies of life now set in juxtaposition. Some have rightly entertained hopes that the leaders of communism in the world could be converted, radically modified, and thereby restrained in their world program. It is Christian to work for and believe in the conversion of all men everywhere to God in Jesus Christ. To this evangelical mission we must ever be faithful. We must never forsake the divine commission which has been given us. Indeed, conversion of leaders who threaten the peace and well-being

of the world is perhaps our best and almost our only hope of averting disaster. But here we must recognize a practical fact: namely, the inaccessibility of the leaders and many of the followers of communism today on the one hand, and the evangelical zeal of their own ideology with which they confront us on the other hand. The fact that not one in a thousand Chinese know what communism is, and refer to it only as the new order makes little difference in the crisis of the times. The world significance turns on the objectives of the persons in power. Not many hours ago, I spoke with an expert on Chinese affairs in the State Department who confirmed what I had long suspected, that the core of the new leadership in the new order of China is as ardently committed to the standard doctrines of Stalinism as the dictator himself and are increasingly behaving in like manner.

We may be thankful for those who have really appreciated the spiritual significance of the crisis of our age and especially its menace to our kind of freedom. We should be grateful to those discerning men, like John Foster Dulles who as a boy was reared in this church, and Henry L. Stimson, long an officer of this church, for their understanding of the dynamism of communism and the tragic predicament of our age.

III

Let us as evangelical Christians clearly understand the spiritual nature of the crisis. When you read the New Testament and trace the meaning of the Christian life through Christian history, you discover that our kind of democracy is created and sustained by Christian conviction and faith. In the verse which I have set at the head of this sermon, "For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant," it is suggested that the Christian is a freeman only because he has become a servant. He is liberated from the restraints of legalistic religion and legalistic government because he is committed in a higher loyalty to God. He is not free to do as he pleases; he is only free to glorify God. He is free under God's sovereignty. He is a freeman because he is captive to Christ.

"Make me a captive Lord
And then I shall be free."

The familiar hymn puts it.

Men are free on this basis because they are no longer in rebellion against God. Men outside of God require restraints and inhibitions, but men who are redeemed and who live under God can be trusted with their own destiny. They are free because they serve a higher loyalty. They are free only because there is a voluntarily accepted spiritual discipline. This truth is the crux in the matter. You can only have our way of life where men and women understand that it is derived from God.

1. The Christian begins by faith in God. God as a concrete reality, God as a personal being, God who is the sovereign ruler of the universe, who holds all creation in His hands, to whom allegiance is given, and to whom the eternal souls of men are accountable.

Communism rejects the reality of God and substitutes an atheistic and materialistic absolutism. Ultimate reality, communism asserts, lies in matter and matter alone. It teaches that there is no God above the movement and therefore it makes absolute a human finite reality. It capitalizes on the religious spirit, but it would be false to say it is a religion. In rejecting God, therefore, communism has no understanding of the corrupting effect of pride, self-centeredness, and the will to power within it.

2. Christianity proclaims the dignity and worth of individual man. The first thing we say about human nature is that man is created in the image of God, and that although man is a sinner, he may be restored to the dignity of his created state. The freedom which man has is his, not as a personal achievement, but as something which he has as a gift of God through creation. This conception gives Christians a different attitude toward their fellow beings. The only reason for treating other persons with respect and with any rights at all is that they are God's creatures with an eternal destiny. You cannot treat a man as a piece of machinery if you believe him to be a living soul—the creation of God. For the Christian the chief purpose of life is to glorify God who is the creator.

Communism rejects this conception of man and thereby devalues man. Man has value only in relation to and in service of the collective society. The chief end of man is not to glorify God but to serve the state, or some other collective entity. That is why they have no disturbed conscience in resorting to unbridled police methods, liquidations, concentration camps, and the other violations of human dignity which are part of the approved program.

At no other point is the difference so great as in the conception of man. Devaluing man there develops an intense class consciousness, vastly greater than anything we have known in the Western World and in Christian history. The proclamation of the dictatorship of the proletariat is itself an assertion of class consciousness. All other classes are denounced, only those approved by the party are tolerated. In Soviet Russia where this experiment has been tried longest you have probably the most class-conscious area of the world today. Communist propaganda talks about the people, but the people of that world does not include a great many people in this congregation. The people are ultimately limited to those who favor the Communist regime. All opponents, as has been discovered over and over again in the satellite countries soon become known as antidemocratic forces, or as enemies of the people; thus, they do not count. It is this devaluation of man as a person that leads to the tyrannies with which we are so familiar.

A great singer, Mr. Paul Robeson, laments our cruel and un-Christian race discrimination in America, and exalts the Soviet paradise into fantastic heaven which it cannot be. Let us grant that we must make our race relations and other social and cultural relations more Christian, but let Mr. Robeson understand that he has lost all sense of perspective and discrimination. We are at least striving to make our way more Christian and to put justice into our treatment of minority groups. Let Mr. Robeson and others understand that there is nothing in our life which so emphasizes differences of class or race that is in any way comparable to the treatment by Communists of the bourgeois or the capitalists who are hunted like animals and where persons who are deemed unorthodox are terrorized and liquidated and where millions are placed in concentration camps and slave-labor units, simply because they do not agree with the government.

Under that system there is vastly more discrimination between classes than there is under our way of life. We should recognize also that although communism professes a philosophy which says, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need" there is a greater differentiation between people in Russia than between peopl. here. During my visit to Russia before the war, I was amazed to observe how great could be the incomes and fortunes of artists and writers in the propaganda agencies. And how lucrative were the incomes of plant managers and farm managers. The Stakhanovite movement is really an appeal to the profit motive and a spur to individual wealth, which awards individuals for piecetime work, honoring them with extra pay, with cultural and recreational privileges. Members of the party, administrators, social planners, factory and farm supervisors are made increasingly rich in contrast with the average Russian. At the same time in America, because of our system of taxation and response to benevolent enterprises, there has been a general lessening in the amount retained by those who have large incomes. During the period of the Russian experiment the average American level of living has phenomenally improved. Much more could be said to indicate what happens when you have a low estimate of man.

3. Christianity believing in God and having a high conception of man believes also in a fixed point of moral reference. Some things are eternally right and some things are always wrong.

Rejecting God and undervaluing man, communism has no ultimate standard of morality. For them there is no transcendent judgment. When the rulers of a nation thus disown God, they become responsible to no one but themselves and recognize no morality or conduct except that which achieves the party's ends. The absolute authority reposes in the leaders of the party. Anything is moral which furthers the party's objectives—even lies, deceit, and barbarism. In countries where this force has become dominant, lying and stealing and killing does not have the same moral meaning as it has to us. This fact is directly derived from differing views of reality and man. And this fact makes it difficult to come to any trustworthy agreement with them.

This is being sharpened with the passing of the days in China. The Communists have now provided themselves with authority to take over all private property, all business firms, foreign property, including that of churches, with police power exercised to the limit. The attitude toward human life, already well known, is only emphasized the more. We have learned that within the last 3 or 4 days, in order to depart from China, it is now necessary for an American, including a missionary to have a Chinese sponsor or guarantor. If, thereafter, the foreigner who has departed says anything uncomplimentary about the new order, or even if he doesn't, but is accused of doing so, the native sponsor or guarantor pays the price. Everywhere you note this absence of moral certitude in Communist practice. That is what makes peaceful and dependable negotiations difficult.

IV

We are called back in this hour to understand more clearly why it is we have these differences and to dedicate ourselves more resolutely to the faith which is ours. The time is short for a rebirth of spirit, which will undergird us for the struggle. But the Spirit working in us may make of us a greater force than we have ever dreamed we could be. Time and time again in human history, dedicated minorities have won the day. The spirit makes the difference. The Communists may outnumber us many times over. But if we have the faith we claim to have: if we really believe what we profess to believe, we shall be indestructible. The most important thing for us to do today is to set over against communism a more vital, a stronger and more Christian society. A tepid church and a half-hearted nation cannot possibly deal with the dynamism set against it. Vital and radically applied Christianity is called for. The Christian call is clear. It is to live by this faith in God, in man's dignity, and in moral certitude and to be willing and ready to pay whatever price is necessary to make it what it really is. The way of God for the sons of God.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in response to a questionnaire printed in newspapers of the district which I have the honor to represent, many answers were received. The bulk of the answers were received in the first week of 1951.

The questions and results in percentages are as follows:

Should the United States:	Percent Yes	No
1. Abandon Korea, evacuating American troops and supplies as quickly as possible?	42	58
2. Increase our military forces in Korea, fight to the finish there, only abandoning it when and if driven out?	58	42
3 If we abandon Korea, should we agree to recognize Red China and abandon Formosa in return for cease-fire in Korea?	6	94
4. Send substantial military manpower to Europe?	62	38
5. Rearm Germany?	78	22
6. Initiate use of germ and gas weapons?	16	84
7. Atom bomb Russia now?	39	61
8. Cease Marshall-plan aid now	52	48
9. Cease North Atlantic military aid now?	21	79
10. Increase mobilization, taxes, controls (including rent, wage and price controls)?	90	10
11. Eliminate for this emergency when not connected with defense: road building, flood control, harbor development, soil conservation payments, etc.?	82	18
12 Eliminate farm prices support program?	80	20
13. Increase old-age assistance?	53	47
14 Increase working hours without overtime rates, establish 6-day week in industry and Government?	71	29
15. Allow railroad unions to contract that all employees must join unions?	12	88

Boxcar Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the shortages of boxcars in Nebraska and surrounding States is very acute several times a year. I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter from the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board together with a resolution adopted by that board. The letter and resolution are as follows:

CENTRAL WESTERN SHIPPERS
ADVISORY BOARD,
Beatrice, Nebr., January 5, 1951.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: While in regular session at Lincoln, Nebr., on December 11-12, 1950, the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board gave serious consideration to the railroad freight car supply and to ways and means of preventing troublesome shortages.

It was the consensus of all that the established practice of maturing Government grain loans uniformly in all States on April 30 has contributed materially to serious car shortages through causing heavy movement of old grains at the time new crops are harvested and offered for shipment. In the interest of lessening the impact of peak seasonal movements of grain, thereby relieving the strain on the freight car supply, the board went on record as recommending the staggering of maturity dates on grain loans predicated upon harvest dates of crops in the various areas.

Copy of resolution No. 3, setting forth the recommendation of the board in this matter is enclosed. Your favorable action in support of the views expressed therein is respectfully requested and will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

R. W. BAGBY,
General Secretary, Dempster Mill Manufacturing Co.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE STAGGERING OF MATURITY DATES OF GRAIN LOANS IN LIEU OF THE PRESENT PRACTICE OF MATURING THESE LOANS UNIFORMLY ON APRIL 30 IN ALL STATES

Whereas the railroad freight car shortage is acknowledged to be as acute at the present time as it has been for several years in the past, and that apparently no definite relief is in sight; and

Whereas the existing plan for the maturity date of loans on all grain products has been established with an April 30 deadline, thus causing a unified shortage of cars for loading in all areas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board goes on record as recommending an adjustment of the maturity dates on grain loans to be predicated upon the harvest date of the crop in the particular area being considered so that, by staggering maturity dates, the car shortage in any given area might be more effectively controlled.

Elimination of Waste and Inefficiency in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star concerning the activities of the House Subcommittee on Overstaffing in Executive Departments. The report of this subcommittee is a major contribution in the unending struggle to eliminate waste and inefficiency from our Government. My distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, is entitled to full credit for the splendid manner in which his subcommittee has performed its functions.

The editorial follows:

ODD CASE OF THE ESQUIRE PICTURE

The House Subcommittee on Overstaffing in the Executive Departments was understandably curious about the odd case of the requisitioned Esquire magazine. Its study of procurement records of the Interior Department had disclosed that the National Park Service had invested $13.39 of taxpayers' money for one 50-cent copy of the August issue of the well-known magazine. The committee was not so much interested in the use to be made of the publication as the reason for the high cost.

In the course of the investigation, it was discovered that a park official wanted to cut out a pin-up picture of—believe it or not—Custer's Last Stand. So the ponderous procurement machinery was put in motion. Forms were filled out and signed, letters written, copies made, distributed and filed and all the other operations incidental to purchase of an item—large or small—were faithfully carried out. In due time (how long the subcommittee did not reveal) the National Park Service was the official owner of a magazine that could have been acquired in 5 minutes for half a dollar at a nearby magazine stand.

The Esquire transaction was only one of several that Chairman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS and his group delved into at Interior. There was the Bureau of Reclamation's order for $2.45 worth of paper drinking cups (for the Department's transport plane for executives) that cost the Government $17.35 in administrative expenses, a Fish and Wildlife Service item listed as costing 32 cents but actually costing the Department $13.78, and so on. The subcommittee found the procurement costs per item varying from $4.78 (for the Secretary's office) to $17.35 in the Reclamation Bureau.

Obviously something is wrong with such a system, or variety of systems. The subcommittee bluntly declared that procurement activities at department headquarters are wasteful and extravagant. This charge was made despite an apparent effort within the Department to reduce administrative costs in the procurement field. The Esquire purchase, incidentally, was made subsequent to an order to consolidate small items and to reduce the number of purchases of articles of small cost. These wasteful buying incidents are trivial of course, standing alone, but they are symbolic of the profligate attitude that prevails in too many governmental sectors. That such an attitude should continue to exist in some Federal agencies in time of national emergency is beyond understanding.

Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the National Tribune of last week entitled "Unfinished Business."

The editor of this well-known veterans' newspaper, Mr. Edward K. Inman, writes understandingly and comprehensively of the important problem now facing the Veterans' Administration in caring for disabled veterans of the Korean conflict with a hospital set-up that is inadequate and understaffed.

I want to urge upon all of you earliest priority of consideration for legislation that will provide sufficient hospitalization and treatment for disabled veterans of all wars. This is not a gift nor a grant; it is an obligation and duty we owe to those who are injured in defending our country. There should be no time lost in enacting legislation that will authorize the building of additional hospital facilities. The editorial follows:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

If it were not so tragically misleading we would have been amused no little at the recent statement of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., that his agency is fully equipped to take care of all veterans of the Korean conflict who are discharged disabled and cannot be returned to duty. We suppose that Gray was referring to some portion of that 27,000 reported wounded, who are not to be retained indefinitely for treatment and rehabilitation by the Department of Defense or who are not separated from service after maximum recovery from lesser disabilities, but, even so, the good general is either being misled by some of his own staff or he just does not know what he is talking about. Under the circumstances, and because the new Eighty-second Congress must deal with the whole question of veterans' hospitalization, we think it is timely to once more discuss here this very critical problem. We suspect that the Veterans' Administrator was merely parroting the convictions of his chief medical officer, Dr. Paul Budd Magnuson, and his crowd from the American Medical Association who have no desire to have former servicemen occupy hospital beds at Government expense under any conditions, and we believe we can justify that inference.

For purposes of accuracy suppose we once more review the facts and from them draw the only possible conclusions that can be found in these repeated assertions that the VA is equipped to hospitalize an indefinite number of disabled, and let us go all the way back to the beginning so that there can be no mistake about any of it. We were not here during the Civil War and the wars that preceded it, and we know only what we have read about the abject lack of facilities to care for the wounded. There are only a dozen Union veterans now living, and thanks to the vision of their younger comrades, they have available Veterans' Administration beds which will not be denied if or when needed. However, there are something under 100,000 elderly veterans of the Spanish-American War still living, who are entitled to have humane treatment at the hands of the VA and are not receiving it. As of November 30, 1950, there were an estimated 3,500,000 men surviving from World War I, who are supposed to have the right to hospitalization when they need it, and, omitting the potential list resulting from the war in Korea, there were almost 15,000,000 World War II veterans of record who could demand the same protection under given circumstances. Shocking as it may seem, there are available and building to take care of this load exactly 118,363 operating beds. And VA officials have the effrontery to say they can take care of all comers. They have "plenty" of beds.

Let's see what they do have. Ten thousand of the number just stated are not yet built. Operating, or capable of being operated, are 108,266, but Dr. Magnuson says he cannot use all of these because he cannot staff them with doctors, nurses, and other necessary personnel. Some 97,488 are occupied by veteran patients, or were on November 30. These hospital beds are made up of 31,170 general medical and surgical; 52,100 psychotic and other nervous cases; 12,978 tubercular; 832 obstetric and miscellaneous, and—mark this—408 in readiness or occupied by nonveterans. Also, there are 5,954 beds reserved for one reason or another, and 4,824 are vacant. How many of them are staffed we do not know, but these are the "plenty of beds" for Korean casualties. Actually the VA was renting 12,500 beds before last July when the Commies began their march of aggression, but at least some of them had to be turned back to the armed services. These off-the-cuff statements by VA officials make good reading, but the truth is that they are spotted for the purpose of propagandizing some veterans out from between the sheets—about which we shall remark further, later on.

As a matter of positive fact, this country is many thousands of beds for veterans short of its needs. Many readers will recall the mad building program that was started after World War I when the Government had not begun to anticipate its requirements and was caught with its pants down. Interested parties, especially organized veterans, were compelled to fight tooth and nail to get new and enlarged hospitals. It was found, obviously enough, that it takes years to build such facilities, and—note this—the presently built and proposed total of 118,363 operating beds above mentioned are fewer than were then expected to fill the anticipated wants of World War I veterans alone. Far from being able to care for any new crop of war casualties, no provision has yet been attempted for any of the 15,000,000 World War II servicemen, let alone those coming home from Korea or to come back from world war III. In January 1949, President Truman defied the Congress and cut back by Executive order an authorization for 16,000 additional beds at a then estimated cost of $237,000,000, but, despite the fact that 300,000 or more patients must be cared for in another 25 years, the AMA and its stooges in our own veterans' agency have been able to block passage of legislation to provide what everybody knows will be required if veterans' laws are not circumvented.

Should anybody have any doubt about what we have written here, we challenge them publicly to deny what is proven fact. As the VA has expanded and as its bureaucratic power has increased, it has defied the Congress, the representatives of the people, and it is giving orders, not taking them. The interests of the very veterans that the VA is intended to serve are being fouled up. This hospital-bed proposition is only the beginning of further encroachments upon the rights of men and women who have served their country in time of war. The whole truth is that it is planned to keep veterans out of the hospitals excepting for treatment of proved service-connected disabilities, and, after that is accomplished, we had better be prepared to defend other legal privileges. The boys in the saddle are up to their old tricks again, and our veterans had best watch out.

With long, long lists of applicants seeking to be admitted to veterans' hospitals, MAGNUSON and his kind accuse some of enjoying "hospitalitis." He states that there never will be enough beds to take care of everybody who wants them. While men of war die like flies outside VA installations because of a lack of beds, the brass there says "there's no room in the inn." Reports show vacant beds which General Gray's bosses say they cannot staff. MAGNUSON insists that no more will be built and orders the Congress, through the President and his Budget Director, to turn down legislative requests, and the Administrator joins him in saying "we are fully equipped to care for all Korean casualties." Follow these tactics through to a final end, listen to the publicized attacks on war veterans who need hospital care and cannot get it, and there is but one answer. Hospitalization for veterans without disabilities proved to be the actual and direct result of war is on the way out regardless of the menace posed to the public health by those who suffer from communicable diseases and mental disturbances. Those fine warriors who have saved this Nation from its enemies in time of war and who now need help in disablement and old age are turned away to be public charges under social laws designed to care for other unfortunates. Their services forgotten and deprecated by time and neglect, they are to revert to the economic scrapheap and die disregarded heroes.

This is not a very pretty picture, but it is what is in the mill. There is plenty of money to appease Communists, debate the state of the world, and feed and clothe all backward nations, but none for those who have made such things possible. We enjoin this new Congress to do something about it. We warn the spokesmen for war veterans to place the facts before the citizenry and demand that their legislators correct abuses by protecting those who have protected them. It is time to move, and move fast, if we are not for a third time going to have to treat war casualties in tents, in barns, and in poorhouses. This is a part of our unfinished business.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Col. C. H. Lindsay, an outstanding resident of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent, has for many years been one of our most substantial citizens and has achieved distinction in many lines. He is the active manager of two large sawmills in Louisiana, owned by the Joyce interests, one at Ponchatoula and the other at my home town of Winnfield, La. It probably can be said of him that he has made a success of everything he has ever undertaken. He can do almost anything with wood or iron. I think he comes nearer to being jack-of-all-trades than any man I have ever known. He not only can operate large industries, but he can plan the construction from the ground up. His latest achievement was the construction of a large sawmill at my home town.

Recently Colonel Lindsay took on a new field of endeavor. In addition to his many duties and undertakings, he has contributed a number of guest editorials to a local paper. These editorials have been received with considerable interest. I believe the thinking of this outstanding businessman will be of interest to many others, and I am, therefore, including the following editorials prepared by Colonel Lindsay in the RECORD:

THE LIGHT OF LIFE

(By C. H. Lindsay)

The light of liberty is the light of life for mankind everywhere. It is a light which

has burned with ever-increasing brilliance and strength in this land of ours since 1776.

Today, as seldom before in all of our long and glorious history, that light and that liberty are imperiled. A deadly serpent has been loosed upon the American people. Already its deadly virus has seeped into government, commerce, industry, labor—into our schools, colleges, and homes.

The name of that deadly serpent is communism.

Communism, which has a thousand aliases, is the most terrible menace which has faced our people in all of our history. It is even now gnawing at the very vitals of our life as a Nation, and our lives as individuals. It would, first of all, extinguish that light of liberty which has guided us since the birth of our Nation; then it would enslave us and crush us under the domination of a cruel and wicked way of life.

There is only one sure and certain defense against the deadly virus of communism. That defense is the faith of the American people in our way of life—and their willingness to be ever alert against the insidious virus of communism. That defense is the faith of the American people in our way of life—and their willingness to be ever alert against the insidious virus of the communistic doctrine and to put down the serpent, to crush the monster with truth.

It is up to every man and woman and child of us who would preserve the American way of life.

The sacred light of liberty is the light that shall not and must not fail.

PREJUDICE—A TOOL OF COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

Prejudice is a weapon which most world powers seeking imperialistic goals have found most effective in the battle for power. Such techniques are now being employed by the Communist and are threatening the very existence of our democratic form of government.

It is the Red's aim to pit race against race, religion against religion, prejudice against prejudice and thus divide and conquer.

We know what has been done to stir up hatred for the avowed purpose of causing confusion, distrust, and disunity among the American people.

Thought and action are the redeeming features of our lives, so we must think and act every way possible to defend, by all means, our fundamental tenets of liberty, justice, and decency. This rests on all alike.

YOU CAN'T TRY COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

You either buy communism, or you don't. If you buy the Red package, you've bought it for keeps, you're stuck with the deal, no return goods, you can't change your mind.

Maybe America isn't exactly heaven all the time. We have our ups and downs, lately principally downs, but at least you can holler—without some party member beating your ears off. You can gripe without being liquidated. You can always throw your weight around, and sooner or later conditions will adjust for the better if you think right and act right.

So keep both eyes open for the oily comrade. When he tries to feed you—try communism—you know the come-back, say to him:

What do you mean try?

Why not try arsenic, or cancer, or leprosy?

How can you try something when you can't change your mind?

THE RIGHT TO CHANGE OUR MINDS IS THE RIGHT OF ALL AMERICANS

(By C. H. Lindsay)

Maybe you know the Declaration of Independence by memory, maybe you know every word of the Constitution, or maybe you don't, but every one of us should know American ideas like these:

In America, power belongs to the self-governing people.

Government has always and is now the servant, never the master.

In America, you can say or write what you believe.

If you think the Government is rotten, you can yell it from the house tops.

In America, you can always change your mind and keep on changing it. You can try this, you can try that, you can always say, this is no good, try something else. But not under communism, you don't think, you don't talk, you don't try anything, because you can't change your mind. The Communist member with the gun will see to that.

You do what you are told to do or else.

The Late Gen. Walton Harris Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the New York Times in tribute to the late Gen. Walton Harris Walker. I had the honor to serve under General Walker in his XX Corps of the Third United States Army through the entire period of the European campaign. The Eighty-first Congress is to be commended for its action in giving General Walker the posthumous rank of full general, which he so well earned on the field of battle.

A GENERAL GOES TO HIS REST

Nearly half a year has gone by since Lt. Gen. Walton Harris Walker took over command of the United Nations ground troops in Korea. These have been terrible months. General Walker saw his men pushed back almost to Pusan. He commanded, under General MacArthur, the bold and arduous northward advance. At the seeming moment of victory he had the heartbreaking task of surrendering dearly won ground before the overwhelming Chinese attack. Throughout the victories and the reverses he conducted himself like the great soldier he was. Men who had fought under him when he led the late General Patton's Twentieth Corps in the drive across France and Germany and into Austria recognized in Korea his skilled and dashing tactics, his sturdiness under difficult conditions, and his indifference to personal danger. General Walker had 19 awards and decorations. He earned them all.

When he died yesterday in an accident north of Seoul, General MacArthur had already recommended his promotion to the rank of full general. As General MacArthur said, "His gallantry in action has been an inspiration to all who have served with him and his loss will be keenly felt not only by our own country but by those allied with us in the cause of freedom on the Korean Peninsula." No doubt he would have preferred to die under enemy fire. But his death at that time and place was a true sacrifice to the country and the cause he served. An officer whose motto was to make training hard so that combat would seem easy, he had the affection and respect of his men. He will not be soon forgotten.

Champions Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward Tomlinson from the Washington Star of January 7, 1951:

CHAMPIONS SOLIDARITY—ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE MILLER TRIES TO MAKE AMERICAS INTO ONE FAMILY

(By Edward Tomlinson)

The one bright spot on the horizon of our international relations is Latin America. In spite of our indifference toward, not to say our neglect of them, in the years following World War II, the 20 other American Republics and the vast majority of their 150,000,000 people are wholeheartedly on our side in the bitter struggle against Russian imperialism.

More promising still, we are once again assuming a definite and positive leadership in inter-American affairs. Under the initiative of Assistant Secretary Edward G. Miller the State Department is finally going all-out to revive and restore our lost prestige in the nations to the South. On the heels of our reverses in Korea and the threat of aggression in Western Europe, Mr. Miller has not only been pressing the administration for a New Deal in hemisphere policy, but boldly assuming responsibility for its success or failure.

At the critical moment when the United Nations was reeling from the Russo-Chinese forces in Korea, he put forward the plan for an emergency consultation of the 21 American Foreign Ministers, the fourth such conference ever convoked. Both Secretary Acheson and President Truman approved this full-dress inter-American gathering.

Previously Mr. Miller had busied himself principally with strengthening the economic ties with the various Latin American countries. He had endorsed the return of Nelson Rockefeller, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs, to Washington as chairman of the advisory board of the point 4 program. Realizing Mr. Rockefeller's interest in the industrial development of the Latin-American nations, and his prestige in the financial and business world, Mr. Miller welcomed his predecessor to the new job, which brings him in close collaboration with the State Department.

PITCHED RIGHT IN

Soon after the Assistant Secretary took office he tackled the ticklish Argentine question in an effort to ease the tension which had existed between our own and the Government of President Juan Domingo Peron for more than 6 years. Disregarding the critics, particularly anti-Peron labor groups in this country, along with a considerable number of leftist elements and even some of the liberal newspapers, he shouldered full responsibility for making an economic deal with the Buenos Aires regime. After months of the most tedious negotiation Peron agreed to lift many restrictions on United States-Argentine trade, in return for a $125,000,000 loan, or "credit." This agreement made it possible for the majority of United States firms doing business in Argentina to be paid in dollars for goods already sold in the country, and for other companies to remit their earnings.

Unfortunately, the Argentine agreement intensified the already critical attitude of Brazilians toward Washington. Officials in Rio had previously expressed bitter disappointment over what they felt was the failure of this country to lend more economic aid in the development of their industrial resources, in return for their collaboration during World War II. Whatever we may have thought about it, such a deal with their next-door neighbor, a country that had neither sacrificed anything nor cooperated in the great world conflict, seemed to even the most intelligent Brazilian like rewarding an enemy and turning our backs on a friend. Adding insult to injury came the charges of Senator GILLETTE'S Agricultural Subcommittee that Brazilian coffee growers were largely responsible for the skyrocketing of coffee prices in this country.

With State Department approval, the Export-Import Bank and also the World Bank have granted a sizable list of loans and credits to Brazilian business firms, and also to the Brazilian Government for a number of hydroelectric and other industrial projects, amounting in the past 12 months to over $100,000,000. Recently came the announcement that more than three-quarters of a million dollars of point-4 funds have been earmarked for use in providing more scientific know-how and industrial techniques for the people of that country. This is one of the very first allotments made since the fund was voted by Congress.

SEES FOR HIMSELF

A large measure of the credit for easing economic difficulties between Mexico and this country, and the advance of $150,000,000 in new loans to the government of President Miguel Alemán in the past 6 months, can be ascribed to the efforts of the Assistant Secretary. This in spite of the fact that Mexico posed a very serious personal problem for him when he took over the direction of Inter-American Affairs a year and a half ago. He had hardly been confirmed by the Senate when he became the target of a campaign instigated by persons connected with the Mexican Government oil monopoly. Several Congressmen even took up the cudgels against him and repeated some of the charges in our own legislative halls.

These charges grew out of the fact that Mr. Miller championed a State Department policy against making government-to-government loans for the exploitation of oil resources in any country. The Department and Mr. Miller took the stand that there was no justification for using public money for risk enterprise so long as there is plenty of private capital available for such purposes.

Mr. Miller has made a point of personal, on-the-spot investigations of the problems existing or arising between this country and its neighbors. No other high official of the State Department, since the days when former Secretary Cordell Hull visited so many of the southern capitals, has been in more intimate contact with Latin American leaders in their own countries. Within the first 12 months after he assumed office he had visited and spent time in every one of the 20 republics.

Nor have any other policy-making officials of the Department in recent times been so well qualified to meet and deal with Latin officials of all the countries on equal terms. In fluent Spanish, Portuguese, and French, the three langauges spoken in the various 20 nations, he has been able to converse with presidents, politicians, businessmen, and day laborers.

Close observation of the personnel of the Latin American division reveals that the chief deputies and assistants also are nearly all old hands in the Latin American field. Most of them are proficient in the different languages of the countries with which they deal. Thomas Mann, present Deputy Assistant Secretary; John Drier, one of those assigned to keep liaison with the Latins in the United Nations; Fletcher Warren, director of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, and others have served many years on the firing line, and are among the most experienced men in hemisphere relations.

No Time To Quit in Tidelands Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram:

NO TIME TO QUIT IN TIDELANDS FIGHT

The United States Supreme Court has entered a final decree transferring Texas oil-bearing tidelands to the Federal Government by a process which Senator CONNALLY brands with the bald term of theft. That means that insofar as court action is concerned Texas has gone down to bitter defeat in a fight in which it passionately believes that right was on its side. It means also that the one last hope of overturning the effect of the Supreme Court's decision lies in action by Congress quitclaiming the tidelands to the States on which they border.

The National Association of Attorneys General has voted to fight for such legislation. This help will be welcomed, for passage of title-validating legislation undoubtedly has been made more difficult by the high Court's decision. Unquestionably the attorneys general are motivated, at least in part, by the clear perception that the doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court in the tidelands case constitutes a threat to State-owned and private holdings in other States. As a dissenting opinion in the Texas case pointed out, the Court by the same reasoning could transfer to the Federal Government the ownership of inland waters or uplands deposits of iron ore or other minerals now in the hands of private owners or the States.

It was an astonishing dissent which Attorney General Wallace Warner, of North Dakota, took to the resolution pledging a continued fight for State ownership of the tidelands. Mr. Warner said that since the Supreme Court had decided the case, lawyers had no right to protest.

Since when have lawyers, the supposed servants of justice, given up the right to protest against injustice, however perpetrated? Since when has it become incumbent upon them to accede silently to a decision demonstrably based upon a glaring error of fact? Since when has the obligation been placed upon them to acquiesce in a summary judgment rendered without any hearing of evidence which unmistakably would have pointed out this error?

And what, in ethics or in conscience, bars them from seeking redress of injustice by means clearly provided for in our system of government and fully within its spirit?

Texans are not likely to be convinced that injustice is a thing to be accepted until every effort for its redress has been exhausted.

Restoration of Confidence in Our Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the House for its permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written to the New York Herald Tribune by a warm personal friend and constituent, Mr. Stuart A. Young. In his letter Mr. Young expresses the hopes and fears of many people in the country and it is not written in any spirit of partisanship. It is the fervent prayer of all Americans that we have unity in our thinking and in our actions during these days, but it is impossible to acquire that unity unless there is confidence in our public servants.

Whether we like it or not and whether it is justifiable or not, the awful fact remains that there is a lack of confidence in our foreign policies as determined by the Department of State, and it is imperative for the good of the country that that confidence be restored, and I am afraid that it can only be restored by a thorough overhauling of its personnel.

Mr. Young's letter follows:

JANUARY 9, 1951.

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

I am one of the many citizens of this Republic whose voice carries little weight in the solution of its problems or in the shaping of its high destiny. However, my forebears and my four children have fought (and some died) in defense of their country from the time of the Colonial Wars down to the present. No charge of isolation or lack of patriotism can be lodged against them, or any of them. They fought to preserve their freedom and independence of thought and action and the sacred guaranties under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States.

The voice of the American people who have these traditions to uphold should be heard and heeded in this crises. And their voice should be heeded in the halls of Congress where final authority rests to engage the American people in war. Was it the intention of the founding fathers to vest in the President power over the lives of our countrymen without prudent consideration of their will and opinion? Should such power be placed in the hands of a well-meaning but incompetent leader whose ability extends only to the field of partisan politics? Should secret treaties and commitments be made with foreign governments, concerning which the Congress and the American people have had little or no knowledge? Well, the answer is "No." Woodrow Wilson tried something of that nature at the conclusion of World War I, and because Congress did not approve, failed in his undertaking—and Woodrow Wilson was a great man.

The handwriting is on the wall. Let us get our boys out of Korea before they are utterly destroyed; they can be used to better advantage elsewhere. Resistance in South Korea will prove disastrous in the end, with ever increasing hordes from the north pouring down to the scene of conflict.

Let us reexamine our foreign policy to the end that before sending the flower of our

youth to fight again in Europe, we shall be certain and not merely hopeful of cooperation from our allies. Otherwise, these boys of ours may be buried in foreign soil.

If we can rely on unity and cooperation among our allies, then our solemn prayer should be: "Godspeed General Eisenhower in his mission."

Let us recognize the fact that the political views of the Far East and of the West are totally different, and at this time impossible of reconciliation. Let us make every effort toward a peaceful solution, but not by way of appeasement or further loss of prestige. Russia does not want a peaceful solution. If she cannot attain her ends through the methods now being pursued, she will not hesitate to launch a third world war, when and where she wills. She should not be heard with her voice of slander and political propaganda either in the Security Council or the General Assembly. She has no place in the deliberations of free nations.

Let us arm to the teeth, but let us arm with only two thoughts: First, for our own preservation and defense, and next for the preservation and defense of those of our allies who feel unflinchingly as we do.

Let us look well before we leap, and let the people of this country, through their representatives in Congress, look well before we are all committed to a policy that may prove disastrous.

The question of the President's right under the Constitution to send troops abroad without congressional approval is academic and subject to debate; but his assertion that he has this vital and decisive right and presumably will exercise it, is presumptuous and insulting to the intelligence of the American people.

If the American people understand their commitments, if they believe in the righteousness of their cause, if they have confidence in the ability and judgment of their leaders, they will fight now and hereafter, as they have in the past.

The verities that prudence is often the better part of valor and that fools rush in where angels fear to tread, are still eternal.

Let the voice of the American people be heard.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, as the war clouds in Korea worsen, many of our friends in Colorado are worried and feel that immediate steps should be taken by our Government to supply our Armed Forces with all weapons necessary to strike at the enemy with force sufficient to drive them back into China.

As part of my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a petition signed by those who wish action to be taken now on this matter. I also include two newspaper articles.

PETITION

1. We, the undersigned, believe that an immediate decision must be made by our Government in the Korean situation.

2. We believe that our Government must either grant to our military leaders the authority to use every weapon and to strike the Chinese Communists at any target necessary to successfully carry out the Korean operation, or that all American troops in Korea should be withdrawn immediately.

3. We believe that the needless loss of life in this conflict which is due to our refusal to give complete support to our troops is morally wrong.

4. We believe that if there is a reason for the present policy of fighting in Korea with one hand tied behind our back, that the American people deserve to know that reason.

Barbara Martinson, Reuben A. Martinson, Jr., Robert D. Inman, Virginia C. Inman, G. A. Shomaker, Jr., J. J. Dolan, W. A. Cockle, Anna I. Cockle, Norene Velte, D. F. Velte, Dean A. Sanborn, Ernest Eggebrotin, Adda Catewell, A. A. Wukstron, Laverne D. Hayman, Albert W. Copeland, Mrs. Albert Copeland, Durland G. Skinner, Gerold C. Wickmann, H. J. Marin, Benjamin B. Weybrew, H. C. Klewere, Nellie Klewere, Merle June Green, Merll C. Green, Dr. Ernest Moore, A. O. Elerl, C. S. Higby, Charline K. Scoggin, Mrs. Henry Knudson, A. Engdahl, Milton E. Lewis, Mrs. Luther L. Higby, Mrs. Nancy White, John C. Horton, Byron Wells, George V. C. Shuger, Mrs. James B. Graham, James E. Watson, Mrs. J. E. Watson, Mrs. Wayne Riggs, Mrs. James Hackett, James Hackett, Byron L. Tankersley, Mrs. Vera L. Mathes, H. H. Pribbeno, Mrs. B. L. Tankersley, Mr. John Machesney, Mrs. John Machesney, Mrs. Ella M. Paull, T. S. Paull, Mildred Post, W. B. Post, Mr. J. R. Kennedy, Mrs. J. R. Kennedy, Mr. Joe Scheib, Mrs. Joseph Scheib, and Mrs. Carrie Williams, all of Boulder, Colo.; Harold Mullikin and Mrs. Harold Mullikin, Denver, Colo.; C. W. Parsons, Peryl Wade Parsons, Bethel L. Curtze, Gordon H. Curtze, G. C. Hayman, Dean Faulkner, Patricia P. Faulkner, Nilrose Heinemann, Donald G. Brotzman, Henry P. Smith, J. A. Lunsford, S. L. Koch, Earl Pettigrew, Mrs. Earl Pettigrew, and Elizabeth Rawson, all of Boulder, Colo.; Mrs. Stuart Kastner and S. P. Kastner, Littleton, Colo.; C. C. Ireland, Mitchell, Nebr.; Mollie W. Hubbell, Thelma Driver, Mrs. W. B. Golliher, Mrs. I. S. Kendall, Edna Mae Kendall, and Katheryn Noelker, all of Boulder, Colo.; Mr. James T. Hacker, Sr., and Mrs. James T. Hacker, Sr., Lafayette, Colo.; Ferne King, Don Heinemann, Ruth E. Warden, Robert Roemer, Catharine Roemer, Marguerite Sherman, Grace M. Sherman, Argie Watsen, Mattie Pribbeno, Lois McCray, Al McCray, and Mrs. Jessie McCray, all of Boulder, Colo.; Mrs. Essie Marshall and Mr. E. J. Marshall, Longmont, Colo.; George A. Walters, Lea Massman, Margaret Hightower, Alex Schneider, Asa C. Wing, Priscilla M. Hardifer, Isabel Moore, Luella Gifford, Margaret Flanigan, Grace and Joe Stapp, J. K. Stengel, Mrs. J. K. Stengel, Mrs. A. Engdahl, Lee Roy Shields, J. A. Hochstatter, Mrs. Frank Dolan, Frank F. Dolan, Mrs. Henry Smith, Mrs. David Morgan, Mrs. John A. Lunsford, Glen E. Powers, and Marianne Koch, all of Boulder, Colo.; John F. Simpson, Eldorado Springs, Colo.; Harry Driver and Chas. Ackerman, Boulder, Colo.; R. W. Jones and Mrs. R. W. Jones, Berthoud, Colo.; Lulu Rosengrant, Sarah E. Brenner, David Morgan, K. E. Brandt, Harold H. Close, Mary Anne Scheib, all of Boulder, Colo.

BOULDER PETITION ASKS KOREA WAR DECISION

BOULDER, COLO., January 8.—Petitions calling for an immediate decision by the Government on the Korean situation were being circulated in Boulder Monday by the committee for a decision in Korea.

The newly organized committee is headed by two young Boulder businessmen, Reuben Martinson, and Robert Inman. Martinson is the husband of Barbara Guild Martinson, sister of Marine Lt. John Guild, who was recently killed in the Korean fighting.

Mrs. Martinson and her husband have offered a $5,000 legacy, left her by Lieutenant Guild—to open a fund that would be used to promote a drive which through public opinion would demand a decision by the administration on the Korean problem.

FOUR PARTS OF PETITION

Here are the four parts of the petition:

"1. We, the undersigned, believe that an immediate decision must be made by our Government in the Korean situation.

"2. We believe that our Government must either grant to our military leaders the authority to use every weapon and to strike the Chinese Communists at any target necessary to successfully carry out the Korean operation, or that all American troops in Korea should be withdrawn immediately.

"3. We believe that the needless loss of life in this conflict which is due to our refusal to give complete support to our troops is morally wrong.

"4. We believe that if there is a reason for the present policy of fighting in Korea with one hand tied behind our back, that the American people deserve to know that reason."

URGE PRESIDENT NOTIFICATION

Besides circulating the petitions, the committee is urging all American citizens to notify the President or their Congressmen that an immediate decision on the Korean situation must be made by the Government.

And the committee is advocating that the people demand all-out use of American armed might in the conflict with the Chinese and North Korean Reds so the wasting of American lives may be stopped.

WHO IS FIGHTING THE UN WAR?

The United States News and World Report, in its issue of January 12, 1951, raises the question, "Who is fighting the UN war—United States gets no more aid against fresh enemy." The article says that the United States cannot count on much more outside help for the "next phase in Korea" and that "Communists, in fighting men, hold almost a two-to-one advantage. And there are millions more where those came from. On the other side, United States casualties alone are more than twice the entire number of troops sent in by other UN allies."

The news magazine said the Communists have a land force of 440,000 in Korea and that UN troops totaled 273,000, made up as follows:

United States	150,000
South Koreans (estimated)	100,000
Britons	10,000
Turks	4,000
Australians	1,500
French	1,400
Canadians	1,200
Filipinos	1,200
Siamese	1,200
Belgians	1,000
New Zealanders	900
Greeks	800
Dutch	600

The United States News article then concluded: "The United States, thus, is furnishing the major part of the ground troops fighting the Communists in Korea. Although General MacArthur pleaded for help from other members of the UN, the 24,300 soldiers he actually has received from them amount to less than one-half the casualties suffered so far by American Ground Forces."

Earl Michener Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement appearing in the Adrian Daily Telegram, of Adrian, Mich., on January 4, 1951, in reference to our former colleague, Earl Michener, of Michigan:

EARL MICHENER RETIRES

In the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress words of high praise were spoken by Democrats and Republicans alike in the House of Representatives for the service performed there over the years by Earl C. Michener. They are richly deserved.

Mr. Michener has served the Second Michigan District devotedly and sincerely. He has been especially close to his constituents, winning the support and admiration of his district in a way it has been the good fortune of few Members of Congress to enjoy. Yet Earl Michener has always been guided by his conscience and his country's interest.

If we were speaking a tribute in Congress to Mr. Michener's work as a public servant we would repeat what Edmund Burke told the British Parliament, back in 1774, about the duties of a representative. Burke said:

"Surely, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction to theirs; and, above all, ever, and in all cases, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from providence for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment; which he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

World War II Veterans' Benefits—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include part I of a summary of major World War II veterans' benefits, as carried in the December 19, 1950, issue of the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly:

ROUNDUP OF MAJOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS' BENEFITS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Basic eligibility requirements for all major benefits that VA administers for World War II veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries in the United States, its possessions and Territories, and in foreign countries are briefly outlined below. More detailed information may be obtained from any VA office in the United States, its possessions or Territories or from any DAV national service officer. In foreign countries, it may be obtained from any United States Foreign Service office.)

MEDICAL AND DOMICILIARY BENEFITS

Hospitalization: World War II veterans, if discharged or separated under conditions other than dishonorable, are entitled to VA hospital treatment, under the following priority system:

First. Emergency cases.

Second. Those suffering from injuries or diseases incurred or aggravated in line of duty during wartime service.

Third. Those who state under oath that they are unable to pay hospital charges for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities or illnesses. These veterans, if not in the emergency category, must wait until a bed becomes available.

Emergency patients may be taken directly to the nearest VA hospital. If possible, the veteran, or someone acting for him or her, should communicate with VA by telephone or telegraph.

In all other cases the veteran, his nearest relative, guardian, or representative, should fill in the proper form for hospital care. These forms are available at any VA office.

If admission to a VA hospital or home has been approved, Government transportation may be provided as follows:

1. Hospitals: To the hospital and, upon completion of treatment in service-connected cases, to his or her home. This service may be provided for non-service-connected cases if they are unable to pay for the transportation.

2. Homes: To a VA domiciliary home.

Domiciliary care: Domiciliary care is designed to provide a home for those veterans who have a chronic condition which incapacitates them from earning a living and who require minimal medical attention. Requirements for admission for domiciliary care are essentially the same as for hospital treatment. Transportation at Government expense as a rule is provided only for the initial admission.

The veteran, or his nearest relative, guardian or representative, should obtain preadmission approval from the nearest VA installation having facilities for domiciliary care.

Outpatient medical treatment: Outpatient medical care is available for veterans in need of treatment for service-connected disabilities.

Under this plan, eligible World War II veterans may receive treatment at VA hospitals or other field stations furnishing medical treatment, or from approved private physicians. Each veteran's eligibility must be determined by VA before treatment of this type can be authorized. Necessary drugs may be obtained from home-town druggists at Government expense by veterans who are authorized to report to private physicians for treatment.

Outpatient dental treatment: Veterans entitled to outpatient dental treatment may, upon VA approval, be furnished dental treatment by private dentists at Government expense. Here, again, the condition must be determined by VA to have been incurred in, or made worse by, the veteran's wartime service before treatment can be authorized. Preliminary examinations may be made in a VA dental clinic or, if VA dental facilities are not feasibly available, by a participating dentist. Treatment, if approved, may be completed in a VA clinic, or the veteran may be assigned to an approved private dentist.

Prosthetic service: A veteran's eligibility for prosthetic appliances may be established if (1) he has a service-connected or service-aggravated disability requiring an appliance or (2) if an appliance is determined necessary as a part of hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

Complete information and necessary forms for procuring needed appliances, equipment, and repairs are available at any VA office.

Examinations: Free medical examinations if required will be given veterans filing compensation claims. Veterans desiring to reinstate their national service life insurance may receive a physical examination free of charge at any VA medical office.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Eligible disabled veterans may receive education or training at Government expense, with tuition, supplies, and, in many cases, subsistence allowance provide by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 16, 78th Cong., as amended).

Eligibility: Disabled veterans are eligible if: (1) They had active service between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947; (2) they were discharged or separated under conditions other than dishonorable; (3) they have a service-connected or aggravated disability which would entitle them to compensation (even if they are not receiving disability compensation); and (4) VA determines they need vocational training to overcome their handicap. All four conditions must be met.

Length of training: Eligible veterans may get training for as long as is necessary to restore their ability to work, up to a total of 4 years. Veterans may apply for vocational rehabilitation at any time after their discharge but in time to complete their training by July 25, 1956.

Type of training: Before disabled veterans begin training, they will be interviewed by VA counselors. If necessary, they will be given a series of tests to determine their aptitudes and interests. This, together with a review of the veterans' past experiences, will enable the VA counselor and training officer to help the veterans decide the type of training they should get.

Eligible veterans may be: (1) Enrolled in schools or colleges; (2) placed in apprenticeship or other training on the job; or (3) entered in institutional on-farm training programs or other programs which combine school and job training.

Subsistence allowances: While in training and for 2 months after rehabilitation, the disabled veterans may receive subsistence allowances in addition to their disability compensation.

Basic monthly subsistence rates for disabled veterans studying full-time in schools and colleges are $75 without dependents, $105 with one dependent, and $120 with more than one dependent.

Basic rates for job trainees are $65 without dependents and $90 with one or more dependents.

Rates for veterans enrolled in combination types of training may be somewhat higher than the job-training rates.

Additional allowances may be provided, depending on the veterans' degree of disability and the number of additional dependents they have.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Eligible veterans may receive education or training at Government expense, with tuition, supplies, and in many cases, a subsistence allowance provided by the GI bill.

Eligibility: Veterans are eligible if: (1) they were in active military service some time between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947; (2) they served 90 days or more or were discharged before 90 days of service for a disability actually incurred in service; (3) they were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. All three conditions must be met.

Length of training: Eligible veterans may get a course of training not to exceed 1 year plus a period equal to the time served in the Armed Forces, between the abovementioned dates, up to a maximum of 4 years. Veterans must start their training within 4 years from date of discharge or July 25, 1951, whichever is later, and complete it by July 25, 1956.

Type of training: Eligible veterans may choose their own course of training in any school or establishment approved by the appropriate State approval agency. Generally, the school must have been in operation on its own for at least 1 year prior to the date of the veteran's enrollment. Veterans may: (1) Enroll in schools or colleges; (2) take apprenticeship or other training on the job; (3) enroll in institutional on-farm training, or other programs which combine school and job training; or (3) select correspondence-school courses.

The law does not permit a veteran to take a course for avocational or recreational purposes. If the course is one which is frequently pursued for such purposes, the veteran must submit to VA complete justification or sworn affidavits that the course he wants will be useful to him in earning a living. Prior approval of VA must be obtained before he may start such training.

After a veteran has commenced a course he must at all times maintain satisfactory conduct and progress. If he wants to change from one course to another he first should consult VA, for the law has established some limitations on course changes.

Subsistence allowances: Veterans entering any type of training (except correspondence-school instruction) may be eligible to receive subsistence allowances.

Maximum monthly allowances for veterans studying full time in schools and colleges are $75 without dependents, $105 with one dependent, and $120 with more than one dependent.

Maximum rates for job trainees are $65 without dependents and $90 with one or more dependents.

Rates for veterans enrolled in combination types of training may be somewhat higher than the job-training rates.

These amounts are reduced for part-time courses and also may be affected by the extent of a veteran's earnings.

GI BILL LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS

A veteran who served at any time between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, and was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after at least 90 days' active service (or for service-incurred disability in less than 90 days) may qualify for a GI loan.

Unremarried widows of men who served during that period and who died as the result of service may also qualify.

Three types of loans are permissible: (1) To purchase, construct, or improve a home; (2) to buy a farm, farm land, stock, feed, and seed, farm machinery, and other farm supplies and equipment, and (3) to buy a business or otherwise to enable a veteran to undertake or expand a legitimate business venture.

Under certain conditions, loans may be obtained to liquidate delinquent indebtedness incurred in connection with these three categories.

Normally, VA is not empowered to lend money to the veteran. He makes his own arrangements for the loan through the usual financing channels, VA then guarantees the lender against loss up to 50 percent of the loan, with a maximum guaranty of $4,000 on real estate and $2,000 on non-real-estate loans.

If the veteran has previously used none of his loan guaranty entitlement, his home loan may qualify for a guaranty of 60 percent of the loan with a maximum guaranty of $7,500.

Under certain conditions, VA also is authorized to make a limited number of direct, Government loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of a home in areas where private mortgage financing at an interest rate of 4 percent is not available.

The interest rate on GI loans normally may not exceed 4 percent per year on the unpaid balance.

In the case of all GI loans, VA pays the lender, for credit to the veteran's loan account, an amount equal to 4 percent, but not more than $160 of the guaranteed portion of the loan. This is a gift to the veteran and not a loan.

Veterans, and widows as well, have until July 25, 1957, in which to apply for GI loans.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

Any veteran who served a minimum of 16 days between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, and was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after at least 90 days of total service (or for service-incurred disability in less than 90 days) may qualify for unemployment or self-employment allowances.

The period of entitlement is based on length of service between those dates, with the veteran receiving 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of such service and 4 weeks for each additional month. The major fraction of a month counts as a full month.

The maximum entitlement for unemployment allowances is 52 weeks, and for self-employment, 10⅔ months.

Eligible veterans may claim readjustment allowances during periods of total or partial unemployment or when self-employed and earning less than $100 a month.

A veteran has 2 years from date of discharge in which to claim readjustment allowances, but no payments may be made for any week which begins later than July 25, 1952.

Unemployment allowances: The veteran must be able to work and be available for suitable work. He must register for work with a public employment office, where he also files his claim. Unemployed veterans receive $20 per week. Partially employed veterans get $20, less net earnings during the week in excess of $3.

Self-employment allowances: Self-employed veterans also make application at a public employment office. They receive $100 per month, less any net earnings during the month, if they are fully engaged throughout the month, and for profit.

ARMED FORCES RECRUITMENT ACT ENLISTEES

The Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 provided that persons enlisting or reenlisting in the Armed Forces between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, may count the entire period of such enlistment or reenlistment as war service for purposes of GI bill benefits, regardless of the date the war was declared officially ended.

Such enlistees, therefore, may substitute the date that their period of enlistment ended in computing their benefits where that date is later than July 25, 1947.

Dating from the end of the enlistment period, such enlistees will have: (1) Ten years in which to use their loan guaranty rights; (2) the full period in which to accrue entitlement for education and training, 4 years in which to commence training, and 9 years to complete it; (3) the full period in which to accrue entitlement for readjustment allowances for unemployment or self-employment, and a maximum of 5 years from that date (or 2 years from discharge, whichever is earlier) in which to claim them.

Equalization of Disability Pension Tax Exemption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append hereto the substance of two letters from the Pensioners Protective Association of America, Inc., which relate to H. R. 1198, the text of which is also appended, which I have introduced to exempt disability pension for Government workers disabled in the line of their duties and forced to retire. This bill is an effort to equalize the treatment now afforded certain Government workers on disability pensions, such as firemen and policemen.

From letter of March 16, 1949:

As you know several States now exempt from taxation disability pensions paid to retired Government employees for disability received in the performance of their duties. In a recent Federal court decision exemption was likewise extended to these retired disabled Government employees on the basis that the disability pension is equivalent to and in lieu of workmen's compensation benefits which are wholly tax exempt. Enclosed is a copy of the summary of the Washington, D. C., Federal district court case and also a copy of a letter from the Treasury Department, and you will note that the case and the letter refers to firemen and policemen.

We are having a considerable amount of trouble with the Treasury Department when the disabled Government employee is not a fireman or a policeman and applies for tax exemption on his disability pension. There are many cases where street cleaners, highway workers, and various kinds of mechanics and, in fact, office workers have been disabled in the line of their duties and are forced to retire. * * *

In fact, in a recent claim filed in behalf of a department of correction employee of the city of New York, a member of the New York Employees' Retirement System, who was injured on the job as a result of an accident and forced to retire in September 1943, had to battle with the Collector of Internal Revenue's office from March 1944 up to June 1948 to get any consideration on his case, and only after we interceded in his behalf and were allowed to file a formal claim for him in July 1948 was any appropriate action taken, and finally in November 1948 the Bureau of Internal Revenue granted him tax exemption on his disability pension but refused to allow him any refund for income taxes paid on his pension for the year of 1944. There are dozens of other cases similar to his now pending for disposition.

We wonder would you be kind enough to consider this matter and, if you feel that these disabled retired Goverment employees are deserving of consideration, to sponsor a bill similar to the one in the last session of Congress to give them aid and relief from Federal taxation on their disability pensions.

From letter of December 28, 1950:

As you know, all the types of health, accident, sickness, workmen's compensation, and disability benefits are income-tax exempt and as all other types of social legislative benefits are tax exempt, we can see no reason why the Internal Revenue Code has discriminated against Government employees

in not granting tax exemption to disability benefits paid to their employees on forced retirement (States et al.).

The text of H. R. 1198 follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the words "(including personal service as an officer or employee of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing") the following: "except pensions, retirement allowances, and annuity payments received by such a former officer or employee from such source because of disability arising solely out of such employment."

World War II Veterans' Benefits—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include part II of a summary of major World War II veterans' benefits taken from the December 19, 1950, issue of the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly:

ROUND-UP OF MAJOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS' BENEFITS

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

A veteran disabled by injury or disease incurred in, or aggravated by, service during World War II may qualify for disability compensation. He must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Monthly rates range from $15 to $150, depending on the degree of disability, plus statutory awards for amputations, blindness, etc., up to a maximum of $360.

Veterans rated 50 percent or more disabled receive additional sums for dependents.

DISABILITY PENSION

A World War II veteran who becomes permanently and totally disabled for reasons not traceable to his service in the Armed Forces may be entitled to pension.

He must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after a minimum of 90 days service, or else discharged for disability in less than 90 days.

The veteran is disqualified if his income exceeds $1,000 a year if he is single or $2,500 if he is married or has a minor child.

The monthly rate is $60, which is increased to $72 after 10 years or when the veteran reaches age 65.

DEATH COMPENSATION

The widow, children, and dependent parents of a deceased World War II veteran whose death was due to service may qualify for death compensation.

A widow loses her entitlement if she remarries. The child loses entitlement, normally, upon reaching age 18.

Monthly amounts vary according to the number and relationship of the dependents. Examples are: widow, no children, $75; one child alone, no widow, $58; one parent, $60.

DEATH PENSION

The widow and children of certain deceased World War II veterans may be entitled to death pension benefits where the veteran died of causes not due to service.

Such dependents of a veteran who, at time of death, was receiving or entitled to receive compensation for service-connected disability are eligible. Otherwise, the veteran must have served at least 90 days (or have been discharged for service-incurred disability before 90 days of service) and, at time of death, had a service-connected disability of less than 10 percent.

The widow is disqualified if her annual income exceeds $1,000, or $2,500 if she had a child or children. A child with an income in excess of $1,000 per year is not eligible. A widow loses her entitlement upon remarriage, and children normally become ineligible when they reach age 18.

A widow alone receives $42 per month, with additional allowances for children. Where there is no widow, a single child is entitled to $21.60, with added amounts for more children.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

A veteran of World War II who served at any time between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, is eligible to apply for up to $10,000 of national service life insurance, whether or not he took out such insurance while in service or has since let it lapse.

He may get term insurance or any of six permanent plans available—ordinary life, 30-payment life, 20-payment life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65.

No one may at any time hold more than $10,000 worth of Government insurance, including United States Government life (World War I) insurance.

Term and permanent policies which have been allowed to lapse may be reinstated within 3 months from date of lapse, provided the insured is in as good health at the time of reinstatement as he was when the insurance lapsed. He must furnish the necessary information to establish that fact, preferably on VA Form 9–353 or 9–353a.

After 3 months of lapse, a physical examination is required. This will be given without charge at any VA regional office or hospital.

Term insurance may be reinstated by paying only two monthly premiums, but for permanent policies, payment of all premiums in arrears with interest is required.

CARS FOR DISABLED VETERANS

A World War II veteran who in service lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle may be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance at Government expense.

VA defrays the cost of the vehicle, including any special equipment necessary to enable the disabled veteran to operate it safely, up to a maximum amount of $1,600. For vehicles costing over $1,600, VA pays $1,600 of the purchase price.

Veterans have until June 30, 1951, to apply.

AID IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING

A veteran of war or peacetime service who is entitled to compensation for permanent and total service-connected disability for loss or loss of use of both legs due to certain specified conditions such as to prevent him from moving about without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, may qualify for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing with special fixtures made necessary by the nature of his disability.

Eligible veterans will receive Federal grants of not more than 50 percent of the cost of their homes up to a maximum of $10,000 with which to pay part of the cost of building or buying such homes, or to remodel existing homes for their requirements.

The grant also may be used to pay off the indebtedness on such a special home already acquired by an eligible veteran.

GUARDIANSHIP SERVICE

Incompetent World War II veterans, their minor dependents, and incompetent beneficiaries, are entitled to protection of their estates derived from benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration under acts of Congress.

Such protection is provided by the chief attorneys of VA regional offices, in accordance with State and Federal laws and VA regulations, acting under the direction and supervision of the legal service (guardianship) of the VA solicitor's office.

The chief attorneys maintain supervision over guardians appointed by State (probate and county) courts, as well as legal custodians recognized by VA in their respective jurisdictions.

BURIAL BENEFITS

Funeral expenses, up to $150, will be paid by the Government in the death of any World War II veteran discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Additional costs, covering transportation, will be allowed if the veteran died in a VA hospital or home, or while hospitalized at the expense of VA, or while in transit to or from a VA hospital, home, or regional office at the expense of VA.

All claims must be filed with the VA within 2 years from the date of permanent burial. These allowances are payable only to undertakers or to reimburse the person who paid the funeral expenses.

BURIAL FLAG

An American flag to drape the casket, which may be retained as a memorial by the next of kin, is supplied in the death of veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Such flags are issued upon application, by VA field offices, most first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and those fourth-class post offices located in county seats.

VA BENEFITS AVAILABLE OUTSIDE OF UNITED STATES

(a) United States possessions and Territories: Ordinarily, all VA benefits available to World War II veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries in the continental United States are also available to them in the United States possessions and Territories.

Certain exceptions are inevitable because of conditions peculiar to each area. For detailed information in any single case, check with the nearest VA office in the United States, or directly with the affected VA office in Alaska, Hawaii, the Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) Foreign countries: Most VA benefits are available to World War II veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries who are residing in foreign countries.

Benefits not available are readjustment allowances for unemployment and self-employment, and loan guaranties on properties or businesses situated in foreign countries.

Hospitalization or medical treatment is available only to a United States citizen-veteran residing temporarily in a foreign country who requires such care for a war service-connected disability.

The United States Foreign Service cooperates with VA in the administration of benefits available to veterans, their dependents or beneficiaries in foreign areas.

Any query originating in a foreign country should be directed to the nearest United States diplomatic or consular office in that country.

(c) Philippine Republic: VA maintains offices in the Philippines to administer VA benefits in the Republic.

World War II veterans in the Philippines and the VA benefits for which they are eligible fall into three groups. They are:

Group 1: World War II veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States, including members of the Philippine Scouts who enlisted prior to October 6, 1945.

Such veterans are eligible for all benefits that are available to veterans residing in any foreign country. (See (b), foreign country benefits above.)

Group 2: World War II veterans who enlisted or reenlisted in the Philippine Scouts between October 6, 1945, and June 30, 1947,

under Public Law 190, Seventy-ninth Congress.

VA benefit payments with respect to the military service of this group are limited by title II, Public Law 391, Seventy-ninth Congress, to compensation for service-connected disability or death, at the rate of one Philippine peso for each dollar authorized by law.

Provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, apply to this group only as such provisions relate to contracts entered into before passage of Public Law 391, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved March 27, 1946.

Group 3: World War II veterans who served in the Philippine Commonwealth Army, including recognized guerrillas, while such forces were in the service of the United States Armed Forces under a military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941.

VA benefit payments with respect to the military service of this group are limited by title II, Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, to compensation for service-connected disability or death, at the rate of one Philippine peso for each dollar authorized by law.

National service life insurance benefits apply to this group only if the NSLI contracts were entered into prior to the enactment of Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946.

APPEALS

The Board of Veterans' Appeals is available for rendering final decisions in all cases appealed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wherein a claimant has been denied benefits to which he claims entitlement. The Board has no original jurisdiction; its work is similar to that of a court of appeals. (Appeals arising under readjustment allowances are expected)

What the People Are Telling Congress About the Removal of Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the sickening reports of continuous United Nations defeat in Korea and the outrageous waste of American lives parade before the Nation a ceaseless indictment of Secretary of State Dean Acheson for his complete failure to develop a foreign policy in the Far East which would have operated in the best interest of the United States, and of President Truman for his stubborn support of the Acheson policies.

For the first time in the history of our Nation, we have lost the initiative and have become the victim of the whim and caprice of Communist Soviet Russia and Red China. Acheson has blindly led us into this position aided and supported by President Truman.

Never before in our history have leadership and wisdom in high places been so lacking, and the Government been rendered so impotent as it is in this critical period due to the mistakes of the administration.

In these crucial days, we cannot accept incompetent leadership without question. The stakes are too high. The future existence of our Nation, the maintenance of our form of government on this earth, depends upon competent, sure decisive leadership in the United States now.

The people are awake to their danger, and are demanding the removal of Acheson as Secretary of State. And the voice of the people must be heard.

A recent survey reported in a late issue of the United States News and World Report entitled "What the People Are Telling Congress" tells the story of the rising demand from the people. That survey which follows is worthy of attention of every citizen of the Nation.

WHAT THE PEOPLE ARE TELLING CONGRESS: "GET RID OF ACHESON" AND "LISTEN TO HOOVER"

The folks back home are writing their Congressmen:

"Fire Acheson." The mail is heavily against him.

"Follow Hoover." Mail on the former President's defense plan is divided, but most letter writers are for it.

Congressional mail, over all, shows voters are anxious, apprehensive. But it won't have much bearing on Truman policies.

If letters to Congressmen accurately express the voice of the people, two things are likely to happen:

Dean Acheson will be replaced as Secretary of State.

This country will tend to reduce commitments abroad as former President Herbert Hoover suggests.

The voters who write to Congress clamor for those two changes.

In actual fact, however, letters to Congress are not as influential as they often are supposed to be. The volume of mail is small in relation to total voters. Sometimes letters are inspired and follow a pattern. Sometimes they obviously come from cranks and are discounted.

Letter writers often are persons with set, long-standing viewpoints, or deep prejudices, who do not necessarily reflect the thinking of the people as a whole. Public-opinion polls show that the general public frequently is on one side of an issue and the comparatively few persons who write to Congressmen are on the opposite side. The Congressmen themselves, urged by letter writers to vote one way, often vote the other.

These writers, nevertheless, do give something of a clue to the thinking of the public. Senators and Representatives do pay close attention to views in the mail. They find, at the moment, thinking that can to some degree be measured.

Thousands of constituents in letters blame Mr. Acheson for setbacks in Korea and for those parts of foreign policy they dislike. They demand his removal. Congress cannot fire Dean Acheson, and President Truman insists he will not do so. Yet the anti-Acheson mail, although it has fallen off greatly, still is sizable.

Herbert Hoover's ideas on the role this country should play in the world now begin to rival the Acheson issue as a cause for letter writing. Mr. Hoover has suggested that the United States convert the Western Hemisphere into another Gibraltar, that it draw back from its guaranties to base its defenses on the Elbe River in Europe, unless Europe shows much more determination to defend itself.

Mail at first was almost entirely from pro-Hoover writers. Then second thoughts began to occur, and the majority in favor of his plan began to decline. But the edge, definitely, remains on the side of Hoover, as the tabulation on page 21 indicates. This tabulation is a rough measure of sentiment as mirrored by mail to Members of the Senate. It does not represent a letter-by-letter count but an appraisal by Senators and their assistants who keep track of the mail.

The volume of letters on Mr. Hoover has not been up to that on Mr. Acheson. Total volume might be 10,000 letters—15,000 at the outside. That cannot be classed as an avalanche. Yet the former President obviously touched a nerve that was sensitive. Many of the people back home tell their Senators that Mr. Hoover put into words just what they have been thinking and wanting to say.

An Ohio housewife writes her Senator: "His address is an answer to our prayers." A Kansas cattle breeder: "Pull out of Asia and Europe and arm to the teeth for Western Hemisphere defense. If this is isolationism—so be it."

Fear and confusion are dominant notes in much of the mail. Some writers complain that the United States lacks a definite policy for combating communism. They seize on the Hoover plan as something concrete. An Iowa farmer sums it up:

"Mr. Hoover's speech offers a plan and a hope. As of now we have neither."

Some people fear that, for the first time, the United States may lose a war. Instead of sending more troops abroad they want to pull back those already overseas and get set at home for whatever is to come.

A Missourian says: "We are already whipped. Bring our boys back and defend our country." Constituents of an Illinois Senator plead: "Let us not send our men and boys to slaughter on foreign soil. * * * Is it treason to be called an isolationist, or is it treason to send boys into Korea to die? * * * We must not send our troops to Europe to die in a futile war and bleed America white."

A Kansas army veteran puts it this way: "It is high time to push our chips out of the game and begin to protect our own country. I'm for Mr. Herbert Hoover's plan 100 percent."

In contrast, another Kansas veteran has this to say: "In our present-day civilization * * * isolationism has no place whatever." And a Connecticut housewife calls the Hoover proposal "ostrichlike isolation * * *. Europe is lost without our aid, and without Europe the United States could not hope to stand."

Downright anger runs through many letters attacking Secretary Acheson and the way United States foreign policy is handled. Some typical portions of letters to a Maryland Senator:

"Never before have I been so angered, so appalled by the tragedy of badly conducted, possibly corrupt, Government * * *. Let us stop the appeasing and clean the waxmustached Acheson and gang out and also Truman with the lot * * *. Can you imagine our President going cruising down the Potomac and attending football games while our boys are being slaughtered? * * * Impeach Truman * * *. Impeach Acheson."

A simple working man, writing in pencil on a postcard to a western Senator, says, however: "I feel certain that we need Acheson. The opposition is making him a scapegoat." Another defender declares: "The current sniping at * * * Acheson by the political vultures has reached the revolting stage."

Three key facts, the record shows, are overlooked by most of the writers.

Internationalist Congress: First fact that is overlooked is this: Since the end of World War II, Congress consistently has taken a stand on the side of internationalism rather than nationalism. It did this under both Republican and Democratic control, and it is expected to continue the trend. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT of Ohio, a leading Republican and a leading critic of the administration, votes at times for internationalism.

The United Nations Charter, committing United States to collective-security measures, was ratified in 1945 by a Senate vote of 89 to 2, with a two-thirds majority required.

Fifty-three Democrats, 35 Republicans (including TAFT), 1 Progressive favored ratification. Two Republicans voted against ratification.

The North Atlantic Pact was ratified in 1949. The Senate vote was 82 to 13, with 18 votes to spare over the two-thirds majority. Fifty Democrats were for ratification, 2 against. Thirty-two Republicans were for it, 11 (including TAFT) against.

A foreign-military-aid bill was passed in 1949 by the Senate, 55 to 24, and by the House, 238 to 122.

Powerful President: The second fact often overlooked is that foreign policy is set by the President—not by Congress, not by people who write letters to Congress, not by a former President. Mr. Truman's policy is to keep on fighting in Korea, send more troops and arms to Europe, build up armed services at home. And he believes he has ample power now to move additional troops to Europe without asking Congress for more authority.

Existing treaty: The third fact that many people fail to see is that the United States, by formal treaty, by acts of Congress, already is committed to defend her European allies against attack. The North Atlantic Pact, in effect, says an attack on any member nation is an attack on all.

Thus, regardless of the viewpoint expressed by letter writers, Congress may be expected to keep on supporting internationalist policies and programs, and to send more, not fewer, American men into military service abroad.

FCC Examiner Linked to Reds by Radio Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Willard Edwards, from the Washington Times-Herald for January 10, 1951:

FCC EXAMINER LINKED TO REDS BY RADIO FIRM

(By Willard Edwards)

An attack upon the legality of decisions by Federal officials alleged to have Communist affiliations or sympathies has created a stir in Government circles.

This unique legal move could have far-reaching consequences affecting dozens of bureaus, particularly those of a quasi-judicial nature, which issue thousands of rulings affecting American citizens in every walk of life.

The question was put before the Federal Communications Commission last November 17, it was learned, in the form of a petition for construction permits by the Gretna and Lower Coast Radio and Broadcasting Co., Gretna, La.

LAWYERS GUILD NAMED

Reversal of an initial adverse ruling was requested on the ground that the hearing examiner was a member of the Washington board of directors of the National Lawyers guild, recently described by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as the legal bulwark of the Communist Party.

The committee recommended that the lawyers guild be placed on the Justice Department's subversive list and that the guild be required to register as an agent of a foreign principal. It recommended further that members of the guild be barred from Government employment because the organization was an arm of the international Communist conspiracy.

The request for rejection of the decision was stated in the petition as follows:

"The purpose of the FCC, as provided by Congress, is to serve the interest, necessity, and convenience of the people of the United States.

"TYDINGS' DEFEAT CITED

"International communism is a criminal conspiracy, having for its aim the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

"The majority of the people of the United States are opposed to international communism, in all forms and under all conditions, and they are particularly opposed to persons holding positions of trust in the Government who are even suspected of having sympathies for international communism.

"This statement is supported by the action of the people of the State of Maryland on November 7, 1950, in defeating for reelection Senator Tydings, chairman of a senatorial committee which is alleged to have 'whitewashed' certain governmental departments which it had been alleged contained employees who were Communists or had Communist sympathies.

"HOUSE REPORT QUOTED

"Every American is entitled to have his business with the Federal Government attended to by persons who are not Communists, who are not Communist sympathizers, and who are not suspected of being such."

The document then recites the House committee findings on the National Lawyers Guild and notes that the report identifies the FCC examiner as an official on July 1950, of the Washington chapter's board of directors.

"On information and belief," the petition states, "Chairman Wayne Coy of the FCC knew, or in the reasonable and efficient exercise of his duties should have known, of the affiliation of this high-ranking employee as a member of said guild and member of its board of directors.

"For the very obvious reasons set forth, Gretna and Lower Coast Radio & Broadcasting Co., Inc., is entitled to have the initial decision rejected and set aside and a rehearing ordered before a trial examiner who is not affiliated with the National Lawyers Guild."

Mass Hypnotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph W. Page, from the Philadelphia Bulletin:

MASS HYPNOTISM—PROPAGANDA MILLS SPEND HUGE SUMS TO SWAY CONGRESS AND PUBLIC OPINION

(By Ralph W. Page)

Conducting pressure upon Congress and public opinion has become big business.

The Buchanan House Lobby Investigation Committee reports that this synthetic opinion racket amounted to over half a billion dollars during the first 6 months of this year.

Ten organizations each spent over $100,000 bombarding Congress and flooding the country with their demands. The Committee for Constitutional Government (Fascist version) alone spent half a million.

The worst of this is not the effect upon Senators and Representatives. It is the impact of these gigantic propaganda mills upon the knowledge and judgment of the whole country.

Even if these richly endowed or mass organizations accurately and honestly presented their sides in current controversies they would be a menace—tending to drown out all other valid considerations. But almost without exception these lobby machines distort the record beyond recognition and hypnotize the public mind by endless reiteration of untenable propositions.

OTHER THREATS TO INDEPENDENT OPINION

Independent opinion is further threatened by enormous publicity funds in the hands of professional agents of such aggregations as workmen, farmers, managers, and doctors because it is assumed that all of the myriad members accept and support without question the biased and provocative partisan version of facts presented by the hired advocate.

Examples would fill a library.

The American Medical Association spent over $347,000,000 screaming that the proposed health insurance is socialized medicine under which no man could select his own doctor. Both assertions are false. But the repetition has convinced most physicians that they are gospel.

The only reason that the unions failed to produce a monolithic opinion in labor circles that Taft-Hartley is a slave-labor act is because the business publicity hounds spent twice as much to assert that it was a liberation.

A prime example is provided by the electric utilities industries. They consistently contend that the Government is enslaving the people and wasting their substances by generating electricity in such works as the Grand Coulee, the Hoover, and the Tennessee Valley Dams.

WATER RESOURCES REPORT BRINGS FIRE

Their latest is an hysterical blast at the report of the Water Resources Policy Commission. The Commission merely stated the irrefutable proposition that the water in a river basin should be so managed as to best preserve all of its necessary usages.

Since this categorically requires further Federal multipurpose dams, the chairman of the electric companies' public information program blandly broadcasts that the Commission obviously had failed to listen to the people and has written a report ignoring their expressed wishes.

In other words, the people are to believe that their interest and wishes are identical with the power interests who want no water policy whatever.

What About Unemployment Compensation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, late in the last Congress H. R. 8059 was introduced dealing with unemployment compensation. That bill died with the ending of the Eighty-first Congress, but that bill has been reintroduced in this Congress as H. R. 5225. Mrs. Elinore Morehouse Herrick has written an excellent analysis of that proposal. This

should be of interest and the article is as follows:

"POLITICKING" IN SOCIAL LEGISLATION—FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT ON STATE FUNCTIONS IS CALLED PLAIN IN H. R. 8059

(By Elinore Morehouse Herrick)

The "politicking" in social legislation by Federal administrators is very disturbing. Only a week-end notice of hearings on H. R. 8059 radically affecting the unemployment compensation system was given recently by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. Although employers who pay the full cost of unemployment compensation were taken by surprise by these almost furtively announced hearings, Secretary Tobin and his cohorts were on hand with long prepared statements.

H. R. 8059 scraps the original concept of unemployment insurance as a way to cushion the shock of unemployment to the worker who loses his job involuntarily through no fault of his own. It would make payments to strikers mandatory, contrary to the policy of some States. Payments would be made to persons who quit their jobs for "good personal reasons." The entire concept of "suitability" of employment by which States have attempted to safeguard their funds from abuse is broadened to make payments to persons who voluntarily quit "unsuitable" jobs or who are discharged for cause. Even a person who is discharged for theft will get benefits. It would substitute uniform Federal standards for those which have been tailor-made by State legislatures to fit conditions in the various States. It would substitute Federal administration for State over the heart of the law, namely, the determination of the individual's right to unemployment benefits.

The statements of Secretary Tobin and Mr. Goodwin, Director of the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security, were interlarded with references to staff reports, advisory council reports, etc, etc., to bolster their arguments on specific points. These frequent references to reports of seemingly impartial groups conveyed the impression—as they were intended to do—that there was overwhelming and disinterested expert opinion in favor of their position. Yet the 1948 report of the advisory committee to the Senate Committee on Finance throws an entirely different light on the picture presented by the administration spokesmen. It states: "The majority approves the basic principles and arrangements of the present State-Federal system * * * the State is the proper unit to determine the benefit provisions which will meet the varying conditions in different parts of the country."

A minority report written by a labor man on behalf of five dissenters advocated a completely federalized system. That, it seems to me, is also the goal of the Secretary of Labor. In spite of the finding of the majority of the advisory committee that the States had improved their systems, Mr. Tobin told the House subcommittee "until there is some degree of uniformity established in respect to amounts and duration of benefits, individual States alone will be most reluctant to raise their benefit standards." This simply is not the fact, as State experience has proved.

Some further improvements in State laws should unquestionably be made which are included in H. R. 8059. For example, no one can quarrel with the thesis that involuntary unemployment lays as great a hardship upon the sole employee as it does upon the person who is one of several hundred in the shop. H. R. 8059 seeks to broaden the coverage, as has been done in the Social Security Act.

The bill would raise the taxable base from $3,000 to the first $4,800 of wages, the tax being solely paid by employers and not a joint contribution as in the case of old-age and survivors insurance. The cost to employers, therefore, would be increased greatly, and, as Secretary Tobin pointed out, "would be passed on to consumers." He estimates that the increase in costs of the proposed minimum standards would be about 30 percent for the Nation as a whole and for individual States will run from 10 percent to 90 percent.

It is when we come to the uniform high benefits, the introduction of dependency benefits into a wage system heretofore based on the degree of skill required and the amount and quality of work, and the criteria for disqualifying benefit claimants that the gravest questions of public policy arise, except for the overriding one of whether we should switch to a federalized system.

H. R. 8059 assumes a weekly wage of $60 and the single individual would get 50 percent or up to $30. A person with three or more dependents would get 70 percent of his wage or up to $42 a week. By the time the various authorized payroll deductions are made the $60 is dangerously close to the maximum benefit allowable. No one can tell exactly the extent to which this narrowing of the gap between take-home pay and unemployment compensation would lead people to ask themselves, "Why work?" We know that this happens. New York, Ohio, and California, to cite a few, have all had to follow up beneficiaries who were wintering in resort areas such as Miami Beach rather than looking for work—New Orleans seems to be the latest resort favorite for the unemployed.

If dependency benefits are paid as a means of making up part of the wage loss of the unemployed, the logical next step is to say that the family man should get a higher wage than the single man and the larger the family the higher the pay without regard to the quantity or quality of work. In countries where this has been tried industrial activity has been notably less efficient than here in America where workers enjoy the highest standard of living in the world.

By requiring that all States pay benefits for a flat 26 weeks the current practice of relating total benefits to past earnings would be destroyed. This would mean that an unemployed person could receive more in benefits than he received while working. Secretary Tobin thus does only lip service to the idea of distinguishing between the worker who is only casually attached and the one who is permanently attached to the labor market. Under H. R. 8059 both would get benefits for 26 weeks, regardless of the length of his past employment.

In discussing the proposed uniform standards for disqualifying claimants, Mr. Goodwin is surprisingly frank. There are three objectives: "To limit the reasons for which a disqualification may be imposed, to prohibit the reduction or cancellation of benefit rights for any cause, to establish a maximum period during which benefits may be postponed. * * * For example, a claimant could be disqualified only if he left suitable work without good cause attributable to the employer. Moreover, it makes the disqualification applicable only to those who leave suitable work because claimants should have the same right to leave an unsuitable job without incurring a disqualification as they have to refuse unsuitable work."

Remember that unemployment insurance legislation was intended to protect the worker from the full shock of involuntary unemployment incurred through no fault of his own. Mr. Goodwin carefully explains that the second objective of the proposed bill is to prohibit the cancellation or reduction of benefits for any cause. He makes it plain that an employee discharged for theft from his employer could have his benefits postponed, not canceled, but only if a court then convicted him of a crime. An employee who stole from someone else and was discharged because therefore his employer regarded him as a poor risk could draw benefits along with the honest man laid off because of lack of work. Not even the person who files a fraudulent claim will lose future benefits but will only have to wait longer to get them. Mr. Goodwin explains it thus: "A longer period of postponement is contemplated in those relatively few cases in which a worker has been disqualified for a discharge of gross misconduct connected with his last work that has resulted in a conviction of a crime or for deliberate misrepresentation to obtain benefits."

Who will interpret these uniform Federal standards? The Federal Government, of course. Thus Secretary Tobin or his agents will determine whether old or new employment is suitable, whether the personal reasons for quitting a job were proper. This comes about because the Federal Government would have the right to decide whether a State was in conformity with the Federal statute and to cut off the funds for administration in a nonconforming State. If this is not Federal control of the unemployment system I do not know what it is.

Secretary Tobin renews his fight on the Knowland amendment which would preserve to the States the right to have State courts interpret the laws before the Federal Government could intervene. Secretary Tobin told the House subcommittee that workers should not have to go to court to collect their unemployment compensation. With this any impartial person would agree. But this is not the real issue in Secretary Tobin's fight on the Knowland amendment. He cannot achieve his goal of uniform national standards if the States are permitted to retain their State laws and have them subject to review by State courts. He cannot require payment of unemployment benefits to strikers while a State law subject to interpretation by State courts postpones or prohibits payments to strikers.

The attempt of Federal administrators to encroach upon State functions is made plain in H. R. 8059. Mr. Tobin admits that the costs of unemployment insurance are passed on to consumers. As one consumer I don't want to pay for the benefits given to a man who tried to cheat the unemployment insurance system or who quits his job voluntarily, or who quits for a good personal reason which Secretary Tobin is going to appraise. For the man who is involuntarily unemployed for a cause beyond his control I shall be happy to pay higher prices.

State Department Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the State Department; also I include the pertinent part of a letter I received from A. M. Willis, Jr., of Longview, Tex.:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 8, 1951.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have received your letter of December 26, 1950, acknowledged by telephone on December 28, with which you enclosed a letter from ——— ———, who recommends careful consideration of the foreign policy advocated recently by the Honorable Herbert Hoover. Thank you for making ——— ——— correspondence available to the Department for comment.

Basically, the United States is striving to insure the development of world conditions in which all peoples will be able to conduct their affairs in peace and with full protection for the fundamental rights and freedoms to which all men are entitled. Tragically, the achievement of this policy, which coincides with the interests of all free peoples, is being challenged by the leadership of the Soviet Government which, by maintaining great armies and persistently refusing to cooperate in measures to maintain peace either through the United Nations or otherwise, has created potentially dangerous situations and a sense of foreboding and tension throughout the world. The threat of Communist imperialism confronts not only the United States but all peoples who believe in the free way of life.

The present policy of our country is based on the concept that the security of each one of the nations of the free world is closely tied up with the security of all these nations. The great lesson of this century has been that this is the only policy which gives any hope of ultimate success. It is the national policy which has grown out of decisions of the executive branch, of the Congress, and of the people of the United States over a period of years. It has been put into action through our membership in the United Nations, through aid to Greece and Turkey, the European recovery program, the North Atlantic treaty for common defense, the program for assistance to underdeveloped areas and the mutual-defense assistance program, all of which have been enacted into legislation by the Congress and have had the broad support of the people.

A policy which would desert this concept of common security would reject the entire broad strategy for freedom. It would require the United States to isolate itself from the rest of the world and to try to survive alone. This deceptively attractive policy holds out a false promise of security, and the consequences of it must be understood clearly. It was discussed at some length by Secretary Acheson in his press conference of December 22, 1950, in which he reported on the Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Council. A copy of his remarks is enclosed for your constituent's information.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Acheson disclosed that the National Security Council, composed of the President, Cabinet officers having responsibilities in international affairs, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has repeatedly considered such a policy as that outlined by Mr. Hoover and has rejected it for many reasons. Mr. Acheson mentioned six of them, which are: (1) This completely defensive policy would enable the Soviet Union quickly to conquer the entire continents of Europe and Asia; (2) it would place at the disposal of the Kremlin military resources and economic power vastly superior to our own and give the Soviet Union a strategic position catastrophic to the United States; (3) it would enable the Soviet Union to develop power which could destroy our own and which would undoubtedly be used for that purpose; (4) this vast balance of power in favor of the Soviet Union would put us at such a disadvantage that it would be impossible to negotiate for a peaceful settlement of differences; (5) under such conditions the United States would have to accept whatever terms would be imposed or fight entirely without allies to maintain physical existence itself; and (6) physical existence—if that—would be all that is left, for the entire American heritage would be undermined.

I am also enclosing other material which may be of interest to your constituent, and I am returning his letter as you requested.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

LONGVIEW, TEX., *January 9, 1951.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I write in regard to the present debate on foreign policy.

As you know, this Nation and the world are in grave danger. There are certain men in the country like ——— and ——— who are seeking to disunite our people. To further discredit the administration, they have suggested that we should withdraw our help from Western Europe until the nations comprising that territory have themselves raised and equipped armies of such numbers "as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood." In other words, we should withdraw our help until no help is needed. To keep from being labeled "isolationist" they suggest that we help Britain to the extent Britain will cooperate. In our world of atomic-guided missiles, defense of Britain would be an impossibility with Russian armies completely in control 20 miles away. Therefore, this suggestion is meaningless.

Now, Congressman, I submit that if these men succeed in this policy, our Nation is doomed. The facts are that today there are 200,000,000 free people in Western Europe. The facts are that the land in which these people live contains an industrial capacity greater than that of the Soviet Union. The facts are that if Russia is allowed to get this industrial area for her own, she will then be able to take Africa, the rest of Asia, and then move into Latin America. The uranium we now get from Africa, which is vital to our atomic-energy program, would no longer come here, but would go to the Soviet Union to make atomic weapons to use on us.

In addition, Congressman, you are of course familiar with the North Atlantic treaty, ratified by the Senate in 1949. I have read this treaty and it is my understanding that in it the United States, Canada, and 10 Western European nations pledged their faith to give continuous mutual aid and come to one another's assistance in the event of armed attack. In view of this treaty, would any nation in the world be justified in putting any credence whatever in the written or stated word of the United States should the suggestions of ——— and ——— be followed? To be sure, Congressman, the peoples of Western Europe must help themselves. But they will not help themselves unless they are led, and there are only two nations in the world capable of providing that necessary leadership—the United States and the Soviet Union. Therefore, we must take the lead in helping those 200,000,000 people to provide adequate defenses for themselves.

History records, Congressman, that would-be dictators have only been defeated by a coalition of free nations. Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler were all defeated by such a coalition. We cannot beat Russia alone. We need all the help we can get; Western Europe, a rearmed Germany, a rearmed Japan, Spain, Tito, and everybody who will fight if necessary.

As to ———'s assertion that the President does not have authority to send troops abroad, any student with a cursory knowledge of history knows that he is wrong. Presidents Jefferson, Polk, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt all exercised their constitutional right as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to use the forces of the United States as they thought necessary. In several instances the Supreme Court upheld that right and every attempt to question it was successfully refuted.

* * * They are either blindly ignorant or purposely trying to disunite our country in the interest of keeping alive their morally bankrupt political party. They ought to be exposed, and it is up to you and other people with brains to do it before it is too late.

Very sincerely yours,

A. M. WILLIS, Jr.

Fast Cargo Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent discussion on the floor of the House in reference to fast cargo ships, I include at this point in the RECORD the following quotation from an article by Vannevar Bush entitled "The Weapons We Need for Freedom," as reprinted in the Reader's Digest for January 1951:

The day of the convoy may be over, and we certainly need to develop and build in quantity cargo carriers of such speeds at sea as to be immune to submarine attacks, and means such as we used at Normandy to land cargo in spite of mines. There is no point in discussing airlift when millions of tons of cargo must be moved thousands of miles, if it can be done by fast cargo ships virtually immune to submarine attack.

Extension of Time for Educational Courses for Ex-Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, together with other members of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress, I received this week a letter from the New England College of Pharmacy, of Boston, Mass., urging the early enactment of legislation that would extend the time in which ex-servicemen can start their courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and complete them.

As many of you know, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs issued a ruling last July that permits veterans who have started GI bill studies and interrupt them to go back into active military or naval service, to resume their training within a reasonable period following their release from active service, even though they get out after the dead-line date. Such veterans must meet three requirements: The conduct and progress in his GI bill course must have been satisfactory. The amount of training he may obtain after he gets out of uniform will be limited by his remaining GI bill entitlement. And his course may not extend beyond the wind-up of the GI bill program on July 25, 1956.

At the request of the New England College of Pharmacy, I am introducing a bill

today that would extend the cut-off period for 2 years beyond the present requirements. Under existing law, the July 25, 1951, cut-off date applies to World War II veterans discharged before July 25, 1947. For those few discharged afterward, the cut-off date is 4 years from date of discharge. My new bill will take care of those veterans who have not initiated their training before reentering the military or naval service.

Following is the letter to which I referred above:

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE OF PHARMACY,
Boston, Mass., January 4, 1951.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The New England College of Pharmacy, a nonprofit educational institution, incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts, which is fulfilling a crying need at the present time in Massachusetts; namely, the supplying of competent pharmacists, is humbly seeking your aid and assistance on behalf of the veterans and citizens of Massachusetts.

At the present time, and for the past 10 years, and possibly for the next 10 years, there will exist an acute shortage of competent registered pharmacists in our State.

Due to the limited facilities there are in the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Western Massachusetts School of Pharmacy, and the New England College of Pharmacy in regard to chemistry, materia medica, pharmaceutical laboratories, there is a shortage of available facilities to fulfill the present needs. Prior to this year all of the schools have had to turn away students because of this limited laboratory capacity.

Many of the veterans who had enrolled for the present year as freshmen have gone back into the armed services, having been in the Reserve. Other applicants who could have taken their places are also in the Reserve and have been recalled, especially the younger men. This has resulted in a situation that will create an injustice to these young men and women on their return from the service, inasmuch as the present law requires that they be enrolled and start their course by July 25, 1951. None of the three Massachusetts pharmacy colleges now have accelerated courses; their courses all start in September and October.

We cannot say when the present crisis will be terminated, so that these veterans can resume their studies. Pharmacists and pharmaceutical chemists in the large drug companies in the United States are in great demand and young men completing their courses can get an immediate position with salaries ranging from $65 per week in Greater Boston to over $100 a week in the Middle Atlantic and Southern States.

The board of trustees of the New England College of Pharmacy, because of the aforesaid situation, have voted to ask your aid in extending the time in which the servicemen can start these courses and complete them. For that reason, we are enclosing a proposed amendment extending the period of starting studies for 15 months so that the boys may start in September of 1951 and September of 1952, especially these boys who are now in the Reserve. This will protect their rights. If, in your wisdom, you think this time is too long or too short, we shall gladly accept any changes of date you want to make.

In any event, we respectfully urge and request that the entering time be extended until at least October 1, 1951, so that the discrimination against schools having regulation courses and not accelerated courses will not hurt the veteran.

May we ask you to introduce the enclosed amendment to cure this injustice, and we are sending a request to other members of the Massachusetts congressional group in Washington for their support.

Thanking you on behalf of our schools, the veterans who will be helped, and the public of Massachusetts who will be served by such an amendment, we are

Respectfully yours,
MARTIN E. ADAMO, *President.*
CONSTANTINE N. MERIANO, *Dean.*

Withdrawal From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1951.

Mr. ———,
Waco, Tex.

DEAR FRIEND: Your recent letter in which you suggest our withdrawal from Korea undoubtedly expresses a widespread and, I fear, growing view. I know that from the standpoint of purely selfish politics it would be smart for me to simply ride with the tide, but I cannot do such a thing when I feel that that tide is simply leading us onto the rocks.

I think we all naturally feel, without reasoning it through, that if we could but repudiate our world-wide commitments, that we could return to the relatively happy and secure days of the past. When we stop to think it through, every one of us knows that it is impossible to make such a return. The one thing that is inevitable in this world is change. The world has changed tremendously in your lifetime and mine. It has grown exceedingly small. As the time required to reach distant points has been reduced, their importance to us has increased.

Senator TAFT and Mr. Hoover say, in effect, that we should defend the United States only at our own shores and on our own soil. I am compelled to take exactly the opposite view. When considering the defense of America, I like to take a globe and look for that spot on the globe which is farthest from central Texas. I believe that that will be somewhere in the South Indian Ocean. If it were within my power I would try to start the defense of America at that spot. I fear that if the enemy were to march up the Little River Valley or over the Bosque Mountain, no amount of home-guard preparation could save us

Of course, I realize that I have pictured two extremes, but I hope I have been able to picture the two basic philosophies which are in conflict. Certainly we must choose one of these two concepts in shaping our entire policy of national defense. If President Hoover and Senator TAFT are right, it will be possible for us to abandon the rest of the world to the Communists and live a contented, peaceful, and prosperous life between the two oceans and between the Gulf and Canadian borders. This is an intriguing prospect, and I think that I am sufficiently selfish to grasp it if I could believe that it was anything more than an illusion. I cannot, however, believe that we can allow more than 90 percent of the population, territory, and resources of the world to fall into communistic hands and survive as an island of democracy and free enterprise. On the contrary I think we would certainly succumb without the necessity of any communistic military invasion. I don't think any nation can survive the air age by living to itself alone.

I know you will say, "But neither President Hoover nor Senator TAFT contemplated going as far as you are suggesting." It is true that neither admitted that he was drawing the lines where I have drawn them, and possibly neither realized it, but is it not equally true that if we follow their philosophy, the boundaries will ultimately be exactly where I placed them?

Nor does it seem to me that the Senator and the ex-President clearly recognize that we are now engaged in a world-wide conflict of ideologies—a conflict between the idea of a godless communistic society on the one hand against a theistic (if not in all countries Christian) society in which the rights of property and individuals are recognized on the other—a conflict between dictatorship and democracy. This conflict is in my opinion now under way. It is much larger than a simply armed conflict between the United States and Russia. It involves every means of existence. It includes diplomatic, economic, and propaganda warfare as well as armed conflict. Declared war between the two most powerful nations of the world, of course, overshadows the other elements of the conflict, but these other elements are nonetheless of tremendous importance and could greatly influence the outcome of the larger conflict. The fighting in Korea is a part of this larger conflict just as is our effort to aline the democracies of Europe on our side.

The question then arises, can we withdraw from Korea and expect the United Nations to survive? You will probably agree that such action would be as disastrous to the United Nations as was the failure of the members of the League of Nations to prevent aggression in Ethiopia, but you will probably say, as so many undoubtedly feel, that the United Nations has failed anyway, and that it is not worth saving. I agree that it has accomplished relatively little, but I cannot agree that it is not worth making an effort to establish collective security in this world. I know of no other way in which we can in ages to come expect to bring about world peace. I, for one, am not going to quit working for world peace.

But it would not simply be the United Nations that would lose were we to now abandon the Korean Republic to the Reds. Our own Nation would incur the same contempt which Britain incurred after Prime Minister Chamberlain attempted to appease Hitler through British acquiescence in Hitler's aggression. Mr. Chamberlain undoubtedly honestly believed, as did many more, that he had saved the lives of British boys, and he did save them for possibly 10 months. But the very next year Britain was engaged in the most terrible conflict in her long history, and the loss of British life was heavier than she had ever known.

Doubtless we could retreat from Korea with a minimum of momentary losses, but were we to do so, would we not openly invite communistic aggression in every other part of the world? Surely we could not expect the Communists to much longer delay a thrust into the middle eastern oil fields. Would we resist that aggression? Iran is much farther from American bases than is Korea from our base in Japan and the loss of American lives would doubtless be even greater than it has been in Korea. On the other hand, can we afford to allow the Communists to take this great supply of oil which is so essential to them if they are to carry on any long-continued conflict with America? Without additional oil Russia faces one of the same handicaps which did so much to defeat Hitler.

Surely, were we to withdraw from Korea, the Chinese Communists would be free to provide overwhelming forces to push the

French, British, and Dutch out of southeastern Asia, and to cut us off from our supplies of rubber and tin. Can we afford to let these resources fall one by one into hostile hands? Can we finally defend our own shores with the enemy in possession of these essentials of modern war?

Nor do I believe that the Communists would wait long after our withdrawal to attempt the conquest of Japan itself. Why should they if we showed that we had neither the power nor the disposition to prevent aggression in Korea? And how could we expect to have any friends or allies in Europe if we follow such a course? If we demonstrate to the world that we either will not or cannot resist the aggression that we said we would resist in Korea, how can the people of Western Europe, including the people of Britain, be expected to rely to any degree upon our assurance that we will help them resist aggression in Europe? And if they cannot expect a fulfillment of that pledge, is it not to their own selfish advantage to join with the Russians and avoid the horrors of another occupation and another "liberation?"

If you lived in Belgium, or France, or Western Germany, would you line up with a world force which had demonstrated its inability or its unwillingness to give protection to others who faced the same aggressive forces which threatened your independent existence, or would you follow the lead of Poland, Hungary, and the other satellites? And when the inevitable consequences of Korean withdrawal have run their course in Europe and Asia, are we not certain to find ourselves defending our homes and our institutions on American soil, and will there not be more American boys (and women and children too) who will suffer and die from such a war than would be endangered were we to stand firm in the distant parts of the globe?

I make no claim to be a military strategist, but I think it is clear that one of the great deterrents to Russian movement in the west at this time is the existence of a powerful American force in the Far East. If Russia can clear her eastern frontier from the threat of effective American retaliation, she will certainly be more likely to march in the Middle East or in Europe.

I know it is argued that we cannot afford to wear ourselves out with a series of fruitless engagements the world over. I recognize the force of this argument, but what course is likely to encourage new and additional outbreaks like the one in Korea? Is not American withdrawal the most certain guaranty that there will be more and even stronger thrusts of this kind into the free world?

As I see it, the answer is not to run. The answer is not appeasement. The answer is not isolationism. The answer is to accept the responsibility of world leadership, but let us become leaders not simply carriers of all burdens. Let us seek the assistance of those we lead rather than attempting to provide all of the manpower and the money for the defense of the entire world. Let us enlist Japanese to help us fight in the common cause in Asia and Germans for a similar purpose in Europe. I am, of course, talking about enlisting these men in the United States Army. I am not talking about any kind of deal with the German or Japanese Governments. We could strengthen our situation in Korea almost overnight if we would enlist Japanese troops, and there is no doubt but that there are millions in both Germany and Japan who would like the food, clothing, and pay of the American Army.

We could build a sufficiently hard core of military resistance in Europe to encourage the free nations of that continent to make a serious effort at self-defense if we would enlist 25 or 30 divisions of Germans. The situation is not hopeless. It simply requires that we take some practical and commonsense steps; that we forget some of the traditions of the military, especially their insistence on taking none but perfect physical specimens of American manhood in our Armed Forces. It requires that we recognize that we cannot be strong militarily unless we remain strong economically and that our economy is certain to crash if we cut ourselves off from contact with the rest of the world.

Possibly I should put it another way. We cannot afford to attempt to buy a few weeks or months of respite from the conflict at the expense of committing ourselves to policies that are certain to be ever so much more costly in blood and treasure in the years to come. I know that our people generally have not recognized the similarity between the present situation and the conditions which existed during the dark days of the American Revolution. You will, however, recall that a very substantial part of the population then sought to have Washington abandon the fight and to stop further unnecessary loss of life.

If the American people decide they cannot stand the sacrifices that resistance to communism impose upon us, then I think that we would do well to prepare ourselves for the inevitable destruction of our own institutions and the substitution of a communistic economy and a totalitarian government. I will not, however, believe that our people are incapable of understanding the issues involved or of meeting them courageously and intelligently when they understand them. I think that the great failure of the hour has been the failure of our Government to make our position clear to our people. I know that we failed in securing such an understanding after World War I and that our people swung to the isolationist viewpoint just as they are swinging today. I know that that failure led to World War II just as a similar course today will lead to world war III.

I can only hope that this time our people will more quickly grasp the vision of Woodrow Wilson than they did last time. I am sure that in the long run they will swing back and that they will repudiate the leadership of Senator TAFT and of ex-President Hoover just as they repudiated the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge and Warren Harding as soon as they understood the ultimate issues involved.

I have written you at great length because I admire and respect your own opinions and also because I recognize that your letter does generally reflect a growing feeling among our people. I hope you will understand that I do not mean to put the question on a personal basis at all, nor do I question the sincerity or patriotism of anyone. On the contrary, I realize that none of us can claim to be able to foretell the future and that my position is based entirely on what I believe to be the long-time interest of America and of the world. If I am wrong in projecting the history of the past into the probable events of the future then undoubtedly we should give grave consideration to the suggestion that we might gain a present advantage by complete retreat from our effort to organize world sentiment and action against aggression. I don't question the sincerity of those who counsel immediate and complete withdrawal from Korea, but I think that only by discussing these great problems can the American people (and the American Congress) hope to arrive at a clear understanding of the issues involved and at a sound answer to these issues.

Let me thank you for your letter which has helped me to more clearly understand our common problems and for your interest in the affairs of our country. With all good wishes, I am,

Your friend,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, Eleventh Texas District.

Presentation of Medals of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week the Army of the United States paid the highest tribute the American people can give to their military heroes. Five ground force soldiers, all either killed or missing in action in Korea, were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their valor far above and beyond the call of duty.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the account of the presentation of the Medal of Honor by President Truman, as reported for the New York Times by Anthony Leviero, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PRESIDENT CONFERS FIVE MEDALS OF HONOR—RELATIVES OF HEROES OF KOREA RECEIVE HIGHEST AWARD IN WASHINGTON CEREMONY

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—Relatives of five heroes of the Korean battlefields received the highest honor of the United States today from President Truman.

Pride and sorrow created an atmosphere of pathos as the Congressional Medal of Honor was conferred for the first time in this war. The heroes could not be there in the President's press conference room in the old State Department Building. Two of them were dead and three were missing. Their wives and mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters rose for them.

The relatives struggled as hard to smile as they did to hold the tears back. They managed the smiles, but the tears flowed. All five men were ground fighters, "the men who win the wars," President Truman said.

The citations of their deeds reflected the bitter nature of the fighting against great odds. The general had fought like a buck private—a brave buck private—to set an example. The GI's had displayed leadership qualities worthy of generals. All five had made the purest kind of sacrifice for their comrades and for a cause.

PRIVATE AND GENERAL

Pfc. Melvin L. Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., slashing the heads of North Koreans with an intrenching shovel, the way the citation told it, was doing essentially the same kind of deed as Maj. Gen. William F. Dean.

Private Brown held off the enemy while his platoon took an important plot of terrain known as hill 755. He was perched atop a 50-foot wall firing away with his rifle. When he was wounded and his ammunition gone comrades below the wall tossed him grenades. When he had used these he drew out the shovel and cleaved the heads of 10 or 12 of the enemy as they mounted the wall.

General Dean's story is now well known. Trying to hold the key city of Taejon with a hopelessly small force, he fought tanks with grenades and inspired his men. That was early in the war when his troops had little combat experience.

The citation told all that he had done for his men and added that apparently he felt it necessary to sustain the courage and resolution of his troops by examples of excessive gallantry committed always at the threatened portions of his front lines.

Both Private Brown and the general are listed as missing.

SERGEANT AND LIEUTENANT

It was the same with the other three. Before a burst of enemy fire killed him, Sgt. (1st Cl.) Charles W. Turner, of Boston, covered the withdrawal of his platoon and thus enabled it to counterattack and rout the enemy. He did this by opening fire with an exposed turret machine gun of a tank. His accurate fire showed up targets for the tank's 75-millimeter guns, and his action caused the destruction of seven enemy machine-gun nests.

First Lt. Frederick F. Henry, of Clinton, Okla., saw his platoon disorganized by a heavy fanatical attack. He left his foxhole to rally his men and reform a defense line. Soon his men were delivering a devastating fire.

Though wounded, he ordered his own wounded men evacuated, took their weapons, ordered his platoon to withdraw and established himself as a one-man defensive position. As the citation said, "When last seen he was single-handedly firing all available weapons so effectively that he caused an estimated 50 enemy casualties." He is listed missing

Master Sgt Travis E Watkins, of Gladewater, Tex., organized a perimeter defense when 30 of his men were attacked by an overwhelming force He ran from foxhole to foxhole, giving encouragement and directions. When they ran short of ammunition he killed five enemy soldiers, dashed 50 yards beyond the perimeter and brought back their ammunition and weapons.

Paralyzed from the waist down, he ordered his men to withdraw, refused all food so they could have it, refused evacuation, for he considered himself in a hopeless condition that would burden them He cheerfully "wished them luck" and his "aggressive leadership and intrepid actions" caused the destruction of nearly 500 of the enemy.

When General Dean's name was called, his family rose, Mrs. Dean calmly came forward for the medal inscribed "Valor." Anybody who knew General Dean immediately recognized his young living image in the West Point cadet in the front row, William F. Dean, Jr., his red hair as prominent as the shiny brass buttons of his uniform. He was with his grandmother, Mrs. Charles W. Dean, and his sister, Mrs. Robert C. Williams, both of Berkeley, Calif.

"I can't say this gives me pleasure because you'd rather have General Dean alive than to have this medal," said the President, his voice trailing off into a murmer that got lost in the grind of motion-picture cameras.

Tech. Sgt. Christopher C Henry, wounded in Korea and lying on a stretcher, was among the relatives as his sister-in-law, Mrs. Lavon P. Henry went forward to receive Lieutenant Henry's medal. He had been flown here from Japan for the ceremony.

Private Brown's elderly father, Edward D. Brown, stepped up to hear the amazing story of his fight with the shovel, which Mr. Truman said was a "wonderful citation." Sergeant Watkins' widow, a pretty girl of 22, smiled bravely for a moment then wept as she received his medal but in a moment she was helping Mrs. Hazel O. Turner to a chair. Mrs. Turner was the mother of Sergeant Turner.

When he had presented all the medals and before he went around shaking hands with the relatives of the heroes Mr. Truman paid them a final honor. He said:

"At this point I want to pay tribute to the ground soldiers, the men who hold the ground and who fight from the trenches and from machine-gun nests, and who receive the first treatment which you have heard outlined in these citations. They are not the glamour boys of the services, but they are the men who win the wars and who make it possible for us to have freedom in this great Nation of ours."

To Prevent Creeping Socialism the People Should Have the Right To Vote on Valley Authorities Before They Are Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the United States is in danger today, in danger more serious than ever faced before. The average American citizen is aghast at the array of problems paraded before him on every hand, each vital to his independence and future welfare, each far reaching in effect. Decisions must be made by the citizen or for him through elected and appointed officials, and they are decisions which will be felt by the inhabitants of this land far beyond the life span of those who today are responsible for them.

On the international front our Nation has become involved in war in Korea. American casualties are measured in the thousands. We as a people are dedicated to the defense of our Nation against Communist aggression. We have been dedicated by the New Deal-Fair Deal internationalists to the defense of the world against Communist aggression for the protection of the democracies. But we hear the term, "democracy," loosely tossed around with regard to our allies, though many of these allies are already dedicated to the principles of socialism, different only in degree from communism with its attendant regimentation and dictatorial control—in effect governments which destroy independence and freedom of the individual in but a lesser degree than communism.

Americans are bewildered as they recognize some of the contradictory and grotesque facets of our international policy, but as long as the New Deal, through President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson, control the foreign policies of the Nation little can be done to improve our position internationally.

All criticism of foreign policy or suggested changes for future policy are skillfully warded off by tirades of name-calling in an attempt to brand all dissenters as isolationists.

No American today believes he can live within the borders of his own Nation secure and with no concern for the rest of the world. But an informed American believes that cooperation among nations calls for just that—cooperation of all involved—not for the depletion of American wealth and resources and American liberty and freedom merely for the benefit of other nations who refuse or fail to fulfill their obligations in the international cooperative partnership.

Through the Truman-Acheson administration we pour tax money overseas in the hope that it will buy a nebulous defense in Europe against Communist aggression, tax money which is earned by the sweat and labor of Americans and which today represents a sacrifice and lowered standard of living for every American family. And at the same time, the nations of Western Europe which have pledged cooperation with us only take limited and inadequate measures to bolster their own defense.

If the only danger to America came from without, serious though these threats be, we could hope for their eventual solution or resolution if we felt secure within our borders from threats to enslave our people and destroy the freedom upon which our Nation was founded and which we further guaranteed in the Bill of Rights within our Constitution.

But we are not secure within the boundaries of the United States, in fact have not been secure since the inception of the Roosevelt New Deal and its present counterpart, the Truman Fair Deal.

Creeping socialism is abroad stalking through the Nation, threatening the security and liberty of every home. The men who are insidiously boring away to establish it sit in high places in the Government. They are New Deal-Fair Deal appointees. They hold positions which can further their plans blueprinted to establish a socialistic state in America, a system of government control, Federal bureaucracy capable of regimenting the lives of every citizen from the cradle to the grave. Under the lying cover of promises of security and stabilized, controlled economy, Americans are being lured into a state of hypnotic acceptance of the welfare state. They are being enticed to sell their birthright for a mess of socialistic pottage that will, if accepted, place the shackles of collectivist society upon America.

Only an alert, informed, active public can combat this danger at home. Every plan for extension of government control must be examined not only for what it purports to accomplish but for the actual motivation behind it.

No major change in our form of government should be allowed by default. Any issue that will affect and change our form of government should be submitted to the people for their direct vote.

Today the socialistic planners are at work to accomplish one of the most important steps in their over-all plan for the socialization of America—Federal control of public utilities. To accomplish this they are working first for the establishment of the Columbia Valley Authority of the northwest, and then for additional valley authorities.

Some idea of the actual scope of a valley authority such as CVA and the socialistic planning behind it is contained in the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest by Leslie A. Miller, former Democratic Governor of the State of Wyoming:

How many people bother to read on when they see a headline about CVA? What's CVA? Oh, that means Columbia Valley Authority. Uncle Sam wants to build a lot of big dams to give the people in the Pacific Northwest cheap electricity. Well, what does it all mean to me?

The CVA means plenty to you. It is just one more step in an ambitious plan to socialize the electric-power industry as a big stride toward socialism. And while the Government may dig the dirt out of some

distant State, it will dig the billions the project will cost out of everybody's pocket, including yours.

The Columbia Valley Authority, covering Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, and Utah, is just one of nine huge power authorities into which Washington is planning to divide the entire country. These authorities will embrace hundreds of huge power dams built and operated by the Government. They will produce all the hydroelectric power in the Nation and will sell it to no private electric distributors—only to Government-owned or State-owned utilities. The President, in May 1950, declared that "these benefits must not be diverted to private profits."

Holding in its hands the power by which almost all industry operates, the Federal Government will be able to dominate the industrial life of the Nation. Socialist planners inside the Government admit, privately, that they look upon the socialization of electric power as the key to socialization of the United States.

The unsuspecting American imagines we are safe from socialism because he knows the people will never vote for it. But socialism can be put over by a small minority. And the struggle now going on in the valley of the Columbia River is a good example of how it can be done.

Up in the northwest corner of the Nation are seven States, all or part of which make up an integrated economic region dominated by the Columbia River and its tributaries. Along these rivers 130 dams have already been built. Of these, 86 are hydroelectric power dams, 32 are irrigation dams, and 12 are multipurpose—for irrigation, power, flood control. Some were built by private companies, some by municipally owned utility systems, some by the Federal Government. All have been hooked up by high-voltage transmission lines to form one giant power pool. The States, cities, private companies, and Federal Government have joined in a voluntary arrangement under which power can be shifted from one locality to another to meet varying seasonal needs. This region has the Nation's most bountiful supply of electricity and the lowest rates—half the national average. It is handled by a body representing all the partners in the pool—the private companies, States, cities, and Uncle Sam.

Now let us see how a small group of men, inserting themselves in strategic positions in the Washington bureaus, have set out to grab the whole Columbia River power network for the Federal Government. The Government built and operates the dam at Bonneville, and it is through this that it finds itself in the present Columbia River power pool. The Government also has control over the Nation's navigable rivers, and the management of irrigation and power schemes heads up in the Reclamation Bureau in the Department of the Interior. If, therefore, a Socialist intriguer wanted a finger in this great power pie, the thing to do would be to get into the Reclamation Bureau.

This is what an old-time Socialist did. He is Stephen Raushenbush, who has spent years promoting Government ownership of power. He believes the first decisive step toward socialism is the public ownership of all utilities. He has written that the socializing program should begin with local and State ownership, then power authority, then complete nationalization. The program could be eased along gradually by a small group in the right positions. He wrote: "One good man with his eyes, wits, and ears about him inside a department * * * can do more to perfect the technique of control of industry than a hundred men outside."

In 1941 Raushenbush turned up as the chief economist and planner of the power division of the Interior Department. And he was not alone. There were two other good men—Dr. Carl D. Thompson and Dr. Paul J. Raver. Dr. Thompson, once research director of the Socialist Party, has written that when the Government owns electric power this will mean control of transportation and industrial production. Dr. Thompson was consultant to the Bonneville Power Administration from 1938 to 1947. Dr. Raver, also a Socialist, has been Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration since 1939. So we find these three men neatly placed in strategic spots for promoting their Socialist dream. When Raushenbush left the Department in 1947, the Secretary of the Interior told him: "We have relied heavily on you." That marks the degree of his influence.

Dr. Raver represents the Government in the Columbia power pool. But he does not like the way that pool works. He declares he wishes to revitalize the power program in the Northwest. By this he means pulling together all of the public ownership forces of the region around an agreed program of public ownership and acquisition of private utilities. He has refused to let private companies have long-term contracts for any part of the power produced by Bonneville dams.

The proposed Columbia Valley Authority will supersede the present power pool. It will be a monopolistic Government corporation, run by three men answerable only to the President. It will have autocratic power over the rivers and the power generated in them. It will control all natural resources, including land, forests, soil conservation, irrigation and water rights.

The three directors of this proposed CVA could spend money as they saw fit. They could buy and sell real estate and private utilities. They could regulate mining, lumbering, and fishing. They would be authorized to determine the size of farms and to dictate farm practices through their control of irrigation water. They could establish any business they might think desirable by calling it a "demonstration" operation. Their mission would be to plan the economic life of the whole region—"to establish a balanced and stable economic development." Add to these powers the Federal Government's control of credit through its numerous lending agencies, and you will realize what the word "Authority" means.

These planners have a theory that our division into States is unnatural. They believe the country should be divided into "economic regions." Dr. Arthur Morgan, who built TVA and was its first Chairman, wrote to the Senate Commerce Committee, saying that while he was chairman of TVA his colleagues were talking about the "Authority" gradually taking over the functions now being exercised by the States, towns, and counties, and that they had the dream that this might go on gradually as the "functions of the local authorities withered away."

Thus you behold the revolution that creeps over the land. But those managing it never disclose their intentions. They advertise, instead, the rich fruits they will bestow.

Opposition to CVA in the Pacific Northwest remains obdurate and up to now has been able to hold the Federal Government planners off. More than 200 organizations have protested, including irrigation districts, citizens' committees, Grange units, the Farm Bureau Federation, organized cattlemen, miners, lumbermen, and businessmen. The legislatures of Idaho, Oregon, Montana, and Wyoming have protested it. The governors of Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming have spoken against it, along with most of the Senators and Congressmen from that region. The opposition would be even more intense if more people understood this important fact: Under CVA, irrigation would of necessity have to take a back seat to power production, and private ownership of water rights, so precious in the west, would go by the boards.

In Seattle, Mayor William F. Devin, who is also head of the municipally owned power system, says: "This is not a fight between public and private power. This is a case of the Federal Government using phony gifts of our own taxes as bribes to rob us of our basic rights. * * * We are capable of developing our own economy. I say let us develop the Columbia River as our own responsibility."

This is precisely what the Federal Government does not wish that valley, or any other valley, to do. Once the Columbia River area is made over in the Socialist pattern, it would be followed by the Missouri Valley Authority and then the others, to blanket the Nation. Governor Langlie, of Washington, says: "The issue here is whether the people are to manage their own affairs or have them entrusted to three men appointed in Washington, D. C., and given almost unlimited power. What would be left of our State and local government when such an agency gets into full swing?"

The CVA project has been stalled for the moment. But it will be resumed in the next Congress. We must not forget that what is planned for the Columbia River Valley is planned ultimately for the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing the danger to the Nation resulting from establishment of valley authorities without due deliberation and examination, I believe that such projects should be created only after the people in the areas directly affected have expressed a desire for the establishment of such authority by vote in a free election, and I have introduced a bill for this purpose. The holding of plebiscites in the areas where a valley authority is to be established will permit frank and open discussion of the effects of such an authority upon the people and the extent of the socialization which would grow from it.

In April of 1950, a convention of 400 delegates representing the Utility Workers Union of America—CIO—condemned by unanimous vote the creeping paralysis of nationalization of the industry, and in their resolution added:

> Control of the electric industry is the key to control of the major industries of the Nation. The Government is already in the utility business to quite an extent and, unless we are on our guard, will soon own most of it. This will be the first step down the socialistic highway. Then transportation, communication, steel, and the rest will follow to put an end to our American way of life.

I am certain that if the people of the Nation are given the opportunity to use the ballot in a direct election before establishment of additional valley authorities is allowed, they will vote against any further encroachment of the Federal Government which would destroy freedom and extend socialism in our Nation. The following is the bill which I have introduced to provide for a plebiscite before establishment of additional valley authorities:

> A bill to prohibit the establishment of a valley authority in any State that would be substantially affected thereby until the people of the affected areas of such State have voted affirmatively for such valley authority
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That no law establishing a valley authority (similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority) shall become effective within a State which in the judgment of the

Governor or legislature any part of such State would be substantially affected by such law, if such law were to become effective within such State, until a certificate from the Governor of such State has been filed with the Senate (or with the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) and with the House of Representatives (or with the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House of Representatives is not in session) stating (1) that an election has been held pursuant to the election laws of such State in those congressional districts which would be substantially affected by such law, if such law were to become effective within such State, and (2) that a majority of persons voting in such election have voted affirmatively to have such law become effective within such State.

Review Wire-Tap Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Decatur (Ill.) Herald and the Washington Post dealing with the necessity for recanvassing our attitude banning the use of evidence obtained through wire tapping in the apprehension of spies, traitors, enemy agents, and others disloyal to our country:

REVIEW WIRE-TAP BAN

Heightened concern over the national security may lead, it now appears, to a review of the use of wire taps as a means of gathering evidence against spies, traitors, and saboteurs. Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, made the first step when he introduced a bill to permit Federal Bureau of Investigation agents to obtain Federal court orders for wire tapping, if national security appears involved.

Some modification of the doctrine which bans the use of wire tap evidence clearly is needed. Representative KEATING calls the rule absurd, and it certainly proved so recently when Judith Coplon's conviction for plotting to spy on this country for Russia was overruled on grounds that part of the evidence against her was gained by wire tapping.

The proposed change now becomes a matter of practical necessity. As the law stands, it permits spies to conduct their nefarious profession over American telephones. Government agents may suspect the tenor of the conversation, but are not authorized to listen in.

Permission to tap wires should be doled out sparingly, surely, for the private rights of the citizen must be guarded. The author of the bill, however, has provided against a possible danger of too free a use of the privilege when he asks that FBI men and military intelligence agents secure court permission before using the tapping system.

Fact is, the average citizen conducts business over the telephone of less importance than is ordinarily believed. If his conversation was really important, he would protest more vigorously than he does the party-line systems in use in all rural areas and in many city systems.

LEGALIZED WIRE TAPPING

Readers of this newspaper will know that it has long believed that wire tapping in any form is abhorrent to American principles of privacy of the individual. The country is now faced, however, with a sinister threat to its security. In the perpetual struggle to maintain a balance between civil liberties and measures to safeguard national security it may be necessary to yield somewhat on civil liberties in order to prevent the loss of both liberty and security. It is in this context that we believe that the bills to legalize wire tapping by law-enforcement officers under certain specified conditions should be considered.

Wire tapping where now carried on by Federal officials is patently against the law. The Federal Communications Act forbids the interception and divulgence of wire communications, and the Supreme Court has said plainly that this means divulgence even to another person in a law-enforcement agency. Present use of wire tapping by the FBI—a practice reportedly confined to espionage and kidnaping cases—rests on a flimsy, and in our view entirely unsupportable, authorization by the Attorney General.

At the same time there can be no question that wire tapping is going on. It is engaged in not only by Federal authorities, as brought to light in the Coplon case, but also promiscuously by "private eyes" and others. Disclosures before the Senate District Committee last summer showed that Police Lt. Joseph Shimon, acting in a private capacity, intercepted telephone conversations on a broad scale in connection with the Howard Hughes hearings. There are continuing allegations that wires of various governmental officials are tapped, and no one knows, in truth, how extensively wire tapping is carried on.

Thus, as a factual matter, the practice has outrun the law, and there seems to be no disposition on the part of Federal authorities to crack down, whatever the law says. The danger in this situation is that the continuing evasion of the law tends to bring disrespect for all law and increase the number of violations. The reason that this has happened, in our opinion, is a deep-seated feeling among law-enforcement officials and the public generally that wire tapping may be necessary to protect the national security or to save lives. In the wake of the Canadian spy trials, the Fuchs disclosures, and other evidences of conspiracy, anyone who would forbid law-enforcement officers the use of means necessary to arrest the conspiracy would take upon himself a terrible responsibility.

Hence, it seems to us, the best chance of preventing wire tapping from becoming a monster, is to channelize it into cases in which it is clearly necessary, and to provide stiff penalties for its unauthorized use. That is what the Neely bill attempts to do as respects Washington. It would permit wire tapping by District law enforcement officers only on specific authorization by a Federal judge, obtained in much the same manner that a search warrant is now obtained. The bill would require law officers to state under oath that a crime involving the safety of human life had been or was about to be committed, that wire tapping would lead to essential evidence, and that no other means were readily available. It is explicit in prohibiting wire tapping under any other circumstances.

This version is a distinct improvement over the original Neely bill, which did not restrict the categories of crime in which wire tapping would be permitted. That of course, would have been more than the camel's nose in the tent; it would have been the whole camel. It would have put any Federal judge applying the regulation under an impossible burden. The inescapable fact about wire tapping is that all telephone conversations involve two persons, and there is no way to limit the interception to the words of the person being sought.

For this reason it seems to us imperative that any legalization of wire tapping by Federal officers be also confined to cases affecting national security or human life, and that a Federal judge authorize it only after rigorous conditions have been met. There is justification, we believe, for such a law on a national scale along the lines of the Keating bill introduced in the last Congress. This sort of law, coupled with severe penalties for violation, could help protect the national security and at the same time remove fears that telephones were being tapped indiscriminately. The limitations on wire tapping, however, must be narrow and precise, and any law which did not contain careful safeguards could result in incalculable harm.

What's the Matter With Senator Taft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 7, 1951:

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH SENATOR TAFT?

("The President simply usurped authority, in violation of the laws and the Constitution, when he sent troops to Korea to carry out the resolution of the United Nations in an undeclared war." ROBERT A. TAFT, in the Senate, January 5.)

Is it Senator TAFT's purpose to outdo Senator MCCARTHY in irresponsibility? It begins to look that way. Almost every statement the Ohio Republican makes these days is more dangerous than the one before.

Consider only the most recent of the GOP leader's utterances.

On December 29, Senator TAFT said in an address in Cincinnati: "I have no great confidence in the judgment of the top military."

Yet it was not enough for him to attempt to undermine popular trust in men of the character of Defense Secretary Marshall, General Bradley as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the latter's associates, General Collins, General Vandenberg, and Admiral Sherman. Senator TAFT then went on to quote the top military as follows:

"They doubted if we could hold out in Korea or the Philippines. Now they have 250,000 Americans spread out across Korea and they think they can defend indefinitely against 2,000,000 Chinese."

Thus, the Ohio Senator made no allowances for any of the problems involved in the supremely difficult Korean choice last June. Thus, he quoted for the benefit of our opponents on the field of battle information which he himself said he received in secret from high military leaders.

Inevitably, Senator TAFT was questioned by reporters about this amazing statement. Thereupon he amended it to say that he did not mean to include in his vote of no confidence the command in the field. Presumably this revision was to exempt General MacArthur from his black appraisal of the competence of the Nation's top defense command.

That did not lessen the seriousness of what Senator TAFT had said. Actually, it made his egregious error only worse. For now he said in effect that General MacArthur was trustworthy and able, but that his assignment was hobbled if not made impossible by General Bradley and other shapers of over-all military policy.

The man who is often called Mr. Republican did not wait long before announcing

another vote of no confidence. When the new Congress opened last Wednesday, he accused the White House of deliberately holding up work of the session for perhaps 2 weeks because the Presidential state of the Union message was not immediately forthcoming.

Since the President speaks tomorrow and congressional committees had not been named anyway, this was a display of utter unreasonableness. The danger, however, was that some people would be misled into thinking that Senator TAFT had a fair complaint.

But it is the GOP leader's 10,000-word address to the Senate on foreign affairs which is worst of all. Speaking Friday, he charged President Truman with taking the United States into the Korean War without authority. He declared that the Commander in Chief has no right to send American troops to a European defense without approval from Congress. He repudiated the new assignment of General Eisenhower by saying that he did not think the United States should assume the leadership in the formation of an international army by the appointment of an American commander.

It is not necessary to comment on these dangerous assertions one by one. There are adequate answers to these points Senator TAFT attempts to make. The authority of the President as Commander in Chief to use the military forces of the Nation has been demonstrated repeatedly in history. Every school child knows that there were military engagements before Congress declared war in 1812. The course of President Polk in the Mexican War is an answer to Senator TAFT. So is that of Wilson in 1916 on the border and at Vera Cruz.

The American people, we believe, see these matters a great deal more clearly than Senator TAFT. They see, we believe, that the creation of a defense force in Europe is not to protect Europe alone but also to protect this country. They see that a defenseless Europe would be an almost certain invitation to Communist aggression. They see that a Communist-controlled Europe would doubtless foredoom Great Britain and place the United States in gravest jeopardy.

What has come over ROBERT A. TAFT that he does not understand this? Is he so eager to be the Republican standard bearer next year that he cares not what he says or the effect of his words?

If not, why will he say now what he chose not to say last June? Is it because he thinks it is politically smart to try to capitalize on the reverses in Korea?

The Truman administration has its faults, far too many of them. It should be criticized for its shortcomings. But it is our responsible Government. And it is recruiting men of unquestioned patriotism and ability to lead in creating a defense so strong that the Kremlin will not push the button to start world war III.

Mr. Republican should think twice before his next outburst. In barely more than a week he has done enough damage to last throughout his new 6-year term.

Good Neighbor Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Good Neighbor Day, an institution dedicated to good neighbor relations between persons and nations, has attracted widespread and active support. In recognition of the importance of the good-neighbor spirit, the mayor of New York has proclaimed January 1, 1951, as Good Neighbor Day and set aside each Tuesday evening of this year, from 6 p. m. until midnight, as Good Neighbor Evening. Appended hereto is the Mayor's proclamation to stimulate this spirit of cooperation within the great metropolis of New York:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed a national emergency; and

Whereas world events daily remind us of the urgent need for harmony and teamwork, since we are all part of the greatest struggle for peace the human family has ever known, a struggle made more complex by the challenge of the Atomic Age; and

Whereas our great city is the composite of the toil, energy, blood, sacrifice, and intelligence drawn from all races, all peoples, and all creeds; and

Whereas the future of America depends upon whether we merely talk love of country or actually live it; upon whether we engage in unworthy strife here at home or stand shoulder to shoulder to achieve a glorious destiny; and

Whereas our destiny is inseparable from the destinies of the peoples of other nations; and

Whereas we are the home folks in the home city of the United Nations; and

Whereas the daily demonstration of the spirit of the good neighbor and the practice of the Golden Rule in our own city will inspire oppressed peoples, wherever they may be, to search for true freedom and for peace on earth; and

Whereas the practice of cooperation can be stimulated, implemented, and kept alive by holding good-neighbor meetings at stated, frequent intervals; and

Whereas the coming New Year will mark the nineteenth annual observance of Good Neighbor Day in America:

Now, therefore, I, Vincent R. Impellitteri, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby proclaim January 1, 1951, as Good Neighbor Day, and I further set aside each Tuesday evening of 1951, from 6 p. m. until midnight, as Good Neighbor Evening, and I call upon all agencies of religion, education, government, and community life, and all media of communication, to join together as good neighbors on the first day of the year and on each Tuesday evening, to foster brotherhood and teamwork among New Yorkers at home and abroad and to promote good will among all men, to the end that peace on earth may be achieved.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed this 22d day of December 1950.

[SEAL] VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor.

By WILLIAM J. DONOHUE,
Executive Secretary to the Mayor.

Anticipates the Worst in Clash With Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial appearing in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on December 31, 1950:

ANTICIPATES THE WORST IN CLASH WITH SOVIETS—WRITER WOULD BRING HOME CIVILIANS IN GERMANY

(By Frank R. Kent)

As the year 1951 begins the state of the Nation seems almost incredibly bad. Perhaps as the months pass unity may be achieved and leadership developed. But, as of now, a great crisis has arisen, and from whatever angle viewed our inadequacy seems appallingly evident. It is all very well to talk about the duty of strengthening the national morale. But there also is the duty of facing realities. This we have not been doing at all, and every attempt to make us do so seems to promote discord and dissension. The attitude of the Soviet Republic and its satellite states toward us and our attitude toward them have become so openly and vehemently hostile that a titanic and catastrophic clash threatens.

If the grand smash comes, we cannot, of course, permit our faith in the ultimate triumph of America to be shaken, but there is no sense now in trying to paint a bright picture. In Korea the great bulk of our military land strength and the bulk of our Navy and Air Force are engaged in a hot, costly, and apparently hopeless war against the Chinese Communists, whose cause is savagely championed by the Soviets in the United Nations. Because of the Russians the efforts of that Organization to avert aggression and promote peace are dismayingly feeble. It is rounding out a 5-year record of almost complete frustration so far as progress toward its great goal is concerned. The continued vicious and terrific Russian propaganda against us, together with Soviet acts of unprovoked aggression, have compelled us to recognize the menace of a third world war, in which the survival of the Nation is at stake.

There, of course, is nothing to do except see it through to the end with the minimum of waste and blundering we can manage and an inflexible determination not to weaken no matter what the odds. In this connection there is one great basic fact which protrudes—to wit, our shocking military feebleness. This is not only admitted—it is proclaimed.

As for the western front in Europe, we have already told the world that if the Russians attack, we and our allies are in no position to make a successful resistance. We would be overrun. They outnumber us in equipped divisions, in tanks, and in airplanes—in everything but the atom bomb, and they have that in numbers about which we can only guess. So, what it amounts to is this—we are now unprepared to cope with an attacking Communist China in Asia or an attacking Russian Army in Europe. Nor will we be prepared for a year and a half to 2 years. The question then arises, if these are the facts—and they are not disputed—and if, as most believe, the fixed Russian purpose is to overthrow our Government by violence and destroy the capitalistic system completely, why does she not attack now?

Our intelligence about the real Russian intentions is so negligible as to leave us nothing to do but guess. The one sure thing is that we cannot afford to take a chance. It is just ordinary common sense to prepare for the worst. In brief, we should assume that an attack is imminent and inevitable and use every ounce of strength and every hour we have to meet it. There is now no excuse for disunity and poor leadership. There is no excuse for inefficiency and politics. Every possible protective step should be taken. One very obvious one is the step to remove from Germany the wives and children of American soldiers who obviously would be unable to reach safety in the advent of a Soviet attack.

We are no longer an army of occupation there. As rapidly as possible we are becoming an army of defense. A bill to send home these dependents was introduced in the House last week by Representative BURNSIDE, of West Virginia. It should be passed.

Blockade Again on in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the well-known columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for January 5, 1951:

BLOCKADE AGAIN ON IN CONGRESS
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Our emphasis on the defense of democracy everywhere in the world, and our desire to extend it wherever possible, naturally enlarge our interest in our own democratic institutions. In short, we look at ourselves more closely—or should.

It is, therefore, somewhat embarrassing that a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats in our House of Representatives has just delivered a smacking blow to democracy. This was done on the opening day of the new Eighty-second Congress by restoring to the Rules Committee the arbitrary power to pigeonhole bills approved by the appropriate legislative committee and deny the House the right to vote on them.

What the coalition effected was repeal of the rule—adopted by the Eighty-first Congress after the 1948 Truman victory—which removed this arbitrary blockade by permitting the chairman of any legislative committee to move for House consideration of bills approved by his committee if the Rules Committee failed to send such measures to the House floor after 21 days.

That can't be done any more. Again a handful of men can thwart democracy in the House.

The purpose of this undemocratic move is no secret. It is to keep social welfare and civil-rights measures from getting to the Representatives of the people in the House for a vote.

From the standpoint of their party's own political welfare it is a bit hard to see why the House Republican leadership again was maneuvered into this alliance with the anti-social welfare, anti-civil-rights southern Democrats. For it was the blockade of the Rules Committee—then as now controlled by the coalition—against a housing bill, combined with the hostile attitude of the House Republican leadership toward other social legislation, that had much to do with the party's 1948 defeat in the Presidential election. Many Republicans were conscious of the bad judgment of their leadership. Forty-two of them refused to go along and voted against repeal of the so-called 21-day rule.

As a practical matter, the blatant, overt coup hardly was necessary. Little social legislation and no civil-rights legislation had been expected from the new Eighty-second Congress. Emphasis will be on foreign policy and defense. Furthermore, the coalition now has enough votes, as a result of last November's election, to defeat measures it doesn't like openly on the floor, though the Rules Committee strangulation allows Members to duck responsibility.

The Republican action could be costly politically. For, because of its admitted aim, it will provoke resentment among millions of people, who whether Republicans realize it or not, now are fully aware of what dictatorial control of the House by the coalition through the Rules Committee bottleneck means to them.

They know because President Truman told them the story in simple language in the 1948 campaign, revealed to them the chicanery whereby bills for their welfare can be pigeonholed by a few men in the Rules Committee. This simplifies the task of special-interest lobbyists who can concentrate on this committee and not worry about the regular committees too much, and never worry at all about the House itself. By his campaign the President won support for removal of this blockade after his victory. It was the first thing done by the Democratic House leadership at his direction at opening of the Eighty-first Congress.

What had happened became clear once the President raised the curtain in the campaign. While the Republican Senate of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress had passed social legislation, including housing, increased minimum wage, Federal aid to education, the House leadership tied it all up. This became a mockery when the party, in its 1948 platform, advocated all these measures that the House leadership had stifled just before the convention. President Truman capitalized this on stumps all over the Nation. Labor unions told the story to their members through their union newspapers, as they are telling now of repeal of the 21-day rule and its meaning. This is not very helpful to Republicans in their effort to win back labor votes.

During the Congress just ended, eight bills were extricated from the Rules Committee and brought before the House for a vote by the 21-day rule. Beyond that, because of threat of its use, the Rules Committee itself moved to the House floor for passage the housing, minimum wage increase, and expansion of social security system bills.

Now the blockade has been raised again.

Speaker Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of January 5, 1951:

SPEAKER RAYBURN: ABLE, RESPECTED LEADER

Again it is Speaker SAM RAYBURN. There was no surprise in the election of the veteran Texas Congressman to preside over the House in the Eighty-second Congress, but nonetheless his choice for that high and responsible position makes history. Mr. RAYBURN becomes only the second Member of Congress in the Nation's history to be elected to the Speakership six times, equaling the record set by the magnetic Henry Clay, of Kentucky, in the first half of the nineteenth century. If Mr. RAYBURN serves out his 2-year term he will have clear title to the distinction of having occupied the Speakership longer than any other man, because Mr. Clay resigned twice as presiding officer of the House.

It is not, of course, length of service which counts, unless that service has been of high order and rendered fully in behalf of his State and his Nation. This was achieved fully by Mr. RAYBURN. His long tenure as Speaker and previously as minority leader in the House attests the high caliber of that service to his Nation and State.

The Speaker of the House as been a Member of Congress since 1913, and previously he was a representive for 6 years in the Texas Legislature and speaker of its house for 2 years. In 1948, he and Senator VANDENBERG were the recipients of the Collier magazine award for distinguished congressional service.

An impartial appraisal of SAM RAYBURN's statesmanship was given by Republican Minority Leader MARTIN upon the Texan's election as Speaker Wednesday. Representative MARTIN declared that the Nation in a time of peril was most fortunate in having in responsible position a man who has "the courage, the integrity, the ability, and the fairness that he [Mr. RAYBURN] has." He pointed out that election six times as Speaker would not have been possible without Mr. RAYBURN's being a man of fine character and extraordinary ability.

The House affirmed this appraisal in a tribute of standing applause as Mr. RAYBURN took the gavel and the office of Speaker. In that role, he will serve his Nation and State with the same selfless devotion, capacity, and zeal that have marked his almost four decades of service in Congress. Texas takes pride in this son who measures up fully to the standard of outstanding Americanism. The humility and firm resolve with which SAM RAYBURN accepted a stern responsibility again is a measure of his caliber as a servant of a free people.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my comment on the President's state of the Union message carried on the Mutual network program Mutual Newsreel:

On the credit side, the President is to be commended for subordinating his domestic program to the critical needs of national defense and security. It is to be hoped that his future course, unlike the past, will demonstrate that he is willing to pay more than lip service to the principle that nondefense spending must be curtailed in order to maintain a sound domestic economy on which alone our national strength to resist aggression can be based.

It is also commendable that the President recognized that unity does not require complete submission by the minority to policies and methods advanced by the majority which are believed to be demonstrably unsound. We must, as he points out, keep our debate on a high level with our sights trained on only one objective, the safety and welfare of our country. But debate we must have in order that we may arrive at conclusions which reflect the true will of the people without whose wholehearted support any effort will fail.

In that connection I am disappointed that the President did not even mention the all-absorbing question of the moment whether he will consult with Congress before ordering large forces to be deployed in Western Europe. An assurance to that effect would

have gone a long way toward accomplishing that unity of purpose which he properly seeks.

Another regrettable omission in a message heard around the world is the President's failure to serve emphatic notice upon the United Nations and its members that we have a right to expect a much stronger demonstration of their willingness to cooperate in resisting aggression than they have yet indicated. This is a critical week for the future of the United Nations. I fear that our allies may read into his message with some justification an endorsement of what seems to many of us a significantly unsatisfactory showing to date. It is time to speak out plainly and tell them what we think.

We have never been at a point in our history where it was more important that Americans go forward together. There can be no question as to the goal of every one of us—a just peace and true freedom for the peoples of the earth.

There is unity on the question of the extent of national effort. No reasonable move should go untried, no necessary sacrifice should be avoided. There is unity on the proposition that every American must render every effort to resolve this crisis successfully, to achieve victory and to establish a real and just peace.

Thus, there can be no doubt that Americans in all walks of life stand together on these worthy objectives. In their accomplishment we Republicans will put our country first.

A Report to the Congress From the People of the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker and distinguished Members of the House, it is my privilege to again report to the Congress the views and feelings of the people of my district, the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama. This report from my people is tremendously important, in my opinion, because of the deep feelings they have expressed to me in this grave hour.

The serious world situation is uppermost in their minds, and let me tell you they have no patience with diplomatic niceties when their sons, husbands, and loved ones are being sent to war, some of them for the second time in the last decade, and many parents are receiving that dreaded telegram from the Adjutant General saying, "I regret to inform you." The people are facing the hard facts of life realistically and they expect our Government to act realistically.

The Ninth Congressional District of Alabama wants two-fisted, hard-hitting, intelligent leadership from the Executive, from the military, from the Congress, and from everybody in a place of public trust. Let no one forget this important fact as our people are being rallied to make greater sacrifices and greater efforts which are necessary for the protection of our country.

The people of my district are ready to go all out. They are willing and able to do whatever is needed to protect our country if given a reasonable plan of action and the fighting leadership which we must have to be successful. They want bold leadership, with a positive course of action toward a definite goal. They want the best brains in this country drafted to help the executive branch of our Government steer that course. Although the President has the chief responsibility for foreign affairs, my people feel that Congress should not just sit back and rubber stamp the plans and programs of the executive department. Charting the destinies of 151,000,000 American people in this shrinking, explosive world is too grave a responsibility for the Executive alone and my people expect Congress to take an active part in the formation of our foreign policy. The world's greatest deliberative body should deliberate on the world's greatest question—the question of bringing about peace—and come up with some realistic solutions to our dilemma.

My people have always been foremost in rising to the defense of our country in time of crisis when the danger and course of action were fully understood. They will not follow blindly. They want to know the whole truth about the dangers we face, the odds that are against us, and the reasons for the course we take.

The fact is—and we might as well face it—that we do not have the unifying, psychological bombshell of the tragic Pearl Harbor, and yet our danger now is much greater. We are already in a war for our freedom if not for our very existence. The odds against us are greater than they have ever been in the history of our country. Nothing short of an intelligent plan of action to fight the Communists inside and outside our country, backed by the full force of the people, will prevent our destruction.

It has been next to impossible for my people to reconcile the bitter reverses in a far-off land with what they have seen here at home. On the one hand they have suffered the loss of loved ones in Korea, the drafting of young boys, the rising spiral of inflation, and they have heard the warning about greater sacrifices to come. All this has added to their anxiety and their instinctive feeling that we face a terrible situation although the nature of the danger and a positive course of action have not been clearly outlined by our Government. On the other hand they have seen inadequately trained troops sent into combat without proper reinforcements, the publication of secret military data, enactment of halfway control measures, the lack of cooperation among the two political parties and the Executive in cleaning out the Communists in Government, talk about police action in Korea, the small amount of support from members of the United Nations, failure of the UN to brand Communist China as an aggressor, the insistence by England of UN recognition of Red China, and continued war shipments by the Allies to Russia and her war-making satellites.

Is it any wonder that great hope of a simple, easy solution was aroused in so many minds by the speeches of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT? They said much that I agree with, but they also left out some impelling facts about the world situation that must be taken into account.

It has been suggested that small United States garrison forces could hold out in different parts of the world while friendly nations rearm. This is impossible. The slaughter of our troops and the capture of friendly nations would be a certainty in an open military conflict. Who can trust the Soviets to stop military aggression of their own accord? It has been inferred that America can stand alone. Facts do not give much support to this theory. We may be forced into such an undesirable position, but it would be a short-sighted policy indeed to fail to help the development of economic, religious, and military resistance wherever we can find it. How else can atheistic aggression be stopped before it reaches our own shores? Our task will be increased a hundredfold if we try to go it alone.

We all agree, however, that first priority should be given to building up our own defenses. We must demand it. We must also demand greater effort on the part of our allies, if they are to expect continued assistance from us. Not one of these countries, with the exception of Turkey, has waked up to its own peril to the extent of taking adequate military action.

Withdrawal of our troops from Korea may be a military necessity and it may be the wisest policy in view of the prospects of being thrown into an all-out war with China. So far China, with 450,000,000 people, has unleashed only a small part of her military forces. She has millions more in reserve. Russia is using Korea as a proving ground for tactics and equipment in preparation for bigger things to come. These facts are clear.

The solution depends upon our overall policy regarding whether or not to abandon the entire Far East. If we do not abandon the entire Far East then all available forces must be used to stop Russia in that general area wherever and however it is militarily possible. The wraps must come off. Our fighting men and their families deserve this consideration. This would include strategic bombing wherever it is to our advantage. It would include the use of Korean guerrillas and troops, the estimated 1,500,000 Chinese guerrillas on the mainland, the 500,000 Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa who must be rearmed, the Japanese, and other friendly nations. All must be used in a way that is most advantageous to our cause. The results of this course of action would be to keep Russia from concentrating in Europe to keep these nations from rearming against her.

If we abandon the entire Far East, we must realize that this will mean the immediate collapse of Japan, a country that has no arms at this time but has great industrial power. Formosa and the friendly guerrillas in Korea and China would be helpless. The Philippines and Alaska would be seriously threatened so that the only effect would be to move the war zone closer home.

The same policy of withdrawal applied to Europe would mean the inevitable collapse of such industrial powers as Germany and England, along with the entire European Continent. This would hand over to Russia control of about 90 percent of the world's manpower, in addition to a combined industrial capacity comparable to ours, and backed up by the world's largest army—an army which is ready to go into action now.

In case of our withdrawal from Europe and the Far East either voluntarily or involuntarily, we could not count on anything but war coming to our own shores very quickly and in the most devastating form yet known to man.

The greatest deterrent to a world war now is the temporary advantage we hold in the quantity and quality of the atomic bomb. However, we must bear in mind that Russia can send over one-way, suicide, sneak A-bomb attackers and level some of our cities at this very time. The power of our A-bomb is not great enough to win a war alone and our superiority in this field is fast diminishing. We must strengthen ourselves immediately to make up for this loss.

Mr. Speaker, our people in the Ninth District are representative of America in that they have too much faith in our way of life, too much character, vitality and independence to bow to Russia. My people know down deep in their hearts that the forces of evil are not going to conquer the world ultimately. Atheistic communism cannot dominate the minds of men very long because such unfortunate people will eventually realize that they have been deceived by false promises. It cannot dominate the souls of men very long because man inevitably seeks a higher being. The religious peoples of the world and the freedom loving peoples of the world are slowly but surely lining up solidly against Russia for a showdown. But the number of us, both as individuals and as nations, who will be living to enjoy freedom again, is in direct proportion to the speed, vigor, and intelligence with which we tackle this task together.

The freedom of America was not easily won and it will not be easily defended. The safest course, Mr. Speaker, is bold action. I submit the following programs for immediate consideration and urge their inclusion in our emergency policies:

First. Bring in top leadership for Government service and set up a permanent advisory commission to the President, on foreign affairs.

Second. Initiate a full-scale debate in the House of Representatives on foreign policy, adopting a program that has the backing of our people which is so necessary for success.

Third. Mobilize all industry, catalog every citizen according to his capabilities for emergency national service, step up production and work to keep production lines rolling.

Fourth. Stop publicity and leaks of secret military information which have caused unnecessary loss of lives.

Fifth. Concentrate on the improvement of our military intelligence.

Sixth. Place a complete embargo on Russia, Red China, and Soviet-dominated countries. Put more pressure on all countries sending Russia war materials.

Seventh. Enact a plan for the Government to finance the war on a pay-as-you-go basis in the fairest possible manner. Cut out unnecessary nonmilitary spending.

Eighth. Effect across the board controls, including price and wage controls, to stop runaway inflation which threatens to wreck our economy.

Ninth. Mobilize and train the necessary armed forces as quickly as possible with particular emphasis on a permanent training program.

Tenth. Utilize the Japanese and Chinese nationalists in every possible way in the far-eastern war.

Eleventh. Speed up the mobilization of the Army of Europe, pressing into service German, Spanish, French, and Yugoslavian troops.

Twelfth. Let Russia know we will use the atomic bomb when and where it will do the most good.

Thirteenth. Improve our counterspy and espionage system and make use of DP's in this connection as much as possible.

Fourteenth. Develop a strong civilian defense program.

Fifteenth. Take the initiative of world leadership away from atheistic Russia.

Sixteenth. Ask for divine guidance as our country is being called upon to lead the free world in the most crucial period of our history.

A Comparison of the Funds Provided for Fire Suppression by the Forest Service and the California Division of Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, we are frequently criticized for overstaffing and overspending in Federal Government. This criticism is in the main, I think, justified, but in some places we spend a small amount of money compared to the responsibility the Federal Government has. As an illustration, I offer for the RECORD an editorial in the Lassen Advocate of December 27, 1950, which points out that the State of California provides about $10,000,000 for fire suppression, whereas only $7,500,000 is allowed for the entire Forest Service and another $6,000,000 for actually fighting fires as they occur, for all of the 160 national forests involving about 180,000,000 acres. It could be said, of course, that California has appropriated too much money for fire-suppression work by the State division of forestry, but I doubt it. The California Legislature has been careful in its expenditures, and the State has a balanced budget. In any event, I think this editorial is noteworthy in that it calls attention to one agency of the Federal Government which appears to be doing an awfully big job with a comparatively meager appropriation. The editorial referred to is as follows:

POOR RELATION

This isn't exactly forest-fire weather, but same interesting information in that line, always important in this area, came out in recent talks with State and United States foresters here.

The United States Forest Service is the poor relation compared to the State division of forestry when it comes to cash available for fire suppression. Uncle Sam or Congress is stingy with money for fire fighting, compared to the California State Legislature.

The State provides about $10,000,000 for fire suppression for the State division of forestry, compared to a meager $7,500,000 allowed the entire United States Forest Service for its protection organization and another $6,000,000 for actually fighting fires as they occur. That has to do for 160 national forests, protecting about 180,000,000 acres. The Lassen National Forest's share is $95,000 to finance its prevention organization; this does not include pay for keyhead personnel in the supervisor's office. It finances two fire-suppression crews, lookouts, and equipment.

Because of this, the Forest Service fire-suppression crews are only 3 or 4 men compared to about 10-man crews of the State in the area. It explains why the Forest Service has to call on lumber-company personnel to do most of its fire fighting and sometimes on the assistance of the State.

Formerly, Congress allowed a deficiency appropriation, which was like a blank check, to pay for suppressing actual fires, whose cost is unpredictable. This year they put on a ceiling of $6,000,000. Maybe the Congressmen will do a little volunteer forest fire fighting if another bad fire season turns up like last season.

Another curious facet of the picture is in financing costs of fire protection of private lands intermingled with national forests. The State pays the United States Forest Service for this protection. But the State legislature appropriates only enough so that the United States Forest Service gets paid about half as much per acre what the State division of forestry receives for protecting its acreage.

While we are a great believer in Government economy, it would be a pleasant surprise if Congress would use common sense and divert a few more million from some silly waste to the real service of the United States Forest Service. The State legislature recognizes the importance of protecting the resources from fire far more than does the United States Congress.

Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. Harold John Ockenga, preached at the Park Street Church,

Boston, Mass., on December 3, 1950, entitled "The Answer to Communist Aggression":

THE ANSWER TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

(Text: "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him" (Isaiah 59: 19).)

I have read for our Scripture passage, Isaiah 10:5–12.

Communism is on the march, and it is marching to war. It is marching in China, Korea, Indochina, Japan, Germany, Iran, Greece, and other nations of the earth. We Christians of western culture had also better be on the march, and that right soon.

This struggle is more a struggle of light and darkness, of righteousness and iniquity, of God and Satan, than any other struggle which has taken place in history. I do not infer by that that there are no righteous people in Communist countries. No doubt there are many of them, but they do not have control. I do not infer that there are no wicked and corrupt individuals in our free West. There are plenty of them, and too many of them are in control. But the basis of our western culture is certainly founded upon the great principles contained in the word of God. Tonight, therefore, I want you to see that this struggle which is taking place in Korea, though it may not yet be world war III in all of its catastrophe and hideousness, is most certainly the prelude to and the first annunciation of that very thing.

In Korea we see the determination of Communist Russia to test the mood of the west, particularly the mood of the United States of America. Twice in 6 months wars have been launched by two nations—puppet nations—under the control of Communist Russia. The first, of course, was that in Korea launched by the North Koreans; the second was that in North Korea launched by the Chinese Communists. Both of them were open, naked, pure aggression. This is a test just as unquestionably the Japanese seizure of Manchuria or the German seizure of Austria and Sudetanland were tests of the mood of the days in which they occurred. By the reaction to them, these nations were encouraged to go forward or were warned to halt in their aggression.

At the outset, we must recognize that the things which are taking place in the world are not disassociated, isolated, fragmentized events. They are all part of one great world revolution which is being initiated by Communist Russia. I have made that statement from this pulpit many times. For many years I have tried to expound to you the essence of Communist teaching, the program of Communist strategy, the inevitable results of Communist dialectic. I have protested many actions of our Government from this pulpit and in messages preached in important meetings over America. We have been foolishly, almost imbecilically, maneuvered into a situation where American blood must now be shed against puppet nations with whom we have no quarrel, with the Koreans, with the Chinese, and soon, no doubt, with the Germans and with other nations of the earth. This has occurred in spite of the fact that the Communists announced in advance exactly what their intention was, but they were not believed by those in power in the United States of America. Now we are seeing the evidence of their intention and at long last our leaders have become aroused to what is taking place and to what is imminent.

In this Korean struggle, we Americans have for the first time actually reached a decision to check Communist aggression. Our borders are no longer on the Pacific and the Atlantic. They are in Berlin and Vienna and Korea. They are far from America because the stated intention of communistic Russia is world revolution. It is the conquest of the world. It is not to stop in Korea or in China or in Tibet (for there is no reason for taking Tibet unless India is to be threatened), or in Viet Nam or in East Germany. It is to move all over Asia and over Europe and ultimately, because of geopolitics, with these two continents in their control to overrun the whole world.

We have now come to the place where we recognize that it is essential to resist this evil thing called communism. Our approval and our support must be given to the Government in at last standing firm. Here I want to pause and speak as an American citizen. You as a citizen may not agree with me and that is your privilege; you as a Christian may not agree with me and that is your privilege; you as a member of Park Street Church may not even stand by me as the pastor of Park Street Church and that is your privilege. I want to say that I indict this Government for impotence, for irresponsibility, and for actual imbecility in the things which it has done. I spoke 3 years ago from this pulpit, pleading night after night in the fall of 1947. I wrote to the President of the United States, I wrote to the Secretary of State of the United States, pleading that our Government should not dismantle the industries of Western Germany and turn them over to Russia. I went to see the head of the Republican Party in Massachusetts in order to attempt to put some pressure on Washington to stop the permission given by Washington to the Russians to print money (American occupation money) which was redeemed to the tune of $560,000,000 by our Government in 1947 alone. I have tried again and again by public speeches, through organizations, and by protest to stop the betrayal of the Chinese Nationalist Government under Chiang Kai-shek by those in authority in our country. We were told in propaganda coming out of China by men of the breed of Lattimore that Chinese communism was an agrarian movement and that Chiang Kai-shek and his government were hopelessly corrupt. Now the whole world can see that the Communist movement in China was of Russian origin and of the same Soviet pattern and that Chiang Kai-shek was the one to whom we should have turned with confidence instead of selling him down the river.

I have spoken again and again against the turning of huge lend-lease materials over to Russia as we did, against turning Manchuria over to Russia, and turning North Korea over to Russia; in other words, against betraying one of our own allies in the great World War II. Of this betrayal we are guilty. The American Government stands indicted in its leadership for immoral acts and it is fully responsible in this hour for the conditions in which we find our own country and those which our young men are facing in Korea. The time has come, therefore, for us to speak with no uncertain voice upon these things. We must realize that the destiny of the whole west hangs in the balance now.

Our people have always rallied in the past in days of crisis and the will to resist is now universal. Dismay at any sign of weakness would sweep through the democratic world.

Let us remember that the Communists have nothing to restrain them from waging an aggressive war if and when they please. Communist morality is one of expediency and relativism, so that if it advances the Communist cause to launch a sneak attack upon the world, especially upon the United States, the Communists will do so, but we, who act upon law and moral order, or at least profess to do so in international affairs, we who have the vestigial remnants of a Christian civilization, cannot wage a prophylactic or a preventative war. We deplore hearing men like Secretary Matthews and Representative Walsh and Senator Olin Johnston and Harold Stassen and President Truman and others speak about our intention to use the atomic bomb. When such statements are joined with the fact that we did use the bomb in the last war they remove all moral restraint for Russia to use it if and when she pleases. Consequently, there is nothing to prevent a sneak attack being launched upon the great centers of American industry, communication, and intelligence at this very moment, according to Russian morality.

Do you realize that when Mr. Stassen interviewed Mr. Stalin on April 9, 1947, that Stalin said to Stassen, "Lenin is our teacher and we Soviet people are Lenin's disciples." What then did Lenin teach?

Lenin said, according to page 398 in the seventeenth volume of his collected works: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain, we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. This is a respite in war * * *. There is no alternative left * * *. Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world, or the most reactionary imperialism triumphs * * *. There is no middle course."

What Leninist propaganda calls reactionary imperialism is actually representative democracy and free enterprise which he hated. This was a derogatory term used by Lenin to refer to democratic culture. My friends, if you listen to the teacher of Communist Russia, you hear one tell you that Russia is out to dominate the world and to remove from the face of the earth any government which resists her purpose. In Lenin's last speech he said, "Gather strength and strike the bourgeois as is necessary. Strike it only in the chest when you are sure of victory."

Let the moment come when the Communist government in Moscow thinks that it can be sure of victory, the moment when it has wooed from us the Chinese, the Germans, the Persians, and others, let the moment come when they have bled us white by our struggling with their puppet soldiers, let them achieve the development of the atomic bomb and gather a stockpile, as probably they have done through the traitorism of those who have been employed by our own and the English Governments and then the moment will come to strike. There will be no moral restraint. There will be no intellectual restraint. There will be no political restraint. There will be no reason why Communist Russia should not in a moment of time try a sneak attack, as Japan once tried, in order to knock us out of the conflict. Thus in one fell blow Russia would remove the only dam which holds back communism from world dominion. The solitary obstacle to communism's conquest of the world lies in the 150,000,000 people in the United States of America.

How then are we going to meet this situation and what is the answer to communism today? I wish I had much time but due to the limited radio period I must be brief. Therefore, I would suggest three answers which may be given to aggression of Communist Russia. They are righteousness, reason, and resistance. Just three things. I announced these on September 14 to over 60,000 people gathered in the Rose Bowl in California and I have outlined them to you previously.

Mark you, first of all there is righteousness. I have suggested earlier this evening that our western culture, the culture of free men and free society and free enterprise and free ballot and free worship and free speech, has been built on one foundation alone. It is the Judaistic Christian tradition drawn from the Bible, developed through the long process of Christian history from the day of the collapse of the Hellenistic culture unto our present glorious civilization. This western culture is founded on three ideas which I can only mention but not expound. The first is the belief in God, namely, that God exists and that He has created the world and has made man in the image of Himself.

God is supreme Second, there is a moral law. This is a moral universe which is dependent upon God and God's law. This law of God is shot through the universe. Third, individual men are of infinite value in the sight of God for they were created in the divine image and they have infinite potentialities for righteousness or for evil. On these three ideas, the entire culture of the West has been built. I know that there have been conflicts between what we call equalitarianism on the one hand and libertarianism on the other hand, but they have been balanced in equilibrium by Christian brotherhood. The pendulum has been swinging from one extreme to the other extreme, but it has been kept fairly well balanced in the center because of Christian teaching which infused righteousness and integrity in the lives of individual men so that they embraced neither extreme. This balanced culture has descended from various philosophical sources which I have not time to describe tonight. It is exemplified in what is called Christian civilization.

It is an anomaly that we of the Christian West should act upon the ground of moral law in international things while in our personal lives we have been repudiating this authority of divine law. It is essential for our Nation to turn unto God who says, "If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." For divine deliverance, we must first of all have righteousness infused in the life of the people, for without it we have no answer to the problems upon which communism feeds.

The second answer to communism is reason. It is time we understood this business of communism. This summer I heard a professor make a speech in New Hampshire on the Korean situation. He is dean of the American School of Political Affairs and has taught political economy for 25 years. He opened his speech by saying that he had never had inclination enough to read the writings of Karl Marx. I was utterly dismayed Here was a man who has been teaching young men for 25 years how to run the United States Government and he never had read the writings of Karl Marx. How did he have any right to talk about the Korean situation or about communism today? That is the trouble with too many of those in leadership in this Nation. They do not know what they are talking about. They do not know what communism is, what it aims at, what its dialectic is.

Let me tell you that communism is a religion. It is an atheistic, ruthless, fanatical religion which calls for sacrifice and for devotion to convert the world to its viewpoint. Communism is an integrated philosophy which binds its adherents together Only 2 days ago the Communist leader of Germany warned the world that the nations in the Russian camp would not stand by and see American cannon used in Korea, but that they would unite in opposition to it as one man. Communism has developed a strategy whereby it can conquer a nation with a minority and then prevent the majority from staging a counterrevolution. People do not know what communism teaches. Yet the books on communism are in our libraries and could have been read by those in leadership in our Government. Therefore, we are facing an integrated philosophy having the vitality of a religion with the absolute ruthlessness of atheism which is out for world domination. If you contain communism in Korea it will break out in East Germany. If you contain it in Greece it will break out in Indochina. It is the same old underlying sore that is spreading like a cancer throughout the whole of the body politic of the world.

We had better understand that the antagonism of Soviet communism is directed toward the United States as the citadel of the philosophy of theism, of freedom, and of democracy. Only last week Mr. Wu, of Peiping, spoke 10,000 words filled with venom and hate against America. He turned every good deed we had ever done for China into an action of materialism of our own ends and for the exploitation of China. He is an illustration of how the Communists of the world hate America. They hate its Christianity. They hate its free enterprise. They hate its democracy and they are determined that this Nation will go down. We had better understand that fact very soon.

We need the light of reason thrown upon the United Nations. In a moral universe there will be no strength in an international organization which has no moral base, which does not believe in God and whose charter can be broken at will by those who want to break it because they have no moral scruples, whereas a nation which is a member and believes in God, tries to fulfill the requirements of that charter. Herbert Hoover was right in calling for a union of God fearing, moral nations of this earth to act together. Lake Success may very well prove itself to be "Lake Failure." The San Francisco Conference may well be the sunset of western culture instead of the sunrise of a new day. The United Nations Building in New York instead of becoming a building of unity may well be a Temple of Babel, a source of the division of the nations. Though we have subsidized the United Nations, we have seen it turn into a gigantic propaganda agency for the espousal and the promotion of causes that are contrary to our national interest and to the preservation of western culture. The day has come when we must recognize that giving our money, giving our sons, giving our substance to the nations of the earth must be conditioned upon moral grounds and upon international cooperation.

We need to understand ourselves also. Time does not permit that I speak about the sins of our own nature. We are no saints in this country and we need to recognize ourselves for what we are and for what must be done for us by the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Lastly I want to speak about resistance. We must have the resistance of an unwavering faith, of an unfaltering firmness and an unconquerable force. We must have faith in God and in his sovereignty if we expect him to intervene in the course of events by strengthening us for victory. Let us have done with the weakness of doubt.

Resistance comes from firmness. It was Mr. Lincoln who said, "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." Vacillation is interpreted as weakness. We as a nation must stand by our committals before God and the world, but we must stop committing ourselves to that which we cannot fulfill. Our failure in firmness in China has been vicious.

Lastly, resistance implies force. In the Scripture we hear words, "The war was of God." The Bible sanctions the use of force in the establishment of human government and the requiring of human life by that government, in the committal of the sword to the magistrate, in the establishment of police and of national defense. Those who are the heirs of Christian culture should have the Christian conviction of reenforcing right in the world. Unless we use it, democracy is doomed. Away with all weakness and, if an inevitable show-down comes between communism and the West, let us put our trust in God and be prepared.

If we are going to have God's blessing on our arms and we must and want to have it, then we had better begin to confess our sins, we had better get on our knees before Almighty God, and we had better do it soon. It will not be too long before this conflict and conflagration engulfs the world. Listen, my friend, the Lord intends us to be strong. The Lord intends us to stand up to evil and, when we have committed our way unto him, to do what is right and then, if necessary, to fight unto the end for those things in which we believe, trusting that God can intervene on our behalf.

How To Make Democracy Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a brief statement entitled "This Is My Idea of How To Make Democracy Live," by Helen Smith Lasseter, which I consider an excellent guide and worthy of consideration:

THIS IS MY IDEA OF HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

1. Be the best individual that you know how to be.
2. Look for God's image in others and try to reveal it in your own life.
3. Get the best education that is available to you so that you may make use of your skills and talents for your own well-being and the blessing of others.
4. Be the kindest person that you know how to be.
5. Do the best job that you know how to do in everything that you undertake.
6. Make the best home that you know how to make.
7. Find the place in your community in which you can render your best service and your life will be a living example of how to make democracy live and how to create a better world.
8. Invest in yourself, your fellow man, your country, and your Uncle Sam—buy United States Savings stamps and United States Defense bonds.

HELEN SMITH LASSETER.
JANUARY 9, 1951.

Information About Possible 1952 Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter I have received from the Department of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.. C, December 15, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR BECKWORTH: This is in reply to questions which you raised in our telephone conversation of November 27, and also in reply to your letter of November 27, 1950, regarding what might happen to a particular county's cotton acreage allotment and the allotments for individual farms within the county, if cotton acreage allotments should be required in 1952.

In our letter of November 24, 1950, we outlined the present provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, that would probably cause 1952 State

and county cotton-acreage allotments, if required, to vary from those established in 1950 (in many cases the difference would be substantial) even if no change is made in the national acreage allotment in 1952 from 1950. This is true because of changes in base periods and in formulas provided in the act for apportioning the national allotment to States and the State acreage allotments to counties. We have also discussed with you in previous letters that the provisions of the act do not include the acreage planted to cotton in 1951 in the base for establishing 1952 State and county allotments and, therefore, will not affect them.

Since farm cotton acreage allotments are determined primarily on a uniform county percentage of cropland, the acreage planted to cotton on a farm has little bearing on the allotment. The law provides that the acreage of cotton be used in determining minimum and maximum allotments in distributing the county allotment (less the acreage reserved by the county committee) to eligible cotton farms. Therefore, if all farmers in a county should double their cotton acreage in 1951 over 1950, the 1952 farm allotments may be changed considerably or none at all or somewhere between, depending on how farmers in the particular county vary their cotton acreage in proportion to cropland.

In view of the many factors affecting allotments as provided by law it is impossible to determine what the 1952 county and farm cotton acreage allotments would be, if required, until the provisions of the act have been applied in determining State, county, and farm allotments. Consequently, even though we assume that (1) there will be cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas in 1952, (2) the national allotment for 1952 would be the same as the 1950 national allotment, and (3) a particular farm or county plants exactly twice as much cotton in 1951 as was planted in 1950 it would still be impossible to determine the changes in any given county allotment or the farm allotments within a given county.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. McCORMICH,
Under Secretary.

The President's Message and a Republican Response

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of comment on the President's state of the Union message and the responsibility and opportunity of the Republican Party, carried on the NBC network program Pro and Con, January 12, 1951:

When the President addressed the Congress in his state of the Union message 2 years ago, his opening sentence was: "I am happy to report that the state of the Union is good."

Last year on a similar occasion he started off: "I am happy to be able to report to you today that the state of the Union continues to be good."

This year in a very different vein he started off: "This Eighty-second Congress faces as grave a task as any Congress in the history of our Republic."

The 1950 message, full of rosy optimism, said: "While great problems still confront us, the greatest danger has receded." The President then proceeded to devote 60 percent of his message exclusively to advancing his domestic program.

By contrast, this year only 4 percent of his message related to his domestic program and that only in the most generalized terms.

This is a powerful commentary upon the deterioration in world conditions during the past year. At the opening of Congress this year we heard a message dictated by a total reversal of all the assumptions of 12 months before.

The people of this Nation are terribly worried and justifiably so. We enjoy neither peace abroad nor security at home.

The people are disappointed, many of them incensed, over the indecisive, vacillating and faulty leadership which has contributed so heavily to our present plight.

We Republicans must ask ourselves, What is our proper function as a minority party?

By its very nature a minority party is the proper vehicle for expression of opposition to the policies of the party in power. Indeed, with the rising tide of indignation in this country against the present administration, if our constitutional processes had been patterned after those of most European countries, we would have had long before this a vote in Congress to express confidence or lack of confidence in the administration. If that vote had been adverse, as I sincerely believe it would, the Truman wing of the Democratic Party would already be out of power.

That, however, is not the way our forefathers fashioned the framework of this Republic. For better or for worse, White House leadership will not change for two more years. These 2 years may determine whether our Nation can survive and our people remain free.

In an era so challenging, in the face of issues so far reaching, we Republicans are under a solemn obligation to the people to insure that all avenues of discussion are kept open and all sides of the weighty questions affecting the very life of our Nation are thoroughly explored and debated. Only thereby will we arrive at conclusions which reflect the true will of the people without whose wholehearted support any national effort will fail. At the same time we have an equally solemn obligation to keep our debate on a high level with our sights trained on only one objective, the safety and welfare of our country.

Too many administration spokesmen have advanced the thesis that unity requires that in these critical times we of the minority party subordinate our views and submit to the will of the wing of the Democratic Party which now controls the White House. Nothing could be more dangerous, nothing more fatal to the preservation of the vitality and strength of our two-party system of government. I was happy to hear the President himself repudiate this line of reasoning in recognizing that unity does not require complete submission by the minority to policies and methods advanced by the majority which are believed to be demonstrably unsound.

Nor should we of the minority remain silent if we believe that appointed officials of the Federal Government at any level, either because of questionable loyalty to their country, incompetence, or personality deficiencies have completely lost the confidence of the people to the extent that they can no longer effectively and efficiently lead them in the great effort to which our Nation is committed.

While carefully avoiding irresponsible charges and demagogic appeals, we have a duty to protest emphatically their retention in high positions.

But just as it is our duty as critics to be constructive, so it is the obligation of those holding ultimate power to give weight to that criticism without regard to partisan considerations. Both of us should seek, in these critical times, areas of agreement rather than of disagreement.

This requires greater opportunity for free and responsible discussion in the formulation of national policies. This must take place when those policies are taking shape.

It was a disappointment that the President in his message did not even mention the all-absorbing question of the moment, whether he will consult with Congress before ordering large forces to be deployed in Western Europe. An assurance to that effect would have gone a long way toward accomplishing that unity of purpose which he properly asks.

When General Eisenhower returns from Europe, it is to be hoped that his report on the prospect of building an international army for defense of the Atlantic community will be made to representatives of both parties at the White House.

The best way to make Members of Congress sensible of their responsibility is to keep them informed as to the underlying facts of our position in the world. This has not been done. Decisions have been made and Congress presented with the accomplished fact. Then the charge of causing disunity is made, if the wisdom of the decision be challenged. That must be altered if we are going to work in harness.

While I realize that consultations in advance give rise to many difficulties, nevertheless they point the only way to advancement of a foreign policy which will be widely understood and at least to a large degree insulated against the passions of partisanship.

We have never been at a point in our history where it was more important that Americans go forward together. There can be no question as to the goal of everyone of us—a just peace and true freedom for the peoples of the earth.

There is unity on the question of the extent of national effort. No reasonable move should go untried. No necessary sacrifice should be avoided. There is unity on the proposition that every American must render every effort to resolve this crisis successfully, to achieve victory and to establish a real and just peace.

There can be no doubt that Americans in all walks of life, regardless of party, stand together on these worthy objectives. In their accomplishment, we Republicans will put our country first.

Broome County's Sons Spring to Her Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for an all-out effort to build up America's defense of her freedom and liberties all over the world, we would defeat our very purposes of rearming if we let our vigilance lag for a minute here at home.

The fundamental principle of keeping free is preserving our direct election system. That is as important as any step

we will ever take in defending the ramparts.

There is now in the making in Albany, well hidden behind massive, closed doors, and the general alarums of preparatory legislation, formulas of reapportioning the congressional districts of New York State.

As I understand it, Broome County, which is one of the largest and most important counties in the whole State, will become a vassal state to be subjugated in importance to many lesser counties in remote sections. It will be fastened on to them as a sort of a geographical freak, most resembling on the map an alligator.

I pointed this out a month ago and was joined by leading Republicans in Broome who expressed their indignation that anything like it should be conceived.

Yet, the same source who gave me the original valuable tip, persists in telling that the experts of gerrymander are on the march, and that they have not swerved in their determination to cut up the Thirty-seventh Congressional District into sardine slices, thereby reducing our importance and prestige throughout the State to little more than that of a third-rate community.

If they succeed, the people of Broome County will receive secondary consideration in vital matters of civil defense; our GI's and our veterans will be pushed aside, and our citizenry will be relegated to positions of unimportance both in Albany and in Washington.

I cannot stand idly by and keep silent in the face of such a misfortune. The people of my home section deserve a happier fate than to be consigned to the political junk heap.

Last week, a glimmer of light appeared on the horizon when the Broome County Board of Supervisors passed, without a dissenting vote, a resolution by Mr. Harry D. Prew, of Binghamton's third ward, protesting any radical change in our congressional district.

Although this action was played down in news reports, it was significant and highly commendable both of Supervisor Prew in presenting the resolution and of the board approving it. I understand many members expressed strong feeling in support of the idea that Broome County should be the center of any district she is a part of.

I am happy indeed to see so many of Broome's loyal sons spring to her defense. Albany ought to take heed and see which way the wind blows.

To edify the gerrymander tacticians, I think I should make it plain that from a personal political standpoint, they will not affect me no matter what manner of district they throw Broome into.

As long as Broome is in the district I run in, they cannot defeat me in the Republican primaries.

They cannot build up majorities enough in a dozen other counties to offset the old home town.

There may be doubters of that statement now but in 1952 they will see that I was correct.

The Philosophy of Wilson and the World of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a splendid and timely speech delivered by the Honorable Shane MacCarthy, political scientist and lecturer, Washington, D. C., at the Wilson day dinner celebration, December 28, 1950, before the Knox County Democratic Women's Club, at Knoxville, Tenn.

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

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WILSON AND THE WORLD OF TODAY

We gather tonight not in sentimental fashion to moisten our emotions in remembrance of a great leader of our Nation. Our aim is not to load accolades of praise on a President whose meritorious work for freedom, justice, and peace is being appreciated more with the maturity of time. It is not our goal to consume time by a monotonous recital of dates and occasions in the life of a great man. Rather shall we endeavor to drink at the fountain of political thought which was filled so freely and so brilliantly by the mind and pen of Woodrow Wilson.

Thirty-three years ago, in January 1917, a man slight of physical stature poised his frail being before the Senate of the United States and there differentiated between the concepts of "victory," which implied peace forced upon the loser, and "peace based upon equality and mutual pursuance of the common good." That man was President Woodrow Wilson. The warring nations heeded not his advice and 3 months later, in April 1917, recognizing that the wrongs being inflicted by the aggressor nations of that day cut deep to the very roots of human life, he solemnly asked for a declaration of war by the United States upon the Imperial German Government. In his grave request he said:

"Our object is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power. The menace to peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments, backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people."

How well and accurately these words of Wilson express the conditions of the world today. Two world wars have been fought and ended, concluded in so-called triumph for the democratic nations of the world, and yet we are seeking that elusive something called perfect peace. Since you are citizens of the noblest vintage, all picked and culled, you will readily agree that in this finite world perfection is not attainable. However, we may have a lasting peace among nations if we follow the prescription of the great feast we've just celebrated, for peace shall prevail and remain only among and between men of good will.

We meet at one of the most critical junctures in our national history and in the history of civilization itself. Out of our efforts at this very moment could generate the thoughts which, like beacon lights could stimulate the positive actions that are required to lead us out of the morass in which freedom and democracy are wallowing today. Accordingly, I come not here to talk, and not merely to participate on your worth while program; I do not desire to add gloom to pessimism or to create false hopes in minds already captured by wishful thinking. Rather do I hope by utilizing Wilson's thoughts and words to translate the impact of a world in turmoil into the context of what you and I as individuals can do and must do to aid civilization in this struggle for existence.

No more need be said about the goal of the Communists. Without a glimmer of uncertainly, we know that they seek world domination at any cost. This strategy remains unaltered regardless of the ebb and flow of tactical changes. In the achievement of their dastardly aims we have seen the laboratory of communism in the U. S. S. R. itself unfold before us a horrible panorama of slavery, torture, and godlessness. Those preaching the gospel according to Marx have accomplished nothing for the good of mankind, and yet, in their quest for power this negative factor is no deterrent. Onward they go stirring up fresh wars in the Devil's caldron of hates; proceeding under the false veneer of aiding humanity, when in reality human beings count for naught in their evil designs; enslaving nations as stepping stones toward achievement of world conquest; eradicating from life everything good, noble, just, and moral. While the death march of the Communists continues to grind its way toward total destruction of life and liberty, we of the free world appear to flounder in thought and to hesitate in the realm of indecisive action in counteracting this satanic force. Do we delay in diagnosing bodily illness when symptoms of disease appear? When thieves attempt to plunder and rob our homes and businesses, do we sit as bleacherites watching their machinations with indifference? Would we react with aloofness and unconcern if our material savings, which had been the product of patient toil over the years, were to be snatched by gangsters? Would we be unresponsive if evil doers were to spoil the moral character which we are attempting to develop in our children? For strength of body; for protection of home and business; for security of monetary investments; for the safeguarding of the character of our loved ones we would not allow apathy to make us lukewarm and detached. Then why do we not strip all issues of today of their verbosity? Why do we not dissipate the clouds that blind our vision? Why do we not realize that a weakened and war-weary world is sorely infected by the evil doings of one godless nation, and that the desecration of civilization itself is being checked by the existence of one country which is still strong and courageous—our own United States?

As we stand poised at this crossroads, let us realize that the battle for the survival of democracy will not automatically fade into oblivion. This struggle for the world now being waged is a contest to the finish, because the triumph of the Soviet system would spell the doom of ours.

In this battle for life let's look up with confidence to what we have, and to our capacity for engineering the triumph of good over evil.

"Democracy," said Wilson, "is the most difficult form of government because it is the form under which you have to persuade the largest number of persons to do anything in particular. But I think we were the more pleased to undertake it because it is difficult. Anybody can do what is easy. We have shown that we could do what was hard."

Not many years back our fathers reached into the heavens and brought down a segment of that power from above, and gave

to weak man the power to rule himself. We gave substance and form to the thoughts of philosophers and statesmen, and launched the great "experiment," by instituting a Government which derived its right from the consent of the governed. In so doing, we recognized that man—the individual man—was first, and that the state existed but to protect his rights. We openly acknowledged that man was greater than the state—the state has no immortal soul. Thus, the fundamental issue of the moment, the fight between God and Satan, is part of the continuous adventure in the art of governing mankind. In this fight, our country, by the grace of God, stands a free, prosperous, and strong Nation, ready for the morrow, realizing that no nation ever had greater responsibility for the future of the world, for the retention of freedom, than we have. We are the sample democracy, the windowdressing of the democratic concept, and if the light of freedom were to be quenched here, unborn generations would know only serfdom.

With such a profusion of storm clouds, are there any fair-weather signs which may kindle our hopes? Over the horizon which hides the future can we anticipate the rising of a morning sun which will shed its rays on a world of freemen? Is there any answer which will give to life in this finite world more than a temporary solace, more than intermittent peace, more than mere cessation of hostilities? Thank God that in response to these searching interrogations we can reply with a concrete and strong affirmative answer. In preparing ourselves to accomplish the desired end, the first basic premise is that the task belongs not to indefinite humanity but to definite human beings who are you and I. We fail before we start if we approach the solution by the thought of relegating action to the Government, to the military, to a political party, or to someone else. The strength of government, the power of policy is as strong or as weak as you or I make it. In conducting this individual crusade, we must condition ourselves by preparing our minds and our souls for the task ahead.

1. From our thinking processes we must eradicate confusion. It is fundamental to all action that we know, with accuracy, the essential facts which make us love the life we have and abhor the concepts which the rulers of the Kremlin would force upon us. Unless we think alike about the major problems of today, then all of our attempts to apply corrective remedies will lose their strength by dissipation and bewilderment.

2 It is essential that we eliminate uncertainty as to what we are striving to attain. We must recognize that this is not a mere battle of differing ideologies; it is not two systems selling their wares in the market place; this is not a competition between equals for control of humanity; rather is it a struggle for civilization. It is the death battle between truth, justice, charity on the one hand, and on the other, world servitude. Our God-given principles of life are not being weighed in a scale of international caliber to be matched against the atheistic pronouncements of Communists. If the pursuit of happiness is to remain a right of man, if freedom and liberty are to prevail and survive, if life itself is to win the struggle, then there is no choice as to the outcome—we must win.

3. In this struggle we must avoid timidity which will inevitably bring on defeatism. If we are afraid, it is a self-indictment of the ignorance we possess about our Nation and its people. If we are faint-hearted we do not recognize that truth and God are on our side in this fight against evil. If we don the cloak of a coward, we are easy prey for an enemy which has no fear for even a brave man. Those who rule by fear and seek to crush men by fear must be met by fearless people to whom liberty is even more sacred than life itself.

4. Trample underfoot the indifference which makes us unresponsive to our obligations. If we continue to enjoy the God-given benefits of freedom without a realization that these benefits carry with them militant obligations, then we are indeed selfish and myopic, unwilling to give the future the heritage that was bequeathed to us by past generations, and unaware that we could lose what we have by default.

When, then, will the arts of peace catch up with the powers of destruction? Not until each person individually realizes that it is his and her task always to wage the peace with the same unity of purpose so evident in time of war. Solidarity is a unique by-product of war. But must we be doped up by recurring crises to recognize this militant obligation for guarding and strengthening democracy?

THE ANSWER

I hope not. Thus, with confusion, uncertainty, timidity, and indifference expelled from our systems, we approach the combat with positive attributes of courage, confidence, resolution, and conviction which must be all cloaked in strength to produce the type of practical patriotism demanded by the challenge of today. Unless, however, we translate these concepts into practical action they remain mere words signifying no usefulness in solving current issues. Hence, if we are possessed of that quality of mind which meets danger and difficult situations with firmness of spirit; if ours is the self-reliance which strengthens faith in our cause; if we are resolved to wage the peace for a better type of life; if all our actions are guided by a persuasion in the righteousness of what we stand for; then, with the necessary aid of military strength, we have marshaled our resources to develop a formidable front against the forces of atheistic communism.

But, who will carry on this fight? The Government? The armed services? Let's get the cue for our answer from Wilson, who said:

"We overlook the fact that the real source of strength in the community comes from the bottom. Do you find democracy renewing itself from the top? Don't you find society renewing itself from the ranks of unknown men? * * * What you are constantly depending on is the rise out of the ranks of unknown men, the discovery of men whom you had passed by, the sudden disclosure of capacity you had not dreamed of, the emergence of somebody from some place of which you had thought the least, of some man unanointed from on high, to do the thing that the generation calls for."

Leadership in government is certainly essential, and the power of our armed services must be capable of dealing effectively with a regime that recognizes only military might. But the menace of totalitarianism which overshadows the world today can be diffused only by the individual man and woman. Again you ask, How can a solitary man influence the whole of mankind? Remember that mankind does not exist but men do. Since all our efforts to subdue the Soviet threat are premised upon the greatness of the individual life, how can the individual contend that he or she is too small to participate? On the contrary, freedom—genuine God-given freedom—will fail unless we relate the battle for freedom to our individual lives.

In the struggle of the hour, we are not merely seeking military victory which brings a peace that is no more than a cessation of hostilities; we are not striving for economic domination over commerce and trade; we are not attempting to extend an imperialistic strangle hold over nations. Our own goal is to see that mankind is not reduced to the level of the brute beast and living only in accordance with the will of a central oligarchy. Such a struggle demands the continuous participation of all men since each one of us is concerned about our own survival. Ladies and gentlemen, this fact is as practical as an adding machine and is as impartial as a traffic light.

The individual campaign I call for must be waged at four levels:

(a) In the home and office.
(b) In the community.
(c) In the State.
(d) In the Nation.

HOME AND OFFICE

One of the most sensitive target areas at which the strategy and tactics of international communism are beamed is the home. In their devilish crusade to subdue the world, much of the Communist power in the U. S. S. R. has been generated by their capacity to weaken the home and control the youth. Lenin himself said "Give me the youth for 8 years and I'll give you a Bolshevik (Communist) forever." By putting mothers into the labor force of the Soviet Union and training the children in state-supported schools, the infant minds have been indoctrinated with the philosophy of Marx, Lenin, and the police-state tyrannical thoughts of Stalin to the point where they fit into the scheme of Communist world conquest. These are the young people who now form the youthful leaders in carrying out Communist policies and undertakings. Well, indeed, does Stalin know that if the home is rendered unstable, the State will totter. Accordingly, you and I must live our lives in our homes and in our work surroundings in such a manner as to beget confidence in the system of which we are a part. Truth, morality, kindness, patience, love of fellow man, are integral parts of this blueprint. If these do not exist then our striving for victory is an empty struggle.

COMMUNITY

The lowest level of government in our democratic system is that of our rural or urban surroundings. Business interests and business rivalries are therein developed. Knowledge of the capacity of persons for leadership is a component of our daily associationships. Each community is a proving ground for testing the practicable application of ideas which strengthen our society. Accordingly, see to it constantly that you are giving to the community the full, unselfish contribution of your capacity for preventing evil and accomplishing good. In this way your efforts will shine as brilliant examples to stimulate similar undertakings in localities where the contagion of good will result in like benefits for others.

THE STATE

Not many years have passed since the fathers of our Nation, by divine providence, brought into existence one indivisible Nation composed of sovereign States and commonwealths. The power of their sovereignty, the capacity for continuation of the philosophy under which they were formed, their ability to avoid unhealthy rivalries must all be guided by you and by me who live in those States. The land of each is bountiful in its beauty and generous in its capacity, but these attributes are inanimate and do not possess the importance of a single citizen of any of those States. Therefore, you must be constantly on guard to protect and strengthen the policies of your State as a sacred unit in our democratic system.

THE NATION

The men and women who form our national and international policies come from the State, from the community, and from the home. They are not an isolated category of citizenry. They are chosen by us to carry the torch of liberty and freedom through ages dark and bright. They are our missionaries selected by us to speak our gospel and formulate our decisions. Why then criticize policies when we ourselves, by indirection, are the makers of those policies? When will we be men enough to recognize that the power in the Government is the power from our people? Immediately, therefore, we should close the gap between ourselves and our rulers so that we develop a oneness of thought, of purpose, and of action in the evolvement of our national and international policies. Don't just wait for election opportunities. The process of democracy is continuous and under our system the one elected is the representative of all. Accordingly, from us to our representatives and appointed officials should go suggestions and recommendations and from them to us should come explanations supporting their actions. This cohesion will bring about a teamwork for good that will forge strength in our national and international endeavors.

CONCLUSION

In all our endeavors let us be guided by the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence and of our Constitution. As Wilson said:

"My dream is that as the years go on * * * the world * * * will turn to America for those moral inspirations which lie at the basis of all freedom; * * *.

"I do not know that there will ever be a declaration of independence and of grievances for mankind, but I believe if any such document is ever drawn it will be drawn in the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence, and that America has lifted high the light which will shine unto all generations and guide the feet of mankind to the goal of justice and liberty and peace."

This philosophy explains that inalienable rights come not from the state; they are not derived from the majority vote of the people. They come to man from God. Hence, if they are taken away, the action violates the natural law, it violates the law of God. Therefore, the battle for inalienable rights means nothing if God is eliminated from our consideration. At San Francisco, however, one nation—Russia—succeeded in vetoing God from the deliberations and from the Charter of the United Nations. How, then, can we achieve a solidarity of peace for the worlds? How can we attain a brotherhood of men under the fatherhood of God when this fatherhood is not recognized? Hence, in the home, in the community, in the State, in the Nation, enthrone God in our individual lives, and let our actions be guided thereby. The words of Wilson are indeed appropriate for us tonight:

"This," said he, "is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. Here muster not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity. Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try? I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men."

Therefore, do not leave this chamber saying that you can do nothing. Do you want democracy to become a formless ideal, mocked by some conqueror who will relegate to it a place in history that never mattered much? Of course not. Therefore, as the scepter of world leadership is ours to wield, let us as Americans, as all Americans, as individuals, but, more important still, as individual Americans, go forward with unity of purpose and with enthusiasm for the opportunity which is given to us for doing good. Every ounce of our energies should shout for action at this challenge. Let us not bequeath to the future a task which we should face and do today and every day. This alone can save civilization. This alone can save the world.

God bless you.

Let's Remove the Ancient Figures From These Walls and Replace Them With Great Americans—Including Thomas Alva Edison

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, when we get around to moving these caricatures off the wall of the House Chamber, of course I shall want to put the figures of George Washington, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, James Monroe, John Adams, and other great Americans in their places.

I certainly want to remove that ancient figure of Hammurabi, who is said to have lived 4,000 years ago. I want to remove his picture and also that of Suleiman, who is said to have been an emperor of Turkey at one time, as well as that of the Spanish Rabbi, Maimonides, and other misfits, who have been dead from 500 to 3,000 years, and replace at least one of them with the figure of Thomas Alva Edison, in my opinion the greatest single benefactor mankind has ever known.

Mr. Edison probably did more for humanity than any other human being who has ever lived, from the dawn of civilization to the present day. He is one man who never served in public office whose figure I would like to see placed upon the wall of this historic chamber, in the place of one of those ghastly figures that now confront us.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the speech which our genial colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], made before the House several years ago on the subject of Thomas Alva Edison has now been reprinted in that great series of volumes "Modern Eloquence" and has been recognized by authorities on public speaking as one of the great deliverances of our time.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his compliment.

In that address, I was simply saying what I felt about Mr. Edison, the man whom I consider to be one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, benefactor that mankind has ever known.

That speech has not only been printed in the set of books called "Modern Eloquence," to which the gentleman from Iowa refers, but it is reproduced in several other volumes, one of which is "The Principles of Public Speaking," which is used as a textbook in many colleges, including George Washington University, and also in a book on public speaking called "You Can Make a Speech," by Hon. William Doll, former president of the Wisconsin Bar Association and a former instructor of public speaking at the University of Washington and also at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, at this point, my address on Mr. Edison as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, February 12, 1940. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Vreeland, knowing of my admiration for Mr. Edison, asked me to make a few remarks during the memorial services which were held for him here in the House. Owing to the limitation of time, he was able to yield me only 10 or 15 minutes, in which time I expressed, as best I could, my sentiments on Mr. Edison's life, work, and character.

That address follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to the memory of one of America's most illustrious sons. Yesterday was the ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, our country's greatest contribution to the world's list of scientific men.

He was the foremost inventive genius of the age and one of the leading benefactors of mankind. He was the greatest liberator the world has ever known. By the force of his matchless genius, aided by his tireless energy, he struck the shackles of drudgery from untold millions of human beings and lifted the world into the light of a new civilization, the like of which humanity had scarcely dreamed.

He stands in history among the leaders of the men of genius of all time—Homer, Galileo, Michelangelo, Rembrandt, Mozart, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Columbus, Jefferson, Newton, and Marconi. Towering amid that great galaxy rises the immortal figure of Edison, in glorified silhouette against the horizon of the ages, sending a glow of radiance down the centuries to come, to stir the hopes and fire the imaginations of toilers of the future who struggle for the betterment of mankind.

It is unnecessary to attempt to magnify his virtues, to minimize his vices, or to clothe him with qualities he did not have. All that is necessary to commend him to the minds and hearts of peoples of all climes is the simple story of this earnest, patient man, toiling through the silent hours of the night to make the world a better place in which to live.

He was the greatest public servant of his day; yet he held no political office, he founded no political party, he advanced no new political creeds. Therefore no array of illustrious speakers volunteer to sing his praise or use his name as a sounding board to further selfish ends.

He was one of the mightiest conquerors this world has ever seen; yet he waged no wars of human destruction, he fought no bloody battles, he stirred no fires of human hate nor pandered to the baser passions of the race. But he conquered the elements,

as it were, and gave to humanity the greatest ascendancy over the forces of nature the world has ever known. He brought the dawn of a new civilization—the electric age.

He never intentionally hurt a human being. Therefore no memorial has been erected to him in his country's Capital, no monument dedicated to his name, no blazing epitaph upon these historic walls proclaim his services to the world.

I sometimes wonder if we really appreciate the services of men of genius. They scale the heights and blaze the way to those sublime achievements that mark the milestones in the progress of the race, while men of talent dig in, solidify, and hold the gains and enjoy the progress that genius makes.

Have you ever thought what would happen if we should lose all that men and women of genius have accomplished for the world? What this land would be like? It would be a different world—cold, pulseless, monotonous, and silent. Our transportation system would come to a standstill, the telephone and telegraph wires would become useless obstructions, the lights would go out, the radio would be silenced, and all the machinery of industry, as well as that of commerce would cease to move. As has been well and wisely said, if you take from the world all that genius has given, "all the niches would be empty, all the walls would become naked, meaning and connection would fall from words of poetry and fiction, music would go back to common air, and all the forms of subtle and enchanting art would lose proportion, to become the unmeaning waste and shattered spoil of thoughtless chance."

It would be useless to attempt to enumerate all the things that Edison did for mankind. His greatest contribution was the invention of the electric light—the incandescent lamp. With that one act he did more to change the course of our civilization than has any other man who ever "lived in the tide of time." He not only lighted our halls, our homes, our streets, and our highways, but he gave us the spark that fires the gas that makes the motor machine possible.

He ushered in the electric age, and the motor age as well. He made possible the automobile, the X-ray, the airplane, the submarine, the moving picture, and the radio. He gave us a new system of overland transportation, taught us to navigate the air, and enabled us to roam with safety on the bottom of the seas. He eliminated time and space and aided us to see through objects that were formerly supposed to exclude all light.

He made possible mass production through new industrial machinery, and gave us that great multiplicity of electrical appliances that add to the comforts and conveniences of every home and every business establishment. He made necessities luxuries, and luxuries necessities, and enabled us to electrify the farm homes of America and to lift from the shoulders of burdened humanity the great weight of drudgery under which farm men and women have struggled since the beginning of time.

He tapped a source of wealth richer than the diamond mines of Golconda, more valuable than all the oil fields and all the gold and diamond mines of the modern and ancient world—a wealth that is inexhaustible, and one that will last as long as rains fall and rivers flow to the sea.

There is enough hydroelectric power in our navigable streams alone, that throughout uncounted centuries has been running waste and wanton to the sea, to electrify every home in America, including every farm home, and then have enough left to supply every commercial establishment, if not every industry throughout the land.

His monument is in every home that turns an electric switch; his epitaph is written on every heart that beats in gratitude for the services he gave. He needs no pompous memorial to commemorate his life. He needs no monument save the eternal and indestructible substance of his own greatness to commend him to the consideration of all coming ages. His name will live and his fame will reach to the remotest times in which civilized man shall dwell upon the earth.

Someone has said that—

They are the truly great who, as the centuries slowly pass, are found by each succeeding race near to the heart of human love.

Centuries may come and go, empires may flourish and pass away, republics may rise and fall, but the work of Edison will endure.

When the monuments to lesser men shall have perished with the lapse of time, when this Republic shall have run its course and taken its place among the dead nations of the past, when in the distant lapse of ages yet to come, errant wanderers from different lands shall stand before the crumbling columns of this Capitol and look down across the ruins of the District of Columbia, the name of Thomas A. Edison will remain, unscarred by the wreck of ages and undimmed by the floods of time. [Applause.]

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, since the war started in Korea, White County, one of the small counties in my district in southern Illinois, reports to date 11 casualties, with two killed and one missing.

It is about time the President, the United Nations, and the State Department recognize we are in a war in Korea and not just a police action.

The people of White County and all of the Nation know too well that we are in war. That we are in a war in which the American Army has suffered its first defeats in our history, suffered these defeats because the administration changed its policy overnight and sent our soldiers into battle outnumbered 3 to 5 to 1, outgunned, and unprepared for sudden war.

The result has been 50,000 American casualties to date.

Strategically Korea has never been worth protecting. It is not worth the thousands of lives it has cost to say nothing of the billions of dollars in expense. We should not have gone into Korea, and we should take our troops out of there if possible, without further loss, to another perimeter of defense.

Yet, we read in the press this morning that those directing our foreign policy say we will stay in Korea. If that is the final decision then I would again suggest that the President and the United Nations immediately lift the embargo they have had against Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Government helping us, and permit them to join with us in an effort to relieve the pressure on the American soldiers, cause the Communists to fight on two fronts which would doubtless save the lives in the future of many of our American boys.

Wisconsin, America's Dairyland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the words, "America's Dairyland," appear on the automobile license plates of the State of Wisconsin. The figures bear out the statement. I set forth herein an article which recently appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison. Figures therein are taken from United States Department of Agriculture reports.

STATE DAIRY INDUSTRY WINS 14 UNITED STATES FIRSTS—TOPS ALL OTHERS WITH SIX TYPES OF CHEESE, 1949 RECORDS REVEAL

Wisconsin's dairy industry, from which the biggest portion of the State's agricultural revenue is derived, gave the State 14 first places in the production of milk and manufactured dairy products in 1949, according to complete figures available for that period in the Wisconsin and United States Department of Agriculture crop reporting service records.

Wisconsin topped other States in the production of Munster cheese, producing 95.2 percent of the United States total of 9,613,000 pounds; brick cheese, producing 90.7 percent of the United States total, or 18,387,000 pounds; Swiss cheese 59.6 percent of the United States total, or 48,271,000 pounds.

FORTY-NINE PERCENT OF LIMBURGER

In the production of Italian cheese, the State produced 50.4 percent of the United States total, or 27,771,000 pounds; limburger cheese, 49.1 percent of the United States total, or 3,528,000 pounds; American cheese, 46 percent of the United States total or 430,103,000 pounds, malted milk powder, 81 4 percent of the United States total, or 20,665,000 pounds.

Wisconsin produced 47.9 percent of the United States total of powdered whey, or 76,216,000 pounds; 36.4 percent of the powdered whole milk, or 45,648,000 pounds; 27.7 percent of the powdered skim milk, or 264,839,000 pounds; 27.5 percent of the condensed whole milk, or 40,912,000 pounds; 21 percent of the evaporated whole milk, or 578,578,000 pounds; 19.5 percent of the condensed skim milk (unsweetened), or 104,477,000 pounds; and 13.1 percent of the United States milk supply, or 115,568,000,000 pounds.

In all the above production figures, the State ranked first in the Nation.

In the production of cream cheese, it ranked second, with 27.2 percent of the total production, or 14,796,000 pounds; second on the production of condensed whole milk (unsweetened), with 13.5 percent, or 27,207,000 pounds; third on butter, with 11.9 percent, or 168,214,000 pounds; and third on condensed skim milk (sweetened), or 23,360,000 pounds.

TENTH PLACE ON ICE CREAM

Wisconsin took tenth place on the production of ice cream in the 1949 total dairy production figures, producing 3 percent of the Nation's total, or 16,690,000 gallons.

Iowa was first on the production of butter in 1950 but third in 1949. Minnesota took first place on 1949 butter production but rose to first in 1950.

Wisconsin's total production of cheese of all types during 1949 was 552,469,000 pounds, its total production of other manufactured dairy products was 1,379,496,000 pounds.

Figures presently available for 1950 production show that the State's production of butter had dropped 11.8 percent during the period, January–August, inclusive.

The State's production of American cheese during the above 1950 period had dropped 1.3 percent over 1949.

The price paid for milk to Wisconsin's farmers in October, latest crop reporting figures available, showed that those producing grade A milk for whole milk use averaged $3.60 per hundred pounds; for cheese making, the milk averaged $3.21 per hundred; for butter making, the milk averaged $3 49 per hundred pounds; and for condensery use, it averaged $3.44 per hundred pounds.

Milk prices in Wisconsin continued to lag behind the rise in the general price level during October, with milk prices paid to farmers up to October being slow to reflect a return to him in proportion to the rising feed and labor costs since July.

Here We Go Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a letter regarding the international situation from a constituent:

Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Well, Joe, here we go again. World war III, and in a couple of weeks the eighth member of my immediate family leaves for military service. Counting my own army service and 7 years in selective service out of the past 10, my family will have had over 32 years in uniform or in direct war effort for Uncle Sam. Under the circumstances this must be so, and under the circumstances I would not have it otherwise.

The circumstances, however, are that we all were sold down the river at Yalta. And the pitiful and pathetic leadership we have had since that fateful day has put us a long, long way down the road to ruin. To me, it is no coincidence that every time we are at war there is a Democratic administration and a Democratic foreign policy in power. Would that we had a "Teddy" who spoke softly but firmly, and carried a big stick.

"The world has become a neighborhood," said F. D. R. "Hear, hear," said the puppets. So what? What if we don't like some of our neighbors, and they don't like us even a little bit. Even those to whom we give aid and sustenance mock us behind our back and will not thank us in the end. We have, and are still pouring unnumbered billions into futile attempts to feed and arm a Europe that can never be held against an all-out assault, and into other parts of the world that have no capacity to appreciate the gesture.

I just wanted to get this off my chest because your enemies have perennially accused you of being an isolationist. If you are an isolationist so am I, and so are thousands of others out here in the Middle West. I like my own children a little better than I like those in totalitarian countries, and I don't want my competence for old age dissipated completely by huge taxes to support the welfare programs both at home and abroad. I'm for America first, last, and all the time, even if it's selfish to think that way. The funny part of it is, Joe, that four life-long Democrats have voiced these same sentiments to me the past 10 days. If these are straws in the wind, then Truman and Acheson will go down together.

Letter and Questionnaire to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter and questionnaire which I propose to send out to the box holders in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. The letter and questionnaire follow:

DEAR FRIEND: Each year I send out a questionnaire to the folks in the Fourth District, seeking reactions to problems before the Congress. My purpose is to stimulate a broader interest in government and to give people, who otherwise would not write their Congressman, a chance to express their views. I shall be very happy if you would return the enclosed questionnaire, stating your views. It would be good to have a letter from you, in which you go into considerable detail about the problems facing our country.

QUESTIONNAIRE

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

1. Should there be complete mobilization, including price controls, rationing, and wage freezes?
2. Do you favor universal military training?
3. Should the draft law have exemptions for farm boys, students, or other groups? Should 18-year-old boys be drafted?
4. Should we raise taxes and attempt to pay for the war as we go?
5. Should we eliminate the 40-hour week and overtime at extra pay?
6. Do you favor Federal aid to schools? Socialized medicine? Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?
7. Should we eliminate farm price supports?

FOREIGN PROBLEMS

1. How do you feel about the United Nations?
2. Should we send ground troops to defend Europe and other parts of the world?
3. Should we withdraw our troops from Korea? Where would you suggest we take a stand?
4. How large an Air Force, Army, and Navy would you recommend?
5. Should Marshall-plan aid, and the point 4 program (aid to backward countries) be continued?
6. Should we recognize Red China?

Commitment of Armed Forces Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement by Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 10, 1951:

COUDERT'S RESOLUTION—REPRESENTATIVE REPLIES TO EDITORIAL CRITICISM

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

I am, indeed, sorry that your editorial comment of January 5 upon my resolution obscured a simple, clear-cut, and vitally important constitutional issue by seeking to identify it with Mr. Hoover's recent proposals. I am not prejudging in any way, shape, or form the merit of Mr. Hoover's position. The substance of the resolution was originally drafted 6 months ago for use as an amendment for the armed services appropriations bill and therefore long preceded Mr. Hoover's speech.

The purpose of the resolution is to prevent the commitment of Armed Forces abroad in advance of aggression solely by Executive decision. It is just as simple as that and just as fundamental. The President, on the other hand, asserts precisely such power. I say that he does not and should not have it. If the President alone is allowed to send anywhere abroad, at any time, hundreds of thousands of American troops without a declaration of war by Congress, pursuant to the Constitution, then, indeed, there is little left of American constitutional government or freedom. Such power obviously carries with it, in fact, the power to determine war or peace and ultimate control over the lives and destiny of the American people. If the American people are ready to accept such a theory of Presidential power, then they can dismiss their Congress and prepare to accept government by Presidential decree.

Frankly, your editorial position is difficult for me to understand unless it be, in fact, predicated upon lack of confidence in the Congress—a lack of confidence in no wise justified by the congressional record over the last 5 years in the field of foreign affairs.

I believe that Congress would be wholly derelict if it failed to insist upon the right to full participation in the making of decisions and the taking of actions which will determine war or peace and the fate of the American people. I, for one, do not intend to participate in any such abdication of responsibility.

Your reference to the Atlantic Pact seems to me misleading. In the first place, the United States' obligations do not come into operation before there is an act of aggression against one of the partners. Thus, before aggression, the Atlantic Pact does not in any way enlarge the constitutional powers of the President. Second, you concede that "the United States is not bound by treaty to any particular strategy in meeting its obligations. The broad bounds of such a strategy might properly be debated." That is precisely what I ask. To assure the opportunity for such debate, however, it must be clearly recognized that Congress is entitled to full consultation and participation.

To say that such a debate would constitute a security risk ignores the obvious impossibility of concealing substantial troop

movements across vast oceans to lands where every fourth or fifth person is a Communist sympathiser.

In conclusion, adoption of the resolution would provide a sure method of effective cooperation between the two coordinate branches of the Government—the executive and the legislative—and hence make affirmative action truly that of the United States Government and people.

F. R. COUDERT, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 5, 1951.*

A Correction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes before the House convened on January 4 I received a letter from an official of a well-known national organization which has conducted numerous research studies for many Members of Congress throughout the years. The letter called my attention to two original press-release copies of Gallup polls—one marked for release on December 20 and the other for release on December 22—together with the statement that neither had appeared in the Washington Post, which has the local publication rights for the Gallup poll, and that these particular polls should be of great interest to the Congress.

I had no recollection of having seen the printed reports of these two particular polls, although I am a regular reader of the Washington Post. Without checking personally, as I undoubtedly should have done, I inserted the reports of the two polls in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the statement they had not appeared in the Post and the comment that probably the unusually large volume of pre-Christmas advertising had prevented their publication.

On Wednesday of last week the Washington Post carried a reproduction of one of the Gallup polls referred to, as it had appeared on page 25 of the December 22 issue of the Post—which perhaps explained why I had missed it, inasmuch as such polls usually appear on page 1. I was later informed by a reporter and by one of the officials of the Post that both polls had been published, and since then I have been furnished with tear sheets from the Post showing both such publications.

Therefore, in the desire to be fair to my colleagues and to the Washington Post, and not wishing to do an injustice to that publication, I have asked leave to insert these remarks in the RECORD and to express my regret over the incident. While my original remarks on this subject were based on information I believed to be correct, I take full responsibility for the error, inasmuch as I had failed to check the information personally, as developments demonstrated I should have done.

Our American Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following full-page display article as copied from the Los Angeles Examiner, of Sunday, December 10, 1950, was reprinted from regular editions of that newspaper of December 4, 1950. It appears to have been an editorial. The thoughts therein expressed are in keeping with the sentiments expressed by our many newspapers and statesmen, as well as by what appears to be an overwhelming majority of the people of this country. I have obtained permission to insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of those who have not had an opportunity to read it elsewhere.

OUR AMERICAN DUTY

The blundering and disloyal foreign policies of the New Deal are taking this country into complete disaster—both military and economic.

Our sovereignty has been impaired by making us a virtual vassal of the United Nations, which disrupts our councils, and seeks to fly its mongrel flag over our public buildings.

Our wealth is dissipated to support socialism abroad and to defend alien peoples who are not willing to defend themselves.

The lives of our young men are being sacrificed in a desperate war which our purported allies are not trying to help us win on the battlefields and are conspiring to make us lose in the mazes of diplomacy—and duplicity.

For our own survival, it is imperative that we extricate ourselves from these destroying situations at once.

Without even inadequate support from others in the United Nations we are fighting almost alone against massed hordes on the Asian continent.

Continuing the war means only the slaughter of millions in a quixotic American attempt to conquer a vast and distant population.

First and foremost, therefore, this country should withdraw its Armed Forces from the invasion areas.

We should get our troops out of Korea as quickly as possible.

We should come home to our own country, reconstruct our defenses, and give heed to our own security and welfare.

This might be a defeat for the New Deal, which is responsible for our dismal plight.

It would not be a defeat for the United States, but merely an act of self-preservation.

Secondly, we should get out of the United Nations.

That organization has not sustained us in the war that we undertook in its behalf.

Instead, it has interfered with our operations.

Furthermore, it is conniving to admit the enemy into a privileged membership where the enemy could dictate peace terms.

Accordingly, the United Nations should let Red China in and leave the United States out.

Then let the United Nations see how it gets along.

This country has maintained the United Nations since its inception, with no return in loyalty or gratitude.

So let those who run the United Nations pay for the United Nations and fight its wars.

Finally, we should end our unrequited efforts to support and supply an ingrate Europe.

Even England, our supposedly stanch ally, has not genuinely backed us in our solitary United Nations war, nor assisted us elsewhere.

On the contrary, Marxist England formally recognized the Chinese Communist government, and collaborates with Marxist France in preventing an European rearmament.

Europe has intimated it no longer wants our martial help.

This is Europe's attitude; let Europe look out for itself, and see how Europe gets along.

Since obviously we stand alone, we should have the wisdom and courage to act alone.

For our duty is to protect our own people and to foster our own Nation.

Vital Service of Grass-Roots Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the December 30 issue of the Publishers' Auxiliary, there is printed a letter from President Truman to Mr. George H. Bechtel, editor of the Publishers' Auxiliary, relative to the President's attitude toward the weekly and smaller daily newspapers and their value at this time of crisis. In connection with the printing of the complete text of that letter from the President, there is also a news article contributed by Mr. Walter A. Shead, Auxiliary Washington correspondent. I ask unanimous consent that in the Appendix of the RECORD there may appear the copy of the President's letter and the copy of the news article relative thereto by Mr. Shead.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 22, 1950.

Mr. GEORGE H. BECHTEL,
Editor, the Publishers' Auxiliary,
Frankfort, Ky.

DEAR MR. BECHTEL: Our country today looks to its weekly and small daily newspapers for vital service in a critical period.

World developments have placed this Nation in the position of needing every bit of internal strength it can muster, if it is to survive in the form we know and love.

Traditionally, freedom of information has been one of our greatest sources of strength. Because our people have been able to get a full picture of the conditions in which they live—they have been able to act in the manner best calculated to improve their lot.

The American press has, since the earliest days of our existence as a free Nation, been largely responsible for the development and maintenance of this principle of freedom of information. The men who now edit and publish the hundreds of smaller newspapers throughout the Nation are the direct heirs of our great pioneering editors. It is essential that they carry on the great tradition they have inherited. They can allow no

special interest of any sort t encroach on their time-honored freedom to print the news as they see it—and to express their honest opinions as they feel them.

We can be sure that, if the American people are given the whole and uncolored truth on every major happening and issue of the day, they will inevitably choose the most intelligent and effective course of action.

The weekly and smaller daily newspapers are in the best possible position to perform this service to the American people. They reach a broad cross-section of the American public. They are close to their readers, with whom they share a wide community of interest. Their writers and editors are frequently in close personal contact with their readers. All these factors tend to give what they print a high degree of credibility—and therefore to increase the degree of responsibility of the papers to their audiences.

I feel certain that in this difficult time the Nation's weekly and small daily newspapers will meet their responsibilities with all the skill and intelligence they can muster. In so doing, they will immeasurably increase the ability of the Nation to meet the serious problems it faces.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

PRESIDENT CITES VITAL SERVICE OF GRASS-ROOTS PRESS—LETTER TO EDITOR OF THE AUXILIARY EXPRESSES FAITH

(By Walter A. Shead)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman this week advised the weekly and small daily newspapers of America that our country looks (to them) for vital service in a critical period.

In a letter to George H. Bechtel, editor of the Publishers' Auxiliary, the President declared:

"The weekly and smaller daily newspapers are in the best possible position to perform this service to the American people. They reach a broad cross-section of the American public. They are close to their readers, with whom they share a wide community spirit. Their writers and editors are frequently in close, personal contact with their readers. All these factors tend to give what they print a high degree of credibility—and therefore to increase the degree of responsibility of the papers to their audience."

The President was responding to a letter from Mr. Bechtel, which sought the Chief Executive's words of advice and encouragement for the nonmetropolitan press.

His statement is exclusive with the Auxiliary.

"World developments have placed this Nation in the position of needing every bit of internal strength it can muster, if it is to survive in the form we know and love," the President declared.

"Traditionally, freedom of information has been one of our greatest sources of strength," he observed. "Because our people have been able to get a full picture of the conditions in which they live—they have been able to act in the manner best calculated to improve their lot.

"The American press has, since the earliest days of our existence as a free Nation, been largely responsible for the development and maintenance of this principle of freedom of information," President Truman continued. "The men who now edit and publish the hundreds of smaller newspapers throughout the Nation are the direct heirs of our great pioneering editors. It is essential that they carry on the great tradition they have inherited. They can allow no special interest of any sort to encroach on their time-honored freedom to print the news as they see it—and to express their honest opinions as they feel them."

Before expressing confidence in the nonmetropolitan press, the President declared, "We can be sure that, if the American people are given the whole and uncolored truth on every major happening and issue of the day, they will inevitably choose the most intelligent and effective course of action."

The President's confidence in the nonmetropolitan press was reflected in his conclusion: "I feel certain that in this difficult time, the Nation's weekly and small daily newspapers will meet their responsibilities with all the skill and intelligence they can muster. In so doing, they will immeasurably increase the ability of the Nation to meet the serious problems it faces."

Chapman Unjustly Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a fine article entitled "Chapman Unjustly Attacked," which appeared in the December 1950 issue of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association News.

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

CHAPMAN UNJUSTLY ATTACKED—BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC POWER ADVOCATES ATTACK

Seasoned veteran though he is of many hectic campaigns, Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman must have been somewhat chagrined over the barrage and counterbarrage laid down on him as he took over the responsibility of the power needs under the Defense Production Act. The promptness with which proponents of private power attacked the aims and the ambitions of their public power rivals was rather surprising. There had not been time for anything to have actually been done before leading journals, representing the private utilities, began to warn the Secretary that the dangerous public-power group was going to try to use the national crisis as a means to further the extension of publicly owned power systems. Hardly had this warning been sent up for Mr. Chapman's consideration before leading daily papers, who have sponsored and supported public-power movements, became equally vigilant in warning the Secretary that he had put too many private power people on his committee and that he need not expect cooperation from this group.

UNITY NEEDED

These are but two illustrations that could easily be multiplied several times of the tactics being used by the contending parties. Secretary Chapman would be very justified in being quite disappointed over this attitude on the part of the utility industry, both public and private. The Secretary has a perfect right to expect the entire industry to help him accomplish his job of getting sufficient power generation for the defense of the country. It little behooves either the public or private groups to carry on their feud during a time of national crisis. We would like to be distinctly understood that what is being said in this article is just as much in criticism of the public group as it is of the private group. More important, it is an appeal to both groups to put first things first and see to it that the power industry meets the needs of our country.

BOTH SYSTEMS GROWING

Public and private systems have proven in more than one section of the country that they can live side by side and both have a profitable business without the necessity of crushing the other fellow. Most everyone familiar with the electric-utility industry knows where these illustrations are. It is not necessary to be specific in naming these spots. If we did undertake to do so it would be interpreted as a reflection on the sections that were not named, but we do not believe there's anyone in the electric industry who will deny this fact. If it can be done in one section of the country it can be done on a wide scale. Bear in mind that private utility profits are greater today than at any time in their history and also that there is more public power in the country than there has ever been before, and that more farms are electrified than have ever been electrified in the history of our country. Does anyone need to say any more on the subject of whether public and private power can get along without an actual bloodletting?

Federal Manpower Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement issued on December 15, 1950, by the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, and accompanying a resolution unanimously adopted by the board, which recommends that there be established forthwith a Federal Manpower Authority to develop a plan for the proper training and utilization during the national emergency of the tremendous resources America has in her youth. This statement embodies the specific recommendations of the regents for the cooperation under such authority of all the educational institutions in New York State, all of which are a part of the University of the State of New York and under the jurisdiction of the regents.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, N. Y., January 1, 1951.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL MANPOWER AUTHORITY RECOMMENDED

On December 15, 1950, the board of regents unanimously adopted a resolution that there be established forthwith a Federal Manpower Authority to develop a plan for the proper training and utilization, during the national emergency, of the tremendous resources America has in her youth, and issued the following comprehensive statement embodying the specific recommendations of the

regents for the cooperation, under such authority, of all the educational institutions in New York State, all of which are a part of the University of the State of New York and under the jurisdiction of the regents.

The board of regents further directed that a copy of the resolution and statement be sent by the commissioner of education to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Governor of the State, the New York Senators and Congressmen, and to every institution affiliated with the university.

The present challenge to our liberty and our national security is the most critical in our history. It is essential that those in a position of trust in the field of education assist in the development of plans for the best use of the manpower of this country. In recognition of this fact, the regents of the University of the State of New York desire to record their beliefs in regard to a basic policy for the efficient utilization of all our available men and women.

With the many demands that must be made on the citizens of this country, both for the maintenance of an essential military force and for the operation of our domestic economy, it is urgent that the Federal Government designate some agency, directly responsible to the President, to plan a program for the effective utilization of our total manpower and with the authority to put such a plan into effect. This agency should seek advice from the military, from labor, from industry, from agriculture, from education, and from other important groups that make heavy contributions to our national defense and security in order that an over-all program of manpower utilization may be conceived. The planning must be realistic and far reaching and must recognize the important demands of American democracy that are fundamental to military strength. The unity of purpose and the centralization of authority that is envisaged in this statement must be achieved at the Washington level at the earliest possible moment.

In such a national emergency as we are now facing it is urgent that all our resources be mobilized, including those of education. The educational resources of this country are the finest in the world, and they are at the service of this Nation. The State of New York with its 120 colleges and universities, its technical schools and institutes, and with its tremendous network of public and private elementary and secondary schools is ready to provide all possible assistance in this crucial period. It appears inevitable that this will mean some reorganization of programs and reassignment of staff.

The challenge of Communist arms to the democratic nations of the world is such that we must be prepared for any possible aggression. It would appear that the time has come when we as a Nation must request some form of universal national service from all our young men and women within certain age limits; this would mean a period of basic military training for most of our youth. Any training program that is developed, however, must be conceived with great care lest there be great wastage of our available human resources. Moreover, it is most important that every step be taken, both for reasons of economy and for efficiency, to make certain that any national training program will make maximum utilization of educational resources that are available.

During World War II, we learned that approximately 75 percent of the skills required by the Armed Forces were essentially the same as those needed in civilian activities. This fact makes it apparent that even a military training program should utilize to the full all permanent educational facilities, these facilities being retooled where necessary and supplemented only when required by the construction of temporary training facilities. A wise procedure in the use of educational facilities would be essentially the same as that followed so successfully during World War II in our industrial war production program, where existing industries were reorganized and expanded to meet the new needs required by war conditions. It is self-evident that the basic military training itself must be provided directly by military authorities, but most technical and general education programs can be provided best by organized education. Such matters of policy are emphasized for the purpose of utilizing to the fullest extent all our resources to the end that we may meet satisfactorily an unparalleled emergency.

We believe that the ideal set-up would envisage the return of young men and women, after a period of basic training, to the educational facilities in the neighborhood of their homes for the supplemental and fundamental educational programs essential to their training to meet all the necessary and varying needs.

In order that the policies enunciated above may be implemented at the earliest possible moment, it is our belief that certain definite steps should be taken now by officials of our educational institutions.

Renewed emphasis should be given to all programs that are concerned with physical fitness and the correction of physical defects. Our schools and our colleges and universities have a prime obligation to this country in emphasizing the importance of physical fitness along with academic attainment.

Upon every level of educational endeavor there should be renewed efforts to acquaint our youth with our American heritage and to provide a better understanding of the present international situation. To this end the regents have already appointed a committee that will assist the State education department in preparing supplementary materials for use in the schools, and are revising the program for the teaching of American history.

Urgent consideration should be given immediately by both our secondary schools and by our colleges to the desirability of providing accelerated programs. Acceleration upon the secondary level would make it possible for a very large number of young men to receive at least 1 year of college education before a possible call to military service, by enabling them to complete high school before they reach their seventeenth birthday. Any elevation in the educational level of our youth during this period, with the resulting gain in maturity of judgment, is important both for the young people involved and for the total welfare of this Nation. The accelerated program that is conceived would utilize the usual summer vacations and, in some instances, would make it possible for some young men to take slightly heavier loads during the regular academic sessions.

Secondary schools and colleges should take active steps to ascertain what they have to offer to the adult population of the communities in which they exist. For example, laboratory facilities might be utilized for the training of technicians in subprofessional areas. As a further illustration, World War II revealed critical shortcomings in our population in literacy, so much so in fact that the Army and the Navy had to provide special classes in reading and writing. The existence of such educational deficiencies should be a challenge to our schools. It is hoped that a Nation-wide program will be developed that will recognize the important contribution that our educational institutions can make during these times; in the meantime, each individual institution should be making an inventory of its facilities in terms of possible services that could be available, including the offering of preinduction training for military service and possible contributions to essential war industries.

Work of the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Chattanooga Times, Chattanooga, Tenn., on December 31, 1950. The report gives us an excellent summary of TVA's present work and also its potential with regard to adaptability to the defense effort. The article should be encouraging to us all and read with interest, for it shows the part TVA plays in our present way of life.

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

REPORT ON TVA—CAPACITY OF TVA TOO SMALL, BUT AGENCY SAYS EXPANSION FOR POWER PRODUCTION IS MOVING AT FAST PACE

Power capacity of the mighty Tennessee Valley falls far short of defense needs and expansion is proceeding on a fast schedule.

Reporting this today, the Tennessee Valley Authority said the building pace aims at installed capacity of 4,900,000 kilowatts in 1953. This compares with 3,000,000 June 30, 1950.

Yet last year's TVA production of electric energy—the heart of the defense effort—was three and a half times that of 1940, when the Nation was on the brink of World War II, TVA said. It reached a total of 17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

The agency's chemical facilities at Muscle Shoals, Ala., stand ready at almost a moment's notice to produce munitions.

Making its seventeenth annual report, TVA said that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, its power operating revenues were $58,800,000, with net operating revenues of $27,000,000 producing a return of about 7.75 percent on the average depreciated power investment. During the life of TVA, returns have averaged 4 percent.

TVA sold power at wholesale during the war to 95 municipal and 50 cooperative systems, which distributed it to 1,100,000 ultimate consumers.

By comparison, there were 275,000 consumers in the region when TVA was set up in 1933. Now 82 percent of the farms have electricity, where only 3 percent were served in 1933.

On the controversial subject of public versus private management efficiency in electric utilities, the report noted:

"The publicly owned and locally managed distribution systems in the valley show costs of service averaging somewhat lower than those of the entire electric-utility industry, whether or not the cost of wholesale power is included."

TVA, established as a Federal project for developing the Tennessee River Valley, is completing its eighteenth dam and serves an 80,000 square mile area. The report stressed that State and local agencies concerned with natural resources had greatly increased their activity along with TVA.

Per capita income in the valley has increased from about 40 percent of the United States average in 1933 to nearly 60 percent at present, TVA said.

The TVA reservoir system lowered two crests of a long flood of last January-Feb-

ruary on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, the first by about 2 feet and the second by more than a foot measured at Cairo, Ill., the report said.

These reductions helped materially in averting use of the 200 square mile Bird's Point—New Madrid floodway, a rich farming area from which hundreds of residents moved out when engineers considered opening the levee, TVA related.

No major flood crests occurred in the Tennessee Valley, "but regulation averted about $800,000 damage at Chattanooga and lesser damage elsewhere along the Tennessee," the report said.

It estimated that flood damage totaling $45,000,000 had been prevented at Chattanooga since Norris Dam began operating in 1936, "equal to more than one-quarter of the total investment flood control" in the TVA system.

The Muscle Shoals chemical plants were built for munitions production in World War I, and today produce large amounts of fertilizers under TVA operation.

Ready for fast conversion to munitions production, the plants now have six large electric furnaces which can turn out munitions grade elemental phosphorus, compared with only four in 1940, TVA said.

Growing New England Industrial Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Growing New England Industrial Economy," written by Dudley Harmon, executive vice president, the New England Council, and published in the Washington Post of January 9, 1951.

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

GROWING NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIAL ECONOMY

(By Dudley Harmon)

We have read with much concern the article Is New England Withering? written by Ysabel and Robert Rennie, which appeared in the Washington Post and was reprinted subsequently in the Hartford Courant, and which, in our belief, did injustice to our region.

Some of the things the Rennies said are true. New England has never had large material resources such as coal, oil, iron ore, etc. We are off the main line from New York to San Francisco, and the center of population is moving steadily westward as the great open spaces fill up with people and industries. Much New England money has gone into building the West.

However, many facts have been left out of the article, which, had they been included, would, we believe, have changed its conclusions considerably.

Federal census and other reports show, for example, that from 1939 to 1947:

(a) The number of manufacturing establishments in New England increased 33.3 percent; from 15,201 to 20,274.

(b) The number of production workers in New England increased 24.1 percent; from 947,412 to 1,348,325.

(c) The value added by manufacture in New England increased 68.1 percent; from $2,414,268,000 to $6,813,800,000.

Our New England population has increased as follows:

1930	8,166,341
1940 (3.3 percent)	8,437,000
1950 (10.4 percent)	9,314,453

Our per capita savings, in several categories, substantially exceed the national per capitas:

	New England	United States
Mutual savings bank deposits at end of 1949	$587	$128
Equities in life insurance	406	332
Government savings bonds	458	307
Private capital in savings and loan associations and cooperative banks	117	82

New England has a very high percentage in proportion to its population of homes owned and lived in by the owners; of telephones, automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and now television sets. These all point to a high standard of living, made possible by the earnings of our people in our industries.

The housing census of April 1950 showed 1,408,797 dwelling units in Massachusetts alone, an increase of 187,545 or 15.4 percent, over the 1940 count.

The generalization about wage rates is too sweeping. Wages are high in some cases and low in others. What really counts is unit product cost, which means wages divided by the number of units produced in the period for which the wages are paid. There is nothing incompatible in high wages and low unit costs. It is what you get for what you pay that counts. That the costs of New England products permit them to compete effectively is shown by the 68.1 percent increase in value added in New England compared with 67.2 percent for the United States as a whole.

Hundreds of millions have been spent in New England since VJ-day by our manufacturers for new machinery, buildings and entire factories, and have been publicly reported by American Machinist, Engineering News-Record and the F. W. Dodge Corp. Large expenditures are also planned for the early future by our industries, our utilities, railroads and other agencies.

The statement was made by the Rennies that New England's "natural disadvantages are so severe that the wisest course is for New England's skilled labor force to seek better opportunities elsewhere." If conditions were as bad as the article suggests, we think that the skilled labor force in New England would already have left to seek better opportunities elsewhere. In fact, however, there was a large in-migration into New England during the war years, and only part of the wartime gain was lost during the postwar years. New England had a net in-migration of 446,000 persons from 1940 to 1949. It also had a very small gain from 1930 to 1949. For the entire period 1930 to 1949, New England gained 5.5 percent of its 1930 population through in-migration.

That percentage was second only to the percentage for the Far West as a record of immigration. The up-and-coming Southeastern area lost 11.6 percent of its 1930 population through out-migration from 1930 to 1949, and the booming Southwest lost 7.5 percent during the same period. Admittedly, these figures relate to a long-time period, and to come extent they have been reversed by the experience of recent years. Nevertheless, it remains true that New England, along with other industrial areas, plus Florida and the Far West, has tended to attract migrants from agricultural and mining regions.

Migrants have followed job opportunities. It was also characteristic that the regions which gained through in-migration were those with above-average but relatively declining per capita incomes, while the regions which lost through out-migration were those with below-average but relatively increasing per capital incomes.

Despite the temporary surplus labor in New England during the recession of 1949 and the small recent out-migration, the region is not overpopulated, on the average, in terms of job opportunities. Surplus labor has already largely dried up and there are at present many shortages within the region, particularly for certain categories of skilled industrial labor. There are a number of recent examples of manufacturing concerns moving into New England from other States, and the relocations are not just to Connecticut. Under the circumstances, the Rennies statement would seem completely unjustified.

The statement is made that the Federal Government should show the same imagination that it did in wartime, when it encouraged the shift of millions of workers from labor-surplus to labor-shortage area. The article goes on to state that New England's high technical skills could be an asset to many new industries in the South and West. On the contrary, we believe that New England's high technical skills would be as much or more of an asset in New England, for this area is already highly industrialized and will need all its present workers and more under the impact of defense spending.

In connection with the proposed New England steel mill, the Rennies declare that "every steel company which has surveyed the problem says (the New England mill) would be high cost and uneconomic." This statement is completely without foundation. Only one company, Bethlehem, has expressed a dubious view of the economics of the New England project, and Bethlehem's present share of the region's growing steel market is estimated to be 40 percent. Incidentally, of the net gain of 5,000 manufacturing establishments in New England between 1939 and 1947, over 2,000 were in metal working, and two-thirds of the 300,000 gain in manufacturing jobs was in the same field. At present about 40 percent of the region's manufacturing employment is in metal working.

In its application to the NSRB for a certificate of necessity for the New England mill, the New England Steel Development Corp. said: "Detailed and exhaustive studies and negotiations extending over the last 4 years have demonstrated that an integrated steel mill of the type described * * * is economically feasible and would have excellent promise of financial success. * * * Our findings with respect to the feasibility of this mill have been confidentially confirmed by presently operating steel companies."

Finally, a recent study of New England business prospects made by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston shows that if present upward trends are maintained New England's income by 1960 (in terms of 1935–39 dollars) will be $10,000,000,000 a year, as compared with $4,000,000,000 in 1920, and that its labor force will have increased by 32,500 a year to 4,500,000.

These facts and many others, mention of which space does not permit, directly contradict, in our opinion, the Rennies' contention that "New England's decline in the national economy has become a matter of public concern." The mere fact that other sections of the country are growing does not mean that New England is losing ground. We can demonstrate the contrary to the Rennies and anyone else, and will welcome the opportunity to do so.

The Place of Agriculture in American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at New Orleans, La., January 11, 1951, before the members' council of the New Orleans Association of Commerce and the Southern Farm Forum.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, events are now moving rapidly in the Capital, and Washington is a swirl of activity. Things have taken on a somber note since our recent reverses in Korea. Members of Congress and officials of the executive department alike are serious; they realize that these are indeed perilous times, and that we must proceed to full mobilization without delay.

A great portion of my own time has been taken up with matters relating to our Nation's agricultural program. For several months I have been acting chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and now in the role of chairman I shall be devoting the major part of my time in helping guide our Government's agricultural policies. In particular my committee will be studying and planning the role of agriculture in a mobilizing economy.

Farming is just one item in the great jigsaw puzzle of our national economy, but it is one of the key pieces to be fitted into the complete whole. And that is what I want to talk to you about this afternoon—agriculture at the crossroads of mobilization.

As we go into what might well be world war III our bins and cribs and warehouses are full. Before the 1950 harvest, we had over 400,000,000 bushels of wheat in the carry-over and 850,000,000 bushels of corn. We have surpluses of other commodities, too. Those same surpluses that last summer were the object of bitter criticism are now proving to be a comfortable backlog to be put to vital use in this emergency.

But in spite of this huge reservoir of food, American agriculture will have to expand and buckle down to work as never before. Already the flow of manpower to the armed services is beginning to pinch a little. It will get worse, far worse. President Conant of Harvard recently advocated the conscription of every male citizen for the war effort, and I believe it may well come to that. The American farmer will have to redouble his efforts and till his land and harvest his crops with less help, fewer tools, and less fertilizer. Our full cribs will melt away in the light of added demands, and it is only by a further increase in our output that we will be able to produce sufficient food and fiber for our needs.

The answer is efficiency. The efficiency of American farming must rise to meet the challenge of the coming period. As production goals are raised, so must yields per man-hour and per acre ascend. Something has to give if we are to remain productive but have less with which to produce. That is the test for the American farmer.

Today there is much talk of rationing, price controls, priorities, and allocations. I feel that part of my job is to secure for the American farmer the best deal possible at the conference table when materials and manpower are allocated. During World War II, the American farmer faced shortages of help and tractors and fertilizers and insecticides and all of the other things that are apportioned throughout our war-making productivity. He will face them again, and perhaps in greater severity, but so will we all, unless things take a turn for the better. As Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I shall endeavor to secure for American agriculture a fair share of the scarce items, so far as I am able. You have my solemn assurance that I shall battle to the utmost. For 13 years I have worked with the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and I have seen first-hand the vital necessity that the farmer bears to our economy, in peace and in war. Farming is basic, it is fundamental. I need not tell most of you this, but there are many people who would wholly subordinate the interest of the farmer to those of the manufacturer or the distributor, little realizing that the needs of each are coexistent and interdependent, one with the other.

What can the American farmer do to assist the mobilization effort? The economic and mobilization planners in our Government have not yet imposed controls to any substantial degree, but as I have said, they are in the offing. What is the farmer's role in this new era? First, the American farmer must cooperate with his Government to the fullest extent. Second, the farmer should make plans to step up his production all along the line. I may say parenthetically here that I believe that if the Government requests that farmers materially increase production, then the Government in turn has a moral obligation to the farmer to prevent ruinous prices that usually result from increased productivity. We need a big cotton crop next year. It was wise, I believe, of the Secretary of Agriculture to waive any production controls that might jeopardize a bumper crop. In clearing the decks for increased cotton production, the Secretary is recognizing the future need for more fiber. With the present wool shortage, cotton will be even more valuable to our economy. While on the subject of cotton, which I know is a subject dear to the hearts of most of you, I will say that if and when it should be necessary to reimpose acreage controls, I shall fight for recognition of the older cotton-growing areas, and for complete protection to our historical cotton-farming sections. This emergency must not be used as a vehicle to deprive the older cotton-growing areas of their fair share of allotted acreage.

Production at the highest possible levels will do much to inspire us for the future. It will serve to hold down prices all along the line, and it will serve to postpone the imposition of rationing and price controls. It is when there is not enough to go around that rigid curbs on buying and selling must be enforced.

The agricultural planners have not been unmindful of the impending needs of the farmers. The Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture has been given the job of looking after the interests of the farmer in the national-defense effort. I think this is to the advantage of the farmer. The Production and Marketing Administration is an established and operating agency, and its assumption of mobilization planning will avoid the experimentation and hesitation of a new agency. A number of other Government agencies have found it necessary to entrust their war and mobilization functions to new departments with untried personnel, but under the Defense Production Act it was a natural and desirable step to designate the PMA to handle the farmer's problems.

Since the same commodity and financial branches which handle the normal farm program services are taking on the additional defense activities, the farmers can continue to work with the same units and insofar as personnel workloads will permit, with the same people with whom they have been dealing right along. The same field offices and the same committees will be the ones to deal with on defense problems.

PMA has set up a few coordinating offices and staffs to direct the over-all operations, and to maintain working relations with other agencies and groups. These include an Office of Materials and Facilities, an Office of Requirements and Allocations, a price staff, and a group to watch the manpower situation. They are already working actively on the many special problems agriculture must face as our national mobilization goes forward.

The special job of those in charge of materials and facilities will be to act as a claimant agency for agriculture when any priorities are being established for the use of strategic materials and services. They are there to keep reminding everyone that farm production is defense production. If farmers are to hold production at the high levels needed, they must be assured—insofar as it is possible to do so—against crippling shortages of materials and facilities. They must also be given protection against the danger that the very production we are asking will not someday break farm prices to ruinous levels. This, of course, involves the question of sound price supports.

I have mentioned a few moments ago that I thought that careful planning was the keynote to efficient mobilization of agriculture. In my humble opinion, without it we are lost, foundering about in a sea of indecision, overproduction of some crops, underproduction of others, and general confusion. I would like to impress upon you here today that I feel that in war or peace, we should concentrate on reappraising and redrafting our farm plans and policies. We have a good, a basically sound, farm policy in effect now. Of that I am convinced. But as I have often said, it is not perfect. Far from it. We must not only revamp it to suit the changing tempo of the times, we must also iron out of it the flaws that are so readily seized upon by critics. I repeat: It is a good program; it is a sound one, but it needs refinements here and there, and we are working to smooth out the defects. In particular I am concerned with the price-support program for perishable commodities.

In handling price supports on what are termed the six basic commodities: Cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, and rice, the Commodity Credit Corporation has over the period 1933 to date shown no loss, but instead has made a profit, when we consider the basic group as a unit. We should all remember this when we hear irresponsible criticism of the whole farm program. Price supports on storable commodities have formed the backbone of our farm program. Critics of the farm program should remember not only that over the past 17 years the Government has lost nothing on the program for basic commodities, but also should keep in mind that our national economy has benefited immeasurably by the stability and security that American farmers have achieved under it. The farm program has afforded us a relatively balanced and abundant production, and has put agriculture in its strongest position over the past 40 years. Price supports have proved themselves; I am convinced that they are not only sound and effective, but are absolutely necessary if we would avoid the boom-and-bust cycle of the past years.

It is with respect to the price-support program on the perishables that we must reexamine our plans and policies. This has

been the vulnerable spot of the program—the Achilles' heel of farm price supports. It is on butter, eggs, dried milk, potatoes, and other programs that we have taken the shellacking, financially, as our farm critics are so wont to point out.

The situation regarding surplus commodities is today not so critical as it was 6 months ago. The vast surpluses of dried eggs and cheese and butter that the Government has stored in warehouses and caves throughout the Middle West are now looked upon much more favorably by even our severest critics than they were before the Korean crisis.

Many proposals have been advanced as to how we can in normal times handle perishables and semiperishables. One plan, much publicized, was suggested by Secretary Brannan. Without question, Secretary Brannan was on the right track, in that his ultimate goal was the elimination of burdensome surpluses of perishable commodities. But, I do not believe he was even close to the solution. The cost of the Brannan plan would be exorbitant, and in addition it would depress the market for the commodities involved. The difference in price between the market and the support or parity price would have to be met through taxes and yet more taxes, which would eventually fall of course upon the consumers themselves. The Brannan plan would, too, take from the farmers the incentive to find the best markets for their crops, since they would know that regardless of what they received the Government would reimburse them up to the support price. If the Congress should fail to provide the necessary appropriations, the farmer would be left holding the bag, for once prices in the market place are depressed, it is extremely difficult to get them back up to where the growers can realize a fair profit.

But it is not enough to disagree with or challenge or criticize the present program or the Brannan plan. I will say this about the Brannan plan: It is at least an attempt at a solution. As Secretary Brannan has said, we should all try to develop a better mousetrap; in this case, a sounder, more practical method of handling perishables.

I venture to say that if I or you—or someone—does not come out with a practical idea, the Congress may go back to the idea of supports only on basic storable farm products.

I certainly do not presume to have the answer today. I do think that there are certain avenues that we might well explore more fully. For example, the school lunch program is a splendid outlet for perishable stocks. We might consider broadening it. And there comes to mind the thousands of people receiving direct Federal assistance under the social security laws. Could we not substitute for some of the cash payments we are now making, food that could and would be used?

I, along with other Members of the Congress, took the lead in granting Government agencies the authority to barter with foreign countries for the strategic materials that we now so sorely need. This could be developed far beyond its present infant state.

This matter of price supports for perishables and the more serious emergency occasioned by war in the Far East find agriculture prepared to meet them, although as I need not warn you, many problems lie ahead for American farmers.

The situation in which we find ourselves today, so far as agriculture is concerned, is a testimonial to the wisdom of the farm legislation which has been enacted over the past 17 years.

I am sorry to say that the objectives of this legislation are misunderstood in some quarters. Some critics do not understand that the present preparedness of American agriculture is directly related to the farm programs written by the Congress during those years.

No better example of this need be shown than the complaints that price ceilings on many foods are impossible because the Defense Production Act prohibits price ceilings on agricultural commodities at less than parity.

The Defense Production Act did prohibit price ceilings on agricultural commodities—and rightly so—at less than parity. However, in my opinion, this would not prevent workable ceilings on foods made from agricultural commodities unless, of course, the ceilings on those foods would necessarily result in less than parity prices on the commodities. In other words, if the ceiling price established for a processed food—or anything else, for that matter—made from an agricultural commodity, is not so low as to prevent the agricultural commodity from rising to parity, or would not serve to drive the price of the commodity below parity, such a ceiling on farm products can be put into effect now.

The reason for the provision which prevents price ceilings on agricultural commodities at a figure below parity is simple.

After all, what is parity? It is, simply speaking, a fair price for an agricultural commodity. It is arrived at by taking into account the costs of the things farmers buy in relation to the price for the commodities they sell. Parity price for an agricultural commodity fluctuates as the price of the things farmers buy fluctuates.

I feel that everyone will agree that farmers should receive parity prices for the things they produce. No nation can expect farmers to produce needed foods and fibers unless they get fair prices. This is particularly true in this time of emergency. We do not expect labor to work for low wages, nor industry to produce without reasonable incentives. Consequently, we should see to it that price ceilings do not interfere with the productive effort of the farmer. Let me emphasize—parity prices are fair prices—not high prices. Today only a few agricultural commodities are above parity. Among these are cotton, wool, cottonseed, beef cattle, veal calves, and lamb.

All of us will agree that the production of a sufficient amount of food and fiber is just as important in this crisis as the production of munitions. Both the military and the civilian population must eat and must have clothing to wear.

I am sure that when the reasons for the prohibition against less-than-parity prices are understood there will be an end to the criticism we have been hearing.

As a matter of fact, American agriculture would not be ready to do its part today if it were not for the fact that we have striven through our agricultural programs to get the farmers a fair price for their products.

Agricultural production in 1950, the third largest of record, just didn't happen. One of the big reasons was the incentives and protection given farmers under the Agricultural Act of 1949 and previous agricultural legislation. Under this legislation the Government fixed support prices on most agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity. Keep in mind that farmers were assured of price protection before hostilities began in Korea and before the international situation reached the crisis stage. If farmers had not had this protection, today we would not have the agricultural reserves we now recognize as priceless, nor would we have an agricultural economy in a sound and healthy condition, ready to do its part in the tasks which lie before us.

All of us realize that the emergency we face will necessitate many unpleasant things. Our boys are going into the armed services. Taxes are high and will go higher. Controls are in effect and still others are to come. All of us will have to make sacrifices.

The people, in my opinion, will make the sacrifices and be glad to do so if we can thereby prevent all-out war, or win victory if total war comes. But we must never lose sight of one very important fact. We are rearming to protect the American way of life. We are rearming to protect democracy. We are rearming to combat communism and to retain our freedom.

It must be remembered that we are not going to apply controls for the sake of controls. Price ceilings, wage ceilings, allocations, and rationing are hateful. We do not like them. We are accepting regimentation now in the hope that it will be for a temporary period and that thereby we will avoid permanent regimentation by a stifling tyranny of collectivism.

Consequently, we should reject vigorously every control that is not absolutely necessary. We want to retain as much of our freedom as we can. If the end result of our rearmament is communism, we will have made all our sacrifices in vain.

For example, I have opposed proposals for further regulation of the commodity exchanges by the Government. Charges were made that speculation on the exchanges was a major factor in causing price increases. There is no basis for these charges. The exchanges simply reflect the conditions which cause price fluctuations. They perform a valuable service for farmers and the handlers and processors of farm products. They are a part of our free-enterprise system. So long as the exchanges conduct their own affairs in an orderly and sensible fashion I will continue to oppose the extension of Government control over their operations.

There is another thing that I should like to tell you about this afternoon. It ties in with what I have said about shifting our farm production into high gear, and it ties in with our planning for a return to normal times if and when the present emergency condition subsides.

It is conservation. Conservation used to be a luxury with us here in America. It used to be a civic duty to conserve our national resources. It has now come to be an economic necessity.

The other day, Louis Bromfield, of Malabar Farm, in reviewing a book on conservation, said:

"From the very beginning of the Nation the exploitation and waste of our natural resources has set a record unequaled by that of any people at any time in history."

I long ago realized that on a long-term basis the only salvation for the American farmer was to conserve his resources in every manner in which he was able. And, faced with the production demands of the next few years, this "must" becomes increasingly apparent. Every dollar and every hour spent in conservation practices comes back with interest. It has been recently estimated that, at current prices, for every dollar invested in, for example, Chilean nitrates, a farmer may reasonably expect a return of from $3 to $10.

Farmers here in Louisiana are taking to heart the lessons to be learned by conservation practices. Let me give you a few statistics. Last year Louisiana farmers used nearly 30,000 tons of superphosphate, over 7,000 tons of rock phosphate, 10,000 tons of basic slag, and almost 70,000 tons of limestone. They terraced over 8,000,000 linear feet of farmland, dug 2,000 stock ponds, and sowed 4,000,000 trees for reforestation. I am proud of the foresight that is being shown by our Louisiana farmers, for I know that they have come to realize that conservation practices not only make sense but will eventually make money.

Now let me get to some of the broader aspects of conservation. I refer to conservation practices exercised by our Government in conjunction with its agricultural functions. The farmers cannot conserve the

great waterways and forests of the public domain, but the Government can, and, if I have anything to say about it, the Government will. Every year somewhere about the country great floods come raging down and destroy crops and homes and even cities. Damage is untold. The Mississippi flood of 1927 cost over $2,000,000,000 alone. Almost within shouting distance of us here this afternoon, the Mississippi flows placidly past this great city, awaiting quietly the flood-waters of next April and May, which can and well may devastate again thousands of acres of incalculable value.

Our natural resources must be conserved on a national level. The Federal Government is the only power capable or empowered to harness our great waterways and conserve the fertile farmland and the crops along the banks. With the crisis facing agriculture today, we cannot allow waste of crops that may feed our fighting men here or abroad. We must harness and distribute the waters of our rivers and streams. Back on the watersheds our farmers can do much to alleviate flood loss by carrying out conservation practices that help to keep the soil from going down the river. And by making water available to the arid lands of the West, the Government can make the deserts bloom.

A short time ago I traveled through some of the countries of the Middle East. I went by air, so that I was able to view directly the ravages of exploitation of the soil. I flew over Mesopotamia, the ancient region on the Persian Gulf, and saw first hand the land that was once the cultural and population center of the world. The Tigris and the Euphrates, great rivers of antiquity, are now only silt-chocked canals. Desolation reigns today over this land once ruled by Alexander the Great. At one time the valley known as Mesopotamia supported great cities, fertile fields and 25,000,000 to 35,000,000 people. Now a scant 3,000,000 eke out an existence from the parched and impoverished soil. I learned that at one time the Euphrates carried down its upper topsoil so fast that its delta silted up at the rate of 150 feet a year. I flew over Persia, too, and I later talked with some of the Persian farmers. According to historians, Persia once supported 105,000,000 people; now a bare 15,000,000 exist on the bare and eroded land.

It is a question of time until a like fate catches up with our country, unless we continue to accelerate conservation measures. The longer we wait, the harder it becomes to retrieve the wasted and worn-out soils, and the more stringent our efforts must become.

And for another thing, we must not lose sight of the fact that conservation is good business. For, every dollar we spend on conservation comes home to roost, and with interest. I mean hard dollars and cents interest, not just the benefits that accrue to a State or a region containing a specific project.

Let me give you a few examples. There are seven western projects, the Salt River in Arizona, the Yuma project area in Arizona and California, the Boise project in Idaho, the Yakima project in the State of Washington, the Shoshone project in Wyoming, the Sun River project in Montana, and the Lower Yellowstone developments in Montana and North Dakota. The total cost of these was in the neighborhood of $134,000,000, yet during 1948 alone, these seven projects produced to the Treasury tax revenues in excess of $80,000,000. Since 1916, these seven projects have contributed more than $400,000,000 to Uncle Sam. Would any of you like to get in on the ground floor of investments like that?

Before closing my remarks, I want to emphasize that the farmer himself is not only a beneficiary of the conservation, price support, and other agricultural programs fostered by our Government, but also he is a debtor to them. He has a direct responsibility in making conservation work and in making price supports a success. This means that he must cooperate when necessary, or the entire structure will fall, and he will find himself again at the mercy of an era of ruthless economic warfare. I mean that the farmer must adjust himself and his crops to the needs of our agricultural economy; he must make adjustments in production and acreage from time to time; and he must employ the best and the surest methods to conserve the natural resources under his control. Farmers must realize that they might well adopt a little policing of their own activities, and there is no doubt in my mind that they have to hang together or they will hang separately.

Indeed, these are serious times. I well realize that Fourth of July orators have been saying this since 1776, but I challenge anyone to now disprove it. These are serious times for agriculture. The American farmer is one of those upon whom we pin our hopes for the future. I can think of no one more important. I can think of no one I believe less likely to let America down.

Acheson's Fatal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Acheson's Fatal Policy," published in the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of January 12, 1951.

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

ACHESON'S FATAL POLICY

The Dutch used to be powerful in the Orient. American diplomats helped to pry them out of Indonesia. We cannot expect the people of the Netherlands to be too fulsome in their praise of American far eastern policy, therefore (by this we mean the Acheson-Lattimore policy which has prevailed since the defeat of Japan in 1945—not the traditional American policy of the Treaty of Portsmouth and of the open door which was the rule until Roosevelt and Stalin sat down to cocktails at Yalta).

On the subject of this Acheson-brand American approach to far eastern problems, an article by Dr. C. Gerretson in the Amsterdam conservative newspaper De Telegraaf recently had this to say:

"Nobody who has learned to know China between both world wars can have any doubts as to the unique moral position which America, in contrast to the European powers, had acquired there for itself. This result of one century has been squandered in a few years by postwar Washington, especially by Acheson's fatal policy. Now China vociferously requests the undoing of America's 'colonial aggression.' Is it completely without foundation that China now is talking about American aggression? American policy has tried to conjure Asiatic nationalism by eliminating every 'colonial' authority and every resistance to the unlimited expansion of Asiatic nationalism. That is why the Netherlands had to evacuate Indonesia. The Americans have achieved nothing else but playing a far eastern Asia into the hands of communism, which is incapable of effective autonomy, and nothing else but conjuring a new nationalist imperialism. Now America and the United Nations with America are being defeated by the spirits which America itself has stirred up."

One may dislike Mr. Acheson. One must nevertheless concede that he put over this new American policy so very adroitly that the great mass of the American people—the people who have been content to elect and reelect Democratic administrations ever since 1932—appear never to have opened their eyes to what was being done to their country's prestige in the Far East until the war, which Westbrook Pegler calls the Roosevelt Memorial War, burst upon them in Korea last June 25.

Now, some eyes are opening. But we still have Mr. Acheson directing American foreign policy. And it is now rumored (see today's Merry-Go-Round column by Drew Pearson) that if Mr. Acheson ever does relinquish his post, we may see him replaced by New York's Gov. Thomas E. Dewey—whose "adviser on foreign affairs" is John Foster Dulles who, like Mr. Acheson, has been on very good terms, in the past, with Alger Hiss.

The difference between Acheson and Dewey, in handling the foreign affairs of this Nation, would be not unlike the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. It might fool some Americans, for a while. It would not fool the watching world.

Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am enclosing an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of December 22, 1950:

CAPITALISM: NOTHING IS SUPERIOR EXCEPT BY COMPARISON

When we compare the conditions of nations and people in anticapitalistic countries with the security, prosperity, happiness, and well being of our people under United States capitalism, we appreciate our privilege of living in a capitalistic, democratic country.

The basic principle of the free, capitalistic system which we have developed in our country affords opportunity to the individual who is willing to use his talents to the extent of his ability and desire to produce—to accumulate something for investment in a home, a farm, in savings accounts, bonds and other securities, life insurance, the education of his children, and comforts of life—and become a capitalist.

The following facts give us a deep appreciation of what capitalism has done and is doing for our country and its people.

Private capital in the form of taxes and purchases of United States Government bonds made it possible for us to spend $380,000,000,000 in carrying out our part of the program in winning World War II. This, of course, is unimportant when we consider the loss of life and permanent and partial disability which our youth sustained and which cannot be measured in dollars.

Our participation in World War II has left us today with a national debt of $257,000,000,000, but on the credit side we find that our annual national income, at the current rate, is equal to 90 percent of our

total national debt. Of this total national debt, $39,000,000,000 are in Treasury obligations owned by Government agencies, so our net debt is slightly over $218,000,000,000.

The United States free-enterprise business system is operating at its highest level, furnishing employment to 62,000,000 people at the highest hourly and weekly earnings ever recorded. Stockholders and corporations, after paying the highest peacetime taxes in the postwar years, have had the highest net average earnings in history from their investment.

Our farmers had cash income from marketing last year amounting to $27,500,000,000, the highest on record.

Total farm assets of our country amount to slightly more than $127,000,000,000, against which there is an indebtedness of only $12,400,000,000. Thus our farmers have ownership equity of over 90 percent in their farms.

In nonfarm homes, counting apartment buildings with four or less families, and all valued at a total of $200,000,000,000, our home owners have an equity of $156,000,000,000—a substantial ownership of 79 percent.

Therefore, as a result of the opportunity provided by our free-enterprise capitalistic system, the people of our Nation have a free and clear ownership in their homes and farms of 83.4 percent.

Our people have savings of more than $136,000,000,000 in Government bonds and savings accounts.

An additional $97,000,000,000 are on deposit in commercial bank accounts.

Our men and women have a cash investment of $60,000,000,000 in life insurance policies.

A high percentage of our working people are provided with unemployment insurance, sickness, accident, and retirement benefits, financed by employers, employees, and Government. Others who are not covered by these plans and who find themselves in need are provided for by governmental and social institutions.

We are increasing our efforts to improve the standard of living of the people in the lower income brackets.

The United States, with only 6 percent of the world population and 7 percent of its land area, under its democratic, capitalistic system, before World War II, produced 47 percent of the world's manufactured goods, but what is more important, 90 percent of that production was consumed within our own borders. Today we are producing over 50 percent of the world's manufactured goods, of which a substantial percentage is for other countries.

Capitalism is backing freedom of worship and providing increasing educational opportunities by constantly giving more and more support to the two things upon which our democratic, cultural civilization depends—spiritual and educational values.

We have a permanent investment in churches and schools of $18,500,000,000 and are spending annually $8,000,000,000 for religious and educational purposes.

Membership in the churches is increasing at a much faster rate than the increase in the population, and in our Sunday schools at an even greater rate.

In the past 30 years elementary school enrollment has increased 13.5 percent; high-school enrollment, 146.1 percent; and college and university enrollment, 351.6 percent.

Our public-school expenditures per pupil enrolled have gone up from $48.02 in 1920 to $132.06 in 1947, or 175 percent.

Since 1920 the population of our country has increased 43 percent and the investment in school and college equipment has increased 571 percent.

Since the beginning of our industrial and scientific development in the early 1800's, the capitalistic system, due to individual freedom, initiative, and ingenuity, has given the world more of the comforts and conveniences of life than mankind had received in the previous 5,000 years of civilization.

Under this system our people as a whole are happy and united, are increasing their capital, and enjoying a fuller spiritual, cultural, and material life.

Today our scientific and industrial knowledge and experience in the various fields of peaceful activity are open to the rest of the world, and in this respect we have joined with other like-minded nations in contributing to the technical-assistance program of the United Nations.

No nation, no individual, no venture, no private or public institution, no program for the welfare of the people can progress without capital.

It is each individual's duty to contribute to the preservation, protection, and improvement of our democratic civilization on a basis which is sound and fair to all our people.

THOS. J. WATSON,
Chairman of the Board, International Business Machines Corp.

The Late Emil Frey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, again there is told in this obituary another chapter in the American story—an accomplishment of a Swiss emigrant boy to the land of opportunity—America. His factory as white and clean as a laboratory, which in fact it was, the largest cheese-making plant in the world, it made not only a delectable table delicacy for the millions who now enjoy it, but it made a new dairy outlet for hundreds of farms, new employment for many men and women in my district, it is part and parcel of the private enterprise system that is America and American opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned obituary from the Van Wert (Ohio) Times-Bulletin of January 11, 1951:

ORIGINATOR OF LIEDERKRANZ CHEESE IN 1893—MEMORIAL SERVICES WILL BE HELD SUNDAY AT 4 P. M.

Emil Frey, 83, inventor of Liederkranz cheese, died at 9:45 a. m. today at the Van Wert County Hospital following a year's illness. He had been a patient in the hospital since last October.

There will be an immediate cremation service. A memorial service, open to everyone, will be held Sunday at 4 p. m. at the First Presbyterian Church.

Frey had been a resident of Van Wert since 1926 when he and his associates moved their cheese plant here from Monroe, N. Y. He was a member of the First Presbyterian Church, the Masonic Lodge, and the Rotary Club. In 1930 he received a citation from the Pasteur Institute of Paris for his contributions to the art of cheese making. He was invited to become a member of the Inventor's Club of Washington, D. C.

With the death of Emil Frey, the world loses not only the man who invented an internationally known cheese, but also a central figure in the development of the world's largest cheese factory, Borden's Van Wert plant, for Frey was superintendent of the local plant from its beginning in 1926 until 1938, years during which it became noted as the only Liederkranz-producing company.

The story of Emil Frey and Liederkranz has been told and retold throughout Ohio, and especially Van Wert, as visitors come to the city and residents point with pride to this claim to fame.

A native of Switzerland and the son of a cheesemaker, Frey came to the United States in 1882, when he was 15 years old. For 6 years he worked in New York as a mechanic in a printing-press factory, then he went to Monroe, N. Y., to take up his father's occupation.

There he began work in a cheese factory, and because of his diligence was commissioned by a New York delicatessen operator, Adolph Todt, to try to develop a domestic Bismark cheese, because much of this delicate cheese spoiled in transit when it was imported.

Frey worked for 2 years with all types of curing processes, but before he got what he wanted, he turned out a gold-crusted, soft-ripening, spready cheese that proved to be more popular among the delicatessen customers than Bismark.

Mr. Todt served the cheese to the members of the Liederkranz, a famous New York singing society of which he was a member. The response was so enthusiastic that Frey decided to name his new discovery after the society, hence the cheese was christened Liederkranz, which is translated as a wreath of songs.

The foreign-sounding name is misleading, and until people know the history of the cheese, it is often classed with the famous imported cheeses.

Frey manufactured his new cheese in Monroe for a number of years, but since that city is 50 miles from New York, and an increasing amount of milk supply was needed for that densely populated area, his company began a search for another location.

In 1925 Frey made his first visit to Van Wert. He was at first discouraged because of the lack of dairying here, but he found no better location in Indiana, Michigan, or Wisconsin, and came back to Van Wert a second and third time. With the cooperation of the newly organized clearinghouse, and the assurance from farmers that they would raise more dairy cattle if a good and convenient market were available, Frey and his associates decided Van Wert would be the new location of the Monroe Cheese Co.

Frey had his troubles here. For instance, the closely guarded formula turned into nothing but a sorry mess in the new plant until the fixtures of the old plant containing the proper bacteria were installed. Trouble was overcome and after 3 years of operation in Van Wert, the Monroe Cheese Co. was merged with the Borden Cheese Co., and Frey continued as plant manager. He personally supervised the making of his cheese until 1938 when he retired, and was succeeded by Sylvester Young.

Even since his retirement, Frey continued to visit the plant and exercise some supervision over the manufacture of his invention. And throughout his life, Liederkranz has remained a part of his regular diet. In 1943, the fiftieth anniversary of the invention of Liederkranz, Van Wert and the Borden Co. paid tribute to Frey with a special anniversary celebration. Again in 1949, as the Borden Cheese Co. celebrated its twentieth year in Van Wert, Frey was recognized for his part in the company's success.

But throughout all the fame and praise, one of Frey's principal characteristics has been his humility. The soft-spoken man has pushed aside praise for his accomplishments, being too busy doing things to talk

about himself. At most, he liked to look at his handiwork, and smile with satisfaction. He derived his pleasure from viewing the large factory, and riding through the county and seeing the large, modern barns so symbolic of a prosperous dairy industry which he helped to build.

Veterans' Education and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter received from Robert S. Kelley, of Boston, Mass., containing information of great value to a large percentage of veterans of World War II. It follows:

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS., *January 12, 1951.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: Reprint of paragraph 10035, Veterans' Administration regulations, dated April 1, 1950, paragraph 10035 states as follows:

Regulations concerning the pursuit on or after July 25, 1951, of courses of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended (pt. VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended)—July 25, 1951, is a critical date in the education and training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Veterans who are eligible for education or training and who have not undertaken such training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as well as those who have commenced but have not completed their course, may be vitally affected by the July 25, 1951, date. In order that all such veterans may be made fully aware of the importance of the date and of its effect on the education and training program, this regulation is promulgated at this time for the purpose of providing all such veterans with ample advance notice so that their plans may be made accordingly.

This regulation applies to all courses of education or training pursued by veterans on or after July 25, 1951, under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.

(B) The law provides that a course of education or training shall be initiated before the termination of 4 years after the date of discharge or by July 25, 1951, whichever is the later, and that such education or training cannot be afforded beyond July 25, 1956, except for those veterans who enlisted under the Voluntary Recruitment Act of October 6, 1945. Therefore, a veteran otherwise eligible must have commenced and actually be pursuing his course of education or training on July 25, 1951, or the date 4 years after discharge, whichever is later, except where his attendance is interrupted because of the normal interruptions for summer vacations, or other reasons beyond the control of the veteran.

(C) A course of education or training shall consist of such curriculum, program of study or training, or combination of subjects as are prescribed by the institution as constituting the course. When the veteran elects his course of education or training, is accepted by the approved educational or training institution as qualified to undertake and pursue the elected course, and commences such course, he shall pursue his course of education or training continuously until completion, except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student.

(D) A veteran may change his course of education or training only while in training and then for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator. A change of one or more subjects in the elected curriculum or program of training, including the dropping of a subject without replacing it with another, or the adding of a subject, or a change in the sequence in which the subjects are undertaken does not constitute a change of course of education or training. Advancement from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase within the course of education or training which the veteran is pursuing does not constitute a change of course.

(E) A change of course of education or training may be considered to be for satisfactory reasons when—

1. The veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present course and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application; or

2. The course to which the veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude, previous education, training, or other such pertinent facts; or

3. A course to which the veteran desires to change, while not a part of the course currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from said course and will enable him to atttain his educational or vocational objective.

No additional changes of courses of education or training will be approved except for the most cogent reasons.

(F) When the veteran completes his course of education or training as defined above or discontinues his elected course of education or training, the law does not permit the initiation of another course of education or training.

In view of the fact that there are approximately 60 percent of the veterans of World War II in this Commonwealth who have not taken advantage of this law (Public Law 346, ch. 8) and whereas there are thousands of these veterans who are now employed in national defense industries, working in many cases 10 to 12 hours per day, 6 days a week and are not physically or mentally able to pursue further education or training due to these aforesaid situations, I would recommend most strongly that wherever the date July 25, 1951, appears in this law and its amendments thereto that same be deleted, no substituted added. In other words a veteran of World War II could at his convenience pursue a course of study until the termination of this law, namely, July 25, 1956. Also those that are now going into the service and have not enrolled are also eliminated.

Fraternally,

ROBERT S. KELLEY.

Sleigh Riding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Oh, What Fun It Wasn't," written by John Gould and published in the Christian Science Monitor January 4, 1951.

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

OH WHAT FUN IT WASN'T—A DISPATCH FROM THE FARM

(By John Gould)

Before Christmas, 1950, is wholly forgotten by a forward-plunging world, may I ask again why "Jingle Bells" has become included in our repertory of "traditional Christmas music"? I think it's indicative of our times—a confused era when people sound the melody but pay no attention to what the words mean. The least I can do is register a protest in the aggregate.

At first, some years back, I was amused at this. Some youthful radio announcer said we would now have some Christmas music, and he slapped "Jingle Bells" on his perpetual-motion machine. He was confused. Perhaps he was up early that morning. Again this year, during a program that was presenting Yuletide music in great dignity, a radio station came right out and called "Jingle Bells" a fine example of traditional Christmas music. Anybody who listened to the radio much before Christmas must have noticed that Jingle Bells got quite a play.

It would have been no worse if "Sidewalks of New York," or "Annie Laurie," or "Who Threw the Overalls in Mrs. Murphy's Chowder" had been similarly interpolated thus into a sacred occasion. I have nothing against "Jingle Bells" as a composition of its own sort, but I give myself credit for being able to understand what the words are about. If I had the job of making up the agenda of a Christmas music program, it would never occur to me to include "Jingle Bells."

Some people may object that I am too precise, and that a certain inference is justified—namely, Christmas comes in December; snow is likely at that time in northern latitudes; and men are to be excused if they associate a crisp jaunt o'er hill and dale in a trim cutter with that season's dominant holiday. This is a certain kind of logic, worth about D-minus, and would infer that "The Last Rose of Summer" is a song about Milwaukee because they have a big greenhouse there. Besides, I think Christmas is still one thing we can be purist about.

I am not the world's greatest enthusiast for sleigh rides, which may enhance my feeling about "Jingle Bells" and Christmas. My substitute for this more horseless era, if anybody wants a sleigh ride, is to sit on a porch hammock in the teeth of a stiff northwest gale, thermometer about —10, with your feet in a bucket of ice water and somebody to throw snowballs at you. If somebody can jingle a string of bells at the same time, the simulation is complete. You are now enjoying a sleigh ride, and if Christmas pops into your head I will be surprised.

In the old days a sleigh ride was not necessarily a joyous event. I often wake up at night and congratulate myself that sleigh rides are not, now, an integral part of my life, I am not beguiled by recollective sentiment, as are some people who will object to my harsh treatment of the subject. It is one thing to be sweetly reminiscent, and quite another to face the actual ordeal. Our old Tantrabogus, our sleighing horse, was not—in winter—the sleek Currier & Ives type that lends a romantic touch to a moonlight jaunt. A sleigh ride had numerous sensitory nuances the romanticists seem to have forgotten.

First, of course, Tanty had a great coat of shaggy and matted hair that he wore in the winter. He looked a lot like a buffalo, except that he had a stout aroma of horse. I never knew a horse that smelled so much like a horse as Tanty did. He was a nice old fellow, but he was all horse. When we

left the house and walked across the squeaking dooryard snow, the icy blash at our backs, and swung open the barn door, the horsy nature of Tantrabogus was overwhelming. The idea of a sleigh ride was instantly revolting—as if it hadn't been, anyway.

I recall how hard it was to fit the tug eyes over the ferrules on the sleigh—not just because the tugs were cold-stiff, but because our fingers were, too. People who, in fancy, still glide over winter's broad expanse of white seem to forget that the sleigh runners were usually frozen down. Also that the wind kept the snow blown off the driveway right by the mailbox, and that runners going over bare gravel make a noise this world should never hear.

There also seems to be a recollection that the jolly horse scampered along on winged feet, lending a wild perception of speed to the affair. Tanty wasn't like that. He picked up one foot, and then held within him a lengthy, labored, and complicated mental conference as to what he should do with it next. The order in which to lift and replace his feet was always a great problem with Tanty, and the wonder is he didn't fall flat on his horse face while making up his mind.

All that ever happened was that going sleighing made us glad to get back. Many a time we got off the seat and ran on our own numb feet, boots frozen solid, while Tanty came along behind at his own pace. Then we'd run back to meet him.

There is a whole lore of lanterns under lap robes, and the foul smother you discovered when, in desperation, you plunged your cheeks in under for a moment out of the wind. What a lantern under a sleigh robe will do to the impounded atmosphere is something sleighing recollectionists don't mention. There were hot soapstones, too—and you could put bottles of hot water in your pockets to warm your hands, and then stop at farmhouses to refill them before they froze up and burst. That was sleighing.

Christmas is supposedly a time of spiritual joy. I prefer not to be reminded, at that time, of sleigh rides and jingling bells. Particularly when we have plenty of valid Christmas music.

Inaugural Address by Gov. Edward F. Arn, of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the inaugural address of the new Governor of Kansas, Edward F. Arn. In it, Governor Arn points up the gravity of the national situation, and brings to our attention the great Kansas potential of men and resources my home State has to offer.

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

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. EDWARD F. ARN

It is with a special and urgent sense of responsibility that your elected State officials stand before you today and solemnly pledge to perform the duties which have been entrusted to them.

Your faith in your elected officials makes their public office a public trust. I accept that trusteeship with humility, and with deep gratitude.

I pray to God for the strength, preseverance, and sound judgment which I will need in the task to which I today dedicate myself as your Governor—for this an hour in our National and State history which requires the utmost in effort and devotion from all of us. We must not attempt to conceal nor to minimize the gravity of our situation. Free citizens have a right to demand truth and frankness from their chosen leaders—and it shall be my purpose to see that such demands are squarely met.

The stark truth is that we face a terrible challenge from a determined and powerful enemy. Our freedom, our institutions, our lives, are at stake. But it is a challenge that we can meet and overcome. Kansas and her sister States of our Union have the spiritual and material resources to resist and vanquish the legions of darkness which have set themselves against us in the world. We have a system of government designed to take full cognizance of our private initiative, our individual energies, and of our collective strength.

First, however, the need must be fully realized so that our slumbering power may be awakened and our forces marshaled. Security, at this midway point in the twentieth century, will not be maintained by halfway measures or halfway efforts on the part of men and women either in or out of public office.

It is to this grim international picture that the conduct of State government must be geared during these coming 2 years. To assume anything less would be dodging reality and inviting disaster.

We can be doubly thankful today for the progress which has been made in Kansas since the end of World War II. Remarkable gains have been achieved in our service to the people in such fields as education, welfare, public health, and highways. And this progress has been accomplished without in any way impairing our financial strength—present or future. Our house is in good order. We owe a debt of gratitude to all of those who urged this program of action and to the legislators who enacted it.

It would have been tragic if we had left these things undone, only to find ourselves entering into another period of wartime economy in which manpower and materials are short or unavailable. And that is the type of economy we face today. We must anticipate that it will gain in intensity from month to month. Along with restrictions on manpower and materials we can expect an increased burden of Federal taxation, making it untimely for us to consider any new or additional State taxes. All of these things show us clearly that we must put aside any thoughts of ambitious new programs, or of any but the most necessary increases in programs already launched.

We must hold the gains we have made in Kansas progress as long as it is humanly possible. We must not go backward. I do not intend, for my part, to let our State be guilty of any neglect of the men, women, and children who deserve and need our service and assistance—but, at the same time, we must examine each proposal with extreme care in the light of our existing economy and of our present national peril. We must ask if it is necessary, if it is practical, if it is patriotic. In our State affairs it will be far better to make an error on the side of caution than to stray too far the other way and do anything that would in any way endanger our security.

I intend to give special attention to those things which will enable our State to do its part in increasing our war potential—such matters as our production on the farm and in the factory, the condition of our highways, and the efficiency of our civilian defense. And I particularly urge all State employees to work to the limit of their energy and ability so that essential services may be provided with all possible efficiency and economy.

I firmly believe that all of us should resolve today to live henceforth through this era in a spirit of personal sacrifice. The least we can offer is to forego anything which might weaken our fighting front in either a cold or a shooting war. Each individual can search his own heart and determine what additional contributions he is prepared to make. If we expect and prepare for the worst, we will be better able to avert disaster and come again into happier days in a peaceful world.

Kansas has much to offer the Nation in war or peace—the bounty of our fields and of our industries, our truly American way of life, the vigor and the courage of our patriotic Kansas citizens, who so well exemplify the spirit of America here in the heart of our Nation.

With these things God has blessed us. Let us pray to Him that, whatever lies ahead, we may persevere and win out in His name, setting an example which will be worthy of our fathers before us.

Preparedness Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summation of statements of mine regarding certain measures which was prepared by my administrative assistant.

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

PREPAREDNESS AGAINST COMMUNISM—RECORD OF SENATOR LODGE

Because so many queries are received regarding LODGE's anti-Communist activities, the following reference material has been compiled, taken entirely from official or published sources.

Soon after his return to the Senate in January 1947 LODGE began working by voice and by vote for complete preparedness—military, informational, economic, and security-wise—in the fight against communism.

Part I of this pamphlet contains chronological excerpts from his preparedness record before the Communist aggression in Korea of June 25, 1950, beginning in early 1947, when he returned to the Senate after World War II.

Part II deals with his record after the aggression began.

PART I. PREPAREDNESS AGAINST COMMUNISM—PRE-KOREA

February 1947:

"I am constantly concerned with the problem of maintaining our armed forces. The common defense is one of the prime responsibilities placed upon us by the Constitution; and it is utterly vital, not only for American security, but for the peace of the rest of the world, that we maintain armed forces at a sufficient strength effectively to support our foreign policy" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"Senator LODGE has raised a series of questions about the theory and composition of

our Armed Forces. He is without doubt the best qualified Member of the United States Senate to propound such questions and to array the answers. He has come closest of anyone thus far in getting down to brass tacks as to the basic principles and policies which must underlie our national security"(Army Ordnance Magazine).

April 1947:

"We must be ready when the whistle blows" (Hearings on S. 758, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate).

"I hope that in the future we will seek to achieve permanent results by our expenditure of money and effort as the result of forethought and far-reaching plans, and not to be constantly surprised by a succession of expensive rescue parties in which we simply pour money down a rat hole and achieve no basic improvement. There is not sufficient money in the world and there is certainly not sufficient money in the United States to pursue such a course" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

May 1947:

"A consistent, decisive, and thoroughgoing over-all plan for foreign policy which will secure military, political, and economic conditions in the world, which will make peace and prosperity possible, and which, by making foreign peoples self-supporting, will obtain for us the markets and raw materials we need is essential. In other words, what is wanted is a foreign-aid program which will aid Americans" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The fact that we allowed so many of the war's painfully won gains to slip away between our fingers in the year after the shooting stopped must teach us once and for all what a crime we commit against ourselves and against humanity when we allow ourselves to become weak" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

July 1947:

"The amendment which I shall offer represents my attempt to provide an ever-ready Air Force of 70 peace-strength air groups. * * * The first priority for the national security of the country should go to the striking Air Force, and these are the figures which will give it to them, and I hope the Senate will adopt them" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

(This amendment was defeated.)

"Senator LODGE has waged an admirable, though losing, battle on the floor of the Senate to give the Army Air Corps the full striking force it contends it should have in the postwar period. The picture which Senator LODGE gave his colleagues of our demobilization-battered aviation spearhead as it exists today is not a pleasant one; except, perhaps, to any potential enemy" (editorial, Washington Star).

"Without unification we are doomed by the nature of future war, the first effect of which will be to disunite us tactically. I say with all the vigor and all the sincerity of which I am capable, without unification we cannot even begin to fight" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The adoption of an intelligent policy with respect to our diminishing raw materials of all kinds is of vital importance and can mean the difference between defeat and victory in case of war" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

October 1947:

"The time has come for us to indulge in some plain speaking and to set the record straight * * * I have just returned from Europe where every kind of untruth is circulated about the United States, and I assure you that much of it is believed simply because we never do reply * * * We must not hesitate, and we shall not hesitate, to brand as lies the things which the enemies of human freedom in the world today are continually saying about the ideals which animate us here in America. For every lie they publish, let us proclaim the truth." (Columbus Day speech, Boston, Mass.)

November 1947:

"Certainly our words would not be heeded abroad if our military defenses were weak.

"There is no Nation-wide organization in being which is ready to deal with massive bombardment of our population centers and of our industrial and military establishments." (Report to the chairman, Foreign Relations Committee).

"We are at present 60 to 70 percent short of the minimum strength of five divisions which the Army requires in combat ground troops, not counting occupation forces" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The warning by Senator LODGE that our military defenses are seriously weak should not be ignored by Congress. Senator LODGE should know what he is talking about. He knows the military situation here and elsewhere by personal contact. His words on this subject merit serious consideration" (editorial, Boston Post).

"The experience of Senator LODGE gives weight in the public mind to his comments on the Nation's unpreparedness to meet any emergency" (editorial, Fall River Herald-News).

December 1947:

"We must be ready for the worst. War has become total, our defense must be total, too. * * * If Washington were hit, the President, the Cabinet, all Members of Congress, all records would be gone. A new Government and a new President should be ready to take over—perhaps in some bunker or cave" (open letter to Herbert Hoover, Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government).

January 1948:

"I rise this morning to express the hope that at this regular session of Congress the Appropriations Committee will not be bound by any short-sightedness or lack of understanding on the part of the Bureau of the Budget and that it will include in the appropriation bill adequate funds for 70 air groups. We must have an Air Force in being, an Air Force that is immediately ready, not a skeleton Air Force. Seventy groups are the minimum" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

(Although Congress voted funds for a 70-group Air Force, a Presidential directive reduced this by 28 groups.)

"Under the leadership of Senator LODGE, Congress raised the number of Army air groups from the 55 that the President wanted to 70" (Lowell Sun).

"There is no substitute for professional knowledge, and Senator LODGE has it where modern warfare is concerned. He is showing an acute and penetrating vision of what that means when he calls for an increase in air power. His voice should be heard with complete respect" (editorial, Boston Traveler).

"The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act is only a beginning, insofar as United States public relations abroad are concerned. Unless there is energetic, intelligent, and imaginative administration we shall not really hold up our end in the great debate which is going on over the world and in which we, whether we like it or not, are one of the two principal participants" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"While supporting the European-aid bill in principle, LODGE is readying a series of amendments designed to: Build up stockpiles of strategic materials this country needs in exchange for European aid, strip the program of all but bare essentials, put the privately hoarded assets of European nationals to work supporting the Marshall plan, force at least some unification of Europe and halt the drain of American vitality" (article, Washington Times-Herald).

"We all know that the program which we are confronting makes sacrifices on our part inevitable and we also know that the American people can make sacrifices and have done so in the past many times, but let us remember this: That whatever aid we send, we must never do violence to vital American needs. It must never be at the expense of the food and the heat and the clothing and the housing and the economic system whereby America lives and has its being. A strong America is not only necessary to Americans; it is vitally necessary to the world. If there is one thing that we must preserve above everything else, it is the strength and vigor of our country.

"If we are to deprive ourselves of badly needed oil, let us get back all of this oil from Middle-Eastern sources, just as soon and just as fast as Middle-Eastern oil gets into production" (speech, Columbia University, New York).

"We must get something back in return. If we are to send our machinery overseas, let there be a hard and fast agreement that we will get natural resources in return, such as bauxite, manganese, and iron ore, and many other things which we have not got in sufficient amounts in this country. Such an agreement enhances self-respect and minimizes the chances of bad feelings" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"We must be absolutely sure that all assets owned by foreigners are put into the service of this great cause, insofar as this can be done. If, as we are officially told, there are between $2,000,000,000 and $3,000,000,000 worth of gold in France, this gold must be put to work. If there are wealthy people in Europe, they should be taxed. If there are $8,000,000,000 worth of foreign assets held in the United States, they should be pledged in the operation of the Marshall plan, because the poor here in America must not be made to support the rich overseas" (speech, Boston, Mass).

March 1948:

"I have absolutely no responsibility for the lack of preparedness for peace which was shown at the conclusion of hostilities. I have no responsibility for the decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam * * * I am not a party to the tragic lack of foresight and the appalling miscalculations which were made at the end of hostilities and which account for so much of what is going on today" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"Your telegram so utterly distorts the truth and uses the phrases which we all love in so cynical a manner that I cannot hope by any reply of mine to make you admit the great wrong you are committing. Because of the fact that you once held a high office, your activities are interpreted abroad as signs of American disunion and are therefore a direct encouragement to the masters of the Soviet police empire to continue their campaign of extending the iron curtain" (open letter to Henry A. Wallace).

"I think we should realize that we are meeting in the shadow of a tremendous world emergency" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

April 1948:

"The Russian tactics of bullying and intimidation in Berlin demonstrate what a ghastly error and what a tragic miscalculation were made at the end of the war when we withdrew our troops from what is now the Russian zone of Germany. It also shows the pressing need for prompt military preparedness" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The Russians, believe me, are not smart enough to have singlehandedly created the Communists of Europe. Europe's chronic ills—overpopulation, maldistribution of goods and wealth, the failure of its educated class to provide leadership, the selfishness of its people—these are the facts which create communism.

"Fundamentally we face a political and human challenge of the very highest order. In spite of our great efforts and vast expenditures, we have been hugely unsuccessful in the battle for men's minds.

"An enthused America, speaking through its Government, can make American democracy an article of export. The Christian concept of the dignity of man is the strongest revolutionary force in the world. But because we lack imagination or understanding, we have allowed the materialistic and brutal verbiage of communism to gain a greater export currency than our own belief which springs from eternal sources—the job of stating our aims for ourselves badly needs to be done.

"This fight is fundamentally one for men's minds. The effort must, therefore, be made by ideas which appeal to the aspirations of men's souls. With such ideas we will win; without these, all the money and Cominterns and 'cloak-and-dagger' services in the world will fail.

"The belief which traditionally grips us after every war that permanent peace will soon be definitely assured has never been a correct belief and is clearly an undependable doctrine today, although we still desire peace as fervently as we ever did and are willing to work and to sacrifice for it more intelligently.

"We are learning that in the present test of strength with Russia it does not pay to run away.

"Our ideas must emphatically mean that we do not uphold any regime abroad, no matter how corrupt, provided only that it is anti-Communist. At its best such a course would be stupidity; and at its worst it would be nihilism.

"We have it within our power to hold aloft a torch which cannot only rival but easily surpass communism and the other violent doctrines of the dictators as a brightly shining attraction to all the weary people in the world, young and old, who are looking for a way out of their misery" (speech, New Orleans).

May 1948:

"I object to being bullied or hornswoggled by any foreign state into weakening, if not destroying, our prime military asset—which is our productive capacity. * * * Our desire to be ready for the first blow in any future war must not force us to take steps which make it difficult, if not impossible, for us to win the closing battle."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

June 1948:

"I hope that this bill (Selective Service Act of 1948) is not merely a flash in the pan. * * * I hope that it is a forward step in a coherent, well thought-out military policy."—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The purpose of the Vandenberg resolution is to show that we are in sympathy with the broad trend of strengthening the freedom-loving countries, but it does not commit us to anything definite. They must make the showing. If they make a good showing and if it is advantageous to our national security to help them, we shall help them. If the showing is not good enough, we shall not help them. It is the most perfect arrangement from the standpoint of American interest that could possibly be imagined. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

August 1948:

"We have never been in a world where there are so many loose pieces of dynamite lying around. Our country at the present time is going through the valley of the shadow. In addition to battleships, guns, and airplanes, we must keep our spiritual strength high and reaffirm our faith in our institutions" (Speech, American Legion Convention, Worcester, Mass.).

October 1948: "We should all realize that effective allies are indispensable to survival should we again confront the grim contest of war" (This Week magazine).

January 1948:

"We simply do not have the manpower to carry the whole burden of a future war alone.

"The factor which is at the bottom of every good military organization is the will to fight of the individual soldier. In Europe this will to fight depends fundamentally on the extent to which Europe unifies itself.

"We in Congress may be asked to help in setting up a Western European armed force and it might be strongly in the interests of the United States and of world stability generally for us under the proper conditions to give help to such a force. What are the 'proper conditions'?

"There is the question of whether the proposed pact is enthusiastically vouched for by one or more of our American military leaders who actually commanded foreign troops in combat in World War II and therefore knows from experience the realities of coalition warfare. The endorsement of staff officers, however brilliant they may be and however necessary their approval is, would not be enough. There must be approval by a former combat leader based on intimate personal knowledge of the provisions of the pact.

"There is the question of whether the reaction to such a pact in nonparticipating countries has been thoroughly anticipated and whether we are ready to meet such reaction.

"There is the question of whether there is a supreme commander on whom all the member nations agree and who really has got the power to command the Western European armed force. What is needed is not a chairman of the board, but a real general so that there is an unquestioned single authority.

"There must be a comprehensive, strategic and tactical plan in which definite assignments are given to all the military units which are members of this Western European armed force. This is absolutely essential if we are to avoid the typical Western European catastrophe in which the invader swoops down from the East and the western nations start a long debate as to who is to do what.

"The governments of the nations concerned must be strong enough to provide the foundation of civil power which is essential to the existence of a healthy military organization.

"There must be complete proof that the strategic plan for the defense of Western Europe is one which the nations of Europe are actually prepared to carry out insofar as pledging their manpower in regularly organized military units is concerned. Unless they are willing to pledge their manpower as we have pledged ours, and unless the men are presently and actually integrated into units, there is no use in our even beginning to send equipment.

"We must know how much we can afford to send abroad in relation to our Military Establishment and our own solvency" (speech, Baltimore, Md.).

"Senator LODGE wants a lot of questions answered: How much of the munitions will be made here and how much in Europe? Why can't considerable arms be manufactured in the Ruhr? How much aid has been extended to Europe since the end of the war? How much is proposed for the future? How is this aid going to be divided up among the participating countries? How many military units is each country going to have? How much manpower is involved in each year? What effect will this plan have on our own Military Establishment? What sort of organization will supervise this aid to see that the other countries for their part maintain effective self-aid? These are intelligent questions and ones that must be answered" (article, Boston Herald).

February 1949:

"To put the war-making power in the hands of other nations, or for us to underwrite nations over whose foreign policy we had no control would be a great mistake. I think it would be a mistake to take away from Congress the right to declare war on the part of our country" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"People like the Kaiser and Hitler are never as much embarassed by words and phrases and good intentions as they are by their knowledge of the actual physical military means that are ready to be used in order to fight" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"In June of 1948 I made a speech which developed in some detail the fact that the United States had become a have-not Nation in terms of essential raw materials. Since that time, the situation has grown worse and is causing concern to all the students of this problem. I wish that something could be done to arouse public sentiment to the dangers of the situation. If we lose our sources of material strength we will in many ways have dealt a real death blow to our country" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

March 1949:

"If, in a future war, we will have even fewer divisions on the front, does not that argue even more pressingly than ever before in our history that we simply must have allies, that we must have friends so that American boys will not have to carry the whole load by themselves?" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"I am interested in obtaining strategic materials to replenish our depleted resources. The provisions of existing law have been inadequate in this respect. The cleverness of the whole scheme is that it takes the ECA Administrator, with his hard-hitting organization and his bargaining position, and puts him into the existing strategic material policy of the Government."

July 1949:

"I believe we should furnish arms to Europe, but only with the understanding that we do not undermine our own defense, that we help only nations making maximum efforts to help themselves" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"The North Atlantic Treaty is assuredly no panacea for security * * *. It by no means relieves us of the need for military preparedness" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

January 1950:

"I have very grave doubts if we should undertake military action in Formosa. I think we have got to stop the military aspect of communism somewhere, but I don't think that's the place. For a minor military success we might suffer a major loss politically and propagandistically" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

February 1950:

"We must continue to build our strength in every way that we can * * * then—and only then—will there be a real prospect of accomplishing results" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

May 1950:

"I believe that we should not send anything that is of military value behind the iron curtain" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"I do not think world war III is inevitable at all. But whereas 2 years ago we thought we might have 10 or 15 years in which to make everyone strong and self-reliant, I now think we probably have only three or four. We have lost time in which to get the free world on a firm footing" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"Let us consider the rearmament of Europe under the North Atlantic Pact. I am very much worried as to whether that is proceeding fast enough, whether enough is being accomplished with respect to it" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

June 1950:

"The dangers of the world situation are largely self-evident. * * * It is plain to me that the Western World, of which the United States is a part, must build up a very strong front. * * * In a very real sense, we of the free world should have been ready yesterday and should never have allowed the disintegration of our Armed Forces

in 1945 and 1946" (speech, Norwich University, June 12, 1950).

"The sole purpose of all loyalty investigation must be to ferret out disloyal persons. Mistakes have been made in the past and they must be ruthlessly corrected. Americans must stand together before the world menace of communism. The public is everlastingly right in its determination relentlessly to ferret out all disloyal persons and it is up to us who are in public office to work out an effective method" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

"Those behind the iron curtain have been trained in a hard school. They understand only strength. America is going down a dark road strewn with dynamite. We must be in a position to show strength" (I Am an American Day speech, Boston, June 21, 1950, 4 days before Korean attack).

"The whole trend of events * * * forces upon us the necessity of being immediately ready. * * * Nations no longer take the trouble to declare war and give advance notice of an attack. * * * It seems to me that we are in one of those fateful moments in history when we have it within our power to make a decision whether we shall have World War III or whether we shall not" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 22, 1950, 3 days before Korean attack).

PART II. VOTING RECORD

LODGE voted for:
- The 1947 Military Unification Act
- The Greek-Turkish assistance program
- The 70-group Air Force (1948)
- The Selective Service Act of 1948
- Increase of funds for Voice of America and related programs (1949)
- Ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty (1949)
- One hundred million dollar assistance program for Spain (1950)

LODGE voted against:
- An amendment cutting down the duration of selective service from 5 to 2 years (1948)

LODGE personally was the author of legislation to:
- Provide for a 70-group Air Force (1947)
- Allow enlistment of selected qualified aliens in the United States Army (1947) (1948)
- Receive strategic materials for United States stockpile in return for ECA aid (1949)
- Establish a coordinated civil defense program (1950)
- Give congressional consent to interstate civil defense pacts (1950)
- Require Armed Forces to stockpile fabricated wool (1950)
- Clean out disloyal persons in the State Department (1950)
- Prevent shipment of strategic materials to the Communists (1950)

LODGE ATTACKED BY COMMUNISTS

The Daily Worker (official organ of the Communist Party), of February 23, 1950, commented as follows on LODGE's belief that disarmament talks between the United States and the Soviet Government would but falsely raise the hopes of the American people:

"Senator LODGE insults the intelligence of the United States by arguing that any Soviet-American peace negotiations would only bring war that much closer."

The Daily Worker of February 22, 1950, said:

"The trouble with the Lodge resolution is that it proposes to erect a beautiful building on a completely rotten base."

William E. Mullins, writing in the Boston Herald of December 6, 1950, observed:

"One of the pleasures of a visit to the United Nations is a first hand discovery of the ardent dislike the Russians have for Senator LODGE. The Bay State Senator infuriates them. They do not speak to him."

And Mr. Mullins wrote on December 7:

"The Russians dislike LODGE deeply."

Congress and Strategy in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 5, 1951, and also an editorial from the Washington Post of January 7, 1951:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of January 5, 1951]

CONGRESS AND STRATEGY IN CRISIS

A resolution has been submitted in Congress by Representative COUDERT, Republican, of New York, calling on the President to send no more American troops overseas without the prior consent of Congress. There may be anticipated a strenuous effort to get this, or some resolution expressing the same idea, adopted and made binding. Some soul searching by individual Congressmen, not related to political considerations, is in order.

This newspaper has long advocated that Congress be alert to its responsibilities as a check upon the executive branch of the Government. Such responsibilities by Congress are imbedded in the American tradition; planted there by the founding fathers, who wanted to make sure that popular government prevailed and survived. Part of such responsibility is the careful examination of any delegation of powers to the Executive; care in this respect is imperative for the successful carrying out of the people's will.

The President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, but Congress, through its lawmaking prerogatives, has ultimate control of the over-all employment of such forces, except when it voluntarily and temporarily relinquishes such control. It has relinquished a great deal of such control, traditionally, in wartime. It voted the President extraordinary — indeed, dictatorial— powers over the military in the Civil War, again in World War I, and again in World War II.

The present proposal is, obviously, a step away from the centralization of military power. As such, it should be debated with utmost care, with maximum regard for consequences in the current world military-political situation.

It seems clear to us that the Executive must have considerable leeway in the present emergency, in respect to the deployment of manpower at the various outposts of American military strength. The American zone of Germany is clearly one of the most important of these outposts. The Executive, for these purposes, must be considered as embracing the whole hierarchy of military command, including not only the President but Secretary of Defense Marshall and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Within the limits of general policy as established by the people, the executive department has the responsibility for strategic and tactical operations concerned with the defense of the Nation, the waging of war, or preparing to meet threatened war. At the present time those responsibilities are great and grave.

We are doubtful of any procedure of Congress that would force the Executive to disclose before a congressional committee the military's secret plans for coping with the military situation facing the Nation. And we are doubtful of any blanket resolution that would cripple the Nation's capacity to move swiftly in its own defense.

We suggest, therefore, that this resolution—which is bound to be pivotal in American foreign policy—should be debated soberly and we urge particularly that no punitive partisanship should enter into the debate. A personal or political grudge against the President would be a weak and dangerous ground upon which to base judgment on a proposition as vital as this. If the proponents have a sincere case, they ought to be heard and their counsel weighed. But political guns should be checked in the anteroom for this debate.

[From the Washington Post of January 7, 1951]

WE ARE NOT THROUGH

It is a vast oversimplification of war to pronounce judgment upon every military action in terms of ground gained, cities occupied, fields won and losses inflicted, or even as engagements in themselves. Winner does not necessarily take all in a single victory in what is a global struggle that may last a decade. Britain in the heyday of its empire got accustomed to losing every campaign till the last. In the Crimean War a series of disasters made the country demand a scapegoat. Cardinal Newman's great pen gave the people one—themselves. This was not unkind, but was part of a larger explanation, viz, that Britain was a nation, not a state; therefore it was always unready in the initial stages of a military campaign. This is the case with our country in relation to the Soviet Union. Moscow is the capital of a state, not a nation, and it is a garrison state, always prepared for warfare, and thus having a preliminary edge on non-Communist nations.

Korea is the warning signal that after the recent war we were told we wouldn't get. Fortunately we are not as weak as we were in 1941 when we were compelled to stand by and see our Pacific strongpoints wrested from us, one by one. Our power upon the sea and in the air is such that no calamity of this kind portends. The enemy can strike no mortal blow across the water barriers. If behind these barriers which Providence has provided we proceed to build up the power the world situation requires, there will come a day when it will be possible to reassert the power of the right in quarters of the globe where it may now be defied with impunity.

In an interval bound to be marked with rebuff and reverse, it will be wise to remember the high purpose that led us to undertake the Korean operation. Whatever rough handling we get in this uncomfortable interlude, there will come a day when we, and those allied with us, will say of Korea, as Byron said of Waterloo:

Millions of tongues record thee, and anew
Their children's lips shall echo them, and say—
"Here, where the sword united nations drew,
"Our countrymen were warring on that day!"
And this is much, and all which will not pass away.

The Stockpiling and Rationing of Scientific Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include an interesting and informative address

by Commissioner Henry DeWolf Smyth, United States Atomic Energy Commission, at the one hundred and seventeenth annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Municipal Auditorium, Cleveland, Ohio, on Thursday, December 28, 1950:

THE STOCKPILING AND RATIONING OF SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER

Nine days ago the President declared a state of national emergency. Such a declaration, and the facts behind it, naturally influence all our present thoughts and plans. Some of us are filled with emotion and can think only in terms of immediate action. This is not good enough. Regardless of the outcome of the situation in Korea, this country now faces the necessity of planning not only for the coming months but for the coming decade and the decade after that. We may not have to fight a full-scale war. We profoundly hope that we shall not. But we know now that we must prepare to resist aggression with all our strength for the foreseeable future. We shall have to increase greatly the Armed Forces of this country, using our material resources and our manpower in the wisest possible way. In every aspect of civilian life the first concern of each citizen must be the long-range value to the country of what he is doing. In the period ahead of us, no citizen can be deferred from national service in this sense.

It is not good enough to boast that we will fight for freedom. We must think for freedom, and this is much harder. As we prepare for possible war, we shall inevitably have to delegate increasing authority over our lives and actions to the National Government. At the same time we must be vigilant to maintain our fundamental rights of independent thinking, criticism, and free discussion.

THE DANGERS WE FACE

It has become clear that our survival is at stake. Not just our material survival, but our survival as a society of free men and women. If our cities are destroyed we can rebuild them. Our spiritual destruction would be still more fearful. It is not numbers, nor buildings, nor wealth that make a people great. It is their freedom and their vigor. We might lose our freedom, we might even lose our passion for it. This could happen through armed attack and conquest by our enemies, or it could happen from our own stupidity and short-sightedness. If we are forced into a major war we must remember that armed victory is only a means to an end and that the years after the war gage the reality of victory. If the means we use to win a military victory should destroy our moral position in the world, or our own self-respect, or change our free society into a totalitarian one, we shall not have won the war. On the other hand, if our hatred of war and our desire for peace lead us into the acceptance of an alien and barbaric conqueror we shall have lost more completely. We shall then have given up our freedom and be the serfs of a police state imposed by men who neither understand nor respect the ideals that have made us great.

A third danger remains. We may be drawn into a war for which we are not adequately prepared, and we may fight it less skillfully than it needs to be fought. It is to one phase of this specific danger that I want to address myself today.

SCIENTISTS AS TOOLS OF WAR

Men of science, traditionally peaceful, internationally minded, and nonpolitical have become a major war asset. It is important that they be used to the greatest advantage. Therefore, I am asking you as representatives of science to consider carefully how you and your fellows can be most useful to our country in the years to come. I believe that we are facing dangers so great as to make the comfort and convenience of any group trivial in comparison to the contribution such a group can make to our survival. For that reason I have chosen a somewhat grim title for this speech, "The Stockpiling and Rationing of Scientific Manpower." For that reason I am speaking of scientists not as men who enrich our culture but as tools of war needed for the preservation of our freedom. I hope you will understand why I am willing to consider the group to which I belong in this objective and impersonal way.

TWENTY YEARS OF TENSION

To plan the stockpiling and rationing of any war commodity requires some assumption about timing. If we are discussing how scientists can be used most effectively as tools of war, we must ask when such a war will be fought. This is a question Americans cannot answer with any exactness, for we will not be the aggressors. But it is now clear that if the free society of the west is to survive, we must be prepared to meet at any time a large-scale attack upon us or our allies. It may come soon or it may not come for years. In considering scientific manpower as a major war asset of this country, I assume a 20-year period of tension with the possibility of major or minor wars occurring at any time in that period. This is indeed long-range planning, but the events of the last 5 years have forced it upon us. We must now face these realities with courage and intelligence.

NATURE OF TOTAL WAR

The forces involved in a future war will be as important as timing. In every war this country has fought for the last hundred years, we have been able to crush our enemies by sheer weight of numbers and matériel. It is unlikely that we can do so again. In any future war we shall probably be outnumbered, and by men who are physically tougher than we are. Our natural resources may be no greater than those of our enemies. We may be fighting with much longer and more vulnerable lines of communication. We shall win only by being cooler, cleverer, and more skillful than our enemies, and by using the resources at our command with foresight and judgment. We must understand the nature of modern total war. Every citizen will be involved in it, whether he is in or out of uniform. We must get over the idea that men in uniform are automatically more valuble than the same men in civilian clothes. The men in uniform may be in greater danger, though even this is doubtful in view of the large number who are never in combat and the probable dangers to a civilian population in a future war. Each man's usefulness should be the sole criterion of his value to his country.

USE OF SCIENTISTS IN PREPARATION FOR WAR

On these assumptions as to the timing and nature of a possible war, how shall we best use our scientific manpower? First of all, let me say what I mean by scientists. For purposes of this discussion, I mean men who have had at least some graduate study (or equivalent experience) in the physical or natural sciences. This definition arbitrarily excludes most medical men and engineers, although much of this discussion applies to them also. Of course their value is comparable, but the problem of their use differs enough in detail to require separate treatment which I will not attempt at this time.

Based upon our experiences in World War II, I believe we can say that science contributes to our effectiveness in war and preparation for war at six levels. First of all, scientists are needed to provide fundamental knowledge, adding to our basic understanding of the laws of nature. In World War II, for the first time in history, we pushed our development of weapons close to the limit of our basic knowledge. Discoveries in science less than 5 years old were put to use in the atomic bomb and in other weapons. This may happen again, but only if there is new knowledge to put to use. Basic research is so near the forefront of knowledge that no specific use can be foreseen for any part of it, nor can it be specifically directed. But if there is doubt in anyone's mind about the military value of work of this sort, it could be set at rest by the Atomic Energy Commission. If secrecy permitted, I could cite examples of postwar research in basic science that have already been put to use in our weapons program.

The second level where science is essential is intermediate between what is clearly basic research and what is clearly development. At this level possible utility is borne in mind in a general way and may dictate a choice of field but not a choice of problem. An example of this level is the study of certain areas of organic chemistry by chemists working for a plastics company or the study of ferro-magnetism by the physicists of the telephone company.

A third level of scientific usefulness is in applied research where a specific question is posed and an answer sought. The development involved may be that of a new chemical process, a new material, or a new weapon, but always to meet a specific need.

The last stage in development work and a fourth scientific level is testing of prototypes under field conditions and getting into production. The amount of labor and ingenuity required in this last stage is often very great and the cost correspondingly so.

Once new weapons are produced, they must have operators. Generally speaking, scientists are rarely required as operators, but experience in World War II proved that they were needed to instruct operators. They were also needed to inspect the actual use being made of weapons in the field so as to understand weaknesses which should be corrected and to explain the capacities of the weapons to their military users. This work constitutes the fifth level where scientists are valuable.

Finally, but of great significance for a prolonged crisis, we must have new scientists educated. The education of a new generation of scientists cannot be done quickly. They must have a minimum of 4 years' special training, and in many cases 10 to 15 years of training and experience. To produce such men, we must continue to have teachers and universities.

NEITHER BUSINESS AS USUAL NOR WAR AS USUAL

These are the jobs we have to do—all of them necessary if the country is to excel in the techniques and weapons of modern war over the next 20 years. All these levels of work have been carried on during the last 5 years of peace. In the period now facing us, we can expect only to shift the emphasis or increase the effort, or both. Some peacetime activities can perhaps be curtailed. These are most likely to be found in the middle of the spectrum that ranges from basic research to weapons development. For example, work on improvements of nonessential industrial products or processes certainly could be curtailed. On the other hand, applied research on weapons or on industrial processes bearing on weapon production needs to be accelerated. Vast sums of money will be available to the services for research and development. I hope this money will not be squandered on doing things in triplicate or on hiring able scientists for pet projects that have little bearing on either science or war. Money does not create brains, nor the expenditure of millions of dollars alter the laws of nature. Our ignorance of these laws is still so great even in advanced fields like nuclear physics that basic research must go on. On the time scale I have suggested, our success in basic research is necessary to our survival.

All this adds up to slight curtailment and considerable expansion. It may sound as if I were recommending business as usual. I am suggesting that we cannot have war as usual. We cannot win another war by a mere outpouring of men and resources. We can only beat our enemies by being much brighter, much shrewder, much cooler, and more farsighted than they are. We must use our weapons and men more skillfully than they. In particular, scientific men are important because the novelty and effectiveness of our weapons depends on them. If we are to expand our scientific efforts, we must examine closely our stockpile of scientific manpower.

PRESENT SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER

Have we the scientific men we need? If not, can we get them, and how can we best use them? I could quote to you statistics that have been gathered by many painstaking studies in the last few years. These statistics show we do not have the men we need. But the lack is obvious even without statistics. We trained almost no scientists between 1941 and 1946; and since 1941 needs have developed, like that of the Atomic Energy Commission, which now employs directly or through contractors as many physicists as there were in the whole country in 1920. The lack is also obvious to anyone who has recently been trying to hire first-class senior scientists. Therefore, I will omit statistics at the risk of being considered unscientific by those who consider numbers less fallible than words.

Can we do anything in this period of emergency about the shortage of scientific personnel for war work? As I have suggested, some diversion from present industry is possible. For example, I will venture to single out two areas that might supply scientists. I suggest that most of the chemists from the cosmetics industry and most of the physicists from the television industry could have their abilities used in ways that would be more likely to insure the survival of this Republic. In such industries as these, a fair number of qualified senior scientists could be found and a considerably larger number of men who could work under direction.

Yet it is clear that taking men from industry will do little or nothing to strengthen the basic research which will continue to be vital. Nor will it furnish very many senior men capable of directing bold and imaginative work in weapons research itself. Evidently there is such a shortage that each man must be used wisely and more men must be trained in science by holding many students and teachers in universities.

The problem then is clear and has two parts. First, to use the scientists we have as effectively as possible; second, to train more. Before making some suggestions for the solution of these problems, it may be well to review how we tried to meet them between 1940 and 1945.

EXPERIENCE IN WORLD WAR II

Dealing first with the question of use, let us recall what happened during World War II. It is easy to say that we misused our scientific talent in that war. I hardly think that is a fair statement but certainly better use could have been made of them. Among the older men, recruitment for various projects was usually carried out by a kind of chain-letter system. The initial group brought in men they knew. These new men brought in their friends, their former students, or other scientific acquaintances, and so on. Had the supply been unlimited, this would have been an excellent system. In practice, however, different projects soon came into collision so that individuals had to choose between offers from different laboratories without having the necessary information to make the choice wisely. Not infrequently the advice of the top people in the Office of Scientific Research and Development had to be sought. Except insofar as it was counteracted by OSRD, this system tended to strengthen projects that had started early and were already strong. Vested interests were built up and it was difficult to man new projects or to deflate projects when they had essentially completed their missions.

This system also had the disadvantage of stripping men from universities and stopping basic research almost completely. Quite apart from the removal of students by the draft, it was psychologically almost impossible for a man to continue basic research, since there was no one to tell him it was important and the recruiting officers of every war-research project were continually telling him it was not. In the scientific community, the last war began in the summer or fall of 1940, but full mobilization was not reached until sometime in 1942 and lasted about 3 years. Nevertheless, its effects on training and basic research were very serious. In the period of sustained tension that may now be facing us, effects of the kind I have mentioned could be disastrous.

I have been referring to the scientists who were used as civilians in various war laboratories of the OSRD or the services, men who were above draft age or whose deferment was relatively easy to obtain. For the younger men, the situation was much more unsatisfactory. Either they were deferred by a process often painful and temporary or they went into the services.

When young scientific men were drafted or volunteered, they became enmeshed in a system designed to train and use men for combat. This is no place for me to discuss the wisdom of using military uniforms and ranks for the many jobs a modern war organization has, in which the work to be done is much more like civilian work than it is like fighting. I can only say that a research laboratory is probably the most inappropriate place in the world to have military organization. Fortunately, ordinary common sense usually came into play in laboratories such as Los Alamos where there was a large detachment of soldiers who were more familiar with slide rules than guns. The men were given positions and responsibilities determined by their scientific qualifications regardless of their scale of pay, or the color of their suits, or buttons. This is one reason our war laboratories produced results.

In general, the services did try to use men of scientific background in places where their training was appropriate, but there were many cases where such men were entirely wasted and many more where they could have been used more effectively. The Selective Service System was not designed with this objective in mind and could hardly be expected to function successfully.

On the whole, we can find little satisfaction in the methods of using scientists of any age in World War II. As for stockpiling, it practically stopped. Almost no new scientific men were trained between 1940 and 1945. In preparing for a possible future war, we must do better.

DANGER OF REGIMENTATION

When one tries to work out solutions of this scientific manpower problem, one immediately runs into a contradiction. It is a contradiction inherent in the nature of a free society and perhaps accentuated in the particular section of society made up of scientific men. Freemen cannot be treated like inanimate tools. They will do their best work if they retain initiative and responsibility, and this is above all true of men doing scientific research. We cannot have completely centralized Government control of science without losing much of the strength we are trying to preserve. At the same time, the country has a right to expect that young scientists of military age will be as much at the command of their Government as other young men of the same age. If we are to avoid the mistakes of the last war, we must propose a positive kind of service to replace the policy of deferment for young men in scientific work. No course of action to accomplish this will seem attractive to men used to complete freedom of choice, for science—like other fruitful products of men's minds—has known its best fulfillment in the free atmosphere of peace. But today we face a possible struggle for survival and so our first concern as scientists must be to ask how we can serve this country, and to accept whatever plan seems to fulfill that purpose. I urge you to listen carefully to the suggestions I shall put forward, and to improve upon them. They are not original with me, but I am responsible for the form in which I present them.

PROPOSAL FOR A SCIENTIFIC SERVICE CORPS

I propose the establishment of a Scientific Service Corps directed by a Scientific Manpower Board and based on a national roster of scientists. These organizations would be concerned only with scientists who have completed their education, not with students. Nevertheless, two categories are concerned; men of military age, normally subject to call for military service, and older scientists. Both categories would be under the general supervision of the Scientific Manpower Board and both would be listed in the roster. At present, only the scientists of military age would be required to join the Scientific Service Corps, and only the members of this corps would be subject to orders from the Scientific Manpower Board. For older scientists the Board would act in an advisory capacity only.

This Scientific Service Corps would be a civilian organization without ranks or uniforms. I believe it would be most effective if it were guided by that curious mixture of cooperation and discipline that characterizes most civilian organizations in this country. The principal function of the Board in charge would be to get the right man in the right job and often this man's own judgment should carry great weight. The Scientific Manpower Board, although a civilian organization, would need to have real authority over the members of the Service Corps. It would need power to keep them out of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or to put them in. It should have power to return men from military to civilian service or vice versa, or to shift them from one project to another, or to return them to universities. But I hope that most of the orders issued by this Board would be merely formal endorsements of voluntary agreements. Cooperation will serve us better than force.

For scientists not in the Service Corps, the Scientific Manpower Board would act only in an advisory capacity. With information on the full scope of national defense research projects, it could be an invaluable guide for men who wanted to be sure they were making the best use of their abilities.

The Scientific Manpower Board should be responsible to the President, not to the Department of Defense. The quality, wisdom, and powers of this Board would be the key to the success or failure of the whole scheme. Their ideal should be guided cooperation with the scientists, not rigidly organized direction of them. The Board members and staff would require access to complete information on all technical and scientific phases of our military activities and of the supporting civilian economy. They would also have to know the scientific community—not just the names and numbers in a card file, but the men themselves. This suggests the need for regional branches of the Board.

STUDENTS

Turning to the question of stockpiling, that is, the training of new scientists, we have quite a different problem. Various schemes have been proposed for the deferment of students. Most such schemes do not make it clear that we are aiming at a positive goal, not a negative one. We are not interested in helping individuals escape the duty of military service just because they are bright boys or happen to have played with chemistry sets as children. We are interested in developing a group of men, with trained minds and disciplined imaginations who can strengthen the country over the next 20 years. That some of them will be doing very nearly what they would choose to do in peacetime is irrelevant except insofar as it may make them more effective.

Can we not have something more positive than draft deferment for brilliant students of science, medicine, and engineering? The continuance of their education in such times as these, implies obligation, not privilege. I propose a student scientific corps with enrollment beginning in the freshman year and continuing through graduate training. The requirements of native intelligence and industry in such a student corps would be high and the requirements of sustained performance higher still. Students who did not keep up would be continually weeded out. Men of excellent technical competence but lacking in imagination and originality would be carried only through their undergraduate training and then released to the armed services or to industry. Others would be continued through graduate training. Some recruits should occasionally be added to the student corps from the services or industry or project research to receive more education.

Administration of this student science corps should be, it seems to me, decentralized as much as possible. Professors in the universities would be best fitted to take the responsibility of making judgments within the established criteria. No amount of statistical data, intelligence tests, or examinations can replace the intimate knowledge a university professor should have of his good students. The student science corps or training program or whatever it is called should perhaps be under the general jurisdiction of the National Science Foundation. Cooperation with the Scientific Manpower Board and with Selective Service would be essential but the problems are sufficiently great and sufficiently different to suggest separate authorities.

EFFECTS OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

Although the programs I have discussed are intended to meet both short-range and long-range requirements for scientific manpower and are not meant to be dependent on the present system of recruiting under the Selective Service Act, they may appear in conflict with other proposed systems of recruiting for the armed services. One such system is the plan to put all 18-year-old men into military service. It is estimated that if these men were kept in service for 2 years, the country would have a total of 3,000,000 men constantly under arms and would shortly build up a large trained reserve. Once their period of service was over, these men could feel confident that they could pursue their education and begin their professional careers without interruption unless large-scale war broke out.

The first effect of this proposal on the training of young scientists appears to be bad. All men now 18 would defer their education 2 years with a corresponding interruption in the supply of engineers and scientists 4 to 8 years later. To some degree these effects could be counteracted by acceleration or by special training of men still in service or by reduction of the length of service for obviously talented men. On the good side would be the smaller probability of interruption for men already started on their professional careers. In the long run, that is, the 10- or 20-year period I have been talking about, these effects would largely disappear, with one exception—the dozen or so students of really outstanding brilliance who appear each year—and there are seldom more—might be lost to science or have their early and most productive years spoiled.

There is another danger. The young men who had been in service might be kept in some sort of reserve; in fact, they should be, or much of the point of their military service would be lost. However, they constitute a whole generation of manpower, the manpower that is needed for the innumerable civilian activities as essential to success in total war as the Army or Navy or Air Force. It would be wise to put the control of this reserve manpower in civilian hands at the highest level.

As to the use of mature scientific manpower, this 18–20 service proposal seems to have only secondary effects. It might relieve the pressure for direct military service on some of the younger scientists. In the long run, it might help stabilize the universities. It does not remove the need of a scientific Manpower Board, a Scientific Service Corps, or a student corps. While I believe the Scientific Manpower Board should be vested with great authority from the first, the proposed military service for 18-year olds might lessen the danger of too hasty and too arbitrary exercise of that authority.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I have tried to put before you the problems of stockpiling scientific manpower and rationing it, in the best interest of the country, just as we would any other essential resource. I have proposed for this purpose a student scientific corps to insure a continuing supply of scientists. For men of military age, I have proposed a Scientific Service Corps to be directed by a scientific manpower board. For men above the age of military service, I have suggested widespread voluntary cooperation with the Scientific Manpower Board.

These may not be the best solutions to this problem, but they are possible ones. Any system to be established must obviously be flexible and subject to change with experience and with changing international conditions. Either the organization I have suggested, or a better one, should be set up now before we repeat the errors of the last war.

I believe there is real danger that nothing will be done or that a system will be set up and will fail. Scientists can best understand the nature of this danger. They know very well that a thoughtless bureaucracy with centralized control can threaten the independence, imagination, and clarity of mind needed for creative work. Scientists know also that a haphazard system of recruitment can lessen their value to the country. I suggest that the members of this audience and their associates throughout the country have a peculiar duty to work for the adoption of a sensible system for the wise use of scientific manpower, to talk to their friends of the need for such a system, and to make such a system work. You know what needs to be done. Give the foresight and leadership to achieve it.

Such questions as these cannot be left entirely to the Government. They are everybody's business. What John Curran said in 1790 is still true:

"It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

The Fair Deal, 1951 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to cause to be reprinted in the RECORD an editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier which analyzes what was purported to be a state of the Union message delivered by President Truman a few days ago.

Without detracting in the slightest from the excellence of this editorial, I would like to amplify with respect to one sentence.

The writer says:

It seems that from now on every Fair Deal spending scheme will be disguised as a vital expenditure in the defense effort.

I would like to point out that in the last 2 years, whenever objection was raised to any free-spending measure, administration mouthpieces raised the hue and cry that it was necessary because of crisis, emergency, security, or defense effort. Those who have been doing their best to spend this country into bankruptcy and oblivion can well be expected to continue using their specious arguments in the Eighty-second Congress.

Following is the editorial:

President Truman trotted out his 1951 version of the Fair Deal before Congress, dressing it this time in a uniform and carrying a placard which read: "Let us have unity."

The President's task in this period is, indeed, difficult. It is easier to rally a people to fight a war than to cajole them into the sacrifices necessary for full-scale defense to prevent a conflict.

But the President did not give answers to some of the questions the American people are asking and his answers to others were so vague as to be meaningless.

He declared, for instance, that American troops are fighting in Korea because aggression in that country "is part of the attempt of the Russian communistic leadership to take over the world, step by step." Yet, if we are not proposing to drive the Communists from Korea, what is the use of fighting the present costly delaying action? Does defeat after defeat, withdrawal after withdrawal, salvage our pride and prestige more than a complete evacuation? The President gave no satisfactory answer to that.

Discussing the charge that Western Europe is not showing sufficient determination in planning its own defense, the President declared: "Their actions are answering this question." Are they? How many divisions does France have now compared to those she had in 1914 or 1939? "Our North Atlantic Treaty partners, together, are building armies bigger than our own," Truman declared. They should build armies much bigger, since they have the manpower and the resources. They, moreover, are the ones directly endangered by the threat of Soviet aggression.

And in his 10-point legislative program the President spoke in such broad generalities that no one can know what he means. He wants "improvement of our agricultural laws." Does that mean he will again seek

enactment of the Brannan plan? He wants "improvement of our labor laws." Does he mean repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?

He wants "aid to the States to meet the most urgent needs of our elementary and secondary schools." Yet he asks for a major increase in taxes "to meet the cost of the defense effort." It seems that from now on every Fair Deal spending scheme will be disguised as a vital expenditure in the defense effort.

And the President failed to put the present arms program on a plane that is understandable to the public. "We are preparing for full wartime mobilization, if that should be necessary," he declared. But he added: "We are continuing to build a strong and growing economy, able to maintain whatever effort may be required for as long as necessary." That is hardly a concise expression of goals to set before the public in a state of the Union message.

The address will not aid the public or Congress to understand what kind of mobilization is being planned, nor will it win any converts to unpopular features of the administration's domestic and foreign policy.

National Referendum on National Defense and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a resolution presented by Alderman Milton Lundstrom, and adopted by a vote of 17 to 3 by the city council of Rockford, Ill.

This resolution deserves consideration by the Congress, and within a few days I expect to introduce a bill providing for this referendum. The resolution follows:

Whereas the world crisis becomes more acute daily, and it does not appear to have developed the unity within our Nation necessary for our defense; and

Whereas the present United States policy has become a matter of widespread division of public opinion; and

Whereas our representatives in Washington wish to know our desires and many citizens are looking for an opportunity to express themselves on the foreign policy: Therefore be it

Resolved, To secure the fullest expression of the people's wishes in this controversial matter, the city council of the city of Rockford urges and requests that Congress respond to the public will and initiate and submit at once to the people of the United States an opportunity, through a national referendum, to register their opinion on these two vital questions:

1. Shall the United States immediately adopt a policy to defend itself and its possessions and give limited assistance to free nations?

2. Shall the United States continue to follow its present world-wide foreign policy and lend unlimited assistance to free nations?

Be it further

Resolved, That in case Congress does not see fit, within the next 30 days, to initiate this request for an early submission of this vital question to a national referendum, then the city council of the city of Rockford shall submit the same to the voters of Rockford, and the city council urges all other cities to initiate similar action so that the will of the people may be registered.

Resentment Against Unfair Tax Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have received so many letters during the past 2 weeks from citizens representing all walks of life, protesting vigorously against tax discriminations, that I think this matter should be brought to the attention of the public. The following letter is a letter from one of my constituents, which I believe is deserving of serious consideration by the Representatives of the people in Congress. In this instance, as in the many other letters I have received, the people are complaining bitterly of the laws which Congress has from time to time passed, favoring the cooperatives and other organizations in the matter of tax liabilities.

It is quite generally contended that it is extremely unfair for a tax-paying private enterprise to be taxed to provide a loan, a subsidy, or the capital structure for a nontaxable, or a tax-favored competitor which may ultimately destroy or put out of business the tax-paying free enterprise which provided the money with which the tax-favored institution began business.

Resentment against unfair tax discrimination makes people furious. It causes them to want to revolt. After all, it is considered by so many as a method of taxation without representation, as we sometimes say. Tax discrimination seldom, if ever, can be justified, as between citizens, or groups of citizens within a given jurisdiction.

The following is a very interesting letter of the type I have been receiving from many of my constituents, and which, I think, will be read with much interest by those who are making a study of this subject:

The Congress has recently passed bills which substantially increase taxes upon corporations and some other forms of business organizations. It has passed an excess-profits-tax bill, designed both to increase revenue and to pacify those who desire increased inflation.

The Congress likewise has passed appropriations bills providing for expenditures of huge amounts of money—for defense, for foreign aid, for many other purposes, some sound, some unsound, some purely pork-barrel.

Income-tax rates for individuals were increased October 1, 1950. Still more money will be needed, meaning that individuals must be taxed and taxed far beyond present rates. Our Government must have more and more money, if for no other reason than to defend this Nation.

Now, since I and my neighbors, my employer and my fellow employees must be taxed in this outrageous fashion, what excuse is there for allowing some types of profit-making businesses to escape their fair share of taxes? Why should the cooperatives, many of which are big business, be permitted unfair tax advantages? Why should they be permitted to accumulate tax-free funds into huge surpluses with which to destroy the competition or even the existence of tax-paying enterprises?

Why should mutual savings banks; building, savings and loan associations; credit unions; and other forms of cooperatives enjoy freedom or relative freedom from taxes which other businesses and individuals must pay to protect the Nation which protects these cooperatives? Isn't this their country, too?

There is not and never was either reason or excuse for the tax advantages, tax freedom, of these purely profit-making enterprises. They do not distribute their so-called savings, nor are they required to pay taxes upon their incomes.

Already thousands upon thousands of young men are being called upon to give up their careers, their futures, or their very lives to defend this country. All citizens are being called to their duties of citizenship in this time of emergency and to pay a greater and greater share of the extraordinary and normal costs of government. Pressure already is being applied to the citizenry in the sale of United States Savings bonds—again the cry of patriotism is being raised to encourage people to buy these bonds whose value has been and will continue to be destroyed by a corrupt and financially illiterate administration. The old shell game come-on is being sounded again.

No one who desires this country to survive will oppose or attempt to evade a heavy tax burden for defense; he will not object to buying Defense bonds whose value he knows will decrease; he will not object to any sacrifices necessary to the preservation of America. But a great many of us do object to an unfair tax structure which permits co-ops and their ilk to escape the burdens we must bear. Must we all pay an unjustifiable high tax in order that these Socialist contrivances may continue to grab increasingly large tax-free profits?

My sore back is awfully tired of carrying a part of the load for these legally protected tax slackers, and I'd like to know what you propose to do about it. Are you going to try to put these leeches on the tax rolls or are you willing to let hundreds of millions of what should be tax dollars continue to escape collection?

Surely, if it is right and just for me and my employer to be taxed for that swindle known as social security, it is also right and proper to tax the co-ops for their share of Government expense like anyone else; or, if there no longer is any such thing as equality under the law, including the tax laws, what are we getting ready to defend? If there is to be one class which supports the Government and another which legally escapes that obligation, there is no point in fighting communism because we already are its victims.

Put all the legitimate burdens you want upon me, so long as they are my fair share, but since these burdens are congressional measures "for the common defense," as the Constitution provides, then, for goodness sake, make the burdens common to all those who are being defended, and that should include the cooperative enterprises which are engaged in business.

Yours sincerely,

(Name of constituent.)

P. S.—When mandatory price controls are put into effect again, do you believe the co-ops should again be made exempt from such controls as they were during World War

II? Remember, when OPA controlled prices of every other form of business, the co-ops were legally free to pay or charge any price they desired or could get, and in numerous cases they monopolized sources of supply by paying more than OPA ceilings—payments made possible by tax-free profits. Will you be for or against such exemptions in any new price-control set-up?

Communicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was written by Mr. Albert J. Bates, of 523 North Locust Street, Hazleton, Pa., and appeared in the Hazleton Plain Speaker on Wednesday afternoon, January 3, 1951:

COMMUNICATED

EDITOR, THE PLAIN SPEAKER:

The recent address of former President Herbert Hoover in which he advocated making an American Gibraltar of this hemisphere has proven highly popular with a large segment of our population. After the First World War, as everyone will remember, this country extended so-called loans to Europe, notably France and England, which have never been repaid. And for this outpouring of American gold, all at the American taxpayers' expense, we were subsequently alluded to in many European quarters as being not Uncle Sam, but Uncle Shylock, for the reason that we had the temerity to suggest that just possibly these loans ought to be repaid.

It is no great wonder therefore that Mr. Hoover, and a large body of American thought should hold the view that we should send not one more dollar and not one more American soldier to Europe until that continent has demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt a will to both fight its own battles, and pay its own bills. Wealthy Nation though we are, there is most certainly a limit to the amount of money, in billions, we can throw down into the bottomless pit of European aid. Otherwise, we face national bankruptcy eventually.

However, in suggesting this old form of American isolation, in new dress, Mr. Hoover and those who think with him base their argument on the basic concept or premise that this country with a mighty navy and an expanded and equally mighty air force can indefinitely defend itself against communism on this continent. If this be true, then we have been a Nation of Simple Simons to have expended all that we have to date on the Marshall plan to aid and rehabilitate Europe. If this conception of Mr. Hoover's be true, we should pull out of Germany and Europe tomorrow, and out of Korea the day before tomorrow, wash our hands of Europe, wash our hands of Asia, and stay home, arming to the teeth.

Mr. Hoover's picture is attractively painted, but if his basic premise be true we have already fought two world wars foolishly and needlessly. For both those wars, World War I and World War II—as everyone ought to remember—were fought not to save any European nation, or group of nations. They were not fought to save western culture and civilization. They were fought solely to save our own skins, to keep them from coming over here. Them—in World War I, and World War II—were the Germans, and World War II of course the Germans and Japanese. Or, worded differently, we fought two world wars to prevent the forces of aggression from overwhelming Europe, and subsequently overwhelming us.

In both world wars this country remained on the sidelines, saying it was not our war until it appeared that the forces of aggression were going to overwhelm the rest of the civilized world. Then, fright and necessity forced us to take a part, not to save any one country, or group of countries, but to save our own skins—just that, no more and no less. This our responsible Government officials and every man in Congress knew. This we as a people knew, or at least all our more intelligent people.

We knew that if any dictatorial and aggressive government completely controlled the European land mass—Europe—that its military power would become so great that it could easily, in time, overwhelm this country, conquer this country, and reduce us to vassalage, to the role of a conquered people. Thus we entered reluctantly into two World Wars to save our liberties and our own skins. We did not enter for any noble and altruistic reasons such as saving anyone else. It was solely to save our own skins and preserve our liberties. Other results of our participation were incidental.

Every military man of any competence, from 1914 to 1951, has frankly admitted that this country could be conquered by any government or power, which had full control of Europe, and its vast steel mills and armament making and shipbuilding potential.

If this was true in 1914—and it was—and in 1941—and it was, it is much more true today. Russia in full control of the Ruhr valley, all the mills and factories of France, and in full control of English shipyards, could build an army so large, an air fleet so vast, a sea armada so huge, that she could conquer us easily. This is a fact beyond dispute, and it was the reason why we fought World War I and World War II. To prevent Germany from doing it.

When now Mr. Hoover presents his attractive picture of retiring to this hemisphere in a military sense, he is flying in the face of military fact. He is stating that this country can do something which no competent military man believes it can do—defend itself against a Russian controlled conquered world. He is advocating another Munich, to achieve peace in his time. If the course he advocates were pursued, it would be but a matter of time until we become a conquered people, taking our orders from Uncle Joe Stalin. Our liberties lost. Our way of life lost. Our high standard of living lost. All that we hold dear in life—lost.

One thing few of us question. No price is too high to pay for our liberty. The price will be high. The way will be long. Our present standard of living may be reduced 50 percent. It may take 50 years to restore the country to its present living standard. But if our liberty is lost—all is lost. Let us never forget that salient fact. If our liberty is lost—all is lost.

It is highly unlikely that we have the financial resources or manpower to defend both Europe and Asia. But we do not need Asia. It is not industrialized. It is backward and primitive. There are no or few vast armament factories which can be turned against us, if in Russian hands. But Europe is different. The steel-making potential of Europe, Russia, Germany, and France is greater than our own. Every military man in the Pentagon knows if we lose all of Europe we are three-fourths conquered, before a shot is fired at our shores. If this is not true, why did we fight World Wars I and II?

Europe must be held at all cost. Competent American military men would like to see a million Americans in Europe next week. But we have no million, not in arms, not in training. So we can but hope, and if wise, pray that we can get them there in time. In time to hold, until we can bear down upon our enemy with our full armed might and mobilized industrial potential. Before our enemy seizes the industrial potential and manpower of Europe and turns them against us.

And if we can but get them there, in time, our enemy may think twice about plunging the world into a war, the outcome of which is doubtful. But if we retire to our own unsafe shores our eventual destruction is unavoidable. If we can but get them there in time there may never be a third world war.

No one likes mobilization, controls, shortages, war. But if our liberty is lost all is lost. It was not bought cheaply, or kept cheaply. It was bought and kept with blood. Now, God willing, we can preserve our liberty by merely being prepared, by arming, by mobilizing—in time. And if we do so, perhaps this time we shall not have to pay a fearful price in blood to keep our liberty Only one thing matters now, if we are to hold off this ghastly prospect of a third world war—speed, speed, and more speed. There is yet a way to peace, speed in rearming. But it is not Mr. Hoover's way, which is the way of our eventual destruction as a people.

Yours very truly,

ALBERT J. BATES.

Hon. Mary T. Norton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the accompanying statement is a splendid and proper editorial appearing in the Boston Post of January 3, 1951, entitled "She Served Well," relating to the outstanding service in this body of our friend, Mary T. Norton. We who served with Mary Norton will all agree with this editorial and more, and particularly with the last sentence of the same, "Her quiet, vibrant presence will be missed on the floor of Congress."

SHE SERVED WELL

For the first time in 26 years the name of Mary T. Norton will not be on the list from which the Clerk will call the roll in Congress as it meets for its eighty-second session today. At 75, the Congresswoman from New Jersey has well earned the retirement she decided upon last year when she announced her intention to withdraw from the field of active politics. Back in 1924 when she became the first Democratic woman to win a seat in Congress, there were those who looked with askance at her success. They were the men and women who believed they had reason to question the wisdom of selecting a woman to carry on such duties.

The confidence she evoked from the start was reflected in 13 successive elections which saw her returned to the same seat. To her must go a lion's share of the credit for the passage of the controversial wage and hours legislation of 1937. Her quiet, vibrant presence will be missed on the floors of Congress.

Do People Know the Facts of Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Dowagiac Daily News, of January 8, comes an editorial written by Harry Whiteley, which accurately represents to a great degree the thinking of the thoughtful people of southwest Michigan.

Permit me to read that editorial:

CONFUSION IN FOREIGN POLICY

In the old days we used to call them jingoists, those folks who were forever wearing a chip on their shoulders and daring the world to fight us or egging our leaders to take on a war of their own. Today they are either isolationists or internationalists. There seems to be no middle path.

The internationalists or some of their extremists think we have to send our young men to war to save the downtrodden of the world. None of these people will do any fighting themselves. The isolationists think we can withdraw behind our own iron curtain and lead a monastic life safe and secure. They are equally wrong.

We are in the world, of the world, and have certain responsibilities, but these responsibilities do not go so far as to lead us to disburse our resources beyond a reasonable point or to assume responsibilities for others beyond our certain ability to carry them out.

It is a fine philosophy to think we are so big we can take on all the troubles of the universe but it is not a practical one. Certainly we can and should lead the way but we do not need to go to the extent the administration seems to desire, to the point where we involve ourselves in the internal alliances, trouble, and problems of each of the individual nations with whom we are associated nor do we have to accept their philosophies and follow their leadership beyond our depth.

That is what we have been doing and that is what we want to check. We think that is what Mr. Hoover and others have been talking about and we think that is what most of us believe. There is a definite fear that the administration is beyond its depth in internationalism and that gives rise to an equally spurious nationalism that calls for restricted measures. Between these extremes we are in great confusion of mind and proponents of each side are beclouding the issue with their oratory.

We have a civilian defense program financed to the tune of $3,000,000,000 and now Congress is working on a defense housing bill which is estimated could run to $3,000,000,000 more. What other crimes will be committed in the name of defense we would not know but the Treasury certainly will be well tapped.

Great Britain's Government is proceeding steadily toward the recognition of the Chinese Reds by all her Commonwealth members. Then would follow their acceptance by the United Nations. In spite of Chinese participation in the Korean War and its well-publicized aggression Britain proposes to throw this menace into the face of the United States while we are sending our young men to their death to save the world from communism. At the same time we are pressing a resolution before the UN to declare the Chinese as aggressors and apply the sanctions which exist in the constitution of that organization for just such cases. British appeasement of Hitler in the last war evidently has made no impression on her present socialistic government. If she proceeds in this line, there is no recourse left the United States except to get out of the UN and withdraw from further expenditures of men and money to save Europe from the Reds.

Mr. Speaker, the editor might well have added, as another reason for getting out of the United Nations, the fact that, when the British succeed in having the Chinese Communists admitted to membership in the United Nations, that body will desist from being a forum for discussion, but will become a powerful minority which will continue to make world peace unattainable.

Why submit our destiny to an organization where there are those who are seeking to destroy us; where they can either learn of, or have a part in, making our foreign policy?

Isolation in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech prepared by Louis R. Columbo, a law student of Hazleton, Pa.:

ISOLATION IN THE FAR EAST

Once upon a time there was a cunning bear who spotted a honeycomb high on the limb of a tree. In reaching for the honeycomb, he found that he was some distance away, so he immediately began searching for something to stand on to enable him to reach it.

He first spotted an orange crate (Manchuria). Finding this not enough, he came across a barrel (China). Again he tried to reach that luscious morsel and again he found that he was still short of the mark. Disgustingly, he went in search of a means to achieve his goal and this time he had to be satisfied with a peach basket (Korea). Not finding any other isolated means by which he could reach his goal, this bear now has to revert to brute force.

He steals the prized box of firecrackers (Formosa) from Chiang Kai-shek. His next theft is MacArthur's footstool (Japan) upon which he places a coil of Manila hemp (Philipines). Now he is ready to make his final attempt to take into his possession the honeycomb (United States).

If this structure does not topple before the bear makes his final attempt to gain possession of the honeycomb, then the sting of the bees must be strong enough to withstand this clawing attempt or else.

What I have just stated in this tale is part fact and part speculation. If we are to follow some form of isolationism, there is no doubt in my mind that what I have speculated will come true.

It is my firm conviction that our policy should be anything but that of isolationism. If we are to prevent ourselves from being forced to form our first line of defense in California, and therefore, in all likelihood, have to fight for our survival on our own territory, we must arm Japan and send aid to Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. We must also fortify the Philippines as well as Australia to the extent whereby we will have a strong defense line extending from Australia in the extreme south to Alaska in the extreme north. In this manner we will have a chance to stem the tide of the yellow hordes and the communism which they are trying to force upon us.

Munich-Minded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Star of January 15, 1951, entitled "Munich-Minded":

MUNICH-MINDED

The latest proposal from the United Nations Truce Committee, which has been approved by our own Government, looks very much like a betrayal of the principles for which so much American blood has been shed in Korea.

The new plan is in five stages. These call for:

1. Arrangment of a cease-fire, with safeguards against its use as a screen to cover preparation for new aggression.

2. If and when a cease-fire occurs, consideration should be given to further steps toward restoring peace.

3. To permit the carrying out of the General Assembly resolution that Korea should be "a unified, independent, democratic, sovereign state with a constitution and a government based on free popular elections," all non-Korean armed forces will be withdrawn by "appropriate stages." Arrangements should be made in accordance with United Nations principles for the Korean people to choose their own government.

4. An interim administration should be set up.

5. As soon as agreement is reached on a cease fire, the Assembly should set up a committee consisting of representatives of Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China to try to achieve settlement, in conformity with existing international obligations and the UN Charter, of far-eastern problems, specifically Formosa and the the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

That is the smiling face of this truce proposal. But we should consider what lies beneath the surface.

Under the vague wording of this proposal all that would be needed to bring point 5 into operation is a cease-fire. What we are saying here to the Chinese is that if they will stop fighting we will sit down with them, the Russians, and the British and try to settle the questions of Formosa and their admission to the UN. And, having said that much, does anyone believe for a moment that we would not be obliged to agree to let the Chinese have Formosa and to admit them to the UN? We have said, bravely, that we would never enter into any settlement of the Korean question which rewards aggression. But if this proposal is not in contemplation a reward for aggression, what in the world is it?

At this point, one should turn back to article 3 of this proposal. Is its reference to a unified, independent, democratic Korea merely an expression of a pious hope which

the authors know will never be fulfilled? If not, why the vague language? What is meant by the withdrawal of non-Korean forces by "appropriate stages"? Why is not the setting up of this independent Korea, with its free elections, made a condition precedent to any discussions under article 5? If the Koreans are not to be sold down the river, as were the Czechoslovakians at Munich, why does this proposal not lay down conditions to safeguard their independence in clear and unmistakable terms?

The answer, one may fear, is all too obvious. The Communists, first the North Koreans and then the Chinese, with Russia always in the background, launched this aggression to enslave all of Korea, not to set up there a free, independent, and democratic country. They have, by force of arms, virtually attained that objective. Who thinks they are going to turn back now? Who would have the slightest faith in discussions with them, looking to that end? The Chinese, of course, might agree to a cease-fire, if, as a starter, they are going to get Formosa and a ticket of admission to the UN. If these things are to come first, and if a decent political settlement in Korea is to be pushed back into the indefinite future, the effect would be to give the Communists precisely what they want. They might very well agree to that. But if the United States and the United Nations agree to it, they will have betrayed every moral principle on the basis of which our young men were sent out to Korea to fight and die.

It is clear enough that Korea, so far as the original UN objective is concerned, is a lost cause. Perhaps we have no alternative but to get out of Korea. But it is one thing to battle for a principle and suffer defeat; quite a different thing to compound defeat with self-stultification.

Great causes are not sustained by weak knees. Munich-minded men have never been able to achieve a decent peace. If any substantial number of the UN members are so intimidated by the Chinest Communists that, instead of being willing to indict them for the aggressors that they are, they are resigned to a shabby deal in Korea, that is their affair. But this country, in the Star's judgment, should have nothing to do with it.

Samuel Gompers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last October, John F. Henning, director of research, California State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L., paid a tribute to the late Samuel Gompers at the California State Federation of Labor convention, then being held in Santa Barbara.

I know John F. Henning to be a sincere, able man of great capabilities.

He is devoting his energies, as did Samuel Gompers, whom he eulogizes, to the fight to assure to all who work the right to a full life in the great American tradition.

Mr. Henning's speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, brothers and sisters of the American Federation of Labor, I am honored this afternoon to speak in tribute to Samuel Gompers, the centennial of whose birth we celebrate in the year of 1950.

Just 100 years ago this past January, the founder of the American Federation of Labor was born in an impoverished, congested neighborhood on the east side of London.

He was of a family of nine children, a family which knew well the heavy, depressing hand of economic exploitation. His father toiled for survival at the cigar-making trade amid the foul, wretched working conditions which identified the industrial life of nineteenth century England.

At the age of 10 years, and in the manner of the times, the young boy who was destined to become the very symbol of organized labor in the United States, took to what was then the dismal, discouraging work of his father. He entered the cigar-making shops of London.

Samuel Gompers never forgot the lessons of labor learned in those early days; no matter how great his later stature, he never forgot the people from whom he came. He never forgot the hungry men and women of his childhood. He never forgot the desperate workers nailed to the wall of poverty by those in ruthless pursuit of commercial gain.

In the year 1863, at the age of 13, young Samuel sailed with his family for what they hoped would prove the free, inspiring air of the new Republic. They sailed for the United States and the tenements of Manhattan.

Samuel Gompers soon learned, however, that the plight of the worker on the east side of New York was little better than the plight of the worker on the east side of London, and so from the day in 1864 when he joined the Cigar Makers Union, Local 15, in New York City, until the day he died in 1924 a man of national prominence and world renown, he dedicated his industry, his talents, and his life to the betterment of the working people of the United States.

Gompers was trained in a significant and challenging school of labor. In the sixties, the seventies, and the eighties of the last century New York was the preferred sanctuary of the political, social, and economic exiles who fled the Old World for the safety of America.

Thus the young Gompers came into daily contact with the disciples of almost every economic system known to the mind of man. He evaluated the various theories that were being espoused with crusading vigor in the New York labor movement, measured them in the light of his daily working experience, and then formed his own concepts—concepts which were to become the foundation stones of the American Federation of Labor.

Gompers developed in the labor world during an era of terrible test and trial. The employer powers of that phase of the nineteenth century enjoyed an almost unqualified advantage over the frail, disjointed movement of the day. With the advent of corporate wealth, capital, organized on national lines, was able to smash with ease and efficiency, the local, isolated efforts of labor.

And so Samuel Gompers, with the other wise leaders of his generation, advocated a national labor organization.

Gompers was familiar with the experience of the national labor idea. He knew that the first attempt had been made in 1834 with the organization of the National Trades' Union, an attempt which had proved abortive. He also knew of the first serious effort to found a national movement, an effort that had begun in 1869 with the coming of the Knights of Labor.

Now Gompers knew the intimate story of the Knights of Labor, for to him it was a living experience. He saw their errors and vowed that he would never walk their way.

The Knights of Labor provided a noble contribution in principle, in devotion, and in sacrifice to American labor. But Gompers, who had been trained in the grim labor school of New York City, knew that the Knights of Labor fell because they were poorly led. He knew that the Knights of Labor fell because they were led by men who had no practical philosophy of labor, by men who fought on every front and secured none.

The Knights of Labor were led by men who, at one and the same time, sought to establish industrial unionism on a national basis, reform the currency system of the Nation, impose an unwieldy, incoherent system of national political action, institute a series of land reforms in the West, and, finally, to found and manage an industrial cooperative society.

And mind you, during all of this, the Knights of Labor were engaged in a death battle with some of the most brazen bandits of our American industrial history. They were locked in mortal struggle, for example, with Jay Gould, the railroad financier, whose Pinkerton thugs, legalised gunmen, were terrorizing every railroad union in the land.

Essentially, then, the Knights of Labor fell because they were led my men who had ambitions beyond their capacity for action, and thus, when involved in those strike efforts which are often essential to the existence of the movement, they collapsed through sheer loss of wasted strength.

Samuel Gompers in his day saw the decline and fall of the Knights of Labor; he saw the ruins of the dreamer and the doctrinaire, and again—he was determined to avoid their failings.

Gompers appreciated with the leaders of the Knights of Labor that the destiny of the labor movement runs beyond the limits of collective bargaining, but he insisted that the movement of the nineteenth century must first achieve its fundamentals—wages, hours, and conditions of work.

He argued that the primary obligation of union labor was to place sufficient bread and butter on the tables of the working people of the Nation.

And now in our own time, because Gompers emphasized the essentials, some of the pseudo liberals have had the temerity to brand him a reactionary. Samuel Compers was never that, for Samuel Gompers never sought to turn back the clock of history.

However, Gompers was first, last, and always a realist. Samuel Gompers pronounced that the labor movement of his day must learn to walk before it could hope to run; hence, the American Federation of Labor concept of first things first.

It is imperative, of course, that we remember in our present era that Gompers did look beyond the limits of collective bargaining. It was Samuel Gompers who gave to organized labor the command that in the political theater it must reward its friends and punish its enemies. Surely it is mockery to quote that pronouncement if labor is not organized for efficient political effort.

Looking beyond the zone of collective bargaining, Gompers desired a society in which, insofar as is humanly possible, every American would be well clothed, well housed, well fed, well trained, and well cared for, whenever in legitimate need.

Within the past 18 years of our national history, through the aid of a liberal political administration which has recognized and encouraged the respect of the rights of the working people of this Nation, labor has so extended its base of economic strength that it is free at last to achieve that destiny which Gompers saw always on the horizon of the future. And so today we seek the full life for America.

If we would be worthy of our history, it is essential for us to remember that we must pursue that abundant life in the name of Samuel Gompers and the founding fathers of 1881.

Whatever stature, whatever position, we have today, we owe to the struggles of yesterday. In our march on the economic,

social, and political fronts, we are obliged to remember the sacrifices of the American Federation of Labor men and women who, from 1881 until our time, struck and bled and died for the working people of this land.

We are the heirs of a superb tradition. We are the heirs of the American Federation of Labor workers of 1892 who fought the bloody battle of Homestead, Pa., against the tyranny of Carnegie Steel. We are the heirs of the A. F. of L. Danbury Hatters, who by their persistence and by their valor exposed the corruption of the company court.

We are the heirs of those of the breed of Andrew Furuseth, who, through his sailors, sent the call of liberty out to all the water fronts of the world.

We had great fathers in the labor movement. We must never forget them. We must never forget those American Federation of Labor workers who met in shacks, and shanties, and hovels and who there planned, and plotted, and schemed for the welfare and security of every man and women in this auditorium.

They faced overwhelming odds. They were hounded, outlawed, and persecuted. They looked across the barricades of industrial dispute in that nineteenth century and saw alined against them the power of organized wealth, a prostitute press, and a controlled government.

They looked at the odds of a thousand to one and they said: "To hell with the odds, and to hell with their wealth, and their press, and their political hacks. We have riches no money can buy. We have the sacrifice of our kind. We have our union, and the union makes us strong."

And so they maintained that inspiring struggle, the fruits of which we know and enjoy today. They built a movement which survived the criminal assaults of nineteenth century capitalism and which has become in our day the largest free labor organization the world has ever known.

Surely it would ill become us ever to forget Samuel Gompers and the men who founded that movement with their heart, their brain, and their blood.

We stand today arrayed against great opposition, against organized wealth and commercial power. However, we are no longer frail. We stand today before the Nation 8,000,000 strong.

But however strong we are, or however strong we may become, God forbid that we should ever forget Samuel Gompers and the hungry, hunted men who built the American Federation of Labor.

Remember always, brothers and sisters, that if we keep faith with them, then, whatever the tide of battle, the last victory must and shall be ours.

The American Legion Has a Job To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the State commander of the American Legion of South Carolina, Mr. O. D. Freeman, of Loris, S. C., on Monday night, January 8, 1951, at Loris, S. C. The speech is entitled "The American Legion Has a Job To Do."

This speech bears upon one of the problems we are facing in the United States and, in my opinion, it would be worth the time of all of us to read every word of it.

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

THE AMERICAN LEGION HAS A JOB TO DO

We veterans who have fought in two wars, and especially those of us of World War I who recall the founding of the American Legion in Paris, France, in 1918, know that the American Legion was founded as a service organization. The first part of our preamble states that "For God and Country we associate ourselves together to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, to maintain law and order, and to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism." Although we veterans have fought and won two wars in the past 32 years, yet he have not lived up to our ideal of service, for we have failed to win the peace. The result is that the youth of America is engaged in another struggle in Korea and are being killed by the thousands and are being wounded and mangled for life. Although we are told by our Government officials that we are not at war with Russia or Red China, still our boys are being killed by the Chinese Communists.

We of the American Legion who have fought in two wars and know the hardships would like to point out to our policy makers that it is high time the American people woke up to the realization that the spread of communism throughout the world is bleeding America and weakening our resources, both material and manpower. V. I. Lenin, founder of the communistic government in Russia in 1917, at that time declared "the historical mission of the Soviets to be the gravediggers, the heirs, and the successors" to the governments of the world. Mr. Lenin further stated, and I quote from page 172, volume 10, of the Selective Work of Lenin, "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia. Then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack it. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands. Let us prove to the bourgeoisie there is not, nor can there be, a sphere or field of work that cannot be won by Communists"—end of quotation. We know our Government is under attack; the enemy is communism. We cannot sit idly by and let communism win. Therefore, we urge all our Representatives and Senators in Congress to act and act now. We are tired of the pussyfooting and dilly-dallying of our policy makers and we believe it is time to call Russia's hand.

Look at Russia's record. They have broken all their promises to the allied nations; to be exact, they have broken 69 treaties and have cast 47 vetoes in the United Nations. From 1939 to 1941, while Germany and Russia were on the same side in the European war, Communists sabotaged our arms factories and spied on our Government for Hitler as well as for Stalin. But when Germany attacked Russia they wrapped themselves with the American flag overnight and immediately demanded that we go to war for Russia's sake. Since that time when we took Russia in as one of the allied nations, America has supported Russia to the tune of $11,000,000,000. But let's take a look at the conquered nations across Europe and Asia. We see that the Communists rule more people than any other system of government on the earth—more people than any government has ever ruled in the history of the world. In fact, Mr. Stalin today dominates more people than the Allies liberated in World War II. Yet we allow Russia to be a member of the United Nations where they continue to block every effort for peace presented by the allied nations. And we people of America sit idly by and let our international policy makers tell us that peace is possible and that we are closer to peace than at any time during the conflict.

We of the American Legion fully realize and believe that we cannot make peace with such an aggressor; yet we are a peace-loving Nation and we pray that with the help of God an everlasting peace may come to the world. We do not want war, but knowing that every effort that has been made has failed, we now ask that our policy makers call the hand of Mr. Stalin and we further plead to our Senators and Representatives that the universal military training bill, which the American Legion has advocated and recommended for the past 30 years, be passed immediately and that America be rearmed to full wartime strength on the ground, in the air, and at sea. Our only hope to bring peace to the world is through strength. We have the resources and the manpower, but we must mobilize them immediately to stop the onrush of communism which is threatening our very survival. Instead of manufacturing materials so vitally needed for war, our factories are turning out their greatest quantities of civilian products, such as automobiles—in the past year the production of cars and trucks exceeded 1949's all-time record of 6,500,000 cars and trucks by 1,500,000. Automobiles and trucks were being turned out at the rate of 15 a minute when there are many of our American boys who lay in hospitals this very minute and who would thank God if they had two legs to walk on. On the other hand everything has gone up, including the wages of the industrial worker. Food prices have increased 9½ percent since the start of the Korean police action. Everybody seems to be confused, even the manufacturers and businessmen who went to Washington to try to find out what war goods they could make; they received the answer, "Wait until you hear from us." It seems that our policy makers are more confused than anyone else and do not know what steps to take. What are we going to do about the situation? We in the American Legion are getting tired of double talk and dilly-dallying and we ask for action for the survival of the American people. Unless our international policy makers can work and act in favor of the American way of life, for which our forefathers fought and died, then we ask that they be removed and be replaced by ones who can work and act for Americanism and the survival of the American way of life.

We of the American Legion are willing and ready to answer the call on the home front and on the battleground to stop this dreadful disease—communism—which is penetrating the heart of America.

The Third American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include therein an editorial from the Stuart News, of Stuart, Fla., on January 4, 1951, which is published in my congressional district.

The publisher of this paper is Mr. Edwin A. Menninger and the editor is Mr. Ernest F. Lyons. Mr. Lyons was awarded the Florida Press Association's "Oscar" for the best editorial in Florida in 1950 and I am glad to insert the editorial, The Third American, as further evidence and recognition of Mr. Lyon's outstanding ability as an editorial writer.

The following editorial entitled "The Third American" convinces one that as nations go we have only begun to live. In these dangerous and troublesome times some consolation can be gleaned from this editorial:

THE THIRD AMERICAN

Today a child was born. As you read this, he is beating his fists on his bed and squalling to high heaven. He is the third American.

He was born in a dark time, a time of crisis for his Nation, this America that he will learn to love, be proud to defend, help to build to even greater heights.

Right now he wants his mother, so we'll leave the third American and go back to another dark time.

It was July 4, 1776, when a band of brave men led an outraged people in the Declaration of Independence. We rebelled against England. We pledged our lives and sacred honors in a revolution against tyranny.

Dark, dark were the times. Homes were burned, fathers of families killed or wounded, and there were bloody tracks in the snow at Valley Forge.

A child was born—let's call him the first American—at the instant John Hancock's pen signed the Declaration.

The first American knew nothing of the troublous times of his birth, but he lived to see even darker days—the burning of the city of Washington by invading British troops in the War of 1812, and when he died, ripe in years and old in wisdom, the Nation was in its blackest hour. This contemporary of Washington and Franklin lived for 87 years and 4 months, dying a contemporary of Lincoln and Lee. The Civil War was raging. Brother murdered brother. Pillars of smoke told of burning homes and the flower of a Nation was falling under musket fire.

Dark, dark were the times.

And a child was born on November 4, 1863, when the first American died. Let us call this child the second American. He beat on his bed with his tiny fists and squalled, though he knew nothing of the troublous times.

He lived a full life, did this second American, and ripe in years and old in wisdom, he died today at the age of 87 years and 2 months.

In his dying moment, the second American feared for his Nation, target of communism spread across half the world.

Dark are the times, was his last thought.

And a child was born today at Martin County Hospital, the third American.

Not yet 1 day old, caring naught for the world's troubles, if he lives as long as the first and the second, the third American will see the year 2,088 roll around.

What a heritage is his.

He inherits a nation only two lifetimes old.

Within the span of two men, one of whom died only today, Washington's men whipped the troops of King George, Decatur said his famous words, Pickett charged at Gettysburg, the Maine was sunk, twice we conquered Germany, once Japan.

The dark has always been followed by the bright.

Just think how young we are: only two lifetimes between Patrick Henry's speech and the sprawling plants of today forming the hydrogen bomb. In two little lifetimes America has grown from 13 tiny colonies to 48 great States, with navies girding the globe. Though we lick our wounds today from the foolish Chinese, we know, and they will know, that like all oppressors of the past they will pay.

We're the youngest, most vital, most powerful Nation in the world. A lusty land where men are free—sprung in two lifetimes from some immortal words.

Gird yourself, young third American. Feel the youth that surges in your country's veins. As nations go, we've only begun to live. Old Russia, brazen with ancient cruelties, pretends to have been reborn in 1917—with all the oppressions of the Czars still in its character. The China of today is yet old, old China wearing a made-in-Moscow mask with all the old vices underneath. We alone are young in freedom, young in courage, girding now for another crucial test.

Put this down, remember it. Only 175 years and 6 months ago, when things looked darkest, the Thirteen Colonies rebelled, and defeated England.

Only 139 years ago, after the city of Washington was burned, we defeated England again.

Only 53 years ago the Maine was sunk. We defeated Spain.

Only 34 years ago German subs opened unrestricted warfare on United States shipping. We defeated Germany.

Only 10 years ago Japan sneak-bombed Pearl Harbor and Nazi Germany declared war on the United States. We defeated both of them.

Only 1 year ago Russia sicked the North Koreans on us, and we licked the tar out of the North Koreans.

Only 1 month ago Russia sicked satellite China on us—and we will beat the living hell out of both Russia and China before this shindig is through.

We're only two lifetimes old. We've just begun to fight.

Should there still be wars and rumors of wars when this third American reaches his allotted span in 2,038 * * * if, from his deathbed, the video screen shows interplanetary invaders approaching Earth, and dark is the picture, he may take comfort that this Nation still will be too young to die. There will be another squalling, fist-pounding infant to take his place in a Nation which even then will be only three lifetimes old.

A Nation which will have just begun to live.

Resolution of Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, assembled at the Hotel Redington, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on Sunday, December 17, 1950, and letter of transmittal from Attorney Alexander J. Laffey, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., chairman of the resolutions committee. The above-mentioned follow:

The Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, assembled at Hotel Redington, Sunday, December 17, 1950, hereby adopts and promulgates the following resolution:

Whereas on May 28, 29, and 30, 1944, a period when the United States of America was engaged with its Allies in resisting by armed force brutal, unprovoked aggression on Poland and other nations, by enemies of freedom, there assembled in the city of Buffalo many hundreds of leading American citizens of Polish descent. They met to organize into a cohesive, militant, and closely knit organization of national scope. They comprised delegates who were elected and sent to this conclave by hundreds of societies, fraternal organizations, lay and religious associations, clubs, and federations and purported to reflect the attitude and views of the 6,000,000 American citizens of Polish background resident in the United States. Their objective was to devise ways and means whereby they could best assist the United States in the grave emergency and, coincidentally, provide aid and comfort to America's first Ally, the Republic of Poland, in a struggle for its very existence as a free nation; and

Whereas the said assemblage adopted bylaws which provided, inter alia, the following salient objectives:

(a) To implement the American war effort in such measure as to assure an early and successful termination of the struggle.

(b) To fully support the United States Government in its defense program and insure a just peace in accord with the concepts of the Atlantic Charter.

(c) To coordinate the activities of its members in accordance with their obligations and responsibilities as citizens of a great, free Nation, through local branches of the organization in various sections of the country.

(d) To act as a liaison organization between representatives of the American and Polish peoples.

(e) To disseminate true and impartial information to the American people concerning the historical role which the Republic of Poland had played on the horizon of great and free nations.

(f) To promote a closer understanding and greater cooperation between the democracies of the United States and Poland in cultural, ideological, sociological, and economic activities; and

Whereas from the date of its inception, the Polish American Congress, through its officers and local divisions in various sections of the United States, did give great material and moral support to our Government, dedicated all of its resources to the task of winning the war, and insofar as it was practicable to do so, warned and advised our policy makers of the ulterior purposes which masked the activities of our ostensible ally, Soviet Russia, who had already sown the seeds of the third world war by enslaving Poland in the incipient stages of its present ruthless program of world conquest, and who was even then building up its war-making potential at our expense while planning our own destruction; and

Whereas shortly thereafter, representatives of our own Government participated in conferences with these international gangsters at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, where the liberties of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and other nations were bartered and sacrificed to them on the altar of appeasement; and

Whereas the betrayal of Poland, a nation of 35,000,000 brave and God-fearing people who had first courageously bared their breasts in defense of world freedom, shocked and outraged the hearts and minds of the membership of the Polish American Congress. They protested vigorously against this crime toward humanity and openly predicted that by this betrayal we had unwittingly planted the seeds of another great world holocaust; and

Whereas, in the supervening years, the warnings of the Polish American Congress that the world cannot survive half slave and

half free, have unfortunately proven to be well-founded. We now find ourselves unprepared militarily and economically and surrounded by the threatening, belligerent traitor, our alleged ally, Soviet Russia and its satellites who are spreading fear, death and destruction in the ranks of our own people and those of our friends within the framework of the United Nations; and

Whereas this Frankenstein monster has exposed its death dealing fangs and claws on the frontiers of many more free nations in Europe and Asia where American blood is being needlessly spilled and is threatening the safety and freedom of America itself in such an uncompromising manner as to prompt our President Harry S. Truman to declare a state of national emergency and order the mobilization of our manpower and resources in preparation to resist further aggression and defend liberty against the onslaught of these Communist gangsters wherever they might rear their heads.

Now, therefore, the Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, hereby resolves:

(a) That His Excellency Harry S. Truman, our President and Commander in Chief be, and he hereby is, commended for the uncompromising attitude which he had manifested against the aggressive tactics of Soviet Russia and its Red collaborators in Korea and other parts of the world.

(b) Approval is registered of the current policy of our Government in facing the present emergency without thought of further yielding to the demands of predatory tyrants by more appeasement. Such policy is consonant with the long history of American courage in times of danger.

(c) That the United States and United Nations take necessary steps to insure the eventual restoration of freedom to Poland and all other enslaved nations.

(d) That the members of the Polish American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania pledge their resources and all of the facilities at their individual and collective disposal to the Government of the United States in this period of national emergency.

(e) That its membership hereby pledges unswerving loyalty to the Government of the United States and offers its services wherever the same may be needed in defense of our flag and all that it represents and particularly in tracing, rooting out, and destroying every evidence of communism in our mills and on our farms, in our mines and factories, in our schools, and our Government, wherever it may be detected.

(f) That all Americans be adjured to remain faithful in this time of national danger to the traditions of our forefathers by pledging their lives and their fortunes in defense of the freedom of our country and that of other nations within the framework of the United Nations, because the liberty of all is dependent on the freedom of each individual nation.

(g) That the membership of our organization redouble its efforts to obtain assurances for as many more displaced persons as possible before expiration, next summer, of the enabling legislation making it possible for them to seek asylum in the United States.

(h) That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our President, His Excellency Harry S. Truman, at the White House, Gov. James H. Duff, Governor-elect John S. Fine, the Honorable Blair F. Gunther, our representatives in the United States Senate and House, Charles Rozmarek, our national president, and distributed to the press.

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *December 19, 1950.*

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DANIEL: The Polish-American Congress of northeastern Pennsylvania, a local unit of the national organization, whose headquarters are in Washington, D. C., held its annual meeting at Hotel Redington, this city, on Sunday, December 17, last. Approximately 150 delegates were in attendance. They represented various organizations, parishes, societies, and clubs within the environs of the northeastern part of this State. The local unit is a part of the national organization which purports to reflect the views of the 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent resident in the United States.

The assemblage adopted a resolution commending our Government for the uncompromising attitude manifested by it against the aggressive tactics of Soviet Russia and its Red collaborators in Korea and other parts of the world. In its resolution, this organization also pledges the lives and fortunes of its membership in defense of the freedom of our country and that of other nations, within the framework of the United Nations. It also points out that the world cannot exist half slave and half free, and that no permanent peace can be achieved in the world, unless the 35,000,000 people of the Polish nation that are held in subjection behind the iron curtain of Russian communism are liberated.

Congratulating you upon your recent magnificent victory in the election which returned you to your office as Congressman of our district, and praying God to guide your activities in Congress toward enacting legislation that will be beneficial to our own Nation and to free people throughout the world, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER J. LAFFEY,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

Government by Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am so impressed with the vigorous fight which William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, has been making to arouse the American people to the realization that government by treaty is a serious menace to America at this time, that I have decided to do something about it.

At the proper time, at a not too far distan date, I shall introduce in the Congress a proposed constitutional amendment which will forbid the invasion of domestic law by treaty unless specifically authorized by Congress: forbid the Congress to make treaties effective by laws not otherwise authorized by the Constitution, and forbid any fundamental change in our form of government, as now constituted, by the device of treaty ratification.

The text of the proposed amendment advocated by Mr. Fitzpatrick in the New Orleans States is now under preparation and discussion by some of the outstanding legal authorities on the subject. It has been the subject of study over a period of time by a special committee of the American Bar Association. It has been a subject to which Mr. Fitzpatrick has devoted many months of study and research and to whom should go the major credit for bringing the problem to the attention of the American people.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's crusade, and it has been a crusade, to awaken the American people to the dangers of government by treaty has been one of the finest contributions in many years to an old and honored profession. He deserves the support and the commendation by action, not only conversation, of every American who cherishes and believes in constitutional government. In this fight, I consider it a privilege to stand by his side and to be the instrument through which his high purpose shall be brought forcibly to the attention of the Congress and to the American people.

This is an opportune time to bring the matter into the open for complete ventilation. It is timely because at the moment there is serious disagreement among public officials on the highest level as to the powers of the Executive to commit the American Nation without specific action of the Congress or the power of the Senate, through treaty, to circumvent the Constitution, and destroy the very guaranties which are the essence of the United States Constitution and constitutional government.

From time to time I have placed before you editorials from the pen of Mr. Fitzpatrick on this general subject. Today I offer his latest and most poignant series which suggest a most affirmative approach to a solution of the problem. I, for one, wholeheartedly accept this affirmative suggestion.

Please note that while opposition to these proposed treaties, such as the Genocide Convention and the Covenant on Human Rights, is the main theme of these editorials because of the dangerous manner of their drafting, Mr. Fitzpatrick's approach is definitely not negative. His suggestion that the Constitution can be amended to allow us to enter into international compacts and still maintain our traditional rights and privileges is sound and a postive approach to international understanding.

Of particular and special interest to the Members of this body is the sixth editorial of this series which I submit to you.

In this editorial you will note that Mr. Fitzpatrick, under the title of "Government by Treaty: Are Americans Ready for It," observes:

> Under this concept the House of Representatives will have no voice in adoption of any domestic legislation contained in a self-executing valid treaty.

This means that as far as it is concerned, any treaty which has teeth in it—self-executing—as these have, and any treaty upheld by the Supreme Court—valid—the House might as well stay home.

I recognize that the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution is a long, hard, up-hill fight, but that principle for which we shall fight is well worth the battle.

I shall again come before the House when I introduce this proposed legislation to elaborate and discuss more in de-

tail that which I have briefly touched on at the moment. In the interim I suggest that you read these editorials carefully and weigh their impact in order that each of you will be familiar with the subject when I again bring it to your attention.

Following are Mr. Fitzpatrick's editorials:

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: IT THREATENS BASIC AMERICAN LIBERTIES

In March 1949 this newspaper in a series of seven editorials pointed to the dangers in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in December 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The United States delegation voted for this declaration. It was said by its proponents to be merely a statement of aspirations and ideals. It was not intended to have any legal effect in the United States.

It was to serve as a blueprint for a Covenant on Human Rights which would be legally binding upon any country which adopted it. The Declaration was likened to our Declaration of Independence and the Covenant to our United States Constitution.

The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations drew up, during March, April and May of 1950, a Covenant which is near completion and which the Senate may be asked, in the next 12 months, to ratify as a treaty.

The New Orleans States begins today a series of editorials on this Covenant.

If the Senate ratifies it as a treaty, this Covenant will become the law of the land, and will supersede all State laws and constitutions where they conflict and will stand equal with the United States Constitution and laws of the Federal Government.

Students of constitutional and international law point out that the effect of the Covenant may be even more far-reaching than that. It may be held to nullify articles of the Bill of Rights.

There is much in the various articles of the Covenant which can be criticized. This series of editorials will discuss four articles only.

For these four articles—articles 2, 13, 14, and 15—strike at the very heart of the freedoms contained in the Bill of Rights while professing to guarantee wider freedoms for all the world.

These four articles endanger some of our most precious heritages:

Freedom of worship.

Freedom of speech.

Freedom of the press.

Freedom of peaceful assembly.

Each of these liberties has its inception in the first amendment to the United States Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

There are no exceptions to these rights in the United States Constitution. But the Covenant on Human Rights contains so many restrictions, executions, and limitations that these rights are transmuted from the bright coinage of liberty to the fool's gold of dictatorial statism.

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: WE CAN LOSE OUR RIGHTS THROUGH TREATY

The first amendment planted the seeds of freedom of worship, freedom of speech and the press, and freedom of peaceful assembly into the United States Constitution. But it took a long line of judicial decisions to firmly root them in constitutional law.

The courts early recognized some limitations on free speech; as an example, Mr. Justice Holmes put it this way:

"The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting 'fire' in a theater and causing a panic."

And, of course, there are laws of libel and slander to make certain that liberty of language is not license.

But as Mr. Justice Holmes also said of free speech:

"The question in each case is whether the words are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has the right to prevent."

Holmes was the father of the "clear and present danger" doctrine—a philosophy of the widest possible latitude in the interests of liberty. This doctrine has since his time guided our courts in decisions bearing upon free speech and a free press.

All of this is endangered if we ratify as a treaty this covenant on human rights. For if ratified by the Senate, it will become the law of the land, and may be held even to override the Constitution by the courts.

An American Bar Association committee, which had this covenant under study since its inception points out:

"Free speech and a free press are not in express terms guaranteed by our Constitution. It is only provided that Congress and the States may not pass laws impairing these rights; there is no similar express restriction on the Senate and the President in making, ratifying, and approving treaties."

The United States Supreme Court already has held:

That the treaty-making power extends to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations; and

That the treaty-making power is not subject to limitations imposed by the Constitution on the power of Congress to enact legislation.

If the Senate ratifies the covenant on human rights and the Supreme Court upholds it under the established principles outlined above, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of peaceful assembly may be destroyed by our own Government at any time by an official proclamation of a state of emergency. The covenant contains that power.

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: THE THREAT TO FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

The first amendment to the United States Constitution—article I of the Bill of Rights—reads in part:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof: * * *"

Those words are the cornerstone of freedom of worship in the United States; under their protection Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Christian Scientist, Hindu, and Moslem have been secure in their right and desire to worship their God as they chose. Agnostic and atheist have been equally secure in their right to question or to disbelieve.

Those words are unequivocal, given to no other judicial interpretation through the years than these:

The Congress can establish no state religion; and

The Congress is prohibited from interfering with religious worships or beliefs.

After the United States Constitution had been ratified by the States, fear of a strong centralized government arose. The Bill of Rights was written to allay these fears. But the prohibition against Government interference in religious worship did not lead the list of freedoms in the Bill of Rights by accident.

Freedom of worship was deep-rooted in the history and mores of the people, for those who believed in freedom of worship had helped found the country. It was a desire for religious freedom that brought the Pilgrims to Plymouth Rock, William Penn's Quakers to Pennsylvania, and Lord Baltimore's Catholics to Maryland more than a century before George Mason wrote the Bill of Rights.

This freedom of worship which Americans have recognized as the right of each individual is endangered by the Draft Covenant of Human Rights.

Paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Covenant on Human Rights reads:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

What effect will this have if this covenant is ratified by the Senate as a treaty? A treaty accepted by two-thirds of the Senators present becomes the law of the land. If the Supreme Court validates this treaty, it can nullify the religious freedom in the Bill of Rights.

The Committee for Peace and Law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association said in a report last September 20 the effects also would be these:

"We are confronted with a concept of the freedom of religion embracing the free use of limitations reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. The purported agreement of church and state in Hungary is an example of religion under state regulation and control for public safety and order.

"The people of the United States are asked to approve those restrictions for others on the assurance that perhaps they will not apply in the United States. The persecuted brethren of any religious group in any country dominated by the Soviet shall be assured that such persecutions are legal and proper under a covenant on human rights because the public safety and order of their state demand such protective action. Is this the message we shall send to persecuted worshippers in other lands?

"Today, when an atheistic ideology of great power and proportions confronts the religious groups of the world, an organ of the United Nations presents the doctrine of state regulation of religion, a codification of the right of regulation, and complete destruction of the freedom of religion if laws based on alleged public safety and order of the state shall so provide."

For this danger to religion, among other reasons, the American Bar Association at its September meeting condemned the covenant in the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association is of the opinion that the Draft International Covenant on Human Rights as prepared at the March-May 1950 session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights is not in such form nor of such content as to be suitable for approval and adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations, or for ratification by the United States of America."

THE COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS: THREAT TO A FREE PRESS AND FREE SPEECH

Article 14 of the Covenant on Human Rights sets forth rights and privileges of speech and the press, and then limits them to a degree heretofore unheard of in free countries.

Similar restrictions are placed upon the right of peaceful assembly in article 15.

Article 14 reads:

"1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.

"2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing, or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

"3. The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health, or morals, or of the rights, freedoms, or reputations of others."

Article 15 reads:

"The right to peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary to insure national security, public order, the protection of health or morals, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

And as if these limitations and restrictions on these vital rights were not enough, article 2 of the covenant gives signatory nations the privilege of canceling articles 14 and 15 among others "in the case of a state of emergency officially proclaimed by the authorities."

An American Bar Association committee named to study this proposed treaty asks of it:

"Is this not prostituting these fundamental rights to the readily invented emergency declarations of the all-powerful state?"

And says:

"The government could, for example, close down newspapers just as in other emergencies the President has closed down banks."

The Government could also close down universities and radio stations, seize and burn books and pamphlets, and disperse any assembly of citizens gathered together to question such steps.

Are these the "rights" a free people will welcome for themselves?

Government by Treaty: A Danger to Our Bill of Rights

Are opponents of these treaties alarmists, as is claimed by those pressing the Senate to ratify them, or are they presenting valid arguments?

Those opposed to the Covenant on Human Rights include the American Bar Association, the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism fraternity.

Opponents also include jurists, both Federal and State; a growing number of newspapers, university presidents and law school deans and Members of the United States Senate.

These organizations and people, along with this newspaper which as long ago as March 1949 pointed to the dangers in the Declaration of Human Rights, believe the Covenant on Human Rights unacceptable to the American form of government as we know it.

But is there any judicial basis for their fears?

What has been the attitude of the United States Supreme Court in the matter of treaties?

Let's look at the record.

The Supreme Court has never expressly declared any treaty ratified by the Senate invalid.

The Supreme Court has upheld a law enacted to place teeth in a treaty after it had declared the same law unconstitutional before the treaty was ratified.

This instance of the Supreme Court ruling that the treaty-making power could be used successfully where the Constitution forbade the Congress to act is pointed to by Frank E. Holman of Seattle, a former president of the American Bar Association, in an article in the September issue of the ABA Journal, entitled: "Treaty Law-Making: A Blank Check for Writing a New Constitution."

Here's how it came about: In 1913, Congress enacted a Federal Migratory Bird Act. After its approval by the President, its constitutionality was questioned on the grounds that it invaded the reserved powers of the States, and the statute was declared unconstitutional in 1914 by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Shauver*. The Court held:

"That the National Constitution is an enabling instrument, and therefore Congress possesses only such powers as are expressly or by necessary implications granted by that instrument, is not questioned. Unless, therefore, there is some provision in the National Constitution granting to Congress either expressly or by necessary implication the power to legislate on this subject, the act cannot be sustained."

Supporters of the regulations governing the taking of migratory birds then sought the treaty route. The President concluded a treaty with Great Britain and the Senate ratified it.

A second Migratory Bird Act was then enacted. It was practically identical with the first, and it was attacked as unconstitutional also.

This time the Supreme Court, in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, upheld the law as valid since it was implementation of a valid treaty.

"This decision," Mr. Holman writes, "in effect, and really for the first time, opened the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate."

This is nothing more nor less than government by treaty.

We can lose such rights as freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of peaceful assembly if our Senate ratifies as a treaty the covenant on human rights.

Government by Treaty: Are Americans Ready for It?

The people of this country are the inheritors of liberties gained at great cost through the centuries.

These liberties—such as religious freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of peaceful assembly—are endangered by such proposed treaties as the Genocide Convention, already submitted by the President to the Senate for ratification, and the Covenant on Human Rights, which is near completion in the United Nations.

These treaties invade the precincts of domestic law.

These treaties reduce the powers of the States while strengthening the powers of a centralized government.

These treaties strengthen the powers of the executive branch of the Government, thus weakening the historic balance of the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

These treaties, if ratified by the Senate and upheld by the Supreme Court, can destroy utterly our Bill of Rights, and our form of government.

Mr. Frank M. Ober of Baltimore, 1949–50 president of the Maryland Bar Association, writes in the September issue of the ABA Journal:

"This argument (that the treaty-making power is almost, if not entirely, without any constitutional limit) has received strong support from the implications of a recent decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright*, where it is said 'the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution;' but are 'necessary concomitants of nationality.' If it be true that the treaty-making power is not derived from the Constitution, then it logically is not limited by its other express provisions or any other restrictions implied from that document. Hence, on that hypothesis, there would seem to be nothing that would logically prevent, for example, denying freedom of religion or of the press by treaty, or the cession of some of our States to a foreign government—"

Mr. Ober declares it seems doubtful that the Supreme Court "would press the Curtiss-Wright doctrine that far," but points out these dangers:

1. Supreme Court rulings on implied limitations on the treaty-making power "are vague at best," and "the Supreme Court has never expressly declared a treaty invalid, and has cast doubt on its own power to do so in the Curtiss-Wright case;" and

"2. There is some indication that the Supreme Court might decline to take jurisdiction to declare treaties invalid on the ground that they involve political questions, thus leaving treaties subject to the unrestricted power of the President and Senate."

This is government by treaty.

Under this concept the House of Representatives will have no voice in adoption of any domestic legislation contained in a self-executing valid treaty. It means a change in our form of government, for the House of Representatives was fashioned to make its Members more directly answerable to the people by election every 2 years.

Government by treaty means, in the ultimate, destruction of the Bill of Rights.

Are Americans ready for that?

Government by Treaty: What We Can Do About It

This newspaper is opposed to government by treaty. This newspaper is opposed to ratification of the Genocide Convention and the Covenant on Human Rights, because it believes them to be dangerous to our liberties and freedoms.

Members of the American Bar Association's committee on peace and law through the United Nations ask:

"Can we sacrifice fundamental principles of freedom on the altar of necessity for a compromise?

"For which standard of free speech and a free press will we be fighting under the banner of the United Nations—the standard of the covenant or the standard of the Constitution of the United States?"

Proponents of these treaties say that we must ratify theme to assume the leadership expected of this Nation in the conflict of ideologies and the battle for men's minds.

But is it leadership to endanger the rights of our citizens to meet upon the common ground of agreement with other countries whose nationals do not possess nor understand nor, in some cases, desire the rights we as Americans hold dear?

If the Government's policy is to set an example, then we recommend the example set by the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and Canada in refusing to approve the proposed treaty on public information because it included the same sort of general restrictions of public safety and public security that the covenant includes.

But if the policy of our Government is to agree to these lower standards on the premise that forsaking our own historic ideals is necessary in the interest of world peace and understanding, then there is a way to implement that policy of compromise and still maintain our own traditional rights and freedoms.

This can be done by amending the Constitution to—

Forbid the invasion of domestic law by treaty unless specifically authorized by act of Congress;

Forbid the Congress to make treaties effective by laws not otherwise authorized by the Constitution; and

Forbid any fundamental change in our form of government as now constituted by the device of treaty ratification.

The American Bar Association has authorized a committee to study this suggestion of amending the Constitution to protect our Bill of Rights. But until these three steps—or some equally acceptable safeguards—are adopted to prevent destruction of the United States Constitution through government by treaty, the Senate should reject summarily any and all treaties which are judged to contain unacceptable restrictions on and derogations of our rights as free Americans.

American Trade Council for Histadrut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, at a testimonial dinner in his honor given by the American Trade Union Council for Histadrut on Thursday, January 11, 1951, at the Hotel Waldorf Astoria, New York City.

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

I am deeply honored and sincerely delighted to be here with you tonight and to respond, in the name of the American Federation of Labor, to the generous tribute embodied in this occasion.

I cannot help but feel, however, that this meeting has a deeper significance in symbolizing the unity of purpose and spirit that binds the trade-union movement of Israel with that of the United States.

Since the days of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 the American Federation of Labor has been active on the side of those who have struggled and sacrificed to bring the great dream of a Jewish national home in Palestine to reality. Both before and after the creation of the State of Israel the American labor movement has given all the material and moral support it could muster to this historic cause.

The American Federation of Labor could, in good conscience, do no less. Since the year of its foundation by an immigrant Jew, Samuel Gompers, the pioneering tradition and the moral and cultural ideals of the Jewish people have left an indelible mark upon our great organization. Jewish workers and leaders have presided at its birth, contributed to its education, pioneered in its development, and sustained and advanced it in its maturity. This is a debt which the American Federation of Labor can never fully repay—it can only hope to recognize it adequately.

The aims and ideals of the American Federation of Labor are identical with those which inspired the many brave men who gave their strength, energy, and even their lives that Israel may live as more than a dream. Together we stand for brotherhood, for liberty, for equal justice and opportunity, and for the sacred right of freemen to determine the course of their own destinies. These are the principles which raise mankind above the level of the beasts of the field.

These principles have been advanced to new heights by the creation of the State of Israel, by the influence of Histadrut as a force in its national life, and by the unity of action and purpose that exists between the labor movements of Israel and America. The American Trade Union Council of the National Committee for Labor Israel is one of the strongest of links in that chain of unity.

The American Federation of Labor is proud of its close fraternal ties with Histadrut. Histadrut has triumphed over the most formidable obstacles that any labor movement has even faced. It has brought order out of potential chaos, without compromising its democratic principles. It has inspired the free world by demonstrating in a vivid and practical way that security, welfare, and social and economic progress can best be achieved in an environment of freedom and democracy. We have gloried in its victories as though they were our victories; we have watched its progress as though it were our own.

And, in a very real sense, the progress of the workers and citizens of Israel is a measure of our own progress—just as the progress of any group of pioneers is a measure of the progress of the whole of human society.

It is a bitter commentary on the state of the civilized world today that there should be such a vast number of oppressed and dispossessed, from so many different nations, who should be compelled to wander so far to find a safe and congenial haven. It stands as the brightest episode in a dark era that the State of Israel, a small community of 650,000 people newly arrived at independence, offered such a haven to more than half a million persons in less than 3 years. The burden of settling these newcomers, providing them with housing, food, clothing, and work devolved upon Histadrut.

Histadrut has been the mainstay of the entire society of Israel. As a democratic institution of workers, it has been intimately concerned with the social and cultural life of the country as well as the economic welfare of workers.

In its relatively short span of existence, it has given workers an 8-hour day, employment through its own labor exchanges, seniority, family allowances, sick leave and vacations with pay, social insurance, and many other tangible benefits. It has developed its own system of schools to improve the level of educational facilities. With the great influx of immigrants, it has assumed the task of training new workers in the skills required for the expansion of the national economy.

In a country where capital is at a premium, Histadrut has established cooperative industries to help maintain a high rate of employment and production. Over half the hospitals and health centers of Israel were built and financed by Histadrut. Its housing cooperatives have taken over the job of providing low-cost housing, and have built more than half of the new housing. This in itself is a tremendous task considering the magnitude of the immigration.

These are all inspiring accomplishments. But the most inspiring aspect of this magnificent record lies in the fact that all of this was done without yielding to temptations, which surely must have arisen, to abandon the principles of liberty, democracy, and equality and to resort to authoritarian methods. Even in the face of crisis and danger, Histadrut adhered to the democratic principles upon which it was founded.

Its leaders were as scrupulous as regards the means they used as they were enlightened as regards the ends they sought. They adjured the insidious principle that the ends justify the means. The Jewish people have learned only too well, under the iron heel of totalitarian regimes of the past and present, that ends are inextricably bound up with means, and cannot escape their consequence.

No other group has suffered more bitter, first-hand experience of "man's inhumanity to man," in its most brutal and sadistic form, than have the Jewish people, throughout their history. No group has more nearly justifiable grounds for vengeful emotions or retaliatory acts, when the tables are turned, than have the Jewish people. Yet no group has given a more soul-stirring demonstration of the principles of the brotherhood of all mankind, of magnanimity toward vanquished adversaries, than they have. Of the new Israel it can truly be said, in the terms of Paul, that there now abides "faith, hope and charity—and the greatest of these is charity.' This, rather than area, population, or wealth, is the true measure of the greatness of a nation and of a people. If only the rest of the world would take note and guidance from this example!

Not only are Jews from every point of national origin or cultural and economic background accepted as equals in Israel, but likewise are the Arabs, with whom there had been incessant conflict when they were the predominant group. The first Arabs to participate in a truly democratic election did so in Israel—both men and women. The first compulsory education program for Arabs was in Israel. One of the greatest Arabic libraries in the world is being catalogued by both Jew and Arab in Jaffa. Palestine organized the Palestine Labor League. By working together, wage differentials between the Arab and Jewish skilled workers have almost disappeared, and the Arab unskilled worker's salary has increased from 120 to 150 percent in the last 4 years.

The opportunity of immediate benefit for the entire world lies in the triumph of Israel, its example, and its steady progress. The fact that the Jews have won their age-long struggle to establish a national homeland, and the example of the supremacy of tolerance, justice, and democracy there, should serve to counteract and reduce the intolerance, prejudice, and race hatred from which Jews living in other nations have suffered for many centuries.

It is the task of those, like ourselves, who believe in the rights of minorities, to fight for the defense of those rights everywhere, not only abroad but right here in our own country. Prejudice, intolerance, and discrimination are errors of human thought which even our own constitutional guarantees have been unable to eradicate. Just as American labor has helped in the establishment of Israel, the inspiring record of Israel will be of great aid to American labor in combatting intolerance and discrimination in this country.

All Americans should take pride in the fact that the President of the United States accorded immediate recognition of the State of Israel, thereby serving notice to the rest of the world that America stood squarely on the side of international morality and decency.

Now the rest of the world, in extending recognition to Israel, has come around to the acceptance of an accomplished fact—the creation of a free nation that by force of justice, as well as of arms, has demonstrated its ability, its fitness, and its right to take its place in the family of nations.

There are many striking parallels between the birth and growth of Israel and that of the United States. The cause of Israel, like the cause of America, is for us more than a mere humanitarian one. It is really the

same cause as that which inspired the founders of American democracy—the cause of freedom, justice, and opportunity for the common man.

It is my fervent hope that the people of Israel can establish in Palestine an America of the Middle East that they can carve out of the desert a progressive, prosperous nation whose high principles and honest practices will serve as an inspiration to all the millions of oppressed, downtrodden, and subjugated peoples of the world.

We are now engaged in a great struggle against the Red beast of tyranny. The outcome of that struggle will determine the future of the free trade-union movement and of all free peoples throughout the world. The Jewish people know from the lessons of their past what the curtailment of liberty means in concrete terms. They know that liberty is not just a word or a high-flown concept, but a living, breathing thing, essential to a moral society. No one needs demonstate to them that the world cannot continue to exist "half slave and half free."

Our mutual interest demands the unity of all free labor and of all free men. We must work together toward a united free world, where the dignity of labor and the dignity of man reign supreme.

We must all do our part to make sure that Israel remains as a shining beacon to show the people of the Middle East, of Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa the way and the workings of a truly democratic society, and as a bastion of freedom in that vital part of the world.

Milwaukee Leads Great Lakes in Preparation for St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to explain how the city of Milwaukee has done a remarkable job in preparing its port for handling of heavy cargo after the St. Lawrence waterway is completed. The municipal port director of the city of Milwaukee, Mr. H. C. Brockel, has planned the port of Milwaukee with a keen foresight of the future use of this great port. The city of Milwaukee is to be commended for the fine work it has done in carrying out these plans.

I include herein an article written by Mr. H. C. Brockel which appeared in the November 1950 issue of the Nautical Gazette. This article shows how Milwaukee leads the Great Lakes in preparation for the St. Lawrence waterway:

MILWAUKEE'S BID FOR HEAVY CARGO

(By H. C. Brockel)

As a part of its considerable program of improvement, the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners has recently placed in service the largest heavy-lift gantry crane on the entire Great Lakes. Milwaukee has thus realised its objective to provide unexcelled handling facilities, and continues to set the pace for the Great Lakes area in the field of harbor facilities.

Milwaukee has already won wide recognition for its aggressive program of municipal port development, and ranks as the first ocean port of the Great Lakes in terms of number of ocean sailings. From 80 to 90 ocean vessels will have taken on or discharged cargo at the port of Milwaukee during 1950.

For several years past export industries in Milwaukee and throughout Wisconsin and the territory west of Lake Michigan have been utilising the port of Milwaukee to an increasing degree as an export gateway to Western and Northern Europe as well as to Canada and the Caribbean area. Milwaukee, often described as the "machine shop of America," is a major producer of heavy-type machinery, including cranes, shovels, excavators, turbines, generators, crushers, bottle washers, and other major industrial equipment.

Much of this machinery, even when knocked down for export shipment, involves lifts of single pieces ranging from 20 tons to 50 tons or more in weight. The Milwaukee municipal dock facilities, formerly equipped with 25-ton- and 30-ton-capacity cranes, were already outstanding on the Great Lakes, but excellent as these facilities are, it was found on occasion to be impossible to handle some of the heavy export pieces originating in the territory.

To correct this situation and to provide for the Milwaukee export gateway handling facilities equal to those of most seaports and excelling any other Great Lakes port, the Milwaukee Port Authority has placed in service its new heavy-lift gantry crane, which gives Milwaukee a facility unique among inland ports.

The city of Milwaukee contracted with the Clyde Iron Works, of Duluth, Minn., in July 1949, for the new heavy-lift crane, after receiving competitive bids from recognized manufacturers. Bids were taken on the basis of a complete specification prepared by the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners.

Prior to erecting the crane, it was necessary to reinforce the dock structure to carry the tremendous weight of the new crane, at a cost of approximately $25,000. The cost of the new crane, delivered and installed at the municipal open dock in Milwaukee, was approximately $100,000, and with incidental equipment and the dock-reinforcement work, the total investment in the new crane is about $130,000. The crane has a lifting capacity of 70 tons at a 40-foot radius, and a capacity of 15 tons at its full radius of 110 feet. According to the manufacturer, an overload of 50 percent or more will be required to tip the crane, which indicates that the new equipment could, on occasion, safely handle lifts of well over 75 tons within a good working radius for shiploading purposes. The followings is the radius-capacity table for the new Whirley:

Load radius and capacity

	Tons
40 feet	70
50 feet	51
60 feet	39
70 feet	31
80 feet	26½
90 feet	22½
100 feet	20
110 feet	15

The crane is equipped with a 100-foot boom and a 10-foot jib, giving it an extensive working radius. It will be used principally for loading and unloading cargo to and from vessels, for loading and unloading railroad cars, and for handling material in and out of open storage. Its long boom length assures adequaqte coverage of a considerable dock area and good penetration into storage areas.

The boom hoist line is a 13-part line. The single line pull on the main hoist is 18,000 pounds at a hoisting speed of 225 feet per minute.

The crane has four four-wheel driver trucks and has a ground travel speed of 90 feet per minute.

The crane erected weighs approximately 334,000 pounds and required more than 50 tons of counterweight. Its total weight installed is about 220 net tons. This large load, concentrated in a relatively small area under the wheel trucks, necessitated, as already noted, structural reinforcement of the dock area in which the crane operates.

The crane embodies the most modern features with complete one-man control; a so-called inching control for lowering heavy loads, and electrically-operated braker. Other interesting features include an extended operator's cab which gives the operator full visibility throughtout the entire work area, and a crane gage which indicates to the operator exactly what load is being lifted and when he is approaching his maximum capacity at any radius for any load.

The Milwaukee crane is unique from another standpoint, in that its track gage is only 20 feet between rail centers. Most heavy-lift cranes of this character operate on gages of 32 feet or more, but physical limitations of the dock structure necessitated a compact design on an unusually narrow track gage. The manufacturer successfully worked out his design to accomplish this objective. The gantry structure has a vertical portal clearance of 22 feet, permitting railroad locomotives to pass under the crane. The operator's cab is about 30 feet above ground level.

The crane is powered by electrical motors, 440-volt, 3-phase, 60-cycle. The hoist motor, travel motors, and slewing motor are independent of one another, with separate controls. Motors are General Electric and electrical controls are by Cutler-Hammer.

Official tests were run on the new crane after installation had been completed early in the summer. The crane equaled or exceeded all specification requirements with regard to travel speed, swing speed, hoisting speed, and capacity. Capacity loads were lifted at various radii and then lowered electrically through dynamic braking, and mechanically through use of foot brakes, to test brake adequacy and speed control. The results of these tests were entirely adequate.

After testing, the crane was officially accepted by the board of harbor commissioners, and has been utilized to load a number of heavy-lift cargoes during the current shipping season. A considerable volume of cargo involving lifts from 30 to 75 tons has been booked, to be handled during the latter part of the 1950 shipping season. Several thousand tons of cargo in the extreme heavy-lift category have already been scheduled to move via Milwaukee, thus assuring the new crane of a good degree of utilization during its first season of operation.

Milwaukee is the only port on Lake Michigan with heavy-lift handling equipment except for the Manitowoc shipyards, which have, occasionally, as an accommodation, made heavy lifts of export material originating west of Lake Michigan. Much heavy machinery from Chicago and other points in Illinois regularly moves to Milwaukee for export loading in the absence of any heavy-lift equipment at the port of Chicago. The Milwaukee port authority is confident that the new crane will serve as a magnet to attract heavy-lift export business from the States of Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

In addition to its important function of serving the export trade, the crane will be used actively for routine dock operations, loading and unloading lake vessels, handling pleasure craft in and out of storage, and for other local harbor work. It will, for example, permit installations of new engines in tugs and other types of vessels by topside loading, thus eliminating need for placing such vessels in shipyard.

The port of Milwaukee has gained considerable stature from the new installation, and Milwaukee port authorities are confident

that it will prove a wise investment not only in terms of prestige but in terms of new port activity. The crane has already proven a powerful economic factor in the Wisconsin area by aiding Wisconsin industries to bid successfully on highly competitive export business, with the assurance that heavy-lift items can be expeditiously handled to ocean vessels at a nearby port, thus eliminating costly rail hauls to shipping points on the seaboard. Several major orders have already been assured Wisconsin industries in highly competitive areas as a result of the combination of heavy-lift facilities, and frequent ocean sailings available via the port of Milwaukee.

In addition to its unique new crane equipment, the port of Milwaukee is in the midst of a port expansion program which will have involved almost a million dollars of expenditure by the end of this year.

Under construction is a new lake-front pier of special design, over 1,000 feet in length, which will be for the accommodation of tanker vessels. The new pier, which is of "open bent" design, will have as its sole function the carrying of pipelines from petroleum vessels to nearby marine storage terminals. Four lines of tankers are already committed to use the new pier, including Shell Oil Co., Cities Service Oil Co., the Texas Co., and Phillips Petroleum Co. The initial movement of petroleum through the new facility is expected to be at least 500,000 tons annually. The new tanker pier will cost $400,000. One hundred and eight thousand cubic yards of material were dredged from the Milwaukee outer harbor to provide two slips which will give deep water access to both sides of the new facility.

Another outstanding Milwaukee port project is a $200,000 program for the improvement of Maitland Airstrip, Milwaukee's unique lake front landing strip. The facility will be provided with a modern administration building, improved highway access, drainage system and new access road. The program, when complete, will place on Milwaukee's lake front an "air park" which will blend into the lake front park system.

Other projects in full swing include a new dock office building to serve the municipal harbor terminal, which will cost $60,000; a mile and a half of water mains for outer harbor fire protection, $100,000; industrial lease improvements, such as sewer, water and railroad facilities, to serve industrial developments on the Milwaukee outer harbor, $100,000.

The continued industrial utilization of the Milwaukee outer harbor is evidenced by the fact that the Texas Co. is completing its new marine terminal on the Milwaukee lake front, and the Phillips Petroleum Co. has negotiated a 20-year lease with the Milwaukee port authority for a 10-acre site for a new marine terminal.

The Moral Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 15, 1951:

THE MORAL ISSUE

On December 1, 1950, President Truman sent a message to Congress describing the crisis produced by Communist China's intervention in Korea. In this message he said: "The moral issue now is the same as it was in June. The aggression of the Chinese Communists is a direct assault upon the United Nations, and upon the principles of international law and order which are its foundation. By their action the Chinese Communist leaders have proved themselves lawbreakers in the community of nations."

Can these words be reconciled with the American acceptance of the five-point cease-fire proposal which the Assembly's Political Committee has sent ot Peiping? On the principle that no cease fire can be bad they can be reconciled. But the details of this action, fully considered, include much that must be a cause of regret and apprehension to all friends of the United Nations—that is, to all friends of peace, security and freedom.

The five-point proposal contains not a single syllable remotely suggesting any wrongdoing on the part of Red China. It contains not one word indicating that we or our friends are even mildly displeased with the government whose troops are at this moment trying to annihilate United Nations soldiers in Korea. The military defeat, the lost battle, could not be prevented. The courage of the wounded and the dead, the valiant efforts of the living have not been enough. But we do not have to accept a moral defeat. We do not have to submit—we cannot safely submit—to what General Romulo, in his impassioned speech on Saturday, described as "intimidation and blackmail."

At this moment the important point for us in the five-point proposal is point one, which calls for a cease fire. This means, if it means anything, that there can be no peace talks with Communist China until a cease fire is in operation—that is, until Communist China has ceased her aggression in Korea, or has at least desisted in her attempts to extend the area of aggression.

But what General Romulo was thinking of was point five, in which we would agree to sit with Britain, Russia, and Communist China on a committee to discuss Far Eastern problems, including, among others, those of Formosa and of representation of China in the United Nations. When President Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet into the Straits of Formosa on June 27, 1950, he laid down the stipulation that the determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan or consideration by the United Nations. Thus, on the record, we can consistently take up this question. But it ought to be clearly understood that we will not accept as good and righteous the forcible reconquest of the island by the Peiping regime, and that we will not vote for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations until she has given convincing evidence that she had abandoned her policies of direct and indirect aggression, in Korea and elsewhere. And for such evidence we may have to wait a long time.

We want no war, limited or otherwise, with China. Every humane instinct cries out against such a war, every sentiment of prudence demands that it be avoided. But let us have a care that we do not apply to great and powerful nations a different moral yardstick from the one we use in judging small and weak nations. We cannot prevent all wrongdoing in this unhappy world, but we need not condone it, we need not call it peace. Let us do all we can to bring about a real and lasting peace. Let us meanwhile avoid commitments we cannot fulfill. But let us not sell our souls. Let us not stand silent at Lake Success if Communist China presumes to attempt to dictate a conqueror's peace to a beaten United Nations.

The Indiana Plan for the Maintenance of National Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the Indiana plan for the maintenance of national manpower, as approved by the Indiana Conference of Higher Education. This proposal, drawn up by 30 colleges and universities in Indiana, is a careful study of the present manpower situation in this country; it offers suggestions for meeting the problems of the future, when the military will apparently make greater and greater demands on the Nation's manpower.

The suggestions offered in the Indiana plan will be, I believe, of great value to everyone studying alternate proposals on this vital issue. Here follows the Indiana plan:

THE INDIANA PLAN FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF NATIONAL MANPOWER

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

1. The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the present crisis in world affairs and is sensitively aware of the fact that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations.

2. Charged with the responsibility of leadership in American thought and life we must constantly point to the clear and present danger of the short view which would seriously impair our tradition of freedom under God. We must proceed on the commonly accepted assumption that our present situation must be viewed as a long term phase of our national preparation for any eventuality. Though victorious in our conflict with an alien and vicious ideology we could lose so many cultural and spiritual values that our victory would be empty.

3. It is our profound conviction that in any plan of national mobilization we must maintain the values for which American colleges and universities have stood throughout their history as an expression of the heritage of our people. This means that definite and intelligent provisions must be made, even in time of national emergency, for the uninterrupted training of the leaders of tomorrow. The American college and university must make a continuous contribution to the national welfare in terms of supplying manpower needs in every field of learning during this crisis and beyond it. Thus it is in the national interest that every man pursue his formal education for as long a period as he is willing and able and so long as he can be spared from military service.

STATEMENT OF PLAN

Upon the basis of these principles we affirm our conviction that those sections of the present Selective Service law which provides for registration at age 18 with induction not before age 19 should be retained.

2. As soon as possible following age 19 each person shall be given a physical examination. Those physically and mentally acceptable to the Armed Forces who have completed at least two terms in an accredited college or university on a curriculum which

leads to an academic degree and desire to continue their formal education may do so on the following conditions:

(a) The proper authority of the institution where the student is enrolled shall certify to Selective Service:

(1) That the student has maintained an academic performance satisfactory to the educational institution attended and that such performance if continued will give assurance of graduation within two calendar years.

(2) That the institution has established a committee or committees whose duty is to counsel, guide and examine each student in this group with a view to determining the value of his continued education in terms of the national welfare and service.

(3) That the student is continuing in attendance on a round-the-year college calendar.

3. Postponement of military service shall not be extended beyond the twenty-first birthday except in cases approved by Selective Service.

4. If the needs of the Armed Forces become such that postponement of military service of all college students until graduation is no longer possible, induction shall be made of the oldest students first; those who are 20 years old shall be inducted before those who are 19.

5. Year-round college attendance imposes a significant additional financial burden on the average American family. Every American youth should be given the opportunity for the training to which his ability entitles him irrespective of his financial status. Therefore it is recommended that the Eighty-second Congress pass enabling legislation which will permit any qualified student who has reached the age of 19 to borrow from the Government up to $100 per month during the period he is attending college.

It is further recommended that interest on this loan shall be at a rate one-half of 1 percent greater than the going rate on long term Government bonds at the time the loan is made and repayment of the loan shall be made on the basis of annual payments equal to 25 percent of the participant's Federal income tax.

STATEMENT OF MANPOWER SITUATION

(This statement is based upon the most recent manpower figures which have been verified with responsible Government authorities.)

In his radio address Friday evening, December 15, President Truman stated that the Armed Forces of the United States will be increased to 3,000,000 or 3,500,000. To maintain a military organization of any such proportion will require that every young man who can meet the physical standards will be required to do a tour of duty in uniform.

Whether or not a plan of flexible induction can be worked out that will allow a young man in college to postpone his military service until he has completed his college education will depend upon the size of the military unit and the length of time served by each inductee.

The following analysis is made on the assumption that the term of service will be 2 years and that the numerical size of the Armed Forces will be either 3,000,000 or 3,500,000.

It is estimated that in all branches of the service there are at present approximately 1,200,000 career men. If total personnel is increased to 3,000,000 this means that approximately 1,800,000 will be noncareer men. If the average service of a noncareer man is 2 years, 900,000 new personnel will need to be inducted annually. Unless men of previous military service are to be called, these inductees will be taken from among those who are 23 years old and younger.

Approximately 1,050,000 men reach a given age annually. Of these about 750,000 qualify under present military standards for the Armed Forces. On this basis there are 3,750,000 qualified men between the ages of 19 and 23 who have not seen military service. By the time the Armed Forces have reached 3,000,000 about 1,800,000 of these will have been inducted. This will leave a surplus of approximately 2,000,000 men in the United States between the ages of 19 and 23 physically acceptable to the military who have not seen service.

Approximately 375,000 young men enter college as freshmen each year. Of these about 250,000 continue as sophomores, 200,000 as juniors, and 175,000 as seniors. This makes a total of 1,000,000 undergraduate men in college at any one time. Assuming these men attend an accelerated all-year-round college program 500,000 will not have reached their nineteenth birthday, 325,000 will be between their nineteenth and twentieth birthdays, and 200,000 will be over 20 and under 21 years of age.

This will subtract 500,000 from the pool of 2,000,000 eligible inductees leaving a surplus of 1,500,000.

If 900,000 men are withdrawn from this pool annually and 750,000 are added to it through age increase the pool will be reduced by 150,000 per year. On this basis it will take 10 years to absorb the surplus in manpower currently existing before bringing the demand for inductees to the point where young men will be unable to finish college prior to entering the service.

If the military force is built up to and maintained at 3,500,000 the numerical size of the pool after subtracting the men eligible for military service who are in college will be reduced to 1,000,000. The induction rate on the same formula will be 1,150,000 annually and the inroads on the surplus will be at the rate of 400,000 men annually. This will absorb the cushion of manpower reserve down to the 500,000 college students in about 2½ years.

It is clear, therefore, that sufficient manpower is available to sustain an armed force of 3,000,000 almost indefinitely and still allow all young men who desire and are capable to do so to complete their college training on an accelerated college calendar before reporting for military duty.

Even a military force of 3,500,000 men can be recruited and maintained for a period of a few years before encroaching upon those young men desiring to complete their education before going into uniform.

Tabulation of manpower resources

Total men required for Armed Forces	3,000,000–3,500,000
Career men now in Armed Forces	1,200,000
Total men to be supplied by induction	1,800,000–2,300,000
Total men 19–23 qualified for induction	3,750,000
Surplus of qualified men 19–23	1,950,000–1,450,000
Total men 19 and 20 normally in college	500,000
Surplus men 19–23 if service postponement for college is granted	1,450,000–950,000
Annual inductions required to maintain Armed Forces	900,000–1,150,000
Qualified men annually reaching age 19	750,000
Annual reduction of surplus pool	150,000–400,000
Years until surplus is depleted	10–2½

Members of Indiana Conference on Higher Education: Anderson College, Ball State Teachers College, Butler University, Canterbury College, DePauw University, Earlham College, Evansville College, Franklin College, Goshen College, Hanover College, Huntington College, Indiana Central College, Indiana State Teachers College, Indiana Technical College, Indiana University, Manchester College, Marian College, Marion College, Oakland City College, Purdue University, Rose Polytechnic Institute, St. Joseph College, St. Mary's College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Taylor University, Tri-State College, University of Notre Dame, Valparaiso University, Vincennes University, Wabash College.

War Jitters Grow on Campuses as Morale Drops and Many Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 15, 1951:

WAR JITTERS GROW ON CAMPUSES AS MORALE DROPS AND MANY QUIT

CHICAGO, January 14.—War jitters have hit college campuses across the Nation and many students are adopting a what's-the-use attitude, because of the uncertainty of world conditions and their own futures, a survey showed today.

Morale has grown worse since the Christmas holidays, schools reported, because of United States losses in Korea and the consultations students have had with their draft boards at Christmas.

The typical bitter attitude of soon-to-be-drafted students was summed up this way by Larry Kaufmann, a nonveteran senior at the University of Oklahoma: "Why study to be a soldier?"

Officials at many schools said they had made direct appeals to students to live as usual from day to day and try not to worry. But some admitted privately that they don't blame students for being jittery, when their draft statuses were so hazy.

The survey of more than 55 colleges and universities showed that many students had been called into Reserve units and that large numbers of students planned to enlist their mid-term examinations rather than wait to be drafted in June so that they might have their pick of the services. Some students just did not show up after Christmas.

SCHOOLS URGE ACCELERATION

A number of schools were urging students to double up on work so as to complete their education before entering service. Many men were reported to be heeding this advice and working harder to finish school or to keep their grades high in an effort to avoid the draft, at least for a while.

Many school authorities called for a clear-cut directive from Washington to take the burden of doubt off students' shoulders and allow them to study in some peace until they must enter the Armed Forces.

"We need a clearer outlook for students," said Willis Tate, vice president of the Southern Methodist University. "Many of the weaker students—those in the lower half of their class—definitely are studying less. After all, they've lost their incentive because of the present draft laws."

He said there was "much hysteria and misinformation" on the campus and indecision on the part of men faced by the threat of changes in the draft laws.

Dr. Guy Stevenson, dean of the Arts College of the University of Louisville, said about 100 men had left the college in the last month and this trend was causing other students to wonder if they should go too.

George Gibson, dean of men at the Georgia Institute of Technology, said the scholastic average had dropped slightly, partially because of the terrible turmoil at present.

"There's a bitterness among students I wish we could overcome," said William Powell Jones, dean of Adlebert College at Western Reserve University.

George Wadsack, assistant dean of admission at the University of Oklahoma, reported that 60 percent of the university's students had unsatisfactory grades at the end of the fall semester.

Deane W. Malott, chancellor of the University of Kansas, said a large bulletin board had been set up in the administration building to carry all the latest draft information.

Dr. L. L. Click, associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Texas, said about 400 students had dropped out of school to enlist but "in general all students who are staying seem determined to make their grades."

Charles McGurk, director of Ithaca College's School of Business, said: "The attitude of some students is, 'what's the use of studying if we've got to go into military service at any time.' Some feel that in enlisting they are getting something over with."

The dean of Duquesne University said a check had showed that 5 percent of the students had adopted a "don't-give-a-darn attitude" and were cutting classes and ignoring their studies. He said another 20 percent were the victims of worry and general tension, but were more confused than disinterested in their work.

J. D. Williams, chancelor of the University of Mississippi, said: "The uncertainty of the mobilization program has contributed to restlessness, impatience, confusion, frustration, and in some instances despair on the part of many students. Some seemed relieved when they actually were called to active duty."

JUNE ENTRY FOR FRESHMEN

Authorities at the University of North Carolina and Duke University suggested that students go to school around the calendar to finish their educations in 3 years rather than 4. Duke announced this week it would admit freshmen in June.

At Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, Brown, and Princeton, a general unrest was reported. A Dartmouth spokesman said the school already had lost a sizable percentage of students through enlistments.

Students at Princeton said dormitory janitors had been asked to make a check to see just who had come back from the Christmas holidays. University officials there predicted their enrollment would drop to 2,000 next fall, a decline of one-third.

At the University of Florida, J. Hillis Miller, the president, scheduled a meeting of all 8,000 male students next month in an effort to combat the despondent attitude caused by the war threat and draft. Professors said grades in all except Reserve officer training courses had plummeted and the student newspaper estimated about 50 men a week were quitting school to enlist.

Isolation Is Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Coldwater Reporter, a daily newspaper published in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. This editorial written by Earle Davidson, publisher, well expresses the thinking of most of the people in southern Michigan regarding the situation in which we find ourselves today. The editorial, which follows, well points out that isolationism, used as a word to smear opponents of the Truman foreign policy is actually Americanism. Here it is:

GOOD EVENING—THE EDITOR'S CORNER

(By Earle Davidson)

The Korean debacle, in which the forces of the United States have received only token support from other members of the United Nations, has resulted in some mighty serious thinking on the part of Americans everywhere.

When President Truman ordered American boys to take up the fight in Korea, he embarked upon a mission which threw this country in a state of confusion from which it has not yet fully recovered. Nine out of ten Americans still think the President is constitutionally required to secure the consent of Congress before taking such a step.

With every announcement of mounting casualties in the Korean "police action," the people are now wondering just how far the Congress will permit the President to go in sending American youth to bleed and die in other parts of the world.

Not only has the President lost much of his popularity among the rank and file of our people, but at the same time the prestige of the United Nations has sunk to a new low because of its failure to share the load in sending fighting men to back up its vote in favor of the Korean "police action."

Americans are fast awakening to the fact that their country is the sucker nation of the world organization. By the same token, they are also awakening to the realization that the Truman administration, having been outsmarted in its diplomatic relations not only with Russia, but also with the enemies of Russia, is now attempting to raise a large force of American foot soldiers for another possible "police action" in Europe.

It is indeed regrettable that in this hour of trial we have such small minds at the top level of our Government. We have only ourselves to blame for that. Perhaps those thousands of Americans who stayed home on election day in November of 1948 will at long last see the folly of their neglect of duty.

With no firm basis upon which to argue their position, those in high places who are responsible for leading this country to the very brink of disaster now shout "isolationist" at anyone and everyone who dares to challenge them.

I suppose that, after this editorial sees the light of print, your editor, too, will be branded an isolationist.

Well, if failure to see either merit or justice in the sacrifice of thousands of American lives in far-off Korea while our so-called allies send only token forces to the battle is isolationism, if failure to see the reasoning behind the declaration of a national emergency in America when no other country in the world sees the necessity of doing likewise is isolationism; if a sincere desire to see this country become militarily and economically strong for the purpose of protecting our own people is isolationism; if opposition to a foreign policy which would break America's economic back and spill the life-blood of precious American youth over a confused world is isolationism; if seeking a respite from war for the mothers of America's young men and women, in whose eyes the suffering of World War II is still recorded, is isolationism; if all these beliefs may be properly added up to define an isolationist, then I pray to God, make me an isolationist.

But you and I know that to believe these truths is not isolationism. You and I know that in the absence of complete abdication of its duties by the Congress, the administration in Washington is limited in its powers over the lives—and deaths—of the American people.

It seems to us that the time has come for the Congress to reassert its prerogatives and reassume its rightful place in the determination of the steps necessary to insure peace.

President Truman and his government by crony should be forcibly reminded by the new Congress of its intention to represent the people in examining the administration's policy with regard to committing American forces in the defense of foreign nations not yet committed to defending themselves.

The new Eighty-second Congress could render no greater service to the American people at this time than to forestall the Administration's plan of garrisoning millions of American troops abroad—a course which can only lead to eventual war with Russia.

No, this is not isolationism. It is Americanism. Nothing is more sorely needed in this country today than a serious rebirth of good, old-fashioned red, white, and blue Americanism. This is not to say that we should desert the United Nations. Someday that organization may become more than a hope as a deterrent to war. But until the time comes when the United Nations is an effective guarantor of world peace, we should keep our own stars and stripes flying in the top spot. Our Korean experience has shown us—and it should have shown Mr. Truman—that the United Nations banner is meaningless.

After all, what's wrong with the American flag anyway? Doesn't it today represent man's greatest bulwark for liberty and freedom? Haven't we had just about enough of global dogooding? Isn't it about time to get back home and look to our own defenses?

Americans generally are in favor of a heavy defense program. We want to make—and keep—our country the strongest nation, both militarily and economically, on the face of the earth.

The Russian problem can be solved in 10 minutes, merely by serving notice on the Kremlin that if its armies set foot on free soil in Europe they will have to fight America to win. Then, if Moscow ever gets foolish enough to disregard that notice, will be the time for us to go overseas—and lick hell out of Russia once and for all.

On the other hand, if we put a huge land army overseas merely as a show of strength such a step could only lead to disaster in one of two ways. Either we would break America's economic back in attempting to finance such an overseas force over a long period of years while Russia calmly watches us tax ourselves to death, or the very presence of such a force would touch off the war all of us are seeking to avoid.

It is to be hoped that the Congress will heed the will of the people in this instance and close ranks. Not one more American soldier should be made available for the defense of Europe than the nations of Europe are willing to put up themselves.

And these American forces should be kept at home until a clear need arises for their presence overseas. That's the kind of military strength America needs— a huge potential that can be called up quickly in an emergency. Any other kind of strength will only weaken our economic system to the point where Russia will not need a war to win.

A Prayer—Capitol Hill Day, Calvary Baptist Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 7, 1951, Calvary Baptist Church, of Washington, with Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, minister, leading, devoted the morning service to Capitol Hill. Several Members took part in this service. They were Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin; Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas; and myself.

The theme for the morning sermon brought by Dr. Cranford, The Dream That Made America Great, was suggested by Representative NOAH H. MASON, of Illinois.

During these crucial days it is so important, Mr. Speaker, that we seek divine guidance as we attempt to resolve the tremendous and serious problems that face our Nation and the world. It is, I think, most significant that this great church in the Nation's Capital should devote this particular service, as the Eighty-second Congress began to convene, in the interest of the National Congress. With the belief that my colleagues share that view, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks and include the prayer that was offered at this service by my colleague, Hon. BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas:

PRAYER BY CONGRESSMAN BROOKS HAYS AT THE SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 7, 1951

Our Father, there are many things we would pray for this morning. Our deepest aspirations we cannot phrase, yet we know that Thou wilt hear even the petitions that struggle vainly in our hearts for expression.

Our thoughts are upon our Nation, its safety in an hour of great peril and its future, that its institutions might continue to be dedicated to the noblest ends. We who are a part of its official family are grateful for the friendliness which is so often evidenced by Calvary Church. May it be typical of the Nation; may the ties between the representative and the people be strengthened.

We thank Thee for the American heritage, for the system of government which we believe represents the best hope of conformity to the principles of Christian faith. We do not defend it as a perfect expression of Thy will, but we believe that precious spiritual values are inherent in it, and these we would preserve. Our Father, we ask, too, that as we contemplate the grandeur of America we may think of our country in relation to the world and measure its greatness in terms of widest service. May we never feed our sense of superiority nor glory in achievements of the past, as long as there are unfinished tasks to challenge us.

For the meeting of dangers help us to achieve unity, not from diluting conviction nor in the tolerance and perpetuation of error, but rather in the harmony of Christian brotherhood which keeps our hearts and minds upon the highest goals.

We pray for the world's peace, that peace with justice may be the good fortune of our generation. Save us from a sense of futility; may the temporary conquests of evil not disturb us and may we continue to put our chief reliance in Thy leadership. In the laws that are to be made by the new Congress and the policies to be devised, may there be moral content and moral power. May we see in our failures the inexactness of human effort and help us to understand that we have failed only to the extent that we have not followed Thy plan for human life and destiny.

We thank Thee for the resources of good will that surround us. We have drawn so much from them, may we determine to contribute to them. And may such suffering as comes upon us as an inevitable experience never create bitterness. Our Father, spare us from little-mindedness and from the sins of cynicism and self-centeredness. May we live worthily before the world, though new fears and dangers press upon us. If we cannot have peace for our world may we have peace within. Give us tranquility for the decisions that are vital for our times.

We thank Thee that in this service the anxieties of the world may yield to the strength and power of Thy presence, and as the busy world beckons us to perplexing new duties may we go with the assurance that Thou art our refuge, that underneath us are the everlasting arms. We pray, our Father, not only for Thy favors but for Thyself.

Finally, our Father, we pray for our fighting men abroad. Comfort and heal them, and may there be nothing in our actions to create doubt as to our appreciation for their sacrifice. Forgive any lightheartedness or gayety that is based upon indifference to their plight or the needs of stricken people anywhere. We do not hesitate to ask that our men be restored to loved ones, unimpaired and buoyed by the consciousness of Thy care.

Help us to preserve in the world today those elements of love and compassion which made sublime the mission of Jesus. In His spirit we would pray even for our enemies; may reconciliation come with peace.

"In every change of fortune and down to the gates of death may we be loyal and loving to one another."

In the name of Jesus. Amen.

How Much Authority Does President Truman Want?—The United States Is Still Governed "by the Consent of the Governed"—Congress Should Be Consulted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, whether the President has the right to send American troops abroad is a question of legal right, and conflicting precedents confuse the issue. But while the debate goes on, the world burns.

President Truman has stated to the press in effect that he will do as he pleases about sending American troops abroad. This certainly is not a step in the right direction toward the unity above partisanship that President Truman has stated he desires.

If President Truman were sincere in his request for unity, he would not refuse to consult with Congress on the issue of sending troops abroad. He would ask the Congress to pass legislation approving such use of American troops and thereby give to the people's representatives a full partnership in the formulating of vital policies which may mean war or peace for the world. In his State of the Union message he said, "There shall never be a dictator in this country."

The following editorial by David Lawrence on this subject which appeared in a recent issue of United States News and World Report is appropriately titled "Quibbling While World Burns."

QUIBBLING WHILE WORLD BURNS

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman made an unfortunate mistake last week when he told the press, in effect, that, while he would consult Congress, he would do as he pleased about sending American troops abroad.

The question of legal right is at best a technical one. Strictly speaking, under the Constitution, Congress alone has the explicit power to declare war, while the President has the implicit right to use our Armed Forces to repel invasion as well as to protect American lives and property outside this country. The exact point at which the authority of each branch of our Government begins and ends has never been clear, and there are many conflicting precedents.

Mr. Truman is confronted with a resolution introduced by Representative COUDERT, of New York, who would have Congress forbid the appropriation of any money for troops to go abroad without the prior approval of both Houses. This is a congressional prerogative known historically as the power of the purse.

Should this resolution be pressed, the President says he will go to the people. Presumably this means that he will attempt by speeches to influence public opinion against the passage of such a proposal. This, too, is the President's right.

Most Americans, however, will be saddened by this exhibition of quibbling while the world burns.

In countries with the parliamentary system of government such a dispute could not happen. The national legislature is a part of the executive and the executive is a part of the national legislature. The majority party has the responsibility for a leadership exercised jointly by both the executive and the legislative branches acting together. This is because together they stand and together they fall. It is impossible for the executive and the legislative to differ without carrying the dispute immediately to the people. Then, as a result, the country gets either a new legislature through an election held for that purpose or else it gets a new executive, as the case may be.

This is responsible democracy. It is working effectively in Canada, Australia, and other English-speaking commonwealths.

When Mr. Truman speaks of going to the people to resolve an issue, he knows, of course, that the next presidential election is 2 years off. Such an issue as has arisen over sending troops abroad cannot wait that long to be resolved.

A fundamental issue of constitutionalism has cropped out. It goes to the worth of our own system in a crisis as compared with parliamentary systems where the people have a continuing voice in telling their representatives what they shall do.

What we need, of course, is a streamlining of the American constitutional system. It seems curious that with so many vital issues confronting us nobody in Congress has arisen to press for the passage of a constitutional

amendment which will enable the American people to rule themselves. Such an amendment would provide for the President to resign if he cannot get a two-thirds vote of both Houses or else for Congress to resign and submit to a new election at once if the President and Congress cannot agree. There are many variations of this system, but the principle of responsibility runs through all of them.

In the absence of such a needed reform, it would be wiser if President Truman accepted the spirit of the parliamentary system which requires that the executive and legislative branches of the Government work together and act together. If Mr. Truman were to ask for specific approval of a broad program to send troops abroad to implement the North Atlantic Pact, it seems certain he would get such power. If the people, however, don't want to approve that step, the sooner the world knows it the better. To meet the issue squarely is to take advantage of an unexampled opportunity by the United States to show the world that both branches of our Government are united in support of the treaty obligations we have undertaken.

It is idle to argue that ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty didn't mean we were committing ourselves to send troops in advance of a war. The practical situation is that by sending troops abroad we help to prevent a war. To contend that the United States is not committed to send troops now is technically correct, but this is largely a quibble on the part of Congress.

Let's be done with all quibbling. The President should recognize that Congress is a part of the United States Government and is entitled to something more than polite or perfunctory consultation. Congress, as a coordinate branch of the Government elected by the people, is entitled to a full partnership in the formulation of policies that could mean war. There is no lack of machinery. It's the will to cooperate that seems lacking despite exhortations about unity.

Let us go forward together. It can be done—if grown men will cease to act as legalists and prima donnas at a critical moment in our history when we must take bold steps to avoid large-scale war.

God Saved My Life in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saturday Evening Post of January 13, 1951:

GOD SAVED MY LIFE IN KOREA

(By Pvt. Robert L. Sharpe, as told to Bill Currie)

THIS IS THE FULLY DOCUMENTED FIRST-PERSON STORY OF WHAT HAPPENED TO A BOY FROM NORTH CAROLINA WHO WAS TAKEN PRISONER BY THE REDS—A RECORD OF SAVAGERY ALMOST WITHOUT PARALLEL IN OUR TIMES

(About the author: Pvt. Robert L. Sharpe, who has done so very much living in his 18 years, gave up a promising baseball career when he enlisted in the United States Army. He was best known in his home town, High Point, N. C., for having pitched a no-hit, no-run game in the Red Shield League, sponsored by the Salvation Army and civic clubs of High Point. He also pitched for his high-school team and played basketball. Private Sharpe enlisted on July 27, 1949, after his sophomore year in high school, and he was sent to Japan in February 1950. His father, mother, and three younger brothers—one only 18 months old—live in High Point. Robert aspires to be a professional soldier. Despite his experiences, he says he does not think the atom bomb should be used on the North Koreans.)

What happened to me while I was a prisoner of the North Koreans is no different from what happened to hundreds of others. Only I was spared to come back and tell about it. There has been a lot written about massacres and atrocities committed by the North Koreans. But I doubt that the whole horror of what it was really like has ever been recounted, or ever will be. As a matter of fact, in the time that I was a prisoner we experienced things for which there are no adequate words.

We landed in Korea on last Fourth of July for what we were told was to be a "police action" As we understood it at first, the South Korean Army was to do the fighting and we were to do the mopping up behind. But the "police action" business got to be a bum joke to us. In 2 weeks our whole battalion was torn apart, most of our men killed or wounded, and I was a prisoner in the hands of the Communists. As a medical corpsman, I arrived in Korea with little equipment and, of course, I was unarmed. But we heard of the massacre of the medics in the first battalion of the Twenty-fourth Regiment of the Twenty-fourth Division, so before we went into action we were issued an M-1 rifle and plenty of medical supplies. Men were so scarce that we medics threw away our arm bands, painted over the crosses on our helmets, and helped fight—carrying ammunition, moving equipment, and doing everything else that had to be done.

I was in G Company, Second Battalion, Nineteenth Regiment, Twenty-fourth Division. We had lost about a third of our men when we went on a volunteer mission to draw fire away from the surrounded first battalion. Our action enabled the first to fight back and rejoin the regiment. The rest of our battalion was in reserve and moved up to the line on the same day that we were coming back with the rescued first battalion. But because things were getting so hot, we were put off the trucks for the rear, and sent back into the line.

At that time we were sent along the bank of the Kum River. We didn't have an automatic weapon on our flanks, and we would have been wiped out if the North Koreans had tried to cross. But they didn't and after 1 day they pulled us out and we started moving back. Our combat action had been sudden and tragic. The shock of violent death and suffering was too much, even in those early days, for some of us. Some of our men cracked up and were just crying shells of themselves before we reached our rest area 5 miles south of Taejon.

We were scheduled for a 4-day rest. But the North Koreans smashed across the Kum and after only 2 days we were sent back to the front to try to stop them. Morale was low and some of the men were drinking tank fluid. Others stole morphine from medical kits to bolster their nerves. Captain Bartz, our company commander, told us before we went in that the folks back home were counting on us and that we couldn't fail. When he got through, we were ready to fight to the last man. That's just about what happened. Captain Bartz and my platoon leader, Lt. Charles M. Matlock, of the Bronx, New York City, were the bravest men I ever saw. They had iron guts and knew how to make a man fight.

That we were fighting for the folks back home weighed heavily on our minds. The battle was fierce and bloody. In the confusion of fighting against heavy odds, our communications fell apart—even between the platoons of our company.

Communists were swarming all over the place and Captain Bartz ordered the company to fall back. But the runner didn't get to our platoon, so the rest of the company withdrew and left us surrounded—no way to get out. We finally got a message to abandon our position and it was every man for himself. We had to leave many of the wounded behind. I can still hear them screaming. I attended to all I could. But it wasn't much use, because the North Koreans came right along and bayoneted the wounded as they lay on the ground.

I found out the first day in battle that they had no mercy for the wounded. We had lots of casualties then, and when we were ordered back, one of our medics stayed with the wounded. Since he wouldn't leave, our chaplain wouldn't leave either. The medic got his—a bayonet through the neck—as he was trying to help a wounded man. The chaplain was bayoneted while he was on his knees praying beside a dying man.

Lieutenant Matlock led what was left of us into the hills. We thought we might circle back south and rejoin the American lines. It was a good 25 miles back to the American lines, and rough going because we were walking through rice paddies where the mud was sometimes knee-deep.

I think probably there were 15 of us left. We kept going until we came to a ravine, where the Communists in the rocks above us opened fire. It was murder. The fire came from all directions. Men fell and their shrieks could be heard even above the gunfire. I went face down in the mud and lay still, pretending that I was dead. The shooting finally stopped, and the Koreans came down to see if any of us were left. To make sure, they ran their bayonets through some, they kicked others, and they bashed others with the butts of their rifles.

But they didn't do anything to me. I was covered with blood anyhow, because I had been working on the wounded. My arms were soaked to the elbows. I had bent my head to listen for heartbeats in wounded men until my hair was matted with blood and it was dried on my face. They figured I was dead, I guess, because they sat me up and pulled my belt off. Then another Korean unlaced my boots and left me barefooted. I never had another pair of shoes—except some grass slippers which I stole—until I was liberated. I walked nearly 400 miles without my boots.

The M-1 rifle which I had taken into battle was too clumsy with all my medical equipment, so I had swapped it for a carbine. But that was too much, too, so just the day before I had traded off the carbine for a .45 pistol. When the shooting started in the ravine I junked the pistol and the aid kit. Luckily the North Koreans didn't find either.

It was horrible lying there in the mud with all my buddies dead or dying around me. So I buried my face in the mud and lay there a couple of hours until the sun went down. I kept quiet until just before day, but then I crawled over to where I could get the pistol and the aid kit. I checked around to see if anybody else was alive. I found only three others. We drank some of the scummy rice-paddy water and got farther back into the hills to hide.

We didn't have anything to eat, so we tried grass, but that made us sick. We had to have food, and we decided to move at night, hoping to get back to the American lines. But I never could get the others to leave.

During the 4 days we hid out we read the Bible a lot and prayed much of the time. I always believed in God, and I believed that He could do anything. I believed that He could and would save us. We prayed hard and felt better because of it. God was our

only hope, and we tried to lay all our burdens on Him.

But we had trouble among ourselves. One of the fellows cried and carried on so that we were afraid he would give our position away. For a while we considered shooting him because we knew if he kept on we would be discovered. I'm glad, of course, that we didn't have to do it. We looked after him, and he got a little better, but we had to watch him every minute.

On the fourth day I was so hungry I didn't care if I got killed. The others wouldn't go, so I walked down alone. I went along a road and came on a farmer in a rice paddy, and asked him about some food. I think I just about scared him to death. He didn't want to have anything to do with me. But finally he agreed to give me something to eat, and took me to his little shanty on the mountainside. He and his wife gave me some mush—it was delicious to me. I got full, then kind of sick, and I was feeling mighty bad. The farmer kept urging me to go. I didn't want to get him in any trouble, so I headed back for the hills. But just as I got outside about two squads of North Koreans came running up, screaming and jumping up and down. They were in civilian clothes, but they had bayonets fixed, and they had hand grenades hanging all over them.

I had read about what the North Koreans did to prisoners; I jerked my pistol from the holster and put it up to my temple. I intended to commit suicide. But I just couldn't pull the trigger to kill myself. So I dropped down on both knees and waited for them to bayonet me. But it didn't come. They danced around me and whooped like Indians. Then one jerked me to my feet, slapped me across the mouth and asked if I understood Japanese. I told him I did, a little. So, right off the bat, he asked me what I thought of General MacArthur. I thought I had better play along, so I said I didn't like the general. He asked me about President Truman, and I said the same thing. Then he asked me about Henry Wallace, and again I said I didn't like him. It was a mistake, because I got cuffed around for that. But they didn't hurt me much. I became a prisoner.

While they walked me into Taejon, I thought about all the fellows who had been killed, and whose last words had been gasped out to me. Battlefield deaths aren't so dramatic as you see in the movies. Most of the time the fellows say something easy, like: "Well, I guess I didn't dodge that one," or "Get one for me, will you, doc?" I had a lot of 'em die in my arms, and I thought about 'em—I'm still thinking about them. And I was thinking that for a guy who had been 18 years old only a little over a month, I was getting near the end of a pretty short string myself.

One fellow I went to on the field had a bad chest wound. He was going; I could tell. But he kept pawing at his chest, thrashing around and crying, so I opened up his clothes. He had a big picture of a girl under his clothes next to his skin. She was a pretty girl, and the bullet that killed him had gone right through her chest too. I took the picture and rolled it up and put it in my kit. I was going to try to find her if I got back to tell her about him, but the North Koreans took the picture away from me.

As a matter of fact, they took everything I had. My shoes were already gone, and so was my belt. But they took my watch and my wallet, even my underwear. I slipped most of my money into my mouth. I'm glad I did, because later I was able to buy a cigarette butt for $10. Another fellow paid $200 for a half slice of bread.

They marched me through the streets of Taejon and showed me a whole arsenal of captured American weapons. Then they took me to a command post, where I was questioned. Not just the intelligence officer questioned me, all the soldiers did, and civilians, too. What they wanted to know most was where they could find Gen. Bill Dean. Of course, I didn't know, but they thought I did. They had the general's helmet liner with the two stars painted on it, and they had the silver stars from his jacket too. But they didn't have the general. From that, we figured that General Dean threw away his insignia to keep from being identified, and kept on fighting with the men until the end. [General Dean is still reported missing as this issue goes to press.—The Editors.]

They kept me around a couple of days, and then they sent me to a POW camp in Taejon. There were about 70 Americans there, about 25 of them wounded. They had had no medical attention, and there were no doctors or aid men in the prison until I arrived. There was nothing to work with, but I ripped up uniforms and made bandages and did the best I could to help the guys out a little. We didn't get much to eat—three rice balls a day. What we got was pretty hard to get down, and even harder to hold. The guards were rough, but their treatment seemed like Sunday School compared to what we got later.

During the 5 days I stayed there a lot of the men died, but their dying was easy beside the deaths of a lot of those who had to go later. It hurt me awful. I wanted to cry and hide myself, but I couldn't. I couldn't let down for a minute. My nerves, while still controllable, were almost to the breaking point. While we were there, I met Pvt. Edward Slayden, of Quincy, Ill. We became good friends and we swore never to leave each other. That promise cost me several chances to escape, for Slayden was later wounded. But I knew that had the situation been reversed he would not have left me.

After the 5 days we were told that we were being shipped to Seoul by train, where we would be placed aboard airplanes bound for the United States. I knew it wasn't true, but some of the men believed it. I tried to encourage it, because it meant hope. That's one way the Communists have of breaking a man. They beat you, starve you, and have you just about ready to die. Then they put out something hopeful. They pat you on the back, and then they drop the bottom out, and you're more hopeless than ever.

The train never showed up, so we started out to walk to Seoul. Between 50 and 60 men were able to walk; the rest were left behind. We moved at night, because the American planes were active against troops in the daytime, and while the guards were happy to have us strafed, they didn't take to it themselves. We walked only about 10 miles when we were picked up in trucks and carried to Chochiwon. We got there in the morning. But by this time I had lost track of what day it was.

They placed us in one of the few buildings left standing. Every day American planes came over and strafed. It was terrifying, and many of our men lost their minds as the bullets kicked up about us. We all tried to burrow into the concrete floor of the building. Some of the men tore the flesh from their hands trying to scratch their way to safety. But, miraculously, our building was never hit.

The march had hardly begun, but already death was everywhere. Rations had been cut to one rice ball a day. It was about the size of a golf ball and just about as good to eat. Once somebody brought in some green peaches. Oh, they were good, but they turned the insides of our men wrong side out. Dysentery hit and the men were mighty sick, passing blood nearly all the time. We were filthy and the place stank horribly. We were also crawling with lice, and though I must have picked a million off my own body, for every one I picked off there were a hundred I missed. It was all bad, but the dysentery was the worst part. One man had several feet of his entrails on the outside of him, and he lived for a while with his insides tied to his leg so they wouldn't swing when he walked.

We left Chochiwon on foot, and walked the round-about route to Chonan in about 4 days. It was forced march all the way. We had almost nothing to eat. The wounded and sick were left to die alongside the road—if they escaped being shot or bayoneted. The guards beat us, too, only not too much. They knew we had to walk. Too much beating meant we wouldn't be able to. The dysentery got worse all the time, of course, but they kept us marching.

The names of many of the men on the death march I remember very well, but most of them are still classified as missing in action. I have had lots of letters and visitors wanting information since I got back to the States. But I still think it wise not to circulate those names.

When we left Chonan, we all were getting much weaker. Sickness was getting worse. We walked about 20 miles. Then just outside of Osan they loaded us abroad a train and moved us to Suwon. There we stayed for 2 days, and of about sixty who had started from Taejon, I doubt if 40 survived. Finally we got to Seoul, the South Korean capital.

At Seoul we were joined by more than 300 other prisoners who had been sent back from all parts of the front. Among them was Capt. William Locke, who had married a girl from my home town, High Point, N. C. I talked with Captain Locke as much as we dared. I could have escaped with him later on the march but for my promise to Slayden.

The death march started winding its way northward from Seoul almost at once. The destination was Pyongyang, the North Korean capital. It was a peculiar route which we followed, carrying us many miles out of the way. There were 386 who left Seoul, but fewer than 100 ever reached Pyongyang. In a couple of days we were mighty hungry. After a while you get use to being hungry and it isn't so bad, but when you're just beginning to starve it's the toughest.

What made it really hard was marching through the farmlands where there was good food in the fields and apples and other fruit on the trees. They wouldn't let us have any. American planes strafed us daily and killed a lot of our men. But they didn't know they were doing it—and for those or us that lived, it helped a lot. When the planes came to strafe our column, the guards would run. That gave us a chance to steal food from the fields and eat while they were rounding us up again. I remember once I stole two pumpkins and ate them raw—I don't believe it took me more than 5 minutes. The guards fired over our heads a good deal to keep us in line. But by then most of us had lost any fear of death itself. We were more afraid of living another day like that.

The planes were terrible. The guards always cried, "Hongo," when the planes came over. "Hongo," means "Get down." The guards followed their own orders better than we did.

During our breaks, which came only when the guards got too tired to go on, those of us who were able tried to bury our dead. Most of the men who died went during the breaks. It seemed that a fellow could keep going as long as he was moving, but once he sat down his will couldn't keep him alive. We made little crosses out of sticks and said prayers over the graves. But the Koreans would laugh at us and kick the crosses down. God! How I hated their guts.

We finally got so it was almost too much effort to hit the dirt when the planes came over. We just stood in the middle of the

road and waved. After a while the pilots figured out that we were American prisoners and didn't shoot, but it took a lot of lives before they recognized us. At Sariwon, on the way to Pyongyang, some of the sick were loaded into oxcarts because they couldn't walk any more.

Captain Locke, the only Air Force man with us, was about through walking because he wasn't trained for it. But when he saw American planes drop a wing and head for us, he cried for all the men to get off the carts. Not one moved except Captain Locke. The rest were too sick to move, so the Air Force shot them up without knowing they were Americans. But then it wasn't long before the Air Force quit shooting at us. Still, while one threat to our lives was gone, it meant we had to march in the daytime, because the guards then knew it was safe.

As I walked along I had plenty of time to think. I thought and prayed mostly about my mother and father and three kid brothers back home in High Point. I thought some, too, about our chances. I always remembered the Korean officer in Seoul who asked me what I thought of General MacArthur. By that time I was fed up with them, so I told him the General was just fine. He spit right between my eyes for that. I'll never forget it or him.

About 50 miles before we got to Pyongyang, Ed Slayden slipped into a field for some food. The guards shot him and he was badly wounded, but he made it back to the column and I practically carried him the last 50 miles.

That sounds like quite a job, and it was, but not a bit more miraculous than our escape in the end. The Koreans did everything they could to have us killed without actually doing it themselves. Still, we managed to stay alive. It was no accident. There is only one power big enough for that. I still know that God alone brought us through. God gave me strength to walk and half-carry Ed, and kept Ed alive even after he spit up blood with every breath.

Even after we got to Pyongyang, the Koreans tried ways of killing us. They starved us, beat us, and they threw hand grenades into the building where we were quartered. We threw them out again before they could explode. They took our Bibles and tore them up. But we kept on praying, and they kept on laughing.

Though weaker every day, I was still in much better shape than most of the men. Being younger and in good shape when it all started, I was able to stand the march better than the older fellows. Those of us who could, tried to bury the dead, but it was a hard job. Those North Koreans still kicked the crosses off the graves almost as soon as we put them up, but we put them up anyhow. We finally tried to find a bottle of some kind for every man who died. In the bottle we put his name and serial number, so, if the graves-registration men ever find them, they'll know who they are.

It is a little hard for me to remember just when we left Pyongyang, but one day we were told we were being moved to a permanent camp near the Manchurian border. Few of us could have walked any distance at all. Without mercy, the North Koreans beat the sick ones to get them on their feet, and clubbed them with the butts of their rifles—Russian rifles.

They loaded us aboard a train. It was getting cold then, and we had nothing but our fatigue clothes. Nobody had any real shoes and the grass slippers which some of us had stolen were not much help, so everybody had foot trouble. The train was made up of coal cars. It was night, and pouring down rain. We had a new set of guards—a bunch of South Koreans who had been "converted"—and they were just as mean as the North Koreans had been. They beat us and kicked us around. The surest way to get a lick was to show fear. You had a better chance if you could look 'em in the eye. Sometimes I could, sometimes I couldn't.

All night the train shifted back and forth. I don't think we made more than 10 miles that night. We were freezing. The next morning they gave us some hard crackers to eat. You couldn't throw one of them down and break it. More of our men died from exposure, pneumonia, dysentery, and exhaustion.

One of the guards was a pretty good guy—we called him John. He was American-educated, and he would have nothing to do with beating any of the prisoners. He even tried to slip us food. He was later shot because he wouldn't beat us or help shoot us in the massacre which was to follow.

They took us off the train in the morning. We walked to a ravine, where we sat down and rested all day. That night they put us back on the train, and then they made us get off again. This sounds like a simple order. But to some of our men, getting on and off a train was a great effort. The next day they put us back on the train and started shifting around again. When we got back on the train the third time we were in a regular passenger car—they picked it up after bumping into a deserted train which had been left standing idle on the tracks. The shifting forward and back continued—I don't think we moved over 25 miles in two nights. On the third day I left Ed Slayden in the rear of the car and crawled under the seats to the forward part to talk with Allen J. Gifford, from New Jersey. Allen was an old friend, my roommate in Japan before we went to Korea. We had a reunion as prisoners.

We talked for quite a while about old times in Japan and about the march. We talked about how hard it was to walk by the fields and orchards full of crops and fruit without being allowed to eat. We shared broken hearts over having seen pilots in planes who were within hollering distance of us, and yet couldn't help us.

Suddenly we went into a tunnel which ran through a mountain. The train stopped. We paid little attention—we had been stopping and starting for 3 days. The guards said something about food. That brought me up from under the seats in a hurry. They said we were going to near-by farmhouses to eat. Not taking a chance on missing food, I was the fourth man in line off that train. Some of our fellows had little bowls or pieces of cups they had picked up, so they brought them along. They marched us along the railroad track out of the tunnel the same way we had gone in. We walked through the brush to a little ravine. There they let us sit down. Those who had little dishes were cleaning them out and getting ready to eat. Then I heard a rifle bolt slide home and, a minute later, a shot.

The guy next to me pitched over on his face. He was dead. I screamed something in the way of warning, and hit the ground. Then all hell broke loose. They opened up on us with rifles, machine guns, burp guns and everything else that would shoot. The men were screaming and begging for mercy, and calling on God to spare their lives. But the Koreans kept on shooting. They raked the ground up and down with fire, cutting the screaming men to pieces.

I was on the ground almost at the first shot. Another fellow piled on top of me. He saved my life at the cost of his. They shot him all to pieces and his blood ran all over me. It was warm and sickening. I wanted to jump up and cry, but I kept still. The shooting continued. It seemed a very long time. In reality it was all over in about 15 minutes.

I had been hit in the right arm and the right leg, and I was losing a good deal of blood. But I lay still. The Koreans then made the rounds of the bodies. They stuck some with bayonets, and they broke the heads of others with their rifle butts. I could see the detail coming toward me. But they didn't hit me in the head—only in the chest. Though I had the print of the rifle butt for several weeks, there was nothing serious done to me then.

I was praying. Not out loud, but praying anyhow. I prayed that it would come quickly, that I would be dead without any more suffering. It hurt me more than I can ever tell, to think about those poor, helpless men who had walked and suffered all those miles, only to be shot down without a chance. I can hardly bear to think of it now.

Gifford was lying beside me. He was moaning that he was dying. I whispered to him to be quiet. He, too, lived through it all. He cried, "Don't leave me," over and over again. I tried to reassure him in whispers. Finally, all the Koreans left but one. Then he, too, left, and we were alone among all the bodies of our friends. It was the second time for me, but the fact that I had been through something like it before didn't make it any easier.

We waited quite a while, and then we found that there were four able to walk. Some of the others were alive, but we had to leave them behind because we were too weak ourselves to carry anyone along. It hurts me yet to think of leaving those fellows. But we had to try to save ourselves then.

We made for the hills, but we couldn't go far. I ripped out a piece of my fatigue jacket and made a tourniquet for my arm. I managed to stop the bleeding in both my wounds. But I was so weak that I fell down, and it started again. Then I couldn't stop it, and I got weaker and weaker.

When the sun came up I was spitting up blood, and I was sure that I couldn't live through the day. We were all just about dead. I prayed hard most all day, for myself and for the folks back home. About 4 o'clock that afternoon we heard voices and people walking around, and we thought the Koreans had us again. The folks we heard were shouting for us to come on out—that we were free, and saved.

But we had been lied to and tricked too many times. We were afraid to answer at all for a while. Then when they kept calling, I yelled down. "Who is Betty Grable's husband?"

I was pretty well convinced that the folks we heard were Americans. But we were still cautious. I got up on my feet, feeling pretty dizzy, and hollered, "If you guys are Americans, come up here!"

We didn't have long to wait. In just a few seconds a big sergeant came up the path. I ran, fell, crawled to him, and dropped into him arms. Yes, I even kissed him. My prayers had been answered.

We were taken to an aid station, where our wounds were tended, and then evacuated to Japan. After a term in the hospital there, I was flown to the United States, and I spent a short time in a hospital on the Pacific coast.

When I landed in Korea I weighed 162. When I was liberated I weighed 98. I'm back up to 140 now, and feeling fine. I hope to make the Regular Army my career. But the entire muscle in my right arm is gone, and my right leg will never be exactly normal again. So I may not be fit for military duty, but I hope to be.

As I said before, we prayed a lot in Korea. But I had been taught to pray all my life, so it was nothing new to me. The fact that our prayers were answered, while wonderful, was no great surprise. God brought us out of there, and I want to tell the world that I know He did it.

Not So Self-Sufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, January 14, 1951, entitled "Not So Self-Sufficient":

NOT SO SELF-SUFFICIENT

In the debate over continuance of American aid to our democratic friends and anti-Communist associates abroad, most of the emphasis has been placed on their dependence on the United States and on our moral, political, economic and military obligations to help them. These countries do need our assistance; but sometimes we tend to forget that we, in turn, need theirs. In fact, when it comes to obtaining an adequate supply of certain vital raw materials absolutely essential to our military effort, the United States is now totally or largely dependent on foreign areas, and on areas outside the Western Hemisphere at that. Much-needed steps are being taken to establish with our allies a joint procurement policy for some of these commodities whose price has skyrocketed—tin and rubber, for example—and also to prevent them from getting into unfriendly hands. But the fact remains that the United States needs these raw materials; and if we were cut off from the sources of supply in Asia and Africa, we would be in serious straits.

It is precisely because of this dependence that we have embarked on a gigantic stockpile program. The strategic stockpile, more and more shrouded by the Munitions Board in military secrecy, is far from complete; yet Congress has already appropriated almost $3,000,000,000 for the purpose since 1946. But since no man can tell how large a stockpile of any given commodity would actually be needed to carry us through an emergency of indefinite duration, this device is at best only partial insurance against our lack of self-sufficiency.

We are, for example, stockpiling tin—an essential metal for military uses—of which we produce virtually none in this country. Most of it comes from southeast Asia. Formerly dependent on Russia, we now turn to Africa and India for manganese, indispensable in steel production. The United States produces about one-tenth of its own needs. We get chromite, necessary for high-speed cutting steels, mainly from Turkey and other far-distant areas. This tremendously valuable metal also used to come principally from Russia. Cobalt, the importance of which has shot up because of its use in making jet engines, is imported mainly from the Belgian Congo—the United States producing about one-ninth of its own consumption. The Congo is also our primary source of uranium, basic constituent of the atom bomb. These are only a few of the outstanding examples; but the list is, of course, not confined to minerals. One of our most vital deficiencies is in natural rubber. We produce none ourselves and import practically our entire consumption from Asia. Our synthetic rubber industry is growing; but for certain uses—truck tires, for example—a considerable admixture of natural with synthetic is essential. Silk, needed for specialized wartime uses, is imported from Japan; wool for uniforms comes from Australia and other distant countries. If shipping from South America were very seriously interfered with—as it probably would be in case of war—we would find ourselves short of many other vital products—for example, bauxite, the ore from which aluminum is obtained.

Some of these critical materials can, of course, be produced at great cost and with much expenditure of time and labor in this country. Vast deposits of low-grade manganese, for example, exist in the United States, and they are beginning to be developed with Government assistance through the newly created Defense Minerals Administration. Conservation of imported materials and substitution of one ingredient for another can prolong the use of existing stocks. But there are no substitutes for some items in certain uses, and even where substitution is possible it is likely to cause further dislocations, shortages, and disruption of war industry.

The brutal fact remains that there is no easy way out. The United States is not, and probably never can be, self-sufficient. While we could conceivably squeeze by for a considerable time under war conditions without access to the world beyond the Americas, we would be at a monumental disadvantage in respect to raw materials. For this reason alone—leaving aside for the moment all question of morals and politics, of strategic bases, and of industrial and economic power—our renunciation of the rest of the world and voluntary withdrawal to the so-called Gibraltar of the American Continent would be a policy as foolish as it is dangerous. We believe that if its advocates looked squarely at the facts as they are now and as they are likely to be for years to come, they would recognize the error of such a course.

Spies and Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorial comment from the Washington News and Washington Evening Star advocating immediate Congressional action to aid Federal investigative agencies in their efforts to apprehend and convict traitors, saboteurs, enemy spies, and other disloyal elements by permitting interception of their communications with one another. The editorials follow:

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of December 28, 1950]

SPIES AND LAWS

Congress has passed, at the Justice Department's request, a bill authorizing FBI agents to make arrests without warrants in cases involving espionage, sabotage, and other felonies.

Another bill, introduced by Representative K. B. KEATING, of New York, would legalize FBI wiretapping to obtain evidence against suspected spies and saboteurs.

Both measures result from the New York Federal Appeals Court decision which voided Judith Coplon's conviction for stealing secret Government information and giving it to a Russian agent. The court held that, although her guilt was clear, Miss Coplon had been deprived of the constitutional right to due process of law because—

FBI agents, who arrested her without a warrant, failed to prove as present law requires that this was necessary to prevent her escape.

The Government failed to prove that FBI wiretaps led to none of the evidence used in obtaining her conviction.

Present Federal law makes it a crime to intercept and divulge communications. Yet the FBI does intercept—does tap wires—in its work of protecting the country from spies, saboteurs, and other public enemies. It must first get permission from the Attorney General, who acts by authority of an Executive order issued by President Roosevelt in 1940. But if information the FBI obtains by wiretapping is divulged by its use as evidence in court, that can give a guilty spy basis for a successful appeal from conviction.

That is a ridiculous situation. If FBI wiretapping was essential to national security in 1940, it is more essential now. It should be legalized. Information obtained by this method should be made admissible as evidence. And safeguards against its abuse, and for the rights of innocent persons, should be provided.

The Keating bill proposes that the FBI be required to obtain wiretap permits from Federal courts, upon showing of good reason to believe that information thus obtained is necessary to proper investigations. This would seem a much better safeguard than the present requirement for permits from the FBI's boss, the Attorney General.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

"FOOLHARDY AND INEXCUSABLE"

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has used the right language to describe the handicaps imposed on American counterespionage agents by the anti-wiretapping provision of the Federal Communications Act. It is indeed foolhardy and inexcusable to continue to give spies and saboteurs the protection they now enjoy under section 605 of the law establishing the FCC. That section forbids interception and divulgence of communications. The Supreme Court has ruled that this bars the use in court of any evidence derived from wire tapping.

The committee, in its year-end report to the House, cites an anonymous case to illustrate the absurdity of permitting this legal restriction on prosecution of known spies and traitors to remain on the statute books. "The committee knows," the report states, "as do the intelligence agencies of the executive branch, the identity of an individual who has turned over secret and confidential information for the use of the Soviet Union. Proof of this traitorous act, together with proof that this individual perjured himself when he denied the accusation, is contained in the form of evidence which cannot be used in court because of a prohibition contained in the Federal Communications Act. The committee is aware that this is not the only case in which prosecution is affected by the act." (The report indicated that the case referred to is that of the mysterious Scientist X, said to have passed atomic information to Russia.) The committee expressed its horror at the immunity from prosecution conferred on such suspects by the much-debated section 605.

Congress has dillydallied too long with the wire-tapping problem. Surely there has been enough evidence of fifth-column operations within the past several years to convince any reasonable person of the grave risk of allowing spies to go free because of an ill-advised legal restraint on law enforcement. The cause of national security demands immediate amendment of the FCC law to enable the FBI and other intelligence agencies to listen in on spy communications and to use what they hear in court.

Hands-Off-Korea Advocates Lead Press Poll, 5½ to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me to place extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following article from the Binghamton Press:

HANDS-OFF-KOREA ADVOCATES LEAD PRESS POLL, 5½ TO 1

The hands-off-Korea advocates have dominated the Binghamton Press opinion poll by a landslide margin of 5½ to 1.

The believers in a stay-out-of-Europe policy also have prevailed in the poll, but with a lesser show of strength. Their margin is about 2 to 1.

A tabulation last night showed that 663 readers checked off and submitted the poll ballots published in the Press.

Exactly 620 readers voted on the Korea issue

Of that total, 527 readers, or 85 percent, said the United States should withdraw its troops immediately from Korea in order to provide a combat-trained corps for the big army of recruits now being built up in the United States.

This left only 93 readers, or 15 percent, who said the United States should keep its troops in Korea as long as possible to maintain a strong bargaining position in the hope a settlement can be negotiated with the Chinese and North Korean Communists.

The question of participation in Europe drew responses from 636 readers.

Of these, 417 readers, or 65½ percent, said the United States should refrain from sending men and arms to continental Europe. They believe the country would serve its own interests by strengthening its own defenses, with perhaps Great Britain as its farthest Atlantic outpost.

This left 219 readers, or 34½ percent, who said the United States should send men and arms to western continental Europe, provided that Europe itself assumes a fair share of the defense. They believe the United States thus would serve its own interests by deterring the Soviet Union.

Yesterday's tabulation showed approximately the same proportions as an earlier accounting, when only 212 ballots had been tallied. The later count showed just a slight strengthening of the "stay-at-home" faction.

About 100 of the readers had strong enough sentiments to attach notes to their ballots. In all but a few cases, these readers believe we should get out of Korea and stay out of Europe.

One reader advised adoption of this rule in international affairs:

"People are a great deal better off if they mind their own business."

Another said, with reference to Europe, that assignment of troops "should always be decided in Congress."

One reader, summed up a feeling shared by several others this way: "We need more men like HOOVER and TAFT."

At least four readers suggested bitterly that the big shots in Washington should be sent to Korea. This, they said would halt war.

One reader came up with a slogan: "TAFT or MacArthur for President."

Another said:

"We should export all Russians and persuade all western nations to do so. The taxpayers should be willing to pay their way back to Paradise, U. S. S. R."

From the other side of the fence, an internationalist said the first published results of the poll must have "the local Communists jumping with glee."

He also said cryptically that "maybe you should have taken the poll" at Harpur College, and added: "I'm for Truman, Acheson, Dulles, Dewey and Austin."

Another internationalist said American troops should stay in Korea as long as General MacArthur advises it. This reader also said, "We should not leave our European allies in the bag."

Feelings ran strong on both sides in this barrage of notes.

One reader suggested simply that another poll be held on the subject: "Should we impeach the President?"

What Are We Waiting for?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, recent news dispatches from abroad, concerning which there has been almost no comment at all in the newspapers, may provide an explanation of the hysteria which marks the actions and the pronouncements of the Truman administration.

From the signs and portents plainly visible in these news dispatches from responsible representatives of the major wire services, one is compelled to wonder if the administration realizes, and dare not admit, that it is later than anyone had thought.

The President concedes that it will be late in 1952, or possibly 1953, before Uncle Sam's fighting muscles regain a respectable size and strength. He concedes that the same is true with respect to our Western European allies. He remains, as yet, unwilling to do anything about building up the strength of our allies and potential allies in the Far East.

Yet these news dispatches reveal an over-all situation that calls for no vacillation, no delay, and for the most strenuous efforts to speed up war production and to put our economy on a wartime basis.

One dispatch, dated about 2 weeks ago, told how Russian soldiers, munitions, and equipment have been pouring through Black Sea ports into Bulgaria. Later news indicates that at least seven new divisions have thus entered the satellite nation lying closest to Yugoslavia, with more on the way.

A later dispatch told how Soviet Russia, within the last week or so, has massed troops in excess of half a million men around Vladivostok, close to Japan and not far from our Alaskan frontier.

Dispatches from various sources, in the last 10 days, have told how Soviet Russia is stepping up the effort to enlist the sympathies of oil-rich Iran, and take that country away from the camp of the western nations. The dispatches indicate that this effort is meeting with considerable success.

Within the last week dispatches from Berlin have told how the Russians have reestablished in part the former Berlin blockade, whereby coal from east Germany is prevented from reaching west Berlin. This was done in an apparent effort to create the necessity of a new Berlin airlift, which would draw American planes away from the Far East.

The action in Berlin would seem to hook up directly with the latest dispatches, which say that the Chinese Communists have massed several thousand vessels at Amoy and Foochow in readiness for an invasion of Formosa as soon as weather permits. It would seem to hook up, too, with General Douglas MacArthur's belief that Japan will be attacked, when and if American troops are driven entirely out of Korea.

The reason for Soviet Russia's apparent attempt to draw American planes away from the western Pacific, it seems to me, is the fact that our planes are important in the blockade now being maintained between Formosa and the Chinese mainland. Also that Russian strategists know well enough that our air power would be the greatest factor in preventing an invasion of Japan.

When all of these things are added together, and to them is added the appeasement of both Russia and the Chinese Reds, now sought by Great Britain and some other members of the United Nations, the outlook for halting the early onset of a new global war does not appear rosy.

In view of this black outlook for global war by next spring, it would seem to any reasonable person that the present vacillation and delay, the tendency of the Truman administration to preoccupy itself with the partisan political aspects of mobilization and the change to a war economy, unless laid aside at once, can lead only to further disaster.

Governor's Message to the Thirty-first Session of the Legislature of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very profound inaugural address delivered by the Honorable Len B. Jordan, Governor of Idaho, at the convening of the thirty-first session of the legislature, on January 9, 1951.

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

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE TO THE THIRTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF IDAHO, 1951

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the thirty-first legislature. We are gathered here today in joint session to examine

the solemn responsibilities of legislation in Idaho for the next 2 years. If the world were at peace, the task ahead of us would still be serious. In a world torn with conflict the burden is immeasurably greater.

It is a time for standing together, for in days like these we must preserve every ounce of strength and conserve every resource against the uncertain future. There is no greater resource than unity among our people.

We need to plan with calmness and deliberation as opposed to snap judgments and hysteria. To do this we must be able to trust each other, not have to suspect motives.

None can say how long the period of international conflict will last; no one knows how deeply we may become enmeshed in the crisis. Each day's news brings more confusion, and more sense of heartbreak and terror.

Against this background of chaos we begin today to set up our own State problems for examination. I am not a person who speaks in generalities; I shall tell you plainly what I think.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The people of this State must be warned not only of atomic attacks; they must be warned that saboteurs or special aerial bombs could spread infections among people, animals, and crops; and that colorless, odorless gases delivered by the same means could paralyze whole populations.

Local communities should be urged to build up their health agencies at once for defense against disaster from atomic, biological, or chemical warfare. Every city block and every county in this State should have a framework for defense set up for it.

Since all laws are better administered at the local level, we should have our civilian defense locally organized, thus to secure better functioning and better protection.

We must prepare all our resources and manpower for immediate mobilization if that becomes necessary. Up to now, our civil-defense program has been purely voluntary. Two officers from the Sixth Army Headquarters in San Francisco spent 2 weeks in Boise a month ago and assisted in setting up a civil-defense plan for the State, a plan to be integrated with those of neighboring States. Gov. C. A. Robins appointed Col. Phillip Doddridge as director. I concurred in that appointment.

Colonel Doddridge will have our plan ready for distribution sometime this week.

I have approved an emergency request for $10,000 to pay the administrative costs of his office for the 6-month period ending June 30. A similar administrative budget has been approved for the next biennium.

COST OF GOVERNMENT

The cost of government is always of major importance. In the midst of an undeclared war against an evil that threatens our very existence, and at a time when we have not yet recovered from a previous titanic struggle, our State revenues have reached their peak and are on the decline. Meanwhile our national debt has mounted to heights never before dreamed of. Our State income will be less this year and our Federal taxes to support the war will be much greater. This simply means that the State must spend less.

However, there is a measure of satisfaction in the fact that a substantial free balance remains at this time in Idaho's general fund. Government revenues can and often do shrink with amazing speed and Government functions cannot always be adjusted downward that fast. Obviously the safe course is to maintain a reserve or cushion of available funds to continue the essential services of Government during periods of lowered revenue. That is common sense.

The estimated free balance in the general fund June 30, 1951, should be approximately $4,500,000. As your Governor, I recommend that $2,000,000 of this amount be set aside in the permanent building fund. This will protect the orderly program of construction at State institutions that the legislature of 1947 undertook.

The possibility of demands upon State government for large emergency expenditures for civilian defense or for major catastrophes appears to justify an appropriation of $1,000,000 from this free balance for such protection. Use of this money should be subject to the will and control of the legislature, but without the need of calling a special session.

The remainder of the free fund balance, in my opinion, should be preserved intact against unexpected shrinkages in State revenue between now and June 30, 1953.

It may be that the estimated general-fund revenues of $32,500,000 during the biennium is too optimistic. To arrive at this figure it was assumed that while excise-tax collections may show an increase, State income taxes will probably reflect curtailed profits with a consequent reduction of at least one-sixth in the next biennium as compared to that now drawing to a close.

A substantial part of the reduction in income taxes will be due to the imposition of increased Federal taxes on incomes. These become items of expense in computing State income taxes. In a State like Idaho, where agriculture is an extremely important income factor, the reduced net profit on major crops, such as potatoes, will be felt keenly.

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS

Budget requests for appropriations from the general fund as first submitted to me totaled $48,500,000.

The first revision of these requests still totaled $47,000,000, leaving a gap of $14,500,000 between that total and the estimated general fund revenues of $32,500,000, which sum does not include State ad valorem tax receipts.

The easiest and most comfortable course to close this gap would be to seek so-called new sources of revenue. However, I am convinced that there are no new sources of tax revenue. What may appear to be new sources are actually only new avenues of approach to the same purse from which must come all money for operation of all Government, local, State and Federal. That purse is in the hand of the individual citizen. It is he who must finally pay every cent of the cost of government while meeting with today's 50-cent dollar the increased cost of his own living.

I am resolved that Idaho shall not go into deficit spending during the coming biennium, and it is my earnest hope that the members of this legislature will join me in this endeavor. Our State is solvent. We must keep it solvent. Our people will have to get along on less and be proud to do so. They must put aside pleasant dreams of free spending and focus on reality. And they must be ready personally to share in the cutting down—it is each of us, not somebody else, who must reduce his ideas of what the State can spend on itself.

Deficit financing as a planned policy is indefensible. Every department of State government must cut out spending for nonessentials, and I promise you the Governor's office will accept the same austerities that are asked of other departments.

Practically $1 in every $4 requested from the general fund has been eliminated in scaling the budget down. It is my belief that the existing tax system in Idaho when operating at maximum effect can produce adequate revenue for the conduct of all necessary functions of State government, assuming that these same functions are also operated efficiently.

Budget cutting is not painless or easy. It is especially hard when you realize, as I do, that salaries must follow the rising curve of living costs. With this in mind, and in this tme of high employment, I propose the economy of more efficient staffing of State offices. That is, we cannot cut salaries but we can eliminate personnel and insist that those retained do a day's work for a day's pay.

In facing the necessity of drastic cuts in the State budget requests, what government functions have the first claim on the tax dollars?

Few will dispute the statement that the humanitarian needs of our people have the highest priority. The unfortunate men, women, and children who find themselves on our relief rolls and in our custodial institutions must be cared for with preferment over other Government demands.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

I have made no cut in pensions and relief from the amount requested. This amount, while somewhat higher than that of the present biennium, is a revised figure. Living costs for recipients follow the same curve as do living costs for all other people. The deserving destitute must have more money to meet this rising figure.

Taking care of the relief load under this revised estimate will be possible only if the legislature will cooperate in clarifying certain public-assistance statutes so that exploitation of relief funds can be sharply checked.

The experience of a neighboring State indicates that it is quite possible to rid the relief rolls of elderly pensioners not actually dependent on the State. By so doing, more money should be available for the truly needy.

I urge your favorable consideration of legislation to attain this end.

EDUCATION: PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Education stands next in priority, and in that category public schools have the right to prior consideration over higher education.

The public school equalization request was for $9,000,000 from the general fund. A new transportation appropriation formula adopted by the State board of education at its meeting December 15, 1950, reduces State participation in public school equalization by an estimated $3,000,000, which action of the board I do approve.

I therefore approve the sum of $6,000,000 from the general fund for public school equalization as the State's full share in this program.

The transfer of the bulk of the transportation cost to the local level may require the upping of county or district levy limits for this purpose.

TEACHERS' RETIREMENT FUND

The budget request that three and a quarter million dollars be appropriated from the general fund to the reserve of the teachers' retirement fund does not have my approval. On the other hand, it is my recommendation that the legislature reappraise this entire problem, keeping in mind that you are free to alter any program set up by a preceding legislature in the light of two things: operating history and changed conditions.

It is conceivable that amendments to the Federal Social Security Act that have brought State and other local government employees under its coverage may be adequate for teachers as well. At any rate this possibility should have a full and dispassionate study, something that may not be feasible during a legislative session.

If there is even a remote chance that the State might some day be unable to keep up with the continuous increase in cash requirements for this program, this issue should be faced today, not later.

The present solvency of the fund and its adequacy to meet any existing demands upon it are not in question. But now is the time to determine our future course while existing reserves are adequate to pay back all personal contributions, provide for prior

service benefits and meet any transition costs that might be involved in modifying the program.

I repeat that I do not approve the budget request for $3,250,000 to be appropriated to the teachers' retirement fund.

HIGHER EDUCATION

It has long been clear to the thoughtful that Idaho is neither populous enough nor wealthy enough to support four institutions of higher learning.

It may come as a shock to some of you to learn that necessary adjustments have now been worked out between the State board of education and the university and State college jointly, to permit these two institutions to absorb the functions of the North Idaho College of Education and the South Idaho College of Education. The new arrangement would become effective at the end of the biennium, which is June 30, 1951, and I do so recommend, subject of course, to your approval.

Owing to military demands, curtailed enrollments are due at both the university and the college, and thus housing and classroom facilities would still be sufficient for absorption of students from the Lewiston and Albion institutions. It is my belief that the young people who choose education for their profession will have greater and not lesser opportunities under such a program. The greater scope at the university and at the State college should attract more men and women to the important field of teaching. No additional funds will be required by either the university or the State college to cover the expense occasioned by the proposed absorption.

I wish to touch here on the question of research work carried on by both our higher institutions. Some of this will have to be deferred, for resumption at a later, more prosperous period. Many activities that are justified in time of affluence must be reduced when revenues begin dwindling.

Along this line I recommend that the work of the agricultural extension service, admirable as it is, be made available only to those counties that feel it is of such value that they desire to bear half of the total cost.

PUBLIC HEALTH

I recommend particularly that you scrutinize the program for public health in Idaho. In the limited time I was able to give the subject, I became so involved in the intricacies of Federal matching funds that I cannot claim to see the picture clearly. I call your attention, however, to the mushrooming of public health requests during the past several years, and I raise the question, Where is it taking us?

SPECIAL FUNDS

Operations in State government that are financed from special funds are especially likely to be revised by legislative action. With this in mind, I have approved many special-fund budgetary requests on the theory that if they are not changed by legislative action, some revisions can be worked out through consultation with administrative heads.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The position that State government should occupy in the field of law enforcement calls for careful study. Certainly one aim should be the acceptance of their legal responsibility by all county and municipal officials and law-enforcement officers.

I do not believe that our economy justifies specialists in law enforcement. In other words, State police will be expected to handle any phase of law enforcement.

To increase the efficiency of our State system, the special session last year provided for fixed and mobile checking stations. It requires 24 men to handle these stations, and I have approved appropriations to activate this work in addition to a force of 25 regular State police. This adds up to what should be a highly efficient group of officers, men who are more than patrolmen, and who are available wherever State law enforcement, rather than local, must be used.

I assume that the State went into the liquor business first for regulation and control, and secondly, for profit.

Profits from liquor sales are divided between the general fund of the State and the counties. Liquor-law enforcement, therefore, becomes a joint responsibility of the State and the counties. One-half of 1 percent of total liquor sales has been set aside and earmarked for liquor-law enforcement exclusively. The $100,000 per biennium thus raised should be made available to the Department of Law Enforcement to defray the State police cost of liquor-law enforcement.

Let no one construe these comments as implying a let down in that law enforcement which is the responsibility of the State.

HIGHWAYS

Few State government activities have the widespread effect that the construction and maintenance of State highways have.

Because of the large stake of the Federal Government in our State land area, we receive substantial sums each year from that source. However, one-third of the State's area remains in private ownership, and a heavy ad valorem tax burden for secondary county and municipal highways and streets is the result. Our mountainous terrain and our widespread, small population increases this highway burden.

It is clear that any increase in funds for highways and streets will have to come from some type of highway-user revenue, and that a larger share of the total highway-user taxes should be available to local units of government, especially to those local units that levy the maximum for road needs.

It is mandatory that the legislature determine which of two types of State highway administration shall be employed. If a single administrator is made responsible for a highway program that spends $30,000,000 a biennium, then the salary ceiling that follows such responsibility must be raised.

Or, if responsibility is to be shared by a group, there should be clearly defined duties and authority. A tremendous volume of pressure has developed through the State following the authorization by the special legislative session of a highway advisory board.

I have reached the conclusion that the present administrative set-up with an advisory board is unworkable. We need workable highway laws. I shall have more to say about this later. Long-range highway planning is always essential in the public interest. It was never more so.

Highway-user taxes have not kept pace with the needs for highway maintenance and construction. Through long-range planning the fiscal needs of the entire State highway program can be determined.

Highway-user taxes can then be adjusted to meet the costs of the program.

Particular attention should be given to equitable distribution of highway costs among the several classes of highway users. I believe each class of users should pay its share of highway costs in proportion to the use it makes of the road plant.

SLOT MACHINES

Limitations under which cities and villages of Idaho could permit or prohibit the operation of slot machines and punchboards were provided by the legislature of 1947. If the present legislature decides that these acts should be repealed because such gambling devices are undesirable under any circumstances, I shall adhere to the statement I made prior to election. That is, if a proper bill prohibiting slot machines and punchboards, either or both, reaches my desk, I will sign it.

Whatever you decide, I earnestly request that you do not allow gambling legislation to consume a disproportionate share of valuable legislative time.

OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING

There is evidence that a number of revisions will be asked in laws relating to occupational licensing. These will be presented for groups seeking to have the State regulate their professions and occupations but at the same time collect license fees which would be spent without State regulation.

Some of these bills will probably create the equivalent of closed-shop conditions in these occupational groups, and it is important that they receive close study to determine who is to prescribe the rules and regulations that will prevail.

CONSOLIDATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

As an economy measure to effect the saving of possibly $50,000 in Federal funds, which, however, are collected annually from Idaho employers, to provide an integrated program without duplication of effort and as a safeguard against further growth of Federal control over State operation, I recommend uniting the Employment Service and Employment Security Agency into one department.

This combined department would be directly accountable to the governor on administrative matters of State policy and for efficient handling of all job placements, including placements of farm labor, veterans—particularly disabled veterans—and teachers, and for prompt payment of unemployment-insurance benefits to those claimants who are entitled to them. Appeals would still be made to the Industrial Accident Board.

Such a consolidation has already been effected in 44 States and is recognized by the Federal Government as a single program. Administrative funds of the two present agencies are provided by a single congressional appropriation and are received by the State in a single check.

The tax rates supporting the reserve fund would be adjusted so that they will not exceed the minimum necessary to maintain solvency. An actuarial study which has just been completed indicates that benefits can be raised and tax rates reduced while maintaining a safe financial position.

Legislation incorporating these as well as some other desirable improvements, including such things as preservation of veterans' experience rating rights and strenghtening fraud prevention in the employment security law, has been prepared for your consideration.

In all this talk of cutting down, some will argue that certain State departments will be deprived of funds now available under Federal grants or Federal aid.

Federal aid is a misbrand. All money that comes from Washington, D. C., originally came from Idaho or some other State. When it goes to Washington a good deal of it rubs off before it gets back. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, Federal participation means Federal regulation with all the involvements of bureaucratic red tape.

I am asking every State office to operate on less money than it has requested, or else accept the responsibility of justifying its increased expenditures before the proper committees of the legislature.

There are no exceptions to this rule. I am not asking other departments to do what I am not willing to do myself. Accordingly, the combined request for the office of the governor and budget director has been reduced substantially below the level of the past biennium.

SALARIES

Salaries of elective and appointive State officials in Idaho are much more uniform than are the comparable duties and responsibilities of the several offices.

If we are to keep on attracting capable men and women to the service of this State,

it will be necessary for the legislature to review and to take action removing the inequities of the system.

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Your committee on workmen's compensation and occupational diseases has completed its work well in advance of the opening of this session, and its report is before you for consideration.

It is desirable that this important study be given fullest attention by the legislature to the end that any action taken shall be for the best interests of all affected parties.

UNDERGROUND WATER

Regulation of water is no longer a problem limited almost entirely to surface water. Today we have not only underground water rights with which to deal, but we have rainmaking as an extra complication. The sooner underground water rights are controlled by legislation the less troublesome they will become. The problem affects agricultural, municipal, industrial, and other interests and should have your careful consideration.

DRIVERS' LICENSES AND DRIVER TRAINING

I urge you to enact a new drivers' license law patterned after the uniform code, a law that will help reduce the useless slaughter on our highways. It is clear that this kind of murder cannot be stopped by licensing alone, unless accompanied by driver education.

I believe every high-school student should be taught to drive safely, should be taught the law of the road and the rights of others, and that such a course should be virtually compulsory.

Such a course should not be limited, either, to the public school. Training on the law of the road should extend to adult classes so that individuals would know road laws before they are permitted to have a driver's license.

The Automobile Dealers Association, automobile manufacturers, and insurance companies have spent great sums for moving pictures on safe driving and are ready to cooperate with any program designed to save life on the highways.

NO STRAIGHT BALLOT

I urge the legislature to consider doing away with the straight ballot in our general elections. Under the present law, election boards are often obliged to make arbitrary rulings, rulings that may vary from precinct to precinct. This type of confusion should be stopped.

As a former member of the Idaho Legislature, I feel that I have some knowledge of what you expect of the Governor. I feel you are entitled to frankness and the clearest possible statement of my general policies.

It is commonly believed that you are also entitled to leadership, and when I say leadership, I do not mean dictatorship.

It is desirable that there be a full exchange of information between legislative leaders and the office of the Governor. By exchange I do not mean a one-sided giving. I mean a reciprocal connection.

When you examine the budget, you will observe that I have taken action in every case. On page 8 in the budget book under "Governor's action" you will see a column with the caption "Passed"—a column that could be used for "passing the buck." You will find no entries of mine in this column. Right or wrong, I have given you my best judgment on every request.

I wish to counsel you, as members of the legislature, to apply economy and efficiency in determining the value, the importance of, and the necessity for every piece of legislation passed.

I urge you to reject every piece of proposed legislation for which there is no desperate need.

I request you to eliminate all duplicate machinery in the operation of the State's business.

You must keep the proposed State budget within the present revenue available and reject all demands of pressure groups to increase the benefits of legislation beyond the capacity of the people of the State of Idaho to pay the bill.

We must reduce the tax burden in this State if we are to remain a solvent democracy while waging a new kind of war against totalitarianism.

By their ballots the people of the State have brought us in session here, and have assigned to us the trust of conducting their government through these important and troubled times.

May we be given the fortitude and the integrity to do what is right, in the best light that is granted us.

The Primacy of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the presidential address delivered to the American Political Science Association at its annual meeting in Washington December 28, 1950, by Dr. James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan. I am advised by the Public Printer that the article will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $348.50.

In view of the fact that the address contains much food for thought respecting our Government, I make the request that in spite of the added cost, the address may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PRIMACY OF POLITICS

(By James K. Pollock)

In presenting my valedictory to this distinguished association which has honored me by selecting me as its president, I should like to point out by way of introduction what has happened to this office, and therefore to me, during the past year. I have heard of one of my distinguished predecessors some 25 years ago who had little else to do as president of this association than work all year on his presidential address. This was important work, and I have no word of criticism of it. But the association has changed, and today it leaves to the harried wearer of its presidential toga little time to reflect about the status of political science and his own impact, if any, upon it. An active association life, now happily centered in our new Washington office, is enough to occupy the full time of your president, and universities as well as this association might well take note. Therefore, in presenting my own reflections to you this evening in accordance with the custom of our association, I do so without the benefit of the generous time and scholarly leisure which were the privileges of some of my distinguished predecessors.

Nevertheless I do base my presidential address today upon my own active participation in the problems of government, as well as upon my scholarly experience. I have extracted it in part from the dynamics of pulsating political life. It has whatever authority I may possess after having been exposed these 25 years to the cross-fire of politics, domestic and foreign, as well as to the benign and corrective influences of eager students and charitable colleagues. This change in the nature of presidential addresses reflects, I believe, the new role of the political scientist and the development of our profession.

I

As our association moves into a second half century of activity, I am impressed with the seriousness of our responsibility. As I see it, our responsibility is primary because politics is primary and central to every great problem facing us today. There is nothing new about the central importance of politics, for Aristotle long ago referred to politics as the most sovereign of the sciences and as the master science. In his Ethics he pointed out that it is "politics that determines what other sciences should be studied in states; which of them should be learned by each group of citizens; and to what extent they should be learned * * * observation," he continued, "shows that even the forms of capacity which are most highly esteemed—the art of war; the art of household management; the art of oratory—come under the control of politics." Considering the complexity of modern civilized existence, it is even more true today than ever before that political action is of primary importance. Little can be accomplished any more without reference to political processes.

Unfortunately, however, political scientists in their study of politics have not quite kept pace with the complex responsibilities which have been placed upon them. In the Greek city-state, responsibilities were few and of rather limited scope. In the modern world, our responsibilities are very broad and very compelling.

In the present state of national and international politics, a special responsibility attaches to Americans. Particularly in the last decade new duties all over the world have been thrust upon us. As a result of the war, the United States in various parts of the globe, is now performing services which a generation ago would have been thought impossible. Our role in the creation and in the operation of the United Nations is likewise of great importance. Our leadership in the programs of military occupation both in Europe and in the Far East have been a drain upon our resources and continue to pose serious problems for the United States. The unprecedented American economic aid and technical assistance under the program of Economic Cooperation has not only been a boon to world economic recovery, but has demonstrated to us the possibility of constructive action in raising the welfare level of human beings everywhere. More recently the point 4 program and our leadership in the North Atlantic Treaty organization, not to mention our fathering of programs intended to facilitate European integration and Philippine rehabilitation, illustrate the extent and complexity of our international activity, and the measure of responsibility placed upon us. Our country, in a word, has been doing something new and distinctive and has assumed a role heretofore unknown to us.

We have not always sought the leadership of these programs. This leadership has been thrust upon us and as a consequence we have not always done our best, although it is clear to me that our contribution has been very great indeed. In some cases it has been almost providential that we have had a Clay, a Hoffman, a McCloy, or a MacArthur to handle programs of great magnitude, complexity, and importance. Lacking the ex-

perience and the trained personnel to undertake great programs, we have often had to improvise and we have sometimes found that our intentions and our programs have been misunderstood and misinterpreted. Anyone familiar with our efforts to staff overseas functions knows only too well how few Americans are really familiar with the other cultures of the world, and capable of working with them in a constructive way.

Despite unprecedented American activity and generosity, both their country and the world are, unfortunately, still affiliated with tensions. Our period has been well characterized as "the twilight of warlike peace." We are now in the midst of great defense preparations at the same time that we are attempting to carry on life and business as usual. Everyone asks, "Will there be war? Shall we have inflation? Must we stand still in other areas while we are putting the country in a state of defense?"

II

It is in this atmosphere, in this crisis situation, that I am called upon to discuss certain critical areas of our politics and to emphasize the responsibility of political scientists with respect to them. Such a discussion, I believe, will serve to emphasize the primacy of political considerations. Let me speak first of the impact of our new world position upon our Government and our whole political life. Our new role in world affairs has placed new organizational requirements upon the State Department in particular but also upon the whole Government. In the words of the Report of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch:

"The executive branch today finds itself forced to develop positive foreign policies and programs involving not only the State Department, but many other departments and agencies as well and to deal cooperatively with other nations on a multilateral as well as a bilateral basis. The Congress, in addition, finds that the exercise of its traditional powers in the domestic as well as in the international field has made it a participant in the conduct of foreign affairs on an unprecedented scale.

"The problems of Government organization for the conduct of foreign affairs are, therefore, not confined to the State Department alone but involve the organization of the Presidency, the State Department and the Foreign Service, the departments and agencies other than the State Department, the interdepartmental relationships and the relationships between the executive and legislative branches."

In the good old days, the State Department might have to handle a crisis or two every year; but now Mr. Acheson is faced with a major crisis almost every day. If the crisis does not develop overseas, it is almost certain to develop in some portion of the Capitol. Adding to the complexity of the situation is the greatly increased size of the Government as a whole and of the State Department in particular. Our Foreign Office now is almost five times larger in personnel than it was 10 years ago and in terms of appropriation, nearly 12 times larger. In the interdepartmental field, there are more than 30 committees concerned with economic, social, military, and other aspects of foreign affairs. Of the 54 major departments and agencies in the executive branch, at least 46 are drawn into foreign affairs to a greater or lesser extent. Statutory interdepartmental bodies, such as the National Security Council, have assumed greater importance. Certain units, such as the Department of Defense and the Economic Cooperation Administration, are deeply involved with the administration of occupied areas abroad and with financial assistance overseas. The Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Commerce Department are important in international financial and agricultural matters, and also in connection with export control.

Congressional participation in the conduct of foreign affairs has become particularly evident in the expanding role of the House of Representatives in connection with appropriations for foreign programs. Under existing constitutional arrangements and structural provisions, the State Department has to operate under strictures and limitations which do not hamper any other foreign office in the world. When there is mutual cooperation and restraint between the executive and legislative branches, progress is achieved. But past experience points to the need of several significant changes if our country and our people are to play a significant and important role in world affairs. There, political considerations are primary.

Some of the necessary changes are organizational in character and have been dealt with adequately in the recent report to which I have referred. When the full effect of the reorganization of the State Department recently authorized by Congress has been felt, and when time has been given to allow the Department itself to work out the fundamental changes in its internal organization and personnel recently recommended to the Secretary of State—assuming always the support and sympathy of Congress—we will have a staff and an organization in our foreign office adequate to the traffic and requirements of our complicated world.

In two areas, however, we shall need to make important changes. One is in the administration of overseas affairs; the other is in the position of the United States Senate. On the latter point I should like to quote from the Report of the Hoover Commission on Foreign Affairs and then add a postscript. The report said:

"One serious procedural impediment to achieving satisfactory legislative-executive cooperation is the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote for the confirmation of treaties. No thoughtful student of the conduct of foreign affairs can ignore the consequences of this provision. It is a serious trouble breeder between the executive branch and the Senate in that such an inherently rigid rule encourages circumvention by the Executive by resort to the procedures of executive agreements and joint resolutions. Attempts to use these procedures, in turn, involve friction between the Senate and the House of Representatives. An especially bad result is that the emphasis is directed to the question of whether the proper procedure is being employed, instead of to the substance of the issues before the Congress. The question of a change in the present requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote is deemed, however, to be outside the province of this Commission."

Speaking now as a responsible political scientist and not as a member of a Government commission, I should like to recommend that the power of the Senate over treaties be modified in the light of present world and domestic requirements. Many of my distinguished colleagues have previously recommended an amendment to the Constitution by which treaties should be confirmed by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone. Such a change in my view is eminently fitting and necessary. It arises not from any desire to lessen the effectiveness of the United States Senate, but rather from the necessity of bringing the present constitutional provision into accord with the requirements of present international life, both at home and abroad. When one considers the speed with which international developments are moving today, not to mention the procedures of other countries with which we are now having close and friendly relations, it would seem reasonable to press at this time for a constitutional change. It is possible, of course, that difficulties between the Senate and the Executive in foreign affairs can be eliminated by other means, but I think it is doubtful

With respect to the administration of overseas affairs, I feel a special urge to press for some prompt retooling of this aspect of our organization for the conduct of foreign relations. The Korean War and the Bell report on the Philippines have recently been added to the new problems of the ECA, the North Atlantic Treaty organization, and point 4, to emphasize how the American Government has developed vast overseas operating agencies to alleviate suffering and to ameliorate economic conditions all over the world. Among other things, these new activities require a new type of public servant. Without disparaging our military or diplomatic personnel, it is, I believe, quite correct to say that specialized administrative and technical qualifications are necessary for the successful operation of these huge overseas ventures. We have done, in my opinion, amazingly well under very trying circumstances. But I should be less than frank if I did not also say that the development of a corps of career men, trained for overseas operations, as distinguished from the training now provided for the foreign diplomatic and military services, is urgently required. The magnitude and importance of the problem is grasped when one recalls that there are now almost as many Federal civilian employees outside the United States as in the city of Washington.

Furthermore, it is no longer possible to have a unified foreign policy, if we do not have a unified administrative center in Washington under the policy direction of the State Department. The recent Gray report has shown very admirably how all aspects of American foreign policy, political, economic, and military, must be interlinked and a proper organizational home provided. It might be well to add that coordination and unification of all overseas administrative activities in Washington will be without full effect unless we achieve the same degree of unification under each of our foreign missions abroad. It is just as bad to have several spokesmen for America in a foreign capital as it is to have several of them in Washington.

We should also not forget that the appropriations for providing participation by the United States in international organizations and conferences exceeds the combined appropriations of the State Department and the Foreign Service. In the active international arena in which we are now very well supplied—not to say almost overwhelmed—with all kinds of functional organizations and international conferences, it becomes increasingly important that our Government should promote efficient arrangements and procedures for our activities in these international organizations. Otherwise, we will not get value received for our expenditures, and our foreign commitments will become confused.

Another factor of supreme importance is the close collaboration between the State Department and the Department of Defense. Similar close coordination between foreign and military policy now, I trust, happily on the way to realization, will avoid the bickering, the delays, and the fatal mistakes which characterized clashes between these two arms of our Government toward the end of the war and immediately thereafter.

Finally, if in addition to this improvement in the structure and operation of our foreign policy, we could at the same time achieve a more responsible and cooperative relationship between Congress and the State Department, we should then have the basis for a popular understanding and support of foreign policy which now seems to be lacking.

In a well functioning democracy, the people must also be associated with policy formulation. As long, however, as the responsible agencies of the Government continue to pull

and haul and to confuse the public about the great issues confronting the world, there is little chance for the citizen to participate with any degree of satisfaction or confidence in helping to decide great international questions. All of these problems are of primary importance and they are political.

III

The reorganization of our conduct of foreign affairs is only part and parcel, however, of the much larger problem of adapting our whole democratic structure to the increased needs of the time. "We need," as John Gaus puts it effectively, "a theory of Government functions and one of the classification, recruitment, and education of the personnel to administer them that are reflective of the conditions of big democracy." I have not yet recovered, in fact I am not sure that I ever will, from the shock I received when I recently observed and scrutinized from an unequaled vantage point the whole vast, sprawling edifice of the Federal Government. It takes a man of great hardihood to look at, let alone understand, the budget of the United States with its thousand-odd pages. But the experience of being regaled for 2 years with all of the facts and figures relating to the organization and functioning of the huge Federal structure which spreads all over this country and all over the world, has naturally left on me some lasting impressions which I still find difficult to express.

Despite unprecedented achievements in reorganizing the Federal Government, much remains to be done. One trouble, of course, is that so much more than government in the formal sense is involved in Government reorganization. If someone, more statesmanlike than the average, is seminal and vital and penetrating in his proposals, he immediately encounters the entrenched and the selfish interests which consider themselves to be adversely affected by these recommendations. The great extravaganza which is staged every year in Congress, an extravaganza which the late Will Rogers one time referred to as "Rivers and Harbors" or "I'll Get Mine," is a case in point. Here again it is the politics of the problem, and not merely its administration, which must be solved.

Even when it is essentially a bureaucratic responsibility and opportunity, much pushing by citizens is necessary. I still catch my breath when I reflect on how the President, not merely President Truman, but any President, must decide great questions. Even the very smart Budget Bureau does not know, or finds it politic not to inquire, who is doing what and when and how in the President's office. The idea of a career staff secretary such as was recently recommended by our Commission after a careful, and if I may say so, highly realistic consideration of the problem under our constitutional system, apparently does not appeal to those immediately around the President. Like staff reductions, such proposals must often be pressed from outside the bureaucracy.

The importance of pressure-group opposition and bureaucratic neglect should not be minimized, as I will presently indicate. But it is very important to realize that the Federal Government has become so big and awkward that it is, in effect, out of control. So difficult is it to secure the cooperation of numerous officials and agencies involved in any program, and in all programs, that at any given time no one is on top of the heap. Bureau or departmental autonomy, statutory restrictions, overlapping jurisdiction, absence of coordination, poor staff services, and just plain bigness add up to a condition of lack of control—one might say free wheeling—which is the opposite of that responsible democracy which we seek to have. No political scientist has developed hydramatic control for Government machines, or if he has, it has not yet been adopted.

It is still a source of amazement to me that otherwise sensitive and intelligent men should continue to pile billion upon billion and bureau upon bureau without much thought of the administrative and political consequences. It is hard for me to believe that any thoughtful person could still think that it was possible for any one agency to attempt to write or even approve the position classifications in the entire Federal service. Or that the Congress of the United States should be so perverse and unlearned in the principles of financial administration as to continue to insist upon a system which runs counter to the almost unanimous views of those who have studied the question. It is disheartening and discouraging to find that even hospitals are bandied about with the same kind of financial and public abandon that characterizes the construction of a dam on Tombigbee Creek or the dredging of the Clatskanie. Even when the political scientist considers himself to be a sort of political pathologist and tries to view the whole scene with that scientific reserve and calm judgment which befits anyone whose appellation is scientist, he still feels like remarking with Ostrogorski that "God takes care of drunkards, of little children, and of the United States."

Perhaps as Herbert Emmerich remarks: "Our governmental institutions are better than we tend to think." But we must not forget that they are now assailed by new enemies and by reinforced old ones. At a time of national crisis we should not be tolerant of inefficiency, nor neglectful of popular control. A new compulsion is now present which should drive the Congress and the President to move with all speed in the direction of implementing the recommendations of the last few years which would put our house in order for any emergency.

I cannot hope in a few brief moments to summarize all of my deep reflections about executive organization and of the relation of Congress to it. But I do want to demonstrate how political considerations are of primary importance and to say that we have only started along the road of integrating our economy, our defense, and our resources. Despite the reorganization of Congress and the progress which has been made toward executive reorganization, there still remains a vast area of inefficiency, duplication, and lack of control which continues to be a menace to our free institutions. The great problem of executive-legislative relationships cannot be effectively tackled until both the executive and legislative branches are in such reasonable state of organization that one can think of having them work together successfully. As long as Congress fails to equip itself with adequate, nonpartisan staffs, and as long as it relies almost entirely upon seniority to select its leadership, and as long as the executive branch continues to consist of a congeries of unrelated services, dependent upon and limited by a nineteenth-century set of personnel regulations, just so long will the pattern of our Federal politics be one of oscillation between executive bureaucracy and congressional oligarchy.

With the pedagogs now rushing to Washington for Federal aid to education, I suppose it will not be too long until Washington, not content with generous grants to farmers and veterans, will be filled with strange new ideas of educational organization and expenditure, and one of the last fields left to the States and the localities will be dumped willy-nilly upon the overloaded shoulders of the Federal Government. Decentralization and deconcentration which seem to be our only salvation, will then become nothing but empty words. This would be fatal indeed to our democracy. As Charles Beard one time pointed out: "Unless our administrative system is so constructed and operated as to keep alive local and individual responsibilities, it is likely to destroy the basic wellsprings of activity, hope, and enthusiasm necessary to popular government and to the following of a democratic civilization."

There is not much use worrying about intergovernmental relations unless some effective limit is placed upon the power and activity of the Federal Government. No one can say with any assurance what the optimum load of the Federal Government can be. But it is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that we are now attempting in Washington and through the Federal Government much more than can be efficiently administered or popularly controlled. I might suggest that we already have in the Federal Government unsolved problems of sufficient seriousness that we do not need to take on any more. For instance, in the very critical period ahead when national security will demand a large military budget, our time-honored devices for subordinating the military to civilian control, to say the least, are likely to prove to be inadequate. This whole field of civil-military relationships deserves the closest study and scrutiny. To involve the Federal Government in further new problems at a time when a question like this, so fraught with grave consequences for the future of our Republic, is pending and unsolved, would seem to be utterly foolhardy and irresponsible. Progress in coordinating diplomatic and military planning, at least at the top, could easily be shattered if Congress attempts to rely merely upon its control of the purse strings without insisting simultaneously upon what is necessary to develop firm lines of authority and accountability within the executive branch.

I cannot conclude my discussion of the labyrinth which is the executive branch, or the confusion in the Congress, without referring to the real menace of pressure-group politics as it operates in the Capital City. Harold Lasswell has not exaggerated when he wrote:

"National policy increasingly becomes a matter of deals made between national pressure group officials and the bureaucracy of executive departments and agencies. What the pressure organization is able to 'deliver,' more than ever depends upon what the officials of a centralizing government find it expedient to give."

It is deeply discouraging to the average citizen, as it is depressing to the trained observer, to find the public so frequently pushed around in favor of combinations of interest groups. "Aggression of groups and agencies against the people as a whole," as Mr. Hoover puts it, "is not a process of free men. Special privilege either to business or groups is not liberty." The unusual and plutocratic and extravagant atmosphere of Washington is in no small measure due to the unlimited resources of lobbies and special interests which find their outlet in some portion of the District of Columbia. This problem, although seriously affecting the whole functioning of the Federal structure of government, must be remedied elsewhere than in Washington. Thus I come to the next point of my discourse.

IV

One of the major problems of our democracy, after all, is how to strengthen and improve our political parties. We cannot exalt and enthrone the citizen without at the same time utilizing the politician. Under our form of government the politician operates within the framework of the two-party system, which, over the generations, has acquired a peculiar form and certain peculiar habits. The special form and spirit of our party system has determined the whole character of our government. Party politics is therefore of central importance. Sooner or later in every discussion of government and politics in this country, one must come back to the organization and functioning of our political parties. Party organization by

itself is of crucial importance and although American political scientists are probably in advance of those in all other countries of the world in their understanding and analysis of party processes, nevertheless in the last decade we have tended to emphasize—some might say overemphasize—other aspects of our discipline. We now have it on the best of authority that "in democracy all social classes, all economic interests, all expertise, planning, and power are subordinated to politics." Until recently some enthusiasts had almost convinced us that there was nothing outside the administrative framework.

It requires little argument to demonstrate that effective popular government rests upon a proper functioning of the party system. In the United States, a basic prerequisite not merely to good administration, but to active citizen participation and control is a responsible two-party system. We know, however, particularly since the growth and change of the Federal Government in the last 25 years, that our parties and our politics have gradually become more and more confusing and frustrating, not merely to students of government but also to the sovereign citizens themselves. Alert to the great significance of this subject, our association several years ago created a special committee on political parties. That committee under the chairmanship of Professor Schattschneider has now, after the most commendable study of the problem, presented to us and to the country a keen analysis and a series of important recommendations. I commend this report to you and to the country, and express my deep gratification that it should have been completed and presented at this important turning point in our political development. I might add that having just come through, or one might say having just survived, another national election, we should be more than ever instilled with the strong desire of raising the level and improving the quality of party action. How to relate public action and public decisions to the legislative and administrative processes must ever remain before us as subjects requiring the most thorough and complete and constant study.

In this connection it is well to remember that graft, corruption, improper influence, excessive campaign expenditures, still constitute the Achilles heel of democracy. In the political arena as well as in the legislative and executive branches, we must be ever on the alert to detect and to ferret out influences and practices which interfere with the true expression of the popular will. The present investigation of the interrelation of gambling and politics conducted by one of our distinguished Members, Senator KEFAUVER, is an encouraging case in point. In public elections today more than ever is at stake, and as students of politics we must be more than ever active and alert to detect, understand, and explain to our fellow citizens the true import of political developments. Yes, politics is primary; everything else is supplementary and secondary. Although American political life is at times quite disorderly and confusing, it is still unwise and ineffectual to attempt to solve legislative and executive and administrative problems as if they were separate and distinct from the party process.

V

I have now presented a series of observations about government and politics in the United States which are deemed worthy of particular attention at this time. I come next to a discussion of the place of the political scientists in our new political and governmental setting.

As I remarked earlier, our present situation has been aptly referred to as the "twilight of warlike peace." What we used to refer to as crisis government has become chronic. Emergency conditions have become the regular and normal thing. We, as political scientists, would be derelict indeed if we did not throw the light on ourselves and on our collective work to see if we are now doing as significant work as is required, or as we are capable of doing. "Have the scales fallen from our eyes and has the lead gone from our feet?"

I have spoken earlier of Aristotle's reference to politics as "the master science." But are we working today in relation to all the social sciences as if we were the master, the coordinating, the integrating discipline? I think not. I believe that we are not as vital and active and significant as we should be, and I want to express my own view as to the reasons for the academic restraint and reserve which up to this time have characterized our activities. Our contributions are urgently needed, and although political scientists as individuals are now active and important in the various levels of our political and governmental life, I strongly hope for greater and wider activity by our association.

Why are we so restrained? Perhaps our recent specialization and compartmentalization has weakened the significance of our work. Perhaps we, as a discipline, have a separation-of-powers doctrine which prevents us from cooperative work with brother political and social scientists. I realize, of course, the vastness of the subjects with which we deal and the natural modesty of political scientists to avoid the sweeping generalizations—and errors—which make some politicians and even members of other disciplines objects of pity or derision.

But after all, the political scientist is and must be a generalist. Just like the politician, as Paul Appleby puts it, "Is the preeminent, practicing governmental generalist," so must the political scientist who studies, and who we know is called upon to advise the politician, be a person who trains himself to deal with large, complicated problems. Acquaintance with all allied disciplines is necessary, for one can hardly be a generalist unless he is able to generalize from something—namely, the facts, procedures, and processes outside as well as inside his own profession. Even more necessary is the ability to take a set of facts and recommend a sound policy out of them.

John Gaus recently referred to economic and social policies which are "gaily—or grimly—urged today with almost no reflection" of administrative experience, and recalled how Margaret Cole frankly confessed to the neglect of political factors by a group of which she was an active member. "Gaily or grimly" is good, but with what grave consequences to our welfare. Government has more and more become so complicated that policy must be formulated, not by a specialist but by a generalist if we are not to become, even more than at present, a loose confederation of modern feudal interests. What we need is a political scientist who in the words of Sir Edward Bridges in his rede lecture "will be a good adviser in any field because he or she knows how and where to go to find reliable knowledge, can assess the expertise of others at its true worth, can spot the strong and weak points in any situation at short notice, and can advise how to handle a complex situation."

Of course, we must not expect the best thought and the best men in our profession to be automatically transferred to the posts in government where they could do the most good. Unfortunately in these days of impoverished research, inadequate travel, heavy teaching loads, and impecunious living, we must not expect too much. In fact, it is one of our most urgent problems to release the abilities of our most mature scholars to work on the new and the difficult and the enormous problems which beset our world. We must not send a boy to do a man's work. Neither must we kill off the great minds we have already developed, in commuting between Washington and our seats of learning. It seems that both universities and governments have neither the heart nor any proper realization of what is necessary to assure the availability and full contribution of leading minds to the processes of government.

Herbert Emmerich has pointed out how we must recognize "that no one of the serious problems of today and tomorrow can be answered by the specialized approach. The big questions of today and tomorrow are not just matters of public administration, or of international relations, or of administrative law, or of public opinion, or of political theory. They do not belong exclusively to any of the specialists in these subdivisions of our field. All the insights of the political-science disciplines must be focused on these questions with a view to getting complete, not partial, answers—and in time to have some effect on action. We must break down the jurisdictional boundaries which divide us within our own field, and the jurisdictional jealousies, and work at these problems as complete scientists."

I cannot agree with my dear friend, Charles Merriam, when he writes that "the weal or woe of mankind in the coming years rests very largely with administration and administrators." I think it rests with politics and politicians in the broadest sense of these terms. My belief is that any narrow specialization is inimical to the primacy of our subject and to the success of government in a free society. It is the complete political scientist skilled in the art and science of politics—not just in theory, in law, in administration, but in politics—whom I espouse, and on whom so much depends.

One of our colleagues, who is in a position to know, pointed out to me how most everything in government might be considered an economic problem. "Yet," he added, "when economists in Government get together to develop a new policy, what they really talk about and what they really think about is politics. There is nothing wrong with this," he concluded, "because they must develop policies that are possible; and politics is, above all, the art of the possible. The only trouble is the tendency to approach essentially political problems in an amateurish way because of a failure to recognize their political character."

One of my distinguished colleagues who will remain anonymous, has asked me, "Why the other social sciences with their glamorous new vocabularies are playing so vigorously in our own backyards, including those of sample polling and political theory?" The answer in part is that we have not sufficiently utilized the materials and techniques available to us in related disciplines. We have been somewhat deterred, it is true, by the horrible gobbledegook, particularly of the social psychologist, and we have had no desire to subordinate the substance to the technique. No doubt the other social sciences can help us. But the almost overwhelming problems of the modern world can only be solved by our most mature minds, and political science is the integrating and synthesizing discipline. The pulling together must be under our auspices. Economic and social problems occur in their most vital form in the political-legislative-administrative processes, and we must use other social sciences and accept a definite leadership in our relationships to them.

It was, I believe, our own Charles Merriam who provided the inspiration and leadership for social-science integration in this country. The first president of the Social Science Research Council, Robert Crane, was also a political scientist, and his present successor, Pendleton Herring, is also one of the stars in our political-science firmament. It is in no narrow disciplinary way that I would insist on the primacy of politics in determining public policy. I have seen something of

the mistakes which are made because too specialized minds are at times on top, and because a broad political judgment was absent. It is the task of the political scientist to synthesize everything which goes into the formulation and implementation of public policy.

I am not interested in jurisdictional conflict, and I believe in drawing more fully upon the anthropological, psychological, sociological contributions which are available to us on a basis of interdisciplinary exchange. But I would be less than frank with you if I did not assert that foreign and military policy is hardly the task of the nuclear physicist, and that power and bureaucracy and other similar concepts are being manhandled by the psychologists. Why? Partly because political scientists have not sufficiently used the other social sciences and partly because we are focusing too much attention on small problems without developing frontal attacks on large, significant ones.

Nevertheless, there are more practical and mundane reasons. The mere bigness of a problem, like legislative-executive relationships, for instance, is almost beyond the facilities of political scientists, unaided and unsupported, to handle. Without the generous support of the Carnegie corporation it would not have been possible to produce our recent report on political parties and the party process. With the Federal Government devoting a billion dollars a year to research, mostly in the physical and biological sciences, it is only occasionally that funds are available for those really seminal and significant investigations into our vast governmental and political structure which present conditions require. Political scientists and social scientists generally may, therefore, quite legitimately excuse themselves because of lack of adequate equipment and resources. The terrific and overweening development of science and technology has necessarily pushed us aside for the time being, but it will not be for long. An active committee in our association, headed by one of our greatly respected expresidents, Arthur Holcombe, will soon make our judgment and influence felt.

Perhaps the most favorable development of our times in its effect on human welfare is the activation of the policy and program of the Ford Foundation. The work of its study committee on which our president-elect served, has been correctly evaluated by Henry Ford II as "one of the most thorough, painstaking, and significant inquiries ever made into the whole broad question of public welfare and human needs." Their work and recommendations, which every member of this association should read, were accepted unanimously by the trustees, and there is therefore now in existence what never existed before in such ample form, financial support for large and significant research by political and other social sciences. No longer can we complain that resources are not available. The Ford Foundation can now redress the balance in favor of the social scientists.

I am tremendously impressed with the impact of this report upon our profession. It may well become the greatest boon to fruitful and constructive research and action in the political field we have ever had. As the president of this association, I salute this significant development and express our deep satisfaction that now for the first time in our history we have the possibility, if we are good enough, to assume our rightful place in making significant contributions to world peace, in the strengthening of democracy, and in the other areas for the advancement of human welfare.

In what I have said about the place of political scientists, and in the expression of my hopes and desires for a greater future for our profession, I would not have anyone think that we are not now playing a significant role through our leading members and in our research and teaching everywhere. Our vice president today is Ralph Bunche, recently winner of the Nobel Prize, and there are many others who are indispensable as advisers and participants in the decision of public questions at all levels of government.

But I still think that we must step up the significance of our work. Political theory, for instance, could do much today in the development of a more adequate concept and understanding of the democratic way. We have not contributed as much as we should to the practical solution of international affairs—perhaps in the latter case because we have gotten away from solid foundations in comparative government and international law. I also feel that we should not shy away from proposing remedial action once we have made our analyses.

Our training of political scientists leaves much to be desired. We should rethink and recast our graduate training programs so as to develop generalists who are acquainted with the other social sciences as well as with the emerging and pulsating political life around them. The new generation of political scientists must have a stronger sense of their important mission, they must be better equipped to understand and handle the procedures of other related disciplines, and they must be trained in the evaluation of large situations and in the solution of big problems. Perhaps I should say with Plato "that is the pattern according to which they are to order the state and the lives of individuals * * * making philosophy their chief pursuit, but when their turn comes, toiling also at politics and ruling for the public good."

Nor have we included in our profession many who are interested and active in public affairs, those whose research contributes materially to the knowledge of political life, but who are not academicians, and those who teach citizenship to the large mass of our people who never attend a college or a university. If our research is to have the practicality which it requires, and if the results of that research are to have maximum application, it is indeed time that we associate these groups more closely with our profession.

Now that we have been able to establish an executive office here in Washington, it is up to the membership to consolidate our gains, coordinate our research, broaden our avenues of influence, enrich our teaching, and enlarge the participation of our professional membership. We have a deep responsibility as well as a unique opportunity in this troubled world. If we will reconsider our whole field and make such professional reorganizations as are required to bring us abreast of our new responsibilities, we can say with Henry Stimson:

"Let them learn from our adventures what they can. Let them charge us with our failures and do better in their turn. But let them not turn aside from what they have to do, nor think that criticism excuses inaction. Let them have hope, and virtue, and let them believe in mankind and its future, for there is good as well as evil, and the man who tries to work for the good, believing in its eventual victory, while he may suffer setback and even disaster, will never know defeat."

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 on behalf of himself and other Members of the Senate.

As one of the cosponsors of the resolution, I have prepared a statement expressing some of my own views on it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

At a time when the nations of the globe are beginning an armament race it may be too late to propose a Senate resolution which seeks to explore the possibilities of a common meeting ground that would promote stability and unity of the democracies of the New World and the Old World.

There are many great developments—such as Russia's spread of communism over Asia—a continuing cold war in Europe—a United Nations that has developed into a debating society when positive action is needed, and here at home a defense budget that will virtually make of this Nation a military dictatorship, reduce our standard of living, and make it difficult to ever regain the freedoms and liberties we now enjoy.

Surely there must be some alternative to a war of extermination or a program of more and bigger armaments.

In this present situation we must explore every avenue for a comprehensive solution of our security and economic problems. The most desperate necessity of our time is for the United States to assert the moral leadership of which she is undoubtedly capable, but which she has not yet fully laid hold on.

Our Nation is now going ahead with its superarmament program because, in self-defense, it must; nonetheless we stand committed to peace and the survival of man. There are those that contend that this proposal would require a world government—a government where nations would lose their identity—this I deny and am opposed to. We can have a federation of governments based on principles by which people can unite without impairing their local autonomy.

The resolution does not commit the United States to joining a union of Atlantic democracies. All it does is give the United States opportunity to show the leadership expected of us in the struggle to safeguard freedom.

This is an exploratory move. It may be too late. I believe that those of us responsible for the welfare of the American people can do no less.

The State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a radio discussion on January 7 between the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. This admirable discussion on the state of the Union took place on the American Forum of the Air, the famous radio program under the direction of the talented Mr. Theodore

Granik, one of radio's pioneers in the field of forum and discussion programs.

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

THE STATE OF THE UNION

Moderator GRANIK. Tomorrow, the Senate and the House of the Eighty-second Congress will meet in joint session to hear the President of the United States deliver his annual message on the State of the Union. With the Nation in a state of emergency, President Truman will outline the program he deems necessary for our security.

In 1951, hundreds of thousands of young Americans will be inducted into our Armed Forces. We on the home front will be called on to contribute more than ever before in self-sacrifice, higher taxes, and moral responsibility. Just over the horizon are price controls on foods, ceilings on wages, and a decline in our standard of living.

Today, on the eve of the President's address, the American Forum of the Air poses the vital question: "What is the State of the Union?" to two distinguished United States Senators, Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, minority leader of the Senate, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, and formerly Secretary of Agriculture.

Senator WHERRY, what would be the main theme of your message, if you were President?

Senator WHERRY. President of the United States?

Moderator GRANIK. That is right.

Senator WHERRY. Well, Ted, first, before I answer that, would you permit me to say that I deeply appreciate the invitation to appear again on this program as now sponsored by the trucking men throughout the country. I know a lot of them, and I think it is a great program, and I am glad that they are sponsoring it. And if I have to debate a Democrat, Ted, I would rather debate with CLINTON ANDERSON than any man across the aisle. I respect him and have a deep regard for him and am glad to appear on this program with my good friend, CLINTON ANDERSON.

If I were President of the United States, and I were preparing a message to deliver to the people of the country tomorrow, and to the Congress, Ted, I would tell the American people about our foreign policy over there in Asia. I would mention the mistakes, the colossal failure, and I would tell them what I intended to give them in the future. I would do the same thing about Europe. I would take the American people into the confidence of the President of the United States relative to his program over there. Are we to commit foot soldiers to Europe? If we are, why not be frank about it? Why not tell the American people? Let us have a propledged partnership about what we are going to do in the foreign policy so that we can get complete unity.

Then I would tell them the plans that I might have. I believe the greatest contribution we can give to those countries that want to fight communism—and, believe me, I think communism is a threat; I don't agree with those who say it is not, whether they strike next week, or 2 months from now, or next year, or when, I do not know, but they have infiltrated into every country in the world, and they have infiltrated right here. And I would say, in the first place, to eradicate communism right within our own gates. I would prepare a great national security program armed to the teeth to defend America at home, and then I would extend that aid through mutual aid, through the air, and on the sea, to these free countries of the world who want to fight to stop the expansion of communism and have a free world.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator ANDERSON?

Senator ANDERSON. I think, Ted, that I would like to join right in the beginning in congratulating this program on its new sponsor. Naturally, I would have to admit that KEN and I are unusual in this respect, that when we say nice things about each other, we really mean it.

Senator WHERRY. That is right.

Senator ANDERSON. Sometimes on the floor they refer to a distinguished Senator and they do not believe that he is so distinguished, but KEN and I have that fortunate and pleasant experience, we mean what we say.

I think if I were to be making a state-of-the-Union report, I would remind the people of America, first of all, that there are some hopeful signs and there are some discouraging signs. I think I would remind them about our banks that are bulging with money and our factories which are operating at top speed, that the steel mills are working to capacity, and that in some areas of the country where steel has never been regarded as a possibility for manufacturing, New England, they are now pressing for plants because they believe the future is so promising that these areas will be able to sustain these mills for a long time to come.

I would point out that the farmers have had unusually fine growing weather, to be sure, but they have also had an opportunity to market their crops under extremely fine circumstances for years and that while they might encounter bad growing weather again, they have now the resources and ability to sustain them in temporary bad spells.

I would point out that workers are enjoying their best wages and unemployment is extremely low. In other words, I would say that our domestic economy is in very fine shape. Then I would say, of course, that the only clouds that exist are clouds outside our Union; that there are troubles in the world, and we are closely tied to that troubled world and that we cannot expect to escape at home the effects of warfare abroad.

Moderator GRANIK. What do you have to say to that, Senator WHERRY?

Senator WHERRY. That is quite an optimistic statement. If CLINTON would go on he would have to mention also that not only as a part of our economy are we confronted immediately with price controls and freezes of wages, but that we are also confronted with higher taxes and allocations, all of which goes on with this artificial economy that he has so eloquently and forcefully described.

Moderator GRANIK. When can we expect the allocations and controls?

Senator WHERRY. Some of the allocations are already on. The President of the United States, as I understand it, in his message—and, of course, this is what we expect in his message—will ask for price controls and wage freezes, and I have heard from the other side of the aisle that as to taxes, we have just begun to tax. We have really got to have a tax program to stop inflation and help pay the costs of this great defense program that is producing this artificial economy.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator Anderson?

Senator ANDERSON. I would simply like to point out that I picked up a copy of a great New York newspaper on last Tuesday and I clipped a number of the headlines out of it. One reads:

"Labor and employers score greatest gains in history." The next reads, "Steel industry set for greatest year." "Gas reserves rise despite wider use." "Aluminum output geared to expand." "Handling devices are facing boom."

They are going to do $2,500,000,000 worth of business in 1951 against $1,000,000,000 in 1950.

"Retail sales gain foreseen for 1951."

If that is your artificial economy, I just want more of it.

Senator WHERRY. More cheap dollars, CLINTON; more taxes, more controls, more allocations, it all goes hand in hand. And if we are to stop the expansion of communism and protect the free economy, and certainly if those powers are granted, those who operate the business with dictatorial powers and controls should not abuse that authority in this time of total mobilization to fasten upon the backs of the American people a controlled economy that cannot be eliminated whenever and if these emergencies cease to exist.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think raising $50,000,000,000 in taxes will hurt business in any way?

Senator WHERRY. On the Appropriations Committee, we have adduced a lot of evidence. Some very, very high authorities in this country have stated, if I recall the figures, that you can only tax 40 percent of the national income. Others feel that all you can take away from the individual is 25 percent out of each and every dollar. I am not sure where the saturation point lies. But just as surely as we all here in America consider the future—and I believe that you have got to tax—I have been one who has believed in a balanced budget, but you cannot balance a $100,000,000,000 budget, on the taxes we receive now which are approximately $40,000,000,000 a year. And grant that we tax as much as we can, you get to the place, Ted, of the law of diminishing returns. It creates such an impact upon business that instead of doing more business you will do less business, and if you do it with cheaper dollars all you do is handle more money and you do not handle more goods, and, after all, it is production of goods that counts in total mobilization.

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I am only reminded of something that happened to me, and I think our experiences are sometimes helpful to us.

When I went on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, it was just when we were beginning in 1943 to have some terrific budgets. And a very eminent New York financier had just been down to Washington to assure everybody that if the national debt ever went beyond $50,000,000,000, you would close every bank in the country and every insurance company would go broke and our savings would be no good, and business would come to a standstill.

You can imagine my joy in being handed a copy of the budget and it ran $108,000,000,000. I saw the national debt at $200,000,000,000 and I saw it go to $250,000,000,000 and almost $300,000,000,000, and strangely not a bank closed its doors; not an insurance company went broke. None of the things that this eminent financier had promised happened, and I wondered if we all know the answers. Frankly, I don't, because I have seen a nation that supposedly had gone broke two or three times, still remain the most powerful economic pumping line anywhere in the world.

Senator WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that it is unnecessary to impose price controls at this time?

Senator ANDERSON. I would keep price controls away as long as I could. I am thinking particularly of a situation in the agricultural field which I know more about than I do about anything—if I know anything about anything. I know in the case of cotton we need 16,000,000 bales next year. If you put a price control on that at a low figure, with the shortage of insecticides and fertilizer, you are not going to have more than 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 bales of cotton and that would contribute more to inflation than perhaps turning it loose.

Senator WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that selective controls will work?

Senator ANDERSON. I never had much enthusiasm for that.

Senator WHERRY. If the Senator agrees with me on that, I think the Senator will agree

with me, if he is not in favor of selective controls, if price controls are imposed that price controls and wages should be extended clear across the board. Is that not right? If you have an effective price control in this country, should you not go clear across the board and impose controls on prices and also freeze the wages simultaneously?

Senator ANDERSON. I think there are some places where your production goes on regardless of whether control is on. I think there are other areas where you have to have a free market in order to get production, and I believe it is possible to pick out a few of those places without taking them all.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us get back to this foreign policy for a moment.

Senator WHERRY. Just one more remark about this inflation. I am interested in the economy. Let me ask this question: Does the Senator feel it is necessary to increase taxes to stop this inflation program?

Senator ANDERSON. Since you have asked a specific question, I will say I do think it is necessary to increase taxes. Again, I go back to experience, and I know that as a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House I was in favor of greatly increasing taxes in the last war on the theory that when you did make it closer to paying for the war as you went you reduced inflationary pressures, and I think now we are going to have to dip and dig a great deal deeper to get additional money there. I recognize that if you took all the money from those who had $25,000 you would not get very much, and, therefore, you are going to have to move in new directions, and you are going to have to have billions more in taxation, in my opinion, if you are going to be able to come close to paying for the present endeavors upon a pay-as-you-go basis, and I think we must go on that basis.

Senator WHERRY. You are in favor of levying those taxes this year to accomplish that purpose?

Senator ANDERSON. I am.

Moderator GRANIK. A while ago, Senator WHERRY, you referred to armed security at home, and then a foreign mutual aid sea and air policy. Didn't you advocate that in 1949, when the North Atlantic Treaty was pending?

Senator WHERRY. I certainly did. My feeling on that, Ted, is that the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty, when they were discussed, resolved themselves around what mutually might be termed, what we could best afford to give. What is the major contribution we can give those countries to not only render a defense for ourselves, but also for the free countries that want protection. I said then nearly 2 years ago, as I say today—and many others are joining in that program—that the United States should arm to the teeth. We should become masters of the air, and that is the greatest offense that the United States of America can have.

While we are preparing that, we are not only preparing our own defense, but when Russia strikes, if it does, it will be the major contribution we can give to those countries in giving aid to them at that time. We have first got to pulverize potential war-making power of Russia before you can go in—if you ever go in—and invade the land. So that it is necessary that we have mastery of the air to drop the bombs on the offense and to resist an air attack from Russia on the defense.

Senator ANDERSON. I do not think that trying to have the greatest air force we can have necessarily means that you must desert those allies we have been painfully trying to build up in the intervening years. As to our efforts in Italy and France, those countries were ready, and almost overready for communism and we were able to save them for a while. We have certainly saved Turkey and Greece, and by doing those things I think we have minimized the need for the type of all-out air force we might otherwise have to have a long time ago.

Moderator GRANIK. It is time for questions, but before we take any questions from our audience, here is an important message from the American trucking industry.

The ANNOUNCER. Highways and States are the arteries that nourish America as it races the clock to rearm itself. Over them moves the world's greatest fleet of automobiles, busses, and trucks. No other nation, friend or enemy, has perfected a bombproof transportation system such as America's highway transport. Today, the wheels roll over faster. But our street and highway system, once the world's best, is beginning to bog down under the traffic load. More than 40,000,000 cars, more than 8,000,000 trucks and busses. Highways and streets are bursting at the seams. Our interstate highway system is yesterday's miracle, today's hardened arteries, tomorrow's bottleneck. All highway authorities agree it is too narrow, too winding, too old for the full flood of motor vehicles as America moves to meet the challenge of 1951. More and better highways are needed today for a better, safer tomorrow.

Now, here again, is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Let us take the first question from the audience. Go ahead.

Question: I am an agricultural engineer and my question is directed to Senator ANDERSON.

Moderator GRANIK. The former Secretary of Agriculture.

Question: Why were prices and wages not fixed by the Congress at the start of the Korean War so as to save the Government billions of dollars in increased costs of all materials necessary to carry on the war?

Senator ANDERSON. I cannot answer that question except to point out that in 1942, or 1941, I believe it was, an effort was made to pass what was known as the Gore bill in the House, commonly known as the Baruch plan, by which everything would have been frozen as of the date of entry into difficulty. It got about 35 or 40 votes. Those of us who voted for it were hopelessly in the minority.

Many people felt this time that if we are going to put controls on across the board, do it as of June 25 or 26. I was one of them. You could not possibly have had a vote to do that because a majority of the legally elected Congress feels otherwise. That is the best answer I can give.

Senator WHERRY. My feeling is that I introduced the amendment to do the very thing that the questioner asked, the Bricker-Wherry amendment, which, if enacted into general law, would have put a complete price control on across the board. My feeling is that the administration didn't want to control the wages at that time. What they wanted to do was let the wages increase and pay subsidies to roll back the prices. I think that is wrong. I think we should have done it the other way and if they are now going to put them on, while these wages have increased, and some prices, yet I am still of the opinion that the only way to have an effective price-control law is to have them clear across the board and freeze the wages simultaneously.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to reply to that?

Senator ANDERSON. I was just thinking of a program you had here 2 years ago in which Senator TAFT, Mr. Republican himself, was on the program and you asked the question of Senator McGrath whether Congress should grant stand-by controls, and Senator McGrath said yes. You asked, "What do you think, Senator TAFT?" and he said, "Of course not. It never was necessary."

Senator WHERRY. On what? Stand-by controls on what?

Senator ANDERSON. Price controls and allocations and all those things. It never became necessary until just before election.

Senator WHERRY. I am not saying now that the time to put on those controls is at this moment. I said if they are going to put them on the only effective price control you can have is one clear across the board. If the administration felt in total mobilization when this act was up in the last session of Congress that it was necessary to impose them, that was the time they should have put them on.

Moderator GRANIK. May I take a question from the young lady?

Senator WHERRY. That is what I would have done.

Question: I address my question to Senator WHERRY. I want to ask him if it seems right to him that we as mature people should stay at home in comparative safety while we send what might be termed a second children's crusade into the horrors of Korea?

Senator WHERRY. If I had my way about it they would not have been in Korea today fighting. That is, if we adopted the policies I advocated. Now they are there. The question is: How large an army do you want? I understand now that the army that is being suggested is 3,500,000 people. If we are to have 3,500,000 personnel, I want to say to the little lady, that if that prevails it will take in class 1-A every available man, including those 18 years of age. Would you agree with me on that, CLINTON?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator WHERRY. So that if it is necessary, if this demand is here, if this all-out mobilization is the policy, it will take them down to 18, regardless of how you feel about drafting 18-year-olds, and others staying at home. There will not be any other choice in the matter. That will be all that are left in class 1-A if that happens.

Senator ANDERSON. Anything you do in that nature is unpleasant. If you had to draft the 18-year-olds there are arguments against that. When you start moving up the list you start moving into people in college, young married couples, and then young married couples with children. And anything you do is unpleasant and probably the easiest is to move into the 18-year-old group.

Senator WHERRY. If I may enlarge upon the observation of the Senator, that is not the only thing. If we are to have three and one-half million in personnel, that is, military personnel, it is absolutely necessary with the classes that we have that we take everyone down to 18 to get enough out of 1-A to do the job; is that not right?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes; it is unpleasant, but inevitable.

Moderator GRANIK. We must admit that President Truman in the last election did a pretty good job of selling himself to the American people. What would you think of a meeting with Joe Stalin and trying to sell him on the necessity of peace in the world and eliminating some of this?

Senator WHERRY. I am in favor of discussing peace any time anywhere with anybody. If we can get a peaceful solution in an American Forum of the Air or get them at the Town Hall meetings, or any level, I am for it. The only thing is, I don't want any commitments made by the President that ought to come back and be ratified through the constitutional processes. I want the American people and Congress to be full-fledged partners in any agreements or commitments which he might make.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you think they would go along with him?

Senator WHERRY. I think he has the power to make an agreement and negotiate, but if they involve constitutional processes—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will agree with me—we ought to bring them back and have them ratified.

We don't want any more Yaltas and Potsdams.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator ANDERSON, do you care to comment on that?

Senator ANDERSON. As to a meeting with Stalin, on that I think after what Russia has done and is now engaged in doing in China and elsewhere, that I would certainly not want to see our President take his hat in hand and take Uncle Joe and say, "What do you now suggest that I do?"

Senator WHERRY. He might write him a letter, CLINTON.

Senator ANDERSON. That is a good point. I would just like to point out that that is the very crux of this whole story, if I may say so. Here is a President who feels outraged, and the only remedy he has in America is to write a letter. In Russia they do something else. In Russia he would have killed the man long ago. And thank God, we still have the kind of a country where, when the President of the United States becomes outraged, all he can do is write a letter.

Senator WHERRY. I hope he just keeps on writing letters, I think it is wonderful. The more letters he writes, the better chance we have.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question.

Question. I am a member of the Massachusetts State Senate. My question is addressed to Senator ANDERSON. For how many years can the Nation stand all-out mobilization before the private economy is destroyed?

Senator ANDERSON. That is a question that should not be asked of a New Mexico farmer and insurance agent. You have got to ask that of some great economist, and, confidentially, he cannot tell you.

Moderator GRANIK. The Senator says that leaves him out.

Senator ANDERSON. My best answer is that nobody seems to know what the capacity of the American Government is. Nobody seems to know what our great production machine can do. Certainly we ought not to try all-out mobilization as long as we still have a possibility of keeping away from the controlled economy.

I am glad to see we are trying to do a lot of these things without taking full control of production of this land.

Senator WHERRY. May I just point out, however, for the benefit of the questioner, that I sit on the Appropriations Committee, and although the Senator has foreclosed me because I am not a great economist, from answering this question, yet I do get a lot of information on the appropriations from just such characters as the distinguished Senator has mentioned. I would like to say to this member of the Massachusetts State Legislature that our budget this year, ending in July, will total $75,000,000,000 and that the available income of taxes is $40,000,000,000 on the present business that we are doing, and that the contemplated budget, including contract authority that has been suggested to the Appropriations Committee for the next fiscal year will be $100,000,000,000 and for the succeeding year after that it will be likewise.

So I agree with you: How long can we continue to support these land army divisions in Europe as a standby defense army, and whether to accomplish what Lenin once stated in 1924, "What we are going to do is to require the United States to spend itself into distraction."

That is the big question.

Moderator GRANIK. Now for our first summary, Senator WHERRY.

Senator WHERRY. Ted, I would sum up today's discussion in two phases. On the domestic front certainly there is not much disagreement between Senator ANDERSON and the junior Senator from Nebraska. I want to preserve the free economy of the United States of America. If we are to lead other nations out of this darkness into the light of a new day, the United States has got to remain spiritually and economically sound. Certainly, we start from that premise. For that reason it is my feeling that in this great debate on Mutual that we should have it in the Senate of the United States on any commitment made, that we should not commit ourselves to land forces until it is debated, and that we might determine the character of the aid the United States can afford to give to these free countries of the world in helping them, if you please, to eradicate communism from the world.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, Senator WHERRY.

Now, your summary, Senator ANDERSON.

Senator ANDERSON. I think, after discussion, it seems apparent that we are going to be greatly worried about the economy here at home, and I think we had better put our very, very best efforts into trying to have this work done on a pay-as-you-go basis. I think we need, therefore, immediately again increasing taxes. I think we need to constantly pare down our spending. When we talk about our work abroad let us remember that we must save Europe. We cannot afford to lose Europe. There are things that we say we cannot afford to do at home. I recognize it is hard to afford them. We cannot afford to lose that part of the world where democracy has always grown and where it can grow again with a very small amount of assistance from us. We have watched it in other areas. Italy seems to come into my mind constantly. We were able to save it. It did seem like quite an expenditure, but it is not too much if Europe can be saved.

Therefore, I hope that everything we do shall be done with one thought, that we do not want just America, we want Europe with us.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, very much, gentlemen.

Politics in Controls?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from the Readers' Column of the Los Angeles Times, which ably states the growing distrust in our present administration:

POLITICS IN CONTROLS?

There appears to be two reasons for threatened price control and rationing of meat. Neither has any connection with the supply or price of same.

The first reason looks like a Truman "red herring." By hitting at the people's dinner table our wily President sets up such an irritation that the monumental blunders of the State Department and the United Nations fade into oblivion.

The second reason is to make the Socialists now running our Government happy. The Truman gang is treating the tragic world situation as a heaven-sent opportunity to spread their philosophy of more and more control under the guise of the national emergency.

Mrs. JOSEPH SHELL.

LOS ANGELES.

Welfare of the American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion among people interested in legislation on Indian welfare over a joint resolution which passed the House of Representatives in the Eighty-first Congress, but failed to pass the Senate. The resolution is House Joint Resolution 459.

It was the subject of discussion by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in a recent issue of the Washington News.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article referred to and written by Mrs. Roosevelt.

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

BILL NOW ON HILL MAY STRIKE AT AMERICAN INDIANS

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Friday.—People who are dependent and are not fully able to defend their own interests are always an invitation to exploitation.

Even in our own democracy we cannot deny that this has been so. That is why most of us hope that the day will come when all American Indians will be sufficiently well educated to be allowed to enter into the stream of American life as citizens and to take care of their own business. That day, however, does not seem to be very close at hand. Education has been woefully bad where our Indians are concerned, and, as yet, they are far from being able to look after their own affairs.

It is well, therefore, that many people are interested in the welfare of the Indians. Some are interested in their purely artistic contributions, for the Indians have many expressions of their own art. But, for the most part, people are interested in seeing the Indians integrated into our national life and are working toward again making them full citizens in this land which once belonged to them entirely.

I am quite sure that the new Commissioner of the Indian Bureau, Dillon S. Myer, whom I knew and admired when he was in charge of the relocation camps during the last war, wants to do the best that can be done for the Indians. His experience, however, has not been long with this particular question and he has around him men with whom he has previously worked on other matters. It is possible, therefore, that interested people, wanting to achieve personal objectives, might present Indian affairs to Commissioner Myer in a somewhat misleading manner. In fact, certain bills which already have been presented lead one to feel that this may have been so. The fact that the Indians have been deprived of their right to choose their own counsel, a right which they long enjoyed, is a serious infringement on their liberty.

In certain States it always has been difficult to protect rights of Indians and the Representatives from these States quite naturally think first of the rights, or rather the advantages of the other citizens of the State. Now it looks as though an effort is

being made to hurry the Indian plan of self-development going on since 1929, and many fear that if the Indian bill presently before the Senate is passed the Indians and their interests will seriously suffer.

Perhaps it would be well for Mr. Myer to call together some of the organizations and some of the men in this country who have had long experience in dealing with our Indian minority groups. He might be able to clear up some of the misunderstandings that they have about his attitude, and they might be able to help him to a clearer understanding of the interests of the Indians as they see them. Many individuals in this country have been closely associated with Indian tribes over a long period. They have gained a knowledge and a feeling for the Indians that cannot be gained without much study and association, and I think they should be heard.

Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is inserted herewith from H. Bond Bliss, on the letterhead of Miami Life, Florida's most influential weekly, a letter addressed to the editor of the Miami Daily News, which reads as follows:

TOO LATE

To the EDITOR OF THE MIAMI DAILY NEWS:

In answer to Philip Wylie, I remember many of the events he cites in his attack on the Miami Herald and its confusion of policies. It is ironical for me, of all persons, to take up the cudgels for the harassed Herald. I cannot speak for the later years but I do feel responsible for his tirade against the isolationism of 10 years ago.

I plead guilty to writing isolation editorials in the Herald before our glorious entry into the Second World War to save America, the world, humanity, and freedom. I emphasized the same theme in my front-page column day after day and he derided me then. Wylie has always shouted for conflict, for other American men and boys going abroad to have their heads mashed and their legs mangled and increasing the crosses row on row.

Yes; I wrote and argued and fought for America first and always; for a strong and invincible United States, for a united Western Hemisphere that could defy the world, protected by two wide oceans; an America at peace, armed to the hilt, with navies and air forces, prospering and happy.

Yes; I remember those peace meetings. Communists and fellow travelers were among those who shouted to keep the United States out of war, until Germany turned upon Russia. Then they, like Wylie, yelled for intervention not to save this country nor democracy nor liberty, but to help poor Russia.

With the Communists joining the capitalists, the power-hungry statesmen and politicians and militarists, we isolationists, we Americans, became rather lonely, crying in the wilderness for peace in vain.

Yes; the internationalists and interventionists won. They won back in 1914 after the American people had voted for peace and were given war. We licked the Kaiser and his Huns to establish peace and freedom forever. And the wounded boys came back and also the veterans. The debts piled up. But did the world win peace and brotherhood? Instead it was given Hitler and nazism, Mussolini and fascism, Stalin and communism. Japan felt its muscles. That is what our intervention and internationalism accomplished. Wylie cannot blame isolationists for that.

Wylie should be very satisfied over the results. The United States saved Soviet Russia and Communist China.

Now there is the third world war. Now the United States really is in danger. Now there may be that fighting in American streets, about which Wylie prates. Now there may be bombs dropping in our cities, on our homes. Now the Red spies may be blowing up our industries, our utilities, our transportation, our Government. Never was this country in such grave peril as now. Never in our time was democracy and liberty so threatened.

That is the price we are paying for intervention, for internationalism, for striving to tell others what they should do on this earth.

Yes; I was an isolationist. Millions and millions of Americans today are wishing and praying they had been, that the United States had followed the wise advice of the forefathers.

It's too late now, Philip Wylie. It's too late to be an isolationist. We are up to our necks in internationalism—and the noose is hanging there.

H. BOND BLISS.

MIAMI.

Dr. Henry Bennett and the Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor regarding a statement of the able new director of the technical assistance program. The editorial follows:

LAND REFORM, NEW STYLE

The farmer under the American capitalistic system is far from being a downtrodden man, points out Dr. Henry G. Bennett, who has just taken office as Administrator of Technical Aid to Foreign Countries (the point 4 program). He believes it is incentive that makes the American farmer tick, and that more of it spread to other farmers would help feed the world.

This is a sound approach to what the point 4 program can do in its agricultural phase. Communism assumes that land reform can be accomplished merely by taking land, especially large holdings of it, away from its present owners. What results usually is that the peasant finds himself again a serf, this time on a collective farm, or the exactions of the tax collector become as severe as were those of the landlord.

The kind of rural capitalism America wants to encourage does not take pride in vast tracts under absentee owners; it is rather a system in which the owner-operator has both the responsibility and the reward for what his acres produce. To make this system function requires a considerable amount of knowledge and competence on the part of the individual farmer.

In fostering that competence among American farmers, the county demonstration agents, the experiment farms, and the agricultural colleges (such as Dr. Bennett headed) have been very effective. To share that experience with other countries will be mutually beneficial.

Views on Decentralization of Patent Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia on January 8, 1951:

Whereas tentative suggestions have been made to include the United States Patent Office in the so-called decentralization plan, which would result in its permanent removal to a city remote from Washington, D. C., and from all related agencies concerned with rearmament and the national defense effort; and

Whereas the records of the Patent Office accumulated in Washington over a period of more than 100 years include copies of millions of United States and foreign patents and a vast store of applied scientific and technical literature constituting the greatest single source of scientific information and knowledge available in the world and now accessible for immediate consultation and inspection by the various defense agencies; and

Whereas the records of the Patent Office are consulted almost daily by the representatives of the Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Government Patents Board, the patent sections of the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, Justice Department Patent Section, Government research bureaus, such as the Bureau of Standards, and others having development procurement and contract problems involving inventions; and

Whereas such removal of the Patent Office under the decentralization plan would greatly hamper the activities of all defense agencies by making said records inaccessible; and

Whereas the relocation of the Patent Office under decentralization would destroy the efficient functioning of the Patent Office, through the loss by resignation of highly trained, experienced, and irreplaceable scientific personnel, who would not accompany the Patent Office to a distant location; and

Whereas decisions of the Patent Office for a great number of years have been reviewed by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and the judges sitting on these courts are highly trained in patent matters, the review of Patent Office proceedings would be seriously impaired by removal of the Patent Office from the city of Washington to a distant city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bar Association of the District of Columbia hereby goes on record as opposing the removal of the United States

Patent Office from the city of Washington under decentralization and earnestly submits that it should remain where now located; but that if the Patent Office space is determined to be absolutely required by other defense agencies, the Patent Office should be included in the so-called dispersal plan (as distinguished from the decentralization plan), which would result in relocation of the Patent Office within a radius of 20 miles of the White House; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Director of the General Services Administration, and the Commissioner of Patents.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., on January 8, 1951.

JUSTIN L. EDGERTON,
Secretary.

General Eisenhower Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am including an editorial by Anna M. Carlson, editor of the Lindsborg News-Record, of Lindsborg, Kans.

I think the Members of the House will be interested in the views expressed in this editorial:

GENERAL EISENHOWER POINTS THE WAY

At last there is a ray of hope piercing the dense fog of Washington's Fair Deal rearmament muddle.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower made his stand known last week on the eve of his departure for Europe, regarding the arming of European nations for defense. Preparing to leave for his combined European command he told a news conference that European democracies must make equal sacrifices with America if forces are to be built up capable of defending Europe and maintaining peace. The general stressed that if every sacrifice by America is not matched by the European democracies this thing cannot win.

General Eisenhower is undertaking a stupendous task. He will visit each capital of the North Atlantic Treaty organization nations during the trip he started Saturday to talk with the officials of the various countries and reassure himself that they are not working at cross purposes.

It will be a herculean task to make those nations understand that they must do their part. For years most of them have been holding out their hands to Uncle Sam for doles furnished by the American taxpayers. Most of those countries have made little effort to beat back from the ravages of war and defeatism. It has been easier to depend on the United States.

Now they are depending on the United States to furnish men, arms, and means to defend them in event of aggression by a powerful nation.

Happy landings, General Eisenhower, and may a divine providence help you make order out of chaos.

General Herr Says Use of Horse Cavalry as Part of Armed Forces Should Be Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the question as to the need of the horse cavalry as part of the Armed Forces is being revived. This has been brought about largely because of the situation developed in the Korean area. Maj. Gen. John K. Herr, a retiring cavalry officer, has given this matter a considerable amount of study. He has first-hand information because of his long service as an officer with the cavalry while a member of the Armed Forces.

General Herr has handed me a statement dealing with the problem, which he believes to be pertinent and of sufficient importance to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress. Under permission granted me by the House, I am including his statement, together with an article that appeared in the Detroit Free Press in support of the opinion expressed by General Herr.

[From the February 1948 issue of the Rider and Driver]

(By S. W. Taylor)

Mr. Frank M. Smith reported in the Washington Times that a strong plea for revival of the United States Cavalry was also made at the last hearing by General Herr. He quoted General Herr as saying that it was not true that horses were not needed in the last war and had read statements from General Patton and others that cavalry units would have been of great advantage in the North African and Sicilian campaigns. General Herr also said that General Wainright would testify as to the effectiveness of cavalry if he was called before the committee. General Herr placed before the committee a letter by Lt. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott, Patton's successor as Third Army commander, which held that if the United States had kept its horse cavalry, the bloody Cassino and Anzio battles could have been avoided and the Italian war possibly shortened by many months.

Col. Fred L. Hamilton, United States Army, retired, former Chief of Remount Service, told the committee: "I talked to German officers of the Air Corps and the ground forces and the mechanized outfits and cavalry outfits and almost to a man it was their opinion that they lost the war on the eastern front because the Russians had better horses. The horses were better and the German motor and mechanized outfits were helpless in the roadless stretches of Russia. To a man they were of the opinion that one of the major reasons for losing the war on the Russian front was the superb cavalry of the Russians, regular and irregular."

General Herr said in conclusion that he would like to submit to the committee a document which was restricted Intelligence Bulletin of May 1946, issued by the G-2 division (Secret Service) the Information Division of the General Staff. He read a part of it as follows:

"The U. S. S. R. with vast distances and few roads, and with severe climatic conditions during much of the year, has used horse cavalry to great advantage during World War II. By the results achieved, the Soviets have justified the use of cavalry, not as a substitute for armor, but as an independent arm and as a supplement to armor and mechanized might in operations over severe terrain. Russian cavalry has great power in supporting weapons. The organization is so designed as to provide a small and mobile striking force with adequate support of artillery, mortars, and automatic weapons. Cavalry and tanks have been combined into a smooth working and effective organization."

Following the submission of the foregoing document to the committee General Herr and Senator MORSE carried on a conversation in which it was brought out that the United States horse cavalry was eliminated in spite of evidence as to its necessity. Their conversations in part follow:

"Senator MORSE. In other words, when you are dealing with military operations, in that part of Europe in which the Russian, Hungarian, Yugoslavian, and Polish Armies operate, you are dealing with military operations in which horses play a very important part.

"General HERR. Yes. There they play a part which is of increasing importance, and I wish to state right here that there is no truth in the popular idea that the cavalry is only useful in out-of-the-way places, where there are mountains and tough country, where vehicles cannot go. It is highly useful in any terrain in the world. A horse can go anywhere a vehicle can go, but a vehicle cannot go a lot of places the horse can go. The horse can go almost anywhere a man can go. It can transport its fire power over places where vehicles cannot go, and over good country where men can go, much faster than men can go on foot. It is a vital thing. No country which pretends to be well organized for war in all manner of terrain over the world, and in all kinds of weather can pretend to be able to fight in any theater of war where it may be called upon to do so, to the best advantage, unless it has the proper complement of horse cavalry and pack animals. The Chinese are finding that out right now.

"Furthermore, I submit and I charge and allege the War Department prematurely, unwisely, and mistakenly suppressed our cavalry in 1942, after I was retired as chief of cavalry, and changed the cavalry into other organizations and futile units such as the mechanized reconnaissance units, over my bitter protest when they started this thing. Not only that, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of War in June 1942, shortly after I was retired, inviting his attention to the dastardly sabotage of the American cavalry and calling on him to put a stop to it and quoting to him what the Russian cavalry was doing—that the results would be detrimental to our country; that we had a highly organized cavalry, though small, the best in the world, based on our Civil War experiences; that to do away with the grand cavalry now was criminal, almost because it could not be reconstituted during the emergency; that we would have need for it and use for it. I knew him well personally. I received a very kindly letter from him. I have the original on file. In that letter he assured me that he had a very kindly feeling for the horse, too. In the old days he had been with it and so on. But they just couldn't quite see where they were going to be able to use any cavalry in this war. He hoped I would not feel too bitter about it."

[From the Detroit Free Press]

HAY BURNER WARFARE

(By Royce Howes)

So what would be so odd about the cavalry horse coming back? As a matter of fact it wouldn't have far to come.

In World War II the Russians had an army of 600,000 horsemen and made astonishingly good use of it. Right now for that matter, the Chinese Reds in Korea are going into battle on Mongol ponies.

Of course, like the Germans, the Russians were not fully mechanized, and the Chinese aren't either. Our Army is, so the horse might not mesh quite so well, but it would have its uses.

I remember in the early days of the last war standing on a hilltop with the commander of a mechanized reconnaissance troop. We were watching his men and vehicles run off a maneuver in the broken brushy country below.

The troop commander kept moaning for horses, and pointing out the limitation of his jeeps and armored cars in such terrain. Even to the untutored eye it was plain that horsemen could scout that particular piece of landscape much more adequately.

It would have been smart to have kept a regiment of horse cavalry around somewhere, or at least a squadron.

A cadre with equine management and combat know-how would be available to lend a hand in such situation as the request from Korea has presented.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff had better get an ear to the ground. They might hear hoof beats.

Also, it may come about that one of these days Congress will demand to know who was so premature about turning the horses out to pasture.

Bill Ogan Went Through Hell in the Hungnam Retreat in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, while we know the news from Korea is censored, I think this letter written by Bill Ogan to his father, Carl Ogan, in North Powder, Oreg., tells the story clearly and graphically. The above-mentioned letter follows:

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12.

I probably don't have to tell you that we have just come through hell during the last 2 weeks. That I am alive is nothing but a miracle or the good Lord was surely with me.

I received 11 letters yesterday, one had a map asking me if that was the sector I was in. Yes, it was and there were two regiments of us, the Seventh and Fifth. We were surrounded by seven Chinese divisions.

We were cut off entirely except by air. They made drops for us every day: food, gasoline, ammunition, etc.

One week ago we started fighting our way out. There is no need telling we had many casualties. We hear now that there are approximately 1,000,000 Chinese troops trying to annihilate us. Our platoon, originally 43 men, came through with 13.

ONLY SEVEN LEFT

The weather was always below zero. Frozen feet and hands were not uncommon at all. My finger tips are still numb. My feet, well I don't know, I'm still walking. Our last lap yesterday we walked over the pass to a small town which had a railroad. We walked 16 miles. The staff sergeant and I were the only ones who made it all the way on foot, the rest of them fell out and rode on trucks.

NIGHT IN FOX HOLE

Three nights ago we were on a defense perimeter of the First Marines. About 3:30 a. m. I went on watch. We were standing one hour on and one off. I noticed the bullets were getting pretty close and was sitting behind the fox hole so I raised up to try to see. It was awfully dark and the wind was blowing right through me. There about 15 feet from the fox hole were five gooks. As soon as they saw me they threw a grenade. It hit in the fox hole but luckily it was a concussion grenade and not fragmentation. At the same time I opened fire. They fired a Thompson sub. I hit two and luckily again the bullets from the sub didn't get any of us. I picked up the sub the next morning about 2 feet in front of my fox hole. They were trying to go through our position but they failed.

We had several casualties but nothing like they had.

It was estimated the next day that there were about two divisions on the attack. The next morning there were five dead Chinese in front of my position. Later on during the night they moved me to another foxhole that the men in had been hit and there were seven dead "gooks" around there so I know I got my share of the "blanketyblanks."

FOUGHT WAY THROUGH

We pulled out the next day. We had to fight our way through road block after road block. Never have I seen as much Marine gear lying on the side of the road. Trucks along the side, all kinds of gear. It was surely different than anything I have ever seen or probably ever will see again. Anyway, we made it.

We are now back at Hungnam and are supposed to go aboard ship either today or tomorrow. Where we don't know for sure but some think we are going to Pusan. I hope not, but I am happy to just be alive and it will be a rest.

Our gunnery sergeant was killed. Sure was a good man. A mortar shell got him. Out of the original brigade there are seven left in our platoon.

FEW DAYS OF REST

We are sitting in tents today getting our back mail, getting some gear issued to us. Most of us lost most of our gear. It was either burned or lost in our withdrawal.

There is some talk of our old original brigade going back to the States, but I doubt it.

All my film was burned up back where we were cut off but I saved my camera and I have about eight pictures left to take. I am saving them for special occasions.

We go aboard am tracks today to board ships. I hear we are to take our tents and stoves so that probably means we will set up in Pusan or some place else for awhile.

About all for now. I made it through this so guess I can make it through most anything now. I feel pretty good but have lost a little weight. Will write again as soon as I know more.

BILL OGAN.

Hope: An American Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on November 16, 1950, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan delivered an excellent and thought-provoking address to the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities at its annual meeting in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

HOPE: AN AMERICAN EXPORT

(By Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan)

It is a privilege for me to take part in another of your annual meetings and to discuss some of the matters that are of mutual concern to us in our joint effort to serve agriculture, the Nation, and the cause of world peace.

A great deal of the work in which we have mutual interest has been long established and continues through the years to merit all the care and attention we can give to it. From time to time we also enter jointly into new undertakings to improve upon the work that is already under way or to meet the challenge of changing conditions.

In accordance with a recommendation of the joint committee on extension programs, policies, and goals, annual meetings are now being held between the Secretary of Agriculture and the executive committee of this association. From my standpoint, at least, this is an important development. I am also glad that your committee on extension organization and policy is continuing to meet regularly with the director of extension work in the Department and with our Department committee on extension relations.

I am particularly happy with the progress that has been made by committees of State extension and experiment station directors and representatives of the Department in developing plans for an intensified and joint effort to strengthen the Nation through grasslands improvement. Grassland improvement holds great potentialities for improving the diets of our people, improving our soil, increasing the economic opportunities in agriculture, and strengthening our national defense. I assure you that we of the Department will be glad to cooperate with you of the land-grant colleges and universities to the extent of our ability in the proposed undertaking.

At your meeting a year ago, I discussed with you some of the promise and some of the problems of the point-4 program which President Truman had proposed.

The beginning of such a program, as you know, has since been authorized by Congress, and the first appropriation has been provided. Fortunately, we have all had considerable experience with the problems involved in technical assistance to other countries. It is vital that we pool our experience and resources in meeting the larger problems that are now before us. Our joint committee on agricultural services to foreign areas has made a good start. I am sure we can all look to it for real leadership and guidance.

All of us, necessarily, have been devoting a great deal of thought to this relatively new work, especially to the real objectives we seek. Obviously, point 4 is not an end in itself but is a part of the over-all effort of the American people to help build world peace.

When I accepted your invitation to speak here, I thought that I might contribute best by discussing agriculture in relation to the building of our national strength. However, as I thought more about it, my mind kept turning to the more fundamental question that is constantly in all of our minds: What can we do to achieve world peace?

So, with your leave, I should like to go beyond my scheduled subject and discuss agriculture's part in implementing our desire and determination to build a just and lasting peace.

Let us get into the subject by considering two questions: (1) What are the obstacles to world peace? and (2) What do we have to work with?

The first obstacle we think of is aggressive totalitarianism of the Communist variety. Korea has proved beyond all doubt that international communism is aggressive—and not just in the ideological sense but aggressive in the use of raw military power. Against military aggression there is only one immediate defense and that is military power. The United Nations, including the United States, have recognized the necessity for military power, have acted effectively, and are determined to exercise effective force as long as necessary.

That may be a long time, but force is only a temporary expedient—not the ultimate answer. The world has seen many great military powers rise and fall. True peace has not yet come. If force can be balanced with force without achieving peace, then logic demands that we look deeper for the real obstacle between us and peace.

So we come to this question: Is communism the basic trouble, or is communism the current symptom of an older, deeper disease?

It seems to me that communism is the symptom. Its leaders are capitalizing upon the misery, the wants, the unrest that have long existed. Propaganda-wise, they pretend they are not merely against something but for something better. They have convinced millions of people that this is so. That is the meaning of postwar Communist gains in Europe. It is the meaning of the Communist success in China, the nearly successful aggression in Korea, and the continuing Comunist pressure in many other parts of Asia.

We know that the Communist leaders are misleading their followers with false promises and lies. But many of the world's people do not have access to this fact until it is too late. They follow false hopes to their doom.

Hope lays hold on men's minds and stirs them to desperate action. Our first task is to understand this thoroughly because man's hope must be directed toward peace—not capitalized by aggressors as an obstacle to peace.

Americans above all others should realize what hope can mean in terms of constructive action toward freedom. Our national life began with a revolution, and it was not merely a military revolution but one based on ideas and ideals. It was a revolution that laid hold on the minds of men—in America and throughout the world. The American revolutionists were not merely insisting that Americans should be free and independent of Great Britain. They were insisting that all men are born to be free, that the rights of man are inherent, God-given, not subject to either bestowal or denial by temporal powers.

I have spoken of the American Revolution in the past tense, but it can be and should be thought of in the present tense. It is alive today, and the satanic appeal of communism need not prevail over the good and the true that is democracy expressing the God-given rights of man.

The two opposing ways of life are competing for the minds and hearts of men.

This, I believe, is the basic struggle. For us who are now living there is no escape from this reality. What we do—and what we fail to do—both will affect the lives of our children and our children's children.

Our record clearly indicates we will not shrink back.

Our leaders have made clear to the world that we seek no national aggrandizement. Our occupation of former enemy countries has been firm but not vindicative. We have provided foreign relief that saved millions of lives; strengthened Iran, Greece, and Turkey against Communist aggression; helped to establish Philippine independence; provided billions of dollars worth of aid to China, Korea, and certain other Asiatic countries; promoted European recovery through the Marshall plan; joined a program of mutual defense for the North Atlantic area; helped to organize and staunchly support the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies; started the point 4 program, and promptly responded to the United Nations call for the military defense of Korea.

In all history, there is nothing remotely approaching either the high moral principle or the scope of this record.

Yet the peace is far from won.

In the struggle for the minds of men, totalitarian Communist dictatorship is drawing support from millions who by nature should be joined with us in developing a democratic way of life—a way or life based on inherent human rights, individual dignity, and brotherhood of the human family.

Man was born to be free. There can be no peace until mankind has won its freedom.

As we know from recent experience, the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism is at a critical point in Asia, and the outcome in Asia is of critical importance to the entire world.

Half the people of the world live in Asia.

Eight persons out of 10 in Asia are peasants.

Most of those peasants live in abject poverty. Few of them farm as much as four acres. Their tools are primitive. Their farms are so small that they would have no use for modern machines if they had them.

They have little part in world trade, either as suppliers or buyers.

Few Asian peasants own the land on which they toil, and few have had any hope of owning the land. Unlike United States tenants, they are completely dependent upon their landlords—politically, socially, economically.

Most peasants must turn over to their landlords most of what they produce—50 to 75 percent is common, and in certain parts of China it runs as high as 90 percent. Many have no security of tenure whatsoever. Some areas have laws to protect the peasant's tenure, but in many areas the laws are not enforced. Too often the landlord may turn the peasant off the land whenever he wishes.

The yields on much of the land are low, but the peasant is not much interested in improving it.

He is not greatly impressed by irrigation projects and other improvements when it is not his land that will be improved. He has little hope of gaining; there are plenty of peasants who will work the land in return for enough food to keep their families alive. Therefore, how can one peasant hope to be given more than he is now getting from his landlord. He has no incentive.

This is a major problem in the point 4 program.

Our technical assistance will do little good unless the family on the land welcomes and uses the knowledge. That, I believe, is a fundamental point recognized by all of you in extension work.

You will find some exceptions to the dark picture I have painted. But for the most part, the Asian peasant is landless, hungry and about as nearly without hope as it is humanly possible to become. That is, he has been without hope; today, it may be a little different.

All over Asia, Communists are spreading the word that the land is to be divided up. "Join with us," they say, "and the land you farm will be yours. Help us overthrow the present authorities, and you will immediately be a landowner. This is the only way you can ever hope to have your own farm."

There's more to it than that. The Communist propaganda uses words about freedom, dignity of the individual, and probably all of the other principles of democracy. The Communist claims are inflated like balloons, and are just as empty. But how can the peasant know that communism has never brought democracy but only dictatorship? How can he know that the so-called land reform of communism consists of transferring land from feudal landlords to a feudal government?

Hence, among at least half of the world's people the misery of the peasant is a basic obstacle to peace because it provides the "soil" in which communism or some other form of totalitarianism breeds.

An attack upon this problem is the most direct way by which democracy can win over communism in the struggle for the minds of men. That is the real hope for peace.

In meeting any problem, understanding it is the first step. The next is to take stock of what we have to work with.

Fortunately, we have many tools, and we have been using some of them.

But we can never make it too clear to the people of the world that the principles of the American Revolution guide American democracy and commit us to the cause of human improvement everywhere. The world must be led to understand that when Americans tax themselves to send aid abroad they do so because they want to help the everyday folks. We must continually make known the fact that we believe in freedom and dignity for all people.

It is terribly difficult to make these things clear in a period of chaos. Sometimes any kind of stability seems preferable to compounded chaos, and our efforts to gain time are misunderstood. But we must make our position clear.

We should, by all means, make clear that our country has had experience in dealing with such problems as are faced by the farm people of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, South America—problems of land tenure.

Those looking toward Russia for a tenure pattern are looking in the wrong direction if they want progress and independence for their farm people. We must help them compare democracy and communism from the standpoint of both philosophy and performance. As to philosophy, communism from the beginning has opposed the private ownership of property. How can anyone hope that communism will suddenly adopt the freehold principle? Logic and experience require anyone to expect that the Communist pattern for agriculture will continue to be the government collective.

On the other hand, let our friends study Jefferson, who believed that a democratic nation should be a nation of freeholders.

Some of his ideas about agriculture may seem rather extreme, in view of the industrial development of modern society, but those ideas are a part of our national background.

It was Jefferson who said: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever He had a chosen people, whose breasts he has made his peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue. It is the focus in which he keeps alive that sacred fire which otherwise might escape from the face of the earth. Corruption of morals in the mass of cultivators is a phenomenon of which no age nor nation has furnished an example."

(Jefferson would be shocked to see how communism today is corrupting the people on the land by exploiting their natural desire to own the bit of earth on which they toil.)

In 1820, Daniel Webster, who was to become a Senator and later Secretary of State, made this perceptive statement: "A republican form of government rests not more on political constitutions than on those laws which regulate the descent and transmission of property. Governments like ours could

not have been maintained where property was holden according to the principles of the feudal system, nor, on the other hand, could the feudal constitution possibly exist with us. * * *" He further declared that "a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition" are "the true basis, most certainly, of a popular government."

Our friends in agricultural countries of the world should also be aware that there was in the time of Jackson a Senator named Thomas Hart Benton, who did perhaps more than any other man to shape the land policy of the United States. Listen to his philosophy:

"Tenantry is unfavorable to freedom. It lays the foundation for separate orders in society, annihilates the love of country, and weakens the spirit of independence. The farming tenant has, in fact, no country, no hearth, no domestic altar, no household god. The freeholder, on the contrary, is the natural supporter of a free government; and it should be the policy of republics to multiply their freeholders, as it is the policies of monarchies to multiply tenants. We are a republic, and we wish to continue so. Then multiply the class of freeholders; sell for a reasonable price to those who are able to pay, and give without price to those who are not."

Later the Nation did give land freely to those who would farm it.

I shall not attempt to trace the entire history of United States land policy. However, the facts show that the public made land available to farmers either freely or at low prices during our early development period, and that the public has intervened in many ways to keep the farmland in the hands of the operators. This is still the policy of our democracy. It is a policy which we commend to all nations in the interest of freedom and peace.

If you will pardon a personal reference, my own entry into the public service was connected with a national effort to preserve the American family farming system. I was employed by the Government to buy land on which farm people were unable to make a living due to a long period of low prices and a drought. The Government was helping some of the distressed people move to other locations where they would have a better chance, helping others improve the land and form economic farming or ranching units which they could pay for out of yearly earnings, and finding desirable uses for land on which people had no chance to make a living. I, of course, had no part in planning this program. I mention it because it has always seemed significant that such problems—problems of land and people—are regarded as public problems in a democracy.

Knowing how farm people feel about the land, it is no surprise to me that the Communists have made gains by promising land to the landless. But it is surprising that the whole world doesn't know and appreciate the great record that democracy has made in keeping the land in the hands of the people.

The American public has provided capital funds for cooperative farm credit associations and has legislated low interest rates and long terms for repayment of farm purchase loans. (Incidentally the Government capital in the Federal land banks has been completely returned and the banks are entirely farmer-owned.)

The Government in recent years, through Farmers Home Administration and its predecessor agencies, has supplied credit directly or insured private loans to nearly 2,000,000 American farm families who did not have adequate sources of credit. Many thousands of these loans made or insured by the Government have been made to tenants so that they could become farm owners. The same type of credit is being made available to farm families who want to improve their farms and to others who want to start new farms in areas opened up by Government reclamation programs. The same type of credit is being made available to improve farm housing.

Nearly every farm service offered by the United States Government is based on the public policy of promoting the welfare of the family-type farm. You of the land-grant colleges and we of the Department carry on scientific research and education so that the individual farmer may farm well and so that his family may live well.

The public shares with the individual farmer the cost of conserving the soil. The public finances administration of a crop insurance program through which the farmer may protect himself against ruinous crop failures. The public recognizes that the small individual farmer has no control over commodity prices, and therefore provides protection against ruinous prices. The public encourages marketing and purchasing cooperatives through which the individual farmer may gain the economic strength of many. The public supplies credit and other assistance to cooperative groups of farmers so that they can provide for themselves the modern services of electricity and telephones.

Anyone reading the history of agricultural legislation in this country will be impressed by the consistency of the philosophy behind that legislation. Probably without exception, the legislators advocated each act as a means of aiding and encouraging the individual farmer so that he could own his land, attain greater security, and enjoy a better life.

Another point should be noted: Our country recognizes no class barrier between land owners and land tenants. Every year many tenants become owners. Because tenants generally share equitably in production, they have a foundation of economic opportunity on which to build toward farm ownership.

In 1900 tenants operated about a third of our farms. By 1930, as a result of war-inflated land prices followed by a prolonged depression, the number of farms operated by tenants was up to 42 per 100. In 1948, however, the proportion was down to less than 28 per 100.

Our tenure system is far from perfect. I can, and frequently do, point out problems that need to be corrected. But, relatively, it is good, and our history indicates we will continue to make progress.

I am convinced that the increasing productivity of our agriculture and the growth of our industry alongside agriculture are due not only to our resources and science but also to the tenure system which provides an incentive for profitable production. Not so many years ago, 80 percent of our people lived on farms, as is true in Asia today. Now we have reversed the figures, and fewer than 20 percent of our people are farm people. Early in our history, one farm worker could supply food for himself and only about three other persons. Today one worker can supply 14 other persons. Without this change, our modern industry would be imposible, and without such a change modern industry is impossible in other lands. Without such a change, world trade is severely restricted. Certainly there is no market for modern tools and machinery where the farmers have neither land nor incentive.

I have dwelt upon our record in some detail because the details are more convincing than any general statement I could make. Many more details could be added, and I think it is our job to see to it that the leaders of all political factions in every country of the world know this record. There are some in every country who are eager for this sort of progress, and they should have the facts that strengthen their determination.

The worst error that could be made by such leaders would be to look to American democracy as merely the center of productive genius and to Russian communism as the spiritual center in the field of social organization. The Communist pattern offers only degradation. The democratic pattern conforms with the most deeply felt desires of mankind.

It is probably hard for people who have never been to the United States to appreciate the character of our agriculture and our agricultural philosophy. For that reason, I believe we must work harder at taking the story to the people of other countries in terms that they can understand. This is not merely the story of what democracy has done. We need not boast. The importance of these facts is that they tell what democracy is. Every representative of the United States Government in other countries should become expert in this task. We can also emphasize the truth about agriculture in our democracy, in our radio, visual and other foreign information programs—not with the idea that our pattern can be duplicated in detail but with the idea that the basic principles are universal and appeal to human nature everywhere.

We can also well afford to show representatives of other countries what our agriculture is like. We do have many such visitors from abroad every year. I should like to see the numbers increase.

Think what it could mean if a few hundred additional persons—representative citizens—from agricultural areas of India and Pakistan, for example, could visit United States farm people next year, to learn something about our farming methods and also about our strong attachment to family-type farming, individual liberty, and equality of opportunity. They would be able to give the lie in very convincing fashion to Communist propaganda in their own countries. They would also, I hope, find economic use for production techniques demonstrated here. Furthermore, they would understand that we are friendly in the deepest sense and on their side in their struggle to maintain political independence and improve living standards.

Let us also make it clear to all that the principles of American democracy are being applied in our foreign policy with respect to agriculture.

In the Western Hemisphere we have long been engaged in a program of technical collaboration with other American Republics.

This type of work is being extended to other areas of the world under the point 4 program.

We are participating wholeheartedly in the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, whose program is to assist the people of the world to produce enough food and to improve the lot of the agricultural producers.

Giving economic aid to China, the United States in 1948 joined with the Chinese Government in setting up the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction to decide how United States money should be used to help rural Chinese. Two Americans and three Chinese comprised the Commission. On their recommendation, the Chinese Government began to put into effect rent reduction and, in a minor way, land-purchase programs which had been authorized by law for a long time but never before used. It is estimated that 2,000,000 tenants in one province alone were benefited directly, even though the total cost to the United States was only a little over $200,000.

During our military occupation of that part of Korea which lies south of the thirty-eighth parallel, the United States sold to tenants at reasonable prices the lands which were formerly owned by Japanese landlords. This did not go far enough toward meeting the tenancy problem in Korea, but it was something, and it contrasted sharply with the much-advertised Communist program of so-called land reform in North Korea. There the tenants got a lot of propaganda but did not get title to the farms.

In Japan, under United States military occupation, a land-reform program has enabled more than three million farmers—well over half of all farmers in this country—to obtain land. About 90 percent of all cultivators of land in Japan are now owners. It remains to be seen whether Japanese farmers can hold these gains that have been brought about largely by Government order. Much remains to be done before anyone can be sure that lasting land reform has been achieved. But even at this stage, we can see good results. Reports indicate that the Communists are now able to make no gains in rural Japan. Thus, practical democracy is competing successfully for the minds of men in Japan, as it will everywhere it is given the chance.

Evidently, a little bit of land, a little bit of opportunity, can do for world peace something that great armies cannot possibly accomplish. It is something that happens inside a person. It is something that cannot be shot or chained.

However, communism is still on the march, and millions upon millions of people are in its path, subject to its lure. There is much to be done.

The United States alone does not hold the answer, but we occupy a position of leadership. This is not merely because of wealth and power but, more importantly, because our domestic and foreign policies represent the principles that can bring peace and well-being to the people of the earth. Beyond this, we have a record of unfaltering support to the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

Let us use our influence in the United Nations to keep the eyes of the world on the basic requirements for world peace, while we meet our military commitments.

Those countries that want to give opportunity to the tenants to purchase the land on which they work should not lack for support in the United Nations. The United Nations as an organization has credit facilities and the facilities for giving aid in technological, social, and economic fields. It is clear that these facilities can be used to help member nations increase their production by such means as irrigation and flood-control projects and livestock-disease eradication. It should be made just as clear that these facilities are available to help meet problems of social and economic organization. For example, a country planning an irrigation project may find that the benefit to the nation could be increased manyfold by seeing to it that the land to be irrigated is owned by many farmers rather than by a few landlords.

Other countries may find that the most pressing need is to assure the tenant a larger share of his production and gradually to pay for an adequate-sized farm. Such a country may want to draw upon the experience of other countries for guidance. It may be surprising, but it is true, that few countries have ever developed a system in which a tenant can buy land by making payments similar to rent.

Still other countries may be interested in developing agricultural cooperatives, which in some parts of the world have proved to be great aid to individual farm enterprise and a real weapon against communism.

Some countries may wish to improve their agricultural credit system so as to relieve their farm people of dependence on usurers. The Bell mission to the Philippines—of which Dr. A. L. Strand, of Oregon State College, was a member—found that the confused state of land-title records is a severe handicap to land ownership. I understand somewhat the same problem exists in other countries.

To such needs as those, as well as to help increase total production, it seems to me that the United Nations should give major attention, and that we, the United States, should continually stress such a policy.

In our administration of point IV work in our related programs of economic aid, we should practice the same policy, making it clear that our purpose is to help the peoples of the world to help themselves, that we are thinking of the great body of citizens in any country to which we extend aid, and that those governments which want to develop agrarian improvements on an orderly and fair basis will find us both sympathetic and cooperative. A large part of our effort, of course, must be to carry the practical techniques of production and the techniques of extension education to those who want to learn what we have learned. But let us not mislead anyone in this matter—let us not fool ourselves either: Technical know-how will not go far toward solving the food problem and building peace where a bad system of land tenure exists. We will do well to concentrate our technical assistance in those places where it has a chance to benefit the common people.

In the main, the chance to benefit is inseparable from the opportunity to own the land. Ownership of the land by the cultivator is the key to individual freedom and free government. To extend this principle is simply to extend a basic tenet of United States democracy. And I believe nobody has a greater interest in this than the people of the land-grant colleges.

I would not for an instant depreciate the value to the world of our techniques of production. But they are, of course, by no means all that our democracy has to offer the cause of world peace.

The greatest thing we have to export is hope—hope based on experience in democracy, hope based upon successful practice of the universal principles of the American revolution, hope that amounts to faith—mankind's faith in mankind. As a result of the American experiment, we know that man is capable of self-government, that his inherent rights are truly attainable, that the dignity of the individual can and must be respected.

We have military power, and we are increasing it, for the cause of peace. It is an essential expedient. But the basic contribution we are making is hope and faith in a future of freedom, justice, and peace.

In making this contribution, we have reason for both pride and humility. We can continue to be a source of hope and faith only so long as we continue to advance the principles which are the source of hope. If democracy is to be a continuing source of hope to others, democracy must continue to advance in America.

And our system of tenure must be strengthened here if the principle of operator-ownership of farms is to be the center of hope in the world-wide struggle for the minds of men. To put it another way, the peasant of Asia or the Middle East has grounds for a hope that far excels anything offered by a Communist collective as long as there is proof that the democratic principles, including free enterprise, really work for the benefit of farm people. But without the proof that is furnished by a strong American system of family farming—that is, farming by families who own the land they operate or can buy it if they wish—the wellspring of hope may go dry, with disastrous results throughout the world.

I believe that all farm organizations and all public institutions concerned with agriculture, including the land-grant colleges, can and will unite in a definite, vigorous program to strengthen family farming in America. I believe that the general public will support such an effort.

Let us work to strengthen our democracy in all its aspects. This is a task that challenges educators, Government, everyone. Let us live up to the ideals upon which our Nation was founded. Those ideals can win the world. They are humanity's ideals—as different from communism as light is different from darkness.

Right now the world is choosing between light and darkness.

Let us make the light of hope shine brightly.

Monthly Benefits Assuming Basic Pension Rate of $50 per Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a tabulation showing the monthly benefits which would be paid to those aged 65 or over under the proposal for a universal-eligibility social-security program I made last summer.

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

Monthly benefits, assuming basic pension rate of $50 per month—How to determine your citizen's pension

If your annual income is—	Your monthly citizen's pension is—	Your annual citizen's pension is—
0 to $600	$50	$600
$601 to $650	49	588
$651 to $700	48	576
$701 to $750	47	564
$751 to $800	46	552
$801 to $850	45	540
$851 to $900	44	528
$901 to $950	43	516
$951 to $1,000	42	504
$1,001 to $1,050	41	492
$1,051 to $1,100	40	480
$1,101 to $1,150	39	468
$1,151 to $1,200	38	456
$1,201 to $1,250	37	444
$1,251 to $1,300	36	432
$1,301 to $1,350	35	420
$1,351 to $1,400	34	408
$1,401 to $1,450	33	396
$1,451 to $1,500	32	384
$1,501 to $1,550	31	372
$1,551 to $1,600	30	360
$1,601 to $1,650	29	348
$1,651 to $1,700	28	336
$1,701 to $1,750	27	324
$1,751 to $1,800	26	312
$1,801 to $1,850	25	300
$1,851 to $1,900	24	288
$1,901 to $1,950	23	276
$1,951 to $2,000	22	264
$2,001 to $2,050	21	252
$2,051 to $2,100	20	240
$2,101 to $2,150	19	228
$2,151 to $2,200	18	216
$2,201 to $2,250	17	204
$2,251 to $2,300	16	192
$2,301 to $2,350	15	180
$2,351 to $2,400	14	168
$2,401 to $2,480 [1]	13	156
$2,451 to $2,500	12	144
$2,501 to $2,550	11	132
$2,551 to $2,600	10	120
$2,601 to $2,650	9	108
$2,651 to $2,700	8	96
$2,701 to $2,750	7	84
$2,751 to $2,800	6	72
$2,801 to $2,850	5	60
$2,851 to $2,900	4	48
$2,901 to $2,950	3	36
$2,951 to $3,000	2	24
$3,001 to $3,050	1	12
$3,051 to $3,100	0	0

[1] At this level aged persons would not normally gain by applying for benefits, as loss of the $600 special exemption for the aged would outweigh value of benefit.

Potatoes Are Cheaper, Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief, following information derived from a recent news release of Guide-Post Research, Pittsburgh, Pa., reveals the housewives of the Nation have excellent reasons for their ever-increasing demands for speedy congressional action on the control of food prices, not only to stop the ever increasing price spiral, but also to eliminate price disparities. The statistics cover the cost of 11 typical market basket items in the Pittsburgh district super markets during the last year:

Guide-Post's regularly conducted survey of the prices of 11 typical items in Pittsburgh district super-markets, finds potatoes are down 20 percent, compared to January 1, 1950; flour costs the same, while all other items have increased; sirloin steak is up 16 percent, chuck roast up 32 percent, bacon up 14 percent, butter up 18 percent, eggs up 42 percent, soap powder up 19 percent, sugar up 4 percent, coffee up 6 percent, and vegetable shortening up 38 percent.

According to C. F. Ackenheil, director of the survey, the total cost of this typical market basket has moved up from $8.10 last January, to $9.30 today, an increase of 15 percent during the year.

The market basket still costs 1 percent less than the all-time high reached July 1948, but that is largely due to the fall in potato prices. Excluding the potatoes, the grocery price average is 2 percent above the July 1948 peak.

The decline in potato prices is the result of the Government dropping its price support which had kept them at an artificially high level.

Compared to 3 years ago, some peculiar things have happened to food prices. Pound for pound, steak and bacon cost just about the same in January 1948. Now steak costs 1½ times as much as bacon. Three years ago, butter cost 56 percent more than coffee. Now coffee costs 11 percent more than butter. Disparities like those and delay in food price controls pending congressional action are forcing housewives to change their menus to take advantage of the best food values.

But even with reduced demand for relatively high priced items, their prices do not drop.

Mr. Ackenheil says it appears that the Government has repealed the law of supply and demand.

The above comments are based on the data to be found in the following chart:

Grocery items	Jan. 1, 1950	Jan. 1, 1951
Pound sirloin	$0.87	$1.01
Two pounds chuck	1.08	1.42
Pound bacon	.56	.64
Pound butter	.69	.80
Dozen eggs	.52	.74
Box soap powder	.27	.32
10 pounds sugar	.93	.97
10 pounds flour	.93	.93
Peck potatoes	.62	.49
Pound coffee	.84	.89
3 pounds shortening	.79	1.09
Total 11 items	8.10	9 30

A Plan for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] made a timely and most interesting talk this morning to a group of Senators in the Senate Restaurant. In his usual scholarly manner he gave a brief review of the wars of Palestine, and then tersely and clearly applied the lessons of these wars and the times thereof to our present world problems. I feel that his remarks are of value to the entire membership of the Congress and to the people of the Nation, and therefore ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A PLAN FOR PEACE

A cynic has described the Old Testament as being a history of wars wrapped up in a prayer for peace. Many of the prophets prayed for peace but the principal prophecy was voiced by Isaiah about 600 years before the birth of Christ when he said: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

The new Jerusalem will be a city of eternal peace but the Jerusalem of Palestine has been the most fought over city in the history of the world.

In undertaking to give you this morning a brief résumé of the many wars fought in Palestine in fulfillment of the divine purpose that the lion of the tribe of Judah, designated by Isaiah as the Prince of Peace, was to be a descendent of Abraham to whose seed Palestine was promised as an inheritance, I wish to pose for your discussion the fundamental issue that now troubles the world: "Can we avoid world war III?"

Palestine is a tiny country with an area of 10,124 square miles, slightly larger than that of the State of New Hampshire. It occupies part of an ancient plateau extending from the desert shores of the Mediterranean on the west to an elevated tableland cut by the deep rift of the Jordan Valley, bounded on the east by the nation of Transjordan, on the north by Syria and on the south by Egypt. It varies from 23 to 80 miles in width and from north to south is approximately 140 miles in length.

This area, so important to us because it was the source of the Judo-Christian system of religion and philosophy on which much of modern western civilization is based, was important in ancient times because its strategic location made it the highway of commerce and of war.

Going back as far as we can into recorded history, we find evidence that the Canaanites, a Semitic people, probably invaded Palestine and settled there in the third millenium B. C. The Bible indicates they were there at the time of Abraham's arrival which is estimated to have been between 1935 and 1400 B. C. The Canaanites were in Palestine when the children of Israel, some 1,500,000 strong, invaded the land at about 1290 B. C. They were greatly feared by the Israelites because of their chariots of iron, but were gradually exterminated or absorbed by the Israelite tribes. David captured their remaining towns and after the time of Solomon, in the ninth century B. C., they disappeared from history. They left behind, however, part of their language, culture, and literary tradition, which influenced the writers of the Hebrew Bible.

Abraham, the great ancestor of the Hebrews, was a nomad who left his home in Ur of the Chaldees, eventually reaching the promised land of Palestine by way of Harran. His son, Isaac, and Isaac's son, Jacob, lived at peace with the Canaanites. Joseph, sold into Egypt by his brothers, rose to be its master and welcomed his father and brothers when famine drove them to the Nile. They continued to live in Egypt until a period probably 250 to 300 years after the time of Abraham when they were led by Moses, adopted son of the King's daughter, in escaping from a harsh taskmaster. They then wandered for 40 years in the wilderness until Joshua brought them back across the Jordan and into the promised land.

From the time of the Exodus (about 1220 B. C.) until 733 B. C. the Jews lived in Palestine. In the latter year a portion of the inhabitants of Israel were taken to Assyria as captives and shortly thereafter (721 B C.) Israel was subdued to a tributary relation and more of the people were taken to Babylon as captives. This was the first captivity of the numerically most powerful branch of the divided house of Israel.

More than a century later (597 B C.) a portion of the population of Jerusalem was deported to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar and in 586 B. C. an uprising among the Judeans led to deportation of the greater part of the Jewish people to Babylonia.

In Babylonia they were settled in various districts and given a good deal of freedom but some of their leaders looked forward to a change of rulership that would make possible their return to Jerusalem and the rebuilding of the temple. In 539 B. C., Cyrus took advantage of dissension in Babylonia and sent his armies against Babylon which fell without striking a blow. A proclamation was issued allowing the Jews to return to Palestine but they had become so attached to the country in which they were living that few availed themselves of the opportunity and for centuries Babylonia remained a center of the Jewish people.

During this period, from 538 to 332 B. C., Palestine was under Persian rule. Cyrus the Great established a rule of tolerance toward subject races and their religions and in 520–516 B. C. the temple of Jerusalem was rebuilt. The condition of the Jews in Palestine was described by historians as "wretched," however, until Nehemiah came to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem in 445–433 B. C. and to enforce observance of the law. It was he who said: "So the walls were rebuilt because the people had a will to work."

In 332 B. C. Palestine was conquered by Alexander the Great and in 323 B. C. it was brought under the Ptolemies of Egypt who ruled it until 178 B. C. Under Alexander the Jews were left undisturbed in their customs and religion and the high priest was the head of the state. The Egyptians merely used Palestine as a source of tribute to their treasury. Then, in 187 B. C. Antiochus the Great took possession of the country for the Syrians and a new period of intolerance began.

A revolt was led by Judas, later known as Maccabaeus, which gained for the Jews religious freedom in 168 B. C. and political freedom in 142 B. C. The Jews lived under their own kings and controlled an expanded territory until 63 B. C. when the Romans began their rule which lasted until 395 A. D. The Roman period was characterized by intermittent repression and religious freedom. From 37 to 4 B. C. the country was

ruled by Herod the Great, who was a Jew appointed by the Roman Senate. He was succeeded by his three sons and, to satisfy their claims, the country was divided into three parts. After their deaths Palestine was placed under Roman procurators. A Jewish rebellion led to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Emperor Titus in 70 A. D. There were other Jewish rebellions in 115–117 and in 132–135 A. D. After the devastation of Judea in 135 A. D. Jerusalem was made a Roman colony and barred to the Jews.

This marked a turning point in the history of Palestine. The Jews had dominated or been a principal part of the country for 1,500 years, but after 135 A. D. they began to give way to the Arabs until in 1170 A. D. a Jewish writer recorded that there were scarcely 1,500 Jews in the entire country.

When the Roman Empire was partitioned between the east and west in 395 A. D. Palestine went to the emperor of the east and for the next 200 years there was comparative quiet, although along with the development of pilgrimages and holy places there was occasional persecution of the Jews who remained in the country.

Then in 615 Persia overran Palestine. It was retaken by the Emperor Heraclius in 628 but was lost again to the Moslem Arabs under Omar in 636. For the next 300 years there were rivalries among the Arab rulers of the country but their hold was not seriously challenged by outsiders.

In 1072 A. D. there was a Turkish invasion. During the First Crusade Jerusalem was captured (in 1099) and Godfrey of Bouillon was made King of Jerusalem. The Second Crusade (1147) undertaken to aid the weakening kingdom failed and in 1187 A. D. Saladin captured Jerusalem without destroying it. In 1240 the Mongols seized Jerusalem, massacred its inhabitants and plundered its churches. In 1290 Palestine was overrun again, this time by the Tartars, and in 1400 Tamerlane overran the country. Except for these brief periods of raids Palestine remained under Egyptian-Arab domination until 1516 when it was occupied by Sultan Selim of Turkey and became part of the Ottoman Empire. It remained in this status for 400 years, although the Ottoman rulers were challenged by a Druse prince who established a Lebanese kingdom early in the sixteenth century. It was taken by Napoleon in 1798 and by Mehemet Ali, a rebellious Egyptian viceroy of the Sultan in 1832.

During World War I Palestine became a battleground between the Turks and the Allied forces stationed in Egypt. The Turks were defeated and the British under General Allenby entered Jerusalem on December 8, 1917. A few days later British control was extended to all of Palestine.

The British held Palestine as an occupying power until April 1920, and from then until May 15, 1948, they continued in control as the mandatory power. The British then began their withdrawal in favor of the United Nations Commission which was to carry out the plan of partition between the Arabs and the Jews which had been approved by the UN General Assembly in November 1947.

Under the partition plan the Jews were given 5,550 square miles, the Arabs 4,550 square miles, and 74 square miles were left in the Jerusalem enclave, but it took another war between the Jews and the Arabs to establish the new Jewish state.

I have outlined for you the major wars fought in Palestine over a period of approximately 3,500 years. In the summary I did not include what might be termed minor tribal wars, as when Samson slew the Philistines with the jawbone of an ass and David slew Goliath with a slingshot, nor the instances in which the 12 Jewish tribes fought among themselves. Suffice it to say it was a period of constant turmoil, of constant warfare and bloodshed.

The significant fact that stands out from this record is that when God's chosen people obeyed Him He either gave them peace or victory over their enemies, and when they decided to go their own way and rely on their own right arm He let them suffer the consequences, which in many instances was disastrous war.

In one of his famous sermons Dr. Peter Marshall analyzed the qualities of the men Christ chose for his disciples and then drew the illuminating lesson that they became worthy of such a Master because he had changed their natures. History teaches and science confirms the teaching that human nature in all races and in all ages has been very much the same with a percentage of good people and a percentage of evil ones. History likewise teaches us that no nation has ever achieved lasting peace by superiority of arms. The historian Gibbon claims that the fall of the Roman Empire was due to the spread of Christianity which taught that the first allegiance of man was to God and not to the state but that viewpoint is successfully challenged by the modern historian, Arnold Toynbee, who clearly shows that the seeds for the downfall of the Roman Empire had been planted before the birth of Christ.

If our Nation can learn by experience, which Edmund Burke says no nation has ever done, we would be justified in asking God's help in the creation of an allied military strength sufficiently powerful to stay the hand of the Communist aggressors until members of the Christian faith have a fuller opportunity to reexamine the plan for peace proposed by the Prince of Peace—namely, a change in the hearts of men by divine and not by human power.

The Jews of the first century wanted and expected a messiah who would by force release them from bondage and crucified him when he said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." When Pilate said, "I find no fault in this man," the mob cried, "His blood be on us, and on our children."

In this emergency democratic nations may be able to assemble sufficient force to defeat the Communists on the battlefield. But such a victory would not settle the fundamental conflict between truth and error, between good and evil.

The thesis I should like to be able to sustain is that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of spiritual force. Peace will, in my humble opinion, continue to escape the chancelleries of the world until it finds a home in the hearts of men.

Inaugural Address of Gov. John S. Fine, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, yesterday Pennsylvania inaugurated a new Governor, the Honorable John S. Fine. The impressive ceremonies at Harrisburg recalled that Benjamin Franklin, in the final years of his public service, was chief executive of the Commonwealth from 1785 to 1788.

Pennsylvania is proud of the part Benjamin Franklin played in establishing the greatness of the Keystone State. We are proud that upon the foundation he helped to lay there has been developed a great diversity of industry which serves the Nation in peace and war. It has won for Pennsylvania an enviable reputation as the arsenal of democracy.

We are proud of Pennsylvania's place in the history of our Nation and of the sacred shrines which stand on her soil as milestones in the progress of liberty and human rights on the American continent and in the world.

Every American reveres our monuments of freedom: Independence Hall, Valley Forge, Gettysburg, Fort Necessity, where General Washington first commanded troops in battle, the Fort Pitt Blockhouse, and Bushy Run.

Throughout his whole lifetime Benjamin Franklin preached the virtues of industry, self-reliance, and thrift.

Those qualities were emphasized by the new Governor of Pennsylvania in his inaugural address. He advocated a pay-as-you-go policy and the most rigid economies in all government expenditures excepting those that contribute to the national defense.

Because of its importance I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the inaugural address of the distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable John S. Fine.

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

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. JOHN S. FINE

My fellow Pennsylvanians, you have entrusted to me the administration of the government of our Commonwealth for the next 4 years. I realize the tremendous responsibilities of these times, fraught as they are with the terrific clash of ideologies and the bitter conflict of beliefs and denials—the belief in truth and God against untruth and denial of God. I humbly acknowledge the great trust of serving you at a time when we are engaged in a militant crusade for peace.

I begin my duties with mixed feelings, but no misgivings; happy to have the opportunity to serve, yet humble before the magnitude of the task. No man can lightly regard the grave responsibilities that today go hand in hand with public service.

We are living in a period that requires the most rigid economies in government for other than defense and human needs, and demands a multitude of sacrifices on the part of each individual. This is the era of sacrifice, of strict Spartan living, that freedom may survive in a world threatened with enslavement. We will, and we must, endure endless restrictions so that we and others may remain free—free to work, free to speak, free to worship. We face a temporary end to luxuries, a curtailment of necessities to a minimum.

The indomitable spirit that is an American heritage will overcome whatever obstacles we are called upon to meet. Reflection on past periods of trials and perils leaves but one conclusion: America has always emerged from perilous times stronger in unity of spirit, in physical resources and in spiritual freedom. This is true because our objectives have been and are now dictated by justice and right, and not motivated by hope of material gains.

Our position today and the position of those who join with us is precarious, but far from despairing. We are at war and our Nation is in the beginning of a war economy. More and more restrictive measures, harnessing industry and individual alike, are inevitable.

We are plagued by the festering sore of communism. Hordes of godless people are lusting for power and would destroy freedom and enslave the world. In this terrifying situation free nations everywhere look to our country to be the instrument of their salvation. We must see to it that they do not look in vain. We must not fail them. By the same token, they of other lands should not fail to give us in our common cause the fullest measure of every assistance of which they are capable.

If we are to successfully meet the challenge before us, there must be a submergence of selfish interests. We can coddle no favorites nor resort to narrow partisanship in our search for victory and peace. All of us in State government—Democrats and Republicans—must move constantly and confidently with single-minded devotion toward dual objectives: The welfare of the Commonwealth and the welfare of the Republic.

This is the most crucial time in our history. What we do or what we fail to do may determine the destinies of our Nation and of mankind; the preservation of religion and the survival of a world in which we would care to live.

We know there can be no security without freedom; without freedom there can come no true peace. America is the last sanctuary of freemen. It is the repository of those dynamic ideals which lead irresistibly to the triumphs of freedom if those ideals are not sacrificed by political and diplomatic expediencies.

We must strengthen ourselves in Nation and in State. We need, immediately, to place our economy on more stable grounds. The American people want and should have more enlightenment on what is expected of them. When Americans know the full facts—and often they sense them when they are not officially disclosed—the present challenge to agonized humanity will be wholeheartedly and successfully met. Our people have confidence in themselves, and properly so. We will not lose that confidence. We can add substance to it by accelerating sound preparedness at home and abroad.

As we in Pennsylvania face the possibility that the Korean conflict will spread into world conflagration, we realize that much of our energies and our deliberations should be devoted to the creation of a strong and integrated home defense. Protection of our people and our industry transcends all other considerations.

The civil defense commission in Pennsylvania has accomplished an early and sound beginning on the program of protection of life and property. Its work is proceeding speedily and with commendable thoroughness. Already we are advanced far beyond most other States. This program is going to be costly—how much we do not know. We must guard against overlapping and wasteful expenditures. Security, prudence, and utility will dictate the nature and extent of these expenditures.

It has never been said, and it will not now be said, that Pennsylvania ever failed to contribute in fullest measure to our national security. The people of our great Commonwealth are conscious of the burdens resting upon us. Our problems are critical, but they are not insurmountable. They are many, but they will lessen. There is no need for pessimism, no place for defeatism. This is the time for all of us to rededicate ourselves and our vast resources unsparingly to our National Government in its emergency.

Pennsylvania already has contributed to the Federal Military Establishment more than 16,000 National Guard men, including our justly famous and always revered Twenty-eighth Division. If the remainder of our National Guard is called up, we will need a strong State Guard to replace it. We are now building that State Guard. We shall not be found wanting. We will be ready for anything. We should immediately provide the means for the exercise of suffrage by our men and women in the service, no matter where they are stationed.

There can be no denying that the times demand that we husband our resources, enlarge our productivity, even conserve ourselves, that we may best assist in the emergency. We must—and we will—be thrifty. Frugality in everything except protection of our people will be the watchword of this administration. Where our people's health is concerned, we will not stint. We will not be parsimonious in educating our children. We shall not be rigid in our treatment of the unfortunates among our citizens; nor will this administration be wasteful with the people's money.

Due to the war larger expenditures than are currently made will in all probability be necessary to properly run the State's business. New taxes or additions to existing taxes are apparent. To keep tax increases to a minimum requires most careful study. We have to face these demands knowing there is no escape under present conditions. They exist and we must admit it. The plain fact is that a rise in the cost of government is inevitable in Pennsylvania, as it is elsewhere. Careful management and prudent administration will insure a lesser burden on the taxpayer.

Generally speaking, the increased costs of administration of our Commonwealth should be paid for on a pay-as-you-go policy. The costly errors which have plagued our generation with wars ought to be borne by us, insofar as it is possible. The costs should not be passed on to our children, as in all probability they will inherit less of the American way of life than was bequeathed to us.

As this administration begins, the general cost of living is up 74 percent over the cost of 1940, only 11 years ago. Building construction costs are three times as high. Public assistance grants per person are nearly two and a half times 1940 grants. These are but a few of many illustrations which show rising costs of living and higher expenditures for the conduct of the Commonwealth's business. Unfortunately, the prospect is that the costs are destined to go still higher.

These facts present a real problem to our financial planning for the years ahead. This problem is not ours alone; it is a problem common to all the States, though it is magnified in those States which like ours, must budget for 2-year periods. It must be remembered also that we have the expenses incident to civil defense, as yet uncalculated; our commitments to the soldiers' bonus; mandated salary increases for teachers; and State authority rentals. These costs add many perplexities to the problem.

Pennsylvanians have long been justly proud of our great material wealth. We have been, and are today, the arsenal of America. Our resources, our productivity, and our contribution of scientific and industrial leadership to the Nation and to the world are astounding and without parallel. We are predominant as a cultural center. Yet, with all, our greatest wealth, our most valuable possessions, are the 2,000,000 children and youth in our Commonwealth. Soon they must assume the responsibilities of leadership. To them falls the opportunity of perpetuating the American way of life. They must be prepared for that opportunity physically, mentally, and spiritually, that they will not fail.

Of greatest assistance to them is the school system. The school can be no better than the teacher. And the teacher must see to it that American history and Americanism above all else are properly taught and fully absorbed by our children. It is our bounden duty to give the best of everything to education. The cost of worth-while education, like everything else, has increased. Nevertheless, it is our obligation to provide the necessary financial support to meet these increased costs. We must continuously improve our school system; we cannot afford to do otherwise.

Our State must do everything it can to better the peoples' health. We propose to give without additional expenditures a reorganized and improved Department of Health dedicated to a full and thorough public service.

The interests of labor and industry in Pennsylvania will continue to be treated with sympathetic understanding. We must and we will see to it that they live and work in harmony with justice to each.

We welcome industry to Pennsylvania. In some sections we need a greater diversification of industry, and this administration will make every effort to obtain it. We seek expansion of industry already doing business here. We plan early attention, consonant with a war economy, to relieve the economically distressed areas in the anthracite and bituminous fields.

We have the greatest highway system in the Nation and in the world. Our turnpike across the State from Ohio to near Philadelphia was not designed as a military highway, but it is a superb one without parallel in the Nation. Completion of the Schuylkill Expressway will add to the turnpike's value and will be a boon to industry and to the Philadelphia area. Further plans call for the turnpike's extension in the west to Erie, in the east to the New Jersey border, and through the anthracite regions to the New York State line.

Pennsylvania's agriculture enjoys an enviable position among the States. While we rank thirty-second in area, we are thirteenth among the States in the value of farm products. I feel certain we will add to our productivity, and, where possible, the State will aid agriculture to gain this goal.

I believe it to be the duty of Government to encourage, not throttle, private enterprise. I shall vigorously oppose any move aimed at dwarfing the freedom of individual effort or strangling the American way of life.

Because of limited time, I have not approached many matters which will be presented to the legislature for the benefit of our people. These matters will be outlined later. However, it is fitting at this time that I reaffirm my faith in sound, efficient, and progressive government, administered with common sense.

As we face grim uncertainties we Americans need not fear for our strength. We must shun the counsel of despair. We must not listen to the voices of doubt or defeatism. The light of truth will dispel the clouds of confusion for those of faith and confidence.

Everywhere, the hearts and minds of men constantly yearn for freedoms denied. The march of freedom knows no divisional lines—geographical, religious, racial, or of color. This insatiable thirst of man to remain free or to regain his lost freedom is our most potent ally. It strengthens us and is devastating to the opposition.

True, it is disturbing that free men are temporarily thwarted in their search for peace by evil men who have renounced their God. But to men of stout hearts and firm faith it is a challenge for them to rise above their ordinary selves and fight with crusading enthusiasm for principles which are eternal—justice, equality, and freedom.

The way of right is the path to victory, if we have the will to boldly and confidently pursue it. Meanwhile, all of us must carry on for a greater and more secure Pennsylvania. It is the duty and responsibility of every Pennsylvanian, as it is the responsibility of all Americans, to buttress our Nation. I implore your aid and seek your prayers. I ask for God's help in meeting our manifold problems, confident that with His aid we will solve them to the advantage of all of our people.

Present Political Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several weeks ago Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, delivered an address at Tampa, Fla., on present political trends. This address elicited widespread editorial comment, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various editorials dealing with Mr. Farley's address.

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

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times of November 27, 1950]

AN OLD HAND AT THE GAME

James A. Farley was master minding for the Democratic Party when some of its present strategists were still school children. He may be no smarter than his successors, but he has had more experience than they have had. Furthermore, being out of party politics now, he can speak freely.

Out of his experience, he has drawn the conclusion that the attempt by unions to take over the Democratic Party is contrary to the idea of the two-party system. The unions are not broadly representative. This defect in their nature, as far as politics is concerned, was sensed by many Democrats in the 1950 election.

In Ohio, Mr. Farley believes, many Democrats voted for Senator TAFT because they wanted to salvage their party from the labor politicians who had taken charge of the anti-Taft campaign.

He believes, in other words, that the Ohio senatorial election was a show-down on the unions' bid for domination of one party in the two-party system and that the unions were licked.

Senator TAFT thereby was made the beneficiary of a decision far more important than a decision in an ordinary political contest. His successful candidacy settled a momentous issue.

In view of the fact the union politicians lately have been blaming their failure to win in Ohio and other States on many other things, including the war in Korea, it is interesting to know that an old hand at the game thinks the unionists helped to lose votes for the Democratic party's candidates.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of November 25, 1950]

MONEY WE HAVEN'T GOT

James A. Farley is, in the opinion of a good many Americans of both parties, one of the best political minds in the United States today.

Mr. Farley has been somewhat behind the political clouds the past few years, but appears to be emerging once more.

His comment on the recent elections is shrewd, sage, and to the point. Speaking some days ago he said: "The Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments won no honors in this election. We want to be a humane, progressive Nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got."

That seems to hit the nail smack on the head: "We cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got."

Far too many of those who are superenthusiastic for the socialized schemes so widely and even wildly advocated these days appear never to think about where the money to make them work would come from.

The Government, of course, is expected to pick up the checks.

But the Government, as we have noted in these columns for some years now, hasn't a penny of its own. It has to get all its money from the people themselves.

"The recent elections," Mr. Farley declared, "clearly demonstrated that the voters want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs."

Most students of current events agree, it seems to us, with Mr. Farley. Indeed, it seems difficult for any intelligent analyst of the voting in the recent election to arrive at any other conclusion. The Fair Deal trend to the socialistic heaven was given a rude jolt that even its greatest protagonist must have understood.

We have on our hands a world problem of breath-taking proportions. We will need a united and a prosperous and a productive Nation to lead the world out of the present dilemma in which it finds itself. If this Nation is to dabble in socialism, to try to be big-hearted with money we haven't got, what is to become of us on the international front?

Even if the majority of the American people were minded to try socialism—we do not believe they are—this is worst of all times to take a whirl at it.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of November 22, 1950]

JIM FARLEY'S WARNING

James A. Farley's speech last night to the Florida State Chamber of Commerce in Tampa sounds very much like the opening gun of a campaign to stage a political comeback. Clearly the former Democratic national chairman feels his party got its comeuppance from the voters and must revamp its strategy. It seems equally clear that he's willing to have a part in that job.

The election, as he sees it, was a warning of disaster for the Democrats—

If they become overzealous in courting labor leaders;

If they continue making alliances with splinter parties;

If they persist along the road to socialism and a welfare state;

If they try to expedite a natural trend toward liberalism by forcing civil-rights legislation on a reluctant public.

In Ohio and elsewhere, Mr. Farley believes, the voters made it plain they want a two-party system with each party bidding for general support, not selling out to pressure groups. America, he is convinced, wants no labor party as such. He thinks the way Ohio Democratic leaders turned over their party to the labor crowd caused many Democrats to cast protest ballots for Senator TAFT.

Similarly in New York where leaders of the Democratic and Liberal Parties made their deal, the rank and file rebelled. As a result, he argues, the Liberal vote fell below its previous record and Democrats flocked to an independent rather than their party's official candidate.

Mr. Farley also believes that Americans made it very clear on November 7 that they want no part of the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other crackpot schemes. At a time when the national economy must be built up to face threats from without, people do not want their money squandered on what he called unsubstantial experiments.

Altogether the former chairman gave the Truman strategists a thorough and well-merited going over.

[From the Hartford Times of November 27, 1950]

MR. FARLEY IS RIGHT

The moderation and common sense that the country has come to expect from James A. Farley are well exemplified in an address he recently delivered in Tampa before the Florida Chamber of Commerce. The former national Democratic chairman, with characteristic frankness, chose to speak in part on the issue of civil rights. That is a subject that some national Democratic leaders might prefer to touch lightly, if at all, before an audience in the South. But as it was handled by Mr. Farley, there was enlightenment and guidance for both the North and South in his remarks.

As a basic proposition, he declared that to pass a law, especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice. "Free men in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense" he said "can generally be trusted to do what is right." Consequently, Mr. Farley would leave the correction of the denial of civil rights—and he did not blink the fact that they are frequently denied—to the sense of justice and common sense of the areas in which the problem arises. He pointed out that most of the problems are "gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South."

Mr. Farley feels that "the gates of economic opportunity for all races" are opening wider and wider, that the right to vote is spreading, and that lynchings "have been brought under control by the States and communities."

All of that is true, to a degree. And Mr. Farley undoubtedly outlined the most effective—perhaps the only effective—approach to the problems. But there is still a question whether the opening of the gates and the spreading of the right of suffrage and the control of mass murder are proceeding at a rate consistent with the determination of the American people that they shall soon prevail without question wherever men live under the stars and stripes.

The answer lies either within the States of the South or in the hands of Federal authorities. Mr. Farley is right when he says corrective action should come from the local areas. The citizens there never tire in their insistence on State autonomy. But the thing that keeps up the steam in the movement for centralized attention to civil rights is the failure of local governmental units to meet their responsibilities.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of November 23, 1950]

FARLEY ON THE ELECTION

James A. Farley feels the election results generally showed a Republican trend, but were also "good for the Democratic Party," if it learns the lessons that will make for a better and more unified party and a better two-party system for the Nation.

We know of no Democrat better equipped to draw whatever lessons there may be in the election results, and to offer sound advice to his party, than James A. Farley. He puts first the lesson of Ohio and several other places where the CIO-PAC were particularly active, that neither of the two parties nor the workingman himself, nor the voters generally want an independent labor party.

He believes labor has sufficient leeway within the scope of the two-party system to protect and further its interests. Moreover, a political party loses its effectiveness when it lacks a universal viewpoint. "The interests of all the people must be considered in framing a philosophy or platform when an appeal is made to the voters."

Mr. Farley drew the further lesson that the voters want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs, confronted as we are with a great peril in our foreign relations, with immense deficits and

heavy taxation. He referred specifically to the Brannan plan and socialized medicine, adding "other unsubstantial experiments." We want to be "a humane, progressive nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got." Expenditures for nonmilitary purposes must be "cut to the bone."

He thinks the best way to help the farmer is not through a "two-pronged threat to the farmer and the taxpayer," as even the two big farm organizations regard the Brannan plan, but rather in helping him find the way to the market at less cost and with more efficiency. "Government aid in marketing, in lowering the cost of transportation, and in finding new uses for farm products is the way to prosperity with freedom."

If President Truman listens to Mr. Farley's advice on the civil-rights problems he will ask the southern leaders to solve them on a regional and a State basis, instead of playing political football with a Federal bill.

"To threaten the South with drastic Federal legislation is the last way to approach these problems * * * Freemen in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense can generally be trusted to do what is right.

"When we review the history of past years we see clearly that most of the problems raised by the so-called civil-rights program are gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South. The gates of opportunity for all races are opening wider and wider, the right to vote is spreading to all, and disorders that once resulted in lynchings have been brought under control by the States and communities."

The earliest hint that Mr. Farley was parting with the philosophy still current in Washington was his break with President Roosevelt, presumably on the third-term issue, but in reality over the sort of 'experiments" to which he now objects. His is one more voice calling upon the party to get back to its earlier sound traditions by abandoning the road that leads eventually to socialism. There are many other Democrats who agree with him, but few who speak with greater effect. That he has spoken will be good for the Democratic Party, if it takes his advice, and for the country as a whole.

Tactics, Not a Strategy, of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, ever since it was my privilege to visit the Ukraine DP camp in Germany in the summer of 1947 and to talk with the leaders there of the Ukraine insurgent movement, I have been profoundly interested in the Ukraine, and the great courage of its people, who have consistently resisted the totalitarian dictatorship of Soviet Russia.

In this connection I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, on the timely subject of "Tactics, Not a Strategy, of Freedom," which appeared in the January 1, 1951, issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, a publication of the Pan-American Ukrainian Conference.

This article contains certain concrete proposals for American policy toward Soviet Russia. I am sure all Senators will find these proposals interesting and challenging, and will admire the spirit which motivates them.

All who read this article will join sympathetically in its tribute to the courageous leadership of the late General Taras Chuprynka, commander of the still very active Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) which operates politically and militarily behind the iron curtain. All believers in freedom suffered a loss when General Chuprynka fell in battle with Russian MVD troops last March 5, 1950 in the western Ukraine.

When word of his death was recently received by the free world, his loss was mourned not only by Ukrainians, but also by Lithuanians, Croats, Slovaks, Poles, Hungarians, Georgians, Latvians, Cossacks, Turkestans, and many other who have known intimately the general cause for which he fought, and for which his Ukrainian insurgent army is still courageously fighting.

The people of America and the peoples of the free nations, who today are building our strength to preserve peace, cannot but be inspired and reassured by the heroism of these fighters for freedom behind the iron curtain, for whom there is no peace.

I ask unanimous consent that this commemorative statement by Dr. Dobriansky be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

TACTICS, NOT A STRATEGY, OF FREEDOM

(By Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky)

History, we are told, has its own dispassionate way of revealing the truth. And how powerfully, not to say brutally, true this is. For even before the closing days of World War II, the burdened populaces of the world hopefully heralded the peace of the future, while many of their naive and unrealistic leaders were feverishly engaged in laying anew the supposed foundations of international law and order—literally, and frankly, with outlaws participating. But far in the distance of the Carpathian Mountains, away from the momentary clamor of unbridled emotion and pious commotion, stark reality was being squarely and courageously faced. It was then, in May, that the unsung hero whom we are solemnly honoring tonight issued his famous proclamation to the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army, fighting valiantly under his command against the forces of Red Russia. It was then that he proclaimed in no uncertain terms the basic truths that "The peace is not yet won" and, in a sense more important, that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone." In effect, it was then, in May 1945, that General Chuprynka, who, to the immense loss of the anti-Communist world, fell in battle this past March in the Ukrainian village of Bilohorscha, raised the cry of all freedom-lovers for concrete tactics, not a strategy, of freedom.

Never has this cry been more pressing than now. The so-called strategy of freedom, as was so exhortatively enunciated recently, is scarcely novel or instructive to those who have long been inspired by the ideals of freedom, whether they be in the comfortable confines of these United States or in the boggy regions of the Pripet Marshes. The time for mere statement of ideals and abstract virtues has definitely passed. Current conditions call for judicious consideration of not what we are striving for, but how we are to achieve it. What is urgently demanded is concrete, determining political action, not a sanctimonious contemplation of general principles coupled with a passive adaptation to determined circumstances. The so-called strategy of freedom is patently presupposed, but the positive tactics of freedom are yet to be efficiently composed. Composed chiefly in the living spirit of Chuprynka that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

The requisite tactics of freedom are clearly definable and so formidably within our pragmatic reach. To succeed in this universal struggle for survival, the first and basic tactic of freedom is to actualize our bipartisan leadership, a leadership in the international field that is intrepid and risk-taking, that knows intimately the substance and machinations of Russian Communist imperialism, that possesses the dynamic vision to see that in the end the peace cannot be securely won and everlasting until the tenuous foundations of Russian Communist imperialism and the politically unnatural Russian empire are reduced once and for all time. It requires a tactical leadership ungiven to timidity, appeasement, suicidal containment, and the superficial niceties of diplomatic play, all of which has led to the fantastic contradictions of fighting now a Communist China whom our State Department so blindly coddled, of being unable to bomb the very material bases of the enemy, of refusing in Korea the military aid of a chartered member of the United Nations, namely Nationalist China, and of vainly tolerating in the council of the free nations the notorious representatives of the only contemporary aggressor, Soviet Russia.

There are far-seeing men about who can implement this bipartisan tactical leadership, as witness the profound ideas of a James Burnham (The Coming Defeat of Communism). Of the capacity of a Chuprynka, who incredibly sustained organized anti-Soviet resistance these many years, and, let me emphasize, without any outside aid, this tactical political leadership is our only hope of averting a devastating world war III, a war which we will be saying was born of inexcusable blunders and contradictions, outmoded diplomacy, and timid containment. To overcome this frightful record and to steer our course away from world war III, this first tactic of freedom will surely be forcefully inspired by the Chuprynkan dictum that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

The second tactic of freedom is the dauntless functional use of one of the most powerful and precious principles of th American democratic tradition, the principle of self-determination. The tragic note of the current situation is the fearful refusal of our State Department to use this atomic ideological weapon against Russian Communist imperialism on the contradictory plea that such an act will be construed as an intervention in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. Construed by whom—the professional distortionists of the Kremlin? In the contemporary historical context, there is no substantial difference between Soviet aggression in Korea, in which we have intervened, and preceding military aggressions in the Baltic States, Ukraine, Georgia and numerous others which exist strategically close to the heart of the Soviet Russian octopus.

President Truman well observed recently that the Chinese people are being forced to serve the end of Russian colonial policy, but who with historical perspective can ignore the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union who have met this fate earlier? Yet—listen to this—I have been informed that the pathetic Voice of America deleted this observation of President Truman from the script beamed to various parts of the Soviet Union If this is true, then Almighty God will have to bless our America to overcome

the Soviet scourge. The Soviets intervene in every state of the world through their fifth columned Communist Parties, but we, behind the Maginot wall of containment, fear to build up our fifth columns of freedom. Only fearless tactical leadership can explode the ideological atom of self-determination when, as its first step, it will beam over the Voice of America to the enslaved non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union—"In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

The third urgent tactic of freedom is the rapid formation of allies who in one way or another have tasted the deadly poison of Russian Communist imperialism. The phalanx of anti-Communist power will not be so effectively established at traditional centers which have had little experience with Russian Communist imperialism and which will insularly seek to appease and appease the insatiable Russian imperialist appetite after the fashion of Munich and Yalta—only in the end to have American lives sacrificed at stupendous costs.

In the best tradition of "speak softly (and, I might add, briefly) and carry a big stick," American tactical leadership would depend as well on the big stick of a remilitarized Japan and Western Germany, the embracement of the Chinese Nationalist Army, and aid to anti-Communist Chinese guerrillas, the mobilization of a foreign legion consisting of Eastern and Central Europeans, and of the material support of Tito and anti-Communist Spain. Appeasement treacherously contains the seeds of ultimate American disaster. Nonappeasing forces must be tactically rallied in the spirit demonstrated by Chuprynka with the non-Russian undergrounds behind the iron curtain—the spirit that "In the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

Coordinated with the third is the crucial fourth tactic of freedom, enormous aid to the underground systems behind the iron curtain This can be done, and under courageous tactical political leadership would be done Many in high places are fully aware that in the vanguard of this underground activity stands the Ukrainian insurgent army—the amazing UPA of the late beloved General Chuprynka, the UPA which has invincibly symbolized unyielding resistance for all the Communist-bludgeoned peoples behind the really unriveted iron curtain. Amply supplied with guns, medicine, photographic and printing material, the UPA and its existing allies would grow immeasurably, infiltrating the multinational Red army, harrassing the MVD and MGB, disseminating propaganda leaflets, and shaking the very psychological props from under the very center and heart of world Communist imperialism. Through this undermining tactic of freedom the possibility of averting world war III is by far greater. Through this cardinal tactic of freedom the peoples upon whom we shall basically have to depend will assuredly know that "in the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone."

In truth, the only real source of aggression today is not North Korea, nor Communist China, but Soviet Russia, the spawning ground of international lawlessness. To eliminate aggression elsewhere with minimum loss of American lives and resources logically necessitates a prudent concentrated attack on the sole instigator of all serious aggression today. Time is in the outlaw's favor, but the powerful elements of fearless Americanism, resistance, and less costly victory are in ours. The time is now for tactics, not an already known strategy, of freedom. Bold leadership, the ideological use of self-determination, spirited alliances, and underground operation—these are the winning tactics of freedom. It is these tactics that the gallantry, infinite courage, and unappeasing wisdom of General Chuprynka, that great pioneer in the modern anti-Communist cause of freedom, so brilliantly exemplified. By these tactics America can victoriously fulfill that uncanny Chuprynkan promise that "in the struggle against the Kremlin you are by no means alone." These tactics of freedom will serve to insure the preservation of American freedom and the regained freedom of others, for the two are inextricably interwoven.

Regulations on Indian Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we have thousands of original Americans—the Indians—within the United States. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter relating to regulations on Indian counsel, written by Alden Stevens, secretary, Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., of New York, which was published in one of the local newspapers last week.

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

REGULATIONS ON INDIAN COUNSEL

The rights of American Indian citizens of the United States and Alaska are seriously undermined by new regulations governing contracts of Indian tribes with attorneys. These regulations, promulgated on November 9, 1950, by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, would so hamstring the Indians seeking counsel and the attorneys they retain as, in effect, to deny Indian people the right to counsel of their own choice and to a confidential relationship with such counsel. Inevitably, citizens of Indian affiliation will be prevented from securing the due process of law guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

The regulations are minute and detailed. For example, they require that before a tribe may hire an attorney it must prove to the Commissioner its need for counsel—not in general but for the exact services he is to be asked to render—and its ability to pay the fees. They control the term and terms of the contract, the fees, and renewal conditions, making it mandatory, in the case of claims contracts, that fees and even expenses be wholly contingent, regardless of the desire and ability of tribes to pay set fees. They empower the Commissioner to control the amount of Indian legal business to be undertaken by any one legal firm, in effect frustrating the desire of Indian tribes to hire attorneys known to be successful in this special field. They require that a tribe hire a local attorney for general legal services, rather than one established in Washington, where they need him most. They even give the Commissioner, who is not a party to the contract, power to terminate it without cause and without advance notice—subject only to tribal "consent," a concurrence which itself is subject to many administrative pressures.

These regulations are not only a denial of constitutional rights and a grave step backward in the progress of American Indians toward full self-determination as citizens. The Association on American Indian Affairs, in a legal memorandum—submitted December 18, 1950, jointly with others, to the Secretary of the Interior—maintains that these regulations go beyond any authority given the Commissioner of Indian Affairs by existing law; that, in fact, they violate specific rights of Indians under present law as well as public policies established by Congress. The association maintains, for example, that the obsolete 1872 law on which the Commissioner bases his authority does not apply to Indians who are citizens, as virtually all American Indians now are, and that Indian tribes organized under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and related statutes are specifically guaranteed by those laws the right to make their own attorney contracts.

Although issued in November, these regulations are still subject to veto by the Secretary of the Interior. Unless revoked, they will open a new period of arbitrary bureaucratic control of the daily lives of American Indians, to their detriment and that of the Nation. We ask your help in arousing Americans of good will to appeal to the Secretary of the Interior to reject this invasion of American Indian rights.

ALDEN STEVENS,
Secretary, Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.

N. W YORK.

Where Shall We Look for Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the December 29 issue of United States News and World Report there appears an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence entitled "Where shall we look for leadership?"

This is one of the finest editorials I have read in a long time, and I think there will be many who will find in it an expression of the thoughts they have held in their own hearts.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial may be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

WHERE SHALL WE LOOK FOR LEADERSHIP?

(By David Lawrence)

Hundreds of millions of people today live in fear. Among them, however, are legions of youth who are not afraid to die—who are not afraid to give their all for a great cause.

People at every age level, however, are bewildered. They need leadership. They look back at World War II and feel it has not accomplished its main purpose—to emancipate mankind from slavery. Military victory was achieved but no peace.

Humanity is not unwilling to make further sacrifices—to finish the job. If military means constitute the only way, free peoples will accept that way.

But millions of persons feel there must be some other way besides war. That's why there is wavering. That's why the will to fight has been dormant in countries which made sacrifices before. By some governments, unfortunately, this reluctance is misconstrued as a readiness of peoples to surrender vital principles—to accept the easy way out.

Such a course does not mean peace except for a brief moment in history. War is brought nearer when there is a compromise on principle—an appeasement of those who are faithless to their pledges and promises.

To seek to curry favor with them is only to stimulate their insolence and encourage further aggression.

It is time for clear thinking and deliberate planning.

We must first designate our real enemies.

Our enemies are not the peoples of Soviet Russia or the peoples of the so-called iron-curtain countries.

Our enemies are not the peoples of China or of North Korea or of Siberia.

What is more important still is that our enemies no longer are the people of Germany and the people of Japan.

We need to examine the status of peoples rather than the status of governments who claim to represent them.

Our primary obligation is to humanity—to the innocent peoples who are the victims of governments that seek to exploit peoples and make cannon fodder of their youth.

Once we have the courage to make this differentiation—to make the case clear to all peoples—the road becomes clear.

The Soviet government has forfeited its right before mankind to represent the Russian people. So has the Communist government of China forfeited its right to represent the Chinese people.

We compromise with truth, we appease, and we bargain with evil when we try to deal across the table with tyrannical and despotic governments which have demonstrated an unwillingness to fulfill international obligations. This is an inescapable truth. However painful to the policymakers, it is the underlying truth on which world policy must be based.

The record for expulsion of Soviet Russia from the United Nations is conclusive. It is idle to say that we will thereby be denying ourselves a means of communication. There is no value in continuing communication with an enemy of freedom—an aggressor government.

We must have a bold policy that applies first the great instruments of moral force—renunciation of evil governments. Until we have shown that we will not compromise with truth, that we will not yield to expediency or fear but will deal firmly with the source of the infection in today's troubled world, we will be temporizing.

Let us not be deterred by the cry that to rearm morally or militarily may offend enemy governments. If war must come, let us face it as our forebears have faced it before.

Above all, let us seek help in the only place where mankind has an abiding faith—in the leadership of God.

Prayers to Almighty God will not avail, however, if we are not ready to face truth within ourselves, if we are not willing to purge ourselves of the sins of materialism which so often cause us to seek the easy ways of expediency rather than to accept the hard ways of duty and sacrifice. Prayer is a two-way line of communication. We must give ourselves to service if we expect guidance in return.

When we are willing to clean house of evil at home, we will be strengthened to resist evil abroad.

In this Christmas season, we are usually reminded of the great teachings of Jesus. We are inclined, however, to overlook our own sins and, with self-righteousness, focus on the sins of others.

As we bow humbly and ask for divine guidance, we shall find the leadership we seek. Our temporal leaders can be inspired to greatness and we shall follow them dutifully. But there must be among allied governments and among peoples allied with us a readiness to face truth and to accept truth. We shall not win by selfishly withdrawing into our own boundaries and asking for protection solely for our own territory while ignoring the attacks on freemen elsewhere.

We are our brothers' keepers—everywhere that mankind calls for human help. For in saving others, we shall save not only our bodies but our souls.

The Road to Bipartisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on December 7, 1950, Holmes Alexander, noted Washington columnist, wrote an article for a syndicate of newspapers on the subject The World Crisis Stems From Many Errors. This article created a sensation because of the fact that it quoted from a Senator on the Democratic side, a Senator close to the Pentagon, the White House, and the State Department, on the reasons why President Truman ordered our Armed Forces to intervene in the war between North Korea and South Korea.

Subsequently, on the 20th of December, the same writer wrote another article entitled "The Road to Bipartisanship." The Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, under date of December 20, published Mr. Alexander's article.

These two articles are in a sense related, and should be read together.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article dated December 20, which appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

The other article to which I referred has already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 20, 1950]

THE ROAD TO BIPARTISANSHIP

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Historians looking for significant American dates could jot down December 13—the day that Mr. Truman began a series of meetings with congressional leaders of both parties to discuss wide areas of foreign policy and national defense. The occasion—if Mr. Truman doesn't backslide—could mark a return to the history treaty-making and war-making powers of Congress.

As a recent example of what's at stake, let's go back to last June 27 when the Korean war officially began. On the afternoon of that day Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, entered the Senate Chamber while Majority Floor Leader LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, was reading the White House proclamation which kicked off the ill-fated police action. The following dialog is lifted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

"Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I came into the Senate late. Was the document referred to by the Senator from Illinois a message to the Congress?

"Mr. LUCAS. No; it is a statement by the President which was given to the (White House) conference and also to the press of the Nation.

"Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that the action taken is a step which in effect is war. It may be that is the very thing we ought to do. But it seems to me that this should have been called to the attention of the entire Congress.

"Mr. LUCAS. What would the Senator from Utah do if he were President of the United States?

"Mr. WATKINS. I would have sent a message to the Congress."

We have here the gist of the argument that Mr. Truman—like his predecessor at Yalta, Tehran, and Cairo—has taken over the powers of advice and consent which the Constitution gives to Congress.

It will not do to write off WATKINS as a head-in-the-sand isolationist. He is, in fact, a very good example of a reexaminationist. Elected to the Senate in 1946, Watkins began by voting for the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan at a time when bipartisanship was in full force behind the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG. WATKINS began to shy away from White House foreign policy at exactly the time VANDENBERG withdrew from the scene because of illness and Secretary Acheson assumed office at the resignation of General Marshall. This time coincides roughly with the introduction of the North Atlantic Pact and the downfall of Chiang Kai-shek in Asia. On the day after the Lucas-Watkins debate, Senator (Mr. Republican) TAFT also complained that the White House had failed to seek advice and consent on its Far East policy. TAFT said:

"It should be noted that there was no pretense of consulting the Congress. No resolution has ever been introduced asking for the approval of the use of American forces in Korea. My own opinion is that there is no legal authority for what he (Mr. Truman) has done."

Most of this legalistic criticism was drowned out in the cheers that acclaimed Mr. Truman's boldness and in the early din of battle. But, one result of the Korean disaster has been to reexamine the Constitution and—possibly—to restore bipartisanship after a considerable lapse. The White House conference of December 13 marks the first time that Mr. Republican has been consulted in the role which earned him that title.

No one should suppose, however, that the change-over will be instantaneous and complete. The President has a short temper with critics, both musical and political. Those of us who attend his press conferences have seen a marked change in the man since 1948. He is given to outbursts which cause his neck to swell and his face to go crimson with rage over seemingly inoffensive questions.

It is hard to imagine that he will take closed-door criticism in a spirit of sweetness and light. His Republican consultants, too, are angry men with tempers just as triggerish as that of the President's.

But at least a situation is developing which will give both sides the opportunity to practice the bipartisanship that both have preached. Come good luck or bad in the days ahead, the country will have a chance to benefit from two-party planning and two-party responsibility.

A Letter From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in your remarks to the House on January 3 you expressed a conviction that everyone now living lives in the most dangerous time anyone ever lived in since the founding of our Republic. You called for unity and for working together in order that we might make ourselves strong to assure

the preservation of our Republic and of civilization itself.

The expression of your feelings about these things closely parallels my own. There is need for a universal recognition of the dangers before us. There is need for oneness of purpose to do whatever may be necessary in the interests of preserving our Nation, our principles, our lives, and our freedom.

Although we are a peace-loving people, during our brief national history we have become involved many times in war and in each case we have been a unified Nation impelled by noble ideals. We have never lost a war, but at the conclusion of fighting, certainly of World Wars I and II, we failed to achieve peace. I wonder whether this may have been due to the sacrificing of some of those ideals on the altar of expediency.

It may be that we, as a Nation, are not without responsibility for the present plight of the world. Appeasement has gotten to be a nasty word, but how often have we sidestepped our responsibility for world leadership and permitted other nations to disregard their commitments, to exploit weaker nations, and to engage in acts completely contrary to the principles by which we live and for which we fought. If in fact we have not ourselves been guilty of appeasement do we not have a measure of responsibility for standing idly by and permitting it? In effect have we not been an accomplice?

In Korea we are meeting our responsibility. We are paying a great price, but it may well be that the price we pay there in measuring up to our obligations and standing by the things in which we believe may save us from more dire consequences which otherwise would follow.

Our young people in the combat areas today recognize the part which they are playing in the fulfillment of the obligation of the United States and the United Nations to a civilized world community. That this is so is exemplified by a letter which a young Army lieutenant in the Korean theater wrote on Christmas Day to his family in my district. I know this fine young man intimately. He exemplifies all of those high attributes of character, loyalty, and devotion to his God and his country which have been the basis upon which our Nation has become great. Lieutenant Bowers' letter was printed on the editorial page of the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch for January 13. Our young people in Korea have put aside selfishness, petty jealousies, and offer their lives that we may fulfill our obligations to the world, to ourselves, and to posterity. We at home should do no less. We must make our maximum contributions. Any sacrifices which we make or any adjustments which are required in our mode of living are minor when compared to the contributions which they are making.

I want to read the article and the letter:

[From the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch of January 13, 1951]

A SOLDIER'S GLIMPSE OF WAR'S MISERY AT HUNGNAM

The letter below is from First Lt. Thomas D. Bowers, United States Army, son of Mr. and Mrs. G. H. Bowers, of Norfolk. Lieutenant Bowers, a graduate of V. M. I. in 1949, is a member of Headquarters Battery, Thirty-ninth Field Artillery Battalion, of the Third Division, and the letter was written on an LST in Hungnam harbor during the evacuation of marines and other American forces and some 100,000 Korean civilians. The Third Division had been the spearhead of the drive to clear the way for the historic retreat of the First Marine Division and part of the Seventh Infantry Division from northeast Korea. The letter is reprinted here by permission of Lieutenant Bowers' family because of the spirit of selflessness displayed by an American soldier. The letter follows:

CHRISTMAS DAY.

DEAREST FAMILY: Yesterday we loaded the last of our vehicles and personnel on LST 799 and pulled out into Hungnam harbor. We are very much overcrowded, but very happy to be warm and alive, and although this is not like any Christmas I ever spent before, I have much to be thankful for.

Christmas is passing for us without my hearing even a Christmas carol, and I believe I miss that more than anything—other than being with all of you.

We are going to Pusan, but we would feel much better about it if we knew where we were going from there. Although I haven't been here long, I've seen an awful lot, and I know that these must be the most pitiful people in the world. And they have fewer people to feel sorry for them than any other group on earth. I saw thousands and thousands of these forlorn creatures wait patiently days on end in the most cruel cold weather just to be shipped out of here in the holds of ships where few other human beings would or could be forced to stay even for a short while.

These people are the victims of cruel circumstances. They are afraid of their communistic Chinese friends and turn to us for help. When I saw them cut the line the morning that we—the Third Division—made a dash for the LST's, there were as many waiting then as there had ever been. Women began screaming and throwing themselves on the ground. They begged and pleaded, but it was of no avail.

In particular, I saw a little girl who had lost her parents; evidently they had been loaded out and she had been lost in the shuffle. No one could quiet her, and there was nothing to do. She looked about 12 and was at the age when she was probably most dependent on her parents. To be cut off like that, helpless, in a world so mixed up and so hard for her to comprehend, makes one stop and think.

There are literally millions of stories I could tell like this one, but it would take weeks to write of them and more paper than I could borrow. The only reason I wrote of this is because it starts your mind to racing and thinking a million things. First of all, how lucky we are, both here and in the United States. In the United States we hope nothing like this ever happens—and yet you can't help but think it must have been the same in the Civil War.

Here, for us, it is often very discouraging. But we look at scenes like this—and know that things might be worse and we draw new courage. I think even now of our own family and I wonder what would happen if any one of us were cut off for some unforeseen reason from the rest of the family. How helpless we would be.

Well, there's nothing else right now that I would like to write about, but I've got a million thoughts and ideas which I'll never forget. Although I'd love to be home and I sometimes want to quit or give up, I'd never trade this experience for anything in the world. I've always had a secret desire to see if I could live like this, and to test my courage, and I am getting self-confidence and satisfaction I could get nowhere else on earth.

I took my first bath today in over a month, and once again I realized that "cleanliness is next to godliness" in that it all happened on Christmas. Please don't worry about me, but pray for me. Hope to see you soon.

Love to all,

TOMMY.

Facts Prove Mr. Hoover Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a fine editorial from the Livingston Manor Times, one of the most outstanding and courageous weekly newspapers in my district:

FACTS PROVE MR. HOOVER IS RIGHT

Former President Herbert Hoover seems to have caused considerable of a disturbance in Truman administration circles with his plea that the United States should concentrate on turning this hemisphere into a Gibraltar and stop sending men and money to the western European nations.

After all, let us look at a few cold facts and it would appear we are being taken down the river for another sleigh ride to rearm Europe at the United States taxpayers' expense and fight her battles with American boys.

In this country we are now raising an army of 3,000,000 men, which is a small number compared to the more than 12,000,000 we raised, equipped, and armed in World War II, at much less expense than we are paying at present. We also actually armed Europe at American expense. We have recently been aiding Europe to the tune of $10,000,000,000 and although Europe is in the best shape she has been in for some time, we are requested by Mr. Truman to keep on.

France asks financial aid and American manpower in Indochina, but France has an armed force of only 650,000 men, and the facts are significant that in World War II France had an army of 5,000,000 men. In World War I France had an army of nearly 8,000,000, and not only equipped them but aided in outfitting American troops. It is also interesting to note that France today is at least 25 percent communistic.

We will now take Great Britain, without considering Canada. England has a token force of men under arms, but in World War II she raised and equipped an army of 4,683,000 men, and Canada supplied an additional number of 780,000 men.

Italy has been given enormous aid by this country and has actually given no aid at all to us. In the World War II Italy had an army of 4,000,000 men. Let us look at some of the other countries included in the Atlantic Pact and their war effort in World War II.

Australia supplied 680,000 troops; Turkey, 850,000; Greece, 414,000; Yugoslavia, 500,000; New Zealand, 157,000; Netherlands, 500,000; Japan, 6,095,000; Spain, 850,000; and Germany, 10,000,000. This is not all of them.

Already Mr. Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, has committed this country to an army of 200,000 men in Europe, but is leaving General MacArthur with a force of less than 180,000 men, most of them Americans, to hold off a force of 1,600,000 Chinese Reds in Korea.

We believe that Europe is in even better condition than she was before World War II,

and that her resources of manpower are just as large, and the facts printed here have never been refuted.

Why, then, more American aid unless certain people high in our Government are working to drain American resources and manpower to their lowest point, to make us a push-over for an aggressor nation? Why were 17 shiploads of munitions for Nationalist China dumped in the sea without being delivered, and by whose orders? Why are we at war in Korea without the consent of Congress? After all, 50,000 American casualties is a lot of men.

Our only hope of stopping these very peculiar incidents lie in the incoming Congress, which may be able to bring reason and order out of chaos, corruption, and, if we may say it, "treason."

Valuation of Gold by Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include two letters, one from the Director of the Mint, Mrs. Ross, which is self-explanatory, and the other, a letter of comment from Mr. Frank Lilly, director of the mines and research bureau, of Spokane.

I feel that these two communications pose a mighty interesting and serious question in our troubled times. The above-mentioned letters follow:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1951.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HORAN: This is in further reply to your communication of December 16, 1950, enclosing a letter from a constituent asking two questions regarding the valuation of gold.

The first question reads:

"Would it be correct to say that Great Britain is getting our gold on the basis of the value of $35 an ounce that we have set and, in turn, giving that gold a measure of value in their economy equivalent to $102.17 an ounce?"

The answer is that it would not be correct to say that Great Britain gives gold a measure of value equivalent to $102.17 per ounce. Great Britain values its monetary gold at a figure in pounds sterling which is equivalent to about $34.72 per fine ounce.

The figure of $102.17 is apparently arrived at through the mistaken application of a legal parity rate (suspended since September 21, 1931), instead of the current exchange rate, for the British pound sterling.

The second question reads:

"If this is true, and we are getting only the equivalent of $35 for each ounce of gold that goes abroad, wouldn't it be good sense to place a higher measure of value (price) on our gold so that we could get more goods and commodities for it—particularly in view of the fact that our imports are increasing at a tremendous rate?"

Since the initial hypothesis—that Great Britain values its gold at the equivalent of $102.17 an ounce—is incorrect, the conclusion of the question is not established. On the contrary, to devalue the dollar to the equivalent of $102.17 per ounce would seriously aggravate inflationary pressures and be interpreted by the public of this and other countries as meaning that this Government has broken faith with regard to stabilizing the value of the dollar and of their savings.

Very truly yours,
NELLIE TAYLOE ROSS,
Director of the Mint.

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 10, 1950.*

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: Thanks for the copy of letter that you received from the Director of the Mint in reply to the question on gold which I suggested that you ask.

This reply from the Director of the Mint dodges the question because it goes without saying that it is the use that is made of a thing that determines its practical value. I am wondering how the Treasury can explain the fact that we lose gold when Great Britain devalues if this devaluation does not, in fact, give gold a higher measure of value in Great Britain.

It was Great Britain's devaluation in September 1931 which, in giving gold a higher measure of value, caused our gold to flow to that country; and this, in turn, caused President Roosevelt to increase the price of gold here so as to meet the British figure.

On this point I quote from a statement by the Honorable FRANCIS CASE as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1939:

"It is evident that a great deal of confusion exists in the minds of the Members of this House with respect to the gold situation, for the statement has been repeated frequently that the only reason that we are paying $35 for gold is because of an act passed by Congress and a proclamation made in 1934. Anyone who will take the opportunity and the trouble to review the history of the price of gold during the year preceding the passage of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 will be disabused of that idea.

"The price of foreign gold prior to the Gold Act of 1934 was not $20.67 an ounce. The average price for gold in London for the month of January 1934, immediately prior to the President's proclamation under the Gold Act, was $32.87 an ounce.

"On different days in the preceding months it had been higher. For instance, on November 15, 1933, it was $34.91, and the average for November was $33.10. And after the United States accepted the situation and paid $35, the London price has exceeded that on several occasions. It averaged $35.18 in September 1934, going as high as $35.37 September 4. In more recent years also the price has also bounded above the price offered in the United States.

"Gold was going out of the country in 1932 ($446,219,397) and 1933 ($173,455,507). Our stocks were depleting before the advancing world price of gold. In 1933, an embargo was declared to stop the outward flow; later the RFC went into the foreign market to outbid the buyers. Finally, it became a matter of self-defense that we should act to pay what the world was paying in order to maintain and build up gold stocks here."

During this period, 1932–1934, when the London price was higher on a United States equivalent basis, Great Britain was getting its trade balances paid in gold at $20.67 an ounce and in turn using the gold at a higher measure of value in her economy. And she is doing the same today.

I think it goes without saying that, if the London prices of gold in 1933 and 1934 as given by Senator CASE had verity then, they have equal verity now because in each case the United States equivalent of the London price has been calculated on the basis of legal monetary parity.

I cannot tell you how much I appreciate your cooperation in my efforts to clarify this matter of the disparity between the gold price in the United States and other countries. Frankly, I think the Treasury Department is hiding its head, ostrich-like, in the sands on what is really a very important matter. Certainly the loss of over a billion and a half of our gold within the last 6 months is a serious matter.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely,

FRANK.

Hardships Facing Armed Forces in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, an example of the hardship facing the fighting forces in Korea is exemplified by the letter written to his wife and son by a marine sergeant of Ansonia, Conn.

It is shameful that the men fighting for survival against overwhelming odds should lack adequate facilities and food. The full story is contained in the accompanying clipping from the January 11, 1951, issue of the Ansonia Sentinel.

WHAT CHRISTMAS MEANT TO ANSONIA MARINE SERGEANT IN KOREA AFTER WITHDRAWAL FROM CHOSIN RESERVOIR—EXTREME HARDSHIP MEN OF FIRST MARINE DIVISION UNDERWENT IN WITHDRAWAL FROM CHOSIN RESERVOIR AREA IS VIVIDLY DESCRIBED IN LETTER TO HIS WIFE

The extreme hardship which men of the First Marine Division underwent over narrow, snow, and ice-coated roads in subzero weather in the successful withdrawal of troops and equipment in the Chosin Reservoir area, in Korea, is interestingly told in a letter written by ——— ——— to his wife ——— on December 26, which was received today. The men of the First Marine Division and the Forty-first Royal Marine commandos of the British Army were highly commended in a division memorandum, Operations in the Chosin Reservoir Area, dated December 19, 1950, by Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Smith, commanding general of the First Marine Division.

CHRISTMAS IN KOREA

The letter written by ——— to his wife and son ——— follows:

"Because of the international date line, today is Christmas back in the United States, so let me wish you both a very holy and merry Christmas Day.

"I attended Christmas mass at midnight and also on Christmas Day, when I went to confession and communion. Somehow I'm contented that I was away this Christmas because I now understand the true meaning of the holiday. With all the wickedness in the world, we who believe in Christ still have a precious thing to fall back upon and no matter where I am on Christmas Day, I'll always remember to rejoice because of our Lord. No matter what happens, one always finds peace with God and for that reason I for one am thankful. Be sure to bring our son up in a manner in which he will be able to understand and appreciate the things it took me so long to learn.

"I received your most precious letters and Christmas cards. I only wish you had more time to write more. Those short letters, although appreciated, don't give me a chance to take a second breath. I just want to sit and read and read about you because, my dearest, I miss you terribly. I keep myself

busy so that I don't have time to think, because I doubt if I could stand things."

AN EMPTY FEELING

"Knowing how wonderful you are and how much fun and trouble our son is at this time, leaves me with an empty feeling. I used to think of the days when I could play with our child and he'd appreciate and know who was playing with him. I still do and I picture you sitting on the couch saying and just saying 'tsk-tsk' at our actions.

"Now by the time I get back he'll be grown and I'll never have the chance to live that part of our lives. Being a father is something I'm very proud of (you of course already know that). I only hope that this war will end soon so that maybe I can get home and throw him around a little.

"As it looks now we'll be here for some time. For a while we thought they were going to take us to Japan and eventually the States because as Marines our job was finished a long time ago along with the fact that we are in a pretty darn run-down condition. At night I almost cry when I hear the men cough and know that there isn't much anyone could do about helping them. I never saw so many men that are sick, partially sick or have something wrong. Apparently we can't be spared because we are not leaving.

"After Hagaru-ri we thought we'd really have a good rest, get some good food, etc., before going back, but our conditions for rest are very poor and our food is terrible. I'd rather eat C rations than the stuff they are giving us. For the 4 days before Christmas we had hash and dehydrated potatoes. We had an excellent meal for Christmas, though. I don't mean to be a griper, as they call them, but looking at the matter from a broad viewpoint, we're in a sad shape. The food for one thing in the area we live in should be much better, our living conditions could be better, and the sick, well, they could stand some better conditions, too.

"Now that we have a meal under our belt we must be ready again because we are moving again soon. Just like around Thanksgiving, by the time you get the letter, we'll probably be on the lines and you'll know our whereabouts when you read the paper."

PEOPLE AT HOME KNOW MORE

"It's a funny thing how little we know ourselves about our lives. Today at mail call one of the fellows got a letter from home and his wife said that the news in the paper was that the First Marine Division will not come back to the States and instead are going back up to the lines. Tonight we were officially informed of the fact. It seems that the people at home know more than we do."

TRADITION OF OLD GLORY

"It's a funny thing, ———, we saved everything we could in our withdrawal from Hagaru-ri and came back in a manner that upholds the tradition of Old Glory. We didn't get panicky and run like the others. We did our job and knocked ourselves out doing it. So what? Here we are again.

"All I can say is that even though we are not up to strength physically, tactically or morally we'll perform our task, no matter what. I hate the thought of going back just like everyone else, but if they need us, and there isn't anyone else, I'll go in good faith and spirit just like always.

"We are the only outfit that can be depended on to do their job according to orders."

——— enclosed a commendatory letter from Major General Smith on the successful withdrawal of the First Marine Division.

In closing his letter——— writes "Well, darling, this will be all for tonight. Maybe tomorrow I'll have some more. Depends on how I make out with the day's schedule. Haven't been feeling well and our training starts tomorrow. You see we never stop or forget about our professional duties."

The Marine Corps Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following supplementary statement before the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee on Reserves:

MARINE CORPS RESERVE
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

It seems desirable to place on the record certain background facts regarding the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve in order that Korea and its impact upon Marine Reservists and their families may be understood.

1. It was not the fault of the Marine Corps that its two divisions were badly understrength, or that the great bulk of the Fleet Marine Force was in the United States when the hostilities began in Korea.

2 Nor was it the fault of the Marine Corps that it had to mobilize its entire ground reserve of organized units in order to supply needed combat troops for Korea. The Commander in Chief authorized this extraordinary measure and the Marine Corps carried it out.

3 It was no fault of the Marine Corps that enlisted men in the Reserve went for a time without dependency allowances.

Solutions to these three above matters rested outside the Marine Corps and the Marine Corps Reserve, namely, with the Congress and the Department of Defense. It is essential to mention this for the record, for much of the criticism made of the corps by relatives and loved one of Reserves has been based on the above problems. Had there been a strong enough ready force in being outside the continental limits of our country, Korea may never have happened. It is certain that it never would have gotten far in July of 1950 had we been able to put ashore one or more reinforced divisions of marines.

4. There has been some criticism of the Marine Corps because young reservists were fighting in Korea within a few weeks of mobilization. The criticism has not been general, but usually in scattered localities where casualties have been reported to the next of kin.

After the Joint Chiefs directed the Commandant to get a full strength Marine division to Korea as soon as possible, the Marine Corps organized ground reserve was mobilized and arbitrary training standards set up for overseas use of reservists. Generally if a man had attended 48 drills and 1 summer camp or 24 drills and 2 summer camps or had World War II experience, he was considered properly trained under the emergency conditions. There were some slip-ups and some few reservists were sent to Korea without what might be termed desirable training and experience. However, even after the Inchon landing training of many troops went on in Reserve areas while assault units were fighting out in front.

The state of readiness and training of the Reserve is evidently high when only a few weeks after mobilization orders, the Marine Corps could land more troops in Korea than there had been in the entire Fleet Marine Force in June when hostilities began.

One last comment, the morale of the organized aviation units of the Marine Corps Reserve and the fighting efficiency of the Marine Corps itself has been lowered by refusal of the Joint Chiefs to permit an increase in the number of Marine tactical squadrons at a time when they could be used to great advantage.

Submitted by:

Maj. WILLIAM P. MCCAHILL,
National Executive Director
(For the National Council).

Portraits in Relief in the Redecorated Chamber of the House of Representatives at the Opening of the Eighty-second Congress, January 3, 1951, Described and Explained by Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, that which constitutes the decorations of the Chamber of the United States House of Representatives is naturally of interest to every patriotic American citizen. As I took my seat on January 3, 1951, as a member of the Eighty-second Congress, and observed the redecorations of the Chamber in which I have already worked for 4 years, I realized that some 23 relief portraits, appropriately arranged around and near the ceiling line of the Chamber, were about persons distinguished in history, several of whom I knew relatively little.

Since it will be my privilege to again sit as legislator the next 2 years in this Chamber where these relief portraits of these 23 historic characters are to be daily present, I asked the Library of Congress to give me a brief comment about each of the characters represented by these medallion portraits, or reliefs, so that I might know who is in my presence by "proxy." I am also aware that no doubt all other Members of this great legislative body are likewise interested; as well as all other citizens of our great Nation. Therefore, it is with pleasure that I share the following information from the Library with you:

The redecorated Chamber of the United States House of Representatives features a series of medallions portraying 23 historic characters. These individuals were chosen as representative of the great lawgivers of the world who contributed to the American law system. The one and only inscription that accompanies them, appearing behind the Speaker's desk, reads:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day may not accomplish something worthy to be remembered."

The subjects of these relief portraits were selected by the Architect of the Capitol, after consultation with many authorities and approval by the Special House Roof and Chamber Committee. A biographic sketch of each of these great men is attached hereto.

The statements given above and the list of subjects have been provided by the office of the Architect of the Capitol. The sketches summarize salient—and apropos—material found in the Encyclopedia Britannica (1942 ed.) and the first and second editions of the Columbia Encyclopedia. Articles in these

sources were found to complement one another, and material from both sources was used in every sketch, with the exception of Pothier, who is not listed in the Columbia Encyclopedia. The pronunciation notes are taken from the Merriam-Webster unabridged dictionary, second edition.

The Architect of the Capitol has released a statement that serves to explain why each man was chosen for inclusion in this group. It is attached as an appendix to this report. Some of the material therein does not appear in the following biographical sketches because it does not appear in the sources used in their preparation.

(George L. Kackley, History and General Research Section, January 11, 1951.)

HAMMURABI FLOURISHED CIRCA 2100 B. C.

Hammurabi was a great king of Babylonia. His military and political achievement of establishing a central and efficient government at Babylon is regarded as one of the most far-reaching events in ancient history. Henceforth Babylon was to be the political and intellectual center of west Asiatic history right down to the Christian era.

Hammurabi's name is particularly associated with the great law code which he was declared to have received from the sun god, Shamash. This is one of the greatest of ancient codes. Promulgated for the use of the courts throughout the empire, it is particularly strong in its prohibition of defrauding the helpless. It is genuinely humanitarian, although one savage feature is the retributive nature of punishment, which follows "an eye for an eye" literally.

MOSES FLOURISHED CIRCA 1400 B. C.

The lawgiver of Israel and the founder of her nationality and religion, Moses stands out as one of the greatest figures in history.

From his infancy, according to Exodus, there were constant signs of God's selection of Moses to lead His people. His leadership in the Exodus and his prominence in the great covenant at Sinai are well known and documented. It was he who welded into one people the various kindred tribes under his leadership. But further details must be a matter of conjecture.

Not only the Ten Commandments, but the whole Mosaic law as found in Leviticus, Exodus, and Deuteronomy are ascribed to Moses. However, close study of the Bible makes it difficult, if not impossible, to accept the tradition which accredits to him every detail of Israel's legal and cultural institutions. Even the earliest code of laws in the Bible (Ex. xxi: 23) is simply a local and national form of the civil law common to Babylonia, Assyria, and the Hittites, and was probably adopted by Israel after the settlement in Canaan.

LYCURGUS FLOURISHED SEVENTH?-NINTH? CENTURY B. C.

Lycurgus is the reputed founder of the Spartan constitution. According to a standard hypothesis he lived in the seventh century before Christ. He may be a mythical figure.

Tradition represents Lycurgus as finding Sparta the prey of disunion, weakness, and lawlessness, and leaving her united, strong, and subject to the most stable government which the Greek world had ever seen. To him we may attribute the unification of the several component parts of the state, the strict military organization and training which soon made the Spartan hoplite the best soldier in Greece, and above all the elaborate and rigid system of education.

His subordination of the individual citizen to the all-powerful state has been the model of subsequent police states, but it has yet no parallel in the history of the world.

SOLON, CIRCA 638–559 B. C.

Solon was an Athenian statesman and lawgiver. His amatory poems and patriotic and didactic verse won him inclusion among the Seven Sages. He led the Athenians in a victorious military campaign. But his enduring renown rests on his economic and constitutional reforms.

Solon was elected archon at a time when the nobles held unchecked all the governing power of Athens and the new capitalists virtually owned the entire peasant class. Receiving the unlimited powers of a dictator, he annulled all mortgages and debts, put narrow limits on the amount of land anyone could add to his holdings, outlawed contracts in which a person's liberty was pledged, and put limits on the amount one might spend on various functions, such as funerals. Other state controls included those over exports, education, the use and sinking of wells, bee farming, the planting of olives and figs, and the cutting down of olive trees.

Solon's new constitution laid the foundations of the Athenian democracy and paved the way for its later developments. The assembly was thrown open to all freemen. He erected a whole new law code that tends toward democratization. His reforms were characterized everywhere by a moderation that made him the model of Greek statesmen.

GAIUS, CIRCA, 110–180 A. D.

Gaius was a celebrated Roman jurist of the second century A. D. Of his personal history very little is known. Indeed, it is impossible to discover even his full name, Gaius being merely the given name.

Gaius is remembered for his Institutes, which contributed materially to our knowledge of early Roman law, and on which much of Justinian's work is based. The Emperor Valentinian named him, along with Papinian, Ulpian, Modestinus, and Paulus, as one of the five jurists whose opinions were to be followed by judicial officers in deciding cases.

Besides the Institutes, which are a complete exposition of the elements of Roman law, Gaius was the author of several other works. His interest in the antiquities of Roman law makes his work valuable to the historian of early institutions.

PAPINIAN, DIED 212 A. D.

Papinian (Aemilius Papinianus) is generally considered to be the greatest of Roman jurists. He was magister libellorum and afterward Praetorian prefect under the Emperor Septimius Severus. An intimate friend of the Emperor, Papinian accompanied him to Britain and became the guardian of his two sons. In 212 one of these brothers, after committing fratricide, had Papinian put to death.

Papinian was noted not only as a jurist of wide learning and great comprehension but as a stern moralist. His works are known to us through the numerous quotations of them in the Theodosian Code and in the Digest of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian). The constitution of Theodosius II and Valentinian named him the principal of five jurists set up as authorities to be cited in future decisions of the courts (see Gaius).

JUSTINIAN, 483–565 A. D.

Justinian I (Flavius Anicius Iustinianus), surnamed The Great, is the most famous of all the Emperors of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. He recovered Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the Ostrogoths, but met with less success in fighting Persia. He insisted upon the supremacy of the Emperor over the church, not only in matters of organization but also in matters of dogma. He engaged in various important controversies about dogma but never succeeded in creating unity.

It is as a legislator and organizer of the law that Justinian's name is most familiar to the modern world. His greatest accomplishment was the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, which has influenced all subsequent legal history. Finding the law of the Roman Empire in great confusion, he ordered the preparation of this work—consisting of the Codex Constitutionum (a collection and revision of the imperial constitutions from the time of Hadrian), the Digesta or Pandectae (a revision, abridgment, and rearrangement of the classical jurists), the Institutiones (a handbook for students), and the Novellae (the new laws instituted by Justinian). The Corpus was not a codification but a consolidation. Thus regarded, Justinian's work may appear to entitle him and Tribonian to much less credit than they have received.

TRIBONIAN, DIED 545 A. D.

Tribonian (Tribonianus) was a famous jurist and chief legal minister to the Emperor Justinian. Under the command of Justinian, he directed the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, the most important collection of Roman law and the basic document of modern civil law.

It is not possible to determine exactly what Tribonian himself contributed to the Corpus Juris Civilis. In all likelihood he wrote a large part out of his encyclopedic knowledge of Roman law. Of the four parts of the Corpus he was the most important editor of the Digest, Institutes, and Codex. Of the Novels (the new laws) he must have been a principal author, as chief legal minister. Tribonian was probably not a juridical thinker, like the great five jurists (see Gaius), but his knowledge of Roman law and his somewhat pedantic erudition was absolutely essential to the great project that he directed.

MAIMONIDES, 1135–1204 A. D.

Maimonides (Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon, or Rambam) was born in Spain and migrated to Cairo, Egypt, where he became the greatest of all medieval Jewish scholars. He produced a great commentary on the six orders of the Mishna (where he was the first to enumerate the fundamental dogmas of Judaism), a collection of discourses, a work on logic, a treatise on the calendar, several medical books—including an important work on hygiene—and the great philosophical work, Moreh Nebukim (Guide for the Perplexed). (The Mishna is the text of the oral law, in contradistinction to the Scriptural, or written, law of the Jews.) In the latter work he explains the esoteric ideas in the Bible, formulates a proof of the existence of God, expounds the principle of creation, and elucidates baffling metaphysical and religious problems. The work has dominated Jewish thought and exerted a profound influence upon Christian and Arabian thinkers.

The greatest scholastic work of this savant-physician-philosopher was the Mishna Torah, a classified compendium of the Jewish law. This attempt to organize and systematize the vast mass of Jewish oral law became a reference book for laymen as well as rabbis and judges.

GREGORY IX, 1145–1241 A. D.

The papacy of Gregory IX (Ugolino Conti de Segni) was largely devoted to hostilities against Frederick II, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Gregory systematized the medieval inquisition. His zeal for the extirpation of heresy made him generally disliked. The people of Rome, disapproving his temporal power, exiled him for a part of his reign. He died as Frederick was invading the papal states.

Gregory ordered the condensing of five compilations of decretals into a single collection. (The decretals are papal decisions and decrees to be considered authoritative and binding in future decisions.) The editor, Raymond of Pennaforte, did not attempt any original work, and the Pope had no idea of codifying the whole of canon law. However, the collection was an important step toward codifying canon law.

INNOCENT III, CIRCA, 1161–1216 A. D.

Innocent III (Lotario de' Conti de Signi) was elected Pope at the age of 37. The effective assertion of world power is the characteristic feature of his pontificate. Working from a theory that since things of the spirit take preeminence over things of the body, and since the church rules the spirit and earthly monarchs rule the body, earthly monarchs must be in all things in subjection to the church, Innocent effectively exercised his ideal that the Pope is the political ruler of the world.

Innocent's exalted ambitions were eventually their own undoing, and had the effect of setting almost every resolute Christian prince automatically against the church. The triumph of his pontificate was the fourth Lateran Council (1215), a great assembly of States that did little more than listen to and endorse the decretals read by the Pope.

The Pope's interest in law was active: he constantly held court, with a good name for impartiality. He instituted ecclesiastical reforms, centralizing the administration at Rome and his authority within the church exceeded that of his predecessors. Innocent is remembered for his abrogation of the Magna Carta. Supporting King John, against the barons who demanded the great document, Innocent declared it null as a forcibly exacted promise.

SIMON DE MONTFORT, CIRCA, 1200-1265 A. D.

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, spent the most active part of his life giving skillful and ruthless support to, then leading revolts against, Henry III of England. At the "Mad Parliament" of Oxford he headed the opposition. In civil war he became master of England, which was placed under a constitutional government. De Montfort was practically dictator after his victory on the battlefield at Lewes, in May 1264. However, he promulgated a scheme for establishing a thorough parliamentary control over the executive. He was killed in a resurgence of civil war.

Simon is an important figure in the history of legislative bodies because the great parliament which he summoned in 1265 was a revolutionary assembly that established an important precedent: it contained not only knights from each shire to represent the rural nobility, but also representatives from the towns and boroughs. He left a heritage in the precedent he had established in championing the cause of the nobles and the people against the King and in calling the parliament of 1265. For years after his death he was revered by the commons as a martyr.

LOUIS IX, 1214–1270 A. D.

Saint Louis, or Louis IX, King of France, was an accomplished knight, physically strong, fearless in battle, heroic in adversity, of imperious temperament, unyielding when convinced of the justness of his cause, energetic and firm. He stands in history as the ideal king of the Middle Ages. Here was an ascetic who gave charity to over a hundred beggars daily, yet safeguarded the royal dignity by bringing them in at the back door—and by a courtly display greater than ever before in France. He made presents of haircloth shirts to his friends and went on two crusades. He was canonized in 1297. His reign was comparatively uneventful.

Louis was active in arbitration, adjusting territorial claims, imposing peace upon warring factions of his nobility, and settling succession disputes in neighboring countries. He simplified administration, improved the distribution of taxes, abolished the judicial duel, and sought to introduce uniform Roman law. The English barons (see Simon de Montfort) submitted their quarrels with Henry III to him, but his judgment in favor of the king led to civil war and the victory of Simon at Lewes. This judgment, known as the Mise of Amiens, was a flat denial of the parliamentary reforms known as the Provisions of Oxford. However, it expressly declared that the decision was not to invalidate the privileges and liberties of the realm of England, which had existed before the time of these provisions.

ALPHONSO X, 1221–1284 A. D.

Aphonso the Wise, or Alfonso X, King of Castile and Leon, ruled from 1252 until he was deposed by the Cortes in 1282. He is perhaps the most interesting—though he was far from being the most capable—of the Spanish kings of the Middle Ages. As a ruler he was weak, unstable and obstinate and he ruined the economy of his lands while endeavoring to secure his election as emperor of the Holy Roman empire.

El Sabio (the Sage) is called the father of Castilian prose. Under his patronage and editorship a number of vast works were undertaken, including Las Siete partidas, the earliest known Spanish-vernacular chronicle, valuable compilations from Arabic sources such as the Alfonsine Tables in astronomy, an illustrated book of games, and one of the greatest collections of medieval poetry and music. Under his patronage the flow of oriental culture into Western Europe was greatly accelerated.

Alphonso showed legislative capacity and a very commendable wish to provide his kingdoms with a code of laws and a consistent judicial system. He was largely responsible for the Siete partidas, a compilation of Roman and canon law which was promulgated by his grandson, and other codes: the Fuero de las leyes or Fuero Real and an Espejo de Fueros.

EDWARD I, A. D. 1239–1307

Edward I, King of England, failed in the chief ambition of his life, the conquest of Scotland. (He did humiliate Scotland by removing the coronation stone of Scone to Westminster.) Yet, his conquest of Wales, his legislation, and his triumph over his barons, his ecclesiastics and the greatest of French medieval kings indicate the strength and permanence of his work.

Edward is remembered for the developments in law and constitution that have caused him to be called the English Justinian. Before he became king he appropriated some of Simon de Montfort's ideals. The general effect of his work was to eliminate feudalism from public life. The Statutes of Westminster I and II formulated much unwritten law. The Statute of Mortmain was a landmark in his struggle with the church, resulting from his dislike of authority not emanating from himself. The Statute of Winchester established police and militia regulations. Westminster III, also called Quia emptores prohibited subinfeudation.

Thus Edward brought within the formulated law the gains of a century of common law, supplementing them. He gave a tremendous impetus to the development of law and courts, and built up the central administration.

Some important developments were wrung from Edward against his will. The parliamentary constitution of England was established as the result of his convocation of the model Parliament of 1295. "What touches all," ran Edward's writ of summons, "should be approved by all, and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common." This action marks a tremendous forward step in the development of a powerful representative body. Two years later, the rising hostility of his subjects, barons, merchants, and clergy forced Edward to issue the confirmation of charters granted by John and Henry III, including the Magna Carta.

SULEIMAN, 1494–1566 A. D.

Suleiman the Magnificent was the most fortunate of Ottoman sultans. He lived during the most glorious period in the history of Islam and ruled without a worthy rival. He inherited a well-organized country, a disciplined army and a full treasury. Although his campaigns were not always wisely and prudently planned, they added great territories to his realm. In his days Turkey became a first-rate sea power and attained the culminating point of her glory. Suleiman is remembered for his encouragement of learning and the arts. He wrote verses and it is from his time that historians date the rise of the occult influence of the harem on Turkish political development.

In Turkey, Suleiman is known as the lawgiver. His claims to renown as a legislator rest mainly on his organization of the Ulema, or clerical (religious) class, in its hierarchial order. The judges belonged to this class, but all executive and administrative power remained outside it, in the hands of the military. Suleiman's administration was, relatively, one of the best of his time. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame. However, his record of magnanimity was marred by the murder of his two sons, at the insistence of his favorite wife.

GROTIUS, 1583–1645

Hugo Grotius, or Huig van Groot, was a Dutch jurist and humanist. He strove vainly to reunite the Christian sects and the European countries. He wrote valuable works in theology, history, and classical study, but his fame rests chiefly on the De Jure Belli et Pacis, which he prepared in Paris after fleeing life imprisonment in his native country.

Concerning the Law of War and Peace, the De Jure Belli et Pacis, is a systematic study of the bases and principles of positive natural law. Though not the first attempt in modern times to ascertain the principles of jurisprudence, it went far more fundamentally into the discussion than any one had done before. The work is startling in its originality and in the scope of its consideration of international law and international ethics. One of the great masterpieces of legal literature, it is usually considered to be the first definitive text on international law.

COLBERT, 1619–83 A. D.

Jean Baptiste Colbert was a statesman who did much for France. Nevertheless, his rule was a very bad example of overgovernment. He did not believe in popular liberty. The parliaments and states-general received no support from him. The technicalities of justice he never allowed to interfere with his plans. He trafficked in public offices for profit.

Colbert became the chief power in the administration of Louis XIV, where he cleansed the financial administration ruthlessly. His ambitious scheme of encouragement of industry and trade involved subsidies, state planning, and rigid control of every detail of production, including quality and price. Similar policies were applied to agriculture. His greatest and most lasting achievement was the establishment of the French marine. (To supply oarsmen for his galleys, he required judges to sentence as many persons as possible; the convict, once chained to the bench, was seldom released at the expiration of his sentence. Colbert never thought of the long agony of those who filled his needs.) Colbert extended his scheme of paternalism to the arts and literature. His industry was colossal; he even found time for the improvement of the breed of horses.

Colbert reformed certain aspects of the legal administration and codified ordinances.

POTHIER, 1699–1772 A. D.

Robert Joseph Pothier was a French judge and professor of law. He paid particular attention to the text of the Pandects, or Digests, of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian, Tribonium, etc.). His Pandectae Justinianae in novum ordinem digestae is a

classic in the study of Roman law. He wrote many learned monographs on French law and much of his work was incorporated almost verbatim in the French Code Civil.

BLACKSTONE, 1723–80 A. D.

The fame of Sir William Blackstone rests on his Commentaries on the Law of England. His career in Parliament, to which he was elected first in 1761, was somewhat inglorious, as he disliked attendance there. In the 10 years of his judgeship he administered the law satisfactorily but attained no special distinction. He inaugurated courses in English law at the British universities, which had previously confined themselves to Roman law.

The Commentaries of Blackstone have been regarded as the most thorough treatment of the whole of English law ever produced by one man. Whether it is owing to its literary graces, or to its success in flattering the prejudices of the public to which it was addressed, the influence of the work has been extraordinary. It may be more correct to regard it as a handbook for laymen than as a legal treatise. Yet, it has been used as the standard textbook in English law for generations.

The fame of Blackstone is greatest in the United States, where the Commentaries was, for many years, almost the only source of knowledge of the English law.

MASON, A. D. 1725–92

George Mason exercised great influence in local and Virginia legislative bodies. As a member of the Virginia convention, he drafted the Virginia Constitution and the famous Bill of Rights, a radically democratic document which had great influence on American political institutions. This great work was extensively copied by other American States and had some influence on the French declaration of the rights of man.

Mason was a member of the Federal Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 and took an active part in drafting the Constitution. However, he objected to the large and indefinite powers given to Congress, the compromises on the tariff and slave-trade issues, and failure to include a bill of rights. He refused to sign the Constitution, and, with Patrick Henry, he led the fight in Virginia against its ratification. Failing in this, he suggested amendments, the substance of several of which was afterward embodied in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the American Constitution.

Mason believed that local government should be kept strong and central government weak; his democratic theories have had much influence in Southern and Western States.

NAPOLEON, A. D. 1769–1821

Napoleon I, Emperor of the French, was a spectacular military genius of unlimited ambition. One of the greatest conquerors history has ever known, he made France paramount in Europe, rearranged its map, and set his relatives upon its thrones.

In France, Napoleon consolidated the results of the Revolution and sought a new conservative balance by his reforms. He centralized the administration, established the Bank of France, inaugurated financial reforms, made peace with the church, and instituted legal reforms to pave the way for the Code Napoleon. His excessive centralization made the state supreme over the entire people—a system singularly favorable to statism.

The Code Napoleon, sometimes called the Code Civil, was the first code of French civil law. It embodies the private substantive law of France, fusing the preexisting Germanic and Roman civil law applied in France with additions resulting from the French Revolution. The code has been in force, as changed by legislative amendment, since it was first promulgated. Still in force in Belgium and Holland, it has served as a model for—and has exercised the greatest influence in—many other countries. The Spanish civil code was largely based on the Code Civil, as were the civil codes of most of the South American states, Quebec and Louisiana.

JEFFERSON, 1743–1826 A. D.

Thomas Jefferson is the outstanding apostle of American democracy and one of the greatest liberals of all time. He held a great range of public offices; he was prominent in many, and foremost member of several, of the most important deliberative and legislative bodies in American history. He is famous for many contributions to the American democratic system, as Governor of Virginia, member of the Continental Congress, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President.

Jefferson was the chief inspirer and most ardent worker for reforms embodied in a revision of the laws of Virginia. These included the statute for religious freedom—the first law of its kind in Christendom, abolition of primogeniture and the repeal of the laws of entail. Here, he was the first American statesman to make education by the state a fundamental article of democratic faith. He gained his greatest fame as author of the Declaration of Independence. As Vice President and Presiding Officer of the Senate, he wrote the influential Manual of Parliamentary Practice, which is still used in both Houses of Congress.

In Jefferson the Nation had a great scholar and philosopher, who was at the same time one of her most competent political managers—a leader with unlimited faith in the people. The ideas he advocated have become the very foundations of our Government. His importance as a maker of modern America is unequaled; it can hardly be overstated.

APPENDIX

RELIEF PORTRAITS IN MARBLE OVER HOUSE GALLERY DOORS

The relief portraits on the upper walls of the House Chamber are of men noted in history for the part they have played in the evolution of what has become American law. There has grown a great body of judicial tradition and a mass of legislation embodying the rules and standards by which the American people, regardless of State lines, are content to guide their lives.

The colonists brought to this country the common law of England, its concepts of property, liberty, and justice, but they took pains to make themselves free of governmental tyranny. But though our law is mainly derived from the British system, it also owes something to French law, and both of these great systems derive from Roman law, and the laws of earlier peoples.

These great lawgivers, in chronological order, are:

Hammurabi, the first King of Babylonia, reigned about 2067–2025 B. C.: The great law code bearing his name is recognized in legal literature as, perhaps, the earliest surviving, naturally characterized by its primitiveness.

Moses, circa 1571–1451 B. C.: Hebrew prophet and lawgiver. Amongst all lawgivers, founders of states and teachers of mankind, none has excelled Moses, who transformed a horde of slaves and wanderers into a nation, disciplined a race, and breathed into it its character. To him is attributed the delivery of the Ten Commandments.

Lycurgus, circa 900 B. C.: Legislator, traditional author of laws and institutions of Sparta (by present standards a harsh code).

Solon, circa 594 B. C.: The great Athenian lawgiver, author of constitutional and legal reforms.

Gaius, circa, A. D. 110–180: A celebrated Roman jurist, probably a native of the eastern empire. He was the author of numerous works on the civil law, the most noted being the Institutes.

Papinian, circa, A. D. 200: A Roman, remarkable not only for his juridical genius, for his independence of judgment, lucidity, and firmness, but for his sense of right and morality by which he frequently rose above the barriers of national prejudices, and merited the highest veneration of succeeding centuries.

Justinian, 483–565 A. D.: One of the most important events of the reign of this Byzantine emperor was the publication of the Justinian Code, the body of the Roman law compiled and annotated, the most important of all monuments of jurisprudence.

Tribonian, circa 500–547 A. D.: A Byzantine jurist, he was head of the commission which codified the laws under Justinian.

Maimonides, 1135–1204 A. D.: Jewish philosopher of Cordova, he compiled a systematic exposition of the whole of Jewish law as contained in the Pentateuch and in Talmudic literature.

Gregory IX, circa 1147–1241 A. D.: Author of a compilation of decretals on canon law; during a critical period he accomplished much in maintaining the remnants of Roman law.

Innocent III, 1161–1216 A. D.: A profound student of canon and civil law, his accomplishments during a dark and critical period of human history were much the same as those of Gregory IX—preservation of the remnants of Roman law.

Simon de Montfort, 1200–1265 A. D.: Celebrated English statesman, he originated the first appearance of the House of Commons of England.

St. Louis, 1214–1270 A. D.: King of France, author and mise of Amiens.

Alphonso X, the "Wise," 1221–1284 A. D.: King of Leon and Castile, he was the author of the code "Las Siete Partidas," the basis of Spanish jurisprudence.

Edward I, 1239–1307 A. D.: King of England, founder of the parliamentary constitution of England and eliminator of feudalism from political life. "What touches all should be approved by all, and common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common."

Suleiman, 1494–1566 A. D.: "The lawgiver," Sultan of Turkey, reformer and improver of civil and military codes. "His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame."

Grotius, 1583–1645 A. D.: Dutch statesman, Advocate General of Holland and Zealand. Author of "De Jure Belli et Pacis," first treatise on international law.

Colbert, 1619–1683 A. D.: French statesman, codifier of the ordinances, reformer of the French legal system.

Pothier, 1699–1772 A. D.: French jurist, author of "Digest of the Pandects." He assembled and codified the remnants of Roman law, and the prevalent French law.

Blackstone, 1723–1780 A. D.: A celebrated English jurist, professor of common law at Oxford; his Commentaries on the Laws of England, had considerable influence on the importation and adaptation of English common law in this country.

George Mason, 1726–1792 A. D.: He drafted the Virginia Declaration of Rights, 1776, was a member of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, but led opposition to the ratification of the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was inserted in it.

Napoleon, 1769–1821 A. D.: He appointed a commission which produced the Code Napoleon, and saw that it was enforced. It is prevailing law, even now, in Louisiana, quite influential in Florida, New Mexico, and California.

Thomas Jefferson, 1743–1826 A. D.: Third President of the United States, he was author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Statute of Virginia for religious freedom.

Index

	Page	Appendix page
Alphonso X	14	27
Blackstone	19	28
Colbert	18	27
Edward I	15	27
Gaius	6	25
Gregory IX	10	26
Grotius	17	27
Hammurabi	3	24
Innocent III	11	26
Jefferson	22	28
Justinian	7	25
Louis IX	13	26
Lycurgus	4	25
Maimonides	9	26
Mason	20	28
Montfort	12	26
Moses	3	24
Napoleon	21	28
Papinian	7	25
Pothier	19	27
Solon	5	25
Suleiman	16	27
Tribonian	8	26

(George Knckley, History and General Research Section, January 11, 1951.)

Connally Rebukes State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. James Reston that appeared in the New York Times today:

CONNALLY REBUKES STATE DEPARTMENT—SENATOR PROTESTS—CONNALLY COMPLAINS HE WAS NOT CONSULTED ON CEASE-FIRE VOTE, QUESTIONS ACHESON AIDES—TWO DENY UNITED STATES APPROVAL OF UN RESOLUTION WAS SURRENDER TO COMMUNIST CHINA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told the State Department today that he wished it would stop making major foreign-policy decisions without consulting his committee.

In a meeting with Assistant Secretaries of State Dean Rusk and John D. Hickerson this morning, the administration's principal foreign-policy spokesman in the Senate complained that he had not been consulted before the United States voted in favor of the latest United Nations cease-fire appeal to Communist China.

To read about this decision for the first time in the newspapers, and then be confronted with a horde of angry associates in the Senate, said Mr. CONNALLY, was a peculiar method of trying to keep the State Department and the Congress in step.

QUESTIONS JUSTICE OF APPEAL

Moreover, Mr. CONNALLY indicated, he had reservations himself about the justice of the United Nations appeal, which proposed that a Korean cease-fire should be followed by negotiations with Communist China on the future of Formosa and the question of who should represent China in the United Nations.

It was said in the Senate that the United States approval of the United Nations resolution was a surrender to Red China and the start of a maneuver to give Formosa to Peiping and to seat Peiping in the United Nations. Messrs. Rusk and Hickerson denied it was anything of the sort.

The United States, they said, was trying to maintain unity in the United Nations on the problem of Communist China. It was the overwhelming sense of the United Nations that another effort should be made to bring a halt to the fighting in Korea. The United States also was urged to agree to discuss the Formosan and United Nations representation questions, if the cease fire were carried out.

It was entirely wrong to assume from this, however, Messrs. Rusk and Hickerson added, that the start of discussions meant a "sell-out." We had been discussing many things with the Communists for years without surrendering to them.

PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT STRESSED

The United States was obligated under the United Nations Charter, they pointed out, to try to settle all disputes by peaceful means. We had been "discussing" the question of who should represent China in the United Nations—the Nationalists or the Communists—for months. We had also agreed some weeks ago to discuss the future of Formosa with the Chinese Communists at the United Nations, they declared.

Secretaries Rusk and Hickerson added that if the United States had failed to go along with the United Nations cease-fire appeal, some United Nations members would have feared that Red China would have had one more excuse for rejecting the resolution—namely that the proposals put forward by the United Nations were not accepted by the United States.

By accepting the resolution, however, the State Department aides said, one last clear and fair attempt to end the war had been made, and if it were rejected by Peiping, then the other members of the United Nations could scarcely have any excuse for not going forward with a clear condemnation of Red China's aggression.

The representatives of the State Department and several members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee differed on the obligation of the State Department to consult before last week's vote. Mr. Rusk said it was the policy of the State Department to consult with the Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee whenever there was any change in the basic policies of the United States Government.

NO POLICY CHANGE ADMITTED

The vote for the cease-fire resolution, however, did not signify or imply any change in our basic policy toward Communist China, Formosa, or the questions of representation in the United Nations. These policies remained the same. If Red China accepted a cease-fire in accordance with our terms, we would discuss the other questions, but that did not mean that we were prepared to turn Formosa over to Peiping or bring the Communist regime into the United Nations.

The United States voted for the cease-fire resolution in good faith, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Hickerson observed. It would, of course, enter into any negotiations in good faith. It was not simply maneuvering on the cease-fire resolution in order to get the other members of the United Nations to go along with our condemnation of Red China as an aggressor, but if Peiping did not accept the cease-fire—both thought it would not—the path for all members of the United Nations, under the Charter, would then be fairly clear.

Mr. Rusk said he would try to keep in closer touch with the committee in the future. He pointed out, however, that while it was easy to explain any basic policy change on such questions as our policy toward Formosa, it was difficult, if not impossible, to keep Senators informed of all the rapid acts of negotiation with other nations at the United Nations.

He told the committee members that the United States would press for action as soon as possible if Peiping did not reply favorably to the cease-fire appeal. Our idea was that maybe by Thursday a reply should be received, but if it was not, he felt confident that the United Nations would be ready to take up the question of condemning the Peiping regime and studying the question of what to do about the aggression.

The meeting was not stormy, as has been reported. However, Mr. CONNALLY, an artist at Texas diplomacy, conveyed to the visitors in his own way that a little less "sudden diplomacy" sure would ease his pain.

A Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and at the suggestion of a mutual friend, I include at this point in the RECORD a striking prophecy made almost 8 years ago on May 24, 1943, by Hon. George Holden Tinkham, who served with great distinction in the House of Representatives for 28 years from the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Tinkham, a Republican from a Democratic district was never defeated.

Over the years he has traveled in almost every country in the world. He has always been a student of foreign affairs and of economics. He is held in high regard and affection by those who served with him in the Congress.

CRAMERTON, N. C., *May 24, 1943.*

You say that you would like me to give you my view on the present and of the "shape of things to come" as I should if I were talking to you personally. Here they are for what they are worth:

As early as 1933 I saw coming another great war in Europe, and so stated in a speech I made in Congress at that time. By 1936, I had decided that war was inevitable, would come soon, and would last at least 5 years, perhaps longer.

Looking ahead at that time, as serious as the war seemed to me, what would inexorably follow in the political and economic spheres, both nationally and internationally, seemed very much worse. In the long view I saw, after a postwar boom, universal poverty, undiluted bolshevism, and Red revolutions and more bloody wars rampant, we not to be excluded.

At present I see a Bolshevik Russia, with the largest victorious army in Europe, dictating the peace, a partially bankrupt and semi-Bolshevized England cooperating in an alliance, the United States being allowed to finance that alliance. I see the Western Hemisphere and the Pacific being left to the United States, with England cooperating when and where she wishes. All this will be nothing but cynical, brutal power politics—and of course all dressed up in saintly clothes and made to bear the hypocritical mien of alleged democracy.

If out of this there eventuate leagues or federations, they will be mere puppets of a naked power alliance.

In relation to the revolutions and wars which I saw and still see in the long view, let me remind you that it was out of poverty that followed the last war that Lenin, Mussolini, and Hitler came to power. The end of this war will see the whole world, including ourselves, very much more impoverished than after the last war.

I recommend that you read the second part of Oswald Spengler's The Decline of the West, in my opinion the ablest book written since 1900. In 1919, before the rise of Mussolini and Hitler, in a penetrating historical analysis, he predicted many things which have come to pass; for example, that democracy and money were having their unbelievable final triumphs and would shortly collapse with the coming of the Caesars. Certainly, that is exactly what we have witnessed and are witnessing here and throughout the world.

It might be well for you to also read the Outline of History by Wells. He has another interesting point of view, although it is not so different as far as money is concerned.

Let us look at our own economies for a moment. The financing of ourselves and the world during and after the war means an eventual Federal debt of between two and three hundreds of billions of dollars, and perhaps much more, dependent somewhat upon the length of the war, sums equal to if not more than our accumulated wealth.

I see much greater taxation from old and new sources. I see nearly everything subsidized, nearly everyone pensioned or "bonused"—the cost of all of which to come from accumulated wealth and business being put on a socialized collectivist basis so as to meet the cost. That would mean the end of the American system of economics.

I see ahead the progressive fall of the purchasing power of the dollar, probably a radical fall, conditioned somewhat by the length of the war. I think I see in time the value of gold much enhanced. Paradoxically as it may seem, I see perhaps the Canadian dollar and the Argentine currency, as well as some other South American currencies, better refuge for money than dollars, since they have better control of their economics, including their currencies, than we have.

A grim picture, I have painted, I know, but you asked for it.

Believe me, with every good wish,
Sincerely yours,
GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM.

The Medway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, the text of a Christmas message from William Montgomery Bennett, national director of the Medway plan. Included also is an explanation of the objectives of this organization.

Mr. Bennett is a sincere worker for international cooperation, and is to be commended for his untiring efforts to secure friendship among the peoples of the world. The above-mentioned follows:

THE MEDWAY PLAN FOR HUMAN REHABILITATION AND WORLD PEACE,
Woodbury, Conn., Christmas, 1950.

Mayor Pierre LaPortier, Comte de Bagneux, Abbe Amiard, and to All Plan-Medway Comité Associates in France.

GENTLEMEN: The great day of the Medway plan is still before us. Its work is not done. It has hardly begun as yet. It must not be diverted by war or transient events however important. Its eternal work is peace and the preparation for peace.

These are critical, formative days for us all. At last a clear demarcation between free democracies and Russian slavery stands defined. All hope for understanding and toleration between the two ideologies has been swept away by the ruthless men of the Kremlin. It is now a fight for survival.

The governments of the Western European and the American nations are belatedly seeking to meet the threat of war. The peoples of those lands have at last awakened to danger. They are on the march. In very truth World War II has never ceased. The defeats of Germany and Japan were but way-stops on Russia's schedule for world domination. Just as Hitler openly told his aims in Mein Kampf, Stalin from the first has given a clear statement of his over-all objectives. In neither case has the world credited those blackhearted dictators with meaning what they said. The plain fact is that France, England, the United States, and the peace-loving countries of the United Nations are in an undeclared war with Russia. This we must face. The forces of hatred still challenge the forces of human brotherhood; the minions of darkness still wrestle with the children of light.

A deeper degree of understanding and friendship is needed between the men, women, and children of France, Britain, and America, so that a fuller confidence in their unselfish devotion to truth and spiritual values will exist as a bulwark for mutual defense. The united west will trumph over their foes not alone through armed might but through a common faith in freedom, human rights, the rule of law, and the blessing of world peace under the one God.

And now I give you the message that the Medway Plan Associates in America wish to give to the people of France. It is a very important message. I ask that you take steps to make it widely known. This is the message:

"There sings in the hearts of all true Americans a song of deep appreciation, of affection, and of sympathy for all the people of France. We Americans hark back to Lafayette and de Grasse and their great love for the little America of the early days. When we recall our first steps toward freedom we remember how liberty was born in France. Deep in our inner selves we feel that your people and ours have raised their eyes to the same horizon of freemen to claim those rights which the Creator fashioned for all human beings. Americans and Frenchmen will never give up those God-given rights.

"There is no shadow of doubt but that all Americans will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with France to guard and guarantee her life and freedom. There may be dark days when politicians differ in policies. Those will pass. But in the hearts of our people there will be no deviation and the best that we in America possess will be joyfully placed on the altar of liberty that France shall live.

"We, here, pray that all Frenchmen will stand steadfast as our friends and brothers. Friendship is never bought; it is earned. Friends are won by love. France earned America's friendship for all time in the American Revolution and America will never fail France.

"Our peerless Eisenhower, backed by our mighty resources and our unswerving determination, goes to France to fight with all the freedom-loving nations to save our ways of life; to establish truth, honor, human rights, and liberty for all men. Let France be assured there will be no let down in that fight until the eagles of victory perch upon our united banners."

That is Medway plan's message to the people of France. The basic principles of the Medway plan cannot be assailed or denied by any man. They are spreading around the earth. Men grasp them as they would a chalice filled with the holy wine of love. Men realize that only when those principles prevail will there be amity throughout the world.

Accordingly, on behalf of our great host of Medway Plan Associates, I confidently call upon you to press forward with unflagging zeal and unflinching courage. Victor Hugo wrote that no earthly force is so great as an idea whose time has come. The time of Medway plan has come.

With warm Christmas greetings, I have the honor to be,

Faithfully,
WILLIAM MONTGOMERY BENNETT,
President, the Medway Plan.

THE MEDWAY PLAN FOR HUMAN REHABILITATION AND WORLD PEACE

(By Dr. Charles R. Joy)

A RAINBOW OF HOPE

A huge, rusty gun rises above the battered ruins of the old Atlantic wall, the great bastion built by Hitler along the Channel Coast of France to prevent an Allied invasion. Storm clouds mass behind it, black and threatening. A gust of wind, a rush of rain, and then—the rainbow.

Back again in Strasbourg, this is a vivid memory of a recent visit to a little fishing town in northern France. But it is more than a memory. It is a symbol of our hope. The shattered remnants of the old war remain; guns and walls and mines, widows and orphans and mutilated children. Now a new conflict in eastern Asia threatens many parts of the world, the dark clouds lowering in the heavens, driving winds and rains beating down upon us in scattered showers, but there, vibrant in glowing colors overreaching all earth's sorrows and its pains, is the rainbow of man's eternal hope. To this rainbow the unique Medway plan adds its bit of light and color. It stretches in beauty from land to land and binds the people together in love and hope.

THE BASIS OF PEACE

Councils and parliaments, charters and treaties, codes of international law and leagues of united nations will never of themselves create a world of peace. These are but the channels through which a river of life must flow; the empty chalice into which the wine of love must be poured. There are many who cry peace today when there is no peace; many who, behind the form of law, conspire to break the law; many who would organize an idea in order to destroy it. Men put their confidence in external things and artificial forms because faith and love are absent from their hearts. But peace is an inward quality. It is born in the mind and in the soul. It is profoundly spiritual and religious.

The world has never sought peace early enough. Peace is usually a frantic, postwar dream. Former enemies meet with all the old hostility in their hearts to sign it. Wartime allies, sometimes with little in common except their hatred of a former foe, meet to organize it. It is obvious that upon such a basis a lasting peace cannot be found or made.

THE LONG VIEW

Jesus looked beyond the present moment. He cherished a dream of a richer world, He preached a future messianic kingdom. He was not deeply concerned with immediate problems. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." There in brief compass was his attitude toward present and future. There are temporal things, things of today to which we must make our adjustment. But there are things that are of God, eternal in the heavens, and these are the important things. To the divine law, to the future heavenly kingdom our loyalty is due. In the end the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our God.

THE MEDWAY PLAN

The Medway plan believes that the essential thing is a will to peace which is based on friendship and understanding. It pins its faith upon the spiritual forces that move in the hearts of men—forces which, eventually, will produce a world conscience wherein the cornerstones are honor, human rights, the moral law, and rule by law. The Medway plan is not an organization, in the ordinary sense. It asks for no contribution and carries on no financial campaigns. It is what its name suggests—a simple plan for individual action freely offered to all those who would help to build a world at peace, either through their individual efforts or through voluntary cooperation with others. To such as these the Medway plan makes its suggestions and offers its assistance through its voluntary workers, who are known as Medway Plan Associates.

THE CHILDREN FIRST

The Medway plan begins with the children. They are the leaders, the educators, and the voters of tomorrow. If the children of one land come to understand the children of other lands they will grow into adult citizens of a world community where war is unthinkable. The Medway plan therefore attempts to bring the children of America into helpful contact with the children of other lands through correspondence and through the gifts of simple essentials of life. It is an exciting thing for a child in a war-torn country to find a new friend in that America which he has always thought of as the wonderland beyond the seas. And little hearts reach out to little hearts, binding friendships are formed, and the future of the world made more secure. It is the business of the Medway plan to facilitate these friendships. It has long lists of names and addresses available. Perhaps the children will lead us into the promised land.

THE ADULTS NEXT

It is the deep conviction of the Medway plan that every individual should make his contribution to the peace of the world. Those who make no such contribution strengthen by act of omission the evil forces that at present dominate the world. The Medway plan has suggestions for those who would like to help but do not know where to begin. It is ready to put Americans in touch with individuals and families abroad who need encouragement and a little help. During the past 3 years many thousands of Americans have found a way into the hearts of stricken families in the war-torn countries by this method of free adoption. This is the final, convincing argument for democracy.

TOWN SPONSORSHIPS

The Medway plan facilitates, also, the adoption of community by community, and many American towns and cities from Maine to California have sponsored sister communities in France, Austria, Italy, England, and Germany. This has resulted in bulk shipments of supplies—food, clothing, medicines—to provide immediate relief, and, more important still, the establishment of personal friendships. The many letters of gratitude attest to the enduring consequences of this plan. But there are many more such communities that await the evidence of loving concern. The work of building a world of peace has only just begun.

THE RESULTS

More than 200,000 American children and adults are now in regular touch with a corresponding number of persons in Europe. Over 150 American communities have adopted European towns under the Medway plan program. About $2,000,000 worth of relief supplies have been sent abroad to date. Eighty information centers are being established overseas, stocked with material telling the story of a friendly, democratic America. This is a remarkable record of short-time accomplishment by a group of devoted persons working without compensation because of their loyalty to the future peace of the world.

INCEPTION OF MEDWAY PLAN

The Medway plan was founded and developed by Mr. William Montgomery Bennett, of Woodbury, Conn., and Charleston, S. C., a retired industrialist and economist, who is now giving all of his time and work to the promotion of true freedom and world peace. In this he is ably assisted by chapters of Medway Plan Associates of which Mrs. Gertrude Sanford Legendre is chairman. Mr. Bennett was formerly director of church services for the British War Relief Society and for Bundles for Britain. He founded and directed the Interfaith Group for World Peace Under God, the purpose of which was to secure spiritual representatives as advisers in the organization and development of the United Nations. He also founded and is chairman of the National Religious Council composed of a hundred leaders of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths. But Mr. Bennett's heart is in the Medway Plan for Human Rehabilitation and World Peace.

THE MEDWAY PLAN INVITES YOUR COOPERATION

This, then, is the Medway plan, a simple, flexible, personalized, integrated program for constructive action. The plan cooperates wholeheartedly with other relief agencies, particularly with the National Medical and Surgical Relief Committee, with the Pestalozzi Foundation of America and with CARE. In turn it invites the cooperation of all men of good will, who want to help and do not know how. Here is a way by which everyone, whatever his means, can have a part in building the brave, new world of the future. He can at least write a letter of friendly good will to someone. He can send a CARE package of food or clothing. He can become, perhaps the Medway plan associate in his community and help organize it for the sponsoring of a town abroad.

St. Francis of Assissi prayed that God might give him strength to leave a bit of love in every place where he found hatred, to leave a little joy wherever he found sadness. That can be the privilege of all those who cooperate through the Medway plan, and a new rainbow will rise about the outmoded symbols of war—a rainbow of faith and hope and love.

Additional information will be gladly furnished.

The Medway Plan, head office; Woodbury, Conn.

Offices also at 1 Wall Street, New Yor City; 20 Montague Street, Charleston, S. C.; Chenedouit, Orne, France; Salzburg, Austria.

Address of Erle Cocke, Jr., National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an address delivered by Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion at the National Press Club in Washington on yesterday. We of the South take great pride in the splendid achievements of this young American. His forthright statements in this message leave no doubt of the vigor or of the quality of the leadership he imparts to the Legion. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that he was introduced on yesterday by Radford Mobley, president of the National Press Club, and one of the leading newsmen of this or any other city. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Press Club, guests. I am glad to be here not only for the personal pleasure of meeting with the Capital's press, but for the pride of knowing that you do honor to the organization I represent.

The American Legion, throughout its history, has enjoyed splendid relations with the press, and I consider it one of my responsibilities to keep it that way. Wherever I have gone across the country, I have found large numbers of your colleagues who are also active Legionnaires. And I think you should know that we feel the press has had a good deal to do with pushing American Legion membership ahead of the total a year ago.

I am especially glad for the opportunity to lay before you at this time The American Legion's position with regard to the current emergency. That position reflects the thinking of 4,000,000 men and women at all levels and all places in our society—men and women with a common background of service in the Nation's Armed Forces during war.

The question of how best to meet the challenge of communism is being debated hot and heavy at the present time.

The debate, it seems to me, will serve a good purpose—provided it is held above personal and partisan levels, and provided it does not end in filibuster. To argue for argument's sake at this moment is dangerous. To argue for partisan advantage would be unpatriotic.

Certainly, we agree that there must come a time—and soon—when the people will have to accept and actively support the policies of our national leadership. In order for this to come about, I believe that both sides will have to give ground.

The administration should lead the way by frankly admitting that mistakes have been made. Nobody expects an administration to be 100 percent right, but everybody resents the attitude that never owns up to a wrong.

Isolationism in this country died in 1941. There are signs now of its revival. If the trend takes hold, it will be because the American people were left with no place else to go.

It isn't a question of whether or not large numbers of Americans should be disillusioned. The fact is that they are disillusioned, and disappointed, and discouraged by what they believe to be inconsistent and unproductive foreign policies.

In 1947, President Truman declared that it would be the purpose of this country to support free nations everywhere in resisting communism. You called it the Truman Doctrine, and it won popular approval. Best of all, it worked; Greece and Turkey proved the experiment.

In 1948 came the Marshall plan to spend American dollars and know-how in rebuilding the economy of Western Europe. And again, the people applauded and the plan worked.

But then came the sad awakening. With the rout of the Nationalists in China, it became apparent that, while combating the Kremlin on one side of the world, we had delivered it into power on the other.

The State Department then asked us to believe that the Reds in China were not really bad people, that they wanted only land reform. Most of us refused to swallow that one. The fact that it was offered at all is, in my opinion, a grave indictment of the State Department's policy makers.

United States approval of the UN's cease-fire plan for Korea impresses our organization as being one more link in a chain of misadventures in the Far East. Appeasement is a cloudy word, but I think it can be applied with all of its original meaning to that action. What can be gained by voluntarily surrendering the cause for which we went into Korea It's a little late to be making a gift of that country to the Reds under terms that would preclude us from punishing them.

Whether we pull out of Korea is a decision for the military to make. The American Legion favors holding that ground as long as the effort is vastly more costly to the enemy than to us.

We submit that the failure of a majority of United Nations members to join the United States in branding Communist China an aggressor has done more to foster isolationism in this country than all of the speechmaking in Congress or out of it. The UN cannot long endure the reputation of penalizing little aggressors while letting the big ones get away. It is tagging itself with precisely that reputation today.

Chiang Kai-shek's offer of 30,000 troops to fight in Korea has gone begging for 5 months. There is talk now of sending over reinforcements from this country. I submit that it would be a grievous error to commit another GI into that battle while ignoring the ready assistance of the only Chinese Government recognized by the United Nations.

In the event that the UN does not act against the Chinese Reds, we believe it will be necessary for the United States to take that action alone. Regardless of the outcome in Korea, we should blockade the Chinese coast and give all possible aid in weapons and military advice to the forces on Formosa and the guerrillas within China itself.

Committing large numbers of American troops to the defense of Western Europe is admittedly a risky proposition, one that deserves the most careful study and which the President—again in the interest of unity—should discuss with the Congress.

Two basic concepts must be borne in mind.

First, Europe cannot stand against Russian attack without substantial American ground forces.

Secondly, no amount of American men and weapons can hold Europe unless those countries contribute a maximum military effort on their own hook. You simply cannot defend a country that will not defend itself.

Now we are not ready to admit that this is the situation in Europe today. General Eisenhower went abroad for the express purpose of sizing up that issue. And the American Legion is prepared to accept the general's judgment. To attempt to settle the question on any other basis seems to me a dangerous break with realism.

After all, why have we undertaken such a huge and costly rearmament effort? If we are going to be candid about it, not primarily to save Italians or Frenchmen or Germans from capture by communism. And certainly not for reasons of charity. We are doing it because it is necessary for the security of our own country, our own homes, our own lives.

The Hoover plan, in our judgment, combines extreme pessimism with exaggerated optimism. It leads from his premise that Europe cannot be defended to the conclusion that the Western Hemisphere, alone, can be defended.

I think everyone would agree that the time may come when communism will have to be battled from the Americas. That is a possibility. Mr. Hoover's proposal would make it a certainty. He is asking us to concede all of Europe and all of Asia and Africa at a time when there is a reasonable chance of keeping powerful resources of those continents in the fight.

When you consider that retiring to this hemisphere would leave the Kremlin in control of seven-eighths of the world's peoples and more than half of the world's industry, you have to believe that the Americas under that condition would be considerably less than a Gibraltar.

All in all, it would appear that Mr. Hoover—out of the very best of motives—has come up with an untimely recipe for national survival.

With regard to Mr. Taft, frankly, I am confused as to which side of the plate the Senator is batting from. He has established himself in a very short period of time as the top switch-hitter in the foreign relations league.

One week ago—and speaking in this room—Senator Taft disclosed that he wasn't at all certain that Stalin intends to attack in Western Europe. In 1948, the Senator gave that same reason for opposing Universal Military Training. And 10 years ago, in early 1941, he said it was asinine for anyone to suppose that Japan would make war on the United States.

I think the veterans of the country, particularly those of World War II, can be excused for respectfully discounting Mr. Taft's knowledge of dictators' intentions.

The Senator from Ohio also warns that our going into Western Europe with troops might provoke attack. That may be. But if we are agreed that communism is an aggressive, imperialistic force bent on world conquest, then at some time and place we must take a stand. I believe the time is now and one priority place is Western Europe.

One good effect of the great debate has been to get the people thinking—a great many people who otherwise might have coasted along unmindful of the issues. We should make certain, however, that in all the excitement we do not make the mistake of falling for an easy way out.

The idea of concentrating on sea and air forces—with a relatively small Army—is a case in point. This old chestnut was pretty well buried by World War II. I am sure that the 8,000,000 ground troops who helped bring victory to America in that war do not consider they were either unnecessary or unessential. And I am equally certain that our ground forces in Korea feel they are doing an important job.

History shows that every major war has brought forth new and more destructive weapons. And the need for manpower has gone up with every war. Atomic bombs hastened the surrender of an already-beaten Japan, but who can guarantee that Russia would react accordingly? Unless we come up with planes and ships capable of storming hills and taking away the enemy's guns, we had better leave those jobs to the foot-soldier and train him to do them.

The really encouraging side of the present situation is the degree of unity already expressed on the need for building and maintaining powerful armed forces. Where they should go and how they should be used are live questions. But for the first time in our history, short of declared war, the American people are convinced that military preparedness is most essential.

How do we go about it?

The President has announced a goal of 3,500,000 men in uniform by July. I look for the figure to reach 5,000,000 in 1952, unless there is all-out war, and maximum mobilization would then be in order. If Russia does not attack, mobilization will probably level off at approximately 7,000,000 in 1954.

To our way of thinking, the build-up in manpower should be limited only by the ability of the armed services to absorb new recruits. We cannot gamble again on time to train while we fight. For every man of service age who was ready to do battle on Pearl Harbor day, there were 10 who had no prior military experience. The year that it took us to mount our first major offensive in North Africa would not be ours to waste next time.

The American Legion will support a program of universal military training and service as the best and fairest means of filling out the armed services.

I believe that congressional action on the UMT feature of this plan is as important a security step as the Nation will be called upon to take. No other move could do so much to guarantee that the strength being mustered now will outlast the emergency. If UMT is not enacted, we will be well on the way to repeating the old mistake of sprinting to a dead stop so far as national preparedness is concerned.

Certainly, every qualified young man can expect to undergo military training and service during the next 10 years. Bearing arms is going to become as much a habit of American life as studying in school and paying taxes, and not only will the Nation be more safe but the people will be stronger and better citizens because of it.

We hear a lot about the great sacrifice involved in youngsters giving up their time and careers for military service. Personally, I believe that most young men neither need nor want that type of sympathy. Military service in these times is the first obligation of citizenship. But beyond that, and equally important, it is an opportunity for the individual to increase his own chances of survival.

The compelling factor of this stage of mobilization is speed. We need to build up the fighting services with the finest available fighting stock. To do that, we must draw heavily, it seems to me, on the 18-year-old age group.

The American Legion does not presume to have sure-fire answers to all of the problems I have touched on here today. But I am convinced that on one essential point, we have caught the will and the hopes of the majority of the people. That is a deep and abiding belief in the future of this country—and in the capacity of 150,000,000 Americans, pulling together, to come up with honorable and workable solutions.

Leading a Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very worth-while letter appearing in the New York Times of January 14, from the Honorable Herbert Pell, a distinguished New Yorker who formerly represented the Seventeenth New York district in the House:

LEADING A FREE WORLD—SURVIVAL OF CIVILIZATION SAID TO DEPEND ON ERA OF PEACE

(The writer of the following letter, formerly a Member of Congress and State chairman for the Democratic Party, served as Minister to Portugal and as the American member of the UN Commission for Investigation of War Crimes.)

HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.,
January 10, 1951.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I am for peace. I am for minding our own business. I am particularly opposed to a policy which boils down to an effort to impose American ideas and customs on other

nations. This does not mean that we should not recognize the duties and responsibilities of our position.

We must properly understand the situation of the United States. This country is the leader of the free world, which is a very different thing from being the free leader of the world. We are the first of a group of associates. We cannot act as the master of slaves, as the paymaster of hirelings or as the dominator of satellites.

The nations on our side are weaker and poorer than we are, either because they are smaller or because they have suffered more, but they are not slaves, servants or sycophants; they are free nations and can be led by their willing consent or not at all. We cannot treat them as tools to be broken in our interest. When we assume the burden of leadership we assume at the same time a responsibility for the interest of those whom we lead. We cannot offend their conscience or sacrifice them for our own gain.

ECONOMIC SURVIVAL

Intelligently, we must recognize that the United States cannot be alone in the world. It cannot long remain prosperous in a company of ruined nations. So much is obvious. For a good many years to come the core of individualist economy—if that economy is to survive at all—must be a prosperous United States. It is manifest that we cannot as a nation continue as the leader and the bulwark of a civilization based on the assumption that peace is the normal condition of mankind if we persist in a policy of military adventure or turn ourselves into an armed camp.

If the United States is to be the first nation of the future, if we are entering on the American century, let us hope and do what we can to make it so that the period of our leadership will be a period of peace, amity, and prosperity rather than a time of subordination for the world under the rule of a people themselves oppressed by the tools of their dominance.

Peace is the only possible base for our civilization. It was built on peace, and without peace it will die. War will ineluctably end the customs and the outlook and the way of life, the ideals and the national purposes which we inherited from our fathers to be held as a sacred trust for our children. Peace is not always easy to maintain; at the present moment its maintenance is, and will be for some time, extremely difficult. As Governor Dewey once said, "We must wage peace."

HISTORY OF WARS

Twice in our time we have seen that total war (and there really is no other kind possible) decides nothing, settles nothing, answers nothing, and leads to nothing. Winner and loser, both are vanquished. Is there a single nation on earth that got, by any imaginable system of accounting, a net gain out of either of the two wars we have lived through?

Today, does any sane person believe that a conflict with Russia will mean anything but mutual destruction and ruin? Do we hope to overrun Russia as Germany was overrun and occupy it as Germany was occupied, and then build it again, as we are doing in Germany and Japan, into something very like what it was before? What do we plan to do with a victory?

It is manifest that a war with Russia will end in a collapse of common exhaustion. The representatives of a shattered Russia will meet the emissaries of a worn and exhausted United States and devise a means by which both can survive without continuing mutual slaughter and destruction. Is there any person in the world who imagines any other result possible?

The real difficulty lies in the fact that the negotiators on both sides fear disapproval by the politicians at home.

I do not know how it is in Russia, but in the United States today every person who dares to express the obvious fact that compromise is better than the best conceivable result of any possible war—which is the real belief of thinking Americans—finds himself attacked and stabbed on all sides by men sitting safely in public offices, who know very well that come what may they will be safe from any enemy.

OPPONENTS OF COMPROMISE

Here, there, and everywhere you hear them shouting against compromise, calling the world to witness that their only desire is to shoulder a musket and face the wicked foe. It is only the superior quality of their patriotism that prevents them from selfishly indulging this wish. They must for the good of the Nation remain in public office while they cheer on the envied heroes.

They have the effrontery to attack as cowards all who disagree w th anything they shout. The whole thing is contemptible. How much courage does it take for a Congressman or a Senator to yell for blood? Does a district attorney show a high quality of bravery when he howls against compromise? Right or wrong, no question of courage is involved. How much courage does anyone think it would take for me, 66 years old, living on an ample income quietly in the country, to clamor for gore, to demand the sacrifice of a million men 40 years younger than I am and then end my heroic address with a bitter note of regret that my years or my grapevines prevented me from joining the brave boys whom I envy?

Such words do not come from the mouths of heroes or of patriots but from the lips of self-seeking politicians hoping to ride into office on a wave of excitement that will conceal their own shortcomings. I have been in politics for 40 years. I was a Member of Congress 10 years before the oldest soldier drafted was born, and I know.

Most of the political shouters think they are backing a winning horse—that's all. Twenty-five years ago thousands of American politicians attacked the Catholics to get the Klan vote. Today they follow McCarthy. Twenty years ago they said as they drank their bootleg liquor, "There's one more election in prohibition." Today, safe behind desks, they think that war and hatred will keep their snouts in the public trough in 1952. It's as simple as that.

I am for peace. I am on the side of the angels of God, who sang, "Peace on earth, good will to men." They were not popular with those who filled the inn and crowded Mary into the stables, but they were right all the same.

Why not negotiate now, while the young men are still alive?

HERBERT PELL.

High Cost of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, just to let the consumers of the East know that the high cost of bread cannot be fastened on the farmers who raise wheat, I submit an original statement from one of the best farmers in my area. The letter follows:

WILLISTON, N. DAK.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: I bought a loaf of bread today for which I paid 20 cents. It contains less than 1 pound of dry wheat flour. I also sold a load of No. 1 wheat at the elevator for 3 cents a pound, and then the consumers blame me for the high cost of living.

I buy the land at a high price, spend big sums for improving the land, pay high taxes on it, buy thousands of dollars' worth of high-priced machinery, furnish the seed, hire high-priced labor, etc., to grow and harvest the wheat and bring it to market. And then somebody else takes that wheat and grinds it into flour and bakes the bread, and all I get is 3 cents, 7 percent, of the final cost to the consumer for the bread. Why is not that fact mentioned oftener when Congress is arguing ways and means of how to lower the cost of living?

Happy New Year.

O. S. ELLEVOLD.

P. S.—If you start figuring General Mills' Puffed Wheat, it looks 10 times worse.

Don't Penalize Parenthood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column by Albert W. Spiers, editor of the Michigan City (Ind.) News-Dispatch, which appeared in that newspaper on January 15.

Commenting on plans for increasing taxes to help pay for the expanded defense program, Mr. Spiers presents a most convincing argument against any across-the-board cut in dependency exemptions. Lower exemptions, he points out, would place an unfair share of the tax burden on families with children. A fairer method would be to leave exemptions unchanged while boosting the levy on taxable income.

Mr. Spiers' point is well taken, and, I hope, will be considered by the Ways and Means Committee when it begins formulating a new tax bill next month. The above-mentioned follows:

The new tax plans of Truman and company will deal a low blow to parents who are struggling to raise good kids in tough times.

Let's write our Congressmen.

Here's the gimmick: Truman wants to raise income taxes mainly by lowering the $600 per exemption, perhaps as low as $400.

That sounds fair and simple, but let's see how it works with two families of identical income.

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Doaks like kids. They have three, and make continual sacrifices for them. Only when income taxes are calculated are those tykes a budget blessing. The Doaks live in a house that is perpetually battle-scarred, but always warm, happy, and rambunctious.

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Iceberg decided long ago not to have costly kids. They like the comforts of life for themselves, so their home, while lacking warmth and noise, is neat, modern, and fitted with all the latest conveniences.

Both the Doaks and Icebergs make $5,000 a year. With their two exemptions, the Icebergs now pay about $600 a year to Uncle Sam. The Doaks, having five exemptions, only pay about $250—a difference of $350,

which is little enough when the real cost of raising children is considered.

Comes costly war. New taxes must be imposed, new sacrifices made. Who should make these sacrifices—the Doaks, who already are fulfilling their obligation to God and society by struggling to raise three fine youngsters, or the Icebergs, who live selfishly in cold personal comfort?

You know the answer, and so do I—but the tax men don't.

Let us now cut those tax exemptions, as Truman suggests, to $400 each.

We now have added $400 ($200 for each of two exemptions) to the taxable income of the Icebergs. At roughly 25 percent, that will cost 'em $100 more.

But we have added $1,000 to the taxable income of the struggling Doaks, and that will cost them $250 more.

In other words, under this plan the family with three children will bear two-and-one-half times as much of the new tax burden as the family without children.

Should that be? Or should the shoe be fitted to the other foot?

That could be done easily by leaving the $600 exemption unchanged and boosting the levy on taxable income. Let's try that on our two families.

The Doaks now have a taxable income of roughly $2,000—their $5,000 less $3,000 for five exemptions at $600 apiece. Their $250 bill is a shade less than 15 percent.

The Icebergs' taxable income is $3,800—their $5,000 less two $600 exemptions. Their $600 tax bill is a shade more than 15 percent.

Now raise taxes 20 percent.

The Doaks will now pay 35 percent of $2,000, or $700.

But the Icebergs will pay 35 percent of $3,800, or a healthy $1,330.

We have increased the Doaks' tax bill $450 and the Icebergs' tax bill $730—and brother, that's the way I like it. The Icebergs, by any measure, are better able to make new sacrifices than the Doaks. They have chosen not to make sacrifices for children. It delights me to force them to make sacrifices for America.

Servicemen's Wives and Infants Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD, a timely editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press dealing with the necessity for a maternity and infant care program for the wives and infants of the men in the Armed Forces. The editorial follows:

SERVICEMEN'S WIVES AND INFANTS NEGLECTED

The emergency maternity and infant care program (EMIC), inaugurated back in 1943, should be reestablished by necessary legislation at Washington if we are going to remove a hardship that falls upon the wives and infants of men in the United States service.

This program was administered by the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, through State agencies, and it did a magnificent job. The program was available to the wife and infant of an enlisted man serving in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh pay grades of the Armed Forces or of an aviation cadet, providing without cost medical, nursing, and hospital maternity service during the prenatal period, childbirth, and for 6 weeks thereafter, and medical and hospital care for the infant during his first year.

After July 1, 1947, there was a gradual termination of this emergency, and the latest dates on which care could be provided was July 1, 1948, for mothers, and to April 20, 1949, for infants. At the present time there is no such program, and need for a similar program for wives and infants of servicemen is even greater than it was during World War II. The quarter allowance for dependents now varies with the pay grade and the number of dependents, as follows:

Pay grades 1, 2, and 3:	
1 dependent	$85.00
2 dependents	107.50
Over 2 dependents	125.00
Pay grades 4 and 5:	
1 dependent	127.50
2 dependents	127.50
Over 2 dependents	145.00
Pay grades 6 and 7:	
1 dependent	147.50
2 dependents	147.50
Over 2 dependents	165.00

The serviceman could, of course, send to his family additional sums from his pay.

Let us point to the local situation today, and every taxpayer will realize the need for this agency program. During the months of November and December a record was kept of local pending confinements of wives of servicemen. Up to this time 12 have been recorded, and it is reasonable to assume that there are as many more that have not been brought to the attention of the Red Cross or to any other agency. In many instances hospitalization insurance was forfeited with termination of husbands' employment, and at the present time payment of confinement bills is arranged for directly with the doctor and hospital by the wife. Every month that this continues without a new emergency maternity and infant-care program it will work a hardship on many of the families of men in the service.

If an application is made to Army Emergency Relief, Navy Relief, or Air Force Society, depending on the branch in which the head of the family serves, it is handled on a loan basis and deducted by allotment from the serviceman's pay. There is no local agency, other than the Red Cross, which will pay for such confinements. It would be interesting to learn what support the county medical association will give a new program.

Our point is that we can do no less for those fighting in Korea and who are in the service in other portions of the world than to give them a program similar to the one which was in force from 1943 through April 20, 1949. It should be resumed and immediately. The United States Department of Labor issued a folder back in October of 1945 which outlined the various services of the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program:

1. It is for wives and infants of men in the four lowest pay grades of the Armed Forces and of aviation cadets, regardless of family income, race, or length of residence.

2. It provides medical, nursing, and hospital services—not cash payments—to the wife.

3. It provides services without cost to the men, their wives, or families.

4. It operates in every State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

5. It is administered by the State Health Departments under plans approved by the Children's Bureau.

6. It depends for its success in each State on the cooperation of physicians, hospitals, nurses, clinics, and public-health agencies.

7. It provided care for about 850,000 mothers and about 110,000 babies during the 30 months it was in force.

This is a subject that should call for immediate action, and our Representatives in Congress and in the Senate should hasten to enact a program similar to that which was discontinued or replace it with a new measure covering the various phases that we have mentioned. If we are going to build the morale on the home front, if we are going to give our fighting men with dependents at home something to build up their morale, the best way is to provide ways and means in the nature of care and medical treatment for the dependents here at home. If we want to make a wife or a mother feel that the Government is interested in her welfare, this is the surest way to proceed.

The Cost of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, of January 15, 1951:

THE COST OF FREEDOM

The Nation today was given the estimates on the cost of preserving freedom against the encroachment of totalitarianism. Mr. Truman's budget figures are, of course, approximate. None can foretell the course of events. But they are grim reminders of the sorry plight of a world which twice in a generation fought to eradicate the very condition that faces us today.

No American can be happy over the leadership of the free world which now is ours. It is a costly honor—costly in effort, blood, and treasure, but it is inescapable. Paradoxically, this Nation, grew to strength and power through wars which weakened most of the other nations. Perhaps we grew in spite of wars, or because the wars were fought on other people's grounds. In any event, the torch of freedom is in our hands and if we fail there will be no other to take it up.

The President's determination, that this country shall do everything possible for its security cannot be logically challenged. All of us want peace and security. Estimates of cost will, in time, be tested in committee inquiry and congressional debate. But the cost of government for the years ahead will be heavier than we ever have known in peacetime.

Mr. Truman has offered a Federal budget for the fiscal year starting next July 1 of more than $71,500,000,000 and will propose increased tax rates to meet it in full. If approved the tax load will require $471 from the average person in fiscal 1952, or $1,884 in Federal taxes for the average family of four. Since approximately one-half the Federal revenue comes from personal income taxes, it would mean $235 from each person next year, or about $940 for each average family in direct Federal income taxes. Many, of course, would pay much less and many would pay more than the average amount.

A Federal sales tax is certain to be asked. This would be in addition to the present sales taxes in many States. It could be collected with less work as a tax on goods at the source, although the total revenue would be smaller than if taken at the retail level. Still, a tax of 3 percent might yield five billions annually. It still would leave the heaviest burden for the income tax field.

Sales taxes hit harder at the small income citizens and income taxes strike harder at big incomes. In the present situation all will have to pay more.

The Budget fixes probable Federal spending next year at seventy-one and one-half billions, as compared with an estimated forty-seven and one-fourth billions for the current fiscal year. It estimates also that higher production will bring higher incomes so that the current Federal revenues of forty-four and one-half billions would rise to fifty-five billions next year even with no rate increases. This year's anticipated deficit of more than two and one-half billions will increase the Federal debt to two hundred and sixty billions, a staggering figure which we should not contemplate increasing.

Even with the higher national income, next year's deficit probably would amount to sixteen and one-half billions unless taxes are increased or new ones levied. Mr. Truman will ask Congress to raise in taxes sufficient funds to put the defense program on a pay-as-you-go basis. To do this, we will have to pay one-third higher taxes than at present, with at least 27 percent of the national income going into the Federal coffers.

This is a huge sum. Plans call for forty-one and one-half billions, or 58 percent of all Federal revenues, to be used for rearming and for seven and one-half billions to be spent in military and economic aid to our allies. Thus almost forty-nine billions or 69 percent of all Federal funds would be used for defense, leaving a little more than twenty billions for domestic purposes.

The welfare of all the people and the preservation of their national existence calls for speedy rearming with as little waste and error as possible. Although the domestic costs are relatively small, they afford the most debatable fiscal points. Mr. Truman's apparent attempt to inject his Fair Deal, checkmated in the Eighty-first Congress and largely repudiated at the polls, may endanger the worthy portions of his program. Certainly no effort should be made under the cover of national distress to sneak such things as FEPC, Federal health insurance, and the Brannan plan through the back door under the cloak of national defense.

There are ways in which the domestic costs can be reduced. They will make only a small dent in the tremendous budget, but every million saved will help to ease the burden. Several members of Congress tried uncuccessfully in the last session to reduce ordinary costs. Now these savings must be made. We shall pay billions for defense, but we can't afford a cent for waste.

Universal Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in the present critical state of affairs throughout the world it is most vital that our country have the benefit of the thinking of leaders in every walk of life. One group which has been organized with this thought in mind is the Committee on the Present Danger, which includes among its membership a number of college presidents and leaders in the professions and in business.

One of the proposed programs for government which this committee considers urgent is the adoption of universal military service. A statement on this matter presents the reasoning behind it in such convincing terms that it deserves to be brought to the attention not only of the Members of the Congress, but of all our people.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement from the Committee on the Present Danger be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 12, 1950.*

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

The acts of naked aggression by powerful Communist forces in the Far East constitute a grave threat to the survival of the United Nations, and a peril to the very security of these United States, which cannot be mistaken, cannot be ignored.

The members of the Committee on the Present Danger, making this statement, believe that the hour is at hand when our country must mobilize its manpower and resources on a scale great enough to meet the real and present danger, and that scale is very great indeed.

We confront the actuality of the assault by vast Red Chinese armies on the United Nations forces in Korea. We confront the condition of military weakness in Western Europe, a condition seriously worsened by recent shocking developments in the Far East. We confront the fact that in these circumstances American power is far from adequately mobilized. We confront the fact that we can find no safety by withdrawal from overseas and by attempting to make the North American continent impregnable—that would be a counsel of despair and defeat.

Even in this crisis we totally reject the idea of a preventive war. Nor do we accept the idea that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable—unless the Soviet so wills it. On the contrary, we believe that the great objectives of our foreign policy and military policy—working in common with the other free countries in the United Nations—should continue to be the attainment of an enduring peace, looking toward a condition in which the beginnings of world disarmament may be made. But we are convinced that there is no hope of accomplishing these objectives so long as the military position of the free countries remains as weak as it is today.

The aggressive designs of the Soviet Union are unmistakably plain. Its Asiatic ally and satellite has launched an all-out attack upon the United Nations forces in Korea. In Western Europe the ability of the United States Air Force to inflict heavy damage on Russia's strategic centers has been the chief deterrent to a full-scale Communist attack. Radical improvements in defense against air attack, together with growing ability of the Soviet Union to produce atomic bombs, is progressively weakening the effectiveness of this restraint. Unless an adequate supplement for the atomic potential of the United States is brought into existence the time may soon come when all of continental Europe can be forced into the Communist fold, and the British Isles placed again in even graver peril than in 1940, at sacrifices in blood and wealth that the Kremlin would accept. No scruples of conscience will stand in their way.

In our view, the necessary supplement to our present atomic leadership is an allied force in being strong enough to furnish effective resistance to military aggression. Such a force in readiness to execute the decisions of the free countries assembled in the United Nations would make those decisions respected. That force does not exist. To meet the need, it must be promptly built. To create it, the United States must take the leadership. The European nations will make the greater effort required only if the United States takes a firm stand beside them, provides the balance of the equipment needed, and, most important of all, makes a powerful contribution of troops.

Our part will call for greater sacrifices than any our people have yet been prepared for. Since our contribution will include forces in Europe and in the Far East, as well as a strategic reserve in this country, the total program will of necessity be a large one, calling, we believe, for a total United States armed force of at least 3,500,000 men.

Also, the danger of an all-out war is so serious that all of our young men must have military training. But universal military training alone is no longer an adequate solution of the problems which now face us because it does not provide a force in being.

The time has come for a new concept that universal service in defense of our freedom is a privilege and an obligation of our young men. To accomplish this with the least interference with education, with business and professional careers, and with family life, this service should commence at the age of 18 or upon graduation from high school, whichever is later. Two years of such military service, including training, will be necessary, and the program should embrace radically broadened standards of fitness.

We recognize that many detailed provisions interpreting and applying these principles remain to be worked out, and we expect shortly to present concrete proposals.

The above program would, of course, be a supplement to the selective service law, not a substitute for it.

But in addition to providing military manpower, this country must expand the program for equipment and supplies far beyond goals already announced. This will be a hard task, calling for development of the strongest possible organization to supervise our military procurement here and abroad. It will require submission to economic controls more exacting than those now in effect, particularly in the field of credit, Government and private. It will also render necessary a sharp reduction in Government spending for nondefense purposes.

The doubt is not whether such a program is too arduous. The doubt is whether it is arduous enough. Certainly it is not nearly as drastic as the conditions which make it necessary. The price is high, but we believe it must be paid. It is, in our judgment, the only chance of averting a war of world dimensions, or of assuring victory if, in spite of all efforts to maintain the peace, the Soviet Union insists in precipitating world war III. We shall at the least have created strength which may convince the 14 men in the Kremlin that further aggression will not pay.

The Committee on the Present Danger has been formed in the American tradition by civilians acting on a nonpartisan basis. It will enlarge its membership and strive to further the above purposes. To this end we are already studying certain specific problems, and will from time to time make reports to the public dealing with them.

The bitter fact is that our country has again been thrust into a struggle in which our free existence is at stake, a struggle for survival. We have no time to lose.

Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, James Phinney Baxter III, Laird Bell, Lewis H. Brown, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, R. Ammi Cutter, Harold W. Dodds, Charles Dollard, Edward S. Greenbaum, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, Frederick A. Middlebush, John Lord O'Brian, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Stanley Resor, Robert E. Sherwood, Robert G. Sproul, Tracy S. Voorhees, Henry M. Wriston.

Emergency This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, among us who are not painfully aware of the apathy and complacency of our Nation toward the menace which threatens our very existence.

In this hour of crisis many eloquent and forceful voices have been raised in an effort to awaken the Nation. Among these the voice of Mr. Donald J. McQuade, the national commander of the Catholic War Veterans, raised an intelligent and unspectacular appeal to our people, should merit our attention.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Commander McQuade's call to action, Emergency This, which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the Milwaukee County Vet, and commend it to the Members for their careful consideration:

EMERGENCY THIS

(By Donald J. McQuade, national commander of CWV)

It becomes apparent as the critical stages of the present global situation wends their ways, propelled by basic materialistic and atheistic programs of complacency and anti-God idealism, that we, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, white and black, man and woman, have come to the end of the proverbial rope. This endangers not only our lives but the lives and well-being of our children; not only our religion, but all sound Christian ideals; not only our American way of life, but the only progressive hope of the suppressed peoples of the world.

WE ARE COMPLACENT

We need not go far to find the use of materialistic and atheistic programs; need not analyze the mind of the self-styled atheist; need not question the attitude of our neighbors; but definitely ask ourselves what we have done with the gifts of liberty, freedom, and justice. Have we used our freedom individually, to stanchly defend and promote true Americanism as only a private citizen can, or have we been materialistically complacent in our duties to God, to our country, and to one another?

WARNINGS ARE IGNORED

Throughout history the severest struggle of mankind has been to obtain liberty in keeping with his dignity as a human being and so necessary for the fulfillment of his most sacred aspirations.

Yet during the world wars our people have too often stated openly, "Why are we fighting? What do we owe this cause?" Yes, and today, even in the face of utter domination and complete destruction of our ideals—at any time we have been warned, may come the claw of the hammer and sickle to disjoint the links of a free unity and in its stead proclaim a slave state—we are still complacent. Where? Not in Poland, it has happened there; not in Czechoslovakia, it has happened there; not in Yugoslavia, there too it has happened. For none of these conquered territories is there fear, but for the articulate and carefully-laid plan of control and domination of these United States.

MUST REJUVENATE OUR IDEALS

The iron curtain is not able to keep from our minds, our hearts, and our bodies the sting of terror and loss of ideals that Russia is continuing to expound. Yet, in the face of this peril that could befall us, Americans still find themselves liberal with their liberty, free with their freedom, and irreligious with their religion; for example, our Supreme Court upholds godlessness as a part of liberty and anti-Americanism as a part of freedom, and our churches during special prayers for peace continue to be unattended.

The tenets necessary for the period which we are experiencing will go down in history as mere words, if there is not an immediate rejuvenation of the ideals upon which our great Nation was founded. We must vigorously move to restore the faith to our people in God as the Supreme Ruler and Guarantor of inalienable rights.

The news of the hour will not allow us to be presumptuous. At once we must make ourselves and our families ready for sacrifices that we have never known, to assure for our own generation and the generations to come the continuance of life with inalienable rights.

APPLY CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

There is a crying need for the stoppage of the disconcerting decay that is occurring within. Americans must overnight refortify themselves with the knowledge of the principles of Christ and of our country, and a sincere demonstration of them. Our children must be taught the principles of restraint and discipline; the mother and father to respect their sacred contract; employers to take an honest interest in the rights of employees; employees to take cognizance of the rights of employers; and all of us, to consider and appreciate our basic liberties in the light in which they were bestowed upon us by the Creator.

TAKE A DETERMINED STAND

In complete trust that Americans and other free people of the world still have within them the native ability to defend and protect their liberties, we believe that the threatening fangs of terror with which Russia is striking, will give us, who can be called upon to be the world defenders of freedom, a new and invigorated will. Only through sacrifice, sweat, and determination, and with the help of God, will freedom be restored to suppressed, helpless people, and will freedom be protected in our loved land. Only then can we ourselves enjoy real progressiveness in the fear and love of God and progressiveness in the American way of life.

ALL MUST COOPERATE

Many of us will be recalled to military status. Our leaving will cause certain sadness and sacrifice to our wives and mothers of our children. Our women may be mustered to bolster our defense. Our industry will be called upon to produce untold quantities. Our scientists and technicians will be found working far into the night. Our Government officials will be bound by a deeper sense of responsibilities and keener consideration of decisions. No room for profiteers. No basis for strikes. No realm for politics. No place for the weak. No time for the slacker. Emergency this.

You've Been Cold for as Long as You've Lived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the article by Jim G. Lucas, Scripps-Howard staff writer, which appeared in the January 17 Washington News.

This report relates in realistic language the hardships endured by our combat troops in Korea. The article follows:

YOU'VE BEEN COLD FOR AS LONG AS YOU'VE LIVED

(By Jim G. Lucas)

SOUTH OF WONJU, January 17.—It's the cold, the awful uncompromising cold, that gets you.

There's no describing it. Some people call it "frostbite."

Frostbite, hell. That's not the word when the flesh falls from a man's feet. Not when the toes swell and burst out of the shoes. Not when the hands turn black and the finger joints swell as big as a baby's elbow.

Somebody ought to be able to describe what the men are going through day after day on these wind-swept mountains in central Korea. Up here where it's 32 below zero. Where the winds cut like a razor. Where men haven't been out of clothes for 15 days. Haven't taken off sweat-soaked socks. Haven't been by a fire for 2 weeks. Haven't had a real sleep.

NO WAY

There ought to be a way to tell you about it but I don't know how. Not with words like frostbite. Not with any temperate zone words I know.

I'm not writing about myself. I'm cold all right. But I'm not sleeping in the mountains tonight. I'm sleeping in a valley where it is 21 below. Where at least I will have a fire and lights. My rations will be warm. And when I go to bed it will be inside a warm sleeping bag with a roof overhead. When I get up tomorrow I'll have dry socks and shoepacks. The all-night fire takes care of that. And I will have slept. That's important. A man needs sleep.

Up in the mountains it's different. I know. I was there this afternoon. I came back because I couldn't take what those men are taking. Just getting there was different. Three to five hours over the worst mountain passes in this part of Korea. Icy roads. Narrow horseshoe curves. Stalled trucks. Steaming convoys. Wrecks. And always the cold. The awful bitter, uncompromising, relentless cold.

Over by the mortar platoon I watched a weary young lieutenant greet a handful of replacements. The kids obviously just recently arrived from the States. Now they were in a terrible new world. A war they had been reading about was concentrated right here. They couldn't have come at a worse time. Twenty-five yards away heavy mortars were firing salvoes. Jets were strafing nearby hills. Artillery was going all-out.

"You men probably have been wondering why we forgot to give you sleeping bags." The lieutenant wanted to sound hard, but only succeeded in sounding tired.

"O. K., I'll tell you. You don't sleep at night up here. Get that? You'll have no sleeping bags. We got them but we shipped them back. Those things are death traps. Zip yourself up in one and what happens? I'll tell you. Some Chink slips in and slits your throat while you're trying to uncorset yourself."

"Don't get me wrong," the lieutenant continued. "Don't get scared, damn it. Scared men are dead men. You got a good chance of getting out of here alive. Keep your eyes open and most of you will get out in one piece. Only remember this: No sleeping. That's all."

The night comes and these kids sit in fox holes. The holes are not very deep because the frozen ground is too hard. There's a little rice straw on the bottom and each

man has a single wool blanket. You've seen the type. They sell them in war-surplus stores. Probably you appreciate how much protection one blanket offers when it's 82 below. It snows and the wind roars.

ATTACK AT DAWN

Usually—around dawn—the Reds attack. Sometimes it's only a probing patrol. But other times—like this morning—it's four or five companies. Some men tell me they welcome that. It gives them a chance to get the blood circulating again. Sometimes somebody gets killed. But what the hell?

Lots of these kids have troubles which are their own fault, of course. They haven't changed socks when they could. They haven't washed their feet. They have done a hundred things they shouldn't and failed to do a hundred things they should have. So their feet begin to crack and bleed and before they know it, they've had it.

These kids have been at grips with the enemy for 17 days and 17 nights. They never let up. They never can rest. They never can relax.

THEY'RE STILL FIGHTING

But they're not complaining any more than soldiers always complain and they're still fighting. It may be their fault, but you have got to admire the way they take it.

It's just that godawful cold. That bitter, uncompromising cold. You've forgotten what it is to be warm. You just know you're cold. That you always have been cold. As long as you have lived you've been cold.

Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Congress will have to give early attention to the question of extending and strengthening rent control in order to prevent inflation and injustice during the emergency. In this connection, I believe the attached article from the Peoria, Ill., Star, of December 21, 1950, will be of interest to all Members since it graphically describes the useful work being done by the rent advisory boards throughout the country:

RENT DISPUTES ADJUSTED BY ADVISORY BOARD'S WISDOM

(By Theo Jean Ahrends)

To bring a landlord and tenant face to face (and particularly when one has filed a complaint about the other) is a nerve-wracking possibility.

Despite the danger, the Peoria Rent Advisory Board continues to confront landlords and tenants on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month, armed with the Federal Rent Act of 1950 and a sense of equity.

Giving their time (sometimes as much as 4 hours each evening), the members of the board review decisions rendered by the rent control office and then make what they consider a just recommendation to Area Rent Director H. S. Heilman, who also gives his time to the hearings without pay. Any landlord or tenant who complains he has not had a fair hearing has certainly not been before this board.

On a typical review evening a week ago only two board members and Mr. Heilman could be present. Those waiting to be heard were told this was not a quorum but were asked if they wished to go ahead. They did.

First to come into the brightly lighted rent office from the dim corridor of the post-office basement was a stoutly built young woman, in this case the landlady, who was appealing an order to refund $300 to the tenant, a dark-haired young man accompanied by Attorney Hudson Sours.

Why had the young woman charged above-ceiling rent? Why, specifically, had she charged $65 a month? The board wanted to know. The house payments had been $35 a month, she said, the installment payments for storm windows were $20 a month and by adding $10 a month to make up the annual taxes, the rent added up to $65 a month.

Moreover, said the young woman, she had kept only one room in the house for herself; the tenant had four rooms for his family. She had kitchen privileges only on the week ends when she brought her two children home with her. It was at their (tenant's) invitation that I used the house freely; I used to baby-sit for their kids.

LOST INVESTMENT

Now the house was gone, too, sold for $6,000, although it had cost $7,500 and she had added $3,000 worth of improvements. Suddenly the young woman spoke out in a tear-tight voice, "I have just this to say. In the first place I don't know where I'd get the money if I have to pay it. I'm not asking anyone to help me. I'm supporting two children and working to do it. But I haven't asked the Government or anyone to help."

Murmurs of reassurance went around the room. Then attorney Sours asked, "Would you be able to pay $50 or $60 if you had, say 3 months to pay it?" She would. "Then if that's agreeable with you (to the tenant), let's say $50 in 75 days."

Not all cases solve themselves. Into the landlord's chair next came a thick-set, short man in overalls and striped shirt, a brown cardigan sweater buttoned tightly about him and his former tenant following close behind. Both sat down, in chairs not more than 2 feet apart, facing the board.

The charge again was overcharging. The man who owned the house on Bigelow, read Mr. Heilman from the original complaint, had charged his tenant $23 a week for 16 weeks, and then $18 a week for 10 weeks. The house was originally registered with a $40 a month ceiling, later increased by the rent office to $60 a month. Overcharges amounted to $158. The tenant wished to collect.

While landlord and tenant and board members listened, Mr. Heilman read more. A rent office inspector had made a report on the house. It read, "Structure poor, about 50 years old, exterior in need of painting; interior in need of paint, one room not furnished, other furnishings sparse, linoleum on floor—no scatter rugs, private bath, old fixtures, old refrigerator—runs constantly, doesn't freeze."

The landlord, by definition, had a house in the classification of "zone 5," wherein the rental range was $50 to $55 a month with heat and water furnished and garage. But his tenant had paid $92 and then $72 a month and paid his own utilities. On his own account to the board he had also fired the furnace and mowed the lawn.

Why?

DESPERATE FOR HOUSE

"Because I moved in in the winter when I had to have a place to stay. I was living in another place owned by him (the landlord present), a one-room concrete floor apartment. It was cold and I had a little boy who was sick and I was desperate for a place to stay."

Were there any extenuating circumstances for the landlord? His attorney pointed out that the tenant had his brother staying with him while he paid the $28 a week, and that the landlord reduced the rent to $18 when the brother left. (It was still $3 above the ceiling set.)

Board Chairman Clarence Hillyer wanted to know if four was above the occupancy limit for the kind of apartment. "No," answered Heilman—checking through his code—"six is the limit."

"That's not all," interposed the tenant. "When he told me to move out he said he was going to move in (a legitimate reason for eviction). But I think foul tactics were used to get me to move out. He hasn't moved in yet."

There was also the question of a receipt. The rent office had one for $23 signed by the landlord. He had signed it under pressure it seemed. "Why do you object to signing a receipt for money you receive as rent?" asked Hillyer. "Just never got in the habit of it," the landlord returned. (Signing of receipts, with amount indicated, not just "paid in full," is required by rent law.)

Since the landlord was a "repeater" in offenses, Heilman pointed out, the board was not bound by the refund indicated and could penalize the landlord up to triple damages. But after both tenant and landlord departed, members decided for a $100 refund. The tenant, could if he wished, refuse to accept and take the case into court where he might collect triple damages. The board hoped the settlement was "equitable."

COMPROMISE

The board had convened at 7 p. m. By 10:45 p. m. it had also considered a case on Aiken avenue where a landlord had failed to register with the rent office and when finally registered had refused to reduce his rent from $60 to $40. He said he had to have $30 or sell the house. The board compromised at $50.

In the case of a house on South Bourland, the bank seeking relief was asked to turn in D–1 forms, showing actual expenditures, and D–106 forms, showing fair net operating income needed. A landlord, protesting that his rent increase was not yet sufficient to cover his added costs, was asked to file the D–106 form.

One landlord, who told the board his tenants had agreed to the increase he sought because they understood about the rising costs of maintenance and repair, was referred to a later meeting, the board taking the position that both parties should be present.

Close to 11 o'clock, the men who had put in eight hours of their own work before coming to the rent office, closed their briefcases and shrugged into their overcoats. To give both landlord and tenant a chance to "explain" personally what could not be told adequately on paper, it had taken almost four hours.

Members of the local advisory board are currently—Jack A. Coney, John H. Sprecher, Byron E. Huston, Clarence G. Hillyer and Daniel E. Horan. For Mr. Heilman it was only one of six such evenings a month. He meets with the Macomb-Canton board once a month; with Galesburg board on two Friday evenings a month and with the Bloomington board one Monday evening each month.

Confusion Confounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a splendid thought-provoking article, written by Louis Bromfield, the noted agriculturist and author. This article appeared in

the January 15, 1951, issue of the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal:

In Washington we are certainly suffering from a confusion compounded of confusion and tragically the confusion finds its way into the hearts of all of us. It seems to me that much of the confusion arises from hypocrisy, dishonesty, and the deliberate and calculated misuse of words. Instead of dealing with realities and truth, the administration and in particular the State Department is dealing with a fog of illusions, shifty maneuvers, and deliberate deception.

Each time that I read in the newspapers or hear over the radio the term "United Nations forces now fighting in Korea," something turns over inside of me. Why does this hypocrisy exist? The war in Korea is between American forces and those of Soviet Russia and her puppet China. All the supplies and expenses are furnished by the American people. Not 1 percent of the troops are supplied by the other nations included in the UN. Why does the administration insist on referring to a full-scale tragic and disastrous war as a police action when it is war being fought by us virtually single-handed?

What, indeed, has the UN turned out to be but an agency which has shillied and shallied and hamstrung our efforts in a bitter war. Our State Department and our military leaders, hamstrung first of all by President Truman himself, cannot fight an all-out war. They must await the consent and decisions of the UN made up of other countries playing both ends against the middle, while our own American soldiers are being frozen, wounded, and killed. We cannot bomb the supply sources and lines in Manchuria without the permission of the UN. This will never come so long as European nations want to continue their trade in war materials used against us and Great Britain wants to protect Hong Kong from attack as a port out of which she is making money while we pay in lives and expense.

What is the UN anyway? It is not the only world alliance of nations. There are two—the UN and the Cominform nations. Soviet Russia, under a plan worked out by Alger Hiss, Secretary of State Acheson and others, has the power to veto and block nearly all decisive collective action. Soviet Russia and her satellites all sit on the UN which even invites an aggressor nation like Soviet China to present its utterly destructive case. None of our side sits in on the Cominform UN. We admit Yugoslavia and reject Spain. And not only are we as a nation and the UN as an organization hamstrung by the Soviet group but confusion is created by every nation which wants to save itself at the expense of the United States. The philosophy seems to be, you protect us but don't do anything rough which might involve us in a war. Just fight a war with one hand tied behind your back and we'll be safe.

In the Western Europe that remains free there are approximately 330,000,000 of people. In the United States there are 150,000,000, yet President Truman drafts ours sons and brothers with the avowed intention of sending them to Europe to defend these 330,000,000. We have already contributed about fifty billions to the economic welfare of these 330,000,000, and we are expending more billions to arm them, yet they make very little effort to defend themselves. The Labor Government of Great Britain clearly places its mangy Socialist ideals above the welfare of the nation and the free world itself. It insists upon nationalizing the vital steel industry and throwing it into the confusion and inefficiency and bureaucratic management in the midst of the worst crisis the western world has ever known.

Washington tells us that aid to Great Britain under the Marshall plan has ended and in the same breath tells us that we are paying two and a half billion to Great Britain to help her arm. What kind of silly double talk is this? What difference does it make to a Government on the verge of bankruptcy whether we call the two and a half billions Marshall-plan or military aid? It's all in the same pot, and we American citizens pay it while we draft the best of our young men to do the fighting not only in Asia, but, if Truman has his way, in Europe as well.

Truman cries "Wolf! Wolf!" and declares an emergency when there is no emergency save the unpreparedness which grew out of the politicking and inefficiency of his own administration and the high command of the Armed Forces, which spent fifty billions in 5 years to achieve a state of unpreparedness. It is not possible to cry "emergency" again and again and again. What, therefore, happens when a real emergency arrives?

What is it we are trying to do? Whither are we bound? Why do we go on calling Communists in this country Communists instead of what they are—a Soviet Russian fifth column of saboteurs. We cannot meet any situation or even save ourselves so long as we deal with hypocrisies, deceits, and secret agreements designed to sell the American people a bill of goods under false pretenses. Or is all this because Stalin, before the whole world, has made fools of certain high officials at the very top of our Government?

Suspension of the Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H. R. 256, providing for the suspension of the copper-import tax for the duration of the national emergency.

The following editorial from the December 22, 1950, issue of the Waterbury, (Conn.) Republican, and the accompanying letter from the C. R. Norgren Co. of Denver, Colo., are particularly pertinent to the need for rapid enactment of that legislation.

EXPLANATION DUE

We hope that every Member of the United States Senate who voted against suspension of the copper tariff when it was brought up again Wednesday is prepared to answer for his action.

Every Senator who voted against the copper bill should be prepared to explain why he was willing to approve a measure which will add millions of dollars a year to the cost of defense material.

Each Senator who shouted his opposition in the voice vote that killed this legislation should be ready to explain his willingness to risk a shortage of strategic materials at a time of national emergency in order to satisfy the political demands of the copper bloc.

The legislators who killed the chances of the Connecticut copper measure should be ready to explain why they favored a policy which risks diverting South American copper to users who won't necessarily be helping the United States in a military showdown that might confront us any minute.

They should be prepared to explain why they favor a policy which is designed to deplete American copper reserves rather than to conserve them against a time of even greater need.

The opponents of the copper bill should have some explanation of why they were willing to support a policy which helps the Reds in South America by driving a diplomatic wedge between the United States and Chile.

Unless the state of world affairs begins to show some improvement pretty soon these economic Pollyannas are going to have some tall explaining to do.

C. A. NORGREN CO.,
Denver, Colo., January 11, 1951.

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Representative, Connecticut, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I have been informed that you have been actively striving to eliminate the import duty on copper which was reinacted this past summer. I have written many Congressmen and Senators with respect to this matter and those of us in industry are totally at a loss to justify import duty on copper which is in short supply and which is selling at the highest price in history.

On the contrary, we fe l that copper should be brought in here in the greatest possible abundance from every source or earth in order to reduce the drain on ou: own natural resources. Copper is not an expendable item in our economy. We only have a few producers of any consequence in the United States. Marginal mines should not be considered as a source to fill the breach. The best they could possibly do would be a token tonnage, and, although I am fully in favor of developing these mines to see what their capabilities are, we know that they cannot be great.

Most of all, we are concerned with the fact that if we go on treating copper as an industry to be protected under prevailing prices we are merely hastening the day when we will become a mineralogical desert so far as this strategic material is concerned. Patriotically, the thing to do is to exhaust every foreign source of supply and conserve our own. Then, too, the addition of the 2-cent import duty is terribly confusing. Because of the short supply and world demand the importer merely adds the 2 cents so that we receive invoices for domestic copper on a net basis and imported copper plus 2 cents, which, of course, makes cost accounting a very difficult problem.

Then, too, to further support the validity of bringing in all of the copper we possibly can is the fact that copper is definitely being sold on the black and gray market and we are asked by people, whom we had assumed to be perfectly respectful, to pay as much as 10 cents a pound more for this material when they purchase it from the hoarders. The same reasoning applies to zinc, tin, and lead. It is a sad commentary on the intelligence of the American people when they do not treat these compelling matters dealing with the ultimate preservation of our economy in a manner that makes just a little sense.

We are commending you highly on your efforts and sincerely hope that you will have some success in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. NORGREN CO.,
CARL A. NORGREN,
President.

Waste by Nondefense Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, presents dismal prospects for the taxpayers of this country who

are now faced with the certainty of additional sharp tax increases in the near future.

No one familiar with the attitude of most of the nondefense agencies since last June had any reason to expect that they would voluntarily accept the President's assertion in his message of January 8 that, "it, the Government, must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities." But it is shocking to learn of the determined resistance of certain Federal agencies to anything resembling ordinary prudence, to say nothing of rigid economy.

A glaring example is contained in the Department of Agriculture's proposals for the continued purchase of wholesome food commodities.

It intends to use $323,975,000 in the period between July 1, 1950, and June 30, 1952, to buy unknown quantities of butter, cheese, dried milk, and eggs.

It estimates the payment of $38,402,657 just to store these four commodities during that period.

It expects to take losses on sales of these commodities in the amount of $81,093,000.

This $443,470,657 would pay for the construction of the new large aircraft carrier in the bill passed by the House today, for 30 modern Navy fighter planes, and 85 modern Navy attack planes and still have enough to construct a heavy cruiser and two new-type destroyers to accompany the carrier.

I hope and believe that the Appropriations Committee will bring this kind of insane and inexcusable waste to an abrupt end. But I think this would be even more certain if an aroused public were to make its voice heard by the executive department.

I do not have the slightest doubt that further study of the budget will reveal demands of many other Federal agencies not even remotely connected with our national defense and security. It is a difficult task to ferret these out in the 1,495 pages of fine print in the budget. But it must be done. The public is entitled to the full facts as to this continuing flagrant indifference and "government as usual" policy.

Genocide Outlawed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "Genocide Outlawed":

GENOCIDE OUTLAWED

The last war produced no more horrible chapters than the Lidice massacre, the Nazi gas-extermination camps, the "selective" sterilization programs. The Korean War, where a group of American prisoners were slaughtered at a general's direction, indicates the urge to mass racial killings will recur with every new conflict.

As of yesterday, however, genocide for the first time is a crime under international law. Ratified by the twentieth nation 90 days ago, the United Nations measure is now in force and requires signatories to pass laws providing imprisonment or death for persons convicted of killing or inflicting bodily or mental harm on a racial or religious group.

No one stands above this law. It applies to rulers, public officials, private citizens or any group. Nations which do not ratify need not set up enforcement machinery, but they are obligated to obey the injunction against killing, on penalty of being cited before the UN and the international court of justice. Nations refusing to act against genocide can be cut off from UN services, including the World Bank.

More than any other one man, credit must go to Raphael Lemkin, a Yale law professor whose Polish parents and 47 relatives were slain in the gas chambers of Auschwitz. Reared on a Polish farm, he rose to be public prosecutor in Warsaw. He quit in 1933 to practice law privately and to campaign against the genocide—he coined the word—he had seen in World War I.

He pleaded before the League of Nations and in the European capitals without result. With formation of the UN, he persuaded delegates of Cuba, Panama, and India to present a resolution calling for a treaty against genocide. Lemkin supervised, without official status, the drawing of the treaty, then saw it adopted by the general assembly on December 9, 1948. Even Russia and the satellites went along probably for propaganda reasons. None, however, has ratified the convention.

Today, Lemkin, at 49, is broke, in debt, and in bad health; but jubilant at his victory. He holds no hope this generation will see strict, universal enforcement of the law, but he is convinced the third generation will. When that day comes, let us hope, he may get the acclaim he deserves.

Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with remarks which I made today regarding a bill to permit the President to veto single items in appropriation bills, I include two editorials, one from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and one from the Rochester Times-Union, calling attention in a forceful and effective manner to the imperative need today for drastic reductions in nondefense, nonessential expenditures.

The editorials follow:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

IF FAMILY RUNS WILD ON SPENDING—WHAT?

Papa is the nominal head of the house and he has a few extravagances. Mama is the one who controls the purse. She is a warm-hearted person with several children and a host of relatives who look to her for some financial help.

Papa earns $8,500 a year and he manages to keep some of the money for himself. He likes fancy neckties, an occasional snort with the boys and he is a sucker for all kinds of fishing gear. Mama looks on with a tolerant eye but she cannot resist the pleas of the children or the plaintive wails of those relatives. The result is that papa has a troublesome note in a finance company; he's in arrears on several household purchases and he's getting something of a reputation as a week-end cadger at the factory. If he keeps on this way, and if he is able to continue his borrowings, he will die a bankrupt.

He might, of course, make the big decision, decide to quit his little extravagances, exercise his authority as head of the family, and see to it that mama doesn't have such a free hand with the purse. That's a difficult decision. It means he would miss his recreations, some old friends would drop him, and mama would be fit to be tied.

Right there we have a picture of the Presidency and the Congress. The administration has its extravagances. It makes all sorts of fair-weather friends by free spending. Congress, the mama, has the finest, sleekest lot of hanger-on relatives you ever saw. They have it good.

Papa faces a crisis right now. He is loaded down with expenses he cannot control. He is afraid to ask mama to cut her expenditures. The two are headed for bankruptcy and don't know what to do about it.

When we prepared for World War I our national debt was about $1,000,000,000. It was forty billion when we started into World War II. As we rally for defense of the country again, the debt is more than two hundred and fifty billion.

Most of the time in the last 20 years we have spent more money on Government than the Government could collect. This year our budget is about $50,000,000,000. Next year it could go as high as $75,000,000,000. Taxes of all sorts will be increased but we will have a deficit of at least $25,000,000,000. If we were to continue such deficits over a period of 10 years—and that is possible—we would have another debt of $250,000,000,000, doubling what we already owe. No quibbling about who owes whom will ever erase the fact that in interest charges alone we would face a staggering yearly cost.

Now the only place the administration can save is in nondefense spending. The Budget Director will tell you of fixed charges—pensions, interest, and the like. If you were to ask him about those nondefense costs in agriculture, in superwelfare activities, in foreign relief, he might smile wanly and say that, of course, he couldn't control those figures. Mama, the Congress, runs that program and she just can't bear to cut off the nephews, cousins, uncles, and aunts who have been depending upon her all these years.

If you think it is time to operate a common-sense financial program, go to the Congress with your demands and suggestions. If you think mama is a trifle nutty, tell her so. If enough of us tell her so she'll begin to believe we might be right. And if she has not gone completely, financially insane, she might try to mend her ways.

[From the Rochester Times-Union of December 27, 1950]

AS WE SEE IT—TRUMAN LEADERSHIP URGED IN FINDING DEFENSE MONEY

Defense spending will take $75,000,000,000 next year. The most optimistic guess on revenue, including new taxes, is about $51,000,000,000, leaving a gap of $25,000,000,000.

Since defense spending at this rate or higher will continue for a protracted period, steps to close this $25,000,000,000 annual gap must be immediate and drastic.

Unless the free world's guns and tanks are backed by a sound economy in the United States, neither the spiritual nor physical force to resist communism can be mustered.

Soundness has to be attained by deep and immediate cuts in non-defense spending.

The President has said that it will be cut "to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort."

Taking his cue from that, Senator BYRD in a letter to the President last Friday proposed that a beginning be made with cuts of $7,600,000,000 in domestic civilian programs including the postal deficit, by curbing the notorious, extravagant use of civilian manpower by the armed forces, and by cutting to one-half billion the foreign economic aid programs which are scheduled to end next year anyway.

But this is the least important part of Senator BYRD'S letter. These immediate steps would close less than one-third of the gap.

Federal spending is so enormous because the total is an accumulation of commitments made by laws setting up programs that become a continuing drain on the Treasury from year to year.

Senator BYRD therefore suggests to the President that his budget proposals recommend to Congress action to "repeal, reduce, or suspend" enough commitments to meet the need. He calls on the President to exert his leadership for joint legislative-executive action to close the money gap.

This is what to do and how to do it. Reductions in non-defense spending of the size and scope required can be made only by reexamining all the commitments made since the Federal Government started to mushroom. This reexamination cannot be effective without the leadership of the President.

The security of the United States and the free world is as dependent upon financial soundness at home as upon strength in the field.

China's Red Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Father Raymond J. De Jaegher, from the Freeman for January 8, 1951. Father Raymond De Jaegher went to China from his native Belgium in 1930. From 1937, when the Communists occupied the country of An-Kwo—Hopeh—he had ample opportunity to know their generals and to observe their methods. After 2 years as a Japanese prisoner during the war he returned to his mission. Since leaving China in 1949 he has lectured widely in Europe and the United States on social conditions under the Communists. The article follows:

CHINA'S RED ARMY

(By Raymond J. De Jaegher)

Every soldier in the ranks of the Chinese Communists believes it is his mission to liberate the world from "imperialism." First, the fight of Mao Tse-tung's armies was directed against Japanese imperialism; then against Chiang Kai-shek and the National Government of China, represented to them as "imperialistic." Now the Red Chinese hordes have been loosed against alleged American "imperialism" in Asia. The enemy held before the Chinese Communists by their leaders has changed his guise like a chameleon, according to directives from Moscow. But always these soldiers are prepared for an international struggle, to create not only a "new China," but a new world.

The tactics of the Chinese Red armies reminded me of mercury. Strike a pool of mercury on a table, and it will seem to be destroyed as a unit. But soon the droplets, scattered in all directions, will roll back together again.

Before an enemy superior in number or armaments, the Communist troops would scatter very fast. Then they would reassemble immediately after the departure of the enemy. If the enemy is not strong, speedy mobile units will arrive in far greater number than the opposing forces, will strike unexpectedly, and will always win the battle. The Chinese Communist soldiers are trained for swift action in guerrilla warfare.

Once I visited General Lu Cheng-Tsao in Chen Wei (Po-Yeh) in the early morning. His forces consisted of about 50,000 men of the Central Hopeh's armies. In one night they had assembled from the southern part of Shulu some 100 lis (35 miles) to the south. Already units were set up in villages all around, and were linked with the general by telephone.

The secret services of the Chinese Reds were very good. They always knew the exact force of the Japanese along the railroads and highways, and all about the enemy's city garrisons, even if he changed his units very often. When they saw the Japanese concentrating their strength for a mopping-up operation, the Communist forces would move into the mountains or other parts of the country where the enemy had only small garrisons at that time.

When the Communists attacked, it was always in overwhelming strength, greatly outnumbering their opponents. They would fight until the enemy had no more ammunition and would be obliged to surrender.

The formation of the armies was significant. First always came some elements of the civilian population that the Communists wanted to finish off; these men were poorly armed. For example, to take strategically important Kao Pei Tien, along the Peiping-Hankow railroad, the Communists tied local peasants together by their arms in threes—even some women—and gave them a few grenades to throw in front of them when they were marched against the enemy. These poor people were sacrificed just for the purpose of wasting the enemy's ammunition.

Behind the masses of the people came the "min ping," the local militias. The Reds always give some military training to their civilian populations. The best among the village militias will be taken into the regular army, where the danger is not so great and a soldier's family enjoys many advantages. Hence the boys in the villages will work hard to improve their militia.

Bringing up the rear are the Red shock troops, who arrive at the end of the battle to deliver the final blow. Their attack is launched only when the first two groups have been practically annihilated or have found a way to slip out of the danger zone. By this time the enemy has been surrounded, and cannot get further supplies of ammunition except by air—which is very difficult when a contingent has only a small space in which to defend itself. The shock troops I saw were composed of very young men, strong physically and well equipped. They are trained in mountain bases from which reinforcements are sent continuously to keep the units at the same strength.

The Communists used to send word before an attack, warning of their strength and announcing that the enemy would be permitted to retreat if they left behind part of their ammunition. Many times I have seen boxes of ammunition left for the Reds by the Japanese, particularly at Ta Ly Ko Chwang and at Ta Wu Niu, both in the district of An-Kwo.

Most of the great battles for the possession of Chinese cities were fought during the night—to prevent action by planes—and at some distance from the city. For example, the battle of Peiping, one of the fiercest in North China, took place in two small towns between Peiping and Kalgan; the combined Communist forces numbered ten times those of their adversaries.

The three qualities that the Communist leaders praise most in their soldiers are: Yeh Yen, eyes that can see during the night; Tieh Kiao, feet strong as iron, trained to travel fast; Chen Hsien Tou, a stomach that requires little food.

The officers of China's Red Army are nearly all Communist Party members, accustomed to obeying rigid party discipline without a word of discussion. Only party members can be promoted quickly. The officers live on the same level with their soldiers, except that they have more responsibilities. When there is no fighting, officers must meet with their men every day to give them special ideological training, explaining why they are fighting for a new China. Most of the soldiers are peasants who have left their homes for the first time and have no desire to fight. But they are systematically indoctrinated with the idea that they must battle for a great international cause. Infiltration of the Nationalist armies by secret agents helped bring about the Communist victories. During the war against Japan these agents were sent in large numbers to "volunteer" for service with Chiang's armies. They even penetrated the national military academies, where they showed ardent patriotism and tried to work themselves up to key positions—from which they could spy and propagandize. Inside the armies Communists created cells to spread propaganda.

Here is an example of the effectiveness of this Red under-cover work: Immediately after VJ-day, Gen. Sun Lien-Chung, commander of the Eleventh War Zone, came to Peiping to accept the surrender of the Japanese Army in North China. He was appointed governor of Hopei Province. A brave officer and an honest man, he had won important victories over the Japanese. But Communist elements had worked hard among his staff. His chief of military operations, Gen. Sie Che-Yuan, was in the service of the Communist Party. And at the head of the planning committee for Hopei Province was Yu Sui-Ts'ing, a former Protestant pastor who was linked with Gen. Li Chi-Shen, now a prominent Communist.

Gen. Ch'eu Fong-Ch'eng, who served under General Sun, had a leading Communist Party member as his chief of staff, but was unaware of it. This chief of staff had all General Ch'eu's bodyguards replaced by Communists who could take control of the provincial government in Paoting, where General Ch'eu was garrison commander.

Such men in high positions under General Sun were responsible for all his defeats in north China. When these activities inside headquarters were finally discovered, it was too late. Most of the territory under his command in Hopei Province had been lost, and even a part of the territory in the strategical triangle of Peiping, Tientsin, and Paoting. An important railway junction controlling four provinces, Shih Chia Chwang, had been lost, and Generalissimo Chiang was obliged to remove General Sun from his command. More than 2,000 generals and officials were on the inside of this vast Communist plot.

The same tactics were used by the Communists in Mukden and Tsinchow, which led to the disaster of the national armies in Manchuria. The fall of Mukden was China's Stalingrad; its loss marked the beginning of Communist victory.

In the battle of Peiping in 1948–49 the over-all commander of North China's armies, Gen. Fu Tso-Yi, had strong support from the people. It is true that he made a few mistakes in the great battle of Peiping and Kalgan. But a major reason for his defeat was

the fact that one of his trusted generals, who had been with him for 20 years, was a top Communist, Gen. Teng Pao-Shan, who revealed his true identity to his commander in the midst of the battle. General Fu also discovered too late that his secret code officer was a Communist.

Through their secret agents the Communists always knew the exact strength of the National armies and of the neighboring garrisons. They then surrounded these small garrisons and took them one after the other with all their forces. They treated the Nationalist prisoners well. Giving them a few dollars, they would send them back home or to the National armies just for propaganda purposes. The Communists also distributed cards, telling the Nationalist soldier or officer that if he would come over to them with the card and his weapons, he would be welcomed and given the same grade and position in the Red Army.

Mao's men had a high-sounding slogan, "Chinese will not fight Chinese," and another, "No more civil war," which they used in their attempts to demoralize the National armies. But they never pointed out that the Communists had been the first to attack the National troops and the first to wage civil war.

A slogan the Chinese Communists use among themselves, however, is: "To win, three-tenths military strength is needed, and seven-tenths political and propaganda strength." Communist newspapers, books, and leaflets were left by the Red propagandists among the troops of the National armies in a continuous effort to break down morale.

The National Government of China allowed Communist newspapers to be published in Chungking, the Nationalist capital, but never would the Communists allow a Nationalist newspaper to be published in Communist territory. Communists everywhere preach about the freedom of the press, but they do not practice it. In China they had "bamboo curtains" from one Communist region to another, and kept strict control over publications in their regions. But if the free Chinese wanted some control over Communist publications, all the Reds and their sympathizers in that region would protest against "imperialistic and oppressive measures taken against freedom of thought."

A young Catholic boy of Tungiu bought, shortly after the war with Japan, a copy of Chiang Kai-shek's book, "China's Destiny." The Communists discovered that he had the book and immediately executed him as "a special agent of the Kuomintang."

A top Chinese Communist once said to me: "We Communists have three great enemies; first, the United States of America; second, the Catholic Church; third, Nationalist China under Chiang Kai-shek." But he immediately added that within China the order was not the same, but should be classified: first, Chiang Kai-shek; second, the United States of America; third, the Catholic Church. All the Chinese Red leaders whom I met from 1937 up to 1949 have always recognized that they owe their highest allegiance to Soviet Russia.

Unity Is Built on Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following excellent editorial by Mr. Cliff Ziegler from the Carlton-Yamhill (Oreg.) Review of January 11, 1951:

UNITY IS BUILT ON CONFIDENCE

President Truman has declared a state of emergency. We are told that communism threatens our very existence as a Nation. He asks for unity and singleness of purpose in fighting aggression.

With this we are in complete accord. For some years now we have been fighting over controversial domestic questions: the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, CVA.

If we are to win the big war we must stop these little wars. Therefore, for the sake of achieving unity, we propose that the President issue a statement that for the duration of the emergency all plans to put these ideas into effect will be dropped.

In fact, we as American citizens should demand this pledge from him. It is our right and it is his duty.

This is no time for petty politics or petty politicians. We cannot afford to be Democrats, Republicans, or New Dealers as long as a state of emergency exists.

Regardless of the merits their advocates claim for them, America has grown great without the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, or the CVA. It can exist a few more years without them.

Inasmuch as they only serve to divide us, let's put them on the shelf for the duration.

The Army's View of the Air-Ground Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army has recently published a review of what the air-ground team has been accomplishing in Korea, and a prediction of what it will be able to accomplish as the result of the present buildup of our Armed Forces. In these days in which we still hear criticism of the United States Air Force for what it did or did not do in Korea, it is interesting to learn what the Army thinks about the Air Force. The article I refer to makes that very clear. The Army thinks the Air Force is great.

As an Army man myself, I have been surprised at the attacks on the Air Force made by a lot of people who ought to know better. The air-ground team in World War II was a winning team, with a know-how developed from months of hard campaigning. The air-ground team that is operating in Korea is also a great team. The Army knows it, and says so.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me the latest issue of Officer's Call, a magazine published monthly by the Department of the Army to furnish materials intended to assist commanders in maintaining the highest standards of integrity and professional ethics, and to inform all officers on significant military matters and national and international events. The latest issue of Officer's Call is devoted to just one thing—the article on The Air-Ground Team.

This article is a review of what has happened in Korea, including the difficulties that result from the peculiar nature of the Korean fighting. The article points out that one big lesson Korea holds for Army officers is that we generally require a fuller understanding of how to use tactical aviation. The Army and the Air Force, even before Korea, initiated a joint training program that calls for participation by every combat battalion in the United States in a type field exercise involving close air support with live bombs. The Korean situation disrupted the program but it has put new emphasis on the need for this type of training. The recently established Army air support center at Fort Bragg, N. C., will do much to bring about the widespread understanding of the doctrine and application of tactical aviation.

One of the most helpful things about this article in Officer's Call is that it points out the fundamental relationship of tactical aviation to ground warfare. The airplane, used tactically, is a new weapon for the queen of battles. Just as the infantry had to develop cooperation with the artillery, and mutual confidence founded on understanding of each other's problems and capabilities, so the Army today is developing the principles that must apply to the use of tactical air support. "We always use the most economical means to do the job," the Army says. Air support can be that means. "We are today," says this review, "on the threshold of opportunities in the field of air-ground development such as we have never before encountered." I am glad to find this recognition of the value of Air Force support to Army operations expressed so clearly and forcibly by an Army spokesman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article on "The Air-Ground Team" from volume II, No. 9, of Officer's Call, an official publication of the Department of the Army.

The article, with illustrations omitted, is as follows:

THE AIR-GROUND TEAM

In its never-ending quest for weapons of greater mobility, range, and firepower, our Army is placing increased emphasis on the airplane to support ground troops.

The airman and the soldier have made great strides in learning to work together. But both agree on the need for continued improvement of doctrine and techniques to exploit fully the combat potentialities of the air-ground team.

During World War II, the air-ground team came of age.

As the war progressed, tactical air support played an increasingly important role in the success of ground troops. To be sure, not all air-ground operations were perfect. But there is no denying that support from the air gave the ground forces an added powerful punch that speeded our victory.

Members of the air-ground team knew how to work with each other and what to expect from each other. Ground commanders were accustomed to count on prompt, efficient air support when they needed it. This support was often as smooth-working as artillery—which is saying a lot.

A priceless ingredient of air-ground operations in World War II was teamwork based on know-how built up during months of hard campaigning. The practical knowledge was the sum of many skills, distributed widely

among the agencies that made up the air-ground team.

After the war, a combination of factors permitted only limited training in air-ground operations. Army combat units and tactical air support units had little opportunity to work with each other.

When the Korean fighting began, practical skill in applying air-ground techniques had all but diminished to a lost art in comparison with late World War II standards. Moreover, initial shortages of critical equipment, key men, and other deficiencies tended to hinder smooth air-ground operations in the early days of the Korean campaign.

Fortunately, we were able to overcome these disadvantages—often through hurried improvisation. Despite handicaps, the air-ground team developed in Korea has taken a heavy toll of the Communist enemy.

AIR-GROUND ACTION IN KOREA

In Korea, air power has supported ground troops in virtually every way possible. Because of our immediate air supremacy, the Air Force assumed a close support role almost from the start. Air support was especially welcomed by those ground units whose normal artillery had not yet arrived.

Weather permitting, ground troops received almost continuous bombing and strafing support. As fighting progressed, our amphibious and airborne landings were screened with fighter and bomber protection. Troop carriers flew soldiers to and from Korea (the first ground units arrived there by air), transported paratroopers, and brought in cargo rivaling the amount of the Berlin airlift.

Most of the infantrymen and tankers who have fought up and down the rugged Peninsula of Korea are now combat veterans. They know that their own skill and courage plus that of their artillerymen and other ground units played the biggest part in stopping the Korean Communists and then striking back. But they also know they could not have succeeded without real air suport.

Many of our doughboys fighting in Korea have never met a pilot—unless one was shot down and landed in their lines. They do not know the airmen as they do the artillerymen and the tankers. But they have gained a real appreciation for what our fliers have done and are doing. Day and night—sometimes actually around the clock—Allied air power has blasted the Communist army. Korea is today dotted with the wreckage of Red trucks, tanks, and guns. Against heavy odds, many Allied ground attacks have succeeded largely because of air suport.

Soldiers fighting in Korea appreciate what the term "air support" means. Along with their own fire support, they have learned to count on it when they size up a job. They have learned, too, their own responsibility for the success of air-ground operations.

SOME AIR-GROUND DIFFICULTIES IN KOREA

Our top military leaders share the front-line soldiers' enthusiasm about what the airmen have done in Korea. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, summed it up early in September after a visit to the combat area:

"Like the Army, the Air Force had to switch from peace to wartime operation overnight. Gen. Walton Walker testifies that, but for what the fliers did those first few days, we would have lost Korea."

This is typical of what other observers have said about air support in Korea. They praise air units operating there. This does not mean, however, that air operations have been perfect, any more than the Army's have been. General Collins went on to explain:

"At the beginning, there was confusion over air support. But with the inevitable early creaking, the situation has steadily improved. Special Air Force teams rushed from the States to coordinate close support of ground troops; we now have one with each American division and have assigned others to Republic of Korea units. Now the system works."

EARLY DEFICIENCIES

Many of the "kinks" in the early Korean air operations stemmed from the same sort of difficulties the Army faced on the ground. Far East air groups were there to support the occupation. Initial shortages of trained men and communications equipment to work with infantry units existed partly because of the occupation mission, and partly because of budgetary ceilings which had limited the programs of all the services. At any rate, recently authorized budgetary increases for our Armed Forces should correct deficiencies of this kind.

Other difficulties grew out of the peculiar nature of the Korean fighting. For example, the first several weeks involved a delaying action on our part. Although not new in our thinking, this difficult operation has been relatively rare in our experience.

This is one of the problems that developed: the bomb line set for our own troops' safety actually proved a disadvantage in a fluid situation where the enemy, always probing for weak spots, could get between it and our own positions. (A bomb line is a precautionary line designated by ground troops beyond which air attacks may be made without clearance from ground forces.) Here the enemy was relatively immune until the bomb line could be lifted or special permission to bomb inside it could be obtained. While points of contact seesawed along a line marked by deep salients, the conventional bomb line became a somewhat unrealistic safety measure. This and similar difficulties have emphasized points which will need consideration in improving our air-ground techniques.

WE NEED PRACTICE

One big lesson Korea holds for Army officers is that we generally require a fuller understanding of how to use tactical aviation. Specifically, every combat troop leader must know what targets are appropriate for tactical aircraft and how to get air support. We need to understand also the limitations of tactical aviation and under what circumstances we cannot expect air support at all.

An obvious corollary is that we need actual practice—as much as we can get—in working with the air-control system used in obtaining and insuring the accuracy of air strikes.

KOREA MAY NOT BE A PROTOTYPE

We should be careful against extending the lessons of Korea too far. The fighting there has been a special type of warfare. The Korean Communists have used an odd combination of old and new weapons, old and new tactics. We have used many weapons of World War II, and the tactics our combat veterans knew have had to be modified at times. Future fighting in which we may be involved will not necessarily be like that in Korea.

Another thing to remember is that in Korea we have been almost unopposed in the air: This has permitted an unusually large part of our air strength to be used in close support of ground units. Further, in the limited geographical area involved, even the bombing of targets farthest removed from the battle area has been largely tactical. Certainly strategic bombing, to the limits of its present capabilities, has not been involved.

Korea has given us a good test of our air doctrine and techniques but not a complete or conclusive test.

STRATEGIC AIR POWER

In this issue we are concerned primarily which tactical aviation and what it does to assist ground troops. But we cannot understand its role without having some knowledge of what strategic aviation can accomplish. The two overlap in a number of ways.

For this reason we need not become involved in complicated attempts to define each category. The distinction is sufficiently clear for our present discussion if we think of these differences: strategic aviation includes aircraft and other facilities intended primarily for long-range bombardment with the most destructive types of weapons; tactical aviation operates at shorter ranges, generally using smaller aircraft and less powerful weapons against a wider variety of targets. Strategic air strikes at sources of enemy strength; tactical air denies effective application of his strength in a given battle area.

Besides the functional relationship between strategic and tactical air power, there are two additional aspects of strategic aviation which touch on our discussion. First, we are today devoting a very material part of our war potential to the building of a strategic air force second to none. This obviously affects the size of our tactical air forces. Second, a successful strategic air campaign, though it may not quickly bring about a decision, can contribute greatly to the ultimate success of our land and naval forces by weakening enemy means of resistance.

TACTICAL AIR IN EUROPE, WORLD WAR II

When we think of "air support of ground troops," many of us may visualize fighter bombers screaming down on an enemy strong point, blasting it to rubble, and thus clearing the way for the tactical success of infantry and armor. This type of close support is quite naturally the first concern of the embattled doughboy or tanker. But it is by no means the only kind of support tactical air gives to ground troops. This becomes evident when we review the air offensive in Europe during World War II.

We know the story of the German Luftwaffe. From the high point of its might in 1940, it was turned away over England by the Royal Air Force, and then gradually beaten back and reduced in strength by the growing Allied air offensive. By early 1944 the turning point was passed. German aircraft production was no longer able to keep up with losses. Hitler largely wasted the rest of his air strength on tasks of secondary importance and thus helped reduce the Luftwaffe's effectiveness.

In the last few months before the Normandy invasion, more and more of our fighters and shorter-range bombers concentrated on German-occupied airfields in France. The Luftwaffe's remaining power was rapidly destroyed. By D-day it was impotent against the Allied landings. One of the primary objectives of our air campaign had been achieved; at the time of the invasion and afterward, we enjoyed almost total air superiority in Europe. Most of our tactical air forces in that theater were able to operate thereafter in support of ground troops.

During the last few weeks before D-day, our tactical air forces also systematically knocked out rail and highway bridges along the Seine River from the English Channel to the outskirts of Paris. As the invasion began, more bridges were cut to the south and east of Paris.

SUPPORTING THE BEACHHEAD

A large part of the German armies were thus cut off in western France and separated from their sources of supply and reinforcement. Trapped in this area, they were subjected to a terrific pounding from fighter-bombers. Rail lines, trains, and convoys within the area were blasted so that movement by day was virtually impossible, and night movement was difficult. This series of air operations, designed to isolate the battlefield, made possible an Allied buildup in the beachhead much faster than the German commanders could assemble forces to counter it.

When our buildup reached sufficient strength to permit a breakout, the air forces

again played a major role. All available aircraft blasted an area along the St. Lo-Periers road about 6,000 yards wide by 2,500 yards deep. The blow fell on July 25, 1944. More than 1,500 heavy bombers dropped about 4,800 tons of bombs on the target area; approximately 400 medium bombers and 350 fighter-bombers worked it over with napalm and fragmentation bombs and strafing.

This unusually heavy air effort on a target immediately in front of friendly ground troops is hardly a typical mission. Yet it is illustrative of many hundreds of strikes—most of them on a smaller scale—delivered in close support of Allied army units in World War II.

THREE MAIN TASKS

The events we have just summarized demonstrate the three main objectives of our tactical air forces: gain and maintain air superiority—isolate the battlefield (also called interdiction)—and give close support to ground troops.

These three types of activity, sometimes given numerical designations and referred to as phases of an air campaign, have been the subject of occasional misinterpretation. Let's see if we can clarify them.

In the first place, all three phases may be going on at the same time. At least initially, a large part of our tactical air strength in a theater probably will be engaged in countering the attacks of enemy planes. This air defense complements the more aggressive missions aimed at seeking out and destroying enemy aircraft and air facilities. These tasks contribute directly toward gaining air superiority, and their ultimate objective is not reached until enemy air power is destroyed.

Our air superiority is by no means a concern of air forces alone. If the enemy controls the sky, our ground forces also must operate under great handicaps.

This does not mean that our aircraft concentrate solely on gaining air superiority while enemy planes contest us for control of the skies. The decision as to how much air effort will be allotted in a given period to air superiority missions and how much to isolating the battlefield or close support activities is made after weighing the facts. Phases overlap; we do not wait for one phase to end before we start another. Even during the fight for air superiority, for example, conditions may be such that aircraft also may be used in close support fighting.

Additionally, the term "air superiority" is a relative one. The degree of air superiority necessary for success varies with different operations and different conditions. It may mean control of the air for only short periods in specific areas. It may mean control over only a part of a combat area.

For example, consider the critical phase of an amphibious attack. When troops are disembarking and coming ashore, we need a much greater measure of air control over the segment of hostile shore involved than would be necessary after the troops have secured the beachhead. Another difficult operation demanding a high order of local air superiority is the capture and buildup of an airhead.

RECONNAISSANCE AND AIR TRANSPORT ROLES

Besides the actual combat operations of its fighters and bombers, tactical aviation has other important functions.

One of these, reconnaissance, is a continuing, day-and-night job. Modern fast reconnaissance planes cover areas far beyond the range of the ground soldier's patrols and observation posts, or even his liaison planes. Besides actually reporting what they have seen on their flights, reconnaissance pilots take photographs of several kinds, day or night. Also, through the use of special electronic equipment, limited reconnaissance can be carried out in bad weather. Both air and ground commanders benefit from the information these missions obtain. It has been said that up to 80 percent of an army's tactical information of the enemy is gathered by reconnaissance aircraft.

Although troop-carrier units usually are not a part of a tactical air command, air transport support may be vital in directly furthering land operations. Normally, troop-carrier units are theater forces and are not assigned to tactical air forces except in some cases for administrative purposes. This assignment under theater command permits their exploitation for strategic as well as tactical missions.

AIRBORNE NEEDS

Airborne warfare demands large numbers of passenger-cargo type planes. An army today must always be ready to exploit opportunities to react to emergencies requiring use of airborne troops. Once these troops are committed, they must be supported by air until relieved or reinforced overland.

We also are relying more on air transport in carrying out other ground operations. This is one of the ways we hope to make up in mobility what we may lack in total manpower and other resources. Troops and equipment as well as urgently needed supplies often can reach their destination in time only if moved by air. The vital role of air transport in the Korean campaign offers the most recent example.

Then there is the great morale importance, as well as the practical military value, in evacuating wounded men by air, taking them quickly to areas where the best medical care can be provided. Time saved means lives saved.

These jobs and many more are carried out by the troop carrier units assigned to the theater. The Army is now organizing its own special light air-transport forces. Army helicopter companies are being formed for the speedy movement of men, equipment, and supplies.

TACTICAL AIR ORGANIZATION

To exploit the speed, range, and versatility of aircraft, Air Force organization stresses the principle of flexibility. In general, units are standardized but may vary greatly in strength and composition. An air commander enjoys considerable latitude in organizing his forces for a mission. Moreover, as operations progress, he usually modifies this organization to meet changing requirements.

In our typical theater setup for combat operations, a single headquarters—that of the theater commander—directs all Army, Navy, and Air Forces assigned to the theater.

Each army group in the theater is usually supported by a tactical air command. The latter's headquarters is located with that of the army group and controls all its tactical air units according to the dictates of the common mission of the army group and the tactical air command.

Each field army is supported by a tactical air force. Again, the two headquarters are together, and close coordination between air and ground action is effected. Incidentally, this is normally the lowest level at which air commanders are physically present and working directly with ground commanders. All missions of the tactical air force are controlled from this point in much the same way that fire missions of artillery batteries are controlled from their battalion fire direction center.

At levels below the Army, there are air control agencies to help coordinate requests from subordinate units and to guide planes to their targets. There are also officers to insure air-ground coordination.

TACTICAL AIR FORCE

A tactical air force normally has these major components:

A headquarters which controls all operations and integrates them with those of the supported army.

An air control group for control of planes in flight.

A reconnaissance wing, including about 18 highspeed aircraft specially equipped for day and night photography and electronic (radar) reconnaissance.

Fighter aviation, which may include one or more all-weather groups (usually 36 planes each) and 2 to 8 fighter-bomber groups (equipped with jet or conventional fighters—total planes may vary from 250 to 800).

In addition, there are communication, engineer, transportation, and other units.

Detailed discussion of our newest aircraft's technical characteristics is not appropriate here. However, for our present purposes, we may think in terms of fighter planes with speeds ranging from a minimum of 185 to a maximum of 700 miles per hour, armed with 6 or more .50 caliber machine guns and carrying two 1,000 pound bombs or about twenty 5-inch rockets, or various combinations of rockets and smaller bombs. These aircraft may be used for air combat or strafing and tactical bombardment missions within a combat radius varying from 300 to 500 miles, depending on the type of plane and how it is loaded.

These data, purposely given in very general form, are useful only as reflecting in a general way the capabilities of our tactical air forces.

CLOSE SUPPORT MISSIONS

We are familiar with the artillery plan that usually accompanies a division or corps operation order. In this plan, provision is made for using every gun according to its range and effectiveness against targets in priority of their importance to the over-all commander's plan.

In the same way, the field army commander and the tactical air force commander work out a plan each day for the most effective use of air support during the next 24 hours. This close air support is integrated with the fire and movement of ground troops. Requests of lower units for air strikes in support of their contemplated operations are incorporated into the over-all air plan.

These lower-unit requests, plus necessary reconnaissance missions, often take most of the aircraft allocated for close-support missions. The rest are retained for close support on request. They are designated to operate on call of the joint operations center (JOC)—staffed by officers of the field army and tactical air force headquarters jointly—at the field army-tactical air force headquarters.

AN AIR STRIKE REQUEST

The front lines ask for an immediate air strike like any other fire-support request. Probably the front-line commander or an artillery forward observer initiates the call.

If the weapons under the control of the fire-support coordination center (FSCC) at the direct support artillery battalion cannot fire the mission, the request is sent to the division FSCC. Determining that an air strike is necessary and not having planes on air alert under its control, the division FSCC asks for an air mission by sending a request over a special net to the joint operations center (JOC). If planes are overhead on an air alert status, the procedure may be shortened. Division FSCC would probably be able to give these planes the mission by working through the G–3 air.

Corps monitors this net and could cancel the request if it is so desired. Corps silence means corps approval.

Decision to fly the mission is then up to the JOC. The air-ground operations section receives the request. If approved—normally depending on priority of effort—the request is given to the combat operations section as urgent. After accepting the request, the combat operations section issues an attack order to a tactical air unit.

Word is sent back to the front line that the mission will be flown, the estimated time

of the attack, and the type and number of planes.

The aircraft are guided to the target by a control and direction system. The tactical air control center (TACC) gets the flight under way. It is the operational headquarters for control units which will guide the flight to the target.

After the planes are airborne and moving to the target, a tactical air direction center (TADC) takes over and directs them to a tactical air control party (TACP) near the front lines. The TACP brings the planes onto the target. If the TACP is unable to direct the planes visually, a tactical air direction post (TADP) takes control, brings the planes to the target, and "fires" the mission by electronic rather than visual means.

Working with front-line units are experienced combat pilots. These forward air controllers usually are assigned so that at least one forward air control party is with each forward infantry regiment. They may operate from vehicles, or they may be aloft in light planes. In either case, their job is similar to that of forward observers in controlling artillery fire.

ARTILLERY AND TACTICAL AVIATION

We have already found the analogy with artillery convenient in describing some features of tactical aviation. This is worth pursuing further. There are important differences as well as similarities between the two forms of support.

For example, tactical aviation uses a wider variety of weapons than does artillery. These normally range from multiple .50 caliber machine guns to 1,000-pound bombs, and they are available in many combinations for different types of missions.

Tactical aircraft have ranges up to hundreds of miles. The effective range of our largest field artillery pieces is about 20 miles. But this difference may be reduced greatly by the advent of guided missiles, which will extend the striking range of ground weapons considerably beyond that of our present artillery.

THE TIME ELEMENT

An air strike requested on targets of opportunity (as distinguished from preplanned missions) normally requires more time than would an artillery fire mission on the same target. There are exceptions, of course, as in the case of planes immediately overhead on an "air alert" status. A forward air controller can direct such planes onto a target in a matter of seconds.

As a rule, however, a ground commander requiring air assistance must allow time for transmitting his request, processing it at the joint operations center, issuing orders to the air squadron, and briefing pilots. This briefing is very important. Any error of 500 yards is easy enough for a pilot to make at upward of 500 miles per hour; yet this distance may place his bomb load on friendly troops instead of on the enemy target.

In addition, the planes may have to be "run up" and readied. And unless someone has foreseen the mission with uncanny accuracy, bomb loads already on the planes may have to be modified or changed completely for the specific mission requested.

The time factor involved in "immediate" support means that, generally speaking, artillery fire offers a much quicker means of attacking emergency targets.

AVAILABILITY

Artillery is available for targets within its range 24 hours a day, in all types of weather. Tactical aircraft, on the other hand, are seriously curtailed by bad weather.

In general, air support is more powerful but also more expensive and is seldom available as generously as artillery support. As much as the front-line doughboy would like air support constantly over the battlefield, there will be times when he will have to get along without it.

Air-force tactical aircraft must be based on prepared airfields which include relatively large fixed or semifixed installations. Artillery requires positions protected from enemy small-arms fire. But these positions require no preparation, and they may be located in most any type of terrain over which the other ground arms can move.

There are times—particularly in "special operations"—when close-support aircraft may be the only means or the most effective means of destroying or neutralizing a target. In the early, critical stages of an airhead, for example, fighters and bombers will be the commander's major "artillery" support. Supporting planes are especially valuable in combating enemy tanks, the major threat to airborne soldiers. Likewise, during the initial part of an amphibious landing before artillery is ashore and emplaced, aircraft may be the only effective means of silencing enemy howitzers hidden in defilade from flat-trajectory naval guns. And both in pursuits and in retrograde movements the role of aircraft support as column cover and long-range fire power becomes increasingly important.

RULES OF EMPLOYMENT

Two simple rules governing employment of artillery as well as other ground weapons have a logical application to the use of tactical air support.

The first has to do with where we place a weapon and who controls it. The greater the range and versatility of a weapon the farther back we place it, and the higher up in the command system is its control retained.

The second concerns selection of weapons. We always use the most economical means to do the job. If mortars can handle a target, we spare the artillery; if only light artillery is needed, we hold back the medium artillery; and so on. We try not to waste our resources by using a sledge hammer to break eggs.

Applying these rules to tactical aviation, we see the logic in placing our air units and air control agencies where they can best be employed in furtherance of the common air-ground mission. We can also see why controls are set up to see that air strikes are not used against targets the artillery can handle.

TEAMWORK IS ESSENTIAL

One more analogy with artillery may prove helpful to us in understanding tactical aviation. The teamwork between artillery and its supported arms, which we take for granted today, did not always exist. Many years ago, there was a period in our Army's development when artillery-infantry cooperation was inadequate. There was lack of mutual confidence founded largely on ignorance of each other's problems and capabilities. It was not until the forward-observer system was established that a common sympathetic approach to fire-support problems was achieved. When members of the two arms lived together and fought side-by-side, these problems quickly disappeared.

Despite difficulties, air and ground units usually worked well together during World War II. They have done the same thing in Korea. In both cases, cooperation grew in an environment where the common goal was urgently clear and when airmen and soldiers lived and fought together.

Our air-ground doctrine and techniques have advanced rapidly in the few short years since air power came of age. Future common problems which airmen and ground soldiers may encounter will find ready solution in the same spirit of mutual respect that brought our infantry-armor-artillery team to its present level of effectiveness.

TODAY'S OPPORTUNITIES

We are today on the threshold of opportunities in the field of air-ground development such as we have never before encountered.

Our first postwar statement of air-ground doctrine was published in Field Manual 31-35, Air-Ground Operations (War Department, 1946). Since then, analysis of World War II lessons, and study of postwar technical developments have continued. The Tactical Air Command and the Army Field Forces, which have worked together on these studies, have just published jointly a Training Directive for Air-Ground Operations (September 1, 1950). This directive amplifies FM 31-35 and will be used for training within the Army and the Tactical Air Command. After the doctrine and techniques set forth in this directive have been tested in field operations, a final version is expected to be published jointly by the Departments of Army and Air Force.

Even before Korea, the Army and the Air Force had initiated a joint training program calling for every combat battalion in the United States to participate in a type field exercise involving close air support with live bombs. Although the Korean situation disrupted this program—partly because of the emergency movement of units—we may look for renewed emphasis on this type of training in the near future.

The Army has established at Fort Bragg an agency known as the Army Air Support Center. This center will help the Chief, Army Field Forces, in conducting air-ground training, in determining Army requirements for tactical air support, and in promoting joint consideration of doctrine, procedure, tactics, and other matters affecting air support of ground troops.

These developments, together with the build-up of our Armed Forces, offer us a chance to recover much important ground lost since the end of World War II, when our combat-trained air crews and air-ground staffs, with the know-how they shared, were dissipated.

Our goal should be to develop throughout our combat echelons the practiced skill best exemplified recently by the air, infantry, armor, and artillery elements in Korea, who earned their places on the air-ground team.

Teamwork and mutual understanding are of the essence.

Left Hand, Right Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that our Republic has suffered approximately 100,000 casualties in Korea under the United Nations, aided and abetted by President Harry S. Truman, the final act of perfidy and betrayal is to be consummated.

First came conspiracy between the executive department and the United Nations to put the United States into war—now comes bribery and cowardice by the conspirators to trade the lives and liberties of Formosa to Red China. Next by way of insult to our dead in Korea, the Red murderers are to be given a seat on the Security Council of the United Nations.

I voted against the United Nations when it was organized. The moving spirit in the creation of the United Nations was Alger Hiss. It has served his subversive purpose of giving aid to Rus-

sia in her communistic drive for world domination.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Wednesday, January 17, 1951:

LEFT HAND, RIGHT HAND

General Collins, the Army Chief of Staff, has announced from Tokyo that American forces are in Korea to stay and fight and that new forces would reach the front within 2 or 3 months.

This statement followed within a day United Nations approval, with the concurrence of the American delegate, of a plan to end the conflict by giving the Chinese Communists in Korea everything.

By this deal, we would withdraw our forces, together with those of other UN members, and Communist China would do likewise. A plebiscite would then be held in Korea. Inasmuch as the North Korean Communists would be left in possession of the ground, the populace would be under its thumb. Communist China and Russia, as well as Great Britain, which recognizes the Chinese Communist regime, would certainly have an influence in supervising the election.

Nobody can doubt that the result would be that Korea would vote in a Communist government, just as happened in Poland under similar circumstances.

CONFLICT OF ABSURDITIES

As collateral undertakings, the United States and UN would agree to give consideration to Communist China's demand for the island of Formosa and for a seat on the UN Security Council. All of the evidence makes it clear that both demands would be granted.

If our diplomacy is ready to concede Korea to the Communists, and to throw in Formosa and a UN seat as extra inducements, why is our Military Establishment planning to stay and fight?

It may be said that this military decision is announced as a means of inducing Communist China to accept the UN appeasement deal, which Russia, in Communist China's behalf, has said is unacceptable. Why should we try to press the Communists into a deal that is so greatly to our disadvantage? Why, if our spokesmen have signified disposition to write off Korea, should the military expect to convince anyone the fight is worth carrying on?

Since the Truman administration has admitted its willingness to get out of Korea, why does it not simply get out?

Why expend one more American life in its temporary and futile defense?

In its latest brainstorm, the administration proposes to give the place up and to fight for it to the end. Can anyone carry absurdity beyond this?

Rights Without Responsibilities—A New Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Enquirer, published in Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 2, 1951.

It is difficult to believe that the Office of Education would circularize American colleges and universities appealing for publicity on a declaration of human rights at the taxpayers' expense. Nevertheless, this apparently is true.

This document, as indicated in the editorial, sets out the New Deal and Fair Deal philosophy of influencing people to believe they can have something for nothing, that the Government owes them a living, and that they have no obligations nor responsibilities of their own. Such propaganda appeals to the weakness of people and not to their strength. This indeed is the welfare state on which the present and recent administrations have fattened and retained their power.

In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground (Genesis, 4: 19).

The editorial follows:

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Once in a while it happens. Not often enough. But once in a while somebody with a sense of reality and faith in the stuff that built America will shake himself free from the present welter of moral obfuscation and take a swing for the jaw.

It happened not so many days ago. Earl J. McGrath, Commissioner of Education at Washington, circularized American colleges and universities appealing for publicity on a Declaration of Human Right.

It reached the wrong man, or we should say the right man, when Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, received his copy. The Tennessean's reply merits at least a footnote in American political and social history. Wrote Mr. Branscomb to Mr. McGrath:

"I have your form letter asking that we publicize as much as possible the Declaration of Human Rights. I read it * * * with much interest. I presume you are merely carrying out the responsibilities of your office in pushing this declaration. May I say, however, that this declaration is an immoral document. It lists 6 pages of rights for everyone with only a brief, vague, and almost apologetic reference at its close to duties to the community The demand for rights, however, is detailed, specific, and extensive. Article 25, for example, reads: "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, medical care, and necessary social services, and the right to security." All of this without the slightest reference to any obligation involved.

"I call the document immoral because morality chiefly consists of the assumption of obligations and duties to others by every individual. To insist upon 29 articles of rights which everyone is encouraged to expect from others, without a comparable insistence upon obligation, is merely to encourage the moral weakness of our times. What I miss is even one little phrase, perhaps at the end of article 25. I would have thought that so wise and distinguished a commission would have added to this long list of rights, including that of an adequate standard of living, the phrase: "Provided the individual endeavors to render to society such services as are within his capacity.'

"This document may be good politics, but those like yourself in high and responsible office need to give attention to developing a sense of obligation in this America of ours in addition to the universal cry for 'my rights.' If you do not do it, this great country of ours is headed for disaster.

"Your letter offers to send material advertising this Declaration of Human Rights. Do you have available also something that promotes a sense of social obligation and public duty? Your sincerely, Harvie Branscomb, Vanderbilt University."

We do not know what reply the Federal Commissioner of Education made to the Nashville educator. We hardly know what reply he could have made, in good conscience.

Declarations of human rights are idealistically unassailable. The very conscience of the United States Constitution is its Bill of Rights. But Chancelor Branscomb uses a fitting word when he describes as immoral a declaration which describes the more abundant life as the right of every human—without compensating effort on his part. Opportunity is a true right. Dependence upon society is not. That is the worst failing of the welfare state—it devolves into the "gimme" state.

What About Rationing and Price Control for Meat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Omaha World-Herald on January 10 published an editorial dealing with price control and rationing of meat. I believe this discussion merits the consideration of Congress, and I wish to include that editorial in my remarks. It is as follows:

THE FIRST BIG TRY

"We don't know to what extent meat prices can be controlled, but as soon as we can we'll make a try at it, and it will be a big try."

The words quoted above were spoken by Alan Valentine, Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency, in an interview published in U. S. News and World Report.

This will be the second big try at controlling meat prices. The first was during World War II, and most Americans remember how that one turned out. Meat was driven out of the butcher shops and into the black market, and frequently even those who had coupons—which were the real money of that era—couldn't buy a pork chop or a pound of hamburger.

This time, says Mr. Valentine, the "big try" will involve "strict rationing, and probably subsidies."

The subsidies, presumably, would be paid to stockmen as an incentive to them to raise more animals and to sell them into the legal market instead of the black market. In effect, the Government would pay a part of everybody's meat bill, subsidizing the rich as well as the poor.

This is the same subsidy plan which is used in Great Britain and other Socialist countries, where it is one of the standard devices used for bringing everybody—both producers and consumers—under the protective wing of the government.

As a matter of fact, is there any good reason why meat should be controlled and rationed? Is there an actual and inescapable shortage of meat in this country?

We think not.

It is true that meat production has slumped a little in recent years, but that is because of too much Government interference, rather than too little. The price-support program, which kept the prices of various cash crops and products artificially high, tended to discourage the raising and feeding of animals—because there was no longer the old inducement to send corn to market on four legs. If price supports of all kinds were

wiped out now, and farmers were given incentive to raise what the consumers want, rather than what the bureaucrats want, there would be a quick upsurge in the production of meat.

The long-standing threat of meat rationing and price control also has had a depressing effect on recent production. Feeders, remembering their experiences during World War II, have been slow to take a chance.

If the Government would wipe out price supports now, and if it would assure farmers and livestock growers that there would be no meat controls in the future, we think beyond question America would produce all the meat it will need. And the total cost would certainly be less than the cost of the control-and-subsidy scheme.

Why doesn't Mr. Valentine adopt that common-sense approach?

For one reason only, and he states it quite candidly. The great unions—particularly Walter Reuther's auto workers—are demanding price control over meat before they will accept stabilization of wages.

So apparently the tedious story of World War II is beginning all over again. One control begets another, the freezing of one aspect of the economy demands the freezing of others. Presently, if the process continues unchallenged, the Government will be running everything and the decrees of bureaucrats will be substituted for the decisions of the free market.

In other words, America will be ruled by totalitarianism. And we doubt if that is what the people think they are fighting for.

Mr. Valentine, and his superiors in the administration, and the Members of Congress, should reflect long and prayerfully before they make the first big try.

We Must Control Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the 30-day price freeze recently recommended by Michael DiSalle, Price Stabilization Director, has been turned down by the office of Defense Mobilization. The American people are entitled to more prompt and more vigorous action to stop the rapid rise in the cost of living. The President's budget message has stated that the bulk of new taxes must come from the middle and lower income groups. If this is so, it seems to me that rising prices are already destroying the ability of these citizens to contribute more taxes to the defense program without reducing themselves to poverty. No one has a right to take advantage of this emergency to extort unconscionable profits from our people and the evidence is becoming quite clear that this is what is being done. There can be no excuse for some of the increased prices placed upon articles that were already in stock when the emergency developed, and yet many employees of merchandising establishments have offered me unmistakable proof that they were ordered to mark up such merchandise. The situation this country is in calls for patriotic responsibility and for equal sacrifice—not reduced living standards for some and huge profits for others. The people are getting impatient and rightly so. Perhaps the last Congress should have made price controls mandatory instead of leaving the matter to the Executive's decision. If the Executive does not act soon, it is imperative that Congress take the lead in bringing prices down. The failure to act now will cause new rounds of wage increases followed by new rounds of increased prices which means higher defense costs and then higher and higher taxes. We cannot afford to permit the economy of this nation to drift toward chaos.

Will the Public Stand for the Persecution and Prosecution of MacArthur?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who recall the trial of Billy Mitchell, because he had the courage to do what was patriotic and heroic, can begin to see the handwriting on the wall so far as General MacArthur is concerned. The smear artists are now sharpening their poisoned pencils in an effort to place the blame for the cruel and unnecessary slaughter of our boys in Korea on one of the greatest generals that this country has produced.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article which may be of interest to those who admire and respect General MacArthur who, after his hands have been tied by the State Department, has performed miracles in leading our forces:

MAC WANTED TO ABANDON KOREA IN 1945, RECORDS HERE REVEAL—CALLED YANK POSITION UNTENABLE IN FACE OF SOVIET STRENGTH NORTH OF PARALLEL

(By Walter Trohan)

General MacArthur had plans to withdraw from Korea as soon as the first American soldiers set foot on the peninsula at the close of World War II.

Buried in War Department records are documents attesting MacArthur's apprehension of a Soviet advance into South Korea in September 1945. The general recognized the position as untenable and was prepared to withdraw American occupation forces.

Details of the story of the cautious American occupation and withdrawal plans were disclosed as sentiment mounted in and out of Congress for withdrawal of pounded American troops in Korea.

KOREA DIVIDED AT YALTA

Korea was divided into the United States and Soviet zones of influence at the 38th parallel as the result of secret deals at Yalta calculated to bring the Soviets into the war. These secret deals have resulted in communization of China and the Korean war.

In the final days of the war 178,000 Japanese troops were stationed in Korea under Lt. Gen. Yashio Kozuki. Plans were drawn at Potsdam for attack in Korea by Soviets from the north and Americans from the south.

The end of the war made attack unnecessary, but the 38th parallel was established as the dividing line for surrender of Jap forces to American or Russian troops. It was hoped after the surrender Russians would withdraw along with American troops and leave Koreans to select a government by a free election.

MAC ARTHUR CURBED

On August 6, 1945, MacArthur advised the War Department that his intelligence reported 60 Soviet divisions in Manchuria, where the Soviets were given a foothold by a secret Yalta agreement. In the current war MacArthur was barred from crossing the North Korean border for reconnaissance purposes and thus was hampered in gathering intelligence on Chinese Communists.

The Tokyo radio announced Japan's readiness to surrender on August 14, 1945. Formal surrender was concluded 2 weeks later on September 1.

Soviet troops started into Korea at the time of the surrender. Some 100,000 Red soldiers, under the command of Col. Gen. I. M. Chistiakov, occupied Korea down to the thirty-eighth parallel.

MacArthur feared Soviet forces might move down from the dividing line and receive support from the divisions in Manchuria. When American forces were landed, vessels were held off South Korea to take them off in the event of a Soviet move southward.

REDS SPEED TO PARALLEL

The Twenty-fourth Corps, under Lt. Gen. John R. Hodges was landed in South Korea beginning September 8, 1945. His forces comprised 72,000 troops. When Americans reached the thirty-eighth parallel they found the Reds already there.

Japanese forces which surrendered to American troops were shifted to Japan. The fate of the Japs captured in the Soviet zone has never been made clear.

Efforts to unite the two zones by negotiation failed. The United States placed the Korean question before the United Nations. The South Koreans held an election filling 200 assembly seats and leaving 100 open for North Korea. Two-thirds of the Koreans lived in South Korea before the war.

Moscow announced withdrawal of its troops from Korea in December 1948. However, the Soviets refused the United Nations access to the zone. North Koreans later barred access to the zone.

The United States withdrew its troops from Korea in January 1949. At that time it was recognized that the position in South Korea was untenable in the face of attack supported by Communist China and Communist Russia.

A Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we are now engaged in what has been termed the "great debate" on foreign policy. Prior to the statements of many of the leaders of various schools of thought, an editorial appeared in the Wooster (Ohio) Daily Record of December 27, 1950, titled "A Way to Peace." Many requests for reprints of the editorial were received by the publisher. It was more than apparent that the article reflected the views of the people of the great agricultural and industrial area in which it was printed. It is apparent, I am sure, that Ohio's distinguished senior Senator has

expressed the views of the people of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned editorial:

A WAY TO PEACE

Everyone has a right to have a peace plan, for this is going to be nobody's private war.

We have to start toward peace from where we are. Therefore we have to begin with a few fundamental principles.

No. 1. We can't live other peoples' lives for them. We must be content with this. We can tell them, inform them, guide them, be kind to them, set them a good example. But we'll have to stop about there.

No. 2. People are going to have to endure the kind of government they permit to exist. Freedom exacts a high price in suffering and human life, but it must be paid by the people who win the freedom. It is impossible for freedom to be forced in from the outside.

No. 3. We cannot in the foreseeable future wage a successful land war against Communist Asia. We simply haven't the manpower. Even though we were to win a battle in the field we could never impose our kind of government on the Asiatics. They will have to make their own government. It can be like ours if they want it, or it can be something else. It must be what they want or are willing to endure.

No. 4. With our naval power we can prevent invasion of Japan, Hawaii, the Philippines, perhaps Formosa and Australia. With Britain's help we can stop Russia at the Channel, if we can't stop her before.

No. 5. An alliance with Canada and Mexico can protect this continent.

No. 6. In our opinion we should set up no general European army, for the simple reason we are merely setting up a target for Stalin to knock down. Instead we should encourage the individual nations of Europe to rise to their own defense with their own separate armies. Given enough time, this kind of program might fill the power vacuum now in Europe. General Eisenhower should be only a consultant, channeling ordnance where it is needed. No defense of Europe can be undertaken unless Europeans are willing to do most of their own fighting—at least for the next decade. We should, of course, lend our material help to the individual countries.

No. 7. At home we must keep our economy sound but we must rearm as rapidly as possible, coordinating our efforts with Canada, which may well bear the brunt of the first attack if and when it comes.

No. 8. We must keep the UN going, never ceasing to try for international understanding, always hoping that somehow it might be reached.

No. 9. We must embark on the most gigantic sales program undertaken in the history of the world. We must try to sell peace to the people of the world, through the use of international radio, leaflets, and all the avenues of diplomacy. We must try to sell people on our idea of freedom. We must encourage people to revolt against tryanny, to demand their rights of free speech, free thought, and unoppressed worship. If we can keep them (the Commies) occupied at home they'll be less likely to start something away from home.

No. 10. The Christian forces of the world must go to work. They have a way which changes men's lives. Thousands of martyrs have died proclaiming this way. Many more may have to. A renewed Christian movement, given time, might possibly avert the almost certain disaster which seems to lie ahead.

The one hopeful thing about this holiday season is the fact that we are not yet at war. By an intelligent, vigorous, peaceful program we might yet avert it.

Patriotic Women Speak Out for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, these are perilous times for our Republic. The people back home know that something is wrong. They know that the administration has pursued and is pursuing policies that unless changed will lead to disaster.

The mail that I receive on this subject is not only heavy but it is evident that the people are aroused. Many of my colleagues report the same thing from their districts. I wish to extend my remarks by including a telegram received by me yesterday from Mrs. Edwin S. Towle, president of the Richardson County Republican Women's Club. The telegram is as follows:

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *January 16, 1951.*
Congressman CARL CURTIS,
Washington, D. C.:

The Richardson County Republican Women's Club composed of 71 members are resolved that we are in favor of (1) withdrawing out troops from Korea but if the Government keep them there we blockade Communist China; (2) no more troops be sent to any other countries without the approval of Congress; (3) no more police actions be undertaken until the other United Nations are willing to furnish their proportionate share in money and troops; (4) defense production being accelerated; (5) taxes not being increased until nondefense spending has been cut to the minimum; (6) this being read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. EDWIN S. TOWLE.
President.

4–H Members Aid War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, all of us realize the necessity of military preparedness in today's world. No one knows how long this period will last or how much of a sacrifice it will demand. We know for certain that the price will be paid by each and every one of us. For some it will be military service. Others will face shortages in materials needed to carry on their business. All of us will be asked to pay for defense.

The agricultural extension officers are doing an excellent job in getting services and information to our farm folks. Their primary objective is to promote conservation and better methods of farming. This is a long-range program just as our preparedness is a long-range program, both essential to our Nation's life.

The 4–H division of extension service has had many good results among our young farm folks I have had students in class who have received this training, and I feel that many of the good qualities they exhibited came from this experience

Their pledge is one, which if followed by everyone, would solve many of our problems It calls for clearer thinking, greater loyalty, and greater services, to the club, the community and the country. These are the things we must have to survive the present struggle

Conditions today will undoubtedly bring shortages in many of our food items Farmers can perhaps best aid in relieving these conditions by producing more of the products they use in home consumption The program each farmer should follow would be to produce his own meat, poultry, and dairy products as well as fruit and vegetables.

Farm production of poultry and dairy products for home use has been carried on by most of our farmers. Those farmers who are not now doing this will find it a well paying sideline.

The main point in producing more meat, fruit and vegetables would be to increase the amount preserved for winter use. The 4–H members and farm wives in this way can make a major contribution to the war effort.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Economics Club of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, January 17, it was my profound privilege to address the Economics Club of New York, one of the Nation's outstanding groups of distinguished business leaders in the fields of finance, industry, banking, and so forth. At that time I discussed America's obligations at home and abroad in the present world crisis.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

OUR COUNTRY'S ROLE IN THE WORLD CRISIS

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin, member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

It is a profound privilege to address this outstanding group of leaders of American industry. I should like to talk to you tonight about leadership itself—leadership which is the great obligation of our American people in this hour of world destiny.

YOUR BUSINESS AND MINE

Frankly, my friends, there was a time when I was much younger, when the thought of facing men who represented the great corporations of Wall Street might have given me, a little country boy, some concern, and yes, even a bit of fear. But now that I have been elected three times to the directorate of the

greatest business in the world, your Government and mine, I have no such concern.

Why, the great companies which you represent are as pygmies compared to the gigantic institution which I am supposed to help direct—the United States Government with its 2,500,000 employees, its $260,000,000,000 debt, and its gigantic budget, to say nothing about the powers we exercise over you.

CONGRESS MUST MEET CRUCIAL PROBLEM OF SECURITY

Big government is here to stay, and the basic problem of your big Government and mine is—the problem of survival which confronts us. To meet that problem of survival, it is essential that your government and mine drop ballast, so to speak, get rid of excess responsibilities and functions. It is essential that it concentrate on the big challenge facing the Federal Government, namely, national defense and security.

THE TWO BIG QUESTIONS

"Will the United States be ready—adequately ready—if war comes?" There is the great question mark.

"Will Europe unite to defend itself?" There is the subsidiary question.

TRIBUTE TO FELLOW SPEAKERS

It is an honor and privilege to share this platform tonight with two such outstanding spokesmen of American industry and American labor as my old friend and fellow alumnus of the University of Wisconsin, Mr. Harry Bullis, president of General Mills, and the distinguished president of a great railway labor organization, Mr. George Harrison.

I DO NOT ASSUME UNJUSTIFIED ROLES

Now, some folks, in talking on the topic of national security, assume one of three roles, but I reject all of these roles tonight:

1. A "Monday-morning quarterback"; or
2. To be considered a prophet or the son of a prophet; or
3. An armchair general.

I do, however, try to bring in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which I serve, something which I should like to consider common sense, which you will remember Dooley said was "the scarcest commodity on the market."

DANGER OF SYNTHETIC THINKING

Unfortunately, there has been a tremendous lot of uncommon sense spoken about foreign policy. There has been a lot of wishful thinking, or synthetic thinking, as I call it. We have built up a mass of illusions, delusions, and myths which have put some people in a fool's paradise when they think of this problem.

It is absolutely absurd to conceive, for example, of an America supposedly secure behind a Chinese wall in the contracted world of the atomic age. Similarly, it is ridiculous to think of America crawling into a shell, waiting until the enemy has devoured all of its foes, and then waiting till that enemy pounced at our own shores.

This, my friends, is an hour for right thinking—on your part and mine—an hour for decision. But it is a time, too, for prayer and faith which must result in moral and spiritual rebirth in individuals and nations. Yes; we must have faith which is, as Paul said, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen." We must have faith if the world is to advance toward solving the problem of peace.

THE THREE GREAT JEWELS

As a people, you and I know that we are the custodians of three jewels of great price. Those jewels are:

1. The Judaic-Christian religion teaching the unity of the spiritual man with God.

2. The political idea, a constitutional Republic with a Bill of Rights and with three separate and coequal branches of government, serving as a check and balance on one another, and finally,

3. The American economic way, the system of private initiative, of private enterprise, of private profit, the system whereby a man can take his chances of being either winner or loser of the fruits of his labor.

THE STATIC VERSUS THE DYNAMIC MIND

If we are to preserve these true jewels, we must be adequate to every emergency of the atomic age. Obviously no man knows what the future holds. Obviously, too, America's whole concept of foreign policy can be shaped by overseas events even more than by our own decisions. If we are to figure out the shape of those overseas events and be adequate to meet them, we must clear the cobwebs from our minds and change static minds into dynamic minds.

One of the significant faults of our times is that we are constantly thinking of world war III only in terms of World War II. We are constantly trying to appraise the future almost exclusively in terms of the past, instead of keeping our minds fresh, open, and capable of visualizing new things. The hydrogen bomb, guided missiles, jet propulsion, and other instances of modern invention can completely change our concepts.

Therefore, we cannot and should not use the yardsticks of the past unless we are sure that the circumstances of the past are really similar to those of the present. It would be a mistake of course to adopt Buck Rogers-type fantasies of what will come. But it would also be a grave error if we allowed static concepts to stifle our thinking.

RUSSIA WILL TEST THE UNITED STATES PERIMETER

The next great world crisis will come when Russia seeks once again to test the perimeter of western defense. The big question of course, is as to where that test will come. If Russia chooses to unleash her Balkan satellites against Marshal Tito's Yugoslavia, then we ourselves will not necessarily be in an all-out world war III. But we will give aid in every way possible to Marshal Tito short of actual troops. If, however, Joseph Stalin and the leaders of the Politburo should unleash the satellite armies for an invasion of Western Europe (where we already have occupation troops) or Greece or Turkey, then the fatal die would have been cast. There is universal agreement that America would then be in world war III.

BOLD, TRUE AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Well, my friends, we come to the nubbins of the discussion tonight.

My basic theme is this: America's role in the world crisis must absolutely be one of bold, far-seeing, intelligent leadership—political, military, economic, and spiritual leadership.

But what precisely is a leader? A true leader among men, as among nations, recognizes his inherent responsibilities. He does not shirk or shrink timidly from them. A true leader fulfills his pledges and commitments such as we have solemnly made under the United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Pact. He does not go back on his word.

A true leader does not, however, dissipate his resources as we have so unfortunately. Rather, he concentrates his energies and facilities on first things first. That means that if we are to be a leader, we must basically defend the American Continent itself. But to the extent of our facilities and resources, we must simultaneously help lead the Western European nations so that they, together with us, can work out the common defense.

Remember this point: No true leader allows himself to be baited into a trap the way we have blindly fallen into Russia's trap in Korea. Now, the Russians undoubtedly are preparing for us still bigger traps to come. So the question is, "Will we have enough wisdom to keep out of those traps?" And—"Can we set a few political and other traps of our own?"

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Now, how can we demonstrate leadership? Where and how do we go from here? Let me make certain specific recommendations:

1. First of all, I renew my recommendation for the immediate appointment of a high-level United States board of counter-revolutionary strategy. Let's beat the Reds at their own game. This board, composed of the best experts we can get, would be designed to stir up trouble behind the iron curtain by shipment of: (a) Arms; (b) silver bullets (money) to dissident elements in Russia and her satellites. Yes; let us give the Russians a taste of their own vile medicine—sabotage and insurrection, thus giving hope to the slaves of the Kremlin and giving it something to think about at home.

NO APPEASEMENT OF CHINESE REDS

2. I recommend that the Secretary of State immediately issue a forthright and unequivocal declaration that we will remain 100 percent opposed to admission of Red China to the United Nations. It would be absurd for us to reward international aggression by admitting of another Red "Charlie McCarthy" to the United Nations.

Appeasement of the Reds simply will not work. We must remember that the road to war, like the road to hell, is paved with good intentions—good intentions of trying a policy of complete timidity and weakness. In other words, we as leaders must stand up for principle in the United Nations, in the Congress of the United States, and in our individual lives, even as our heroic boys are fighting for principle on the road to Pusan tonight.

MORE VOLUNTARY CENSORSHIP NEEDED

3. I recommend that America immediately tighten her voluntary censorship. I know our newspapers, radio stations, and magazines are eager to cooperate to prevent the further "leaking" of crucial defense information. It is absurd that we continue to publish so recklessly the details of the location of our atomic plants, the news of new weapons, etc.

REVISED MILITARY TRAINING

4. I recommend that the United States Congress proceed to reevaluate our entire program of military training and that we pattern our future policies along the lines of the Swiss system of universal training. Under this system, as you will recall, the emphasis is not placed on a huge standing army. Instead, emphasis is placed on a large well-trained, well-equipped reserve force adequate to meet whatever challenge arises.

You and I know that America cannot hope to match in numbers the mass armies of the Soviet Union. And so, as much as we might otherwise deplore the idea of universal military training, I believe that the time has come for every able-bodied young American to recognize that he is going to have this national obligation:

(a) He must contribute a certain period of time directly in our armed services; and

(b) Thereafter, he must contribute a certain number of weeks for several years to Reserve training. In that way, every young American will be able to go to his battle station instantly if necessary.

MORATORIUM ON NAME CALLING

5. I recommend that a national moratorium be declared on name calling. To smear a man as an "isolationist" or a "globalist" or any other name does not contribute to public thinking and enlightenment. In a critical situation like this we need diversity of views so that we can get every possible angle of the situation explored. Actually, there is far more agreement on fundamentals between the recent major speeches in the foreign-policy debate—far more agreement than superficial observers believed possible.

MOBILIZING OUR FRIENDS

6. Next I recommend that we mobilize every possible friend among the nations just

as the Soviets have so effectively mobilized their satellites. What does this mean concretely? Just this:

(a) We must secure a complete military agreement with Spain. It, aside from all other considerations, possesses the largest available land army in Western Europe. (It is, of course, totally inconsistent for us to deal with one totalitarian government—Yugoslavia—and to refuse to deal with another—Spain.)

(b) Now, as regards Germany and Japan, we must assist these two nations to become strong bastions of defense—to become military assets rather than liabilities.

(1) Germany and Japan should be given their independence.

(2) We should help provide them arms.

(c) In relation to Germany and her neighbors we must stress the absolute necessity of greater political, economical, and military unification in Europe. Only when these countries have made genuine progress in eliminating their age-old fears, hatreds, and jealousies will they be able to stand as one against the common threat. German troops must in particular be integrated into overall European defense forces.

I recognize that we are taking a calculated risk in revitalizing Germany and Japan, but it is a risk that we must take, while putting up various safeguards.

We will await with deep interest the report which General Eisenhower will bring back from his visit to Europe. We trust that he will bring a favorable report on the possibility of genuine military unification, utilizing German and other manpower.

REEVALUATING FOREIGN POLICY IN MILITARY TERMS

7. Next, I recommend that the Joint Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees and Armed Services Committees go into executive session with the finest military brains of the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force. Let them find out the significance of (a) the long-range Russian snorkel submarine fleet; (b) the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb; and (c) other modern weapons—the significance of all these in shaping foreign policy.

A LOOK AT THE WORLD SCENE

Let us pause briefly to look about us on the world scene. We see many things—the heartrending American retreat down the Korean Peninsula, the failure to date of the United Nations to adopt the resolution designating the Chinese Government as an aggressor, the use of the UN forum by Russia and Chinese Communist spokesmen as a great propaganda pulpit.

And yet we see facts in our favor—the defeat of Russian intrigue and infiltration in Greece, the strengthening of Turkey, the continuing resistance of Marshal Tito's Yugoslavia, the tremendous success of the Marshall plan, which together with Europe's self-help has rejuvenated the western part of this continent economically and has given the basis on which to resist. It is helpful to know that universal military training is in effect in Western Europe, that France has just agreed to increase its military budget by 75 percent, has agreed to set up 10 modern divisions by the end of 1951, and has consented to German rearmament. Even previous to Korea, Britain was spending a larger part of her national income on arms than was America. There is unrest in Russia and dissatisfaction and unrest in the satellite states. We must never forget, moreover, that of the four great world industrial centers three—Japan, Western Europe (including the Ruhr), and the United States—are still free from Russia (which possesses the fourth great industrial center).

Now, let us return to my final specific recommendation.

ANTI-INFLATION FIGHT

8. My friends, we must not, of course, forget the crucial economic front with which you gentlemen are particularly concerned. I recommend that Congress and the executive branch apply an all-out anti-inflation program. Why? Because we must recognize that our country faces two great dangers: (a) The danger from without—the Kremlin; and (b) the danger from within—inflation, insolvency, and national bankruptcy.

In order to meet the inflation problem we have to do the following:

(a) Secure greater efficiency, especially in Government procurement. The tens of billions of dollars appropriated for the Armed Forces must not be regarded as a "gravy train" for extravagance. The cost of war matériel and war training should be cut wherever possible in order that we don't blow our economy out the window in the effort to keep America safe. The chiseler and the grafter should, in effect, be court martialed.

(b) Congress and the Bureau of the Budget and the President must cooperate to cut nonessential expenditures. We will never succeed in achieving this unless we all agree that all of us must make sacrifices in peacetime services. So long as Government continues its own nonessential spending, inflationary forces will grow stronger.

(c) The Federal Reserve Board should use its power to further tighter credit.

Those, then, are my specific recommendations. But now, friends, there are a few basic propositions on which you and I should agree.

BASIC PROPOSITIONS

First, one of the foremost needs of the hour is to secure greater bipartisan understanding and cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of Government. We must recognize that in the present situation two constitutional principles are in conflict with one another. On the one hand, the widest possible powers are given to the President by our Constitution for the direction of United States foreign policy. This may include the President's right under the North Atlantic Pact to put as many troops as he wants on the Continent of Europe at any time without asking the consent of the Congress.

On the other hand, the Congress of the United States has its own constitutional powers and has the vital power of the purse, so that if it wanted to, Congress could strangle any executive policy, by a specific act or by holding back appropriations.

Under conflicting circumstances like that, we might have an irresistible force meeting the immovable body. That is why I feel that it is so essential that we do not daily in endless argument as to who has the power to do what. When a fire is raging in your house, you don't get into a quarrel with the firemen as to who has the authority to carry the water hose. Both Congress and the President are, after all, merely servants acting on behalf of the Republic and there must be mutual reason and judgment, rather than futile bickering.

I do not want to see the Congress stubbornly stalemate the President into inaction. However, neither do I want us to hand over to the President the entire making of our foreign policy, which would be an unwise, unsound, and undemocratic procedure.

Second, while we are protecting America from the grave danger from without, let us not forget that we must protect her, as I have repeatedly said, from the dangers from within. The American Constitutional Republic, with its checks and balances, can be destroyed not only by Communist sabotage but by other qualities of looseness and immorality in Government.

Let us never forget, therefore, the absolute necessity of maintaining strong, sound, independent legislative, executive, and judicial branches. So long as we comprehend and preserve our system, America will shine like a lighthouse through the darkness. All mankind will see its beacon and its hopes will remain high. But if that light goes out, then the faith of mankind will be lost.

CONCLUSION

In a previous serious hour of history, let us remember that Abraham Lincoln utilized three great safety valves, and they were:

1. A wonderful sense of humor;
2. The power of prayer; and
3. A selfless devotion to the Republic.

We, too—you and I—can utilize these same three safety valves in this great hour of confusion and crisis, and become personally more adequate to serve God and country.

With true faith and courage, we must boldly pursue our course. We need the Lincolnesque qualities and, yes, the qualities that enabled men like Christopher Columbus to proceed in the face of all obstacles. When I look at the head table here and at this outstanding audience, I see men like your distinguished President—Juan Trippe—whom I consider to be a modern-day Columbus. He has been forging ahead to open up new continents—new frontiers—in the field of aviation travel. He has added impetus to the progress of civilization. Today we are better prepared because of Juan Trippe. Let us, therefore—you and I—and our nation as leaders—military, economic, political, and spiritual leaders—likewise move forward to man's brighter horizons Then America will be ready for what comes. May it be peace.

May I recall the words that the Lord said to Moses when the Israelites came to the Red Sea: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." Let that be to all Americans the watchword: "America, go forward."

Assignment of Ground Troops for Service in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Veto on Troops Could Cripple United States Policy," by James Reston, which appeared in the New York Times on January 15. I believe that this article merits the careful consideration of Members of Congress and the public.

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

CONGRESS VETO ON TROOPS COULD CRIPPLE UNITED STATES POLICY—WHERRY RESOLUTION POINTS UP THE PROBLEMS, SUCH AS FILIBUSTER BY ISOLATIONISTS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—The big argument about who commands the Commander in Chief in this country will reach an interesting point in the Senate this week when Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, tries to gain a temporary veto over sending more United States troops to Europe.

Mr. WHERRY himself has written a resolution that probably will be sidetracked quickly into the deep freeze in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. But in the meantime it helps illustrate why the President opposes any veto, temporary or otherwise, on what he insists is his constitutional right to order troops wherever he likes.

The resolution states:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United

States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by Congress."

TESTIMONY OF ACHESON

Mr. WHERRY can point to various reasons why Congress might expect to be given a veto over the dispatch of more troops to Europe. Secretary of State Dean Acheson specifically told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee before the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified that there was absolutely no reason to believe that the United States would be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist.

Moreover, the first act in implementing the North Atlantic Treaty—the policy of sending substantial quantities of arms to Europe—was submitted to Congress for approval, and Mr. WHERRY no doubt will argue that if the President submits the question of sending more guns to Europe, his obligation to submit the question of sending more men is even greater.

If the President were to agree to submit the question to Congress, however, as he has been requested by one of the most distinguished Democrats in the Senate, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; specifically, if he were to agree to be bound by the decision of Congress in this matter, he could find himself in an almost impossible situation.

Suppose, in the interest of national unity, the President agreed to stand by the decision of the Congress and Congress approved the Wherry resolution. Then the President would be bound not to send more ground troops into the European area pending the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by Congress.

POSSIBILITY OF FILIBUSTER

Under such circumstances a handful of men in the Senate could prevent the formulation of a policy with respect thereto by Congress through the simple expedient of a filibuster.

The President could then appeal, in any crisis that might develop, for release from his pledge, but a few determined isolationists in the upper Chamber—and those who remain are determined—could defeat the appeal simply by talking.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower could return from Europe with a recommendation that we send more troops. He could convince the House and the vast majority of the Senate and the country at large, but if he could not convince the isolationists, the Senate could not respond to his recommendation or release itself from its vote in favor of the Wherry resolution.

No such series of events, of course, is likely to happen. Mr. WHERRY will argue for his resolution, but the President will not agree to be bound by the Congress' decision. In fact, the administration is confident that, if a vote were taken, Mr. WHERRY would lose. But what worries the administration is the precedent that would established by agreeing to let Congress have a veto on the President's authority to move troops about as he feels necessary in order to preserve the security of the Nation.

COULD WIDEN CURBS

If Congress can forbid the President to send ground troops to Europe, they ask, why could it not forbid the Commander in Chief to move American ships and planes around the world as he sees fit?

Moreover, what would be the position of the President, under such a precedent, not only now but in the future?

The Wherry resolution, if passed by Congress, would certainly stand before the world as a legislative rebuke to the President, but it probably would not change the military situation in Europe one way or another.

In other circumstances, however, the need of this or some future President to move United States troops to Europe in a hurry might be urgent, and if at that time the President were laboring under the precedent of Congress' right to block emergency action of that kind, essential action might be prevented.

For the time being the administration wants to avoid a difficult parliamentary situation before General Eisenhower completes his survey and returns from Europe with his report.

In the last analysis, it will be this report that will probably decide the issue, and not the judgments of either the President or the Taft-Wherry bloc in the Senate.

Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there is so much hysteria evidenced at times among our people with regard to the threat to United States security which communism presents that I believe it most desirable to give widespread publicity to views which, in their saneness and soundness, make a worth-while contribution to discussions on the matter.

The January issue of Boumi Temple News, AAONMS, of Baltimore, contains an address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, captain of the outer guard of the Imperial Council of the Shriners of North America, before the members of Rameses Temple, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, on November 8, 1950, which reviews in thoughtful fashion the threat which communism poses to American security, and a well-reasoned philosophy regarding it.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stringfellow's address be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

OUR RESPONSIBILITY

I should like to express my grateful appreciation to your illustrious potentate, S. Titchener Smith, and through him to every member of Rameses Temple, for the honor which you have accorded me in naming this fine body of candidates the George E. Stringfellow class. This manifestation of your friendship and esteem will always be cherished.

Only the imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America is authorized to speak for our great fraternity, and I would have it understood that I speak as an individual and reflect my own thoughts.

Amongst all liberty-loving people will be found the hosts of freemasonry, ever alert to the trust of good citizenship. The doctrines that prompted our affiliation with the fraternity are those upon which your country and mine rest. Our profound belief in the Almighty God, our love of liberty, our native sense of service to our fellow man, our fundamental antipathy to tyranny qualifies us for association with the craft. We are Shriners because, foremost, we are inspired by philosophy and the code of Masonry.

The foundation of every institution of freemen is faith in the Supreme Being. The Golden Rule has ever been our common statute; it is the thesis of our craft.

We must live by its precept if we are to live freemen, and that we may so live our forefathers gave their lives.

Without faith in God, every disillusionment would resolve into despair and inevitable decay.

Communism, a godless ideology, seeks the destruction of Masonry. Communists recognize that millions of God-fearing Masons throughout the world are a threat to their atheistic efforts. Emphatically, we are. Our threat must be effective. Our loyalty to the principles of our order and to mankind must guide us in every effort to keep their atheistic propaganda from harming our freedoms.

We must courageously face the enemy with a solidarity heretofore unknown, lest he divide us. He has infiltrated governmental and fraternal bodies. His power is great; we dare not temporize with it if we would remain free men. With the courage characteristic of our Masonic forefathers, inspired by belief in God, we must exercise every good effort to resist its threat.

Hostility, tyranny, and oppression are creatures of some cunning human failing. Such characteristics are fostered by the selfish motives of nonbelieving minds, averse to the duty man owes to his fellow being.

Bereft of faith in God, all dictators exercise their tyranny, unrestrained by the dictate of the Golden Rule. Their pattern is to impose upon an oppressed people the fallacy that religion intercepts progress and the common good.

The atheistic philosophy of subordination is promulgated amongst their youth, and, as such youth grows into manhood, it blindly accepts that delusion as a method of life.

The tyrant, however, is aware that man instinctively craves freedom, and, with warrant, fears that such instinct at some time will overthrow tyranny.

His scheme is to dominate. He subjugates individualism; engenders hatred of democratic nations and institutions, and descends to that which inevitably destroys his entire scheme, suppression of the right of free worship.

For a time the sordid scheme prevails. He conceals from the people of his land the manner in which free people live, and numbs their reasoning by sophistry. So that he may set himself up as all powerful, he restricts the lives of his citizens until their urgent needs cause submission to the straining point; rebellion is inevitable. He recognizes that he cannot terrorize where religion prevails; he must afford no refuge of faith and reason, for faith and reason would resist oppression.

When tyranny has sufficiently subdued, misled, and embittered its masses, it sets out to divide peoples of other lands.

The Soviet has dumped her spies and sneaks into every country of the world. She has invaded lands that had hoped to recover from the affliction of two world wars, has, without mercy, taken control and enslaved the people thereof, scorning the reprimand and warning of the free democracies. She sneers that hers is the democratic form of government, yet incarcerates, tortures, and purges any subject, men of the cloth, and others who challenge her chicanery.

She has subdued the spirit of her own people and those of her satellites.

Nor can we outwit her unless we know the manner in which she thinks.

We are engaged in a cold war with an enemy skilled in the use of every psychological weapon, who scornfully questions our right to resist the stupid puppets it has driven into aggressive invasion.

Communists are shrewd enough to realize that they cannot dominate unless they destroy the dignity of men. That must not be. As they encourage dissent and strife, we must proclaim faith, hope, and peace. They seek to liquidate the modern world. Our efforts must be bent upon upbuilding mankind in the image of his God.

Let us encourage others to emulate our efforts. So long as we proclaim, with all the good within us, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, we shall muster strength sufficient to overpower their hideous program.

Ours must be the firm belief in the right of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Such has always been the credo of all selfless human beings.

The philosophy of your Government and mine springs from the rights reserved to our people, free from political mandate. Let our loyalty be the result of understanding the basis thereof.

We must intelligently comprehend democracy, be well informed of its activities, so that we recognize and combat undemocratic activities. We cannot vacillate in our attitude toward subversive conduct of those charged with our security. We speak of government by the majority; let the right of suffrage be exercised by a conscientious majority.

Honorable, patriotic public service is ever our duty. As Shriners and as private citizens, me must, by the practices so profoundly advocated by our fraternity, establish that the right to live and worship in freedom is the right of mankind.

Sincere convictions unless practically applied are of no avail; true idealism, unless crystallized into cooperative conduct toward one's fellowman, is like tinsel upon an inanimate body. Inspiration for good is impotent unless pursued; sound ideas are fiction until exercised.

Without an attitude of idealism man suffers defeatism, hope is nonexistent, faith a comfort unknown.

Sound thinking, upright men throughout this world must lend counsel and aid to those who need guidance.

Where false philosophies arise, it is our task to enlighten the ignorant. We are our brother's keepers. Ours is the obligation to sustain propriety and honor through all adversity.

In the words of the Honorable Lester Parsons, Canada's Foreign Minister, "We must guard freedom by wisdom as well as by arms."

It is of great moment to this world that despots be frustrated in their wickedness; it is of greater moment that we so conduct ourselves that all human beings understand our way of life, as God-fearing, freedom-loving people. Such is our destiny. We cannot avoid that responsibility.

God grant us the courage to change the things we can change, the serenity to accept those we cannot, and the wisdom to know the difference. Grant us the courage to support those things we believe to be just, even though their survival may at times seem hopeless.

Our Foreign and Military Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the concern and alarm of the American people over the present national crisis is dramatically underscored by the record volume of mail now reaching my office and, I am sure, the office of every other Member of Congress, on the subjects of our foreign and military policies.

Because they are typical of the thinking in my State and the letters and telegrams which I am receiving, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where's Our Leadership?" which appeared in the Thursday, January 11, issue of the Cedar County News, published at Hartington, Nebr., by Mr. Fred Zimmer; and a telegram forwarded to me by Mrs. Edwin S. Towle, of Falls City, Nebr., on behalf of the Republican Women's Club, of Richardson County, Nebr.

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

[From the Cedar County (Nebr.) News of January 11, 1951]

WHERE'S OUR LEADERSHIP?

There are a lot of things about this Korean War that the common man does not understand, and it makes the ordinary citizen wonder whether the administration does either.

For example, it is hard to understand why we should be so afraid of making Russia mad. She is already fighting us, at least indirectly, if not directly. It is equally hard to understand why we should not want the Chinese Nationalists to help us in our battle against the Chinese Reds. The Reds are fighting us with everything they have in Korea, so what more could they do if America gave the Chinese on Formosa the go-ahead sign.

As matters now stand our Navy is preventing the Nationalists from invading the mainland of China, which in effect is protecting the Red rear while we fight the Reds on the front.

This is a war of manpower. The Americans can produce more war material than the Red nations, but the Reds have the edge in manpower and the production of manpower. It appears that the policy of not allowing the Chinese Nationalists to use their 350,000 well-trained troops, plus another million guerrilla fighters on the Chinese mainland, in our behalf is utter folly.

True it might make Stalin mad to think we had finally come to look at the matter with our eyes open, but he will do all in his power against us anyway. The Reds do not love us and never will, and any half-hearted measures we use in fighting them will not improve matters.

Then there is the situation of not bombing the factories, bridges, and other supply bases for the Chinese Reds in Manchuria. If we cannot fight with both hands in this battle we had better retire entirely and not continue to waste men and materials because we refuse to use both hands in this life-and-death battle.

Then there is the atom bomb. This is a terrible weapon, but if its use will bring an end to this war, and the rumors of war then it is worth the toll it takes.

The American people for the most part realize that the real villain in the world today is not Red China, or North Korea, but Russia. If we want to stop this thing we are going to have to stop Russia. As it is she is egging on China, Korea, and there may be others, so that we will waste away. When Russia feels we have been weakened enough that she can step in and take over, she will be right at our throat, make no mistake about that.

What kind of leaders do we have that cannot see what the common people have already figured out? Why should they wish to go on with this appeasement policy in regard to Russia and China? Have they forgotten what happened when we tried to settle the strife in Europe by appeasing Hitler? We had to fight a long, bloody war just the same.

The Government talks about the people doing without, tells Americans they must tighten their belts, that more and more money must be spent for defense and that more and more men must be drafted. Yet the powers in Washington have not tightened their belts. They still go on trying to do business with Russia and the Reds. Before the start of World War II there was the popular phrase, "You can't do business with Hitler." That same phrase can also be applied to Stalin and his Red allies.

It's time something was done, and what must be done should start in Washington. If our leaders start being real leaders they will not have any trouble getting the American people to follow and back them up. It is time for action. Realistic action, not based on political expediency.

If our leaders will not or cannot give us the type leadership we need, then it is time we exercised our right to remove them and put someone at the helm that knows how to steer a ship.

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *January 16, 1951.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

The Richardson County Republican Women's Club, composed of 71 members, are resolved that we are in favor of:

1. Withdrawing our troops from Korea but if the Government keeps them there we blockade Communist China.
2. No more troops be sent to any other countries without the approval of Congress.
3. No more police actions be undertaken until the other United Nations are willing to furnish their proportionate share in money and troops.
4. Defense production being accelerated.
5. Taxes not being increased until non-defense spending has been cut to the minimum.
6. This being read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. EDWIN S. TOWLE, *President.*

Tax Exemption for President and Congress Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tax Exemption for President and Congress Should Be Eliminated," which appeared in the Winchester Evening Star, Winchester, Va., on Monday, January 15, 1951.

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

TAX EXEMPTION FOR PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Sound-thinking Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has introduced legislation to repeal tax exemptions now permitted on allowances granted to the President, the Vice

President, and Members of Congress. He branded as "unfair" the special $50,000 tax exemption of the President, the $10,000 to the Vice President and Speaker of the House, and $2,500 to each Member of the Congress.

The President only last week stated that Americans must be taxed "until it hurts." Every right-thinking American is willing, we believe, to pay his full share of whatever tax burden might be necessary to strengthen our Military Establishment and to fulfill essential functions of government. But those who call for "taxing until it hurts," and those who vote for such taxes, likewise should feel the full pinch. It is completely wrong, in our opinion, for the President, the Vice President, the Members of the Congress to enjoy a privileged status in the tax field. Virginia's Senator Byrd led virtually a lone fight against this several years ago.

If there ever existed any real logic for establishing such a privileged class, that logic has completely disappeared with recent events. President Truman has not been bashful in making recommendations to the Congress in every field of legislation from socialized farming to unprecedented budgets. We would applaud were he to recommend that his own tax exemption be removed, along with the tax exemption of the Vice President and the Congressmen. If it is necessary to tax until it hurts none should be exempt. And certainly not Government officials who already have shown too little concern for the taxpayer's dollar.

Tribute to Lt. Harry E. Sutton and His Platoon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of December 22, 1950, recounting the gallant exploits in Korea of Lt. Harry E. Sutton, of New York City, and an infantry platoon which he commanded.

Lieutenant Sutton long was a member of the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Coast Artillery Regiment of the New York National Guard, which was called into the Federal service in 1941. As Governor of New York, I had the honor of organizing this regiment, which is one of the finest of the New York National Guard. I am very proud of it. Lieutenant Sutton has served with distinction during the Second World War as well as with our Armed Forces in Korea.

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

NEGRO UNIT HAILED ON HUNGNAM STAND—PLATOON LED BY BRONX OFFICER STAVED OFF MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO BEACHHEAD

WITH THE UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA, December 20.—A gallant Negro infantry platoon fought off the most threatening approach yet to a Communist breakthrough into the Hungnam beachhead.

The United States unit was led by Lt. Harry E. Sutton of 1100 Franklin Avenue, the Bronx, New York, when the North Koreans made their wild charge.

The Red assault disintegrated when each United States soldier was down to his last ammunition clip of eight bullets. That's how close the Communists came to penetrating at least the outer United Nations defense ring.

The savage battle of "Sutton's Ridge" began before dawn Monday. The United States counterattack ended Tuesday noon.

Since then the United States troops have shifted positions. The story now can be told without endangering security.

A famous Third Division regiment was holding part of the hilly eastern flank of the beachhead. Lieutenant Sutton's platoon was assigned to a long, three-humped ridge.

Lieutenant Sutton has been a soldier a long time and an infantry lieutenant 5 years. He spotted his men in strong points on the three ridge nipples and along the World War I type trenches that civilian workers had gouged in the frozen earth.

He was worried. Fresh North Korean soldiers—reorganized, reequipped, and fanatic—were on the next ridge line over. On his right flank they had strong-pointed a hill that surrounding crags masked from United States artillery.

At 7:45 a. m., Monday, the Communists struck. Crawling up the bare windswept ridge came three groups of 20 men—one group on each flank, one dead center. Just a small attack, but made by ferocious men who would not stop even when wounded.

The United States soldiers moved back and forth in their old-fashioned trench, picking off the Reds.

"But they kept coming and coming," Lieutenant Sutton said. "All day small groups of them kept coming. We would wipe out this bunch and before we knew it the Reds were back again."

The Communists from the ridge-line opposite tried to pin down Lieutenant Sutton's men with fire so the assault groups could reach the trench line. The Reds were firing captured United States Browning automatic rifles, machine guns, and Garand rifles.

Master Sgt. Tyler Collins, of Malone, Fla., stood bolt upright and picked off seven Communists. A bazooka man killed 10 with a single shell. But the Reds kept coming for more than 11 hours. Finally at 7 p. m. there was a break.

"We have licked them," the GI's told each other jubilantly.

Shortly after small arms began again from the opposite ridge. There was no assault this time, just the continual bark of snipers' rifles through the long, frigid night.

At 6 a. m. Tuesday the Reds assaulted Sutton's ridge. From the ridge opposite the center of the line came a fierce wall of fire.

A suicide enemy force struck up the slope against the left flank.

Lieutenant Sutton was not too worried about these two fronts—the massed fire power of United States artillery could hit there.

But from the hill on the right—masked from the guns by the other hills—the main force of the enemy was assaulting in the darkness. The Reds were coming down a precipitous slope, tying short fiber ropes on scrub pines and lowering themselves.

With flashing bayonets they burst into the strong point on the last of the three nipples on Lieutenant Sutton's ridge. The GI's there fought desperately. Later, in one fox hole, Lieutenant Sutton found two dead North Koreans and the body of the United States soldier who had killed them before he died.

Once inside the trenches the Reds turned the United States soldiers' own machine gun down the ridgeline.

Pfc Elijah Whitley, of Toledo, Ark., replied with his Browning automatic rifle, silencing the machine gun. Along the ridgeline, Lieutenant Sutton and his men rolled hand grenades down the slope. In the breaking dawn they could see the Communists crumple and tumble down the slope and then see new men replace them. Bodies were strewn crazily on the slopes.

"We gave them everything we had," Lieutenant Sutton said.

That was enough. The last fanatic charge disintegrated.

Reinforcements reached the United States line. United States mortars thumped down on the enemy-held right-hand ridge nipple. Lieutenant Sutton led a counterattack. The enemy was driven off it and Lieutenant Sutton's men again held all of the ridge.

MRS. SUTTON VOICES PRIDE

Holding her 8-month-old daughter, Linda Louise, in her arms and flanked by her other child, Harry E. Sutton, Jr., Mrs. Vadnie Sutton could only say last night: "I'm terribly proud of my husband." Through the day, she had heard over the radio and read in the newspapers about the heroic exploit of her husband, First Lt. Harry E. Sutton.

Neighbors crowded her small apartment and offered congratulations. Mrs. Sutton, born in this city, said her husband had been with the United States Army for 10 years.

What Are We Trying To Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Are We Trying To Do?" written by Louis Bromfield, and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 13, 1951.

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

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO?

(By Louis Bromfield)

In Washington we are certainly suffering from a confusion compounded of confusion and tragically the confusion finds its way into the hearts of all of us.

It seems to me that much of the confusion arises from hypocrisy, dishonesty, and the deliberate and calculated misuse of words.

Instead of dealing with realities and truth, the administration and in particular the State Department is dealing with a fog of illusions, shifty maneuvers, and deliberate deception.

Each time that I read in the newspapers or hear over the radio the term "United Nations forces now fighting in Korea," something turns over inside me. Why does this hypocrisy exist? The war in Korea is between American forces and those of Soviet Russia and her puppet, China. All the supplies and expenses are furnished by the American people. Not 1 percent of the troops are supplied by the other nations included in the UN.

Why does the administration insist on referring to a full-scale tragic and disastrous war as a police action when it is war being fought by us, virtually single-handed?

What, indeed, has the UN turned out to be but an agency which has shilled and shallied and hamstrung our efforts in a bitter war.

Our State Department and our military leaders, hamstrung first of all by Mr. Truman himself, cannot fight an all-out war. They must await the consent and decisions of the UN, made up of other countries playing both ends against the middle, while our own American soldiers are being frozen, wounded, and killed.

We cannot bomb the supply sources and lines in Manchuria without the permission of the UN. This will never come so long as European nations want to continue their trade in war materials used against us and Great Britain wants to protect Hong Kong from attack as a port out of which she is making money while we pay in lives and expense.

What is the UN anyway?

It is not the only world alliance of nations. There are two—the UN and the Cominform nations.

Soviet Russia, under a plan worked out by Alger Hiss, Mr. Acheson, and others, has the power to veto and block nearly all decisive collective action. Soviet Russia and her satellites all sit in on the UN which even invites an aggressor nation like Soviet China to present its utterly destructive case. None of our side sits in on the Cominform UN.

And not only are we as a Nation and the UN as an organization hamstrung by the Soviet group, but confusion is created by every nation which wants to save itself at the expense of the United States. The philosophy seems to be "You protect us but don't do anything rough which might involve us in a war. Just fight a war with one hand tied behind your back and we'll be safe."

In the Western Europe that remains free, there are approximately 330,000,000 of people. In the United States there are 150,000,000, yet President Truman drafts our sons and brothers with the avowed intention of sending them to Europe to defend these 330,000,000. We have already contributed about $50,000,000,000 to the economic welfare of these 330,000,000 and we are expending more billions to arm them, yet they make very little effort to defend themselves.

The labor government of Great Britain clearly places its mangy Socialist ideals above the welfare of the nation and the free world itself. It insists upon nationalizing the vital steel industry and throwing it into the confusion and inefficiency of bureaucratic management in the midst of the worst crisis the Western World has ever known.

Washington tells us that aid to Great Britain under the Marshall plan has ended and in the same breath tells us that we are paying two and a half billion to Great Britain to help arm her. What kind of silly double talk is this? What difference does it make to a government on the verge of bankruptcy whether we call the two and a half billions Marshall plan or military aid? It's all in the same pot, and we American citizens pay it while we draft the best of our young men to do the fighting, not only in Asia but, if Mr. Truman has his way, in Europe as well.

Mr. Truman cries "Wolf! Wolf!" and declares an emergency when there is no emergency, save the unpreparedness which grew out of the politicking and inefficiency of his own administration and the high command of the Armed Forces, which spent fifty billions in 5 years to achieve a state of unpreparedness. It is not possible to cry "Emergency" again and again and again. What, therefore, happens when a real emergency arises?

What is it we are trying to do?

Whither are we bound?

Why do we go on calling Communists in this country "Communists" instead of what they are—a Soviet Russian fifth column of saboteurs?

We cannot meet any situation or even save ourselves so long as we deal with hypocrisies, deceits, and secret agreements designed to sell the American people a bill of goods under false pretenses.

Or is all this because Stalin, before the whole world, has made fools of certain high officials at the very top of our Government?

Warning to the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Warning to the Northwest," published in the McMinnville (Oreg.) Telephone Register of December 28, 1950.

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

WARNING TO THE NORTHWEST

Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE'S call for investigation of the Federal Government's procurement procedure and policies should sound an ominous warning to every small community and business firm in the Pacific Northwest.

The demand came after several days of intensive and frustrating investigation by the Oregon Senator, his staff, and Edward H. Lay, of McMinnville, as to why Lay and similar small manufacturers in the Northwest were not getting an opportunity to make competitive bids on Government orders. The group searched the files of every major procurement office in Washington, D. C. They found the Lay firm listed in the index files, but in no case did they find the name carried through to the bid lists. This was in spite of the fact that Lay had made numerous attempts to get on the lists and had filled out several times all necessary papers to be placed on the lists.

The investigation uncovered the fact that there were no small firms in the Northwest on the bid list. With exception of a few major concerns, which can afford to maintain representatives in Washington, D. C., the entire Northwest is out in the cold at the present time as far as defense contracts are concerned.

The effect of this situation on the economy of our area is not hard to realize. The United States is already involved in a real war in Korea. We have underway a tremendous mobilization program to prepare the Nation for total world war, which Government officials apparently believe is possible if not probable in the near future.

The best word available out of the chaotic situation in Washington indicates that full controls would be in effect now, over all United States production, if the Government were ready to administer the burdens such controls demand. Unless there is a real easing of the international situation, which looks out of the question at the moment, we probably will see severe curtailment of civilian production during 1951. Little effort is being made to protect small-business investments in the rush to rearm the Nation.

It is obvious that our Northwest communities will suffer severely if war production does not take up some of the slack that curtailment of civilian production and distribution is going to leave. We may have major industries in metropolitan areas, such as Portland's World War II shipbuilding, to employ manpower, but even that is not progressing too rapidly. There seems real reluctance in Washington to increase war industrialization in this area.

If we have a shutdown in many lines of civilian business, our area will lose population to districts that are humming with war orders. We are going to see the Northwest's economy set back immeasurably. It is a situation that the people of the Pacific Northwest must not tolerate.

Senator MORSE found that specifications on many products the Lay Co., in conjunction with some 20 other firms, sought to build were drawn so as to completely eliminate western woods. The hardwood interests of the East and South had the full inside track and would have continued to hold that advantage had not the demand been made after Mr. Lay's trip into Washington. Oregon lumber production, purchased under a separate agency, was not affected.

* * * The people of the entire Northwest should make intensive efforts to see that their Washington representatives immediately get behind a program to increase defense production in this area. We have the materials and manpower. The items we could make would go directly overseas from here, relieving cross-country transport snarls.

The situation is vital to every Northwest community that wants to continue a healthy economy. There is nothing like widespread demands from the people to awaken Washington delegations to their responsibilities, and such demand should be made—and fast. Small-business firms, as MORSE pointed out, are not able to maintain contact men in Washington, D. C., or make frequent trips to the Capital to make personal contact for a chance at Government orders.

Californians recognize the problem and spend untold sums maintaining large staffs in the Capital. Large corporations, such as the automobile manufacturers, keep huge crews at work there. We cannot afford such outlays to protect the interests of small business in the Northwest, but its continuation is just as vital to this section as to any other. We must demand that our Representatives shoulder this load and see to it that this area is not forgotten.

Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

MIDCENTURY WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 18, 1950

At the concluding sessions of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 4,620 delegates with voting privilege adopted the following recommendations:

PLEDGE TO CHILDREN

As its closing action, the conference unanimously adopted the following pledge:

"To you, our children, who hold within you our most cherished hopes, we the members of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, relying on your full response, make this pledge:

"From your earliest infancy we give you our love, so that you may grow with trust in yourself and in others.

"We will recognize your worth as a person and we will help you to strengthen your sense of belonging.

"We will respect your right to be yourself and at the same time help you to understand the rights of others, so that you may experience cooperative living.

"We will help you to develop initiative and imagination, so that you may have the opportunity freely to create."

PREAMBLE

Believing in the primacy of spiritual values, democratic practice, and the dignity and worth of every human being, and recognizing that these are essential to individual happiness and responsible citizenship, we have come together to inquire—

How the necessary mental, emotional, and spiritual qualities may be developed in children, and

How the physical, economic, and social conditions favorable to such development may be assured.

And having found that children require, for their fullest development—

Regard for their individual worth and sensitive respect for their feelings, from all who touch their lives.

Loving care and guidance from mothers and fathers, who have a sense of the privilege and responsibility which parenthood involves, and who have confidence in their capacity to rear a child.

A secure home that is free from want, and dread of want, and provides all family members with a satisfying physical, aesthetic, social, and spiritual environment.

A community whose citizens are dedicated to establishing the values and practices that make life meaningful and abundant for children of all colors, creeds, and customs, and to cooperative endeavor for the expression of these values and practices in daily living.

Full access to health, educational, recreational, social, and religious services and programs, directed toward the well-being of all they serve.

Concern on the part of all citizens for all children.

Devotion to the pursuit of knowledge and the wide application of that which is known.

If they are to grow in—

Trust in themselves and others.

Independence and initiative coupled with a true sense of being related to others.

Satisfaction in bringing individual and share tasks to completion.

A sense of personal destiny, of the responsible parts they will eventually play as parents, workers, citizens.

The capacity for the love that underlies the family and that ideally comes to embrace all mankind.

Creativity that brings into being new life, new relationships, new values, and new things of beauty and usefulness, and cherishes them for their worth.

Integrity that sees each life as personally meaningful within the period of history in which it is lived, and in relation to enduring values.

FURTHERING HEALTHY PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDREN AND YOUTH

The conference unanimously passed the first group of 25 recommendations, as amended from the floor.

1. The expansion of research on development and adjustment, and that such research include longitudinal studies of relations and factors that affect behavior and adjustment. In this way there will be provided a continuing understanding of infants, children, and youth and a sound basis for practices. We further recommend support by public and private agencies in extending research pertaining to healthy personality.

2. That the citizens of every community accept responsibility for providing and sustaining adequate programs and facilities with professional personnel for education, health, recreation, and social services. In the development of such programs full and appropriate use should be made of all voluntary and public resources.

3. That schools for professional workers include in their curricula instruction in human growth and change and in family counseling, together with practical experience.

4. That ways and means be found for the formal and informal in-service education of professional people and that promising practices be widely disseminated.

5. That education for parenthood be made available to all through educational, health, religious, and welfare agencies maintaining professional standards and by properly qualified individuals.

6. That nursery schools and kindergartens, as a desirable supplement to home life, be included as a part of public educational opportunity for children provided they meet high professional standards.

7. That children be provided with opportunities that are wide in range and challenging in nature, emphasizing exploration, participation, and social experience in an environment that is rich and stimulating; and that expectations of achievement should be in harmony with each child's ability and growth.

8. That appropriate public bodies set minimum standards for agencies and institutions providing foster care for children, whether foster day care or full-time care, and provide for the authorization or licensing and supervision as to maintenance of standards.

9. That all States establish standards for the hospital care of mothers and children, in order to assure the quality of care which modern science knows how to give; and that these standards take into account the importance of avoiding unnecessary distress and anxiety.

10. That specialists and agencies take every opportunity to foster and increase parents' feelings of satisfaction and self-confidence; and that material concerning the growth and development of children be made as reassuring and nontechnical as possible, and not hold up false standards of perfection.

11. That elementary, secondary, college and community education include such appropriate experiences and studies of childhood and family life as will help young people to mature toward the role of parenthood.

12. That one department in each State government whether it be welfare, health, or education, working in close conjunction with the other departments concerned, set up all-inclusive minimum standards for all day-care center nursery schools and kindergartens.

13. That appropriate public bodies establish minimum standards for licensing or authorization with respect to plant, program, and staff, for all child-care and preschool groups.

14. That there be authoritative exploration of methods of improving the economic situation of children in families with inadequate incomes, giving particular attention to family allowances, tax exemptions for children and expenses of working mothers.

15. That development of new housing facilities give special attention to health, recreational, and social needs; to the extent that private industry does not provide suitable housing for low-income families, that such housing continue to be developed by governmental agencies.

16. That programs for children and youth with handicaps be expanded to provide for physical, mental, emotional, and occupational needs.

17. That local boards of education accept full responsibility for planning and providing adequate educational programs and services, including special services, to meet the needs of children with physical and mental limitations; and that State departments of education accept responsibility for leadership service in realizing this objective.

18. That guidance and counseling services in schools, employment offices, and youth-servicing agencies be strengthened and extended; and that such services take into account emotional factors involved in vocational adjustment and aptitude for specific jobs.

19. That children of migrant and seasonal workers be given all the protections and services available to other children, with special regard to transportation, housing, sanitation, health and educational services, social benefits, and protection under labor laws.

20. That school lunches be provided and that children unable to pay for their lunches be furnished them free, without being differentiated from the children who pay.

21. That restrictive eligibility provisions be eliminated from public assistance programs so as to provide assistance to all children in need.

22. That Federal grants to States for public assistance be varied with the financial ability of the States but sufficient to protect children's personalities from the ill effects of inadequate income.

23. That racial segregation in education be abolished.

24. That it be made possible for qualified youth to obtain college or university education which would otherwise be denied them because of inability to pay.

25. That, as an aid to the economic stability of children and their mothers, the old-age and survivors insurance program be further extended to cover workers not presently included and to make benefits more adequate; and that similar improvements be made in State unemployment insurance laws.

In addition, the Conference adopted a motion from the floor to include the following in its recommendations:

"That churches of various faiths coordinate, strengthen, and expand their religious services and activities for people of inadequate income."

FURTHERING HEALTHY PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE FAMILY, THE CHURCH, THE SCHOOL, AND OTHER SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

1. That there be a comprehensive study of the present body of law relating to children and families and the methods of implementing such laws; and that the study shall include laws that serve to impede the progress of Indians in the fields of social and cultural advance.

2. That law schools include courses on family law and the relationship of the law to other professions, and schools of social work include courses in the law and its philosophy.

3. That standards be developed for juvenile services by police departments.

4. That, in accordance with State-wide standards, courts of superior jurisdiction, with judges qualified in the law with an understanding of social and psychological factors, and with qualified probation staff and auxiliary personnel, be available for all cases involving children with problems that require court action in rural and urban areas.

5. That the preventive and treatment functions of social agencies, police, courts, institutions, and after-care agencies be coordinated so as to insure continuity of service.

6. That more emphasis be put on the effects of recreational activities on the personality of the individual; and that in all neighborhoods where children and youth reside there should be provided recreation centers under professional and voluntary supervision.

7. That youth have an equal chance with adults to participate in planning and carrying out recreational activities; and that, as a practical aid for such planning, States be encouraged to study and establish official State

boards of recreation to provide counsel and information assistance in recreation matters to communities, particularly small towns and rural areas.

8. That States and other appropriate public bodies establish and enforce standards covering the employment of youth in all occupations, such standards to include minimum age and wages, as well as hours of work, night work, protection from hazardous occupations, and provisions for workmen's compensation; and that, under these conditions, employers in cooperation with labor be urged to provide appropriate work experience for youth on a part-time basis.

9. Prompt action should be taken at the national level to provide funds to supplement those of States and localities, and to stimulate the early development of adequate local health service throughout the country, such action being particularly needed because of the physical and mental effects of mobilization and war on the mothers, children, and youth.

10. That a continuous program of education regarding the role of social service in adoption be carried on for the general public and for the professions involved to the end that effective safeguards be achieved for the protection of the adopted child, his natural parents, and his adopted parents; that existing legislation be strengthened, and if need be, new legislation enacted to assure such protection; and that qualified adoption agencies, local and State-wide, voluntary and public, be strengthened and developed to further assure such protection.

11. Further Federal aid should be provided to the States for educational services, in tax-supported public schools, without Federal control, to help equalize educational opportunity—the issue of auxiliary services to be considered on its merits in sepaarte legislation.

12. That all professions dealing with children have, as an integral part of the preparation, a core of common experiences on fundamental concepts of human behavior including the need to consider the total person as well as any specific disorder; the interrelationship of physical, mental, social, religious, and cultural forces; the importance of interpersonal relationships; and the role of self-understanding; and emphasis on the positive recognition and production of healthy personalities and the treatment of variations; and that lay people be oriented through formal or informal education to an understanding of the importance of the foregoing concepts.

13. That steps be taken at National, State, and local levels to improve the facilities and increase the output of professional schools preparing persons for services to children.

14. That an inquiring attitude be maintained toward all services, with appropriate provision at all levels for continuous scientific study of needs, objectives, alternative methods, and effectiveness of programs.

MAKING MORE POSITIVE THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC FORCES ON PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

1. Recognizing knowledge and understanding of religious and ethical concepts as essential to the development of spiritual values and that nothing is of greater importance to the moral and spiritual health of our Nation than the works of religious education in our homes and families and in our institutions of organized religion, we nevertheless strongly affirm the principle of separation of church and state, which has been the keystone of our American democracy and declare ourselves unalterably opposed to the use of the public schools directly or indirectly for religious educational purposes.

2. That there be further study of the underlying causes of broken homes and increasing divorce.

3. That we support the full program recommended by the President's Commission on Civil Rights because it represents our faith in and practice of democracy and we further urge prompt steps to eliminate all types of racial and religious segregation and that this conference through its most appropriate channels appeal to the Federal Government to abolish segregation in the Nation's Capital, making Washington the world's example of a truly working democratic absence of discriminatory practices on the basis of race, creed, or color.

4. That to insure the welfare of all children the following specific measures be taken to provide a well-rounded comprehensive housing and community development program:

A. Maximum emphasis should be placed on maintaining standards adequate for health, comfort, and decency in both private and public housing construction.

B. That the construction of 810,000 low-rent public housing units should proceed at full speed in order to provide much-needed housing for low-income families now living in slums.

C. To meet the needs of middle-income families who are ineligible for public housing, that there be developed a cooperative-housing program specifically geared to the needs and income of middle-income families.

D. That our national housing program should meet the requirements of families not only in every income group, but also in every type of community, rural and urban, and families of every size from the largest to the smallest.

E. That the slum clearance and urban development and redevelopment program, now getting under way with Federal assistance, be supported as an integral part of over-all community planning.

F. That the need principle be regarded as the prime criterion in providing defense housing facilities in a period of mobilization.

5. That specific efforts be made to bring lower income groups up to a higher income level and to increase their real income by providing a greater variety of community services. (All expansion of services should include children in all the States and Territories.)

6. That in view of television's unprecedented growth and its potential as a medium for mass education, the television industry and all educational, health, and social agencies seeking to use this medium accept their great social responsibility; and further that this principle apply also to the other mass media of communications.

7. That the Federal Communications Commission reserve television channels for noncommercial educational television stations so that some part of the limited number of frequencies to be allocated by the Commission may be reserved for educational uses and purposes.

8. That all groups concerned develop and maintain programs for protecting the healthy personality of children living under the stress of defense preparation.

9. That in the present emergency the sacrifices demanded should be shared by all individuals and groups in the population and that the services of men with physical and other disabilities be utilized in some capacity without the use of categories, such as IV–F.

10. That more and better educational opportunities be made available for young adults in civilian and military life.

11. That schools, labor, industry, and other community agencies involved and the military services improve and expand their personnel, evaluation, placement, and vocational guidance and counseling activities to serve the interests of the young people and to promote the over-all development and utilization of our total human resources.

12. That provision of adequate allowances be made for wives and children of servicemen.

13. That the participation of children and youth in times of community stress should be in agreement with their stage of development and designed to minimize their anxieties.

14. That governmental and voluntary agencies work to meet the needs of wives and children of the personnel in the Armed Forces moving to new communities, to insure their absorption into community life and the provision of adequate housing, health, educational, spiritual, and recreational services to meet their needs.

MOBILIZING CITIZENS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH

1. That community groups and community leaders reexamine their attitudes and procedures in the light of findings of this conference, and make appropriate adaptations and changes.

2. In order to insure proper assessment, creative planning, and appropriate action with respect to meeting the needs of children and youth, that communities undertake the following tasks on a continuing basis:

A. Develop broad community interests.

B. Obtain the broadest possible community sponsorship.

C. Obtain where necessary technical assistance in planning and carrying out the program.

D. Initiate or organize studies and gather facts that are focused on specific problems according to priorities.

E. Interpret the facts, and inform the community as to their significance.

Since goals and methods are closely intertwined, that in undertaking these tasks the methods used be based on the following principles:

A. People as individuals and as groups should be helped to help themselves. Professional workers should find their role in giving such help.

B. It should be recognized that differences and stresses may be present and can be utilized positively.

C. There should be broad-based participation of all groups without discrimination as to age, sex, race, creed, national origin, or economic levels.

D. Fact-finding should be used as part of a total educational process.

E. Channels of communication between individuals and groups should be provided for the purpose of not only furthering common social objectives but also for the improvement of relations between groups.

F. Since the community is served by both public and private agencies, which have a common concern for meeting the needs of children and youth, the endeavors of both in planning, assessment, and financing should be utilized.

3. That greater emphasis be placed by the various professions on utilizing methods and seeking new means of bringing the parents into participation in thinking and planning with and for their children.

4. That professional workers should be trained in such a way that they will have an understanding of and respect for other professional skills and contributors in order that they may work together to further community growth. Some of the ways that this might be achieved are:

A. In all levels of undergraduate education, that students receive broad preparation in the knowledge of human growth behavior, and motivation which ought to be common knowledge for all students. This would also serve as a background for professional education.

B. In schools preparing for professional work, that there be included in the curriculum both through the classroom and field experiences opportunities for cooperative work as problems common to all professional interests.

C. The practicing professional worker further his training by seeking, utilizing and promoting opportunities to relate to and participate with other professional and citizens

groups in resolving problems of the individual and the community.

D. That orientation programs be planned for all professional persons and interprofessional groups in the community.

5. Participation in planning in the community should begin in the schools and in other institutions in order that children, youth, and adults learn the importance of voluntary participation and responsibility for community leadership.

6. All interested groups should work in partnership to recruit, train, and use volunteer leaders for community programs, with special attention to using young people in appropriate ways.

7. Since citizen participation is essential for effective community services for children and youth, when not already provided, citizen advisory boards and similar groups representative of the community be established for public services as well as private and that every effort be made to enable and secure participation by a cross section of the citizenry. That educational institutions and other groups emphasize the importance of participation by volunteers as a basic factor in citizen responsibility.

8. Communities foster cooperative community councils representative of all community interests to study and advance better conditions and opportunities for young workers.

9. Citizens be encouraged to support adequate appropriations and qualified staff to administer and enforce basic legislative standards of States, and other appropriate public bodies, covering the employment of youth.

10. That more energetic efforts be made by both public and private organizations for support of selective recruitment and training of professional workers and for an extensive program of scholarships.

11. Recognizing that youth has rights and responsibilities for better community living, that progressive opportunities be provided for youth to participate vitally in community activities and planning in order that youth may early have the preparation and experience for leadership and community service. Further that the professional workers accept their responsibilities to stimulate the community to see that these opportunities are provided for youth.

12. That youth representatives be placed on community boards of various agencies in order that they may participate in the planning, developmental, and operational phases of the total community programs.

13. Immediate vigorous, and continuing work be undertaken to provide for the organization and financing of National, State, and local programs which would put the conference recommendations into action.

RESOLUTION ON FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM

Whereas the President of the United States who called this Midcentury White House Conference has stated that "essential for the progress of mankind" and the preservation of "our own liberty as a Nation" are "ways to help our children and young people become mentally and morally stronger" and develop into the "self-reliant individuals" which are the strength of our democracy; and

Whereas the President has urged that "in the days ahead—we will have to make special efforts to see that children get a fair chance at the right start in life" and has asked this Conference to proceed immediately toward such goals; and

Whereas over 100,000 citizens in all States and Territories have studied ways of improving the well-being of children in their own communities; and

Whereas the White House Conference has so dramatically demonstrated the pressing need for the better application of that which we know and that which we assume to be good as well as the importance of filling by further research the wide gaps in our knowledge of human and social behavior; and

Whereas the follow-up on the recommendations and implications of the findings of the Midcentury White House Conference depend upon the fullest partnership of voluntary and official effort; and

Whereas this White House Conference has demonstrated the need for more effective communication between the national, State and local levels; and

Whereas there is need to establish a continuity of effort in follow-up; and

Whereas the national committee of the White House Conference, its advisory councils, and delegates in attendance at the December meetings have recommended that machinery be authorized to implement follow-up: Be it

Resolved that this Conference recommends approval of the following principles in effecting appropriate action in follow-up:

1. The chief operating group upon which the responsibility for follow-up should fall will be existing organizations—national, State, and local.

2. That chief purposes of the follow-up effort should be to disseminate the findings of the Conference, stimulate action on its recommendations, and promote research designed to fill the gaps of knowledge which the Conference has brought forth.

3. That the participation of youth and the inter-disciplinary approach demonstrated in this Conference should be maintained and further developed.

4. That the formation of a national committee is important as an advisory and consultative group. Such a committee should work through all the groups which have a primary concern for the well-being of the Nation's children and youth. It should be made up of individual citizens asked to serve in their own right rather than as representatives of organizations or interests and determine its own methods of financing.

5. That provision for continuity be implemented by (a) including on this new committee five selected members from each of the present advisory councils wishing to participate in follow-up, members from the presently organized committee and members at large; and (b) by providing for State and local follow-up organization.

6. That on-going activities should be effected by this national committee through an advisory council for participation of national organizations and an advisory council for State and local action and through such technical committee as may be indicated and should provide for appropriate cooperation with governmental groups at all levels.

7. That it is understood that the national committee here proposed would of necessity have discretion, within the framework of the purposes herein set forth, to make such changes as will assure the attainment of the objectives of the Midcentury White House Conference.

8. That authority for setting up this follow-up program be given to the national committee of the Midcentury White House Conference.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the December 21, 1950, issue of the Manchester Guardian Weekly discussing the Marshall plan. The editorial provides clear evidence again of the effectiveness of the Marshall plan. As I have said so many times and now repeat, I consider the Marshall plan, on the economic front, to be the greatest contributor to checking the spread of communism throughout Europe.

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

THE MARSHALL PLAN

It is not the failure but the success of the Marshall plan that has led to the suspension of further aid to Britain. In 5 years we have had first a loan of $3,750,000,000 and then allocations of nearly $2,700,000,000 under the European recovery program. Now, 18 months before the close of the 4-year plan, the sterling area is earning a surplus of dollars—and not, as is commonly believed, because of abnormally high raw-material prices. Higher export proceeds have accounted for something like one-fifth of the unexpected change-over from dollar gap to dollar surplus. Lower imports account for the major part, and this reduction has been brought about partly by devaluation and partly by the ability of growing British production to take the place of dollar goods. Marshall aid has been a vital component of recovery. Ordinary words of thanks are inadequate to meet the occasion. We can only say that the American people have proved themselves to be farsighted as well as generous, and the first is much rarer in this world than the second. Success is worth more than gratitude. Here is one of the most brilliant successes in the history of international relations. All concerned have reason to be pleased with themselves. Statesmanship has been applied to the ending as well as to the starting of the plan. The abrupt close of lend-lease at the end of the war did untold harm to western unity; this time the ending is to be gradual and sensible. Goods in the pipeline will be paid for, though some heavy industrial equipment will not arrive until 1952. Commitments under the European Payments Union will be met. Promises which led this country to undertake financial risks abroad will be kept. In fact, the whole apparatus of the Marshall plan remains in being, and this country remains a full member. The marginal activities, like the Productivity Council and the Fulbright scholarships, will continue. If there should be a set-back to the sterling position the present agreement will be reviewed. All this is highly satisfactory. We shall not, of course, do without American aid altogether. We depend on the United States for our defense, and we expect to receive some help toward the cost of rearmament, particularly the cost of imported raw materials for defense production. The amount to be allotted to Britain—and the form of it—remains to be settled by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The need will depend a good deal on the prices of the raw materials we need, and these in turn depend on the joint planning of raw material supplies which Mr. Attlee proposed in Washington. News of these unsolved problems will be awaited with some anxiety. But nothing can diminish the great news of today. We may be excused for feeling like a man who has paid back a large loan to a friend. Marshall aid to Europe has meant a contribution of £88 from every American family; and the vast majority of Americans are not so well off that the extra tax burden has come easy to them. We salute the American taxpayer and hope he has got value for money. We have done our best to give it to him.

Let Us Face the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I see from the press—Wall Street Journal, January 18, 1951—that the United States Treasury will soon ask owners of $1,100,000,000 of series E savings bonds that mature in 1951 to hold on to them a few more years. At the present rate of depreciation of the purchasing power of the dollar I am sure the interest that the holders of E bonds will ultimately receive will vanish into thin air. Why not stabilize the value of the E bonds and all other United States bonds by cutting down unnecessary, nonessential and nondefense expenditures of the Truman spendthrift administration. The road to the repudiation of United States bonds and the devaluation of the dollar is being greased by the Truman spenders.

The citizens who doubt this drab picture ought to study the proposed budget authorizations for expenditures during fiscal year 1952 compiled by Paul O. Peters. Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting the compilation of Mr. Peters:

Proposed budget authorizations for expenditures—fiscal year 1952

[Compiled by Paul O. Peters, from the budget for fiscal 1952]

Description	Recommended in 1952 budget	Proposed for later	Total
Appropriations recommended:			
Legislative branch	$73,334,906		$73,334,906
The judiciary	26,483,240		26,483,240
Executive Office, the President	35,331,215		35,331,215
Funds to the President	45,476,271	$11,180,000,000	11,225,476,271
Independent offices	7,091,727,250	510,000,000	7,601,727,250
Federal Security Agency	1,886,373,558	335,000,000	2,221,373,558
General Services Administration	148,211,400	1,000,000,000	1,148,211,400
Housing and Home Finance Agency	37,730,000		37,730,000
Department of Agriculture	993,043,560		993,043,560
Department of Commerce	933,640,925	129,400,000	1,063,040,925
Defense Department, military		62,510,000,000	62,510,000,000
Defense Department, civil functions	641,950,000	170,000,000	811,950,000
Department of the Interior	619,858,473	8,000,000	627,858,473
Department of Justice	156,831,000		156,831,000
Department of Labor	231,291,500		231,291,500
Post Office (general fund)	521,374,000	[1] 361,374,000	160,000,000
Department of State	283,646,376	30,000,000	313,646,376
Treasury Department	6,494,013,482		6,494,013,482
District of Columbia (contribution)	12,000,000		12,000,000
Reserve for contingencies		200,000,000	200,000,000
Appropriations, total	20,232,317,156	75,711,026,000	95,943,343,156
Reappropriations: Department of State	625,000		625,000
Authorizations to expend from public debt receipts:			
Independent offices		1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000
House and Home Finance Agency	250,000,000		250,000,000
Department of Agriculture	689,000,000		689,000,000
	939,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,939,000,000
Reappropriation of authorization to spend from same fund	None	None	None
Total authorizations for expenditure, 1952	21,171,942,156	76,711,026,000	97,882,968,156
Contract authorizations, fiscal 1952:			
Housing and Home Finance Agency	100,000,000		100,000,000
Department of Commerce	520,000,000		520,000,000
Department of the Interior	1,000,000		1,000,000
	621,000,000		621,000,000
Deductions:			
For liquidation of prior contract authorizations:			
Legislative branch	5,000,000		5,000,000
Funds appropriated, President	44,476,271		44,476,271
Independent offices	379,700,000		379,700,000
General Services Administration		180,000,000	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,900,000		4,900,000
Federal Security Agency	164,830,000		164,830,000
Department of Commerce	618,626,925	125,000,000	743,626,925
Department of Defense		2,510,000,000	2,510,000,000
Department of the Interior	38,875,000		38,875,000
Department of Justice	360,000		360,000
Department of State	3,000,000		3,000,000
Deductions (subtract)	1,259,768,196	2,815,000,000	4,076,768,196
Net proposed appropriations and contract authorizations for fiscal 1952:			
Recommended in budget	20,533,173,960		
Proposed for later		73,896,026,000	
Grand total new funds			94,429,199,960

[1] Deduction for proposed postal-rate increase to reduce deficit.

SUMMARY

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the Budget requests for appropriations and authority to obligate the Government totals $87,459,449,977.

The proposed requests for fiscal 1952 total $94,429,199,960.

In 2 years the administration wants to spend $181,888,649,937.

The cost of operating State and local governments for the same two fiscal years is estimated at $41,000,000,000.

All government cost would be, under the present proposed spending for the 2 years, $221,888,649,937.

This huge amount represents more than 50 percent of the reported total national income for 1949 and nearly 50 percent of the reported average national income for the first half of the calendar year 1950.

The spending program for fiscal 1952 if approved by Congress will accelerate the inflationary trend, increase taxes, boost the public debt to new levels, and generally disturb the functioning of our entire economic system.

It is indeed time to reexamine our ability to spend and tax the people for the many international adventures included in Mr. Truman's plans for the fiscal year 1952.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Letter From Jesse H. Bond to Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a very interesting retired professor of business administration of the University of Oregon who does not always agree with the junior Senator from Oregon on economic and social legislation, but who, nevertheless, is always stimulating, even in his disagreements, and helpful in his contribution to the discussions of economics. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting letter I have recently received from him in which he sets forth some of his views on important issues.

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

EUGENE, OREG., *December 6, 1950.*

DEAR WAYNE: The time has come, it seems to me, for all men who think of themselves as civilized to reflect with humility and honesty on the fact that fish and animals get hooked and trapped by going full tilt after what they want, without seeing their situations whole. The more we become specialized and therefore limited in our first-hand knowledge, which is what happens to civilized men, the more we seem to become impatient when anyone attempts to acquaint us with unpalatable facts.

Fortunately or otherwise, my own first-hand experience, as well as my academic training, has been extraordinarily wide. I have been through the mill from child laborer in a market garden to landlord and small capitalist. My studies have included physics, chemistry, mathematics, sociology, political science, law, economics, accounting, and business management.

Just now, it appears to me, organized labor is in desperate need of considering some unpalatable facts, only two of which I shall here mention.

First, we must now and probably for several years, possibly a generation or more, produce more guns and less butter. If we try to preserve our butter production undiminished, we shall fall short of the necessary production of guns. The necessary sacrifice of some of our butter ought to be shared by all of us and not shirked by any large number, of course. There are two possible ways of approximating this result roughly, but no way of doing it perfectly. One of these ways is to ration the butter, the other

is to allow the price of butter to rise as the unavoidable scarcity grows in the markets.

Organized labor gives notice that, as the price of butter rises, wages must rise accordingly or even anticipate rising prices. In the absence of rationing, this amounts to a demand that labor escape all sacrifice of its butter consumption and pass the decline in standards of living on to Roxie Erb and other people on fixed, or partly fixed, incomes.

In this connection I suggest you glance over the National City Bank's monthly letter for November 1950, pages 123 to 126. It gives in full a letter from a CIO economist and gives what seems to me a deserved and soundly reasonable reply.

The second item is best introduced by a little personal experience. On my farm are buildings which would cost me over $20,000 to replace, yet I am allowed to charge depreciation only on $7,000, the original cost in dollars of pre-World War and predevaluation purchasing power. If I should have to scrap these buildings, even after recovering in depreciation the whole $7,000, I would be out anywhere from $13,000 to $18,000, with a set of buildings no better than the originals were when they were built. In other words, I must make extra profits of $13,000 to $18,000 before replacement because my income each year as reported and as taxed will have been substantially overstated. To put it another way, inflated replacement costs are an additional or ex post facto tax on income previously earned. To say it still differently, inflated replacement costs are a levy upon working capital, and they could ruin a business entirely if its debts are large. They reduce the ability of management either to pay dividends to their stockholders or to resist excessive demands by organized labor.

I quote from Poor's Investment Advisory Survey, November 25, 1950, final page: "There are some significant things which balance sheets do not show. In the case of steel, one of them is that present replacement costs of plant and equipment exceed $250 per ton of ingot capacity; and that if adequate depreciation reserves were set up on that basis, under present tax laws, the earnings of the industry would look like depression figures." On a recent calculation, the stock market prices of the common stocks of the eight largest steel companies were valuing their plant and equipment at from $36.32 to $87.42 per ton of annual ingot capacity. No, neither my wife nor I own any steel stocks, but we do own some other stocks, enough to enable us to get the investor's hardheaded and realistic point of view.

From that point of view, let's look at the 10,000,000-ton addition to annual ingot capacity which the administration is pushing the steel industry to make, and which must cost very close to $2,500,000,000, or even more since the most recent increases in steel wages and material costs. The requirements in the amount of working capital, or revolving liquid capital, will also be substantially increased.

It is extremely unlikely that such increased annual ingot capacity will be valued on the stock market at a higher rate than existing capacity. To be generous to the critics of steel profits, let us say the market value of the steel stocks might rise as much as $900,000,000. In other words, steel stockholders are being asked to spend between $250 and $300 to add $90 to the market value of their investments. One billion six hundred million dollars or more is thus destined to be taken from stockholders and poured into the inflation rat hole.

Where is this money coming from? Certainly not as a gift from Government, for that would be political suicide for any legislator who might dare to vote for it. Certainly not from new collections from the stockholders, because that would be asking them to throw away at least the $1,500,000,000 from their existing bank accounts, if not more. Eventually, loans or no loans, the whole $2,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 will have to come out of profits, or from one of the two sources mentioned above, which seem out of the question on any voluntary basis. And, mind you, it must come out of profits after taxes, which means that the steel industry must add at least some $5,000,000,000 to the selling prices of its products in order to retain the $2,500,000,000. Not a dollar of this $5,000,000,000 can be added to stockholders' dividends. Additional profits must exist, if working capital is to get necessary increases and fair dividends are to be paid.

Profits on this necessary scale, reported under present corporation income tax regulations, are bound to appear fabulous to anyone who takes the statistics of steel company profits at their apparent meaning, which CIO economists and officers choose to represent as valid, either knowingly or ignorantly. They put the steel industry, and others, in a false and vulnerable position before the jury.

The CIO handling of statistics, as I have observed it, has been an enthusiastic and even bitter use of half-truths wherever they can be used to favor their own interests more than whole truths, at least as I see them. By whatever extent they succeed in raising wages on the claim that they should be paid out of profits without raising prices, they raise replacement costs for steel making plant, make higher depreciation charges necessary, make increased working capital a necessity, make expansion possible only with still larger profits, cut down the proportion of profits which can be paid in dividends, and prepare a situation in which they can again argue for higher wages to be paid out of profits without raising prices, all by using statistics in their apparent meaning which, by Government rules, ignore existing replacement costs. Every investor regards these Government-ordered profits as phony, if he knows his facts as given by such impartial fact reporters as Standard & Poors. That is why the prices (they pay for steel stocks) value equipment with a replacement cost of $250 as low as from $32 to $87. These profit reports in the steel industry are phony in my opinion because they are subject to substantial ex post facto reduction when depreciated equipment is replaced at inflated costs.

This ex post facto reduction of past earnings probably hits the steel industry harder than any other because of the high rate of depreciation of equipment under the tremendous heats and pressures. This high rate of physical depreciation would not be so serious, if it were not for the unusually large investment in plant per dollar of output in finished steel.

In any sound theory of the price system, in my opinion, the remedy for high profits is expansion and competition in the particular industry. But in order to stimulate expansion and competition, the high profits must not, in the opinion of critical and careful investors, be mere overstatements required by law in the face of rising costs. In order to perform their stimulating function, profits must appear to be genuine and not subject to inevitable and substantial reduction for years after they have been earned, reported, and taxed. Why should investors put money into new plants when they can buy three times as much steel-producing capacity in the stock market for the same money?

In other words, by the standards of prudent investors, genuine profits are too small, not too high. These apparently high profits are made to appear so only by Government tax regulations which make no allowance for the fact of increasing inflation of replacement costs of plant and equipment, which hit the steel industry below the belt, in my honest belief.

To ask the steel industry to reduce its genuinely small profits through higher wages without raising prices, and at the same time asking it to finance an expansion to the tune of $2,500,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 to raise annual capacity for ingot production by 10,000,000 tons is to take another long step toward making free enterprise impotent and ready for the scrap heap. Then we shall all have less liberty and a lower standard of living, but, praise God, no one will make profits, either genuine or phony. Or should I praise Marx?

Yours earnestly,

JESSE H. BOND.

It's Time To Reexamine Foreign Commitments That Threaten United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "It's Time To Reexamine Foreign Commitments That Threaten United States" delivered by the distinguished former United States Senator from Kansas, Arthur Capper. Senator Capper, elder statesman of Kansas, is recognized as the No. 1 citizen by the people of our State.

He was a member of this distinguished body for 30 years and during much of that service was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which gave him an opportunity to become familiar with our international problems.

His suggestion that we reexamine our foreign commitments at the present time, I am confident, meets with the approval of the people of Kansas.

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

IT'S TIME TO REEXAMINE FOREIGN COMMITMENTS THAT THREATEN UNITED STATES

In the days ahead, as we work out, the hard way, foreign and domestic policies that can enable America to survive, there is one important point which we cannot ignore.

That point is just this:

We must start from where we are today.

We cannot start from 1900, nor from 1914, nor from 1941. Nor even from 1945.

We have to start from now, whether we like it or not.

Nations and peoples are like individuals in that respect.

They, like you and I, on any today are where all our yesterdays have placed us.

Our Nation today is just exactly where our national leadership, over past years, has placed us.

And our decisions for today, and our programs for tomorrow and for many tomorrows, inevitably will have to be based on that understanding.

For instance, we cannot change the fact that we are engaged, our men are engaged, in a losing battle in Korea.

That is an inescapable fact.

We cannot change the fact that we have occupation forces in Japan; that we have occupation forces in Germany.

Neither can we escape the fact that we, through our leadership, at times without our consent, even without our knowledge, have made certain commitments to other nations and other peoples.

We have made commitments under the Marshall plan; legally for a definite period ending in 1952; perhaps morally for a longer period.

We certainly have approved the Charter of the United Nations, through ratification of that Charter by the Senate as a treaty.

We have committed ourselves, also in a treaty duly ratified by the Senate, through the Atlantic Pact to defend certain other nations in the so-called Atlantic community, in case they or any of them are attacked.

We cannot escape the fact that we have accumulated a national debt that is approaching the $300,000,000,000 mark, and all that that implies.

Nor can we refuse to recognize as a fact, getting back into the field of domestic affairs, that we have made certain commitments to many of our own people: the aged, the unemployed, the farmers, the veterans.

What other foreign commitments and entanglements we have been committed to through secret agreements, we have yet to learn.

I could go on for a long time, reciting things done yesterday, promises and commitments made yesterday which cannot be ignored in our decisions today and our plans for tomorrow.

I would say furthermore, that the commitments we have made, to nations outside and overseas, and commitments made to our own people, should be kept—should be kept to the limits of our ability to keep them.

But I also say the time has come to re-examine a number of these commitments, and reexamine the policies which led to those commitments.

If upon reexamination it is decided that certain of those policies are leading the United States to destruction, and the people of the United States toward the loss of their freedom and their birthright, then these policies should be changed.

And I say further that if upon reexamination into all the facts and factors in the case, that certain commitments cannot be kept, then we should retract those commitments, upon due notice, and with due regard to obligations that other nations and peoples have undertaken upon the strength of those commitments.

And if, upon this reexamination, it develops that our leaders have made unauthorized commitments, have adopted unwise and unsound policies—then we should change that leadership as quickly as is possible.

I am perfectly aware that we cannot live our yesterdays over again. The decisions we made in our yesterdays, the things we did in our yesterdays, are past, cannot be unmade and undone.

But we can, and should, so conduct our affairs that those wrong decisions and those wrong actions, are not made over again.

We cannot escape the evil consequences of the unconditional-surrender policy, the Morgenthau plan, the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

But we ought not to continue the policies and programs—and the leadership—which gave us those policies and those unfortunate agreements, and which have reduced us to our present and very unpleasant situation.

Because what we do in the field of domestic affairs right now is so largely dependent upon our policies in the field of foreign relations, I repeat today the assertion I made nearly a year ago, that Secretary of State Dean Acheson should resign.

I say the men of Yalta, those that are left in the State Department and other branches of our Government—these men of Yalta must go, before the Congress of the United States, with the backing of the people of the United States, can cooperate with the President of the United States in effectuating a sound foreign policy.

I think, myself, it is unfortunate that the determination of many phases of our foreign policy, and of our actions in world affairs, are no longer even measurably under our own control.

Ten years ago the United States was in position, to a much greater extent than today, to determine its own foreign policies.

Today many of our decisions and our actions, whether we like to acknowledge it or not, are being made for us by Soviet Russia and by Red China.

Others are being made for us by the United Nations, by Britain, by France, by other member nations in the North Atlantic Pact—it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that some may be made by the peoples of Germany and Japan, which as of today are not really nations at all.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, I believe it is a healthy thing that Herbert Hoover and Joseph P. Kennedy, and Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, have called for a reexamination of our foreign policy in such a way that the American people can hardly dodge facing the issue.

My regret is that this was not done sooner.

I believe that even those who do not agree with the basic contentions of any of these three men, are in substantial agreement that the so-called big debate they have started is a healthy thing for the Nation and for the world.

For instance, I note this language in the President's message to Congress on the state of the Union which I quote:

"I ask the Congress for unity in these crucial days," President Truman said.

"Make no mistake about my meaning," he continued. "I do not ask or expect unanimity. Only by debate can we arrive at decisions which are wise, and which reflect the desires of the American people. We do not have dictatorship in this country, and we will never have one in this country."

That was President Truman speaking. I believe I will quote three more paragraphs from his message, as follows:

"When I request unity, what I am really asking for is a sense of responsibility on the part of every Member of this Congress. Let us debate the issues, but let every man among us weigh his words and deeds. There is a sharp difference between harmful criticism and constructive criticism. If we are truly responsible individuals, I am sure that we will be unified as a government.

"Let us keep our eyes on the issues and work for the things we all believe in.

"Let each of us put our country ahead of our party, and ahead of our own personal interests."

That ends the quotation from the President's message, and I want to say, my friends, that I agree 100 percent with these sentiments there expressed by President Truman.

And I hope every member of Congress, and of the President's Cabinet, and the White House staff from the President down, keeps those words in mind, and conducts himself accordingly.

And now a few words from Senator TAFT'S talk at the National Press Club last Tuesday, taken from the transcript of that speech—which I also quote with approval:

"I have only one perfectly confident view, and that is that we ought to have a policy; the policy ought to be submitted to Congress and determined. If we want to get unity in this country we have got to tell the people what it is they are expected to sacrifice.

"We are going to have to ask people to reduce their standards of living. We are going to have to ask them to get along on 90 percent of what they got along on last year. And nobody in this country is expecting to do it today, because they don't see the necessity of it and don't understand it. We are going to ask them to give up their boys probably for 2 years' service, every boy in the United States, even on a minimum basis."

That ends the quotation from Senator TAFT—and also my time on the air.

Another Munich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter entitled "Another Munich?" written by Clarence E. Singleton, of Astoria, Oreg., to the editor and published in a December issue of the Portland Oregonian.

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

ANOTHER MUNICH

To the EDITOR:

Shades of Chamberlain and Daladier. Will fools and diplomats never learn? Must Washington become another Munich?

We are now faced with a political equation all too similar to another which most of us remember far too well. Twelve years ago it was Chamberlain, today Attlee. Then it was Daladier, now Pleven. They met in Munich, those early appeasers. Now they plan to meet in Washington with the same illusion that they will effect "peace in our time."

That black day in Munich they talked of avoiding a second world war by appeasing Hitler and his stooges in Czechoslovakia. Now they dream of avoiding a third world war by appeasing Stalin and his stooges in China. We even have a repetition of a demilitarized Sudetenland in the British plan for a similar zone along the Korean-Manchurian border. It is almost unbelievable that men in high places could ever again consider such a plan.

This policy nearly spelled death to civilization and freedom as we know and love it the last time. Historians generally agree, however, that a bold and determined stand at Munich may well have prevented that Second World War.

In one direction lies certain eventual defeat. The other offers at least a hope. It is time, yes, far past the time, that we the American people and the other democratic nations on this globe started treating international outlaws as such instead of meeting with them as honorable members of society, bargaining with them as if they had something to offer, and losing ground at every turn in world events.

CLARENCE E. SINGLETON.

ASTORIA.

Communist China an Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Mr. Constantine Brown, a journalist of high attainments, has contributed such worth-while views in an article published in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, January 12, that I feel the entire membership of Congress and the American public would be immeasurably benefited by reading it.

In a forthright manner, he makes a factual presentation of developments concerning the proposal that Communist China be named as aggressor in the present Korean conflict. Feeling that Mr. Brown is to be complimented for the clarity of his thought and courage of his expression, I earnestly commend this article to general reading, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

UN MEMBERS STILL EVADE ISSUE

(By Constantine Brown)

The Chinese Communists are continuing their relentless drive in Korea.

Our military leaders feel confident that as the Chinese lines of communication are lengthened our strategic position will improve, so long as we have our present mastery of the air.

But from the political point of view it has become questionable whether we should hold the Pusan beachhead. Some of the 53 nations which approved the police action against the Korean aggressors last June now are shaking in their boots and fear to label the Chinese Reds aggressors.

Under these conditions our continued stay in Korea would be an American, not a United Nations operation.

The American delegation at the United Nations for nearly a month now has been asking our associates to declare the Chinese Communists aggressors.

A number of old-fashioned diplomatic subterfuges were used by Britain and her associates to prevent our resolution from coming before the body which last June ordered the police action. In spite of our pleadings, and discreet but clear warnings that the attitude of the appeasers may destroy the effectiveness of the United Nations, the member nations are still evading the issue.

The British and Indian Governments are urging us to get together directly with the Peiping puppets to find an equitable solution to the present problem. In other words, these governments feel that because the Chinese Communists have, by their armed intervention, succeeded in preventing United Nations forces from accomplishing their mission, we should hoist the white flag and go hat in hand to ask Mao Tse-tung for forgiveness.

It is understandable that the European governments, like others of the remaining free nations, should be worried about the present military potential of Russia and her satellites. It is equally understandable that the European nations should want everything that America has of military value poured into Europe, where the Red land and air forces are far superior to what the western nations have ready for defensive purposes.

It is difficult, however, to understand why they believe that abject surrender to China, such as they propose, would improve the present situation. It is difficult to understand how the free nations, which are pledged to support the United Nations to the limit, can hope that this organization can survive by condoning aggression.

The North Korean attack last June and the intervention of the Chinese Communists last November were planned in detail in the Kremlin. The presence of Soviet officers and of the latest types of Russian war materials is ample proof of Moscow's designs, even for the most determined wishful thinkers.

It is hard to conceive how the British and Commonwealth Prime Ministers can imagine that by yielding to Moscow's puppet Mao we do not actually surrender to the Soviet Government.

Napoleon's great victories were due as much to his military genius as to the fact that he was fighting coalition armies belonging to countries which had divergent interests.

Will history repeat itself? There is a desperate need for unity between the free nations. From the political point of view, the United Nations represents the best place where such unity could be achieved. It was put to the test factually last June, when the case of the North Korean aggression was presented to the free nations.

They ordered military measures and we assumed 90 percent of the burden in manpower and 100 percent of the burden in financial expense of the police action, which so far has put us in the red to the tune of more than $14,000,000,000.

This, to be sure, does not include the nearly 8,000 killed Americans, whose value cannot be estimated in dollars. But we played our part faithfully, in the hope that our adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter would consolidate that unity among the free nations, without which the Kremlin's imperialistic aims will be easily achieved.

Waste in Nondefense Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, further study of the Department of Agriculture's demands for the expense of its huge nondefense food-hoarding plans reveals a shocking indifference to the tax burden placed on the American people and to the imperative necessity of "rigid economy in its—the Government's—nondefense activities."

In terms of the uses to which this wasted money could be put in the purchase of equipment for our Armed Forces, it is nothing short of a tragic scandal.

In the period between July 1, 1950, and June 30, 1952, that Department insists it will spend $79,142,217 just to store butter, cheese, dried milk, dried eggs, dried beans, dried peas, potatoes, rice, turkeys, and grain sorghums.

At current costs this money would build 100 of the new Navy antisubmarine attack planes and still leave $14,142,217 with which to purchase ammunition for them.

Such flagrant refusal to recognize the relative requirements for our national security is a clear example of the government-as-usual attitude pervading all too many agencies of the executive department here. I am confident that Congress will not give its approval to such demands. But I am also convinced that a widespread expression of opinion by the American public as to its attitude toward such proposals will bring a quicker end to them than is possible through the procedures available to Congress.

"The Peace of Which the Russian Communists Speak Is in Reality Nothing but Conquest—Their Conception of Peace Is Our Conception of Slavery—Some Day There Will Be Peace in the World—A Peace in Which All Men Will Be Working Together To Build a Happier, Fuller Life for All"—Dr. John R. Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again I bring to the attention of this House a teledocumentary sent over the air last Sunday afternoon by the National Broadcasting Co. entitled "Battle Report, Washington."

It was this week's version of what the Honorable John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, acting in cooperation with Ted Ayers, producer-director of the National Broadcasting Co., conceived to be the primary subjects, not yet discussed, in which the American people currently find great interest.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that I know of no program sent out over the air that is more informative, more intriguing, more thought provoking, or better presented than are the broadcasts, through which Mr. Steelman presents various Cabinet officers, military leaders, and other heads of Government, in frank, open, and candid discussion of the problems which confront the Nation, and particularly those problems which come under their personal administration.

On Sunday last, Mr. Steelman presented four top defense officials from the Department of the Interior concerned with our natural resources: Mr. James Boyd, Director, Bureau of Mines, and Administrator, Defense Minerals Administration, who spoke on the mineral production in its relation to the economic needs of both our military and civilian life; Mr. Bruce K. Brown, Deputy Administrator, Petroleum Administration for Defense, who discussed our petroleum resources; Mr. Clifford B. McManus, Administrator, Defense Power Administra-

tion, who spoke on power; and Mr. Charles W. Connor, Administrator, Defense Solid Fuels Administration, who spoke on coal and other solid fuels.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to conceive of a half-hour television program more chock full of information of inestimable value, not only to the Members of this House but to every citizen throughout the length and breadth of this land. I repeat that Mr. Steelman is rendering a most marvelous service to this Nation by his weekly rendition of Battle Report, Washington, over the National Broadcasting Co. network on Sunday afternoons, as produced by Ted Ayers and commented upon by Robert McCormick of NBC.

It is because of these facts that I am extending my remarks and including therein, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this, the twenty-second edition of Battle Report, Washington.

The program was as follows:

Mr. MCCORMICK. Entering the House Chamber to address the new Congress this past week, President Truman tied the state of the Union to the state of the world. And once again NBC television turns its cameras on both for your twenty-second Battle Report.

Washington—moving forward on the job of expanding our defense, as in Korea, our troops fall back before overwhelming Communist aggressors in a hot war where temperatures are almost 30 below.

Today, Battle Report features a special and revealing appraisal of our mineral-resource strength, so vital to the victory we seek. You will hear, too, from our former chief of ECA in Greece—but first, a statement well worth pondering from the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Since we last met another eventful week has passed into history, and again we have seen how shallow are the Soviet claims that they desire a just peace. We saw with our own eyes how another effort to end the struggle in Korea was blocked in the United Nations by the representatives in the Kremlin.

But even this blatant act, which all the free world could see, did not silence the clamor of the Communist propagandists. They still claim that the Soviet desires peace. But the peace they speak of is really conquest—the confiscation of all property and complete subjugation of all men everywhere to the tyrants in the Kremlin. Their conception of peace is our conception of slavery.

Today, there are already many millions under the Communist yoke. They own nothing. They work long hours in return for scarcely enough to keep body and soul together. And, they are denied the privileges of reading or hearing anything except what their masters decree. Never in the darkest days of slavery in the Western World were any people so completely subjugated or so ruthlessly ruled.

Needless to say, these millions have not been told how another effort to bring about peace has been thwarted by their leaders. In place of the truth they have been given more poisoned words of hatred, they have been told that the men and women of America not only hate them, but are planning to make war against them. I assure you this is not an exaggeration. Hour after hour, every day in the week, Soviet broadcasting stations repeat this vicious lie, and preach the doctrine of hate.

But some day the truth will become known. Some day the suffering, cringing millions who are now feeling the lash of the tyrant will know that we are their friends—that we wish to help them as we are helping millions of others to bring economic security and peace to the world.

Some day there will be peace in the world—a peace in which all men are brothers—not suffering together—but working together to build happier, fuller lives for all.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Korea against this flaming battlefield, American soldiers fight a delaying action as they retreat southward toward Pusan. Latest dispatches from the war front describe the United States Second Division beating off repeated Red banzai attacks. An Eighth Army spokesman reports a menacing Chinese-North Korean build-up east and southeast of Wonju. Obvious purpose—an attempt to trap the Second Division. Meanwhile, our troops launch isolated counterattacks coordinated with heavy bombing strikes to impede the Communist advance. All this news is evidence, if we need it, that there will be no easing of the demand for materials to support our fighting troops. But the average American housewife—according to the recent report of the President's Council of Fconomic Advisers—will still lead a life of luxury compared to any other country. For our economic output has increased by half in the 10 years since Pearl Harbor, the traffic jams in our streets alone testify to the tremendous outpouring of goods after a decade of intensive economic growth, but when Pearl Harbor jolted us, we were just emerging from 10 years of depression and partial recovery. American production not only supplies us with cars, but fills them with gas for us. And our productive capacity, in the opinion of the Council, is the free world's great advantage that offsets Russia's advantage in manpower. We have but to look at the trucks that daily carry the product of our enviable industry to the four corners of the land to know how fortunate we really are. But don't get the Council wrong. They don't mean we can coast through the critical days ahead with life as usual. Guns need steel, and to get that steel we must, say the experts, "beat many of our plowshares into swords." They remind us that 45 percent of our total output went to defense purposes in World War II, went into tanks like these, and into planes and battleships. "There is no bargain price," say they—and I quote—"on aircraft, tanks, and guns—giving things up will be involved, because we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. But we must stop eating so much cake when the aggressor are so many divisions." These are words for all of us to think about, America, as we face the demands ahead that are sure to be made upon our Nation's natural resources, treasures that we must convert into war goods if we are to win in this all-important battle of ideologies. Battle Report is fortunate today, in being able to bring before its cameras for you, four top defense officials from the Department of the Interior concerned with our resources, the sinews of our defense.

On minerals, you will hear from James Boyd, Minerals Chief; on petroleum, from Bruce K. Brown, Petroleum Head; on power, from Clifford B. McManus, Power Administrator; and on coal, from the Solid Fuels boss, Charles W. Connnor. Here we go, then, for the Nation's first television report on its mineral resources.

Men and machines probing the earth for the minerals we need to support our rapidly expanding mobilization. As men go down to the sea in ships, so today—in the face of world crisis—must men march into our mines to dig out more of our raw, precious ore than ever. For a report of the enormity of this task, we focus now on John Boyd, head of the newly created Defense Minerals Administration.

Mr. BOYD. In normal times the United States consumes half of the minerals production of the world. We use four times as much steel and copper, and three times as much lead and zinc, as all the rest of the world put together. With an enormous rearmament program underway, our need for mineral raw materials is greater than ever before.

Few people realize the difference a few ounces of a mineral as little known as mica can make. Without it, neither tanks nor jeeps nor trucks can operate. Most people have never seen a piece of manganese, but without it our present steel production would be impossible.

World War II caused a tremendous drain on this country's mineral resources. After VJ-day, our expanding economy increased the demand for minerals still further. Even before the outbreak of fighting in Korea, we found domestic output of a number of basic minerals insufficient to meet demands, and we had to step up our imports from abroad.

Before Pearl Harbor, for example, we produced in this country virtually all the copper, lead, and zinc we could use, and we had some left over to ship abroad. In recent years, however, we have had to supplement American production of these metals with imports from foreign countries.

To help assure that adequate supplies of mineral raw materials will be made available to meet the growing needs of the country's industrial machine in the present emergency, the Defense Minerals Administration was established in the Department of the Interior.

Our job is to help industry step up the output of domestic mines all across the board, from antimony to zirconium. In addition to expanding our own productive capacity, we are seeking to bring in from abroad those minerals which are in short supply or which, like tin or nickel, we do not have in any quantity at home. Moreover, we must try to discover new deposits of ore and encourage the development of our known but hitherto unworked deposits.

Government geologists and mining engineers stationed in the various mineral-producing areas of the Nation are ready to help those who are seeking Government assistance. They are examining ore deposits, mines, quarries, mills, and smelters where new operations or increased production appear feasible. They are available to advise small mine owners and prospectors. Later on, if necessary, we may set up procurement depots in the principal mining districts, as was done during World War II, where mining operators can bring their ore to sell to the Government.

All these steps are urgently needed to make sure that we have enough mineral raw materials to meet the demands of our mobilization program and of our civilian economy.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Deep into the earth, too, must we go for the oil needed to power our trucks, ships, planes, and tanks. Lost in the dim past is the title "Oil for the Lamps of China." Now the call is for oil to defend our troops against the invading Chinese in Korea. What are our war requirements? How will it affect every car owner? Here with the facts is Deputy Administrator Bruce K. Brown, of our Petroleum Administration for Defense.

Mr. BROWN. During World War II we built a bridge of ships across both oceans and transported millions of men and countless tons of food and munitions to the fighting fronts all over the globe. Over 60 percent of the deadweight of this enormous tonnage was petroleum.

That figure will give some idea of the importance of oil in fighting a war. Our military services depend 100 percent on liquid petroleum to drive their ships, planes, tanks, and trucks.

In addition, oil and gas provide over half of the heat and power we use in the United States—for heating homes, for producing electricity, for refueling our automobiles and trucks.

Total domestic demand for petroleum this year—that is, civilian and military requirements together—amounts to well over 7,000,000 barrels a day. This is one-third more than we were using in 1945, at the peak of World War II.

To meet this demand, petroleum is being produced from over half a million wells in the United States, some of them 3 miles deep. To keep up production we'll have to drill about 44,000 new wells during 1951. This will require almost 2,000,000 tons of steel for pipe and equipment. If we can get the steel and other materials, we can get the petroleum.

Since the Korean War, began 6 months ago, requirements for aviation fuel for the military services have sharply increased. Although the production of aviation gasoline is a tricky job, military goals are being met, and the petroleum industry is being geared to meet further increases in military needs.

What every automobile owner wants to know, of course, is what the outlook is for motor gasoline for civilian use. Some reduction in the octane ratings of gasoline sold in the coastal areas of the country will be required in order to build up our national supply of tetraethyl lead. The Petroleum Administration for Defense in the near future will issue an order limiting these ratings. This reduction in the quality of motor gasoline will not, however, affect engine performance on most automobiles and will work no real hardship on anyone.

I see no need to ration gasoline in the present defense economy. Although the Armed Forces need large amounts of petroleum, the military uses less than 5 percent of our supplies. We can do a whole lot more mobilizing without really straining petroleum facilities.

Mr. McCormick. Matching our needs in oil and minerals, America, is our fast-increasing demand for power—electric power—much of it born of the streams of our Nation, harnessed by our huge dams. As our turbines spin out this invisible strength, and our high-tension lines make a reassuring pattern against the sky—we focus next on our Defense Power Administrator, Clifford B. McManus.

Adequate electric power is one of the fundamental needs of the rearmament program. That power must be available if our defense production goals are to be realized. It is the job of the Defense Power Administration to see that it is obtained—not only wherever needed, but on time.

In this endeavor we are counting on the whole-hearted assistance and cooperation of the entire electrical power industry of the Nation. This includes some 3,000 organizations, both private and public, as well as approximately 1,000 rural electric cooperatives.

It is the responsibility of the Defense Power Administration to quarterback this great team in the electric power phase of the defense effort.

Fortunately, the electric power systems are in better shape to meet the present production emergency than they were in 1942. Because of unprecedented peacetime demands, they have continued to expand their facilities and increase their capacity since the end of World War II.

The United States enters this emergency with a greater electric power capacity and a greater electric power potential than any other nation. In order to meet the demands for power to produce tanks and airplanes and weapons, still greater expansion will be required as quickly as possible. The electric power industry is not one that can mushroom over night. It takes time to produce the heavy equipment necessary to manufacture and transmit electric current. It is imperative, therefore, that nothing be allowed to hinder or delay the electric power expansion contemplated for national defense.

Upon the Defense Power Administration rests the responsibility of funneling electric power where it is most needed for defense work; of scheduling essential electrical materials or equipment in order that they may be delivered on time; of screening the use of scarce electrical construction items and seeing that they do not go into unessential, nondefense projects; of contriving in every possible way to squeeze the last usable kilowatt out of our power plants.

Without adequate power our defense effort would be severely handicapped. I am sure that the electric power industry will meet the challenge.

Mr. McCormick. And finally, add to this roster of essential defense resources coal and other solid fuels—American coal, vital to supporting our European allies as well as ourself. As our mines give out with more coal than ever before, the question still remains, Will we be able to meet the defense demands upon our coal production? Listen to the answer from Charles W. Connor, Administrator for Defense of our Solid Fuels Administration.

Mr. Connor. Our coal resources have always been one of the vital foundations of our economic strength in peace or in war. In peace coal is our most important single source of energy, supplying half of our total demands. In a national emergency, such as we face today, the needs for coal expand rapidly. The extent of these requirements is underlined by the fact that it takes 6 pounds of coal to make a pound of smokeless powder, 2 tons of coal to make a 1-ton bomb, and 220 tons to make a modern tank. The expansion of our electric power industry will require huge additional amounts of coal, and steel expansion will put pressure on our supplies of high-grade coking coal.

In addition to the expanded needs of our own defense economy we are being called upon to ship vast amounts of coal to Western Europe. This year our coal exports probably will be the third highest in history, since Western Germany and Great Britain, Europe's traditional coal supplies, are unable to keep pace with the needs of the Marshall-plan countries. To meet the increased demand and to relieve the shortage of shipping facilities, additional ships are being made available to carry coal to Europe.

Despite these huge demands on our coal production, I am sure that the American coal industry can meet the test. Fortunately we have abundant coal reserves. In an emergency we can greatly expand our coal output. During World War II we supplied coal at a rate of about 620,000,000 tons a year. Today our coal industries are prepared to mine 650,000,000 tons annually, enough to meet even the vast requirements of a total war.

If we are to reach and to maintain peak production, however, we must be sure that adequate transportation is available, that a steady flow of essential mining machinery is maintained, and that adequate mining manpower is on hand. A substantial number of additional open-top coal cars are required to move coal from the mines to consumers. The car-building program is moving slowly at present, but is expected to reach 10,000 cars a month by June 1951. This program must be pressed if the emergency coal needs of our economy are to be met.

Because of this transportation bottleneck and because coal cannot be stored at the mines, stockpiling of coal by industrial consumers and home owners is an important phase of our defense effort. Hoarding coal is patriotic.

Coal shortages would drastically handicap our entire rearmament effort. The Defense Solid Fuels Administration is working cooperatively with the American coal industry to make sure that we have enough.

Mr. McCormick. In Korea, the resources of which the officials you have just heard have reported, must often purposely be expended as part of our scorched-earth policy, a policy to deprive the enemy of whatever must be left behind as we are forced to withdraw southward. This is what our NBC front-line cameramen saw as they pictured the evacuation of Kimpo airfield. Going up in flames are huge stocks of fuel and petroleum jelly bombs which couldn't be moved. This business of seeing that the enemy gets nothing that can be helpful to him is not new to modern warfare. In World War II the Nazis—as shown here—carried it to the point of running railway trains over cliffs, blowing up bridges and often demolishing, as they estimated, any structure that might give shelter to the enemy; Korea but echoes all this.

Countries like Greece—filmed here—know the problems this poses when peace returns. The World War II destruction it suffered imposed a heavy strain upon its people—orphaned children and homeless adults both. Only when American help came did Greece begin on the long road back. We hear next from Paul R. Porter who was there as chief of our Economic Cooperation Administration aid, and serves now as ECA's Assistant Administrator for Program—Mr. Porter.

Mr. Paul R. Porter. A fine example of how American aid has combated communism is found in Greece, where communism virtually has been halted cold.

Three years ago there was chaos in that country, and communism thrives upon chaos. Greece had gone through long years of war and occupation, with severe damage to its ports, railroads, highways, communications, industries, and housing. Liberation did not bring peace, because the Communists purportedly began a Kremlin-sponsored war for the conquest of Greece.

Then came American aid—military and economic. Fighting on Greek soil came to an end in August 1949—the immediate threat of Soviet conquest through revolution was averted * * * and the hard task of reconstruction began in earnest. Today the Greek economy no longer is in a state of near paralysis. Agricultural and industrial production have surpassed their prewar levels. Ports and railroads have been repaired. Modern highways have been built. An ambitious electric-power program is under way. Inflation has been checked and there is a greater degree of financial stability. The hundreds of thousands of refugees, uprooted by the guerrilla war, have been helped to return to their home areas. The Marshall plan helped them to a new start in life with materials to repair damaged homes, and with seeds, tools, and farm animals. Today per capita food consumption is as high as it has been in modern Greek history.

Efforts of the Economic Cooperation Administration also have been directed to modernizing productive facilities of the country, through technical-assistance programs, new methods in agriculture, and work with labor unions.

Communist influence, which a few years ago was dominant in the Greek trade unions, now is a minor factor. New infiltration, however, remains a constant threat. The ECA labor officers in Greece have helped strengthen democratic practices in the Greek trade unions and in doing so have weakened Communist propaganda among workers.

While much progress has been made, a great deal remains to be done. A part of the future plan is directed toward tax reform, cheaper credit, cheaper transport and further removal of trade barriers. Despite the historic poverty of the country, I believe Greece can become self-supporting within

a few years. The people are richly endowed with courage and intelligence. They are thrifty and hard working. The natural resources of the country are not large. However, a comparatively modest investment in productive facilities and technical training will permit a substantially greater production, and a higher standard of living.

The Greeks know how the Marshall plan has improved their lives and their security. They are on the side of freedom and appreciative of American aid. The Greek people will play an increasingly more effective role in the partnership of free nations as economic recovery progresses.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thank you, Paul Porter. That "partnership of free nations"—America—the goals of that partnership were stated in clear and ringing tones by President Truman in his closing remarks to Congress last week. Battle Report's own cameramen were there. And that you may not forget what it is we're fighting for, let us recall the President's words again:

"This is our cause—peace, freedom, justice. We will pursue this cause with determination and asking divine guidance that in all we do we may follow God's will."

Thus the Nation looks from Washington on this second Sunday of this year of decision, 1951.

Moral Rearmament and Its Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks, I am pleased to include an address by D. Hayes Murphy, president of the Wiremold Co., Hartford, Conn., to the employees of that firm on January 5, 1951.

As Members of Congress we are familiar with the work done by Moral Rearmament, having been sufficiently impressed to authorize the appointment of congressional observers to its international convention.

Mr. Murphy tells an inspiring story of the results of Moral Rearmament in labor-management relations, a story which may be repeated time and time again as this movement becomes more widespread in its adherency.

The address follows:

When I went to Washington last week I took with me a letter addressed to the Office of Defense Mobilization. This letter stated that in Wiremold we have a loyal, patriotic group of people who know how to work together as a team and who are ready to serve our country. It contained a summary of what we did in the last war and what we are doing now to try to get some Government orders. It was signed by Morris Johnson for the union and by me for management. This letter is on file in the Office of Defense Mobilization, with a copy in the Office of Small Business Administration. It will not get us any business. We will still have to dig up the orders ourselves. But it will do no harm.

What I want to talk with you about is quite another subject:

Mrs. Murphy and I have been spending several days in Washington attending the Moral Rearmament convention.

Moral Rearmament (MRA) is a philosophy based on what you and I know to be right—things that we have been taught ever since we were children.

MRA is the practical application of these principles—and here they are:

THE FOUR MORAL STANDARDS UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF GOD

1. Absolute honesty.
2. Absolute purity.
3. Absolute unselfishness.
4. Absolute love.

Certainly there is nothing new about that. But what is new is to see the miraculous changes that result when these moral standards are actually applied to our problems.

There were about 500 delegates and others at the convention. They came from many countries—most all the countries except those behind the iron curtain. There were people from all walks of life—people in high positions, people in low positions—rich and poor, black and whote, labor leaders and management leaders—military leaders—political leaders, coal barons and miners—all with one idea in their minds and in their hearts. People of all religions were there but they all agreed on the four moral standards. MRA just makes people better—whatever their religious beliefs or even if they have none.

Here is evidence not only of what can happen but of what did happen:

For 16 months the United Air Lines have been on the verge of a strike and the bitterness on both sides was intense. A pilot named Larry Shapiro was the labor leader—a very clever fellow. He sat on the platform on one side of Dr. Buchman, the convention chairman, and Mr. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, sat on the other side. Also present were Mr. Fallon, personnel manager, and about 30 pilots of United Air Lines.

Shapiro was the first speaker. For 16 years he was a pilot and 2 years ago was elected president of the Air Lines Pilots Association. He told us that he was a very bitter expert in damning management and could twist into the negative any company policy, no matter how sound and well intended it might be. He had charge of grievances and considered it his job to create dissension and bitterness whenever and wherever possible. He met planes at the airfields and solicited grievances from pilots and stewardesses and magnified them.

In the course of the negotiations there were five bitter days of hearings with lawyers and experts on both sides chewing the rag over 101 grievances—each side cheering for the other side to say something that they could be crossed up on—and getting nowhere. At this stage of the proceedings Shapiro went home one day to think things over quietly by himself.

He had attended an MRA conference in Los Angeles some time before and it occurred to him that the application of the four moral standards was the answer. He knew that the whole affair between pilots and United Air Lines was dead wrong—there was nothing to lose, so he decided to try it. He went to the personnel manager with the idea and Mr. Fallon asked him if he had been hypnotized—he couldn't believe that Shapiro the agitator could be sincere in his admission that he had been causing as much trouble as he possibly could and now wanted to make amends and cooperate. President Patterson of United Air Lines heard of it and sent for Shapiro, and they had a heart-to-heart talk. Sure enough, Shapiro was a changed man and they went to work together to clean up the mess.

After Shapiro finished speaking, Patterson spoke and gave the same story from his standpoint.

The result is that the 101 grievances were boiled down to 11—not grievances but problems. Eight of these have been solved and they are sure they will settle the other three. These are problems which cannot be settled by management alone and cannot be settled by labor alone but must be settled by both working together. There is no other way.

Example: One of the demands was that the pilots be guaranteed a day off each week. This was changed from a grievance to a problem, the problem being "How can the pilots be assured a day off without interrupting United Air Lines' service to the public?"

Shapiro said that this new philosophy is the answer not only for the United Air Lines but for the entire airlines industry and for the world.

Another example of how the four moral standards under the guidance of God work is their influence on Communists.

Communists, as you know, infiltrate into every organization, schools, churches, labor unions, etc. They used to infiltrate into MRA but what do you suppose happened? I don't think you could ever guess. Believe it or not, these Communists themselves were converted and are now working for MRA. There were five of them, all former Communist leaders, at the convention at Washton and we heard their most amazing stories.

Communists have now been forbidden to infiltrate the MRA for fear that more of them will find a better philosophy and join the movement.

Mr. Ed Perry, of West Hartford, arranged for Mrs. Murphy and me to have dinner with two of these ex-Communists and, with the help of an interpreter, we carried on one of the most interesting conversations we had ever participated in.

Two of the ex-Communists whom we met had gone to a moral rearmament meeting at Caux, Switzerland, to see what it was all about and get some arguments against the movement. They stayed so long that one of the most trusted Communist Party members was sent to bring them back. Did he bring them back? No; he did not. He also found an idea that was better than the Marxist or Communist idea and is now also working for MRA.

You see, the moral rearmament movement is not against anything except the opposites of the four moral standards—dishonesty, lust, greed, and hate.

All this is first-hand evidence. We saw these men and heard them talk. One of them said, "I am a revolutionist and this MRA is a far bigger revolution than communism because it is for the good of everyone—not just one class. I will spend the rest of my life fighting for it."

The settling of the United Air Lines' problems and the conversion of Communists were only two of many wonderful things that have happened as a result of changes that occurred in human nature.

Before I went to Washington I could not see how world war III could be avoided but with this evidence of how industrial disputes can be settled and Communists can be changed, I now have hope. But we must change ourselves first and we must change fast.

There was a lot of talk about change and guidance. One of the Communists said that the first two English words he learned were "change" and "guidance."

A labor leader from the docks of London said he was so changed after attending an MRA meeting that when he came home his dog bit him. I have a dog and when I came home I watched her bahavior very carefully. She wagged her tail, took a sniff, and looked puzzled. If I can read a dog's mind, she was thinking, "Yes, that's the old man all right, but he's got a strange smell about him. I guess he's got religion."

To illustrate what I mean and to start with myself, I have an apology to make and it never would have occurred to me to do it if I had not had this MRA experience. I hope

Eddie Goulet is listening because the apology is for him. When he was in my office a while ago, he made a remark that irritated me and I made an angry retort. I shouldn't have lost my temper, and I am sorry.

This MRA story is a big one. It is a world-shaking story and much of it is in a new book just off the press called "The World Rebuilt," by Peter Howard. It tells the actual experiences of many of the people we met in Washington. In order that all of you and some of our other friends may read it for yourselves, I ordered 500 copies which will be distributed as soon as they are received.

I intend to talk more with you about MRA and in the meantime let us all give some serious thought to the four moral standards under the guidance of God. Just think what would happen if we applied them in our shop, in our homes, in our country, and in the world:

Absolute honesty.
Absolute purity.
Absolute unselfishness.
Absolute love.

Proposed Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A247, I inserted as a part of my remarks a table showing the proposed budget authorizations for expenditures in the fiscal year 1952. It now appears that the Ways and Means Committee will be called upon to find new sources of revenue to take care of nearly $11,000,000,000 in deficiency and supplementary appropriations which are President proposes to submit to Congress for the fiscal year 1951, ending next June 30.

If these appropriations and authorizations are approved by the Congress, the total for fiscal year 1951 will reach nearly $87,500,000,000. This is by far the largest peacetime budget in the history of the Republic. These figures of proposed expenditures by the Truman New Deal spenders point unerringly to the necessity of cutting out nonessential and nondefense items in the proposed budget.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the table prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters:

PROPOSED BUDGET AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES—FISCAL YEAR 1951

(By Paul O. Peters)

(Compiled from the budget for the fiscal year 1952)

Revisions in the appropriations, contract authorizations, together with proposed supplementary requests for appropriations, run the total budget authorizations for Federal expenditures during the fiscal year ending next June 30 to the record peacetime total of $87,459,449,977. The details are shown by the table following:

Description	Authorized or enacted	Proposed for later request	Total
Appropriations:			
Legislative branch	$69,592,721	$200,000	$69,792,721
The Judiciary	25,304,665		25,304,665
Executive Office, the President	20,373,553		20,373,553
Appropriated to the President	8,077,460,729	210,000,000	8,287,460,729
Independent offices	9,066,323,710	168,245,848	9,234,569,558
Federal Security Agency	1,725,870,450	25,187,500	1,751,063,950
General Services Administration	3,253,564,444	190,000,000	3,443,564,444
House and Home Finance Agency	40,700,000		40,700,000
Department of Agriculture	906,264,514	6,500,000	912,764,514
Department of Commerce	822,741,909	20,750,000	843,491,909
Defense, military functions	41,866,060,336	10,000,000,000	51,866,060,336
Defense, civil functions	963,792,590	450,000	964,242,590
Department of the Interior	690,750,594	2,450,000	699,200,594
Department of Justice	151,320,200	643,000	151,963,200
Department of Labor	235,637,300	3,000,000	238,637,300
Post Office (general fund)	466,376,176	174,135,500	640,511,676
Treasury Department	6,342,426,710	20,000	6,342,446,710
State Department	325,574,287	100,000,000	425,574,287
District of Columbia (contribution)	10,800,000		10,800,000
Reserve for contingencies		50,000,000	50,000,000
Total appropriations	75,086,940,888	10,951,581,848	86,038,522,736
Reappropriations: Enacted	789,573,151		789,573,151
Authorizations to expend from public debt receipts	1,833,698,457		1,833,698,457
Reappropriation of authorization to spend from same receipts	6,282,000		6,282,000
Total, authorizations	77,716,494,496	10,951,581,848	88,668,076,344
Enacted contract authorizations:			
Legislative branch	100,000		100,000
Independent offices	312,680,000		312,680,000
Federal Security Agency	181,668,000		181,668,000
General Services Administration	125,000,000		125,000,000
House and Home Finance Agency	127,000,000		127,000,000
Department of Agriculture			
Department of Commerce	877,126,000		877,126,000
Department of Defense	1,418,285,000		1,418,285,000
Department of the Interior	41,697,000		41,697,000
Department of Justice	700,000		700,000
Department of State	1,000,000		1,000,000
Total, contract authorizations	3,085,245,000		3,085,245,000
Reappropriated authorizations	103,214,141		103,214,141
Total	3,188,459,141		3,188,459,141
Grand total	80,904,953,637	10,951,581,848	91,856,535,485
Deductions for liquidation of prior contract authorizations	4,369,585,508	27,500,000	4,397,085,508
Total	76,535,368,129	10,924,081,848	
Total, new obligation authority, fiscal 1951			87,459,449,977

There it is in black and white: More than $76,500,000,000 already authorized to be spent in fiscal 1951 or obligated during this fiscal year, plus new obligations for which requests are yet to come in this fiscal year of nearly $11,000,000,000, minus the deductions to pay former obligations, and the net new obligations total nearly $87,500,000,000.

If the Congress (and the people they represent) continues to appropriate and authorize expenditures in such stupendous amounts, the American competitive free-enterprise system will soon fall before the authoritarian state and socialism will be enthroned in the United States.

It appears there is much truth in a study made by Link and Freiberg in 1949 (quoted in Leonard E. Read's book, Outlook for Freedom), which showed that 75 percent of the American people believed themselves to be against socialism, yet 66 percent of them favored Government measures that fell within their own definitions of socialism.

This report will be followed in a few days by a report on the projected expenditures and contract authorizations for fiscal 1952.

Tax Deals of Ike and Harry Insult Us All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I think these individuals should practice what they preach:

TAX DEALS OF IKE AND HARRY INSULT US ALL

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, January 19.—Taxing until it hurts is a relatively empty phrase, since I never knew a man to squirm with pleasure when suddenly chopped off at the hip pockets, but as an individual you find it easy to resent the use of that phrase in Harry Truman's mouth.

The man wants another sixteen billion extra. This drives the annual tax nut to beyond 70,000,000,000 skins. These dollars come, directly or indirectly, from individuals. I am an individual. You are an individual. And so is Harry S. Truman.

In his recent budget speech Mr. Truman has exhorted the people to pare another necessity off the weekly cash outlay in order to meet the fresh demands of Government and defense. I will be pleased to break out the peeler and pare with the other kids, but in this instance I want it unanimous.

Unanimous includes Mr. Truman, who knocks off a cash grab of 50 lovely G-notes each and every year—gorgeous thousand-dollar bills because they are subject neither to scrutiny, account, nor the itching palm of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The way we heave the scratch around, I do not care if they pay Harry a million a year, because the lumps of being President demand a big salary. But tax him they must.

As the symbolic man—as Mr. America, as the leader, the boss, the mirror of us all—the fellow has just plain got to be subservient to the laws that govern us all, or admit that no American can subsist on his earnings.

If Mr. Truman draws a gun, in a fit of anger at a critic, and shoots him dead, then you would expect the law to take its course, with an indictment of murder, a trial by jury, and a just and honest sentence by a judge who awaits the beck of the 12 good men. This is law—"all men are created free and equal."

Saying he survives his term, Mr. Truman will have been able to squirrel away $200,000 of nontaxable money for the 4 years, outside his salary, expenses, and perquisites such as yachts, trains, cars, planes, and such familiar truck. Nobody else alive can line up that much from earned income under the current tax structure.

Except, of course, General of the Army Eisenhower, who was allowed a capital-gains interpretation on about $750,000 revenue from a book he wrote about the war. Other ex-soldiers who wrote books got slashed for the regular earned-income percentage.

Both Truman's free $50,000 annually, and Eisenhower's allowance of capital gains represent a gross insult to the other people who work at all trades, pay taxes, and now are told to take another reef in their belts.

Declaration on Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a meeting of the presidents and representatives of the Association of American Colleges was held recently at Atlantic City, N. J., and out of this meeting came a declaration on manpower, a very carefully prepared statement. I believe it reflects the views of the heads of our great body of independent colleges throughout the country.

At the present time Selective Service and the armed services together are insisting that boys in college will not be permitted to voluntarily enlist in the armed services and select the branch of their choice after an official preinduction notice of physical examination has been sent to the boy in question. He is permitted to finish out the school year, but at the conclusion of the school year he must enter the service and has no opportunity to make a selection I believe that the armed services has made a grievous mistake in this respect Hundreds of boys are leaving college in order to enlist in the branch of their choice, and those who are remaining in school are often unsettled emotionally and not prepared to concentrate on their studies to the best advantage. College boys should be permitted, I think, to select the branch of the service they desire and I believe that the situation that exists at the present time should be looked into carefully.

The statement on manpower which I herewith ask to have printed as a part of my remarks touches very definitely on this subject. The statement reads as follows:

DECLARATION ON MANPOWER BY THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES ANNUAL MEETING, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., JANUARY 10, 1951

PREAMBLE

The present national emergency is without parallel in our entire history. It will extend over a long period. It will require great sacrifice. Both from within and from without. It threatens our basic heritage of freedom.

The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the crisis and is actively aware that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations. It is recognized that there is a present and presumably continuing requirement that essentially all able-bodied young men give service of a proper length of time in the Nation's military forces. As representatives of higher education, we recognize the importance of meeting this requirement to the full. We believe that all young men should share equitably the responsibility of national defense.

It is our conviction that the key to ultimate national survival is the wise use of manpower. In the immediate pressure to have now the men we need in the places where they seem needed, we must not lose sight of the long-range importance of providing a constant flow of trained persons to fill critical places 2 years, 5 years, 10 years, or more hence. Leadership of all types, political, economic, military, educational, and religious, will be even more necessary in the years ahead than today. Further, in a democratic Nation we deal with men as individuals; not as units in the mass. No effective manpower program will treat men in the mass without concern for their dignity as human beings and their individual differences. If we lose sight of this truth, the battle with totalitarianism has been lost at the start.

The American colleges and universities are and have been a vital source of leadership and spiritual strength. Hence, these institutions are more necessary today than ever before. Their strength is the strength of our democracy, from the largest university to the smallest liberal arts college. They must make a continuous contribution to national welfare in every field of learning. Thus it is in the national interest that higher education be viewed as essential to the development of manpower resources.

PROPOSALS

The Association of American Colleges, representing more than 650 institutions of higher learning, therefore strongly recommends to the Federal Government the following considerations concerning the relationship between military manpower and higher education:

I

In the education and training for the armed services and for the civilian war effort there should be no duplication of existing educational facilities. Before new educational facilities are developed by the armed services or other governmental agencies, a thorough survey should be made to see whatever existing facilities could more readily be converted and adapted to meet the particular need. Every effort should be made to bring the facilities of as large a number of educational institutions as possible into the defense efforts, both by increasing the existing number of ROTC units and by allotting other training programs to non-ROTC institutions.

II

We request that appropriate authorities take immediate steps to assure that students whose induction is now postponed or deferred will be permitted to apply for entrance, at the termination of their postponement, any branch of the armed services in which voluntary enlistment is now permitted, regardless of any intervening action by the Selective Service System.

III

Since the shortage of trained personnel is becoming acute, and womanpower is an ever more important source of leadership in civilian service and in the professions, we urge adequate and immediate comprehensive planning to insure the constructive utilization of the ability and training of all college women.

IV

A. In setting the age for entering military training and service we believe that the age for induction should be 19. A lower age should be adopted only when and as long as an emergency manpower shortage requires such lower age.

B. We endorse the present policy of deferring ROTC students until the completion of their college courses. We recommend that the number of ROTC units be increased. We endorse the legislation now before Congress to place on the same basis stipends and educational allowances for men enrolled in all ROTC programs.

V

Certain groups of students now enrolled in colleges and universities have progressed so far with their studies, that it is in the national interest to allow them to complete their course. Among the students to be deferred during the present transitional period should be:

A. Students in professional schools of theology, of medicine, dentistry, and related health fields, and in the graduate schools in mathematics, engineering, and physical and biological sciences.

B. All students who will have completed 2 years of undergraduate study in any curriculum by July 1951 and who are eligible to continue because of satisfactory standing in accredited 4-year colleges.

VI

An enrolled college student who reaches the age of induction while successfully pursuing a course of study should have his induction postponed to the end of his academic year.

VII

If 18-year-olds are to be subject to universal military service, we assume that it is unlikely that more than half could be inducted in the first year of the new legislation. To reduce to a minimum the uncertainty in the minds of prospective and present college students, it is highly desirable that those who are not to be inducted before the opening of their academic year should be notified that they will be able to complete that year before induction.

VIII

To maintain a flow of educated personnel as an important element of national strength we recommend that after basic training a substantial number of properly qualified young men be furloughed to colleges of their choice for further education in all areas of learning before completing their required military service. In implementing this plan, special consideration should be given to a Federal scholarship or loan program, in order that no one who qualifies may be deprived of this educational opportunity for lack of means. We recommend that the administration of this program and the testing and other procedures of selection under it be entrusted to competent civilians.

IX

We recommend that the board of directors appoint a committee to take steps to present the views of the association to the appropriate officers and committees of the executive and legislative branches of the Government and to cooperate with other educational organizations having similar objectives.

X

As an association in which the majority of member institutions are small independent colleges, we recognize the fact that the present emergency seriously threatens the very existence of many of these institutions which represent a vital element in American life. While the foregoing recommendations are intended to provide full participation by

these colleges, we are aware that their problems will be severe for a minimum of 2 or 3 years. We therefore urge governmental agencies, philanthropic foundations, and the American public to consider seriously the need to preserve these institutions for continued service beyond the period of the immediate manpower crisis.

People Should Begin Bearing Down on Congress To Remember Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Press Register of January 17, 1951:

PEOPLE SHOULD BEGIN BEARING DOWN ON CONGRESS TO REMEMBER THEM

United States Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, served on the so-called Hoover Commission for reorganizing Federal bureaucracy. This service gave him an opportunity to get a close-up view of the costly lost motion in present-day Government operations.

A statement just made by Congressman BROWN emphasizes the vital importance of reducing wasteful spending in these days of greater demands for national defense funds.

"Certainly," he says, "before a new tax burden of another $15,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 or $25,000,000,000 is to be added to the $7,700,000,000 tax boost just voted, we should stop, look, and listen, and be sure that we are doing the right thing in the right way.

"First of all, we should attempt to reduce or eliminate every unnecessary governmental expenditure. We should cut the fat out of the governmental structure.

"We should attempt to determine what is necessary and what is not necessary in the way of expenditures to meet the national emergency.

"Once that is done—but not until it is done—can we determine how much money must be raised to operate our Government and to meet the cost of our national defense program."

Congressman BROWN insisted that we should make certain that any tax legislation which is enacted will be in such a form and make only such levies as our economy can stand.

He warned that a hasty, ill-conceived tax bill can easily wreck our national economy and do irreparable damage to our productive capacity and our national defense effort.

Mr. BROWN made the point that there is a limit on the tax burden any people can long pay or carry. It is imperative that Congress consider this fact in connection with tax legislation. Mr. BROWN should have the unanimous support of his congressional colleagues in keeping this point in mind and giving it proper consideration.

It is the feeling of Congressman BROWN that Congress "has no moral right to increase the tax burden on the American people again and to compel them to make greater sacrifices unless the Federal Government itself first proves its good faith by eliminating every needless expenditure."

He insists that Congress "should not increase taxes just to give the tax spenders more tax money to spend."

Whether they fully realize it today or not, the American people are going to need the protecting arms of many Congressmen CLARENCE J. BROWNS this year. Without this protection, they will stand exposed to an exorbitant new Federal tax raid and the continuation of profligate policies in the use of Federal tax money.

Let no American taxpayer kid himself about that.

Mr. Truman has submitted a Federal spending budget of $71,594,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. A United Press Washington dispatch says "many Democrats and most if not all Republicans" agree with Representative JOHN TABER, member of the House Appropriations Committee from New York State, that billions of dollars could be sliced from the President's budget figure.

United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has a term for the Truman-proposed budget. He calls it "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

These reports on sentiment in Congress are encouraging to the hard-hit taxpayers. But the taxpayers had better not go to sleep at the switch. They had better start bearing down right now on their Senators and Representatives in Congress to please remember them.

Lost: American Way of Life, If Russia Overruns Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an article by Mr. J. A. Livingston in the Washington Post of January 11.

Mr. Livingston is a writer on business and economic conditions in the Washington Post. His enlightening and instructive article, Lost: American Way of Life, If Russia Overruns Europe, is the viewpoint of a man well qualified to analyze the situation which would occur if we withdrew from Europe, as has been proposed by some prominent Americans. And it is a viewpoint that to my mind has not been sufficiently stressed.

The article is as follows:

LOST: AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE, IF RUSSIA OVERRUNS EUROPE

(By J. A. Livingston)

The defense of Europe is more than a matter of real estate, more than economic resources—coal, iron ore, steel. Yes; and it's more than human beings—Frenchmen, Germans, Belgians, Hollanders—cold-blooded though that seems. It's a defense of a system, a culture, akin to ours, and built over centuries. Once lost, that way of life would be irretrievable. For the United States would be isolated—intellectually, economically, politically, and militarily.

And that's something for former President Hoover, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, and Members of Congress to ponder: How far can we let Russia go? In his state-of-the-Union message President Truman emphasized the military consequences of a Russian conquest of Europe. He said:

"If Western Europe were to fall to Soviet Russia, it would double the Soviet supply of coal and triple the Soviet supply of steel. If the free countries of Asia and Africa should fall to Soviet Russia, we would lose the sources of many of our vital raw materials, including uranium, which is the basis of our atomic power. And Soviet command of the manpower of the free nations of Europe and Asia would confront us with military forces which we could never hope to equal."

But the economic consequences are even more important. It's surprising that Republicans like Hoover and TAFT, supposedly business-minded, don't see them. Stalinism is Hitlerism by a different name. We fought Hitlerism as a military threat to the United States. Beyond that we fought Hitlerism as a dagger at our economic heart. Now Stalin poises the same dagger.

If Russian commissars took over European factories, Stalin would have a new workshop—to make tractors as well as tanks. That workshop would change our way of life, our method of doing business.

Just as Stalin directs Russia's military might to a predetermined, ruthless end, so could he direct Russia's workshop. American industry would be up against something unprecedented: Integrated, directed, unmitigated, and "uneconomic" economic power. In America wages, hours, and prices are determined by what the traffic will bear, by competition. No one man nor one company controls a major market.

But in Russia, Stalin rules the economy by fiat. Wages, prices, and hours are set willy-nilly by the state. Economics—costs—don't count. Stalin has no dividends to pay, no creditors to satisfy, no union leaders to appease. He's the sole stockholder, creditor, and union leader rolled into one.

He could undersell American corporations anywhere—merely by dumping French or Belgian or Italian or German man-hours, materials, and technology on world markets at any price he saw fit. He could even raise the standard of living of the Russians while doing it, because: First, he'd have a new source of slave labor; second, by reducing military output at home only a little to produce civilian goods, he'd be able to increase the levels of consumption by a great deal.

If America wanted to do business with a Stalinized Europe it would have to be done by barter. That's the way Russia deals. Interchange of goods and services—as we learned it from Western Europe—would be out. America would be pushed into a narrowing ambit. We'd have to deal with Canada and South America largely. And would Stalin, supposing he made no war, let us have that chunk of commerce for our own? Hardly. He'd dump in competition.

American corporations would be confronted with Stalin-determined prices on locomotives, farm machinery, electric generating equipment—in selling to Chile or Brazil. American corporations, with dividends to pay, with capital to preserve, could not stay in the struggle for Latin-American markets. Or the United States Government would have to subsidize them to compete with dumped man-hours.

Our system of free men and comparatively competitive markets—at least, undictated markets—could not survive in a world in which Stalin throttles competition. That, it seems to me, is the issue involved in the defense of Europe.

Isolation — retirement — is easy. Stalin would gladly confer it on us. But how unsplendid it would be. We'd hate it so much we'd fight to get out of it. And in such a fight, without allies, we'd be less prepared, while Stalin would be better prepared. That's the issue Congress must face—and former President Hoover—and Senator TAFT.

Trends Show Big Increase in Oregon Income by 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Trends Show Big Increase in Oregon Income by 1960," written by Paul W. Ellis, associate professor of economics, University of Oregon, and published in the November 1950 issue of Oregon Business Review.

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

TRENDS SHOW BIG INCREASE IN OREGON INCOME BY 1960 [1]

(By Paul W. Ellis, associate professor of economics, University of Oregon)

Oregon's income will increase 90 percent by 1960 if recent trends continue. This conservative estimate, which augurs well for the future of business in the State, is based on current trends and data now available from a large number of reliable sources.

The same trends if continued would also produce an increase of 31 percent in employment, and 32 percent in the commodities and services that can be purchased by the average man, woman, and child in the State.

In spite of these clearly discernible trends, however, certain possible obstructions to their continuance may arise. Both the trends and the threats to their continuance, will have differing effects upon the industrial balance of the State, with some industries suffering severe restrictions and others as yet unknown or little known in this area achieving new places of prominence in our economy.

Oregon income payments were $2,112,000,000 in 1949 before the deduction of $15,000,000 for unemployment compensation and old-age insurance taxes (see table I).[2] On the basis of current trends these payments will increase by an average of $173,000,000 per year through 1960, when the total will be $4,014,000,000. The 1949 figure includes $1,381,000,000 of wages and salaries, $437,000,000 of proprietors' income, and $294,000,000 of other income payments, including rent, interest, dividends, old-age and unemployment benefit payments, and relief payments. By 1960 the figures will be $2,667,000,000 wages, $767,000,000 proprietors' income, and $560,000,000 other income payments.

Annual estimates are presented in table I for the convenience of those who may wish to use them for business plans for shorter periods. The 1960 estimates are used as a basis for determining the figures for the intervening years. Accordingly, the annual figures represent the results of annual increases for each year equal to the average for the 11-year period. It is not to be supposed that growth will follow such an even pattern, but no adequate body of information exists which would show the fluctuations from year to year satisfactorily. Chart I [omitted from RECORD] gives a graphic picture of the estimated growth. It is important to note that part of the growth will be slower during the 1949–55 period than for the 1955–60 period because of the limitations of available electric power. At the same time, the productivity of the lumber industry is expected to decline because of depletion of timber resources, especially in some of the Ponderosa pine regions. Chart I [omitted from RECORD] and table I depict steady changes each year, not because steady change is to be expected, but because there are no adequate bases for estimating irregularities. Annual estimates therefore do not reflect any study of the timing of power expansion, the timing of the termination of logging operations, a major war, or other events that will influence irregularity of growth.

The crucial elements in the picture as a whole are the trends in the lumber and wood-products industries, on the one hand, and development of new manufacturing industries on the other. The future of the lumber industry even within this 11-year period is dependent upon the amount of standing timber available for lumber and the rates of growth of established forests—both very controversial questions. The figures in this article are based on the higher of two estimates prepared by the United States Forest Service.[3] This estimate was chosen because projections or forecasts usually underestimate rather than overestimate future economic productivity. However, even these higher estimates of 1960 lumber production make it apparent that the industry will suffer such a very sharp curtailment of production and employment as to create serious problems of adjustment in many Oregon communities. The creation of satisfactory alternative employment in the 11-year period, while absorbing additions of immigrants and young people to the labor force, will be a big task. This problem will be correspondingly greater if the lower 1960 estimates of lumber employment are realized.

TABLE I.—*Oregon income payments, 1949–60* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Gross payrolls	1,381	1,497	1,614	1,732	1,848	1,965	2,082	2,199	2,316	2,433	2,550	2,667
Agriculture [2]	61	63	65	68	70	72	74	76	79	81	83	85
Mining	4	5	5	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	8
Manufacturing	425	466	508	549	590	632	673	714	756	797	838	880
Contract construction	83	91	98	106	114	122	130	138	145	153	161	169
Utilities [3]	158	171	185	199	213	227	240	254	268	282	296	310
Trade	303	327	351	374	398	421	445	469	492	516	540	563
Finance [4]	45	48	51	54	57	60	64	67	70	73	76	79
Government and service [5]	302	320	351	376	400	425	450	474	499	524	549	573
Proprietors' income	437	469	501	532	564	596	628	660	692	723	755	787
Farm	142	148	153	159	165	171	176	182	188	193	199	204
Trade	140	152	165	177	189	201	214	226	238	250	262	275
Service	78	85	92	98	105	112	119	126	133	140	147	154
Other	77	84	91	98	105	112	119	126	133	140	147	154
Other income payments	294	319	343	367	391	415	439	463	487	512	536	560
Total	2,112	2,285	2,458	2,631	2,803	2,976	3,149	3,322	3,496	3,668	3,841	4,014

[1] Before deductions for social insurance taxes.
[2] Includes forestry and fisheries.
[3] Includes transportation.
[4] Includes insurance and real estate.
[5] "Government" not elsewhere classified. About 23 percent of Government employment is represented in other classifications.

Sources: All estimates and projections by Paul W. Ellis unless noted in the text. For detailed discussion of 1949 estimates see the Oregonian, Apr. 16, 1950, city news section, p. 15, or Oregon Business Review, June 1950.

Achievement of the high level of income and employment indicated above is largely dependent upon the establishment of new manufacturing industries in the State. This point cannot be emphasized too strongly. We cannot make a living by buying and selling to each other or by taking in each other's laundry. Accordingly, we must expect the commodity-producing industries—manufacturing, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, mining, and construction—to continue for some time to account for a probable minimum of perhaps 44 percent or more of the total State employment. At present this percentage for Oregon and for the United States is about 46 percent. Other industries are very largely secondary, in the sense that they cannot expand much except as expansion of the commodity-producing industries justify. These secondary industries include wholesale and retail trade, transportation, and other utilities, finance (including insurance and real estate), service, and government.

In Oregon, mining, forestry, and fisheries are almost negligible elements of our economy. Agriculture employs about 35 percent more of our labor force (16.9 percent) than is employed in the Nation as a whole (12.5 percent). In the present article, the forecast for agriculture is based on a Department of Agriculture study which estimates a decline in agricultural employment in the State by 1960.[4] Construction accounts for about 7 percent of our total employment at present as compared to 6 percent for the United States as a whole. As long as we continue to expand our population at a

[1] This article is a revision of the 1960 projections published in the Oregon Business Review for July 1949, presenting a more complete discussion of the underlying trends and conditions. It appeared with variations, in the Portland Oregonian for October 22, 1950.

[2] The United States Department of Commerce estimate is $2,095,000,000 after deduction of these taxes.

[3] Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, North Pacific Division, Review Report on Columbia River and Tributaries, Appendix N, pt. 3.

[4] Ibid., Appendix N, pt. 4.

greater rate than the Nation as a whole, we can maintain a higher proportion of our population building residential and commercial structures to serve the expanded population. The projections assume that the 7.3 percent which prevailed in 1947 and 1948 will continue through 1960. If this estimate is in error, it is probably too high. On balance, then, any major changes in the figures for 1960 and the preceding decade must be in the direction of either a higher level of manufacturing or a lower total of production.

Oregon as a manufacturing State falls somewhat below the average of the other States, with 23.4 percent of total employment in manufacturing in 1948 as compared with a national average of 26.2 percent. Moreover, more than 50 percent of Oregon manufacturing employment has been in lumber, and only about 20 to 22 percent has been in industries other than lumber, food processing, paper, and textiles. It is the expansion of this other manufacturing that must be depended upon to support the expansion of Oregon income and employment depicted in this article. And that means increasing employment in such industries from 27,500 in 1949 to 84,600 in 1960 (see table II). Obviously, if lumber holds up better than is assumed in this article, then other manufacturing will not need to expand as much in order for the State to achieve the estimated levels of prosperity.

There are important obstacles to such a rapid development of new industries, but prosperity in 1960 depends on overcoming them. The solution of this problem must be found in new industries established by immigrants to the State, by present residents, and by nonresident corporations.

The reasonableness of these conclusions is tested in part by the data of table II. In addition to actual employment in 1948 and 1949, this table gives the industrial balance of employment as shown by its percentage distribution. The normal distribution for the State is probably indicated by the 1948 percentages, which differ only very slightly from those of 1947. Earlier figures must be discounted as a guide to the future, because of the great changes resulting from World War II and the great expansion of available electric power in the last decade. The table also shows Oregon percentages compared with those of the United States as a whole. Finally, the table provides three projections of employment by industry to 1960.

The income estimates for 1960 are based on the employment estimates of the last column of table II. It will be noted that, for the Nation as a whole, only mining ranks very much higher than in Oregon, though manufacturing, finance, and government and service are also relatively more important in the United States average than in Oregon. Perhaps some observers would want to give these greater weight in their 1960 income projections. Oregon, by comparison with the Nation, devotes a relatively higher proportion of her labor force to construction, utilities, and trade. When and if population growth in Oregon approaches more nearly the national rate, we should expect all three of these industries to employ more nearly the proportions that prevail in the country as a whole. This observation applies with particular force to construction and trade, both of which could easily become overexpanded in a growth period, in relation to more permanent prospects for the economic balance of employment in the State. During periods of rapid growth by immigration, there is more demand for residential housing, furniture, clothing, and other items of retail trade than prevails when and where immigration is less important. Oregon can continue to develop its construction and trade industries at a higher level than the Nation as a whole only for a limited period.

TABLE II.—*Oregon employment by industry, 1948, 1949, 1960*

	Thousands of workers		Percentage distribution			1960 projections		
			Oregon				Based on population projections	
	1948	1949	1948	1949	United States, 1948	Based on 1940–48 trends	Using United States 1948 ratios (thousands of workers)	Using Oregon 1947–48 ratios [1] (thousands of workers)
Agriculture [2]	99	101	16.4	16.9	12.5	113	99	[3] 100
Mining	2	2	.3	.3	1.7		13	2
Manufacturing	142	132	23.4	22.0	26.2	198	207	193
Food	19	19	3.2	3.2		24		[3] 23
Lumber	82	74	13.4	12.4		101		[3] 65
Paper	5	5	.9	.9		7		[3] 12
Textiles	6	5	1.0	.9		10		8
Other	30	28	4.9	4.6		57		85
Construction	43	40	7.0	6.6	5.8	56	46	58
Utilities [4]	50	50	8.2	8.3	7.3	79	58	69
Trade	124	127	20.4	21.1	19.2	185	151	167
Finance [5]	17	19	2.9	3.1	3.4	24	27	23
Government and service [6]	130	130	21.4	21.7	23.9	180	188	177
Total	606	599	100.0	100.0	100.0	835	788	788

[1] Projections for agriculture, food, lumber, and paper are obtained on other bases (see text).
[2] Includes forestry and fisheries.
[3] See note (1).
[4] Includes transportation.
[5] Includes insurance and real estate.
[6] Government not elsewhere classified. About 23 percent of Government employment is represented in other classifications.

Sources: Oregon 1948, 1949, Oregon State Unemployment Compensation Commission; United States percentages computed on Department of Commerce estimates of "persons engaged in production"; 1940–48 trends are unedited computations in Wesley C. Ballaine, "Oregon Employment," People, Jobs, and Income on the Pacific Coast, 1949–60, except, however, that "government" has been revised.

Trends of employment growth in recent years would, if continued, produce significantly higher levels of employment than those used in the estimates for agriculture, lumber, utilities, and trade, and significantly lower levels in paper and "other manufacturing." Such trends, with certain modifications and analysis by Prof. W. C. Ballaine, were published last year in People, Jobs, and Income on the Pacific Coast, 1949–60, issued by the Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations.[5] The writer used the Ballaine employment projections for an earlier set of 1960 income projections which were published in the same book.[6]

Agriculture, food processing, lumber, and paper estimates for 1960 are taken from or adapted from studies made by the United States Department of Agriculture for the Corps of Engineers of the Army,[7] and are made on a somewhat different basis than those for other industries—the estimates for which are based on the 1947–48 balance. The results for all except paper are substantially lower than would have been developed from the 1947–48 ratios.

Higher standards of living in 1960 are best measured by increases in per capita income payments. With an estimated population of 2,097,000 in 1960 (estimate by Prof. Elon Moore and Mr. John F. Staehle, in People, Jobs, and Income on the Pacific Coast, 1949–60),[8] our average income for every man, woman, and child should rise from $1,448 in 1949 to $1,914 in 1960. Since all 1950–60 figures are in terms of 1949 prices, this means a 32-percent increase in average incomes in the 11-year period.

The computation of these income estimates was based upon a number of fundamental assumptions, which must be recognized. First of all, it is assumed that there will be no full-scale war and that the gross national product of the United States will rise to $375,000,000,000. This increase would be consistent with recent trends of increases in productivity per man-hour, decreases in hours of work per week, and increases in the labor force.

Population in 1960 is assumed to follow the middle Moore and Staehle estimates. It is also assumed that the percentage of the Oregon population in the labor force in 1960 will be the same as in 1949. If the recent tendency for the employment of women to increase is continued, the projections will be correspondingly below the attained income. Unemployment of 5 percent of the labor force on the average throughout the year 1960 is also assumed. If President Truman's attitude toward unemployment in 1949 is

[5] See also Oregon Business Review, February 1949.
[6] See also Oregon Business Review, July 1949.
[7] See notes 1 and 2.
[8] See also Oregon Business Review, May 1949.

characteristic of that of succeeding administrations, governmental policy might be utilized to keep this figure down to 3.5 or 4 percent, in which case again attained income will be higher than shown in table I.

The agricultural employment figures are based on 1930–45 trends in relationships among numbers of people living and working on farms, numbers of farms, and the amount of cropland, as well as on declining trends of farm population. Trends in the net income of proprietors and other income payments are based on trends in wages. This is not a satisfactory procedure, but no better assumption seems available. No allowance is made for deductions for old-age and unemployment insurance.

"Let's Get Going, Harry"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial written by my good friend, R. M. Beer, of the Ashland Times-Gazette. I recommend this editorial for the reading of all:

"LET'S GET GOING, HARRY"

(By Robert M. Beer)

It's not an easy trick to be in Europe for 6 weeks and come back with all the answers. I wrote an editorial a few weeks ago which was radio-teletyped from the cruiser *Des Moines* while still at sea—3 days from Norfolk and 1 day ahead of the Dewey and Truman speeches.

What I said then still sounds pretty good to me. The "Truman letters" have indicated that our President appears to be both impulsive and vindictive. He seems to lack the stature of a director under these grave circumstances, as evidenced by his reactions to petty affairs. As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he has terrific influence without curtailment of his plans short of actual war. Congress has sole power to declare war and Congress is made up of the men we have placed there to represent us.

Why, then, shouldn't our President seek the counsel of nonpartisan people to help him in this bedlam?

There are two reasons why he doesn't ask Senator TAFT or Tom Dewey to select someone to confer with him. No. 1 reason is political, of course. No. 2 reason is that the Republicans have no one who represents a solid thought on the answer.

I think the Republicans can take plenty of blame for this situation. My small voice suggests a meeting of the opposition party, not to ridicule the President or the State Department but to designate a spokesman who will sit with the President and his Cabinet and offer to help. I don't see how the administration can turn down such a proposition at this stage of trouble.

The United Nations can do no more than reflect public opinion in regard to the countries of this world. In that respect they do well. A united America can accomplish the same thing if we all get our heads together and decide whether we should get out of Korea and defend Western Europe or piddle around in a section of the Pacific that means the loss of our boys in utter futility.

The defense of Western Europe is No. 1 in my estimation. Western Europe will determine the division of the world. If we lose the Mediterranean countries we have lost Willkie's "one world." Why not shoot for it? If we lose we still should be able to unify and defend our own half.

Europe is a mess. I told you so in the articles that were written while I was away. Eisenhower can't unify Europe in 6 months when it has been impossible to do it through centuries. I think it's a shame to send these old veterans on an assignment that defies fulfillment. The Sixth Fleet, with Admiral Ballentine and 20 ships can't defend Europe if the Soviets want to go south. Neither can Ike organize things over there to stop them. The losing side doesn't win allies. Small states go with the winner.

I suspect that there is a very good reason why we have not left Korea and dropped the bomb in that area. There's a slip-up some place; we're not ready, even with the atom.

What is wrong? Don't we have a right to know? Continuation of this sort of dawdling and hoping for peace only gives the enemy more chance to get ready for the push through Europe. While we spar around in Korea and lose men Russia is enhancing their position. Chinese and Americans are dying, not Russians. Delay is fatal to us.

I sincerely believe that spring will bring further encroachments upon the free states that will surely provoke war by pure insult and challenge.

It may be another 50 years before this world becomes compatible. In the meantime we dare not lose our principles by being the savior of Japan and Asia. At this half century we need the judgment of the best brains in America—not politicians and diplomats—but the opinions and advice of men who can think realistically.

I'm not advocating the use of the big bomb in Korea or Russia but I believe that we should at least consider the possibility, providing all of us hear, read, or see such a thing discussed through radio, newspaper, and television. Participants in that discussion should represent all factions so that the final decision can be made with the knowledge that everybody has a hand in our destiny.

Let's get going, Harry.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to a joint letter written by four members of the board of directors of the Park Region Publishing Co., of Alexandria, Minn. The Congress has the tremendous responsibility of formulating a foreign policy which all of us hope will prevent a third world war. In order to formulate such a policy the views and expressions of responsible, thinking people throughout the Nation should be solicited and studied carefully by all of us.

The letter follows:

PARK REGION PUBLISHING CO.,
Alexandria, Minn., January 6, 1951.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN: As common, ordinary citizens of our great democracy, we are generally content to let our elected representatives and officials and their administrators handle the affairs of the state, trusting their ability and wisdom to make decisions for the welfare of our Nation, the United Nations, and the world as a whole. However, in view of the very apparent and serious mistakes which have been made in our foreign policy during the past several years, mistakes that have involved us in a costly and bloody war, we feel that we cannot sit idly on the side lines without raising our voices against a policy which if continued will undoubtedly ruin our economy, jeopardize our freedom, and cause our young manhood to be sacrificed and slaughtered.

It is apparent that the so-called police action in Korea was an administrative and military blunder and has led to the involvement of our troops with the Chinese people. The Chinese people and the American people have a tradition of mutual understanding and friendship and we should not, we cannot, allow our Government to further provoke the Chinese people, as this policy will only lead to a prolonged war with staggering losses of materials, resources, and men and would eventually benefit Russia.

Some diplomatic action must be taken before it is too late to withdraw our troops from Korea and terminate the futile effort to carry out a United Nations idealistic policy without proper and adequate participation and support of all the United Nations.

A more realistic policy in our foreign commitments must be worked out by our diplomats or by Congress. We cannot afford to fight communism in places of their choosing and in methods of warfare which they prefer and in which they excel.

We must by force of circumstance expect to grant some concessions in order to get out of this precarious situation. This should be done, and it could serve as a costly lesson for our future benefit.

If certain interests have been allowed to pursue a course of aggression and greed in the Far East, that may have been a contributing factor in some of our difficulties, but this should terminate, and we should rather turn to the Prince of Peace for patterns of policy in dealing with people and nations.

We trust that you will consider the contents of this letter and use your influence to get some action that will lead to a peaceful solution.

We have contacts with hundreds of people every week and we know that we are expressing their sincere sentiments as well as our own.

Very truly yours,

S. O. WOOLLSCROFT,
ARTHUR L. PETERSON,
FRED J. FOSLIEN,
THEO. G. WINKJER.

Drafting of 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, that the question of drafting our 18-year-old youths into the armed services is a basic and controversial one is evidence by the tremendous amount of letters being received by the Members of Congress. Out of the many letters I have received, one in particular has a strong appeal, and I include in the Appendix of the RECORD

this letter from Dr. M. J. Horsch, president of the West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery, W. Va.

The letter follows:

WEST VIRGINIA INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
Montgomery, W. Va., January 2, 1951.

The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: I believe that I voice the conviction of a great many thinking Americans when I say that I trust that when Congress finally reaches the point where it deems the emergency so acute as to force upon immature 18-year-olds the moral shock of combat training and combat, it will first have forced upon us—every one of us—an equivalent sacrifice. To permit business as usual, profits as usual, wages as usual, working hours as usual, luxuries as usual, riotous living, and all the rest of our current souped-up ways of life as usual—and at the same time risk the destruction of the moral fiber of our 18-year-olds by exposing them, en masse, to a shock to which they have not the maturity to adjust themselves—would be a travesty upon American democracy.

When it becomes necessary, then let it come; but let us not call it necessary in the face of what is currently asked of the rest of us.

Whoever contemplates coming out of the present emergency one nickel richer than when entering—whether corporation, worker, management, merchant, or professional man—either doesn't understand the situation confronting us or doesn't deserve to be called American. Let's keep our values straight, and put priorities where they belong.

Respectfully,

M. J. HORSCH.

Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial entitled "Betrayed," by J. Robert Smith, editor of the Carmi Democrat-Tribune, at Carmi, Ill., which, in my judgment, is a powerful editorial expression of the composite thought of the people of the great Midwest with reference to our foreign policy and the Korean War.

He packs a lot in a few paragraphs worthy of your careful consideration.

The article follows:

BETRAYED

Every soldier who has been killed in Korea, every man who has been wounded, every one who has suffered frozen feet, every man who has been shipped to that devastated land has been betrayed by the United Nations.

Every man, woman, and child in America who has paid the price of tears and inflation and crushing taxation has been betrayed by this sorry successor to the ill-fated League of Nations.

Every person who has been called upon by Truman to work harder and longer has been betrayed.

This organization has finally showed its true colors—yellow. This spineless group of appeasers has voted to give Red China a seat in its Security Council in exchange for a cease-fire in Korea.

Our own delegate, Warren R. Austin, strung along with the appeasers—so it's time for him to resign.

It's time for Dean Acheson to get out.

It's time for a house cleaning in Washington.

If Red China should accept the UN proposal, the United States should walk out of the United Nations forever when the Red delegate comes to take his seat. Then we should tell them all to get out of this country and hold their appeasement sessions elsewhere.

The UN is an unholy alliance which has been a sounding board and instrument of communism.

What has it got us?

Over 40,000 casualties in Korea.

We're sick and tired of fighting and carrying on a war under a godless banner—and that's what the UN flag is.

Let's get back to sanity, with Old Glory as the only flag for which we'll work and fight and die for.

Pfc. James W. Ogden, of Norris City, didn't lay down his life in Korea so that his mortal enemies might be admitted to the United Nations.

Sgt. Carl Sheraden, of Burnt Prairie, was killed in Korea thinking he was fighting a war to destroy communism—not to reward it with another seat in the Security Council.

Security Council?

Whose security?

Not ours.

Oh, how can such little men in high places make such stupid blunders?

Cooperative International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 1725, a bill to establish a Commission on Cooperative International Relations.

The nations of the world are presently experiencing the most dynamic, political, economic, social, educational, and spiritual upheaval in history. The movement is both evolutionary and revolutionary. It is not, as in the crises of the past, limited in area to specific countries or regions, but is universal in compass. It blazes forth the fact that in truth we live in an interdependent world.

The Lord did not ordain that a patterned educational process, or constitutional government, or the industrial revolution, burst upon all segments of the globe simultaneously. Nor did He place all of us in temperate zones or regions of plenty. The result is a historic unbalance of progress. This unbalance is vivid to the mass of less fortunate, and the difficult task of satisfactory equalization is pressing. The unfulfilled wants and aspirations, the hunger, the ignorance, and the fear of peoples shriek for gratification, help, and guidance.

The problem is the proper directing and containing of these demands toward a common good.

The tragedy is that, while one group of nations would solve these problems by the tenets of the Golden Rule, another would exploit misery by false promise and untruth, and, succeeding, end by making a degraded mockery of mankind.

The selfish, the false, the reactionary phases of this agitation must be analyzed, publicized, and curbed lest the orderly processes of progressive history yield to universal chaos.

While we were preaching the freedoms, people were starving. Russia promised the multitudes abundance. The iron curtain expanded. Not until our aid programs backed up our philosophies did we check the Soviet onslaught. Curbed, like a spitting monster at bay, this menace has added to false promise a bitter campaign of hatred, vilification, and abuse, attempting thereby to delude masses into allegiance through doubt and fear of our motives.

Many have appraised the Gemini of Russian expansionism and communistic atheism. But multitudes, especially in the backward areas, are confused between the two diametrically opposed ideologies of east and west.

The battle is for the minds and hearts of men. It is the cold war—democracy versus dialectic materialism; freedom versus slavery.

Our present strategy is a campaign of truth by the use of three media—the press, films, and radio. Russia's weapon is the propaganda lie, disseminated by every accredited and discredited means. The consequences would be catastrophic were Satan's weapons to prevail and the balance of power swing weightedly toward Russia's might. In the counterbalance rests humanity's hope of averting Armageddon.

We are presently spending upward of $100,000,000 in our international psychological campaign of truth. To present to the peoples of other countries a picture of the American people, their ideals and way of life, we have an educational exchange program and employ the press, publications, radio, motion pictures, educational films, and libraries as information media.

Assuming that these collectively are effective, the questions remain: "Are they accomplishing the objective of retaining for us the initiative in the cold war? Are they convincing and adequate? Are they reaching the masses? Are these methods quelling doubts and fears, answering untruths, and turning peoples toward our democratic orbit? Finally, are we utilizing all known techniques or are we failing to use our greatest dynamic scientific American weapon, the show-how technique, to wit, television?"

While we should doggedly continue attempts to penetrate the iron-curtain countries with truth, hopeful for the day when their peoples will break their chains, our greatest emphasis must be to save the peoples of the free nations from being drawn into the reeking morass.

But we cannot convince the masses of the benefits of our way of life by the written word when they cannot read. Nor can we show them films depicting the American process by means of mobile units when there are no roads to reach them, or guerrillas bar the way. We can-

not tell them our story by the radio voice when they have no receivers, and cannot, in any case, understand the strange dialects spoken from remote transmitters. Static, too, does strange things in tropical areas, and the Russians jam the air waves over all like sorcerers apprentices possessed. The history of most peoples has never known democracy or the meaning of the freedoms, and we speak vainly to them when we use these terms.

Like Americans, people everywhere want to be shown. This is especially true in remote areas where tradition persists and custom defies change. These people, presently, might well quote from the Holy Script and say:

> There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world and none of them is without signification. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. (I. Corinthians XIV: 10 and 11.)

Our compulsion must be to give meaning to our words for "saying is one thing, doing, another." If ever a proverb were useful to save civilization's process, now is the time to put to work the time proven adage that "seeing is believing." And we have the technique for proving that "One picture is worth ten thousand words."

But, as we show our way of life and simultaneously explain it, we must be certain that it is adaptable to the mores and ways of life of the viewers. Self-gratulation has been known to create envy, resentment, and resistance. The have-nots are ever skeptical of the haves. And, while the masses of the free peoples of the earth have not much materially, they cling tenaciously to their pride.

Two-thirds of the peace-loving free peoples of the world live in economically undeveloped areas. Their problem is to realize their full human capabilities. The basic job is one of education. Our contribution is to help them to help themselves, but we cannot prevail by distant preachment. Our humane task is to provide a mass means for them to speedily educate themselves; to swiftly rid themselves of their many plagues; to curb contagion and infant mortality; to give them technical skills; and to show them by making available our store of technical knowledge how to raise their agricultural and industrial output. And we can only do this by giving them the means of mass communication so that their leaders, with our help and guidance, can visually show their peoples, and, while showing, explain the how and the why of change and progress.

There is but one way of certain and speedy achievement, and that, by establishing national radio-relay television networks in the free countries of the world.

THE INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States and other free nations of the world have a common concern for the material progress of these people, both as a humanitarian end in itself and because such progress will further the advance of human freedom, the secure growth of democratic ways of life, the expansion of mutually beneficial commerce, and the development of international understanding and good will. (Bulletin No. 3719, Department of State, January 1950.)

INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION

The progress of electronic science has been phenomenal. The age of the telegraph pole and of wire lines is passing. The airways have become man's means of communication and understanding. A single air channel will inevitably bring to the eyes and ears of people everywhere around the globe spot news events, the meetings of the United Nations, the opera at La Scala in Milan, the monkey dance of Bali, an American election, and the secret films of life under the Soviets. Motion pictures, the best of live talent wherever in the world, historical films, and educational shorts will at once amuse and create a sense of good humor in a somber world.

But, besides the audio and the video, this same single air channel can relay to us, in our several languages, a newspaper by facsimile, as well as teletype, telegraph, telephone, multiplex, and many other services.

The one must requirement to accomplish this end is that there be established universally accepted scientific standards for transmission and reception. It would be the greatest single tragedy in historical cooperative endeavor were any nation or nations arbitrarily or for greed to establish a system differing from all others, breaking through-transmission relays and precluding reception.

Free competitive world markets for electronic devices, including television transmitting and receiving equipment, must not share the fate which followed upon the invention of electricity. Then, selfishly determined interests in certain areas fixed upon differing voltages from standards in other countries and frustrating competition cartelized the world.

A NATIONAL RADIO-RELAY TELEVISION SYSTEM

It is proposed that a television network be established at strategic points within a nation. Each station would act as a link in a relay chain to permit integrated network operation of all stations throughout the area. When desired, each station could be operated independently to provide a local broadcasting service in its zone or district. All stations in the system would be situated on elevated points at suitable locations, selected to provide completely reliable transmission to adjacent stations under all weather conditions.

To insure satisfactory relay operations, the stations forming links of the network chain would be placed 50 to 125 miles apart, at elevated points where strong signals could be received from adjacent relay points. Such a network would constitute a complete, integrated audio-video intercommunication system, and would not be subject to jamming techniques.

COMMUNITY RECEIVERS

To reach the populace effectively with provable "show-how," large screen projection television receivers will be used. Manufactured for a single reception channel, their cost will be moderate. They will be adaptable for use wherever people assemble, both in and out of doors. A single television blackboard will be in operation both day and night—teaching children the three R's, health, duty, and freedom during school hours; showing mothers practical sanitation, diet suggestions and food values, child care and home nursing during their free hours; and demonstrating to fathers that 2 feet of wood added to a hoe will enable them to do twice as much work, and that a longer handle attached to a sickle makes a scythe.

This system will make practical the aspirations of the point 4 program and give peace-loving peoples the benefits of our own costly lessons and of our store of technical knowledge.

It will give practical answer to Secretary Acheson's concern, recently expressed, viz:

> We desire only a world in which we can live in peace. This is one of our constant preoccupations—how to break through this barrier of tangled words and make it unmistakably clear to all people everywhere that the purpose of our efforts is a peaceful world.

Television, our "show-how," will give the world our know-how, and with knowledge will come experience and, with experience, confidence and faith in us and in our doctrine.

Excess-Profits Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *December 28, 1950.*
Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you because I think you are sincerely interested in trying to solve our national and international problems, and that you will take the time to read this letter.

This is merely a suggestion, but sometimes a fellow gets a viewpoint when he is close to the job, which you may not get in Washington.

First, let me say that I am heartily in agreement with you in advocating increased taxes, even though the thought is not pleasant, but I am a realist and know that the bill must be paid. I am also a businessman, being president of Llewellyn Laundry, and as such I am subject to the ordinary temptations as I am just an ordinary human being. By temptations I mean that it is the nature of a person to immediately try to figure out how he can come out best when there are any changes made.

I am talking about the excess-profits tax. I am certainly not talking against it. I will go along with whatever program you recommend. What I would like to see is that the excess-profits tax does not create inefficiency. Such a tax can work very much like a cost-plus arrangement if it is not set up properly.

Let us take a businessman like myself. The way the excess-profits tax is proposed, everything my company makes over $25,000 will be taxed 77 percent. (Believe me, I am not complaining.) Now, I do not think I

am any better or worse than the average businessman, therefore, my thinking may be typical. If I reach the excess-profits brackets, will I become careless in the operation of my business? Will I hire more people than I really need, because it is only costing me 23 percent to do so and it will make life easier? Will I try as hard to maintain my present efficiency in the plant? In case the war situation becomes worse, I really should drive my people harder to help the cause along, but again, will I do so with most of the incentive taken away? Will I spend more than I should for advertising? I could go on citing examples, but I am sure you are familiar with all of them.

I offer a solution which I think will enable us to maintain our efficiency, yet give you the taxes you need. We businessmen are no different than other types of people in one respect—we, too, are looking for security. We may not have these lush years forever. We are not happy when we think of those years when we lost money and when we think that the same thing could happen again.

Here is my proposal. Go ahead with your excess-profits tax. Make it as stiff as you want. You will find businessmen more patriotic than some people in Washington think. However, in order to maintain efficiency, say to the businessman: "We will set up this excess-profits tax which we take from you as a credit against any year in the next 10 years that you show a loss, provided this loss is not due to neglect or mismanagement." For example, if in 1951 you take $10,000 as excess profits and if some year before 1961 I show a loss in my business, you will take care of me out of this $10,000. This seems fair, because the businessman may feel he is taking care of you now—you do the same for him when he needs help.

Let us hope that we will never need this credit. Let us hope that in the next 10 years business will be good. But there may come a time when we have a bad year. Giving the businessman this assurance of future help will, I am sure, save the country millions of dollars, because you will have created a reason for us staying efficient. We will consider the excess-profits tax as insurance.

Frankly, I do not think there will be much reason to use this credit, but is it not true that if business conditions would get bad, that the Government would step in in some way to help business. So you see Government will be helping anyway, so why not now use this idea as a means to have efficiency in business during wartimes?

As a plus value, this idea will preserve what I think is a prime American idea, to constantly get more efficient. Maybe we can even run a war period efficiently if we try hard enough.

Yours very truly,

E. A. MALL.

American Indians in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article having to do with the services of Indian men in our Armed Forces. They have given distinguished service in the two World Wars and many hundreds of them are even now on the battle line in Korea. This article, from the Poplar Standard of Poplar, Mont., was written by Mr. James Archdale, a prominent member of the Fort Peck Tribe of Indians, who conducts a weekly column in the newspaper entitled "Jim Says."

The article follows:

In more than two wars American Indians have taken part. In World War I some 17,000 young Indian men enlisted and fought. In World War II some 23,000 enlisted and some were in the draft and served from buck privates to the top commissioned officers, generals and colonels, captains and lieutenants.

They have been honored from the Congressional Medal of Honor down to every decoration on the calendar.

This writer has been informed that proportionately the Indians of Montana, 7 reservations of about 20,000 Indian population, stand at the head of all races in the United States of 93 per thousand.

These facts are irrefutable and stand out like some say a sore thumb, but many people come to me and ask me, after the United States Government has worked so hard in the 1860's, the 1870's, and the 1880's to stop the American Indian from fighting for his own country, and defending it against white encroachment on Indian domain, how can we or our boys be fighting in Korea helping the South Koreans fighting their own people?

Indians have signed peace treaties never to take up arms again. How can we be made to fight people that we do not know, and hence have no right to fight?

I think it was that great Nez Perce Chief Joseph once declared to General Miles and Howard "from where the sun now stands I will fight no more, forever" and I suppose his young men are fighting in Korea too.

Oh! You say we are fighting for the four freedoms; we are fighting for freedom and liberty, but my friend you go on some of these Indian reservations and see some of these Indian soldiers how they live, see their homes, see their living conditions, and see how much freedom they have gained or won for themselves and their people. On the Fort Peck reservation, alone, we have some 400 vets that served in two wars.

Many of them cannot get even Government loans under the GI loans. Big farmers who already made their life stakes in farming get all the acreage allotments, and our poor Indian GI's couldn't get a start, let alone getting loans for the purchase of farm machinery. The draft never misses Indian boys if there are any around. They tell me if you are a farmer in an essential business you cannot be drafted; in other words, you are exempt. Maybe that's the reason our boys are indirectly kept from the farms and the draft boards seem to have a pretty good eye for our boys. They even took our underage boys to fight. I have two nephews over there and I lost a boy in the last war, our only boy.

Up-State New York Loses Its Hide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, every time somebody in Albany tries to cover up their real plans of scuttling the Thirty-seventh Congressional District, he sticks his foot in his mouth by making a lame excuse.

It is now pretty obvious that the boys have just one objective and that is to keep sitting Members of the New York State congressional delegation in the dark as long as they dare without giving them any idea of the composition of the new, distorted districts for 1952.

The most recent kidding we have taken comes from some State senator who says the committee on gerrymandering has its hands tied and cannot do any more on the vital question of reapportionment until the Census Bureau in Washington makes available their figures.

For Albany's information, I have personally conferred with census officials here and they assure me that preliminary figures by counties are now ready. They went a step further to convince me by placing these figures in my hands.

The only difference between preliminary and final figures, they tell me, is that in the final check there will be a few more added who happened to be away on vacation when the census was taken. They emphasize that the difference between preliminary and final figures will be only slight.

Therefore, I charge that Albany officials are deliberately stalling on the job of reapportioning for 1952 with the ulterior intent of keeping us on the hot seat in a state of uncertainty as long as they can.

The committee's duty is to make available to the general public within the next few weeks their recommendations for the new congressional districts.

The State legislature will fall short of its responsibility to the people of New York State unless the reapportionment bill becomes law during this session which will end in late March.

Why should they pigeonhole this all-important question which is the very basis on which free American government is founded?

In resorting to further delay they are preventing the people of our State from getting a clear-cut picture of their most important subdivision of government, namely, the congressional district, which elects the men who serve in our National Congress. This means the people will not be able to elect their own representatives with care and deliberation.

The question is not so complicated that they cannot work it out in a few short sessions and then it will be out of the way. They have been discussing it for months behind closed doors. All they have to do is consult the population chart of each county and add up the totals.

But, unfortunately for the people, they are playing politics and will make everybody suffer before they settle their petty logrolling.

I learned today from excellent authority that they are trying to do a job on up-State, and to deprive that great section, not of one Congressman but of two.

They cannot get away with it without my squawking and squawking loudly. Why should the tail of the Empire State wag the dog?

I call upon the committee in charge of this gerrymander and upon the State legislature to get busy and submit the reapportionment question to a vote right away before they pack up and go home, as they always do up there, in early spring.

As for my own standpoint, I know they are fixing to do a job on me and I want to prepare for the worst. I suppose other New York State Congressmen would like to hear their fate, too, at least those who, like myself, do not have the good fortune to be in on the grapevine.

When the legislature reapportioned the State for 1944 elections there were men among them with enough integrity to insist that the design of the new districts be made public more than a year ahead of the election itself.

Why are not they decent enough to do the same thing today? What are they afraid of? What sleight of hand are they indulging in to perpetuate chaos and confusion at the very time they should be trying to create calm?

The boys in Albany owe it to the people of New York State and to good government and to sane, straight thinking to get down to business. Get the reapportionment job off the agenda so they can clear the way for problems of civilian defense.

Unification of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I introduced a House resolution which called upon the House of Representatives to express their belief that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland, unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland should, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary. Although hearings were held before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs early last year, it was not possible to obtain final action by the committee so that the resolution might have been considered on the floor of the House.

Today I am again introducing that resolution in the hope that the matter may be brought before this body and affirmative action be taken during the present session of Congress. The desirability of such favorable action by the House of Representatives is not subject to question, any more than the justice of Ireland's demand for unification can be questioned. The United States has always proclaimed the rights of small nations to independence and the free determination of their own form of government without the outside interference of any other nation. By the passage of my resolution the House can again proclaim our championship of the rights of small nations.

In the unsettled condition of the world today, with war in Korea and an uncertain type of peace existing throughout the rest of the world, many suggest that the Irish situation be soft pedaled or neglected. But it is because of this very unsettled world situation that I feel that at least the disturbing situation in Ireland should be remedied without delay and the threat to peace in this small country be eliminated, so that full attention can then be given to other situations.

I need not emphasize at this time the fact that partition has been in existence in Ireland for a period of only 30 years. Nor need I discuss the long history of Ireland's struggle against Great Britain in her efforts to achieve complete freedom and independence. The fact is that the British have recognized Ireland's right to freedom by granting to the 26 counties of Ireland their full independence under the Government of the Republic of Ireland. In doing so, however, Great Britain withheld this right from the people living within the small six-county area in the northeastern section of this island. An attempt has been made to picture the people of the six counties as of a different race or nationality, and that section of the country as a distinctive and unique area, having no natural ties or relations with the rest of Ireland.

The utter fallacy of this attempt is only too self-evident if one but studies a map or reads a line of the history of Ireland. No geographic barriers separate this area, no different customs distinguish these people, nor are any different racial strains to be found here than in the rest of Ireland. It was out of the northern section of Ireland that her greatest champions and warriors in behalf of freedom have arisen, while the leader of the British union faction, Sir Edward Carson hailed from Dublin. The geographic unity of the nation is too apparent, and the historic unity of the people too well settled to be subject to debate.

Only two factors demand a division of Ireland. The one is the desire of Great Britain to maintain a foothold in Ireland in keeping with her age-old imperialistic policy of domination of other nations. The other is the desire of large landholders and powerful industrialists to maintain their personal control of the government and the people in that area. The United States can endorse neither of these excuses, but rather must protest against the unjust suppression of the will of the people by Great Britain, and the enslavement of both the government and the people to the whims of a small group of industrial monopolists and large landowners.

The unification of Ireland will put an end to the centuries of strife that have disturbed the peaceful development and growth of Ireland, and will bring a sound economy to both sections of the nation, which is not now attainable. The elimination of the contention between the Irish and the British will be achieved and a new era of friendly cooperation and good will would ensue. I am confident that the British Government itself would be happy to see the Irish controversy satisfactorily ended, and I am sure that the urging of Britain to bring about unity, through the action of our Congress, would provide the British Government with the necessary impetus to bring this about.

The very unsettled condition of the world situation in Western Europe particularly justifies our interest and concern over this situation. Divided, Ireland has been forced to abstain from joining the Atlantic Pact nations in cooperating for the defense of Western Europe. Vetoed by Russia, Ireland has been denied a seat in the United Nations, mainly because of her strong anti-Communist sentiment amongst the people and on the part of the Irish Government. Yet European defense may well hinge on the role that Ireland would play in the event of active warfare once more in Europe.

We have been told by American generals that the use of bases in the six-county area of Ireland was vital, and that without them we would have found the invasion of France far more difficult. If that be true, then the use of all 32 counties in Ireland would be far more effective, and would be made available, undoubtedly, were the Government of the Republic of Ireland to have full control and jurisdiction of the entire territory of Ireland. Moreover, so long as Ireland is excluded from the defense of Europe in all our planning, the same may not be true of the Communist attackers, once they engage in open warfare in Europe. Instead, they may well plan the active conquest of Ireland, which is being omitted from all our rearming program and defensive strategy for Western Europe. A defenseless Ireland is an open invitation to aggression and attack, yet Ireland is denied participation in the Atlantic Pact solely because of the partition of the country. Without the means of arming herself adequately, Ireland would be unable to share directly in the battle for the defense of Europe, and would be unable to ward off an attempted invasion of her shores.

It appears to me that our military planning is short-sighted if we continue to disregard the strategic position Ireland occupies in Western Europe and its usefulness as a base of operations for the supplying of European troops. The position of Ireland as the most westerly portion of Europe is too vital in military strategy, so far as the United States is concerned, for it to be disregarded and ignored by our military planners any longer. To cope with possible European warfare, our planning must be thorough and complete and must be carried into effect in advance of need. The usefulness and importance of Ireland to any such planning cannot be denied, if the words of our generals following the last war had any truth in them regarding the value that bases in the six counties had in the victorious outcome of the war.

Any weakness in our battle lines in Korea has been made the point of attack repeatedly by the enemy. The same weaknesses in the European line of defense will become the point of attack. The division of Korea became the occasion of war in the Orient. Let not the division of Ireland prove the encouragement to Russia for war in Europe as well. Instead, I trust that this House will give favorable consideration to my resolution calling for the unification of all Ireland, and that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will make that possible by itself taking early action on the resolution. Further hearings are not needed

following the excellent hearings of last year when the committee considered the various resolutions introduced by several Members of this body.

At those hearings last year, the great interest in this situation as far as the American people are concerned was most clearly demonstrated. From every section of the country representatives appeared to express their approval of the proposal that the House of Representatives express itself regarding the unification of Ireland. Only the concern over the outbreak of war in Korea hindered final action during the last session. I trust that now the necessity for speedy action in completing the defense program for all of Europe will cause equally speedy action to be taken on this resolution. The sooner the unification of Ireland is accomplished the sooner will she take her rightful place amongst the European countries. Always a force for freedom and right, Ireland has repeatedly shown herself in full agreement with the American efforts to rehabilitate and reconstruct Europe. Once her full freedom and independence has been achieved, Ireland can become a strong force in the councils of Europe, where leadership is sorely needed and vigorous anti-Communist ideals are so essential. I urge prompt action on this matter and request that the Members of this body join with me in urging the unification of Ireland at this time.

The resolution referred to follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas in the intervening 30 years the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

United States Now a Garrison State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Dorothy Thompson that appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star entitled "War Declarations Seen at End." It is Miss Thompson's belief that the United States has now become a garrison state through the United Nations' concept of peace. This is a matter that should have the prompt attention of all Members of this House. The article follows:

WAR DECLARATIONS SEEN AT END—UNITED STATES HAS BECOME A GARRISON STATE THROUGH THE UN CONCEPT OF PEACE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

At his last Thursday's press conference President Truman declared he had untrammeled right to send United States troops anywhere in the world. He thus answered the challenge of Senator TAFT and other critics that he obtain congressional approval before furnishing troops under North Atlantic treaty obligations. The implications in his remarks were that he had no requirement to obtain congressional approval except for a formal declaration of war, and he has previously declared the action in Korea not war, but the carrying out of obligatory UN commitments.

If we continue to interpret those commitments as Mr. Truman interprets them, it is unlikely that there will ever again be formal declarations of war. All future wars will be police actions, initiated or restrained by the President alone. We actually do not know on whose advice the President suddenly decided to lead the UN into action in Korea while the Russians were absent from the Security Council, whose members, under the Charter, are charged with responsibility for such action, and protected against it by the veto.

Our spokesmen have fallen into the habit of referring to the UN as though it were only that part of the international organization associated, under American leadership, to resist aggression everywhere. By votes of countries in the Assembly the United States commands a majority. However, wars or police actions are not settled by majority votes of governments, many of them of puny states, but by mobilizable populations, weapons, and political and psychological factors adding up to morale. In terms of these factors, the world, as represented in the United Nations, is fairly evenly divided into two hostile blocs, and the war in Korea is not a UN campaign but a struggle within the UN itself.

If Mr. Truman's viewpoint on UN obligations is, indeed, the only correct interpretation of the UN Charter, it would follow that those who aid and abet aggressors should be thrown out of the international organization. But that Mr. Truman's interpretation is dubious is illustrated by the fact that none of the great powers can be dismissed over its own veto. And at San Francisco the United States was as intransigent as the U. S. S. R. in insisting on the veto.

Our leaders—and Mr. Truman was President—wanted the veto to protect the United States from possible military commitments against the interests of, or in areas of indifference to, the United States. It is not logical or even truthful for the same leadership now to invoke obligations which, as a primary framer of the Charter, they took studious pains to avoid.

The fact is that the UN was never designed to bring sanctions against any great power. It was designed to act only by unanimous great power consent against small states that might threaten the peace. Under the Charter, small states can be coerced into accepting UN disciplines and restrained from waging war, thus abandoning a primary sovereignty in favor of great powers who are not compelled to abandon it.

The foreseeable result was the clustering of small states around such great powers as might represent and protect them and the ending of small-state independence or neutrality; with the further danger that clashes between small satellites of hostile great powers might draw the great powers themselves into war, fought, of course, in the name of peace.

These criticisms of the United Nations are not made with hindsight. They were made by this column in 1945, when the outlines of the Charter first appeared as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. But then, as now, anyone who expressed doubt in the United Nations was branded as rocking the foundations of peace.

Today the universal peace promised through this universal body is patently a mirage. So are the universal freedoms.

Through the UN concept of peace, we are becoming a garrison state under a virtual dictatorship.

Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, through Mrs. Ada B. Holt, district president, I had the great privilege of delivering a speech in Statuary Hall on the occasion of the anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, whose character as a great American looms larger with each passing year.

The speech follows:

Madam President, and friends—
Who is the happy warrior? Who is he
That every man in arms should wish to be?
It is, the poet tells us—
The generous spirit, who, when brought
Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
Upon the plan that pleased his boyish thought.

If ever words so beautifully uttered might be fittingly applied, they seem consummated in the memory of the man we gather this day to honor. Once more we pause to observe an anniversary which becomes ever more precious, ever more meaningful, to the great Republic which without partisanship, without political or geographical bias, without stint or limit, east or west, north or south, today gladly and proudly unites with one accord of heart and voice to salute the blessed memory of Robert Edward Lee. For it is a blessed memory. It is more than that: It is a most precious heritage, ever purifying the national tradition, ever stimulating the national conscience, ever sustaining the national pride. If at the time of his passing, 80 years ago, the figure of Lee was already seen to be emerging from the mists of blind and passionate partisanship, whether from the one side or the other, to take on the majestic proportions of one of the heroes of history, how much clearer is our perspective today! He is like the mighty mountain which one must see from afar before one can fully appreciate its grandeur.

In evaluating the life of Lee one is at once struck by the enormous importance of his ancestry and background. It is impossible to escape it. Lee was himself a man of the gentlest simplicity despite his innate dignity. He would have been the last to claim any preference or prerogative because of his name and birth. The fact nonetheless remains that the soil which nourished this rare genius and the long line of high-born, distinguished and, above all, honorable ancestors whose blood coursed through his veins gave, beyond any question or doubt, a cast to his mind, an elevation to his spirit, and the deep-rooted—so deeply rooted that perhaps he himself was never wholly aware of it—fundamental, instinctive preference to the sane, the wholesome, and the true. He

was drawn to the right as the needle is drawn to the magnet. He spoke the truth by instinct.

In his old age an enterprising genealogist undertook to chronicle the Lees and the general commented:

"I am very much obliged to Mr. So and So for the trouble he has taken in relation to the Lee genealogy. I have no desire to have it published, and do not think it would afford sufficient interest beyond the immediate family to pay for the expense. I think the money had better be applied to relieving the poor."

"Which does not mean," adds one of his most eminent biographers, "that he was not daily and hourly conscious with pride that he belonged to the Virginia Lees, a name writ as large as any in the history of the country and transmitted to him with an honor which it was his constant care never to tarnish. From the first Richard (Lee) down, the Lees had always been doing something useful and often something great, and they were distinguished by the friendship as well as by the admiration of Washington."

If Lee was indeed proudly, and properly, conscious of the noble heritage transmitted to him on both sides—by Carter no less than by Lee—he was unquestionably profoundly influenced by his family's—especially his father's—close relations with General Washington. To have Light Horse Harry Lee for a father and George Washington for that father's intimate friend would be enough to make an indelible impression on any sensitive boy. Think of the tales he must have heard of the great and soul-stirring times when the War for Independence was being won. Think of the anecdotes of days when buff and blue were in the saddle. Think of the former brothers in arms who must often have stopped at the house on Orinoco Street over yonder in Alexandria to pay their respects first to the gallant, ailing general, and later to his widow. Can anyone doubt that there was a grave but eager-eyed boy in the background? I dwell on this aspect because many of my audience, being mothers, can appreciate the force of the old saying, "Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined."

Lee's own mother was evidently a woman of the highest character and it is to her even more than to the distinguished father from whom he was separated so young that Lee owed the formative influences of his early life. Soon after the father's last, sad departure on the hopeless quest for health Mrs. Lee lapsed into invalidism and though only a small boy at the time Lee took much of the care of her and her household. To this is probably due in large measure the steadiness and high sense of responsibility which marked him so early in life.

In 1825, when he was 18, Lee, through the influence of some of his father's old friends, entered West Point. There he was noted for his temperance and self-control which seem doubly creditable to him when we read the statements of the Superintendent of West Point at the time in a report to President John Quincy Adams as to the dissipation generally prevalent among the young men. Being duly graduated in 1829, he immediately received appointment in the Engineer Corps, then the elite of the service. In June 1831, he was married to Miss Mary Custis, the great granddaughter of Martha Washington, and from thenceforward to the tragic day in 1861 when he left it forever, Arlington, with all its hallowed Washington relics, was to be his home. There followed long, busy years on engineer and garrison duty in various parts of the country ranging from Georgia to New York and from Washington to St. Louis. They were not dramatic years but they were eminently fruitful. Such important tasks as superintending the fortifications of New York harbor, adjusting the boundaries between Ohio and Michigan, problems connected with the control of the Mississippi constituted a notable series of constructive achievements.

But it was the war with Mexico that first showed unmistakably the promise of the rare military genius which later was so magnificently to flower. In view of the tragic divergence of a future day when each man was to find himself on opposite sides of an unbridgable gulf the testimony of Lee's old commander, admirer, and beloved friend takes on poignant appeal. The following formal testimony of Gen. Winfield Scott, the good "Old Fuss and Feathers," is of unusual interest, for in it we behold the first lightning flash of the genius which was one day to dazzle the world. Appearing before a Senate committee of inquiry into the conduct of the war, General Scott declared with characteristic vigor in speaking of Lee's now classic reconnaissance before Vera Cruz over a lava tract into which no man had dared venture before:

"I had dispatched several staff officers * * * who had, within the space of 2 hours, a . i after dark, successively returned * * * and reported to me that each had found it impracticable to penetrate far into the Pedegral during the darkness. * * * Captain Lee, * * * having passed over the difficult ground by daylight, found it just possible to return to San Augustin in the dark, the greatest feat of physical and moral courage performed by any individual, in my knowledge, pending the campaign." Again we have Scott's written praise of "the gallant and indefatigable Captain Lee, who was as distinguished for felicitous execution as for science and daring" We have also the testimony from a brother officer that General Scott exclaimed in his downright way one day after the war:

"If I were on my death bed tomorrow, and the President of the United States should tell me that a great battle was to be fought for the liberty or slavery of the country, and asked my judgment as to the ability of a commander, I would say, with my dying breath, let it be Robert E. Lee."

Prophetic words: A little more than a decade later when the future of the Nation seemed dark, indeed, it was General Scott, then approaching his end, who earnestly recommended to President Lincoln that Robert E. Lee should be given command of the Union armies.

But this is not, ladies, a military history of Lee the general. I leave that where it belongs—to military experts and to such great biographers as Douglas Southall Freeman. Nor is it the place nor the occasion to sound the trumpets of military remembrance. This is not a day of battle triumph; it is a day of dedication—for a renewal of the spirit in the wellsprings of a noble past. So I invite you to consider Lee the man.

One of our more amiable, and very human, traits is so to idealize our great leaders—once, be it strictly noted, they are safely dead—as to magnify them out of all proportion, which process does not in the least add to their true greatness and makes posterity not a little ridiculous. In short, if man, as Sabatier says, is "incurably religious," he is also a born hero worshiper—as Carlyle very well knew. It is a perfectly natural, perfectly normal, and, as I said, very human characteristic. Nevertheless, it has to be guarded against; that is, if we wish to preserve the true lineaments of the man we admire.

This is what kept Washington a frozen monument behind a veil of ice making him thus secretly odious to generations of rebellious school boys until at last a generation arose which knew not Parson Weems; the American sense of humor triumphantly burst through and presented us with a very human Washington we increasingly love and admire and feel close to. Does any lady here object to learning that the Father of Our Country turned out to be very human indeed? Does anyone here think him the less great in that without relaxing the pursuit of virtue, he was not averse from pursuing the fox? I confess that I, for one, was delighted to discover in a charming pamphlet that the youthful Lee spent many vacations at his birthplace: that through the fields, woods, and swamps of Stratford-on-the-Potomac he hunted deer, fox; shot wild duck, partridges, and geese; he fished, rowed, sailed; rode horseback, skated in winter, and tramped through old Westmoreland from dawn to dark.

It is good to know these things—to know that Lee's boyhood was a happy and normal one, with plenty of opportunity to let off boyish steam. There are many indications that to the very end of his life he was not without a touch of impish humor which, while it never left a sting, gave ample proof that its owner was in intimate touch with the reality of his fellow men.

Woodrow Wilson, in his Robert E. Lee, says:

"It is true that we do not think entirely correctly of Lee in supposing that he was compact entirely of gentleness. No man whom you deeply care for or look to for leadership is made up altogether of gentle qualities. When you come into the presence of a leader of men you know you have come into the presence of fire—that it is best not incautiously to touch that man, that there is something that makes it dangerous to cross him, that if you grapple his mind you will find that you have grappled with flame and fire. You do not want sweetness merely and light in men who lead you; and there was just as much fire in Lee as there was in Washington. In Washington it was more upon the surface, but it was not more truly present. Every man who approached Washington had the singular impression that he was in the presence of a man of tremendous passions. He was always well in hand; but you knew that the man himself was aware that he was driving a mettlesome team, which he had to watch at every moment to avoid sudden run-away, when circumstances were exigent or exciting.

"You did not get that impression when in the presence of Lee. I have only the delightful memory of standing, when a lad, for a moment by General Lee's side and looking up into his face, so that I have nothing but a child's memory of the man; but those who saw him when they were men and could judge say that you got no impression of constrained and governed passion such as men got from General Washington. But whenever General Lee was in the field no one dared cross him, no one dared neglect his orders, no one dared exercise a dangerous discretion in the carrying out of his commands. There would flare in the man a consuming fire of anger; those who were in his presence felt it was dangerous so much as to breathe naturally until it was past. There was something of the tiger in this man when his purpose was aroused and in action. It would immediately recede; quiet gentleness would come again, that perfect poise, that delightful sense of ease as he moved from one purpose to another; but you would not forget that moment of exposed fire—you would know that you had been in the presence of consuming force."

And so the long tranquil years passed by filled with active duty, happy family life, healthy children romping through the fields and woods of Arlington. During most of this time Lee was stationed at remote outposts where his wife and children could not follow him, and this seems to have been the only cloud on a singularly calm and sunny period. Perhaps he was storing up strength and serenity against a time when we would have great need of them. As the dread question so many had lightly raised in decades gone by and from which sober men both North and South now were beginning to shrink even from thinking of, began to press down upon men's consciousness, we have occasional glimpses of Lee's interest and concern in the swift-moving events which were crowding everything else off the national stage. Here it should be stated with due emphasis

that it was then, and always thereafter remained, Lee's firm conviction that a soldier's profession had no part with politics. You all know that by a strange coincidence the John Brown raid occurred while Lee was on furlough at Arlington. Lee was ordered to take charge of the troops in putting down the insurrection which he did with coolness and precision.

As events rushed inexorably on, however, Lee foresaw that sooner or later he and every honest man would be forced to choose. He shrank from the prospect. Neither party satisfied him. Each seemed to him unreasonable, headstrong, utterly inconsiderate of the rights of the other. In December 1860, he writes:

"Feeling the aggression of the North, resenting their denial of the equal rights of our citizens to the common territory of the Commonwealth, and so forth, I am not pleased with the course of the Cotton States, as they term themselves. In addition to their selfish, dictatorial bearing, the threats they throw out against the 'Border States,' as they call them, if they will not join them, argues little for the benefit or peace of Virginia, should she determine to coalesce with them. While I wish to do what is right, I am unwilling to do what is wrong either at the bidding of the South or the North."

And again, in January 1861:

"As far as I can judge from the papers, we are between a state of anarchy and civil war. May God avert from us both * * * I see that four States have declared themselves out of the Union. Four more apparently will follow their example. Then if the border States are dragged into the gulf of revolution, one half of the country will be arrayed against the other, and I must try and be patient and wait the end, for I can do nothing to hasten or retard it."

It is perhaps as well at this point to make clear once more Lee's exact attitude toward secession. I take the liberty of quoting from his great biographer, Douglas Southall Freeman:

"During the later months of his second period of duty in Texas, the secession movement began. Lee had no sympathy with it. With him, a Whig, warmly devoted to the Union, the political and economic arguments for Southern independence did not weigh. He knew little of constitutional law, and the few slaves he had owned in earlier years had died or been manumitted. The question with him—a question he hoped he would never see brought to an issue—was simply whether his first allegiance was due his State or the Union. He answered it without mental debate: In case Virginia seceded, the traditions of his family and its long association with Virginia instinctively determined him to cast in his lot with her. He stated this repeatedly before he left Texas, and said at the same time that he regarded secession as revolution. It was not until the discussions of wartime campfires had acquainted him more fully with its constitutional basis that he accepted the doctrine of secession."

In April 1861, Lee was still at Arlington awaiting orders. On the 18th of that month he had one of the most memorable interviews in American history at the home of Francis P. Blair—now temporarily occupied by the President of the United States. There he was unofficially offered command of the Union Army with the undoubted knowledge of Mr. Lincoln who was advised by Lee's old commander, Scott. We have the account in Lee's own words written after the war in reply to a correspondent who wishes to know whether Lee had ever sought or desired command of the Union forces.

Lee writes:

"I never intimated to anyone that I desired the command of the United States Army, nor did I ever have a conversation with but one gentleman, the Honorable Francis P. Blair, on the subject, which was at his invitation and, as I understand, at the instance of President Lincoln. After listening to his remarks, I declined the offer he made me to take command of the army that was to be brought into the field, stating as candidly and courteously as I could that though opposed to secession and deprecating war, I could take no part in an invasion of the Southern States. I went directly from the interview with Mr. Blair to the office of General Scott, told him of the proposition that had been made me, and my decision."

Two days later Lee sent in his resignation to Scott expressing in an affectionate letter his heartfelt regret at separating himself from the service "to which I have devoted the best years of my life and all the ability I possessed," and adding, "save in defense of my native State I never desire again to draw my sword." Almost immediately, the State having already seceded, Lee was offered and accepted the position of commander in chief of the forces of Virginia.

In his memorable Lee Centennial Address which, perhaps, did more than all that had gone before to bridge the gap between North and South, Charles Francis Adams, grandson and great-grandson of Presidents of the United States astounded both North and South by the unequivocal declaration, "I hope I should have been filian and unselfish enough to have done as Lee did." Strange words from an unexpected source. But they foreshadowed the day, now happily long since arrived, when northern eyes could see the great commander in a just and proper light.

As I stated earlier, this is not the time nor the occasion to comment on the military phase of the great life we commemorate today. The fearful struggle which engulfed the Nation in a sea of blood and anguish is only made bearable to think upon—especially to southerners—by the memory of the great leader who rose, first to transcendant military glory and then after military defeat, rose to heights of moral grandeur which will enshrine him forever in southern—no, no, American hearts! Here was that "Happy Warrior"—

"Who, doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear, and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain.
* * * * *
Whose powers shed round him in the common strife,
Or mild concerns of ordinary life,
A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
But who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
Is happy as a lover; and attired
With sudden brightness, like a Man inspired;
And, through the heat of conflict, keeps the law
In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw;
Or if an unexpected call succeed,
Come when it will, is equal to the need:
He who, though thus endued as with a sense
And faculty for storm and turbulence,
Is yet a Soul whose master-bias leans
To homefelt pleasures and to gentle scenes;
Sweet images! which, wheresoe'er he be,
Are at his heart; and such fidelity
It is his darling passion to approve;
More brave for this, that he hath much to love:—
'T is, finally, the Man, who, lifted high,
Conspicuous object in a Nation's eye,
Or left unthought-of in obscurity—
Who, with a toward or untoward lot,
Prosperous or adverse, to his wish or not—
Plays, in the many games of life, that one
Where what he most doth value must be won:
Whom neither shape of danger can dismay,
Nor thought of tender happiness betray;
Who, not content that former worth stand fast,
Looks forward, persevering to the last,
From well to better, daily self-surpast:
Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
For ever, and to noble deeds give birth,
Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
And leave a dead unprofitable name—
Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
And, while the mortal mist is gathering, draws
His breath in confidence of Heaven's applause:
This is the happy Warrior; this is He
That every Man in arms should wish to be."

Diversion of Water From Columbia River

EXTENSICN OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following letter which I received from Mr. John W. Cunningham, of Portland, Oreg., relative to the proposals to pipe Columbia River water to California:

PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. WALTER NORBLAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORBLAD: I have been very much interested in the newspaper accounts of the exchange between President Truman and you regarding the diversion of water from the Columbia River. This project has impressed me as an absurdity from the start. It is something that could be disposed of finally through a very short and inexpensive engineering study of the fundamental factors. The thing that burns me up is that an elaborate and costly investigation and report is to be made. A local engineer has been assigned to this. I believe him to be competent, and have little doubt regarding his final conclusions. I cannot blame him for accepting a high-salaried job, but as a taxpayer I consider the whole study boondoggling of the worst sort.

It should take an engineer only a few days to make the basic calculations on pipeline size, frictional resistance, horsepower required, and pumping costs, which I am sure would show the fallacy of the scheme regardless of the original construction cost.

Some people no doubt think such a project feasible by comparison with the long-distance transmission of petroleum products and natural gas. There is a tremendous difference in the value of the commodity. For water an average sale price is 10 cents per 1,000 gallons. Gasoline is worth around $250 per 1,000 gallons, or 2,500 times as much. This makes quite a difference in the allowable cost of transportation.

While I have no doubt as to the ultimate outcome of the project for diverting Columbia River water to California, those of us who are interested in the Northwest do have a real cause for worry that California may steal our power supply. The Columbia Basin is the greatest reservoir of undeveloped power in the country, and our premier resource. The possibility for industrial development is unlimited, and industrially this section can go ahead of California. The transmission of power 500 to 1,000 miles has not yet been accomplished, but is right around the corner. It could be done right now if there was occasion for it. It would be inherently

unfair and a calamity to this area if our power, produced at Government expense, were taken to California to further their industrial development.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. CUNNINGHAM.

Confusion in Administration Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including the following newspaper article by Mr. Constantine Brown, well-known columnist, that appeared in last evening's Washington Evening Star:

ADMINISTRATION RANKS CONFUSED—EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOLLOWING OWN POLICIES WITHOUT CONSULTING SPOKESMEN IN CONGRESS

(By Constantine Brown)

There is utter confusion in the ranks of the administration. The executive branch, taking its cue from the attitude of President Truman regarding the participation of legislative bodies in major foreign affairs decisions, is following its own policy without consulting administration spokesmen in either the Senate or House.

The Democratic leadership in the Senate, while trying to keep the party line intact, is angered by this neglect on the part of the State Department. This became evident last Tuesday, when Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, lashed out at representatives of the State Department over acceptance of the truce terms at the United Nations. Senator CONNALLY previously has gone to bat for the policies of the State Department, even when he personally doubted their wisdom.

Neither the White House nor the State Department keep as closely in touch with the temper of the country as do Members of Congress. The important debates now taking place on the floors of both Houses, and the anger voiced by some Members of Congress over some features of our present foreign policies spring not only from personal convictions, but also from the unbelievably large volume of mail received by Congressmen from all parts of the country. These letters and telegrams express fears and doubts about the way in which our foreign policies are being conducted.

The decision to intervene in Korea last June was approved almost unanimously by Congress. The mail received in the Senate and House has given an 80 percent endorsement to President Truman's decision to send forces to repel the aggression.

However, the State Department's decision to accept the idea of the truce proposal—rejected yesterday by the Chinese Reds—which in effect would have given Russia and China a complete political victory met with unprecedented indignation.

The Nation has accepted our losses so far in Korea without murmur. They were considered inevitable in a campaign intended to back up the fundamental principles of the United Nations and at the same time help our strategic position in the Pacific.

Now, after we have had more than 50,000 American casualties and are some $14,000,000,000 out of pocket, the State Department's willingness to accept a truce which would have given a full political victory to the aggressors is beyond the patience of the American people.

Senators of both parties cannot easily digest the argument of our foreign policymakers that Warren Austin was ordered to "go along" with the authors of that sordid deal because the State Department wanted to abide by the decision of the majority in the UN and because the Department was convinced beforehand that the Chinese would not accept even these favorable terms.

Democratic and Republican Senators argue that while expediency may be proper on occasions, it is inexcusable in a matter involving fundamental moral principles. They also argue that the other explanation given the Senate by the State Department that "talking with aggressors does not mean accepting their terms"—is equally fallacious and hollow.

If we had become involved in a deal such as that presented by the UN, because this Government could not afford to take a minority position in the UN, there would have been no way to escape accepting the terms of the truce we had already endorsed.

The country would have wanted to know, Congressmen say, why we had undertaken a police action and then, when faced with inevitable military difficulties, backed out and, in fact, surrendered. The political consequences of such a surrender would have been more far-reaching than the military setback.

Withdrawal from Korea, if dictated by strategic considerations, is understandable and desirable. But a surrender—which is what the "truce" plan meant in its provision that we sit at the same table with the aggressors and arrange for "peaceful conditions" in Asia—would have placed the whole of Asia in Russia's lap. And Asia is vital to our security in the struggle with the Kremlin.

A Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Crittenden County Times, West Memphis, Ark., for January 5, 1951:

A WELFARE STATE

The records of the sheriff and collector of Crittenden County will reflect that his collections during the year 1950 amounted to $761,059.54. This sum is not so large when one is advised that it represents everything that is to be collected in the county for roads, hospitals, drainage, schools, and the operation of all the county offices, including the police protection of the citizens and the operation of all courts.

But there is another item that is gigantic, stupendous, in fact it is colossal. We refer to the $699,400 that was given away and handed out in the name of public welfare in Crittenden County during that same 1950.

Is it possible that during good times, high prices, and scarcity of hands to make our crops and do our labor that the public needs to distribute such an immense sum in charity? How could there be any need for Red Cross or any of the other agencies that make annual demands for relief funds upon our populace in the face of this melon-cutting? We import foreign labor, haul pickers from across the river, beg for household service, and still we must, it seems, pay people not to work for themselves.

The fact is this: Our people are asleep at the switch; we are not taking enough interest in what is going on before us. We are not mindful of the fact that a welfare state would likely lead to ruin, to communism, or something just as distasteful, and that we are placing a penalty on honest labor.

Why should the taxpayers pay some carefree mother for taking care of a houseful of illegitimate children? Why should she not work for herself and children if she is able? Why should we pay for the keep of housefuls when the party responsible is wandering about telling others "the Government is taking care of the children."

It is a sad state of affairs. A lack of interest leads to such. Should we not advise, even insist, that our representatives in the coming legislature fight for some new method of seeing that requirements for welfare aid are stricter?

The rolls are obviously too large. While we do not blame those who operate the county department and who are people doing an assigned job, there are no doubt some in the upper strata of the welfare organization of the Nation and the State who work to keep lists of recipients large in order to insure a large number of jobs for themselves as employees.

We will never condemn honest charity or relief to those who are unable to help themselves. In fact, we will ever be ready to join in it. But we have a bad situation here and certainly the same situation exists elsewhere. It's a condition that needs looking into.

What are we, as citizens and as taxpayers, going to do about it?

Organization of the Committee on the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I herewith insert in the RECORD the organization of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Four regular subcommittees have been formed, together with two special subcommittees, the special subcommittees being the Special Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power and the Special Subcommittee on Reapportionment. The assignment of Members to the subcommittees follows:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over immigration and naturalization bills.

Mr. Walter, chairman; Mr. Feighan, Mr. Chelf; Mr. Gossett; Mr. Graham; Mr. Fellows; Mr. Case.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over claims bills.

Mr. Byrne, chairman; Mr. Frazier; Mr. Rodino; Mr. Machrowicz; Mr. Keating; Mr. Goodwin; Mr. Jonas.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over patents, trademarks, and copyrights; also, revision of the laws.

Mr. Bryson, chairman; Mr. Ramsay; Mr. Willis; Mr. Rogers; Mr. Reed; Mr. Boggs; Mr. Crumpacker.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4

1. General jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned.

2. Special jurisdiction over bankruptcy and reorganization.

Mr. Lane, chairman; Mr. Wilson; Mr. Jones; Mr. Forrester; Mr. McCulloch; Miss Thompson; Mr. Hillings.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. Byrne, chairman; Mr. Chelf; Mr. Willis; Mr. Reed; Mr. Goodwin.

Enemies in Our Midst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received one of the most thought-provoking letters since coming to Congress 2 years ago. Unquestionably, the thoughts expressed in this letter are echoed by every mother and father whose sons and daughters are soon to be called into service to protect our country from those who would destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of this body to the following letter:

CANTON, S. DAK., *January 15, 1951.*
Representative HAROLD O. LOVRE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After talking with and hearing the cry of a large group of South Dakotans, together with the incessant cry in my own bosom, I take pen in hand to utter a protest on the laxness with which our Government permits the destroying Reds to stay within our borders.

I believe the adage of "God helps those who help themselves" is very true. Is it not a mockery to prayer and national prayer days to pray for peace and yet let 50,000 enemies stay within our gates? Is there any country on the face of the earth that, knowing a large group of destructive peoples and a menace to their freedom, would feed, nourish, house, and only talk about such enemies without doing anything or taking action against them? Is there anyone who thinks at all who doesn't realize where fires started in hotels one after another had their origin or the destruction of large warehouses, instigated strikes, dissension in large measure among the working classes, and all manner of other unnecessary evils come from? True, any country will have its problems, but "it was never so here" in our country in such measure until the "isms" rose up on the face of this earth. Shall we sit by and idly wait for the end until more men and women have filtered into our Government chairs to sit and draw fat pay envelopes and pass on all necessary secrets vital to our national safety to those who would conquer us and enslave us? If a small percentage of these are discovered, what about the taxpayer's money for long, expensive, drawn-out trials? I am a mother of two boys, one soon 18, the other 21, and must I sit idly by listening to the radio and reading the newspapers how these would-be conquerors are right in our "camp" undermining and spreading disease and what not? Shall we mothers and fathers who have raised loving and good sons send them out to defend our country and those we send to Washington at taxpayers' expense only sit idly by and talk about this destructive army here in the very land we send our boys out to defend? Believe me, I'm only voicing the heartcry from thousands of mothers and fathers who feel the same way. Many of them only wring their hands, hoping for the best, and patiently waiting, but many more are praying for action from our Congressmen to do something about it. They may say, "We don't do things that way in America," and yet isn't one of our initial laws to the very point on that? If I remember my civics since schooldays, there should still be something on those good old books that says, "Anyone writing or speaking against the President or Government, etc."—it doesn't finish with saying "feed them, nourish them, assist them, and let them stay." Let's not wait until they have so weakened us at home that we have no power to resist. And what about sending our boys to Europe? Shall we send our strength in every direction to police the world and endanger our own freedom? Has Congress degenerated to such a weak force in our land that they can't take action to insure safety, peace of mind to the people, and confidence in the men we send and pay to take action? Mr. and Mrs. America are truly expecting it, and I feel I have a right to expect that the Reds in the United States of America be locked up where we don't have to fear them. Somehow it doesn't seem right to send them back to their own country at this time to be a potential force for their own country with their secrets and manpower to be used against us. The church today is saying, "Wake up, America." What does our Government say? Actions speak louder than words. Let's strip these within our borders of their power and then take it to the Lord in prayer. How can we expect God now to answer our prayers for peace and safety when we block the prayer avenue with such obstacles in its very path?

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN URBEN.
Mr. JOHN URBEN.

What Are the Real Reasons for Halting Potato Dumping?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press dispatch from Presque Isle, Maine, is another example of the confusing and apparently improvised operations of the Department of Agriculture in its food hoarding and food destruction program. The lack of clearly stated reasons for this halt in dumping of potatoes gives rise to natural speculation as to the real reasons. It may be that greater export needs or greater Army needs or both offer the sole explanation, but I shall submit some comparative figures from the official Department reports which may disclose also reasons to which no public reference has been made.

First, I shall include here for the record the dispatch:

UNITED STATES ORDERS HALT IN DUMPING OF HUGE MAINE POTATO CROP

PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE, January 17.—Dumping of surplus potatoes from Maine's 61,000,000-bushel crop has been ordered halted by Washington, a Commodity Credit Corporation representative said today.

Edwin A. Bates, CCC purchasing representative, said the telephonic order did not specify the reason but it was believed there was a likelihood of greater export and Army needs.

The Washington action affects "on-farm disposal" through which, Bates said, about 5,000,000 bushels have been diverted to date to fertilizer or livestock usage under the price-support program. The program will continue insofar as movement of Government purchased potatoes is channeled to starch factories, school-lunch programs, institutions, and export.

Bates estimated that approximately 30 percent of the Maine crop has been disposed of so far either through regular market channels or the price-support program.

Under price supports, which are scheduled to expire this year, the Government pays the farmer $1.15 per hundredweight for surplus spuds and he, in turn, buys them back for 1 cent to use them either as fertilizer or for livestock.

A year ago, a halt in "dumping" as the disposal action is generally called, came in May when heavy export orders for Western Germany came in.

To cope with the Maine surplus problem, agriculture experts have recommended an acreage reduction next year.

Maine potato carload shipments are lagging far behind this year as compared with a year ago. To date only about 6,300 cars have moved out as compared with nearly 15,000 a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1949, the Department had no potatoes on hand. By November 30, 1949, it had purchased 590,090,100 pounds and had disposed of 589,889,100 pounds at a loss to the American taxpayers of $5,850,344.40.

I do not know and have not been able to find out how much of that loss was due to "dumping" or other destruction.

On June 30, 1950, the Department had no potatoes on hand. At that time we were in Korea. Despite that, the Department had purchased by November 30, 1950, 1,360,636,500 pounds and had disposed of 1,272,281,800 pounds at a loss of $13,091,657 29.

The Department ended up on June 30, 1950, with a loss in potatoes of $75,887,619.68. That created widespread indignation.

It is more than possible, it is probable, that in November, as it was running 124.0 percent ahead of its extravagance and waste of the last fiscal year, the Department at long last realized that it was facing a major scandal if the full facts became known.

Whatever the facts are, they should be made public. I hope and believe that the proper Committees in Congress will see that this is done. The American people and the Congress should have this information promptly.

At the Pistol Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, January 18, 1951, entitled "At the Pistol Point":

AT THE PISTOL POINT

The answer of the Chinese Communist Government to the proposal of the United Nations for a cease-fire in Korea is that it will cease fire when, as, and if the spoils of a successful war are handed over to it.

This is the clear meaning of the Chinese Communist reply, whatever efforts may be made in certain quarters to gloss over it. For the Chinese Communists say, in so many words, that the United Nations plan for a cease-fire first and negotiations afterward cannot be agreed to. They say that the negotiations must come before, and not after, any cease-fire is arranged. They indicate that if the cease-fire is actually to follow the negotiations, then the negotiations themselves must first result in terms which they regard as satisfactory.

What these terms would be we are told again, specifically, in this latest note of the Peiping government. They are three in number: First, all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Korea and "the solution of the internal affairs of Korea" must be undertaken "by the Korean people themselves"; in the existing circumstances, with North Korean troops already established well to the south of the thirty-eighth parallel, and with great numbers of "volunteers" all set to come down from Manchuria to reinforce them, this means simply handing over South Korea to the North Koreans and their masters. Second, the protection of the American Seventh Fleet must be withdrawn from Formosa. Third, Communist China must be admitted to the United Nations.

These are the terms. They are to be discussed in China, and not at Lake Success. And unless and until they are granted Communist China makes it clear that it will keep its pistol pointed at the head of the United Nations.

Since the second week of November, when General MacArthur reported the invasion of Korea by large numbers of organized Chinese Communist troops, the United Nations—collectively, and despite the efforts of individual spokesmen of individual nations—has marked time while the armies of these Chinese Communist forces multiplied. The question of the Chinese Communist invasion has been debated at great length; not a single resolution has been adopted to describe and condemn this invasion as a breach of international law. A cease-fire commission has been established by the General Assembly; it has addressed five different communications to Peiping; in not one of these five communications has it remotely suggested any wrongdoing on the part of the Chinese Communists. In fact, it is fair to say that the Cease-fire Commission has seemed to act on the premise that it was its duty, somehow and to the best of its ability, to use its good officers to settle a quarrel between two outside parties—Communist China and the United States—when the whole truth of the fact is that if this is anybody's war it is the war of the United Nations.

Meantime, while nothing was done at Lake Success, all manner of excuses have been offered—individually, to be sure, but from high quarters in nations which were quick enough to act when only North Korea was the aggressor—excuses serving by one means or another to palliate the offense of the Chinese Communist government. First it was said that that government was concerned only about the safety of the power installations on the Yalu River. Then it was suggested that it simply did not understand the way of westerners, and took natural alarm at the northern moves of western armies. Then, when the western armies were no longer moving northward but retreating southward, it was argued that, after all, the solution of the problem had been approached from the wrong angle; nothing could be done to clarify the issue without admitting Communist China to the United Nations. And meanwhile the Communist Chinese armies have been marching, marching, marching.

And meanwhile, too, young boys from the western nations have been fighting in Korea, fighting and dying in Korea, facing odds that were too great to be overcome, beating their way back southward along mountain roads in zero temperatures, leaving large numbers of their comrades behind them.

What are these boys doing in Korea? Are they there through some ghastly mistake? Or are they there, in the cause of the United Nations, and at its command, to resist an aggressor?

If the second explanation is the correct one, as we believe it to be, then it is high time to identify the aggressor.

It's Not Funny—It Can Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the President persists in his New Deal program although Congress has consistently rebuked him. He is calling for additional billions for defense, yet asks for billions more for socialized medicine and other socialistic schemes.

Mr. Speaker, a friend who is editor of the Delavan Enterprise, wrote a thought-provoking editorial that appeared on January 3, 1951. S. Robert Andersen looks ahead to 1975 and what he sees sends chills down my back. It is not funny nor is it fanciful. It can happen here if the New Deal program is finally consummated. It is up to the people. I am including the editorial at this point:

RAMBLING AROUND

(By S. Robert Andersen)

Here all of us are, facing the first January of the last half of the twentieth century. Within a few weeks after you receive this issue of the Delavan Enterprise I shall be observing another birthday. Since I was born in the nineteenth century, before another 25 years roll by I may be old enough to write reminiscences. So this month let me be old and cantankerous and pessimistic, and imagine that I am already 24 years older. Would I, perhaps, be writing notes like these?

January 1975: I can remember clearly how, back in 1950, nearly every family had an automobile. People were putting television sets in their homes. New houses were being built by individual families. No one used ration coupons for anything, although some had been used during the Second World War, and then people knew what they were. All meat and grocery stores and industries were then owned and operated by private individuals and companies, who competed with each other on price and quality.

February 1975: A farmer friend of mine was arrested today and they say he will be sent to jail for 2 years. His sow raised a litter of nine pigs, but he reported only eight to the Meat Administration. He had managed to hide the other one from the farm inspector, but someone found it out when he butchered the pig. He had hoped to give his four youngsters a little home-grown meat. The Meat Administration says that not nearly enough meat can be produced or imported, and that the ration must be reduced to a half-pound per week.

March 1975: The 15th was the date set for the tax reports to be made to the Federal Government. They are still paying off the interest in the national debt which was so greatly enlarged during the Second World War and in the fight against Russian imperialism. No effort has been made as yet to pay off any of the principle yet on our tax rate, which has risen since 1950 to the point where we all must pay the Treasury at least 65 percent of our earnings. The higher incomes pay proportionately more. The cost of our Government has risen through the years because of the need for additional bureaus to handle the controls set over our national economy.

April 1975: I was visiting on a friend's farm the other week end. Their hens, encouraged by spring, laid a couple of extra eggs. It would have been nice to have two fresh eggs for breakfast again, but it has become too dangerous to try to dodge the law. Besides, for many years now one egg a week has been the allowance, and we have gotten used to getting along. We never appreciated our good fortune when it was possible to have two eggs and bacon, too, every morning for breakfast, and even cream for our coffee. I remember how sorry I felt for the English back in 1950, when they had only one egg a week.

May 1975: I went down to the Lumber and Building Administration today to apply for three two-by-fours to brace up the front porch. Had to fill out three sets of application blanks, six copies of each, and to draw a diagram to show just where the pieces would be used. The inspector will be around next month to make recommendations which will be forwarded to Washington. The clerk in charge of the office said that I could expect quick and favorable action on a minor request. He said that I could expect to make the repairs before cold weather set in this fall.

June 1975: This morning I stood in line until noon before the Health Administration offices. Wanted to get the tooth pulled that has kept me awake most of the 3 nights. I couldn't get in to see the clerk. Long ago, before we had this free medicine for everybody, one could generally find a doctor or dentist fairly quickly. They took a personal interest in our troubles. Now they just jot our number down in the book and hurry us through, if we get to see them at all. The dentists nowadays seldom have the time to fill teeth and must make application for filling material through the Health Office. Each applicant must be examined by the district office.

July 1975: The Fourth of July reminds an old fellow of his younger days, when we celebrated or not, according to how we felt. Today, as is usual now, everybody had to appear in town to listen to the official program and watch and hear the President make his speech on the municipal television. He ranted about freedom like his father used to do, but what he says and what he does are two different things. The administration keeps the populace happy on holidays by giving free shows over the television sets. The show usually consists of a military review of our Army which shows the people how strong our Nation has become. The fireworks display and other celebrations remind me of the days of Hitler when he resorted to such dramatic spectacles to keep the people emotionally pent up.

August 1975: The Lumber Administration refused my application for three two-by-fours. They said it was improperly made out.

I was instructed to report at their office to initiate new applications. My son ended his 2 years of compulsory military training today and will be coming home soon. He will have to continue his training here at home with one of the home training units that meet once a week at the local armory. Every summer the home units must go on a 2 weeks' maneuver period in the northern part of the State. This period constitutes the worker's vacation for his job. The women have to serve their time with the Armed Forces also but they only have to enlist for 1 year, and they are exempt from summer maneuvers if they have children.

September 1975: I have been trying to figure out in my mind just when these present conditions had their beginning. Some say it was when the Government bought all the railroads. Next they took the coal mines, then the steel mills, then the truck hauling business, then the whole petroleum industry. They said they had to have the mines and the oil business to get fuel for the trains and trucks, and the steel mills to get enough steel for everybody. Just try to buy some now. Now the Government runs nearly every kind of business, just as Russia did when I was a young fellow. Then production started going on down, and the country has been getting poorer ever since.

October 1975: I think the beginning was further back. It might have been about 1936, when the politicians discovered they really could buy votes in quantities with borrowed public money through the WPA and other things. Some of the younger people now can't remember when we used to have elections. The situation began to get out of control in 1948, when the ballot boxes were stuffed. We had several elections after that, but people lost interest in voting when the politicians gained control of a unified union vote. We don't have any unions today with the Government running things.

November 1975: Have been busy reading the history of the twentieth century and have come to the conclusion that our freedom began to be lost in 1913. That was the year the income-tax amendment was ratified. The idea would have been all right, probably, if it had contained a provision that no more than one-fourth of any ordinary man's earnings could be taken in taxes and no more than half of the biggest incomes. Since there were no limits on taxes, the politicians eventually discovered that there were no limits on the amounts they could spend. They kept taking more and more from everybody to give more free help until no one could save. Then there had to be still bigger pensions for us old people and more Government services of every kind. No one could save up enough for investment, so the Government said it would have to take over business.

December 1975: Kind of hard to be cheerful at holiday time. Can't help remembering the great days when every American out of jail was free and full of hope for the future.

The Government Conservation Administration ruled that only one large community Christmas tree would be permitted and no individual trees for homes could be had. This ruling was supposed to be temporary, but it was made over 5 years ago. The Government said that it had to preserve the forests. The Government took over control of all forests many years ago and have been in the lumber business ever since the Lumber and Building Administration was formed.

Are my reminiscences exaggerated? I hope so. But I have mentioned nothing that doesn't happen today in England or Russia. And the United States of America has been faithfully following the English route.

Victory or Defeat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pride in including an inspiring address delivered by Rev. William J. Schifferli, assistant pastor, Holy Redeemer Church, Rochester, N. Y., and Monroe County chaplain of the Catholic War Veterans, on Armistice Sunday, November 12, 1950.

Father Schifferli's courageous, inspiring address is one of the finest expositions which has come to my attention of the menace of communism. As we all know, the patriotic organization for which he spoke, the Catholic War Veterans, is one of the most militant and effective forces in our country today against the godless, totalitarian ideologies parroted by those traitorous or misguided elements whose first loyalty does not lie with their own country which has nurtured them and bestowed on them its richest blessings.

In these times when men must stand up and be counted, challenging words like those of Father Schifferli stand out like a beacon pointing the way to victory over the evil forces which would destroy us and the ideals for which our Nation stands.

His address follows:

VICTORY OR DEFEAT?

At least twice in every year, our busy and active Nation pauses in its many affairs to give thought to its faithful dead, its heroes and patriots who heard the call to arms, who arose to defend our country, who struggled and sweated and suffered and died for our country's cause. The memory of these men, and their living comrades, who happily were not called upon in God's providence to pay the fullest measure of their life in the cause of right, is held sacred in the throbbing hearts of a grateful people. Their deeds of heroism and valor sound a stirring call to loyalty, and should be set before the youth of the Nation as a shining example.

Cynicism, doubt, bitterness, selfishness, have no place in the hearts of youthful Americans, and unless they are cleansed from the consciousness of a young generation, they will sap the strength of character, the will to win, the desire for freedom, and the determination to fight, yes, and to die, if necessary, to uphold the glorious traditions of our heritage of freedom.

On Memorial Day and on Armistice Day, we pay the tribute of our reverence, our love, and our gratitude to the high courage and daring self-sacrifice of these patriots who did so much and dared so much for the good of our country. These men and their glorious deeds are in our hearts and our minds. We, whose lives are surrounded by the fruits of their sacrifices and lapped in the delights of a life of freedom won by their devotion, can little realise the intensity of the terrible struggle, the upheaval of lives, the shock of war, the pain and horror and fear of those great conflicts. The human mind has the tendency to forget pain, so that even in the consciousness of those who fought, the horror of those battles has lost its sharpness of image, and the great healing power of time has tended to soothe and lull to forgetfulness.

But we would indeed be faithless to those who died for us, were we to expunge from our memory all that they did. Memories rich and rare which make us all purer and stronger and better, crowd in upon the heart as we recall the matchless valor of American hearts and the deathless glory of American arms. Well do we know that the service which they rendered to their country cannot be measured in terms of human precision. The sacrifice was enormous and the prize for which they fought was beyond price. Small, indeed, is the mere memory of their valiant deeds, nor can we keep faith with them were we only to recall on special occasions their glorious courage. A memorial to these men would be a hollow and fruitless thing unless in our daily lives, in our every thought and action, we took care and planting for the preservation of that country and those ideals for which they sacrificed all. We must beware lest the palms of victory become, through our own lack of vigilance and care, the ashes of defeat.

There is at work today in the caldron of America's thoughts, a virulent poison, introduced by elements foreign to our country, fostered by traitors in our midst, encouraged by some of the so-called intelligentsia who are so deluded in their naive false idealism that they fail to realize that they themselves will be among the first victims of their vicious system. This poison is called communism.

We might wonder how an intelligent informed people like Americans, who live in a country of plenty and are blessed with more material possessions than other people in the world, who dwell in a vast and gracious land, can possibly be deceived by this monster. But let us face facts. In spite of our educational system, there are many people among us who are not intelligent. God gives to us talents in varying degrees. In spite of our press and radio, there are many people who are not well informed. Furthermore, many are open to the danger of being swayed by propaganda, for we know that if a person is told a thing often enough, he begins, although incredulous at first, to believe it. In spite of our vast economic resources, there are many people who live in misery and want. Even our own fair city is not without its slums.

Into a body politic, weakened by these ills, the virus of communism, with its false promises, with its mastery of the lie and deceit, with its evil, malignant, cancerous doctrines, this virus makes a gradual progress which will, if not checked, in time corrupt the entire body politic.

There are those of us who say that it can never happen here. But we say that it can. We have witnessed, since the conclusion of this last world-wide conflict, the fall of country after country into the orbit of this enslaving monster. Under the guise of democracy, under the banner of liberation, the forces of this monster have infiltrated many countries. The sufferings and poverty of a people are played upon. Promises are made that conditions will be better. A few positions of power in the country are captured by Communists. And it is then that the poison begins to take its toll. It begins by a discrediting of communism's enemies; then their elimination is next. All organs of information and thought fall under the monster's control. All weapons and means of liberty's defense are seized and taken from the people. A police force then begins the terrible reign of terror. On any door, at any hour of the night, comes the dreaded knock of the secret police, and the poor victim is spirited away, never to return. Is his fate the torture chamber? The vast slave camps? The uranium mines? The

concentration camps? Or is he to be so drugged and tortured until his mind is misshapen and he becomes putty in the hands of soulless beasts to be molded as those beasts see fit, and then pitilessly and mercilessly exhibited in a so-called court of justice which makes a blasphemous mockery of its very name?

This has happened in our "enlightened" age, to peoples we once helped. Poland and Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Hungary, China—the list grows, the dead multiply, the tortures increase. Gradually, the glow of freedom on this globe is dimmed. Never before in the history of the world have so many people been reduced to the condition of slavery, slavery of the body, slavery of thought, slavery of the soul. Yes, it happened to others; it can happen to us. Can we imagine in such a world of tyranny a gathering like this worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our consciences, dedicated to the remembrance of a throng of dead heroes, who lives and deaths were for the cause of liberty and justice?

Our dear America is a Nation which has never lost a war. From the War of Independence through World War II, from 1775 to 1945, victory has been ours on the battlefields of the world. The ground of many nations and countries has trembled under our marching feet and rumbling tanks; the seas have foamed under the prows of our mighty ships; the air has roared with the power of our air armadas. And the glorious symphony of the power of our arms has been exerted, not in the enslavement of peoples, not in aggression, not in a drive and search for world imperialism, not in a selfish bid for power, not in the destruction of freedom, but in the cause of liberty and justice for all.

We have never lost a war. And so we say that victory is ours. Yes, victory has been ours. But now, 5 years after the cessation of hostilities in the world-wide conflict, 5 years after the destruction of our enemies, 5 years after the armies of our foes were destroyed, killed or captured, and disarmed, 5 years after their fleets were riddled and sunk, 5 years after the horrible fury of the atomic bomb burst like a portent of the future, like an Apocalyptic scourge in the skies, 5 years after, where is our victory?

We see nation after nation falling to the scourge of communism. We see our former friends drawn into the camp of the future enemy. We see our former enemies, countries we conquered by force of arms, flaunting insults in our faces. We see our consulates closed, our businessmen imprisoned as spies on trumped-up charges; our Government representantives in foreign lands forced to flee for their lives and be covered with public humiliation. We see the world organization established for the preservation of world peace, the United Nations, mocked by the Reds in Korea, who without provocation, launched a war of aggression. We see our youths, insufficiently trained, without the proper materials for war, forced to retreat and to die in South Korea. We see our armies, apparently victorious in the bloody struggle, met by hordes of Chinese Communists, for whose very existence we are in a measure to blame. We see our efforts for peace, tranquility, and order among nations consistently blocked by a power whose avowed purpose is the creation of chaos and anarchy, and the ultimate overthrow of our Government, indeed, our very way of life.

If we are to face facts, we must admit that much of this has been our own fault.

An astounded world looks on and says, Is this America? Is this the victor? How far can we be pushed? How many insults shall we take? Can it be that some of our men in high positions tolerate this because they are sympathetic to the vicious ideology of communism? Is this victory, or is this defeat?

We are a peace-loving people, and we avoid to our utmost, war. But how many unarmed planes must we let be shot down deliberately in the Baltic? How many Americans murdered? How many imprisoned? How low must we grovel in humility to avoid war? We decry war, we hate and fear war; but we say, better war and glorious death in defense of liberty, than life as a slave to a totalitarian state.

Let America bend every effort to solve peacefully the problems of the world; let us be sympathetic and understanding of other peoples. But let us be inflexible in our love for, and our defense of, liberty. Let us keep faith with our honored dead. Let us perpetuate the ideals for which they died. Let us act, not like the vanquished, but like the victors.

Faith, Not Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following verse composed by George D. Case, of 1014 South Main Street, Horseheads, N. Y., which recently came to my attention and which deals with our current national and moral perplexities. I commend it to those who are as sorely troubled as I:

We are in need of faith, not fear,
Faith that builds wisdom.
Let the changing year
Bring us leaders, wise in thought
With prophetic vision, who can lay
A path for us to follow day by day,
A road that ends, not in defeat
But constant gains, as it is meet
For those who love but do not hate,
Let us mark the path before too late.
We are in need of strength, not waste,
Strength of our son, our daughter,
Our future lies in those, who in our
Half-thought acts, we slaughter.
In name of liberty, we slaves
Of politics and greed, boast of our skill
But find our only creed is fight and kill.
We are in need of God, not guns,
To give more wisdom to our deeds,
The power that Nature holds for us to solve
Is great beyond our needs.
We have but to set our minds and hearts
And ask the way. We have to only
Bow our haughty heads and pray,
Why should we cede that man is wise.
From God's great tower, what is his size?
We are in need of wisdom, not device,
Wisdom to know if we are right,
Then right will reign. If wrong, go on and fight,
For we are foolish, weak and vain,
Fools who take the hardest way
When all we need is just to pray
And ask the greater power that be
To guide our way to make men free.
We are in need of standards high
That others may gage their virtues by.
What we need is greatly less
Of dishonesty and selfishness.
Aye. What we need is strength of right.
Prepared—but never have to fight.
Is it too much to ask, that we
Make this our goal for liberty.

—*George D. Case.*

JANUARY 1951.

Pfc Melvin L. Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., Awarded, in Absentia, the Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the community of Mahaffey, Pa., made front-page news on January 9 when one of its native sons was awarded in absentia the Nation's highest decoration for valor—the congressional medal of honor.

The official citation of the War Department reads in part:

Brown was seriously injured during this action and has not been heard from since this attack.

Melvin L. Brown was a typical American youth who enlisted in the Army 2 years ago and who is truly representative of the millions of American teenage boys now in the uniform of their country and on the alert to defend this Nation against any threat to its security.

The people of Mahaffey, Pa., as well as the great Keystone State realize that Private Brown's service to his country made him a national hero and that a grateful Nation owes young men of his resourcefulness and courage an eternal debt of gratitude that cannot be paid by mere tribute alone. Every American citizen owes a portion of that debt to our fighting men and the only payment that can be made on such an obligation is continued interest in the servicemen of this Nation so that they may be provided with every possible means of assistance in defending this Nation. This obligation is also in effect when they return home as veterans and resume their places in civilian life.

I should like at this point to insert the following editorial that appeared in the January 11, 1951, issue of the Clearfield Progress, Clearfield, Pa., and which is an eloquent tribute to the gallantry of Pfc Melvin L. Brown:

A SAGA OF AMERICA

Clearfield County in general and the little town of Mahaffey in particular has reason to feel proud of one of its sons this week. He is, of course, Pfc Melvin L. Brown, the 19-year-old Mahaffey youth who enlisted in the Army 2 years ago and who was awarded, in absentia, the Nation's highest decoration for valor, the Congressional Medal of Honor, in a White House ceremony Tuesday morning. To win the Medal of Honor, Private First Class Brown "distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty," according to the official citation.

It happened at Kasan, "the walled city," last September 4. Pfc Melvin L. Brown, a member of Company D, Eighth Engineer Combat Battalion, took a position on a retaining wall approximately 50 feet high. Only 3 days before, he had written his parents that he was driving a truck but expected "to be back in the lines soon."

Not many who serve in the Nation's Armed Forces ever win the Medal of Honor. Still fewer return to receive it in person. Here are a few statistics to prove the point: Only

427 men received it in World War II—258 Army, 57 Navy, 37 Air Force, 79 Marines, and 1 Coast Guard; since March 25, 1863, when the first 6 medals were awarded, only 3,041 have been presented.

"Enemy superior in number started climbing the wall just as Brown's last round of ammunition was expended and he was wounded by enemy fire," the citation said. "Realizing the vital necessity for holding, and without concern for his personal safety, though wounded and without his rifle, Brown continued to throw his few remaining hand grenades into the enemy, causing several casualties with each grenade."

No records are available, but Pfc Melvin L. Brown is doubtless the first Clearfield Countian ever to receive the Congressional Medal. We've had heroes in every war and there are many well-decorated veterans in our midst today. But it remained for a 19-year-old youth to top them all. And probably no one gives him more credit than those heroes of World Wars I and II who also distinguished themselves "above and beyond the call of duty."

"When his supply of grenades was exhausted, his comrades from nearby foxholes commenced throwing hand grenades toward his position. On several occasions the grenades were thrown short of his position. When this would occur, Brown would leave his position and retrieve the grenades, exposing himself to enemy rifle and machine-gun fire."

We haven't any idea what kind of a boy Pfc Melvin L. Brown was when he enlisted at the age of 17. We suspect he was a typical teen-ager; in trobule occasionally, eager to grow up, sometimes critical of the older folks' ideas. But he was typical of his age. No better and no worse than your son or mine.

"However, the enemy continued their climb and Brown, taking his entrenching tool (a small shovel) from his pack, waited until the enemy, one by one, peered over the wall, delivering each a skull-crushing blow across the top of the head. Brown's conspicuous performance in knocking from 10 to 12 enemy troops from the wall and his outstanding personal bravery served as an inspiration to his comrades, delayed the attack and enabled his platoon to repel the enemy."

When the chips were down, Pfc Melvin L. Brown came through, just as any American boy will do. He wasn't old enough to vote, by law he hadn't yet reached manhood on that fateful September 4. But he did a man's job so well that his comrades and his Nation have awarded him the highest honor possible. Even in their sorrow and hopes, how proud his father and his mother, his brothers and his sisters must be of Pfc Melvin L. Brown. It's a thrilling, inspirational chapter in the saga of America that he has written.

"Brown was seriously injured during this action and has not been heard from since this attack."

It was early in October that Pfc Melvin L. Brown was officially listed by the Defense Department as "missing in action." That's how the record stands now.

Publicity for Draft Deferments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, last fall a number of American Legion posts of the Fourth District of Iowa adopted a resolution urging the enactment of legislation that would require selective-service boards to make public the names of all draft-age men who are granted deferment, with the reasons given for such deferment.

In order that all Members of Congress may have the benefit of these views, I include in the RECORD a copy of the resolution on this subject adopted at a meeting of the Monroe County (Iowa) American Legion organization, consisting of Howard Cessna Post, Albia; Chester Bishop Post, Lovilia; and Richard F. Ward Post, Melrose.

The resolution follows:

Be it resolved, That a list of names of men deferred under the present selective-service law be published, with reasons for such deferments.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include a report to my constituents upon the President's budget for the next fiscal year.

This week the President submitted his 1952 budget, calling for appropriations, contract authority, and loans of $93,400,000,000, of which he hopes to spend $71,500,000,000 in the 12 months beginning next July 1. His estimate of receipts, which many consider quite optimistic, falls $16,000,000,000 short of $71,500,000,000 to be spent and he asks that this amount be made up by new taxation.

For several reasons, the budget message was most unsatisfactory as a guide for future action of the Congress. In the first place, the President said it is not a firm statement of how much he hopes to spend but only an estimate of what he may be able to spend. The military and foreign-aid programs, which take up $73,800,000,000 of the total, are still so indefinite that he was unable to give any break-down of them. The possibility is that spending may be a great deal higher than the budget indicates if the military finds it is able to increase the speed of production of the things it orders. It will be a very great task for the Appropriations Committee to conduct hearings on the military and foreign-aid programs while they are so indefinite. The same considerations apply to the $1,200,000,000 requested to expand production facilities, including the construction of Government owned and operated industries, none of which are described, and the $273,000,000 requested for wage- and price-control programs which are not yet formulated.

The $48,000,000,000 for defense—out of $62,000,000,000 to be obligated—is 90 percent greater than is being spent this year, and compares to $13,000,000,000 for this purpose last year. The $7,000,000,000 to be spent in 1952 for foreign aid—out of $11,000,000,000 he asked us to obligate—is 58 percent more than is being spent this year. No details have been given as to how much will be used for military aid, how much for ECA or how much for the point 4 program. All foreign aid programs have been lumped together. From the message it is fair to expect that a large share, perhaps as much as $3,000,000,000, is for economic aid and point 4.

NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Economy advocates in Congress were premature when they applauded the portion of the state of the Union message in which Mr. Truman said the Government "must practice rigid economy in its nondefense spending." There is little evidence of such economy in the budget message. Senator BYRD characterized the message as "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility." Certainly it is disappointing to see the old Truman spending programs reappear under the guise of national defense. Among those for which he asks appropriations once again are:

Government construction of industrial plants, $1,200,000,000.

Federal aid to education, $300,000,000.

Socialized medicine, $275,000,000.

Brannan plan farm subsidies.

Increased unemployment compensation.

Restoration and extension of rent control.

Fair Employment Practices Commission.

St. Lawrence seaway, $20,000,000.

In addition, we find that the budget for slum clearance is to be increased as a defense measure, that Federal grants-in-aid to States are $500,000,000 greater than this year, and that the supposed economies, such as the falling off of veterans' benefits, would have happened anyhow in many instances.

Aside from the added cost of these nondefense proposals for new Federal spending, it is disappointing that the President intends to press such highly controversial issues, some of them outright socialistic, at a time when we are striving to establish policies which all Americans can support in united action. The budget message makes no contribution to unity.

THE DUTY OF CONGRESS

Presented as we are once again with a budget based upon the philosophy that there need be no limits on Government spending except the desire of the administrators to spend, it is once again the duty of the Congress to review carefully the request of each department and agency and to save wherever possible the wasteful or needless spending of the taxpayers' dollar. People who are willing and even anxious to do their part, through their taxes or otherwise, for this war effort will not continue in that frame of mind when faced with evidence that their effort is being wasted.

I believe, and others share my view, that we can cut another three billion from the domestic programs including those already in effect and those new programs which are not essential to our war effort. It seems that we can and it is necessary that we should eliminate a very large part of the economic aid for foreign nations unless it contributes di-

rectly to the war effort. Perhaps another three billion can be saved here.

Despite the optimistic statements of Mr. Truman, it is going to be very difficult and even dangerous to increase greatly the tax burden on American individuals and industry. Unwise taxation can destroy us. Every effort should be made to balance the budget through higher levies and more fair distribution of the tax burden, but only after every nonessential dollar has been wrung out of Government spending. Strict limits must be placed upon nondefense spending, and where limits are impractical in the Defense Department we must exert every effort to improve the efficiency of the armed services so that we will get a dollar's worth of security out of every dollar spent.

The national debt now stands at $257,400,000,000. The President expects it to increase to $260,000,000,000 by June 30, the close of this fiscal year. With a $71,000,000,000 spending program and a tax load that already stands at $55,000,000,000, it behooves every official of the Government, both in the administration and in Congress, to devote his honest efforts to the preservation of our financial soundness.

RESOURCE PROGRAMS

The budget as it affects resource agencies shows some reductions and some increases. A reduction of $9,000,000 is provided in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, almost all of which is in construction work. However, the funds for health, education, and welfare are increased $3,000,000. The Bureau of Land Management budget request is $9,000,000 greater than its appropriation for the current year. The message explains that better management of range lands is required for greater food production. A sizable decrease in the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture is explained by the rise in farm prices which has wiped out most of the expense of the farm price-support program. The reclamation program suffered the greatest cut, a total of $141,000,000. No new projects are to be started in Montana, and only seven new projects in the Nation, all for hydroelectric power—none for irrigation. Funds are provided to continue and complete other projects, including several of the Yellowstone pumping units, Canyon Ferry, and Hungry Horse. No construction funds are recommended for Yellowtail.

The Appropriations Committee of the House will start hearings on the budget message next Monday, and the Ways and Means Committee has already started tax studies.

Protest by Blackfoot-Piegans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the following communication I have just received from a group of Blackfoot-Piegan Indians which I am calling to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with the request that they give the petition every possible consideration:

BROWNING, MONT., *January 16, 1951.*
Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We landowners and full-blood Blackfoot-Piegans oppose resolutions 65-50 and 66-50 passed by the Blackfoot Tribal Business Council on January 4, 1951, in regard to leases. We still want the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to work with us in regard to letting leases and permits to the highest bidder outside or in the reservation. No one except the council members knew anything about the resolutions passed by the council. A petition signed by full bloods and landowners opposing the resolutions and a copy of the resolutions will be mailed you shortly. We still want the protection of the Indian Commissioner. If the council sends a delegation to Washington to support their resolutions we would appreciate your help and support in sending a full-blood delegation to oppose them. Please give copies of this wire to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Secretary of Interior.

Louis Plenty Treaty, George Bullchild No. 1, James Whitecalf, Sr., Juniper Old Person, Joe Calf Robe, Mike Day Rider, Paul Old Chief, James Kicking Woman, Phillip Many Hides, Joe Bear Medicine, Joe Young Eagle, Rose Kicking Woman, Maggie Many Hides, Robert Many Hides, James White Calf, Jr., John Little Plume, Paul Many Hides, George Old Person, Fish Wolf Robe, Jim Morning Gum, Joseph Old Chief, Joe Morning Gum, George Talks About, Peter F. Blackface, Maike Bad Old Man, Chewing Black Bones, Henry Morning Gum, Under Chief Coward, Mary Chief Coward, Tom Bear, Short Face, John Bird Earrings.

Resolution of Kansas Oil Men's Association Opposing Increased Federal Taxes on Gasoline and Motor Oils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am enclosing the following copy of a resolution adopted by the Kansas Oil Men's Association at its convention in Wichita, Kans., on January 8, 1951:

Whereas the present gasoline-tax law provides for the automatic elimination of 1 cent per gallon of the present State gasoline tax at 12:01 a. m., July 1, 1951; and

Whereas there is sufficient reserve in the State treasury at this time to amply take care of road building and maintenance under present plans for some time: Be it

Resolved, by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention assembled at Wichita, Kans., January 8, 1951, That we will actively oppose any legislation extending this tax. We also urge that the counties and cities be provided revenue out of the license fees from cars and trucks. We also oppose any increase in Federal taxes on gasoline and motor oils; be it also

Resolved, That a copy of the above resolution be sent to our National and State Senators and Representatives.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE,
WM. B. DALTON, *Chairman.*
LAVERNE HEITMAN.
J. J. SCHROEDER.
C. C. ABERCROMBIE.
JIMMY O'CONNELL.
C. A. ELMBORG.

A Mother Speaks on Foreign and Domestic Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mrs. Fred Dooley, Adel, Iowa:

ADEL, IOWA, *December 8, 1951.*
Mr. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: First I wish to congratulate you on being there to start with the Eighty-second Congress, and you have certainly got a job to do and the whole world is anxiously waiting to know just what the next move is.

I have listened to news broadcasts and read every article on the world situation that I can get my hands on. I call it war and I don't see how it can be called anything else, but some of the high officials say they have to move so carefully for fear of starting world war III, call it what they may, it's sure one big mess although stronger words would express it better.

Boys dying by the thousands, tortured, crippled for life, and mentally ill, while the UN continues to argue, argue, and call for cease fire, they have been doing that now since the start of the war, and who is paying any attention? No one. The boys are still fighting the war while what we thought were intelligent men continue to argue and get nowhere; it doesn't look as though the UN were doing anything; just stalling for I don't know what.

There are boys after boys in Korea writing home wondering what they are doing in Korea. Why hasn't there been a blockade set up a long time ago? What good does it do to fight when the French, and, I believe, British, continue to send supplies that will help Red China?

Why didn't the other countries send more men?

Why did the United States have to furnish most of them?

I don't understand just why the atom bomb hasn't been dropped. I have read a lot of conflicting stories why, but I thought that was why it was founded and made, to save lives, but it seems it's just to be talked about.

We'll soon have a son in this conflict, in fact, a matter of days, then when you drop to the 18-year-olds, in a couple of years our last child will be in; that's one more thing I wish to write you about: Why drop down to the 18-year-olds, they have had so little of life; some of them haven't finished high school yet. Why don't you leave it 19 as the low age. God only knows that's young enough to warp a mind and that's what war does, and take up to 35 years; their life is half over or nearly so and there

are men after men who evaded the World War II, hurrying out to rent more land, buying more cows, a scramble for more brood sows to keep out of the service, and they got the job done. Now they are over 26, so are in their glory.

I can tell you about one fellow in our neighborhood. This is the story.

He knew, to stay out of the service, he had to have more land, so he buys a farm, has cattle and hogs, works hard, his wife had a, and still has, a very good-paying job in town.

As soon as the war was over, the cattle were sold, also hogs, he converted the barn to a hen house, and has made good money at it, of course it's much easier to feed hens cafeteria, one doesn't have to get up so early and can chore early and be on one's way.

But with cattle and hogs—well it's really a chore when snow is deep, bedding to haul, tank heaters to keep going and barns to clean, setting up all night with sows having pigs in January and February or even March to save their young, and just why they pick the wee hours of the morn to have their young is something they keep to themselves but that's the way it usually happens.

But that's beside the point, the above fellow says he has paid for his farm with the high prices and his wife's high wages (they have no children) and he now can retire if he cared to and live off the rent of his farm—but all over the bloodshed of boys who were his age, but were town boys or farmer boys whose father didn't see fit to farm more land, or boys who had a desire to do their part. Mr. CUNNINGHAM it is not fair—especially now I heard on the radio they or one Congressman suggested cutting the boys' wages down to $10 or $30 a month while fellows like the above are doing so well.

Believe me those soldiers are earning every cent of their money, what are they going to have to come back to if the wages are cut back to the above.

This news report said they were not paid to go to school, well the Army or any branch of it is anything but a quiet, peaceful school, the training doesn't hurt them but it is what they have to go through after their training. Some of the fellows in Congress should go through what those kids are if they think it is such a snap, the ones that are thinking that way, I am sure you wouldn't be one of them.

Why isn't Nationalist China turned loose on the Red Chinamen, they perhaps know just where and what to do with them.

If there hadn't been so many mistakes made before hand, we wouldn't be in this mess.

Why did F. D. Roosevelt give Manchuria, the railroads and important ports and the right to arm to Russia? It seems to me he should have moved heaven and earth to have saved that.

It seems a shame to take the veterans who fought in World War II back to fight again; they won it once and we didn't have men smart enough to write the peace, I think it alright for the ones that were taken in late and didn't do any fighting and have their training, but those who have seen actual fighting and then not to take the ones who didn't see any kind of service.

Every group I'm in, be it neighbors or friends, all express fear of our leadership, they aren't afraid of America, but it's of our State Department and President, I sincerely do hope this Eighty-second Congress can give us some strength to hang on to and know what is planned for the future. Why have prices been let run wild, why the groceries are terrible, every week they go higher and higher, I'm sure that is not necessary.

Last June before the Korean War, I bought some sheets. Today that same sheet is $1 higher. No, I'm not buying any, I can make some sheets out of mash feed sacks, they won't look so pretty but they can be just as clean as the high-priced sheet that I feel isn't necessary.

Don't you think its about time to make Europe buckle down and do something for themselves; are we going to play another Korea and furnish most of the men while they supply the Reds with important materials?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, I've tried to put this down on paper so that you can understand the way not only I but the thinking of many of our friends and neighbors. Believe me, I am always urging them to write their troubles to you, but they have the idea, a Congressman does what he wants to and doesn't pay any attention to our little whims, but I assure them that's the only way you have of knowing our desires and if you are good enough to vote for, they should have you fighting out their wants in Congress.

Oh, yes; I nearly forgot. I say why not make the Jehovah Witnesses and Con (can't seem to spell it now) objectives go for combat the same as the rest of our boys. Neither do our boys believe in war or killing or any other boy, but they are going any way. I feel as though you will do your very best to do the right thing during the Eighty-second Congress.

Yours truly,

Mrs. FRED DOOLEY.

Administration of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the Taft-Hartley Act will be law and that organized industry and labor will have to operate under the provisions of the law for some time to come. Of course it is assumed, that from time to time the act will be constructively amended. However, there is little chance, if any, for Mr. Truman to bring about the repeal of the act any time during the next 2 years. What the public may do in the November 1952 election, insofar as electing a President and the personnel of the House and Senate, that will bring about the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is too far in the distance to forecast or predict with any degree of certainty.

Recently there appeared in the Saturday Evening Post a statement by Mr. Robert Denham, who for a long time was closely affiliated with the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. The two closing paragraphs of Mr. Denham's statement read as follows:

One of our most important Government agencies, exercising wide influence over a large segment of our economy, has been captured by a crew who apparently intend to operate it without heed to the orders of Congress—to substitute government by men for government by laws. The Taft-Hartley Act is being interpreted by a board which my experience leads me to believe is too partisan to give it fair application. And the board's subjugation of the general counsel has removed the counterweight which Congress provided.

For the present the only remedy the country has lies in the courts. I am convinced that a real solution requires not only amendments to the law that will make explicit the intent of Congress but replacement of the entire board, the general counsel, and key officials with persons who believe in the act and are capable of applying it.

These words from Mr. Denham appear to me to be a direct and specific warning and words of counsel to the people of the United States if they will only give serious consideration to what Mr. Denham has said. Therefore, I have submitted them to the RECORD to call to the attention of the many readers who have an opportunity to peruse the pages of the RECORD.

Parents Must Realize Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times when the impact of the world's ills lies heavily upon each home, thereby causing uncertainty, doubt, perhaps even despair, it is heartening to find an example of courage equal to need.

We are all aware that our sons were not raised to be soldiers and that there is no inherent dedication of American life to the horror of war. Yet there are some who so subscribe to this as to forget that, conversely, our sons were not raised to be slaves nor dedicated to spineless acquiescence to the domination of the world by a godless dictatorship. In the course of human events those who were raised in freedom, have often had to fight for its preservation. This day is another of great peril. The world is rushing headlong to somewhere. Only courage and sacrifice equal to the peril will steer the course to freedom—a freedom for us, the world and for our unnumbered sons and daughters who are to follow. Such a courage, such a dedication to the preservation of liberty, shines out in the article below; which I include under leave to extend my remarks:

[From the Durango (Colo.) Herald-Democrat of January 9, 1951]

PARENTS MUST REALIZE FACTS

Until recently Douglas Larsen, NEA Washington correspondent, conducted a reader column of questions and answers on service problems. A high percentage of the inquiries were from women, mostly mothers of boys who faced a service call.

More often than not, these queries seemed to add up to: "How can I keep my boy at home?"

The other day, however, Larsen got a letter of a different sort. Like many of the others, it was from a mother—this time of two boys. But her questions didn't have the same tone. Indeed, they didn't really seem like questions at all. They were more a challenging message, a message that every American might listen to in these times.

Here's how this mother feels:

"Q. Have only two sons whom we love dearly and for whom we have entertained great hopes. One, now studying for his doctor of philosophy, expects momentarily a call from the Naval Reserve. The other was in the Marine Corps 3 years * * * He started back to college only to be recalled to the Marines last September.

"Is there any possibility that these boys will not be allowed to fight for their country and continue to make sacrifices for a land which has given them so much?

"Is there any danger that these boys will be infected by the loose talk of selfish and unthinking Americans into letting down the men who suffered and died in Korea, and their brothers in humanity who are held in the harsh chains of slavery all over the world and cry out to them for help?"

Mothers and fathers everywhere in America could well ponder these words. For there are disturbing reports from many sections that lots of boys of draft age do not understand either the peril the Nation faces, or the justice of their being called to help meet it.

Many young men have the notion they are being asked to shelve their individual plans and hopes and perhaps risk their lives because a few men charged with the conduct of our foreign affairs have committed some mistakes.

Certainly mistakes have been made. And no matter who holds high office in this country, they will probably continue to be made. Never infallible, human beings are particularly not so when confronted with a world so complex it taxes the greatest minds to the very limit.

But the basic things we have to remember is that our peril is not primarily a product of such errors on our part. Our danger is being contrived in the Kremlin by a group of men who are bent upon conquering us, one way or another, if not now then later.

Even if our top-rank leaders had not made a single major mistake, the peril would be there. For Russia's purpose is unalterable. It is the Soviet Union, not some willful or unintentional slip by an American official, that has plunged us into this crisis. Our avoidance of mistakes might have changed the shape of Russia's plans. But it would not have changed the plans.

If all parents can grasp this overriding fact as does the mother quoted here, then they will understand why their sons are needed. And they can make they boys see it is right to put aside personal plans until the safety of their Nation and the whole free world is assured.

Whenever the Country Is Faced With Pestilence, Plague, Famine, or War the Advocates of the Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Come Forward and Say: "Here Is What the Country Needs"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, whenever the country is faced with pestilence, plague, famine, or war the proponents of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway come forward and say: "Here is what the country needs."

In the earliest state of this never-ending controversy, it was claimed the waterway would make bananas cheaper to midwesterners, then the agitation turned for years around the contention that Midwest farmers could send their wheat to Europe at cheaper transportation costs. Now the amount of wheat they can export to Europe and the price they receive is fixed by international agreement. Now the project has become essential to national defense as a means of bringing ore in from Labrador and Quebec over an inside, secure route protected from submarines.

The facts are that for several years American steel companies have been looking around for foreign high-grade iron-ore supplies to supplement, not replace, the low-grade ores of the Mesabi Range, which are in seemingly inexhaustible supply, to take the place of the diminishing high-grade ores of that area. The Mesabi Range or Lake Superior area is still to be our main reliance for so long as man can see.

The Labrador-Quebec deposit, in which six of the smaller steel companies have invested, is only one of three main sources of outside supply which American steel companies are working. United States Steel and Bethlehem have gone to Venezuela, while Inland Steel and the Cyrus S. Eaton interests are developing deposits near Port Arthur, Ontario, which is on Lake Superior. This ore is, indeed, now moving over the Great Lakes the same way the Mesabi ore moves. Both the Venezuelan and this source near Port Arthur are easily of equal importance with the Labrador-Quebec project.

The promoters of the Labrador-Quebec project do not plan to bring out any ore before 1955 and then only 10,000,000 tons annually as compared with our annual needs of 100,000,000. Lacking the St. Lawrence waterway, which would take 7 years to build, they have announced they intend to bring it to Midwest steel centers over presently available transportation facilities, including the 14-foot St. Lawrence canal system. They have announced this ore would favorably compete in price with Mesabi low-grade ores.

It is a commentary on the alarm about our domestic supplies of ore that this Labrador-Quebec ore has got to compete with the low-grade Mesabi ore or it will not be sold.

Now, should the deeper St. Lawrence waterway be built, the promoters of the Labrador-Quebec project would be in a better competitive position, which makes the waterway important to them, a fact which is, however, not the same as being important to national defense, or in the national interest. Indeed, should the project be authorized by the Congress, I am quite sure you would find that the defense officials would not allocate the necessary scarce materials and manpower to the building of the project. It is not a national defense item.

It is not generally understood that there is now a St. Lawrence waterway, 14 feet in depth, and that foreign vessels move over it in the 7 months of the year when the Great Lakes are not frozen over, to Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, and other lake ports. The highest tonnage ever handled in a year was 9,500,000 tons. This system has a capacity of at least 5,000,000 additional tons and this could be greatly increased with the expenditure of a few million dollars. However, in 1948 and 1949 the tonnage handled dropped to around 7,500,000. So it is proposed to build a deeper waterway, one of 27-foot depth. This would permit additional foreign vessels to use it, but less than 9 percent of American flag tonnage could use it. Thirty leading American oceangoing ship operators have said they would not use the proposed 27-foot waterway and are opposed to the project.

When the New York Barge Canal was being agitated years ago it was claimed it would handle 25,000,000 tons annually. The highest it has ever handled is 5,000,000 tons.

As to the proposed hydroelectric plant in the St. Lawrence River, a part of the dual project, it would be another big public power plant, but no bigger than any one of four plants now operated by private utilities in New York State. Its capacity would be no more than 10 percent of New York's present consumption.

For years the battle cry of the proponents has been that just a little bottleneck in the St. Lawrence River presents Great Lakes ports from becoming ocean ports. Every Great Lakes port is in itself a bottleneck in that every port using the proposed deeper system would have to have its harbor, entrance channel, and slips deepened.

Small Business and Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the heading "Small business," by C. Wilson Harder, there has been presented some observations which are of interest to many people. I herewith submit them for the RECORD:

SMALL BUSINESS

(By C. Wilson Harder)

Watch for investigation of tin plate situation, especially if the recent order curtailing tin usage results in small canners and packers having difficulty in getting tin cans.

Among other questions will be this one, Why, when the tin reduction rule was announced, did ECA Bulletin No. 1937 announce almost concurrently that through the Marshall plan, $800,000 worth of tin plate secured in United States of America was given to French North Africa? This equals an entire year's supply for 15 to 20 medium small fruit and vegetable canners.

During World War II many small food packers lost markets to big corporations because they could not obtain sugar.

Yet, with the Nation presumably on the verge of a global war once again, Agriculture Secretary Brannan reduces the amount of sugar that can be marketed in the Nation during 1951 to 8,000,000 tons, or 700,000 tons less than used in 1950.

There is no shortage of sugar. The ruling was made to stabilize prices, the Secretary says.

Housewives who paid 4 cents per pound for sugar in 1940 will continue to pay 12 cents or more. If total war comes, the sugar trust will once again determine who will stay in business. This upholding of monopoly by bureaucracy will get close scrutiny in Congress.

Alcohol befuddles many, but in high officialdom alcohol seems to especially befuddle.

That's the substance of a Senate preparedness committee report on the amazing deal whereby Schenley secured a Government industrial alcohol plant in Kansas City valued at $2,500,000 for $760,000.

A month after Korea, the Government Surplus Administration opened bids for the plant. Schenley won with an offer $701,000. Three days later Senator JOHNSON, chairman of the committee, and Jess Larson, GSA head, conferred. Three days later a freeze order was issued. But on the same day, August 17, GSA wired Schenley acceptance, who took possession of the plant on August 23. No one knows yet how it happened.

But this is known. The synthetic-rubber program needs one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and thirty-five million gallons of alcohol.

On the first request, Office of Rubber Reserve did not receive a gallon from distillers. For the last 2 months of 1950, 10,000,000 gallons were requested. Prices ranged from 90 cents to $1.25 per gallon. So the Government bought French alcohol at a price of 48½ cents per gallon. Senator JOHNSON will undoubtedly carry this probe further. Watch for developments.

Mr. Speaker, the distribution of tin plate, which is referred to by Mr. Harder, is just a continuation of the most interesting study of the diffusion of the substance of our people to the other parts of the world, and against which such diffusion our people are so bitterly protesting, and it is, of course, evident that the citizens of the United States are very much concerned and that they have many questions in their minds about the general program.

Mr. Harder refers to sugar, and insofar as we can presently determine, there will be ample stocks of sugar for all the Western Hemisphere with this sugar being produced in the Philippines, which have a free market to the United States, and the domestic sugar industry, consisting of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the United States sugar beet and sugarcane areas in the continental United States, together with the foreign production of Cuba. The crop recently harvested in the continental United States was one of the largest on record and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are increasing their production and now that the Philippine producers are getting back into the harness, we can expect substantial tonnage from that area. Cuba's output is also on the increase most all the time. So, with this momentary ample production and the Sugar Marketing Act, with the flexible powers of the Secretary of Agriculture, there is no reason for us to assume that there will be a shortage of sugar, or that prices will be excessive, unless the White House and the State Department come to the conclusion that this sugar should be given to other nations of the world.

ALCOHOL AND INTOXICATING LIQUORS

Mr. Harder submits some observations with respect to alcohol. In this general connection, and as we face enormous tax liabilities I wish to direct the attention of the Congress to the large distillers, importers, wholesalers, alcohol cookers, the cooperage chiselers — the barrel boys—and the alcohol profiteers who ship into this country foreign-produced spirits moving in the bottoms of small schooners.

Many of these operators, to which I refer—outside of the so-called big four—are the boys substantially constituting and working with the mobs. I am afraid that in many instances the big four plays ball with many of these operators, hand in glove, and that the mobs substantially control all of the imports worth mentioning.

From a tax standpoint, our people who can financially afford to drink expensive imported whiskies and wines can probably afford to pay almost any price that the traffic will bear, and the other citizens, less fixed financially, can, during this war period, be content to drink domestic beverages.

Why not have the control machinery of the Government, during the emergency period, issue rules and regulations limiting the advertising of these imported and domestic liquors to a simple announcement of the brand and the name of the manufacturer with nothing else in the ad, and also limit the size of the ad? Naturally the distillers' group would kick about such a regulation, but, after all, when the people are making the contributions which are now being made, and which would have to be made, it certainly cannot be successfully argued that imported and domestic intoxicating liquors are a necessity, or that they substantially contribute to the protection and defense of the United States and the ideals and institutions of our people.

With respect to the revenue, I would recommend that the tax on all imported spirits be returned to the original scale of $5 per proof-gallon, plus double the rectifying tax on all blended spirits, the contents of which is an alcoholic mixture, regardless of whatever name same is called. In order to conserve alcohol for the war effort, the tax on blended spirits—domestic—could be raised to $1 per gallon and let this apply to all beverage spirits, wherever the source.

Distillers' licenses could be raised to $25,000 per annum, having all affiliated or tied distilleries pay an annual license of $50,000 per annum to distill alcoholic beverages, and increasing the wholesale license to $10,000 per annum.

In addition, a floor tax on the stocks of all dealers should be assessed immediately upon the signing of such a tax measure. And certainly we could afford to have a much heavier tax on cabarets, and this due to their nonessentialability during the war emergency. Along with this, a substantial increase in the penalties for illegal distilling, and thus make the penalties so severe that no loyal American citizen would dare carry on such an operation.

In view of the shortage of shipping, we should prohibit such facilities being used for the transportation of beverage spirits and provide that failure to comply with such a regulation should make the vessel liable under the Anti-Smuggling Act and subject to forfeiture of vessel and cargo.

We have a shortage of cooperage and we should not provide cooperage and other types of containers being used to hold alcoholic beverages and licensed for export from the United States without very special permit granted by the Secretary of the Treasury. The tax on all imported wines and liquors not classified as imported spirits, should be returned to its original scale, plus 50 cents per bottle—$61 per case—with the internal revenue tax on alcoholic beverages to be raised to $12 per proof gallon from the present $9.

If we are to face a period of price controls and rationing, we can well afford to limit the profit margin of the distillers and fix the price of alcohol on the basis of the value of the material used, such as grain, black molasses and vegetables, and thus bring this industry into a position where it must make its contribution, instead of leaving it free to carry on its destructive work. Here is a chance to raise some revenue.

Finally, we will unquestionably face great difficulty, insofar as our supply of rubber for all purposes is concerned. In dealing with the synthetic-rubber production, alcohol is one of the great, basic needs. Mr. Harder points out that prices range from 90 cents to $1.25 per gallon as quoted by our local distillers, but that our Government purchased from the French alcohol at a price of 48½ cents per gallon. Such price levels are of great interest to our people.

A Tragic Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of World War II one of the chief concerns of our military intelligence was to keep a close check upon activities of the fifth-column groups throughout our country. Although our country was aware of the constant building of Communist-front organizations during this time, this alien ideology was thought to be of far lesser importance in protecting the American way of life. After the ending of hostilities, and with the beginning of the period of rehabilitation and reconstruction, we soon became more aware of the constant necessity of maintaining an eternal surveillance on Communist organizations which always have had as their objective the complete destruction of our way of life and our form of government. Now, with Russian imperialism casting its eerie shadow on freedom-loving countries the world over, all thoughts and efforts are centered thereon, and people in their search to find weapons to combat this enemy slide over to the other extreme and uphold the ideology of fascism which is just as much of a menace to our democracy as is communism. Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country and think through the issues at hand rather than listen to and be swayed by prejudiced propaganda. The following editorial from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel of January 10, 1951, cautions the American citizen to watch out for the less publicized opponent of today who may be the enemy of

tomorrow. I include it under leave to extend my remarks:

A TRAGIC ERA

We have all faith that our military might, coupled with that of our allies, will save the free peoples from the Communist aggressors. But we confess that our democratic way of life may not survive this era of suspicion.

It is a sad and tragic thing to watch Americans losing faith in themselves and in one another; to see us come to the place where neighbor spies on neighbor; where friends suspect one another of disloyalty because their opinions differ. Trust in one another, with tolerance of opinion, has been one of the distinguishing features of the American way of life.

But to such a state have we come that mistrust and intolerance are menacing our most treasured heritage—the freedoms guaranteed us in the Bill of Rights. Ironically this situation, this atmosphere of suspicion has been created by the agents of the two most anti-American forces in the world, communism and fascism. There have been many among us who have fallen for the Communist line as its proponents presented it as the cure for all our weaknesses. On the other hand there are equally as many others who have been taken in by the Fascists, who promulgate the doctrines of Hitler while claiming that only they can defend Americanism from the Reds. The truth, of course, is that neither of these ideologies, nor their insidious native agents, are concerned with curing our weaknesses nor defending the American way of life. What they both seek is destruction of that way. Yet so subtle have been their respective propagandists that presumably intelligent Americans have fallen for both lines, and in so doing are serving these enemies of our Nation.

For well over a century and a half our American Government, our way of life, has persisted and defended itself from outside foes. How terribly tragic it will be if we let it be wrecked by our own stupidity; by not realizing that there is more than one alien ideology seeking to weaken us through stooges who claim to be trying to save us. Not less deadly to our American way of life than the 11 Communists leaders, under conviction of treason, are some leaders of fascism in our country who are using certain patriotic organizations as their fronts (however innocent these groups may be) to divide our citizenry and weaken our Government, that some Nazi-Fascist man-on-horseback may take over, either before or after the Red aggressors are defeated.

National Security Has Long Rested on Our Atom Bombs and the Undisputed Ability of the United States Air Force Long-Range B–36 Bombers Land-Based in the United States To Deliver Them Anywhere on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recently came upon a highly thought-provoking article in the Freeport Journal-Standard, of Freeport, Ill., telling of the tremendous achievements made by the Department of the Air Force under the administration of the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter.

The article headed "Air Force team reports progress" carried a Washington date line and was written by Marquis Childs, one of America's best-known authors and news columnists.

Mr. Speaker, the name of Thomas K. Finletter is not a new name to the Members of the Congress and all others concerned with Government here in Washington. For more than 10 years past, and at a great personal sacrifice to himself, Tom Finletter has given unstintingly of his time and largess to the solution of some of the most vexatious problems that have ever confronted our Government and country.

Mr. Speaker, we who know him know that America has no finer citizen nor, indeed, one possessed of a more judicial mind that Thomas Knight Finletter—eminent soldier-diplomat, barrister, lecturer, teacher, author—a man of tremendous vision and one who, by his proven executive abilities in the handling of our Air Force, has marked himself preeminent in administration of one of the principal departments of Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fortunate that we have such a man as Tom Finletter to head up the forces and the destinies of our great Department of the Air Force at a time when it is being called upon to spend billions of dollars.

It is indeed no happenstance, however, that he has serving with him, and as his first assistant, still another great American—a great actionist, engineer, and business executive—Mr. John A. McCone, of Los Angeles, Calif., and who served with Mr. Finletter on the President's Air Policy Commission. It was once said of Mr. McCone, that there was no man in these United States more capable of thinking a problem through to its ultimate conclusion and long-time effect than John A. McCone, now the Assistant Secretary of Air.

Mr. Speaker, more now than ever, I am confirmed in my belief that the only thing that has contained the Russians and kept them from opening a global war on the continent of Europe has been our possession of the atom bomb and our B–36 long-range bombers.

Mr. Speaker, I have, on more than one occasion in addressing this House, stated that we in the Midwest know that the first line of defense of these United States is manned by the United States Air Force. The American people have never been afraid, nor are they today afraid, of coastal attacks by a nonexistent Russian surface navy. Neither are they afraid of Communist tanks rumbling ashore in these United States, spearheading infantry attacks against our great centers of population.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, from the Chesapeake Bay to San Francisco, and from Maine to Mexico are, however, in deadly fear of Russian attack that can come out of the sky.

The merest school child knows that the immediate peace and security of these United States rests upon our possession of the atom bombs in our stockpiles, and the proven ability of the United States Air Force great intercontinental long-range land-based bombers to deliver the bombs almost upon a moment's notice.

They also know that our B–36's can fly straight on their course to drop these bombs, and at the one time, not alone upon all strategic points in Russian territory, but upon any possible advance of the Russian hordes of infantry that stand with bristling bayonets on the border of Western Europe.

This article from the Freeport Journal-Standard tells of the splendid work accomplished in behalf of our Nation's defenses by the Finletter-McCone Air Force team.

It tells of the speed-up in the construction of the continental defense radar warning system, of the tremendous aircraft procurement program that is now rolling, of the air bases reopened, and of the pride of the Finletter and McCone team in the new B–47 and B–52 long-range high-speed jet bombers—greater, if such a thing could be possible, than is the B–36 itself.

Because of the exigencies of these times, the strain placed upon our Nation's economy due to the dangers of war, and the great part being played by these two preeminent Americans, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this clipping from the Freeport Journal-Standard.

The article reads as follows:

[From the Freeport (Ill.) Journal-Standard]

AIR FORCE TEAM REPORTS PROGRESS

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON, December 30.—In this the winter of our discontent it is not difficult to find causes for complaint. The chorus of recrimination rises as though Washington were a wailing wall and the source of all the ills of mankind.

It is therefore news—under the man-bites-dog definition—to report a field in which progress is being made and men are working with a minimum of snafu. Directing the rapid expansion of the Air Force is a team that is pulling together effectively and efficiently to do one of the two or three most essential jobs in the rearmament program.

Secretary of the Air Force is Thomas K. Finletter, a New York lawyer, who has served in several previous Government assignments in connection with the last war and its aftermath. As Chairman of the President's Air Policy Commission, he recommended a 70-group air force, and the maintenance of an expanded aircraft industry.

He has believed all along that preparedness to meet the threat of Soviet expansion should move at a much swifter pace. Consequently, when he accepted the post last April, he was prepared to push as hard as possible for an expansion of air power.

TANGLE WITH JOHNSON

Louis Johnson, then Secretary of Defense, was still plugging for economy in the defense budget. But this did not inhibit Finletter, who came in with a more or less independent mandate from the President. The retiring Secretary of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington, had tangled with Johnson repeatedly on the issue of economy versus expansion.

Last February 1 in a speech at Baylor University in Texas, Symington called for a reappraisal of America's defense budget, pointing to the radically altered situation created by Russia's having exploded an atomic bomb and having built an air force capable of delivering such bombs against American targets. But this served chiefly to quicken the

feud with Johnson. Symington felt so frustrated that there was nothing to do but get out.

Without the handicap of having engaged in previous controversy, Finletter came in as a new boom. However, he has a show-me kind of skepticism which is like an X-ray. This was applied in salutary fashion both to military claims and pretensions and civilian red tape and reluctance.

RADAR WARNING SYSTEM

One of Finletter's first aims was to speed up the construction of the continental radar warning system. He was told that the money simply wasn't in the budget for such a speed-up. His answer was that somehow the money would be found.

Finletter's partner is Under Secretary John A. McCone. McCone is a successful businessman and engineer who was also on the Air Policy Commission. He has drive and organizing ability to a high degree without any of the bluster sometimes associated with those capacities.

McCone is pushing through an aircraft-procurement program that has begun to get rolling in a big way. Within 2 years the number of air groups will be approximately doubled for a total of 84. This is on the basis of reopening plants that were closed or partially closed at the end of World War II. By constructing new plants it is estimated that 168 groups could be created by the end of 1952.

Already 25 air bases have been reopened since June. Soon the personnel of the Air Force will be nearly double the 412,000 in the service at the time of the Korean attack.

The pride and joy of the team of Finletter and McCone is the big new B-47 jet bomber. Units equipped with the B-47 will be ready by the end of 1951 or perhaps even earlier. While its actual cruising speed and range are still secret, it is known that it will travel at 600 miles and over and carry the atomic bomb at that speed.

THE SUPERSONIC WORLD

Finletter flew in the B-47 the other day. He sat at the controls and reported later that he was a bit startled when the pilot told him to make a 180° turn with the plane traveling at hair-raising speed. Beyond the B-47 is the B-52 which is an even longer jump into the supersonic world.

According to advices believed as trustworthy as most, the best long-range bomber the Russians have is an improved B-29. They are believed to be working on a B-36 type. But the important fact is that the improved B-29 can carry a Russian atomic bomb to targets in the United States. And the Air Force has never tried to conceal the fact that a certain number of those bombs would get through any defense now in sight.

But the retaliation to be meted out by a greatly expanded Air Force would be terrible. The threat of this retaliation will, it is hoped, keep the peace in the coming critical months while the land power of the North Atlantic nations is being built. If that is the outcome, thanks will be due in no small part to the production drive of the past 6 months. It is an example that could be followed in other fields where defense production has lagged.

What Can We Expect from the UN?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, our people are greatly concerned over the failure of UN to extend any worth-while aid to us in the Korean war. Talk is cheap. What we need is less talk and more active participation. Before any future commitments are made by this Nation with respect to Korea or elsewhere in the world, we are entitled to know to what extent the UN can be depended upon to do its part.

I include as part of these remarks, and in accordance with consent granted, two well written and thought provoking articles by Ivan H. Peterman, recently appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer, reading as follows:

UN PREPARES TO REPEAT HISTORIC LEAGUE RUN-OUT

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

NEW YORK, January 9.—United Nations, despite President Truman's brave declarations of continued faith and support, is preparing to run out on its responsibilities exactly as did the League of Nations. The Manchurian episode is about to be repeated, and old man Hagel, the German, was quite right when he said:

"We only learn from history that we do not learn from history."

Thus the crowd which cheered, approved, and did everything but finance or contribute troops to the American effort to stop Red aggression, is now hustling behind the curtains, mounting a "face saver." This will take the form of another phony cease-fire about the time UN's forces are forced to evacuate Korea, and since there will be no further GI targets, the victorious Mao Tse-tung mob will agree.

Then, the truce committee of Iran's Nasrollah Entezam, Canada's Mike Pearson, and India's Sir Benegal Rau, who huddled with Mr. Wu and still confer amiably with Mr. Malik, will propose (with the Asian-Arab bloc) that United Nations proceed to supervise unification of Korea, under Red gun muzzles.

If there are any flowers left over from the graves of 15,000 dead Americans by that time, you can send them to the blue monolith at Forty-second Street and Turtle Bay, N. Y. And if Trygve Lie wishes, he can instruct the janitor, who spelled out "UN" at Christmas, to arrange the skyscraper UN headquarters' lights in "RIP."

This is the United Nations which wasn't going to appease or give in. But Dr. T. F. Tsiang, the gritty Nationalist Chinese who for 2 years has taken their cold shouldering, truthfully told the delegations yesterday they were "connivers in crime" if they persisted in the new approach, which is no less than total surrender to Moscow-Peking aggression.

Sir Gladwyn Jebb, with an eye to Commonwealth leaders' discussions in London, asked the political committee to adjourn until tomorrow, before broaching any condemnation of Red China. The United States wants such a gesture now, but it would be so heavily abstained from as to lose us more face. Our UN pals have lost all their starch since last June 25.

At the same time, it is evident now would be the time to toss a smashing blow behind Mao, on the Chinese mainland. Apparently lots of revolt, uprising, sabotage, and economic trouble have broken loose, especially in the southern provinces.

Six Chinese newspapermen, some of whom had been feeding information to British papers and services in Hong Kong, have been shot in Canton and Shanghai. You see little about such things in the press. Hong Kong papers didn't print a word. In fact, Hong Kong is terrified—lest the Reds move in and take over. The Overseas Press Club has protested to UN—whatever that is worth.

Nearly all missionaries are moving out now. The freeze of United States assets, plus the blockade now going into effect, are pinching the Red marauders. Stuff is being moved mysteriously in Manchuria. It could be another liberation by Joseph Stalin, or it could be Red preparation for all-out war—going underground.

Ferocious hate-rallies against Americans are part of a patriotic movement out of Peking, aimed at tightening inner control of China. If Chiang Kai-shek's regime had 1,600,000 guerrillas waiting to join a return to the mainland, the Reds may be purging them in the new cleanup. Whereas Red Chinese reports prior to their Korean assault, told of improving conditions, now they've turned bitter, detailing harsher rule and rougher treatment than ever.

Granary raids are charged to keepers, who are shot. Taxes are going up. Raw materials are scarcer. Fuel and imported goods are off the market. Even budget figures are secret. Mao is learning that war, on the massed bandit scale can be costly too.

But do we strike? Do we prepare to land Chiang's troops as he pleads? Don't be naive. The United Nations would never consider such a move. Too many prefer Red Peking to the legitimate Chinese government that helped beat down Japan.

Since seeing Mr. Wu in action, and the Red Chinese onslaught in Korea, United States arms shipments have been resumed to Formosa. This matériel is said to be for defense of the island. In Acheson-Rusk-Jessup have their say, that will be all. They still spread the Communist line that Chiang is no good, although it's now admitted by other Government agencies, he did pretty well on what we gave him.

One of these days the United States Congress—possibly with angry constituents demanding action in the streets—will look into this China story. It may demand facts from start to finish, especially the last touches put on by current State Department experts. It will want to know why the President, pleading for debate and unity on the subject, still refuses to admit we are at war, won't bomb Mao's communications and supply lines, was not told by these experts if he crossed the Yalu he was due for a blasting, and otherwise declined to back our Yanks in Korea.

The people want to know why Chiang Kai-shek's offers to invade the Chinese mainland have been refused. We need not get into an Asiatic land battle; let the rightful Chinese government win back its place. After the raw deal the Kremlin has forced on them, millions of Chinese would rise to liberate themselves.

But the hard core of infallibles behind Truman won't have that. With their British Commonwealth friends, they go to extremes for non-Americans, but they let our GI's get run over.

Someday there will be a full accounting.

APPEASEMENT SIDETRACKS KOREA'S PLEA

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

As of this moment, the best break the United States, and its allies in UN, can expect is another refusal of the Kremlin to let its Chinese puppets accept our appeasement. This wouldn't be the first time the Russians have extricated us from a pit of our own clumsy devising.

They did it in Berlin, with the blockade. They did it in Iran, they did it with Tibet, scaring India's collaborationists into a sweat. They have been our best "policy makers" all along in Europe.

But now the United Nations, with American diplomatic approval, offers a fifth cease-fire and talks of adjusting far eastern problems, with the inference that Korea is the first throw-in. It would be the cruelest abandonment of all, and a shattering blow to our vanishing prestige.

It was a pity, in the bigger flare of headlines over this vain UN gesture last week, that more of Korean Foreign Minister Ben Limb's appeal to the civilized world was not

heard. He made perhaps the greatest speech by any aggressed government, since the unanswered cry of China before the League of Nations, 1931.

There must be close to 10,000,000 people running from extermination by the Communists mingled in and ahead of UN's retreat, he said. He told how Seoul dwindled overnight from 1,500,000 to 200,000—the latter number anxious to flee also, but prevented by the military jam. He described homes, villages, towns, and cities in ashes—with no shelter, food, or much hope of assistance for the silent, sick, terrified miles of refugees carrying their only chance for survival on their backs.

But Colonel Limb's speech was not only a supplication, it was one of the bravest challenges ever offered to UN. Once more Korea asked only for weapons with which to fight to the death their Red oppressors. President Syngman Rhee repeatedly requested half a million rifles to aid the fight.

Now one of the strange things about this screwy war in Korea, is that since last June, over 6 months, we have had opportunity to arm and instruct literally hundreds of thousands of the embattled Koreans. I don't mean to say we should have attempted full-scale division or even regimental organization along the United States approved plans. But what was wrong with establishing a flock of our own guerrillas?

One of the exasperating features of the way our Government proceeds against Russia's proxy armies, is its failure to exploit obvious opportunities. The cry for weeks and months has been: "But they outnumber us."

Outnumber us, why? Because we have from the start, declined to put the South Koreans on a full military footing. In the beginning, at the advice of the Lattimore-Rusk school of bum guessers, we armed them without ammunition, with rifles that had no bolts, with light mortars and lighter artillery which could not stop old-style tanks. We put public relations officers in charge as military and field instructors, and we wondered why the hard core, long prepared and fanatic North Koreans ran through them at will.

Since then the South Korean has been toughened by privation, and with many an Asiatic, has had his eyes opened to the massive snare and slavery of Russian-imperialist communism. They are, as Colonel Limb told UN, "prepared to fight in the valleys, in the mountains, in the snow, ice, by day and night—until their last breath is gone."

He said 500,000 are ready this minute. They will fight with anything—rifles, Sten guns, grenades. They will go in as guerrillas, climb the mountains our men cannot yet negotiate, to meet the Reds on equal footing.

Gen. Robert B. McClure, relieved yesterday as commander of the United States Second Infantry Division, put all this into a statement which may or may not have caused his removal. He reiterated that Americans prefer to fight where they can utilize mechanized vehicles, bring fire power to bear, and eliminate the bushwhacking business at which nobody can match the Red Chinese, the Russians, and the other experts at assassination-style warfare.

Furthermore, he might have added, to arm these Koreans—and if we still don't trust them we can, as the Germans did throughout the Second World War, place our own squads behind them, with proper orders—isn't any costly task. We gave Sten guns to the resistance all over Europe. Why not now, to our Asiatic friends?

But more pertinent, there are whole arsenals of captured Japanese arms, rifles, and ammunition, mortars, and machine guns in Japan. We won't need all of that to rearm Japan. We could save plenty of GI's and Koreans by putting it in the hands of able-bodied refugees who now only add a feeding and care burden to outnumbered UN forces.

In short, do we want to win in Korea? Or are we just going through some motions, waiting to appease and negotiate it all away—as per the last 5 years?

We Can Win If—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, believing as I do that the establishment and maintenance of a strong United Nations is essential to world peace, I am naturally disappointed in the attitude taken by many of the members thereof. It is almost unbelievable that our own Nation was left alone to present the resolution the House passed at our last meeting condemning Red China as an aggressor.

It still appears that most of the fighting, dying, and spending in the prosecution of the Korean War is being done by the United States. Attached hereto is a timely editorial from the current issue of the United States News and World Report:

WE CAN WIN IF—

(By David Lawrence)

We can win the battle of nerves and prevent war. But to do so we must not be afraid of war. It will take something more than physical courage, more than big airplanes and big aircraft carriers and big armies and big bombs.

It will take moral courage—and in this we are more lacking than in arms.

It will take moral courage not only for the United States but for our allies—because in this they, too, are sadly lacking.

Why is this so?

Maybe it's the materialism that surrounds us, maybe it's the illusory belief that creature comforts—the luxuries of a high standard of living—are as precious as life itself.

Maybe there are too many of us who think that the only law of compensation is that which is reflected in the weekly pay envelope or the coupons on the bonds or the dividend checks.

Maybe there are too many of us who think that peace means just plenty to eat and drink—high profits and high-wage levels—and that taxes and economic controls are simply devices invented by the devil to interfere with our American way of life.

Maybe the so-called isolationism which has cropped up recently is a sincere manifestation of the belief that Americans do not owe anything to any other nation in the world by way of arms or economic help and that the good Lord doesn't care whether we share what we have with any other peoples—indeed, whether we concern ourselves at all with the poverty of other peoples.

But, if so, there's something wrong with this age in which we live.

Is it the governments or the peoples?

Certainly in Europe and Asia the passive acceptance of a rule of tyranny behind the iron curtain indicates that many persons apparently prefer despotism and life in slavery to freedom and the risks of death.

Certainly on this side of the iron curtain there are many persons in Britain and France and Germany and India and even in the United States who are ready to discard principle and moral standards in exchange for some paper agreement that temporarily, at least, gives them a promise of continued existence without fighting.

Isolationism isn't just an American phenomenon. It is to be found in all countries where the prime desire is to protect one's own interest and offer as little as possible to protect anyone else's interest.

There can be no effective program of collective security on that basis. The UN has all the machinery needed to express international policy. But the defect isn't in the mechanism—it's in the members who are failing to live up to their responsibilities as partners in a world alliance. Mutuality of obligation and reciprocity seem to be the exception rather than the rule. Moral courage is rare.

What is it that the Communists have that we don't have?

They have imagination, boldness, and courage born of a fanatical devotion to a cause.

If some human beings can exhibit courage to carry out a diabolical cause like communism, why can't other human beings exhibit courage to carry out the greatest moral purposes that man could possibly have?

The truth is that we are dawdling along on all sides—we sacrifice principle and deviate from moral standards in the UN, and we do the same thing in our parliaments and our congresses. Our elected leaders play selfish politics, snarl at their opposition, and trifle with moral standards—preferring expediency to principle.

Whatever it may have been that caused the decline and fall of Rome or the extinction of great empires and republics in ancient days, we do know that governments are as frail as the individuals who compose them and the constituents who elect them.

We can win—we can prevent the big war. But it will take resoluteness. And resoluteness means moral fiber, and not craven surrender to materialism.

Resoluteness means a spirit that is ready to fight against evil and to make collective security a reality instead of a mythical goal.

Resoluteness means courage in high places and a forthrightness in expressing moral purposes to the peoples of all countries—whether or not their governments are allied with us. He who is right within himself is thrice armed—in body, in spirit, and in the inspiring example he sets to others. Our Government is not right within itself—and neither are all our people right within themselves. Too many would acquiesce in hypocrisy. Too many would condone evil. Too many would sell their souls for a mess of pottage.

We are less ready to do battle on the moral front than on the military front. We can win—but only when we build up the moral courage that comes from a sincere desire to make sacrifices for the cause of human freedom everywhere that it is gravely challenged. We are our brothers' keepers.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Project Should Be Abandoned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway project is before the Eighty-second Congress. Already proponents of the economic monstrosity have introduced legislation on the subject.

We who come from the great State of Pennsylvania or from other coal-producing areas as well as coastal towns are opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway project as vigorously as we were when it was first proposed many years ago.

In support of our opposition to this project, I call your attention to a statement on December 20, 1950, made by Mr. Carroll Huntress, eastern vice president of the Republic Coal & Coke Co., of Chicago, in an address before the Rotary Club of Detroit, Mich.

The address of Mr. Huntress is packed full of facts that should convince any person that the St. Lawrence seaway project should be permanently shelved. The address is as follows:

A CERTAIN INALIENABLE RIGHT

It is a real pleasure to be here in this company of alert progressive men. Your committee advises that the program today is intended to focus on the public-utility industries. We are using the phrase in its broad and proper sense, to embrace electric and gas supply systems, telephone and telegraph systems, bus and trucking systems, railroads—all of those businesses which serve the whole public and which exist only by virtue of public franchise.

Although not in the employ of any of those industries, I have had a keen interest in them since the late thirties, when I had the privilege of assisting Wendell Willkie in his historic rear-guard fight against the Tennessee Valley Authority. That fight did not succeed in salvaging all the investment in the electric companies that were put out of business; but it did, I believe, serve to help keep alive, in the minds of the American people, some realization of the important public issues at stake.

You people of Michigan are fortunate in that most of your public utilities are in that type of ownership which, for want of a better word, we call private. Of course, there is nothing so very private about ownership that is divided amongst tens of thousands of investors, in industries whose services are completely under the surveillance of public regulatory commissions. But the ownership is private in this sense, that all the investment in these companies has been voluntary; that the investors have some degree of control over the properties; and that any investor is free to withdraw from the business at any time, by selling his securities to someone else. So it has come about that the people of Michigan have at their service several billion dollars' worth of public-utility properties that have been built without any burden whatever to the public treasuries. Not only that, but these industries are among your largest taxpayers, and all the rest of the taxpayers benefit from this sharing of the tax burden.

The reason I emphasize these two features of the so-called private ownership of your public utilities is that these industries are favorite targets of the Socialists—not only the sincere Socialists but also the political opportunists who think they can use Socialist methods without putting on the Socialist label. In Great Britain such industries were the first to be nationalized. In the United States there is a concerted drive to nationalize electric power. About one-fifth of the supply of that power in this country now comes from plants owned by Federal, State, or local governments or their agencies—principally Federal as to the plants themselves but not as to the distribution systems.

This huge development has used large amounts of public funds raised by taxation and public borrowing. There is a sad contrast between the situation of a taxpayer who is compelled to contribute to the cost of building public works without hope of any direct personal return and that of a voluntary investor who puts his savings at the disposal of a business with some hope of compensation and with reasonable prospect of being able to recover his savings when he needs them.

Now that we are all getting a first-hand acquaintance with inflation, it is becoming plain enough that the taxpayers not only suffer losses as underwriters of projects whose costs are not wholly recovered from project revenues. They are hit in another way, too, when the Federal Government borrows money for public works or any other purpose. That is the biggest single factor in the pressure toward shrinkage of the dollar—especially when the borrowing follows the present fashion of calling on the country's banking system. Beyond all that, the ownership of a public-utility system by a government or by a governmental agency always enjoys tax exemptions not enjoyed by business enterprises. This in itself places added burdens on the tax-paying public, for the taxes have to be levied on somebody. So I think you people of Michigan have been wise in leaving most of your public utilities to function as self-supporting, taxpaying enterprises, rather than as governmental units.

But I must call your attention to the fact that those who connive to expand governmental activities into all possible fields are itching to get a real foothold in this part of the country. At present they are trying to exploit your very natural interest in the proposal to construct a deeper waterway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. They hope, with your help, to create, through the dual-purpose project, a new center in the Northeast for the growth of Federal electric-power systems and a new bludgeon with which to make life tougher for the railroads.

Some of you may be surprised to hear the St. Lawrence project spoken of in those terms. I am sure no one in this room has favored the project on grounds of leftist political ideology. Those of you who have favored it no doubt felt that it would be a good thing for the city of Detroit. But I suggest that you take notice of the consistent energetic support that has been given to this project, for many years, by the left-wingers in Washington. I don't think they are doing it out of love of Detroit.

Their motives have shown up in the recent tug-of-war between President Truman and New York's Governor Dewey over the question of building the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power plants in New York and Ontario without the deeper ship canals and locks. New York and Ontario have made a dicker to do that at their own expense, if permitted by their respective Federal Governments. They point out that it would not interfere with later construction of the navigation works, whenever the two countries might want to build them. But New York has been unable to get approval of its plan in Washington. The Federal administration seems determined not to let the power project slip out of its own hands.

Perhaps you thought the Federal Government was going to sell the power plant to New York, anyway, should the combined power and navigation project be built. That is the pretended plan; but it is a phony. The St. Lawrence legislation now before the Congress says a few kind words about transferring the power project to New York, but it leaves all the necessary arrangements for such a transfer unsettled until after Federal construction gets under way. The busy little Federal planners know how to handle that kind of set-up. The power plant would be built and finished while arrangements for its transfer to New York were being discussed, endlessly. Then the plant couldn't be left idle. It would have to be put into service as a Federal power operation. Then it would be ready to become a key point in that visionary Federal power system for the Northeast that is so dear to the hearts of Washington's planners, a system stretching from Niagara to the Bay of Fundy.

There is a sound principle summed up in that old proverb, "When it toucheth thee then thou smartest." Four years ago, before a congressional committee, R. L. Ireland, Jr., vice president of the Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., Cleveland, testified in opposition to the St. Lawrence project, as follows: "We have reviewed the St. Lawrence seaway as to its effects on our Labrador ore interests and we have come to the conclusion, after again reviewing the whole situation, that our interest in this big ore body up there is far greater without a seaway than with a seaway—if you can bring in cheap raw material, what use will you have for cheap raw material if the end product is going to have to compete with cheap finished products? We have got to protect our standard of living in this country; and, failing to do so, we merely bring our economy, which is developed so greatly in the Great Lakes Basin area, into competition with all the cheaper foreign goods that could be brought in by such a seaway." That statement is as timely today as when uttered and I commend it to labor and management in this great industrial city, lest they be touched and then smart; a debacle devoutly desired by certain left-wingers determined to disrupt our economy.

Last month, I understand, the mayor of Detroit, in an address before this club, spoke of plans to put the harbor of Detroit into shape to take care of oceangoing vessels over the proposed 27-foot canal. Surely the mayor must have had reference to foreign-flag ships, for less than 9 percent of United States flag tonnage, fully loaded, can transit a 27-foot canal—the depth designated in an agreement made with Canada 18 years ago. That was admitted at the House Public Works Commitee hearings last May by General Fleming, then Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. Furthermore, letters from 80 leading American steamship companies appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1947, in protest against the project and stating they would have no use for it were it built.

It might be well for your mayor and your Congressman, GEORGE DONDERO, to get together on this matter. The latter knows how few United States flag ships could move over the proposed canal; knows that the sole purpose the waterway would serve, other than accommodation of the smaller-type foreign-flag ships, would be extension of the Great Lakes system to the lower St. Lawrence, so that lake carriers could load Labrador ore at Seven Islands. He knows that, because he said at the House hearings last May, and I quote, "There is no sense in deepening any ports except those used for iron ore." General Pick, chief, Army engineers, concurred in that statement at the hearing.

Reference to iron ore calls to mind a question asked of me by a member of this club. He inquired about the recent fervent appeal of your Congressman, JOHN DINGELL, for the launching of a holy crusade to save dynamic Detroit from becoming a ghost city. That catastrophe, your Washington representative claims, is in the cards unless the St. Lawrence canal is built pronto to provide for the movement of Labrador ore to Midwest steel plants. Such propaganda about Detroit and other prosperous lake cities to me appears puerile. One wonders why the chambers of commerce are not up in arms. The worst of it is that this propaganda is being disseminated in the face of the greatest expansion ever to take place in the Midwest steel industry and Great Lakes fleet construction.

There is no more ghostliness about the Labrador ore investments than there is about the lake ports. The conclusion, a few weeks ago, of financial arrangements between the steel operators and insurance companies for development of the project was marked by a

statement from an operator-spokesman who said, of the presently contemplated annual production of 10,000,000 tons, that plans called for bringing in 5,000,000 tons up the present 14-foot St. Lawrence canal system; 3,000,000 tons by rail from Montreal to the Pittsburgh and Youngstown areas; and 2,000,000 tons by ocean route to Baltimore and Philadelphia. What is more, he said the delivered price of the Labrador ore will compare favorably with that of ore shipped from the Lake Superior district. A high railroad official stated a few days ago that American and Canadian railroads can and will take care of all west-bound ore shipments offered them at Montreal. Congressman DINGELL must now be in a quandary to fashion another battle cry. Commencing with bananas, which were to be brought cheaper into the Middle West via the waterway, the dictionary has been pretty well pruned, during the 30 years of active agitation for this project, of names of commodities that might be promoted. But let us not be harsh on our lawmakers. It is a fallacious belief that man thinks intelligently or acts rationally in the political field.

There remains one threadbare string on the St. Lawrence bow, which the proponents continue to strum. We hear much about the necessity for the navigation features and the power capacity of the project as instruments of national defense. The project would represent an ideal objective of aerial warfare in a polar attack, particularly in the light of the bottleneck features of transportation to and from the Great Lakes Basin. It is not the point that anything that can be built can also be destroyed. The point is that to thus tie up the waterway would tie up its vaunted transportation program and bottle up in the Great Lakes any boats built for ocean use. For 5 months, ice does the bottling. On November 29, according to the Associated Press, "Senator TAFT said he did not believe the St. Lawrence proposal could be classed as a defense project."

As to the need of electric power for defense industries, the St. Lawrence project is about the slowest conceivable way to provide power. Its completion would take 6 or 7 years. Steam plants are built in less than half the time. The electric utilities in New York, as well as in Michigan and elsewhere, are meeting their challenge in the present war as they did in the last one. As to the period of World War II, former Secretary of the Interior Krug said, "Power was never too little or too late." As to the national power situation today, James W. Parker, president, Detroit Edison Co., said on August 13, "It is good; and don't let anyone tell you otherwise." Of the situation in the State of New York, Alexander M. Beebee, president of the Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., recently said, "The need of such developments as the St. Lawrence because of a claimed shortage of power just is not true."

As to the need of transportation for defense purposes, the record of the railroads in World War II stands out as one of the greatest achievements in American industry. These words of Clarence F. Lea, spoken during that war, when he was chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, tell the story, "In all the world no job is being better done than by the American railroads." And today, against odds, they are doing a great job. However, the present efficiency of the railroads cannot be maintained, if subsidized competition grows increasingly severe. Despite their efficient operation, the railroad earnings, due to that competition, are insufficient to attract investment of new capital necessary to keep pace with national transportation requirements.

While we are on the subject of subsidy, a North Carolina project is illustrative of the absurd lengths to which that practice is being stretched. Federal funds in the amount of $3,849,000 have already been spent in the dredging of a channel in Cape Fear River for the sole benefit of a single oil company. Washington was shocked recently when this case was exposed before a congressional committee. But the Cape Fear River project is a pigmy alongside the St. Lawrence proposal which contemplates expenditure of over a billion dollars in the dredging of a channel primarily to benefit six steel operators. The proposal, mind you, is not designed to enable those operators to ship ore under competitive conditions; for such conditions already exist, as the operators admit. It is planned principally to give them an advantage over their competitors through a subsidized waterway; for tolls, if ever imposed, would fall far short of self-liquidation. The Cape Fear case is bad enough. The St. Lawrence affair, in that it would push eastern railroads toward bankruptcy, might lead to a national calamity. The present danger of nationalization of the railroads lies not in a conscious choice of the voters but rather in the indirect result of conditions, brought on by subsidized competition, which would make it impossible for the railroads to do the job.

Should the railroads be forced into bankruptcy, the Government would have to take them over. They would not go out of business, for no carrier or group of carriers can supplant them as the backbone of the Nation's transportation system. The economy of the country is built around the railroad freight car. Nationalized railroads would then be in direct competition with all other forms of transportation; which means that Government would take over those other forms, as has been done in Great Britain. From nationalization of transportation to that of many, if not most basic businesses would be but a short step, as Great Britain has shown us. This is the all-important fact, namely, that the problem is much larger, broader than the future of the railroads or the electric power industry. It concerns the very life of our free economy.

The fathers of the American Republic, in their great Declaration, found that men had been endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among which, they listed three. They apparently did not feel it necessary, specifically, to list one which for generations had been the principal subject of their declaration of the rights of man—namely, the right privately to possess and enjoy the fruit of one's labor; an inalienable right on which life itself, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in a very real sense were believed by them to depend. Today this inalienable right is being whittled away—whether at Moscow, Peiping or Washington. There is but one way to resist usurpation of the inalienab e rights of men, and that is to resist each individual attempt of overreaching government to appropriate, to itself, those things inalienable in the people, whom government is supposed to serve. It is for that reason that unnecessary collectivist devices like the St. Lawrence canal and power project should be opposed, even though a statistician's dream might seem to show that they can be made to pay their way.

I have referred to the drive to collectivize the power industry. When that has been done, might not the production of aluminum and magnesium by the use of electrical energy also become communized? Should a subsidy be given to the steel operators, by way of the proposed ore transportation route, would it then be terrifically difficult to carry out a suggestion as to which a broad hint has already been made in a most exalted place, namely, that of communizing the steel industry? And when aluminum and steel have been communized, how about the industrial products into which those raw materials enter? The producers in this area know what that would mean.

Gentlemen, is this fantasy? On December 8, 12 days ago, the president of the American Bankers Association, James E. Shelton, charged that the American people have been led down the road to ultimate political and economic enslavement. The Foundation for Economic Education just recently put out a graph showing the growth in Government ownership of wealth (land excluded) from 1902 to 1946. This graph shows that, as of the year 1946, over 20 percent of the total wealth of the country (outside of land) were in the hands of Government—a percentage over three times as great as the 6 percent Government ownership shown for the year 1902

So much for the ownership of the wealth of the people. So much for the destruction of that inalienable right. But your Government and mine goes even further: "Practically every business, large or small, is affected by some form of governmental licensing control." Those words, gentlemen, are not mine. They're quoted from page I of a publication of the United States Department of Commerce entitled—and God save the dimension—"Small Business and Government Licenses." Not the Gargantuan steel industry, not the automotive industry, not the railroads, not the power octopus—this is small business, that is now acknowledged to be under not merely governmental regulation, my friends, but governmental licensing control. Is it fantastic to say that we have got to look to the safety of a certain inalienable right?

NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE
PROJECT CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1950.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You have been a stanch friend of the opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, and we appreciate it.

We are wondering if you would mind putting the enclosed speech and statement by Mr. Huntress, our chairman, in the RECORD.

It is not our desire to load up the RECORD, but there have been several incorporations lately by proponents of the waterway, which we think should not go unanswered.

Thanking you very much, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CARLISLE BARGERON,
Publicity Representative.

STATEMENT BY CARROLL B. HUNTRESS, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT CONFERENCE

Those frenzied proponents of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway who are loudly sounding doomsday for Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, and the Great Lakes area unless 10,000,000 tons of Labrador-Quebec ore can come into the country in a particular way, are doing their area a serious disservice. One wonders why the chambers of commerce are not up in arms against this type of propaganda because it is certainly not the way to get new investments and new industries.

However, what is worse is that this propaganda is being pursued in the face of the greatest expansion to take place in the Midwest steel industry and Great Lakes fleet construction in years.

The American Ship Building Co. in its magazine, the American Ship Builder, tells about that company's having plans on the drawing board for five freighters, discusses other Lakes shipbuilding activity and says:

"The decision of lake operators to start the long-awaited rebuilding of the fleet reflects great faith and optimism in the future and it sets at rest rumors that the Great Lakes region was doomed to obsolescence because of the exhaustion of high grade hematite deposits in the Lake Superior region.

"The decision to build new ships, to enlarge the ore-carrying capacity of the fleet, indicates that there are either adequate

quantities of high-grade ore, or that the use of lower-grade ores is feasible and economically possible. These low-grade-ore reserves are known to be tremendous."

The Cleveland Press of November 17 reports that three steel companies, Republic, Jones & Laughlin, and American Steel Wire, plan to spend $150,000,000 for plant expansion in Cleveland alone. Several weeks ago Inland Steel announced an expansion of its East Chicago, Ind., plant to an additional capacity of 750,000 tons; about the same time National Steel announced its plan to spend between $25,000,000 and $30,000,000, mostly on the expansion of its plant near Detroit.

On July 19, United States Steel, whom the propagandists cite in support of their argument that the steel industry is headed toward the Atlantic seaboard because it has bought the site for a plant in New Jersey, announced it was increasing the capacity of its plants in the Chicago and Pittsburgh districts by 1,660,000 tons. Similarly, two of its Lakes carriers announced they were immediately beginning construction of four large Lakes carriers to cost more than $20,000,000. Early in the year, the largest ore carrier, the *Wilfred Sykes* which cost $5,000,000 was put into service by Inland Steel.

The whole agitation about Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago et al. becoming ghost towns sprung from the small group of steel operators who have invested in the Labrador-Quebec ore and want the subsidized waterway to help them with the competitive costs of their relatively small kitty of ore in the 100,000,000 tons which we use annually.

Now it seems that not only is it nonsense about ghostliness being in store for Lakes ports but also it is evident that the absence of the St. Lawrence waterway will not even mean ghostliness for the Labrador-Quebec investments of the steel operators.

Charles R. Hook, chairman of the board of Armco, one of the companies interested in the Labrador-Quebec project, was quoted in the Chicago Journal of Commerce of October 19 as saying this ore could be brought in over present transportation facilities at a reasonable cost but, of course, it would be more reasonable over the St. Lawrence waterway.

Now, George M. Humphrey, president of the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, and leader in the Labrador-Quebec enterprise, announced in the New York Times of November 16, that present plans call for bringing in 5,000,000 tons annually over the present St. Lawrence canal system, 3,000,000 tons by rail from Montreal to the Pittsburgh and Youngstown areas, and 2,000,000 tons by ocean route to the Baltimore and Philadelphia sections.

"The delivered price," said Mr. Humphrey in the *New York Times of November 16*, "will compare favorably with that of ore shipped from the Superior region."

You can bet your boots that the insurance companies, with which the Labrador iron ore interests had just closed a financing deal for the building of a railroad from the ore fields to Seven Islands on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, were convinced of this.

Aviation Corps

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I led the fight in this House during World War II to permit men who did not have a college degree to fly our fighter planes. After much agitation, I succeeded in prevailing on the flying services to abolish such a silly requirement and let down the bars. As a result, all Americans were admitted to our flying services, and victory was ours.

Today thousands of eager, patriotic young men find themselves denied the right of becoming aviation cadets solely by the accident of being born into families who did not have enough money to send them to college.

This is class discrimination at its worst and goes on the shaky premise that the boy who did not go to college is unqualified to fight for Uncle Sam flying a combat plane.

There are more boys who have the technical know-how to fly but who are automatically disqualified by such a ruling than there are those who are eligible. Just because a boy did not go through 2 years of college does not mean he lacks the mental keenness, the high intelligence, and mechanical ability which are the prime requisites of a good fighter pilot.

I repeat, to bar these countless thousands from our aviation cadet schools solely for the reason they did not attend a college for 2 years is building a serious caste system in the American fighting forces.

The only fair way is to base requirements on sound mechanical knowledge, physical and mental alertnesss, and general technical proclivity. In so doing, boys who may not have been lucky enough to attend schools of higher learning will be able to become aviation cadets just as readily as their more fortunate comrades.

The President has called for a gigantic air force, and Congress has voted even a larger one. How can we approach these demands if we shut off the chief source of manpower for such an important unit of our armed might?

There is only one answer. Lift the unnecessary restrictions that bar so many enthusiastic applicants for training as aviation cadets and build the greatest air forces ever known. The bill I am introducing today will accomplish this.

Kremlin Is Grateful to Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, never let it be said that the Kremlin is ungrateful for services rendered. Owen Lattimore, the long-time State Department adviser and propagandist of the Communist line, has just received more of the acclaim that is due him for his part in turning China over to the Communists and putting them in a position to make war on our troops in Korea. Most recently Lattimore's specialty has been to peddle the Communist gospel that Red China should be admitted to the United Nations.

For this and other devotion to the cause, the Soviet magazine Novy Mir in a recent issue praised Lattimore to the skies as "an outstanding far-eastern specialist of the United States Department of State" and "one of the few collaborators of Acheson who is actually acquainted with conditions in the Far East." Lattimore also knows, according to the Soviet magazine, that colonial peoples "who are shot at from American guns see more and more clearly that Russia is their true friend."

When an alleged American who has spent several years on the Government payroll and has had the ear of top Government officials holds views of that kind, the American people are entitled to know the facts so they may judge for themselves exactly where his loyalty lies.

At this point I am placing in the RECORD the full text of an article about Lattimore in the January 8, 1951, issue of the new magazine titled "The Freeman," which is published at 240 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.:

THE KISS OF DEATH

The Kremlin recently decided it was high time to give Owen Lattimore a friendly pat on the shoulder. This was done in the characteristic, clumsily devious Bolshevik manner. In the authoritative magazine Novy Mir for November 1950 appeared a long and exceedingly favorable review of Dr. Lattimore's book, The Situation in Asia, published in 1949. The review is prefaced by the familiar statement that since the liberation of Europe and Asia by the glorious Red army there has been a wonderful resurgence of the Asiatic peoples against their Anglo-American exploiters.

Novy Mir calls Dr. Lattimore "an outstanding far eastern specialist of the United States Department of State," "one of the few collaborators of Acheson who is actually acquainted with conditions in the Far East," and "a bourgeois with a sober approach to far-eastern problems."

"Lattimore's views," says the review, "are entirely different from the wild, nightmarish views of American reactionaries." The Johns Hopkins professor is presented as understanding the true nature of Soviet democracy, and as knowing that it is Soviet propaganda which attracts the Asiatic peoples. He also knows, according to the Moscow journal, that colonial peoples "who are shot at from American guns see more and more clearly that Russia is their true friend"; that it is "sheer madness to oppose the admission of (Communist) China into the UN."

Emphasis is laid on the high esteem in which Owen Lattimore holds the Soviet Union and everything Moscow stands for. "The utterances of this bourgeois American observer," says the magazine, "are an indictment of the ruling circles of the United States, and of the entire postwar policy of the imperialist camp." Novy Mir is pleased to note that Dr. Lattimore's indictments are directed exclusively at the United States. He indicts America's intervention in the civil war in China; he indicts our policy in the Philippines, Japan, Iran, Indochina and elsewhere in the East—Far, Near, and Middle.

The review ends with a strong condemnation of the United States Government for not having followed the course outlined by Dr. Lattimore. The ruling circles of the United States, Novy Mir maintains, have refused to accept the advice he has so magnanimously given. This saddens Moscow no end.

ARGUS.

Mr. Martin in Minute-Man Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Register, of Mobile, Ala., on January 16, 1951:

MR. MARTIN IN MINUTE-MAN ROLE

It is not necessary to always agree with him, or to always agree entirely with his views on a given subject, to appreciate the presence in Congress of a figure such as Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts.

Particularly in the face of conditions which now exist, the country can count it a stroke of good fortune that Congressman MARTIN of Massachusetts is a Member of the House. This is illustrated by a statement he has just issued.

As Robert Barkdoll, of the United Press, sums it up, Congressman MARTIN'S "ire was aroused by Mr. Truman's annual economic report and an accompanying report from the President's Council of Economic Advisers." Mr Barkdoll adds that "he (Mr. MARTIN) said the council spelled out the 'blueprint for socialism' at which Mr. Truman only hinted."

These remarks are attributed to Congressman MARTIN by INS in its report on his statement:

"In the name of the national crisis, it is planned to transform America into a completely socialist economy.

"The pattern of control and regimentation which the council's report contains is nothing short of a blueprint for socialism. * * *

"Critical times call for critical and conscientious action. The determination of the socialist planners to reach their goal by taking advantage of the situation is a disgrace."

Congressman MARTIN called increased taxation the "touchstone in this socialist blueprint."

According to INS, Mr. MARTIN said the average American now pays more than 25 percent of his income to Federal, State, and local governments in taxes, and went on to add:

"With the additional staggering increases proposed, American citizens will find themselves turning over to the Government between one-third and one-half of all they earn so that the Government may spend it for them.

"This can only lead to less independence for the individual and more dependence on government—exactly the socialist goal."

The Nation needs "minute men" like Congressman MARTIN on guard in Washington to keep an eye open and be ready to speak out.

Apropos of Interoceanic Canals: Atomic Bomb and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of my remarks in the RECORD of March 16, 1950, entitled "Interoceanic Canals: Modern Arms and National Defense," I included a condensation of Dr. Vannevar Bush's book Modern Arms and Free Men, as published in the February 1950 issue of the Reader's Digest.

In that work Dr. Bush, though fully recognizing the terrific destructiveness of the atomic bomb, emphasized that the development of other modern weapons, namely, radar, proximity fuzes, and fast interceptor planes, might again place the defensive warfare in the ascendant and result in the reappearance of the deadlock on land, as was experienced in World War I.

In support of his thesis that the powers of defensive weapons are increasing with respect to the offensive use of the atomic bomb, Dr. Bush recently made an important statement with respect to the present war crisis. It should go far in allaying any hysteria or exaggerated interpretation of the importance of any single weapon, however powerful. It effectively emphasizes at this time the need for disciplined thinking on questions of national defense, the avoidance of oversimplifications, and the need for a well-proportioned program toward a balanced defense.

To make this statement, as published in the Washington Daily News of December 18, 1950, readily available to the Government and the Nation, I am extending my remarks to include its full text:

OUR A-BOMB EDGE IS FADING FAST

(By Dr. Vannevar Bush)

(Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, has joined with Harvard President James B. Conant, former Under Secretary of Army Tracey Voorhees and a score of other prominent Americans in forming the Committee on the Present Danger. Their purpose is to put forward the idea that America needs a universal-military-service law providing 2 years' training for every young man on reaching age 18 or on graduation from high school, whichever comes later. In the following statement Dr. Bush gives his reasons for thinking that this drastic proposal is necessary.)

In any consideration of atomic warfare today there are several factors that must be borne clearly in mind.

First, there is no question that Russia has produced an atomic bomb.

Second, having produced one, there is no doubt that Russia can produce more in time, and can make a stockpile. I do not know how many. I do not know their rate of production. But we certainly must conclude that they are now engaged in producing a number.

Third, I would point this out to you: There are many evidences that defense against the atom bomb is mounting.

BOMBING PLANES CAN BE STOPPED

Toward the end of the war you may remember that German jet planes came in against our bombers. If Germany had produced jet planes in quantity, they could have stopped our bombing. The Germans' mistake was that they concentrated on trying to produce terror weapons like the V-bomb.

Since that time, faster bombing planes have been developed, and means have been developed for bombing from higher altitudes.

On the other side of the picture, the jet planes have been developed for greater speed and greater range. Ground-controlled guided missiles have also been developed, and proximity fuzes.

They are all very powerful things to stop bombers with. That is why I say the defense against delivery of atom bombs is mounting.

At some time, in my opinion, Russia can build such a defense that we would have exceedingly great difficulty in delivering A-bombs on their primary targets.

We might still reach their secondary targets. But whenever Russia feels that she could impose upon our bombers such attrition that we could not undertake to bomb primary targets, then at that time we must have other means of stopping the Russian armies.

TV, BUT NO RADAR

It is my belief that we in this country have not given the attention to these things that the present danger demands. For instance, we have built a great television network. At the same time, Russia has been building much more of a radar defense network.

I realize the value of a TV network. It means enormous power in conveying to the public important events of the day. What I am saying is that in the last 5 years we have built a TV network and that we have not built a radar network.

I think we had better get busy. Fortunately, we are awake now, after Korea.

I think that the principal reason the Russian armies have not moved is our possession of the A-bomb. I think that after Korea, none of us should have any illusion that the Russians have been held back by any other scruples.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

We should have no illusion that they are paying any attention to anything except what their power can accomplish. If they have not moved across Europe in the last 5 years, I think it has been because of our possession of the A-bomb.

I think the effect of this superiority of ours is decreasing with time. By the time it has decreased far enough, the bomb alone cannot prevent a holocaust.

We must have other means—an Army in being capable of holding the line.

I believe also that this job of holding the line in Europe cannot be done unless the other countries put their armies on the front simultaneously. It cannot be done by America alone. Western Europe must be aided and armed for that purpose.

Program, Priority, Personalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the London Economist of January 13, 1951:

PROGRAM, PRIORITY, PERSONALITIES

When Parliament reassembles in 10 days' time, it will be clear that the political climate at last permits the rearming of the country to be treated with the seriousness it deserves. The assumption of last summer that there was a low limit to the amount of safety that the country could afford has been tacitly, and may soon be openly, abandoned. Ministers, Members of Parliament, and common citizens are all frightened, and all calling for action; so much has been achieved by Mao Tse-tung. But not all the old inhibitions have been shaken off; the direction has been changed and the pace quickened, but it is still plodding. The Government still

gives the impression of tired men making unwilling efforts.

Yet if ever, in the field of public policy, there was a disagreeable necessity that will be over the quicker the more energetically it is tackled from the start, it is this unprecedented effort to insure peace through strength. If it is done in sufficient measure and in time, there will be no war. If it is botched and bungled, the effort may be in vain. Those who hate the necessity for rearmament most should be the most insistent on it now.

What the country should require of its rulers in the next few months can conveniently be summarized under three heads—a specific program drawn up to meet the necessities of the situation, the grant to it of enough effective priority to insure that it is carried out, and the emergence of personalities strong enough to give the public confidence that the policy will attain its objects.

PROGRAM

A specific program—a promise to raise and equip forces of stated size by a stated time—is needed for two opposite, but by no means contradictory, reasons. The first of these is to make it clear that the British people are in earnest and mean to play their full part in the alliance of the free nations. The clamor that has arisen in America, accusing America's allies of making an inadequate effort, is manifestly unfair, at least as far as the United Kingdom is concerned. Every country's effort has been inadequate, but British achievements will compare favorably, by any test, with those of the United States itself—as, with their usual fairness, the sober American publicists are pointing out. But backward-looking self-justifications are not very convincing. The major contribution that the British Government can make to the hardening of mutual confidence among the Allies, on which everything else depends, is to come out with a clear, specific, and impressive statement, couched in terms that anyone can understand, of what they propose to do.

But if this first purpose of a specific program is to be able to show that it is big enough, the second purpose is to be able to demonstrate that it is not unlimited. Public opinion in this country, though increasingly determined, is fatalistically so. There is a sinking feeling that the whole horrible business that this generation has known twice before is beginning again, a conviction that, however mildly it starts, it will inevitably cumulate until the burden is intolerable. If full war comes, this will indeed happen. But if war does not come—and the object of the policy is to prevent it—then what is now planned is only a fraction of what the country went through between 1939 and 1945. At the height of the war in the middle of 1943, there were 10,206,000 men and women in the forces in civil defense and in war production. A specific program of rearmament could be turned into a similar figure of manpower required; one may guess that it would come out at about one-quarter of the 1943 total. This is still an enormous waste of effort. But how much more rational it seems to ask the people to make the effort of a quarterwar to insure their safety than to allow them to believe that there will be a steady drift back to all the home-front miseries of total war.

PRIORITY

The program once drawn up, it is very easy to declaim that nothing shall be allowed to stand in its way. Most people are now ready to say that; but very few of them realize what is meant by it. An article on a later page illustrates some of the hurtful things—not really important in the national life as a whole, but distinctly inconvenient and unpopular—that will have to be done to get the needed number of men into the armed forces. At the other end of the scale, it is equally clear that sacrifices of wealth will have to be made, and it follows that the largest sacrifices will have to be made by those who are still comparatively wealthy. But those who make their sacrifices in person and those who make them in money have a right to ask two things of the politicians. The first is that nothing shall be asked beyond what is necessary and useful. There is perhaps little risk of too many men being called up. But there is a very great risk of too much wealth being conscribed. A capital levy is a prime example of a device that would squeeze an ounce of real benefit to the community out of a ton of sacrifice by capital owners. Giving defense priority means abjuring acts of class warfare such as that. The second thing that the public has a right to ask of the politicians is that they, too, shall sacrifice something There are already hints that it is impossible to reduce other forms of government expenditure to meet the rising cost of defense This means, of course, that the citizen is going to be asked to make all the necessary cuts in his own personal expenditures, the reduction of which seems fully as impossible to him as cuts in grants and subsidies seem to Mr. Gaitskell. The budget will be a very clear test indeed of whether the Government is really determined to give defense an effective first priority.

PERSONALITIES

The burden even of a quarter war will not be borne unless the people have confidence in their leadership. The figures of the latest Gallup poll published in the News Chronicle on Tuesday are most illuminating. Mr. Attlee's personal popularity has risen since October by two points; he enjoys a clear majority of approval. But the stock of the Government as a whole has slumped in the same period by no less than 7 percent, and is now at its lowest ebb.

Unfortunately it is precisely in the most crucial departments that confidence is lowest. Public opinion has been very kind to Mr. Bevin, since it admires the gallantry of his fight against illness. But the safety of the realm is involved. Mr. Bevin, to put it bluntly, is no longer equal to his work, and it is imperative that in these critical months the country should have a Foreign Secretary who is fully alive and awake and capable of inspiring confidence both at home and abroad. The quartet of defense ministers also inspire the reverse of confidence. Mr. Shinwell has done very much better at the War Office and the Ministry of Defense than he did at the Ministry of Fuel and Power. But he is a controversial figure, an embittered and embittering man; his "tinker's cuss" speech is not forgotten; and it is not for him that sacrifices will be made beyond the call of duty. Lord Hall and Mr. Arthur Henderson are nonentities; and Mr. Strachey is perhaps the most distrusted figure in the Government. Taken together, it can be said of these four that they may not frighten the enemy, but they certainly frighten the British public.

No Prime Minister has ever had a clearer duty than Mr. Attlee has to replace these five of his colleagues by men who will inspire real confidence, not only in the Labor Party but in the country as a whole. If there were in the Parliamentary Labor Party reserves of talent to be drawn on for the purpose, the Prime Minister's task would be easy. But there are not; one needs only to listen to the names that are put forward for the Foreign Office in current speculation to realize how very restricted, how almost nonexistent, is the choice. It is therefore necessary to go outside the ranks of the party. Even this, however, does not by itself make a coalition of the parties strictly necessary—certainly not a coalition in the ordinary sense, a sharing of the patronage of office among the stalwarts of both the major parties. There are strong personalities among those servants of the state who are not active politicians. There is among the ambassadors at least one who would make an admirable Foreign Secretary; there is among the retired service chiefs at least one excellent Minister of Defense. But it is not to be supposed that personalities of this sort would take office in a partisan Cabinet still bent on such spasms of doctrinaire spite as the nationalization of steel. At the very least, a party truce is necessary if there is to be real leadership. And if the best men are to be sought for the job, it would be wrong to exclude active Conservative politicians just because they are active Conservative politicians—and just as wrong for them to exclude themselves.

We shall be told that this is not practical politics. But if practical politics is to continue to be the order of the day, the writing on the wall is clear. Labor's popularity is slumping, and with a fuel crisis added on top of the burdens of defense, it will clearly slump further. Is it really in Labor's interest that it should limp on, steadily losing its moral authority, until in the end it is forced into an election which, after such a performance, might well be another 1931? Can it conceivably be in the country's interests? Is it not far better to admit that the British nation is once again in grave peril, and that not only its manpower and its wealth need to be called upon without exemptions, but also all its resources in the art of government? The three p's—program, priority, personalities—will not combine with party; they will with patriotism.

Conservation and Use of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has prepared a comprehensive report on the immense advantages flowing from the conservation and use of water.

The proposed reservoir at Falmouth, Ky., is one of the important flood-control projects in the program of flood control for the Ohio Valley. Short-sighted opposition has prevented the construction of the reservoir which would mean so much to the people of the region.

The beneficial effects which would accrue from the construction of this reservoir are graphically shown by the following article written by Glenn Thompson, the able Washington representative of the Cincinnati Enquirer:

WASHINGTON.—It may be that Congressman JOE B. BATES, of Greenup, Ky., is unwittingly doing Greater Cincinnati a very great favor. The redoubtable Democrat, Mr. BATES, did not have this in mind. But, if legislation now being written by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission and soon to go to Capitol Hill should ever become law, it may work out that way. There are two proposals for development of the Licking River, a river that flows up through Kentucky, between Newport and Covington and into the Cincinnati Harbor.

One calls for flood control only. Under this, the Army engineers now seek to build Falmouth Reservoir, some 30 air miles up the Licking from the foot of Sycamore Street, and Cave Run Reservoir, 50 air miles farther upstream. Both are authorized as part of the comprehensive plan for flood control in

the Ohio Valley. Falmouth would cost $18,500,000; Cave Run, $9,500,000. But, when it comes to money, they don't get it. The fact that Mr. BATES is on the House Appropriations Committee is the explanation.

The other plan for development of the Licking calls for a high-level project and production of hydroelectric power.

Besides high dams at Falmouth and Cave Run, there would be small reservoirs at Boston Station and Pool's Creek. Cost is estimated at $51,885,000. This plan would provide not only flood protection but an estimated $3,106,000 worth of hydroelectric power a year.

The Kentucky General Assembly in 1946 went on record against power development in the Licking.

Before that, the district engineer at Louisville and the division engineer at Cincinnati had approved the high-level plan, including power. It came on here to the board of engineers for rivers and harbors. In view of the general assembly's opposition, they disapproved the high plan and approved development for flood control only.

Mr. BATES doesn't want even this.

"My people," he says, "want to farm—not peddle fish."

Arguments that a low-level dam at Falmouth would displace only 325 families change him not at all.

"That is some of the best bluegrass land in the country," he says. "Families there have been living on it for 150 years. They don't want to move."

Now here is where the President's Water Resources Policy Commission comes in. It has just made a voluminous report after a year of work. Its purpose was to devise a national policy that would make the best use of all the water resources of the Nation. It hopes that Congress will write the policy into law.

Considerations in water use include these: Flood control, irrigation, municipal water supplies, industrial supplies, ground water recharge, recreation, power production, pollution abatement, navigation, soil conservation, and fish and wildlife propagation.

The policy calls for consideration of both the national welfare and of the region's development in the use of any river.

Army engineers, great builders of flood-control works, consider the various uses of water in designing a project but final authority remains in their hands, and their major interests are flood control and navigation.

If Congress adopts the proposed national policy, each great valley like the Ohio would be considered as a unit. Each of the interests listed above—flood control, power, pollution, etc.—would be represented on an interagency committee charged with planning development of the water use in that valley. Each project would have to fit into the valley plan.

The committee would have to decide such questions as: Does the central Ohio Valley need the additional power that the Licking could produce? Would it be produced at an economical cost?

It would decide whether the valley should supply some water for northern Kentucky municipalities. (Domestic water supply, in fact, has first priority under the policy.) It would consider the Licking dams as a possible source for industrial water.

Greater Cincinnatians might pause right here and consider that last. Because their faucets seem to run freely, they are often unaware that their region is hampered by a shortage of industrial water. But this is no secret to some leading Millcreek Valley industries which have foregone expansion plans because of the shortage and which are now working vigorously to find new supplies.

These Greater Cincinnatians might note that the Government recently dropped five Greater Cincinnati sites from consideration for a new $11,000,000 Quartermaster research laboratory. A major consideration was inadequate water.

Recently the Atomic Energy Commission disclosed that a tremendous new production center is to be located near Paducah, Ky. Greater Cincinnati might not have wanted it. Nevertheless, a major reason for the choice of the western Kentucky site was the availability of a great clean water supply from Kentucky Dam.

On the interagency committee the clean-river people would, of course, be represented, probably through the United States Public Health Service. The Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission would have its say in the plans. So would State and local health authorities.

Here is the kind of problem they might take to the committee: Regulated release of impounded water can be used to dilute river pollution. Would such release from the Licking be an economical means of reducing pollution in the Cincinnati Harbor and reducing the cost of sewage treatment by Greater Cincinnati communities?

So all-inclusive would be the water policy that it might even include mosquito control. The commission's report points out that the life cycle of the anopheles mosquito can be broken by shifting the water level in a reservoir. Think of everything, don't they?

Kentucky would hardly overlook the recreational possibilities in the Licking. It has been quick to develop play areas beside the many dams already built in the Commonwealth and it would be unlikely to miss this one so close to a populous center.

Well, would the new policy force Kentucky to accept high-level development of the Licking if it still objected?

The answer is "No."

The further answer, however, is that, if opponents of what was regarded as proper development of a river were strong enough to prevent it, no development at all would be undertaken. Future possibilities of a water resource would not be destroyed by improper development.

Morris L. Cooke, chairman of the commission, thinks another thing might occur.

"I believe," he told me, "that if you could show the people of a region the full use that could be made of a water resource, if you let everybody in on discussing it as you plan the development, and then if you tell them definitely what you are going to do, this one this year, that one 10 years from now, nearly all opposition would fade away."

That probably will not be enough for Mr. BATES. Meanwhile he goes ahead preventing the Licking from being developed for flood control only. Maybe he will prevent development long enough for Congress to adopt a real national water policy.

Economy Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include a comment from the National Republic Bulletin on the appropriation record of the Eighty-first Congress in comparison with that of the Eightieth Congress:

ECONOMY NOTE

Total appropriations and contract authorizations approved by the Eighty-first Congress, which expired January 3, were $135,300,000,000.

That's a lot of money to be spent in 2 years. The first session, in 1949, approved $46,400,000,000 in appropriations and $6,800,000,000 in additional contract authorizations.

The second session, 1950, passed appropriations aggregating $78,600,000,000, then added new contract and loan authorizations to the tune of $3,200,000,000.

The Republican Eightieth Congress, so roundly denounced by President Truman in the 1948 presidential campaign, approved total appropriations and contract authorizations (1947 and 1948) in the amount of $73,700,000,000.

So the Truman economy program comes out here: For every $1 spent by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Democratic Eighty-first spent $1.85—enough to wipe out the Treasury surplus of $9,200,000,000 left by the Republican Eightieth, and then to run up an additional deficit of $5,600,000,000 to January 1, 1950.

Obviously the American people must find some way to bring the Truman squanderbund under effective control. At the present spending rate, the country can't afford even to wait for the next election. It will have to press down on individual Congressmen.

Resolution of Hodges Bible Class, Main Street Methodist Church, Greenwood, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

BOARD OF STEWARDS,
MAIN STREET METHODIST CHURCH,
Greenwood, S. C., January 9, 1951.

Whereas the Hodges Bible Class of Main Street Methodist Church, Greenwood, S. C., realizing that our country is faced with the probability of a war that will involve all nations and peoples of the world; and

Whereas the United States of America has been blessed in the material things of life far superior to other peoples; and

Whereas other nations of the world are looking to the United States of America for leadership; and

Whereas our Government, municipal, State, and National, are stressing material progress and preparedness and are neglecting the moral and spiritual life that is so essential to permanent progress and adequate preparedness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That our municipal, State, and National Government, and particularly our legislative and executive departments be reminded of our foundation principles on which this Nation was built, with a resolve that we will not ask God to be with us in this fight, but that we will fight on God's side and with his guidance assist in bringing our world to a sense of its obligation to God and to our fellow man.

2. That the members of the Hodges Bible Class pledge themselves to the support of the principles hereinabove enumerated.

3. That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the executive heads of our city, State, and National Government and to the Members of the United States Senate, the Congressman of the Third Congressional District, members

of the General Assembly from Greenwood County, and members of the city council, Greenwood, S. C.

4. That a copy of this resolution be released to the press, with request that it be given wide publicity, and particularly to the Methodist Advocate, the Index-Journal, the Columbia State, Greenville News, Washington Post, and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

W. K. CHARLES,
E. H. BOWERS,
L. C. BRADY,
Committee.

Princeton University Provides an Aeronautical and Allied Science Research To Be Named for James V. Forrestal, Late Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to note from a news article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, issue of January 9, 1951, and made a part of these remarks, that the laboratories and 800-acre tract on the east bank of Lake Carnegie formerly occupied by the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research have been purchased for $1,500,000 by Princeton University. According to the announcement of Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of the university, accompanying the purchase the facility will be converted to a $3,000,000 aeronautical and allied research center to be named for James V. Forrestal, late Secretary of Defense. This is a deserving honor to Mr. Forrestal, who gave so unselfishly of his ability to the service of his country, and, also recognition of the important part that science is taking in providing for our security as a Nation and the welfare of our people. President Dodds and the officials of Princeton University are to be congratulated for providing this important research facility.

The news article to which I have referred reads as follows:

PRINCETON BUYS $1,500,000 SITE NEAR CAMPUS AS SCIENCE CENTER

PRINCETON, N. J., January 8.—The laboratories and 800-acre tract on the east bank of the Lake Carnegie formerly occupied by the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research have been purchased for $1,500,000 by Princeton University.

Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of the university, who announced the acquisition today, said that the facility will be converted to a $3,000,000 aeronautical and allied science research center to be named for James V. Forrestal, late Secretary of Defense. By spring the research program underwritten with Government and private contracts totaling $1,000,000 will begin.

The property, including 2 three-story major laboratories, 13 single-story buildings, and 26 family dwellings will be enhanced by the transfer of equipment from the crowded research buildings on the 1,200-acre university campus adjoining the tract.

Dr. Dodds said that "the opportunity for rendering a public service in this time of national emergency through an expansion of our existing research facilities was so obvious that our board of trustees voted to negotiate for the purchase of this property."

Although it was understood that the money for the purchase was to come from current university funds, Dr. Dodds said that the university had received assurances of support from various agencies. Existing equipment at the university and new apparatus purchased under the research contracts will bring the value of the facility up to $5,000,000, it was said.

In addition the center will be used in connection with the university graduate-research program, Dr. Dodds said, and would in no way diminish the university's standing as a fine arts institution.

According to officials of the Rockefeller Institute, the property had been appraised by Army engineers to be worth $1,750,000 and the Army Quartermaster Corps was considering buying it. When the institute decided to vacate the site in 1947 and concentrate its research at its York Avenue plant in New York City, the New Jersey tract was put on sale for $3,000,000.

JET STUDY PLANNED

The institute began its work in New Jersey in 1914 in the investigation of animal diseases and in 1931 added the study of plant diseases. The institute was founded in 1901 by the late John D. Rockefeller, Sr., as a philanthropic corporation.

Dr. Dodds said that in making its plant and property available to Princeton, the trustees of Rockefeller Institute took into consideration the perpetuation of the property for scientific use under the university's aegis.

Specific projects to be located at the center will include Project Squid, a program of supervised and correlated research into rocket, ram-jet, and pulse-jet aeronautical power plants being carried on in six eastern universities.

The Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Jet Propulsion Center, and departments dealing with problems of chemical flow and aeronautical engineering will also be transferred to the new property, it was said.

PURCHASE HASTENED

Dr. Dodds said that for more than 6 months the university has considered the question of how it could best organize its engineering and science departments to make a maximum contribution to the national defense effort and at the same time preserve and build the university's potent as a source of scientific knowledge useful to the broad ranges of the wants of mankind. The national emergency hastened the decision to purchase which it was understood will put the research program at the university ahead 2 years.

It was understood that the center will be named for Mr. Forrestal, who was a member of the class of 1916 and a charter trustee of the institution, because the late Secretary was instrumental in developing the vast aeronautical research program when he was Secretary of the Navy and later as the first Secretary of Defense.

Korea GI's Hate Brave-Talking Politicians Most

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of January 18, 1951:

KOREA GI'S HATE BRAVE-TALKING POLITICIANS MOST

(By William Chapman)

SOMEWHERE IN CENTRAL KOREA, January 18.—American GI's in Korea are getting hopping mad about this war.

And their wrath is directed at one general classification: the politician.

Get two or more GI's to talking over their troubles and by the time they finish all the blame has been heaped on the politicians.

The politicians are responsible for prolonging the war; for failure to bomb Manchuria; for the failure of new equipment or replacements to arrive on time.

"Wait until we get home," they threaten. "Those politicians sit around and say, 'We will not leave Korea.' Why don't they come over here and then say 'We'?"

These men—once so near to victory—have now lost the burning urge to fight. They honestly doubt that they would gain anything if they took all of Korea—and their officers know it.

There is no low morale in the ordinary sense. The GI's continue to do their jobs like the well-trained soldiers they are. And they will fight as long as they get orders to do so.

But they believe someone is trying to save face at their expense and they don't like it.

Anniversary of an Iowan's Pioneer Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I called the attention of the House to the impressive display at the entrance to the Navy Building at Eighteenth and Constitution Avenue commemorating the first successful landing and take-off of an airplane from the deck of a Navy ship 40 years ago. Iowa is very proud of the achievement of one of her noted sons who was the pilot of the Curtiss biplane in that flight.

I am including in my remarks today two newspaper items from Iowa, one that appeared in the Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer-Republican of January 18 and the other item that appeared in the Des Moines Register of the same date:

[From the Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer-Republican of January 18, 1951]

EUGENE ELY, NATIVE SON OF IOWA COUNTY, MADE FIRST PLANE LANDING ON A SHIP 40 YEARS AGO TODAY

Forty years ago today, January 18, 1911, Eugene Ely successfully flew a Curtiss biplane to an improvised platform aboard the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* anchored in San Francisco Bay. His landing was the first ever made on a ship.

After spending 1 hour aboard the *Pennsylvania*, Ely took off and flew back to his hangar near San Francisco. He thus completed the first shipboard landing and take-off from which has evolved the present 600-mile-per-hour precision carrier jet maneuvers which characterize fleet operations off Korea today.

Mr. Ely, holder of aviator's license No. 17, met his death in a plane he was piloting at

Macon, Ga., on October 19, 1911. He was buried near his birthplace at Williamsburg, Iowa. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross posthumously in 1933 for his pioneer aviation efforts.

BORN NEAR WILLIAMSBURG

Ely was born before the days of the automobile or the airplane, on October 22, 1886, on an Iowa farm 6 miles east of Williamsburg. His father, Nathan D. Ely, was later an attorney and served as a colonel in the United States Army during World War days. His mother was Emma Harrington, a resident of Williamsburg.

When he was about 9 years old Eugene moved with his parents to Davenport, where he attended the city schools. While yet in his teens "Gene" became deeply interested in automobiles and went to work in a local garage. Presently he was recognized as an expert driver and mechanic. Leaving Davenport, young Ely found employment in the town of Cosgrove in Johnson County, where he became chauffeur for Father Smyth. Ely held the automobile speed record between Iowa City and Davenport.

CHAUFFEUR FOR FATHER SMYTH

The story is told that some years later a resident of a nearby village and a friend of the young chauffeur, not having seen him about for some time, inquired of Father Smyth where Ely had gone. The priest hesitated for a moment, and then with his distinctive Irish brogue, replied: "Ah, yes, Ely, Ely, I remember him well. He became entangled in the snares of a woman. He's married now." Ely was indeed married, and his bride was Miss Mabel Hall, of San Francisco, Calif.

Meanwhile Ely had taken up his residence in California, where he was engaged in the automobile business and was known as an expert driver. In a short time he was conducting an auto stage line from northern California to Oregon.

JOINED CURTISS SCHOOL

It was while he was thus engaged that his inquiring and mechanical mind became interested in aviation. He joined the school which Glenn H. Curtiss had established probably sometime in 1909. In this new adventure he soon became recognized as a leader in attempting to master the air. "No one had a clearer or cooler head, no one more thoroughly understood the mechanical requirements of aerial navigation." Recognizing him as a daring and skillful aviator, Curtiss induced Ely to join the Curtiss Exhibition Co. in 1910 and become one of the leading demonstrators of the Curtiss-built airplanes. It was in this capacity that he performed his epoch-making feats of flying to and from the decks of naval vessels.

Two months after a spectacular exploit from the deck of the cruiser U. S. S. *Birmingham* in Hampton Roads, Va., Ely was in San Francisco participating in another naval aviation experiment. Glenn H. Curtiss, who had trained several Army and Navy officers at his flying school in California, was anxious to demonstrate the value of aircraft in warfare. Again with the cooperation of the Navy, Ely made a 12-mile flight in a Curtiss biplane from Selfridge Field to the deck of the cruiser *Pennsylvania*, which was anchored in San Francisco Bay. Thus the feasibility of flying from shore to ship was demonstrated.

CANVAS TO STOP PLANE

For the purpose of accomplishing this landing a special platform had been erected on the stern of the vessel, and canvas shields had been stretched on each side to catch the machine if it should slide off the platform. Special arrangements were made to stop the airplane after it landed.

Ely left the field about 10:30 a. m. on January 18, 1911, climbed 2,000 feet, and crossed the San Bruno hills at a great height. He then headed straight for the warship. At the proper point he shut off his motor and glided down for a perfect landing. He had so little trouble in performing this feat that he believed he could do it 9 times out of 10 under moderate weather conditions. Although floats had been fitted beneath the lower plane on each side of the center section, this proved to be an unnecessary precaution. The aeroplane was brought to rest by means of a score of ropes stretched across the platform above the two rails which ran its entire length. These ropes were attached to sandbags at each end, and they were found to act as an efficient brake in checking the momentum of the machine.

LANDS ON "PENNSYLVANIA"

The flight of 12 miles was made in 13 minutes. Soon after Ely took off from Selfridge Field, the sailors in the fighting tops of the warship anchored amid the dense shipping in San Frascisco Bay sighted him as a tiny speck above the hills. The speck grew larger as it rapidly approached and the surface of the biplane was outlined against the sky. As it neared the harbor Ely's aircraft descended rapidly until, when he flew over the *West Virginia* and the other small vessels, he was only 150 to 200 feet in the air. At just the right moment he shut off his motor and glided down to the platform on the stern of the *Pennsylvania*. He struck this 32 by 127 foot platform 25 feet from its outer end, which sloped downward 4 feet in 10.

After a reception of about an hour on shipboard, Ely returned to Selfridge Field the way he had come in 16 minutes.

[From the Des Moines Register of January 18, 1951]

ANNIVERSARY OF AN IOWAN'S PIONEER FLIGHT

Forty years ago today a daring Iowan made aviation history with the first successful airplane landing on the deck of a ship.

Today over Korea, carrier-based Navy Corsairs scour the battle fronts in a manner that Eugene Ely probably never foresaw in his wildest dreams.

Yet he was one of the pioneers who made carrier-based flight possible.

Ely's historic flight took place January 18, 1911, when he flew a 50-horsepower pusher Curtis biplane onto an improvised platform resting on the deck of the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* anchored in San Francisco Bay.

He was 25 at the time.

Ely was born on an Iowa farm 6 miles east of Williamsburg in 1886. His father later was an attorney and served as an Army colonel in World War I.

TO DAVENPORT

When he was 9, Ely moved with his parents to Davenport, where he attended the city schools. While in his teens, he became interested in automobiles and went to work in a local garage.

He soon became known as an expert driver and mechanic. He held the automobile speed record between Iowa City and Davenport. He attended and graduated from the State University of Iowa at Iowa City.

TURNS TO AVIATION

Later, the youth moved to California, married, and turned his inquiring and mechanical mind to aviation. He learned to fly, and early became associated with another aviation pioneer, Glenn H. Curtis.

Recognizing him as a daring and skillful aviator, Curtis induced Ely to join his company in 1910 to demonstrate Curtis-built planes.

On November 14, 1910, Ely successfully flew a Curtis biplane off the deck of a cruiser at Hampton Roads, Va. This prepared the way for the first airplane landing on a ship at sea.

A description of his famous 12-mile flight from Selfridge Field to the deck of the *Pennsylvania* in San Francisco Bay went as follows:

"Ely left the field about 10:30 a. m., climbed 2,000 feet and crossed the San Bruno Hills at a great height. He then headed straight for the warship. At the proper point he shut off his motor and glided down for a perfect landing."

STOPPED BY ROPES

The plane "was brought to rest by a score of ropes stretched across the platform above the two rails which ran its entire length. These ropes were attached to sand bags at each end, and they were found to act as an efficient brake in checking the momentum of the machine."

An observer on the ship wrote:

"We sighted Ely as a tiny speck over the hills. The speck grew larger as it rapidly approached and the surfaces of the biplane were outlined against the sky."

TWO HUNDRED FEET IN AIR

"As it neared the harbor, Ely's aircraft descended rapidly until, when he flew over the other vessels in the bay, he was only 150 to 200 feet in the air. At just the right moment he shut off his motor and glided down to the platform on the stern of the *Pennsylvania*.

"He struck the 32-by-127-foot platform 25 feet from its outer end."

THE FLYING CROSS

After a reception on the ship celebrating the success of the flight, Ely returned to Selfridge field the way he'd come—by flying from the ship's deck.

Eight months later he was killed in an airplane crash at Macon, Ga., on October 19, 1911. He was buried near his birthplace at Williamsburg.

For many years his exploits remained unknown, but 19 years later—in 1933—the United States Senate awarded him posthumously the Distinguished Fying Cross. It was received by his father, Col. N. B. Ely.

Velvet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Robert C. Ruark's column of January 18, 1951, entitled "Velvet":

VELVET

(By Robert C. Ruark)

"Taxing until it hurts" is a relatively empty phrase, since I never knew a man to squirm with pleasure when suddenly chopped off at the hip pockets, but as an individual you find it easy to resent the use of that phrase in Harry Truman's mouth.

The man wants another sixteen billion extra. This drives the annual tax nut up to beyond seventy billion skins. These dollars come, directly or indirectly, from individuals, I am an individual. You are an individual. And so is Harry S. Truman.

In his recent budget speech Mr. Truman has exhorted the people to pare another necessity off the weekly cash outlay in order to meet the fresh demands of Government and defense. I will be pleased to break out the peeler and pare with the other kids, but in this instance I want it unanimous.

Unanimous includes Mr. Truman, who knocks off a cash grab of 50 lovely G-notes each and every—gorgeous thousand-dollar bills because they are subject neither to

scrutiny, account, nor the itching palm of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

This is a fee the gamblers describe as "off the top," meaning that it is literally in large coarse bills and, therefore, is not liable to the tax take. It is the exempt tip they voted Harry a couple of years back, and which he eagerly endorsed.

The way we heave the scratch around, I do not care if they pay Harry a million a year, because the lumps of being President demand a big salary. They can give him another million in expenses, if needed, and no squawk. But tax him they must.

As the symbolic man—as Mister America, as the leader, the boss, the mirror of us all—the fellow has just plain got to be subservient to the laws which govern us all, or admit that no American can subsist on his earnings.

If you and I are to be taxed until it hurts, then Mister Truman has some aches coming, too. Such as making that tax-free, nonaccountable $50,000 a year—which he receives in addition to his salary and equipment and travel and entertainment expenses—subject to the same laws on income that afflict everybody else in the land.

If Mr. Truman draws a gun, in a fit of anger at a critic, and shoots him dead, then you would expect the law to take its course, with an indictment for murder, a trial by jury, and a just and honest sentence by a judge who awaits the beck of the 12 good men. This is law—"all men are created free and equal."

The free and equal business includes Presidents, and it works both ways. For the boons you accept the penalties, and it seems to me you cannot except in any case, including the case of the President of the United States. Soldiers pay taxes on their earnings, too, you know.

Saying he survives his term, Mr. Truman will have been able to squirrel away $200,000 of nontaxable money for the 4 years, outside his salary, expenses, and perquisites such as yachts, trains, cars, planes, and such similar truck. Nobody else alive can hive up that much from earned income under the current tax structure, which the beamish boy is shouting to increase.

Except, of course, General of the Army Eisenhower, who was allowed a capital gains interpretation on about $750,000 revenue from a book he wrote about the war. This meant only a 25 percent deduction for a one-shot author. Other ex-soldiers who wrote books got slashed for the regular earned-income percentage.

Both Mr. Truman's free $50,000 annually, and General Eisenhower's allowance of capital gains, represent a gross insult to the other people who work at all trades, pay taxes, and now are told to take another reef in their belts.

We'll haul taut joyfully, if it applies to all, but if they tax me 'til it hurts, I want the hurt spread out to everybody. Including President Truman. Including General Eisenhower. We're all in the same business. American citizenship.

"No" Is Red China's Answer to UN Cease-Fire Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Mansfield News-Journal, Thursday, January 18, 1951. I certainly recommend this editorial for the reading of all:

"NO" IS RED CHINA'S ANSWER TO UN CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL

As expected, the Chinese puppets have uttered Russia's "No" to the United Nations proposal for a cease-fire order in Korea. The Red-manipulated Peiping government came back with five-point counterproposals. If these proposals were translated into eventual action they would mean that United States forces withdraw from Korea and Formosa and that Red China be admitted to the UN.

In other words, the diplomats are right back where they started.

On the actual fighting front, American forces under the UN flag made a few gains early this week. But no one is deceived. Our men have been forced back headlong from the Manchurian border.

General MacArthur has been maligned because he is not winning a war which he knew it was folly to start—and which he is expected to fight under the polite rules laid down by impractical Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

A recent letter from one of the fighting men on the Korean front told his parents, "I am feeling pretty bitter." And small wonder. Americans are ordered to let the enemy bring up all the supplies he wants to the Korean border without interference. Americans are not permitted to attack sources of supply in Manchuria.

Secretary Acheson's reasoning is that we must not get involved in a war we are already in.

On the other hand, if recent UN advances were to mark a turning point in the Korean war; if, by some wild stretch of imagination, United States troops with token assistance from their allies were to drive all the Chinese out of Korea and redefeat the North Koreans—then what?

The vast Communist machine would stand ready to infiltrate or conquer Korea again at the first moment our attention was directed elsewhere.

The truth of the matter is, President Truman has involved this Nation in a pointless war. We now have three choices: get out of it as best we can; go on fighting an endless limited action in Korea with thousands of Americans giving up their lives; or becoming involved in a world conflict starting in Asia. Even Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson recognize that the real enemy is Russia. But they choose to fight Russia with words and her puppets with American lives and wealth.

The Kremlin no doubt finds this quite amusing.

The Resolution To Declare Red China an Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, at its Friday session this House by an overwhelming bipartisan vote adopted a resolution calling upon the United Nations to declare Red China an aggressor in Korea.

The unity displayed in the House on this vote will have a great salutary dual effect. It will show the Nation that we are cognizant of the serious crisis which we face and are willing to act promptly, decisively, and courageously as the occasion arises. It will also serve a second purpose, namely, it will show the rest of the world that the Americans are united when it comes to matters affecting our national security.

There is no doubt that there is a genuine bewilderment abroad about the events inside the United States. People abroad seem to sense a deep and frightening split within our country on basic issues confronting America and the world.

We need more frequent positive assertions to aid them in understanding us and to bolster their confidence in our leadership and in our unity.

Even with our tremendous military strength we need the people of the world genuinely on our side, and we need to state and prove more clearly what our side stands for. Our effort must center around a definition of American purpose—clearly but imaginatively conceived and spoken. That purpose must not be theoretical, but visible.

We must first understand and make it clear to all the people of our country and to our friends and prospective allies, that our fate in the world and the fate of human freedom is tied up with that of other free nations and peoples.

We must have a strong military force to guarantee our security and to redeem our peace pledges under the United Nation Charter. Our job is peace. It is peace without appeasement, but it is not war, unless others cause that war.

As our President so ably stated in his address on the state of the Union, our cause is peace, freedom, and justice. But more precious than peace are freedom and justice.

The war to maintain peace and to allow freedom to survive cannot be won by arms alone. It has to be won by capturing, first or ultimately, the loyalties of people to freedom and peace. To do so first, is best and less costly in terms of bloody sacrifice.

We must take a fair and realistic view of the attitude of the European nations in the present crisis which we face. Theirs is a grim prospect. Their lands may well be our battlefields. We must make it clear that we know it too, and that this knowledge is an inherent element of our strategic plan to persuade them to drop reluctance to accept American leadership.

We do not need to dramatize the dangers of communism to Europeans. They have had first-hand opportunity to understand and dread those dangers. Their fears are based, rather, on the doubts as to our willingness and ability to act firmly to protect the ideals which we profess.

Our capacity to lead the fight against communism or any other form of totalitarianism will be judged not so much by what we say, but by what we do; not so much by our anxiety over human rights and freedoms as by our determination to act to keep those freedoms safe and healthy, wherever they are threatened throughout the world.

And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, may I say that much of the doubt and hesitation of the free European nations

results from our failure to speak up clearly, and act when the rights of the free and liberty-loving people were trampled upon in Poland and in the other countries beyond the iron curtain.

When Soviet Russia flagrantly and brutally violated its pledges under the Yalta and Teheran agreements—agreements in which we made commitments which we never should have made—and when it enslaved millions of Poles and other peoples who believed in freedom, democracy, and in the leadership of the United States and its allies, then it became our solemn duty to act by condemning the act of aggression, just as we did Friday in the case of Korea and Red China. But we failed to act, and those peoples are living today under a brutal tyranny and are suffering unbelievable acts of persecution. Regardless of that, however, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that those peoples have not yet lost faith in our leadership and may be counted on again to take up arms and overthrow their yoke of slavery if and when the occasion arises.

We have lost much time and ground in our battle to save ourselves and civilization. But we can still regain that ground and succeed, if we determine to act firmly, boldly, and decisively to defend the high and lofty principles to which we have dedicated ourselves.

Should the 18-Year-Old Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the young editors of the University School News, which school is located in Cleveland, Ohio, wrote an editorial for his paper which appeared January 12, 1951. Since the Congress is giving consideration to the drafting of 18-year-olds, I believe the Congress should give consideration to the thinking and expressions of this group. They certainly are entitled to express their views.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the above-mentioned editorial:

SHOULD THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE?—EDITOR SAYS "YES"

The papers recently announced that the Defense Department intends to ask Congress to permit the drafting of 18-year-olds. We're back to the war period where we exchange our June high school diploma for an army suit and helmet. We have to defend our country—it's part of our economic and political system. Yet, come to think of it, do we get to choose the leaders who determine those political and economic policies? Do we, who must defend this great country and its political leaders, get to decide who should be the officials to make those policies which may or may not involve us in wars that could or could not ruin our own lives and future?

In other words, this editor advocates that 18-, 19-, or 20-year-olds be permitted to vote.

If we are forced to sacrifice our lives for democracy—which is all very well—then we should be permitted to choose that democracy's leaders.

In the State of Georgia 18-year-olds are permitted to vote, and today the State has two Senators who are two of the most capable and highly respected in the United States Senate.

All in all, if we defend our political institutions, then we should be able to confirm or vote them out. Do you agree?

Federal Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be called upon shortly to raise additional revenue for national defense and necessary Government expense. The following is an editorial taken out of the Huronite, a daily newspaper, printed and published in the city of Huron, S. Dak., which requires the careful consideration, not only of all the Members of Congress, but of the American people generally.

The editorial is as follows:

TALK OF FEDERAL SALES TAX

With $16,500,000,000—23 percent—of President Truman's $71,600,000,000 budget for 1952 to be met by new taxes on borrowing, or both, talk of a Federal sales tax is heard again throughout the land. President Truman is said to oppose the proposal at present, and his Council of Economic Advisers opposes a Federal tax on mass consumption items as "an inordinate burden on low-income families." But Senator BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), recipient of the President's recent "Dear HARRY" letter, says the Government must "enter new fields of taxation—probably such as a retail sales or transaction tax." When the chips are finally down, the administration may have to choose between a large deficit in 1952 and sales taxation.

Except as a measure to pull in sorely needed revenue in a national emergency, a sales tax—ordinarily opposed by retail business organizations and by farm and labor groups—would be looked upon by most Members of Congress as too unpopular for enactment. Even in the depression year of 1932 a Republican administration was unable to obtain approval of a sales-tax measure. President Hoover had asked "an extension for a limited period of the many special excise taxes to a more general manufacturers' excise tax." The Senate voted 53 to 27 against; the House, 223 to 153 against.

Opponents of sales taxes call these measures regressive; that is, they are said to fall hardest on those least able to pay. Earlier in 1932, 4 months before he unqualifiedly recommended a manufacturers' sales tax, Under Secretary of the Treasury Ogden Mills had told the House Ways and Means Committee the tax bore no relation to ability to pay. At that time he opposed the tax also because of "the great administrative difficulties involved and the almost inevitable pyramiding of the tax in the course of successive sales."

In 1948 the Democrats considered the idea of a Federal sales tax unpopular enough to warrant the charge that the Republicans had elaborate plans to enact one. Senator BARKLEY, candidate for Vice President, challenged Governor Dewey to tell the country whether GOP plans contemplated "the levy of a general sales tax by the Federal Government in addition to those now levied by the States."

Some evidence that the line-up against a Federal sales tax may be cracking is furnished by a recent statement by Ralph W. Button, chairman of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, who said: "Such a uniform tax is the only way left to let the public know what they're paying." The National Association of Manufacturers, which has long favored a Federal sales tax, recommends for the period of defense and partial mobilization "a uniform excise tax on all end products of manufacturers except food and food products, to replace all existing excises except those on alcoholic beverages and tobacco."

Present excise taxes, the NAM points out, include not less than 20 classes of goods taxed on the basis of the final manufacturers' price. An over-all tax on all consumer products except food at a rate of 5 percent, according to NAM estimates, would produce the $4,000,000,000 in revenue realized by present excise taxes in 1949. In addition, the NAM proposes a special defense tax rate of another 5 percent, to produce $3,500,000,000 of additional revenue for defense purposes.

Great Britain's purchase tax is essentially a manufacturers' sales tax. Current rates are 33⅓ percent of wholesale price for necessities; 66⅔ percent for semiluxuries; 100 percent for luxuries. At retail, these rates sift down to 25, 50, and 75 percent, respectively. The rate (wholesale) for luxuries shot up as high as 125 percent at the peak of the postwar austerity program.

Promotion of a Federal sales tax, however, is going to come right smack up against the fact that the new income tax to be levied is aimed at the $3,600 to $6,000 income group which—as a group—has the greatest reservoir of money to go after. Individually, members of that group will be hard hit by the 1951 income tax and putting a Federal sales tax on top of that will be imposing a real financial difficulty.

In the face of that it will be very hard for the administration to argue in behalf of continued unabashed spending for so-called Fair Deal measures as FEPC, Federal medical insurance, and the Brannan farm subsidy plan. It is hard to see the logic in any argument that those plans would help the very economic bracket on which the administration plans to place the greatest tax increase this year to pay for it.

Public Liars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Bruce Barton from the Washington Star of January 21, 1951:

PUBLIC LIARS
(By Bruce Barton)

Simeon Strunsky, with his charming mixture of wit and wisdom, once wrote an essay against Public Liars. He denounced the weighing machine which stands with such disarming stolidity in the railroad station, inviting your penny, only to give you the wrong weight or no weight at all. He arraigned the crooked thermometer outside the drugstore door. What a travesty of justice, he exclaimed, to be betrayed by a courthouse clock. What a horrible blow to a

trusting heart to be lied to by a weather vane atop the steeple of a church.

Like Mr. Strunsky, we Americans always have hated public liars, men or machines. Schoolboys were raised on the story of George Washington and the little cherry tree: "Father, I cannot tell a lie."

The greatest figures in our history—Jefferson, Adams, Lincoln—never questioned the Biblical test of an upright man—one "that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not."

Today public lying has become almost the rule rather than the exception. And the idealists, the reformers, the professional friends of the people are, on the whole, worse than the old-line politicos.

Fiorello LaGuardia was a great liberal whom no reporter wanted to interview unless there were a witness present. Franklin Roosevelt's reign gave birth to the cynical phrase "conditioning the public mind"—meaning, "tell 'em only what, and only as much, as you think will promote the policies which you, in your superior wisdom, have decided are good for them."

Consider the recent performance of New York's Mayor O'Dwyer. In the face of a gambling scandal he resigned without warning, to be hidden away by President Truman in the Embassy in Mexico City. The New York papers then printed the record of eight separate public denials by him that he ever would resign, all of them issued in a few previous weeks. He deserved to be thrown out of public life. Instead, he was promoted.

This, I think is something we ought to get mad about. We ought to keep a boxscore of all the lies told by every important public official and every seeker after public office. A lot of us, regardless of party, would be glad to vote for the candidate who had lied the least.

Is Our Bill of Rights Still Potent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Timken Essay Contest, of November 17, 1950, was sponsored by the Timken Roller Bearing Co., of Canton, Ohio, for boys and girls who were regularly attending the junior or senior—grades 11 and 12—classes of high school and were children of Timken employees.

Its purpose was to instill in these children who will be entering the business and industrial world in the near future a fuller realization of just what the American way of life as lived through the Bill of Rights really means to everyone.

In entering the contest, the students naturally had to do a good amount of research on the subject and this studying no doubt made a more lasting impression in their minds than their previous exposition to the subject.

The entries were limited to less than 1,000 words and were judged on literary style, contents, and evidence of original thought and imagination applied to the subject.

The contest was judged by a five-man board of men not connected in any way with the company. They were: Right Rev. Msgr. George N. Habig, pastor of St. Peter's Catholic Church; Rev. Willard I. Hackenberg, pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church; Rabbi Lawrence H. Charney, of Shaary Torah Congregation; Judge George N. Graham, Stark County Common Pleas Court; Clayton G. Horn, editor in chief, the Canton Repository.

Prizes awarded were in United States savings bonds as follows: First, $300; second, $200; third, $100, and 10 additional prizes of $50 each, totaling $1,100.

Winner of the contest was Joyce Ann Urbach, 16-year-old junior at McKinley High School, Canton, Ohio. She is the daughter of Harley J. Urbach, works engineer for the company. The essay follows:

UNITED STATES BILL OF RIGHTS CAN SAVE FREEDOM

(By Joyce Ann Urbach)

We, the youth of today, are growing up enveloped in the problems of war and peace. We cannot remember a time free from war or the threat of war. We look to the future, not with a bright, eager expectancy as our parents did, but with doubt and hesitancy at what we see. Just what does lie ahead in this world left to us by our elders?

For a century and a half the Bill of Rights has stood as a magnificent signpost of personal freedom, but it can only point the way. The road to freedom we must travel ourselves.

Americans have sometimes stumbled on this road, but they have always surged forward with a driving force. They have been inspired by the knowledge that what they were working toward was the best form of government yet established on this earth * * * a government of freedom and equality.

For twenty-odd years now there has been an outside force trying to turn us from our rocky road of freedom to the smooth road of communism—smooth because it is effortless just to drift along with the masses. Men acting as mechanical robots with all precious free spirit gone.

Will the Communist plan succeed, or are the people of this country beginning to realize just what has been happening? Many people are now aware of this outside threat against our freedoms, but what about the threat from internal sources? Is our Bill of Rights in danger of violation in our own Government? Are there certain stumbling blocks set out on our road to freedom that seem to flash red as a warning sign?

For the past 18 or 20 years, our Government has lived by deficit financing. Debt destroys confidence, inertia sets in, and socialism is just a step further. The Government steps over the line between democracy and socialism when, through spending and debt, it levies taxes on private business to the extent that companies cannot carry the tax burden and continue to grow. It is absolutely astonishing to know that $10,000,000 a year is used to operate Government-owned automobiles. Can this be anything but mismanagement of our money? Our generation will have to carry a terrific burden of taxation largely due to the unwise spending of our predecessors. This is, in form, a curtailment of our liberties and may be considered unjust taxation on us.

Two bills that may come to the new Congress when it assembles are the Brannan plan and the bill for socialized medicine. We are teetering on the edge of a precipice when the Government ceases to regulate and begins to manage. So long as men are free to choose their own work and develop their chosen fields America will march forward and prosper.

The Brannan plan would, in substance, tell the farmers what, when, and how they can grow their crops. Are not such controls infringement of personal freedom?

Socialized medicine means the Government would tell us what doctor we could call and tell the doctor what people he could serve. These things must not happen. We must keep our freedom of incentive. Because of this our country has grown great and will continue to grow in all things that better our standards of living. This freedom distinguishes America from any other country. It's a freedom we must save.

Freedom of speech is a very precious heritage. It gave a man the right to say in Cleveland that some day, "We—meaning the CIO—will be able to tell the press what to print and what not to print." By exercising one right he abused his responsibility to another. If the press ever becomes controlled by any pressure group we will have completely strayed from our freedom road.

Freedom of the press came to the aid of our freedom of speech when General MacArthur was not allowed to give his recent address, but it subsequently appeared in the newspapers. It has been truly said, "A state which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands, even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

According to the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights the really flagrant abuse of the Bill of Rights is in regard to the Negro situation in the Southern States. There are seven States in the South with poll taxes that keep the majority of the Negroes from voting. There are many records of unfair and prejudiced trials held in southern courts.

This minority race in our country suffers from many discriminations because of color. Where even a small section of our people suffer the loss of their rights as set down by our early leaders, our ideal of democracy is not completely realized. There should be constant effort to make the Bill of Rights a living experience of all our people regardless of color.

These are a few of the threats to our freedom and security. Notice that they are stumbling blocks which can be rolled away. They have not yet become permanent barriers on our freedom road.

There are and always have been two kinds of government—without consent of the people and with consent of the people. Because our fathers suffered under the first, they chose the second. They believed in democracy and freedom; we believe in it too. We must back our belief with positive action. Believe, act, think American, all the way.

We, the youth, in order to have faith in the future must come to the conclusion that our Bill of Rights is still potent.

We must know that the American people will not let us down.

We want to know that they are aware of the existing threats to the basic freedoms, and will see to it that we have the chance that they did.

We should have the opportunity to enjoy all the liberties granted under the protective framework of our American Constitution.

It will then become our responsibility and privilege, with the help of God, to defend, preserve, and pass on to future generations our most sacred heritage—the American way of life.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I included in the Appendix of the RECORD, a report and a number of signatures on a petition concerning the wishes and desires of constituents of the Second District of Colorado, particularly Boulder, on the war in Korea. Today I include additions to the petition and a clarification of the objectives of the organization:

COMMITTEE FOR DECISION IN KOREA,
Boulder, Colo.

Your signature has been noted on the petitions signed at the public meeting held Sunday, January 7, 1951.

As you know this demonstration by the people can be effective only if it is Nationwide.

You can help by forwarding the enclosed petitions to your friends and relatives in other localities in the Nation, telling them of the campaign and urging a public meeting in their community

When writing to your friends or relatives, we suggest you include the following explanations:

1. A legacy of $5,000 received from a service man killed in Korea, is being used to urge people to demonstrate their opinion to Congress and the President.

2 A few statements should be included about the letter which set off the venture and the public meeting in Boulder which followed it.

3. The purpose of this group is not to form public opinion, but to bring it into focus.

4. The urgency of immediate action cannot be overstressed; events in Korea demand it.

5 We seek a decision in Korea around which American people can unite.

6 Originals of the petition should be returned to this committee; we recommend that certified true copies be sent to your representatives in Congress

The most important action to be taken, however, in addition to completing the petition is—a letter or telegram to President Harry Truman and congressional representatives. Now is the time to revive our democratic heritage of action.

COMMITTEE FOR DECISION IN KOREA,
R. A. MARTINSON, *Chairman.*

SIGNERS OF THE PETITION

Ralph Nielsen, Frank R. Burton, John E. Anderson, Harry M. Nordlok, Strasburg, Colo; Donald W. Jackson, Byers, Colo.; Henry Fruhling, Niel I. English, Elmer Hopper, O. E. Brown, Mrs. Zylpha Brown, Strasburg, Colo.; Mrs. Zylpha Snavely, Byers, Colo.; Miss Martha Balanga, C. J. Linnehus, Mrs. C. J. Linnehus, Strasburg, Colo.; George F. Tegeler, H. Strot, Everett Douglass, Richard T. Bothwell, Wiggins, Colo.; Henry Lebsoek, Brush, Colo.; G. L. Bothwell, Jesse Bernard, Robert C. Larson, Wiggins, Colo.; C. L. Maritt, Burney Sloan, Strasburg, Colo.; H. E. Bryson, Denver, Colo.; Mrs. Vern Rice, Strasburg, Colo.; R. W. Helling, Limon, Colo.; Donald Rin, Armal C. Hanson, Vernon D. Whelden, Emma Ehlers, Dal E. Gabbert, Strasburg, Colo.; D. R. Baldwin, Denver, Colo.; Doris White, Mrs. James Warren, H. H. Kruse, A. Dorothy Pescko, Strasburg, Colo.; Lohma Palmer, L. J. Tippett, Byers, Colo.; Martha A. Nordloh, John H. Nordloh, Reed L. Nordloh, Strasburg, Colo.; Courtland Rybicks, Bennett, Colo.; Claude H. Baxter, Robert Rice, Richard Rice, Vern Rice, Betty Rice, Jean Rice, Beulah Barrois, Wanda Barrois, Strasburg, Colo.; Roy Hinkle, Marvin Hinkle, Neil Hinkle, Lucelle Hinkle, Wiggins, Colo.; D. Mitchell, Strasburg, Colo.; Robert Ehrlich, Weldona, Colo.; Mrs. I. L. Wirth, J. L. Wirth, Wiggins, Colo.; Raymond Minaem, Byers, Colo.; Fred Poston, Henry G. Bartholomew, P. R. Hamilton, Charles B. Nordloh, Erushel O. Nordloh, William P. Nordloh, Ellen Belle Nordloh, Mrs. P. R. Hamilton, Chuck Landon, Strasburg, Colo.; Lyle Ingersoll, Platteville, Colo.; Floyd Price, Strasburg, Colo.; William C. Beck, Bennett, Colo.; Joan Klein, Donald Price, Neva A. Burton, Lina V. Giuter, Leon Birney, C. H. Wilson, Earl Ennis, Eugene Berney, Strasburg, Colo.; Bobbie Adams, Lucille Palmer, Clifford Orusby, Junior Gordley, Byers, Colo.; Ed G. Sohert, Beatrice Luke, T. J. Weddell, Marian Weddell, Strasburg, Colo.; Loren A. Guy, Deertrail, Colo.; Chester D. Derby, Walter L. Best, Byers, Colo.; Russell Pote, Strasburg, Colo.; Howard Fox, Denver, Colo.; Victor D. Wright, Strasburg, Colo.; Otis Fitch, Burlin Pitts, Byers, Colo.; C. E. Finkbeiner, Little Rock, Ark.; B. J. Wawak, Bigelow, Ark.; Freeman Scott, Sanford L. Scott, James G. Wassin, Oryly Luse, Strasburg, Colo.; H. McLaughlin, Denver, Colo.; Frank Nyback, Strasburg, Colo.; Clifford Smith, Byers, Colo.; C. Oudukirk, Strasburg, Colo.; Russell W. Wood, Joe Andreotto, Denver, Colo.; James W. Sounsen, Wallace B. Black, J. W. McLaughlin, Raymond L. Zyback, L. M. Montgomery, Dorothy Driscoll, Gene Rice, Joe Tibebon, Chuck Bates, Strasburg, Colo.; William F. Guye, Bennett, Colo.; B. L. Moorehead, Strasburg, Colo.; Robert M. West, Wheatridge, Colo.; Harold D. Carmichal, Indian Hills, Colo.; Theodore Billinger, Brighton, Colo.; Mrs. Nell Bradley, Walter Llewellyn, Mabel Llewellyn, Fred Beitler, A. W. Stahl, Ralph W. Williamson, William J. Rerksiek, Ross Blias, Karl M. Luke, Charles T. Heinricy, John E. Williams, Roy H. Funk, L. W. Burchfield, R. L. Beitts, Hubert A. Haugen, John Schmidt, Craig Miller, H. M. Mermenge, Frank Roberts, J. H. Ferguson, Lee Cooper, J. A. Hart, Gunnor Herskinel, Oliver Hibbs, Cecil M. Cook, Philander B. Rice, George Michell, R. H. Bauman, J. L. Pinzenzeham, Phillip E. Pinzenzeham, J. R. Rhine, Otto Engelbrecht, Benney Sloan, John Nordloh, Jr., Willis I. Young, Strasburg, Colo.; Chris Voldin, Byers, Colo.; A. P. Wagner, Strasburg, Colo.; Ben Wolden, Jr., Byers, Colo.; Halver Walden, Spring Valley, Minn.; O. L. Johnson, Denver Colo.; Glen Clark, Robert Beutels, Ross Perry, Byers, Colo.; C. L. Huston, J. W. Weddell, R. A. Meller, Audrey Cooper, May Cooper, Naonie I. Young, Elsie Kerksiek, Ethel Pinzenzeham, Fannie Morehead, Strasburg, Colo.; E. D. Trour, Deertrail, Colo.; Richard Vansyou, Walter Vansyou, Lydia Beltz, J. O. Beltz, W. H. Scott, Byers, Colo.; J. D. Rogers, Strasburg, Colo.; James E. Hunter, Bennett, Colo.; Herb Barr, Byers, Colo.; Lyle L. Butler, Strasburg, Colo.; Arlie Manen, Byers, Colo.; Ed Savard, Arthur E. Phillips, Wilmer Pimberton, Strasburg, Colo.; Tom Pemberton, Agate, Colo.; George Williams, Floyd R. Hamilton, Bill Pinchock, Strasburg, Colo.; A. W. Henderson, Watkins, Colo.; N. Scheure, L. W. Podoll, Aurora, Colo.; E. B. Zimmeura, Denver, Colo.; Walter Schroth, Joseph R. McEroy, Bub Bordner, Alvin Young, John Clair, Georgia E. Clair, Harold B. Tuffs, Barney Stoffel, Sr., Tom Brockman, Glen Lascasta, Barney Stoffel, Jr., Bennett, Colo.; Phil Tann, Greeley, Colo.; Norman Toft, C. R. Shuer, G. W. Hanlon, Ralph Hanlon, Roy Hanlon, Alvin Tedesko, Bennett, Colo.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials and an article relative to the excellent address made by former Postmaster General James A. Farley to the State Chamber of Commerce of Florida in November of last year be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first is entitled "Farley Looks at November 7," and appeared in the Bridgeport Post on November 24, 1950. The second is entitled, "Mr. Farley Woos the South," and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on November 23, 1950. The third is in a column headed "Heffernan says Farley makes a diagnosis," and appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle, November 30, 1950.

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

[From the Bridgeport Post of November 24, 1950]

FARLEY LOOKS AT NOVEMBER 7

From all sections of the country political pundits have been having their say about the election on November 7, in varying degrees of importance.

Perhaps the most significant analysis has come from James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman, who in two elections successfully presented Franklin D. Roosevelt to the voters of the country, and then broke with him on the third-term principle. Mr. Farley has always been scrupulous about principles, in and out of politics.

Although not active politically since then, the former Postmaster General still knows more about the Democratic Party, and the men and women who make up that party, than any other citizen. There is no question about his qualifications to speak on the effect of the November 7 results on the party which he led to power.

Defeats of union-endorsed candidates clearly indicate that the country does not want an independent labor party, he told the Florida Chamber of Commerce. "The principle upon which this Nation rests is that individuals vote as individuals, not as members of blocs. They vote their convictions through the party of their choice, and that party represents all interests, business and agricultural, labor and capital," Mr. Farley said.

There are many lessons to be drawn, he said, which may not only make for a better Democratic Party, but a better two-party system for the Nation. He has always been a stanch believer in the two-party system and has often pointed out that it would be an error for labor unions to form a party of their own. The Ohio election proved beyond doubt how the people, and workingmen themselves, feel about a labor party. Yet, he noted, there has been great danger that labor would do this through union political organizations set up in districts and in States.

Such a development would be contrary to the theory of government under our American two-party system, since it would allow the elimination of policies by one issue and by one group in the community. It was this fear, he believes, that drove many Democrats into the Taft column in Ohio.

In his clear and frank appraisal of the results, he does not believe that people prefer to support third, or splinter parties, of which there were two in New York State. He scored the Democratic Party for allowing the Liberal Party, though less radical than the American Labor Party, to move in and dictate candidates. He pointed out the perils to European stability because of the multiplicity of parties.

He believes the election carried a warning to the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs for at least the duration. He mentioned specifically the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments. They won no honors in the recent election, the former chairman said, declaring that we want to be a humane progressive Nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got.

Mr. Farley urged the abandonment of the proposed Federal civil rights legislation, because the problems cannot be solved on a Federal basis. They belong to the States or to the region, and he finds the Southern States solving their problems in this regard successfully without the heavy hand of law.

Mr. Farley's talk was filled with common sense, and if the Fair Dealers have any of that rare commodity, they will agree with him and change their partisan tactics. If they don't, Democrats will continue to vote with the more conservative Republicans, just as they did in Ohio.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 23, 1950]

MR. FARLEY WOOS THE SOUTH

James A. Farley, one may assume, did not journey all the way to Tampa just to hear himself talk. The former Postmaster General's address before the Florida Chamber of Commerce covered a variety of topics, but the references to civil rights appear to have a special purpose. It must have been pleasing to southerners to hear the former national chairman of the Democratic Party say that "most of the problems raised by the so-called civil rights program are gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South." While Mr. Farley's position may not utterly coincide with that of the Dixiecrats, it is certainly the complete opposite of everything that President Truman and the Democratic Party profess to advocate. Mr. Farley was giving the audience what they wanted to hear—that Federal legislation is the wrong approach, that Mr. Truman really ought to sit down to friendly chats with the southern leaders, and that good people can be trusted to do the right thing.

The trouble, from the South's viewpoint, is that Mr. Farley holds no position within his party. He speaks merely for himself, but the Farley opinion in political matters commands respect. And when Mr. Farley says that his party is pretty much wrong on civil rights, it is logical to assume that he is prepared to push the challenge. Just what he proposes to do is not plain, but the evidence has been mounting for some time that this Democrat would like to get back into some seat of political power. Perhaps Mr. Farley is convinced that a swing to the right is on, and calculates that the South is just the place to try out. As a political analyst and tactician, he is among the best. It is easy to imagine that Mr. Farley would like to direct a conservative turnabout in the Democratic Party. How he could ever sell the southern idea of civil rights to the big-city Democrats is a trifle obscure, but then the expert politician is always good at hybridizing.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of November 30, 1950]

HEFFERNAN SAYS FARLEY MAKES A DIAGNOSIS

What was in an editorial this commentator wrote in May of 1931 is beyond recall. But in his files he finds a letter in which James A. Farley wrote: "When I am again in Brooklyn I shall drop in and say hello to you, as I believe a personal chat would enable me to give you some information as to what I am trying to do around the State." In what he was trying to do then he was conspicuously successful.

Nineteen years, heavily freighted, have passed into hectic history since that letter reached my desk. Mr. Farley has been around the State, around the Nation, and around the world. He has learned much. His recent speech to the Florida Chamber of Commerce encompased much of what he learned.

It was good medicine. The political doctor made an excellent diagnosis and prescribed medication.

"Somehow," said Mr. Farley, "I feel, as a Democrat, that the results generally, while they indicated a Republican trend, were good for the Democratic Party. That party still holds the Presidency and it still holds both Houses of Congress. There are some Democrats who are disappointed.

"And there are some who were never real Democrats who were deeply disappointed. But out of the lessons of this election we can draw some wisdom that may make for a better and more unified Democratic Party and a better two-party system for the Nation as a whole. I shall mention a few of these lessons."

It is not too difficult to identify those who were never real Democrats. Some of them transcended the bounds of democracy in the train of the leader in whose cause Jim Farley entered the political lists 19 years ago. Some of them went down to defeat in the recent election.

After touching briefly on the revolt of the workers against the labor bosses, notably in Ohio, Mr. Farley held up as a warning to honest liberals the danger of bloc or splinter parties which had reduced France to impotency when Hitler attacked and which now make difficult her decisions in the matter of rearming Germany.

We can pass his approval of the inclusion of Spain in the western alliance, and his plan for raising defense funds.

Mr. Farley's views on the outstanding issues of the late campaign might well receive consideration from Mr. Truman if he has in mind the conciliation of many interests, particularly those of the South. Thus:

"As we turn from parties to issues there is another real lesson in this election. Confronted as we are with a great peril in our foreign relations, with immense deficits and heavy taxation, the voters have made it clear that they want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs for at least the duration. The Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments won no honors in this election. We cannot be big-hearted with money we don't have.

"This election and the primaries in the South that preceded it showed further that this country has no desire to follow Socialist Britain in adopting socialized medicine.

"Freemen in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense can generally be trusted to do what is right. I say to those anxious people who are too ready to lift the threat of authority to leave recovery to the spirit of liberty."

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three excellent editorials respecting a recent address by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of November 23, 1950]

FARLEY GIVES ADVICE TO FELLOW DEMOCRATS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—Probably the sagest of the political observers of our times is James A. Farley, who, after twice piloting a Presidential nominee to success at the polls, nevertheless parted from that same individual on a matter of principle—opposing a break in the third-term tradition.

What Farley says now in analyzing the recent election is particularly significant and revealing. For it is the opinion of a man who, more than any other outside of public office, knows what the Democratic Party really means to its followers and what it can mean in pursuing a course that might be termed sound instead of unsound liberalism.

The man who not only served in the late President Roosevelt's Cabinet as Postmaster General, but who led the Democratic National Committee is certainly entitled to speak about the Democratic Party as an institution.

"First," says Farley concerning the last election, "it showed in Ohio and in several other places that neither the Republican nor the Democratic Parties, nor the workingman himself, nor the voters generally want an independent labor party. I have many times made myself clear on this subject.

"Since labor unions became an effective force in our economy, it has been suggested by some that labor might conceivably form a political party of its own, with the avowed objective of presenting its aims through the medium of a platform sponsored by an independent labor party.

"I want to say that I am definitely opposed to such an idea because I am a firm believer in the two-party system.

"The great danger since the two big labor federations have set up their own political organizations is that in many districts and in some States these organizations might well supplant one or both of the regular parties. The result of this would be the elimination of policies by one issue and by one group in the community. That is quite contrary to the whole theory of government in this Republic under a two-party system. The fear of that in Ohio I know in this year's election drove many Democrats to vote for TAFT. And it is also clear that thousands of union members refused to be told how to vote by the political arms of the unions and voted for TAFT in protest."

This is a frank exposition by one who knows the trends in party fortunes and the changing attitudes of voters. Farley, however, not only refers to what happened in

Ohio, but in his latest speech—made in the deep South at Tampa, Fla.—he calls attention to the way the American Labor Party, which he says "came to be heavily influenced by Communists," ran a ticket in New York State that was thoroughly buried by the regular party vote. He adds that he is happy to note that the outlook is very dark for third or fourth parties in this country.

The former chief of the Democratic National Committee condemns also the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments and calls on the President to summon the leaders of the South to solve civil-rights problems on a regional and State basis.

"To pass a law," he remarks with reference to this issue that has aroused the South, "especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice."

What Farley says to his fellow Democrats and to the Nation will be discussed widely. For it is the beginning of a very important dissent against new dealism and fair dealism which has been smoldering for some time, but which is now coming to the surface as the independent Democrats, forced to choose between radicalism under the Democratic banner or antiradicalism in the opposite party, are voting in favor of Republican candidates. Thus they do not hesitate to leave their party for the time being—at least until the Democratic Party can get back on the track again.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of November 23, 1950]

BELATED ADVICE

A suggestion that is as sensible as it is belated comes from James A. Farley.

In an address at Tampa, Fla., Mr. Farley said President Truman should abandon his civil-rights program and leave the problems involved in it to be handled on a State and regional basis.

Mr. Farley is a former Democratic national chairman, and he spoke as one pained over the split in the party. He plainly realizes that the cleavage has arisen mainly from Mr. Truman's insistence on his so-called civil-rights program, despite the South's unyielding opposition to it.

Said Mr. Farley: "The President might as well, in the interest of national as well as party unity, summon the leaders of the South to solve these problems on a regional and State basis."

Mr. Farley misses an important point. The South's position is that Congress has no constitutional authority to enact measures such as the FEPC and anti-poll-tax legislation. To do so would be to trample on the rights and powers reserved to the States. There is no call to summon southern leaders. As a Missourian, however, Mr. Truman could feel free to urge his State legislature to pass such laws.

The Democratic Party under Mr. Truman's dictation has pressed for his civil-rights program as a matter of politics. It has been motivated by a desire to win the votes of Negro and other blocs in doubtful States. Consequently the administration may not heed this warning from Mr. Farley: "To threaten the South with drastic Federal legislation is the worst approach to improving Negro-white relations." The Fair Deal is either blind to that danger, or considers it of less consequence than getting votes.

For all that Mr. Farley's approach to this subject is a sound one, it comes late. His words might have meant something had they been uttered earlier—and in the North. Unless his school of advice prevails, the President is going to continue to urge passage of the legislation so obnoxious to this section. And Mr. Truman has already said he will recommend his program to the new Congress. He evidently isn't in the market for good advice.

[From the Savannah Evening Press of November 22, 1950]

MR. FARLEY'S GOOD ADVICE

James A. Farley, who in the field of politics has a reputation for knowing whereof he speaks, has given President Truman and the others who preside over the policies of the national administration, some good advice. Acceptance of Mr. Farley's advice by Mr. Truman would be a manifestation of the President's sincere interest in a program which up to this time appears on the face of the record to be largely designed to catch the votes of some big pressure groups.

Press dispatches quote Mr. Farley as having said in a speech in Tampa that the so-called civil rights program of President Truman is taking the wrong approach in seeking to achieve results by threatening legislation against the South, that the proper and productive approach would be through inviting those who know the problems best to solve them on a regional and State basis.

Mr. Farley spoke emphatically against what, regardless of the names they may be called by their sponsors, are 1950-model force bills directed primarily against the South. Mr. Farley puts his faith in freemen in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense rather than in edicts and fiats. Such men as he describes, he goes on to say, "can generally be trusted to do what is right." And in the South they have been doing just that, working steadily in the direction of fairness and expanding opportunities.

Tremendous strides have been made in the South in race relationships, and this section has more in this regard to point to with pride than have some other sections which have a very sorry performance and which have deceived people by pointing to their laws, laws that actual conditions prove mean virtually nothing. In the South, where the problems are well understood, people of good will have been leaders in bringing about greatly improved conditions, and the progress is continuous and cumulative. The greatest dangers that the good work faces are the politically inspired force bill attacks and the misguided efforts of pressure organizations.

Mr. Farley has a clear conception of how an ever-growing better relationship is to be nurtured. We repeat, he has given the President some excellent advice.

Recommendations for Preventing World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and able article by our former colleague, Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, as it was printed in the Durham Morning Herald, of Durham, N. C., on Sunday, January 7, 1951.

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

AS A STEP TOWARD PREVENTING WORLD WAR III—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

(By Frank P. Graham)

CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR

Christmas 1950 and the New Year 1951 have come with their heritage from a great past and their hopes amid the darkness which broods over the peoples of the earth.

In the nearly 2,000 years since the first Christmas there have been transmitted to the keeping of our generation the Hebraic, Greek, Latin, Catholic, Protestant, scientific, industrial, democratic, European, American heritage of human freedom and humane hopes yet unfulfilled and now imperilled in this world.

In the reorientation of America as part also of the Pacific-Asiatic world, it is of concern to us that in the East the spiritual heritage of the oldest civilizations is being uprooted by conquerors who would exalt the ideology of one generation and the quick ruthless methods of the police state above the wisdom of hundreds of generations. The need for reform is large and insistent in the East and the West. The East and the West need the values of creative cooperation in reform. This cooperation will be more creative when based on a mutual respect for the deep spiritual heritage of historic peoples, a decent regard for the truth above the falsehoods of hate as the basis for fair relations, the freedom of the human mind as the creative source of progress, and the dignity of the individual and the moral antonomy and enterprise of the human spirit as the basis of enduring freedom and reform in this crucial age.

In the womb of the mid-twentieth century are a-borning the ideological, economic, social, political, scientific-atomic-cosmic, and spiritual forces which mayhap determine the destinies of peoples for generations. The modern economic framework of production and communication, which encompasses the earth with its dynamic power, catches up ideas, depressions and wars anywhere and involves, and sometimes engulfs, peoples everywhere.

Dictatorships have risen through and for the concentration under one central political control of the police state all the powers of production and communication (1) for its mastery over the bodies and minds, the work and life, the hopes and the spirits of the people; (2) for the subjugation of the free peoples; and (3) for the domination of all the peoples of the earth.

The spiritual heritage of a great past and the humane hopes for a freer and better world in the west and the east are both now in peril. In two hemispheres the peoples, with both despair and hope, look from the background of centuries gone into the years ahead pregnant with war or peace, freedom or slavery for hundreds of millions of people across the earth. The world-wide crusade for freedom and peace must climb from the valleys of weakness and fear into the hills of courage and power.

In the midst of the global gloom of the closing days of 1950 Christmas came with its ray of hope in a darkening world. Nearly 2,000 years ago a Child was born in a lowly manger in a little country in Asia near the sea which yet joins with hope the east and west. Glad tidings came in the darkness before the dawn. With the Child was born the hope of peace on earth and good will toward men. The Child became a man and lived and died for the brotherhood of all men and the fatherhood of one God. Jesus and the prophets and saints, east and west, taught the Golden Rule and human brotherhood: one God, one family, and one world of freedom, justice, peace and good will among men, unfulfilled to this hour.

I. THE YEARNINGS OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE

1. In the United States: In the United States today the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people on farms, in factories, stores, mines, and upon the seas, the people in cities, towns, villages, and the countryside, in schools and churches, want peace. They would have peace, they are sure, if only the cruel dictators of the Soviet Union would stop their aggressive tyranny and let the people have peace.

2. In the Soviet Union: In the Soviet Union, the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters, who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people on farms, in factories, stores, mines and upon the seas, in cities, towns, villages, and the countryside, want peace. They would have peace, they have been led to believe, if only the Fascist warmongers in the United States would let the people have peace.

3. In other nations: In other nations of the earth the mothers and fathers in homes, the sons and daughters who dream their youthful dreams of homes of their own, the people everywhere as they work and love, dream and hope, want peace. They would have peace, hundreds of millions of them believe, if only the Soviet Union and the United States would let the people have peace.

4. The people of all colors and creeds, races, and regions: The yellow, brown, red, black and white peoples want peace. The Buddhists, Hindus, Confucianists, Shintoists, Moslems, Jews, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Protestants, believers and unbelievers, want peace. The people of North and South America, Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia and the islands of the oceans and seas, want peace. All the peoples of the earth, who in this generation, have suffered through a world war, a world depression and another world war, yearn and pray for freedom and security, justice, and peace.

II. THE UNIVERSAL YEARNING OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE CONFRONTED WITH THE HIGH POTENTIALS OF THE WORLD FOR WAR

Against this time for universal good will, in the face of the universal desire of the peoples for peace, and despite the unresting efforts of the Government of the United States and other governments, the nations are confronted with dictatorship, imperialism and aggression.

1. The ways of dictatorship: The Communist dictatorship has made war on religion, subjugated the freedom of the mind, the freedom of representation in parliaments, the freedom of association in churches, corporations, labor unions, cooperative societies, fraternal and civic organizations, has broken treaties; blocked the unification of Germany and Korea; subjugated by methods of the police state nine nations and parts of two nations; sought to sabotage the recovery of Southern and Western European nations; stripped Manchuria, poisoned the minds of hundreds of millions of people with falsehoods and hate; crushed the freedom to struggle for freedom; enslaved increasingly more millions of people in enforced bondage than were ever held in slavery at any time in history; segregated 200,000,000 people behind the iron curtain; vetoed the international control and inspection of atomic power; blocked the international efforts and procedures of the United Nations for peace; and has gone far in a program of aggression and imperialism for the domination of the world.

2. The ways of freedom: With all its unfair but decreasing discriminations, injustices, failures, and frustrations of freedom and democracy, the United States has preserved the freedom of religion, the freedom of the mind, and the freedom of association; has advanced the freedom to struggle for freedom by which more millions of Negroes in the last 85 years in the United States have made more progress than any like number of people in any like time in modern history, revealing, against many handicaps, the innate capacities of a great people for self-development in an advancing democracy; liberated the Philippines; has, against both the Dutch and Communist imperialists, thrown its weight on the side of the independence and freedom of the 70,000,000 Indonesian people; has, against both the French and Communist imperialists, favored the autonomy of the Indochinese people; has favored the self-determination of peoples in Israel and the Near East, in Southern Asia, Korea, West Germany, Northern and Western Europe, and Great Britain; offered to give up its then monopoly of atomic power for international control and inspection; helped to facilitate the procedures and cooperated with the purposes of the United Nations against aggression as the best hope of freedom and peace in the world.

3. No appeasement of aggression: Standing on the brink of the abyss of another possible world war between dictatorship which, with all its pretenses, would crush the freedom to struggle for freedom, and the democracies, which, with all their faults, would preserve the freedom to struggle for freedom, some free nations are still torn by the opposite pulls of appeasement and resistance to aggression. In the present complex world situation resistance to aggression in Korea or anywhere may lead to global war. Appeasement of aggression leads no less surely and even more disastrously into another world war.

Not backward from a Dunkerque to a Munich, but forward. In resisting aggression in Korea the United Nations risked the military disaster of a Dunkerque to avoid the moral disaster of a Munich. If the recently victorious United Nations forces should be driven off the peninsula, the way would not be backward to Munich but forward with the United Nations for the ultimate triumph of freedom, self-determination of all peoples, justice and peace under the laws rather than by the wars of nations. In the present situation, whether we appease or resist, drift or plunge, or stand aside in isolation, the world potentials are so heavily charged that a local spark may become a global conflagration.

In the global dilemma of the universal yearnings of the people for peace and the high potentials of the world for war, it is only through heroic efforts of the Government of the United States in cooperation with the other governments of the United Nations, persistent against great odds, that a way may be found to make effective the people's passion for peace against the aggressors' will for war.

The free peoples must stand resolutely together against appeasement of aggressions and any surrender to the universal domination of a world totalitarian state.

III. MEANTIME, MOBILIZATION OF THE FREE WORLD FOR COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE OF HUMAN FREEDOM

Meantime, the United States, and all the nations of the free world, East and West, must mobilize their economic, military, scientific, democratic, human and spiritual resources for the cooperative self-defense of their democratic existence and the self-determination of peoples. Denunciations, armaments, plans, and pacts—essential as they are—are not enough. The American people, in democratic and moral answer to fascism and communism, must relentlessly keep up the struggle against imperialism, privilege, monopoly, and discriminations, and take the next step toward fulfillment of our American dream and our spiritual hopes for the freedom and equal opportunity for all people in a free and federated world.

The free peoples must stand together in defense of their commitments to the freedom of the human mind, the dignity of the human being, and the moral autonomy of the human spirit against a monstrous tyranny which seeks to subjugate all peoples in the expanding dominions of a world police state.

IV. THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

In such a complex and desperate situation, where may the people of the earth look for the implementation of their universal aspiration for peace? Not to the capital of any one or two nations. That way alone is the isolated way to war. Rather to the capital of all the nations. The way of international cooperation is the only way to enduring peace. The only international agency available for the balanced information and action of the peoples of all nations is the United Nations. With all its failures and frustrations, with all the need for amendment to its Charter for a federated world, the peoples of the earth still look in hope to the United Nations dedicated by the noble principles of its Charter to stopping aggression, preventing war, promoting freedom, and maintaining peace in the world.

1. The General Assembly is the only world forum of all the nations:

More democratically and organically the people now look to the General Assembly with new hope in the recently and overwhelmingly adopted procedures for uniting for peace. In the General Assembly are represented 60 nations which include the overwhelming majority of the people of the continents and islands of the earth by their own self-determination.

In the midst of the almost unsolvable dilemmas on the edge of a world catastrophe, whose burdens are now heroically borne by the statesmen of the free world, time does not wait for amendments to the Charter, for stronger ways, better days, more democratic governments, or nobler people. To amend the Charter the United Nations must now save the Charter and itself from destruction. To become more democratic the people must save the freedom to be a democracy. Freedom and democracy begin at home but without resistance to the aggression and tyranny of the totalitarian police state, freedom and democracy would have no home in which to grow. The people of the world, as imperfect as we all are in our human and inhuman ways, are the only people available in this fearful time. Now and soon is the only time left. The General Assembly is the only world forum of all the nations. The Assembly of the delegates from 60 nations is the most representative of the organs of the United Nations. It is not subject to the veto in its own jurisdiction. It is the only agency in existence in this confused and yet hopeful world which has a chance of enlisting the attention of most of the peoples of the earth for making effective their hopes for peace.

2. A majority vote of the Security Council on a procedural matter not subject to the veto can lift the dispute from the Council agenda and free the Assembly to make recommendations:

It is recognized that, in accordance with article 12 of the Charter, the General Assembly cannot make a recommendation concerning any matter on the agenda of the Security Council. Nevertheless, since putting a dispute on the agenda of the Council is a procedural matter not subject to the veto, a majority vote of the Council can remove a matter from the Council's agenda and thus make it a matter regarding which the Assembly can make recommendations.

Now is the time and the General Assembly is the agency to make findings and recommendations for the principles and procedures

toward the settlement of a crucial dispute. This further attempt to settle this dispute is another effort to prevent a total global war, which would engulf the peoples of the world in the killing of scores of millions of people across the earth and the fateful destruction of the civilization accumulated from all ages and inherited from all peoples. As a starting point of the discussions for settlement of the dispute in Korea, the Renville principles themselves suggest their own applicability to the Korean dispute.

V. THE RENVILLE PRINCIPLES

The Renville principles already approved by the United Nations in the Indonesian situation are a possible starting point for the consideration of principles and procedures for the Korean situation.

The Renville principles are substantially the following: (1) Military provisions for cease fire, a truce, a demarcation line, demilitarized zones on both sides of the line, and the withdrawal by stages of all non-Korean armed forces under the supervision of the United Nations; and (2) political principles with provision for internal security, civil liberties, free trade, transportation, communication, economic rehabilitation, plebiscites or other forms of free elections, and convention of delegates elected on the basis of population, for framing a constitution for a free, independent, and united Korean nation under the supervision of the United Nations for the self-determination of all the Korean people and their admission as an independent member nation into the United Nations.

These Renville principles and procedures, modified and adapted to meet the Korean situation, could be the ways and means of substituting ballots for bullets and of substituting law and the self-determination of peoples for war and the self-extermination of peoples.

VI. THE REJECTION OF FAIR PRINCIPLES AND OPEN PROCEDURES FOR THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES WOULD REVEAL TO THE PEOPLES OF THE EARTH THE DESIGNS OF DICTATORS FOR AGGRESSION AND WORLD DOMINATION

If, in the face of the publication of the findings and recommendations for the truce and the principles and procedures for the settlement of the international dispute, any nation—and specifically the dictatorship behind the puppet government which refuses substantially to accept them but determines heedlessly to go on its way of defiance, aggression, and war—would thereby make its position of recalcitrance and aggression dramatically known to the great majority of the peoples of the earth. Above the false propaganda of dictators and beyond the reasonable question of free peoples, such a position would make clear which government is recklessly bent upon aggression and war for the domination of the world. Any such government, in flagrant disregard of the yearnings of the people for peace and in rejection of the recommendations of the only existing international agency based on full and open discussions in the only world forum, brands itself as an outlaw before the judgment bar of mankind. Such an outlaw nation, exposed before the world, would have to take the consequences of the combined economic, political, military, and moral self-defense of a free world in carrying out the principles and purposes of the United Nations as the best hope of fulfilling the yearnings and prayers of the peoples for freedom, justice, and peace under law.

While some wait for universal disarmament, a limited world federal government, world law, and a world police force, for the prevention of aggression and war, there must be mustered now on the side of human freedom against aggression not only more people and more bombs but also a greater faith. In the moral potentials of the United Nations fully utilized is more ultimate power than in the explosive force of atomic bombs.

The muster of the effective power of the General Assembly for human freedom and the self-determination of peoples might prevent war and thereby avoid the use of atomic bombs against aggression. The world's potentials for war and self-destruction of peoples must be brought under the control of the United Nations' potentials for peace and the abundant production by peoples. To the large executive power and influence of the Security Council, presently subject to the paralysis of the veto, must be added more promptly and effectively the moral power of the General Assembly of all the nations, which can, without a veto, make recommendations to the Security Council and to member nations—with the peoples of the world looking on with their hopes and listening in with their great moral power.

The yearnings and prayers of the peoples for freedom and peace are universal. The potentials for war and self-destruction are world-wide.

The time to save freedom and peace is desperately late. The only agency which can now possibly express and muster the moral power of mankind for freedom and hope and peace is the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The peoples of the world, under God, to save themselves and their civilization, shall have a rebirth of freedom and faith in the effective power of the moral opinion of mankind, mobilized by the General Assembly of the nations of the earth against tyranny, aggression, and war.

VII. THE ULTIMATE TRIUMPH OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE MORAL LAW THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION BY WHICH DICTATORS MUST FALL, EMPIRES CRUMBLE, AGGRESSION FAILS AND FREEDOM PREVAILS IN GOD'S GOOD TIME

Undergirding the power of the free world and the principles of the United Nations would be the universal yearnings of the peoples of the earth for peace and the world-wide assertion, through the General Assembly, of the moral sovereignty in the minds and hearts of the peoples as a part of the structure of God's universe. False propaganda in the face of the truth will eventually become as chaff which the wind driveth away. All peoples will yet rise in self-determination through the knowledge of the truth which will make them free. The light of liberty will yet shine through the iron curtain of men's minds. The warmth of human brotherhood will yet melt away the iron curtain of men's hearts. The people's hopes for freedom and peace still fly their flags high in the Western World and across the eastern seas. Against the ultimate sovereignty of the moral law which runs through the universe, the history of nations, and the minds and hearts of the people who pray for freedom, justice, and peace, empires will crumble, dictators fall, and aggressors make war no more.

THE BIRTH OF THE CHILD

With the birth of the Child the idea of the fatherhood of one God, the ultimate sovereignty of the moral law, and the brotherhood of all men, became flesh in Jesus, Son of God, Brother of Men, Scourge of Wrong, and Prince of Peace. He was Son of man who had not where to lay His head, lived among men, ministered to the poor in body and sick of heart, was crucified and rose again in redemptive and spiritual power to resist aggression, tyranny, and injustice, and to bring peace and brotherhood on earth in the great adventure of the human spirit in our earthly pilgrimage toward the kingdom of God.

Charles E. Wilson, Director of Office of Defense Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, when Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, testified before the Committee on Small Business, I was happy to be able to tell him that I had had at least a dozen messages from businessmen from all over the country telling me that his appointment, in their opinion, was the finest appointment the President could have made to the great and heavy responsibilities which he has assumed over the economy. The President is often lambasted for his appointments, but now I think we should pay tribute to him for the unusual men who appeared before the Small Business Committee yesterday, including Gen. William H. Harrison, Mr. Jess Larson, and Mr. John D. Small. We should also congratulate these men on the patriotism which prompted them to accept their tough positions.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilson's testimony before the committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I believe that all Members of Congress will be interested in this foreshadowing of what lies ahead. In the question period after his prepared testimony, I discussed with Mr. Wilson his closing paragraph. Unhappily thousands of businessmen are now faced with annihiliation because of material shortages. Mr. Wilson agreed that allocations are urgent, and, as with wage and price controls, must be enforced at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Wilson sounded a cheering note for small independent businesses who are "on the ball vigorously seeking business." He said that such businesses "got it," and pointed out that regardless of the size of the vessel, "cream comes to the top." This is the theme which I struck in Bridgeport in the first clinic sponsored by the Small Business Committee for small independent businessmen held last July 17, 1950. The problem of government is not to pamper and spoon-feed the manufacturer, regardless of his size, but to assist those with ability and enterprise to bring to the war effort their creative talents and capacities. Mr. Wilson pointed out the needs for sales skills, as well as engineering and production skills. When he said this, I think he must have been mindful of those thousands of Connecticut independent manufacturers among whom he lived as one of the leading citizens of Bridgeport for some 10 years prior to his appointment as President of the General Electric Co., when he was in charge of the great General Electric operations centered in Bridgeport.

I have suggested to the Small Business Committee an expansion of the small-business clinics, and I plan to work out such clinics once more in Connecticut in April. I suggest that those Members of Congress who come from manufacturing States, and who have not taken advantage of this idea developed by the Small Business Committee, should investigate it at once.

There being no objection, the testimony of Mr. Wilson was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. E. WILSON'S TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss some of the problems small business faces in the defense effort.

As you know there are certain basic factors inherent in such an effort. Among these are time, integration, and expansion. Clearly, we must achieve our defense requirements as quickly as possible. We must, within a minimum period integrate our production resources, both large and small, into the defense effort. While this program is being carried forward we must expand our productive facilities thereby increasing our defense potential and at the same time decreasing the strain upon our civilian economy.

In any accelerated defense program there is, unfortunately, a time lag in some instances between the curtailment of civilian production and conversion to defense production. In an already tight economy stockpiling and production for defense must have first call on materials needed to combat the threat of foreign aggression. To assure our military requirements, it is necessary to curtail the use of scarce materials and provide a system of priorities and allocations. An unfortunate result of this in the early stages is hardship to some individuals. On an overall basis hardship cases decrease with the increase of defense contracts at work in the economy. We are particularly aware of this problem and are moving as promptly as possible so that dislocations may be held to a minimum. The individual hardship cases, however, are a matter for consideration by the particular operating agencies.

In this connection it might be helpful if I briefly describe the present organization which has been set up to carry forward our defense efforts.

As you know the Office of Defense Mobilization was created within the Executive Office of the President. The Director of that Office is charged with the duty, on behalf of the President, to direct, control, and coordinate all mobilization efforts. These include production, procurement, manpower, food, transport activities, maintenance of a sound economy, and foreign aid. In discharging these functions the Director is assisted by an advisory board known as the Defense Mobilization Board. The membership of this Board includes the heads of various executive departments and agencies having responsibilities connected with the national defense.

The Office of Defense Mobilization does not perform any operating functions. Its job is to determine over-all policies and to coordinate the activities and programs of the mobilization effort. It is our duty to keep the machinery of defense mobilization running smoothly.

The Defense Production Administration is the programing agency for the production phase of the program. It will perform functions incident to the determination of production programs required to meet defense needs and will establish procedures to accomplish such programs. In this connection the Administrator secures the production plans of all agencies and estimates manpower requirements to meet them. He is charged with responsibility concerning the expansion of productive facilities and it is only upon his authorization that the General Services Administration can make purchases to promote expansion of productive capacity and supply. He also is the certifying authority for tax amortization for emergency facilities.

In connection with expansion, the Defense Production Administrator is responsible for the direct loan program under which loans may be made to private business enterprises for the expansion of capacity, the development of technological processes or the production of essential materials. Under the provisions of the Defense Production Act this program is limited to those cases in which financial assistance is not otherwise available. I believe that to the extent possible these direct loans should be utilized to integrate small businesses into the production effort and therefore applications from small business will receive careful consideration.

Insofar as food is concerned, the Defense Production Administrator determines with the Secretary of Agriculture how the available supply is to be divided between industrial and other uses. In the event of any differences between these agencies the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization will make the final decision.

In addition this organizational arrangement separates programing and operating procedures over priorities and allocations. The Defense Production Administrator will determine the over-all production priorities and will decide when curtailment of civilian production is necessary. The priorities and allocations orders, however, will continue to be issued by the various operating agencies subject to the direction and approval of the Administrator. Thus, the Secretary of Interior will continue to have jurisdiction over petroleum, gas, solid fuels, and electric power. Any problem the public may have concerning these materials should be taken up with the appropriate agency within the office of the Secretary of Interior. These agencies are the Petroleum Administration for Defense, the Defense Minerals Administration, the Defense Solid Fuels Administration, and the Defense Power Administration. With respect to food and food facilities the Secretary of Agriculture has assigned the operating functions within his Department to the Production and Marketing Administration. Insofar as transportation is concerned, such matters are handled by the Defense Transport Administration.

The Secretary of Commerce is responsible for all other materials. In order to discharge this responsibility, he has established in the Department of Commerce the National Production Authority, which has within it an Industry Operations Bureau with industry divisions. Applications for adjustment in individual hardship cases are handled initially by the particular industry divisions within the Industry Operations Bureau. You will notice that the various orders of NPA contain a statement to the effect that any person affected by the order may file an application for an adjustment or exception on the ground of extreme hardship, or that enforcement of the order against him would not be in the interest of the national defense program. To aid in meeting the problems of small business, a small-business office has been established in NPA.

In the procurement field the responsibility of the Office of Defense Mobilization relates to general policies and coordination among the procurement agencies so that, among other things, the demand for raw materials may be channeled, the maximum use of tools and machines attained, and definitive supply and requirements estimates procured. Although the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Defense Production Administration are directly concerned with procurement policies and programs, the actual contracting is done by the Defense Department and the procurement agencies of the Government. For the present any problems of this type should be taken up with the appropriate procurement agency.

The Economic Stabilization Agency handles price control and wage stabilization. When such controls are imposed there may be individual instances requiring adjustment. As the Agency is establishing procedures to handle these matters, any problems concerning them should be referred there.

The Congress, in the Defense Production Act of 1950, has expressed its concern over the difficulties that may face small business in the mobilization effort. In section 701 it has specifically stated that "It is the sense of the Congress that small-business enterprises be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act." In order to carry out this policy, it has provided that information concerning the activities of the various agencies under the act shall be made available to small-business enterprises. It has also provided for representation by small- and medium-sized businesses on industry advisory committees; for the establishment of procedures so that small business may receive such exemptions from the act as may be feasible, and for the expeditious handling of all requests, applications, or appeals from small business.

You may be sure that we are making every effort to carry out this legislative intent. Through arrangements with the Secretary of Commerce any citizen can procure from any one of more than five thousand offices throughout the country cooperating with the Department of Commerce and the Government purchasing agencies information regarding Government procurement. These offices comprise local chambers of commerce and civic groups The purpose of this wide dissemination is to give small business every opportunity to participate in the defense effort. Specifically it includes a daily report of practically all proposed Government purchasing through competitive bids. With respect to negotiated contracts these agencies have available a weekly report showing the prime unclassified contracts awarded. The report, which lists the items, quantities, and contractors, is disseminated so that the small-business man may solicit subcontracts for components. In this connection the information office also advises him of the facts he should supply a prime contractor when seeking a subcontract.

I believe that small business must be given every opportunity to participate in the defense program. True, some small-business enterprises may not be able to underbid large firms or in some instances only a large manufacturer may be able to supply the needed quantities. In such situations, however, the prime contractor is being encouraged to subcontract. The Secretary of Defense is of the same view and has issued a statement of policy to the effect that in procurement the military departments should pay particular attention to:

(d) The fullest possible use of small-business concerns.

(e) The utilization in negotiation of competitive and multiple awards, whenever possible.

(f) The aggressive encouragement or requirement of subcontracting by prime contractors.

I heartily agree with these principles and propose to see them carried out to the fullest extent possible.

With respect to the advisory committees I plan to assign the Defense Production Administration the responsibility of coordinating the utilization of such committees by the various agencies so that there will no longer be overlapping committees from particular industries. I shall also request the Administrator to prepare, insofar as possible, uniform procedures for representation on and use of advisory committees. In this request I shall specifically ask him to consult with the Attorney General and the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission concerning those problems.

Provision has also been made for exemption for hardship cases and some of the metals orders contain specific exemptions for small business. There is no doubt that special provision should be made for expeditious handling of all requests, applications, and the like whether they be from small business or any other segment of the public.

One of the main problems concerning small business is integration into the mobilization effort. In my opinion we can accomplish this in several ways. Among these is the direct loan program through which we can assist and encourage small business to convert to defense production and, if necessary, expand productive facilities. In undertaking such a program we must, of course, see to it that small business receives its fair share of prime contracts. In those instances where this may not be possible, we must continually encourage subcontracting to smaller enterprises. Then, too, efforts can be made toward pooling of manufacturing resources by smaller manufacturers in order to handle prime contracts. Although this is not specifically mentioned in the law, I believe that within the scope of section 708 of the Defense Production Act governmental agencies may under appropriate conditions enter into voluntary agreements for so-called production pools.

These then are but a few of the efforts which should be made to carry out the legislative intent of the Congress concerning the contribution of small business toward accomplishing the purposes of the act. In order to insure the implementation of this policy, I am directing the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration to lend encouragement and support to small business through the Small Business Office of the National Production Authority. It will be their duty to determine methods and set up procedures by which small-business enterprises can be integrated into the defense effort. In this connection all the agencies having operating functions in the mobilization program would be requested to adhere to these principles in the issuance of orders curtailing production or use of materials by business enterprises with a view to insuring that small-business concerns will not be disproportionately affected by such orders. Moreover, I believe that the other small-business programs such as direct loans for small business, assurance of equitable treatment in the issuance of prime contracts and the encouragement of subcontracting can be appropriately centered in this official.

Undoubtedly the steps which have been taken so far with regard to this problem are in the right direction. There are many advantages in centering this activity in one office. Not only does it allow for realistic study and programing but it also gives the small-business man a central office to which he can appeal for expeditious action.

President Truman, in his state of the Union message, pointed out that our program calls for increased "capacity to produce and to keep our economy strong for the long pull." This phase of the program is essential to meet the threat of Communist aggression. As a part of this program we must have vigorous small-business enterprises capable of participating in a united effort for defense. The more effective and energetic these enterprises are the stronger our economy will be.

I appreciate that once a business disbands it is practically impossible to recreate it. The engineering skills, the labor force, and the management are soon dissipated. Such losses are detrimental to our economy and steps must be taken to avoid them. In the administration of the mobilization effort we shall make every effort to keep such casualties to a minimum.

Final Peace Rests on Espousal of Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the article Final Peace Rests on Espousal of Christianity. Mr. Paul E. Belcher is one of Akron, Ohio's, most prominent citizens. Although he is of the opposite party of that which I am a member, my observations of the past have proved to me that neither party has a monopoly on stupidity or intelligence. I will appreciate your comment regarding the article which follows:

[From the Akron (Ohio) Business Analysis of January 15, 1951]

FINAL PEACE RESTS ON ESPOUSAL OF CHRISTIANITY

(By Paul E. Belcher)

The concept of armed isolation for the Americas has received increasing attention during the last few months. The idea has different meanings for different people. Some would only avoid future involvement on the mainland of Asia. Others would include all of continental Europe in the ban as well. There are those who would abandon all territory they believe to be indefensible, but no more. Still others would return immediately to our side of the protecting oceans, here to construct an invincible continental fortress, if that is possible.

Last June our Government was confronted with the necessity of choosing a line in the Orient on which the spread of communism would be resisted. For better or for worse, that choice was then made. Some modification in its details may have been, or yet may be, impelled by our experiences in Korea. But otherwise the die there has been cast.

More recently, tentative lines must have been officially affirmed for Europe. Amendments in these lines may be forced upon us by future developments, the fortunes of war, or irresistible logic. Nevertheless, the overall pattern of this phase of our foreign policy would now appear to be fairly fixed as to Europe. It has already been implemented by the selection of General Eisenhower as supreme commander and by sending additional American troops to Europe.

Originally, we had two choices available to us. They represented the extreme viewpoints. We might have retired to our own shores. Had we done so, our problems and costs would have been one thing. Instead, we elected to make our stand as far away from home as was then possible. In consequence, our logistics, foreign commitments, economic requirements, costs, taxes, and everything else will be quite another matter.

Each possibility held out its group of advantages. Neither was devoid of risks and detriments. A decision between them involved selecting positions offering the most benefits and the least evils. The national interest, and only the national interest, as seen by men in authority, was determinative of the issue. So it must ever be.

If world war III is eventually inevitable, several fundamental questions must be resolved. For instance, where shall the battle fronts be initially established? We invite them to be on or close to this continent by permitting the Communists to absorb the rest of the world. We keep them as far away from home as we can by attempting to draw our battle lines first in distant lands.

Shall we make it as easy or as tough as possible for the enemy to bomb America? Obviously, the greater the distance between their bases and our strategic centers, the more difficult their bombing missions become. By the same token, the greater the opportunity we give ourselves for successful interception of their efforts. In any event, we are likely to suffer bomb damage when the next war is fought.

Shall we add to our problems of successfully destroying the enemy's cities, factories, and other essential concentrations? Certainly not if we can help ourselves. Yet the farther these targets are from our airfields, the more difficult our bombing assignments will become. That we would forego this kind of attack is senseless.

If Communist nations must be occupied by our ground forces to stop their aggrandizement—and how else can it be done—from what point should we undertake that job? It would seem that the less territory we had to conquer before we reached the heart of our opposition, the better off we would be. The risk of being pushed back or out is an accompanying military gamble.

Shall we rely solely upon our own manpower for the forces with which to fight Russia or shall we also use the manpower of other nations to the fullest extent possible? The latter expectation becomes impossible of achievement if foreign populations on which we might draw are permitted to fall under the domination of the Reds. The 150,000,000 people of the United States should array themselves alone against the Communist hordes only as a last resort.

Now it may be argued that world war III is not inevitable and, hence, that none of the foregoing questions is pertinent. True, indeed, but who, in the light of world events of the present and the immediate past, wants to run that risk? We ought to seek diligently and long for acceptable peaceful solutions of the world's problems. We must never forget that a single dictator can start a war.

The hope of ultimate peace rests on the espousal of the precepts of Christianity by all peoples. So long as national leaders and the masses from which they spring regard human life as freely expendable, the individual as nothing, might as right, morals and ethics as weaknesses, the means to every end as immaterial, solemn commitments as voidable, liberty and justice as meaningless—just so long will the threat of war becloud this earth. The work of the ministry is not yet finished.

Perhaps the Communists would not overrun the lands we were unwilling to defend. Perhaps, but history indicates quite the contrary. Not once have they failed to absorb every country they could conveniently swallow. They are not likely to change their ways at our request. A more reasonable assumption would be that they might seize all of Asia and Europe despite everything we have time to do.

Some would not undertake anything we haven't, or think we haven't, the strength to do if challenged. Appeasement readily springs from this philosophy. Nothing was ever accomplished on its foundation. Such a show of weakness invites disaster. The Kremlin understands nothing except force. The A-bomb is still the most potent force yet harnessed by man, and we have it.

Every people should certainly aid in its own defense. Each ought to have a supreme interest in that endeavor. A people's contribution to that cause, its will to fight, its unity with others similarly engaged, the training of its personnel, and the adequacy of its matériel are all essential to success. Our own national interest could well dictate that we assist in this effort of others beyond

ordinary limits, even perhaps, in the face of possible early military reverses.

There is no assurance in the impregnability of any part of this globe. Powerful air and sea arms with isolation might be enough to save us and then, again, they may not be. We have no exclusive right or ability to construct the implements of conflict. Many wars have been commenced against nations fully armed. Seldom have any of them ended in a draw. Less than a rounded preparation for possible war in every sphere with every conceivable weapon hardly seems appropriate to present exigencies.

Regardless of where we establish our lines of resistance, the economic cost of the period ahead will be truly astronomical. To be sure, the cost of preparation for any particular defense will differ from that of any other. No one can accurately measure any of these costs in advance. We may be eventually bankrupted by the effort we must make but that effort must still be made. No cost could possibly equal the cost of ultimate defeat.

The underlying motive of all we shall do is the national interest. Naturally, each of us has his own opinion of what that is, from time to time, and how it can best be served. Those opinions should be expressed and discussed. They will be diverse, however, even when predicated on identical understandings of the facts. Yet some particular policy must always be determined and followed.

Responsibility for all determinations of policy rests finally upon the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Both branches of Congress must frequently act. Every decision will not be right and many cannot be hedged. Once a course is laid out, its alternatives will usually be over the dam. But right or wrong, our salvation depends on carrying out all decisions made in the national interest with singleness of purpose. Note well what has happened to every people who disregarded this requisite to their continued freedom.

NO WAY OF AVOIDING INFLATION

The Economic Stabilization Agency has a tough job before it. Over-all prices have not been effectively frozen by the Government. Certain automobile companies have caught it in the neck because the administration was piqued. Gradually, mandatory price ceilings will be established over the principal components of war goods. Similar treatment will be accorded many items comprising the basic costs of living. Eventually everything may be covered. But practically everything is presently subject to voluntary controls.

That really means that each seller whose product or service is exempt from mandatory controls must judge for himself what he will do about his selling prices. Each knows pretty well what the Government wants. He has his conscience to deal with. His sense of patriotism must be satisfied. The threat of eventual controls, either with or without price roll-backs, constantly impends. These deterrents are often powerful but seldom compelling over long periods.

In spite of them, uncontrolled prices will climb. The volume of money prevented from entering the legitimate markets for goods under control—for lack of enough such goods to absorb all of that money—will compete for goods available for purchase outside those limitations. Here, the law of supply and demand will operate under the sole restraints of an honor system. A considerable variety of goods and services may be had on these markets for months to come.

Existing law does not authorize the Government to clamp fixed price ceilings on everything. The prices of farm products may be tied, at best, to prices farmers pay—parity—or to agricultural price peaks during the month preceding June 25, whichever is higher. Such items as real estate, professional fees, utility rates, insurance premiums, the publishing business, and others are specifically exempted from price control by and under the Defense Production Act of 1950. Of course, Congress could eliminate parity and extend the price control law to every present exemption.

The President could, and in due time undoubtedly will, impose price ceilings where he has not yet seen fit to do so. However, even when these events occur, human behavior will still interpose a serious impediment to the control of real prices. The natural laws of economics cannot be legislated out of existence.

Prices represent the exchange values of goods and services. Fixing those values in dollars and cents freezes real prices only if the composition and quality of goods and services remain unaltered. In practice, composition frequently changes and quality tends to deteriorate. This rule is not universally applicable but it usually obtains. To the extent that it does, real prices rise. Inflation then occurs in concealed form.

Substitutes must now be found for materials the civilian use of which has been curtailed. Regardless of the cost of the substitutes, no one claims that they are, in every respect, as desirable as the originals. Their use is dictated by the exigencies of our times. Products superficially resembling previous models and intended to satisfy identical needs come into being. This is especially true where price rollbacks have been invoked. Defense period models sell at prices in excess of what they would have brought if offered for sale in competition with goods they replace. Thus, despite price controls, do prices indirectly increase through decline in the composition of goods.

The war effort transfers much skilled help to war industries. The Armed Forces acquire a lot more of it. Replacement workers in civilian industries cannot be expected to put out products of the same quality as highly trained labor could have done. Rarely do they actually do so. Yet this fact is not reflected in price reductions. We continue to pay ceiling prices for the best products available. Prices just are not frozen, in reality, by the mere process of stating fixed figures on the price tags.

Price limitations in the face of excess money and credit produce black markets. These markets flourish because human nature tries to satisfy its wants whenever and wherever possible. The fact that such markets are illegal and that punishment may be visited upon those caught dealing in them adds its premium to the prices that would prevail in them if such markets were merely gray. Whatever is paid for goods and services on the black markets serves to increase the real level of prices regardless of the apparent readings of official price indexes.

This discussion should not be construed as an argument against price controls. Nor is it intended to make the Government's problems any more difficult of solution than they are. The control of prices is no simple undertaking. It has its limitations. It cannot accomplish the impossible. This is especially true of voluntary price control. The public should thoroughly realize the economics involved. The very strictest of Government price controls may postpone and conceal the immediate effects of inflation but it cannot stop inflation.

The Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of a remarkable letter from Gen. Lucius D. Clay, national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom. This is a report of what the people themselves can do when they recognize the urgency of a problem. Here is a concrete effort by the people to penetrate behind the iron curtain.

Of the $1,288,000 received in contributions for this Crusade, the great bulk came from persons who contributed a dollar or less. The people are developing an increasing awareness of the need to penetrate the iron curtain with truth and the principles of democracy and freedom.

The Russians called the Freedom Bell the "bell of death." This is a typical distortion of the Soviet propagandists.

General Clay's Crusade for Freedom is a two-way inspiration. We in Congress should encourage the citizens of this country to dedicate themselves to this purpose, and, conversely, I feel the people of America should urge the Government to dedicate itself to a similar purpose.

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

EMPIRE STATE BUILDING,
New York, N. Y., December 22, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: Although some contributions and signatures continue to be received at national headquarters, the results of the Crusade for Freedom campaign are now substantially in. The number of signatures of Americans on the Freedom Scroll has passed the 15,000,000 mark—15,507,877. Breakdown by States is attached.

Total contributions amount to $1,288,000. With only a few gifts of over $1,000—largest gift was $2,500—the great bulk of this total came from small contributions of under $1.

I think we can all take just pride in this accomplishment.

Since all expenses of conducting the campaign were met from a special contribution to the National Committee for a Free Europe, the entire amount contributed by the public is now being used for the purposes intended—namely, the expansion of the operations of Radio Free Europe.

As you know, Radio Free Europe began broadcasting to the satellite countries on July 4, 1950, over a 7,500-watt short-wave transmitter located near Frankfurt, Germany. It now has under construction in Munich a powerful medium-wave transmitter, which should be on the air by late winter. It also has on order eight additional transmitters—thanks, in no small measure, to the support of the American public in the Crusade for Freedom drive.

There is no way, of course, in which we can accurately estimate the intangible values of the Crusade. The presence of nearly half a million Berliners at the Freedom Bell dedication ceremonies—100,000 of them from the Soviet sector—gives us more than a hint of what it meant, in terms of hope and encouragement, to those behind the iron curtain. High Commissioner John McCloy expressed his feeling that the event was comparable to the airlift in its effect upon the morale and confidence of the German people.

Without question, also, the campaign served to strengthen our own peoples' basic understanding and appreciation of the freedoms we enjoy.

It is my personal belief that recent world events make an intensified effort in this field of idea warfare even more important. We must build up our strength in this psychological field just as we are doing mili-

tarily and economically—in order that we can meet and turn back the menace of world Communist aggression. Speed is of the utmost importance. If we are able to do these things fast enough, we may be able to avoid full-scale war. The next 2½ to 3 years, in my opinion, will tell the story.

With respect to the future, a meeting of the executive committee of the Crusade was held on December 4. The organization has been incorporated and a committee is at work studying all of the ideas for a continuing program that have been sent in from the field. Our tentative ideas for 1951 will be forwarded for your comment in the next few weeks.

With deep appreciation and every good wish for the holiday season.

Sincerely,

LUCIUS D. CLAY,
National Chairman,
Crusade for Freedom.

FIFTEEN MILLION AMERICANS JOIN FREEDOM CRUSADE—CONTRIBUTE $1,288,000 TO RADIO FREE EUROPE

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Gen. Lucius D. Clay, national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, today made public the results of the recent Crusade for Freedom campaign.

Although contributions and signatures are still continuing to come in to national headquarters in the Empire State Building, Clay announced that the number of signatures of Americans on the Freedom Scroll have passed the 15,000,000 mark (breakdown by States attached) and that total contributions exceed $1,288,000.

"I wish to thank, most sincerely, the thousands of Crusade workers throughout the country who have made this accomplishment possible," Clay said in a letter to field chairmen.

"Radio Moscow sneered that the American public was being forced to pay to join the Crusade. All contributions, of course, were completely voluntary. The great bulk of the total came from small contributions of under $1. Since all campaign expenses were met from a special contribution to the National Committee for a Free Europe, the entire amount contributed is being used to expand the operations of Radio Free Europe, the American people's 'freedom station' in the shadow of the iron curtain."

BUILDING NEW TRANSMITTERS

"Radio Free Europe began broadcasting to the satellite countries of Eastern Europe on July 4, 1950, over a 7,500-watt short-wave transmitter located near Frankfurt, Germany. It now has under construction in Munich a powerful medium-wave transmitter which should be on the air by late winter. It also has on order eight additional transmitters—thanks, in no small measure, to the support of the American public in the Crusade for Freedom drive.

"The presence of nearly half a million Berliners at the Freedom Bell dedication ceremonies—100,000 of them from the Soviet sector—gives us some idea of what the Crusade meant in terms of hope and encouragement to those behind the iron curtain.

"High Commissioner John McCloy has expressed his opinion that the event had a profound effect upon the morale and confidence of the German people—comparable, in this respect, with the airlift.

"Without question, also, the campaign served to strengthen our own people's basic understanding and appreciation of the freedoms we enjoy."

INTENSIFIED EFFORT MAY PREVENT WAR

"It is my personal belief that recent world events make an intensified effort in this field even more important. We must build up our strength in this area of 'idea warfare' just as we are doing it militarily and economically—in order to meet and turn back the menace of world Communist aggression. Speed is of the utmost importance. If we are able to do these things fast enough, we may be able to avoid full-scale war. The next 2½ to 3 years, in my opinion, will tell the story."

Clay stated that the Crusade organization has been incorporated under the laws of New York State and that a committee is now at work developing a continuing program for 1951.

Launched by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on a Nation-wide broadcast on Labor Day, September 4, the Crusade offered the individual American citizen an opportunity to fight back against vicious Kremlin propaganda, and to help send the truth through the curtain. Almost overnight, thousands of local committees sprang up across the country, scrolls bearing the Declaration of Freedom [1] were circulated in all communities and the public began making contributions to Radio Free Europe as they signed.

Symbol of the Crusade—the massive 10-ton World Freedom Bell, inscribed with the paraphrase from Lincoln, "That this world, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom"—toured the United States from coast to coast, crossed the ocean on a DP transport and arrived in Berlin 2 days ahead of its scheduled dedication and ringing on United Nations Day, October 24. Its solemn notes were heard by millions of people throughout the free world over the largest international radio hook-up ever attempted. An estimated 450,000 Berlin citizens gathered hours ahead of time in Schoeneberg Platz to hear the former leader of the Berlin airlift say, "As this bell rings, may it strike a note of warning to all oppressors; a sound of courage to those called upon to defend their freedom; and a message of hope to those who are enslaved."

MOSCOW LIES

Moscow, as usual, lied to the Russian people about the event. Their controlled press and radio stated falsely that the people of Berlin ignored the ceremonies; that they called it a "bell of death," symbol of United States militarism contrived by the warmongerers, Eisenhower and Clay. The scrolls, they said, were signed by a handful of Government employees—policemen and firemen—who were forced to do so by threats from Washington. (The facts are that 2,000,000 American signatures were enshrined in the bell tower with the Freedom Bell on October 24. Thirteen million more will be added in special ceremonies in the near future.)

According to Moscow, barbed wire and a whole bevy of armed police were required to protect the speakers during the ceremonies. (Actually, the small force of city police was completely inadequate to handle the immense enthusiastic crowd.)

Also particularly annoying to the Kremlin was the presence of the UN flag, flown that day for the first time in Germany. "This is the same evil banner," Radio Moscow told its home-service listeners, "under which the United States cannibals are shedding the blood of Korean patriots." (This, though Russia is a member of the UN and on that day at Lake Success Vishinsky and Malik were conducting their short-lived peace offensive, which proved to be the prelude to Red China's attack on UN forces.)

BROADCASTS EXPOSE COLLABORATORS

The tones of the world freedom bell are now being heard 15 times a day as station breaks between the foreign-language programs of Radio Free Europe. The identification goes like this: Announcer: "This is Radio Free Europe." Sound: Four strokes of freedom bell. Announcer: "That was the freedom bell to remind you that you are listening to Radio Free Europe, your constant and reliable source of information."

In addition to news broadcasts, Radio Free Europe carries warnings regarding specific informers and collaborators, commentaries which point out deliberate falsifications in the Communist-controlled press, and programs of folk music, history, and literature banned by the regime. Very effective, also, are satirical sketches on the Soviet system and addresses by exiled leaders, well known in their homelands, speaking on present conditions of labor, government, religion, and economics.

Campaign signatures and contributions by States

State	Signatures	Contributions
Alabama	205, 261	$16, 979. 11
Arizona	55, 554	1, 062. 29
Arkansas	169, 933	451. 39
California:		
Northern	586, 174	67, 995. 08
Southern	672, 193	95, 486. 00
Colorado	230, 411	62, 629. 58
Connecticut	235, 160	20, 152. 89
Delaware	50, 000	2, 955. 60
District of Columbia	55, 803	2, 140. 31
Florida	421, 689	13, 350. 89
Georgia	802, 032	65, 342. 38
Idaho	57, 048	11, 646. 50
Illinois	339, 603	21, 304. 26
Indiana	376, 259	25, 638. 10
Iowa	83, 041	3, 710. 58
Kansas	143, 080	(1)
Kentucky	416, 033	37, 725. 76
Louisiana	256, 853	1, 365. 23
Maine	101, 024	6, 664. 09
Maryland	423, 568	10, 641. 07
Massachusetts	235, 541	12, 479. 13
Michigan	677, 748	21, 031. 65
Minnesota	158, 040	36, 857. 08
Mississippi	139, 522	6, 308. 43
Missouri:		
Eastern	303, 627	44, 235. 42
Western	166, 788	[2] 20, 578. 90
Montana	79, 194	13, 858. 74
Nebraska	86, 702	4, 979. 89
Nevada	70, 917	5, 180. 32
New Hampshire	61, 444	5, 697. 39
New Jersey	1, 011, 470	23, 187. 57
New Mexico	108, 814	4, 833. 12
New York:		
Upstate	895, 280	147, 419. 38
New York City	259, 417	[3] 108, 033. 86
Nassau County	35, 000	2, 732 03
Westchester County	72, 000	6, 763. 52
North Carolina	200, 508	15, 689. 56
North Dakota	26, 171	4. 590. 03
Ohio	1, 165, 267	22, 084. 03
Oklahoma	218, 319	10, 980. 35
Oregon	203, 072	21, 261. 69
Pennsylvania:		
Eastern	1, 031, 217	58, 635. 84
Western	498, 710	39. 350. 58
Rhode Island	94, 327	8, 207. 74
South Carolina	148, 141	6, 852. 26
South Dakota	65, 771	4, 668. 65
Tennessee	489, 033	17, 299. 75
Texas	421, 699	50, 707 94
Utah	102, 000	9, 413 16
Vermont	44, 378	5, 796. 86
Virginia	170, 599	17, 570 38
Washington	126, 836	16, 248. 20
West Virginia	211, 089	5, 985. 93
Wisconsin	220, 504	6, 602. 98
Wyoming	72, 653	10, 271. 60
Unidentified and out of country		23, 304. 68
Total	15, 507, 877	1, 288, 044. 59

[1] See western Missouri.
[2] Including Kansas.
[3] Including special campaign.

---

[1] I believe in the sacredness and dignity of the individual. I believe that all men derive the right to freedom equally from God. I pledge to resist aggression and tyranny wherever they appear on earth.

American Ground Troops in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr.

BUTLER] delivered a very interesting address before the Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., at the Washington Hotel on the night of January 20. He discussed the question of sending ground troops to Western Europe, and I believe his observations will be of interest to the Senate and the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address of the Senator from Maryland be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Comrades, I'm happy to be here tonight. Truly so because I feel at home. And, I'll tell you why. Right now I'm going through an experience you and I know all about.

Remember when you were a rookie and were taking your basic? I'll never forget the first weeks I spent at camp. I remember how new everything was. How strange I felt. How many mistakes I made. How frustrated I felt.

Well, I'm going through the whole thing all over again. Maybe it's a little more refined where I am now. The top sergeants don't yell as loud as they did when I went to my first Army camp. The brass doesn't snoot me—all the time, but, I'm a rookie just the same.

Of course they don't call it that. They call me a freshman—a freshman Senator.

I came in with the newest class of Senators. You know they are all graded according to seniority. That is, first on how many years you've served in the Senate, then how many years you've served in the House of Representatives or whether you've been a governor of your State.

You know this is my first venture into politics. I never held any kind of public office before. So, my name is on the bottom of the list with a couple of other Senators when it comes to patronage, influence, and authority.

Now I'm not telling you all this because I need a crying towel or a slip to my chaplain. I asked for it when I asked the people to elect me Senator and no matter how tough it is or how tough it gets I'm going to stick to my part of the agreement.

I'm going to slug it out like every rookie that was ever born has had to do. But right now I want you and the people who supported me to understand what the score is.

As soon as I get a little more experience and maybe win a stripe or two I'll be able to help solve more and more of the problems now facing the people in this great country.

Right now I am a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. These two committees do extremely important work for Congress but they are not rated among the big committees such as Appropriations, Foreign Relations, Finance, and Judiciary.

Now of course I wanted to get on the important committees but old man seniority blocked the kick. I have a feeling however that things are going to be different in '52. Then I can move up to a more important position.

However, at the present time I can see where I'm going to have my hands full on the committees to which I have been assigned.

For instance on the District Committee I understand I will become in effect a member of the City Council of Washington. I think I'm going to like that. I know there are a large number of Marylanders working in Washington. Their problems can be handled through the District Committee.

And then there is another angle to this assignment—problems like atomic defense, sanitation, and transportation are so intertwined in this metropolitan area that they must be coordinated.

An atom bomb recognizes no State lines.

I intend to lend my efforts to see that District authorities and Maryland officials work hand in glove on all problems affecting this area.

Also I'm glad to have some say in running affairs of the Nation's Capital. Next to my home town of Baltimore I think Washington is the best city in the country.

And I know Washington is the greatest capital in the world today. I think it is beautiful. I want to do everything in my power to keep it great and beautiful.

As for my other committee, I feel that having had some experience with civil service I will be able to be of assistance in this field. I was a member of the City Service Commission of Baltimore, which is the civil-service commission of that city.

I am strongly in favor of an efficient Government. I do not want any drones on the public payroll. I do not want to see money wasted. Even before coming to the United States Senate I developed a great respect for the work of my colleague, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in urging Government economy.

On the other hand, I want to see the civil-service system conducted so that the loyal Americans we are asking to handle the country's business are fairly and squarely treated. I know this is especially necessary as we struggle through the present emergency conditions facing our Nation today.

I do not have any legislation in mind to bring before these committees at the present. As a matter of fact, I am going to be very chary about introducing any legislation for several months. Not that I do not intend to take an active and vigorous part in the work of the Senate, it is just that I believe first we have too many laws on the books today, and, second, I intend to study very carefully the proposals now pending which are sponsored by the more experienced hands in my party.

For instance, the Senate is today engaged in a most important foreign-policy debate. It is a subject of such vital interest to every person living in the United States, and for that matter everyone living in the world today, that every effort should be made to give every viewpoint intelligent consideration.

I have not made any firm commitments on any of the various phases of the problem under discussion, and I shall not do so until the Senate debate is finally at an end. However, there are several points on which I have reached a conclusion on the basis of the present situation.

Right here I want to say that when I do make up my mind on the basic elements of our foreign policy I am determined to see this country stop the bumbling and fumbling that has brought on this present serious condition.

One of the aspects now under scrutiny is the avowed intention of President Truman to send more troops to Europe. There is a very serious doubt in my mind as to the constitutionality of this move without the consent of Congress.

I call attention to the following provisions of the Constitution:

"SEC. 8 The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; * * * ;

"To declare war, * * *;

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, * * *."

Certainly, the very foundation of our Government will be shaken if the executive branch is allowed to usurp this power of the people placed exclusively in the hands of Congress.

Now on Tuesday the Senate is to vote on a resolution introduced by Senator WHERRY, minority leader. This resolution says simply:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States shall be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by Congress."

I have made up my mind to vote in favor of that resolution. I understand, however, that an effort will be made, probably with the consent of the minority, to send this resolution to the Foreign Relations or some other committee for hearings.

I have read in the newspapers that this move is being contemplated in order to give General Eisenhower time to get back from Europe and report on conditions over there. I don't object to this.

The question involved here is not whether troops are to be sent to Europe. It is whether a commitment should be made to send them prior to the time of the ratification of such commitment by the Congress.

My vote for the Wherry resolution does not mean that I am opposed to dispatching troops to Europe to become a part of an integrated international army. It is not necessary at this point to make that decision. All my vote means is that I am opposed to making operative any commitment in that connection by the President until the Congress or the people have had an opportunity to examine it.

I deem it appropriate to acquaint you with my present feeling on the principal question of whether or not we shall commit troops to Europe.

But, before doing so I want to emphasize I am not for running out on our Western European allies. I do not think that we can in all conscience repudiate the Atlantic Pact.

In that pact this Nation has given its word to aid our allies of the North Atlantic community, and if they face the murderous onslaught of an aggressor, I favor keeping our word.

However, it is worthy of note that when the Atlantic Pact was signed the Congress was told by Secretary of State Dean Acheson that our aid would consist of matériel, not men. Now, today, without consulting or even advising with the Senate of the United States, President Truman has apparently decided to expand and supplement the Atlantic Pact by sending ground troops to Europe. He depends upon his authority as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces to legalize this act.

The Wherry resolution merely asks President Truman to hold up any action implementing the Atlantic Pact until the Senate has decided the issue. Surely the country does not want the President to bypass the Senate on this very important facet of treaty making. It is clearly set forth in our Constitution that the Senate alone by two-thirds vote has the power to bind this country in treaty.

If the Atlantic Pact itself had to be ratified by the Senate, it logically follows that any extension must likewise be so ratified. I am tired of this Executive grab for power.

Let's call a halt on this move to place a standing army of United States troops in Europe as a part of an international army until all constitutional provisions have been met. After we put a curb on this impetuous act then will be time to hear from General Eisenhower.

I want to hear the general's opinion as a military expert on conditions in Europe. I want to know what European nations are doing about the threat of aggression that we are now rushing headlong to meet on foreign shores.

To return to the principal theme, I entertain the conviction that the first shock

of an attack upon a member of the Atlantic community should be borne by the country upon which the aggression is launched. However, I do not say that I am rigidly opposed to committing a limited number of American troops to an integrated international force for the purpose of absorbing the initial shock of such an aggression.

If our military leaders feel that the presence of some of our troops in Europe is beneficial to the attainment of the over-all objective of containing the aggression or ultimately reversing it, I would not object too strenuously. Such a course would give us command of bases from which we could bomb out the enemy's potentials.

In this connection I would like to direct your attention to the speech of that great and good American, ex-President Herbert Hoover. I think the meaning of his great pronouncements have been deliberately distorted.

Mr. Hoover, at the outset of his speech, said: "No appraisal of the world situation can be final in an unstable world. However we find our national path, we must constantly reexamine where we have arrived and at times revise our direction." He then pointed out that from his observations the free peoples of Western Europe were lacking in a will to defend themselves and that disunities were manifest.

But he also said: "We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of the defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will, and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money."

I have the temerity to tell you that in my opinion what Mr. Hoover has said is that upon the basis of present appraisal, Europe hasn't the means nor the will to defend itself. That being so, our dollars, while making up the insufficiency in means, will not restore the will.

However, if upon reexamination it becomes apparent that the differences and disunities of the North Atlantic community have been resolved and a desire for freedom is apparent and the will to defend it is present then our former President would be the last man in the world to say that aid should be denied them.

Maybe the wish is the father to the thought. I hope that is what Mr. Hoover means, although at the moment, as I have said, I am prepared to go a little further and favor the dispatch of a limited number of troops to Europe in the hope that their presence there will bring new hope and courage to our Western Europe allies and wake them up to their responsibilities to themselves and the rest of the free world.

However, I do not believe in sticking our nose into situations where we will have to stand alone as a target from all sides. Let's find out what Europe is going to do first before we further pledge the resources of this country in a foreign policy, if it can be called that, that has again led us to the place where we must assume all the risks—a place where we stand to lose everything and win nothing. Look at our situation in Korea.

Do you think it could be worse? From what I read about it our top military men have said over and over again that our position on the peninsula is untenable. If that is so, why do we keep on fighting there? Why don't we get out before we sacrifice any more Americans to save face?

There are a lot of my people in Maryland who think we should never have gone there in the first place. There are a number of Marylanders who think we should get out now. They have been writing to me about it. I am certainly going to give close consideration to their arguments.

America is big and strong. America has the spiritual fortitude to take defeat such as we have suffered in Korea and to make a come-back. Everyone in life takes a licking once in a while. The courageous acknowledge it and begin over again. The wise look upon set-backs as a lesson on which to build success.

We may not like taking a beating, but as long as we fight for a righteous principle we have nothing to be ashamed of if we lose now and then.

Certainly if we are in an untenable position in Korea we should drop back to another line. We should regroup our forces in a position where our men will have a fighting chance of survival. We should not wait to be shoved out of Korea while our men are daily being mowed down by the weight of superior forces.

We know the Chinese forces are winding up to swamp our Army. We know that the refusal of the Communists in China to accept the terms of a reasonable cease-fire order means that they are determined to push the United Nations Army off the peninsula.

Unless the military strategists can increase our forces with help from other United Nations countries to an extent where we will have a fighting chance of victory, I am inclined to follow the pleas of the people who have written me on this subject and to demand our withdrawal.

Regardless of what action the administration orders in Korea and Europe, we are faced again with the demand to increase our Armed Forces. And again I reserve the right to make up my mind as to the necessity of this move after all the chips are down.

I want to be thoroughly convinced we need the tremendous number of men under arms the new program calls for before I vote to put our sons in uniform for 3, 4, or 6 years of their lives.

I am disturbed for instance about the proposal to draft youths 18 years of age. I think that age is too young. I enlisted the day after war was declared in World War I. I was 19.

Now I have two sons in draft age. One is eighteen and a half, the other is nineteen and a half years old. They will be drafted soon I know and they are thinking about enlisting even before they are called in the draft.

As I look at them I realize that it is time for them to assume their responsibility of defending the country in which they have lived their youth. I also realize that the shock and brutality of war will rest heavy on them if they are sent into the fighting. And I do not believe they would have been ready to do the part that is now being asked of them if they had been called when they passed their eighteenth birthday.

So I do not believe your sons or anyone's son should be called to make this sacrifice until they are ready to do the job.

And since my sons have passed their eighteenth birthday my reaction will in no way protect them, but perhaps I can throw my weight toward preventing unnecessary tragedy in thousands of other homes throughout the Nation.

I wish to make some reservation in connection with the stand I am taking against an 18-year-old draft. First, if this country was placed in dire straits and the very young and the very old were called upon to aid in defending these shores of ours I would not stand in the way of calling the youth of the country to its defense.

And if it is deemed necessary to build up a reserve for our Armed Forces by placing 18-year-olds in uniform to prepare them for active duty after they become seasoned I would be inclined to go along. For instance, if 18-year-olds were drafted with the specific provision that they would be given 6 months' training and not sent out of this country until they had been in uniform for another 6 months, I might be willing to vote in favor of such a draft.

In conclusion we want to be prepared certainly but we do not want to fall into the trap set by the Soviet leaders. By that I mean we do not want to spend our way into bankruptcy. Nor to adopt a program of Socialist government. We must protect our domestic economy.

We must begin now to cut down on nondefense Government spending.

We must keep America free.

Truman-Congress Amity Near

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Truman-Congress Amity Near," by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star, January 19, 1951.

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

TRUMAN-CONGRESS AMITY NEAR—SPIRIT OF COOPERATION BETWEEN STATE DEPARTMENT AND LAWMAKERS ALSO WOULD HELP COMMON CAUSE

(By David Lawrence)

Relations between Congress and President Truman are getting better. There's a rift in the clouds and a bit of amicability is beginning to appear.

Apparently President Truman didn't mean to be brusque with Congress last week when he said, in effect, he would consult Congress but would do as he pleased about sending troops abroad. He told the reporters that maybe they didn't write the story the way he meant it. They, of course, wrote what they heard him say. Mr. Truman thinks the implications of his words were perhaps misconstrued or ignored.

These misunderstandings will occur. Mr. Truman is really not complaining that the reporting was unsound but that at times things don't sound in print as they sound when he says them. Maybe they ought to have a system of sound effects to cure this so that the exact intonation of voice could be recorded. Maybe the whole press conference should be put on radio and television so that the public—whose business is being discussed—can judge for itself what the inflections of a Presidential voice really mean.

As for Congress, there are signs that Senator TAFT is softening or clarifying his position, too. He wouldn't object to sending troops to Europe, he says, but wants Congress to spell out some sort of ratio so that America will supply certain divisions and the other nations some divisions in proper proportion.

Anyway, there seems to be a convergence toward agreement. So far as foreign governments are concerned, they can properly derive from the modifications, clarifications, and explanations that the executive and legislative branches of the American Government are beginning to see eye to eye on the major things—they are agreed on what the diplomats call the principle, and there are

just some slight details of difference on how the principle shall be applied.

Basically there never was any doubt that, if the President asked Congress for authority to station our troops in Europe as a part of our North Atlantic treaty obligation, he would get such authority by overwhelming vote. The legalists who told him a bad precedent would be created if he asked for such authority were giving Mr. Truman poor advice. The President of the United States can always act of his own initiative in sending troops out of the country if there is danger. He does not need to wait for congressional action. But where there is time, the words of the Constitution would seem to imply that he ask for congressional authority soon after he sends the troops abroad, if not before.

It may be stated also that a declaration which recognizes a state of war with Communist China, if submitted to Congress now, would pass by an overwhelming vote of both houses. Congressional sentiment is almost unanimous on the rejection of the phony "peace" proposal made by the Chinese Communists, and there is complete backing for the State Department in its efforts to obtain the adoption at the United Nations of a resolution condemning Red China as an aggressor.

Under the American system of free discussion, world policies are praised or criticized, or proposals for amendment are made publicly. Thus every official of the State Department knows what Congress is thinking about and, if not, members of the congressional committees are free to come in and talk about it or write in or telephone.

What is needed here mostly is to encourage a spirit of cooperation—to instill the feeling at the State Department that Members of Congress have a responsibility to their constituents and also to instill on Capitol Hill the feeling that the State Department will welcome advice. Having established the right kind of relationship between the two branches of Government, it then becomes essential for Congress to recognize that under the Constitution the conduct of foreign relations is an executive function and that the President and Secretary of State must make the final decisions and be held accountable for them to the country.

As one looks back on the somewhat clumsy performances of the last few days, one wonders how much it is all due to the deep-seated partisanship of the President himself, which distrusts the opposition party, and conversely to the distrust which the opposition party has with respect to Mr. Truman and his Secretary of State.

Contribution of Industry in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] regarding the contribution of industry in the Pacific Northwest in the present situation, together with a letter from Jack Hickman, president of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY P. CAIN, OF WASHINGTON

One of the characteristics of a free people has always been that in times of trouble they voluntarily unify in a common effort in behalf of the Nation. This is true of American industry. I think it can be truly said that there is no section of our Nation or our economy which exceeds any other in its patriotism—in its eagerness to contribute in full measure to the national security.

I am proud, however, Mr. President, in being able to point out that the progressive workers, and industry of the Pacific Northwest have always been in the vanguard of our defense and war efforts.

Characteristic of this eagerness to serve the Nation is the Pacific Northwest marine industry, the industry which provided the oceanic highroad to victory in two world wars. That industry stands ready today to provide that same highroad to victory in the present mobilization effort of America and other free nations of the world.

Mr. President, I call upon the leaders of our Military Establishment to make full use of the ingenuity, the technical skill, and the patriotism of the men and women who design and build the ships of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from Mr. Jack Hickman, president of the Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., cosigned by Mr. John McNichol and Mr. John M. Haydon, of the Northwest Marine Industry Mobilization Committee, which constitute that industry's declaration of its readiness to serve in the present crisis in whatever capacity it can best contribute to the defense of America. I should like to call it to the attention of the Nation and the Nation's leaders by having it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NORTHWEST MARINE INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Seattle, Wash., January 11, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: The membership of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., representing the boatbuilders, marine suppliers, ship chandlers, marine manufacturers, and allied maritime industries of the Pacific Northwest, wish to voice through you to President Truman, the Chiefs of Staff, and the heads of the various Military Establishments, the sincere desire of this association to aid in any way possible in the successful conclusion of the present emergency, and to pledge that every ounce of skill, and all the resources of this association are instantly available.

Obviously, in the type of warfare which now appears imminent, the availability of skillfully constructed, rugged, seaworthy boats will be of prime military importance. Of equal importance will be a reservoir of skilled labor and properly equipped plants to build such craft. This organization knows that an unmatched combination of such skill, equipment, and know-how exists within its membership. We are anxious that this supply of manpower, knowledge, and tools be put to the proper use insofar as winning the current struggle is concerned. The industry which for years has built economical small craft for fishermen and commercial boatmen to withstand some of the world's most rugged and trying waters—as in Alaska and the Bering Sea—obviously will be able to do a real job for our Government and military in the present emergency.

It should be remembered that the work horses of the Navy were largely built in this area during World War II, among them air-sea rescue boats, harbor and seagoing tugs, salvage vessels, mine sweepers, and many other types of small and medium sized military craft. The recent award to a builder in this area, Tacoma Boatbuilding Co., Tacoma, Wash., of a contract to build five mine sweepers is an indication that the job this area did in the last war is not forgotten.

At present the geographical area covered by the membership of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., has a boatbuilding, maintenance, and repair pool of thousands of trained, skilled men—especially in the wooden boat construction field—and a total of 351 yards in Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and British Columbia which are ready, willing, and able to be of service. Of these latter, 319 are yards for the building of wooden vessels and 32 are yards capable of building either steel or wooden ships.

In addition, the great maritime Pacific Northwest has manufacturing facilities for virtually every type of equipment used on a boat or ship, including such items as winches, Diesel engines, paints, radio and electronic communication and navigation equipment, remote controls, boilers, marine stoves, tanks, propellers, and many others.

In this same territory are located a number of the largest marine supply houses in the world. This area is also, with approximately 33,000 registered small boats, the second largest such district in the United States. It holds the same position in regard to the number of documented vessels in the area, with Juneau, Alaska, in the third position nationally.

In the interests of our Nation, this great maritime potential must be put to the most valuable use. We would appreciate your working with us as closely as possible, particularly in the matter of seeing to it that we are quickly informed of any possible ways in which our capabilities may be put to use. Your past interest in our affairs assures us that you will do so.

And may the membership of Northwest Marine Industries, Inc., repeat that all our skills, equipment, and manpower stand ready to serve in any way. All that is needed, now, is the word to swing into action.

Sincerely,

JACK HICKMAN,
President, Northwest Marine Industries, Inc.
JOHN MACNICHOL,
JOHN M. HAYDON,
Northwest Marine Industry Mobilization Commission.

Measures for the Defense of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on January 17, my able colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], delivered before the Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Alexandria, Va., an address in which he presented, among other things, several most useful facts with reference to the Organized Reserves of our Armed Forces. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Would that I could bring good news to you tonight. It is always popular and pleasurable to say those things which please the fancy of those to whom we talk, but under the present circumstances which exist in the world today, it would be futile and immoral for me to attempt to be gay or to be the conveyor of good news.

Today it is trite to ring the bell of gloom. The facts of this Nation's sad and dangerous plight have been intoned by grave and dour voices over and over again. To say that we face a long period of sacrifice, hard work and danger is to trespass on the obvious. Everyone who can read the headlines of any newspaper knows of these things, he knows of the critical and perilous situation that world communism has placed us in.

There is an old Chinese proverb which says "It is better to strike a light than to curse the darkness." Well, let's have some light on what we are trying to do today. What we must try to determine is, now that we are in this situation, what are we doing about it? Where are we going? What are the prospects for the future?

Now that the Communists have made it abundantly clear that they are not only willing, but intend to use force and military might where it will advance their cause, it leaves us only one course open—that of getting ourselves militarily prepared. What are we doing along that line would be the next question.

The President, day before yesterday submitted a budget message to the Congress calling for increased appropriations for the military by approximately $39,000,000,000 over that actually spent in the period from July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950. In that 1949–50 period we spent $12,303,000,000 for the military. The President's budget this year asked for $50,971,000,000 of appropriations for the 1952 fiscal year.

However there is a large difference between authorizing money to be spent, and having on hand military equipment and manpower. Large appropriations, big tax bills, won't by themselves stop an enemy bomber nor a battalion of Communists. The only true test of defense is equipment and manpower available for use, and on that in the words of Al Smith, "Let's look at the record."

In the past 9 months we have increased the size of our Armed Forces from 1,460,000 before the Korean invasion to a present-day strength of 2,367,000. The Department of Defense estimates that we will have in the armed services by June 1 of this year some 3,225,000 men, and it is anticipated that by January 1, 1952, there will be approximately 5,000,000 men in the Armed Forces.

These men are being placed through volunteers, Reserve programs and the draft. It seems to me as we progress in this matter of building our Armed Forces, that some changes are drastically needed in this matter of procuring manpower. For under present operation, each of us knows of many injustices which daily occur.

According to recent figures submitted by the Department of Defense to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, 28 percent of all the men between 19 and 26, eligible for the draft, have been rejected for one reason or another. In a breakdown of that 28 percent rejection figure, 13 percent were rejected for literacy or intelligence reasons and 15 percent for failing to meet the medical standards. This high rejection of manpower puts the heavy burden of defense more and more on the Reserves and creates a greater and greater pressure to start drafting veterans. Most of the Reserves today are inactive. At the end of World War II many officers were not discharged, but were automatically placed in the Reserve on inactive duty. Most of them have so remained. Others have evidenced their willingness by becoming weekend soldiers and flyers. Generally speaking, these men and the veterans—not in Reserve are the ones who carried the burden of the last war—they are the men who gave up from 2 to 5 years of their young lives to satisfy the appetite of the monster war. Most of today's veterans have had overseas' experience, many of them know, first-hand, of the anxiety and the danger of momentarily having one's life snuffed out quickly and painfully by an enemy bullet. Those youngsters of the last war—today's veterans—were the bulwark, the bone and the marrow of our successful fight against the dictatorship of Hitler. And today it is these men who are just now getting a delayed start in life. The majority of them are now married; they have small children and responsibilities; they are now beginning for the first time to get over the hump in the matter of earning a livelihood, and they are becoming an increasingly important part in the Nation's economic life. These men, veterans of the last war, except for their ages, are generally speaking, physically fit. They are good citizens, they are great Americans, their patriotism is beyond question, and they are ready and willing to take up arms again if there is an urgent need for them to do so. But they already know of the long wait at sick bay and in chow lines, the tediousness of policing barracks, the boredom of digging over and over again slit trenches, the driving of jeeps, the assembly and disassembly of M–1s, the monotony of close-order drill. They have already experienced that and more, and they do not want it again unless it is absolutely necessary. They would like to understand the theory of why a man should be rejected by a draft board because he has flat feet when they know, and he knows, that it would not interfere with that man's driving a jeep. They would like to know why a man who has a broken eardrum still cannot operate a car pool or drive a bulldozer. They would like to know why it is that a four-fingered man who throws a football with great accuracy on Saturday afternoons could not with equal accuracy throw a hand grenade or at least a shovel full of dirt. They would like to know why a man who has poor vision cannot issue shoes, or cook food, or be a general's aide. For as a matter of fact, every day these men who are rejected for some slight physical defect, do a similar or more difficult job in civilian life than that which they would be called upon to do in military life. Everybody in the military doesn't actually carry a gun, or fly a plane. The latest estimate, I believe, is that for every combat soldier at the front, there are seven other men behind him who arrange for his feeding, his health, his pay, his transportation, and all the rest.

The time has now come to more realistically consider this manpower problem and particularly the drafting of men. Men with certain physical defects can be used in specialized jobs, and the proper use of our manpower should be made by drafting men for specific jobs. It is not essential to have a perfect physical specimen plan meals, repair trucks, or code messages. Certainly the men who have already served overseas should not be yanked away from their homes, their new family responsibilities for the second time within a period of 10 years, at least not until those who can serve, even though suffering from a slight physical defect have first rendered their service and taken their turn at giving their time for their Nation. And so as the military program moves forward, as more men are taken into the Army, it seems to me essential that we change the present policy of calling up only those men who have no disabilities, and begin to realistically draft men for the job which they can do.

Another specific program of preparation for the future is that of seeking the support of allies throughout the world.

This is, in essence, the subject of the great debate, as the newspapers term it, which is now going on in the Senate. As I have listened for the past week to this debate, it seems to me that all sides are rather close together. All recognize the desirability of having active participating allies on our side when faced with a fight against a powerful opponent. The only points in issue are first—how far do we go in encouraging those Western European countries to become active participants in joint defense programs with us.

One group of Senators take the position that the United States should do nothing more to assist the people of Europe. They advocate no more aid or encouragement to them until they, over there, manifest a stronger will to defend themselves. The other group says that the people of Europe know they cannot defend their countries without our active, real, and practical help, and that we must encourage those countries to bestir themselves to action, by showing them we will help, by sending arms, equipment with which to fight, and by actually joining forces with them in a mutual defense program. This latter group argues that when and as this is done, the feeling of despair and hopelessness will disappear and a spirit of resistance and cooperation will develop.

For my part, I think the answer to this question could best be answered with a question, Which course of ours would make Joe Stalin happier? I think Stalin would be most pleased if we abandoned our former allies of Western Europe. Such a course on our part would be opening the door and inviting Stalin to step in and fill the vacuum.

It seems to me, it is our own self-interest to encourage those people of Europe to join with us as active allies and resist communism. This must be done practically and within our own limitations. But it should be done, for in truth, the people who wish to preserve their way of life need each other in the face of Communist aggression. They, over there, need us, and we need them.

The other point under discussion in the great debate is an offshoot of the first.

Does the President have the authority to send troops to Europe without first consulting the Congress?

I think a strict technical interpretation of the President's authority would give him the power to send our troops overseas. But I think the President is too politic not to submit the matter to the Congress in one form or another, for to do so would reassure the people of the United States and gain their better cooperation for future proposals and add much to the unity of the Nation.

However, it's my opinion, that for all practical purposes, the issue of troops going to Europe will be decided by one man—Gen. Dwight E. Eisenhower. If he recommends against it, no troops will go. If he recommends for it, I believe that they will go.

There are many other specific programs for the future which are today being worked on and in which we in Government and you out of it must take a vital interest, but time does not permit the discussion of them here. There is, however, one point I would like to briefly make in closing, and that is this: The battle in which we find ourselves unwilling participants is one in which the victor will not necessarily be that nation with the biggest, most destructive war machine. This battle in which we find ourselves today is one in which the victor must not alone seek to control the bodies of men but must seek to convince the hearts and minds of men as well.

For the past 5 years we have allowed Communist propaganda against us to keep us

on the defensive, dodging, ducking, denying. The time has now come when we must move from the defense to the offense. A great selling job is called for, not only by the Government but by all the people of this Nation. We have the greatest commodity on earth to sell—freedom, democracy. And yet our efforts to sell them in recent years have been puny and ineffective. We must instill within our people and the people who represent us in Government a fervor and enthusiasm for democracy greater than that which the Communists feel for communism.

We must begin to send the message of the blessings of freedom out to every corner of the globe. We must be particularly interested in our neighbors to the south, for the Latin-American countries—all the nations of South America, are today of extreme and utmost importance. We must develop our relationships with them and develop their love of and desire for freedom, independence, and democracy.

This is not a one-man job. It's not alone the Government's job. It's everybody's job who looks hopefully to the future. But it particularly falls on the shoulders of the young people, for as you have longer to live, more to look forward to, your stake in the future is greatest. The challenge to freedom and opportunity should ring loudest in your ears and in mine. For we are the young people of America. The responsibility of keeping our lives free, our system of government intact, is rushing toward us.

And like those who have preceded us we must step forward and accept the challenge. That's the way with all God's creatures—as the aged wither and die, the young move up to replace them. This is our time on the stage, and the scene will be short, without rehearsals or repeats.

With our knowledge that men who are free to think, work and worship as they choose are always happier and superior to those who live on their knees under communism with their hearts and minds in chains; with our faith that right makes might; and with our willingness to step forward and meet this challenge, I know that the lamp of freedom and liberty will continue to burn brightly for generations to come.

The Proposed Cease-Fire Order in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial bearing on the United Nations Organization, which seems to have come to a dead-end in its discussions of a cease-fire order in Korea at the price of blackmail paid to the aggressor forces in Asia. So that the record on these points may be as complete as possible, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a most pertinent editorial on this subject which appeared in the Cleveland Press, one of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, on Monday, January 15, 1951. It is entitled "A Vote To Pay Blackmail."

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

A VOTE TO PAY BLACKMAIL

The United Nations now stands ready to reward aggression by offering to give Formosa and China's seat in the UN to the Chinese Reds in return for a cease-fire order in Korea.

The old League of Nations had some sordid chapters in its brief history because of its cowardly retreats from aggression in Manchuria and Ethiopia. But it merely looked the other way, without condoning aggression by paying it tribute.

The latest UN act is one of infamy.

The UN cannot long survive this base betrayal of the very purpose for which it was created. The memory of every soldier who has died in Korea fighting under its flag will rise to haunt it. The day Red China is seated in the Security Council, this country should walk out. That much is due our honored dead.

No nation can have any faith in the idea of collective security as it is administered by the UN, because if it will sell out one government, it will sell out others. Indeed, if the Reds accept the bribe which has been offered them, what more can the organization be considered than a cat's-paw of aggression?

CHINA'S BETRAYAL

Protesting against the betrayal of Nationalist China, which is a member of the organization, its delegate, Dr. T. F. Tsiang said that Formosa was being treated as though it were a no man's land.

Actually, he said, Formosa is the home of free China, defended by an army of a half million men, the largest single unit of power against Communist imperialist aggression in the Far East. The proposed peace talks with the Reds, he added, pose only one question:

"How do you want Formosa, rare, medium, or well done?"

That is not funny.

The lives of 7,500,000 people, including permanent residents of the island and the refugees from the mainland, will be in jeopardy if Formosa is handed over to the mercies of the Peiping Reds. Many of these people on Formosa have been branded as war criminals for no other reason than that they have opposed communism.

Thus we treat our friends—the first government to offer its assistance when we took up arms in South Korea. And we are doing this at the urging of India, which proclaimed its neutrality in that crucial hour.

VOICE OF FREE ASIA

How will the free nations of Asia react to this perfidious act by the great powers? That question was answered on the floor of the United Nations by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines.

"How far, sir, can the United Nations keep retreating from established, sound moral positions without courting final disaster?" he asked.

"A retreat in the course of battle is understandable and sometimes inevitable, but a retreat from right principles while a battle is being waged for those principles cannot be justified on any ground whatever.

"My country knows the nameless terror and agony of war as few countries around this table do. Therefore, we understand the anxious desire of many delegates to exhaust every possibility of avoiding a general war. But we also know there is at least one thing that is worse than war itself, and that is the degrading enslavement that would surely follow an abject surrender before the threats of a fanatic and implacable aggressor."

The United Nations was saying to Peiping, he charged, "You may stop hitting and killing my boys so that we can discuss how to reward you with the gift of Formosa and a seat in the United Nations."

General Romulo warned the United Nations it would lose its reason for being if it resorted to appeasement in this situation.

"We have heard moving appeals to the free nations of the world to close ranks," he said. "But such appeals cannot be met by an admission of weakness and abject surrender. The march of Communist aggression cannot be arrested by a policy of moral retreat and surrender."

Indeed, doesn't the betrayal of Nationalist China and Korea put every free nation on notice that its best hope lies in making peace with Moscow on the best terms it can?

OUR SORRY ROLE

Where did the United States stand when the roll was called on this unhappy occasion?

Ours was a craven "Me, too" vote.

Warren R. Austin, the American delegate, supported the proposal to buy off the Reds, explaining that he did so in the interest of unity. Afterward, it was explained that Mr. Austin did not expect the Reds to accept the proposition, and then he would be free to revive his resolution condemning them as aggressors. Would he add as a second count of his indictment their refusal to accept a bribe?

We assume Mr. Austin was carrying out orders of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

Nothing less than immediate resignation of both men could in any way relieve this country of even a small part of embarrassment caused by the indefensible position our Government has taken.

The administration first lost the initiative in the UN by failing to press for forthright action against Red China, then joined Britain and the other appeasement advocates in offering to pay blackmail.

That act is a virtual admission that the whole Korean undertaking was a miscalculation, and that Red China was right and the United States was wrong. The appeasement offer to which our UN spokesman consented cannot be appraised on any other basis.

We don't believe Congress or the American people will buy any part of it. They cannot forget the case of Private First Class Brown, who hasn't been seen since September 4.

That day, Pfc Melvin Brown, of Mahaffey, Pa., stood atop a 50-foot wall at Kasan, Korea, and beat back the enemy singlehanded, while his platoon regrouped to repel the attackers.

Private First Class Brown fired his rifle until he ran out of ammunition.

Private First Class Brown hurled grenades until he ran out of grenades.

They still kept coming up that wall.

Private First Class Brown wasn't a man to let a little thing like no ammunition thwart him. He took his entrenching shovel and bashed those Reds over the head as they came up—delivering skull-crushers with his shovel to a dozen of them.

Last week at the White House President Truman presented a Congressional Medal of Honor to the father of Private First Class Brown.

"Outstanding personal bravery" the citation reads.

And a good solid American brand of personal bravery, that Private First Class Brown delivered atop that lonesome wall in Korea.

Private First Class Brown was in a position where he had to call a spade a weapon.

Countless hordes of Chinese Reds have swept down on the Private First Class Browns in Korea.

Our leaders and Allies are not in the position they put Private First Class Brown in, but they should be statesmen enough to call a spade a spade.

How Much Are You Willing To Sacrifice for Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an unusual editorial entitled "How Much Are You Willing To Sacrifice for Peace?" from the St. Petersburg Times of January 14, 1951.

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

HOW MUCH ARE YOU WILLING TO SACRIFICE FOR PEACE?

(I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost to maintain this Declaration and support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom I can see rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see the end is worth more than the cost.—John Adams, 1776.)

It is literally impossible for anyone to comprehend the full meaning of the $100,000,000,000 defense program for next year which President Truman has said will be necessary. Of that amount only $40,000,000,000 will be in cash; the remaining $60,000,000,000 will be in contract authorizations. Even thus broken down, those figures are beyond grasp.

The President's goals of 1,000,000 more men and women in the armed services in the next few months, and 4,000,000 more persons in defense production by the end of the year, are not quite so hard to understand. But what they will mean to us, in changing our accustomed living habits, we still have to learn.

This much is certain: Never in the lifetime of any living person if, indeed, in the history of the Nation—have the American people been called upon to assume so tremendous a burden. Never have we been faced with a program promising such austerity and sacrifice.

The road ahead will challenge every resource, will call for every ounce of moral stamina on the part of every citizen.

Were atom bombs today to fall on Chicago and Pittsburgh, or an enemy fleet to appear off our shores, or enemy paratroopers to drop in Alaska—or Mexico—then there would be no doubt about the response of the people.

If we were engaged in all-out war—even though it were not on our shores—no one would complain of working longer hours, putting up with rationing and price controls, paying heavier taxes, sending our young men and women off to war. In the face of disaster or its imminence, the American fiber is the toughest in the world.

But we are not now engaged in all-out war. There is disagreement in the ranks of democratic leaders the world over as to how imminent all-out war is. There is doubt as to whether Russia and its satellites want all-out war—either in the immediate future or for years to come.

Ironically, what we may find the most difficult thing facing us is not war but nonwar, since what we have and what lies ahead for a long time to come cannot be called peace.

The ultimate goal of our Nation, and of all free nations is, of course, peace—peace with freedom and justice.

It may be that we may achieve that goal only by victory in all-out war. Or, if we are strong enough and determined enough, we may win it without total war—perhaps even with no war at all.

But make no mistake about the cost of a nonwar victory. If we are to be spared the devastation and death of war—more terrible than ever before—then we must still pay the same price of taxes, toil, deprivation, regulation, discomfort, and sacrifice.

We can win the victory we seek without war. Totalitarianism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Because it is politically, economically, and morally wrong, no totalitarian system can long survive.

However, it is equally true that we can lose without war. We can lose if we are not willing to pay the price of being so impregnably strong that it is not necessary for us to fight. We can lose if, through the "Gibraltarism" of Herbert Hoover or the isolationism of Joseph P. Kennedy, or the equivocation of Senator ROBERT TAFT, we permit the rest of the world to succumb to the imperialism of Russia.

It is far harder to face and endure the sacrifices which will be needed for victory if there is no war than if we are plunged into a life-and-death struggle. The "rays of ravishing light and glory" which John Adams foresaw shine far brighter through the murk of battle and the smoke of dying cities than they do through the gray gloom of a nonwar which is not a peace.

Each of us—this day—ought soberly to face the facts and do some earnest soul-searching. We ought to realize just what we're up against. We ought to ask ourselves whether we are prepared for the task—and if we're not, then adjust our thinking, our plans, our hopes, and aspirations.

Let's take up some specific items:

Longer hours: With the stepped-up defense program and the drain of manpower by the Armed Forces most of us are going to have to work longer hours. Are you prepared to work 48 or, if need be, 56 hours a week—and take your overtime pay in defense bonds which can't be cashed until after the emergency is over, so as to fight inflation?

Shortages: Are you prepared to drive your present car for 5 years longer—do with your present radio and vacuum cleaner and washing machine for a long time to come?

Rationing: When rationing comes—as it will shortly—are you prepared to accept it freely and cooperatively, so that a vast army of enforcement agents will not be needed to combat the evil of black markets? Even if you know there is some cheating, will you, personally, shun the black market?

Taxes: Are you prepared—have you adjusted your budget—to pay perhaps half again or even double your present taxes?

Service: If you are a young man or woman apt to have your schooling interrupted by military service, will you go back to college after your hitch is up?

Politics: Are you willing to put the interests of the Nation—of other people, if necessary—above your own or your party's, so that we can be assured of a Government which will preserve democracy despite the temptation which defense regimentation will bring?

Production: If you are a manufacturer of steel, aluminum, rubber, or other critical products, or a producer of electric power—or a stockholder in such a company—are you prepared to help vastly expand the productive capacity of your industry without holding back for fear of postwar overproduction?

These are not all the sacrifices which we must make if we are to achieve victory; you can think of the others yourself. And the most vital question of all is this:

Are you prepared to do all these things—as you probably think you are—without the stimulus of war? Are you prepared to pay the price of peace for year after year—possibly for 20 years?

The gamble which Moscow will make—if it chooses not to precipitate total war—is that the American people and the other free people of the world won't have the courage and firmness of purpose to pay the price of peace. They will gamble that we haven't enough guts to take it year after year. They will bet on their ability to hold their rotten system together by the force and terrorism of police tactics until we succumb to our love of luxury and comfort.

There is no excitement, no fun, no glory in a nonwar struggle.

On the other hand, neither is there blood and tears, nor widows nor orphans nor devastated cities and a scorched earth.

Is it worth the price?

You—and you alone—have the answer to that.

Contribution of Farmers to the Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made before the annual convention of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, at St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday of last week. The address deals with the production of food, with the farm parity program, and also with Western European ideas on those questions.

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

I am indeed happy to have the privilege of speaking to you at your annual Minnesota Farm Bureau meeting, and to meet again so many of my old friends. With many of you, I have been associated in farm organization activities for many years. You and I worked together in those frightful depression years.

In those days the farm organizations had much to do with obtaining improvements and enactment of farm credit legislation which enabled farmers to refinance their farm operations and stave off what appeared to be positive foreclosure for many a farm family. You also were instrumental in helping to write the farm-support legislation that has stabilized not only the agricultural economy but the very economy of every one of our Main Street merchants throughout the entire Nation.

Today we have legislation that permits us to deal with the farm questions and possible emergencies that may occur, due to the Korean crisis and the general possibility of complete and full mobilization. The Secretary of Agriculture can encourage increased production by incentive payments in any commodity of which we are in short supply. Likewise, we have the stabilizing factor in our agricultural program that protects the producer, should he overproduce, against a drastic price decline that would spell ruin for him.

There is a need for strong farm organizations. For the past half century the number of people residing on farms have been on the decline until at present less than 20 percent of the Nation's population is engaged in productive farming. Because of

the small percentage of the Nation's population, you must be a part of a farm organization. You must speak as a unit and be represented in the halls of your State capitol as well as in the Nation's Capital.

I want to report to you, the members of the Minnesota Farm Bureau, that your officers, Frank White, your president; J. S. Jones, your secretary; and the board members are doing a commendable job representing the farm families before State legislative committees and testifying in your behalf. Yes, I have met them in Washington, appearing before congressional committees along with members of the national board of directors, and particularly such leaders as, first, Ed O'Neill, and now, in later years, Allan Kline, the presidents of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

GAINS IN FARM LIFE

There have been many gains in improving farm life. One in which the Government has had a large part is rural electrification. Anyone who has carried a lantern for many years doing chores, and has experienced the inconvenience and dangers of a kerosene lamp in his home, fully realizes and appreciates what rural electrification has brought to the farm home and the farmer. Rural electrification has brought not only safety, convenience, and the possibility of a modern home on the farm due to the automatic electrical water pumps, but it has provided the possibility of increased production to the farmer's poultry flock in the long winter months, as well as many other conveniences that I need not mention to you.

The farm organizations have also greatly assisted in improving the educational opportunities of the rural child by helping to bring about consolidations of schools and the establishment of school busses and improvement in highway conditions that make these school busses possible. The present State commissioner of agriculture, Mr. Clark; J. S. Jones, your secretary; and Dr. J. O. Christianson, of the school of agriculture, consented to serve on the educational study committee which I, as your Governor, organized here in Minnesota in 1945 to make a study of the over-all school question and to report back to the State legislature. The University of Minnesota, with its agricultural experiment station, has made ours a leading State in agricultural research. Dr. Peterson, of the university, is recognized the Nation over. The Minnesota State Legislature is to be commended for its foresight and support of sound legislation in this field and I know that Governor Youngdahl has a commendable record in support of research in the field of agriculture.

These important and constructive contributions are of utmost significance. The new frontiers of today are your experimental stations and research laboratories. The experimental stations are constantly improving the variety of grains and livestock, searching ever for higher yield and production, greater disease resistance, developing a product through improved methods of processing to broaden the consumer's demand. We have made improvements in breeding of new grass strains but we have much to learn still in this particular field and adequate appropriations must be made in order that this scientific research may be carried on. It has most generally been the practice of the farmer to use his poorer land for pasturing purposes, paying little, if any, attention to improving not only the variety of grass grown on this land, but the condition of the soil itself. Fortunately, however, much attention is being paid now to these questions through the research studies made at our National Research Center in Beltsville, Md., the agricultural departments of the University of Minnesota, the splendid educational and demonstration work carried on by the Extension Service and soil-conservation programs.

We are meeting here in this Farm Bureau convention today in a period of national emergency. I should like to discuss with you some phases of our agricultural problems and give you a report of my views, as your Senator, on our immediate obligations so far as Europe is concerned.

NEED FULL PRODUCTION

The Korean crisis and the threat of Communist aggression by Soviet Russia are causing this Nation to expand its military manpower and also to reactivate many war plants. This has brought about a tremendous demand for additional manpower and it has also increased the purchasing power of some individuals. This increased manpower, increased earnings, and the fear of scarcity are threatening this Nation with inflation. To meet this inflationary trend in food costs we must have increased production in agriculture in order that we may have an ample supply of food and fiber. Only an ample supply can hold down the inflationary trends.

The first problem that we are confronted with is the question of manpower. Our farms today are highly mechanized, and the machines require experienced operators. Those administering the selective service and recruiting of military personnel must study every phase of this manpower question and make deferments where deferments are necessary in order that we do not handicap our agricultural operations. They must recognize this need and make deferments of a sufficient number of competent farm workers that we may be able to continue the high production and even expand it in some commodities in the immediate future.

Together with building up our military strength and gaining full production in industry, we must have full production in agricultural products as a prime factor in the economic stability and strength of the Nation. Only if there is an ample supply of food and fiber from the farms can this country meet the grave crisis it faces. Agricultural production, already at high levels during World War II and during the postwar period, can and must be further increased.

The farmer's needs for machinery must be considered in the allocation of raw materials. The farmer must have adequate supplies of fertilizer and power. He must have assurance of a stable price structure.

In order to avoid controls and rationing of meat we must increase our production. First in poultry and turkeys, and next in pork. All this can be accomplished in the year 1951. I know each and every one of you farmers, as you have in the past, will try to save a greater number of pigs farrowed. Every little porker you are able to save will increase the meat supply.

Beef is a longer cycle, requiring more than 1 year. We had a splendid increase in 1950 in cattle by 3,200,000. Beef prices are above parity. We can increase the over-all poundage of beef if we can continue to encourage feeding, filling our feeder lots with feeder cattle, thereby producing greater poundage of meat per animal slaughtered.

FARMERS' SHARE LESS

There are those who feel that controls and rations are a necessity to avoid inflationary food costs. It has been most disturbing to many of us since the Korean crisis to see, in far too many instances, an unreasonable mark-up not only in food prices, but in other merchandise. I had a little experience one day in a grocery store in Washington. I remarked, "These prices have certainly gone up." The grocery clerk informed me that it was the farm support program that was the cause of it. I asked him a few questions, and all that he could say was that it was the farm price supports that had caused the rise in food costs. This propaganda has been going on across the Nation. I would say that the farm organizations need to do more of a job of public education relative to what effect farm support legislation has had on the retail cost of foods of all kinds.

Farmers' produce and commodity prices have not been excessively high. If we examine the entire price index, we would find some commodities slightly above parity, others below parity. For instance, wheat. As of December 15, 1950, it was 88 percent of parity. Corn was but 86 percent of parity. Of the nonbasics, butterfat per pound was but 81 percent of parity; milk, wholesale per hundredweight, 89 percent of parity. Beef-cattle prices were above; in fact, beef was at 141 percent of parity as of December 15. Hogs were only at 89 percent of parity. Lambs were 138 percent; live turkeys but 90 percent; chickens, live, 74 percent of parity.

Farm price supports have not been responsible for increased consumer prices during the present emergency.

Let us take a further look at the record. Of the consumer's dollar the farmer did not receive as much in the year 1950 as he did in the years of 1946 and 1948. On all food products, in June 1946, the farmer received 53 percent of the consumer's dollar; in July 1948 he received 52 percent; but in October 1950 he received only 48 percent. On meat products the farmer received 76 percent of the consumer's dollar in June 1946, but in July 1948 he received 65 percent, and in October 1950 only 63 percent. Poultry and eggs are the same. In June 1946 the farmer's share was 72 percent; in July 1948, 71 percent; and in October 1950 but 61 percent. Take bakery and other cereal products. In June 1946 only 31 percent of what the consumer paid was represented by the farmer's share; in July 1948 it was 30 percent; but in October 1950 it had dropped to 27 percent. For dairy products the ratio was 55 percent in June 1946, 59 percent in July 1948, and 55 percent in October 1950. For all fruits and vegetables the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar in June 1946 was 43 percent. It dropped to 36 percent in July 1948, and to 34 percent in October 1950. It is clear that the farmer has received for food products a continuously smaller percentage of the price to the consumer.

As we examine the records of our livestock population, all cattle, as of the last official report, we find that the total was up to 83,500,000. All cattle on farms increased by more than 3,000,000 animals in the year of 1950. We have had a steady rise in all livestock population in 1948 and 1949. Unless controls and rationing are reimposed, I am confident that increases will continue in the livestock population. Certainly the volume of meat produced will be on the increase if we can continue the movement of light cattle to feeder lots to be finished out, and thereby actually get the big poundage of meat per animal.

Many think that controls and rationing of food are an immediate necessity. I do not share this conviction. The immediate necessity is, first, there must not be any more undue mark-ups in the prices or excessive profit taking. Secondly, the purchaser must not hoard food stocks. There is no need for it. There is an ample supply of food and fiber to meet the needs if there is no hoarding. Many of the housewives have been buying unnecessarily, fearful that shortages would occur and that rationing would be reestablished.

MUST CONTROL INFLATION

Controls and rationing of food products at this time would subject us to a threat of black-market operations. Such black-market operations would deny the legitimate merchant the product to sell, but more espe-

cially, the very byproduct that is saved in the established slaughter yards that go into medical processes would be lost to the public. Likewise many of the hides, too, would be destroyed. Such were the experiences under control and rationing of meat and food products in World War II.

You folks, the producers, if granted favorable growing weather, will expand your production. You will do it first in poultry, as that can be done in the next few months. Next in pork, which can be accomplished within the year. Beef, however, requires a longer cycle. If the housewife will purchase the poultry we can avoid inflationary prices in meats in general.

There are several ways of help avoid inflation. Increased taxes for defense needs and control of consumer credit have been initial steps. The full effects of those steps have not yet been felt or noted. However, the increase in taxes and the credit controls as imposed by the Federal Reserve, have been effective as safeguards against inflationary trends. The tax committees of Congress are going forward, studying scientifically the entire tax question to make certain that we tax to the maximum of our ability to pay without jeopardizing the future of this great Nation, paying as much of the defense costs as our economy can stand so that the very men fighting today will not be compelled to bear the indebtedness incurred due to the conflict.

The Korean crisis and the unsettled world condition makes it necessary that we plan for further stabilization of our economy. We must consider most carefully the continued allocation of scare materials. We must determine whether price and wage controls on a selective basis are now necessary.

But I repeat, at this time our major problem in agriculture is to stimulate increased production without too much restriction in order to insure ample supplies of food and fiber and avoid the dangers which we experienced in World War II.

THREAT OF COMMUNISM

You and I are indeed very fortunate people to be citizens of the United States of America. We need to think and forever talk about the great opportunities of this land in order that future generations may have strong convictions of the greatness of our country as we inherited it from the founders and from our pioneer parents who blazed trails out across the wilderness of North America, establishing homes and little communities in the Territories that were later to be incorporated into States. We have achieved in America a standard of living higher than has been known to the average person in any country of the world in all of its history.

All of this and the freedom of man is threatened today by Soviet Russia and the atheistic, Communist ideology and philosophy which they are endeavoring to spread out over the earth like a dragnet to involve all.

Since the ending of World War II we have learned of mistakes, serious mistakes made by this Nation in secret agreements entered into and made in conferences, such as those held at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. This great Nation made a mistake when we permitted Russia to hold a corridor about the city of Berlin, thereby causing this Nation the great expense of the airlift in order that we could supply our sector of Berlin with foods and other supplies. We, likewise, made another serious mistake in later conferences that permitted Russia to enter into Manchuria, thereby giving Russia a control of all of the lines of communication and railroads which enabled the Communists to gain control of vast areas of China that eventually forced Chiang Kai-shek to flee from his country to Formosa. And now the Communists are demanding of the United Nations that they be recognized as a nation.

I joined with others in Congress in sponsoring a resolution, demanding that any agreements made in conferences by our national leaders must be made known or the full text of those conferences or agreements must be made available to Members of Congress in order that we do not make mistakes in this day comparable to some made in those secret agreements of years past.

I supported the Marshall plan. I fully realized that the war-torn and devastated countries of Western Europe needed our assistance in order that we could rebuild their economies, bringing hope and courage not only to the businessmen of those countries but to the citizens to fight against communism. I spent many weeks on the European Continent in the fall of 1949 to learn first-hand what we had achieved under the Marshall-aid program and also what we could hope to achieve and accomplish through the Atlantic Pact, and I am indeed grateful that General Eisenhower again has answered the call to duty and has gone to Europe to personally confer with the leaders of those countries, seeking information. We must assist, and give them the leadership, the incentive, the hope, and the courage that will create a will on the part of the leaders of those countries to develop a military strength that can resist Russia.

MUST GIVE AID TO EUROPE

The redevelopment of a military force on the European Continent is absolutely essential, I believe. It was for that reason that I supported the North Atlantic Treaty and, likewise, supported the appropriation that would assist countries of Western Europe to obtain the military equipment and modern equipment that an army should have. It has been exceedingly disappointing to me that the State Department and the military have been unable to develop the military forces that we hoped for and that the Atlantic Pact authorized. Let us hope that General Eisenhower will achieve what we have all hoped and prayed for.

I also feel that rearming and developing military strength in Western Europe will serve us militarily here in the United States for this reason: It is absolutely essential, I believe, to maintain air bases in countries of Western Europe. It would be exceedingly costly were we to build up a fleet of bombers, long-range bombers that could fly from this continent to Russia if it became necessary to strike effectively were we faced with an aggressive Russian warfare against our continent. Were Communist Russia to attack us by a fleet of long-range bombers, hoping to get enough planes through our line of defense, endeavoring, even though it be a suicidal flight, to bomb out our industrial centers and cripple our lines of communication, it would then be highly advantageous for us if we had a friendly relationship with the countries of Western Europe which were protecting our very air bases from which we could counterattack speedily and decisively, thereby destroying the enemy's ability to continue her attack on us. Such a national defense would be less costly in defense fighter planes to guard long flights.

If all of Western Europe were to fall to communism and go behind the imaginary iron curtain and we had no such military bases as I have just described, I think we would find it far more difficult, our long flights more vulnerable to air attacks, and certainly far more costly in the development of an aerial striking unit. It was for this reason that I have felt strongly that Spain offered certain military advantages, not only to the United States but to the European countries that are endeavoring to fight communism. I have felt that a recognition of Spain would strengthen our position. Spain certainly showed a friendliness during World War II. We have the question of the defense of Gibraltar that we must not lose sight of. The Pyrenees Mountains in Spain offer a protection against an invading land army as there are but few passes through there that would have to be guarded and, likewise, it offers certain security from air attacks.

CONFIDENCE IN EISENHOWER

These many questions have led me to the conviction that we have much to gain in the development of military units and a military strength in the countries of Western Europe. I feel confident that General Eisenhower will be able to achieve what we had hoped for in the Atlantic Pact when Congress ratified it. An army such as the Atlantic Pact really authorizes, will bring the German youth, the French, the Italian, the Belgian, the Scandinavian, and the British, as well as the Dutch, into a closer understanding and relationship which will enable those people to work together much better in future generations. The hatred is so evident in the breast of the youth of these foreign countries against the people of other countries. They have inherited it from their elders. It is still present, ready to flame into a bitter fire of hatred. I hope that that wall of hatred that has separated those countries in generations past can be torn down and overcome by such a military organization as is hoped for under the Atlantic Pact provisions and I am confident that General Eisenhower will be able to develop such armies from the manpower that is available in the countries of Western Europe, thereby not compelling this Nation to develop the necessary ground troops to guard the aerial installations and to give security to the countries of Western Europe against an invading Russian army.

Yes, we have the technical know-how to develop the strongest aviation strength on earth. We have the greatest naval strength on earth and we can continue it as such providing that we can keep the industrial potential of Western Europe and Africa on our side and on the side of free Christian people rather than in back of the iron curtain.

There is a great challenge in these problems at this critical time. I have supreme confidence that a united America will meet that challenge with the courage, the self-sacrifice, the hard work, and the faith that are required.

Omnibus Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a remarkably able statement by the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], which appeared in the Washington Daily News today.

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

OMNIBUS BUDGET BILL IS BLESSING TO THE TAXPAYER

(By Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

The prize of the economy advocates in Congress—the single, or omnibus, appropriation bill—is in jeopardy in this Eighty-second Congress after its trial run in the Eighty-first Congress.

There is a vigorous drive under way to abandon this system of putting all of the

appropriations in one big bill. The aim is to return to the expensive and obsolete method of having several separate appropriation bills.

I am against this movement. I am for the omnibus appropriation bill, particularly now when there will be such great pressure to pass appropriation bills hurriedly on the argument that we must act fast to get our defenses up.

I certainly see some weaknesses and shortcomings in the single appropriation bill as it worked last year. But surely the faults cannot be attributed to lack of speedy action or tardiness. The failures must be laid to House and Senate leadership. It's not a weakness of the system. It's a weakness of the men who legislate or, more accurately, appropriate.

In judging whether the single appropriation-bill system should be retained, we should review some of the arguments pro and con. The greatest argument in its favor is that since it puts all of the appropriations together, each Senator and Representative can know better just how much money he is voting to appropriate and lay on the back of the taxpayers.

That makes good sense. I remember when I was a housewife and had to operate on a household budget. There was just so much money available to spend for running the house and I had to keep that in mind to stay within the budget. The single appropriation bill performs this function for Members of Congress. It stands as a constant guide as to whether a balanced budget is being achieved or can be achieved and, if not, how much more we will have to raise taxes to get a balanced budget or bring the budget back into balance.

The single appropriation bill makes it easier for Congress to detect and eliminate duplicating and overlapping appropriations. It checks "pork barrel" logrolling. It gives the advocates of economy a much better chance of getting over-all reductions.

The record proves this. For the first time in 5 years the House last year made a sizable reduction from the amount reported out by the Appropriations Committee.

The big argument against the omnibus appropriation bill system is the time that it takes. That is an argument to be leveled more properly at those who control the calendar and the debate on legislation. They say it encouraged absenteeism. But attendance last year was better than average and disproves this argument.

Regarding attendance prior to the single appropriation bill, it was the spenders who made it a point to be present to get their pet projects through. In contrast, the best attendance last year was during roll-call votes on reduction amendments.

There are rough edges to the single appropriation bill system, as there are to any new system. All new systems need polishing up as experience dictates. That applies to the omnibus bill system. It should be retained and improved with revisions. It is one of our best hopes for efficient, businesslike operation of our Government on expenditures and taxes.

Draft of American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "We Agree, But," published in the Altoona Mirror, January 13, 1951.

I also ask that there be printed following the editorial a reply to the editorial which I wrote to the editor of the Mirror on January 17.

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

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of January 13, 1951]

WE AGREE, BUT

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, former major general, former Governor of Pennsylvania, and now senior Senator from Pennsylvania, is quoted in a Washington, D. C., dispatch as favoring the drafting of 18-year-olds for the armed services. Senator MARTIN says the 18-year-old boy makes a grand combat soldier. "Older men are more likely to be set in their ways," he is quoted as saying.

The Senator should know something about both points. He is now 71 years of age and has something of a reputation of being set in his ways about a number of things. He served for a number of years in the Armed Forces and, according to the same Washington quotation, says he served in the Spanish-American War before he was 19 years of age. The 52 intervening years were spent for the most part either in the Army or in the service of the Government. He served Pennsylvania in a number of capacities and to his credit it must be said that he usually served Pennsylvania well.

So, we agree with the Senator that 18-year-old boys make good soldiers. But we must also point out to our Senator that 18-year-old boys make good in a number of other fields also and that it should be the aim of this Nation to give them an opportunity to make good in these other fields.

Eighteen-year-old boys make good students. This is the period in life when youth learns quickly and it is just about the age when most boys finish high school. After school most boys either enroll in college or start learning a trade or business. American parents want something better than Army training for their sons when they graduate from high school. They certainly don't want their 18-year-old boys to be trained for duty in foreign lands. They are not too keen about making them available for "police action" in another Korea. Nor do they want them sent to some other shore on the say-so of any individual.

Before the citizens of this Nation will agree to the drafting of their 18-year-old sons they want some assurances from Congress that this Nation is being operated as a republic. The popular notion around the country, as we get it, is that only the American Congress has the power to declare war. We do not believe that the American people want any more undeclared wars, where troops are sent in without the sanction of the Congress.

Mr. Senator, 18 years of age is a grand age for many things. At 18 most of us had grand illusions of a better way of life. We had higher ideals than those of us who are more advanced in years have been able to keep. We had a better knack of getting along with our fellows and just a little more of the joy of life than at any other time of life. The boy of 18 is standing on the threshold of manhood. Would you, Mr. Senator, advocate shortening that space of time for him? Would you have him grow up overnight? Would you teach him to hate and kill?

Is it too much of a boon for those of us who fill in the more humble stations of life to want to see our children have at least one or two more years in that last stage between boyhood and manhood? Do you advocate this lowering of the draft age in order to protect America, or are you, too, one of the international set that has lost faith in America's ability to defend herself? Do you believe that we must send more and more men to Europe to defend nations that up until the present time have shown little tangible evidence of the will to defend themselves?

America needs its 18-year-old boys. It needs its 18-year-old girls. There is a line of defense that is as important to our way of life as any army or navy line that has ever been thrown about the Nation in its hours of need. That line of defense, my dear sir, is the line of industrial and moral supremacy that has been nurtured by our free-enterprise system.

We are a great Nation because we have had the individual freedom to develop our lives as Providence intended them to develop. We are a great Nation because we know how to do things. The greatest advances of the past 50 years have been made by men and women who received basic training in fields other than the military during the formative years of life. America owes its No. 1 position in the world today to the men and women of science, of business, of education and to the boys and girls of yesteryear who were able to develop their talents in the formative years of life.

Where are we going to get the engineers, the technical experts, the doctors, the ministers, the merchants and, yes, the fine mechanics that are necessary to operate our complicated machines and gadgets of the modern world if we allow all of our youth to be siphoned off as soon as they finish high school?

Great technological advances have been made since our senior Senator was 18 years of age. In the world of manufacturing and business the advances have been most pronounced. The implements of modern warfare have been altered so rapidly that what was modern a year ago is ancient today and what we had 6 months ago may be outmoded tomorrow. Must we match the enemy, man for man, slug it out, toe to toe, or might we do better if we overmatch him with weapons so far superior to his own that even a reckless regard for life will not be able to overcome them?

America needs men who think in modern terms in its positions of great trust. War is no longer fought on the same level as it was back in 1898. There is no romance about war. It is a deadly business. It is serious business—too serious for the Congress of the United States to hand over to the decision of any one man or small group of men.

It will take courage, Mr. Senator, to face the charge of being an isolationist. It may take courage to regain the power that has been handed over to the executive branch of Government. It takes courage to take a positive stand about anything these days. It takes courage to be wrong occasionally. It takes even more courage to admit error. But it is going to take a lot of courage to get this Nation out of the trouble in which it has become involved. A lot of that trouble, Mr. Senator, can be traced to those of us who are past the middle years of life. How much of it can be laid at the doors of the 18-year-olds?

JANUARY 18, 1951.

Mr. HERMAN REIFSNYDER,
The Altoona Mirror,
Altoona, Pa.

DEAR MR. REIFSNYDER: I have a copy of your editorial of January 13 entitled "We Agree—But."

I appreciate very much indeed this fine discussion of one of the most critical problems ever to confront our country. Only by frank and free discussion can we reach decisions that truly represent the will of the people and will make the greatest contribution to the preservation of American ideals.

Present world conditions leave no doubt that we must prepare for full mobilization. Even if God spares us the tragedies of another world war, as we all hope and pray, it is my firm belief that basic training for every young man, excepting those physically unfit, is the foundation of any plan for building the defensive strength of our Republic.

For many years I have favored universal military training. I believe every American, regardless of his station in life, should be ready to defend his country. My contention has been that if everyone were given basic training, it would be a great arm for peace. In my plan of basic training, I would want to teach the youth of our country personal hygiene—how to care for themselves in peace and war—what America stands for and an understanding of the American way of life. Military instruction teaches the value of organization and that we must aid each other in all our endeavors.

Personally, I feel that if we had a good plan, backed up by the American people, war could be prevented. My own plan would be to build the greatest Navy and the greatest Air Force in the world. We would then have land forces—the best trained, the best equipped, and the most mobile the world has ever known. Back of all of that, we must have a rearmed, spiritual America—an America that is decent and obeys the laws and is willing to support itself. It would be a God-fearing America where the strong appreciate their obligations toward the weak.

The people of the United States have a right to know our commitments. My military experience convinces me that we have made commitments that we are unable to fulfill. We cannot fight a war all over the globe. In my plan I would want to join with other countries that also appreciate individual freedom. I see no reason why the Nationalist Chinese should not be fighting the Communist Chinese. I see no reason why our military strategy should be restricted by preventing the destruction of enemy communication lines, enemy dumps and reserve positions.

I don't want to see the American youth thrown into the battle. However, my own experience as a citizen and a soldier teaches me that in half a century America has thrown into battle its youth without proper training and without proper equipment.

Referring to my own position as a youth, my military work taught me self-reliance and my duty toward my comrades. I left college as a sophomore and I came back and graduated from college. I was handicapped physically for a while as it took me 6 years to regain my health and weight. It made a better American out of me and a better worker for myself and my country.

Again, I greatly appreciate your editorial.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

EDWARD MARTIN.

Courage of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous censent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "We Are Americans; Let Us Act Now As Americans Should," published in the Saturday Evening Post last week.

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

WE ARE AMERICANS; LET US ACT NOW AS AMERICANS SHOULD

Reading the newspapers these days, a Communist agent might conclude that the American people were trying to scare themselves to death. Commentators vie with military experts to expatiate on our helplessness. It seems our equipment is nonexistent, our allies are no good, our guard is down, and our morale is hopeless. An innocent bystander might conclude that the Soviets had already won the war and that Americans were already working under the lash of the Red Simon Legrees in Siberian timber camps. Stalin might well conclude it was time to start marching, except that he might also suspect that such abysmal despair was a booby trap.

To be sure, there is nothing in our present state of affairs that justifies insouciant optimism. We are in a dangerous mess. But, after all, America has been in danger before this—but before this she has expected to survive the danger. For our part, we see no reason to justify the apparently widespread feeling in certain circles that this time we are sunk for keeps. Sacrifices we shall have to make, anxieties we shall have to face, and we may even have to repel an enemy from our own shores for the first time in 135 years. But these hazards ought to be faced with the confident understanding that we have assets as well as liabilities in the struggle, whatever it may turn out to be like.

First of all, of course, we have courageous and well-trained defenders, potentially numbering millions. The record in Korea is put down as a defeat. Nevertheless, the assignment as originally understood was brilliantly executed against heavy odds. South Korea was liberated, and the Reds were driven back to the Manchurian border. Only the intervention of the overwhelming Chinese Communist horde was capable of nullifying the United Nations exploit, under the command of General MacArthur. The Korean War suggests the risks in matching our limited manpower on the ground against the millions of Asia, but it also revealed the limitless courage, stamina, and resourcefulness of the American soldier. We cannot afford to forget that.

Nor can we forget that, in contrast to the plight of the Russian millions and the unwilling satellites of the Kremlin, we have something important to defend. Our industrial capacity and know-how have not yet been fully mobilized, but does anybody doubt America's ability to outproduce and outgadget the Russians, once a wartime tempo is achieved? It is our guess that the Kremlin, at any rate, has no illusions about this.

Even the undoubted advantage of the Soviet system in manpower need not appall us—unless we are determined to engage it exclusively on the ground. Let us not forget that when Hitler invaded Russia in 1941, his armies took as prisoners hundreds of thousands of Russians who swarmed over the German lines on the supposition that they were being liberated. If the brutal invasion of the Nazis was thus received, should we despair of the possibility that freedom and democracy may have at least as great an appeal? The bosses of the Kremlin are not so confident as we, shaking in our shoes, think they are. The Communist bosses of China are reported to be in serious trouble, and it could be worse when and if our State Department chooses to exploit it. A world in chaos poses tremendous problems, but America is not the only nation to face them.

Surely if "courage mounteth with occasion," that quality should be amply present now. Without vain boasting, or wishful optimism, or inane bravado, the American people can weather these storms, no matter what the experts say. General Eisenhower agrees. It is our opinion that, despite the pall of gloom which hangs over the insiders, the mass of Americans are facing what comes with firm hearts and realistic determination. They want to be sure their leaders are doing as well.

The Welfare and Safety of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 18, Col. J. Carroll Cone, vice president of Pan-American Airways, delivered a very able and forceful address to the Women's National Democratic Club, here in Washington, D. C. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN UNITY AND BOUNDARIES

I thank you for your gracious invitation to be one of your speakers today and for inviting me to select my own subject.

This privilege tempted me to use it as an opportunity to talk about air transportation but on second thought it became obvious that we might better devote this time to a consideration of the welfare and safety of our country.

Not only the United States but the entire free world is facing the greatest crisis in history. The manner in which this crisis is resolved will determine whether or not our children and children's children will live in a happy world, or whether they shall be virtual slaves of a foreign and brutal government.

These ominous clouds threatening our very existence can be dissipated only by the greatest determination and sacrifices on the part of every good American regardless of age, sex, color, politics, or religion.

Should we shirk our responsibilities and duties now—should we try to continue to make the same profits, enjoy the same luxurious and easy living—we cannot criticize other Americans for the same conduct.

If we all sidestep our duty in this time of dire peril to our country, we shall certainly be defeated, and then our march to the concentration camps, slave legions, and the firing squad begins. We shall have selfishly profited for a short time, only to realize later that our actions, or failure to act, constituted a crime against our country.

We cannot afford to profit in worldly goods, to enjoy easy living, while shirking our responsibilities to our fellowman everywhere, to our country, and to our God in times like these. "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

Our enemy has already proven his complete disregard for the dignity of man and for the teachings of our Maker.

International law is ignored, churches are maliciously destroyed, and the clergy imprisoned or killed. Women and children are brutally manhandled in every evil manner.

If we, our sons, daughters, and other loved ones are called upon to make the supreme sacrifice for the protection of the rights, opportunities and ideals for which our ancestors fought, we should go—nay, we must

go, and encourage to go—every person who can serve.

Always in time of national peril we talk about boundaries. Yet no one has ever seen a boundary or a borderline anywhere but on a map. The exact point at which our national claims end and those of some other nation begin is not visible to the naked eye.

Now I think that many of the border lines that circumscribe our private lives today are figuratively just as shadowy. Contrast our times with the days of the mercenaries—the Hessians, for instance, who fought for the British in our own Revolutionary War. They were paid to do a job. The British citizen felt little concern about the war and was only remotely conscious of its nature. War hardly impinged on his private life.

Even in our own Civil War—or the War Between the States, if you prefer—it was not uncommon for a citizen to hire someone else to take his place in the ranks of the draftees.

But in today's world it isn't possible to buy immunity. It isn't possible to delegate personal responsibility, or to provide a substitute for one's own active participation. The boundary between the fighting man and the production man, from the standpoint of importance in a war, is not easy to define. They are mutually dependent. Even the civilian who isn't engaged in production becomes a vital element in providing the capital that war requires.

The boundary where military responsibility ends and civilian concern begins is vague, and becoming increasingly so.

Methods of transportation, technological advances, even the explorations of the human mind in philosophy, are obliterating the old boundaries. Today, then, we are not fighting to preserve our coast line, nor our frontiers, nor our buildings. We are fighting to save something even less tangible but vastly more important.

We are fighting not to preserve our houses, but our homes. We are fighting not to preserve our industries, but a concept of life in which an individual can maintain himself and his kin with dignity. We are fighting not for our bodies, but for our souls.

Isn't that the essence of total war?

People close to the imaginative minds in air transportation are perhaps more conscious than others of our lack of protective boundaries. Time and distance were once on our side; now they are gone. We have observed how populations can change. We have seen, tragically enough, how in the process of change ideas are transported that are more deadly than cholera.

It is inconceivable to us that there can persist today in the minds of supposedly responsible leaders the notion that our shores constitute a defense, and that our responsibilities end with our geographical borders.

Total war takes no cognizance of boundaries or frontiers or established fighting lines. Total war enters and destroys the dwelling of the civilian. Even more importantly, it invades his mind.

The insidious, stultifying effects of that invasion are apparent today in the kind of leadership which insists that the concerns of other nations are not ours.

In retrospect we now recognize many mistakes—honest mistakes—we, as a people, have made. Some of the mistakes we have made at home in our lack of preparedness, in our failure to recognize the danger signs on the international horizon. The most hideous mistake we could now make would be to fight among ourselves, each accusing the other, destroying confidence in each other—Democrats or Republicans alike. We cannot continue to survive under the slogan of business or politics, as usual.

We must, as good Americans, close ranks and put up a completely solid front against our enemies, both domestic and foreign, and we have many dangerous enemies within the borders of our own land.

The President of the United States is the President of Democrats and Republicans alike. He is a good President, loyal to our country, patriotic to the *n*th degree. He has inherited many tremendous and baffling problems. He has had many heaped upon him by persons and by governments who would destroy us. The solutions are not easy. Some maybe are impossible, but political friend and foe alike must admit, if they are honest, that President Truman is struggling unceasingly, patriotically and heroically, to lead us out of the miasmic swamps of domestic and international discord to the sunlight of peace and freedom from fear.

We must lay aside all destructive criticisms that may add to our dangers; we must unify the efforts of every patriotic American. We must become ready for heavy sacrifices. We must do our utmost to safeguard the interests of future generations, and the continued existence of our great country as the "home of the brave and the land of the free."

The new burdens we shall be called upon to carry will be heavy, heavier than Americans have ever experienced. We shall be forced into a long period of austerity. Luxuries as we have known them will vanish. We shall have to devote every possible energy and asset to defense in order that we may not perish.

While individuals are tightening their belts, our Government must eliminate every activity or expense that is not required for the security of our Nation.

Waste in our homes, factories, in transportation, and in Government, must be eradicated. Fuel, power, clothing and food must be conserved. Our every energy and resource must be devoted to strengthening our ability to protect our country against numerically superior and merciless antagonists.

A Declaration of Dependence on Almighty God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a declaration of dependence on Almighty God, prepared and delivered by Dr. Albert P. Shirkey, pastor, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, Washington, D. C.

The people of America are accustomed to issuing declarations of independence, but it is most appropriate at this time that we should individually and collectively join in subscribing to this declaration of dependence.

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

DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE

(Proposed by Albert P. Shirkey, D. D.)

When in the course of human events the heart and soul of a nation's life (that part for which our fathers bled and died) is being attacked by subtle and insidious forces, it becomes the duty and obligation of that nation made so aware to make certain declarations.

This declaration becomes imperative first, to insure the continuation of our people in that kind of life that issues in good citizenship, happy home life, honorable business practices, the stabilization of education, and the production of philanthropic impulses. Second, to make our Nation aware that man does not live by bread alone and that life does not consist in the abundance of things one possesses. Third, to inform our own people and the peoples of the world that it is our firm conviction that the mainstay of our political, national, home, and individual life comes to its fullest fruition only when God is written upon the mind, heart, and conscience of a nation's life. It is this that holds us true to the highest and noblest ideals. The loss of these ideals breeds instability, unrest, injustice, bloodshed. Then, to be true to our place in the family of nations, it becomes our solemn duty to issue a call that will bring not only to our Nation but to the nations of the world, that poise which is the cherished possession of those who trust in God.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled, led by the President of our country, issue the following declaration:

We believe in God, and we hereby reaffirm our dependence upon Him. Woven into our national life is this confidence that we will not allow to be shaken. Upon our coins we have inscribed, "In God We Trust." We now call upon the people of these United States of America to write this afresh upon the spiritual tables of their hearts—to guard this faith as one would guard his life. We remind our people that this country was founded for the purpose of allowing each man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Throughout our history God has been the warp and woof of our national existence.

We believe in God. Democracy has been the outgrowth of this faith. It is this principle of government that we see fast disappearing in nations that have overthrown God. Wherever there is to be found reverence for God, the lowest have equal opportunities for life, love, and liberty, which are the cherished possessions of the more fortunate.

As lovers of liberty we declare that when God has disappeared from a nation's life, slavery in some form or another has ensued. The dignity and worth of human personality has been preserved only when men have been made conscious that they are responsible to the Judge of the Universe for their actions.

Thus, to preserve the life begun, protected, and fostered in our national history, we publicly make this declaration of dependence on Almighty God.

The Role of Labor in the War Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address of Mr. George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, and vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Economic Club of New York, January 17, 1951, at the Astor Hotel, in New York City.

Mr. Harrison is an industrial statesman who has honorably represented the interests of organized labor for many years, and I believe his thoughts should get careful consideration from every Member of Congress.

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

Mr. President and members of the Economic Club of New York, it is a great pleasure for me to be here to talk with you about some of the problems that are facing us today. It is a pleasure not only because I find such contacts always useful and enlightening, but also because the present national emergency demands of all of us that we try to reach as great a mutual understanding among the people of the United States as is humanly possible. The war in Korea has finally unmasked the designs and the program of the Communists; anyone who had any doubt before must know now that the dictator in Moscow is willing to risk world war in order to extend his despotic power. We should realize now, too, that there is no limit to that appetite for power. We can't satisfy that Russian bear with a little raw meat. The more he eats, the more he wants—and the meal he really has his eyes on is the United States of America. In the emergency that confronts us, the achievement of effective national unity is of first importance.

It is important that we Americans try to build up our national strength, as much as we can and as fast as we can. We must try to resolve our own differences of opinion, as much as possible, to understand each other, so that we can pull together in the difficult days that lie ahead of us. Unless we learn to stand together today, we may fall together tomorrow.

You will not expect me, I know, to tell you of the problems or desires of American financiers, industrialists, or businessmen. The men who speak for the owners of American industries assuredly need no help from me, especially before this group. You will expect me to tell you of the problems and attitudes of American wage earners; that I propose to do, as simply and directly as I can. It would not be any kindness to you, either, for me to pull any punches here; for your own good, and for the good of the country, you ought to know exactly what American workers are thinking, even though you may not like those thoughts.

Let me say, first, that the working people of this Nation are fully awake to the menace of communism. We have faced that threat in many forms, during the past 20 years, and American labor has never for one moment wavered in its devotion to our free American institutions. No part of the citizens of this country are more determined to combat Communist dictatorship in whatever form and wherever in the world it threatens than the men and women who work for a living.

That determination springs, first of all, from the belief that our way of life—based on human freedom to worship, think, and speak, and vote as we believe—is right in principle, and the only just basis for any civilization. Labor is for freedom and democracy, and we are opposed to all kinds of dictatorship. But we are also opposed to Communist dictatorship from the immediate and direct standpoint of our own interests. We know that our unions, our personal freedom, and our living standards could not and would not survive under Communist domination. Labor leaders, and every outspoken workingman, would share the honors of the firing squad with the leaders of business and industry if Communist dictatorship were to be established in America. We know that. We know, too, that the same results would follow if our domestic breed of Communists were ever able to overthrow our form of government. Whether communism were imposed upon us by foreign aggression, or in some fashion slipped over on us by any home-grown dictator, the effect would be the same.

Don't ever forget that fact or let any of the more rabid antilabor newspapers or columnists or radio commentators mislead you. American labor is anti-Communist; American labor knows far better than American business the evils of dictatorship and domination, the benefits of freedom and democracy. We know, because in the not distant past, American workers were denied industrial and economic freedom, and they lived under the power of some petty despots and dictators in American industry. This, perhaps, is as good a place as any to say bluntly that American labor will fight against the return of that kind of industrial oppression in this country, and will fight as vigorously to get rid of it in the spots where it still exists.

Let us look at the facts of our American situation frankly. In normal times we do a lot of fighting among ourselves; our basic way of living is that every man is supposed to have an opportunity to work his way upward, and the competition in every walk of life, if it is fair and free, is one of our ways of making certain that the able and upright man will gain advancement to positions of leadership. Down through the years, the struggles of individual men, and of groups of men, have brought great progress to us as a people. American workers have not only improved their standards of living, but they have gained greater leisure for themselves, and they have won a substantial measure of freedom and democracy on their jobs. Part of that came from their efforts as individuals, but the great progress of recent years has been accomplished by them through their labor organizations. It hasn't been done, either, without great effort; every gain we have made in wages or working conditions, every right we have won, and every protection we have thrown around our jobs have been over the vigorous opposition of many employers. Sometimes we have been able to persuade, with facts and arguments, but much more frequently what we have secured has come only because we have said, "This is what we want, this is what we have got to have, and this is what we are going to have." The progress of the American working people has been won over the resistance of the representatives of business and industry.

I am not here complaining about that resistance. We have been free to ask for what we wanted, and the employers have been free, and willing, to answer "No." What I do complain about, however, is the methods and tactics that have been used. In ordinary times, we can trust to the ultimate sense of fair play of the American people, and our own efforts at explaining the facts, to get things set right in the long run. But now, in the gravest national danger we have ever faced, I believe we have a right to expect that the business community will police itself a little bit, as we have been trying to police domestic and international labor organization. We do not expect the American employer to drop all opposition to labor progress, any more than we expect the sun to rise in the west tomorrow morning.

Before I explain what I mean let me give you the reasons for insisting upon fair play and broad-minded action from the representatives of industry. This world situation in which we find ourselves is not just a battle between nations or groups of nations. As the Russians and some of their friends are preaching it, this fight is what they call a class conflict. They insist that the world is witnessing a battle between capitalists and workers, between employers and labor. The Communists in the Kremlin tell the world that labor rules in Russia, and that Communist victory in every other country means labor will rule that country; more than that, they are shouting all over the world that the United States is a capitalist-ruled country, that labor here is oppressed and downtrodden, that the American Government is the tool of big business and stands for industrial exploitation and the degradation of the workingman.

That, of course, is the technique of the big lie. Hitler, I believe it was, said that if you tell a big enough lie often enough, it will be believed, because people will think you couldn't have the nerve to invent a really fantastic story. That's the Russian Communist method today.

Look, now, at the world situation. We are the main bulwark of democratic human freedom and private enterprise, but two-thirds of the world is still free from Communist domination. We are the No. 1 target of the Communists, but the No. 1 tactic of the Communists is to separate us from all possible friends and allies abroad. They seek, also, to win any possible support for their program from among our own political leaders and the working people. But mainly they are trying, in Germany, France, Italy, in all of Western Europe, to persuade the labor groups that Uncle Sam is a capitalist despot, that our way of life is fundamentally antilabor and proemployer. The Communists hold up Russia as labor governed, and America as capitalist dominated. The real battleground of today is not just the rice paddies of Korea, it is the minds of the political leaders and the working people of Western Europe, and even of many in England and more than a few in the United States of America.

American labor is doing everything possible to counteract that Communist propaganda, in America and throughout the world, I need not tell you of the campaign within this country; you must have seen the news stories of the constant vigorous opposition to the Communist line and Communist people in all labor unions. Most of our labor organizations are free from any actual Communist influence, although there may be individuals who are still unbalanced enough to accept the Russian line. But in the international field we have been no less active and determined. We have succeeded in smashing the Communist international labor front; we have destroyed the Communist dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, and set up a vigorous and effective anti-Communist world organization. I think I may justly say that American labor leadership was primarily responsible for this action. In the fight we have been making, we believe we are entitled to the cooperation of American businessmen, to the extent, at least, that they will not in this emergency seek to evade their fair share of the sacrifices and burdens that are necessary to make our country strong and united so we can win this world struggle.

In the development of this Nation, the Government has uniformly and consistently done its best to aid American business. Labor has no objection to the principle, in general, that Government powers should be used for the benefits of the citizens. We believe, with the founding fathers, that governments are instituted for those purposes. The long record of land grants, of tariff laws, of governmental subsidies, of patent legislation, of governmental loans and liberal Government contracts, the direct aid given by the State Department and occasionally by the Armed Forces in foreign affairs—all of these things illustrate and attest the devotion of the United States Government over the last century and a half to the advancement of American business interests. While businessmen, industrialists, and financiers have sometimes disagreed about what measures Government should adopt to foster and

help the business community, they have seldom taken issue with the idea that Government should offer such help. The great total of billions of dollars that has flowed from Government to industry, and the other direct aids that have been given, have been tremendous factors in our industrial growth. But I do not recall having heard such governmental assistance called socialistic, or communistic, or un-American, or paternalistic by the representatives of business.

Against this necessary background, I ask you to consider what is happening today. During the last year, and especially the last 6 months, the price level in America has risen sharply. Every American industrialist, practically, has shared in the wealth thus created; his debts have shrunk, his goods on hand have grown, in terms of his dollar situation. Every American workingman, every consumer, on the other hand, has suffered; his debts oppress him more, his weekly income buys him less. Billions of dollars of real wealth have changed hands.

What has been the reaction of the business community to this terrific windfall? The proposal to tax excess profits, for example, has met with an opposition that seems wholly incomprehensible in view of the facts. Business actually seems to expect that the new taxes, required in our national emergency, shall be secured from a Federal consumer's sales tax which will fall largely upon those same groups whose incomes have been shrinking under the impact of rising prices. And the business community, through its spokesmen, object to the control of prices to prevent profiteering, although they are responsible for raising prices and the inflation that has occurred. At this time when every American family is being called upon to give its sons to the Nation for military service these business attitudes are profoundly disturbing to American workers. It does no good to speak a lot of hard words in such situations, but we cannot avoid a feeling that too many business representatives are adopting and expressing a narrow, selfish, and greedy viewpoint in this national emergency. We do not expect a suspension of the desire for reasonable and fair profits; we do not believe the ordinary motives of economic activity can be set aside in this emergency without disrupting our industrial efficiency.

Labor knows the harvest that has been garnered by American business in the last year of rapid price increases, and the harvest that resulted from the price increases after the repeal of control laws in 1946. We know the rich gains to business resulting from the rapid amortization of war plants in the last war, and the sales of such plants in the postwar years. We see again the provision for 5-year retirement of plant to be used in the new defense effort. In the face of those terrific, those unprecedented gains by American business, we believe we have a right to expect forebearance, common sense, and national cooperation from those who own our industries.

We cannot reconcile the national emergency with the efforts being made not only to raise the price level still further, but, on the legislative field, to prevent excess profit taxation. The worst of it, from some standpoints, is that when the workers try to get enough wages to meet these price rises and to prevent undue hardship and suffering for their families some business men want to take away their fundamental liberty. The right to strike is as fundamental as the right of any businessman to buy and sell, as fundamental as any right protected by the contract provisions of the United States Constitution. It is as fundamental, and we believe more sacred; no man's property is as sacred as his personal liberty, his personal freedom. We cannot get around the simple fact that laws prohibiting strikes of workers in private enterprise take away one of the few great fundamental rights of every American citizen. We hope that the business community will rise to the level of dignity, common sense, and patriotism that is required of them if we are to preserve America and Americanism through the perils that lie immediately ahead of us. Since we all have a supreme stake in freedom, all of us must make our fullest contribution to its defense. With cooperation, labor and industrial management can get much of the additional production that will be needed for an effective military defense and relieve much of the inflationary pressures, but the place to stop price increases is where they originate.

The seller and the speculator fix prices, and if they won't stop raising prices they must be controlled. If prices are controlled, then we agree that wages should be stabilized in parity with prices. Taxes must be raised to get the revenues to pay for our rearmament and they should come from corporation and excess profits and individual incomes. We are opposed to a national sales tax because it does not attack inflation at its source—the price and profit level. Government spending for nondefense activities must be reduced, but this does not require curtailment of essential social services.

Postal services should be made self-sustaining and the charges should be raised to get the necessary revenues. There is no good reason why private business should be furnished parcel post services at a loss of $100,000,000 a year to be made up by the taxpayers.

I would like to see the advocates of private enterprise practice what they preach and agree to a correction of this unfair subsidized Federal competition with private transportation.

Soviet aggression constitutes a challenge to our free way of life. We can overcome that challenge if we stand together, as Americans have done in past emergencies. We must convince Soviet Russia that America has the will to fight and the strength to fight in defense of freedom and international justice. We must make the Soviet leaders understand once and for all that America is willing to live and let live in peace.

American wage earners face the future and its responsibilities seriously, but with confidence. We want peace and the opportunity that peace affords for new progress. But if we are compelled by circumstances beyond our control to wage another war, we are determined to let nothing stand in the way of victory—victory that will mean not only a better America, but a better and more peaceful world in our time.

This Way to Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Way to Suicide" which appeared in the January 22 issue of Life magazine. I completely share the editorial views regarding the unrealistic policies of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

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

THIS WAY TO SUICIDE

If we build our strength—and we are building it—the Soviet rulers may face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world. That is what we hope will happen, and that is what we are trying to bring about. That is the only realistic road to peace.

The foregoing words should be read and reread by every American. They were spoken last week by President Truman in his sixth message on the state of the Union.

On their face they are attractive and reasonable words. They reflect a hope of peace and a dread of war which endure in millions of human hearts.

These words of the President occur in a message which, but for them, would deserve to be applauded as a fine and forceful speech.

It may very well be argued that the President's words are a useful concession to the universal desire for peace, a necessary recognition of the European and Asiatic state of mind.

But these words of the President cannot be dismissed in so easy a fashion. They cannot be dismissed on any ground.

The President has shown too many times that he believes in the capacity of the Soviet rulers to face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world.

Mr. Truman's principal adviser on world affairs, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, has shown too many times that he believes in what he has chosen to call the possibility of coexistence, a cooperative peace, a cooperative relationship with the rulers of Soviet communism.

On the record the passage quoted here from the President's message must be taken for what it unquestionably is—a considered restatement, made in all good faith and with full conviction, of the major conception and major purpose underlying American policy.

THE FATAL FALLACY

Taken for what they are, these words of the President are mistaken and dangerous.

Taken for what they are, these words demand the attention and the talents of all the participants in the great debate over United States policy, a debate which has explored almost every aspect of the subject except the corrosive and fatal fallacy which the President preserved and restated.

The nature of the fallacy is clear. The fallacy is that those whom Mr. Truman calls the Soviet rulers are capable of arriving by their own decision, at a state of peace with the non-Communist world. There is no prospect whatever that they are capable of doing so. Not so long as they are the Soviet rulers. Not so long as the system which drives them to their conquests, feeds their purposes, and gives them their power is in being. Not so long as the vast complex of doctrine, nations, governments, parties, and men called Soviet communism is intact, undefeated, and undestroyed. Not until its power—its inherent compulsion—to harass, assault, and engulf the non-Communist world is effectively eliminated can there be any chance of peace in the world.

The defeat and abolition of Soviet Communist purpose and power are not enough; the forces of anticommunism must always have other and more positive objectives. But, to repeat, there can be no peace worth the name and no secure progress toward a better life and a better society everywhere so long as Soviet communism retains its power to obstruct all progress and to assault all non-Communist societies.

THE FALSE CONCEPT

Make no mistake: The President does not assume and require the defeat and dismem-

berment of the Soviet system. The official author of this fatal fallacy, Mr. Acheson, has recently said in so many words that "to subvert the Soviet Union"—that is to bring about the downfall of Soviet communism—is neither required for peace nor a proper purpose of American policy. When Mr. Truman speaks of enforcing peace through strength, he must, on the record of what he and his Secretary of State have said, be supposed to mean peace with the present rulers of the Soviet system.

Many Americans do not need to be told that this concept is false. With their minds, in their hearts, and in their bones they know that it is false.

Many others would like to believe in the possibility that Mr. Truman says he believes in. Many Americans do believe in it still. But their number lessens. Events visible to all, and the actual behavior of the Soviet rulers, make any belief in the possibility of peace with the present rulers of the present Soviet system more unreal with every day that passes.

There is something nightmarish in the spectacle of a President of the United States who at this late and awful hour refuses to perceive that the concept which he restated last week is false. There is something nightmarish, too, in the continued presence at the President's right hand of a Secretary of State who has so long cultivated this pernicious fallacy. It is terrifying, it is wrong, that this proud priest of coexistence with Soviet communism, Dean Acheson, should still be in a position to shape the President's most vital conceptions and statements of American policy.

Here, Life once more submits, is a real and present danger to this Republic.

So long as the nature, the purposes, and the capacities of our enemy are misunderstood and underestimated at the very pinnacle of American policy, what hope is there that our policy will make sufficient sense? What hope is there that American power will be fully and effectively mobilized? What hope is there that, once mobilized, it will be used to maximum effect and with adequate awareness of the tasks before it? What price "the great debate" over policy when the declared objective of our policy is founded upon so glaring a fallacy?

This fallacy is a source of weakness—a cancer—which only the President can eradicate.

He can eradicate it. He can at long last drive from his councils all who have sold and fed him on the pap of coexistence with Soviet communism.

He can drive from his own mind, and drop from his utterances, the paralyzing illusion that the rulers of Soviet communism as it now exists can be persuaded to peace or forced to peace.

He can perceive that the situations of strength on which he relies can be effective only if they are used to bring about the dismemberment of the Soviet Communist system as it now exists and to remove from the world the threat of Soviet power as it is now exercised.

He can perceive that peaceful, stable coexistence with Soviet communism is utterly impossible. To hold that it is possible, as the President holds when he talks of forcing or persuading the Soviet rulers to lay aside their plans, is to perpetrate a pietistic fraud.

THIS PRODIGIOUS EVIL

If coexistence with the present Soviet Communist system is impossible, is total war inevitable?

Maybe so. Maybe not. Given the pressures resulting from a full recognition on our part of what must be accomplished and a full determination to accomplish it, the Soviet Empire may start to change within and to crumble. No man can say just how the pure wickedness of Soviet communism will ultimately be banished from the earth, as some day it will be banished. But what no man has a right to say is that we can live peaceably and happily with this prodigious evil.

Meanwhile what must be said is that the Soviet Empire, far from retreating, will continue to expand unless it is opposed with all our strength and all our mind and all our will. That includes the steady, calm, and constant acceptance of the risk of all-out war.

The President said last week that his chosen road—the road to a contrived peace with the present rulers of the present Communist system—is "the only realistic road to peace."

It is not a realistic road to peace.

It is not a realistic road to anything.

It is the road our enemy wants us to take.

It is the road to our defeat.

It is the way to suicide.

Defense Program Seen Back Door to Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Defense Program Seen Back Door to Fair Deal," by Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Star of January 13, 1951.

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

DEFENSE PROGRAM SEEN BACK DOOR TO FAIR DEAL—LABOR SUPPORT FOR TRUMAN GIVES BODY TO RUMOR

(By Gould Lincoln)

A growing suspicion that the defense program is to provide a back-door route to the Fair Deal measures, advocated by President Truman and the so-called liberal wing of the Democratic Party, is making itself felt in the National Capital. The alacrity with which some of the leaders of organized labor have gone to the front for President Truman's recent message on the state of the Union to Congress gives body to this hovering rumor. The labor leaders say "O. K. We are going right along with the President, especially on national defense." William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, amplifies. He points out that Mr. Truman in a message urged Congress not to overlook improvements for the long pull—and Mr. Green spoke particularly of national health insurance.

To Mr. Green, and, indeed, to all of the 100 percent Fair Dealers, compulsory national health insurance does not mean socialized medicine, or even placing many more billions of dollars on the backs of the taxpayers.

MORE REALISTIC VIEW

The man on the street seems to have a more realistic view. But the man on the street soon is going to be ground down by heavier and heavier taxes; and when he is, for the sake of national defense, he may be forced into a frame of mind friendly toward proposals for free medical service. That at least is what the Fair Dealers hope. They will tax him until he is unable to pay for medical care, and then tax him again to subsidize free medicine. It's a nice idea, for the Fair Dealers who want the Government to do everything, if it works.

Further, with the prices of foods going up to a point where the man on the street and his family are going to have a difficult time getting enough to eat, there is going to be a demand for Government subsidies to help keep these prices down to the consumer while at the same time letting the prices the farmer and the middleman get remain at higher levels. Then the Brannan farm program, with its production payments to farmers and its subsidies to the consumers, is going to be launched again—make no mistake. The administration promises that the Brannan plan will keep prices up for the farmer and low for the consumer may be as phony as the old medicine shows. But they will sound better, when the man on the street has been softened up enough. Here, too, the man on the street will have been taxed until he cannot buy food he needs for himself and family, and then will be taxed again to provide subsidies so he can get more meat and butter and eggs, etc.

CORRECT VIEW UNDECIDED

Washington also is trying to decide whether the Mr. Truman who addressed Congress last Monday and who soft-pedaled the Fair Deal measure gives the correct view of the administration's present attitude, or the Mr. Truman who militantly declared at his press conference on Thursday that the Fair Deal measures were not being abandoned at all. Mr. Truman made no plea to Congress to put through an FEPC law or other civil-rights measures—as he did with emphasis when he spoke to the last Congress. But at his press conference, when he was asked if the civil-rights program was being put aside for a while, his answer was an emphatic "No."

The idea has grown—immediately after the President's message to Congress—that he had decided not to press for civil-rights legislation now—or to seek a repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law. His recent letter to Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, asserting he believed they could cooperate, gave additional color to this belief. But when he was asked point-blank at his press conference about these things, the President gave emphasis to his assertions that these things had by no means been abandoned, even temporarily.

Organized labor leaders, who are opposing wage controls and demanding price controls, must have had some kind of assurance from the White House, it is said here, that the President still stands for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Otherwise they probably would have been yelling their heads off. Whether the Negroes are going to accept the Monday Truman, or the Thursday Truman, remains to be seen. Some hold that the Negroes are being sold down the river to bring about a rapprochement between Mr. Truman and the Southerners in Congress.

Analysis of the 1950 Gubernatorial Vote in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis of the vote in the recent gubernatorial contest in California between Gov. Earl Warren and James Roosevelt.

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

Governor Warren's total vote was 2,461,754 which exceeds his 1946 general election vote (2,344,542) when he was the nominee of both the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Warren's vote exceeded Roosevelt's by 1,127,898.

Although California has 1,117,393 more Democrats than Republicans registered, Warren's margin of victory exceeded the Democratic registration majority.

Warren received 11 votes for every 6 votes for James Roosevelt.

A total of 73.82 percent of the registered voters in California voted in the election. Warren polled a greater percentage of votes than at any previous governorship election, primary or general, in which he was opposed. In his third bid for the governorship he polled a greater percentage of the votes than was cast for him in 1942 when he first ran for the office. In number of votes received he broke all previous records for both himself and all other candidates for office, including 1946 when he was unopposed in the general election.

Warren received 64.85 percent and Roosevelt received 35.14 percent of the votes cast for governor. In the primary election Warren received 60.75 percent of the votes cast and Roosevelt received 36.46 percent.

No other major party candidate in California history has ever been defeated as decidedly as was James Roosevelt.

Roosevelt was beaten by a greater majority than any major party candidate for governor or United States Senator in any State of the Union at this election.

Although 58.39 percent of the registered voters in California are Democrats, Roosevelt polled only 35.14 percent of the total votes cast for governor.

Roosevelt's total vote amounted to only 43.56 percent of his own party's registration. Warren's vote amounted to 126.58 percent of his party's registration.

Warren won in all 58 counties, among which were such counties as Fresno, Kern, Solano, Contra Costa, Kings, and Sacramento where registration is better than 2 to 1 Democratic.

San Francisco, with a registration of nearly 2 to 1 Democratic, gave Warren a majority of 93,514.

Los Angeles County, where the registration is better than 1½ to 1 Democratic, gave Warren a majority of 438,539.

Warren carried 22 counties by more than 2 to 1 and in 5 of these the ratio was more than 3 to 1.

Who Are the Isolationists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by A. Q. Miller, publisher of the Belleville Telescope, Belleville, Kans., entitled "Who Are the Isolationists?"

Here is a voice from the grassroots that could well be heeded by those who are prone to brand those who might disagree with them on our foreign policy as isolationist. The stark truth happens to be as Mr. Miller points out in this editorial and gives reasons why the common people of this country feel as they do about what is happening on the Washington level.

I commend it to my colleagues for careful reading.

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

WHO ARE THE ISOLATIONISTS?

(By A. Q. Miller)

According to the administration standard, an "isolationist" is anybody who disagrees with the foreign policy of the administration—a contradictory policy which has not only kept confused the people of this country but also our so-called friends and enemies throughout the world.

If a voice is raised in this country by a Congressman or a citizen, suggesting a change or improvement to make our foreign relations consistent and conform to the charter of the United Nations, some administration spokesman cries out "Isolationist" and brands the individual an enemy of his country. Timid Congressmen and frustrated individuals do not have the courage to run the gantlet of hundreds of administration publicity hounds and therefore they acquiesce in policies which they honestly believe are detrimental to the best interests of the country.

The result is that the people of this country are committed in secret agreements by the State Department. Then Congress and the country are told what our foreign policies are. This is the thing that has aroused many loyal and courageous Congressmen and individuals to speak out and brand the policy as wrong and not in conformity with our Constitution.

These protestors declare that the Senate is the treaty-making body, and that Congress is the law-making body and the only authority which can declare war. Many Members of the next Congress which meets in January declare they are going to demand that the country go back on a constitutional basis.

In times of great national and international stress when administration leaders make commitments agreeing to appropriate money and supply our troops to fight on foreign soil without a formal act of Congress, those commitments do not conform to our so-called democratic principles and American way of life—and a few courageous souls have the temerity and courage to say so, thereby subjecting themselves to a "smear campaign" by politicians.

Because of conflicting and incoherent policies now existing between this country and a number of our allies under the United Nations, many demands are made that our foreign policy be examined and reviewed by Congress in order to know what commitments we have, but such suggestions are met by scorn and sometimes by harsh language. The administration rightfully demands unity in this country, but it does not hold out the olive branch and obviously does not recognize that unity is a two-way street.

Billions of dollars have been appropriated by Congress for national defense under requests by the President without knowing how the money would be spent. We find in a crisis that we are not prepared and our troops are not adequately equipped. We won two World Wars, the first to make the world safe for democracy and the second "a war to end war," and in both cases we won the wars and lost the peace. Now we are faced with another world war more devastating if it comes than the others.

People are frustrated at a leadership that has failed to keep us out of war. We have had nearly 20 years to build a structure of peace on a solid foundation and have failed. At San Francisco this country had the confidence and good will of practically every nation on earth, and we could have written into the Charter of the United Nations practically anything we wanted, but we followed the fatal policy of appeasement and gave Russia the veto power which completely destroyed the effectiveness of the Charter.

And since that time the record is replete with examples of vacillation and appeasement, which took us through the tragedy of Pearl Harbor and down to Korea and China, apparently without learning anything from experience or without a sound foreign policy. Frankly, our foreign policy has been so vacillating and incoherent that we have lost the confidence and friendship of practically all of the world.

India Starves Herself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "India Starves Herself," published in the Washington Post of January 21, 1951.

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

INDIA STARVES HERSELF

A good deal of nonsense is parading under the guise of humanitarianism in the current clamor to send grain to India "with no strings attached." A correspondent in an adjacent column puts the finger squarely on the point. The self-defeating trade war with Pakistan has deprived India of large sources of food close to her own border. Even now food is available in Pakistan which would help greatly to alleviate the Indian crisis.

In 1940 Pakistan is said to have offered to sell India 600,000 tons of wheat. Prime Minister Nehru spurned the offer at the same time that he was importing it at greater cost. The same situation still prevails. To be sure, the Pakistan exchange rate is something of an obstacle in that Pakistan did not devalue her currency when other nations in the Commonwealth followed the devaluation of the British pound. Even so, India is paying far more for wheat from Australia, Canada, and Argentina than she would have to pay from Pakistan. A similar situation prevails with respect to cotton: India has refused cotton from Pakistan while buying it from Egypt.

This does not mean that the famine in India could be wholly alleviated by imports from Pakistan and nearby areas, or that the United States should not view Nehru's request for grain sympathetically. The famine is a very real thing. We believe that some help is warranted and that Congress should enable the Department of Agriculture to make some surplus American grain available. But it would be worse than foolish to overlook the fact that the seriousness of the famine has been heightened by the Indo-Pakistan war. It is made worse by the diversion of agricultural land to jute production so as to be independent of Pakistan. And India's financial position certainly is impaired by the immense drain of the army mobilized over the Kashmir dispute.

Now, it is said, is the psychological time to win Indian affections by a nonpolitical gift of grain. Whatever the merit in this argument, Congress would be sorely remiss if it did not insist on a quid pro quo. The plain fact is that India is not doing what she can to help herself. It is time for frank speaking on these points. We hope that Congress will answer India's call, but only on the condition that there be some realism in New Delhi.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President's 'Strict Economy' Budget Begs for Congress' Knife," which appeared in the Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, on Tuesday, January 16, 1951.

I believe this editorial merits careful consideration at this time by Members of Congress and by the public.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S "STRICT ECONOMY" BUDGET BEGS FOR CONGRESS' KNIFE

While we beg a day to mull over the complicated detail of the President's $71,594,000,000 budget request which he laid before Congress yesterday, we can note such items as these:

If granted outright, without paring it down, that budget means $471 for every man, woman, boy, and girl in the United States.

There are only about 152,000,000 of us to carry this staggering load, including babes in arms, public charges, and persons incapacitated by age, disease, or crippling injuries from doing any kind of gainful work.

The next thing we can note is that there is a lot of fat stashed away in the mail-order-catalog-sized volume of budget itemization.

Despite his urgent admonition to every wage earner, housewife, business person, or private enterprise to practice the sternest disciplinary thrift as an aid toward meeting the national economic and fiscal emergency, Mr. Truman's proposed budget actually shows an increase in nondefense spending over the comparable items in last year's deficit monstrosity.

It was the fact that last year's was a deficit budget, when it should have been not only balanced, but overbalanced so that some headway, at least, might have been made toward reducing the national debt as a protection against the inflationary pressures which the present situation are increasing—it was that fact which made that budget monstrous in the truest sense.

Particularly since that budget could easily have been balanced not by raising taxes but by cutting unessentials out.

There is nothing more fruitless than crying over spilt milk—a practice which this newspaper deplores and tries its best to avoid.

But there is no greater folly than spilling the same kind of milk over again.

And unless Congress sharpens its knife to do a shrewd job of surgery on the unessential nonmilitary items in the budget now before it, the amount of fresh fiscal milk that will be spilt will be large.

Out of the $71,594,000,000 that Mr. Truman has asked, $41,421,000,000 is for military needs.

That 58 percent of the total we cannot discuss. For one reason, dictates of security kept it from being itemized; for another, Congress will not be too critical about its parts in any case, any more than will we, because in times of national danger parsimony which might hamper actually necessary national defense is unthinkable.

And so though the amount asked is enormous—little more than a billion dollars less for military purposes alone than the total $42,428,757,406 asked for all purposes in the President's budget last year, and more than twice the $20,427,000,000 which the President estimates will be spent to meet military needs this year—still whatever the appropriate congressional committees decide, after consultation with the appropriate experts and advisers, to agree on as proper expenditures for purely defense items, we are prepared to accept as correct.

It is the 32 percent of the new budget—23,112,000,000 taxpayers' dollars, a $1,622,000,000 increase rather than a five or six or eight or nine billion dollars decrease in the Federal Government's domestic costs, that particularly begs for the knife.

The remaining 10 percent of the budget is debatable. In fact it is already in process of debate. It is the proposed $7,461,000,000 budgeted for military and economic aid to foreign countries allied with us against the Red surge.

It may be that this is far too much, as one side of the Dewey-Hoover-Kennedy Dulles-Taft et al. debate argues. It may be that the amount suggested by the President and his advisers is exactly right. It may even turn out that it is much too little.

More than geo-political argument is involved in that question; certainly quite as important is, How much of a load can the American economy stand?

It is pretty certain that it shouldn't have to stand a good deal of the purely domestic 32 percent, the twenty-three-odd billion dollars included in the budget which Mr. Truman curiously claimed, in his accompanying message to Congress, exercised "strict economy in nondefense spending."

This newspaper tries not to be captious. We strive never to ask a question which is not posed in good faith.

But how, we query, could anyone make such a strict economy claim as we have quoted, on behalf of a budget which slips in under the guise of defense need, major portions of the discredited Brannan plan, an FEPC civil rights scheme, expanded Federal aid to State-supported schools, taxpayer-provided housing for certain special groups, a version of an item of socialized medicine, $20,000,000 to get a St. Lawrence deep waterway-public power project under way, and other such truly dubious matters as that?

It is such that we desperately hope Congress will examine coldly before raising the Nation's tax bill by the whole $16,500,000,000 that Mr. Truman's budget asks.

Lacking in Business Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, we have been requested by President Truman to adopt a spending budget in excess of $71,000,000,000.

This is a colossal amount of money for the American people to take from their salaries, wages, and incomes, and remit to the Federal Treasury. It will mean great sacrifices for all. It will reach into every home across the land. Those in the lower and middle income brackets will sacrifice most of all in direct payment and in reduced standards of living.

The Eighty-second Congress will fail in its duty to the people if it does not squeeze out every drop of water in this request. It must eliminate without fear or favor each item that is nonessential.

My State of Kansas has contributed much to the field of journalism. In the contemporary group of Kansas journalists Mr. R. A. Clymer, editor of the El Dorado Times has few equals in expressing convincingly and with clarity the trends of public thought.

His editorial on the Federal budget appearing in the El Dorado Times on January 17, 1951, is, in my opinion, one of the finest in its analysis of, and the public reaction to the President's request for money, that I have read.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LACKING IN BUSINESS SENSE

President Truman laid down a spending budget of $71,500,000,000 for the Government next year, in his address to Congress, and demanded that taxes be increased over their present swollen proportions by nearly $16,500,000,000 to balance it.

That, of course, as the mathematical sharps have already figured, means an outlay of $471 from every one of the 152,000,000 men, women, and children in the United States.

The impact of these sums on the country was startling, though every form of public propaganda has been employed to prepare the Nation for the blow.

More than half of the sum proposed would go to military needs, though no breakdowns were given on this score in the huge budget document—which is described as being of mail order catalog size. Reasons set forth for this were on the basis of security, and also "because estimates are still tentative." This last leaves room for the juggling—and no doubt upping—of figures, as military departments are notorious for having only hazy ideas of economy.

No reduction was proposed in non-defense spending. Instead, slight increases were noted in many of the items. Tucked away in the Budget text were all of the fair deal fair-haired projects—the FEPC plan for equal rights for Negroes, Federal aid to State schools, Federal medical insurance with a first-year tax totaling $275,000,000, housing for low-income groups, the main part of the Brannan farm program, and the St. Lawrence power-seaway project. The President blandly put all these on a defense-needs footing, though just how some of them can be accepted on that basis arouses burning curiosity.

The effect of the whole Budget was reassuring in no sense. In fact, it indicated to even the most casual reader that wild and lavish spending will continue under the present administration—even at a time of national crisis. The people of this country will more or less cheerfully produce all the money that must be had to meet the emergency. But they have a right to insist that

all frills be removed from Government operation, and that something like an honest attempt to conduct the domestic establishment on an economic basis be exerted. The President's budget, as proposed, offers no evidence whatever of any intention toward these two objectives.

What it does reveal is that this country suffers not a paucity of dollars, but of strong, sensible, business leadership at the top.

The World Situation and America's Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER C. HUNT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "If You Agree, Write Your Senator," which appeared in the January 4, 1951, issue of the Wyoming State Journal, published in my home town of Lander, Wyo.

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

IF YOU AGREE, WRITE YOUR SENATOR

The present military conflict, with its ominous forebodings, has presented this country with a problem which is completely new in our military experience. For the first time we face the fact that our enemies, actual and potential, are superior in manpower to us and our dependable allies. This, indeed, is something new for Uncle Sam who has never lost a war.

In past wars, the situation was the reverse. Then the Western Powers had men in abundance, and the primary problem was to find time to equip and train and harden them for the final grand assault on the enemy. In World War II, Allied superiority in this field was tremendous.

Look at the situation now. On paper, the nations which have been going along with us in the UN represent most of the world population. But a statistic on paper doesn't do any fighting. Many of those nations have pretty well made it clear that they intend to limit their participation in the world conflict—and it is a world conflict now, whether or not war is formally declared by any power—to diplomatic negotiations and the writing of polite notes to the various chancelleries. Others have been terribly drained of men—and of spirit and morale as well—by the other wars. Others still are so geographically situated as to be in the most imminent peril of national destruction.

Russia alone has about the equivalent population of the United States, England, Canada, and Australia combined. No one knows precisely how many Chinese there are; but the figure is somewhere in the neighborhood of 450,000,000, and the birth rate is high.

For many years there has been an optimistic theory that no one, the Communists included, could organize China, and create in China a really effective military force. The recent terrible trend of events has certainly demonstrated the danger of still holding to that theory. Mao is an able and resourceful man. It is probable that he has done more than any other Chinese ruler to suppress the debilitating official corruption that characterized Chinese governments of the past. He has exploited to the full China's old hatred and distrust of the west. He has made it abundantly clear, if his acts and pronouncements mean anything at all, that he is solidly and without reservation on the side of Russia in the world struggle. And he has built an army that no informed man dare to regard with contempt. The Chinese Red soldier has had good training. He has morale and a sense of purpose. By Asiatic standards, he is well fed and well clothed. He has the fanatic, fatalistic courage of the Orient. And his name is legion.

Here is why it is so strongly argued—in this country, and by practically every European spokesman—that the west must use every reasonable means to avoid a full-scale war with China. Here is why more and more emphasis is being placed on the fact that the other western powers must, as Herbert Hoover has so ably pointed out, do a good deal more for themselves, militarily, than they have so far done. And if they don't do it, then the United States alone cannot hold Europe. And to say that we should not attempt to do so is not isolationism, as the weak administration in Washington now would have everybody believe, it is a matter of self-preservation and just good common sense.

We simply cannot carry the whole load, or the major part of it—we just haven't enough people. We will help to the full in the strengthening of Europe, but Europe must earn and justify that help by cooperating to the limit. No more American boys to Korea, or to Formosa, or to Europe until the European powers show that they are going to help themselves—that should be the stand of all Americans and Fremont countyans can help bring this to pass by writing or wiring now to their Senators, taking this stand. The time for half measures has passed.

Bank of North Dakota Sets Operations Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Bank of North Dakota Sets Operations Record," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of December 27, 1950. I wish to quote one paragraph from the article as follows:

The bank manager, H. C. Bowers, in a report to Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, said that as of December 21 the net operating revenue is "in excess of $1,000,000." On the same date, Bowers reported, deposits in the bank amounted to $96,870,000.

I may say, Mr. President, that last year the bank also made a profit of nearly $1,000,000. This year the profit is more than $1,000,000. In my opinion that furnishes a direct answer to those who say that a bank cannot be operated by government when it is operated to take care of the interests of the people and is in reality not in competition with private banks.

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

BANK OF NORTH DAKOTA SETS OPERATIONS RECORD

BISMARCK, N. DAK.—The net operating revenue of the Bank of North Dakota for 1950, its manager said, will be the highest in the institution's history.

The bank manager, H. C. Bowers, in a report to Governor Fred G. Aandahl, said that as of December 21 the net operating revenue is "in excess of $1,000,000." On the same date, Bowers reported, deposits in the bank amounted to $96,870,000.

Bowers said that from January 1 to December 21 of this year, the Bank of North Dakota made 49 farm home administration insured loans for a total of $439,407, of which 18 loans were to veterans in the amount of $156,675. In the same period, he added, the bank made 52 GI loans for a total of $284,816.18 to assist veterans in buying or building homes, establishing businesses or engaging in farming.

The bank manager said thus far this year 17 title II insured loans for a total of $100,350 have been made to finance home construction.

Loans to school districts and municipalities so far in 1950 total $2,653,093, in the form of certificates of indebtedness, bonds, or warrants.

Bowers said securities covering loans and held by the bank of North Dakota on December 20 this year totaled $12,200,368.95, compared with $11,509,424.07 on December 31, 1949. So far this year, he said, loans made total $5,146,206.07 and loans paid total $4,455,261.19.

Cost of American Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sanity Gets the Brush-Off," published in the January 11, 1951, edition of the Concord Daily Monitor, of Concord, N. H.

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

SANITY GETS THE BRUSH-OFF

Senator BRIDGES prodded General Marshall yesterday about our ratio of one fighting man to every four others in the armed services and Russia's ratio of four fighting men to every one in the armed services who does not fight. In effect, the General's answer was that part of the difference was in providing our men in the armed services with all the things which the Congress says they shall have in the way of recreation, and so forth.

There is no doubt at all about the American propensity for considering nothing too good for men in the armed services. We spend upon them lavishly, both while they are in service, and subsequently. The bill for veterans since World War II exceeds $25,000,000,000, for example, enough to produce a pretty good army according to anybody's standards except our own.

What we seem to have done is to forget first principles again. Liability for service to protect one's country is a responsibility which falls upon every citizen. It isn't just the country which is thus protected, either, for in this Nation it is our individual liberties which we preserve if we protect the country.

All war is wasteful. Hence the waging of war should be held to a minimum of expenditure in manpower and in servicing that manpower. Far from taking this attitude,

we in this country now go in for grandiose spending the moment war is mentioned.

We do a lot of foolish things. We are forever changing the style of uniforms at terrific cost. We provide sheets for the beds of fighting men. We conduct the most marvelous post exchanges, officers clubs, noncom clubs, recreational facilities for enlisted men, and so forth, that anyone could wish for. We pay our men wages far above any ever earned by fighting men of any other nation. We are excessively liberal with leaves. We go to extremes on military transport of all kinds. And, as Senator BRIDGES pointed out, we have four men serving every fighting man, many of the four-fifths of nonfighters living in greater comfort and with greater privileges than they enjoyed as civilians.

Our men are good fighters on fighting fronts. But they could and probably would be just as good and perhaps better if less pampered in so many directions.

Good soldiers or sailors or fliers need tough training, for their own good on battle fronts. They need the best fighting equipment, and that doesn't mean merely variety and quantity. It means quality, especially in guns, and so forth. Fighting men need substantial food. They need cigarettes, and they need beer, but beyond that their personal needs are simple.

We must, with our ingenuity and inventiveness, have the means to prosecuting war, or preparing for war, at far less cost than obtains, both in manpower and in goods. And one of the best components of a good defense against the world situation in which we find ourselves is to maintain Federal solvency.

The economic aspects of the period ahead are as frightening as are the prospects of another all-out war. Except for a slight pause in 1949 we have been inflation-bound now for almost 20 years, and the prospect is for worse inflation in the years just ahead. Yet virtually nothing is being done to counter this trend. Only today the administration decided against imposition of any further price controls for the time being.

Senator BRIDGES touched upon one source of our troubles economically when he questioned General Marshall. The whole subject needs exploration, and the general's fear of offending the fighting men in Korea by looking into the subject publicly is, we believe, ill-founded. They would feel better supported and less forgotten if they knew the Nation was practicing a little austerity at home, within the home-based Armed Forces as well as domestically.

Will anything be done? No. The matter will drop with the brief exchange between the Senator and the general. The Nation, under the leadership of the greatest something-for-nothing administration the world has yet seen, will rush ahead toward the ultimate doom it is inviting in the false name of national security.

North Dakota Mill Operation Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "North Dakota Mill Operation Praised," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of January 8, 1951. I may say that the profit of the North Dakota State mill and elevator last year was more than $800,000.

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

NORTH DAKOTA MILL OPERATION PRAISED

BISMARCK, N. DAK.—Management of the State Mill and Elevator was praised in explanation of the State requested appropriations made by Senator R. R. Morgan of Grafton, chairman of the senate appropriations committee at the 1949 session.

The statement explained that it was impossible for the budget board, the appropriations committee, or members of the legislature to intelligently pass upon the details of the operation of this complicated and technical business.

"It is our belief that the mill and elevator has had excellent management during the past 12 years, and its financial statements bear this out," the statement read.

"The administration of the bill has submitted to the budget board a detailed and comprehensive budget for the next 2 years, which is about 8½ percent higher than the budget of 2 years ago. Basing our judgment on other costs of doing business in other lines of business, it would seem that this increase is very nominal."

The total allowed for the present biennium was $2,193,820. An increase of $190,030 is requested for the present biennium, and the board approved the full request of $2,383,850, which is expected to accrue from the profits of the mill. R. M. Stangler is manager of the mill.

Support for the Troops in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the January 6, 1951, edition of the Evening Leader, of Manchester, N. H.

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

"BACK UP OUR BOYS," BRIDGES DEMANDS

The soundness of Senator BRIDGES' reasoning in his demand that we either back our boys up or take them out of Korea is inescapable.

These brave boys have been slaughtered long enough as a result of diplomatic restrictions that have hampered their efforts. It is a hideous crime to send men to Korea to fight Communist aggression, and then refuse them the legitimate means to defend themselves against powerful enemy assaults.

Senator BRIDGES' labeling of the situation as ridiculous is putting the matter mildly. Our land forces, as he says, wage a total grim and bloody battle, hopelessly outnumbered by Chinese and Korean manpower. In such a situation, the normal requirement is to give the Air Force and the Navy a free hand to cripple the enemy's offensive strength. But what do we find? The Air Force is allowed to fight only half a war. It operates gallantly in support of our land troops, while the mission for which it is particularly prepared—bombing the supply lines and supply bases beyond the Yalu—is forbidden by the endless debates going on in the UN.

Meanwhile, the Navy, under orders to patrol the waters between Formosa and the China coast, serves as a protecting screen for the Chinese Communist armies in Korea by preventing a possible invasion of the China coast and the establishment of a second front to relieve the pressure on our troops in Korea.

In the face of this situation, President Truman's statement at his press conference that he has no intention of bombing Communist China, because it might bring on war in Asia, is positively idiotic. What is going on now in Korea, if it is not war? Truman's statement is more than idiotic. It reflects an indifference, an absolute disregard for the welfare of our boys whom he sent to Korea, and who are now fighting and dying in subzero weather on the frozen fields of that war-torn country.

Is this a face-saving gesture on the part of Mr. Truman, who is trying to cover up his mistakes by refusing to acknowledge them and to adopt alleviative measures? If so, it is a tragic fact. For these boys could defend themselves successfully if their hands were freed and they were given a fair chance. The three steps Senator BRIDGES asks are ordinary military protective measures. We should remove restraints on Chiang Kai-shek at once and permit him to open a second front on the China mainland. We should permit our Air Force to bomb Red China's supply bases and supply lines just as they would in any other war. We should blockade the coast of Red China and cut off her trade with the free world.

If the United Nations won't support these measures, then to hell with the United Nations. It is a broken reed anyway to which Truman clings. These are the plain, simple, legitimate demands of the situation in Korea. If the Government won't take them, then BRIDGES is right. The only alternative is to withdraw our men from Korea at once.

Hon. Warren R. Austin, Homespun American Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, historians will record the rugged courage, the high integrity, and the devoted sincerity of Warren R. Austin, the honorable, loyal, and capable United States representative at the United Nations.

His homespun Vermont philosophy, his strong and urgent voice has left no one in doubt as to what he meant or what the position of the United States was on many occasions. I have been proud of his representation of the Nation's best interest and welfare many times in the Security Council and the political committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

It is not only the plain, understandable words and logic he uses but the strong, convincing tone of voice he has when he speaks that carries weight and has more than once cut deep and shook the emotions of the apparently phlegmatic and immovable Malik of Soviet Russia in his debates with Malik in the Security Council about the Korean crisis.

The people of the United States are fortunate to have a man with the background, the stamina, and the sturdy Americanism as former United States

Senator Warren R. Austin to represent them at the United Nations.

How fortunate we would be if we had men of such high capabilities and attainment in some of the other vital high offices which are directing our foreign policy. We can be justly proud of our Ambassador at large, Warren R. Austin.

Here is a brief appraisal of Mr. Austin recently written by William R. Frye:

"SLUGGER" AUSTIN, FREE WORLD'S CHAMPION

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK.—The man who is guiding American diplomacy through some of the stormiest waters the United Nations has ever seen is a humble, devout, rock-ribbed Vermont lawyer who combines burning idealism with an uncommon amount of the good old-fashioned "hoss sense" which New England breeds.

He is Warren R. Austin, permanent representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations—known universally by the less resounding and more affectionate title of "Senator."

Among his aides he now has a new title. As a result of his knock-down-and-drag-out verbal battles with chief Soviet Delegate Yakov A. Malik in recent months, they call him "Slugger" Austin. The staff of the American delegation presented a pair of tiny boxing gloves to him for Christmas.

RANK OF AMBASSADOR

The Senator, or the "Slugger"—or, to be absolutely precise, the Ambassador, for that is his formal rank—spent 16 years, from 1931 to 1947, in the United States Senate.

Well before World War II, he was an outstanding internationalist, defending his world viewpoint from bitter isolationist attack. One of his prime adversaries in those days was Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, of Michigan, who later became a leader of bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. Austin is squarely on the firing line at the United Nations. Day after day he sits in the Security Council or the Political Committee of the General Assembly with Mr. Malik just two seats away (by alphabetical placement) and listens to the torrent of Russian abuse and vilification poured out against the country Mr. Austin so passionately loves.

NO OUTBURSTS

The Senator's lower jaw juts out, and his lips are pressed tightly together. His pince-nez seems to glower. His face reddens. But when he speaks, it is clear that Mr. Malik has not succeeded in baiting him into some ill-considered outburst which could jar the delicate balance of American relations with India, Great Britain, or China.

His words weigh a ton, whereas Mr. Malik's are a dime a gross, and the Senator knows it.

There are two books which Mr. Austin uses constantly for reference, and he is thoroughly familiar with both. One is the Statutes of the State of Vermont, which embodies many of the great principles to which he is fond of referring—biting into the great with the rising inflection of a Senator and the relish of an orator conscious of dramatic effect.

"I LOOK TO THEE"

The other book is the Bible. Its pages are well thumbed. He often knows exactly where to turn for the right quotation. In speeches he delivers to children—the Senator makes time for talks to schools, Boy Scout groups, and organizations some diplomats would consider a chore—he frequently quotes from its pages.

"In seeing you off at the beginning of the trail of the second half of the twentieth century," he recently told a Scout group, "I give you the most precious wish that I possess:

"It is that you, in your sincere and earnest lives, may early realize in your fight for good and against evil that you are never alone; that your heavenly Father is constantly at your side, and that in every righteous endeavor you are upheld by His law."

Mr. Austin does not hesitate to invoke the same guidance and support for his own tremendously important endeavors on behalf of the United Nations and world peace.

His intimates say one of his favorite pieces of literature is the poem of Samuel Longfellow which begins, "I look to thee in every need, and never look in vain," and ends:

"Embosomed deep in Thy dear love,
Held in Thy law I stand:
Thy hand in all things I behold,
And all things in Thy hand.
Thou leadest me by unsought ways,
Thou turn'st my mourning into praise."

Bibliography of Material on the Proposed Columbia Valley Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of development of a feasible plan for the coordination of the Federal activities in the Pacific Northwest remains most important for both the region and the Nation.

For those who wish to study this problem, I ask that the bibliography of material on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MATERIAL ON THE PROPOSED COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION

S. 1645, introduced by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson (for himself and Senators Kefauver, Humphrey, Chavez, Murray, Langer, Douglas, McGrath, Pepper, Sparkman, Hill, Green, Wagner, Taylor, Gillette, Johnston of South Carolina, and Johnson of Texas); Eighty-first Congress, first session; Senate document room, United States Capitol, Washington 25, D. C.; April 19, 1949. A bill to reorganize and consolidate certain Federal functions and thereby secure their more effective administration by establishing a Columbia Valley Administration to assist in the achievement of unified water control and resource conservation and development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding lands.

H. R. 4287, introduced by Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, and H. R. 4286, introduced by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, Eighty-first Congress, first session; House document room, United States Capitol, Washington 25, D. C.; April 14, 1949. Identical to S. 1645 above.

Columbia Valley Authority needed in Pacific Northwest, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1949.

Better Government, Not Bigger Government, by Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 11, 1949. Statement supporting the Columbia Valley Administration legislation.

The CVA bill (H. R. 4286) sets forth a new and better way of doing things already being done by the Federal Government in the region of the Columbia, speech by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, in the House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1949. A discussion and section-by-section analysis of the CVA bill.

Question and Answers on S. 1645, To Establish a Columbia Valley Administration, extension of remarks by Hon. Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, in the Senate of the United States. Reprinted fro mthe CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 9, 1949. Questions and answers on the CVA bill, section-by-section explanation.

President Truman calls for proposals on Columbia Valley Authority legislation, a resolution from the Columbia Basin Commission, of Washington, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Columbia Valley Authority Legislative Program, letter to President Truman from Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, and news article and editorial reprinted from the Washington Post and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1949.

The Truth About CVA, by Hon. Glen H. Taylor, United States Senate, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27, 1950, by Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana. Speech in Rupert, Idaho, July 8, 1950, explaining why Idaho needs CVA and answering arguments of opponents.

Introduction to a Columbia Valley Administration, pamphlet containing reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 13, April 19, and August 25, 1949, inserted by Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington. The pamphlet includes the following items: Message from the President of the United States to the Congress advocating Columbia Valley Administration; remarks of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration; editorial comment—east and west; questions and answers on the proposed CVA; a section-by-section analysis of the CVA bill; comment on the comprehensive reports.

CVA Facts, extension of remarks by Hon. Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, in the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C. Reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 10, 1949. A discussion of the CVA and its relationships to present conditions; Hoover Commission recommendation, continuity of construction; the benefits of TVA experience, anti-CVA propaganda.

Private Power Lobby Opposes CVA, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and reprint from Christian Science Monitor editorial entitled "The Valley Programs." Reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1949.

My Position on the Pending CVA bill, S. 1645, by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, United States Senate, Washington, D. C. Reprinted from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 14, 1949. Speech by Senator MORSE in the Senate of the United States in opposition to the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

Columbia Valley Authority Memorial Passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, a memorial passed by the Washington State House of Representatives urging enactment of CVA. Inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Columbia Valley Administration, hearings before the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, first session, June 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, July 13, 14, 15, 18, 29, August 1 and 2, 1949. Testimony for and against H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287, bills to establish a Columbia Valley Administration.

Columbia Valley Administration, hearings before the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, first session, May 27, 31, June 1, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, July 8 and 9, August 3 and 4, 1949. Testimony for and against S. 1595, S. 1631, S. 1632, and S. 1645, bills dealing with the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin and the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration, and for other purposes.

For a Columbia Valley Administration, by J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, Depart-

ment of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., June 22, 1949. Mimeographed. Statement before the House Public Works Committee in support of H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287, which would establish a Columbia Valley Administration.

Fair Deal on the Columbia, speech of Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1949.

How a Columbia Valley Administration Would Operate, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., July 13, 1949. Mimeographed. Statement before the House Public Works Committee in support of H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287 to establish a Columbia Valley Administration, including an analysis of how a Columbia Valley Administration would operate if S. 1645, H. R. 4286 and H. R. 4287 were enacted.

What CVA Means to You, the Columbia Is Our River. League for CVA, 3015 Sixty-third Avenue SW., Seattle 6, Wash., May 1950. Free. Booklet explaining why the coordinated development of Columbia River resources through a Columbia Valley Administration is important to the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Government by Authorities, a Program of Socializing Our Economy at the Source by Controlling All Natural Resources—Do You Want It? Natural Resources Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington 6, D. C., 1950. Five cents each. Pamphlet opposing regional and valley authorities of any kind.

Majority of Democratic State Legislators in Montana Support CVA, statement of support for CVA by Democratic members of the Montana State Legislature. Inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 16, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Blueprint for a Boom, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. Published in the May 15, 1949, issue of This Week magazine, New York Herald Tribune. Article outlining a means to maintain prosperity in the Pacific Northwest by developing region's resources under CVA.

Kilowatts Out to Sea, by Richard L. Neuberger, an article published in the June 21, 1949, issue of The Reporter, and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 7, 1949, by Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. Article outlining the pros and cons of the struggle in the West for adoption of the CVA.

Northwest, Feeling on the Columbia Valley, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL of Washington, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1949, from a reply published by the Washington Post.

The Magnificent Columbia, CVA: An Over-All Plan for the Valley: CIO Committee on Regional Development and Conservation, Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington 6, D. C., January 1950. Publication No. 178, 15 cents each. Pamphlet dealing with the planning problems of the Columbia Valley. Discusses the various aspects of planning and points out its relationship to union people and the need for an integrated program.

Fifteen Basic Objections to the Administration CVA Bills: National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., reprinted by Seattle Chamber of Commerce, 215 Columbia Street, Seattle, Wash. Lists 15 basic objections to the administration CVA bills.

Two editorials on CVA: Two editorials from the Prosser (Wash.) Record-Bulletin, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

CVA—A Business Proposition, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., August 19, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before the Young Men's Club of Tacoma, Wash., pointing out that the development of the Northwest requires effective management of the Government enterprises as provided by CVA and that the businessmen of the whole region will benefit.

Valley Authorities: Special number of Legislative Daily, Department of Governmental Affairs, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., January 10, 1950. A special edition pointing out the opposition to the CVA and to the valley-authority idea in general by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The Growing Need for CVA, by Joe Miller, published in the New Republic magazine of April 11, 1949. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1949 by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Jackson and the CVA, address by Earl Coe, secretary of state, Olympia, Wash., reprinted in part in January 1950 issue of Oregon Democrat. Oregon Democrat Publishing Co., 428 Southwest Eleventh Avenue, Portland, Oreg.; 25 cents per copy. Statement favoring CVA.

Managing the Federal Investment in the Northwest, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.; June 7, 1949; mimeographed. Address before Oregon Bankers Association, Portland, Oreg. A discussion of Federal investment and the economy of the Pacific Northwest, pointing out that CVA will create an economic base for further growth of business, industry, and agriculture.

Read for Yourself What CVA Means (full text of S. 1645, reproduced from the original with marginal comments). Pacific Northwest Development Association, 205 Multnomah Hotel, Portland 4, Oreg. Marginal comments on CVA bill by opponents to the measure.

CVA and Defense Production, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., July 31, 1950. Mimeographed. Speech before Chamber of Commerce Forum Luncheon in Pendleton, Oreg. Emphasizes importance of hydroelectric power and other natural resources for defense production. Shows how present divided system of Federal resources operations has contributed to delays in providing necessary electric power and how CVA would speed the job.

Coordinated Development of Pacific Northwest Resources, a resolution by the Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1949, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell of Washington.

Task Force Report on Natural Resources. Prepared for the (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. 1949. 50 cents. Analysis by experts employed by the Hoover Commission of present Federal system of river basin development and resources operation. Points out in detail deficiencies of present system and recommends consolidation and decentralization of existing agencies.

CVA—Order on the Frontier, by Richard L. Neuberger, published in July 1949 issue of The Survey, Survey Associates, Inc., 112 East 19 Street, New York 3, New York, 50 cents per copy. Article analyzing Columbia Valley Administration legislation in terms of needs of Pacific Northwest.

The Canadian Portion of the Columbia River Basin, speech by the Honorable H. W. Herridge, member of the Canadian House of Commons. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1949 by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Question and Answers on the Columbia Valley Administration Bill, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. Multilithed. Analysis of specific language of the CVA bills in relation to existing law and administrative operations, showing fallacies in some charges made by opponents of CVA.

How 27 Men Can Capture the United States, Pacific Northwest Development Association, 205 Multnomah Hotel, Portland 4, Oreg. Pamphlet charging that proponents of valley authorities would put the entire United States under socialistic government-corporation rule.

Why You Need CVA, League for CVA, 3015 Sixty-third Avenue SW., Seattle 6, Wash. Pamphlet supporting CVA.

CVA and Public Power, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., August 26, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before Progress Conference on Public Power, Spokane, Wash. Traces the fight for public power by the people in the Northwest against the private utilities and the present fight for a CVA by those who want cheaper power and better administration of our natural resources.

Northwest support of CVA, letters showing support of CVA by E. M. "Ed" Weston, president, Washington State Federation of Labor; Henry P. Carstensen, master, the Washington State Grange; Roy W. Atkinson, regional director, CIO; and Harold J. Gibson, president, Aero Mechanics Lodge No. 751, and president, Washington Council of Machinists, IAM. Also letter by John T. McCutcheon, Washington State Senator. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

The Press and CVA, by Richard L. Neuberger, published in January 1950 issue of Nieman Reports, volume 14, No. 1, Harvard Press, Cambridge, Mass.; also reproduced in part in March 1950 issue of Oregon Democrat, Oregon Democrat Publishing Co., 428 Southwest Eleventh Avenue, Portland 5, Oreg.; 25 cents per copy. A survey of the attitude of the press regarding President Truman's proposal for a Columbia Valley Administration.

Analysis of Charges Made by Various Individuals and Groups in Opposition to a Columbia Valley Administration, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. 1949. Multilith. Legal interpretations of passages from CVA bills to explain misconceptions underlying some attacks on CVA legislation.

Washington Machinists Go All Out for CVA, a resolution supporting CVA by the Washington Machinists Council, published in the May 12 issue of Aero Mechanic, official publication of Lodge 751, IAM. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

CVA Promotes Conservation, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. September 17, 1949. Mimeographed. Speech before Izaak Walton League of Oregon, Bend, Oreg. Points out why conservation agencies are strapped for funds and how the CVA will promote better conservation of fish and wildlife, soils, forests, and recreational resources.

Why the Northwest Needs a CVA, by Harold J. Gibson, published in the April 27, 1950, issue of the Machinist, International Association of Machinists, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. A short newspaper article outlining the backing of CVA by labor organizations and the prospects offered labor by CVA.

Pacific Northwest Trade Association Stand on CVA, letter from Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, to the Pacific Northwest Trade Association regarding its negative attitude on CVA. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1949.

People and Resources, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C. August 26, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, Portland, Oreg. Discusses the relationships between people and natural resources, the necessity for proper

management in order to bring balance to economic and social aspects of our environment, and how CVA can bring about this balance.

Excerpts From Analysis of the Administration CVA Bills (H. R. 4286 and H. R. [S.] 1645) by E. W. Rising, Pacific Northwest Development Association, 205 Multnomah Hotel, Portland 4, Oreg. Mimeographed. Explanation of opposition to CVA bills.

The CVA Area, a special edition of the People's Voice, People's Voice Publishing Co., 1205 Lockey Street, Helena, Mont. January 27, 1950. Price, 5 cents. Extracts from speeches, statements, and documents of public officials favoring CVA.

Newspapers on CVA, an editorial published in the Western News of Hamilton, Mont., in the issues of May 12, 1949. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1949, by Hon. HUGH D. MITCHELL, of Washington.

TVA—Model for CVA? by Malcolm Bauer, the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., March 17–April 1, 1949. Series of 16 articles written by city editor of the newspaper after a special month's study of the Tennessee Valley Authority, reporting on TVA operations in regional development in relation to proposed CVA.

Resource Management by the Farmer and His Government, by Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., December 12, 1949. Mimeographed. Address before the National Land and Water Conference of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill. A discussion of the relation between efficient management of farm resources by the farmer and efficient management of river basin resources by his Government through CVA.

CVA Legislation and Columbia River Development, letter sent by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington, to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee relative to CVA hearings, and Mr. MITCHELL's statement of testimony on CVA before the Committee on Public Works. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13, 1949.

What About CVA? Editorial in Nature magazine, American Nature Association, 1214 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. January 1950. Fifty cents per copy. Editorial favoring CVA as the essential basic approach to a broader and coordinated resource management program.

Private Utilities in Washington Help Finance Anti-CVA Groups, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington, showing tabulation of partial list of contributions by Washington utility companies to organizations opposing CVA. Inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1949.

CVA and Jobs for Lumbermen, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., September 22, 1950. Mimeographed. Address before Northwest Council of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union, Portland, Oreg. Outlines the necessity for more complete utilization of timber so as to create new industry using the present waste materials and how CVA promotes stability of the lumber industry.

CVA Speaker's Manual. League for CVA, 3015 Sixty-third Street SW., Seattle, Wash. Materials primarily for the use of those asked to participate in discussion of CVA. Contains quotations from advocates, and material relating to the CVA issue.

League for CVA Terms Pacific Northwest Development Association Front Group for Private Power Companies. An editorial regarding CVA from the Oregon Teamster, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22, 1949, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington.

More TVA's? by Willard R. Espy, in New York Times magazine, May 7, 1950; reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 6, 1950, by Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana. Article points out that valley authorities in Missouri and Columbia Basins only way waste, overlapping, and logrolling now taking place there are likely to be eliminated; valley authorities need not be a way to spend money but a way to get far more value for the money we are spending now; valley authorities act as a stimulus to free enterprise.

Workers and Farmers Fight for CVA, by Joe Miller, published in the December 1949 issue of the Butcher Workman, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago 6, Ill. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 27, 1950, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell. Article expressing the support of the workers and farmers of the Pacific Northwest for the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

Area Included in Proposed Columbia Valley Administration. Geological Survey, Washington 25, D. C. 1949. Map showing the area included in proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

CVA Issues Reviewed by Northwest Writer, a series of four articles on CVA, written by Mr. Stub Nelson, of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1949, by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington.

A series of three articles (separately titled) on forests, soils, and land problems related to river basin development, by Bernard Frank and Anthony Netboy, in the January, February, and March 1950 issues of American Forests Magazine, Society of American Foresters, 919 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. First article, Dams Are Not Enough, questions whether dams and engineering approach will solve water and watershed problems. Second article, Land Use—Key to Our Water Problems, points necessity of coordinated planning of watershed conservation and land restoration with river control. Third article, Mirage of River Basin Development, points out incomplete and uncoordinated status of present river-control programs, with notes on accomplishments and shortcomings of CVA.

Northwesterners Hold Round Table Discussion on CVA, article published in the Wenatchee World by Howard Ordway, reporting a round table on CVA held in Moses Lake, Wash. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1949, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Federal Administration of Natural Resources Programs, by C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C., June 29–30, 1950. Mimeographed. A series of two lectures given at Great Plains Workshop, Montana State College, outlining the basic principles governing Federal administration of natural resources programs. Also contains a discussion of the administrative structure which inhibits efficient resource development and conservation. The situation in selected regions is noted and a number of possible solutions is reviewed.

CVA. This is Pioneering. 1950 Style, special issue of New Veteran, Oregon State Council of American Veterans Committee, 2 Southwest Brugger, Portland 1, Oreg. February 1950. Fifteen cents per copy. Considerations of the proposed CVA legislation by Oregon American Veterans Committee. Included are the following articles: The Press and CVA, by Richard L. Neuberger; the Farmer's Stake in CVA, by Morton B. Tompkins; A Union Man Looks at CVA, by Bill Way; the People and CVA, by Phil Dreyer; CVA and the Hoover Commission, by Sidney Lezak; Safeguards for Freedom, by George Holcomb; and others.

CVA Foes May Have Overplayed Their Hand, by Joe Miller, published in the CIO News of December 26, 1949. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1950, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Plan, Not Objective, Is Issue in Development of Columbia River. May 1949 issue of Rural Electrification Magazine, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. This is third article in a series published by Rural Electrification Magazine dealing with the present movement toward the full development of America's river valleys.

United States Chamber of Commerce distorts CVA issues, a letter from Mr. Lloyd B. Dysart, member of the Centralia, Wash., Chamber of Commerce to the United States Chamber of Commerce and an article published in Labor News on the negative attitude of the United States Chamber of Commerce on CVA. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1950, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Government and Water Resources, a symposium in the September 1950 issue of the American Political Science Review, published quarterly by American Political Science Association, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis. $2 a copy. Symposium contains the following articles: Congress and Water Resources, by Arthur A. Maass; National Executive Organization for Water Resources, by Gilbert F. White; The Valley Authority and its Alternatives, by Charles McKinley; and Water Resources and American Federalism, by Albert Lepawsky.

Montana Wants Early CVA Hearings, a copy of a resolution passed by the Western Montana Conference for CVA and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1950, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, of Washington.

Long Beach Navy Shipyard Active Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago on the floor of this great legislative Chamber, it was my privilege and honor to announce that the Navy had just informed me that it had been found that the inactive shipyard at Long Beach, my home city, had been found to be a necessary facility and would be immediately reactivated to its full capacity. The inactivation order was enunciated in September 1949. The reactivation ceremony and celebration will be observed at the Long Beach Navy Shipyard, Thursday, February 1, 1951. In the meantime, however, some 2,000 employees are "demothballing" at the earliest possible date; peacetime employee list is about 6,000; the last war peak was about 16,000.

Following is a very appropriate editorial which appeared in the Long Beach Press-Telegram for Friday, January 5, 1951, clearly showing that the citizenry there readily comprehends the impacts and responsibilities arising from the shipyard being located there:

SHIPYARD REOPENING ACCENTUATES LONG BEACH'S VARIED DEFENSE ROLE

The mounting defense crisis has accomplished what Long Beach's most valiant efforts failed to do a year ago. The reactivation of the naval shipyards in many ways confirms the strong case presented by this community in opposition to the closure order of mid-1949.

It is useless now to discuss the question as to whether the shipyards should ever have been shut down. The happy circumstance is that the yard was not abandoned—that it

has been only closed and kept in readiness for rapid reactivation if ordered. The yard has been kept in an excellent state of repair, and a major project is under way to remedy the subsidence problem, which was given officially as the principal reason for its closure.

It will take time, of course, to restaff the facility and get it back into full operation, but the announcement to Representative CLYDE DOYLE'S office indicates that there will be no lost motion in that direction. Locally there has been some puzzlement over the fact that the reopening was not started sooner, in view of the Korean War, the general defense situation, and the overloading of other west coast yards.

There is something about the presence of a closed facility such as the shipyard that is embarrassing to a community, no matter what the justification. Long Beach is naturally gratified that the naval shipyard, which had such an outstanding record during World War II and in the immediate postwar demobilization program, is now to make its contribution to the revitalized defense effort.

What the local effects of the shipyard reopening will be are still somewhat in the conjectural stage, naturally. It will, of course, carry a strong impact on the community in such fields as employment, housing, and general business conditions.

At present Long Beach has an unemployment roll of between 7,000 and 8,000. The minimum of shipyard employment is set at 3,500, and opening the yards will obviously cut the jobless roll sharply.

However, filling the shipyard's needs will not be simply a matter of hiring 3,500 persons from among those 7,000 to 8,000 unemployed listed by the State employment office. The employment office lists approximately 1,300 skilled and 811 semiskilled workers as unemployed. Among these, very likely, there are many potential shipyard employees. On the other hand, the unemployment lists contain numerous clerks, domestics, and so forth who wouldn't be available for shipyard work.

While large numbers of shipyard workers may be recruited from local manpower, it is believed many employees will come from outside. Observers expect some difficulty may be encountered by the shipyard in filling the more highly skilled and key positions. The decline in the construction boom in Los Angeles and in Orange County is beginning to throw construction men out of work. Many of the skilled workers—particularly those who have commuted to those areas from Long Beach—should find employment at the shipyard.

As for housing, Long Beach is far better prepared to meet the housing needs of a busy defense center than it was during the hectic days of World War II. In 1950 alone, approximately 17,000 new houses were constructed in this immediate area. There are at present nearly 4,000 vacant residential units in Long Beach. People are moving daily from in-the-city apartment to new housing in the big suburban tracts. Further, it is to be assumed that many of the men who will work in the shipyard are already residents here. All of this adds up to a much looser housing situation than existed in World War II days when from 5,000 to 7,000 men were employed at the shipyards.

The critical world condition that brought on the reactivation of the shipyard is not a welcome circumstance, of course, but it is gratifying that this community, through its reactivated shipyard, its airplane factories, air fields, ammunition and net depot, harbor, oil fields, and other facilities, will play an important role in the mighty defense effort of the free west. Making that contribution will require cooperation, sacrifice, and constructive solution of many problems. It is hardly necessary to say Long Beach will rise to the challenge.

EVENTS OF PAST 10 DAYS PRESAGE CHANGES IN LONG BEACH AIMS, THINKING

Long Beach has just spent 10 of the most eventful days in its history—days whose activities foreshadow marked changes in the lives of local citizens.

Rapidly Long Beach has begun gearing for defense. The meshing may be heard in almost every area of local society.

Here are some of the developments:

The city heard that the naval shipyard here would be reactivated. Immediately, officials began receiving and processing applications for employment from skilled shipyard workers and stenographers and typists. Capt. Emmett Emerson Sprung, 51, graduate of the Naval Academy class of 1923, was appointed commander of the shipyard And two of his key officers were to be Capt. Homer Dahlke, in charge of planning, and Capt. Charles Tooke, production. Only a few hours after announcement of reactivation of the huge installation, workers heard that the first big project would be the diking of drydock 1, which has handled many of the major ships of the fleet.

At the same time, Undersecretary of the Navy Dan Kimball announced in Washington that expansion of the Seal Beach Ammunition and Net Depot would keep pace with the reactivation of the shipyard here. Bids were opened on repairs to facilities at the depot, and the restoration goal was set at 90 days.

New naval trainee activities here were presaged by the announcement that the Los Angeles Naval Base, which had been on naval station status, would be reestablished as a base. Simultaneously, the Coast Guard announced its intention of expanding its activities in this area and called for new barracks facilities. Long Beach and Los Angeles harbor authorities announced they were perfecting security plans which will be coordinated with Coast Guard activities.

Douglas Aircraft revamped and strengthened its executive structure to meet the problems of accelerated defense production. A stone's throw away, at municipal airport and Los Alamitos Air Station, stepped-up air training activities were noticeable.

The civilian defense front hummed. The Long Beach Red Cross chapter launched a preparedness training program aimed at training 80,000 persons in this area in new first-aid techniques. Meanwhile, a training period began for civilian auxiliary police, officials hoping to recruit a force of approximately 1,000 eventually. The Chamber of Commerce pledged to gear its 1951 program to the needs of preparedness, while the Board of Realtors voted to offer their services, as a group or individually, to the director of civilian defense. Councilman Bazil U. Carleson suggested that some of the city's largest storm drains might be used as air raid shelters. The city tested a new air-raid-warning system, and immediately it was urged that 15 new sirens be purchased at once. City Manager Vickers said he would seek an ordinance providing for a Long Beach civil defense and disaster council, supplanting the present ordinance which provides for a disaster council, and giving greater emphasis to all aspects of defense.

As these events unfolded, Long Beach citizens experienced others which gave significance to the revitalized defense program. New casualty lists, some of them containing names of local boys, furnished a reminder of the front line which all these home-front activities must support. And the paraplegic ward at Long Beach Veterans' Administration hospital received Major Raymond Pepple, 41, of Seattle—the hospital's first casualty from Korea.

These things, and many others connected with defense, happened during a 10-day span.

Suddenly, in so brief a period, the atmosphere of national preparedness has come over this city, changing local aims and habits of thinking. Because of its coastal situation and its possession of valuable military and industrial installations, Long Beach is experiencing the metamorphosis more rapidly and more rigorously than most other cities in the country. Upon the shoulders of local people fall many of the initial responsibilities of the defense effort. They must accept the position of leadership which has been accorded them.

The Republic of Mexico Is Solving Economic and Social Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I was among the half-million citizens of the United States who visited Mexico in 1950. It was the most favorable tourist trade year in Mexico's history.

I was impressed first by the fact that there are two civilizations—the ancient rural society still resembling that of the eighteenth century and the other, a fast-moving and progressive urban life. Probably in no other part of the world is the contrast so striking. Mexico City has modern buildings and factories. Good roads, electric power development, and vast construction projects indicate that economic progress is welcome throughout the country and is rapidly affecting rural life. Cultural patterns are more resistant. Latin America is not likely to abandon all of its old-world practices, many of which have a special charm.

The contribution of the United States to rural improvement is notable. The Rockefeller Foundation, financed entirely by private funds, began an unusual research program in 1943 that has already brought revolutionary results. It is designed to increase improved yields of corn, wheat, beans, and other crops. Mexico's progress in corn production, for example, is demonstrated by the fact that in 1948 for the first time in 35 years it was unnecessary to import corn for its 27,000,000 people. Another program of great significance is the sanitation and health projects directed by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, staffed by able American technicians and cooperating to the fullest extent with the Mexican Government.

My contact with the Government was confined to a single visit to the Mexican Congress. Through the courtesy of two members of the Chamber of Deputies, Hon. Teofilo Borunda and Hon. Mario Romero Lopetegui, I was privileged to observe proceedings during an afternoon session. I understand that an official delegation from the Mexican Congress will visit our body in 1951 for the purpose of returning battle flags taken by Mexican troops in 1847. There was abundant evidence that this Government's action in returning Mexican flags taken in the same engagement inspired great appreciation on the part of the Mexican people.

The Mexican people had a longer struggle for their freedom and independence than we. The revolutions of 1821, 1857 and 1867 produced many heroes and slogans, but the devotion which one finds everywhere to the principles of the revolution was inspired by the great upsurge of 1910 against dictatorship.

Mexico is proud of its history and makes full use of its archeological resources for the benefit of tourists. We saw impressive works of the Aztec Indians thousands of years old. And with the Spaniards came a genius for construction that we have not surpassed.

What of Mexico's future? There is hopefulness in every field of thought and action. Businessmen are quite impressed with the potentialities of trade with the United States and the benefits to flow to our own country. A new and valuable market is at our doorstep. The building of good relations through the agricultural and educational activities I have mentioned is a very important development. The United States needs Latin-American friends and Latin America needs us.

As I have indicated, the most prominent official activity of our Government is that of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Its operations are carried out through the Mexican Government's agency, Direccion de Cooperacion Interamericana de Salubrida Publica. Our contributions since 1943 have been rather modest—$5,100,000—but the results have been enormous. As of May 30, 1950, the Direccion de Cooperacion Interamericana de Salubrida Publica has had under construction or had completed 46 potable water supplies in various towns within the Republic. There had also been installed 16 chlorinators to protect already existing water-supply systems. During the same period the agency had under construction or had completed a total of 22 municipal sanitary-sewage systems.

In the field of preventive medicine the following activities have been carried out: First, field investigations of such diseases as brucellosis, onchocerciasis, pinta, and malaria; second, training of public health workers within Mexico, in the United States, and in other Latin-American countries; third, promotion of disease control activities, with special emphasis on malaria, tuberculosis and typhus; fourth, promotion of general public health activities, including construction and equipping of health centers, and technical assistance in their operations.

The magnificent results attained by the American and Mexican Governments' program for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease are already well known.

In these two official programs and the research activity of the Rockefeller Foundation, a basis has been laid for a successful cooperative program under point 4 legislation. Its value in terms of the Western Hemisphere's defense is apparent.

Mexico's future depends partly upon the faith exhibited by privileged groups of both countries in the capacity of the rural population to achieve a higher level of living. Rural people have looked upon a more prosperous and satisfactory way of living and they aspire to reach it for themselves and their children. It will take a generation or longer to achieve some of the economic and social goals erected by Mexico's progressive leadership, but I am confident those goals will be achieved. In the meantime, I shall occasionally recall the half-pleading but bright little eyes of a baby hanging limp from the mother's shoulders in a village street.

Faith Can Master Fear—Mankind Can Learn To Live in Cooperation, Trust, and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by G. Ernest Thomas from the Miami Herald of January 16, 1951:

FAITH CAN MASTER FEAR—MANKIND CAN LEARN TO LIVE IN COOPERATION, TRUST, AND PEACE

(By G. Ernest Thomas)

(Out of a firm belief that the human spirit will prove supreme again, as it has in earlier crises, G. Ernest Thomas has written a new study of fear and its cure by faith. This is the second of six articles taken from his book, Faith Can Master Fear.)

A great principle which should be recognized by those who are in the grip of a fear of the future is this:

Men can learn to live together.

Much of our uncertainty for the future is centered about the international situation. We fear that nations will again resort to war. We fear the conflict of systems of thought which we assume to be incompatible.

The history of human fear indicates that this point of view has caused greater worry than any other. The earliest records of people who were filled with terror come from the civilizations which were dominated by the obsession that destruction was inevitable because men could not get along with each other.

When man came upon the earth countless ages ago he had to live in fear in order to survive.

Every day he met hostility from man and beast. He feared every savage who came out of the forest, perhaps sometimes just to look curiously at his neighbors.

It took thousands of years to convince man that he could trust the families on the other side of the hill and that he could serve his own best interest by joining with them to make a tribe.

It took more thousands of years before the tribe learned that it could best protect its interest by uniting with other tribes to form a larger unit.

It took countless generations before tribes could learn that their best security lay in the nation. It has taken centuries until the people of the world would even consider the idea of a United Nations.

Every step of the way fear has slowed man down. Yet the testimony of the ages is irrefutable. Man can learn to live together.

Much of our fear of the future will be dispelled if we accept this fact. The divisions which seem to make a cleavage between the peoples of the world today are minor compared with the severe handicaps to unity which already have been overcome.

It is true that the development of agents of human destruction has been so rapid that we do not have as much time to resolve our difficulties as people have had in former generations. We must quickly learn how to live together. Time is running out for us. The way of cooperation must be found.

The evidence of the ages indicates that a plan for cooperative effort will be found, and will be put into effect. Men can—and, we believe, will—learn to live at peace with each other.

Another principle which will help to dispel our fear of the future is this: The human spirit is supreme.

People for many generations have lived in abject fear of their future because they believed that weapons, or money, or government was supreme. Because they could not control the power of those weapons, or because they did not possess enough wealth, or because they had no part in the Government, they felt helpless and weak. They were afraid.

The Christian attitude toward life is closely bound up with the idea of the supremacy of the human spirit. "Man shall not live by bread alone," said Jesus. For Him the soul of man was of greatest significance.

How does that affect the attitude of the individual Christian who is confronted by a world in which his neighbors tremble constantly with fears of the future?

Just this: He knows God is the Father of all mankind. He believes man is made in the image of God with divine possibilities for life. He accepts the clear witness of our faith that the human soul is immortal. He does not understand all the mysteries involved, but he is aware that the noblest witness of the ages is Christ, and the voices of the greatest of the philosophers and the poets are united in proclaiming that man is made to live forever. He is immortal.

Such a faith in human immortality is a sure antidote for our fear of the future. Suppose the world is faced with dire uncertainties; suppose the civilization of this age is headed for destruction.

The Christian soul has within it the seeds of immortality. The blazing light of such a faith has the power to dispel even the darkest fear.

Fear of the future often is based on the idea that material factors are the ruling agencies in life. But courage often has been a more valuable factor than an army. Love frequently has overcome the strangling power of money. Brotherhood sometimes has been more useful than political might.

The human spirit is supreme. More often than we think, it can be victorious over the threats to security and peace which cause us to fear the future. If the human spirit cannot find the means to transform the world in which it lives, it still can seek a better country under the providence of a loving God.

Fear of the future plagues almost everyone who lives in this generation. We wish life might be different, we say, but the world looks dark. Rich or poor, highly educated or ignorant, American or Russia, we fear the future. In those moments when we are given to wishful thinking we long for some miracle to dispel those shadows.

John Bunyan, in Pilgrim's Progress, painted a picture of a world held fast in the strangling power of fear.

Pilgrim is made to say to his wife: "I am for certain informed that this our city will be burned with fire from heaven—in which fearful overthrow both myself with thee my wife and our sweet babes shall miserably come to ruin, except (the which yet I see not)

some way of escape can be found, whereby we may be delivered."

You remember that Pilgrim began to run with his feet on the path and his eyes on the shining light which led to the wicket gate. On the journey he was not alone, for the Evangelist met him and guided him.

Fear of the future is well described by the experience of Bunyan's Pilgrim. But too few of us accept the light which Bunyan saw. If we walk forward with our feet on the path of righteousness, and with our eyes set on noble goals, we too will discover a strange power and peace to calm our frightened minds.

And on the journey we shall find that a divine spirit is leading us. Our fear of the future will have disappeared.

Benefits Available to World War I Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly, January 16, 1951, entitled "Summary of Major World War I Veterans' Benefits":

SUMMARY OF MAJOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS' BENEFITS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Basic eligibility requirements for all major benefits that VA administers for World War I veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries in the United States, its possessions and Territories, and in foreign countries are briefly outlined below. More detailed information may be obtained from any VA office in the United States, its possessions or Territories or from any DAV national service officer. In foreign countries it may be obtained from any United States Foreign Service office.)

MEDICAL AND DOMICILIARY BENEFITS

Hospitalization—World War I veterans, if discharged or separated under conditions other than dishonorable, are entitled to VA hospital treatment, under the following priority system.

First, emergency cases.

Second, those suffering from injuries or diseases incurred or aggravated in line of duty during wartime service.

Third, those who state under oath that they are unable to pay hospital charges for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities or illnesses. These veterans, if not in the emergency category, must wait until a bed becomes available.

Emergency patients may be taken directly to the nearest VA hospital. If possible, the veterans, or someone acting for him or her, should communicate with VA by telephone or telegraph.

In all other cases, the veteran, his nearest relative, guardian, or representative, should fill in the proper form for hospital care. These forms are available at any VA office.

If admission to a VA hospital or home has been approved, Government transportation may be provided as follows:

1. Hospitals: To the hospital and, upon completion of treatment in service-connected cases, to his or her home. This service may be provided for non-service-connected cases if they are unable to pay for the transportation.

2. Homes: To a VA domiciliary home.

Domiciliary care: Domiciliary care is designed to provide a "home" for those veterans who have a chronic condition which incapacitates them from earning a living and who require minimal medical attention. Requirements for admission to domiciliary care are essentially the same as for hospital treatment. Transportation at Government expense as a rule is provided only for the initial admission.

The veteran, or his nearest relative, guardian, or representative, should obtain preadmission approval from the nearest VA installation having facilities for domiciliary case.

Out-patient medical treatment: Out-patient medical care is available for veterans in need of treatment for service-connected disabilities.

Under this plan, eligible World War I veterans may receive treatment at VA hospitals, or other field stations furnishing medical treatment, or from approved private physicians. Each veteran's eligibility must be determined by VA before treatment of this type can be authorized. Necessary drugs may be obtained from "home-town" druggists at Government expense by veterans who are authorized to report to private physicians for treatment.

Outpatient dental treatment: Veterans entitled to outpatient dental treatment may, upon VA approval, be furnished dental treatment by private dentists at Government expense. Here, again, the condition must be determined by VA to have been incurred in, or made worse by, the veteran's wartime service before treatment can be authorized. Preliminary examinations may be made in a VA dental clinic or, if VA dental facilities are not feasibly available, by a participating dentist. Treatment, if approved, may be completed in a VA clinic, or the veteran may be assigned to an approved private dentist.

Prosthetic service: A veteran's eligibility for prosthetic appliances may be established if (1) he has a service-connected or service-aggravated disability requiring an appliance or (2) if an appliance is determined necessary as a part of hospital treatment or domiciliary care.

Complete information and necessary forms for procuring needed appliances, equipment, and repairs are available at any VA office.

Examinations: Free medical examinations if required, will be given veterans filing compensation claims. Veterans desiring to reinstate their United States Government life insurance may receive a physical examination free of charge at any VA medical office.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

A veteran disabled by injury or disease incurred in, or aggravated by, service during World War I may qualify for disability compensation. He must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Monthly rates range from $15 to $150, depending on the degree of disability, plus statutory awards for amputations, blindness, etc., up to a maximum of $360. Veterans rated 50 percent or more disabled receive additional sums for dependents.

DISABILITY PENSION

A World War I veteran who becomes permanently and totally disabled for reason not traceable to his service in the Armed Forces may be entitled to pension. He must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after a minimum of 90 days service, or else discharged for disability. The veteran is disqualified if his income exceeds $1,000 per year if he is single, or $2,500 if he is married or has a minor child.

The monthly rate is $60, which is increased to $72 after 10 years or when the veteran reaches age 65.

DEATH COMPENSATION

The widow, children, and dependent parents of a deceased World War I veteran whose death was due to service may qualify for death compensation. A widow loses her entitlement if she remarries. The child loses its entitlement, normally, upon reaching age 18.

Monthly amounts vary according to the number and relationship of the dependents. Examples are: widow, no children, $75; one child alone, no widow, $58; one parent, $60.

DEATH PENSION

The widow and children of a deceased World War I veteran who died of causes not due to service, in most cases are entitled to death pension benefits. The widow is disqualified if her annual income exceeds $1,000, or $2,500 if she has a child or children. A child is ineligible if his or her income exceeds $1,000 per year. A widow loses her entitlement upon remarriage, and children normally become ineligible when they reach age 18.

A widow alone receives $42 per month, with additional allowances for children. Where there is no widow, a single child is entitled to $21.60, with added amounts for more children.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE

A veteran of World War I who served at any time from October 6, 1917, to July 2, 1921, still is eligible to apply for up to $10,000 of United States Government life insurance, whether or not he took out such insurance while in service or has since let it lapse.

He may get term insurance or any of six permanent plans available—ordinary life, 20-payment life, 30-payment life, 20-year endowment, 30-year endowment, and endowment at age 62. No one may hold at any one time more than $10,000 worth of Government insurance including National Service Life (World War II) Insurance.

The veteran must furnish satisfactory evidence that he is in good health. Ordinarily, this is done by submitting report of complete physical examination which will be given without charge at any VA regional office or hospital.

AID IN ACQUIRING SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING

A veteran of war or peacetime service who is entitled to compensation for permanent and total service-connected disability for loss or loss of use of both legs due to certain specified conditions such as to prevent him from moving about without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair, may qualify for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing with special fixtures made necessary by the nature of his disability.

Eligible veterans will receive Federal grants of not more than 50 percent of the cost of the homes up to a maximum of $10,000 with which to pay part of the cost of building or buying such homes, or to remodel existing homes for their requirements.

The grant also may be used to pay off the indebtedness on such a special home already acquired by an eligible veteran.

Application for the grant may be made at any VA office.

GUARDIANSHIP SERVICE

Incompetent World War I veterans, their minor dependents and incompetent beneficiaries are entitled to protection of their estates derived from benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration under acts of Congress.

Such protection is provided by the chief attorneys of VA regional offices—in accordance with the State and Federal laws and VA regulations—acting under the direction and supervision of the legal service (guardianship) of the VA Solicitor's office. The chief attorney maintains supervision over guardians appointed by State (probate and county) courts, as well as legal custodians recognized by VA in their respective jurisdictions.

BURIAL BENEFITS

Funeral expenses up to $150 will be paid by the Government in the death of any World War I veteran discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Additional costs, covering transportation, will be allowed if the veteran dies in a VA hospital or domiciliary home, or while hospitalized at the expense of VA, or while in transit to or from a VA hospital, home or regional office at the expense of VA.

All claims must be filed with VA within 2 years from the date of permanent burial. These allowances are payable only to undertakers or to reimburse the person who paid the funeral expenses.

BURIAL FLAG

An American flag to drape the casket, which may be retained as a memorial by the next of kin, is supplied in the death of veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Such flags are issued upon application, by field offices, most first-, second-, and third-class post offices and those fourth-class post offices located in county seats.

APPEALS

The Board of Veterans' Appeals is available for rendering final decisions in all cases appealed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wherein a claimant has been denied benefits to which he claims entitlement. The Board has no original jurisdiction (except in claims of disabled emergency offices); its work is similar to that of a court of appeals.

Rejection of Reds by Koreans Sets Example for All Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to you and my other distinguished colleagues an editorial viewpoint as released by the editor of the Long Beach, Calif., Press-Telegram. This important daily is admittedly recognized and rated as Republican in editorial policy.

And as said editorial refers to an appeal for help written by B. C. Limb, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea, I also call to your attention the full text of the "appeal" to which the Long Beach editor refers.

The editorial was on Thursday, January 18, 1951.

REJECTION OF REDS BY KOREANS SETS EXAMPLE FOR ALL FREE MEN

Communist Chinese snubbing of the UN cease-fire proposal turns attention again upon the Reds' own major condition for cessation of hostilities—withdrawal of United Nations troops.

The United States is against such a retreat. Voluntary withdrawal from Korea, giving the Reds that territory which they really expect to get only at severe cost, doesn't make sense from either a military or a diplomatic standpoint. It doesn't make sense at this moment—and certainly it doesn't make sense from the long-range viewpoint.

Look at today's forum column, elsewhere on this page. You will find a powerful appeal for help written by B. C. Limb, who is the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Republic of Korea. Mr. Limb presents cogent arguments for continued United Nations participation in Korea. When he describes Korea as the "front line of worldwide democracy," he is reemphasizing the concept which led the United States and the United Nations to accept the challenge posed in June by the North Koreans.

Those who would abandon Korea now, hoping to end far eastern troubles, have a naive approach to the problem. They fail to consider the Kremlin's program—outlined in speeches by Communist leaders, recorded in books by Communist writers, and inherent in party doctrine—for domination of the world. The free world should have learned, after its experience with Hitler, that to ignore those fantastic programs of the dictators is only an invitation to trouble. Broadly speaking, the Russian Communists intend to dispose of all other existing types of government and set up in every conquered country a system of militant communism which would prevent counterrevolution. It's simply another totalitarian movement, in its way as bad as fascism and nazism.

These are the things you have to keep in mind when you speak of dealing with the Reds. Appeasing totalitarianism is the beginning, not the ending, of your trouble with it.

If this view is accepted, it is difficult to see how the UN can voluntarily withdraw from Korea, for the remaining question is a military one, and, militarily, the situation is far from the debacle stage. By withdrawing slowly and only under pressure, the UN forces make the enemy pay, and after the demonstration at Hamhung of its power to hold a beachhead by air and naval power for an indefinite time, the UN certainly should not agree to any terms which would give the Reds their heart's desire. Important military leaders believe the Pusan beachhead can be held, just as the Hamhung beachhead was held. In fact, this apparently is the line of reasoning which governs the campaign.

People who are faint of heart may take instruction from Foreign Minister Limb's countrymen. Millions of Koreans have abandoned their homes and endured horrible suffering in order to escape the Communists. Millions are crying for arms. Faced with choices, they have turned down the Reds. They entertain no illusions. They are willing to endure present hardships in order to avoid future slavery.

While the choice between opposing communism or appeasing it is not so immediately personal and dramatic to many other people in the world, that choice is nonetheless an existing problem for them. It exists for them now in the question whether the United Nations should leave Korea or stay there and fight. Stronghearted people know the right answer.

ABANDONING KOREA WOULDN'T AID WORLD FREEDOM CAUSE

EDITOR, PRESS-TELEGRAM:

Would it benefit the world cause of freedom to abandon Korea? It is freely suggested in these trying days that the democratic world should avoid being drawn into an extended conflict in Korea. It ought, according to this view, to disengage itself there in order to have more strength to employ 'n Europe. This view is clearly fraught with danger for the free world everywhere.

International communism has made clear its design to conquer the peoples of the Far East. It is in Korea that this design has, for the first time, been brought to at least a temporary halt. Now if Korea be abandoned, would not other Asian countries as well be left open to Communist conquest. Would it be deemed equally expedient to abandon the defense of Southeastern Asia, or of Formosa, or of India, or of Iran, or of Turkey, or of Greece? Is it not a simple fact that the union of the endangered peoples of the world can exist only upon the one solid assumption that all are equally precious to the defense of freedom?

The urgent need of the hour is manpower. It is the manpower of the Chinese Communists which brings so much defeatism to many men who are otherwise strong and honorable. This defeatism is a major cause to defeat. Fear has blinded them from a major source of victory.

The Government of the Republic of Korea has repeatedly and earnestly asked the democratic powers that weapons be supplied to it so that it can arm 1,000,000 of its young men who are already organized to fight and another half million who are still available to be mobilized for the struggle. Let us arm the Korean youth, who have the best reasons in the world for fanatical fighting spirit. Let us pour waves of our own upon the waves of the foe. These Koreans will show you how to turn the tide of war into a victory.

Thus far it is perfectly plain to all of us here and to the mothers and fathers whose brave sons are engaged in the battle front of Korea that this war is being fought more on political than upon military grounds. The enemy is being protected less by his own strategical plans than by the decisions that are made—or by those that remain unmade—in the capitals of the democracies. No war in history has ever been waged on such unequal terms as is the war in Korea. No enemy ever enjoyed such protection from his own victims as the Communist Chinese and their Russian cohorts are enjoying now.

For us to retreat is to die. And where we stand the front line of world-wide democracy is saved. Our advance is the advance of democratic freedom. We are all in this struggle together. Surely the struggle cannot be aided by fear, withdrawal, and abandonment. It can only be aided by the profound determination to stand and to win.

B. C. LIMB,
Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Republic of Korea.

The March of Dimes Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a beautiful tribute, in verse, to the March of Dimes campaign, written by Milford E. Shields, of Durango, Calif.

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

THE MARCH OF DIMES

That swift, insidious breath, that void of fate
Called polio, that thirst unslaked and great
Draws life from children that is pure and fresh
And leaves them with a starved and withered flesh.
We cannot give them ours, though try we might,
For they are entities in God's high sight;
But we can give them elements of hope,
The utmost care within man's mortal scope—
Translate our dimes and dollars into love
And give for them with passion from above—
Let our love walk with them and buoy them up,
Their love will drink with ours from life's sweet cup.

—*Milford E. Shields.*

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the broadcast of Sunday, January 21, on the American Forum of the Air. Senator TAFT and I participated in this broadcast on the subject A Foreign Policy, What's the Answer? under the able chairmanship of Theodore Granik, pioneer in the development of radio forums, now in his twenty-second year of broadcasting. I was happy on the program to be able to congratulate him on achieving an NBC network sponsor. Representatives of the Motor Transport Association of Connecticut were on hand to applaud this sponsor, the American Trucking Association.

I told Mr. Granik and officials of the Association that from my long experience with the University of Chicago Round Table, for which I was responsible for nine years, I thought this type of program was not only most suitable for such a trade association, but would prove to be a most effective promotion and public relations instrument—in reaching key people throughout the country, and in developing public understanding and good will. Here is an example of an advertiser who, in benefiting himself, at the same time renders an important public service. Here is an example of enlightened self-interest.

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

A FOREIGN POLICY, WHAT'S THE ANSWER?

Chairman GRANIK. The great debate rolls on in the newspapers, on radio, on television, and on street corners. Here are a few of the headlines in this week's news describing some of the developments:

"President invites backing of Senate on sending troops."

"TAFT would limit number of divisions."

"Military chiefs urge twenty-seven months' universal training for eighteen-year-olds."

"United States alone in branding China aggressor."

"Soviet claims France lies about defensive aim of Atlantic Pact."

So while the great debate simmers and boils in the Congress and in your homes, peoples everywhere are asking, "What is the answer to our foreign policy?"

We again pose this vital question to two distinguished United States Senators, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, and Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, formerly Assistant Secretary of State.

Since their dramatic election campaigns, some have called Senator TAFT "Mr. Republican"; others have called Senator BENTON "Mr. Democrat," as his seat, contested even after the election, finally retained the majority for the Democratic Party in the Senate.

Senator TAFT, what are the the prospects of the President and you sitting down together to discuss our foreign policy?

Senator TAFT. Well, I made an offer, Mr. Granik, but it didn't seem to be greeted with very much favor.

Chairman GRANIK. What are the chances?

Senator TAFT. I don't think that there is anything to add to what I said before the National Press Club.

Chairman GRANIK. All right, Senator. Do you want to go on with the general subject of what is the answer to our foreign policy?

Senator TAFT. The great and over-riding purpose of a foreign policy should be to maintain the liberty of the people of the United States. The second is peace for the United States and for the world; a war only when it is absolutely essential to protect our liberty which is our first concern.

Today the great threat to liberty and the peace alike is Soviet Russia, which threatens the domination of the world through propaganda, infiltration, and military aggression. To meet that threat, the first necessity of our foreign policy is to build up and maintain a great sea and air force so that we may have absolute control of the sea and air throughout the entire world, a bastion of freedom for all, a means of access to every country in the world. If we maintain that control, it is inconceivable that the liberty of our people could be seriously jeopardized by Soviet Russia, and Russia knows it and is less likely to begin a war.

From a position of complete control of sea and air we can extend our power in many instances into continental territory, even to some extent on the Continent of Europe, but Korea should teach us that we should avoid any tremendous commitment on any continent in terms of American soldiers because we would be fighting Russia on their own most favorable ground; in a contest of manpower they can outnumber us in the end ten to one.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON.

Senator BENTON. Thank you, Ted Granik, for that little phrase "Mr. Democrat." I will try to live up to that although I never expect to achieve the eminence that connotes the "Mr. Republican" that is attributed to Senator TAFT.

As I have listened to Governor Stassen and General Eisenhower, and John Foster Dulles, and other Republicans on the subject of foreign policy perhaps it would be fair to modify that phrase "Mr. Republican" and maybe call Senator TAFT "Mr. Fifty Percent Republican," or even sixty-six and two-thirds percent Republican.

Senator TAFT. I think the Republican Party in the end is a little more likely to support my point of view.

Chairman GRANIK. There is your answer.

Senator BENTON. The Senator has always been looking ahead, and I can see that he is looking hopefully ahead now. The wing of the party represented by your speeches, Senator TAFT, and by President Hoover's speech in the current debate, seems to me much too centered on military policy rather than foreign policy. By air and seapower, I feel that the particular viewpoint you represent is seeking a kind of nostalgic return to the nineteenth century kind of security. The New York Times, in reporting your first congressional speech, summarized this viewpoint by saying, "Senator TAFT said in effect what was needed now was a return on a greater and more modern scale to the balance of power, once preserved by the British Fleet."

I admit you are consistent on this, Senator TAFT. Back in 1940, you may remember saying that "the day of large armies is wanting," but I deny, and perhaps this is the most important thing to discuss on this program, the soundness of what I will call a stockade psychology, a kind of return to the Alamo. I think the day when we can count on the stockade and "remember the Alamo," and rely wholly on our own resources, is a day that we should now put behind us. We must now seek the support of nations who want freedom and notably this means Western Europe. Further, we must give them faith and hope. The masses of people will not fight unless they have a chance to win, and unless we Americans give them faith and give them hope in our leadership and in our policy—we are going to find ourselves in the Alamo behind the stockade, and without the security which is sought by President Hoover and the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator TAFT, do you think Russia contemplates a military attack on Europe today?

Senator TAFT. Well, I don't know, and I don't know how we can tell. I do not think that there is any conclusive evidence that they do. They have had five years during which they could have attacked at any moment. They have not moved Russian troops beyond the zone of influence that we so generously gave them at Yalta. Of course, we have to assume that they may. We have to build up an army that can meet them. Incidentally, as far as sea and air power is concerned even the Joint Chiefs of Staff today give a good deal more money in this whole new budget to the sea and air than they do to the Army, so maybe they think the days of mass armies, the days when they were the predominant feature, are going by.

But I think we have to assume if Russia intends a military attack, I ask a question that no one has been able to answer for me, Why should they wait three years for us to build up a great army that will prevent such an attack? And not only that, if the army contemplated is great enough to prevent such an attack, it certainly has an aggressive threat against Russia. Why will they wait, Mr. BENTON?

Senator BENTON. There we are—back talking about military strategy and problems, Senator TAFT. I agree with this point, however, and this is where I welcomed your speech and President Hoover's speech—that war is much too important to be left to the generals, but I don't claim to have the answers on many of these military questions, and I certainly don't claim I know what the men in the Politburo are thinking about. I know they are able men, and I know that they are realists and you have asked for conclusive evidence that they don't plan to attack. Where is the "conclusive" evidence that they are not going to attack?

Chairman GRANIK. Senator TAFT.

Senator TAFT. I do not ask for conclusive evidence. I think there is none.

Senator BENTON. Of course, there is no conclusive evidence. People who are going to attack are not going to give you conclusive evidence they are going to attack. Further, I submit there is no conclusive evidence that they are not going to attack, and here is an illustration of the problem of risk and hazard involved in foreign policy.

Now, could I—on the theory that there is much evidence of Russian hostility—and on my doctrine that we are in a better position to resist it if we have as friends the French and the British and the Italians—may I take an Italian today and ask you to imagine how this resident of Florence or Milan pictures our policy when he hears the debate from the United States saying, "Let us put our confidence wholly in air power and sea power, in airplanes to bomb the land and destroy Milan if and as the Communists take over Milan"?

Senator TAFT. Oh, no, no; but to keep them out; as a matter of fact, sea power, if we furnish one hundred percent of sea power in Italy, if we helped them defend their borders, their Eastern borders, it would be almost as effective as soldiers and I don't know of any American who intends to send any American soldiers to Italy to help defend Italy, and nobody yet has suggested that program. So I think what the Italians are interested in is having their own army and having them

armed as we are willing to arm them and having our airplanes and our Navy in the Adriatic to help them defend themselves. Why, they are not asking for American troops in Italy, Mr. BENTON.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON.

Senator BENTON. I would just as soon take a Frenchman or a German, Senator TAFT. You said in response to Senator FULBRIGHT's question on the floor of the Senate that with the Communist armies taking Western Europe on the assumption of war, taking over European production resources—that one purpose of our air power could be to bomb and destroy the Ruhr. Now imagine yourself, a resident of the Ruhr, reading in your German newspaper that we are building up this great air force to destroy your home and family. It may become necessary—I do not deny it might become necessary—but where is the hope for the resident of the Ruhr? How do we give him hope?

Senator TAFT. There is no hope either way for the resident of the Ruhr and the Germans today are refusing to arm because they know that, under the policy you are advocating, a great army in Germany means the destruction of Germany. Just look at the map. Here is the line of the Elbe they talk about defending. Why, you can't defend the line of the Elbe. Look. Here is the Russian Zone. The Russians are away over half way to the Rhine already. We can't defend the line of the Elbe. There isn't any defensible line in Germany except the Rhine, and if we choose the line of the Rhine, if we fall back to the Rhine, we would have to bomb the Ruhr as we did in the World War. The Germans know that the policy that we are advocating means the destruction of Germany, of course, because that is going to be the battleground between the European nations and Russia. Consequently, of course, the Germans today don't want to be armed. They don't want to assist in this project and today they are substantially refusing to do so. As a matter of fact, the line shows the tremendous difficulty of this project, a great international army led by an American, fighting in Germany.

Incidentally, as to bombing, how do you suppose that the French and British are going to defend Paris and London against Russian bombing? We are building or spending two and a quarter billion dollars building air shelters in this country for fear the Russians may bomb Detroit and New York. It is about ten times as easy for them to destroy Paris and London, when this war starts. So that as far as the project you are proposing here, it is a project which if war starts means the destruction of Europe. I don't care how it is, whether we do the bombing or whether they do the bombing, and war has shown in Korea that when that occurs, both sides do the bombing. All of the cities in Korea have been destroyed today.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON.

Senator BENTON. Senator TAFT, I hope when I have been in the Senate as long as you have I will be as sure as you are on the answers to some of these highly complicated questions. Even our generals and leading strategists all over the world differ profoundly on how the next war will be fought. The only thing we know for sure is that it won't be fought like the last one.

Senator TAFT. Well, Mr. BENTON, I agree.

Senator BENTON. All we know for sure is that it is going to be different.

Senator TAFT. That is my point. This whole program is a program of fighting the third world war on the same lines on which the Second World War was fought, and my only objection is, I say, "Yes, I am willing to commit some troops to Europe. I am willing to help build up these countries and help them build up their own defense, but let us not put all of our eggs in one basket, let us not make that our main feature because maybe that is not the way we will want to fight the third world war if it comes, on the Continent of Europe, where the Russians can outnumber our manpower three or four or even ten to one, if they get the Chinese in.

Senator BENTON. I think that our troops in Europe must be judged by psychological grounds as well as by military grounds. General Eisenhower sees this very clearly, and I know your admiration for him as expressed just the other day, but you may not have noticed his remarks at the Dutch airport, when he repeated that "success is certain, and I repeat that success does not envision military victory, but it envisions the avoidance of war."

You do not find General Eisenhower in Europe announcing that there is no hope for the Ruhr. You do not find him going to France and to Italy and talking about the destruction of their productive facilities in the defense of the United States.

Senator TAFT. I say that is what will happen if you get a war in Europe. Now, the question, of course, the main problem is to bring peace. I think it is very important—and we are committed to this project in Europe to a certain extent—and I think it is very important that it should be made perfectly clear to Russia that it is not an aggressive attack, because that is going to incite the Russians to war when perhaps they have no idea of a military attack. I don't know about that.

In other words, if Mexico went communistic, and they sent a great Russian army to defend Mexico, we would be very dubious about the actual intentions of that army. So they will be doubtful about the intentions of this army.

Senator BENTON. Just a minute. That is the kind of talk that I think leads to great confusion on the part of the American people. We do not intend—literally nobody intends—to send the kind of army to Europe that can attack Russia. Russia is sitting there with one hundred and fifty or one hundred and seventy-five divisions, and it takes twice as many men to attack as to defend. Even the great power of Hitler couldn't conquer Moscow and Stalingrad.

There is not the slightest intention on anybody's part—and the men in the Kremlin know this perfectly well—of developing the kind of European army that can march through Russia into the Russian cities.

The purpose of sending troops to Europe is to give the people of Europe hope and faith that they can and should defend themselves, and to show them that there will be a fair sharing of burdens in the defense of the western world and in the defense of the western countries seeking freedom.

Senator TAFT. Well, now, that is all right, but in the first place, you have got to get this army there. If it could spring into existence overnight, I would say it would give them some hope. But they know it is going to take two or three years to do it, and the Russians are there, and I say, Why will they wait if they see that force gradually increasing in strength?

I agree fully; the intentions of this project are entirely pacific. I am only saying that to the Russians it may not look pacific. I am only saying that when you send over the conqueror of Germany as the head of a great army to be made up largely of Americans, the Russians are going to be suspicious. They are a suspicious people anyway. I hope we can do it in such a way that we can make perfectly clear that it is not an aggressive force, that it is not intended for that purpose. Let us not station the army on the borders of the German Zone or on the borders of Czechoslovakia.

I agree that the Atlantic Pact got us into this, and I am willing to go through with it. But, you say, we are not doing our share. In Europe we have already given twenty billion dollars to build up their economic strength, and we have increased their production forty percent over prewar, and we have already appropriated six billion dollars and we are willing to give any amount of money to give them the arms for their soldiers.

And we have given them a few divisions. And I am perfectly willing to commit a limited number of divisons at least to show our spirit. We know for any war in Europe we are now planning to do fifty percent of it anyway, under the present circumstances, and if we add a tremendous land army we would go up to ninety percent where we are in Korea today.

Senator BENTON. I think that there is a basic fallacy in your point. You are talking about Europe today as if it is a thing apart—we over here and Europe over there—and this fallacy applies to all of this argument about the Atlantic Pact and our obligations under it, and whether we have them or have not got them on sending troops to Europe.

The truth is that from the standpoint of American foreign policy, and the preservation of our freedom, the preservation of liberty and peace as you stated in your opening comments, Europe is an opportunity, and should be judged as an opportunity and not an obligation. The truth is that the Atlantic Pact provides us with an opportunity to help raise our own defenses in Western Europe, defenses which can help maximize the chances for peace and minimize the risk of Russian attack.

In the case of Czechoslovakia and other countries on which the Russians have moved in and taken over, the Czechs pacific intentions have certainly been no deterrent to Russian aggression. Senator TAFT, you may recall two or three years back when you remarked that the Communists, in taking over Czechoslovakia, were just consolidating the U. S. S R. spheres of influence. I am afraid that that same kind of invitation can be invoked by the men of the Politburo if we don't have a strong Western Europe.

Chairman GRANIK. That is our dilemma. It is time for questions from the audience.

Gentlemen, there is a question. Go ahead.

Question. My name is Freeman Alberry, and I am with the staff of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and my question is addressed to Senator BENTON. If the United Nations fails to brand Communist China as an aggressor in Korea, will it have failed and should the United States withdraw from the United Nations?

Senator BENTON. May I precede my answer to that question by commenting on the interruption we have just experienced, and by congratulating you, Mr. Granik, on your achieving the goal of every radio broadcaster after twenty-two years—on finally achieving a network sponsor.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you.

Senator BENTON. The Motor Transport Association of Connecticut and the other State associations join in sponsoring this program.

My answer to the question of course is an unequivocal "No." We are going to have many, many set-backs in the development and strengthening of the United Nations. I have no sympathy with the people who are so willing to abandon the UN or to toss it casually over the left shoulder on one excuse or another or on one set-back or another set-back.

In the American Congress, as Senator TAFT well knows, progress is made through compromises. One problem in the United Nations is that you have a group of countries with which you cannot compromise, with which you cannot compromise without forsaking American principles. But because we cannot compromise on certain basic principles we

must not withdraw. Indeed we must never give up hope for the UN, a great new potential vehicle for collective action of the kind for which men have been longing for centuries.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator TAFT.

Senator TAFT. Well, I don't think we ought to draw out of the United Nations. I have been advocating for some time a proposal of amendments and a convention to try to amend it to make it an effective weapon as it was originally intended to be before Russia vetoed everything, and some method of eliminating the veto and improving the system. If this should fail, after a determined effort, because of Russian vetoing the attempt to change it, then I would withdraw from the United Nations, and try to set up an international body leaving Russia out.

Chairman GRANIK. Talking about weapons, there have been recent proposals to use the atom bomb against enemy troops. How do you feel about that?

Senator BENTON. I agree with Senator TAFT, I do not favor that policy. I concur with his statement of a few days ago.

Chairman GRANIK. Let us take another question.

Question. My name is Silvia Holtsberg, and I am a housewife. I am addressing my question to Senator TAFT. Is our recent foreign policy being pursued to save face as it were, or wouldn't a change save billions of dollars and thousands of lives?

Senator TAFT. Well, you are asking me to comment on the motives of the President and Secretary of State, and I never know what people's motives are. I think the policy could well be changed to save lives and billions of dollars.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BENTON?

Senator BENTON. I think I know something about Senator TAFT's motives.

I am sure that there are areas in which we could save billions of dollars, but I concur with Senator TAFT that that question in effect opens up the whole subject of our program, the whole area of debate upon our foreign policy. However, I admit I think Senator TAFT and I would disagree about money if we were debating about money. I have greater faith than he has in the strength and ability of our American economy to resist some of the attacks upon it over a period of years.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Granik, of course our economy can stand almost anything in all-out war. What we face here is something we have never faced before, though, and that is perhaps ten years of semi-mobilization, and I think it is most vital that we do not set up an armed force outfit so great that we can't handle it by paying for it as we go to prevent inflation and adopt a policy which in the end perhaps can eliminate controls, although they may be necessary in the beginning, and it seems to me vital that we must not destroy our strength at home in order to set up this armed force.

Now, what that shall be, I don't know. I think myself the army is very reasonable on the whole. I don't greatly differ from their general program of three million four hundred thousand men under arms, I think, and I think that that could be handled, but I certainly disagree with Senator DOUGLAS' idea of six million men under arms, and I think it would mean inflation and I think it would mean a steady increase in prices, devaluation of the dollar and weakening of our whole economic strength.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator, do you subscribe to some of the Republican proposals that the President replace Dean Acheson as Secretary of State?

Senator TAFT. Well, I subscribe to that, and in fact I was one of those who suggested it back when the Korean War began. That seemed to me to be a condemnation in itself of the policy which he had pursued.

Chairman GRANIK. How about the suggestion that Dewey be made Secretary of State, Senator TAFT?

Senator TAFT. I have no power to appoint Secretaries of State.

Senator BENTON. It is a lot easier to say who should not be Secretary of State than to say who should be. Entirely apart from whether Secretary Acheson should continue as Secretary of State, and, of course, I am a great admirer of his, and I am enthusiastic about his experience and his capacity, and I hope that he carries on, but entirely apart from that, a real issue that makes for tragic disunity in this country is the kind of scurrilous attack we have had on our Secretary of State, unwarranted by fact and unwarranted by any evidence whatsoever.

Chairman GRANIK. Will you continue on with your summary, Senator BENTON, please?

Senator BENTON. I hope that Senator TAFT, after this current debate is over, will speak again, Mr. Chairman, on one aspect of his key speech of early January to which he devoted only a paragraph or two. In this speech, he stated, "But I also believe we should adopt aggressive methods of propaganda. We have something to sell," etc., etc.

I feel that in our efforts to develop a strong foreign policy we in Congress should get over this phase of talking like generals and trying to outdo each other as military experts, and should devote ourselves to the problems of building a foreign policy emphasizing nonmilitary aspects—the great development of Point 4, for example, and the great strengthening and development of the Voice of America. I solicit Senator TAFT's cooperation with me in the Senate on the development of programs and appropriations toward that end.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator, for your summary.

Senator TAFT.

Senator TAFT. I fully agree we have to defeat communism in the minds of men, and any method that is going to be effective for that purpose I am going to support, and I did not develop it in my speech but I put it in because it must be a part of any program.

I think as a matter of fact there is a pretty wide agreement here on foreign policy and only some points of disagreement. I feel the question is, How we are going to defeat communism and maintain peace? I go along with the whole picture, except I think that the emphasis ought to be on complete control of sea and air so that there is no doubt of our position in that field, and so the Russians know it, and they know they can't conquer the world, and if they know that they are less likely to start to begin to conquer the world.

The only difference I have is that I think it is doubtful whether we should commit a great land army, seven hundred and fifty thousand men, fifteen divisions, to the Continent of Europe, because in the first place I think it is likely to bring war, and in the second place I don't know if the war is brought there, whether it is a place where we can win the war.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. You have been listening to another in a series of discussions on foreign policy. What is the answer? Our speakers have been Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, and Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Senator BENTON. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I didn't think that we can be conclusive, perfectly confident or perfectly certain. There is a real area of disagreement between us.

Senator TAFT. The question of a bomber getting through, that does not necessarily mean you haven't got control of the air, and yet if you get your control complete enough, it is going to be pretty difficult for a bomber starting five thousand miles away to successfully bomb a city in the United States.

Chairman GRANIK. Another question.

Question. I am Radford, and my question is addressed to Senator TAFT. The question is this: Why shouldn't the representatives of all of the governments of the world be entitled to a seat in the United Nations, particularly Communist China, even though it is Communist China?

Senator TAFT. Because we have now the Nationalist Government of China, which we have recognized, and we never have recognized the Chinese Communist Government as anything but a rebel government, and I don't think that we should do so.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator BENTON?

Senator BENTON. Well, I agree with Senator TAFT, but the spirit of the question is an interesting one, because if the Communist Government maintains control and establishes itself certainly and surely as the Government of China, there should come a time, in my opinion, when they should be represented. That will involve diplomacy, a trade, a deal, negotiations, and this is why we have diplomatic representatives and this is where the role of diplomacy comes into the conduct of our foreign policy. So, I agree with Senator TAFT on the immediate answer and I agree with the questioner on the ultimate goal. The ultimate goal is to work out a satisfactory and constructive negotiation that will strengthen the United Nations and solve this among many other complex problems with which the United Nations is today faced in Asia.

Senator TAFT. There is one more vital reason today, and that is that the United Nations ordered or asked their nations to go into Korea to resist aggression, and while they were there the Chinese Communist armies attacked them. In such a condition are we going to therefore reward them by admitting them to the United Nations?

Senator BENTON. I agree with the Senator on that.

Chairman GRANIK. We have another question.

Question. My name is Ray Bart. I will admit self-interest in this question, and as an ex-GI. Senator TAFT, are you in favor of drafting eighteen-year-olds, and if so, will you place any restrictions on their service?

Senator TAFT. I have always been opposed to drafting eighteen-year-olds, and I was before. The investigation we have made then seems to indicate that while probably a good majority of eighteen-year-olds were perfectly competent to be drafted, there were still a fair number who had not matured sufficiently so that they could be certain that they would not be injured by the experience in the Army. Of course, necessity is the last law, and if you are going to have to have three million five hundred thousand men you have to get the best method of getting them, and if by taking eighteen-year-olds you can avoid something else that might be worse, there may be an argument. I haven't analyzed the figures. I have felt myself, however, that there should be some restriction against any boy being sent abroad until he is nineteen years old.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator BENTON?

Senator BENTON. I think the nineteen-year-old boys in some parts of the country look younger than the eighteen-year-old boys in other parts of the country. I agree with Senator TAFT. It is too bad and it is tragic and difficult at eighteen or at nineteen to interfere with the chance for education of these young men. It is wholly a problem of weighing the necessity against the cost. That is what General Marshall and Mrs. Rosenberg are attempting to do. I am not on the committee exposed to the problem,

and I would like to hope we can avoid it. Reading the headlines it sounds to me as if we probably should not go any further than General Marshall has recommended in this area.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a radio broadcast on NBC, Friday, January 19, 1950:

The President's budget calls for new obligational authority, and that means appropriations—and that is what the budget is—of $94,500,000,000. There will be, according to his estimates, $80,000,000,000 remaining to be expended out of this and prior years' figures after June 30, 1952.

Included in the $94,500,000,000 is $62,500,000,000 for military functions and $9,500,000,000 for foreign aid of one kind and another. The nonmilitary operations of the Government are only reduced in cases where legislative programs are expiring, such as certain programs in the Veterans' Administration, or where enormous sums were provided, such as the stockpile job, and have not yet been expended or obligated.

There still is a huge increase in the Foreign Information Service in the State Department, headed by Mr. Barrett, which has so far proved utterly worthless in getting the position of the United States across to foreign countries. Here they are asking for $115,000,000, as against $84,000,000 expenditures in the fiscal year 1950.

I have made it my business to procure from them scripts of their broadcasts, on eight or nine different days since the 25th of June when the Korean hostilities began. Never once have they broadcast to foreign countries anything which in the slightest degree would make these foreign countries feel favorable to the United States or realize why we are taking the position and attitude we take on foreign relations questions. Most of their operations are so ridiculous and puerile that they would drive listeners away, rather than interest them in the United States and its programs. They seem simply to try to get off a lot of words, some of which sound like they were being placed in a bag and drawn out by lot. Frankly, I believe we need some kind of a propaganda service, but there is no sense in our spending more money on a service that is completely worthless. It would seem as though the administration would take interest enough in the war effort to realize the value and necessity of such a service. The longer the Congress continues to appropriate funds, only to have them wasted, the longer the State Department will continue to maintain the so-called Information Service on an utterly inadequate and worthless basis.

The President is asking for a $1,000,000,000 increase in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank and a $1,000,000,000 increase in the lending authority of the International Bank, at a time when we should be conserving every single item. Foreign loans should be used only in places where the war effort of the United States will be promoted. We should get over the idea of lending money just to help foreign countries when it will not contribute directly to our defense. The question of doing good in the world will have to be postponed if we are to have the resources to support our war effort.

The President is calling for a large item for the continuation of the ECA, when we have already this year provided $500,000,000 more than they are able to spend, even with the very liberal programs they have set up. Foreign relief should be limited to what is absolutely necessary to keep the people in other countries together and to what we can afford to pay out. Unless we get down to what we can afford to pay out, the expenditures are going to be so big that we will not be able to raise taxes enough to meet them.

Power projects stand out in enormous figures in the estimates of the engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation. Many of these are in territories where the power costs, if all the cost factors are taken into consideration, make the power produced more expensive than steam. And this is especially true of the large dams in the Missouri River where they are unable to compete for cost with the steam plants placed beside the coal mountains of the Dakotas. Many projects are in territories where the dams will silt full in a comparatively short time and where they will be utterly useless for either navigation or power, as compared with their cost.

With very few exceptions, the President proposes to increase the number of personnel in the already top-heavy bureaus of the Government. Even in the Defense Department there is enormous waste. There are offices where large numbers of officers are gathered together with civilian personnel, doing almost nothing.

My information is that the building and rehabilitation of the set-ups for the armed services are being done on a very extravagant scale and under loose contracts which cost vast sums of money.

I cannot single out many things yet, because the requests have not been broken down.

Out of the $98,500,000,000 request for appropriation authority, only $21,008,000,000 is detailed. The rest is to follow later, and totals $76,700,000,000.

The President is asking nearly $300,000,000 to start off on subsidies to farmers, along the lines of the Brannan plan. This is ridiculous.

He is asking for a $290,000,000 spending program on Federal aid to education for the purpose of starting that program and getting the Federal Government committed to it in such a way that we could never get out.

He is asking for the construction of 75,000 public housing units which, very evidently, could not be built for under $600,000,000.

The President is also proposing medical aid to be operated by a payroll tax by the Federal Government, a start toward socialized medicine and an effort to break down the morale of our civilian doctors. How much it would cost no one can tell.

Amongst other New Deal operations, the President is proposing the FEPC, an effort to completely regiment and destroy the morale of the workers in industry. Those who think about it know that the passage of the FEPC is a declaration that the minority groups are inferior races and that they are unable to get a job without the decree of a Federal commission which will be composed of social promoters who know nothing about the problems of the industry involved.

In other words, the President wishes to promote every activity which would tend to demoralize our people in time of stress, and he is trying to sneak through a lot of these measures at a time when everybody should be giving of his best to prepare the United States to resist the efforts of the Communists in Russia to destroy the last vestige of freedom in the world.

America became great, and the opportunities of our people for a good life with a high living standard became possible, because our people were taught to work and produce, and the rewards of industry went to those with the greatest capacity to produce. The incentive of rewards has kept the individual production of individual workers in the United States at an increasingly high level, and that is what has enabled us to build up and improve the standards of living of our people. When we get to the point where we measure the rewards of our people and the pay that they receive on some other basis, than the ability of the individual, selected by the employer who is working for a big production, then we slow down the wheels of industry and the production for defense. For my own part, I think we should stop trying to socialize the United States and concentrate more and more on our war effort.

I think perhaps the best comment on the budget message is that the President, instead of promoting these socialistic and destructive measures and demands, should cooperate with the efforts that are being made to get rid of enormous expenditures and should quit attempting to distract the thoughts and efforts of the people from the thing that should be before them first at this time.

Question. The President suggested new taxes of sixteen billions to meet the deficit, do you think the budget can be cut much below his figure, and reduce the deficit?

Mr. TABER. The budget should be cut by three to four billion dollars.

Question. Is it possible to raise $16,000,000,000 more by taxes than present laws will yield?

Mr. TABER. A 10 percent retail sales tax, exempting food, would yield $7,000,000,000. That is the biggest figure that I can put my finger on. Other increases would very largely have to come out of the lower income tax group, because increased taxes on the upper brackets will not yield very much money.

Question. As a general practice, should we raise taxes to meet whatever the deficit may be—in other words—pay as we go?

Mr. TABER. If it is possible to increase taxes and balance the budget, it should be done. Otherwise, we're going to have a continuation of the inflation which Mr. Truman has steadfastly promoted ever since his inauguration. The dollar of 1945 purchased more than twice as much as the 1951 dollar. Big dollar figures in income are no good to the people unless they will buy something.

Question. You have referred to the difference between the seventy-one billions which the budget has earmarked for spending, and the ninety-four billions of obligational authority, which you say is the true budget. Does this difference mean still higher budgets in future years?

Mr. TABER. If we appropriate $88,000,000,000 in 1951 and spend forty-seven billions, we will have, including the carry-over, left over to spend in 1952 and subsequent years—$54,500,000,000. If we appropriate ninety-four and one-half billion and spend seventy-one and one-half billion, we will have left, on July 1, 1952—with odd figures that will be added—about $80,000,000,000. If we appropriate just as much for 1953 as we are being asked for 1952, very evidently the expenditure in 1953 will go up to ninety-seven or ninety-eight billion dollars, and we will have a continual increase in the amount we spend—so that there will be a deficit in 1953 of twenty-six or twenty-seven billion dollars, even if we increase our tax take by $16,000,000,000 now.

The Late William T. Cowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word that one of Montana's most distinguished pioneer citizens, Mr. William T. Cowan, of Box Elder, has passed away. For many years I have been privileged to know Mr. Cowan and I cherished his friendship and support. I join with the countless other Montana people who mourn his passing. I wish to include in the RECORD a tribute to Mr. Cowan written by Herbert C. Watts, Jr., editor of the Havre (Mont.) Daily News, and published in that newspaper January 19:

BILL COWAN: A REAL MAN

We like stories with a point to them and with a zestful flavor. Bill Cowan could spin a yarn with a degree of authenticity which could never be questioned. That alone would make him dear to us but there are so many other fine facets in the make-up of the late sage of Hill County which make us pause and say, Now there was a real man.

When we were notified yesterday that Bill had passed away we felt that for a moment at least, time had stopped, for Bill had represented all that is good for this old world. His name stood for good deeds, for interest and loyalty to his fellowman and for conscientious endeavor. He characterized those attributes which are the alpha and the omega of the perfect personality.

Bill always was in balance. What he had to offer in his energies and talents gained for him the admiration of all with whom he came in contact. Whenever problems beset him he tackled them as if his very existence depended on their answers. If he got his nose bumped in the process, his philosophy was "Well, I gave them a darn good run for their money."

One of our biggest regrets will be that we never did get around to chronicling some of the historical high lights of this area as related by Bill. A photographic memory equipped to give the facts in considerable detail, his descriptions were priceless. You see, Bill Cowan was raised in an age when life meant so much that people could take some time off and include the side lights which made any story worth listening to and absorbing.

All men are created equal as far as the Cowan line of reasoning went. That is, all have equal opportunities if they will take the brains that God gave them and apply them in self-betterment. He once told us, "Young man, anybody with a lick of sense can be rich. Most of us are born with a lick of sense or else somebody takes care of us at State expense in an asylum or something. I'm rich in a way. I don't mean as far as money goes. I mean in great friendships. That's what I mean. Uncle Sam can take my money away from me every year in taxes but he can't take away my friendships. So I have a lick of sense, I have good friends and, I might add, I have the satisfaction of helping this country of ours along in my own little way."

Some people have described Bill as a politician. He certainly wasn't a politician in the popular sense of a man throwing the curves for material gains. He was proud to be a Republican and was an indefatigable chairman of the Hill County Republican Central Committee and later as national committeeman. But his real politicking was built in working among all men regardless of party allegiance.

Everybody knows the background of Bill Cowan's stout fights for Northern Montana College and the Marias project. We are grateful for his foresight and the bringing into reality dreams of progress for this State which Bill dearly loved.

We can't be hackneyed in thought at this writing and state that Bill never had an enemy. Perhaps he had many. That makes no difference because he was a human being not an ethereal creature passing through the space of the years. However, he had the courage of his convictions and he stood up for his beliefs on his own two feet. When he was wrong he admitted it but he would often say, "Maybe there is a particle of truth in what I stand for and if so I'm not going to sit down totally licked."

That was Bill Cowan, merchant, stockman, State senator, community worker, friend of men, and forgive an oft-used expression, salt of the earth. We thank God that we had the joy of knowing him for what he was—a real man.—H. C. W.

Representative Norris Poulson Reveals Central Arizona Project Would Consume Vital War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Arizona leaders have stated they once more will push for swift passage of the central Arizona project bill, S. 75, and that this year they will urge its adoption on the ground that it is vital to the national defense program.

To term this fantastic and nonessential project a national defense measure is to place it on a completely phony and deceitful basis.

The bill itself absolutely refutes any argument that the project would contribute to the national defense program. The promoters of this scheme will pretend that the electric power to be developed by the project—some 10 years hence—would be used by national defense industries.

Let me cite just one paragraph from the bill which shows that any national defense needs would be the last to get power from this project. I quote from page 5, section 4, of the bill:

Electric energy developed at any of the generating plants herein authorized shall be used first for the operation of pumping plants and other facilities herein authorized, and for replacement purposes, and the remainder thereof sold or exchanged to effectuate the purposes of this act.

In other words, surplus field crops, including potatoes, come first in this bill, and our national security comes last.

In addition, the authors of S. 75 have tried to becloud the real issues by adding a meaningless section to this year's bill, namely, section 15, which is intended to deceive Congress into the belief that the project would not be built if critical materials to be used are needed for the war program.

The fact is, that the principal materials which would be consumed by the project are steel, other war metals, concrete, machinery, and, above all, manpower—a vast number of skilled workers.

Do we need a finding by some bureaucratic agency that at this very moment steel, concrete, machinery, and manpower are critical materials?

Even though the central Arizona project used not one ounce of critical materials, it would inflict upon the taxpayers of the Nation an additional tax burden of more than $2,000,000,000. And that statement is based on the tax estimate made by Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

It is shocking that at a time like this, when we are faced with a war for our survival, that the Members of Congress should be required to waste one moment of their time in considering an outrageous project of this nonessential nature

Fight for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, January 22, 1951:

WE REARM TO SURVIVE

Fellow Americans, we've got a job to do, a big job, and it's high time that we rolled up our sleeves to do the extra work required from all of us.

It's the job of protecting our homes and our families from the international outlaw who wants to take us over.

For the past 5½ years we gave in to him on this point and that point, hoping that reason would finally prevail and that he would mind his own business because he had enough work to do in his own enormous back yard to absorb all of his time and his energy.

We have found out, belatedly, that such a policy will not bring peace.

For every concession that we make the appetite of Russian imperialism becomes hungry for more.

The Russian Government has the mentality of a criminal, employing every element of fraud and force to take away from neighboring nations what they have built by honest effort. Think of this fact. It has more land and natural resources than any country in the world. And it knows that there is no combination of other nations that has the power or the intention of invading that land mass. Then, why isn't the Russian Government concerned with the development of its own country so as to raise the standard of living for the Russian people?

Basically it envies and fears the free way of life beyond its frontiers. It realizes that if its own people knew the truth of life in the United States they would demand the right to build such a life for themselves.

But that would lead to freedom and undermine the power by which the Communist minority holds the majority in bondage.

They must destroy us because they cannot compete with us out in the open.

Only 300 years ago this land of ours was a wilderness.

What happened between then and now?

Did a miracle occur whereby a nation of 150,000,000 people with all its homes and cars and schools and churches was dropped ready-made from a celestial assembly line upon the North American Continent?

The Reds haven't got the nerve to offer this propaganda line to explain our progress.

For that would admit that there is something divine at work here in the United States which is an incentive for men to build a society from which all benefit in varying degrees, depending upon the ability and the effort of individuals.

That miracle is freedom—the right to think and do, and experiment, and work, and produce.

We are limited only by the moral restraints of the Ten Commandments and the laws we make through our servants in Government, and not by the 10,000 curbs enforced by a tight and rigid group of tyrants who cannot be recalled or repudiated by the people for the crimes they have committed against the people.

The Communist leaders know that they cannot match the broad distribution of the good things in life that is a developing fact under free governments.

When millions of automobiles are produced in 1 year in the United States, they are not sold to the members of any one special class. Americans do not have to pass a Marxist test or produce a card showing membership in the Communist Party or any party in order to buy a television set. Republicans and Democrats debate fiercely, then vote a decision as to laws and appropriations. After that, they obey the majority opinion, and then worship in mixed congregations on Sunday.

Behind the Communist double talk we penetrate to their real purpose. The few want to gather into their hands the concentrated power that will completely dictate to the many. The devil himself wants to be God.

The pity is that communism lures the envious, the ones with twisted minds, and the gullible to follow the leaders who stop at the gate, exhort their followers to go in, and then lock the door of the prison behind them.

We the people of the United States are not attracted by this form of security.

The sucll game of communism will not deceive us to our own loss.

And if they try to pull a gun on us to make a fast dollar and rob us of all that we have, we shall be waiting for them with a bigger gun aimed at them in order to discourage them.

Our job is to get that gun ready.

It won't be easy.

No sane person wants war. But as long as there are lawless elements in the community or the world we have no other choice than to establish an effective security force that will prevent aggression or punish it.

It will have to be a big gun, costing a fabulous sum in terms of money, brains, and manpower, both military and industrial.

We had hoped and still hope that the United Nations may be able in some measure to halt aggression.

On a more substantial basis, however, we must count on the efforts of ourselves and those nations allied with us in common defense under the Atlantic Pact.

Here are the facts that compel us to mobilize.

Communist Russia and its satellites control more than one-third of the earth. From Iran to Japan, Asia is threatened. Europe, from Turkey and Greece to Scandinavia, is open to attack. Communism is international in scope, and its goal is conquest of the world. The Soviet Union has rejected all offers of cooperation because it seeks to dominate.

As of the present, the Kremlin is attacking the outposts of the free world with troops of its satellite slaves, while the Red Army is being built up for the major assault.

Stalin plans to defeat us by one or a combination of two ways: (1) By forcing us to undertake such unbearable defense costs that the American economy will crack under the strain; (2) by all-out military force.

We know that we will not start a war, but can the same be said of Russia?

Soviet diplomacy is trying to involve us in an exhausting land war on the Chinese mainland.

At the same time it is trying to provoke misunderstandings among the United States, Britain, and France, that will splinter the unity of the free world.

What is the strength of this Nation which seeks our downfall?

The major war assets of the Soviet Union and its stooges include: A central position in the Europe-Asia land mass with vast natural resources. The population totals more than 700,000,000. It has powerful land armies; an air force that exceeds ours in quantity if not in quality; hundreds of modern submarines; and cells of traitors in every country including the United States.

Among the weaknesses of the enemy are: The low level of efficiency in the members of its armed forces, its industry and its agriculture; and the shortage of technically trained personnel. The transportation system is poor. Steel and petroleum are not sufficient to sustain a long war effort. And there are millions of people within the Russian sphere of control who would rebel if they had a chance.

In the planning of new and secret weapons, we are ahead of Russia. And we have the great industrial machine that can produce them in quantity if the holding operations give us time to work out these blueprints along the assembly line and to train people in the use of these weapons.

A favorite technique of the Reds is to weaken a neighbor for conquest by provoking civil wars. They tried this in France and Italy, but we countered this maneuver effectively by our Marshall plan aid which helped these Nations to regain production and provide income-producing employment for their people.

Communist propaganda makes headway in Asia where too many people exist in ignorance and poverty. But while we strive to offset Communist influence there as best we can, the main danger centers in Europe.

The Atlantic Pact, which will be strengthened by the military assistance program, is evidence of the importance of Western Europe in our foreign policy. If the resources of that highly developed area should fall into the hands of the enemy and, added to his own, should then be turned against us, what would be the result? We would be isolated and then slowly strangled. Looking at it the other way around the resources of Western Europe, coupled with our own, give us a decided edge. The defenses of this area must be strengthened without delay. Even then, our chief reliance would be the overwhelming number and quality of our weapons to overcome the masses of Soviet manpower.

A foreign policy to be sound must prevent war or, failing that, be able to win a war. Our Government cannot succeed in either unless it knows what is going on in the world. Above all, it must secure information concerning the strength, disposition and intention of the potential enemy. We, as a Nation, have been weak in this department. At the end of World War II, a central intelligence agency was organized to put all these functions under one head and to bring system to the job of digging up these vital facts and interpreting them correctly.

Our security demands among other things that our morale or spirit must be superior to the enemy's. To guarantee this, we must carry the psychological or propaganda war directly to the enemy's population. In the contest of ideas, the so-called Voice of America, beamed to the heartland of the Communist empire, is an important weapon. So far, however, its timid approach has turned up few results. We shall have to strengthen this program, pointing up the contrast between communism and democracy, showing the Russian people how they can better their lot, and encouraging them to overthrow those who enslave them. To do this convincingly we must employ the talents of those Russians who have escaped from communism, broadcasting the truth to their own people back home.

The A-bomb, long-range planes, saboteurs, and the possibilities of germ warfare all expose our civilian population to direct attack. The Nation has been slow to recognize this danger, because we have never had to cope with it before. Short of all-out war and complete mobilization it is up to the cities and the States to organize their civilian defense staffs and to train them in advance. We cannot afford to wait until after a surprise attack has hit us for proof that such an attack could happen. The best insurance is to be prepared ahead of time.

As one reads the daily papers, it seems that the mobilization of men and women for the Armed Forces and the mobilization of plant, materials, and skilled labor are all competing for priority.

This underscores the fact that the Nation with the best industrial set-up and resources, is more likely to deter an aggressor, or to defeat him if he plunges the world into war.

Manpower problems as a whole come first. We need men to make the weapons and men trained to use them. At the same time, we need workers in agriculture and volunteers for civilian defense.

The services of more and more women will be needed on a full- or a part-time basis.

Modern defense costs a lot of money. But the tax burden we shall be called upon to bear is light compared with the crushing burden suffered by those who have fallen under the iron rule of communism.

You and I can help to keep our burden from becoming greater by giving extra effort to our job, by avoiding waste in any form, and by resolutely avoiding the black market which would weaken the controls that will be imposed to hold the line on prices.

Look at it this way. Most Americans are working to give us the products and the services that we rely upon for our everyday peacetime needs. To this we must add those things and those services required for defense.

We can meet this larger order if all of us work longer.

I am confident that we can build up our defenses without suffering critical shortages of peacetime goods by working harder all around.

The American people are anxious to know what they are expected to do. I have tried to sketch in the dangers of the situation confronting us, and the steps that must be taken to protect ourselves.

Communism must be prevented from taking over other countries because the balance of power would shift to them, thereby placing us at a hopeless disadvantage.

Up to Korea, Russia had gobbled up plenty of this world's real estate and the people on it without meeting any military resistance.

For our own security, we must oppose Red Russia's expansion and let the Kremlin know that we are preparing to oppose it with power.

The wishful thinkers who cling to the hope that Russia will respond to the appeals of reason or morality, blind themselves to the record of communism. Stalin has broken so many agreements during the past few years, that I haven't got time to list them. The Reds are materialists, and the only thing that will stop them is the fact that we refuse to be tricked and that henceforth we shall arm to the teeth. The big gun that will inflict a mortal wound on communism if it dares to attack is the only deterrent that the Reds understand and respect.

The big gun of defense is what we must build and man.

It is not a course of our own choosing. We are impelled to it by stern necessity.

The sooner we arm the better will be our chance of avoiding a major conflict or surviving, if that grim test should be forced upon us.

I believe that under our present realistic policy the odds incline toward an uneasy truce instead of an all-out war.

An Issue for Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, just prior to the opening of the present Congress, it became evident to most of us that the adventure in Korea had failed. It became more than ever manifest that this country's foreign policy was leading directly to world war III.

Because of these things, Republican leaders in the other body planned a "great debate" on the subject of our foreign relations. Properly speaking, they proposed a complete reexamination of foreign policy, and a demand for an accounting from the Truman administration.

The attitude and actions of the President and his Secretary of State, had made it clear that bipartisanism in foreign policy was dead.

This, in itself, was a good thing. It was so because the former bipartisan policy never had been anything but Democratic policy, with some Republican leaders saying "me too."

A situation had arisen wherein those with the energy and courage to oppose the tragic blundering of the administration, were silenced for the most part by smear words, such as "isolationist" and "Fascist." In any event, their protests and criticism were ignored.

Therefore it seemed that the opening of a new Congress presented a favorable opportunity for opening up the whole subject of foreign relations. It seemed that some light at last might be thrown upon the dark area of administration concealment, with respect to its panicky vacillations, its failures properly to evaluate Russian intentions, and its impulsive and ill-considered use of such military power as remains to us.

And so the "great debate" was started. It has continued, rather sporadically, for nearly 3 weeks. But now it seems to have boiled down to a single question.

Does the President possess constitutional powers to send American troops in force to Europe, or anywhere else, without the consent of Congress?

The President sent our troops into the Korean debacle without the consent of Congress. And without the consent of Congress, the late President Roosevelt sent our troops to Iceland, just before the onset of World War II. Many still earlier precedents for such action exist in American history.

It is true, even, that many constitutional authorities of past years, have supported the contention that American Presidents do, indeed, possess such powers.

Nevertheless, I believe that a question still remains. Can the President send our troops abroad at his own discretion, any time and for any reason that seems to him valid? Or can he do so only when American citizens or American properties directly are jeopardized? That question, I believe, remains to be answered.

At the same time, it seems to me that the question concerning the President's constitutional right to send American divisions to Europe this year, without first obtaining the consent of Congress, is somewhat beside the point at this time.

The President acted without consulting Congress in sending our young men to fight and suffer and die fruitlessly in Korea. Plainly he acted on impulse, without due consideration, and without consulting even such poor advisers as he keeps about him. His action brought disaster.

Therefore, it would seem to me now, in view of President Truman's tragically irresponsible decision on Korea, that the real question at issue pertains chiefly to the responsibility of his actions in the future. Especially with respect to the decision on when, and if, and in what number our troops should be sent to bolster a faltering defense of Western Europe.

Can the President be trusted to use properly, with due caution and good judgment, those powers to which he lays claim in this connection?

One of the constitutional functions of the Congress is to serve as a checkrein upon the ambitions, or the possibly ill-judged actions, of the Chief Executive.

Is not this the time for Congress to exercise that curb on the Chief Executive which is implicit in the powers granted Congress by the Constitution?

This, I believe, is a question really worthy of debate.

Rabbi Maxwell Dubin, of Los Angeles, Speaks Out Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are awake to the danger of Communist aggression and of the design of Communists to spread their power and enslave the free nations of the world. They are alert to the dangers of sabotage within the United States as well as to the threat from foreign aggressors, and they realize that every American must join in a united effort to defeat the threats of aggression.

In a recent address delivered at the Wilshire Boulevard Temple, Los Angeles, Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin gave an inspiring message enumerating the reasons why every American must today be on guard against communism which is worthy of the attention of every citizen. The following editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News high lights the vital message from Rabbi Dubin:

REASONS FOR BEING ON GUARD

Civilians are just as much in this war as though they actually wore a uniform, declared Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin, of the Wilshire Boulevard Temple in a recent sermon dealing with the "horrible thing" that threatens this country.

"Wars are fought at home," said Rabbi Dubin. "Wars are fought in the laboratories. Wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze—to sabotage—to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

"In the days ahead you and I have got to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going to be asked to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing and if you do not know, ask."

We have made many false assumptions in the past concerning the enemy, Rabbi Dubin pointed out. We failed to understand the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia.

"We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality.

"We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for its international promises and commitments and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands."

Such ideas should never have been accepted, the Rabbi said, as he pointed out how the millions of Jews who lived in Russia when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. "They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals; they were sent to Siberia and they died—by the hundreds of thousands—because the thing for which the Jew stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia."

But the warnings of those who knew went unheeded, so "Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word. We had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. * * *

"Russia violated every promise to the Western World. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world and poisoned the minds of millions of people against their native governments."

Rabbi Dubin hopes that now after 5 years of disillusionment we have awakened to facts. He referred to the fact that today behind the iron curtain "the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated."

After 3 months in Europe, Rabbi Dubin reached the conclusion that everyone wants to come to America because "materially and spiritually there is not another land in the world as fortunate as ours."

The above few extracts from an inspiring address provide reasons enough for the Rabbi's declaration that, "we must be on guard."

The Price of Lettuce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the excessive mark-ups in the price of lettuce, a subject which was discussed January 19 by Gabriel Heatter, the well-knowr. Mutual news commentator. He reported the average Nation-wide retail price of lettuce as 27 cents per head. If this price is correct, the people should know that the farmers last year received an average of less than 5 cents per head for their lettuce. That is still the price, although growing costs are about 7 cents per head.

We had in my district of California over 30,000 acres in lettuce. I am told that almost half of the crop on this acreage has been destroyed by frost, which will lower the supply and make the growers' costs greater. The farmers of my district will do all they can to get lettuce to the markets at the lowest possible cost.

Following is a telegram which the lettuce growers of my district sent to Mr. Heatter immediately after his broadcast:

EL CENTRO, CALIF., *January 21, 1951.*
Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
Washington, D. C.:

Your timely review of lettuce prices in grocery stores has opened possible channel for benefits to every household and prevent further injustice to farmers of lettuce. Through you it is possible to bring factual information to public and in these times this gesture would be welcomed by all. Your quotation of 27 cents per head of lettuce is reported to be accurate Nation-wide in chain stores as well as independent markets. The public will be interested to know that the farmer is now and has been for the past year receiving an average of less than 5 cents per head for his lettuce. Costs have averaged at least 7 cents minimum. The lettuce farmers have been and are now suffering their greatest financial losses because of the situation you have exposed. That is the excessive profits obtained because of excessive mark-ups over costs by those who retard consumption with high prices. This could be worked to better advantage with cheaper prices to housewives, causing greater consumption, thereby creating greater demand for farmers' lettuce which would increase volume and lower unit costs. Nothing new to axiom of supply and demand. Nothing new to larger volume and lower prices and same total profits for retailer. Nothing new to production being among greatest assets of our country. Your stand against profiteering is applicable to lettuce and would be one more of your noted public services. It touches every family and would be invaluable in establishing an understanding between producer and consumer. This becomes increasingly important when the retailer and the Government are getting what the consumer believes is going to the producer. The Imperial Valley Farmers Association in Imperial Valley, Calif., along with our neighbors in Arizona produce over 90 percent of the lettuce consumed in the United States and Canada.

IMPERIAL VALLEY FARMERS ASSOCIATION,
El Centro, Calif.
YUMA VEGETABLE SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
Yuma, Ariz.

Antisubmarine Ships and Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following comments as a preface to an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Daily News of December 21, 1950.

The most recent edition of Jane's Fighting Ships reports that the Soviet Union is building a powerful fleet of 1,000 submarines. Those of us from the Atlantic seaboard remember only too vividly the dark days of 1942 when Nazi Germany with a much smaller fleet of less advanced design than the deadly snorkel type submarine now being built by the Communists wrought terrible destruction upon our merchant shipping and threatened for a time to disrupt our entire war effort.

It took us many months of hard work to overcome the initial advantage enjoyed by the enemy submarines. Even today some of our beaches are darkened by the oil lost from the scores of tankers that were sunk 7 or 8 years ago by U-boats lurking off shore.

Our Navy is keenly aware of the menace of the submarine fleet being built by Soviet Russia. They need to be encouraged to meet it. If we are called upon to fulfill the obligations assumed under the North Atlantic Pact, the submarines which seek to cut our lines of communication across the sea may well be the most dangerous threat we will meet.

The Philadelphia Daily News in a recent editorial has deplored false economy which cuts into appropriations for the latest type antisubmarine ships and weapons which the Navy needs. Mr. Speaker, this is no place for economy. We must recognize the challenge of the submarine and prepare to meet it. It is not a phase of our defense effort we can afford to neglect even for a moment.

Two world wars have found us unprepared to deal with undersea warfare. It must not happen a third time. The warning given by the Philadelphia Daily News is, indeed, timely and important:

NAVY SHOULD HAVE ANY ANTISUBMARINE WEAPONS IT ASKS

Since the days of Commodore John Barry and Capt. John Paul Jones, the United States Navy always has been a major consideration in any plans for the Nation's defense. True, between wars, its personnel and ships and equipment have been reduced to proportions that other countries thought ridiculous. But when the shots were fired and the United States began to rebuild its Navy, the odds for victory increased apace. And quite often, the efficiency of the Navy represented the difference between victory and defeat.

Most military strategists admit the need for a strong Navy for they realize the American sea forces are, when at full strength, the Nation's first and greatest line of defense from attack abroad.

The gathering clouds on the international horizon have brought this question forcibly to the forefront of public attention.

In the First World War, the major threat to the lifelines of the United States and its Allies was the German submarine warfare, in which hundreds of vessels were sunk until the United States Navy went into action and immobilized the undersea wolves of Kaiser Wilhelm. In the Second World War, Hitler's Third Reich also tried to use the submarine but never was able to accomplish the destruction, either in scope or monetary loss, that the Imperial German Navy did because of the alertness of the American Navy.

However, the Nazis did considerable research on submarines and built the snorkel, the most powerful and fastest undersea craft ever constructed. And when the Russian Armies swept into the Baltic States, where the Germans had their shipyards and submarine pens, they confiscated the plans and models. They also made prisoners of the German scientists, naval experts, and architects who were engaged in the development and put them to work for the Communist war machine.

Since then, the Russians have been busily building submarines and today it is known they have a fleet of approximately 200 snorkels, whose range is more than 7,000 miles, which enables them to make a trans-Atlantic crossing and return without stopping. In addition, they have more than 150 other types they can use to harass shipping if they go to war. They also have 120 submarines under construction and plan to expand their underwater fleet to 1,000.

At present there are more than 100 of these Russian submarines lying in the waters off Japan and Korea. If Russia entered the Korean War, the havoc these subs could wreak to the Allied forces attempting to evacuate their hard-pressed troops would be catastrophic, except for a gallant stand by our never-give-up-the-ship Navy. They also could threaten the American defense line from Japan to the Philippines.

For these reasons Congress must give the United States Navy whatever it asks in the way of finances to build its own submarines and antisubmarine service to meet the gathering threat from the Soviet Union. Any secret weapon in process must be speeded to production at once, because the fleet of 200 Red snorkel subs presents a major problem. If these U-boats can be immobilized, the total defeat of the Russian Navy is certain, and the American Navy will have little difficulty in keeping the sea lanes open for American and Allied transports and supply ships.

The staggering sum of $2,000,000,000 was spent to perfect the atomic bomb, but if this

weapon had not been developed, the loss of American lives in the invasion and subduing of imperial Japan would have been terrific.

So, regardless of the cost, the Navy, as the bulwark against foreign invasion, as the protector of the open sea and as the guard of freedom's forces abroad, must not be hamstrung in its plans to meet any threat posed by the Russian submarine fleet.

This period of national emergency is not the time for Congress to become penurious. Economy is one thing, but any penny-wise policy that will rob the Navy of any weapons it needs to put a foreign submarine campaign under control would be only pound-foolish in the end. Economy is a matter of saving with good judgment, not paring funds to a point where the remainder will not accomplish the full purpose of national defense required.

The United States Navy, today as in the past, is an integral part of America's protection and shares equally with the Army and the Air Force the responsibility for safeguarding American lives.

At present it is giving a remarkable account of itself in bombarding enemy positions in Korea from the sea to permit the ground forces to maintain their orderly withdrawals from dangerous areas. None can say how many American lives are being saved every time a shell from the U. S. S. *Missouri* explodes in Chinese Communist ranks.

Each branch of the Navy, likewise, is important to the effective whole. Without its carriers in the Pacific war, the Japanese Fleet would not have been driven back to its ports and destroyed forever as a threat to peace. Its transport service, its battle wagons and fast cruisers and destroyers have their special roles to enact in any action, and they must be brought to the fullest degree of efficiency.

But, at the same time, the submarine phases of the problem are emerging as most important. If the United States is to cope with what will be, in time of war, a major peril, not only to the surface craft, but to the coast-line cities as well, the Navy must be given the green light to develop whatever antisubmarine or other naval defenses they need.

To do otherwise would be depriving the Nation of a defense it may sorely need at a not too far distant time.

Victor Lasky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the television and radio industry is currently beset with problems rising out of the Communist menace. The industry has long been a target for Communist infiltration. Therefore, it is heartening to learn that the great pioneering network, the National Broadcasting System, is considering the appointment of Victor Lasky as a consultant and commentator. Mr. Lasky, as many of you know, is coauthor of Seeds of Treason and one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the Communist menace.

The noted radio editor of the New York Daily News, Mr. Ben Gross, has written a column about NBC's negotiations with Mr. Lasky, a staff writer of the New York World-Telegram and Sun. I am inserting it in the RECORD so that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to read it:

[From the New York Daily News of December 29, 1950]

The big headache, Who is a Communist sympathizer? What is pro-Communist propaganda? Trying to answer these questions is giving the radio and television networks a major headache these days. The problem has come to the fore again with the recent attack on commentator Drew Pearson by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. It also boiled over a few weeks ago when several hundred protests poured into NBC denouncing a program celebrating the Bill of Rights, with Melvyn Douglas, Burgess Meredith, and Kenny Delmar in the leading roles, as Moscow-inspired. The truth is that the broadcasters have become so jittery of late that they fear almost any offering save an innocuous song and comedy period might contain some hidden leftist significance.

To those who know the leaders of the broadcasting industry—most of them conservative Republicans and all of them patriotic citizens—the idea that they would knowingly permit their properties to be used for anti-American purposes is nothing less than laughable. But whether some of their employees—commentators, performers, and writers—are sympathetic to the Commie cause—well, that is a different matter.

The powers that be in radio and TV are hopelessly confused. They simply do not know the score. What they need is sound advice from experts who can tell the difference between a party-liner and one who believes in democratic principles.

So it's interesting news that NBC is considering the appointment of Victor Lasky not only as a commentator on the Communist movement but also as a special consultant on communism as it affects policy, programs, and personnel. Lasky, an able newspaperman and the coauthor of the most interesting book written about the Alger Hiss case, the best selling Seeds of Treason, is an acknowledged authority on the topic. He knows who the Commies are and what they are up to. But, at the same time, he's not one of those fellows who shout "Communist" at everyone in sight. For example, when the recent excitement over Anna Rosenberg hit the print, he immediately appraised the charges as being unfounded.

It seems to me that NBC is on the track of a good idea. And it's one that other networks might well copy.

Men in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Men in Politics," that appeared in the Scranton, Pa., Catholic Light on November 9, 1950, together with an editorial that appeared in the Boston, Mass., Post under date of November 13, 1950, entitled "Impellitteri's Victory." The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Catholic Light of November 9, 1950]

MEN IN POLITICS

A politician is a politician even after the election. Unfortunately, this fact is not always appreciated. And while everyone realizes that a man seeking office is a politician, entirely too few remember that he is no different and no better after he gains office.

Consequently, the candidates who lose are remembered as politicians. Those who win become office holders and remain such until the next election. But they're still politicians.

These latter, mindful of their status, should study remarks made recently by one of their very own, the Honorable James A. Farley.

Mr. Farley traces the Christian attitude toward political power back to St. Paul's remark that "there is no power but from God and those that are ordained by God." This, he avers, means that those who hold political power are in a sense ministers of God in the temporal order. Since their powers come from God, and since they act in His name, obviously any politician who dares use his office in a manner that is contrary to the laws of God or in a way likely to arouse His wrath is rushing toward an inevitable day of reckoning with a speed and a blindness awful to behold. And this applies to every politician, however great or small the office he holds.

To Mr. Farley, politics is an ancient calling. More than that, it is an honorable profession and a sacred trust. So long as God remains in the picture; so long as politicians remember that they are the servants not the masters of the people and so long as they do not lose sight of their only raison d'etre no one will quarrel with Mr. Farley's statements.

But what is the principal task, nay the only purpose, that even remotely justifies the existence of politicians? Again Mr. Farley supplies the answer:

"Always the common welfare is the goal. In a public order under God, neither the heads nor the members of the political parties should try to advance merely partisan or group interest. Self-enrichment is a betrayal of the sacred trust of the public officer in his office and of the political party in its power. It violates sound ethical principles and is an offense again good morals. We must never forget that it is the common good which is commanded by the natural law—that is, by the eternal law of God which we learn by examining human nature with our human reason."

Forthright as are these words, they are mild compared to those Mr. Farley uses in declaring that politicians have definite responsibilities. Oddly enough, no mention is made of responsibility or loyalty to the party. Mention is made, however, of responsibility to God and man. Politicians, he declares, "are responsible to God to keep a just account of their stewardship. They are responsible to man for the wise and temperate exercise of their God-given authority."

And yet who can deny that all too often no one is more completely forgotten than the people—unless it be Almighty God.

As Mr. Farley points out, the day will come when each politician must render an account of his works. He will be better prepared for that day of strict judgment by frequently recalling these final words of one who knows whereof he speaks:

"Let no one think that these are trifling matters. Let no one think that they are easy matters. Let no one think that they

are matters which can be responsibly handled except reverently and prayerfully under God."

[From the Boston Post of November 13, 1950]

IMPELLITTERI'S VICTORY

The victory of Vincent R. Impellitteri, the new mayor of New York, is entirely his and the people's. The machines were defied; the parties were defied; the bosses were defied. He performed a political miracle and demonstrated the strength of American democracy—the tough fiber that lies beneath the political encrustations. But a word of thanks goes from all to James A. Farley, who lent his name and prestige to Mayor Impellitteri's campaign. In a political squabble such as that out of which the three-cornered New York mayoralty fight developed there are a good many voters who, hesitant about the issues, will gladly put their vote beside the name of the man that Mr. Farley says is "deserving."

The Railroad Workers Tell Their Side of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Wisconsin Daily News, Monday, January 22, 1951. This article was by W. P. Kennedy, president of one of the great railroad brotherhoods, namely, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which I believe is the largest of the transportation organizations.

I know of no organization of men who have been more patriotic and who have done more in the industrial field for the country, both in time of war and in peace, than have the railroad brotherhoods. In rain or snow, in ice or sleet they man the transportation systems of this great Nation. They are ever patient, but among them at the present time is a bitterness that is clearly justified by the treatment that they have received at the hands of their employers who have made the Government their chief instrument. The following is an intelligent and factual statement of the case of the railroad brotherhoods, and I commend it to the House for their conscientious consideration:

THEIR BITTERNESS RUNS DEEP—THE RAIL WORKERS TELL THEIR SIDE OF THE STORY

(By W. P. Kennedy)

The men who battle the icy blasts of winter and face death every day on their jobs to keep the Nation's trains running are not getting a fair deal these days.

They cannot understand just why this should be. Haven't the Government, the press, and their employers been telling them how important and how valuable their work is to national welfare during these trying times?

If their jobs are so vital, if their contribution to our economy and to the defense effort is so necessary, why is it that 22 months of negotiations have failed to yield conditions of employment that are standard in practically all other industry?

This is shabby reward for the patience, responsibility, and the generally cool-headed manner in which the railroad man has always conducted his relations with his employer. And it has fostered a bitter resentment against our employers that has hitherto been unknown in the railroad industry. It runs deep. It is dangerous.

DISCRIMINATION CHARGED

Although practically all United States workers have now long enjoyed the standard 40-hour workweek with overtime on the sixth and seventh days, the railroad switchman and yardman are being denied this accepted American working standard. One million nonoperating rail employees (clerks, shopmen, boilermakers, machinists, etc.) have enjoyed the 5-day week with no pay reduction for almost 2 years. Why the discrimination?

Train crews, who operate the trains over the road, are seeking in addition to desperately needed wage-rate increases, improvements in working rules that are long overdue. These include away-from-home expenses, such as lodging and meals, and penalty pay for delays at the terminals that are the result of management bungling. There are some others, but these are two objectives that should be readily understood. They are accepted practices in all other industry.

As matters now stand, a majority of yard service employees work 7 days a week at straight time. They work that kind of schedule just to buy their families the bare necessities of life under today's soaring living costs, the biggest in United States history.

Steelworkers, auto workers, common laborers, in fact, most other workers have received four wage increases and some a fifth since the end of World War II. Trainmen have had three. Their last pay hike was in October 1948.

EIGHT RATE INCREASES

In contrast, the railroads have asked for and received eight general rate increases since the end of the war. They add up to 57 percent. They are hauling more freight and making more money than at any time in their history—and have just filed for still another rate hike.

Of course, we want the railroads to prosper, but we want and must have a fairer share in our contribution to that prosperity. The railroads are today hauling several times the freight of 25 years ago—and they are doing it with more than 1,000,000 fewer employees. This means that individual productivity has increased manyfold. Management refuses to share this increase with the men who make possible its improved financial situation.

Because of this attitude, the operating rail worker, who was once at the top of the list, has slipped to about thirtieth place in the scale.

For example, in Cleveland, BRT headquarters, yardmen's pay ranges from $1.34 to $1.64 an hour as compared to building tradesmen who range from $1.95 (for common labor) to $2.70; steel workers, $1.80 to $2.25, and machinists, $1.80 to $2.10. Many are paid bonuses over and above their regular rates because of labor shortages. They have all this plus double time on certain holidays, overtime after 40 hours, and many other benefits not included in our contracts.

We are glad our brothers in the A. F. of L. and CIO enjoy such conditions, but are not men engaged in the hazardous and important work of rail transportation entitled to at least as good a break from their employers?

THE MEN ARE BITTER

The restive and bitter spirit among operating rail workers, which broke out around the country a few weeks back in unauthorized strikes, is the result of management's absolute refusal to enter into collective bargaining in the usual and realistic sense as practiced in most other industries.

We have obeyed the Railway Labor Act to the letter—and have not violated its spirit. We came to the bargaining table, prepared to give and take in an effort to work out a satisfactory agreement of our differences.

The carriers came to the table to delay. At no time did they deal straight across the table. Their intention from the beginning was to take advantage of the endless delays afforded by the Railway Labor Act. They could stand the wait more than the switchman on the job. Each day the settlement was put off meant almost $1,000,000 in their coffers.

When the case finally went to a Presidential Emergency Board, we painstakingly and patiently presented the justification for our demands, backing them with irrefutable statistical and sociological data. That Board, comprised of men totally unfamiliar with the railroad industry and rail labor problems, turned in a report we could not accept.

FINDINGS NOT MANDATORY

Contrary to the general belief, Emergency Board reports under the law are not mandatory or binding on either party to the dispute. We rejected the Board's findings but did agree to use it as the basis for discussion and further negotiation.

The carriers retorted that it was either the Board's report or nothing. This has been their position in recent years. Its acceptance would amount to compulsory arbitration, a mechanism most repulsive to free enterprise and free labor. How can we permit strangers, unfamiliar with the complexities of rail labor-management relations to have the final say in such vital matters?

Our demands were first served on the carriers 22 months ago. By exploiting the Railway Labor Act and their loyal, responsible employees, the railroads have thus far managed to avoid a fair and realistic settlement.

At this point "realistic" means at least the 40-hour week with no pay cut and substantial wage raises to match those of the rest of labor, including the coal miners, who have been granted a 30-cent hourly pay hike within the last 11 months.

The recent White House proposal was turned down because, like the Emergency Board report before it, it would have given away conditions achieved in over 50 years of collective bargaining, and would not have granted the standard 40-hour week or a reasonable wage hike to help meet the burdens of the onrushing inflation.

Living costs are the same for the railroad man as the painter, auto worker, carpenter, or plumber, and he is entitled to the same treatment they have demanded and received from their employers.

MANAGEMENT STUBBORN

We are now trying again to reach an agreement with the carriers but we are up against a recalcitrant, stubborn, and greedy management that is using the Korean War to weaken our union and jam an unfair, unreasonable deal down our throats.

The railroad men's plight is desperate. That's why our thanks go to the Scripps-Howard newspapers for giving us this space to tell briefly our side of the story that in recent weeks has put the rail workers on the front pages.

Since we can't strike—the workingman's only real weapon—during the war emergency, and since the hand of Government has made no genuine effort to even the scales that are balanced against us, we are asking public opinion to come to our aid. Our cause is just. Our men are the 40-hour week and two pay rounds behind—and inflation is way ahead.

The "rail" deserves a better break than he is getting today.

Horses and Mules Needed in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of January 4, 1951. The editorial follows:

HORSES AND MULES

Col. John F. Wall, of Camden, S. C., is well known in Lexington as the author of A Horseman's Handbook on Practical Breeding and other books dealing with horses. For years, in connection with the United States Remount Service, he was in charge of breeding and purchasing horses for military use of the Government. Colonel Wall, in a recent interview with the Camden (S. C.) Chronicle, said:

"In the first place the only reliable source of information of enemy ground troops anywhere near the front is secured by other ground troops and cannot be relied upon if reported by air. This is true for the reason that a division of troops can be easily hidden between Lugoff and Blaney—or even more open territory, all day, and not be detected from the air. That division may then move by night with safety if reconnaissance by air is the dependence by his adversary. Unfortunately, we have depended much on reconnaissance by jeeps, and other motor military outfits. That worked very well in the parkway country of Europe and in some of the more rugged terrain. But in a rough tangled country such as our men have found in parts of Korea, a dismounted infantryman or a horseman is the safe reliant agency. They can go in the byways or across country. Ambushes are avoided that way. But our infantry has taken the lesson from our recent war in Europe. They are transported on trucks, while our horse cavalry has been eliminated from the Army.

"The G–2 in the Korean theater had to depend on the information he could secure. Had he had the old-time patrols of infantry and horse cavalry, his estimate could have been accurate.

"But information of the enemy and protection on the march from him is not the only place that we want to mention the horse and mule situation. Horse cavalry has been used effectively against our troops in Korea. It is indeed said that men of the First Cavalry Division—a former horse outfit—suffered from such attack. I was a member of this outfit once myself. If any old-timers remain in it today, their estimate of their situation has been most adequate, I am sure. And all of us can see what a great assurance our troops could have had if adequate pack trains had been in Korea.

"Our good military leaders are not branch protagonists. I fully expect them to use everything against an enemy that they can muster. I expect them to organize horse cavalry units and plentiful mule pack trains. We don't know where we may be called upon to serve. The club, the slingshot, the horse, and the mule, too, will be taken from moth balls. They will never become museum pieces."

The comments of Colonel Wall are particularly timely. Much has been heard of the losses in Korea and of the need for horses and mules for pack trains. However, his references to the need for scouting and for cavalry for fighting and patrol are good. Colonel Wall offers no criticism. He is not the type to criticize, for he is, first of all, an Army man. But he desires to see the American forces equipped with all they need, including horses and mules which in such activities as those in Korea remain indispensable.

H. R. 1658 Will Provide a Nonvoting Delegate in Congress for District of Columbia and Other Changes in the District Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 1658 which I introduced on January 17 is similar to the bill introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by my colleague from Arkansas, Mr. HARRIS. The bill bears the title "A bill to provide for a Delegate in the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia; for a Board of Education of the District of Columbia to be elected; and for reorganization of the executive departments of the District of Columbia."

This bill, if enacted, will accomplish four things:

1. DELEGATE TO CONGRESS

First, it authorizes qualified electors domiciled in the District of Columbia to elect a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives biennially with the same rights and privileges as the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii now have.

It has been a traditional practice of the United States to grant to areas which are part of the Union but not yet States the privilege of being represented in the National Legislature by nonvoting Delegates in the House. Alaska and Hawaii have such status and are so represented.

The District of Columbia has such a status. Organized Territories which are not part of the Union are occasionally given this privilege. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have this status. The former is represented by a Resident Commissioner in the House.

There is precedent for the District of Columbia to have a nonvoting Delegate in the House. From 1871 to 1874 it did have such a Delegate elected by the voters of the District. It was eliminated when the franchise was denied District voters under the temporary commissioner government in 1874, the beginning of disfranchisement for the District which has continued to date.

I believe that a District nonvoting Delegate to the House would be a valuable addition and materially relieve the workload on the rest of Congress. He would be familiar with District problems and act as its spokesman. He could introduce District legislation and check on its legislative progress. He would be the representative to receive petitions, consider grievances, and otherwise care for District residents—thus freeing other Members of the Congress from such burdens. He would be very useful in giving other Members the District viewpoint.

2. BOARD OF EDUCATION

In the second place, this bill creates an elective Board of Education for the District of Columbia with nine members. The existing school board and its functions would be transferred to the new board. The new board is also constituted as a Board of Vocational Education, and the functions of the Federal Security Administrator with respect to vocational rehabilitation in the District would be transferred to the Board of Education. The school board is authorized to perform appropriate educational and rehabilitation functions and policies and to appoint the superintendent of schools.

Members of the Board of Education under this bill must be qualified electors, resident and domiciled in the District. They may hold no other elective or compensated appointive office. Their term of office would be 4 years. The Board of Education would elect a president from among its members every 2 years and could remove him from office. The board would appoint a secretary and hold regular monthly and special meetings which would be open to the public, except for executive sessions. Vacancies on the Board of Education would be filled by appointment by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

It has frequently been recommended that the Board of Education in the District of Columbia be elected. It is entirely within the tradition of local government in the United States to elect the school board. An elected Board of Education for the District of Columbia has been recommended by Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle who for 20 years was the able chairman of the school board here. The recent controversy between the District Board of Education and the superintendent of schools has revealed the weakness of the present appointed board.

3. ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

In the third place, this bill provides for a three-member Board of Elections for the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the President of the United States for staggered 3-year terms. Members of the Board of Elections must be qualified electors and residents in the District. The Elections Board would prepare and maintain a permanent registry of qualified electors and conduct the elections for Delegate to Congress and the Board of Education.

No person could register to vote in District elections under this bill unless he is a citizen of the United States, has resided or been domiciled in the District for 1 year, is 21 years old or over, can read and write the English language, is not mentally incompetent, and has never been convicted of a felony or has been pardoned.

Nomination to elective office shall be by petition, filed with the Board of Elections not later than 60 days before the election, signed by not less than 90 registered persons, and accompanied by a filing fee of $125 in the case of a petition nominating a candidate for the office of Delegate, or $25 in the case of a petition

nominating a candidate for the Board of Education.

Voting in District elections shall be secret, by paper ballot or voting machine. Ballots must be cast in the precinct where the voter resides. Absentee voting is prohibited. Provision is made for watchers at the polls, recounts, and contests. Interference with registration or voting is prohibited. Penalties are imposed for violation of the election laws.

Only voters domiciled in the District of Columbia may vote for a Delegate to Congress. Persons who are qualified to vote elsewhere are not disqualified from voting in District elections.

4. REORGANIZATION OF CITY DEPARTMENTS

Finally, this bill reorganizes the administrative structure of the District government. It consolidates the existing 42 departments of the city government along functional lines into 12 new departments, each headed by a Director to be appointed and removable by the Board of Commissioners, at salaries to be fixed by the Commissioners. Provision is made for the transfer of functions, personnel, property, records, and funds to the new departments. The 12 new departments under the Board of Commissioners would be: Health, Welfare, Recreation, Public Safety, Finance, Law, Public Works, Library, Labor, Commerce, Corrections, and Professional and Occupational Standards. The Board of Commissioners is also authorized to appoint an executive officer to serve at their pleasure and to perform functions assigned by them.

The administrative structure of the District government has grown like Topsy since 1878. New agencies have been set up from time to time in piecemeal response to local needs until today it has become a tangled jungle of overlapping, uncoordinated, and duplicating departments, boards, and commissions. Since 1920 a series of studies of the organization and operation of the District government have been made by congressional committees, Presidential commissions, citizen groups, efficiency engineers, and the Brookings Institution. All these studies have agreed that the administrative set-up of the District government is incredibly cumbersome, complicated, and confused. It is generally agreed that modernization of the administrative structure is long overdue.

Major Provisions of Proposed Amendments to the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

1. Policy statement is changed to correspond with the proposed UMST program.

2. Registration is required at 17 instead of at 18.

3. Induction is authorized at 18 instead of at age 19.

4. The term "trainee" is used for the first time, but such term is limited to persons inducted before attaining nineteenth birthday. A trainee must be given 4 months' basic training, and this period may be raised to 6 months by the President. Such persons cease to be trainees upon completion of initial period of basic training. Trainees may not be assigned to duty in a combat area or be permanently assigned to duty (other than training duty) at any installation located on land outside continental United States.

5. No overseas service is authorized for 18-year-olds until after basic training (4 to 6 months).

6. Twenty-seven months' service is required instead of 21 months' service (including those already inducted).

7. Eight years of active and Reserve service is required (instead of the present 21 months' active service plus 3 years of service in Organized Reserve unit or 5 years of inactive Reserve service) for those inducted after this amendment is enacted.

8. Eliminates authority to enlist voluntarily for 21 months in Army.

9. Does not repeal provision establishing general classification test score of 70 as minimum required for enlistment or induction. (Services no longer use GCT but use Armed Forces qualification test.)

10. Authorizes compulsory officer training upon completion of required training and service.

11. Release from active service is permitted for those who agree to enter organized units of National Guard and Reserve components.

12. President may reduce basic training pay of trainees to $30 a month.

13. President may increase basic training to 6 months and reduce 27 months' active service, and do this differently for different age groups.

14. Extends period of required service for doctors and dentists to 27 months and repeals section of "doctor draft law" which provided for annual deferment of optometry students and premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preoptometry, and predental students equal to level of present attendance at colleges. (Such persons are to come from 75,000 to be deferred annually until June 30, 1954, by proposed amendment; or pursuant to section of the present law, not repealed, that permits President to defer students necessary for national health, safety, and interest.)

15. Repeals deferment of persons enlisting in National Guard prior to 18½ years of age.

16. College training:

(a) Until June 30, 1954, President authorized to relieve annually from active duty 75,000 men after they complete basic training (civilians selecting them), with a post-education civilian or military service obligation (to study medicine, science, humanities, etc., presumably at their own expense).

(b) ROTC or equivalent deferments are continued and expanded, with 2 years' active duty after graduation plus 6 years' reserve service required. Subsidy authorized with a year's additional service required in return therefor.

(c) Other officer candidate programs authorized for persons on active duty.

17. President's present authority to provide for deferment of persons engaged in industry, agriculture, etc., and those whose activity in study, research, medicine, science, etc.—necessary to national health, safety, and interest is not repealed. President may also continue deferment of men with dependents, and those mentally, physically, or morally defective.

18. Eighteen-year-olds' inductions are postponed until end of college academic year in which ordered for induction. High-school students' inductions are postponed until age 19 or until completion of high school.

19. Liberalizes and clarifies reemployment rights for persons enlisting for first time, and requires employers to grant leave for employees reporting for induction, and requires reemployment of those rejected.

20. The act is indefinitely extended; no termination date.

21. Extends for 2 years authority for involuntary call of reserves and doctors and dentists.

22. President is authorized to establish committee of five to eight civilians to advise him on basic training.

23. Voluntary rehabilitation through civilian agencies is authorized for those disqualified for induction so as to qualify them for induction.

24. Two-year extension of authority to extend enlistments for 1 year.

25. Removes limitations on size of WAC, WAVE, WAF, and Women Marines until July 31, 1954.

26. Suspends active duty personnel ceilings of the Armed Forces until 1961.

Resolution Declaring Communist China an Aggressor in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. WOOD
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 19, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain my opposition to the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts last Friday, stating the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

My objection was based upon my impression that such action would be tantamount to a declaration of war against Communist China, and also that it would give the tentative consent of Congress to the ill-advised and tragic action of the Chief Executive in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a pacifist, nor a Communist lover. I think we shall perhaps always have wars so long as international "mad dogs" range around in the world. One does not placate such ravening beasts, even though deploring the fact the animal has hydrophobia.

But I am irrevocably opposed to the idea that any other power than that of the duly elected representatives of this great people should be given the power to commit us to war.

Looking backward from the vantage point of elapsed time, it now seems easy to comprehend that we should never have joined the UN. Conceived in sin, and born in iniquity as it was, a child of the warped and traitorous brain of Alger Hiss, committing us to admit the murderer, Stalin, as our bed-fellow, how could one expect anything else than what we got?

If the "blood of Abel cried from the ground to the ears of the Lord God," with what a roar must the blood of the scores of millions of Stalin's murdered countrymen ascend to the Father of all that is!

Advisory action through a league of free nations might be a good thing, but

I shall always be opposed to leaving the determination of our destiny to the devious minds of savage or barbarous peoples which form part of the present membership of the UN.

Tax Deduction for Mothers Engaged in War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House and particularly the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the Treasury Department, to a timely suggestion made by Mr. Kenneth Allen, editor of the Albert Lea Evening Tribune, of Albert Lea, Minn., with reference to the expenses of women workers who must hire someone to take care of their children while at work.

Under existing regulations of the Treasury Department these women are not allowed to deduct as a business expense the pay for those who take care of their children. Mr. Allen clearly points out the need for a change in the revenue laws and regulations of the Treasury Department so that such expenses may be deducted as a legitimate business item. Women are being encouraged to go into war production in the war emergency, and it is only fair and just for them to be allowed to charge off as a business expense such items of necessary expense. I am grateful to Mr. Allen for calling this matter to our attention in the following editorial:

[From the Albert Lea (Minn.) Evening Tribune of January 17, 1951]

WORKING GALS NEED BREAK IN TAXATION

Labor recruiters are finding their task of finding men for essential jobs becoming more difficult. There are fewer able men every day. So the usual stories about "scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel" are cropping up. And the Nation's lawmakers, with an eye on the headlines such proposals always get, are threatening to "draft the dames."

America's women demonstrated during the last two wars they can hold down jobs in industry on equal terms with men. They did good work. And a great number of them probably will go back to work when the situation in manpower grows more acute.

Women actually perform many tasks in industry better than men; particularly they do well in monotonous jobs that irk men. Women usually do not engage in shop politics, nor do they let a burning ambition blunt their output. Women are conserving of materials and are good housekeepers—traits appreciated in industry.

Women, once they get used to the idea of wearing slacks and hairnets, are safe workers. They are apt at learning rules and usually abide by them without question.

Oh, there is a lot to be said in favor of women in jobs. There's another side, too, but it need not concern us in this column today, because whether or not, a lot of women are going to be needed by the economy in a few more months.

The purpose of considering women in essential work was to point out an inconsistency in the income-tax structures. If the Government wants women to do their bit—and from every indication it does—then the Government should give the women a break in the income-tax-deductions column. When a woman, for instance, is forced to hire someone to take care of her children, this expense cannot be legally deducted as a cost of doing business. But her boss can entertain a colonel from the procurement section by taking him to a hootchy-kootchy show and that is considered a legitimate business expense.

The militant woman-righters, always ready to splinter a lance for the fair sex, should do something about these deductions for women who work. The idea would be a shot in the arm for labor recruiters because they would have a bargain to offer women.

And what woman can resist a bargain?

Ninety-five Percent in Poll Hit Korea War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Bob Considine, appearing in the New York Journal-American, showing the result of a poll he has taken.

This poll shows the overwhelming desire of the American people that our Ground Forces be pulled out of Korea. The Journal-American article follows:

NINETY-FIVE PERCENT IN POLL HIT KOREA WAR

(By Bob Considine)

A recent radio query of mine, asking listeners for their opinion on whether or not we should keep our forces in Korea, has now resulted in a response of about 7,000 wires, letters and cards.

About 95 percent of the responses, and they came from every State in the Union, recommend we pull our forces out of this still undeclared war. A great percentage of these messages are pretty bitter. There is sharp criticism of the President, Secretary of State Acheson, and the failure of other United Nations properly to share the burdens.

The theme of the responses seem to be "let's lose face and save lives." But several letter writers suggested, after hearing the way the vote was going, that the letters might be a vast Communist plot to sway official action.

ENDLESS MIXTURE

But that's preposterous. It is belied by the variety of the mail, both in text and geography. It comes in in an endless mixture, some of it dictated to secretaries by tycoons, some of it scrawled in pencil on penny postcards.

There was no pattern to the choice of words, as there always is when a writer is the target of an organized letter-writing movement.

I wired several officials in Washington, giving them the count on the mail and the margin in favor of withdrawing from Korea, and asked them to make some comment that would clarify the situation.

My point was that if this great proportion of the writers were for our getting out of Korea, they must reflect a very widespread public antagonism toward the struggle.

REPLY FROM MARSHALL

And that an explanation of some kind might satisfy the letter writers on why we seem determined to stay.

Defense Secretary George C. Marshall replied:

"Thanks for your information on letters you have received. Would like to oblige (with statement) but must consider the timing and frequency of my public statements, particularly as regards my appearances before congressional committees next week."

Secretary of War Frank Pace, Jr., wired:

REASONS THIS WEEK

"Since question of United Nations forces staying in Korea is not a matter for decision by Department of the Army, I feel statement by me on that subject would be inappropriate. Results of your mail poll were most interesting and I appreciate your requesting my views. Best regards."

Secretary of State Dean Acheson replied by phone through Bill Wood, in charge of the department's radio section. His point, in effect, was that he'd like to give a clarifying answer but felt he couldn't give it to a single reporter. Which makes sense even to this married reporter.

Mr. Acheson added something which might mean a lot, or little. He empowered his spokesman to say that clarification of our position in Korea will be presented early this coming week. The reasons why we will or must stay, or will or must leave, will be provided by appropriate officials in Washington.

Bill Wood said it was safe to assume that "appropriate officials" meant men in the political and military fields, as well as diplomacy. The Secretary, Wood continued had found the poll most interesting and had said, in effect, that it is things of this type that clarify the thinking of public officials.

CONNALLY SILENT

Senator TOM CONNALLY made no reply to the wire. But that may be due to the fact that he and every other Senator and Representative in Washington is currently swamped by mail of this general type which I received.

A check of congressional offices, some of which are inundated by the most mail the men ever received, shows that the mood of the people is consistent. People want this country to check its costly Korean adventure, after about 50,000 casualties and great loss of matériel, and they want it even though this happens to coincide with Soviet wants.

In addition they want us to encourage and equip the Chinese Nationalists to fight against the Chinese Reds. And, finally, and somewhat enigmatically, they want a big, well-trained army without the services of 18-year olds.

How these demands will be resolved seems about to be decided.

Our Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Hugh A. Murrill from the newspaper Greenwich Time, January 19, 1951. Hugh A. Murrill, of Pheasant Lane, Greenwich, a West Pointer who fought in both world wars, recently returned from a 7,000-mile business trip. Concerned at "the degree of frustration in the minds of the people," this former colonel in the general staff corps sat down and wrote a treatise on Our Present Danger. Mr. Murrill was a captain on the general staff in World War I. In May 1942 he returned to uniform as a colonel. He holds the Order of the British Empire Medal, the Croix de Guerre with Palms from the French Government, the Order of Leopold from the Belgian Government, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, and two Bronze Stars. The article follows:

OUR PRESENT DANGER: CAUSE, EFFECT, AND FUTURE

WHERE ARE WE?

(By Hugh A. Murrill)

Our country is at war, and no amount of United Nations' diplomatic shadow boxing can obscure that fact.

We may be on the verge of world war III.

We have weak friends and a strong enemy.

The military strength against us is still growing faster than our own, plus that of our friends.

The crisis we are now in has been precipitated by continued aggressive and uncompromising action by the Russians as part of a long-range plan for world communism.

We have been slow to recognize the deep-rooted, ruthless determination of the Russian drive, with its terrorism, suppression, and intrigue.

We have been slow to appraise the uncompromising hatred of America that the Kremlin has set about implanting in the minds of both its own people and those of its satellites.

We have been reluctant to believe the Lenin-Stalin concept that communism and democracy cannot live side by side in a world of peace, and that the United States, as the leader of democracy, must be the foe of Russia in the struggle for survival between two irreconcilable ways of life.

In all international affairs, the Kremlin has consistently shown itself to be without scruple, honor, or integrity, and to regard only one law: the law of expediency.

So far, Russia has pulled the strings for puppets.

We have no guaranty that they will wait 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years, to move for the two things they want most:

1. The Ruhr with its coal, iron, and steel.

2. The oil of the Middle East.

They will move when they think it expedient, when they are convinced that military means will be more profitable than political means.

We may be certain that the only thing that restrains them now is their belief that they could not exploit either of these resources under atomic bombing by the United States strategic Air Force.

The only thing that will continue to restrain the Russians is the balance of power against them.

We must gather strength more quickly, preparing for the worst in the hope that adequate preparation and steadfastness will keep the worst from happening.

We did not get where we are crusading for western civilization.

We were pushed here by the hand of destiny and the Mongol character of the Russians who have sought out the United States as the major foe to be destroyed.

Withdrawal from Europe, withdrawal in the Pacific, would only strengthen the enemy, not in any way alter his determination.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

The United States and Russia emerged from World War II as the strongest nations of the world.

The technology of modern war itself had completely demolished isolationism as an effective policy for the United States.

Time after time, the war showed that no island, large or small, can be defended successfully if the enemy has adequate air, land, and sea power to isolate and attack it.

Singapore, the great island fortress which took 20 years to build, Corregidor, Truk, Okinawa, all fell to the coordinated attack of air, land, and sea forces.

Japan itself would have fallen to United States assault without the use of the atom bomb.

Anyone who was in England under V-1 bombardment from launching sites on the continent can visualize all too clearly the impossibility of holding the British Isles with the continent of Europe overrun by the enemy, and modern guided missiles added to his capabilities of attack.

There is no impregnable Gibraltar today, no island fortress secure against a stepping-stone advance, and coordinated attack by air, land, and sea.

Hence, any isolationist withdrawal to the North American Continent has become an impractical and futile policy for the United States.

It has become clear that the successful defense of America must begin far from our shores.

A further succession of events, whose potency we were slow to realize, pushed the United States forward as the leader of western civilization against communism.

These events were:

1. The defeat of Germany and the Yalta agreement, which extended the Russian occupation zone well west of the Elbe River, thus eliminating Germany as an effective force against Communist expansion.

2. The defeat of Japan and the Yalta agreement, which ceded to Russia the Kurile Islands, and the southern half of Sakhalin Island, strategically dominating Japan on the north, and definitely limiting her military capabilities, regardless of what type of peace treaty might later develop.

3. The weakening of the British Empire as a result of the strains imposed by World War II, the decline of sea power as a world force, and postwar government policies in England itself.

4. The too-rapid demobilization of United States air, land, and sea forces, to a state of virtual disarmament.

Such were the supporting events which led Stalin and the Politburo in February 1946 to reaffirm the Lenin doctrine that communism and democracy cannot exist in a world of peace and that communism must destroy its democratic enemies.

Since that time, Russia has bullied, blustered, and maneuvered by intrigue and force, to strengthen herself and weaken the United States.

It has become apparent that any further gains by the Soviet in the direction of the Ruhr, the oil of the Middle East, or the Japanese Islands, are a serious threat to the security of the United States.

We may not be able to contain Communist aggression everywhere, but in these three strategically vital areas, we must contain it.

When the Soviet launched their puppets in Korea, we reacted with decision and courage.

Why?

Because our Government rightly—if somewhat belatedly—became convinced that the real purpose of the Communists was to occupy the last remaining strategic area necessary to insure their dominance of Japan, from nearby bases on the mainland, supplementing their island bases to the north.

If Japan should fall to the Communists, Okinawa, the Philippines, and all of our island outposts in the Pacific would become vulnerable.

We know now that the Soviet cannot be deterred from their aggressive drive for world communism by conciliation or reason. They now see in America the last strong bulwark of democracy denying to them the final success of embittered years of planning and intrigue.

We must banish any wishful thinking that some stroke of diplomacy may produce a rapprochement between the United States and Russia.

The Chinese move to drive the white man out of Asia, United Nations from Korea, the French from Indochina, and at their leisure the British from Hong Kong are merely the opening gambits in the Soviet game.

They are determined to weaken and destroy us.

Grim necessity spurs us to strengthen ourselves quickly and to organize a balance of power against communism.

On the Soviet timetable it may be later than we think.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The hour for a larger mobilization of our military forces struck 6 months ago with the Russian move in Korea.

Events since the Soviet-engineered Chinese move have high-lighted our present danger.

In our security action, however, we must take thoughtful account of two factors:

1. The Russian flair for propaganda and subversion and the ability of the Communist Party to carry on political warfare in the United States and the democratic world.

2. The difficulties of sustaining partial mobilization in a free democracy over an extended period of time, even 5 to 10 years.

The Russians may elect to prolong the crisis we are in for a long time without risking a show-down. We must expect softening gestures, skillfully mixed with subversion and sabotage, to divert us from our program.

We must expect a calculated effort to bleed us white economically, in the hope of setting up internal stresses and strains in our political system.

We must recognize the difficulties inherent to a democracy in maintaining a steadfast course without the daily drama of a major war to keep us steeled in our purpose.

Six months ago the public reacted to our countermove in Korea with decision and courage. It was an immediate and understandable emergency.

Every day since then American commentators and columnists have poured out to the people an anguished and unending barrage of hysteria, pessimism, and criticism more powerful than the Voice of America, by which we try to reach the people behind the iron curtain.

To sustain a great national program of partial mobilization, to steel the people against hysteria and misinformation, the Government must reach their minds as well as their emotions.

First, we must have an agreed national policy defining the vital interests of the United States, and what we must do for their advancement and defense.

This basic policy must be clearly nonpolitical in character, not Mr. Acheson's plan, not Mr. Truman's, but a Security Council decision which the people can believe is an effective safeguard for our country.

Its basic framework must be explained and sold to the people.

Second, to implement such a policy, we must have a long-range program to do these things:

1. To increase our active military forces, in being fully trained and equipped, to such

strength as may be necessary to insure against a quick and easy Russian success in Europe, the Middle East or Japan, or other areas defined by our national policy.

2. To aid and hasten the build-up of the forces of our Allies, who have the will and physical capacity to resist Communist aggression. (General Eisenhower's job in Europe.)

3. To establish and bring to readiness the productive facilities to supply and equip both the forces in being, and the greater forces that will be required under full mobilization.

4. To build up basically trained Reserves suppementing the active forces, to insure the most rapid full mobilization of our military strength and powers of retaliation. If war comes, the initial Russian move will be a sudden "Pearl Harbor" blow.

5. To accomplish all of the above without destroying the essentials of Democracy that we are prepared to fight the Communists to protect, patriotic individual liberty and free enterprise.

The responsibility for the plan and mobilization of our forces rests with General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, a great soldier and a great American.

The responsibility for the mobilization of productive facilities has been assigned to able and rugged Mr. Charles Wilson. Mr. Wilson has already chosen experienced and able executives in General Clay, General Harrison, and Mr. Sidney Weinberg.

Before Mr. Wilson can really move to set up the facilities immediately required for equipping our active forces, and those ultimately to be required for full mobilization, the entire program must be crystallized and reduced to specific requirements.

We must assume that this is now being accomplished with the greatest urgency, and without too much dependence upon either our allies or the atom bomb.

Finally, there remains the vital matter of how to provide the reserve strength we must have ready for swift mobilization, without permitting the Russians to bleed us white by prolonging the emergency.

The type of conflict we are in will require the active assistance of every patriotic American.

Millions of our people now realize that in modern war, the trained have a better chance of survival than the untrained. The Selective Service Act, the draft, does not provide the reserves that we require for safety. It is full of inequalities and exemptions, and fails to kindle the spirit of national service that must underlie our program.

For an all-out war, all of our young men need military training.

It is time to supplement the Selective Service Act with a program of universal military training for every young man as a part of his basic education.

We know that the complex technology of modern war requires a longer period of training than a strong and crafty enemy shall give us. The period required for universal military training is stated by our experts to be 24 months, to begin at age 18, or upon completion of high school.

This would train from 800,000 to 1,000,000 young men every year.

There would be no exemptions except for physical or mental disability, because there are many technical requirements in the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, where extreme physical fitness is not essential.

The time has come for America to develop in its young men a spirit of national service. We must guard against the softer belief that the magical machines which flow from our production lines, will, themselves insure our security. It is the men who manage the machines, their skill and dominating spirit, that count most.

Universal military training is the only effective way to develop the reserve skills required to enable us to shift quickly to meet an all-out Communist attack.

It should become a part of our national security plan in 1951.

The people are ahead of our leaders on this.

In this time of danger, let us do quickly what must be done.

Get Forces Out of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address on the subject of the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea, and the helping of Japan to rearm, delivered by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, on January 17, 1951, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, to the end that other Members of the Congress may have the privilege of reading it. It is very thought provoking.

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

GET FORCES OUT OF KOREA, COWLES URGES, ADVOCATES HELPING JAPAN TO REARM

The most important thing in the world to Americans is freedom.

We believe that each individual has God-given, inalienable, natural human rights, and the basic right is freedom. While freedom is indivisible, its most important phase is freedom of choice; the freedom of the individual to speak as he chooses, the freedom of an individual to worship as he chooses, the freedom of an individual to choose one's own job, the freedom to choose where one wants to live.

Of course these various freedoms, even though they are theoretically indivisible, are of relatively differing degrees of importance. In an emergency we must voluntarily abridge some of our lesser freedoms in order to try to save our basic freedom.

We are having to give up, in large measure, our freedom of choice as to how we will spend, for example, our earnings or income. We have no choice but to pay the bulk to the tax collector.

In contrast with our philosophy of belief in the freedom and dignity of the individual, communism flatly rejects the idea that there are any intrinsic human rights. The Communists believe that collective society confers upon individuals conditional rights which may be withdrawn at the pleasure of the state.

Our philosophy and that of the Communists are completely irreconcilable, and I believe that our philosophy of individual freedom—our whole system of life—is now and in the years immediately ahead will be in greater peril than ever before.

BELIEVES RUSSIANS SEEK TO RULE WORLD

While I make no claim to any expert knowledge of Russia—I have only been there briefly twice, once in 1928 and once in 1937—I am convinced that the Russian leaders sincerely expect that communism will eventually conquer the world.

I believe that the fundamental law of the Communist Party is the enhancement of its power. I am convinced that the Communist Party will use any methods whatsoever to attain its objectives.

We are thus facing a dynamic international revolutionary movement with which historic Russian or Pan-Slav imperialist expansion has been fused.

The Russian leaders in their cold fanaticism regard every nation that they do not control as an enemy to be taken over or destroyed. We may have an armed truce for many years but there is, in my judgment, no possibility of a permanent accommodation or of genuine peace until and unless the Communist philosophy changes. That is the nature of the threat we are facing.

Perhaps some day the Communist philosophy will be modified. Perhaps some day the Communists will shed their imperialistic militancy. Only if and after that happens can the two systems exist side by side in the world without our always having to be ready at any moment for all-out war.

BETTER POLICY WILL COME FROM DEBATE

The current great debate over our foreign policy is the best thing that has happened in the United States in the last 6 months. It is giving the public a clearer understanding of the problem, and we will end up with a better policy that has much sounder public support.

Although the administration does not admit it, it should be obvious that our foreign policy is currently being substantially modified. The doctrine that we would, and could, contain Communist aggression wherever it took place anywhere in the world has been proved impossible of fulfillment. That policy has failed, and we are now forging a new and more realistic one.

Ever since we hastily dismantled our Armed Forces after winning military victory in World War II, our foreign policy commitments have been greatly in excess of our capabilities for fulfilling them. We were bluffing. We were endorsing notes at the bank without realizing that we might be called upon to make them good.

Fortunately we got away with our bluff in both Greece and Turkey. Had the Russians thought it wise they could easily have thwarted the so-called Truman doctrine at its very start. Russian satellites alone could have quickly taken Greece, and Russia could have conquered Turkey easily.

Our bluff fortunately was not called at the time when the Truman doctrine was first enunciated, and we are lucky today that Turkey is still with the free world.

I was in Turkey briefly last spring, and was told by men who should know that Turkey is now much better prepared than she was a few years ago and will without question fight if Russia attempts to invade her.

You will all recall, too, that Turkey sent several thousand ground troops to help us in Korea, and according to reports they fought courageously.

MARSHALL PLAN PROVES ITS WORTH

On the whole the Marshall plan phase of our postwar foreign policy was, I think, a magnificent success. I was in Western Europe just before the Marshall plan was started, and I believe Italy certainly and very probably France also would have gone Communist if we had not extended those countries Marshall plan aid.

But because we appeared to be successful with the Truman doctrine of containing Communist aggression against Greece and Turkey, we became overconfident and too inclined to make sweeping international commitments about containing communism everywhere.

Our bluff was called in Korea, and events have clearly demonstrated that the United States does not have the power to win ground wars against foes, whether Russian or satellite, whose manpower is inexhaustible and to whom human life means little or nothing.

The Korean war also demonstrated that while the United Nations may stil be—and

I believe still is—our best hope for gradually developing world law and world order, most of its member nations, aside from the United States, are at the present time either unable or unwilling to furnish much military assistance toward suppressing aggression in remote areas.

Since Korea has no strategic value, I incline to the view that the sooner all American and other UN forces are evacuated from Korea, the better.

It is now accepted by everybody, I believe, that we do not possibly have the power to contain communism in every single part of the globe. Consequently, we must hereafter use our resources only where they can be used effectively and successfully, or where the loss that would result if we failed to attempt to stop aggression fully justifies our taking the calculated risk.

BALANCE OF POWER NEEDED IN WORLD

In his World War II strategy, President Roosevelt ignored one of the basic facts of history, namely that unless there is either a single nation or an effective world organization that is able to enforce law and order, a reasonable balance of power among the various ntions is, always has been, and always will be essential to the maintenance of peace.

We did away with that balance of power by our destruction of Germany and Japan. We voluntarily opened up to Russia those areas which had formerly been influenced or controlled by Germany and Japan. The Russians naturally moved in to the vacuum.

The sooner we now make a genuine peace settlement with Japan and help Japan to rearm, the better. There is a deep-lying hostility between the Japanese and the Russians. Putting Japan back on her feet militarily is a calculated risk that I believe it would be wise for us to take.

If we can possibly avoid it, I think it would be a grave mistake for the United States to engage in even a limited war with Red China. The idea for our fighting a war against Red China was simply a naval blockade and some Air Force bombing may sound appealing in theory.

I fear, however, that no one can foretell where such a war with China might lead, and I think it would be a profound error for us again to send American ground troops anywhere in eastern or southeast Asia.

Possibly we can give some substantial unofficial assistance to the non-Communist Chinese war lords in their attempts to make civil war against Mao's Red China, but I question whether we should go further than that.

I think it would be a grave error for us to put American Ground Forces into Indochina to help the French or into Malaya to help the British. From people who have been there within the last month, I hear that the French position in Indochina is desperate.

I suggest that we might be wise to urge France immediately to offer the Indochinese full autonomy within the French Union or to grant them their complete freedom under a temporary United Nations trusteeship on the theory that there thus might be one chance in a thousand that Indochina would not go Communist, whereas it is absolutely certain to end up under Red control if the people think that the only way they can gain their independence from the French is through joining with the Communists.

In addition to suggesting that the French give the Indochinese their freedom, I think it would be beneficial if the British Government would announce officially that Malaya also would be given its freedom or be made a self-governing dominion within the British commonwealth at some specified future date.

Unless the British do this, and perhaps even if they do do it, I fear that they are going to have great difficulty in holding Malaya.

The United States is on the unpopular side in southeast Asia. The natives suspect our motives. The Russian propagandists charge that the United States has gone into Asia not only to support French and British colonialism, but also because we have similar imperialistic designs of our own. The slogan Asia for the Asiatics, has real appeal and the Communists are making full use of it.

Serious as the loss of southeast Asia would be to the free world, it does not compare in importance with what the loss of Western Europe would mean. Western Europe, including Turkey but excluding the Russian satellite nations, has a population of some 270,000,000 people, and approximately half as much income as the national income of the United States.

Western Europe has great industrial capacity. If Russia were to take over its iron and coal mines, its steel mills and its factories, our present huge margin of productive superiority over Russia would be enormously lessened.

Wholly apart from reasons either of honor or sentiment, our abandonment, or the loss, of Western Europe to Russia would make our own national security far more precarious.

ENGLAND WOULD FALL WITH REST OF EUROPE

If the Russians were to sweep over continental Western Europe, I don't believe the British Isles would be tenable. I was in England during the bombing of World War II, and I don't see how England could stand up under heavy sustained attacks of guided missiles, particularly if they carried atomic war heads.

We shouldn't ignore the disagreeable fact that if the Russians take Western Europe, probably England would be lost as well. I fear that those who express the contrary view are letting wishful thinking influence their judgment.

It is a grim picture, and I hope we won't find ourselves confronted with the unhappy task of having to prove whether or not those who optimistically predict that with Europe gone the Western Hemisphere could be made a Gibraltar of peace and security are correct.

In a recent speech, Senator TAFT again repeated that in his judgment the United States should go to war with Russia instantly if Russia attacked Western Europe.

I agree completely. So long as the Russians know that any attack by them on Western Europe would mean immediate all-out war between Russia and ourselves, and that the first of a long series of atom bombs would promptly begin to fall on Russia, Russia may be deterred.

Russia certainly now has sufficient military strength to enable her to occupy Western Europe to the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. She has had that capability for the last 4 years.

I suspect that the reason she has not moved is because she has feared that even though she were successful in occupying Western Europe she would probably face eventual defeat from the United States because of our superiority in atom bombs and our capacity to deliver them on Russia.

Whether that superiority will long continue is debatable. Perhaps Russia has not moved in Western Europe because of her appraisal of her own internal weaknesses. Perhaps she is having more trouble at home than the outside world knows about. We can hope that such is the case, but cannot rely on it.

WE CANNOT ABANDON EUROPE TO RUSSIA

Defeatism and war-weariness, plus Communist minorities, are so widespread in France and Italy that I personally question whether their military strength and, even more important, their resolution and will to resist, can be built up to a point where it is certain that with reasonable help on the ground from the British and ourselves the west would be able to stop the Russians if they attempted to overrun Western Europe.

Certainly the United States and the British cannot alone maintain sufficient divisions in Western Europe to stop the Russians, and any suggestion that we should attempt it is fantastic.

Nevertheless, despite all the arguments that have been advanced, it would in my opinion be an act of national insanity for us at this time to conclude to abandon Europe to Russia or to proclaim that we will not send another American division there.

It is entirely possible that the Russians may direct the Communist East Germans, whom they have rearmed, to invade West Germany under the guise of its being simply an internal civil war to unify Germany. We thus might quickly face a situation where the Communists actually were controlling the Ruhr although ostensibly Russia herself had not been involved.

If the United States and Britain, however, each promptly put two or three additional combat divisions into West Germany, we then presumably would have sufficient allied strength so that it would be clear that the East Germans alone could not take over West Germany.

EISENHOWER MAY WORK A MIRACLE

The Russians in turn might be deterred from using their own troops to help the East Germans invade West Germany, since the Russians would know that such action on their part would mean immediate all-out atomic war.

In other words, the sending by the British and ourselves of a very few more divisions to West Germany might prevent any possibility of the Ruhr's falling into Communist hands as the result of what pretended to be simply an internal German civil war of unification.

It is within the realm of possibility, moreover, that General Eisenhower will be able to rekindle the will to resist that is so desperately needed in France today.

It is at least premature for us to conclude that he can't perform that miracle. Perhaps he can. And if he can I think we should make every effort to help the west rearm. But certainly that program would not and should not involve the use of many American ground divisions.

General Eisenhower has had unique experience in dealing with the Europeans. Surely we can depend on his not recommending involving either American or other troops in an international army with himself as its commander if in his judgment the people of Western Europe are not going to demonstrate the will to resist and if the project is consequently doomed to failure.

Surely the American people should await Eisenhower's return from his European trip a few weeks from now and hear his recommendations and conclusions before making any final decisions as to what our future defense policy should be.

While the United States is in the process of hammering out its new foreign policy, one which I hope will be truly and not synthetically bipartisan in nature, we must not overlook another important fact. The men in the Kremlin are the ones who will determine the date when the war, if it comes, starts. It might be next week or next year, or it might not be for many years.

The Communist leaders may conclude that it is in their interest to stimulate our all-out mobilization without their actually precipitating war. They may believe that we will get bogged down in the quicksands of inflation and that our productive power will get so snarled up under economic controls that their chance of winning would be relatively better if they delayed for an additional few years. We have, therefore, to make an extremely difficult decision as to the speed and extent of our mobilization

program. On this point, too, we should have wide and bipartisan debate before our policy is finally determined.

MEETING OF MINDS NEEDED ON POLICY

It is tragic that President Truman and Secretary Acheson did not welcome Senator TAFT'S recent suggestion that he would be glad to sit down with them and work out a policy that both parties could support.

Actually there are many vital areas of agreement between the views Senator TAFT recently expressed and those of the Truman administration.

The administration should emphasize and try to expand them. I would guess that far wider agreement still could result from frank private discussions between the administration and Republican congressional leaders if a reasonable spirit of compromise on nonessentials and a desire for a meeting of the minds in the interest of real national security were evidenced by the administration.

And while we are trying to increase our national strength in a material way, we must steadfastly keep our faith in right principles, from matters of the highest importance to the lowest.

The nation that acts in accordance with principle has the best chance to find the strength and courage for ultimate victory. If a nation does not act from principle but only from expediency, unavoidable defeats may make its people despair and become defeatist.

We should increase our efforts to remove social injustices. If we fail to do that, we help the Communists' propaganda become more effective and thus lessen the likelihood that all of our people will continue to have the faith in our social system and the determination to preserve it that may be necessary.

In conclusion, let me repeat that I am not saying that war with Russia is certain, but rather that there can be no real peace in the world until and unless the philosophy that now motivates the Communist leaders is modified.

In the meantime, the best we can hope for is an armed truce, with the United States possessing such military power in being that the Russians may be deterred from starting a war in view of our terrible power of instant retaliation.

If the American people show wisdom and resolution, I have not the slightest doubt that we can and will permanently keep our freedom, which is more important to Americans than life itself.

Chinese Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, at a time when the Senate is hearing much about the question of how many divisions of troops we should send to Europe, it is particularly important for us to realize that the Armed Forces are only one instrument of national policy. Because it has been concentrated on military questions, this debate has drawn into the shadows, nationally as well as here in Washington, the nonmilitary methods of achieving our ends. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD, a story from Hong Kong in yesterday's New York Times about the rapidly expanding psychological activities of the Chinese Communists. At a moment when the Chinese Communists are flushed with military victories, we find the Peiping radio talking less about the fighting in Korea than about the propaganda victories they are winning on the Chinese mainland.

The news in this story is not that the Communists are concentrating on propaganda. The news is the colossal scale of the effort by which they claim they can reach China's 450,000,000 people with the party line within 24 hours, even in the absence of the big newspaper circulations or a large number of radio receivers. While their people are starving, they build radio networks and train propagandists.

When General Marshall returned from his mission to China I heard him say—and remember, his whole career had been devoted to the effective handling of Army divisions—that the course of history in China for the free world might have been altered by the use of radios and motion pictures on a scale hitherto unheard of.

When I made my first remarks on the floor of this Chamber last March, I think some of my colleagues were a little startled and perhaps unbelieving when I declared that China had fallen, not so much to Communist armies as to Communist propaganda. I commend this New York Times story to the Congress. Its moral for our own policy is obvious.

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

BIG RADIO NET AIRS CHINA PROPAGANDA—MANCHURIA AND NORTHERN AREA HEAR VOICE OF PEIPING—AIM IS TO COVER ENTIRE COUNTRY

HONG KONG, January 21.—According to the Peiping radio, Chinese Communists have built up a vast propaganda network through which the voice of Peiping will be heard by virtually half of China's vast population.

In North China and Manchuria, the Communists assert, the propaganda network already is showing results. Unofficial reports said branches of the gigantic network were being set up in other parts of the country.

When the nation-wide network is in full operation, the Communists will be able to make their line of thought known to the country's 450,000,000 inhabitants within 24 hours.

Peiping will be the nerve center of this propaganda network. From there the Chinese Communist policy makers will be able to transmit their speeches and the influential People's Daily in Peiping will be able to broadcast its editorials to even the smallest villages in China. This is the first time in Chinese history that rural districts have received such special attention.

SPECIAL TRAINING

The Communist New China News Agency disclosed that 8,000 party members in North China recently were mobilized to undergo special training in propaganda work. They form the nucleus of the propaganda network.

They were assigned to handle political indoctrination and supervise the "learning of current affairs" among 2,000,000 People's Militiamen in North China.

In Hopei Province alone more than 40,000 primary teachers were trained to mold students and lead local political activities in rural districts. The Province also trained 30,000 winter school teachers to conduct adult classes among farmers. The network also has 6,000 full-time propagandists to distribute material received from Peiping.

In the neighboring Province of Shansi winter schools for farmers have special newspaper-reading classes.

In conducting propaganda the Communists employ various forms, mostly vocal and visual. There are street-corner theatrical performances, Yanko songs and dances, singing story tellers, lantern slides, movies, cartoons, blackboard newspapers, and housetop loudspeakers, to relay Communist broadcasts.

NEWSCASTS COPIED

In Hopei as well as Shansi Province copyists in every county listen to Communist newscasts from Peiping and distribute mimeographed sheets which are used as textbooks for various winter schools.

In north China, according to the New China News Agency, the propaganda network handled the recent anti-American Korean aid movement so successfully that farmers whose minds previously were paralyzed now are responding warmly to the call of resisting Americans and defending the fatherland. Many have put down names to join the people's volunteers in Korea or to serve as stretcher bearers, the news agency added. They have also shown a high degree of enthusiasm in turning in grains to state granaries.

In Manchuria the Communist propaganda network is built on workers' schools where laborers attend classes after working hours. In the North Manchurian Province of Heilungkiang alone there are more than 34,000 authorized propagandists. In Antung City, which is across the Yalu River from the North Korean city of Sinuiju, 1,400 propagandists drum up feeling against the United States.

In the western Manchurian Province of Jehol 360 laborers attend workers' schools and 200,000 peasants attend winter schools where propaganda also is intensively conducted both in basic party lines and as current affairs.

Petition of the People's Lobby of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 3, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition of the People's Lobby of California:

To the President of the United States of America, Harry S. Truman, the Senate, the House of Representatives:

The board of directors of the People's Lobby of California organization, through its committee, passed the following resolution at its regular meeting in Los Angeles, Calif., Monday, July 17, 1950:

Whereas the United Nations Security Council has commenced proceedings involving the United Nations flag for war; and

Whereas such action by the UN violates the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas such action by the UN is unconstitutional and illegal; and

1. To exercise such interference among nations is illegal and violates article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, in which it states, "Congress shall declare war":

Now, therefore, it is the sense of the board of directors of the People's Lobby of California that (1) such proceedings as those above mentioned are of vital concern to the people and civic organizations; (2) all civic organizations should take all necessary steps to inform themselves of the issues involved and defend themselves against such usurpation of power by the United Nations Security Council by all appropriate methods including bringing the same to the attention of the Congress and of the people; (4) the matter should be retained on the board's agenda for further consideration, and should move actively to participate in this matter.

On July 7, 1950, the United Nations Security presented a resolution relative to, the use of the United Nations flag for war. Such use of police force power violates the UN Charter, and the resolution passed by UN July 7, 1950, is unconstitutional and illegal.

No American soldier should be permitted to enter battle and offer his services and life under any emblem other than the flag of the United States of America.

The United World Federalists favored before our State legislature the resolution which was passed favoring a world government. Our organization opposed the passage of the resolution and was partially responsible for securing its revocation.

The ground of our opposition was the effect of such world government in nullifying the provisions of our Constitution, that war must be declared by action of Congress.

If this is a trick to strengthen the UN into world government which would give mixed ideologies prestige, establish a precedent for police rule through the UN, it would be the first step to the last chapter where we would give up our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and our Republic of the United States of America.

The UN is exceeding its power to make puppets of our President, Senators, and the Congressmen. If we are not fighting for the United States ideals of freedom, then why are we fighting? If our boys and young women are induced to fight for peace with honor, we want it to be only under our own Stars and Stripes, representing the United States and the Republic.

The United Nations was set up for peace, not war. Why then should they be sent to foreign soil over the nation of Korea squabble? We oppose foreign entanglements and, most certainly oppose any entanglement that would create, or help to create world government and, the nullifying of the Constitution of the United States.

We request proper action on the part of our House of Representatives and the Senate to take such action as will make the action in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

The petition of resolution above is prayerfully submitted by the committee and patriotic citizen names attached and in behalf of the people of the United States.

Respectfully,

People's Lobby of California, now United Patriotic People, U. S. A., Los Angeles, Calif.; Clara McDonald, President; Dr. Charles T. Murdock, Vice President; D. B. Troth, Executive Secretary; Katie B. Gay, Mrs. Frances Tufts, Nicholas Kudosh; Joseph Weldon Anderson; Mrs. Maude B. Jones, R. C. W. Friday, Joy A. Winans, Regina V. Farris, Michael J. Riedel, Annetta Heep, Clarence E. Burr, George D. Higgins, Margaret Wheeler Hess, Betty Henderson, Mary P. Cathey, Elsie M. Smoot, Helen Mary Lucas, Max E. Perkins, Mrs. Luella Anderson, Homer A. Jonas, Sr., Frederick L. Boon, Dr. Robert B. Anderson, Mrs. Ethel H. Richards, Anne G. Webb. Goldye M. Brierton, Mrs. Lou T. Downs, Russell P. Howard, Sam P. Fontano, Frank B. Hewitt, Amy E. Merrihew, Rae Sichman, E. L. Parker, Frank B. Ohlquist.

Contribution of Small Business to Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by me entitled "Small Business To Do Its Share," which was published in the Daily News Record on Monday, January 22, 1951.

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

SMALL BUSINESS TO DO ITS SHARE—MANUFACTURERS, RETAILERS OF ALL SIZES READY TO SERVE IN EMERGENCY—INVENTORIES IN STORES SEEN AMPLE FOR AT LEAST 6 MONTHS

(By Senator GUY M. GILLETTE)

WASHINGTON.—The crisis confronting our country today may ultimately determine whether we, as a Nation, are to exist free or in bondage. It is difficult to overestimate the seriousness of the situation in which the entire world finds itself. Never before in our history has the need been greater for America to stay strong—and become stronger.

If we are to preserve our political democracy—the cherished ideals and institutions upon which this Nation was founded—we must bend every effort to maintain and strengthen our economic democracy. For our system of competitive free enterprise is one of the prime sources of our national vigor.

To stem the tide of aggression, the President has ordered mobilization of our manpower. Congress has blueprinted the effective use of our vast industrial potential. Now is the time to make certain that small business, the broad base of our great industrial and commercial pyramid, has the opportunity to contribute its full share to our war effort.

It would be folly for us not to profit by the bitter experience of small-business men in the early years of World War II. Unfortunately for many a small operator, it was then a question of too little and much too late. While our defense effort got under way in 1940, it was not until the middle of 1942 that official notice was taken of the thousands of small-business facilities which were being bypassed in the race for more and more production. For two critical years, small-business men waited outside the defense-production door for such subcontracting crumbs as might fall their way. Their plants lay idle. Their supply of materials dried up. Their skilled labor drifted away to larger plants, whose backlogs of orders were even then reflected in weapon shortages on the fighting fronts.

In an industrial mobilization program, it is customary to emphasize the role of manufacturers, since they produce the actual materials of warfare. We must not forget, however, that most retail establishments serve basic civilian needs and have an indispensable place in any wartime economy.

Moreover, retailing is essentially small business. Slightly more than one-half of the 3,670,000 business concerns in the country are engaged in retailing. And more than two-thirds of all retail establishments in the apparel, shoes, and accessories field employ fewer than four persons. In every neighborhood throughout the Nation, we find that the small retailer is the very heart of the business community.

During World War II, with its serious material shortages and rationing of civilian goods, many small retailers failed to survive. While their costs of doing business rose, the volume of merchandise they had to sell declined.

Today, there is hope that, at least for the next 6 months, the dislocations in our civilian economy may not be too severe. Inventories of consumers' goods on retail shelves and in industry warehouses, seem ample for several months to come.

In addition, with employment at a record high, the prospect of millions of dollars in overtime wages and a vast Government-spending program point to a continued brisk demand for merchandise, especially in the apparel lines.

What shortages develop will in all probability be spotty. Increased dollar volume should more than compensate for loss of sales through shortages. In fact, some retailers feel that dollar sales may exceed comparable 1950 figures by as much as 10 percent. This, unfortunately, will probably be attained through higher prices to the consumer, rather than by an increase in unit sales.

As nearly as can be foretold at this time, the heaviest demand seems likely to be in the accessories, ready-to-wear, and men's and boys' wear lines.

In their planning for the future, all businessmen, and especially the small-business man, must take into consideration the prospects of even higher taxes. It is clear that at this time we are able to estimate our tax needs only for short periods and within the shifting framework of our military requirements. Although we cannot calculate with certainty the exact amounts needed, tax policies in general will be governed by three main objectives. These are: (1) A tax load commensurate with our defense expenditures, (2) control of inflationary forces, and (3) expansion of essential civilian and military production.

Two provisions of the excess-profits tax just passed by Congress were designed to be of specific aid to small business. Under the old law, no minimum credit was provided. Now, any company earning less than $25,000 will not have to pay an excess-profits tax. In addition, new companies—those started since the beginning of 1946—will be entitled to a credit equal to their entire industry's average rate of return on assets during the base period.

The only way for our Nation to minimize the inevitable dislocations which will occur as the war-mobilization program gains speed is for business, Government, and consumers to work hand in hand. Our American retail trade has a splendid reputation for cooperation. It is gratifying to observe the readiness with which the cotton-textile industry and the men's-wear industry have pledged their cooperation with voluntary system of price controls.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am proud to be a member, plans to exercise every means at its disposal to assure that in the present race for defense production the vital interests of small business are not overlooked. In this regard, let us fervently hope that the bitter lessons of the last war were not lost upon us. If we cannot learn from so recent an experience, the road ahead will be rocky indeed.

We may well ask ourselves this question: How firm and enduring will the foundation of our cherished political democracy be if we allow our economic democracy to crumble? In some places in the world today even to be permitted to conduct a business is a privilege. In America it is a right. Now and in the perilous days ahead we cannot

afford to take any chances with our traditional institution of free and independent enterprise. We cannot afford to ignore the needs of the small-business men, who, by their numbers, furnish the major portion of our national productive and service facilities.

America cannot be strong; America cannot stay strong—without independent enterprise.

Resolution Adopted by the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, January 19, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Senate Joint Memorial 2

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a department of natural resources, the establishment of regional or branch offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies, and for the location of a United States Military Academy of the Air in Colorado

Whereas the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, has recommended the reorganization of the Department of the Interior and the incorporation of its functions and related functions concerned with the conservation and development of natural resources into a new Department of Natural Resources; and

Whereas it would be highly desirable that regional offices of that and other Federal departments and agencies be established in order to bring the Federal Government and its activities closer to the people; and

Whereas consideration is being given to the establishment of a United States Military Academy of the Air: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for—

(1) The creation of a new Department of Natural Resources;

(2) The location of a regional office of that department and of other important Federal departments and agencies in Colorado; and

(3) The location of the United States Military Academy of the Air likewise in Colorado.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado of the United States.

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

Opposition to United States-Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Many Here Opposed to United States-Korean War," published in the Benson County, N. Dak., Courier of January 18, 1951.

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

POLL FINDS FOLKS THINKING AND CONCERNED—MANY HERE OPPOSED TO UNITED STATES-KOREAN WAR

There is a lot of opinion—some offered as expert; some just comment—to be heard on the world situation, how it affects us as a nation, and what we should do about it.

A lot of the comment heard on the air and available through the syndicated columns in the newspapers is regarded by some to be the reflection of special interests. Some probably is; some is not.

The Courier believes the real voice of America is the opinion to be heard on the streets, in the cafes and stores, and in homes where people on the grass-roots level congregate. These opinions, magnified thousands of times, are the real voice of America.

We present here 15 opinions on the current international situation from Benson County folks. The opinions were solicited for publication and are necessarily brief. They are not intended to be related to one another.

J. G. Johnson, Leeds plumber: "I think we should get out of Korea and get back to Japan and watch Europe more closely. We should furnish material to Europe, but there should be an understanding that they should attempt to defend their own countries."

Joseph Blegen, Leeds township farmer: "I've wondered what we were doing in Korea in the first place. I've asked and have yet to get a satisfactory answer. I think we should keep our forces closer to home—at least till we see how things are shaping up."

Harold Whalen, Knox merchant: "The St .te Department is right in withholding aid from the Chinese Nationalist Government under Chiang Kai-shek, whose government for years practiced corruption in keeping the peasants of China in a state of servitude. I think any American forces sent to Europe should be matched at least man for man by the European nations. I don't think we should help any Communist nation—Yugoslavia included; communism is communism, wherever it is. I think the American people should wake up to the dangers of McCarthyism." (Whalen observed conditions in China firsthand as an American pilot there during World War II.)

Nels C. Fosen, Springfield Township, farmer: "I am absolutely for getting out of Korea. I don't know what we were doing there in the first place."

Oscar Tufte, Leeds, merchant: "I think TAFT is closer to right than anybody so far. I think it is a mistake to stop Nationalist China from opposing Red China and also in not rearming the Japs. I think the Japs should have a land army only, but Japan could protect themselves and our bases, too."

A. E. Petsinger, Leeds, merchant: "I can't help but feel that we should draw back to Japan till they make up their minds what they are doing. I can't see losing a lot of lives in Korea for what seems to be no gain. I don't think we should send more than our proportionate share of troops to Europe."

Fritz Hove, York Township, farmer: "I don't think we ever had any business in Korea. We're just as much an aggressor as Russia would be in moving into Mexico in the name of peace. Rather than so much stress on rearmament, I think we should have more faith in United Nations. I think Red China should be recognized. They are a majority of the people there. A big army here could bring economic breakdown—and communism. Russia can't impose communism here."

C. T. Madsen, Maddock, creamery manager: "I feel we have our elected officials and their military staff, and we'll have to rely on their judgment and hope for the best. I don't feel that the State legislature was in position to judge on the Korean situation."

Palmer Larson, York, farmer: "I feel we should do our share, but I also believe the other nations seem to be expecting too much of us in manpower and finances, both in Korea and Europe. I think the next war will take longer to win than any before."

Matt Johnson, Wolford, farmer: "I'm afraid we are going to have another big war, and I think we can win it, but to say what has been right or wrong with what we have done so far is hard to say from what we know."

Mrs. Frank O'Connell, Brinsmade, housewife: "It's hard to know what to say. I have maintained that the United States has been the goat for the world in previous wars. I don't say that we should try to fight man-for-man with the North Koreans and Chinese. I'd say one American is worth five Reds, and we don't want to spend our manpower in that way. Maybe if we knew more, we could appreciate the situation better."

Mrs. Einer Skold, rural Leeds, housewife: "I don't think we should send all our men over to Korea to fight. I don't think it's worth it to lose as many men as we have. I think we should send help to Europe to fight communism before it gets to this country."

Miss Nora Jacobsen, Leeds, music teacher: "Way down deep in my heart I can't help but feel that we are not going to have an all-out war, that somehow, something will come to make those people over there change to be better able to reason, feel, and understand. I think we have all gotten away from the fundamental Christian principles."

John Johnson, Leeds, farmer: "I don't think we should pull out of Korea. That would be the same as giving up. It doesn't seem that it should be so hard to hold. European nations should have help."

John Burkhardsmeier, Leeds, cafe operator: "We'd be a lot better off if we'd mind our business and let other nations mind theirs. We had no business in Korea. Hoover is no fool."

The Good-Faith Sales Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by Harold Fleming. The article is to be found in the Christian Science Monitor of January 15. It relates to the "good-faith sales rule" and it is worth reading.

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

GOOD FAITH SALES RULE BY COURT HELD WEIGHTY

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK.—The recent Supreme Court 5 to 3 decision in the so-called Standard of Indiana or Detroit gasoline case is considered by antitrust lawyers here as the most important high court decision on the antitrust laws since the Cement Institute (basing-point) case in 1948.

It is also virtually the first important antitrust decision in over a decade which has upheld the position of a large corporation against Government lawyers.

The other such decision was in the Columbia Steel case, allowing United States Steel to buy a west coast steel fabricator. But in its Columbia decision the court obliquely took into account the west coast's interest in getting in new eastern steel capital. Also the Columbia decision was 5 to 4, and the minority report contained Justice Douglas' famous remark: "Here is the curse of bigness." But in the recent Indiana decision Justice Douglas sided with the majority.

LEGALITY OF DISCRIMINATION

The original and basic issue in the case was the legality of good faith price discrimination.

A price discrimination under the Clayton Act of 1914 and its amendment, the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, merely means the giving of a lower price to one customer than to another.

The law prohibits such discriminations—but with certain exceptions. One is for quantity discounts when justified to the Federal Trade Commission on the basis of cost savings on large orders. Another is where the reduction is made in good faith for the purpose of meeting a competitor's price. Such was the Indiana case.

In this case the Indiana company sold gasoline to certain Detroit jobbers. A competitor offered these jobbers lower prices. Indiana met the lower prices. But this enabled some of these jobbers to undercut some retailers to whom the Indiana company sold direct.

GOOD-FAITH EXEMPTION

Some of these retailers complained to the FTC. The Commission ordered Indiana to quit granting these lower prices to these jobbers. Indiana replied that it had to make these prices or lose the business; that the cuts were made in good-faith competition. The FTC replied that the good-faith exemption was in section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, and so didn't apply to section 2 (a) under which Indiana's cuts were injuring competitors (i. e., some of Indiana's retail customers).

The court of appeals agreed unanimously with the FTC, but the Supreme Court has now restored to the law the meaning most people thought it had before the Indiana case. Said the Supreme Court majority: "There is nothing to show a congressional purpose * * * to compel the seller to choose only between ruinously cutting its prices to all its customers to match the price offered to one or refusing to meet the competition and then ruinously raising its prices to its remaining customers to cover increased unit costs."

RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE

There was, however, another aspect of the case, not dwelt on by the high court, involving resale price maintenance. The background on this is shown by the following quotations taken from chapter 5, The Forgotten Consumer, of a forthcoming book on the antitrust laws by Harold Fleming, to be published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., in February under the title "Ten Thousand Commandments."

"Long before World War I * * * a group of retail lumber dealers were angered by a number of wholesale lumbermen. The wholesale firms were edging into the retail business, and * * * not respecting the usual retail mark-up. * * * The retailers, however, felt that they had a fair and proper place in the business, including mark-up, and that it should be protected.

"At about the same time a leading patent medicine company, Dr. Miles, fell out with some of its distributors. They were not maintaining the retail price. * * *

"The Supreme Court had little difficulty in striking down both of these efforts at what is now called resale price maintenance. If distributors wanted to cut prices below the customary margins, that was all right with the Court. It was a form of competition, and it benefited the consumer. (*U. S. v. Eastern States Retail Lumber Association* (234, U. S. 600 (1914)), and *Dr. Miles Medical Co. v. John D. Park & Sons Co.* (22 U. S. (1911)).

"Much more recently the Supreme Court made a similar finding in the Ethyl Gasoline case. * * * It here again struck down resale-price maintenance. * * * Recently the Federal Trade Commission found resale-price maintenace to be a violation also of the Federal Trade Commission Act as an unfair method of competition."

"FTC REVERSES ITSELF IN DETROIT CASE

"[But] in an astonishing recent case—the so-called Detroit gasoline case—the FTC reversed itself in effect and required a big oil company practically to enforce resale price maintenance on certain of its jobber-retailer customers. What happened in the case was this:

"The Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, had in Detroit, what is called a 'dual-distribution system' * * * it sold, on the one hand, direct to several hundred retail gas stations; and, on the other hand, to four jobbers, some of whom not only sold to retailers but also sold at retail * * * direct to consumers.

"Standard sold to the jobbers at 1½ cents a gallon lower than it sold to retail-station operators. This was a tank-car price to the jobbers, and a tank-wagon price to the retailers. This was not a wide spread. In fact, a number of oil companies had been fined a few years earlier under the Sherman Act for holding the jobber-retailer spread at 2 cents. (C. R. 11364, 5, Western District of Wisconsin, 1936, companion case to the so-called Madison case (310 U. S. 150).)

"COMPETITIVE BATTLE AGGRAVATED

"One of these jobbers, however, selling at retail through its own service stations, often passed on some of this discount to the drive-in customers during some of the repeated price battles that raged in the Detroit gasoline business. And this tended to aggravate the competitive battle, pull down retail prices to the consumer, and hurt some of this jobber-retailer's competitors.

"The FTC thereupon ordered the Indiana Standard Co., among other things, to cease dealing with any wholesaler who [it] knows, or should know, will not maintain [its] price to retailers. And the court of appeals upheld the FTC in this, saying that Standard might, under the right to choose its customers, refuse to sell to wholesalers who sell to retailers below the price [it] makes to its own retailers.

"By odd coincidence, a somewhat similar case was tried in Milwaukee at about the same time, also involving gasoline prices but with a quite different outcome. * * * It was Detroit gasoline dealers who * * * precipitated this FTC price maintenance ruling. But meantime the State of Wisconsin was winning a case against price maintenance in Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Retail Gasoline Dealers' Association had sent bulletins to its members suggesting resale prices, which were adhered to by more than 90 percent of its members, while only 55 percent of the nonmember dealers to whom these bulletins were sent maintained the suggested price. The Wisconsin court found the association to have conspired to maintain gasoline prices, fined it $2,000, and ordered its charter dissolved.

"The Wisconsin proceeding was brought under a State antitrust law. This law and the action taken under it were in line with the original spirit of the Federal antitrust laws."

The Phillips Petroleum Natural Gas Rate Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is tremendous interest in the State of Wisconsin and throughout the Midwest in the long-pending investigation by the Federal Power Commission of alleged excessive prices charged for natural gas at the well-head by the Phillips Petroleum Co. Unfortunately, however, there have been no fewer than seven postponements of the hearing, all but one of which have been due to the company itself.

Now, we all recognize that the high cost of living is one of the gravest problems which America faces on the home front. Naturally the fuel element in that high cost must be controlled if we are to prevent further terrific inflationary pressures from developing in our already over-inflated economy. For this reason I was happy to act upon a sound recommendation which I had received from the new attorney general of the State of Wisconsin, the Hon. Vernon Thomson. This distinguished officer recommended that on behalf of my State, I contact the Federal Power Commission urging the setting of a day certain for the filing of evidence. I was happy to do so, not only in the interest of Wisconsin consumers but in interest of other Midwestern consumers as well, and more important, in the interest of the over-all national effort to hold the price line.

There is, as I have said, widespread interest in this subject, and for that reason in order that my position on behalf of the setting of a specific hearing date may be absolutely clear, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following items:

(a) The text of the letter from the attorney general of Wisconsin to me;

(b) The text of my reply to him;

(c) The text of my letter to Chairman Walgren, of the Federal Power Commission; and finally,

(d) The text of an illuminating editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, January 17, issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

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

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Madison, January 9, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In October 1948, the Federal Power Commission initiated an investigatory proceeding upon its own motion as to the status of the Phillips Petroleum Co. under the Natural Gas Act.

A copy of the order describing the basis for the Commission's action is enclosed herewith and is self-explanatory.

The respondent, Phillips Petroleum Co., is the exclusive supplier of natural gas to the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co., which in turn is the exclusive wholesale supplier of natural gas to Wisconsin distributing companies. The price of natural gas at the wellhead is a material factor in the composition of the price to the consumer in Wisconsin.

The contract between Phillips Petroleum Co. and the pipeline company is a subject of inquiry in this proceeding. It is interesting to note that the price of the gas supplied by Phillips Petroleum to the pipeline company was increased five times between the date the contract was first entered into and the date the first cubic foot of gas was delivered into our State. This, notwithstanding the contract was supposed to be an arms-length transaction.

It can readily be seen that unless some control is exerted over the sale of the gas from the supplier to the pipeline company, the regulation of the price between the pipeline company and the distributors becomes an empty and meaningless formality.

You are fully conversant with the Kerr bill which was vetoed by the President in the last session of Congress. The effect of that bill, among other things, would have been to nullify the basis for the present inquiry into the status of the Phillips Petroleum Co. It is my understanding that the cost of gas charged by Phillips Petroleum Co. to the pipeline company is approximately $5,000,000 per year greater than the amount which would have been permitted under the original contract. It is conceivable that if the matter goes to hearing and the State of Wisconsin prevails upon its contentions, a substantial saving will be effected to the consumer public in this State and in other States served by the pipeline company.

The Phillips Petroleum Co. has endeavored from time to time to postpone the hearing. It now relies heavily upon its participation in the national mobilization effort as the basis for a motion for indefinite postponement of the hearing. The State of Wisconsin does not wish to interfere with this company's participation in the national mobilization effort. However, by a motion being filed with the Commission this day, I believe we have suggested a procedure under which the public interest can be fully served and the respondent company's participation in the national mobilization effort can be fully protected. A copy of that written motion is enclosed herewith and is self-explanatory.

In your capacity as a member of the bar, and as as a representative of the public interest of the citizens of Wisconsin, I request that you study this matter; and if you share my conclusions as expressed in the enclosed motion for a definite hearing date, I request that you communicate with Chairman Wallgren, of the Federal Power Commission, and submit your viewpoint to him.

Respectfully,

VERNON W. THOMSON,
Attorney General.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 15, 1951.

Re Federal Power Commission Natural Gas case.

Hon. VERNON THOMSON,
Attorney General, State of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wis.

MY DEAR VERNON: I appreciate very much your fine letter of January 9 and enclosed materials setting forth the petition by our State of Wisconsin to the Federal Power Commission for the setting of a hearing for a day certain in the Phillips Petroleum case.

I have read through your letter and enclosures most carefully, and I should like to state now that I feel that Wisconsin is on completely sound grounds in urging no further postponement of the seven-times delayed FPC hearing. I shall, therefore, in compliance with your suggestion, immediately contact the Commission along the lines set forth in the enclosed letter to Chairman Walgren.

As you will kindly recall, I voted against the Kerr bill which would, as you say, have nullified the basis for the present inquiry into the status of the Phillips Petroleum Co. From all the evidence I have seen since my vote, I believe more strongly than ever that the natural gas companies must be controlled at the source of supply. Obviously there is tremendous pressure for cost of living increases all along the line, and I feel that the consumers of Wisconsin and other States are being squeezed enough already without having to worry about still further increases in natural gas rates.

Be assured, therefore, of my complete cooperation with your office toward the objective you have well stated. I shall be happy to receive your further suggestions and reactions.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 15, 1951.

Re Phillips Petroleum Natural Gas case.

Hon. MON WALLGREN.
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you to express my complete support of the position adopted by the State of Wisconsin in urging that there be no further postponement of the Federal Power Commission hearing on the Phillips Petroleum Co. Natural Gas case.

I have endorsed the sentiments expressed by the attorney general of my State, the Honorable Vernon Thomson, in contending that no further postponement of the hearing is justified. Neither my State nor any other State would want to interfere with the participation by this company in the national mobilization effort; however, I do not believe that the hearing contemplated under Wisconsin's appeal would in the slightest constitute such interference.

I do not like to see "the national defense effort" or "the mobilization emergency" be used as a cloak under which any company seeking its own self-interest can justify any arbitrary action. Already the hearing has been postponed seven times and all but one of those times such postponement had been requested by Phillips.

I want to be fair to this company but I feel that it is infinitely more important that we be fair to the public interest as set forth by the Wisconsin brief.

I appeal to you, therefore, and to your fellow Commission members to immediately set a day certain under which the evidence could be presented in this case.

I feel that the Federal Power Commission owes an obligation to the consumers of my State and to the sovereign State itself. Already the price of gas supplied by this company to the pipeline company has increased five times between the date the contract was first entered into and the date the first cubic foot of gas was delivered into our State.

These facts, it seems to me, underline the imperative necessity for an immediate hearing. I do not presume to judge the merits of the case in detail because that is a matter for the Commission itself to determine; but I do presume, because it is my right as a United States Senator, to respectfully urge that there be no further stalling.

Looking forward to hearing from you on this matter, and with all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, January 17, 1951]

FPC REFUSES TO PROTECT USER OF NATURAL GAS; WHY IS THIS?

A year ago natural gas consumers won what seemed to be a great victory when President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill, which would have removed so-called independent natural gas producers from control of the Federal Power Commission.

There is disquieting evidence that the victory may have been hollow. The FPC, after winning the right to "control," isn't showing much interest in "controlling."

Long ago the State of Wisconsin and the city of Detroit asked the FPC to investigate alleged "excessive prices" charged for gas at the wellhead by the Phillips Petroleum Co. Phillips, which owns 12 percent of the Nation's natural gas reserves, is exclusive supplier of the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., one of the two wholesalers in the Wisconsin market.

Gas in the area served by the pipe line company is costing consumers $5,000,000 more a year than original contract agreements set because Phillips has made five successive price boosts, the State of Wisconsin claims.

The first hearing on the State's complaint was set for last March. It has been postponed seven times. On December 19 the FPC, at the urging of the Phillips Co., voted "indefinitely to postpone" the hearings. That, in effect, gave Phillips a clear field for setting any gas rate it desires. The decision to kill the investigation will be reconsidered, because one commissioner was absent when the vote was taken. But the 3 to 1 vote knocking the probe on the head doesn't lend much hope of reviving it unless one of the majority can be persuaded to change his mind.

The entire fight against the Kerr bill was based on the theory that unless gas prices can be controlled at the wellhead, controls by the FPC of pipeline rates and by the Wisconsin and other State public service commissions of consumer rates are "an empty and meaningless formality."

The wellhead price, as Attorney General Vernon Thomson, of Wisconsin, has pointed out, of necessity sets pipeline and consumer prices. If Phillips can raise prices at will the FPC and the State PSC are wasting their time—and consumers have no protection.

Phillips' argument against the investigation is ridiculous. The company has claimed that if it has to spend time defending itself at hearings the national defense and mobilization effort will be hampered. This is pure

hokum. The defense and mobilization effort will be much more hampered if gas prices are allowed to soar far above legitimate levels and to add to the already high cost of living.

The FPC is charged with protecting the public. If it refuses Wisconsin's request for an investigation aimed at protecting natural gas consumers it ought to be investigated itself.

A New Congress Sits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Congress Sits," published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of January 4, 1951.

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

A NEW CONGRESS SITS

While it seems more important to us in North Dakota that we have a legislature in session, we should not forget the national—and international—importance of the fact that a new Congress opened in Washington the day after our legislature opened.

What can we expect from this new national legislative body?

It seems to be the unanimous opinion of economic experts that we can expect more taxes, less and more expensive goods (inflation), and that on the whole it would be a very good idea if we could have avoided living during this next year. We shall have less of almost everything that goes into the American standard of living, and we shall pay more for less. We shall also pay more into the national treasury in taxes of all sorts. Not a very cheerful prospect being held out for us.

Some of those threatened things have already come to pass.

It was not necessary for the President to await the approval of the new Congress to put some of the things into effect. He had wartime powers already written into law that gave him the right to issue executive orders. But the Congress will have to implement (what a miserable word to use in this connection, but economists use it and seem to adore it) his program, whatever it might be or become. We might as well believe this, for there is not the slightest disagreement among experts about this.

Congress will have to give the President a lot of things he is going to ask for. Whether the Members like Mr. Truman makes not the slightest difference for the President is in a position that guarantees him his way in a lot of things, so long as there is a war threat hanging over the world.

There will not be much room in Washington, or in the national legislature, for politics as such. The welfare of the Nation is the concern of all of us, congressional Members included, and broadly interpreted, the aim of the administration must be the aims of the Nation, irrespective of political feeling of the person in Congress who must vote for or against what the President and his advisers propose.

The job of our State legislators may seem tough. But it is of little hardship compared to what the Members of Congress must do. What we do in our own State effects our own State principally, if not entirely. What Congress does affects not only the entire Nation, but the entire anti-Communist world.

The eyes of the whole world are on our national Congress and our President. What Washington does is of supreme importance.

Proposed Draft of Youths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Mothers and Youths Unduly Frightened About War Outlook," by Roger W. Babson. This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star and other afternoon papers of January 22, 1951, and I think it is well worth including in the RECORD.

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

MOTHERS AND YOUTHS UNDULY FRIGHTENED ABOUT WAR OUTLOOK, DECLARES BABSON

(By Roger W. Babson)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—I am not a military expert and cannot speak with authority as to what is to happen to our 18- to 22-year-old young men during the next few years. The plans and hopes of many homes, jobs, and colleges are completely upset.

Let me, however, add a little hope to frightened families. Men who know what the probabilities are assure me that the future is not as bad as it now looks. They insist that only a few more boys will be shipped to Asia. We will be willing to supply guns and munitions to enable the Japanese to protect Japan, to enable Nationalists to hold Formosa, and to give needed aid to the Philippines. But no more American boys will be sent to Korea, Indochina, Burma, India, or elsewhere in Asia.

Experts at Washington believe world war III, if it comes, will be fought mainly by the Navy and Air Force. They say it would be suicidal to depend upon numbers of infantry to meet the Russians, even in Europe. With the large number of Communists who infect each European country, it may be best to limit our help to Western Europe to supplying them with A-bombs. Therefore, I believe mothers and boys are unnecessarily excited. Americans seem unable to strike a middle course. They either ignore danger and insist on business, profits, wages, and entertainment as usual, or else become panic-stricken and go too far in the opposite direction.

I, therefore, strongly advise that parents and their youths avoid getting unduly excited. First, the chances are 3 to 2 that Russia will not risk a "hot war" for some time to come, and second, if only the present "cold war" continues, 2,500,000 young men in training would be a nuisance and handicap to all concerned. I, moreover, speak with some authority, having founded three colleges and graduated thousands of young men.

I further advise young men between 18 and 20 to quit listening to radio commentators who know no more as to the future than you, my readers, do. Go on about your plans for schooling or work the same as if no war is now probable. Then if you are called, it will be O. K.; while the chances are 20-80 you won't be called. When you go to work, get a job with some industry which is essential to the war program; don't be content to jerk sodas or drive a truck.

WAR WILL NEED BRAINS

The next few years offer a great opportunity for young men to become expert in some one line of work. The new defense efforts enable a young man to take tests and ascertain for what he is best fitted and how to train therefor. If you live in a small town where there are no industries, have your mother teach you to cook. This is becoming a real profession. Drafted young men who can qualify as trained cooks are always given good opportunities for advancement.

The trouble with parents and youths today is that they visualize the next war—if it comes—will be like the last war. This is a great mistake. We cannot lick Russia by numbers. Korea proved this. It was our intelligence forces that let us down. We can win by brains. If world war III comes it will be a conflict of superior intelligence. Hence, let our youth prepare to use their brains; while the poor Russians, Chinese, and other peoples are treated as cannon fodder. If General MacArthur had given more attention to the intelligence division of his Army and less to old-fashioned fighting customs, things would be different.

REMEMBER OUR RELIGION

Finally, let us parents not forget that God continues to rule in His Heaven and that, in the long run, the Russians can never win without Him. God is still our refuge and our strength if we will cease worrying and take each day as it comes. Let us give more time to reading our Bibles and less to television or radio. Perhaps God is using the Russians to again bring us to our knees and to make our young people—who have had things pretty easy—"stop, look, and listen."

McMahon's Plan To Express Amity Toward Russians Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article entitled "McMahon's Plan To Express Amity Toward Russians Hailed," written by David Lawrence, in his column Today in Washington, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 23, 1951.

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

MCMAHON'S PLAN TO EXPRESS AMITY TOWARD RUSSIANS HAILED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Senator BRIEN MCMAHON'S proposal of a resolution to be adopted by the Senate expressing friendship for the Russian people is the first sign of common sense that has come in a long while from officialdom here on the subject of moral force as a preventive of war.

The assumption that because armament has to be increased substantially to meet outbreaks of aggression, all other forms of

peaceful effort to prevent war need not be pressed is erroneous. Yet whenever military measures take the limelight these other methods of avoiding war seem to be sidetracked.

With two world wars to remind mankind that military conquest does not really bring peace, there have been equally erroneous assumptions current that military strength has become futile or unnecessary. The truth is that defense armament is indispensable, and so is an armament of reason and genuine friendship expressed by one set of peoples to the other.

THE CAUSES OF WAR

The Russian people are not bellicose by nature. They do not want war any more than do the people of the Allied countries. Inasmuch as all peoples would prefer the ways of peace to armed hostilities, the real question always is why there should be any wars. Generally they result from the acts of a dictator or of a small group of men—oligarchies, they used to call them in ancient days—who exploit whole nations and force the young to go to war by inflaming public opinion against other countries.

There is no reason to believe that, if the minds of the 200,000,000 people of Soviet Russia could be reached with genuine evidences of friendship, the rules of the Communist regime would have the power to take the steps of aggression which have now brought the world to the brink of war.

Like all other moves of this kind—and they are by no means novel—the question of methods and means arises. The United States has brought forth what is known as the Voice of America program. This project was for a long time in need of funds, but now has the money from Congress. What is lacking is the ideas that must go into such an undertaking to make it successful. Those ideas cannot begin and end on the bureaucratic level. They must come from the very top level of our policy makers. They must be part of national and international policy.

Today the Voice of America is just one of a number of bureaus in the State Department. It ought to be an important agency independent of any department and reporting directly to the President. It should have enough prestige to command the sympathetic support of Members of both Houses of Congress. It should be the "public relations" instrument of the Government itself in international relations. Few men who have been at the head of the State Department have ever been qualified to do this type of planning even if they had the time to devote to it.

But to occupy so important a role, the project must have Cabinet-level ranking and must be composed of advisers who are able to suggest major policies that will appeal to other nations, especially those behind the iron curtain. Strange, indeed, that nobody has put any official momentum behind the idea of a formal expression of friendship by the Congress addressed to the people of Soviet Russia or that other moves which can appeal to peoples behind the iron curtain should not have come before now from authoritative quarters.

MUST CAPTURE IMAGINATION

The Voice of America can relay messages and broadcast interesting scrips and carry a polemic technique to counteract Communist propaganda, but that's not enough. There must be ways to capture the imagination of the Russian people. That's why the suggestion by Senator MCMAHON is likely to prove more penetrating that all the high-sounding speeches of diplomatic phraseology that come forth so regularly as the only expression of American idealism.

But will such policies of friendship and other proposals get through to the people behind the iron curtain? The answer is that any event of sensational importance percolates through any man-made barrier. The persons who go and come across the border from the satellite states to the free world are constantly discussing these same issues. Word-of-mouth distribution of ideas still remains the most effective single instrument of communication the world has ever known.

Proposed Draft of 18-Year-Old Youths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I have received from Frederic B. Terry, of Waynesboro, Pa., quoting an article by Dr. Charles S. Tippetts, headmaster of the Mercersburg Academy, at Mercersburg, Pa., regarding the proposal to draft youths of 18 years.

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

WAYNESBORO, PA., *January 13, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Concerning the idea of whether or not the United States should lower the draft age to 18, Dr. Charles S. Tippetts, headmaster of the Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa., has written pointedly in his Headmaster's Letter for the Mercersburg Academy Alumni Quarterly. His striking contribution to American thought in this matter follows:

"Again we have to decide whether or not to lower the draft age to 18. This should not be done unless we become involved in a major war, and even then with the provision that no one under 20 should be sent to the front. Our allies during the last war had stricter regulations about age than did we. We sent many a boy of 18 over as an infantry replacement after only a few weeks of training. Australia would not permit her young men to leave the country until they were 20; England did not let those under 19 go overseas until the last few months of the war. But we callously let 17-year-old boys join the Marines, the Navy and Coast Guard and be blown to bits. Look at the list of 17- and 18-year-old boys killed and wounded in Korea.

"Yet in Pennsylvania if we let a 17-year-old boy stand on a box and wash windows we are subject not only to a fine but to a jail sentence. We learned this at Mercersburg the hard way. But a 15-year-old boy can work on the roof of a barn, fall off and break his neck and it is perfectly legal, because it was a farm and farmers have lots of votes, and no one dares to say, 'No' to the farm vote. I saw a sign in the window of a liquor store the other day saying that no one under 21 could legally buy liquor.

"But it is perfectly legal in this 'civilized' country to kill boys under 21 by the thousands with bullets, bombs, and bayonets, and yet anyone selling them a drink will go to jail for a long term. When a distinguished lawyer and judge told me I should not say such things because it bred disrespect for the law, my answer was that if judges and lawyers want laws to be respected, they should pass laws that are worthy of respect. No other country in modern times except Germany and Russia has had so cruel and brutal a policy of throwing boys who are still children into the front lines to be killed as had the United States of America. Why their mothers and fathers stand for this I have never been able to understand.

"Cordially,

"CHARLES S. TIPPETTS."

To this statement by Dr. Tippetts the question should be appended: Why should anyone under 21 be subject to draft when he is denied the right to vote?

Sincerely yours,

FREDERIC B. TERRY.

Address by Assistant Secretary of Labor Ralph Wright, Representing the Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1951, there was a tremendous outpouring of Americans. They gathered at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York City to pay a well-deserved tribute to a great labor leader in the person of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. Messages of good will and of high commendation came from many high and respected sources, including our own President, Harry S. Truman; the President of the State of Israel, Chaim Weizmann; United States Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas; the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben Guiron; the Speaker of the Israeli Knesset, Josef Sprinzak; as well as from labor organizations throughout the world.

The dinner was sponsored by the American Trade Union Council of the National Committee for Labor Israel. The chairman of the dinner was Joseph Breslaw, chairman of the American Trade Union Council and vice president of the ILGWU. The toastmaster was Max Zaritsky, president emeritus of United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union.

In addition to addresses by Dr. John Steelman, assistant to the President of the United States; Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor; and His Excellency Abba S. Eban, Israel Ambassador to the United States; our distinguished Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin, sent his greetings by his Assistant Secretary of Labor, Ralph Wright, whose remarks follow:

It is an honor to represent Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin at this splendid testimonial of the American Trade Union Council to President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor. Secretary Tobin deeply regrets that the inordinately heavy press of emergency duties has kept him in Washington. He has asked me to bring you a message from him which I am glad to read to you:

"*To the American Trade Union Council, National Committee for Labor Israel:*

"I congratulate the American Trade Union Council on its great achievements and upon this most fitting testimonial to William Green. I am delighted to have this opportunity to pay tribute to him. This wise and noble leader, who has been president of the

American Federation of Labor for more than 26 years, is one of our greatest Americans. His lifelong, effective fighting for the cause of the common man has raised great economic monuments to his victories that will stand so long as there are freemen.

"So long as we have men like William Green labor statesmanship will continue to be a fact of tremendous significance in the life of America. The interests of labor have been widened with the years and William Green has been a part of these broadened horizons. He can always be counted upon to stand on the high plateau of national well-being and world advancement.

"That is why when William Green declares—as he did recently—that 'American wage earners face the future and its responsibilities seriously, but with confidence,' the country's spirit is lifted. That is why when he declares, 'we want peace and the opportunity that peace affords for new progress,' he expresses the heart's desire of the American people.

"William Green has contributed immeasurably to the improvement of our American way of life. He has always striven to make our democracy work ever better. He has led the fight to raise free trade-unionism to its rightful place in this country and in the rest of the free world. He has seen economic justice joining political equality to promote the good of all.

"On that account and for his great ability, kind and warm personality, and unimpeachable integrity we honor and love him."

I want to subscribe fully to all that Secretary Tobin has said and to add my own congratulations to the American Trade Union Council and to President Green for his outstanding leadership in the field of trade-unionism and for his equally outstanding service to his country. His is a record of service in both peace and war—a record of invaluable contributions to the welfare of the people of his own country and to the cause of economic justice and freedom throughout the world.

You meet here tonight to do honor to Mr. Green. You meet here also—as you have on other occasions—to help the free trade-unionists of Israel, a movement and a state which President Green has always aggressively supported. I warmly commend you and him for your unselfish activities on behalf of fellow workers in Israel—the world's newest democracy.

As we look upon the map of Asia, particularly in the Near or Middle East, we find that Israel is the only nation in that area which has been built from the very beginning on the same principles of democracy on which we in the United States have built.

Israel is probably the only country in the Middle East which has an effective free trade-union movement, a movement which owes much of its structure and character to the American trade-union movement and to a large degree to the inspiration and leadership of men like Mr. Green.

Israel as a nation faces gigantic problems. But I know that the people of Israel have the faith and the stamina and the will to win through. Histadrut, Israel's free democratic trade-union movement, will be in the vanguard.

American organized labor applauds Histadrut's contribution to the welfare of its members and to the State of Israel. This is shown by the important contributions which American labor has made to labor in Israel. Because of the importance of this help across international boundaries, organized labor in America will continue this program.

As President Truman said recently, "Our labor unions have already done fine work in communicating with labor in Europe, in Latin-America, and elsewhere. The story of free American labor, told by American trade-unionists, is a better weapon against Communist propaganda among workers in other countries than any number of speeches by Government officials."

Never in the history of the world was the cooperation of freemen so vital. These are critical times. We are in great danger. The peace of the world is gravely threatened by Communist imperialism.

When the freedom and security of freemen of good will is threatened by naked Soviet imperialism, then all freemen must stand together resolute against this threat. We must build our defenses to whatever is necessary to contain this threat.

This will entail much sacrifice by all of us. But we have the faith which will impel those sacrifices. We know that the stakes are high.

Free American trade-unions will never trade their democratic institutions and way of life for a life that is based on totalitarian concepts. American workers want no part of a mess of Communist pottage.

The American trade-union movement knows that the Communist claim that Soviet Russia is a paradise for workers is a mockery of the truth. Even if we should base our consideration on wages and working conditions alone, without thought for the precious God-given freedoms we possess, it is sheer madness for an American worker to consider for a moment changing places with the worker in Russia.

If America were transformed overnight into a Russian-dominated economy, I estimate that the American workers' wages would be reduced by approximately 86 percent. In other words, the American worker would have to give up four out of every five dollars to qualify for the low living standard of the Russian worker.

A Labor Department study shows that the Russian worker must toil 4½ hours for a pound of beef; it takes the American worker only 29 minutes—and you can bet that he will get better beef. The American worker earns a dozen of eggs in 27 minutes—for the Russian worker it takes 2½ hours, and so on.

The workers of America will never be sucked in by the red flame of Communist propaganda. Thank God for American organized labor, which stands as an impregnable bulwark against communism's false promises. Thank God for the leadership of men like William Green. American organized labor flatly and completely rejects the totalitarian philosophy of communism and its resulting low standards of living and suppression of individual liberty and initiative.

In midcentury the Communist war machine has drawn the issue of communism versus democracy. To maintain our freedom and security democracy must win. It will win through the work of organizations like your American Trade Union Council. It will win through the leadership of men like William Green, who has always stood like granite against communism, and whose rocklike strength is based upon an abiding and vigorous faith in the dignity and freedom of individual man. It will win through the efforts of such men because they know, as Emerson said:

"For what avail the plow or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail?"

Red China an Aggressor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding Red China's aggression, published in the Pittsburgh Press on Thursday, January 18, 1951.

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

GET A SHOW-DOWN NOW

Red China's rejection of the United Nations offer of Formosa and a United Nations seat in exchange for a cease-fire agreement in Korea has removed the United States from the predicament in which the State Department placed it by approving this infamous proposal at the outset.

That brings us back to the original proposition that Red China is guilty of unprovoked aggression by its attack on the United Nations forces.

This issue should be pushed to an immediate vote, and this country's future participation in the United Nations should ride upon the result of that roll call.

Our troops have no business in Korea if the United Nations will not support them with all of the resources at its command. This means reinforcements in men and equipment, as well as the organization's wholehearted moral support.

If this support is not immediately forthcoming, we should pull out of Korea, and pull out now.

So much for Korea.

Should this vote demonstrate, as now seems the case, that India and the Arab States, fronting for Britain, have captured the United Nations, to use it to serve their own selfish ends, let them have it. But let them support the empty shell that is left with their own money, without the United States as a member.

We cannot afford to be a party to so base a betrayal of the Charter to which we subscribed with such high hopes.

We should demand an immediate showdown in this issue.

The roll call on this question will be useful to us in deciding on our future relationships in the struggle against international communism. We cannot afford to go along with any nation which is willing to compromise with it. This is the time to ask them to stand up and be counted.

The stipulations in the Red's counterproposal to the United Nations' confessed willingness to sell out to them are so arrogant and insulting that they could only have been intended to humiliate the organization. The Communists not only name the members of the United Nations with whom they are willing to meet but insist that the representatives of those nations must come to China to see them.

Having arranged a set-up in which they would have an assured majority, the Reds demanded a free hand in Korea and withdrawal of all protection from Formosa, as well as the United Nations seat they were offered. This would be unconditional surrender, with the surrender given on Chinese soil, and delivered on bended knee.

Thus the appeasers have convinced Mai Tse-tung that he is a modern Genghis Khan, who can write his own ticket.

We should have no part of this ridiculous farce.

We should break, and break clean, with this whole situation and do it now.

But this break will come only if the American people demand it.

No such forthright action can be expected under the leadership of Secretary of State Acheson. He has worked throughout his tenure to bring about a situation where the Peiping Reds would be recognised as the legal government of China.

He has been willing to sacrifice the only friends we have in Asia with an army ready and willing to fight the Communists—the Chinese Nationalists. And the British have very good reasons for regarding him as the

best American Secretary of State Britain ever has had.

Mr. Acheson has repudiated the Reds' counterproposal in this instance, to be sure. But he is the same man who only last week consented to a deal which would have given them a seat in the United Nations and Formosa as a reward for their treachery.

If there has been any change in his attitude toward the over-all Communist problem in Asia, he has yet to reveal it by any positive action.

The only way to save this situation is to get him out of office, and this will be done only if the American people demand it with a voice which cannot be denied.

The UN Should Get All in or All Out of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, while the so-called statesmen of the United Nations debate what should be done about Korea, American boys are being maimed for life and dying there.

An editorial in the Chehalis Advocate, of Chehalis, Wash., shows how this so-called police action affects the life of one American boy—a story that could be repeated 45,000 times for that is the number of our Korean casualties.

While the so-called UN statesmen debated, this Chehalis boy, Pfc. Clyde Kennison, lost his foot in Korea which caused Don Ingraham, the editor of that newspaper, very appropriately to remark editorially that "The United Nations either should get all in or all out of Korea immediately."

Editor Ingraham's editorial from the Bee Nugget follows:

Pfc. Edwin C. (Clyde) Kennison, of Napavine, is home.

Clyde hasn't been away very long, just a little more than a year to be exact. But a lot has happened to him since he enlisted in the Marine Corps January 13, 1950.

First, he was sent to San Diego, Calif., where he got about 6 months of recruit training and that first stripe. By July he was in Korea helping the United Nations "police force" stem the tide of North Korean aggression.

Then, in August, he was in Japan recovering in a base hospital from a head wound suffered in the intense fighting in South Korea. By October, Clyde was back in action in Korea.

Now Clyde Kennison is home. He isn't back with his folks, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Woosley, of Napavine, yet, but he will be soon. Right now he's in the United States naval hospital at Mare Island. Last week doctors amputated his frozen left foot. They said his right foot probably would be all right although it, too, was badly frozen.

Clyde Kennison has been in the service only a year. It hardly seems possible that all this could have happened to him in such a short period of time. Why, it was only a couple of years ago that he was playing football for Chehalis High School.

Private First Class Kennison is a victim of policy, the policy this Nation is following in allowing its youth to be expendable. He, and thousands like him, from Lewis Counties all over America, have been sent out to fight and die in a half-way war. A war which our leaders do not choose to call by that name and refuse to allow to be fought in an all-out manner. We are engaged in a "police action." The enemy is engaged in total war.

The United Nations either should get all in or all out of Korea immediately. This country must not allow its men to be sacrificed while statesmen debate the advisability of permitting planes to bomb Communist China or of turning Nationalist Chinese troops on Formosa loose on the enemy.

Clyde Kennison has not been gone long, but he has been gone much too long to fight the type of war we are carrying on in Korea.

Re Panama Canal: Modern Weapons and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of my remarks in the RECORD of March 16, 1950, I included a condensation of a book on Modern Arms and Free Men, by Dr. Vannevar Bush, as published in the February 1950 edition of the Reader's Digest. In my remarks I stressed the application of Dr. Bush's ideas to the problems involved in the defense of the Panama Canal, or any other interoceanic waterway which may be constructed.

Another most timely article by Dr. Bush, entitled "The Weapons We Need for Freedom," was published in the January 1951 issue of the Reader's Digest. This paper is accompanied by the following biographical sketch of its distinguished author:

Vannevar Bush, former vice president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and dean of its School of Engineering, is one of America's foremost scientific military authorities. During World War II Dr. Bush was director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which coordinated the work of 30,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians, and was closely associated with the atom-bomb project. He is now president of the Carnegie Institute of Washington.

Dr. Bush, in the present instance, develops more fully the conclusions arrived at in his February 1950 thesis, applicable not only to the problems of defense of interoceanic canals but also to defense problems generally. He emphasizes that the solutions of such questions are never static between the weapons of offense and defense, and at this time those of defense appear to be in the ascendant, with the resulting tendency toward a deadlock on land.

This contribution should go far toward the maintenance of disciplined thinking on defense problems and the avoidance of hysteria. It emphasizes the point I have repeatedly tried to stress to the Congress, viz, that the defense of any part of the United States, including its industrial capacity, transportation systems, ports, and canals, is an over-all governmental responsibility of the Federal Government. It depends primarily upon active defense medium of our Armed Forces and not upon inherent features of design.

The full text follows:

THE WEAPONS WE NEED FOR FREEDOM
(By Vannevar Bush)

The grim events in Korea have aroused the United States and the rest of the free world from a perilous quietude. While we are now appalled at the cost in lives and treasure, the Red aggression in that country may prove in the long run to be a godsend, for it has served final notice that the Kremlin is bent on world conquest—by armed force, if need be.

If the free world fully heeds the notice—takes account of stock, ferrets out and corrects errors, pushes ahead full steam on sound lines, and keeps it economic balance—we can be ready for the eventuality of all-out war. Indeed, if we are ready, there probably will be no all-out war. It is a question first whether there is time for preparation, and second, whether we take full advantage of it. Hence we need to evaluate the means and techniques we will use if forced to fight with our full strength.

On military research and development we have not done badly, but we need to do better and to do it much faster. There is a race between offensive and defensive techniques in every field, especially in that of strategic bombing. We need to be in the lead both in means of stopping enemy bombers and in means of penetrating enemy defenses. There is a decided possibility that the defense may catch up, that radar warning nets, anti-aircraft artillery, ground-controlled interception utilizing jet-propelled aircraft, and ground-to-air missiles may make it increasingly impractical to penetrate to prime targets.

We must credit Russia with the ability to progress rapidly with all these. If the Red hierarchy becomes able, at some future date, to prevent the delivery of atom bombs onto its great industrial and administrative centers, the danger point will have arrived. At that time we must be able to stop their armies and to protect our own centers.

The ground-to-air guided missile promises to be the key weapon in a system of defense against high-altitude bombing. Traveling at bullet speed along a radar beam, carrying a heavy charge and a proximity fuse, such a weapon against the high-flying bomber can be deadly. It is not here yet, in quantity and tested reliability, but it can be, and it offers the greatest promise of the comparative immunity of key centers to high-altitude bombing. We should not let anything stand in the way of bringing it to full fruition at an early date.

While our means of strategic bombing have been well delevoped, neither we nor our allies are properly equipped with tactical air power. It is well accepted that when great armies clash on a well-defended line tactical air in quantity is essential to success. Russia has profited from the many examples of this in the last war, and has built tactical air extensively.

Our Navy and our Marines have their own air support for their missions. Our Army depends upon the Air Force for its tactical air support. It does not now have what it needs to do its job, in spite of the magnificent effort of the Air Force in Korea, for most of that was conducted with planes not specifically designed for the purpose. We must correct this defect as rapidly as the inevitable delays of construction will allow. There is no doubt that the Air Force, now facing the facts squarely, can meet the need, and will, with full support. With our support, our allies can do much, for they can build as well as we can, and less expensively.

The time may come when strategic air operations, even with the A-bomb or the possible H-bomb of the future, will not pay out. Any operation in war to be successful must do more vital damage to the enemy than it costs in men and treasure. If that day comes, and long before, we need to think of the A-bomb as a tactical weapon to stop great armies. It may even be true that we would be nearer right, all things considered, to think in these terms today. The tactical use of the A-bomb to break up concentrations of tanks, artillery, and masses of men may, in the long run, be more important than its strategical use. It would certainly be more salutary for the world.

The United States, at the end of the war, succeeded the British Empire as the world's greatest sea power—greatest in terms of a type of past warfare that will not come again. It may well be that World War II was the last in which the clash of great fleets will be a determinant, or in which the operation of great aircraft carriers will be of primary importance. We must face, if we fight a major war in the not too remote future, fleets of undersea craft, fast and of long endurance, armed with extraordinarily deadly weapons—torpedoes of greater range, speed, and subtlety than the world has hitherto known. We face attacks on our merchant fleet by guided bombs from the air. We face the modern submarine mine, which is exceedingly difficult to sweep. Mines placed from the air, arranged so that they can be swept only with enormous effort, vastly increase the power of an enemy to deny us ports. Air attack on shipping has potent aids in rocket weapons and guided bombs.

It is essential to our success in war that we maintain our transport over the seas. The Navy's mission is as important as ever, and its task is far more difficult, but this task has changed radically. We no longer build battleships to fight battleships. There is much question whether great carriers are now worth the cost of building, maintaining, and supporting them. The small carrier certainly has its place, to take air power to remote places and to fight submarines, and we may come to mosquito fleets of all sorts—agile, versatile, and hard to hit by torpedo or bomb.

A great part of the equipment with which we fought submarines in the past war was rendered obsolete when a torpedo appeared that could outrange underwater sound-detecting apparatus, and could home on its target by various means. The snorkel and the high-speed submarine, important though they are, are lesser threats than this.

The day of the convoy may be over, and we certainly need to develop and build in quantity cargo carriers of such speeds at sea as to be immune to submarine attacks, and means such as we used at Normandy to land cargo in spite of mines. There is no point in discussing airlift when millions of tons of cargo must be moved thousands of miles, if it can be done by fast cargo ships virtually immune to submarine attack.

The outlook for sea warfare is not all one-sided; there are many answers to the threats, many devices already built or capable of development; many ways of going on the offensive against the submarine, and of bringing down mine-laying or bombing aircraft, many devices in fact that have not been described and will not be mentioned here. It is against all these threats to our sea communications that the reorientation of our naval program inevitably must be directed.

Land warfare with mechanized armies, communication nets, radar-controlled guns and rocket-carrying aircraft is an extremely complex affair, fully as much so as war in the air or on the sea. It demands for success, therefore, active efforts in research, development, procurement, training, and the use of the most advanced weapons. A striking illustration of this matter is that of antitank defense. There has appeared a new antitank weapon of great power which can in time render the heavy tank largely obsolete. This is important, for the Russians are said to have 40,000 tanks, many of them heavies. Their whole doctrine of land warfare revolves about tanks and massed artillery to prepare the way.

But the day is coming when it will no longer pay to build heavy tanks, because they will be too vulnerable. And if they become practically obsolete our potential enemy will have to do a lot of reorientation and reequipping, which would probably take years.

The new antitank weapon is based on the principle of the shaped charge,[1] whose virtue is that it can penetrate a surprising thickness of armor—in fact, any armor a tank can carry. During World War II the bazooka fired a rocket which carried a shaped-charge projectile, and we have since built superbazookas which have been useful in Korea. We also have aircraft rockets that use shaped charges.

The trouble with the bazooka is that it is of short range and inaccurate. But a shaped-charge projectile has now been built that can be fired from a high-velocity gun, which can hit a moving tank at 1,500 yards with high probability of scoring with the first shot. Moreover, this type of projectile can be combined with the inexpensive recoilless gun which can be carried by a jeep or used as a squad weapon. About 200 such guns can be built for the cost of 1 heavy tank. They can also be built efficiently by our allies. The race between guns and armor has taken a sharp turn in favor of defense.

There are other opportunities for the sort of ingenuity and enterprise that produced this advance in antitank artillery. Land mines and means for laying them offer defensive possibilities. Defense against low-flying aircraft is full of chances for progress.

Such are some of the main lines of the change in weapons and techniques of war during the past 5 years.

We are now awake to the threats. We must move far and fast and use to the utmost the time that is still ours. Thus, if there comes another all-out war, can we and our allies defend the free world with confidence. Thus indeed may we hope to prevent an all-out war from occurring at all.

Fiftieth Anniversary, Division 18, AOH, Salem, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered at the fiftieth anniversary banquet, Sunday, January 21, 1951, of Division 18, Ancient Order of Hibernians:

Greetings: The Irish have come a long way in the first half of the twentieth century, both in the homeland that is called the Emerald Isle and in the sanctuary that we love and cherish as the United States of America.

It is no mere coincidence that our people have fought to win and to protect freedom, not only in the two countries that rank highest in our affections, but have also given so generously in life and in treasure helping other people to win their independence.

For the Irish have the sublime courage born of their sturdy Christian faith which practices its belief in the dignity and equality of all mankind as God ordained.

We resent injustice and cruelty in any form.

Perhaps that is why it is so difficult for us to forget the indignities and the sufferings that were forced upon our ancestors in the last century.

In the history of the Irish you will find that they were persecuted, time and time again, but you will never find that they were guilty of aggression against other races or creeds. They asked only to live their own lives in neighborliness with others.

The Irish believe that their land was first peopled by Greeks and others, a thousand years before the birth of Christ. About 500 B. C., some Celtic adventurers crossed into Ireland and conquered the natives. They brought with them that strong sense of kinship that left its mark on the Irish character. The relatives who made up the clan were considered as far more important than any state, and the men of Erin fought at the drop of a hat to protect the family unit from encroachment by any larger form of social organization. Before the coming of St. Patrick, good Irishmen after death were buried upright with faces turned toward their foes, ready for battle.

Christianity had come to Ireland a few years before Patrick, but the honor of converting Ireland to the faith which she has supported with complete loyalty, belongs to her patron saint.

St. Patrick was born in England, about 389, and as the son of a Roman citizen, he was named Patricius. As he grew up he studied the Bible with such persistence that he could quote much of it from memory. After he was captured by raiders and taken to Ireland, conversion came to him. His piety was all-consuming. Every day before dawn he got up and went outdoors and raised his eyes toward heaven. There were no rain checks in his devotion. Snow, cold, or storms were never permitted to interfere with his daily prayers.

Later, after much travel and study, he was made a priest. In 432 he became a bishop and was sent back to Ireland. From the Confessions he wrote toward the close of his life, we learn that on 12 different occasions he was seized by the pagan Druids and that each time he was in mortal peril. That he was saved to go on with his divine work was due to his confidence and his faith. He drew to his side countless men and women who dedicated their lives to spreading the good news that man was redeemed. His teaching was handed down from generation to generation with the result that the Irish consider it the highest of honors for their sons and daughters to take up the religious vocation. No other saint could match him in this, that alone he had converted a nation.

In the three centuries after the coming of Christianity Ireland became famous as the island of doctors and saints. Culturally, it was more advanced than any other nation north of the Pyrenees and the Alps.

There was such a thirst for education that poor scholars whose parents could not support them were educated by public funds. Most students were studying for the priesthood, for which mothers and fathers cheerfully worked themselves to the bone, happy in the knowledge that they were making the finest sacrifice of all.

The high achievement of Irish art in this period was the Book of Kells, the four gospels

[1] A shaped charge is a piece of high explosive with a depression, usually cone-shaped, molded into its face. When the explosion occurs, the depression focuses the blast into a small, highly penetrating jet. The action is similar in some ways to that of a concave mirror in focusing the sun's rays to produce intense heat.

in vellum, done by Irish monks in the ninth century. Nothing in Christian illuminated manuscripts can equal this prized possession of Trinity College in Dublin, which has been called "the work of angels masquerading as men."

As early as the year 748, an Irish monk, St. Fergil, suggested the possibility of another world and other men under the earth. Centuries after, Magellan sailed around the world, thereby vindicating the ability of the Irish to look ahead. For the rich imagination of this gifted race is not the least among its many talents.

There are few children whose lives are as eager and adventurous as those of the Irish, peopling the woods and the night with wonderful creatures of their own invention. A nation of individuals, kind and hearty in the rural loveliness of their land, and so full of life that it overflows into dreams that feed the stories, the poetry and the music of the world.

Brian-Boru, Emmet, Parnell, O'Connell, the martyrs of Easter Week, 1916, DeValera, Cosgrave, these are but a few in the long litany of great-souled Irish men and women who never surrendered to appeasement. Their passion for independence was twin to their supreme religious faith.

Would that Ireland were a member of the United Nations, to strengthen that organization with its high principle and its unyielding courage.

The international airport at Shannon and the big hydroelectric plant in County Limerick which provides cheap light, heat, and power for homes and industries throughout the land are examples of the progressive spirit that stirs in the newly emancipated nation.

You and I are proud of our forebears and the land that gave them birth. And we are proud of the outstanding contributions they have made and are making to the growth of our American civilization. For the United States was a natural home for the Irish, giving them the opportunity to develop the talents that are the genius of the race.

Wherever you scratch an American, from GI to President, you are more apt to strike a strain of rich Irish blood, for we are everywhere in the land and have been there from the start.

For proof, let us take a British source, which cannot be accused of favoritism toward the Irish.

On April 2, 1784, Lord Mountjoy, speaking to the English House of Commons said, and I quote: "I am assured, from the best authority, that the major part of the American Army (in the Revolutionary War) was composed of Irish. It was their valor that determined the contest. America was lost to us because of the Irish immigrants."

We realize, of course, that all peoples have made a contribution to the building of America, but on this special occasion we mean to high light the truly remarkable services rendered by the men and women of the Emerald Isle in making the American dream come true.

I must admit that I was surprised and pleased to discover that of the 3,000,000 population of the Colonies in 1775 about 1,000,000 were Irish. As we go down the names on the muster rolls of Washington's Army, we find that over 38 percent were as Hibernian as those to be found here tonight. This does not include many others who were part Irish.

From Concord to Korea, the honor roll of American heroes is star-studded with names as Irish as the shamrock. From Commodore Barry, father of the American Navy, to "Lightning" Joe Collins, present Chief of Staff of the United States Army, they lead the parade. Reverently, because it represents the summit of sacrifice, we recall the five Sullivan brothers who went down fighting with the cruiser *Juneau* in the battle of Guadalcanal. In the pages of American history you will find no greater giving than theirs.

Our people have been conspicuous, not only in defense of the United States, but as builders of its railroads, its schools, its factories, and its political institutions.

The freedom of the new land was made to order for the individualism of the Irish spirit and its ability to harmonize it with social order through the instrument of self-government.

Up New Hampshire way they tell this story, which is an example of the confident hopes and plans of the Irish for their future in the New World.

It seems that Margery Browne, from County Cork, was asked by a fellow passenger on the boat what she intended to do when she reached the Colonies. Without a moment's hesitation she replied:

"Raise governors for thim, to be sure."

Margery was as good as her word. She married John Sullivan, a schoolmaster, formerly of Limerick. In her old age, Margery Browne Sullivan used to say she had known what it was to do a man's work in the fields, "carrying in my arms the Governor of Massachusetts, with the Governor of New Hampshire tagging at my skirts."

Her son John grew up to become a celebrated general who, when the war was over, also knew how to maneuver his way in political campaigns. He became Governor of New Hampshire in 1786. His brother James, not to be outdone, became Governor of Massachusetts in 1807.

As political organizers, our people stand in a class by themselves. It is taken for granted that no one but an Irishman need apply for the position as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In time the Republican Party will match this wisdom, and then their fortunes will undoubtedly improve.

As labor leaders, and as manufacturers, as judges, artists, and scientists, the ability of the race makes its presence and its creative power felt in the multiple human endeavors that fill the American scene.

In New England, we can point to tremendous progress during the past 50 years.

The active and inspiring teamwork of clergy and laity has accomplished wonders. Schools and colleges and hospitals dot the region as living testimony to the culture and good works without which our people would not regard their lives as meaningful.

What a noble Irishwoman—Charlotte Grace O'Brien—thought of her people was described by her in these words written in 1905:

"What nation has for ages made the greatest personal sacrifice for its religious life? The Irish. What nation has maintained purity of marriage? The Irish. What nation has humbly sanctified its family life through prayer and religion? The Irish. What nation has more tenderly regarded its duties to the ties of family love than these poor Irish?"

From this tribute she goes on through the Gospel Beatitudes to prove that the happy and friendly people from the green isle are blessed in the very ways that were pointed out by our Lord.

Because we are Hibernians, we treasure this legacy from the old country, and it is our purpose to keep these values alive in the new world.

As a man honors his father and his mother, so do we honor the land of our forefathers, whence we draw the life and the faith and the freedoms that we enjoy today.

There will always be a soft spot in our hearts for the "old sod," a pride and affection that we will transmit to the generations that will follow us.

In gratitude we will work, as we have always worked, to bring about the unification of Ireland, and for the day when it will win its rightful place in the councils of the United Nations.

Civilization falters, but it does not fail.

The history of Ireland is proof that no tyranny can crush a brave people. Centuries have come and gone since that golden age when she was the light of the world, teaching mankind the truths of this life and the faith in that eternal life for which this journey is but the preparation. Through countless decades her people suffered oppression that would have crushed a less hardy race. But the miracle of it is that the faith grew stronger with every indignity that it had to bear.

Today most of Ireland is free and independent.

And the complete redemption of all her counties is not far distant.

How Fair Is the Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article entitled "How Fair Is the Draft?" culled from the pages of Nation's Business of January 1951.

Today, with so much agitation over the question of drafting 18-year-old boys, it is well to have an enlightened statement such as this. It proves the short-sightedness of our military leaders in their attempt to get a 3,500,000 armed force. I suggest that the proponents of the 18-year-old draft approach the President's Committee on National Employ-the-Physically-Handicapped Week and the Vocational Rehabilitation Office for information on what can be done by handicapped people. It seems that our friends in the armed services are behind the times. Perfect physical specimens are needed where combat or arduous work are required, but not for the vast number of sedentary occupations in the Army.

HOW FAIR IS THE DRAFT?

(By Stanley Frank)

We can't say we haven't been warned. Complacency verging on arrogance cost us irretrievable lives and time during the last war and a hang-over of the same attitude is setti· g us up for another crisis all over again. President Truman had good firepower but erratic aim on October 25 when he called the high rejection rate of men found physically or mentally unfit in the draft "a disgrace to the richest Nation in the world." The President, referring to World War II statistics, mentioned a rejection rate of 34 percent—actually, it was 35.8 percent—but newspapers carrying his speech told a more alarming story.

Reports from local selective-service boards throughout the country revealed that 45 to 80 percent of the men called up since Korea had been turned down by the Army. The implication was clear: The draft was in trouble. The United States, committed by act of Congress and the North Atlantic Pact to a Defense Establishment of 3,000,000 men by June 1951, would fall far short of its objective.

Something, obviously, is wrong. Americans are the best fed, clothed, and housed,

the most thoroughly doctored and scrubbed people on the face of the earth. There is a direct correlation between a high standard of living and physical vigor and mental stability, but the figures don't add up. By our own admission, one young man in every three is a pantywaist or a psychoneurotic.

We must be better than the figures say we are. If we were not, we would have been licked decisively in two bloody wars. We are not as good, however, as the big wheels in the Pentagon think we are. A military axiom holds that a nation, or a coalition, faces certain defeat when one third of its forces in the field is eliminated by casualties. The United States is undermining its security by eliminating one third of its available manpower before uniforms are issued. That policy inevitably will catch up with us when, for the first time in our history, we and our allies are opposed by an enemy numerically stronger. It will be too late then to correct mistakes. Second chances are buried in the rubble that mounts with the increasing fury of all-out-war.

Who says one third of our young men are unfit to serve in the Armed Forces? The answer will come as a surprise to most citizens. The Armed Forces, which arbitrarily establish their own criteria, say so. The Army, Navy, and Air Force which, like all military organizations from time immemorial, complain—perhaps justifiably—that they do not have enough of everything they need, say they cannot use one youth in every three. And what is the basis for this strange contention?

Now we are getting to the heart of the matter and the answer no longer can remain unchallenged. The Armed Forces of the United States insist on regarding every recruit as a potential combat man. It is a concept as archaic as a cavalry charge with drawn sabers and as unrealistic as an umbrella in an air raid, yet our military leaders continue to adhere to it despite the experience of disastrous consequences. Their own elaborate tables of organization prove that the idea of training every volunteer and conscript for front-line fighting is utter nonsense.

The old saw to the effect that 20 men are needed behind the guy with the rifle is not a rule of thumb. Less than 5 percent of all the men in the Armed Forces in the last war saw, much less engaged, the enemy in combat. No more than 15 percent ever heard a shot fired in anger. Even in an infantry division fewer than half the troops are assigned to rifle companies. The overwhelming bulk of men in every army, navy, and air force, especially the American, is occupied with logistics and the technical aspects of modern war, a trend highlighted in startling fashion by comparisons of World Wars I and II. The total United States Army mobilized in April 1945 was more than twice as large as that mobilized in November 1918, but the strength of combatant ground forces was just about the same.

Another lucid example of the same sort of thing, but on a lower level, comes from Gen. Mark W. Clark, the Army field forces chief. The general has estimated that an infantry division of 19,000 men under the present set-up probably would call for 60,000 to handle the rear area service activities. The Red army has only five to six thousand backers-up per combat division.

What were all noncombatant GI's doing during the last war? They were hauling supplies, driving and maintaining vehicles, handling communications, sorting mail, making propaganda, guarding installations and supply lines, cooking chow, administering liberated and conquered territory, planning future operations, and keeping records in triplicate for still others to file. The million and one details that, while not so dangerous, were just as necessary to supply and maintain riflemen, tanks, ships, and planes, employed 95 percent of the men in uniform.

Few of those rear-echelon jobs required top physical condition, and every military organization in the world except the United States, has recognized that fact. The United States alone accepts only first-rate physical specimens, regardless of their eventual assignments. The result, of course, is that such men are diverted from the front lines, where strength and stamina are needed, to duties that can be discharged satisfactorily by the majority of men who are rejected.

No other nation is deluded by what Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, calls a philosophy of abundance—a polite way of saying the United States is dissipating its manpower with an overconfidence that smacks of insolence. Every other country, friendly or hostile, has three to seven classifications for conscripts according to physical capabilities. They operate on the theory that a job can be found in the service for any man of military age who is gainfully employed in civilian life. The United States takes men who qualify only for combat and discards the millions who can be competent clerks, truck drivers, mechanics, guards, cooks, and technical specialists.

Despite the manpower shortage, there still is not a general limited-service classification for draftees in the Army, the only branch now drawing on selective service to meet its authorized strength. The Navy and Air Force are getting enough volunteers to fill their needs, although they shortly will feel the pinch of expansion. The tragic lessons of the last war have been forgotten or ignored. We were at war for nearly 2 years in 1943 before all three branches agreed, reluctantly, to accept men who did not measure up to their physical and mental standards for combat. It was a short-sighted policy that eventually cost lives and unquestionably delayed the successful prosecution of the war.

As early as September 1942 the Army Ground Forces were short 330,000 men; the Services of Supply, 84,000; the Air Force, 103,000; and the mushrooming Navy was severely strapped. In June 1943 the manpower situation was so acute that 500,000 men were dropped from the proposed strength of the Army. Only then did our military authorities scrape the bottom of the barrel—as they condescendingly called it—but it already was too late. Three months after the invasion of Normandy, rear echelons were combed frantically and their rugged men in desk and administrative jobs were rushed to the front. GI's were sent into combat with insufficient training; a calculated risk—a euphemism for lines stretched to the breaking point—led to the Battle of the Bulge and the largest number of casualties suffered by American forces in any 10-day period of the war.

It would be fine if every young American in uniform could tear down a brick wall with his bare hands after a 20-mile march with a full pack. It would be even more wonderful if no young American had to wear a uniform at all, but such wishful thinking is as dangerous as the first hypothesis. We cannot afford the luxury of either one. The facts in the case are uncompromising and inescapable.

To maintain a defense establishment of 3,000,000 men, 800,000 new men a year are needed to fill the gaps left by completed tours of duty. During the 1940's, some 1,200,000 men reached the draft age every year. The United States then was cashing in on the prosperity of the 1920's, which, as always is the case in good times, produced a high birth rate. But this year, and every year until 1957—the most critical period of our relations with Russia, according to military and diplomatic authorities—fewer than 1,000,000 men will turn 18. We now are getting into the depression babies of the 1930's, when the birth rate fell to an all-time low.

You can't beat the percentages. If one third of the 1,000,000 youths reaching military age are rejected, the United States will not have the 800,000 recruits needed every year to keep its Armed Forces at the minimum level needed for the Nation's security—and the situation will get progressively worse, of course.

And that does not take into account the indeterminate, but large, number of talented young men who must be deferred for scientific and cultural study in college. We need them as much as combat troops to remain vibrant and progressive. A blanket deferment cannot be given, however, to every boy who wants to go to college. That will arouse justified criticism of a "poor man's draft." In these days of rising tuitions and increasing strains on self-sacrificing parents, college is, more than ever, an economic hardship. To excuse from military service every boy who can buy safety behind ivy will lead inevitably to the widespread abuses of the Civil War, when northern conscripts hired stand-ins for $300.

A committee of educators and professional men appointed by Hershey to make a 2-year study of the problem recently submitted a plan that proposes to give all high-school graduates aptitude tests and grant educational deferments to those in the upper 25 percent. If a boy cannot pay for college, he would be provided with a Federal scholarship. If boys so deferred do not maintain high grades in college the draft would get them.

There is another condition. After completing their educations, the bright boys must go into work that is "essential to the national health, safety, or interest." Doctors, teachers, physicists, chemists, and engineers fall into that category, along with economists, political scientists, and trained specialists in Slavic and Oriental cultures. But there is to be no deferment for dilettantes.

A quick estimate of the physical and academic deferments leaves a manpower deficit of at least 250,000 annually. Those are the harsh facts.

What is the solution? Reduce the strength of the Armed Forces? That's unthinkable in the present political climate. Expand the 19-to-26 age limit of the draft? The net will catch only veterans of World War II, who already have discharged honorably their obligation to the country. It is unfair to expose these men to double jeopardy. Uprooting them again will dislocate severely the Nation's economy, to say nothing of the emotional strains married men and their families will suffer. Lower the draft age to 18? That will solve nothing after the first year.

There is an easy, effective, and equitable solution. The chief drain on our military manpower pool is the rejection rate for physical and mental deficiencies. (Forget the 45 to 80 percent rates reported after the Korean campaign stepped up selective-service quotas. Half the men in the 19-26 age group were rejected during World War II. Exemptions for military service already rendered and enlistments accepted, not included in the statistics, threw the figures of last summer completely out of line.) Since the standards are substantially the same as in the last war, it is reasonable to assume that about 35 percent of the men coming up will be declared unfit again.

We cannot afford to eliminate one young man in every three. We need not lose more than 300,000 men a year if a reform, dictated by logic and necessity, is adopted.

The physical standards for induction must be lowered. It can be done without impairing the efficiency of the Armed Forces by the simple expedient of junking the outmoded notion that every conscript must qualify for combat.

Dr. Henry H. Kessler, who was in charge of the rehabilitation program at Mare Island in California during the war, believes 75 percent of the men rejected can be used for general—not limited—service if the present physical standards are lowered.

"It can be accomplished without fuss or bother," Dr. Kessler says, "in 6 to 8 weeks during regular boot training."

Dr. Howard W. Rush, chief of the Convalescent Service during World War II, mentioned on July 22, 1950, some specific jobs industry has found for the physically handicapped. "Dwarfs proved invaluable in the construction of airplane wings; paraplegics produced precision instruments; the blind proved that many assembly lines are operated as well by touch as by sight; the deaf showed that inability to hear can be minimized by written instruction, and cripples of every sort more than pulled their weight."

Look at some of the more common reasons for disqualification the Army still is applying in the current draft. A man is rejected if his feet are not good enough for marching. No consideration is given to the proposition that the man can be used in a desk job that involves walking only to the nearest filing cabinet, mess hall, and washroom. The minimum height requirement for the Armed Forces is 5 feet, 2 inches and the maximum is 6 feet 6. Lack of height is a definite asset to a mechanic in the cramped quarters of a tank, a jeep motor, or the fuselage of a plane. Excessive height can facilitate the handling of supplies in a quartermaster depot.

Men with perforated eardrums are rejected because poison gas is fatal to them. Gas has not been used as a weapon since World War I. Men who cannot see at 20 feet what normal vision sees at 400 feet are rejected. Sounds reasonable until you consider that visibility of 24 inches is all that is required to operate a typewriter.

The thousands of professional athletes who were classified IV–F during the war and continued making muscles provoked so much criticism among servicemen and their families that the Army made an official study of such exemptions. It was found that the majority of them were deferred for trick knees.

"Those fellows would be a liability on the battlefield if they threw their knees out of joint," an Army spokesman commented.

"Suppose they popped a cartilage in the Pentagon?" I asked.

The man changed the subject.

The United States would have no manpower crises, no agonizing shortages of combat troops, if an effort were made to use, rather than discard, every youth regardless of physical handicaps. Like all generalizations, this one must be modified. Although spastics and paraplegics can work in offices and release men for more rigorous duty, the problem of transporting and caring for them might tie up more fit personnel than were replaced. Men who must have special diets for organic gastric ailments also might complicate Army routine. Severe heart cases and a few other categories would have to be deferred. But as a basic proposition, every man of military age—the one material resource we cannot roll off assembly lines, for all our productive genius—able to live a normal life in civilian society should have a place in the Armed Forces.

Military people will howl. They will argue that establishing several classifications for physical capabilities demands as many different training programs. So what? Other countries do it. Sure, it means a lot of staff work. So what? For that matter, it is a palpable waste of time and money to give everyone under arms the intense training for combat only 5 percent needs. Further, setting up limited-service components to take care of supply, housekeeping, and bookkeeping chores will enable the brass to train more thoroughly the men who do the actual fighting.

Apart from military expediency, there is an equally strong recommendation for selective service that combines less selectivity with more service. Civilian confidence in the draft as a democratic, impartial process will get a boost.

There will be less uncertainty, less finagling for occupational deferments if every young man knows he has an unpleasant, but necessary, obligation to perform. As General Hershey says, "I haven't seen a draft questionnaire yet in which the guy said he shot people for a living." There will be less griping in the Armed Forces if everyone knows he is in the same boat with all other members of his generation.

History has conferred few favors on a generation born in depression, weaned on upheaval, and maturing now in the shadow of another war. It's tough to be 19 in the sixth decade of the twentieth century, but the very law that imposes sacrifices on a boy contains certain key words which are his only hope for the future. The law, enacted on June 24, 1948, reads:

"The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy."

The key words are, of course, "security," "free society," "obligations and privileges," and "fair and just."

Communism and American Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on August 25, 1950, a very distinguished citizen of my home city, Mr. Dave Beck, executive vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, made an address on the subject Communism and American Labor Unions, before the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco. I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately three pages of the RECORD at a cost of $246.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

COMMUNISM AND AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS—HONORABLE DEALING BETWEEN LABOR AND INDUSTRY THE SOLUTION

(By Dave Beck, executive vice president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, I am delighted to discuss with you today the subject of communism and American labor unions. Communism is not solely the problem of labor, however. As you know in the State of California, it is also a problem within our universities and in many other segments of our social and economic life.

All of us are deeply interested in meeting the problem posed by communism in America, and throughout the world. If we are to do this, however, we must first understand the reasons for the spread of communistic doctrine, how it is propagated, and to whom it makes its appeal. It will not help us to shift the responsibility, for personal advantage, to the shoulders of either labor or industry.

The organization with which I am identified, and which I have served for so many years, is the largest labor union in the world. It has a membership of more than a million men and women. It is made up largely, if not entirely, of people who are classified as unskilled. Yet we have no problem whatever with communism.

There must be a reason for this fact. It is because for more than 30 years in the history of our international union, its basic constitution—the law of the union—provided that a Communist shall not be eligible to membership. At our last national convention, here in San Francisco in 1947, we further clarified and broadened that provision by barring from membership all who are affiliated or associated with subversive organizations or groups of any kind, or who advocate any subversive philosophy.

Since we are a voluntary organization, we do not require positive proof that a man is a member of the Communist Party; we must simply satisfy ourselves that he advocates the philosophy of communism. If he does this, then for all practical purposes, he is a Communist, and we do not waste time in throwing him out.

There can be no compromise between Americanism and communism. Any attempt at compromise is an admission of defeat. Surely we have had enough of appeasement, of attempting to compose differences with those whom we know to be sworn enemies of our way of life. I believe that the greatest result that can come out of the situation in Asia is that we will bring sharply home to the attention of our people this outstanding fact: That just as we must carry life insurance for the protection of our families, and fire insurance on our homes and businesses, so must we carry national insurance in the form of adequate military preparedness for our Government and our free institutions and ideals.

More than 5 years previous to the last World War, in many talks which I made before business and professional groups and service clubs, I advocated as strongly as my ability would permit, that we maintain our Army and our Navy and our Air Force at the highest possible degree of strength and efficiency, regardless of the cost. There is not a man or woman in front of me today—not one—who if confronted with the choice of losing the life of his son or contributing his entire fortune, would hesitate for an instant. Of course, he would sacrifice everything of material value he possesses for his loved ones. Yet, we hesitated then as a Nation to prepare to defend our rights and our way of life, with the result that untold thousands of our boys did not come back from that war, or returned maimed and broken in body.

So long as communism spreads its fangs across the world, we must be ready, we must be prepared to hurl the vicious beast back from our shores.

We must demand in these hours of national peril that men in positions of trust tell us truthfully where they stand on the question of communism. I have no time whatever for men in politics, or in labor, or in business, or on the faculty of any of our

universities, who refuse to take a positive stand on this question of communism.

It is a lot of tommyrot for members of university faculties to talk about interference with their academic freedom, while young Americans are making the great sacrifice on the battlefields of Korea to defeat communism and to defend free America. We are in an era of national emergency which has endured for a long, long time. World War II has not been officially ended. Thousands of men who gave up their peacetime ambitions for a period of years, who gambled their lives on the battlefields of Europe and in the South Pacific, are again being called into military service, while some of our theorists—exponents of what they pretend to call their constitutional rights—refuse to stand and be counted as Americans. They forget that the soldier, both in peace and war, lives under military law, not civil law. They blandly suppose that their rights would survive if communism should sweep this country. How wrong they are. American rights and all the liberty our forefathers fought to give us would be destroyed instantly and without trace if we were to prove unworthy to survive in this present conflict.

It was my privilege to travel to Europe a year ago and to speak as a representative of the American Federation of Labor before the British Trades Union Congress, and to visit some of the countries on the eastern side of the Atlantic. I had a private audience with the Pope at his summer palace near Rome. We discussed the problem of communism. I also conferred at some length on the same subject with Bishop O'Connor, who heads the North American University in Rome, one of the outstanding schools for the development of young men for the priesthood.

Both the Pope and Bishop O'Connor stated that it was where the common people were struggling against direst poverty that communism made its greatest advances.

Later we drove through the streets of Rome on a hot afternoon, just as the day was coming to a close, and we could look into the houses and see where 15 to 20 lived in absolute squalor in a single room. Down in Naples, as well as elsewhere in Europe where communism seemed to thrive, we found the same appalling conditions, and we could then understand something of the problem of communism and how it could appeal to those people. There indeed was a fertile breeding place for ideas which appeal to desperate men, to men who have lost their hope and their faith in themselves and in the future.

But these facts do not excuse men and women in American labor for tolerating communism. There is no such fertile ground here for the propagation of the Moscow doctrine.

The problem of communism in America is one which labor and capital must solve jointly. We are making definite and steady progress in this country toward the solution of the other problems of capital and labor. There is a constantly improving standard of living here.

If we want the truth, and I am sure that we do want the truth, we must not judge men and women in any phase of our social, economic, and business life by the actions of an individual, or of a few misguided individuals. We must judge industry as well as labor by the character and the conduct of the overwhelming majority. I can say to you positively, because I know whereof I speak: the working men and women of America want no part of communism whatever.

My friends, the strongest bulwark to restrain the sweep of communism must come from within labor. You cannot find Communists in the membership of the Kiwanis Club, or the Rotary Club, or the Lion's Club, or the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. Why? Because you people and others in similar organizations are financially successful. You enjoy a standard of living, you and your families and your associates, that does not permit the seeds of communism to take root. You and your families and your friends may not be wealthy but you are a long, long way from poverty.

We must recognize the fact, both in labor and elsewhere in America, that many of the evils, which once were destructive of our standards of living, and which made possible the fetid breeding grounds for communism, are no longer tolerated.

As we right the old wrongs and as we banish forever the ancient evils of squalor and poverty and substandard living, we will sound the death knell of communism in this country.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not lay the responsibility for communism and its growth in the lap of industry, because I know that men in labor, men in high place in labor, also have tolerated communism and have courted it. Neither do I condemn those who change their minds, and abandon that false philosophy, or any other evil doctrine. We are all members of this human family and we can all err.

Yes; there have been men in high places in labor who put their arms around the Communists and welcomed them, back in 1934, and even in later years. There was Philip Murray, for instance, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Walter Reuther, of the Auto Workers. There were also many others whom I could name. They tolerated the Communists in their ranks, they invited them in, and they worked with them and trusted them.

There was also John L. Lewis, with whose philosophy and actions I do not agree in many, many instances. Lewis definitely is not a Communist, but he, too, tolerated them and their leaders.

Why did these men in labor consort with Communists? Because they believed they could use Communists in labor to accomplish their objectives more easily.

But they were in error. They made a serious mistake, and they are still trying to correct it and to live it down. They discovered, as will anyone who makes the experiment, that the Communists, as quickly as they could do so, using any and all methods, no matter how reprehensible, tried to take over their union organizations. That is the objective of Communists when they infiltrate labor unions and organizations of university professors and any other group in our social and economic life. The Communists cared nothing for the American toiler or his union; they sought places of authority so that they could promote the Communist party line. The Communists have no loyalty to America or Americans; their hearts and their loyalties are with the Kremlin. They will destroy a union or any other group if it will serve the ends of Russia. Their very thoughts are subservient to the Soviet dictators.

The chief goal of the Communist is revolution—violent and bloody revolution. He wants chaos and disorder and ruin for our country, for it is through such catastrophe that he hopes to take over and to rule America with an iron hand, destroying every trace of our democratic institutions, and blotting out our rights and liberties. Our American system of free enterprise is his especial enemy.

We of American labor believe in our free-enterprise system. We do not believe in it simply because it benefits those who have money invested in business upon which they may make profits. Not at all. We believe in free enterprise because we know that it has preserved our liberty and at the same time has given us the highest standard of living and opportunity the world has ever known.

Free enterprise, as opposed to communism and socialism, is in the interest of the vast, overwhelming majority of the people who toil for their living, both here and in other countries. I believe in free enterprise because it inspires initiative within men and women. It provides them with opportunities to rise above their environment and to attain any high place which their ability and intelligence will permit them to achieve. I contend that no system in the history of the world has ever made possible such progress for the working men and women, as free enterprise has accomplished for the American people. I have traveled somewhat around over the world and I do not know of a single, solitary country where the workingman lives under as fine conditions as he does in this land of free enterprise. Certainly no honest, intelligent man can think that communism offers more.

I have never known of a Communist, nor one who advocated communism—and I have watched them in action for more than 30 years—I have never known of one Communist who, of his own volition, has left this country to live in Russia. They fight deportation to Russia with all their might, and if they go to Russia, they fight just as hard to get back to this country.

In days long gone by, in Seattle in 1918, there was a general strike. I think that I headed the only labor organization in Seattle which voted against that general strike. I listened then in the Central Labor Council to men espousing the cause and extolling the wonders of Russia.

To hear them talk, you could put them off the boat blindfolded at Vladivostok and they could walk from one end of Russia to the other without bumping into a single obstacle. But not one of them went to Russia and stayed there. Why? Because no working man anywhere in the world can earn for himself and his family the benefits and security that he can receive as a matter of course under our system of free enterprise.

Among the men and women in this room today, successful men and women, the overwhelming majority were not born to wealth and position. They fought and they earned their way up to the places they now hold. The tragedy is that so many have forgotten the adversities and misfortunes they endured and overcame in the early days.

I represent an organization which, I believe, has as good wages, hours, and working conditions as any labor group in the world. We accomplish this by working with industry and within the framework of this Government, and by no other method.

I disagree with employers in many parts of the country almost every day, and undoubtedly I shall continue to disagree with them, but I will disagree with them within the framework of our American law and Constitution and in an effort to take from industry what I honestly believe the men and women of labor are entitled to receive. That, in my judgment, is the only way we can stop the spread of communism.

We can go back into the history of any industry and where we find the greatest number of Communists today we also will discover that in the days gone by the most intolerable conditions existed. Yet, communism is not the solution for these people.

Yes; we are making progress. There was a time when, in the midst of depression, there was nothing for thousands upon thousands of hungry men and women to do but get into the bread lines, or go to the soup kitchens. Those who have lived in San Francisco since 1928 have had the experience of seeing hundreds and hundreds of men and women in the bread lines. Does anyone think we can send men and women into the bread lines without giving tremendous impetus to the spread of communism?

We must take steps to keep men and women out of the bread lines in times of business depression. It is futile to expect all of the working people to accumulate financial resources on their own initiative

sufficient to provide insurance or some other form of protection to save them from destitution in such times of business distress. It therefore devolves upon this social and economic structure of ours to find the way to solve this problem.

I advocate that during the period of our working lifetimes, we set aside from our own earnings—not from the earnings of others but from our own—and out of the development of the resources and industry of this country sufficient reserve savings to prevent bread lines and poverty. Perhaps you will criticize this idea. If so, what do you suggest to solve the problem? For it is our problem, and it must be solved if we are to stop communism in this country.

It is possible, perhaps, that we may go too far in the direction of social welfare, but I say to you: As surely as you are in front of me today, we must continue social security, for if we do not we will one day stagger this Nation's industry under a pension load which it cannot possibly carry. We must take steps now to provide for future needs. You may argue whether or not there should be investment of security funds as we go along, so that money will be available out of earnings to meet future emergencies, but no one can possibly disagree when I say that we must solve the problem of destitution and poverty among our people. Otherwise this great structure of business will not remain as you and I want it. If, however, we follow the policy of preparing now to meet future needs of our people, we will never have much of a problem from communism in America.

We dare not try to compromise with communism, for there can be no compromise. Phil Murray learned, Walter Reuther learned, and John L. Lewis learned by bitter experience that compromise with communism is disastrous. Neither can we compromise with a Russian Government which follows and advocates the philosophy of communism.

I detest communism as much as any man in America. We must stop it inside labor because, as I said a few minutes ago, that is the only place where it can possibly find an opportunity to grow; that is the only place where destitute, poverty-ridden people may ever be found. It is true that some of the working people have made mistakes. They are not, in many instances, well educated. Add poverty to their other handicaps and we will have ground for communism to take root.

I say to the leaders of industry and business: Associate yourself with men of character, ability, and courage within the American labor movement and help to find the solution to these problems which cause unrest and which threaten to tear the very structure of our Government to pieces. Together we can find the causes, and the answers.

No man in labor today, who is worth anything to his membership, advocates the strike as the first step toward the solution of any dispute he may have with any employer. A 15-year old boy may be able to organize a strike, and if all labor respects the picket line, he may accomplish his objectives even though they may be absolutely wrong. That is not the road to industrial peace or to the proper solution of our problems, for wrong methods will not stand the test of time.

We need more men in the labor movement who have the courage to say "No" when that is the unpopular thing to say. We can find any number of men who are willing to say "Yes" if that seems popular. We need courageous men in our universities, on our boards of regents, directing the affairs of industry I repeat: We need them in the labor movement.

What shall we say of the man in industry who goes along for a period of time, dealing with honorable men and women in labor but who, when he sees that they are on the road to a solution of their common problems, double-crosses them and enters into an agreement, or creates a situation which strengthens and promotes communism? I have had that experience. I have worked with industry and helped to force the Communists into a corner and then I have discovered men in industry who were willing to take advantage of the opportunity to continue contractual relations with Communists and thereby give them a breathing spell in which to regain their strength.

That kind of dealing will not stand the test of time. Such leaders of industry will wake up some day to find that the leaders of labor, who proved they had the courage to stand up against almost unbearable pressure, have lost confidence in them and are unwilling to trust them again.

I have had some experience in saying "No," when it was extremely unpopular. I said it across the bay in Oakland a few years ago when a general strike was threatened. I told our people in Oakland that I did not care if we lost every member in the bay area, we would rather lose them than participate in a general strike, for all general strikes are revolutionary in character and philosophy. I say this not only to the Commonwealth Club, but I also say it to my own people. A general strike is revolution, and nothing but revolution.

My friends, when we in labor educate our people to practice honorable procedures, and when our people display the courage to stand up and be counted against communism, we do not like it when men associated with industry walk away from us when by so doing they can save themselves a few paltry dollars.

Double-crossing will not stop communism in labor or anywhere else.

Yes; we in labor have had associates who forgot and disregarded their duty and their obligations to God and man. Industry has had them, too. There have been men in both labor and industry who transgressed the law, who entered into racketeering schemes and combinations. I remember not too many years ago when a New York labor leader was sent up the river to Sing Sing. I also remember that the man right across the corridor from him was Mr. Whitney of the New York Stock Exchange. It is neither fair, nor just, nor even intelligent, to hold all men in labor and in industry and business guilty and to condem them all because a few have fallen by the wayside. I do not condemn the banking business because a banker occasionally forgets his trust. Nor should you condemn labor because, now and then, a labor leader proves faithless and foresworn.

How to meet the threat of communism concerns not only the people of America; it concerns all free peoples. Here in America the solution lies with those of us who are charged with the responsibility of striving and working together intelligently in this American system of free enterprise, under the finest government in all the world.

First, we must learn to understand each other. Those of us who direct the affairs of labor—to use the vernacular of the street—must have the guts to stand up within the ranks of labor for what we know to be right. Leaders of industry must also have that same qualification.

Industry cannot meet the issue by attempting to destroy the leadership of labor, for instance, by propagandizing the salaries which labor's leaders receive. That will not stop communism; that may build a Frankenstein to destroy us all.

If we believe in the philosophy of free American enterprise, and I believe in it—no man in this room believes in free enterprise more completely and sincerely than I do—then we must realize that if labor is to be represented ably and intelligently at the conference table, if it is to have leadership of high competence, based upon character, experience and brains, then, under our system of free enterprise, labor has the right—yes, the duty—to pay its representatives in accord with the same standards that industry has set for itself. I know an attorney in San Francisco, whose law firm receives a retainer fee of $250,000 a year to represent the interest of employers. Would any sane, fair-minded man insist that labor send a truck driver, earning $60 or $70 a week, untrained and inexperienced and with little knowledge of economics, or labor, or industrial problems, to sit across the conference table from this attorney? Would you think that fair? Does anyone believe that would solve our problems in America? No, it cannot.

There are a great many men in labor who could command much larger salaries if they were working for industry. Through the years industry has watched the leaders of labor carefully. Often, when it has found men of outstanding ability, it has offered them many times more than labor could afford to pay, and put them to work for industry. I offer no objection, for under our system it is each man's individual right to sell his services where and at a price that his own judgment dictates is to his best advantage and the advantage of his family. What I am trying to emphasize is this: do not tear down the outstanding leadership of labor which, under the test of time and in the crucible of action, has measured up to our American ideals. Do not tear such men down, for if you do, the consequences will come home some day to haunt you.

I wish that we had thousands of trained young men within the ranks of labor, not only in this country but throughout the world, striving for positions of leadership, of whom there was not the slightest question as to integrity, citizenship, and belief in our economic system and our form of government. We never have trouble with that type of leadership in labor. Our trouble comes in labor from the men and women in positions of leadership who endorse communism, or through ignorance tolerate it. Communists believe the oath that they may take in a courtroom is not worth a snap of the fingers. They will place their right hand on the Holy Bible and swear to tell the truth, but since they do not believe in God, their oath is meaningless.

I am reminded of the university professor who says he is not a Communist, but who objects to taking an oath to that effect. My friends, I advocated within the American labor movement, within our own national convention, long years ago, that we stand up proudly and take the oath. For we are not Communists.

It is my opinion that a certain large percentage of those who object to taking the anti-Communist oath, or to signing such an obligation—and I want to make it plain that I am not referring alone to your problem in the California academic world—are more afraid of prosecution for perjury than of admitting they are Communists. I do not know what makes Communists among faculty members in our universities. It is over my head. But I want to make this statement: All crackpots are not in labor, there are a lot of them in the universities.

I had some small part, let me assure you, not only in getting rid of Communists at the University of Washington, but also along with my associates on the board of regents and in the president's office in initiating that action, and the Communists do not like it. I wish that I could say over the radio what I think about them.

My friends, we can solve the problem of communism in American labor only through honorable dealing between labor and industry.

Labor must come to realize that the man or woman who invests in business does not always find success and profits easy to obtain. I know there are many instances

where the owners or managers of business, from time to time, sweat blood simply to meet the payroll. All men in business and industry are not rolling in wealth. Labor must realize that fact. We have a right, under our system of enterprise, to earn a bona fide, legitimate, and reasonable return upon capital investment, if we have the brains and ability to do so. I also believe the owners of industry have a right to plow back into their business sufficient money for expansion and growth, so that more jobs can be created and greater production made possible, for out of such expansion and employment comes the wealth of our country and the ever-improving standard of living for all of our people.

Neither labor nor industry has a right to enter into collusive action or conspiracy, for that will not stand the test of time. It contradicts the right of the great consuming public.

In this system of ours free and open unregulated competition no longer exists in many fields of endeavor. A man cannot invest his money in a new railroad, an air transportation company, or a trucking company and take his own chance, in open competition, of making a reasonable profit. He must first obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity, or some other form of regulatory permit which tends to control competition. That is a development which has come about over a long period of time.

I say to you in conclusion, the greatest government ever founded in all the world is our American Government. Above everything else, above the rights of labor, or the rights of capital, or the rights of the individual, is our duty to our Government. We must always subordinate our interests to its welfare. Finally, if you want to solve the problem of communism in American labor unions, I beg of you to recognize character and ability and honorable dealing wherever you find it—in government, in industry, or in labor. Thank you.

Address of Hon. James C. Davis, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned over the current threat of war facing our country as well as its attendant domestic problems. We have all, I am sure, given extensive thought to the proper courses, both domestic and international, which should be followed in order to preserve our American heritage. On the evening of January 20, 1951, our distinguished colleague, Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, was invited to speak before the Atlanta Claims Commission at its annual banquet held in the Ansley Hotel in Atlanta. Congressman DAVIS' speech was, in my opinion, an example of the brilliant statesmanship which has characterized his three terms of service in the House, and deserves the attention of every conscientious and patriotic-minded American. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of Congressman DAVIS' address:

Three of the greatest problems Americans have ever faced lie immediately before us. They are:

First, how can we have peace?

Second, how can we preserve our institutions of individual liberty and free enterprise?

Third, how will we pay the tremendous costs involved in these efforts?

I believe strongly in the principle that where there is a will, there is a way. I further believe that there is a will in the hearts and minds of Americans, to avoid the awful catastrophe of a third world war; that there is a will and a determination to preserve our institutions of individual liberty and free enterprise; and finally, that there is a will to face up to the realities, and to pay the costs involved in these processes, huge and staggering though they may be.

That being the case, our questions, then, are not "Can these things be done?", but, "How will we do them?"

I am convinced that there still is enough American ingenuity and resourcefulness, that there are in this country still enough clear-thinking, energetic Americans, who can add two and two and get four for an answer, to work out plans to pull out of the difficulties which surround us, and do the hard work necessary to carry these plans through to completion.

I think there can be no question that we are engaged in a struggle for survival. We need then, to know, as best we can determine, exactly what confronts us. We cannot close our eyes to unpleasant facts, nor gloss over realities.

These are some of the facts we face today:

Our outstanding national debt is approximately $257,000,000,000, dangerously near the $275,000,000,000 debt limit we have set for ourselves. The purchasing power of the dollar is now 57.3 cents, if we take the years 1935 to 1939 as being a period in which the dollar averaged 100 cents purchasing power.

Where mistakes have been made, they should be acknowledged and not whitewashed. Many have been made. It was a mistake to disarm and to disband our forces.

We made many unwise, even foolish, concessions to Soviet Russia, which are now rising up to plague us.

One such mistake was to place Russia in charge of Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel. I believe it was a most serious mistake to make any concessions whatever to Russia to induce her to enter the war against Japan. That war had been won. Japan was at our mercy. We needed no assistance from Russia there. For no good reason we invited Russia to come over and share in the victory. We placed in the hands of her leaders the means to make for us the trouble in Korea, and in the Pacific area, which is now costing us so many American casualties and so much of our treasure.

We committed serious errors in making unwise and unnecessary concessions to Russia in Europe. Bungling decisions placed Eastern Germany under exclusive Russian domination. Further bungling placed Russia in the position where she can close up rail, highway, and canal transportation into Berlin at will, can stop the shipment of food and supplies into Berlin by all these means of transportation, and even make it necessary for us to transport coal into Berlin by air.

Plans to build up naval strength were discarded, and construction of a super aircraft carrier was canceled after the keel had been laid. This carrier was authorized by Congress and the money appropriated to build it. Construction of this super aircraft carrier has been reordered. Now it will cost many millions more, and will be delayed approximately a year and a half longer than would have been the case had the construction order not been canceled.

It was a mistake to dilly-dally with the question of price and wage controls until rising prices and inflation have already added some $3,000,000,000 to the cost of our defense activities. It is said that since June 25 rising prices have cost us equipment for 10 infantry divisions, 300 B-36 bombers, 2,250 F-80 jet fighter planes, and tanks for 10 armored divisions. Since that time lead has increased in price 48 percent, tin 82 percent, cotton 20 percent, hides 40 percent, shellac 30 percent, rubber 100 percent.

All this is costing the taxpayer additional money—money which could have been saved if prices and wages had been pegged down at the June 25 level, and held there. I and many others urged this action when Congress was considering price- and wage-control legislation. But the President said price and wage controls were not needed, and pursuant to that statement Congress passed a law which did not roll back prices at all, but simply laid the matter in the lap of the President, and authorized him to impose selective controls, when and if he deemed them to be necessary. He has not seen fit to impose them up to this time, although some $3,000,000,000 has been added to the defense costs up to December because of rising prices.

There has been much waste and extravagance in the operation of our Government. Last year I served upon a subcommittee which investigated overstaffing in Government agencies. We found in that investigation many instances of hiring employees who were not needed. We found, for instance, that one agency maintained a purchasing department employing 197 persons, to process purchase orders. Fifty percent of the orders issued were for less than $20 each, and the average workload was 2.4 orders per day, for the 197 persons, and half of those orders were for items costing less than $20. In one branch of the agency the average number of orders issued per person was less than 1 per day, to be exact, 0.9 of 1 order per day, or an average of 9 orders in 10 days. This was the average for the fiscal year 1949.

We found in another agency that in some sections employees went for days, and sometimes weeks, with no work whatever to do. They were instructed to charge up the time on the work sheet to the last project on which they actually worked, even though that project might have been completed days, and even weeks, in the past.

In still another agency, we found that it cost an average of $13.78 to issue a purchase order, and the orders were issued for items costing as little as 32 cents. One branch of the agency had an order issued to purchase a copy of Esquire magazine costing 50 cents.

We face the fact that American prestige has fallen greatly in world opinion, and undoubtedly has reached its lowest point within the past 50 and possibly within the last 100 years.

In 18 of the past 20 years the Federal Government has operated on a deficit basis. In only 2 of the past 20 years has the Federal Government operated within its income. They were 1947 and 1948. Our national debt has reached the figure of $257,000,000,000. This national debt is nearly twice the total assessed value of all real and personal property in the United States in 1940 as shown by the United States census for that year; 1940 was the last such calculation. The exact figure was $143,281,928,000. Our national debt is nearly twice that sum.

It is not my purpose, however, to enumerate the mistakes we have made. I am not referring to those I have mentioned merely to criticize. I mention them because they are a part of the background of our present condition. Sensible people profit by their mistakes. If we are sensible, and see

our mistakes, we can shape our future so as to profit by mistakes of the past.

To plan and carry out our program, two things are of utmost importance, namely, wise leadership in the Government, leadership which will deserve and inspire the confidence of the people; and unity which will throw the unified efforts of the people squarely behind our leaders.

The President calls for unity, and we have never needed unity more than we need it now. Yet he continues to obstruct unity by insisting upon his so-called civil rights measures and other radical legislative proposals which originated through efforts to cater to minority groups and left-wing elements, for political purposes. Among these are the FEPC bills, the Brannan farm plan, socialized medicine, repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and all the other provisions of the so-called civil rights bill and the so-called fair deal program.

In a backhanded effort in behalf of unity, the President left out some of these items in his state of the Union address to Congress on January 8.

Yet in the budget message, delivered a week later on January 15, the President renewed his demand for FEPC legislation. He reiterated his call for compulsory health insurance, which is the entering wedge to socialized medicine, for the principles of the Brannan farm plan, and for other portions of the so-called fair deal program which Congress has refused to enact into law.

These proposals do not contribute to unity. They create discord and disunity, and make it harder to perform tasks which are already difficult.

Rumors are rife that many of the lame-duck New Dealers, who were defeated for House and Senate posts in the 1950 elections will be placed in Federal jobs by the President. Rumors are also rife that while no effort will be made at present to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, efforts will be made to nullify many of its provisions by Executive order, and by writing provisions into Government contracts to accomplish the same purpose.

I venture the prediction also that although Congress refused last year to enact an FEPC bill, as it has consistently refused to do in the past, Mr. Truman will shortly flout the will of Congress and set up an FEPC commission by Executive order, and thus through Executive order place into effect provisions which Congress has over and over refused to enact.

Unity is needed in our defense efforts. But, unity does not consist of an unquestioning blind acceptance, without study and without examination, of every conclusion and policy advanced by the executive department.

That kind of unity is the unity of dictatorship. The great superiority of our form of government is in large measure due to the fact that the citizens have a voice in our Government, can participate in shaping its policies, and thus have real unity.

For the immediate future our task is to map out a program to win this battle for survival. For our own preservation, we are going to have to map out a program of action after mature consideration. When the program has been decided upon, we are all going to have to support it to the limit of our ability.

Taking up the first question, how to avoid a third world war, the broad over-all plan is to build up military strength as quickly as possible. Such a program appearing on its face easy to accomplish, in fact involves many complexities, and is fraught with many dangers. To begin with, it involves a staggering cost. Secondly, it brings a threat of runaway inflation. In building up military strength quickly we will have to feel our way at first. We could easily make grave and serious mistakes, mistakes which can be avoided by proper forethought.

Good men, men of ability, differ in their views regarding methods of building up military strength and regarding disposition of that strength. Diverse views are held, as to whether we should strengthen our forces in Korea, or strengthen our forces in Europe, or build up our strength and keep it in America; as to whether we should reduce the draft age to 18 years, or keep the present minimum of 19 years.

Reasons can be advanced to support each and all of these proposals. Much discussion has been had pro and con regarding them. Arrival at the correct answers involves questions both of foreign policy and domestic policy

We found ourselves, through the action of President Truman, very suddenly involved in the Korean conflict. We have found that it was much easier to get in this conflict than to get out of it.

Our soldiers, comprising the great bulk of the so-called United Nations forces, have faced heavy fighting, cruel hardships, and mounting casualties.

With the entry of China into this conflict we are greatly outnumbered. We cannot afford to win that conflict on the basis of equal casualties. That would be no victory for us. We cannot afford to win it by exacting two Communist casualties for one of ours. It would be too costly for us to win it even on a casualty ratio of four to one. We cannot afford a victory at that price.

Apparently it is a part of Russia's plan to maneuver us into fringe wars with Russian satellites, wars which will destroy our manpower and use up our resources without Soviet Russia being called upon to fire a shot or send a single soldier into battle.

For practical purposes we are at war with China now.

There are three possible courses open to us, and necessity requires that we make an election which one or more of these courses we will follow. They are:

First, reinforce our forces in Korea with enough manpower and equipment to drive the Communists out of Korea. This possibility can be written off. We do not have the personnel and equipment required.

Second, withdraw entirely from Korea to Japan and abandon Korea to the Chinese and North Korean Communists; or

Third, withdraw to the Pusan area and hold a beachhead there while giving assistance to Chiang Kai-shek and his Chinese Nationalists so that they can fight the Communists in Korea and on the mainland of China.

I believe the last is our best course. I believe we should adopt it, and as soon as Chiang Kai-shek's forces can be placed into the field in Korea I believe American troops should be withdrawn from Korea and let the Chinese Nationalists fight the Chinese Communists.

While this is being done, I favor building up our military strength in the United States to a minimum of 3,000,000 personnel, and adequately equipping them with modern, effective planes, ships, guns, tanks, radar, rockets, and other necessary equipment.

Constitutional provisions and requirements should be strictly followed and adhered to in every stage, and at every step in our dealing with member nations of the Atlantic Pact, and with other foreign governments.

Our Constitution provides that Congress has the power to declar war, and to provide for the defense and general welfare of the country. It provides that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces when they are called into service. The President has recently asserted in substance that he has the power to send troops to Europe, without the consent of Congress; that he is willing to consult with Congress, but does not have to accept the opinion of Congress. What he means by that I do not know. What he intends to do I do not know. But these important decisions should be the result of joint action by the President and Congress.

Whatever may be the tendency of the President, however, it is the duty of the Members of Congress, who are the direct representatives of the people, to stand their group, to insist on strict recognition of constitutional provisions, and to yield to no attempts or efforts to usurp legislative functions either by the President, the military, or anyone else. Congress holds the purse strings, and can make its influence felt in all these matters, if it has the will to do so.

With reference to our obligations to other nations, the duty rests upon the other member nations of the Atlantic Pact equally to bestir themselves, to also speedily increase their military strength, to also build up their personnel and equipment, and to recognize the fact that the protection of Europe from Communist Russia is their primary responsibility, and not the primary responsibility or obligation of the United States.

The other Atlantic Pact nations have not only up to this time demonstrated a willingness to accept their part of the responsibility, and carry their share of the burden. They must accept that responsibility, and carry that share of the burden. Their proper relation to us is that of allies, not wards.

For the time being, we have no more troops to send them, and we will not have troops to send them until such troops have been inducted and properly trained.

The time and circumstances of sending any more troops to Europe must be determined, to a great extent, by the action of the Atlantic Pact nations themselves from this time on.

It should be our policy, and should be made distinct and clear to the Atlantic Pact nations, that America will not defend a nation which will not defend itself; that these nations must prepare themselves to the limit of their ability with their own manpower and their own resources.

We have demonstrated our willingness to assist these nations by the billions of dollars we have poured into their countries in recent years. However, we cannot hope to send to Europe enough American soldiers to match the millions of men kept under arms by Russia and her satellites.

In the President's budget message sent to Congress Monday, he called for unity, for a spirit of dedication on the part of everyone, for more years of military service, for longer and harder hours of work, and for heavier taxes.

If the people respond to these requests for unity and sacrifice, and I have no doubt that they will respond, it is not asking too much of the Government to cooperate in bringing about this unity; and to cooperate in every possible way to lighten the burdens which will fall upon the people through increased military service, harder work, and heavier taxes.

We are called upon to burden ourselves with heavier taxes to raise additional sums estimated all the way from sixteen billion to twenty-five billion dollars per year. This is going to bring indescribable sacrifice to many of us. We are also called upon to furnish sons, husbands, and fathers for the military forces. This will mean separation of families, readjustment of life, and substantial hardship through disruption of business and other activities, for those who will eventually come back and pick up civilian life where they left it. Some will not come back. For them it will mean death, and to their families grief and despair.

Those who are to make all these sacrifices have the right to call for efficiency, good faith, economy, and the complete disregard of political considerations upon the part of the Government.

It is not necessary that the entire cost of financing this increased military program be provided by higher taxes. A considerable part of the cost of this program can be provided by cutting out unnecessary spending and by economy and efficiency in Government.

Federal employment increased from 1,014,000 in 1940 to 2,111,000 in 1950. There has been, and is now, considerable opportunity for economy in Government in cutting off unecessary employees. I have already given you instances of useless and unnecessary employees on the Federal payroll.

Within the last few days experts in Federal employment and Federal fiscal affairs have pointed out where it is possible for the Government to save $7,600,000,000 per year. That statement is not a generality. They point out where the dollars can be saved, namely $3,600,000,000 through elimination of unnecessary nondefense spending, $500,000,000 through reduction of civilian employees, and a reduction of $3,500,000,000 in appropriations for foreign economic aid, which is being largely replaced by military aid, and which is due to expire a year from now at all events Such a saving of $7,600,000,000 will tremendously lighten the heavy burden of additional taxes we are being called upon to pay.

If it is practical and feasible through economy and efficiency to save this money, it would be criminal not to do it.

At all times, but especially in this time of sacrifice, in this time of emergency, the Government owes a duty to the citizen to operate efficiently, economically, and without regard to political considerations.

The proposed saving of $7,600,000,000 is more than 10 percent of the entire proposed Federal budget for 1952. This budget of course will not be distributed upon the population on a per capita basis. If that could be done, the share of each man, woman, and child in this country of the Federal Government's 1952 budget would be $477, or for the average family of four persons, $1,908. If we save $7,600,000,000 by eliminating items which can be cut out, on the same basis the saving per family would be $188, which would cut the burden per family down from $1,908 to $1,720.

While some persons will pay more and some less than the figures above mentioned, this does give an idea of how the cost will fall on an average basis.

Certainly every effort should be made to reduce this budget one-tenth. It should be reduced even more, if possible. When the load of taxation is approaching the limit, every dollar which can be taken off is welcome relief. Every dollar taken off means an appreciable lightening of the burden. To accomplish this purpose, all nondefense spending must be reviewed and re-reviewed for the purpose of cutting it to the bone.

When General Eisenhower returns from Europe and makes his report upon the attitude of the Atlantic Pact nations, we will have reliable information from which we can determine what we may count upon from them in the way of military personnel and other resources. When this information is at hand, we will be in position to decide whether to send more troops to Europe, and if so how many, and when they should be sent.

Our security, I believe, requires that a practical, workable system of universal military training be installed. It is possible to provide, and a plan of universal military training should be provided, which will fit in with the educational plans and needs of our youth. Universal military training can be provided which will not conflict with educational programs, but which, on the contrary, will aid the youth of our country to obtain high-school education, as well as a college education for qualified and ambitious youths.

In conclusion, the situation today as I see it, stated briefly, is this:

First. We can have peace.

Our greatest hope for peace lies in quickly building up our military strength.

Second. We can preserve individual liberty and free enterprise. To do this we must prevent disastrous inflation. Runaway inflation would bring with it such regimentation that free enterprise would be destroyed. Payment for our military program on a pay-as-you-go plan will go far toward preventing disastrous inflation. Price and wage controls will help this effort.

Third. The cost of this program must be met by greatly increased taxes, by strict economy, and efficiency in Government, and by discontinuing all unnecessary nondefense spending.

Inaugural Address of James F. Byrnes as Governor of South Carolina in Columbia, S. C., January 16, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday last South Carolina inaugurated a new Governor—our former Member of the House, Member of the Senate, Justice of the Supreme Court, and assistant to the President of the United States—the Honorable James Francis Byrnes, a native of my city of Charleston, S. C.

Distinguished men from every walk of life journeyed to Columbia, S. C., to witness this ceremony. So astronomically stupendous was the crowd that it was impossible to estimate the actual number.

Many people in this Nation were disappointed because they expected our Governor to enter into a tirade designed to further add to the disunity of our people. Many were hopeful that he would add to the petty bickering which has rent and torn our Democratic Party in the past few years. Mr. Speaker, he surprised them all.

Our distinguished new Governor said what we South Carolinians knew he would say. He addressed his remarks to the protection of democracy in South Carolina, the Nation, and the world. He gave notice to all people that South Carolina would defend democracy in South Carolina and in the Nation. He rose to the true heights of his national and international figure.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Byrnes demonstrated his place among the statesmen of the world. In the days that lie ahead this Nation will hear more of Gov. James Francis Byrnes. He is a man who is not afraid to speak. He is a man who will speak. This Nation, Mr. Speaker, will be a greater nation because Governor Byrnes now commands a forum which few men in this Nation can hope to enjoy. His address was as follows:

The large percentage of votes received by me in the Democratic primary last summer, together with the many evidences of good will received since then, have made me very grateful, very humble, and somewhat embarrassed. I am embarrassed because I realize fully my inability to accomplish in the administration of State affairs what is expected of me. Even so it is my purpose and my determination to give to this State and its people the best there is in me.

Within the next few days I shall send to the legislature specific recommendations on a number of subjects. At this time I refer generally to a few.

I recommend that the legislature submit to the people at the next general election a proposal for a constitutional convention to draft a new constitution.

I recommend that the legislature ratify the three amendments to the constitution approved at the recent election, including the amendment repealing the provision requiring payment of a poll tax as a requisite for suffrage.

My investigation of the State government confirms an opinion I have long held, based on knowledge of the Federal Government, that the nearest approach to immortality on earth is a Government bureau.

A beginning has been made to effect the purposes of our Reorganization Act but we still have in the executive department more than 50 independent agencies and commissions. I urge that many of these be consolidated, and some abolished.

We are a law-abiding people. Criminal statistics show that in proportion to our population, we have fewer violators of the law than most States. However, we do have a few people who want to take the law into their own hands and regulate the morals and habits of others.

If a man violates the law he should be arrested by local officers. If they fail to act and complaint is made to the State law enforcement division, the offender will be arrested. If a man does not violate the law, no group of men has the right to assault him or to threaten and intimidate him.

I recommend that the legislature enact a law similar to the Alabama statute prohibiting persons over 16 years of age parading on the streets or highways while masked, and also to prohibit such persons entering upon the premises of a citizen to threaten or intimidate him.

In this State there can be but one government, a government of the people under law. There can be but one governor, elected by the people, whose duty it is to see that the law is enforced. I am going to be that governor. I do not need the assistance of the Ku Klux Klan nor do I want interference by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

If we demand respect for State rights, we must discharge State responsibilities. A primary responsibility of a State is the education of its children. We have made great progress in that field. We spend for education more money in proportion to the income of the State than is spent on an average nationally. While we have done much, we must do more.

It must be our goal to provide for every child in this State, white or colored, at least a grade school education.

We must grant an increase in the pay for school teachers, and we must improve our school transportation system.

We will never be able to give the boys and girls in the rural sections of the State the school buildings and equipment to which they are entitled as long as these facilities are furnished only by taxes on the real property of a school district.

Funds spent for school buildings by local governments should be supplemented by a State building program. This program will involve the issuance over a period of 20 years of bonds to provide $75,000,000 for school construction. I shall submit a special message to the general assembly on this subject.

Preference in construction should be given where the need is greatest. Fifty percent of the building program should be for schools for colored children. Construction should begin as soon as the national emergency permits.

One cannot speak frankly on this subject without mentioning the race problem. It is our duty to provide for the races substantial equality in school facilities. We should do it because it is right. For me that is sufficient reason.

If any person wants an additional reason, I say it is wise. Our Constitution provides there shall be separate schools for white and colored children. More than half a century ago the United States Supreme Court held that such a provision was not in conflict with the United States Constitution provided the facilities for the races were equal.

Last spring the Democratic administration in Washington caused the United States Attorney General to intervene in several cases and urge on behalf of the United States Government that the Court repudiate this decision and declare unconstitutional any law requiring separation of the races. The Supreme Court did not pass upon the question.

Cases are now pending in the lower courts in this and in other States which will go to the Supreme Court, in which the complainants follow the lead of the President and ask the Court to abolish segregation in all schools. We must assume the administration will again urge the Court to repudiate what is now the law of the land.

I am hopeful that the Supreme Court will deny this appeal. The Court appreciates the necessity for continuity of law and the evil results that flow from uncertainty as to the law. I am hopeful, too, that if in a given case there is shown an honest effort to provide substantial equality of facilities, it will favorably influence the opinion of the Court.

This is not a local problem. The races are separated in the schools of at least 17 States of the Union, as well as the District of Columbia, under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

What the leaders of the administration do not realize is that if they succeed in abolishing segregation they will thereby endanger the public-school system in many States.

The overwhelming majority of colored people in this State do not want to force their children into white schools. Just as the Negro preachers do not want their congregations to leave them and attend the churches of white people, the Negro teachers do not want their pupils to leave them and attend schools for white children.

Except for the professional agitators, what the colored people want, and what they are entitled to, is equal facilities in their schools. We must see that they get them.

Our hope must be that in this perilous period the national administration will not urge either political proposals or socialistic programs which are certain to divide our people. But let there be no misunderstanding. While we will continue to oppose such proposals, the governor of South Carolina and the people of South Carolina will loyally support the foreign policy of the Government of the United States.

In these days when the free world is threatened by a fanatical ideology, bent on world conquest, our duty to this Republic and to the world must be met with a display of unity. This is not only our duty; it is our great opportunity.

The last vestige of isolation left the shores of America on the wings of the plane that carried the first atomic bomb to Hiroshima.

That bomb brought an end to the war with Japan. The ending of that war brought to us the leadership of the free peoples of the world. Now when freedom is threatened, free men and women must stand together. We in America must give to them the leadership expected of us because we love peace and have the power to defend it.

In the defense of our common liberty, there is not place for political partisanship. At the water's edge, let us stand together. A united America is civilization's last clear chance for survival. A divided America is the greatest temptation to Soviet conquest.

We cannot meet the perils of this day with a Republican policy or a Democratic policy. We must have an American policy.

The President of the United States is responsible for the conduct of our foreign affairs. He cannot abdicate his responsibility. But in the exercise of that difficult task he needs and should have the cooperation of all loyal Americans, regardless of their views on domestic questions.

If we are to have a bipartisan policy, the President should consult the leaders of the minority political party before and not after basic decisions of policy are made. Once decisions are made, consultation is a sham.

A nonpartisan or bipartisan policy does not call for the suppression of honest debate and discussion. Neither the executive nor the legislative branch of Government has a monopoly of wisdom and virtue

Responsible leaders can and should be assisted by constructive discussion of our foreign policies, but that discussion should be dispassionate and dignified—not demagogic and destructive. But these are not ordinary times and we should weigh our words.

In the United Nations Charter we pledged ourselves to resist aggression. When the Communists in North Korea invaded the South Korean Republic we redeemed that pledge.

We have borne the brunt of that fight. We were disappointed that the nations which voted with us to condemn the aggression did not contribute more troops to fight the invaders. But we discharged our duty. The North Korean aggressors were driven back and rendered powerless.

Then when the people of America were made happy by the hope that our boys would be on their way home by Christmas, we were confronted with another and totally different war of aggression. Communist China attacked the forces of the United Nations.

They have now invaded South Korea. The greatly outnumbered soldiers of the United Nations, fighting as valiantly as have any soldiers in the history of the world, are forced to retreat.

No army has ever fought with such crippling limitations. Our Air Force controls the sky but cannot attack the supply bases of the enemy in Manchuria. In effect, our right arm is tied as the enemy advances.

The United States has called on the United Nations to declare Communist China guilty of aggression. The governments that did not hesitate promptly to brand North Korea as an aggressor hesitate now to declare Communist China an aggressor.

As Chinese Communists daily kill the soldiers of the United Nations, the governments for which they die are fearful of offending China and the Soviets.

If the United Nations is unwilling promptly to declare China an aggressor, authorize our Air Force to attack the supply bases of the enemy, and join in blockading China, then our forces should be withdrawn from Korea.

I am aware that some of our allies fear if China is declared an aggressor and the Air Force authorized to bomb supply bases in Manchuria, it may provoke Russia to war. That is the counsel of fear which I reject. If Russia is ready and willing to make war on the United Nations, she will want no such excuse.

But if the time is approaching when Russia will be ready to go to war, then it is not wise to have our Army divided between Korea and Europe. To my mind western Europe is an indispensable first line in the defense of civilization. We should concentrate our forces in Europe.

It is said that Western European governments have not raised armies for their own defense. In view of our record, we should not complain. In March 1948, after Czechoslovakia had fallen, I made a speech at the South Carolina Military Academy urging that it was so clear the Soviets planned domination of the world, we should cease all nondefense expenditures and immediately draft men to increase our military forces. Many others made similar pleas. Little was done.

On the home front similar delay in freezing prices and wages will hamper the Government and punish the people. In the last war when I was appointed Director of Economic Stabilization I found that the failure to freeze prices and wages at the outset threatened the economy. Upon my recommendation President Roosevelt issued the hold-the-line order. That line was held. Every day it is now delayed, there will be more inequities, higher prices, and additional cost to the taxpayer.

It took Korea to waken us from our slumbers. Now we must rouse our friends in Europe. We must impress upon them that the time has come to stop talking and begin acting.

Since last September we have been discussing with France and Britain what limitations should be placed on military forces recruited in Western Germany. That time should have been spent encouraging Western Germany to raise an army.

The German Republic that we sponsored should be treated on terms of equality. Only in this way can we expect men to have their hearts in a cause. More than a million of the German prisoners taken to Russia have never been returned. They constitute a million reasons why the people of Western Germany, if treated fairly, will fight with us. And they know how to fight.

Since 1945, France has used its influence to prevent Britain and the United States from sending an Ambassador to Spain. We should send Spain more than an Ambassador. We should send military supplies as rapidly as possible. Spain has more divisions of trained soldiers than any of the Western European governments.

We should seek the friendship of Tito and furnish military supplies to Yugoslavia. Tito has trained soldiers. They are brave soldiers.

We should impress upon Britain, France, and all of Western Europe that we want the American soldiers who fight in Europe to have the help of the soldiers of every nation willing to oppose aggression by the atheistic Communists of Russia.

The argument that additional troops should not be sent to Europe cannot be ignored. It cannot be answered by the statement that we must comply with our obligations. The Atlantic Treaty and the United Nations do not require us to act except in case of aggression. But there is a requirement more urgent than these—the requirement of self-defense. Self-preservation demands that we act before the Soviets strike.

If we wait until the Soviet troops invade Western Europe, it will be too late for us to send an army to Europe to be integrated with an army of Western Europe under the command of General Eisenhower.

The people of America have confidence in the intelligence and the integrity of General Eisenhower. If after investigation he is satisfied that the governments of Western Europe are ready and willing to make sacrifices and put armies into the field to defend their own freedom, the American people will accept his recommendation.

I hope Congress will then adopt an affirmative proposal that the United States should

furnish its proportion of that army of freedom. Congressional approval will restore unity. It will put an end to debate at home. It will put at rest one of the greatest fears in the minds and hearts of the people of Western Europe—the fear of a divided America.

I have no fear of what Congress wil do. The people of America do not want to sit on the side lines and permit Stalin to take control of all Europe.

They know that when the Soviets reach the shores of the Atlantic, their atomic bombs will be 2,000 miles nearer our shores. They know, too, that if we abandon Europe to the Soviets, we will abandon the air bases now available to us, from which, in case of aggression, we can send planes to drop bombs on Russia.

No man knows what the Kremlin will do. But I know that the Soviet leaders understand only the language of force.

A firm stand by a united people may deter them from war. A timid course by a divided people will certainly encourage them to make war.

Such a war would threaten the destruction of every vestige of our freedom—religious, economic, and political. I pray it will never come. But should it come, the Nation may rely upon it that the people of South Carolina will do their full part, fighting for God and for country.

Secretary of Defense General Marshall States His Basis for Draft of 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I heard the distinguished General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, who has again answered the call of our beloved Nation, testify and answer questions for 2½ hours.

The text of his prepared testimony as given to us in this public or open meeting of the committee is so important to all America and comes in connection with the study by the committee of H. R. 1752, which is proposed as an amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604 as amended). It is commonly called the universal military training bill.

I am sure having the full text of his testimony to read and digest will be of great value to all my colleagues as well as others also vitally concerned. It concerns the destiny of every moment of American life.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL MARSHALL BEFORE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1951

Today no voice is listened to in our troubled world unless it has adequate steel to support it.

The most effective contribution we can make to our own security and the preservation of peace is to provide clearcut unequivocal proof that we can, first, attain, and second, maintain, the military strength we need as long as world peace remains insecure.

The practical solution to both our immediate and our long-range problems lies in the adoption of a system of universal military service and training. The bill we have submitted to your committee would give us the authority to create the strength that is needed today. It would give us the authority to provide, for the first time, the assurance that our long-term requirements could be met on an adequate basis.

The first part of our job, that of building up our forces to the level made necessary by the existing crisis, must be carried forward rapidly. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have set 3,462,000 men as the goal we must reach by June 30. This is roughly 1,000,000 beyond our present strength, but we will have to increase our forces beyond this strength if the situation worsens.

The second part of our job, that of providing now for the maintenance of a strong military posture on an enduring basis, is equally imperative.

In the past it has been our habit after victory to emasculate our military power and leave ourselves impotent before the world—impotent to defend the peaceful principles that have always been in our American tradition.

If we give the other nations of the world any basis for believing that we may again weary of the need for keeping our strength at a high level, the inevitable result will be to encourage those who plot against us and discourage all of those who have made common cause with us.

It is the terrible and continuing threat of aggression that makes universal service and training the imperative response of our democratic Nation today.

Without such a program we would risk again having our defenses reduced in periods of complacency to a level far below our needs and then be obliged to race uphill again in turbulent, wasteful rearmament in the emotional resurgence after danger again becomes glaringly apparent. There have been too many such occasions in the past. That mistake we must now correct, and at the same time set our guard against its repetition. There must be no repetition of past invitations to disaster.

The speed and destructiveness of present methods of warfare makes it imperative that we place our security on a firm base. We should proceed with the development of our military strength in personnel on the same basis that we are arranging for matériel, to make possible a tremendously rapid expansion of our military forces in an effective manner whenever that becomes necessary.

The program we have developed is within our capacity to support through the years of tension that we may have to endure. It will permit us to meet our urgent immediate military necessities and also will set us on a course for the first time in our history that will give us a reasonable prospect of an enduring posture of military strength, and without bankrupting us in the process.

Under its provisions no man physically able to share in the common military defense will be free to stand aside and ignore his obligation as a citizen. The period for entering upon service and training would be the year between a man's eighteenth and nineteenth birthdays. This age is recommended because it represents the judgment of educators, industrialists, and others who are expert in their field, that this is the period in a man's life when there would be least dislocation if he is called up for service and training. Few men of 18 are married or have children; fewer probably have entered college or started on their life work. From the standpoint of the men and from the standpoint of the community—industry, agriculture, education, science, and family responsibilities, this appears to be the logical year in which the national obligation for military service should be fulfilled.

From my own experience I can state that men of 18 are among our best soldiers. They are brave; they are strong; they perform their duties with patriotic dedication and understanding. Thousands of them volunteer each year because of their eagerness to participate in the great mission of national defense. Then, also, when these young men come out of the Armed Forces, they are much better equipped, I am sure, to enter upon useful lives as good citizens in every field of civilian endeavor. I do not present this as a reason for calling them into service; it is cited as an objective fact well supported by the records of the millions of young veterans who are now making a tremendous contribution to our national life.

It is our desire, it is our intention that none of the men between the ages of 18 and 19 who are inducted at the start of the universal military service and training program would be sent into combat areas until they have passed their nineteenth birthday. I shall not go into the details of these plans. They will be outlined fully by Secretary Rosenberg and the military authorities. When you hear them, I think you will be satisfied that it is unlikely, barring a dire emergency, that anyone will be sent into combat before he is 19.

But I must say in this connection that I very much hope you will not impose a legal limitation barring the assignment of such men to combat duty. No one can foretell the character and degree of hostile action that might be launched against us, except that certainly it would be in a manner to gain the tremendous advantage of surprise, and certainly it would be utterly ruthless in conception and execution. In such a dire emergency we should be free to act instantly and as effectively as possible, that is, without strings attached. We must not be handicapped by limitations of virtually any kind at such a moment when our national existence is at stake.

There is one other phase of our proposal which I should like to bring especially to your attention. It is the recommendation to extend the period of service for men inducted through selective service from 21 months to 27. From a purely military point of view, it would have been desirable to request an even longer period of service than 27 months. Our forces need many specialists and technicians today, and it takes a long time to make them expert in their work. To return most of these men to civil life just as they reach the period of greatest value to the Government is a definite and really severe handicap to the efficiency of the military effort.

We realize that we cannot well insist on holding men simply because it is desirable from a military viewpoint, or because it would result in a considerable saving of tax funds by obtaining this increased return on the training investment. The important consideration is that the 27-month period represents the minimum term we consider consistent with the urgent needs of an efficient military organization in the present period of world tension. We feel that the 27-months period should apply until the continued operation of universal military service and training has enabled us to reduce our forces on active duty and to transfer a larger share of responsibility to the Reserve.

The bill allows for this flexibility. It authorizes the President to reduce the period of service whenever the national security permits. He could eventually withdraw the service requirement entirely, but the obligation for training would remain, so that young men would always be coming forward to build up a vigorous, strong Reserve. Such a system would give us, I feel, the kind of basic protection we need to keep us strong with minimum drain on our productive energies.

Universal military service and training is in the best democratic tradition. It is within our capacity to support through the

years. It will permit us to build up our strength quickly in the present emergency. It will provide a system for procuring and maintaining a reserve of trained manpower. It will give us the enduring system of national defense that our country has always needed—a posture of strength to discourage aggression, a reserve of power to marshal in an emergency.

Why Americans Don't Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a new resolution for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to make a study of the problems involved in nonvoting, having sponsored a similar resolution in the Eighty-first Congress.

It should be noted that 1950 made an off-year voting record with 42,324,232 votes cast, which was still only 60.5 percent of the estimated eligible voters and 43.7 percent of the potential voters—over 21 years old.

In connection with the introduction of this resolution I am also releasing an analysis of over 600 responses received in answer to an article which appeared last fall in This Week, a Sunday supplement magazine, which asked the following question: "Why don't you always vote?" It is estimated that over 9,500,000 people had an opportunity to read this article. The replies came from all over the country and have been analyzed by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Nonvoters, based upon these replies, are found in six categories in order of size, as follows: First, lack of reliable information on candidates, 37 percent; second, voter has little choice in selecting a candidate, 25 percent; third, voting is too difficult, 14 percent; fourth, legal restrictions, 12 percent; fifth, political corruption, 7 percent; and, sixth, miscellaneous, 5 percent.

A typical reply from those who did not consider themselves well enough informed about the candidates to make an intelligent choice said, "The majority of people who do not vote have decided they do not know enough about the candidates running to vote for them."

The second group which was critical of the way the candidates were chosen was typified by the following reply from a businessman of Los Angeles, Calif.:

I believe one reason for the low vote is that we are only rarely given a clear choice. The Republican and Democratic parties under our present setup are largely tweedledum and tweedledee.

Among the 14 percent who complained about voting processes being too antiquated and cumbersome, a New York City woman said that she had to spend a full hour in order to register to vote. Others complained that the ballot was too long and in the case of amendments to a State constitution or city charter too complicated for the ordinary voter. One California voter sent a sample ballot with sample literature all in fine print which would have taken an hour to read alone.

Among the fourth group of involuntary nonvoters the breakdown was as follows:

	Percent
1. For nonpayment of the poll tax	3
2. Failure to establish residence within the time limit to vote	3
3. Unable to get time off from work to vote	2
4. Away from home on election day	2
5. Unable to vote because of residence in the District of Columbia	1
6. In the Armed Forces	1
	12

Among the fifth group of those who did not vote because of political corruption a number of correspondents blamed lobbying, gangsters, and racketeers. In the miscellaneous sixth group most of those who wrote said they were unwilling to give vital statistics like their age to the registrar of elections or were afraid to get on the jury list by registering to vote.

The survey showed strong opposition to compulsory voting, generally on the ground that it would interfere with a free and considered decision. Ten percent of those who wrote suggested ways to improve voter participation. Eight different methods and the percentages of those making suggestions proposing them are listed as follows:

	Percent
1. Use modern promotion methods	22
2. Make the act of voting easier	21
3. Relax absentee voting laws	15
4. Enact a compulsory vote law	15
5. Supply unbiased, concise and clear information on candidates and issues	14
6. Allow a tax exemption for voting	6
7. Let election day be a national holiday	5
8. Relax residence requirements	2

Several vote-promoting schemes were proposed by the respondents; however, three striking ones are given here: A lady in Ironwood, Mich., suggests that spot announcements urging people to vote be broadcast over the radio—"perhaps as often as every 15 minutes"—on election day.

A pipefitter in Bensenville, Ill., proposes a national lottery for the twofold purpose of paying the national debt and encouraging voting. His idea is that a citizen would not be eligible for a lottery ticket unless he could furnish evidence that he had voted.

Since gambling seems to be an inherent part of the makeup of most people, such a lottery would draw on such instincts, forcing the people at the same time to vote.

A Chicago lawyer suggests that the Congress authorize and direct the Postmaster General to place in each mail box, the day before election, a reminder to vote, reading somewhat as follows:

TOMMORROW IS ELECTION DAY

I am directed by the Congress of the United State to notify you of this election and earnestly urge you to exercise your precious right of citizenship by voting.

These responses also brought out what was being done in individual communities to stimulate voting. For instance, a woman in Los Angeles forwarded a printed card reminding her to vote. This card was sent, together with her monthly statement, by a public-spirited firm in that city. In Edina, Minn., 3,000 handbills, reminding citizens to vote, were published and distributed, as an exercise of good citizenship, by eleventh grade students of the Edina-Morningside High School. A transportation union devoted the November issue of its monthly trade journal, the Motorman, Conductor, and Motor Coach Operator, to the importance of voting. A copy of this issue was mailed to Representative JAVITS.

In one case, a veterans' chapter memorialized the Illinois delegation in the Congress to support my resolution to authorize the Speaker of the House to appoint a select committee to investigate the reasons for nonvoting in the United States. Other individuals and groups sent manuscripts, literature, and pamphlets. Even a card game, called Gooddeal was invented to stimulate an interest in politics and voting.

A survey of State governors which I made on this resolution in 1950 showed strong sentiment in favor of an investigation by the Congress of why more Americans do not vote.

I am going to work hard for passage of my resolution at this session and I have received encouragement from the leadership on both sides of the aisle as well as many Members since my resolution was introduced and the active discussion on the subject, which it has touched off, began. The United States is facing the most critical decisions in its history. We need the most voters to participate in making these decisions and we also need to show the best example of widespread public participation in making them to free peoples everywhere.

Is It To Be One-Man Rule?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in today's RECORD an article entitled "No One-Man Rule," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 23, 1951:

NO ONE-MAN RULE—IT WOULD BE IMPRUDENT FOR PRESIDENT TO ACT UNILATERALLY IN HIS ROLE AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF ARMED FORCES

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

No sentiment in President Truman's State of the Union message to Congress aroused heartier applause than the declaration that we do not have and never will have a dictatorship in this country. That word never has sounded well in American ears. And now it is loaded with the odium of the tremendous crimes against humanity associated with the Nazi and Communist regimes.

Unfortunately the President's assertion that he possesses the right to send additional American troops to Europe without

consulting Congress has raised a specter of dictatorship and introduced an unnecessary element of doubt and division into the conduct of our foreign affairs. What is of primary importance in this matter is not what the President may have a right to do, but what is wise and expedient for him to do.

HIGHLY IMPRUDENT TO ACT ALONE

Assuming that the President, as Commander in Chief, possesses the constitutional power to send troops where he may see fit, it would still be highly imprudent for him to make an important policy decision, such as the commitment of considerable American forces to Europe, without assuring himself of the backing of the majority of the American people. Under our representative form of government, the only effective means of testing public sentiment is full, frank debate in Congress, with Government executive agencies making available all the information that can be revealed, subject to reasonable requirements of military and diplomatic secrecy.

Historically the President's powers as Commander in Chief are broad and have never been successfully challenged in the courts or by the more formidable process of impeachment. Nor has Congress ever attempted to thwart a Presidential decision by exercising its constitutional right to refuse appropriations which would be needed to uphold this decision.

However, the widest authority may be dangerously stretched by abuse. Some of the precedents invoked by the extreme upholders of Presidential power are legalistic, in the narrow sense of the word, rather than convincing in terms of broad policy.

There is no real analogy between Thomas Jefferson's action in ordering a few American naval vessels to take punitive action against Barbary pirates and President Roosevelt's inauguration of an undeclared naval war with Germany in the autumn of 1941. The first action involved no risk of involvement in a major war; the second did.

POLICE ACTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

It was an old practice, now happily abandoned in the interest of better inter-American relations, to land detachments of American troops, usually Marines, when riot or insurrection created danger to American and other foreign lives and property in some of the less stable states of the Caribbean area. But such police action, which seldom involved any serious casualties, is sharply differentiated in fact, if not in law, from the sending of a substantial American Army to fight in Korea.

After the United Nations itself, by its scuttle-and-run policy in the face of Red Chinese aggression, has destroyed the theory of collective security, there should never in the future be any question of sending American troops into combat as champions of some United Nations decision. And the North Atlantic Pact does not carry any automatic obligation for this country to station any specific number of troops in the European theater. When ratification of the pact was being discussed in the Senate, Senator HICKENLOOPER put the following question to Secretary of State Acheson:

"Are we going to be expecte.' to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?"

Secretary Acheson replied: "The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute 'No'."

FREE AND FRANK DISCUSSION

It may, of course, be argued that the heightened tempo of Soviet aggression, as reflected in the shooting hostilities in the Far East, calls for a reexamination and raising of American commitments under the pact. But a new policy, such as General Eisenhower may recommend on his return from Europe, should not be slipped over by Executive order.

There should be free and frank discussion in the Senate and in the House. The risks of sending more troops to Europe, and of not sending troops to Europe, should be weighed and balanced in the light of the most authoritative available testimony on all the factors involved, military, political, and economic.

A decision to take an active part in the land defense of Western Europe will have far more authority for the American people and far more deterrent effect on any Soviet schemes for following up its 1950 moves in Asia with 1951 moves in Europe if it is approved, after free and fair debate, by both Houses of Congress. If it cannot command such approval, the decision should not be taken.

Rigid lines have not formed on this issue of defending Europe. Senator TAFT has been made a scapegoat in some circles for what is regarded as the dreadful sin of isolationism. But in his long foreign-policy speech in the Senate Mr. TAFT recognized an obligation to go to war with the Soviet Union if Europe is attacked and recommended a more militant policy toward Communist China than the administration has actually followed. He suggested a large number of spots far from America's continental borders where American sea and air power should be exercised in case of necessity and showed an open mind about "committing some limited number of American divisions" in Europe. Senator TAFT also declared:

"The threat of communism is real. * * * America must be the leader in the battle to prevent the spread of communism and preserve the liberty of the world."

SPECIAL OBLIGATION TO ACT TOGETHER

There is plenty of room for differences of opinion between the two main parties (and between groups within these parties) on issues of domestic policy. But in this critical period, for which no time limit can be set, Members of Congress and representatives of the executive branch of the Government should feel a special obligation to think and speak and vote with America's security and independence as the overruling consideration. No individual and no group can afford to make capital out of national peril. Every step in foreign policy should be judged, approved, or disapproved not because it is of Democratic or Republican origin, not because it may be labeled interventionist or isolationist, not because it can be tagged with some doctrinaire formula, but solely by its impact on the national safety and interest of the United States.

Dr. Townsend's Pension Plan Is Needed More Today Than at Any Time in Our History

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, today those saboteurs of our home front, namely, the enemies of the elderly people and of their children, are exulting over the Social Security Act which Congress passed last year. They like to put tongue in cheek and say with mock satisfaction that so many more citizens are covered under this new measure than ever before.

They like to emphasize their belief that, now social security has been so perfected, it has completely abolished the need for further pension agitation in Congress. They say that, with their heroic efforts in behalf of security for the aged, there is no justification for the continued existence of sincere, patriotic groups which advocate real old-age pensions for all.

They take special delight in ridiculing the earnest, dogged attempts, to get universal justice for elderly people, of men like Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder of the Townsend old-age insurance plan, and will tell you that the Government now has arrived at all his goals by the new improved Social Security Act of 1950.

Actually, there could be nothing further from the truth. We are still just as far from adequate old-age pensions for all as we were 50 years ago.

The only thing which the new Social Security Act has demonstrated is that it was designed to help many who do not need it. I can point to several of my acquaintances who are now drawing retirement under the new provisions but who have privately told me they could get along without it.

That leaves us, then, just as far from the original premise of bringing all Americans under a fair pension plan as we ever were.

I presume the main reason the Townsend plan has come in for attacks is that it is designed to help the American people. The man who advocates anything like that takes his life in his hands these days. It just is not the smart thing to do.

However, there is greater need for the Townsend plan today than ever before in history. There is more hardship and discomfort among elderly people today for want of sufficient wherewithal. I know because I receive thousands of letters from those living in my district.

Group pension systems have sprung up by the dozens, embracing the memberships of powerful groups which are sufficiently vociferous to gain the ear of Washington.

These groups had laudable and worthy objectives to blanket their members into lush pension programs. John L. Lewis presented a fearful enough mien to accomplish such a deed for his United Mine Workers. So have many others.

The fact remains, however, that justice has never been done to the great mass of the American people and the majority of them are still far away from suitable treatment in the all-important matter of old-age retirement.

The stock comeback to this one is, let their children take care of these unfortunates or send them to the poorhouse. Well, their chilren cannot even take care of their own families, and we are paying welfare institutions nearly as much to feed and house these senior citizens as it would cost to pay them a direct pension.

I realize the accent is off our domestic front and is concentrated almost wholly upon the subject of national defense.

Would it not, however, be a vital step in the direction of the sound economy we must attain to take these respectable millions of our population out of the pauper class by approving the Townsend plan now?

After all, they are the parents of all our taxpayers and the grandparents of our fighting men. We will be ignoring the Biblical exhortation, honor thy father and thy mother, if we fail to help them. And we will deprive the Government of a vast new source of income taxes, which these older people will gladly pay to carry on our national-defense program, unless we come to their rescue.

Clipping Coupons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 23, 1951, entitled "Clipping Coupons":

CLIPPING COUPONS

The going currency among the grammar school set along our street has been a popular cigarette coupon. The other day we discovered that one bright youngster—who doubtless will end up in Washington—had scissored all the coupons in two in order to ease a shortage of currency.

For a while he persuaded his hapless contemporaries to accept the new halves at face value and so managed to add considerable to his collection of cigar boxes, marbles, and other articles of wealth. Now we are beginning to see signs that it takes two halves to get what one once would, although since there is considerable haggling over sales it's difficult for us to fathom the exact price scale.

But on the whole our street's population has adjusted pretty well. We've noticed that adults also sometimes get confused by this two-for-one business.

Recently a distinguished officer of the Government spoke proudly of the fact that the Nation's gross national product—the value of all goods and services—had risen from $103,000,000,000 back in 1929 to about $280,000,000,000 in 1950. All this, of course, under an administration which if left undisturbed will soon give us a gross national product of $300,000,000,000.

Well, without a doubt this country has progressed tremendously since 1929. Industry and agriculture today produce much more of the good things than they did 20 years ago, but the figures which the good gentleman used are just about as meaningless as the cigarette coupon statistics along our street.

Just this week the Commerce Department mathematicians tried to straighten it out by adjusting the dollar figures to a standard 1939 dollar. The result gives quite a different picture.

For instance, using that unadjusted dollar figure it looks as though the country has increased its gross national product by 166 percent since 1929. Actually, the Commerce Department figures that the real increase since 1929 has been only about 75 percent, a gain that is satisfactory enough but hardly so phenomenal as some folks would have us believe. The Commerce Department frankly notes that there has been a 50 percent decline in the value of a dollar bill.

So what about that promised $300,000,000,000 gross national product? We suggest that it will be just as easy—and just as meaningless—for the Government to promise us a $600,000,000,000 gross national product. All that's needed is to cut the dollar bill in half again and the happy day will be here.

And if the people in Washington need any help, which we doubt, we know just the youngster who will show them how.

The House Abdicates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the January 22 issue of the Chicago Tribune and commend it to those Members of the House, especially Republicans, who last Friday supported the McCormack resolution calling upon the United Nations to brand the Chinese Communists aggressors in the Korean War:

THE HOUSE ABDICATES

The House of Representatives on Friday approved a resolution calling upon the United Nations immediately to declare the Chinese Communists authorities an aggressor in Korea.

It is impossible to imagine a more subversive resolution than this one. The only Members who emerged from the incident with honor were the few Republicans—among them WOOD of Idaho, HOFFMAN and SHAFER of Michigan, and SMITH of Wisconsin—who protested against the folly.

In contrast, Representative JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, the minority leader, joined in sponsoring the resolution and allowed it to come to a vote without consideration in committee or party conference, without serious debate, and at a session from which many Members were absent because they had been led to believe that nothing of consequence was coming up.

This resolution was subversive because it was directed against the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution says that only Congress may declare war. That implies a responsibility on the part of Congressmen to weigh the facts and the circumstances for themselves in the light of this country's interests and welfare. The House, instead, voted to delegate its responsibility to the polyglot collection of foreigners who constitute UN and who will not send their sons to fight in China, as we know from the experience in Korea, even if sanctions are voted. Nevertheless, the House says, this outfit should be encouraged to commit the young men of America to an expanded war in Asia.

Common prudence, reinforced by the appalling failure of the theory of collective security in Korea, should have warned against adopting the resolution. If there is one lesson which the Korean experience should have taught Congress, it is hereafter to follow our own constitutional plan and let neither UN nor the President usurp the power of Congress.

The snap vote in the House shows that one branch of Congress is willing to leave the fateful decision of war in China to UN. In the Senate, a substantial number of the Members (we hope not a majority) have shown by their speeches against the Wherry resolution that they are willing to leave the decision of participation in another European war to Mr. Truman.

The arguments for and against war with China can be discussed at another time. The important thing to bear in mind now is that decisions for or against war in China, Europe, or anywhere else, should be made by Congress and only by Congress. It is sheer folly to leave the determination to UN whose members do not intend to engage in the war if they declare it although some of them may be quite willing, for their own purposes, to commit us to it. It is just as great folly to leave the decision to Mr. Truman who has shown repeated evidences of having lost whatever capacity for sound judgment he may once have had.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has never had before it a clearer case of subverting the Constitution than was provided by the House itself in voting the China resolution.

The United States Marine Corps

REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a number of members of the House of Representatives are today introducing a bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We are being joined, in the introduction of this bill, by our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and upward of 40 other Senators.

The introduction of this measure is not something new. On June 30, 1949, and September 8, 1950, bills similar to this one were introduced by myself and certain of my colleagues in both the House and Senate. Furthermore, the House Armed Services Committee has recommended in its B-36 report that the Commandant of the Corps be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This action was unanimous. In addition, the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, stated on August 28, 1950, that he had set a goal for Marine Corps combat strength at 4 fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

Mr. Speaker, we need a ready striking force, we need a force in being to lessen the drain on our reserves in the early stages of an outbreak, and we need a hard core of highly trained, efficient, and dependable combat troops. This means, in my opinion, that the Marine Corps must be expanded and the Commandant placed on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This bill proposes to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting at this point in my

remarks, a copy of the bill being introduced today, a copy of a letter sent out to all Members of the House by my colleague, Mr. JACKSON of California, and myself, and a copy of my remarks made in the House on September 8, 1950:

A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 206 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 400,000."

SEC. 2. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are enclosing the draft of a proposed bill which we deem of such urgency and importance to our national security that we are inviting you to join us in its introduction. We recognize that, as former marines, we will be suspected of being a little prejudiced in our proposal. We freely admit the charge. However, the Congress has consistently over a period of years endeavored to insure our country having at its disposal the services of an effective, combatant Marine Corps.

Notwithstanding the Congress' intention which has been expressed in many ways, there have been continuing efforts on the part of certain of the other services to destroy the Marine Corps as an effective combatant force. The situation has now reached such a critical state that only through a clear and unequivocable directive from the Congress can we be certain that its desires, which are the desires of the American people, will be followed. The Marine Corps, proportionately, has never been a large organization. It has always been a most economical and efficient part of our fighting forces. There is every reason to believe that more than ever we need the combat ability which the Marine Corps has again demonstrated in Korea.

The reasons why this legislation is imperative at the present time are manyfold. Basically, it stems from the fact that while the other services are expanding tremendously in organizational structure, the Marine Corps is being held practically to the same level that it had at the start of Korean hostilities. The Army is being authorized a large number of combatant divisions, approximately 28 in number. The Air Force, which was only recently operating with 48 groups, is now being authorized well over a hundred. The Navy is expanding and breaking its combatant vessels out of lay-up at an extremely rapid rate. The United States Marine Corps which had two divisions at the start of the Korean war is being permitted to organize only one additional combat team. Its proven close-air-support squadrons are not even being expanded to the 24 squadrons which are required for the 2 divisions. They are being held at 21 squadrons.

This is not happenstance, it merely is an implementation of the philosophy which certain of the other services have been preaching for a long time. It is our firm conviction, as stated above, that this is not what the Congress has intended, and we intend to push vigorously for this legislation which we hope we can join in introducing.

You will note that there are two sections of the bill. The first provides that the Commandant of the Marine Corps will be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This will place two voices trained in naval and amphibious matters in an organization which is now dominated by services that have little knowledge of, or interest in, the problem of naval warfare. Second, it will bring to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the voice of an expert in amphibious matters which, notwithstanding statements made by the other services as to its obsolescence, has proven again in Korea to be a vital part of modern warfare. Third, it will permit a Marine voice in the highest military councils of our country which should obviate the necessity of constant congressional intervention to preserve the Marine Corps.

The second section provides that the Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 4 divisions of ground troops with necessary supporting ground forces and 4 wings or 48 squadrons of Marine aviation. In order to make certain that the Marine Corps does not become too large or in effect a second land army, the total number of officers and men that can be in the Marine Corps at any one time is limited to 400,000. This is 85,000 less than their maximum strength in World War II. It is probable that they could maintain five divisions out of this total if so authorized by the Congress.

If this bill is enacted, we are convinced that it will insure a strong nucleus of ready troops, capable of performing in the Marine tradition. The military value to our country cannot be overestimated and it should result in a more economical Military Establishment.

We sincerely trust that you will join us, and many other Representatives have already indicated that they will support this legislation.

Faithfully yours,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
DONALD L. JACKSON,
Members of Congress.

H. R. 9623

(Extension of remarks of Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, in the House of Representatives, Friday, September 1, 1950)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today, in conjunction with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, who will introduce a similar bill in the Senate, introducing H. R. 9623, a bill to create, and assign duties to, the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a copy of H. R. 9623, which reads as follows:

"A bill to create, and assign duties to, the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps, to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

"*Be it enacted, etc.* That there shall be in the Department of the Navy an Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive the same compensation as the other Assistant Secretaries of the Navy. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the supervision of the United States Marine Corps and the coordination of its activities with other governmental agencies, and, in addition, such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Secretary of the Navy.

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 206 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947 is hereby amended to read as follows: 'The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall include four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, and the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 300,000.'

"SEC. 3. The Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

On June 30, 1949, I introduced a bill to create the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for the Marine Corps and to fix the personnel strength of the corps at not less than 6 percent of the combined personnel strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In this effort, I was joined by 55 other Congressmen and 4 Senators.

No action has been taken on this bill but, in the meantime, the House Armed Services Committee in its report on the B-36 investigation, recommended unanimously that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be made a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff so that the type of warfare the Marines were so skilled in—amphibious landings and close infantry-air support—could be given due consideration by all the Armed Forces.

On August 7, 1950, I urged, on the floor of the House, that the Marine Corps have a permanent strength of 300,000 men, which would include 4 combat divisions and 4 air wings and that the Commandant be given a place on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Chairman CARL VINSON, of the Armed Services Committee, on August 28, 1950, stated that he had set a new higher goal for Marine Corps combat strength—four fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the Committee on Armed Services in its unanimous recommendation that the Commandant of the Marine Corps be made a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am also in full accord with the statement made by the distinguished chairman of that committee that the Marine Corps should have four fully equipped war-size divisions. I do believe, however, that we should go further and enact permanent legislation to this effect and, at the same time, increase marine air strength to four full-strength air wings. To do this, in my opinion, it is necessary that the personnel strength of the Corps shall be maintained at not less than 300,000.

It is not necessary for me to go into detail concerning the difficulties in which the Marine Corps has found itself since the physical ending of World War II. I do not agree with General Eisenhower's contention, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1949, in which he states:

"I therefore recommend that Marine units not exceed a regiment in size."

Neither do I agree with General Spaatz, former commanding general, Army Air Forces, when he wrote:

"I recommend, therefore, that the size of the Marine Corps be limited to small, readily available and lightly armed units, no larger than a regiment, to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries and to provide interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments."

General Spaatz changed his mind though, because on July 17, 1950, he wrote in Newsweek as follows:

"Two or three Marine divisions, stationed at strategic locations, ready for quick movement to any part of the world, also are essential."

According to the Washington Star of August 13, 1950, the Marines were sent to Korea at the express desire of General MacArthur. It may be well to recall that according to the July 8 issue of Armed Forces, MacArthur, while Chief of Staff of the Army in the early

1950's, was a leading advocate of the consolidation of the Army and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks articles from the Washington Post under date of August 28, 1950, and the Army-Navy-Air Force Register under date of August 12, 1950.

"[From the Washington Post of August 28, 1950]

"VINSON SETS NEW MARINE GOAL; 4 DIVISIONS, 26 AIR SQUADRONS

"Chairman VINSON (Democrat, Georgia), of the House Armed Services Committee, yesterday set a new higher goal for Marine Corps combat strength—4 fully equipped war-size divisions and 26 air squadrons.

"We aim to get the money for that force, VINSON said.

"The new target is up by two combat divisions and eight air squadrons from an estimate advanced by VINSON only August 6.

"He predicted then that Congress will be asked in January for more money for defense, including $500,000,000 for the Marines.

"That sum was expected to permit the corps to increase its strength to 174,000 men and to have 2 fully equipped divisions and 18 air squadrons.

"It now has two divisions, organizationally. However, both were considerably under battle strength when the Korean War started. The size of Marine divisions fluctuates between a peacetime strength sometimes as low as 8,000 to 10,000 men and the huge units of World War II days when more than 20,000 men were in combat divisions.

"The manpower strength of the Marine Corps then was about 65,000 men and 7,000 officers, with about 16 air squadrons.

"When defense officials went to Capitol Hill last month to support their request for an emergency military appropriation, the Marine Corps' portion of the proposed new funds was $128,395,000. This was in addition to the $200,923,000 asked for in the regular 1951 fiscal year budget, or a new total of $329,318,000.

"The testimony given at that time indicated a manpower increase of almost 80,000 above the present level, or a new total of about 142,000.

"Just what the proposal for 2 more divisions may do to the 174,000-man enrollment goal mentioned by VINSON August 6 was not made clear. The amount it would cost was not stated.

"Along with his report of new plans for the Marine Corps, VINSON disclosed he intends to see President Truman to urge this country to step up its tank production by hundreds of millions of dollars.

"He said he has written Mr. Truman, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and top military leaders that the Armed Services Committee is much concerned over the present tank-procurement program."

"[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of August 12, 1950]

"FOUR MARINE DIVISIONS

"The calling to active duty this week of Marine Corps volunteer reservists, most of them battle-trained in World War II, to augment the Marine fighting strength should be a lesson to the American people that never again must this famous fighting organization be permitted to be reduced to less than four full divisions plus four Marine air wings.

"The Marine Corps mobilization announcement this week marked the eighth anniversary of the corps' first assault landing against the Japanese at Guadalcanal and the first major offensive by American ground troops in World War II. From that time on the Marines and Army troops made their assault landings at Tarawa, Okinawa, and Iwo Jimo, all island stepping stones toward the ultimate goal in the Pacific war—Japan.

"All elements of the Armed Forces have acquitted themselves with great distinction in the fighting in Korea. It must be noted, however, with a special interest, the role the United States Marine Corps is playing.

"The Marines committed to Korea cannot compare numerically with the Army and Air Force units in that theater. However, the Marine team hit the beach fully combat-loaded under officers 85 percent of whom had World War II experience. Reports from the Korea fighting indicate that the Marines, within their limitation in force, justified the faith of the American people in this traditional fighting organization of our Armed Forces.

"More than 2 years ago the Marines were fighting desperately to defeat a plan that would have limited largest elements in the Marine Corps to a battalion. At that time the Marine Corps pointed out that no comprehensive training or cohesive operation could be carried out under a structure of less than divisional organization. After a strenuous fight they were permitted to retain two divisions and two air wings in a reduced-personnel status.

"The Marine theory in this discussion is more than justified.

"The Register believes that marine strength should be brought to, and maintained at four marine divisions and four marine air wings.

"Strategic and tactical evaluations indicate that the type of incident in Korea may break out at any time in any part of the world. The need for fast, mobile, self-contained units is evident. The cost of maintaining these divisions and air wings would be negligible compared to the risk undertaken in lives and money in not having them available.

"The other day in the House of Representatives, Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, told his colleagues that the Marine Corps should be raised to a strength of 300,000 men. He also said that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should be made a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff instead of depending upon Navy representation. Marines are now fighting in Korea, and with the certainty that thousands of other marines will be sent to Korea within the next several months, it seems logical and proper that the Commandant of the Marine Corps should become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If Marine Corps personnel is to be employed in operations, it is only proper that the Commandant of the corps should have a part in planning their employment in the national-defense scheme.

"A former marine, Representative MANSFIELD declared that 'the attempts which have been made to whittle the corps down to a guard unit must be stopped once and for all.'

"There are a great number of Americans who agree with the former marine from Montana."

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will give full consideration to the bill introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and myself because we feel that the issue is important and that the Marine Corps be given the recognition and the security it has so justly earned throughout the history of our country.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1951.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: The House Rules Committee has granted an open rule on H. R. 1, a bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service. It is our understanding that this will come up on the floor of the House for debate on Wednesday, January 24, 1951. We of the Disabled American Veterans are hopeful this bill will pass the House as it was reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. From our study and research we are convinced this is the most constructive single piece of legislation to come before the House in many years.

The provisions of H. R. 1 are retroactive to June 27, 1950. This will insure that the designated beneficiaries of every man killed in the Korean conflict will receive $10,000, payable in equal monthly installments. This retroactive feature of the bill would include the dependents of the Pennsylvania and Tennessee National Guard men killed in Federal service soon after the outbreak of the Korean undeclared war.

The Disabled American Veterans is particularly gratified with the provisions of H. R. 1 granting a continuing gratuitous indemnity for veterans having a total service-connected disability rating, and with the provision granting Government insurance to veterans who are uninsurable by commercial standards because of service disability.

The inequities inherent in the present veterans' insurance laws are well known. They are best pointed up by the example set forth in paragraph 2, page 4, of House Report No. 6, Eighty-second Congress, which accompanies H. R. 1.

Another important feature of H. R. 1 is the tremendous administrative saving which can be accomplished if this bill is enacted. If such a law had been in force from 1940 to 1949, it has been conservatively estimated there would have resulted a saving to the Government in excess of $587,000,000 in administrative costs. In a time of national emergency, the saving in man-hours and money cannot be minimized.

The Disabled American Veterans urges your consideration and support of this meritorious legislation. We are convinced that its passage, as reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, will mark a milestone in progressive, beneficial legislation for the dependents of deceased service personnel, as well as the service-connected disabled veteran.

Very sincerely yours,
F. M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

Reds Can Land Atom Bomb on Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the privilege of being permitted to include for the RECORD an editorial appearing in Newsday,

published at Garden City, L. I., under date of Tuesday, January 23.

This editorial is one that should attract the notice and earnest consideration of the membership of the Congress.

Its heading, "No time to hide," is particularly in point and constructively criticizes weaknesses in our coastal defense set-up that are intolerable and challenge most earnest policy thinking and action. Also what is called for and demanded is an immediate re-evaluation of our present protective measures through the prompt revitalization of our United States Coast Guard.

A copy of Newsday was delivered to each Member of Congress and also to each Senator. The story, with photographs, describes the simulated landing and planting of an A-bomb right in the heart of New York City.

I should like to read a few paragraphs from the editorial and then I will insert its entire content. They are as follows:

Today's Newsday is sensational. We intend it to be.

Enactment of a Long Island invasion by saboteurs bringing ashore an atom bomb was more than a newspaper stunt, although we think it is a good one. Our purpose was to dramatize, prove, and warn readers and lawmakers of the ease with which the job can be done. It would be just as easy for agents of an enemy power. They too know the unguarded beaches of Long Island and the rest of the United States. It would be simple to reach New York City, Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, or Dallas, and plant real atom bombs just as Newsday's agents planted their simulated one in Times Square.

Nazi saboteurs who landed at Amagansett in 1942 intended to go to the Ohio River. Their teammates landed on the Florida coast south of Jacksonville. The Newsday saboteurs merely duplicated the Amagansett landing. They could have continued by train, plane, or bus to Pittsburgh or any city between here and the west coast. They could have left their bomb at any chosen target.

It is easy because we have no shore patrol on guard against surreptitious landings. No established or planned radar screen against air attack hinders them. Neither does the United States Coast Guard. For despite the declared national emergency, the Coast Guard is charged only with search and rescue, plus a few port security duties. It still operates in peacetime status for the Treasury Department. It awaits an executive order to put it under the direction of the Navy.

Franklin Roosevelt issued such an order before Pearl Harbor. Truman rescinded it on January 1, 1946. Since then the Coast Guard's authorized manpower has dwindled to one-sixth its full strength. Its improved equipment has been acquired only for search and rescue work. Last October Harry Truman tossed it $21,000,000, authorized an increase of only 5,000 personnel, and charged it with keeping the security of all vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities in the United States.

It is a fact, leaving aside a small appropriation of $23,000,000 for port security work, that not a dollar has been recommended by the administration for the revitalization of our Coast Guard. Not a dollar is presently available to permit the Coast Guard to get an organization going structured along lines similar to what we had in World War II and for an organization to give us complete and practical integration of the Coast Guard into our civil-defense set-up.

I have yet to hear of a single, solitary plan to accomplish the beginning of such an organization. Certainly if anything along these lines is afoot or undergoing study, the administration should appoint an expediter and get things going.

There are vital warnings and implications inherent in this object lesson that challenge and demand immediate and strong administration action. I want to reemphasize that in the billions that have been urgently recommended for defense the administration has seemingly been perfectly willing to keep the Coast Guard in a normal peacetime status. This is not a time of normalcy. The administration, for incomprehensible reasons—and while daily advising the country of the acute dangers it is facing—is doing nothing by way of concrete action in giving the Coast Guard the security duties that this great organization can so well perform. Certainly we all know of the outstanding record of the Coast Guard in World War II.

If we are to set up proper precaution measures against potential disaster the Coast Guard must be immediately revitalized and take its proper place in our coastal-defense set-up.

The editorial, in full, follows:

NO TIME TO HIDE

Today's Newsday is sensational. We intend it to be.

Enactment of a Long Island "invasion" by "saboteurs" bringing ashore an "atom bomb" was more than a newspaper stunt, although we think it a good one. Our purpose was to dramatize, prove, and warn readers and lawmakers of the ease with which the job can be done. It would be just as easy for agents of an enemy power. They, too, know the unguarded beaches of Long Island and the rest of the United States. It would be simple to reach New York City, Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, or Dallas, and plant real atom bombs just as Newsday's agents planted their simulated one in Times Square.

Nazi saboteurs who landed at Amagansett in 1942 intended to go to the Ohio River. Their teammates landed on the Florida coast south of Jacksonville. The Newsday "saboteurs" merely duplicated the Amagansett landing. They could have continued by train, plane, or bus to Pittsburgh or any city between here and the West coast. They could have let their "bomb" at any chosen target.

It is easy because we have no shore patrol on guard against surreptitious landings. No established or planned radar screen against air attack hinders them. Neither does the United States Coast Guard. For despite the declared national emergency, the Coast Guard is charged only with search and rescue, plus a few port-security duties. It still operates in peacetime status for the Treasury Department. It awaits an Executive order to put it under the direction of the Navy.

Franklin Roosevelt issued such an order before Pearl Harbor. Truman rescinded it on January 1, 1946. Since then the Coast Guard's authorized manpower has dwindled to one-sixth its full strength. Its improved equipment has been acquired only for search and rescue work. Last October Harry Truman tossed it $21,000,000, authorized an increase of only 5,000 personnel, and charged it with keeping the security of all "vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities in the United States."

COAST GUARD TRADITION

Ironically the Coast Guard is 6 months behind other services in living up to its proud motto, "Semper Paratus"—Always Prepared. It can't be ready for this emergency until the President wakes up, or until Congress legislates it back to wartime strength of nearly 200,000, with suitable appropriations under the Navy.

Since Alexander Hamilton founded it in 1790, the Coast Guard has built a tradition comparable to that of the Marines. Its cutters raided France in 1797–1801. It sent the first United States ship to Alaska after the Territory's purchase—and has performed Alaskan duty ever since. It fought Seminole Indians in the Everglades of Florida. It pioneered (1904) in ship-to-shore radio. After the *Titanic* disaster it joined the International Ice Patrol, watchful for floating icebergs in the sea lanes.

In World War I the Coast Guard went on patrol and convoy duty; in World War II it again distinguished itself when it helped evacuate Singapore, landed marines at Guadalcanal and troops in North Africa and Normandy. It chased and sank subs off the Atlantic coast. Its loran stations guided planes that bombed Japan. Like the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard is an established and valuable arm of defense. It only awaits rebuilding for its specialized duty.

DESTRUCTION NEED NOT BE AIRBORNE

Defense planning emphasizes protection of the United States from air attack. Civil defense concentrates heavily on postdisaster activities. Newsday's invasion story demonstrates a blind spot in this thinking. Not only must the Coast Guard be restored to patrol the beaches. There must be extensive, organized assistance from civil-defense volunteers. Every precaution must be set against disaster before it strikes.

When the Coast Guard was at full strength, it took 24,000 officers and enlisted men to maintain patrols of 3,700 miles of United States waterfront. But we have 40,000 miles of coastline to watch—and only about 28,000 Coast Guard men in all.

Next Saturday noon, New York City will try out its new air-raid alarm. But mass slaughter and destruction endanger every United States city through these unguarded beaches of entry. There will be no time to hide from an atom bomb brought in by sea and planted. Will Congress demand that the President order the Coast Guard back to wartime Navy duty?

Increase in Personnel Strength of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most ridiculous incongruities in the military picture today is the instance of suppressed Marine strength in the face of the tremendous military potential demonstrated day after day by the Marines in Korea.

The stepchild of the military department, the Marine Corps, lacks a direct voice on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The "policemen" of our fighting forces have not the authority to attain a personnel status even approaching World War II strength.

Unfortunately, the dominant services are unwilling to take on as an equal partner the ancient and honorable branch of the service which has per-

formed with distinction since the founding of the Republic.

National security demands that Congress must take suitable action in view of the reluctance of the Defense Department to accomplish this desirable result. Therefore, I am introducing legislation authorizing four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings, and such other land, combat, aviation, and other services as may be organic therein, for the Marine Corps. The bill additionally provides that the personnel strength of the Regular Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 400,000, and that the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The personnel status envisioned in this measure will be filled to capacity in a short time if enlistments are allowed to the Marine Corps. Never in history has it been necessary for us to draft young men for service in the Marine Corps, and this increase in authorized strength should bring about no exception.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., over radio station WSPR, 5:15 p. m., under auspices of Polish American Congress, Inc., Western Massachusetts Branch, Springfield, Mass., Sunday, January 21, 1951:

Poland is the largest and most populous country in Central-Eastern Europe. In the course of 10 centuries of their recorded history, the Poles were time and again forced to resort to arms in order to throw back into Asia the Mongol, Tartar, Turkish, and Russian invaders. As a result of these successful endeavors, Poland gained the proud title of "Defender of Christianity." Even in 1920, shortly after the First World War, when the Soviet armies were surging westward to join hands with the Red revolutionaries in Germany, it was the Polish Army which defeated them at the Vistula River, right at the gates of the capital, Warsaw, threw the Russians back within their own frontiers and averted for 25 years the sorry spectacle which we are witnessing now. In 1945, there was no Polish Army on the Vistula and consequently the invaders from Asia established themselves in the heart of Europe.

When in 1945, the Red army entered Poland, following the withdrawal of the defeated German Army, the Reds brought with them a government prefabricated in Moscow, and by the sheer force of their bayonets enthroned that government in Warsaw as the legitimate government of the Polish Republic. The same group of men with some variances is still in power in Warsaw and represents Poland in the United Nations and at the diplomatic outposts abroad. At the moment of their inauguration these men were entirely unknown to the Polish people. Long-time agents of the Communist Internationale, trained and educated in Moscow, they had no emotional ties with Poland and many of them were foreign-born. They operated under aliases and even the name of the acting president of the Republic, Boleslaw Bierut, is a pseudonym composed of several aliases which he used in his career as Moscow's undercover agent in various European countries. It is of vital importance for the free Poles in this country and for the millions of loyal Americans of Polish descent that the American people do not confuse the Warsaw regime and its representatives abroad with the unfortunate Polish nation suffering in Communist slavery. Those servants of Moscow who under assumed Polish names follow the Soviet line in the United Nations, throwing insult after insult upon the great American Republic, do not speak for the people of Poland. The true Poles, in spite of years of slavery, feel toward you as the Polish Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski felt when he died for your independence at Savannah, Ga., in 1779.

That government of traitors and foreign agents is already in the saddle in Warsaw for over 5 years. It maintains itself in power by the ruthless application of police-state methods. The people live in an atmosphere of fear and terror. The secret police, known as the UB, trained by the Russians and manned in key positions by Russian experts, controls every aspect of life. Using blackmail and torture the UB recruited a network of informers, who are busy even in family circles, spying on their next of kin and denouncing them to the police for even the slightest sign of opposition to the Communist rule. Old established principles of judiciary and court procedure have been thrown overboard. Warrants of search and arrest are no longer required. Police invade homes at any time of day or night, abducting innocent persons suspected of disloyalty to their Soviet overlords. That's what Winston Churchill and Dean Acheson had in mind when they spoke about the "knock on the door at midnight." It is almost impossible for the free Americans to imagine this awful feeling of uncertainty which grips the hearts of the people in the Soviet-dominated countries when they hear a knock on the door; this atmosphere of fear; these mutual suspicions.

Today, more than 5 years after the cessation of hostilities, military courts are functioning in all major Polish cities, trying civilians accused of opposing or even criticizing the Warsaw or Moscow regimes. Hardly a single day passes without scores of Polish patriots being sentenced to long prison terms, deported to Russia, or executed. In addition to the overcrowded prisons and dungeons of the secret police, where people are kept for months and years without a warrant of arrest, and where those infamous "confessions" are wrung out of the defendants by means of torture or by scientific methods which weaken the will of the individual, the Communists are beginning to establish slave-labor camps, which in the Soviet Union constitute the basic labor force.

In the economic sphere Poland has already assumed the aspects of a welfare state carried to the extreme. Industrial establishments employing more than 50 workers have been taken over by the Government, practically without compensation for the individual owners. Smaller industries are now in the process of being nationalized. Wholesale and foreign trade are entirely in the hands of the state. Private retailers are gradually squeezed out of business by means of tax discrimination and unheard of chicaneries; large estates are administered by the state, while the small farmers are by ever-increasing pressure forced to join their holdings into Soviet-style collective farms. I am glad to say that here the Communists encounter splendid resistance, and the farm collectivization program is progressing very slowly. The free professions, doctors and lawyers, are losing their rights to private practice and gradually assume the character of Government employees. The engineers, technicians, and industrial workers are no longer permitted to choose freely their place and type of work. They are assigned by the state management to certain areas and certain factories. Labor unions are a tool in the hands of the Government and serve as propaganda machinery for health-ruining work contests of the type known in Russia as the Stakhanov production races. Strikes are outlawed. The penalty for the strikers is death from the hands of the hastily summoned battalions of the Internal Security Corps, a highly mobile uniformed striking force of the regime reminiscent of the gestapo elite guards of the Nazi regime or the uniformed special MVD troops of the Soviet Ministry of the Interior.

The Communist welfare state eliminates all means of independent earnings and turns all citizens into Government employees. Thus, the Government controls the purse of each citizen and through it his political loyalty. In case of unrest or dissatisfaction with the Government among certain classes of population, among workers in a particular factory, or among certain professions, one stroke of a pen can drop the troublesome group from the Government's payroll and doom them to starvation, as there is no possibility of independent earnings. Private enterprise is dead in Poland, and freedom died with it.

The year 1950 marked a beginning of a 6-year economic plan in Poland, a plan which puts emphasis on the development of heavy metallurgical industry at the expense of consumers' industries and out of all proportions to the actual needs of the country's economy. The results of the new scheme will be disastrous from the viewpoint of the population's standard of living, but will aid substantially the armament industry of the Soviet Union. The plan obviously fits the grand design of the Soviets in regard to the economies of the satellite countries. This design can be characterized in two sentences—colonial exploitation of the subjugated nations and preparation for war.

The Communists do not limit themselves to the political and economic fields of operation. They have also invaded the realm of the spirit, and it is here where a silent but inexorable struggle is in progress between the apostles of hate and destruction and the Polish people who for centuries carried on the eastern approaches to Europe the torch of western Christian civilization. In that struggle for the soul of the people, especially the younger generation, the Communists are using all modern means of propaganda, including radio, press, books, pamphlets, theater, and moving pictures. From kindergartens to universities the young people are subjected to a constant barrage of Communist slogans, repeated parrotlike a hundred times a day. Textbooks have been rewritten, history changed, the past distorted, the present imbued with idolatry of the Soviet Union, the future—well, you can imagine the Communist vision of the future—universal peace with Josef Stalin as leader of mankind.

The Soviet empire, which stretches from Vladivostok to the River Elbe, is a huge factory of human robots, men with push-button brains, centrally operated by the Politburo of the All-Union Bolshevik Party in Moscow. You have had many opportunities to observe this new creature, the Soviet man. For 5 years now the delegates of Russia in the United Nations have been making the same speeches, repeating the same slogans, insults, waving the withered olive branch or saber rattling in tune with the switchboard operator in the Kremlin. Their minds

proved to be inaccessible to the most skillful and reasonable arguments of the western statesmen, their faces are blank, and so are their souls.

We are living in critical times in which the fate of our Christian civilization will be decided. Either law and order, western culture and the right of every nation and every individual to freedom will prevail, or we shall sink back into the darkness of the barbaric age.

I firmly believe that the country of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln will not fail in this hour of trial, that it will live up to its great traditions by championing freedom everywhere, and that ultimately, with our assistance, Poland, the defender of Christianity, will be reestablished as a strong and independent republic, a bulwark against aggression and the best guaranty for a durable peace in Europe.

Waste and Extravagance in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I stood on this floor to call attention of the Members to a situation that could bring ruin to this country more certainly than an armed invasion by the Red hordes of Soviet Russia. That situation is the drain made on our national economy by waste and extravagance in the Federal Government.

Today, I want to call your attention to a story which appeared on page 1 of today's Washington Post. I would like to read the first two paragraphs of that story:

From June 30 to January 1—the first 6 months of the Korean war—the Army Quartermaster bought almost $5,000,000 worth of potatoes for the armed services.

In the same period another Government agency—the Agriculture Department's Production and Marketing Administration—bought $23,278,000 worth of spuds, and destroyed $22,130,000 worth.

If that does not shock you enough, perhaps the explanation I received from the PMA will. An official of that agency said that there really was not much point to the Department of Agriculture turning potatoes over to the Army because if the Army did not buy on the open market, it would simply leave that many more surplus potatoes which the Department of Agriculture would be obligated to buy.

Let us look at this potato business for a moment—a business that is pouring millions and millions of dollars down a rathole at a time when we are to be "taxed until it hurts" to provide for the Nation's defense.

The Department of Agriculture sets acreage allotments for these potatoes, but in spite of this, anyone, anywhere can plant all the potatoes they want to. Of course, if you plant more than your acreage allotment, you cannot sell the tubers to the Government, but you can sell them on the open market at a price supported by the Federal Government by purchasing potatoes and dumping them.

If this is not one of the most ridiculous situations ever to plague this country, I would like to know what is. This Nation, faced with the most severe test in its history, already billions and billions of dollars in debt, and challenged to an armaments race, is still throwing millions away in this asinine fashion.

This is the sort of thing that can wreck our country by the road of financial bankruptcy more quickly and certainly than the guns and bombers of Soviet Russia ever will. This is playing right into Russia's hands. This is what they want—to wreck the financial structure of the country so that communism can walk in without a shot ever being fired.

The story which I quoted earlier goes on to report that the distinguished Senator from my own State of New Mexico, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, urged Congress to either remove price supports from potatoes or change the law so that production could be curtailed. The present Secretary, Mr. Brannan, has joined in this appeal.

These supports will end with the 1950 crop unless Congress moves to reinstate them. I certainly hope and urge that the Congress bring this shameful situation to a halt as soon as possible.

TWENTY-TWO MILLION DOLLARS' WORTH WASTED—GOVERNMENT BUYING BOOSTS COST OF POTATOES FOR ARMY

(By John W. Ball)

From June 30 to January 1—the first 6 months of the Korean War—the Army Quartermaster bought almost $5,000,000 worth of potatoes for the armed services.

In the same period another Government agency—the Agriculture Department's Production and Marketing Administration—bought $23,278,000 worth of spuds, and destroyed $22,130,000 worth.

The Quartermaster was buying the potatoes with taxpayers' money to feed United States soldiers.

At the same time PMA was spending millions to keep potato prices at a high level. In other words, one Government agency was spending millions to force another Government agency to pay millions more for its supplies.

The money PMA was spending to destroy potatoes so prices would go higher was ordered spent that way by Congress in each of the last three farm price-support bills. Both Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, and the present Secretary, Charles F. Brannan, have urged Congress for almost 5 years to remove price supports from potatoes or change the law so that potato production could be curtailed.

Such supports will end with the 1950 crop—about June 30. The farm law still provides price supports for potatoes, but another law says they won't be paid unless potatoes are covered by marketing quotas, which Congress hasn't put into effect.

PMA has bought and destroyed potatoes this year in 38 States. The largest purchases so far have been made in New Jersey, where $6,706,000 worth were dumped. Maine was second, with $5,118,000 worth destroyed.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, as a great admirer of General MacArthur I am most happy to insert in the RECORD this very fine article on this great American, written by Kyle Palmer, political editor of the Los Angeles Times:

ABOVE AND BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY

(By Kyle Palmer)

Next Friday, January 26, will mark the seventy-first birthday of a great contemporary American.

To what extent the good wishes of a grateful people can be conveyed to him will be determined by the extraordinary circumstances under which the event occurs, but it seems to me that the anniversary of the birth of Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army, soldier, statesman, patriot, calls for something more than passing notice.

Only the pages of history to be written by historians yet unborn will show the full scope of his greatness and render a full accounting of what he accomplished in a long life consecrated to the service of his country.

For unhappily it is true that only the perspective of time can supply the real measure of greatness in a man, it being our common infirmity that only through the passage of the years can we rid ourselves of the prejudices and emotions that magnify both the large and the little in our distinguished fellows.

Hero worship is not a part of the complement of a newspaper reporter, and while factual conclusions concerning a personality may not at all times achieve absolute objectivity, good reporting entails careful avoidance of exaggeration either affirmatively or negatively.

And as one who has ever tried, although often failing, to be a good reporter, I shall set down a few considered thoughts and reflections concerning this remarkable man and what his life, his ideals, and his devotion mean and should mean to this generation of Americans and to the generations that will follow us.

Every American has a stake in the greatness of MacArthur; for, whatever may be its inspirations and horizons, his is the greatness that has made America great. In all the requirements that tradition has established, the stature of MacArthur meets the test; he is an embodiment of the virtues we most esteem, and many of the frailties that in him have seemed most pronounced are common to us all.

MacArthur's strengths and weaknesses have been the inspiration for lavish praise and extravagant censure; some have seen in him only the manifestations of nobility and genius, and others regard him as little more than a colorful and self-dramatized poseur.

Although no soldier or statesman of his day is better known to fame, none has been more remote from the ordinary and natural contacts that make such eminent figures still understandable and approachable as ordinary mortals of flesh and blood.

Thus Douglas MacArthur has become a living legend, and the man himself has seldom been revealed as himself.

If it shall be his lot, on that account, to strike no spark of enduring affection and

lasting gratitude in the hearts of his countrymen the fault will be in ourselves, for we shall have ceased to recognize and to cherish our own noblest and finest instincts and aspirations.

MacArthur has been a target for spite and jealousy directed from high places, but the field of his labors and the scene of his achievements in war and in statecraft were not the result of any plot or scheme by enemy or adversary. No exile he, for when he went to the far places in the Pacific his role and his task were self-chosen.

In the Philippines MacArthur may have seemed to the superficial eye little more than a retired American Army officer who had secured a soft berth in a comic-opera setting, one leading a life of tropical indolence and frustration.

But all the while, as he designed his impressive military caps and strode impressively in and out of drawing rooms and an endless round of social gaieties, MacArthur "the magnificent" studied maps, studied potentials of war and peace, studied racial characteristics and the imponderables of nationalistic interest of possible friend and probable foe, weighed all of the factors that enter into victory or defeat.

He was our sentry, and steadily through the years he walked his beat. Fate, or chance, or the logical accumulation of influences brought to bear by intelligent calculation and unwavering determination fitted the general for the responsibilities he was called upon to assume, prepared the statesman for the unprecedented demands that would be made upon his magnanimity, his wisdom, and his capacities as a ruler of a defeated, proud and enigmatic people.

Let history render a verdict upon his military record and leave to the historian an impersonal evaluation of the monumental documentation of the allied occupation of Japan; it is more to the purpose of MacArthur's contemporaries to understand him in the simple terms of his status and identity as a citizen of the United States.

Essential to an understanding of MacArthur is a knowledge of the fact that he is, in the purest sense of the word, a patriot. Love of country has been the greatest passion of his life, directing his ambitions, controlling his motives, inspiring his undertakings.

As the soldier son of a soldier father, both distinguished in their profession of arms, Douglas MacArthur possessed a vision that extended beyond the objectives of military defensive and offensive operations.

Those who have known him intimately through the years, including some who regard him with adulation and some who retain a less subjective attitude, say that MacArthur has always thought in the larger terms of his country's honor, its security, and its welfare.

He has a gift for ostentation, which has caused many to scoff and others to doubt. But there is no ostentation in the soul of a man who now, above and beyond the call of duty, at risk of reputation and at personal sacrifice few would willingly match, still continues at his post.

The American people know very little of the facts relating to our military intervention in Korea. They know even less about the actual role MacArthur has played in that ill-starred undertaking. Evident from the first has been a determination on the part of some of our civilian and military officials in Washington to give MacArthur very little credit for any favorable developments in the war in Korea and to fix personal responsibility upon him for the reverses, surprises, and humiliations we have suffered there.

Again, let history decide the issue. No revelations or complaints have come from the general—other than his protests against the direct misrepresentations and malicious conclusions of a few journalistic gnats in Korea and Washington. His own generation may never know to what extent he undertook a mission and followed orders which, if left to his own devices, he could have avoided.

Certainly there is nothing in the long record of MacArthur's military dispositions, decisions, and actions that lends any color to the inspired insinuations and spiteful inferences that, even at 71, his judgment is not as sound as heretofore.

His accomplishments as head of the occupation forces in Japan will rank with the greatest achievements of the rulers of men through all history.

And it may be that the greatest fruits of his genius at some future date will mature in the form of a democratic Japanese people dedicated to the defense of the freedom of man. Should that complete reversal of a people's ideals, philosophy, and aspirations be attained, to Douglas MacArthur more than to any other man living in the twentieth century will the credit be due.

And none who know him as he is can doubt that he prepared himself for the task and carried it out faithfully and devotedly, not for personal aggrandizement or glory, but for the weal of the country of his birth.

It is unnecessary to think of Douglas MacArthur in terms of personal admiration and attachment to feel a sense of pride in the fact that he is a great American and that we, as fellow Americans, share in a heritage that has produced such a man.

General, many happy returns of the day.

What Did Hoover Say?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, many attempts have been made by writers, radio commentators and so-called political analysts to distort and confuse the logical statements made by former President Herbert Hoover in his recent speech on his views of our foreign policy. In almost every instance the criticism of Hoover's speech was an attempt to ridicule his statements.

Everyone knows now that the foreign policy advocated and followed by the administration has brought us humiliation, great losses of men and materials, and defeat. In spite of all the funds and help to rehabilitate many foreign countries, we have been making more enemies than friends. The prestige and dignity of the United States has never been so low.

But in spite of the failures of the administration to formulate a sound foreign policy, any suggestions that the administration should reappraise the international situation, and give consideration to suggested changes, meets with immediate and violent opposition. Apparently the Truman administration will tolerate no criticism, accept no advice, and if the Truman-Acheson policies should prove to be leading us down the road to destruction, there will be no turning back in spite of danger signals all along the way.

The proposals of Mr. Hoover were offered as the basis for a healthy discussion which might open a debate on foreign policy through which a re-evaluation of foreign policy might result in some vitally needed changes in our present foreign policy.

But the Truman forces immediately flung the epithet of isolationism to quell any rebellion against the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. Mr. Hoover, in fact, did not propose isolationism. He suggested that we build our air and sea strength for adequate defense of our own Nation, and that we assist Europe providing Europe cooperate with sufficient self-help to assure the success of our cooperative effort.

The following editorial by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P., which appeared in a recent edition of the Tidings entitled "What Did Hoover Say?" gives an honest review of Mr. Hoover's proposals and of the unfair, malicious attempts that have been made to discredit one of America's great statesmen:

WHAT DID HOOVER SAY?

(By James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

Believe it or not there is such a thing as honorable political controversy.

The first obligation of contestants in that kind of conflict is to recognize just what it is that the opponent is saying.

You must not ignore his main idea, pounce upon some possibly dubious word or phrase, overemphasize it, and thus distract attention from the main point of his argument. That trick is an old one; it has been used in innumerable debates. But neither age nor usage can disguise the fact that it is a trick and a mean one.

When Herbert Hoover made his recent speech on American foreign policy, he happened at one point to use the word "Gibraltar." Some of his opponents, either from malice or from inability to see what he meant, lifted the one word "Gibraltar" out of an address of some 3,000 words and flew off with it on a wild tangent of irrelevance.

Gibraltar, they said is outmoded, obsolete like the Maginot line, and they went on to moralize on the stupidity of relying upon a Gibraltar.

A slick trick but it won't work with those who read carefully and think correctly.

Those who heard Mr. Hoover on the radio, or who took the pains to read his speech will remember that he said:

"Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, or Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys and would end in the exhaustion of this Gibraltar of western civilization."

That, I submit, is something very different from a suggestion that we place our hope in an outmoded form of defense.

Another device for damning Mr. Hoover's plan was the well-known use of the epithet. In this case the chief epithet was isolationism.

Even President Truman accepted it in a press conference. The Alsop brothers in their column used the phrase "scuttle and run" to designate Hoover's plan and "crawling on the belly" to designate Joseph P. Kennedy's.

BOSTON'S PIOUS LAMENT

The Boston Herald in an editorial asked, "What is this Europe that Kennedy and Hoover are willing to write off?" and went on to lament piously what would happen to the Pope and to Rome if we were to permit communism to take over Italy.

The writer of that editorial found it convenient to forget that Italy went head over

heels for Mussolini and hence for Hitler in spite of the encyclical against fascism; that only 2 years ago, in the face of the present Holy Father's warning and an avalanche of letters and telegrams from America, the Italians cast 8,000,000 votes for what was in effect the Communist ticket, and that there are still 2,500,000 members of the Communist Party in Italy.

If we are to help save such people they must at least cooperate in their salvation.

Even God cannot help those who won't help themselves.

The nastiest epithets of all against Hoover were those of the Alsops who wrote on Christmas Day, of the "squalid little men who would throw away the future for an hour's partisan success, the trembling gravediggers of freedom who would betray mankind for two more years' low taxes."

I take that to be perhaps the foulest insult I have ever seen, not only to Hoover and Kennedy but to millions of Americans whose only crime is that of doubting the wisdom of the men responsible for Korea.

FIFTY-ONE BILLION DOLLARS

To answer such wild utterances would be to repeat the mistake of clouding the issue.

Hoover said, "We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the Continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of defense of Western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money."

Speaking of money, we have sent into Europe since 1949 the sum of $51,764,500,000.

Of those dollars Britain received thirty-six and one-half billions, France nine and one-half billions, the Netherlands one and three-fourths billions and so on down the line, and we are on the point of spending another one hundred billions to arm Western Europe.

As I see it, what Messrs. Hoover and Kennedy suggest is in the first instance that we should get some military cooperation in return for such outlays.

To call that suggestion "isolationism" is wicked.

It is of record that in Korea the United States of America bore 90 percent of the burden and the other 52 members of the UN virtually nothing.

It is no wonder that the American people are coming rapidly to see and accept the Hoover view.

The New York Times in its carefully compiled Review of the News on December 31, reported that even Congressmen from the East, the so-called seat of internationalism find their mail running from 40 to 1 to 90 to 1 in support of the Hoover program.

The people seem to be wiser than some of the commentators.

Schick Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Whereas the former Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, now being used exclusively for domiciliary purposes by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the said veterans domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa is now being operated at less than one-fourth the capacity of the institution, resulting in inefficient, costly, and wasteful administration; and

Whereas thousands of veterans in the central United States are now urgently in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas many more thousands of disabled and sick veterans will soon be added, as a result of the fighting in Korea; and

Whereas the Schick Hospital should be opened to full capacity to provide care for the many thousand veterans and veterans-to-be, who are now in need of hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and

Whereas the Iowa Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly by Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, passed a resolution on February 3, 1947, requesting the Veterans' Administration to utilize Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and very desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; and

Whereas in the interests of economy and in the interest of the veterans of the central United States, we deem it advisable and necessary that the veterans domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, be used to full capacity; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has been deaf to the plea of veterans that the Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, be opened to full bed capacity thereby utilizing present existing facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Congress of the United States take immediate action to cause the Veterans' Administration to increase the use of Schick Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, from the present limited 500 domiciliary beds to also include an additional minimum of 1,000 beds for hospitalization, convalescence, and rehabilitation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and Gen. Carl R. Gray, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

O. H. HENNINGSEN.

We, W. H. Nicholas, lieutenant governor of Iowa, and Carroll A. Lane, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of Iowa.

W. H. NICHOLAS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Joshua Evans—Half Century Banker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this week many Washington people are paying tributes to a valuable citizen and an outstanding American. He is Joshua Evans who is completing a great history and service in banking. Among these tributes is an editorial in the Washington Post which I include as part of my remarks:

During his 56 years of banking in Washington, Joshua Evans, Jr., now retiring as vice president of the Hamilton National Bank, has sponsored many innovations in financial and civic affairs. But, even more, he has helped to break down the traditional concept of the banker as a cold, personally aloof community pillar. Throughout his career he has emphasized the human element in banking, both in his kindly service to individuals, and in his constant giving of himself to projects to benefit the District and the Nation. His reward is the deep affection of everybody with whom he has ever been in contact. Seldom has a businessman been so personally honored as he will be Wednesday night when national and local leaders pay him tribute at a testimonial dinner.

In some respects the career of "Josh" Evans, as he is widely known, has an Alger-boy quality. He came to Washington a youth fresh from the farm, became a runner in Riggs & Co., predecessor to the Riggs National Bank; learned to operate the bank's first adding machine; was the youngest man ever to become its general bookkeeper; worked his way up to vice president; in 1933 was one of the prime movers in founding the Hamilton National Bank. He wrote a paper, "The Making of a Bank Clerk," which attracted attention in national banking circles, and he helped to develop the American Institute of Banking of which he is a former trustee.

Yet, unlike the Alger boy of finance, Mr. Evans did not give himself to pursuit of a fortune. Rather he gave himself to the community, especially to helping to start new movements for its benefit, as the Community Chest, the Better Business Bureau, the Washington Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, out of which grew the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and new municipal finance committee procedures in the Board of Trade. He also trained and helped many young bank clerks, now business leaders here and in other cities. Now, as he retires, he has the satisfaction of knowing that all of this has amassed for him incalculable deposits of friendship.

Don't Hide the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is very refreshing to occasionally read an article which shows how much real service to the American people is being rendered by one of the Government agencies which we authorized, and which our appropriations support. I read such a story in an advance copy of the National County Agent and Vo-Ag Teacher magazine, which is regularly distributed only to county agents, Vo-Ag instructors, Soil Conservation Service field men, and Farmers Home Administration supervisors.

I have seen many duplicates of the story throughout the Eighth District of Alabama. I am sure any Congressman could find them in his district as well if he visited our farms, as I had occasion to do when working on the legislation which eventually developed into the Farm Housing Act of 1949. It is with considerable pleasure, therefore, that I offer to the membership of this Congress

the full text of an article which describes the accomplishments and the successes which have resulted from some of our actions.

DON'T HIDE THE FACTS

Before you knew the answers yourself, did you ever walk past a United States Department of Agriculture office sign and wonder a little about the people representing that Department and the work they do? Of course you did.

It's difficult to believe, but it's true, there are people and many of them, walking by those signs every day and asking the same questions.

Whose job is it to give them the answers? The local office of that Department has been placed there by Congress, representing all of our people, to provide a type of needed assistance for farmers that they are not in a position to obtain elsewhere. It's their office—it's there for them. Their congressional representatives provided it for them.

At first glance it would appear that it's basically the farmer's job to let others know why this USDA office is there. But that's only part of the story. It's no one person's responsibility more than another's. It's also the job of the USDA worker—the county agent, the FHA supervisor, the Vo-Ag teacher, and other Government agricultural workers to let the uninformed know what that USDA office is doing and why its work is important.

What about the person who isn't a farmer or a Government agricultural worker? He also has a responsibility to learn the facts himself and to let others have the facts too.

As an example of why all of us should be interested in learning the facts and passing them on, let's look in on the work of one of these USDA offices and see the value of its work. This sign says: "United States Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration."

It is one of the many such signs locating an office in county-seat towns in every State and in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Merely by changing the name and showing a different list of duties it could be a story of any USDA agency.

The office behind that sign was set up to help low-income farmers in the area, but in helping this group it helps the entire community. Its principal purpose is to help farmers live better by farming better. But in accomplishing that purpose it creates more and better customers for the community's merchants, makes bank depositors of families who had never previously used a bank's services, brings new groups of people into the various community activities, raises the value of all property in the community by increasing the value and improving the appearances of individual farms in the area, makes it probable that more people will attend the community's churches and more children continue in school work, and creates tax revenue from individuals who once might have been a drain on the community's tax fund. How many taxpayers realize this? And naturally the taxpayer wants to know how all of this is done.

He should know that the principal method the Farmers Home Administration uses to accomplish this purpose is through credit to families unable to obtain needed funds from other sources. Actually, however, this is only one of the tools used, and credit itself seldom solves the individual family problems with which this agency works. The more important tool is supervision; something that is a long step removed from the industrial meaning of the word. As used in this case, supervision means assistance in effective farm planning, and guidance in the efficient carrying out of farm and home plans.

The easiest way to explain the work of FHA and how it has accomplished the near miracle of creating almost a million successful farm families from a group of farmers who once lacked sound farming experience or the efficiency and earning capacity possible by modern methods (or the work of any other U. S. Department of Agriculture office), can best be shown by citing a typical case.

This case, which can be duplicated in principle in every county in the Nation, is of Morgan O'Kelley, who visited Tennessee in April 1941 and found mountains covered with redbud, crab apple, wild plum, and dogwood. The scene started dreams pounding in the head of the impressionable Irishman, and before the visit was ended he had bought a small place 8 miles from Oakdale, Tenn. Not much of a place—50 acres, a two-room cabin without electricity and a spring at the bottom of the hill its only water supply, eroded fields covered with briars, sassafras, and black gum. For the next 3 years the O'Kelleys, back in Michigan, scraped and saved for the time when they could move to Tennessee and start making over that worn-out farm.

Dreams often fade out under the cold, unmerciful light of realities, and that was what happened to the O'Kelleys, when on December 21, 1944, they moved. The last part of their trip was over a sawmill road which quickly let them know how important to a farmer a to-market road can be. Their December view of the farm was a lot different from the beautiful picture it had presented when in bloom. The stark nakedness and the erosion and the briars loomed up as almost insurmountable obstacles. And the house—well, Mrs. O'Kelley insisted that something had to be done about that if she stayed in Tennessee.

Labor being impossible to find, or to pay for with their limited savings, O'Kelley tackled the construction himself and did a good job. But it used up all the money they had saved, and they needed additional money for seed, fertilizer, fencing, and tools. That was when O'Kelley first saw the Farmers Home Administration sign in the office in Kingston, Tenn.

Inside the office he found Henry D. Wattenbarger, agricultural graduate from the University of Tennessee, and a man whom Roane County farmers said "knew his farming and could help folks." Henry listened to O'Kelley's story and said he thought the FHA might help. First, however, it would be necessary for the county committee to approve O'Kelley as an applicant.

As part of his job, Wattenbarger visited the O'Kelley farm to see how the FHA could help. He walked over the briar-grown pastures and suggested that in addition to trimming, it probably needed lime and phosphate. On his pad he made a note to check with the county agent and have the soil tested, not only on the pasture land but in the eroded fields where row crops were growing. He pointed out ways to fence the fields to make them easier to rotate and work, suggested seeding legumes and grass to heal scars of washing. The livestock could be built up, too, by careful breeding and a balanced ration. The tools were inspected, and a note made on the pad that better equipment would have to be available if O'Kelley was to do much of a job of farming. The barn and poultry house would need reworking too; and O'Kelley's carpentry on the new home indicated that he could do the job himself if he had the money to buy materials.

The inspection completed, Mr. and Mrs. O'Kelley and Wattenbarger sat down together around the kitchen table to put down on paper the plan for O'Kelley's operations. For FHA's part of the plan, Wattenbarger promised to provide enough money to make the plan work. More, he would drop by the O'Kelley farm from time to time to help Morgan with any technical farming problems which might develop. He would see that the SCS, Extension, and other United States Department of Agriculture workers were told of O'Kelley's problem so they could help in their specific line.

Today the O'Kelleys claim they are at least 10 years ahead in getting to where we are because of the aid FHA and others gave them. The road leading past their farm has been graded and graveled so that they have easy access to market. They have a completely modern, seven-room house, three brooder houses, a laying house, a two-car garage and a shop, a new corncrib and tool shed. A nephew, living with them for the past 3 years, has readied himself for college and his work on the farm will make it possible for him to go. The eroded cropland now produces 75-bushels per acre corn. Most of the farm is in grass—good grass—and on it Morgan has almost year-round pasture for a small beef herd and the family milk cows. His 3 acres of strawberries produced over 100 crates for market last year, and he raised 1,000 pullets for market, too.

There have been 1,210 "O'Kelleys" who have been aided by Henry Wattenbarger in a similar way during the past 9 years. They have had different names, different problems, different farms, but each has found that the supervised credit available from FHA will help them with specific problems, and enable them to live better because they farm better.

These 1,210 families, scattered over Morgan, Roane, and Scott Counties, Tenn.—the territory served by Wattenbarger—make up only about 28 percent of the farm families in the area; but they represent the people who could contribute little to the community without this type of assistance.

Approximately $610,000 has been loaned in the three-county area, and this represents money coming from outside the district which is spent within the three counties. Most of it went to dealers who sell equipment, seed, feed, fertilizers, livestock, building supplies, or home furnishings. On the basis that a dollar coming into a community is spent 10 times before it leaves, the three-county area has had a turn-over of $6,000,000 as a result of this FHA activity.

Because this money was loaned to families unable to obtain credit elsewhere, it has made 1,210 customers for local merchants who might otherwise not have spent any or much money in the area. Because these families have learned to farm better and their farms are earning more money, the amount of actual spending has been far greater than is represented by the amount of money loaned. O'Kelley's 75-bushel corn meant five times as much income from his cornland as came from the 15-bushel average he had 5 years ago.

Children of families with little or no farm income seldom have the opportunity of attending school as long as they should. O'Kelley's nephew who gained an opportunity to attend college as a side-product of the FHA loan is only one such example among the 1,210 families served by Wattenbarger during his 9 years in the FHA office at Kingston. Other sons and daughters or close relatives of FHA families have been active in 4-H or FFA work when otherwise the opportunity might have been denied them, have completed high school or gone on to college, have trained themselves for occupational opportunities of the future.

The health of the entire family has been improved because the families have learned to grow, preserve, and use a greater variety of food, can spend more for medical services, and have learned lessons of sanitation and nutrition.

The churches in these three counties show the benefits of FHA aid to families in their district. A farmer who is earning a good income from his farm is usually a generous giver to his local church, but the farmer who must skimp every dollar seldom has enough left over to support adequately any

religious activity. The increased good farming by these families has improved their earnings and multiplied their donations to educational, charitable, and religious institutions.

Some not-so-readily apparent benefits to the entire community also deserve mention. When Wattenbarger first came to the Kingston office as an FHA supervisor, many of these families were welfare cases, and few helped support the community by the taxes they paid. With increased income due to their better farming, they have become taxpayers who help to shoulder the burden that might have fallen on other members of the community without this assistance from FHA. Then, too, the changed appearance which has settled over the face of FHA farms has improved property values not only of the farms where FHA has helped but of their neighbors as well. You just can't remove one eyesore from a community without improving the whole community by its removal.

During a typical World War II year—1942—these and families like them throughout the United States were able to increase, with FHA aid, their milk production 20 percent while other farmers increased production only 3 percent. Similar increases were made in egg, pork, beef, sugar beet, dry bean, soybean, and peanut production—each increase larger than the increases reported by BAE for all farmers. In the months ahead, if it becomes necessary again to increase food production, these families represent a group capable of answering the call quickly and effectively.

One key to the success of Wattenbarger and of the families who cooperate with him has been a very active county farmer committee which has worked with the supervisor to select families most likely to succeed with FHA aid. Before any loan can be made, this committee of three local farmers consider the applicant and his abilities. If the loan is to help the applicant buy or develop a farm of his own, this committee also visits the farm and decides whether this particular farm can be made successful with the combination of FHA supervised credit and family ability. Once the loan is made, the committee does not forget the family. Periodically it reviews the borrower's progress, and may from time to time recommend further aid, or decide that he has now qualified for private credit rather than still having a need for continuing with FHA aid.

On the basis of this committee approval, or the family's ability to repay their loans in full from farm income, almost 1,000 of these 1,210 farm families in the 3 counties have now "graduated." That is, they now go to local banks, PCA's or other private-credit sources for any further assistance they may need. Most of the banks and PCA's in the three-county area know that many of their clients of today are farmers whom they would have rejected as lacking adequate security a few years ago. But those families have climbed up the ladder of farm success since that earlier date, and today they are among the most prosperous farmers in the community.

Wattenbarger at Kingston is only one of 1,700 such persons throughout the United States. Collectively, since the program was initiated, the agency has provided supervised credit to almost 2,000,000 farm families. Today they are still helping approximately 270,000 of these families, and most of the rest have now paid their loans in full and are continuing to farm with the aid of their own resources and skills, using private credit for their present needs. Most of them, too, are continuing to practice the planned, diversified farming which started them up the ladder toward their present success.

But when we cite any such case, emphasis should be placed on the fact that like FHA in the O'Kelley case, there are other valuable USDA agencies providing some specialized form of assistance to farmers and the whole community wherever you see their signs. In every county, Extension and its county and home demonstration agents are providing sound farm- and home-management education to farmers and their wives and both extension agents and Vo-Ag teachers are giving farm children an opportunity to develop into the good farmers of the future. The Soil Conservation Service, through its technicians in farmer-organized soil conservation districts, are helping farmers to retain or rebuild the fertility of their land and to use soil and water more economically. Production and Marketing Administration offices provide incentives for farmers to put into practice the sound farm-management methods taught by other agencies, and help to regulate our farm production and our marketing methods so that both the farmer and the community benefit. Forest Service helps prevent forest fires which might ravage whole communities, and indirectly helps farmers to get more benefit from their farm woodlots. Experiment stations are developing more efficient methods, better lines of livestock, and better seed for farmers to use.

Each agency has it own sign, each has its own specific tasks and methods of helping farmers solve specific problems which exist on their farms, but all have one thing in common—they are helping to build a better community.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an essay entitled "I Speak for Democracy" by James McKinney Budd, of Opelousas, La., a junior in high school, which was selected as one of the best in a contest held among junior and senior high school students in Louisiana:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Does the average citizen of the United States of America appreciate his democratic way of life? Does he know its value and the rights guaranteed to him thereunder? Is he willing to make the necessary sacrifices in order that these rights may be perpetuated for himself and his posterity?

Upon the answer to these questions depends whether or not the democracy of America will be lost and engulfed in the "isms" that threaten to destroy the democracies of the world, or whether this Nation will emerge triumphant from this period of the world's history which is marked by socialistic, communistic, and individualistic trends of thought and action. Today nothing less than the preservation of our lives, our fortunes, our honor, and our American way of life is at stake.

Standing as we do today in point of time, far distant from the adoption of the Constitution, it is difficult for us to understand and appreciate what it cost. If we could go back across the years and stand beside the men who took part in the framing of this great instrument, we would better appreciate its meaning. They were fresh from a conflict that was brought about by misrule, and they had banded themselves together in a common cause to resist the injustices which were being heaped upon them. They willingly endured the hardships of merciless war, in order that liberty might be guaranteed to them and to their posterity. They paid that price in order that man might set up in a new world a new form of government—and time has proved the soundness of their reasoning.

Have the sacrifices of our forefathers been in vain, and will this experiment which started more than 150 years ago, be able to endure the vicissitudes which now encompass the nations of the world, or will the historians of future generations have to write that the greatest democracy of all times failed? No, this struggle for self-government and freedom will go on. Democracy lives in the hearts of all who pay the price of freedom, and who have the moral courage to resist oppression, class distinctions, and racial and religious discriminations, and are willing to champion the rights of all human beings. From personal freedom comes all the moral good and all the material wealth of this happy country; the richness of human living, and the always brighter vision of a better future which only Americans know. Let us never forget that personal freedom carries personal responsibility. The citizenship of America have taken upon themselves the responsibility of proving to the world that people are able to govern themselves. The history of the past with all its bloodshed, its heartaches, sorrows, its toil and sacrifices and those who come after us shall ever keep alive our form of free government. The heroes of the past cry out to this generation to save and protect it. It is the duty of every individual citizen, your duty and mine, to learn the meaning and value of the Constitution, and that for which it stands. Thus will we show our appreciation to the founders of the Constitution for guaranteeing to the citizens of the United States of America the democracy which we now enjoy, and for which many of our forefathers paid the supreme sacrifice.

To fulfill these ideals it is obvious that we must stand together. We are being forged into a new unit amidst the fires of envy and suspicion that now blaze throughout the world. In their ardent heat we shall, let us pray, through God's intercession, be purged of faction and division, and be purified of the errant humors of party and private interest, to be brought forth finally in the days that are to come with a new dignity of national pride and spirit. A pride and spirit beckoning all nations into a global democracy, wherein all will join hands and hearts in recognizing the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, which is basically the true concept of all democracy.

I speak for democracy—democracy at home and democracy throughout the world.

Progress on the Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the December 31, 1950, issue of the New York Times entitled "Progress on the Tennessee":

PROGRESS ON THE TENNESSEE

Although the Tennessee Valley Authority produces only a small percentage—perhaps 6 or 7 percent—of the total electric power output of the United States, it continues

to grow. Its latest report, made public yesterday, shows that the capacity of its power system has increased nearly four times since 1940. During the fiscal year covered by the report it produced 17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which was 12 times as much as was generated in its region in 1933. Further construction now under way will bring the present installed capacity of 3,000,000 kilowatts to 4,900,000 by 1953. Of course, TVA's development is a part of the total power development in the country. The electrical industry, private and public, has made great strides. In 1933, for example, the average domestic consumer in the United States used about 600 kilowatt-hours. Average consumption now is 1,765 kilowatt-hours, but TVA's domestic consumers used an average of 3,079 kilowatt-hours during the last fiscal year. It should be remembered, of course, that TVA power for domestic consumption is sold to municipalities and cooperatives, who then undertake the retail distribution.

There will doubtless be argument to the end of time as to TVA's profits. The fact is, however, that the investment allocated to power in the TVA system brought in during the last fiscal year a net operating revenue of $27,000,000, or a return of about 5¾ percent on the average depreciated power investment. Some of these earnings have been repaid to the United States Treasury and a large sum—$111,000,000—has been reinvested in the power system. On the whole, it looks more than ever as though the Government's investment in the TVA's power facilities has been a sound one.

At the same time TVA is able to show increasing use of its 630 miles of navigation channel on the Tennessee River, with an estimated saving of $6,000,000 in transportation costs. Its flood-control system again reduced flood crests, both on the Tennessee and on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. It has carried on research in the production of fertilizers with advantage both to farmers and to private manufacturers. Test demonstrations, most of them in the Tennessee Valley but others in twenty-odd outlying States, have helped to conserve the land. Forests have been protected, malaria has been practically wiped out, there has been a great increase in recreational facilities, and State and local agencies have been encouraged to take increasing responsibility.

All in all, TVA seems to be established as a successful part of the American system. It has not destroyed either democracy or private enterprise in the Tennessee Valley. It has created a model which may be adopted, no doubt with many changes for use in other parts of the country.—From the Sunday, December 31, issue of the New York Times.

Who Said That?—"For Your Information the Marine Corps Is the Navy's Police Force"—The Marines Don't Believe It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House, and in fact most of the people throughout the Nation, will remember the now famous letter which I received from President Truman in response to my request that the United States Marine Corps be accorded representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. President Truman wrote me as follows:

AUGUST 29, 1950.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: I read with a lot of interest your letter in regard to the Marine Corps. For your information the Marine Corps is the Navy's police force and as long as I am President that is what it will remain. They have a propaganda machine that is almost equal to Stalin's.

Nobody desires to belittle the efforts of the Marine Corps, but when the Marine Corps goes into the Army it works with and for the Army, and that is the way it should be.

I am more than happy to have your expression of interest in this naval military organization. The Chief of Naval Operations is the Chief of Staff of the Navy of which the Marines are a part.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Evidence of the widespread interest in the Truman-marine letter and the extent of its publication was brought to light in an Associated Press release of January 22 from Port Huron, Mich., which revealed that 20 Purple Heart Medals were forwarded to the President by 20 wounded Marine Corps veterans of the Korean action to forceably remind Mr. Truman of the error of his recent statement that the United States Marines are the police force of the Navy and have a propaganda machine almost equal to Stalin's.

Pfc. Donald R. Chatterson, a 20-year old marine veteran of Korea, who was wounded and is now on 30 days' recuperation leave at his home, gave the story to the press. According to Private Chatterson, he and 19 other wounded marines heard of the President's remarks upon their evacuation to the Treasure Island Marine Base at San Francisco and were so angered that they put their Purple Heart Medals in the same envelope and addressed it to President Truman.

Private Chatterson said he never learned whether the President got the medals. He was wounded twice in Korea, first at Inchon and later in North Korea.

The Associated Press report of this incident follows:

PURPLE HEARTS SENT TO TRUMAN BY 20 RESENTFUL MARINES

PORT HURON, MICH., January 22.—President Truman has 20 Purple Heart Medals—if the United States mails saw them through to the White House—to remind him of his since regretted remarks about the Marine Corps being the Navy's police force.

This was revealed today by Pfc. Donald R. Chatterson, 20-year-old marine veteran of Korea. Wounded, Private Chatterson now is home on 30 days' recuperation leave.

Hearing of the President's remarks upon their evacuation to the Treasure Island Marine Base at San Francisco, Private Chatterson said he and 19 other wounded marines were so angered that they put their Purple Heart Medals in the same envelope and addressed it to President Truman.

Private Chatterson said he never learned whether the President got the medals.

Besides describing the Marine Corps as the Navy's police force, the President accused it of having a propaganda machine the equal of Stalin's. He later apologized and expressed his regrets.

Describing fighting in Korea, Private Chatterson told a reporter: "It's like a horrible nightmare. You can't imagine what it's like."

He was wounded twice and lost 48 pounds. He now weighs only 90 pounds. First he was hit at Inchon. Later he was hit by machine-gun bullets in North Korea.

In Washington the White House said there was no record that the medals had been received and no comment.

Timid Forget United States Is Mighty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting and informative article written by Lester Allen, appearing in the Boston Post of January 21, 1951:

TIMID FORGET UNITED STATES IS MIGHTY—FEAR NEEDLESS BECAUSE NATION'S ABILITY TO OUTPRODUCE WORLD WILL SURELY DEFEAT RED FORCES

(By Lester Allen)

Beneath the hum of the furiously busy industrial centers of the United States a phrase from the words of a man now dead echoes faintly. "There is nothing to fear but fear itself."

That phrase uttered in the darkest days of the Nation's history, when confidence had fled and the national economy tottered, rallied the confused and divided American people to a superb effort. It bade them to raise their eyes from their own personal problems, look about the broad and fruitful land which was and is theirs and take heart.

Today, the potentialities of the same broad and fruitful Nation, the possibility that an outraged people will unify and rally to another supreme effort, prevents the masters of 735,000,000 people in Russia, China, and the satellite Communist states from attempting a direct affront to 493,700,000 people of North America and Western Europe.

NOT SO SIMPLE

The rule of thumb of Asiatic strategists is "We kill one capitalist soldier, they kill 10 Communist soldiers, pretty soon there are no more capitalist soldiers."

If, however, it were as simple as that the Soviet Union leaders would long since have sent overwhelming armies on the march.

Modern war isn't as simple as that. It must have a base of raw materials, heavy industry, electrical generation capacity, steel production. In modern warfare human cannon fodder spread over the land areas does not always mean victory.

STEEL HALTS STALIN

During the past week a significant figure was announced, not by the Government but by the American steel industry. The annual steel capacity of the United States is now 104,229,650 tons a year, a 28-percent increase since 1940.

In that figure may be found the answer to why Stalin doesn't launch the attempt to grab the world, for this steel capacity fused into an alloy with a unified and determined American people means the ultimate defeat of all the ambitious plans of the Soviet Union.

DEPEND ON STEEL

Even if the steel-producing capacity of the Soviet Union and its satellites were joined to that of Western Europe by quick

conquest, there would still be only 89,700,000 tons of steel annually against our 104,229,650.

All the other superiorities in the hands of the western nations arrayed against Communist aggression are dependent upon steel. Coal, petroleum, electrical output, horsepower output of engines for a mechanized age all depend upon steel. It is no longer "How many divisions have you?" but rather "How much steel production have you?"

TOPS THE WORLD

In the present state of American supply lines the Nation tops anything the world has ever known. But it is not self-sufficient. In order to continue at this level of industrial strength certain raw materials must be imported.

To guarantee a continued supply of imported raw materials a huge Navy and merchant marine is necessary, if war comes, to prevent a stoppage of our lines of supply. Thus the fortunes of the people of the United States are inextricably linked with those of the people of the other western nations arrayed against communism.

CAN WEAR REDS DOWN

With Western Europe security maintained we can go on indefinitely wearing down the strength of the Soviet Union, hamstringing its growing industrial strength, a growth secured only at an appalling sacrifice of a higher standard of living for the people of the Soviet Union and the satellite states.

It can be said without fear of contradiction that the average American doesn't know or appreciate the strength of his country and is inclined to underrate it, to make the task ahead seem more formidable than it is.

SACRIFICE LIGHT

A unified American people, dedicating their whole effort to removing the peril of communism forever from their lives, would have to make certain sacrifices not only in their standard of living but also in their economic status.

Yet the sacrifice would only entail going back to the living standards which prevailed in what has been looked upon as the golden age, the period between 1922 and 1929.

Never in all the world's history has so much power been used and not abused. It is a matter of great pride for Americans to consider how, with the means at hand, to become a dominant and dominating power in the world, the Nation clung to an idealism which is scorned by the exponents of total application of such power.

DO NOT UNDERSTAND

All that the American people have lacked in the performance of one of the greatest feats of unselfishness ever undertaken, the restoration of the economies of the nations of Western Europe after the ravages of war, is a becoming modesty.

Pride in our accomplishment has been mistaken for arrogance or evil intent to tie Western European nations to our wheels by political bonds in exchange for our generous aid. If anything, too few political agreements were exacted for the aid we have given.

EUROPE NEEDS US

It is true that Western Europe cannot get along in the face of the present danger without us. But we cannot get along without Western Europe. We are tied to Western Europe by bonds of blood, civilization, culture and commerce and it would be virtually impossible to sever those ties by a stroke of a pen or a gust of oratory.

The swarming armies of Asia, lightly armed, deficient in transport, are plagued by dependence upon the Soviet Union for the implements of war. Hunger always stalks those lands. It is a hunger that, with famine conditions, can only be alleviated by the generosity and good will of the nations of the West.

Today India, which has striven to play both ends of the political spectrum, faced the stark necessity of securing food from the United States to fill the gap in a deficient harvest. Millions will starve otherwise. The chief question is whether such aid to India would have political strings tied to it. Some experts say yes; others say it would be harmful to our cause.

The rice Christians of the Far East may find their counterparts in the rice democrats, who embrace our cause only for so long as they need food.

URGENT ISSUE

Yet, these questions are collateral ones. The most urgent question is adding the ingredient of national unity and individual faith in our cause to our substantial supremacy in production.

Perhaps the greatest lack in our striving for unity of purpose is that of faith in God, for it is freedom of worship that will first be obscured under the hammer and sickle.

CHURCHES CAN HELP

The churches of all faiths could perform a service to all humanity here in the United States by reexamining the requirements and the attitudes of militant faith. The centuries-long strife recorded in the Old and New Testaments and the utterances of the great prophets nowhere recommend a supine acceptance of cruel aggression and oppression. To fight for the right is a basic duty of all who worship God under any dogma or faith.

FEAR NOT JUSTIFIED

The intrusion of fear and uncertainty into our national life points to a serious deficiency in our moral fiber. Many churchmen of many faiths have a conviction that it is a lack caused by the conflict of materialism with worship. The dedicated and sometimes fanatic idealism of the past, attitudes like the abolition movement, seems not to be possible in a materialistic age.

It is difficult to reconcile our primacy in steel production with the sterility of religious feeling in the mass of the people.

SHUN COM..UNISM

But this much is certain, the perverted religion of communism, trumpeting up its holy wars against the capitalistic infidels, will never be accepted by the American people as the innovation that will cure all. They hold a sublime faith in themselves, and have only forgotten that such faith grew under the protection of faith in God.

Not long ago Henry B. du Pont, of the giant du Pont corporation, made a speech in Tulsa, Okla., in which he described how he would operate if he were a Communist saboteur.

LISTS STORIES

"The stories I would spread," said Mr. du Pont, "would sound very plausible to the uninformed. I would have all kinds of people going about telling their neighbors, for instance, that the big companies are bent on driving the little fellows out of business; that they arbitrarily fix prices; that they suppress inventions; that they make exorbitant profits; that they hold the power of life and death over small business. I would like that word 'power.' It sounds so satisfactorily sinister and I wouldn't have to explain what it means. * * * Then, if this program of propaganda resulted in legislation to break up large units of American business and to provide government ownership of basic industries, think of the delight back in the Kremlin."

INDUSTRY ACCUSED

Mr. du Pont should have gone on to say that the campaign has been carried out in just that way in the United States and that these things that he would do if he were a Communist saboteur have become current coinage in the United States.

Here is where the undercurrent of fear runs swiftest. These charges have been made against big industries. And big industries have failed to point out that they are only as big as their least important worker, that we could not be the world's largest producer of steel, steel that makes the difference between victory and defeat, if it were not for the skill of the sweating steel worker charging a furnace in a steel plant.

TUNELESS CHORUS

The equality of sacrifice which is a constant refrain in matters of taxation mean sacrifice of corporate profit as well as individual profit. The "leading down to the road to socialism" chorus has become rather tuneless, just as the "wave of the future" became hackneyed during World War II.

The American people produce these giant quantities because they are free, because they enjoy a high standard of living, because they have a genius for improvisation, and not because their concerted effort produces big corporations.

CAN SAVE WORLD

If the Chinese peasant understood one-tenth as well as the average American what the stakes are in this struggle they would be really formidable. We need unity and need it badly. We can achieve unity under a code of Christian morality.

We have the tools to work with. We have all that is needed to arm ourselves in righteousness so that a thousand years hence this second half of the twentieth century will gleam like a priceless jewel in history as a golden age. Rid of fear and linked in unity the American people can and will save the world from darkness.

National Council of Churches of Christ Supports Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is a resolution of the National Council of the Churches of Christ adopted at the meeting of the board on January 17, 1951, supporting United States food aid to the people of India. This is one of the first acts of this great new organization of the churches of the Protestant denominations. It is significant that it is an expression of humanitarian and high public policy in the outstanding tradition of the organizations which have combined together to create the new organization.

The resolution follows:

FOOD FOR INDIA

For many months the foreign missions conference and its India committee have been greatly concerned over India's desperate food emergency, knowing that millions of her people are not only underfed and undernourished, but many are at the point of starvation. We have worked closely with the department of international justice and good will and with other interested agencies and at the annual meeting in January 1950 and again in Cleveland last November the conference took action urging that ways and means should be devised by our Government to make available quantities of food in Government possession to the Government of India on mutually agreeable terms, toward relieving India's need. We further instructed the officers of the conference to arrange for consultation with appropriate Government officials looking toward this end.

Since the Cleveland meeting the need has been greatly emphasized by the request in mid-December from the Indian Government through its Ambassador, Madame Pandit, for 2,000,000 tons of food grains on the basis of a long-term loan. Our representatives went to Washington last week. Many vital contacts have been made. The question is now before our Government. The committee on relief and reconstruction services of the division of foreign missions took action last week, the United Council of Church Women took action at their biennial meeting last November. At a meeting of its executive board the division of life and work yesterday approved the draft resolution which is being brought to the general board today and which summarizes and brings up to date the resolutions of the several units, strongly urging affirmative and quick response on the part of our Government. We believe that action of the general board will greatly strengthen the resolutions of its several units.

We therefore bring for your consideration the following resolution:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has been officially requested by the Government of India to make available 2,000,000 tons of food grain to relieve the acute food shortage in that country; and

"Whereas such action on the part of our Government would be justified not only on humanitarian grounds but also for the reason that it would strengthen the bonds of friendship between the American and Indian peoples: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America recommend that the Congress and the executive branch of the Government of the United States take such steps as may be required to assist in meeting the present urgent needs of the Indian people for emergency food aid, and that this food be made available on such terms as may be mutually acceptable to the two governments."

Address by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and address:

WARNER BROS.
PICTURES DISTRIBUTING CORP.,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1950.

Hon. LOUIS B. HELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HELLER: On behalf of Mr. Harry M. Warner, president of Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., I am happy to present you with a recording of an address delivered by Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin of Los Angeles.

Mr. Warner was so inspired by this patriotic anti-Communist message that he wants to make it available to all America if possible. He especially wants every Government official and legislator to hear it. A copy of the text is enclosed for your convenience, but we hope you will listen to the recording as the delivery adds to the power of the message.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge this directly to Mr. Harry M. Warner, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., Burbank, Calif.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. DORSEY.

JANUARY 24, 1951.

Mr. HARRY M. WARNER,
Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.,
Burbank, Calif.

DEAR MR. WARNER: Thank you very much for sending me a recording of Rabbi Maxwell H. Dubin's address. I enjoyed listening to it, and I agree that the delivery adds powerfully to the potency of the message. I thought so well of it that I am today having the text inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your attempt to bring the rabbi's address to the attention of all Americans and the expense and trouble you have gone to in undertaking it again proves that your active role upon the Jewish scene continues unabated.

With kind and cordial regards, I am,

Sincerely,

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

CONDENSED VERSION OF TALK DELIVERED BY RABBI MAXWELL H. DUBIN, WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TEMPLE, BEFORE THE CONGREGATION ON ROSH HASHANA, THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

Last night we ushered in the New Year. In Jewish life this period is called the Yomin Neroim, the Awesome Days, the days when the fate of the individual, so Jewish tradition tells us, is determined by God for the entire year.

It seems to me that there is a Yomin Neroim atmosphere, an Awesome Days atmosphere for the entire civilized world today, but the fate of all civilization lies in the balance trembling, and mankind is awaiting the decision.

Now, this is not the place and there is not time to detail all the mistakes that the democratic nations and peoples made during the past 5 years since the war ended. But I do want to consider with you one of them, because it is the crux of the problem.

The first and the most fatal error that the democratic world made, was our absolute failure to understand the true meaning of communism and the real aims and ambitions of Soviet Russia. We were led to believe in America that communism was a forward-looking social movement, led by great idealists who had a high code of social and international morality. We were sold the idea that Soviet Russia was a civilized country, determined to direct its international life in paths of peace and of progress. We were told that Soviet Russia had a government that would have respect for law and order, that would have respect for its international promises and commitments, and would devote its best interests to the welfare of its own people and to the peoples of other lands.

We Jews knew from the outset that all those statements and claims made by Soviet Russia were not true. We Jews knew the truth about the Communists and about Soviet Russia and we knew it through years of bitter experience and pain and blood and suffering and terrible horrors. We paid a bitter price for that knowledge. We know that the Jews of Russia, the millions of Jews who lived there when the revolution took place were the first ones to be liquidated by the Communists. They were sent to labor camps, they dug the canals, they were sent out to Siberia and they died by the hundreds of thousands because the thing for which the Jew stood and stands—respect for human individuality—was not and is not wanted by Soviet Russia.

We knew the truth; but no one listened to us. When the Jews, during the rise of the Nazis, told the world that the burning of those synagogues in Germany was only a prelude to that which eventually led to the bombing of Westminster Abbey and the other English churches, nobody listened to us. So no one listened to the Jew when he warned the world against the aims and the ambitions of Soviet Russia. We warned the world even during the honeymoon period when Russia was working with us, not an ally—she never was an ally—we just happened to have had the same common enemy, that's all; we warned the world to be careful and to be wary, but no—we were just a voice crying in the wilderness. So Russia was treated by the nations of the world like a spoiled child that threatens to hold its breath if it does not get what it wants. We accepted her word, we had faith in her signature, faith in the agreements that were made. And what was the result? We are facing it now. Russia violated every promise to the Western World. She abused our trust, spread her power, seized lands, destroyed governments, developed fifth columns throughout the world and poisoned the minds of millions of peoples against their native governments.

Well, 5 years too late, we of America realize and the world realizes the bitter mistake that was made. We have to rid ourselves, to rid every aspect of our lives, social and political and industrial and economic, of the Communist infiltration.

So we are at the brink of momentous days, you and I. The destiny of a world is in the scales and no one can tell of a certainty what is going to happen.

Officially, we are not at war because Congress has not said there is a war. But, factually, there is a war at this moment. There is a war, Russian-inspired, Russian-led, Russian-equipped, in Korea. Right now on Rosh Hashana morning when I am talking to you, boys of this congregation—I know of two who are at this moment in battle with the Marines in Korea—American boys are dying, newspapers are carrying casualty lists, homes are being broken, hearts of parents are being torn. Reserves are being called.

We are at war; and that war is being waged on two fronts. I am not concerned so much about the war in Korea if it does not spread, and, please God, it may not spread. That does not worry me very much because I know that that front is going to be cleaned up before long. But there is another front, the home front, and that front worries me. Because on this home front war has been declared on us by Soviet Russia. And that has to concern us. And it has to concern every man, woman and child in America. Because you see, my friends, the whole character of war has changed. Wars are no longer fought only on the battlefield; and wars are fought not only by men, and yes, even women in uniform. You and I who are not in uniform, you and I today are just as much in the service as though we actually wore a uniform. Wars today are fought at home. Wars are fought in the laboratories, wars are fought in the factories. That is where Russia has declared war upon us. Her aim is to paralyze, her aim is to sabotage, her aim is to slow down the work that we in America are trying to do in order to prepare ourselves for the ordeal.

In the days ahead you and I have to be on guard, very much on guard, because attempts have been made and attempts will be made to befog the issue. You are going to be asked to sign all kinds of protests and all kinds of proclamations. Be careful. Know what you are doing and if you do not know, ask. There are Government agencies to enlighten you.

Remember that this terrible scourge that we call communism must be stopped wherever we are going to meet it. And in that connection we have a two-fold duty, you and I. We have a duty to our country, to America—and we have a duty to our faith, to Judaism, and to our co-religionists as Jews, and to all faiths, whatever they may be.

I returned recently from three months abroad. You have heard Americans returning from abroad recite the trite, the very

trite words, but none the less true words, that America is the best, the most fortunate land in the world. And it is. Both materially and spiritually, there is not another land in the world as fortunate as America. The best proof of that is that people everywhere abroad, no matter where one goes, want to come to America.

Everyone wants to come here and few people want to leave America. Your best proof of that is that whenever a Communist agent is ordered to be deported from America to Europe, listen to the fuss that he makes about going back to his paradise of a homeland. He doesn't want to leave, he wants to remain here.

Now, here in America, labor is better protected and better treated than anywhere else in the world, even in Socialist England. Labor enjoys more governmental benefits in America than it enjoys in Socialist England. That irks Russia, because Russia is supposed to be the fatherland of the proletariat. Russia is supposed to be the land where the working people have everything, Russia—and not America. Therefore Russia does not like us. For that reason every person who loves America, every person who makes a living here, every person who enjoys the way of life that is America, must protect it in the danger that now faces it.

As for the Jews, let us not forget this, my friends. That wherever Communist Russia has come to power, Jewish life has been destroyed. There is not a vestige of Jewish religious, economic, social, or cultural life left in Russia today, not a vestige. And even in Moscow, the Yiddish daily, Heint, which was nothing but a Yiddish translation of Pravda, has been eliminated. Yiddish writers have been sent out to Siberia. There is not a vestige of Jewish life in Russia today. And those few Jews who have been able to steal out from behind the iron curtain in Europe—from Rumania and Hungary and Czechoslovakia and all the rest of the Balkan countries, they tell us that the last traces of Jewish life are being eliminated behind the iron curtain by the Communists.

Now, remember this, should—God forbid—the horrible thing happen and communism spread its influence over this country, then I say to you that the American Jewish community, which is today the largest, the most influential, the most powerful Jewish community in the world, will go down and will be destroyed even as have been the Jewish communities of Europe.

Therefore, for these reasons, we must be on guard. We must pledge ourselves to wipe out communism wherever and whenever we find it, even if it means cutting deep into our own family and social circles. My friends, there was in Jewish life, particularly amongst the orthodox Jews in days gone by, a weapon that was used to control the community. It is a weapon which, of course, we of the liberal Jewish group do not have and never have had, but it was a weapon in Jewish life. It was a weapon that was so horrible that even those who watched its being inflicted in the synagogue, were terror-stricken, not to speak of the one who was subjected to that weapon. It was called the charem, excommunication. So we today must take a page out of the book of those old Jews and apply that same weapon, that same punishment today, the punishment of excommunication, of ostracism, of complete isolation from the community of any Jew who has become infected with the Communist virus.

The fate of humanity is lying in the balance and the slightest hair may tip those scales in one direction or another. It is a fact, a fact that faces you, and you, and you, and me every moment of our existence today.

So we pray for life this morning. We pray that God may inscribe us, and inscribe our dear ones, and inscribe the world in the Book of Life. But there can be no certainty of life, there can be no certainty of a future for any of us if this dread thing continues to go on. It will affect you and you, and you, and every single member of your family and mine. So we pray to God this morning for life. We pray that this catastrophe may be averted, that untold millions of people may not be condemned to death through the horrors of another war. Grant us, then, O God, Thy protection. Grant that this year that we have ushered in, may be for us and for all humanity, a year of life and not of death, a year of peace and not of war, a year of happiness and not of misery. Amen.

Taxation Must Be Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the President, a few days ago, asked for a budget for the coming year of $71,500,000,000. To get this money, he asked for a $17,500,000,000 increase in income taxes in this session of the Congress.

In his budget message to the Congress, he made it plain that the great part of it would have to come out of the pockets of the small taxpayers and the laboring man. I quote:

> Income tax increases should be imposed at all levels, but by far the largest part of the additional revenues must come from the middle and lower tax brackets. These are the brackets in which the great bulk of the income is located.

Those were the President's words.

High taxes bear especially heavy on the lower, middle class, and the laboring people because there are so many of them. Those paying on an income of $10,000 a year or less, pay over 63 percent of all income taxes. In addition to the income taxes, they have to pay local, county, and State taxes; and in addition to that they have to pay for hidden taxes in the cost of every item they buy. A great part of the wage earner's salary is now taken in Federal, State, and hidden taxes.

During the latter part of last year's session, we increased the taxes on the little fellows about 20 percent and on larger taxpayers as well. If we try to raise $17,500,000,000 in additional taxes, as recommended by the President in his recent message, we will place an undue hardship on them, and all taxpayers, which may wreck the economy of our country.

The rate is higher for those above the $10,000 bracket, reaching to the point where the Government takes an over-all top of 87 percent of the total earnings of the wealthy. Even with these high rates, the Government will only be able to get 23.3 percent from those earning over $25,000.

Mr. Speaker, if the President and Congress would take the entire personal income of our citizens earning over $25,000 a year, including the income of all the so-called millionaires in the Nation, it amount to $7,500,000,000. The tax program recommended by the President is dangerous to the entire economy of the Nation and will work an undue hardship on all of its citizens.

What the President should do first is to join with us Members of the Congress who know that with his cooperation and help the budget he has recommended could and should be reduced by $7,500,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, we should cut all unnecessary nonmilitary spending to the bone, and greatly reduce the administration's give-away policy to other nations. If we continue to follow this reckless policy of spending, our Government will be in greater danger of destruction from within, than it is from a foreign foe.

We can spend ourselves into financial bankruptcy and lose our liberty and our country, as Lenin, the founder of Russian communism predicted over 30 years ago. He said in substance, "We can cause the United States to spend itself into financial destruction, becoming an easy prey to the Communist form of government."

Reckless and unnecessary spending by the administration for the past few years has fed the fires of inflation, which has continued the rise in the cost of living, causing laboring men to ask for higher wages. The old-age pensioners, those with fixed salaries, and aged people trying to live on insurance savings are hit the hardest. When the laboring man gets a raise in wages, the high cost of living wipes it out in a never-ending cycle of inflation.

Government spending increases inflation, the cost of living, and threatens to bankrupt the Nation. The cost of Government should be cut to the bone before increasing taxes. When that is done, we should then increase taxes as much as our economy will stand, in an effort to balance the budget.

Pythianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of all my colleagues a very inspiring address on Pythianism. This address was delivered by Dr. Karl Applbaum, rabbi of the Bayside Jewish Center in Brooklyn, at special services dedicated to the Knights of Pythias, one of our better-known national fraternities. These services were held on Friday evening, December 22, 1950, with many members of the Knights of Pythias as participants in, and guests at, the services.

Dr. Applbaum is a past chancelor of Lodge No. 515, Knights of Pythias, and is very active in interfaith work. The text of his address follows:

> Our services tonight are dedicated to those of us who have given of ourselves to the

teachings of Pythianism. What is Pythianism? Are its teachings new? Our answer is "No." The basic teachings and concepts of Pythianism are as old as the teachings and concepts of our religion. Its best inspiration and lesson can be found in the story of Hillel.

This story relates that Hillel came to Palestine for the sole purpose of studying under the great teachers of the law. For 40 years, day and night, he kept himself busy with subjects that fascinated and thrilled him. His treasure hunt brought him far more than the average share of gems. Like many a modern student he earned his own way, taking a few hours off daily for chopping wood. Out of his small earnings he spent half on his education and personal needs, and the other half he gave to charity. At last he achieved his goal and became one of the greatest scholars of his day, and one of the outstanding teachers of religion in Jewish history. When he reached the pinnacle of success a Roman heathen came to him and said: "I have never studied the Jewish religion and I should like to start now." "It is never too late, my friend," said Hillel. "Very well, I do not have much time. I want you to teach me all you know about your religion in the short time that I can balance myself on one foot." "I wish, my friend, that you had more time. There is so much to learn. But, stand on your foot and I will teach you," answered Hillel. The astonished Roman balanced himself on one foot and Hillel said to him, "You shall not do to others what you do not want them to do to you. That is our whole Torah. The rest is all explanation." Subsequently the Roman was converted to Judaism and became a devoted disciple of Hillel, and for many years an ardent student of his academy.

The above concept is an example of what true religion represents. Pythianism stands for the same principles as religion, it is a religion, a way of life. One cannot understand or follow the principles of Pythianism unless he understands religion. If we are asked to summarize religion we can say that "Religion is a belief in God the Creator and His teachings, and the attempt to use these teachings to make ourselves finer human beings." A religious person must respect the rights and opinions of others—so does a good Pythian. Respect is the key word in religion. Even though we feel that our observances are the correct ones for us, we must not be bitter toward those who practice any other faith, or even a different shade of the same faith.

A religious person always cooperates with the group. Selfishness makes nobody happy, unselfishness makes everybody happy. That is one of the most important lessons of religion. Pythianism and religion stand side by side and say: "One cannot be a disciple of one group if he does not believe in the teachings of the other." No religion is worth anything if it does not show itself one way or another in actual life. Religion must be lived. "It is no vain thing for you; it is your life."

We can thus summarize religious life and say that in addition to all observances and rituals commanded to us, there must be as the basis—doing what is right at all times and in all places. Right conduct is the most important part of the religious life. It means to do the right in private and in public, in the open and in the secret, against all odds. Without upright conduct, no one can be said to live a religious life, no matter how much he prays and how many forms he keeps up. The real core of the religious life is found in purity, honesty, kindness, in industry, faithfulness, obedience, charity, and every other form of right doing. These are the real molds in which the religious life is cast. Without them, there can be no true and loving relation between man and God. "Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy."

It is with the above thoughts in mind that we Pythians have come here to pray. We know that Pythianism consists not merely in affiliation with the order, not merely in paying dues, but practicing the teachings and living with its principles. We fully realize that if there was more Pythianism in the world there would be less wars; if there was more understanding there would be less dissension; if more money was spent on education less would have to be expended on military training; if there were more disciples of Damon and Pythias there would be less soldiers in the armies of the world; if there was universal Pythianism we would not need universal military training; if more followed the teachings of Hillel there would be no need for guns and ammunition for war. Therefore, believing in all these things, we members of the Pythian order and our friends have gathered here this evening at a time when unrest fills the world, to pray for the day when our Heavenly Father, the maker of all flesh, will rekindle in the hearts of mankind the love of justice and fraternal love, in accordance with the principles of democracy and the spirit of brotherhood of man, when He will teach us to purge ourselves of prejudice, slander, and selfish endeavors.

We pray to Thee, O Father, to cast Thy countenance upon our beloved country, America. Shelter the inhabitants of its sunkissed soil from anguish, humiliation, and gloom. May distress and reproach never entrench their spirits. May our country's educational institutions ever be the lighthouses of justice and freedom, the abode of equal opportunity and brotherly love. Make Thy divine prophecy soon come to pass, when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning forks; when nation shall not lift sword against nation, nor shall they learn war anymore. Then will freedom flood the world and strife and discord disappear. Amen.

Stop—Look—Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank H. Lamb, manufacturer of machinery and author of several books, and at one time a member of the executive committee of Rotary International, published a half-page advertisement in his home-town newspaper New Year's Day in opposition to America's present foreign policy.

Scores of copies of Mr. Lamb's statement have been sent to me by citizens who agree with him, and they and he all are entitled to the fullest hearing on the statements made in opposition to our present foreign policy. I, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, am having the Lamb statement on foreign policy published in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that it may have the widest circulation possible among policy makers in the Government.

Mr. Lamb's statement follows:

STOP—LOOK—LISTEN

Parents of today and of generations yet unborn, are you raising your children for a normal life of work and service or to perish on some foreign battlefield?

Workers in field, factory, or office, are you laboring for a higher standard of living, the necessities of family and old age, or producing battle spoil to be spread around the world?

Businessmen, would you rather trade in or make articles for more human comfort and enjoyment for education, culture, and recreation or machinery, guns, bombs, poisons for the wholesale destruction of life?

Widows, orphans, aged, heads of endowed schools and foundations, all those depending on savings, annuities, bonds, fixed income or insurance, will you be able to live on the provisions you or others have made for your future, or will all your bonds, endowments, reserves, and assets be wiped out by an inflation that has already reduced the value of the dollar to half what it was a decade ago?

These questions and others equally as critical are being decided today with little reference to you and on superficial congressional consideration by an administration dominated by military men (Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and MacArthur for example) headed by a President prone to bombast and snap judgments ("We can lick old Joe" and some recent letters), and supported by a flock of columnists to whom war will offer opportunities for advancement.

FAILURE OF PAST FOREIGN POLICIES

Everyone questioning our policy will be branded as a coward, appeaser, or isolationist. Yes, I am an isolationist, if as I wrote in "The Creed of an American" on October 1, 1943, "by that term is meant an American that is opposed to this country's trying to politically, socially, or economically overlord the rest of the world." Seven years ago I stated, "I have no relatives to sacrifice or money to squander merely to preserve the British Empire or retain Hong Kong, Burma, or India." I wished no part in France's struggle "to support her rotten colonial government in Indochina or elsewhere." I sympathized with China but "her future government should depend on her own 400,000,000 peoples." Although Russia was ostensibly an ally, I was then "opposed to any underwriting of a dominating Soviet influence in after-the-war Europe."

Who in 1943 thought that we would spend many billions to support the British Empire and its Socialist government? Who dreamed we would think of sending American boys to die in the jungles of Indochina to support an oppressive French colonial rule? Who realized that we would make a calamitous surrender to communism in secret meetings of dictators at Tehran, Yalta, and Berlin? Who then thought Americans today would be advocating the dropping of atom bombs on once friendly Chinese civilians?

It is no sign of cowardice to resist warmongers who would send our troops to defend Western Europe against communism when the nations directly menaced are lukewarm and willing to do little for their own protection. The militarists would start us on a march to Moscow, the nemesis of both Napoleon and Hitler. Other jingoists urge the invasion of China, which nearby Japan could not conquer in 8 years of war—a nation that in 6,000 years of its history has been invaded but never really conquered.

The United States has supplied the decisive men, munitions, and wealth to win two world wars, and our success has vastly inflated our ego and swollen our national pride. But against the row on row of hundreds of thousands of white crosses in military cemeteries around the world, after the wastage of the greater part of the natural resources of a continent, loaded with a fantastic national debt of nearly two hundred and seventy billions, what have we gained? Nothing.

TIME FOR NEW DECISIONS

In many respects the world is worse off on account of our interference. We feel morally obligated to replace the property destroyed

by our armies. We have fewer friends among the nations today than at any time in our history. A billion colored peoples that once looked to us now class us as enemy No. 1, because it is our guns and men, our munitions and aid that the European colonial powers are using to suppress their efforts for independence.

"A world safe for democracy," and we are almost the only democracy left in the world. "The four freedoms," and we have less freedom than at any time since the Declaration of Independence. "A war to end war," and we are taxing ourselves to arm 50 nations, some of which may one day be aiming at us the arms we are now giving them.

The armies and industrial plants we so assiduously destroyed in Germany and Japan to make these nations powerless we are now insisting be replaced and rebuilt, mostly at our expense, to help us in a war against communism. Since August 1, 1945, we have appropriated over $49,500,000,000 for foreign aid—$283 for every inhabitant in the United States. At the same time many of our own public bodies lack money to build needed schools, libraries, suitable highways, and the necessary power and reclamation facilities for an increasing economy.

I was an original supporter of President Wilson's League of Nations but I am tired of a United Nations in which 59 do the talking and 1 has to pay most of the costs in money and men. Against America's Korean contribution of nearly 40,000 casualties already reported from at least 7 divisions of troops, and a cost of many billions of dollars, 14 only of the more than 50 other non-Communist United Nations up to December 15, have supplied 18,840 troops, 118 planes, 1 carrier, 4 cruisers, 15 destroyers, a few small naval units, some medical supplies and equipment, including 125 tons of cod-liver oil from Iceland and 400,000 jute sacks from India.

ARM FOR DEFENSE, NOT AGGRESSION

We are inviting national disaster if we permit the masters of the Kremlin during a period of years to involve us in a series of Koreas on the 10,000-mile perimeter of the Communist world stretching from Siberia west to the Baltic Sea. After a few of these fruitless invasions we would be so exhausted and impoverished that Moscow could then safely select the time and place of the final battle for supremacy.

The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are as wide and deep as ever and even more difficult for an enemy to cross because of the planes, directed missiles, and other provisions of a defensively prepared America. Those who would scare us by claiming the Russians could invade our homeland are trading on our credulity. Recall the supreme effort required by all the Allied nations in 1944 to launch the Normandy invasion across the narrow English Channel and the tremendous equipment and munitions the United States used in the recent landing on a practically unprotected Inchon Peninsula in Korea.

In the 1951 military budget now about fifty billions, at least 75 percent is for the expense of infantry, munitions, and equipment suitable only for invasion and ground deployment in Europe and Asia. The defense of American cities from the surprise suicide bomb attack is mostly on paper, we have no bomb shelters, only a fragmentary radar screen encircles the Nation and planes and antiair attack guns are inadequate. The Korean campaign has stripped the United States of most of the material required to repel invasion.

Our choice today is between a policy of forcible containment of communism to its present area in Europe and Asia and putting the defense of America in second place or considering the national defense the paramount object of our foreign policy and military preparedness. We can fight communism as a military power but we cannot stop the spread of communism as a philosophy, as a political or economic system by bullets. Our only defense against it in these realms is to make our own democracy work so perfectly that it will best serve mankind. We should have no fear of the verdict of the future in any such trial.

Reader, if you think that our first duty is to defend our own land, if you believe the oceans are still our natural line of defense, if it is your opinion that an American invasion of Europe, China, or other lands beyond the seas is inviting national suicide and sacrificing untold American lives, if you are willing to let other nations run their affairs and pay their own bills, and content for us to attend to our own business, then write or wire the Congress, both Senators and Representatives, your wishes. It is the only way your opinion can be registered. In this crucial hour of decision, you owe your country this service. Do it today and start a chain letter that will swamp Congress.

The voice of America arising from the parents of future cannon fodder, from workers and businessmen striving to maintain the standard of living, from the poor widow and the multimillionaire who stand to lose all through inflation, from every patriot, should flood Congress with an appeal to consider realities, to avoid bombast and to forget claims of superiority justifying the ruling of others and instead to arm America to make it so strong industrially, economically, and militarily, through the operation of a successful democracy, that we would never need to fear communism as an economy, envy it as a philosophy, or tremble before it as a military force.

We Must Untie the Hands of Our Law Enforcement Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a further editorial from the Washington Evening Star, which is performing a distinguished public service in pressing for the enactment of legislation to permit the FBI and other investigative agencies to intercept communications and give evidence regarding what they have learned in cases involving spies, saboteurs, traitors, subversives, and other enemies of our country.

The editorial follows:

FURTHER STUDY ADVISABLE

With due allowance for the partisan nature of their dissenting report, the Republican critics of the Senate District Committee's wire-tapping control bill have made a good suggestion in urging further study of the measure. The Republican minority asserted that the committee did not consider the possibility of conflict between the local bill and proposed national wire-tapping legislation. Both types of legislation, since they deal with the same basic problem of telephone eavesdropping, should be in accord, lest confusion develop later with respect to their enforcement in the District of Columbia. For both proposed laws would apply to Washington.

There is another reason, however, warranting further scrutiny of the District bill. While it properly excepts local police from the proposed ban on wire tapping in the District, it fails to state—as does the Keating national bill—that information obtained by tapping wires can be used as evidence in court. If it is wise to spell this out in so many words for the benefit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and military intelligence agencies, it is just as wise to spell it out for Washington police. If the national bill should pass with the right so specified and the local bill should become law without a positive assertion of evidence admissibility, some court might well wonder whether Congress intended to do more than authorize wire interceptions by police—as an investigative aid alone.

What is needed—and promptly—is legislation that will make clear the right of proper law-enforcement agencies, when duly authorized, to listen in on certain communications and to use the information so obtained as prosecutive evidence against spies, saboteurs, kidnapers, and similar major public enemies. As Representative FURCOLO, of Massachusetts, recently commented, it is indeed an anomalous situation when such criminals cannot be brought to trial because of an ill-advised legal bar against the use of wire-tap evidence.

Korean Withdrawal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this point the reply I gave to the question, Should we get out of Korea? which was published in the January 21 issue of the Boston Sunday Globe newspaper. My statement follows:

The question of whether we should get out of Korea focuses attention on the practical decision that must be faced in determining just how much our obligations shall be allowed to operate against our own best interest strategically.

We originally entered Korea in recognition of our moral commitment as a member of the United Nations, to help repulse wanton and illegal aggression and promote peace in the world.

When the purpose of the police action, approved by the United Nations Security Council, was practically accomplished, hordes of Communist Chinese troops, obviously by preconceived intention, suddenly and unlawfully attacked United Nations soldiers, causing their retreat to such position that the safety and survival of the entire United Nations forces now appears perilled.

According to the latest press releases, the Peiping communistic regime refuses to honor any cease-fire period except in compliance with their own blackmail terms, for, among other things, a seat in the United Nations and abandonment of Formosa.

Under these circumstances, if the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whose business it is and in whom I have substantial confidence, should recommend our withdrawal from Korea, because the overwhelming pressure of Communist forces may make a prolonged campaign in Korea strategically unwise, I would favor acceptance of their recommendation in order to save the further useless expenditure of the lives of American boys for an indecisive objective.

However, even though we and the United Nations should be forced to accept temporary military set-back in Korea, because of global strategy, I would be resolutely against any submission to the further humiliation

of capitulating to Red China's demands. After the utter contempt Red China has shown to us and the United Nations, any additional appeasement would amount to moral suicide.

Further concessions to either Red China or Soviet Russia would, in my opinion, be turning the United Nations into a tool of those who have flagrantly violated every truth for which it stands. Should the illegal attack on the Republic of Korea not be ultimately repelled in principle, there would seem to be no basis for fulfillment of the further aims of the United Nations, either in Korea or elsewhere.

Congressman HAROLD D. DONOHUE.

Voice of South Texas

REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN REGAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the times when our country is prosperous and at peace, the people back home seem to pay very little attention to what we do here and what we think about, but in times such as confront us today all our people take much more interest in the welfare of our Nation, the fight against communism, and so forth.

LLOYD M. BENTSEN, who became a Member of this body a little more than 2 years ago, has been writing a weekly letter home which has been published in the newspapers of his district, the Fifteenth District of Texas, which borders my district, mine being the Sixteenth. We each have about 500 miles of the Mexican border in our districts. The letters are published in the weekly papers throughout his district, and have been read with interest and considerable favorable comment. This last week the Valley Evening Monitor of McAllen, Tex., published an editorial commenting very favorably on the way the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] attends to his business and keeps the people informed. The editorial is as follows, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the RECORD today in conjunction with these comments:

VOICE OF SOUTH TEXAS

Congressman BENTSEN, of the valley's Fifteenth District, this week gave his constituents a clear statement of his basic policy for the new session of Congress. It is a declaration each of them should read thoroughly. It appears in his weekly newspaper column.

In effect he says it is time for America to get up off its spit-and-whittle bench and go to work. Not only must the Nation rearm, but its vitals will be exposed if it does not organize and strengthen every possible ally it can find abroad. He cites encouraging acts in both directions, acts that have lately been multiplying, but he makes it clear he has no admiration for the tedious pace at which the Truman administration has gone about the defense program.

The citizens of Congressman BENTSEN'S district have every reason to believe that all of his activity at Washington during the forthcoming 2 years will find their root in the two beliefs he has enunciated; that the rearming task and the development of stronger allies both in Europe and Asia must outweigh everything else that comes up for decision.

Back home he will find willing support for such a program. Six months ago people in this part of the country were wondering why domestic restrictions were not being imposed so as to channel more of the Nation's production and intelligence into the war effort.

The Congressman's statement tells how he seeks out every available military expert, hears them, evaluates their information, and then does his "small part" to transmit such judgment into terms of congressional votes.

The valley's Congressman may play a modest part in Congress, but he is the one public official to whom thousands of people of south Texas feel they can turn most quickly for leadership on the national scene. In such a sense his actions transport with them the hopes and prayers of those thousands. To us in south Texas the measure of his responsibility is embodied in Mr. BENTSEN'S forthright declaration that we cannot retire to our own shores and expect to repel the invader; we had better beat him elsewhere while we can.

That is the issue at the core of America's current debate on foreign policy, and he has taken a sound stand on it.

About Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Iowa Development Bulletin:

ABOUT IOWA

Iowa now has 50 industries which employ more than 500 workers. Fourteen are engaged in food processing, including 11 which pack and process meat. Nineteen manufacture machinery, including construction machinery, farm machinery, electrical equipment and aircraft parts. The industries are located in 17 Iowa cities. They include the world's largest cereal plant, washing machine industry and wringer manufacturer, door and millwork factory, silvery iron factory, wheel tractor manufacturer, aluminum-plate rolling mill, fountain-pen factory, independent pork processor, single-operated packing plant, and manufacturer of portable rock crushers.

Iowa coal production the first three quarters of 1950 was running 22 percent over 1949. At the end of September 1950, Iowa mines had produced 1,566,000 tons of coal. In the same period in 1949, Iowa coal totaled 1,276,000 tons. United States soft-coal production in 1950 was up 4 percent over 1949.

Poultry and eggs bring in 10 percent of Iowa's farmers' annual income. In 1949, for instance, poultry and eggs taken to market sold for $187,000,000, and another $18,000,000 went into skillets and ovens on the farm. Cash farm income totaled more than $2,000,000,000.

Nearly all of Iowa's gently rolling land is suitable for farming. At present 97.7 percent of the State's total land area is under cultivation. Iowa contains 35,642,880 acres of land, of which 34,838,247 are in farms.

An Iowan is credited with inventing the tractor. In 1892, John Froelich of Froelich, Iowa, built the first gasoline tractor that propelled itself both backward and forward. Successful models were first sold commercially in 1918.

Iowa's farm land annually produces more wealth than all the world's gold mines combined. In 1949, for instance, world gold production was less than $1,000,000. Iowa's farm products sold for more than $2,000,000,000.

Iowa usually grows 20 percent of the United States corn crop. Iowa's 554,000,000 bushel 1949 corn crop amounted to 10 percent of the world's 1949–50 crop, and was as big as the combined corn crops of 12 European countries, excluding Italy.

One-fifth of all the butter made in the United States comes from Iowa cream. Iowa farmers sell more cream to creameries than farmers in any other State.

One-fourth of all the pork eaten in the United States comes from Iowa hogs. In 1949, Iowa's pork production was more than four billion pounds.

More saddle horses live in Iowa than in any other State. More than 200,000 light horses are stabled by Iowa owners. Only 2,500 are owned by training stables.

Iowa leads the Nation in the literacy of its citizens. In Iowa, 99.2 percent of the people can read and write—the highest percent in the United States.

There are industries in 600 Iowa towns, according to a survey made in 1950 by the Iowa Development Commission. Two years ago, 566 towns had industries.

Of the 100 skilled labor crafts in the United States, 98 are represented in Iowa industries. Only diamond cutters and seamen are not listed.

Iowa is served by 76 interstate motor freight lines, and 80 intrastate trucking lines. There are 170,420 trucks owned in Iowa.

More than half the families in Iowa own their homes. In 1950, a total of 475,122 Iowans held deeds to their homes.

Iowa gained 52 new industries in 1950. One-fourth of all the Iowans working outside agriculture are now employed in industry.

Thirty-six percent of Iowa's people live on farms, 43 percent in cities, and 21 percent in small cities.

Iowa has 27 foundries which cast aluminum, brass, bronze, and other nonferrous metals.

Iowa ranks fourth in railroad mileage. It is served by 13 railroads.

More than 90 percent of Iowa farms have telephones.

Iowa has 46 commercial radio stations, and four noncommercial stations.

Twenty Iowa radio stations are FM broadcasters, and three broadcast TV.

There are 55 gray iron foundries in Iowa.

Iowa has 315 public libraries.

What Really Is Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, "What is really wrong?" is a question that is asked thousands of times every day all over this country. I have just returned from a short visit to my congressional district and I found that practically every person that I met was tremendously interested in the situation here in Washington and in the country generally. They were unanimous in their condemnation of the policies now being followed by the administration here in Washington. This

sentiment is properly appraised in a very well-written article which was written by Mr. Gordon Bush, the publisher of the Athens (Ohio) Messenger of which he is the owner and very capable editor.

The article follows:

WHAT REALLY IS WRONG?

The most difficult thing to understand in America today is why it is necessary, as apparently it is, for the people to be so divided on the subject of foreign military policy.

They are not divided among themselves for all the differences of opinion as to the proper place to resist the spread of communism. That is incidental, and, in fact, a militarily strategic matter. We've got to believe that our military leaders know what they can or cannot do on this front or that. But beyond the problems of specific application, there is a universal dissention on the broad policy of foreign commitments.

You may think what you please of Taft, Hoover, Bridges, Wherry, and others leading the great debate, but you cannot discount them. They do represent our intelligent public leaders in the political field.

You cannot discount the information available to Truman, Acheson, and the administrative advisers, and, seriously, it is unsound to doubt their loyalty and fundamental desire to do the smart thing.

Between these two forces of opinion, stand nearly 600 Congressmen who would give their individual left arms to be right in such a dispute and to go down in history as formulators of a successful policy. They are common men for the most part not equipped with much more information than is the average thinking citizen, but they are in positions of responsibility that cannot be altogether ignored by all of them.

Outside these circles of influence and prominence stand the millions of American citizens who just don't agree with what has been done and with their understanding of what is to be done. Every letter to the editor, every curbstone conversation, proves this. If there is a substantial minority which does not feel like the articulate American citizen feels today, it is a strangely bashful group of citizens.

Charges are made on every hand, from the lowest commentators to the White House, which are unprovable yet the result of this bewilderment. That lack of unity, which may always be deplored, is not so much a difference of opinion as it reflects the failure to understand how those on the other side of the argument can have a case. Surely there is a serious lack of faith in the public, or the administration would not leave it so completely in the dark. That the public retaliates with lack of faith in the administration, is human nature.

Could it be that we are, now, like the great body of Germans as the outsets of both world wars, unwilling to embrace warfare and therefore to risk our Nation, but unable to do anything about it because of an autocracy at the top which is determined to lead the Nation to its doom?

Could we be standing on the edge of an era that will see the destruction of the United States of America because of twisted thinking in the leadership? Has our system of representative government been so despoiled by socialistic progress that we are no longer a people free to choose our governors and direct their performance?

It begins to look like it. If President Truman can commit troops and thereby begin wars, or merely encourage wars, at his own discretion—and he has said lately that he can and will do just that—is there no power left in our so-called democratic Government to stop him? Is Congress impotent, or bribed by Government spending into going along as the ox goeth to the slaughter?

What is the nature of America, its elected officials and its people that we should stand idly by while a new form of government grows in our midst and takes over our rights of sanction and decision? The United Nations has bossed the Korean war from the first, and now we can't even withdraw from it because of Indians and Ethiopians, Yugoslavs and Greeks, Burmese and Chinamen, Britons and Swedes deciding they will keep Uncle Sam in there pitching until they see which way the ball game is going.

Have we no national moral fiber of bullheaded selfishness, without which no nation can be respected? Are we so enmeshed in ideological hope that we cannot distinguish between servitude and independence? Is there no force of brains and determination left in Washington which even cares about maintaining the world leadership of America—leadership in the products and capabilities of the American people, if not in their seemingly stupid leaders?

How can these leaders be right when the people always think better than they do and are now united in the demand to stop monkeying around with our peace and welfare? Is there not a majority of citizens who would give up their Government doles, pensions, pay-offs, parities, for a continuation of the experience that has made this country the greatest place to live in all the world—up to this time?

Qualifications of a Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial Qualifications of a Commissioner, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on December 24, 1950, and another editorial, District of Columbia Commissioner, which appeared in the Washington Post on January 6, 1951. Both are complimentary to our former colleague, the Honorable Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of December 24, 1950]

QUALIFICATIONS OF A COMMISSIONER

Commissioner Mason's illness in recent months and the fact that his present term as a District Commissioner is drawing to a close serve to encourage speculation as to a successor. Among those being mentioned is Representative Mary T. Norton, whose long service as a Member of the House will end with the Eighty-first Congress.

Mrs. Norton is so well known in Washington, she has been such a consistently good friend of the District of Columbia and she is so able a woman in her own right that such an appointment would be generally popular. But the law which requires that a District Commissioner must have been an actual resident of the District of Columbia for 3 years preceding appointment and, during that period, claimed residence nowhere else, would seem to bar her.

The residence qualification, however, has been shown to be more apparent than real. In 1913 the right of Oliver P. Newman to hold the office of commissioner was challenged by W. J. Frizzell, a Washington citizen active in the work of the citizens' associations. He sought to have the attorney general and the district attorney bring quo warranto proceedings, but both officers declined. He then obtained permission from district court to bring such proceedings himself as a taxpayer and citizen in the name of the Government. The case was tried by jury, he won it in district court and in the court of appeals. But the Supreme Court reversed, holding that as a taxpayer and citizen Mr. Frizzell was not an interested party, and also holding that as officers appointed by the President and subject to his removal the attorney general and district attorney would not grant permission to a citizen to bring such proceedings and the Court had no power to do so.

The upshot of the decision was that there was no way to invoke the residence qualification in court and that discretion in the matter lies with the President and the Senate. Mr. Newman was confirmed, despite his lack of qualification as to residence, and served two terms. The reason for the residence requirement, of course, is to protect the people of the District against the President's use of the commissionerships as jobs for nonresident politicians. Most of the Presidents have abided by the spirit of the law, despite the evident lack of legal means to prevent an infraction.

As a Member of Congress, Mrs. Norton has made her residence in Washington for some 26 years—though obviously claiming residence in New Jersey. In itself, her appointment would be well received. As far as the law is concerned, however, her appointment would in effect render it meaningless.

[From the Washington Post of January 6, 1951]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONER

Mrs. Mary T. Norton's statement that she would not accept an appointment as District Commissioner if it were offered was characteristically public-spirited. Her whole congressional career has been marked by generous and statesmanly friendship for the people of Washington; and during her tenure as chairman of the House District Committee she worked earnestly to make this community self-governing. It would, therefore, as she says, be inconsistent on her part to take a position which in her own view should go to a Washingtonian. We wish that she were one.

But since Mrs. Norton is ineligible, we hope that the President will seek within the District the qualities of experience, intellect, and character which she possesses. We have no doubt that they are to be found among Washingtonians. They are most likely to be found among those who have been active participants in District affairs—and particularly among those who have been leaders in the effort to give the people of Washington full status as citizens of the United States. We submit to President Truman that anyone he chooses for the anticipated vacancy in the Board of Commissioners ought to be like himself, a wholehearted supporter of home rule.

Of the several candidates whose names have been put forward for the important post, two seem to us to be outstanding: Gerhard Van Arkel and Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle. Both are persons of high prestige in the community. Both have served it devotedly and understand its problems. Either could be counted upon to work faithfully for abolishment of an office which he or she would hold in trust until such time as the people of the District are free to choose their own governing officials.

Mrs. Doyle has been a distinguished president of the Board of Education. In that office she demonstrated real executive ability

and a comprehensive grasp of local affairs. She demonstrated also, in contrast to her fellow Board members, a willingness to see the office she held placed at the disposal of the people in accordance with the home-rule legislation then pending. Mr. Van Arkel had a distinguishe: career in military service, and since then has been an extraordinarily able and vigorous counsel to the Senate District Committee—a post which has given him exceptional knowledge of all the District's problems. No other person suggested for the commissionership has worked so energetically for this community's emancipation. We urge the appointment of Mr. Van Arkel or Mrs. Doyle with full confidence that, if chosen, he or she would hasten home rule.

This Confused World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal circulates widely in the United States, and its subscribers on the whole, are a very capable group and a group whose patriotism cannot be questioned.

In a recent issue of this newspaper its editor discusses the national situation very logically and very convincingly. Because of the completeness of this editorial, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks. It follows:

THIS CONFUSED WORLD

Joe Stalin must be chuckling up his sleeve these days at the terrible mess he has created in the world. He has us so confused we hardly know whether black is black or white. For example:

By shifting his pawns properly, he got us entangled in a war. Yet we are not in a war, since we have declared war against none of the forces we are fighting. Neither have any of the other nations involved declared war.

Furthermore, the war is being waged from China by one side, and Japan by the second, neither of which is now at war with the other.

On the other hand, our leaders are now sitting down with Germans to plan revival of the German Army. We are, of course, still at war with Germany. At the same time, we talk of reviving the Japanese Army and Japanese war industry. We are still at war with Japan also.

We are tightening down the clamps of censorship for more military security in the Korean War area. Yet in Tokyo, where the allied generals plan their strategy, Russian officers come and go freely, and pass information on to the Communists freely. This is possible because Russia is a member in good standing of the United Nations, which is fighting communism in eastern Asia.

Because nobody wants this thing to spread beyond Korea, this is the only war in history in which one belligerent has a "safe base," like the kids have in a game of tag. The Reds simply step over into Manchuria, and presto! they are "safe." We will neither molest them there nor can we bomb their plants which turn out the shells which kill our soldiers.

To add a further twist to the situation, Great Britain, which is our ally and the recipient of the bulk of our billions in aid during the past 4 years, is diplomatically a friend of the enemy we fight. She recognizes Red China formally and urges that the latter be allowed to become a member of the United Nations. All the while, Red Chinese are killing United Kingdom soldiers daily in Korea.

Well, this could go on and on. But what's the use? The longer the list, the greater the credit to the Russians, who must be given top rank as confusers of the issue. This Nation never was in greater need of enlightened leadership.

Fight To Win or Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Fight To Win or Quit," which appeared in the Washington Daily News for January 22, 1951:

FIGHT TO WIN OR QUIT

General MacArthur says that the American Army fighting of Korea as the agent of the United Nations awaits political decisions from "the chancelleries of the world" on the problem confronting it.

That problem is the intervention of Red China, dating from October.

"Considering that the entire military might of Communist China is available against this relatively small command (the UN forces)," General MacArthur warns, "only by maneuver may it avoid hazards inherent in the great odds which it now faces."

That is a clear challenge to the gentlemen representing the United Nations at Lake Success to make up their minds what they intend to do. And it must be answered.

The American resolution branding the Reds as aggressors, which has been presented to the UN, makes no provision for sanctions against Red China and carefully avoids anything that might be interpreted as authorizing General MacArthur to strike directly at Peiping's homeland and supply bases. It is from China itself, and the bases there, that the Red forces fighting our troops are being supplied. But our troops have become the forgotten men in this war.

The Defense Department is trying to muzzle Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, who raised this same issue upon his recent return from Korea.

"We have been fighting distinctly under wraps since the Communists came into the war," General O'Donnell says. "I never thought I'd see the day when we would have to sit back with our hands tied. * * * If we're going to fight, let's not hit 'em light, for heaven's sake. It's time people knew that this is an all-out war."

That is mild to what the boys in the frozen foxholes are saying.

They have been let down. They know it. They want to come home.

They are tired of being shot at like sitting ducks, while the United Nations exchanges notes with the outlaw Chinese Government at Peiping.

The State Department seems determined to make General MacArthur the goat in this situation, just as it made former Defense Secretary Johnson the goat for the original debacle in Korea.

But it can't get away with that. The record is too clear.

The fault is not in Korea but in Washington, in London, and at Lake Success.

The weakness of American political leadership was demonstrated when it was unable to persuade any of the other great powers to join us in sponsoring the mild condemnation resolution presented to the UN.

Britain, Canada, and our other fair-weather friends will vote for this resolution on the show-down. But they'll do it with great reluctance. And they are not prepared to support any reprisal measures against the Chinese Reds. Yet this resolution would do nothing more than officially recognize a condition which has been fact for 3 months while ducking the question of what is to be done about it. So the resolution itself is an act of appeasement.

General MacArthur has been gagged and General O'Donnell has been called on the carpet, doubtless to be warned to make no more statements on the outrageous way the policy makers have bungled this whole affair. But the truth will out, despite gags and censorship. The record made at Lake Success is there for all to read.

Our Army in Korea has plenty of fight left in it, according to General Collins, the Army Chief of Staff.

But why should that Army fight when the cause it is supporting has been disowned by the organization it is representing? No effort is being made to reinforce it. Why should more men die on a mission that seems to have been abandoned?

The UN must answer these questions, or it will be faithless to the world which has placed its trust in it, and faithless to the men who have died fighting in its name.

Economic sanctions should be voted against Red China. Its ports should be blockaded. The bases from which it is supplying its outlaw forces should be bombed. Aid should be extended to the guerrilla forces fighting the Reds on the China mainland. The Chinese Nationalists should be encouraged to return to China proper so that the Reds will be forced to fight on two fronts. That is the way to carry on this war if there is any desire to win it.

It cannot be won by the present half-hearted measures.

If the UN doesn't intend to fight to win, then our troops should be pulled out and the whole enterprise abandoned.

If the UN will not face up to this issue, then our own Government must. We should fight to win or quit.

A Study in Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sunday World-Herald, Omaha, Nebr., entitled "A Study in Confusion."

Mr. Speaker, those who will have charge of administering price controls, rationing, and all of the other measures to regiment the American people will do well to read this editorial. It might well be entitled "Lest We Forget."

If controls are fastened upon our economy, the Congress should reserve some strings to have them removed when they are no longer needed. The left wing element in this country is now using this emergency to fasten what they hope will be permanent controls upon the American people. This should not happen.

I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

A STUDY IN CONFUSION

Word from Washington that the new crop of economic controllers probably will start by controlling meat must have brought back a flood of not-so-old memories.

For the average householder they were memories of red ration coupons, empty butcher trays, and strange portions of cow and hog anatomy that most had never set eyes on before. They were of meatless Tuesdays and Fridays, and sometimes five other meatless days as well. They were memories of a flourishing black market and a swarm of OPA investigators, more sinister than Mack Sennett cops but not much more effective.

For the livestock producers and the meat packers the memories were even more vivid. In its attempts to regulate this great industry the bureaucracy perpetrated one of the truly monumental snafus of World War II, the effects of which are being felt to this day. There are sheepmen who will tell you that the control program decimated the Nation's lamb flocks, changed the people's eating habits so drastically that the country never has gotten back to eating lamb as it did before the war.

The ups and downs of the cattle and hog industries were almost as frustrating.

A glance at the livestock market news of those days conveys something of the atmosphere of the times. When, for instance, corn prices were frozen in April 1944 the hog market was glutted for seven straight weeks, yet pork remained point-high and scarce in the butcher shops.

In September 1944 the Defense Supplies Corporation disclosed that the meat-subsidy program had cost $462,000,000, and 20 Midwestern Senators asked immediate elimination of the subsidies as the only possible means of stabilizing the market. Instead, Stabilizer Vinson countered with promises of higher support prices and an increase in the subsidy to packers. Within 3 weeks the supply of hogs had nevertheless slid to the year's low.

Two months later, hog prices skidded overnight from the official ceiling price almost to the support price. Spokesmen for producers blamed this break on the subsidy that packers received, regardless of what they paid the farmer. The packers blamed it on low meat ceilings and likewise berated the so-called subsidy. In December New York butcher shops were closed up and retail meat supplies were at an all-time low.

By January 21, 1945, the Government was juggling new ceilings on all meats, and the packers were still pleading for an end of their subsidy. It should go, they said, not to slaughterers but to the producers and feeders. The Government's answer: Another increase in the packer subsidy.

In April 1945 there was a new set-up designed to eliminate packers' financial losses, give housewives more meat. It consisted of $36,000,000 more in subsidies to packers, bringing the total cost of meat subsidies to $560,000,000 for the year. There was a crack-down on slaughtering on the farm and OPA hired 500 more black-market inspectors.

"If ceilings don't work now," said Economic Stabilizer William H. Davis, "animals will be allocated to federally inspected plants and all other slaughter declared illegal."

The ceilings didn't work, and on May 1 the meat controllers reached their ultimate in hand-outs—a fourth increase in the packer subsidy, and a $35,000,000 subsidy to feeders payable through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

By the time the war in Europe was over, the regimentation of the meat industry was complete—at a total cost of more than a billion dollars a year—and still there wasn't enough meat.

Looking back on it, a number of men who spent their lives in producing livestock and processing meat said they believed that only one control was clearly necessary. That was the one setting aside certain quantities of meat for the Armed Forces.

All the rest was a costly and futile exercise in trying to control a vital industry which, its leaders believe, would have produced more and distributed it just as fairly if the bureaucrats had kept their hands off.

Cuba's Strong Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the following articles which appeared in the Michigan Times:

CUBA'S STRONG MAN IS SEEKING PRESIDENCY AGAIN

(By Antonio Torra)

With announcement of his candidacy for the Presidency of Cuba there is special significance now in the personal history of Cuba's strong man, Gen. Fulgencio Batista. Herein follows the biographical sketch of the man who rose from a humble station in life to the nation's highest office:

Fulgencio Batista y Zaldivar, former President (1940–44) of Cuba, now senator from Las Villas Province and candidate for reelection to the Presidency, was born January 16, 1901, in the Veguitas District, near Banes Village, in Oriente Province, a little over a year after the United States flag had replaced Spain's red and gold ensign throughout Cuba, marking the end of four centuries of Spanish colonial rule, and a little more than a year before the Cuban Republic raised its own single-starred banner as the Stars and Stripes were lowered.

A little over 7 years before his inauguration as President he took the center of Cuba's national stage as chief of the revolution of September 4, 1933, a type of revolution new to the Americas, and whose basis cannot fail to deeply affect the future of Cuban history.

The Batista family was a Catholic family. All Banes was out in Sunday best to attend the baptism of Fulgencio, first-born son of Belisario Batista, until shortly before a sergeant in the Cuban Army of Liberation, and of his wife, Carmelia Zaldivar, a local girl Belisario had married on his return from war. The baptismal ceremony took place at the little church of Fray Benito, humble as the village itself, the Batista family and all the country folk in the neighborhood.

In Catholic schools, rural schools, and at a Quaker mission school in Banes, young Fulgencio found his lessons easy to learn. Deepest pleasure for him was found in the tales his father told of the long wars to free Cuba, of the men who offered their lives, fortunes, and honors as rebels against Spain, and of the warriors and thinkers who had inspired them by words and example.

The former sergeant told his son of Marti, poet and apostle of Cuba's freedom; of Saco and Varela; of Caballero and the Maceos; of Washington and Bolivar; Lincoln and Morelos.

At 13 his first great grief struck Fulgencio—the death of his mother. At 16 he started out alone. At 20 he was inside the gates of Habana. April 12, 1921, saw his enlistment in the army. This term was for 2 years. May 23, 1923, he reenlisted for a 5-year term. After 5 years he won his plea for office duty. He served at general staff headquarters, Camp Columbia, winning in a class of 100 the position of staff sergeant stenographer, highest Army rank in those days for enlisted men. September 4, 1933, at the end an orgy of bloodshed and revolutionary acts, he took command of the island. Later he was made chief of the army, retiring December 4, 1939, to become the candidate of a seven-party coalition for the Presidency—and to win.

This election was destined to make history in all Latin countries. It was conceded everywhere that the election was honest and orderly. Women went to the polls. There was no coercion, no threats, no violence except in one or two spots where followers of candidates below the office of president engaged themselves. The huge vote, the tremendous majority accorded Batista, was a genuine expression from a people long oppressed in matters of the ballot. The election was a superb compliment to Fulgencio Batista. He has not been unmindful of it. His life thus far has been dedicated to the betterment of his people, and it will continue to be so dedicated. The road he has traveled to the top was a long, hard, tortuous one, understood best only by those who know what hardships and impossibilities confront the poor boy seeking to brush aside the limited horizon before him.

CHAMPION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE COMMON PEOPLE, THE IMPLACABLE FOE OF "REDISM," BATISTA IS THE "MAN OF THE TIME" IN CUBAN HISTORY

(By Antonio Torra, Habana, Cuba; and Ed A. Nowack, Lansing, Mich.)

Gen. Fulgencio Batista, former presidente of the Republic of Cuba, referred to approvingly as the "nonpareil" of Cuban political history, is facing public service responsibilities probably never before faced by a Cuban. A swiftly changing world has created problems of organized human living almost too great for men to cope with. Capitols of all nations seethe with intrigue. New sets of governmental purposes appear overnight.

Senor Batista's keen grasp of world affairs, the progress of United Nations, his appreciation of the panorama of international causes and effects equip him extraordinarily with qualifications as a world figure.

As guest speaker at Daytona Beach Rotary Batista lifted the iron curtain brusquely. In part he said:

"I desire to make some observations about present world affairs which have involved us in a new tragedy of very grave significance. I refer, of course, to the war in Korea.

"Unfortunately the termination of the Second World War failed completely to bring peace and comfort to humanity. Instead, anguish and fears came out of the so-called peace. I find that the doubts and skepticism of the people are developing in many quarters into a feeling of weariness, fatigue, and a dangerous fatalism.

"We must fight such defeatism vigorously and constantly, otherwise our civilization will be destroyed.

"The hope of mankind that the nations could live in peace in spite of different ideologies supported by strong nations is in danger of being smashed.

"Instead of laying the basis for a friendly world certain nations put self-interests above peace.

"What we have today, after 5 years of temporizing is, in fact, another war.

"We of the Western World cannot, indeed, accept a world of peace if it is to be dictated by the Russian Kremlin. And since the termination of World War II we have an excellent opportunity to observe why we cannot get permanent peace.

"During these years Russia has reduced many sovereign nations into puppets—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary, East Germany. China is dismembered. Iran and Tibet are in immediate fear of reduction to mere puppet states.

"Russia seeks to take all of Asia and continue on until the world is hers. We do not need to speculate or guess any longer about Russia's plans.

"We have the best evidence possible—the tangible, cold facts to prove this. The fate of the puppet nations alone demonstrates it.

"The leaders of democracy, the people of your country and mine and all our allies, must face the awful fact, that I have just stated, that Russia is embarked on a program of world conquest. Fortunately the United Nations (or at least a majority of them) have come to realization of what is going on behind the iron curtain. Democracy has at last, through a decision of the United Nations to oppose Russian aggression, called a halt.

"But Korea, I fear, has become only the first battleground. Only time will tell whether the defeat of Russia in Korea will put an end to her ambitions.

"Whatever happens the destiny of the world is resting now only on two powerful nations, Russia and the United States. The fate of humankind is in their hands. On one side waves the red flag of tyranny; on the other shines the beacon of freedom."

True it is that Russia is playing a shrewd military game in forcing the United States to fight 6,000 miles from home, but Russia had better beware that she might carry the game too far.

So much for the external picture, particularly the workers, who are the big target of Russia, that Russia has used communism to wipe out the freedom of the Russian people.

"It is not necessary to explain that, like the Nazi system, the Russian regime also means slavery; slavery in respect to free thought; slavery in respect to religion; and, in the end, physical slavery. We know how the Russian dictators and the subdictators all the way down, treat the masses. They risk their lives if they express thoughts contrary to the Russian Government; they are sent into exile for minor offenses.

"They must sacrifice their welfare and the lives of their families for the benefit of the totalitarian regime. They are, I say, slaves. We must show the world, by example, that in our democracies we have real freedom, that no man is a slave.

"The burden of arming the democracies of the world has fallen upon the United States. It is a mighty load, of course, but what other nations in these days, can stand up against Russia?

"France's manpower was sapped in the First World War. Britain's was badly hurt in the Second World War. West Germany is an uncertain and a confused country; we do not know how far we can trust the Germans. Italy's power of resistance is weaker than ever and Japan's military strength is gone. The only world power to combat the Russian military machine is the United States.

"The rest of the United Nations look to her for support. But at the same time, all the democracies must prepare themselves as strongly as possible to help.

"It also behooves all democratic nations who can do so to help the struggling masses in the underprivileged parts of the world. They are entitled to live freely, with full protection of the law and to earn a decent livelihood. They are entitled to raise healthy families, to educate them and to prepare them to live their own lives. Overlook these unhappy masses and they become easy victims of Communist dialectic and materialist doctrine. Like everybody else the underprivileged wish a better standard of living, and above all, like everybody else, they want freedom. They want freedom of speech, freedom of thought and freedom of movement and they want democratic institutions because no man, however humble, wants to be a slave. We must help the poorer classes to attain a better existence so that they will fight for freedom and democracy for all people everywhere.

"The disgruntled and the dissatisfied of the world are quick to recognize, just as we do, that democratic systems have certain natural weaknesses, therefore, governments of the people and by the people should strive constantly to eliminate whatever errors we find, so that the great principles in your Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and the hope and need to enjoy the freedom and the rights which your people, my people, and all other freedom-loving people want, will live forever."

The Congress Has a Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "The Congress Has a Duty," published in the Chatham Courier of January 18, 1951:

THE CONGRESS HAS A DUTY

We are not surprised at the worriment of many Members of the Congress over the attitude of President Truman in relation to the disposition of our Armed Forces throughout the world.

Recently, the Chief Executive was quoted as saying that he would listen to the Members of Congress, but that he alone would determine where and in what numbers our troops would be sent.

We assume that the President took this position because of the fact that the Constitution makes him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Yet we feel that there are grounds for every grave concern over his military judgment.

Last June he stated that our forces were in Korea as a "police action." We have never heard exactly what he meant by that, but we do know that American casualties to date number 50,000. We also know that not alone North Korea, but Communist China are fighting with all of their strength against the troops we have in that country. To most people that would mean war, but apparently it doesn't to Mr. Truman.

So many Members of Congress justifiably wonder just what his next venture will be and if he will undertake to circumvent the American Constitution which specifically provides that only the Congress has the power to declare war?

It is a serious proposition and unless steps are taken to restrict the authority of the President, we are very liable to find ourselves governed by the will and whim of a dictator who can send our boys to die wherever he chooses.

It would seem the time is now at had when the Congress accepted its responsibilities which the Constitution clearly gives it and require the President to obey its mandates.

Congress Cannot Escape Its Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are prone to find excuses for failure to measure up to our responsibilities. When indignant constituents write in and complain about existing conditions, the Korean War, Mr. Acheson, drafting of 18-year-olds, and many other subjects, we attempt to evade direct answers to their questions.

As part of my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter written by a prominent constituent who refuses to accept congressional excuses made in response to a letter that he had written. He calls a spade a spade, and the Congressman's face was red.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 17, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you very much for your note of January 3, including your form letter reply on matters of foreign policy, etc. I am pleased to know that you read my letter carefully and welcome the judgment of people in the State.

I wish to refer to certain statements in your form letter as follows: "We cannot dissipate United States resources."

With this statement I agree, and yet we find that Congress is doing exactly that. The hypocrisy and dishonesty of the President's State of the Nation speech is evidenced by the fact that he is calling for colossal additional sums to spend and throw away over the world under the guise of defense and fighting communism.

At the same time he has not made a single move to cut down the ridiculously high expense of our Government here at home.

He asks that the citizens of the country deny themselves "until it hurts."

What is he doing?

What are the Members of Congress doing?

What is the Government itself doing to deny itself to the point where it hurts?

The whole situation is absurd when you look at it from this point of view.

When the Government itself reduces the number of employees by 50 percent and cuts the domestic budget likewise, then it is time to begin to ask for additional sums for defense and similar purposes.

The real situation could be met without any additional taxes if a real effort was honestly made.

You say "The United States is carrying practically the entire brunt of the fighting

in Korea" and that this is a "lopsided situation which must never recur under UN jurisdiction."

Of course, the facts are obvious. As long as we are a member of an institution like the United Nations there will be the same performance; that is why this country should get out of it at once. The United Nations was conceived in dishonesty; it is wholly futile. Every sensible person knew that what has happened would happen when the test came. The United Nations has made itself ridiculous. It pretends to be fighting for peace—to be a peace organization and against aggression.

As a matter of fact it is, at the present time, rewarding aggression and making proposals and doing other acts which are nothing more than paying a premium for aggression. The whole situation is almost unbelievable.

You say "We must protect United States above all."

With this I agree, but we are not doing it; we are protecting everybody else, apparently, but not the United States.

You say, "America has made some solemn and binding commitments under the UN Charter and under the North Atlantic Defense Pact."

We did not make commitments to start wars illegally and unconstitutionally, nor to furnish 90 or 95 percent of all the forces under United Nations police action, yet we are doing it.

We did not make any commitments to supply land soldiers or land armies for Europe under the Atlantic Pact, yet the President is unlawfully and unconstitutionally attempting to do it.

Congress should stop this.

You say, "We as a people believe in the sanctity of the pledged word."

I would agree with this statement if you refer to the people, but I do not agree with it when you refer to our Government. Neither the Congress, nor the executive department, nor the judicial department, all three of whom have violated their oaths of office and their pledged word against the wishes of the people.

For example, they have violated the written word printed on our currency, and on our Government bonds, and have swindled the people out of thousands of millions of dollars by the most colossal swindle ever perpetrated when the United States went off gold and repudiated its solemn and not only pledged work, but its written word. It is idle to speak about honesty when every arm of our own Government is guilty of such conduct.

You say, "If we were to abandon Europe and Africa we would lose all of Europe's and Africa's (a) manpower, (b) production facilities, (c) essential raw materials."

Why do you use the word "abandon"?

If we stayed at home and minded our own business we would not abandon them; we would be doing the sound thing and the correct thing, and we would not lose either the manpower or the production facilities, or the essential raw materials. We would be highly respected by these nations instead of encouraging their contempt and hatred which we have been doing by our policies and acts. The actual facts are that Europe has (a) more people, (b) more production facilities by far, (c) more essential raw materials, (d) much more mechanical and productive and technical ability, (e) much better transportation, communications, both on land and sea, than exists in Russia.

Why then does Europe require any form of assistance from the United States?

If they want to change their system and adopt communism they most surely will; nothing that we can do will stop them.

If they do not want to they have all the facilities—manpower and everything else, far greater than Russia, and can easily stop Russia.

It seems silly to talk about trying to help people unless they want to help themselves, and even more silly for us to talk about helping Europe fight communism when we have done our best to insult and otherwise make ourselves obnoxious to the one country in Europe that is really fighting communism, and that is Spain.

You say "If we were to abandon Africa" (you use the word abandon which I cannot understand) "Russia would have a nearby base to unleash an attack on South America."

It seems to me this is a very far-fetched idea.

What would the United States be doing, and a great many others, if Russia were trying to make a base in Africa to attack the Western Hemisphere which you say would crumble. In fact you say the entire Western Hemisphere would crumble.

If there is any germ of truth or fact in your statement then we better get rid of our present executive department, the Commander in Chief and all the other officials of the Army and Navy and Air Force, and go out and hire some men who have real ability and brains to do the job.

The United States Commander in Chief, so-called, and the Defense forces, have had 10 times as much money to spend and have been spending it for the last 10 years, as any other nation, and if they can't protect the Western Hemisphere, we better get rid of them and do it promptly.

If Hitler, with all of his preparations, could not go 22 miles across the English Channel, how ridiculous it is to assume that Russia is going to fight its way 2,000 miles to establish bases in Africa from which to crumble the defenses of the Western Hemisphere another 2,000 or 3,000 miles away.

You say, "We long for peace but Russia has the decision."

This is a statement that I cannot understand.

You say, "Every thinking person knows that while America longs for peace, the decision rests in the Kremlin."

I consider myself a thinking person and I do not know any such thing, and I know of no other thinking person who believes it.

Anything that rests in the Kremlin in the way of power we, the United States, put there. We financed them, backed them up, and set them up during the recent World War, without our help they would today be a very poor fourth-rate power.

The facts are that Russia cannot fight outside of its own borders; her people will fight for their homeland but they will not fight outside of the borders of Russia for phony ideology like communism. Russia will be lucky if she prevents her satellites or her own people from assassinating the dictators who are controlling them.

We certainly must have a lamentably weak group of men in the Government of the United States if they are laboring under the delusion that world decisions rest in the Kremlin. Even Truman does not seem to believe this because he started a war of his own, privately, without authority, illegally, and unconstitutionally; he paid no attention to Russia's opinions.

You say "that in international relations the President is 'the sole organ of the Federal Government'."

There is nothing in the Constitution that said the President of the United States can make illegal and unsound commitments. It never was the intention of the fathers of this country or the writers of the Constitution to make the Constitution subordinate to some private or secret deal or conspiracy that might be made by the Chief Executive, and he is not "the sole organ of the Federal Government."

There is no arrangement that he can make with a foreign country of any consequence which involves commitments of the United States that does not have to have the approval of the Senate before it becomes a fact or effective. Even then any such proposal or arrangement or treaty is not to override or supersede the Constitution. Every sane person knows that it never was the intent of the Constitution or the people that made it to have the Constitution destroy itself by making treaties supersede, negative, nullify, or undermine any clause in the Constitution.

You say "the Congress must and will remain vigilant and on guard in its domain."

This is exactly what Congress has not done during the past 17 years. They have cheerfully ignored the oaths of office and obligations of the Congressmen during these 17 years by practically abdicating and allowing the Chief Executive to set himself up as a dictator. They have voted him the funds and the powers without necessity at any time, and they have passed laws the effect of which is to undermine the entire American system.

Instead of being "on guard and vigilant" they have done the opposite. They have collaborated with a Chief Executive and with the internationalist to undermine, to socialize, and to destroy America piecemeal.

I have written you a number of times as you know, and I have been hoping and hoping for 15 years or more that Congress would become vigilant and get on the job that Congressmen are elected for.

So, if you really mean what you say in the last paragraph of your circular letter—

"Be assured we of the Congress are on the job," then I would be indeed very happy.

Yours very truly.

Selective Service Act Age Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, soon it will be necessary for us to pass upon the question of lowering the Selective Service Act age limit so as to include young men 18 years of age or thereabouts. It seems imperative that we must expand the provisions of the Selective Service Act in view of our great need for larger numbers in the armed services. Surely we are conscious of the seriousness of the situation. Personally, in view of all the circumstances, I would vote to include 18-year-olds rather than to call upon combat veterans who are fathers to reenter the service. I am very hopeful that conditions will change to such an extent that it will not be necessary to call the teenagers. If it appears we must include young men of tender years, then it is our responsibility to protect them—physically, mentally, and morally. As in the past, I expect to sponsor legislation which should and will limit the temptations to which our young boys will be subjected. In this connection, I include herewith a clipping from the current issue of the Clipsheet, as issued by

the temperance board of the Methodist Church:

EIGHTEEN YEARS OLD

The situation which confronts this country is increasingly serious. Men in whom the people have great confidence, have suggested the possibility that millions of the 18-year-old young men of America must be inducted into the Armed Forces under some system of training and service.

The young man who is 18 years of age is perhaps at the most formative period of his life. It may be necessary that these formative years be spent in uniform but it is not a prospect which gives satisfaction to Americans; it is a terrible thing—but these are terrible times. One thing we should insist upon: that the influences which surround these young men and the example set before them, be in accord with the highest ideals of American life. Their service should not be demoralizing to them. The arrangement by which the Government cooperates with the brewing industry in making thousands of new friends and young friends at that, for the beer trade, should be set aside.

The Government would do well, in whatever system of recruitment and training it sets up, to follow conscientiously the advice of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training which was established in 1947 and which included Joseph E. Davies, Harold W. Dodds, Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Daniel A. Poling, Anna M. Rosenberg, Samuel I. Rosenman, Edmund A. Walsh, Charles E. Wilson, Karl T. Compton—a strong, wise, patriotic group. After 6 months of intensive study they issued a unanimous report recommending UMT and outlining (p. 73) some directions for its set-up.

All these directions were important, such as, for example:

(1) "The selection of men of character as commanding officers of the several camps."

And (2) "The selection, and proper training in the problems of an 18-year-old, of the officers and noncommissioned officers who will take part in the training."

But (7) "Limitation of the opportunities for purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them on any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen, (b) declaring off-limits to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages, (c) soliciting the assistance of local communities in this program, and (d) making it a Federal crime knowingly to sell such beverages to any person in training."

Wise words uttered by wise men.

If the armed services are to have the whole-hearted support of Christian people, it is advisable that these words be heeded. Ruin of tens of thousands of veterans of the recent war, now caught in the terrible toils of alcoholism because they began the habit of drinking while in service, lies heavy upon the hearts of many millions of the best citizens of this country. Beer is the beginning—alcoholism, all too frequently, is the end.

Drafting of 18-Year-Old Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial legislative matters to come before the first session of the Eighty-second Congress is that concerning the drafting of 18-year-old boys. I can well understand the position in which the mothers of these young men find themselves, inasmuch as I am the father of three sons, each of whom began his service in the Armed Forces during World War II when he was of the age of 17 or 18. It is difficult to make a decision as to whether or not we should draft these young men, the cream of all crops, at this early age for the purpose of actively defending our country in the bearing of arms. But yet it is our bounden duty to protect our precious heritage—a heritage of freedom for all ages and made more dear because of the sacrifices of the loyal forebears of the United States. While making these decisions, it is very heartening to have such a frank, honest, unselfish, and sincere letter as that received from Mrs. Mardelle L. Clark, 4509 Elm Street, Chevy Chase, Md., which I include under leave to extend my remarks:

JANUARY 17, 1951.

Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that the congressional mail contains protests by mothers against the drafting or training of 18-year-old boys and that those against such a draft exceed letters in favor by about 100 to 1.

Perhaps the unfavorable ratio is partly due to the failure of mothers like me to express our opinions. As the mother of four sons and mother-in-law of a 20-year-old, I realize that I could find many reasons why not one of them should serve our country in its time of need, if I consulted only my own heart. Nevertheless, my second son, who was drafted in 1945 while in his freshman year at college, and who finally received his Reserve commission at the end of junior year, has been called into service and is en route to the Pacific destination to which his battalion was sent. He may some time be able to complete his education as a chemical engineer, but probably not for a long time. My third son was in the First Marine Corps Reserve unit which was activated. The oldest, married, and with a young son of his own, is applying for a Navy commission because the Navy gave him an education during World War II in the ROTC. The son-in-law will probably be drafted this year.

In spite of these disturbances in the lives of my dear children, I do not hesitate to say that, when my youngest son, who is now 16, reaches his eighteenth birthday, I shall not protest his entrance into military service. Our wars have not been won until the 18-year-olds were trained and put into service, and certainly in the present struggle, unless we win we shall have little to offer the boys of the future. Then, too, if any son of mine must fight, I want him to be sufficiently trained so that he can defend himself as well as fight for others. Any other way is slaughter.

As a Colorado voter, I am ashamed of the public utterances of some of our Senators. It would be well if our Congress considered what is best for our country and helped the protesting mothers to understand the need, instead of catering to their emotional outbursts in the hope of gaining votes.

Sincerely,

MARDELLE L. CLARK.

Spiritual Renaissance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article referred to me by Mr. Fred W. Barnaclo, 1716 Northwest Thirty-fourth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla., which appeared in the Daily Oklahoman on Friday, January 5, 1951:

PRAYER ROOM FOR A NEW UN

(By Edith Johnson)

Would the Congress allow the canceling of a plan to set aside one room for prayer and meditation in the new United Nations Building arising on the bank of the East River in New York?

It was THOMAS J. LANE, Representative from Massachusetts, who put this question in the House a few days before the Eighty-first Congress adjourned.

At a time when the American people are turning to prayer for strength and guidance, it is almost unthinkable that differences in belief or opinion should be permitted to defeat such a plan, nebulous as it may be.

Better late than never, a room for such purposes had been opened at Lake Success at the instance of United Nations Secretary Trygve Lie, as Mr. LANE reminded his fellow Representatives. The majority of people having an interest in spiritual matters and believing that there is power in prayer had assumed, therefore, that a similar room would be provided in the new building. That doubt has been cast over the issue, if one may call it that, comes to them as a surprise.

Whether opposition to this plan comes from representatives from the Soviet Union and Russia's satellites or whether confusion has arisen from sectarian differences within our own country is not, as yet, quite clear. In any event, a decision to rule out a prayer room would be regressive action.

Delegates to the United Nations conference in San Francisco remember that conference sessions opened with brief period for meditation, this method accommodating people of all faiths, many of whom must have felt a need for clearer understanding of the problems before them and greater wisdom in dealing with them. But when the United Nations came into being at Lake Success and Flushing Meadow there seemed to exist a hope that atheist Russia might be appeased and the peace won the more easily if her delegates were not annoyed by any form of religious observance. So the matter was dropped until public opinion became a factor to be reckoned with and a place for meditation was set aside.

Now that there is no prospect whatever of appeasing Russia, Communist China, or any other nation living under the Red flag, surely some plan should be worked out to provide the prayer room. It should not require any great amount of courage for delegates to the UN who want it to ask for it, and it should not have to be urged by Members of the Congress.

Why, indeed, should not the United States establish a room in the new building to which Members could withdraw and pray?

Was not this Nation founded on Christian principles?

Are not all sessions of the Congress opened with prayer, each body having its own chaplain?

Do not all State legislative bodies follow a similar practice?

Is not the ceremony of inaugurating a President of the United States religious as well as civil in character? Is not this true also of the ceremonies when a governor is about to take office in his State?

Is not every witness brought into court commanded to lay his hand on the open Bible and swear that he will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help me God?

Is not the declaration "In God we trust" impressed on some of our coins?

What if Russian representatives should object? Have they not been in the business of objecting ever since the UN was organized?

As for the several religious bodies represented in the UN this hardly would be a time for the expression of sectarian narrowness, criticism or condemnation. Should there be any misunderstanding of this nature it should be cleared up readily among people of good will. The very name, United Nations, suggests, does it not, that the spirit of brotherhood should prevail?

Lay men and women who are in accord with the idea are free to say so. Ministers and priests can plead for it. Also the press and the radio.

No citizen is too unimportant to refrain from speaking up. And this includes the housewife whose voice never is heard in the public forum, the grocer's clerk, the mailman, the farmer, the brakeman on the railroad, the bus driver, and the porter on a pullman car. Students in high school and college certainly have a stake in the making of such a decision and they should be heard from. Who should have a keener concern for the development of events than they?

If, as many believe, the world is passing through a spiritual crisis and the most pressing need for the moment is a spiritual renaissance, provision for a place for prayer in the meeting house of the nations would present one answer to the forces of materialism.

Heroine Mary Frances Housley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the whole country was inspired by the heroic acts of Miss Mary Frances Housley, stewardess on the plane involved in the recent Philadelphia air wreck. The following is a clipping from the latest edition of Time magazine which tells the tragic and heroic story of this lovely young Floridian:

HEROES

TAKE YOUR TIME

Afterward, one passenger remembered seeing "the fence coming" and hearing someone yell: "We're going to crash." Within seconds, the National Airlines DC-4 was skidding along the sleet-coated runway of Philadelphia's International Airport. It ran off the runway, through a ditch. Its landing gear disintegrated, flames shot from a ruptured fuel tank.

Stewardess Mary Frances Housley threw open the door. Men and women rushed for it. One woman jumped with her coat on fire, tore it off and ran from the scene. Pretty, 24-year-old "Frankie" Housley stood by the door, cooly advising her passengers to "take your time." One panic-stricken woman crawled along the aisle away from the door and toward the nose of the plane. Another woman screamed, "Get my baby." Frankie could have jumped. Instead, she turned back into the flaming cabin.

When the wreckage had cooled, firemen climbed in to bring out seven bodies—five women, two infants. One of the women was heroic Frankie Housley. She was found lying in the aisle with the body of 4-month-old Brenda Joyce Smith in her arms.

Facts on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, so many erroneous statements have appeared in the press recently holding the farmer responsible for the increased food costs that I think it is only fair that the House be given the facts. I include in the RECORD an article written by Mr. A. D. Stedman, farm editor of the Saint Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, which clearly states the farmer's position and think each and every Member of this House will do well to study it carefully. I would also like to commend it to the attention of the columnists who have, so far, painted only one side of this picture.

The article follows:

FACTS ON FOOD PRICES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In the hubbub over rising food prices, millions of fingers are now being pointed in accusation. A concert of voices names the alleged offender. The Washington storekeeper, selling dollar-a-dozen eggs to Senator THYE put the bee on the popular culprit—the farmer, he said, and Government-supported egg prices. The baker, talking about higher bread prices, emphasized wheat and other ingredient costs.

The housewife, buying apples at 10 cents a pound; the soft drink consumer laying costs to sugar prices; even the cocktail hound soaking up highballs at 50 cents a drink while orating against milk prices at 18 cents a quart—all these lately have seemed agreed as to where the blame belongs. That is on the farmer, on the huge Government stores of food bought in supporting farm prices, and on the allegedly fantastic Government losses on farm purchases and farm subsidies.

But reasonable people will no doubt be interested in knowing the relevant facts, not on just one side, but on both sides of that story.

As to eggs, it is true that farm prices did advance rather sharply (28 percent) above the unusually low price a year earlier. The price has been steadily moderating from the peak.

But as a farmer and producer of eggs on his farm near Northfield, Senator THYE, talking to the Washington seller, had the facts first-hand about farm prices of eggs. Those prices on THYE's farm had been nowhere near $1 a dozen, but about 42 cents. The Government was supporting them, but stopped that on December 31. So in blaming dollar-a-dozen eggs on Government-supported farm prices, the Washington storekeeper was 100 percent wrong.

As to bread, not over one-fifth of what the consumer pays for his loaf goes to the wheat farmer. On December 15, wheat prices were up just 6 percent from their level a year earlier. That rise wouldn't account for a rise of one-fifth of a cent for a loaf of bread. All the farm ingredients put together, including lard as well as wheat, do not account for one-third of the consumer bread price. Almost two-thirds of the consumer price goes to the baker and retailer.

Recently one of THYE's colleagues, Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, made this statement: "In June 1948 the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel; the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread, 13.8 cents. But in October 1950, the price of wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel, whereas the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread had risen to 14.7 cents." Certainly the labor costs of baking, slicing, wrapping, and offering other services now demanded by consumers have been going up. But centering the blame for rising bread prices on the wheat farmer isn't in accord with the facts.

As to apples, the western farmer last autumn got 90 cents per 50-pound box, field run, delivered at the packing platform. That was 1.8 cents a pound to cover all his costs of growing, spraying, irrigating, picking, and hauling. The charges added by washing, sorting, wrapping, crating, storing, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing are what push the consumer price up to 8, 10, or 11 cents a pound.

As to sugar, the cost was actually lower in late December than it was on October 31, 1947, when sugar controls were removed. And the sugar price is so tiny an item anyway in the cost of a soft drink that it would be hard to find the effect of a 1-cent-a-pound sugar increase on a bottled drink.

The authentic facts about farm prices are available to all. They had, on December 15, risen 23 percent from the bottom a year earlier. Beef cattle and lamb prices were respectively 41 and 38 percent above their official parity or equality with general price levels. But milk, butterfat, grains, turkeys, and chickens were substantially below and potatoes, apples, sweet potatoes, and citrus fruits far below parity.

The recovery of farm prices accompanies a national jump to $206,000,000,000 in disposable personal income, after taxes. Have farmers shared unfairly in that income rise? They have not Net farm income for 1950 was actually below that of 1949 and much below the 1947-48 peak.

A higher disposable national income normally raises food prices because people spend a rather uniform share of such income for food. The $1.60 per day wage increase just won by John L. Lewis, for instance, will enable his coal miners to help in bidding food prices up. But is that, or the fact that greater coal costs of transporting or processing food will push in the same direction, the farmer's fault?

One hour's average labor will buy more food in this Nation than in others and many times more than in any regimented economy in the world. As Senator THYE told the Farm Bureau, the farmer's share of each dollar spent by the consumer for food was only 53 percent in 1946, and has slumped to 48 percent today.

Folks with a real liking for facts on both sides may be shocked also to learn of the gross inaccuracy of much of the recent so-called news of farm price supports.

Last Monday afternoon a Washington dispatch from a usually accurate news agency was widely published which said that "there was a net loss on price supports last year of $1,600,000,000."

People have been stirred up by vivid descriptions of such vast losses, of mountainous food purchases, of waste, and of farm demands for subsidies. And farmers have been told by newspapers and newspapermen to throw overboard their price-support programs or put them in a stand-by status for the duration.

An excellently informed and truthful agricultural correspondent, Fred Bailey, of Washington, recently reported that "the campaign to make the farmer the goat on rising food prices is now well under way in the big city press" supported by some city Congressmen who want to roll prices all the way back to the farmer.

Here are facts: The $1,600,000,000 referred to in last Monday's story as net loss, wasn't loss at all, but was the total amount loaned. The net realized loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the year ending last June was $249,230,000. The net realized loss in the current fiscal year through November was $100,281,000.

Said John W. Haw, agricultural development director of the Northern Pacific, to the Farm Bureau convention: "In its report to Congress on June 30, 1950, the corporation showed a cumulative net realized loss * * * in 17 years of $636,040,401. The Corporation has turned over its capital many times in this period; yet the net loss has been less than 5 cents on each dollar invested." He said the job has been substantially accomplished with economy to the taxpayer.

The recent big losses and big waste have been on potatoes and eggs. Both of those purchase programs were forced by Congress over repeated protests of the executive branch and many farmers. And from both of them the Government now has withdrawn. As to subsidies, the farmers producing the perishables that the Government sought to subsidize are up in arms against them. As to the storable products, the Government's holdings of these are now widely acknowledged as being a vital protection of the Nation's safety in the war emergency and a check on inflation. More stockpiling of this kind is considered absolutely essential, as a munition of war and as a safeguard against runaway prices.

So there are facts bearing on both sides of the farm price story.

Labor's Approach to the National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hands the text of a forthright address delivered by one of America's outstanding labor leaders, Mr. George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, affiliated with the A. F. of L. Mr. Harrison delivered this address at the quarterly conference of the Economic Club of New York last Wednesday night, January 17, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Harrison's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

OUR OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

(By George M. Harrison)

Mr. President and members of the Economic Club of New York, it is a great pleasure for me to be here to talk with you about some of the problems that are facing us today. It is a pleasure not only because I find such contacts always useful and enlightening but also because the present national emergency demands of all of us that we try to reach as great a mutual understanding among the people of the United States as is humanly possible. The war in Korea has finally unmasked the designs and the program of the Communists; anyone who had any doubt before must know now that the dictator in Moscow is willing to risk world war in order to extend his despotic power. We should realize now, too, that there is no limit to that appetite for power. We can't satisfy that Russian bear with a little raw meat. The more he eats the more he wants—and the meal he really has his eyes on is the United States of America. In the emergency that confronts us the achievement of effective national unity is of first importance.

It is important that we Americans try to build up our national strength as much as we can and as fast as we can. We must try to resolve our own differences of opinion as much as possible, to understand each other, so that we can pull together in the difficult days that lie ahead of us. Unless we learn to stand together today, we may fall together tomorrow.

You will not expect me, I know, to tell you of the problems or desires of American financiers, industrialists, or businessmen. The men who speak for the owners of American industries assuredly need no help from me, especially before this group. You will expect me to tell you of the problems and attitudes of American wage earners; that I propose to do, as simply and directly as I can. It would not be any kindness to you, either, for me to pull any punches here. For your own good and for the good of the country, you ought to know exactly what American workers are thinking, even though you may not like those thoughts.

Let me say, first, that the working people of this Nation are fully awake to the menace of communism. We have faced that threat in many forms during the past 20 years, and American labor has never for one moment wavered in its devotion to our free American institutions. No part of the citizens of this country are more determined to combat Communist dictatorship, in whatever form and wherever in the world it threatens, than the men and women who work for a living.

The determination springs, first of all, from the belief that our way of life—based on human freedom to worship, think, and speak, and vote as we believe—is right in principle, and the only just basis for any civilization. Labor is for freedom and democracy, and we are opposed to all kinds of dictatorship. But we are also opposed to Communist dictatorship from the immediate and direct standpoint of our own interests. We know that our unions, our personal freedom, and our living standards could not and would not survive under Communist domination. Labor leaders, and every outspoken workingman, would share the honors of the firing squad with the leaders of business and industry if Communist dictatorship were to be established in America. We know that. We know too, that the same results would follow if our domestic breed of Communists were able to overthrow our form of government. Whether communism was imposed upon us by foreign aggression, or in some fashion slipped over on us by any homegrown dictator, the effect would be the same.

Don't ever forget that fact, or let any of the more rabid antilabor newspapers, or columnists, or radio commentators mislead you. American labor is anti-Communist; American labor knows far better than American business the evils of dictatorship and domination, the benefits of freedom and democracy. We know—because in the not distant past, American workers were denied industrial and economic freedom, and they lived under the power of some petty despots and dictators in American industry. This, perhaps, is as good a place as any to say bluntly that American labor will fight against the return of that kind of industrial oppression in this country, and will fight as vigorously to get rid of it in the spots where it still exists.

Let us look at the facts of our American situation frankly. In normal times we do a lot of fighting among ourselves; our basic way of living is that every man is supposed to have an opportunity to work his way upward, and the competition in every walk of life, if it is fair and free, is one of our ways of making certain that the able and upright man will gain advancement to positions of leadership. Down through the years, the struggles of individual men, and of groups of men, have brought great progress to us as a people. American workers have not only improved their standards of living, but they have gained greater leisure for themselves—and they have won a substantial measure of freedom and democracy on their jobs. Part of that came from their efforts as individuals, but the great progress of recent years has been accomplished by them through their labor organizations. It hasn't been done, either, without great effort; every gain we have made in wages, or working conditions, every right we have won and every protection we have thrown around our jobs, has been over the vigorous opposition of many employers. Sometimes we have been able to persuade, with facts and arguments, but much more frequently what we have secured has come only because we have said, "This is what we want, this is what we have got to have, and this is what we are going to have." The progress of the American working people has been won over the resistance of the representatives of business and industry.

I am not here complaining about that resistance. We have been free to ask for what we wanted, and the employers have been free—and willing—to answer "No." What I do complain about, however, is the methods and tactics that have been used. In ordinary times, we can trust to the ultimate sense of fair play of the American people, and our own efforts at explaining the facts, to get things set right in the long run. But now, in the gravest national danger we have ever faced, I believe we have a right to expect that the business community will police itself a little bit, as we have been trying to police domestic and international labor organization. We do not expect the American employer to drop all opposition to labor progress, any more than we expect the sun to rise in the west tomorrow morning.

Before I explain what I mean, let me give you the reasons for insisting upon fair play and broad-minded action from the representatives of industry. This world situation in which we find ourselves is not just a battle between nations, or groups of nations. As the Russians and some of their friends are preaching it, this fight is what they call a "class conflict." They insist that the world is witnessing a battle between capitalists and workers, between employers and labor. The Communists in the Kremlin tell the world that labor rules in Russia, and that Communist victory in every other country means labor will rule that country; more

than that, they are shouting all over the world that the United States is a capitalist-ruled country, that labor here is oppressed and down-trodden, that the American Government is the tool of big business and stands for industrial exploitation and the degradation of the workingman.

That, of course, is the technique of the big lie. Hitler, I believe it was, said that if you tell a big enough lie often enough, it will be believed, because people will think you couldn't have the nerve to invent a really fantastic story. That's the Russian Communist method today.

Look, now, at the world situation. We are the main bulwark of democratic human freedom and private enterprise—but two-thirds of the world is still free from Communist domination. We are the No. 1 target of the Communists, but the No. 1 tactic of the Communists is to separate us from all possible friends and allies abroad. They seek, also, to win any possible support for their program from among our own political leaders and the working people. But mainly they are trying, in Germany, France, Italy, in all of Western Europe, to persuade the labor groups that Uncle Sam is a capitalist despot—that our way of life is fundamentally antilabor and pro-employer. The Communists hold up Russia as labor governed, and America as capitalist dominated. The real battleground of today is not just the rice paddies of Korea—it is the minds of the political leaders and the working people of Western Europe, and even of many in England and more than a few in the United States of America.

American labor is doing everything possible to counteract that Communist propaganda in America and throughout the world. I need not tell you of the campaign within this country; you must have seen the news stories of the constant vigorous opposition to the Communist line and Communist people in all labor unions. Most of our labor organizations are free from any actual Communist influence, although there may be individuals who are still unbalanced enough to accept the Russian line. But in the international field we have been no less active and determined. We have succeeded in smashing the Communist international labor front; we have destroyed the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, and set up a vigorous and effective anti-Communist world organization. I think I may justly say that American labor leadership was primarily responsible for this action. In the fight we have been making, we believe we are entitled to the cooperation of American businessmen—to the extent, at least, that they will not in this emergency seek to evade their fair share of the sacrifices and burdens that are necessary to make our country strong and united so we can win this world struggle.

In the development of this Nation, the Government has uniformly and consistently done its best to aid American business. Labor has no objection to the principle, in general, that Government powers should be used for the benefits of the citizens. We believe, with the founding fathers, that governments are instituted for those purposes. The long record of land grants, of tariff laws, of governmental subsidies, of patent legislation, of governmental loans and liberal Government contracts, the direct aid given by the State Department and occasionally by the Armed Forces in foreign affairs—all of these things illustrate and attest the devotion of the United States Government over the last century and a half to the advancement of American business interests. While businessmen, industrialists, and financiers have sometimes disagreed about what measures Government should adopt to foster and help the business community, they have seldom taken issue with the idea that Government should offer such help. The great total of billions of dollars that has flowed from Government to industry, and the other direct aids that have been given, have been tremendous factors in our industrial growth. But I do not recall having heard such governmental assistance called socialistic, or communistic, or un-American, or paternalistic by the representatives of business.

Against this necessary background, I ask you to consider what is happening today. During the last year, and especially the last 6 months, the price level in America has risen sharply. Every American industrialist, practically, has shared in the wealth thus created; his debts have shrunk, his goods on hand have grown, in terms of his dollar situation. Every American workingman, every consumer, on the other hand, has suffered; his debts oppress him more, his weekly income buys him less. Billions of dollars of real wealth have changed hands.

What has been the reaction of the business community to this terrific windfall? The proposal to tax excess profits, for example, has met with an opposition that seems wholly incomprehensible in view of the facts. Business actually seems to expect that the new taxes, required in our national emergency, shall be secured from a Federal consumer's sales tax which will fall largely upon those same groups whose incomes have been shrinking under the impact of rising prices. And the business community, through its spokesmen, object to the control of prices to prevent profiteering, although they are responsible for raising prices and the inflation that has occurred. At this time when every American family is being called upon to give its sons to the Nation for military service these business attitudes are profoundly disturbing to American workers. It does no good to speak a lot of hard words in such situations, but we cannot avoid a feeling that too many business representatives are adopting and expressing a narrow, selfish, and greedy viewpoint in this national emergency. We do not expect a suspension of the desire for reasonable and fair profits; we do not believe the ordinary motives of economic activity can be set aside in this emergency, without disrupting our industrial efficiency.

Labor knows the harvest that has been garnered by American business in the last year of rapid price increases, and the harvest that resulted from the price increases after the repeal of control laws in 1946. We know the rich gains to business resulting from the rapid amortization of war plants in the last war, and the sales of such plants in the postwar years. We see again the provision for 5-year retirement of plant to be used in the new defense effort. In the face of those terrific, those unprecedented gains by American business, we believe we have a right to expect forbearance, common sense, and national cooperation from those who own our industries.

We cannot reconcile the national emergency with the efforts being made not only to raise the price level still further, but, on the legislative field to prevent excess-profit taxation. The worst of it, from some standpoints, is that when the workers try to get enough wages to meet these price rises and to prevent undue hardship and suffering for their families, some businessmen want to take away their fundamental liberty. The right to strike is as fundamental as the right of any businessman to buy and sell, as fundamental as any right protected by the contract provisions of the United States Constitution. It is as fundamental, and we believe more sacred; no man's property is as sacred as his personal liberty, his personal freedom. We cannot get around the simple fact that laws prohibiting strikes of workers in private enterprise take away one of the few great fundamental rights of every American citizen. We hope that the business community will rise to the level of dignity, common sense, and patriotism that is required of them if we are to preserve America and Americanism through the perils that lie immediately ahead of us. Since we all have a supreme stake in freedom, all of us must make our fullest contribution to its defense. With cooperation, labor and industrial management can get much of the additional production that will be needed for an effective military defense and relieve much of the inflationary pressures, but the place to stop price increases is where they originate.

The seller and the speculator fix prices, and if they won't stop raising prices, they must be controlled. If prices are controlled, then we agree that wages should be stabilized in parity with prices. Taxes must be raised to get the revenues to pay for our rearmament and they should come from corporation and excess profits and individual incomes. We are opposed to a national sales tax because it does not attack inflation at its source—the price and profit level. Government spending for nondefense activities must be reduced, but this does not require curtailment of essential social services.

Postal services should be made self-sustaining and the charges should be raised to get the necessary revenues. There is no good reason why private business should be furnished parcel-post services at a loss of $100,000,000 a year to be made up by the taxpayers.

I would like to see the advocates of private enterprise practice what they preach and agree to a correction of this unfair subsidized Federal competition with private transportation.

Soviet aggression constitutes a challenge to our free way of life. We can overcome that challenge if we stand together, as Americans have done in past emergencies. We must convince Soviet Russia that America has the will to fight and the strength to fight in defense of freedom and international justice. We must make the Soviet leaders understand once and for all that America is willing to live and let live in peace.

American wage earners face the future and its responsibilities seriously, but with confidence. We want peace and the opportunity that peace affords for new progress. But if we are compelled by circumstances beyond our control to wage another war, we are determined to let nothing stand in the way of victory—victory that will mean not only a better America, but a better and more peaceful world in our time.

Survey Shows No Reversion to Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the National Opinion Research Center:

SURVEY SHOWS NO REVERSION TO ISOLATIONISM

The American public shows no signs of a return to old-type isolationism according to a survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center during the first week of January 1951. Despite military reverses in Korea and recent criticisms of United States foreign policy by Hoover, Kennedy, and Taft, the American public continues to support aid to our allies and active participation in world affairs. As the new year began, the center's survey showed strong majorities of Americans backed such measures as the North At-

lantic Pact and the shipment of military supplies to Western Europe while the proportion of the public which would stay out of world affairs was no larger than it was a year ago.

In answer to the question, "Do you think it will be best for the future of this country if we take an active part in world affairs, or if we stay out of world affairs?" 66 percent of the population advocated taking an active part while only 25 percent advocated staying out. These figures have changed little since this question on support for isolationism was first asked in 1942 and are unchanged from results for the same question asked in January 1950.

Questioned about the North Atlantic Pact—"an agreement with Canada and the countries of Western Europe, to defend each other against attack"—78 percent of the adult population expressed the view that it is a good idea. Only 1 person in 10 called it a bad idea. Similarly, 71 percent of the population approved of sending military supplies to the countries of Western Europe now, in order to strengthen them against any future attack. Support for this measure appears to have increased since the start of the Korean War, for in early June 1950 62 percent of the American population favored sending American arms to Western Europe.

Provided Western Europe works actively to build up its own defense, American opinion seems solidly behind the proposal to send American troops to aid in that defense. Almost two-thirds of the American population were not convinced that Europe is doing all it should in this respect, however. Thirty-six percent of the American public approved of sending large numbers of American troops to help build up the defense of Western Europe, though an additional 34 percent of the population would approve such a step if the countries of Western Europe increased the size of their own armed forces.

The military reverses in Korea were not without their effects, however. A majority of 55 percent of the population still answered "right" in January 1951 to the question "Do you think the United States was right or wrong in sending American troops to stop the Communist invasion of South Korea?" In September 1950 81 percent of the American population had answered "right" to the same question.

The figures cited above are derived from answers to questions put to a national cross-section of 1,300 American adults, 21 years of age and over, during the period from December 29, 1950, to January 8, 1951, by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago.

Ice Harbor Dam and Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that some of the spendthrift agencies of Government are going to wrap the American flag around some of these infeasible projects and declare that they are needed for the war emergency. The following editorial in the Astorian Evening Budget, of Astoria, Oreg., very aptly covers this subject:

TIME FOR A REAL APPRAISAL

A reader has sent us a copy of an editorial just published by the Contractors and Engineers Monthly, of New York City, dealing with the subject of nonessential Federal construction in these days.

It is so pertinent to the subject of Ice Harbor Dam for which a new attempt to get an initial appropriation is under way, that we can't resist the desire to publish it herewith.

The Contractors and Engineers Monthly is a trade publication of the heavy-construction industry, a publication obviously well equipped for sound comment on the Army engineers and their projects. The editorial, entitled "Time for a Real Appraisal," follows:

"One of the most thorough, soul-searching self-examinations ever made is due in the construction business, if that industry is to command continued respect. This is especially true on public works financed wholly or in part by taxes. The United States, faced with the responsibility of maintaining powerful armed forces for decades, perhaps, cannot and must not spend its financial strength on luxury projects whose conception in these critical times is unwise.

"The Bureau of Reclamation's central Arizona project always seemed to us to exemplify this theme perfectly. It is by no means an isolated example of the type of project which, if deferred indefinitely, would make the Nation stronger in her time of peril. At the present time the central Arizona project is pigeonholed in committee, but it may be called to the floor of the House for a vote at any time.

"Other projects, involving astronomical sums of money, are being promoted. Some of these undertakings are good and wise, but many could be held in abeyance or forgotten entirely. Whenever an agency has to strain for justification excuses, as the Corps of Engineers is sometimes doing on its small-boat and pleasure-yacht harbor-development projects, it is time for the construction industry to do some analyzing. Their worthwhile jobs can stand on their own merits; they do not require propaganda selling.

"It is not the purpose of this editorial to imply that all or even a majority of Federal agency construction jobs are unnecessary. Certainly the conception of certain dams is sound, even in these times, and some flood-control channels are undoubtedly needed. A first-class highway network capable of standing up under modern traffic is a crying necessity.

"But the world situation in itself can save the Nation from attack. When the only thing a bully respects is force, the only wise course is to create that force at the expense, if need be, of construction projects no longer justified in the light of the world situation. As Dwight Eisenhower recently said, 'It is time to get tough with ourselves,' and Contractors and Engineers Monthly would be something less than honest if it did not point this out.

"As a matter of fact, the voluntary cancellation of unnecessary luxury projects is the healthiest course for the construction industry to follow. The Nation's contractors have an enormous job ahead to construct installations for the growing Armed Forces Establishment. Equipment manufacturers and distributors will be hard pressed to build and distribute machinery, and not a single unit should be used unwisely. The construction industry cannot allow itself to be spread too thin. It must remain strong and healthy to keep the Nation solvent, and the movement in this direction must come from within to be effective.

"Private hydroelectric power development projects at Kings River, Calif., and Roanoke Rapids, Va., are being blocked at this very moment by Government agencies which argue for Federal development at public expense. It is this sort of thing which should stop at once.

"For projects of this nature which are sufficiently sound for private-venture capital to underwrite should have the fullest cooperation from the construction industry. Projects which have to reach out for excuses like recreation to partially justify their enormous cost should be deferred at least until the battle for survival this Nation is currently fighting is over."

Housing in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. LOVRE, of South Dakota, stated in an extension of remarks on December 15, 1950:

Mr. Speaker, I can only scratch my head in wonder at the antics of the administration. In the hope that some of the other Members can help me out of this fix, I ask that the full text of the following press release be included in my remarks.

The press release mentioned was issued by the Housing and Home Finance Agency on December 2 with reference to progress made under the remote area dwelling program conducted by the Alaska Housing Authority under the sponsorship of the Housing and Home Finance Agency through the provisions of the Alaska Housing Act. Specific mention was made in the release of the loans which have been obtained by Eskimos in Alaska for construction or improvements of their homes, which are called character loans and are not in excess of $500.

Mr. LOVRE, in the course of his remarks, stated further:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything against the Eskimos but I note that while we here in this country are being called upon to accept less of certain strategic materials, the Eskimo who conforms to bureaucratic edict can get corrugated aluminum roofing for his house. This at a time when we desperately need critical materials in the war effort.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. LOVRE and others who read his extension of remarks are interested enough in the subject to have the facts of the case presented to them.

It was Congress and not the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency who authorized in the Alaska Housing Act—Public Law 52 of the Eighty-first Congress, approved April 23, 1949—the Alaska Housing Authority to make character loans to individuals or cooperatives for the improvement, conversion, or construction of dwellings in remote areas to be occupied by such individuals or members of such cooperatives where the loan does not exceed $500 per dwelling.

This program was begun as but a small part of a much larger undertaking under the Alaska Housing Act for housing in Alaska to help meet the needs in urban areas of civilian workers serving

military activities directly or indirectly at our defense installations.

To obtain funds for the purpose of undertaking this program and other projects authorized under the act, the Alaska Housing Authority was authorized to issue obligations for purchase by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in an amount not to exceed $15,000,000 and it was specifically provided that such notes and other obligations issued and outstanding for the purpose of making character loans to individuals or cooperatives shall not exceed $1,000,000. An appropriation of $10,000,000 to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for loan to the Alaska Housing Authority for purposes authorized in the act was passed by Congress and approved by the President on October 10, 1949.

The remote-area dwelling program was first conceived by Father Paul C. O'Connor, S. J., chairman of the Alaska Housing Authority, who has spent 20 years of his life among the Eskimos in the remote areas of Alaska along the Bering Sea. On a necessarily limited basis, Father O'Connor had experimented with improvements to the typical Eskimo dwellings for the purpose of eliminating the extremely damp and unhealthy living conditions of these people. The ravages of tuberculosis and other diseases among this fine race have been partly attributed to substandard housing. These diseases were unknown among the Eskimos prior to the advent of other people. Father O'Connor's experiments with limited resources had proved quite successful and he was desirous of expanding these benefits which he was certain could be done on a self-help, nonsubsidy basis. He very definitely opposed any effort to attempt to place the Eskimos in expensive modern homes, but instead urged that improvements be made gradually. Hearings on the proposed Alaska Housing Act were held by the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees in March of 1949 at which time Father O'Connor testified effectively and in detail as to the nature, purposes and prospects of such a program. I believe Father O'Connor's testimony makes very interesting and informative reading for anyone interested in the Territory of Alaska or more importantly interested in the defense outposts of our country in which the Eskimo takes such an active part.

Special mention of Father O'Connor's testimony and suggestion was made in both House and Senate reports on the Alaska Housing Act, which strongly endorsed the insertion of the character loan provision in the legislation. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency report on the legislation stated:

> Your committee was also impressed by the special housing needs of the Eskimos. Living generally in damp sod huts, they have proved to be highly susceptible to tuberculosis brought in by civilization, and their death rate from this disease is nine times that of the population of the United States as a whole. Experiments have demonstrated that wood floors and roofs can be installed cheaply in their dwellings, which will protect them to the extent of greatly diminishing occurrence of the disease. Testimony was presented to your committee that in one Eskimo village where wood floors and roofs were installed, the incidence of tuberculosis was reduced by 80 percent.

During the summer of 1949 the Alaska Housing Authority conducted a larger experimental program of this character in the Eskimo village of Hooper Bay, on the Bering Sea, and demonstrated the feasibility of dwelling improvement or even reconstruction sufficient to satisfy the purposes within an amount of $500 for each such dwelling. This experimental program was financed out of limited territorial funds and was administered in the form of character loans to the individual natives in an amount not to exceed $500 for each dwelling and in the form of notes to be fully repaid within 5 years, with interest at 5 percent.

For the building season of 1950 the Alaska Housing Authority developed a program designed to improve or reconstruct dwellings for 170 families in 6 villages in the remote areas of the Territory. The authority applied to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for a loan in the amount of $70,000 to support its lending operations in turn to those 170 native families in individual amounts of $500 or less, payable in installments over a 6-year period, with interest at 5 percent. This loan was approved by the Administrator in April of 1950, and the program proceeded with the commendable success reported in the Housing and Home Finance Agency news release of December 2.

The Alaska Housing Authority has now had the experience of two seasons of this program. It should be noted that the program is intended to be self-supporting, without subsidy, and at the present time the outstanding notes are rapidly being repaid. The total tonnage of materials consumed in the 1949 period approximated 70 tons. The total tonnage of materials consumed in the 1950 program amounts to 421 tons. The actual tonnage of aluminum roofing came to 36 tons. These materials were ordered in April of 1950, many months prior to the present situation, with its emphasis upon critical materials. It was found that aluminum was more readily available than galvanized steel, which was originally ordered, and the aluminum was ordered because of its lighter weight, which was a factor in transportation, and because of its availability at that time. Metal roofing is used in this work particularly for the purpose of collecting rain water for drinking and domestic purposes of the Eskimo, which in itself amounts to almost life-saving benefits. Naturally, if aluminum roofing is not available it will not be used, but I believe emphasis should be placed and due recognition given to the fact that the aluminum roofing which was used was ordered almost 3 months before the Korean crisis started.

It is a tribute to the natives and to the Alaska Housing Authority that through ingenuity, initiative, and the cooperative self-help work on the part of the Eskimos it has not only been possible to achieve an improvement in their dwellings of such nature as to eliminate largely the previous unhealthful living conditions but also to construct a new dwelling fully sufficient for this purpose within the $500 limitation, particularly in consideration of the generally extremely high construction costs in these areas.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill granting to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the present hostilities, and to their dependents, all the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to veterans of World War II and their dependents.

While this bill is general in nature, it authorizes and directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe regulations and provisions to make the act effective.

In my opinion, the passage by the House yesterday of House bill 1 was fair, fitting, and proper, and gives to the soldiers now fighting in Korea some benefits, rights, and privileges that the veterans of World War II do not have. However, in my opinion, inasmuch as the boys now fighting in the Korean area are doing so under conditions never before experienced in American history, namely, fighting under the United Nations in an undeclared war that has been called a police action, it is my firm conviction that it is proper for these men to be granted additional benefits and they should lose none of those given to veterans of World War I and World War II.

How You Lose Your Neck Saving Truman's Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 17, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is important that every sovereign citizen of this great Republic, especially the mothers and fathers with 18-year-old sons, as well as younger boys, bear in mind why this demand has been made by the Truman administration for this draft of the 18-year-olds.

Our replacements of men in Korea is 15,000 per month. Must we suffer and permit the continuous slaughter of American boys while the United Nations permits itself to be dominated by our supposed allies who sympathize with Russia and Red China in the military operations now in Korea.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the

RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 25 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

HOW YOU LOSE YOUR NECK SAVING TRUMAN'S FACE

Somewhere in Korea, as you read this editorial, an American in uniform will have been killed by an agent of communism. How does it happen that the American was there to be killed?

The official and public record is worth reviewing, just at this moment when the Congress of the United States has called on the United Nations to declare Communist China an aggressor in war.

A reasonable starting point is June 1, 1950, for it was in June that decisions were taken by President Truman and the UN—not the people of the United States of America—that have put us Americans out to be killed.

June 1: President Truman declares at a press conference he believes the world closer to peace than at any time in the past 5 years and the next day gives a gold medal to Veep BARKLEY "for distinguished service."

June 6: President Truman declares that "Government action in recent years has been the salvation of private enterprise," and accuses business of spending enormous sums of money to spread the "false" idea that his administration is promoting creeping socialism.

June 10: President Truman denounces Soviet Russia, compliments Europe for its "resolute expression of the will to be free and to unite in common defense," says the "cold war" will probably last for "many years to come." "Isolationism," he adds, "is the road to war and worse than that, to defeat in war."

We insert here a request that nobody call on us to balance the remarks of June 1 with those of June 10. We're just reporting what the man said.

June 20: Secretary of State Acheson gives the Governors' Conference, meeting at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., a 3½-hour open and closed review of State Department works and policies. The governors unanimously express satisfaction and gratitude. Acheson goes to Harvard to be anointed, June 22, as an honorary doctor of laws and there tells Russia off again.

June 24, 1950, 3 p. m., eastern standard time: North Korean army crosses thirty-eighth parallel, headed for Seoul, capital of South Korea.

June 25, 5:45 p. m.: Security Council of United Nations issues "cease fire" order and calls for troops.

June 27, 12 noon: President Truman orders General MacArthur to throw land, sea, and Air Forces in against the Reds, as per UN direction. He also reverses himself in the "hands off Formosa" policy, orders Navy to defend it, and promises weapons to the Philippine and Indochinese Governments.

The UN Security Council votes military sanctions against North Korea, meaning an agreement not to sell it munitions of war. Member nations promptly start selling to Red China and other Soviet stooges.

There follows a period in which the people demand to know how the Red Koreans were able to surprise and push United States forces down to the Pusan beachhead.

So such types as John Foster Dulles, who needs no introduction, explain that "we knew it was coming all the time, but we just didn't know when."

How that squares with Mr. Truman's June 1 declaration on peace we wouldn't know.

In no time at all Mr. Truman's dishonest phrase, "police action," is abandoned by all to describe the adventure in Korea by its right name, "war."

The Constitution of the United States says that only Congress can declare war for this Nation, but Mr. Truman and the UN don't mind that.

July 14: The UN flag is put above the United States flag and goes to battle that way, leading United States citizens.

August 28: Nationalist Chinese headquarters on Formosa announce that Red Chinese have crossed Manchurian border into Korea. United States airmen report shooting down Russian bomber.

September 15–16: United States forces, after fighting bitter retreating action in which UN nations send only token support, begin to spring back. General MacArthur leads Inchon landing that leads to quick victory.

September 21: President Truman says it is up to UN whether our troops will cross thirty-eighth parallel in rolling back the Red forces; says United States troops will obey.

October 4: UN cheers MacArthur on and, with India and Russia objecting, directs him to take "all appropriate steps." So he opens drive to clear Korea of Reds.

October 26: South Koreans in MacArthur's forces reach Manchurian border.

November 1: North Korean broadcast announces Red China has decided to send "volunteers" to help them. You know what has happened since.

Now, in New York City, the UN, which took full authority and control over United States soldiers when things looked good, doesn't know us any more.

Americans in uniform are dead from one end of Korea to the other. Congress has been held up to disgrace and ridicule. It deserves as much for supine submission to a President who said on June 1, 1950, that peace is nearer than at any time in the past 5 years, and on June 26 ordered, on his own, a "police action" in support of the UN that now is full war.

The citizens of the United States, who are paying for the very life and living of the UN, the so-called governments represented in it, and the people involved, have been made fools of before the world.

No wonder the mail to the White House and to Congress is the heaviest in history. Have you sent yours?

A Humiliating Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "A Humiliating Defeat" which appeared in the Washington Daily News for January 24, 1951:

A HUMILIATING DEFEAT

When the American resolution seeking to brand the Chinese Communists as aggressors in Korea was sidetracked by a 27-to-23 vote in the 60-member United Nations political committee the United States suffered its worst defeat in the UN's 5-year history.

This humiliating situation invites President Truman's personal attention, for it shows the extent to which our bargaining power has been traded away for nothing through the State Department's political ineptitude.

The defeat was sustained at the hands of the British, supported by India, France, Canada, the Asian-Arab bloc, and the Scandinavian countries—nations, for the most part, presumed to be our friends.

The Russians took no part in the proceedings, because Britain and India were carrying the ball for them. But Moscow must have found great satisfaction in this spectacle.

After all of the proud boasts about the united front against communism, and all the billions we have contributed to this build-up, the only nations voting with us on an issue directly involving Communist aggression were the Latin-American bloc, Greece, Turkey, and the Philippines—not one of them a member of the North Atlantic alliance.

The ingratitude of nations is proverbial. But a practical statesman makes due allowances for this factor and insures himself against it. Obviously, Secretary of State Acheson was not wise enough to do this. He let himself become a rubber stamp for the British Foreign Office and apparently got no assurance that Britain would back him when he needed support.

Just 2 weeks ago the United States approved the British-Indian proposal, which would have given the Chinese Reds the island of Formosa and a UN seat in return for a cease-fire agreement in Korea, on the understanding that if the offer was rejected Britain and India would support the American resolution. But when our resolution was called up those nations found a convenient excuse for voting to lay it aside in favor of another appeasement proposal.

When Britain votes against us rather than offend the Peiping Reds no better demonstration of the penalty of being taken for granted could be wanted. And the other fence-straddlers walked out on us with the British.

Now the United States has been left almost alone in the position of opposing what our erstwhile allies presume to call peace. The Russians, who have been calling us warmongers, have been given new grist for their propaganda mills. And the ammunition they will use against us was provided by our so-called friends.

The unanimous votes by which the United States Senate has asked the United Nations to brand the Chinese Reds as aggressors "immediately," and to deny them a seat in the UN, should be a warning to the UN as a whole, and to our allies in particular. These votes reflect the attitude of the American people, as well as that of a body which must pass upon this country's future contributions both to the UN and to all of our overseas programs.

There's been too much of this tragic nonsense and double-dealing at Lake Success. This country is stultifying itself by being party to the proceedings. But our own State Department has been such a willing party to so much of the trafficking and procrastination that we must share our measure of guilt for the sordid spectacle the United Nations has made of itself.

Only the President can remove the United States from this compromising position. He can do that only by purging the State Department of all of the elements responsible for it, beginning with Secretary Acheson.

He should not wait another day.

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is both refreshing and inspirational in these days of intrigue and confusion to

come in contact with the sentiments which lie basically under our governmental structure and speak the devotion of those who in that earlier day carved out our Nation. Those who flung all they had in the balance and staggered through revolution to found our Republic. Those bold men and pioneer women who rode the slow oxcarts to the West and bought an empire with the bitter struggles of the frontier. These shaped a Nation and gave to the world that which, despite all its defects, has offered and still offers to you and me the largest way of life the human race has ever known.

Such a heritage is symbolized by our American flag.

I am impressed with a tribute to our flag, written by Charles Ulysses Gordon, whose great-grandfather served with Washington at Valley Forge and fought at Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the poem of Mr. Gordon on the American Flag:

THE AMERICAN FLAG

Hail! All hail! The American flag,
Glorious emblem of the world's greatest Republic.
Behold! The Star-Spangled Banner as she
Gracefully rises to her post of duty
And gently flutters in the morning breeze
Across our native land and above the seas;
She proclaims her message of liberty and freedom;
Then softly, as the red, white, and blue sways,
Loyally we grant her our befitting salute.

Contemplate Old Glory as she loftily floats
On yonder mountain high, in the rising sun,
Piercing the warmly glowing azure sky.
From staff and mast she waves throughout the air,
Bestowing her choicest blessings on all alike.
Observe her resplendent above the stately Capitol dome;
Surely she belongs in every American home.
Worthy sons and daughters of freedom, she is yours
To acclaim, to honor, to defend.

Wave on! Wave on! O glorious flag,
Thy destiny is yet unknown.
Amid uncertainty and mounting strife,
Our Nation remains calm and serene,
Surrounded by vicissitudes of a troubled world,
She boldly asserts her established sovereignty.
Washington, Adams, and Jefferson wisely counseled
That America avoid all entangling alliances
And evermore maintain "freedom's banner" at her door.

From early sunrise until the close of day,
Triumphant, the Stars and Stripes are waving.
Symbol of a freeborn sovereign people;
Guardian of our Charter of Liberty,
Defender of our Union, peace and independence,
Sentinel of our honor and priceless heritage;
Patriotic protector of our Bill of Rights,
Supremely does our inspiring ensign proclaim:
The United States of America shall be forever free.

—*Charles Ulysses Gordon.*

JUNE 14, 1950.

No Zeal for Nonmilitary Saving Shown in the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, any person who has analyzed the President's budget message will recognize therein a lack of sincerity in the remarks about economy in nondefense spending. Instead of reducing spending in nondefense items, the President requests an over-all increase in such spending. Then, too, the President has requested the Congress to embark on new spending plans in keeping with his irresponsible schemes. It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, for either the President or Members of Congress to simply talk about economy. It is high time that we—all of us in responsible positions—do something about it.

I set forth here, Mr. Speaker, a fine editorial from a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal:

NO ZEAL FOR NONMILITARY SAVING SHOWN IN THE BUDGET

The President has given Congress a budget calling for appropriations of $71,600,000,000 for the year beginning next July 1. It is the fourth largest budget in our history, being exceeded only by the budgets for the three peak years of World War II.

The revenue of the Government for the new year is estimated at $55,000,000,000, which is the highest in our history but which falls short by $16,500,000,000 of balancing costs.

The public debt, which will reach $260,000,000,000 by the end of the current year, will thus pass $276,000,000,000 by June 30, 1952, unless we raise our already high taxes.

To balance the President's budget through the adoption of a pay-as-we-go policy—and everybody should admit that this is desirable—will entail a 30-percent increase in receipts. This means higher taxes in every category than we have ever known before and perhaps some new sources of revenue.

That, in brief, is the fiscal picture which the President paints. The whole matter is now in the hands of Congress.

Congress cannot well challenge the five billion nine hundred million which goes to pay the interest on the national debt. It will not challenge the four billion nine hundred million set aside for payments to veterans. It will go lightly in trimming the forty-eight billion eight hundred million asked for our own military preparation and for aiding other free nations to prepare.

The trimming, if there is to be trimming, must come largely from the many items which comprise the other twelve billion. While much of the expenditure here is for items related, directly or more remotely, to defense, there should be a fertile field here for some economies.

There is no evidence in the budget or in the budget message that the President has pressed for the sacrifices by Government departments that he has asked citizens generally to make and that they must make as consumer goods dwindle in supply and as taxes increase.

He speaks broadly of discontinuing projects and of not asking for new enterprises because of the emergency. Yet nonmilitary appropriations are up by more than $2,000,000,000 and the cost of general government is up by $100,000,000. In view of this, it is for Congress to determine whether Government services have been put on the same emergency footing of strict economy that is contemplated for the people.

It is not enough to get the water out of Government costs. It is essential that the services themselves be curtailed where that is possible without positive harm.

On the purely domestic side, the President asks for a reorganization of the financing of the Post Office Department and a rise in postal rates to make the Department more nearly self-supporting. He advocates separate accounting for Government and congressional mail and for paying postal subsidies to aviation out of a separate fund. Surely there should be no resistance to this reform.

He advocates a start on building the St. Lawrence waterway and six other power-producing projects. These proposals should be reviewed sympathetically for their defense potentialities.

The President then goes to three more controversial issues—educational aids to the States, some type of Brannan plan aid to farmers and medical care under social security.

Is there any reason why, having gone this far without them, we should now, in the throes of an emergency, start educational aids or a plan for emergency medical benefits under Government auspices? And is it not time to consider withdrawal of agricultural aids, rather than a modification of them?

The President admits that the farmer's financial situation will be good in 1952. He is disturbed, however, by the cost and waste of storing surpluses under the present aid system. Apparently the only choice he sees is a choice between support subsidies and direct subsidies. Congress should go beyond that and inquire into the need for any subsidies at all at this time.

This country is today committed to a policy of rapid development of its defense facilities and of defense facilities abroad which may be used in our common defense. That commitment calls for sacrifice—for a lower standard of living, for longer hours of work, for greater production in spite of the hardships incident to the task to which we dedicate ourselves.

It calls for vast expenditures—but it also calls for getting every ounce of fat out of the services of Government, and especially the nonmilitary services.

Every cent that can be saved leaves a cent in the pocket of some taxpayer. Every billion dollars that can be lopped off the costs, cuts a billion dollars off the new revenues which must be obtained to balance the budget.

There is little to show that the President's 1952 budget was conceived in that light.

Universal Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Universal Training," which

appeared in the New Ulm Daily Journal, New Ulm, Minn., of January 13, 1951:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING

Substantially strengthened by the world crisis, the proposal for universal military training is before Congress again. Universal training is generally thought of as a device with which the Armed Forces could be kept always manned at the size authorized by Congress, and with which the largest possible pool of trained reservists could be maintained for emergency.

The plan sponsored by the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee would build a pool of reservists with 1 year of training, but apparently would compete with the regular services rather than aid them in the supply of men for actual service. Under this plan, every young man would be subject to training, but he would be in an isolated training corps, not a member of any regular service. Only 4 months of his year would be spent in actual field training; at the end of his year he would, unless he volunteered for regular service, go to the reserves.

Obviously this plan would not provide the regular services with much additional manpower. They would still have to get it from their present sources, volunteers and the draft. Their noncombatant manpower requirements would be enlarged, since they would have to provide the instruction and administration for the training corps. Even the value of the reserve pool would be questionable. A man with only 4 months of basic training and 8 months of class work would not attain a high degree of military skill, and what he attained would deteriorate rapidly after his return to civilian life. After 2 or 3 years, extensive refresher training almost equivalent to that given to raw recruits would be required for these reservists if it were necessary to call them into active service.

It is questionable whether anything would have been gained except a year's activity program for the youth of the Nation. If universal military training is needed to strengthen and support our armed services, it should be made certain that the plan considered for adoption would do that.

Patriot or Politician?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, action speaks louder than words. When the President appeared before the Congress to deliver his annual message on the state of the Union, he spoke of rigid economy in nondefense spending. Yet, paradoxically, his budget message requested increased over-all spending for nondefense items.

Rex Karney, the analytical associate editor of the Wisconsin State Journal at Madison, Wis., has written an editorial that the apologists for this administration ought to answer for the people of this country. The editorial is entitled "Patriot or Politician?":

PATRIOT OR POLITICIAN?

Even in an hour which he himself labels one of crisis, the President of the United States wallows about in the muck of cheap, dirty, partisan politics.

President Truman yesterday proposed to Congress a budget for next year of $71,500,000,000.

He asked that Federal taxes be increased by sixteen and five-tenths billions so the Government could operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. This would mean an assessment of about $471 a year on every man, woman, and child in the United States.

No one is much surprised by these figures, astronomic though they are. The ordinary citizens of this Nation have long been ahead of most of their public officials in recognition of the hard struggle for survival that is to be our certain lot.

And there are few citizens who would whittle one penny from the Federal appropriations that are really vital to our defense.

But what else does Harry S. Truman demand in the defense budget he presents to Congress?

He asks for the Brannan plan, an expensive political monstrosity on which even the members of his own party are divided.

He demands public housing for low-income groups, which can mean anything the President and his bureaucrats want it to mean.

He wants Federal aid to education.

He wants Federal medical insurance, a start on the same socialized medical program that was repudiated in case after case in the 1950 elections.

He demands a Fair Employment Practices Act, as controversial a proposal as any before Congress.

All these Mr. Truman demands in the name of "emergency" and "national defense."

It is true that military and international categories of the Truman budget account for about 70 percent of the total. It is true that the individual appropriations for the Fair Deal social experiments are relatively small in comparison to the total.

But Mr. Truman has no right, in this critical hour, to impose upon the American people one cent of spending and taxation that is not necessary to our national survival.

He has no right to allow his social philosophers to get their foot in the door with highly controversial programs now that will mean billions in expenditures and taxes in the years to come.

House Republican Leader JOSEPH MARTIN charged yesterday that Truman administration planners "are attempting to hitchhike free rides on the defense program for nondefense schemes."

He stated the case clearly and fairly.

Individual Members of Congress must now perform their constitutional duty of scanning the President's proposal carefully, and must eliminate the hitchhikers who can be classed only as excess baggage.

Tribute to Edison—Correction of an Oversight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] called attention to the fact that a speech which I made on Thomas Alva Edison on February 12, 1940, had been published in a set of books entitled "Modern Eloquence" which is generally regarded as one of the outstanding publications of its kind in the English language.

In response to his statement, I called attention to the fact that it had been published in several other volumes, including Principles of Public Speaking, which is used as a text book in many of the leading colleges of the country, including George Washington University here in the city, and also in a book on public speaking by Hon. William Doll, a former instructor in public speaking at the University of Washington, and also at the University of Wisconsin.

My attention has been called to the fact that I overlooked another great publication that carried that address. I refer to Vital Speeches of the Day, which published it on April 1, 1940, and which carries it in its permanent publication.

I regret this oversight very much, for I regard Vital Speeches of the Day as one of the most valuable publications of its kind in America, and one that I should like to see in the library of every college and every high school in this country.

In making my address on Edison, I had only a few minutes time in which to express my feelings concerning the man, whom I consider the greatest individual material benefactor of the human race.

When you look around, especially at night, you can realize what would happen if we should lose what Edison accomplished.

If all the lights were to go out, if all the electrical appliances were to cease to operate, and if all the motor machines that have been made possible by the spark of electricity that fires the gas that moves them on, were to come to a standstill, then you would realize what we owe to Edison, the man who made it all possible.

Electricity is the greatest servant mankind has ever known, and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford.

As I said, I am very sorry that I was not aware of the fact that my tribute to Edison was first published in Vital Speeches of the Day and that I therefore did not mention that great publication in connection therewith in my remarks on this floor on January 12.

The Wolf Creek Project of the Cumberland River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address on the subject of the Wolf Creek project of the Cumberland River Basin, which I heard delivered before the Rotary Club in Lexington, Ky., on October 12, 1950, by Col. Henry Walsh, District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, of Nashville, Tenn.

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

Mr. Chairman, Senator CHAPMAN, members of the Rotary Club, and guests, I want to thank you for your kind invitation and add that I welcome this opportunity of appearing before you today to talk to you briefly of the Wolf Creek project and the part this project plays in the development of the Cumberland River Basin and the surrounding area. I hope that it will result in mutual advantages to you, as well as to the organization I represent.

The presence of Senator CHAPMAN here today makes it much easier for me to present the plan for development of the Cumberland River, since I am sure that the Senator is thoroughly familiar with all the aspects of the plan. I might add too, that the Senator has been most active and influential in his support of the Wolf Creek project and in obtaining funds to continue construction of this project in an orderly manner.

You should feel that these projects I am about to discuss are your projects since it is the desires and the interest of the citizens of the area that are the initiating and propelling forces which cause the Corps of Engineers to develop our river basins.

The Wolf Creek project is an outstanding example of this type of development. We are proud of the Wolf Creek project for numerous reasons. First, let me say, this is truly a mammoth structure. The dam itself is over a mile in length. The concrete portion of the structure contains over one and one-third million cubic yards of concrete. The earth-filled portion of the dam contains almost 9,000,000 cubic yards of earth. The lake which is now being formed behind this massive structure will contain over 6,000,000 acre-feet of water. Compared on the basis of reservoir capacity, it will be the largest reservoir east of the Mississippi River. The power plant at this project, rated on installed plant capacity, will rank third in the eastern United States. Six units with a total capacity of 270,000 kilowatts will be installed in this plant. This is sufficient capacity to supply the electrical demand of Kentucky's 10 largest cities.

Besides the professional pride we have as engineers in taking a part in the construction of this structure, we are also proud of the role it occupies in the plans for the development of the water resources of the Cumberland River Basin. This comprehensive plan for the development of this area, which was authorized in its present form, by the Congress of the United States in 1946, provides for flood control, production of hydroelectric power, navigation improvement, pollution abatement, recreational development, and all related benefits for a full development of a great natural resource.

Of these many benefits, probably the most important in these days of potential power shortages and increasing demands, is that of hydroelectric power production. The plan for the development of the Cumberland River Valley provides for the installation of approximately 900,000 kilowatts of generating capacity, which will produce over 3,500,000,000-kilowatt hours of electrical energy annually. This plan utilizes every foot of drop in the Cumberland River between Wolf Creek and Nashville. Of this total installed capacity, the 270,000 kilowatts at Wolf Creek represents about one-third. The other two-thirds is installed at nine other sites. Wolf Creek is truly the key project in the development of the Cumberland River. The construction of the powerhouse is now being pushed at an accelerated pace. We expect to have the first generators in operation in September of next year.

Of almost equal importance are the flood-control benefits to be obtained from this plan. The Cumberland River Basin has had a long history of disastrous floods which have annually cost the citizens of the valley millions of dollars in flood damages. The plan, of which Wolf Creek is the key project, will give complete protection from flood damages from the Wolf Creek Dam site to the vicinity of Clarksville, Tenn., where backwaters from the Ohio River begin to be reflected on the flow of the Cumberland. In addition to the flood control for the Cumberland River Valley, this plan will also materially benefit the lower Ohio and Mississippi Valleys.

To obtain this flood protection, the plan as authorized by Congress provides for the control of the runoff from 11,000 square miles of the Cumberland River Basin. Of this total, over 5,800 square miles of the drainage basin or approximately 53 percent is controlled by the Wolf Creek Dam. The other 47 percent is provided by the Center Hill and Dale Hollow projects, both of which are now completed for flood control, and the planned structures at Stewarts Ferry, Three Islands, and Rossview. Here again, it is quite apparent that Wolf Creek is the key project in the plan.

Last July the governor of the great Commonwealth of Kentucky was honor guest at the closing ceremony of this massive dam. He issued an order for the placement of concrete in the remaining opening in the structure which started the formation of the Wolf Creek Reservoir. With the closure of this dam, complete flood protection from the site of the dam to the mouth of Stone's River just above Nashville, a distance of 255 miles, was provided. In other words, there is no longer a plan for flood control in this area; it is an accomplished fact.

Next in importance, and probably of major interest to many of you sportsmen, are the recreational opportunities afforded by this project. The reservoir will be 101 miles long and will have a shore line at top pool of 1,255 miles, which exceeds that of the entire State of Florida. The area of the reservoir for recreational use will vary, usually from 50,000 to 35,000 acres.

Because of the remoteness of the site it was necessary to construct an access road on both sides of the river at the dam, each about 4 miles long. Upon completion of the dam, these roads will be incorporated into the Kentucky highway system, and Route 35 will be relocated to run across the top of the dam, providing permanent access to this outstanding structure.

The location of this project, the topography of the area, and the inherent beauty of this reservoir will present a tourist attraction which will be unexcelled in this section of the country. The population within a 150-mile radius from the center of Wolf Creek Reservoir is estimated at over 6,000,000. Wolf Creek Reservoir can be expected to lure tens of thousands of visitors annually to its shores with resulting trade benefits to the surrounding area.

To properly serve the public in the use of these recreational opportunities, a master plan for recreational development has been prepared by the Corps of Engineers. This plan provides for the conservation of the natural resources, development of the recreational features for public benefit and management of the property for the greatest good of all concerned. In developing this plan, joint field investigations and conferences were held with the National Park Service, United States Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Soil Conservation Service, and all other Federal, State, and local agencies which have an interest in this work. It is the policy of the Corps of Engineers to utilize the technical knowledge of these agencies to the maximum extent in developing these related benefits.

The water of the reservoir will be crystal clear except in the upper reaches of the main body and major tributaries where at times of flood a muddy condition may prevail. Little, if any, pollution is anticipated. The clear, clean water and the rugged terrain in which the reservoir lies will create a lake of spectacular beauty. Fishing in the Cumberland River and its tributaries has always been good and it is reasonable to assume that Wolf Creek Reservoir will greatly improve fishing as has been true at Dale Hollow and Center Hill Reservoirs. It is safe to predict that this reservoir will become one of the outstanding fishing waters of the southeastern United States.

In the development of recreational facilities it is the policy of the Corps of Engineers to provide only those facilities necessary to assure the public access to the recreational features for use in a safe and healthful manner. Other Federal and State agencies, counties and towns and concession operators are encouraged to take over the remaining development for full use of the recreational benefits.

It is contemplated that the Wolf Creek Reservoir will be sufficiently impounded by the beginning of the recreational season of next year to permit recreational usage of the lake. In consequence, I have recently made award. after competitive bidding, of five dock sites strategically located on the reservoir. These dock sites are shown on this map [pointing to map] and are identified as the Burnside Marina, Greiger Hill, Jamestown, Lee Ford, and Parnell. These successful bidders will be required to make available to the public by April of next year boats, motors, food, bait and equipment, gasoline and oil, sanitary and electrical facilities, and boat moorage. Overnight facilities will also be available at all the sites by that date, with the exception of the Burnside Marina, which will be located at the city of Burnside. It is believed that these five facilities will provide service for the initial public usage of the reservoir. The flexibility of the master plan permits expansion of these facilities, however, as the demands increase.

Also in the initial development, action has been initiated to turn over to the Commonwealth of Kentucky two areas for development by the Commonwealth. The first, a 2,300-acre tract located off Highway 35, near Jamestown, Ky., for a State park site. It is understood that preliminary work has been initiated by the Commonwealth in the development of this site. The second site off Highway 90 between Otter and Beaver Creeks, will be developed for a Kentucky junior conservation camp. Both of these sites are also shown on the drawing.

Provisions have been made in the master plan for the ultimate development of nine parks and public day use areas, 20 commercial dock sites, 8 group camp sites, and 6 colony cabin sites, together with numerous locations which will be available for solitary cabins and private club sites. Many of these, however, will be developed only after public use has demonstrated their need. There is an apparent demand for the solitary cabin site use and efforts are being made to open some of these sites for development during the next year.

In addition to the projects I have mentioned three other projects, namely, the Old Hickory, Carthage, and Celina projects, have been authorized for construction between Nashville and the Wolf Creek Dam. These projects will harness a great power potential in this section of the river and will reuse the water from the Wolf Creek, Dale Hollow, and Center Hill projects over and over again. The Old Hickory plant will have an installed capacity of 100,000 kilowatts. The Carthage plant will be rated at 92,000 kilowatts and the Celina plant at 64,800 kilowatts.

I will not attempt a discussion of the Lower Cumberland since a study of that section of the river is now under way at the President's direction. I will state, however, that the original plans of the Corps of Engi-

neers called for a high dam near Kuttawa, Ky., but the Governor of the State and the citizens of the valley objected to this proposal and an alternate plan of three relatively low dams for the Cumberland was authorized by Congress. This relatively low dam plan seemed to conform to the wishes of the majority of the citizenry at the time of submission of the report in 1945.

The question of costs and return from these projects is probably in many of your minds. I can assure you that this question of economic justification is always a basic one with the Corps of Engineers. The development of the Cumberland River Basin, however, has a very favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. For each dollar expended there will be returned in benefits $1.68 over a period of 50 years which is the normal period over which the projects are amortized.

The water resources of your area are being developed into a recreational paradise. Your interest in the development of these facilities indicate that you are aware of this vast potential. You undoubtedly will see a great change in the Wolf Creek area within the next few years. Should any of you have any questions about the Wolf Creek project or the over-all plan for the Cumberland, I will be happy to attempt to answer them.

I thank you.

Pensions for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, one of the greatest victories for pensions for the elderly was recorded in the vote of the people of Massachusetts on November 7, 1950. On a proposal to liberalize the laws of the State, the vote, as officially tabulated, was 918,555 yes, to 624,362 no, or a majority of 294,193. In all the history of the movement to take care of our elderly citizens, there has never been a more decisive and emphatic expression of the way the people feel on the matter.

In an article in the National Welfare Advocate, there is a complete analysis of the Massachusetts law. The article was written by William H. McMasters, of that State, who is the president of National Old-Age Pensions, Inc. It has been my distinct pleasure on occasions to have been the guest of this organization at their annual conventions, in Boston. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

MASSACHUSETTS VOTES $75 PENSION LAW—KILLS LOTTERY

(By William H. McMasters)

BOSTON, MASS.—On election day, the cause of old-age pensions scored one of the most decisive victories ever recorded.

The citizens of Massachusetts, although bombarded with vicious and false propaganda against a proposal to liberalize the old-age assistance laws of the State, overwhelmingly approved the new law and it is now the law of the Commonwealth, effective in June of next year.

Briefly, the law sets up a minimum of $75 per month for every elderly, needy person who can qualify for old-age assistance. Ten dollars more per month is set up for those who are blind

The law wipes out the statutory provisions that compel children to contribute to the support of their parents who seek old-age assistance. The law reduces the age of eligibility from 65 to 63 years of age.

LOTTERY DEFEATED

At the same time the voters of Massachusetts overwhelmingly defeated the proposal for a State-controlled lottery, designed in some measure to finance the expected costs involved in the new law. No finer example of intelligent voting has ever been seen in any election, anywhere. The voters wanted their elderly neighbors to be taken care of in a more suitable manner. But they did not wish to resort to a State lottery in order to do it. The two questions were only related to each other indirectly. There was no legal connection. In reviewing the victory for the pension cause it might be well to analyze the exact situation.

The law was proposed in a petition circulated more than a year ago by the Massachusetts Society for Old Age Pensions, of which Charles C. O'Donnell is president. He was aided by National Old Age Pensions, Inc., of which William H. McMasters is president. Both of these pension advocates are members of the National Pension Committee, George H. McLain being its national chairman.

The idea of reducing the age of eligibility for old-age assistance was borrowed from the California law that was passed 2 years ago and repealed before it had a chance to show its workability.

Not one of the constitutional officers on the ballot in either the Democratic or Republican Parties came out in favor of the new law. Many prominent political big shots, who were very zealous for old-age pensions in former years, refused to open their mouths in this election. This was because the lottery question was linked up with the old-age assistance proposal by the enemies of both. By hammering away at the lottery law from every radio station, every newspaper and practically every pulpit in the State, they hoped to defeat both questions.

CAGEY POLITICIANS

So the cagey politicians ducked the issue and left it to the people. Candidate Coolidge, who headed the Republican ticket, came out against the lottery, thinking that it would get him some votes. He was wrong in his expectations. But neither Governor Dever nor Attorney General Kelly, both of whom have been benefited over the years by their advocacy of help for the aged, said one word in favor of the pension law or the lottery law. They were mute.

The only known workers for the measures were the members of the two pension organizations mentioned above, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, as always, and the officials of the American Federation of Labor. But this last endorsement was of no particular value, because they were so bitter against the lottery that it looked as though they were not wholly in sympathy with the pension proposal. If ever a cause had to fight entirely on its merits, the cause of pensions was in there pitching valiantly and with only the justness of its appeal to bring victory. But victory was the reward to the tune of more than a quarter of a million majority. The lottery was defeated by about the same vote.

Hardly had the vote on the referendum been tabulated before those who are trying to eliminate the elderly from our economic life are setting up obstacles to defeat the wishes of the people.

OLD WHEEZE

The most silly arguments are being advanced. The Boston Herald, spokesman for the monied interests, now says that the people did not understand what they were doing when they voted for increased costs and failed to vote for the lottery law. But the Herald shrieked to high heaven for the defeat of the lottery. The people agreed with them on the lottery, but they did not wish to let their elderly citizens struggle along, on the border line of starvation. Others, equally lacking the milk of human kindness in their character, are insisting that the law is unconstitutional. This is an old wheeze that never fails to be around when everything else fails.

Another vicious thing that has crept in is a fantastic figure as to the expected cost to meet the proposals of the new law. Of course the amount has been set so high that it is out of reason, but it has been thrown in to frighten the elderly and their friends. They don't frighten so easily these days. Little by little, their morale has been built up until they now feel that they are citizens in good standing and no longer mendicants sitting on the street corners with tin cups hanging from their necks.

I have seen this mental attitude change gradually over the years. The overwhelming victory, unaided and on its own, has put even further hope and courage into the heart and mind of every elderly citizen in the State of Massachusetts.

Fortunately, the provisions of our constitution on matters that have successfully been on the ballot do not admit of a repeal until one or more elections have been held. No quick repealer can be tossed at the voters of the State as was done in California. The people have passed a law under the constitution.

As for the question, "Where is the money coming from to finance this new law?" that is being leveled at us from every available source, the answer is that it will come from the same funds that now give a liberal pension to our legislators and others.

YOU CAN BET THEY WILL

It is interesting to note that there were several members of the house of representatives who have always voted against every pension measure introduced into the legislature, who were defeated for reelection. As they are now eligible for old-age pensions as former members of the legislature, it will be interesting to see if they accept this money from the Commonwealth, especially as they insist that money for more aid to the elderly needy is not available.

Any undemocratic effort to nullify and crucify the new law will be fought by the people of the State with determination. Just as they refused to have their intelligence insulted by fake propaganda and turned to their known friends for honest advice before voting, so they will stand by those of us who have fought the fight for so many long, hard years. Massachusetts will meet her obligations. I cannot refrain from reminding the readers of the National Welfare Advocate again that the battle of Massachusetts is one of our most momentous victories.

It will surely help the good citizens of California when their new petition is being discussed in Sacramento, after the first of the coming year.

Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri, Fills a Necessary Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial appearing in the Springfield, Mo., News Leader, issue of January 20, 1951. The editorial is entitled "Senator KEM Fills a Necessary Role," and emphasizes the splendid contribution that is being made by the distinguished senior Senator from my neighboring State of Missouri, who is one of the outstanding constitutional authorities in the Senate, and is rendering the Nation a real service in these critical times.

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

SENATOR KEM FILLS A NECESSARY ROLE

Senator JAMES P. KEM, who was in Springfield for a visit last Friday, belongs to a race which, unfortunately, has been vanishing from the Washington scene.

We mean statesmen who still cling to the quaint notion that the Constitution of the United States is a mighty fortress looming larger and larger in importance as the bulwarks it guarantees us crumble to nothing in other parts of the world.

The latest example of congressional apathy to the Constitution was the shelving of Senator KEM's Resolution 371, in which he tried to force from President Truman a full report, to the Senate, of the President's recent talks with Britain's Prime Minister Clement Attlee.

Many blame our international troubles today on the arrangements made at Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta by Franklin Roosevelt and at Potsdam by Harry Truman, agreements never ratified by or even submitted to the Senate for discussion or approval. (Pegler calls the current conflict Roosevelt's memorial war.)

Closest the Senate ever got to an examination of the Truman-Attlee meeting was to read newspaper stories written from reports of their talks as relayed through the President's press representative.

Section 2 of article 2 of the Constitution states in unequivocal language that the President makes treaties "with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate."

Roosevelt behaved illegally and so did Truman in these talks with foreign statesmen when they made any secret agreement binding the United States to a course of action.

Time was when such audacity by a United States President would have been followed by impeachment as surely as night follows day.

Yes; there are fewer and fewer Senator KEMS in Washington.

May the good Lord help us when the time comes that there is none left. But by then, it may be too late to call on the Lord, since He helps those who help themselves.

Tribute to Millard F. Caldwell, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article paying tribute to Millard F. Caldwell, Jr., recently appointed Federal Civil Defense Administrator. The tribute is in an article by Crosby S. Noyes, and appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 23 last.

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

A MAN-SIZED MAN FOR A MAN-SIZED JOB

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Back in the days when he was collecting four letters at the University of Mississippi, 6-foot-3-inch Millard Fillmore Caldwell, Jr., earned himself the reputation of being a hard man to shove around. Today, carrying the ball in the national race for protection against an atomic attack, Federal Civil Defense Administrator Caldwell is keeping that reputation bright.

As he told worried Congressmen when he first came back to Washington to take over his new job, he is "quite contrary in the matter of pressure"—pressure that inevitably builds up around a man put in the position of creating a powerful new Government agency virtually from scratch.

The art in Mr. Caldwell's case lies in being contrary in a nice way, true to a gentle tradition of Southern courtesy. Admiring aides say that at such times a well-modulated drawl can work wonders, with lids half closed and a deeply bred charm providing the gracious camouflage for a mind already made up. The staff at civil defense headquarters gives him full marks on an indispensable quality of the successful administrator: "He's one guy who can tell you 'No' and make you like it."

There have been times, to be sure, when Millard Caldwell has said "Yes" against his personal inclination. One of these times was when, a few months ago, he told President Truman he would come back to Washington to take over a job that will certainly be one of the most important in the Government. Mr. Caldwell does not like Washington.

If you ask him, he will tell you he prefers the life of a small-town lawyer and banker; the pleasures of a small-town bird-shooter and fisherman—tastes which, in spite of a 1,000-acre farm near Tallahassee, the presidency of a Tallahassee bank, and a vocabulary spiced with sporting metaphors, he has indulged little in his 42 years. There have been other jobs to do.

Soon after he moved to Florida from his native Tennessee, as a young lawyer in 1925, his public service got under way. He followed the time-honored course from public prosecutor through the State legislature to the Congress, where he took his seat in 1933. Through four terms in the House, Representative Caldwell rose in authority and in the estimation of his colleagues to positions of leadership on several committees.

Then, one foggy February morning in 1939, his only son, 12-year-old Millard Caldwell III, was struck dead on Connecticut Avenue by a hit-and-run driver. A few months later, Representative Caldwell announced his retirement from Congress. He told friends he was leaving Washington for good, taking his wife and two daughters back to Tallahassee.

His retirement was brief. By 1945, small-town lawyer Caldwell was back in public life—running for State governor. He won, and in the course of his 4-year term attained the stature as an administrator that made President Truman pick him for the job he holds today. No less important, he won a high standing among his fellow governors, with whom he must deal directly as Federal chief of the decentralized civil-defense machinery.

Returning to Washington to take over his new assignment, Mr. Caldwell brought with him only one member of his Florida retinue—a private secretary, Lucy Gilbert. He explains that "Miss Lucy has been handling my personal affairs for a right smart time." The rest of the fledgling agency was already on hand, established in temporary headquarters on the seventh floor of a Connecticut Avenue office building.

The staff soon learned a few things about their rangy, tousle-headed boss. They found out that he likes to be called "the Governor" and that he believes in handling his business with little waste motion and smaller waste of words. They also discovered that a relaxed manner does not in every case add up to an easygoing office routine. They learned how a rule can be literally applied: "When the day comes that I have any spare time on this job, that's the day that a new man better take over."

Administrator Caldwell's day begins at 7 a. m., in the Wardman Park Hotel, where he is making his temporary home. If there is no breakfast appointment, he takes the opportunity then and while riding down Connecticut Avenue in a taxi to brush up on the news of the day.

Before 9 o'clock he is installed behind the large mahogany desk in his office, dictating one-paragraph letters to Miss Lucy and going over the stacks of applications from people offering their services and their wares in the name of civil defense. In handling these, he follows an inflexible maxim: To get the best people for the jobs that need doing, he is willing to beg, borrow, or steal. The others, no matter who recommends them, are out. "Before I'm through," he tells you, "I'll have the best organization in town."

Promptly at 9:15, division chiefs present themselves at the Governor's office for the daily staff meeting. Then follows a solid day of appointments with Government officials and military brass. They come to talk about the thousands of questions that will have to be asked and answered before Administrator Caldwell and the rest of the country can afford to relax. Problems of priorities in critical materials and personnel; of translating blueprinted plans into working organizations; of keeping Congress impressed with the urgent need for money to get started on a national stockpile of food and medicine—all of them take time.

That may be one of the reasons why Mr. Caldwell has so successfully evaded the public eye. He has not made a single speech since he took over, and he plans none. "Speeches," says the Governor, "consume a world of time with precious little effect."

Of the fare served him in the course of a working day, the toughest bites are reserved for lunchtime or dinner. Discussions go on far into the night. By bedtime, the Governor and the 110 men and women who work under him know they've done a day's work.

No one who appreciates the destructive power of the atom bomb will tell you that the progress made in civil defense up to this point is something to take comfort in. On both the local and national level we have a long way to go, and time may be desperately short. But those who know him seem to feel that one-time track star Caldwell is a good man to set the pace.

The Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit extracts from an article in the Washington Times-Herald by Fulton Lewis, Jr., columnist, under date of December 31, 1950, as follows:

The British since 1940 got $36,248,000,000, and are coming up for another $2,000,000,000 this year.

France got $9,468,000,000; Netherlands, $1,166,000,000; Belgium, $668,000,000; Turkey,

$294,000,000; Canada, $6,800,000; Greece, $1,217,000; Australia, $1,700,000; Sweden, $62,000,000; Norway, $224,000,000; Denmark, $175,000,000; Ethiopia, $1,000,000; Iceland, $10,000,000; and India, $200,000,000.

This, of course, does not include the billions and billions spent in Europe, and also in Asia, for occupation costs, the multifarious programs such as UNRRA, ECA, Dumbarton Oaks, Export-Import Bank, and other programs, and now Mr. Lewis states in the article above referred to:

At any rate, the United States is going to spend a lot more, probably another $100,000,000,000 to arm Western Europe.

There are a lot of experts who think most of this should be spent in the United States of America in maintaining and equipping the biggest defense Army in history. However, the decision has been made to spend most of it in Europe, and in the next 10 years we will know whether it is right or wrong.

Facts on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Facts on Food Prices," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer of January 21.

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

FACTS ON FOOD PRICES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In the hubbub over rising food prices, millions of fingers are now being pointed in accusation. A concert of voices names the alleged offender. The Washington storekeeper, selling dollar-a-dozen eggs to Senator THYE put the bee on the popular culprit—the farmer, he said, and Government-supported egg prices. The baker, talking about higher bread prices, emphasized wheat and other ingredient costs.

The housewife, buying apples at 10 cents a pound; the soft-drink consumer laying costs to sugar prices; even the cocktail "hound" soaking up highballs at 50 cents a drink while orating against milk prices at 18 cents a quart—all these lately have seemed agreed as to where the blame belongs. That is on the farmer, on the huge Government stores of food bought in supporting farm prices, and on the allegedly fantastic Government losses on farm purchases and farm subsidies.

But reasonable people will no doubt be interested in knowing the relevant facts, not on just one side, but on both sides of that story.

As to eggs, it is true that farm prices did advance rather sharply (28 percent) above the unusually low price a year earlier. The price has been steadily moderating from the peak.

But as a farmer and producer of eggs on his farm near Northfield, Senator THYE talking to the Washington seller had the facts first-hand about farm prices of eggs. Those prices on THYE's farm had been nowhere near $1 a dozen, but about 42 cents. The Government wasn't supporting them, but stopped that on December 31. So in blaming dollar-a-dozen eggs on Government-supported farm prices, the Washington storekeeper was 100 percent wrong.

As to bread, not over one-fifth of what the consumer pays for his loaf goes to the wheat farmer. On December 15, wheat prices were up just 6 percent from their level a year earlier. That rise wouldn't account for a rise of one-fifth of a cent for a loaf of bread. All the farm ingredients put together, including lard as well as wheat, do not account for one-third of the consumer bread price. Almost two-thirds of the consumer price goes to the baker and retailer.

Recently one of THYE's colleagues, Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, made this statement: "In June 1948, the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel; the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread, 13.8 cents. But in October 1950, the price of wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel, whereas the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread had risen to 14.7 cents." Certainly, the labor costs of baking, slicing, wrapping, and offering other services now demanded by consumers have been going up. But centering the blame for rising bread prices on the wheat farmer isn't in accord with the facts.

As to apples, the western farmer last autumn got 90 cents per 50-pound box, field run, delivered at the packing platform. That was 1.8 cents a pound to cover all his costs of growing, spraying, irrigating, picking, and hauling. The charges added by washing, sorting, wrapping, crating, storing, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing are what push the consumer price up to 8, 10, or 11 cents a pound.

As to sugar, the cost was actually lower in late December than it was on October 31, 1947, when sugar controls were removed. And the sugar price is so tiny an item anyway in the cost of a soft drink that it would be hard to find the effect of a 1 cent a pound sugar increase on a bottled drink.

The authentic facts about farm prices are available to all. They had, on December 15, risen 23 percent from the bottom a year earlier. Beef cattle and lamb prices were respectively 41 and 38 percent above their official parity or equality with general price levels. But milk, butterfat, grains, turkeys, and chickens were substantially below and potatoes, apples, sweet potatoes, and citrus fruits far below parity.

The recovery of farm prices accompanies a national jump to $206,000,000,000 in disposable personal income, after taxes. Have farmers shared unfairly in that income rise? They have not. Net farm income for 1950 was actually below that of 1949 and much below the 1947–48 peak.

A higher disposable national income normally raises food prices because people spend a rather uniform share of such income for food. The $1.60 per day wage increase just won by John L. Lewis, for instance, will enable his coal miners to help in bidding food prices up. But is that, or the fact that greater coal costs of transporting or processing food will push in the same direction, the farmers' fault?

One hour's average labor will buy more food in this Nation than in others and many times more than in any regimented economy in the world. As Senator THYE told the Farm Bureau, the farmers' share of each dollar spent by the consumer for food was only 53 percent in 1946, and has slumped to 48 percent today.

Folks with a real liking for facts on both sides may be shocked also to learn of the gross inaccuracy of much of the recent so-called news of farm price supports.

Last Monday afternoon a Washington dispatch from a usually accurate news agency was widely published which said that "there was a net loss on price supports last year of $1,600,000,000."

People have been stirred up by vivid descriptions of such vast losses of mountainous food purchases, of waste, and of farm demands for subsidies. And farmers have been told by newspapers and newspapermen to throw overboard their price-support programs or put them in a standby status for the duration.

An excellently informed and truthful agricultural correspondent, Fred Bailey, of Washington, recently reported that the campaign to make the farmer the goat on rising food prices is now well under way in the big city press supported by some city Congressmen who want to roll prices all the way back to the farmer.

Here are facts: The $1,600,000,000 referred to in last Monday's story as net loss, wasn't loss at all, but was the total amount loaned. The net realized loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the year ending last June was $249,230,000. The net realized loss in the current fiscal year through November was $100,281,000.

Said John W. Haw, agricultural development director of the Northern Pacific, to the Farm Bureau convention: "In its report to Congress on June 30, 1950, the Corporation showed a cumulative net realized loss * * * in 17 years of $636,040,401. The Corporation has turned over its capital many times in this period; yet the net loss has been less than 5 cents on each dollar invested." He said the job has been substantially accomplished with economy to the taxpayer.

The recent big losses and big waste have been on potatoes and eggs. Both of those purchase programs were forced by Congress over repeated protests of the executive branch and many farmers. And from both of them the Government now has withdrawn. As to subsidies, the farmers producing the perishables that the Government sought to subsidize are up in arms against them. As to the storable products, the Government's holdings of these are now widely acknowledged as being a vital protection of the Nation's safety in the war emergency and a check on inflation. More stockpiling of this kind is considered absolutely essential, as a munition of war and as a safeguard against runaway prices.

So there are facts bearing on both sides of the farm price story.

Owen Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter by Eugene Lyons regarding the attitude of the Soviet press toward Owen Lattimore, published in the New Leader.

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

EUGENE LYONS CITES SOVIET PRESS ACCOLADE FOR LATTIMORE

NEW YORK CITY.

Those who read my recent article on Owen Lattimore (the New Leader, September 3) will be interested, I think, in this postscript. Though some of us don't approve of the gentleman's activities, they will be glad to learn that the Kremlin does, decidedly. It has just published a very long and laudatory review of the situation in Asia, Lattimore's next-to-last opus—belated, but neatly timed

for the larger Communist propaganda on the subject. The review took many pages in the November issue of Novy Mir, over the signature of B. Leontiev, and is being circulated in translations throughout the world by "Joint Press Reading Service, Moscow."

Mr. Lattimore is repeatedly identified as a "bourgeois" writer, since that gives added emphis to the miracle of his party-line judgments. But he is also described as one "who is considered an outstanding specialist on questions of the Far East by the United States State Department," as well as "a prominent figure of the United States State Department, one of the few collaborators of Acheson actually acquainted with the situation in the Far East." Novy Mir seems unaware of the formal findings of ex-Senator Tydings.

What Comrade Leontiev likes best about the Lattimore book is that, in explaining Asian trends, it puts in first place the great revolutionizing influence of the October Socialist revolution in Russia. As against "the wild, raving howls of American reactionaries," the Moscow review poses Lattimore's viewpoint: "Not Bolshevist propaganda, he says, but Soviet reality itself—the attainments of the Socialist revolution in Russia—this is what has aroused and inspired the peoples of Asia to a fight against their imperialist aggressors. * * * Lattimore acknowledges that in the eyes of all the Asiatic people Soviet democracy is the only complete, real democracy." In short, "the general conclusions to which Lattimore arrives attest to his realistic understanding of the situation."

These orchids from Moscow must be added to those already awarded by the reviewers of Lattimore books carefully selected by the "wild, raving" howlers who run our capitalist press in America.

EUGENE LYONS.

The Changing Complexion of Medical Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on January 8, 1951, at the one hundred sixteenth annual meeting of the St. Louis Medical Society, Dr. L. R. Sante, the society's new president, gave a very pertinent address entitled "The Changing Complexion of Medical Practice During the Last Half Century."

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts chosen from Dr. Sante's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE CHANGING COMPLEXION OF MEDICAL PRACTICE DURING THE LAST HALF CENTURY

(By L. R. Sante, M. D.)

I am mindful of the great honor which you have conferred upon me by electing me president of the St. Louis Medical Society. It is a distinction which can be accorded to relatively few; many better qualified must be passed by without such recognition; I would like to think of myself merely as their representative.

The primary function of the medical society is scientific; it would seem that the first duty of its president should be to maintain this function. The medical society is a meeting place for doctors, for the presentation of scientific papers in order to keep in touch with scientific advances in the medical field, and through discussion to evaluate new methods of procedure and new therapeutic agents.

The first half of the present century has wrought tremendous advances in the field of medicine, many epoch-making in character, which have virtually changed our conceptions of medical practice.

At the beginning of the century infant mortality stood at an unbelievably high rate. It is difficult for us to believe now that at that time one-fourth of all children did not survive to 5 years of age. Modern sanitation and improvements in infant feeding have done much to reduce the frightful infant mortality of yesteryear to the lowest point in the history of our Nation.

The Second World War has given impetus to many important medical developments. Perhaps one of the most important of these was the discovery that bacterial infection could be eliminated by the administration of drugs or antibiotics, such as the sulfa drugs or penicillin.

The advent of these agents alone has done much to change the complexion of medical practice. They have been called wonder drugs and, indeed, their action may be nothing short of miraculous.

The entire field of chest surgery has been so broadened that today exploration of the chest is undertaken almost as readily as exploration of the abdomen; cancerous growths or other affected areas may be excised or even an entire lung removed.

New methods of anesthesia, utilizing highly perfected anesthesia machines and numerous new synthetic drugs, have played no small part in the advances of surgical practice in the last few years.

In radiation treatment the developments have been remarkable. At the beginning of the century the effects of radiation on living tissue was known, but radiological practice was still in the stage of a medical curiosity. Today it has developed into one of the two most potent agents in the treatment of cancer.

This is a record of accomplishment of which the physician may well be proud. Woudn't you think that the public would be anxious to preserve the system of free enterprise, under which such progress was attained? By and large, the public is fair; by and large, the rank and file of labor is fair; I cannot believe that they will permit saddling of the public with a compulsory socialized scheme of medical practice by an avaricious political machine. It is my opinion that, with the possible exception of the clergy, doctors as a class are among the most honest, sincere, and self-sacrificing group of men in the country. True, there are charlatans here and there, but there are renegades even in the ministry, and we do not condemn the entire profession because of the acts of a few. One would think that the public would be anxious to retain the direction of medical practice in the hands of the medical profession, which, under a system of free enterprise, has been able to accomplish such wonderful progress. One would think that the public would realize that no profession could accomplish its best work when hamstrung by the directives of lay workers. One would think that the public would recognize the political implication attendant upon the addition of a large number of jobs to the Federal payroll, which is already tremendous. One would think that taxes are already so high and the national debt so great that the public would be seeking methods of reduction of expenditure rather than means by which they will be materially increased. One would think that the public would think long and seriously before it attempts to add this additional burden on our poor, tired Uncle Sam when the country is in its present state of anxiety and confusion.

In recent years these political repercussions have done much to change the complexion of medical practice. Time and effort which should be devoted to medical practice and investigation have been diverted to political and economic considerations. Regular meetings have, of necessity, been set aside for the consideration of the economic phases of medical practice. Committees had to be appointed to keep informed on medical legislative bills in order to safeguard the freedom of medical practice. Constant vigil had to be maintained to prevent infringement of the laws against corporate practice of medicine.

The public at large will be most severely affected by all of this; hence it should give it most serious consideration and notify its Congressmen of its conclusions.

Recent elections in Florida indicate that the medical profession can become a potent political force when sufficiently aroused to the necessity of the situation.

The trend of recent national elections also seem to indicate that perhaps the public is doing some serious thinking and has begun to suspect that we cannot continue our orgy of extravagant public spending with consequent continuous pyramiding of our colossal national debt.

Nothing speaks to a Congressman with greater power than the votes of an aroused people. It is clearly the right and the duty of the medical profession to arouse our people and to instruct them of the dire results which will surely follow the political shackling of the American doctor.

Inflation and the National Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Wednesday evening, January 17, it was my privilege to address the New York Economics Club of New York. At that time, I shared the dais with two distinguished leaders, Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of General Mills, Inc., and Mr. George Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, affiliated with the A. F. of L. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Bullis' powerful address entitled "Inflation and the National Survival." I further ask that preceding Mr. Bullis' address there be printed a list of the officers and board of directors of the Economic Club of New York, an outstanding organization founded in 1907.

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

THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK, FOUNDED 1907

Officers: Juan T. Trippe, president; Eugene Holman, vice president; W. Alton Jones, vice president; John M. Schiff, treasurer; Iva Nichols, secretary.

Board of directors: Ellsworth Bunker, J. Luther Cleveland, Gardner Cowles, Ralph S. Damon, Virgil G. Damon, H. P. Davison, Eli Whitney Debevoise, Duncan W. Fraser, J. P. Grace, Jr., H. E. Humphreys, Jr., Devereux C. Josephs, Frank H. Lerch, Jr., Ralph T. Reed, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., Mark Woods, Dwight Eckerman, executive director.

INFLATION AND THE NATIONAL SURVIVAL

(By Harry A. Bullis)

In the year 1861, the first year of the Civil War, our National Capital was threatened by the enemy. One dark night five men, among them the President of the United States, climbed the stairway leading to the tower of the Smithsonian Institution. Through the darkened windows they saw the low line of hills around the city.

The men flashed lanterns toward the hills. In the distance, lights flickered in reply. Thus was tested the means to signal an attack upon the city. At stake was the very survival of our Government.

In this year of 1951, exactly 90 years later, there is once again a lantern in the window. But this time its flashing signal is no mere rehearsal of a possible crisis to come. Today it speaks of a growing menace from across the seas. More important, it warns of trends within our own country that ultimately could undermine our productivity and create hardship everywhere.

NATION HAS TWO ALTERNATIVES

Monetary inflation is a form of national self-hypnosis by which we turn our faces from reality, and look instead toward a never-never land of easy money. We know the consequences. An unsound currency gnaws at our security just as certainly as a defeat on the battlefield. I wonder if we realize that there are only two roads before us. We can heed the warning signals, embrace the economics of sacrifice, and pay the price that must be paid if democracy shall live. Or we can continue on the road we have been following, spending billions of unearned and unreal dollars. This way leads to fiscal disaster.

The free world looks to these United States for leadership—economic, social, and moral. For inflation already has swept most of Europe, and the forces set in motion show little sign of slackening. Compared with 1939, Belgium's increase has been 277 percent, and it is growing. In Greece, living costs have increased nearly 30,000 percent. Italy has marked a 5,000-percent increase. In France, food costs alone were 1,800 percent higher last fall than before the war. In Finland, the costs of living are some 850 percent higher. The average Finnish worker pays 10 times as much for clothing now as he paid in 1939. It is exactly what Lenin ordered—the debauch of the currency. Just as inflation damages our Nation and our allies, so does it aid our common enemy.

In the United States, the cost of living has shot up over 75 percent compared with prewar. The trend continues. In 1950, the cost of living rose about 6 percent; wholesale prices rose 16 percent; the price of farm products at wholesale, 23 percent; and the prices of 28 important commodities rose 48 percent. The rise was fastest at the end of the year. In the second half of 1950, the rise in wholesale prices was at a yearly rate of 25 percent, a rate barely and briefly equalled only in 1919–20 and in 1946. If we are to save our own great white-collar middle classes from financial ruin, if we are to stay clear of the many other destructive forces of inflation, America will have to act promptly and decisively.

HOW INDUSTRY CAN LEAD

Industry is equipped to supply both intelligent action and leadership in this crisis.

The action should take the form of quick production for defense. Enormous production is needed right now. The world looks to us for the arms to halt Communist aggression. During the past 2 years the United States has expanded production and has greatly increased productivity when measured in output per man. We can do the same thing for defense.

The leadership is needed to control inflation. Business, in cooperation with government, can take the case for a firm money policy direct to the people, who must ultimately decide the issue. As the President's economic advisers pointed out recently, "To gain public support for stern policies requires that the public understand the reason why."

In this era of tension, any spark can start a conflagration. We are in limited war now. We may well be on the threshold of total war. It is difficult to exaggerate the crisis.

Only 5 years ago we ended the greatest war in history. We paid dearly for that victory, in tens of thousands of casualties on the fields of battle, and in tens of thousands of psychological victims within the borders of our country. We incurred a staggering national debt. But we stepped up our industrial plant in the process. The amazing fact is that we did the job with no more than a 28 percent rise in the price level during the actual war years. The controls of the war years suppressed inflation. But when direct controls were removed without bringing in the more general indirect controls, inflation burst into action.

Today our economy is roaring along, full throttle. In the case of automobiles and trucks alone, we produced last year over 8,000,000 vehicles. We built over 1,400,000 new housing units. We have the capacity to produce 101,000,000 tons of steel a year, or half the world's total. We are able to squeeze more agricultural production per acre out of our farm plant than does the rest of the world. A good wheat farmer in the West can produce 5,500 bushels of wheat with about 2,000 hours of work a year. In south China it takes the entire family working ineffectively to produce one-twentieth as much, as 275 bushels, with two crops a year. We have shipping in quantity, and war plants in stand-by condition.

Our productive plant is fully engineered, and ready for the job of rearmament. We hope we can substantially increase our gross national product so as to maintain our living standard in the process.

SITUATION DIFFERENT FROM 1941

But getting back again to that lantern in the widow—how about our economic springboard for the tests that lie ahead? Here the situation is far different. Ten years ago we were faced with the need for an enormous increase in output and we had large unused capacity to produce. Today we face a different set of conditions.

We need to divert a part of our fully loaded productive machine from civilian goods to war goods, as well as to convert and expand our plants.

We will recall that in 1940 our national output of goods and services was $100,000,000,000. Eight million of our people were unemployed. By taking advantage of this labor slack, and straining our economy, we pushed our total national output to nearly $200,000,000,000 a year by the end of the war. We spent $90,000,000,000 for war in 1 year. It was a gratifying process all around to put people to work. Today it is an unpleasant task to throw them out of work in order to create labor available for war unemployment.

Today we have no labor surplus. Our idle productive capacity is low, limited to war plants carried over from last time, and even reactivation of idle plants consumes valuable time, of which we have so little. Therefore, it is obvious that the only way we can produce all that we need for war is by producing less of other things—lowering our output of civilian goods. We cannot expect our national output of goods and services to be large enough to include as much civilian goods as we made in 1950 plus all the war matériel we shall need—war matériel for our own needs and to rearm and equip our allies.

Let us be realistic in this crisis. For the present, ours is a problem of diversion more than of expansion.

To look at this from another angle, in World War II we produced about 80 percent of war needs by expanding output. We produced only 20 percent by conversion or by cutting back selected industries to release their facilities and resources for war production. Today, with a comparable war effort, the figures might well be reversed. We should have to obtain about 80 percent of our military needs by converting existing industries and diverting factories, men, and raw materials to war production.

Obviously, this means taking goods away from the consumer. There simply will not be as much goods available for civilians.

But how about the money and credit supply? Unless courageous action is taken, there will be more money on hand than ever, and less consumer goods to spend it on. Here, in a nutshell, is today's stubborn problem. We are now confronted with the need to beat some plowshares into swords. If we do not limit the ability to buy the plowshares that remain—in other words, automobiles, new houses, appliances, and the like—their value will increase excessively.

This brings us to the crux of our discussion. How can we attain stability in our currency in this period of short-of-all-out-war economy and still provide for needs at home? How can we best protect our currency and at the same time put it to work for us?

FOUR RULES FOR SOUND FINANCE

Here are four specific suggestions that may point the way to a maximum production in a stable economy:

1. Overhaul the Federal financial policy and formulate a program—a total, tied-together program—that will restore confidence in the national credit.

2. Reduce drastically Government spending for all nonmilitary purposes. Ask the Government to save exactly as it asks us to save.

3. Continue and extend the use of indirect economic controls, and insist on flexibility in whatever direct controls are imposed.

4. Enlist the cooperation of industry to inform the people of the dangers of inflation and to explain the "economics of sacrifice."

STRENGTHEN FISCAL POLICIES

The first objective should be a program which will provide for paying as we go up to the limit of what the economy can stand and still remain strong and healthy. In the President's economic message to Congress on January 12, 1951, President Truman said, "We should make it the first principle of economic and fiscal policy in these times to maintain a balanced budget, and to finance the cost of national defense on a pay-as-we-go basis." In my opinion, we should muster the courage and the fortitude to pay currently for war costs up to one-quarter of our national production. In 1944 and 1945 Federal tax revenues averaged $45,000,000,000, or about 20 percent of the gross national product. This is not enough at the present time.

In 1951, gross national product will probably be about $300,000,000,000; 20 percent of this for Federal tax revenues would amount to $60,000,000,000. More exactly, the present system will produce about $55,000,000,000 in tax revenues at present tax rates. As the national product increases, we can get more tax revenue. If the costs of armament drive the total Federal budget up to $65,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952, we should get additional revenues by adding more excise taxes and lowering personal exemptions. Much as we dislike sales taxes, we might even have to have a Federal sales tax.

Any tax program should provide a reasonable and effective pattern for spreading the burden. Also there is a limit beyond which taxes should not go. And, if taxes exceed the critical point, they will take away the ability to expand production. There is a growing acceptance of the theory that the critical level of taxation, beyond which the forces of inflation are brought into play, is around 25 percent of the national income. Inflation has already robbed every American

of half of his savings, half of his insurance policies, and much of his earnings. How much more can we take away from the average man? Of course, how far people will go in economic sacrifices depends upon their faith and belief in the value of the cause and the effectiveness of the program to further this cause.

We all want to do everything that is necessary for the defense of the United States but we should be absolutely certain that what we are doing is necessary and that we are not building up excess military equipment which may become obsolete before actual all-out war occurs. General Marshall has been a steadying influence in this respect. Ever since he assumed the office of Secretary of Defense, several months ago, he has said that, until we know what is going to happen to us, we do not want to build up surplus production for the military and have large supplies of excess equipment. He wants an enduring solid program which the American people will be willing to carry out for a long period. I am also confident that General Eisenhower, when he returns from Europe, will present an intelligent and practical plan for the United States to follow in Europe. These military statesmen want intelligent preparations for defense, but they also know that we must not overburden our economy.

In anything short of a full-scale war, it is highly desirable that the revenues of the Federal Government equal or exceed total Federal expenditures. In other words, during this period of limited war, we should do everything we can to balance the budget by increasing taxes and by cutting down less essential expenditures. Only in this way can we keep our Nation, to the greatest possible extent, in the free private-enterprise basis.

If it happens that we get into a war that requires all-out effort, Federal expenditures will undoubtedly exceed our ability to pay as we go. In that case, the Government will have to borrow the additional money that it needs. The fiscal program should anticipate this contingency and should provide that such financing will not be done through banks where the effect will be to increase the supply of money. The extra funds needed should be borrowed from the people's savings on terms which will make Government bonds attractive to hold for income purposes over a long period of years. Short-term financing of war needs should be avoided.

REDUCE NONMILITARY SPENDING

The second objective should be sweeping economy in government—Federal, State, and local. With war on our doorstep, we should stop spending for public projects that can be postponed until the emergency has passed. National defense comes first—ahead of public buildings, housing projects, or subsidies to any segment of the population. If we try, we can reduce Federal expenditures for nonmilitary purposes by at least $6,000,000,000. The Government should set the example in the sacrifice of nonessential spending, and eliminate projects which require materials and manpower which could better be used for war production.

INDIRECT CONTROLS ESSENTIAL

We come to our third point. Assuming that we will have direct controls, we will still need indirect controls more than ever to curb the increase in buying power. We know that so-called direct controls—price and wage fixing, manpower controls, priorities, allocations, rationing, and so forth, will not alone do the job of stopping inflation. Wage and price controls and rationing hold prices down, but they do not shrink purchasing power or increase the supply of goods. Therefore, they do not relieve inflationary pressures but merely bottle them up and suppress them. They may heal the lesion on the surface, but the power to erupt builds up below and may be the more destructive when it does break out.

Government wage and price fixing and rationing mean regimenting housewives, consumers, workers, and businessmen. To enforce such direct controls will call for thousands of "OPA" and other Government officials paid for by the taxpayer. Businessmen will spend many precious hours learning the new rules of the game, and adjusting their businesses.

Prices made in a free market, by reflecting conditions of supply and demand, show where production should be stepped up and where it should be slowed down. Under price fixing, Government bureaus take over this function. During a long period of semiwar or even war, those bureaus cannot possibly guide and direct production as well as would the free market through many thousands of transactions. We are making this effort to preserve a free enterprise system for the simple reason that it is the most efficient system. One of its requirements is a reasonably freely operating price mechanism. We can alter or freeze that mechanism for the short run as we did in 1942. But to do so for the long run of this entire decade would be a mistake. If we do not wish prices to rise, then we should operate so as to have some prices fall. We should operate to have some prices go up and welcome the extra goods and manpower which we get in that industry as a result. Flexibility in price management should be our watchword.

In spite of these weaknesses, we are apparently going to have direct wage and price controls. When they are imposed, let's see that this time they are flexible. They should preserve enough leeway to permit inducements where needed to support production lags. There can be no rigid strait-jacket to contain an economy as complex as the one we have in our land. Direct controls at best must allow for administrative judgment that will get the job done in the best way in the shortest possible time.

Perhaps in a total all-out war, price controls might work. But in this "butter and guns" economy, if we are to have a long-pull, enduring program, we must depend on a tough fiscal and credit policy.

Our strategy must be to curb inflation at the source. This we can achieve, to a large extent, with indirect controls, properly and vigorously administered. These controls include, besides taxation, Federal debt management, interest rates, monetary and credit policies, and the controls of consumer credit and residential mortgage credit. We must curb private credit expansion in order to have individuals save more of their income and thus reduce market pressures.

If we must finance part of the war through deficits, we need a policy that will sell Government bonds to savings institutions and to the people instead of to the banks. We will thus syphon off surplus purchasing power and dry up super-charged reserve-credit inflation such as we had during the last war. The facts are that the public is so distrustful of Government money policies that more savings bonds are being cashed today than are being sold. This is a practice which we must reverse.

THE PUBLIC MUST BE INFORMED

The fourth point is in many respects the most important. Combined with proper tax policies, with a sound money policy, and with proper indirect controls, it will limit inflation.

I propose that industry, through the Advertising Council, the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and whatever other agencies are available, launch a Nation-wide campaign to call attention to the present-day lantern in the window—the danger signal warning of inflation. The Advertising Council just last week approved an anti-inflation campaign. This story must be retold time after time. The program must sell the economics of sacrifice. It must end the short-term money binge and expose the terrific monetary headache that lies ahead. It must show that by tightening our belts and adopting some Spartan principles today, we can reap the rewards of a more bountiful society and productivity in the years ahead. And at the same time we can protect what we have, and stand up and fight for freedom.

Government, industry, and labor can join together in this program. But we will have to move swiftly. There is no time to lose. Public opinion is in a state of uncertainty. Our enemies will employ every means to distort the facts and confuse us.

A recent survey by a leading research corporation emphasized the problem before us. People give strong backing to the war effort, but they do not yet believe that this means sacrifices—sacrifices now.

The interviewers asked, Shall we have a longer workweek? Sixty-three percent said there is no need for it, even on defense work. Thirty-four percent said eventually, maybe.

Higher taxes? Fifty-three percent said that increases would not be needed for some time. Fifty-nine percent turned thumbs down on a 5 percent increase in personal income tax.

The rest of the survey is in the same vein. People are not sold on the danger of inflation. But they can be sold. They will be sold if we set our minds to it.

President Truman, in his economic message to Congress on January 12, 1951, said in effect that, to fight inflation, the great middle working classes may have to pay $3 a week in extra taxes. This is because the middle classes will have to pay most of all future taxes. This workers' group should weigh the ultimate consequences of inflation as against taxation. Such inflation might mean that prices could easily rise to take $10 a week away from each worker. It comes, or rather is stolen, little by little. The facts are that having a higher tax bill is good business for the broad mass of the people—the great middle classes which today are mostly made up of workers' families.

PRODUCTION FOR SURVIVAL

The need for leadership in our country was never greater than today. Charles E. Wilson has the ability and the courage to reach the production goals. His tasks will be lightened considerably if we accept reality—if we embrace the economics of sacrifice and knuckle down to what I would call "production for survival."

In the coming months we might well use this term, "production for survival," as the yardstick by which to guide our decisions. If a project qualifies as production for survival, it should have A–1 priority. If it is anything else, it can wait, or serve as a stopgap until we can get to the main job.

The task of Charlie Wilson and of our military strategists, however, will be directly related to our success in building firm our money policies. Right now these policies are confused. The easy money policies of the past have proved to be easy politics. We have watered our fiscal resources, and we have taken successive deferments in meeting our obligations. The time will come, if we do not watch out, when we can no longer postpone meeting our debts. The final outcome would be either drastic inflation or a drastic capital levy. There is little choice between these two.

Given the facts, the American people have never failed to live up to the American heritage.

We can give them the facts on money, on inflation, and on the economics of sacrifice. If they understand these facts, they will support the proper remedies.

In the meantime let business, Government, and labor climb the staircase together

and hang the warning lantern in the window. We can lead the Nation out of this wilderness of self-delusion and possible disaster to a broader vision of security and faith in our common destiny. We can do so with full confidence that the best is yet to come if we all keep working together.

Newspaper Poll on Korean and Russian Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, an outstanding Missouri newspaper, the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News, has completed a poll of its readers on certain questions relating to our foreign and domestic policies. Of particular interest are inquiries as to whether we should withdraw from Korea, and whether we and our allies should cut off trade with Russia. It is said to be the first newspaper in the Natior to poll its readers on these matters.

Edward W. Sowers, publisher of the Rolla Daily News, summarized the results of his poll in an article that appeared in the January 23, 1951, edition of his newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sowers' article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

GET OUT OF KOREA, KICK RUSSIA FROM UN, ROLLA OPINION

(By Edward W. Sowers)

The Nation's first newspaper to poll its readers, designed to obtain a composite of community opinion on such questions as the Korean War, draft of 18-year-olds, foreign aid, Russia in the United Nations, price control, and taxes was completed here today by the Rolla Daily News.

Exactly 508 readers of the News filled out ballots, answering 18 of today's vital questions. With 477 ballots counted last night, the Rolla community citizens voted 250 to 202 "to withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible."

The Rolla area people are sharply divided on the draft of 18-year-olds, the poll showing 239 favor drafting the 'teen-agers, while 212 would not draft them. The earliest ballots received were from worried mothers, many favoring compulsory military training but few want their young sons in combat at such an early age. Later, with more soldiers from Fort Leonard Wood and students from the Missouri School of Mines voting, the trend changed to a slight majority favoring drafting the 18-year-olds.

Price and wage controls were demanded by the Rolla ballot, 386 to 60. Asked if the honor system of price controls is working, 334 voted "no" and 62 "yes."

The Rolla voters are overwhelmingly sure that nondefense spending should be reduced, voting 340 to 59 for that. They are also equally sure that this Nation should prepare for all-out war and build its defenses. They voted 264 to 161 to prepare quickly for all-out war, and 258 to 68 to gradually strengthen our defenses. They are willing to raise taxes for defense, 326 to 79, but think taxes can be lowered for non-defense funds, voting 159 to 50 for less taxes except for defense.

DIVIDED ON TRUMAN

Seven of the straw voters strongly urged impeachment and removal of President Truman, while 15 or 20 wrote in their comment urging everyone to get behind our President and other leaders.

Rolla citizens would boot Russia from the United Nations, 232 favoring such drastic action, 216 opposing it. Two hundred and five would go so far as to break off diplomatic relations with Russia, while 213 oppose this. If left up to Rolla, the Chinese Reds would never get into the United Nations, as 366 oppose it while only 72 favor it. Likewise, the United States and the UN should cut off all trade with Russia and her satellites, think 327 Rolla voters, while 109 would not impose such economic sanctions.

URGED TO QUIT MEDDLING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Chiang and his Chinese Nationalists should get aid from the United States, believe 298 of those polled here, while 145 would have nothing to do with Chiang or any other foreigner. Many of the comments were caustic, strongly worded appeals for the United States to quit meddling in foreign squabbles. However, 292 voted to send troops to Europe, while 150 oppose sending any Americans to Europe or any foreign soil.

We should expect foreign nations to supply bulk of troops for any United Nations army, voted 359, while only 78 seemed to think the United States should bear the brunt of the international police force.

BALLOTS SENT TO SENATORS

The original ballots, including the comments, were sent to United States Senators KEM and HENNINGS and Congressman CARNAHAN in Washington today from this newspaper. It was added several metropolitan newspapers and national magazines had written expressing interest in the polling plan, and that some other newspapers have already started similar polls in their communities. Such a composite of public opinion on a Nation-wide basis should help Congress make decisions on the vital problems facing the Nation today.

Taxation of Mutual Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Mutual Insurance Companies Angered by NTEA Attack," published in the North Dakota Union Farmer of January 8, 1951.

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

MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES ANGERED BY NTEA ATTACK

CHICAGO.—The so-called National Tax Equality Association's new advertising campaign attempting to smear co-ops and all other nonprofit enterprises has stirred action by mutual insurance companies.

In a letter to insurance executives, American Mutual Alliance explains that the "highly organized large-scale effort to undermine the confidence of the American people in mutual fire and casualty insurance is gaining momentum." Purpose of the drive, it said, is to degrade mutual insurance "so that stock insurance companies can compete more effectively with mutual carriers. This involves such devices as asserting that there is something unpatriotic about insuring in a mutual company."

The drive is also designed "to high pressure Congress into rewriting the provisions of the Federal tax laws so that income taxes of mutual fire and casualty insurance companies will be increased in greater proportion than those of other businesses and so that the present exemption of the small mutual insurance companies will be wiped out."

The letter points out that mechanics of the campaign are being handled by the NTEA, "an exclusively propaganda organization, with offices in Washington and Chicago, which was set up in 1944 to fight the cooperatives. It is financed in part by stock insurance interests. Undoubtedly you are aware of the vigorous anticooperative campaign this organization has been waging since that date. But you may not realize that the campaign now is being directed against mutual fire and casualty insurance, as well as against cooperatives."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mutual insurance companies now pay in taxes 1 percent of their premium income or their additions to capital, whichever is greater, with an exemption for the very small companies of $75,000 of premium income. Mutuals say that if their premiums were as high as those of their competitors they would right now in many cases be actually paying more taxes than stock companies on the same volume.)

Why Not Talk Peace for a Change?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Why Not Talk Peace for a Change?" which appeared in the Hartford Courant of January 24, 1951.

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

WHY NOT TALK PEACE FOR A CHANGE?

In America we hear and read such a constant torrent of words that we tend to dismiss most of them as futile. But words, and the ideas to which they give expression, have a vitality we must never underestimate.

Conditioned as we are to thinking almost exclusively in terms of divisions of men and tons of war production, a lot of us are likely to scoff when BRIEN MCMAHON rises in the Senate to propose a resolution of friendship for the Russian people. Many Americans would denounce any such gesture with today's swear word, appeasement. Others would consider it a new high in uselessness.

We can all admit that no Senate resolution of friendship is going to change the course of world events. Not by itself. But we don't know what the effect of an intensive, persistent, well-organized campaign to reach the Russian people by every means of communication would be. We haven't tried it. The Voice of America is attempting that job, still on a relatively minor scale. But how many Americans, let alone Russians, know just what it is doing, in what ways, and with what success?

The point is that 99 percent of our talk is about the prospects of war with Russia. That

subject fills our conversations, our newspapers, our magazines; it pours out of our loudspeakers; it occupies most of the time of Congress. We aren't warmongers, surely. But is it any wonder that we give even our friends abroad some anxious moments by our constant hammering at warlike themes? We know we must make a great national effort to build up our military preparedness. But shouldn't we at the same time redouble our efforts to make our underlying hopes for peace clear to the whole world?

Moreover, let us remember that propaganda does not consist of words alone. Here as elsewhere actions speak louder than words. What we do or do not do at Lake Success, for example, will go a lot further toward convincing the rest of the world of our peaceful intentions, or lack of them, than what we say in resolutions or through the Voice of America. We ought to think over why it is that we seem so alone in the UN—as witness not only India and the Arab nations, but Prime Minister Attlee's official cabinet statement in London yesterday, on sanctions against China.

Senator McMAHON argues that the Communists, well aware of the universal desire for peace, scored a notable propaganda victory with their so-called Stockholm petition. He thinks we ought to answer it with something more conducive to peace than pictures of the best A-bomb targets in Russia, and talk of letting the Communists feel the lash. If we really want to satisfy our own consciences, and put at rest the misgivings of our friends, we'll follow Senator McMAHON'S advice. We can surpass the Soviet's battery of mouthpieces in one vitally important aspect: We can afford to tell the truth. Let us make sure that the truth is worth telling.

Declaration on Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, president of Notre Dame University, enclosing a declaration on manpower adopted at the meeting of the Association of American Colleges at Atlantic City, N. J., on January 10, 1951. I am informed that the declaration on manpower has already been ordered printed in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., January 16, 1951.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The enclosed proposals give, I believe, a practical and workable answer to the problem of manpower as it affects the world today. We would certainly appreciate your considered judgment in this matter, as well as whatever steps you might take to see that the declaration is brought to the attention of those responsible for formulating the forthcoming legislation.

This declaration of manpower was drafted at the meeting of the Association of American Colleges, held at Atlantic City on January 10, 1951. The following men are members of the special committee, mentioned in proposal IX: President James P. Baxter III, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; President Leonard Carmichael, Tufts College, Tufts College, Mass.; President John J. Cavanaugh, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.; President Arthur S. Fleming, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio; President Goodrich C. White, Emory University, Emory University, Ohio; Mr. Guy E. Snavely, executive director of the Association of American Colleges.

With renewed assurances of my gratitude for your cooperation and of a continued remembrance in my prayers, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
(Rev.) JOHN J. CAVANAUGH, C. S. C.,
President.

A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of the radio debate between the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the subject, A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer? broadcast on the American Forum of the Air on January 14, 1951.

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

'A FOREIGN POLICY: WHAT'S THE ANSWER?'

(Radio debate between Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois)

Chariman GRANIK. Former President Hoover has launched the great debate. He has proposed a foreign policy quite different from the Truman doctrine. He wants the United States to pull out of Europe and Asia; to preserve this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar. He would cut off all aid to Western Europe until it showed spirit and strength in defending itself against Red Russia.

Administration leaders have called this isolationism, a wave of defeat and frustration, an act of appeasement.

Mr. Hoover announced yesterday that newspaper reaction showed nearly 3–1 support of his program.

With leaders in Congress and in your community divided in their views, with every American vitally concerned, the American Forum of the Air presents the first of a series of discussions on A Foreign Policy: What's the Answer?

We are highly honored and privileged today to pose this vital question to two distinguished United States Senators, both from the great State of Illinois but on opposite sides of the political fence: Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, one of the independent Democrats' spokesmen in the Senate; and Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, the new Senator from Illinois, who distinguished himself for many years as a Republican leader in the House of Representatives.

Now, Senator DIRKSEN, do you agree with Mr. Hoover's policy?

Senator DIRKSEN. First, Theodore, indulge me a moment while I throw a little salute to my distinguished colleague, PAUL DOUGLAS. Probably nobody campaigned any harder for my defeat than PAUL DOUGLAS, but he did so honorably and he did so fairly, and so, while we have differences of opinion, I do salute him as a great statesman and as a forthright American citizen.

And so now to your question: I agree very substantially with President Hoover, and even more so if I put my own interpretation on what I think he tried to say. I think that he has been misinterpreted, and the commentators and the columnists have taken a great many liberties with the Hoover speech; but if I can boil it down in 30 seconds, I think first of all, he assumed the worst possible condition, so that if freedom is going to have a beachhead, we have to make this hemisphere strong.

Secondly, I do not agree with the second sentence in your opening remarks, to the effect that he wants to pull out of Europe or Asia necessarily. I think he stated the whole case in two words when he said defense over in Europe is the "prime obligation" of those folks first, and thereafter we come into the picture. And with respect to Asia, of course, there he believes that we have followed a policy of appeasement; that the United Nations has failed very signally; that its discussions have been rather pious and rather foggy; and that we have to hew to a rather consistent and firm line of action.

And so, in the interpretation that I place upon Mr. Hoover's very significant and epochal speech, I agree very substantially with the former President of the United States.

Chairman GRANIK. And your distinguished colleague, Senator DOUGLAS?

Senator DOUGLAS. First, may I say it is a happy indication of the fundamental decency of American politics that, while Mr. DIRKSEN and I are representatives of opposing political parties, we are nevertheless close friends; and that while I did not exactly dance in the streets with joy when he was elected, now that he is a Senator I am very glad, indeed, to welcome him, and I am sure that he will have the same distinguished career here that he had in the House.

Now, my good friend, EVERETT DIRKSEN, has put a gloss on the Hoover position. Mr. Hoover's phrase was that we should not give "another man or another dollar" to Europe until after the European countries had erected "a sure dam against the red flood." Let us note that his phrase was until after "a sure dam" had been erected, when aid, therefore, from us would be no longer needed. The practical effect of Mr. Hoover's proposal would be to withdraw all our forces from the Continent of Europe and from Asia, and therefore to leave a vacuum. And since the struggle against world communism is a world struggle, that would mean that the other countries would not have strength enough with which to resist it.

Communism would take over all of Asia and of Europe, and then all of Africa; and we would be left alone, with the exception of perhaps the northern part of South America.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator DIRKSEN?

Senator DIRKSEN. I think Senator DOUGLAS falls into the same pitfall that has beset so much of the thinking about the Hoover speech. If I can summarize the first part of it, and of course, that would be the first part of our thinking on foreign policy, it would be that foreign policy, like charity, begins at home.

First of all, we have got to have a sense of mission; and what is the sense of mission of America? Well, after all, the ancient landmark is freedom, and I would devote myself to it, and I think President Hoover does, likewise.

Secondly, he assumes the worst possible condition. What assurance is there that we

are not going to be driven out of the Orient? What assurance is there that there is going to be that spiritual and moral strength that he talks about, which is necessary if the European countries are going to defend themselves? And so, he comes to the conclusion that freedom must have a beachhead, and that beachhead is the American Continent. That, to me, looks like sound and logical thinking, because you have to think all of the way down the road and encompass the eventualities that confront us at the present time.

That, then, is the first part of a foreign policy: It begins here at home with the thinking of our people, and he must assume the worst possible condition and prepare ourselves for it accordingly.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, we are all agreed, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we should defend freedom. We are all agreed that we should make America strong. But the question is, at what point should we begin to defend freedom.

Mr. Hoover would say that we should not defend freedom on the continents of either Europe or of Asia; we would only begin to defend freedom when America itself was directly attacked. And the island bases of which he speaks are to be used as merely screens, protective screens around the United States.

Now, my position is this: That this policy would be ultimately fatal to this Nation. It would mean that when the Communists had control of Asia, Europe, and Africa, they would have 2,000,000,000 of the 2,300,000,000 population of the world, and therefore, from a population standpoint, would outnumber us nearly 7 to 1.

They would have 100,000,000 tons of steel capacity in Russia and Western Europe, as compared to our equal figure, so that on an industrial basis they would be on a parity.

They would have virtually all of the rubber of the world, and they would have two-thirds of the tin, and they would have the major portion of the manganese, and they would have the vital sources of uranium. And therefore, when the ultimate struggle came, we would be alone, our backs to the wall, and the struggle would be very hard and the odds very difficult.

Therefore, we who believe in the opposite doctrine think that it is in the interest of America to help those nations which are willing to defend themselves, to defend themselves; provided, first, that they make an adequate contribution to their defense, and provided, second, that the places are accessible to our forces.

Chairman GRANIK. John Foster Dulles, Republican adviser to the State Department, says to abandon our European allies would be ruinous.

Senator DIRKSEN. Let us relate that to the Hoover speech. In the first place, President Hoover didn't say we should get out of Europe. If you go back and examine that speech, he says we shouldn't be blind to or unmindful of western culture on the continent of Europe; and secondly, of course, he believes in a frontier on the British Islands and in the British Commonwealth; and thirdly, if you go back and examine those words that he used, he says, first of all, the foundation of our policy should be the Western Hemisphere; and secondly, he says the prime obligation is upon them. He rests his case mainly, of course, upon the fact that the spiritual and moral strength and the willingness to defend themselves has not been manifest.

Look at the votes in the French Chamber of Deputies; look at the recent vote in Italy; look at the uncertainty and the fear and the drawing away over in Europe at the present time. They are in the line of fire over there, so to speak, and as a consequence, the first obligation is theirs. If they refuse to defend themselves, we could pour in all of the troops, all of the money, all of the munitions, but it would be like pouring it in a rat hole. And so there ought to be a manifestation as to whether those people are willing to stand up and be counted, for if they are not, then, of course, it gives point to the fact that more and more we should emphasize the strength of the American Hemisphere in time of test and great eventuality.

Chairman GRANIK. Is it pouring it into a rat hole, Senator DOUGLAS?

Senator DOUGLAS. No; and I think there is a great misunderstanding as to the degree to which Europe has rearmed and is willing to rearm. We compare our Armed Forces, for example, with the numbers in the armed forces in Great Britain, about three times as much, and we say that the British are not doing their job. But it is not a question of the absolute numbers under arms; it is a question of the relative proportions who are under arms. And I have worked out some figures on this which I think are very interesting.

Last year, out of every 1,000 in the population, we had 14 men under arms, Great Britain had 16 men under arms, and France had 16 men under arms.

As of March of this year all three of these nations will be on an equality—18 men per 1,000 population. So that on a relative basis, up to now, these countries have done substantially as much as we.

And in terms of amounts spent, namely, proportions of national income, at the present rate we are spending 8.7 percent of our national income for defense, the United Kingdom is spending 6.4, and France is spending 7.3. But Great Britain and France, in the budgets which they have just passed, have raised their proportions to 8 and to 9.7, respectively.

Under the so-called Brussels agreement, it is understood from press reports that all of the nations go up together, and when we finally reach the maximum of about 55 divisions, the United States will not be bearing more than about 20 percent of the total burden.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, Theodore, getting back just a moment to your earlier question as to what John Foster Dulles said, it just occurs to me that whenever we make a confession that we can't make it alone in this world if we have to, then we are on the highway to decay. I am not one of those who will ever make that confession, believe me, although it has been made in some high places, because there may come a day when we are out of Asia, and there may come a day when we are out of Europe, and then do we propose, in high places and elsewhere, to make the confession that because we have no people at our elbow that we are going to fail?

My motion is that when we make ourselves strong, we get allies in our corner, and they are willing to stay in our corner.

Now, with respect to this question of men under arms, I think it begs the point. The important thing is: What is the heart and the will of the soldier after you have put him in uniform and given him a rifle? You can give him the best weapons in the world, but if he follows a strange ideology, and there is no real spirit and no resolve and no determination, then he is only a 50- or 25-percent soldier. And what Mr. Hoover sought to emphasize was that will, that indispensable will, is the prime obligation of armies in Europe, and it is not alone a question of size.

Chairman GRANIK. Yesterday there was an announcement that Senator WALTER F. GEORGE joined Republican Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, in demanding President Truman submit to Congress the issue of sending more American troops to Europe. What is your thought on the issues, Senator?

Senator DOUGLAS. I agree with it. I think the President has the constitutional power to send troops abroad in his role as Commander in Chief, but I also believe that there is a sufficient division of opinion in the country, and since Secretary Acheson made a contrary pledge to the Committee on Foreign Relations so that the President should not exercise this constitutional right without approval at least by the Senate and possibly also by the House as well.

But I should like to have this resolution submitted in an affirmative fashion, namely, that the Congress or the Senate approve of the gist of Brussels agreement rather than in the negative form which has been proposed by Senator WHERRY and Representative COUDERT, namely, that we should not send troops until congressional permission had been given.

I think it is better to put the question in the affirmative rather than in the negative.

Senator DIRKSEN. I agree with that position, very substantially, and I would like to amplify it to this extent. Everybody I think who is familiar with our Constitution knows that it confers upon the President powers as the Commander in Chief, and those powers have never been delimited by the Supreme Court of the United States, and we don't know how far they can go, but we know that that power was conferred at the time when this country was a country of 3,000,000 people and it wasn't ranging far afield, and so the question is: Shall the President, because that power was conferred a long time ago, have authority to put us into an undeclared war and dispatch endless unlimited troops to all corners of the earth?

I think, in the interest of common sense, if for no other reason, there must be a full participation by the people's representatives in the Congress. Now, that ought to commend itself, I think, to good thinking and to common sense in this day and age, and we shouldn't be unmindful of the fact that when, as in the case of Senator CONNALLY, they recite 100 instances over the years when the President has used that power, I went back to take a look. Look at the casualties that were connected with those instances. Virtually none. Usually there were a handful of marines into Nicarauga, or some simple example.

But today we are playing for keeps, and it involves the lives of thousands and hundreds of thousands of young Americans, and the President shouldn't exercise that power lightly. I believe the time has come for full, fair, and, as Senator DOUGLAS has said, affirmative consultation.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I would like to make one qualification to this. I believe that the President should submit the issue to Congress, but I think that we of Congress have a reciprocal obligation to decide that matter quickly, and not prevent a decision by prolonged hearings before the committees or by a filibuster on the floor.

Chairman GRANIK. I will take a question from our studio audience. Do you have a question there, sir?

Question. I am Roger Hack, a student from the University of Illinois. This question is for Senator DIRKSEN. If we were to lose Western Europe through Soviet invasion, would it be possible to have enough strength on our part to check Communist power after such a great loss to the United States?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, the answer is simply this: What assurance is there that we might not lose Western Europe? And if that is designed, of course, as a comment upon what President Hoover said, I reaffirm, of course, that he said he wasn't unmindful of the need of saving western culture in Europe, but he believes that it requires a manifestation of will power over there. Will they do it? I don't know.

We are engaged in a great guessing contest today from President Truman and Dean Acheson on down, and they are trying to

guess as to whether the Soviet will move—will there be a war? They don't know. I don't know at the moment. But I do know we could come to the end of the road, and we would have to depend upon ourselves, and so I want this hemisphere to be strong against that eventuality on land, in the air, and on the sea.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator DOUGLAS.

Senator DOUGLAS. We are all agreed on that, but the question is at what points will we throw our strength to prevent facing the world alone? Now, Mr. Hoover's position is that he will not give any men or any materials to Europe until after Europe has already made itself so strong that it can resist Russia, and until after it has occurred—those are his very words. Now, the Europeans say, "If we have to wait for American aid until we have built up armies of millions of men, we don't think that we can bear this burden. We want some American aid."

Then Hoover says, "You can't have it until after you have made yourself secure." And the result is that we virtually cut ourselves adrift from Europe and tell them that we are not going to defend them.

Now, as I understand the press reports from the Brussels Agreement, the text of which, of course, has not been published, it provides for an ultimate European force at the end of 3 years in which there will be approximately 10 American divisions and a European force of approximately 5 times this amount. We go up together, and that is the immediate issue before the American people, namely, whether or not we will agree to the Brussels Agreement.

If we do not, I think we can be perfectly certain that the Communists will take Western Europe, and take it fairly quickly, and when that happens, while our defense is not impossible, I want to make that clear, it is not impossible, it will nevertheless be extremely difficult.

Senator DIRKSEN. I am not unmindful of all of the words in the Hoover speech, but I would like to read every word and every phrase in terms of context and the over-all purpose and spirit of that speech. And so there isn't any case of pulling out of Europe. It is a case of them manifesting some interest in their own defense, and then, of course, America will not be found wanting if that will is manifest.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I think this is a very happy interpretation that Mr. DIRKSEN has put on Mr. Hoover's speech. And I only hope that Mr. Hoover and his followers will subscribe to it, because if they do, then we will be extremely close to an agreement.

We, on the other side, do not want to defend Europe alone. We will not defend Europe alone. We simply say that if the other nations put up adequate forces, five-sixths of the forces, or four-fifths of the forces, we will join them and we will also help with our air forces and our sea forces. Now, that is what the Brussels Agreement, as I understand it, provides.

Now, the effect of the Hoover speech and the effect indeed of the TAFT speech has been to discourage and to oppose our taking part in the Brussels Agreement. That has been the effect.

Now, if Mr. DIRKSEN wishes to indulge in some characteristically able interpretation of the Hoover speech which permits him to pay homage to President Hoover and at the same time adopt the foreign policy of President Truman, why we are very glad indeed to welcome that.

Chairman GRANIK. I would take another question but I know everyone wants Senator DIRKSEN to answer that.

Senator DIRKSEN. When all is said and done, let nobody forget that President Hoover was the first great American to stand behind the League of Nations long ago, and let it not be forgotten that he was for the League of Nations until it began to show signs of fogginess and failure. If they put up five-sixths, I am confident that President Hoover would go along, but he wants something more than what he called lip service, declarations, paper policies, consultations, and let us see the color of the money, and let us see the kind of troops they put up, and then we shall know what to do.

Chairman GRANIK. Talking about the United Nations, some of your colleagues feel the United States acceptance of a proposed cease-fire plan for Korea is a mistake, and that it is complete appeasement. Would you prefer a withdrawal from Korea and to keep our hands free in Formosa?

Senator DIRKSEN. As I examined the text this morning, I was frankly astonished about the language that was used, because I am of the opinion that it does constitute appeasement. And so there is the question, Do we go out or do we stay in? We haven't found out yet whether we are running a war there or whether it is a glorified police action. I have been waiting for the White House to say something about it finally. But first let us make up our minds what we are doing there.

Secondly, let us determine whether it is pride or official stubbornness or a matter of long-range policy that keeps us there, and if we can't find out, in Heaven's name, let us not slaughter any more youngsters over there when it looks as if they are going to run us out of the place anyway. [Applause.]

Senator DOUGLAS. I would like to answer Senator DIRKSEN's exhortation. [Continued applause.] Thank you very much. I should like to answer Senator DIRKSEN's question that we should make up our minds what we are doing there. We went into Korea at the request of the United Nations that the countries should come to the aid of a people who had been attacked. We went in there to resist aggression, and that is what we are doing now. I do not want to see us pull out of Korea under any negotiated agreement.

I wish the other countries had given us the aid which they should have given, and to which we were entitled, but I want to say this, that if we throw up our hands and abandon the effort in Korea and if we in the United States do that, and if the British do that as they have been doing, then it is good-by to the United Nations, and good-by to collective security, and I think the issue is sufficiently important that we shouldn't throw in the sponge. If we leave, let us leave honorably and under gunfire.

Senator DIRKSEN. Let me make one brief comment to that, and that is this: Is the moral effect over there worse when we take a sustained and continuous licking, or whether we do the sensible thing and get out and reform and reframe our lines the better to do a defensive job in the Orient?

Senator DOUGLAS. I am not a military expert and I don't believe my good friend EVERETT DIRKSEN is a military expert either and I am willing to be guided by the military experts in this matter, but I simply say that you never can be certain when you are taking a licking. Things may go against you for a time, but then there may always be a turn of events which enable you to come out on top.

When the military situation becomes hopeless, if it were to become hopeless, and if our generals thought that we should leave there, I would agree, but I do not want to have us leave prematurely, to leave in order to buy off the Communists, that is appeasement of the worst type, and I want to see us stick as long as we have a chance of continuing to fight for law and order.

Senator DIRKSEN. That simply presupposes this question: Do we stay on because MacArthur, a great soldier, wants us to stay on, or do we stay on because Dean Acheson and President Truman want us to stay on? That is all.

Senator DOUGLAS. I am not in the confidence of the General Staff, nor I think is Senator DIRKSEN, unless he has tap lines into the Pentagon which I certainly do not have, but I believe that General Bradley is the Chief of Staff of our Armed Forces, and General Bradley with the President furnishes our military leadership.

Now, I don't know what General MacArthur has been urging. If a military decision comes to that point, let it be made, but I should say it should be a military decision, and it should not be withdrawn because of moral weakness.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN. I have no further comment to make except this: Is it a military policy they are pursuing, or is it a military policy in response to political and diplomatic policy over there? If it is the latter, then we had better think very seriously about getting those boys out of there.

Chairman GRANIK. Will you continue on, Senator DIRKSEN, with your summary?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, Mr. GRANIK, in summary, just let me say this: I subscribe very substantially to what I think President Hoover said in that very epoch pronouncement that he made to the country recently. I think as never before we are going to have to find out whether the people in Europe are going to stand up and be counted and make that one of the conditions of aid. We said so in the Republican policy for the campaign in Illinois in 1950, and I consider it to be a covenant with the people, and I mean to keep it.

In Asia I am in general sympathy with some of the things that Senator DOUGLAS has already said over the radio on other occasions, and that is that we use our natural allies, let us reweapon and reequip Japan, and let us do what are the realistic things over there, and then keep ourselves strong.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. Your summary, Senator DOUGLAS.

Senator DOUGLAS. It is very hard for me to find out precisely where my good friend, EVERETT DIRKSEN, stands, because he seems to agree to a double interpretation of Mr. Hoover's speech. If Mr. Hoover and Mr. DIRKSEN believe along with President Truman that they should give aid to Europe, if Europe will help adequately to arm itself and to defend itself, then I say that the great debate on foreign policy is moving to a very happy synthesis and agreement, and the discussion will have justified itself.

I hope very much that this actually is the case, because if Europe goes, if Asia goes, we lost seven-eighths of the world's population, and we lose a half of the world's steel, and aggression will be closing itself in around us. We will have to become a garrison state and the ultimate chances will not be as good as they might be.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. You have been listening to a discussion on foreign policy between Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The Christian Hope of the New Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely

sermon delivered January 14, 1951, by Dr. Earle B. Jewell, rector, St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo.

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

SERMON BY DR. EARLE B. JEWELL, RECTOR, ST. ANDREW'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, KANSAS CITY, MO., JANUARY 14, 1951

Thirteen men stood in a valley at the base of a mountain. They were young men. They faced a world of terrible conflict. The race they belonged to was in slavery. The politicians had taken over the economic, the cultural, the educational program, and the religious rights of the whole empire. Men were in slavery. So much so that a soldier or an agent of the government could demand the personal service of any man to carry his bundles. A man had no freedom. There was no economic future. Men were discouraged, hopeless, and living a life of futility. But not these thirteen men. These young men stood at the base of the mountain. They had caught the vision of a better way of living. They had been taught, through a personality, the wonderful freedom and liberty of individual human personality. As they stood at the base of the mountain they were united in one conviction. They believed that men had a better day ahead.

Out of that group of 13 men, 4 men went up the mountain, Jesus, Peter, James, and John. On the mountain they had a tremendous and wonderful experience. They witnessed the transfiguration of Jesus. Peter said, "Master, it is good for us to be here."

The young men of our generation are in the valley of confusion and bewilderment and chaos. They too are facing a world that is soon to go into slavery, the slavery of the expediency of an economic and military dictatorship. The hands of the military dictatorship will rap on every cottage door in the land of America where there is a boy 18 years old. That young man will have no choice. His parents will have no choice. We are in the valley of economic dictatorship. The long ruthless spendthrift arm of the Government will reach into the pocketbook of every home and cottage and into every business and into every organization.

These past few weeks I have heard the heartbreaking cry from the homes of my people telling of the futile feeling their sons have about the future. I have been told that in 1 college over 200 college boys did not return to school this semester because of the uncertainty of the chaotic draft law. I have been told that there are certain young men who went back to finish their semester and yet came back home after they had been in college a week. I have a letter that tells me that young men in a certain college do not even get up in the morning to go to classes, they stay in bed and sleep, and their answer is "What's the use."

Surely we are in a terrible state of inertia. We are in a terrible state of demoralization. We are in a terrible state of our lack of faith in the future. We are in a terrible state in the lack of our faith in the purpose of God in the world. We are in a terrible state in the lack of purpose for human personality where we in America are allowing the fine young men of our homes to draw unto themselves a sense of futility about the preparation for the future of their lives.

What happened to Americans? What has happened to Christians that we can stay here in our peace and tranquillity and inertia without raising our own voice against the loss of the freedom of our American way of life? What happened to Americans in their sense of honesty and common decency when we do not add our voice of demand that our suffering and sacrificing boys be brought home from the futile war in Korea. Many military experts tell us we are going to be whipped and pushed out of Korea. Why should we leave our boys there to die? I can see why young men are full of futility.

You and I as Americans have forgotten the Mount of Transfiguration. We have forgotten the hopeful view of the future. When our young men see that we don't care and there is inertia on our part and we are indifferent to the suffering of other young men, they can't help but feel that we shall be so with them.

My heart bleeds for the young men of this generation. You and I got them into this situation. We got them into this position, year by year, by carelessly voting away our constitutional rights, until now the Constitution in America is nothing but a piece of paper framed in the halls of Congress. We definitely sold out our birthright as individuals and it is no wonder our young people have a sense of futility.

As Christians we have a different job to do. We must say "It is good for us to be here" for we know what freedom is, we know what liberty is, we know what courage is. All these things are born not in a heart of fear, not in a heart of discouragement, not in a heart that is full of demoralization; but in a heart that is full of faith, a heart that is full of courage, a heart that has great faith in the future, a heart that believes that this is God's world, a heart that believes that Jesus Christ is loving mankind and that his way of life is the absolute way of life. Unless we are willing to accept this gift of God we will never have the life of transfiguration. We shall be doomed all the days of our life. We become a defeated people

We dare ask the question of the three men in Washington who are responsible for our boys being in Korea, and who have the authority to bring our boys home from Korea: "How many sons of yours are in Korea?" I refer to the President of the United States. I refer to the Secretary of Defense, and I refer to the Secretary of State.

As we sit here this morning American boys are being killed. We indignantly ask "Why does God allow these things to happen?" Our young men have a sense of futility about returning to college. Our young men are discouraged about the future. We witness ambitious young men giving up their established new business because of the uncertainty of their status as a potential soldier. Surely the American voice should be raised against these prophets of doom and chaos. Let us encourage men as Christians to drown out the hysterical voice of the fearful and confused politician. We as Christians have hope. We do not believe in an attitude of futility. We believe that life is made for courage, for strength, for hope, and for a conquering faith in the future. We have been on the Mount of Transfiguration and say with a great voice "It is good for us to be here for we have heard the Master's voice."

Young men, to you I would speak this morning in these words: Go back to your school, stick to your job, do everything you can to develop your personality, do everything you can and take every opportunity you can grasp to develop your intellect and your minds and your sense of the beauty and the worthwhileness of life. I would say to you, stick to your school, stick to your jobs and develop the finest character you can, because if you do have to go to war then you will be better prepared to face what comes because you have had that much more development. And remember, your personality is eternal.

With a view like that you accept every day as a conquering experience. No person in this church this morning is sure that ere the night time comes that we will be in this world. There is not a parent in this church whose young people may go out in a car tonight, that can be sure this young person will get home again, because it is possible that somewhere along the line some adult may give liquor to teen age boys and girls. We have no assurance that tomorrow is going to come to us. Do we live today, therefore, in the sense that this day is futile? Do we live this hour as though it is foolish to try to develop or grow or have hope or courage or faith? Do we do that? No; you and I are living this hour to the full capacity of our potential because we do have hope in the future, we do have a secret belief that tomorrow will be better, so much so that we are willing to go through this day with all the courage we can.

To you young men I would say let's rise above the shadows, let's get out of the valley at the base of the mountain of futility, let's get up high on the mountain and say with all our faith, "Yea, I see a new day, I have a new vision, I believe there is a purpose in the world—God's purpose." Man is doing all he can to destroy it, but I believe there is God's purpose in the world, and because of that I say "It's good for us to be here."

I personally do not believe we are going to have a war with Russia. I don't know enough about it, I am in no position to speak, but I have faith in the future. I have far more faith in the future than I have faith in some of the neurotic, hysterical men who are trying to lead us down the road of destruction. And I have faith that you Christian Americans are going to rise up and revolt against the destruction of our constitutional rights, for they are fast being taken away from us and we are fast being intimidated to lose them.

My vestry can tell you that 2 weeks ago last Tuesday I was warned that if I did not keep still publicly and in my writings about world affairs that this church would be bombed. I point this out to you for one purpose—you can see how rapidly we are losing our democratic constitutional rights when the only free voice left in America, the only courageous voice left in America is the voice of the pulpit, and now they are beginning to take preacher by preacher to intimidate him into silence.

Ah, but I have been on the Mount of Transfiguration. I have said to my Lord time and time again, "It is great for me to be here." For I believe in God and His purpose for the universe. I believe in the future of the fine young men of our generation. I believe in the ultimate victory of right. And I believe, too, that there has to be a costly struggle in the heart and soul of every individual before that ideal will be realized. Ah, yes, get on the Mount of Transfiguration and hear the voice of God Himself as He says, "This is My beloved Son; hear ye him." And we can say, "Master, it is good for us to be here." We will not be intimidated. We will not run away from our responsibilities as Christians. We will help our sons get a sense of purpose.

It's an awful and terrible responsibility to stand here this morning and tell you people, some of you with broken hearts, you young people with a sense of futility, that there can be a better world, that there can be a new hope, and that there is assured victory of the right. However, there is a necessity of struggle and conflict for any individual or any group to grow and develop and be worthy of the name of Christian. That responsibility is resting now upon each and every one of us. "O Lord, it is good for us to be here, where from the mountaintop of our faith we have captured a new vision, we see a new world and a new day, we see the coming of Thy Kingdom upon earth because Thy Kingdom has been born in the hearts of suffering humanity."

Humanity is holding out their hands of faith and saying, "Lord, fill us with Thy spirit that we might be conscious of Thy presence, for a glorious new day lies ahead, the days upon the earth when we live in

faith and hope and courage, knowing that when the day is done and the curtain falls upon our time we still go on in the sense of victory because God has given to us the fulfillment of his promise of living forever in the land of his own Spirit."

Every experience we have, every development we can get for ourselves; our character, our personality, our strength, our hope, our faith, yea, young men, these things are eternal.

Stick to your schools. Stick to your jobs. Stick to your faith in the wonderfulness of the life in America. We are a free people, and by the grace of God, because we have been on the Mount of Transfiguration, we as individuals are going to keep that spirit of freedom and liberty aglow in our hearts, until some day united we will set the world aflame with the Christian hope of the new day. "Master, it is good for us to be here."

Military Policy in Korea and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rolla, Mo., Says Quit Korea but Stay in Europe," which was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Thursday, January 18, 1951.

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

ROLLA, MO., SAYS QUIT KOREA BUT STAY IN EUROPE—POLL FAVORS TAX BOOST FOR UNITED STATES DEFENSE

ROLLA, MO., January 17.—The people of Rolla want the United States to get its troops out of Korea, but not out of Europe. They favor aid to Nationalist China and other foreign countries, but think foreign nations should supply the bulk of troops for any United Nations army. They want American defense preparation, and are willing to pay higher taxes for it, but not for nonessential Government spending. They want price and wage controls.

These are some of the early returns in a poll being conducted by the Rolla Daily News to determine what its 5,700 readers think of American foreign policy, Publisher Edward W. Sowers said today.

DO NOT HAVE TO SIGN

Last Friday the News began printing a ballot giving space for "yes" or "no" answers on 18 foreign policy questions. Readers were asked to fill out the ballots, sign them or not, as they wished, and send them to the News for forwarding to Missouri Congressmen and Senators.

The ballot also includes a space for writing comments, and this prompted at least three readers to demand the ouster of President Truman, although the ballots were presented on a strictly nonpartisan basis and Mr. Truman's name was not mentioned in the material relating to them.

SIX HUNDRED BALLOTS ARE IN

As of today an estimated 600 ballots had been returned, mostly from the 2,000 readers who live in Rolla itself. The bulk of the News' circulation is in the nearby rural area.

Following are the questions and the number of yes-and-no answers; the totals vary somewhat because a number of voters qualified some of their answers and such votes were not counted.

1. Do you think we should withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible. Yes, 157; no, 117.

2. Do you think we should aid Chinese Nationalists [Chiang] fight Chinese Reds? Yes, 186; no, 108.

3. Should Russia be excluded from the United Nations? Yes, 171; no, 123.

4. Should we admit Chinese Reds to United Nations? Yes, 54; no, 237.

5. Should we break off diplomatic relations with Russia? Yes, 141; no, 147.

6. Should we [and the UN] cut off all trade with Russia? Yes, 219; no, 60.

7. Should we send American troops to Europe? Yes, 171; no, 117.

8. Should we draft 18-year-olds? Yes, 126; no, 165.

9. Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries? Yes, 162; no, 126.

10. Should we expect foreign nations to supply bulk of troops for any United Nations army? Yes, 243; no, 48.

11. Should we simply defend our sea bases with our air and sea power, and keep our armies out of foreign countries? Yes, 126; no, 171.

12. Should we hastily prepare for all-out war? Yes, 188; no, 105.

13. Should we gradually strengthen our defenses? Yes, 252; no, 27.

14. Should we raise taxes? Yes, 222; no, 72.

15. Should we substantially reduce nondefense spending? Yes, 173; no, 24.

16. Should we have price controls? Yes, 249; no, 38.

17. Should we have wage controls? Yes, 249; no, 38.

18. Is the honor system of price controls working? Yes, 18; no, 261.

Some of the majority opinions are somewhat contradictory. For example, questions 12 and 13 both drew "Yes" majorities, though adoption of either proposal would automatically exclude the other.

However, the trend of the response indicates that Rolla citizens favor some aid to foreign countries, but think America's commitment in Korea is foolhardy and that foreigners are not contributing their share to the UN forces there.

The Truman ouster demands were somewhat surprising in this city of 9,300, which has a predominantly Democratic population with Old South traditions, and a large cosmopolitan element drawn by the State School of Mines, two Federal agencies, and nearby Fort Leonard Wood.

The comment written by E. B. Aaron, a farmer, was terse and to the point: "Fire Acheson, impeach Truman. Reason: Incompetency. It might save our country. Two more years of this kind of leadership and our country will be Communistic."

PUT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FIRST

Another, who signed his ballot, "A Farmer," wrote: "Replace the President with a man who puts the United States of America before party or self."

"The President should be replaced with a man with less ego and more Americanism," wrote "Taxpayer," who added, "We don't want a socialistic government in the United States."

Former Representative W. P. Elmer, Republican, of Salem, Mo., who long ago predicted that the UN would be merely a debating society, had this comment:

"Quit meddling in other nations' affairs. Enforce the Monroe Doctrine. Look after the United States of America. Quit the United Nations; it is dead, a worse failure than the League of Nations. Quit picking a quarrel with Russia. Just get ready to fight if necessary."

Elmer signed his ballot, "William P. Elmer, isolationist."

To question No. 1, William B. Breuer, combat veteran and businessman, replied with an emphatic, "Hell, yes." His comment:

"Let's stop sticking our nose where it don't belong and daring someone to hit it."

Exemption of Cultural Institutions From Admissions Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article:

JANUARY 24, 1951.

Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While we muster our resources and our physical energies to meet the threat of aggression which endangers our security as a Nation, we must not lose sight of the fact that in so doing we are apt to neglect many of the things which have made America the great Nation it is today.

In our young history we have made great strides in civilization. We are proud of the fact that we are a cultured people, and as such we have become the leaders of the free world.

Rightfully we are now arming to strengthen ourselves against the barbarism of war-bent states. In order that our extensive arms program may be financed, we must tap all practicable sources of revenue.

However, we must not, in the process of building strength to protect our cherished way of life, destroy those very cultural heritages we hold dear to us.

It is unfortunate but factual, that many of our cultural institutions—art museums, symphonic organizations, and opera companies, many the world's greatest—are suffering from financial troubles.

For many companies—the great Metropolitan Opera for one—there is a definite struggle for survival.

The Metropolitan Opera, one of our great national cultural institutions, has found it necessary to appeal to the public for funds to keep it operating. Faced with higher production costs and no possible means of increased revenue, one of the foremost cultural organizations of the world finds itself beaten at the box office.

For the current season, 1950–51, officials of the Metropolitan Opera estimate that its deficit will amount to approximately $400,000.

Immediate relief and assurance of continuance would be obtained by removal of the Federal admissions tax, imposed in 1941 as a war measure and which now approximates the annual deficit of the company.

Up until 1941, the Metropolitan Opera Association retained the full amount charged for its admission tickets. In 1941 the Federal admission tax was imposed. There have been no general increases above the 1941 ticket prices, but today more than 20 percent of all money taken in at the box office is channeled to the Government rather than to the Metropolitan.

In the face of continuously rising costs, the Metropolitan is getting less for what it offers the people than it did in 1941.

The four hundred thousand-odd dollars added to the Government coffers, hardly compensates for the tragic circumstance that may result—death of a great cultural institution.

Mr. Chairman, I myself am an opera lover, and I have always been interested in furthering culture in this country. I might add that I am also very much interested in budgetary requirements of Government and have for some time advocated heavier taxes to meet the costs of defense mobilization.

However, we are bleeding these cultural institutions of their finances. True, in so doing by building formidable armed strength, we protect their existence. On the other hand it is a case of selling a boy's pet rabbit to insure that there will be money to buy it food.

The leading cultural institutions of the country are being strangled to death by Federal taxes and ever-increasing costs of operation. No one can deny the great measure of pleasure and edifying relaxation they provide for the public. No one can deny that their suspension would be a loss to the country and the cultural world in general.

Therefore, when your great committee considers a new tax bill, I respectfully urge that such great organizations as the Metropolitan Opera Association be classified as exempt from Federal admission taxes, so that they may continue to bring to the people those cultural pleasures which have so largely contributed to make this the greatest civilized Nation on earth.

I respectfully request that your committee invite one of my constituents, Mr. George A. Sloan, of Greenwich, Conn., to a hearing, that he may present the case of the Metropolitan Opera and its dire need for tax relief.

Respectfully,

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Connecticut.

[From Opera News of January 8, 1951]

THE FACTS BEHIND THE DEFICIT—ONCE MORE, METROPOLITAN OPERA FACES A CRISIS

Today survival is our major concern. But it must also be recognized that along with economic, political, and physical survival is a matter of equal import, the continued existence of our culture.

The Metropolitan Opera, a national cultural institution, is today involved in a crisis of survival. Deprived of immediate relief from the Federal admissions tax, which was imposed as a war measure in 1941 (and now approximates the annual deficit) and burdened by the mounting costs of production, the Metropolitan must once more come to its public to state its case. Its future depends on the prompt and generous support of its friends, even to the point of personal sacrifice.

To understand the recurrent financial problem and its acute nature at this time, you are strongly urged to study the following statement and the financial report which follows.

I. FACTS OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

In the 1949-50 season, 131 Metropolitan performances in New York were sold to an average of 90 percent of capacity in a season of 18 weeks. The seating capacity of the Metropolitan is limited to 3,417. There were 56 performances in a 7 weeks' tour at which the average attendance was also at an exceptionally high level. With over-all operating receipts of approximately $3,000,000 (after deducting $454,000 paid out for Federal admissions tax) and contributions from all sources of $52,000, the deficit for the season amounted to approximately $430,000.

For the current season 1950-51, it is estimated that the operating deficit will amount to around $400,000. This estimate assumes that the percentage of attendance will be as high as in the previous season and includes the additional revenues from the combination of three first performances; also, the deficit will be reduced by approximately $120,000, representing voluntary contributions of a considerable number of subscribers in a generous response to the appeal made to them to donate an amount equivalent to the admissions tax. The Association is deeply grateful for this assistance and for donations from the Metropolitan Opera Guild and others who have made our fine productions possible.

The deficit for the past season and the prospective deficit for the current season will exhaust the cash resources unless replenished from other sources.

II. THE FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX

At the present time the Federal admissions tax is a major factor in the annual operating deficit of the Metropolitan.

Until 1941 the Metropolitan Opera Association retained the full amount charged for its tickets. In that year, as a wartime measure, the Federal admissions tax was imposed on the Association for the first time.

Since then there have been no general increases above the ticket prices of 1941, but today 20 percent of the money paid through the box office window goes to the Government rather than to the Metropolitan. Thus, the Metropolitan Opera, in the face of skyrocketing costs, is actually getting less for what it offers the public than it did in 1941. It is, therefore, the hope of the Metropolitan Opera Association that the Congress will restore to opera companies and symphonic orchestras the full exemption from the Federal admissions tax which they formerly enjoyed, and so remedy a condition which threatens the very existence of the leading musical institutions of the country. These cultural institutions are operated for the public benefit. They require philanthropic support to survive. Therefore, they should not be penalized by taxation.

Restoration of exemption from the admissions tax is essential to enable the Metropolitan to keep the annual deficits (which will be further adversely affected by the continuous inflationary trend of costs) within manageable proportions. This of itself, however, will not suffice to meet the present financial problem of the Metropolitan. Even if exemption were to be granted in the near future, it could afford only relatively little financial relief to the current 1950-51 season. Since the cash resources of the Association will be virtually exhausted by the deficits of the past and present season, it will be necessary to replenish these funds irrespective of any tax exemption granted in order to assure a 1951-52 season of opera of the highest artistic quality.

III. RISING COSTS

Production of opera of the highest artistic standards traditional with the Metropolitan, is at all times an expensive operation. The artistic policies of the Metropolitan as set forth by Rudolf Bing, our new general manager, are as follows:

"The Metropolitan Opera is and must remain predominantly an American institution. It also is—and we hope will remain—the world's leading opera house. As such, its public has the right to hear the greatest singers of our day—the greatest internationally as well as nationally. Under my management the Metropolitan Opera will continue its policy of furthering American talent and importing the best Europe and the world has to offer. It will continue to present to its audiences the masterpieces of the past, as well as those which living composers—Americans included, we hope—will produce; it will attempt to adapt its scenic, dramatic and visual aspects to more contemporary lines, and in short will strive faithfully to serve its faithful public."

For the presentation of the 18 to 25 operas in a season's repertory of the Metropolitan, there is required an organization of some 600 persons, comprising about 100 artists, conductors, and stage directors, an orchestra of about 90, a large chorus, a ballet, a stage crew of about 85, and about 200 staff personnel, comprising scenery designers, various supporting technicians, and the administrative staff which directs the home season and the national tour.

The services of many artists are obtained in competition with concert theaters and with other major opera houses of the world, practically all of which are government subsidized. Furthermore, in the United States there is a direct relationship between the scale of ticket prices and the basic wage scale of artists. All employees are unionized. Accordingly, the basic wage scales paid by the Metropolitan are the highest prevailing anywhere in the operatic field, due to rising living costs and comparable wage scales in the United States.

IV. WHAT IS NEEDED

Constant study of economy measures is carried on. During the past year a committee, appointed by the board of directors, has made an extensive study of the possibility of building a new, modern opera house of adequate seating capacity which would provide higher revenue and higher operating economies and meet the increased public demand for opera. Another committee appointed by the board has been studying the possibility of complete rehabilitation of the existing house with a view to effecting major improvements backstage and in the auditorium and also looking to operating economies and additional revenue. Continuing consideration is being given to both of these possibilities, although action must be deferred until the present disturbing international situation becomes less ominous. Operating expenses are being kept to a minimum commensurate with the operating requirements of this great repertory company.

Indeed, for assistance in the solution of its serious financial problems the association must not only look for eventual relief from the Federal admissions tax but for the sympathetic cooperation of its subscribers, of other opera goers, of music lovers, and of the many millions of its broadcast audience—in sum, of all who recognize that the Metropolitan is a great institution, the continuance of which is essential to the musical and cultural life of the Nation.

GEORGE A. SLOAN,
Chairman,
Metropolitan Opera Association.

The FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Robert W. Dick, president of the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., with which he enclosed an article in the December 1950 Reader's Digest entitled "Why I No Longer Fear the FBI" by Morris L. Ernst.

Because of my high regard for the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker,

I ask that this letter and article be incorporated at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In my opinion, the FBI and its Director are to be complimented for their outstanding achievements over the year—achievements to which many fine Montanans—personal friends of mine, have contributed greatly.

SOCIETY OF FORMER SPECIAL AGENTS
OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 22, 1951.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: This organization, which has been in existence since 1937, represents approximately 2,000 former special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Recently, there was a scurrilous attack on the work of that Bureau in a book entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." We understand every Member of Congress was furnished with a free copy of this book by the publisher and/or the author.

The members of this society consider the book not only an attack on the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, Mr. Hoover, but also an attack on our entire membership, all of whom have formerly been associated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The allegations and insinuations in the book that ex-FBI agents are labor spies are unwarranted, unjust, and without any basis in fact. In fact, the vast majority of our membership are either practicing attorneys or certified public accountants. The remainder hold responsible positions in industry and the Government. Several former agents are members of the judiciary and others are Members of Congress. All our members having been special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation certainly have first-hand knowledge about the work of the Bureau, and we wish to record our objections to this book in the strongest possible terms.

The book was presented to the public as an objective work and in the interests of national security. We are sure if you have examined the book, you will have found that it is neither. You have probably noted the author's tricky placement of material out of context and that he has compiled nothing but derogatory remarks. The author has failed to make any mention of the Bureau for the 14-year period between 1924 and 1938, and its outstanding achievements in that particular period.

We could comment upon the book at length but realize that the charge of prejudice could always be leveled at us because of our prior association with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is for that reason that we wish to bring forcibly to your attention the attached article appearing in the December 1950 issue of Reader's Digest by Morris L. Ernst, counsel, American Civil Liberties Union.

We have made no effort to determine when Mr Ernst prepared his article for the Reader's Digest but are confident that it was a mere coincidence that it appeared in print about the time of the publication of the book, The Federal Bureau of Investigation. We are sure Mr. Ernst is free of prejudice and that his article is a complete refutation of the attack made in the book upon the Bureau. You will note Mr. Ernst states he has been studying the Bureau since 1939. When one who has dedicated himself to the preservation of personal liberties to the extent that Mr. Ernst has, gives his approval to the operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, you can be sure that such approbation was not lightly given.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. DICK,
President, Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc.

WHY I NO LONGER FEAR THE FBI

(By Morris L. Ernst, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union; author of The First Freedom, America's Primer, etc.)

I still remember my start of surprise when I read in the paper one morning in 1939 that J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had asked the United States Attorney General not to endorse a law that would legalize a free use of wire-tapping. Why was Mr. Hoover opposing a law which would make his own work much easier? His own words, published soon afterward, gave me the answer: "I do not wish to be the head of an organization of potential blackmailers."

I had been hearing criticisms that the FBI was made up of "witch hunters" hounding loyal citizens out of their jobs on the flimsiest sort of rumor; that they tapped telephone wires indiscriminately, learning everybody's private business.

Ever since I read that newspaper item I have been studying the FBI. I would like to record here what I have learned.

As a liberal with a long record of aggressive fighting for the preservation of personal liberties, I am inclined to view all law-enforcement officers with a wary eye, and not without reason—too many times they break the law in the performance of their duties.

I grew up in New York where there was often a wanton disregard for the rights and dignity of human beings. Large numbers of newcomers to American freedom let the cops bulldoze them. In their native lands they had been used to police brutalities, and in their new home they did not know that the laws protected them.

Such disregard of individual rights, expanded on a national scale, seemed to me a positive danger, for national police have almost invariably abused their power. It was therefore utterly confounding to me to discover that our Federal police agency was doing its work with a fervid insistence on respecting the rights and privileges of individuals.

When a skeptical person like myself reads that of all the trials in which the FBI was involved last year 97 percent ended in conviction, he is likely to have cynical reservations. And when he learns that 94 percent of the convictions were based on pleas of guilty, he is bound to ask: "How were these confessions obtained?"

Nazi and Communist courts have taught us that a plea of guilty may prove nothing more than that a man's will can be broken. One rarely hears such charges against the FBI. In our courts of appeal—where accusations are heard of unfair treatment and violations of constitutional rights—the charge is almost never raised against the FBI.

However, I did not rely on this indication alone, nor even on my study of case reports. I wrote articles in which I asked readers to send me any evidence they might have that the FBI had violated a person's constitutional rights. My scoreboard shows a remarkable absence of such accusations. On the contrary, all the evidence indicates that the FBI as a matter of unvarying policy has played fair with criminals and suspects.

This record is of profound importance because events in recent years have brought the FBI into quasi-political problems. Here the danger to personal liberties could easily become acute. The necessity for inquiring into political activities and associations is a new thing in our country. We began this Nation with a great gamble in our hearts—the conviction that, if all opposing viewpoints were allowed free expression, truth in the end would win out.

The progress of our country has so far justified our forefathers' faith in the potency of truth. But in the last 20 years a new enemy—and a complex problem—has arisen to confuse us. New political movements, by underhanded methods, seek to bypass the honest competition of ideas. We face an invisible underground where Fascists and Communists work furtively and zealously against our freedom and our ideas of decency.

Something had to be done about that, and the FBI had to do it. What was its task? To bring the facts up from underground so that all the people can know what is being plotted.

It is natural that loyalty investigations should give us qualms. We shudder to authorize wire-tapping and other forms of spying. But they seem necessary if we are to preserve our freedom. They have been forced upon us by the underground.

I am unwilling to ignore the danger of the Communist movement in the United States just because the Reds seem few in number. I saw my friend Jan Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's democratic Foreign Minister, in Prague not long before he came to his end. I know intimately the story of Quisling. I know how helpless democratic forces can be, if they do not protect their people against the secret discipline, the abominably careful scheming of totalitarian minorities.

The Communists could never win an election in the United States. They do not expect to do so. The Communist program, like the Ku Klux Klan, can grow only by stealth in dark cellars. J. Edgar Hoover was right when he stood firmly against a plan to outlaw the Communist Party when the first public outcry was made against the Communists. Why drive more of them underground? All that such an act could ever outlaw would be a name. The next day the same revolutionists would turn up under a new title.

Until Congress is wise enough to pass laws which force open operation of all mass movements, we shall have to protect ourselves against secretly organized attack. We can bring all subversive outfits into the open by requiring all mass movements to report to the Government the essential facts about themselves—the names of all their officials, the money they take in and from whom it comes, and how it is spent.

I suggest that the McCarran bill recently passed by Congress will not work because the Communists will either put their organizations underground or abandon them to start other organizations for the same purposes under other names.

The requirement to disclose essential facts is no invasion of privacy. The President's Committee on Civil Rights unanimously recommended that such laws be passed; represented on the committee are members of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and various minority groups. No decent organization hesitates to identify itself; why should any other kind of organization be protected?

Even without such laws, the FBI has handled delicate problems well. On Pearl Harbor Day the Bureau was able to advise the Attorney General of the basis for authorizing the arrest of some 16,000 persons. A few of the 16,000 became my clients. I defended them before hearing boards and was able to help free some of them. In every case there were fair hearings, with every consideration being shown to the defense.

And although I was the lawyer for certain acquitted suspects, I must admit that Mr. Hoover had a justification in picking up my clients; there was cause for suspicion, and no injustice was done.

One Jewish refugee was picked up because she had entertained one of Hitler's most potent underground spies. But it was easy for me to produce conclusive evidence that my client did not know her guest was a Nazi. She was set free, but the authorities had been right to bring her in for questioning.

Largely as a result of the trials of Judith Coplon and Valentin Gubitchev, there has been publicity and much argument about listening in, but both sides seem to overlook the real purpose of FBI wiretapping and its actual extent.

Once of the greatest liberals said in 1941: "I do not believe it—wiretapping—should be used to prevent domestic crimes, with possibly one exception—kidnaping and extortion in the Federal sense. There is, however, one field in which, given the conditions in the world today, wire tapping is very much in the public interest. This Nation is arming for national defense. It is the duty of our people to take every step to protect themselves. I have no compunction in saying that wire tapping should be used against those persons, not citiens of the United States, and those few citizens who are traitors to their country, who today are engaged in espionage or sabotage against the United States."

This statement was made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In fact he established the policy which has since been adhered to by the Attorneys General. Note, however, that FBI agents never undertake wire tapping on their own authority; permission must first be obtained from the Attorney General. Furthermore, wire tapping evidence cannot be used in Federal courts. Its only value to the FBI is in opening up leads for inquiry.

The loyalty investigation program has created a misconception about the FBI's function. Every American should understand that the FBI does not try Government employees. It merely serves various Government bodies as a reporting agency. When a reporting agency has the power to edit, it can make anyone appear a devil or a hero. But the FBI does not edit. It gathers the facts about a Federal employee and turns over its findings to the head of the department. And that is all it does, or can do, except that it frequently is able to save a suspect in his job when rumor is doing its best to get him fired. J. Edgar Hoover cannot fire a single person. His reports do not even contain recommendations. The FBI turns in all the evidence it finds—including unverified tips, rumors, gossip—everything. It adds comments and evaluation of their accuracy, and there its responsibility ends. It is up to the heads of administrative agencies to act.

It would be folly to ignore rumors, or even anonymous messages; an unsigned note was instrumental in sending the notorious General Meyers[1] to prison. Ditto for thousands of less spectacular examples. To abandon that policy would be to assign to Hoover's assistants the duty, and the power, to screen the reports. I should be very much disturbed if police agents were permitted to withhold evidence on their judgment of its value. Far better the present system—the complete reports go to the responsible official; everything is in the dossier, with a careful comment on each item, whether it is a fact, probability, or rumor.

In my study of the FBI it soon became clear that lies were being spread against it. For example, it has been said and printed repeatedly that agents in loyalty investigations demand to know whether a suspect reads certain magazines of leftist tinge. This charge is a lie. Whenever he hears of the statement being made, Hoover calls for the facts—and invariably everybody backs down. They "heard it somewhere," they "can't remember where." Directives to FBI agents specifically forbid such questions, unless the reading matter is published by the Communist Party.

Of course, some agents may blunder or offend. When that happens, write J. Edgar Hoover. He will see your complaint and it will be gone into thoroughly. I have personally checked about 100 such complaints and I have yet to find one piece of evidence of improper questioning by agents.

The real difficulty in loyalty investigations is that there is almost no way of proving that a person is a Communist. The suspect, if a party member, would deny it. Communist doctrine holds that it is right and proper to lie and cheat. This fact makes new techniques necessary.

Yet in spite of alarms and outcries, nothing oppressive has been done.

It surprised me to learn that, of 2,873,180 employees whose records were examined by the FBI, all but 12,825 were promptly cleared. This minority being further investigated, only 230 employees were finally dismissed. In 163 cases the employees appealed and were given their jobs back. One significant factor must be noted—1,474 resigned before their cases came up. Actually the FBI is now being criticized for not having found as many subversives as it should have.

A real smear campaign has been carried on against Hoover's work. Those who feared the Bureau, as I once did, will be glad to know the facts. The FBI is unique in the history of national police. It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom. It invites documented complaints against its agents. It has zealously tried to prevent itself from violating the democratic process.

Among liberals I am by no means alone in this opinion. Awhile ago Roger Baldwin, formerly director of the American Civil Liberties Union, wrote to J. Edgar Hoover:

"It seems to me that your bureau has accomplished an exceedingly difficult task with rare judicial sense."

For me, that sums up the record.

[1] Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers, former Air Force purchasing officer, convicted of inducing a former business associate to lie under oath about irregular war contracts in which Meyers was involved.

Proposed Withdrawal From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 25 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Henderson Plans Evacuate Korea Meeting Tonight," which was published in the Evansville Courier, Evansville, Ind., of January 18, 1951.

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

HENDERSON PLANS EVACUATE KOREA MEETING TONIGHT—MAYOR SAYS PETITION TO DEMAND UNITED STATES TROOPS BE RECALLED

HENDERSON, KY., January 17.—Mayor Otis A. Benton said Wednesday morning that a mass meeting will be held at 7:30 p. m. Thursday at the Henderson courthouse for the purpose of drafting a resolution demanding the withdrawal of American troops from Korea "where they are engaged in a useless battle."

Benton said that unless the policies of the Democrats in power are changed, the Democratic Party will be destroyed. "The Democrats are on the verge of handing the Government over to the Republicans for the next 50 years unless we alter our course."

ASKS MOTHERS ATTEND

Benton said he is urging mothers of all soldiers, and all other women, too, to attend the meeting and speak for their rights.

"Our young men are being slaughtered in Korea in a battle. They know not for what they are fighting. Our own Leslie Powell has returned home and says the boys don't know why they are there."

WAS SECOND CASUALTY

Powell was Henderson's second casualty in the Korea police action. He was wounded at Taegon, 17 days after landing at Pusan. He spent 5 months in Army hospitals and then was granted a furlough home.

The mayor declared that "Russia is in no condition to declare all-out war. They are short of a lot of things, one of the essentials being gasoline. They are out-smarting us by having us battle at a half dozen points in the world. They are weakening us by such tactics and find that we are first-class suckers."

The city's chief executive said that when the resolution is completed, it will be signed, and then sent to Washington, demanding that the American boys be removed from that troubled spot. "I hope that other cities will take such stands before it is too late."

At the meeting a civil-defense program also is to be established.

Free Prices, the Only Source of Ample Production for War or Peace—4,000 Years of Failure of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I want very briefly to give you a little sketch of 4,000 years of uninterrupted failure of price controls as applied in the experience of nations from the beginning of civilization. We have heard from time to time that our experience with price controls dates from Leon Henderson, or from 1942.

But our economic freedom has deep roots in our history and is supported by reason and experience. The president of Princeton, John Witherspoon, in a letter to George Washington, said:

> Fixing the prices of commodities has been attempted by law in several States among us, and it has increased the evil it was meant to remedy, as the same practice has done since the beginning of the world.

Is that really true? What does the experience of mankind teach about this fundamental issue, which touches the life of every man, woman, and child?

CONTROLS TRIED 4,000 YEARS AGO

The temptation for people in power to tamper with prices and production seems to be a very ancient human game. Thus, in the Laws of Hammurabi, King of Babylon—2285–2242 B. C.—we find wage controls for boatmen, reapers, threshers, shepherds, laborers, artisans, bricklayers, tillers, stone cutters, milkmen, and carpenters. Regulated also

were builders' fees and warehousing, as well as rental of cows in milk, calves, oxen, wagons, and freight and passenger boats. On the basis of historical evidence, we know that ancient history, throughout the changing centuries, is characterized by a never-ending succession of popular upheavals against tyrannical rules and regulations imposed upon the people from above. This continued strife reveals one of the fundamental themes of human history—a struggle between regimentation and freedom.

We find later laws in ancient history, like, for example, the Hittite Code—1350 B. C.—which was discovered in Baghaz Koi in Asia Minor, that attempted to establish provision for wages and prices. The very fact that such laws had to be abolished or drastically revised under popular pressure indicates that even in ancient times rulers met with deep-seated resentment against their attempts to block the activities and trade of their citizens.

ROME HAD FREEDOM

History tells us that the Roman Republic, under a constitution guaranteeing freedom, became the envy of the "barbarians" of other countries. Its soldiers were increasingly victorious in their conflicts with the half-hearted mercenaries of neighboring nations that enjoyed little freedom. The glory that was Rome extended throughout what is now Western Europe and northern Africa because Rome was the center of freedom. There were no planned economies. As Gibbon tells us, freedom, honor, and justice were universally recognized virtues. And the freedom of Rome extended to its colonies.

The recurrent famines of earlier days were experienced with less and less frequency. Rome gave the civilized world the highest standard of living then known to mankind. But what happened? The leaders reached out for power. The republic became an empire. At first the emperors were cautious. They talked freedom as they planned a police state. Gibbons says:

Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the senate and the people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom. A feeble senate and enervated people cheerfully acquiesced in the pleasing illusion.

And so the people were fooled by bread and circuses. They looked to the government to supply more and more of their needs. Production declined everywhere. Prices skyrocketed.

ROMAN CONTROLS FAILED MISERABLY

Emperor Diocletian decided to maintain his popularity with promises to fix prices and reduce the cost of living. So in A. D. 301 he issued an imperial edict fixing the prices of commodities for the whole Roman Empire. His grandiose scheme was ushered in with a fanfare of benevolent propaganda. In fact, in the preface to the edict, the Roman Emperor shows an insight into the laws of psychological propaganda technique which is as startling as it is up to date. He assures his people that the coming economical control system is built on the highest motives of making the whole nation participate "in the blessings of that peace for which we have laboriously striven." He continues that in order to make this price-fixing system work, it is necessary for the rulers like "watchful parents of the whole human race" to help the people with remedies from above, and that such measures have become necessary, since humanity cannot achieve such good results by its own free action.

The edict goes on to explain how the people have become greedy; how exorbitant profits were being made; how monopoly was running wild, and the people, therefore, needed protection from foes within as well as foes without. The only cure was a complete over-all control of food, clothing, wages, and so forth. Reading the list of commodities which the Emperor asked his Chester Bowles of that day, Maximianus, to take control of, reads astonishingly like our own modern OPA lists: Farm products, dyes, needles, feathers, filling for upholstery, seeds, wine, oil, meat, poultry, fats, sea food, building timber, wooden posts, finished wagons, agricultural implements, and so on ad infinitum.

In order to enforce his imperial law, Diocletian built up a huge bureaucracy to administer his universal price-control system. A contemporary observer has characterized the situation in the following words:

The number of ministers, of magistrates, of officers, and of servants who filled different departments of the state, multiplied beyond the example of former times.

The price-control police forces of Diocletian had as their legal weapon, severe penalties against any breach of the law. Death was the punishment for those who dared sell above maximum prices. Death also for the buyer who aided and abetted him. Death, too, for those who bought and sold illegal stocks. However, human nature being what it is, these penalties did not affect the general picture, and no bureaucratic machinery or legal apparatus could prevent a complete break-down of the law of supply and demand with all the economic and social evils resulting from it.

Economic historians of the Roman Empire find that a situation developed which was as tragic as it was prophetic. Because the scarcity of production was heightened by the interference from price-control laws, prices on consumers' goods in the actual market rose to catastrophic heights. The control system which was put into operation to combat inflation, in this manner actually created inflationary trends which broke the backbone of the economic life of a great empire. Everywhere the results soon became visible: Building and construction stopped entirely. The arts and sciences fell into decay to such an extent that modern historians can recognize immediately the crudity and puerility of the craftsmanship of this period. Artistic creativeness and inventive skill did no longer thrive in this new atmosphere of economic tyranny.

History goes on to point out that while the economic waste was incredible the trades sank to ever lower levels. Poverty was created among the broad masses, while the merchants and small entrepreneurs were impoverished into bankruptcy. Landowners and manufacturers, who were the hardest hit, lost interest in a system of economic slave control that took away the private inventiveness and enterprise of the human genius.

In the realm of agriculture the situation became so bad that the Emperor found it necessary to order the farmers and the farm laborers controlled by serfdom under state supervision. That this measure could only lead to a worsening of the agricultural situation is perfectly explainable by the well-known historical law, that soil tilled by slave labor never yields abundant fruits such as land cultivated by free farmers.

To meet this general extremity of national economics, the Emperor, therefore, naturally turned to the device which is as common as it is artificial, namely, of exorbitant taxation. Taxes and surtaxes multiplied in a hopeless effort to fill an ever-empty treasury.

Thus ends the only total price-control system which the history of the Roman Empire records. Diocletian alone, of all the Roman emperors, was foolish enough to attempt it. If he had listened to the history of his empire he might have observed how earlier attempts of partial price fixing under emperors like Tiberius, Commodus, and Alexander Severus all had broken down. However, like many panic-stricken tyrants in the history of mankind, Diocletian apparently fancied that, if the price-control system only could be made totalitarian and foolproof, it would work where partial attempts have broken down. He lived to see the tragic mistake of his economic tyranny over a whole nation's life, since his experiment ended with such a complete failure that the edict had to be repealed as useless and unenforceable. Soon after the poverty-stricken and indignant people forced his abdication, on May 1 A. D. 305.

The more serious lesson of this Roman price-control experiment is grasped, however, only if one realizes that its long-range effect on the Roman Empire was directly connected with the economic destruction of the greatest empire of ancient history. As the historian, Jules Toutain, has pointed out, the economic breakdown of the Roman Empire made it fall an easy prey to the attack of the barbarians who, a few generations later, poured in over the borders of the Empire south of the Danube and west of the Rhine. What had once been a proud and great nation had deteriorated into a mass of people which had lost both the productive initiative and the national self-esteem which make a people strong and healthy. One of the fundamental laws of national defense is that only a nation in which freedom has been preserved under law is able and willing to take up arms in defense of human rights and human dignity

Upon the grave of the Roman Empire the well-known historian, Samuel Dill, of Oxford, has written the following epitaph, which we may do well to remember:

The system of bureaucratic despotism, elaborated finally by Diocletian and Constan-

tine, produced a tragedy in the truest sense, such as history has seldom exhibited: In which, by an inexorable fate the claims of fancied omnipotence ended in humiliating paralysis of administration; in which determined effort to remedy social evils only aggravated them until they became unendurable; in which the best intentions of the central power were, generation after generation, mocked and defeated alike by irresistible laws of human nature and by hopeless perfidy and corruption in the servants of government.

It is not surprising that kings, who were notorious for their excessive egotism, should be found in the list of rulers bent upon price control. There is Philip IV of France who, in 1306, antedated Hitler's Jewish pogroms by six centuries, and who created a dire scarcity of wheat, bread, and clothing throughout his nation by his price-control system.

There are English kings, like Henry III and George II, who tampered with prices of grain and bread until Parliament rose up in indignation and repealed these royal price-control attempts.

There was Edward II, who, on an island like England, hit upon the ridculous scheme of safeguarding production level on sea food by a control system which was inaugurated as a benefit for the people, but actually turned out to be such an impossible flop that all fish disappeared from the markets in the British Isles.

FRENCH CONTROLS FAILED

A complete survey of ancient, medieval, and modern price-control systems proves that they created scarity instead of production and ill-will instead of cooperation. One of the most illustrious and meaningful examples of this historical law we find as we turn to the history of the French Revolution.

When the leftists of that day—the Jacobins—decided to destroy French culture and French enterprise, they made use of the old tyrannical medium of a violent price control. Being experts in revolutionary technique, they chose to place iron control upon 39 necessities of life under the agency called committee of public safety.

The picture of what happened to the French revolutionary price-control system runs true to pattern.

As one historian, Andrew Dickson White, wrote in 1876:

The first result of the maximum was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate necessities.

As another historian reports this era:

Prices were fixed. Any attempt to profiteer on necessities was made punishable by death. To break all opposition, the terror was established. The tribunal revolutionaire began sending scores of innocent people to the guillotine every day. Between March of 1793 and July of 1794 nearly 3,000 people were executed in Paris and about 15,000 in the provinces. At Nantes three or four thousand prisoners were thrust into old boats that were sunk in the middle of the river; at Lyon they were shot down in groups of as many as 200 at a time.

The Civil War of the Vendee began in 1793. Insurrection against the revolutionary government spread into Poitou, Anjou, and Brittany. Threat of famine compelled the rationing of food. There was much discontent on that account. The Hébert group attempted to incite the famished people to an attack on the convention. Robespierre acted swiftly. Hébert and his chief lieutenants went to the guillotine. That was in March 1794.

Robespierre, then 35, became the uncontested master of the situation. From April to July 1794, his authority was unchallenged. He moved rapidly toward his goal of complete social equality. It was ordered that the confiscated properties of ehemies of the republic should be given to deserving patriots. Saint-Just was charged with this distribution, and was authorized to revise the code of social institutions in the interest of pure democracy * * * trial by jury was denied to those suspected of conspiracy and the tribunal was authorized to make condemnations without the hearing of witnesses. Heads began to fall faster than ever. It was the Great Terror. In 45 days there were 1,285 executions.

The Great Terror was an expression of Robespierre's impatience to realize his ideal state. He wished to destroy all opposition to the establishment of social and economic equality. But he had overreached himself. The razor of the republic began to lose its popularity. The pitiless apostle of liberty, fraternity, and equality began to lose prestige. The word "tyrant" was murmured. * * * On July 28, 1794, Robespierre and his brother, Saint-Just, and 19 others were executed. That ended the terror, and it all but ended the republic. Democracy had followed autocracy to the guillotine. The death of Robespierre ended the dream of pure democracy and equality. No man dared to espouse the perilous cause that had brought death to its devotees. The Robespierre legislation in the interest of equality was either suppressed or ignored and, to the delight of the merchants, price control was abandoned.

All price fixers do not meet so violent an end as that of Robespierre but the wrath of the hungry and disillusioned people always descends upon them.

A sigh of relief and a new spirit of self-governed activities swept through France. The farmers plowed and planted, and during the month of July 1795 they could once again harvest their crops as free men after the disastrous and negative years of revolutionary price control. Liberty had conquered once more.

EARLY AMERICAN OPA'S

Coming now to the United States, we find the resistance to Government tampering with the laws of supply and demand greatest of all. A limited price control was attempted during the American Revolutionary War, but the alert and freedom-loving citizens, taught by experience, soon totally rejected this Government interference with the economic life of the States.

Led by Connecticut and Massachusetts, the New England States went in for regulating prices early in the Revolutionary War. This emergency measure was motivated quite as much by the fact that the Continental currency lost its monetary value as by the self-evident fact that British blockade created a severe shortage of consumers' goods. The inevitable result was that the 1774 price level soon broke down, and as early as the spring of 1777 Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire were forced to raise the level for maximum prices. In Rhode Island, however, the town of Providence objected strenuously. It directed its representatives in the legislature to fight such measures, as they created scarcity and produced animosity.

In Connecticut, Governor Trumbull warned in a public statement:

If we affix a low price to provisions and articles of importation we shall find that the farmer will cease to till the ground for more than is necessary for his own subsistence, and the merchant will not risk his fortune on a small and precarious prospect of gain.

The good Governor was really advocating what later generations prefer to call controlled inflation, even though he must be excused for not knowing the modern devices of economic deception called farm subsidies and cost-plus contracts.

Soon the States, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, began to labor under keen misgivings, however, that the price control as such was a deceptive technique. This discovery led to an interstate convention being called in New Haven in January 1778. The war was still raging and the longed-for victory for independence still did seem far away. In a stampede of economic panic, the delegates voted, therefore, to adopt a price advance of 75 percent above the 1774 price level.

What was meant to be a radical cure threatened to become a disaster, since a run-away inflation soon began to encompass the national economic life. The Continental Congress very quickly realized that it had to reverse its policy in order to avert sure economic doom. In its meeting of April 8, 1778, it declared, therefore, to the sorely tried war-torn Nation:

It hath been found by experience that limitation on the prices of commodities is not only ineffective for the purpose proposed, but likewise productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and grievous oppression of individuals.

The courageous and wise pronouncement by the Continental Congress had a reassuring effect upon the States. In fact, so much so that price fixing was permitted to lapse for about a year. During this period, the American people discovered that price fixing could not serve as a safeguard against the heavy inflation which their just War of Independence gave them to carry as an additional price for freedom. They recognized this as an economic fact which proved that, measured in money values, they all were becoming poorer as together they were winning their freedom.

In 1779, the last brief attempt was made at price fixing as a remedy to control a deeply wounded war economy. On May 25, 1779, the town of Boston adopted a price schedule for 15 articles on a month-to-month basis. And in July of the same year, a State convention at Concord adopted a general price level, stipulating that "violators were to have their names published in the newspapers as enemies of the country." The background for this threat against violators

was, of course, the fact that the very outcome of the whole war hung in the balance.

Yet, even so, history records that penalties were rarely imposed. Indeed, the laws were, for the most part, not enforced. They remained, as Prof. Allan Nevins has pointed out, on the statute books.

And as soon as the fortunes of war turned, the States rid themselves of the fruitless and scarcity-producing price-control system, which they had grasped in a moment of panic. It is to the undying glory of the men and women of the Revolutionary period that a whole year before Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, all the States had already repealed their price-control laws.

Such was the depth of their belief in freedom as a producer of goods and services. Price control in America was over—not again to be revived for 160 years.

They fought not merely for independence. They fought for freedom and learned right in the middle of war itself that freedom produces more food and clothing and shelter than controls can produce. They emancipated freedom from Europe and European controls.

During the postwar period, under the Articles of Confederation, our colonial ancestors lived in an era of high prices. The unsecured revolutionary currency was issued in such quantities that "not worth a continental" became a popular phrase. The monetary situation interfered seriously with trade and tended to foment discord, distrust, and disunity.

It was in this atmosphere that the Constitutional Convention met in 1787. It is worthy of note that no delegate to this convention seriously proposed that our Government should have the power to fix prices. Their generation had learned that Government price fixing would not work and so this power was not listed among those delegated powers which the people gave their Federal Government.

To exercise such power now is sheer usurpation. It was the adoption of our Constitution with its limitation on control that brought the new era of food and shelter. We need to remind ourselves that this era started right here in America. Our example spread around the world until the world rejected freedom for many forms of collectivism. With that has come again the ghastly prospects of starvation and famine. That has been the rule of life throughout history except where for brief periods of time freedom of the people has been maintained.

This has always existed whenever land has been used in common and regulated by some central authority. The planned economies of lords, kings, and dictators have always resulted in famine and want.

Freedom, which is synonymous with ample food and shelter, is the first great achievement of modern times. Under the Constitution, Americans were free to own their lands, work out their own plans, and enjoy the fruits of their labor without regulations by authority or oppressive taxation. With this freedom has come agricultural science and invention of machinery, increased supplies of food, intellectual advance, improved means of communication, steam, electricity, and all the wonders that only the imaginative and creative minds and spirits of free men and women may comprehend for the future blessings of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has clarified one fundamental thing; namely, the fact that we are today witnessing the old, old fight between two contradictory political systems of government. On the one hand we have the advocates of government control over national life and national production. They willingly abandon freedom. To adopt price controls in peacetime would be clear proof that the European idea of government control and government domination and compulsion has moved permanently into the political philosophy and political life of this great Republic.

Those who do not believe that freedom will solve our economic problems should stop fooling themselves. They continue to talk about freedom, but they do not really believe in it. They give lip service to liberty, but the moment the test comes they call for continued and increased power for public officials.

Mr. Speaker, the test is here. The test has been long overdue. Are we going to give our people, and the rest of the world true statesmanship, built on first principles?

I am reminded of the words of a free American from the debate on price regulations of February 14, 1777, in the Continental Congress, where Mr. Benjamin Rush stated:

> The salvation of this continent depends upon the authority of this Congress being held as sacred as the cause of liberty itself. It becomes us, therefore, to be careful of the remains of our authority and character.

We know that what this Nation and other nations expect from the United States at this crucial moment in history is production and more production of vital materials of war, foods and clothing and shelter for consumption at home, and especially food for people abroad. The managed, controlled, and forced spirit of man will neither produce nor work nor fight nor make sacrifices necessary to win a war and rebuild a world civilization which was wrecked by an evil domination system which was built on absolute government control.

It is deplorable that 17 years of false indoctrination has dulled our sense of liberty, our passion for its products. Having won a complete victory over government-controlled systems in Germany and Japan, we too are in danger of continuing to follow the false philosophy of good coming from government interference, the Hegelian doctrine of the omnipotent state.

The Members of this House are the representatives of a free people against these prophets of doom and gloom and their fundamental philosophy of life and Government so completely out of line with truth and fact. I agree with Mr. Chester Bowles that "what is at stake is our entire economic future," only I believe that our future, as our glorious past, should be dedicated to freedom and faith and not to price control and fear.

We have had corruption and we have had our black markets because we have had man-made control instead of adherence to that fundamental law called the law of supply and demand. A natural law which is as inevitable and basic as the law of gravity cannot be set aside by any law even of Congress. Freemen meeting in a free market doing their free selling and buying proves to be far more honest in the long run than people who have Government officials looking over their shoulders every time they turn or every time they finish a product. Freedom is more honest than government and so much more productive.

Everything that is happening now points to the fact that if we now continue to substitute expediency for faith in freedom we are on the road to weakening more and more the central idea upon which the Republic was founded. We are on the way to corruption and disintegration. To guarantee that this catastrophe shall not happen to the last bastion of free enterprise or free economy in the whole world we must keep free from price controls and hold fast to our free country.

If we cannot read history so well or act so courageously as our forefathers in dealing with price controls, we can imitate them. Let us take a leap of faith in freedom if we would win the war, have food, clothing, shelter, and the good life.

Surely Democrats can remember back as far as 1946 when the evils of OPA elected a Republican Congress. The mistakes of history ought not be repeated within four short years.

Let's Call It War or Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial from a recent edition of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier.

To my mind the writer of this editorial hits a high point of reason and logic when he says:

> Korea has no strategic defense value for the United States. The only reason for fighting there is to establish the principle of collective action against aggression. If the other nations of the UN are unwilling to supply sufficient troops to aid in establishing that principle, then it has failed and we should admit it. Then we can concentrate on our own defense, knowing that collective security is a myth.

Here is the full text of the editorial:

LET'S CALL IT WAR OR QUIT

The American public is deeply dissatisfied with the attitude of the Government in Washington toward the Korean War.

Seven American divisions are fighting Chinese Communists in Korea, yet Washington says we are not at war with Communist China.

Although the United Nations did not hesitate to call it aggression when North Koreans attacked, the UN has so far failed to brand the Chinese aggressors for doing exactly the same thing.

Although Washington says it cannot afford to reinforce our Korean armies because that would leave Europe open to attack, it refuses to utilize the 400,000 trained Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. And remember, the Nationalists are members of the United Nations.

Although billions of dollars are being spent to create atomic bombs, Washington says we cannot use them in Korea or against Communist China because this is only a police action. To the men in Korea and their families back home, however, a casualty in a police action is the same as a casualty in a war.

Although Washington does not have any plans for the eventual liberation of Korea, it proposes to fight this costly, bitter retreat, apparently in the belief that it enhances our prestige to be driven off the peninsula rather than retire voluntarily from a war that we choose not to fight.

Apparently, however, not only the public at home is dissatisfied. Maj. Gen. Emmet O'Donnell, returning from command of Far East bombing, demanded that authorization be given for use of the atomic bomb. "If we're going to fight," he says, "let's not hit 'em light, for heaven's sakes. * * * I believe we should have cracked the Chinese Communists hard and smacked the hell out of them as soon as we had them identified."

The American people have no desire to get bogged down in a senseless war on the Asiatic continent against Chinese masses. But it is time to fight it or not fight it. It is time either to use the Chinese Nationalists and the atomic bomb in Korea or get out. It is time to establish military objectives that are worth fighting for.

Korea has no strategic defense value for the United States. The only reason for fighting there is to establish the principle of collective action against aggression. If the other nations of the UN are unwilling to supply sufficient troops to aid in establishing that principle, then it has failed and we should admit it. Then we can concentrate on our own defense, knowing that collective security is a myth.

If there is anything wrong with that analysis of the situation, then nobody in Washington has yet pointed it out. Fuzzy, inept leadership is defeating us as rapidly as the enemy.

United States May Expand Use of Philippines as Defense Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the American Aviation Daily of January 23, 1951, carries a very important article entitled "United States May Expand Use of Philippines as Defense Base."

The article follows:

UNITED STATES MAY EXPAND USE OF PHILIPPINES AS DEFENSE BASE

MANILA, PHILIPPINES.—It is generally expected here that the Philippine Islands will begin playing an ever-increasing role in far-eastern defense, although to date only Clark Air Force Base and the naval station at Cavite, under long-term lease, are the only evidences of United States military might in the islands. Vast majority of the 20,000,000 population is pro-American, some fiercely so, comprising the largest and almost the only group of friends the United States has in the Far East. There are many skilled workers in the islands suitable to man maintenance and overhaul bases.

Ever since the independent Republic was founded, July 4, 1946, the United States has kept hands off of the Philippine Islands Government, which currently is under severe criticism for being both inefficient and corrupt. But the arrival of additional United States forces, even though these will have nothing to do with internal affairs, will tend to stabilize unsettled conditions.

The Huk guerrilla activity has been on the increase but is not strong enough to be more than a continual nuisance. It is serious but not critical. It is bad enough in the island of Luzon, on which Manila is located, to curtail civilian travel, especially at night, except in the city and large populated areas. But outside of Luzon everything is calm and peaceful. The southern islands might actually be called prosperous, and only some localized tribal activity by the Moros (Moslems) in the far south disturbs the peace.

There are apparently well-authenticated indications that several Red submarines have been operating in the Philippine Archipelago and are presumed to be landing some arms and leaders for the Huks. Also, some aid has been coming by sea.

HUK GUERRILLA TROUBLE

The Huk guerrilla trouble has its origin in internal social and economic conditions, and the Government has done very little to eradicate the source of the troubles. The Communists, very few in number, have capitalized on the social unrest and are beginning to make headway. It is not believed that the use of force by an oppressive government is going to make much real headway against the guerrillas. The only real solution is economic betterment.

Ironically enough, the Huks have ample United States arms. Some of this equipment came as the result of generous and indiscriminate distribution of arms to Filipinos in 1944, when the United States invaded the islands and needed local help to oust the Japs. But GI's have apparently been selling United States equipment ever since. One Huk band seen recently had some very recent United States equipment. Filipino military men have not been beyond selling arms to the guerrillas. So, all in all, primarily through the United States, the Huks have large supplies of guns, ammunition, carbines, and machine guns. Some ex-GI's have been mixed up directly with the Huks.

United States Army and Navy officers have never exercised sufficient control over supplies and personnel, both here and in other areas, and the leakages are considerable. All such dealings have helped demoralize the Filipinos themselves and have lowered the United States prestige.

Generally speaking, Huk activity will not interfere with the greater use of the Philippines as an important "unsinkable aircraft carrier." Only a few wartime air bases are fit for use, but there is ample land available throughout the islands for new ones. Local aviation people hope the United States will install an aircraft overhaul base in the islands.

But the first job of the United States is to give economic assistance to the islands to stabilize the country, without offering support to a weak Government. Only by economic effort can the Huk situation be brought firmly under control.

Food Price Ceilings and Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have within the last week introduced a bill (H. R. 1778) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 in order to eliminate the arbitrarily high ceiling price requirements for agricultural commodities, including food. The imposition of price ceilings and the likelihood that certain agricultural commodities may have to be exempted gives additional urgency to the need for action on this legislation. The existing law requires the ceilings to be the higher of, first, 100 percent of parity; or, second, the highest market price in the base period May 24 to June 24, 1950. If the act is amended as I propose the ceiling price will be the actual support price—instead of the higher parity price, as now required—or the highest market price received by producers of any agricultural commodity during the base period. My bill would make it possible to establish immediate price controls on food and other agricultural commodities.

The Defense Production Act fixes ceilings at not less than 100 percent of the parity price used by the Government as a basis for price supports while the price supports themselves are only 90 percent of such parity or less. Wheat, corn, peanuts, butter, and milk are today selling at 10 percent or more below parity prices but as the law stands now price ceilings would mean a 10 percent or more increase in price on these major commodities. The ceiling price is made mandatory at a higher figure than the price at which the Government actually supports the commodity and regardless of the market price. Yet, under the present law, if the market price is higher—which is the case in beef cattle, lambs, wool, and cotton—then the higher price is the basis for the price ceiling.

I introduced a resolution on the opening day of the session—House Concurrent Resolution 4—requesting the President to exercise his power to impose price controls on cost-of-living items now. Price controls are essential and while we wait the cost of living is going to make new highs. This is already indicated by the fact that the cost-of-living index last recorded for the period ended December 31 registered a new all-time high. The confidence of the people of the country for the period of emergency and mobilization must be fortified by these controls protecting the standard of living and the integrity of their earnings. Clerical and office workers, Government employees and those receiving fixed incomes from annuities, estates, and retirement allowances, and so forth, are feeling the pressure very badly.

In addition the confidence of city consumers must be restored. The production of food must be encouraged and no

one wants to see a repetition of the collapse in farm values and agricultural prices of the 1930's. But in a time of maximum demand at high prices it would appear to be only just to the city consumer to adapt the farm parity price program and ceiling prices to the existing situation. Representatives of city districts can well favor fundamental assurances to agricultural producers provided that a fair balance is held between their needs and those of city consumers.

Korea Has Awakened America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, on December 20 I wired the Secretary of State to find ou who committed our forces to Korea without the consent of Congress—never, in my 6 years in Congress, have I had such a flood of mail, 98 percent approving my questions and demanding the answers for themselves. On January 3 he replied, in part, as follows:

> The President, acting upon the unanimous advice of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made the decision to commit the United States Armed Forces in Korea, in accordance with the United Nations Security Council resolution to stop Communist aggression there.

Now, the President, again disregarding Congress, insists he has the power and proposes to order our 18-year-olds to Europe, or other parts of the world.

Floods of letters coming to every Congressman ask how we can fight Russia if we are trapped in Korea, or Burma, or Iran, or other parts of the world. It seems like utter madness. They remember that Germany, the best organized for war, lost 5,000,000 men. Russia lost 10,000,000 and still won World War II. Machines could not win against masses of men. They smothered the guns and tanks until they wilted in the heat of their own futile firing. Masses of dead bodies make bridges over barbed-wire entanglements. The United States and Europe together might lose 10,000,000 men in casualties in a land war; and Red China could lose 25,000,000 in casualties, and still win a land war. Obviously, world war III cannot be fought and won like Wars I and II were fought and won.

Besides, the people know this is a war between two dominant ideas: communism against freedom. They see these conflicting ideas in every country. They question how we can persuade allies of Communist sympathies to fight alongside of our masses of men against the Russian masses on land. Before we join forces, our people want to look squarely into the faces of our proposed allies for confidence. Without that our people cannot march their boys beside them in battle. They know that France has 200 Communists in her Chamber of Deputies, or one-third of the whole Chamber; another third are Socialists.

So, this ally, if General Eisenhower can persuade her to fight at all, will send an army alongside composed of one-third Communists, sworn to support Russia and world communism. Another third will be Socialists. What a choice. What a prospect is Italy? Look at England. She wants to make Red China respectable to sit at the table of the family of nations. She grows rich trading with Red China in the materials that spill the blood of our men and hers, too. That is the horrible picture of the infiltration that has taken place in dear old England since World War II. This is not Churchill's England we propose to fight with now. England is now a weak Socialist government, the weakest form known in warfare. She lacks capacity to act at once, like a dictatorship. And she lacks the creative and productive power of freemen.

No European army can be raised now for world war III which would not include a large proportion of Communists and Socialists. That means that every American boy, every American officer in a combined United States-European army such as proposed now, would be at the mercy of or greatly frustrated by Communists and Socialists. The soldier next to our boy, the messenger carrying important secrets, the sentry outside the general's door—all may be Communists. They have proved their ability to infiltrate everywhere. They destroyed Chiang Kai-shek's mainland army and smashed the duly elected republican government of China with the help of the United States Government, itself deeply infiltrated.

The Asia desk in our State Department so manipulated our military and fiscal aid since 1944 to China as to defeat her. She was one of the Big Four powers, one most honorably recognized by all for holding Japan in World War II. It was our own variety of Communist infiltration that helped to put the Red Communists in control of the mainland of China. This was contrary to the United States treaty obligations and our historic policy toward China. It opened the way for Russia to go through China to Burma for food—where she has wanted to go for a century. Only Japan stopped her. And now we have so completely destroyed Japan and Nationalist Free China that there is no organized resistance except, strangely enough, on Korea. We have reason for suspecting that our own infiltration manipulated that, too.

But it has boomeranged. It woke up the American people. They now persist, in increasing numbers, to ask—

First. Why the administration does not clean out the Communists in our midst so they cannot continue to influence military and political decisions

Second. Why do we not help with arms and planes and ships and know-how and with psychological warfare the free forces in China? "Why do not we help Chiang?" is asked a million times. Nobody answers.

Third. Why do we not help the free elements in Europe willing to fight like Chiang, in the same way?

Fourth. Since Europe has 250,000,000 population and greater productive capacity than she had before World War II, why does the President, in his message, now propose that the United States taxpayers pay 90 percent of the total Western World defense costs?

Fifth. Why do we not organize all the free elements in all countries in spite of all the infiltrated governments to strike the Bear by air and sea power, so as to destroy or greatly cripple him where he is? Why not strike his vital bridges and dams and railroads? There are only a few of them. His oil field? There is but one. And his factories for mass armed aggression? There are not too many of them and we know where they are.

Sixth. And why do we not send private and military and religious groups with ideas of freedom and means of liberation behind the iron curtain? Then the oppressed people themselves will help to overcome our common oppressors. We must unite the free people for action. They alone will throw off communism in their midst, in each country, in a kind of united action. Communist-infiltrated governments in each nation will never win again a mass action war against each other. Instead they will destroy each other.

Reducing the Federal Wasteline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD, an address which was given by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D. D., bishop of Worcester, Mass., on November 3, 1950, over station WEEI, in Boston, Mass.

This address, entitled "Reducing the Federal Wasteline," endorses the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which I wholeheartedly approve, and I believe that Bishop Wright's message should be brought to the attention of all our citizens:

REDUCING THE FEDERAL WASTELINE
(By Rev. John J. Wright, D. D.)

Colonel SHERMAN. When the bipartisan Hoover Report was completed and submitted to Congress, Mr. Hoover said: "The burden now shifts from the shoulders of the Commission to the citizens themselves who must undertake a real and continuing responsibility." Under our form of government this transmission of responsibility from the Commission that made this monumental study of our Federal Government, to the shoulders of the citizens themselves—under our form of government—this was a very appropriate charge or challenge and all over the land this challenge has been met and the responsibility is being accepted by thousands of Americans who are interested in a more responsive and responsible Government. One of the best-loved citizens of our Commonwealth has graciously consented to help us by giving us a few words of encouragement on this subject of responsibility. I am honored to introduce to you folks his excellency, John J. Wright, bishop of Worcester.

Bishop WRIGHT. Thank you, Colonel Sherman. The Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report comprises a group of public-spirited citizens who are anxious to alert themselves and their neighbors to the need for regulating government if government is not to regulate us. They have suggested that you would welcome a radio talk on the moral philosophy behind this important report, a report prepared under the leadership of a distinguished American, ex-President Herbert Hoover. The Committee is in an excellent moral position to ask the cooperation of us all in behalf of their effort. First of all, they represent every segment of the community—they are non-partisan. Like the Hoover report itself, the local committee has been endorsed by members of every responsible American party. Speakers of every political persuasion have already appeared on this program. Their intent is in the public interest. Their principal desire is that citizens read, study and understand this authoritative survey of the growth of government administration in America, and of the possibility of curtailing the staggering costs of civil administration. Behind the Hoover report there is a well-defined philosophy, and that philosophy lies also behind the appeal of the Massachusetts Committee to our citizens. This philosophy is what some of us like to call "the philosophy of responsibility." In terms of the problem of increasingly costly and increasingly complex government, that philosophy takes the form of the contention that in a republic every citizen, however humble or obscure, bears his share of responsibility for government—for what government is empowered to do; for what government actually does; for what government costs; what government fails to accomplish.

The philosophy of responsibility, whether as applied to individual citizens or as applied to government itself, is beginning to emerge from a period of eclipse. For a generation or so, the philosophy of responsibility had lost something of its force, certainly in social thinking and, to a great extent, in political theory. There had always been a temptation among men to shuffle off accountability for failure or for incompetency in the face of complicated problems. Shakespeare described and refuted it when he said: "This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, often the surfeit of our own behavior, we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars: as if we were villians by necessity; fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence." But "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings." (Lear and Julius Caesar.)

The philosophy of responsibility, in modern times, has further suffered from the impersonal collectivist theories of society and of the state which have found favor during and since the last century, chiefly, of course, in the completely totalitarian regimes, but in some measure in every modern state. These linked human action more often to material forces, to group controls, rather than to spiritual personality, to individual responsibility, moral or civic. An earlier generation of devout and God-fearing people had recognized, for example, that there is a challenge in some environments and that there are limitations imposed by some heredities, but they still acknowledged that the generality of men remain free despite their environment, despite their heredity—free to change their environment and to improve the results of their heredity. But, more recently, social theory has followed new lines along which it has attempted to lead legal theory and political application. As against the old philosophy of responsibility, there has grown up the theory that misconduct is always abnormal, that what the law calls crime and what conscience calls sin are to be explained largely in terms of causes beyond the control of the sinner or the criminal. In political life, in the collective life of the civil community, this has taken the form of the frequent assertion that problems of expense, bureaucracy, and complication of government are beyond the understanding, let alone the control, of individual citizens, and that we are hopelessly engulfed in circumstances we cannot change.

The philosophy of responsibility, then, has been replaced by the philosophy of excuse, the philosophy of "what can we do about it" or "let George do it," which is the theory of ultimate irresponsibility. This loose philosophy has played particular havoc in the wildfire spread of government bureaus and the decline of individual responsibility on the part of private citizens. For more than a generation it has undermined the moral and legal and individual social responsibilities, upon which the stability of society must repose. Now, at any rate, it seems at long last to be coming out of its eclipse.

It is certainly good for civilization that the philosophy of responsibility should be reaffirmed and that the philosophy of excuse should be subordinated to it, cut down to size. Civilization was not achieved by any such philosophy as that of excuse, by any vagueness about accountability or about debts and how to meet them. Mankind did not emerge from recurring periods of social decline and even savagery by any such formula. Social progress has not been accomplished by swinging along with impersonal destinies, by riding the wave of the future, or by the blind operation of uncontrolled, biological, economic, or political forces. It has been achieved by the vision and determination, by the self-knowledge, self-discipline, and responsible action of single individuals and of individuals in groups who had not become cogs in the machinery of any group, including the state, but who retained a sense of the central importance under God of individual responsibility, individual personality—people who have been prepared to say, "I know what I am doing, I will change what needs to be changed, I am now beginning to do it."

This was the spirit of men like Lincoln. Lincoln did not call upon the state or any undefined political set-up to advance the American vision; he called upon the American people to do so, by individual self-dedication. "It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us: that from these honored dead, we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; and that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." (Gettysburg Address, Lincoln.)

It was in this spirit that a great archbishop of my own church spoke in a generation which was more conscious of individual responsibility and of how even poverty, so long as we are free, is to be preferred to the riches of golden prisons. Archbishop Spaulding said: "Poverty is the north wind that lashes men into vikings. * * * What we call evils, as poverty, neglect, and suffering, are, if we are wise, opportunities for good. * * * If I am left alone, yet God and all the heroic dead are with me still. If a great city is my dwelling place, superficial life of noise and haste shall teach me how blessed a thing it is to live within the company of true thought and high resolves. Whatever can help me to think and love, whatever can give me strength and patience, whatever can make me humble and serviceable, though it be a trifle as light as air, is opportunity, whose whim it is to hide in unconsidered things, in chance acquaintances and casual speech, the falling of an apple, in floating weeds, or the accidental explosion in a chemist's mortar." (Opportunity, John Lancaster Spaulding.)

It is very easy for our generation, which has so many things done for it, to laugh at these valiant concepts of an age which had to do more things for itself, an age which was therefore more resourceful, more self-reliant, more imbued with the philosophy of responsibility, contemptuous of the philosophy of excuse. The whole history of human achievement gives meaning to the rhetoric of that generation and a test to the worth of those who indulged it, who taught their children and told their fellow citizens and trained themselves to recognize that they need not tolerate evil, that they can change things when these things become burdensome or become productive of evil. And so in our legislation, in our courts, in our social and political theory, we must recognize and make allowance for inadequacies, for unfortunate circumstances, but we must not place emphasis on excuse. We must always seek the affirmation of responsibility, of accountability. We must state the rules, rather than constantly find reasons why they do not apply.

We must recognize that the philosophy of responsibility enabled boys with withered legs to become useful citizens, leaders of their communities and masters of themselves—while the philosophy of excuse allows real intelligence and potential leadership to become instruments of society's confusion and our complete loss. Woodrow Wilson once said some wise things about the relationship of self-government to the kind of character produced by the philosophy of responsibility. He said: "Self-government is not a mere form of institution, to be had when desired. * * * It is a form of character that follows on the long discipline which gives a people self-possession, self-mastery, a habit of order and common counsel, a reverence for law which will not fail when they themselves become the makers of the law."

The Hoover report is in the spirit of that philosophy.

Colonel SHERMAN. I think you folks will agree that we have just received a splendid and inspiring message which should encourage us all to discard the philosophy of excuse which is so certain to breed indifference and apathy and accept in its place, a positive and militant participation in government on all levels, for we are bound to have as bad government as we will tolerate or as good goverment as we demand.

Our Skyrocketing Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I have caused to be reprinted here, from the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette, sums quite well the thinking of the people of Iowa on the subject of spending and taxes.

I would like to comment on one paragraph of this editorial in which Mr. W. Earl Hall, the writer, says this:

So far as our armed services are concerned, Representatives and Senators will be disposed to go along with those charged with this (military) responsibility. They won't quibble.

There is no question but what Congress will deal liberally with the military in the matter of appropriations for building the armed strength of this country. But I am one of those in Congress who insists that spending for defense is no more sacred than for items of nondefense; that the taxpayers are entitled to a dollar's worth of value for every dollar expended on the military. I have not forgotten that in four fiscal years immediately following World War II approximately $50,000,000,000 was appropriated supposedly to build and maintain the Military Establishment of this Nation. But when war broke in Korea, Members of Congress and the citizens of this country were appalled to learn that only about $8,500,000,000 of the $50,000,000,000 actually went into the development of a fighting machine.

In the light of this most recent experience Congress has the responsibility to keep a close check on all expenditures by the military.

Following is the editorial from the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette:

NO HITCHHIKERS, PLEASE—ON HIGHWAYS OR IN BUDGET

While the remotest precincts of public opinion haven't been heard from as yet, there has been a reaction to the President's budget message that augurs some close scrutiny of the fiscal program in the weeks and months ahead.

Expenditures amounting to $71,000,000,000 a year were proposed, with the bulk going for military services and foreign programs designed to add to the military strength of our allies.

So far as our own armed services are concerned, Representatives and Senators will be disposed to go along with those charged with this responsibility. They won't quibble.

On the question of aid to our allies, and what form it shall take, there will be some sharp debate based on some marked differences of viewpoint. But in the end, we won't be penurious.

It's on the domestic proposals calling for astronomical spending that Congress is going to bow its back. While not stressed, they're still recognizable as Fair Deal measures.

Our reference is to such things as the Brannan plan, the ghost of which supposedly was laid last November.

Likewise to public housing for so-called low-income groups, which can mean anything the bureaucrats want it to mean.

Likewise to Federal aid to education, Federal medical insurance—or socialized medicine to those more meticulous in their language.

These are not emergency measures. They're not a part of national defense. They were slipped into the President's budget message as camouflaged hitchhikers.

Highway thumb-twitchers are extremely unpopular at this moment. We've had tragic evidence that they are dangerous. Hitchhikers in a Federal budget need to be just as suspected and just as much scrutinized.

The budget called for a tax increase of $16,456,000,000. That's more than twice as much as the two last tax boosts and if adopted will send the Federal tax load to 27 percent of the national income.

And that's all right with us, and with the average American, we believe if there's assurance that spending for everything other than national defense in a perilous time has been cut to the bone.

Frankly, Congress doesn't think it has. And neither do we.

Roosevelt Day Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a distinguished American scholar, Archibald MacLeish, delivered a very important and inspiring address at the Roosevelt Day dinner held in Washington under the auspices of Americans for Democratic Action, last Friday, January 26, 1951.

Mr. MacLeish pointed to the failure of the American people and their leaders to grasp the true implications of the great social and economic upheaval which is gripping the world today. He noted the great strength of America which only a few years ago, under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, enabled our country to meet the most serious economic collapse and depression in our history. He told how we in America had met the threat of communism in the thirties by correcting the evils and pitfalls which had developed in our economy, and how we had proved that the alternative to economic slavery need not be political slavery. He said that merely to be against communism is not offensive, and pointed to the true course our country should pursue to meet the threat of communism and Soviet imperialism in the world today.

I ask unanimous consent that this able and inspiring address of Mr. MacLeish may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

This day and the name that goes with it carry the mind back. They put the past beside the present. They ask hard questions of us.

There cannot be many here who do not remember what this country and this city were like 6 years ago today, when the name was still the name of a living man. Certainly there can be very few, here or elsewhere, who do not in their minds compare this city and this country as they are with what they were when Franklin Roosevelt was alive.

Six years ago, in the month of January, the United States was the greatest power in the world; materially speaking, the greatest power the world had ever seen. Its Armed Forces and the armed forces of its allies were fighting two wars on opposite sides of the earth against the two principal military nations of the age and were on the point of victory in one and within months of ultimate triumph in the other. In both these wars this Republic had provided far the greater part of the arms and munitions. It had provided the decisive manpower, the strategic plan, and the overriding purpose. It had demonstrated a productivity, an inventiveness, a force of will, a mastery of its situation and itself without precedent in the history of self-governing peoples or, indeed, of any people whatever.

Six years ago, in this city and throughout the United States, whatever the fortunes of the war on either front, men were joined in a common determination which they recognized and which expressed itself in action. They were allied with peoples elsewhere in a common cause which had not only military victory but lasting peace as end and aim. They believed in themselves and in the future.

Today they believe, it seems, in neither. Today, their victory scarcely won, the American people are being told by officials in Washington and journalists everywhere that they face a new world war—not, this time, for the achievement of a purpose of their own, but for the naked right to go on living—to survive. They are being told this, and they are listening. Bewildered and angry though they may be, they are listening. And, listening, they are coming to believe.

The question this day asks us—this day and the name that goes with it—the question this day asks is: Why? Why are we listening? Why are we coming to believe this? What has happened to us?

Well—what has?

The answer, if you read the run of the American press, is Russia. A nation which was our ally in the war, a nation which our productivity and the intervention of our arms saved from disaster, has, since the war's end, turned upon us, violated her commitments to us, poisoned the minds of nations and of continents against us, and openly confessed a purpose to destroy us if she can.

It is true that Russia has done all this. One would have to go back to the history of the petty princelings of the Quattrocento to find a parallel to the duplicity, the cynicism, the brutality, the pompous arrogance of the rulers of the Russian people. But all this, much as it is, is still no answer to the question. Russia was a Communist country in 1945 committed to the Communist dogma of the inevitability of the collapse of such an economy as ours. She was also a populous country with enormous armies in the field. And yet we did not fear her then. We did not think that if it came to war with Russia our struggle would be a struggle to survive. We knew the Marxist dogmas: They did not frighten us. Like Keats, who had the axioms of philosophy in mind, we thought the axioms of history are not true until they are proved upon the pulses, and our pulses did not prove the truth of Marx and Engels. No freeman's pulses ever will.

Russia has changed, of course, in these 6 years. Russia has grown impatient with the timetable of Professor Marx's domesticated Fate and has expedited it where she could by conspiracy and fraud and murder and the intervention of the political police. But she has not changed to something other than she was. She is still the nation we knew 6 years ago. And she is no more our potential master now than she was when the productivity of our people and the skill of our technicians kept her armies in the field and her planes in the air.

What then has changed if it is not Russia? Communism? Is it the capture of the Chinese government by Communists and the pressure of Communist propaganda and armed bands upon the peoples of southeast Asia which persuades us that we have now no choice but to stand with our backs against the wall?

It is true that the Government of China is Communist: That the most populous country in the world, having thrown off a corrupt, reactionary and brutal regime, has turned, not to self-government and individual freedom, but to Government by propaganda and the state police. But tragic as that development is for all who value civilization and freedom, it does not mean that the experience of the 6 years just past has demonstrated the truth of the Marxist dialectic or proved the inevitability of Communist domination of the earth.

On the contrary, the experience of the past 6 years has proved the opposite. It has

proved in France and throughout Western Europe that if communism is opposed by the weapons appropriate to the struggle against communism—by economic and social opportunity rather than by the bombs and bayonets the Republican adolescents would apply to the ills of Asia—communism cannot score its victories of desperation. If the last 6 years have demonstrated anything, they have demonstrated that the Marxist destiny, unlike the destiny the Greeks knew, is not inescapable when men of courage and resource make up their minds to fight it.

Only those who continue obstinately and childishly to regard the crisis in which we live as a military crisis to be won or lost by military weapons can fail to read the vast significance of that victory to which we give the wholly deceptive title of economic aid to Europe. When the history of our time is written, if we keep our courage long enough to leave a history, the battle fought in Western Europe with food and credits and materials, under the name of George Marshall and on lines laid down by the present Secretary of State, may well prove to have been one of the decisive battles of mankind.

No, it is not the irresistible spread of communism over the earth, or some Phoenix change in Russia, which has altered us in 6 years' time from a people who believed the future was our future to a people who talk of fighting for survival. And neither is it the shock of the Korean War and the discovery that Asiatic soldiers are men like any others. Only the old China hands of the Shanghai bars and the Senate lobbies ever doubted that they were.

The real change as always is neither in our stars nor in our enemies but in ourselves. It is not that Russia is all at once ten times more dangerous but that we see her so. It is not that the Marxist dialectic has proved the inevitability of its triumph, but that we do not believe, as we once did, in the inevitable triumph of the dialectic of freedom.

If we really wish to understand the difference between the Republic of this day and year and the Republic of the same day 6 years back, it is that alteration, the alteration in ourselves, we will examine. It is not, I think, a difficult alteration to measure. The difference is not Joe McCarthy or Herbert Hoover or Robert Taft or any of the rest of the timid or calculating men who have succumbed to fear in themselves or exploited fear in others for their partisan or personal advantage. Timidity is not an American characteristic—as those who attempt to live by it politically will learn. We are not afraid of Russia. We are not afraid of communism. We are not even afraid of those gastric and imaginary terrors which frighten the Senator from Wisconsin until every face he sees beneath the bed of his political ambition is Communist. McCARTHY has done incalculable damage to the tradition of decency and truthfulness and mutual respect upon which a free and self-governing society must rest—upon which this society had rested for 160 years before his time—but McCARTHY is not the author of the decay in American confidence. On the contrary, it is the decay in American confidence which made McCARTHY possible. Only a people who found themselves, 6 years after their greatest triumph, contemplating the possibility of disaster, and unable to account for the deterioration of their fortunes, would give a moment's thought to reckless and irresponsible accusations made without evidence and offered without proof.

The real reason for the change in the American situation is something considerably more fundamental even than the decay of a political morality. The difference between the United States in 1951 and the United States in 1945 is a difference in the Nation itself, in the inward being of the Nation, in the sense of purpose and direction which gives vitality and confidence to a life whether it be the life of a single human being or a nation.

Six years ago, and for a decade and more before that, the people of the United States had a common and a creative purpose. In the years of the war that purpose, made articulate and comprehensible by Franklin Roosevelt, was a purpose not merely to frustrate the designs of the dictators but to establish a new order of peace and freedom throughout the world—freedom to think, freedom to worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear. Prior to the war, in the decade of the thirties, the national purpose—the purpose at least of a great majority of the people of the country—was a purpose not merely to pull ourselves out of the last and worst of our business depressions but to create a society in which men could continue to live as men in dignity and freedom without paying the recurrent price of unemployment and the ultimate price of unemployability; a society which would demonstrate to mankind that free institutions and the practice of self-government are not impotent to deal with the problems of an industrialized world; a society which would prove that the alternative to economic slavery need not be political slavery, and that a free and responsible human being, thinking and acting for himself, is still a wiser governor of a nation than all the bureaus of the state police.

No one who was alive in this city 6 years ago or 16 years ago—no one who was conscious of the Republic in the months before the San Francisco Conference or the months of the emergence of the concept of the New Deal—can doubt, however cynical and sick he may be now, that these purposes were then alive and vigorous in the country, and that the confidence of the country in itself and in its future rested directly upon the universal recognition of the will to act. No one who is conscious of this city and this country today can doubt, either, that these purposes no longer shape our minds, and that our loss of confidence in our future and in ourselves, our desperate talk of struggle for survival, reflect that hollow emptiness at the heart.

Certainly our foreign policy reflects it. We liberals have harsh and often just things to say of that policy. We condemn its defensiveness, its dependence upon the Russian initiative, its reliance upon the concept of containment. Who, we say, can imagine the word "containment" in Roosevelt's mouth? But for all our scorn we know, or ought to know, that the defensiveness of our foreign policy is dictated not by the mentality of the Department of State but by the mentality of the country. The basic orientation of a foreign policy is inevitably determined by the orientation of domestic opinion. If a people thinks defensively about its life at home its foreign policy will necessarily be defensive. If the people of the United States fix their minds upon the preservation of something called their way of life, meaning the way they imagine they now live, or the way they like to think they lived before, their foreign policy will be directed to the preservation of the status quo elsewhere in the world or even to the restoration of some earlier and vanished status. By the same sign and for the same reason, if the people of the United States should again fix their minds upon the realization of a new and richer life for themselves and for the world, their foreign policy would inevitably become positive and vigorous as the policies of creative and purposeful countries always are.

The truth is that the place to remedy an unsatisfactory foreign policy is not in Formosa or Western Germany but at home. Until the country recovers a sense of national purpose within itself, until it shapes again its national will, its foreign policy must continue to be defensive and Russia must be left the initiative she has held since the war's end. Those who contend the opposite, those who argue that any consideration of American ends, American aims, must wait upon the realization of our aims abroad, and, above all, upon the arming of this country for defense, delude themselves. Their assumption is unsound and the argument they derive from it is inconclusive.

The assumption supposes that the continuing crisis which afflicts our world is primarily a military crisis and the argument insists that in time of military crisis the unity of parties and opinions is the first objective of policy which must be secured at any cost. A national program within the United States aimed at the realization of American ends—freedom, economic as well as political; equality of opportunity and equality before the law—would, it is argued, divide the country, alienate powerful groups and leave us helpless before our enemies.

The assumption, however, supposes what is not true. The struggle in which we are engaged is not primarily a military struggle. It is primarily a political struggle, a social struggle, which the Russians are waging on their side by conducting a social and political offensive against our institutions and ourselves in every quarter of the world. To trust solely to military means to defend ourselves against such an attack is to lose the war before the battles can be fought—and, it may well be, to expedite the very disaster we seek to prevent. Until we can mount a social and political offensive of our own we cannot successfully defend ourselves, let alone prevail. But an American social and political offensive cannot be mounted to influence the rest of mankind until the American people have committed themselves to its realization in their own country. Merely to be against communism is not an offensive. It is not even a policy. It is a confession of political bankruptcy and intellectual collapse.

As for the argument deriving from that assumption—the argument that unity is the first requirement in such a time as this, and that no price is too high to pay for it, the answer is simple. The answer is that there is a price too high to pay for unity, and a unity too dubious to purchase at any price. The price too high to pay is the price we are now paying in the United States—the price of spiritual impotence. The unity too dubious to purchase is the unity we have acquired in return—the unity of the reactionaries of both parties in a common intention to paralyze the great creative American tradition of liberalism leaving the Republic without purpose or direction—leaving the Republic without anything but the barebone determination to survive which these blind men tell us we must now accept in place of all our hopes, our pride, our confidence, our courage.

No; it is time and past time to face the realities of our situation in this Republic. Everything—our determination abroad, our courage and stamina in the face of the terrible trial which lies before us, our eventual victory in that trial—everything depends upon our undertaking the achievement, not in the millenium but now, not after the struggle is over but in order that the struggle may be won—everything depends upon our undertaking again the achievement of the American dream of a truly free, a truly democratic society; a society in which men shall be equal in opportunity, equal before the law, not in word only but in fact; a society in which all men may share the security which is now the privilege of some men only; a society in which the inexhaustible human resources of a great and intelligent people may be released for the creative labor which is the dignity of human life.

Until we undertake that task we shall not regain the sense of national purpose which is our present and fatal lack. Until we have accomplished some part at least of what we propose, we cannot recapture from the Communists the political and social initiative which we must have to win the struggle for the future.

People like ourselves, liberals in politics and life, have one common professional deformation. We are reluctant to act. We understand very well—far better than the dogmatists of the two extremes—the real nature of a given political situation. Indeed it is our characteristic quality so to understand, for a liberal is by nature a disinterested man, a man who is more concerned with the human truth than with the partisan advantage of some preconceived opinion. But precisely because we see more clearly what must be done we are more reluctant, or so it seems, to do it. In the present critical situation of our country that weakness becomes something more than weakness. It becomes a kind of treason to our country and ourselves.

On this day and in this place we will do well, all of us, to remember that there was one liberal, the greatest of them all, who could not only understand what needed to be done but do it. There was one liberal who could act.

"The responsible man, death's hand upon
his shoulder,
Knowing well the liars may prevail
And calumny bring all his days to nothing;
Knowing truth has often been betrayed
By time that keeps it, as the crock taints
water;
Knowing nothing suffered or endured
Will change by one word what the worst
will say,
What those who listen to the worst believe—
The responsible man: teeth bad: sleep
Difficult: tired, tired, tired, to the heart:
Carries the day to the next day to the next:
Does what must be done: dies in his chair
Fagged out, worn down, sick
With the weight of his own bones, the task
finished,
The war won, the victory assured,
The glory left behind him for the others.
(And the wheels roll up through the night
in the sweet land
In the cool air in the spring between the
lanterns.)"

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Before Executives Club of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered to the Executives Club of Chicago in Chicago, Ill., on January 26, 1951.

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

It is a great pleasure to come here again to speak to the Executives Club and to this magnificent audience. I still feel apologetic for the time that I had to cancel a speech here, but I remember that JOHN BRICKER was kind enough to come and make a better speech than I could have made. I shall always be grateful to your members and to many other citizens of Illinois who gave me such enthusiastic support in my recent campaign in Ohio. Sometimes I thought that the people of Illinois were almost more interested in my success than the people of Ohio, but the final results in Ohio certainly question the wisdom of that judgment.

The victory of Senator DIRKSEN, in Illinois, and my own victory in Ohio showed that the people of this country still believe in sound, conservative, American principles of government; that they are willing to put the public interest ahead of any supposed class interest; and that they will listen to the arguments presented for a progressive program within principles of liberty and justice on their merits if they are clearly and forcibly presented. We can beat Santa Claus. The people in the great Middle West do not believe in socialism. While they respect the value of labor unions, they do not propose to let the bosses of labor unions dictate to the people as to whom they shall choose as their representatives in Congress.

But perhaps more than anything else these elections showed that the people had come to a complete lack of confidence in the foreign policy of the administration. I pointed out in every county in the State of Ohio the reason for the present dangerous situation in which we find ourselves. The leaders of our Nation were blind to the possible threat of communism to this country after the war was over. Hopkins and Harriman at Yalta seemed to feel that communism after all was a pretty good thing, even if we did not want it exactly in the form in which Russia had it. Nevertheless they accepted the idea that Russian communism was in fact democracy, when it actually denied every principle of American government. How far this was the result of the deliberate Communist infiltration into our Government, of which we are now aware, it is difficult to say, but its influence was evident. Our leaders blindly accepted the promises of Soviet Russia when Stalin had never kept a promise. They set Russia up in central Europe, in Berlin and Prague and Vienna, when as a matter of fact our troops could have captured both Prague and Berlin long before the Russians ever got there. We let them write the ticket for the Russian zone in Germany, which stretches half way from the Elbe to the Rhine, and gives them a predominating military position in central Germany. We did not even reserve a right-of-way to our zone in Berlin. We gave them a dominating position in Manchuria contrary to every honorable obligation to Chiang Kai-shek, who had fought the Japanese for years, and contrary to every principle of American policy since John Hay inaugurated the program of the open door in China. We gave Russia Japan's position in Manchuria, though we had gone to war because of Japan's aggression in China. For some years after the war this administration promoted the theory that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers, and sent General Marshall to China to force Chiang Kai-shek to take them into his cabinet. When Chiang refused we cut off his supplies and ammunition at the most crucial moment and certainly were partially responsible for the defeat which he suffered at the hands of the Communists. Our policy invited the attack in Korea while we failed to arm the South Koreans. It is not strange that the people, seeing the fatal results of the foreign policy of this administration, have no longer any faith or confidence in its judgment or ability.

At the present time, because of that policy, we face the most serious external threat to its security and peace which this country has ever faced. I see now no alternative except to build up sufficiently large military forces so that we may be secure against any military aggression that the Russians may have under consideration. All the problems of this Eighty-second Congress depend very largely upon the decision which we make as to the size and character of the military forces that must be built up to meet the Communist threat which this administration itself has so largely created.

On January 15 I reviewed the foreign situation on the floor of the Senate and stated affirmatively the policy which I thought this country ought to adopt. It seems to me that we should develop the greatest and most powerful air force in the world so that we may dominate the air over this country, over the oceans that surround this country, and over as much of the rest of the world as we can. We should have air bases at strategic points in the world where they cannot be easily attacked. We have the largest navy in the world and we should be certain that we have complete control of both sea and air. These are the fields in which we can be supreme without unduly burdening the whole economy of the United States.

My proposal is no withdrawal to the American Continent. It is the establishment of a bastion throughout the world within a reasonable distance by air of every country in the world. Such a control gives us communication to all lands. It gives us access to all raw materials. It makes it possible for us to make bombing raids to all parts of the world against any nation which chooses to begin a war. It should enable us to defend everything in the way of islands or island nations that desire our aid. It should enable us to put land troops ashore in many places where we can successfully aid in protecting a strategic position such as the Isthmus of Suez or the Malayan Peninsula. It enables us to furnish arms assistance and even land troops if at any time such assistance seems to promise success to any country trying to defend itself against an unlawful aggressor and if at that time we consider such aid in our national interest.

Today we have a superiority in the air and on the sea, but it is not at all clear that that superiority is complete. There should be no doubt about our ability to defend Japan, for instance, or Formosa, from an attack across a hundred miles of open water, but unless we give unremitting attention to the job it is not at all clear that we are able to achieve even such a defense of friendly island nations.

I think it is clear that we cannot hope in time of peace to dominate the entire world on land as well as on the sea. Of course, we have to have a land army for many purposes. We have to have a land army to protect the United States, Alaska, and our air bases, and for use in many special situations, but I do not believe we can hope to build up an army, certainly in time of peace, which can overwhelm the millions that Soviet Russia and Soviet China may be able to bring against us. No one will accuse Walter Lippmann of being an isolationist, but he says in the Atlantic Monthly, out today:

"We and our neighbors in North America are outnumbered. We must take this truth to heart. We must write it on the walls of our council chambers. We must never forget it. The Communist coalition can raise more soldiers than we or our allies can ever have. These soldiers have weapons which on any battlefield in Eurasia are quite deadly enough to kill. Any policy which compels us to fight them, as we are fighting them in Korea now—across an ocean, within walking

distance of their own inexhaustible reserves, on terms of battle in which they are forever incalculably superior—cannot be anything but what it has turned out to be; a bloody entanglement."

I made my speech on January 5 partly because it seemed to me that the administration was tending more and more toward the theory that a third world war was finally going to be fought on the continent of Europe, and that a huge land army must be the principal concern of our military policy. I have been encouraged in recent weeks, however, by the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff seem to have accepted to a large extent the sea and air philosophy. I note that the more recent requests for manpower include about a million men in the Air Force, about 900,000 men in the Navy and Marines, and only 1,400,000 men—amounting to approximately 27 divisions—in the land army. They have come to recognize that this country in time of peace cannot be expected to support an unlimited army on land which, after all, is the most expensive of all forms of armed forces. They have apparently rejected Senator DOUGLAS' proposal that we put 6,000,000 men under arms, and Governor Dewey's proposal that we have a hundred divisions.

Even the army that is proposed seems to me somewhat too large and it will be a tremendous burden on the people of the United States. It will probably require 2 years' military service from every boy in this country. It will require a burden of taxation which will mean a substantial cut in the standard of living of practically every American. It means, at least for several years, price control and wage control. Nevertheless, I think it is within our financial means if we are prepared to make the sacrifice; and I do not regard it as beyond reason. But surely if we are going to have to have an army of this size for 5 to 10 years, the whole Military Establishment must be compelled to run on a more economical basis than it does today. Furthermore, if the tax burden is to be supportable there must be a substantial cut in nondefense expenditures. There is no excuse for the budget submitted by the President. Not only are the cuts negligible, but many Fair Deal ideas are added.

The greatest military question which remains in dispute is the proposed committing of American troops to the continent of Europe. I don't think most people understand the novel and radical nature of the proposal which has been made. Under the Atlantic Pact we undertook to join with 10 other nations to develop our individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack, presumably from Russia, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. We also agreed that if an armed attack is made against any one of the parties to the pact, it shall be considered as an attack against them all, and that we will assist the party attacked by taking such action as we deem necessary including the use of armed force. I voted against the pact because I believed that it committed us to the giving of arms aid to European countries, and the building up of a coordinated European army.

Since we entered into the treaty we are performing our obligation to give arms generously, though we were told, at the time the pact was passed, that this was to be merely a little assistance to enable them to complete their local defensive facilities, and the implementation bill only looked toward the expenditure of half a billion dollars a year. Now the total appropriations have amounted to more than five billion, and as much more is contemplated at once in the new budget.

But we were assured that the Atlantic Pact carried no obligation whatever to send American soldiers to Europe. Nevertheless, the President has proceeded without authority from Congress to make at least a conditional offer to provide such soldiers, and some kind of an agreement, perhaps conditional, may have been made at Brussels. The original pact required a definite plan of defense before any aid was given, but it is now much more than a year since that pact was passed and the European countries have never agreed upon a definite defensive plan.

I think it is perfectly clear that the President has no right to enter into an agreement with foreign countries to set up an international army and commit American troops in time of peace to such an army on foreign soil. Many cases have been cited where the President has sent troops to foreign countries to protect American lives or property, but in all our history there is nothing comparable to the setting up of such an army and commitment of troops as is here proposed. The President is Commander in Chief of the American Army, but he certainly cannot delegate his powers as Commander in Chief to a foreign officer. It happens at the present time that General Eisenhower is an American, but he derives his authority not from the United States, but from 11 nations, and he could be replaced by them.

The only comparable action with which I am familiar is that of a military force under the United Nations' Charter. In the Charter it is expressly provided that this force shall be determined by an agreement. In the Implementation Act it is required that the agreement specify the number and character of the troops to be supplied and the circumstances of the contribution, and that that agreement shall be approved by Congress before the President is authorized to furnish American troops to such an international army. No such agreement was ever made because of Russian opposition, and so the President acted wholly without authority in sending an American Army into Korea as I pointed out in the Senate 3 days later.

In the case of the Atlantic Treaty under article XI, it is clearly contemplated that action to implement the treaty shall be taken in accordance with the constitutional processes of each government. The Foreign Relations Committee itself stated in so many words that the treaty in no way affected the basic division of authority between the President and the Congress as defined in the Constitution. It answered the argument that required action by Congress might delay action by saying: "The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator. The action of the democracies in the past great war is concrete evidence of their ability to act with the necessary speed in the event of an emergency."

I have been shocked by the vehemence with which those who are determined to send troops to Europe have rushed to the defense of the President's power in violation certainly of the spirit if not the words of the Constitution. Apparently they do not trust the people or the people's representatives, and they are afraid that if the decision is left to Congress it might possibly decide that they would rather keep our boys at home. But the issue is now, at least partly academic since a number of Senators, including Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, stated that whether there is a legal restriction on action by the President or not, he has no moral right to act in view of the assurances given Congress to make a commitment to send troops abroad without submitting the question to Congress. Senator DOUGLAS said in the Senate on January 15, "the national interest requires that a clear decision on the issue be reached by Congress in some express way. The constitutional powers of the Government are shared powers, and the issue is too important and the dangers to our survival too great for the Executive to act without positive approval of Congress." Therefore we are assured that a resolution will be submitted on the question of sending troops to Europe.

Senator WHERRY submitted a resolution providing that the President should send no troops abroad for the purposes of the Atlantic Pact until Congress had acted on the question. The Wherry resolution did not attempt to pass in any way on the merits of the proposal, but only to hold things in status quo until Congress could act. When the President assured the Congress that they would have an opportunity to pass on the question, the Wherry resolution became of less importance because it had clearly accomplished its principal purpose. Therefore, Senator WHERRY was willing to have it referred temporarily to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services jointly.

But I do not feel confident that the administration is really going to present a legislative resolution. I am very much concerned that they may only contemplate a Senate resolution expressing the views of the Senate that the President shall have the right to commit any number of troops to this international army in Europe. In that case we would have to call up again the Wherry resolution. In my opinion, the kind of agreement that apparently is being contemplated with these foreign countries regarding this international army has all the dignity of a treaty. Strictly speaking, under the Constitution, it should be approved as a treaty by two-thirds of the Senate. It can be argued, however, that since the Atlantic Pact is already adopted as a treaty, a supplemental agreement made along the same general line, even though it extends to a field not provided for by the treaty itself could be approved by Congress by a majority of both Houses. I believe that we should insist at least on a joint resolution, which is an act of legislation. I believe further that any agreement which is made with the other pact countries should itself be submitted to Congress and that the Congress should say yes or no to that particular agreement. I believe further that Congress should impose some limitation on the number of soldiers who can be stationed on European soil in time of peace. It is quite true that in time of war the Commander in Chief of the Army has the right to run the war, and Congress should not interfere, but I don't think the Commander in Chief has the right to commit the entire Nation in advance to exactly the kind of war which is going to be fought, and I don't think he has the right to tie his own hands or those of his successor by obligations to station any particular number of troops abroad. The Constitution confers on Congress the right to raise and support armies and to declare war, and on the Senate the right to advise and consent to treaties with foreign nations. Unless we are prepared to abdicate these constitutional powers and make the President a complete dictator over foreign policy, Congress must insist on its right to decide the questions involved in the so-called Brussels agreement.

I have not reached a definite view as to the manner in which the limitation should be imposed, but roughly speaking it occurs to me that we might provide that there should not be stationed in Europe and in Great Britain more than some specified percentage of our land Army and of our Air Force. This seems to me a more reasonable limitation than a particular number of divisions or a particular number of men. It must be remembered that we already have nearly two divisions in Germany. I would myself prefer to make peace with Germany

and withdraw all troops. That is the logical conclusion to the strategy which I have outlined. But we are in Germany. We have signed the Atlantic Pact and, therefore, as I stated in my speech on January 5, I will not object to committing a limited number of additional divisions, providing the Europeans really show an interest, assume the initiative, and provide altogether an army which has some reasonable chance of success in defending Western Europe against the Russians if and when it is completed.

If the administration submits a resolution in completely general terms with unlimited power to the President, then there will be submitted a substitute resolution along the general and limited lines which I have outlined. Incidentally, I have not changed my position one iota from the position I took in my first speech, in spite of a lot of misrepresentation in the press.

I have been opposed to sending an American army to Europe, and I believe it is strategically unsound. It is more likely to bring about war than it is to bring peace. The formation of a great international army in Germany on the border of the countries which Russia regards as buffer states is certainly likely to alarm the Russians. They are a suspicious people at best and no matter how defensive our intentions are, they will feel that such an army is a threat to the satellite countries, if not to Russia itself. It is all very well to say that it is to be merely a defensive army, but today no army can be merely defensive. This is a day of mobile warfare, and apparently either you push your enemy back, or you are pushed back by your enemy. The defensive army cannot hope merely to defend a Maginot line of bazookas. It must have the weapons to make affirmative movements into the Russian line. So the Russians may regard it as a threat, as they certainly do the arming of Germany.

If the Russians do not intend a military attack, it seems to me that this program is very likely to change their intentions. If they do contemplate a military attack, why would they wait 2 years or 3 years until this army of 60 or more divisions is actually in being? I have asked that question of many generals and others, and I have yet to receive a reasonable answer.

I believe in that feature of the Atlantic Pact which notifies Russia that if they attack Western Europe they will find themselves at war with the United States. I think that is a real deterrent against their beginning a war in Western Europe. They know that we have airplanes with the atomic bomb. Mr. Churchill has stated that that fact is the only thing that has actually deterred them from war, but I do not think they will be deterred from war by the gradual building of a great land army in Germany.

It is said that we cannot abandon Europe. No one is proposing to abandon Europe. We have given them more than $20,000,000,000 of economic aid since the war ended. We have thereby enable them to build up their production to a point 40 percent better than it was before the war. We have given them, and are prepared to give them, unlimited arms aid to build up their own armies. Under the program which I have suggested, there would be several divisions of American troops at the front in Europe at the beginning of any war to assure them of our real interest in their defense, and that would be doing a great deal more for them than they have done for us in Korea. In fact, in any war with Russia we would be doing probably 50 percent or more of the entire job. But I object to getting in so heavily that before we get through we find ourselves doing 90 percent of the job, as we have had to do it in Korea.

Furthermore, it is dangerous to our survival to build our entire military policy on the success of a great land war in Europe. It is a long way from the United States. The Russians can always outnumber us many times in manpower. If the Russians have the atomic bomb—and we are now spending $3,000,000,000 in this country to build air shelters on the theory that they have—then surely they could bomb ll the European ports, could prevent the delivery of heavy supplies, and perhaps in the end might cut off our troops from any possible escape from Europe.

One of the arguments advanced by the Army is that it would be easier to get six divisions out of Europe than the two divisions that are there now. That certainly is a defeatist policy. But when we consider what one atomic bomb might have done to our Army at Hungnam, however, the commitment of a tremendous American Army to European soil under present conditions is a dangerous undertaking which might result in the greatest military disaster this country has ever faced. Hitler and Mussolini brought about the destruction of their countries by overestimating their strength and committing themselves to ventures which they were unable to carry out. We think of this country as having always won a war and being in fact impregnable, but a foolish foreign policy can bring about the same kind of destruction for us as it has for many other nations throughout history. Certainly we should have learned in Korea that the commitment of armies to continental warfare against nations with a tremendous excess in manpower is at best a tragic error. Our casualties in Korea are closely approaching the casualties in the entire First World War. With this lesson before us, it seems almost inconceivable that we would lay any tremendous emphasis on a similar action on the continent of Europe.

I do not say that if we should get into a war with Russia, we might not in the end decide to fight a land war. I only object to our committing ourselves at this time, and to the manner in which a third world war shall be fought. If there is one thing that seems certain, it is that the third world war will not be fought like the Second World War, but the program of many of our military officers seemed to be based on the theory that it is going to be a kind of combination of the First and Second World Wars. With an impregnable sea and air bastion, with a tremendous striking power of air, no one can be absolutely certain that war cannot be won from the air. Certainly, Japan surrendered without our having to land a single soldier on the shores of Japan. We cannot be certain today, and we must not tie our hands.

As far as Korea is concerned, if our allies have run out on us as apparently they have, it seems to me that we have no alternative except gradually to withdraw from Korea to a defensible position in Japan, Okinawa, and Formosa. I question the wisdom of beginning any kind of an all-out war with Communist China as long as our troops are in Korea in such a vulnerable position. Should Russia start a third world war tomorrow, we would indeed have a difficult time to extricate our troops from Korea. Once we have withdrawn those troops, we can release Chiang Kai-shek from the restraints we have imposed upon him, and it may be that he can create enough diversion to occupy the Chinese Communists in south China and perhaps prevent the threatened offensive against Indochina, Burma, and Siam. He has the power to impose at least a limited blockade on the shipment of supplies to Communist China. We need commit no American soldiers and should not. I doubt very much if under those circumstances Communist China would see fit to declare war with the United States, and invite our bombing and blockade. But certainly we would be able to shut off the military supplies which have been reaching them in the past from the United States.

In conclusion, I wish to impress upon you the importance of taking an active interest in foreign affairs and bringing to bear the views which you have upon the Members of the Congress of the United States. I believe this debate has already accomplished a tremendous change in the foreign and military policy of the administration.

First, we have established the principle that constructive criticism is no longer treason, and that debate itself is meritorious. Heretofore, anyone who even questioned the wisdom of the administration's foreign policy was denounced as one giving aid and comfort to the enemy, destroying the unity of the country and an isolationist. Certainly the editors of this country, and the people have come to realize that the only thing that really gives aid and comfort to the enemy is to adopt a foreign policy which plays into their hands as has our policy in the Far East. It is now respectable to present one's own views on foreign policy.

Second, we have obtained at least qualified admission that Congress has the right to speak ón a question as important as the commitment of an American army to the continent of Europe. This right is only grudgingly admitted, and it is not yet clear whether Congress is only to be allowed to talk and not to act. Public opinion should be brought to bear for the principle of the Wherry resolution, and the limitation of the President's power to send troops abroad.

Third, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the administration have apparently accepted the theory that there should be a long-range limit placed upon the total of our Armed Forces, and that that limit should be within the reach of our power to support it over a period of years without serious damage to our economy. I think the limit is high, but I think that we can conceivably find the taxes to balance the budget, and therefore we can hope to avoid inflation and the further depreciation of the dollar.

Fourth, the general policy of appeasing the Chinese Communists has apparently been reversed, although I never feel completely confident of our State Department. It seems, however, that the administration is now definitely committed against the recognition of Communist China, against its admission into the United Nations, and in favor of the denouncing of China as an aggressor. There still seems an unwillingness to criticize the British in spite of the fact that the British are really the leaders in the movement to appease a ruthless and unquestioned aggressor against the United Nations itself.

Fifth, and last, there seems to be some hope that we may at long last achieve the purpose of acquiring a new Secretary of State.

The Religion of Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on the 14th day of January 1951, Dr. Francis P. Gaines, president of Washington and Lee University, was the guest speaker at the Washington Cathedral here in the city of Washington, and delivered an eloquent and inspiring message on the subject The Religion of Robert E. Lee.

This notable address, and the inspiring manner in which it was delivered by Dr. Gaines, who is a worthy successor to the great Robert E. Lee as president of this outstanding university, made a profound impression on all the hearers. I think the address is of real value to all the Members of the Congress and to the American people, and therefore ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE RELIGION OF ROBERT E. LEE

(By Dr. Francis P. Gaines)

No one knows Robert E. Lee who does not know that his life was dominated by religion and protected by it. The religion of General Lee, however, does not easily lend itself to analysis. It was never a matter of ostentatious parade and it did not involve the mouthing of many words. It was central in his soul but it was among the sacred intimacies of that soul. We may surmise, if we will, that his religion was a venture of pure faith. It was not the product of his speculation. He did not build his creed from the painfully collected conclusions of his logic. He was not among those souls who grope for their belief. Rather, he might modestly have paraphrased the words of St. Paul in saying, casting away reasoning and all high things that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God, I bring every thought into captivity unto the obedience of Christ. And this matter of bringing every thought into captivity under Christ was the supreme business of Robert E. Lee; and religion was closer to him than breathing and nearer than hands and feet.

Although we may not scrutinize too closely the motivations or the quality of his faith, we are permitted, since he belongs to history, to observe some of the fruitage in the life of this religious man, fruitage for the summer's glory and fruitage for the autumn's richness and fruitage which the winter cannot kill.

It was religion, I am confident, for example, that made more sweet the hours of his tranquillity, that infused with a singular tenderness of joy all the domestic relations, all the circles of friendliness in his life.

I remember one of the most beautiful letters to a young daughter-in-law of whom he was particularly fond. He was far away from home and he wrote this lovely girl, who was to die young, a playful letter, a somewhat lengthy, playful letter, but he closed with these words: "I send you some sweet violets which I have gathered; they are all I have for you; I hope they may retain some fragrance until they reach you. My eyes plead for relief this holy day but my heart stretches towards you with all its strength and hushes in silence its yearning."

The words that caught my mind were those two words "holy day" because all of the human love, all of the warm reciprocity of affection of which General Lee was greatly capable, all of these things were as if enveloped in the atmosphere of a holy day. They were religion to him.

If I may swing the pendulum extremely to the other end of his emotions, I would call your attention to the fact that religion constrained him in the fiercest moment of his conflict. As far as I know, he was never as excited or as determined as when he made the invasion of the North; he knew that was a crisis, and he knew that if he could triumph there he would strike a mighty blow; but some of his men did not behave as he wanted them to behave and he rebuked them in that famous General Order No. 73; and the basis for his rebuke was this noble phrase: "The claim of Christianity is as strong upon us when we are in hostile territory as when we are in our own." Thus, says the Massachusetts historian, Mr. Bradford, Robert Lee could pour something of Christian charity even into that intolerable hell which is war.

It was religion, too, I believe—his imitation of Christ, that set him free from hatred, the corroding poison of our human lives. You remember the story told by Baltimore's lovely citizen, Miss Bond. It was a great season at the White Sulphur Springs when the Southern element was predominant, and General Lee was there the lion of the hour. There came a Northern general. He happened to be especially unpopular and there was an unspoken but unanimous movement to snub him; General Lee rose dramatically and conspicuously to welcome him and to extend to him the courtesy of his great soul. As he walked back from speaking to this man a Southern girl, rather, partisan and probably petulant, said to him, "But General, don't you hate that man?" And General Lee said, "As in the sight of God I think I can say that I have never hated a human being." Why didn't he hate? Because the Sermon on the Mount filled his heart so full he had no room for the unworthy emotions.

It was religion, too, that gave General Lee the one quality that all men everywhere concede to him. There may be debate as to his political wisdom, let us say, in making the decision that he had to make at the moment of his great dilemma, and I have even read comments, though not many, that raise the question as to his rights in the final lifting of military chieftains, but I have never seen one person who denied him one quality, and that was a forthrightness and a strength of character almost without parellel. It was religion that gave him that character. May I ask you to remember that I am not talking about character in its narrow interpretation, in its defensive aspects as a force merely to resist. I am speaking of character in the great affirmative reaches of its possibilities. The best definition I have ever heard of character, I heard when I was a college boy—given to me by one of my professors—and this is character as Robert Lee personified it. "Character," said my mentor, "is an inner force (please remember those two words) that enables one to carry out a worthy purpose after the mood in which that purpose was born has passed away." All of us, I presume, have the mood in which worthy purposes are born. A great voice challenges us to higher endeavor; some loveliness of song such as we heard today penetrates unsuspected depths of our hearts; the glory of a sunset or a quiet moment beside a grave which brings us some supernal vision of holiness; or the pitiless remorse of our own contritions distresses us and disciplines us and we are in the mood for a great resolution Whether or not we sustain that resolution depends on whether or not we have character; and in Lee's case he had character, perhaps to live more consistently in fulfillment of the purposes of his best moment than any human being I have ever studied. Every moment was his best moment because the inner force to which I ventured to bring emphasis a moment ago, constantly unfailing, the inner force in his life was God.

And now if I may approach the drama of his life, I remind you that it was religion that enabled him to triumph over the black and bitter circumstance. For as objectively as we might measure, General Lee's professional career was a failure, and it was a failure of first magnitude. He surrendered an army in an open field; and surrendering an army he lost the nation which had vested its hopes in the army and in him. He lost his position; he lost his profession; he had already lost his property; he had known, by the way, the heaviness of personal sorrow, in his family; and then he lost his citizenship and was to die 5 years later, technically, at least, a paroled prisoner of war. And yet he rose, not in defeat, but, let us say, from defeat and through defeat and because of defeat, to perhaps our greatest example of triumph over disaster. There are many philosophies from the fatalistic to the pagan order, on how we might meet our bitter circumstance. Many writers thinking of General Lee recall Kipling's four lines in his poem If, which someone has entitled the catalog of ideal impossibilities:

"If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again from the beginnings
And never say a word about your loss."

But Robert E. Lee was no gambler with destiny, risking everything he had upon the whimsy of a chance. Horace, whom he loved, because he read him in the original, has a line that I frequently quote to my boys—"et res mihi, non mi rebus, subiungere conor," which I might translate—"I try to get on top of circumstances and not let them get on top of me." And that's good philosophy. Marcus Aurelius, whom General Lee greatly admired, made a statement which was one of the favorites of General Lee, "Misfortune nobly borne is good fortune." Not that misfortune can be nobly borne nor that we can develop a callousness to fate or a stoical acceptance, but that misfortune nobly borne is transmuted into that which is good and enriching for us; that through misfortune we become greater people.

Those were the great pagan philosophies for the mastery of defeat but none of those was the secret of General Lee's success. He could say, as his Master once said in a moment of what seemed to be his defeat, "I have overcome the world." And Lee could say that he had overcome this world because he walked ever in the radiance of another world.

And if that were the drama of his life, this chapter is the lesson of his life, and again it is religion. It was religion that gave him a tremendous mandate for simple usefulness. If we stop to remember the life histories of his colleagues after the great defeat, we recall that they followed many different courses. General Lee did not criticize that man who went with energy to recoup his shattered fortunes. General Lee did not criticize that man who gave his remaining years to writing books that would justify his conduct and rationalize his ideas. He did not criticize any of them but no one of them had his way. General Lee wanted to work. Not to desert his people in that adversity but to help them, he sought some privilege of service to his day and to his generation. He did not seek rest because he was tired; and he did not seek affluence because he was poor; and he did not seek good companionship because he was lonely. He sought not ease and comfort and compensation; he was no King Arthur in quest of Avalon that there he might heal him of his grievous wounds. When one of his closest friends remonstrated with General Lee as he was working too hard and was overtaxing his energies, General Lee said, "We must work." That was a brave, brisk, energetic remark, wasn't it? But it wasn't what General Lee said. I posed an erroneous statement, hoping you might see the difference. General Lee looked at this man, a great man himself, and he said, "We must work the works of Him that sent us while it is day for the night cometh when no man can work." And if you can discriminate between

a perfectly commendable statement, "We must work" and a divine statement on another plane, "We must work the works of Him that sent us * * *" you know something of how religion was the motive and the compulsion of this man's life; and he took a little struggling Virginia college, even as offer after offer poured in upon him, offers of immensely more money and immensely less labor, and there he influenced through bright boys that tomorrow he would not see. And there he loved his countrymen with never a word of unkindness, loved them into a kind of reconciliation. And there he died, unafraid, and went to his God.

That is the lesson of his life. If the great gray spirit could speak to those of us gathered in this holy church, he would say, this is no time, not when all human values are at stake, freedom, justice, and the very concept that we are children of the Heavenly Father, this is no time to seek our fortune or our profits for our convenience. We must work the works of Him that sent us while it is yet day.

I think the most significant of the Lee stories is the one with which Dr. Freeman closes his long and brilliant study. It was very near the end of Lee's life and a young mother brought to him her baby boy and held him up in her hands as sometimes the great Jewish mothers held their babies before the high altar. And the young mother said eagerly to General Lee: "Tell him something; or tell me something to tell him that came from you." It is the tableau of that moment that impresses my imagination. There was a little assemblage of three, almost symbolic persons. The old man, incomparable victor of life, now in the twilight shadows (and perhaps somewhere trumpets were beginning to sound for him on the other side); the little baby boy unawakened, with the strange pilgrimage we call life entirely before him; and the eternal mother, coveting the best for her own. The tired and thoughtful old man looked at the baby and answered six words, and answered slowly. That reply would have no meaning to the cynic, or the materialist, or the opportunist who feels that the world owes him a living. But it is full of a radiant illumination for all of us who welcome opportunity and who are willing to bear the responsibility.

Said the general to the young mother: "Tell him he must deny himself."

Allocation and Prices of Meat Products and Other Related Subjects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report prepared for the National Independent Meat Packers Association by Mr. Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council.

Mr. President, the total estimated cost of printing this article will be $410, as estimated by the Public Printer. Notwithstanding the cost, I believe that because of its unusual importance it should be printed in the RECORD, I therefore submit my request.

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

Mr. FREDERICK M. TOBIN,
Chairman, Special Steering Committee, National Independent Meat Packers Association, Rochester, N. Y.:

Subject: Allocation and Prices of Meat Products and Other Related Subjects.

In preparing this analysis at the request of Mr. C. B. Heinemann, president of your organization and Mr. Wilbur LaRoe, your counsel, I have tried to be objectively analytical. I realize fully that the livestock industry processes more tonnage of raw materials than all of our American factories added together and therefore is the most important factor in our national income and economic welfare.

My conclusions are based on facts available to all and even though they may not be in accord with some of the confused theories in regard to meat production, processing, distribution and the price levels that prevail, I feel that an examination of the tabulations used in making this report will prove the accuracy of my analysis.

I have at all times tried to be impartial to all the groups directly interested in the production and distribution of livestock and its products. In my report I have separated them into four groups—the farmer or producer, the packer as the processor, the wholesaler and retailer as middlemen, and the public as the consumer.

CURRENT CONFUSION

The passage of the bill to give the President control of allocations and the power to establish price ceilings on meat and other products, reflects the confusion of the American public. The demands for price ceilings are primarily the result of a failure to evaluate the effect of price changes in our economy in terms of the real cost of living or the relative earnings per hour as compared to the retail price of meat and other products.

Most of the American public has very little knowledge of the facts relative to the transition of hourly wages and price levels that have taken place.

Therefore highly publicized and too often erroneous theories lead the public to demand congressional action. Thus we find the public suddenly aroused and excited and everybody blaming everyone else though conditions are such that the producer, packer, retailer, and consumer are all getting an equivalent share of the income generated by livestock production.

ARE MEAT PRICES HIGH?

Whether meat prices are too high depends entirely how the question is analyzed. If compared to the wage and price level that prevailed in 1939, the answer is yes. But, if analyzed in terms of supplies, current hourly wages and present national income, the answer is no. There is no reason to theorize about it because the record is available for a definite comparison. I will use a simple illustration of a pound of round steak and the hourly wage and show the relative ability to buy in 1929 and 1949.

Year	Round steak—retail price in 51 large cities	Average hourly wage, all industries	Pounds of meat for an hour of work
	Cents per pound		
1929	46	$0.566	1.22
1949	85.3	1.40	1.64
1950 (June)	[1] 89	1.454	1.63

[1] Estimate.

This comparison shows that the average worker could buy more meat for an hour of work in 1949 and in June 1950 than he could in 1929. The meat consumption records bear this out on an annual basis. In 1929 the per capita consumption was 130.4 pounds, and in 1949 it was 143.8 pounds. The fairness of this comparison is based on the fact that in 1929 and 1949 the public spent 5.5 percent of its disposable income for meat. The question may be asked why I have used 1929 as a comparison rather than 1939. One of the reasons for our confusion is a comparison with 1935–1939 prices. During this period we averaged over 8,000,000 unemployed, and it is therefore not a normal period.

To enlarge on this relative change in prices without any increase in the real cost of living, I will show the shift from 1939 to 1948.

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Personal income all groups	Retail sales all goods	Total payrolls all labor less social security
1939	$72,600	$42,000	$45,700
1948	$209,500	$124,000	$135,000
Percent increase	190	195	195.3

A fair analysis of this tabulation leaves no doubt in regard to labor as a group receiving its fair share of the increase in national income. It also proves the price of goods at retail was not excessive in ratio to income available for goods and that retail sales volume in dollars lagged behind the increase in wages and national income totals.

NATURAL LAWS OF EXCHANGE

Unless the natural laws of exchange which exist in our economy regardless of legislation are taken into consideration, price ceilings can very easily penalize some group in our economic cycle and prevent the very production which is needed to supply the dollar demand from other sources.

The reason for these laws of exchange is entirely mathematical. The pay received by each group for goods or services is their ration of the national income and is the extent of their demand at the market place.

In our economy as a whole, we have a total of about 60,000,000 civilian workers. About 50,000,000 are on the payroll and the other 10,000,000 are the operators of business units which direct the production of goods and services. Of this 10,000,000 business operations about 6,000,000 are the individually owned and operated farms which produce 70 percent of all the raw materials used in our production cycle.

The wages paid out to the men on payroll represent a cost in the production of goods, but they also represent a market for goods in direct proportion. Thus we find the retail volume correlating in proportion to the payroll and the initial price for raw materials.

The same ratio holds true in expenditures for meat. In the 5-year period 1925–1929, the retail value of meat was quite constant in percentage of disposable income, averaging 5.66 percent. In the following period 1930–39, the retail value averaged 5.83 percent of the disposable income. During the first period 1925–29, we had prosperity and we had depression in 1930–39, yet the ratios were quite constant because of the laws of exchange which determine that the prices paid also total the demand for goods. Therefore with three times the national income in 1949 that we had in 1939, we could expect at least three times the expenditures for meat at retail.

Using this positive expenditure for meats and the laws of exchange which determine the balance between wage income and retail expenditures we can easily check the relative price of meats in 1939 and 1949. The index of disposable income in 1939 was 105 percent of 1935–39 as 100. In 1949 it

was 250 percent. Dividing the 105 into 250, we find that round steak could have sold for 238 percent of the 1939 price level. The average price in the United States in 51 leading cities in 1939 was 36 cents. Multiplying by 238 the result is $0.857 as compared to the price of $0.853 which was the actual figure in 1949.

OTHER RATIOS

The constant ratios extend to many other fields in the same manner. To properly understand their operation and the reason for their existence it is necessary that we have a complete picture of our economy.

The gross farm income, 50 percent of which is made up of livestock, dairy and poultry production, is the gear wheel of our economy. For 25 years each $1 of gross farm income has generated $7 of national income. And whenever the gross farm income has fallen off $1, it has set the stage for a reduction of $7 of national income.

The inflationary or deflationary spiral can be measured quite accurately with this seven times multiple of gross farm production. For example, as the value of the farm products increases at the source, each handling process through our economic cycle, draws out more dollars through capital funds or bank credits.

Rural territory, towns of 2,000 and under have 43 percent of our population. Their income or buying power is in direct proportion to the value of farm products and other raw materials.

Economists as a rule underestimate the importance of this market. The population of New York State spends 50 percent of its personal income for goods, as compared to an expenditure of 70 percent for goods at retail by the citizens of Iowa.

Because of this factor rural territory is roughly the market for 50 percent of factory production. As a direct corollary, factory payrolls (production workers) and gross farm income rise and fall in direct proportion.

For example, from 1929 to 1932 the gross farm income dropped about $7,000,000,000 and the national income dropped from $87,300,000,000 in 1929 to $39,600,000,000 in 1933, or a loss in national income of $47,700,000,000. What was the effect of lower farm prices on the consumer in the Nation as a whole? In 1929 the per capita consumption of meats was 130.4 pounds and in 1932 it was 130.2. The percentage of disposable income spent for meat was 5.5 percent in 1929 and 5.9 percent in 1932. The drop in livestock prices and the price of other farm products shut off the stream of national income and forced our buying power to drop in proportion.

To the reader of this report this conclusion may seem unwarranted. There will be those who say that wages come first or capital expenditures come first. It really doesn't make any difference. The important thing is that our national income does follow the gross farm income up or down at an interval of about 6 months.

This was clearly illustrated in the drop in farm prices from 1948 to 1949. Everybody hailed this drop in prices with glee, not realizing the effect on our national income. The gross farm income dropped approximately $3,000,000,000. In the President's economic report to Congress in January 1950 the report gives the national income level for the last quarter of 1948 as $235,300,000,000. The 1949 income in the President's economic report for midyear in July 1950 gives the national income level for the last quarter of 1949 as $214,300,000,000, or $20,000,000,000 less than in 1948, or about seven times the drop in gross farm income.

During this period the hourly wage for all industrial labor advanced from $1.35, the average for 1948, to $1.40 in 1949. There was no reduction in taxes, transportation rates, etc. Therefore we did lose the $20,000,000,000 of potential income because of the drop in farm prices.

In like manner with the recovery of farm prices and other raw materials to the 1948 level, the national income level in the last quarter of 1950 will be at least $235,000,000,000 or about 10 percent above the national income level the last quarter of 1949. With the expenditures approximately an average of 5.7 percent of the disposable income for meat, this will mean over $1,000,000,000 more purchasing power for meats. With the current price level for raw materials, the increase in hourly wages now being granted and an increase in physical production, our national income by the second quarter of 1951 can easily rise to $260,000,000,000 or roughly $2,500,000,000 more available for meats than the last quarter of 1949.

Do we have the meat to satisfy this market? To those who think of meat production as a push-button industry, we will have, through an edict from some bureau in Washington. But livestock production is not a push-button industry. The supply of meat depends on feed and livestock numbers available to produce meat. It depends on a price which will pay for the increased production. This brings us to the first important segment of our livestock economy—the producer.

THE FARMER OR PRODUCER

Many of our theorists and social reformers think of agriculture as a way of life. This is also true of their thinking in regard to livestock production. Let's take a look at the record. We have a capital economy. Agriculture in the production of livestock and equipment required for production has a much larger investment than all the steel industry and automobile industry combined.

We expect to pay industry a fair price for all war materials or anything which it may produce in peacetime. Following the same principle in peace or war, the agriculture industry is entitled to a proper price for the livestock it produces and the products produced therefrom. The parity equation for agricultural prices is in reality nothing more than an average cost of production plus a normal profit comparable to the price to which every industry is entitled to and must receive if it is to operate and expand in ratio to the increase in population and technological improvement. Too often our social reformers forget that it requires a profit to create the new capital to invest in the expansion of a growing economy.

This conclusion that the livestock industry is a business is not a theory when we realize that today it requires about $6,000 of capital for a Corn Belt farmer to buy 25 head of yearling cattle and the corn and other feed which he requires to finish them for market. The farmer, of course, is interested in the welfare of the Nation, but he is also interested in his own welfare and that of his family. He is not going to feed livestock unless he is reasonably sure that he gets a proper return.

Because of this factor the present confusion as to price ceilings may tend to curtail the movement of livestock to the Corn Belt for feeding purposes. Good feeders are selling at $32 per hundredweight and the parity price for corn is $1.60 per bushel. The farmer cannot be blamed for hesitating with unknown threats of price ceilings in the offing.

One of the principal reasons for the meat shortage in the middle of 1946 was the sudden increase of 30 cents per bushel in the ceiling price on corn without a corresponding increase in the price of livestock.

FEED SUPPLIES

The most important angle in livestock production is feed. As I pointed out earlier in my analysis, the livestock industry processes more tonnage of raw materials than all our factories. Each animal is a factory, consuming grass, hay, corn, and many other feeds to sustain life and growth. The question that comes first is: How much feed do we have?

Again it is evident that the push-button operators in our Washington bureaus believe that by pushing a button, they can increase the feed supplies overnight. This doesn't happen to be the case. It takes acreage, soil, water, and sunshine to produce crops. No governmental agency can, through legislation or edict, control either of them.

Our supply of acres is no greater than it has been for the past 50 years. We have not, and cannot, add a single foot of land to the area covered by the United States. We have all told about 1,120,000,000 acres of improved and unimproved farm land. About one-half of this acreage is available for crops and the other half is mostly grazing land in areas where lack of rainfall, rocky territory, or soil conditions preclude crop production.

Of the 560,000,000 acres of cropland about 170,000,000 acres are used as permanent grassland or pasturage. We have available, after deducting orchards and other trees about 365,000,000 acres of cropland interchangeable for rotation of pasturage and tillable crops. The acreage available for crops has been practically static ever since 1929. New acreage brought in by drainage and irrigation has been offset by acreage taken out of production for factory sites, roads, suburban development and other purposes.

Our principal gain in acreage available for meat production has been in the shift from horsepower to tractors or mechanized power. About 50,000,000 acres have been made available for utilization as feed for livestock instead of power. The greatest part of this acreage has been used for an increase in the number of dairy cattle which indirectly, through veal, barren cows, aged cows, etc., furnish part of our meat supply.

A factor that may have repercussions in our meat supply is the relatively low price of fats and oils. The removal of the tax on colored oleomargarine has increased the competitive price situation as between oleomargarine and butter.

Butter is the production from surplus whole milk supplies. Removal of price supports on butter could curtail dairy production and in turn the meat production from that source.

The low price of fats and oils is a complete dislocation of real values. A pound of fat contains about 4,080 calories as compared to 1,275 in a pound of lean meat. Yet a pound of fat has been selling at 25 cents per pound as compared to 65 cents for round steak or lean meat. If the reverse were true, the consumer would be getting as many calories in buying fat as lean meat.

The high caloric food value of fats and oils should be highly publicized. Low-income families could do much to provide a better diet for less money through a greater use of fats with their high food content.

We have been able, through a combination of a good moisture supply and the utilization of chemical fertilizers, to increase the acreage yield of many of our crops. Whether we can continue the present yield per acre is a question that nature alone can answer. If we were to return to the average weather conditions that prevailed in 1925–29, our feed supplies could fall off 30 percent and this in turn would reduce our meat production 30 percent.

There is no way in which we can regulate the rainfall or the sunshine and realism should force us to realize that our meat production lies in the lap of God. We can, however, through a prudent operation of our economy, take the first step which is necessary for sufficient meat production, provide a reserve of feed crops to carry us over periods of low crop production.

If we keep in mind the simple fact that each $1 of gross farm income means $7 of national income and that livestock, dairy, and poultry products make up one-half of our gross farm income and in turn generate one-half of our national income, the cost of carrying such reserves becomes a minor cost in operating our economy. Good business judgment in providing for the physical volume of goods we need to create national income should force us to recognize the sound principle of reserve feed supplies.

LIVESTOCK NUMBERS

The next important factor is the number of factories we have to process our feed supplies. The human race with all its inventive genius has not been able to produce artificial beefsteak.

The numbers of cattle, hogs, sheep, and poultry over a period of years have kept pace with feed supplies and correspond quite closely to population growth. There has been some efficiency in feeding operations but not nearly as much as some people imagine. A definite picture of our ability to produce meat can be obtained from a comparison of the pounds of meat produced and the bushels of corn in relative periods.

On January 1, 1930, we had 61,003,000 head of cattle. On January 1, 1950, we had an estimated 80,277,000 cattle. On January 1, 1930, we had 55,705,000 hogs as compared to 60,400,000 on January 1, 1950. Our numbers of sheep dropped from 48,381,000 on January 1, 1930, to 30,797,000 on January 1, 1950.

At first glance to those who do not realize that our population has increased this seems like a surplus. In 1930 the census gave our population as 122,700,000 as compared to an estimated 151,000,000 at the present time. This represents an increase of 23 percent in population.

There is an old saying that the "proof is in the pudding." That also applies to our meat supplies. The actual pounds of meat produced when compared end all argument as to surplus, efficiency of feeding, etc.

In 1930–31 our meat production was 16,276,000,000 pounds of beef, pork, mutton, and veal. In 1949, it was 21,710,000,000 pounds. This represents an increase of 33 percent. With an increase of 23 percent in the population this represents an increase of about 11 percent in actual pounds of meat. This increase of 11 percent is quite in line with the average increase in per capita consumption for all products produced in the United States in the transition from 1939 income levels to the current income level. It represents roughly the net gain in our standard of living. It also approximates the increased per capita consumption of 130 pounds in 1930 to about 144 pounds in 1949.

The public has been led to believe that there will be ample meat production. The record would indicate that it will require a continued effort on the part of the producer if meat supplies are to be kept in balance with our population increase and buying power. The end factor in meat production is corn and in the following table are the figures of corn production and meat supplies during the 1942–49 period..

Year	Corn production, bushels	Meat production, pounds
1942	3,088,000,000	21,912,000,000
1943	2,965,000,000	24,482,000,000
1944	3,088,000,000	25,178,000,000
1945	2,880,000,000	23,687,000,000
1946	3,249,000,000	22,956,000,000
1947	2,383,000,000	23,480,000,000
1948	3,650,000,000	21,446,000,000
Yearly average	3,041,000,000	23,150,000,000

On the basis of a 7-year average of corn production and its transition into meat supplies, we find that it will require roughly about 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn to produce 23,000,000,000 pounds of meat.

With full employment at current hourly wages, meat consumption can be expected to be about 155 pounds. With an estimated population of 151,000,000 this would require an output of 23,400,000,000 pounds. Stated in another way, we have the potential production required to satisfy the demand if we have and maintain a proper price structure for the producer.

The other question in meat production is the number of factories or numbers of livestock to process our feed supply. In the next table I have set out the numbers of hogs and cattle on farms January 1 each year in the 7-year period when we produced the meat as shown in the previous table. I have omitted sheep because of their small part in meat production.

Year	Cattle numbers	Hog numbers
1942	76,025,000	60,607,000
1943	81,204,000	73,881,000
1944	85,334,000	83,741,000
1945	85,675,000	59,331,000
1946	82,434,000	61,301,000
1947	81,207,000	56,921,000
1948	78,126,000	55,028,000
Annual average	81,400,000	64,300,000
Jan. 1, 1950 (estimated)	80,277,000	60,424,000

This tabulation points out that we need to increase our cattle numbers about 1,000,000 and hog numbers about 4,000,000 to produce an average of 23,000,000,000 pounds of meat.

Relative production in the first three-quarters of 1949 as compared to the estimated production in the first three-quarters of 1950 are given in the next tabulation.

Production of meats—Beef, pork, mutton, and veal

[Millions of pounds]

Year	First quarter	Second quarter	Third quarter	Total
1949	5,787	4,734	4,813	15,334
1950	5,840	4,936	4,890	15,666

Increase approximately 2 percent from 1949 to 1950.

The record of meat production indicates that our current supplies 1949 and 1950 of about 21,700,000,000 are below the potential demand now existing with current payrolls and national income. This shortage plus the seasonal short supply are primarily responsible for the current outcry against the high price of meat. In all fairness to the consumer it should be pointed out that current prices are higher than the prices which prevail for other commodities. It is, however, not as great as the public has been led to believe. The price of all commodities in August (Bureau of Labor Index 1926—100) was 166.8 as compared to 174.6 for foods. The differential is roughly 5 percent, a very minor differential with the short seasonal supply of meats in July–September.

PACKER OR PROCESSOR

The packer serves the public as a buyer and processor of livestock as it comes to market. Very often the industry gets the blame for a shift in prices for livestock paid to the farmer and, on the other hand, is blamed by the consumer for taking out too great a profit margin.

One of the factors which confronts the packer is the dress-out from live weight to the dressed carcass. He has been unable to increasing the dressing percentage or the amount of steak per animal. The average dressing percentage of cattle and hogs for the period 1939–49 illustrates how constant this ratio is.

Year	Cattle dressing percentage average	Hog dressing percentage average
1939	54.2	75.1
1940	54.5	74.5
1941	54.9	75.4
1942	54.2	75.2
1943	53.6	75.5
1944	51.9	75.5
1945	52.8	75.8
1946	52.9	75.3
1947	52.6	75.9
1948	52.7	76.0
1949	54.5	76.2

In years of abundant feed the percentage increases slightly and falls off slightly in years when the feed supplies are low compared to livestock numbers. The change is very minor and as a result the effect of higher costs for livestock means an increase in dressed meat in almost the same ratio. This can be illustrated by a comparison of cattle prices and the price of round steak in 1942 and 1948.

Year	Average price for cattle at Chicago	Average price round steak at retail
1942	$13.79 per hundredweight.	43.5 cents per pound.
1948	$30.88 per hundredweight.	90.5 cents per pound.
Percentage increase	124	108.

The increase in live weight cost from 1942 to 1948 was 124 percent. On the basis of live weight cost with the same relative margin from packer to the retail counter the price of round steak in 1948 should have been 224 percent of 43.5 cents or 97.4 cents per pound. This proves that neither the packer nor the retailer was charging an excess margin of profit in 1948 as compared to 1942 with the average price at 90.5 cents per pound.

UNFAIR CRITICISM

In fact the record does not support the theory expressed by many, who have not taken a look at the facts, that the packer and the retailer are receiving an unfair margin between the farmer and the consumer. The tabulation below gives the percentage of the consumer's dollar received by farmers for all farm products over a period of years and also that of livestock as a special item.

Year	Farmers share of consumers dollar—all products	Farmers share of consumers dollar—livestock products
	Cents	*Cents*
1925–30	40.8	46.0
1935–39	40.0	47.0
1944	52.0	66.0
1945	54.0	73.0
1946	53.0	68.0
1947	52.0	64.0
1948	51.0	63.0

With the farmer receiving 63 percent of the consumer's dollar in 1948, as compared to 1935–39 average of 47 percent, the charge that there is an excessive margin for the packer and retailer is unwarranted.

I have pointed out that the packer has not been able to change the dressing weight. Therefore the increased percentage of the consumer's dollar to the farmer is due almost entirely to the increased efficiency in the operation of processing and distribution of meat.

Better methods of cooling and storage of meats have been an important factor in preventing spoilage and deterioration in the quality of meat.

The increase in canning of meats and a better utilization of meat in sausage and hamburger since the earlier period 1921-30 has also helped to reduce the operating margin between the packer and the consumer. There is no question that the benefit of this efficiency has been passed on to both the consumer and the farmer.

An important factor that has not been adjusted is that of capital investment. The increase in the price level since 1939 has been from 77.1 percent of the 1926 level as 100 to 167.5 percent as of September 1950. This is an increase of 117 percent. This in turn means that future capital investment in the packing industry and other businesses engaged in meat production will be relatively higher. When this adjustment is made the percentage of the consumer's dollar going to the farmer will decline to that extent.

The high percentage of the consumer's dollar received by the farmer during the war years would indicate that under price ceilings the margin between the farmer and the consumer was relatively low. A lower margin would tend to help create black markets in our system of processing and distribution. Individuals in charge of a business feel that self-protection comes first and if black markets are to be prevented care must be taken to allow proper margins in any program of price control.

The agricultural industry is carried on by about 10,000,000 workers, including unpaid family help. In the retail and wholesale trade, the 1949 employment was a little over 11,000,000. This illustrates that if these men are to receive a relative wage in our system of distribution, a proper margin must be maintained to provide the income to pay the workers in wholesale and retail trades.

BYPRODUCTS

In addition to meats, the packing industry has many byproducts such as lard, tallow, hides, etc. The relative prices of these products very often influence the price of choicer meats, such as steak, ham, bacon, pork chops, etc. For example, if lard prices are 10 cents per pound below the normal that should prevail in ratio to live costs, this loss must be recovered by increasing the price of other cuts.

At times the price of pork chops, for example, will be 10 cents per pound higher at retail because of a 10-cents-per-pound loss on the lard content in the dressed carcass. The retailer is also forced to make an adjustment in the price of salable meat to offset the loss from trimings of fat, bone, etc.

The relatively low price of lard and tallow has been an important factor in the last 18 months. Fats and oils have been selling at about 60 percent of the level for other products and the price of pork chops, ham, etc., has been relatively higher than the price which should have prevailed on the basis of live costs with fats and oils prices at a parity level.

UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION

A very important factor which contributes materially to the public outcry against the price of meat is the unequal distribution of pork products in the marketing season. Hogs produce roughly one-half of our meat supplies. The Corn Belt is the heaviest producer of hogs and because of climatic conditions most of the pigs are farrowed in the spring thus having the advantage of warm weather and also summer pasturage. There is nothing the packer can do about it and he is confronted with 65 percent of the hog crop in the 7 months—October-April—and only 35 percent in the 5 months—May-September. This percentage ratio is a natural one and has been approximately the same for 50 years.

On the basis of 10,000,000,000 pounds of pork products this means an average supply of roughly 900,000,000 pounds per month in the period October to April and about 700,000,000 pounds per month in the period May-September. This is a natural problem and the only thing that can be done about it is to level off this supply differential with a greater supply of meat going into storage in the seasons of heavy production.

An interesting example of this factor occurred in 1949. The swivel-chair producers in Washington told everyone of the tremendous increase in pork supplies available in the fall of 1949 when in reality there was no reason for it. Much of this propaganda was put out in regard to the need of a price-support program.

Even the packing industry was misled and the price of hogs dropped to an average of $15.05 at Chicago in December. In addition, it brought about early marketings thus killing off the very factories which we needed to produce more pounds of meat. The average weight of hogs in September dropped to 215 pounds, reflecting the scare thrown into the producers by the announcement of a support price a little over $14 per hundredweight in Midwest markets for December. There was no excuse for a $14 support price with the parity price at $19 per hundredweight.

These premature marketings and the psychological factor of lower prices prevented some needed expansion in the production of hogs. We had the feed supplies to produce more weight on each animal and in turn more pounds of meat. The packer failed to level off this excess marketing through storage and on September 2, 1950, we find hogs selling on the Chicago market with a top of close to $25 per hundredweight or about $10 above last December.

There wasn't any reason for this extreme fluctuation in prices and it is up to the packing industry to work out ways and means to prevent such an occurrence in the future. The extreme change in prices confuses the farmer and the consumer. The retailer as a rule blames the farmer and the packer for the high cost of meat during the season of short supplies.

By the simple process of paying a fair and higher price in the latter part of 1949 and storing some of this meat, everyone would have been more confident of future markets, feeding operations would have been more stable, and the consumer would have been paying relatively less for meats in August and September this year. It would have materially reduced the demand for price ceilings and controls.

THE CONSUMER

The consumer is a reader of the news that goes out and, in turn, is put out over the radio. He has no way of knowing what is a fair price for meat at the retail counter and therefore is subject to propaganda written up by somebody who knows even less. Because of the psychological factor of lower prices and the rapid reduction in the quality of meat that isn't moved into consumption channels, a short buying strike on the part of the consumer or resistance to prices can be very detrimental to the producer, the packer, the retailer, and finally the consumer. In other words, we all pay for the mistakes.

There is no reason why the consumer cannot be properly informed. Our Government has the finest record of production of farm products, their processing and transition into consumer goods of any nation in the world. The records of dressing percentage and retail prices can easily be ascertained at any price level.

The consumer must be made to realize that if he wants 45-cent steak instead of 90 cents per pound, he will have to take a cut of 50 percent in his current hourly wage. This conclusion is the result of the simple fact that about 60 percent of the national income as an average is the annual payroll in the United States and if current wages are to be paid, then the consumer must be prepared to pay for consumer goods which have been produced with the payment of such wages. For example, 50,000,000 workers with an annual wage of $2,900 means a payroll of $145,000,000,000. This payroll cannot be met unless the price of goods creates approximately $240,000,000,000 of national income.

The consumer must be told that he cannot expect the farmer to produce the meat, to have the packer process it, and to have the retail trade handle it for him, except at a price comparable to the wage he demands.

The packing industry should take the lead in publicising the facts as to the real cost of living, namely, that the consumer today is receiving more goods, per capita, than he did prior to World War II.

In 1939 round steak was selling for 36 cents per pound. The average annual wage was $1,260 and we had 8,000,000 unemployed because of too low a price level.

In 1949 we had an annual wage of $2,869. If the consumer wants 1939 prices to come back then he must expect to take a corresponding cut in his wage or income level. Current price levels and production will generate approximately $235,000,000,000. At 1939 prices levels, current production would generate approximately $108,000,000,000.

We can't have high income and low prices.

OUR NATIONAL POTENTIAL

In arriving at any kind of program of sound economics, either in peace or war, we should know first of all what we can do and the results which we can expect. I have pointed out that with current livestock numbers and feed supplies that there is no reason why, under the normal operation of our economy, we cannot produce the needed supplies of meat and at a price level comparative to consumer income.

In fact the next tabulation shows how the natural laws of exchange force a comparative price as income and price levels change.

Comparative price changes

[Index 1926 as 100—BLS]

Item	Period, August 1950	Period, June 1950	Percentage increase
Farm products	177.5	165.9	[1] 7.0
Foods	174.6	162.1	7.7
Livestock	263.8	222.4	9.6
Meats	258.3	241.4	7.0
Livestock and poultry	217.3	66.0	[2] 229.0
Meats, poultry, and fish	240.2	73.7	226.0

[1] Note that the increase in the price of meat from June 1950 to August 1950 was the same as for all foods and that meat prices advanced less than live weight costs.

[2] Note how the laws of exchange maintain a relative price balance in a transition period from August 1939 to August 1950, 10 years of the most violent changes in the history of our economy. Both tabulations are based on the Sept. 22 release of the Bureau of Labor's wholesale Commodity Price Index.

Both comparisons prove that there has been no excessive mark-up in wholesale meat prices when compared with the live costs which are determined by competitive bidding.

I have pointed out that our national-income level will run a minimum of $235,000,000,000 the last quarter of this year. As an illustration of the increase underway, I would like to quote from an item in the Wall Street Journal, page 1, September 20, 1950.

"Pay envelopes of production workers in manufacturing industries swelled to a high average of $60.26 weekly during August. The average workweek was 41.2 hours."

The hourly wage has risen from $1.40 per hour in 1949 to $1.454 in June 1950. Since then there have been some increases. In August 1949 the number of hours worked was 39.1 hours, as compared to the 41.2 hours as given in the item I have quoted from the Wall Street Journal.

A fact which is often forgotten is that the wage per hour is only part of the laborer's income. The number of hours is also important. The increased hours in August 1950, plus the increase in hourly wage, has increased the weekly income from $54.70 in August 1949 to $60.28 in August of 1950. This is an increase of a little over 10 percent per week. Note how closely this increase ratios to the price increase for livestock. In addition, we have had the reemployment of about 3,000,000 workers in industry and the military forces who were unemployed in 1949. As a result, the national-income level will be at least 10 percent above that of the last quarter of 1949, and this will be reflected in at least 10% increase in the over-all dollar expenditures for goods at retail, including meat products.

With the approach of the heavy marketing season the price of livestock may be reduced to some extent and will be reflected at retail levels. The buying power as indicated by current weekly earnings will mean an increased per capita consumption of meat. As I have pointed out, we have the feed supplies to produce the meat. This feed supply can be utilized if necessary by a proper price on livestock to induce the feeding of the grain to hogs and cattle which serve as a meat factory.

But should the price level drop like it did in the latter part of 1949 the hogs will not be kept on the farm for a longer feed and will go to market at too low a weight to bring about the meat production which our ability to consume will require. Failure to carry over a greater supply of meat from heavy marketings will cause prices to skyrocket next summer and bring on the rigid price controls which should be avoided.

On the basis of the record, there is no reason why livestock prices cannot be controlled through a voluntary program of production, processing, and distribution. Price ceilings do not produce a single pound of meat, and because of the many factors involved in pricing the many varieties of meat price ceilings can very easily curtail the very production we will require. A brief analysis of mistakes under the OPA and the problems inherent in fixed price ceilings might be helpful in arriving at a solution.

OPA PRICE CEILINGS

In establishing price ceilings under the control bill which has been passed by Congress, it is stipulated that no ceiling shall be placed on farm prices below the parity level, or the price in the period May 24 to June 24, 1950.

As I have pointed out, the parity equation is the average cost of production plus the average profit. It is arrived at by a comparison of the prices the farmer receives to the prices he paid. In the prices the farmer pays we have the wage level, the cost of raw materials, management and capital expense, taxes, and the average mark-up or profit that is included in the selling price of goods.

To establish this parity price as the yardstick without any flexibility will tend to reduce production. Our economy is widespread and has a great deal of variation. We have submarginal farms, submarginal business operations, and in many cases submarginal resources.

For example, we have the good farmer with good soil and then we may have a poor operator on a farm with poor soil. With the price ceiling at parity or the average price level, the submarginal operation will not produce unless the production is subsidized or unless the production can be sold at a higher price in the black market. We need the submarginal production to add to the total. The same is true in our business operation, both in the packing industry and our retail outlets. Subsidies are unsound in principle and operation.

FLEXIBLE PRICES

A much more effective program would be a support price at 90 percent of parity and a ceiling at 110 percent with an average of 100.

In fact that is exactly how our economy should operate in peacetime and the laws of exchange are continually trying to maintain the average of 100. In this connection it might be well to point out that with corn supported at 90 percent of parity, a market for livestock at less than 90 percent will tend to curtail production. As products are in short supply an increase of 10 percent in price will tend to increase production and at the same time cause the public to substitute some other product which may have dropped to 90 percent.

Under the long-time operation of our peacetime economy, the tariff was a support price and also a ceiling, shutting off imports when our price level dropped and serving as a ceiling when our prices advanced enough to attract imports.

In our economy we have approximately 35 key commodities, such as grains, livestock, metals, petroleum, coal, fiber crops, etc., that end up in the production of about 90 percent of all goods at the retail market level.

This is the gear wheel of our annual income cycle. I have pointed out that each $1 of gross farm income generates $7 of national income. This is the result of labor efficiency. We have about one farmer producing the raw farm materials for himself and six others. As these materials go through our economic cycle the labor cost for transportation, processing, distribution, service, finance, and so forth, is added on, resulting in the multiple of seven times.

The gross value of these farm products average about 14 percent of our national income. The important fact is that it is a practical constant in either peace or war.

In like manner total wage payments average about 61 percent of the national income as an average constant. The many changes that have taken place in the last 20 years have not changed these ratios. The raw materials and the hourly wages are the principal factor in the price of goods and services. Price ceilings on goods cannot be effective without price ceilings on the basic raw materials and hourly wages.

I have pointed out that the percentage of expenditures for meat are practically constant at an average of 5.7 percent of the consumable income. This is not an accident, but the definite result of the laws of exchange which I have mentioned. A similar pattern exists in all phases of our economy.

The items which have a constant demand because of the natural need for food and clothing bear a fixed ratio to the whole. This can be illustrated by a tabulation of expenditures for food, beverage, clothing, shoes, and tobacco, as compared to retail sales.

Year	Shoes, clothing, beverage, food, and tobacco	Retail sales, all goods	Ratio of column I to II
	Billions	*Billions*	
1929	$32.4	$47.0	69
1939	29 4	42.0	70
1949	85.5	122.5	70

In the same manner the real cost of food is about 23 percent of the national income as a separate item in the same 3 years set forth above. A change in the price level changes dollar expenditures but does not change the percentage of the national income spent for the necessities included in the tabulation. The reason for this constant ratio is a natural demand by nature to sustain life in the human body.

Thus we find that the natural laws of exchange and arithmetic will not permit a change in the cost of living in our economy as a whole through a change in price levels. Also, that there is only one way to increase our standard of living and that is through an increase in per man production of goods and services. Money is just the measuring stick. When prices fall below the parity level, reducing the price of food, unemployment follows. If those who remain employed were taxed to support the unemployed there would be no gain on an individual basis. Under our current philosophy of economics, when prices fall too low to create the income for full employment, they should be supported by governmental expenditures and charged to the national deficit. Very unsound economics but politically popular in some quarters.

This can be further illustrated by a tabulation of staple items with their cost in 1939 and 1949.

Comparison of weekly wages with retail food prices

Staple food items	Retail price 1939 [1]	Retail price 1949 [1]
	Cents	*Cents*
Loaf of white bread	7.9	14.0
Round steak (pound)	36.0	85.3
Chuck roast (pound)	23.4	55.5
Pork chops (pound)	30.4	74.3
Bacon (pound)	31.9	66.5
Butter (pound)	32.5	72.5
Sugar (pound)	5.4	9.5
Eggs (dozen)	32.1	69.6
Milk, quart, fresh, delivered	12.2	21.1
Lard (pound)	11.0	19.2
Total cost	223.7	487.5

[1] Retail prices, Bureau of Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, average price 51 leading cities.

NOTE.—President's Economic Report to Congress January 1950:

Wage per hour 1939 in manufacturing	$0.633
Hours worked	37.7
Wage per hour 1949 in manufacturing	$1.40
Hours worked	39.1
Weekly wages in 1939	$23.86
Weekly wages 1949	$54.74
Increase in average weekly wages 1939-49, percent	125
Increase in total cost of food items, percent	118
Buying power of weekly wages in 1949 as compared to 1939, percent	117.8
Buying power of hourly wages in 1949 as compared to 1939, percent	101.4

Time required to earn food items in 1949, 3 hours 29 minutes.

Time required to earn food items in 1939, 3 hours 32 minutes.

The tabulation illustrates the positive factor of these laws of exchange and unless we recognize them, we will be groping in the dark. Labor clamors for higher wages, the farmer for higher prices, thus causing a spiral in our price level while the real cost of living remains the same. Temporarily some group has an advantage because of the submarginal factors I have mentioned or a shift in the price of some item of goods or a wage increase in some industry. But over a period of years these adjustments have to be balanced by others throughout the economy as a whole.

Once we realize that we cannot change the total cost of living by lower or higher prices, we will become more willing to act with a definite objective.

A price range such as I have suggested could be operated through a voluntary program without the restrictive factors resulting from a fixed price level. The over-all effect of a flexible 90 to 110 percent price structure would be an average of approximately 100 for all goods.

If wage levels were kept in balance with the price index and stabilized, the inflationary effect of higher material price and in turn higher wages would end.

The next question is what should the price be? The hourly wage in all industries in 1942 was $0.853. In June 1950 it had risen to $1.454 or an increase of 70

percent. In 1942 the over-all price level was 98.8 percent of 1926 as 100. On September 5, the price level was 167.5, an increase of 69.5 percent. This illustrates how the buying power for an hour of work is much the same today as in 1942.

The current wage increase and higher prices for all raw materials will tend to force a price level or an over-all basis of 10 percent higher than now prevails. This in turn will generate 10 percent more income and it will require 10 percent more income to buy the same amount of goods. In addition it will reduce the current buying power of dollar savings 10 percent.

If the 35 leading raw materials were stabilized at an average of 170 percent of 1926 as 100 with a range of 90 to 110 percent and wages stabilized at current levels, we could expect a national income of $240,000,000,000 from current production. By utilizing our efficiency and increased labor force we can expand present production 20 percent. This would increase our national income 20 percent of $240,000,000,000 without further increases in our price level and would not be inflationary.

We can still further expand our production by increasing the hours of work per week. This will mean more output per man and give each man a greater purchasing power for a day's work. The economic problem confronting the Nation in either peace or war is to maintain price stability and a balance between raw material prices, hourly earnings and the price of all commodities.

WAR PERIODS

The inflationary factors in war periods is the result of heavier production and consumption of durable goods which average about 10 percent of consumer expenditures in peacetime. In World War II, we increased our durable goods production 230 percent from 1939 to the peak in 1943. In the same period, we increased our production of nondurable goods 61 percent. In addition we curtailed the sale of many items of durable goods, thus leaving the income from their production in the hands of the consumer.

This factor will happen in all wars and leave the consumer with too much buying power for nondurable goods, most of which are the items of foods, clothing, beverage, tobacco, and shoes. In spite of this excess income in the hands of the consumer, the Government in World War II subsidized the consumer, thus adding to the inflationary effect.

If these funds had been drained off through taxation and used to pay for the extra durable goods used for war purposes, we could have eliminated the increase in our national debt and much of the inflationary increase in price levels.

The following tabulation shows the national income for the three war years 1943–45 and the excess of national income over domestic expenditures for goods and services.

Balance sheet for 3 war years

Year	National income	All consumer expenditures for goods and services	Balance of national income above consumer expenditures
	Billions	*Billions*	*Billions*
1943	$169.7	$102.2	$67.5
1944	183.8	111.5	72.3
1945	182.7	123.0	59.3
Total			199.1
Personal taxes, 1943–45			57.6
Inflationary buying power			141.5

Under an economy as widespread as ours it is impossible to stop inflation with price ceilings unless this excess income is used to balance the national budget. If this income had been drained off, then the balance in the hands of the consumer would have been his ration available for consumer goods in the domestic market.

CURRENT MILITARY NEEDS

Current military needs do not present the economic problem of an all-out effort similar to World War II. In the case of meats, an expansion of 1,000,000 in the Armed Forces will mean additional meat requirements of roughly 100 pounds per year per man for those in the military service. The meat per man for our Army ration exceeds our civilian consumption by that amount. These requirements are so minor when compared to total production that there is no reason for the fear of our present military needs creating a shortage of food. The shortage, if any, will be in the production of durable goods. Even in the case of durable goods we can expand enough to take care of the needs without disrupting our normal civilian economy.

On the other hand there is no reason why wages and prices should be advanced above the present level. A proper realization by industry that increased prices and wages will merely increase the number of dollars required to buy the war materials and to exchange goods in our domestic economy should make them wish to cooperate in a voluntary program of price ceilings that can be publicly announced. Labor should forego any further demand for increased wages and the Government should levy the needed taxes to balance the budget.

CONCLUSION

After checking through the record of production of livestock and other factors, I cannot find any need for rigid price ceilings or rationing on any food product. The demand for price ceilings are primarily the result of a confused and uninformed public. I have not tried to set forth a specific program but, in my opinion, it would be a comparatively simple matter to handle the production of meat products and their distribution through a voluntary program which could be expected to stabilize prices and at the same time produce the needed meat supplies. If at any time you wish to have an outline of a definite program, I will be glad to prepare it for you.

In making this report I have tried primarily to set out the positive forces that are not being recognized in the consideration of the problems which we face. Our problem during a war period is no greater than it is in peacetime. A drop in the price level in peacetime can leave just as much wreckage as the inflation caused by war.

The dislocation is primarily monetary or a price factor. In a depression we lose none of our resources, our factories, our transportation, or efficiency. Stated in another way, it is impossible to go bankrupt from a purely economic standpoint. A depression can be prevented if prices are maintained at a level in balance with hourly wages and other cost factors. Inflation can be prevented by the same process. The record of our economy proves that we can produce the goods for either peace or war needs.

In the production of goods for either peace or war, the production of goods creates the income to buy the goods and pay for them. If the factors which I have called to your attention were generally known by the American public we could, by voluntary means, prevent either the depression of peacetime or the inflations created by war.

If our economy is operated on the basis of fact instead of theory we need have no fear of socialism or communism.

A proper price for raw materials, a relative wage payment to labor and a proper operating margin for industry automatically protects the freedom of all. We have the natural resources and our system of free enterprise can outproduce any other type of economy providing we maintain a proper price structure to create the dollar income to distribute and consume our production.

CARL H. WILKEN,
Economic Analyst.

SOURCE OF DATA USED IN THIS REPORT

1. President's Economic Report to Congress, January 1950.
2. President's Economic Report to Congress, Mid-Year, July 1950.
3. Statistical Abstract, United States Department of Commerce.
4. Survey of Current Business, National Income Supplement July 1947 and July 1950.
5. Agricultural Statistics, United States Department of Agriculture.
6. Bureau of Labor, Wholesale Commodity Index.
7. Livestock Market News, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture.
8. Wall Street Journal.
9. Chicago Drovers Journal Yearbook.

How To Cook a Wild Duck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a brief article from the Louisville Courier-Journal under the heading "Ruby's report," and some comments thereon by me.

There being no objection, the article and Mr. CAPEHART's comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, down in Kentucky a new feud is brewing, the equivalent of Kentucky's bitterest and bloodiest feuds, which bids fair to attract national and international attention.

Since this new feud in Kentucky involves my running-and-losing cousin, I feel inclined to have a part in it.

Let me quote from "Ruby's report" in the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 9, 1951:

"RUBY'S REPORT

"JIM STEWART CHALLENGES MAC LEAN AND RUBY TO WILD-DUCK COOKING CONTEST AND NAMES OWN JUDGES

"James G. Stewart, who has run second so many times he should write it James G. Stewart II, has issued a challenge. And, with typical Stewart temerity, he names his own judges. I quote:

"'I differ with both of you and Stuart MacLean on the proper way to cook a wild duck. If you were in the restaurant business featuring wild duck, you'd go bankrupt.

"'Your 3-hour boiling method for duck could only produce something called duck soup. Stuart, being a gourmet of the Henry VIII vintage, could only call the product of his 17-minute cooking recipe bloody duck

"'It is a well-known fact that neither of you has ever personally cooked a duck. Stuart quotes his authority, Lewis Kaye, a nationally known cook who has been approved by Duncan Hines. You advocate the method of a woman who probably is using her greatgrandmother's recipe, whose only cooking utensil was a pot.

"'After many years of personal experimentation I will tell you the best way to cook a wild duck:

"'1. Carefully pick the duck so the skin is unbroken. 2. Stuff with a quarter of an onion, a quarter of an apple, and make a highly seasoned sage dressing. 3. Lay bacon strips over the breasts and put in roaster in a quarter of an inch of water. 4. Sit in front of oven with hunting companions for 1 hour and baste frequently (the duck that is).

"'I challenge you and Stuart to a taste test at your convenience, the test to be judged by Fred Crawford, manager of the Pendennis Club, and Harold Harter of the Brown Hotel.'

"Stuart and I accept the challenge gratefully, but there will be none of the citified kitchen help of the Pendennis or Brown, and not more than one of Jim's pals among the judges. Stuart suggests that each of us name one judge and one cook. Jim probably will elect himself to both posts. I'll name my cook later, but will take a real outdoorsman, a hunter and fisherman, for my judge—Gov. Lawrence Wetherby. Stuart probably will want Kaye to do his cooking and also his judging, but I think he and Governor Wetherby will agree that the test should be made at some camp or lodge untainted by the fumes of the big city."

On the basis of that report, it is no wonder that Jim Stewart, my running-and-losing cousin, always loses when he runs.

In the first place, how can anybody in Kentucky, or any place else south of Indiana, have good roast duck when it is not possible to get good ducks to begin with?

The Midwest duck flyway is through Indiana, and we bag all the good ducks on their way south. Kentucky gets only those we call seconds.

To prove that my running-and-losing cousin does not properly represent the family in this duck-roasting feud, I should like to challenge my good friends and colleagues, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. CLEMENTS] to a duck-roasting and tasting contest to be held at the Pendennis Club in Louisville at any time—no holds barred.

Yes, I shall even submit to throwing into the feud the esteemed Vice President, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

My running-and-losing cousin, Mr. Stewart, outlines his method of roasting a duck to the delight of the most talented and temperamental gourmet. First, he says, pick the duck clean without breaking the skin. In Indiana we shoot them clean.

Then, he says, stuff it with onion and apple and sage dressing. The onion and apple, I take it, are to disguise the taste of a duck that was unwanted in Indiana. The same purpose, I presume, induces the use of bacon strips across the breast.

When we roast a duck in Indiana, we roast a duck.

Of course, I should be much happier if this feud were over fried chicken.

Conditions in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, recently Mr. H. H. (Bill) Fisher, of Salt Lake City, a veteran of World War II, delivered a speech before the Salt Lake Rotary Club which I think is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. While I do not necessarily agree with all of Mr. Fisher's statements and conclusions, yet the speech is so filled with thought-provoking and challenging ideas that it is well worth reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Gentlemen, I asked for the privilege of speaking to you today. I have wanted to say a few things to you ever since I got out of the Army. I spent 3½ years in the Army, so I feel that I know something about the workings of a controlled economy. Of those years, nearly two were spent in Europe, so I feel I know a little about the Europeans. And, for 4 months of that time, I was doing counter-intelligence work in Germany, and studying the people and operations of a police state. I was so impressed by the differences between Europe and America that I have wanted to talk to you about them ever since. You who have grown up in a free country can't imagine other countries, or other people. Gentlemen, the other people of this world—and this includes the so-called free people and free nations—are not like us. This is the only nation founded on the principle that the people are capable of self-government. We elect representatives. In other countries where elections are held, the people elect their masters. Here the individual is supreme. In all the other countries in the world, the government is supreme. In England and Canada, e. g., the people refer to themselves as subjects. Can you imagine an American cab driver or pipe fitter referring to himself as a subject of anyone or anything?

Now, this sounds like a small difference, but it is not. It is the reason our country is the greatest Nation on which the sun has shone. The trouble is a lot of us have forgotten, and a lot of us have never realized that it is this that has made us great, and a lot of us have been told for 18 years by a dilettante Groton and Harvard lawyer and an unsuccessful haberdasher that we were not capable of self-government, until we believe it.

Now, gentlemen, I have seen the slave peoples in action, and I believe in our principle and our way. I believe in it all the way, and I believe that for us to fear a slave nation like Russia is absolute nonsense. I say flatly and unequivocally that the United States is in no more danger of invasion by Russia—now, 5 years from now, or ever—than we are in danger of invasion by Argentina or by Mexico, and, if we are not in danger of invasion, the President's requests are nonsense. President Truman has said we must spend seventy-one billions for defense. He made better sense when he was corresponding with the music critic. The thousands of tanks and the three- to four-million man army which he asks for can never be, and will never be used for defense. They will be used just like they were in the last war—to reinstate or to continue in power one set of slave masters against another set of slave masters, to throw out a Kaiser Wilhelm so a Hitler can take over.

Now, most of us give lip service to the American way, and we will deride the inefficiencies of Government, we will cuss Government red tape, stupidity, and bungling. We will point out the disclosures in the Hoover report of criminal waste. We will swear about the Government's paying high prices for potatoes and eggs so that they can be buried in Kansas, and then the Government imports potatoes from Canada and eggs from China. We will rant about Government officials who know nothing about their jobs and who got these jobs as political plums. We point to England as a horrible example of what big government will do. We recall that Aneurin Bevan said in 1945 that it would take an organizing genius to produce a shortage of fish and coal in England, since England was practically built on coal and surrounded by fish; and that England is now short of coal and fish, thanks to the organizing genius of big government.

Now, gentlemen, think a minute—Russia is all government. Don't you suppose these things happen in Russia? I tell you they are one hundred times worse in Russia. We think our way is best, but we are afraid it's not. We here are not alone, however. Prominent nonpolitical figures everywhere are indulging in the same two-way thinking. Paul Hoffman, former President of Studebaker and now head of ERA, and Hansen Baldwin, the eminent military analyst of the New York Times, are two examples of people who are thinking and talking two ways at once. Hoffman says that the Russians have 15,000,000 people in slave camps and that the Kremlin can crack and fall anytime, but he is afraid of the Russians. Baldwin says that wars today are primarily clashes of nations in arms and he admits that we can outproduce all the rest of the world put together, but he is afraid of the Russians.

Now, just think this fact over. There are 150,000,000 people in our country and they do only 5 percent of the work. Machines do the other 95 percent. So here we have a Nation with a production of 3,000,000,000 workers scared panicky by Russia, a country that has 200,000,000 slaves. Remember, too, what Adam Smith said about slave labor, "Slave labor is the least productive and th most expensive of all labor, and must be, because if a man is going to starve whether he works or not, he does not work." Or, as the present day economists sa,, there is absence of incentive.

Now, I am not guessing or theorizing or wishing. Hitler had a slave state, and let's look at Hitler's record. In 1940 Germany terrified the civilized world by racing across France and completely subjugating her. What we forget is that the country that Germany subjugated was a nation, unlike ours, dominated by a minority. Government bureaucracy had taken its toll in France, and in no way was it a competitive free enterprise country like the United States. Besides, from a supply line or logistics point of view, this was not such a tremendous accomplishment. The entire distance traveled across France by the German Army was not much greater than from Salt Lake to Las Vegas, about 500 miles. Four years later when the German military production potential was still 100 percent, we invaded France, and we found that the great German military machine had 80 percent of its guns pulled by horses. We found that the relatively few German motor vehicles were not even remotely comparable to our jeep and big 6x6 truck. We found that they did have some excellent tanks, a few thousand buzz bombs and the famous burp gun, all good military weapons, but they did not have basic large-scale mass production, such as a free enterprise country has, and such as Mr. Baldwin says is essential in modern war. In fact, so limited was their production that, with all of Europe prostrate in 1940, and with all of Europe's production—French, Czech, Belgian, and Italian—enslaved and at their disposal, they did not even make an attempt to cross the 20 miles of water that separated them from England (we have 6,000 miles of water between us and the Russians). The Germans did not have the production for the ship bottoms and landing craft that would have been necessary to make the crossing. They did not have the production for the jeeps, trucks, weapons carriers, wreckers, mobile shops, portable welding sets, telephone wire, shells, supplies, and food for a successful invasion, if they could have reached the other shore. Later, in 1941, the Germans made their famous attack into Russia, another slave nation. They bogged down after about 1,200 miles because they couldn't maintain their supply lines, another term for production. One thousand and two hundred miles is about the distance from Seattle to

Los Angeles. Remember that in 1941 the Germans had been unhampered by preparing for war and war alone for 8 years. Now, compare this sad record with our own. In 1944 the United States, after two short years of preparation for war, was maintaining an army and a supply line in the Pacific islands six to eight thousand miles away. We were maintaining another army in Europe at the end of a supply line 3,000 miles long. We had armed and equipped a French Army. (I wish I had time to tell you about that French Army.) The British were using our long Toms, our trucks, and our planes. We had given the Russians one minor item of 60,000 giant 6x6 trucks, in addition to countless other vehicles, armaments, and food. In my 300 days of artillery combat, we plastered the Germans with a ratio of 20 artillery shells for each one that we received. Now, boys and girls, that's production, and it is only possible with a free people in a competitive enterprise system.

In our gun battery position south of Cherbourg in July of 1944, we one day received artillery fire from the Germans. Altogether 21 88-millimeter shells landed in our gun area, practically in my lap. Of these, only eight exploded and, of those eight, four more were low-order bursts. Examination showed that those shells were made in the enslaved Czechoslovak war plants. Now, gentlemen, again think a minute—the limestone that went into that steel had to be quarried with German policemen supervising, the iron ore had to be mined by unwilling Czechs with German policemen watching, it had to be transported on railroads with German policemen and spies watching to make sure it got to the steel mill. In the steel mill there was more supervision and spying necessary. The same was true of the fuses and of the shell casings and of the guns that fired the shells and, when they finally got the shells to the front, they only had 20-percent efficiency. That's how slave labor works and that's how it's working with the Russians. The more Russia takes over, the more she extends herself, the more policemen she needs, and the more she weakens herself. I believe that any nation which attempts production by slave methods loses rather than gains production.

Let me show you how a police state has to operate. For 4 months I was in charge of a small detachment in counterintelligence in Germany after the war. We made over 3,500 arrests of suspected Nazis and I interrogated many of the people arrested. One of these was the right-hand man of Sauckel. Sauckel was the Governor of Thuringia who was executed at the first Nuernberg trial. This man told me he belonged to 30 Nazi Party organizations. I said, "How did you ever get any work done?" "It was not easy" he said, "but it was necessary to belong. In Germany, any good party member belongs to at least 12 party organizations. He has to if he wants to hold any sort of government job, even janitor in a government office building." He explained some of the infinite ramifications of the empire safety system. Hitler wanted to do away with the people's rights in courts, so he organized the Gestapo, a secret state police. The Gestapo could arrest anyone, anytime, for any reason, and hold them without trial, and was responsible only to Goebbels and his boss, Hitler. Soon Hitler realized that such a powerful group could constitute a menace to him, and he organized another group, the criminal police, under Himmler. In theory, the Gestapo dealt with civil cases, whereas the Krepo dealt with criminal cases. Actually, their duties overlapped and one of their jobs was to spy on one another. There was danger of collusion between Himmler and Goebbels, so he set up a third secret police outfit called the border police, supposedly to deal with cases in France, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, Holland, and so forth. Actually, this police force had as one of its main duties watching and spying on the other two. This played Himmler, Goebbels, and Goering off against one another. It also produced the interesting economic result that Hitler had one policeman to do what he wanted, another policeman to watch the first, and a third policeman to watch the other two, while the poor slave tried to produce enough to feed the three tax-eaters and have a little left over for himself. It's no wonder that a small farmer came to me in a village 1 day to ask if he could kill a pig. I said, "Whose pig?" He said, "Mine." I said, "Sure, go ahead and kill it, I don't care." And he said, "But where is the permission?" I said, "You don't need any permission. Just go ahead and kill him if you want to." The German walked off muttering something about it was a hell of a way to run a government that wouldn't even tell you whether you should kill a pig or not. Now, gentlemen, if your government is set up so that one man can't kill one pig without permission of a tax-eater, you are not going to get much production.

The Russian set-up is ever more unwieldly. Dan Connole tells about an engineer friend of his who was trying to assemble an American-made automobile plant in Russia prior to the war. The plant came knocked down from the United States with every beam lettered and numbered and its own sack of rivets and bolts attached to it. One day during the erection one of those things happened that happens dozens of times daily in every construction. A beam was set down 6 inches short of abutment with another beam. The engineer said to the crane man, "Move it over." The crane man said, "You told me to set it down there. My orders are to do what you say, but any changes have to be authorized by the foreman." The American got the Russian foreman and told him to tell the crane man to move it over. The foreman said, "Why wasn't it right the first time?" The American said, "We just missed a little. If he moves it over, everything will be okey." The Russian said, "It looks like a trick to me and, even if it goes all right, if I make an unauthorized change at your request, I can be reported for disobedience." The upshot of it was, gentlemen, that after much wrangling, the matter went clear to the Kremlin in Moscow and 8 weeks later an order came back that it was all right to go ahead and move the beam. River Rouge, Willow Run, and the Liberty ships weren't built that way.

My one experience with the Russians came shortly after the war in August 1945, when I crossed the American-Russian border with some 1,200 Russian slave laborers who were not at all happy to be going back to their original set of masters. In my innocence I looked forward to seeing the crack, well-disciplined troops of the great Russian force which had repelled Hitler's splendid army. To my amazement, I saw what looked like a rabble fleeing a stricken city. A column of Russian troops coming down the street consisted of an officer in an American jeep, an American 6 by 6 truck, and then cart after cart pulled by horses or oxen or pushed by hand. These carts were loaded with every describable kind of loot—mattresses, chairs, rugs, vases (no wash basins, however), and the military personnel was a helter-skelter melange of men and women, no two of whom were dressed alike, and no two of whom seemed to have the same type of small arms. A few miles farther on we came to a Russian airfield. The Russian pilots were stunting and showing off in one of the prettiest, trimmest little planes I had ever seen. I remarked to the Yank cub pilot who was with me that that was really beautiful airplane. The Yank pilot said, "Well, it should be, it's the Bell Air Cobra P-39 which we declared obsolete in 1942 because it couldn't fight above 10,000 feet. We sent them all to Russia." (In the Korean fracas our observers also report seeing P-39s.) With these front-line troops that I saw that day, perhaps 50,000 in all, I never saw a Russian motor vehicle, armored or otherwise; I never saw a Yak or Stormovik plane. Maybe the Russians had them by the thousands, as the papers told us they did, but they didn't have them with their front-line troops.

Astonished as I was at the appearance of the Russians, I wondered how could this horde possibly have beaten the well-trained German Army, and then I remembered what a German tank captain, whom I had captured in my CIC work, had told me: "You Americans had a secret weapon that you didn't even know about. That was the big truck where all the wheels go" and he moved his fingers in circles to show what he meant. "Our trucks only had two driving wheels and we didn't have very many of them, and in the rain and snow on mud roads we just stopped or went by horse. You gave the Russians a hundred thousand of those big trucks and the gasoline to run them, so that they could go any place and we couldn't move to their point of attack. We knew where they were building up for an attack with your big trucks, and we couldn't get there to stop them."

Now, that's the way I saw it. I think certainly that the Russians can produce a few excellent tanks. They've already shown us that in Korea. Korea gives us so many conflicting reports that it's almost impossible to tell what's going on, but certainly we can tell that it is not a major war effort comparable to the last war. The Russians have also shown us some excellent jets, but, so far, 40 jets seems to be a large-scale air attack in Korea. At St. Lo in France, I have seen 3,000 Yank planes fly over me in one attack (incidentally, if I were a professional military analyst, I would predict that the Communist attack will bog down within the next 100 miles because of extended supply lines—meaning no production). As I said, I believe that the Russians can produce a few weapons, some of them excellent; but I think their chances of producing enough ships, enough tanks, enough guns, enough shells, enough trucks, enough supplies, enough food for a successful invasion of the United States are absolutely nil. They are nil now and they will become minus nil. The only way a slave nation can go is down.

I have deliberately left the question of the atomic bomb to the last, because I don't believe it deserves the attention it is getting. Mr. Truman and the Russians say that the Russians have the atomic bomb. Let us suppose for argument's sake that they do have it, and suppose that they have a few planes that will fly it to some of our major American cities. What are we going to do? We can't put an antiaircraft gun in every house and building in America. We can't make every house and building an atomic-bomb shelter. We can't make our country an armed camp on an everlasting 24-hour alert. The one thing we can do, we have done. We can have our own planes and our own bombs which can retaliate 10 to 100 times. The atomic bomb today is in the same situation that poison gas was in World War II. Germany did not use poison gas because we had so much gas ready to dump on Germany that the German people would have been up to their caboose in Lewisite if the Germans had ever started. Stalin is far too intelligent to use an atomic bomb against this country.

Now, that's the way it looks to me. Russia can't hurt us, now or later. Now, I ask you, gentlemen, does it make sense to bleed ourselves white for military production that can only be used if we send it overseas? Does it make sense for us to give, at our expense, arms in order to maintain the present masters of France against another set of masters, because every weapon we send to France means that the present French Government will have more money to spend in protecting

itself against the DeGaulle and similar factions who would like to take over the ruling of France? Does it make sense for us to fortify Franco as ruler of Spain on the outside chance that Stalin will take over Spain and rule it even worse? Can we continue perpetual occupation? Military government is not American government and soldiers do not teach the principle that the people are capable of self-government.

Now, what do I think we should do? Obviously, the first and most important thing, as I have said, is for us to quit being afraid of the Russians. Next, I think we should pull every soldier that we have overseas back to this country and get him into civilian clothes. It is my opinion that our military needs in this country are for a strong Air Force, but not a giant Air Force, a strong Navy, with emphasis on submarines, but not a giant Navy, and only enough ground forces for internal policing and officer training. I think we should make two internal reforms. I think we should get back on the gold standard so that the Government cannot render valueless our goods and services and property. I think we should adopt an amendment to the Constitution that would limit the Federal Government's power to tax, but these two items will have to wait until some other time when you will let me talk for still another half hour.

Now, gentlemen, in conclusion let me say this: We can never help ourselves or Europe or President Truman's backward nations of the world by military power or military expenditures. We can only hurt ourselves. If we are to help the world, we can only do it by education, by teaching the other nations of the world that the people are capable of self-government and that when the people have self-government their standards of living rise and there is no need for wars of aggression. Perhaps we could do this if we adopted the plan that the YWCA is doing in such a small way. You remember Mrs. Hurd of that organization told us that in occupied Germany, the YWCA is holding classes telling how the American way operates, telling about PTA's, League of Women Voters, Civic Betterment Leagues, chambers of commerce, telling how the elected officials are the servants and representatives of the people, rather than the masters. The Y is sending German men and women over here to study our system at work and to go back and teach the principle that the people are capable of self-government. Maybe this is the way. Maybe if it were done on a grand scale, it would bring what people want—peace to all. But certainly our present way will not bring peace, prosperity, or anything but hardship and bankruptcy. Gentlemen, get busy today, write our Congressmen and Senators, tell them that our foreign policy and our defense policy are nonsense. And, above all, gentlemen, quit being afraid of the Russians and fight to maintain our principle that the people are capable of self-government, so that this Nation, under God, shall not perish from the earth.

Money Wasted on Food Program Lost for Defense Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, according to the figures released by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the loss on the disposition of only 14 food commodities for the first 5 months of this fiscal year—through November 1950—amounted to $91,614,097.84.

The Department of the Army advises me that as of December 1, a 57-millimeter recoilless rifle cost $1,033. It is nothing short of a national disgrace that when the American people must carry so great a burden to produce and pay for vital equipment for our national defense, the Department of Agriculture throws away the equivalent of 85,000 of these rifles, plus $3,809,097 that might be used for ammunition, on an operation of this sort.

For the same 5 months, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid for the carrying charges on these same 14 items of food, $20,662,461.97. That would have paid for 1,000 radar sets at $16,415 and 900 ¾-ton trucks, with a balance of over $300,000, according to the Department of the Army estimates.

The total of the money lost in this period on disposition of these 14 commodities and the carrying charges is $112,276,559.81. That is an average waste of the taxpayers' money of $22,455,312 a month, or more than 100 light tanks, estimated to cost $200,341 each.

The detailed analysis of the Commodity Credit Corporation report follows:

	As of Nov. 30, 1950	
	Loss on disposition	Carrying charges
Butter	$20,016,887.67	$1,823,674.03
Cheese	7,497,151.54	1,315,265.25
Dried milk	13,962,071.26	2,196,257.37
Dried eggs	15,973,710.93	1,247,896.92
Irish potatoes	13,091,657.29	257,612.45
Raisins	8,195.49	5,812.34
Dried beans	3,133,998.50	1,960,509.13
Dried peas	303,006.80	317,848.07
Rice	[1] 137,453.21	154,191.99
Turkeys	34,025.84	27,683.71
Soybeans	103,876.15	85,742.80
Peanuts	2,055,844.65	138,204.32
Sweetpotatoes	701.33	698.83
Grain sorghum	15,570,423.60	11,131,004.76
Total	91,614,097.84	20,662,461.97

[1] Represents gain.

Surplus of Revenues in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ottawa Shows Heavy Surplus," which was published in the Gazette, Montreal, Canada, of January 20, 1951.

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

OTTAWA SHOWS HEAVY SURPLUS—REVENUES $419,800,000 HIGHER THAN OUTLAY IN 9 MONTHS

OTTAWA, January 19.—The treasury reported today an accumulated budgetary surplus of $419,800,000 for the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, compared with $298,900,000 in the same stage of the preceding year.

It said the Government's revenues in that period totaled $2,048,100,000 compared with $1,836,400,000, while expenditures totaled $1,628,200,000 against $1,537,600,000.

For December alone, revenues were $261,100,000 against $199,600,000 in December 1949. Expenditures totaled $274,200,000, compared with $200,500,000.

Noting that expenditures were higher in the 9-month period, the treasury report said:

"If the special nonrecurring charge of $62,300,000 in 1949, due to the assumption of a portion of Newfoundland debt pursuant to the terms of union, is eliminated, the increase for 1950 over 1949 is $152,900,000."

HIGHER DEFENSE COSTS

"This increase was almost wholly accounted for by an increase of $135,300,000 in national defense expenditures and an increase of $15,400,000 in special expenditure due largely to payments arising out of the Winnipeg flood disaster.

"In addition, there was an uncontrollable increase of $9,200,000 in family allowances and one of $8,200,000 in old-age pensions."

The increase of $46,700,000 in December expenditures was more than accounted for by a jump of $65,000,000 in defense expenditures. Of the expenditure of $99,400,000 for defense, $56,700,000 was used to pay for equipment sent to Canada's North Atlantic partners.

The treasury said that of the 38 divisions of expenditure shown in its statement—excluding national defense—27 showed reduced administrative and general expenditures in December.

In addition to budgetary expenditures, there were nonbudgetary disbursements, totaling $500,000 in December and $68,800,000 in the first 9 months of the year. These outlays were for loans, advances and investments and were smaller than last year.

Internationalism in Action: 1940–50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Internationalism in Action: 1940–50," published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of Monday, January 8, 1951.

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

INTERNATIONALISM IN ACTION: 1940–50

On May 10, 1940, a new era opened in the affairs of the United States and the life of the American people. It was on this fateful day that Hitler's armies surged into western Europe. And although it was not apparent at the time, hindsight now shows that it was on this date that control over the destiny of the United States definitely passed into the hands of the interventionist internationalist group where it has since remained continuously until the present.

It is true that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had been trending in this direction in his conduct of foreign policy for some time. As early as 1937 he had indicated, in his "Quarantine Speech" at Chicago that he was intrigued by the idea of using the weight of American influence and possibly American

military power against the Nazi and Fascist dictatorships.

But after the successful invasion of the low countries, shortly followed by the fall of France, events moved at an accelerated speed to entangle the United States irretrievably in the newest troubles of Europe.

A national emergency was declared. The first peace-time draft law in our country's history was enacted. And, sometimes openly sometimes under cover, Mr. Roosevelt set in motion the many devious programs, commitments and provocative devices which were to culminate in the Pearl Harbor attack and the involuntary entry of the United States—a step he had long planned and hoped for—into the world conflict.

Now that a round-figure decade of control of the American destiny by the internationalists has ended and the Nation is heading into another 10-year span in which the outlook is even more uncertain and unpromising than it was in 1940, the time seems appropriate to look at the record, calmly, objectively, and without rancor; to sum up what the events of the 1940–50 period have meant to the American people and what their future looks like should they continue blindly to accept the leadership of the same group.

Before doing so, it may be instructive to analyse briefly the background of our 10 years under internationalist leadership; to point out how completely the thinkers of this persuasion have dominated American life and policy and have ceaselessly propagandised our people in favor of their point of view.

Since June 1940, the internationalists have controlled the conventions of both major political parties. They nominated Roosevelt for his third term in 1940 and a fourth term in 1944, and Truman in 1948. They blitzed the Republican Party into accepting Wendell Willkie, an ardent interventionist, in 1940. They nominated Dewey, another internationalist convert, in 1944 and renominated him in 1948. Whichever way the election had gone in any of these years, the internationalists would have had one of their own in the White House, so firm was their grip on the nominating machinery of both major parties.

There have been six Congresses elected during this period. In all of these the same internationalist influences have been able to check effectively any legislation of importance that could have greatly diminished America's wholesale appropriations for global causes.

The presence of a fervent internationalist in the White House brought about a bold and successful usurpation of congressional prerogatives. President Roosevelt in effect declared war on his own initiative long before America's formal entry. He followed this unprecedented step by handing American public funds outright to foreign governments and commercial interests. His actions went unrebuked by a Federal court system consisting overwhelmingly of judges appointed by the same internationalist President.

All three branches of the Government thus were continuously under internationalist control during the vital period here under consideration.

Since 1940, the internationalists also have enjoyed virtually a free hand in some of the Nation's mass media of information, culture, and entertainment and a majority representation in others. Let's look at the specific examples:

1. In the Nation's press the internationalist point of view has been supported by a majority of the important dailies. This includes many newspapers which have opposed the New Deal-Fair Deal on domestic issues. The press of the eastern seaboard and the South have been almost solidly favorable to the most belligerent internationalism and all it connotes. Virtually all the major columnists, from the gossip-mongers to the serious thinkers, have preached and still preach internationalism.

2. The radio, by reason of the life or death control exercised over broadcasters by the FCC, has been nearly 100 percent internationalist in its impact on the listening ear. Stations and commentators (except for participants on forum type programs) who have had the courage to express an opposite view, even in nonwar years, have been very few in numbers. Some individuals actually have been forced off the air by official pressure for pointing out the possible consequences of over-extending our commitments.

3. The internationalist penetration of Hollywood and the motion-picture industry also has been close to the saturation point. If there has been a single outstanding movie made in the past 10 years slanted in the direction of preserving the integrity of America or even mildly questioning the concept of Uncle Sam as guardian of the whole world's affairs, its title does not come to mind. Even the newsreels have the authentic global tinge that has colored an entire decade's thinking.

4. The legitimate theater has been even more abject, if that is possible, in its subservience, first to the principle of intervention and then to a militant internationalism and remorselessly severe in its criticism of the opponents of global experimentation.

5. The magazines published during the 1940–50 period have been adherents or converts to the prevailing internationalist creed, with few conspicuous dissenters. Here again the infiltration of periodical offices and staffs has been skillful and complete. The magazine reader of the past decade has been repetitiously bombarded with the idea that anything smacking of American self-interest is a sort of treason to future generations.

6. The success of the internationalist zealots has nowhere been more effective than in the book publishing field. The few books questioning the authenticity of America's rendezvous with global destiny which have seen print have been products either of minor houses or noncommercial university presses animated by the commendable wish to air all sides of the question. The big, successful major book houses have either been too timorous or too hamstrung by internationalist believers in their own organizations to touch anything contrary to the global viewpoint. And when books taking issue with internationalism have, by some miracle, appeared, they have been unmercifully smeared by global-minded reviewers, and often played down by retail outlets which regard them as sinister and reactionary.

7. The eager praise of internationalism in the Nation's public schools and universities is too well known to need comment. Suffice it to say that any youngster who finished his education in 1940–50 without becoming enrolled among the world-minded brotherhood is tough-minded and individualistic indeed. The impact of the war on those of this generation who served in the Armed Forces has, however, usually lessened their faith in the internationalist preachments of their school days.

8. Finally, the internationalists have made some of their most important and sweeping conquests in church organizations, particularly the large national denominational movements. Internationalism has been so identified in this field with hostility to war and with social progress that for practical purposes the terms have become synonymous, and the vast influence of these institutions has been diverted often and skillfully to opposite ends.

The greatest success of all scored by the internationalist movement has been the organization of the United Nations under American guidance and financial support.

In basic theory, UN is an organization to which no thoughtful seeker after world peace and security can possibly object. Into its service many devoted individuals have poured endless time and painstaking work.

If UN could be made to operate as those who have sincerely tried to make it work hoped it could, it would be recognized today as the greatest cooperative undertaking in human history. That it hasn't worked out that way is a matter of sorrowful record, and not by any means entirely the fault of the American internationalists. UN's failure to cope effectually with the hard realities of today's world situation is a bitter disappointment and, perhaps, bitterest of all to those who pinned on it the highest hopes.

So, we enter upon a fresh decade with the internationalists still in control; after 10 years (as we have seen) of either dominance or substantial control of almost every realm of activity in American life touching on public or private initiative.

Towering over all these factors, as we have noted, are the two most important of all: (1) Continuous control of the Federal Government; (2) unlimited access to the Treasury, resources, and manpower of the United States.

However, for the first time since 1940, the sentiment throughout the country which its foes loosely and unjustifiably call isolationist—sentiment which has either been shouted down, or smeared, or intimidated by what sometimes seemed universal scorn, again is making itself felt in calls for a reexamination of our international commitments and a scrutiny of our capacity to meet them.

The recent speeches of Joseph P. Kennedy and Herbert Hoover have evoked a growing chorus of approval throughout the country which now realizes the increasing disillusionment of the hopes raised by the outcome of World War II.

Men and women who have never subscribed to the implications of the internationalist doctrines are making themselves heard. There are many indications that the forthright analyses and proposed programs set forth by these experienced thinkers have given even some of the adherents of the global gospel themselves reason to pause as they realize the grave possibilities they have forced on their countrymen as a result of their past acts and decisions.

The followings on both sides of this new internationalist versus pro-American alignment cut across party lines. Mr. Kennedy is a Democrat, Mr. Hoover a Republican. The two most articulate exponents of the opposite side are State Secretary Dean Acheson, a Democrat, and John Foster Dulles, a Republican.

The question, as we launch into the 1951–60 period, which may very well be known to future historians as the decade of decision for America and the world, is: How do we proceed from here? Do we follow the same guides and the same advice implemented by the same policies, or do we make a radical change, recognizing the devastating conditions we face today as a result of following this leadership?

Isn't it time that those who may have brought us to this impasse, in the sincere belief that they were serving their nation and mankind, should give those who foresaw the probable result and spoke out against it at least a respectful hearing?

Shall an America burdended with crushing debt, militarily in danger for the first time in her 174 years, and rapidly becoming physically isolated in a threatening world by the hard logic of day-by-day developments continue on the same course, and still depend on the philosophy whose advocates apparently fail to recognise the point to which it has led us?

Is the internationalist leadership, which has had a clear field and almost undisputed sway for 10 years, adequate to the severe

challenge of our present plight? Shall we trust it to keep America safe and strong and to carry us through our current trials?

Can this leadership cope with a world situation in which stark, brutal force is now unleashed primarily against this Nation?

The American people must make this decision. It is a decision that they must make at least by 1952—if we are spared an all-out war that long—or which events may compel them to make sooner.

The decision must be considered, and it must be sound and right if the United States of America, as we have known it, is to survive.

Our National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the portion of the annual report by Mr. L. M. Giannini, president of the Bank of America, entitled "Our National Interest."

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

OUR NATIONAL INTEREST

As a nation, we enter the new year with the greatest need in all our history for inspired leadership, national teamwork, and exercise of profound wisdom.

Recent world events make it entirely clear that our efforts to live in peace will be successful only provided they have the backing of defensive strength so impressive, so mighty, that it discourages any acts of aggression, or even the inner ambition to march against free people.

Second sight reveals it was a mistake for us to have decimated our military strength following the armistice. We should have maintained it in a state of preparedness so effective that it would never have to be used.

In this world we can never go back to normal. We can only go forward to a new normal—in this case a new normal of defensive preparedness sufficient to win and hold our goal of peace.

And so we are now embarked upon the task of retrieving our postwar mistake of excessive demobilization. The cost will be high, but we are prepared to pay it.

We will pay the price through our sons and daughters in uniform. We will pay the price in higher taxes. We will pay the price in temporary shortages and other inconveniences.

I am convinced, however, that once our national economy has become adjusted to the requirements of an effective preparedness state, we can—if we possess the will—continue our way of life without sacrifice of any essential freedom. Once having established our national impregnability, we can maintain it permanently in every essential aspect and at the same time produce the goods and provide the services with which our living standard is fashioned. It will be a case of adjustment to a new tempo in all things, which, after all, has always been the basic pattern of our economy to a greater or lesser degree.

The immediate task will be easier, and our goal more quickly won, if labor and management work in harmony, if political expediency is retired to the side lines, and if the Federal Government sets the example for the people to follow in matters of economical operation and conservation of resources, including manpower resources.

From now forward, business and industry must make its manpower more productive. It is to be hoped the Federal Government will do the same shouldering its added tasks without further unnecessary inroads into the labor force, by bringing hours and other working conditions of Government employees into line with those which must prevail in factories and fields and stores and offices and homes.

On behalf of our bank, I wish to confirm that which you already know. We shall continue to promote thrift as a means of strengthening the fiber of our people and as a way of combating inflation. To add to the attractiveness of saving money, we have just increased our savings interest rate by one-third, from 1½ percent to 2 percent. Our resources and our resourcefulness will be adapted to the new needs and made fully available to business, industry, and Government, to facilitate the change-over to our new standard of defensive strength.

Respectfully submitted,

L. M. GIANNINI,
President.

Economic Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a timely statement on economic planning by the Honorable James K. Vardaman, Jr., member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserv. System. This splendid statement, which served as the basis for an article in the New York Times of January 21, clearly and forcibly points out the necessity for across-the-board controls and a program of adequate taxation. I strongly commend it to the favorable attention of the Congress and of the American people, and therefore ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT MADE IN NEW YORK ON JANUARY 18, 1951, TO MR. JOHN G. FORREST, FINANCIAL EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES, BY J. K. VARDAMAN, MEMBER, FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

I have thought for many months that the most serious problem with which the United States Government is confronted is the preservation of a sound American dollar. We can even accept defeat in military engagements and still survive as a nation so long as our economy and our money are sound. But without a sound dollar with a strong purchasing value in domestic and world markets we cannot survive as a nation with our present form of government, even though we may win all of our military engagements.

For some months it has appeared to me that the Nation should have at the earliest possible moment a complete pattern of strict, direct controls embracing allocations of strategic materials, rationing, price controls, and wage controls. These controls should be across the board, total in effect, and cover all classes of our personal and corporate population.

In addition to these direct controls there should, of course, be an adequate program of taxation, including a general sales tax; and there should be other fiscal, monetary, and credit controls sufficiently powerful to siphon off the backlog of surplus money to be automatically created by the direct controls.

It strikes me that we are simply deluding ourselves as public officials, and not being entirely fair with the American people, when we convince ourselves and lead the people to believe that voluntary agreements, as desirable as they may be in peacetime, and selective credit controls, over-all credit controls, and the highest practical tax assessment, will be sufficient to restore and preserve the purchasing value of the dollar and thereby protect and perpetuate our present form of government.

We must have organization and discipline in our civil population as well as the military, or else our whole structure is apt to collapse. The necessity for this discipline is emphasized by the probability of attack on the United States proper. In our present state of mind, panic would probably result from such an attack; whereas, if we begin immediately to accustom ourselves to discipline in thought as well as in action we will be much more likely to survive.

On the fundamental question of selective credit controls I feel now as I have always felt, that such controls are unwise. Actually they have little or no material effect percentagewise on the total national credit structure; but they do have a disastrous effect on the social attitude of the people, primarily because they do not affect equally all income classes and corporate groups. Factional opposition to these controls, some sound and some selfish, handicaps the over-all monetary and credit control function of the Federal Reserve System, because when the Board acts in these limited areas the populace and the congressional opposition become vocal and strong enough to prevent the Board being granted necessary additional selective and general control authority to meet its contemplated statutory responsibility in the monetary and credit field. In other words, distrust and loss of confidence in the Board's objectivity brought about by these pin-point, annoying and ineffective selective controls potentially weaken the entire structure of Board authority. I have always thought that the Board's contribution to our Nation would be much more constructive if the Board were more exclusively in the position of a high court and less in the position of a police judge and policeman.

Right or wrong, good or bad, the fact remains that regulations W, T, and X have not in the past, nor have they at present, stopped the inflationary trend and the flight from the dollar.. They may be very good regulations concomitant to fiscal, monetary, and direct controls, but by themselves they appear to me to do more harm than good. And I speak from more than 20 years' successful experience which I enjoyed as a lawyer, banker, and businessman before becoming a member of the Board.

I believe that the people of this country have confidence in President Truman personally and will wholeheartedly obey and support a program of over-all direct controls. Enforcement machinery can well follow the imposition of the controls, and their imposition should not be delayed the months required to set up such machinery. Of course there will always be an appreciable percentage of chiselers and cheaters, black marketeers and other scum; but a vast majority of the American people are honest and law abiding and in this critical period when our very existence depends on our behavior

I firmly believe that the population will largely police itself in these vital matters.

Having served more than 5 years in combat service with the Army and amphibious Navy in our last two wars I am convinced that the Armed Forces also have faith in the Presidency and in the American people. If they didn't have they couldn't do a good job in the field, and nobody realizes that better than the mothers and fathers and friends of armed service personnel, and those people will obey and help police any pattern of controls that may be necessary.

The Marines' Esprit de Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "They're Just Tougher," by Mr. Jim G. Lucas appearing in the Washington Daily News of Friday, January 26, 1951.

This is an uncensored report and, in my opinion, bears out the need for the legislation introduced by myself and 42 other Senators to strengthen the Marine Corps. What we needed at the time of the Korean outbreak, and what we need now, is a strong, versatile and effective fighting force which will always be ready for immediate action.

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

THEY'RE JUST TOUGHER

(By Jim G. Lucas)

(NOTE.—Reporter Jim G. Lucas appraises the weaknesses of our fighting forces in Korea in this uncensored article. Mr. Lucas has just returned to the United States after 5 months on the Korean battlefields. He has observed first-hand the lack of toughness, aggressiveness and morale which he reports, and has talked with men who felt cheated when they were ordered into the fighting from their relatively soft life as occupation troops. Other uncensored dispatches by Mr. Lucas will follow.)

The general pulled his box closer to the fire. "They're tougher than we are," he said.

Just that. They're tougher than we are. They can take more than we can.

"Over there," he continued, "they're walking around tonight in straw sandals. We say it can't be done. But they're doing it. We're so bundled up we can't move. They're just tougher than we are."

A lot has been written about the training of American troops. The first men into Korea came from Japan. They were accustomed—in varying degrees—to relatively soft living. There had been some field training, but no one contended it was enough. Many enlisted men never expected to fight. They'd simply taken up the Army's offer of security and retirement. Many were marking time to finish their education.

To be thrown into battle was the last thing they expected. Many felt deceived, cheated, abused. They made no secret of it. That doesn't mean all felt that way. There were good, hard, trained fighting men in our ranks. That they were able to hold any kind of a line—with the odds confronting them—is tribute to them and men like the late Lt. Gen. Walton Walker.

ARMY KNOWS IT

The Army now recognizes that fact. It probably recognized it all along. But the burden of garrisoning occupied territories imposed a new and different responsibility on its peacetime shoulders. Now, it says it's going to toughen up. Veterans of Korea will have much to say about how GIs are trained from now on.

There's a growing suspicion in Korea that we are overmechanized. Maj. Gen. Robert McClure, formerly commander of the Second Division, said recently we have become so mobile we have lost our mobility. Everything we sent to Korea, he said, was designed for war in the Low Countries of Europe. Maj. Gen. Frank Lowe, President Truman's representative in Korea, put it a little differently one night. But he meant the same thing.

"I am prepared to bet any man," he said caustically, "that there are more jeeps than fighting men in Korea."

No one took him up.

"The average American soldier," General McClure told a group of correspondents one night, "expects to ride to the battlefield, ride away, live—and if necessary—die on pneumatic tires."

BETTER TO WALK

One afternoon in central Korea, just outside Wonju, a battalion executive officer told me he'd sent his jeeps to the rear. The enemy, in considerable strength, was 500 yards ahead. He and his men knew there was a good chance they'd be overwhelmed. I asked if he didn't need motors for a getaway.

"That may be the trouble with our Army today," he answered. "Too many wheels. I was a company commander in the last war and I had two jeeps. I never saw them; turned them over to my supply and mess sergeants. Today each company has four. That's too many. It ties us down to whatever roads we can find and you can't find them here. Men fight better on foot. They have a better chance getting out if they walk."

Take any given area—particularly in the mountains of Korea—and you can spot the two or three avenues down which our troops can move. The enemy can spot them, too. But the enemy can fan out and move on us from any direction he chooses. The mountains are our roadblocks. They are his highways.

"We are roadbound," General McClure said. "Bound to tortuous, twisting trails which are easily subject to ambush and demolition. We are fighting in compartmentalized terrain and we haven't enough room to move about. Not with the kind of equipment we've been given."

But overmechanization is only part of the story. There's also the matter of discipline and aggressiveness. And many better officers and men quite frankly admit we could stand improvement.

Such a statement, of course, runs serious risk of misinterpretation. It is not intended as a reflection on the courage of the great bulk of our men in Korea. One war correspondent wrote, after Seoul, that the record of our Army had been one of panic and cowardice. In 5 months in Korea, I found nothing to support that kind of generalization.

But I am convinced that our Army at times lacked aggressiveness. After the Chinese came in, many men were interested only in getting out. That was true at the top as well as among enlisted men. Such things as "Pusan, Here We Come" appeared chalked on jeep sides during our retreat. One officer, at Hungnam, told me morale was never higher among his troops than after we began our evacuation. They thought they were leaving for good. No one ever talked of going north again. If it was said, usually as a joke, it was greeted by shocked silence.

Another officer, a lieutenant colonel and battalion commander, complained one night that he had many men who, over a period of weeks, hadn't finished firing their first clip.

"They'll go to the front if ordered," he said. "They'll get shot at. But they won't shoot back. They're not mad."

Again, it would be unfortunate to leave the impression this is true of all, or any major part, of our Army. But a chain is as strong as its weakest link. And one man can cost hundreds of lives.

Too often, the man in the ranks has little feeling of responsibility or teamwork. Frequently, he feels little responsibility even for his own survival. General McClure insisted that most frostbite and forzen feet cases were the victim's own fault. Men didn't change their socks, didn't dry them when they took them off. They'd been told how, but it was too much trouble. And it was too much trouble for their officers to push them. They were conditioned to expect someone else to look after them. Many paid a tragic price.

I spent Christmas night on a listening post 2 miles in front of our lines. We were in deadly peril. We could, at any moment, be surrounded and destroyed. One patrol 2 miles away did meet that fate.

To my dismay, the two soldiers with me laid down their rifles as soon as we reached our outpost and went to sleep. I spent most of the night trying to keep them awake. They not only slept, they snored. And the enemy was right in front of us. Our troops were 2 miles back.

Finally, in desperation, I threatened to report them. I did just that when we returned. Their commanding officer was unimpressed. He'd sent a couple of goldbricks on that patrol, he said, as punishment.

The idea of trusting my life to men with no more sense of responsibility frightened me as badly as contact with the enemy.

Later, the commanding officer conceded it was a deplorable situation. But he insisted it was not unusual. He pointed out that, technically, the men could have been shot on the spot and nothing could have been done about it.

"But can you imagine what'd happen to me?" he asked.

At the risk of special pleading (because I am a former marine), it is my observation as well as that of the majority of war correspondents that the marines offend less in this respect than the Army. The marines' esprit de corps is traditional. The idea that the other fellow depends on you to deliver the goods—that you are part of a team—is drilled into marines from the hour they enter boot camp. Among them, it is high treason to let the other guy down.

American Fighting Resourcefulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Betting on Americans," which appeared in the Bozeman (Mont.) Daily Chronicle of January 18.

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

BETTING ON AMERICANS

Not so many weeks ago we heard a bigwig from Washington give a particularly depressing account of a briefing he had attended at the Pentagon a few days before. He said that one of the top officials—he didn't say who—wound up on this cheerful note:

"I would say that the odds that our children will not live under Russian slavery are no better than 50–50."

We've been thinking that over. And what we think is that we would like to bet every nickel we could beg, borrow, or steal on the American people at odds like that in any kind of contest you want to name.

Since when did this country start fighting shy of even-money gambles? When did we begin to doubt our ability to hold our own in any venture that offered us an even break.

A friend of mine says he is alarmed by what he takes to be a wave of defeatism that is sweeping the country. We'd be alarmed by it, too, if we really believed it went any deeper than just flannel-mouth talk.

We get no goose pimples from the warnings of those who point out that bombs probably will fall on the United States in any future world war, and those who wonder whether the American people have what it takes to stand up under the kind of pounding the British took in the last war. We are not dismayed by the thought that simply because we have never lost a war, in the commonly accepted sense, it doesn't follow that we will never lose one. The logic may be sound enough but the conclusion is preposterous. The Census Bureau could comb the country without turning up a single American who actualy believes the United States might have to knuckle under to any potential enemy now in sight.

Even so, we do seem to scare pretty easily these days. Too many professional crepehangers are figuring out how many divisions we could field in a pinch and assuming that the jib is up if somebody else could scrape up a few more.

What's become of the old Patrick Henry cockiness and the spirit of '76? Those hard-bitten old-timers used to think that a good American could lick any 10 foreigners. They thought nothing of taking on crack enemy troops with squirrel rifles and pitchforks.

Now we trembled at the thought of how many half-starved vagrants a potential enemy might be able to point in our direction. We wonder how our boys, who started making model airplanes when they were 10 years old, will do against butter-fingered peasants who only recently got the hang of the can opener.

It may be that our traditionally high opinion of American fighting resourcefulness leaned a trifle to the irrational side. But it has pulled the country out of many a tight hole. We needn't go around butting our heads into brick walls to prove what stout fellows we are. Nor need we take foolhardy risks with American lives just to save the faces of bungling diplomats.

But let's not mislead stupid aggressors into imagining that any live American is ever going to be a slave to any foreign dictator. That would be downright deceitful.

Gifts of Butter by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Since Korean War Began More Than 75,000,000 Pounds of Butter Given Away by United States," written by John W. Ball, and published in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 28, 1951.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would also call attention to the fact that on January 26 the Boston Globe published the price of butter in Boston, Mass., as being 75 cents a pound.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have the power to yield to the Senator from New Mexico, I do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to say that I was informed by a man in the Department of Agriculture only last week that not only were as many million pounds of butter as the Senator from Massachusetts spoke of given away by the United States, but that during the past year many million dollars' worth of cheese were given away by the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad to receive that information from the Senator from New Mexico, and thank him for giving it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have the power to do so, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Massachusetts also undoubtedly knows that since the end of the last war the United States gave away $20,000,000,000 to Europe for purposes perhaps less worthy than the one he has referred to?

The article referred to is as follows:

SINCE KOREAN WAR BEGAN, MORE THAN 75,000,000 POUNDS OF BUTTER GIVEN AWAY BY UNITED STATES

(By John W. Ball)

Uncle Sam has given away more than 75,000,000 pounds of butter—half of it overseas—since the Korean war started last June. Other millions were sold at one-fourth the Government's cost. The entire cost of the butter given away was about $45,000,000.

While Agriculture Department's Commodity Credit Corporation was handing out these supplies with a more than lavish hand, the Army Quartermaster was buying 20,000,000 pounds at full market price, or about $12,000,000. The Army, also bought more than 7,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine, for the use of all the armed services. It is now buying about 4,000,000 pounds of butter and 1,000,000 pounds of oleo each month to feed the ever-increasing armed services.

The Government's transactions in butter make one of the most fantastic stories in all the weird operations of the farm price support system.

Besides giving away millions of pounds of butter while the Army was buying it in increasing amounts each month, CCC now proudly boasts that it sold 127,000,000 pounds on the domestic market at 60 cents a pound, plus handling charges of not more than 3 cents and usually less.

The last of these transactions took place justly recently, all of them in the last few months. Some of these supplies allegedly went into the speculative market. The butter CCC sold at 60 cents a pound to American commercial dealers, was selling for 71 cents on the Chicago market a week ago and is now bringing around 69 cents.

The 60 cents that CCC got for its supplies—virtually all bought this year—was the price that the Government paid for the butter under the fixed, arbitrary terms twice laid down by Congress within the last 30 months in the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. About 2 to 3 cents a pound was added for handling.

(The Government's price support program has cost more than $100,000,000 already this year, according to President Truman's budget message. It probably will reach double that figure by the year's end June 30. It cost one and six-tenths billion in fiscal year 1949.)

FIFTEEN-CENT PRICE TO ITALY

Here's the butter story step by step:

During 1949 and 1950 CCC bought 242,000,000 pounds of butter to keep consumer prices high and farmers happy.

Of this amount it sold 127,000,000 pounds to commercial dealers, in recent months at 60 cents a pound.

Another 5,500,000 pounds were sold last September to the Government of Italy at 15 cents a pound. (In the same month the Army bought 3,180,737 pounds for $1,963,066, or a little more than 61 cents a pound.)

About 51,000,000 pounds more was given free of charge plus freight costs to the school lunch program and to private or State charities. Estimates place the amount that went free of charge to domestic charities at about 40 million pounds.

Another 37,500,000 pounds was donated free of charge for shipment to foreign countries as follows: Israel, 18,847,350 pounds; Yugoslavia, 11,000,000 pounds; Germany, 5,400,000 pounds; Italy, 1,352,900 pounds; France, 547,250 pounds; Trieste, 278,000 pounds; Austria, 70,500 pounds, Tunisia, 55,000 pounds; India, 51,500 pounds; French Morocco, 44,000 pounds; Great Britain, 43,000 pounds; Greece, 31,525 pounds; and Norway, 22,500 pounds.

These foreign shipments were given free, freight paid to shipboard. Distribution was made in the foreign countries by welfare agencies, such as CARE, Jewish welfare groups, the Friends, etc. All such agencies were first approved for the donations by the State Department.

As of January 12, CCC had only 8,500,000 pounds of butter left. This, it reported, has been "committed," mostly for the school lunch program.

In the present fiscal year CCC has lost $24,000,000 on butter, in addition to the Army purchases.

The Government's Part in the Nation's World Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New York State Agricultural Society, the oldest of its kind in the United States, held its one hundred and nineteenth annual meeting in Chancellor's Hall, State Education Building, at Albany, N. Y., on January 24. The central theme for discussion at its conference was the Nation's World Responsibilities, with particular emphasis upon the citizen's part, labor's part, industry, agriculture, and the Government. My part of the discussion related to the Government's part in world affairs which I include herewith:

The building in which this meeting is held today and this auditorium awaken

treasured memories for me. While a law student in this city I was employed as messenger, clerk, and reviewer of regents' examinations here in the education department, and in this very chamber, Chancellor's Hall, some years ago I witnessed the inauguration of the commissioner of education of this State, a man whom I regard as the noblest soul I have ever known. I am honored to be the son of that man.

So it is a pleasure to me to be here among these many memories of yesterday, among old friends, and to be a participant in this gathering which is of real significance to our great State and to its men and women who, through their agricultural contributions, bring so much to the State and Nation and to the men and women of our Armed Forces, with whom I have long felt so closely allied as a result of my congressional identification with the Armed Forces for the past 14 years.

For any person to be asked to speak of the Government's part in the Nation's world responsibilities today, in such troubled and epochal times, and by such an important a society as this, in itself constitutes an honor and recognition.

I must in candor confess that I have deliberately accepted the invitation to be here in that spirit.

I have done so perhaps in some desperation. My choice seemed a little bleak. Either I could immodestly approach the problem as constituting recognition of an unusual sort, or I could submit to the overwhelming sense of inadequacy any reasonable person ought to feel in approaching a subject to this magnitude today.

In measuring our future today, I think all of us must recognize that the role of our National Government, perhaps for years ahead, will encompass virtually all significant areas of our economy and will penetrate deeply into all critical areas of this distressed and frightened globe.

It is, in fact, in keeping with many currents of present-day thought to say that the citizens of our land are impatiently demanding a greater role for our Government than—remarkably enough—Government itself appears ready to assume.

I think this yearning for governmental initiative and guidance in these times is not so extraordinary. There are unparalleled times The problems we face internationally are not new among mankind, for they are the age-old problems of survival, of violence and bloodshed, of misery and despair, of revolutionary movements among downtrodden peoples, of despotism, of threats to all Christian values and concepts.

These are not the problems that make our times unparalleled. Neither is the sternness of the test in today's world accountable for public yearnings for greater Government energy and purposeful direction of national affairs.

The mark of our times is the vast complexity of the issues with which we must work, and the awful consequences if we miscalculate our course. Our national power has become so vast that once set in motion, like the great flywheel (and, unfortunately, slow to start, like the flywheel), it is a serious task indeed to arrest its motion.

So as citizens, lacking access to the factual data from which decisions of high public policy are derived, it is our right to demand wisdom, to demand initiative, to demand a great sense of responsibility, and to demand vision and statecraft on the part of our Government collectively, and on the part of our public leaders individually. Our people are making these demands upon our Government today in steadily increasing volume. The reason is clear. That reason is the official title of these remarks—the people have become acutely aware of "the Government's part in the Nation's world responsibilities."

And our people are demanding that the Government fulfill that part.

I think it is clear enough that the role of our Government is, in regard to international problems, to serve as the rudder on our ship of State. It is the instrumentality of the people of the United States through which they determine their direction in world affairs, and through which they give evidence of their collective meaning to the nations of the world. It is trite, but largely true, to say that the Government is only as courageous, as insistent, as idealistic, as farsighted, and as wise as are the people themselves, for the Government in our society must always closely mirror the citizens, for better or worse, or surely collapse or be frustrated in its ventures.

But this fundamental tenet of our system does not absolve our Government leaders from their own responsibilities. They are not to be mere weathercocks responding helplessly to the public breeze. Not only do they have a responsibility for leadership in areas in which the people are not informed but our Government leaders also hold the awful responsibility for charting a course for the ship of state through uncharted and perilous waters, the citizens being in a position uncomfortably similar to that of the impressed seamen and having, oftentimes—some say especially so in odd-numbered years—just about as much to do with the direction of the vessel as does the impressed seaman.

In these circumstances we can see clearly the role of the Government in today's world.

It is to lead our people, in areas where they are inadequately informed and where for reasons of national security they cannot be informed.

It is to guide our Nation through the shadowy and threatening valleys which must be traversed if we are to reach the plains of an assured and lasting peace.

It is to harness and concentrate our power, economic and military, to bring the great potentialities of our land to bear when and where needed for the task before us.

It is to instill confidence and faith among other nations in the world in the ultimate conquest of tyranny by freemen, and to bring courage and determination to those to whom the cause seems so hopeless today.

And in these awesome undertakings, the Government must ever remain the tool of our free citizens, reflecting their collective will, for all that it does or attempts to do hinges upon how effectively this is done.

Of these obligations upon our Government today, there can be no doubt amongst any of us who love freedom and revere the type of society which has made our country the phenomenon of the ages, that the greatest test of all is whether or not we can prevent the world from bursting into flames that would ravage victor and vanquished alike. The spectre of the blinding flash of the atom bomb, the shattering roar of mighty rockets fired from aircraft or distant platforms, the hidden menace of bacteriological warfare and chemical warfare, the nightmarish prospect of the new and untold terrors of the hydrogen bomb, the frenzy and terror and hideousness of modern war, all this lies possibly, some say probably, before us, as our Government strives with all the means at its command to prevent the holocaust.

Yes; here is the prime role of our Government in the Nation's world responsibilities. To achieve peace—peace with honor—lasting, durable peace to permit our people and all of mankind to work for their betterment, freed from the oppressive fear of war.

How this can best be done is the central topic of our times, in and out of the Government.

It is the focal point around which the Congress revolves in all of its major deliberations.

I have felt for quite some time that this challenging problem has been compounded of far too much defeatism and bias to be soundly resolved. In the approach of many of us to this issue, I have sensed time and again that revulsion against war by many of our peace-loving peoples has led them to an attempt to deny the military facts of life through a sort of psychological escapism which we see commonly among children who find facing up to hard facts to be too distasteful. It is this sort of escapism that produces the inclination to consign Europe to her own doom and to take the apparently easier road of girding ourselves with moats of wind and water, leaving the world to simmer in its evil brew as if we were not also in the pot.

And from our inherited biases against things and peoples foreign stem our tendency to dismiss contemptuously the halting steps of Europeans to strengthen their own defenses. We tend to overlook completely how different it must be to be so situated as to have to look down the muzzle of a Russian gun which may go off while you are rearming than it is to counsel strong hearts and stout defiance from this citadel 3,000 miles away.

In making that observation, I do not mean to pose as an apologist for the inadequacies of our European friends. Neither do I desire to imply in any way that our people can be or should be content with anything but effort on their part comparable to that which our Nation is making in the cause of freedom.

However, it is one thing for the coach to stay on the sidelines, shouting to his battle-weary, bruised team, "They can't hurt us." It is far more meaningful if the coach makes the same comment, "They can't hurt us," when he too is in the fight with his team.

I feel, therefore, that we are a bit prone to deprecate the impact upon our European friends of their proximity to the mighty and truculent Russian war machine. I sometimes wonder how vigorous Mexico or Canada would be if England or France were exhorting them to arm against America, if our actions and attitudes were and had long been menacing toward those countries. My guess is that their rearmament effort would be halting and slow, or at least prudent.

To return to our theme, What is the proper role of our Government in dealing with this problem?

Our citizens of this great land must hope that our Government can weld the European nations and other freedom-loving nations of the world into a working, virile, determined and powerful team dedicated to the prevention of aggression in the world. That is the present obligation and effort. And I feel profoundly that all of us must pray that that effort is blessed with success.

You will note that I have not stated an alternative. I have emphasized the importance of creating a free world determination and concert of military effort. I have mentioned no alternative because the prospect is too fearful to contemplate. Contrary to the views of some others, my conviction, based on harsh military facts, is that ultimate destruction awaits America if we seek to go it alone on this tormented planet, consigning the vast resources and industrial capacities of the remainder of the world to the diabolical Reds.

Appealing though this plague-on-the-rest-of-the-world concept is, as an escapist mechanism by which to construct a more pleasant dream world than the facts warrant, it smacks too much of an effort to destroy the Russian bear by gorging him to death. I find it difficult to believe that this Nation, or any nation, can vanquish communism by giving it indigestion.

Neither can any of us look with anything less than dread upon the situation that would ensue if the Reds were permitted to place the resources and industrial complex of Western Europe into their own orbit to develop endlessly, remorselessly, day and

night, year in and year out, until the vaunted industrial supremacy of America became a nostalgic memory, or until America destroyed herself in the endless torment of an armaments race stupendous beyond belief.

Nor is security to be found in passive defense, as the annals of warfare amply demonstrate, and as ancient Rome found to her sorrow. Moats of wind and water become highways—avenues of approach—to the nation with superior air or naval fleets. I shudder to contemplate the disasters to be heaped upon future American generations if this generation should yield to the Reds the shipyards of France, Belgium, Italy, and England, along with their aircraft manufacturing capabilities, all of this potentially mighty strength supplemental to the Russian industrial system. Surely there could be no doubt that ultimately America would be crushed in the industrial effort this terrible competition would require; or, if our land gave up the race in order to preserve its economy, military conquest of our land could only be our ultimate reward.

Does this mean, then, that the role of our Government is simply to deny the industrial capacity of Western Europe to the Soviet Union? No, the responsibility is more serious than that. Our Government must, certainly, deny to the Soviet Union the industrial capabilities of Europe even in the terrible eventuality of Russian seizure of these areas. But the lessons of the last war are clear in this respect. Air power has severe limitations, as we see daily in the press accounts of the warfare in Korea. Not only is air power unable, of itself, to stop the advance of a powerful ground army, but it cannot scourge a nation to death by and of itself. All of us remember the Nazi's guided missiles launching sites late in the last war when America and her allies had complete air superiority. Despite innumerable bombing attacks, despite all that air power could do, it was only when the ground troops overran these sites that all of them could be put out of commission.

It would be no different in a future war. Should the Soviet Union overrun Western Europe, we could never wholly eliminate the industrial strength this victory would add to the Red military machine. I am reminded of the fact that in spite of the tremendous and innumerable bombing attacks on Nazi Germany from 1942 until 1944, German war production climbed steadily until American armies were at the frontiers and our air attacks were turned primarily to tactical purposes.

The harsh military fact, true heretofore in warfare, equally true today, is that a nation is defeated only when its military force, ground, air, and naval, is destroyed or rendered impotent. This demands a mighty ground force quite as much as a mighty air force and mighty navy. Much as we might wish it, there is no other route.

The only way I know to keep the military potential of Western Europe from being exploited to our ultimate disaster by the Reds is to keep them from overrunning it in the first instance.

That is our problem. That is the awful responsibility of our Government.

It cannot be accomplished by purchasing allies or by compelling the nations of Western Europe, by cajolery or economic pressure, to create armed forces. A military organization cannot be an effective fighting machine unless there is in existence a strong national determination and will to fight behind that organization. Neither can it be accomplished by America's manhood and American military machines alone. Our manpower is too limited; our national economy cannot endlessly withstand the strains such a policy would produce.

It can be accomplished only if the will of Western Europe to resist is sufficiently strong to instill in European fighting forces the strength to stand up against the alien forces to the east. That will to resist must come from within those nations themselves. It cannot be obtained from America. Determination to retain national and personal freedom is not a marketable quantity; it comes from the national character and traditions.

But this does not leave our Government impotent and consigned to a wringing of hands while awaiting, hopefully, a resurgence of a European will to resist. There are positive steps our Government can and must take, and has taken. These steps include economic assistance within limits, nearly all of which, in my own view, has been given that should be. They include direct military assistance in the form of military equipment and advice where needed, this program still requiring considerable implementation in the future to be effective, and also requiring a much greater autonomy of military personnel in Europe and less State Department control. The effort also requires continuing encouragement of the European countries to confederate, to remove artificial restrictions on trade and commerce and military effort in order that a healthy European economy and military capacity can be built.

But more than this is also involved.

There is also involved the commitment of American military strength to Europe. The American fleet must have sufficient aircraft carrier strength to provide promptly air superiority where and when needed at vital areas in the Mediterranean, in and around the British Isles, and over the coastal areas of the European continent. The American Air Force must amass sufficient fighter strength in England, in Africa, and on the continent itself to withstand, in concert with our allies, the initial Soviet assault from the air should it be unleashed. Our Air Force must also maintain in instant readiness the bombing power required from British, African, and other bases to pulverize strategic Soviet installations in the event the necessity arises.

And on the ground the Americans must have sufficient strength to protect themselves adequately in the event of attack so that, if the need arises, at least they will have reasonable opportunity, in combination with the American Air Force and Navy, to be withdrawn before encirclement or total destruction.

These steps are essential to effective European resistance—to the resurgence of the vigorous European effort required to save Europe from conquest and to save America from the bleak prospects which retirement to our own shores presents. Our ground rule in rendering this military assistance to Europe must be to provide enough to make it evident to Europe that America has both the intent and the ability to stand with the Europeans against the Soviet Union on the European Continent, and that the American ability is sufficiently evident and promising as no longer to make the cause appear hopeless.

More of a contribution than this would be a disservice to our own efforts, for it would encourage Europe to a do-nothing policy which, leaving us to carry the burden alone, also carries seeds for the destruction of our land through economic collapse. Less than this will surely leave Europe so supine and fearful of moving to her own defense that all our great investments in the recovery of this part of the world will have proved in vain.

Acknowledgedly it is a fine balance we seek—a dangerous, a fateful balance. General Eisenhower at this moment is appraising its possibilities, promises, and risks, and all the world looks with extreme interest and concern to his report upon return from Europe. I have the utmost confidence in his ability. I believe in his integrity and objectivity, and it is my observation that the entire Nation respects his judgment. His message to our troubled land will have a heavy impact on public and congressional attitudes and activities for months thereafter.

It is well for all of us to keep foremost in our thinking in all of these efforts abroad these days that our motivation has been, is, and must in the future be the guaranty of our own national security. It is self-interest, not overweening concern over the future of others at this critical time, that underlies our national policies. Nations are never charitably motivated in their military efforts. We need have no cobwebs in our thinking in respect to our relations with our European friends during the critical months and years ahead. The cooperation we receive, if indeed we receive it, will not be the result of European fondness for our peoples. It will be produced from a desire for their own national survival. I digress to make this point only to remove the fuzziness in the minds of those who advocate the defense of this or that area in the world for emotional reasons, or because of traditional factors unrelated to the problems of today.

The tragedy of our times, as was so cogently pointed out by that magnificent American, Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, last October 16 in an address at the University of Washington, is that in the course of the last war, primarily as a result of our unfortunate and shortsighted addiction to the term "unconditional surrender," insisted upon by the late President Roosevelt at the Casablanca conference, we upset the balance of power in the world. More than that, and more deadly, we actually created power vacuums in Europe and in Asia into which armed strength surely would flow, whether it be our own, that of our friends, or the armed might of the Communist millions. These power vacuums, especially in areas as highly primed as that of Western Europe, inevitably draw the attention and efforts of other nations, and we find ourselves faced by this uncomfortable fact in both Europe and Asia today.

Our Government now must fill these power vacuums. We must do it by strengthening our allies, by strengthening ourselves, and also—and I emphasize this point—by bringing Germany and Japan back into the family of nations as counterweights in the balance against Russian aggression.

Only if we follow this course of action, only if we follow it with the firmest determination and dedication, only if we pursue this objective with a great sense of urgency, leaving behind business-as-usual concepts and, even foregoing the peacetime emphasis on orderly and efficient processes, can we hope to succeed.

All of these functions constitute the primary role of our Government in world affairs today. They are risky. They are fateful for mankind. I have not the slightest doubt that because of our faith in the Divinity, Who after all will dispose of these matters in His own way, regardless of our efforts—because of our devotion to freedom, because of our vast disproportion of military resources and industrial capabilities, and because the entire effort is so patently worth the cost, whatever it may be, we shall succeed.

Tom Sweeney Replies to Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the editor of the Wheeling News-Register and Intelli-

gencer, Wheeling, W. Va., conducted a poll of his readers listing 10 queries bearing on the world crisis. One of the most interesting responses received was submitted by Tom Sweeney, of Wheeling, who served as a navigator in the Naval Air Corps during World War II. Prior to his military service Commander Sweeney was a member of the West Virginia Senate for several terms and was the sponsor of many constructive measures. He is an executive in the T. B. Sweeney Agency of the Equitable Life Insurance Co. In view of his political and business background and his extensive service in both the European and Pacific theaters, the proposals he offered will be of interest to the House. His response to the poll reads as follows:

EDITOR, THE NEWS-REGISTER,
Wheeling, W. Va.

DEAR SIR: As a nation we cannot allow ourselves to be bled white in a series of land actions throughout the world. Or the other hand, can we afford to withdraw behind your Atlantic-Pacific-Hemispheric wall? We could have in 1940. Outside was a world divided, and we held the balance of power. In my campaign for the United States Senate in that year my foreign policy platform was the Herbert Hoover-Intelligencer-News-Register doctrine of today. It was sound, sensible, and rejected.

But the world outside has changed. And how confused have been the politicians who brought us to our present dilemma, is provided by the picture of our present leaders attempting to rearm, as allies, the very nations whom their predecessors called upon us to destroy. They have committed us so deeply that complete withdrawal would amount to flat desertion of those whom we may someday need as much as they now need us. Yet, like it or not, isolation without friends, will soon be forced upon us—unless we are willing to change the rules of the game.

And that is what I want now to propose we do. Why not a new kind of Monroe Doctrine—a new kind of war? Why would it not be meeting the dilemma with common sense, if our Nation declared to the world that—

1. We recognize that in the modern world fifth-column forces are a military arm of an aggressor as surely as its uniformed armies, and that such Communist armies (Russia's new kind of war) already exist within the borders of free nations all over the earth.

2. We stand ready to declare punitive war on such forces, or any forces of Communist aggression anywhere in the world, where representatives of a free people, wantonly attacked from within or without, ask for our protection.

3. Punitive war will be limited to: (a) Air, naval, or commando missions against the nerve centers and arteries of the aggressor without commitment of land forces to the invasion or defense of any soil beyond our boundaries; (b) enlightenment—not destruction—of civilian populations, even though such be already indoctrinated as our foes.

4. We will consult with and seek joint action with the United Nations, taking drastic action only where delay might be fatal.

5. We will press such war as a permanent condition; cessation of aggression, not victory over an enemy, being its intent.

Our immediate program, and my arguments to support it, would be as follows under such a doctrine:

1. Declaration of punitive war on Russia's puppet satraps in China and Korea.

2. Gradual withdrawal of land forces from Korea with naval and air units only remaining on our island bases.

3. Intense propaganda in China by radio and leaflets in language such as this: "If this were a bomb, you would not be alive. It could be a bomb, but it isn't, because we are friends who regret the loss of every Chinese life as we regret our own. Our only enemies are the leaders who have forced themselves upon you. They are not the heirs of your ancestors. They are just traitorous puppets of a foreign nation that wants to make your people bleed and die in battle while they sit back in hypocritical sanctity. You will be safe if you do not go near these foreign masters. But we must warn all that at any moment we may decide to annihilate 100,000 at a time. Do not die among those who serve them. They want only to make slaves of you. We want only to throw them out. Join the millions of your brothers who are helping us free China." (It is in this field that the Soviet world has won its greatest victories. Our propaganda has been mush. The ideals of democracy! To peasant millions such talk is incomprehensible, as academic as a treatise on paradise. As to that, how many Americans know what a democracy is? How many could explain why we are not a democracy but instead a Republic?)

4. Collaboration with Chiang Kai-shek and all other friendly forces within China. They would be legion. That is communism's great weakness. It rules by force of ignorance and fear. The iron curtain is the clue to its point of greatest vulnerability.

5. Continuous precision bombing of troop centers, enemy ships, and other isolated military objectives.

Such wars could be conducted on a dozen fronts from nearby bases for a fraction of what our Korean action has already cost in lives and materials, and without any risk of "losing face." Our pilots, naval, and intelligence personnel only would have to risk their lives. But they do, anyway.

This program would be based on a frank acknowledgment that we could not hope to conquer by invasion the land masses of Russia and Asia any more than they could hope to do the same to us. Man to man on their soil they can swarm over us like locusts. But at a distance and with weapons the odds are al on our side. Why play their game when we can make them play our game? I predict that the war of the future will be devastation at long range, and to prepare for it does not mean to draft huge armies. It means, on the contrary, to cut the Army to a reserve force, while building up our Air Force, our Navy, our science research, and the bastions of our Asiatic, Arctic, and Atlantic frontiers to the shores of Asia on the west and Europe on the east.

Of what avail a local civilian-defense organization? Of what avail a million men in uniform, or the world's best air force? Or the most modern radar equipment on the Great Lakes or the Hudson—if just one enemy plane carrying one atom bomb reaches our borders? Radar would tell you a plane is there. But it could not tell you whose plane. Unless detected on some far arctic shore, where any plane is a suspicious plane, it would be just any old airliner plodding its way unnoticed toward any destination. Do we have a radar screen extending from Alaska across northern Canada to Nova Scotia? Have we secret agreements with our neighbors coordinating such detecting devices? Do they even have the means to install any adequate system of warning?

I have long doubted it. A Senate committee recently returned from Alaska removed my doubts. I now know that our leadership, which seems never to see to the heart of a problem, has failed even in our own Territory of Alaska to provide any adequate mechanism of detection. To my mind immediate action on this point is imperative above even our action in Korea. For it is over the arctic that that little group of planes would come that could lay waste some morning in an instant to 10 of our greatest cities.

The objection is raised that if we waged this kind of incessant war against communism on all fronts, it wouldn't be long until Russia struck us such a blow. That would be our best break, but they won't for many years to come, because they know that today at long range we could give it back 10 for 1. The great weakness of a free people is that it cannot choose the time and place to fight. If we could strike with the cold calculation with which our enemies will strike us when they are ready, we would have put an end to the world's troubles in 1945 while we had sole possession of the bomb, a million men in Europe, and the land of our sworn enemy, already in ruins at our feet. Next best is, by honorable behavior, to provoke them into striking us before they are ready.

Such a program I think we could afford. It would give comfort to our allies (who know that we cannot support them forever) while forcing them into greater self-reliance; rain destruction on our enemies (where rebuilding would not be our responsibility); require no billions to put millions into uniform (our Army would be ready long before any enemy could land in force on our shores); strengthen our production might; and preserve and defend in depth, the great arsenal upon which, in the last analysis, the whole free world depends.

Sincerely,

TOM SWEENEY.

Natural-Gas-Line Explosions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H. R. 88, which I filed on January 3, 1951, and which has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I requested the Federal Power Commission to furnish me with such details as it might have with reference to explosions on natural-gas pipelines. This information has now been sent to me with a letter from Chairman Mon C. Wallgren, which is self-explanatory.

I have written to the several companies, with two objectives in mind: First, I believe it is important to have the accuracy of this data determined by the companies, since they obviously have full details in their files; second, I want to obtain any further information as to these explosions listed and as to any other explosions which may have occurred but as to which the Federal Power Commission has no information.

On the basis of the information now available, one conclusion seems to be clear—that such accidents have increased in frequency during the last 3 years. The tabulation shows 8 such accidents in 1948, 12 in 1949, and 14 in 1950, and it should be noted that the last of the listed accidents covers 76 line

breaks during the testing of section of pipe between Raritan and Rahway Rivers near Colonia, N. J.

The letter and tabulation follow:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, January 25, 1951.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: In response to your letter of January 5, 1951, requesting information concerning explosions on natural-gas pipelines, there has been compiled the attached tabulation containing a summary of all the information that has been received by the Federal Power Commission regarding breaks and explosions on interstate pipelines. This information has been gathered from various sources such as newspaper reports, letters, telegrams, conferences, and investigations. The Commission cannot vouch for the accuracy of the data nor can the Commission state that such data represents all the line breaks and explosions that have occurred in this country.

Many of the breaks listed in the tabulation show "no details" as to persons injured or killed. It is believed that in most of these cases no person was injured or killed and damage to property was slight.

If there is any other information you desire, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

MON C. WALLGREN,
Chairman.

Information received by Federal Power Commission concerning line breaks on interstate pipelines as of Jan. 12, 1951

Pipeline company	Location of line break	Date of line break	Number of persons—		Size of line (inches)	Comments
			Injured	Killed		
Atlantic Seaboard Corp.	Tug River, Ky.	Feb. 21, 1947	(1)	(1)	20	Coupling failure because of strip-mine operation.
Virginia Gas Transmission Corp.	Hazel River, Va.	Jan. 14, 1948	(1)	(1)	20	Header failure caused by defective pipe.
Colorado Interstate Gas Co.	Northeastern New Mexico	May —, 1962	(1)	(1)	22	Wash-out caused by floods.
Michigan Gas Storage Co.	Muskegon River, Mich.	Dec. 7, 1947	(1)	(1)	(2)	Explosion in compressor station.
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.	Near Centralia, Mo.	Dec. 8, 1949	(1)	(1)	(2)	Complete interruption of gas deliveries east of Centralia compressor station where explosion occurred.
United Gas Pipe Line Co.	Dallas-Fort Worth area, Texas	Dec. 18, 1944	(1)	(1)	(1)	War plants shut down temporarily.
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.	Valve 120-121, West Virginia	Nov. 23, 1944	(1)	(1)	(1)	Faulty pipeline weld.
Do.	Valve 119-120, West Virginia	Feb. 12, 1947	(1)	(1)	(1)	Rupture in pipe bend.
Do.	Valve 78-79, Tennessee	Mar. 27, 1947	(1)	(1)	(1)	Faulty pipeline weld.
Do.	Valve 104-105, Kentucky	May 26, 1948	(1)	(1)	(1)	Pipe ruptured by bulldozer.
Do.	Valve 83-84, Tennessee	July 13, 1948	(1)	(1)	(1)	Faulty pipe.
Do.	Near Greenville, Miss.	Dec. 4, 1950	2	2	26	Explosion at Mississippi River pipeline crossings.
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.	Wadley, La.	Sept. 20, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Serious fires, some people injured, caused by explosions during testing.
Do.	Chatham, Va.	Nov. 2, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
Do.	Little Rocky Hill, N. J.	Nov. 25, 1950	(1)	(1)	30	Do.
Do.	Culpeper, Va.	Nov. 22, 1950	3		30	Explosion during line testing caused great property damage.
Do.	Norristown, Pa.	Nov. 23, 1950	2		30	Do.
Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.	Union County, Ark.	May 8, 1947			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Grant County, Ark.	Jan. 11, 1948			20	Do.
Do.	White County, Ark.	Jan. 17, 1948			20	Do.
Do.	Pike County, Ind.	Mar. 18, 1948			20	Damage to buildings settled for $18,000 due to defective pipe.
Do.	Pulaski County, Ark.	May 9, 1948			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Near Seymour, Ind.	Nov. 19, 1948	18		(2)	Explosion in compressor station causing $1,000,000 damages.
Do.	Near Batesville, Ind.	Jan. 18, 1949	2		(2)	Power failure caused fire in compressor station with $200,000 damages.
Do.	Adams County, Pa.	Feb. 9, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Jennings County, Ind.	Mar. 4, 1949	1		20	Defective pipe caused property damages of $26,000.
Do.	Craighead County, Ark.	Apr. 2, 1949			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Noble County, Ohio	May 6, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	Butler County, Mo.	May 18, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	do.	May 24, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	Grant County, Ark.	June 26, 1949			20	Do.
Do.	West Chester, Pa.	July 15, 1949	1	2	24	Explosion blew up cover plate where men were working.
Do.	Johnson County, Ill.	Oct. 5, 1949			20	Nominal damages caused by defective pipe.
Do.	Montgomery County, Pa.	Dec. 14, 1949			20	8-inch crack in field weld.
Do.	Noble County, Ohio	Jan. 20, 1950			20	Defective pipe caused explosion with $12,000 property damages.
Do.	Pulaski County, Ark.	May 17, 1950			24	River eroded causing pipe to pull apart.
Do.	Perry County, Ohio	May 19, 1950			20	Nominal damages due to defective pipe.
Do.	Near Beallsville, Ohio	July 1, 1950	(1)	(1)	24	Explosion ripped up 12 feet of pipeline.
Do.	Near Jasper, Ind.	July 10, 1950	(1)	(1)	(2)	
Do.	Butler County, Mo.	July 15, 1950	(1)	(1)	(2)	
Do.	Adams County, Pa.	Sept. 12, 1950	(1)	(1)	20	Explosion occurred after hydrostatic testing.
Do.	Near Colonia, N. J.	Spring 1950	(1)	(1)	20	76 line breaks occurred during testing section of pipe between Raritan and Rahway Rivers.

[1] No details available.
[2] Compressor station.

Dr. Gordon Seagrave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Paradox," dealing with the case of Dr. Gordon Seagrave, published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of January 25, 1951.

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

ANOTHER PARADOX

The Gordon Seagrave case provides one more instance of a strange paradox in American official policy. Apparently the famed humanitarian Burma surgeon is to be allowed to languish, and perhaps die, in an oriental prison for treason against a government of which he is not a citizen. His family estimates he cannot survive a year of his 6-year sentence.

This callous indifference to the fate of individual American nationals is a product of the Roosevelt-Truman era. In recent years we have become so worked up over the horrible lot of Europe's displaced persons, who must be channeled to this country in wholesale lots; so engrossed in the raising of funds for alien unfortunates in the mass; so preoccupied with raising taxes to finance bundles for Britain, UNRRA, Marshall plans, and most recently, Yugoslav famine relief, that we have no time or room for compassion over the fate of our own citizens who are kicked around and mistreated by foreign governments, principally upstart regimes of dubious legality.

So Seagrave stays in prison. Robert Vogeler vanished into a Hungarian concentration camp—or worse. Angus Ward endured a year of imprisonment in a filthy Chinese Communist jail, captive of the same people who a few weeks ago lived in luxury in New York's Waldorf-Astoria while they commuted daily to Lake Success to defame and defy the alpneless United Nations which, these days, makes American foreign policy.

Other American Presidents have met the problem of how to handle gangsters who seized American nationals. But Theodore Roosevelt's ultimatum, to the Moroccan bandits, "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead" now is only a forgotten line in the history textbooks. Or maybe it isn't—a lot of things have disappeared from American textbooks in recent years at the behest of people who can't see the American woods for the towering trees of the one-world doctrine.

Maybe it isn't possible to do anything about Dr. Seagrave. But it would look a little more decent and honorable and self-respecting if our global-minded State Department could focus its attention for a moment on an individual American citizen in distress and at least look into the case. So far as we know, this isn't being done and there is no intention to do so.

It's Happening on Your Own Front Lawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to describe combat conditions as I experienced them as an infantry battalion commander during World War II, but I always immediately realize how inadequate words are to tell the story fully. A patient at Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, D. C., has written about his experiences in Korea and to me he has clearly related how the man in the foxhole feels.

Whatever I might say now would only detract from the story this infantry platoon leader has to say to every American. His letter first appeared in the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader and was reprinted in the Washington Star on January 24, 1951. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this letter which was written by Lt. Robert T. Fallon:

IT'S HAPPENING ON YOUR OWN FRONT LAWN

(By Robert T. Fallon)

I want to tell you something about a war.

I want you to imagine for a moment that it is a very cold, wet, wintry evening at about 10 o'clock. You have been sitting very comfortably by your fireside reading the evening paper. It's been a pleasant day, dismal outside, but warm and restful by the fire. You decide to step out on the porch for a breath of air before turning in. I'm sure you've done it often. But on this particular evening, a strange sight greets you.

There's a great hole right in the middle of your front lawn, and the dirt has been thrown up all around it, outlined sharply against the white, even snow. Squatting in the hole is a hunched figure.

Let me tell you something about him.

He's been in this area now for about 8 weeks, living in a dozen holes just like this one on your front lawn. The most apparent thing about him is that he is cold, and that's because out on your lawn it's about 20 degrees colder than where you're standing. Every now and then he'll grab his shovel and dig a little deeper in the hole just to keep warm. That's the only way he has, because he'll be seen if he builds a fire, and he may bring mortar fire into your living room.

He's been cold for a long time—and wet. He can't feel his feet, and he's getting worried because he's afraid they might be frostbitten. It's going to be a long night, and it's going to get colder.

He's very dirty. The grease from a hundred "C" rations is frozen to his parka and gloves, coating the 2 weeks' beard which covers his face. Soot from the small fires he dares to make during the day is all over his pants and boots.

But he's dirty all the way through. He hasn't changed his underclothes in over a month and he doesn't intend to for some time to come. It's too cold to go down that far. You can smell him, and it's bad.

He's pretty hungry, too. They didn't get his rations up to him until after dark and he couldn't build a fire to thaw them out. He'll have to wait until morning. A cup of hot coffee would sure taste good. He looks old with that beard and sort of hunched-over posture. But he's only about 19, though not like any 19-year-old you've ever seen.

You may wonder what he's thinking about as he sits there during those long solitary hours. Well, it's not much. Just how cold it is and again how nice that coffee would be. Maybe every now and then he thinks of home, but that's a long ways off and the cold, his feet, and his hunger are much more immediate. You'd be surprised how those three things can fill your mind.

You notice that he's cut a hole through your hedge and his rifle is sitting on the pile of dirt pointing in readiness through the opening. That's another thing he's thinking: When are they coming again? He gets a little scared out there all alone. He'd like to go over and talk to this buddy in a similar hole about two houses up, but it's not a good idea to go crawling around at night. He wishes they weren't so far apart but it seems they always have a big sector to cover with never enough men to cover it. It doesn't help being so far apart.

What would you like to do with this man? Ask him in to your fireside, get him a cup of coffee? Would you like to loan him your razor and let him take a hot shower? Give him a bed to sleep in instead of the dirt and cold of his fox hole? Sure you would. You wouldn't think twice about it. But I'm afraid you can't. There's some one on that hill over there who wants to get into your front door, and the man was told by his platoon leader that he's supposed to take care of your house and the one next door. So he can't come in and you find that you can't reach him. He's very far away.

But you come out in the morning and he's still there, huddled over his little fire, thawing out his hands and his rations, trying to get the feeling back into his feet. By this time the hole is pretty deep from all the digging and he's cut down a little more of your hedge. He's there again when you come home from work. While you are greeted by a comfortable fire in a living room, the soldier is getting ready for another cold night.

I have told you about this soldier, and placed him on your front lawn, because I want you to realize that every desolate hill that soldier defends in that far-off land is in reality your front door. There are people who want to get in to do you harm, and it's his job to keep them away. He's going to do his job and he's not going to ask you to do it for him. If he has to sit on your front lawn in the cold, that's just the way things go. He's not going to begrudge you the comforts of your fireside or your dinner table, but he'll be mighty bitter if he finds out that you're not doing your part of the job.

What is "your job?" Well, it's not really important what I happen to think "your job" may be. But I think it is important that you find out soon what it is and start doing it, for whatever it is, it's a vital part of a country's struggle for existence. Perhaps it would be more clear to you what your job is if you returned home tonight to find that hunched, shivering figure sitting in a hole on your lawn.

The Burma Surgeon: Will He Again Return?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the striking news account appearing in the current issue of Time concerning the trial and conviction of Dr. Gordon S. Seagraves in Rangoon, Burma, and the strong editorials that are currently appearing in the leading newspapers of the country confirms my feelings as expressed before this House on January 19, 1951, and in the words of one of the editorials appearing below, "Offhand it seems a very shabby reward to Dr. Seagrave for a lifetime of loving labor in the service of the Burmese people."

It is not my desire as I pointed out on the floor of this House on January 19 to create any misunderstanding or misapprehension, and for that reason I am glad to note that within the past 10 days many outstanding newspapers throughout the country have come to the support of this famous medical missionary, who has given so much to the Burmese people.

With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks and include first, a brief, yet clear-cut factual news item from Time covering the trial of the Burma surgeon:

[From Time Magazine]

BURMA, SEA OF TROUBLES

Three months ago famed Medical Missionary Dr. Gordon S. (Burma Surgeon) Seagrave entered Rangoon's red-and-cream brick high court to stand trial for treason. Last week a crowd gathered to hear the verdict. Dr. Seagrave was brought into court from a comfortable United States Embassy bungalow, where he was allowed to stay after he became ill in Rangoon's crowded, noisy jail.

The three judges filed in, took their places on the bench. Seagrave remained standing. One of the judges began reading the tribunal's verdict: Charge No. 1, that Seagrave had given aid and comfort to the State's enemies by having tea with a Kachin rebel leader, allowing the rebels to play football on hospital grounds—not guilty; charge No. 2, that he had written a letter to facilitate the rebels' arrest of a Government commissioner—guilty; charge No. 3, that he had given medical help to rebels—guilty. Said the judge: "We must take a serious view of the gravity of the offense. * * * While the country was in a sea of troubles, the accused * * * acted in a manner prejudicial to the state and his act was like that of one—graphically described in the old Burmese saying—who pressed down with a pole

on a drowning man." The sentence: Six years' hard labor.

Seagrave did not flinch, but suddenly he looked older than his 58 years. For almost half his life Surgeon Seagrave had been giving medical aid to Burmese peasants, and then a crazy-quilt civil war, spreading around his hill-country hospital, had tangled him in bitter national rivalries. A Burmese reporter asked him for his reaction to the verdict. He replied: "Whatever some few do to me, I want you to know I still love the people of Burma." He added: "I sincerely hope the American people will not judge the people of Burma by the actions of a few."

Two Burmese nurses who had testified for Seagrave wept quietly. Seagrave patted their shoulders. His able Burmese attorney, U Kyaw Myint, who has served without fee, said: "I would like to appeal the case immediately. Will you sign the authority for me to do so?"

Said Seagrave: "But I hate like sin to keep imposing on you." With a smile, U Kyaw Myint said softly: "As a Burman, I think I owe it to you."

Seagrave signed the paper. Told that he could not return to the bungalow, but would have to go to jail, Seagrave muttered: "O Lord, I simply cannot sleep there." Up to this time Seagrave had flatly refused to consider deportation; now he was heard to say: "I think I would almost rather take exile from Burma." All of the Baptist missionaries in Burma were in Rangoon for a meeting, but only one of them was in the courtroom to hear sentence passed on their former colleague, who has operated independently of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society since 1942. As he left the courtroom, Seagrave turned to his loyal friend, Rev. Walter D. Sutton, and asked for his prayers. Said Seagrave: "God bless you. Don't forget to remember me upwards."

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the great host of friends of this courageous surgeon in the United States, and especially Mrs. Seagrave, who now resides in the Baltimore area, working as a receptionist to support their two sons, gratefully acknowledge the free legal counsel being extended Dr. Seagrave by U. Kyaw Myint, an able Burmese attorney.

Mr. Speaker, representative editorials that I have noted within recent days appear below. I ask that they be included as a part of my remarks, and feel that I express the feeling of the membership of this House, that Dr. Seagraves should be released because of the flimsy charges lodged against him:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer]

A SHOCKING VERDICT

The surprising report that Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the famous Burma surgeon, had been found guilty of high treason and sentenced to serve 6 years in prison at hard labor must have shocked hosts of admirers in this country and throughout the civilized world.

Here was a medical missionary, educated at Johns Hopkins, who had given more than 25 years of his life to serving the Burmese people as physician, surgeon, and operator of a hospital. Doubtless great numbers of those people are alive today only because of the skill and the services of this American doctor who long ago devoted his life to the cause of Christianity and the relief of suffering humanity in a backward land.

He had been decorated by the United States Government and King George VI for his heroism during Gen. Joseph Stilwell's jungle retreat from Burma in 1942.

But in 1949 Burma was in the throes of civil war; conditions were chaotic and confusing. Rebel Kachin tribesmen captured Namkham, site of Dr. Seagrave's hospital and center of his work. That was in 1949. It was on August 20 last year that he was arrested at his hospital on charges of aiding the rebel tribesmen in their struggle against the Government.

The trial consumed 3 months and the verdict came as a complete surprise according to the Associated Press correspondent in Rangoon. As punishment for high treason, 6 years in prison at hard labor seems light, but it would be terrible punishment for the kindly gentle Burma surgeon who evidently was never intentionally or consciously guilty of treason or any other crime. As he is now 58 years of age, 6 years of confinement at hard labor would mean that his years of noble service to suffering people would have ended.

His attorney, a Burmese former judge, has given notice of appeal, and the final outcome will be watched with keen interest in this and other countries. But it is doubtful.

That such a good and noble man as Dr. Seagrave should have been prosecuted and declared guilty of high treason against a country whose people he served so long, so unselfishly, and so effectively seems ironical indeed.

The spirit of the man was indicated by the statement he made to reporters immediately after he had been sentenced:

"I sincerely hope the American people will not judge the people of Burma by the actions of a few. I bear the Burmese people no malice for this."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

BURMA SURGEON

It is very difficult for Americans to understand the trial and conviction of Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the famous Burma surgeon, who became one of the legendary figures of the Pacific war. He has now been sentenced to 6 years' imprisonment on two counts of an indictment charging him with encouraging treason against the Burmese Government. His only hope now lies in an appeal to the high court at Rangoon. To complicate matters further, Dr. Seagrave, although a native of Burma, is an American by parentage and nationality, and a medical missionary of the Baptist Church. When he and his hospital staff joined the late General Stilwell in the memorable retreat through the Burmese jungles and over the mountains into India, Dr. Seagrave was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army Medical Corps. After the reconquest of Burma he returned to his hospital at Namkham near the Chinese border.

The details of his trial have been rather scantily reported by the American newspapers. The rebels whom he is accused of aiding are the Kachins of the Chinese border district and the Karens of the hill country. These peoples differ from the Burmans by both culture and religion. They are in a much more primitive stage of development, but Christianity has made more rapid progress among the animistic Karens than among the Buddhistic Burmese. A great part of Dr. Seagrave's medical work has been among such tribes.

Two years ago when Burma became an independent member of the British Commonwealth the Kachins and Karens rose in revolt against the new Burmese Government. There is no indication that these revolts were fomented or dominated by Communists, though both Stalinist and Trotskyite Governments were busily stirring up other revolts. The Karens, the most numerous and successful of these insurrectionary movements, sometimes made common cause with the Communists, sometimes fought against them.

In 1949 a combined force of Karens and Kachins made an incursion into central Burma and captured the city of Toungoo. During this advance Namkham was occupied by the rebel forces. Dr. Seagrave was accused of giving medical supplies to the rebels, of having taken tea with the Kachin leader Naw Seng, and with having permitted rebel troops to play football in the hospital compound. The rebels were subsequently routed by the Burmese forces, but Dr. Seagrave was also accused of having aided Naw Seng to escape across the Chinese border. Naw Seng is now said to have thrown in his lot with the Chinese Communists.

Most of these charges will strike Americans as rather frivolous; and, indeed, the Burmese court dismissed them all save the charge of aiding the rebels by giving them medical supplies. Since the rebels were armed and in possession, it is difficult to see how Dr. Seagrave could have refused them, even if he were not bound by the Hippocratic oath to help them. Another charge of which he was found guilty was that of having written a letter to a nurse. This letter is supposed to have somehow enabled the rebels to capture one Sao Hom Pha, a special commissioner to the Shan states.

We think it would be well if the Department of State which, through its Embassy at Rangoon, has been keeping in close touch with the Seagrave case would issue a clarifying statement concerning it. Offhand it seems a very shabby reward to Dr. Seagrave for a lifetime of loving labor in the service of the Burmese people. Meanwhile, it would be well to remember that Dr. Seagrave was convicted not under British but under Burmese law. In some quarters contrasts are already being drawn between the Burmese and American concepts of what kind of conduct constitutes treason, and much is also being made of the fact that Dr. Seagrave repeatedly asked for release under bail and was repeatedly refused.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I recently placed in the RECORD some guest editorials by Col. C. H. Lindsay, an outstanding leader in the business world in our section. It is refreshing to see men of the caliber of Colonel Lindsay thinking and acting along the lines portrayed in his editorials. These editorials reveal Colonel Lindsay as a man of deep human understanding, possessing a great love of country and humanity. In this connection, I request that the following editorial be printed with my remarks:

DEMOCRATIC BROTHERHOOD IS A GREAT WEAPON AGAINST COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

Ever since the writing of the Holy Bible came the teachings of Brotherhood between men. Our present form of democracy was the outcome of these teachings. We were all taught to "love thy neighbor and do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Many citizens say they are Americans—they believe in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, but do they follow these teachings?

Money, power or appearance does not make you a good citizen. Only when you feel, act and are guided from your heart to help, aid,

and assist your fellow man in the tasks of life.

Where is brotherhood when management and labor daily fight between one another; where is the teaching of "live and let live?" For in true democracy, labor and capital and management are essential to one another; without one the other suffers and progress for all is sadly neglected.

Brotherhood is the only weapon against the present evil of communism. We cannot have brotherhood when labor is fighting labor, management against labor, management against management and religious people against each other—all hindering democracy and furthering communistic doctrines.

Especially today, the Communist seek footholds in shipping, transportation, public utilities, newspapers, radio, labor and political offices; and thus, at the vital moment cripple our country's production, demand and supply, lowering our present living standards which is just what the Communists want so they can let us down to their standard and take over; then what kind of a life we would live.

We must deal fairly with all topics, giving mankind an equal chance of making a decent and honest living, regardless of other teachings which we have had, and will have, as time moves on. Brotherhood can only be obtained when we help and live peacefully with one another. As a guide to mankind, we must follow the teachings of our forefathers, who established our present free, American way of life.

Remember, democratic brotherhood must be daily practiced; personal gains against our fellow man laid aside. With the love of freedom, liberty, and justice in mind and with faith, hope, and fairness as our guide, we will be closer to the means of elliminating the satan of our present time—communism.

Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post there appeared an article written by Mr. Edward T. Folliard to mark an occasion of great historical significance which the Members will observe with great interest on tomorrow. I refer to the fact that on tomorrow the Speaker of the House will have occupied his position of high office longer than any preceding Speaker.

In this connection I wish to extend the felicitations and best wishes to our great Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, and to say that his continued useful service for many years to come is the wish and hope of all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

SAM RAYBURN'S TOPPING CLAY'S RECORD

(By Edward T. Folliard)

SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who is able to say that he's "one man in public life who's satisfied," makes history this week.

When he raps his gavel for order on Tuesday, RAYBURN will have been Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any man in the annals of the Republic. His service in that exalted office, which ranks third in the official hierarchy, will total 3,057 days.

It was Henry Clay who established the record that is about to be broken. The great Kentuckian served as Speaker over a period of 14 years (1811-25), with two interruptions. His total number of days in the chair, the Library of Congress has figured out, was 3,056½.

Physically, there would be little resemblance between the lanky, long-haired Clay and the stocky, bald RAYBURN. In reading about the one and thinking about the other, however, you come to realize that Speaker Clay had at least two attributes which also are to be found in Speaker RAYBURN. They were great personal charm and persuasive eloquence

The greatest dissimilarity would seem to be in the matter of ambition.

Clay, as Speaker, had his eyes on the White House, and in 1824 began a long but vain effort to win the Presidency

How RAYBURN feels about his place as No. 3 man, he described with much feeling at a recent gathering of Democrats at the Shoreham.

"I am one man in public life," he said, "who is satisfied, who has achieved every ambition of his youth. And so I am glad."

The story often has been told of how SAM, as a small boy, rode horseback for 12 miles to listen to Joseph Weldon Bailey, a mighty Texas orator. It was not long after this that he mapped out the stages of his career—to go to college, to the Texas Legislature, and then to Congress to start his climb to the Speakership.

SAM'S rise to high place, although marked by the partisan battling that is expected in a democracy, has been serene compared to the feud-ridden career of Henry Clay.

President Truman alluded to this at the afore-mentioned gathering of Democrats at the Shoreham. He had been talking about the cordial relationship between himself and Vice President BARKLEY and Speaker RAYBURN And this took him back to an earlier time when Andrew Jackson was President. Calhoun was Vice President and Clay (having left the House) was a Senator.

"When Jackson was on his deathbed," Mr. Truman recalled, "someone asked him about the things he had left undone that he wished he had done while he was President. And he said one was that he should have hanged John C. Calhoun and shot Henry Clay. Well, now, there is no such parallel."

SAM RAYBURN came up from Bonham, Tex., to be a Member of the House in 1913. He was elected Speaker September 16, 1940, after the death of William B. Bankhead. Thereafter, as before, he demonstrated the truth of what had been said about him by his old friend and mentor, John Nance Garner.

"SAM stays hitched," Garner said, which was another way of saying that he lived up to his word.

RAYBURN was as completely devoted to Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was in the White House during the earlier part of his service as Speaker, as he is today to President Truman.

On April 12, 1945, Mr. Truman (then Vice President) was in Speaker RAYBURN'S office when he was called to the White House to be told that Mr. Roosevelt was dead. Thereafter some others gathered with RAYBURN, including William S. White, of the New York Times, a fellow Texan. White, writing about it later, noted that RAYBURN "wept silently."

"His heavy and very nearly immobile face was still in the shadows," the Times man wrote, "and the only movements upon it were small and barely visible traces of the tears. He swept them away roughly. * * *

"There, before friends, in words that are yet under the seal of that room, Mr. RAYBURN took an oath for the future. Its substance was that SAM RAYBURN—southern Democrat and all—had followed Franklin Roosevelt in life, and that SAM RAYBURN would follow Franklin Roosevelt in death."

SAM is a patient man, but he gets annoyed at the moaners and the groaners who say that the liberties of the American people are being destroyed. He says that has been the cry ever since Jefferson's time.

"Our liberties have been destroyed?" he asks. "In this land * * * everybody can say what they want to say, write what they want to write, speak what they want to speak, as long as in the doing of that they do not take away from the other fellow the same rights, the same prerogatives, and the same privileges to exercise the same rights * * *. That's how our democracy has been destroyed."

The Texan was a big help to President Truman in the 1948 election, and was credited with doing much in cooling down passions in the South.

Standing alongside Mr. Truman one night in San Antonio, he told a crowd that the Missourian had "shoulders broad enough, heart big enough, and a mind keen enough to do a good job for this sick and war-weary world."

More recently he asked for support of Mr. Truman, and said that if this was forthcoming, Americans could look forward "to the sunshine of a better day, of peace in the world that every good man and every good woman * * * is praying for tonight."

Speaker RAYBURN lives quietly when he is away from the Capitol, and is rarely to be seen in Washington's social whirl. When he does go out, however, he is likely to captivate those who hear him.

A month or so ago he attended a banquet of the Touchdown Club. SAM was accorded a tremendous ovation.

Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, using football jargon, gave this estimate of him:

"SAM RAYBURN is one of the great all-time All-Americans. When his party is in power he is a strong offensive player. When his party is in the minority there is no better defensive player. SAM RAYBURN has never had to call time out or have a substitute—he's a 60-minute player every day."

The most meaningful tribute that has come to RAYBURN—and one that ought to be heeded by Moscow—was delivered in the House on January 3 by a Republican, Representative JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

MARTIN, who became Speaker when the Democrats lost the Congress in 1946 and who probably would take over the gavel again if the Republicans were successful in 1952, called attention to the distinction that lay ahead for RAYBURN on January 30. He said that no man could be elected time after time, as the Texan had, unless he was a man of fine character, of extraordinary ability, great fairness, and a parliamentarian par excellence.

"Those are virtues which we have in our Speaker," MARTIN said. "In this hour of confusion * * * of uncertainty * * * we have a man who has the courage; we have a man who has the firmness to do that which is right, to the end that our country may emerge a better country.

"We are sometimes misunderstood by our friends in other countries. We fight, we debate, we vote, and then we settle the question.

"They cannot understand that these are the practical principles that make for a democracy, a republic. They cannot see either that when our fight is over, that when we reach a decision, we are all united, we are all American but with one thought: To make America a better land for all our people."

Real Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Farmington Press, Farmington, Mo., entitled "Real Brotherhood":

REAL BROTHERHOOD

We don't see why it should be necessary to set aside a week as National Brotherhood Week, but anyway it has been done. And we are in full accord with the spirit of the occasion.

The world is sadly in need of brotherhood as anyone can see who reads the daily papers and listens to the radio. Lack of the brotherly spirit has plunged the world into war after war.

We can feel proud that the United States has done perhaps more than any other nation to spread the spirit of brotherhood and good will throughout the world. We have defended helpless nations with our blood and have helped, through our generosity, to feed and clothe millions in other lands. Often our motives have been misinterpreted, but in the main the peoples of the world look to the United States as their defender and help in time of trouble. And we have been sufficiently blessed in a material way so that we have been able to do these things.

But the enemies of our way of life take a special joy in pointing out the inequities that exist within our own borders. Their propaganda is full of the stories of lynchings in the deep South, racial discrimination in many of our States, our slums and our economic injustices. While we all know these charges are greatly magnified, we do know also that there is much work to do right here in the United States.

Every citizen should feel it his duty to do his small part in making democracy a living, breathing thing instead of just an abstract word. We can do it in many ways. For instance, we can do it by making sure that every child of every race and creed has the opportunity to make a good citizen of himself. We can help eradicate deep-seated racial and religious prejudices by refraining from teaching our children that they are better than children of other races or creeds. We can help by expelling such words as "nigger," "kike," "dago," and "hunky" from our vocabularies.

Instead of referring to our fellow citizens by these unflattering names, we think something more inspiring could be done. In Italy, for example, old world courtesy has evolved what we believe is an admirable form of address. When an Italian addresses a stranger, he often calls him "Paesan," which means literally, "countryman." We believe it would be a fine thing if all Americans of all races and creeds could call each other "countryman."

Considerable progress toward equality has been made in the United States and it is truly heartening. There are still some Americans of comic book mentality who hold strong racial views, but their number is fast dwindling. In the main, the big conflict is with ourselves in the attempt to eradicate from ourselves erroneous ideas which have been imbedded in us in early years—ideas which are purely emotional and have no scientific or moral foundation. It is hard, for instance, for a Southerner, steeped in the contrasts of the plantation house and the Negro shanty, to realize that Negroes have yearnings also to be respectable and to have nice things. Yet many Southerners are winning this conflict with themselves. And we congratulate them. It isn't easy to change years of attitudes but the right kind of people are trying and trying hard. In the end, they will be successful and democracy will be the richer.

We believe that the United States is slowly mellowing and will eventually achieve the heterogeneity found in older nations. When that day comes we shall be even stronger and more valuable to the world.

Louisiana Tidelands Ruling Confiscation, Kemp Asserts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 4, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of January 27, 1951, by Mr. Paul Wooten, Times-Picayune staff correspondent, quoting statement of Hon. Boliver E. Kemp, attorney general of the State of Louisiana, in regard to the tidelands decision of the United States Supreme Court, as follows:

LOUISIANA TIDELANDS RULING CONFISCATION, KEMP ASSERTS—REHEARING SOUGHT IN PETITION BEFORE SUPREME COURT

(By Paul Wooten)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—In its decree in the Louisiana tidelands case the Supreme Court of the United States has acted illegally and unconstitutionally in confiscating lands belonging to the State. This accusation was hurled at the high Court by Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., Louisiana attorney general, who also says the Department of Justice "dragged the sovereign State of Louisiana before the bar of this Court, seeking to deprive Louisiana of the lands under navigable waters within Louisiana's boundaries to which Louisiana has had undisputed title, possession, and physical control since 1812."

These statements are contained in a petition for a rehearing filed with the Supreme Court at 4 p. m. Friday.

"What is the basis for the decree?" Attorney General Kemp asked. He replied to his own question: "There is no basis whatsoever. It is sheer confiscation."

Unless fee simple title and property interests are to be transferred arbitrarily without a trial, or "subtly and by indirection," some clarification is necessary. It seems to Mr. Kemp that as the matter stands no one has a fee simple title or property rights to the marginal sea bed. He points out that the "honorable Court says Louisiana has no such rights, but it does not say that the United States has them."

If property rights can be transferred as some mysterious incident of paramount right, dominion, and power, "then," said Mr. Kemp, "the day of private rights, indeed of free enterprise, is gone." Continuing, he said:

"The decree of December 11, 1950, is utterly without precedent in the tradition of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. It completely denies that trial or fair hearing which is the prime requisite of procedural due process. Indeed, if such a decision arbitrarily transferring property had been made by an administrative agency or lower court, we have no doubt that this honorable court would reverse it in a twinkling. Unless different considerations are to prevail here, the decree should be vacated and the cause restored to the docket for reargument."

The Supreme Court was further denounced in this language:

"Without a trial and by the arbitrary application of unconstitutional power ideology, the property of the State of Louisiana, and in fact, of every other State in the Union, will be confiscated and nationalized by said decree. Further, the Court said by its very statement that the paramount power and dominion of the United States transcended those of a mere property owner, most certainly foreshadowed the doom of private property ownership in these United States, any time those in power in the Federal Government choose to extend nationalization and socialization through unlawful decrees which cannot be resisted ordinarily, but which should be corrected by the Court, itself, while there is yet time to do so."

The Court was accused of seeking to nullify the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and of initiating the theory of confiscation and nationalization which ignores property rights. In the opinion of Louisiana's attorney general and his counsel, the decree of the Supreme Court is unconstitutional, null, and void.

The Solicitor General has made no answer to most of Louisiana's contentions. Counsel for Louisiana think this is because he has no answer. However, the Solicitor General still has 10 days in which to make reply. There is interest in the legal profession here in seeing if one will be forthcoming.

We Can't Save Asia by War Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Justice William O. Douglas in Look magazine of January 16, 1951:

WE CAN'T SAVE ASIA BY WAR ALONE—OUR MILITARY LEADERS CAN'T FIX ASIA'S GRIEVANCES: POVERTY AND OPPRESSION—ASIATICS WOULD TURN TO US IF WE SUPPORTED REFORMS

(To combat communism in the Middle and Far East, says a distinguished jurist fresh from a personal inspection trip, we need more than military action. We need, he says, a political program.)

(By Justice William O. Douglas)

Military power alone will never stop the Communist advance in Asia.

Strong armed forces are obviously necessary at this critical juncture. But we have trusted too much of our thinking to the military. We must win people as well as battles if we are to stop communism.

The generals who plan our strategy are not equipped to deal with the forces that are stirring Asia today. For those forces are not the kind that can be stopped by main strength.

What is happening in Asia is a series of revolutions against oppression and poverty. The Communists whip them and accelerate them. But their origin is not Communist and they cannot be killed off.

They call for a political approach to the problem more than a military plan of action. They demand a great American program to support the aspirations of the Asiatic peoples, to help them achieve those aspirations as we achieved ours in 1776. Nothing short of that can save Asia from communism in the long run.

This became evident during recent journeys I made from the Middle East to Southeast Asia. Since my return, however, I have talked with an increasing number of people with ideas differing sharply from those I gathered on my trip. The matter is vital to our Nation. That is why, as a private citizen, I have decided to write this article.

I did not find on my journeys, of course, that military strength was not needed. If the United Nations had not intervened in Korea, it is my view that aggression would have been attempted immediately at many points along the southern border of Russia.

From sources deemed reliable, I satisfied myself that July 15 to August 15 was a crucial period in the Soviet timetable. I learned on my journeys that, had the Soviet Korean project been unopposed, a series of like aggressive moves would have been made along the whole of the arc from the Mediterranean to the Pacific.

For example, I reached the Soviet border in northwest Iran on August 18. Prior to August 15, there had been a great massing of so-called renegade Iranian and Kurdish troops in Russia along the Iranian frontier. They were well armed and led by a Kurd by the name of Barazani, an outlaw from Iraq.

Soviet satellites, indeed, were poised for action all along the southern borders of Russia. No Soviet troops would have been used. The uprisings or invasions, like that in Korea, would have been under so-called Nationalist auspices, leaving the forces of Russia herself ready for other ventures.

Events in Korea changed the Soviet plans. Invasion forces were withdrawn.

The effects of our defense of Korea, however, were only temporary. As we have seen, Communist forces along the southern rim of Russia have since grown stronger. For, apart from Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, the Communists remain the only ones in Asia who actively support the reforms the people seek.

The people of Asia have been seeking reforms for many years Wendell Willkie saw revolutions on the make and heard their rumblings when he toured the world in 1942. Now in full swing, those revolutions are part of long historic processes.

Sun Yat-sen gave expression to them a generation ago. Mohandas Gandhi—who, though dead, is still the greatest power in Asia—espoused them. Every peasant who raised a hoe against a Maharajah and every tenant who defied the money lender and his extortionate interest rates was expressing the rebellion that has long been smoldering throughout Asia.

France went through a similar process in the French Revolution. We in America added to the turmoil of the age. We revolted. We threw off the colonialism that had been imposed on us. We threw it off by force of arms; and George Washington and all of our other forefathers who led the struggle were undoubtedly subversive influences by the British standards of that day.

WHY PEOPLE REVOLT

Our grievances were specific. They are all catalogued in the Declaration of Independence—taxation without our consent, quartering of soldiers among us, carrying people to far away England to be tried for pretended crimes committed here, and so on.

The peoples of the Middle East and Southeast Asia are today in the midst of revolutions founded on complaints as specific as ours were then and, to them, as important. These complaints are, in part, the following:

1. Ownership of land by a few. This region has a system of tenancy whereby the landowner leaves the tenant barely enough to live. That is partly a result of the sharecropping system which is used; it is partly due to a money-lending system whereby the landlord charges up to 40 percent interest on loans to the tenant. The tenant is bound perpetually by debt just as a serf was bound in feudal France or England.

2. Absence of schools for children.

3. A great lack of doctors, first-aid clinics, and hospitals.

4. A system of taxation under which millionaires pay little or no taxes.

5. Governments that are corrupt and elections that are rigged.

These are the great, burning issues in the villages from the Mediterranean to the Pacific. It is on these issues that the revolutions are based. These revolutions are in many instances directed by Communists. But there is not an ounce of communism in the issues themselves. There are indeed very few Communists in this region. Communism has very little appeal even to the hungry peasant. He wants to own his land—to be able to walk around it, fence it, and say, "This is mine."

He is not interested in having the state become even a bigger and more powerful landlord than the landlord he already has.

He wants his children to be educated.

When his wife gets a pain in her stomach and suffers the torture of the doomed, he can't stand by and watch her die. Yet there are no doctors or medicines in vast reaches of this territory.

The peoples in these areas like the Russian people but they fear Soviet politics. They do not want to be swallowed by Russia. They are intensely national.

These are not theories of mine. I have talked with hundreds of villagers across this wide belt of land that lies against the underbelly of Russia.

The Soviets, keenly alive to this condition, do not preach Marxism or endeavor to sell communism as a philosophy. In these areas the Communists preach straight reform. They inveigh against the injustices of land tenure, high prices, corruption in government, unemployment, and the like. They promise reforms; and the reforms they sponsor are cast in democratic terms: every peasant to become a landowner—public works to provide employment—minimum wages and maximum hours of work—price control—rationing of food—and the like.

This is an old technique. The Communists used it when they campaigned for votes in central Europe. When they gained political control, they changed their tactics. Then terror and force were used in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and the rest of those countries to impose a Marxist regime on them, irrespective of the will of the people.

REDS WIN BY DEFAULT

But these are matters not appreciated by illiterate peasants who are looking for escape from their plight. They are drawn to the leadership that offers reform. And the tragic fact is that in most of the countries in this area, the governments in power are either corrupt or conservative or colonial or all three. And the only party that offers reform is the Communist Party. That gives the Communists a tremendous advantage. They operate in a vacuum. They gain adherents merely by default. Peasants looking for a way out have no other place to go. And so the Red tide swells and swells and appears to be ready to overrun the earth.

Tactically, that offers tremendous advantages to Russia. She gains politically because of the growing power of the parties which she sponsors in these various nations. She also gains from a military point of view.

Every nation in which Russia gains a political victory produces an army to fight her battles. The Red Army is never committed. The only army involved is the national army of the new Communist nation. Yet when the United Nations moves, it must act on an increasingly wider perimeter, exhausting men and resources in a mounting effort to put down aggression. By these tactics, Russia gains in strength while the democratic world becomes steadily weaker.

That is why the problem of reversing the trend is primarily a political as well as a military problem.

It means taking over the direction of the revolutions of the world. America has special capacities for it. We ourselves are the product of revolution. By our act of revolting against colonialism and oppression, we set an example which to this day inspires the underprivileged of the world.

In their eyes we would play the natural role if we helped them attain the same degree of independence that we enjoy. Their wonderment is that we, who profess such high ideals, do not actively help them to find the freedom which we say we want all people to have. They are puzzled and bewildered when, instead, we throw our weight and influence and give our money and support ($2,000,000,000 of it) to corrupt and reactionary groups such as Chiang Kai-shek's.

FIRST NEED: IDEAS, NOT MONEY

The direction of these revolutions is not a simple task, but it is easier than it appears. It means, of course, much more than the withdrawal of economic, military, and moral support from existing corrupt and reactionary governments. If we stopped at that, we would leave the field largely to the Communists, for we would weaken the only core of resistance to their activities which presently exists.

Direction of these revolutions calls for positive, affirmative measures. There is in each of these countries a strong, liberal democratic group. They are the ones that need the backing of our diplomatic power.

Money is not so much needed as ideas. The need for money will come only after the political revolutions have been effected and the new democratic regimes have been stabilized. Money spent before reforms have been launched will be largely wasted. Without those reforms, the money will go largely to enrich the classes at the top, hastening the day the Communists take over.

It is unrealistic and evasive of the issue to say that America does not interfere with the internal policies and affairs of other nations. American influence makes and breaks governments. We interfere when we prop up a government with loans or with a military mission or with economic aid. We have been interfering for years and we must continue to do so if the tide of communism is to be turned.

The question is the nature of our interference. If we interfere by trying to keep in power corrupt and reactionary governments, two results will follow: (1) We will exhaust our financial resources, bleed ourselves white, and reduce irrevocably the standard of living of our people; (2) we will give the Communists continued opportunities to grow politically strong among the peasants on whose backs the American-supported governments ride.

There are two important prerequisites if we are to manage this venture successfully and direct the revolutions of the world into democratic channels.

First: Direction of these revolutions means complete divorcement from the Communist influence and an operation through democratic forces alone.

Once we tried to get the Communists of China and the Nationalists of China united in a government. That was sheer folly. The Communist technique is to destroy from

within. A coalition government that includes the Communists would inevitably work to sabotage that government and to establish for it a record of ineptitude and failure.

Second. If we are to give direction to and control the revolutions, we must make up our minds on the definite and specific issues that plague the peoples of this area.

Platitudes about democracy and freedom are not enough. In those poverty-ridden areas, phrases like that sound empty and fall flat. They are meaningless utterances on wave lengths already crowded with meaty subjects.

WE MUST BE CLEAR

Our program must be as definite and specific as it is on our domestic front. Our position must be clear on land reform, unemployment insurance, price control, taxation, food rationing, and all the other issues that are critical in the area.

We must be clear on these issues in order to decide what leadership we will sponsor, what measures we will finance, what governments we will support. And we must be honestly democratic in practical application of these reform measures. We must, for example, stand for a land-distribution program based not on confiscation (a Communist creed) but on just compensation to the landlords. There are also democratic standards to be applied in industrial and irrigation projects. One example will illustrate what I mean.

A TVA IS NEEDED

There is a great need for a TVA on the Tigris and Euphrates. I have traveled those river basins and seen with my own eyes the service that flood control and irrigation could perform. Such projects, under proper management, could increase the productivity of the area, bring great prosperity to the masses, and produce a land that could support additional millions of people.

But unless it is done under a program of reform—including distribution of land to the peasants—it will work only to increase the hold that a few hundred men already have on these middle eastern countries. The result would be to accelerate the tide of communism.

If we openly undertake to manage these revolutions and direct them, we will at once enlist the support and enthusiasms of the peoples of this area. We will for the first time be identified with them and their struggles for liberty, not in words, but in action.

That would be a welcome relief. For in spite of Soviet propaganda, people in those areas do not believe that America has imperialistic designs on them. American missionaries and American educators have shown the selflessness of which America is capable. Unlike Russia, America has had no past record of gobbling up small nations or carving territory out of her neighbor's domain.

If these projects succeeded—and there is no reason why they should fail—we would have made tremendous gains.

We would have deprived Russia of the great political leverage she now has over the area. We, rather than the Soviets, would be the sponsors of reforms, the champions of the people. There would be no longer a political vacuum in which the Communists would operate. The people of the area would have a choice other than communism.

Land reform alone would establish a strong barrier to Soviet political activity. Land reform would not only deprive the Soviets of their most powerful propaganda; it would make each peasant a capitalist. No greater political barrier to communism could be designed.

Furthermore, we would have deprived Russia of the opportunity of organizing the people along her southern border for aggression. This would be of inestimable aid to our military. It would reduce the potential areas of conflict and reduce the strength of the enemy.

If we succeeded in all this, we would not, of course, be assured of peace with Russia. But we would have taken steps to contain her. She would no longer have troops of new satellites to fight her battles. The Red army might still sweep to the Mediterranean and the Pacific. But if it did, Russia would be fighting alone, not with native armies of border states professing liberation from American imperialism.

It is clear than, that what we must do is direct, not destroy, the revolutions that stir the Middle East and southeast Asia. And it will take an imaginative, creative undertaking—not a military one—to do it.

St. Lawrence Seaway a Costly Hoax: Forget It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 27, under the caption "St. Lawrence seaway a costly hoax: Forget it." My constituents and I are in accord with the views expressed in this editorial:

President Truman's renewed pleas for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, this time on the basis of defense necessity, should be shelved quickly and decisively by Congress. Even to debate this extravagant, impractical, repeatedly discredited venture would be sheer waste.

In his $71,600,000,000 budget message the President again trotted out this mouldy old joker—it's been hanging around since 1895—along with a lot of other costly nonessentials. A few days later, in a letter to the chairman of the St. Lawrence Deep Sea Waterway Labor Conference in Detroit, Mr. Truman said that in the present emergency the project has become urgent.

Furthermore, he added that, because our steel industry must be built up, the seaway was needed to bring in iron ore, not only from Labrador but from Venesuela, by a route well protected from enemy submarines. Just how Venesuelan ore would be protected on the long ocean haul to the mouth of the St. Lawrence wasn't made clear.

But what, precisely, is the seaway's urgency from a defense viewpoint? This high-priced waterway, connecting Great Lakes ports with the Atlantic Ocean, is ice-bound about 5 months of the year, rendering it useless for long periods.

To transport ocean tonnage to lake ports would require the building of some 50 dams. One enemy bomb that shattered a single lock could tie up the whole system.

A few years ago the expense of this vast spending project was figured at $642,000,000, of which Canada would pay $304,000,000. In 1948, when the seaway was debated in Congress without action, the cost was estimated variously at $750,000,000 to $1,500,000,000. Today's cost would be vastly greater.

And that isn't all. By diverting ocean freight, including iron ore, to the Great Lakes, the seaway would cause untold losses to eastern United States seaports, including Philadelphia. Projected steel plants along the Delaware will require a great deal of that Venesuelan ore the President talked about.

Revival of the St. Lawrence seaway hoax now, when this Nation is faced with defense necessities involving multibillion outlays, is thoroughly inexcusable. Congress should pay no attention to the seaway bills already introduced, and get on with real security needs.

Our Political Paralysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the magazine Freeman, December 25, 1950:

OUR POLITICAL PARALYSIS
(By Henry Hazlitt)

If the military disaster in Korea had overtaken any nation with a responsible parliamentary government, there is not the slightest doubt what the result would have been. The chief executive and every member of his cabinet would have been forced to resign.

The next step would have been to set up a government that had the confidence of the parliament and of the people. But the indispensable first step would have been the resignation of the existing government. It would have had to go because its incompetence and unfitness had been demonstrated. It would have had to go if for no other reason than that it had acquired a vested interest in defending, covering up, prolonging, and compounding the very blunders that had brought about the crisis. It would have had to go because it had lost the confidence of the country.

And this would have been true even if its responsibility for the crisis had been less direct than is President Truman's responsibility for the crisis that confronts this country today. That responsibility is as clear and direct as it could possibly be. For it was on the night of June 26 that President Truman made the personal decision to throw American troops into Korea. In doing this he went against the long-considered judgment of nearly every military authority: that Korea was strategically untenable by our land forces if the hordes of Red China or Red Russia chose to dispute it.

In acting that night on the impulse of the moment, Mr. Truman disregarded not only this military judgment, but the American Constitution. The Constitution confers the power to declare war on Congress—and on no one else. Mr. Truman bypassed Congress with the fiction that the United Nations was only taking a police action in Korea. With the passage of time that fiction has become increasingly transparent. The police action has turned out to be a major war, with more casualties for us than the American Revolution. The United Nations turned out to mean in fact that 90 percent of the combat forces in Korea on our side, apart from the South Koreans themselves, were Americans. We have maneuvered ourselves into a preposterous situation, in which American boys do 90 percent of the fighting and dying, while our token-fighting or nonfighting allies in the United Nations tell us what we can or can't do with a victory if we ever win it and what we can or can't do even on the battlefield itself.

All this is the fruit of the theory, assiduously preached in the last 20 years, that

we should have one-man government in the conduct of foreign affairs. Previous fruits were Yalta and Potsdam, where Presidents made foreign agreements not only without the advice and consent of the Senate but without even revealing to their own people what the full agreements were.

President Truman's responsibility is of course shared by Secretaries Acheson and Marshall. It is General Marshall who was chiefly instrumental in trying to force Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into his government—an act which would have brought the triumph of communism in China far sooner than it actually came. The quality of Secretary Acheson's statesmanship was reviewed at length in the previous issue of the Freeman. I will repeat here only one item from that record. On March 20, 1947, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Acheson said there was no danger of a Communist defeat of Chiang Kai-shek. In a letter to the President of July 30, 1949, he said that "no amount of aid could have saved Chiang."

But merely forcing an unfit executive to get rid of unfit advisers, though it may be better than nothing, is not a step of first importance. The quality of a statesman is revealed in nothing more clearly than in his choice of advisers. He is not good or bad because his advisers are good or bad; his own wisdom or folly determines the advisers he chooses and the advice he follows.

In this country, whenever a crisis or a calamity occurs, we concentrate our attack on the advisers, rather than on the top Executive, chiefly because the advisers are the only ones we are constitutionally able to remove. Thus there are broadly two factions in the United States at this moment: Those demanding the dismissal of General MacArthur and those demanding the dismissal of Secretary Acheson. That General MacArthur is a military genius is beyond doubt: He proved it by his Pacific campaign in the last war and by the Inchon landing in the Korean War. That he has made serious mistakes in the present campaign is probable: He has made over-optimistic statements; and his forces were caught off balance when the Chinese attack came. But his defeat has been due primarily to the fact that President Truman assigned him an impossible task. The responsibility comes directly back to the President. Yet Mr. Truman can ignore, if he chooses, even the demand for the removal of Secretary Acheson as long as he is himself irremovable.

Nor can we take much hope in the process of impeachment. Since the effort to impeach President Johnson on purely political grounds, tremendous psychological and political resistance has been built up against the repetition of such an effort. Woodrow Wilson, in his Congressional Government (1885) explained what was wrong about our constitutional provisions in this regard:

"Nothing short of a well-nigh impossible impeachment can unmake a President, except four successions of the seasons. * * * A Prime Minister must keep himself in favor with the majority, a President need only keep alive. * * *

"Great crimes such as might speed even impeachment are not ordinary things in the loosest public service. * * * That which usually and every day clogs and hampers good government is folly or incapacity on the part of the ministers of state. Even more necessary, therefore, than a power clothed with authority to accuse, try, and punish for public crimes is some ultimate authority, whose privilege it shall be to dismiss for inefficiency. Impeachment is aimed altogether above the head of business management. A merchant would not think it fair, even if it were lawful, to shoot a clerk who could not learn the business. Dismissal is quite as effective for his purposes, and more merciful to the clerk. The crying inconvenience of our system is, therefore, that the constitutional authority whose prerogative it is to direct policy and oversee administration has fewer facilities for getting its work well done than has the humblest citizen for obtaining satisfactory aid in his own undertakings. * * *

"It is impossible to deny that this division of authority—between Congress and the President—and concealment of responsibility are calculated to subject the Government to a very distressing paralysis in moments of emergency. * * * In times of sudden exigency this—division of authority—might prove fatal—fatal either in breaking down the system or in failing to meet the emergency."

This paralysis of action has brought about in our political life a paralysis of thought. I hope I may be forgiven if I quote from a book of my own, A New Constitution Now, published in 1942:

"The constitutional restrictions on what the American people are able to do, affect what it is prudent for them to say, and this in turn unconsciously affects even what they dare to think. If the President turns out not to be the man best fitted to lead the country in a successful prosecution of war, if he bungles critical decisions badly and to the national cost, men fear to say so plainly. There is no immediate constitutional method of changing the executive, as there is in England. Therefore patriotic men fear that criticism which brings responsibility home too closely to the President can only divide the country without affecting the change necessary. But this fear, only partly conscious, has a further effect: It leads men to wishful thinking; it leads them to tell themselves that the situation can not be as bad as all that, and that the necessary changes can be effected by moderate arguments which do not urge a change in government but merely in the policies adopted by the existing government. Such a belief will continue to be held even though experience shows that the existing government will not modify its major policies, and may not even, however willing, know how to adopt and carry out the proper policies. The limitations imposed by a rigid constitution, in short, may pervert a nation's very thinking, leading it to a sort of national neurosis in which it refuses to face the truth about the situation that confronts it."

That we are close to such a neurosis now is indicated in the timidity not merely of Democratic but of Republican leadership in what everyone concedes to be one of the most serious crises in our history. Not only are the "responsible" Republican leaders not asking that Mr. Truman resign; they became afraid even to ask that Mr. Acheson resign.

The climax of this timidity was reached by Governor Dewey, the so-called titular leader of the Republican Party, when he declared on December 8: "This moment is not the time for further criticism." Not the time to criticize the policies that have brought us to the brink of disaster. When is the time? After the disaster has become irreparable?

The only answer to these questions is that this is, above all, the time to demand the removal or resignation of the men, and the instant and complete change of the policies, that have led us into this disaster. We have not, in fact, too much time left. It is later than Mr. Dewey dares to think.

Yet there have been many other expressions of this same psychosis. There was the strange article by Cabell Phillips, leading off the New York Times magazine of December 10. This article called upon all Americans to close ranks in a spirit of unity—behind precisely the leaders and selected means that have been discredited.

The argument ran: "Our common faith must, of necessity, be placed in our chosen leaders—the President and his chief civilian and military subordinates. In other words, our faith must be placed precisely in the group whose policies have already led us to the very brink of disaster.

"As individuals," the article conceded, "we may neither respect nor fully trust either those leaders or their policies." In other words, we must collectively have implicit faith in leaders and policies whom individually we neither respect nor trust.

Admitting that its self-contradictory argument might cause some perplexity, the article nonetheless continued: "But the—Truman—administration was put in power by the mandate of a democratic majority. That mandate placed in their hands the conduct of our military and foreign affairs." What is wrong with this argument is: (1) it neglects to mention that this mandate was given more than 2 years ago, when the American people could not foresee the disaster to which it was going to lead; (2) that last November 7, though they still had only a faint and uncertain intimation of the disaster that was coming, the American people considerably modified this mandate; (3) that there never was a mandate to Mr. Truman to usurp the power of Congress to put us into war; and (4) the argument misses the entire point that the American people, now that the disaster is upon them, are not being given the opportunity to renew or reverse that mandate.

The article went on: "We must accept the premise that our leaders are acting to the best of their abilities and to no other purpose than to protect our national interest." It is hard to believe that this argument was seriously intended. It is merely another version of the old Wild West saloon sign: "Please don't shoot the pianist. He's doing his best." The whole question is whether our present leaders have the necessary abilities, whether they know how to protect our national interest. We have seen the disaster to which their lack of ability and their good intentions have already led us. How much more disaster do we need?

I quote one final argument from the Phillips article about these leaders: "We may rightfully question their wisdom and try to influence their decisions. But once those decisions are made we are all, under the rules we live by, equally obligated by them." In other words, even if their decisions threaten to lead us to disaster, we must all go along with them and carry them out. It is better, apparently, to go down to defeat quietly under the old rules than to presume to change the rules. America, apparently, exists for the old rules, not the rules for America.

The New York Times magazine article, like Mr. Dewey's no-time-for-criticism statement, are examples of an intellectual paralysis brought about by the inflexibility of our present constitutional machinery. All such arguments reveal a lack of understanding of the very basis of two-party government.

The shutting off of criticism is the device of a one-party system and of totalitarianism. Is the opposition going to sit quiet, continuing to mumble incoherently about "bipartisanship" while acquiescing in every blunder, in order to tell us in 1952 (if we survive till then) that they could have saved us from these blunders if they had dared to speak out? Are those who recognize the administration's errors to be silent precisely at the moment when their constructive suggestions of what to do—which cannot be separated from their suggestions of what to stop doing—are most needed?

We are already beginning to see the logical fruits of the doctrine that we must trust the very people who led us into this crisis to lead us out of it. One is a demand that a "national emergency" be declared chiefly so that still more powers can be assumed by the leaders who have already demonstrated that they do not know how to use the huge powers already granted to them. Another is a demand for "total mobilization." This phrase

derives its seductive powers mainly from a misleading analogy, especially when it is interpreted to mean over-all allocations and rationing, price controls, and wage controls. These controls do not in fact help to "mobilize" the economy; they do not promote flexibility and efficiency and a quick transformation to a balanced production of war goods. They merely serve to tie the economy up in bureaucratic red tape.

Well, then, I may be asked, what can the opposition do? What can Congress do? Suppose it does pass a resolution of lack of confidence in Mr. Truman? Suppose Congress does point out to Mr. Truman that, though it does not have the power to remove him, the Constitution explicitly permits him to resign, and that his resignation is necessary to preserve the unity and serve the interests of the country? And suppose Mr. Truman then refuses to resign? Or suppose, even, that he does resign. That, under our present system, means ALBEN W. BARKLEY is President. Or even if Mr. BARKLEY also resigns, it means, under the existing Presidential Succession Act, Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Is there any good reason for thinking that either of them would be much better than Mr. Truman, that either of them would be remotely up to the tremendous world responsibilities that the task would impose upon him?

Most of us would feel forced to answer "No." Neither of these men is anything much better than an average political hack. Certainly neither could be regarded as a leader capable of inspiring the unity, confidence, and trust, not to speak of the hope and faith, that the country so desperately needs today.

But this is merely another illustration of the pass to which our existing constitutional machinery—plus our ill-considered Presidential Succession Act, and our irresponsible way of choosing leaders in Congress—mainly on the soggy principle of seniority—has brought us.

There are, it is true, conceivable ways out, without even amending our Constitution. Even under our existing (1947) Presidential Succession Act, it might be possible to persuade both Mr. Truman and Mr. BARKLEY to resign and to have the House choose temporarily in place of Mr. RAYBURN a Speaker more eminently qualified to act as President. But this man would have to come from the House's own Members, and the plan in any case would depend upon three great voluntary self-denying acts on the part of three different individuals.

It would probably be much better for Congress to submit immediately an amendment to the Constitution. Though this is usually regarded as a hopelessly time-consuming process, there is no good reason why Congress could not eliminate the loss of time hitherto regarded as inevitable. Congress has the explicite constitutional right to provide that an amendment be ratified or rejected by "conventions" of the several States. As part of Congress' specified right to select the "mode of ratification," it surely has the implied power (though it has never seen fit to exercise it), to provide that these conventions be elected and meet simultaneously at an early date set by Congress itself.

Nor would the substance of the amendment itself be difficult to outline. The Federal Government must be responsible and accountable at all times to the people. This means that the people must have potential control of their government at all times, and not simply at rigid election dates 2 or 4 years apart. The people must have the power, in short, to change their leaders at any time—above all in times of crisis when our very national survival may be at stake.

The way to make this practically possible has already been shown by generations of tested experience in, for example, Great Britain, Australia, and Canada. Congress should have power at any time to vote a lack of confidence in the Executive, who would then have the choice of resigning or of dissolving Congress. If he resigned, Congress could select a new Executive immediately. If he dissolved Congress, he would force every Member to go to the country for reelection, but he would himself have to stand for such reelection. If the Executive won the country's verdict, he would get a Congress pledged to support him; if he lost it, the new Congress could itself choose a new leader.

Only in this way can we assure continuous national unity, national confidence, national faith in our leadership. Only in this way can we make our leaders truly responsible and select the leadership capable of rising to a crisis.

It is so that the great countries of Europe have been able to act in a crisis. It was in the very midst of war, in 1917, when French morale was bad at the front and even worse at home, that Clemenceau, who had not hesitated to attack the failures of the previous government, came into power and led France to victory. It was in the very midst of war, in 1916, when the British people had ceased to believe in Asquith as war leader, that Lloyd-George took his place and led England on to victory. And it was in the midst of the last war that Winston Churchill displaced Chamberlain and rallied the nation to victory. Does anyone seriously believe today that England should have tried to keep the faltering Chamberlain regime in power in that crisis?

Is America alone to deprive itself of the ability to change its leaders in a crisis? Do we prefer to tie our own hands? Do we prefer the preservation of an outworn political machinery to survival? And are we sure that the effort to preserve this rigid, outworn machinery won't, as Woodrow Wilson predicted, prove "fatal—fatal either in breaking down the system or in failing to meet the emergency"?

Benefits for Veterans of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to grant certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the military, naval, and air operations against the forces of North Korea. To achieve this purpose it proposes to amend pertinent provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, so as to insure that veterans of the Armed Forces in the Korean War shall be entitled to the benefits accorded World War II veterans under those statutes.

I believe a measure of this sort is self-explanatory and needs no extended justification on my part. Surely, those men who have undergone the months of rigorous action, the privations, and heavy casualties of the war in Korea, are entitled to every legitimate benefit a grateful nation can extend. The benefits here dealt with are those already accorded veterans of World War II. The members of the Armed Forces in Korea, one of the costliest campaigns in our history, are veterans in every sense of the word, and surely entitled to treatment equalling that granted soldiers and sailors of previous wars.

I trust the committee and the Congress will give this measure their favorable consideration.

Factual Report Pierces Confused and Emotional Fog on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article, entitled "Statement on our Foreign Situation," by Ernest T. Weir, chairman, National Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.:

STATEMENT ON OUR FOREIGN SITUATION

(By Ernest T. Weir, chairman, National Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa., January 5, 1951)

Whether we shall have peace or world war has now become an immediate problem. It is the most important question confronting the United States and the balance of the world and will directly control all other internal and external problems of every nation. I decided to see how my European friends were thinking relative to this grave crisis and, consequently, have just spent several weeks in Paris and London consulting with men of affairs in whose experienced judgment I have great confidence.

Collectively, these men represent extensive and diverse economic activity. Individually, they occupy positions in which it is essential for them to have intimate knowledge of public trends of thought in the other countries of Europe, as well as their own. On previous occasions, I have found them to be highly accurate in their appraisals of European viewpoints and estimates of world situations. Following is a summation of their opinions which, I believe, represent prevailing thought in England and France and fairly reflect the attitude of Europe as a whole.

The paramount problem now, of course, is the situation in which we are involved with China. In the United States, China is being denounced as an aggressor and as a tool of Russian imperialism. Our friends abroad do not agree that this is the case. They believe that the present Chinese Government, which is avowedly communistic, truly reflects the present thinking of the Chinese people. But they do not believe that the Chinese Government is under Russian control. They have no doubt that Russia has influence with China, because countries that share the belief in communism naturally have close contact but point out that the history of China has been that of an independent people who have never submitted to control by any other nation. There is no natural bond between the Russians and the Chinese. From the Chinese standpoint, Russia is an occidental foreign power the same as the United States and other western nations, and even now, observers with long experience in China report a growing resentment among the Chinese over the presence of Russians in China. It would be a gross error if the United States, through avoidable action, should provide the

unifying bond that is now lacking between Russia and China by making our country their common enemy.

CHIANG KAI-SHEK IS FINISHED

The present Chinese Government is the result of the revolutionary fight which has been waged in China for many years and from which the Communist faction has emerged with total victory. As a result, they believe that Chiang Kai-shek is completely finished as a leader—that he has no influence in the affairs of China now and will not have in the future. In the opinion of our friends abroad, who know much more about China than we do, the overlord system which Chiang Kai-shek represented is completely ended.

From the factual standpoint, therefore, the present government of China represents the more than 400,000,000 Chinese—at least 20 percent of the world's population—and there is no apparent good reason why the United States should not have recognized this government as the representative of the Chinese people. If this had been done, it is felt, the present disastrous situation in Korea would not have developed. Our European friends believe that continued recognition of Chiang Kai-shek is unjustified by the facts of the situation and that persistence in this position simply stirs up additional resentment against the United States. England, of course, very promptly recognized the new government, feeling that this was the only course that would make it possible to deal with China in the future, and I am sure that this action by England has the endorsement of all the European countries.

SHOULD RECOGNIZE NEW GOVERNMENT

The feeling is that we also should recognize the new Chinese government and that such action will make possible negotiation of peace terms with China which otherwise may be impossible. Prevention of war in the East is a consideration of much greater weight than the maintenance of a position in Korea and Formosa which, in comparison with the major problems of the world at large, are certainly not of sufficient importance to justify war. I find that this is the universal position abroad.

Now as to Russia, the thinking is as follows:

Like everyone else, our European friends are puzzled regarding Russia's real objectives. However, I did not find a single person who believed that Russia would precipitate a war now or for some years to come—if ever. Naturally, in the absence of sure knowledge of Russia's intentions, they do not trust her and for that reason feel that definite and regular military preparations should be made both in Europe and the United States. They believe that this in itself would serve as an effective deterrent if Russia actually has aggressive intentions, because it would make clear the opposition Russia would have to meet in event of war. But I found nobody who believed that Russia now was at all prepared for war.

IRON CURTAIN HIDES WEAKNESS

They think that Russia maintains the iron curtain to hide weakness rather than strength, and this position is based on careful analysis of Russia's war-making potential as measured by its production of steel, oil, and other military essentials. In comparison with the production of similar materials by the United States and its allies, they can see no justification for the belief that Russia could carry on a war to ultimate success. For the prevention of war and, consequently, for the safety of the world, it is their position, therefore, that we should continue efforts to deal with Russia. By maintaining contact with Russia, we will have the opportunity to prevent the development of situations that might result in a war that is not desired by either Russia or the western nations.

The feeling is that the day-by-day attacks on Russia in our propaganda over the past several years have not been productive of good; that it certainly gives the Russian people the idea that we have no genuine desire for friendly relations but intend eventually to make war. Our European friends are convinced that this interpretation of our attitude has caused resentment toward us on the part of the Russian people, as distinguished from the Russian Government.

There is no question that we made grave errors in dealing with Russia during and after the war, and most serious among them was the division of Germany which turned Eastern Germany over to Russia. If this and other similar blunders had not been made, we probably would not have to be thinking now of the danger of war. But we cannot remake the past. We must conduct ourselves according to the situation as it is at present. And the wisest course, in European opinion, is to keep the door open to Russia and thus, while there is still time, do our part to prevent conditions of irrevocable hostility from becoming established.

MEET DIRECTLY WITH RUSSIA

Furthermore, there is the feeling in Europe that the United States should be willing to meet directly with Russia instead of insisting on contacts through the agency of the UN. This is due to practical recognition of the fact that the world's major problem is the issue between Russia and the United States. Certainly none of the other nations would resent this direct dealing, because they believe it holds the key to avoidance of war, and none of them wants war.

Getting back to the situation in the East as it is viewed in Europe, it is very evident that the Chinese do not understand us or our intentions and, consequently, are skeptical of our statements. To begin with, we definitely refused to recognize their government, making clear that we dislike it because it is communistic, and we indicate that this is to be our permanent policy. Then we went into Korea and, after driving the North Koreans back over the thirty-eighth parallel, kept on moving in increased strength with the announced intention of gaining control over the entire country. Of course, we stated our reasons for doing this, but our reasons mean nothing to the Chinese. As they see it, we are an avowed enemy of their government and are carrying on a mammoth drive to the Manchurian line. We say it is not our intention to cross the line, but they do not believe us, having no confidence in the statement of what they consider an avowed enemy. Consequently, it is entirely possible that they have determined—on their own and not because of Russian control—to drive us from Korea for what they regard sincerely as protection of their country's future position. If we do get down to negotiation with the Chinese, it is very likely that they will insist on our withdrawal from Korea and will also insist that the Formosa question be settled to their satisfaction. Against the background of the world problem as a whole, as was pointed out above, Korea and Formosa are not considered of sufficient importance to justify a continuing and growing war in the East.

PREVENT WORLD WAR III

Our friends in Europe feel definitely that we should make every effort to better understand the Chinese, to deal with them, and to prevent an open, declared war with China, because they have no doubt at all that such a war inevitably would develop into world war III. A war with China would offset to a major degree the military weakness of Russia mentioned above, and even though she did not promptly enter the war on the side of China—which she probably would not do—it would create the opportunity for Russia to stir up trouble in various parts of the world. There is a great deal of propaganda to the effect that the United States would suffer a loss of prestige if a peace were worked out with China on the above conditions, but this should be ignored, because now the all-important, basic necessity is no war in the East.

In connection with this eastern situation, I give quotations, taken from English publications, which illustrate the frame of mind of China's present leadership: On September 30, Chou En-Lai, premier and foreign minister of China, in a statement the substance of which was conveyed to the Indian Ambassador in Peking, said: "The Chinese people absolutely refuse to tolerate foreign aggression, nor will they stand idly by seeing their neighbors being savagely invaded by imperialists. Whoever attempts to exclude nearly 500,000,000 Chinese people from the United Nations," he added, "whoever sets at naught and violates the interests of this one-fourth of mankind in the world and fancies vainly that any eastern problems directly concerned with China can be solved arbitrarily, will certainly break his neck."

Also, "American imperialists aimed at annexing Korea, whence they could invade Manchuria * * * and finally the whole of Asia. History had proved that a conquest of Korea meant a threat to China's national defense." Consequently, "The only means of bringing imperialism to its senses was a resort to force, and the Chinese people must be prepared to deliver blows to the imperialists, taking the risk of extending the war."

As a further example of China's thinking, the present Chinese Government claims to be the "first independent Government of China insofar as it has abrogated the last remains of privileges enjoyed by the Western Powers. * * * Its desire to have a seat on the United Nations is fortified by the belief that it is indeed the inheritor of the special status whereby China is one—and the only Asian one—of the Security Council's veto-holding big five."

Also important is the following statement taken from the London Times:

"It is deplorably tragic for American statesmen to be so one-eyed as to imagine that everything in China nowadays is due to Moscow communism * * * and that America lost China through not giving enough aid to Chiang Kai-shek. Nothing could be further from the truth * * * the more military material the U. S. A. sent to China, the more military equipment did the People's Liberation Army receive as it came to them directly or indirectly from the Kuomintang armies. * * * The People's Government came into power largely due to the collapse of the KMT * * * the Chinese people showed increasing hatred and hostility toward this regime. * * * No sensible observer can see any alternative to the present Government either now or in the next few years * * * the People's Government is bringing better living conditions to very many people. There has now been much improvement in business, and many factories and shops are working that were not doing so 9 months ago. The present government is controlling inflation which the previous one did not. The KMT imported rice from abroad for China; the present Government has managed to get enough in from other parts of China. In contrast to the corruption under the KMT, government officials today live simply, on low salaries, work hard and serve the people. There has been a very marked improvement in the operation of railways. * * * Without a shadow of doubt, the new Government has won the allegiance of students all over the country, and this is a point of great importance in China."

MUST CONSIDER EUROPEAN ATTITUDE

In the above I have endeavored to give a clear picture of the opinions of men of wide knowledge and influence in Britain and France. Whether one agrees with these

opinions or not, it is impossible to ignore them because it is unthinkable that we should become involved in a war with Russia without having the principal nations of Western Europe as our allies. We cannot make the decision of war or peace alone and without consulting them. Hence we must know their attitude toward the great central problem which is at the heart of the crisis. We need not agree with all of the opinions of these European observers. But in the main they must be considered in forming our own policy.

Having obtained this brief view of the attitude of friendly minds in the nations which must be our allies, we may attempt a summary of what our own attitude ought to be.

It is certainly apparent that the great decision we must make now is the one regarding China. There is no doubt we made a serious mistake in jumping into Korea without giving due consideration to the long-range effect, and I would think that possibly the major part of this blunder was in going beyond the thirty-eighth parallel, where we could have stopped consistently.

In our decision and its effect on the world's situation, we cannot assume that we know the opinion of 400,000,000 Chinese people. We must think seriously as to what this opinion actually is, and then we certainly must be influenced by it once we have some real idea as to their beliefs. We say they are Communists. We, of course, do not like communism, but we cannot eliminate communism in the world by war. Certainly, we cannot ignore the fact that there are many people in the world today who believe, so far as we know, that communism is of value to them.

If we refuse to recognize and deal with the present Chinese Government because it is communistic, we assume the dangerous position of trying to tell the people of other important nations what kind of government they must have. As a matter of fact, we have done this very thing in the case of Spain through our refusal until very recently to have dealings with a Spanish Government that has been in existence for 13 years, solely on the ground that it is a Fascist government and, therefore, not to our liking. Such positions make us intruders in the internal affairs of other nations.

WAR TO ERADICATE COMMUNISM

No matter what claims may be made that our attitude toward China is the result of Chinese aggression in Korea, I think the fact is very evident that if the present situation results in extension of the war, it will be due to our refusal to recognize the Chinese Government because it is communistic. In other words, the war would be caused by our intention to eradicate communism. We certainly must realize that we cannot eliminate communism by war. On the contrary, I am sure that a third world war would increase communism, because the war would be so long drawn out and so disastrous that there would be a greater degree of dissatisfaction among the peoples of all nations than exists today. Therefore, the vital questions are: "Should there be a war?" and if the answer is affirmative, "What, precisely, would the war be for?"

EMOTIONAL APPROACH BARS CLEAR THOUGHT

Statements are coming out of Washington to the effect that we cannot stand for appeasement. This is an emotional approach that at other times has prevented clear thinking and practical decisions. Also, when some of our statesmen, in deliberation on these important world matters, take a position contrary to that held by the administration, attacks are made on them, such as the recent one by Senator Lucas, of Illinois, which he made while Republicans were in caucus to consider the Acheson matter. Senator Lucas told the Senate that the action of the House Members was "an invitation to Stalin to strike anywhere" and shouted that on the basis of the Republican action, Stalin is likely to conclude that this country is so divided that he can start new aggressions.

The Illinois Senator's position, of course, was based entirely on theory, not on facts. We have made vital mistakes in our decisions on world affairs, and they have brought us to the verge of a new world war. Those mistakes were not made because of any division—real or fancied. They were made through lack of the very deliberation, debate, and exposure of the facts to the public that the Senator calls division. Certainly it is far better—in fact, it is vitally important—that we have broad and thorough discussion on policy, even though this will produce disagreement, because it is the only way in which we can come to proper and safe policies and decisions supported by public understanding. It is perfectly ridiculous to say that because a lot of people in this country, who happen to include leading Republicans, lack confidence in Secretary Acheson and demand that he be replaced, that Stalin or anybody else in the world will be encouraged to attack the United States.

TELL THE PEOPLE FRANKLY

If an attack occurs, it will be for some much more substantial reason, yet this is the kind of propaganda that has been issued continuously and has been so confusing to the American people. I am convinced that one of the greatest mistakes has been the failure to tell the people of this country frankly what the actual conditions are. We should have more debates on these matters. We should cut out the secret diplomacy, which in the long run promotes war. After all, it is the people of the country who pay the bill with income, property, and lives. They should have more to do with the final decisions.

It is obvious that to meet this crisis successfully there must be unity among the American people. But unity is not the blind following of whatever the President may decide to do from day to day. We have had too much of that in the past and it has been a large factor in bringing us to our present predicament. Disagreement is not disunity. Disagreement, expressed in full and orderly debate, is the process by which all sides of a problem and all possible solutions are revealed to a free people. It is only through this process that the people of the United States can arrive at the general agreement on objectives and methods that will make real unity possible. The present is clearly a period of disagreement and debate.

Further comments on communism:

There is no sympathy in Europe for a war which would have the objective of driving communism out of the world or any section of it. On the other hand, there is the belief that we should be well prepared against military aggression on the part of Russia, the only nation from which they think there is any possibility of aggression.

I am quite convinced that we will have little, if any, support from European countries if a war should result with China as a result of our unwillingness to recognize the Chinese Government. In view of its position of great responsibility in the world, it is very apparent that the time has come for the United States to stop making offhand, spur-of-the-moment decisions and to quit trying to control people through propaganda and politics. Instead, we must get the facts and estimate carefully the long-range effect of any decision we make. The present administration and its predecessor have made decisions of the gravest importance to the country and the world entirely on their own. There has been no apparent desire for and certainly no effort to obtain the opinions of other groups. The so-called by-partisan movement has always been a farce, because the Republican Party and even nonadministration Democrats have been ignored. I believe that Republicans and nonadministration Democrats have a great obligation to take a strong position, to demand facts, and to refuse to support the administration on any proposal unless they are convinced that the facts clearly merit such support. The result of such a position will be a better perspective on the problems and a more thorough understanding of the necessities of the present situation. If this is done, it will give greater hope and encouragement to our European friends who certainly are not very happy today about the quality of our leadership.

To me, it is a favorable sign that more criticism of the administration and its decisions is developing over the country, in the press and otherwise. I have before me an article taken from one of the newspapers that is based on an interview with an unnamed United States Senator. The entire article is attached to this statement, but I would like to call attention to the following definite assertion:

"We should understand, better late than never, that the cheers which greeted Mr. Truman's bold act of last June drowned out solemn military warnings. The Senator of this interview attended secret military hearings where the Joint Chiefs of Staff plainly stated that Korea was useless to occupy and impossible to defend. These opinions were overruled by the President. It is as simple as that. He reversed both his Secretary of State and his military advisers * * * all of whom might properly have resigned in order to alert the country."

If this is true, it is a sad commentary on our Government. This statement should be investigated and the facts determined. If the President ignored the warnings of military advisers and on his own initiative and authority plunged this country into war, steps should be taken immediately to see that neither he nor any other man shall have such power in the future.

I am convinced that if the situation in the east is settled amicably and war is thus prevented, the world is ready to move forward into a period of great development, both economic and social, out of which will come improved standards of living for the peoples of many nations. In view of this great possibility, a war now would be particularly disastrous. This momentous decision—involving great gain or terrible loss for the world—is largely in the hands of the United States.

EXAMINE ALL THE FACTS

The Europeans with whom I talked are naturally influenced by personal and national interest, but to a much greater extent than most Americans, they are accustomed to thinking in world terms and on a long-range basis. Their opinions as to the proper course for the United States and the Western World in general differ markedly from the position taken so far by our leadership. What they advocate with regard to recognition of China and dealings with both China and Russia may be unpalatable to many, but we should think of two things in connection with this. In the first place, logic may be on their side, and we should examine all of the facts with utmost care to see if this is the case before we take action of any kind. Second, we need as many allies as we can secure, and we particularly need allies in Europe. We can hardly expect the support of Europeans if we act at variance with their wishes and without due consideration of their viewpoint. I am convinced that in their main thesis they are entirely right. Extension of the war in the east would be a tragic blunder. We are woefully unprepared; we would surrender to Russia the initiative to take the kind of action we most fear, and even in the event of ultimate victory in China, what would we gain? What we need and what the countries of Europe need is time, and in decisions on subordinate matters, we must not

let emotional appeals such as prestige and no appeasement stand in the way.

Obviously, the United States should take every necessary step to build its military strength to the level that will guarantee the security of our country. It should never have been allowed to fall below that level and in view of the very large military expenditures in every year since the end of the last war, it is difficult for the lay citizen to understand how we declined to a position of such incredible weakness.

BUILD STRENGTH TO PREVENT WAR

But our policy in building military strength should be not to prepare for war but to prevent war. This also should be our policy in extending aid to the friendly nations of Europe. We should reinforce this policy of preventing war by our attitude toward the Communist countries. We should make it known to the world that so far as we are concerned the door is always open to the peaceful settlement of differences through negotiation. This policy should be applied now in the case of China on the question of recognition and the problems of Korea and Formosa.

If our efforts to establish a basis of world peace in this manner should be repudiated by the Communist countries, we will have lost little, because the plain fact is that we are now unprepared to do anything about the situation in a military way. On the other hand, we will gain much, because it will demonstrate to the world that the United States does not desire war and is not conducting itself in a manner that will make war inevitable. It is a widely held opinion in Europe that the present conduct of the United States will result in war, which helps to explain why we receive only half-hearted support from nations which are our natural allies. A clear demonstration now that peace is our sincere objective will be the best possible way to insure the full-scale, unreserved participation of Europe should the pessimistic fear of inevitable war be confirmed.

It is important that we arrive quickly at sound and practical decisions on United States' policy. We have lost ground with our natural allies. I regret to have to say that confidence in our leadership in world affairs has definitely declined, and this in itself will increase the confusion in thinking that already exists. It is a matter for our most serious consideration, because in this decision of world importance we cannot go it alone but must have the support of the European countries and as much of the world as is possible.

ERNEST T. WEIR.

P. S.—People in Europe are definitely opposed to use of the atomic bomb. In fact, I was quite surprised at the unanimity of this opinion. They believe that if the atomic bomb should be used there would never again be any feeling of security left in the world. The President's statement a short while ago that the United States was considering the use of the atomic bomb was in itself a bombshell in Europe and really frightening in its effect.

Presidential Power: The Issue Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Mr. Henry Steele Commager, professor of history at Columbia University, who is the author of America in Perspective and other books:

PRESIDENTIAL POWER: THE ISSUE ANALYZED—EXECUTIVE DECISIONS TO COMMIT TROOPS OUTSIDE THE NATION HAVE MANY HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

(By Henry Steele Commager)

The Republican high command has now launched its formal attack upon the Presidential conduct of foreign relations. This attack began with the demand for the ouster of Secretary Acheson—a demand which looks to the substitution of a parliamentary system of government for our Presidential system. It has now shifted to the Korean War and the fulfillment of our obligations under the Atlantic Pact. By sending American soldiers to Korea without congressional authorization, says Senator TAFT, the President has usurped power and violated the laws and the Constitution of the United States. Zealous that such usurpations and violations shall not continue, Representative COUDERT has introduced a formal resolution requiring congressional authorization before any American soldiers be sent out of the country in the future.

Whatever may be said of the expediency of the Taft-Coudert program, this at least can be said of the principles involved—that they have no support in law or in history.

Let us look first to the constitutional issue, for this has been urged, solemnly and insistently by both TAFT and COUDERT. It is, fortunately for us, not a new issue. It was discussed by the founding fathers. It arose, and was settled, in one administration after another—the Washington, the John Adams, the Jefferson, the Jackson, the Tyler, the Polk, the Lincoln, the Grant, the McKinley, the Taft, the Wilson, and the Franklin Roosevelt administrations. Time and again it has come before the courts, and time and again the courts have returned clear answers to the questions involved. It has been the subject of frequent congressional debate and of much learned commentary. It is so hackneyed a theme that even politicians might reasonably be expected to be familiar with it.

It must be admitted at once that the constitutional document itself says very little about this matter of the conduct of foreign relations and the exercise of war powers, and what it does say is couched in general terms. The Executive power is vested in the President, and he is required to take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. With the advice and consent of the Senate he may make treaties and appoint ambassadors, and he has the power to receive ambassadors and other public ministers. Finally, he is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and the term "laws" as we know, embraces not only statutes but treaties. To the Congress is assigned, explicitly, power to declare war.

What do all these words mean? Is the term "Executive power" a grant of power, or merely a description of an office? What are the obligations of the oath of office, and how far may the President go in fulfilling those obligations? As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces may he act independently of the Congress, or may he act independently if Congress is not in session? Do the laws that he is to execute embrace not only statutes and treaties but international law generally? And to what degree is his execution of these laws dependent upon congressional support and approval? And what is war?

These questions are not in fact as baffling as they seem. Our Constitution is not only the original document; it is also a century and a half of interpretation, a century and a half of tradition, practice, and custom. Questions similar to those which confront us today have come up again and again in the past, and the answers which history has given provide us not merely with precedents but with guidance.

Of all those who have directed American foreign policy none was abler or more learned than John Quincy Adams, and none gave more thought to the principles which should control the conduct of foreign relations. In his eulogy on Madison, Adams said:

"However startled we may be at the idea that the Executive Chief Magistrate has the power of involving the Nation in war, even without consulting Congress, an experience of 50 years has proved that in numberless cases he has and must have exercised the power."

This observation was both good history and good prophecy. On his own initiative Washington had proclaimed neutrality—a proclamation which might well have involved us in war with France. On his own initiative John Adams overrode his Cabinet and his party and sent commissioners to France to end the quasi war with that country. On his own initiative Jefferson, in theory a strict constructionist, inaugurated the war with the Barbary pirates. John Quincy Adams' successors, too, vindicated his judgment.

When France failed to provide money due the United States under the treaty of 1831 Jackson ordered the Navy to prepare for active service. Tyler, eager to consummate his Texas policy, disposed the land and naval forces so as to threaten Mexico. His successor, Polk, ordered General Taylor across the Nueces and thus precipitated the Mexican War—presenting it to Congress as a fait accompli.

Here was war by Presidential act. Polk's successors did not go quite that far, but that was not, perhaps, their fault. Thus in 1854, President Pierce ordered an American squadron to bombard Greytown, in Nicaragua, and the order was duly executed. Eventually the legality of the attack was brought before the Supreme Court, and Justice Nelson sustained it in words that are relevant today:

"Now as respects the interposition of the Executive abroad for the protection of the lives or property of the citizen, the duty must, of necessity, rest in the discretion of the President. * * * The protection, to be effectual * * * may require the most prompt and decided action. * * * The great object and duty of government is the protection of the lives, liberty, and property of the people composing it * * * and any government failing in the accomplishment of the object, or the performance of the duty, is not worth preserving."

At the same time Presidential policy threatened involvement in another quarter of the globe. In 1853 Commodore Perry sailed his squadron into Yedo Bay, overawed the Shogunate, and persuaded the Japanese to open their country to the Western World.

Even more illuminating was the conduct of Lincoln, the first President of that party which now seeks to constrict the Executive powers. Congress was not in session when Beauregard fired on Fort Sumter, and Lincoln did not think it necessary to call it into session for almost 3 months. Meantime he went ahead on his own. He called out the militia, organized an Army, and ordered an advance into Virginia, proclaimed a blockade, spent money as yet unappropriated—in short, he conducted war. Theoretically, to be sure, it was not war; it was an insurrection. But whatever interpretation might be placed upon such acts as raising an Army and invading Virginia, the blockade was an act of war in international law—and was recognized as such. Contemporaries confessed many constitutional scruples about Lincoln's actions, but there are few now who insist that he should have awaited congressional authorization for what he had to do.

In the post-Civil War years the examples of the exercise of Presidential powers that brought the Nation to the verge of war are so numerous as to be tedious. The most interesting come in the administrations of two distinguished Republicans, McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. When the Boxer Rebellion broke out, the western powers determined to send expeditionary forces to rescue their nationals. Without consulting Congress, McKinley sent an American force of some 5,000 soldiers into the heart of China. This, he argued, involved no war against the Chinese nation and therefore required no congressional authorization.

The ebullient T. R. was even less troubled about congressional support for what he felt he had to do. Among other things, he "took" the Panama Canal, and his comment on that Executive act is illuminating: "I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the Canal does also."

Nor was this the only exercise of war powers by Theodore Roosevelt. Like his predecessors and his successors, he intervened in the Caribbean to restore order and secure American interests—in Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Honduras.

It was the Republican Party which had traditionally favored a strong Executive, but in this principle of constitutional development Woodrow Wilson outbid his opponents. Woodrow Wilson was not unfamiliar with the Constitution. He had written learned monographs on it, and he had made the congressional and Presidential powers his particular object of study. Dedicated as he was to a policy of peace with Mexico, he did not hesitate to order the bombardment of Veracruz and the occupation of that city; 2 years later he sent General Pershing on an expedition into Mexico. Both of these were acts of war had Mexico chosen to regard them as such. It is relevant to note, too, that when in 1917 he asked for congressional authority to arm American merchantmen he was careful to add that he had the power to do this "even without special warrant of law, by the plain implications of my constitutional duties and powers."

Franklin Roosevelt's conduct of foreign affairs is fresh in our minds; it is doubtless a lively recollection of that conduct which inspires some of our present-day isolationists in their campaign for limitations on the Executive power. We need not rehearse here the details of the destroyer-bases deal or the shoot-on-sight order, or agitate anew the question of delegation of power in the lend-lease bill. It is sufficient to say that, notwithstanding the protests which greeted these and other acts "short of war," none of them was successfully challenged at the courts or in the larger political arena, nor has any of them been successfully challenged, as yet, at the bar of history.

All of these Presidential acts involved the danger of war. Many of them involved the use of American soldiers, sailors, or marines outside the territorial limits of the United States. Were they constitutional? Obviously the Presidents themselves thought so, and we cannot ignore the weight of that testimony. Congressmen protested, from time to time, but on no occasion did Congress repudiate Presidential power, or even refuse to sustain it by such appropriations as were required. What of the attitude of the courts, the final arbiters of questions of constitutionality?

Here, again, the record is impressive. To be sure, it is difficult to challenge an exercise of Presidential power directly; the courts will not entertain questions of a political nature. But one of the blessings of our constitutional system is that great issues of public policy are brought before the courts through private litigation, and we have therefore frequent judicial pronouncements on the nature of the Executive power. Perhaps the first of these was in the notable case of Martin versus Mott, where the magisterial Justice Storey held that it was for the President to decide when circumstances justified him in calling forth the militia of the States, and how he was to use that militia. The opinion is relevant to our problem today, for it illuminated the whole question of Presidential discretion in implementing the general terms of the Constitution.

Again in the hotly contested prize cases, involving the legality of Lincoln's blockade—and by implication of his powers to make war—the court held that it was for the President to determine when war comes, and that he is "not only authorized but bound to resist force by force." In the case of Neagle, in 1890, Justice Miller held that the phrase "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed" was not limited to the enforcement of acts of Congress alone but included "rights, duties and obligations growing out of the Constitution, our international relations, and all the protection implied by the nature of the Government under the Constitution." Even more illuminating is the opinion of the court in the recent Curtiss-Wright case. In the arena of foreign affairs, said the court: "With its important, complicated, delicate and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. * * * It is quite apparent that if, in the maintenance of our international relations, embarrassment—perhaps even serious embarrassment—is to be avoided and success for our aims achieved, congressional legislation must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved. Moreover, he, not Congress, has the better opportunity of knowing the conditions which prevail in foreign countries, and especially is this true in time of war."

Most of these precedents, from Washington to Franklin Roosevelt, have involved the exercise of Presidential discretion under the general and ambiguous phrases of the Constitution. For the exercise of Presidential discretion under laws, the case is even stronger. Here the President is confronted not only by his obligation to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution but by his further obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Both of these obligations are involved in our action in Korea and in the commitment to the defense of Western Europe. For it is an elementary fact that must never be lost sight of that treaties are laws and carry with them the same obligation as laws. When the Congress passed the United Nations Participation Act it made the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations law binding on the President. When the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty it made the obligations of that treaty law binding on the President.

Both of these famous documents require action by the United States which must, in the nature of the case, be left to a large extent to the discretion of the Executive. Thus article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, binds all signatories "to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack," and article 5 provides that each signatory "will assist the party or parties * * * attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area." If the Congress can deny the Executive the right to use troops or arms abroad, these phrases lose meaning.

It will not, of course, be denied that Congress may do just this—not by resolution, or even by law, but by control over appropriations. Congress has never yet failed to carry out a treaty obligation by denying money, but in theory it can do so. What we have here, then, is not so much a real danger as a theoretical one. Thus, in our constitutional system the three departments are equal and independent, but Congress could, by refusing to vote appropriations, put a complete stop to the entire machinery of the executive and the judiciary departments. It is not to be imagined that the Congress would ever so abuse its power, nor is it to be imagined that the Congress would be so lost to honor as to repudiate the solemn obligations of treaties.

Government Insurance Isn't Cheap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine Tax Outlook, which was sent to me by one of the officials of the Disabled American Veterans:

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE ISN'T CHEAP—REPORT SHOWS IT COST TAXPAYER $5,600,000,000 IN 10 YEARS

(With the prospect of an enlarged military program engendered by the international situation at consequently greater but necessary cost to the taxpayers, the need to eliminate needless Government spending becomes greater than ever. In this connection it is of interest to note that one proposal that may be debated at this session of Congress is a revision of the national service life insurance program, which, according to a report of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, cost approximately $5,600,000,000 over a 10-year period. The committee in making its report public last year recommended Congress consider establishing a gratuitous life indemnity for all men serving in the Armed Forces "in lieu of, and not superimposed upon" the present program. It recommended, among other things, that if this was not done, the existing program be given a complete legislative appraisal. Because changes in the national service life insurance program, including gratuitous policies, were discussed in the last session of Congress, and may be debated in the new one, Tax Outlook herewith presents a major part of the committee's lengthy findings in the public interest.—THE EDITOR.)

The national service life insurance program has not met the objectives of Government life insurance. It has failed to provide uniform protection in the form of income for the dependents of persons dying while serving in the Armed Forces, and it has failed to lessen demands for pensions.

Federal contributions for administrative expenses and benefit payments have cost the Federal Government from appropriated funds (through moneys largely raised by taxation), more than $5,500,000,000 in the last 10-year period.

[The survey carried through fiscal 1949. Since that date it is estimated costs may have risen to $6,000,000,000.]

There is no evidence that Congress has ever been fully or adequately apprised of the total cost.

The NSLI Act of 1940 was proposed and passed primarily to protect the equity value of the Government life insurance policyholders in the (World War I) United States Government Life Insurance Fund. In the event of a future national emergency, a fourth Government insurance program may be proposed. There is serious doubt that

manpower to administer national service life insurance, or any other Government insurance plan, would be available in the event of a future national emergency.

The administrative and clerical duties performed by the various personnel of the Armed Forces relative to the maintenance of in-service national service life insurance policies has had and continues to have the effect of dissipating military appropriations and manpower.

In addition to the fiscal cost factor, during the war years, hundreds of officers and thousands of enlisted personnel devoted full time to in-service administrative duties. Cost to the armed services of administering in-service national services life insurance policies from October 8, 1940 through March 1, 1950, is conservatively estimated at $96,409,212.

A MISNOMER

Since October 8, 1940, more than 22,500,000 NSLI insurance policies have been issued. Three out of every four of all former NSLI policyholders have permitted their policies to lapse. Of the veterans of World War II, only one of six are covered by NSLI. About 25.9 percent of NSLI policies currently in force are held by in-service personnel. Only 78 percent of those currently serving in the Armed Forces have taken out this insurance. One out of every nine combat casualties of World War II had no national service life insurance whatsoever.

The use of the word "insurance" in characterizing NSLI operations is a misnomer. The paradox of NSLI is made clear when it is realized that the Federal Government underwrites the extra hazards of military or naval service only to the extent to which an individual was insured for normal civilian risk under the NSLI program. The insured having in force NSLI on a personal paying basis, generally speaking, is a condition precedent before the United States Government becomes liable for any death-benefit payments.

This condition presents an inequity and results in discrimination among beneficiaries.

[In the event death was determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be a "result of disease or injury traceable to the extra hazard of the military or naval service", the liability for payment of such claims was borne not by the NSLI fund, but by the Federal Government. During the war 88 percent of all deaths in the armed forces were determined to be "extra hazard." The Government paid not only the face value of the policies held by these individuals, but approximately 19 percent more than the face value or annuities (as a result of the policies)—plus 3 percent on the undistributed principal.

[Therefore the NSLI fund suffered no liability if the death was determined to be extra hazard. The Government assumed the cost of extra hazard only if the deceased had taken out NSLI and then only in the amount of the NSLI policy. Thus, attainment of the objectives of the act was dependent upon the economic predilections and sense of responsibility of the individual sailor, airman, soldier or marine.]

OLD TABLE USE COSTLY

The use of the American Experience Table of Mortality for calculating annuities was outmoded by 1940, and its use has had the effect of granting annuity payments considerably in excess of what more modern actuarial calculations would justify. Testimony revealed that the use of the table was deliberately adopted in order that annuity payments to beneficiaries of World War II would be no lesser amount than similar payments being made to beneficiaries of World War I casualties. The continued use of this table for calculating annuities can only be interpreted as a subsidy to the NSLI fund.

Through October 1, 1948, the use of this table has required the Government to appropriate to the NSLI fund in excess of $502,000,000 in annuity differential payments. There was and is no justification under accepted insurance practices to use this table for NSLI annuity calculations. The use of any annuity table without regard to the difference in life expectancy of male and female lives is contrary to modern insurance practice. Under the NSLI Act as presently written and administered, the total cost to the Government of a $10,000 face value policy may be in excess of $12,000.

Through the conclusion of the fiscal year 1949 (ending June 30, 1949), the total Federal contribution to the NSLI fund was greater than the amount collected from the insured in premium payments. On an overall average, an amount exceeding 75 percent of the total premiums paid on NSLI was returned to the insured in the form of dividends during the first 6 months of 1950.

(Currently, plans are being made for distribution of about $1,000,000,000 in a second "dividend" this year.)

TRUE COST NOT SHOWN

The present rate of interest (3 percent) paid on invested NSLI funds is considerably in excess of the interest rate being paid by the United States Treasury in securing adequate sums required to fund and refund the debt obligation and current expenses of the Federal Government.

Continuation of payment (of interest at 3 percent) is of questionable justification.

The insuring of aviation cadets under present applicable statutes—Government paying the premiums—is excessively costly. It would be tens of millions of dollars less costly to assure each aviation cadet in training that his dependents (in event of his death during training) would receive a gratuitous life indemnity from the Government of $10,000.

From 1941, a conservative estimate is that the premium costs to the United States have been in excess of $31,000,000. The Government by guaranteeing a gratuitous life indemnity of $10,000 to all aviation cadets would have saved well over $20,000,000.

The requested national service life insurance appropriations for administrative expenses cover only a portion of the total administrative cost of national service life insurance operations. The costs are at least twice the amount reflected for such costs in the annual budget request. The present budget procedures do not adequately inform the Congress or the taxpayers as to the true administrative costs of national service life insurance, all such costs being borne by the Federal Government. The direct cost of the VA offices of insurance for 1950 was estimated at $44,900,000, but figures submitted to the committee indicated that other factors involved raised the total administrative cost to more than $80,000,000. Adoption of a gratuitous system in 1940, it is calculated, would have saved about $213,000,000 in interest from the Treasury, $210,000,000 in interest for delay in settlement of claims, $30,800,000 in air cadet premiums, $59,000,000 in premium waivers, and a substantial part of the $360,000,000 spent for national service life insurance administration.

Controls Can Be Democratic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, over the week end just passed the Nation reentered a state of economic controls made necessary by the impact of mobilization and defense preparations.

This was, indeed, a most serious development—but a development which we as a Nation have discovered was necessary and essential. Now, as we undergo for the second time in a decade the application of Government controls, we may trust that the mistakes of the past be studied by our stabilization officials in order that they may be avoided, and that only fairness and equity to all people will result.

In the spirit of hopefulness that the application of controls may deal fairly with all, I ask that there be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Controls Can Be Democratic," by Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in the February 2, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report.

The article is as follows:

CONTROLS CAN BE DEMOCRATIC

(By David Lawrence)

America is entering a new era of controls that may last as long as international tension requires a large military establishment—maybe for generations to come.

This means a substantial change in the economic life of the people of the United States.

But it need not bring an abandonment of the basic principles of free competition which have built up the greatest production machine the world has ever known.

There will be a temptation on the part of those theorists who have long desired state socialism in some form to urge that the emergency proves the need for a system of permanent controls over wages and prices, allocation of materials, and control of all credit.

For many years now the main battle between the radical liberals and the conservatives has turned on the extent to which government should intervene in the economic life of the country. The true liberal—Republican and Democrat—has, on the other hand, accepted the principle that, while some intervention is essential in emergencies, such as in time of great depression or great inflation, the real issue is not the extent of such intervention but the extent of its influence on the normal life of the Nation when the relatively brief emergency has passed.

Such a transition, however, is no longer the only problem because we are headed for an era which will not pass in 2 or 3 years. Normalcy may not be witnessed for decades to come.

We are confronted, therefore, with the need for making economic policy that can carry us through a long period of time during which we may totter constantly on the verge of war and yet not have large military operations or big-scale war.

To the Communist—and he is basically a champion of state socialism the capitalistic countries are doomed to failure because they scorn planned economy.

A few years ago there was a controversy in Russian periodicals over a book written by a Soviet economist who rather admired the way the United States controlled its capitalism during World War II and who ventured the belief that planned economy could be introduced successfully by capitalist countries. He was compelled under duress to take back much of what he wrote on the pretext that our war program was without merit anyway. But it is significant to recall that the Communists repeatedly use the phrase "planned economy" as a synonym for state socialism.

America is challenged now to show the world that, applying the fundamental principle of volition as opposed to coercion, democratic procedure as opposed to dictatorial decree, we can develop a coordinated operation in our economy and keep it free from the deteriorating effects of monopolies and cartels and the special privileges which a political government is tempted to set up under the guise of a war emergency.

Government, to be effective, must be honest and impartial, especially if it wishes to encourage equal sacrifice.

Where there is a choice between a policy that can preserve free competition and one that stifles it, the method of competition should be strengthened and not weakened.

Let America demonstrate that democracy can organize and operate through the voluntarism of its economic elements and that—without losing its freedoms—it can still outproduce the world.

"Captain Courageous"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article which I prepared after hearing the sorrowing announcement of the death of Capt. Don Gentile, a World War II ace of the American Air Force:

A blackened hole in the Maryland countryside where there lies embedded the twisted, flame-scarred wreckage of an Air Force T–33 jet training plane today marks the last landing place of one of America's most famous military heroes. To the ranks of the brave fighting men whose names are a glorious chapter in the history of our country there was yesterday added another marcher—Capt. Don Gentile, who plunged to his death while on a routine training flight which this ace pilot had scheduled to maintain his proficiency.

I had the good fortune to know Captain Gentile personally, and knowing this gentlemanly, reserved, and modest man made it hard to believe that his Air Force comrades could have nicknamed him the "Messerschmitt Killer." It is still hard for me to believe that this top European theater ace of World War II who was the scourge of Hermann Goering's Luftwaffe, could become, after donning civilian clothes, the family man and college student, typical of the many thousands of veterans who are beginning to make their mark in America today.

Captain Gentile had flown 350 combat hours on 182 sorties. He held some of the Nation's highest decorations—the Distinguished Service Cross with oak leaf cluster, the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross with seven clusters, the Air Medal with three clusters, and a Presidential unit citation. He shot 19 enemy planes out of the skys over Europe, and destroyed 6 more on the ground.

He was originally rejected by our own Air Force because he lacked certain educational requirements. He later transferred to the American Air Force after compiling an excellent combat record in the Royal Canadian Air Force, which he had joined out of his driving urge to get into the fight.

The American people are not ungrateful, and long after the details of his sky-borne exploits have been lost to memory, the name of Don Gentile will live on in the hearts of millions of Americans. Daring, brave, resourceful, he was everything American attributes to her fighting forces. As we offer our condolences to his bereaved family, his wife, and his three sons, Don, Jr., Joseph, and Pat, we recall to mind the words of President Roosevelt who once called this handsome Italian-American boy "Captain Courageous," and we pray that we may all partake of the heritage he leaves behind, a heritage of steadfast courage and devotion to country.

Victory for De Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the New York Times on January 15, 1951:

VICTORY FOR DE GASPERI

The Western cause was championed with impressive success in the Roman Senate on Saturday by Alcide de Gasperi, that remarkable statesman who more than ever has been giving proof that he deserves to rank among the greatest of the premiers that Italy has produced since 1870. It was a formidable display of leadership, but it would be wrong to think that the Italian response to North Atlantic defense was simply emotional and rhetorical. Italy has her dissenters, doubters, and obstructionists, her full share of neutralists and defeatists, of Communists and neo-Fascists. One cannot doubt, however, that the prevailing opinion among those who concern themselves with national policies is in favor of the Western democracies and of playing an active role in the defense of the West. Italy, after all, is the cradle of Western civilization; it is inconceivable that she should choose to throw open her gates to another barbarian invasion from the East.

The solid Senate vote of 161 to 92 for the Government's policy is only the latest indication of support for the democracies. On January 5 the Italian Cabinet announced that Italy would place three divisions at the disposal of General Eisenhower for the North Atlantic forces. More is undoubtedly coming. Last week, when the United States turned over three destroyer escorts to the Italian Navy, Ambassador Tarchiani pledged Italy's full cooperation for the common defense of the Atlantic community. "Our strength is now insufficient for the task, as is the case for all the rest of western Europe," he said, "but we are putting into it our firm will and our best resources so that we may raise ourselves and efficiently contribute to a European-American force such as will be able to assure peace by discouraging any assault."

Moreover, Premier de Gasperi was emphatic in rejecting the thesis that Italy can act as a bridge between Russia and the west. That is a dream nourished at various times in Britain, France and Germany since the war, and now we even have Marshal Tito dreaming up a Socialist third force. The fate of bridges is to be blown up when there are wars, and anyway Italy, as Signor de Gasperi said, does not stand halfway between east and west; she is on our side.

Cadet Corps of the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of our participation in World War II it was necessary to expand the merchant marine tremendously in order to provide the ships which carried men and materials for our overseas operations. Many young men performed patriotic services in training and at sea in order that these ships might be manned.

When the fighting stopped and their services were no longer needed they were released and the service of the merchant marine has been since commended on many occasions. Many of those who served, however, hold the feeling that they are being singled out for further service in a manner which unjustly disparages the service already rendered. The viewpoint is rather well expressed in a letter from one of them, which I quote:

If in 1942 you attained the age of 18 and you found your country in a desperate situation and engaged in a world-wide war, you probably would be glad to help in any way you could. If in your investigation as to how best to render service, you were told by your Government that it had become necessary to form a separate branch of the armed services to not only press the then present conflict but to establish a maritime reserve which would put the country in a strong position for any future emergency, you would be interested.

With posters, literature and great enthusiasm you were asked to enlist in the new branch of the service known as the cadet corps of the merchant marine, thus distinguishing it from the former civilian merchant marine organizations. Accepting all the representatives in good faith you enlisted in the Naval Reserve, subject to call. Within 60 days you were requested to travel to a city quite some distance away at your own expense in order to complete your enlistment and take your physical examination.

You returned to school and in another 30 days you were ordered into service. You proceeded to your destination, which was a military establishment under complete military authority and operated along the lines of Annapolis as closely as that institution could be approximately. You were advised that you would have 8 months training at this institution and then have 6 months combat service at sea. At the conclusion of the combat service you were to return to a designated institution to finish your work and receive a reserve commission in the Navy. In the meantime, you received the rank of cadet officer of the merchant marine, a member

of the Naval Reserve, which rank was above a warrant officer and just below that of ensign. Until you received a commission you were paid $65 per month and found; no bonuses as has been wrongly stated.

After 21 months of service, with the war drawing to a close, you were told that the corps was overstaffed and that there was little likelihood of your being able to secure employment in the civilian merchant marine and unless you insisted on finishing the course, the Government would be glad to give you an honorable discharge, advising Selective Service headquarters that in the opinion of the Government you had rendered sufficient service to your country to be ineligible for further service.

Again accepting the representations in good faith, you received an honorable discharge and returned to your interrupted educational career, only to find upon the enactment of a new Selective Service Act in June 1948, that Congress in its infinite wisdom and not being able to distinguish between a duly constituted cadet corps and civilian merchant seamen, had decided that you had not done a thing in the service of the country and as consequence would be at the top of the list at the pleasure of General Hershey unless, of course, you chose to reenlist or marry.

If we are going to have a 3,000,000-man Army we are going to have to have a merchant marine. These boys, I know, will be glad to serve but they are entitled to veterans' status and they are entitled to follow up that branch of the service for which they are trained.

There are some four or five thousand of these boys, which is a negligible number so far as man-power needs are concerned, but each and every one of them is certainly entitled to simple justice and a recognition long overdue. I believe it to be the duty of Congress to rectify gross errors wherever and whenever possible and now is the time to do this job.

Eliminate the Causes of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from A. K. Gardner, chairman of the food and agriculture committee of the New England Council:

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Boston, January 25, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: At a recent meeting of the food and agriculture committee of the New England Council, it was unanimously voted that—

"Inflation must be attacked by eliminating its causes, which are fundamentally too few goods for the money available to buy them.

"Abundant production is essential, but price controls discourage such production and rationing does nothing to increase the supply of goods. The oversupply of money in relation to the supply of goods should be adjusted as far as possible by placing our Government on a pay-as-you-go basis, by controlling credit and by other Federal monetary and fiscal controls aimed to eliminate the inflationary forces of our money supply.

"Unessential governmental expenditures must be eliminated and with a shortage of manpower for essential production, manpower must not be used for unnecessary or undesirable controls."

Because of the seriousness of the situation, it was voted to send the above statement to all members of the New England congressional delegation.

Very truly yours,

A. K. GARDNER,
Chairman, Food and Agriculture Committee.

Atomic Energy Is Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Lowell Mellett appearing in the Washington Star on January 20. Mr. Mellett points out very graphically the necessity of the Federal Government's financial participation in furthering the health and education of the Nation's children.

The article follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY IS NOT ENOUGH—NATIONAL DEFENSE ALSO CALLS FOR HUMAN ENERGY, WHICH MEANS HEALTH AND EDUCATION

(By Lowell Mellett)

People are funny. That includes the American people. If the President says that we need to spend $1,200,000,000 next year in the development of atomic energy we say it must be so; we can't afford to let anybody get ahead of us in atomic energy. But if the President says we need to spend a few hundred million in the development of human energy, we say that is nonessential and socialistic besides; nothing to think about in terrible times like these.

Yet the day is not in sight, regardless of the atom bomb or even of the projected hell bomb, when human energy will cease to be the real basis of national defense. Men still have to do most of the fighting, and that will be true for a long time to come. The biggest problem of our National Defense Establishment right now is where to find the needed number of competent young men to do the fighting. That's what the argument over the 18-year-olds is all about, as well as the argument over the deferment of fathers and other breadwinners who fought in the last war.

Human energy, applicable to national defense, depends on health and education. The Armed Forces reject the unhealthy and the uneducated. It would seem the part of wisdom therefore to reduce the number that must be rejected. That can only be done by improving the Nation's health and providing more education.

Of course, if the war is going to come next week and is going to end very quickly, nothing would be gained, so far as immediate national defense is concerned. But our defense program is not based on those two possibilities. It is based on the probability of war being forestalled for a year or two or three and of war lasting several years if it does occur.

In World War II the draft boards rejected 650,000 men and boys because of educational deficiencies. In other respects these men and boys were qualified for armed service. They were in good health. They were physically strong. But they fell short in schooling. They were either illiterate or had attained less than fifth-grade status.

Counting 15,000 men to a division, that means we rejected the equivalent of 40 combat divisions or twice the number of divisions we used in the South Pacific theater of war, the area from Honolulu to Australia to Tokyo and the islands between.

Now it is suggested that we may have been too exacting in our educational requirements and that we can meet our present needs in part by lowering the Army's standards. To meet an immediate emergency that might be a half-satisfactory answer. But not for the long pull. If our enemies are to be Russia and China, we cannot match them in numbers even if the Army accepts absolute illiterates. We can only offset our numerical inferiority through better equipment, better training and better leadership. That calls for education.

It calls for education at the elementary and secondary level, which can only be provided in many States through Federal aid. Last year the Senate passed a bill, Senator TAFT one of its authors, to grant $300,000,000 annually in aid. It was killed by a House committee. This week the House, without a dissenting vote, authorized $235,000,000 for a single warship, a supercarrier. The experts say, and they should know, that the vessel will be worth the money. But what do the experts say concerning the hundreds of thousands of boys who are not being educated sufficiently to become soldiers?

Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the House calling for the establishment of a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia to honor the memory of the discoverer of America, who made his eventful trip across the Atlantic Ocean 458 years ago.

In addition to honoring the memory of Columbus, the grove of trees which will make up this arbor will also serve as a perpetual tribute to the many thousands of American boys of Italian descent who gave their lives during World War II for the preservation of American freedom and for the liberation of Italy from the Nazi and Fascist yoke.

The contribution of Italy and the Italian people to western culture and civilization is truly immeasurable throughout the history of mankind, beginning with ancient Rome and up to our own day. America is indebted not only to the intrepid navigator who in 1492 discovered this vast continent where our great Nation has been established and where it flourishes, but America is also indebted to her many citizens of Italian descent for their great contributions to our democratic way of life which they helped to build and develop in conjunction with all other Americans.

I trust that this memorial will soon be created to serve as a living symbol of

the friendship between freedom-loving people everywhere, and that it will strengthen the historic relationship between our own country and democratic Italy.

United Nations a Trouble-Making, Futile Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, United Nations from its inception has been a Delilah, and Samson's fate, if we continue to go along, will be ours.

The following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning contains that suggestion:

We can't get very worked up over what is happening in the UN over Red China's military intervention in Korea. Anybody who doesn't consciously delude himself knows that the UN is a fake. Its only accomplishments to date are to serve as a sounding board for Red propaganda and to get Truman's chump administration into a war. On this matter you can take your choice as to who pushed whom.

Truman made a sucker play. He thought he was getting into a scrap with a neighborhood rowdy, but instead found himself up against a gang. He has been looking appealingly toward UN ever since to bail him out. That he is gullible enough to expect any assistance from that quarter is simply the measure of his stupidity.

The proceedings at Lake Success, though irrelevant and unreal, are enlightening, if not surprising. The rest of the nations which cheered us on into the Korean imbroglio and then left us to hold the bag have been continuing the double cross in the diplomatic arena.

FOOTY-FOOTY IN THE UN

Because of cold feet, and for other reasons, they don't want to get tough with the Chinese Communists. Mr. Austin, for the Truman administration, wants to call the Communists aggressors. Calling them anything you like isn't going to alter the mess in Korea, but the other countries can think of all kinds of reasons why a tag of moral leprosy should not be affixed.

Mr. Austin thought he just about had the crowd worked up to go along with him when the Indian delegate, Sir Benegal Rau, pulled a dispatch out of his pocket which, he contended, showed that Red China, after turning the UN down three times hand running, was willing to talk matters over.

Upon examination, it was found that the Red terms were the same as usual. If Communist China got everything she wanted, she would talk. She wanted to load the jury with her pals—Russia, Britain, and India among them—so there'd be no slip-up.

Mr. Austin wasn't buying any of this. Nehru, the boss of India, got very impatient with him and the United States. Clem Attlee told the British Parliament he might agree to calling the Chinese Reds aggressors, but he wouldn't go along on economic sanctions against them. That would be damaging to the empire trade, you understand, and, besides, Britain wants to hang onto Hong Kong.

Of course, while this tedious routine grinds along, Americans continue to get killed in Korea. General Romulo, of the Philippines, was the only speaker with sufficient candor to say that UN is utterly lost when it sacrifices truth and principle to convenience and fear. That is all very true, but when did UN ever demonstrate any attachment to truth and principle?

A more pertinent comment on the whole business is that of Senator KNOWLAND, who inquired: What if the United States should take 2½ months to recognize a Communist aggression in Europe?

That is the only comeback afforded this country by the nations which are running out on it in UN. The Korean War is not a total loss if it has opened American eyes to the untrustworthiness of America's alleged allies. If they can't recognize aggression, neither can we.

Instead of 2½ months, we ought to take about two and one-half centuries to discover the next aggression anywhere—unless it is directed against the United States.

We Are Called Upon To Make a Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Mr. Andrew E. Funk, Jr., editor of the White Haven Record, White Haven, Pa.:

WE ARE CALLED UPON TO MAKE A DECISION

For the past 2 weeks the people of our Nation have been engaged in a great debate, possibly the greatest debate we have ever entered upon, concerning what shall be this country's future policy in the face of a growing state of world unrest brought on by the surging tide of communism.

Within the last fortnight, a veritable broadside of personal opinions regarding our present position in Korea and possible plans for our future action in th face of the Communist threat, has been fired at the American people without discretion.

Unfortunately, most of these well-aired and highly publicized opinions have unwittingly given birth to a gnawing fear and uncertainty in the minds and hearts of a usually resolute people. Nor could the result have been anything else when these opinions were given expression by such men as Senator ROBERT TAFT and former President Herbert Hoover—men whose opinions otherwise have commanded the respect of the American public.

We do not profess to be an authority on American foreign policy, but we do feel deeply about this all-important issue and we are dismayed and disappointed to behold doubt, fear, and indecision take such roots in the Nation which we fought to defend against a similar though less menacing aggressor so short a time ago.

We would like to answer the Senator and the former president in the fine and oratorical phrases and with the grand and impressive words which they employ so expertly. But, we cannot. We must answer in the common language, but we will speak with the heart of a soldier.

To you, Senator TAFT, who have so innocently asked where President Truman derived authority to send American troops to Korea, we would answer you by asking where the authority was found that permitted General Washington to send troops on an invasion of Canada in 1775; that permitted President Jefferson to send ships to Tripoli to subdue the Barbary pirates in 1805; that permitted President McKinley to send troops and ships to oust the Spanish from Cuba and the Philippines in 1898; that permitted President Taft (do you remember him, Senator?) to send the Marines to Nicaragua to restore order there in 1912.

No, Senator, your question is at best little better than a poor attempt to cloak your own befuddled state of mind. We certainly do not blame you for being disturbed on this grave issue, but we do resent and abhor your poor sense of duty in giving voice to that doubt at a time when the American public is looking to you and your fellow statesmen, not for doubt, but for assurance; not for questions, but for answers.

To you, Mr. Hoover, who have so loudly and candidly displayed your personal fear and lack of understanding of the matters involved in this great issue, we would like to say that the lessons of the past 40 years have apparently failed to impress upon you not only the hopelessness but also the ridiculousness of attempting to seal ourselves off in a tight little ball apart from the rest of the world. You yourself have conceded that "any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion is sheer folly." By your statement you have admitted that we cannot match the manpower of the Communists, who at this moment have nearly half the people of the world under their control.

We also expect, Mr. Hoover, that you must realize that we have but one real advantage over the Communists and that is our capacity to produce the materials and weapons of war. Yet, knowing this, you propose that we abandon the industrial nations of Europe to the Red flood and thereby surrender to the Communists the one distinct advantage we have over them. With Western Europe as our ally, we can outproduce Russia and her Communist stepchildren by four to one, but if we lose the industrial power of Western Europe to the Reds we will barely be able to match Communist production.

Yes, Mr. Hoover, your speech proved quite a straw for the weak and fainthearted citizens of our country. But most especially did it please the Communists. As you probably know, the Russian newspapers liked it so well that they reprinted the entire speech. And well they might, for, if we pursued the course of action you advocate, the Communists would in all probability be in control of all of Europe in a short time.

And where would that leave us, Mr. Hoover? We would be alone in our tight little ball, separated from the rest of the world, outnumbered in terms of manpower by more than 8 to 1, cut off from our many distant sources of supply without which our great industrial machine would be sadly crippled. This is where the period of watchful waiting you propose would eventually lead us with our country waiting almost without hope for the inevitable end.

We appreciate, perhaps better than you, Mr. Hoover, that the loss of American lives on foreign soil brings bitter anguish, but, as one who has fought and lived through such foreign battles, we cannot help but say with other soldiers: "better there than here." You toured Europe after World War II, Mr. Hoover. Did you so loosely note or easily forget what you saw? Would you care to see such scenes of destruction and desolation here in America? Would you care to bring war so near your home and loved ones?

No, Mr. Hoover, we cannot "give up" and abandon the freedom-loving people of the world to drowning in the Communist flood. We do not say that it is necessary to stay in Korea regardless of cost, but we do say that we should leave only when we are forced to leave and when we have made it absolutely clear to the whole world that we are being driven out, that we are not quitting.

We must prove to the world, even as our Nation's founders did, that there are some things far more worth fighting for than mere life or property, that the principles and ideals upon which our Nation was built are more than idle phrases; that they are living, vital concepts without which life could be but existence alone; that we believe, even as Patrick Henry, in "liberty or death."

Don't lose heart, America. Faith and courage are easy virtues when our schemes fare well, but they are genuine only when we can fly them in the face of adversity. Is temporary loss so great a blow to these qualities that we are willing to desert the very ideals and principles which gave us birth?

Our cause is right and just. Surely it is worth fighting for under less than favorable conditions, for, if it is not, then it is not worth fighting for at all.

Better to suffer the tortures of Hell for a just and noble cause than wallow in Paradise for a lesser one.

Stand up, America. You are called.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, the House granted permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith the first of a series of short sketches on each of the eminent lawgivers whose part in the evolution of law is commemorated by the marble plaques adorning the walls of this Chamber.

The House probably for the first time in history met for the transaction of business on January 1, 1951—New Year's Day, and it met for the first time in the new renovated and redecorated Chamber—renovated probably for the first time since it was built. There was some speculation as to the marble plaques which were viewed by the House for the first time, and a few days later a distinguished Member of the House arose in his seat and said:

> In looking around the walls of this House, or, I should say at the ceiling, a stranger might think we were meeting in the Pyramids of Egypt, from the appearance of these antiquated figures. * * *
>
> It is my intention to introduce a resolution to remove those ghastly placards, * * * and put the figures of great Americans in their place—those great patriots who helped to establish and build this Republic. * * *
>
> Remember this is the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and not a sanctuary of antiquity or the tomb of King Tut.

I am sure the distinguished Member spoke in jest, for this great country, whatever its faults, is by no means provincial. These figures commemorate not the history of our country only, but the history of the world's civilization during the last 4,000 years, from the beginning of recorded history. It would be well to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these brief sketches of the men represented by these marble plaques which are being published serially by the Washington Post, and with the permission of the House I shall do so. The first sketch is as follows:

HAMMURABI: EARLIEST LAWGIVER AND KING OF BABYLONIA

Hammurabi (pronounced ham-oo-ra-be) was a great king of Babylonia. He reigned supreme for 43 years, from 2067 to 2025 B. C. He is a natural choice in any series on the world's eminent lawgivers.

The law code bearing his name is recognized in legal history as probably the earliest, and perhaps most primitive, surviving.

His code, promulgated for use throughout the Babylon empire, was strangely conflicting. According to historians, it was particularly strong in its prohibitions on defrauding the poor and helpless. But this essentially humanitarian legal dogma also carried the savage feature of retributive punishment. It advocated literal adherence to "an eye for an eye" treatment for wrongdoers.

The Hammurabi portrait was done by one of Washington's own sculptors, Thomas Hudson Jones, of 3612 O Street NW. Jones did the sesquicentennial medallion.

International Whirligig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the McClure Newspaper Syndicate of New York and written by John Fisher:

RUSSIA STEPS UP DRIVE TO FORCE POLES TO LOVE SOVIET MASTERS, BUT PATRIOTISM AND PRIDE NOURISH DEEP HATRED OF MUSCOVITES

(By John Fisher)

As the German international crisis thickens, Stalin is discovering that Poland has not yet been hewed into a submissive satellite, dependable in the event of war in Northern Europe.

Hence a new program of organized high pressure has been inaugurated "to deepen," according to Adam Rapacki of the Polish Politburo, "the feeling of love and esteem for the Soviet Union."

Previous synthetic solidarity gestures failed to erase bitter memories of Russian treachery to General Bor-Komorowski's World War II home army, the massacres of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and more recent outrages. Poles—as they must—sullenly bow to police clubs and machine guns, but in their hearts they are still anti-Russian.

The latest instrument to influence Polish public opinion has been the Second World Peace Congress, transferred to Warsaw from England after London refused to allow the phony congress to meet there.

The ousted delegates poured into Warsaw and shouted themselves hoarse denouncing "Anglo-Saxon warmongers" and accusing America of "flooding Korea with the blood of children and performing all sorts of fascist bestialities."

DEMONSTRATIONS FULLY ORGANIZED

These malicious pro-Soviet fulminations were the most recent of several pep talks. Propaganda bosses in October ordered demonstrations everywhere to celebrate the thirty-third anniversary of the Russian Bolshevist revolution.

In September a National Peace Congress was held. About 25,000 local kick-off meetings preceded the climatic assembly in Warsaw. The stellar role at this hate fest went to Lt. Col. Yu Kan Buk, a North Korean officer, who regaled an audience of 100,000 with fresh lies about American aggression in the Orient.

In addition to these three major peace hippodromes, the month of November was reserved for local efforts to cement Polish-Soviet friendship.

Such superdoses of prolonged, high-pitched ballyhoo are deemed necessary by commissar psychologists because the Polish people, next-door neighbors to vulnerable Russia, show scant signs of adoration of their masters and display many indications that in case of war and the opportunity came they would give Russia the swerve.

Again and again at various mass meetings Red tub-thumpers urged their listeners to be on guard against a rising tide of "subversive activities"—open admission that Poles are not turning into Communists despite propaganda, bribes, and Red terror.

MORE LIQUIDATION THREATENED

Nevertheless the Beirut government, obedient to Moscow, uses every possible means to force its recalcitrant subjects to conform to the Soviet pattern. A recent Warsaw broadcast set as a goal of the new 6-year plan the "elimination of the capitalist element in our economy through curbing, expulsion, and liquidation."

Communists are absorbing the entire educational system so that hereafter youthful minds will be completely molded by the Reds. A commission of Russian and Polish Communist educators have injected the party line into all school textbooks, except histories.

This latter subject also is being doctored. But the visiting savants had some difficulties in persuading their Polish comrades to distort in Russia's favor the record of Polish victories over the Bolshevist armies in the local war of 1920.

College professors are held strictly accountable to political mentors on faculties. Most older students are not Communists. But party membership is on the up in lower classes, as high schools now are dominated by the ZMP, the Polish Communist youth organization.

A high-school student no longer can gain admission to a university unless sponsored by his local ZMP. College members of this order receive all the scholarships, free meals, inexpensive lodgings, and other advantages, and they run nearly all student activities, including state-financed vacation trips.

FIRM CONTROL OF FORCES

Equally powerful pressure is exerted to make Communist zealots of soldiers. Since iron-fisted Soviet Marshal Rokossovsky assumed supreme command, the organization of the Polish Army has been patterned on the Soviet Army system. The two top generals of the ground and air forces are Soviet citizens. In fact, the entire officer class is saturated with Russians. Promising young Polish officers are sent to military schools in the Soviet Union.

The equipment of the army was poor when Rokossovsky took over. He introduced a few Russian jet fighter planes and some modern artillery which is displayed for propaganda purposes. But most units are below combat strength and are armed with Polish, Russian, and German wartime left-over weapons.

Rearmament was not the most pressing problem. Rokossovsky found the army so indifferent to communism and so cold toward Russia that his chief efforts have been directed to indoctrination. Lectures on

Marxist ideology consume more time than even drill. Communist youth cells are being organized in every unit. The soldier's oath now reads: "I swear to stand steadfastly guarding peace side by side with the Soviet Army."

TRADITION OF PATRIOTISM

But even this concentrated indoctrination has not solidified the bonds with Russia. The Polish military arm has a long tradition of patriatism and pride. Most younger officers and their men resent taking orders from arrogant Soviet majors and colonels.

When United Nations forces in Korea commenced to demonstrate their hitting power, Polish soldiers in barracks sang old, tabooed Polish army songs filled with anti-Russian sentiment.

A rumor that Polish units would be sent to bolster the North Koreans sparked a surge of desertions. In July 200 Polish naval officers were arrested on suspicion of disloyalty to Russia. Moscow is so doubtful of the Polish Army that the Kremlin has recently heavily increased Soviet garrisons in Lower Silesia and Pomerania.

Polish antagonism for Russia should not be construed to mean an early peoples' revolt or a military mutiny. But so long as Poland has the power and the will to drag her heels, Stalin cannot count on reliable military support for his martial adventures.

Total Mobilization of Personnel, Partial Mobilization of Matériel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to find that the Federal Government is taking all steps necessary to recruit a full military force, and neglecting to keep pace in equipping those called to service with the materials of war. We find that Connecticut, the arsenal of America, is facing an industrial lag in a turnover from commercial to defense production. Cutbacks in the civilian use of copper and other materials in short supply make necessary the reduction of labor use on nondefense items. Yet the skilled labor in our Connecticut industries, and the Yankee "know-how" is not being utilized for the common defense. Defense contracts have not been awarded in sufficient number to take up the slack.

It would seem most necessary to take two steps to correct this situation. First, amendment of the copper order—M-12—to provide for the continued civilian use of this metal through June 30 instead of the date now set at April 30; allowing completion of items started on April 1 instead of March 1; second, greater defense contract authorization to Connecticut plants to enable a more rapid turnover from civilian production.

Included with my remarks are a copy of the letter I sent to Defense Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson on January 22; clippings from the Waterbury, Conn., American of January 22; and a letter received from the Thomaston Brass Workers' Union, Local 620. The above-mentioned follows:

JANUARY 22, 1951.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: In this period of national emergency the first thought of each citizen should be for the best interests of what will best serve the needs of the Nation. With this paramount in my mind I am calling a grave situation to your attention, affecting as it does the well-being of our citizens and the state of defenses of our country.

In the realization that the task confronting you is one of tremendous responsibility, I would be loath to add to the burdens of your office were it not for the serious consequences which might result from inaction.

The industries of this Nation, and I refer specifically to those in the Naugatuck Valley area of Connecticut, and their employees wish to participate fully in the mobilization of the industrial might needed for our preservation.

Paradoxically, the brass industries of the Naugatuck Valley find, in this period of generally full labor utilization, that Government restrictions and procrastination are leading to a period of less than full employment. To illustrate, I quote from the Waterbury Labor Market Letter of December 1950: "Although brass registered a slight rise (in employment), the outlook in this industry continued to be obscured by Government restrictions on copper supplies and uses * * * Although most industries reported added overtime which resulted in higher earnings, the brass industry continued to be hampered by shortages of raw material and shortened the workweek from 43.6 hours in September to 41.7 hours in December." The Waterbury American of January 17, reported the following relating to anticipated increase in the public welfare load: "Mrs. Ruth A. Jones, welfare superintendent, warned the welfare board at its meeting yesterday that the caseload may increase because of lay-offs in industry due to shortage of materials." A compilation of opinion of many manufacturers in this area provokes the following statement: "The problem that most concerns the manufacturers consulted is that of the retention intact of sufficient working forces during the transition period. Your district, the Fifth Connecticut Congressional District, has perhaps the highest concentration of copper and copper-base alloy mills and fabricating plants in this country.

"These industries are a vital link in the chain of war production of thousands of items. Under the end use Amendment Order M-12 (Copper) civilian production of some 300 items must cease April 1. Since comparatively few defense orders have been placed to date in this area, volume lay-offs will be inevitable.

"The distress which will be caused by this transition unemployment is but one factor. Equally important is that many of those laid off will find employment in other areas and will not return to their old employment when they will be needed for work on Government contracts except on compulsion. The problem is intensified by two facts. First, Connecticut is a small State. As a consequence, labor is mobile. Second, the very presence of the United Aircraft in East Hartford and the proximate plant of the company at Southington, will cause brass industry skills to go there for employment. United Aircraft is now engaged in a vast recruiting program which will, it has been announced, result in a working force of some 33,000 persons.

"We now understand that the military units of the country are drafting their requirements of copper and copper bearing alloys and will have this program ready for submission to the NPA at a comparatively early date. At that time it can be determined somewhat more definitely just how much of the production of the brass mills and, in turn, how much copper will be required for defense purposes. It is presumed at that time that the time table will be established which will permit the copper section of the NPA to formulate its plans, and also the brass industry can work up its operating schedules.

"Until this has been done it would seem that the best way to help the brass industry would be to postpone the effective date of the orders which are now in effect. As the orders now stand, the brass industry is required to ship not more than 85 percent of its average monthly shipments based on the first 6 months of 1950 for so-called commercial use. We believe the figure for March is now set at 80 percent. No percentages have been set for the second quarter of 1951. Presumably these figures will be announced as soon as the military requirements are made known. In the meantime, the conservation order becomes effective on receipt of material by customers on March 1.

"It is now expected that the effectiveness of the conservation order will be quite drastic on the brass mills and unless an increased volume of orders for Government requirements is received, lay-offs are bound to occur."

To sum up, two conditions are evident; a sufficient number of defense contracts has not been awarded to this vital industrial area to compensate for the curtailed production of civilian goods and, the present plan to stop delivery on raw material (copper) for some 300 items not in process of manufacture by March 1 nor completed by April 30 will, if not amended, severely restrict employment in the brass industry.

I recommend, therefore, that considerable impetus be directed to the award of defense contracts to this area of highly-skilled labor without delay, and that an amendatory provision be made in the Copper Conservation Order (M-12) providing for dates of April 1 and June 30 instead of the present cut-off dates of March 1 and April 30.

Most sincerely yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American of January 22, 1951]

MANUFACTURERS ASK DELAY ON COPPER ORDER

Waterbury area manufacturers are seeking an extension of the April 1 effective date of the Government's amended copper order which is scheduled to halt production of around 300 items of civilian goods.

Builders' and plumbers' hardware and cosmetic containers are among the products due to be halted. If the retrenchment program goes through with the present lack of defense orders, a serious employment dislocation is foreseen by manufacturers and labor leaders.

Charles L. Eyanson, president of the Naugatuck Valley Industrial Council, said today appeals in behalf of several valley concerns have been made asking Washington authorities to review this threat to the brass industry.

Scovill Manufacturing Co., Risdon Manufacturing Co., and Plume & Atwood Manufacturing Co. are but three of the firms that would be hit by the order which has already imposed restrictions on their operations.

Scovill's Waterville division is one of the Nation's largest manufacturers of plumbers' supplies. P. & W. and Risdon are extensively engaged in the making of cosmetics wares. So is the Eyelet Specialty Co.

These and other concerns are now functioning under the basic M-12 order which limits use of copper for civilian goods to 85 percent of the amounts consumed in the first 6 months of 1950.

Amendments to the order propose the discontinuance of a substantial line of products beginning April 1. Copper for remaining uses also is to be restricted to 80 percent. Mr. Eyanson said manufacturers are plainly alarmed over the outlook.

Since the Government proceeded with its cutback plans on civilian items the placement of defense orders has been discouragingly slow. Those received up to now will in no way occupy the services of employees working on civilian production due to be suspended, he said.

Last week the CIO United Auto Workers offered its services to management in efforts to persuade Federal defense authorities to gear the defense needs to an orderly conversion of industry in order to avoid short time and lay-offs for industrial workers.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American of January 22, 1951]

SQUEEZE PLAY HITS STATE INDUSTRY, CLAIM

(By Joe Alex Morris, Jr.)

HARTFORD, January 22.—Connecticut's manufacturers admitted today they are worried.

They say they're caught in a Government-directed squeeze play, which leaves them without enough defense contracts to maintain full employment. The squeeze is the gradually-tightening orders covering civilian use of raw materials.

Many accuse the Government of acting too hastily in applying controls. They say the Government itself doesn't know where it's going next in industrial planning. Without knowledge of an over-all plan for the economy, the individual manufacturer can't make his own plans.

Unless Washington acts soon, technological unemployment will hit Connecticut. Some prefer to call it bureaucratic unemployment. In some cases, particularly the brass and copper industry, this may happen in a few weeks.

Manufacturers say the crux of the situation is Washington's inability to decide on the speed and degree at which mobilization should proceed. Some comments:

The Connecticut Manufacturers Association: "The average State manufacturer is getting scared. He's losing his sources of materials, and is anxious to get into defense work."

The machine tool industry: "Washington doesn't know what to do * * * we'll need help from the Government soon * * * technological unemployment is going to come faster than before."

ORDERS BEING CANCELED

The brass and copper industry: "Cancellations of orders are pouring in. * * * The union is as worried as we are. * * * We can't get enough orders to use up the reduced amount of material we're allowed."

A small arms ammunition manufacturer: "We need defense orders fast or employment will have to be cut."

Naturally, there are two opinions on how the mobilization plan will work out, but Labor Commissioner John J. Egan sounds almost like a voice in the wilderness in the present situation.

Egan is optimistic. He thinks the conversion will happen soon, with Government contracts pouring in by March 1. There will be a minimum of technological unemployment, he believes.

That a serious mobilization has not occurred yet is illustrated by Government statistics. Only $61,000,000 in unclassified Government contracts was let to Connecticut plants during the final 6 months of 1950.

By comparison, a full 2 billion in war contracts poured into the State during 18 months of 1941–42. There are 600 State industries which did defense work in the last war, many with difficult conversion jobs facing them.

SQUEEZE PLAY

A State manufacturers associations official calls the situation a "national production authority squeeze play." The association is doing what it can to cut the change-over unemployment. Its current advice is this:

Some vital industries, the aircraft industry, for instance—are getting big contracts. The best thing a small manufacturer can do is advise these big companies that they are available for subcontracting. Once Government contracts make it worth while, the association plans to put out a weekly bulletin keeping its members up-to-date on work or help-wanted situations.

A vague sort of pattern is emerging out of the chaos of the present industrial situation. Big and small manufacturers are cutting down their variety of produce, and are sticking to the most essential of their products. Where at all possible, they're substituting non-critical materials in their wares.

Only one industry in the State apparently knows where it is going. The aircraft industry, principally the three divisions of United Aircraft Corp., is expanding. United plans to add 7,000 workers by July 1. The corporation has licensed two automotive manufacturers to produce its engines, and will soon open a big training school in Hartford.

A spokesman called it a selective mobilization of the aircraft industry. President H. M. Horner has said the industry is being projected into the pattern of all-out production. By midyear, United's employment will be about half the wartime peak of 74,000. The company is short of engineers and electronics specialists, and is advertising throughout New England for them.

Before all-out production can be instituted, the machine-tool and die industry needs at least one, perhaps 2 years to retool the Nation's plants. This isn't being done now.

Connecticut's tool industry is now only 20 percent on Government defense orders, one industry officials says. It has a heavy backlog of civilian work to do, but NPA restrictions are going to cut heavily into this.

The industry is getting special treatment from the Government, however. Orders must be relayed to Washington for screening before they are filled. This permits the Government to keep close tab on the industry, and officials expect some reallocation of orders in the future.

BRASS PLANTS HARD HIT

The brass and copper industry is without doubt the hardest hit so far. An NPA order forbids the use of many items made of brass and copper after April 1. The order is affecting manufacturers now. One producer reported order cancellations are pouring in.

So far, he said, the plant—one of the largest in the State—has kept full employment by "juggling." If the situation doesn't change within a few weeks, short-time will be instituted. The manufacturer said this way he hopes to keep his labor force intact for the expected heavy defense orders.

With the unions as worried as the manufacturers, this spokesman called for a 1-month lifting of the ban, and institution of a sliding scale for conversion to war production, similar to that of the past war. The industry is authorized to use 85 percent of its base monthly supply of copper in February, but can't get orders for even this much. Defense orders so far are only about 15–20 percent of the industry's capacity.

The arms industry, which can be converted in as little as 3 months to war production, "can't figure out why" it's not getting Government contracts, one manufacturer of small arms ammunition reported. Although the Government has reopened at least one huge arsenal and expanded others, this manufacturer has received only "a few, small contracts."

Plenty of civilian orders are obtainable for ammunition, but "critical shortages" of copper and brass make it impossible to fill them all. This one plant, which employed 15,000 during the war, just recently reinstituted a 5-day week for its 2,500 employes. Before that, they were on 4-day shifts.

POSSIBLE LABOR SHORTAGES

The future doesn't look as bleak as the present and near-future to industrialists. Everyone expects the mobilization program to start eventually.

When that happens, the shortage won't be one of materials, but of labor. The State labor department is working on long-range plans to put another 100,000 persons into industry, on top of the record 800,000 now working in the State.

Commissioner Egan doesn't think the manpower needs will be so critical in so short a time during the forthcoming mobilization, but says housewives and others will have to give up their normal routines for a longer time—possibly 7 to 10 years.

The labor department has made a survey of the State's employable 29,000 persons who are now jobless, and also of part-time workers. This time, the department hopes to keep the labor force more stable, and if possible, restrict one worker to one job.

Housewives and other persons not usually employed outside their homes will be urged to replace workers in nonessential industries. In turn, the labor department will try to get regular workers into defense production lines.

This is all long-range planning and speculation. Right now, producers are worried that the Government isn't going to permit them to produce—either for defense or the civilian economy.

THOMASTON BRASS WORKERS' UNION,
LOCAL 620,
Thomaston, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: The jobs of about 50 employees of the Plume & Atwood Manufacturing Co. plant in Thomaston, Conn., practically all of whom are members of this union, are seriously jeopardized by amendment 1 to NPA Order M–12, part 29, Copper and Copper-base Alloys Subpart B—Use of Copper and Copper Base Alloys.

This order, which forbids the use of copper in the production of pen caps, pencil parts, lipstick containers and lipstick working parts, will cause the immediate unemployment of our members engaged in this type of production.

You have already received a communication from the Plume & Atwood Manufacturing Co. concerning this order, which goes into effect partly on March 1 and fully on April 30. On behalf of the employees involved, this organization wishes to add its objections to the order and request your assistance in obtaining its revocation on the following grounds:

First. The severe and unnecessary hardships which it will cause those who are forced out of employment, with no prospect of other jobs within the foreseeable future.

Second. The impossibility of finding adequate and salable substitutes in the manufacture of the products mentioned.

Third. The inflationary effect on our entire economy which will inevitably result from the banning of copper and brass in the production, not only of the items made by our plant, but hundreds of others also affected by the order. These include some of the most common household articles, the shortage of which will cause further price

increases, the growth of black markets, and hardships to the consuming public as well as the producing public.

For these reason, all of them basic to the welfare of the general community, we urge you to do everything in your power to bring about the revocation of this amendment.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES DIDSBURY,
President, Thomaston Brass Workers' Union, Local 620, IUMMSW.

Sales Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in line with the speech I made on the House floor today, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton Press:

SALES TAX PROPOSALS

Federal sales taxes are under consideration as a tax component in meeting the President's demand for $16,500,000,000 in new taxes. President Truman is quoted as saying he opposes such taxes at present. But this is only pretense. He knows that Congress will not increase personal income and corporation taxes enough to provide $16,500,000,000. When this happens he will "reluctantly" approve a Federal sales tax.

Opposition to sales taxes always has been great, because they are regressive. They fall hardest on those least able to pay. Greatest of national emergencies alone justifies such taxation. Such a tax may be levied either at the manufacturer's or the consumer's level. If it is levied at the manufacturer's level, it is pyramided through the price of goods. The wholesaler, let us say, may take a 10-percent profit on basis of cost, as also may the retailer. The consumer in the price he pays gets nicked for more than the Government gets in taxes.

A sales tax collected at consumers' or retail level is difficult to administer, because of the thousands of establishments whose collection of the tax must be policed.

Federal excise taxes as they exist today, covering some 20 classes of goods, are in effect sales taxes. They are taxed on the basis of the final manufacturers' price. The New Deal and Fair Deal actually have sneaked in a sales tax while bellowing to the hills against sales taxes.

Such hyprocrisy appeared in 1948 when Democrats were hollering that if the Republicans gained control they would enact a sales tax. Candidate for Vice President, Alben Barkley, challenged Governor Dewey to tell whether the GOP had plans for "the levy of a general sales tax by the Federal Government in addition to those now levied by the States."

Most present proposals for a retail sales tax put the levy at 5 percent, which it is estimated would bring in revenue of around $5,000,000,000 a year. Presumably, though not assured, food would be exempt. One proposal is that each individual would be exempt from these taxes up to purchases of $250 a year. To provide for such exemption coupons would be issued. It would mean that buyers would have to go about carrying not just ration stamps but also tax stamps. Such a prospect would loom because rationing, as in World War II, is an inevitable accompaniment of price control.

The Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General of the Army George C. Marshall delivered an address at a ceremony dedicating the new Washington Post Building. Those of us in public life have an excellent opportunity to view the whole American press in operation and to study its impact upon every phase of American life. We have reason to be very proud of the American press and I am sure we will all want to join with General Marshall in congratulating the great Washington Post on its past achievements and in wishing it continued success. I am therefore including his remarks as a part of our RECORD:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY GENERAL MARSHALL

We are here to mark a milestone in the life of a public institution and to confirm our faith in the conception of a free press to which this newspaper is dedicated.

It is appropriate that the ceremony should take place in front of the presses that turn out the daily editions. The publication of a great newspaper like the organization of a military force includes an echelon of services in depth. The uninitiated see only the finished product, the newspaper itself, in the Army the man in uniform. But those who work on the team appreciate the printers, the layout men, the advertising men—the craftsmen of many sorts as well as the more obvious workers who take part in the enterprise, the editors and the reporters.

Those like me who understand military organization appreciate the deep echelons extending from the front lines back to the support and reserve, back to the drawing boards and the production lines in factories, all the way back to the American taxpayer and his intimate family circle. The art and science of logistics of backing up front lines with services and supplies may lack the glamour of duty at the front but they are equally honorable and indispensable. The military services often take for granted the vital contributions of their rear echelons, and apparently become concerned about them only when it looks as though there might be a failure in production. I think, therefore, it is a fine thing that the Washington Post has chosen to honor its logistics forces by holding this ceremony right here among the presses.

Those who work in these surroundings symbolize the strength and the spirit of American labor. You are engaged in the production of one of the most delicate instruments in America's arsenal for freedom, an independent newspaper.

I don't have to tell you here that a free press is one of the fundamentals of our democracy and none insisted upon it more firmly or more wisely than did the founders of our Government. There is an oft-quoted statement accredited to Thomas Jefferson, which is worth noting today. "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government," he said, "I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." Now that may be something of an overstatement but it does illustrate the point.

There is another statement of Jefferson's, however, that I prefer to quote as more applicable to our present times. In a letter in 1799 he said, "* * * citizens * * * have a right to full information in a case of * * * great concernment to them. It is their sweat which is to earn all the expenses of the war, and their blood which is to flow in expiation of the causes of it."

No better reason could be set forth for the right of citizens to know about a war situation in which their sons are involved and I think both the press and the Armed Forces are keeping our citizens well informed during this period of great peril.

Out in Korea more than 250 correspondents are covering the operations and incidentally giving not only the American people but the entire world an intimate picture of the events taking place there. The courage, the suffering, and the spirit of our GI's, both in combat and behind the fighting lines, are made matters of public knowledge. At great costs to the press and at grave risks to themselves, the correspondents and photographers move freely in and out of the fighting lines to get their stories. They share the privations of the men in the field, expose themselves to similar dangers, and casualties among the corps have been very heavy.

Already 8 American correspondents have been killed, 19 wounded, 2 captured by the enemy, and 2 missing in action. Four correspondents, representing the British and French press, have made the great sacrifice, and four have been wounded. This ceremony offers me an opportunity to express deep appreciation of the devoted services of the corps of correspondents in Korea.

Relations between military censors and battle correspondents usually and quite naturally become strained. Differences are bound to arise. Both are interested in the freedom of the press, but each approaches the facts that make up the story with a different point of view. The reporter is concerned with information that will interest the American people who, in the final analysis, must work, fight, and pay for the campaign. The censor fears that some of this information may interest the enemy even more. The censor would err on the side of security; the correspondent, on the side of disclosure. It will always be hard to reconcile these opposite points of view.

There was a time when military men had little patience with the correspondent's point of view. To Lord Wellington, for instance, correspondents were anathema. During the Peninsula campaign he complained bitterly about newspapers and the detailed information they published about his order of battle and the morale of his troops. Sherman vigorously denounced correspondents on more than one occasion. He was rather famous for his attitude in this regard. Today there is no such hostility on the part of the military toward newspapers and correspondents.

All the way from the lines in Korea to the Pentagon the press is briefed daily by officers and furnished background information to help the reporters write with a full appreciation of the facts and factors concerned in the campaign. There are and there always will be points of friction, but I sincerely feel that the traditional gap between the censor and the correspondent has greatly narrowed. Censors and reporters are becoming more appreciative of each other's point of view and their joint responsibility. The result is more accurate and more interesting reporting for the benefit of all of us.

Reporting of news connected with activities in the Pentagon has been, I think, on the whole, fair and objective. The recent wide and accurate coverage of the manpower legislation which we have just given to the Congress has brought the issue squarely before the American people. The case for inducting the 18- to 19-year-old group has

been well reported and fairly. And speaking of fairness, I shall always remember with respect and great satisfaction the extraordinary care that the newspapers gave to the reporting of the inquiry into the fitness of Anna Rosenberg to serve as Assistant Secretary of Defense.

This is a free, democratic country, and will continue so because we enjoy the advantages of free and responsible newspapers produced under our American system of free enterprise.

I close with a quotation from the late Joseph Pulitzer, who said in 1904: "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together."

This dedication is good proof that our Republic and our press stand together and will rise to further heights of good government in the interests of the people.

ESA for Democrats Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an item from the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 27.

Mr. Speaker, if the news item is correct, politics has reached a new low in the United States. John H. Hoover, who resigned a few days ago, was the enforcement officer for ESA. He resigned in protest because of Democratic political favoritism in handing out jobs in the price-control organization. It would seem that price control, with political flavoring, will be on every table in the United States.

While it is true the two top men, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston, are supposed to be Republicans, they are the lukewarm "I agree with your New Deal philosophy" type. Apparently, everyone above the $4,000 bracket must carry a New Deal label. The article follows:

IN THE OFFING

(A weekly size-up by members of the Washington staff of the Scripps-Howard newspapers)

ESA FOR DEMOCRATS ONLY

Economic Stabilization Agency (ESA) is being built into Nation-wide Democratic machine.

Democratic National Committee is in charge; is passing on candidates for every job paying $4,000 and up.

Committee asks Democratic governors, Senators, State chairmen, national committeemen, for names, sends them on to Price Administrator Michael V. DiSalle.

Party loyalty is a test. No Dixiecrats accepted and no one who opposed President Truman's renomination or otherwise offended top Democrats. Backing from potent party figures is required. Some appointees have price-control experience; most have not. Lists submitted by Republican officials aren't considered.

It's a contrast to procedure in OPA 10 years ago. Politicians weren't consulted, party labels weren't checked. One result: Constant attacks on OPA from Capitol Hill, constant threats to withhold appropriations.

A few Democrats in Congress worry about staffing ESA with party men from top to bottom because it pins responsibility for success or failure of new price-control agency directly on party. They're afraid it may be unpopular by next election. Same men refuse to sponsor candidates for district office, for same reason. But they're the exception.

Pay of new officials isn't fixed. They'll get $50 a day until Congress acts.

Here's sample of how the picking's done.

Regional administrator for Rocky Mountain States will be George Rock, president of Truman-Barkley club in 1948. Before Alan Valentine was fired, a five-man panel he had named picked another man.

New outfit's a haven for lame ducks. Already slated for jobs: Vernon Dwyer, Indiana State director, defeated Democratic candidate for Congress; Doc O. A. Noland, consultant to DiSalle, and father of a defeated Indiana Congressman; Herbert Meighan, defeated for re-election as mayor of Gadsden, Ala.; James G. Lyons, New York regional office, defeated for re-election to State legislature; Michael Howlett, Jr., Illinois temporary consultant, defeated for State treasurer.

Washington's full of party officials elbowing each other in rush to pie counter.

Statement by the Committee on the Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 9, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a statement by the Committee on the Present Danger. This committee is composed of outstanding citizens whose views merit the consideration of Members of Congress.

The statement follows:

A STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 7, 1951.*

Today General Eisenhower is scheduled to arrive in Europe to endeavor to create, and then to command, the free world's forces there.

As he begins this supremely important task, our people here are asking themselves how best to defend the United States, how to prevent a major war if possible, how to win it if it comes.

On these problems the Committee on the Present Danger ventures, completely without partisanship, to present its deeply held conviction: As he undertakes his new mission to Europe, General Eisenhower must be given full support by the American people. We must do this by creating balanced armed forces of great strength, and by giving the people of Europe a sense of our unity with them.

Certain facts are beyond dispute:

A menacing despotic power, bent on conquering the world, has twice in recent months in Korea resorted to aggressive war. But those attacks do not prove that Russia—which clearly directed both—will launch a major war. Much less do they prove that Russia is ready to start such a war at this time.

Europe is the next great prize Russia seeks. If Europe falls, the Ruhr with its coal and steel, the Atlantic ports with their shipyards, the whole industrial complex with 200,000,000 people possessing great scientific and technical skills, will be absorbed into the Communist empire against us.

The fall of continental Europe would remove any assurance that Britain would again be an unsinkable aircraft carrier and advance base. It may well mean the loss of the Middle East, the Mediterranean, and Africa. In such case, Russia would have the oil she so much needs, and the world's richest source of uranium—which lies in the Belgian Congo—would go to Russia to make atom bombs for use against us.

We learned belatedly in the First World War, and again in the second, that successful defense of the United States must be made in Europe. So in entering into the North Atlantic Pact, we sought to prevent a third world war by serving notice that an assault on Europe means war with the United States. And we fortified this position by keeping our troops in Germany and Austria, as well as by the Berlin airlift.

Fortunately our best course to prevent war now is the same as that required to win it if it comes—to make aggression unprofitable by restoring the power of the democracies. How the United States should do its part in this is in large part a military problem requiring the highest professional knowledge and experience. In this question our responsible military leaders are of one mind.

Only a few days ago, General Eisenhower expressed his faith that Americans can accomplish anything if they have unity behind their purpose. And he said that the defense of Europe can be made successfully "if there is unity among Americans and if their allies understand this." The depth of his conviction that the defense of the United States must, if possible, be made in Europe is proved by his sacrifice in undertaking his new task.

Many Americans are troubled by the thought that we will send large additional forces to Europe before we can be certain that other free countries will make the full effort necessary for success in the joint plan. But the practical question before us does not involve this risk.

Today we do not have anything more than token forces which we are in a position to send to Europe. Before any army of substantial size can be trained for such a purpose, General Eisenhower will have had an opportunity to determine that those people of Europe who love freedom as we do have the will and the stamina to make a real defense possible.

Even those who would now have us suspend all military and economic aid to Europe have not proposed that we withdraw our troops from Germany, Austria, and Trieste. They do not recommend that we fail to live up to our obligations under the Atlantic Pact. They know that to take those steps would be to give up at once most of that for which we have made enormous sacrifices almost every day since the dark summer of 1940.

So the real questions presently before us are whether this country should not prepare forces to be ready for use in Europe on General Eisenhower's recommendation, and whether we should give a convincing reaffirmation to the people of Europe of our unity with them and of our leadership in setting up an effective defense. If we are to do so, and this committee believes we must, our course is clear: First, to build up with the utmost possible speed balanced armed forces of great strength; second, to make it clear that we are prepared, when these are ready, to dispatch adequate forces to Europe at such time as General Eisenhower may decide that a proper effort will be made by Europe in its own defense and that the total forces—theirs and ours—can be effective.

Today one question stands clear before the American people: Shall we help create the

conditions necessary for the success of General Eisenhower's great mission? It is the firm conviction of this citizens' committee that in its own self-interest this Nation can and must do this now.

Committee on the Present Danger: Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul William Douglas Arant, James Phinney Baxter III, Laird Bell, Lewis H. Brown, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, Robert Cutler, R. Ammi Cutter, Harold W. Dodds, Charles Dollard, William J. Donovan, Truman E. Gibson, Jr., Meta Glass, Edward S. Greenbaum, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, William C. Menninger, Frederick A. Middlebush, John Lord O'Brian, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Stanley Resor, Theodore W. Schultz, Robert E. Sherwood, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Stearns, Tracy S. Voorhees, Henry M. Wriston.

Farm Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a very informative letter from an outstanding farmer of my congressional district regarding the number of displaced persons who have abandoned farm work after having been admitted to this country for placement on our farms. My constitutent, Mr. Howard W. Greiner, of Wellman, Iowa, states so effectively the situation that confronts him and his neighbors that I am including his entire letter of January 10 in my remarks so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read the situation as he has reported it to me.

The letter follows:

WELLMAN, IOWA, *January 10, 1950.*
Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: It is becoming more apparent every day that we farmers in Iowa and other States are facing a menacing situation, our labor shortage.

I am probably classified as an over-family-sized farm operator. I manage 570 acres here in Washington County, southwest of Wellman. Last year I sent to town over 224,000 pounds of pork, or approximately 1,600 head of hogs, all farrowed and raised on the farm. I feed 100 head of cattle and have other enterprises such as eggs, etc. The plans this year are for more, as our President requested. But the labor situation has me worried. I am sure you can see that I cannot operate like this without help. I now have two Polish DP families, having had one for nearly 2 years, and one for 14 months, but actually live in daily fear that they will pick up and leave us for city jobs. These DP's are all dollar shopping. Of the 10 DP's settled in this community, only 2 remain. The rest have gone to cities for factory jobs. Don't you agree that there should be some provision to keep these people on farms as laborers? They feel no obligation to us "for now we are in America we do what we want," as one told me. Don't they owe America something? I have built for one family a new four-room house any American would be happy to own, pay them both $140 per month plus houses, meat, milk, eggs, electricity, etc., but they say that is nothing.

I am a veteran of World War II, a pilot officer, and was a German prisoner of war, but that is beside the point. My point is this: I am in the Reserves and may be called to active duty. I have a father incapable of manual labor, who could run this farm on a limited scale if I had to go, provided we could keep our help. But what could we do without it? Washington calls for increased production, but how can we at this rate?

After seeing Europe in the last war I agreed that the DP bill was all right, feeling that there are a lot of good people. But now I feel that these DP's are all money hungry, wanting to give America nothing and take everything. Can't you get these people back to the farms? They declared they were farmers in order to get here, as one said, "we no farmer, we no come." After dealing with them for 2 years I am afraid Uncle Sam made a big mistake. Some day the soup lines will be miles long in the cities and these DP's will be in front. Here is a potential labor force for farmers, but there will have to be some immediate freezing done somewhere along the line, or we will all want for pork chops and ham.

Can't we get a law to bring these folks back to the farms, and the farmers who sponsored them, who are being left holding the bag?

Hoping to hear from you, I am,
Sincerely yours,
HOWARD W. GREINER.

Excerpts From Remarks by National Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of the American Legion, Before Meeting of National Executive Committee of Jewish War Veterans, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Sunday, January 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, the national executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans held a meeting in the Statler Hotel in Washington.

Commander Erle Cocke, Jr., of the American Legion, made a visit to the group. He made a brief address, and in appropriate and well-chosen language dealt with some of the current problems of our people and our Government.

The substance of Commander Cocke's address follows:

There is no place in a fight for survival for fighting among ourselves. There is no moral or patriotic ground for any American to seek political or personal profit out of the present emergency. I believe that most Americans—including a great majority on Capitol Hill and in the administration—recognize these facts and are living by them. What we must do is use all of our personal and organizational influence to reduce the number of exceptions.

I say it is high time that sniping at military leaders by uninformed and inexperienced sources should be halted. No one is infallible; everyone makes mistakes, generals and admirals no less than Cabinet members and Senators. But the fact is that some of the very people who now serve to discredit our military leadership and discourage public confidence in it, were themselves responsible in less critical days for discounting the warnings provided by that leadership.

The one value which all of us share and revere alike—the country which provides our liberty and way of life—is in desperate danger. We must put away the differences that divide us and rally around that uniting cause. Personal bias and pet hates are expendable; the lives and freedoms of Americans are not.

People are not born biased. Prejudice is not inherited. To the extent that we in our time can expose and overcome these destructive habits, the next generation will be spared the temptation to adopt them.

Service in the armed forces is a great equalizer and a great teacher. Those of us who have served know what it means to live and work with the other fellow—all kinds of other fellows—and to find out that people are basically alike under God. I can't recall a single instance of a man's religion or family tree being held against him in the combat zone.

America has been described as the melting pot of the world's people. We will do well, particularly in these tense days, to realize that the melting process is not yet completed—and that each of us can perform an important patriotic service in that regard. One of the good byproducts of manpower mobilization, in my opinion, will be the opportunity afforded young Americans to better understand by association and mutual dependence the problems and background and thinking of their fellow countrymen.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times of January 15, 1951:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

In the global attempt to wipe out race murder the United States has placed itself unnecessarily on the side lines. The genocide convention of the United Nations formally became part of international law last week, 90 days after its ratification by 20 members, more than 2 years after its unanimous adoption by the 1948 Paris Assembly of the UN. Yet the American Senate is still unresolved about the pros and cons of the issue.

The United States has come close to lining up formally with those nations convinced that history has gone far enough without making it an international crime for either a nation or an individual to attempt the extermination of national, racial, religious, or ethnic groups. Last year ratification was urged by a subgroup of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Similar sentiment was expressed by a cross section of the population, led by President Truman. Yet the Eighty-first Congress, arguing over reservations, went into limbo without final action.

When adopted by the UN the genocide convention was heralded as a vivid manifestation of man's hopes. That such a pact was necessary has been demonstrated with tragic repetition throughout history, from the days the

Romans tossed Christian martyrs to the lions to a more contemporary period, the days of Lidice and the Nazi murder camps.

Now the United States is working round-the-clock to rally the west to preserve its freedom. Toward this end the new Senate can make a substantial contribution; it can ratify the genocide convention.

The Late Julius H. Amberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of his home community, Grand Rapids, the State of Michigan, and the United States have suffered the loss of an outstanding American in the passing of Julius H. Amberg. The tributes paid this truly great and fine person by our President, General Marshall, and others are examples of the esteem in which he was held.

President Truman knew Julius Amberg during World War II when he as a Senator from Missouri headed the Truman investigating committee and Mr. Amberg represented the Department of the Army before the committee as Special Assistant to the Secretary of War. The President's thoughtful message to Mrs. Amberg is as follows:

I have heard with a sense of deep personal regret of the passing of your devoted husband who will be long remembered as a faithful and efficient public servant. My heartfelt sympathy is yours.

Gen. George C. Marshall, presently Secretary of Defense, likewise paid high tribute to this great citizen. The general's respect for and appreciation of Julius Amberg is best shown by the wonderful message to Mrs. Amberg which reads as follows:

The death of Julius H. Amberg leaves me with a sense of personal loss.

As Special Assistant to the Secretary of War from 1941 to 1945, Mr. Amberg not only lightened the burdens of the late Secretary Stimson but he made some of my tasks much easier.

General Marshall had underlined the word "much" in the text as it was forwarded to Grand Rapids.

In representing the War Department before congressional groups concerned with the war program, he brought a personal integrity and a professional excellence that were of immeasurable value.

A Navy veteran and a public-spirited citizen, Mr. Amberg typified the American whose passing is a severe loss to the country.

A résumé of his very successful legal and civic career should be included in my remarks.

Mr. Amberg was special assistant from 1941 to 1945 to Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, who was a classmate at Harvard law school. They were editors of the Harvard Law Review.

During the First World War, Mr. Amberg served for a time as assistant to Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, who was then an adviser to the Secretary of War.

He began his career at Chicago in 1910 as an attorney for the Federal Trade Commission and opened a practice here in 1915. He was chairman of the Kent County Relief Commission from 1933 to 1936. Before that, he had headed the Committee of One Hundred, which surveyed relief problems and recommended changes in handling of the city's relief agencies.

Recently Mr. Amberg was chairman of a technical advisory committee of the Council of Social Agencies which brought about the Hamilton Hospital survey for Grand Rapids. He was president of the Michigan State Bar Association in 1939–40.

Several years ago Mr. Amberg, as a leading citizen in his home town, unselfishly led a successful recall movement for the recall of the incumbent in the office of mayor. This civic effort made willingly but at great personal sacrifice, undoubtedly contributed to his passing at a relatively early age.

Mr. Amberg has been eulogized by the newspapers in his home community. The Grand Rapids Press comments are as follows:

In the death of Julius Houseman Amberg Grand Rapids has lost one of its most distinguished and most effective citizens. Nationally he was known for the important services he rendered his country throughout World War II as special assistant to Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson in the years 1941 to 1945. His city and State knew him as a brilliant attorney with a long record of legal accomplishments to his credit.

Grand Rapids also knew him as a man devoted to the public welfare and the cause of good government. He was the best kind of citizen, who not only has ideas as to how public affairs should be handled but gets out to fight for them. He never sought public office, but time and again his community came to him for leadership in helping solve its problems. At the depth of the great depression of the 1930's it called on him to head a committee of 100 to survey the city's desperate relief problems of that period and to outline a decent, workable relief program.

Seventeen years later it again was to appeal to him to lead a civic campaign, this one for decent city government. The effectiveness of Citizens' Action from the time he accepted the assignments as its president up to the present moment has been due in no small measure to the time and effort he expended on its behalf.

Scores of persons will remember him as chairman of the Kent County Relief Commission from 1933 to 1936. To his office came a steady file of unfortunate persons in need of material assistance or advice. He had time for all of them. Hundreds had cause to be grateful for his attention.

Mr. Amberg's intense interest in the other person's welfare did not begin or end with his service on the relief commission. He was identified with the Community Chest for 30 years, including 5 years' service as its president. He served as chairman of a special council of social agencies committee which cleared the way for the Hamilton Hospital and health survey. He was trustee of Butterworth Hospital for 28 years and a trustee of the Grand Rapids Foundation.

These were some of the services he performed for the public. No man gave more unselfishly of himself or of his time and knowledge. It was Grand Rapids' good fortune to have him as a lifelong resident. And because he lived and worked here so long and so effectively, his loss will be keenly felt.

The Grand Rapids Herald editorial likewise paid high tribute to this outstanding citizen and is as follows:

Grand Rapids and the Nation lost an outstanding citizen when death came Tuesday night for Julius Houseman Amberg.

His untimely passing leaves a void not only in the legal profession, where he was a brilliant figure, but in the civic enterprises that gained by his guidance and dynamic leadership.

As Special Assistant to the Secretary of War in World War II he played a large role in marshaling the forces of victory, and the Presidential Medal for Merit was the Nation's token of appreciation.

It was in his own city, however, that he was most honored, not alone for his intellect and his achievements but for his character. Liberal, progressive, deeply concerned for his fellow men, he stood for principles above prejudice or partisanship.

Throughout his professional career here, Mr. Amberg, member of an old Grand Rapids family known for good works, devoted much of his time to social and welfare projects.

Among these were his chairmanship of the committee of 100 which surveyed relief problems and his service as chairman of the county relief commission in the depression days of the 1930's, the presidency of the community chest which honored him as citizen of the year in 1938, and his leadership of the Council of Social Agencies and United Hospital Survey Committee whose findings resulted in a hospital building program and other improvements now going on.

Although never seeking public office for himself, he was at times a leader in politics when his conscience dictated political action.

His death at the age of 60 cut short a life of great usefulness. He leaves the imprint of his sterling character and accomplishments on the hearts and minds of his fellow citizens.

It was my great privilege to be associated with Julius Amberg in the practice of the law. His achievements and his ability in his profession are well known, but those who worked with him as an associate perhaps understood and appreciated his great talents, his profound knowledge, and his superior integrity better than the public generally. The legal profession has lost one of its finest.

On behalf of the citizens of Grand Rapids and the multitude of Julius Amberg's friends throughout the Nation I consider it an honor to make permanent his records as an example for all future generations. He and all for which he stands has been and will continue to be an everlasting inspiration.

The Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power—A Progress Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

delivered by me before the New York State Bar Association, January 24, 1951:

It was only a year ago that it was my pleasure to address you gentlemen and to set forth the purposes and objectives of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power. The program of the subcommittee was at that time in its diapered infancy, still groping, still unweaned, still unsteady, and unsure. We have come a long way since then, not only toward understanding the issues and problems which are wrapped up in that all-embracing term "monopoly power," but also in discovering concrete remedies to fulfill the often thwarted purposes of the framers of the Sherman Act.

While the subcommittee has undertaken important economic studies to which it has devoted painstaking effort, I would like, first, to dwell upon its legislative activities. For this is a legislative subcommittee directed by the Congress to report "such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable."[1] It has been the main objective of the subcommittee to obey this mandate.

At the risk of being repetitious, I would like to discuss briefly what many people consider to be the most important piece of antitrust legislation in more than a quarter of a century. I refer to the Celler Antimerger Act,[2] which, after an abortive legislative history some two decades in duration, finally emerged from the Eighty-first Congress during the death throes of its last session and was signed by the President less than a month ago.

The muse of history possesses all the whim and caprice of woman. By what strange oversight the zealous and learned men who authored that ambitious statute, the Clayton Act, neglected to provide for all probable and possible contingencies when they came to its seventh section, I do not know. Nor can I find prescription for the myopic lenses through which peered those aging justices of the Supreme Court who could read in the clear language of the act words which prohibited one corporation from acquiring the stock of another competitor, but, insofar as the acquisition of assets was concerned, could discover no abiding intent or philosophy in an economic statute some twenty-six sections in length, incorporating by reference three other laws of historical importance, and running by its very terms, the lengthy gamut of the national economy, from banking to railroads. Why, too, Congress, for over 20 years allowed to go unheeded the persistent plaints of the Federal Trade Commission, the voices of two Presidents of the United States, and the repeated recommendations and reports of its own committees, I am at a loss to explain.

I fervently hope that this legislation, which bears my name, has not come too late. The growth of concentration of economic power in this country, despite the legislative barricades of the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and other antitrust measures, has been steady and unremitting. A report submitted to me by the Secretary of Commerce in December of 1949, indicated that in 46 major industries studied, four companies had already garnered more than 75 percent of the output. In 104 additional industries, four companies accounted for between 50 and 75 percent of total output.[3] As of 1946, one tenth of one percent of the total number of American corporations owned 49 percent of the assets of all American corporations, while 2 percent of the number owned 78 percent of the total assets.[4]

From one important standpoint, however, this measure has become statute at an appropriate time. Once more embarked upon a program of industrial mobilization, perhaps this time the nation will be able to prevent the concomitant growth of economic concentration which has in the past been a constant and faithful handmaiden of American military endeavor.

Between 1940 and 1947, for example, some 2,500 formerly independent manufacturing and mining companies ceased existence as a consequence of merger or acquisition.[5] Over 70 percent of the total number of firms merged or acquired during this period were absorbed by the large corporations which had assets of $5,000,000 or more.[6] A repetition of this phenomenon might well see the battle won but the victory lost. The Celler antimerger law has been a legislative attempt to overrule these economic precedents of history and to assure the preservation of a competitive economy. Its success has been entrusted to able hands.

Let me proceed now to some further legislative recommendations of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power. The more candid of the representatives of industry appearing before the subcommittee were quick to admit that the present criminal penalties for violations of the Sherman Act were completely ineffectual and inadequate.[7]

No better description of the futility of the present penalty of a maximum of $5,000 for each count in a criminal indictment under the Sherman Act has appeared than the statement of former Judge Simon Rifkind, a distinguished jurist, who will appear before one of the current sessions of this association. Said the judge, in imposing sentence upon six defendants in the case of *United States* v. *National Lead Co.*, on March 1, 1949:

"I cannot even go through the formula of looking the defendant in the eye and saying, 'Is there anything you wish to say before I pronounce sentence?' But I must confess that these amounts being substantially the maximum allowed by the statute, there is very little I can do or very little reflection that I can give this matter except perhaps to make the inevitable comment that a violation of the antitrust laws which persisted from some time in the early twenties to the 1940's, with respect to which the criminal liability is discharged by the payment of $5,000 a count, hardly seems to me to be the nature of penalty which is likely to discourage violations of the antitrust laws as far as the criminal laws are concerned but that is a problem for the Congress."[8]

The subcommittee, quick to recognize this debility in existing law, reported favorably to the full Committee on the Judiciary a bill which increased the criminal penalties of the Sherman Act from a maximum of $5,000 to a maximum of $50,000.[9] This measure was reported to the House[10] where it was passed under suspension of the rules on June 5, 1950. Despite the universally recognized need for this provision of law, H. R. 7827 met its death in the upper Chamber.

A similar fate befell H. R. 8763, another bill recommended by the subcommittee which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary[11] and which passed the House under suspension of the rules on July 17 of last year. This bill was not highly controversial and was introduced in order to provide for that highly clamored for clarification and uniformity in certain areas of the antitrust framework.

The first major aim of this bill was to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act so that the Government of the United States could sue in its proprietary capacity to recover actual damages suffered by it through violations of the antitrust laws. This section was an attempt to negate the holding of Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Cooper Corp.*,[12] that the United States was not a "person" within the meaning of that term as used in section 4 of the Clayton Act.

Another section of the bill established a uniform statute of limitations 6 years in length and applicable to both private and United States damage suits resulting from violations of the antitrust laws. Not only did it appear anomalous to the subcommittee that a right of action bestowed by Federal statute should be governed, as it is today, by the limitation statutes of the various States, but there seemed to be a serious defect in a law whereby substantial rights were left to the hazard of statutes of repose ranging from 1 to 20 years in duration.

The final provision of H. R. 8763 tolled the statute of limitations in favor of the private suitor during the period in which the Government was instituting its proprietary claim as authorized by the first section of this measure discussed above.

One of the most interesting, as well as significant, aspects of the subcommittee's activities during its growth and development into one of the important facts in the world of antitrust was its economic investigations, first of steel[13] and then of newsprint.[14] The subcommittee was fortunate to have had, during this time, the services of Edward H. Levi, now dean of the University of Chicago Law School, as counsel. I seriously believe that his conduct of the two economic studies which I have mentioned constitutes a substantial contribution to modern economic and legal thought.

Permit me to go into the facts uncovered by these two investigations in some detail, because I fear that the results of these inquiries have frequently been not understood, or, if you will, misunderstood, by many observers. When the report of the subcommittee on its steel investigation was finally released, for example,[15] it was reported in the press that the subcommittee, hopelessly confused by the issues presented during its lengthy investigation, had emitted an amorphous report which was the aftermath of indigestion from too much iron and steel.

While this report had no legislative recommendations or conclusions and parenthetically it is neither the intent nor the province of the subcommittee to legislate with regard to each studied industry, I do not see how anyone who merely perused the aggregated facts contained within the pages of this report could have failed to be impressed by the results of the subcommittee's investigation.

---

[1] H. Res. 137, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949).

[2] Public Law No. 899, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[3] Report, December 1, 1949, Department of Commerce, printed in hearings, Subcommittee on Study and Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial 14, pt. 2-B, p. 1436.

[4] S. Rept. No. 1775, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950), p. 3.

[5] H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 2.

[6] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial 14, pt. 1, p. 216.

[7] See, e. g., hearing, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial 14, pt. 2-A, pp. 563, 676; id., 81st Cong., 2d sess., pt. 4-A, p. 605.

[8] Cited in H. Rept. No. 1906, 81st Cong. 2d sess. (1950), pp. 2-3.

[9] H. R. 7827, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[10] H. Rept. No. 1906, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[11] See H. Rept. No. 2467, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950).

[12] 312 U. S. 600 (1941).

[13] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pts. 4-A and 4-B.

[14] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pts. 6-A and 6-B.

[15] The Iron and Steel Industry, report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., December 19, 1950.

The report pictures in minute detail the vast empire of the United States Steel Corp., extending from the bowels of the Mesabi to the peak of the Cerro Bolivar in Venezuela. This empire is served by more than 15 carrier railroads, over 1,500 miles of railroad trackage, 26 or more oceangoing steamships, and numerous barges and tugs. It has satellites engaged in the manufacture and production of supplies for drilling oil and gas wells, steel drums and barrels, structural steel products, fences, prefabricated houses, cement, wire products, and innumerable other products. For half a century United States Steel has dominated the iron and steel industry of the United States. In every facet of this complicated industry, one finds the presence of this corporation—ubiquitous, omnipotent.

The bible of the steel industry reads: "In the beginning there was ore." Look at the iron-ore supply of the Nation and you will find the United States Steel Corp. in possession of 51 percent of the ore reserves of the rich Lake Superior region from which emanates 80 percent of the country's iron-ore supply.[16] In 1946 it was estimated that the corporation accounted for 47 percent of domestic iron-ore production.[17] Some 12 or 14 steel companies resort to the ore-mining subsidiary of their competitor, United States Steel Corp., for iron-ore supplies.

The economic effect of this picture in the ore segment of the iron and steel industry was best summarized by the distinguished Secretary of Interior, Oscar Chapman, who said:

"I do not think it would make any difference whether you had 5 companies in the steel business or 500 companies in the steel business, if 1 or 2 companies controlled the source of raw material. The monopolistic features would be there in the controlling point, and it only would make a slight difference of distribution, and that is about all." [18]

Turning to transportation, a factor in the iron and steel industry which affects the accessibility of raw materials, the location of plants, the prices of ore and of finished steel, we again find the United States Steel Corp. a dominant element. As Representative BLATNIK, the Congressman from the Mesabi district, described this area of the steel corporation's power to the subcommittee:

"The key to the steel corporation's monopoly control is found in its ownership and operation of the only railroad which is available to haul Mesabi and Vermilion iron ore from the mines to the ore docks on Lake Superior, where the ore is relayed by ore boats to the steel mills of Gary, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh. This railroad is the 'captive' Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railroad." [19]

By owning the bottleneck of transportation facilities which serves the Mesabi Range, not only is the steel corporation's economic power over competitors enhanced, but it is in the fortuitous position of being totally unconcerned over what rates are established for the transportation of iron ore, because no matter how high the tariff, it is always paying itself.

In the production of steel ingots, which is the next stage in the evolution of iron into steel and steel products, we again find the industry under the hegemony of the United States Steel Corp. About a third of the Nation's capacity and production of steel ingots comes from the furnaces of the many plants of the corporation. Today, its ingot capacity is over twice that of its nearest competitor, Bethlehem, almost four times as large as Republic, and only slightly less than its four nearest competitors, Bethlehem, Republic, Jones and Laughlin, and National, combined.[20]

The corporation has also led the way in expanding into semifinished and finished products. It now has 42 percent of the total United States market in structural shapes, 49 percent of steel arils, 40 percent of wire rods, 41 percent of blanks and pierced billets for seamless tubes, and 60 to 70 percent of cotton ties. It is the leading producer in the industry of ingots, blooms, tin and terne plate, hot-rolled strip, strip for cold reduced black and tin plate, butt-welded pipe, galvanized pipe, seamless pipe and tube wire products including nails and staples, and wheels and axles.[21]

In many basic steel products, the corporation's participation in the market has been on the increase during the past decade. I mention only wire rods, tin plate, and cold-rolled sheets as examples. A factor of more significance, however, has been the great increase in the amount of hot-rolled sheets, the principal steel product consumed by fabricators, which has gone to the fabricating plants of the corporation rather than to independent producers. The percentage of hot-rolled sheets supplied to the corporation's subsidiaries almost doubled between 1940 and 1947, increasing from 5.7 percent of total output in 1940 to 10.5 percent by 1947.[22]

A partial list of finished steel products manufactured by the corporation includes wire clothesalines, door springs, garden tools, electrical wires, cement kilns, coal chemicals, barrel hoops, steel drums, nails, spikes, staples, and tacks. The total number of products made by the steel corporation is so great that Mr. Fairless, president of the corporation, preferred to "leave it at thousands." [23] Nor has the United States Steel Corp. been content to rule tranquilly over the entire steel industry. It has embarked upon invasions into such various alien fields as international steamship lines, cement, sulfate of ammonia, zinc mining, production of natural gas, and prefabricated houses.

I have attempted to portray here in rather broad strokes what is contained in much greater and more thorough detail the subcommittee's report on the iron and steel industry. But I think the consequences should now be stated in more explicit terms.

The real issue raised by these facts regarding the position of the United States Steel Corp. in the industry is not whether United States Steel is intentionally violating the antitrust law. While its past record indicates that it has participated in illegal schemes to fix prices, international cartels, and similar offenses, it has been no better or no worse in this regard than many of the large and important companies of the Nation. The essential question is one of monopoly power.

With the above facts laid clearly before the Nation by the hearings and report of the subcommittee, the United States Steel Corp. may no longer hide its light under a barrel, steel or otherwise. The corporation is a system of power, a large and spawning organization, a bureaucracy in the best sense of the word. Whether its power is characterized as "monopoly" or not is purely a matter of semantics. Whatever its name, it exists, in esse, to be seen and felt throughout the hamlets far and near of the country.

Has this agglomeration of power been for the best interest of economy as a whole? Certain evidence introduced during the steel investigation of the subcommittee suggests an answer. A study of the entire organization of the United States Steel Corp. under the aegis of the firm of well-known consulting engineers, Ford, Bacon, & Davis, in which the management of the United States Steel Corp. intimately participated, reached a number of significant conclusions. These findings, as summed up by Dr. George Stocking in testifying before the subcommittee, indicate that the United States Steel Corp. "was slow in introducing the continuous rolling mill; slow in getting into production of cold-rolled steel products; slow in recognizing the potentials of the wire business; slow to adopt the heat-treating process for the production of sheets; slow in getting into stainless steel products; slow in producing cold-rolled sheets; slow in tin-plate developments; slow in utilizing waste gases; slow in utilizing low-cost water transportation because of its consideration for the railroads; in short, slow to grasp the remarkable business opportunities that a dynamic America offered it. The corporation was apparently a follower, not a leader, in industrial efficiency." [24]

Whenever I attempt to express my analysis of the important factors in the steel industry, it is continually suggested that I am attacking the industry or its leaders. I wish to state explicitly that I am not criticizing the United States Steel Corp., nor am I in the least way reflecting upon Benjamin Fairless, its outstanding president. I have met Mr. Fairless and have found him a sincere, an honest, and an able man. The United States Steel Corp. has always been a patriotic company which has made significant contributions to this country in time of war and peace.

But I am pointing out a system of business organization in this Nation which possesses a great deal of economic power in many of the important crevices of the economy. With great sincerity, I am questioning whether this untold amount of power should rest in the hand of a small coterie of men, no matter how able. And I am suggesting, finally, that the centralization of private economic power, like the centralization of political power, results in inefficiency, red tape, bureaucracy, and waste.

I wish I were able to dwell upon the results of the subcommittee's newsprint inquiry as thoroughly as I have gone into its investigation of steel. In sharp contrast to steel, newsprint portrays a different system of economic organization of industry raising many important problems from the standpoint of monopoly power and the antitrust laws. But time will not permit this and I must refer you to the hearings and the subcommittee's soon forthcoming report.

While I am mindful of certain inhibitions precluding me from making full recommendations as a result of the newsprint inquiry prior to a full report by the subcommittee itself, I feel the conclusion is inescapable that the newsprint industry is one of the strongest and most powerful aggregation of monopoly partners extant.

This aggregation has absolute power to control prices, for example, to raise them or to keep them down. It has the power to prevent new establishments as competitors. There is an utter lack of social responsibility, lack of national or international

---

[16] The Iron and Steel Industry, report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., December 19, 1950, p. 22.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 4–A, p. 76.

[19] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 4–A, p. 899.

[20] The Iron and Steel Industry, report of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., December 19, 1950, p. 50.

[21] Id., p. 57.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, Part 4–A, p. 583.

[24] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 4–A, p. 967.

responsibility on the part of the industry's leaders who thumb their noses at public opinion on both sides of the border.

Since over 80 percent of the newsprint consumed in the United States comes from Canada, and since there is presently no alternative major source of supply, the Canadians have the power of life and death over American dailies and weeklies. Their power is so great that they have prevailed upon the provincial Legislature of Ontario to pass a bill making it unlawful for any person to remove its records to a point without the borders of that province. In this way they have forestalled complete inquiry into their affairs by the executive and legislative branches of this country. Records of companies doing business in the United States have been spirited across the border and rendered impervious to our subpena powers.

The practices I have mentioned strongly point to the need of appropriate legislation which possibly might require as a condition precedent for doing business in the United States that any foreign corporation agree to open its records for inspection by a duly constituted judicial or legislative body in this country.

In these monopoly practices, the American newsprint companies are not without fault. They are coconspirators with the Canadian companies. I have accordingly asked the Attorney General to renew the antitrust proceedings which were begun by a grand-jury investigation only a few years ago. This investigation was interrupted through protestation by the Canadians to the State Department. My investigation into this industry, however, has received the approval of the Department.

I would like, however, to conclude by discussing the functions of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power in a mobilization economy. There is generally a tendency during an emergency program to forget about the consequences of monopoly power and to toss in the antitrust sponge with accentuated vigor. This attitude should be deplored because the preservation of the overall principles of the antitrust laws are in no way inconsistent with the objectives of an industrial mobilization program. I am sure that it was in the belief that the President issued his directive of September 29, 1950, calling upon the defense agencies in charge of mobilization to eliminate, insofar as possible, "any factors which may tend to suppress competition unduly, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power." [35]

I believe that this subcommittee can serve a useful purpose in the emergency period. Monopoly power must not be allowed to impede the defense effort. It must not be permitted to stifle independent enterprise which is eager to contribute to all-out production. It must not be allowed to mulct taxpayers through monopoly profits which add to the cost of a mobilization economy. It must not be allowed to utilize Government controls as a sanction for perpetuating old discriminatory practices. It must not be allowed to thrive and grow under Government auspices when there are others who can perform necessary functions with equal facility.

The economic areas I have just delineated are certainly within the province of this subcommittee during the existing emergency. I also believe that the long-range objectives of the subcommittee—of discovering the causes of and remedies for monopoly power—should not be lost sight of. We fight to preserve a way of life. With the battle over and the blood lost, fate would be more than ironic if she then decreed that the American way of life should go by default.

[35] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, 81st Cong., 2d sess., serial 14, pt. 6-A and pt. 6-B.

Hungers, Wars, and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address given by Philip W. Pillsbury, of Minneapolis, president of Pillsbury Mills, Inc., at Kansas City Chamber of Commerce luncheon on January 10, 1951:

HUNGERS, WARS, AND PEACE

Kansas City and its neighboring town of Atchison are my second homes. As most of you know, 25 years ago I spent 2 years living in your neighborhood. Twelve years ago I spent another half year living at the Muehlebach.

Even since I was a kid of seven I have been whipping a fly rod, catching fish in the rivers of this big area. I am just as much at home on the banks of the Mississippi where our flour mills use its power at Minneapolis, as well as at our feed mills at Clinton, Iowa. In the upper waters of the Ohio, our paper mills at Wellsburg are dependent on this same area, as are our flour mills and office here on the big "Mo."

You and I have a common bond together in that we live, eat, and help develop the great food basket of the world, but food is not our only bond. We are United States citizens, and our country not only needs leadership, but help right now.

While our Representatives in Congress debate the imperative issues of foreign policy today—with all the world listening, and dependent on their decisions—it is our right and duty and our obligation as citizens to think about these same issues and reach our own conclusions.

Here in Kansas City we are about as far away from Korea and the Kremlin and Europe as we can get—but not to escape, for we are intimately affected by our military operations, our national and foreign policies. Distance is like the old gray mare, she ain't what she used to be. It's only one hop, doesn't even take a skip and a jump with today's seven league boots, to reach from the Kremlin to the grass roots. We are not here to escape. There is no escape from our responsibility as citizens. Besides, escape has never been our way as a Nation—equality is our way, equality of opportunity.

Man's struggle toward equality of opportunity has been intertwined for 6,000 years with his struggle for bread. Man's hunger has caused wars. Man has fought other wars to still other hungers than that for bread. Mankind hungers for peace.

My business is the food business. I'd like to be asking each of you: "What do you think we can do to make food a tool for peace?"

After all, the whole world knows that Kansas City is the point of focus of the fertile Wheat Belt of the United States, our heartland and the breadbasket of the world. Food, agriculture, built Kansas City. It's the center of the wheat, hog, sheep, and cattle country, of an agricultural productivity unequaled anywhere in the world. But it took people with courage, vision, hungers, and ideas to turn this prairie sod into a breadbasket.

In the middle of this plenty, in Kansas City, we are sitting in comfort almost on the same thirty-eighth parallel that Time magazine's man of the year, the American fighting man, is crouched on half a world away, defending an American outpost and defending the American idea. A short century ago his grandfather was extending the American idea, making it come alive, as a frontiersman, as a pioneer, opening the country west of us, opening the great Wheat Belt that runs up and down the one hundredth meridian north far into Canada and south deep into Texas; that 200-mile-wide swath of prairie ready, fertile, and waiting to produce billions of bushels of wheat for man. And what is to the west of that American fighting man on the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea?

Ancient lands with fertile soils, much like the prairies west across the Mississippi were 100 years ago, but shut off behind an iron curtain, teeming with starving millions who yearn for our plenty and our freedom, as man always has.

Why this perilous, tragic difference? What can we do about it?

Three hungers make the world go 'round. These three hungers are the dynamics of the peoples of the whole world, East and West alike—hunger for food, hunger for freedom, and hunger for power.

Man has an instinctive hunger for freedom. But this instinct for independence stops short of license and demands equality of opportunity not only for self but also for the greatest possible self-realization for all persons.

This concept of freedom—our common but unique concept of freedom—produces an infinite diversity of thought among us but restrains no socially worth-while force. It is this concept of freedom and its unmatched release of human energy, not our raw materials, that is the secret of our productivity. Our freedom is the freedom of ingenuity, freedom to invent and to choose.

The genius of our freedom is characterized by a little story about what happened not so many years ago in a small town in the northern end of the wheat belt. Some fathers got their heads together to find a way to keep their young sons busy and out of the pool hall, got the boys to put on a minstrel show—and they made some money. Then the problem was, what to do with the money. It was about the time boys everywhere were all excited about wireless, so they put the money into some "ham" wireless equipment. There weren't many boys in this small town—but look what happened to two of them: One is Dr. E. O. Lawrence, inventor of the cyclotron. The other is Dr. Merle Tuve, inventor of the V. T. (proximity) fuze. Just a few small-town men, a minstrel show, a few boys—plus a vision of freedom beyond self for the self-realization of others.

Here's another angle. Great Britain is to be praised for pulling out of India. You and I say India is free, but—England failed to leave an educational system in India sufficient to teach the people the value of freedom.

A bare month ago when we had a hundred American women and girls baking together at the Waldorf-Astoria to help us find the best recipes in the country, his Highness, the Duke, and the Duchess of Windsor paid these hundred women a visit.

I was highly interested to see the Duke stop and talk with one of his former subjects, a Hindu girl. She is Mrs. Rukmini Krishnasqamy, wife of a Hindu student at the University of Ohio, and herself a doctor of philosophy in education. Her forehead bears the mark of her heritage—high position in her homeland, India, where electric ranges are barely known. Charming, brilliant, modest, and humble, she told us that their great national leader, Prime Minister Nehru, has asked her to return to India to establish high schools for all India's young people to educate them to the concept of freedom, to teach them how to achieve freedom.

Hunger for food is an age-old twin hunger to man's hunger for freedom. Man has

always had to fight for food. For centuries, all over the world, man's very struggle for existence was largely for food. It was a battle of wits against the elements, animals, pestilence—and other men—for food. Armies with food won over famished armies and famished peoples. Food has often been the deciding weapon in war, in settling a peace.

Freedom, the release and realization of human energy, depends on food. If man has to work himself to exhaustion 13 or 14 hours a day just to provide himself with food, he has no time or energy for anything else. No food, no freedom.

In this country, more than any other and within the last 100 years, American ingenuity and inventiveness have rapidly reduced the time and energy required to produce an abundance of food. We have been able to do more about freedom—and out of freedom get the maximum release of human resources toward maximum self-realization.

On the contrary, in vast regions in Asia, millions will starve this winter and millions more work to exhaustion to keep barely alive. They have no time, no energy for freedom. They are simply so weak and exhausted physically that they are easy prey, and have been through the centuries of their hunger, to leaders with a third, threatening, and insatiable hunger—the lustful hunger for power.

With the growth and ever-increasing reality of human freedom in the free societies of the western world food has always been a powerful weapon, because it has given men energy to fight for freedom. Today, against the despots of the Kremlin, food can serve again as a powerful weapon if we have ingenuity enough to find the way.

Let's see for a moment what has happened in the past—it's full of clues to the future, to all mankind.

Life magazine, for instance, a couple of weeks ago reviewed for us the story of the decline of the Athenian democracy. The editors drew a parallel with the world situation of today. Athens in its hey-day was, like Kansas City, on the thirty-eighth parallel. Athenian democracy lost to Spartan military rigor, controlled thinking, and despotism.

Athenian democracy lost? Not really—the Athenian ideal and tradition of democracy and freedom to think has survived and lives a lusty life in most of the nations of the world today, and we have to be reminded who the Spartans were and how they lived.

A little later in history, Greek slaves taught their Roman masters. Through the Roman Empire and in spite of its despotism they gave the world new concepts of law and order—which give freedom to the individual. Meantime the stupid Roman emperors, vaguely aware of the urge for freedom among the slaves and their power, tried to appease them with panem et circenses—bread and the circuses—and the dross of that civilization disappeared into the past.

The concept of law, order, and freedom, and the seven free arts survived, lives in us all today.

Orientals—Attila and the Huns—overran much of the then western world, but did not conquer. All through the dark ages of the medieval, fires of freedom burned in men's hearts here and there, to emerge in a renaissance, a renewal of men's twin battle for food and freedom.

A tax on tea, taxation without representation, set off the American revolution by our food- and freedom-seeking founding fathers. They won independence for themselves, for the Nation, for us.

A little later, the people of France were starving, restive under taxes, confiscation of crops, the king's despotic hoarding and profiteering on grain. They put Marie Antoinette to the guillotine when she said, "Let them eat cake." Liberty, equality, fraternity began their rise again in France. Set back, to be sure, by Napoleon, but Napoleon, military man and strategist, leader and despot, fell back in utter defeat before Moscow. His men were starving, they were only fighting for Napoleon, not for freedom. Napoleon lost, freedom won.

In Europe, only a little while ago, foolish people turned to a Mussolini, a Hitler, who promised them arbeit und brot—work and bread. He unleashed the technical forces of hell on the emotions of man, and the modern technical forces of hell on wheels in war, but fell. Freedom won—but not quite enough. His hungry peoples, hungering for food, shelter and freedom, had too long a tradition of despotism. After World War I, the United States and Herbert Hoover had helped feed them. We had helped them set up a democracy, but we did not show them how to think democracy. We made the same mistake after Hitler. We must not make that mistake—anywhere in the world—again. We must fill the vacuum the despot leaves.

Or, let us ask, how did communism arise? Out of the twin hungers of the oppressed Russians under the Czars, after centuries of despotism. The Bolshevik revolutions of 1918 were the rise of people too-long starved for food and freedom. They have since succumbed as tools to their own slavery to the dictators of the Kremlin and their insatiable lusts for power. They are reported weary, disillusioned, hungry—almost ready to revolt.

At Bunker Hill one shot echoed for freedom around the world of that day.

Before and against the time threat of the blast that might echo doom for the world now our common job in the Western World is to do our best to fill the emptiness left in the hearts of the peoples who have revolted in their time for food and freedom, have been betrayed, but still seek.

There has always been time before, there may be now.

It was only in 1854 that Commodore Perry first penetrated the iron curtain aloofness of Japan and opened that Oriental nation—less than 100 years ago—to trade and fellowship with other nations. Long-term, the good of doing it must outweigh the evil. But, with centuries and dynasties of depotism behind them, any upsurge for freedom among the Japanese people must have helps to democratic thinking.

Mere American military discipline and administration will not do the job, if the Japanese are to become allies and an asset. This is true everywhere in the world our armed forces have gone—and withdrawn. Just when these hungry peoples were ready and waiting for—and we were almost ready to give—on the ground example of our most valuable, our priceless achievement, the twin concept of freedom and democracy, we have pulled out.

India and China were iron curtain lands, opened only recently to trade, then exploited by the western world. There, too, we failed to leave the true imprint of this concept, and we see these vast lands and populations—people—enmeshed by the lure of food and freedom via communism. Tibet, the Shangri la impenetrable except by a hardy few, has just been iron-curtained anew and with ease by the warring despots of the Soviet. Tibet? Think then of the buffer nations in Western Europe, as deftly maneuvered behind the Soviet iron curtain, yet all inhabited by people who yearn for food and freedom.

It is not hunger of people for food and freedom that keeps Asia and Western Europe apart—the east and the west of which Kipling predicted, "and never the twain will meet." It is the third hunger—lust for power—in a despotic few.

The latest report is that 15,000,000 will starve in the Orient this winter. They are of the people who thought, not too long ago, that they had destroyed their brutal despots for a brotherhood, for food and freedom—and got only new dynasts and dictators and less freedom and more misery. Their voices must still be crying, as in a wilderness, to be heard, but they know not what to do. These hungry peoples, throughout the world, people with hungering minds, must still be listening, yearning, hoping, as mankind always has.

All these peoples look to us—just as their ironclad despots fear their knowing the truth about us. That's why they have iron curtains, censorship, a party line.

That's why, like Hitler and Mussolini in their day, the iron-curtain men prostitute all the fantastic modern techniques of communication—rumor, newspaper, radio, even television, when they can—to distort, confuse, bewilder, split up and diffuse the strengths of the western world.

Our voice in no voice in a wilderness. It's a voice we can amplify by all our research and production and free creative thinking. It speaks, and can speak more, with instant impact even behind iron curtains, for there are no iron curtains to the mind. The blackouts of World War II could not black-out the dream of ultimate freedom in the minds of the underground patriots of France, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries. There are ways, and there is time—perhaps, if we are as quick about it as the American mind is quick about most things—to let the restive, even warlike peoples see the food on our tables, to let them learn of our strivings toward many freedoms, to let them see how we live together as friends and of showing them how to do it themselves.

To the masses in Asia Stalin and his henchmen promise food and land reform. The starving millions, hungering for food and freedom, listen and believe. They have no way of knowing the despotic plan of those who hunger for power to use them as fodder, as cannon fodder against the freeman of the Western World. The despots of the Kremlin fear our plenty, our productivity, our ideas, our ideals. That's why they draw iron curtains around their lands and their people. That's why they extend them around their satellite states.

It's up to us, as citizens, to ask our representatives to find and execute ways of combating the Kremlin promises of Asiatic land reform and food with our own food, with what we know about producing more food—and to do it quick. It does not mean tractors and gang plows and combines, now. It means things as simple as the next step from the forked stick to a plowshare. It means another ounce of food, perhaps, a day, for now, the difference between life and death. It might mean the difference between freedom and slavery.

Coupled with our productivity and military strategy—to defend the principle of a society of free and independent nations working together for self-realization—food might again be the leavening agent that will turn the tide against the tyrants of the Kremlin.

This is what we must ask Congress to do:

1. Enact realistic agricultural legislation that will strengthen the food-farm economy of the Nation.

2. Set up a competent bipartisan board to plan mobilization of and strategic use of food—and methods by which hungry peoples in other countries can themselves produce more food—as a weapon to prevent extension of this war.

This should be planned to make as much impact as possible as soon as possible as a preventive to further war. Methods of telling the whole world what we are doing should be employed to the hilt.

If this seems to require price controls and rationing, this decision should be reached and announced as soon as possible. But any such controls, to be effective, must be different from those of the last war. They must be controls that encourage, not tend to limit, production.

Latest estimates are that our breadbasket will have a carry-over of 450,000,000 bushels of wheat this year.

Do we have an equally adequate carry-over in terms of devotion to our freedom?

For with food comes release of energy for the cause of freedom—release of human energy powerful enough in the hearts of millions of people to defeat the evil hunger for power.

I apologize. I haven't really given you any real solution to beat this evil power that is closing in on our world. With all your help, we citizens of the United States must develop a creed far beyond the Marxian and the Mein Kampfs. I am not downhearted that this can't be done. I haven't been, ever since I heard Larry Gould, president of the Carleton College, point out that there had never been a cynical historian throughout history.

The world does improve.

Maybe our Congress has abrogated too much of their responsibility to too few.

Maybe you and I can really roll up our sleeves and help our representatives build a peaceful free world—not by giving away food, but by having a creed that teaches the hungering people:

"Come to us, be our friends. We know we have been the most disliked nation in the world—that is, next to communistic countries. You help us mend our ways and we will teach you how to produce more, both food and freedom. We will show you that only out of freedom comes the maximum release of human resources."

Concord Village, Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Judge Edward A. Richards, president of the East New York Savings Bank and president of Concord Freeholders, Inc., at a dinner of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board held Saturday, January 20, 1951, at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

CONCORD VILLAGE

Be sure that I appreciate this honor extended to me as president of Concord Freeholders by the Brooklyn Real Estate Board. Your purpose, I know, is to pay respect to the savings-bank stockholders of Concord Freeholders. It is only because I am at this time president of the corporation that this dinner is being given to me. Your plan and your purpose is to express appreciation to the savings banks who have joined together to do this good job for Brooklyn.

Concord Freeholders has existed now for more than 5 years. It was incorporated by savings banks to assist in getting for Brooklyn a civic center worthy of our borough.

That we may get dates a bit in mind, let me remind you that World War II ended in the second half of the year 1945, at which time Fiorello LaGuardia was mayor of our city, John Cashmore president of our borough, and Bob Moses coordinator of about every public improvement worth while.

Members of the board of estimate, doubtless prompted by John Cashmore, our borough president, decided that Brooklyn was entitled to, and should have, a better and more beautiful civic center.

Generally speaking, the area of the new civic center was to extend from Joralemon Street on the south to the bridge approach on the north, and from Fulton Street on the west to widened Adams Street on the east.

In that civic center was to be built a wonderfully fine supreme court building, a children's court, court of domestic relations building, and a welfare center, a public library, a Federal court building, and a high school to commemorate Gov. Alfred E. Smith.

Cadman Plaza was to be graded and parked and otherwise improved, and in the center of it a Brooklyn war memorial to commemorate the valor of boys from Brooklyn who gave their lives in World War II.

Borough President Cashmore and other members of the board of estimate, and Bob Moses, active in the whole scheme, appreciated the need of changing the character of the neighborhood to the east—that between Adams and Jay, Tillary and Sands, an area of about eight blocks, perhaps the oldest neighborhood, and in some respects, the most dilapidated area in all Brooklyn.

That was the property to be known as Concord Village, taken by the city as excess land in condemnation and sold at auction and bought by Concord Freeholders. It consisted of 107 parcels of land on which stood 98 dwellings, housing about 300 families and 50 stores and factories. The houses were very old; the tenants very poor. To properly exalt the civic center every building had to be destroyed and then the land redeveloped. The savings banks undertook that job.

Bob Moses was apparently assigned the task of selling the idea to the savings banks of buying that land and improving it. He proved to be a good salesman. One of the stipulations was that the large high-class apartment dwellings to be built would not cover more than 20 percent of the land and that the balance of the property would be nicely landscaped and parked.

It was on March 1, 1945, in the mayor's office in the city of New York, when the mayor, the borough president, and other city officials, Bob Moses, and four savings bank presidents entered into a gentleman's agreement to carry this deal through. The agreement bears the signatures of each member of the board of estimate, and of Bob Moses, as well as Elliott Eldredge, president of the Williamsburg Savings Bank; Philip Benson, president of the Dime; Fred Gretsch, president of the Lincoln, and the speaker, president of the East New York.

Promptly thereafter, the area designed to be used for the enlarged civic center, plus this excess land (now Concord Village) was acquired by the city of condemnation, and promptly thereafter a group of savings banks (14 in Brooklyn, 3 in New York, and 1 in Buffalo) agreed to provide funds to build the project. We then agreed to limit the coverage to 18 percent of the land area. The savings banks now interested in Concord Freeholders are, for the most part, the same group that originally undertook to do the job.

It is not always possible for a municipal authority, in the face of changing times and conditions, to carry through the plans of previous administrations. After Fiorello LaGuardia who, in my judgment, was in many respects a great mayor, came William O'Dwyer and, after O'Dwyer's resignation, and quite recently, came Mayor Impellitteri.

No one in this room need be reminded of the great changes that have come in the economic condition between 1945 and the present date. There has been a bit of inflation, and then a bit more, and then a lot more on top of that. Everything is up in value—except money.

The land needed for this enlarged civic center was acquired by the city 5 years ago, but none of the city buildings than proposed to be built have yet got beyond the planning stage and, in view of the present day world-wide outlook, may yet be a long time delayed.

The speaker has been president of Concord Freeholders since May 1949, prior to which time plans for seven buildings were prepared and filed. Early in my administration these plans were discarded and new plans drawn and filed. After careful study, and because of the lack of improvement in and around the civic center, the directors of Concord Freeholders felt that it should at this time do no more than to clear all of our land and build three 15-story elevator apartments on the north side of Tillary Street.

No one, however conversant with the rent laws that existed in 1949 and 1950, can appreciate the difficulty Concord Freeholders had in getting tenants to vacate these buildings.

Some years ago, and for 12 years, I was justice of the municipal court. At that time a warrant of dispossess meant just what it said. It mean get out. It does not any more. We now have a rent commission, the consent of which is necessary before a landlord can enforce a dispossess warrant. Ours is no longer a government of laws, but rather of committees appointed by the Executive. Whether or not that is justified, whether necessary, whether fair, right or proper, let others say, but I do say that by this means the Government has taken private property for private use without just compensation. That is probably an extension of the so-called emergency police power, but to same of us old-fashioned folks it seems like confiscation.

Now to get a tenant out it takes a final order of dispossess, the consent of a rent commission, and a few hundred dollars, after the court has directed his removal.

Notwithstanding that dispossesses were issued long before May 1949 when I became president, we did not get full possession for nearly a year thereafter. Demolition meantime had to be delayed.

The work of vacating these buildings required the services of an experienced organization. If it had not been for the fact that we were wise enough to employ the James Felt Co. and their staff of fine assistants to do the work, I do not know how he would have been able to make the progress we did, and to them I want publicly to express our appreciation.

I was not the first president of Concord Freeholders. Our old friend Phil Benson was president for several years. He was succeeded by Paul Connelly, one of Brooklyn's best builders and now president of the Fulton Savings Bank. Paul is well and favorably known to everybody in Brooklyn who knows anybody. Had his health been better, he would have continued as president of Concord Freeholders.

Our three buildings, now approaching completion, are 15-story elevator apartments and, because they occupy but 18 percent of the land, will have the appearance of being located in a fine park.

Let it be known that our savings banks are receiving no subsidy, nor concessions of any kind; no tax exemption; no aid in any way from the city, State or Nation. They are building the property as any investor would build any project and relying upon current rental values for a fair return on their investment. As nearly as we can figure it, these buildings with a normal vacancy will bring to the savings banks a net of 5 percent or less on their total investment after taxes and a proper charge for depreciation.

It is interesting to note that in 1945, at the time this project was conceived, it was assumed that these buildings would cost approximately $1,500 a room, and that the rentals could be from $18 to $20 a month per room.

The room cost of $1,500 once estimated has now become $3,500; the rent of $18 to $20 is now nearer $40. That may not be due wholly to inflated costs, but to some extent to the fact that all concerned believe that

on this site on Brooklyn Heights, next to this wonderfully fine civic center in New York City's best borough, we should have a fine type of building. There is already ample evidence that those who will occupy them will be glad to pay for their exceptionally fine appointments.

Savings bankers always remember, and must remember, that the money in their banks belong to depositors, and must always be safely and soundly invested. Our investment in Concord Village is safe and sound, and at the same time we are aiding the city in clearing up this area, and making possible a graceful and beautiful Brooklyn civic center.

We know we are building only three out of seven proposed buildings. God and Stalin willing, we will do the other four. I am personally very confident that these buildings will not only grace the civic center, but will prove popular with many of the best families in Brooklyn, and a fair and safe investment for the savings banks.

It is only occasionally that the law gives to savings banks the right to make such unusual investments, and when it does, the legislators usually provide for special attention by and approval of the State banking department, under whose jurisdiction we operate. That is true in the case of Concord Village.

At the time I became president of Concord, Elliott V. Bell was superintendent of banks, and our present superintendent, William A. Lyon, his deputy. I want to here publicly acknowledge the fine cooperation that we have had both from Elliott Bell and Bill Lyon. They have done more than just consent to our proposals—they have given every proposal prompt, careful and proper consideration and have been most helpful.

Unfortunately widened Adams Street, and the present condition of property to the west, is not today a very pleasant sight. City authorities expected to proceed faster. Perhaps some may wonder why, in these last 5 years or more, greater progress has not been made. Let me say to you that I think I know, about as intimately as any man, the trials, the tribulations, and the multiplicity of difficulties constantly confronting city officials. Let us all appreciate their difficulties and let us continue to have faith.

Barring an atomic bomb, I am sure you will be pleasantly astonished when you see the condition 6 or 9 months from now.

We Brooklynites are mighty thankful to the savings banks of Manhattan for the substantial help they have given this Brooklyn project, and more especially our thanks ought to go to the Buffalo Savings Bank, way up at the other end of the State, for their faith and confidence in us. We will not fail them. They have a safe investment.

The Savings Banks Trust Co. is a company wholly owned by savings banks. That company has undertaken to give guidance and direction to the financial problems involved in this development. They have thereby greatly helped the directors and the president in solving problems. To Gus Ihlefeld, president of the trust company, and to George Ficken, his able assistant, may I here say a word of sincere thanks and appreciation.

It has been said that a good executive is a fellow who knows how to get other people to do his work. I have lived long enough in Brooklyn to know the fellows who know how. Everybody in Brooklyn, who has had anything to do with the building trade in the last 30 years, knows Johnny Moran, formerly Brooklyn's superintendent of buildings. I was foresighted enough some years ago to take him into the employ of the East New York Savings Bank. When this job started, I made Moran supervising engineer. He has done a great job, both for the contractors and for me.

Our architects are Benjamin Braunstein and Alfred Ryder, men with whom I have worked for many years. Without their able and ever ready assistance, my days would have been longer and my work much harder.

The Paul Tishman Co. and the Sol G. Atlas, our builders who outbid seven other outstanding building contractors, have cooperated with the architects and with Johnny Moran, even though at all times they have not seen eye to eye

We have had many applicants for rentals, and from many a conditional deposit on a lease. Up to the present time no leases have been signed and no definite arrangement made with tenants because, until now, we have not been able to be sure when we can give possession. Personally I want not to put a single tenant into any of these buildings until they are fully completed and ready, and until I can be sure that the tenants will not be interfered with in any wise by mechanics.

Tillary-Center building—the building that sets back in the middle of the block between Adams and Jay—will be ready for occupancy on March 1; the Tillary-Jay building by May 1; and the Tillary-Adams building before the first of July.

I know I am talking to a group of real estate agents and brokers—a group of the best. I want to say to you that while we have a renting agent on the property to take care of people as they come in to look at apartments, we are very glad indeed to have any of you send to us the right kind of prospects and we expect, of course, to pay the usual commission on the closing of a lease. Come, or send someone, around with your prospects, or have them present a letter of introduction when they call. We want to know before we rent that the prospect is yours.

And now, before closing my remarks, let me mention the fine cooperation which I have had from my old and dear friend Phil Farley, borough engineer, and all under him in authority. John Cashmore and the borough president's office would not be the same without him. And then let me also say that when nobody seems to be able to get a job done, and we get plumb up against it, we call Bob Moses on the telephone.

Mayors may come and mayors may go, but Bob goes on forever.

Price Controls on Meat and Meat Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a telegram from the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at Alliance, Nebr., addressed to Eric Johnston, the Economic Stabilizer.

Mr. Speaker, the meat-producing sections of the country are greatly disturbed about how far controls will go in governing the production, processing, and distribution of meat and meat products. I can remember that under the OPA controls, it took 600 words to define one particular cut of meat and there were dozens of cuts. If the Economic Stabilizer expects to control more than 8,000,000 items, the city of Washington will become the "District of Confusion" instead of the District of Columbia.

I have stated several times, that under existing circumstances in this country, price controls will not work. The people have no heart or confidence in what the administration is trying to do in foreign affairs. They have no heart for what is going on in Korea. They have grave doubts about the emergencies that this administration is constantly stirring up. Laws cannot be made effective unless they have the support of the majority of the people. There are too many leaks in the dam which is trying to hold back inflation. These leaks are caused by policies adopted by Government. The flood of printing-press money and spending beyond our means and income has gone on for such a long period of time that it seems doubtful the present orders issued by ESA will bring anything but confusion and less production. The orders issued for the so-called freeze will soon be as full of holes as a Swiss cheese.

The cattlemen of the country want to cooperate, but they realize that if controls are to be imposed upon their industry, the ultimate end will be less production. Increased production in all lines of endeavor is the keynote to our ultimate success in the present crisis. It does not follow common sense that agencies of Government should advocate increased production on the one hand and then, through controls and rationing, work in absolute opposition to the desired results.

Experience with the old OPA should have convinced the Government that flourishing black markets have already geared their machinery to swing into full operation the moment controls become a reality. That happened under the old OPA. It will happen much quicker now because these black marketeers have had some experience.

Our Government, through controls can strike a devastating blow to civilian morale. The controls advocated will do that to the livestock industry. The controls will take from the livestock and meat industries the necessary confidence and assurance they need for full production.

ERIC JOHNSTON,
Economic Stabilizer,
Washington, D. C.:

The Nebraska Stock Growers Association, representing the livestock producers of Nebraska, is greatly disturbed by the gravity of the situation confronting us and the everlasting threat of a program of controls.

Recognizing the need for stabilization of our economy, including meat prices and, at the same time, realizing the need for increased production of meat, we have for the past 4 months urged our Nebraska delegation in Washington to oppose controls. It is our sincere, honest judgment that these ends cannot be accomplished by direct controls, price ceilings, rationing or subsidies. It is our unanimous conclusion that controls on the livestock and meat industry are neither feasible nor practical.

Experience with price controls and subsidies during World War II are ample evidence that these controls are unworkable and will be detrimental to the whole economy. Price ceilings imposed now will have the effect of decreased livestock production which will become increasingly acute 2 to

5 years hence, at a time when the need for meat will probably be much greater than at present.

The only way to achieve stabilization is by increased livestock production. Organized farm and ranch livestock groups are certain this can be obtained if hampering controls are not imposed.

From our knowledge of the industry we represent and because we know the calamity that will result from adoption of a system of controls over that industry, but primarily because we as American citizens want to avoid these evil results and to do the things best for our country, we urge that no program of controls be adopted for this industry.

W. A. JOHNSON,
Secretary-Treasurer, the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, Alliance, Nebr.

Our One Asian Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, these are momentous times for the United States. Since the end of the Second World War we have given of our substance in order to help other peoples to rehabilitate themselves from the ravages of war. Through the Marshall aid plan and the European recovery program we have given tangible proof of our friendship and good will.

In Korea, American boys are fighting and dying to repel aggression, to give teeth to the otherwise futile provisions of the United Nations Charter, to give the world that collective security it needs in order to have peace. But Soviet Russia, bent on world domination, would not have it so. American success in Korea would spell the doom of Russia's aggressive plans. Hence, when victory was within our reach in Korea, Stalin saw to it that his satellite, Mao Tse-tung dispatched his Chinese Communist hordes to come to the aid of the North Koreans. Communist China committed a brazen and flagrant violation against the United Nations forces in Korea.

The United Nations in Lake Success should have immediately and without equivocation branded Communist China as an aggressor. The United States proposed a resolution to that effect. That was the test for us to find out who are our friends and allies in the United Nations, who are those who are willing to stand by us. A so-called Asian-Arab bloc was formed against us—12 of them—most of them we have helped. In the guise of conciliation and search for peace, that bloc proposed one resolution after another that if approved would have meant humiliation for the United States.

Fortunately, a voice was heard that stood for decency and justice, not a faint voice but a clarion call, the voice of an Asian, a Filipino, and he lashed out at all those who wanted appeasement, and he spoke the words of loyalty and truth. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Minister of the Philippines, who was last year's President of the General Assembly, took the floor again and again in defense of the United States and democracy, and every time he spoke he won America's heart, for he was speaking for the American people and for all those who love peace.

Mr. Speaker, once again the Philippines, in the midst of a crisis, has come to our help. In 1941, of all the subject peoples in Asia, only the Filipinos rallied to the defense of their sovereign Nation, the United States. Now, 1951, when 12 Asian and Arab nations refused to throw their lot with us, the Philippines did not only side with us but its spokesman valiantly, ably, and brilliantly led the fight in the United Nations to assert American principles of democracy and freedom and world security. How fortunate we are that we can count on such tried and true friend. In war, he fought for us in Bataan, Corregidor, Leyte; in peace, he is fighting with equal devotion in Lake Success.

Under unanimous consent of the House, I ask to have printed in the RECORD one of the latest speeches made by General Romulo before the United Nations, a rebuttal of the statements made by the representative of the United Kingdom and by members of the 12-nation Arab and Asian bloc:

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EXTEMPORANEOUS REBUTTAL MADE BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, FOREIGN SECRETARY OF THE PHILIPPINES, IN REPLY TO THE DELEGATES OF INDIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, BEFORE THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JANUARY 25, 1951

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reply to the statements of the two speakers who have just preceded me, the delegates of India and of the United Kingdom. I will speak frankly and plainly because no useful purpose can be served at this time by vague or evasive generalizations.

Is it a surprise to anyone that, as the delegate of India claims, Peiping should be disposed to accept this proposal? Why should Peiping reject a proposal which is cut exactly to the pattern of its demands?

It will be noted, first of all, that the draft resolution bases itself entirely on Peiping's reply of January 17. That reply, as is generally known, completely rejected the basic principle approved by the first committee, namely, that cease fire must precede negotiations. Peiping has stubbornly insisted that negotiations must come before cease fire.

This is exactly what this draft resolution seeks to accomplish. It proposes that the General Assembly establish a negotiating body of seven governments, exactly as listed and nominated by Peiping, to secure further explanations from Peiping of its reply of January 17 and make arrangements for a peaceful settlement of the Korean and other far-eastern problems, also exactly as demanded by Peiping.

Thus, instead of maintaining, as we should, the just principle of cease fire before negotiations, we are being led by an ingenious formula of words to reverse ourselves and capitulate to Peiping's demand of negotiations before cease fire. Indeed, the situation is even worse than this, for the committee will note the curious fact that there is no mention whatever of cease fire in the operative part of the draft resolution. The idea of cease fire has vanished altogether, and all that is left is elucidation, amplification, and negotiation at the pleasure of Peiping and on its terms.

This proposal has one undoubted merit—it has been drafted with extraordinary skill. On the excuse of seeking further elucidation and amplification of Peiping's intentions, we are being induced to abandon our basic principle of cease fire before negotiations, and we are supposed to like it and not to notice the difference.

I am afraid that what we have here is either an optical illusion or a feat of prestidigitation. In the beginning, we were quite sure that cease fire was there, and then suddenly it is not there anymore. It is like seeing a rope rise out of nothing and then disappearing in the thin air.

What has happened to create this illusion?

Last Monday, in the middle of the debate on the United States draft resolution, the text of an alleged clarification from Peiping was placed before this committee. That message vaguely hinted that Peiping might agree to a cease fire for a limited period so that further negotiations might be undertaken. The necessary doubt, confusion, and vacillation having been planted in the minds of some delegations by this so-called clarification, we are now confronted with a proposal which seeks to make capital of the resulting indecision that has made itself felt during the past few days.

But the committee will note that the draft resolution makes no reference whatever to Peiping's supposed clarification of January 22. Yet the existence of that message is implicit in the proposal. This is but another aspect of the optical illusion to which I have already referred. Since no such clarification has, in fact, been made to the committee, the operative paragraphs have no relevance to the preamble, and the draft resolution becomes an absurdity. We would, in effect, be saying to Peiping that, having noted its reply of January 17 rejecting the principle of cease fire before negotiations, we have decided to abandon that principle in favor of Peiping's demand for negotiations before cease fire.

The Philippine Government is firmly of the opinion that no resolution calling for negotiations on existing issues in the Far East can be entertained by this committee on the basis of Peiping's reply of January 17. We can give due course to such a resolution only if and when Peiping accepts clearly and without equivocation the principle of cease fire before negotiations. Any move, however artfully contrived, to propose negotiations before cease fire must therefore be rejected as a snare and a deception. I am confident that the majority of the committee will resist the dangerous sorcery of such proposals.

The Philippine delegation cannot agree with the delegate of the United Kingdom and consent to a proposal which would place the United Nations in the abject position of begging for one kind word or gesture of explanation from Peiping. Peiping is free to make any elucidations or amplifications that it wants directly to the United Nations. No new body or procedure is needed for this purpose. If Peiping undergoes a change of heart, it can even advance new or substitute proposals. Alternatively, the group of 12 Asian and Arab states can request Peiping to make such clarifications or to submit new proposals directly to the United Nations through the President of the General Assembly. But I do not believe that the group of 12 can properly ask the General Assembly to go around begging for such crumbs of hope and consolation as the authorities of Peiping may deign to throw in our direction.

The position of the Philippine delegation is clear. We maintain that, at this stage, the only resolution that can properly be considered by the committee is the draft resolution submitted by the United States. That proposal has been adequately explained and discussed. Indeed, it presents no diffi-

culties of interpretation since it is plain and unambiguous and corresponds exactly to the facts. It recognizes Peiping's reply of January 17 for what it is—as a rejection of the United Nations proposals to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea, and then proceeds to do three things: It finds that Peiping is engaged in aggression; it calls upon the Peiping regime to cease hostilities against the forces of the United Nations and to withdraw its troops from Korea; it affirms the present United Nations policy of continued resistance to aggression in Korea; it requests a committee to consider additional measures to meet the aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly; and it keeps the door open for a cessation of hostilities and the peaceful settlement of the Korean problem.

If we rule out the usual distortions of Peiping's allies in this committee, I believe it true to say that no serious challenge has yet been made to these clear and straightforward propositions. By directly assisting the North Korean aggressor, the Peiping regime is itself engaged in aggression. Who dares honestly to question this statement? I do not believe that the Asian and Arab states would challenge this statement because, as I reminded the committee the other day, they themselves condemned 2 years ago the military action against the Republic of Indonesia as a breach of the peace and act of aggression, and only last June supported the Security Council action on Korea. They may doubt whether it is prudent or whether it would serve a useful purpose to pin the label of aggressor on Peiping, but I believe they all concurred in the finding of aggression which is contained in the draft resolution and which was bluntly affirmed by the distinguished delegate of Iraq the other day when he declared that, of course, Peiping is actually committing aggression.

There are two misconceptions about this draft resolution that must be dispelled. The first was pointed out by the Australian delegation yesterday, and this is the notion that it pro ides for further economic, military, or diplomatic sanctions against the aggressor. The draft resolution does nothing of the sort. It authorizes no sanctions that are not already being enforced under existing resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. It is logical and it is prudent that additional measures to meet the aggression should be considered, but such measures will, at all events, require subsequent action by the General Assembly.

The second misconception is that this resolution would close the door to such negotiations as Peiping might be moved to undertake at a later stage. The last paragraph of the United States draft resolution makes sure that the door is kept open for any subsequent negotiations on just and honorable terms and in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The counsel of prudence of the Indian and United Kingdom delegation cannot go so far as to induce us to make the naive assumption that Peiping would reject the need for a peaceful settlement merely because we have decided to call a spade a spade. And it is equally naive to think that Peiping and its allies would be deterred from continued or further aggressions merely because we have desisted from calling a spade a spade. The aggressive plans of Peiping and its allies do not depend upon verbal affirmations or abstentions of this kind. Their aggressive aims are determined solely by a cool and objective calculation of profit and loss, benefit or disadvantage. If the free world cowers before the aggressor, he will press his advantage; but if we stand up to him, not only physically but with our whole moral strength, he will reconsider his ways and there is a good chance that he may be dissuaded from further aggressions.

May I tell my Indian and British colleagues that to us, to adhere to the truth, to stand by right principles—this is the highest form of morality among nations as among individuals. If the United Nations evades its clear duty and sacrifices truth to convenience and principle to fear, then it is utterly lost.

In my statement last Monday, I recounted a significant bit of United Nations history to show that 2 years ago, under the leadership of Prime Minister Nehru, 15 Asian and Arab states, including the Philippines, met in New Delhi to condemn the military action against the Republic of Indonesia as a breach of the peace and act of aggression. The words that were spoken and the action that was taken there have become part of the political heritage of Asia. I recall them today in reply to the statement made by the delegate of India. Especially memorable was the speech made at the opening day of the conference in which Prime Minister Nehru said:

"If open and unabashed aggression is not checked and is condoned by other powers, then hope will vanish and people will resort to other ways and other means even though these might involve the utmost catastrophe. One thing is certain: there can be and will be no surrender to aggression and no acceptance or reimposition of colonial control.

"It was not without deep thought and earnest consideration that we decided to hold this conference. Believing as we do that the United Nations must be strengthened as a symbol of the new order, we were reluctant to take any steps which might appear to weaken its authority. But when the will of the Security Council was itself flouted, then it became clear to us that we must confer together to strengthen the United Nations and to prevent further deterioration of a dangerous situation. We meet, therefore, within the framework of the United Nations and with the noble words of the Charter before us."

One could wish—and I am addressing myself to the delegate of India—that we might again hear today from New Delhi, in a similar situation of "open and unabashed aggression," words of the same import and equal dignity.

One felt proud to be in that gathering of the representatives of Asia and Africa, for we had met to reaffirm our common faith in the freedom and security of more than one-half of mankind. Though we had no armies or navies or air armadas, our moral position was unassailable and we took heart from the knowledge that justice was on our side. This was the high-water mark of Asian strength and solidarity and I cannot believe that it is the desire of any of the countries in Asia to fritter away the moral prestige and power that was firmly established there.

Mr. Chairman: And now, let me reply to the delegate of the United Kingdom. In my recent readings of history—for history is an excellent teacher in a time of confusion—it was perhaps inevitable that I should review the events that led to and followed the Manchurian conflict of 1931. It will be recalled that after a suitable incident had been started by Japan, the latter immediately undertook a major campaign for the conquest of Manchuria. The League of Nations dispatched the Lytton Commission in the hope of finding a peaceful solution. But the conquest of Manchuria was completed before the arrival of the commission.

The United States, though not a member of the League, gave full support to the organization in its effort to end the conflict. Public opinion in the United States was virtually unanimous in denouncing the Japanese action as an act of aggression, and Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson based his policy on the system of collective security which rested on the League Covenant and on the Paris Peace Pact of 1928.

The Lytton Commission, however, thought differently. It made all sorts of excuses for the Japanese aggression, including the statement that "in Manchuria there are many features without an exact parallel in other parts of the world." While advocating an autonomous regime for Manchuria, it concurred in Japan's claim than Manchuria was its "life-line," and expressed concern that Japanese legitimate interests there would be safeguarded.

The Lytton Commission, of course, reflected the policy of Great Britain, which at that time had an alliance with Japan. Its action afforded ground for the belief that General Tanaka spoke the truth way back in 1927 when he said that Japan had sounded out the European powers and had secured from them the pledge of a free hand in Manchuria.

Thus, in Manchuria, started the chain of Japanese expansionism and aggression which in 1941, ten years later, culminated in the Japanese aggression against Southeast Asia.

What does this bit of history teach us, Sir Gladwyn? A great deal, if we are willing to learn. Use the word Korea instead of Manchuria, and Communist China instead of Japan, in this context—the other protagonists are the same—and the parallelism becomes startling indeed. A new Lytton Commission is being set up to placate the aggressor and to recognize the fruits of aggression. How can anyone suggest that the results will be different this time and that the United Nations, by appeasing Red China, will reap peace where the League of Nations reaped only the continuation of Japanese aggression?

To the delegate of the United Kingdom I say: If Secretary Stimson were still living, one wonders what he would say to the Lord Lyttons of today.

Though Stimson is dead, the perceptive intelligence which enabled him to tag aggression and to oppose it from the beginning has not vanished. His spirit has spoken through the many delegations that, having sought a just and honorable settlement with the aggressor, have now the courage to affirm the truth and to stand by the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

True Now as Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is taken from the January 17 issue of the Anaheim Bulletin, a daily newspaper in my district. It says in simple language something we should all think about, and now more than ever, as we are about to start consideration of a tremendous budget request, and as we face increasing controls and proposed panaceas for our self-produced problems:

TRUE NOW AS THEN

Many things which were said years ago when the national and world situation were entirely different are as timely now as the day they were uttered. These bits of wisdom by Edward Everett Hale are a good example:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

"You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

"You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

"You cannot aid the poor by destroying the rich.

"You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling the wage payer down.

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.

"You cannot establish sound social security on borrowed money.

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them the things they could and should do for themselves."

Power of Purse a Vital Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. George Sokolsky, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 19, 1951:

POWER OF PURSE A VITAL ISSUE
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The quarrel between President Truman and the Congress may resolve itself into an inquiry into the constitutional question of the power of the purse.

Even on the Democratic side it is evident that supporters of the President's policies feel that he should not, at this time, raise constitutional issues which need not be raised. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a supporter of Mr. Truman's war program, indicated that clearly.

The President's position, stated on January 11, is that he admits that Congress controls the purse, but that if Congress disagrees with him, he will go to the people.

Of course, that is precisely what Congress did in the last election: The whole of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate were then elected. By the only legal process available in this country the people were gone to and they made choices.

The Constitution is altogether clear on this subject:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

The power of Congress in the control of our money is absolute. Congress, in turn, is responsible only to the people, whose decisions are made at elections. The President may veto an appropriation bill, but he may not expend a cent unless Congress so authorizes him.

Ours is a government of limited and enumerated powers. No one can assert legal power; it must be granted either by the Constitution or by Congress. The money power is enumerated as belonging to Congress.

The object of this provision in the Constitution is to prevent a President from becoming a tyrant. After all, if he could raise and use money without restraint, he could govern as a dictator without authorization by Congress or by the interdicts of the Supreme Court. Our government would then be an autocracy.

Lord Bryce, in his masterpiece, the American Commonwealth, explains the congressional control of the purse as follows:

"If he were to engage in military operations—he cannot under the Constitution declare war for that belongs to Congress—the House might paralyze him by declining to vote the requisite Army appropriations.

"If he were to repeat the splendid audacity of Jefferson by purchasing a new territory, they could withhold the purchase money.

"But if, keeping within the limits of his constitutional functions, he takes a different course from that they recommend, if for instance he should refuse, at their repeated requests, to demand the liberation of American citizens pining in foreign dungeons, or to suppress disorders in a State whose government had requested Federal intervention, they would have to look on.

"To withhold the ordinary supplies, and thereby stop the machine of government, would injure the country and themselves far more than the President. They would, to use a common expression, be cutting off their nose to spite their face.

"They could not lawfully refuse to vote his salary, for that is guaranteed to him by the Constitution. They could not, except by a successful impeachment, turn him out of the White House or deprive him of his title to the obedience of all Federal officials."

In this phase of the debate, the Constitution looms large, for those who maintain that the so-called UN (90 percent American) police action is a subterfuge, insist that congressional control over the budget, peacetime or wartime, must not be bypassed by any device or subterfuge.

The issue is tremendously important. For if we are not fighting for constitutional government, what are we fighting for?

Unless Congress can control the power of the purse, this country may become a dictatorship. Does it matter by what name a dictator is called? Does it matter by what scheme and device the Constitution is bypassed? Does it matter how skillfully a legalistic mind discovers a loophole through which he can snare a trick? The effects are the same.

Therefore, the fight in Congress over this issue may go far afield. It may even lead to an inquiry as to expenditures during the past 20 years.

Col. C. H. Lindsay, the Miracle Man of Cypress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks I wish to include those which I made recently after a trip through a most picturesque cypress swamp in Louisiana.

There is a song about a dream walking and talking. Well, do you ever see a dream growing? If you had been with me recently, you would have been exceedingly privileged to have seen thousands of rare and very remarkable dreams growing. There in a picturesque Louisiana tidewater swamp stood giant cypress trees over a hundred feet tall, in all their majestical splendor.

This trip was arranged by Col. C. H. Lindsay, vice president and general manager of the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co., of Ponchatoula, La. Many State and parish officials, two Congressmen, and business leaders and their wives from various parts of Louisiana boarded the log train which was to take them for a ride they would never forget, but long remember and cherish. All preparations had been worked out in the minutest detail to make the trip in comparative luxury and ease. Included in the trip were 57 from various parts of Louisiana; 15 from nearby communities; a total of 72 visitors on the train.

A NATURE'S WONDERLAND

This particular area of swampland is located just north of Lake Pontchartrain, which likewise is just north of New Orleans. Lake Pontchartrain was named by Iberville in honor of Count de Pontchartrain, who was then Minister of Marine in France and who arranged and organized the celebrated Iberville expedition to America.

As we jogged along the private railroad—owned and operated by the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. for its cypress logging operations—we soon found ourselves miles back in a beautiful swamp, truly a nature's wonderland. No women and few men, except logging employees, had ever been there before.

It was truly an awe-inspiring sight to behold. Colonel Lindsay, aided by a loud speaker system, began to tell the story of the growth of this genuine red tidewater cypress. Soon, as though we suddenly found ourselves in another world, we were looking at a cypress tree well over 2,000 years old. The record age of the oldest tree taken from this swamp was 3,960 years. Standing there and realizing that those trees started growing two, three, and four thousand years ago, is like manna from heaven for one's imagination.

Detail by detail, Colonel Lindsay gave us something that our fondest imagination could never even dream of. Here we were, riding on a railroad on log cars drawn by a steam locomotive on a railroad not built on solid ground but on imagination as Colonel Lindsay calls it; but, actually on no man's land, because there is no land, just 2 or 3 feet of water, then a slippery and disintegrating muck far more treacherous than quicksand. The track, which actually partially floats, goes down from 1 to 2 feet as the heavy train rolls over, and then bobs up again when the train has passed.

A FLOATING RAILROAD

All cross ties that hold the rails are made of cypress, otherwise they would rot away in one or two years, submerged in water.

So, you wonder who built such an amazing floating railroad? And how? Frankly, it is a magnificent accomplishment, especially when the comparatively low cost for this kind of expensive construction is considered. But, thanks to Colonel Lindsay, with his "Rube Goldberg" ingenuity, he personally invented and built this track-laying machine, the only one of its kind in existence. This machine is self propelled, carries its own cross ties underneath, reminding one of the way a kangaroo carries her young, and lays—with only seven men working—80 feet of railroad a day. Without this machine, with three times as many men, only one fourth or 20 feet of railroad can be built per day.

The question came up of how similar cypress was logged before this railroad building technique was devised. Cypress logging previously was accomplished by a very expensive, often cumbersome and somewhat unsatisfactory pull-boat operation. Giant steam shovels on barges floated in by the nearest water inlet, dug large ditches through the swamp areas and the cypress logs were pulled out of the adjacent swamps by pull-boats and loaded on barges or tied together as logs and floated to the mill. This was most expensive, and in many instances, unsatisfactory.

Soon, in the distance, we saw steam flying in clouds. As we approached this area we saw a railroad spur, or side track, on which a steam-operated log loader was loading cypress logs, that had been cut and stacked on cars, to be hauled to the saw mill on this floating railroad.

TOONERVILLE TROLLEY UPSIDE DOWN

When the question was asked, "How did those logs get stacked or piled up that way?" Colonel Lindsay replied, "You will see for yourselves in a few minutes."

We did see for ourselves, because as we traveled on we were switched to another spur where we again noticed puffs of steam. Here was a most unique machine—another one of Colonel Lindsay's remarkable inventions—bringing out logs on an overhead trolley high in the air, reminding us of the so-called Toonerville trolley operating upside down.

In most logging operations, the logs stay close to the ground. The very opposite is true here. The so-called trolley wire is some 50 feet in the air. It goes back from the railroad some 600 feet. Giant log tongs, attached to a cable, roll back and forth on a giant pulley on this trolley wire. Workmen take the tongs back into the swamp where the logs are cut and attach them to one, two, or three logs. Then the steam from the machine on the railroad starts hissing and the logs are raised high in the air and rolled across the trolley wire, to be piled along the railroads so the loader we had previously seen could pick them up and load them on railroad cars. It would be impossible to drag these logs on the ground, due to the dense undergrowth of the swamp, so the log first has to be raised high in the air and then pulled on this elevated trolley wire to the railroad.

As the sun was going down, we turned around and started back toward Ponchatoula. One of the guests asked what Ponchatoula meant. Colonel Lindsay explained that it was an Indian name meaning an Indian maid's flowing hair.

It was fortunate that we were traveling by rail, because to walk back through that swamp would have been practically impossible. Only skilled trappers and hunters travel in this swamp by foot, and even they are limited to short distances daily.

A WORKER IN CYPRESS

One of the guests in our party mentioned that in his 45 years he had never seen anything like these cypress trees in this swamp. His companion countered: "And in more than 3,000 years these cypress trees have never seen anything like us."

It was not very long until I was seated in Colonel Lindsay's private office at the Louisiana Cypress Lumbering Co.'s mill in Ponchatoula.

In a way this office is as picturesque as the swamp that we had just visited, except in a completely different manner. All the walls are of magnificent cypress paneling. The office furniture, the venetian blinds, were all made of cypress. His telephone is on a unique sliding device—only one of its kind anywhere—that is made of cypress. The large steel safe, where the records are kept, is cleverly covered with beautiful cypress paneling and would grace the loveliest home as a prize piece of furniture.

Actually his office, its walls and contents, are all of cypress. My curiosity at this point was getting the best of me and I had to say, "Who made all of this astounding cypress work?" In a modest tone, Colonel Lindsay pleaded guilty. He had made it—and much more, I was later to learn—with his own hands in his own work shop, in what he called his spare time.

A REAL SUCCESS STORY

Right then and there my suspicions were about to unfold—this was one of the most unique and amazing individuals I had ever encountered—and Col. Claude H. Lindsay is an amazing man. His life and his success read like a Horatio Alger story, except that it is not necessarily from rags to riches, because he did not start out in rags and he is not rich, but rather his is a life of amazing accomplishments, he having begun at the bottom and climbed to the top rung of the ladder of success.

Forty-three years ago, in 1908, Colonel Lindsay started out with this same lumber company in Eros, La., as a kid, willing to do any kind of work. He was sort of a handy man around the mill, even though he was in his teens.

Two years later he was promoted to apprentice machinist and took to machinery like a duck takes to water. His rise was meteoric. He served for 4 years, then was promoted to shop foreman, and in 1918 received the promotion to master mechanic of all the mills this company operated, including its railroad, the Tremont & Gulf Railroad. In 1930 he moved to Rochelle, La., and was promoted to general superintendent of the Rochelle mill. In the comparatively short period of 22 years he had risen from a willing kid around a little mill to general superintendent of one of the largest mills in the United States.

Shortly thereafter this company decided to buy the mill owned by Joseph Rathborne Lumber Co., in Ponchatoula, and operate it under the name of Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. Colonel Lindsay, in 1931, was given full responsibility for this operation. However, he postponed this operation—and wisely, too—because of the depression, until July 16, 1936.

HE PROFITED BY HIS MISTAKES

To get an insight into this man's thinking is to analyze this mill's operation. It was supposed to last for only 10 years, or to be finished or cut out by July 1946. This is practically the last large stand of ancient red tidewater cypress in the United States. Because of this scarcity, and the fact that it does not decay nor is it subject to attack by termites, its demand is greater than for any other kind of lumber. It is truly the "wood eternal."

Realizing this, Colonel Lindsay, profiting by years of experience, cut down the daily capacity of the mill and concentrated on getting the best grades possible by careful and improved mill operation.

"Unfortunately," he said, "In the olden days when we were cutting virgin long leaf pine, we didn't pay much attention to getting the best grades by skillful mill practices in sawing the logs, but rather the supply seemed unlimited, so the general idea was to cut the greatest number of board feet per day, regardless of making the best grades by skillful cutting. All the mills then did the same.

"So, naturally, I tried to profit by the mistakes the lumber industry made in the past." He not only tried, but he succeeded. He was the first person to ever cut cypress, pine, and hardwood, in the same mill. By doing this the company actually made more money and the mill, instead of cutting out in 10 years, has been operating 14 years, and many believe it has 10 more years to go—thanks to Colonel Lindsay.

Incidentally, Colonel Lindsay was the first lumberman to put an oak flooring plant as far south as Ponchatoula. Most lumbermen said oak flooring could not be successfully manufactured in that territory. Colonel Lindsay said it could and he did it.

A PERMANENT MILL

The new mill at Joyce, La., which cuts 80,000 feet daily of pine and hardwood is also under his supervision. Whereas it takes cypress hundreds and thousands of years to develop into a saw log, by contrast pine grows rapidly, making a saw log in from 20 to 30 years under favorable conditions. By selective cutting this mill will operate permanently because the pine timber on the lands owned by this company will grow faster than it is being cut.

Sitting in Colonel Lindsay's office and admiring the cypress paneling, the chest of drawers, filing cabinets, tables, and all other types of office gadgets all made of cypress, one's eyes are attracted to four pictures on the wall—each with a cypress frame around it.

"Those are pictures of the three generations of the Joyce family that owned this company." First came David Joyce, the grandfather; then, his son, William T. Joyce, who died in 1907; next, his sons, David and James S. Joyce. Now, there is only one living heir, who before her marriage to Doctor Kean was Beatrice Joyce. She is president of the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. and Tremont Lumber Co., and at present resides in Chicago, Ill. The holdings today of the Joyce Lumber organization include the Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co., at Ponchatoula; approximately 130,000 acres of pine timberland in north Louisiana; the Tremont Lumber Co., at Joyce, La., and Chatham, La.; and the Tremont & Gulf Railway Co. The Louisiana Cypress Lumber Co. and the Tremont Lumber Co.

are under the supervision of Colonel Lindsay.

A MOST VERSATILE MAN

You would think, with all this responsibility, that Colonel Lindsay would not have time for anything except running these massive operations. His son, Hubert, is assistant superintendent and is following in his dad's footsteps. But, Colonel Lindsay has time for many outside activities. To me he is the Will Rogers of the lumber business with his modest humor, his kindness, and above all else, his friendly feeling and genuine fondness for his fellow men.

In my book he is one of the best I have ever seen in dividing his time. He is not so big and busy in this vast operation as to lose his identity as a human being, who lives a relatively simple private life as a citizen of Ponchatoula, a town of 4,000 inhabitants. He and his delightful wife share an attractive home there in Ponchatoula. His benevolence and charities seem endless. He is one of the most public-spirited individuals any town or city could boast of. Pasadena may have its Rose Bowl, and New Orleans its Sugar Bowl, but he helps to see that Ponchatoula has its Cypress Bowl. He even makes the trophy, a giant cypress bowl, himself, in his woodworking shop in his spare time.

Many churches have elaborate cypress paneling and altars which he himself built and donated. The altar and pulpit that he built for the Catholic Church in Ponchatoula—he is a Protestant, but helps all churches—would make England's immortal George Hepplewhite turn over in his grave with envy. It is truly a magnificent accomplishment in cabinet making.

Hardly can you find a man more versatile. He personally helped lay out the football stadium there at the Cypress Bowl. He takes time off to annually present the cypress bowl to the winning football team. He developed 23 different kinds of cypress molding, known in the cypress lumber trade as CHL No. 1 to No. 23, inclusive. The only place in the world that has these 23 kinds of moulding is there in Ponchatoula.

It was Colonel Lindsay who recently designed, for the Joyce interests, the new mill at Joyce, La. This mill, just recently constructed, is one of the most efficient and finest mills in our Nation, thanks to the creative genius of Colonel Lindsay.

INVENTS GRATELESS FURNACE

In Chicago, on swank Michigan Boulevard, an ultra modern building designed by some of Chicago's leading architects, is being erected and many parts of the building have beautiful cypress paneling and molding, all designed by Colonel Lindsay.

A prominent engineer, a graduate of Georgia Tech, requested the blueprints from Colonel Lindsay of his drawings of grateless furnace, which he designed in 1930. This engineer said it was the finest precision drawing on this type of furnace he had ever seen. A hurried phone call in 1949 came from the distant Blind River, Canada, requesting Colonel Lindsay's original drawings on how to erect steam boilers with grateless furnaces.

The citizens of Ponchatoula decided that they would fix Colonel Lindsay once and for all, by promptly kidnapping him one night, via the strong-arm method, hustling him over to the schoolhouse. When they took the blanket off his head everyone was singing, "Happy Birthday to You." There were all the public officials, the high-school faculty, the coaches, and all the businessmen and their wives to celebrate in a gigantic birthday party.

Being extremely civic-minded, Colonel Lindsay has been most active in civic affairs. Two governors of Louisiana have honored him by placing him on their official staff as colonel. Mayor Morrison, of New Orleans, made him honorary member of his staff, and the New Orleans police force and the mayor extend to him, at all times, the courtesies of all municipal departments. He is a member of all lumberman associations, and an honorary citizen of Boy's Town. He is even an honorary deputy sheriff.

"You see those three generations of Joyces," said Colonel Lindsay. "They have all passed on. There is only one left—Mrs. Kean—but they, like many others of their kind, played a big part in making this Nation the greatest nation in this world. You see this organization just didn't happen. It takes many kinds of different individuals, each with different traits and abilities, working as a team to accomplish our success.

EACH MAN PLAYS A ROLE

"Take those men working in that mill, many of them can do things in the mill that I couldn't do. Yet, by the same token, they couldn't do my job. I could not do what those three generations of Joyces have done. Yet on the other hand they wouldn't have done what I do. They are needed, those employees are needed and I believe I am needed for the respective part that each of us has played in developing this organization.

"You see, those three generations of Joyces"—again pointing to those pictures—"they died at a comparatively young age. They had an insatiable desire for success. They lived hard and they worked hard. Many people would not have necessarily done that—they are not constituted that way. They would have done it differently, been satisfied to live a different life. But that is why those fellows named Joyce played such a big part in this organization. They made it possible to have this big operation. Without them there would be only a small operation or no operation at all.

"So, you see there are thousands of similar Joyces all over the United States, playing the same part in their respective organizations—each, of course, under his true name. Their determination, their uncanny skill in financing, their creative executive ability, all combined into one intent, caused me to be where I am, caused those workmen out there to have secure employment. They are happy. I am happy because we all play on the same great team. There are thousands of just such other great teams in America—some smaller, some larger. That is why we are the greatest industrial Nation in the world. God Almighty must have intended it that way."

UN Saved Temporarily Not by Its Own Wisdom or Courage or Integrity but by Red China's Rejection of Its Appeasement Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

RED CHINA'S REJECTION OF UN'S OFFER CLARIFIES UNITED STATES POLICY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has been saved by outsiders from what might have been a disastrous course.

Red China has rescued American policy from the disastrous fix in which it would have been stuck had Mao Tse-tung and his comrades accepted the UN cease-fire offer. For that offer illogically combined an end to aggression in Korea with a discussion of the future of Formosa and of a seat for Red China at the United Nations.

By refusing and offering counter terms that border on the insolent or the farcial (according to the point of view), Red China's Foreign Minister Chou En-lai has taken our Secretary of State off a very hot spot. There is little doubt in my mind that, had the Chinese Communists been sly enough to accept, they would have provoked in the United States a furore that would have driven Mr. Acheson from the State Department.

In this case, it is proper to note that the State Department had foreseen, one may even say, had gambled on, the certainty of a refusal by Peking. Mao Tse-tung's answer justifies that gamble.

Had Mao accepted he would also have deprived the United Nations of what little authority it still possesses. Cynics and appeasers may consider smart that organization's readiness to negotiate with an outrageous aggressor. Most Americans are unable to see anything admirable in a readiness of the world police to hear from the criminal the exact terms upon which he is ready to desist from lawlessness.

UN AIM—PREVENT AGGRESSION

The Government of India may argue that the UN's primary aim is to lessen the punishment of aggression rather than to preserve world peace The Government of the United Kingdom and of some other countries, unhappily including Canada, may reason that since the law-abiding countries lack the strength to keep order all over the world, it is the part of wisdom to dicker and stall in the less important region, namely, in Asia.

Most Americans cannot see the wisdom of this. Those millions who cheered the formation of the United Nations at Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco did not do so in the expectation that they were merely creating a new diplomatic forum at which a number of countries, unwilling to help uphold world order, could diplomatically maneuver the United States into the acceptance of immoral policies detrimental to the security of the United States. I refer specifically to the policy of supinely turning over Asia piece by piece to communism.

Those Americans who most firmly support the United Nations have hoped that the international body would prevent further aggression by legalized police action. They understand that if peace is to be kept by progressive surrender to aggressors, this needs no international aggression—as Britain's

Chamberlain and France's Daladier demonstrated at Munich back in 1938.

THANKS FOR INSOLENCE

Our foreign friends, including our Canadian and British allies and those Indians to whom we are on the point of sending a large amount of wheat at a gift, might just as well learn now that the American people refuse to be a party to any further appeasement.

They may consider our insistence on the creation of enforceable world law to be a sign of our immaturity. They may scoff at and criticize our flat refusal to recognize what they call political realities in Asia.

Personally, I shall not mind a bit. Having noted how Nehru's Hindus insanely massacred Moslems merely because they were Moslems, and having seen how he refuses to patch up the insignificant Kashmir affair, I disbelieve in India's morality and in its love of peace.

Having unhappily lived through the inexcusable diplomatic blundering of British diplomats between the two world wars, I have small respect for their present political sagacity, particularly not when I see them repeating the same blunders in Asia.

Therefore, as I said before, I remain thankful for the unacceptable insolence of Mao Tse-tung and his friends.

NECESSARY FUTURE STEPS

From here on, it seems to me, our road is both clear and straight.

We should continue the war in Korea, if necessary by ourselves, until the Chinese get sick of being slaughtered.

We should refuse to discuss the future of Formosa so long as aggression continues anywhere in Asia.

We should rearm our friends on the island to make them proof against any sort of attack. We should not discourage them from taking the offensive against Red China whenever they feel capable.

We should further bolster Viet Nam in Indochina.

Finally, we should announce that under no circumstances will we accept an aggressor government as a member of the UN—preventing its entrance by our veto, if necessary.

And should these steps, as is likely, provoke new shrieks from New Delhi, Ottawa, and London, we should gently but firmly tell Messrs. Nehru, Pearson, and Bevin to go roll.

"The Nation's New Budget—It Calls for $71,000,000,000 in Addition to the Blood, Sweat, and Tears the Year Ahead Will Demand of Us, More Than Half of Every Dollar for Defense Alone—Against the Curtain of These Hard Facts, NBC Television Presents Dr. John R. Steelman and Your Twenty-third Battle Report"—Battle Report, Washington

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the hundreds of letters of commendation I have received, no day passes but what some Member of this body speaks to me of the tremendous interest they find in the television broadcast, each Sunday afternoon over the National Broadcasting Co. network, entitled "Battle Report, Washington."

This, as you know, is the program sponsored by the National Broadcasting Co., on which—without the hawking of merchandise or a commercial of any kind—Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, presents top-flight Government officials to the television audience of this Nation. These, in turn, make direct reports to our people with respect to matters that come within their immediate jurisdiction as Federal officials. At various times in the past, not alone the Members of the President's Cabinet, but many other top-flight civilian and military officials of the Government have spoken on this program.

Last week, in the twenty-third Battle Report, Washington, Mr. Steelman spoke with respect to General Eisenhower's trip to Europe, and succulently summed up the task which lies ahead of the general by saying that—

Today, he must assess accurately what is available in Europe—what manpower is available—what material is available—and, above all else, what spirit is available, for the support of the free world.

Additionally thereto, Mr. Steelman presented a former colleague of ours, wh once having represented the Third District of Florida, became the Governor of that State—and now bears the heavy responsibilities that go with the title, Administrator of our Civil Defense Administration, the Honorable Millard F. Caldwell.

In addition thereto, he presented the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, Acting Deputy Administrator; the Honorable George C. McGhee, the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs; as well as Pfc. Rufus McAdams, of the Seventh Division, K Company, Thirty-first Infantry, who was in the planned withdrawal from the reservoir in Korea to Hungnam a month ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to observe the tremendous interest and the will to do on the part of the Assistant to the President in rendering this splendidly presented and real service to the American people. Anybody who follows closely teledocumentary Battle Report, Washington, certainly is not alone in tune with the times, but well informed about the current matters of their Federal Government which are of greatest interest to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn that the famous Jones twins, on Wednesday, January 24, took off on a tour of the trouble spots of Europe and the Near East—where they will serve as camera correspondents for Battle Report. Inasmuch as they will cover any and all points of interest in the European and Near Eastern areas, we, in America, can look forward shortly to seeing their work.

Mr. Speaker, I need not remind you that these are the young men, Gene and Charlie Jones, natives of Washington, D. C., who, after seeing action in the South Sea Islands of the Pacific in World War II, returned from that war to take up employment with the National Broadcasting Co. and various local daily newspapers.

Immediately upon the opening of hostilities in Korea last June, these two intrepid cameramen were hired by the NBC Television—and spent months at the front in Korea. There they shot some 25,000 feet of combat film, which pictures today constitute some of the finest top-flight pictorial coverage made of fighting in the Korean war from the very time of its inception.

One of those splendid American Jones boys was critically wounded at Inchon, where he hit the beach with the first wave, and who, despite his wounds, a mere 3 weeks later parachuted with his brother Charlie into North Korea with a portion of the Eleventh Airborne Division.

Mr. Speaker, you may be assured that the splendid service now being given the American people by the Honorable John R. Steelman, Ted Ayers, producer, and the National Broadcasting Co., will be further augmented by the pictorialization of the actual conditions that obtain in Europe today in all of the free nations in that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in order to bring the Twenty-third Battle Report, Washington, of Sunday, January 21, to the attention of my colleagues and the millions of Americans who are as yet without television, I ask the unanimous consent of this body to extend my remarks and include the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That Battle Report is as follows:

Mr. McCORMICK. The Nation's new budget. It calls for $71,000,000,000 in addition to the blood, sweat, and tears, the year ahead will demand of us—more than half of every dollar for defense alone. Against the curtain of these hard facts, NBC television presents your Twenty-third Battle Report.

Washington, where this week the House asked the UN to pin the tag, "aggressors" on the Chinese Communists in Korea. Korea, where our air power is now blasting away to stall the build-up for the expected new Red offensive.

Today, Battle Report selects from representatives of our diplomatic and fighting fronts, as well as from the field of civil defense, to paint a picture of the war as we see it, here in the Nation's Capital. But first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Five and a half years ago, General Eisenhower returned home from Europe after leading the allied forces to a glorious victory fought to preserve the dignity of mankind.

Two weeks ago today, General Eisenhower was again in Europe—this time to begin his fact-finding tour of the Western European nations who are pooling their resources once more to preserve the way of life cherished by democratic countries. The Supreme Commander of Allied Powers in Europe faces a difficult task * * * he must assess accurately what is available today, what manpower is available, what material is available, and, above all, what spirit is available for the support of the free world.

While General Eisenhower has been devoting all of his energies to tying the free world together for its common defense, the Communists have been employing their usual insidious techniques in an effort to discredit his mission and to destroy its successful conclusion. The Cominform is doing its utmost to foment anti-Eisenhower demonstrations throughout free Europe. Regardless of what

these Communist-inspired demonstrators are saying, they mean one thing: "Let us stay weak and defenseless and disorganized—so that we may join those happy and fortunate countries under the tyrant's heel behind the iron curtain." Though the Soviets may seem to enjoy temporary gains through such antics—subversion and strikes—they cannot seriously expect to fool people indefinitely.

At this moment, the Nation is responding to the urgent need for organizing an effective defense against attack on civilian populations. Telephone calls—letters by the hundreds—have been received here from individuals, from organizations * * * offering aid, demanding to help. Everyone wants to do something. Here are two men who can tell you what is being done about civil defense: Gov. Millard Caldwell, Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, and James J. Wadsworth, Acting Deputy Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration.

While the modern nation of Turkey is only a vest-pocket edition of the once far-flung Ottoman Empire, it continues to play an important part in world affairs. Today, George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, will discuss Turkey and the adjacent Kingdom of Greece, both vital in containing the avaricious ambitions of Soviet expansion, Greece in Europe, and Turkey, athwart the path to the rich resources of the Middle East. Also, Mr. McGhee will touch on some of the problems of south Asia.

The appearance here of one of our boys who has been in Korea is to me a dramatic and solemn occasion. Pfc. Rufus A. McAdams, of the Seventh Division, was in the planned withdrawal from the reservoir to Hungnam last month. He comes to us today from Walter Reed Hospital especially for Battle Report.

And, so again, we see what our Nation is doing on several battlefronts. May God assist us on each.

Mr. McCORMICK. Just this past week, the man to oversee our Nation's civil defense setup was confirmed by the Senate. Former Governor of Florida, and once representing its Third District in Congress, he now bears the heavy responsibilities that go with the title. Administrator of our Federal Civil Defense Administration, ladies and gentlemen, meet Millard F. Caldwell.

Mr. CALDWELL. The Civil Defense Act, as recently passed by Congress and signed by the President, concerns itself with more than mere survival. It creates an active civil defense force which would enable our strategic target cities to recover quickly from an enemy attack and get back into the fight.

Ours is not a passive nation under such circumstances. We do not take attacks lying down. We are not people who run from trouble or hide from an aggressor. No foreign power has ever been able to make us do either of those things. No foreign power is strong enough to make us do them now—unless we let it.

The trained civil defense force that we need can only come into being, however, through the voluntary efforts of millions of Americans. Civil defense must begin with the individual and his local authorities; not with the Federal Government. As civilians, we must have the courage and determination to do what is expected of us. Quite simply, that means we must stick to our homes and jobs, no matter what happens.

Under the Civil Defense Act the Federal Government can lay down a blueprint for reorganization at regional, State, and local levels. It has already done so. The Federal Government can advise, guide, and consult with civil authorities who are charged with the responsibility of carrying out the national plan. It is doing so and has been doing so.

The Federal Government can also stockpile equipment and supplies, build, and operate a warning and communications system, set up training schools and courses, instruct, and inform the public, and supply matching funds for the building of shelters and the purchase of certain civil defense needs. All these things will be done as soon as possible, following congressional appropriation of the funds needed to implement the Act, which is expected promptly.

The passage of the Civil Defense Act did not, of course, automatically create and staff an operating organization. It merely established the legal basis for transforming civil defense plans into action. It now becomes my duty, as Administrator, to press that action along the lines already laid down—and to do it as quickly as possible. We have not a moment to lose.

As Administrator, I have only one ambition—to make the Federal Civil Defense Administration the best staffed, best run, most efficient and most effective agency in government. It has always been my practice in administrative posts to surround myself with the best people I could find. That will continue to be my practice in this post.

I am confident that the national program for civil defense will bring out the best of our national qualities if trouble comes. As a Nation, we are capable of great triumphs of individual effort and organizational skill. Neighborly help in time of disaster, which is the basis of the civil defense program, has always been a part of our national tradition.

Therefore, I have no hesitation in asking the full cooperation of every man, woman, and child in the defense of our homes. As the President said when he signed the Civil Defense Act, "No true American would want to give less than his best to that cause, and no one who knows the American people could ask for more."

Mr. McCORMICK. London well remembers the horror of its World War II ordeal by rocket bomb. The V-1's, shown here, sent over by the Nazis, called for every ounce of courage Britain could muster, plus a civil defense system that couldn't falter. While some of the rockets were shattered in the air by defense planes, many fell unimpeded to the ground to kill and destroy. Matched with the threat of the atom bomb which leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki—the problems these memories pose for our civil defense are slightly short of terrific. What is being done now to protect our American cities? What specific action has been taken to date? Because you have every right to hear the answer from one of our top officials, we focus now on the Federal Civil Defense Administration's James Wadsworth, Acting Deputy Administrator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Six months ago, only 16 States had appointed civil defense directors. Today, every State, every Territory, and the District of Columbia, has a competent, full-time director with authority to act by legislation or executive order. That simple comparison is a fair measure of the progress we are making in civil defense.

There are other encouraging reports. Many of our strategic target cities have already inventoried their disaster resources. A number have tested their civil defense plans under hypothetical attack, or are ready to do so in the near future. All of our major metropolitan centers have civil defense organizations in being, and are working out mutual aid plans with nearby communities in cooperation with their State directors.

Enlistment of auxiliary policemen and firemen is under way in many places. Hundreds of doctors and nurses throughout the country have received instructions in radiological defense. Thousands of volunteer wardens have been trained in cities where civil-defense programs are well advanced. Transportation, communication, and utility systems have been checked and strengthened in critical areas. Existing buildings have been designated as air-raid shelters, or are being surveyed for that purpose.

On a national basis an air-raid warning code has been established. It is estimated that a few minutes of advance warning plus a well-organized civil defense would cut our casualties in an atomic raid by at least 50 percent. Specifications for radiological monitoring instruments have been issued to the States, with the Federal Civil Defense Administration offering to pool orders to reduce costs and insure high standards of performance.

To inform the public fully on what to do in the event of atomic bombing, a 32-page booklet has been issued under the title "Survival Under Atomic Attack." More than 5,000,000 copies have been distributed to date. A motion-picture dramatization of this booklet is now in preparation, and will be widely televised shortly after its first appearance in theaters throughout the country. Other public-information booklets will follow shortly and will be publicized in the same way.

A manual entitled "Health Services and Special Weapons Defense" has been prepared and sent to State medical officers. This 250-page volume deals with our defenses against germ and chemical warfare, as well as radiation sickness. Still another manual entitled "The Fire Effects of Bombing Attacks" has been issued for the guidance of fire-fighting services.

For the individual citizen who asks, "What can I do?", the American National Red Cross has mobilized its facilities and chapters in cooperation with the Civil Defense Administration to carry out three major activities in which anyone can take part, now. These are the first-aid programs, in which 20,000,000 people should be trained as quickly as possible: the blood-procurement program and the nurses'-aide and home-nursing program.

Perhaps more important is the growing rejection, by the public, of the "take-to-the-hills" attitude, which was in evidence a few months ago. We are beginning to realize, as Americans, that there is nothing to be gained by giving up our homes at the first hint of trouble. On the contrary, if we were to abandon our cities and surrender our production lines, we would lose a war for the first—and last—time.

Once that idea sinks in most of us will be determined to stand by our homes and jobs, no matter what happens. If we do that, our individual chances of survival are good. Our national prospects are certain. We will withstand any attack which an enemy might hurl against us—and come back to win.

Mr. McCORMICK. From these front lines in Korea—while men work out the problem of protecting us here at home—comes better news than we've heard for a long time. Our troops are no longer in retreat. In a series of counteroffensives—the first since we lost Seoul—they are suddenly lashing out at the enemy. Latest reports have the UN forces stabbing deep inside Red lines on three icy sectors. Wonju was reoccupied without opposition, and there is fighting now near Osan, 28 miles southeast of Seoul. Fortunately, America, we are not in this battle alone. Other nations, closer to the real enemy than ourselves, recognize this fight as theirs, too, and are assisting it as best they can. For some pertinent information on this score we turn our cameras now on the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, George Crews McGhee.

Mr. McGHEE. Now, we'll take a look at the Near East and south Asia. This vast area of more than 500,000,000 people bounds Russia and Communist China on the south for 4,000 miles. This area has close ties with Europe and the west. What happens there is of vital concern to us and the rest of the free world. None of these countries are Communist. If they are attacked, they will defend their freedom.

The peoples of the Near East and South Asia are increasingly disturbed by the threat of Soviet aggression and by developments in Korea and China. They realize their vulnerability and their relative weakness. The strategic near-eastern bridgehead between Europe and Asia and Africa has been coveted by every would-be conqueror from Alexander the Great to Hitler. Soviet ambitions clearly include taking over, sooner or later, the inhabitants of the vast territory in the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean areas.

These lands contain great resources—half the world's oil, and important quantities of manganese, rubber, and other essential raw materials. They constitute almost half of the manpower resources of the free world. The Near East is, moreover, the gateway to the fabulous riches of the African Continent, the uranium of the Congo, the copper, chrome, and industrial diamonds.

I want to highlight the response of two countries in this area to the Soviet Communist challenge. I refer to Turkey and Greece. Both have extensive frontiers with the iron curtain. Both realize that their security depends upon the strength and unity of the free world. Both contribute to the defensive strength of other countries in the Near East for which they set as a shield.

Moreover, these two countries have voluntarily and enthusiastically supported the larger cause of collective security through the United Nations in Korea. Although Korea is farther away from them than it is from us, they realize that if aggression were not stopped in the Far East, the forces of aggression would soon turn to a new victim—perhaps to them. Their contribution to the United Nations forces in Korea has been outstanding.

For instance, the Turkish brigade of 4,500 men is the equivalent, population-wise, to 34,000 American troops. We have all followed with admiration the fighting prowess of the Turkish soldiers in Korea. A few weeks ago, they volunteered for a dangerous rear-guard action of great importance. Although surrounded, they accomplished their mission and heroically fought their way out.

As for the Greeks, they have courageously defended their homeland against Communist aggression. Since World War II, Greece has lost about as many men fighting Communist guerrillas in Greece as we have lost in Korea, although their national population is only 5 percent of ours. Greece sent to Korea her best troops, thoroughly trained in mountain and commando type warfare.

It is true that in some of the other countries of the Near East and South Asia, the governments have felt unable to make a contribution to the UN effort in Korea. This has resulted from various factors, but more because of a feeling of military weakness than from any lack of desire to support the UN. Some states have unfortunately not seen eye-to-eye with us on all details of handling the conflict in Korea. but they have, through their spontaneous cease-fire effort, sincerely sought to restore peace.

With the growing strength which is resulting from our own rearmament program, new confidence and hope will be given to our friends in the Near East and South Asia that they and the rest of the free world can be defended against Communist aggression. There is a growing recognition on their part that their own true interest calls for a step-up in their own efforts to strengthen their individual and collective defenses.

We must vigorously seek to increase such strength wherever we can. The potential of the free world is tremendous. It is great enough to assure ultimate victory in any conflict. If it is to be fully realized, we must achieve increasing mutual understanding and teamwork on the part of all the free nations.

Mr. McCORMICK. When the war in Korea is history, America—the story of it will lie long on many tongues. And among the tales that are sure to be passed down from father to son, are the bitter, heroic days that are summed up with two words "Changjin Reservoir." For it was here, entrapped in the frost-biting cold, and struggling against perhaps the most overwhelming odds that ever faced modern American combatants, that the GI—beating out his escape—wrote an unforgettable chapter in American military history. With us today is a young veteran of the Changjin Reservoir engagement. His name, Rufus McAdams. His home town, paradoxically, Winter Garden, Fla. His outfit, Seventh Division, Thirty-first Infantry, K Company. His rank, private first class, and his story, well—How did the battle start?

Private First Class McADAMS. Well, Bob, the battle started when we first arrived at the reservoir. I was on guard from about 3 to 4 in the afternoon—I and a South Korean. Just about 10 minutes before I came off guard, I noticed a person coming down the railroad track and wondered if it was an enemy or one of our men which we we sent out about 200 yards down to the track as a machine-gun nest. Getting closer, I halted the man and found out he was one of our boys. The machine-gun nest had been overrun and he had been wounded during the battle. I and the South Korean took him to the medics. Before we had a chance to get back to our position, the enemy had already overrun our position, so we had to pull back and start fighting, too.

Mr McCORMICK. And you didn't even know the enemy was anywhere near you?

Private First Class McADAMS. No, Bob; we didn't know they were anywhere around. So, after fighting that night and the next day—for 4 days—out of our company of 260 men we had 60 men left who were able to fight.

Mr. McCORMICK. You mean 200 men were killed or wounded?

Private First Class McADAMS. Two hundred were killed and wounded.

Mr. McCORMICK. In 1 day's fighting?

Private First Class McADAMS. One day's fighting—and the night. After getting supplies from the air—we got most of the supplies, but Chinese got the rest. After fighting for 4 days, we decided our best chance was to try to get our wounded, and what men we had left, out. So we loaded our wounded on trucks and assigned guards to them and pulled out. After about one-half hour's travel, I got wounded for the first time in the left leg. Proceeding on for about another 2 hours, I got wounded again in the left arm. That's where we met the convoy. I was put on a truck for about 4 hours. After fighting our way through road block after road block, we finally got as far as we could with about 4 trucks out of the 20 we had.

Mr. McCORMICK. You mean 4 trucks out of 20 got through.

Private First Class McADAMS. Well, we got through to the last road block. I don't think any of them managed to get through there. With one truck, we tried to get down and make a break down the railroad track and after about 100 yards the truck got hit. I was hit, too, and was thrown off the truck. Making my way back to where the other three trucks were and what few men were left, and the wounded—we finally tried, six men, to get back to where the marines were.

Mr. McCORMICK. Could I go back for just one second? These trucks were burned, you say?

Private First Class McADAMS. Yes. After getting back up to where these three trucks were we noticed two trucks about 300 yards down the road. The Chinese had already poured gasoline all over them and set them on fire with wounded in them.

Mr. McCORMICK. You mean our wounded were burned alive in trucks?

Private First Class McADAMS. Yes; they were, Bob. After seeing that and what few men were left, I and six other guys who were wounded decided to try to make our way back up to where the First Marine Division was. After going through the woods for about one-half mile, we came across a creek—I fell in and this caused my feet to get frostbitten like they are now. After going for about another half mile, we came to a Korean village, where we stopped to get some water and rest awhile. We found a security police, and he said he would guide us to where the Marine division was, so we left and went on our way. About one-half mile down the road, we came to where the road forked and we noticed that whatever was up there was having a little battle. So we decided we'd leave the Korean there—we didn't trust him any more. We went on up the road for about another mile—then we met the First Marine Division. I was sent to a station hospital—and then flew from there to Tokyo and then back to the States.

Mr. McCORMICK. One other thing. What about the cold? You should be a first-hand witness to that. Ladies and gentlemen, not only frozen feet, but frozen hands. Is it as cold as we hear it is?

Private First Class McADAMS It is, Bob. Sometimes it is from 10 to 20 below in the morning and afternoon.

Mr. McCORMICK. Do you ever get warmed up? How do you warm up?

Private First Class McADAMS. Well, the only chance to warm up is to find a little brush and build a fire—and when you have time, and they're not firing too bad, you can warm up. Most of the men take turns getting out of the foxhole to warm up.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thank you very much, Private First Class McAdams. Not only from NBC and Battle Report, but also from your country.

Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your twenty-third Battle Report, Washington.

Muzzled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, spread over a period of years, I have made an effort to destroy the "yes man" psychology which hinders Congress, who represents the American people, from getting first-hand and straight-from-the-shoulder opinons from the military spokesmen of the Nation.

Among the many editorials supporting my efforts is the following one that appeared in the January 24 issue of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa.:

MUZZLED

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Altoona, Tuesday called attention in a Congress speech to a growing tendency in this country to endeavor to pattern our thoughts and policies, and eventually probably, our actions and our lives, along lines laid down by the Central Government in Washington.

The Altoona Congressman's verbal attack was aimed at a "confidential directive" which he said had been issued by Secretary of Defense Marshall prohibiting officers of the armed services from speaking for publication unless they confine themselves "to the

bounds and policies which have been publicly announced by the White House, State or Defense Departments."

"JENNER" said a similar directive in 1946 ordered officers to support in testimony before Congress only the budget estimates recommended by President Truman. Said Representative VAN ZANDT:

"No wonder we were unprepared for Korea."

And he recalled that a number of top-ranking military leaders were reprimanded or lost their posts because "they spoke their mind."

Said Mr. VAN ZANDT, "This yes-man psychology is the ruination of good government and especially of our national defense."

The truth of this indeed has been proved by Korea, and by our fumbling on the diplomatic front.

Mr. Truman obviously has been endeavoring to control the thinking of all our officers and governmental leaders. As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he appears to think it is his right to direct the thoughts of every man under him.

It was obvious during the armed services hearings on unification and in the B-36 investigation that officers appearing as witnesses were reluctant to give their personal opinions. Those who did, as in the case of Admiral Denfeld, were demoted or fired.

Of what value is officer experience if all thought is to be guided by official directives?

The stultifying effects of the restricted unification hearings have been tragically apparent.

Freedom of our officers, and our other leaders, to think for themselves gives power to our country and our Government.

The authoritarian doctrine that the head of state can do no wrong, that policies emanating from the seat of government are sanctified, and not to be questioned, has brought one nation after the other down into the dust.

The defeat of Nazi Germany depended in the end upon many factors. But, one of the most important of all was Adolf Hitler's insistance upon using his own judgment, and in refusing to defer to the wisdom of his skilled officers.

Representative VAN ZANDT indicated that the latest "muzzle" to be imposed upon our armed services was the result of the strong public statement issued last week by Air Force Maj. Emmett O'Donnell, one of our top aerial strategists, who returned the other day from Korea, and criticised our restrictions in Korea, the mandate which prevents us from bombing or attacking China or Manchuria.

General O'Donnell said he favored use of the atomic bomb. It is likely that the general was so incensed by the bitter handicaps imposed upon us by the UN in Korea that he spoke out for the strongest weapon we have.

The American public, judging General O'Donnell's remarks on the basis of what we know about the Korean War, would agree with him, we believe.

It is an unfair handicap to place upon a fighting force to direct that they must not strike back at the enemy nation.

Red jet planes attack our forces from across the Yalu River border, and return there quickly. Once across that river, they know they are secure from attack. American planes may not chase them across that river, and may not attack them or their bases, once over the border.

Yet, these planes can emerge safely from their sanctuary and strike quick blows at us, then dash back to their haven.

The Chinese Red army is being supplied from lines and bases which could be destroyed * * * if our forces with the UN army were a free, American fighting force, instead of "policemen," to use Mr. Truman's term, serving a master, who apparently would be eager to get rid of them.

There Are Nearly 2,000,000 Guerrillas Fighting the Communists in China; Proper Aid by Us Could Make Them a Major Army

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the New Leader of January 22, 1951. Its author, William Caldwell, is a Washington news man and radio commentator. If it is right for Americans boys to be fighting Chinese Reds in Korea, why is it wrong to let or to help Chinese anti-Communists fight them on their own soil? Do we want to win in Korea, or don't we? If we do, then why not do everything possible to weaken the enemy. If we do not, then why should our Government ask Americans to die in fighting them? How long can this two-faced murderous policy be continued?

OUR SECOND FRONT IN CHINA

(By William Caldwell)

WASHINGTON.—A second front in China—effectively maintained and supported—could upend Stalin's timetable for Asia. It could prevent the capture of Korea and Indochina, the outflanking of Thailand, Malaya, and Indonesia, the isolation of Japan, and the complete neutralization of India. It could relieve American, British, and French troops for the defense of Europe, and cause new strains on Soviet war industry.

A number of public figures, including Senators STYLES BRIDGES and PAUL DOUGLAS—have urged the creation of such a second front by mounting an invasion of the Chinese mainland by Nationalist troops from Formosa. Actually, our potential second front in China already exists. It consists of nearly 2,000,000 guerrillas now actively harrassing the Communists in every corner of China. Peking has repeatedly claimed the destruction of these forces, but they have grown from less than 400,000 in September 1949, to 824,000 in January 1950, to 1,667,000 last August. These are the figures of Dr. T. F. Tsiang, Nationalist China's UN delegate; but on April 28, Christopher Rand of the New York Herald Tribune estimated that half the land area of China was in anti-Communist hands. The chief reason for the guerrillas' growth was also indicated by Dr. Tsiang, when he revealed last June that more than 15 percent of the resistance units were commanded by former Communist officers. Mao Tse-tung himself on June 13, while claiming that a million resisters had been rounded up since the withdrawal of the main Kuomintang armies from the mainland, conceded that there are still more than 400,000 bandits to be annihilated."

The underground forces received a great spur last fall when Communist Premier Chou En-lai announced a full-scale land reform for Central and South China. Chou said this program would involve "China's second fiercest class struggle"; the first, of course, was the setting up of the Communist regime, which took 22 years and untold millions of lives. Chou conceded this time that 300,000 bandits were still rampant, but claimed that the Reds had arrested 13,797 secret agents and unearthed 175 secret radio stations.

This was one of the more modest Communist claims of destroying the resistance movement. Radio Moscow on October 29 said that 20,000 "United States military intelligence agents" had been arrested. Pravda added that 2,000 radio stations had been seized. On August 16, the Communist news agency claimed the back of resistance had been broken in most areas of Central and South China, and that 210,000 guerrillas had been wiped out there in the past 6 months. Last winter, they claimed to have killed another 130,000 bandits in Honan Province alone. On August 8, 1949, General Teng Wen-yi, discussing the revolt of 170 village societies of Honan, declared that 240,000 guerrillas had just been wiped out in Honan, Hupeh and Anhwei Provinces. The most grandiose and most recent Communist claim of guerrilla annihilation came last November 15, when the Chungking radio claimed that 400,000 bandits had been liquidated in the previous 6 weeks. Chungking added, however, that "Kuomintang espionage agents will not stay down, but have become very active."

STRONG IN SOUTH CHINA

The area where anti-Red guerrillas are most numerous centers around the province of Szechwan in West China, but since mountain barriers prevent any effective link-up with other guerrilla forces, the most important underground groups are the ones in central and south China. The traditionally revolutionary provinces of Kwantung and Kwangsi in south China have been a subject of mounting concern to the Communist authorities. The Central and South China Military and Political Affairs Committee of the Communist Party admitted last March that Lukfung County (in Kwantung, between Hong Kong and Swatow) was "infested with bandits" and that 14 Communist officials had been killed by the "Kuomintang agents." By last summer, Kwangsi Governor Chang Yun-yi was complaining that the people of the province had been "deeply affected by the deception and propaganda of reaction" and that there still existed the "feudalistic, anti-alien ideology of Pan-Kwangsiism." (The latter label is based on the fact that South China resents the Communist troops in the area, who come mostly from Manchuria and Shantung.)

The Governor of Kwangsi said spring uprisings had led to the slaying of 105 Communists. In a bitter report to Peking, he declared:

"The masses were incited into organizing insurrections, public grain stocks were robbed, rural workers were killed, local government offices were attacked and all sorts of evil acts committed."

With the withdrawal of large occupation forces to Korea, conditions have been getting worse for the Communists in Kwangsi and Kwantung. On December 29, 2,200 Russian advisers were sent to Canton, martial law was proclaimed in the city, and 7 new Communist divisions were dispatched to the Kwantung area. Within the city, a cultural purge was under way: six Canton newspapermen (along with two in Wuchow, Kwangsi province, and one in Shanghai) are known to have been executed as cultural special agents on December 1. A week before the proclamation of martial law, a Soviet plane at Canton's Paiyun airfield was destroyed, and Formosa claimed that in the 2 weeks ending December 6, the strategic Canton-Hankow railway had been damaged seven times.

Probably the most effective underground force is the one concentrated in inland central China in the Provinces of Honan, Hupeh, Anhwei, Hunan, and Kiangsi. The main Chinese railways bisect this area. The Communist news agency had reported peasant revolts in Anhwei as early as June 22, 1949; Communist Gen. Lin Piao declared

some time later that fuedal rule and the influence of bandits and Kuomintang agents is still very strong in the villages. In the year that followed, the Reds made several claims of destroying the guerrillas, adding up to a total of 380,000 annihilated. Wang Shou-tao, the Governor of Hunan, did admit last summer that many of our old and new cadres were lost.

ANTISABOTAGE FORCE

At the time, he claimed that there were only 13,000 guerrillas left in his province. But Peiping announced on October 24 that a force of 1,157,000 would be "recruited" to quell the guerrillas in these areas. Three days later, the Liberation Daily of Shanghai revealed that 200,000 troops were being "recruited" to fight guerrillas in northern Anhwei alone. And on November 14, the Peiping radio announced that Red China's regular 5,000,000-man army would have to be supplemented by an armed militia of 5,500,000 for the express purpose of combating "sabotage."

The guerrilla movement today has little to do with the political factors involved in the old civil war; it is based on direct experience with the Communist regime in power. According to Christoper Rand, "The unifying factor in the guerrilla movement is a resentment against the Communist regime—chiefly against its grain levies."

This resentment extends right into the Communist party and army. The party, which grew from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 between 1948 and 1950, had to launch an intensive period of "criticism and self-criticism" last summer. On July 26, the death penalty was established for "American agents." Formosa claims that on November 7 some 15,000 troops mutinied outside Wusih on the Shanghai-Nanking railway. On November 13, the party cracked down on Voice of America listeners. And on November 19, on the Honan-Hupeh border not far from Hankow, a full division of Lin Piao's Fourth Field Army is reported to have rebelled and joined the guerrillas. Of the Chinese soldiers taken prisoner in Korea, a great majority expressed their desire to join the Nationalist armies on Formosa.

Can the guerrilla forces within China become an effective second front? The answer lies with the United States. The guerrillas' prime needs are encouragement and equipment—mostly small arms and radio gear. Both of these could easily be provided by the United States. Our air drops enabled guerrilla forces in wartime Greece and Yugoslavia to develop into full-fledged armies. If the United States Air Force is restrained from officially aiding the guerrillas, military men here propose the formation of a new group of volunteer airmen, like Gen. Claire Chennault's Flying Tigers, to aid the guerrillas. But if the United States is not determined to surrender east Asia to the Mao Tse-tung regime, a program for the liberation of China would have to include:

Full-scale airdrops of arms, ammunition, and radio gear to the guerrillas, under the direct supervision of an American airman (General Chennault perhaps).

A twofold political program for the post-liberation establishment of an all-China constituent assembly under UN supervision and for large-scale United States and United Nations economic aid to the Chinese people. This program would have to be vigorously enunciated again and again through every possible medium to the people of China.

WORK WITH FORMOSA

Full representation for all guerrilla forces in the Republic of China Government on Formosa. While this reconstituted government should be readmitted to full partnership in the Far East, both we and the Nationalists should make it clear that it is an interim government, to be dissolved on the election under UN auspices of an all-China constituent assembly.

Pin-point non-atomic bombing of China's important railway and supply centers. This would have to be preceded by a long bombardment of warning messages to the Chinese civilians, urging them to evacuate these centers and/or join the guerrilla forces.

When guerrilla forces have attained critical military importance, American air and sea forces should assist the Chinese Nationalist armies to link up with the guerrillas by invading the mainland.

This program, which enjoys the support of increasing numbers of military men since the turn of events in Korea, would require considerable expenditures on the part of the United States. But, it is argued, greater expenditures will have to be made in Indo-China, Malaya, India, and Japan if communism is not stopped in China, and these efforts will have a much slighter chance of success. What is more, in those nations we might have to use large numbers of western troops; in China we would be availing ourselves of the largest anti-Communist force in Asia, without involving a single American foot soldier.

All of which leads to Washington's $64 question: What about Chiang Kai-shek? Will his popularity or unpopularity affect seriously any program for the liberation of China? Military men here point out that United States diplomats have been calling Chiang inadequate since 1944, and yet, in all of that time, have not been able to name a single other figure around whom non-Communist Chinese would rally. These military men still remember the ill-fated experiment with Li Tsung-jen in 1949, which considerably accelerated the disintegration of the Nationalists on the mainland. Quite possibly, new and stronger leaders may develop now, from the ranks of the resistance movement, if it is properly encouraged.

To offset the possible effects of self-seeking interests within the Kuomintang, and to put the Free China program on the broadest possible footing, it is urged that an outstanding American general, acceptable to the Pentagon and to the Chinese, be given full power over all American economic and military aid to the anti-Communist Chinese. For this post the outstanding candidate is Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, whose 1947 report on China now stands up as a model of sobriety and cool thinking. Such an appointment, combined with the constant reiteration of America's pledge to help China choose its own government, would offset any deleterious effects resulting from Chiang's alleged unpopularity and emphasize anew that the struggle against Stalin is one for all peoples.

In an era of tranquillity, the urgency of such a program would not be too clear. But with Lin Piao's armies driving our divisions down the Korean Peninsula and appeasement and neutralism sweeping the Orient, it has become clear that freedom must make a stand in Asia. The men and women best qualified to make that stand are the people of China, whose long and courageous resistance to Japanese and Communist imperialism entitles them to their just share in the fight for a free world.

Extend Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act will come before Congress this week. Since its original enactment, this legislation has proven to be a highly constructive step both for the economic welfare of our country and the improvement of good trade relations with other nations.

The Rules Committee has reported a rule for its extension and I hope Congress will extend our reciprocal trade agreements with an overwhelming majority.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune reflects a general endorsement given this legislation throughout the country:

EXTEND RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

The Reciprocal Trade Act is back before Congress for consideration. The 2-year extension voted in 1949 will run out on June 15. A 3-year extension is being sought now, and it ought to be approved.

Congress has approved the principle of reciprocal trade agreements seven times since the law first was enacted in 1934, so that it would seem an extension for an even longer period might be approved. The trade act has been called "the cornerstone of our foreign economic policy" and it is especially important that it be retained in the present international situation.

The reciprocal trade law never has come within the framework of the bipartisan foreign policy, but Republican support of it has been increasing through the years. Indeed, the GOP might claim some credit for originating the idea on the basis of flexibility provisions carried in Republican tariff acts prior to World War I.

When the reciprocal trade law first was enacted in 1934, only two Republicans in the House and five in the Senate voted for it. In 1945, when a 3-year renewal was voted, Republicans in the House divided 33 yeas to 140 nays, in the Senate 15 yeas to 16 nays.

Republicans were in control of Congress in 1948 and they gave a 1-year extension overwhelming support. However, the extension law carried restrictions, including the peril-point plan. In 1949, with the Democrats again in control, the act was extended in substantially its original form. The House Republican vote was favorable, 84 to 63, although the Senate GOP division was 15 yeas to 18 nays.

If the act is worth extending, it should be retained for at least 3 years. Anything less gives an impression of uncertainty not to be desired in our dealings with other nations.

Government Waste Contributes to High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following material:

With the widespread interest in the terms and effect of the price order issued last Friday evening it is increasingly important to examine the operations of the Department of Agriculture in its food purchase and hoarding program. Surely no one will deny that the Department's activities have a significant effect upon

the prices of similar commodities in the open market.

The loss incurred by the Department on the disposition of five commodities and the carrying charges, as compared with the same operation last year, reveal astonishing increases.

The official figures follow:

	Loss on disposition		Carrying charges	
	Nov. 30, 1949	Nov. 30, 1950	Nov. 30, 1949	Nov. 30, 1950
Butter	$2,376.47	$20,016,987.67	$997,549.25	$1,823,974.03
Cheese	101.74	7,497,151.54	117,526.44	1,315,265.25
Dried milk	[1] 266,663.34	13,962,771.26	1,205,272.42	2,196,257.37
Dried eggs	823,910.22	15,972,710.98	920,687.67	1,247,896.92
Irish potatoes	5,850,344.40	13,991,857.29	1,291,675.14	297,612.45
Total	6,410,026.49	70,541,478.69	4,142,708.32	6,840,706.02

[1] Represents gain.

This is a percentage increase of 1,000 percent in loss on disposition of commodities; 66.1 percent in carrying charges; and 633 percent in the total of both items.

Surely it is of vital importance for the appropriate congressional committees to develop the full details of the Department's operations and, through legislation and limitations on appropriations, insure that these practices are eliminated.

The American Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the American Scholar, winter edition of 1950, written by Mr. Clinton Rossiter, which I believe will be of interest to the Members:

THE AMERICAN MISSION

(By Clinton Rossiter, associate professor of government at Cornell University)

The belief that God or providence or fate occasionally singles out a nation for some higher destiny is a striking example of the power of ideas in history. It sustained ancient Israel, the "holy people unto the Lord thy God"; it apparently helps sustain Soviet Russia, "the beacon of the toilers in every land." And surely the vigorous American conviction that God also chose this people to fulfill a historic mission has been a profound ideological force in our national development.

We seem to have been chosen for different missions at different times. The Puritan of 1640, the revolutionary of 1776, the Federalist of 1800, the expansionist of 1850, the Union soldier of 1865, the missionary of 1875, the imperialist of 1900, the idealist of 1917, the interventionist or isolationist of 1940—each of these has entertained his own surmise of the purpose for which America was called into being. Yet one solid belief has flourished from the beginning as the finest expression of American nationalism. This is the concept of the model republic, an article of collective faith that we may properly term the American mission.

It is a simple belief—comprehensible, viable, and endlessly serviceable. It assumes that God, at the proper stage in the march of history, called forth certain hardy souls from the old and privilege-ridden nations; that He carried these precious few to a new world and presented them and their descendants with an environment ideally suited to the development of a free society; and that in bestowing His grace He also bestowed a peculiar responsibility for the success of popular institutions. Were the Americans to fail in their experiment in self-government, they would fail not only themselves but all men wanting or deserving to be free. If such government could not work here, it could not work anywhere. America was to serve as a "testament to freedom." Or, to vary the analogy, it was to be the "laboratory of democracy," in which God could mix the best of all possible men with the best of all possible environments, and determine once and for all whether liberty was worth the pains.

The belief in the mission, in one variant or another, has been part of the American tradition since the first settlements. Great and remembered men, presidents and philosophers, and small and forgotten men, preachers and country editors, have stated and restated their belief in our unique responsibility for the defense of human freedom. Now, in a time when Americans are specially self-conscious and soul-searching about their obligations to other nations, the idea of the mission invokes our renewed attention. The progress of this idea is worth recording.

Massachusetts Bay was the nursery of the mission. Winthrop and Cotton, and a host of lesser men, looked upon themselves as latter-day Israelites, never doubting that God had brought them over the sea for a purpose higher than their own well-being. The kind of men they were, the trials they had borne, and the conditions under which they hacked out their wilderness Zion fostered a well-nigh universal assumption that this was not just an experiment, but the experiment, in the manner of society that God had ordained for his chosen vessels. The impassioned cry of William Stoughton in his election sermon of 1668—"God sifted a whole nation that He might send choice grain over into this wilderness"—was echoed in dozens of doughty books like Cotton Mather's Magnalia Christi Americana (1702) and Edward Johnson's Wonder-Working Providences of Zion's Savior in New England (1654), and in dozens of pioneer pulpits from Saco to Southbury.

Like all righteous people, the New England saints were prone to self-righteousness, and heavy upon the nonconformist lay the hand of the Puritan who felt himself in the hand of God. Yet there is something admirable about these colonials who believed so tenaciously in their moral-historic ascendancy over all other nations, however proud and mighty, and who could bring added vigor to their efforts by exhorting one another to repay God for His extra care with zeal in His service. In a simpler age, when the power of ideas was more visible than today, it was a matter of consequence that men believed, in the words of Jonathan Edwards, that America was called to be "the glorious renovator of the world."

Toward the end of the seventeenth century, the thoughts of more and more colonials shifted from piety to liberty, and the true American mission took widespread root. One of the first to express this thought was John Wise, of Ipswich, who ended his noble democratic preaching in 1725, as he had begun in 1675, by exhorting his listeners to give "recognition of what God has done for these famous English colonies" and govern themselves after the dictates of reason. At the same time, three further variations of the mission of America won popular acceptance: as asylum for the "miserable people on the continent or isles of Europe"; as future savior of the mother country in distress, and as greatest and richest of nations, destined by its splendor and spiritual elevation to carry all older nations in its orbit. The first two of these prophetic and hortatory sentiments were most eloquently proclaimed by Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, in The Snare Broken, a sermon of sober rejoicing on the repeal of the Stamp Act. The mission of America as asylum was also vigorously advertised by such revolutionary figures as Franklin, Paine, Jefferson, and Freneau. The prophecy of untold future splendor was spoken by many Americans, but it remained for an Englishman, the estimable Berkeley, to voice, some 50 years before the Revolution, the grandest fancy of American destiny:

"There shall be sung another golden age,
The rise of empire and of arts. * * *
Westward the course of empire takes its way."

Despite these refinements and flights of imagination, the central idea of America's divinely appointed mission remained that of a people who by mere example would advertise liberty to all nations. This vision was a conspicuous arrow in the well-filled quiver of the great revolutionaries. For them spoke John Adams as early as 1765: "I always consider the settlement of America with reverence and wonder, as the opening of a grand scheme and design in Providence for the illumination and emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth." And he agreed with hundreds of other patriots that the defeat of the colonies would mean the defeat of liberty everywhere.

The American mission came to flower with the adoption of the Constitution. The "Father of the Constitution" reminded the Philadelphia convention that "it was more than probable we were now digesting a plan which in its operation would decide forever the fate of republican government," reason enough to aim for the best. Washington, too, was conscious of the mission. In his first inaugural address he expressed the conviction that "the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people." In his Farewell Address he hoped that the "free Constitution" would be worked in such a manner that it would recommend itself "to the applause, the affection, and the adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it."

The Jeffersonians were, if anything, even stouter believers in the higher destiny of the infant Republic. Jefferson, who had proposed that the seal of the United States picture "the children of Israel in the wilderness led by a cloud by day and a pillar by night," never wearied of saying that Americans had a clear responsibility for the promotion of liberty. In 1802 he wrote Dr. Priestley:

"We feel that we are acting under obligations not confined to the limits of our own society. It is impossible not to be sensible that we are acting for all mankind; that circumstances denied to others, but indulged

to us, have imposed on us the duty of proving what is the degree of freedom and self-government in which a society may venture to leave its individual members."

And just 10 days before he died, in the last of his exhortations, he could say of the Declaration of Independence:

"May it be to the world what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all), the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstitution had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government."

For all men in this heroic age, whether Federalist or Republican, merchant or "mechanick," pious or secular, President Ezra Stiles, of Yale, spoke as prophet of inspiration in the United States Elevated to Glory and Honor. If he foretold wealth and might and dominion, he did so only to remind his Connecticut listeners that God gave these good things to those who deserved them, in this instance to a people determined to prove to a doubting world that "a democratic polity for millions, standing upon the broad basis of the people at large," could be made to work. The American mission was an influential ideological force in the formative years of the Republic.

In the decades of expansion, most Americans lost sight of the interpretation of the Nation's mission formulated by Washington and Jefferson. This was the age of Manifest Destiny, a phrase of huge import coined by John O'Sullivan in his Democratic Review in 1845. The loudly voiced assertion that it was America's duty to expand without delay to its natural geographic limits obscured the simpler, uncombative beliefs of the founding fathers. Even the concept of America as asylum for the "huddled masses yearning to breathe free" was made to serve this muscular version of the national destiny. "If ours is to be the home of the oppressed," thundered Representative Duncan, of Ohio, in the debate over Oregon, "we must extend our Territory in latitude and longitude to the demand of the millions who are to follow us, as well of our own posterity as those who are invited to our peaceful shores to partake in our republican institutions."

Yet the idea of the model Republic had lost none of its appeal for more thoughtful men. Andrew Jackson reminded his fellow countrymen that "the eyes of all nations are fixed on our Republic," and in his farewell address observed that "Providence has showered on this favored land blessings without number, and has chosen you as the guardians of freedom, to preserve it for the benefit of the human race." No less convinced of this truth were his opponents, Story and Calhoun. Said the first of these, "We stand the latest, and, if we fail, probably the last experiment of self-government by the people." Said the second, "We may * * * do more to extend liberty by our example over this continent and the world generally, than would be done by a thousand victories." Representative Severance, of Maine, countered the shrill cries of the expansionists by urging that we "rather extend the 'area of freedom' by * * * our bright and shining example as a pattern Republic."

The philosopher and the poet joined the statesman in this persuasion. Emerson proclaimed his belief in the Nation's peculiar destiny: "The Office of America is to liberate * * * I wish to see America a benefactor such as no country ever was." He hoped profoundly that we would contribute "our peculiar and legitimate advantages to the benefit of humanity."

And, of course, Walt Whitman:

"For we cannot tarry here,
We must march. * * * We must bear the brunt of danger,
We the youthful sinewy races, all the rest on us depend,
Pioneers! O Pioneers!"

Politer folk preferred to hear this message from Longfellow:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

The mission was given one final prewar turn by the economist, Henry Carey. In his Principles of Social Science, published some 11 years after Marx had proclaimed the inexorable antagonism of classes, Carey called America to testify that the class struggle was not the inevitable consequence of an industrial civilization.

"Such is the true mission of the United States * * * to prove that among the people of the world, whether agriculturists, manufacturers, or merchants, there is perfect harmony of interests, and that the happiness of individuals, as well as the grandeur of nations, is to be promoted by that greatest of all commandments, 'Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you.'"

The fateful meeting of the great American and the great American crisis cast this antique doctrine in a new and vital role. Repeatedly Lincoln expressed the persuasion that the cause of free government everywhere hung in the balance of this epic struggle, and repeatedly this theme was hammered home in press and pulpit. For Lincoln the mission was an article of national faith, "felt in the blood and felt along the heart." His profound distaste for slavery derived to an important degree from his opinion that the mere existence of human bondage as a legal and social institution virtually destroyed our claims to be the model republic. On the road to Washington he dedicated himself to "that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time." And in his dramatic message to the special session of Congress, July 4, 1861, he made clear the historic purpose for which he at least could justify the letting of fraternal blood:

"This issue embraces more than the fate of these United States. * * * This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men."

He returned to this belief again and again, as if it alone had power to revive his flagging faith and give some semblance of moral purpose to a war that must have often seemed a senseless pageant of suffering and corruption. He confided to Hay, "For my part, I consider [that] the central idea pervading this struggle is the necessity that is upon us, of proving that popular government is not an absurdity." He reminded Congress that it was not alone the Union but "the last, best hope of earth" that we would "nobly save or meanly lose." And finally at Gettysburg he made clear that he had acted and "these honored dead" had fought so "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." Thus with the help of the American mission, did Lincoln sublimate into an eternal symbol the best remembered of the Nation's battlefields.

In the decades of industrial, continental, and finally overseas expansion that followed the close of the Civil War, the doctrine of the mission was twisted into several unlovely and almost unrecognizable shapes. The generation of high-spirited Americans who went a whoring after the false gods of imperialism likewise went a whoring on a swarm of idealistic but hardly democratic missions. Anglo-Saxony, the native version of the myth of the superior people, called upon Americans to ready themselves for inevitable triumph in the mysterious process of racial Darwinism. A close kin was the White Man's Burden, which a host of American Kiplings heralded as America's mission of the twentieth century. The belief in inevitable and God-given empire, an inflated version of Manifest Destiny, was voiced by Mahan, Lodge, Beveridge, and many others. Even the missionaries, especially those of the more vigorous Protestant groups, fell victims to this unattractive imperialistic trauma. "The taste of empire is in the mouth of the people," observed the Washington Post, "even as the taste of blood in the jungle." The true American mission was weak ideological meat for a people with Havana and Manila on their hands and minds. And the Isthmus of Panama. To Senator Morgan, of Alabama, the building of the canal had become "the proud mission of our Government and people, under a providence that is as peculiar to them as the founding of the kingdom of the Messiah was to the seed of Abraham."

The most dramatic proponent of these imperialistic notions was, of course, the rough-riding President. Roosevelt never doubted that the hand of God pointed out the high-road of international stewardship to the deserving American Republic. A weird but decipherable combination of democrat, jingo, missionary, and Anglo-Saxon, he had nothing but contempt for the argument that America should teach the world democracy by example alone. In the end, perhaps, the spirit of the age was more boldly heralded by his friend Beveridge, although Roosevelt would have been "de-lighted" to associate himself with these remarks:

"God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No. He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. Were it not for such a force as this the world would relapse into barbarism and night. And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world."

This was hardly the American mission as conceived by Washington and Lincoln.

It remained for Woodrow Wilson to hack away this jungle growth and lay bare the American mission in its pristine simplicity. Not only did he mount that rescue-party for freedom that Mayhew had foretold some 150 years before, but he created almost single-handed a pattern of high-minded values as the ideological support for American participation. And of these none was more exalted than the mission. He told Americans that this Nation had always been destined to lead mankind "in the assertion of the rights of peoples and the rights of free nations; as destined to set a responsible example to all the world of what free government is and can do for the maintenance of right' standards, both national and international." Our immediate mission was to make the world safe for democracy; our ultimate mission was to show the world that democracy was worth saving.

The missionary urge, the call to duty that assigns the Republic a historic responsibility nobler than the mere defense of its own independence, lives on in a half-dozen recognizable forms. Harry S. Truman, Henry Luce, Henry Wallace, Francis Biddle, Eric Johnston, David Lilienthal, and Paul Hoffman are a few of those who have recently exhorted their countrymen in the idiom of the mission. Yet their versions, most of which look to the export of American ideas and institutions, are framed in terms of active proselytism. The true American mission seems to have lost its popular appeal—perhaps because there are now so many

other testaments to freedom, perhaps because it lends itself so easily to the discredited cause of isolation, certainly because those Americans who recognize our obligations to other nations appreciate that the force of good example is not enough in this savage world.

Yet it would be unfortunate were we to lose sight of the authentic American mission. If we must have a mission—and historically and spiritually we probably must, whether dictated by God or providence or sheer utility—why should it not be this humane and humble version of a universal trait of national consciousness? Admittedly it can serve as a cloak for the revival of the most short-sighted, ethnocentric stamp of isolationism, but only if internationally-minded Americans permit it to be stolen from their keeping. The American mission, a view of national destiny neither vulgar nor imperialistic, can certainly be squared with a healthy attitude of international cooperation. And at the same time it can continue to serve as a healthy spur to domestic improvement—in race relations, education, politics, labor-management relations, and all the other major areas in which we might, if we felt the world's gaze fixed upon us, be better Democrats.

And no matter what positive obligations we assume toward other nations, or what ideological adjustments we make in assuming them, it is inconceivable that this doctrine, which Ralph H. Gabriel ranks with the fundamental law and the free individual as one of the three leading articles of our democratic faith, could be cast upon the scrap heap of outworn American ideologies. If we are no longer the only testament to freedom, we can still be the most notable. America, which seeks to meet the vast problems of sectional, economic, racial, and religious diversity with democratic solutions, has much to teach by mere example. The American mission is yet to be fulfilled.

Communist Hungary's Anti-Jewish Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since Soviet Russia has embarked on a policy of anti-Semitism and mistreatment of its Jewish minority in Nazi fashion, the Communist satellite governments of Eastern Europe are following the dictates of Moscow by adopting similar policies toward their own Jewish minorities. A striking example is Communist-dominated Hungary, where the Jewish community of 160,000 souls has undergone a vicious campaign of political repression in recent years. Hungarian Jewry has been rendered destitute by the Communist regime, its religious and communal life has been subordinated to the state, and the flourishing Zionist movement among the Jews of Hungary has been outlawed and destroyed.

Not only have the Jews of Hungary been robbed of their rights and nearly all earthly possessions, but according to recent reports they are on the verge of wholesale deportations to the concentration camps of Siberia. Anti-Semitism is rampant in Hungary, the Jews and other religious minorities are regarded with suspicion because they look to America and the west as their last hope for eventual freedom.

The well-known magazine, the New Leader, in its issue of January 15, published an article Do Hungary's Jews Face Communist Liquidation? by Bela Fabian, himself a former victim of the Nazi concentration camps and a veteran Hungarian democratic leader. He is in contact with the underground now working against the Communist regime in Hungary and is said to have been the first to predict the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. His article follows:

DO HUNGARY'S JEWS FACE COMMUNIST LIQUIDATION?—SATELLITE REGIMES ARE ROBBING JEWS OF RIGHTS AND PROPERTY; WHOLESALE DEPORTATION MAY COME

(By Bela Fabian)

(Bela Fabian, himself a victim of Nazi concentration camps, is a veteran Hungarian democratic leader. He is now a member of the Hungarian National Council, with wide contacts in the Hungarian underground. He was the first one to predict (in the New Leader of January 1, 1949) the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.)

Gyula Perl is as large as a giant. In 1944 he and I had been deported to Auschwitz in the same cattle car. On our first night in Auschwitz, he intercepted with his huge body the blows intended for me. On December 10, 1948, he came to visit me in New York. He had just escaped from Communist-ruled Hungary.

"Why did you leave, Gyula?" I asked him. "You are no politician. Surely you could have lived inconspicuously."

"I did not want to live to see the sealed cattle cars again," he replied. "You will see, they will come again."

Although I have no illusions about the Communist regime in Hungary, I listened to Gyula's words with doubt. But very soon the information coming to me from within Hungary began to confirm my friend's expectations. All the events within Hungary point to the possibility that the cattle cars of deportation may soon be rolling out of the country again. A few months after my friend's visit, I got the first hint of what was coming.

On February 7, 1949, at 6 o'clock in the evening, Premier Matthias Rákosi received five delegates of the Hungarian-Jewish Public Office. All Hungarian Jews, both Neologue and Orthodox, were united in this organization. Ministers Gerö and Révai were also present. The delegation was led by Lajos Stockler, the president of the Jewish community of Budapest, and by Dr. László Benedek, its vice president.

The Jewish delegation entered Rakosi's majestic office at Akademia Street, which is furnished with works of art and precious antique furniture stolen from the aristocracy, and lavishly decorated with pictures and Persian carpets. Minister Joseph Reval received the delegates with these words: "Gentlemen, we are now among ourselves."

"Does this mean that we are among us Jews?" asked one of the delegates. He referred to Rakosi, Gero, and Reval, who are Jews by birth.

"No," Gero replied, "among us Communists. According to my knowledge, neither I nor my comrades Rakosi and Reval are Jews, we are nonsectarian; we are Marxist-Leninist-Stalinists. Our prayer is our work for socialism."

Stockler and Benedek approved this. But an elderly lawyer declared:

"We are here to discuss the following vital problems: the quick decline of city Jews to beggars; the growing hostility of the Hungarian Communist Party to the Jews, whether or not they are party members; the Government's new policy toward Zionism and against the emigration of Jews to Palestine."

To this Matthias Rakosi replied:

"Do you believe, comrades, that we Communists will give up our progressive economic policy because it does not suit the Jewish bourgeoisie, or because it is disagreeable for them, or because they feel themselves injured? Do you believe, comrades, that we shall make exceptions for your fellow religionists? That we shall do this when only the indigents and their sons, as well as the former members of the forced-labor battalions of the Horthy regime, are our sincere adherents? Do you believe that you really are the chosen people? A state within the Communist state? Do you believe we shall close our state-owned department stores, our socialized hotels, cafes, etc., which because of their low prices drive the Jewish businessmen into increasingly painful bankruptcy? Do you believe that we shall tolerate the old bargaining? If you came to discuss such problems, you had better go."

JEWS PROWESTERN, ANTI-COMMUNIST

Révai added to this:

"Don't you know that the Jewish bourgoisie is conspiring against us? And this together with the big landowners, big-business men, bankers, fired state officials, and priests. Not only here in this country but also on the other side of the borders. Vile Jewish jokes against the Communist regime are spread throughout Budapest. We have documents to prove that you Jews give money to the Mindszenty clique for the purposes of espionage, for the organization of 'Black gangs,' for the restoration of the throne of Otto Hapsburg, the king of rich Christians and Jews?"

Dr. László Benedek agreed. He said: "I am a Communist in the first place and a Jew only in the second place. I am on your side. The former wealthy Hungarian Jews are incurable. They are the enemies of the Soviets. They are the adherents of the west. They do not deserve anything but the whip, the jail, and bayonets."

Rákosi then explained the new official Communist stand on Zionism: "The present State of Israel is a nationalistic state, its government is hypocritical, by no means democratic, and has taken up the attitude of 'hurrah nationalism.' The present state functionaries are under American influence and, moreover, are in the service of the Western Powers preparing for war. You can find no traces of Socialist arrangements in Israel, either in politics, economy, or education. Ben-Gurion and Shertok are the puppets of Washington. We have good proof of this. The elections in January were a tragi-comedy. Eighty to ninety thousand voters were crossed off the lists. What kind of voters? Those voters who did not make a secret of their solidarity toward the Soviet Union. This is how this election result was obtained. An American bluff, which means a slap in the face to everyone who knows the political structure of the present State of Israel. I do not speak of the ingratitude of the government, which ought to thank the Kremlin for everything which was done for Israel in world politics and in the UN. We have recognized the government, which is corrupted to the bones. The Kremlin was the first to recognize the State of Israel. Only after that Truman came hesitatingly, because he saw that our policy toward Israel undeniably showed the generosity and sincerity of the Soviet Union. Only after that did Truman also act, followed by

all the chessmen of the Washington chessboard. But they still allowed Bevin to make a few little moves to exploit the recognition of Israel by the Kremlin for their anti-Communist agitation in the Arab States. I do not wish to speak of Israel having got their best weapons for this war from the Czechs through the intervention of Moscow. The members of the Government of Israel are simply scoundrels in the pay of Washington. They will live to see unexpected things. Those Jews who are Communists, that is practical political revolutionaries, will understand us. And those who do not understand us shall feel our impact."

Another delegate, an old Communist foreman in a great Budapest printing plant, who had been a Zionist for decades, said timidly:

"This is why we would like the Communist-trained Jews to lose less time than last year in going to Israel so that they can do their best for the revolution."

Rákosi replied:

"This, comrades, is out of the question. Comrade Rajk [this was before the Rajk purge—Ed.] has already explained our point of view to the Minister of Israel. Old and sick Jews can get out of the country, but only with their most necessary household utensils, without any other property. But workers we need ourselves. The young Jews must use their efforts and strength in this country."

"We inform you," Rákosi continued, "that the government will shortly dissolve by the stroke of a pen all Zionist recruiting offices, schools, organizations, denominational and nationalist underground movements. We shall tolerate no longer the Zionist machinations in Hungary. The Minister of Interior, Comrade Kádár, will remove this illness of Hungarian Jews by an operation."

After the death of Zhdanov in October 1948, it was no longer a secret that anti-Semitic instructions had arrived from Moscow to the Communist governments of all the satellite countries.

Shortly after my conversation with Gyula Perl, I received more news as to how these instructions were being acted upon. I received a memorandum from a former professor who miraculously escaped from a Transylvanian prison. By chance he was put on the same train in which Rumanian Jews were being deported. He described how the bodies of those Jews who perished on the journey were thrown out of the train, just as they had been thrown out of the cattle cars on their way to Auschwitz.

ASKED OLD NAZI QUESTIONS

The chairman of the 1949 Rajk trial, Vilmos Olty, formerly a prominent Nazi, posed the same questions to the defendants which were asked in Nazi times by Nazi judges:

"What was your father's last name? What was your grandfather's last name?"

By this he wished to demonstrate that the defendants were of Jewish origin. Rajk, who was well known for his anti-Semitic feelings, after having replied that his grandfather's name was "Reich," remarked at the same time:

"His name was Reich but he was an Aryan."

He confessed to everything except that he might be of Jewish origin. After the Rajk trial, 38 prominent Jewish Communists were taken from the party center to the secret police. Eighty others received heavy sentences. Still others disappeared without leaving a trace.

This was followed by an anti-Semitic campaign throughout the country. The campaign was directed by István Kossa, deputy general secretary of the Communist Party, and by a member of parliament called Joseph Gém. The latter, in a speech in Nyiregyháza, declared that the Jews were sabotaging the 5-year plan, that they sided with America and were the enemies of the Soviet Union. A few days later, the president of the Jewish community of nearby Tokaj and his wife were cold-bloodedly beaten to death in their home in broad daylight and in the presence of their child and their maid. This happened on February 19, 1950. A few hours after this crime, the president of the Jewish community of Miskolc and the rabbi of Miskolc arrived on the scene. They were immediately arrested, but released on condition that they would mention the murder to no one else. The next day, the Jews of Tokaj started to pack their belongings because they no longer felt safe and therefore wanted to flee to Budapest. They were told that if they dared to leave the community they would be interned immediately.

Was there any investigation of these crimes? There was not, and no one was surprised, because Laszlo Piros, who was responsible for the widespread pogroms in 1946, had just been named a major general. Piros only 4 years ago was a shoemaker.

Throughout the country today the Jews are being questioned in their homes by the secret police. "Have you got jewels? Have your relatives got jewels? Which of your friends has jewels?"

The interrogations are conducted as they were in Nazi times. At one such interrogation, conducted in the vaults of the Bank of Commerce in Székesfehérvár, when beating and torture were of no use, the secret police applied the old Nazi method of forcing religious Jews to eat bacon, strictly prohibited by the Jewish faith.

Illegal escapes through Czechoslovakia ceased in July 1949. A transport of refugees was brought back from Slovakia to Hungary, in July 1949, by a lieutenant colonel of the secret police named Kovács. The escapees received heavy prison sentences. Since then, refugees have been leaking through the Austrian border, heavily guarded by mines and barbed wire. More than half of these refugees are killed by mines or by the bullets of the guards. Nevertheless, these flights continue. Hungary's Jews know that Hungary and the Soviet Union have a common frontier. They know that 35,000 Jews have been deported from Lemberg and that almost the entire Jewish population of the Ukraine, of White Russia, and of the Crimea are being sent to eastern Siberia. When I mention these facts in the United States, I am often told: "There are no gas chambers in Russia." Those who say this do not know that the coal mines of Karaganda can be just as deadly as gas chambers.

DISBELIEVED NAZI ATROCITIES

In August 1942, Msgr. Béla Varga, today the president of the Hungarian National Council in New York, smuggled out to Switzerland the microfilms telling the story of the Warsaw ghetto and of Auschwitz. At that time, the Western World was late in reacting.

Before the Nazis deported the Jews of Eastern Europe to Auschwitz and other extermination camps, they deprived them of their conditions of living. When the Jews were left without jobs and without bread, the Nazis simply declared that people without income or profession are a menace to society and must be removed. Today, the first part of this proceeding has been repeated by the Communists. Jewish businessmen, industrialists, lawyers, journalists, actors, and officials have nearly all lost their jobs.

Several months ago, I received a letter smuggled out of Budapest. The letter was written by a friend of mine who as yet hasn't been arrested; together we had fought against the Nazis before my deportation to Germany. "Do you remember," he writes "with what hope we looked toward the west in those days?"

Famine in India—United States Aid Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1951:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
FAMINE AND DIPLOMACY

There may be some good reason—though it is not easy to think of one—why the State Department chose last week as the time to talk to Senator CONNALLY'S committee about India's application for food. The Department, we have all been told, has been studying the famine which India must meet this year, it is strongly in favor of sending the food, it is well aware of the consequences of mixing up human misery with domestic and international politics. Yet the Department picked the present moment when the Indian-American disagreement over China is the hottest to approach Congress.

What happened, of course, was that the committee was cool, and the news was broadcast to India and to the world that the United States Government is withholding food from the famine-stricken masses of India because it disagrees with the foreign policy of the Indian Government. Is it possible that the Department did not know that this is what would happen if this subject was opened up last week? Why did it not wait until the issues at stake and the consequences had been explained fully to the leaders of Congress and until the crisis in the UN had subsided?

Let us hope that it was only bureaucratic insensitiveness which prevented the Department from realizing how Congress was feeling about India last week and how India would be feeling about America this week.

The problem of the Indian famine is grave and urgent, and what we do about that famine will have great and far-reaching consequences.

The main facts of the problem are as follows: There has been a crop failure in India during the last year which is due primarily to a combination of natural disasters in the different parts of India—to floods in some regions, drought in others, to the earthquakes in Assam, and to a plague of locusts. There are about 100,000,000 people who depend on rationed food, and they are already down to 9 ounces of rice or wheat a day. These rations cannot be sustained until the autumn unless the Indian Government imports about 6,000,000 tons of food grains, of wheat, millets, and rice.

Two-thirds of this amount, or 4,000,000 tons, the Indian Government has been able to procure and pay for—with some assistance from us. But 2,000,000 tons have still to be taken care of. It is known that we can supply this amount of food—mostly but not entirely in the form of wheat. The necessary ships are also available, though it may be necessary to use some ships that are now moth-balled. The cost is estimated at $100,000,000. The Indian Government wishes to finance this transaction as a credit, to be sure on easy terms. The State Department, after studying the over-all Indian financial

position, thinks it unwise that India go into debt for consumable goods. It is, therefore, proposing a grant, and that of course requires action by Congress. This is how the matter got to Senator CONNALLY'S committee.

Let us hope the members of the committee will approach the question bearing in mind the fact that there is no doubt that India needs the food desperately and that there is no doubt that America has the food and can easily make it available. Under these conditions failure to provide the food can be due only to one reason—an intention to use the granting and the withholding of the food as an instrument of diplomatic pressure upon a government with which we happen at the moment to be disagreeing.

That is something we ought not to do. It is beneath us. We cannot, we must not, stoop to it. It is also something that we cannot afford to do. For it would illustrate too dramatically the propaganda of our enemies—namely, that American philanthropy undermines the independence of the nations which accept it.

Let us not defame ourselves by giving even a shred of justification to the charge that we could let people die of hunger because their government did not vote as our Government would like that government to vote. Let us not place between the people of India and the people of America, perhaps for decades or generations to come, such a terrible memory. Let us not for lack of imagination and experience do as a government what no decent American would dream of doing if it were his own personal and private responsibility to give or to withhold out of his surplus food for men, women, and children who are dying of hunger.

Let us rather buy with this food and this money the incalculable benefit of having proved to the whole world that we do indeed believe in freedom—and that we do not buy the consciences of our friends but only their good will and their confidence in our own decency. If ever there was a chance to justify our friends and to confound our enemies, it is here and now—by rising above all the petty feelings of the moment in order to play that part in the world which, when we are at our best, we find it a joy and a pride to be able to play.

Let's Use the Belasco Theater as a Service Center Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to lease to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the Belasco Theater Building on Lafayette Place with a nominal annual rental of $1, and to assume the cost of renovation and operation, as long as it is managed by the United Service Organization as a recreation center for service personnel of the United States and the United Nations.

The bill will, in normal procedure, be referred to the Committee on Public Works; and in deference to my friends on that committee I wish to explain that the bill I presented today is little more than a legislative draft. When I started going into the ramifications, I found that many public and private agencies are involved in any plans for a service and recreation center in Washington, and will wish to be heard. It may well be that any bill reported by the committee will be much changed in language.

However, I am convinced that the fundamental idea is sound, and that the use of Federal funds to maintain such a center in Washington can be logically defended.

Among American municipalities the city of Washington is unique in many respects. It is, as the Nation's Capital, the only municipality wholly dependent on Congress for appropriations. Probably no other municipality of such compelling interest to the men of the armed services is within traveling distance of so many men in military installations.

The appropriations required will not be large. It is estimated that restoring the stage and other facilities to the conditions existing when it was a famous World War II stage-door canteen will cost about $75,000, and that light, heat, power, and maintenance and janitor service will cost two or three thousand dollars a year. Neither the government of the District of Columbia nor any of the agencies serving the armed services personnel have available funds to defray these costs at this time—and the center is needed now. I hope the bill will be promptly and favorably received and studied by the committee.

Some Practical Thinking on the Price Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist and keen observer on economic affairs, Sylvia F. Porter, always seems to be able to express in a clear and simple manner the difficult economic problems with which we are faced and to comment upon them intelligently. Her brief column in the New York Post of January 29, 1951, concerning the recent price freeze is characteristic of her thinking on economic matters and is most timely in its presentation. I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress:

NOW IT'S UP TO US
(By Sylvia F. Porter)

The Government can't put 5,000,000 of us in jail if 5,000,000 of us decide to violate the law.

A few hundred law enforcement agents, operating out of only 55 key areas in the entire land, can't really enforce price ceilings if enough buyers and sellers elect to break the ceilings.

We are witnessing an insane economic race from which no American can emerge a winner.

We are watching a devastating attack on the dollar which can destroy our Nation and our security just as surely as a hydrogen bomb can blast our Nation and our security.

Now another half-way move—flexible controls on prices and wages—is being made to cut short the race, beat back the attack.

As a half-way move, it can achieve half-way results—but only if you and I, acting as individual buyers and sellers, as individual businessmen and wage earners, want it to achieve even this.

It can and it will accomplish nothing if you and I, acting as individuals, decide to wink at violations, cooperate in price-wage chiseling.

In fact, if we don't get into this act and get into it fast, the new stabilization will fail miserably and the result will be less than nothing, for there'll be only intensification of cynicism about the dollar's value.

There's no pious pontificating in what I'm writing here.

Our dollar is in a terrible trend.

To an increasing extent, where the cost of living goes from here depends on you. United we stand, divided we fall.

We must stop fooling ourselves about the delights of inflation. It is a disease. The glow it seems to bring to the economic face—to the profit report and the weekly pay check—is only a fever.

This disease has killed economies since civilization began. It can kill ours, too.

Even during World War II, when we had much, much tougher controls and rationing too, prices rose 15 percent.

Even when we were fighting an all-out war on two fronts, hundreds of thousands of Americans ghoulishly violated the law, played black markets, betrayed themselves and their land

Now the new controls are flexible—and even that word is misleading, for flexibility is supposed to suggest something that can go two ways. In these rules, the flexibility is only on the way up.

We've wasted 6 months in talk and seen the cost of living rise month by month to the highest mark ever—81 percent above the level of prewar days.

We're still fumbling, and harsh as the control headlines may appear, the fact is the regulations are full of loopholes.

Worse still, the latest schedule I've heard indicates that officials view this as just another interim step, figure they can't put on a real freeze until late spring or summer because prices and wages haven't yet reached the right level.

So our only protection is our own understanding and my only prayer is that you're thinking more clearly than the politicians.

If thousands of businessmen decide to rush to the control agencies to yelp about inequities the stabilization will be a mockery in no time.

If thousands of wage earners decide to crowd their spokesmen for additional concessions, ditto.

If thousands of you decide to chisel, there aren't enough policemen to find you or jails to hold you.

It's that delicate, it's that touch-and-go.

As one individual, I can only emphasize the magnitude of the stakes, vow to do my best. How about you?

Pacific Pact and Organization for Far East Economic Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 12, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following article written by me for the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1951:

A DECISIVE FAR EAST POLICY—NEED AND VALUE OF A PACIFIC PACT AND ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM ARE PRESENTED

(By Representative JACOB K. JAVITS)

A bipartisan group of eight Members (Representatives LAURIE C. BATTLE, Democrat, of Alabama; WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota; MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana; CHESTER E. MERROW, Republican, of New Hampshire; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut; CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and the writer) last week introduced in the House of Representatives a bill favoring a Pacific Pact. Two members of this group (Representative RIBICOFF and the writer) sponsored at the same time a resolution favoring a far-eastern recovery program implemented by an organization for far-eastern economic cooperation. Both programs of self-help and mutual cooperation, for defense and for economic development, are to be joined in by the United States. These efforts are to be considered in the context of the negotiation of the Japanese peace treaty for which John Foster Dulles also left last week.

The resolutions represent together an affirmative foreign policy for the Far East by the United States with the primary responsibility placed where it belongs, on the peoples affected, but with the United States backing them in their efforts in recognition of the fact that the eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean is the strategic frontier of the United States itself. This effort recognizes the adulthood of the free peoples of Asia and puts them on a parity in American consideration with the mature nations of Western Europe with whom we have developed the Atlantic Pact and the European recovery program. In such a framework of regional organization within the United Nations Charter, the development of Japanese military capabilities for the defense of the Japanese islands and of Japanese industrial production for the economic improvement so urgently needed by the free peoples of Asia, can proceed without the overhanging fear that a new aggressor Frankenstein might be created.

The North Korean and Communist Chinese aggression in Korea and the commitments undertaken by the United States respecting Formosa, the Philippines, and Indochina show the urgent need for collective action with full contribution by the powers in the Pacific area themselves in a Pacific area council, to guarantee their independence and territorial integrity against further aggressive action of the Korean type or by subversive tactics. Accordingly, regional pacts for collective self-defense which come squarely within article 51 of the UN Charter paralleling the example of the Atlantic Pact will, it is expected, provide an organization capable of coping with the Communist threat.

It is my conviction that a Pacific pact can do much to discourage further aggression. The principle of self-help and mutual cooperation implicit in the Atlantic Pact, and in a proposed Pacific pact, is one of the greatest contributions which can be made to a constructive foreign policy and to international peace and security. We see in this principle a decisive answer to Communist efforts to confuse the free peoples and lead them to their own destruction by charging imperialism and warmongering. The other free peoples have a right to fight for their freedom, and to share in the great responsibilities of meeting the challenge of communism; proper organization for such an effort is essential.

The sponsors of the resolution contemplate that the immediately eligible powers for a Pacific area council would be the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand and Japan. It would be the aim of the pact to include also Indonesia, Thailand (Siam), Burma, India, Pakistan and Ceylon, the states of Indochina and the Federated Malay States. Formosa would, of course, be a logical and essential addition for the defense of the Pacific Ocean area, but the terms upon which Formosa should join in and be represented should be determined by the other participants in the pact. This also applies to the participation of France, Great Britain, and Holland, which administer areas in that part of the world.

This position would assume no appeasement of the Chinese Communists, and therefore dispositions of our forces committed in Korea as military needs dictate. It would also imply an early peace treaty with Japan, giving her a framework of regional organization which would protect her neighbors while putting her in a position to defend the Japanese islands. The fact that we would not appease the Chinese Communists with Formosa, however, makes it vital that we must be more concerned than ever about democracy and free institutions in Formosa—economic development and good government there.

The resolution favoring the creation of an organization for Far East economic cooperation represents an effort to follow the policy of self-help and mutual cooperation so successfully developed with the European recovery program and which I consider to be the most enlightened development in American foreign policy since the Monroe Doctrine. It is a policy of improving the well-being of peoples in order to give them an incentive to fight of their own free will for a freedom which is valuable. It emphasizes the one strength of the United States which all admit and recognize: the strength of production of goods and services. While the Communists only promise economic betterment, the United States should help the free peoples of the Far East to deliver economic betterment.

A blueprint for the economic development of South and Southeast Asia, the Colombo plan, was developed by the members of the British Commonwealth at a meeting of the Cabinet ministers of the Commonwealth Governments concerned in the Pacific held at Colombo, Ceylon, January 1950. The 6-year program calls for £1,085,000,000, equivalent to about $3,000,000,000, which is needed from abroad for economic development in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Malaya. The British expect to supply about $750,000,000 out of blocked sterling, leaving a net requirement of $2,250,000,000. An extension of the economic development program with others of the Asian countries which urgently require such development, it is estimated, would add to this figure for the same period another $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 required from abroad. The Colombo plan emphasizes the other sources than new investment from which such vast amounts of money may be drawn and points out that these are already largely being utilized to the maximum. These, for example, include, aside from sterling balances held in London by India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, loans of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and private investment.

It is pointed out that private investment has a great field but that public investment to improve food supply, health, education, and transportation is first essential to provide a sound economic and social framework which will encourage private investment. The role of the International Bank, though important, is recognized to be limited, as it must make reasonable banking requirements for its loans. The bank has already made loans to India totaling $62,500,000 for development projects and loans to Thailand (Siam) of $25,400,000 for such developments, but this must be compared to a minimal net capital requirement for India alone under the Colombo plan of £607,000,000, or about $1,699,600,000.

It is important to emphasize that the Colombo plan has limited objectives commensurate with the economy of means imposed upon the Commonwealth countries by their own economic problems and by the balancing between expenditures for armament and economic development required in any development plans which are now sought to be financed by any country including the United States. Hence, the Colombo plan promises an increase of 15,000,000 acres of land under cultivation, or about 3.5 percent; an increase of 6,000,000 tons of food grains produced per annum, or 10 percent; an increase of 17 percent of land under irrigation, adding 13,000,000 acres, and an increase of 67 percent in electric generating capacity. Lest anyone be deceived as to the extent of the improvement which this would make, it is to be noted that in the case of India it would mean approximately 20 kilowatt-hours of electricity production per capita, as against 2,296 kilowatt-hours per capita for the United States.

The need for economic development to give the peoples of the Pacific Ocean area and of south and southeast Asia a basis for resisting communism and seeking freedom and a real incentive to do so is certainly there. Living conditions in that area are as low as anywhere in the world, with annual income per capita in the range of $56 per annum, as against about $600 per capita per annum for Great Britain and about $1,700 per capita per annum for the United States. It is significant to note, for example, that in India there are 73,000,000 agricultural workers out of an estimated population of over 350,000,000, while in the United States there are only 8,000,000 agricultural workers out of a population of over 150,000,000

It is this fundamental economic fact of chronic hunger and debased living standards in the whole area which underlies the great revolutionary ferment now in process in Asia and the appeal of the spurious Communist promises. It might seem easier from our point of view if we could, while we are so heavily engaged in military expenditure, by reason and argument show the people the fallacy of these Communist promises. But the conditions of the people in that area are so bad and a rate of over 90 percent illiteracy and other impediments to the spread of information add so much to the difficulties that this approach is not too promising for the short term when the greatest danger exists. Accordingly, direct economic improvement on the most basic level without political strings and with a maximum of self-help on the part of the peoples affected will prove to be the most effective weapon to win away the peoples of this area from the inevitable attraction that fake Communist promises of economic equality and improvement are now exercising. This is the basis for my own efforts and those of other Members of Congress to help India with the 2,000,000 tons of grain currently needed to avert famine there, though we deeply feel Prime Minister Nehru's political pronouncements on Communist China to be untenable and ill-advised, and though we were among the first to advocate UN action in condemnation of Communist Chinese aggression in Korea.

Let us not forget that India has a formidable army of 500,000, that Pakistan has a substantial army and that means exist in this whole area to withstand and hold back an armed Communist tide. It is the will and the morale which must be builded as well as the military means and all in recognition of the new day in Asia—the day of adulthood and self-reliance. This is entirely in accord with American tradition, and it is the purpose of the sponsors of the resolution for a Pacific pact and a Far East recovery program to galvanize the executive department into action before it is indeed too late.

New York: The Port With a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Howard S. Cullman, chairman of the Port of New York Authority, before the annual dinner of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association at the Hotel Commodore on January 9, 1951:

I am here with you tonight for just one reason—to take a look at the Port of New York. You are the men whose business depends upon moving large volumes of export-import freight through the Port of New York safely, expeditiously and economically. The Port of New York Authority is an organization set up nearly 30 years ago to help do the same thing from the public angle. I understand your association is just 5 years older than the authority.

From some of the statements made by our competitors one might get the impression that the Port of New York is on its last legs. A trip up and down the water front discloses much that needs to be done, both in New York and New Jersey, and might lend some support to such statements. The comparison of new port facilities at other points along the Atlantic coast is embarrassing. However, the Port of New York has always been characterized by vigor. It has always been able to find the road to leadership, and I am confident that we will ultimately find the method and the resources to go forward with the program of modern pier construction that will assure the continuance of our preeminence.

We are currently handling over six billion dollars' worth of foreign trade a year. Back in January 1861, just before the Civil War, when the total trade of the port was less than half a billion dollars, Harper's Weekly commented that alarm had been created by threats of new commercial rivals to New York, but sagely concluded "It is very easy to open a port and to expect a great trade but it is very hard to create a rival to New York."

This is no time, therefore, for a Pollyanna attitude, either with respect to the international situation or the future of the Port of New York—far from it. We all have a hard job to do for the future. However, once in a while we need to take stock of both our strength and our weaknesses; to publicize just how much effective work is being done to insure the future supremacy of the port, and to do a little self-criticizing on what more needs to be done.

Last spring the Mayor of New York appointed a committee to review the future needs of the port. I was asked to serve as chairman of a subcommittee that had to do with the transport rates and other costs paid by the shipper, which in many instances are a handicap to competition for commerce. I am also serving on another committee which has to do with increasing the effectiveness of port promotion.

Although the reports of both these subcommittees are in semi-final form, they have not yet been submitted to the main committee for consideration, and hence I will not try to discuss them. I shall, however, give you some of my own views on both of these subjects.

As Al Smith would say, "let's look at the record." It is well known to you gentlemen, although not to all of the businessmen of New York, that transportation rates between the interior of the United States and the Port of New York have for many years been higher than to other ports. Responsibility for this situation goes back to the dim pages of history 50 to 75 years ago when the great rail transportation systems were engaged in a bitter rivalry. When they finally worked out a compromise peace treaty, New York ended up with the distinction of being the port taking the highest handicap, a sort of 10-goal man on the polo team.

Over the years our port has lived with these disadvantages in rates without too much pain because of our superiority in ocean steamship service, some offsetting ocean rate advantages, and the great magnetic force of a large banking, forwarding, and consuming area at the port.

In recent years, however, the rules of the game have been rigged against us in several ways. Since 1946 the percentage increase in rail rates has hiked our long-time port differentials to new levels of disadvantage. On export agricultural implements from Peoria, Ill., where New Orleans formerly had an advantage of $44 for a 20-ton carload, the difference is now $96. On the same commodity from Minneapolis, the New Orleans advantage under the normal differential of $32 a car was lifted to $120 a car, and Baltimore's prewar advantage of $12 was jumped to $20. On imports of burlap bagging to Milwaukee, New Orleans' advantage was increased from $19.50 to $51 per car.

The restoration of the normal basis of port relationships has been a matter of great concern to the Port Authority, to business interests of the port, and to the New York carriers. The Port Authority has carried this matter to the Interstate Commerce Commission every time a percentage increase came up. The Commission's orders have been clear that the inflated differentials should be readjusted to norm. Readjustment of these rates involves rechecking and republication of thousands and thousands of class rates. The carriers have delayed this action and shoved it aside. The New York railroads have restored the prewar relationships by the publication of special commodity rates on automobiles, agricultural implements, rubber tires, meats, grain, burlap bagging, cocoa beans, coffee, crude rubber, and a few other commodities for particular origins and destinations in the interior, but there are still many rates out of line. One of our most important objectives is to find a quick and simple way of restoring these relationships, disrupted since 1946, and the Port Authority is working constantly with the railroads to attain that objective.

Another disadvantage which has bothered us a great deal is the fact that at the Port of New York big pieces—machinery, large vehicles, and similar weighty objects—are subject to a heavy lift charge, when lightered to shipside. A piece of machinery weighing 20 tons from an inland point such as Springfield or Peoria, Ill., is assessed a heavy lift charge of approximately $20 at New York and no such charge is made at other ports—a disadvantage which has resulted in some substantial diversions of this type of business.

The Port Authority trade promotion offices in Chicago, Cleveland, and Washington have tried to overcome this situation by advising shippers on how to route heavy pieces to shipside by carfloat to avoid this extra charge, but such routing requires a minimum of six cars and does not help the shipper of consignments in lesser volume. A proposal is now before the New York carriers to eliminate heavy lift charges on pieces up to 25 tons, and to reduce the minimum requirement to one car in ordering a carfloat in lieu of lighter delivery.

At New Orleans, where heavy lift freight has to be handled through pier sheds or by lighter, in much the same physical manner as at New York, the railroads on October 10 last year abolished all heavy lift charges. This leaves New York as the only port where such charges are still in effect. We hope the railroads at New York will act promptly to meet the situation, since comparisons of 1950 with 1949 tonnages show a definite falling off in the proportion of heavy machinery moving through New York as compared to certain other ports.

There are other rate disadvantages at New York with which you gentlemen are very familiar, which are the subject of constant attention by the Port Authority. Nobody should assume for one moment that an active campaign is not constantly under way to improve our position ratewise as compared to other ports.

The Port Authority has just filed a complaint against five Swedish steamship lines which have been imposing an added charge of $1 per ton on wood pulp to New York, and will take the matter to the Federal Maritime Board. The New York railroads and the Port Authority are acting vigorously to abolish the long-standing disadvantages in rates and unequal free storage time on export grain from the Great Lakes area. The matter will probably have to go to the Federal courts but it will be pursued to a final conclusion.

Over the years attempts of Baltimore, Philadelphia, Albany, Boston, and the Florida ports to permanently widen the disadvantages on railroad rail rates have been beaten back. The attempts of the railroads serving the Gulf ports to extend their rate advantages east of Chicago, Indianapolis, and Cincinnati were successfully resisted.

All of this work requires the constant attention of skilled traffic, rate, and economic analysts, and the ablest attorneys we can find. Under its directive from the two States to intervene in proceedings affecting commerce of the port, the Port Authority alone is spending $200,000 a year in this work. Over the years we have had our experts assemble data and present testimony, and our attorneys file briefs and make oral arguments in 182 formal cases before the regulatory commissions having jurisdiction over rail, water, and motortruck rates. In recent years several score more cases have also been carried on before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the field of air transport. The over-all batting average has been good but the work must go on with undiminished effort as the competitive situation becomes sharper and sharper.

I welcome particularly the evidence in recent months of an aggressive attitude on the part of New York railroad carriers to assert their rights to compete on an equality with carriers serving other ports.

Part of the struggle is in the political field—other sections of the country, for example, are advocating an outpouring of funds to subsidize transportation operations such as the Federal Barge Line on the Mississippi River. Although the operations of these lines are costing the taxpayers of the United States as much as $2,000,000 a year, there are perennial bills in Congress calling for the expenditure of $17,000,000 more for purchase of new barge-line equipment and extension of operations to new points. This Federal Barge Line project was set up in 1924 as a temporary pioneering operation to be turned over to private enterprise when river channels were fully completed and adequate terminal service and rate structures established. Nevertheless, now 26 years later, the Louisiana delegation is spearheading an attempt to continue and to expand this line which, at the expense of the taxpayers, is maintining such low rates in combination with the Mississippi Valley railroads, that an exporter of agricultural machinery from Minneapolis has an advantage of $168 per 20 ton carlot via New Orleans as compared to New York. In close cooperation with New York and New Jersey Senators and Representatives these matters are being fought out in Congress.

There are many other facets of rate disadvantages, such as extra transfer charges at

the port and special rules and practices by carriers and by labor which obtain here and not elsewhere, which require attention and concerted corrective action on the part of our business community, labor and political leaders to keep this port on a competitive basis with our neighbors and competitors. However, as long as we have a vigorous group of business and labor executives and vigilant public representatives to protect the interests of the port, I am satisfied that we can hold our own in the great American tradition of equality for all and special privilege for none.

I have been talking about some of the disadvantages under which we labor and against which we must continually fight. It would not be proper or wise to talk only about our ills. We have our strength and our attractions and we must in every way use them to build up the port. The unrivaled advantages of one of the great natural harbors of the world, a people skilled in business and transportation know-how, a preponderance of steamship and air communication to all parts of the globe, and an aggregate of machines and manpower not to be found in any other port, offer to all the world opportunities for prompt, safe, and efficient dispatch which do not exist anywhere else. Although the Port of New York is known in every part of the world, we must continue to tell every shipper, every passenger, every industrialist, of the specific facilities and services that he can find here. Furthermore, it is necessary that we understand his problems first hand and give him specific advice on how to make the best use of our great port.

To this end the Port Authority is now spending another $225,000 a year in a promotion program designed to reach the shipper at grass-roots level. We maintain in New York, Washington, Cleveland, and Chicago trade-promotion offices staffed by outstanding men who know the technique of transportation, traffic routing, and foreign trade.

Day after day, by personal visit, by telephone, by telegraph, and by correspondence they handle shippers' problems. Today it may be the next available sailing from New York to Genoa, Guiana, Cairo, or Capetown. Tomorrow, it may be the most economical way to ship a 178-ton steel press via New York to France. The day after, a way to consolidate 21 separate export consignments into one carload for piers serving nine overseas destinations, to eliminate local transfer charges.

You know their work, probably better than I do. Our files are full of appreciative letters citing the work of George Weiss in Chicago, Charlie Hafner in Cleveland, Lloyd Harvey in Washington, and our own home office under Lou Byrne. Their solid accomplishments in bringing back traffic to the port of New York need no further comment from me.

These men do not try to do the whole job. They cooperate at every turn with the railroad, steamship, motortruck, airline, forwarder and warehousing solicitors of New York companies, advising on new leads, working out expedited schedules, planning service combinations to attract new commerce.

We also extend the legs, arms, and voices of these men by circulation of thousands of maps, leaflets, special traffic advices, commerce bulletins, motion pictures, photographic-slide lectures, exhibits at conventions, trade fairs, and the like.

For 2 years we have been circulating to key shippers and transportation men each month several thousand copies of a magazine, Via Port of New York, which I believe is familiar to many of you. This magazine describes terminals, handling equipment, warehouses, and services of all kinds in an attractive photographic format. We salt this magazine liberally with illustrations of why it pays to ship through the Port of New York. I want to express publicly here the great contribution which members of your industry make to this magazine by furnishing the basic information out of your broad experience.

The excellence of this magazine is attested to by the comments we hear from all sides, including some of our competitors. Two weeks ago the foreign freight agent of one of the larger railroads commented, "Our traffic officials who have been receiving copies of your monthly publication, Via Port of New York, have been so loud in their praise of many of the articles contained therein that I recently circularized all of them to see whether those who were not presently receiving the publication would be interested." He asked that 65 names be added to the mailing list.

I should throw in as a closing note the fact that a vigorous campaign to remove rate handicaps and promote the advantages of the port must be backed up by an ever-increasing effort on the part of both private enterprise and public agencies to make our facilities economical to use and modern in every respect. If piers are not designed to eliminate traffic congestion and to provide adequate space for uncongested handling of freight, we cannot sell the port.

Wherever the Port Authority has been permitted to do the job, it has been able to go forward with a real program of modern waterfront construction. Thus, over the past 2½ years we have spent $8,000,000 at Port Newark, completing among other things two of the most modern and commodious cargo sheds in the port district. For 1951 we have budgeted another $2,400,000 to create additional terminals for efficient cargo handling and storage. As a result of the port modernization plan started in 1948 in this sector of the Port of New York, the number of steamship dockings have more than doubled and cargo volumes are up over 30 percent.

Expansion to meet the growing tide of passengers and freight, modern truck terminals and rail terminals, faster internal communication by bridges and tunnels across our waterways, are all elements in a modern and progressive port.

You will be interested to know that the Port Authority alone has constructed, financed by revenue bonds without cost to the taxpayer, over $350,000,000 worth of such improvements and has projects in progress or in plan for at least $200,000,000 more.

Yes, we have a port with a future. To assure that future, the Port Authority will continue to press with vigor its comprehensive program of port promotion and protection for which we are now budgeting at the rate of $600,000 a year. But to assure that future also, we must implement paper plans for the construction of modern port facilities with dollars and with the actual construction of modern facilities.

Grass-Roots Views on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Garden City Daily Telegram of Garden City, Kans., published an editorial in which it suggested that its readers take part in the debate now going on with respect to foreign policy by submitting their views on 22 questions covering matters of current interest with respect to that subject. These questions were exceptionally well drafted and covered the field so well that the answers which were received constitute an excellent survey of grass-roots opinion on the great issues affecting foreign policy which now confront this country.

In order that all Members of Congress and all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the opportunity to become familiar with this cross section of public opinion in western Kansas, I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of the editorial containing the questionnaire together with a news article analyzing the replies which were received:

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

One of the Telegram's readers, John Creigh, has suggested that the American people themselves should be participating in the current great debate on American foreign policy.

His suggestion is a crackerjack idea. The flow of the grass-roots sentiment into the halls of Congress is what made America great and keeps it great.

So the Telegram proposes to tabulate your yes or no answers to the following 22 $64 questions on United States foreign policy and forward the results to our Senators and Representatives in Washington, D. C.

If you want to get in the great debate, take out your pencil and check off your yes and no opinions down this list. Then clip this list from your paper and mail it to the $64 question editor, Garden City Daily Telegram. Your opinions don't have to be signed.

If your husband or wife or other members of your family want to enter their opinions too, especially if they differ from yours, just total up the opinions and write in a number 2 or 3 in the yes or no column after each question instead of checking. That way the whole family can participate.

We'll give you your answers next week if you show by your interest that you want to participate in the great debate.

This of course is an experiment. It's also a challenge to our readers to determine if they have thought through the questions of the great debate closely enough to form definite opinions.

Get your pencils, here goes:

1. Shall we withdraw fom Korea? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. If we do, shall we attack Red China elsewhere? Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Whether or not we withdraw from Korea, shall we withdraw protection from Formosa? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Come what may, shall we try to hold Japan and the Philippines? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Do you consider the Western European front more important against Russia than the Asiatic front? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Shall we offer Western Europe naval, air and war matériel support but require that part of the world to supply its own manpower? Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Shall we send to Western Europe heavy ground troop reinforcements? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Shall our aid to Western Europe depend upon what steps it takes to defend itself? Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Shall we allow Russia to occupy Western Europe and organize its people and resources? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Shall we retire to our own hemisphere and adopt a purely defensive policy? Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Do you believe that whether or not Russia has the atomic bomb, the United States is strong enough to be relatively safe even though Russia has command of both Western European and Asiatic forces? Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Do you believe the United States, unaided, has enough men and resources to defeat a Red China-Russian alliance? Yes ☐ No ☐

13. Shall we try to raise in Asia a great foreign legion, drill it, arm it and use it as a major force to combat further aggression of the Chinese Reds? Yes ☐ No ☐

14. Shall we supply and furnish, with adequate naval and air support, the 500,000 soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek now in Formosa, aid them to invade the Chinese mainland, recruit additional forces and attempt to drive the Reds out of China? Yes ☐ No ☐

15. Shall we seek the support of every nation opposed to Russia, regardless of whether we approve of its rulers or its form of government? Yes ☐ No ☐

16. Shall we write off the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐

17. Shall we encourage a United Nations of free peoples opposed to Russia? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Do you favor admission of Red China to the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐

19. Shall we follow the Baruch plan and demand that Russia agree immediately to go along with the United States in outlawing all atomic weapons and accept international inspection? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Should Russia refuse, should we promptly make an attack upon her military potentials with our atomic bombs? Yes ☐ No ☐

21. Instead, shall we wait for Russia to manufacture an adequate supply of atomic bombs, enabling her to make a surprise attack on us if and when she chooses? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Shall we rearm Japan as the most logical defense against Russia in the Asiatic Area? Yes ☐ No ☐

READERS JOIN GREAT DEBATE OVER FOREIGN POLICY—OPINION DIVIDED OVER STAYING IN KOREA

Garden Citians who want to speak their minds in the current great debate over United States foreign policy remain almost evenly divided today over whether America should withdraw its forces from Korea.

But in most other items of foreign policy, local citizens were pretty generally agreed.

They favored not getting involved with Red China elsewhere, but continuing to protect Formosa. They want to hold Japan and the Philippines in Asia at all costs and are in overwhelming favor of rearming Japan. The only question they are in 100 percent agreement on is that the old form of United States isolationism goes out the window. Every one opposes retiring to the American hemisphere in the present world crisis and adopting a purely defensive policy.

Garden Citians showed they aren't so hot on the Baruch plan of atomic control and are even less willing to attempt to cram it down Russia's throat.

They are firm believers, however, in Herbert Hoover's suggestion to boot the Soviet bloc out of the United Nations and continue that world organization solely as a union of free nations.

Surprisingly enough they oppose sending American ground troops to garrison Europe and they favor by two to one the recruiting and equipping of a great foreign legion in Asia to battle to the death with Chinese communism while American boys stay at home.

These are some of the interesting answers to the 22 864 questions on foreign policy posed in a Telegram editorial last week.

There was a surprising response to the invitation to editorial page readers to join in the great debate. Soon the compilation of the response will be on the way to Washington to Congressman CLIFF HOPE and Senators ANDY SCHOEPPEL and FRANK CARLSON as Garden City's own grass roots opinion about Garden City's foreign policy.

There were 36 replies to the editorial questionnaire and in several instances whole families or two or more couples participated.

In one home family and friends sat up until 1:30 a. m. conducting their own great debate on foreign policy.

But as usual, Garden Citians found it hard in some cases to make up their minds in concise "yes" and "no's" to the questions.

One reader, signing himself An American Patriot, wrote a two-page letter explaining why he couldn't make it a plain "yes" or "no" to three of the questions. But he heartily endorsed the editorial survey idea and urged that it be presented again on other issues of national policy.

Another Garden Citian also sent along a letter suggesting a few more questions, such as whose side is England on—America's or Russia's. He made one interesting point.

"Furthermore, I really believe if we had honest reliable leaders that could be trusted, I think Russia would talk and make proper agreements," he explained. "If Americans have no faith in Acheson, how can Russia?"

One reader, instead of writing yes or no, penned "can't be done" to the questions of raising a foreign legion in Asia to fight communism and encouraging a United Nations of free peoples opposed to Russia. On four others he wrote opinions, not answers.

But getting back to how the answers totaled up.

GET OUT OF KOREA

In the most divided question of the 22, 19 (53 percent) favored United States getting out of Korea, while 17 wanted the Yanks to stay.

There were two other questions about which the readers weren't so sure.

Nineteen (56 percent) favored furnishing adequate naval and air support to Chiang Kai-shek for a Nationalist invasion of China from Formosa. But 15 (44 percent) said no to the proposition.

Twenty (57 percent) favored seeking the support of every nation opposed to Russia regardless of whether we approve of its rulers or its form of government. But 15 refused to go to such extremes. There was almost a split opinion, too, on immediately attacking Russia with atomic bombs if she refused to accept the Baruch plan and atomic-bomb controls, including inspections. Thirteen (45 percent) said yes to bombing Russia, but 19 (55 percent) said no.

For the other answers:

Twenty-five (80 percent) opposed the plan of attacking China elsewhere if we withdraw from Korea; only six approved.

STAY IN FORMOSA

Thirty (89 percent) opposed withdrawing our protection from Formosa, but four wanted to.

Twenty-nine (87 percent) said hold the Philippines and Japan come what may; five weren't interested.

Twenty-two (61 percent) considered the Western European front more important against Russia than the Asiatic front, but 14 didn't

Twenty-five (78 percent) favored offering Western Europe naval, air, and war matériel support, but require that part of the world to supply its own manpower; seven said no to that.

Only 6 (19 percent) wanted to send Europe heavy ground-troop reenforcements; 26 (81 percent) said no.

About everybody agreed—35 to 1—that our aid to Western Europe should depend upon what steps it takes to defend itself.

Twenty-eight, however, were against letting Russia occupy Western Europe and only three didn't mind.

Everyone was opposed to retiring to our own hemisphere and adopting an entirely defensive policy.

Twenty-five (71 percent) agreed that, whether or not Russia actually has the atomic bomb, the United States is not strong enough to be relatively safe if Russia commands both Western Europe and Asia; 10 thought America still was safe enough under such circumstances.

Twenty-eight (82 percent) said the United States alone can't defeat a Russia-Red China alliance and must have allies; only six thought America could go it alone.

Twenty-three (69 percent) favor attempting to recruit a foreign legion in Asia to fight further aggression by the Chinese Reds with the United States providing the arms; 11 said no to that.

Twenty-one (63 percent) didn't want to write off the United Nations, but 12 did; 29 (89 percent) favored a United Nations without the Communist bloc and only 4 opposed.

By 30 to 4 they opposed admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Twenty-one (70 percent) were opposed to following the Baruch plan of atomic-energy control and demanding Russia agree to outlawing atomic weapons and accepting international inspection; nine liked Barney's idea.

Twenty-four (88 percent) are opposed to giving Russia time to manufacture an adequate supply of atomic bombs which would enable her to launch a sneak A-attack on the United States and only three said yes to giving her atomic time.

Twenty-five (73 percent) said yes to rearming Japan; nine said no.

Some left several questions blank, probably because they couldn't make up their minds.

But, all in all, Garden City proved it was mighty interested in the great debate.

Teaching of English in the Puerto Rican Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from Dr. Pauline M. Rojas, director of the English section of the Department of Education in Puerto Rico. This letter points up sharply the difficulties encountered in the teaching of English in the Puerto Rican schools. The subcommittee which visited Puerto Rico last fall, and of which I had the honor to be chairman, centered its investigation on the educational problems of the island and found the teaching of English to be a severe one.

The letter follows:

GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
San Juan, January 15, 1951.

Congressman KELLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KELLEY: We have read your committee's report on education in Puerto Rico and would like to congratulate you and the other members of the committee for your excellent appraisal of English teaching on the island. We are especially pleased with your acceptance of the basic assumption on which we are working; that is, on the assumption that English for our children is psychologically a foreign language and that for teaching it we need special methods and materials.

During the last 3 years we have been implementing the changes which you suggest

as fast as time and resources permit. In the spring of 1948 we introduced the oral approach developed in the language training program of the Armed Forces during the last war. In applying the techniques of the oral approach we have been advised by Dr. Charles C. Fries, of the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan and have used his analysis of American English as the basis for the selection of the language content to be taught.

In the fall of the school year 1948–49, an administrative reorganization was effected and a program of orientation for teachers and administrators was begun. The number of supervisors at both insular and local levels was increased. Before 1948–49 there were 3 general supervisors of English and 24 local supervisors. Today there are 7 insular supervisors, not including the director of the program, and 65 local supervisors.

The new approach was implanted by means of demonstration classes, of which hundreds were given.

The next step was the preparation of materials. Unfortunately, there are no books for teaching English as a second language to public school children. In order to tide us over until we could write language textbooks suitable for our situation, the insular supervisory staff prepared and issued a three-volume teachers' manual. We were fortunate in having the assistance of Dr. Charles C. Fries and in being able to use his research. In the matter of procedures we were able to guide ourselves somewhat by the work being done at the English Language Institute and at Teachers College, Columbia. But, both of these two places work with educated adults, in small classes, with English speaking teachers, with the best in equipment, and in an English-speaking environment—conditions which differ greatly from those under which we work.

Our situation, as you know, is characterized by huge classes, lack of books and equipment, non-English speaking teachers, a Spanish-speaking environment, and a high percentage of economically and culturally underprivileged pupils.

In regard to the English of our teachers, we have done much toward improving it, but certainly, not enough. We need continental teachers but how to get them is a different matter. In the first place, our salary scale is so low that few teachers from the States are interested in coming down here and, in the second, our budget does not permit us to hire the number of teachers we would need if we were to make English teaching what it should be. It is well to remember in discussing the question of the proficiency in English of our teachers, that they are the products of our schools when everything was taught in English. Those who think that the pupils would fare better now if all subjects were taught in English might reflect on these things. The schools then were highly selective. Classes were smaller than they are now for pupils who could not get along in English were dropped. We had many English-speaking teachers, especially in the high schools. If our present teachers are representative products of such schools and such a system, surely a return to teaching in English under present school conditions would be no solution. Of course, to make the schools selective again and drop everyone who couldn't get along in English, as I understand is done in the high school of Hawaii, would be unthinkable in Puerto Rico.

We know that there would be a tremendous demand for English classes for prospective migrants and other adults but our present budget can not carry such a program. Business Education Service, a division of the Insular Board for Vocational Education, offers a few classes to policemen, waiters, taxicab drivers, and so forth, but those are the only adult classes we are able to offer.

We are pleased that you recognize that in spite of the many handicaps and limitations, much has been done to provide for better English teaching on the island. We are also glad that you realize that lack of economic resources is the principal cause of the deficiencies you encountered.

How can Puerto Rican English teachers be expected to speak fluent, correct English if they never have a chance to travel to the United States and how can anything but a very small number of them afford to make trips up north on the salaries they earn?

Again let me say that I think your report is accurate and fair and that we appreciate greatly the support you have given us.

Sincerely,

Dr. PAULINE M. ROJAS,
Director, English Section
(By order of the Commissioner).

Forty-nine Years of Faithful Service—Joseph H. McGann, Sr., Chief Clerk, House Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, Joe McGann has today just completed 49 years of service with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and Public Works, having served as temporary clerk, assistant clerk and clerk of the former committee for a period of 45 years, and as clerk of the Committee on Public Works during the past 4 years. He has served under the following chairmen: Theodore E. Burton, Ohio, 7 years; D. S. Alexander, New York, 2 years; Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida, 6 years; John H. Small, North Carolina, 2 years; Charles A. Kennedy, Iowa, 2 years; S. Wallace Dempsey, New York, 10 years; Joseph J. Mansfield, Texas, 16 years; George A. Dondero, Michigan, 2 years; and Will M. Whittington, Mississippi, 2 years. He is now serving under the new chairman, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, as chief clerk.

During his early service the appropriations for river and harbor and flood control projects averaged a little over $28,000,000 annually. He has seen them grow to $656,000,000, the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1951. Many changes occurred in the membership of the committees during his service. While the number serving on the committees varies from 17 to 27, he has served under 262 members.

Joe McGann came to Washington on January 31, 1902, for a temporary assignment of 2 weeks with the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and he has been here ever since. His service began with the Fifty-seventh Congress, and it is not known of anyone who was connected with that Congress who is here at this time.

Recognized as an expert and authority on rivers and harbors and flood control matters, he has served these committees well and faithfully for nearly a half of a century. Such a record is unique, and is a testimonial to his ability and devotion to his life's work.

The Real Deterrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events, issue of January 24, 1951:

THE REAL DETERRENT
(By Bonner Fellers)

I

The logic of the December 20 broadcast by ex-President Hoover and that of the January 5 address by Senator TAFT is compelling. Nevertheless critics found in the addresses implications of a complete abandonment of Europe with all the resultant dangers from such a course.

These critics, however, have apparently misinterpreted the Hoover-TAFT position. It is true that both strongly opposed the administration's program which would risk ground combat in Europe against the full weight of the Red Army. Mr. Hoover said, "Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, or Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys." But ex-President Hoover also urged: "Hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate); the other on Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines." Thus Hoover clearly envisaged Britain as an air base to deter war in Europe.

The essence of the Hoover-TAFT position is a pragmatic, resourceful attempt to deter war, win it if war comes, and in any event avoid the slaughter of millions of our youth on the Eurasian mainland.

II

The principal reason given for the enormous European program, which the administration is determined to undertake, is that it will deter war.

But will it?

The contention is that the presence, by 1953, of 50 or 60 allied divisions will be the best possible war deterrent. But against these, Russia now could throw 175 divisions, some 25 of which are armored. British and our own intelligence estimates concede Russia can take Europe in a matter of days.

To offset European reluctance to provide manpower, it is proposed to rearm Western Germany. But Russia has been quoted in the press as having announced that she will fight if we rearm these German warriors. Our determination to rearm them, therefore, can scarcely be classified as a war deterrent.

Moreover, the stationing of American units supported by our Air Force in Western Europe—regardless of the peaceful purpose for which they are intended—can be interpreted with some justification by the Russians as an aggressive gesture.

What then is the true purpose of creating this collective defense force for Europe? The real hope is that it would act as a delaying agent until enough American manpower could be brought from the United States to turn the tide. In a recent speech, General Bradley disclosed the approved administration concept of the only way we can win a war: "I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that should this Nation be forced into still another conflict, we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground."

If victory for the free peoples of the world can only be gained "over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground," then it follows, irrefutably, that the free world has enjoyed its last victory.

It is true that World Wars I and II upset the world's balance of power. However, it is impossible for the United States to endeavor to restore this balance on the basis of manpower. Today there is no combination of free peoples willing to fight which can equal numerically the manpower of Russia and China. Russia can draw soldiers from China's vast reservoir of youth, merely by offering food, clothing, and shelter. We are irrevocably on the short end of a 3-to-8 manpower ratio.

If western powers are to survive in a war against communism, we must somehow manage to gain our decision by methods quite different from mass ground combat. Instead we must draw heavily, not primarily on our manpower, but rather on the genius of our people.

In one respect our genius, which is derived from our free system, lies in the capacity to exploit the weakest links in Stalin's armor—his dissatisfied home population. This weakness should be exploited by a full-scale psychological campaign against the Kremlin.

Instead, however, the presence of our forces on the Rhine gives Stalin a visible symbol, a unifying agent which tends to enlist support of all Russians behind the Kremlin.

Secondly, on the material plane, where does our natural genius express itself better than in air power?

III

It is right here, in this question of air power, that we can find the answer to the terrifying fact that numerically we cannot hope to right the world's balance of power. To succeed in a program of containment we must be able to strike quickly, not just on the European fronts but anywhere about and within Russia's far-flung borders.

Only air power has the range, speed and flexibility to perform such a mission. Infantry divisions are characterized by enormous ponderosity; they cannot be shifted easily from one front to another.

Until ranges are increased, the mass of our air power cannot strike Russia without the use of overseas bases. Let us make the assumption that air bases could be held in England and Spain. But the fortunes of war might easily deprive us of their use. Sound military planning must provide flexibility to meet just such a misfortune. Africa might be utilized as a huge north and south approach to air bases in Libya or Egypt, from which medium bombers and long-range fighters could strike deep into Russia. From the Mediterranean shore of Libya it is less than 2,000 miles to the Baltic. It is only 1,500 miles to Russia's chief source of oil—Baku, in the Caucasus.

Indeed it is Africa which offers the best available ground to offset the potential weakness of Europe and its periphery. A superior allied air force based in Libya could interrupt the supply routes leading from Russia into Europe. It would be a true deterrent to war, infinitely more effective in protecting Western Europe than all the infantry divisions we could station on Europe's eastern frontier.

As a matter of fact, in 1942 as United States Military Attaché to Egypt I proposed repeatedly a similar plan to the War Department. It was my thought that from Turkey—which later came into the war—our escorted B–24's could cut Hitler's supply lines between the Black and Baltic Seas. At this time the Nazi forces were overextended, pinned down, desperately attempting to crack the Leningrad-Moscow-Stalingrad line. Had Nazi supply lines been severed by air strikes, the entire Hitler effort would have collapsed. This concept was favored both by President Roosevelt and Assistant Secretary John McCloy but vetoed by General Marshall.

However, at this point, I should serve a warning. In 1942 the political situation in the Middle East and Africa was much less unfavorable than it is today. Much bitter history has been made since then.

We cannot hold North African bases, unless we enjoy the friendship of all the peoples in the Middle East. We must have these peoples' consent to use their bases. Hence on the diplomatic plane, constructive changes are absolutely necessary.

IV

Providing this political problem is solved, militarily we can hold bases in Africa. The difference between holding these and bases on the mainland of Europe lies in the fact that in Europe the bulk of the Red Army can be thrown against the land forces defending the frontier. Against African bases only a small fraction of the Red army could be brought to bear. These bases have the incidental protection of great natural barriers—the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, and a thousand miles of desert where the going is most difficult.

Attacks against African bases by the Red army would have to be launched over the long and vulnerable desert route or they would have to be airborne. Because of these natural barriers there is no way that the full power of the Red army can be used against Africa. Consequently African air bases can be defended by limited ground forces—provided we have sufficient air power to control the air above them.

If we neglect to take advantage of air bases in North Africa, Russia could move through this strategic area which is the easiest of all roads to the conquest of Africa. Then Africa and her vast natural resources, including uranium, would fall like ripe fruit into Stalin's lap. On the other hand, were we to lose the entire Continent of Europe, we could still hold Africa with air supremacy over Egypt and Libya.

Although our fleet could not safely operate in the Mediterranean until we won the battle of the air, supply of African bases by air is nevertheless feasible. Meanwhile our fleet could service bases on the Gold Coast of Africa. Air facilities already exist at Takaradi. During the war a number of landing strips were built between Takaradi and Khartoum. From Khartoum north to the Mediterranean is an easy flight.

Also, an air force operating from North African bases would be of enormous diversionary value. Attacks could be launched to draw the Red air force into combat over especially selected areas so that strategic bombers, from bases in North America, could make atomic assaults against critical areas deep into Russia.

More than anything else, Russia fears air power. It is the one weapon against which Russia's terrific ground forces, enormous distances, and winters are impotent. Stalin has amply demonstrated this fear of air power in his present program of engaging our ground forces by satellite powers so that his own war potential—heavy industries, hydroelectric power, oil fields, oil storage, and communications are immune from our air attack.

A plan to strike from African bases is in no wise an abandonment of Europe. Rather it is the surest way to prevent war and win it, with minimum punishment for our allies, if war comes.

Remarks of Hon. Dean Rusk on Television Show, Battle Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks of the Honorable Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, on the National Broadcasting Co. television show, Battle Report, Sunday, January 28, 1951:

Today I wish to say a word to those who ask why we stay in Korea. It is a serious question—because men's lives are at stake—and it deserves a serious answer.

We are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a world war and the frightful destruction of life which such a war would produce.

The thousands who have died in Korea have sacrificed their lives in a struggle to prevent the millions of deaths which world war would surely bring.

The issue in Korea is aggression. We can face it, or we can run away from it. If we face it, we have a chance to organize the determination of the world against aggression, to show the aggressor that his crime will not be accepted and that his crime will not pay. If we succeed, the aggressor may hold his hand. If we run away from it, the aggressor will learn that there is great profit in crime, that he will not be resisted, and that his victims are weak and can be destroyed at will.

These are not theories but hard facts. We Americans have already had one unforgettable lesson about what happens when unbridled ambition goes unchecked. We have seen the world go down the trail from Manchuria to Ethiopia to Munich to Poland and, finally, to Pearl Harbor. We must not tread this path again.

Let us not be discouraged too soon. At the end of World War II the human race almost succeeded in doing what men have dreamed about for centuries, i. e., in organizing a world to keep the peace. Only one government stands in the way. That government is a dictatorship which has behind it considerable power. But the peace-loving world itself is strong and we cannot afford to give up our goal just when we have come so close.

We are in Korea because we cannot afford to leave Red China and its neighbors under the impression that the forces of Peiping are irresistible and that Red China's neighbors must now come to terms with communism at the cost of their freedom.

The vaunted power of Red China is being unmasked in Korea. Chinese soldiers do not relish the punishment they are getting from our guns and planes and ships. They are learning that their masters have tricked them into a war of foreign aggression. They are learning that their masters have put them into battle without provision for minimum care in case of wounds or sickness or frostbite. In other words, Red China is learning a great deal about the cost of aggression.

We are in Korea because we cannot abandon 20,000,000 gallant Koreans to communism. We and they have fought side by side against aggression for several months, sometimes in defeat and sometimes in victory.

We cannot now abandon our comrades to the fate which would be theirs if the Communists took over.

Further, we cannot leave our friends in the Philippines and in Japan under the impression that we do not take our commitments seriously and that we might lack courage in the face of adversity.

Our gallant force in Korea is fully able to take care of itself. We should not act like a defeated Nation when in fact we have not been defeated.

The willingness and ability of the entire free world to increase its strength and to join its forces to insure their mutual defense depends to a considerable extent upon the attitude of the United States. Our strength is increasing rapidly as is that of our friends.

If we can show that we have both the will and the ability to defend ourselves, the main attack may be averted. Our attitude in this situation may easily determine the course of history for years to come. That course may lead to peace or it may lead to disaster. This great Nation cannot let history say of us that we chose the road to disaster because we were unwilling to fight for peace.

Ethel May Ness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as you know, was the birthday of one of the greatest leaders our country has ever known—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This man was not only great as a President of these United States, but was outstanding in his fight against the dreaded disease of poliomyelitis.

It is only fitting, then, that I call to your attention one who, while not as great in the ranks of our country, is just as great in her struggle against the same distressing disease—polio. This individual of whom I am speaking is only 13 years old—very young to have to fight such an overwhelming force—but through her untiring efforts this little girl will receive tonight a diploma for completing her first phase of education. Yes; tonight Ethel May Ness, of 327 Chestnut Street, Kearny, N. J., a resident of my congressional district, will graduate from the Lincoln Junior High School of Kearny. I must say that such determination is surely an incentive for our youth of today, especially to those who know the sufferings of polio.

Ethel was admitted to the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation Hospital at the Jersey City Medical Center, Jersey City, N. J., on September 26, 1950. The diagnosis was infantile paralysis. Three days after admission, her condition was so bad she could not sit up. The case was a little late in coming to the Sister Kenny clinic, as many cases of polio are. She was examined by Dr. Marvin A. Stevens, the medical director of the Sister Kenny Medical Foundation, assisted by Miss Valorie Harvey, chief technician of the foundation.

While all hope had been abandoned that this child would again walk, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that today, after just a matter of a few months at the Sister Kenny clinic, Ethel can take a few steps, and it is the hope that before long she will again be walking and playing along with the 84 percent of the patients who received treatment through the Sister Kenny hospitals and clinics throughout the Nation.

It has been my privilege to serve on several committees to help raise funds for this worthy organization, so that they can continue to lend a helping hand to the victims of polio. We in New Jersey have a feeling of security because of the closeness of the hospital in Jersey City. It is my sincere hope that it will be the realization of every State in the Union to boast of a Sister Kenny Hospital so that the thousands and thousands of polio cases, that are yet to come, can be helped.

I want to congratulate the Sister Kenny Foundation for the wonderful job they are doing for the people of America. There is no discrimination, as to race, creed, or color, when patients are admitted to the care of the foundation. Any patient who is referred by his physician, is admitted to any of the hospitals or clinics provided a bed is available. I would also like to extend my congratulations to Mr. Marvin Klein, of Minneapolis, Minn., executive director, Dr. Marvin A. Stevens, medical director, the Honorable Rex G. Williams, executive director of the eastern area, their chief technician, Miss Valorie Harvey, the Australian nurse who was personally trained and brought to this country by Sister Kenny, Thomas J. Duffy, the director of Hudson, Bergen, and Essex Counties, and to the thousands of graduate nurses of the United States, who have devoted their professions to the Sister Kenny Foundation.

However, tonight, let our thoughts stray to that little 13-year-old girl who will be celebrating her first victory in her wheel chair, when she receives her diploma from the hands of Dr. John Bossart, commissioner of education of the State of New Jersey, who is personally being sent by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll to extend his congratulations and best wishes.

I, too, would like to publicly extend my felicitations to Ethel and encourage her, and the many like her, to be inspired by the great example of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Our Safety in Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to read and insert as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the Daily Democrat News, in Marshall, Saline County, Mo. Rosier N. Hains, editor and publisher, is noted for his ability to express in clear and forceful manner the economic and international problems with which we are confronted and to comment upon them intelligently with sensible and sound suggestions on our policy and course of action we should adopt and follow. I commend the editorial to the attention of all Members of Congress:

OUR SAFETY IN PREPAREDNESS

For the last 4 or 5 years there has been constant talk of peace. The United States has done everything possible, even bordering on appeasement, to attain peace, and today we are much further from peace than when the talks first began. It would seem the prudent thing would be to stop talking peace and prepare for the war that seems inevitable. Peace can be accepted on short notice but it takes time to prepare for war.

Russia has stated repeatedly that communism and capitalism cannot exist in the same world and that they will not stop until capitalism is overthrown.

Russia's strategy has been to divide and conquer and to date it has worked successfully. That country is now attempting to make a deal with Germany whereby Russia would withdraw her armies from Germany and turn that entire country over to the Germans to rule. Of course, that is just a ruse to weaken the western allies and it would only be a short time until Russia would occupy that nation, the best in all Europe.

The United States and her western allies cannot afford to let Russia occupy Germany for then the war materials that Russia needs so badly, steel, coal, etc., would be available in such quantities and with Russia's unlimited slave labor, she could never be defeated. Thus country after country—England, Africa, South America—would succumb to that overwhelming power.

There has been some criticism of England, France, and other western allied countries for not preparing more and faster for their defense. It must be remembered those countries are right now looking down a gun barrel in the hand of a ruthless dictator and are rightfully afraid to provoke Russia to march.

This country should start tomorrow to prepare for war and reach the peak as quickly as this country attained it during World War II. We lived through that struggle then and we can do it again, quicker and more efficiently. Why wait for another Pearl Harbor before preparing for war to the limit? It would be much better to reach the peak of the last war in preparedness and never use the war equipment and men than to be forced to defend ourselves when unprepared. If we could win a bloodless world war III by preparedness we could afford the financial loss, or rather the cost of the preparedness. We should be lavish in our expenditures for equipment that would save the lives of our boys.

Had we started several years ago to turn out thousands of tanks, bombers, fighters, artillery, and all necessary fighting equipment, we could today turn some of this equipment over to Chiang Kai-shek for a diversional war, could arm the thousands of Japanese who are already army-trained. The same would be true with the soldiers in Germany, England, France, and our other allies.

It has been said that Russia fears an armed Germany more than she does the atom bomb. If we could show an overwhelming force, it is possible Russia might decide that

it cannot rule the world and would accept a peace of our own dictating.

Should Russia decide to march in Europe before the United States is prepared there is no doubt she would reach the waters of the Atlantic within weeks. We must not permit that. She would have then all the war production she needs and we could not use the atom bomb, for that would kill our innocent friends along with the enemy. However, France, Belgium, and other countries should be warned that if they give up without a struggle as they did in World War II, their country will not be immune to A-bombing if the occasion demands such action.

Would you be willing to attack Russia without advance warning if you knew by so doing it would save the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys and millions of lives of others? Then the United States must do something that she has never done before, for this struggle is going to be one for survival.

Russia would not give the United States 30 days' notice of an attack. Instead it would come suddenly, without warning.

Russia is ready right now to march in Europe but as long as the Kremlin leaders see we are doing nothing but accumulating bombs they feel they can wait. If Russia believed we were ready and might do something now then Moscow would start immediately.

We are not in Korea because we are a belligerent nation and wish to fight for the fun of it, but we are fighting in Korea for self-protection by keeping communism from the United States. Our interests in Europe are for that very same purpose.

We must select the time and place to start world war III. When we learn that Russia is about to start to overrun Europe, we must drop enough atom bombs on her armies in Eastern Germany, on her industries in Russia, to deliver a knock-out blow until time can be gained to put a strong army in Germany. We must never have another Normandy Beach, Okinawa, Iwo Jima, Tarawa, and other beaches, as we did in World War II.

Should the western Allies ever penetrate the iron curtain the going should be easy, as 90 percent of the people of the Communist-occupied countries should join the crusade for freedom.

It has been reported that the Russian army and also the Red Chinese army live on the land they are invading. Just imagine a ruthless horde of men, unrestrained by military rule, overrunning a civilized country, allowed to loot and murder civilians at will. That privilege is about the only recompense they receive for being in the army It has been reported that Red China intends to kill 100,000,000 of their people, possibly all old ones and political objectors.

It is believed that the United States has the capacity to produce about 10 bombs to every 1 the Russians produce, if they have such a bomb.

If this war is to be won with A-bombs, why delay dropping them until Russia has a sufficient quantity. If we had a thousand bombs today, two thousand would not be of any use to us, for a thousand should be more than enough to devastate Russia.

There has been some criticism of our entering the Korean War. Perhaps we shouldn't, but that shouldn't cause a division in our war effort here. If the United Nations can only cling to an entrenched beachhead at Pusan for a considerable length of time, many thousands of Chinese will be killed and at the same time prevent the Reds from starting a war somewhere else, which they would surely do, flushed with victory. That next country would probably be Japan, only 150 miles away and wholly unprepared without an army.

The people of the United States should realize they are now in an undeclared war of survival and it is up to us to save the world. It is folly to think that we could stand by and see all the remainder of the world overrun by communism and expect to withstand the combined forces of the world. The United States is the prize that is more important to Russia than all the remainder of the world.

The Draft's Lower Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 24, 1951:

THE DRAFT'S LOWER LIMIT

A basic question in the problem of achieving systematic, intelligent mobilization of manpower for the various requirements of the defense program is: Shall the minimum age for induction into the Armed Forces be lowered to 18?

Until that highly controversial question is answered by Congress, the size of the manpower pool from which the services will draw their necessary additional strength will remain uncertain. And so will the selective service regulations governing classification of men in the present draft-age span (19 through 25); and that, in turn, makes uncertain the volume of the labor supply for defense production.

We say that the minimum draft age should not be dropped to 18; that it positively should not be lower than the 18½ years suggested by Senator TAFT, and that it can safely remain at 19, barring this country's envelopment in a general war. We say that on the basis of objective considerations untinged by the emotional opposition to the drafting of 18-year-olds that is manifested, quite understandably, by so many parents.

One of the most important considerations is that too many youths have not reached true maturity at 18; too many at that age lack the physical and emotional development that is needed to make them of full value in military service and to permit them to profit, rather than be harmed, by a period in the Armed Forces. A far larger percentage of present-day, often excessively sheltered young men have, at age 19, the state of maturity required for military service, than possess it at 18.

Furthermore, the lowering of the draft age to 18 probably would not add to the Nation's potential in military manpower as much as the more rabid advocates of the 18-year-old draft have led us to believe. The plans to drop the minimum draft age by 1 year contemplate that inductions shall start at age 18 or on the completion of high school, whichever is later. If the Cleveland schools are a good criterion, and they should be, the average youth completes high school nearer the age of 19 than 18.

The average age of the young people who will be graduated from Cleveland high schools at the end of this semester will be 18 years and 9 months, we discovered. We also learned that of the youths beginning the final semester of high school last September, more were 18 or older than were younger than 18.

We are impressed, too, with unquestioned data showing that the military services can attain their planned goal in personnel by keeping the draft age limits as they are, 19 through 25, and still have a margin of reserve amounting to about 470,000 men.

And it should be pointed out, as the United States News and World Report shows, that none of our Atlantic Pact allies, nor our one great potential enemy, Russia, begins drafting men at 18. Here are the ages at which draft or general military conscription begins in various countries: Russia, 19; England, 18 years, 3 months; France, 20; Norway, 20; Italy, 21; Belgium, 20; Netherlands, 20; Denmark, 20; and Spain, 20. Does it seem reasonable to ask the draft to a lower age in this country than in countries whose existence is more immediately threatened by Communist imperialism than is ours?

We reiterate, then, our belief that the minimum draft age can safely be kept at 19. But, in revising the selective-service act, Congress should call on the Armed Forces to lower physical requirements, in the light of the fact that a goodly percentage of men in uniform perform noncombatant functions, and thus reduce the number of young men obtaining physical exemptions from service. Congress should also stipulate that all the manpower for the Armed Forces be raised by selective service, instead of by the chaotic method of part enlistment and part drafting. It should, however, permit men under 19 to volunteer—and be placed in the branch of service that can use them best and needs them most—if the facts in each case warrant a selective-service board's authorizing the enlistment.

Such a set-up as this would be a modified form of universal military service. It would postpone college education for most men turning 19 years of age and it would greatly deplete college enrollments, and that seems inevitable. But, in order to spare many educational institutions from utter collapse, provisions should be made for assignment to colleges, by the military services, of men in uniform who are selected for scientific and technical training.

Reducing Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee voted Monday to go back to the method of handling appropriation bills that was in vogue up until the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

I hope that now the committee will get to work on the budget estimates that have been sent to Congress by the President, and that the members will realize the serious situation that confronts the committee and the Congress.

The majority of the committee felt that there was greater opportunity for reducing appropriations with the method which they have chosen than existed in the single-package appropriation bill, and for some of the following reasons:

First. With the single package appropriation bill only one motion to recommit is possible and that hit effectively only one item in the over-all bill, whereas if you have separate bills for each department the motion to recommit on the separate bills can bring out for a separate vote the most glaring items in that bill which need to be cor-

rected. The Congress can be put on record in each of the bills for or against unnecessary spending.

Second. The Congress can also, under the provisions for separate bills, have a separate vote on the passage of any one of the bills and, if it has been loaded with unnecessary spending, be put on record for or against the passage of that bill; whereas with the omnibus bill there could be only one record vote and Members would not feel free to vote against the enormous number of items in it, whereas this hesitation would not exist with the separate bill.

All of the cuts that should be claimed in the first and second session of the Eighty-first Congress were made by the subcommittees, with the single exception of foreign relief where the cuts were made mostly in conference, and in the final amendment which was adopted to the bill reducing it $550,000,000 and turning it over to the President to allocate. Of that $550,000,000, $75,000,000 in budget estimates have been sent up on one item alone, and other restorations on many other items so that what will be saved in the long run out of the $550,000,000 remains a big question mark.

What savings were made were not because of the omnibus bill. They were because of the action of the subcommittees. What we need in the Appropriations Committee is to build up in that committee a willingness and capacity to cut the appropriations. With that spirit it will be possible to reduce the bills by sufficient amounts so that it will be possible through increased taxes to balance the budget next year.

However, that is only a little of the situation that we are facing.

On July 1, 1950, we had left unexpended $13,500,000,000 according to President Truman's budget. He has asked for appropriations aggregating $88,000,000,000, making a total of $101,500,000,000. He estimates expenditures in the fiscal year 1951, in which we are now operating at $47,500,000,000, which will leave, on July 1, 1951, a balance of $54,000,000,000. His estimates of any obligational authority for 1951 total $94,500,000,000, which will make available for expenditures, if they are allowed, $148,500,000,000. He estimates expenditures in that year to be $71,500,000,000, which will leave a balance unexpended on July 1, 1952, of $77,000,000,000. If we have appropriations of $94,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1953, there will be available $171,500,000,000; and there would no doubt be expenditures of at least $90,000,000,000, so that if the Congress should this year provide additional revenues of $16,000,000,000, thereby providing for balancing the budget in the fiscal year 1952 we would still be short $19,000,000,000, to balance the budget in 1953.

This will increase the national debt beyond the statutory limitation.

The reason I am giving you this advance look at what might happen is to show that the United States Government, with the burden that it has assumed internationally, is rapidly spending itself into bankruptcy.

If we are going to survive, it is going to be necessary for the Appropriations Committee to drastically reduce nondefense expenditures and the appropriations for defense which are not necessary and will not contribute to the national security.

It means the most thoroughgoing effort at cutting appropriations that has ever been attempted in the Congress, and I hope that the committee will very shortly start work on its job.

Its job is to cut appropriations and cut out the fat which the department heads have inveigled the Budget Bureau into submitting to Congress.

We should not be spending any more time quibbling about procedure.

MacArthur at 71

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times, Friday, January 26, 1951, concerning the birthday of a great American:

MACARTHUR AT 71

Again as so often in the past, Gen. Douglas MacArthur celebrates a birthday today surrounded by war maps and battle reports. It is his seventy-first, and perhaps the most significant birthday of his life. For it finds him, after one of history's greatest victories over one totalitarian system, and at an age when generals are usually in retirement, in the position of the first military commander of the United Nations, leading the forces of freedom in a struggle against aggression by another totalitarian system.

In some respects this new struggle must also be the most bitter of his life. For the moral and political imponderables involved in it have so circumscribed the freedom of military action that after snatching victory from initial defeat at the hands of one foe he has not only been forced to withdraw because of the intervention of another and mightier enemy, but has also been compelled to report that because of this new aggression he has been unable to achieve the objectives for which the United Nations entered the Korean war. This development, as is now known, was in the cards from the moment that the United Nations determined to resist North Korean Communist aggression by force of arms, and especially after it instructed General MacArthur to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea. Yet, in some quarters, efforts have been made to saddle almost the entire blame for this development, not on the new Chinese Communist aggressors, where it belongs, but on General MacArthur.

No doubt like most positive personalities, General MacArthur has the capacity of arousing both profound loyalty and sharp animosity, and military strategy is the favorite subject of dispute among generals themselves. But the mainsprings of the criticism leveled against General MacArthur may well be found in efforts of delinquent members of the United Nations to cover up the inadequacy or total lack of their military aid for an enterprise which they supported in principle but not in practice.

General MacArthur who, as Allied commander in Japan, has wrought a peaceful revolution in that country and saved his army in Korea from the onslaught of a superior enemy, to put it in a position to strike back again, can pass over such criticism with equanimity. So can the United States, which sponsors him. We therefore join with other friends in wishing him happy returns of the day and in expressing the hope that a kind destiny will preserve him in vigor and good health to advance the cause for which he and the free world are fighting.

Russian Crab Imports Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Government, after 11 long months of investigation, finally has acted to stop further imports into this country of Russian canned crab.

The Russian canned crab is produced and packed under slave-labor conditions in slave-labor camps. Costs were so low for the Russians that American fishermen and cannery workers could not and should not be expected to compete with this slave labor. It was a question of shutting off these Russian crab imports or our own American crab fishing industry, in which millions have been invested in boats, gear, and shore installations, being financially ruined.

One of those principally responsible for calling the attention of Congress and the country to what Russian slave labor has been doing to our crab fishing industry was Victor Riesel, whose column "Inside Labor" appears in 154 American daily newspapers.

Mr. Riesel now believes our Treasury Department should act to bar further imports of Russian furs into the United States, and I agree with him. These importations of furs are destroying our American fur industry.

In the first 10 months of last year Russia shipped into the United States furs valued at $19,599,919 according to figures I obtained from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Riesel's arguments as to why Russian fur imports of about $2,000,000 a month should be stopped were discussed by him in one of his recent columns. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Riesel's article herewith:

Now that we've finally shoved Soviet slave-packed Chatka crabmeat off American tables the time is now to get Soviet slave furs off the backs of American women, or there will be more razor-sharp shrapnel in the backs of our boys.

It took us a year. But we finally pressured our Government into admitting officially that the Soviets run slave camps; that the Reds use forced, convict, and indentured labor; and that faceless political slaves catch and pack the crabs sold to us for good old American folding money.

So, very quietly and very unnoticed, last Friday when virtually every newsman had

been mobilized to cover and try to understand the big wage and price freeze, the Treasury Department banned the importation of this delicacy from Kamchatka, land of the world's finest slave camps.

This is the first time any Soviet product has been barred from the United States. Okay. I will no longer crab over the red crabs. But the fact is that we didn't wait for the White House to move. Our A. F. of L. longshoremen have been sending the stuff back for months.

What we now want is for the Federals to close our ports to the $50,000,000 worth of other junk the Soviets are dumping here each year, so they can supply American dollars to their camouflaged agents across the world to buy rubber, copper, and steel for the Red war machine. The stuff is coming in boatloads. Each cargo hold is filled with $50,000 to $70,000 worth of furs, beads, stones, hats, and even religious items.

The labor leaders with whom I organized the original boycott are furious, but helpless. It took us a year to get crab meat barred. It took 6 months to force the weird Department of Commerce's Office of International Trade to stop sending stuff to Soviet China via Hong Kong.

How long will it take us to stop this other blood money from pouring into the hands of Soviet foreign trade commissars? But we're going to try. Here are the facts:

The dirtiest role in this business is being played by British merchants. My friends in the British Cabinet will attest that I've never criticized them unjustly. But now they're dirty. They're fronting for the Soviet foreign trade state trusts. Millions of dollars' worth of Red slave-skinned furs are first sold to British brokers. These traders then hold auction in London. There the furs are resold and reshipped to American (if you'll excuse the expression in this context) furriers.

To avoid our longshoremen's boycott the furriers send their stuff to Montreal in the east and to Vancouver and Seattle in the west.

Seattle is getting the biggest play today. Many a longshoreman there was trained by Harry Bridges and unloads the stuff for love as well as money.

The furs are then trucked from Canada, or packed into freight cars to complete their dollar trek from the original Leningrad auction to the New York fur market, via England. Jolly chaps, the British. All the while the big furriers, many of whom worked closely with the Communist-led furriers' unions in the 1926 days of the union's "Black Glove" gangster organizers, save face by saying they've bought the stuff from the English.

The anti-Communist labor leaders are helpless. It would take an army of investigators to track down the truck and rail shipments. Another army of organizers would be needed to convince the teamsters and freight handlers to let the stuff rot on the sidings as we did on the docks.

This trade runs into real dough. Scores of millions of dollars. Where does the Soviet spend it? Let's look at one item, rubber. We have figures for this war-vital stuff for the first 11 months of 1950. That's just about 60 days ago. In those 11 months the Russians bought 10,000 tons of raw rubber from the British. That's just about 20 times more than the Soviets picked up from them in all of 1949.

And just to make the Chinese caissons go rolling along, the Swiss are shipping aluminum ingots, iron, steel, and rubber tires, for example.

And the American dollar is the one thing those ghouls believe in. But the Russians have plenty. Obviously the time is now for our Government to say loudly, "The whole Red land is a slave camp. We want none of their goods. It has blood on it. So have the dollars our merchants of menace pay for it."

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is wholesome and refreshing to know that at least one Federal Government agency is interested in saving some of the taxpayer's money. That agency is the General Accounting Office, headed by Lindsay Warren, the distinguished Comptroller General of the United States. In a letter addressed to all Congressmen under date of January 29, 1951, Mr. Warren gives the Congress and the country a splendid résumé of what can be done in reducing public expenditures if there is actually a will to do so. The letter is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, January 29, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: With the many vital problems before the Congress today, I know you don't have time to read annual reports of Government agencies. Anyway, ours is still in the process of printing. But, knowing of the interest of Members in the General Accounting Office, an agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch, I believe there are certain facts you will want to know. That is the reason for this letter.

The General Accounting Office is an independent and nonpolitical agency. It is a part of our system of checks and balances. It audits and settles the accounts and claims of the Government, and advises and assists the Congress and the agencies on matters relating to expenditures.

The Comptroller General is appointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed. He can be removed from office only by the Congress.

During recent years, when it seems the Government has been expanding beyond all reasonable comprehension, the GAO has proved that it is possible to reduce employees. In April 1946, the number of employees reached a peak of 14,904. There were 7,063 employees on January 1, 1951, a reduction of 7,841 in the last 5 years, of whom 779 were transferred to the Post Office Department. This has been accomplished through constant surveys of our work and the elimination of procedures which serve no useful purpose under present conditions.

For example, just recently I abolished the Accounting and Bookkeeping Division of the GAO. This division employed 325 people. Certain of the work formerly carried on by that division has been transferred to other divisions. However, it will be possible to carry out the work transferred with 61 people, making a reduction of 264 people and an annual salary savings to the GAO of nearly $1,000,000. There will be no loss of control of public funds. In fact, the revised procedures should enable the GAO and the Government generally to do a more competent job.

While practically every agency of the Government will ask for increased funds for 1952, the GAO will request less money than was made available to us for 1951.

A few statistics on our work in the last year: 25,300,000 vouchers audited; 492,000 claims settled; 318,000,200 checks reconciled; 12,400 decisions rendered to departments, agencies, claimants, and others; inspections made of 945 different Government offices; 84 comprehensive audits submitted to Congress (for the first time since the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 audits of Government corporations were up to date); 685 reports made to Congress and its committees; and 3,500 replies made to inquiries from individual Members of Congress.

The GAO is one of the few agencies that not only pays its way but in addition makes a substantial contribution each year to the Treasury. Collections from 1941 through December 31, 1950, total $718,100,000. This money had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out and it is a fair statement to say that little of it would have ever been recovered except for the General Accounting Office. Collections are impressive, but also important is the prevention of illegal or improvident use of funds without waiting to collect back what has been paid out illegally.

The joint accounting program inaugurated in December 1947 by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and myself, is achieving remarkable success. As a result of the program and of legislation enacted by the Congress, accounting improvements and red-tape cutting are going forward with rapid acceleration.

The GAO is expanding comprehensive, on-the-site audits which bring about broader coverage, more effective results, less paper work, and reduced flow of documents into Washington.

During the Eighty-first Congress, the GAO supported the enactment of a number of laws which made possible some of the improvements just mentioned. Probably the most important are the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950. The Budget and Accounting Procedures Act, among other things, permits the elimination of certain procedures upon determination that the interests of the Government are otherwise protected. This made possible the abolishment of the Accounting and Bookkeeping Division mentioned above, but this is only an example. Many other benefits have resulted and will continue to come about. The revisions of procedures and improvements made have reached into every agency of the Government.

The Post Office Department Financial Control Act made possible the abolishment of the Postal Accounts Division of the GAO last November 15. The administrative accounting work which had been done for the Post Office Department has been turned over to that Department. The GAO should never have been given those duties in the first place. I have set up a new Postal Audit Division which will make comprehensive, up-to-date audits of postal financial transactions.

It is essential to our economic survival not only that the national defense be strengthened, but that it be done as effectively and economically as possible. On this score, the GAO bids fair to make a real contribution. We will not only audit defense spending, but will also concentrate to seek out excesses, waste, and extravagances in the defense program. At the same time, we will continue to keep a watchful eye on civilian spending to ferret out those extravagances and frills which our country should not and cannot now endure.

This letter is for your own information and no reply is necessary.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Workmen's Compensation To Apply in Case of an Atomic Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., in which they memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide workmen's compensation in the case of an attack by atomic bomb:

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION TO APPLY IN CASE OF AN ATOMIC ATTACK

Whereas an effective atomic attack on one heavily populated area, or even a single large industrial plant, could result in so many industrial injuries as to exceed the resources and ability of a self-insurer or an insurance carrier of workmen's compensation insurance to furnish compensation benefits and might well exceed even the powers of an entire State to provide such benefits: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this council memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such action so that adequate provisions may be made for the protection, medical care, and indemnity to the workmen of this country and their dependents in case of an atomic attack; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of Congress from Erie County.

This resolution, if enacted into law, certainly would aid the area in which the attack took place in its rehabilitation work and at what I believe would be less cost financially. I feel it would also bring the people as a whole to a consciousness of their responsibilities.

Educational Short-Change of the Nation's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, every United States citizen should consider the long-term meaning of the New York Times educational survey conclusion that 3,000,000 children are being short changed in their education because of inadequate buildings, the lack of teachers, the assignment of poorly trained teachers, and the dependence on double-time or part-time sessions.

With record-breaking enrollments everywhere, I think the country must consider educational needs as defense needs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the January 21 issue of the New York Times editorial page entitled "Education in Review":

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS ALL OVER THE COUNTRY FACE EMERGENCY BECAUSE OF MOBILIZATION

(By Benjamin Fine)

Because the needs of the national mobilization program are so great, American public schools during the coming year will be seriously handicapped in their operation. The construction of many school buildings will have to be postponed, and consequently there will be more overcrowding. There will be shortages of teachers, and school systems will have to accept poorly trained personnel. Morale among teachers is low because of their income.

These serious problems confronting the Nation's schools were emphasized last week with the publication of the New York Times' annual survey of educational conditions in the 48 States and the District of Columbia. The schools have not yet made up for the losses they suffered during World War II. And now, with another emergency facing them, educators throughout the country are deeply concerned by the potential effects of the mobilization program. Some of them even use the word "havoc."

This latest in the series of annual Nation-wide surveys by the Times revealed a condition that is disturbing in its implications: 3,000,000 children are being short-changed in their education because of inadequate buildings, the lack of teachers, the assignment of poorly trained teachers and the dependence on double-time or part-time sessions. The States report that despite everything they have been able to do thus far, large numbers of pupils are simply receiving an inadequate education.

Serious as the situation is now, it is destined to become worse because of the inevitable rise in enrollment that results from the high wartime and postwar birth rates. In the current school year the public elementary and secondary schools have 900,000 more pupils than they had a year ago—just about the largest single gain in any 1 year in recent times. The public schools now have a registration of nearly 26,000,000. For the next 10 years—perhaps for longer—enrollment will increase by 500,000 to 1,000,000 annually.

IMMEDIATE STEPS URGED

Educators everywhere recognize the significance of this record-breaking enrollment. They realize that schools already harassed by overcrowding cannot readily add 30 to 40 percent to their enrollment and continue to provide the same kind of education they have been offering. They emphasize that immediate steps must be taken to plan for the future. Otherwise, they warn, within 5 years we will have 6,000,000 children receiving inadequate education instead of the present 3,000,000.

This year's survey also points up the seriousness of the teacher shortage, especially of competent teachers for the lower elementary school grades. All of the States and the District of Columbia reported that they were unable to find all the well-trained teachers they needed for their elementary schools. Nine States also reported that they could not find enough qualified teachers for their high schools.

More teachers are employed this year than ever before in school history. During the past year about 80,000 teachers have been added to the staffs, bringing the total to 960,395. Yet school administrators are quick to point out that the personnel increase has barely been large enough to meet the needs of increased enrollments. Moreover, the present teaching staff still includes 75,000 with emergency or substandard certificates.

AVERAGE SALARY IS $2,867

Teachers' salaries remain the fundamental factor behind the teacher shortage. Salaries rose during the year, but not nearly enough to keep pace with the rising cost of living. The average classroom teacher now receives an annual salary of $2,867, or $55 a week gross pay. This is an increase of only $82 a year over the average salary for the school year 1949–50.

Signs of discontent are evident all over the country, with morale at perhaps its lowest point since the end of the war. In New York City high school teachers are still refusing to take on any extracurricular duties; in Minneapolis the teachers are seriously considering a strike.

The financial problems are enormous. In the face of rising inflation, school boards are having a desperate time getting enough funds to construct new buildings and to maintain those they already have. The Nation's public schools are now paying the record sum of $5,000,000,000 for their schools, an increase of $350,000,000 over last year.

MORE FUNDS NEEDED

Yet, school administrators insist that the $5,000,000,000 can hardly buy as much as the smaller appropriations did in years past. They say twice the present allocation will be needed if the children are to have an adequate education.

And they are deeply worried by the question: Where is the extra money to come from? They realize that defense needs will cut deeply into any extra funds that they might otherwise have expected from their communities. They are giving up hope that Congress will appropriate the $300,000,000—just a drop in the bucket, anyway—that President Truman recommended last week.

The Nation's most pressing needs for the improvement of education were epitomized in this list from Pennsylvania: (1) An accelerated building program; (2) sufficient elementary-school teachers specifically trained for elementary-school work; (3) an adequate school-financing plan at the local level; (4) guidance and vocational information; and (5) enrichment of the instructional process through wider use of audio-visual aids and other apparatus.

CONDITIONS BETTER THAN LAST YEAR

Despite the handicaps and the needs of the Nation's public schools, administrators are not entirely discouraged. On the whole, conditions are better now than they were 5 years ago, or even last year. The Times survey showed, for example, that the schools expended half a billion dollars last year for new buildings and repairs. If the schools could maintain that pace they would lick the congestion problem.

What does discourage school men, however, is what they consider the indifference of Government—Federal, State, and local—to the importance of education, even in a time of national emergency. They believe that if the three levels of government fail to recognize the schools' needs the schools will suffer disastrously. For that reason they urge that education be given a high priority during the coming year. This would mean, for example, that building materials now in short supply be allocated on a priority basis for schools. It would mean that communities must recognize the essential requirement of maintaining a competent teaching staff with a high esprit de corps. That, of course, means higher salaries.

Whose Side Are They On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, "What kind of a war are we fighting in Korea, anyway?" asks Robert Boyer, editor of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa., in an editorial in the January 27, 1951, issue of that newspaper. The editorial follows:

WHOSE SIDE ARE THEY ON?

Indications are that Congress is being pressured to the point where it will approve the sending of any number of troops to Western Europe recommended by Mr. Truman and General Eisenhower.

And, it is expected that the General will recommend the defense of Western Europe, when he makes his report to the President and Nation next week. After all, General Eisenhower's orders apparently were to lay the groundwork for an international army, not primarily to discover if he could raise one.

But, the question persists, Does Western Europe have the will to resist?

Former President Herbert Hoover raised this question. So has former United States Ambassador to Britain, Joseph Kennedy.

Without the will to resist, without the spiritual force necessary to fight communism, any army raised in Western Europe, regardless of its size, would be worthless.

The question for Americans to decide then, within the next week or so, is: Shall we be sending American armies into a wasp's nest of Reds and apathetic Western Europeans?

Here is an indication of what we mean.

From London Friday came a dispatch quoting the liberal News-Chronicle newspaper as saying that if Gen. Douglas MacArthur "only knew how to keep his mouth shut, he would stand a good chance of going down in history as a great commander."

Said the paper, "As it is, posterity will hardly be able to avoid the view that he was a political menace of the largest caliber.

"It is not for him, a serving officer, to say that there can be no turning back in the war against communism in Asia. He, therefore, should not say it.

"Nor should he, while half the world is hoping that some way of negotiating with China will be found, take the opportunity of remarking loudly that he will give the Chinese a bloody nose in South Korea."

Now that is no less than a bitter insult to Americans, most especially to Americans whose sons or brothers or husbands are fighting in Korea.

Those Americans are fighting the Chinese, one of the most brutal enemies of modern times. They are fighting on behalf of the UN.

Yet, Britain, a major UN member, gives evidence time and again of showing extreme disinterest in the war with China, even, as in the case of the News-Chronicle, some sort of sympathy for the Red Chinese cause.

The British paper criticizes the American commander because he says his forces are going to give the enemy a bloody nose.

What kind of war are we fighting in Korea, anyway?

Since when has the commander of any nation's forces been prohibited from criticizing the enemy?

General MacArthur exhorts the free world to fight to the end against communism, and the British paper says he has no business to make such a statement.

Perhaps this is not typical of the British press reaction.

But is is indicative at least of a vein of feeling in Britain and throughout Western Europe—France with her known 5,000,000 Reds, Italy with her 8,000,000—Reds who sabotage, spy, murder, and stand ready to form a fifth column in the rear of any American armies we send to France.

These are things every American should take cognizance of, so that perhaps ultimately we can inject the stabilizing factor of strong public opinion into our top echelons of government.

That factor has been missing, unfortunately, for many years. As a consequence, inept men have bungled affairs so badly that now they know not which way to turn.

They must know the terrible risks of Western Europe. Yet, their irresponsible commitments have us in so deeply that they can find no safe way to extricate us, so, they propose to wind up by commiting hundreds of thousands of American boys to the doubtful defense of an area which itself admits it is practically indefensible, because it lacks the spirit to fight against what it considers the inevitable—Soviet communism.

We need more than a 2-week flying trip to General Eisenhower to convince the American people that western Europeans will stand and fight Russia.

Blue Star Mothers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement regarding the Blue Star Mothers of America.

This organization is a fine, patriotic body serving the best interests of America at all times. I have personally attended meetings of the Blue Star Mothers of America and I know of the high and patriotic motives that actuate their activities.

In order that the country may be informed of the attempt of another organization, bearing an almost identical name, to capitalize on this patriotic organization, I am inserting a statement in the RECORD and urging all Members of Congress to read it:

STATEMENT BY MRS. GEORGE P. TAUBMAN, JR.

The executive board of the Blue Star Mothers of America announced today that it will take action to prevent the use of its name by an organization branded by the Justice Department as subversive.

The announcement was made following a special meeting of the board in Washington. The board members voted unanimously to instruct its national president, Mrs. Lee C. Scott, of Willoughby, Ohio, to take whatever action is necessary to restrain the National Blue Star Mothers of America from further use of that name.

Mrs. Scott said that her organization, Blue Star Mothers of America, was organized immediately after Pearl Harbor as a patriotic service organization to unite all mothers who had sons or daughters in the armed services in the United States of America into a permanent organization. "This organization," said Mrs. Scott, "is nonpolitical, nonsectarian, and nonprofit, and shall not be used for personal or partisan purposes. Its membership of more than 10,000 is composed of mothers of servicemen and women."

Mrs. Scott said that the other group, which has been branded as subversive, later assumed the Blue Star Mothers name, adding only the word "national." It is the National Blue Star Mothers of America which has been placed on the Attorney General's subversive list and which has its headquarters in Philadelphia. Because of this similarity of names, Mrs. Scott said, many sons and daughters of members of the original organization have been discriminated against. A Milwaukee boy was returned from the Great Lakes Training Station because his mother was a member. A boy hospitalized in Japan wrote home advising his mother to discontinue her application, and families have been refused employment in industrial plants in Ohio because their mothers belonged to the original group. Mothers who formerly were recognized by the Special Service Directors in VA hospitals were refused admittance to the hospitals because of this confusion in names. Later, when the matter was taken up with the hospital superintendents, they wrote letters of apology for their error, because the Blue Star Mothers of America had been reinstated by the Justice Department as being an eligible group.

Letters have been received from the Attorney General's office and also from the office of the Justice Department regretting that the similarity in names of the two organizations has caused confusion and embarrassment to the Blue Star Mothers of America.

Mrs. Scott added that we have in our membership such eminent women as the Honorable FRANCES BOLTON and the mother of Gen. Mark W. Clark.

Other resolutions adopted at the executive board meeting were: To support H. R. 910, the amendment to the Public Health Service Act providing a program of grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing sponsored by Congresswoman BOLTON, Twenty-second District of Ohio; also to support every phase of General Marshall's civil-defense program; to express approval of General MacArthur's command in the Far East; and to support universal military training.

The Blue Star Mothers of America subscribed to a plaque dedicated to the Unknown Soldier and was presented to Colonel Williamson, commanding officer of Arlington National Cemetery by Mrs. Scott. The plaque was placed in the trophy room of the amphitheater in Arlington. A short memorial service was conducted by the board at the graves of two lieutenants, sons of Mrs. Margaret Meyers, of Columbus, Ohio, a member of the Blue Star Mothers of America.

Our Political Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item:

OUR POLITICAL INVASION

Marquis Childs, one of the outstanding Washington correspondents, puts into print something not published often enough. He says, in part:

"As to Korea, the basic fact which must always be remembered is that military commanders never believed that the Korean Peninsula was defensible. They went into

Korea because it was decided at the top political level that it was vital to sustain the United Nations as a force for collective security in the world."

On the same day comes the news that American casualties in Korea totaled 40,176 as of last Saturday—and that report probably was at least a week old. Of this number, the roll of dead was 6,761.

Is this a high price to pay to allow President Truman and Secretary Acheson to save face with United Nations by maintaining a "police action" in Korea?

And what, then, would the price be if they admitted it was war?

Is it any wonder that the run-of-mill people of America, whose families are paying this price, are more and more approving the views of Messrs. Kennedy and Hoover?

Public Housing Flop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 22, 1951

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News:

PUBLIC HOUSING FLOP

Remember that public housing program the social reformers said was absolutely necessary to supplement private enterprise in curing the ills of the have-nots? The program was to subsidize 135,000 low-rent units annually for 6 years. Now it is revealed that only 11,100 such units have been started since July 1949. As is usual with social planners, all they could cook up was a batch of highly extravagant designs. Then the costs of building material and labor began to go up and up. The money allotted by Congress was limited and the planners found themselves stymied. All of this is a lucid sidelight on the operations of the Government in business. It always progresses more slowly than private enterprise and is more costly. Both the ill-housed and the taxpayers ought to wonder why it ever seemed a good idea to go in for public housing.

Men at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ivan H. Peterman from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 28, 1951:

MEN AT WAR—TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION GI'S RATED TOPS BY ARMY, CIVILIANS

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

CAMP ATTERBURY, IND., January 27.—A 24-truck Army convoy swung off the upState Indiana highway and parked in front of the roadside diner late at night. Forty-eight GI's wearing the red Keystone patch hopped out, filed quickly inside and sat down. A hardened, hungry lot, they filled the place. The nervous entrepreneur and his waitress began taking orders.

"Ham and egg sandwich; coffee, please." Someone put nickels into the juke slot. They listened to the music while the orders were served.

Half an hour later they filed past the cashier, paid, and resumed their trip. But as the last one pocketed his change, the diner boss couldn't hold back comment:

"Sergeant," said he, "my compliments to your men. When you came in, I got a scare. I figured about $300 worth of damage, loss of a couple of hours' business, and maybe a scuffle or two. But you're all right. Tell your commander his soldiers are welcome anytime anywhere on this route."

The Twenty-eighth Infantry Division likes that incident. It ranks with editorials in the Indianapolis papers praising its conduct and the resolutions of surrounding church and clergymen's groups stating that never before in this Midwest training area has there been a finer grade of American soldier on view.

Deportment, courtesy, and unbelievably good conduct are only part of the Twenty-eighth's mounting reputation. Right now it's the biggest division in the Army—well over normal strength of 19,000, with plenty more coming in. Its commanding general, Daniel B. Strickler, of Lancaster, Pa., until recently Lieutenant Governor, just conducted a basic training efficiency test that brought quick inquiries from all sections of the United States Army.

Lt. Gen. Matt Eddy, commanding our forces in Europe, wrote for particulars so he might consider them for use with occupational troops. Every enlisted member of the "Bloody Bucket" outfit took the test. There were 90 sections on 18 different subjects—weapons, map reading, compass, signals, reconnaissance, chemical-warfare protection, combat problems, military courtesy, character, and educational-intelligence affairs, down to fundamentals like properly policing a barracks. Every GI was scored on every question. A grade of 60 was passing; 80 was excellent; from 90 up was rated superior.

And what was the Twenty-eighth Division's performance? Well, 98.9 of the men passed, and the division average—for 19,000 men—was 92.2 percent. No wonder local papers write editorials, that ministers say nice things in sermons, and conservative Indiana folks are happy to invite Keystone wearers into their homes.

"I'm proud of them," says General Strickler, of whom the State of Pennsylvania should say the same thing. For Strickler and his National Guard staff have done a job that amazes the Regular Army, so that a steady stream of draftees are arriving for the same type training. That is why the Twenty-eighth remains here, preparing thousands more as its own are indoctrinated. Strickler and company, veterans of two world wars, are teaching the kids how to fight and win and come out alive. It's the nearest thing to actual combat this correspondent has seen. It's tough, it's cold, it's fatiguing, and it's necessary. Don't worry about your boy if he's had a course with the Red Keystone.

"One reason is we're getting remarkably fine, intelligent men," Strickler said. "Gen. Mark Clark, head of the United States Army Field Forces, has seen to it we get as good or better than any of the services. They aren't picked over, rejects. Or those considered suited only for ground slogging. They are a cross of America's finest between 19 and 25 years of age. A serious, hard-working, disciplined crop.

"We call them 'fillers,' not replacements, these days. The Army has allowed us to apply many lessons learned in the Hurtgen and Ardennes. We are also looking at what has happened in Korea and telling the men how to be ready for guerrillas, infiltration, and night surprises."

His chief of staff, Col. James G. Mackey, now of St. Davids Apartments, Wayne, Pa., and the assistant commander, Brig. Gen. Thomas L. (Zeke) Hoban, of Scranton, were never so enthusiastic at Indiantown Gap. General Hoban, who fought through the hedgerows, Hurtgen, and the Bastogne Bulge in Europe, thinks today's GI is the smartest he ever helped train. They, along with Lt. Col. Oliver W. Robbins, G–1, from Paoli; Maj. Alvan Markle 3d, the G–2 from Ardmore; Lt. Col. Richard A. Dana, Annville, Pa., the G–3 in charge of training; Lt. Col. George I. McLeod, Villanova, the G–4; and Lt. Col. Albert G. Branyan, Merchantville, N. J., the adjutant general, form the Twenty-eighth's headquarters staff.

All operate from one of the modest frame buildings which awaited the division on its arrival from Indiantown Gap last September. Quarters are of the plainest; indeed, the Twenty-eighth headquarters sometimes were as well housed during the Second World War's hectic moves. General Strickler occupies a tiny bungalow; Brigadier and Mrs. Hoban, and the Artillery officer, Brig. Gen. Guy O. Kurtz, of Denver, Colo., have about the only other cozy quarters on this huge reservation, which is some 35 miles south of Indianapolis.

The division occupies "subdivisions" of barracks, laid out along wide, paved drives. The barracks are all frame, standing on cement pillars and the biting Indiana winds, which are colder than anything in Pennsylvania, cut under the floors. The soft-coal boilers are forced to maximum to warm the high-ceilinged, two-story interiors. The furnace broke down in the senior officers' barracks my first night here, and I nearly froze stiff under six blankets. It got down to 7 degrees during the night, an accustomed temperature since last November.

But few are kicking about housing, food, equipment, or even the hours. They get up 6 a. m. to 7, and the job of soldiering goes on around the clock. Day training usually ends at 5 p. m., but night missions, firing drills, patrol practice, keep the GI's and officers in the field and woods sometimes 2 and 3 days. They sleep in the open or under pup tents, or group beside small fires in the brush.

"But we don't cry," said Sgt. Dave Derentz and Sgt. Bill Bass, of the 155-mm gun crew I visited last night. "It's still better than Korea."

Derentz lives at 4508 Lieper Street, Bass at 2235 North Mole Street, Philadelphia, and both are with the One Hundred and Eighth Field Artillery Battalion. Their sentiments were seconded by Joe Duda, of 1432 North Coley Street, and Gunner Ralph Carter, also of Philadelphia.

The main deficiency is in company and field grade officers. The Army just hasn't enough. Draftees are being inducted faster than officer schools, West Point, and the Reserves can provide commissioned personnel to train them. Then, too, a great many of the Twenty-eighth officers are attending technical schools all over the country.

One productive routine begins the moment a recruit or draftee arrives at Atterbury. He's not treated as a raw recruit. There's no "riding" or "breaking in." No rough stuff. The Army is polite. The older GIs are actually sympathetic and make the new guy feel at home. "What the heck," they say, "we're all greenhorns at this, except the veterans or guardsmen who had combat, and they're not happy over the prospect of more war. So we make the best of it."

One has to admire such common sense and quiet facing of facts. Bewildered, confused by the topsy-turvy events and mystifying

high-level developments of diplomacy, these citizen-soldiers deserve a nod for their forbearance.

When the newest bunch—say 200 to 400 newly uniformed from the the induction centers—comes to join the Twenty-eighth's organization, they get, first of all, a briefing by Strickler. It's part of old combat-day stuff, when the Twenty-eighth had to reform its riddled ranks after Mortain, after Hurtgen, and again after the Ardennes.

"We bring them to the assembly area and I welcome them to the outfit, explaining its traditions, records, and our pride in it," Strickler said. "They're made to understand that they're now one of u· and the Twenty-eighth's mission is explained. At present it's full training. We distribute their weapons, assign them to units. Then follows 28 weeks of training and of basic. As you know, we're starting unit teamwork now, lasting until May."

Strickler wants every bloody bucketeer to be curious.

"I want you to know what, when, how, why, and where at all times," he tells the men. "If your're in doubt, ask. Keep asking till you get the answers."

Next advice is: "Be ⌐ sol ·ier." No twenty-eighth man looks sloppy. They swing along like those grim lads you saw in wartime movies. They're told they're proved superior to the 48 percent who flunk the draft physically. Their mental qualifications are stressed. The patriotic duty is made clear. There is no smirking or sniffing at the flag or country in a United States training camp.

Finally, the matter of good conduct, proper language and dignity is explained and enforced. There are no profane, vulgar GI's out here, no swaggering or drunkenness or messing around in the city and towns. Saluting, military courtesy, and respect for fellow citizens is universal. I've not met so many polite people since the war ended. I've heard more "thank you, sir," and observed more regards for the amenities in 3 days here than in 3 months at the United Nations sessions in New York. No fooling.

The Twenty-eighth Division soldier proceeds head up, gloved hands swinging briskly, not stuffed in his pockets. He is alert, keen on orders—a sentry stopped the general last night, refused him passage when he didn't have the password—and pretty well aware of the serious job that lies ahead, if aggression continues.

This was frankly surprising, for I expected a brooding, resentful soldiery, disgusted with our failure to button up victory in 1945. Instead, these kids are philosophical, aware and, more amazing, they apparently are much better oriented on what it's all about than their predecessors in two previous wars. Few Americ ns ever know for sure what's ahead, but these at least are going to be doggone well prepared when and if it happens.

The Twenty-eighth Division has blueprinted that preparation in the present emergency. The Army is pleased, and the whole country should be proud. Says the Indianapolis Times:

"As a soldier's town of long standing, Indianapolis tends to judge men in uniform by the way they behave away from camp. The judgment on the men of the Twenty-eighth is that they are soldiery gentlemen. On pass, most of them appear to be alert, neat, courteous young men and not given to displays of toughness which some servicemen in training seem to think marks them as future Medal of Honor winners.

"As for real toughness, we've confident the Twenty-eighth will be as tough an outfit as any enemy ever faced, if it has to go to combat. Meanwhile, we're proud to have Major General Strickler and his men as our neighbors."

Titoism in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 30, 1951:

TITOISM IN ITALY

Significant cracks are beginning to appear in the Italian Communist Party. Two of its former stalwarts have resigned from it. Both members of Parliament, they are Aldo Cucchi and Valdo Magnani, the latter distinguished for having organized what is regarded as the most effective Red regional unit in Italy. They have broken away because they found themselves unable to stomach the traitorous Cominform dogma that all comrades, no matter what their nationality, must be more loyal to the Kremlin than to their own native lands.

Mr. Magnani, with Mr. Cucchi supporting him, has definitely washed his hands of that idea. He has done so not merely by resigning from the party but by publicly declaring that every Italian, without exception, should consider it his first and highest duty to defend our fatherland if the frontier should be attacked from any direction whatsoever. In other words, if the attack should come from the Soviet Union or one of its satellites, then Italy's Reds, as patriots owing allegiance to their own country above all countries abroad, must battle the attacker as bitterly and as steadfastly as they should any aggressor of any ideology.

This is what the Cominform inveighs against as the crime of nationalistic communism. It is the kind of communism under which Marshal Tito has declared Yugoslavia's independence of Moscow, with the result that the Soviet Union has marked him down as one of its most dangerous enemies. He is dangerous because he has become the leader of a potentially far-reaching schism in the Communist world, on both sides of the iron curtain. Now the schism has struck Italy's Red organization, the biggest in Western Europe. Next it may strike in France, and in due course, let us hope, in the satellite lands. It is a thing that could shatter all of the Kremlin's imperialistic dreams and ambitions.

Selling Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, if we could win the war of ideas, all-out war may never prove necessary. Our Government has never really faced up to this challenge. Discouragingly small sums of money have been granted to our Voice of America program, and the recent Republican-controlled Congress denied even a token appropriation to continue the program which was doing as fine a work as possible with its limited funds. Fortunately, the Eighty-first Congress appropriated enough money to reinstitute the program and it is now continuing, but is still far too limited in its scope.

Mr. Henry L. Johnson, of Seattle, Wash., is one of a great number of people genuinely concerned that America should do a better work in the field of spreading democratic ideas and explaining democratic objectives. Following is a letter from Mr. Johnson which I believe will prove interesting to every person interested in this vital subject:

NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL FIRE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Seattle, Wash., January 18, 1951.

Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MITCHELL: The events of the past 6 months have caused many Americans to do more serious thinking than they have ever done before about their country, its security, the manner in which it is being governed, and its foreign policy. Most of us, and myself in particular, have been very derelict in our duty of letting officials in our Government know our views. I, for one, am going to correct that situation.

One field in which our Government has failed miserably in the past few years is the field of propaganda. Russia has made a big part of her gains throughout the world through the clever use of propaganda. The surprising thing is that they have been able to accomplish this in spite of the fact that their propaganda consists almost entirely of lies and falsehoods.

We, in the United States, have developed advertising to a point far in advance of anything any other country has ever known, and yet our Government has apparently ignored its possibilities for use in the war of ideas. Our most obvious and apparently our main effort along these lines has been the Voice of America which has had to fight for its very existence ever since it was inaugurated and has never had sufficient backing to do a thorough job. It could be made very effective.

What is needed is an aggressive propaganda or advertising department to spread democratic ideas and a free way of life, and expose communism, in every corner of the globe. The best advertising and diplomatic brains in the country should be mobilized for this purpose.

Costs should not even be considered. An expenditure of $1,000,000,000 for this purpose might very easily accomplish more than an expenditure of $10,000,000,000 for armaments or atom bombs. Such a program could conceivably weaken communism to the point where a world war could be avoided.

We have the truth to tell the world and if we spent as much time and effort telling it, as Russia has telling its lies and falsehoods, we would strengthen the Western World tenfold.

One thing the American public cannot understand is why we permit Russia to malign and slander our officials, our citizens, and our Government daily in all parts of the world without making a vigorous effort to counteract these lies with the truth. If people hear only one side of any question, that is the side they are going to believe, and the reason many of the backward people around the globe have accepted communism is because that is all they have heard. There has not been an effective propaganda program for democracy and the free way of life.

We have delayed far too long in this matter. We should take action immediately.

We must depend on our elected representatives to see that programs of this kind are put into action and properly carried out.

Very truly yours,

HENRY L. JOHNSON.

Letter From Mr. and Mrs. William J. McLean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, many families in our country are still bearing unusually heavy burdens and contributed too heavily in the cause of our common defense. To such people we all owe a debt of gratitude which we cannot possibly pay.

Recently I received a letter from Mr. and Mrs. William J. McLean, who are residents of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon which I represent. Of their four sons one was killed in action in World War II, one served through that war and fought in the European area, one was ready for embarkation to Europe when the war ended, and one boy now 18 years of age they think may be drafted. It is small wonder that these parents, this family, having suffered so much from war, are embittered and have lost faith in our Government leaders.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include, at their request, the letter I received from Mr. and Mrs. McLean:

JANUARY 21, 1951.

Hon. HARRIS ELLSWORTH,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLSWORTH: The enclosed Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters was awarded to Capt. William J. McLean, who was killed July 26, 1945, a few days before the end of hostilities with Japan.

A brief history of our family. Mrs. McLean and myself have been registered Democrats ever since we have been able to vote. My mother raised two sons, myself and my brother Frank. We both served overseas in World War I. My brother has never been heard from since the end of World War I. We never could get any information from the War Department as to whether he was discharged or what happened to him.

Mrs. McLean and I raised four sons. Three were in World War II and the other boy was about 9 years old at that time. One served in the Pacific area as a pilot and after numerous combat missions, was killed as stated above. One served in the European area and returned from the service. The other boy was at the point of embarkation for Europe when hostilities were over in that area.

Bud, the boy that was killed, wrote to his mom and said, "Mom, if anything happens to me, it will be to keep Mickey from the necessity of ever fighting on foreign soil." That promise was made in good faith and now Mickey, the 9-year-old boy, was 18 on January 17, 1951, and apparently is going to be drafted to serve in world war III.

I would like to know what we have accomplished in fighting World War I and World War II and the so-called police action in Korea. Mrs. McLean's only nephew, old enough for service at the present time, has been missing in action in Korea since July 10, 1950.

If our country is sincere and would take the profit out of war and quit trying to protect interests on foreign soil, maybe the American way of life would lead along the road to peace.

I respectfully request you to read this letter to any of the committees who will take action on the present recommendation to draft 18-year-olds and, if necessary, to read it before Congress itself, and then we further request that you return the enclosed medal to Mr. Truman to dispose of as he so desires, as we feel that this country has betrayed the memories of the boys who have died in service to their country.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM J. MCLEAN.
EDNA B. MCLEAN.

Walnuts: Black Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Missouri Conservationist, a magazine published monthly by the Missouri Conservation Commission. The article is entitled "Walnuts: Black Gold".

WALNUTS: BLACK GOLD

(By Merrill V. Nipps)

Walnut kernels, picked out by hand, were for many years a small source of income to Ozark farmers. Some sold their own kernels; others sold to produce dealers who in turn sold to nut brokers in cities. Many small operators, produce dealers usually, would sell walnuts in the hull to farmers and buy back the kernels, setting a price so that women and children or shut-ins in the home could make a dollar or so a day. This grew into a sizable business until, in 1941, a walnut kernel dealer in Fordland, Mo., handled more than 500,000 pounds of kernels, buying from other dealers as well as from farmers.

About this time things happened. The food and drug department started cracking down on home-cracked walnut kernels due to the danger of spreading disease. The Wage Act was passed requiring processors to pay a minimum wage, thus complicating further the walnut business. It was along about this time, too, that we went to war and needed black walnut shells for gas-mask filters.

I came here from Philadelphia about the time the war started to get walnut shells for making activated charcoal to be used as filters in gas masks. Lined up with a nut processor at Gravette, Ark., who said he would process all I could buy or ship to him, I pegged the price at $1.25 to $1.35 per hundred pounds for hulled, dry, sacked black walnuts and started every produce and feed dealer in Missouri to buying them. That winter of 1941 was the first time there had ever been an unlimited, guaranteed market for black walnuts. We got over 4,000,000 pounds that season. Shells were shipped to a plant in Chicago. We sold the kernels as our profit.

The business was continued and has grown until now, in a good year, we buy 12,000,000 pounds of black walnuts. More recently other plants have sprung up, one at Stockton, Mo., and another at Sulphur Springs, Ark. Each of them bought over a half-million pounds of walnuts last year.

Farmers are becoming more and more conscious that this is a sure cash crop for them and are gathering more walnuts every year. Last year they got from $3 to $3.50 a hundred pounds for them as compared to slightly over $1 a hundred in 1941.

As walnut kernels were produced in larger quantities, new uses for them have been found. Main outlets today are in the bakery, ice cream, and candy industries. In our factory at Gravette, we can crack 100,000 pounds of black walnuts, and clean, pasteurize, and ship 12,500 pounds of kernels in a two-shift day.

The forestry division of the conservation commission and the college of agriculture of the university are urging farmers not to sell their immature walnut trees for logs, since, over a period of a few years, they are worth far more for the nuts they bear. They are good income possibilities to individual farmers. I have personally gone out and, with the help of three or four boys, picked up and hulled 3,000 pounds of walnuts in a day. At $3 per 100 pounds, that would be $90. I know of one farmer living near Walnut Grove, Mo., who sold more than $750 worth in one season, bringing in from 500 to 2,000 pounds of walnuts each week end. During the fall of 1946, the dealer in Walnut Grove bought for us over 500,000 pounds of walnuts, paying the farmers in his area some $15,000. That is a good income from one small area.

Missouri is by far the biggest walnut-producing State in the Nation, the heaviest producing area being within a hundred-mile radius of Springfield.

Walnut kernels are rich in protein, 1 pound having as much protein as 5 to 6 pounds of beef. Ordinarily native black walnuts will produce from 12 to 15 pounds of kernels per 100 pounds of hulled nuts. The 12-pound figure is about average for machine methods.

Grafted name-variety nuts will produce from 25 to 35 percent kernels. I planted 12 in 1943 that at present are not 30 feet tall, but are bearing large crops of nuts each year. They respond richly to manuring and cultivation. I firmly believe that 10 years from now my walnut orchard will produce more money per year than a same size orchard of apples or peaches. And it is much less expensive to maintain. Walnut trees planted in a pasture do not impede the grass. In fact, wherever you see black walnut trees there is fine blue grass, for the tree doesn't shade heavily and the outer hulls of the nuts serve as soil feeders.

A warning to farmers who plant walnut trees—keep stock away from them until the trees are 'way up there. Livestock eat the foliage like nobody's business.

Lately many people are having native walnut trees of medium size top-worked. To do this cut off all limbs down to stubs and then bud or graft on small cuttings from name varieties. It is surprising how fast the tree recovers and soon you have an adult tree bearing name-variety nuts.

There is absolutely an unlimited market now for all the black walnuts the farmers have or can find anywhere. Next season prices probably will be as high or higher than ever before. The nuts are clear profit just for picking them up and hulling them. A quick easy way to hull them is with a home-made trough installed under a jacked-up rear wheel of a car.

Black walnuts can be a million-dollar industry in the Ozarks. We're already more than halfway there.

Aggressor Tag To Hurt Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well-considered and informative article written by David Lawrence and appearing in the Washington Star of January 29, 1951:

AGGRESSOR TAG TO HURT REDS—FAR-REACHING CONSEQUENCES ARE EXPECTED WHEN UN APPROVES LABEL ON RED CHINA

(By David Lawrence)

Passage this week of the resolution by the United Nations declaring Red China to be engaged in aggression will lead to consequences of a far-reaching nature. These may be outlined as follows:

1. The war with Red China will go on until Communist China takes the initiative in stopping hostilities. America is weary of the palavering with Chinese Communist leaders about a cease fire.

2. Because Red China is an aggressor, she cannot be admitted into the United Nations until the Communist regime has been completely purged of any further tendency toward aggression and pledged herself to make reparation for damage done to Korea. This means that in all probability Red China will not get into the UN for a long time and perhaps not at all, especially if another government of substantial strength should emerge to challenge Red China's claims to recognition.

3. With Red China declared an aggressor, Great Britain and other governments which have recognized the Peiping regime will be in a position to withdraw such recognition. Otherwise they would be in the embarrassing position of carrying on diplomatic relations with an aggressor regime.

4. The United States by agreeing to limit the war to Korea has not foreclosed the opportunity on a subsequent occasion to demand that the UN permit the bombing of Manchuria as a means of ridding Korea of aggression.

5. Measures of economic and naval blockade of Red China will be brought up for discussion later on, but as long as the fighting inside Korea is indecisive there is no immediate pressure for the adoption of further penalties against the territory of Red China.

6. A large vote mobilized behind the American resolution will be regarded throughout the world as a symbol of unity and particularly as a manifestation of the will to cooperate with America, the absence of which for several weeks has had such a depressing effect on public opinion in America.

But when all these effects are appraised the question still remains unanswered: What is going to be the outcome of the whole Korean episode?

The probabilities are that the answer will come on the battlefield rather than in the UN or the realm of diplomacy.

American air power is now so substantial that air raids of a saturation type can be conducted on a scale comparable to that which was inflicted on Germany during the last war. Thus, 250 of the B-29 bombers carry a tonnage equivalent to that of 1,000 of the B-17's, which did such extensive damage in Germany. When the newspapers used to report a 1,000-plane raid the American people got the impression that the maximum amount of damage was being done. Something of the same sort is going on right along in Korea, but the American public isn't aware of it as yet. Possibly it is because there has been a noticeable soft-pedaling on the extent of the damage being visited on large areas. Undoubtedly many civilians are being killed, too.

"Napalm," which is the deadliest of the fire bombs, rings the enemy troops. When they infiltrate behind our lines, our ground troops signal the Air Force the positions of the enemy and everything within the circle is pounded to pieces or burned.

The tragic truth is that the Red Chinese are taking some awful punishment. Their crack army cannot indefinitely take such heavy losses. They will need these trained troops for battles in the interior of China. Incidentally, Russia isn't risking any of her armies while Red China is bearing the brunt of the Korean struggle. The casualties on the UN side are relatively low due to the defensive campaign being waged and the utilization of counteroffensive moves on a hit-and-run basis. This kind of campaigning can go on for a long time. It could happen that the Red Chinese will be begging for a cease-fire without any conditions very soon, and the UN will then have a free hand to discuss or negotiate whatever it pleases.

As time goes on, terms will grow stiffer because the Red Chinese have had their opportunity to end the bloodshed and have insisted on a victor's terms instead.

It is being asked, of course, on many sides: "What will all this accomplish?" The only answer that seems at the moment to be acceptable is that if the Korean episode does prevent a third world war by impressing the Communists that the free world will fight aggression wherever it arises, the sacrifice made will have been more than worth while.

Governor Dewey's Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Democratic State chairman of New York, which, in my opinion, is most timely in view of the submission by Governor Dewey to the New York State Legislature of the highest budget in the history of New York State:

There is no excuse for Governor Dewey's misleading statement regarding the new Federal budget.

Mr. Dewey has taken it upon himself to blast the President's allocations for domestic affairs—a portion of the national budget which amounts to only 17 cents out of every dollar. It may be, however, that Mr. Dewey in issuing this statement is seeking to divert attention from his own inflated budget.

Since Governor Dewey took office, the budget of this State has more than doubled.

Under Governor Dewey, the State's debt is greater than it was at the end of the depression of the 1930's. This despite the fact that he has been reaping the most tremendous revenues in our State's history.

The vast increase in administrative expenditures under Governor Dewey can most easily be seen in a department by department comparison of Governor Lehman's last budget with Governor Dewey's 1950 budget. Typical examples are:

Department of commerce: from $223,860 to $2,042,492.

Department of audit and control: from $1,116,160 to $3,314,019.

Department of civil service: from $561,115 to $1,968,290.

Department of conservation: from $3,155,095 to $8,355,031.

Department of state: from $813,767 to $2,229,335.

Department of taxation and finance: from $5,955,545 to $13,022,027.

About the only economies made by the Republican Governor in his last budget were slashes of $6,739,000 in aid to dependent children and of $1,069,000 in aid to the aged.

The soaring expenditures under Governor Dewey are no doubt due in great part to the vast increase in public employees. From January 1943 to last October the number of persons employed by the State has skyrocketed from 52,215 to 78,120—a 49.6 percent increase. This has caused a jump of 188 percent in the State payroll, from $7,280,000 a month to $20,000,000.

These are but a few examples—enough, however, to indicate where Mr. Dewey should display his talents for economizing and sacrificing.

We shall be interested to see what economies and sacrifices will be found in Governor Dewey's forthcoming budget.

The Frog Story and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cottage Grove (Oreg.) Sentinel of December 14, 1950:

THE FROG STORY AND SOCIALISM

In some parts of the United States there is in circulation a frog story, which illustrates how a new governmental theory which advocates either socialism or communism can get a foothold in a democracy. It shows how we can embrace the creeping socialism or communism. If a frog is dumped into a pail of scalding water he will immediately jump out or conversely if the frog is dumped into a pail of icy water he will jump out immediately. But if the frog is put into a bucket of tap water and the water is gradually heated or cooled, the frog would remain in the bucket of water until he is cooked or frozen beyond further struggle.

Socialism is not being fed to us all at once, but slowly like the process of cooking or freezing the frog. The process has been going on now for 10 or 15 years and is coming from nowhere but our National Capitol.

Playing With Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well-considered and timely editorial, Playing With Fire, appearing in the Boston Post of January 28, 1951.

As a matter of fact, every right we possess under the Constitution can only exist if the United States of America continues to exist.

PLAYING WITH FIRE

Back in September 23, 1949, President Truman made an announcement which stunned America and rocked the free world.

He stated publicly he believed that the American people to the fullest extent consistent with national security should be informed of developments in the field of atomic energy.

His information was this: "We have evidence that within recent weeks an atomic explosion occurred in the U. S. S. R." The headlines shouted, "Russia has A-bomb." It was something the American people should know.

There was no hysteria or stampede in the United States. Outwardly the citizens of our land, in the traditional way, took the awesome news in stride. But inwardly they began to rearm. The honeymoon was over.

No longer was the United States sitting on top of the world with a weapon which could win any war and knock off any would-be conqueror. We had been asked to move over on our preferred seat and make room for our foe, our greatest and most determined foe. Once more, broadly in the matter of weapons, Russia was equal with America.

Since then there have at times been doubts propounded by certain thinkers and public orators whether Russia really has the bomb. But the belief that President Truman knew what he was talking about overrides those quibbles.

Let us assume Russia has the bomb as the American people have been informed and ask these questions: Do the American people know the exact date that bomb went off in Russia? Do they know exactly in what part of Russia the test was made?

The reason we raise these questions is this: Everyone in the wide world knows today that the first explosion has occurred at the Atomic Energy's new testing grounds in Nevada. Everyone also knows that the detonation occurred last Wednesday night.

If anyone doubts that they will have to doubt the word of Governor Russell, of Nevada. He announced it to the world. Pressed, the public relations man at Las Vegas, on authority from Washington, confirmed it.

Furthermore, the world was publicly informed that the explosion was a "dry run" to test communication and other facilities on the bombing range in Clark County.

Now that the American people know that, what do they know?

We doubt that President Truman wanted everyone to know about it because he said he would only give information consistent with national security. We do not know if such information now given out upsets national security, but we cannot see how it helps.

For one thing, there are the Russian spies in America whom we daresay are as busy ferreting out our atom secrets right now as they were during World War II.

We hardly expect that a Russian spy, so engaged, would bother right now checking through Vermont or Illinois. It would seem a matter of common sense, and Russian spies have lots of that, they would be heading for Nevada.

Unfortunately, they will not be wearing black whiskers and Russian caracul caps. They will not be walking into bars demanding vodka or roaring the Internationale.

They will look like other American citizens because in the guise of American citizens they are working for Russia.

As a member of the free press we are against censorship. But since the free press can only exist if the United States of America continues to exist, in times of grave national emergency there must be some restraint for safety's sake.

If we have war secrets Russian spies would die to know about, why hand them to them on a platter?

This Way It Began

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] has told today a story that touches the heart of every one of us of the Congress as well as every mother and father throughout the Nation.

A 13-year-old girl, Ethel May Ness, of 327 Chestnut Street, Kearny, N. J., was stricken with polio on September 26, 1950, diagnosed as the dread spinal paralytic type. Practically all hope had been abandoned when she was brought to the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation Hospital at Jersey City, N. J.

Tonight Mr. Speaker, this young lady graduates with her school class at the Lincoln Junior School of Kearny, N. J., not yet fully recovered but well enough to be brought to her school and to stand up long enough from her wheelchair to receive her diploma from the hands of Dr. John Bosshart, New Jersey's State Commissioner of Education sent to Kearny by the Governor of New Jersey, Alfred E. Driscoll, to officially represent him in congratulating this young girl who continued in hospital her studies under the direction of Mrs. Ramm of the Jersey City Fund of Education.

The attention of the Nation will be on this young lady tonight when she receives her diploma. Congratulatory letters have been sent her by New Jersey's Governor Driscoll, Senators Smith and Hendrickson; Congressmen Sieminski and Lart; also from the United States Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, the honorary chairman of the Sister Kenny Foundation and House Minority Leader Martin.

Our colleague, Mr. RODINO, himself has taken the time to go to Kearney to personally participate in the exercises for Ethel who despite all obstacles continued on with her studies so as to graduate with her class.

Mr. Speaker, this story of her faith in God that she would get well and her determination to keep going is a tribute to our children of America and a challenge to all of us in these days of troubles and anxiety that where there is a will there is a way with God's help.

Mr. Speaker, we of Texas, perhaps more than any other State of the Union, have suffered from polio. California and North Carolina too have had epidemic after epidemic, of this dread crippling disease.

Our colleague Mr. PRIEST, from Tennessee, introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress to provide for Federal research into polio and other crippling diseases. This bill was approved by the House Interstate Commerce subcommittee but died in the last days of the Eighty-first Congress. I sincerely hope he reintroduces this bill in the Eighty-second Congress. Mr. Speaker, the only bright spot that I have seen are the results of the reports of the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation hospitals and clinics wherein 84 percent of their admitted cases walk out on their own limbs.

At this time I would like to compliment the Sister Elizabeth Kenny Foundation, its Mr. Marvin Klein, the executive director; Marvin A. Stevens, M. D., their medical director; Miss Valerie Harvey, chief technician; Rex G. Williams, eastern regional director; and Thomas J. Duffey, assistant regional director, and all the others who day by day work so that others may walk and live and play.

I join with my colleague from New Jersey in his sincere hope that one day every State in the Union will have a Sister Kenny Foundation Hospital, so that the thousands of polio cases yet to come can be helped and cured by the method of this great Australian nurse, Sister Elizabeth Kenny.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude these remarks with the story "This way it began":

THIS WAY IT BEGAN

"Infantile paralysis. No known treatment. Do the best you can with the symptoms presenting themselves.

"MCDONNELL."

Elizabeth Kenny, 23-year-old Australian nurse, looked at the telegram again, then moved away from the lonely pool of light by the telegrapher's shack toward the hitching rail where her horse stood in tired patience.

The time was 1909; the place, Australia's isolated outland. Elizabeth Kenny had hoped that Dr. McDonnell, her mentor, would be able to help. But the dread term "infantile paralysis" even in a cryptic wire message dashed that hope completely. Or should have dashed it completely.

But riding back toward sickness in the bush-country hut, Nurse Kenny dwelt not on frustration but upon the terrified mother who waited, upon the child, her patient, given into her hands by the circumstances of isolation. She saw again the 2-year-old tot contorted by pain, her knee drawn up, her heel twisted outward, her arm drawn tightly beside her chest—the symptoms, puzzling to Nurse Kenny, which had sent her post haste to the nearest town astride the saddle horse she used to reach outlying districts. The symptoms which Dr. McDonnell had correctly diagnosed over a telegrapher's thin strand as polio. "Do the best you can with the symptoms presenting themselves."

And now young Elizabeth Kenny rose up in her stirrups. Galloping through the night, she kept repeating those helpless words in a growing pattern of rebellion and fury. No known treatment? Tell that to a child in agony?

But there was no further time for thinking; the situation demanded action—and quickly.

At the hut she flung herself from her horse and strode into the sick room. Working with desperate haste she tried warm salt in a bag, and then a linseed meal poultice, but twisted pain remained. Then she tore a woolen blanket into strips and wrung them out in boiling water, wrapped the strips around the painful parts. She repeated this process until amazingly, unbelievably, pain stopped. The child slept.

Nurse Kenny went wearily outside and stood close by a giant tree fern, hearing faintly the bark of a dingo, and in the distance a raucous kookaburra. She knew she had won. Perhaps * * *?

During the next few weeks Sister Kenny treated similarly five more cases of polio in her area, then reported back to Dr. McDonnell.

"Do you mean to tell me they recovered?" asked the doctor skeptically. "Without deformity?"

"Why, yes," said the young nurse. And she showed him, and the other doctors of Australia, and later the medical men of America too. And today—because a girl nurse in Australia's bush country refused to bow to orthodox medical dictum—thousands of children, and adults, too, are spared the hideous crippling of a dread disease.

This way it began.

United We Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, James Patrick McGovern, a former captain in the AEF during the First World War, and a member of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, has composed a poem which affirms the worth, the honor, and the soul of mankind, which I now present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

UNITED WE STAND

What love of country and of Government
Can plant our flag on far Korean heights
When greed and hate and ignorance are blights
By which our soldiers' minds and hearts are spent?

If communism is the tyrant's lust
For power veiled behind a Judas' guile,
What are those righteous leaders with their smile
Whose god is votes, whose lie "In God We Trust"?

Our fathers in their wisdom framed the state
With Christian virtues, which they sanctified;
The Congress, Courts, and President allied
Are balances they held inviolate.

Never was the need for unity
So crucial here, abroad, as freedom's name
Is desecrated in the blood-guilt flame
Of communism's far-flung treachery.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

When May A-Bomb Be Used?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this article which I am inserting, taken from the Los Angeles Tidings, the official Catholic newspaper of that area, certainly brings to our minds the seriousness of the use of the A-bomb. I recommend its careful and thoughtful reading:

WHEN MAY A-BOMB BE USED?

(By Rev. Robert F. Coerver, C. M., professor of philosophy, St. Johns Seminary)

When the Chinese Communists launched their unwarranted and overwhelming assault against our troops in Korea, the hue and cry was raised in this country to retaliate with the use of the atom bomb.

This demand was heard in both the House and the Senate, from several military leaders, and from many a Mr. Average Citizen in the street. The possibility of using the atom bomb in reprisal was given impetus in a remark from President Truman.

However, in a later interview, President Truman seemed to express the sentiments of our national conscience when he sadly shook his head at press reporters and stated:

"It is a terrible weapon. It should not be used on innocent women and children who have nothing to do with this military aggression."

Thus President Truman recognized, as we all do, that the use of the atom bomb has certain ethical implications.

MORALITY OF WARFARE

Before discussing the ethical aspects of the atom bomb, it might be pertinent to say a few words about the morality of modern warfare. I do not intend to raise here the question: Can any modern war be morally justified? The overwhelming majority of moral theologians, I am sure, would answer that there can be a justifiable modern war.

The church teaches that the rulers of a nation may not declare war against another nation unless (1) they are sure that they are in the right; (2) they have first exhausted all peaceful measures of bringing about an end of conflict; (3) they have good reason to believe that the benefits achieved by their victory will not be outbalanced by the evil consequences of the war.

I accept the position that modern warfare can certainly be justified, especially in view of the defense of our spiritual possessions and the threat of enslavement by a godless, tyrannical power.

Our question deals rather with the morality of a given means (the atom bomb) made use of in the prosecution of a war which itself is justified.

BOMBING OPERATIONS

Bombing operations in modern warfare are divided into two classes, tactical and strategic.

Tactical bombing missions are those in which the enemy is directly engaged. For example, bombing troops in the field or enemy troopships at sea.

Strategic bombing missions are those in which the enemy is not directly engaged but which are a part of an over-all strategy to reduce his military effectiveness prior to direct engagement. For example, enemy munitions factories behind the lines.

Precision or "pinpoint" bombing is a bombing assault in which the target is a specific, assigned, definite target—such as a factory, shipyard, railroad center. Tactical, strategic, and precision bombing, in a justifiable war, present no moral problem for they do not differ radically from the use of long-range artillery fire. They are a necessary concomitant of modern warfare.

MAY A-BOMB BE USED?

The question arises: may an atom bomb be used in tactical precision bombing?

The answer seems to be certain that an atom bomb could be used in tactical operations such as against an enemy fleet at sea or enemy troops in the field.

Here we presume that the harm of the bomb and its destructiveness would be limited to combatants. There seems to be no difficulty as to the use of the atom bomb in this case.

May an atom bomb be used in strategic precision bombing? The answer is twofold.

1. If the target were entirely military or munitions, such as a town or city which is exclusively dedicated to manufacturing bombs or munitions, with practically no civilian personnel, then the atom bomb could be used. Oak Ridge or Los Alamos might be cited as examples. In this case, atomic bombing could be justified.

2. If the target were a munitions factory in a large city, surrounded by civilian homes and residential areas, the use of the atom bomb would be questionable. If the target were one of supreme importance whose destruction was essential to the winning of the war and the atom bomb was thought to be the sure means of destruction, in this case, it seems that the atom bomb could be morally justified even though it is foreseen that thousands of noncombatants might be killed or severely wounded as an indirect result of the bombing.

The destruction of such extremely important objectives would seem to justify the concomitant and indirect deaths of so many civilians.

Father Connell, moral theologian of Catholic University, gives two examples where such might be the case.

(A) The destruction of the building in which all the war lords of the enemy are gathered.

(B) The destruction of the factory where the enemy is making his own superbombs.

Even in these cases there is some hesitancy on the score that precision bombing by high explosives might do just as effective a job without the consequent death of nearby civilians.

OBLITERATION BOMBING

If the target is not of vital importance, then, a fortiori, it is difficult to see how the atom bomb could ever be used in strategic bombings where it is foreseen that many thousands of civilians will die in consequence.

However, precision bombing, like modern warfare, has tended to become uncontrolled. Gradually, the targets become less defined, less limited, and whole areas become the targets. This brings us to the important question, the heart of the matter, obliteration bombing.

Obliteration bombing is defined as the bombing of industrial centers of population in which the target to be wiped out is not a definite factory, bridge, or munitions plant, but a large area of a whole city, comprising one-third to two-thirds of its whole built-up area, and including by design the residential districts of workingmen and their families.

This type of bombing occurred during the last war and is likely to occur in this next war. For these compelling reasons, the following discussion of its morality is necessary.

Some proponents of modern, total war have attempted to justify obliteration bombing on the score that in the changed conditions of modern warfare, there is no longer a dividing line between combatants and noncombatants, soldiers and civilians.

According to their logic, in total war all citizens are mobilized. Men not actually in the army are munitions and defense workers, war-bond purchasers, and contribute to the war effort. Women are drafted as plant workers, and even children are classed as war potential.

NATURAL LAW

Since all citizens are mobilized, then it follows that all citizens of a modern warring nation are subject to bombing. Therefore, obliteration bombing is lawful.

It seems to our way of thinking (and also in the practically unanimous opinion of theologians) that such an opinion is untenable.

We shall refute these claims in the following discussion of two questions:

1. Do the majority of civilians in a modern nation at war enjoy a natural-law right of immunity from obliteration bombing?

2. Does obliteration bombing necessarily involve a violation of the rights of innocent civilians?

In answer to the first question, it is fundamental in the Catholic view that to take the life of an innocent person is always intrinsically evil, that is, forbidden by the natural law.

Catholic theologians have never abandoned the distinction between innocent and guilty—they still maintain that it is intrinsically wrong to kill directly the innocent civilians of the enemy country.

This principle was recognized by President Truman when he said: "The atom bomb should not be used on innocent women and children who have nothing to do with military aggression."

Pope Pius XII spoke recently in behalf of innocent civilians when he said. "These weapons (atomic) hit not only armies but often wipe out private citizens, children, women, the sick, and holy institutions."

Actually, then, who are noncombatants in a modern war, and do they constitute a majority of a nation?

Noncombatants would be all men, women, and children who are not engaged in the immediate and proximate prosecution of war work.

Even in wartime, there are hundreds of occupations which are not directly connected with the war effort.

Taking the United States as an example, the present population is estimated to be around 150,000,000. If we went to war, the top number of men in the Armed Forces would be from 10 to 12 million. If we would allow another 40,000,000 for those individuals who are employed in munitions and defense works, that would leave a total of 100,000,000 or two-thirds of the population, none of whom would be giving in any sense immediate cooperation to the armed prosecution of the war. These figures would be validated by the estimates of the War Manpower Commission made during the last war.

Thus, two-thirds of the population cannot be considered combatants, or guilty of aggression, or deserving of violent repression.

Do the majority of civilians in a modern nation at war enjoy a natural-law right of immunity from obliteration bombing? The answer is an emphatic affirmative.

Now, let us proceed to the question whether obliteration bombing violates the rights of innocent noncombatants?

TERROR OF WAR

One of the principal motives of obliteration bombing, as expressed by military men during the last war, was the terror, devastation, and demoralization carried to the core of the warring nation.

It seems impossible to make civilian terrorization, or the undermining of civilian morale, an object of bombing without having a direct intention to injure and kill civilians.

The principal cause of civilian terror is the danger to life and limb which accompanies the bombing raids. If one intends the end, terror, one cannot escape intending the means of obtaining the end, namely the injury and death of civilians.

Obliteration bombing includes, then, the direct intention to kill innocent noncombatants and as such it cannot be justified.

The indiscriminate bombing of civilian cities carried out in the last war and envisioned in the next war, is immoral.

True, such bombings are often cloaked under the guise of military necessity, but military necessity can become a mere catchword and an excuse for every sort of excess.

"THEY DID IT FIRST"

The argument is advanced that "they did it first, therefore, we can do the same thing to them." The answer to this objection is simply that two wrongs do not make a right. This is elementary morality. And if we abandon morality in war, then we must abandon it in peace, since morality is not something to be put on and off like a cloak, at one convenience.

Another argument is that obliteration bombing will hasten the day of defeat and bring about quick victory. The answer to this objection is the cardinal principle of morality: The end does not justify the means. If this principle is abandoned, then all morality is abandoned and anything can be justified.

The final question that might arise is this one: Suppose Soviet Russia should atom bomb our civilian cities, what recourse would we have against them?

The answer is that we could retaliate with all the forces at our disposal, including the atom bomb, but within the limits already suggested.

Of course, this last question is an academic question at best, since it is difficult to conceive of our military leaders thumbing through manuals of moral theology and international law before dropping bombs in retaliation.

This is not to say that our military leaders do not have moral consciences; it only asserts that they are not sufficiently acquainted with the niceties of distinction to give the matter weighty consideration.

The conclusions of this article can be briefly stated. First, modern warfare can certainly be justified. Second, the atom bomb can be used in both tactical and strategic precision bombing missions under the conditions stated, namely, as long as there is a proportionately grave cause. Third, obliteration bombing is an immoral attack on the lives of innocents.

The atom bomb, therefore, may not be used in obliteration bombing.

These opinions would seem to be justified from the voice of the Popes, the opinions of theologians, and the Christian laws of justice and charity.

One Public Official With Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a letter written by an irate tenant to a member of the Los Angeles city council, and the latter's reply.

We in public office receive many letters similar to Mr. Rinehart's, but very few of us have the nerve to answer the way we would like to, as Councilman Don Allen has done in his letter.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 22, 1951.

MY DEAR MR. ALLEN: I am coming to you for assistance. You seemed so eager to remove rent control that I feel you might be as anxious to help people find new places to live. Perhaps you would have a vacancy in some of the apartments you apparently own.

I am a Federal employee and my salary is fixed by Congress, and I am still in the low salary brackets. Too, I do not make $600 per month from the people for misrepresentation.

The apartment I live in is a small single apartment. It's rent was $35 a month. It is really worth $38.50 but I told the landlady I would pay $40 per month. However, she raised the rent to $45 which I cannot afford to pay. She also adds $5 per months for television use.

Too, she did not give a full 30-day notice as I believe the law required. Those notices were dated December 21, 1950, but postmarked December 27 and received December 28, 1950. And so we have had to pay the increase early. I called the rent-control office for information but was advised that the office had been closed.

What protection do you offer? I am a war veteran of World War II and might possibly be called again. But are we going to be fighting for the right of people like you—to deprive us of a decent place to live at a decent price?

Yes, I've been looking for a place to live but without success. I saw one place renting for $30 per month about which I considered calling the health department as being unfit for human habitation, but considering the vile state of our city government, I considered it would be a waste of time.

I am glad to see that elections are coming up soon and we will have the opportunity of expressing our disapproval of the action of you and other councilmen who railroaded the removal of rent control.

This is not an accusation because I haven't any proof, but there is a grave suspicion that you and other councilmen did benefit in some financial manner for rent removal. How much was it?

Disrespectfully yours,

PAUL E. RINEHART.

CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
City Hall, January 23, 1951.

MR. PAUL E. RINEHART,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Your recent letter of January 22, 1951, wherein you state you are coming to me for assistance, and then you start off by saying I was so eager to remove rent controls that I would be anxious to help people find places to live in. I have been anxious to help people find places and have been successful in doing so, but for people who are decent and worthy of such help.

Further, you say you are a Federal employee, and your salary is fixed by Congress in the low brackets. Then you make a crack to the effect that you do not make $600 a month off of the people by misrepresentation.

If you are a Federal employee—and I do mean if you are—your salary has been increased since 1940 by more than 25 percent or 30 percent or even 50 percent.

I also note that your landlady has added $5 a month for television use. Now isn't that just too darn bad. I know property owners who cannot even afford a television set and many who cannot even afford a small portable radio.

You ask what protection do I offer. What are you looking for—something on a silver platter? I also am a war veteran and a father of a World War II veteran who has just been called back into service. So what? Who is fighting for what—the right of who to deprive who of a decent place to live at a decent price?

I am glad that you note elections are coming up soon. Yes; each one has a right of expressing disapproval of actions, but you might consider your remarks to be of the criminal libelous nature when you say the councilmen railroaded the removal of rent controls. This matter was under consideration by the council for some 18 months before we took the action.

Then you wind up by saying that there is a grave suspicion that I and the other councilmen did benefit by the rent removal and you ask me how much was it—but still you ask me for assistance.

For your information, I am sending a copy of this letter to the United States Senator, the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, and Congressman NORRIS POULSON. If we taxpayers and citizens have to have such an impertinent misfit sitting at the public trough, I am going to see if some action cannot be taken to remedy the situation. I certainly will begrudge every bit of the income tax I need to pay to the Federal Government for helping to support an individual like you. Your attitude is a serious reflection upon the decent, fact-minded, and hardworking Federal employees with whom I am acquainted.

Sincerely yours,

DON A. ALLEN,
Councilman, Seventh District.

All-American Canal Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Senate Joint Resolution 6 of the California State Legislature:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6, RELATING TO THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL PROJECT

Whereas the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057) authorized the construction of the All-American Canal and made provision for Imperial irrigation district, a political subdivision of the State of California, to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of said canal upon the completion thereof; and

Whereas said act also granted the right to said district to utilize the power possibilities on said canal, the net proceeds therefrom to be applied against the district's obligation to repay to the Federal Government the construction cost of said canal; and

Whereas pursuant to the provisions of said act, before any moneys were expended by the Federal Government on or for the construction of said canal, Imperial irrigation district entered into a contract with said Government under date of December 1, 1932, by the terms of which said district was granted the right and required to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of said canal upon the completion thereof and also the right to develop the power possibilities thereon; and

Whereas the main All-American Canal has been completed and has been in operation for a number of years and the Secretary of the Interior has transferred the care, operation, and maintenance to Imperial irrigation district of all of said main canal except the upper section thereof, being that section from and including the diversion works on the Colorado River at Imperial Dam down to and including the Pilot Knob check and Pilot Knob wasteway; and

Whereas Imperial irrigation district has proceeded to develop the power possibilities on the section of the All-American Canal which it is operating and in connection therewith has acquired and is operating a complete power system serving the needs of all consumers of electric power in Imperial County and in Coachella Valley, Riverside County, Calif., served with water by the said canal but to date said district has been prevented by certain Federal departments from developing the power possibilities at the Pilot Knob site on said canal, which is the most important and valuable power site to said district on said canal; and

Whereas over the past years, Imperial irrigation district has requested the Secretary of the Interior to keep faith with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the district's contract of December 1, 1932, and turn over the care, operation, and maintenance of the upper section of said canal to said district and grant permission for said district to develop the Pilot Knob power site (without expense to the United States); and

Whereas the water treaty between the United States and Mexico dated February 3, 1944, grants to Mexico the right to receive a portion of its water by means of the All-American Canal and Pilot Knob wasteway, such water to be carried from the point where the latter empties into the old Alamo Canal to the delivery point on the international boundary; and

Whereas the amount of such water to be so delivered to Mexico is but a relatively small proportion of the total annual flow of the All-American Canal and need not interfere with the district's operation of the canal nor the development of power at the Pilot Knob site; and

Whereas the United States does not have the right to the use of any of the capacity of the All-American Canal for such supplying of water to Mexico but Imperial irrigation district does have surplus capacity in said canal down to Pilot Knob which it proposes to use in connection with the development of power at that point; and

Whereas to remove any question as to possible conflict between said treaty and said district's contract, and also in a spirit of cooperation, said district has, by a proposal submitted to the Secretary of State in December 1947 offered to make available without cost to either the Federal Government or the Mexican Government capacity in the All-American Canal down to the end of the Pilot Knob wasteway and to transport to that point the water necessary to fulfill the requirements of said treaty under rules and regulations therefor to be promulgated by the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the upper section of said canal is turned over to said district and it is permitted to develop the Pilot Knob power site, as provided for in said district's contract of December 1, 1932; and

Whereas after concurrence by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, the Secretary of State accepted said district's proposal in principle, subject to a clarification of wording, and did so notify said district by letter dated August 4, 1948; and

Whereas for reasons unknown to this legislature, despite such acceptance the Secretary of State has recently turned the matter over to the Secretary of the Interior to decide who shall operate the upper section of the All-American Canal and the latter has announced that the Bureau of Reclamation will handle such operation, without giving any valid reasons why and in total disregard of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the district's contract of December 1, 1932; and

Whereas Imperial Irrigation District has already suffered large financial losses caused by the Federal Government's refusal to permit said district to develop the Pilot Knob site and the Nation has lost hundreds of thousands of barrels of fuel oil used to generate power which otherwise would have been supplied by the Pilot Knob plant had the district been permitted to build it, which situation should be remedied without further delay; and

Whereas this legislature believes that the Federal Government should take every reasonable means to observe and keep faith with the contracts it makes with its people and that this principle is particularly important at this time of world crisis when our form of government is on trial before the world; and

Whereas this legislature believes in the principle of local control of public works to the greatest extent practicable, subject only to such reasonable rules and regulations by the Federal Government as may be necessary to protect the Government's investment in such works: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State of the United States be memorialized to uphold the principles of our form of government in its dealings with Imperial Irrigation District under the terms of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the contract with said district of December 1, 1932, and the treaty with Mexico dated February 3, 1944; and be it further

Resolved, That said two secretaries be memorialized to proceed under the principles of the proposal made to the Secretary of State by Imperial Irrigation District in December 1947, in accordance with the acceptance thereof by said secretary as stated in letter of August 4, 1948, to said district, to the end that said district be permitted, without further delay, to assume the care, operation, and maintenance of all of the main All-American Canal and to proceed with the development of the power site at Pilot Knob; and be it further

Resolved, That the attorney general of California, the State engineer, and all other officers of the State of California be and they are hereby directed to use all means within their power to carry out the objectives of this resolution and to assist Imperial Irrigation District in accordance therewith; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General of the United States, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

The Dinosaur Dam Sites Are Not Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article from a magazine entitled "The Living Wilderness," which was written by U. S. Grant 3d, the President of the American Planning and Civic Association. This article concerns the preservation of some very unique geography, which has been set aside under the Antiquities Act as the Dinosaur National Monument. I commend it to my colleagues in the House, especially those who are anxious to preserve for posterity one of the most unique pieces of land in the world. The article follows:

THE DINOSAUR DAM SITES ARE NOT NEEDED

(By U. S. Grant 3d, President, American Planning and Civic Association)

The Trojan horse in our national park system, model 1950, is now driven by electricity supplied from water power impounded behind great dams.

In most cases such dams are doubtless economically justified, and their construction may be expected to prove beneficial; but in some cases the dam builders have a preference for a location where they would destroy other existing and irreplaceable values that are the heritage of the American people. Such a case confronts us now as we face the threat to our national park system posed by the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects in the Dinosaur National Monument.

Like the cynics of half a century ago, these dam-builders know the price of everything but the value of nothing. When the fancy strikes them they must have their way. Then they trot in their Trojan horse, secretly pass through the wall established by law to protect the natural wonders and play places of the American people, and by an intensive campaign of propaganda "sell" the local inhabitants and their leaders the project The final step is then to persuade Congress by a well-organized pressure group; that it is necessary pro bono publico to legitimize the violation of the law in a particular case and authorize an exception to a policy explicitly stated in a law adopted after years of consideration to protect our heritage.

Of late years, with the popular recognition of the need of our air regions for more water and of the benefits of cheap power to their communities, the frequency with which such projects are espoused and fought for has become alarming. The proposal to include in the upper Colorado basin program the two dams and reservoirs proposed in Dinosaur National Monument has thus had its precursors, but none has been so serious as this one which has already been embodied in three bills in the Eighty-first Congress—H. R 8980 and 9014 and S. 3839—and will be further pressed in the next Congress. Most of those who are pressing the inclusion of these two projects are persuaded—honestly, of course—of four wholly erroneous claims, alleged by the dam salesmen who have done their job only too well: (1) That the crying need of northeastern Utah and the Bonneville Basin for more water cannot be met without the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs; (2) that without these two reservoirs the amount of water for the lower Colorado River Basin, stipulated in the interState agreement, will not be forthcoming; (3) that without them there will be less water impounded and less power produced; and, finally, (4) that the cost of the entire upper Colorado River program will be substantially increased if these two dams are eliminated and others substituted for them.

All four of these claims are disproved by the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation itself, although the Bureau for reasons not evident has continued to press for the inclusion of these two projects in the program and has apparently persuaded the Secretary of the Interior to approve its recommendations.

The construction of these two dams will destroy the character of a unique national monument having special scenic, geological, archaeological, and recreational values.

If the American people wish to preserve this God-made wonder for the inspiration and enjoyment of themselves and future generations, they must act now.

Immediate popular support of the opponents of the projects is needed to prevent authorizing legislation.

Such support can be given with the knowledge that dam sites exist in other places in the upper Colorado system which will give equivalent or better results at no substantial increase of cost and, probably, as far as conditions are now known, at less cost.

By prohibiting any water power developments in our national parks and monuments, the 1921 and 1935 amendments to the Federal Power Act, adopted after full discussion and debate lasting over 15 years, established a well-considered policy of the Government to protect the interests and heritage of all the people of our country—and the enjoyment of the citizens of other nations who come here to see and appreciate the wonders nature has given us—against just such attempts as are now being made for the temporary benefit of relatively few.

Such an established policy—and I emphasize it is to protect not only the rights and interests of our generation, but also the inheritance we should pass on to future generations—such a policy should never be violated just to make easier or a few dollars cheaper the storage of water and the production of power for the benefit of a limited area. When the needed benefits can be obtained at alternative sites, and more economically at these sites, the violation of the national park system should be unthinkable.

The natural features of Dinosaur National Monument are many and unique. If the proposed dams are built, the unique character of the river and canyon will be changed; their special value will have been destroyed forever for the particular kind of recreation and inspiration they in their natural state can give. Let no one say that the dams and reservoirs and power plants will afford better and more recreational facilities. Such facilities as they will afford will be different, of a kind encountered on all the hundreds of other reservoirs proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and by other agencies, and they will exist equally whether these two reservoirs are built or their equivalents are located elsewhere.

Our industrial civilization is creating an ever greater need for the average man, woman, and child, to reestablish contact with nature, to be inspired by and appreciate the wonders of nature, and to be diverted from the whirling wheels of machinery and of chance. There is an ever-growing craving to be eased of the anxious tension of the factory and the city. Moreover, our population is growing rapidly. The national parks and monuments now developed are already overcrowded, with more than 30,000,000 visitors reported last year. More must be developed for the teeming generations to come. It would be a crime to destroy this unique value which we have inherited, and cut off our heirs with a shilling—a few acre-feet of water and a few kilowatt-hours which, it must be emphasized, can be provided elsewhere.

The preservation of this monument of nature's grandeur, with its prehistoric record, will in no way disregard the needs of the people in the Colorado watershed and the Bonneville Basin, for their needs can be met by reservoirs outside the national park, without the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

The notion that the central Utah requirements are to be provided and can only be met by the Echo Park Dam is entirely erroneous; actually, the Bureau of Reclamation's program itself calls for these needs to be met by a diversion from Flaming Gorge Reservoir outside the monument.

Equally mistaken is the notion that the 23,000,000 acre-feet of storage, needed to provide the average annual flow of 7,500,000 acre-feet at Lee Ferry, as required by the interstate contract, cannot be got without this storage in the monument. The fact is that the capacity now proposed for the Glen Canyon Reservoir alone is estimated at 26,000,000 acre-feet.

Turning to financial estimates, we note that the Bureau of Reclamation reports indicate a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.73 to 1 for power alone; and for combined benefits a ratio of 1.89 to 1. Evidently, where there are so many possible dam sites to choose from, to save the irreplaceable values of the Dinosaur National Monument, we can well afford the selection of a slightly less profitable location for the additional storage required without substantial reduction in the economic justification for the Colorado River project as a whole. This is manifest from the fact that the present project utilizes only 10 dam sites out of some 81 possible dam sites indicated in the Colorado River report of 1947. (The Colorado River: A Natural Menace Becomes a National Resource; Interim Report on the Status of Investigations, etc., United States Department of the Interior, etc., H. Doc. 419, 80th Cong., 1st sess.). While, of course, many of these 81 possible sites will prove impracticable on further examination and local survey, it is evident there are plenty of substitutes from which to choose.

Evidently many red herrings have got into the upper Colorado.

Although the selection of substitutes will have to be made by the Bureau of Reclamation and any outsider must approach the problem with much diffidence, suggested substitutions are, nevertheless, here proposed to show that there is an adequate solution for doing without the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs, based on information and data contained in the Bureau of Reclamation's own reports.

In brief, what is here suggested is: (1) Construct in the initial stage of the Colorado River project two dams now planned for a later stage—Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain—and thus omit the Echo Park Dam from the initial stage, and (2) plan for a substitution of three dams—Desolation, Bluff, and New Moab—for the Echo Park and Split Mountain combination contemplated for construction in the national monument during the second stage. The advantages and costs of these alternative proposals are carefully considered in the following discussion:

Five reservoirs are now recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation for immediate construction "in the initial stage of the Colorado River storage project." Four of these are the Flaming Gorge, on the Green River above the Dinosaur National Monument, to provide for the diversion of water to Utah; the Curecanti Reservoir, on the Gunnison River; the Martinez, on the San Juan River; and the Glen Canyon Reservoir, on the Colorado River just above Lee Ferry. The fifth now proposed is the Echo Park Reservoir, which would be created by a dam across the Green River just below the junction of the Yampa and the Green, in Dinosaur National Monument. The Echo Park Reservoir would flood the canyons of both the Green and the Yampa.

The results will not be harmfully affected if the Echo Park Reservoir is omitted and the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain Reservoirs are in its place incorporated in "the initial stage of the Colorado River storage project." They are now included in the second stage of the project, to which the Echo Park Dam would be postponed.

The Echo Park Reservoir is estimated to provide for 6,400,000 acre-feet of gross water storage and 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year—annual firm power, which is expected later to be reduced to 666,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

TABLE 1.—*Reclamation Bureau proposal and suggested alternative in initial stage of Colorado project*

Reservoir project	Gross storage of water	Annual firm power	Estimated approximate cost
	Acre-feet	*Kilowatt-hours*	
Gray Canyon	2,000,000	1,018,000,000	$178,600,000
Cross Mountain	5,200,000	335,000,000	49,100,000
Total	7,200,000	1,353,000,000	227,700,000
Echo Park	6,400,000	1,200,000,000	139,400,000
Gain	800,000	153,000,000	
Additional cost			88,300,000

The Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain Reservoirs are similarly estimated to provide for 2,000,000 and 5,200,000 acre-feet of storage, respectively, and 1,018,000,000 and 335,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year, respectively—or a total together of 7,200,000 acre-feet of storage and 1,353,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power, an increase of 800,000 acre-feet of storage and 153,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year above the estimates for the Echo Park Reservoir. (See table 1.)

It is evident from this comparison that the substitution of the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain projects, outside the monument, for the Echo Park proposal that would destroy the monument, will give even greater capacity in both storage and power during the initial stage of the project.

The additional cost of this substitution in the project's initial stage—as is shown in the following paragraphs—will be compensated for in the later stage of the project by the savings in costs and the added returns in power and storage from the substitutions of other dams outside the monument. And it is to be remembered that the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain Dams are to be built anyhow—later if not in the initial stage. In the long run their construction as here suggested would thus involve no additional expenditures at all.

The second phase, or stage, of the Colorado River storage project, has also been planned to include a dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. This is the Split Mountain Dam which would create a reservoir in Split Mountain Gorge and Whirlpool Canyon, a reservoir that is to be so used in conjunction with the Echo Park Reservoir as to make the two dams eventually into what might be called twin projects.

As the project enters the second phase, the power production of the Echo Park installation, it is expected, would reduce to 666,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, while the Split Mountain would provide for 720,000,000 kilowatt-hours—a total of 1,386,000,000. The Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs would store 6,400,000 and 335,000 acre-feet of water, respectively, a total of 6,735,000 acre-feet. These two dams are now estimated to cost, respectively, $139,400,000 and $67,000,000—a total for the two together of $206,400,000.

The data of the Bureau of Reclamation show that for these two dams that would so seriously damage the national park system there could be substituted in the second stage, three alternatives—Bluff, on the San Juan River; New Moab, on the Colorado; and Desolation, on the Green, immediately above the Gray Canyon Reservoir—so close, in fact, that the data for these two proposed projects in their present state include some overlapping.

The Desolation Dam is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to provide for 900,000 acre-feet of water storage and 433,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year; its construction cost is estimated at $33,000,000. The Bluff and New Moab Reservoirs would, respectively, provide for 3,000,000 and 3,965,000 acre-feet of storage, produce 289,000,000 and 845,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power per year, and cost $19,000,000 and $95,000,000. Thus this combination of alternatives would provide for 7,865,000 acre-feet of storage and produce annually 1,567,000,000 kilowatt-hours, at an estimated construction cost of $147,000,000.

These three substitutes—Desolation, New Moab, and Bluff—would thus provide for 1,130,000 more acre-feet storage of water and 181,000,000 more kilowatt-hours of power per year than would the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs combined. And the three substitutes would together cost an estimated $59,400,000 less than the two dams now proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation for construction within the national monument.

These comparisons of storage and power-production potentials and costs are summarized in table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Reclamation Bureau proposal and suggested alternative in second phase of Colorado project*

Reservoir project	Gross storage of water	Annual firm power	Estimated approximate cost
RECLAMATION BUREAU PROPOSAL	*Acre-feet*	*Kilowatt-hours*	
Echo Park	6,400,000	666,000,000	$139,400,000
Split Mountain	335,000	720,000,000	67,000,000
Total	6,735,000	1,386,000,000	206,400,000
ALTERNATE POSSIBILITY			
Desolation [1]	900,000	433,000,000	33,000,000
Bluff	3,000,000	289,000,000	19,000,000
New Moab	3,965,000	845,000,000	95,000,000
Total	7,865,000	1,567,000,000	147,000,000
Increase from alternates	1,130,000	181,000,000	
Savings from alternates			59,400,000

[1] Including some overlapping with Gray Canyon; see text.

The saving thus shown in estimated costs, and the increased storage and power to be obtained, if compared with the expected results from alternative proposals for the initial stage, would seem to indicate a net increase in costs of $26,909,900 that is, $86,300,000 minus $59,400,000), together with a 1,930,000 acre-feet increase in storage and a 331,000,000 kilowatt-hours increase in power. However, such a comparison would ignore the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to build the Gray Canyon and Cross Mountain projects anyhow—in the later stage even if they are not built as alternatives to the Echo Park project. This means that their added costs during the initial stage would simply involve an earlier expenditure of some $86,300,000, rather than an increased one. The fact is that the total alternative program here proposed would result ultimately—not only in preservation of the monument—but in an economy in expenditures and a greater return in power production and water storage.

If we can project ourselves into the future, then, we can make the total comparison shown in table 3 between the Bureau's program and this one alternative possibility we have suggested.

When probable costs are compared, the ground is less firm, of course, than when we are dealing with storage and power-potential estimates. Such cost estimates as exist were made in different years, which means that they are based on different construction-cost levels. In any case, such estimates are not very reliable until after extended investigations of sites, foundations, character of rock, and soil, etc. Nevertheless, such estimates as do exist regarding costs very definitely favor these proposed substitutes rather than the objectionable Echo Park and Split Mountain projects.

Evaporation and silting will be somewhat higher for the alternatives; but the increased storage possible should compensate for the former. The soil conservation work now going on in the Upper Colorado watershed will reduce the silting appreciably while these dams are being built and filled. Moreover, the Moab Dam will reduce the amount of silt reaching Glen Canyon, so that the over-all reduction of storage by silting will not be appreciably increased.

TABLE 3.—*Summary of Reclamation Bureau proposals affecting monument and suggested alternatives*

Reservoir project	Gross storage of water	Annual firm power	Estimated approximate cost
RECLAMATION BUREAU PROPOSAL	*Acre-feet*	*Kilowatt-hours*	
Built first: Echo Park	6,400,000	[1] 666,000,000	$139,400,000
Built later:			
Split Mountain	335,000	720,000,000	67,000,000
Gray Canyon	2,000,000	1,018,000,000	178,600,000
Cross Mountain	5,200,000	335,000,000	49,100,000
Total	13,935,000	[2] 2,739,000,000	434,100,000
ALTERNATE POSSIBILITY			
Built first:			
Gray Canyon	2,000,000	1,018,000,000	178,600,000
Cross Mountain	5,200,000	335,000,000	49,100,000
Built later:			
Desolation [1]	900,000	433,000,000	33,000,000
Bluff	3,000,000	289,000,000	19,000,000
New Moab	3,965,000	845,000,000	95,000,000
Total	15,065,000	[2] 2,920,000,000	374,700,000
Increase from alternates	1,130,000	181,000,000	
Savings from alternates			59,400,000

[1] During the initial stage Echo Park's annual firm power is expected to be 1,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours, but this will reduce to 666,000,000 when the later stage has been reached. The present table makes a comparison between completed projects.

[2] Including some overlapping with Gray Canyon; see text.

In spite of such compensation, the proponents of the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams make much of their claim that using the alternate sites would involve evaporation losses which would be 350,000 acre-feet a year larger than at the reservoirs they want.

Hard as it is to believe, to avoid this somewhat vaguely determinable evaporation loss (which can be compensated for in any case), they are asking the Federal Government to violate an area of the national park system and sacrifice the possible advantages of the alternates here proposed.

Moreover, there is a very real doubt as to whether excess water enough will be available in the upper Colorado River Basin to fill all the reservoirs proposed after meeting the year-to-year local requirements. This is an additional and conclusive reason for postponing construction of the two dams in the Dinosaur National Monument until it is shown that they are needed and can be effectively operated.

There are, of course, other alternatives than those here considered—and other combinations of alternatives. The important fact to demonstrate and emphasize is that it is not necessary to invade the national park system in order to realize the objectives of the Colorado River storage project. Even if alternatives would cost much more than reservoirs within Dinosaur National Monument the alternatives should be chosen rather than destroy the unique irreplaceable wilderness resources of the monument. When actually, it is seen that such alternatives can be constructed at less cost, considering the added storage and power gained, there should be no tolerance for a moment of the failure of the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with plans for these alternatives.

The hard fact is that the Bureau of Reclamation—despite the laws safeguarding the national park system from such dams—has already made site surveys in the national monument and has done other preparatory work (including propaganda) to such an ex-

tent that it does not want to make similar studies of alternative sites.

Conservationists throughout the country can, in this instance, defend to the full their national park system confident that preservation of the Dinosaur Monument entails no sacrifice of other benefits.

To sum up, in conclusion, let us emphasize:

1. The Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams are not necessary for the successful and economical development of the upper Colorado Basin, or for compliance with the interstate compact, or to furnish the proposed diversion to the Utah Basin. The claim that these dams are so necessary is definitely in error.

2. In fact, substitutes may be found which will not only furnish more water storage and more hydraulic power, according to the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation, but will cost less for the results attained.

3. The Dinosaur National Monument contains natural, geological, archaeological, and recreational features that are unique and irreplaceable. These are treasures which our generation holds in trust for posterity. There is a moral obligation upon us to preserve them undamaged for our grandchildren, our great grandchildren, and for their children.

4. Such recreational features as could be developed in connection with the reservoirs would be equally provided on the substitutes and would be just what is found at every one of the thousands that already exist throughout the country; the unique educational and inspirational values would be destroyed—and quite unnecessarily—if the dams are built in the monument.

5. Our growing population needs more national parks and national monuments and more places of special interest displaying the variety of natural manifestations. Every visitor to such a park is a better citizen afterward, and we need good citizens. Any reduction in the extent or character of our parks would be a step contrary to the public interests.

6. If these dams are allowed to be built they will constitute precedents for again repeatedly violating in the future a wise policy, established by Congress with the Department of the Interior, to prevent just such wanton destruction of irreplaceable values.

7. The injury will be to the whole country and to future generations not here to defend their heritage, the benefits are claimed for a relatively small number of local inhabitants and their communities—but this is all due to a misunderstanding; the benefits can be had just as cheaply or more cheaply without these two dams and reservoirs. There are really no valid reasons for them; it is just that there is always a temptation to grab a park for any other purpose and public opinion has been stirred up under a misunderstanding, and then it is human nature not to want to give up a cause which has once been espoused.

Education and the American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD the text of two addresses and a brief statement in connection with the eighty-fourth convocation of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, held on October 20, 1950, at Albany, N. Y. The theme of the convocation was "Education as the guardian of the American heritage," and the two major addresses were delivered by Dr. Charles Franklin Kettering and the Right Reverend Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, two outstanding personalities in American life. I am certain that my colleagues will find these addresses both timely and interesting:

EDUCATION AS THE GUARDIAN OF THE AMERICAN HERITAGE

REGENTS' STATEMENT OF THE CONVOCATION

The eighty-fourth convocation of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, held in Chancellors Hall, State Education Building, Albany, N. Y., is now part of our history.

The theme of the convocation, "Education as the Guardian of the American Heritage," proved a most attractive one, judging from the enthusiastic crowds which attended each of the sessions and stirred the various speakers to deliver addresses which, without exception, were notable and provocative.

The convocation was held on October 20, 1950, and the three afternoon sessions were designated, respectively, higher education, elementary and secondary education, and adult education.

The Senate Chamber was filled to capacity for the session on higher education to hear, under the chairmanship of Regent Moot, the addresses of Dr. Irwin Edman, Johnsonion professor of philosophy, Columbia University; Brig. Gen. Ames T. Brown, New York State director of selective service; Dr. Everett N. Case, president, of Colgate University and president of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York; and Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, associate commissioner for higher education.

The Capitol Room at the Hotel Ten Eyck was not large enough to accommodate the overflow crowd for the session on elementary and secondary education which, under the chairmanship of Regent Eastman, listened to addresses of Col. Lawrence Wilkinson, director, New York State Civil Defense Commission; Dr. Samuel Flagg Bemis, Sterling professor of diplomatic history, Yale University; and Dr. Harry V. Gilson, associate commissioner for elementary and secondary education.

In the Cathedral Guild House a large audience attended the session on adult education under the chairmanship of Regent Macy, and enjoyed the reports of the two youthful community ambassadors, Theodore Rhoades, who was sent to the Netherlands, and Dora L. Bertoglio, who was sent to Italy, and the addresses of Dr. Kenneth Powers Williams, professor of mathematics, University of Indiana, and Dr. Edwin R. Van Kleeck, assistant commissioner for adult education and special services.

The evening session found Chancellors Hall crowded to its utmost capacity, and it was then that the convocation, which was under the chairmanship of Chancellor Wallin, swept to a dramatic climax in the addresses of Dr. Charles Franklin Kettering and the Right Reverend Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen.

Dr. Kettering's message was primarily one of hope—a resolute call to educators to inspire youth to face the future with dauntless courage in their own abilities and unshaken confidence in the resources of America.

Monsignor Sheen's message was primarily one of faith—a clarion call to educators to reaffirm in youth the pioneering spirit of our founding fathers, their trust in God, and their recognition that from Him come their inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The board of regents felt that these two addresses, going as they do to the fundamentals of the democratic way of life, are so valuable and timely that they should reach a much larger number of readers than the formal publication of the proceedings of the convocation, and, therefore, has provided for the separate publication of such addresses in this brochure.

The regents call upon educators and all others who would keep the American heritage constantly to reaffirm such faith and hope in all who seek their ministering services—faith in the Creator, faith in this great country of ours and her democratic processes, faith in fellow man and faith in self; hope in the future of America and of mankind, so that youth, fortified by their instruction and example, may overcome all dangers, difficulties, and discouragements, and press on to achieve the goal of youth's most cherished dreams.

To that faith and hope the regents join a message of charity, that youth may be taught and may fulfill their life's mission with malice toward none and in the spirit of that brotherhood which instinctively recognizes the dignity and the privileges of all, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

Thus will our eighty-fourth convocation, while remaining a part of our history, continue as a vital force guarding the American heritage.

ADDRESS OF CHARLES FRANKLIN KETTERING, DIRECTOR AND RESEARCH CONSULTANT, GENERAL MOTORS CO.

Gentlemen, distinguished guests, the ladies. I am delighted to be here. I have no prepared talk because your situation in this convocation is so different from anything that I had been acquainted with, and further, if I had attempted to write something, it would have been inadequate when I got on the ground.

I thought I would like to talk to you for a minute about a different point of view in education. I have been an inventor all my life, and I thought you might be interested in how an inventor looks at education and what is the difference between an inventor and a scientist.

I was asked the question last winter: "What is the difference between an inventor and a scientist?" My explanation was rather simple. I said a scientist is really something very special. He is like the strings in the loom that go lengthwise, and if you made a hammock of that type, it would be difficult to sleep in. The inventor puts the strings in the other way.

A study made a number of years ago said the more education a man has, the less likely he is to be an inventor. Now the reason for that is quite simple. From the time the boy, or girl, starts in school he is examined 3 to 4 times a year, and, of course, it is a very, very disastrous thing if he fails. An inventor fails all the time and it is a triumph if he succeeds once. Consequently, if education is an inhibition to invention, it is due entrely to the form by which we rate things and not because of any intellectual differential.

I can take any group of young people, any place, and teach them to be inventors if I can get them to throw off the hazard of being afraid to fail. Because failure is just exactly like the steps that lead up into this great education building. You fail because your ideas aren't right. You shouldn't be afraid to fail, but you should learn to fail intelligently. By that I mean, when you fail, find out why you failed, and each time you fail it will bring you up nearer to the goal.

It is very interesting that most people look at problems as being complicated. We cannot solve the complicated problem. Consequently, we have to analyze it and bring it down to the most elementary things in the world. We have had a motto in our research laboratory that reads: "This problem, when solved, will be simple," because every

one we have ever solved has been simple. We don't think anybody can solve a complicated one.

There are two general types of knowledge in the world. There is the knowledge about people, and there is the knowledge about things. Things are much older than people. Nature was here for millions and millions of years before the people were here and we sometimes, in our scientific approach to the thing, get the idea that we can tell nature what to do. We read in the paper about the great discoveries that have been made. Well, those are discoveries, but we shouldn't get excited about them. If they hadn't been there, we wouldn't be here. And so I think that because over the past few hundred years we have been able to understand some of the phenomena of nature we have become egotistical as to how much we know about nature. Of course, a knowledge of nature is science. We have developed a thing we call research and we perhaps overestimate what it is because a researcher is simply an amateur; he is going to do something for the first time, and that is all the amateur does. The researcher is a professional amateur. He is professional in that he knows that he is going to have a lot of trouble with the problem and it isn't going to be a very good solution when he gets it, because the work of an amateur is never very good. So we have tried to set up a method of describing these elemental things. That is why I say I can take any group of people, any place, and I can get a good result with them if they don't try too hard and if we can analyze the problem.

The word "design" is a very bad word. We don't design very much of anything. We make it so it will work. Right after this last war some friends of mine from Europe came over and they were amazed at some of our developments in Diesel locomotives and Diesel engines in general. The type of engine they looked at was quite unconventional. They said, "How did you get yourself into the state of mind that you could design such a cockeyed engine?" "But," I said, "we didn't. We built a single cylinder engine and we gave it half a dozen pistons and said, 'You try these out. See which one you like the best. Here are some valves.' We let the engine try them out." I said that if the engine wasn't any good, we didn't design it. We made it the way it wanted to be, to show how much smarter the engine is than the engineer. These parts run 30 times as long as anybody thought they could be made to run. But we let the engine pick them out. The engine is a pretty smart piece of machinery if you let it talk to you.

In science we need to listen to the problem. We have one motto in our laboratory: "Let the problem be the boss"—because it's the only thing that can be the boss. We have the idea that if we have a couple of Latin and Greek synonyms set up, that is a good substitute for knowing how. I have been working on a problem called photosynthesis, or why the grass is green, for many, many years. I think we are going to find out some day. We have made more progress in the past 3 years than in the past 50 or 60 years.

The oldest plant we have in this universe is the little blue-green alga which grows on ponds. Blue-green alga goes back to prehistoric days. Its appearance hasn't changed. It has a mind of its own and goes on being a blue-green alga. A friend of mine picked up a little book and sent it to me air mail. The particular thing that had interested him was that in this little book it said it had been definitely proved that the active principle in blue-green algae is phycocyanine. I read this and I immediately grabbed the telephone and said to one of my associates, "Send me the structural formula of phycocyanine." I didn't get a reply. So I called him up again, and he said nobody knew the formula for phycocyanine. I called several well-known book stores, Brentano's in New York, and Kroch's Book Store in Chicago, and said, "What can you get me on this subject?" They couldn't get me very much. So when I got back to my home in Dayton I thought I would look it up in the Oxford unabridged dictionary. Sure enough, there it was. Phycocyanine. Phykos is the Greek word for algae and cyanine is the word for blue. So I went out, walked around the house and came in the same door.

I was walking past the International Business Machines Co.'s office the other day and saw in the window display something representing the old Tower of Babel. As you know, when the people tried to build the tower to heaven the Lord confused their tongues. Don't think that tower is gone—we are confusing the tongues today—so if any fellow in any line can understand anything in any other line, he is not well educated. Yet nature made all. It was all here, all developed, before any words were in existence at all. Consequently, take the problem and try to find out what it is. You have had no trouble in learning to talk to the problem. You don't need to know Greek, nor any Latin, but you do need to know how to ask and how to recognize the answer. A great many people say that the trouble with the inventor is that he is a cut-and-try artist. We never thought we were that bad. In the East you call it trial-and-error. That is because you are older and more refined than we are out West. It isn't either of them. It is when you cannot make the calculations at all. We try to find out what those factors are by experimental evaluation, which is a tremendously different thing from cut-and-try. The inventor is constantly stumbling onto something. I used to tell this story. If this room were very dark and there were a chair in the middle and we all sat around the wall, we could philosophize as to where it was, but the fellow who got up and walked around and stumbled over it would find the chair. One fellow puts it this way: "There is one thing proven, that nobody ever stumbled into anything sitting down."

In the introduction of the new college presidents and the new superintendents of schools here, it was mentioned in the remarks of both of these gentlemen that there are opportunities which exist today in the whole world of education. There never was such an opportunity in the history of the world for people to know things. Therefore I have been trying to work out the idea that this is the age of opportunities unlimited. A great many people are quite distressed; a great many people are worried, and the reason for it is that there are two types of things—the current confusion, for one. We have a war, and I think there are some elections coming up. Those are the confusions of the day. They are the current distractions, but they haven't anything to do with the long-range type of things that we need to do, and therefore if we plan some of these long-range things—there never was such an opportunity to do, never such an opportunity to understand, never such an opportunity to find out. We live in a world of fear and despair. If you listen to some commentators and Communists, you will find that out. I have been very fortunate in that I have never been able to read very much, so I have been spared a lot of that.

I was talking before the American Broadcasters Association not long ago. I said I wished I had a business of my own. I would put on 1 hour a week, the Happiness Hour, and tell what wonderful opportunities we have in this country. We talk about exhausting the lands. We are talking about people going to starve to death. I don't know whether you know it or not: I have been in the automobile business all my life. I have built a lot of engines. Everybody always said that we are the people who are ruining the world. I admit the streets are getting pretty full. I asked a very good friend of mine, "Why are you worried about people starving to death?" "Well," he said, "we are exhausting the land." I said, "Just wait a minute. We can feed about 200,000,000 people in this United States of ours without very much trouble. In the past 25 years the horse population has gone down 18,000,000 and for every horse you don't feed you can feed four and a half people."

Without farming one more acre of ground you can feed 70,000,000 more people. I know it is a little hard on the horses, but then * * *. Nevertheless, he came back and said, "Of course, you are going to exhaust your oil and your petroleum, and so forth." I said, "Suppose we do. Let's be realistic. Let's find out at what rate we are exhausting those things."

I don't like to live in this atmosphere of despair. It is hard on a person. It makes one nervous. Just where are we in the picture? Well, we got some figures together. Here is what we find. Only 5 percent of the coal has been taken from the mines. We still have 90 percent of our petroleum in the ground. We have 90 percent of our natural gas. We have all of our shale oil, which is perfectly enormous in quantity. Out in Colorado there is one rock that contains six or seven times as much oil as we have ever used. It is interesting to know that shale oil is made up from the remains of those little algae that I was talking to you about. It takes 8,000 years to lay up an inch. There is one rock out there 500 feet deep, so you see they weren't in a hurry about it.

Our whole source of power comes from the sun. I think we know how much our agricultural colleges have done. We don't have to jump at this thing. We have fuel in sight for 1,500 years. I think we can raise enough fuel on an acre of ground to run an automobile. Incidentally you use up the weight of your automobile in fuel per year. That would be about 2 tons. The people in Maine who have had their quotas reduced in potatoes are raising 20 tons to the acre. Of course, there is a lot of waste. The only way we use it is by fermenting it into alcohol, and that is the wrong way to do it. I do not mean from the social implications, but because a pound of alcohol has only 12,000 or 13,000 heat units while a pound of petroleum has 19,000. So there is no advantage in making it that way. You want to make it the other way, but we don't know how to make it the other way yet. Nature made this fermentation process automatically. There is nothing to worry about, but our point of view to the whole situation is that we can answer any questions that you need to ask if we do them in a nonegotistical way, if we don't want to become authorities.

A fellow said to me, "Inventors have no respect for authority."

I said, "We do have respect for authority, and the authority we have respect for is the fact and that is the only authority in the world. Nature will answer your questions for you. Nature will do these things for you if you don't try to edict it."

You haven't any idea how many people want to say, "That is the way it ought to be done." It ought to be done the way it will work. So, people can learn things today as they never did in the history of the world. It doesn't necessarily have to be a formula. We have this great pneumatic tire industry. We think it is one of the greatest mechanical inventions that has ever been made. It isn't mentioned in any textbook in any engineering school. The reason, they say, is that we have no formulas for it. You have to study low-pressure steam boilers because we have the formulas, but they don't make those any more.

I have read about the integrating machines—these wonderful calculating machines. We got our tires by using a kind of

integrating process. We put them out and tried them on all automobiles under all kinds of conditions. They have to be pretty good. We try them out on all the roads and all the people of the world. It is the biggest integrating machine we know of.

So, you can abide by these simple approaches. Do you want to do a thing? What is the best way to do it? Let's start. Remember you can't start finally. You have to start as an amateur. You have to learn how.

One time I was talking with an industrialist who said, "You fellows do a very, very poor job in your research. Your things are never very well done."

I said, "I will go down to the music store and get you the finest violin that you have ever seen. Will you attempt to play a recital in Carnegie Hall right away with that?"

He said, "No."

I said, "The fellow who plays in Carnegie Hall starts when he is a kid and he practices all through the years."

The great trouble with us is that we want to edict our ideas into completeness instead of having them grow. Ideas grow like corn. You get the idea started and if you don't become politic about it—people say it has to be this or that. It doesn't. It can be this and that in any ratio, in any proportions you want.

I would like to congratulate this great State of New York on its educational system because it is doing here what everybody is trying to do—integrate the thinking—and everybody has a right to think as he wants to. You are trying to open the road.

From an inventor's standpoint, we think the question of procedure is more important than knowledge. You have to know how to analyze a problem. You don't have to know much to do that, because you can get everybody else to do it. Let me give you an illustration. If you were building a house and you went separately to a carpenter, a bricklayer, an electrician, and a plumber, you wouldn't get a very good house. If you took a plan, you would get a good job. The procedure, to the inventor, is like the plan of a house. We have developed laboratories which are known as problem analysis laboratories.

I have a friend who is a very brilliant man. He is quite old. One of his recreations was to work these big jig-saw puzzles. He had a table set up in his house in a room he used for this particular purpose.

He said, "I can work these in half the time anybody else can."

I said, "That is the research procedure you are using. We don't get puzzles that easy. Let me give you the kind of problem we have. Let me take three pieces out of three other puzzles and stir them into your box and see what you can do with that one. You can't solve the problem until you find out what pieces don't belong to it, and what ones you don't have "

That is the thing we have to do all the time in trying to solve the problem. We have to do something about it. Let's find out what the thing is that we want to do something about. If you do that, you can write your ticket, and you will underwrite it every time, because your success will be greater than your anticipation.

ADDRESS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR FULTON J. SHEEN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH

Mr. Chancelor, Dr. Kettering, members of the Board of Regents, your Excellencies, friends, I always consider applause at the beginning of a lecture a manifestation of your faith. If it comes in the middle, it is a sign of hope. And if it comes at the end, it is always charity.

Dr. Kettering said that he had no prepared speech because he did not know exactly the nature of the group which he was to address. I have no prepared speech because I know the nature of the group that I am to address.

Dr. Kettering was telling us the difference between invention and education. Dr. Kettering said that invention was research. If you copy anything out of one book, it is plagiarism. If you copy it out of two books, it is research. If you copy it out of six books, you are a professor.

Dr. Kettering was speaking of nature as a teacher, which, indeed, is right. No man ever sits down before nature and tells it how it ought to work. He is passive before it. There is a note of submission, resignation, respect and obedience in which he says, "Be it done to me according to Thy word." While Dr. Kettering was developing that theme, there came to me the idea that that is just the way we all ought to be before the will of God. As we sit passively before nature, so we submit to God's will. Apropos of God's will, it is certain that we are to be educated. Which brings me to my theme of Education as the Guardian of the American Heritage.

We begin now by defining terms. What is the American heritage that we have to defend through education? The American heritage, I think, is respect for human rights and liberties. That brings up this next question: Where do we get our rights and liberties which we have to defend? They have a source. Where do I get the right of free speech? Where does the board of regents get the right to educate? Where do you get freedom of conscience, freedom of religion? Do you get them from the State of New York? If you got them from the State of New York, the State of New York could take them away. Do you get your rights and liberties from the Federal Government in Washington? If you got your rights and liberties from the Federal Government in Washington, the Federal Government in Washington could take them away. They are taking almost everything else away. And they could take away your rights and liberties.

Our founding fathers had to face this question, and it was one of the very first that they answered. They looked around the world for an answer. England was saying that rights and liberties come from Parliament, and the new French school was saying the rights and liberties of man come from the will of the majority. But our founding fathers knew very well that if your rights and liberties came from the will of the majority, the will of the majority could take away the rights of the minority. After all, the majority is the custodian of minority rights.

So they sought for some basis and ground of human rights and liberties, and they found it and set it down in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence: It is a self-evident principle that the Creator—the Creator—has endowed man with certain unalienable rights. Unalienable rights. They cannot be taken away. And among them is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then, finally, when the Bill of Rights was drawn up, article 9 was written. This article reads: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

A cow has no rights. Neither has a pig. No animal has rights except by association with a human. We alone have rights, and that is because we have transcendental ends, because we have an immortal soul and because this soul was created by God. Just as soon as education, civilization, and so-called culture, alienate themselves from this divine basis of human rights and liberties, there is tyranny. If you have ever read the Soviet constitution you will recall that there are 118 articles setting up a totalitarian system before there is a mention of the word "right." I think the constitution reaches either chapter 9 or chapter 10 before you find out that one of your first rights is the right to work. That is a duty, not just a right. And then when it comes down to the more basic rights which we take for granted, they change the wording of the constitution and begin to use the weak word "recognize." Rights are no longer guaranteed. They mention in article 125 freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, but on what condition? On condition that they are used to support the totalitarian system.

The American heritage is concerned with rights and liberties, and rights and liberties do not come to us from a dictator. They do not come to us from a state. We do not have them because they are socially expedient. Otherwise a political power might some day determine that they were not expedient. But they come to us from beyond this world, and perhaps one of the difficulties that we are in, in the international order, is trying to preserve these rights and liberties which are the great fruits of civilization, without also keeping the roots.

If you wish to keep your light and heat, you must also keep your sun. If you wish to keep your perfume, you must keep your flowers. If you wish to keep your forests, you must keep your trees, and if you wish to keep your rights and liberties in education, you must also keep your God. That is the American heritage.

How does education preserve these rights and liberties? Education preserves them by developing first of all reason or knowledge, secondly, freedom, and thirdly, character. These words are used often very loosely.

Reason has undergone a tremendous transformation in the past two or three hundred years. Reason always used to mean ends, goals, purposes, and destinies. And then men lost sight of their destinies. Reason began to be used almost exclusively for technical purposes and to discover means. Now reason is being used in some parts of the world solely for planning.

Socialism is the forcible organization of a chaos that was created by egotistic reason. Socialism varies in direct ratio and proportion with the decline of reason and responsibility. One of the reasons today why people are becoming constantly, increasingly frustrated is because they have lost the meaning and purpose of life. There is nothing that so much undermines the minds of people as the loss of meaning of life. After all, if we do not know why we are here, why go on living? One of the reasons why an inventor can go on experimenting and be sure that there is going to be a right result sometime is because there is a great Logos and reason and purpose behind the world.

If education is to guard our American heritage it must ever keep in mind the meaning and purpose of life, namely, that we were really made for God as well as for this earth.

Freedom has undergone a great transformation, too. Freedom, or liberty, can be understood in three ways. First of all, freedom can be called the right to do whatever you please. If freedom is the right to do whatever you please, then freedom is not moral but physical. Certainly you can do whatever you please. For instance, you can turn a machine gun on your neighbor's chickens. But freedom does not mean the right to do whatever you please, because that is nothing but power and it leads to anarchy and tyranny.

As a result of the confusion that was produced by so many people in the world thinking that freedom meant that right to do whatever they please, there began a reaction. In nazism, fascism, and communism we had a new definition of freedom. Freedom is the right to do whatever you must. For example, Engels, who helped Marx write his Communist Manifesto, actually gives this example: "If I drop a stone from my hand, that stone is free because it must obey the

law of gravitation. So you are free to the extent that you obey the law of the dictator." That is the philosophy behind communism. Here are the two extremes of communism: The right to do as you please and the right to do whatever you must.

In between both is what American freedom must be, and the freedom that education must preserve. Freedom is the right to do whatever you ought, and ought implies purpose and law. We are free in the law and not outside of it. We are most free when we obey the nature of things, not when we disobey them. I am free to drive an automobile in traffic on condition I obey the traffic laws. I am free to draw a triangle provided I draw three sides. I am free to draw a giraffe on condition I draw a long neck, not a short neck. Many people want to be free from everything, but you are free from something only for something. Freedom is not negative. It is positive.

A rich man went up to a taxi driver and said, "Are you free?"

The taxi driver said, "Yes. I am free."

The rich man left, shouting, "Hurrah for freedom."

It was meaningless to the taxi driver because if he was free, he was free for something. Our American heritage implies a memory. A heritage is a tradition, and just as you cannot think without going back into the storehouse of your memory, so, too, civilization has a memory, and our country has a memory and a tradition. That tradition is freedom within the law and not outside of it.

Finally, education preserves the American heritage through the development of character. Character to some extent is a little different from education. In education you always take what is best in a pupil. For example, education would never take hold of me and teach me to be a singer. I was telling someone at dinner tonight that when I first instructed Grace Moore, she said after the first 10 minutes, "You have a wonderful voice." I said, "If I do have a wonderful voice, why can't I sing?"

She said, "Have you ever tried?" (What priest hasn't?)

She said, "What is your favorite duet?"

I said, "Anges Pures from Faust."

She said, "Let's sing it."

Well, we sang it. It goes up about eight octaves each verse. She finally stopped and said, "You are right. You can't sing."

Education lays hold of what is best in a person but I think that character lays hold of what is worst. It takes hold of a failing and by very skillful manipulation and training turns it into a perfection. St. Paul said, "Power is made perfect in infirmity." Sometimes the part of the house that is repaired is the strongest part in the end. There is a tendency today in certain quarters to believe that character is made by some single act in the past, and so you go back to the day when you were locked in the closet during the terrible thunderstorm when your aunt Minnie called. That was the day you began to hate your mother, and you grew up with that terrible hatred and all the complexes that you have since are due to that one single instance. Character is not made by a single act in the past. Character is made by what is called the habitus. Habitus in Latin is a virtue and is made by repeated acts directed toward a certain end or purpose. If the end is bad, then you have an evil character. If the end is good, then you have a good character.

If I sat down to play at the piano it is possible, if you gave me a selection to play, I might hit a right note. Ed Wynn was once talking to someone who boasted that he knew operas very well. Ed Wynn struck one note on the piano and said. "If you know operas so well, from what opera does that note come?" So if you gave me a selection to play, it is possible that I might hit one right note, but if a great artist like Rachmaninoff sat down to play, it is conceivable that he might hit a wrong note. But you would say Rachmaninoff could play and I couldn't. You would not be judging by the individual act. You would be judging by the habitus. A good tennis player might sometimes make a very bad stroke. A person who cannot play tennis might sometimes make a very good one, but there is the habitus in one and not in the other, and habitus is developed through the will and not through knowledge.

There is apt to be the assumption of Socrates in education that the only reason people are bad is because they are ignorant, and if you give them enough education, they will be good. Oh, no. Sometimes education can make clever devils instead of stupid devils. Not every doctor of philosophy is a saint, nor every doctor of divinity. I am both, and I am not a saint. We ought to be, but we are not. We have the knowledge. Most of the saints never had a doctor of divinity degree nor a doctor of philosophy degree.

Ignorance is not identical with evil. Evil comes from the will and from bad choices. That is why the preservation of the American heritage requires a certain amount of discipline. Is education forgetting it? How little of memory work there is in modern education. And those of you in the audience who, like myself, are over 30 years of age will remember when we went to school, that we had to do considerable memorising. Memory has to be trained when we are young. It is a very good discipline. Spelling is a very good discipline. Then there are moral disciplines. There is nothing that develops character like a pat on the back, provided it is given often enough, hard enough and—low enough. All the education in the world will not make good citizens unless, as I say, we keep in mind the purpose of life and also train the will of our young. That means that we have to decide what is the purpose of education. The purpose of education is not merely to train for a democracy. That we must do, but that cannot be the final end. The purpose of education cannot merely mean to earn our economic living. The purpose of education is the training of the whole man, body and soul. In order to understand how to educate a man, you must know what a man is. Our world is oscillating between two extreme solutions of man. We have the optimistic solution that made every man a saint, and the idea that man is naturally good, progressive and that through the forces of evolution and time alone, he will go on and upward until he becomes a kind of a god.

Remember how it was 20 or 30 years ago? Now no one believes in it. What has happened to our philosophy of progress? Look at the rapidity of wars. The interval between the Napoleonic and Franco-Prussian Wars was 55 years, from the Franco-Prussian War to the First World War was 43 years, and from World War I to World War II it was 21 years. All this at a time when man had all the material conditions essential for happiness—this is not necessary and inevitable progress.

The world swept to the other extreme and fell into this terrible despair which Dr. Kettering condemned so rightly, the despair, for example, that is registered in the philosophy of Sartre that man is made for nothingness. Man came from nothingness but he was not made for it. Sartre just put nothingness on the wrong end. This is the essence of Sartre's philosophy. He said, "Anything that negates my ego is nothing. But you negate my ego. Therefore, you are nothing." The result is that today there is a pessimism and a despair about man.

Education cannot fall into either of these extremes of optimism or pessimism. Rather we have to realize that we are all not saints and we are not devils, either—that we are just human beings who can be very weak. Our weakness can take one of three directions, and the psychologists of the world have recently rediscovered them. Not one of them discovered all of them but each one discovered a third. The three instincts that we have in us that are not wrong, but that can be perverted, are the instinct that belongs to our body, which is sex, the instinct that belongs to our mind, which can be egotism and know-it-all-ness, and third, the instinct that is related to things—avarice, greed, and material selfishness. Freud rediscovered sex. Adler, with his inferiority complex, discovered egotism, and Jung discovered avarice and the philosophy of security. These instincts of body and of mind and the instinct to control things are not wrong. They are God-given. They are right, but they have to be watched and controlled and channeled. Body has to be controlled and channeled into marriage. Things have to be controlled for the common good. Mind has to be controlled toward fraternity, spirit of generosity and humility, and all of these are necessary in the development of character. If, then, education is to preserve the great American heritage, it will train the will as well as the intellect. It will keep God and it will also stress discipline in education.

America is now perhaps at one of its greatest moments of generosity. We have many failings, indeed, and we are living in a time when we are cursed by the nemesis of mediocrity. But let us also count our greatness. We are, under Providence, the secondary cause for the preservation of the freedoms of the peoples of the world. We have been the pantry of the world. We are feeding the world. We are in danger of attack but if that attack comes, may we as educators recall our founding fathers and the source of our rights and liberties. May we see the fulfillment of the words that Moses wrote. "As the eagle stirs among her young so does God stir among the nations." Moses noted that the eagles built their nest high in the mountain alongside of a crevice. When finally the mother eagle had hatched her young, she would stir in the nest and finally push one reluctant eaglet over the edge. The little bird would use its wings for the first time—wings that were all too feeble to bear its weight—and he would fall and fall and fall down to what must have seemed to its little eyes certain death on the precipice or in the chasm below. But just before it would crash, the mother eagle would swoop out under it and gather the young one on its giant pinions and then sweep it up into the air. Then it would fly from under the eaglet and repeat the process until finally the little bird learned to fly.

And as the eagle stirs among her young, so does God stir among the nations. We have had material security. Now the nest of America is being stirred by God, and we are being made conscious that there are other worlds and other peoples besides those in our own nest. Sweet Providence is now pushing us over the edge of this nest of ours and in the uncertainty of feeding the other nations of the world and preserving their freedoms, it may seem that we are crashing to death below. Just as that eagle gathered up her young, may God who stirred our nest also swoop down under us and bear us up again, as education, conscious of its American heritage, does more and more to preserve the foundation of all rights and liberties; under God to Whom we give all honor and glory forever.

A Government of Laws and Not of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on January 27, 1951, the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] delivered an address before the Maryland State Bar Association in Baltimore which richly deserves the attention of the Members of this body, and of all the people of our country.

In most scholarly fashion the Senator from North Carolina reviewed the legal aspects of American freedoms and guarantees, freedoms and guarantees which at this moment are threatened as perhaps never before in the history of this great Republic.

An outstanding audience, including many members of the Maryland judiciary and leading authorities in many fields of legal endeavor, was privileged to hear the address. Judge Levin C. Bailey, of the first judicial circuit of the State, is president of the Maryland Bar Association. Judge Stedman Prescott of the sixth judicial circuit acted as toastmaster at the dinner.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the distinguished Senator be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN

The people of America are concerned, as rarely ever before, with the paramount problem of their freedom and the question of national survival. They wish a defense that will preserve to us and to our posterity the freedoms that have come to be regarded as commonplace in America. The people are thinking about the history of those freedoms.

The founding fathers set a course and followed a path designed to furnish us a correct pattern for life and liberty in a democracy. And, that was done when the concept of democracy was not nearly so well understood in the world as is true today. From their studies and efforts they evolved a government of laws and not of men. They knew the dangers of a government by an individual.

The history of dynasties and tyrannies was well-known, and it was their purpose to prepare for us a path of progress in national life that would afford the people the greatest good and freedom. They abhorred the tyrannical abuses of governments based upon the concept of the divine right of kings or despots.

We have then our form of government under a written Constitution, whose virtues have many times been proclaimed. Our Government was designed to prevent the possibility of a dictatorship ever arising in America controlling the lives and liberties, or dedicating the activities of the people to unwise objectives.

In a nation where the people are to such a great extent homogeneous, it would seem unnecessary for such a constant cleavage to exist between the Congress and the executive department as sometimes appears. That there have been obstructions coming from all three of our departments—legislative, executive, and judicial—cannot be gainsaid.

But, behind and above all the conflicts has been the determination that despots should not rule the people of America. History is replete with the story of despots in many lands overrunning the will of the people and subjugating them to their dictates. Such was never contemplated in America. And, with that feeling, it is my purpose to discuss briefly with you the duties and responsibilities of the three coordinate branches of our Government, and particularly the duties of the legislative and the executive.

You, as lawyers, are as familiar with the Constitution of the United States as am I. But it is well indeed to have a recurrence to fundamental principles now and then, in order that we may keep clearly in our minds just what our type of government is supposed to be.

The legislative branch was given the responsibility and the duty of legislating the will of the people into the written law of the land. The executive branch was allotted the duty of executing the laws of the land under the Constitution. The judicial branch was charged with interpreting the laws, and holding a check rein, so to speak, upon any unwarranted exercise of powers by either the legislative or the executive.

It is nothing new in the history of nations that conflicts have arisen between the legislative on one hand and the executive on the other. But, we in America have been able to avoid the results that have sometimes overtaken other nations. It was with a profound understanding of human nature that those philosophers of government who organized our system, and knew the history of governments in the past, provided that the elections of Congressmen should be every 2 years, so that the people might have a chance to frequently express themselves upon public questions and policies. Those philosophers of government also knew that many times in the past the people have been exploited by their rulers, when those rulers were unrestricted in their activities, their whims and caprices.

It must be conceded, I think, that dictators and despots have for the most part come from executives who have been given too much power, and have abused that power. Our Constitution placed restrictions that now apply and as such are generally respected by our legislative and executive departments, but not always.

It was the executive, Kaiser Wilhelm I, who brought about the Franco-Prussian War. We do not have to think far back to realize that it was Kaiser Wilhelm II who projected the holocaust upon Europe which we know as World War I. We would not have to search our recollection to remember that it was Hitler who brought the Second World War upon Europe, along with Mussolini, both executives who became despots and dictators. That war was in spite of the efforts of representatives of constitutional, democratic governments to prevent it. Nor can we forget the so-called Imperial Japanese Government, represented in the person of a ruler possessing power in both the temporal and the spiritual realms, who startled the world with the dastardly depredations upon a peace-loving people at Pearl Harbor on that Sunday morning so well-described by our past great President as "a day of infamy." Nor can we forget the other despotic characters in history.

These lessons of history justify the wisdom of our founding fathers in creating a government of, for, and by the people, whose wish should be expressed and heeded through their chosen representatives. Undoubtedly the legislative branch of our Government has made many mistakes, but generally those mistakes have been made in devotion to the interests of the people, in trying to protect their rights and liberties. The activities and mistakes of Congress, as egregious as they may have been, have always been in the open and not in secret.

All the world knows each day what Congress is discussing, and what its Members are thinking and planning. People of all walks of life have equal opportunity to express their views. They do not have to be on guard against secret deals such as were made at Yalta. The secret deals of the past are undoubtedly responsible for our present situation. The people applauded when President Wilson proclaimed in his memorable message that there should be open covenants, openly arrived at. Yet we have seen this Nation of people knowing little about agreements made in their name and which have so materially affected their lives and well-being. It was not the legislative branch of the Government that made the deal at Yalta. It was the executive branch.

The people have a right to know of commitments by the executive branch with respect to duties and obligations that may be placed upon them. We are a people with a missionary spirit and zeal, that sometimes seems to prompt us almost to the point of meddling in the affairs of others. I believe it was something like that in the mind of Nehru which caused him to speak out against our Nation in the last few days, even in the face of the fact that he is expecting millions of tons of grain from this Nation to preserve the lives of his people. There can be no doubt but that we are well-wishers to all the liberty-loving and freedom-seeking peoples of the world. And yet, there can likewise be no doubt that our motives are suspected and our efforts, at times, unappreciated.

We cannot hold one man, or even two, responsible for our recent diplomatic mistakes. Many were responsible, including some in the legislative branch. It does appear that maybe there was too precipitate action.

It is not my purpose tonight to censure or to blame, but to call attention to the fact that in this hour of national seriousness we should remember, and indeed we must remember, that the problems at hand are those that must be dealt with in a spirit of conciliation and of mutual understanding between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. Mistakes will be made, and while we should not stop to cry over spilt milk, nevertheless it will be well for us to keep an eye upon those who may have had such an unsteady hand as to do the spilling, lest they may again do likewise.

War means death to millions of men who have the same right to live, to bask in the sunshine of freedom, and to breathe the air of liberty, as you and I do tonight. It should be entered into only after careful consideration and joint action by the executive and legislative. Our Constitution was planned to avoid precipitate action by any branch of our Government. It was contemplated that discussion and debate in Congress would bring out the correct facts on every situation before our Nation proceeded with warlike activities.

Entering upon the shores of Korea was a terrible mistake. We went there in high spirits and with great hopes of what we could do for human freedom. But the hopes for that achievement have long since vanished in the minds of most of our people. Who can say what would have happened with respect to the Korean situation if Congress had had the opportunity and had debated the question and the dangers with which that expedition was fraught. If we

had gone into Korea after such a full and free discussion, we would have had a collective feeling of responsibility.

If we had stayed out after such a discussion, then probably we could have avoided our present dilemma and saved the casualties that now amount to approximately 50,000 American boys. We need the collective wisdom of the branches of the Government to be exercised for the benefit of all. In the present period all chips should be removed from all shoulders, so that we may approach the problem with a clear and open mind.

Let us, therefore, examine the duties, under the Constitution, with respect to the making of war—for that is what we have. Let us do so dispassionately. Let us forget for the present the usurpations of authority by executives of the past that can and probably do furnish impelling precedents.

We know that the first part of our Constitution, article I, provides for legislative powers, and that those were the first powers to which the founding fathers gave consideration. In section VIII of that first article there was provided that—

"The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for the common defense."

And then we go to those paragraphs in section VIII which provide for the authority that is given to the legislative branch and known to all of us as the war-making powers. I quote them in order that we may have them clearly in mind tonight:

"(11) To declare war.

"(12) To raise and support armies.

"(13) To provide and maintain a navy.

"(14) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"(15) To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

"(16) To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States. * * *

"(18) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

A consideration of the meaning of those sections would seem to indicate rather clearly where the powers for making war rest, but in spite of the arguments that have proceeded for these last several weeks, I do not believe that I have seen quoted in any discussion the foregoing provisions from the Constitution.

Then there is the provision, in article II, for the executive power, which says:

"The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

As you will note, nothing is said therein about the powers of the President, but merely that the executive power, as that may, of course, have been interpreted by one or another group, was to be vested in a President. Then there comes section II of article II, which provides:

"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

Neither of those sections gives the Executive any power, either as President or as Commander in Chief, to make war, as does section VIII of article I spelling out the powers of the Congress. I do not know of any provision in the Constitution that appears to counteract the provisions which have just been cited.

We do know that paragraph 2 of section II of article II provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." And it is, of course, correct to say that the Atlantic Pact was approved as a treaty in which the Senators concurred and to the extent that such treaty placed a duty upon the United States Government of helping to defend the freedom of our allies.

I do not understand, though, that that treaty gave to the Executive any additional war-making powers, or that the right of Congress to declare war, if indeed we were to go into war, was abrogated in any respect. In fact, I understand, that the Secretary of State "categorically denied that the pact had for its purpose or its intent the sending of American troops to Europe to meet any possible defense prior to an armed aggression"—and I am quoting from a speech made by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] in the Senate of the United States on January 22. In connection with that speech there is listed fifteen interventions by the Armed Forces of our Nation which have been cited as precedents, to support the claim of executive authority to send into foreign countries armed forces without the approval by Congress.

Those 15 interventions prove interesting reading and show the disparity between police actions and all-out war: Naval hostilities with France, 1798; Jefferson's expedition against the Barbary pirates, 1804; the Seminole War, 1817; Polk's occupation of disputed Texas-Mexican border territory, 1846; intervention in Samoa, 1840-41 and period subsequent thereto; the use of naval forces in China, 1891; Boxer Rebellion in China, 1900; Theodore Roosevelt's intervention in Panama, 1903; intervention in Santo Domingo, 1940; in Nicaragua, 1899, 1910, 1912, 1926; the intervention by Marines in Haiti, 1914; President Wilson's intervention at Vera Cruz, 1914; the Santo Domingo intervention in 1916; the effort to pursue and capture Pancho Villa, 1916; the intervention in Russia, Archangel, Siberia, in 1919.

Those instances were police activities but not war such as we have in Korea today. The largest number of troops, as I understand, involved in any of those expeditions was in China in connection with the Boxer Rebellion, and upon that occasion there were less troops involved than we have already had killed in Korea. Certainly we cannot say, then, that there are any precedents for the Korean operation.

We do have treaty obligations which should be carried out in defense of the Atlantic Pact, but in accordance with law. There was an open covenant, openly arrived at, and the executive branch of the Government as well as the Defense Department has a right to expect from Congress cooperation to the extent necessary to a proper fulfillment of our treaty obligations, having in mind the proper interpretation of that treaty by the Congress itself.

It has been said that "a frank confession is good for the soul." Would it not be in order for those responsible to admit their mistakes and join in an effort to do that which will properly carry out our treaty obligations, and yet be responsive to the will of the American people? Should we not proceed in accordance with our constitutional provisions whose terms we have sworn to uphold? Dissatisfaction is rampant amongst the people, and that should make us pause and think, but should not prevent us now from having a clear understanding of the rights and duties of the respective departments of our Government.

I shall hope that we may be able to see an end to political partisanship and bickering, and party adherence merely for the sake of such. Rather we should see a complete understanding between our branches of government undisturbed by personal pique. But that is a two-way street and the elected representatives in Congress are entitled to exercise their governmental duties without abuse or side-stepping by subordinates in the executive department.

May we be so guided that America may remain a beacon light of freedom to all the world, and that, in the words of a famous American, "Liberty shall not perish from the earth."

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, to the Republican Club of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on January 29, 1951, to the Republican Club of the District of Columbia.

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

It is always a pleasure to find the Republican Party operating vigorously at the seat of the Government, exercising a personal influence on those who determine the policy of government. Those nonvoters certainly did a great job in bringing in through absent voters' ballots those many people here who have been wise enough to retain a residence in the great State of Ohio.

I am delighted to join with you in honoring the new Republican Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who won this year because they are fighting Republicans. The addition to our membership in both Houses is an augury of victory in 1952, and their enthusiasm will step up the determination of those of us who perhaps have been here too long for our own good.

The year 1950 was a great Republican year. While the ultimate results were not so favorable as in 1946, nevertheless the victories in individual States were more impressive and more promising. In 1946 the result came somewhat from temporary issues; in 1950 they represented a victory of principle. Now is the time for all Republicans to begin to plan the campaign of 1952 and the best way to start is to find the reasons for some of the huge majorities in many States in 1950.

First, it seems to me clear that the people have responded and will respond to a straightforward appeal for progress under the basic principles of American freedom which are the foundation of the Republican Party. I believe if that appeal is presented in behalf of liberty, justice, and equality at home and independence and peace abroad, they will respond to that appeal more than to any socialistic promises and programs. The issues in the recent election included the Brannan plan supposed to appeal to the farmer, socialized medicine supposed to appeal to the millions of middle-income and lower-income families, and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law supposed to appeal to the members of the labor unions. If those suppositions had been correct, the Republicans would have lost by large majorities, because most of the candidates took a head-on position against all of these three programs. They did not lose. New Deal victories in recent years had created the impression that you couldn't beat Santa Claus. They had created the impression that a man can successfully promise the farmer high prices and the

consumer low prices at the same time; that people can have free medical service and many other free benefits without paying any increased taxes; that government could give the people something for nothing. Now we know that the American people need not be fooled by that kind of philosophy.

I was particularly impressed with the attitude of the labor union member in Ohio. The officials of all the great labor unions combined to purge me from the Senate in order to prove the power of the unions in politics and secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. They made no headway with their own members. The union members voted in what they considered to be the public interest. The American workman still regards himself as an American citizen first and a union member afterward. He does not respond to an appeal based on the claim that he is the member of a particular class, has only a class interest, and that somebody is trying to discriminate against his class. He believes, as we believe, that America is not divided into classes, and that there is no division line which separates the interest of one man from that of another and no boundary which cannot be easily crossed by any American boy. In Ohio certainly, he rejected a purely class appeal.

The same thing is true of the farmer in his rejection of the Brannan plan which had all the elements of demagoguery dressed up in a palatable and attractive form. The people rejected socialized medicine, I believe, because they have an instinctive distrust of the efficiency of Government service.

Socialism and communism are based on a class appeal. They are based on the theory that only government will protect the interests of different classes and that control of all activity must be concentrated in a great central government. That principle the people of America rejected in 1950, and will reject in 1952 if we do a proper job of publicity and organization.

But the affairs of government in which we in Washington have such a tremendous interest are a good deal further from the people than we realize, and the majority of the possible voters do not follow the issues in politics and government as those of us who are in political life imagine. Consequently, we must not only adhere ourselves to basic principles, but we must present those principles in the most effective way to all of the possible voters. We have a tremendous job of publicity and propaganda, and we cannot rely on old methods. We need every kind of publicity—radio talks, columns, magazine articles, speeches, pamphlets, and a steady barrage of material to the columnists, commentators, and newspapers, upon whom so many of the public rely for argument and information. In addition to publicity, we need organization; that is, we must ask those who are concerned about sound progress in government to organize groups among their friends and extend the scope of their interest. We must finally ask thousands of volunteers to go from door to door to present oral arguments and written pamphlets.

Left-wingers are first-class propagandists. They outnumber Republicans on the lecture platforms, in writing books, on the radio, and, I think, particularly in pamphleteering. The Communists taught the labor unions and others how this propaganda job should be done, but the political organizations have lagged far behind. The American people fundamentally believe in American principles.

Every program presented by our friends or our opponents should be analyzed and tested on the basis of whether it promotes liberty in the long run or destroys liberty; whether it favors special interests or special groups, or whether it holds the scales of justice evenly and impartially as government should do. The Republicans present a program of progress in increased production, in standards of living, better education, public works that are worth while, sound principles of finance, but they must tell the people why their program will achieve permanent results, and why the Fair Deal proposals can only lead to inflation, socialism, and complete Government control of the lives of our people.

But I believe the decision last November was probably more affected by the concern of the people over the foreign policy of the United States, and that in 1952 also, that may well be the determining factor. In spite o. the President's recommendations in his budget message, I doubt if this Eighty-second Congress will embark on any new ventures in domestic policy. The interest of this Congress, and very likely that of the people in 1952, is centered on this problem of meeting the threat of Communist aggression. In the last campaign, the Republicans for the first time attacked directly the past foreign policy of the administration. We pointed out that the present power of Russia and its ability to threaten th security of the United States arose out of that policy. We pointed out that Communist infiltration into the Government, into Hollywood, into labor unions, and into the intelligentsia of the colleges and the writing profession. At Yalta our policy was largely dominated by Hopkins and Harriman. Both of them, like many other Government officials at that time were apparently convinced, perhaps by deliberate Soviet Communist design, that communism was another form of democracy. They took the position that Soviet Russia was a peace-loving democracy, as much interested in liberty and justice as the American people themselves. Any anyone brought up in American schools and conversant with the history of Lenin, Trotzky, and Stalin could have come to that conclusion, it is difficult indeed to understand. But they did.

They accepted the promises of Stalin that he would establish freedom in Poland and other countries, although he had never kept a promise and was as much of an aggressor in Poland as Hitler was. They set him up in control in Berlin, Prague, and Vienna, and American troops were turned back from Berlin and Prague because of the agreements made at Yalta. The administration established Stalin in Manchuria contrary to every principle of American foreign policy since the days of John Hay, and contrary to our obligation to our ally who had so long fought the Japanese. They encouraged the Chinese Communists. They tried to make Chiang Kai-shek take Communists into his cabinet. They cut off the ammunition and supplies which he needed at the most crucial period. In effect, they notified the Communists that we would not intervene in Korea, and wholly failed to arm the South Koreans, except with small arms, for fear apparently that they might attack the Communists in North Korea.

They intervened in Korea without even consulting Congress on the call of the United Nations, knowing well that Russia would veto all subsequent action. In spite of the most liberal policies of assistance for 5 years, costing our taxpayers billions of dollars, the administration apparently obtained no promises from England and France that they would back us up in the east even against all-out aggression by Chinese Communists, an aggression not only against the United States but against the United Nations. It is not strange that the people suspected the influence of communism and resented the weakness of the State Department.

Today the administration's foreign policy is chiefly dominated by a wavering uncertainty. We don't know exactly the size of the Armed Forces considered to be necessary. We don't know the extent of the burden of taxation or of drafting of boys. The people are certainly prepared to meet any sacrifices that are necessary either in taxation or in the drafting of men or in Government controls. But they want to be certain that they are necessary and why they are necessary. They certainly want an all-powerful Air Force and complete control of sea and air to protect our own safety. I believe they will acquiesce in the drafting of as many boys as are necessary for that purpose and for a land army of reasonable size. They know as well as everyone else that we cannot assume to run the world. They know that if we take on commitments heavier than we can assume, we may well bring this country to disaster.

If the people are going to be asked to cut down their spending, they would like to be certain that the Government will cut its nondefense spending. If we must have a huge Army, Navy, and Air Force for a good many years, they would like to see all of the frills cut off from those services, and the same results accomplished with more economy and good sense in the obtaining of munitions, supplies and equipment, and in the use of personnel.

The detailed program to be presented by the Republican Party can hardly be determined until there is more crystallization of opinion, but I believe that our policy must be based first on the maintenance of the independence of the United States, and second, on peace unless that independence is threatened. It must be based on assistance within our capacity to assist those nations which are willing and anxious to battle communism at home and abroad. It must be based on a program which maintains America as the mighty fortress of liberty, unassailable from without and strong and sound within. It must maintain the economic soundness of this country and increased production as we go, and this both for our own interest and for the interest of those who are closer to the Communist menace. We must, therefore, avoid inflation and the waste of our resources. Foreign policy is to a large extent the application of sound principles to hundreds of situations that arise from day to day. It requires sound underlying principles, but also good sense and judgment in their application. Perhaps because the present administration has failed to understand the principles, they have surely lacked judgment in their day-to-day decisions.

In foreign policy as in domestic policy, we must present our case to all the possible voters of America. We must meet head-on any truckling to Communist sympathizers in the United States, any appeasement of Russia which is likely to lead to more aggression, any waste of our resources with the idea that we can buy the support of nations who, of course, will not be bought. Our affirmative policy must be definite on the particular problems before us at the time; but founded always on a strong America, and cooperation with those nations who are willing to join with us in meeting the greatest threat from without to our own security which we have known since the Revolutionary War.

Development of the Nation's Potential Water Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Development of the Nation's Potential Water Power, delivered by me yesterday at the REA convention in Cleveland, Ohio.

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

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATION'S POTENTIAL WATER POWER

As I offer my greetings to you assembled at this REA convention I speak as one whose support for rural electrification and its achievements, is a matter of record, and I am happy to be with you in this fellowship.

The man speaking is not the only Tobey who is interested and concerned with the well-being of rural electrification, for my son, Attorney Charles W. Tobey, Jr., is counsel for the New Hampshire Electrical Cooperative. This cooperative has many of my friends among its officials and members, and is a living memorial to the ideals and sacrifice of the late Bill Neal, of Meredith, N. H., whose tragic death was a shock and a profound loss to the good people of New Hampshire and to farmers all over the United States.

Friends, I am an old-fashioned Theodore Roosevelt "bull moose" Republican, a man of progressive political instincts. To my mind, the creation and development of the Rural Electrification Administration, and its system of rural electrical cooperatives, expresses one of the very best examples of the possibilities of the Federal Government's constructive role, in the economic and social progress of our great country.

The chief basis of our great national production and high standard of living is a truly competitive, free-enterprise system. I underline the thought "truly competitive." The dynamics of our society rejects a static existence or a status quo psychology. As we work long hours with a strong and free spirit, we know, given equal opportunity, that we can aspire to better ourselves in the spiritual, mental, and material values of life. That hope and that goal is ever with us, one and all, and is the American inspiration. Communists and Fascists take note.

In any system of economics and government, perfection is not attainable, and our capitalist free-enterprise system is no exception. Chinks and cracks exist, both because of the imperfections of man and a natural selfishness and grasping of private corporate interests, which sometimes manifest themselves when they are in a position to dominate and monopolize a segment of the economy of a locality, a State, a region, or the Nation. What economists call perfect competition, which implies the automatic competitive distribution of goods, to each of us according to ability and need, is a mirage however pleasant to contemplate. With the culmination of the industrial revolution in the United States, and the disappearance of the American frontier, the Federal Government was forced by circumstances, and the extremes of wealth, private economic concentration, and monopoly, and the protection of the equality of opportunity for its people to enlarge its sphere of operations far beyond the Jeffersonian concepts, which were developed in an agrarian economy and based on the premise that a man could go west if he wanted to start anew.

And so today, in the great industrial and atomic age, the individual may find himself without a job in the factory or without the resources or private credit to properly develop his marginal farm, all due to factors entirely beyond his control, to change or better himself by hard and earnest work. Thus, your Government has stepped in, sometimes spasmodically and haphazardly, but always at the will of the people as a whole, and helped to provide and equalize opportunity, and protect the individual from private monopoly, and the disastrous extremes of inflation and depression, which sometimes spring from the private business cycle.

I support this concept as a matter of principle, although we in Congress have a duty to balance and check the Executive by prohibiting Federal control over the economics and day-by-day activities of private industry and agriculture, while at the same time encouraging and aiding private economy where it is needed and desirable. To be concrete and specific in modern-day terms, I have cosponsored and fought for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which is now the law of the land, and voted and worked for the decentralized Taft Federal-aid-to-education bill. On the other hand, I stand against the compulsory-health-insurance bill and the controls envisaged under the Brannan farm plan. There is all the difference from Dan to Beersheba between these programs, enacted or proposed for your Federal Government.

The housing and education bills provide financial aid to local communities on a decentralized basis, with minimum standards, to equalize opportunity for the people as a whole, in fields where private industry cannot make a profit, and shouldn't be expected to, or where the local communities alone cannot meet the need from their own resources. The socialized medicine bill and the Brannan plan, in contrast, are based on the principle of Government control at the central level, which ultimately would have an undesirable effect on the consumer and the farmer. The problems of health and farm standards have been, and will be, approached in other ways, without loss of initiative, by coordinated programs of encouragement and aid where needed, but without Federal control. This is the essence of the American Government in action and should be accomplished within a sound budgetary framework at all times.

As I noted a moment ago, the development and execution of the REA program is a shining example of what can be done, by the wise use of Federal aid and encouragement, to help people to help themselves. By use of minimum standards, the REA has been able to chart its course of aiding electrical cooperatives to build power lines, distribute electric power, and bring light and energy to thousands of farmers and rural homes, throughout the country. This program has involved contracting for large purchases of power from private utilities and in some cases the construction of generators by the cooperatives themselves.

What was the genesis and background of this program? What were the needs and the circumstances which made the program a necessary and legitimate area of Government concern?

It arose from one major factor and a host of interrelated results. First of all, it has long been a clearly discernible economic fact, that the private utility business sometimes tends by its nature to be monopolistic, with economic and social evils that threaten the consuming public. The industry rarely, if ever, feels it advisable to run competing lines to bid for the consumer's purchase. Instead it has tacitly divided up the available territories, consolidated its position in highly marketable areas, and, at least in the old days, charged what it can get for this vital and constantly necessary service in an industrial age.

The recognition of the public's stake in electric power was recognized by the establishment of State regulatory commissions. But although helpful to the public, by making the utilities justify proposed rate increases with economic facts, and by licensing intrastate construction and consolidation, this type of regulatory approach is, at best, a palliative, not a cure for the public's concern. Also, later establishment of the Federal Power Commission to license interstate utility construction was based on the same approach.

But there is nothing in this type of governmental regulatory approach at the State and Federal levels which ameliorates the lack of this vital service of electric power in vast portions of our country, particularly in thinly populated areas. As a matter of policy, private utilities have lagged, in expanding their kilowatt production, and decreasing margins of profit. Rather they have limited their operations to populous places and the main highways of commerce in the best farmlands. Only at prohibitive cost would they expand to the byways of our Nation, where farmers toil to produce our grain and fowls. It was uneconomic, they said, and with a degree of truth, up to a point.

Therefore, when harried and overworked State public service commissions were presented with reams of facts on costs, they tended to go along with increased rates without increased service. You see, there was nothing with which the commissions could compare the cost and service factors because the utility in the area had no competition, no urge for efficiency and increased service. In other words, no yardstick was available and the consumer was the loser.

But what of the basic needs of the farmers and rural folk who wanted desperately the miracle of kilowatts and horsepower to apply to their farm tasks and farm homes? Private industry was failing them completely. And as more rural youth left for town and city life after World War I, there was as much or more work to be done, and less people to do it. Wasn't large-scale use of electric power essential to preserve and expand further the farm economy which, if anything can be so called, is the basic prop of our Nation? The answer was "yes," and Congress made it an area of its concern, and rightly so.

You who are here, the experts, architects, and beneficiaries of the REA program, know the details of the development of rural electrification far better than I. The results speak for themselves and need no elaboration. Suffice it to say that the expansion of the REA system in our rural areas has been a stimulant for private utilities to expand to areas previously considered not profitable; it has been a strong factor in reducing rates in areas where consumers have realized the benefits of cooperative effort; and above all it has made countless farm homes the recipients of all the many joys and workloads of electricity which have long been taken for granted by town and city dwellers.

Do there exist today any doubting Thomases as to the values which have accrued to people in rural communities, from the extension of rural electrification? Go out in the hinterlands of America and ask the farmer who now has eliminated a large part of his labor in the care of cattle and poultry and increased production thereby. Ask the farmer's wife how she evaluates the adequate water supply pumped into that home and outbuildings by electricity, with the consequent saving in physical fatigue. Ask the housewives in rural areas what it means to them to be saved the back-breaking work of doing the family laundry in the old tubs in place of the electric washing machine. Ask the rural families of the Nation what it is to have an adequate supply of good lighting throughout the home and outbuildings, doing away with the fire hazards in the use of kerosene and the tedious care of lamps.

The truth is rural electrification has meant emancipation from back-breaking, toilsome daily work to men and women in rural life. There are millions of people across the country who rise up to call it blessed.

Yet, no private utility, to my knowledge, has failed or been forced to reduce its overall profits as a result of REA activity. Indeed, they are in a more prosperous state than ever before, in areas adjacent to rural electrical cooperatives. That's as it should be, and more power to them. With a tremendous defense effort a very necessary part of our lives today, we need every single kilowatt of installed central-station power capacity we can possibly achieve, keeping in mind and balancing other critical uses, for our public and private defense dollars.

Rural electrification and the ideal of social service it exemplifies is as old as the history of this Nation; as indigenous, as American as the granite of my own State of New Hampshire—it isn't socialism.

While it is as modern as the latest New York play on Broadway in the comforts and conveniences and pleasures it is bringing to the farm, in its essence it is merely another form of continued self-help, which is the American way of doing things.

If I may speak as a Republican, rural electrification is an idea and an ideal that the great commoner of our party, whose birthday we will celebrate next month, would have understood and fought for. Born and raised on a farm, teaching himself, as every schoolboy reads, by lamplight and firelight, drawing his water by hand from a well, Abraham Lincoln would have known what electrict light and electric power means to the farmer and to the farmer's wife.

Lincoln—the true Lincoln—has always been my idol

He had political imagination to know and enough human heart to feel that the test of men in public life is the degree to which they organize the materials available to society in their time, so that the economic and scientific progress of every age can be transmuted into less drudgery and more living for every man and woman.

In his own way he led the battles for the REA's of his own day. As a Member of Congress and as President, before his energies were swallowed up in the Civil War, he was in the forefront of the fight for internal improvement, for building roads and canals with Government funds, so the country could be bound together with communications and the farmer could bring his produce to market. Lincoln was in truth and in fact the father of the farm-to-market road in his time. He would have tried to be the father of rural electrification, if it were possible in his time.

His theory of government was based on the axiom that government is the mechanism by which we, the people, combine to help ourselves. You may remember these word of his:

"Why * * * should we have government? Why not each individual take to himself the whole fruit of his labor, without having any of it taxed away, in services, corn, or money? Why not take just so much land as he can cultivate with his own hands without buying it of anyone? The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves. There are many such things; some of them exist independently of the injustice in the world. Making and maintaining roads, bridges, and the like; providing for the helpless young and afflicted; common schools; are instances."

Rural electrification is just that—neither less nor more.

Lincoln believed in no socialism; you and I believe in no socialism. But Lincoln and you and I all believe in what my fellow Yankee, Justice Holmes, called the socialization of luxury—that society should use its best brains to contrive to multiply the luxury of the few today into the happiness of the many tomorrow.

In our time rural electrification, in concrete terms of labor saved, has brought, more than any other movement, the relief of drudgery for many and the increase for many of the capacity to live more as we want Americans to live.

All of us who have had any part in creating it, all of us who have had any part in sustaining and extending it, can be proud of the old American tradition in which we act.

This leads me into a broader field, the development of our Nation's potential water power. I do not believe it is unsound to say that whole civilizations have been built on water, land, and people, and as the recent report of the Water Resources Policy Commission reminds us, "when (this) combination ceases to be infused with a moral relationship between man and man, and man and nature, civilizations decline and give place to new combinations of these elementary values."

I don't have to remind you how important the rivers of New England were in turning the wheels of our early-day manufacturing plants. Nor do I have to recall to you at length the role of our middle Atlantic rivers, as they carried the increased burdens of our early national commerce, and made possible the beginnings of other great industries. And of course, the continuing saga of the great Mississippi-Missouri-Ohio River network, as well as early and modern commerce on the Great Lakes system at our backs here today, is a part of the daily lives of a great proportion of you in this assembly.

But it behooves us—all of us—to think deeply how much water and its resultant electric power, irrigating aids, navigation possibilities, and countless other uses, can mean to us directly and indirectly in our everyday lives, whether we live on a farm or in an eight-story apartment house. You and I take so many things for granted when things are going right. But we can least of all succumb to this attitude in the potential development of our Nation's water power, and the conservation and husbanding of our natural resources. The right policies and programs, private and governmental, just don't happen. We must plan, analyze, and give careful thought to the best possibilities, and then we must fight for them.

While developing my thoughts for this talk today, I have been doing, on a limited scale, just what I advise—some basic research and thinking. I have referred to the report of the Water Resources Policy Commission, volume I of which was issued on December 11, 1950, entitled "A Water Policy for the American People," and I will again in a moment. Magazine articles, speeches, and other informal sources are always useful fodder A new book, published only last week, called Water, Land, and People, is aggressively critical with challenging and sweeping ideas, as the authors contend that a water and soil crisis is upon us now. They point out that a dam built 30 years ago at Elephant Butte now finds itself with 20 percent of its capacity filled with silt, due to generations of abuse of the soil. The authors remind us that Lake Mead, above the Hoover Dam, is already filling with silt. They make the statement that two-thirds of the 10,000 largest reservoirs in the country have an estimated useful life of less than 100 years.

To go on. The first report of the Water Resources Policy Commission is well worth the time and trouble of any citizen who is concerned theoretically, or practically, with the use of our Nation's water resources. The Commission has made some 70 policy recommendations for Congress and the people to consider. Among others is the proposal for a Federal Board of Review, appointed by the President, with the confirmation of the Senate, which would evaluate proposed water resources developments, and coordinate the many activities of the Federal agencies in an orderly manner. Another suggestion is a new law specifically directing all Federal agencies to apply the same standards and methods to the evaluation of all river basin programs. These two recommendations, along with certain others on program planning and evaluation, are eminently sound and would have the effect of eliminating the duplication and throat cutting, for example, between the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The avid competition between those two agencies for power and their respective theories of development have echoed through the halls of Congress, and the taxpayer has been the loser. See the Hoover Commission report on this subject for further reference.

At first glance, there are many of the 70 recommendations made by the Water Resources Policy Commission with which I do not agree. That's not surprising, due to the scope of the subject covered, and due to the great emphasis the Commission puts on its solutions, without having the tremendous competitive demands on the national budget and defense programs within its viewpoint. The Commission does make a bow in the direction of the present national emergency from time to time, and they point out rightly that these very defense needs accentuate, not diminish, the need for changes in evaluation, program planning, and for certain projects. Aside from being disturbed by the philosophy of the Commission in some of its reasoning and recommendations, I question the necessity of some of their urgings, in view of competitive defense needs alone. But I do call attention to the conclusion of the Commission's summary of recommendation where they summarize their views under the label "Critical Decisions." Here they have made a valiant attempt to get their long-range and short-run ideas into focus, and I commend them for it.

Some of the questions covered by the War Resources Policy Commission in great detail include:

1. Surface and ground water.
2. Flood management.
3. Land reclamation.
4. Domestic and industrial water supply.
5. Pollution control.
6. Inland and intercoastal waterways.
7. Hydroelectric power.
8. Recreation.
9. Fish and wildlife.
10. Conservation education.

Each and every one of these questions has been and is the subject of intensive study and action by private industry, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. However, I shall limit my remaining remarks to two of these subjects—inland waterways and hydroelectric power. In so doing I am going to plead the case of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which by every standard is right and vital for the well-being and future success of our great country.

As we look back on the history of our country in every field of endeavor and action, we can see that, by and large, those things which benefited the majority of the people have eventually come to pass. Yes; there may have been years and perhaps decades of pulling and hauling, backtracking and sidestepping, but eventually, when the people as a whole have found out where their interest and their future lay, no selfish interest, however determined, has stopped them. Thus have come vast political reforms, spectacular economic advances, and a steady lifting of

the level of society. And so the fight goes on in all walks of life and for every conceivable objective. That is the backbone and vitality of our great American democracy.

I have touched in a general way today on my subject, the development of our Nation's potential water power. Now I want to use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a concrete example of what can be and must be done as a part of the pattern of water-power development. I am the sort of man who feels he has to come to grip with a subject, fight for what he believes in, and call a spade a spade. That's part of my nature. So I use the St. Lawrence seaway as an example of a development which is part of the American vision, just as the Cumberland Road, the transcontinental railroads, the Panama Canal, and the Grand Coulee Dam are the realized dreams of the past.

But for some decades this great project, which has been carefully planned to the last engineering detail and which will be eventually self-liquidating to the last red cent, has been stopped cold in its tracks by one of the most cleverly organized, and carefully conceived, lobbies in the political history of the United States. Our long-term national defense, the economic growth of our good Canadian friends, the future of heavy industry and commerce of our own great Midwest, and the electric power hunger of our industries and consumers in New England and New York, are all tied up in the success of the St. Lawrence seaway. And yet organized minority interests, afraid to face competition or lower power rates, are unable to put the safety and future of the country first, have muddied the waters, misled many people and exerted tremendous political power.

These efforts must be exposed for what they are and the force of public opinion brought to bear. All of you here can help in this effort to start a counter grass-roots campaign of truth about the St. Lawrence project. In politics we often need a series of backfires, to deal with heavily financed and selfish interests. We have been defeated in Congress again and again, but we have just begun to fight. I plead with you to give us a hand in arousing the country in behalf of its long-term future and self-interest.

Let us take a look at the background and history of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, as well as some vital statistics. The seaway, when completed, would give access to ocean-going ships to an inland sea, the Great Lakes system outside our windows, which is by all odds the business center of commerce in the world. Do you realize that more yearly tonnage passes through one of its bottlenecks, the MacArthur locks at Sault St. Marie, than passes through the Panama, Suez, Manchester Ship, and Kiel Canals combined? Think of it, this vast reservoir of commerce which would be tapped and made available to ocean trading. The proposed seaway would, in effect, give the United States and Canada a new seacoast more than 8,000 miles long with ports such as Montreal, Toronto, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and Milwaukee. When construction is completed, a 27-foot ship channel would be guaranteed from Duluth on the western end of Lake Superior to the Atlantic Ocean, 2,650 miles to the east. With the Great Lakes, the deeper parts of the St. Lawrence River, and the already constructed canals and locks at various points already available, nature and man already have done more than 95 percent of the job.

The twin to the completion of a ship canal is the great hydroelectric power project, which is planned down to the last blueprint for construction on the St. Lawrence River. This 2,200,000,000 horsepower station would be located on the international boundary between Barnhart Island and the Canadian mainland, near Massena, N. Y. More about Massena in a moment.

The amazing thing about this project is the natural favorable even flow of water which is provided by the Great Lakes. Whereas the maximum flow of the Columbia River at Bonneville Dam is 33 times the minimum, the maximum of the Tennessee River at Wilson Dam is 115 times the minimum, the spread at the proposed St. Lawrence powerhouse is only 2.2 to 1. There would be no dry months when large amounts of generating capacity stand idle, nor would it be necessary to build standby steam plants, such as Congress is asked to approve at TVA. This natural reservoir which is provided by the Great Lakes, reduces to an absolute minimum the size of the reservoir, that must be built immediately above the power station, above the proposed Long Sault Dam. Millions of dollars of construction costs for huge control systems which have been built in other areas, are thus saved by the kindness of mother nature.

Try to let your imagination visualize the vast good which would be reaped by the Midwest, Canada, my New England area, and the defense and security of our country as a whole. Never was a project contemplated in our history which could mean so much to so many people. Yet it has been stopped cold in its tracks.

The cost? That is one of the most incredible facts of all. The total cost of the program, both the seaway and the power project combined, would amount to only $802,566,000 in terms of 1948 construction costs. In other words, well less than a billion dollars would be spent over the approximately 5-year period of construction and, most important of all, the seaway and project would be self-liquidating over a period of 40 years. This "pay-for-itself" principle will be accomplished, through tolls for the seaway, and sale of electric power by the power project. The complete and detailed story on costs and all other imaginable charts, surveys, engineering problems, and so on, has been brought up to date by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a committee report issued March 2, 1949, which is available to the public.

Before leaving the question of cost, it might be pointed out that the United States share of the $800,000,000 c. t will be $573,000,000, over the 5-year period, the remainder being charged to Canada. Don't jump to conclusions, however, because the Canadians have already spent $132,000,000 for construction of the Welland Canal and improvement in the Thousand Islands section, these costs being incurred in terms of 1935 dollars. Our good neighbor to the north went ahead in good faith, feeling we would honor the terms of our treaty and agreement with them for St. Lawrence construction, but I fear they are beginning to despair at our ability to keep our word.

What is the history of our long efforts to consummate this great project with the aid of our Canadian friends?

Back in 1895, looking for cheap transportation into the heart of the continent, the United States and Canada set up a Deep Waterways Commission to study the seaway problem. This body reported favorably, the first of a long, long series of bodies to do so. In 1909 a boundary waters treaty established an international joint commission which went to work in detail on the St. Lawrence seaway and power situation after World War I. It held hearings in cities across the United States and Canada and filled 60 volumes with testimony. The joint commission reported favorably, causing President Coolidge to appoint a United States commission in 1924 with Herbert Hoover as chairman. At the same time, beginning in 1924, a joint board of engineers developed complete plans for the project, which since have been revised continually and kept up to date. These commissions and the engineers reported favorably, with the result that a seaway treaty was signed by Canada and the United States in 1932.

At that time most naive people thought that the weight of evidence and study was so great, and the public interest so clear, that the treaty would be approved by the Senate. But they were figuring without knowledge of the great power of organized self-interest. These railroads, commercial interests, and utilities who feared expansion of competition, and were against lower rates for the good of the consumer, marshaled their forces and carried the day. The final vote was 46 to 42 in favor of ratification of the treaty, but, as you know, the Constitution requires two-thirds of the Senate to concur in approval of treaties.

But the fight for approval continued, while Canada stood by ready to go, and actually constructed the Welland Canal linking Cleveland's Lake Erie with Lake Ontario. In 1941 the Roosevelt administration negotiated a seaway agreement with Canada. This agreement, by eliminating certain policies of a treaty nature, would only have required a majority vote of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Various resolutions implementing this agreement have been introduced in the Senate and the House and long hearings and favorable reports by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate resulted in 1946 and 1947. The House Public Works Committee held hearings in May of 1950. The cost estimates and other details were brought up to date by the Senate committee in 1949. But only once has the Senate voted, in 1948, and that time the resolution was returned to the committee, on motion, by a majority of the Senate for further study.

But still we fight on. Now the Members of Congress, and those of you who will help us defeat these grasping selfish interests, who have neither the ability, nor the vision, to see beyond their own high profits to the greater good of the country, have a new and unanswerable argument. If we are to properly meet the enormous challenges of increased production and expansion of capacity necessary to lead the free world against the world-wide Communist menace, we have absolutely and incontrovertably got to have the transportation facilities and hydroelectric power which would be provided by the project. In other words, the St. Lawrence seaway has assumed the clear-cut dimensions of a national defense necessity, both to the United States and our friend and ally, Canada.

Don't get me wrong. If we were to become involved in a war with Soviet Russia tomorrow, that would be one thing. We most probably could not engage in 5-year projects, however desirable, if we were actively battling for survival. But, as we marshal our manpower and resources, for a period of semimobilization in what General Marshall has termed a period of "prolonged tension," stretching for 10, 15, and perhaps 20 years, we must plan and program to increase our supplies of raw materials expand our industrial capacity, and increase our production for the long haul ahead.

Already Russia is far ahead of us in making the best use of internal waterways, and is challenging us in hydroelectric power. Take, for example, the network provided by the Don-Volga River Canal, which links the Black, White, Caspian, and Baltic Seas, and you can see what I mean. But we have one great margin of superiority, which we must maintain at all costs. That, of course, is our overwhelming and overpowering production of such vital items as steel. We must have the vision and courage to increase this margin by all possible means. Don't forget for one moment that Stalin himself, in happier days, expressed absolute amazement at our ability to produce in World War II. The

Politburo has a healthy respect for the strength of our industrial sinews, and they are working their slave labor day and night, to try to narrow the margin of our superiority.

In concrete terms what must we do? We must tap every source of iron ore to replenish the almost bankrupt Mesabi Range. Although we may hope that beneficiation will help the quality of the quantities of taconite available there, the high costs of such treatment make it almost prohibitive for large-scale industrial use. But we are lucky. In addition to the quantities of South American ores which will be brought into our Atlantic ports, the M. A. Hanna Co., with headquarters here in Cleveland, and the Hollinger mining interests of Canada have uncovered and are prepared to exploit huge deposits of high-grade iron ore in Labrador. The problem is to get huge quantities to our inland steel mills at reasonable cost. The answer? You guessed it, the St. Lawrence seaway. If work is begun this year on the project, its completion should coincide with the opening of large-scale production of the Labrador mines. This is a good example of capitalistic democratic planning, inspired by a stroke of luck.

We who have championed the cause of the St. Lawrence project for many, many years, welcome with open arms the conversion of the Hanna interests and certain other steel companies. We can use their help, and they tell me there is nobody as zealous as a convert.

To use one more concrete example, we must expand and expand and expand our production of electrical energy, the driving force behind all great industries. This should be done quickly, in areas where it will do the most good and where it is desperately needed. No greater need exists than in the power-deficit areas of New England and New York, and there is where it will do the most good, in our skilled metal industries.

During World War II in 1942 the War Production Board had an expert survey made as to the power-deficit areas of the country from the point of view of the national war effort. This survey was headed by Mr. J. E. Moore, who was then Deputy Director of the Power Division of the WPB. Was he a so-called Government bureaucrat? Oh, no; he was, and, I assume is, once again, an official of Electric Bond & Share. He could hardly be accused of bias against the private utility industry.

At any rate, the results of the survey were expressed in a chart entitled "Areas of Power Scarcity and Surplus in the United States of America," and marked "Confidential." Although the original of this chart later disappeared from the files of the War Production Board, I have seen a photostatic copy. As shown by the chart, the worst power scarcity existed in the Niagara, N. Y., area. Think of it, right next to a God-given water supply of unexcelled potential. The next worst power-deficit area included all but a minor fraction of New England, as well as Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky.

Another facet of the power need for defense purposes is the aluminum plant at Massena, N. Y., owned by ALCOA. This is the exact site of the proposed St. Lawrence power plant. You can remember how vital Massena aluminum was to our World War II effort. Yet ALCOA, even with its vast resources to carry along a marginal operation, was forced to discontinue production of aluminum there in about 1947. They gave as their sole determining reason the prohibitive cost of power, which I believe is the largest cost factor in the manufacture of aluminum.

There is a sequel to the Massena story. Late this fall the Federal Government, through its agent, the General Services Administration, made a series of contracts with ALCOA, Reynolds, and Kaiser to expand their production of aluminum for the defense effort. ALCOA agreed to reopen the Massena plant, where the power must be transmitted from several hundred miles away. In its contract with ALCOA the Government had to agree that all the cost of electrical energy above 5 mills per kilowatt-hour will be added to the contract price. Since it requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce a pound of aluminum, this means that the product of the Massena plant will cost the United States not less than 5 to 6 cents a pound above the contract price. Think of it. And right at the site of a power plant which would have been finished long ago but for the selfish interests who oppose it.

One final argument directly related to our defense and security. Our neighbor, Canada, is potentially one of the world's greatest areas for industrial expansion. We are vitally concerned with her well-being in these troubled times. She is our closest friend and ally.

The vast richness of Canada's natural resources is evident, even though only a small percentage of the country has been thoroughly explored. Quantities of high-grade iron ore lie on the Labrador-Quebec border; extensive oil fields and trillions of feet of natural gas have been discovered in the prairie provinces. Canada has titanium, and it has a virtual monopoly of nickel, used to harden steel. It has gold, lead, zinc, and other metals in quantities as yet undetermined. Unfortunately, many of Canada's natural riches lie so far from markets that they are at present almost useless. Their development depends on transportation, which today is Canada's greatest problem. And the most urgent of Canada's transportation needs is the St. Lawrence seaway.

Will you join us, one and all, in this crusade? Will you spread the gospel of the St. Lawrence seaway? You have both a duty and a privilege.

In conclusion, I want to leave you with a bit of my philosophy which applies to the political, economic, and social problems of our day. As applied to the development of our nation's potential water power, I hold that when Almighty God has placed upon the face of the earth bodies of water which science and the ingenuity of man can develop and transform for electric power, transportation, and good works for all the people, it is an economic sin if political and business interests are allowed to stand in the way for purely selfish reasons. The only qualifying test should be the economic soundness of the proposed projects and the availability of public funds, apportioned under a sensible budget. The good of the people as a whole is greater than any part.

So much for my attitude toward water-power development. But I have one final thought as to my general philosophy of government.

I am one who was brought up to, and still does, believe sincerely and genuinely in the principles of free competitive enterprise, and the profit system, when and if it gives just consideration to human needs, as it carries on in its operations. I hold that business and finance, and parties and government, are all-important factors in our American life, and I want to do all I can to improve them and build them up, but I also hold that even more important are people, and that these four equations I mentioned are not an objective in themselves, but should be judged, in the last analysis, as to their effect upon the lives and fortunes and happiness of people. I am not alone in this thought. Many authorities have expressed it far better than I can, and I recall the words of former President Herbert Hoover, who well said:

"We aim to set up in this country a human society, not an economic system. We aim for increased production and greater efficiency, but to the end that we may have happier home life in America."

That aim is real, and in my heart, and I commend it to you.

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at a Kansas Day Republican Banquet

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on January 29 last, in my home State of Kansas, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] was the speaker at the annual Kansas Day Republican banquet. I ask unanimous consent that the address he delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Since June 26, 1950, there have been 46,201 American casualties in Korea. The blood of the 46,201 which has consecrated the mud of the Korean valleys is only a small drop compared to the American blood which may well be shed in the days, weeks, and months just ahead.

Let me tell you of one of the 46,201 young men.

On the afternoon of November 29, a typical, young American boy, Bob Smith, of Middleburg, Pa., climbed the slopes near the Yalu River and took up a defensive position on the Changjin Reservoir. Before a red dawn broke over the mountains of Manchuria on November 30, much western blood and eastern blood had mixed in the Yalu River. As that cold red dawn broke Bob Smith was lying in a gutter near the Changjin Reservoir. Three cold bloody dawns he saw break, as his bullet riddled body lay in the gutter covered only by a raincoat. One morning the Chinese Communists, the agrarian reformers, overran the area. He played dead and they stripped him of his shoes and most of his clothing. Wounded and half frozen, after 3 days Bob Smith dragged himself to a nearby hut with a few other wounded sons of American mothers. Eleven days later a group of marines, having learned of those wounded soldiers, slugged a bloody path back through the ring of Chinese Communists and rescued them.

Bob Smith is home today, but his hands and legs are still in the hills beyond the Yalu River.

Each of us whom you, the American people, have sent to the United States Congress, if he is doing his duty, will be working long days and nights, examining the minutest detail of our foreign policy that cost Bob Smith his hands and legs. We shall be examining the planners and their planning to discover whether the blood of those 46,201 American boys shed in the past 8 months has been well spent or whether it has been wasted—to find out whether some of the agony, blood, and tears promised the American people for the future can be avoided.

For some time now we have been attempting to expose those who have been leading us along the road to disaster—leading us along a road which will be strewn with Bob

Smiths—a road watered with the tears of American wives and mothers; wives and mothers who are again being forced to travel deep into the valley of darkness and despair.

We have been damned from hell to breakfast for exposing those responsible. In fact, the left-wing cabal of press and radio have accused me of almost everything but murdering my great-great-grandmother. Take my word for it, ladies, I don't enjoy this task. It is a dirty, disagreeable job, but a job which must be done.

When I was a boy on the farm my mother used to raise chickens. From those chickens the groceries for a large family were supplied, as well as mother's Christmas money. The greatest enemy the chickens had were skunks. In order to protect mother's chickens my three brothers and I had to dig out and destroy those skunks. It was a dirty, foul, unpleasant, smelly job. And sometimes after it was done people did not like to have us sit next to them in church. But we learned early in life that the jobs that most badly need doing and are left undone are more often the most difficult and unpleasant jobs.

And, I intend to devote my efforts to digging out a much more dangerous brand of animal in our Government. This I intend to do regardless of the high-pitched squealing of those left-wing bleeding hearts of the press and radio. This I intend to do as long as I am in the United States Senate.

There is no reason on God's earth why this should be a fight between Democrats and Republicans. Those who have been betraying us can't honestly claim the label of Democrat or Republican. When they profess to be Democrats they are insulting the millions of good loyal Democrats in this Nation. Every thinking American knows that there will be neither a Democrat nor a Republican Party if the sell-out continues and the Communists win out.

Keep in mind, please, that the Communist fight is not a Russian fight. It is only being directed by Russia at this time. Keep in mind that 10,000,000 Russians have had the guts and nerve to stand up and fight atheistic communism to the extent that they are doomed to Siberian slave labor camps. So don't make the mistake of thinking that this is a fight between the Russian people and the American people. It is a fight between international communism and western civilization.

This is the Armageddon foretold in the Bible—the fight between the forces of good and evil, a fight between the forces of light and darkness, the last titanic struggle between atheistic communism and Western civilization.

Let's not waste time discussing whether or not we want war. We are at war. It is not a war of our own choosing We did not start it. We can't stop it. Only the Kremlin can call a halt and the leaders of the Kremlin have decided not to. This war can end only with victory for Western civilization or the death of Western civilization. Therefore, let's be done with this senseless drivel about whether we want to fight a war. We have no choice. Our task is to decide how we can win the war with the least amount of death and destruction.

The active phase of the war between international communism and our Western civilization commenced over 33 years ago when the Bolsheviks took over Russia. It is now entering its final stage. During that 33-year period the Communists have been steadily moving forward on practically every front. During the past 5 years communism has been racing forward to the staccato beat of time—like a forest fire in dry woods.

There have been many phases of this satanically clever Communist war against civilization. One important phase was directed toward gaining control of the key agencies of our Government by placing Communists and their dupes and stooges in key spots in our Government. They made fantastic progress in the early thirties at the time we recognized Communist Russia. This was the time that the Hiss-Remington-Pressman-Witt-Acheson group started to work their way into key spots in the Government. So great did their power in Government become that Alger Hiss, as you recall, was appointed the very top man to misrepresent this country at the United Nations Conference. Men like Harry Dexter White, a known Communist agent, drafted many of the postwar plans for Europe. Men like Remington were in charge of shipments of war materials to our friends and enemies.

Before discussing the personalities responsible for Communist victory and impending disaster for this country, let us briefly review the Communist plans for world enslavement. There is nothing secret about those plans. They are just as public as were Hitler's aims in Mein Kampf. The plans were publicly expressed by Lenin, publicly approved by Stalin. Their first task was the creation of a Red China. As Lenin said: "He who controls China controls the world." The brains of the Communist Party for years proclaimed to their loyal workers that one of their two major tasks was to work for the creation of a Red China; that this was a necessary prelude to the creation of an entirely Red Asia and a Red Pacific, which could wash our western shores with its communistic, atheistic erosion, and then the plan for world enslavement could enter its final stage—the creation of a Red enslaved America.

The final stage of the battle has arrived. It is with us tonight. If we are to take advantage of every possible opportunity to win even at this late date—even after tremendous Communist victories—it is necessary that we examine the reason for the Communist victories to date and their plans covering the immediate days, months, and years ahead.

Let's first examine the record and see whether Russia has been successful in her plans to control our foreign policy by her agents, her dupes, and her stooges in key spots in our Government. Let's look at the cold record and find out to what extent Russia has been able to twist and pervert our foreign policy. This we must do if we hope to win in the final stages of this Communist war against us.

The statement that there are those high in Government who are doing the work of Communist Russia must not be lightly made. It should be made only after deep study. It must be made only when he who makes it is willing to submit the proof of what he says.

Let us do that now. Keep in mind as we examine the mistakes of the past, as we examine the work of those who have brought us to the brink of disaster, this proof is examined not for the purpose of punishing those who have betrayed us. Much more important work is at hand. It is done so we may get rid of those individuals—remove them from positions of power and replace them with good, loyal, intelligent Americans in their place.

Lenin and Stalin long stressed that the turning point in world revolution would come when China was conquered by communism. William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country, in December of 1945 said, "The war in China is the key to all the problems of international communism."

Now let's see how closely the State Department plans tied in with the plans of Lenin, Stalin, and Foster: A short time after Foster's statement, General Marshall was sent to China with secret State Department instructions, which as a soldier, he obeyed.

Those instructions to Marshall were (1) place an embargo on ammunition to the Chinese troops fighting communism; (2) force the anti-Communist troops to withdraw from Kalgan Mountain pass to Manchuria, making it possible for the Chinese Communist forces to move freely and obtain arms from the Russians; and (3) force Chiang to reduce his army by more than 1,000,000 men, many of whom after 8 years of war, having no occupation, were forced to enlist with the Communist forces. Nineteen hundred and forty-six dragged by. Marshall came home. The Communist army—grown from 300,000 to 2,000,000 men—armed, trained, directed, and even officered by the Soviets—was ready for the offensive by late 1947. But the Marshall embargo made it impossible for the Chinese troops fighting the Communists to get ammunition from either America or England—the only sources of supply.

Marshall was given the job of cutting off all arms and ammunition to the forces fighting communism in China, if they would not agree to take the Communists into partnership. Marshall did this and commented, "As Chief of Staff I armed 29 anti-Communist divisions. Now, with a stroke of the pen, I have disarmed them."

At the time the Acheson group was writing the secret instructions under which Marshall was, in his words, disarming 29 anti-Communist divisions with a stroke of the pen—at that very moment, according to documents supplied by Ambassador to China Patrick Hurley, this same group was "openly advising the Communists to refuse unification * * * unless the Chinese Communists were given control"—a weird, traitorous double-deal, if ever there was one.

Here the treason of Yalta was brought to full bloom. Here was signed the warrant condemning to atheistic communistic slavery 400,000,000 of our allies who fought so well with us during the entire war. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who have been dying today in the hills and valleys of Korea. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die tomorrow in the jungles of Indochina. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die on the sands of Iran the next day. Here was signed the death warrant of the young men who will die in the streets of Berlin and Paris the day after that, unless the clamor of the American people becomes so great that the President is forced to get rid of the crimson clique which has such a hypnotic Svengali-like influence over him.

And lest you think that this sell-out was made in error, let me quote from the Secretary of State's own words last January before a National Press Club audience in referring to the Communist victory. He said: "A new day has dawned in Asia."

About 30 days before that his chief lieutenant and architect, Owen Lattimore, had referred to the Communist victory over our friends and the enslavement of 400,000,000 of our allies as the opening of limitless horizons of hope.

In the article written by Acheson's adviser, which I hold in my hand, from the July 17 issue of the Compass, he praises the State Department for having succeeded in letting China fall without letting the American people know we pushed her. At that time he also said: "The problem in Korea is the same as in China; that is, to allow her to fall without letting the American people know that we pushed her."

And so the blood of 46,201 American boys is part of the price we pay for this great task of allowing China to fall to communism without letting the American people know we pushed her.

Before discussing the proposed sell-out of 1951, let's just take a few brief minutes to discuss some of the typical personnel who are doing the planning for us in the State Department and in the United Nations.

When you hear of the sell-out of American interests in the United Nations and the State Department, keep in mind that these are

just a few of a vast number of individuals like them.

[Cases given but omitted from prepared speech.]

Now, let's take an example of one of the top planners of the State Department, if we may.

[Cases given but omitted from prepared speech.]

I dislike taking your time, on these individual cases because we could recite like cases all night, but I think that it is important for you to have a few of those typical cases in mind so that you can better understand the entire dangerous picture as it develops.

Let's examine more closely the sell-out of 1950 and 1951. At the time our troops moved into Korea there was issued to the Seventh Fleet one of the most fantastic wartime orders that you or I will ever hear of. Prior to this order to our Seventh Fleet, Chiang Kai-shek, who leads the forces who are fighting communism in China, was rather effectively blockading the main Communist ports of China. He had on Formosa over half a million Chinese soldiers. The Communists had about a quarter million soldiers on the mainland opposite Formosa. One reason why the Communists kept a quarter of a million troops opposite Formosa was to protect against a possible landing on the China mainland by Chiang's anti-Communist troops. So the State Department drafted an order to the Seventh Fleet, ordering it: Number 1: to break Chiang Kai-shek's blockade of the Communist ports. Number 2: to prevent any landing by Chiang on the China coast—a tremendous service, of course, to the Communists.

Immediately the quarter million Communist troops which had been stationed opposite Formosa on the China mainland, moved north to the Korean border. Secretary Acheson stated in his recent broadcast early in July or August that he was fully aware of the fact that those Communist troops were moving up toward Korea.

Now there might have been some reason for that fantastic order to the Seventh Fleet before the Communists started shooting Americans, but certainly no reason on God's earth for its existence after they started shooting American men. Let me repeat that order to you. We said to the Chinese Communists: No. 1: We will keep our friend and your enemy from blockading the Communist ports. We will allow war material to flow into Communist China—war material now being used to kill Americans. No. 2: We will not allow Chiang Kai-shek to attack the China mainland. So you may move your Communist troops northward into Korea. So we find the incredible picture of Truman issuing a State Department order—an order to our Seventh Fleet to aid the Chinese Communists.

The one bright spot in this dangerous picture is that Truman himself is not part of the Acheson-Lattimore-Jessup-Service crowd. Truman is a loyal American. He doesn't want communism to win out in this country any more than you and I do. Unfortunately, however, he is a man of great stubbornness and a small mind—a man who is being operated by puppet strings pulled by the Acheson-Jessup crowd, but if the pressure from the American people becomes great enough, there is hope that he will yet clean house.

So much for the bungling of the past. Let's examine what must be done if we are to win this war with the least amount of death and destruction. Today we are considering drafting 18-year-old boys—today we are actually calling back into service men with wives and families—men who served in World War II. While this is being done, Chiang Kai-shek, who heads the anti-Communist Chinese forces, has offered us the use of his troops—500,000 of them stationed on Formosa. He says: "If your State Department and the United Nations will only say the word, we will give you half a million trained troops to fight the Communists. Give us the weapons of war and we will give you another million Chinese guerrillas now on the China mainland. They are willing and eager to fight the Communists." But the State Department and the United Nations say, "No, we want this war fought by American boys." The old Yalta crowd says, "No, we won't use those Chinese because they were resisting the advance of communism in China while we were aiding the Communists." They say, "No, we will draft a million and a half American boys instead." The United Nations chimes in and agrees that only the sons of American mothers can fight and die. Spain has offered to give us a million men within a matter of weeks if only we will say the word. But the Yalta crowd which still runs our State Department says, "No, we don't like the Spaniards because they fought against communism during the years that we were coddling it. We will draft another million American boys instead—18-year-olds and boys with wives and families."

Now, what to do. The answer is obvious. We must make a direct about-face and first kick out the entire Yalta crowd—replace all those architects for disaster with good, loyal Democrats and Republicans—Democrats and Republicans loyal to America. Next use the manpower of our allies; use the anti-Communist forces on Formosa; use the anti-Communist guerrillas in China; give them the tools of war so they themselves may strike the Communist chains from their wrists and ankles; use the manpower of Spain to create a powerful army in Western Europe; give them American weapons so they may do their own fighting.

Above all—now and forever—discard the tortured reasoning of the Yalta crowd that only the sons of American mothers must fight and die in this last final showdown struggle between international, atheistic communism and western civilization.

If this Nation and our civilization is to live, then the rallying cry of the American people should be: Get rid of the entire Acheson-Jessup-Yalta crowd—get rid of all of the Pied Pipers for disaster.

It follows as the night follows the day that when the crimson clique in our Government engineered the Communist victory in China, they signed the death warrants of every young man who has died in Korea. At that time they condemned the Bob Smiths to live out their lives with no hands and no legs.

Bob Smith has no hands for us to shake today. He has no feet on which to walk to a hero's welcome—not tonight—but some day he will have artificial legs and when he does he should walk straight to the headquarters of the United Nations. He should walk to the office of the Secretary of State.

He should say to him: "Mr. Secretary of State, as I fought up the slopes of the Changjin Reservoir I was met by Communists firing rockets from horseback—a reincarnation of the horsemen of Genghis Khan.

"Mr. Secretary, do you still think that they are agrarian reformers?

"Mr. Secretary, up until a few months ago you felt that the anti-Communist forces on Formosa should all be turned over to Communist China. Do you still think so, Mr. Secretary?"

He should say to him: "Mr. Secretary, you have never fought in the cold so you cannot know its bitterness. You have never felt the shock of a bullet, you cannot know its pain. But 46,000 of us have faced those combined killers, Mr. Secretary, because you and the Yalta crowd sold China out to the Communists."

He should say: "Mr. Secretary, do you still think you were right when you ordered the embargo on arms and ammunition to our friends in China to the end that communism swept over all China? If you think you were wrong, tell us when you discovered it, will you, Mr. Secretary?"

He should say: "Mr. Secretary, do you think the communization of China and the resulting war in Korea was an accident, or was it the handiwork of traitors and are they still doing the planning, Mr. Secretary?"

He should say to the United Nations: "Gentlemen, why do you dawdle and debate while 46,201 men are crippled and die? Why the uncertainty over whether killing 46,201 of our men is a friendly or an unfriendly act?"

Perhaps we, the American people, tonight should say to the President: "Mr. Truman, perhaps God wanted Bob Smith home even without his hands and legs. Perhaps he wanted him home to face the stubborn and the unwise and the traitorous men who betrayed him. Perhaps that is the reason for his suffering. He is the symbol, Mr. President, which may bring an end to the blunders, the stupidity, the cowardice, and the betrayals."

Bob Smith is the symbol of the courage we need. He is the symbol of the honesty we do not have. He is the symbol of the honesty which we must regain if our civilization is to live.

Importance of Navy in War Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered in Norfolk, Va., on January 20, 1951.

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

The war in Korea has proved one thing beyond any shadow of doubt. It has proved the Navy cannot be relegated to the limbo of the blunderbuss.

Korea has made it certain that our actual and potential enemies are Red China and Russia. Korea has made it clear that we cannot hope to match these enemies with foot-soldier manpower alone. Korea has demonstrated that their type of fighting, characterized by the mastery of infiltration, half way around the world is no target for strategic bombing.

In short, Korea has proved that the Navy is still not only our first line of defense but also our first requirement for offense.

This is not to say that the Air Force and the Army do not have vital roles or that they do not rate the stature of integral parts in our military force. They must be made just as invincible as the Navy.

But those who a short time back were talking about the "fancy Dans" of the Navy and the policemen in the Marine Corps have eaten a lot of salty words since Korea.

It was the Navy and the Marine Corps that were thrown into the breach when the Red Koreans were overrunning the thin United Nations line early in Korea, and it was the Navy that went to the rescue at Hungnam.

Since Korea, the Navy, with the aid of chartered merchant ships, has hauled more than 127,000 passengers, 1,400,000 barrels of oil and gasoline, and 3,000,000 tons of cargo

across 6,000 miles of water. In 4 months Navy cargo would have filled 101,000 freight cars. That would be a solid train stretching from Norfolk almost to New Orleans.

In the type of warfare which we must anticipate it will be only with sea power that our numerically inferior forces can expect to strike at times and places of our choosing. It will be with overwhelming sea power that we can hold back significant numbers of Red troops which must be kept in reserve against seaborne invasion.

Sea power and air power are our only weapons by which we can seize and sustain initiative. Without them we cannot gain the initiative, and we cannot hold initiative without open sea lanes. Moreover, diversified air attack depends upon sea power and its carrier-based planes. If and when war should come we cannot win until we gain control of the timetable and assume and hold the initiative.

At Pusan and at Chungjin Reservoir, when our land troops were in desperate need of support, light carrier-based Navy and Marine fighter planes held the enemy down and in check until our ground forces could rest and regroup to fight again. In Korea the Navy was called upon not only for amphibious support and air cover but even the heavy artillery of the battleships found a place in 1950 warfare. In fact, under seaborne fire power every man at Hungnam was evacuated by sea, with equipment and stores, without casualty.

The Government has recognized both the importance and the significance of sea power in the struggle which confronts us. The House of Representatives this week has passed the bill authorizing new naval construction to supplement existing tonnage, and the conversion and recommissioning of World War II ships from the mothball fleet. One hundred and seventy-three vessels, totaling 500,000 tons displacement are included in the 1952 shipbuilding program, which will be before the Senate Armed Services Committee in the next few days, and 130 of these vessels will be combatant ships. Construction of the 60,000-ton aircraft carrier will be authorized by this bill. This huge carrier will be an expansion and an improvement on the *Midway* and *Essex* type, but smaller than the carrier which was previously started and scrapped at Newport News.

In addition to the proposed new tonnage, a total of 240 ships of all classes have been taken out of reserve since last June and placed in the active fleet. Many of these reactivated ships are already in service, and many of them have been modernized to include latest developments.

The ship construction bill now before Congress authorizes the conversion of 291 more vessels of practically all classes, including aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, guided-missile ships, picket vessels, and submarines converted for antisubmarine warfare.

We are faced with a Federal budget this year, short of war, approximating $75,000,000,000. Unless we reduce nondefense expenditures or raise taxes even higher we are faced with deficits as far as we can see at the rate of $25,000,000,000 a year or more. These will be superimposed on top of a Federal debt already a quarter of a trillion dollars. When we started World War I the debt was $1,000,000,000. When we started World War II the debt was $41,000,000,000. When we started this one we shall be laboring under the handicap of a debt such as no other nation has ever survived.

We have got to have an army of the maximum strength, and to overcome superior numbers we must be superior in skills, weapons, and mobility. The quality and quantity of the Russian Air Force is unknown and for this reason we must assure that ours is superior in all respects. To assure our own defense and to keep open the only road to offense which must be taken before victory can be won, we must have a Navy such as we have never had before.

Faced with debt and taxes and the cost of materials and labor such as they are today, we cannot meet these requirements unless we get more than a dollar's worth for every dollar spent for the Army, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Navy. And then we must eliminate every dollar of nonessential Federal expenditure.

Even when this is done it will be necessary to increase the tax burden still further to pay as we go. Any other course will jeopardize our fiscal security.

Obligation of Americans to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by former United States Senator Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey, on January 25, 1951, when he was the principal speaker before the American Coalition of Patriotic and Civic Societies of the United States at their annual meeting in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Senator Hawkes has said a number of things in his speech which the American people should take time to understand in this critical era facing our Nation. There are a number of important points in the speech, but in my opinion one of the most important things he had brought out is the fact that this Nation has fought in two World Wars, and carried the larger part of the burden of those wars, with great loss of men and wealth. Those wars were each fought to victory for the cause of free men, but the victory seems to have been only a physical victory. Neither of the two great victories has done much good for peace and the cause of free men.

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

Let me say no man living knows the answer to the thousands of distressing problems which have been created for the people of this country and the people of the world by large groups of self-seeking politicians and dictators whose interest seems to be personal power first and the people's welfare second, if there is any welfare left. It is too late for any of us to lose our patience and temper, or to cease striving for a sense of humility. No one can hope to be all right or to find the other fellow all wrong in a situation of mad confusion which faces the people, due to the concentration of power in a centralized government, which power has either been unwisely voted or improperly seized by those in authority. Mass confusion, in the minds of the people, has always preceded the downfall of any great government or organized effort of man.

In attempting to appraise our commitments of every kind, made to foreign governments or groups of governments, and their commitments to us, and in trying to ascertain the billions of dollars we have given away in the two world wars, and since the cessation of actual fighting in 1945, up to the time of the Korean "event," plus the billions of dollars we are yet obligated to put into the foreign situation, I am unable to find a man in Washington or elsewhere who would even attempt to evaluate the situation. Practically all who are in a position to know considerable about the situation recognize and admit that the loans or gifts, whichever you wish to call them, will eventually be charged off to profit and loss.

I think we should stop making any further commitments abroad, and (1) appoint a committee of the ablest lawyers, statesmen, economists, accountants, and financial minds of the country to take an honest, nonpolitical, nonpartisan inventory of our present economic and defense equipment and abilities; and (2) this committee should list all of our commitments and show all the gifts and loans, with their total sum, since World War I. Then we should determine whether it lies within our power to fulfill all the commitments made or promised in good faith and whether the nations to whom the promises were made can fulfill their part of the commitments and if they have acted in complete good faith.

Then we should try to find out whether the mothers and fathers of the United States are in favor of having their boys sent all over the world to fight battles in which I, personally, believe there is no way to do more than win a physical victory here and there without any of the fruits of peace and good will to follow the physical victory. Americans forget too soon and forgive too often. Woodrow Wilson, a great and distinguished American, who took us into World War I, was elected for his second term, in which we became embroiled in foreign alliances, by this slogan, "He kept us out of war." I remember the posters all over the United States of a mother standing with her hand on her son's shoulder, saying "My son, vote for Woodrow Wilson, he kept you out of war." I will not analyze the right or wrong, but just take this look at the facts.

Right here I would call your attention to two of the cardinal rules of equity, which are fundamental in all human relationship:

1. He who asks equity, must do equity.

2. He who comes into equity, must do so with clean hands.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to his third term principally through a campaign speech he made in Boston, when he said to the mothers and fathers in the United States the following: "I say to you again and again and again, that your sons will not be sent to fight on foreign soil." It is quite reliably reported by those who heard the speech, and I was one of them, that the words which were later found inserted in the manuscript "unless we are attacked" were not used in the speech when it went to the ears of millions of Americans. My only purpose in reemphasizing this fact is that it convinces me that our American people never wished to be drawn into the wars of foreign nations which have been going on for centuries.

Both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt will probably occupy a distinguished position in history and were beloved by millions of our citizens. That does not change the fact that the people did not want their sons sent to foreign soil and did not want to become involved in foreign entangled alliances. Certainly it is true that none of us know what George Washington might say today to the American people in a farewell address, but I want to ask every American to think carefully as to whether the morals, the character and the spiritual development of a vast part of the world justified or justifies us in changing our position of living under our American way of life and contributing all within our power to help

others to find the way of improving their lives and freedom. As one American, to those who are willing to listen to what I say in good faith, my answer is, that we have entered into partnership and alliances with political powers, leaders, and dictators whom no intelligent American citizen would choose as a partner in his life's work.

Perhaps we are moving too fast. Perhaps we are forgetting how the tide of good has come in over the last 2,000 years only to recede to points further away from our objective than they have frequently occupied over the centuries gone by.

I ask you if any one in this room feels that this world is better after World Wars I and II than it was before World War I, when the Constitution of the United States was supreme with us and the American flag occupied first place in our hearts, minds, and souls.

A relatively small percentage of our people appreciate that a treaty made, executed, and ratified with a foreign power, takes precedence over our Constitution and the law of the land. A relatively few of our people have made the understanding of government important enough for them to realize that when we go into a world government, that we have lost control of our own affairs and have become just a part of a muddled, confused world. A world whose selfish motives and objectives dictate their vote. If socialism and communism are predominant, then we have thrown our fine system and way of life, in a kettle of international dictatorship, there to become part and parcel of the conglomerate whole, where the state is master, and man its puppet or serf. Then there will be no leader of freemen left to hold the light of liberty and opportunity aloft, to lead others out of the darkness and despair brought about by rulers who have all the iniquitous qualities of the worst kings and emperors of the past, regardless of the name by which you call them.

Perhaps power-seeking politicians and leaders are trying to change the quality and character of humanity faster than it can be changed. Perhaps they are hoping to accomplish by force and subsidy those things which can only be accomplished by spiritual development and decency of purpose on a voluntary basis in keeping with the spirit of the Golden Rule. Perhaps they are trying to change humanity by force faster than God ordained it should be changed. A human life is but the wink of an eye or the break of a wave as compared to the known time of the past. I am not saying that some day the world may not be right for world government, but I am saying if we try to force it on the people of the United States in view of the conditions confronting us, and considering the character of the people of the world now, we will destroy the greatest accomplishment of mankind in the history of the world. I refer to the American form of government and way of life.

Regardless of what any one may say or how much it may hurt the feelings of some people in the world, I claim that the United States of America has been the greatest charitable organization ever known in the history of the world in its attempts to do good for others without seeking anything material in return. I also claim that, in our great zeal to do good, we have overpromised ourselves, or agreed to things which, if pursued, will wreck this greatest charitable organization in the world.

If any great charitable institution within our borders were to become emotional or over-zealous in promising to do things which its board of directors and contributors found could not be done without destroying the institution, then it is my opinion, that board of directors would be forced to take inventory and reappraise its powers and the relative importance of the things it would like to do. Then the members of the board would be forced to say, "We have undertaken to do more than is possible with our manpower and material wealth without jeopardizing and destroying our whole effort in charity." I think they would be courageous enough to say we have over-estimated our power to do good, and they would be compelled to adjust themselves to the doing of things within the limits of their known, or at least their probable income and manpower. Thus they would preserve their great charitable institution to do good within the scope of its ability.

No decent American ever wishes to defy the law of his country. No decent American ever wishes to evade military service required to protect and preserve our great country. But, if we are a free people, every American should have the right without smears or reprisals to say openly how he feels our welfare and purpose in life are to be best served and accomplished. If, because we are in a great emergency—if, because we are involved in some kind of a war that our leaders do not call war, if, because we are on the brink of a great war, possibly engulfing the world, we stop the citizen from expressing his honest, patriotic views, then, indeed, have we become a dictatorship where those in power in the Government are the masters and the people its puppets.

Right now I would not attempt to appraise who is responsible for the dilemma in which we find ourselves. Nor would I urge others to do so. Two great world wars fought to victory by the men in the field. Two great opportunities for the establishment of peace or ways to peace forfeited or bungled away by the political leaders because selfishness could not be made into intelligent self-interest, and our leaders compromised principle.

I often think of the admonition I gave to our political leaders and the leaders of the world, in the speech I made before the GI Forum in Rome, less than 3 weeks after VE-day. I had had conferences with Winston Churchill, and a delightful visit with His Holiness, the Pope—four other Senators being present. The substance of what I said was this. We have spent probably $200,000,000,000 to get an Army of 3,400,000 of the best trained and equipped American soldiers on the European Continent, and to assist our ally, Britain, in getting 785,000 of the best trained and equipped British soldiers on continental Europe. Then I asked the question, Why shouldn't we announce to the world in simple unambiguous language, the objectives for which we fought the war, and our objective in securing peace, before we take this great Army back home, and ship the equipment to other parts of the world? All I wanted to do, was what any plain, ordinary, American citizen should have wanted to do. For making that statement I was blasted by the socialistic, communistic, New Dealish sympathizers as a warmonger. Now I am receiving letter from the most distinguished men in the country, saying that I was one of the few people who saw the picture clearly and expressing great sorrow that no heed was taken of that speech except by the smear artists and character assassins. The only object I have in referring to this—which is water over the dam—is to prove that all we have thus far done is to win physical victories and bungle away the peace. Why should we expect the political leaders now in power in the world, to do a better job if we win another physical victory, after the loss of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our fine young manhood.

No, I reiterate, they should call to arms, all of their available manpower, to defend themselves, before we take another step with land forces into the foreign arena. I do not mean we should fail to support our boys in Korea or in Europe. But we should think well about maintaining land forces for our own soil, and the return of our men from Korea, in an orderly way. I would adopt some sane program for pretraining our youth for armed service in case of necessity and not call upon them to fight wars without training. I would build and equip an armed force for the defense of our country, and it seems to me that Senator TAFT's figure of a million and a half men over-all, with a backlog of trainees, should be ample for this purpose.

Then an appraisal and inventory of our resources, manpower, and abilities to do things, should guide the American people and their Representatives in Congress as to how far we can go with any degree of safety in the future.

As one American, if I had the power, I would make the saving of the United States my No. 1 job. I would change the slogan which has led us into the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, the crippling of hundreds of thousands of more lives and put us on the brink of national insolvency. That slogan is, "We must save the world if we would save ourselves." I don't believe it to be true I agree we should save the world, if we can, but I would make our new slogan, "We cannot save the world unless we save ourselves."

I would ask those in authority to truly appraise the atomic bomb and not distress and terrify the people with imaginary things that may never happen, neither would I overemphasize the importance of dangerous things that may happen. Certainly, what General Bradley said is true, "We may be bombed." But we will never be overcome, as a nation of freemen, except by great land force, landing on our own shores, and greater than we can combat. Hitler had one of the greatest armies in the world and he got to the shores of the English Channel. England was on her knees, crippled from tensions and ruthless attacks from the air. Hitler didn't dare attempt to cross the Channel—22 miles. Russia would have to bring a man force of tremendous magnitude some 4,000 miles if she started from home, and some 3,000 miles if she started from the shores of our former allies in Europe. It is inconceivable that she could transport a large land force either across the Atlantic Ocean or across Siberia down through Alaska. We can likewise bomb, providing we spend all that is necessary to be supreme in the air and maintain supremacy on the sea.

I said on the Senate floor almost 5 years ago that Russia would never need to precipitate an open war with us in order to accomplish her objective of destroying our way of life. I made this statement on the basis that we were and are spending ourselves into national bankruptcy, and national bankruptcy would sound the death knell of the free-enterprise system. I agree with what Abraham Lincoln said when he was 29 years old: "No power on earth can ever land a force in this country to overcome us. As a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide." Tolerance, patience, equity, and justice in our dealings amongst ourselves are the things required to build national unity. If we can build complete unity no one can overcome us. Then we will set an example to the world which free men can follow if they are willing to pay the price of liberty.

Our people favor air and naval supremacy, but they are opposed to our sending millions of men to fight on foreign soil side by side with people whose political philosophy and economic objectives are certainly not stabilized and unified any more than all of their morals and character are stabilized and unified.

What if these countries who are leaning strongly to socialism should change their course, while a vast army from here is on foreign soil?

Yes, I would take an inventory right now regardless of what the world might think of us. The better people of the world would thank us later for having done it.

When I was on the Air Policy Board of the Congress I told the committee and the high command of the various branches of the armed services, that I would vote for any amount of money necessary to make us supreme in the air and on the sea as fast as we could lawfully and intelligently spend the money.

I would not say now what we should do to help other nations, who believe sincerely and are on record as being in favor of the freedom of the individual. I would let them know their Uncle Sam cannot do their job for them no matter how kind his heart is. The best work of all men in the world has been done when mother necessity stood back of them with a broomstick and, particularly, when self-preservation was their objective.

I hear Americans say, "Wouldn't you send even 10 divisions to Europe or to Asia, just to show good will?" My answer is, if you send 10 divisions anywhere and the vast hordes of any nation, which is our enemy, is putting them and our supposed full-fledged allies to rout, then, in the name of decency and honesty we will have to send many hundreds of thousands, or millions more as is necessary to support them, protect them, and save them. We can't just send our boys around the world, and, if they fail, let them be massacred. No war can be conducted under the direction of the United Nations, which takes 2 or 3 months to give a go-ahead signal in every case, except where they voted to resist the Communist advance from North Korea and we furnish 90 to 95 percent of all the aid given to the South Koreans. I voted for the United Nations and it may yet serve a purpose, but when our fine ally, Great Britain, is holding Red China by one hand, while patting us on the back and asking for more help and more favors, and up to date, has refused to vote Red China the aggressor, it does not seem to me to justify the sending of our fine boys to all quarters of the earth to fight battles for what we believe in, but apparently not the things in which the present British Government and some others, believe in.

Let us not forget that England has not shown her colors yet in regard to Red China becoming a member of the United Nations and thereby further contaminating it with communism.

Of course, every decent American would help feed those in need and deserving, even if it means sacrifice at home.

Of course, every decent American wants to keep his promises within the limits of his ability, but the bankruptcy law, which helps individuals, who have overreached themselves and failed, does not help nations who do the same thing. Of course, every decent American is interested in lending aid and help to nations who truly believe in the cause of freemen and who, themselves, are willing to pay the price to fight to the limit of their ability for that cause; therefore, I would be in favor of giving all possible help in the air and at sea to such nations, so long as that does not jeopardize the life and the preservation of our American people and their system of freemen.

Ex-President Hoover did the people of the United States and all the decent people of the earth a great service when he made his radio address on December 20, 1950. The gist of his speech meant to me this—we cannot save the world unless it first does everything in its power to save itself.

We must stop where we are, take an inventory of our assets and liabilities in this world mess, then if not too late, make certain we save ourselves, otherwise all will be lost.

Why should we not consider Spain as an ally, in our great need to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the American people? Spain, protected by the Pyrenees Mountains, with 400,000 men now in arms ready to fight communistic aggression and probably 1,000,000 more men who soon could be in arms, should have our consideration as an ally and a protected base for Air and Navy. Think carefully of some of the allies we now have in and out of the United Nations before we ignore this available ally.

In closing, I think every American mother and father should make it their duty to notify their representatives in Congress and in the executive branch of Government how they feel and what they expect of their elected and appointed representatives. It is not a question of right to speak, but duty to speak. I would urge that it be done now, so that these representatives may understand, and be encouraged by the wish and will of the people. I would urge the people to carry that wish and will through to the next election, for if the people sit idly by and watch their rights destroyed one by one, and, later try to arise to action, they may find they have lost the power of action.

If the people are masters in this country of ours, they must act like masters, because when a master abdicates to his servant, he is no longer the master, and the dove of peace, and the flower of liberty, will have vanished and faded away.

"With malice toward none and charity for all" let us build unity and strength in the land of the free, and thus create an example for the world to follow. An example that may spell peace on earth.

The Way of Justice the Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who has been called out of the city, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the sermon delivered on Sunday, January 14, 1951, at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., by the Most Reverend Joseph F. Flannelly, D. D., auxiliary bishop of New York.

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

"And the fruit of justice is sown in peace, to them that make peace." (James III: 18.)

When the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus discussed friendship, he first cautioned the chosen people against seeking direction from fair-weather friends, selfish companions, and deceitful counselors. Secondly, he advised continual contact with a holy man who feared God and had real sympathy for them. Finally he said, "But above all these things, pray to the Most High that He may direct thy way in truth."

Some 200 years later, the Eternal Son of God, having come to earth, revealed the power of prayer in the Sermon on the Mount, declaring, "Ask and it shall be given to you: seek and you shall find: knock and it shall be opened to you."

It is therefore something more than precedent or tradition that has brought you, the members of the judiciary, the Congress, and the bar, here today. Directed by the divinely inspired word and invited by the Son of God, you have come here to pray for guidance in the way of truth. Ever conscious of the sacred trust imposed upon you by your high office, and particularly anxious about the grave problems of this fateful year of 1951, you have come to ask for that divine help without which we can do nothing.

Thanks be to God that you do stand and knock, through prayer, at the heart of God, for the guidance and assistance indispensable to the fulfillment of your office the settling of the difficulties of God's suffering children. If you continue to knock, the way will be opened to you. This is the promise of the God-man.

Prayer will direct you in your solicitude for the safety and preservation of America. Prayer will strengthen you in your service, as jurists and legislators, as advocates and counselors, to the millions of men and women who are America. Prayer will support you in the fulfillment of your noble vocations. God has given you these vocations for the benefit of His creatures. In legislative chambers and in courts of justice, it is your vocation to represent and plead and protect the cause of every individual living under our flag. What is this cause? Is it advancement in the material and physical order?

Is it better health and more wealth for the individual?

Is it more power and wider influence for the Nation? Not at all.

These things are the effect or fruit of our cause. Our cause is spiritual.

Just 6 days ago the President of these United States of America declared, "This is our cause—peace, freedom, justice." Today and forever let us proclaim that this is also the cause of all God's creatures, peace, freedom, justice. In this, they were created equal. Unfortunately, instead of peace and freedom, there is war and human slavery, because some do not understand that peace was promised by God's angels to men of good will only, that men of good will are those who accept God's eternal principles and live by His law; that peace is obtained not by the victories of fighting men over fighting men, but rather by the victory of men over the world, the flesh, and the devil, over injustice, selfishness, and godlessness. In one word, there is war and there is human slavery because there is injustice. Fully comprehending the price of peace, our President, in his state of the Union message, further said, "But more precious than peace are freedom and justice." In this sentence the President was briefly re-echoing the convictions of our founding fathers. In the preamble of the Constitution, they gave us the reasons for that document, which we hope and pray will live and function until the end of time. For the sake of continuity may I presume your indulgence and state these reasons? "To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. * * *

"To secure the blessings of liberty." Well, did the patriots understand that liberty and freedom are part of every man's God-given nature? Since every creature was thus endowed by Heaven, they knew that only one force could gather these sovereign creatures into a more perfect union: that that force must also come from heaven. Despotism could club men into slavery. Only justice could unite them for peace. This they knew to be a sound principle of eternal truth and so, for the safeguarding of man's freedom and for the promoting of peace, they established legally, in the Constitution, this principle—the absolute necessity of strict justice. This was the cause

of our fathers. This is our cause. This must always be the cause of America, justice.

By the divine plan, justice is necessary because of the nature of man, in his fallen state. Man is composed of a soul which can think and determine freely what acts will be performed by his other component part, his body. Unique as man is in the order of creation, and with mastery over the lower orders, albeit, he is not self-sufficient. He depends upon God, directly, for his existence and he depends upon God indirectly insofar as he is assisted in his living by his fellow creatures. He depends upon this human assistance not only in the material order but, what is more important, in the moral order.

In addition to their physical and intellectual birthrights, all men are born with moral rights. When a man exercises these moral rights he is projected beyond himself to intercourse with his fellow men, and thereby he becomes dependent upon them in greater or less degree. His freedom and his peace depend upon how justly he is treated by his fellow men. And, of course, the same natural law which gives a man his rights imposes upon him the obligation to respect the rights of every other creature of God.

In this intercourse of fallen humanity, conflicts as to rights and obligations are quite probable, because of men's varying temperaments, unrestrained appetites, and self-satisfying judgments. Since order is Heaven's first law; since "all things must be done decently and according to order" (I Corinthians 14: 40), order was required, an absolute and unchanging rule for human behavior was necessary. The Omniscient Creator of man established that order by the moral virtue of justice. And coming from the mind of God, justice adheres to truth which is eternal and immutable. Since truth is absolute and unchanging, so also is justice.

Justice is quite properly termed the "social virtue." It constantly directs every creature to give to every other creature whatever is his due. It constantly directs every creature to give to society and to any division of society, whatever is its due. Likewise, it constantly directs the community, the Nation, and society to give to every one of God's creatures whatever is his due. Justice, therefore, preserves inviolable the God-given freedom of every individual man. And justice cements individual men into society which in turn protects the individual man from any injustice which would rob him of his freedom and thereby destroy his peace. Justice is verily our cause.

As creatures of God every one of us has the strict obligation to pursue justice in all our ways. "Know ye not," warns St. Paul, "that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God."

As jurists, legislators, and lawyers, there rests upon the conscience of every member of your honorable bodies the additional obligation of holding the scales of justice even. To society, to the country and to every individual, justice must be done. And you are the essential instruments of that justice.

The law which insures justice is enacted by you who are Members of the Congress. The rights of man, who is the very material of society, are defended by you who are members of the bar. And you who are the most estimable members of the bench, you are the principal instruments of justice. You make the judgment. You stand between freedom and slavery, between liberty and despotism. It is yours to translate words into deeds; to put the law to work; to make justice concrete.

As a fruit of this holy sacrifice of the mass, we pray the holy spirit of God to infuse in your soul His seven gifts. May His wisdom and counsel, understanding and knowledge further enlighten your intellect so that you will see and pursue and procure justice always. May the fear of the Lord and piety enkindle in your hearts an even greater love for justice. May fortitude ever strengthen your will to enact in the Congress laws only for the common good, and to seek and render in our courts only strict justice. May the most high God direct thy way in truth.

Finally, as Americans, let us all pray for the grace to cooperate with those seven gifts of the spirit, especially in the doing of individual justice, justice of man for man and justice of society or government to every individual creature. This is a moral obligation; this is a patriotic duty.

There is nothing that renders the soil more fertile for atheistic communism than individual injustice. Need I say that atheistic communism is the most deadly enemy to society and civilization; the greatest enemy of freedom and peace; the most insidious enemy of our constitutional system of government; the only enemy of the United States of America. Our battle is not against flesh and blood. Our battle is against the false principles of men and women who hate God and deny the sanctity of His creatures. These satanic principles can be conquered by the eternal principles of God.

It was under the guidance of the Holy spirit of God that our forefathers established this Nation upon the firm and unchangeable foundation of justice

This Nation will continue to survive; will grow nobler and greater; and will increasingly share the blessings of liberty with the other nations in God's world, provided that every man, woman, and child of us, under that same Divine guidance practices justice.

Only when every individual, in any nation, private citizen, or public servant, pursues justice can that nation possess justice and enjoy its fruits—freedom and peace. "Justice," says the Book of Proverbs, "exalteth a nation; but sin maketh nations miserable."

The natural law and the inspired word of God directed our forefathers along the way of truth to justice. They followed that way, wholeheartedly, and so the United States of America was born. If this Nation is to survive, God and America demand of us that we follow that same way—justice. It is the only way to peace. In the words of our Holy Father's Christmas message, "The way leading to true peace is long and hard, and impeded by briers and thorns." But we receive this consolation and assurance from the inspired word of God that "when the ways of man shall please the Lord, He will convert even His enemies to peace."

The American Stake Inside Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this morning the New York Herald Tribune published an interesting article entitled "The American Stake Inside Europe," written by the distinguished historian, John Gunther. This article merits the earnest consideration of every Member of the Senate and of the public generally. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN STAKE INSIDE EUROPE—RUSSIAN CONTROL OF THE CONTINENT AND ITS DEPENDENT AREAS WOULD CRIPPLE STEEL INDUSTRY OF UNITED STATES AND MEAN LOSS OF ATOMIC SUPREMACY

(By John Gunther)

The grand abstraction "Europe" means more than Chartres or Shakespeare; it means steel, the fabric of modern man. Europe and its copious dependent areas do not merely connote richness in history and culture akin to ours; they connote strategic—and explosive—raw materials like uranium.

The price of the loss of Europe would be grievous to America and the Americans. If Russia becomes Europe, if Europe becomes part of a Communist master state, the point can fairly be argued that the United States as it exists today could not survive.

Emotion and one of its illegitimate children, fear, dominate so much of our discussion of foreign policy that issues become milky. Even those who speak in the name of strict American self-interest are sometimes tempted to forget what that self-interest is. It is time to bring forward some statistics—statistics of the crispest.

But first—

Most statesmen advocating isolationist policies today deny vehemently that they are isolationists. This has a certain quaint significance. The very word has become so tainted that even archisolationists want to avoid being blackened with it. In actual fact, millions upon millions of perfectly good patriotic and reputable Americans would like to be isolationists—if only isolationism could be made to work. The chief reason that it is impossible these days as a practical policy is the obvious one of history—the world has changed.

It is extraordinarily interesting that several American leaders, who seem to be living in the age of Beowulf, are still isolationist about Europe though interventionist about the Far East. They are willing to fight communism in Asia, with American forces, but not in Europe. This is as if a man should, let us say, take out fire insurance for one wall of his house and not the other.

But let us proceed to consideration of what Europe means to us in blunt, specific, economic fields, in terms of bread and butter. The conception that the United States, in peace or war, could be self-contained, self-sufficient, is as mischievous as measles. What would we lose if we lost Europe? What would Russia gain?

First, steel. Production of steel in the United States in 1950 was 96,700,000 tons; in the Soviet Union and its European satellites, roughly 31,000,000 tons; in Western Europe (including West Germany) 46,600,000 tons. The Ruhr-Saar area is, as everybody knows, a crucible in which the fate of whole nations may be forged. Adding American to Western European steel, we get 143,300,000 tons, as against a Russian figure of 31,000,000—a comfortable superiority. But suppose the Soviet Union makes war; suppose Western Europe should be lost. That would transfer the Western European steel production to the Russian column, and we would have only 96,700,000 tons as against 77,000,000—not so comfortable.

Closely allied to the question of steel is manganese. Steel without a component of manganese is, for most important uses, about as valuable as a compass without a needle. Practically no manganese deposits exist in the United States—nature is capricious—and though some could be developed in northern Minnesota and the Gun Flint Range in Canada, this would take some years. Our chief sources of supply for manganese, Russia itself excluded, are the Gold Coast, Morocco, and India. Whether, if Europe were lost and seaways imperiled, we could continue to import substantial amounts of manganese from these areas is uncertain in the extreme. But I have heard it said by experts, if the United

States should lose its accessibility to manganese, 60 percent of our steel industry would have to close down. This would mean, since steel is an octopus, that 60 percent of automobiles would close down, 60 percent of machine tool production, 60 percent of coal, and a formidable lot else. The consequent unemployment in the United States might rise to 30,000,000.

CONGO SUPPLIES URANIUM

Second, uranium, on which the production of atomic energy depends. Now it happens that most of the uranium in the world available to us lies in the Belgian Congo. Suppose the Russians should march into Western Europe, suppose that we were not in a position to beat them back, and suppose that Brussels became overnight the capital of a Belgian satrapate of the Soviet. This would certainly seek to deny us its uranium. We would have to jump all the way to the Congo with strong armed force and jump there fast. Maybe we would get there in time; but maybe not.

If we did not seize the Congo deposits it would be impossible for us to continue for long production of atomic bombs. Conversely, and perhaps more importantly, Russia would suddenly gain all the uranium she so hungarily lacks and desperately wants.

Third, returning to the strictly European scene, it is instructive to compare the present production of some other massive and critical commodities. Take coal. American production of coal is roughly 650,000,000 a year; that of Western Europe roughly 500,000,000 tons; that of the Soviet Union and its 250,000,000 tons. Suppose Russia takes Europe. That will give Russia a coal production, according to these figures, superior to our own. Or take electricity. The United States has the capacity to produce roughly 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power annually; Western Europe 225,000,000,000; the Soviet Union 125,000,000,000. Add Western Europe to Russia, and she will be running us neck and neck.

THREAT TO OIL STOCKS

Again in this field, oil. Western Europe itself does not produce oil. But geography is the most implacable of masters; if we lose Europe, or if Europe loses itself, the Middle East and the Mediterranean will almost certainly be lost too. At the best, our gateway to oil in the Persia-Arabia area will be impeded; at the worst, we will lose the solid billion of barrels this Golconda produced every year.

The United States, even in peacetime, is not self-sufficient as to oil; we have to import large quantities. If the Middle East were lost, there would still be sources in Venezuela and the Caribbean. But even this route might be endangered in a global war.

A modern society can no more exist without the bone and calories provided by steel, coal, electricity, and oil, than a puppy can exist without water. If Europe were removed from us our position in these elemental commodities would be severely prejudiced. From an opposite point of view shortages in steel, oil, and uranium are a principal reason why Russia does not make positive war. The chief deterrent to war by the Soviets is not merely our possession of the atomic bomb; it is the American industrial potential as a whole. Stalin knows that what won both World War I and World War II was, in the last analysis, the productive capacity of the United States. But, today, if we cripple this capacity by permitting Europe to be lost, we might find it more difficult to win.

RAW MATERIAL STOCKPILES

Fourth, stockpiling of strategic raw materials. The story of this is little known, partly because of security reasons. But some details are still publishable. The United States has begun to store up reserves of strategic and critical materials—60 to 70 commodities in which we are either totally deficient or very largely dependent on foreign sources. The list includes items from newsprint to the cobalt essential to the manufacture of much electrical equipment; from asbestos to mercury, without which detonators cannot be made.

It comes as a shock to learn that the United States is 100 percent dependent on external sources for tin, chrome and cordage fibers; 27 percent for zinc and copper; 92 percent for both manganese and cobalt; 73 percent for tungsten; 34 percent for lead; 51 percent for rubber. Then there are multifarious items like platinum, silk, mica, graphite, cinchona bark, industrial diamonds and jewel bearings, in which we are wholly or in large part dependent on imports from abroad.

Now Europe itself, the continent does not supply us with all these materials. Its role is, however, substantial. Most of our imports of mercury come from Italy, platinum from Switzerland, chromite from Turkey, sperm oil from Norway. As to tin and rubber they arrive predominantly from Malaya. Malaya is not in Europe, but it is in European hands, and if we should lose Europe we would have to take on the job of defending it ourselves.

FOUR-BILLION-DOLLAR GOAL

The total value of our stockpile is approximately $1,500,000,000 as of the moment; our objective is to reach $4,000,000,000. So we are still dependent on sources abroad (mainly Europe) for essential commodities valued at the gigantic sum of $2,500,000,000.

ECA has bought and stockpiled enough rubber for 7,000,000 automobile tires so far. Recently it bought in London and Amsterdam $5,300,000 worth of industrial diamonds, $6,700,000 worth of sisal, more than a ton of platinum from England, $800,000 worth of sperm oil from Great Britain, 500,000 ounces of quinidine from the Netherlands, 19,800 tons of Madagascar graphite, $500,000 worth of Danish cryolite (used in the electrolysis of aluminum), and quantities of fluorspar (a flux for steel) from Italy.

Another field little known is that of development projects put forward by ECA. American teams are prospecting for copper, manganese, lead, and zinc in the Sahara. We are working hard to restore the ancient lead and silver mines in Greece. Recently a converted zinc plant in Italy was put into operation. We are working on cobalt in Rhodesia, industrial diamonds elsewhere in Africa, chrome in Turkey, and miscellaneous mining developments in places so far afield as New Caledonia, Sierra Leone, and Tanganyika

THE SHIPPING SITUATION

Fifth, shipping. The fleets of our allies in Western Europe comprise not less than 35 percent of the world's total merchant tonnage. Some of it, if Russia takes Europe, might manage to get away to our shores. Some might not.

Sixth, trade. One does not even need to mention that if Europe were lost, Americans would have to go begging for British woolen goods, Scotch whisky, Belgian lace, Swiss watches, Italian olive oil, French wine and perfumes. As to our export trade, roughly 30 percent of the total—almost a third—goes to Western Europe. The margin this represents means, as is well known, success or failure to many American industries, like the movies.

Above and beyond this, the loss of Europe would be almost certain to disrupt our commerce on a world level. And consider what it might mean to Latin America, which would presumably be our only hinterland if Europe disappeared. Latin America has commercial ties to Europe of the closest. Several things might happen in connection with, let us say, Argentina's prodigious crop of beef.

MANPOWER AND BRAINS

Seventh, manpower. I do not mean merely that Western Europe has what is probably, next to our own, the most numerous and best trained reservoir of skilled labor in the world. One may likewise skip over the fact that the experienced civil service, the bureaucracy, of Western Europe would, if it could be made to work, be of immense X value to Soviet conquerors. Nor need we mention the over-all fact that, if the population of the 10 Atlantic Pact countries in Western Europe were shifted from our side to the Russian column, the Soviet constellation would be augmented by the terrific bulk of 178,010,000 people—more than the total population of the United States.

But consider brains. Consider leadership in scientific know-how, in industrial research. Think of the work that was done in Norway on heavy water. The sulfa drugs were discovered in Western Germany, and penicillin in the United Kingdom. British research gave us the jet airplane engine; similarly British ingenuity gave us radar. Where would our defenses be today without radar and jet propulsion? Similarly British inventors did the pioneer work on magnetic mines and antimine devices. As of today the Belgians are working hard on small arms and automatic weapons and the French on infrared photography amongst much else.

RUSSIAN LAG IN RESEARCH

Now it is striking fact that, whereas the Russians have signal capacity to adapt scientific procedures and to put quickly into mass production items that somebody else has invented, they do not do so well in pure research. The intellectual climate in Moscow is not good for that. They are copyists, not innovators. Hence it behooves us to guard well the manpower trained in the great European tradition of faith in science and independent, individualist research.

Eighth, one might go into all manner of strategical and political implications. But they are hardly part of our specific story. One might at least mention, however, the pertinent fact that, when continental Europe was overrun by the Nazis, the Europeans awaited and welcomed us as liberators. But, this time, few Europeans have much desire to go through the onerous process of which liberation may—or may not—be the triumphant end. They largely and emphatically prefer not to be occupied in the first place. There is no glamour to the idea of liberation any more. Moreover it will be much more difficult to organize resistance movements in Europe now than in 1941–1945, if only because a Russian occupation will be even more severe than was the German.

Also in this field one might mention Latin America again. The pull of a Communist Europe on several South American countries could be magnetically strong, even though the rank and file of Latin Americans detest communism.

EUROPE'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Finally, one should have a word on what Western Europe has done for itself in the last year or so. It has become a kind of parlor game to malign the Europeans, but all things considered they have made a substantial contribution to their own survival. Take one figure only—that during the second quarter of 1950, the industrial output of 10 Western European countries was at an all-time high—24 percent above the prewar level.

All things considered it might be wise for Americans to turn their criticism inward, instead of across the narrow belt of ocean to the European bastion. Much that a sound European would find incomprehensible goes on in Washington—muddle, greed, panic, and confusion.

The world will be a safer place for all when we recognize a fundamental truth: Europe needs us—but we need Europe too.

Inflation and Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent letters; one in regard to the important subject of inflation, the second relating to medical care, which I have received from a distinguished West Virginian, Judge Harlan M. Calhoun, of the twenty-second judicial circuit.

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

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
Moorefield, January 29, 1951.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I want to express the view that the inflation of the present day is a grave problem. And by inflation I refer to the cost of all the essentials of life. I sometimes wonder if persons in authority are aware of the gravity of the simple problem of making ends meet financially for the average American family. With some exceptions, people of my acquaintance find it almost impossible to live on income available. In more cases than I like to realize, it means using up savings, or in the absence of savings, simply going more and more into debt. I believe this situation prevails more now than at any other time since the depression.

I believe this unfortunate condition obtains to an alarming degree among salaried people and other persons on fixed incomes. They are caught, in the present scheme of things, in a two-way squeeze. First, incomes within this group do not rise, and have not risen with price levels as among other groups; and second, persons within this group are hit the hardest by every raise in taxes, and particularly income taxes. I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that salaried persons pay several times as much income tax as persons in other groups with comparable incomes. The reasons for this are fairly obvious and I shall not undertake to detail them. For instance, I would say that a school teacher in Hardy County pays several times as much income tax per $100 income as the average farmer, or independent businessman.

This hardship to the individual is only one small part of the problem created by the inflationary price level. For instance, a bond issue for school building purposes recently voted in Hampshire County will not now build the schools. There is no other money to supplement the fund, and the money cannot be used for any other purpose, such as to build a part only of the schools. Again, we find that our $50,000,000 bond issue for building secondary roads in this State will build comparatively few roads. As you well know, the cost of maintaining and equipping the Armed Forces essential to world peace and freedom is almost more than the national economy can be expected to stand. This means that if necessary governmental functions and services are maintained at their former levels, more and more taxes must be levied. And I venture the assertion that the average American is now taxed about as much as the traffic will stand.

And who profits by the present scheme of high prices, ceilings, supports? Frankly, I hardly know. I do not believe it is the average American, whoever he may be. If the wages of a laborer are doubled, and the cost of his living is doubled, he does not profit. He has gained nothing, perhaps has lost nothing. But, meantime, the millions who have not had the benefit of the doubled income are penalized. Their income, in effect, is cut in half and, meantime, their taxes are raised. I am afraid that more people than we realize at first blush are among those living on such reduced incomes. The average American cannot be expected to build and pay for a home today. If the tendency is as alarming as I believe it to be, there is a danger that few people will be able to buy refrigerators, radios, electric appliances; and I believe there is a danger of purchasing power being lessened to the extent, in normal times, of creating a surplus of everything available for sale, with consequent closing of factories and unemployment.

I am much of the opinion that if all prices and incomes were now as they were at the close of World War II, all individuals would have more spending money. I am quite certain that the Government could buy a tank for a much, much lesser cost, and consequently the demand for public revenue would be eased in proportion.

I am not an economist. I do not undertake to suggest a remedy. But, I do say that the matter of inflationary prices today is an extremely acute problem for the average citizen as well as for the Nation, and I fear that we are caught up in a self-perpetuating spiral which must be stopped in some manner.

Very respectfully yours,
HARLAN M. CALHOUN.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
TWENTY-SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
Moorefield, January 2[illegible] 1951.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I believe the problems relating to medical care and treatment are extremely grave problems. In fact, I believe certain aspects of this problem are little short of a national disgrace.

In connection with our efforts to get a 4-year medical and dental college in this State we have become acquainted with some rather startling facts. Briefly stated, I refer to the fact that the American Medical Association will not accredit a medical school unless it conforms to certain standards. Among other requirements, there must be a hospital of certain specifications. Furthermore, there must be so many beds in the hospital per medical student. The required costs are almost prohibitive. All in all, the effect is to create a virtual "closed shop," so far as the medical and dental professions are concerned. One of the saddest, and at the same time one of the most provoking, things I have been called upon to contemplate was the recent spectacle of thousands upon thousands of veterans who were denied admission to dental and medical schools. They had fought for their country. They had the desire, and with the aid of the Government, they had the ability to complete the prescribed courses of study.

There were more than the usual number in recent years because of the GI benefits available for the schooling of veterans. But it is a perennial problem. Each of us knows many, many very deserving young men who have the desire, the means, and the capacity for becoming doctors and dentists. Yet, in this land of free enterprise, they are denied the privilege. The situation is all the more shocking because of the fact that national health is an important public problem. I, personally, see no reason why, in this land of wealth and opportunity, one should, in small towns such as mine, be required to sit for hours in a doctor's office simply to consult him about a cold; or why one should be required to make an appointment with a dentist months in advance. If such a situation should prevail in the garage business, enterprising Americans, in this land of opportunity and free enterprise, would simply open up other garages nearby so that the public could be served. But, under the existing system, free enterprise is nullified, and in a field so vital as the national health. In the towns and counties of this area, I believe there are not half as many doctors as there were 30 years ago, partly because, competition being virtually nonexistent, the doctors go to the larger cities where greater incomes are available, and partly because there are so few of them.

I have spoken of the problem as a grave one in relation to the public health. As we all know too well, it is also a grave problem in this very hour with reference to national safety. I am quite certain that in this section of our State, no doctors can be spared to the Armed Forces, with due regard to the health and welfare of our citizens. Probably more of them are available in the larger cities. Nevertheless, this system which I consider pernicious, selfish, and unnecessary, strikes at two very vital points—our national safety, and our national health. I know that many doctors share this viewpoint and deplore it. I trust that we may never have socialized medicine: but if we ever have it, it will be only because members of the medical professions make it the only apparent alternative.

The cost of medical care is another problem which is inherent in the scarcity of medical men. I am quite certain that the public health is hampered because so many people feel that they cannot afford medical treatment or hospitalization at prevailing costs.

I feel that the Federal Government should tackle the problem. I believe it has the constitutional right to do so because the problem so affects the national defense, as well as the health and welfare of the people. I believe the Government could well establish medical schools in conjunction with its very fine veterans' hospitals. I believe, also, that a single school might, under Government direction, be made available for the benefit of two or more States acting jointly; with the cost thereof to be shared by the States, possibly with the aid of Government subsidy. I have understood that in certain instances, two or more States have combined their resources for this purpose. Or, in any event, in view of the serious nature of the problem, I feel that the Federal Government should see to it that medical and dental schools are made available to meet all reasonable demands, even if it be totally at Government expense.

Finally, I feel that the Federal Government should set up its own standards for such schools, adequate in every respect. And if the American Medical Association fails to approve such standards, I believe they will, nevertheless, be sufficient in the eyes of the American public.

Very respectfully yours,
HARLAN M. CALHOUN.

Indians See Peril in Rule on Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it has always been my contention that the American Indian can take care of himself. I ask unanimous consent to have

inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Indians See Peril in Rule on Lawyers," written by Dorothy L. Pillsbury, and published in the Christian Science Monitor.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 30, 1951]

INDIANS SEE PERIL IN RULE ON LAWYERS

(By Dorothy L. Pillsbury)

SANTA FE, N. MEX.—Thousands of American citizens may have their rights, inherent in the Constitution, jeopardized if new regulations of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs are approved by the Secretary of the Interior, according to observers here.

These citizens are Indians of the United States and Alaska. The regulations concern the hiring of attorneys by Indians to represent them in lawsuits.

These regulations, although more or less in effect previously, were put in written form and circulated November 9, 1950. They were drawn up without consultation with vitally interested groups, both Indian and white.

In the opinion of many here they offer one advantage in that they are a definite, written statement of policy and procedure by the Indian Department, in approving or disapproving the employment of attorneys by the tribes. Even when the Indians pay their legal representatives from their tribal money, their selection is largely circumscribed in the new regulations.

METICULOUS OPUS

The document outlining these regulations is a long and meticulous opus. It seems quite evident here that the document is the work of men unadvised by either the Indians, themselves, or interested groups of whites—such groups as the Association on American Indian Affairs of New York City, headed by Oliver La Farge, of the New Mexican Association on Indian Affairs headed by Mrs. Charles Dietrich, or the National Congress of American Indians headed by John C. Ranier.

The points covered require that before a tribe can hire a lawyer to represent them it must offer proof that it actually needs a lawyer and why. The why cannot be in general terms, but must be an exact statement of the exact services needed.

CORE OF CRITICISM

This seems doubly strange when, at the same time, the tribe's ability to pay the legal costs must be verified. In other words, American citizens whose ability to pay has been proved must have their attorneys handpicked for them by the Commissioner. The Indian Department would be in control of the terms of the contract, the fees, and renewal conditions.

The regulation that is arousing the most criticism here is the one that in the case of claim contracts, fees, and expenses must be wholly contingent on the attorney's winning the case. This is the case even if the Indians have the financial ability and wish to pay customary fees. Many of these claim contracts involve expensive travel and research on the part of the attorney.

It is felt that few skilled and experienced attorneys would undertake such expenses on the distant possibility of being reimbursed for heavy expenses when the suit is won—if it is. Many attorneys look with disfavor on contingent fees, feeling that they are contrary to the ethics of the American Bar Association in that the attorney thereby becomes a partner in a law suit.

These regulations empower the Commissioner to control the amount of legal business to be undertaken by any one legal firm, thus blocking the natural desire of Indian tribes to hire attorneys who have shown their ability in successful suits in a given field. To some observers this hints that the Department is on the lookout for lawyers who are "yes" men.

It also is recommended that a tribe hire a local attorney for general legal services rather than one, say in Washington, where often he might be of the most value to them. The Commissioner also is given the authority to terminate a case without cause and without advance notice, subject to tribal consent, which consent might easily be brought about by administrative pressure.

TIMING NOTED

No informed person denies at this time the need of some of the Indian tribes for the supervision and protection of the Indian Department.

The Navajos are a case in point. But this latest regulation of their legal affairs is thought by many to amount to a denial of the contract.

General Fellers on Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial that appeared in the Sunday Times-Herald, January 28, on the subject of Air Power. The editorial refers to an article by Gen. Bonner Fellers that appears in the current issue of Human Events. He refers to a recent speech by General Bradley that seems to indicate that our military policy is to fight a ground war at the expense of American lives. This should not be the policy, according to General Fellers, who contends that if war comes we must win it in the air. The editorial follows:

AIR POWER

The ruins of Berlin and Tokyo are monuments to one fact that nobody can deny: It is bad business to lose a war. It always was bad business to lose a war, for that matter, but the worst that ever happened in the past was child's play compared with the worst that happens to nations that lose a modern war.

Now, cities are not just sacked. They are blown up. Individual soldiers do not have much opportunity to run down conquered streets and cut throats. The bombers have been there ahead of them to fill the street with broken bricks and bodies not even worth looting.

War, as presently practiced, is played for keeps and the looser is pulverized. Out of World War II and the heavy bomber development there grew a rule that is worth remembering. It is:

"We no longer waste time milking the cow dry. We just kill the cow and she goes dry for good."

In other words, why waste time trying to defeat a nation by killing its young men and destroying its material wealth out on battlefields if you can go over their heads and literally blow the nation up, behind them?

The war in Korea, which has so far been confined to battlefields, has caused many people to forget that business of killing the cow instead of trying to milk it dry. But the principle is still there, and the security and survival of the United States are contained within it.

Which do we want to do, get in a milking contest with Russia or develop the power to kill the cow if we have to?

THE TRUE PURPOSE

A clear-thinking and clear-writing military man has summed up the challenge very neatly in the latest issue of Human Events, the weekly journal of analysis.

The writer is Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, formerly on the staff of General MacArthur, and now director of veterans' affairs for the Republican National Committee.

Writes General Fellers:

"The principal reason given for the enormous European program (the Eisenhower paper army) is that it will deter war. But will it?

"The contention is that the presence by 1953 of 50 or 60 allied divisions will be the best possible war deterrent. But against these, Russia could now throw 175 divisions, some 25 of which are armored.

"British and our own intelligence concede Russia can take Europe in a matter of days. * * *

"What then is the true purpose of creating this collective defense force for Europe? The real hope is that it would act as a delaying agent until enough American manpower could be brought to turn the tide.

"In a recent speech General Bradley disclosed the approved administration concept of the only way we can win a war:

" 'I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that should this Nation be forced into still another conflict, we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground.' "

To that declaration of administration policy, General Fellers submits this conclusive opinion:

"If victory for the free peoples of the world can only be gained over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground—then it follows, irrefutably, that the free world has enjoyed its last victory."

It is perfectly true that Europe alone has enough manpower, counting bodies as bodies, to outmatch Russia, alone. But look at Europe. The politicians who hold office there can't even agree on the time of day. They are so ridden with hatred and jealousy of one another they continue to quarrel on the very edge of the volcano.

How many Europeans will follow these maniacal grafters to a war, even if the maniacal grafters could agree on what to do? And when Russia puts Chinese troops into her force, where are they, then?

RUSSIA WINS ANY MILKING CONTEST

Clearly, in any milking contest, a war fought to see which side can pile up the most dead bodies in open fields, the United States of America has nothing to gain in Europe. Says General Fellers:

"If western powers are to survive in a war against communism, we must somehow manage to gain our decision by methods quite different from mass ground combat. Instead, we must draw heavily, not primarily on our manpower but on the genius of our people."

The supreme genius of our system, in war, is our air power. General Fellers outlines a plan to develop that in advance of war so that Russia may fear the death of the cow, and so abandon a contest in which she is inferior.

The plan supposes first the fullest possible striking power in the air, and bases for it in Africa and the Middle East, beyond reach of Russia's land-based armies or undeveloped air capacity.

"However," adds the general, "we cannot hold north African bases unless we enjoy the friendship of all the peoples in the Middle East. We must have these peoples' consent to use their bases. Hence, on the diplomatic

plane, constructive changes are absolutely necessary."

Everybody knows this is perfectly true. Do we go on shoving young men into Europe to be killed in a milking contest with Russia, or do we build weapons and friendships that can protect the peace?

Criminals Who Get Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an excellent article entitled "Criminals Who Get Away," written by the outstanding writer Donald P. Wilson, when he was a research psychologist at Fort Leavenworth Penitentiary. This article appeared in the February issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

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

CRIMINALS WHO GET AWAY

(By Donald P. Wilson)

I

The psychopathic personalities that fill our prisons are the least influential members of criminal society. It is an easily demonstrable fact that few of the smart operators are in prison; they are still operating on the outside. It is the dumb operator who gets caught. It is no wonder then that the convict thinks very little better of our conscience on the outside than we do of his. Many of his gripes are legitimate and a great shame on society.

There were three specific reasons why most of the convicts I knew in the penitentiary were not penitent:

1. The capriciousness of the written law and its interpretation.
2. The corruption of law enforcement.
3. The respectability of the white-collar criminal.

The six convicts who served as my assistants at Fort Leavenworth illuminated these reasons for me. Some of their arguments were warped by rationalisation. Some were true and shocking.

The sheer cumbersomeness of the body of written laws is one of its vulnerabilities. Over 375,000 new State laws have been passed in the United States in the last 30 years, and these are in addition to the more than 1,000,000 then existing State, municipal, and Federal laws and ordinances. They are too numerous to enforce. Therefore you are a criminal only if you get caught. The trick is not to get caught: this is a convict's concept of society's concept of a criminal. You hear it on every side. "You know the difference between me and the guy on the outside? I got caught." A man is punished not for his crime but for getting caught. This view implies that crime is not an absolute moral offense, but a legal caprice.

Not only does the decade in which you commit an act determine whether you are a criminal, but the place where it is committed as well. A law which appears on the books in one State may not appear on the books of another, so that by an act you become a criminal in one State but not in another. If the offense appears on the books of both States, the disproportionate sentences of the two States are sometimes staggering. Two men in different States are guilty of arson. The prisoner in Alabama is in for 1 year, the prisoner in North Carolina for 40 years. Perjury carries 4 years in Connecticut, 20 years in New York, life in Maine, death in Missouri, $500 and 40 lashes in Delaware. West Virginia punishes bigamy 16 times as severely as incest; Wyoming and Colorado punish incest 10 times more severely than bigamy.

Another practice that feeds the convict's belief that crime is not absolute, but relative, is the fine system—$5,000 or 3 years; $300 or 90 days. Though debtors' prisons were theoretically abandoned a century ago, 57 percent of those who are in prisons, jails, and penitentiaries are serving sentences because of debt—they cannot pay a fine. Many of the remaining 43 percent would gladly have paid a fine, but they had the bad luck to be sentenced by a judge who didn't levy fines.

It would be difficult to persuade a prisoner that a fine represents punishment in the sense that imprisonment does. Why, he would ask, does every man who can, pay? And why, when a fine is imposed, does the money go into public coffers instead of into some form of restitution for the offense committed? One man pays a fine and goes home to his family. Another goes to prison, and he and his family are ruined.

England and Scotland have solved the problem of fines by the simple expedient of installment payment. Imprisonment for nonpayment of fines in England exceeded 80,000 in 1913 but dropped to 11,000 in 1933, the latter representing largely unemployed and paupers. It seems odd that America, with its mania for installment buying, has not applied this concept to its courts. Nearly a fourth of American imprisonments for inability to pay fines are for amounts less than $10, and 60 percent for fines of less than $20. The fact that laws change in point of time, and have become too cumbersome to be prosecuted, may simply be the toll of civilization and the caprice of the written law. But the matter of fines versus sentence is considerably more sinister in its implications. Is a man to pay for his crimes or his poverty? For his crimes or for getting caught?

II

Other evils affecting the convict are stool pigeons, false arrests, bail bonds, and fixed sentences—rackets which go hand in hand in many large cities in a sorry parade of justice. While there are not many innocent men in penitentiaries, the prisoner's frequent complaint, "I been framed," cannot be too quickly dismissed. One estimate claims that nearly a third of the prison population are serving time for offenses they did not technically commit. They are in on false charges. Either the offender agreed to plead guilty to a lesser charge in exchange for a fixed sentence, or he was actually framed by a stool pigeon in the employ of the police.

The procuring of a fixed sentence is called bargaining. If the district attorney's office knows its case is weak, it may assure its conviction records by throwing a scare into the offender, urging him to plead guilty to a lesser offense in return for a lighter fixed sentence and thus avoid coming to trial. This sounds good to the uninitiated. The offense may be one that the offender actually did commit in the past, or it may represent an unsolved case on the police blotter.

This procedure accomplishes several things. It increases the conviction records of the district attorney and those of the police department. The offender gets off with a lighter prearreed sentence, and often the fixing attorney and all concerned are the richer. A notorious case involved a highjacker who looted a truck of $30,000 worth of silk. The charge was armed robbery, subject to a sentence of ten years to life. The highjacker pleaded guilty to petty larceny, was fined $1 and given 1 year in prison.

A major stumbling block in the way of a convict's developing a respect for the law is society's approval of the stool pigeon.

The stool pigeon in the pay of the police and vice squads in most of our large cities is a common device in effecting false arrests. It is a practice used frequently to apprehend the small-time criminal who otherwise eludes the police. The stool pigeon is given marked money or stolen goods to place on the person of a victim. The victim is then immediately frisked by detectives or police lying in wait. What possible defense can such a victim make?

Sometimes the stool pigeon is paid, and is protected in the continuation of his own pickpocketing or dope peddling racket as long as he is valuable to police in his snitches.

England uses no stool pigeons, yet she convicts 70 percent of her offenders. In 25 years, from 1860 to 1885, England closed 137 of her 193 local prisons through reforms in penal concepts. In another quarter century, from 1910 to 1934, the British Commissioners of Prisons reported that annual prison receptions fell from 186,000 to 56,000. They further reported that these results were attributed to reforms in the criminal law; reduction of long sentences; abolition of solitary confinement (1921), useless labor, and the rule of silence; the introduction of school courses, concerts, and constructive labor; installment payment of fines; and the assignment of the feeble-minded to hospitals instead of prisons. Thus by avoiding recidivism England closed 31 more prisons and has now but 25 on the whole island. She reduced imprisonment 81 percent and crime 43 percent by these reforms. Scotland's record is even better.

The stool pigeon system has many friends among authorities. Most American penitentiaries still defend and use it. Certain it is that as long as the system of giving immunity and protection and money to informers is used, no better system will be devised. That there are better systems should be quite apparent.

Another nefarious practice in some of our big cities is the bail bond racket involving police, bondsman, attorney, and sometimes judge. Texts in criminology explain one type of shakedown in this racket, wherein thousands of innocent nurses, shopgirls, wives, and landladies are paying vice squad members dearly to avoid the publicity growing out of a threatened or false accusation of prostitution.

The racket operates by the stool pigeon placing marked money in plain view, in payment for the alleged immorality, and "escaping" just as the raiding vice squad detail appears on the scene. The woman is then booked on the false charge and released on bail. A shyster attorney agrees to fix the case and keep it out of the papers for an amount, usually a percentage of her bail bond, which in turn may be based on her savings account book or other collateral. If she pays the fee, which is split between the parties involved in the fix, the false charge may be dropped. Or sometimes she is repeatedly "bled," and when she can't continue to pay, she is convicted on the original false charge. A prison term will usually shut her up. Men too are paying heavily to avoid publicity on a false homosexual charge engineered by the vice squad. A citizen would have a rough time battling the perjured testimony of the police in a jury trial.

Other easy preys to false arrest and casual conviction without trial are convicts like two I knew at Fort Leavenworth: Weary Willie, whose chief pastime was riding the rods, and the man with an I. Q. of 33. These are sometimes picked up by the police as a convenient way to close a case lingering on the blotter, and the convict finds himself in prison before he knows what has happened.

Sanford Bates, the former director of the Bureau of Prisons, himself reported the case of an ignorant mountain boy whose conviction was railroaded by a Federal marshal after getting the boy to "plead guilty of not doing it" on the day the revenuers raided a still. "Ah jes' pleaded guilty to not bein' dar, but heah ah is."

In England there is no racket in bonds. Charging for bonds is a criminal offense. Bond may be supplied by friends or any freeholder who will hypothecate his property for the defendant, but no fee may be charged and no reimbursement made.

The practice was not exploited in America until this generation. Now a bondsman has legal protection and is a very busy man. There are, of course, bondsmen who are honest businessmen. But there are bondsmen who are not. If a bondsman is implicated in a fix, he is either at the police station when the victim arrives, or he is phoned by the policeman making the arrest and arrives in a matter of minutes. He sometimes arranges for the hiring of an attorney for the bewildered victim, and procures a financial statement from him or her, so that the bail bond figure can be arrived at by a judge who is in on the fix. Although a bondsman's fees are now set by law, he can always refuse to write the bond in the absence of a bonus, especially if he is tipped off regarding the amount of valuables taken from the victim for safekeeping by a desk sergeant.

Less than 2 percent of forfeited bonds are collected by courts, yet the courts still accept millions of dollars in worthless bonds annually. Of more than $10,000,000 in forfeited bonds in Chicago courts alone during a 5-year period, less than 1 percent was collected. One bondsman, who himself had been arrested 12 times, had forfeited $30,000 in bonds within a year; yet the courts accepted $670,000 more in bonds from him within the same year. He secured them with a $24,000 piece of property on which there was a $31,000 mortgage. This was his only traceable asset, although he netted from $33,000 to $100,000 annually in his bail racket.

Obviously a man who is out on bail has a better opportunity of preparing for trial than a man in jail. The difference between freedom and conviction may be bail, just as it may be one's ability to pay a fine.

Much has been written and documented about the lawless police in many of our large cities, in the use of the third degree, illegal search and seizure, arrest without warrant, holding of persons incommunicado, beating and brutality, and other violations of the Bill of Rights. The offender's first contact with a judicial society is the police. If that contact is constructive and just, the possible salvage of the offender is greatly increased. If that first contact is sadistic and stupid, the hostility of the offender is directed toward all society through the police, because to the offender the police represent society.

In a study of the annual arrests in the major cities of the United States, 47 percent of them are shown to be false, unwarranted, or illegal, and to result in dismissal without charge after interrogation.

Criminals quickly learn to plead guilty to almost anything to avoid the third degree. The fact that the rough stuff is frequently delegated by the police to private detectives, who in most States are not supervised, bonded, or inspected, fools nobody—certainly not the convict. A cartoon which hung in our office for months showed an exhausted police sergeant and two patrolmen dragging a much beaten suspect into the captain's office, stating that the prisoner had finally confessed to murder. "Fine," said the captain, "now hold him until we have a murder."

That there are unimpeachable police departments, district attorneys, and judges throughout the country cannot be disputed. But equally indisputable is the fact that corruption in law enforcement bodies as it has existed in the United States in the last 30 years is a greater threat to a citizen's confidence in and a convict's respect for the law than the open flagrancy of the underworld, which at least is not committed by oath of office to law enforcement.

The fate of the jury system in the United States is another of the sad preoccupations of all our big legal minds. Although through the Bill of Rights and the Constitution we are committed as a people to the right of trial by a jury of peers, less than 10 percent of our cases ever reach a jury. This right is completely and unconstitutionally abrogated by the Army and Navy in the court-martial and in the operation of the growing corps of secret police in America. In Massachusetts only 1.7 percent of cases reach the jury; in New York, 4.7 percent; in Chicago, 3.7 percent; and in St. Louis, 13 percent. About half of these fail of conviction.

The reasons for the inoperability of the right of jury trial are several. Few people can afford the cost of a court trial. Those who can afford it face crowded court dockets which sometimes result in the defendant's serving out his sentence in jail before he can come to trial. A judge cannot try a plea of not guilty; it must be tried by a jury. In the light of the above obstacles it is small wonder that most cases are settled by the defendant's bargaining for a fixed sentence—pleading guilty to a lesser charge and getting the whole thing over with. But suppose the citizenry suddenly began to exercise their right of jury trial. With the intolerable number of laws on our statute books, municipal, State, and Federal, there would hardly be citizens enough in our Commonwealth to sit as jurors.

III

Few of the prisoners at Fort Leavenworth Penitentiary complained that they shouldn't have been serving time. If they were not guilty of the crime for which they were convicted, they freely admitted they they were guilty of others that were never detected. Their attack was on the cupidity of the law that convicts one man and protects another, and on the immorality of society which, having attached a price to almost everything else in life, has also hung a price on crime.

But the last frontier to yield to rehabilitation in the convict's mind is the knowledge that society has hung a price not only on crime but on respectability as well. And this in the form of the white-collar criminal. By this term is meant the man whose antisocial practices flourish with society's approval as well as its protection.

We as a people have become supine about graft and politics going hand in hand. Occasional protest meetings are held, but at elections the same gangs are too often put back in power. The graft and fraud in the regimes of Big Bill Thompson and Anton Cermak in Chicago, Jimmy Walker in New York, Boies Penrose and the Vare brothers in Philadelphia, and the Pendergast machine in Kansas City left the prisoners in the penitentiary shaking their heads over all the diligence displayed in rounding up the petty thieves and forgers.

The box scores of personal bank deposits of police and prosecuting attorneys during these regimes were common knowledge in the penitentiary. Probably the record is held by an attorney for the zoning department in New York City during Walker's mayoralty. The attorney deposited $5,250,000 to his own account in 5 years. A Kings County, N. Y., sheriff banked $520,000, the sheriff of New York $360,000, and his deputy $662,000 in the same period of time. A minor employee of the New York bureau of standards was making $25,000 a month for 12 years on false weights. Currently the Kefauver investigation, Murphy's housecleaning of the New York Police Department, and the grand jury's inquiry into police payoffs in Los Angeles are cases in point.

Our national business philosophy of getting something for nothing; our admiration of the rugged individualists who boast that they can do anything as long as they do it cleverly; our crooked practices which are considered "good business" or "sharp business"; and our rationalization that graft and crookedness are all right "if they don't hurt anybody" are criminal concepts, whether exercised on Wall Street or behind a gunman's mask.

A discussion of abstract criminal character as a cause of crime would be more supportable if these conditions in our national life did not exist. Whom do we mean when we say criminal? The gangster, the white-collar criminal, the corrupt police? Or the small-time criminal who is too often made the scapegoat for his more spectacular brothers? When the man in prison sees society give respectability to the white-collar criminal, and sees law enforcement bodies give protection to big-time criminals, it is not surprising that he looks upon crime not as a moral offense but as a competitive profession, and upon his punishment as gross discrimination on the part of both society and law.

Crime is with us always, on many levels, in many forms. The proportion of the problem it poses is not reflected in the number of crimes on our books or convictions on our police blotters or prisoners in our penitentiaries. It is reflected in the attitude of our people toward what crime is. For what a nation comes to agree upon as being the nature of crime is what determines the nature of her criminals.

Most of us would heartily agree that respect for law is essential to a Nation of peaceful communities. But in order to command respect, the law, both in interpretation and enforcement, must be constant, unimpeachable, and equable. It is no news to the American people that we have been undershooting that precept for the last 30 years. How could fear of punishment deter crime in the thirties, the era of the gangsters not yet closed, when an offender had an 85 percent chance of escaping arrest, a 93 percent chance of escaping conviction, and a 99 percent chance of escaping punishment?

If constancy, integrity, and equability are not reflected in the law, all that is left to respect is the cop's night stick and his third degree. This kind of respect can quickly turn to contempt, both in the law-abiding and the lawless. It is an affront to human dignity and resourcefulness.

Our most serious problem in crime is not the run-of-the-mill convict in a penitentiary. It is the criminal at large who remains so with the knowledge of the populace. It is not reasonable to expect the reformation of small-time criminals, while gangsters operate with political and police protection. The smalltime criminal then becomes only a red herring thrown to the public to feed the illusion that justice is being done. Organized crime could not survive without protection. The small-time criminal knows this, so does the big-time criminal, so do his protectors. So do you and I.

Spain Expects Larger Defense Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "Spain Expects Larger Defense Role," appearing in the Christian Science Monitor for January 30, 1951.

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

SPAIN EXPECTS LARGER DEFENSE ROLE

(By Arno Dosch-Fleurot)

MADRID.—As Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower flew over Spain on his way from Lisbon to Rome there were few in Spain who did not wonder what the general thought as he looked down on the snow-covered plateaus and sierras of Spain.

Even though this country is not a member of that Atlantic Pact, whose military power General Eisenhower was examining, he was doubtless asking himself how Spain could be fitted into European defense.

For Spaniards of all opinions know that today they have more military power than was formerly the case. Their army and fleet were once negligible compared with those of France and Germany, but this has now changed.

OUSTING OF COMMUNISTS

The Spanish Army consists of about 600,000 men with rifle-stage training who could be mobilized at once. It could cover the Pyrenees line of defense. But if the emergency arose, the army could be swelled to 2,400,000, all troops with some military training and with an officer corps which has been rebuilt and augmented ever since the end of the civil war by generals who fought the civil war to a successful conclusion.

It also has been the business of these same generals and their staffs to eliminate all subversive activities in the army and in the country. At times military courts have sat almost constantly trying Communists who either in the ranks of the army or as agents sent from abroad have either tried to organize a Communist movement in the country or to break down discipline in the army.

The Spanish Army has not, in consequence, entered this critical period of history with its ranks weakened by defeatism. It has the normal qualities which reflect the national will to fight and repulse invasion.

There are, of course, in Spain the same differences of opinion as always on the dictatorship of Generalissimo Francisco Franco, but before the threat of invasion there is a solid front.

Yet the Spaniards know that their army could not of itself and in its present state of armament resist very long even with the natural defense line of the Pyrenees, and no matter how heroic the resistance.

EYE ON THE UNITED STATES

Under these circumstances they have been asking themselves how they are to save themselves, and to them General Eisenhower has come to symbolize the will to fight, while the United States is seen as the one source of power and arms that make victory possible.

But they ask, how are they excluded from the Atlantic Pact to get those arms.

The return of an American Ambassador to Madrid and the renewal of diplomatic relations have led them to believe that the diplomatic way is now open. Both governmental circles and the public foresee a new period in American-Spanish relations out of which somehow will come an association in defense.

This idea has not simply come out of the air. There has for some time been a difference between the American attitude toward Spain and that of the European members of the Atlantic Pact. The American Navy has undoubtedly done the most to make the Spanish people feel that the United States is interested in them and their country.

ENTERTAINMENT BY SPAIN

For a year and a half, beginning with the visit of the American Fleet at the end of the Atlantic maneuvers in September 1949 to the Spanish naval port of El Ferrol, there has been a number of definite acts on the part of the American Navy in connection with Spain, the most recent nearly a week of official entertainment of a portion of the American Fleet at Barcelona.

During all this time the two other principal naval powers represented in Spain, the British and the French, have made no such friendly moves.

On the military side, the development of friendly relations has been less evident to the public, but it is generally known that many high-ranking officers of the American Armed Forces have visited Spain, while Spanish officers have visited the American Armed Forces in Germany.

So the conviction has grown in Spain that the United States will put aside political considerations, take an even broader view of European defense than that offered by the Atlantic Pact, and take full advantage of Spain's strategic position.

ANTICIPATIONS LISTED

And once the United States goes into the defense of the Iberian Peninsula, Spain expects it to be thoroughgoing. The Spaniards anticipate in detail:

First, a treaty or a series of treaties such as already exist between the United States and Portugal, giving the United States the use of Spanish naval and air bases.

In exchange they expect Spain to receive the arms and equipment making it possible for Spain by itself to meet any ordinary emergency, and, in the event of great emergency, to have the American Army, Navy, and Air Force cooperating with theirs in the fullest possible manner. In short they anticipate that the United States, by treaty, will work as closely with the defense forces of Spain as it is preparing to do with its fellow members of the Atlantic Pact.

In practice this would mean the development of all the naval bases on the mainland and in the strategic islands of the Mediterranean and Atlantic; the outfitting of the Spanish Navy with all modern devices, the development of the military airfields scattered about Spain until they could handle anything in the air; and the furnishing of all the modern arms the Spanish Army is prepared to use effectively.

The idea is that Spain will become a huge military base, the central control position on the western Mediterranean and Atlantic, in liaison with an equally heavily armed and garrisoned north Africa, outfitted, if it were to come to that, as the principal point of departure for the reconquest of Europe.

The Government Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Powerful Lobby," published in the Oil City Derrick on January 25, 1951.

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

THE MOST POWERFUL LOBBY

In this period of talk and investigations of lobbying and related activities by private business, it may be of interest to review what the Hoover Commission task force on Government publicity and propaganda had to say.

Federal operations in the fields of publicity, public relations, and dissemination of intelligence cost the taxpayers about $166,000,000 a year, it found. Every Federal agency maintains its public relations staff. It also said, "In many cases, public relations work is concealed entirely from routine accounting review, principally by the device of carrying publicity operatives on the roll as supervisors, administrative assistants, and technical experts."

How potent is the Government lobby? Congressman Harness, who headed a committee which worked 15 months looking into Federal pressure groups, said "Everyone in Congress is keenly conscious of the tremendous power of this Government propaganda machine, for he comes in direct personal contact with it every day. He lives with the lobbies, good and bad, which constantly seek to influence the course o. legislation, and he can hardly fail to know that the most powerful, most persistent of them all is the Federal lobby. It works around the clock every day of the year."

There is one more point of importance. Lobbyists for private interests must register with the Government, and their connections and purposes are known to all concerned. The political lobbyist knows no such restriction. He goes merrily on his way, seeking to drum up support in favor of this scheme or that, and the taxpayers foot all the bills. This represents the continuous drive of an official aristocracy to extend its powers and privileges.

The Basis for Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "The Basis for Foreign Policy," published in the Wall Street Journal of December 26, 1950. I urge every Member of the Senate to give careful attention and study to the editorial.

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

THE BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

What should be the basis for the foreign policy of the United States?

President Truman, in what has come to be known as the Truman doctrine, says that it should be the containment of communism, that this Nation should fight communism anywhere, and if necessary everywhere, that it threatens the peace.

Former President Herbert Hoover says that the foundation of our policy must be to preserve this Nation and the Western Hemisphere.

There is an important difference between these two points of view. That difference is now being openly and widely debated for the first time in a silent decade.

The two views need not, of course, conflict always or in every particular. To fight Communist power in particular places can be an essential part of our own defense. The defense of the Western Hemisphere does not preclude, and may require, fighting Soviet

power outside the Western Hemisphere. The two viewpoints can converge.

There is, moreover, similarity of purpose in the two views. The advocates of containment everywhere advocate it to save America. The objective of the others is also to stop communism from engulfing the whole world, including ourselves. They are all honorable men.

Nevertheless, the difference is vital—not for what is intended but for what results.

The Truman doctrine begins by accepting United States responsibility for defending all parts of the world from Soviet encroachment; this becomes primary policy. In effect, the United States becomes a Nation without differentiated frontiers. The frontier becomes one gigantic circle around Russia's present sphere. And since the doctrine is to defend that circle everywhere, the relative values of the various points on the circle become lost. All points become more or less of equal value.

The next progression, an unintended one, is that the responsibility of other peoples to defend themselves gradually becomes secondary.

Their self-defense is, of course, definitely desirable. But since containment everywhere is viewed as essential to our ultimate safety, we soon think we must defend other countries regardless of their own efforts. And the other countries soon begin to think they do us a favor to let us defend them.

At this stage decision becomes confused. Korea, let us say, cannot be weighed on any balance. It is a point on the circle; it is a part of the general responsibility we have assumed, and so we fight for it whether or not it has great value in terms of the larger fight.

So long as the policy is to contain everywhere, there is simply no standard to distinguish among Korea, Indochina, or the Rhine—all become Koreas if the Communists choose to make them so.

From this kind of thinking there is another progression, also unintended but also inevitable.

Unconsciously we begin to make the defense of this Nation a subordinate consideration in weighing any proposed action.

If the policy is to contain everywhere and there is a threat anywhere, what room is there to debate whether to fight this particular threat will strengthen or weaken our own defenses? Unless we are to abrogate the policy, there is no choice but to fight the threat anywhere. Action is automatic. The United States has then no choice but to intervene in Korea—or any other place.

The Truman doctrine thus puts the defense of this Nation second in the minds of the men whose trust is the defense of this Nation.

With the defense of this Nation as the paramount policy all this is changed. From this premise the cost of any action would be measured against the gain; the risks of intervention in any Korea would be measured against the risks of abstention.

Men would still differ in judgment. They would still debate the intervention in Korea, the rearmament of Germany, the reinforcement of Europe. All these things would still be difficult matters to decide. Even from the Hoover premise, men would differ on the Hoover proposals as to what is best or prudent in a particular place.

But in the debate men would have a common plane of reference—the safety and preservation of this country. There would then be something to measure against, there would be a standard for making value judgments, a balance on which to weigh military and political opinions.

The policy of containment leaves us no choices. By trying to contain everywhere we become vulnerable every here and we can be truly strong nowhere. In the name of saving the world this policy deprives us of the freedom to seek out what is best to save America.

The policy of putting the safety of this Nation first is the only on which offers us a way of wisely measuring our strength against the task—or, indeed, offers any way of measuring at all. Therefore it, and not the policy of containment everywhere, ought to be paramount in the foreign policy of the United States.

It may be argued by honorable men that this reversal of emphasis ignores morality. For in its application there may come a time when the United States, measuring what is best for her own safety, may have to make the harsh decision of abandoning temporarily some cherished bastion. And the greater obligation, it is truly said, is to preserve the world from barbarism.

To this we can only reply that there is in the world today only one power that stands in the way of that barbarism. So long as the United States stands the way is barred. So soon as it falls, the whole world will be engulfed.

It will profit neither ourselves nor civilization to risk the destruction of that power in the name of saving civilization. To pursue in the name of morality a course which weakens the power of the United States would be the true immorality.

A foreign policy which puts anything ahead of the preservation of this Nation betrays the Nation and civilization.

Sale of Surplus Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the New York Times of January 29, 1951, carried an interesting story on the revenue realized by the Treasury from the sale of surplus ships since the end of hostilities of World War II. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SELLING THE SHIPS

For 5 years, after it became evident that the Nation would have a tremendous surplus of merchant shipping left over from the frantic wartime building project, we have been disposing of tonnage to all comers. The final report of Vice Admiral Edward L. Cochrane, Federal Maritime Administrator, makes interesting reading. It is particularly gratifying since it relates the flow of money back to the National Treasury.

Since the Ship Sales Act of 1946 the old Maritime Commission and its successor agency, the Maritime Administration, have sold to American and foreign buyers 1,960 surplus ships for $1,728,821,057. Other money has been returned to the Government for charter hire of Federal tonnage. Not counting the cost of extra tooling and new shipyards for the unparalleled wartime building program, the 5,500 vessels constructed cost about $13,000,000,000; we still have more than 1,800 vessels in the reserve fleet. Most of them are Liberty ships, the misnamed ugly ducklings. The finer ships are in operation, owned by United States-flag operators who bought, out of the disposal program, a total of 847 carriers. Few ports in the world have missed seeing the C-type freighters, high-quality ships with records of excellent performance.

It might appear to the layman that, with ships waiting in mothballs, we are ready for the next emergency, but that is a dangerous assumption. We need new ships for two reasons: we cannot afford to let our war-built fleet grow obsolescent in a block, for competitive reasons; and for our next emergency we must plan with 20-knot enemy submarines in mind. Admiral Cochrane has already called for bids on fast new freighters that can speed great distances without convoy. To build the first 50 of these craft will cost but a fraction of the money recaptured in the bargain sales program. And in war or peace they will earn, as did the valiant Libertys and other standard ships of the Second World War, the last dollar of their cost and keep.

The Proposed Increase in Tax Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, several days ago I received a very ably written letter from Mr. Oscar H. Curry, one of my constituents in Riverton, N. J., dealing with our tax problem.

Since the letter offers some thought-provoking suggestions, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I hope all Members of the Senate will both read and heed some of the admonitions contained in the letter.

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

RIVERTON, N. J., *January 15, 1951.*

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: The administration is indicating that it intends to ask the Congress to increase personal income tax rates in the middle- and low-income groups 30 percent. I wish to protest such action because it will not produce the required income the Government needs and will accelerate the already serious inflation trend.

Personal income taxes at present are producing about twenty billions of our Federal income; an increase of 30 percent will increase such receipts only six billions. Such an amount principally collected by payroll deductions will be considered an increase in cost of living by labor and be the stimulant for another round of wage increases; increasing the cost of Federal expenditures and leaving the budget in as unbalanced a position as it was before. Experience has proven that increases in wages to adjust for cost-of-living rises produce a perpetual-motion inflation.

Gross corporation earnings are running approximately thirty billions per year. The administration indicates it will ask an 8 percent (47 percent to 55 percent) increase in the corporate tax rate. Such an increase is again insignificant when compared with the Government's requirements for additional income. Such a tax, too, would be inflation-

ary since it would remove much of the stimulant (profits) to be gained from economical operation. This would result in increased costs and establish the basis for increased selling prices which would become the foundation for another round of wage increases—again, perpetual motion inflation.

The proposed increased taxes (six billions from individuals plus two and a half billions from corporations) would produce but eight and a half billions of additional revenue, less than half of the amount required to balance the budget. This, once more, will react to violently motivate the forces of inflation in our economy.

If a subversive were given carte blanche control over our entire economy, he could not concoct a more lethal device for our destruction than the administration tax proposals.

As an alternate, a national defense tax of 10 percent on consumer expenditures should be proposed. Such a tax will add between eighteen and twenty billions to Federal income which is sufficient to balance a Federal budget of seventy to seventy-two billions. It should be assessed only at the consumer level and should be collected as a tax at the time payment is made. It thus would not be a hidden tax and the individual would be mindful of his contribution to the national defense. The Congress should insert in the legislation that this national defense tax could not be used as basis for wage or price increases. Cost-of-living data would not include this tax since the law should specify that quoted prices may not include it.

A national defense tax of this nature would not be inflationary since it could not be used as a basis of supporting wage and price increases. It is flexible to the Federal budget requirements. Such a tax would penalize all alike and it would yield a further tax on the higher income group which cannot be reached by the administration's proposals (consumer expenditures increase as a consumer's income increases).

Another factor to be considered is the probable effect of the tax on the individual. The administration's proposal for individuals would increase the amount withheld from the employee's pay; in addition to its inflationary reaction, such a tax would discourage the individual in an all-out defense effort. It would lessen his willingness to work longer hours because the withholding would seem to reduce his pay for such effort. If the worker did not suffer the additional withholding, he would have the discretion of paying or not paying the national defense tax by restricting his expenditures (another inflation brake).

It is my opinion, the most potent enemy we face is not communism but inflation. If we defeat inflation, we will defeat communism because communism could not stand exposure to the prosperity offered by our democratic ideals. I strongly urge your support of a national defense tax based on consumer expenditures.

Yours very truly,

O. H. CURRY.

Lewis Schwellenbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which is in the nature of a short and very fine biography of one of the most distinguished former Members of this body ever to serve in the Senate of the United States. He was a Senator from my State and a former Secretary of Labor—Mr. Lewis Schwellenbach. I commend the reading of the article to all those who served with him and those who loved him.

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

MR. SECRETARY

(By Harry J. Martin)

Our United States Government has three branches, executive, legislative, and judicial. To secure a high position in any one of these departments is something, but to be a member of each, in the short period of a dozen years, is worthy of considerable mention. Our great citizen, Lewis B. Schwellenbach achieved this quite unusual record. He became a United States Senator, a United States District Judge and a United States Secretary of Labor.

I first met Lew when he was a young practicing lawyer in Seattle, active in his American Legion and, subsequently, its commander, in the early twenties.

Born in Minnesota, Lew grew up in Spokane and later made a good record at the University of Washington law school. He was King County chairman of the Democratic central committee from 1928 to 1930. He was an unsuccessful candidate for governor in 1932, when Clarence D. Martin was nominated and elected, but when 1934 rolled around, Lew was a candidate for the United States Senate. He defeated John C. Stevenson in the primaries and downed Republican Reno Odlin in the finals and was off for Washington, D C. He and Harry S. Truman met at the swearing-in ceremonies and became friends. Here Lew spent a hectic 6 years and broke his friendship with Senator Bone.

Lew was a great speaker and really enjoyed the Senate. Vice President Garner assigned to him some difficult jobs in the world's greatest debating club and he always made good. He was a great favorite among his colleagues. For instance, on one occasion he appeared at the Young Men's Democratic Club's annual banquet in Seattle and brought with him Senators Truman, of Missouri; Minton, of Indiana; and Chavez, of New Mexico; and I recall Senator Minton saying, "Whenever any issue comes on the floor of the Senate we always know where old Lew stands."

Like most lawyers, Lew had a yearning to be a judge; so when a vacancy showed up Schwellenbach accepted F D. R.'s offer to be United States district judge in Spokane in 1940, and during Judge Schwellenbach's term in Spokane a Seattle lawyer took occasion to follow his work there. He told me that nowhere had he read briefs more profound in their reasoning.

In this district judgeship Lew served until his friend, Harry S. Truman, became President in 1945. President Truman urged Schwellenbach to accept a place in his Cabinet—that of Secretary of Labor.

This job was a tough one. During the 10 or 12 years prior to Lew's taking over, because of the war and other conditions, the Labor Department had become sadly decentralized. Secretary Schwellenbach set himself to the task of reorganization and worked like a Trojan. During this period he made several trips home and I had brief visits with him. He looked well, I thought, despite reports of ill-health. He kept up his confining work and, with no advance news of his illness, the radio flashed the report of his death.

After a service in Washington, D. C., Lew's body was brought to Seattle by air. The old Trinity Church was crowded to the doors. At Washelli Cemetery all the old party people from Governor Wallgren down were on hand. A soldier blew taps and I recalled all the life Lew had crowded into a few short years and thought, "What price glory?"

Northwest Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Governor Speaks for Idaho." This editorial has to do with the activity of one C. Girard Davidson, a former Under Secretary of the Interior, as he goes in and about the State of Idaho on a problem which is of profound interest to the people of the State of Idaho. Written and printed by Idaho's oldest newspaper, the Idaho Daily Statesman, of Boise, I commend it to my colleagues for interesting and intelligent reading regarding a problem which must be met head-on in the State on Idaho.

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

THE GOVERNOR SPEAKS FOR IDAHO

Governor Jordan may be occupying the limelight presently from the fact that he is a sharp man with a pencil but there should be no overlooking of his stand on water and natural resources. Here the Governor is for Idaho's best interests all the way.

Interviewed Tuesday following a meeting in his office attended by water users and C. Girard Davidson, a former Under Secretary of the Interior who is now making a special report to the Secretary of the Interior on northwest power development, Governor Jordan laid it on the line. He's for private development, with private funds which would pay State taxes. He is opposed to Government socialism and the blind theory that the Federal Treasury is a bottomless pit. The Governor is one of the hard-headed type of men who knows that every dollar the Federal Government has to spend is taken from you and you in taxes.

Mr. Davidson, who has been coming to Idaho for several years in behalf of the Columbia Valley Administration (Authority) and who now seems to be operating with a new approach, but still under the steam of Federal cash, knows perfectly well that Idaho wants no part of any scheme he happens to favor. Not enough Idahoans agree with Mr. Davidson's dreamy ideas to make a quorum for a poker game and Mr. Davidson just isn't going to be able to sell more Idahoans with any honeyed approach. Fact of the matter, Idaho doesn't consider Mr. Davidson either an authority on Federal resources or even a resident of the western country where the resources remain free. He can come here the rest of his life and he will only determine Idahoans more and more that what he has to offer is exactly what we do not want, now or any time in the future, "wah or no wah."

The fact that Mr. Davidson found this out from Governor Jordan (which we are confident he did) will neither stop his effort or

cut him loose from spending your tax money for his campaign to choke something down Idaho's throat that the State simply won't swallow.

Every time Mr. Davidson comes to Idaho he will bring along the old CVA glint in his eye. Defeated in the main idea, he now has substitutes. Fortunately, Idaho remains on guard. To remain a free Idaho it can never stop.

Russia: The Giant on Clay Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian Bulletin for January 15, 1951 contains a pertinent editorial on the vulnerability of Communist Russia. Our Government should be exploiting the suggestions contained in it which I insert at this point:

THE GIANT ON CLAY FEET

On a number of occasions this publication endeavored to point out that Soviet Russia, despite its superficial show of strength and its geographical extent, is not as strong as it appears. If only to help dispel the pessimism and defeatism that threatens to become widespread in America, we must again declare that unbridgeable weaknesses are to be found in Russia's economy, industrial output, social and political structures, and above all, in its predatory nature. It has become essential that the entire west recognize and assess these weaknesses. It has also become essential that the west capitalize upon them by all means to the fullest extent.

The economic and military strengths and weaknesses of Soviet Russia are ably summarized in a booklet edited by Mr. John F. Stewart, chairman of the Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, Scotland. The booklet itself is a compilation of reports presented by the various delegates of the peoples subjected by Soviet Russia at the Congress of Independence Movements, held June 12–14, 1950. The delegates came from such countries as Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Caucasus, Kazakia, Croatia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Serbia, Turkestan, and Ukraine.

Upon the basis of these reports of conditions in the countries under the Soviet heel, it is definitely established that Russia is not invincible, that the west has too long been misled by what reduces to Russian propaganda, and that the power Russia possesses has been built up mainly through utter misunderstanding of Russia's nature and methods by the west.

ATOMIC BOMB NOT ENOUGH

The consensus of the reports is that Russian aggression will not be deterred by the threat of the atom and hydrogen bombs, but by a new faith of all freedom-loving peoples and a renaissance of religion and of national idealism. Otherwise the ideal of materialistic communism will prevail by default.

At least one opportunity for the renaissance will arise at the time that Soviet Russia launches an all-out attack upon the free world. If the west can draw fresh strength from its roots, and confront the Kremlin fearlessly, Soviet Russia is doomed to ultimate defeat and destruction. The very fact that it oppresses millions of alien peoples, breeds the germs of this destruction.

But the west must be extremely wise as well, should it wish to win these peoples to its side. The appalling blunders committed with respect to them prior to the present Soviet-American crisis must not be repeated.

THE POWERFUL WEAPON IN OUR HANDS

When war comes, or preferably before, the oppressed nations must receive unequivocal recognition of their existence as national and ethnic entities, and above all, of their inalienable right to the fruits of freedom and national self-determination. Then, fired by patriotism and the love of their native soil, these nations might muster armies of millions.

By giving full and unreserved support to the non-Russian peoples, we would be striking at the very base of the Russian totalitarian structure. Apart from the question of manpower, these nations possess great natural resources and economic wealth. Without such, Russian imperialism would be deprived of its impetus and power. The coal, iron, manganese, and wheat of Ukraine, the mineral ores of the Crimea, the petroleum, manganese, and subtropical products of the Caucasus, the nonferrous metals and the coal of Turkestan, the petroleum and metals of the area between the Volga and the Urals, and the timber of Byelorussia—all these riches are now being devoured by the Russians in order to extend and solidify their totalitarian imperialism.

In agriculture, too, the non-Russian countries possess superiority in the cultivation of sugar beet, cotton, silk, tobacco, tea, rice, and citrus fruits. Ukraine alone produces over 75 percent of the sugar of the entire U. S. S. R., while Turkestan produces 91 percent of the cotton, the remaining 9 percent being produced by Azerbaijan, Crimea, and Southern Ukraine.

As a result the non-Russian countries have tremendous industrial potentialities. For the nonce, however, their products are funneled into Soviet Russia's armament plants and workshops.

MILITARY POTENTIAL

From the military viewpoint, Soviet Russia's power is extremely sensitive to any outside influence, since the great majority of its armed forces are unreliable and in fact can be turned against Russia by proper political and psychological handling. It is certain that millions of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Caucasians, and others, once assured of a free and decent life in a liberated land, will not fight for Moscow. It is foregone that they would fight against it.

According to the proceedings of the Congress, in the event of war, there will be over 10,000,000 militarily fit Ukrainians in Ukraine and outside it; half of them may be put in the Soviet armies and the other half used in the other branches of the Soviet apparatus. But whether in uniforms or in working clothes, these people will be with us, as will the other non-Russian peoples, because they hate Soviet Russia's enslaving hand. Hating Soviet Russia and craving their freedom, they constitute an overwhelming force, which the West must strengthen and utilize fully in order to destroy Soviet Russia and thus save itself.

From the geopolitical viewpoint, the non-Russian nations present a highly significant picture as well. Most of them lie on the periphery of the U. S. S. R., and hence are accessible to the armies of the west. The Carpathian basin, populated chiefly by Ukrainians, offers the crossing the strategic roads leading toward the east, south, and northeast.

Ukraine's geopolitical position, protruding into the heart of the European territories now under Soviet Russia's control, opens the way toward the Don and the Caucasus, while her river system connects the land with the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. This but underscores the highly important position of the non-Russian countries, among which Ukraine, because of its population, natural resources, and its geopolitical significance, is the most outstanding.

In the light of these facts, as attested to by the spokesmen of the oppressed nations, Soviet Russia becomes something less than an invincible enemy. While the iron curtain has served to shut out the west from the inmates of the cemetery of nations, it has also performed the no less vital function of shutting off Soviet Russia from our view.

For our own survival, it has become imperative for us to riddle this curtain with truth and to assure enslaved peoples of justice.

Only then will the Giant on Clay Feet assume his proper and puny stature.

Tribute to a Great World Figure: F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it is no exaggeration to say that in all history there has been no one man so beloved in his lifetime by the millions upon millions of human beings who toil and struggle unknown to fame or distinction, and so bitterly hated by the thousands of specially privileged creatures who, in Jefferson's memorable phrase, "ride booted and spurred upon the backs of the people," as Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Because of the near-idolatry bestowed on the magic name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt by the common people everywhere, and perhaps too because of the insensate hatred of the same name by the secure few, our late President has already assumed, in the folk memory of the people, a halo of deification which he himself would not have liked.

We think of him now in company with the greatest of men—with Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, with Moses, Solon, Aristotle—though he has been gone from us only five short years.

DYNAMIC CHAMPION OF LIVING DEMOCRACY

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the apotheosis of the best kind of American pragmatism. He was the dynamic champion of a living, growing, expanding democracy. He held out as an attainable ideal, as have other great Americans, the hope of realization of the opposed but complementary goals of the democratic way of life: freedom and equality.

The genius of this great American was the genius of a great America: to make things better, but not to destroy what was already good.

With the noble political idealism which animated the founding fathers and the succeeding exponents of freedom and equal opportunity, he combined a charm of personality seldom equaled by the sons of man.

MEMORABLE TRIBUTES

Of the many tributes to Franklin Delano Roosevelt which appeared to mark the observance of his birthday on January 29, it seems to me that the

column by Walter Winchell, published in the Washington Post of January 30, most happily and memorably caught the Roosevelt spirit.

Like so many of us, Walter Winchell's own life and philosophy was changed and shaped by the Roosevelt impact. F. D. R. had a tremendous gift for formulating the unformulated thinking of millions of people, and for those with articulate gifts of expression the collision of ideas was often pyrotechnic. A whole body of American literature was founded on the reaction of eager intellects to the Roosevelt leadership.

It is with real gratitude to Walter Winchell for his Roosevelt column of 1951 that I insert the article in the RECORD:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

F. D. R

Historians frequently evaluate leaders solely on the basis of their public records. The resulting portraits have the quality of marble statues—impressive but cold. History, of course, is not a mere compilation of dates, speeches, treaties, and charters. It is composed of people equipped with human frailties and attributes. And these characteristics often play a major role in domestic and international decisions. To understand history it is necessary to understand the personalities of those who make it. Newspapermen call it human interest. Franklin Roosevelt was intensely personal. He always translated abstract principles in terms of human problems His genuine affection for people was his most conspicuous characteristic. And the feeling was cordially reciprocated, not only by his friends but by millions of strangers.

F D R once noted that his discussion with mill-workers gave him a deeper insight into the meaning of an economic depression than theories expounded by economists.

The many-faceted Roosevelt personality defied the analysis of his closest friends. However, there was an apparent trait they could all detect: His supreme self-assurance. F. D. R.'s infectious smile was not a vote-getting ornament; it reflected his inner warmth. He was an innate optimist. Even during the darkest days of the war he never succumbed to despondency. His jubilant spirit was continually unfurled—and he carried it like a banner. "Some people see clouds and think of storms," he once remarked. "But I have seen clouds form beautiful sunsets."

Despite the torrent of books, the architects of the Roosevelt story have scarcely sketched the foundation. There remains a mountainous mass of material for historians to assess. For 37 years F. D. R. saved everything, from a youngster's postcard requesting an autograph to crackpot letters. His administration was completely documented. Even the thousands of Christmas cards he received were neatly filed.

Tragedy is the handmaiden of agony, but it also inspires lasting exaltation in those who triumph over it. The most tragic incident in F. D. R.'s life had its blessed aspects both for himself and our Nation. His lengthy bout with polio gave him time for contemplation and an opportunity to forage his philosophy. The physical affliction amplified his spiritual power. He emerged from his illness with a deeper sense of humility, patience, and courage. Roosevelt's malady gave him a wider understanding of the social and political ills burdening humanity. The strength he lost in his legs he gained in heart. A man of great personal valor, he had one fear. It stemmed from his infirmity, which prevented mobility. He dreaded being caught in a fire.

His gregarious nature revolted against pompous frills which impeded friendly relations. F. D. R. cut through the icy exterior of diplomatic formalities by dispensing with customary stilted speeches of greeting for new envoys. He welcomed them as friends with light-hearted conversation.

Never in history was there a closer personal relationship between the heads of two nations than the friendship between Roosevelt and Churchill. It was based on mutual respect and affection. A striking illustration of their informality is this merry tale: Churchill once emerged from the bathroom stark naked as F. D. R. entered his bedroom. Winston quipped, "The Prime Minister of Great Britain has nothing to conceal from the President of the United States."

He was a devoted father until the pressing responsibilities of the war years forced him to neglect his paternal duties. Momentous official problems devoured almost all of his energy and most of his time. Consequently, he was almost completely cut adrift from his family. F. D. R. was aware of the loneliness attached to the stern functions of high public office. He went into the public domain. And his family became the American people.

He was one of the fortunate few who was completely fulfilled in his job He frankly reveled in public adulation, and the political give-and-take increased his zest for life. He accepted the honors and drama that come with the Presidency with almost childlike exuberance. And he faced challenges with the confidence of a champion. Of course, what his friends described as confidence—some foes called arrogance.

His remarkable political acumen was rooted in his knowledge of human nature. When he was New York's Governor he arrived at his office accompanied by a friend. A number of men were in the anteroom. He paused as he passed through and offered an ancient quip. His friend later remarked that it was a very old joke.

"I know," Roosevelt chuckled. "But I wanted to find out which of those fellows wanted favors. They were the ones who laughed."

He had a passion for simplicity. F. D. R. slept on an iron bed with a thin, hard mattress and used an old gray shawl for a blanket. He was a moderate drinker and a small eater. Chain-smoking was his chief vice. F. D. R. originally intended becoming a midshipman, but his father dissuaded him. Of such minor quirks of fate is history made. He loved the sea, and took great pride in his seamanship. Next to stamp collecting, his pet hobby was conversation.

Roosevelt's jaunty spirit was expressed in his love for humor. He relished the company of witty companions F. D. R. could define his political tenets in a single crackling line: "I am not trying to muzzle the upper dog. But I want to take the underdog off a leash."

Fearing it might disrupt his close attachment with his mother, F. D. R. did not tell her about his courtship until the date the engagement was announced. He had known Eleanor (a distant cousin) since he was four. Their marriage attracted wide attention. President Theodore Roosevelt gave the bride away. She was his niece.

He was a devout man who knew many Bible passages by heart. He once explained why he did not worship publicly more often. "I can do anything in the goldfish bowl of the President's life, but I'll be hanged if I can say my prayers in it. It bothers me to be looked at by all the tourists in Washington when I go to church."

Here is one of history's little known ironies: While serving as Assistant Navy Secretary he formed a friendship with another Government official, which lasted several years. They had numerous ideals in common and spent many happy weeks together traveling through the United States and Europe. His companion's name, Herbert Hoover.

This was F. D. R.'s reply to a reporter who asked him to explain his philosophy: "I am a Christian, Democrat, and human being." And the greatest of these was his warm humanity. It isn't just his statesmanship and leadership that millions miss. What made the grief of his passing so deep and lasting was that he took so much of you—and left even more—of himself.

Freedom is such a beautiful American word because it contains the inspiring letters: F. D. R.

Lost 400,000,000 Allies in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Freda Utley in Spotlight points out a few salient facts about the fall of the Nationalist Government of China. Chiang Kai-shek was our friend, and still is, but in 1946 Stalin tried to steal him from us by promising the return of industrial machinery that had been stripped from plants in Russia. In spite of this promise, which was a considerable inducement, Chiang Kai-shek refused to do business with Russia. On March 5, 1946, he rejected the Soviet offer. It was Truman and Marshall, however, who put an embargo on the shipment of military goods to China, with the result that the Chinese Communists overran China.

Members of this body should be interested in this article. It is an answer to the State Department's propaganda picture: Why Korea? The answer to that question is found in a review of events in China since 1946, and prior thereto to the Yalta Conference in 1945. The article follows:

HOW WE LOST 400,000,000 ALLIES

(By Freda Utley)

A fitting epitaph for the tomb of United States interests in the Far East is either "Too little and too late," or "They knew not what they did." Whichever inscription one chooses, the record shows that it was ignorance or political ambition or Communist sympathies in the State Department which brought China behind the iron curtain. It was the United States which first put Soviet Russia in a position from which Stalin could dominate China. At Yalta, President Roosevelt not only broke pledges to Chiang Kai-shek to return Manchuria to China. He also secretly agreed to let Russia step into Japan's shoes.

Chiang never once doubted that he should be loyal to the west. He fought Japan single-handed for 5 years before, by the tragedy of Pearl Harbor, he became America's ally. Yet, far from winning the friendship of America, he lost the much-needed bulwark of American aid. It was perfectly clear that the official American attitude was not one of interest in the survival of China as an independent nation opposed to communism. What critics of Chiang did not know, or did not want to know, was that he had every opportunity to play Stalin's game and save China by at least staying on as head of a puppet government.

The story of Stalin's efforts to win Chiang Kai-shek over to his side has never been made public in America. In a supreme effort to appease the United States, Chiang and his foreign office were silent when by shouting aloud they might have saved China.

In January 1946, just as General Marshall was launching his mission to compel the Nationalist Government to accept the Communists into their ranks on the latter's terms, Chiang Kai-shek's son, Chiang Ching-kuo, was in Moscow conferring with Marshal Stalin. At this time the Chinese National Government was facing the refusal of the Red Army in Manchuria to observe the terms of the 1945 Sino-Soviet Treaty. The Soviet Government had promised noninterference in China's internal affairs and would "render to China moral support and aid in military supplies and other material resources, such support and aid to be given entirely to the National Government as the Central Government of China" (Chiang's government).

China paid a high price for that promise. She had to give up Port Arthur and give Russia joint ownership of the Manchurian railways. The Soviet never even pretended honoring this agreement. Its representatives in Manchuria declared they would transfer responsibility "to whatever existing military authorities" they found on the spot. The only "existing military authorities" were, of course, Chinese Communist forces.

It was in this situation that Chiang Kai-shek sent his son to talk with Stalin. Chiang Ching-kuo had spent many years in Moscow. He had a Russian wife and on the whole he was friendly to the Soviet Union. Stalin was not at all unfriendly to young Chiang. He proposed that if the Nationalist Government of China would collaborate with Soviet Russia against America, he would instruct the Chinese Communists to submit to Chiang Kai-shek and enter a coalition government in which the Kuomintang should maintain its ascendance. Provided American influence and business interests were excluded from Manchuria, he would return the billion dollars of machinery removed by the Red Army in Manchuria and thus restore Manchuria as the workshop of the Far East. Specifically, he proposed that all Manchurian industries be monopolized by a joint Sino-Soviet authority.

Shortly before Stalin made this offer to Chiang's son, the economic adviser to the Russian commander in Manchuria formally submitted the same proposal. Chiang Kai-shek's representative in Manchuria was handed a list of 154 plants, comprising 80 percent of Manchuria's heavy industry, which Stalin suggested should be jointly operated by Russia and China. The list included airfields. The Sino-Soviet corporations to be set up were to operate for 30 years with a 50-50 share for Russia and China. China was warned that if Russia's proposal were rejected the Red Army would remain in Manchuria. On January 21, 1946, the offer was renewed in Chungking.

These offers were not published in the western world. When I was in Chungking and Shanghai, in this critical period, I tried to persuade the Chinese Foreign Minister, Wang Shieh-chieh, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek himself, that China's one hope lay in revealing the truth to the American public. I got nowhere. Wang Shieh-chieh said to me: "The Polish Government protested and look what happened to Poland. It is better to be patient and make sacrifices than to risk extinction by protesting. Since we ourselves cannot fight Russia, we must do what America wants, hoping that the United States will restrain Russia if we do everything which America wants us to do."

I must confess I had no answer to this argument. Perhaps China can be condemned for the inadequacy of her foreign policy. Perhaps she should have been realistic and not trusted us so implicitly. But how can we explain our betrayal of our own interests in the Far East?

Apparently Chiang Kai-shek was confident that America would support China if the Communists attacked in violation of the terms of the treaty. So, on March 5, 1946, he rejected Stalin's offer. His reward was General Marshall's embargo on arms aid to Nationalist China. Cornered, he again accepted Stalin's invitation to visit him in Moscow in late September 1946. But when Gen. Nikolai Rushchin, the Soviet military attaché, made it clear that no compromise with Russia was possible unless China agreed to exclude America from Manchuria, Chiang canceled the visit to Moscow.

Over 2 years later, General Rushchin, now Soviet Ambassador to China, admitted that Chiang Kai-shek's failure to visit Moscow in 1946 was due to the Generalissimo's loyalty to America, for he said that Chiang had decided not to visit Stalin because of "the return of General Marshall to China with his pockets stuffed with American checks."

This accusation was, of course, ridiculously untrue. Far from bribing Chiang to resist Soviet enticements, Marshall had clamped an embargo on American shipments of arms and ammunition to China in an effort to force Chiang to come to terms with the Communists. Chiang Kai-shek's loyalty to America ruined him and his Government. Because he refused to agree to the exclusion of American interests from Manchuria, this territory was converted into the base for Communist operations, first against China, then against us in the Korean war. Throughout this period of warfare against Nationalist China, the Communists received powerful assistance from some 65,000 Korean troops, under Li Hung-kwang, and trained by Russian officers, some of whom were veterans of Stalingrad. The fighting abilities of the North Koreans, who killed or wounded nearly 40,000 Americans in 1950, were due in large part to their experience in fighting our Chinese allies.

Substitute for Blood Plasma Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the wonderful discovery recently made at Marquette University. As a result of the experiments in the Marquette University Medical School, it now appears that it may be possible to substitute okra for blood plasma to replace blood losses in patients suffering from shock, burns, or bleeding.

If this use of okra proves successful in human beings as it has already proved successful in dogs, medicine will have made great strides for its simplifying the methods of assisting people who need external supplementary blood supplies.

I include herewith two articles, one which appeared in the January 28 edition of the Washington Evening Star, and another which appeared in the January 28 edition of the Milwaukee Journal:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 28, 1951]

SUBSTITUTE FOR BLOOD PLASMA MADE OF OKRA FOUND EFFECTIVE

MILWAUKEE, January 27.—A substitute for blood plasma made of okra, a green vegetable plant, was announced tonight by Marquette University.

Dr. John Hirschboeck, dean of the Marquette Medical School, said the discovery was made by Dr. Hiram B. Benjamin, anatomy instructor. The substitute of powdered okra, he added, has been used successfully in dogs and is being purified to meet the standards of the Federal Food and Drugs Act for trial on human patients.

Plasma, the liquid part of blood before clotting, is needed to replace blood losses in patients suffering from shock, burns, or bleeding. Whole human blood also is used.

Dr. Benjamin, experimenting with okra in the treatment of ulcers, made his discovery while working on a test dog. The animal was under anesthesia after a previous experiment in which it was bled. A huge injection of the okra product into the dog's blood stream revived the animal. Subsequent experiments with dogs confirmed the scientist's theory.

Okra is a green vegetable very common in the Southern States. It grows 2 to 8 feet in height and bears pods 4 to 6 inches in length.

According to Dr. Benjamin, the substitute for plasma was prepared by grinding the pods and then removing the waxes and fats with ether and alcohol.

Unlike human plasma, the okra substitute need not be refrigerated for storage.

Working with Dr. Benjamin in the development were Dr. Harry K. Ihrig, vice president in charge of research at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; Walter Zeit, director of Marquette's anatomy department; and Ronald Roth, a Marquette student.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 28, 1951]

BLOOD PLASMA SUBSTITUTE DEVELOPED AT MARQUETTE—PRODUCT IS MADE FROM OKRA BY SCIENTIST AT UNIVERSITY—TESTS INDICATE ADVANTAGES

A cheap and limitless source of lifesaving blood plasma has been discovered in a commongarden vegetable by a Marquette University Medical School research team.

The Marquette researchers found in okra—the gumbo in chicken gumbo soup—a substitute that is said to be better than the original.

Plasma is the fluid portion of the blood before clotting. Administered as a transfusion to victims of shock after injury, surgery, bomb blast, or other tissue damage, it is an invaluable aid to survival. Heretofore, its only source has been whole human blood.

SAME BENEFICIAL EFFECTS

In tests on animals, the okra substitute appears to have the same beneficial effects as plasma.

It does not carry a harmful virus as some plasma does.

It is stable, and can be stored for long periods without refrigeration.

It can be prepared as a powder for storage. Less than an ounce of the powder, mixed with sterile salt water, is the equivalent of a quart of plasma.

It can be produced with existing facilities in drug-processing plants and some food-processing factories.

DISCOVERED BY DR. BENJAMIN

The plasma substitute was discovered by Dr. Hiram B. Benjamin, a member of the anatomy department staff at the Marquette Medical School. He was helped by Dr. Harry K. Ihrig, formerly a physical chemist at the Globe Steel Tubes Co., and now vice president in charge of research at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. Dr. Donald Roth, Slinger, Wis., a chemist, who is a medical student, also assisted. The research was coordinated by Dr. Walter Zeit, head of the anatomy department.

The need for plasma or a substitute in the event of an atomic bomb attack has been haunting civil defense officials. American Medical Association and Red Cross experts have agreed that it would be all but impossible to stock pile enough human plasma.

Whole blood, plasma or a substitute is needed frequently to replace fluid lost from the blood stream. For this reason, a plasma substitute might be a lifesaver if kept in police squad cars. Officers trained in transfusion technique could use the substitute at an accident scene before an ambulance arrived.

HAS SEVERAL ADVANTAGES

The okra substitute seems to be just the thing that civil defense officials have been seeking. In Milwaukee alone, doctors have estimated that about 300,000 units of plasma would be needed urgently the first 24 hours after an atomic bomb was dropped on the city. Such amounts are not available; if they were, the cost would be too high to buy them.

Dr. Benjamin was doing research with okra for treating ulcers about 2 years ago when he first saw the possibilities of the vegetable as a plasma substitute.

He was making a standard research test to determine how much of a drug it takes to kill an animal—the minimum lethal dose, test. The test dog, "Annie Okra," had been bled for a previous experiment and was under anesthesia when Dr. Benjamin injected a dose of the okra product into the animal's blood stream.

Instead of dying, Annie began to come out of the anesthesia and recovered remarkably. It was then that the doctor conceived the idea that the okra substance might be an excellent plasma substitute.

USED AS SOUP THICKENER

Okra is a kind of hibiscus; its botanical name is "hibiscus esculentus." It grows to a height of 2 to 8 feet and bears pods 4 to 6 inches long. Powder made from the pods is used for thickening soups, and the seeds sometimes are roasted as a coffee substitute. Okra is the second largest crop of the south. It grows as far north as Wisconsin, where it is raised by home gardeners, but not commercially.

Dr. Benjamin made the plasma substitute by grinding up the pod and removing the waxes and fats with ether and alcohol. The remaining material was suspended in water, then purified. The plasma powder was made by precipitation or freezing.

REMOVED 72 PERCENT OF BLOOD

Okra "plasma" is a complex sugar—a polysaccharide. Unlike the Swedish plasma substitute, dextran, the molecules of the okra product are of uniform size. They are large enough so that they are not excreted from the body, but not so large that they damage body cells. The chief difficulty with dextran is the high cost, a result of tight patent control by a Swedish firm. Dextran, on which the Pabst Brewing Co. is doing research, is excreted by microorganisms ordinarily found in the sugar-refining process.

In Dr. Benjamin's work with dogs he removed as much as 72 percent of an animal's blood and brought about its recovery with the plasma substitute. In one experiment a dog stopped breathing for 5 minutes—as close to death as is generally thought possible—and was brought back. It would have died without the transfusion.

A dog's normal blood pressure is 150 to 160 millimeters of mercury. Dr. Benjamin reduced this to 27 millimeters by bleeding and kept it there for relatively long periods. The animal's heart was fluttering and it was close to death. Transfusion with the okra product saved the dog.

MARQUETTE MAY GET PATENT

Drs. Benjamin and Roth were helped in preparing the powder form of the substitute by Darwin Kaestner and Joseph N. Jacquse, chemists at Lakeside Laboratories, Inc., of Milwaukee.

Dr. Benjamin has applied for a patent on the "plasma." If it is granted, the patent will be turned over to Marquette, which will license manufacturers of the product and control its quality. Marquette would receive royalties, which would be used to finance research at the university.

Dr. Benjamin is a native of Austria. He was graduated from the University of Rochester (New York) and from Marquette Medical School in 1930. He practiced privately in Milwaukee and served in the Navy in World War II. After his release from service he entered Marquette graduate school and in 1949 received a master of science degree. Since then he has been a full-time member of the anatomy department staff.

Assistance for Domestic Mines Essential for National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending seriousness of world conditions and also the lackadaisical attitude of our own bureaus relative to the naticnal stockpile, the lack of strategic metals, and the lack of help given to our domestic mines, I have today sent the following letter to Mr. Harrison. It is my hope that every Member of the House of Representatives will read this message and support me on legislation which will recognize our western mines and our national defense:

JANUARY 31, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
Administrator,
Defense Production Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRISON: As a Member of Congress from a mining State I am fully aware of the problems and needs of small-mine operators and the basic requirements of any Government program that may be conducted for the purpose of obtaining maximum production from the mines and undeveloped mineral deposits of the United States.

Although the Defense Production Act of 1950 provides the President with broad powers to encourage and expand exploration, development, and the production of minerals and metals from domestic deposits, I am alarmed and discouraged to find that the defense-minerals program as it is now planned and functioning is not intended to be an all-out program to obtain the maximum production of strategic and critical minerals and metals from domestic sources.

I call your attention to the policies outlined by Dr. James Boyd, Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration, in an address before the annual members' meeting of the American Mining Congress in New York City on December 5, 1950. These policies, in effect, exclude probably 95 percent or more of the active and potential small-mine operators from obtaining any materal assistance under the defense-minerals program.

One policy announced in the DMA press release of December 5, 1950, that automatically excludes small mines from consideration and participation under the production program conducted by the DMA, is as follows:

"The applicant for certification of a purchase contract * * * will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Defense Minerals Administration that ore reserves * * * are available and adequate to fulfill the requested contract, and the applicant will be required to satisfy the Defense Minerals Administration that he can meet a firm delivery schedule."

Few small mines, especially those that are inactive, have sufficient developed ore reserves to obtain a negotiated contract of any consequence or duration and probably fewer still could satisfy the DMA on the matter of meeting a firm delivery schedule.

Those familiar with small mining enterprises know that such operations, in comparison to the larger enterprises, generally are conducted on a hand-to-mouth basis. Financial limitations, size of operations, and the physical characteristics of many small mine-ore bodies are handicaps that generally make it impractical if not impossible for most small mines to develop known ore reserves more than several months ahead of ore extraction. This, in turn, prevents small-mine operators from estimating their future mining costs, average grades of ore, rates of production, and potentialities with any degree of accuracy. It was found that most small mines operating under the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc during World War II, when presenting data in support of their requests for premium-price assignments invariably, and to their great disadvantage, underestimated future operating costs and overestimated anticipated grades of ore and rates of production.

You probably realize that the amount of currently known ore reserves at a particular property is not of itself any indication whatsoever of the potentialities of a mining property and its ability to produce under an appropriate incentive system.

Dr. Boyd also announced in the DMA press release of December 5, 1950, that—

"Projects to be approved by the Defense Minerals Administration must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding material * * * in amounts that will significantly improve the mineral supply position for national defense."

It is a foregone conclusion that this policy also would exclude all small-mining enterprises from the benefits of incentive assistance under the defense-minerals program. While the production of any one small-mining operation would be insignificant insofar as improving the mineral supply position of the United States, the total production obtainable from several hundred or several thousand small mines under an incentive system adapted to their needs would be considerable.

Based on the experience record of World War II and the known requirements of small-mining operations, it appears conclusive to me that in order to activate and obtain substantial amounts of minerals and metals from thousands of small mines and undeveloped mineral deposits in the United States it will be necessary to effectuate methods of assistance adaptable to the needs and abilities of small-mine enterprises, as follows:

1. For small copper, lead, and zinc mines, an incentive program similar to the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc as it was conducted and administered at the termination of the plan on June 30, 1947, but with necessary improvements.

2. For small mines producing minerals and metals other than copper, lead, and zinc, purchase programs patterned after those conducted by the Metals Reserve Company of the RFC during World War II, with their retarding and objectionable features removed.

3. Exploration assistance and liberal development loans as were provided during and following World War II. However, this type of assistance would prove of little value to most small mines without the programs proposed in items (1) and (2).

In view of the current minerals and metals shortages, the still greater shortages in prospect for the future, and the growing list of orders and regulations cutting back and controlling the use of minerals and metals,

I find it impossible to reconcile the fact that the Federal Government has not embarked upon an all-out and effective program to obtain the maximum production of minerals and metals from the mineral deposits of the United States, both large and small. What is being done is too little and it is fast becoming too late.

In order to improve the mineral supply position of the United States to a much greater extent than is otherwise possible and as a matter of equity, I strongly urge that present policies and methods of administering incentive assistance to the minerals industry by the Defense Minerals Administration be changed from those designed to favor and assist only the larger and more substantial enterprises to policies and methods which encourage and readily enable full participation by small mining enterprises.

In my opinion either the passage of H. R. 976 or S. 240, Eighty-first Congress, as an amendment to the Defense Production Act, or drafting its text in the form of an Executive order to be issued under the broad authority of that act, would promptly cure most of the ills which beset mineral production at this time. Had this been done last September, the present mess the Defense Minerals Administration has gotten us into would have been avoided.

Many Members of Congress are becoming highly incensed at the situation. Should there be no intention of correcting the conditions which I have brought to your attention, I would appreciate receiving a full explanation for the reasons involved. In the event that material changes are to be made in the defense-minerals program, I would like to be fully informed of the same.

Yours very truly,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman From Nevada.

Ambassador Robert Butler Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised of the resignation as Ambassador to Cuba from the United States of the Honorable Robert Butler. His resignation is a great loss to our foreign service and Cuba has lost a real, understanding friend. In spite of his resignation I hope the future will find Mr. Butler soon again in the service of our country, especially during the present crisis. Before and during the war this great American has contributed much to our Nation's cause. In peace he has been one of our outstanding industrialists. Those of us who have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Butler extend to him much happiness in whatever future pursuits he may follow. Our Cuban neighbors have learned to love, respect, and admire Mr. Butler during his service as our representative in that country. This admiration is reflected in the following three editorials which I insert as part of my remarks:

[From the Diario de la Marina, Habana, Cuba, of January 31, 1951]

[Translation]

DEPARTURE OF AMBASSADOR BUTLER

The news of the day is the resignation of Mr. Butler who, for personal reasons, has given up his high position as Ambassador of the United States of America to Cuba. Being a distinguished engineer and industrialist and leader in naval construction, it is natural that he would feel it necessary to give his services to his countrymen along those same lines which, in the past have included the very important Farragut Naval Training Station, the second largest in the United States, which Mr. Butler constructed for his country shortly after Pearl Harbor. He also built the great chemical arsenal in the State of Alabama.

Now, faced with further totalitarian aggression, equally as traitorous and with the same sinister dangers of a third world war, it is natural that this diplomat should want to give his best services to his country which also, in a sense, means serving the community of free nations which are now mobilizing their intelligence, will, and resources for the international defense of liberty and for the rights of man.

Yet, for Cuba, the absence of an Ambassador of such high personal and cultural qualifications as those possessed by Mr. Butler, will be sad. He has gained the friendship, the confidence, and the esteem of all real Cubans. When loyalty and a spirit of cooperation and reciprocal service is used in the cultivation of good relations between countries, there is also gained a harvest of understanding and sincere friendship. That is what occurred when Mr. Butler took his first diplomatic post in Australia. In Canberra they called him "an Ambassador to and from," referring to his fine work so that the people of the United States should know the people of Australia better. He has done the same thing with exceptional success in Cuba. This was rightfully recognized by Dr. Carlos Prio Socarras when he said at the University of Villanova that of the Ambassadors to Cuba none has been as good as Ambassador Butler.

The President expressed regret over the departure of the Ambassador of the United States to Cuba, calling him also the Cuban Ambassador to the United States. He reiterated the same sentiments of the Ambassador's good will which inspired his reputation in Australia.

Some of the fruits of the Ambassador's diligent work have been in the sale in 1949 of the surplus sugar which was sold in London and paid for with American dollars. He was able to accomplish this with the cooperation of our representatives. President Prio also called attention to the incident when the statue of Marti was profaned, and the action taken by Mr. Butler in the name of his country when he offered profound expressions of regret to the apostle. He did this without waiting for instructions from his chancery.

In cultural and economic fields we have found Ambassador Butler always cooperating and offering efficient suggestions drawn from his technical abilities to Cuban engineers with the hope that his suggestions could be used for the development of constructive plans for the country in an effort to stabilize and expand its economy on permanent foundations. Mr. Butler also showed his good intentions toward Cuba, leaving his permanent seal at the University of St. Thomas of Villanova, which college recently honored him with an honorary degree. He was also honored by them with homage at a dinner.

These private universities, the wings of the future of Cuba, along with the official universities, have in the rapid and great development of St. Thomas of Villanova University a very high example. That is why, Ambassador Butler, looking toward the cultural improvement with the idea of establishing firm and realistic foundations, has made the important suggestion that chemical industrial engineering be made part of the curriculum of the university because of the high importance these professions would have on the expansion and diversification of the country's economy. This advice is timely and sound. It might also include mining engineering.

A man of enterprise is aware of the fact that greater employment and permanent prosperity for a more generous material life are to be found through technical progress and research in the development of national resources, together with the spiritual and moral uplifting of the community and contributing to more employment and permanent prosperity.

The above are a few phases and a few facts which illustrate the personality of Mr. Robert Butler. Both place him among the good and sincere friends of Cuba. And the Cubans will look upon his departure with the same reciprocal feeling of friendship.

[From Informacion, Habana, Cuba, January 31, 1951]

[Translation]

OUR ADIEU TO MR. BUTLER—HE IS A GOOD FRIEND OF CUBA—HE FULLY UNDERSTOOD OUR PROBLEMS

The Ambassador of the United States in Cuba, Mr. Robert Butler, for personal reasons, as is announced by the White House, has resigned his diplomatic post to return to private life. His letter of resignation addressed to President Truman, as well as the latter's reply accepting it, which we published in yesterday's edition, are not only two examples of human documents but in the text of both letters it is stated once again and the mutual understanding that exists between Cuba and the United States is recognized. Mr. Butler, up to the last moment, has served further to strengthen this solid and constructive friendship between both countries.

What may be considered as Ambassador Butler's last official appearance was his attendance at the banquet of the father who directs Villanova University, which was tendered to the President of the Republic, Dr. Prio Socarras, for having sponsored and promulgated the law authorizing private universities, the bill which led to the law having been drafted by Dr. Angel Fernandez Varela. In addressing this gathering the chief of state, with his customary generosity and serene spirit of justice, made a brief summary of Mr. Butler's activities in Cuba, emphasizing that, in his opinion, he has been the best representative of the United States here, in spite of the fact that there have been other ambassadors who have done a wonderful task for the benefit of both countries. After referring to different matters in which the participation of Mr. Butler was final and served the just aspiration of Cuba in her relation with the United States, he spoke the following words which are the greatest homage that can be rendered an American diplomat:

"That is why it is to be regretted that the Ambassador of the United States in Cuba, and what is more, the Ambassador of Cuba to the United States, is leaving us. I am at least consoled by the fact that Ambassador Butler is surely going to render greater services in his country and whatever he does or wherever he lives, Cuba can count on a good friend. And that is why I do not bid adieu to a friend, but to a brother."

The activities of Mr. Butler here have evidently been very advantageous for Cuba, since he was smart enough rapidly to become acquainted with our character and immediately realized what the basic needs of our country, in its relations with the country that he represented, were. His action and his words on different occasions have been the subject of our editorial comment. That is why we believe that the words spoken by the chief executive in publicly bidding adieu to Mr. Butler are the result of something that is true and are due to a full recognition of Mr. Butler's activities in Cuba, of his desire to bring our country as close as possible to his own and to obviate the difficulties that might exist in an eco-

nomic order so that when financial transactions were entered into, especially in connection with sugar, they would not be detrimental to the future of our main national industry.

With a foot already in the stirrups, Ambassador Butler called on President Prio. In his statements following his conference, which we also published in yesterday's edition, the American diplomat once again proved that he was a good friend of Cuba and that he was fully aware of its internal situation as regards its possibilities in case of war. Referring to the United States, he said that his county was "perfectly aware of the fact that, in the event of war, the United Nations should be faced with the extreme emergency of a war. Cuba is not in a position of furnishing large military forces, and maintain order within its own frontiers to control the subversive elements that might exist within the country. It's cooperation with the United States should primarily be in the economic field.

Those words reflect the true internal situation of Cuba in the event of a war, and it is very proper that the same were spoken by such an impartial criterion as that of the representative of the United States. That is why Ambassador Butler, who knows our problem so well, is departing from Cuba and leaving behind him a trail of sympathy and affection and a memory which time will not be able to obliterate.

[From the Habana (Cuba) Post of January 31, 1951]

A GOOD FRIEND LEAVES

When Ambassador Butler leaves Cuba about a fortnight hence, after having resigned from the diplomatic service, Cuba will miss a good friend.

Practically from the moment of his arrival Mr. Butler began his efforts to aid Cuba's industrial development. Many people, particularly members of the press, will recall his showing of a color film taken in Australia which depicted what that country from "down under" had done to develop its agriculture and industry. Mr. Butler's words seem still fresh, "That can be done here too."

From that moment the departing Ambassador, who has had ample experience and success in the industrial field, has been constantly striving to aid Cuba in its economic development. His interest in furthering production of kenaf is outstanding. An album of mills for the industrialization of kenaf brought the query, "Do you think that would be successful here?" "Why not?" was his rapid answer, demonstrative of a deep conviction that Cuba can produce and industrialize the fiber necessary for making the bags for its sugar crop as well as for other articles.

It is not only in the industrial field that Mr. Butler has endeavored to help Cuba. He has, since he came here striven unceasingly to make Cuban-American relations still better. He has had some difficult problems to solve, and solved them superbly.

Officials, businessmen, and the Cuban people regret the Ambassador's departure. How he has endeared himself to officials is exemplified in President Prio's remarks at a dinner tendered the Ambassador Monday night by the priests and officials of Villanova University, whose establishment he aided. The President called him, "my brother" and went on to relate how, at a time when Cuba felt gloom under a surplus of sugar on hand, Mr. Butler was instrumental in getting credits for soft currency countries to purchase Cuba's surplus This was of great benefit not only to producers of sugar, but to the Cuban people at large whose dependence on sugar is practically absolute.

The social world will also miss the Ambassador, who with his charming and talented wife and their simpatica daughter made many sincere friends.

We feel that though Mr. Butler will leave, he will always think of Cuba and that at every opportunity will endeavor to be of service to this Nation.

In thus taking an interest in Cuba's welfare and lending aid wherever possible, Mr. Butler has proven an able diplomat and served his country well. For he has further intensified that traditional friendliness of the two peoples which some elements under influences inimical to democracy would destroy.

We wish Mr. Butler, and feel convinced that it is also the wish of all Cubans, that he may attain the same large measure of success in any new enterprise as he has in diplomacy.

Waste and Inefficiency in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER:

Waste and inefficiency are still the watchwords and battle cry of the Truman Fair Deal.

At a time when the people of America face the greatest burden ever imposed upon a tax-paying public, we find the bureaucrats seeking to embark on another boondoggling expedition which will nullify every sacrifice made by the people during this New Deal-Fair Deal created emergency.

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress balanced the Federal budget for the first time in approximately 20 years and reduced Federal taxes to permit the flow of risk capital. The Republican Eightieth Congress realized the necessity for a strong military defense and provided funds for a 70-group Air Force; it recognized the need for adequate housing facilities and sought to ease the critical housing shortage. Each of these accomplishments has been scuttled by President Truman and his army of double-talking, power-mad bureaucrats.

This is the same type of bureaucracy that killed little pigs, plowed under row after row of cotton, thus creating a scarcity through which public money could be paid in subsidies for the patent purpose of buying votes.

Today, in the midst of what President Truman chooses to term a "great emergency," it is still politics and waste with his administration. Never was there a more crying need for housing facilities in view of our industrial and military expansion created by this present crisis.

In the face of this need comes the latest instance of the Truman gang's waste and inefficiency. It is a recommendation of William Henry Harrison, National Production Authority Administrator, that the property of the Lustron Corp. of Columbus, Ohio, be turned over to the Navy Department to be used as an assembling plant for the North American Aviation Co.

The North American Aviation Co. is now beginning occupation of the buildings adjacent to Lustron for construction of airplanes. I am advised further that North American Aviation Co. does not even hope to be in production for a period of 16 to 18 months. As a matter of fact, I am told the company cannot be tooled and ready to start operation in less than 12 months.

At a time when housing is one of the most critical problems facing our country and while mothers are writing to me about their sons who are in training in the Air Force at Larkland Air Base, Tex., and other fields, and who are sleeping in tents in near zero weather, Mr. Harrison's proposal constitutes inexcusable and wanton waste of public money.

The North American Co. requires only 200,000 square feet of space for additional production purposes, yet Mr. Harrison would revert to WPA days and plow under approximately 900,000 square feet of floor space and destroy millions of dollars worth of valuable machinery which could be utilized in turning out 100 prefrabricated houses every 24 hours.

Defense agencies today are spending $39 per square foot for houses outside the confines of the United States. The Lustron Corp. proposes to construct similar houses, which require no upkeep, for $25 per square foot, a saving of $14 per square foot to the American taxpayer.

It is almost impossible to imagine the stupidity of a proposal to waste this floor space when it cannot possibly be put in use for approximately 18 months.

I wonder how many similar projects are in the making. If that is a pattern the multibillion dollar budget request of the administration will be only a small ante in our international poker game.

There is another crying need in this Nation, in addition to housing and military preparedness. That is the need for competent leadership. And when and if that leadership is obtained, we must remove the shackles that are placed on it by underlings whose patriotism is exemplified only in a revival of the "tax, spend, and elect" theme.

United States Government Asked To Buy Almonds Crowded by Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Enterprise Record of January 24, 1951:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ASKED TO BUY ALMONDS CROWDED BY IMPORTS

SACRAMENTO.—Faced with continued heavy imports of Mediterranean almonds, the California Almond Growers Exchange has petitioned the United States Department of Agriculture for assistance to the California almond industry under section 32 of the AAA.

D. R. Bailey, general manager of the grower-owned exchange organization, personally filed the application in Washington Tuesday. It calls for a diversion purchase of almonds displaced from normal trade channels by excessive importations. Bailey pointed out that imports during the past 60 days have been greater than in any like period during the past 25 years.

Earlier in the season, in its recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the marketing of the 1950 crop, the Almond Control Board had expressed the opinion that the State's entire production could be marketed successfully provided imports were held at or below a season total of 5,000,000 shelled pounds.

Imports have already exceeded 7,240,000 pounds of shelled almonds, and have been entering the United States at the rate of approximately 500,000 pounds per week during the last 2 months. Unless the rate of importation during the first 4 months of the 1950–51 crop year is curtailed, the season's

imports will reach a total of 18,000,000 to 20,000,000 pounds of shelled almonds.

Imports for the week ending January 18 totaled 497,444 shelled pounds, with approximately 485,000 pounds of this total originating in Spain. Until last week imports from Spain have not been a factor in the domestic market during the past two seasons, and exchange officials here attributed the significant increase to the removal of the countervailing duty on Spanish almonds on November 16.

Subsidies paid by the Spanish Government to almond exporters had led to the imposition of the countervailing duty in November 1948.

In addition to the present application for the diversion purchase of almonds, the growers also have before the Tariff Commission a petition for import quotas. An interim report published by the Commission on November 24, 1950, stated that the effects of imports on the domestic market were under continuing investigation.

Can We Stop Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following toastmaster talk by Dr. C. O. Watkins, reprinted from the Sidney (Mont.) Herald:

CAN WE STOP COMMUNISM?

(Toastmaster talk by Dr. C. O. Watkins)

You have heard many times that communism is a people's movement. Our society is made up of a great number of people's movements.

If we are to understand communism, we must know more about the basic nature of the people's movements. The term, "people's movement," in itself means little.

All people's movements can be divided into two types—free movements and ideological movements. Each type has some particular purpose it hopes to accomplish. They differ only in the basic method used to accomplish that purpose.

Communism is an ideological movement, and if we are to stop it, we must learn more about the basic nature of such movements. What are some ideological people's movements?

There is socialism, there is Christianity and other spiritual movements, there is the Townsend movement of a little different nature, to mention only a few.

What are some free people's movements? Our labor unions, our service clubs; in fact, any movement which does not have a firm ideological basis.

All ideological movements have one thing in common: They are all constructed around ideas. In the frailer movements these are ideas thrown together rather loosely, but the stronger ones have a firm, well-defined, ideological core, usually in the form of a philosophical teaching or doctrine. One of the basic weaknesses of an ideological movement is that its ideas by which a purpose is to be accomplished are regarded as more important than actual accomplishment of the purpose.

Free social movements are built around a given purpose, but there is no sacred way or fixed ideological formula that must be used to accomplish that purpose.

The strength with which we have built our great society is found in this fact. But also, it is the same facts which make us weak in warding off the threat of the Communist scourge today. We lack the unity of a society built around a firm ideological core.

To understand communism, it is best to pick out another ideological movement with which to compare it. Then, you must start forgetting much you know about your way of life.

We can use the Christian movement for comparison, if you will keep three important differences in mind:

1. Christianity is a spiritual movement while communism is a social one, thus in a temporal realm.

2 The missionary methods of Christianity were based upon casual experience or what we call the empiric method. The missionary methods used by communism to condition Marxist minds are scientific and perhaps were developed in the laboratories of the Pavlovian institutions of Russia.

3. You must keep in mind that the ultimate effect of the Christian movement is good. The ultimate effect of the Communist movement, if it succeeds in capturing the world, will be tragic and carry our society back to the level of the Middle Ages, perhaps in but one century.

That statement can be well supported by logic and historical fact, but to do so would take time. For now, I ask you to accept it. If you will keep these three points in mind we can use the Christian movement for our comparison, so that we might understand communism better.

Now start forgetting. Forget national boundaries if you want to understand communism. The only boundary communism knows is between the minds of the Marxist and the non-Marxist.

Christianity knows no national boundaries; it knows only the boundaries between the Christian and non-Christian. Forget national, State, and local governments as you know them. In communism, they govern nothing because the teachings of Marx is the governmental authority. The national, State, and local governments are only police forces. Their function is only to enforce the Marxist doctrine.

The Christian church has the same type of government. There the teachings of Christ are the actual authority. The function of church government on all levels is but to preserve and carry out the teachings of Christ.

If you would understand communism, forget the importance of democracy. The system by which the government is formed under a Communist society is unimportant. The government governs nothing, anyway. They perhaps are, or at least could be, democratic and it would change matters but slightly. Most church governments are democratically selected, but it is unimportant. In communism, as in the church, only those are elected to office who are ardent supporters of the central doctrine because it is their responsibility to preserve and carry out its teachings.

I could go on drawing parallels, but what you want to know is: Can we stop communism, and if so, how?

To answer that question, let me ask you some questions. Could we stop Christianity if we wanted to? How would you go about stopping Christianity? Could you stop it by armed force? Could you stop it by diplomacy? Could you stop it by a treaty? Could you expect your civil government to stop it? Could you stop Christianity by any of the methods now being used to stop communism? Doesn't history tell us that Christianity has already withstood all of these?

Yet we know that Christianity was stopped. Like a fire, it spread half way around the earth and then came to a sudden halt when it reached the Moslem and Hindu people's movements. It was stopped by these other strong people's movements. In 2,000 years, there has been but little Christian penetration of the Moslem or Hindu lands.

Christianity filled a great spiritual vacuum that existed throughout half the world. Today Marxism is filling an ideological social vacuum because we do not give the formula of our way of life ideological expression. Despite the great need of military might today to defend ourselves from military aggression, no amount of military power will fill that vacuum.

Here I make my first point: The only way to stop the Communist people's movement is by building another people's movement in the area of social government. In short, we must build a people's movement to protect our way of life.

If we are to build a people's movement, what kind of an ideological core will we build it around? For the past 800 years, we have had uninterrupted social progress. There must be some basic reason for our great progress in the foundations of our social structure. Some ideas that exist as a foundation to our way of life which we are today unaware of must be the answer. What has been the secret formula of our 800 years of uninterrupted social progress?

So far as I know, our basic formula does not even have a name. But it has been our method for the past eight centuries to find the solution to every social problem through free investigation and experimentati n, to repeat the process again and again, to find yet better solutions, and all without regard for any preconceived ideological social doctrine. Using this formula, we have learned to solve social problems better than any other people in history, and until today, hardly any among our people suffers indignities or inhumanities. That formula is supported by logic and 800 years of history. That formula is the sleeping giant which is the ideological foundation of our way of life.

My second point is this: Today, we must raise that formula to the level of a primary principle and build a people's movement around it. If we do not do this, it will be replaced by Marxism.

If my construction is right, and I believe it is, we have determined certain things:

1. If communism is to be stopped, we must build a people's movement.

2. If we are to build a people's movement to stop communism, we must build it around those basic ideas which are the foundations of our way of life.

3. If we are to build a people's movement to stop communism around these sleeping giants, we must do it soon.

Comparison of Draft Age and Length of Military Service in Atlantic Pact Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the thinking people of America are deeply concerned about the future of our Nation. The women of America are aroused as never before. The people, and the women of America in particular, are justified in their concern, and may I say their resentment, of the mistaken policies of the party in power that has brought us into the most dangerous position our country has faced in its history.

Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter from a woman in my district, typical of many letters I have been receiving, which, in an able and intelligent manner, expresses, in my judgment, the voice and thinking of millions of American women. The Members of Congress must find the right answers to as many of these questions as possible in the interest of our Nation.

The letter follows:

Hon. Congressman CHARLES VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: Several months before and on November 7, every woman in this community and district left their household duties and helped elect our present Senators and Congressman, because we knew we were putting into office men who would stand up and debate for what issue might come up for the betterment of this district, State, and Nation.

These same women, who have read, done research work, and pondered over our present crisis, are now asking our Congressman and Senators to stand up and fight for an issue which is not only a serious matter for today but for our future generations, and that is, Why is the United States furnishing two-thirds of the manpower in the fight in Korea? Why should we furnish men for the whole UN? Why should the cream of our Nation leave school to make an Army so great that it curtails the future generation, who will be our future leaders?

The following compares the proposed Defense Department with those of the Atlantic Pact nations:

Nation	Draft age	Service
		Months
United States	18	27
France	20–21	18
Italy	20–21	12
Denmark	20	12 18
Norway	12	9–12
Belgium	20	12
Netherlands	21	12
Portugal	21	12
England	18	24
Luxemburg, Iceland, and Canada (volunteer system).		

Are we following the footsteps of England or are we still the land of the free? If we take these boys at the age of 18 years out of their scholastics how many will return and finish their education—the percentage will be very, very few.

Already more boys have been killed in Korea, for time duration, than in any other war. Are we going to make fodder out of our youths? World War I—4,744,000 participated—131,000 deaths. World War II—16,535,000 participated—409,000 deaths. Compare this with today's deaths. Stop, ponder, and think over this not for a few minutes, but by the hours.

We, as Americans, have always been proud because we believed in the education of our youths; yes, in some cases more than their financial status could stand without sacrifices elsewhere, so that our children could be able to pick their vocation in life, whether it was a teacher, preacher, lawyer, scientist, druggist, dentist, or doctor—he was free to pick his choice. Are we blindly going to stumble into the standards of Europe where they know nothing but turmoil and wars?

They have no choice as to who is elected as the President nor any other leader of our Government. Should they be forced to give up their future plans of life, selecting their future vocation, when they are not considered old enough nor intellectual enough to give their vote as to who the leaders of our Government will be until they are 21 years old?

The people proved to you on November 7, 1950, that a change was needed; let's not let these people down, nor our forefathers, who gave us the land of the free, home of the brave; so let's fight for what we know to be right. * * *

Is Anna B. Rosenberg, an Austrian-born woman, going to tell you and the rest of the United States how to run our Government without a fight? No; I know you better than that.

Please weigh every measure pro and con, hour after hour, before you give your final answer. You know what we and the whole of the American people want. Don't be influenced by anything but your good, sound judgment. What does the future hold if this is not accomplished?

Yours very truly.

Reduce Expenditures Before Increasing Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, before levying heavier taxes, or even before we look for new sources from which to get the additional billions we need to balance the budget, we should give serious consideration to reducing nonessential Federal expenditures. Both the Hoover Commission and Senator BYRD have pointed out where $7,000,000,000 of Federal spending can be lopped off from nonessential Federal expenditures. Senator BYRD in his recent letter to the President offered his complete cooperation in any move to reduce the expenditures of the Government; and in that letter he spelled out in minute detail just where and how the reductions could be made without in any way hampering or hindering the national defense.

Should we not insist that these reductions in the nonessential items of the budget be made before we consider adding additional taxes upon our already overtaxed people? A reduction of $7,000,000,000 in Federal spending would go a long way to make our task of trying to balance the budget less difficult, and at the same time it would be much easier upon the overburdened American taxpayer. We should give the proposed $7,000,000,000 reduction in Federal spending priority over any new or additional taxes in our effort to obtain a balanced budget.

THEN AND NOW

In 1940 we had 4,000,000 individuals paying personal income taxes; today we have 52,000,000 people making personal income tax returns to the Government. In 1940 a married couple with no children had a tax-exemption allowance of $2,500; today the exemption allowance is $1,200. In 1940 the tax rate in the lowest tax bracket was 4 percent; today the tax rate in the lowest bracket is 20 percent. In 1940 the top corporation tax rate was 19 percent; today it is 47 percent, with an excess-profits tax added on top of that. In 1940 Uncle Sam collected a total of $4,000,000,000 in income, corporation, and excise taxes from the American taxpayers; today Uncle Sam collects a total of $55,000,000,000 from these same three tax sources.

Ten years of New Deal bungling in both domestic and foreign affairs has made these changes in our tax burdens.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks on the need for reducing Federal expenditures, I include the following statement from Senator BYRD on the same subject:

HOW TO SAVE $7,000,000,000

(By Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia)

When the President said that nondefense expenditures would be cut "to the minimum required to give effective support to the defense effort," I pledged my full support. He told news correspondents that he welcomes my support but had not examined my data because he did not believe I knew much about the budget. I may not know much about his budget, but as Governor of a State which lived within its income, and as a United States Senator for 18 years and active in the exposure of unessential Federal activities, my acquaintance with governmental economy is much longer and more intimate than the President's. He will need all the help he can get to keep us from financial chaos.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder forecasts for the coming fiscal year expenditures of some $75,000,000,000. Including new taxation already enacted, Federal revenue may reach more than $51,000,000,000, and, assuming conditions short of total war, we shall have an annual deficit of nearly $25,000,000,000. It is appalling to contemplate continued $25,000,000,000-a-year deficits. They must be wiped out or greatly reduced by more tax increases and by deep cuts in expenditures nonessential to defense.

Few rivers and harbors, public roads, and reclamation projects are essential to the defense effort. The Post Office Department, which has an annual deficit of more than half a billion, should be self-supporting, as it was during World War II. About 25 percent of the domestic-civilian budget is for State aid: public assistance, housing, education, agriculture, civil airports, business promotion. At this critical period, the extent to which these items help the defense effort must be the controlling factor. Most of them are tied to long-term statutory commitments, and Congress and the President should agree to legislation which repeals, amends, or suspends those commitments. Some domestic-civilian programs must have more money for activities which tie in with defense. These include control and allocation agencies, labor training, revenue collection, and the like. In data I submitted to the President, these increases added up to some $625,000,000, and no reasonable person would deny their necessity. But their inclusion must not swell the total of nondefense items. Instead, that total should be—and can be—cut by at least $3,600,000,000.

In my long study of Federal fiscal affairs, I found that excessive civilian employment was the key to extravagance and inefficiency. Today's worst offender is the Department of Defense, where there is one civilian employee for every two men in uniform. At the peak of World War II, the ratio was one civilian for every five uniformed persons. Should the Military Establishment cut its estimate of 1,250,000 civilian employees by 150,000, the saving would be a half billion dollars.

Neither at home nor abroad are give-away programs defense essentials. Foreign economic aid, which this year is $4,000,000,000, is due to expire a year hence and already has

been withdrawn from Britain. Meanwhile, the billions since appropriated for military aid overlap ECA programs at many points. In the new budget, ECA should not exceed commitments already made, and this would mean a reduction of $3,500,000,000.

The savings I have outlined total $7,600,000,000. They can be made if an enlightened public opinion makes itself heard. Officials who impose austerity upon the American people must also practice it. If business as usual is out, the same must hold for spending as usual. If readers will express their convictions on this possible saving of $7,000,000,000 of taxpayers' money, they will be giving helpful guidance to their Representatives in Congress.

RÉSUMÉ OF SENATOR BYRD'S DATA FOR REDUCTIONS IN DOMESTIC-CIVILIAN BUDGET ITEMS

Figures in table below are exclusive of all military and related items such as atomic energy, merchant marine, stockpile, Coast Guard, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Also exclusive of ECA, veterans' costs, and public debt interest.

Domestic-civilian expenditures by major functions (compared with war, postwar, and new emergency fiscal years)

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	War peak, 1946	Postwar period, 1948	New emergency— 1950	New emergency— 1951	Suggested budget, 1952
1. Welfare, health, security	1.0	1.9	2.2	2.3	1.3
2. Housing and community facilities	—.2	.1	.5	.5	------
3. Education and general research	1.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
4. Agriculture, including CCC	.8	.6	2.6	1.5	.8
5. Natural resources	.2	.6	1.2	1.2	.4
6. Transportation and communication	.4	1.0	1.5	1.5	.4
7. Finance, commerce, industry	.1	.1	.1	.2	.4
8. Labor	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
9. General Government	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.3
Total	3.6	6.1	9.4	8.5	4.9

In fiscal year 1946 we were descending from peak military requirements. In the coming fiscal year we shall be ascending in military requirements. The total of suggested reductions for domestic-civilian program expenditures for the coming fiscal year would be approximately 35 percent higher than in fiscal year 1946.

GENERAL COMMENT BY ITEMS

1. Most welfare reductions would be in public assistance and construction grants to the States. Contributory social-security system would be unaffected. The total of this item, after all reductions, is nearly one-third higher than at the end of war.

2. Calls for elimination of all but essential defense housing which would be financed from returns from housing loans of previous years.

3. Includes increase for scientific research directed to the defense effort.

4. Reductions principally in Commodity Credit Corporation's price supports. If food subsidies are imposed, as in World War II, price-support receipts should meet the cost as they did then.

5. Major reductions are in nonessential-to-defense public work by Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. Remaining total is twice figure of World War II.

6. Decreases would be in nonmilitary highway and airport construction. Also elimination of postal deficit. Increases provide for navigation aids and regulation of transportation and communications necessary to defense effort.

7. Reduced sums for ordinary activities, but increases provided for export and domestic controls along with those covered in "General Government" item.

8. Figures cover 1946 level of activity with increase for labor training.

9. Provision is made for increased immigration control costs. Also for civilian control incident to current conditions and for increased Federal retirement costs.

Using All Man (and Woman) Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Petersburg Times of January 30, 1951:

USING ALL MAN (AND WOMAN) POWER

Defense Secretary George Marshall caused considerable commotion when he told the House Armed Forces Committee that there weren't going to be any more 4-F professional athletes. His manpower assistant, Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, hastily assured the alarmed moguls of pro baseball, football, etc., that "there aren't going to be any special rules about athletes."

That's probably as it should be, but General Marshall's statement made a lot of sense to most people. It's perfectly obvious that any man in good enough physical condition to make a living as a professional athlete could do something useful in the armed services, or in some civilian defense job.

This is no reflection on the professionals who were IV-F's in the last war, or are so classified now. Most of them didn't ask for it. But it is a reflection on the classification rules.

At present out of every 100 men in uniform in any of our services, only 23 are actually in combat units. The other 77 are in various service, supply, communication, transport, and administrative jobs.

In contrast, the Russians are able to put 80 out of every 100 men in their armed services into combat.

Secretary Marshall is aware of this huge discrepancy, but he says there is little we can do about it and still have our fighting troops the best armed, best fed, best supplied, and best transported in the world. And this, of course, is our great strength.

However, at a time when we are on the verge of drafting 18-year-olds and obviously are going to be severely strained for manpower both in uniform and in industry, it seems appropriate again to raise the issue of filling as many as possible of those 77 out of 100 noncombat jobs with persons who can't fight, so as to free the physically fit for combat duty.

There is a natural reluctance on the part of professional military men to include in their regular personnel anyone with physical handicaps or limitations. They like to feel that a supply sergeant, yeoman, clerk, or storekeeper can, if necessary, be shoved into a shooting job.

Since our particular type of warfare, however, has become complex, and so much of our uniformed personnel necessarily is at all times engaged in noncombat work, new concepts have to be accepted.

Gen. Lewis Hershey, Director of Selective Service, insisted all through World War II that the Armed Forces standards were far too rigid and that many, if not most, IV-F's could be used in some capacity. He's still saying the same, even louder, and we think it is time he was heeded.

If the strait-jacketed military mind can't get the idea, this is a perfectly justifiable spot for Congress to step in. Maybe it doesn't need to legislate. In this instance it might be sufficient just to investigate.

It is certain that the public would take much more kindly to the 18-year-old draft—which we believe is imperative—if the people were certain that the only IV-F's deferred were those who literally were completely useless to the armed forces.

To a lesser extent that goes for using as many women as possible in uniform. And here legislative action by Congress is needed, since at present the number of women permitted in the Armed Forces is limited by law.

Despite the fact that women themselves repeatedly have indicated by public opinion polls that they are willing to be drafted, our chivalrous males—at least in Congress—probably aren't up to that yet.

To the extent that they are willing to volunteer, however, women ought to be allowed in the WAVES, WAC's, SPARS, and Marines to the full extent of their usefulness. Here again the "old pro" military need a lot of prodding. Although the ice was broken in World War II, there are still a lot of jobs the girls can fill which cause the old pros to shudder to admit.

For instance, early in 1944 the Navy experimentally assigned five WAVES to the Naval Air Combat Intelligence School. Considered among the toughest of all Navy schools, there was little expectation that the WAVES could make the grade.

As it happened, however, four of the five finished in the top quarter of the class and the leader, an understanding miss, eased up in the last couple of weeks to permit a member of the stronger sex to nose her out for the coveted No. 1 spot.

There never was another WAVE assigned to this school, despite the fact that at least a third of the work of ACI's could have been done by women.

Tough as things are and will be for a long time to come, the Nation simply cannot afford the extravagance of unrealistic chivalry, needlessly high physical or mental standards, or rigid and outdated military concepts which waste our man and woman power.

We're up against the most enormous military manpower pool in the history of the world. The only way we can hope to hold our own against it is by the fullest utilization of the skills and abilities of every man and woman in the Nation.

United States Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "United States Budget," which appeared in the Ashland Times-Gazette, Ashland, Ohio. I suggest the reading of this article:

UNITED STATES BUDGET

Most people will agree that there is nothing we can do but go along with the Truman budget from the standpoint of strengthening our military defenses.

But there is no reason why Congress cannot make some rather drastic cuts in all sections of the budget dealing with nondefense items.

No legitimate arguments can be presented for any major reductions in budget items dealing with defense expenditures during the emergency.

Do you recall that President Truman, in his state of the Union message, stated that nonmilitary expenses should be reduced?

That statement doesn't jibe with the increased requests for funds for nondefense items in the budget.

The American people will be grateful to Congress if steps are taken to slash these exaggerated requests. It is possible, we believe, to chop several billion dollars from budget items such as housing loans and subsidies, public works, farm subsidies, welfare and public assistance, and the Veterans' Administration.

It appears that the President is making an effort to push some of the Fair Deal proposals through under the guise of the all-out defense program.

It is up to Congress to see that some of these uncalled for expenditures are eliminated.

We should operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. If we can save several billion by reducing nonessential expenditures, it may mean that the new tax bill can be held considerably under that $16,000,000,000 figure estimated by the President. Isn't it worth some effort?

Sticking It Out Is Matter of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, most arguments of any importance have at least two sides. This, of course, applies to political matters especially, and all the more so to those involving international relations.

Recently we have heard a great deal about the desired necessity of pulling out of Korea. One of the outstanding papers in my district recently carried an editorial entitled "Sticking It Out Is Matter of Principle" in which the other side of this question is well set forth. Believing that we should have all of the thinking on this matter in particular, I am inserting with my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Herald-Democrat, published in Durango, Colo.:

STICKING IT OUT IS MATTER OF PRINCIPLE

The "new phase" of the Korean War now has proceeded far enough to make it plain the United States is not simply conducting an orderly withdrawal in prelude to a final evacuation of the peninsula.

We're fighting to hold as much free Korean soil as we can—as long as we can. At least, in the words of Chief of Staff General Collins, that is our present intent.

Insofar as this keeps a substantial proportion of our trained combat troops tied down and thus unavailable for duty elsewhere, the policy may actually be viewed by Russia as an advantage on her side.

But evidently the leaders of this country believe the gain to Russia is outweighed by the gain to us.

First of all, we are continuing to exact a high price for aggression. Our defense of key positions south of Seoul has cost the Chinese and North Korean Reds dearly. Surely they understand that if they wish to push us off the peninsula it is not going to be a quiet walk.

Secondly, by staying in Korea we are standing by our declared friends, by a free people in distress. The fledgling Republic of Korea is virtually a ward of the United Nations; more than almost any other, it is entitled to protection from the countries which assisted at its birth.

To get out of Korea without being driven out by overwhelming enemy forces would be to tell nations in both Asia and Europe that it doesn't pay to side with us, that when the chips are down we'll desert them. We'd be saying, in effect: "You'd better make the best terms you can with the Communists. You can't count on us in the long run."

This we decline to say. And so we go on fighting and dying there, as we have for 6 months past. Short of all-out involvement with Red China, we intend to stick—if we can. We insist upon showing the Reds up as the bullying gangsters they are. We intend to give them no free soil on a platter.

In other words, the high principles that led us to enter Korea in the first place are still valid reasons for being there.

It is regrettable that the United Nations has been so slow to suport us in the Chinese phase of the Korean War. But it's hard to grasp the reasoning in the argument we should leave Korea if the UN refuses to condemn China as an aggressor.

If the UN will not do so, that will be bad, both for us and the UN. For it will gravely weaken the UN as a peace agency But the situation may be made worse if we should then proceed ourselves to abandon the principles we are asking the UN to espouse.

No matter what the UN does or does not do, we must maintain our status as the rallying point for the noblest aspirations of freemen. Other peoples' failure to live by high principles is no excuse for our own failure. We are still the great torch-bearers of liberty. That's why we're in Korea.

Effect of Inflation on Bond Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in which he quotes the remarks made by Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, on the effect of current inflation on the value of bonds:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Perhaps the most puzzling of the many inconsistencies of national labor union leaders is the unwavering regularity with which they cheer every new spending plan concocted by Mr. Truman's so-called economic planners.

Socialized medicine, the Brannan farm program, Federal aid to education, socialized housing—anything that comes along.

Their idea, of course, is that in those programs the Government is giving the worker something for nothing. So it's good policy for the union bosses to support them.

The truth is that the cost burden, in every instance, falls directly on the rank-and-file wage earners of the Nation—which means the union members—and if we get into an era of wild inflation, which currently seems a sure bet, the worker will be among the hardest hit.

Economists agree that excessive Government spending is the most powerful of all inflationary forces. It increases the Government's drain on available materials, and at the same time pours additional money into the hands of the public to bid for the short supplies left for civilian consumers.

And it is incontrovertible history that in periods of inflation, wages and salaries always lag far behind prices. They always have and always will.

The heaviest damage, however, falls on the capital holdings of the unions: The retirement and pension funds and social security plans into which members have been contributing for years.

The dollars they contributed are still there, but the inflation that already has worked into our national economy has cut the value of those dollars to the extent that they now buy only half of what they did 10 years ago.

In short, the pension payments which the union members have been looking to to take care of them in their retirement days, will provide only half the actual living that they paid for.

A good line on what happens to dollars when the Government keeps dipping into the taxpayers' pockets is to get out your war bonds and add up what they are worth today.

With the mint working overtime to produce defense dollars, Senator ANDY F. SCHOEPPEL, Republican, of Kansas, did just that. Here is what he has to say:

"I am sure that many of you patriotically bought these bonds in 1940 with the dollar that would buy you 10 loaves of bread and four or five pounds of beef.

"As an example, let's suppose that you bought in 1940 a $100 bond for $75. It matured in 1950 for $100. You are required to pay an income tax on the $25 profit, leaving you a net of perhaps $85 which will not buy you as much as $40 would in 1939 in the way of requirements in life."

SCHOEPPEL, back in the early twenties was an all-America football end at the University of Nebraska who helped stop Notre Dame in the days of the famous Four Horsemen. He can't tackle the value of the dollar that has already vanished; but he does think something could be done to stabilize the dollar at its present level to prevent its value from falling even lower.

As a starter he points out—for the benefit of the new Congress—that the Eighty-first Congress that just went out of business doled out $30,000,000,000 more in Federal funds than the much-maligned GOP-controlled Eightieth Congress.

The Kansas Senator says that if the spending for nondefense projects keeps up, the Government is going to have to print more money.

Some of the economic planners now are talking about again reducing the gold content of the dollar, which may sound like pretty fancy fiscal talk, but it actually is a simple matter.

Prior to 1934 you could take your dollar bill to the bank and get 23.22 grains of gold. In 1934 the Government reduced this to 13.71 grains, and then printed 3,000,000,000 more dollars, deflating your dollar by statute. Later the New Deal hit on the formula of increased taxing and increased Federal spending.

Now the Government is getting nervous and wants to tamper with the gold content of the dollar again.

If it does, it means that the printing presses will roll again, which in turn means sealing

into our money system a new and permanent reduction in the buying value of the dollar. So the union members take a further licking on their savings.

Watch the bosses, though, when the Eighty-second Congress takes a look at the Truman spending proposals in the weeks to come. They are already set to give the big hurrah, and anybody who fails to go along with them will be a "vicious reactionary"—or worse.

Carl Sandburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on Carl Sandburg by Robert Blake Kimble:

CARL SANDBURG

(By Robert Blake Kimble)

In the March 1914 issue of Poetry magazine there appeared this poem:

"CHICAGO

"Hog butcher for the world,
Tool maker, stacker of wheat,
Player with railroads and the Nation's freight handler;
Stormy, husky, brawling,
City of the big shoulders;
They tell me you are wicked and I believe them, for I have seen your painted women under the gas lamps luring the farm boys.
And they tell me you are crooked and I answer: Yes; it is true I have seen the gunman kill and go free to kill again.
And they tell me you are brutal and my reply is: On the faces of women and children I have seen the marks of wanton hunger.
And having answered so I turn once more to those who sneer at this my city, and I give them back the sneer and say to them:
Come and show me another city with lifted head singing so proud to be alive and coarse and strong and cunning.
Flinging magnetic curses amid the toil of piling job on job, here is a tall, bold slugger set vivid against the little soft cities;
Fierce as a dog with tongue lapping for action, cunning as a savage pitted against the wilderness,
Bareheaded,
Shoveling,
Wrecking,
Planning,
Building, breaking, rebuilding,
Under the smoke, dust all over his mouth, laughing with white teeth,
Under the terrible burden of destiny laughing as a young man laughs,
Laughing even as an ignorant fighter laughs who has never lost a battle,
Bragging and laughing that under his wrist is the pulse, and under his ribs the heart of the people,
Laughing!
Laughing the stormy, husky, brawling laughter of youth, half naked, sweating, proud to be hog butcher, tool maker, stacker of wheat, player with railroads and freight handler to the Nation."

This was a song of a city. An American song. A song so thoroughly Yankee Doodle that those Americans whose ears were tuned for European music failed to recognize it. But for those whose eyes were for Lincoln, for those whose ears were tuned to the great poet of Lincoln's day, here was a new song coming over the ridges, a new song by a new Whitman, the poet of our day. As he came closer, as they got to see his face and to hear his music better, he says, "There was puzzlement as to whether I was a poet, a biographer, a wandering troubadour with a guitar, a Midwest Hans Christian Andersen, or a historian of current events."

And no wonder. Little chance that we would recognize all these in one man. He became our great American poet; he gave us our greatest monument of biography in his six-volume Abraham Lincoln; he went about our land, singing and playing his guitar, singing to us about ourselves; he told tales and sketched our daily lives in rhythmic verse. All this in one man? All this is Sandburg.

Mr. Sandburg was born in Illinois on January 6, 1878. His parents were Swedish immigrants and as a boy he had to do many kinds of work. When the Spanish-American War began, he enlisted in the Army and served in Puerto Rico. After the war he worked his way through Lombard College. He became a newspaper man, then a free-lance writer. In 1914 he won the Levinson prize for his poetry. In 1919 and 1921 he was cowinner of the Poetry Society of America prize In 1928 he was Harvard's PBK poet. During World War II he performed many services among the OWI foreign broadcasts and the commentary for the United States Government film Bomber. He stands now, dean of American poetry, beloved and honored by his people.

The people, yes. He loves the people. Especially the plain, the simple; especially the toiler and hand worker. For they are he.

"I am the people—the mob—the crowd—the mass.
Do you know that all the great work of the world is done through me?
I am the workingman, the inventor, the maker of the world's food and clothes.
I am the audience that witnesses history. The Napoleons come from me and the Lincolns. They die. And then I send forth more Napoleons and Lincolns.
I am the seed ground. I am a prairie that will stand for much plowing. Terrible storms pass over me. I forget. The best of me is sucked out and wasted. I forget. Everything but Death come to me and makes me work and give up what I have. And I forget.
Sometimes I grow, shake myself and spatter a few red drops for History to remember. Then—I forget.
When I, the People, learn to remember, when I, the People, use the lessons of yesterday and no longer forget who robbed me last year, who played me for a fool—then there will be no speaker in all the world say the name: 'The People,' with any fleck of a sneer in his voice or any far-off smile of derision.
The mob—the crowd—the mass—will arrive then."

Mr. Sandburg likes the language of the people. He uses it. He talks to us in our own tongue. And that is good for he has much to say, and often much to teach us; as when he asked me once:

"Can you bewilder men by the millions
With the transfusions of your own passions
Mixed with lies and half-lies
And then look for peace, quiet, good will
Between nation and nation, race and race
Between class and class?
Who are these so ready
With a hate they are sure of
With a perpetual and considered hate—
Who are these forehanded ones?"

Finally, when we have read these poems, when we have lived in the pages of his great life of Lincoln, when we have heard his own voice say, "The people, yes," we want to honor him and on his birthday to tell him that we love him. But we find that we cannot honor him without honoring ourselves.

Kansas Celebrates Ninetieth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Mr. Fred W. Brinkerhoff, editor of the Pittsburg Headlight, entitled "Kansas at 90." I also wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House that Kansas, during the past 90 years, has developed into the largest wheat-producing State in the Union and ranks high in all agricultural pursuits. In addition to this, our State has developed its industrial potential. From a cultural standpoint, Kansas has always been one of the outstanding leaders in education and religion. We are proud of our citizens and their accomplishments. The editorial by Mr. Brinkerhoff follows:

KANSAS AT 90

Kansas is starting on the last decade of its first century. Ninety years ago the struggle between two different economic and social ideas had been decided in blood and suffering on these prairies that comprised the territory of Kansas. The fight was to get control of the new State that it was conceded would be admitted to the Union. On one side were those who were against human slavery and wanted to wipe it out both as a social and as an economic menace. On the other side were those who believed that a very vast section of the country, meaning the South, could not exist except for slavery. The question had been in politics since the founding of the Republic. It had grown as a menace to a continued Federal Union for half a century.

The whole question was brought out across the Mississippi River and was dropped into Kansas Territory. The antislavery forces in New England and in the North generally set out to populate Kansas with settlers who would fight and vote for a free State. The South did not take strongly to the idea of putting permanent settlers into Kansas because the South did not have potential settlers. It did not have people to spare. It put its reliance on the influence of the power of neighbors, particularly the neighbors in nearby Missouri. It does no violence to history to say the southern statesmen set out to win Kansas by intimidation, and they used ruthless Missourians for that purpose. Thus for several years free State settlers in Kansas and political emissaries from Missouri engaged in bloody struggles which finally came to an end as the free-State population built up and overwhelmed the good neighbors on the east.

After its struggles to write a constitution, Kansas finally obtained one that would pass. Congress passed the act admitting Kansas under a free-State constitution, and the State came into existence January 29, 1861. When that happened, the country was moving swiftly into the great Civil War. The

arguments and debates and conflicts of 50 years over slavery had been brought to a heading in the Kansas question. And so Kansas could not escape them and cannot escape now, its significance in connection with that great war.

So Kansas was a famous State on the first day of statehood. It has pretty well maintained its place during these 90 years. It has been an independent roughneck part of the times. It has been somewhat cultured and refined at other times It has generally been decent, and always it has been patriotic. But never in its history has it been too timid to step forward, too bashful to speak up, or too cowardly to do what it thinks it wants to do. It has produced fakes and fakers in its time. It has indulged in a good deal of flapdoodle, and it has been embarrassed by many freaks. But all in all, up one side and down the other, Kansas has been sturdy and robust and rugged, which, finally, when added to a fair degree of common sense and honesty and decency, will make up a wholesome public.

The people of Kansas make Kansas. The wheat fields, the vast pastures, the oil wells—these and scores of other natural assets are incidental. Kansans have made Kansas out of resources God gave the State and out of the resources they wrought themselves—and of a spirit that is their own creation.

Robert Gordon Sproul, Champion University President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the January issue of the California Monthly. It concerns "Bob" Sproul, who last June 30, 1950, completed 20 years of service as president of the University of California.

President Sproul, when appointed, was referred to as the administrative type of president. His 20 years of administration have certainly brought the University of California to the pinnacle of success. Whether he is a scholar or not, he appreciates and understands scholars, and no president—no matter what his background—could have created a better academic climate than President Sproul has created for scholars by his skillful administration. Lincoln was not a great scholar of English, but his Gettysburg Address is pointed to as a model of perfect English.

Californians are prone to be a little optimistic—some rudely call it boastfulness—about the products of our State. The author of the article referred to has expressed my view of our hero in his last sentence.

This is the article, which I commend to my colleagues who wish to know about the great men of today:

PRESIDENT ROBERT GORDON SPROUL

It is scarcely necessary to identify the picture appearing on the cover of this issue of California Monthly as that of California's first citizen, Robert Gordon Sproul, 1913. But it may be news to most that on July 1 last he began his twenty-first year as president of the university, and thereby shattered the long-standing presidential endurance record for the Golden Bear course established some time ago by his greatest predecessor, the beloved Benjamin Ide Wheeler.

This is quite an achievement for a young fellow trained in civil engineering who as an undergraduate functioned as drum major for the band, and ran the 2-mile for the track team. It is not easy to administer the largest university in the world for 20 years and do it to the satisfaction of 23 fellow regents, not to mention what is perhaps the largest, finest, and most discriminating company of scholars at any university in the world.

There are some 900 years of tradition behind the concept of a great university, and every faculty with any pretensions to greatness knows that it must carry a torch for the fundamental principles involved. There is often a tendency to view with alarm any president who has not had an early background of teaching and research, because he might fail to understand the teacher's approach or to appreciate the importance of the intangibles upon which greatness rests. Faculties have usually preferred to select a scholar as president and take a chance on his administrative ability.

This procedure worked with fair success in past years, but in the present day of very large, highly complex universities, a president without administrative experience or skill would soon find himself too snarled up to even think of greatness.

The more one reflects upon such facts, the more he comes to appreciate what Robert Gordon Sproul has meant to the University of California, and to know why the faculty and the regents have consistently joined forces to hold him whenever attractive opportunities to go elsewhere presented themselves.

It was outstanding administrative skill, demonstrated as cashier, comptroller, and vice president, during the years 1914 to 1930, which won for Robert Sproul the confidence of the regents. It was his consistent deference to the opinions of the academic senate, and his ability to represent the university brilliantly and successfully on every public front, which won him the respect and loyalty of the faculty. He not only demonstrated an understanding and appreciation of true greatness in a university, but he provided the practical ability to maintain and increase that greatness.

It has been his privilege to count as friends a tremendous number of those leaders who control sources of support, both public and private. No man could have had a greater test of loyalty than was provided by the unfortunate loyalty-oath controversy.

On occasion "Bob" Sproul has smilingly said that he would never have survived the demands of the presidency without the Latin which he learned in high school from Monroe E. Deutsch, 1902. Later, of course, he was bolstered by having 15 universities confer doctors' degrees upon him, honoris causa, including the far-famed academic Emily Post, Harvard. If the truth must be told, his success results from nothing more than an extraordinarily friendly personality and a wonderful sense of humor, backed up by a remarkably clear and quick mind, a phenomenal memory, an inexhaustible store of energy, and a larynx of commanding quality.

When "Bob" Sproul became president in 1930 there were a good many people who felt that the concept of a single great university for the State of California, however desirable it might be, would soon be destroyed by a lack of confidence on the part of southern California in any institution closely associated with northern California for almost two-thirds of a century. If any single factor is responsible for the survival of the University of California, it is the confidence which "Bob" Sproul has won personally from the thoughtful and far-seeing leaders in the South.

All-University Week End, a modern California tradition, sprung straight from the core of the university-family philosophy, is an annual tribute to President Sproul, that philosophy's strongest advocate. It was significant, then, that students, faculty, and alumni chose those few days last year to celebrate his twentieth year as president. This was the second major tribute among innumerable smaller ones that has been paid to "Bob" Sproul by students and alumni. In 1946 they awarded him the "highest honor at their command," the alumnus-of-the-year award, for his "manifold services to university, State, and Nation."

This brief sketch cannot hope to cover the subject of President R. G. Sproul. For a complete list of honors and achievements see "Who's Who in America." We prefer the epitome coined by the late Prof. Dixon Wecter, who said that God doubtless could have made a better university president than Sproul, but doubtless God never did.

My Visit With Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article I wrote recently about Yugoslavia for the Methodist Laymen's magazine:

MY VISIT WITH TITO

(By Congressman LAURIE C. BATTLE, of Alabama)

Arriving in the United States last November after 6 weeks in Europe, including several days in Yugoslavia, I felt humble and thankful for the privilege of living in this great land of ours.

It is very difficult for Americans to comprehend what life in Yugoslavia means today. Yet it is extremely important from the standpoint of improving our relations and in getting a realistic glimpse of Stalin's difficulties, economically, politically, and militarily as he tries to enslave the world by taking over one nation after another. Since the Dictator, Marshall Tito, broke with the Kremlin the iron curtain has been rolled back beyond Yugoslavia's borders—the only instance of such a roll back to date. By comparison with the iron curtain which has been drawn tight between Yugoslavia and Russia, there is only a lace curtain between Yugoslavia and the West. Like some of Russia's satellite countries in the Balkans, Yugoslavia is suffering from the drought of last summer, in addition to internal collectivist policies which are not bearing fruit. All told, an extra hard winter is in prospect and pressure from the Soviets is mounting.

In traveling through the city of Belgrade evidences of Tito's break with Stalin could be easily seen. In one section, where a new area of the city was being developed, a series of skeleton structures loomed against the sky. These buildings could not be completed because the supply line of materials from Russia had been cut off. Most of the shops were bare. We learned that a bar of soap, if one could be found, would cost us about $8. After visiting in a little home along the roadside I gave the lady of the house a 25-cent script pencil with the words "U. S. House of Representatives" printed on it. She had given our group some apples which

we did not want to take because we knew that she and the several colorfully but simply dressed children needed them. Upon my return to the Embassy I told about our embarrassment at accepting this lady's hospitality when we could not return her kindness. I was quite surprised to learn that the 25-cent pencil which I gave her was worth several dollars because pencils are practically unobtainable in Yugoslavia.

These two examples will give you an indication of the great poverty of the people of Yugoslavia. Of course, the average person does not have the money to buy such luxuries as soap and pencils, so it is necessary to resort to barter for these things if they can get them at all. I understand that economic conditions of other nations in that part of the world are not too different.

We also visited one of the collectivist farms and stopped to talk to men, women, and children working in the fields as we rode through the countryside. I was amazed to find so much good will being expressed toward America because I had expected an outright hostile attitude. I learned that many of the people have relatives in the United States and that a lot of them hope to be able to come to this promised land or make it possible for their children to come to America. Except for the Communist leaders sent out to run the collectivist farms, I do not believe the average person knows anything about Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism, or any other kind of political philosophy. They impressed me as being just simple, poor, hard-working people who have never had much of a chance in life.

The high point of our visit to Yugoslavia was an hour-and-a-half interview with Marshal Tito. Representatives FISHER, of Texas, CHATHAM, of North Carolina, and I made up the congressional group. We were accompanied by George Allen, our Ambassador; Colonel Wilson, of the United States Air Force; and Allen Moreland, of the United States State Department. Leaving the American Embassy, where members of our subcommittee were staying, we went a short distance down the street to Tito's home, if it can be called that. Sentries bristled from every vantage point. Several sets of well-armed guards ushered us into Tito's room, which was very spacious and handsomely decorated. The marshal sat behind a long desk at the far end of the room. A huge mural depicting a sixteenth century peasant uprising covered the entire wall behind him. On Tito's left was a bust of a very familiar Communist leader which interested me a great deal. Through the interpreter, I asked the Marshall about it, and he made it very clear that it was a bust of Lenin and not of Stalin.

Tito is a mild-mannered man with a commanding personality. He is about 5 feet 11 inches in height, and rather heavy set. His build, square jaw, steel-blue eyes, and graying, wavy hair all give him a trim appearance. The marshal's manner is very direct and he exhibited a good sense of humor to us. In evaluating him as a person, however, we remembered that Tito was Stalin's No. 1 pupil for many years and is now the dictator of a Communist country. In fairness to a man who has been very ruthless at times, it must be recognized that since his break with Stalin he has helped to stop the Red-inspired Greek war, his representative in the United Nations has departed considerably from the Soviet Party lines, and he has expressed a desire to settle such international problems as returning Greek children to their homes and reestablishing the railroad system from Salonika, Greece, to Belgrade, Yugoslavia. This is important to remember along with things that are not so complimentary to him.

Tito always talked through an interpreter. Yet every time the interpreter made a mistake the marshal would catch him up instantly. I believe he understands English much better than he might have us think, and certainly he understands English better than we do Serbian.

Our group questioned Tito sharply about whether or not the United States could place confidence in his break with Stalin. We asked him point blank if the break was permanent and if he would go back into the Soviet fold. Although I have certain reservations concerning Tito's answers, nevertheless he assured us that his break with Stalin is real enough and that the only relationship Yugoslavia wants with Russia is the relationship between two friendly countries which would necessitate Stalin giving up his aggression. One of my reservations is the natural distrust of a Communist dictator, and another is the fact that Yugoslavia may be forced back into Stalin's camp for economic survival.

We asked Tito why Russia had not taken Yugoslavia over militarily. He said there were several reasons. In all of his answers he seemed very self-assured and forthright. The first reason he gave is that the Soviets miscalculated as they always do in thinking that Yugoslavia would crack up economically. Tito said they were not going to crack up and surplus food from America would be a big help in avoiding this catastrophe. Second, Tito said he has thirty divisions which are well trained for fighting in the mountainous terrain of Yugoslavia. Hitler found this combination quite an obstacle in his drive to conquer the Communists. He said Stalin knows that these divisions could tie up at least 30 Russian divisions and hold them off long enough to start world war III. The marshal had no doubt that the Allied Nations would join in the fight against Russia if Yugoslavia was attacked. Despite the fact that practically every young man I saw in Yugoslavia had on a military uniform, Tito insisted that he does not have too great a percentage of his boys in the armed forces.

One of the most significant statements that Tito made was relative to Yugoslavia's obligations in the United Nations. In response to a question which I asked him, he said that in the future Yugoslavia was going to uphold her responsibilities in the UN whether or not she was attacked first. Previously he had said only that Yugoslavia would fight anybody that attacked his country. But there, for the first time, he made the statement that Yugoslavia would fight under the auspices of the UN regardless of which nation was attacked first. We thought perhaps we misunderstood, or were having interpretation difficulties so we questioned him further in this matter. There was no misunderstanding. He stuck to his original statement. His reasoning went like this: There will be no such thing in the future as a bilateral war. In the world of today, if two great nations get into a war, it will soon spread into a global conflict. Despite his strong desire to remain neutral and avoid entangling alliances with foreign countries, Tito said he realizes that no nation would be able to stay out of such a conflict.

There is no doubt about the dire effects of the drought and the need for food in Yugoslavia this winter. I asked Tito if he had plans for the distribution of food in case the United States granted this request. He said yes, that he already had a system whereby he takes surplus food from the breadbasket of Yugoslavia and distributes it through his agents over the entire country. Of course, the army and party members get priority in this distribution, which strengthens their hands. Tito said he would expand this system if this request was granted and that his people would know where it came from and would be appreciative. In fairness to him, I understand that information about previous assistance from the United States was disseminated widely by press and radio throughout the country.

The $38,000,000 worth of surplus food which has just been granted by Congress to communistic Yugoslavia in her hour of need is a long chance. A chance that Yugoslavia will appreciate our Christian, charitable act and not fight us; a chance that this assistance will help to keep Tito from being forced back into Stalin's camp, or from being overthrown by Stalin's henchmen because of economic chaos; a chance that Yugoslavia's 30 divisions can remain independent from Soviet domination; a chance that Yugoslavia will help to stop those who would conquer the world.

This humanitarian act and calculated military risk might save thousands of American lives. The cost is nothing by comparison with the bloodshed, misery, and money that would be necessary to stop Russia in an all-out war, even without these additional 30 divisions. Yugoslavia's forces are larger than any in Europe, and they are dwarfed by Russia's army.

Yes, Yugoslavia has a communistic government, but Russia has the aggressive communistic government that is determined to enslave the world. Not that Tito has or ever will give up communism, or that we would dictate Yugoslavia's form of government, but here we have the only country that has been able to defy the Soviets, emerge from behind the iron curtain, and drop aggression. A helping hand in this instance would encourage other satellite countries to do the same. The forces of good must be receptive to those who will break with the Kremlin, and try to convert them to become active members in the family of nations for the cause of peace.

The phenomenon of an independent Yugoslavia deep in the Russian orbit is particularly important to us today because the world situation is so grave. We are facing a long drawn out struggle for our freedom if not for our very existence. The voluntary or forced withdrawal of our troops from Europe and the Far East would mean Russian domination of about nine-tenths of the world's population. The additional industrial power gained by the Soviets would be disastrous for most of the free nations of the world, and would certainly bring a horrible war to our own shores. I mention this because some Americans advocate voluntary withdrawal and because such a course is well within the realm of necessity based on present comparative strength, if Russia goes all out in the next few months. In such a situation our task would be multiplied a hundredfold.

In conclusion, our Nation cannot survive if each of us goes his own selfish way like the average Frenchman who refuses to participate in his Government or strengthen it, thereby making a mockery out of democracy. There is nobody to accept the responsibility of world leadership except the United States unless we meekly turn the gavel over to Soviet Russia to bring about a living hell on earth. Of course we are not going to do that. We must develop stronger leadership backed by an active, well informed public in order to weather this storm. It is necessary to see that our friendly allies strengthen themselves and to bolster the faltering wherever possible. We should encourage and cooperate with the individuals, groups, and nations that are trying to throw off the treacherous yoke of Soviet domination. Above all, we must make ourselves stronger physically, mentally, and spiritually.

Stalin faces great difficulties, too. He cannot take an aroused United States from within or from without but his capacity to cause destruction and suffering in the world is even greater than Hitler's. Even the Red Bear will have acute pains of indigestion in trying to assimilate people and nations that hate her.

Aggressive, atheistic communism will not win out. It cannot dominate the minds of men very long because such unfortunate people will eventually realize that they have been deceived by false promises. It cannot

dominate the souls of men long because man inevitably seeks a higher being. It cannot use the bodies of men long because its course is the path of self destruction. Atheistic communism will not dominate the souls, minds, or bodies of men in the long run because the religious forces of the world are lining up against it. But the number of us, both as individuals and as nations, that will be living to enjoy freedom again is in direct proportion to how quickly and with how much intelligent vigor we tackle this task together. "The ox is in the ditch" and we must all pull together to get on higher, safer ground.

Where the Soldiers Are Coming From

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly all Members of Congress are receiving letters protesting conscription of our manpower for a war abroad. Typical of one class of those letters is the following:

ST JOSEPH, MICH., *January 18, 1951.*

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have never written to you before, but I just have to express my feelings now. How can they put a young married man, who just got married to escape the draft and whose wife is able to go to work in class 3 and a young man who is the only child of a widow in class I-A? My husband died when my son was 3½ years old. And during the depression days we had to drop his insurance, and when he died I had to pay a large doctor bill, funeral expenses, and besides lose our little farm. No Government agency stepped in then to ask how I would be able to raise him, because I had a house in town on which we were hardly collecting enough rent to pay the taxes. I was lucky to get my job back which I had before I was married. I didn't make much, but enough to raise my son. When he was 12 years old he got a paper route and has been helping me ever since. But I kept on working and now when I can hardly work any more—I am nearly 52 years old, they want to take him in the draft. It seems to me that draft law should apply the same to only sons of widowed mothers as it does to young married men. The shop that I worked in closed down last year but I was lucky for one of my age to get another job, and only because I had a sister-in-law working in this shop and she put in a good word for me. I have had a nervous stomach for years and most days I just have to force myself to go to work and if they take my son from me I just won't be able to go to work.

My nephew is in Korea in a fox hole and thinking of him makes me nearly crazy. If this war would be on our shores we would all be doing our utmost, but why our boys should always be sent to other countries to fight I just can't take. But I still say a boy who is the only child of a widowed mother should have the same consideration as these 19- and 20-year-olds who only got married to be deferred.

Hoping I will get your opinion on this problem, I remain.

P. S.—My son is working in a newspaper shop and never made enough until this last summer after he went away to a linotype school. He only made 75 cents an hour before; now he makes $1.15 an hour. That's why I had to keep on working.

The Proposed Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, thinking Americans everywhere have become alarmed, and I think properly so, over certain aspects of the tremendous Federal budget sought in the Eighty-second Congress by the administration. This alarm has not been eased in any degree by the Presidential tax message presented today. Concern of the people does not revolve primarily about the vast sums required for essential defense efforts, but rather from the apparent unwillingness of the administration to reduce substantially the spending for activities of the Government in no way connected with our defense responsibilities.

Like most of my colleagues, I have received many thoughtful letters on this subject from informed residents of the district I have the honor to represent. Under permission granted by the House, I am including for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of these. It comes from an informed citizen, Mr. Frank R. Mills, publisher of the Hoopeston (Ill.) Daily Chronicle-Herald. What he has to say could be read with profit by every person serving in government, whether in the legislative branch or in the executive. His letter follows:

THE CHRONICLE-HERALD,
Hoopeston, Ill., January 26, 1951.

Representative EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: The proposed budget has just crossed my desk, and although I do not claim to understand all its features, I am no end alarmed and perturbed with the increase for civilian purposes.

No doubt you have studied it closely and can explain what people in Washington are thinking about. It's all I can do to abstain from profanity, and if I had the Truman gift for vulgar expression, could tell you in a more colorful way how I regard this proposal for increasing wasteful spending.

However, I know you to be an intelligent individual, and will understand what I mean, when I say I do not like it. It's all wrong, it stinks to high heaven. This is no time for a politically expedient plan to build votes.

Last week, I sent my boy to the armed services. He's only 19 and so I want him to have the advantage of the best training he can get, the best equipment possible so he can fight a good fight. I most certainly do not want his efforts hamstrung by high expenditures for farm subsidies, when every morsel of food can be sold at astronomical prices, or for fair employment boondoggling when every man who will work has a job, or for so-called socialized medicine while our doctors are going to war, or any of these other swindles now being perpetrated on we yokels out here in the sticks.

It is high time we get back to basic principles. Why subsidize until prices climb out of sight, and then put on ceilings? The second might be unnecessary without the first.

I am willing to believe you have made a personal sacrifice in going to Washington to serve our country. Why not make this sacrifice pay off in benefit to the folks you represent? Let's cut out this back scratching and vote trading. Stand on the principles of your own belief and those of the people back home desperately looking to you for wise leadership.

This is an opportunity for you to go on a record against, or for, this vicious spending. The people at home you represent will be very definitely interested in how you vote.

Best regards,

FRANK R. MILLS,
President.

Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Mills has to say clearly represents the thinking of great numbers of our people in the present tragic hour. Congress must accept the responsibility so far evaded by the administration. Nondefense spending must be pared to the bone. There must be no "government as usual" until we have won our battles against our enemies on the military front, and on the economic front.

A New Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Coalition has for years been one of the best champions of patriotism and liberty in the whole United States. Organized and supported for years by Capt. John B. Trevor, of New York, this organization cemented together many of the leading patriotic organizations into a great movement whose influence has been felt all over the country.

Recently this great organization adopted a set of resolutions under the caption of "A new declaration of independence."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include these resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN COALITION AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25, 1951

A NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(Submitted by John W. Finger, president, American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies)

Whereas on July 4, 1776, the United States of America became a free and independent nation by proclamation of their legal representatives assembled in Philadelphia; and

Whereas this independence was established in international law by the valor of American soldiers under the inspired leadership of George Washington and for nearly two centuries has been maintained by the blood of American citizens shed upon many battlefields and the guardianship of American statesmen who thought patriotically of America first; and

Whereas under the benign influence of independence these United States have not only developed a "more perfect union" according to the ideals of the founding fathers but have offered to other peoples the precepts and the example of representative constitutional government "with liberty and justice for all"; and

Whereas Almighty God in His great munificence has permitted this Republic to prosper in the enjoyment of the fruits of

agriculture, the applications of science and invention and the arts of industry, and to become the friend and benefactor of afflicted mankind everywhere; and

Whereas because of alien-minded theories, base betrayals, false counsels, mendacious propaganda, unintelligent executive leadership, and subservient legislators the Nation has been misled into international complications and warlike situations which endanger its very existence at a time when pagan forces are attempting the extinction of freedom, religion, and civilization throughout the world; and

Whereas it is obvious that the compelling duty of Americans to God, to humanity, and especially to our own citizenship is to reestablish our independence and to conserve our resources of materials, of manpower, and of moral law in order that "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth":

Now, therefore, we as citizens of this Republic do hereby declare, and call upon the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the several States to declare:

1. That the United States must again become a free and independent Nation

2. That it shall be the policy of these United States to avoid entangling alliances which diminish or imperil our sovereignty and independence, and to remain forever free of any involvement in any form of foreign regional or world government.

3. That armed services shall be fully maintained, to guard our independence and territory from invasion or aggression.

4. That, except in case of attack requiring immediate offense, no part of the armed services shall be engaged in any hostilities save only by authorization of Congress, as the Constitution requires.

In pursuance whereof, we as citizens further declare:

1. That the Congress of the United States, in commemoration of the Declaration of Independence and fulfillment of the oath of its Members to support and defend the Constitution, should immediately renounce this country's mistaken adherence to, and any participation in, the United Nations and should withdraw all financial support of that organization.

2. That our Armed Forces which have been sent to war on the continent of Asia without a constitutional declaration of war should be immediately recalled from that action.

3. That a joint committee of Congress should be selected by vote of the Members of both Houses to conduct a complete and public investigation of all aspects of our international relations and affairs since 1940, and to propose necessary or advisable protective and remedial measures.

Finally we call upon the legislatures of the several States to support these declaratory recommendations by making suitable addresses to Congress.

A Report to the American Coalition on Our Present Situation

(By John B. Trevor, president emeritus)

There is no provision in the Constitution of the United States which gives any justification for the belief that the founders of our Republic ever conceived of the possibility that the Government which they established would drain the resources of the United States of its manpower, its money, or material to reconstitute and rehabilitate foreign nations and, above all, surrender its independence to a foreign agency. Nevertheless, that is exactly what our Government has done, is doing, and proposes to go on doing to an even greater extent than it the past.

As a Nation we have, like foolish children, violated every admonition handed down to us by the Father of our Country in respect to dealings with foreign nations and involvement in the eternal quarrels of Europe. We intervened in Europe in 1917 to make the world safe for democracy. One of the fruits of our follies on that occasion was to leave Russia in the birth pangs of a political system which has been at war with civilized society ever since their early constitutions boldly advertised that fact, and the policy of the infamous regime which so came to life has never belied this profession of faith.

Another fruit of our naive conception of foreign relations was sponsorship of the League of Nations. The League did not fail, as alleged, because the United States did not adhere to the covenant, but rather because England was determined to destroy the preeminence of France as a military power and re-create Germany as a counter weight in the councils of Europe. The English politicians did destroy France and did re-create Germany to fight the Second World War.

We intervened again in Europe because no one in Washington had the vision to prevent a crisis arising at a time when the opportunity to avert a new war was presented.

According to the United States Statistical Abstract of 1935, the accumulated money costs of our first intervention was $41,000,000,000. Then, for reasons not disclosed, the Government ceased to publish the ever rising totals of the cost of this war.

The money costs of our second intervention was over $330,000,000,000. On both occasions our intervention saves France and England from defeat, but the cost to us in money has not stopped. From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1950, we have paid out in grants, aids, or loans to foreign nations $81,400,000,000.

Everyone recognises that our military victory was overwhelming, and yet through childish folly, ignorance, and possibly even treason, we are in the midst of a hideous and unnecessary war, with the possibility that we may end on the verge of a world cataclysm.

Under these circumstances, it is vital that the people of the United States assert their sovereignty through their Senators and Representatives in Congress.

In the determination of the policy which we should pursue there are certain indisputable facts which must be borne in mind. Prior to World War I in 1914, the French budget for her military and naval establishments totaled $343,000,000, and provided for the maintenance of a peace-time army of 846,000 men or 56 divisions. Between April 3, 1948, and June 30, 1949, the United States—excluding all other grants of aid or loans—subsidized France through ECA in the amount of $1,313,000,000, or almost four times the amount provided by the French Government for national defense before the outbreak of the First World War.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, France received through ECA more than double the cost of her military and naval budget in 1914. Let us now examine what France has done for herself in the way of European defense during that period:

On December 17, 1950, the New York Times published a map of Europe on which is printed the distribution of Western European troops as compared to Russia's, and in the text of the explanatory article underneath this map, it states that France maintains in Germany "three under-strength French divisions" and goes on to say, "Beyond this, in the first line of defense, are two French divisions in France."

The facts in regard to Britain are very similar to those which have been related in regard to France. From April 3, 1948, to June 30, 1949, the United States supported the British Government in the amount of $1,619,000,000, or approximately four times the sum budgeted by the British Government for national defense just before the outbreak of the First World War. In the following year, through ECA the United States gave the British Government twice the amount of her national defense budget in 1914.

It is now pertinent to consider what Great Britain has done for herself in the way of European defense:

The article to which reference has been made, published in the New York Times of December 17, states that the British have contributed two first-class divisions to the defense forces of Western Germany, and the map accompanying the article indicates that the United Kingdom has retained two divisions in garrison for home defense.

There are good grounds for the belief that the factories of both France and England are in better shape now than ever before to provide war matériel for the rearmament of the forces of their respective Governments, but these factories have not been so employed, but rather in the production of war matériel which has been shipped to the active and potential enemies of the United States.

A review of the past histories of both England and France suggests that they, with their increased population over what it was in the prewar period, are well able to build up for themselves substantial forces to oppose an assault by Russia, if they so desire. The difficulty which confronts us in the United States is that England now has a form of government which is based upon an ideology similar in many respects to Russia; and the willingness of the British to commit themselves to a united defense action against Russian aggression is by no means definitely established.

Likewise, the French, who put up a magnificent defense against the Germans in 1914, collapsed in a disastrous fashion when assaulted the second time, upon the outbreak of the Second World War. There is evidence to show that the professional army of France in this war lived up to the highest traditions of its history, but the reserves were so infiltrated with Communist officers and Communist soldiers in the line, that the defeat of France followed in short order upon the opening of the attack.

We must consider this fact and, while it is impossible to state exactly to what extent France is permeated with Communists now, there is ground for the belief that possibly two-thirds of the reserve officers are of doubtful quality, and perhaps one-third of the line troops may be directly or indirectly influenced by the Communist leaders.

If the résumé of Western European troops, compared with Russia's, as set forth in the map accompanying the article in the New York Times on Sunday, December 17, is accurate, the anti-Communist forces in Europe, excluding the United States, that is to say, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Yugoslavia, together with Belgium and Holland represent an aggregate of only 52 divisions against a total force of 235 divisions under the control of the Soviet high command, that is, including contributions from the Eastern European satellite states.

That is the picture of the situation we face. And under the circumstances, it is suggested that the American coalition adopt the following resolutions:

"Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That, in the absence of any evidence that France and England have any force in being at the present time adequate for the defense of Western Europe, the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urge upon the members of all associated societies and other patriotic citizens that they impress upon their Senators and Representatives in Congress to hold the Military Establishment in Western Germany to a mere token force, and at the same time provide for planes, pilots, and ground crews, together with naval equipment in sufficient force to assure our superiority in the air and on the sea, together with such land forces in

American possessions as shall be necessary to meet any situation which may arise; and be it further

"Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, hold that, unless the powers signatory to the United Nations Charter discontinue supplying our enemies with war matériel, and immediately contribute reinforcements to the armies engaged in the Korean War equal in proportion to their population to those contributed by the United States, steps be initiated by our Government to withdraw the United States from membership in the United Nations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urge the members of associated societies and all patriotic citizens to impress upon their Senators and Representatives in Congress the necessity of an immediate reappraisal of the whole economic situation here and abroad, with the understanding that the economic resources of the United States are not inexhaustible, and that unless all proposed expenditures, not absolutely essential for the maintenance of Government and the building up of an adequate military machine, be stricken from the budget proposed by the President, there is a strong possibility that the Communists will destroy us without having to fire a shot.

"COMMUNIST CHINA

"Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, approved Senate Resolutions 35 and 36 introduced by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and action of a similar character:

"1. That the United States 'should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea,' and

"2. That the Communist government should not be seated to represent China in the United Nations, and in addition, the imposition of such economic sanctions as may be necessary.

"TREATIES

"Whereas under recent court decisions a treaty and even a diplomatic note not approved by the Senate may nullify and render inoperative those guarantees of states rights and individual liberty which are embodied in the Constitution of the United States, and especially in those amendments which are known as the Bill of Rights: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, calls upon the members of its associated societies to urge the President of the United States not to negotiate and the Senate not to consent to any treaty or other international agreement which may in any way infringe upon or affect the domestic laws and institutions of the United States or the rights of the several states or of individual citizens, and calls upon both the President and Senate to re-examine all international agreements heretofore entered into, and to take steps to abrogate all such treaties or agreements which can in any way affect the rights of liberties of the States or their citizens.

"GENOCIDE

"Whereas the Senate of the United States has been asked to approve the convention against genocide which has been devised in the United Nations; and

"Whereas this convention is a piece of proposed international legislation which is intended to supersede our domestic law; and

"Whereas genocide, or the destruction of races or groups of people, is defined in the convention as the destruction or persecution of national, religious, and ethnical groups; and

"Whereas the convention originally contains the words "political groups," but these words were deleted on the motion of Soviet Russia, so that the persecution of a political group could not be penalized as genocide; and

"Whereas the convention was also amended on the motion of Soviet Russia to make genocide the persecution of national, ethnical, and religious groups as such, consequently it would be possible for any nation, brought up on charges of genocide following group massacres or group persecutions, to plead that the persecuted groups were not persecuted as such, but as individuals, guilty of political crimes, and under the convention political persecution would not be genocide; consequently, the convention is so devised that it will not prevent and will not punish the crime of genocide in those nations where genocide is now practiced; and

"Whereas under our Constitution the convention against genocide will become the supreme law of the land if approved by the Senate; and may subject American citizens to prosecution in alien courts, and outside the laws of the United States, even for offenses which are crimes under our domestic law and are properly prosecuted in our own courts; and

"Whereas the Convention Against Genocide would amount to an abrogation of the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it hereby

"Resolved by the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, That it is opposed to the approval of a treaty accepting the convention against genocide as now submitted for approval by the United States Senate.

"COMMUNISM

"Whereas communism is inimical to the best interests of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled this 25th day of January 1951 do hereby approve and endorse provisions of Senate Resolution No. 7, or a similar measure, authorizing the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of the administration, operation, and the cause for the difference of interpretation of the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the Departments of State and Justice and other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States.

"INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

"Be it resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled this 25th day of January 1951 do hereby wholeheartedly and most enthusiastically support the Internal Security Act of 1950."

What Has Happened to Our United States Savings Bonds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are beset by many problems in these trying days of peril. One of the most serious of these is the dwindling value of United States savings bonds purchased in response to the pleading of the Federal Government during World War II.

Under permission granted to me by the House, I am including for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received only today from a resident of our congressional district who asks the pointed question as to who or what agency of Government can or will do something to support the buying power of United States Government bonds. The author of the letter, Mr. W. O. Peirce, 843 East Penn Street, Hoopeston, Ill., has this to say:

HOOPESTON, ILL., *January 31, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
Congressman, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENISON: I understand that our Government has departments representing agriculture, labor, etc., which departments support wages and living costs. Please let me know the name of the Department of Government to which I can appeal for some support to the buying power of United States Government bonds.

Since I have been retired I do not have wages, and do not have a farm. Unfortunately my principal saving is in Government bonds and I must depend very much on these and on a retirement pension for a living. This pension is small.

I bought these bonds during the past 10 years, including all of the E bonds I could afford in addition to regular purchase of payroll savings bonds during the World War II. I still have most all of these bonds, which I now regret.

On September 18, 1941, the Secretary of the United States Treasury at Washington wrote me a letter urging me to start buying United States bonds periodically for a sound investment. His letter was addressed to me and included the following:

"I should like to urge you to start buying United States bonds periodically. * * *
"This is an opportunity to serve your country while making a sound investment for yourself."

Signed H. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury.

He also mailed to me at that time a pamphlet, O-200699, which I hold, urging me to "Buy a Share in America" and stated that—

"Investment in Government bonds is one of the best known ways of building future security for yourself and dependents."

Now that these bonds are soon to start maturing it is a very great disappointment to me to find that the investment was only 50 percent sound, and that the security was only 50 percent as secure as was promised me by the United State Government. The administration, which, I regret to say, is the Government, has manipulated things so that these bonds will buy only one-half as much as they should, therefore, they are worth only one-half as much as they should be.

This appears to be a gross misrepresentation on the part of the Government and is the next thing to, if not actually, the crime of obtaining money under false pretense. The fact that it has been a common practice does not make it lawful.

The laborer and farmer are not being deceived by being supported in receiving lots of dollars while the Government permits its dollars and United States bonds to sink toward the worthless point, which is being done every day by permitting prices, wages and living costs to go higher and higher. This is exactly what is desired by Moscow and all Reds and Pinks, and is being done by our present administration. If the Reds have something so good why don't Washington let us know what it is so that we can all be for them.

I trust that you will advise me what steps can be and will be taken for justice in this matter.

If not, I propose to investigate thoroughly in an effort to recover some of the lost "security" and "sound" investment which was urged upon me by our United States Government.

This injustice to those who were persuaded to "invest" their previous 100-cent dollars

for United States bonds, pensions, and life insurance can be made right with these dupes by bringing down prices and wages, both of which go together. This would reduce all costs and expenses in every line and would assist the Government in financing its present war program and all of its other expenses under this new enormous budget. This program would also reduce your salary—and the President's, which might be a good thing.

I should greatly appreciate hearing from you soon, if anything, and what can be done in our behalf, or if it will be necessary for us to organize and start something ourselves.

Yours very truly,

W. O. PEIRCE.

Mr. Speaker, the author of this letter speaks in the language of the great body of American citizenship, and I find myself in agreement with his contention that we must act with courage not only to defend our interests as we are doing from a military standpoint, but we must act with equal courage to fight the common enemy—inflation. We must tighten our belts or the noose of inflation will tighten around the neck.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the second and subsequent short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

MOSES: THE GREAT JEWISH LAWGIVER, PROPHET, AND MEDIATOR (CIRCA, 1571–1451 B. C.)

Moses is the great Jewish lawgiver, prophet, mediator, and leader of the Israelites from Egypt to the eastern borders of the Promised Land. Moses stands out as one of the greatest figures in history.

One congressional historian wrote: "Among all lawgivers, founders of states and teachers of mankind, none has excelled Moses, who transformed a horde of slaves and wanderers into a nation, disciplined a race, and breathed into it its character."

Not only the Ten Commandments, but the whole Mosaic law are attributed to Moses. Some critics hold that his authorship of the Mosaic law is highly questionable.

The Moses plaque was done by Jean deMarco, of New York City.

LYCURGUS: FOUNDER OF THE SPARTAN CONSTITUTION

Lycurgus is the reputed founder of the Spartan Constitution. He flourished, according to tradition, in the seventh century B. C. He may be a mythical character.

Lycurgus is said to have found Sparta the prey of disunion, weakness, and lawlessness, and left her united, and subject to the most stable government the Greek world had ever seen.

The law giver is credited with uniting the several component parts of the state, the rigid military organization and training which made the Spartan youth the best soldier in Greece. He also is the reputed father of the elaborate and strict system of education in the Spartan world.

Lycurgus' subordination of the individual to the all-powerful state is without parallel in history.

This plaque was sculptured by C. Paul Jennewein of New York City.

SOLON: THE ATHENIAN LAWGIVER (639-559 B. C.)

Solon, who lived from 639 to 559 B. C., was the first Greek clearly known to history. He was an accomplished poet, but is known especially for his economic and constitutional reforms.

The law giver, with almost unlimited dictatorial powers, curtailed feudal rule by annulling mortgages, putting limits on the amount of land an individual could hold and outlawed contracts in which a person's liberty was pledged.

Other state controls, instigated by Solon, included those over exports, education, use of wells, bee farming, and cutting down olive trees.

Solon then reformed the Athenian Constitution, thus laying the foundation for the Athenian democracy.

The Solon plaque was done by Brenda Putman of New York City.

GAIUS: THE CELEBRATED ROMAN JURIST

Gaius was a celebrated Roman jurist of the second century A. D. History books are skimpy on his personal history.

The jurist is remembered for his "Institutes," which contributed materially to our knowledge of early Roman law. Gaius was one of five jurists whose opinions were followed by judges on deciding cases.

Gaius was a conservative in his thinking, advocating strict adherence to ancient law and resistance to innovation.

His interest in the antiquities of Roman law makes his work important to students of early institutions.

His plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski of New York City.

Justice Alfred Budge, "Grand Old Man" of the Idaho Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho has just lost one of her great leaders, Justice Alfred Budge, who adorned the Supreme Court of Idaho for 34 years with courage, integrity, and honor, but in passing he has left Idaho a rich heritage in an equally distinguished family consisting of his widow Ella Hoge Budge, who was selected as Idaho's Mother of the Year in 1950, and eight children, one of whom is my colleague from the Second District of Idaho, the Hon. HAMER H. BUDGE. The following article from the Coeur d'Alene Press, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, of January 25, 1951, describes briefly the distinguished career of Judge Alfred Budge:

FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE BUDGE IS STRICKEN

BOISE, IDAHO.—Former Justice Alfred Budge, "the grand old man" of Idaho's Supreme Court, died today. He would have been 83 in February.

Budge served a record-breaking 34 years on the supreme court bench before retiring December 30, 1948. He was the first jurist to retire under the 1947 judge's retirement act.

He was the father of Representative HAMER BUDGE, Idaho Representative from the Second Congressional District.

Justice Budge entered a Boise hospital last Saturday. His son, HAMER, is expected to arrive in Boise today from Washington.

WROTE NEARLY 1,800 OPINIONS

Justice Budge, who wrote nearly 1,800 opinions during his 84 years on the supreme court, served in public life for 54 years. He served 12 years as a district court judge before being appointed to the supreme court November 28, 1914, by Gov. John Haynes. He was reelected continuously until his retirement.

During his 46 years on the bench, he missed only one term of court. A back injury prevented his attending the final supreme court term in 1948.

Many of the famous decisions in Idaho legal history were handed down by Justice Budge and many a University of Idaho law student has come away from one of Justice Budge's many lectures there with a clearer understanding of ethics of law and appellate procedures. His father, who lived to be 95, was one of the University of Idaho's first regents.

Justice Budge was a close personal friend and business partner of former Gov. Frank Steuenberg and was with Steuenberg at Richman, Utah, on the night before an assassin's bomb killed him December 30, 1905.

Mrs. Ella Hoge Budge, whom he married in 1892 at Paris, Idaho, was selected as Idaho's mother of the year in 1950. She survives along with eight children: Dr. Alfred Budge, Jr., Boise; Dr. Bruce Budge, Boise; Representative Hamer Budge (Republican, of Idaho), Boise; Drew W. Budge now living in Mexico; Walter L. Budge, Salt Lake City; Mrs. Wayne C. (Ina) Courson, Ontario, Oreg.; Mrs. William F. (Ora) Cleary, San Francisco; and Mrs. John R. (Belva) Baker, Walnut Creek, Calif.

ON MISSION ABROAD

Justice Budge was born in Providence, Utah, February 24, 1868, but the family moved to Paris, Idaho, when he was very young. When he was 18, the Latter-Day Saints (Mormon) Church called him into missionary service. He went to Geneva, Switzerland, where he learned to speak German fluently. After learning the language he walked across Switzerland, preaching as he went, and continued walking into Germany.

He spent 3 years in Germany before being arrested in Nuremberg on a charge of preaching a faith hostile to the government. He appealed his case to the supreme court at Munich. Hearing that the conviction would be upheld he quietly left the country and reentered Switzerland.

It was this experience which turned him toward law practice. He was graduated from the University of Michigan law school and was admitted to the Idaho bar in 1892. Two years later he was elected district attorney for the fifth judicial district in 1894. He was elected Bear Lake County attorney in 1898.

In 1902 he became district judge at Pocatello and served continuously until his appointment to the supreme court in 1914.

SETS SERVICE RECORD

Three years ago Justice Budge, in an interview, said he didn't know of a jurist in the country who had served as long as he did. He served six terms as Idaho supreme court justice, an honor which is rotated yearly among the justices.

Justice Budge was a member of Oriental Lodge No. 60, A. F. & A. M.

More Evidence That Chinese Communists Are Antireligious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if there is any lingering doubt in anyone's mind of the intentions of the Chinese Communists to destroy all expressions of Christianity, the recent report of Father George M. Carroll, Maryknoll missioner and chaplain with the South Korean Army, showed that not a single one of the priests who were laboring in Korea and were captured by North Korean and Chinese Communist forces, has been heard from. Some of the priests have been hanged and two native sisters have been beaten to death.

I wish that everyone here in the House will take note of the comment of Father Carroll as to the nature of these Communists. Said Father Carroll "these Communists are not men, but devils".

I include herewith an article which appeared in the January 28, 1951 issue of Our Sunday Visitor:

A LETTER FROM KOREA—REDS WANT TO STAMP OUT ALL RELIGION

PYONGYANG, KOREA.—"Korea has lost between 60 and 68 priests in this war, including missioners," reports Father George M. Carroll, Maryknoll missioner serving as chaplain with the South Korean Army.

Father Carroll was stationed here before World War II halted Maryknoll work in North Korea. When he returned recently, after an absence of nearly 10 years, he could find no trace of the native Korean priests who had replaced the American missioners in 1941.

"Bishop Francis Hong and every single one of his priests have been taken, and no word has been heard of them," said Father Carroll. "It is greatly to be feared that they are all dead, although no bodies have been found. Since their hair was cut and they had on ordinary Korean clothes, it would be difficult to identify them."

The bodies of a French priest, Father Joseph Cadars, and an Irish Columbian missioner, Father Anthony Collier, have been found and identified, Father Carroll said. In the Huanghaido area a Korean priest, Father Andrew Chun, had been hanged, and two native sisters had been beaten to death. A third sister who was beaten is not expected to live.

Father Carroll learned definitely that Bishop Patrick J. Byrne, M. M., apostolic delegate to Korea, had reached Pyongyang in a weakened condition, but then was moved to an unknown destination by his Communist captors. With him were his secretary, Father William R. Booth, Maryknoll missioner from Rockville Centre, N. Y., and a French missioner. Also missing are 17 American, Irish, Australian, and French missioners; 9 French, Belgian, and Korean sisters; Bishop Hong and his 15 Korean priests, plus an indefinite number of priests from the Huanghaido area.

"These Communists are not men, but devils," commented Father Carroll. "They have done things that are fiendish. At Andong, in North Kyungsang Province, they took the door off the tabernacle, painted a bull's-eye on the back wall, and used it as a shooting range. They took all the vestments, holy pictures, sacred vessels, crucifixes, and burnt them. At Taejon, where so many were murdered in the prison, and at the Franciscan Monastery, many victims had their hands tied with strips of cloth from the vestments stolen from churches.

"In Kangkei they took the blessed sacrament out of the tabernacle and held it up, mocking it. They told the people to look and see—there was no man there, that it was only the priest deceiving them. They took the host and stamped on it and desecrated it. These Communists were definitely haters of the church and churchmen. The Protestants suffered just as much, if not more, than we Catholics did. All religions were equally hateful to them."

Credit, Production, and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the mass-production line, so familiar to our people in industry and those in agriculture who use the products which flow from that line, is the wonder of the world, insofar as supplying the material needs of mankind is concerned: Even General Eisenhower has recognized this fact.

This mass production and distribution is possible only because we have a market here in the United States. This market in turn is possible only because we have a system of economics and private enterprise which recognizes the fact that the man and woman who produces, is entitled to share in that production, and thus a distribution of the dollar value of goods to the payrollees who are employed by those who first lived simply, exercised thrift, accumulated savings, and then invested those savings in the buildings, machinery, and machine tools and in the form of productive capital, thus making it possible to employ the people who constitute the payrollees.

Some contend that there are those in high Government circles who seek to obtain absolute control of the installment credit which makes it possible for individuals to obtain the use of these goods prior to the accumulation of the necessary savings to pay for the goods. Should the control of such credit be obtained and then sufficiently withheld from the consumers, both the production and distribution of consumers' durable and nondurable goods would drastically decline and we might face a terrific economic recession or depression. In this connection, when I addressed the House, January 25, 1951, I pointed out that—

In 1939 all consumer credit totaled $7,000,000,000 as compared to $20,000,000,000 in December 1950. This is an increase of 185 percent. Credit extension in 1939 when compared to total retail sales of $42,000,000,000 in 1939 was $1 of credit for $6 of sales. In 1948 total retail sales were $133,800,000,000 with a credit extension of $14,300,000,000 or $1 of credit extension for each $8.40 of retail sales. In fourth quarter of 1950 total retail sales were running at a level of $136,000,000,000 and consumer credit extension averaged $19,600,000,000 or $1 of credit for each $7 of sales.

I will concede there have been abuses of installment credit, but to say that it is a major cause of inflation is nonsense and a smoke screen behind the real attempts to do away with it.

A group of responsible retailers years ago recognized some of the abuses in the installment-credit field and banded together and formed the Retail Credit Institute of America. This is a group of public-spirited retailers who have spent their own money and time in educating the public and weeding out the abuses in retailings' own back yard. The institute has earned the respect of the country and deserves the recognition and protection of the Congress.

Again referring to my remarks on January 25, 1951 where I dealt with the question of increased payrollees, increased productive hours, increased production and increased national dollar income, I pointed out that, let us say in 1952 we could attain an annual national dollar income of about $360,000,000,000 at the present price level.

Executive director of the Retail Credit Institute of America is William J. Cheyney, a former professor of economics. Mr. Cheyney made an address before the National Appliance and Radio Dealers Association in Chicago on January 15. Mr. Cheyney pointed out that a few administration spokesmen have brought on the inflation which we now face by scarce statements of shortages of certain goods.

This could be offset by statements predicting an abundance of materials for civilian use and by following this up with all-out civilian production, just as we are doing with items needed for war. Mr. Cheyney feels that there is no conflict between a simultaneous maximum production both for war and civilian use.

He also feels that the American's extra cash, if any, would go into war bonds if the Government made this proposition sufficiently attractive. I am including the following partial text of Mr. Cheyney's speech in the belief that the thousands of molders of public opinion who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will want to study his remarks:

I am led to believe by scrappy data that among the many lines of consumers' durables, those which you handle are enjoying about the best continuing consumer demand. This is understandable. The administration at Washington day by day is practically telling the American people to buy electrical appliances, radio, and TV now or never. The President personally notified each housewife the other day that there will be 50,000 airplanes and 38,000 tanks built each year from now on, requiring the ingredients now put into your product lines, and indicated that soon the result would be drastic shortages in the stores.

I can imagine no more powerful sales talk than this for stampeding markets could be devised by the most lurid advertising genius in America. I must admit, too, that I think the result is both disastrous and pitiful—tragically so and unnecessarily so.

Are the American people such unthinking mobs that they cannot be called upon to cooperate? Is it necessary to treat them with the psychology which says, "It is our intention to cut off your sources of supply. Run, therefore, to the nearest store and buy everything you can lay your hands on which contains steel, aluminum, and copper, because within a few weeks we shall eliminate the supply, issue ration cards, apply stringent

controls, because we know you haven't the brains to be treated any other way."

It seems to me the President could have told us something like this: "We are going to need in our mutual self-defense 50,000 airplanes and 38,000 tanks a year. This will take millions of tons of steel, hundreds of thousands tons of aluminum, copper, etc. As your elected representatives, we the Government, ask: Are you willing to contribute, each one, as many pounds of these metals as you can to the common pool in our common defense? Will you look over your mechanical equipment in your homes, make sure it is in good order? Will you refrain from buying any household mechanical equipment containing these certain ingredients just as long as you possibly can—as long as your present equipment will serve you well—to give us the tanks and planes we need?"

I believe the American people would cooperate if they were asked to contribute their share in this way. Never have we been asked to help except in vague, politically tinged terms. Always we are told we are to be regulated. Why in the world the President of the United States should ask every buyer to rush to the markets and clean out the retail and wholesale stocks of electrical appliances, radio and televisions, despite the fact that millions of the buyers already have usable equipment, is more than I can see.

This faulty approach is the result of mediocrity in the advice the President receives, from people who do not understand markets and marketing, and even less understand the feeling and potential cooperation that lies in the average American family.

On the subject of prices, it is obvious that the present propaganda program of the administration is doing more to pressure prices upward, by stampeding customers into the markets, than any other single price pressure factor. Prices are nothing more than the interplay between the supplies we have and public demand for them.

On one side of the picture today the administration has made a sound move. It has set up an organization under the leadership of Charles E. Wilson, until recently president of the General Electric Co., to bring efficiency and speed into the procurement of defense matériel by the Armed Forces. No one better than Mr. Wilson can ascertain the sources of all necessary ingredients for these defense products and every businessman and citizen stands ready to help him and his associates.

The fact remains, however, that this country is not at war and that in the hit-and-miss type of international relations that have developed, we are face to face with a situation which cannot in any likelihood be altered for 10 more long years. Even if we have a war with Russia, it will be a 10-year war, and not a war of quick invasion. Whichever side is the victor, such a war would bleed both sides white for many, many years to come.

Every economist, including those in the administration, admits that when one considers 10-year periods, the only fundamental answer to a question of inflation, price, and supply lies in a tremendous output increase. Price controls as we have known from the past do not strike at the source of inflation and the price problem—merely dam up a flood which sooner or later must break through. The only long-term answer is increased production, particularly in the areas where because of mobilization needs, shortages of material, manpower, and production may occur. This is a problem lying in part directly at our doorstep. It cannot be solved by price control, rationing, wage control, taxation, or savings programs.

It is my judgment that the President should quickly appoint a commission consisting of a number of the Nation's most brilliant industrialists and marketing experts, with the sole responsibility to find ways and means of increasing our supplies of these most necessary and potentially scarce ingredients.

I have on my desk pamphlets issued by investment analysts pointing out that the stocks of certain industrial concerns are "good buys" at the moment, because these plants have found the way to double or triple their present production. This means they have found sources of materials and new manufacturing efficiencies to offset manpower loss problems, and expect to be able to give to this country tremendously increased output. To the extent that this sort of thing could spread to hundreds of plants, we see a direct cure to both the price and the scarcity dangers we face.

A commission of properly chosen men, respected by all Americans in and out of business and industry, could multiply by hundreds, perhaps by thousands, the number of such concerns, some of them small, some larger, which could increase their own, and in the aggregate, the Nation's industrial and extractive output. This is a big nation with terrific raw-material potentials. In it are men and firms whose output has not been taxed as yet. In it are raw materials which have not been mined or extracted to anything like their fullest potentials. Furthermore, the world too is large and there are sources of raw material in nations not likely to be at war, materials which could be available if we set about scientifically and systematically to find them, eliminate the bottlenecks which restrain their production, and export to the United States.

Most of us in and out of Government have a sleepy idea that, left to its own devices, each industrial enterprise will search the world and country over individually, and thus obtain every last ounce of iron, aluminum, copper, and all the other ingredients it needs so badly.

It is my opinion, however, that in a time of stress like this, this voluntary search cannot possibly be more than 50 or 60 percent effective. Even during the last war at the height of the conflict there were untold resources available, but there was never the properly constituted, highly respected authority specifically commissioned to do the one specific job of finding these missing ingredients.

To set up powerful agencies for military procurement is an obvious need. It has been done. I hope and believe it has been done well.

But for the good of our entire economy, let us call upon our Government to do what it has never done successfully before, i. e., the job of assisting industry—not through bureaucratic, low-level controls—but by the means I have sketched broadly above, carried out to the full extent of the hundreds of ramifications an exploration of the idea makes obvious.

We have used neither efficiency nor foresight as to the Government's responsibility to help industry increase its production. Thus far we have played with special tax exemptions, and capital loans, but the problem remains: "How shall we find new sources of missing ingredients, raw materials, machinery, and manpower, in a gigantic way?"

The three major antidotes for inflation are: Increased production, savings programs, and taxation. I have discussed the first. Our administration needs no help when it comes to imagination about taxing, so I shall skip this one.

In inducing the American people to save by buying E-bonds in 1950-51, we are failing utterly and miserably. We have a wonderful product to sell, but it looks to the American people like a Cadillac car without its chrome, its bumpers, headlights, and windshield. It lacks the vital clinching appeal.

The way E-bonds are offered to the public smacks, too, of misrepresentation. The public is catching on.

Since it is tremendously important that we drain off purchasing power, not just that of the people who buy on credit—but of all of us—and since the E-bonds obviously are the means to do it, I suggest we untangle our bungled packaging and selling of this product.

Here is the problem:

1. If kept for 10 years the bonds pay 2.9 percent. The income from them is taxed. So far for the average workingman the 2.9 percent is only 2 percent. He can do better in a building and loan association.

2. The Government has calculated all along that it never actually will pay this 2.9 percent in the aggregate. And at the beginning the little people bit. They didn't realize that the softly spoken 10 short years are in reality a lifetime when lived out. Now these people have learned that they will have to redeem their bonds after the second, third, or sixth year for family emergencies, hospital bills, to buy homes, and for many other reasons. They know now that Uncle Sam without saying so has intentionally prepared to pay them not the promised 2.9 percent, but closer to 2 percent, or 2.4 percent—even this taxable

All this could be changed. The bonds could be made popular again. The buying power of the working people could be drained off in savings made to look, and be, real and worth while, and at little cost to the Government.

I urge that an E-bond saving plan be offered to the little people of the country.

1. On which the interest rate is constant through the years, that the Government be intellectually honest—not rely on the fine print to prove legal honesty.

A man's dollar is just as vital to the Government in 1951 as it is in 1958. For every American who must in emergency redeem his bonds, there will be another to pick them up—if the rate is sound and unvarying. There should be no penalty for lending hard-earned money to the Nation. A 6-month holding period might be reasonable, but with interest.

2. The little people must be made to see that they are offered a good bargain—that it is worth while to forego present purchases and to save.

I suggest a 4-percent interest rate, and to prevent those with larger funds from dipping into the Treasury for this bargain package, I suggest that the maximum purchasable quantity of these little bonds be limited to $500 per month. A $5,000 limitation per month on these securities is ridiculous. Confined to $500 per month and kept nonnegotiable as now, the net new cost of the 4-percent rate to the United States would be negligible. I do not suggest that this income be made tax exempt. Therefore, close to one-fourth would come back to the Treasury.

We may have forgotten that the pressure of the cash buyer is more volatile and more inflationary than that of the credit buyer today. A soundly conceived savings bond program will take the pressure off all types of consumer demand, not just off the credit market, as is the purpose of the ill-conceived credit control method of today. All credit controls can do is to channel demand from one area into another. They cannot eliminate it. The effect is about zero upon the major inflationary picture. A soundly conceived, well-sold E-bond program is an entirely different matter.

We can expect Americans to live under strict regimentation for just so long. If our present situation is to last 10 long years, I am quite certain the pure and simple control approach, that was only partially effective in its last experiment will only succeed if accomplished by outright dictatorship; and the loss of all we have any reason to fight for.

Fear of Deportation Drives Aliens Toward Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following newspaper article by Ted Mrozowski, of the Citizen, of Hamtramck and North Detroit, Mich., entitled "Fear of Deportation Drives Aliens Toward Communism," which appeared on January 25, 1951:

FEAR OF DEPORTATION DRIVES ALIENS TOWARD COMMUNISON—150 GIVEN PAMPHLETS AT MEETING

(By Ted Mrozowski)

Fear of deportation is making many aliens and naturalized citizens easy prey for pro-Communist influences.

This is the conclusion I reached after attending a meeting arranged to protest the detention by the United States Department of Justice of John Zydok, 54-year-old waiter, who is listed as financial secretary of the Russian section of the Communist Party here. He was arrested last October under provisions of the Internal Security Act.

Held Friday at Yemans Hall, 3014 Yemans, the meeting was sponsored by the Polish-American Defense Committee, John Zydok Defense Committee, the Michigan Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, and the Civil Rights Congress.

I entered the unheated and dreary hall after buying a copy of the Daily Worker, being sold in the lobby by an elderly and heavily-mustached codger. Even before I was seated, a handful of literature was given me by a person who later was introduced to the audience as one who is facing deportation.

The literature—expensively printed booklets—dealt primarily with harangues on the injustice of the trial of the 12 Communist leaders in New York.

At no time during the meeting, which lasted nearly 3 hours, did the audience exceed 150 persons. Most of those present appeared to be foreign-born, although there were several Negroes in the audience.

It should be said that not once was there any verbal expression of pro-communism during the meeting, but the same cannot be said of the issued literature. One of the pamphlets, issued by the National Non-Partisan Committee To Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders, lists as its officers Paul Robeson, Howard Fast, and Harold Christoffel.

I should say that most of the audience seemed to be interested in only one thing: The answer to all this talk they have been hearing about the deportation of aliens. They are apprehensive and fearful of what is in store for them. They are looking for comfort and consolation. They want to know the answers. Did they get them? Decide for yourself from what transpired.

On the stage behind the speaker's stand was a huge sign with the large printed letters: Free John Zydok. Around the sides of the room were posters, some of which read: 50 Detroiters Face Deportation Proceedings—Fight Deportation Hysteria—McGrath, Jail Lynchers—Protect Use of Stool Pigeons—Reporting Is a Police State Procedure.

The entire program was in the English language and I got the impression that much of what was being said was beyond the comprehension of most of the audience. The chairman introduced several speakers, but the main personality was Abner Green, executive secretary for the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

He painted a bleak picture of what the foreign born can expect if the Justice Department is not stopped (as he put it) "in its drive on noncitizens."

He labeled the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service as the "enemy of the people," and advised the audience not to answer its questions if called downtown.

"If they ask you for the time of day, don't tell them. Don't even tell them if the sun is shining if they ask," he said.

I felt that this was all wrong. This would only instill fear and distrust of the authorities and was a deliberate summons to defy a legal agency. Green engendered additional fear when he said that 3,400 more aliens face deportation.

Sneeringly, Green told how Federal Judge Thomas Thornton ordered Zydok kept in that dirty, filthy Wayne County jail. Judge Thornton, when ordering Zydok held, said, "Zydok's evasiveness convinces me that he is willfully participating in the Communist movement."

The half-understanding audience was told that they might be roused in the early hours of the morning and taken into custody for interrogation; they were told that they would have to prove their innocence rather than the accuser proving them guilty; they would be held without bail, and denied the right to ask for an attorney.

What did this meeting accomplish besides painting a dreadful picture for the audience? The chairman read a resolution which he offered to the audience for action. It was adopted without a dissenting voice. The resolution called for the immediate cessation of all deportation proceedings; repeal of the McCarran Act; and a protest against the jailing of Zydok.

The chairman called for the formation of a delegation to go personally to the Federal building and urge the dropping of the case against Zydok. He also asked all who could to harass the Immigration Service with telephone calls to secure better jail accommodations for Zydok.

Something then happened which I hardly expected. The audience was asked to help pay for the cost of aid to Zydok and others. The chairman asked for voluntary contributions of $20, $10, $5, and $1 bills. He got some of each. In the end, a basket for small change was circulated around the room. I passed it up.

I'm sure that if I were a noncitizen, I would walk away from the meeting with the thought that America is no longer free and that the only thing for me to do is to resist its leaders.

It is here that the real task lies. There are thousands of good, loyal, conscientious noncitizens who are being given a distorted version of America. They can easily become innocent victims of subversive groups, if not immediately reassured by their Government that they have nothing to fear.

Public Favors Thorough Rechecking of All Classes of Draft Selectees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Knoxville Journal of January 26, 1951:

PUBLIC FAVORS THOROUGH RECHECKING OF ALL CLASSES OF DRAFT SELECTEES

Congress is on a spot on this question of lowering the draft to include 18-year-olds that its Members won't succeed in getting off of unscathed politically, no matter how they vote.

There is a natural reluctance on everybody's part to bring young men of 18 into the service except in the face of real necessity. Yet the alternative held out by the manpower experts upon whose facts Congress has to rely is not acceptable either. That alternative is to call back into service substantial numbers of the 2,530,000 men now exempt from the draft as veterans. Among veterans of all wars there is a feeling, for which there is some justification, that, except in a national emergency, no citizen should be forced to participate in more than one war until all those who have become eligible since his war was concluded have taken their turn.

But while Congress and the country is coming to a majority conclusion on the 18-year-old issue, there is one thing that most citizens, and especially veterans, are agreed upon.

Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, last week denounced what he called the horrible practice of the Defense Department, through selective service, of too readily deferring men for failure to pass too rigid intelligence tests. Congress also directed the Defense Department to crack down on selectees classified as IV-F's.

The conviction is widespread that the military authorities, through selective service, have been altogether too choosy about their material in the past year. The heavy percentage of those rejected, on intelligence tests and those for physical fitness, support this view. Whatever Congress may decide about the 18-year-old issue, there is definite sentiment in favor of abandoning the theory that only the most intelligent and only the perfect physical specimens shall be included in the draft. Unless the armed services have changed in a revolutionary manner since most of us were in them, there is still productive work for the uneducated, the stupid, and even those who are only fair physical specimens.

Available Manpower and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a resolution adopted by the Misssisippi Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars a few days ago at Jackson, Miss.

The resolution speaks for itself, but it is inserted herewith in the RECORD for the information and guidance of the members of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, as well as for the Members generally.

In the present controversy as to where the needed men should come from, it is well that those charged with this important duty should give consideration and study to the resolution.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has declared a state of emergency, prices and wages have been frozen, and young men are being drafted for defense of our way of life; and

Whereas there is much controversy as to who shall or shall not be drafted, adding to the confusion which exists in the minds of our people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the council of administration, Department of Mississippi, Veterans of Foreign Wars, meeting in regular session at Jackson, Miss., January 28, 1951, That our leaders should be reminded of the vast pools of manpower now untouched, as follows:

1. Those who were exempted from military service during World War II as being essential to industry, and who are still in an age bracket which would not preclude their being used for combat duty, and whose places in civilian life could be taken by qualified combat veterans of World War II who have been trained since the termination of that conflict;

2. Those who hurried to marry after the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (even though they have become fathers since that time). These men have as much to fight for as any group in the United States.

3. Those who were rejected for minor defects as late as a year and a half ago, and who have not been screened again to determine their fitness fo service;

4. Those who were trained during World War II in the V-12 and ASTP programs without prior combat service, and who have not repaid the Nation for their education by active service; and

5. Those who had short periods of service in the United States as members of the armed services just prior to the conclusion of World War II: Be it further

Resolved, That we doubt whether it would be beneficial to the interests of our Nation to exempt so-called superior students in colleges. Under the training programs for World War II veterans, many men have acquired college educations and from what we learn in the press, these men have made the best marks in college work, when taken as a group. Therefore it seems that the country has acquired a reservoir of brains, and further exemptions of students might injure morale; be it further

Resolved, That our Congressmen and Senators and all persons in responsible positions be urged to study the possibilities of the above-named groups as sources of military manpower, so that the principle of equality of sacrifice shall prevail; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be handed the press and the radio.

Do We Have Adequate Domestic Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a broadcast of Sunday, January 28, on the American Forum of the Air. Senator MUNDT and I participated in this broadcast which reviewed the question, "Do we have adequate domestic security?"

This is a question which merits the study of every loyal citizen of the United States, and I believe the American Forum of the Air, under the leadership of Theodore Granik, has rendered a significant service to the country in developing this question and seeking an impartial answer to it.

Theodore Granik, I may add, has focused public attention on the many vexatious problems of our time and through his broadcasts has helped in their clarification and in many cases in their ultimate solution. The broadcast on Sunday takes me back 22 years when I participated in the first broadcast of the American Forum of the Air. Since that time I have followed with much interest the growing scope of the program and the public enthusiasm it has aroused. It is an exhibition of the American and democratic way of life.

The broadcast follows:

The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the continental room of the Wardman Park Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

Each week at this time the American Forum of the Air presents special guest speakers, so that you in your home may enjoy authoritative discussions of the provocative and vital topics of our time.

Now to bring you this week's program, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. President Truman has just appointed Admiral Nimitz to report on how best to protect the Nation's internal security without imperiling our individual freedoms. His announcement has focused attention on a dramatic article entitled "The FBI Wants You," appearing in the February issue of Reader's Digest, America's leading magazine, which tells its millions of readers how they can cooperate in the tremendous job being done by the ever-watchful FBI.

But with American mobilization proceeding at top speed there is increasing need for us to be alert against the increasing danger of sabotage, and the question arises ever more imminently: "Do we have adequate domestic security?"

We pose this question to two congressional authorities on the subject, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, coauthor of the Mundt-Ferguson bill, which is part of the internal-security bill passed by the Congress, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Now, Senator MUNDT, do we have adequate domestic security?

Senator MUNDT. Well, Mr. Granik, I don't believe we have to worry much about the answer to that question. It seems to me it is just as obvious as the red ink in a proverbial New Deal budget. The answer is: "Emphatically no." We do not have adequate security in this country now.

I think we need go back only as far as the news of the last 2 weeks to demonstrate the veracity of that point. Within the past 2 weeks, for example, the Senate Judiciary Committee has constructed a subcommittee, to be called the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities, so that the Senate for the first time will have a committee to be a companion to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which has such a distinguished record over in the other body.

The other development in the last 2 weeks is even more recent, when President Truman appointed the so-called Nimitz Commission, also to check up on the security situation in this country.

It seems obvious, therefore, that either we have to have new and more legislation on security, or we have to have better and more vigorous enforcement of the legislation we now have—or we must have both—in order to get adequate security, domestic security, in America.

And certainly with a war raging in Korea we are not justified in spending billions of dollars to fight communism abroad until we take every conceivable measure to protect our domestic security at home.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman CELLER?

Representative CELLER. Of course we must adequately protect our domestic security. Whether we have or whether we have not adequate domestic security is difficult to say.

One might ask, "How high is up?" One might ask, "How much armament should we have for external defense?" Those questions are difficult to answer. We cannot adequately tell until some emergency arises.

This is certain: We have 54,000 dues-paying Communists in our midst, and probably an equal number of crypto-Communists, and many more Communist sympathizers. There is evident danger from those sources. We must prepare and arm our hearts, minds, and muscle against the danger.

But we must learn to face that danger without hysteria. We must not develop herd excitement. We must be careful in our tracking down Trojan horses and fifth-columnists that we do not lose our birthright of freedom.

The President very wisely stated, "We must guard our freedom well, guard it from armed assault, guard it from subversive infiltration, guard it from internal suppression of rights, guard it from the deadly imposition of conformity."

I don't agree with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Dakota, that it is well to leave investigations as to whether we have adequate or inadequate security to a congressional committee.

If I may just cite the reasons: We have had investigations, and they are not without political import. The political import is of such a nature that it does more harm than good. And therefore I applaud to a great degree the appointment of the Nimitz Commission by our President. I believe it is an act of statesmanship, and I am sure that Admiral Nimitz and his committee will view this whole subject objectively and without any political bias.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I see no conflict between us on that score. I am in favor of bringing into focus all of the legitimate methods that we can to eliminate the dangers to our domestic security.

First, I would say that the FBI should head the list. Then we have the Central Intelligence Agency. We have the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We now have the new Senate Committee on Un-American Activities. We have the President's Commission, and it is comprised of some very fine Americans. It seems to me, incidentally, that the test about the President's Commission is a simple one. It should be clear that it is a good Commission and is established for legitimate reasons; provided, the President makes available to the Senate and the House Committees on Un-American Activities the same facts, the same files, the same evidence, and the same records, that he proposes to make available to his own Commission.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman CELLER?

Representative CELLER. I don't think there should be that duplication. I am of the opinion that politically biased senatorial and House of Representatives committees have abused their privileges when they have received confidential files from Government sources. And I would not want those privileged files made available and public. It would be highly dangerous. There are many

Government employees in this room who, if you would allow those files to be made public—files containing written notes of rumors, unfounded observations, and if you would publicize them—would be gravely and unfairly injured, just like the harm that was done to Mrs. Pearl Buck, who was refused the right to speak before a high school in this very city because the Superintendent of Schools said he had to clear her name with the Un-American Activities Committee files. And the files of that committee of the House were looked at for information about her. There were many unfounded and ridiculous charges against Mrs. Pearl Buck in those files. She wasn't called to refute them, to appear before the committee, and she was deprived of the privilege of answer. This woman—a Pulitzer prize winner, a Nobel prize winner, a woman of great renown, of great talents—was not privileged to speak before an audience in this city.

Senator MUNDT. I wonder if we can get the train back on the track for a moment. I never said at any time, Mr. CELLER, that we should have these files made public. I said that if this Presidential Commission was established in good faith, then the same identical facts, files, and records should be made available to the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities and the House Committee on Un-American Activities as are made available to the President's hand-picked Commission. I deny emphatically that the President's Board is going to be any more patriotic or any more trustworthy than the Members of the House and the Senate. I quite agree that some records should not be made public, but they should be made equally available to the legislative body as well as to a body established by the Executive for the alleged purpose of checking up on the executive branch of Government.

Representative CELLER. From my experience of 28 years in the House, I will say to my distinguished colleague that there is nothing secret—and the gentleman was a distinguished Member with me—there is nothing secret in Washington. It is like the story of the old lady who said, "I can keep a secret, but the people I tell it to can't." There is where the difficulty stems from. There is nothing secret in the House Office Building and the Senate Office Building, or in the Senate or the House itself. The minute anything is developed there it is made public, because there are many ways in which reporters can get the information. They get a piece here and a piece there, and then you have it blared out in the newspapers, and then you have accusations by headlines, which is a very dangerous thing.

Senator MUNDT. My experience in Congress goes back only 12 years, not 28 years. I don't know what happened in the preceding 16 years when we had Republican administrations, but in the 12 years that I have been down here under a Democratic President, the Executive has continuously withheld information from the Congress. So certainly there have been no such leaks from Congress in the last 12 years.

Representative CELLER. The fault, of course, lies on both sides of the aisle.

Moderator GRANIK. Let me ask this question of Senator MUNDT: We all have confidence in the FBI. Wouldn't it be better to place our emphasis on aiding that well-established organization with new personnel, and so forth?

Senator MUNDT. It is not a question in my mind of "either" and "or." Certainly we should strengthen the FBI. We should give it every last man it needs and every last dollar it can wisely use. But there are certain things that the FBI cannot do. It cannot, for example, conduct congressional hearings. It cannot, for example, call people in and bring folks in the administration in, if necessary, to find evidence and make it public. The FBI is denied, by the very way in which it is constructed, the making of any facts which it discovers public.

So if you are going to discover a man like Alger Hiss or W. K. Remington, who is now being tried, you are going to have to have in addition to the FBI some other commission, some other body—and I think it is wise to have both a Presidential commission and a congressional commission—provided the President isn't going to say, "I will give my commission all the facts and keep these congressional committees operating in the dark." Obviously that would be a fraud and a deception.

Representative CELLER. I yield to no man in my admiration for J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, and I believe we must strengthen the arm of the FBI to track down the Communists and those associated with the Communists in the interests of our internal security. And to that end, only recently I offered a bill, as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, giving the officials of the FBI, with the sanction of the Attorney General, the right to tap wires. I will be severely criticized for that, Senator, as you know; but I believe, in the cases of espionage and sabotage and subversive activities and matters involving our internal security, the FBI has heretofore been greatly hampered by its inability to use the evidence it has obtained by the tapping of wires. I hope that that will be over, and that the FBI will be able to better track down these malefactors with that right.

Furthermore, in the last Congress I offered and successfully had passed a bill which would avoid a repetition of the mistake made in the Coplon case, where there could not have been made an arrest without a warrant. In cases of that sort, my bill—which is now a statute—provides that the FBI shall make arrests without warrant. We have always given that right to United States marshals. Why not the FBI?

Moderator GRANIK. Senator?

Senator MUNDT. I concur completely in both of those bills and congratulate Mr. CELLER on his good work in that connection. It surely is a tragedy to have a situation such as the Coplon case, when there is no question about her guilt, and she is still running around loose, still able to engage in Communist conspiracy, because of some legal technicality that has crept into the statutes. I congratulate my former colleague on his good work in that connection.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman CELLER?

Representative CELLER. I want to say also that no one has made the Nation more alert to the danger of communism than my friend here this afternoon, Senator MUNDT.

Moderator GRANIK. Congressman, let me ask this: Do you favor the repeal of the Internal Security Act?

Representative CELLER. I do not favor the repeal of all the provisions of the Internal Security Act. There are some provisions in my mind which in my view, as a lawyer of many years standing, I will say are unconstitutional. For example, if the 11 Communists are declared, by affirmance of the Supreme Court, to be guilty of a violation of the so-called Smith Act, which act makes it a crime to teach—without overt acts except teaching—the overthrow of the Government by violence, which the Communists undoubtedly do teach, then, if, under the McCarran Act, Communists must register as Communists, you will force them to incriminate themselves, which is in violation of the Constitution.

Moderator GRANIK. Will the Senator answer that point?

Senator MUNDT. I want to point out that I agree with one point that Mr. CELLER is approaching, and that is that in connection with the present Internal Security Act there are some changes that need to be made. In my opinion they are not changes that need to be made legislatively. They are changes that need to be made by the Attorney General's Office, so that he will administer the act properly. And I would like to suggest that he administer that act in conformity with the very good advice given him by my colleague, Mr. CELLER, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in his address in New York just last month, when he pointed out that the present difficulties in the Internal Security Act with regard to bringing people to this country on visas grows out of a distorted, perverted, and strained interpretation made by the Attorney General.

In that speech my colleague said that the Congress wanted to close our doors to those who are Nazis or Fascists or Communists actively, knowingly, and willfully helping in the penetration of the most appalling crimes ever recorded in human history.

In my opinion, and I repeat it once more, the Congress certainly wanted the administrators of the law to look at the record of the individual himself, and not to classify him automatically as a component part of any objectionable group. I think it utterly idiotic, under the Attorney General's recommendation, the keeping out of a 3-month old baby from Spain because, the Attorney General says, Congress intended to keep out those kinds of people. Obviously that is an effort, a deliberate effort in my opinion, to discredit a good piece of legislation with the American public.

I congratulate you, Congressman CELLER, on your splendid advice to the Attorney General in that speech, which I have studied very carefully.

Representative CELLER. I will say that in the New York Times this morning Attorney General McGrath denied there was any such attempt to keep a 3-month-old baby, born in Spain, out of this country.

Senator MUNDT. The baby was kept out, maybe by intent or maybe by accident, but it was kept out because of an erroneous interpretation of the act.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for questions from our audience, gentlemen.

Now for our first question. Young lady, you have the first question from the audience?

Mrs. SHERWOOD. My name is Claire Sherwood. I am a housewife, and my question is directed to Congressman CELLER. Is any effort being made to combine with Canada on a cooperative system of antisubversive control in view of easy border crossing?

Representative CELLER. I understand there is liaison between the Department of State and appropriate officials of Canada in that direction. I cannot give you the details at this juncture.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that at all, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. No; because that involves matters of military security which are best not discussed in public. But I can say that there are some efforts being made in that direction.

Moderator GRANIK. We will take another question. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. BART. My name is Ray Bart. I am a writer. My question is to Senator MUNDT. How do you propose to counteract the tendency of human nature to be fascinated and attracted by anything that is forbidden?

Senator MUNDT. I think the best way to counteract that, Mr. Bart, is to make the general public understand the dangers involved in eating that kind of forbidden fruit. I live out in the great State of South Dakota. Out there we have a pest known as the rattlesnake; and it is forbidden by human nature to play with the rattlesnake because you get hurt if you do. I think if we can make people understand that playing with communism is even more dangerous than playing with a rattlesnake, that particular proclivity of human nature will not worry us any more.

Moderator GRANIK. Have you gentlemen thought out a program for internal security? Or do you want to comment on the last question?

Representative CELLER. I will answer your question. Yes; I have thought out a program for internal security; and I agree with the Senator that we must make the people of the Nation conscious of the danger, and we must build up barriers from within by education and by example.

I understand, for example, that the Munitions Board—and I note in the audience the distinguished Vice Chairman, Mr. William VanAtten, of that Board—has been entrusted with the program of spreading the gospel of caution against negligence and prohibition against loose talk throughout the Nation. And they are, by educational processes, infusing the Nation with the idea of being careful and of reporting any suspicious circumstances to the FBI. They are urging slogans like those successfully used during the last war, like, "Button up your lip, the enemy is listening."

They, in addition, are watching the focal points of production, the power plants, and the arsenals and the warehouses and the bottlenecks of strategic production, the airplane plants and the atomic energy plants, to see to it that there will be no infiltration of subversives or fifth columnists or spies and the like.

Every mill, mine, and factory is a potential Communist fortress. The Communists want to know all about those mills and the factories, and every workman on the work bench must be alerted to the peril. If they are properly warned and educated, that will build up to a great and measurable degree of internal security.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I think those are all good suggestions. I think it would also be very helpful if in every high school in America, a course could be taught in capsule form—short and to the point—on what is right with America so that young Americans growing up could come to understand that there are some things in this country we have got to protect and defend if we are going to stay free.

I would also like to see such great organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and many other fine patriotic service organizations conduct simultaneously throughout America a Know Your America Week, in which you have all kinds of displays and programs and editorials and motion-picture shows and pageants pointing out those things about America which are strong and fine and fundamental and good, because I think that if the average American comes to appreciate those things sufficiently it will help make him alert against communism and less inclined to go for the forbidden fruit that my friend suggested in his question.

Moderator GRANIK. May we have another question?

Dr. GIGLIOTTI. My question is for Congressman CELLER. I am Dr. Gigliotti, the national chaplain of the Veterans' Association, and I am from Mesa, Calif. The question is: If the recent results we have had abroad with our intelligence is a sample of what we have at home, how do we know that a fifth column isn't operating in our midst to destroy us?

Representative CELLER. There is no doubt, in my humble opinion, that a fifth column is operating. I mentioned before—and the Senator will vouchsafe what I said—that there are many Communists, crypto-Communists, neo-Communists, Communist sympathizers, and Communist-front organizations, all bent in the direction of having a huge fifth column to weaken our industrial might, weaken our military, and thus give aid and comfort to the Kremlin.

As to the military intelligence abroad, I don't care to give any opinion now. At some subsequent time, I might.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. The doctor from California is a great friend of mine, and I would like to assure him that certainly there is a very formidable fifth column operating in our midst now. As a matter of fact, this article in Readers Digest which gave the genesis to this program today points out that the FBI considers there are 500,000 dangerously disloyal people in America now, every one of whom is a potential and many of whom are actual spies.

Moderator GRANIK. Another question. Go ahead, Congressman CELLER.

Representative CELLER. I might say that in all of this we must be careful that there are no character assassinations, that there are no purges, so-called, that we don't discourage scientists because of vexatious and most annoying inquisitions from doing a good job for the country. We don't want any witch hunts. We don't want any besmirching of character. We don't want to have too much conformity because that is dangerous to the Nation. We don't want men and women labeled Communists because they don't conform. We don't want them labeled Communists because they are unorthodox in their political views or because they refuse to abide by the political status quo. That is the danger that we must also be conscious of. We must have a wise balance between security, on the one hand, and freedom, on the other. Then we will have a perfect condition.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I would like to say, of course, that I concur in all of those pious objectives. But the real danger today is not that we are going to have a witch hunt, not that we are going to have hysteria—the big danger is that we are going to lean so far over backwards that we are not going to be able to stand up and fight.

Representative CELLER. I think it is dangerous too. For example, to give one illustration of what foolish fears can lead us to say and do—in the House of Representatives only recently one of our Members rose to state that he was troubled by the fact that on the walls of the House appeared plaques commemorating the great law givers of all ages like Gaius, Justinian, Moses, and Hammurabi, and Solon. He added that he didn't want any of these "foreigners" here. "Why couldn't we have Americans?" I do not give the exact language. I do give the import.

He indicated that he had a fear, that he didn't like these foreigners—these old foreigners who were law givers—and he wanted to have the walls stripped of them. That is the attitude that I am fearful of, that kind of distrustful provincialism which will give us a herd and animal instinct which, when we cannot get rid of, we want wise counsel to prevail.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. I still think the great danger in this country comes from the fact that we have some 500,000 disloyal people in this country, most of whom have not yet registered, or come out in the open so we don't know who they are. We must control and curb this communistic conspiracy at home.

Now, we have to do this thing wisely and we have to do it without hysteria, but the main thing is that we have got to do it, and we haven't been able to do it up to now.

Moderator GRANIK. One last question.

Mr. RADFORD. My name is Alton H. Radford, and I work for the Government. My question is directed to Senator MUNDT. Is it a safe policy to divulge our domestic security measures to the general public and thus risk giving this information to our enemies?

Senator MUNDT. It depends on kind, of course. If we are dealing with some kind of espionage case in a munitions plant, if it is like the earlier question involving our neighborly relations and cooperation with Canada, I would say no. If it is the matter of focusing public opinion upon the dangers of communism and how it operates so that the average American can detect what is happening in his own organization and his own neighborhood, I would say emphatically, yes, we should do that. The danger then is that we fail to give sufficient publicity to the threat of communism at home.

Representative CELLER. In that connection there is a provision in the McCarran Act which provides that the Secretary of Defense must publicize a list of the names of all defense plants or plants having subcontracts for defense work so that Communists will not be employed in those plants. But that is an aid to Stalin. I think that is one of the provisions we must rip out of the McCarran Act.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for our summaries. Senator MUNDT, please.

Senator MUNDT. Just a statement about what is and what is not in the so-called McCarran Act, which I think is not foolproof, that it is not a compulsory mandate for the Secretary of Defense; and the best test of that is that he is not using it now. It gives him the authority to use it if he wants to. I don't believe my colleague is holding that the Secretary of Defense is in defiance of the law.

I think the most important thing we have brought out this afternoon, in summary may I say because a great many people are listening in on this program, is that I think it is important our people watch the papers mighty carefully during the next few weeks to see whether or not the President's commission to check on subversive activities in the executive department is going to be given the opportunity to function in a fashion which is going to get results. It is comprised of some mighty fine Americans. If the President gives the Senate and the House committees the same facts as he gives them, we shall certainly have a fine arrangement. But every American should be skeptical of an arrangement which would permit the President's Commission to be privileged to have access to the facts, files, and records and denies the same evidence to the Senate and the House. That would be a very bad miscarriage of justice.

Representative CELLER. The Communist Party covertly and overtly would use all means to overthrow our Government. Not only its members, but its sympathizers, who are its dupes, would unwittingly do the same. They constitute a Trojan horse of disloyalty.

The American people must beware their mealy mouthed sweet words of peace, democracy, brotherhood. The knife they would plunge into our backs is coiled in their slogans. But our response to the danger must be without hysteria, without excitement that leads to scapegoatism, witch hunts and vigilantism.

We cannot allow individual rights to be swept away. They are as sacred as internal security. There is no internal security if our constitutional rights are destroyed. We must strike a balance between security and individual rights.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on "Do We Have Adequate Domestic Security?" Our speakers have been Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of of New York.

Quit Bluffing, California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Arizona Daily Star on Thursday, January 25. The editorial deals with facts and is concise and to the point concerning California's tactics in regard to the Central Arizona project bill, which has again been introduced in both the Senate and the House in the Eighty-second Congress.

QUIT BLUFFING, CALIFORNIA

As the Eighty-second Congress begins work, Arizona has again introduced her central Arizona project bill, and California has again started her tactics of delay, confusion, and pure bluff.

The program to bring 1,200,000 acre-feet of main stream Colorado River water annually to the farm lands in central Arizona which needs it so badly has been defeated in past Congresses by these tactics. Unless Arizona is able to expose California's bluff defeat may again greet the bill.

The bluff goes something like this: California has in the past made loud and self-righteous demands that the Supreme Court decide the issue of how much water belongs to which State. Behind these demands was the old plan of delaying the issue.

First, California had no justifiable issue. Since the bill had not passed, no threat had been made on the Colorado water which she considered her own, and there was nothing for the Supreme Court to decide. California had no grievance to take before the Court.

Second, her plea for a Supreme Court decision was so handled that the matter would have had to wait 2 years before the Supreme Court would even take a look at it to decide if it could make a judgment.

Arizona, anxious to have the matter settled, wrote into the present bill an amendment which provides for Supreme Court settlement of the issue, answering California demands.

The amendment provides that, after passage of the bill, the irrigation portion of the project would be held up for 6 months, giving California that time to file suit before the Supreme Court and have the issue decided.

Should the Supreme Court decide in favor of California, the power program of the project, which California wants, would be completed and the Arizona plea for water would be rejected.

But California was bluffing about wanting Supreme Court action on the issue, and she is still bluffing.

The following is an excerpt from an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday:

"The logical way to look at the matter, it now seems, is to press for a Supreme Court settlement of the basic water dispute between California and Arizona. * * * California has contended with indisputable common sense that the matter of who owns the water should be determined before any further projects are authorized."

The catch occurs in the last six words, "before any further projects are authorized." Unless the central Arizona project bill passes, authorizing this project, there will be nothing for the Supreme Court to decide. California will have no threat of loss to take to the Court.

If California truly wanted the Supreme Court to decide, she would help Arizona pass this bill, the amendment in which gives her 6 months to sue before that court.

The Times, in its editorial, makes no mention of the fact that this amendment is part of the bill. Instead it states:

"Admittedly the Supreme Court of the United States is the only agency that can settle the controversy. Arizona has attempted to side-step this fact by 'bulling through' the measure with sheer political pressure."

Obviously California, while pleading for Supreme Court action in the matter, is determined to prevent the issue from reaching the Supreme Court.

Why? Because the legal history of the Colorado River controversy gives Arizona unquestionable right to the water she seeks for the central valley. California knows that, and knows that once the Supreme Court hears the case the matter will be settled once and for all in the favor of Arizona.

Price and Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, price and wage controls are an ever-growing problem among the people of the United States. Skyrocketing prices are about to destroy the purchasing power of the dollar, destroy the effectiveness of our defense program, and are increasing the confusion and destroying the faith of our people in the Government.

The Economic Stabilization Agency has no mean job. It is a stupendous task that Agency has undertaken, but at least the Agency can be frank with our people. If a definite date for price and wage setting or roll-back had been set months ago, with the admonition that the producer, middleman, and consumer must beware and act at his own risk, we would not be facing the situation we face today. In this connection, I include the following sensible letter on the subject from an outstanding young attorney from my South Carolina district:

JANUARY 27, 1951.

Hon. J. P. RICHARDS,
Member of Congress,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICHARDS: This letter to you was prompted by the wage and price controls just announced yesterday by the Economic Stabilization Agency. I have just returned from a trip to a local supermarket here in Lancaster. The result, this letter.

I have been buying the groceries for our home for a long time and am fairly familiar with the price of food as far as the consumer is concerned. Since I have been buying the groceries, we have been getting the same foods week after week and, I might add, trying to live on a very close budget.

Prices have been increasing steadily since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. The payoff came today when there was an increase of approximately 10 percent over the prices of last week. They were marking up the prices of certain articles while I was in the store today. It is an outrage.

And the worst part about it is the fact that when price controls were announced from Washington, the prices adopted as the maximum amounts were those in existence on certain articles on January 25, 1951, which prices are at the highest level in the entire history of these United States.

I've heard the old story that to roll back the prices would disrupt the entire economy of the country. If something is not done to roll back prices, the economy of the country will be disrupted because of the fact that there is less money in the hands of the wage-earner than at any time in recent years and the buying power of the almighty dollar is only one-fourth that of pre-World War II.

There are 150,000,000 consumers in this country that are being affected by the high cost of living. There would be at greatest 1,000,000 meat packers, producers, canners, and the like, who would be affected by a price roll-back; and the only ones who would suffer would be those who have been speculating on the price of commodities due to the war effort.

Something can and must be done about it. I have stated my views and the views of other consumers with whom I have talked concerning the utterly stupid move on the part of the afore-mentioned agency in setting the date which it did as the date to set up price-control standards.

Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit Urging the Immediate Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the resolution approved unanimously by the Common Council of the City of Detroit at its formal session of January 23, 1951.

This resolution urges the Congress of the United States to give its immediate approval to the agreement between this country and Canada calling for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The present period of international crisis and tension is the background against which there appears, with increasing clarity, the vital importance of this long-considered project to the maintence of our national security in the troubled days which lie ahead. It is essential that we preserve intact the productive industrial pattern of this area of the great Midwest, and in the opinion of most of the experts who have set down their views on the subject, the St. Lawrence seaway is the only practicable way to accomplish this highly desirable end.

The unanimously voiced opinion of the common council of the great city

of Detroit expresses the urgency of beginning this construction immediately, and I respectfully offer it here for the consideration of every Member of this body.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas Detroit's great mass-production machinery supplied a major portion of the implements of war during the last world conflict to force the principle of democracy into submission and the city earned the title of "The Arsenal of Democracy"; and

Whereas for the third time within a generation, Detroit factories are being called upon to convert her factories into producing arms in a preparedness program to preserve the liberties and security of freethinking people; and

Whereas the entire Nation and all freedom-loving peoples of the world having a common interest in stopping an aggressor nation that is presently challenging the security of the world, has a stake in Detroit's ability to produce the necessary goods; and

Whereas Detroit, the largest steel-consuming area in the country, is gravely concerned about there being an adequate source of iron ore available to produce the necessary steel at a reasonable cost; and

Whereas a sizeable portion of the steel industry that must find a new source of ore in the near future is developing fields in Labrador and Quebec and the Department of Defense has stated the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is now essential to our national defense because it would provide greater access to additional sources of high-grade iron ore in Labrador and Quebec; and

Whereas there are grave doubts whether the required Labrador and Quebec ore can be secured by existing transportation facilities in view of the perennial freight-car shortage every fall that disrupts the free flow of goods; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has also stated the seaway would be of distinct advantage in the event of a national emergency because it would make available additional shipbuilding and repairing facilities; and

Whereas the Department of Defense claims the inland route from Laborador, free from enemy submarines, would require less protective measures than open-sea routes, because of the high defense priority already accorded the area; and

Whereas the National Security Resources Board points out even greater amounts of foreign ores must be imported if the demands for steel are to be met and that only as a last resort would any attempt be made to bring this ore in over the open-sea routes and concludes that the power and navigation produced by the project is extremely important to the national security; and

Whereas the President of the United States has decreed the St. Lawrence seaway project to be vital to the defense needs of this country and other democracies of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the interest of the defense of this Nation and in the interest of the security of free people here and in other countries, that the Common Council of the City of Detroit wholeheartedly support the St. Lawrence seaway project and urges the Congress of the United States to give immediate approval of the agreement with Canada calling for the construction of the project; and be it further

Resolved, That this Common Council urge the Michigan State Legislature to pass a concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to give immediate approval to this important defense project and to call upon other State legislaures to take similar positive action; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of Michigan and to the Michigan Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

Someday You May Be President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. H. L. Hunt, a well known and very successful businessman of Texas and the Southwest:

SOMEDAY YOU MAY BE PRESIDENT
(By H. L. Hunt)

Do you remember when you heard this as a child? How many mothers in all walks of life have said it to their sons. How many teachers in public schools have encouraged their students with this challenging and really startling statement. Though said millions of times, it was always new. It was an intriguing thought. Inspired by it, young men of high ability in the past have given up chances to build a fortune for themselves for a life of public service. However distant, indefinite and slim their chance to be President, it was for them always a goal within the range of possibility. It was a possible reward for high integrity, honest ability and recognized usefulness, and they were willing to give their best.

The belief that every boy has a chance to be President has always been a part of national thinking during the 170 years of our history. Limiting the tenure of the President to 8 years is not only in keeping with our national tradition, it is of the essence of American democracy. Nearly 4 years ago both the Senate and the House adopted a constitutional amendment to effect this. A two-thirds majority vote was required. Since the adoption of this amendment by Congress, 24 States have ratified the amendment. Ratification by 12 more State legislatures is required. There has never been a constitutional amendment ratified unless it was ratified within 4 years from the time of its adoption by Congress.

The third-term precedent which, by usage and custom, had served the purpose of limiting the President's term in office was one of the great casualties of World War II. In those tense and uncertain days the American public chose to continue its war leadership.

From this time on every President, regardless of party, will be persuaded by the hangers-on which they accumulate to continue to serve their country, to force their renomination and attempt to force their reelection as long as they may live. A salutary situation would promptly result from the limitation of the President's term. Many prominent statesmen and up-and-coming lesser figures in public life would be seriously considered as presidential and vice presidential timber, their qualifications and availability studied, and perhaps their names appear in public opinion polls. For example, Texas would be bragging on and boosting its SAM RAYBURN, Governor Shivers, Senators JOHNSON and CONNALLY, ex-Governors Moody, Allred, Stevenson, Hobby, Congressmen GOSSETT, FRANK WILSON, and other outstanding Members of its delegation in Congress, the partisans for each saying that they would make great Presidents, which most of them would.

Oklahoma's Senators KERR and MONRONEY and its other favorite sons would come in for greater recognition and fuller influence. Enthusiastic appraisal would be made of leaders throughout all of the States.

The South, which has not had one of its residents elected to the Presidency for 103 years, would have a vastly better chance to be so honored.

A President, upon being renominated, personally selects his Vice Presidential running mate. This custom further closes the door to the Presidency for men of outstanding ability.

Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming have not ratified. The legislatures of 22 of these States are now in session.

The limitation of 4 years tenure in the governor's office is a part of the Constitution of many of the States which have failed to ratify the constitutional amendment. This limitation of the governor's tenure has served them well, and there is not a single State in the Union which has it whose people would consider for a moment giving it up

Let us look at the score. The Democratic incumbent Truman is exempt and unaffected. The amendment is truly nonpartisan, nearly noncontroversial, and much to be desired. The legislatures are in session, and one might think ratifications will surely be voted. But find out, by talking to your friends, either in or out of public life, how much they know about it, what they think about it, and what they are doing about it. You will likely be appalled at the stupendous indifference which you encounter and realize that this wonderful constitutional amendment may die through inattention and inertia.

The Ground Hog and the Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am moved to again remind my colleagues and the country that we are celebrating groundhog day, and out of consideration of the presence in my congressional district of the slumbering ground hog of Quarryville I can do no less than once more emphasize the prognocticating powers of this great marmot.

In extolling the virtues of this noble animal I cannot help but give way to righteous indignation at the base canard which has been leveled at this profound prophet of portentuous events by the National Geographic Society. Happily this slur on our peerless predictor has been ably answered in a news item which appeared in the Coatesville (Pa.) Record, which I am privileged to include in this statement, as follows:

CAN'T SLUR GROUNDHOG'S FORECASTING SAY QUARRYVILLE LODGE OFFICIALS

The entire membership of the Slumbering Groundhog Lodge of Quarryville let go yesterday with a bitter blast at the National Geographic Society, Washington, D. C., which recently attempted to discredit the groundhog's position as a weather prophet.

Charles F. Hess, chairman of the board of hibernating governors, declared for the entire lodge, "The scurrilous attack on the wisdom, integrity, and inclinations of the groundhog recently issued by the National

Geographic Society is deeply deplored by the Slumbering Lodge of Quarryville. Geographic Society members may know geography but they just do not understand groundhogs."

Among the charges leveled by the society was a statement that the groundhog "refuses to work on the one day it is expected of him."

"Never in the 42 years of official groundhog-watching has our patron saint failed to make his appearance," snorted Hess.

Groundhog day, 1951, will be the forty-third observance by the Quarryville Lodge. "Of course, we will see the groundhog," declared Hess.

The Geographic Society also deplored the fact that a calendar day is named especially for him.

Hess, expressing amazement that the Geographic Society should be so small, declared, "Why shouldn't there be a special day named for the groundhog, when he has been a respected member of society for many thousands of years?"

Dr. Rhys Carpenter, a lodge member and professor of Archeology at Bryn Mawr College, issued this statement:

"I have succeeded in tracing the time-honored practices of the groundhog through the past 3,000 years of European cultural history, and I am in possession of evidence suggesting his possible primal rise on the paleolithic horizon, roughly 50,000 years ago."

"With such a background of antiquity to his credit," declared Hess, "the groundhog would be attacked only by such interests as would destroy the cherished legend of Santa Claus."

Hess noted trimphantly that three of the honored members of the Quarryville lodge are shaping the destiny of the United States in this crucial time.

He spoke of the significant contributions being made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Charles E. Wilson, defense mobilization chief. Heading the country is President Harry Truman, another honorary member of the lodge.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the friendly rivalry which has always existed between the respective hibernating prognosticators of Quarryville and Punxsutawney I am pleased to report that my esteemed colleague from the Nineteenth Pennsylvania District [Mr. GAVIN] has agreed to an armistice for the duration of this present emergency. While each of us will continue to insist on the superiority of his local prognosticator we recognize that it is essential that we unite for a common effort in this crucial period. Henceforth we shall issue joint reports and predictions which will be based on the omens observed by our subterranean seer and, in addition, have determined that all material thus assembled shall be made available to all agencies of Government, particularly the State Department which, while its collective head has for so long been buried in the sand, has never had the sense to look into the earthy cloister of the humble woodchuck in order to determine when it is advisable to come in out of the rain.

We are moved also to point out that as the designer and builder of the original air-raid shelter our Government could do worse than call in this accomplished artisan to direct our defense against atomic warfare. Certainly calling upon his sage advice could not help but bring to the councils of state a refreshing departure from the vacillation, uncertainty, evasion, and befuddlement which for, lo, these 20 years has marked a Government of the people but which has all too often apparently been against them.

That "Wall of Separation" and the Public School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the Catholic World. This magazine is published by the Paulist Fathers in New York.

The article, entitled "That 'Wall of Separation' and the Public School," was written by Rev. J. E. Coogan, S. J. Father Coogan for the past 14 years has been director of the department of sociology of the University of Detroit and, since 1947, chairman of the Mayor's Interracial Committee, a part of the Detroit City administration. Father Coogan writes for many magazines.

The article follows:

THAT "WALL OF SEPARATION" AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

(By J. E. Coogan, S. J.)

The Catholic hierarchy of America in its November 1948 annual meeting startled many critics by its forthright condemnation of Mr. Justice Black's version of the Supreme Court decision in the Everson and the McCollum cases. As remarked in America (April 24, 1948, p. 50) the Justice had written into our Federal constitutional law the revolutionary principle that the first amendment prohibited both the Federal and State Governments from passing laws in behalf of religion, even though without sectarian discrimination. The American system required a wall of separation between church and state. These decisions, the hierachy declared, paid scant attention to * * * history.

In view of the obvious truth of the bishops' charge, it is difficult to explain the surprise their words provoked. There is no need to go outside the field of tax-supported public school education to find countless examples of Government cooperation with religion throughout the history of these United States.

Everyone is aware that colonial American tax-supported education was religious in content and control. The adoption of the first amendment by no means emptied public education of its religious content. As Conrad Moehlman, professor of the history of Christianity, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, says in School and Church: "Well into the nineteenth century the churches were directing the progress of education, and local ministers concerned themselves about proper teachers, teaching, and morals, expecting financial support from the Government."

So beyond dispute is the religious character of public education well into the nineteenth century that Horace Mann is commonly though mistakenly said to have begun the work of secularization when made the secretary of the board of education in Massachusetts as late as 1837. The fact is that as Mann indignantly protested, he was the foe, not of religion, but of sectarianism in public education. One such denial Mann wrote in his reply to a secularizing charge made by a Boston minister (Raymond B. Culver, Horace Mann and Religion): "You accuse me before the world of being opposed to religion in our schools. I regard hostility to religion in our schools as the greatest crime which I could commit against man or against God."

Dr. Culver's own studied conclusion regarding Mann's attitude toward religion in public-school education is emphatic:

"Horace Mann was opposed to sectarian doctrinal instruction in the schools, but he repeatedly urged the teaching of the elements of religion common to all of the Christian sects. He took a firm stand against the idea of a purely secular education. * * * Far from taking religion out of the schools, Mr. Mann sought in positive fashion to * * * devise a constructive, nonsectarian program of moral and religious education which would be in accordance with the terms of the law. It was largely due to his advocacy that the Bible was almost universally used in the schools before he resigned the secretaryship. He abhorred the idea of a purely secular curriculum."

For many years after the Revolution the most religiously significant text—perhaps after the Bible itself—in New England tax-supported schools was the New England Primer. First published between 1687 and 1690, its circulation was enormous. Arthur Jackson Hall, in his Religious Education in the Public Schools of the State and City of New York, shows that the Primer was still much used after more than 150 years, by which time 3,000,000 copies had been sold. But for the public schools of the country as a whole, outside of the Northeastern States, and beginning over a hundred years ago, the instrument of overwhelming importance for religious indoctrination in the public schools was the well-known series of seven books (the first a primer) called the McGuffey Readers. During the period 1836 to 1920 an estimated 124,000,000 copies were sold, the high point of their use being about 1880. Because of the altogether special place these Readers had in American public-school education a discussion of their religious content seems worth while.

In his historical series, Our Times, Mark Sullivan says, "At all times and in every respect, the McGuffey Readers had a strong flavor of religion." Richard D. Mosier in his Making the American Mind, says as the result of his own study of the Readers: "As the research proceeded, it soon became apparent that the McGuffey Readers were consistently stressing a few basic ideas, playing upon a few major themes. * * * The continuity of the basic pattern of ideas is * * * quite the remarkable phenomenon of the whole series."

Quite the most characteristic portion of this basic pattern is religion. This element is found early in the primer itself and grows in variety and force through the succeeding six Readers. As an evidence of this development we have but to turn to the last of the Readers; we use here the edition of 1857, reprinted by Henry Ford in appreciative memory of his own McGuffey school days. Religious references occur throughout, borrowed widely from English literature. Some single citations extend through several pages. To give a few typical excerpts covering the chief points of the scheme of salvation: We have (from Everett) God's existence shown in the sunrise:

"I am filled with amazement, when I am told, that, in this enlightened age and in the heart of the Christian world, there are persons who can witness this daily manifestation of the power and wisdom of the Creator, and yet say in their heart, there is no God."

But the God of the sunrise is shown in the Reader to be everywhere:

"See where the mountains rise;
Where thundering torrents foam;
Where, veiled in towering skies,
The eagle makes his home:
Where savage nature dwells,
My God is present too:
Through all her wildest dells
His footsteps I pursue."

Service of this God alone is shown to make life worth while; to cite a few of the many lines given of Heber's Life, a Mighty River:

"Shall we not think ourselves henceforth as wayfaring persons only, who have no abiding inheritance but in the hope of a better world, and to whom even that world would be worse than hopeless, if it were not for our Lord Jesus Christ, and the interest we have obtained in His mercies?"

In a manner to send shudders through the Freudian frame, self-conquest over animal nature is promised the victor's crown:

"He hath wrestled with Self, and with passion striven;
And to him hath the Sword of the Spirit been given—
Oh! crown him! for his foes—his sins—are slain."

The Hebrew Psalmist too is called to testify to God's goodness to such as fear Him:

"Fret not thyself because of evildoers,
Neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity;
For they shall be cut down like the grass,
And wither as the green herb.
Trust in the Lord and do good;
So shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed.
Delight thyself, also, in the Lord,
And He shall give thee the desires of thy heart."

That after death comes the judgment is solemnly affirmed:

"Before that assembly, every man's good deeds will be declared; and his most secret sins disclosed. As no elevation of rank will then give a title to respect, no obscurity of condition shall exclude the just from public honor, or screen the guilty from public shame."

To life's faithful pilgrim comes the promise of heaven for sorrow bravely borne:

"There is bliss, there is bliss, in the regions above,
They have opened the gates of the sky;
A spirit has soared to those mansions of love,
And seeks for admittance on high;
And friends long divided are hasting to greet,
In a land where no sorrow may come,
And the seraphs are eager a sister to meet,
And to welcome the child to its home."

As the prospect for the impenitent, McGuffey holds out Milton's Satan, Sin and Death.

The McGuffey readers easily make mention of Christ and salvation through Him. A telling apologetic for Christianity is cited in this sixth reader as from John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States. The Acts of the Apostles are used to tell the story of St. Paul before King Agrippa, where the king confesses, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian;" and Paul answers: "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds."

Although the McGuffey readers were compiled for tax-supported schools largely Protestant, the readers were remarkable for the absence of things offensive to Catholics. At times they went out of their way to discredit bigotry. The following tribute from Irving to Columbus, plainly labeled Catholic, is illustrative:

"His piety was genuine and fervent. Religion mingled with the whole course of his thoughts and actions, and shone forth in his most private and unstudied writings. Whenever he made any great discovery, he devoutly returned thanks to God. * * * All his great enterprises were undertaken in the name of the Holy Trinity, and he partook of the holy sacrament previous to embarkation."

Not content to sing the praises of religion, the Reader deplores the consequences of its absence. The disastrous outcome of secularism is prophetically foretold in Observation of the Sabbath:

"No man can preserve his own morals, no parent can preserve the morals of his children, without the impressions of religious obligation. If you can induce a community to doubt the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures; to question the reality and obligation of religion; to hesitate, undeciding, whether there is any such thing as virtue or vice; whether there be an eternal state of retribution beyond the grave; or whether there exists any such being as God; you have broken down the barriers of moral virtue, and hoisted the flood gates of immorality and crime."

Champions of the secular school as alone American evidently should be told that they are scarcely of yesterday. The public schools of our founding fathers and nation builders alike were inspired with the story of God and His relations with men; of God in nature, of God in revelation old and new; of Christ and Salvation through Him. Why, then, should the secularizers be provoked by the Catholic hierarchy's condemnation of Mr. Justice Black's version of the Supreme Court decisions in the Everson and McCollum cases? Those decisions, indeed, paid "scant attention to * * * history."

What, No Red Herring?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Burlington Free Press which is quite to the point.

It does seem that there is at least a moral obligation on the part of the President to once and forever disavow the red-herring charges that he has leveled against all efforts to eliminate Communists and fellow travelers who are or were employed in the Federal Government.

The editorial follows:

A PRESIDENT SPEAKS

After considerable criticism of the man in the White House, we would be shirking the interests of fair play if we did not remark on his apparent change of heart shown in a speech last week in which he said there was no difference between Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolino. Now, that took a long time to sink in. A lot of simple, little people have known that for years.

Even though press services, including the friendly greatest daily in Wisconsin, report that the President added the name Stalin last, and we quote "almost as an afterthought," the ring of truth has at last been heard in the words of the Nation's leader.

Now, if he will just explain what a red herring is in his vocabulary, and admit that Acheson, Lattimore, Service, and that motley crew of Red-loving foreign-affairs experts might have been just a teeny, little bit wrong about simple agrarian reformers and the oriental problem, there may be hopes for the man yet.

The Sixty-ninth Birthday Anniversary of President Roosevelt, January 30, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to know our beloved late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, having been introduced to him in 1915 by the then Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Josephus Daniels, with whom I had worked in the William Jennings Bryan presidential campaign in 1896. I was tremendously impressed with his tactful and diplomatic manner in discussing a Chicago matter I had presented to him that had been submitted to me by the Honorable Carter H. Harrison, II, mayor of Chicago. Mr. Harrison now 90 years of age, called on me the other day in Chicago and, recalling that meeting of 35 years ago, commented on the statesmanship and personality of the then young Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is unnecessary for me to again restate the splendid services performed and ability displayed by Mr. Roosevelt in many important conferences and trips he made during World War I. Following the war, I was further impressed with his personality and charming ways during the course of the Democratic National Convention in 1920 and with the great speech that he delivered in nominating the Honorable Alfred Smith, of New York, for the Presidency. Notwithstanding his eloquence and strong appeal the nomination fell to our former colleague, Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio.

At that convention, as chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Cook County and as a member of the platform and resolutions committee of the convention, I had the privilege of consulting with the leaders of the Democratic Party in selecting candidates for the Vice Presidency. The committee came to the conclusion that Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, would be the strongest candidate for that honor. I recall that it was suggested that I visit the New York delegation, which I did. I did not find the members of the delegation in good humor, due to Mr. Smith's failure to obtain the presidential nomi-

nation. My instructions were to see them and to ascertain whether, in view of conditions, they would be satisfied with the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt for the Vice Presidency. Unfortunately, the leaders of the New York delegation were not friendly to the suggestion and I reported back to the leaders that were awaiting my return to the speaker's platform for the result of my mission. After my report was made, they insisted that I return for a further conference. Since I was well acquainted with a majority of the New York delegates, I was urged to prevail upon them to agree. After some argumentation they finally concurred that it would be agreeable if the convention would nominate Mr. Roosevelt as running mate to Governor Cox. Unfortunately for the country, Cox and Roosevelt failed to win the election.

A few years later, however, the great State of New York elected Mr. Roosevelt as Governor and in 1930 he was reelected. On the evening of his reelection, being unsuccessful in reaching him on the telephone, I sent him a telegram assuring him that by reason of the tremendous majority be attained in his great victory he would become the next President of the United States. I have been told by many persons who were present that the telegram was read and received with a great deal of enthusiasm.

During 1931 the Republican newspapers, as was their wont, began to publish many articles derogating Mr. Roosevelt's health. Later in the year I had the opportunity to see him in Albany. When I entered his office, he struck his desk with his fist and asked: "A. J., how do I look?" I frankly stated: "You look wonderful." I then asked him: "How do you feel?" He replied: "I feel better than I look." He then began talking about the coming Democratic convention and from that day on, until he was nominated, I had many conferences with him, Colonel Howe, and his campaign manager, Mr. James A. Farley.

Unfortunately, I failed to prevail upon the Illinois leaders, Mr. Anton J. Cermak, Mr. Edward J. Kelly, and Mr. Patrick Nash to cast the State's vote for him on the second ballot. However, I obtained their promise to do so on the third ballot. Before Illinois was reached on the roll call of States on the third ballot, Mr. RAYBURN, our present Speaker, representing Mr. John N. Garner, of Texas, whose name was also before the convention as a candidate, in conjunction with Mr. MacAdoo, of California, cast their respective States' votes for Mr. Roosevelt, before the Illinois and Indiana delegations had an opportunity to do so.

Late in the afternoon on the day that he was nominated, Mr. Roosevelt requested me to conduct the campaign among the naturalized foreign born and those of foreign descent, as I had done in previous national campaigns. I actively carried on this campaign to the day before the election.

Due to the failure of the Hoover administration, the country suffered its worst financial panic and business depression in the history of our Nation. It fell to Mr. Roosevelt immediately after his election to devise legislation and other means that would provide for reconstruction and to facilitate the recovery of business from the catastrophic conditions that confronted the country.

Time will not permit me to again describe in detail President Roosevelt's continuous activity and effort to find ways and means to rebuild our commerce, to bring about the reemployment of the 16,000,000 workers who were unemployed, to save our commercial businesses and banks, nearly all of whom were insolvent or on the brink of bankruptcy, and to save hundreds of thousands of our citizens from losing their homes and farms. The country thankfully and even prayerfully appreciated his great services and accomplishments to restore the entire Nation to normal conditions.

President Roosevelt in his second term as in his first term advocated and recommended the enactment of many progressive and helpful laws. Unfortunately, in 1940, when the world was thrown into turmoil, he was obliged to devote his ability and statesmanship to the approaching dangers that threatened to engulf the entire world.

In 1938, President Roosevelt made a speech in Chicago in which he called attention to the dangers facing our country. He was assailed by many people, but he firmly persisted, from time to time, in acquainting the country with the seriousness of changing world conditions, and was thus subjected to further attacks. He keenly felt these unfair criticisms. No President before him and, I hope, no President in the future will ever be subjected to the trials and tribulations that confronted him during those trying days.

While no President up to that time had served more than two terms, many people who had the interest of the country at heart felt that no one was better qualified, informed, and with a wider knowledge of world conditions than President Roosevelt, I am pleased to say that I was one of the very first who urged him, notwithstanding the precedent of no President serving more than two terms, to continue to serve the Nation for a third term. In fact, I stated that he owed it to the country, and to himself, to do so.

Unfortunately, differences arose between the President and Mr. Farley, who felt it unwise for the President to accede to the demands of a large majority of our citizens to continue for a third term. The fears of Mr. Farley were not well founded because the President was reelected to a third term, again with a tremendous majority.

In 1944 the United States was in the throes of war, and I again urged him and insisted that he continue in the Presidency for another 4 years, not only in the interest of our own country but that of the world. Had I known then of the condition of his health, I never would have urged him to be a candidate for reelection, but he was brave and courageous, and against the advice of some of his friends, made the campaign in the most inclement weather, which, no doubt, affected his health. He was again reelected in 1944, but the great strain of his effort to bring peace to the troublesome world and to eliminate future wars told on his strength, and his condition did not improve. He continued with all his resourcefulness and the strength he possessed in the tasks that faced him until, upon the insistent demand of his family and physicians, he sought rest at Warm Springs, Ga., in the hope of recouping his health and strength. But even there he never ceased in his effort to strive to bring about peace and improved conditions in our country to his dying day.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that on the day of his death one of his secretaries, the son of my old friend, Josephus Daniels, Mr. Jonathan Daniels, who had arrived that morning from Warm Springs, came to my office with a request from President Roosevelt that I should endeavor to obtain the reporting of a rule by the Committee on Rules for the consideration of the then pending fair-employment-practices bill. I have reason to believe that it was the President's last request. During our conversation that day Mr. Daniels assured me that the President was improving and hoped shortly to return to Washington to resume his work. Unfortunately, while I tried to comply with his request, I was unable to do so.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that anyone in the history of our Nation or of any other nation was more sincere or devoted to improving the welfare of the common people than was President Roosevelt. I further believe that no man was more beloved and respected than he, and when the report of his passing was reported throughout the world, the whole universe mourned his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that as long as our Republic endures the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the sacrifices he made for the welfare of our country will be remembered and will remain ever fresh in the minds of our people.

Escape Under Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the so-called escape clause of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade provides that—

> If as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a contracting party under this agreement, including tariff concessions, any product is being imported into the territory of that contracting party in such increased quantities and under such conditions as

to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in that territory of like or directly competitive products, the contracting party shall be free, in respect of such product, and to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, to suspend the obligation in whole or in part or to withdraw or modify the concession.

This is the escape clause that has been publicized by the Department of State as the guaranty that American producers have a remedy against mistakes made in reducing the tariff. An analysis of the clause will soon reveal how loosely and defectively it is drawn and why, in good sense, it is deceptive to describe it as a remedy.

In the first place, the actual or threatened injury must have resulted from developments that were unforeseen and must be attributable to a trade agreement or similar obligation. The first half of this criterion, namely, that the developments that caused the injury were unforseen, creates some doubts of interpretation as well as of intent.

Assuming, for example, that foreseen rather than unforeseen developments should lead to injury, would relief be denied? The language of the clause so indicates, for it would appear that if the injury was foreseen and was not guarded against or avoided by refusal to make a concession, such as a duty reduction, the injury must have been intended; and if it was intended, no remedy would be available; for the remedy extends, by the language of the clause, only to those instances where the adverse developments were not foreseen.

The question naturally arises whether the injury would be any less damaging to the producers concerned if it had been foreseen by someone in the administrative agency that made the agreement.

If foreseen injuries are to be without remedy, the further question arises whether trade agreements may lend themselves to punitive measures aimed at particular industries. Whether intended or not, under this clause an administrative agency could deliberately destroy an industry and at the same time strip the complainant of a remedy precisely because the damage was foreseen. But this is not all. Should the injured party then seek a remedy under section 336 of the tariff, which provides for a cost-of-production study and offers a method of increasing the rate by 50 percent, he would find this avenue closed. The provisions of section 336 are not available with respect to any item that has been made the subject of a concession in a trade agreement.

The Tariff Commission has taken note of the extremely awkward wording of the escape clause in the matter of "unforeseen developments." In the Procedure and Criteria With Respect to the Administration of the "Escape Clause" in Trade Agreements—revision of February 1950—the Commission states that—

> The construction which the Commission places upon the words "unforeseen developments" is that when imports of any commodity enter in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers, this situation must, in the light of the objective of the trade agreement program and of the escape clause itself, be regarded as the result of unforeseen developments.

In other words, the Commission, confronted by the plain wording of the escape clause, simply side-stepped the language and elected to read common sense into it.

The second half of the first criterion, which requires that the injury complained of must be attributable to a trade agreement as a condition of escape, is also restrictive. The attribution of economic effects to particular causes, such as a trade agreement, is, to say the least, an uncertain but heavy burden to place upon a complainant, and leaves him on an unstable footing since his allegations can be denied by attributing the alleged effects to other causes. The complainant has then no answer because his allegations, by their nature, are not subject to proof. This leaves him completely in the hands of the agency hearing his complaint. Under these conditions the scope of the agency's discretion is very wide indeed.

Once more, the Tariff Commission found it necessary to relax the restrictive effect of the clause. In the "Procedure and Criteria" cited above, they say:

> If the increase (in imports) was, even in part, the result of the concession, that is sufficient, since the language of the escape clause clearly does not require that the concession be the sole, or even the chief cause.

Thus in two instances the Commission has found it necessary to substitute its own interpretation for that of Executive Order 9382 which contains the official wording of the escape clause. There has been ample opportunity to revise the clause since its first inclusion in a trade agreement in 1943 and even since its appearance in the executive order dated February 25, 1947, but this has not been done in any remedial sense.

While the interpretations of the Tariff Commission just cited, have materially improved the administrability of the clause, the fact remains that no delegation of power should be so loosely and poorly drawn that an administrative agency, in order to avoid a wholly absurd requirement, must deliberately read something into the order that it does not say, or brush aside something that the order clearly states.

Another requirement for escape laid down in the clause is the condition that the quantity of imports must have increased and that such increased imports are entering under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury.

This, again, is a compound condition: Imports must have increased and must be entering under certain conditions.

Once more the Tariff Commission found it necessary to make its own interpretation. Of the increase in imports it says in the Procedure and Criteria, cited above, that—

> This means that imports under the trade agreements must supply a larger share of domestic consumption than they did during a previous period.

Of course, that is not what the escape clause says, but only in that light does it meet the dictates of common sense. This latter the Commission no doubt felt impelled to supply. The framers of the clause had apparently overlooked the condition where domestic consumption declines while imports remain as high as before or decline less than domestic consumption. This oversight was repaired by the Tariff Commission's interpretation, by which the word "relative" was inserted to modify the word "increase," so that actually imports need not increase in order to afford a basis for escape. They might even decline, so long as they declined less than domestic consumption.

However, despite the improvements of the clause by administrative interpretation, very serious defects remain in it. These appear to be quite beyond the reach of interpretations even as liberal as the Tariff Commission has been willing to supply.

It has been noted, for example, that the increased imports must also enter under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious damage. The only conclusion to be drawn from the linking of increased imports to the condition of their importation is that it was done to foreclose the possibility of an escape if there has been no increase—or relative increase under the Commission's interpretation—no matter how much injury might be inflicted otherwise; that is, in the absence of an increase. There was little that could be done about this through the medium of interpretation.

Yet it is easily conceivable that severe damage may be caused by imports even though they have not increased, either absolutely or relatively.

This would not only be possible but highly probable in a buyer's market. It is not necessary that imports take a higher percentage of the market than during a previous period in order to inflict damage on domestic producers. The determining factors are the domestic economic situation and the prices at which imports are offered in competition with our producers. Injury is not merely the result of an upward trend of imports. Changing domestic economic trends have as much bearing on the effect of imports, if not more, than the trend of imports themselves.

A given volume of imports may work great havoc in a buyer's market while the same volume would produce little or no competitive pressure in a seller's market, where, of course, demand is strong in relation to supply. Imports that have fallen to a small percentage of domestic consumption, even as low as 2 or 3 percent, may cause much more damage than imports that formerly equaled 10 or 20 percent, if competitive conditions in the domestic market have in the meantime changed to a buyer's from a seller's market.

The escape clause takes no account of such a distinction between domestic market conditions. It simply assumes that imports cannot produce injury unless they take a larger share of the market than during some earlier period. Actually there is no necessary relationship between present injury from imports and the volume of imports 5 or 10 or any other number of years ago.

Many of the present trade agreements were made while a seller's market prevailed in this country. This was a time when consumer demand was stronger than supply. Under these circumstances, dating of the trend of imports from the time of the trade agreement—as a means of determining whether imports have increased under its terms—is irrelevant to the question of injury. If a trade agreement was signed at a time when a seller's market prevailed, neither the volume of imports nor the tariff rate remaining on an article after a concession has been made, had any competitive meaning. Domestic producers could not satisfy the entire demand even at the high level of prices. Competitively it was a matter of indifference whether imports supplied 1 percent or 25 percent of consumption. It was equally immaterial whether the rate of duty was 1 percent or 25 percent.

When thereafter—as happened in a large number of cases—the seller's market reaches its end and is succeeded by a buyer's market, the volume of imports that the market absorbed successfully during the period of shortage offers no clue to the volume that can be absorbed under the new condition without injury; nor does the tariff rate that was in effect during the period of the seller's market indicate the level that may be appropriate in a buyer's market.

Therefore, to insist that applicants for escape from injury show an increase in imports since a particular trade agreement was entered into, is to impose an unjustifiable and meaningless condition upon those who allege injury. Imports may not have increased and yet serious injury may threaten or actually be in course.

The increased imports that must have occurred, in order to justify an escape, must, as already stated, also enter under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury. This means that it is not enough to prove an increase in imports alone. It must be shown that the imports are entering under such conditions as to inflict damage or threaten it.

The escape clause throws no light upon the kind of conditions that would be taken into consideration. However, market conditions, such as a buyer's market, might be regarded as suitable for consideration; as might also the relative price levels at which the imported products were being offered.

This requirement—of proof that imports are entering under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury—is sound in itself and would be acceptable but for its linkage with the preceding condition which requires that imports must have increased. If this conjunction were dissolved and the conditions of importation made an independent consideration, the difficulties and deficiencies of the increased-imports requirement would be overcome. This effect could be produced by changing the "and" to "or" in the clause that provides "and under such conditions" so that it would read "or under such conditions."

An escape could then be justified by showing that imports are entering under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury, whether or not they had increased. In other words, it would be possible to deal with the only part of the problem that has any meaning.

Since the conditions are not defined in the clause, it is, however, not clear how much weight is to be given to the volume of import trade as such, in relation to domestic consumption. There is a strong tendency to dismiss imports lightly as a source of injury if they are small in relation to domestic consumption.

That such dismissal may not be justified becomes clear when consideration is given to the possibility that the imports may compete with a particular variety of items in a broader classification, or in a particular market area, and may therefore offer heavy competition in the narrower field. Thus, imports of textiles may be small in relation to the domestic consumption of all textiles but may be much higher in relation to a particular kind of textile product or in a particular market. Acute injury may thus be suffered by the producers of the particular item or by those located in a particular area while other segments of the textile industry, or those in other locations, may experience little or no foreign competition.

Perhaps more important, however, than this consideration is the possibility of injury out of all proportion to the relative volume of imports. This may occur, as already indicated, when the domestic market is on the surplus rather than the shortage side, and particularly at the end of a seller's market, when prices are high while demand begins to falter.

If imports are offered at prices below the domestic levels under such circumstances, no large volume of such imports is necessary to produce widespread and serious injury. Domestic producers will seek to reduce their high-priced inventory as rapidly as possible in the hope of averting a heavy inventory loss through falling prices precipitated or accelerated by low-priced imports. Inventory is most readily reduced by producing less, that is, by allowing sales to move stock from the warehouses while replenishing at a greatly reduced rate. Reduced production, of course, calls for a curtailment of employment, either by lay-offs or reduction of the workweek, or both. The damage may be all the greater if domestic producers do not know how large a supply is available abroad for shipment to this country at low prices, or if they know that a large supply is available.

If the imports flow in, as feared, and find a ready market domestic prices will fall and profits will be reduced. The pressure on employment and wages will mount steadily and the lay-offs may become permanent. It will be difficult to plan future production, and, as long as the threat remains, there will be no plant expansion and a minimum outlay for new machinery and equipment. This is not the road to an expanding economy.

If the threat or fear of increasing low-priced imports does not materialize, damage will nevertheless result because of the uncertainty about the potential. What domestic producers reasonably anticipate or fear, rather than the fact, which will only subsequently reveal itself, will determine the extent of the injury.

Clearly, the possibility of escape should not be limited to any preconceived level of imports in relation to domestic production or consumption. Imports amounting to 5 percent or less of domestic consumption may produce more injury than a volume that takes 20 percent or more of the market.

Thus it is neither the fact of increase in imports nor the share of the market captured by imports, alone, that determines the likelihood or degree of injury sustained. Equally or more important are the domestic market conditions, relative price levels of imports and domestic products, extent of the available foreign supply and possession or lack of accurate information by domestic producers with respect to the foreign supply and its trend.

The foregoing analysis has demonstrated quite amply the serious need of a revision of the escape clause. An examination of the administrative provisions of the clause will show that they are equally in need of change.

The Tariff Commission is the agency vested by Executive Order 9382 with the authority and responsibility of administering the escape clause. While the Commission is the appropriate agency for carrying out this function, the grant of power and discretion is entirely too broad. It is left to the judgment of the Commission, for example, to determine whether an investigation should be made to determine the merits of an application for relief. The Commission, under this grant of power, has dismissed most applications brought before it, without a single word of explanation.

Even when the Commission makes an investigation, it need make no explanation of its denial of a remedy. Again it is under no obligation or mandate to make public its findings or expose its reasoning.

The grant of authority to the Commission is obviously designed to confer arbitrary and irresponsible power upon this agency, wholly out of keeping with good principles of government. The need for a revision is clear.

Penalizing Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for those who are willing to serve in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of Defense is certainly discouraging the hundreds of thousands who have enlisted in the Reserves. Up in my district, one Myron J. Smith enlisted in the active Naval Reserve on October 26, 1945, was honorably

discharged therefrom on August 1, 1946, then enlisted again for four additional years and in July 1950 again enlisted in the Naval Reserve for four additional years.

After all of these enlistments in the Naval Reserve and his desire to serve in the Navy during war or emergency, the selective service inducted him into the Army on October 30, 1950. He was sworn into the Army and is now stationed at Fort Knox, Ky., in spite of all his objections with selective service of his being enlisted in the Naval Reserve from October 26, 1945.

Further on January 17, 1951, he received orders from the Navy to report at Great Lakes Training Center on May 9, 1951, the service in which he has been continuously in since October 26, 1945, but he is now in the Army at Fort Knox, Ky. I have taken this up with the Armed Forces here in Washington, and it seems that this is an erroneous induction by selective service. Yet, he is in the Army and the Army has no inclination to discharge this man who has been in the Naval Reserve for nearly 6 years previous to this erroneous induction.

Mr. Speaker, what did it mean when the Congress passed the Unification Act? The Army, the Navy, and Air Corps are supposed to be under the Secretary of Defense, yet the Army takes and keeps a man who wants to serve in the Navy and who has continually been in the Naval Reserve since October 1945.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of respect and allegiance can the parents of young men of this country have for the military when the Secretary of Defense permits the same old brass to violate its agreement with citizens after asking them to go into the Reserve forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why this young man who wants to serve in the Navy and enlisted in the Reserves at the request of the Navy, should not be immediately discharged from the Army or transferred to the Navy by the Secretary of Defense. Such confusion and violation of promises to citizens by the various branches of the Armed Forces should be made good. The Secretary of Defense should protect those who have long before their time enlisted in the Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, the services should not be permitted to violate the rights of a citizen who has enlisted in the Reserves and the Selective Service should be ordered not to forcibly induct those who have enlisted in the Reserves.

Federal Aid Means Loss of Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News of January 30, 1951:

FEDERAL AID MEANS LOSS OF FREEDOMS

A State legislative proposal which would open welfare records to inspection by those other than members of county welfare boards, has once again directed attention to the fact that to receive Federal aid also means to receive Federal dictation and consequent loss of freedoms.

The Federal Security Administration has given a strong hint that $20,000,000 of subsidy to Indiana's welfare program might be cut off if the names of persons getting State aid are made public. In other words, if the State of Indiana does not do exactly as the Federal Government dictates in the conduct of the Hoosier welfare program, Indiana may lose the millions of dollars now donated federally to the program.

A law which would open public-welfare records to inspection would undoubtedly result in a reduction in the number of persons now receiving such aid. For one thing, such a law would help to uncover those cases in which both individuals and entire families have been discovered, through special investigation, to have been receiving public funds, while at the same time receiving money from regular jobs in amounts sufficient for support.

Hoosier Day Columnist Frank White recently declared that "This threat (the one made by the Federal Security Administration) points up graphically some facts about our drift to a welfare state. * * * When a State accepts Federal money, there goes hand in hand with such subsidies controls and telling us how to run affairs. Furthermore, you can't collect taxes, send the money to Washington, and get back as much as you send."

Columnist White adds that, "There is too much governmental red tape and expense involved. Welfare costs are rocketing even in our boom wartime employment. Hundreds of names of those getting State welfare aid would be taken from the welfare rolls were the secrecy removed. We are entitled to know where public tax money goes, since we pay the tax bill."

Federal officials tend to push aside any accusations that the Nation is solidly on the trend toward an all-out welfare state. But the facts prove that these officials are only talking fast to evade being pinned down by a fact. The people of the United States are arming themselves to beat back the forces in the world which would rob them of their freedoms, and yet there is too much to show that there are those who, through government policy at home, would rob the people of those same freedoms. Federal aid means loss of freedoms.

A Boondoggler Objects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, once a boondoggler always a boondoggler seems to be a firm and fixed habit with a spendthrift New Dealer, Representative CECIL KING, of California, seems to resent any criticism of President Truman for his unsound policies which have brought the Nation to the brink of financial disaster. I will say this, however, that Representative KING has been consistent in his ardent support of the New Deal spending, wasteful program. Now that the unsound fiscal policies of the Truman administration and its inordinate waste has placed a crushing tax burden upon the people and has by its every move brought the evil of a ruinous inflation upon the people, Representative KING, of California rebels against any criticism of the disastrous course he and his President have followed.

I gave out an interview after the delivery of the President's tax message. My colleague, Representative KING, reminds me of the big 16-year-old boy who was weeping and howling imprecations. When asked what was troubling him, he sobbed, "Ma is weaning me." It may be tough for my friend to be weaned from his wild and reckless spending of the taxpayers' money, but if he fails to join in a program of economy, his constituents will wean him from public office.

I am inserting under leave to extend heretofore granted, the statement of my views and references to President Truman's tax message, of which Representative KING objects.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK

I am opposed to the President's recommendation for a two-package tax program. Everyone agrees that we are close to the bottom of the tax barrel and therefore any new taxes can be levied only after careful consideration of the administration's entire tax program.

Either the administration has no such over-all program to raise the $16,000,000,000 or the President's tax message is so politically clever as to amount to down-right dishonesty. The administration should immediately disclose its complete program to the American people or confess that it is impossible to raise $16,000,000,000 without disastrous consequences.

In my opinion this tremendous tax increase is unnecessary because President Truman could save approximately $6,500,000,000 if he had an honest desire to reduce nonmilitary expenditures to a minimum.

I am unalterably opposed to presently raising $10,000,000,000 on the assumption that we will raise a subsequent $6,000,000,000 unless it becomes clearly imperative that we raise $16,000,000,000.

I think that the most important single task is to prune out unnecessary spending. The American people are tired of shelling out their hard-earned dollars to support scatter-brain socialistic schemes of the Fair Deal administration. They are also tired of supporting thousands of Fair Deal bureaucrats on the public payroll.

I strongly oppose consideration by the Congress of additional taxes for this administration to squander until the congressional appropriation committees have cut the fat out of the President's budget. I do not want them to deprive the military of necessary funds. But I do expect them to eliminate Mr. Truman's pet socialistic program, I do expect them to reduce the Federal payroll; I do expect them to put a crimp in our world-wide WPA. In short I expect them to cut nonessential expenditures by $6,500,000,000 or $7,000,000,000. After these reductions are made, we will then be in a position to deal with taxes on the basis of the information we will have on hand.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the New York Times in an editorial under date of February 2, 1951, which shows how futile it is to stop inflation when President

Truman by his many and inept moves encourages inflation.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I insert the editorial as a part of my remarks:

A VICTORY FOR INFLATION

On Wednesday the members of the Federal Reserve Board were summoned to the White House for a conference with President Truman. Yesterday the White House press secretary announced that the Reserve Board had "pledged its support to President Truman to maintain the stabilization of Government securities as long as the emergency lasts."

What does this mean? Apparently the administration would like to have the country believe that the White House has merely stepped in to arbitrate a minor difference between the views of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve over the proper pattern of interest rates for Treasury financing during the defense program. Mr. Snyder, if one may judge from an interview he gave out on Wednesday, would have the public believe that this is a defeat for "the bankers," and a victory for the taxpayers, who, he says, will profit by lower interest charges on the Government debt.

But if this is a victory for the public, then we can only say that the public is likely to find it one of the most dearly bought victories in its experience. Let no one delude himself with the belief that it is the bankers who are going to bear the cost. It will be the American people as a whole who will foot this bill—the little people, who will see the yield on their savings further diminished; the Government, the biggest buyer of goods and services in the country, through increased cost of the rearmament program, and the taxpayer who provides the money for the Government.

To state the matter in the simplest terms, what has happened in this case is that the President has called in the men who are charged with the responsibility for seeing that the country's monetary policies are conducted with the best interests of the Nation as a whole in view, and has ordered them to take their orders in the future from the Secretary of the Treasury. We can recall offhand no instance where the independent central banking system in a democracy has been subjected to similar public degradation. And we can recall no instance, under any form of government, in which the central bank, once made a captive of the exchequer, has functioned otherwise than as an engine of inflation.

General Eisenhower's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, rarely has a Nation awaited with more hope and more confidence the answer to questions of national importance than did our country wait upon General Eisenhower and the answers which he brought to an anxious Nation from his tour of European capitals. General Eisenhower did not fail in his mission—he did not fail to fulfill with integrity, intelligence, and understanding the national mission upon which he embarked. He brought home the information which we as a Nation sorely needed—in so doing he has perhaps rendered as valuable a service to peace as any one man in recent years.

General Eisenhower's report is both encouraging and realistic. He has stressed the need for effective cooperation among democratic allies. In this connection, the Christian Science Monitor in an editorial entitled "Eisenhower's Answers," from the issue of February 2, last, has concisely and clearly summarized these answers and I ask that a copy of this editorial be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

EISENHOWER'S ANSWERS

General Eisenhower in his report to Congress has answered the chief questions the American people have had about the defense of Europe.

His answers carry all the weight of a first-hand investigation by a man who through his professional services and personal qualities has won the confidence of the American people in superlative degree. He has approached the questions frankly from the standpoint of the good of the United States. Isolationists will not find it easy to attack his answers as those of a do-gooder or just another Europe-lover. Let's take his testimony:

As to the importance of Western Europe to America:

"The Western European complex is so important to our future * * * that we cannot afford to do less than our best to make sure it does not go down the drain."

As to whether the United States' allies will defend themselves:

"There is a spirit to resist. There is a determination to do their part—to take the risk."

As to timing:

"There is not a moment to waste."

As to the purpose of rearming Europe:

"We are going to build for ourselves a secure wall of peace. * * * What we are trying to do cannot honestly be considered by any nation as a threat to its existence."

As to a sound attitude toward the Europeans:

"Have patience with our allies. * * * Some of their problems are very great."

As to the effect of abandoning Europe:

"If we were left standing alone, isolated in a world of communism, our system would wither away."

The Eisenhower report will leave little ground for die-hard opposition to early and ample aid in the defense of Europe.

One of the things we like most about General "Ike's" statement is his reminder that military power is more than a matter of men or weapons, or even of productive capacity. It depends also on courage, on purpose, on faith, and on willingness to work together.

The core of the problem of Europe's defense is right in these moral and spiritual ingredients. With them the physical power can be mustered. Those who take a negative line and say, "We won't supply another man or dollar until you prove you can defend yourselves," miss the point. The Eisenhower approach is positive: "Here's what we will contribute to the common effort. Now, what can you do?" Can anyone doubt that this confident, cooperative attitude will evoke a better response?

General Eisenhower is insistent that Europe must help itself; indeed, that it must do the larger part of the job. But he perceives that to spur that effort Europe needs hope, the assurance that it will not be deserted by America. We trust that his magnificent presentation of the case will persuade Congress and the public to give that assurance—unmistakably and promptly.

The Strike of Switchmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very splendid editorial entitled "Strong Words Are Not Enough," published in the Washington Sunday Star of February 4, 1951. This has reference to the railroad strike, and is directed to the President.

My own thought is that Congress should take authoritative action to prevent strikes of this character which threaten the security of the Nation and are in violation and defiance of solemn contracts entered into by the union, and in utter disregard of the public interest. Several measures could be adopted. One would be to deny further bargaining rights to any union for its membership where it authorizes or tolerates a strike in violation of its contract. If the union cannot control its members, then it should not be given power and responsibility to represent them. The present "sickness" strike is nothing more than a dodge or subterfuge, as has been demonstrated previously. The situation demands vigorous action. This editorial also suggests another possible remedy.

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

STRONG WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH

The President, who said not long ago that he believed in calling aggression by its right name, now has done some plain talking about the railroad strike. But in this matter strong words are not enough.

This strike is steeped in dishonesty, and is doing a great deal of damage, both materially and morally, to the country.

The switchmen who have walked off their jobs are not sick, and every one knows it. This is simply a transparently dishonest device to escape the consequences which might befall them if they went out openly on strike. This is a serious matter in itself. For if men will not deal honestly in such matters, how is it possible to enter into any agreement with them that merits confidence?

Of greater moment, however, is the damage to the country that this strike is doing. Mr. Truman says that it is "directly injuring our national security." Men engaged in defense work are being laid off as a result of the strike and defense plants are being shut down. Food and clothing destined for our combat forces in Korea are tied up in shutdown yards. In a few more days, the results will be calamitous.

There are those who make excuses for the strikers. It is said they have not had a wage increase since 1948, and that is true. But it is their own fault. Last June, after extensive hearings, a presidential fact-finding board recommended an increase of 18 cents an hour. The railroads accepted, the workers refused. Later, the railroads, trying to avert a strike, raised the ante to 23 cents an hour. The union still refused. Then came the White House intervention. This resulted in an apparent agreement on 25 cents an hour, plus cost-of-living protection, plus

other benefits. This was signed by the union representatives, but was later rejected. Others say the railroad presidents should be compelled to negotiate with the union presidents. But what is the point of this? The railroad representatives have had full authority to negotiate and their agreements have been kept. It is the union representatives who have not acted in a responsible manner, and who, as the President says, apparently signed the White House agreement in bad faith. So what purpose would be served by bringing the railroad presidents into the picture?

What is obviously needed in this situation is some means of holding the unions responsible for the acts of their members. If the unions cannot control their members in matters that come within the province of the unions, then they have no right to function as the representatives of the men.

How this can best be done is a difficult question. But some means of doing it must be found. The Government cannot call on all other Americans for heavy sacrifices in the name of the national welfare, and permit a handful of irresponsible strikers to pursue their own reckless and selfish aims. That not only cripples the national effort in a material sense; it will, if tolerated, certainly destroy the national morale. It is not enough to denounce this strike, or even to find some way of patching up the dispute. The President, as Chief Executive, should start now to provide the machinery that will compel, not some, or most, but all Americans to serve the interests of their country on even terms. All unions today enjoy a privileged status under the law. If this privilege is going to be abused, as it is being abused, it must be revoked.

The Golf Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have taken note of the recent controversy concerning the operation of public golf courses here in Washington with a good deal of interest.

It is not my intention to discuss the problem at this time, but under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following correspondence which, in my opinion, should receive the close attention of the Committee on Public Lands:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1951.*

DEAR SIR: The story of golf in the District is one that reflects great credit on the operators of the courses from the taxpayer's standpoint, because to this present moment their operation has cost the taxpayer not 1 cent. While there is a continuing deficit in every branch of the Government the golf courses have returned a profit to this same Government. While the District recreation chairman, Harry Wender, asks each year for increased appropriations for his department, the golf courses, under private management, have paid their way. In doing this they have kept green fees way below the green fees of other municipalities throughout the United States.

Many people believe that the Government built the courses and maintains them. The facts are that the courses, in part, were built by the present management of the courses from personal funds. The present operator of the courses risked his own finances in building the courses and was repaid from fees later collected from the players. Year after year during the early stages of golf-course building the District Recreation Commission manifested no interest in the golf courses whatever. During those days when the present operator of the courses was setting up the finest public golf courses in the country, the District Recreation Commission occupied itself with other matters. It was only when wise management started showing a profit that the District Recreation Chairman started casting anxious eyes at the local golf courses.

The golf courses are on Department of the Interior property. The swimming pools are on the Department of the Interior property. The tennis courts are on Department of the Interior property. Mr. Harry Wender does not want his recreation department to operate the swimming pools—he just wants to operate the golf courses. The golf courses show a record of wise management and continuing profit under private management. The swimming pools, once operated by the present operator of the golf courses at a considerable profit to the Government, are now operated by a quasi governmental agency and are showing a continuing loss. The Recreation Commission has always reached into the pockets of the taxpayers for funds for all operations under their command, while the private operator of the golf courses has put money into the taxpayers' pockets. Anacostia golf course was once operated by a quasi governmental agency, but again a continuing deficit forced the management to turn the golf course over to the present operator, who again turned the operation into a profitable venture.

No one on the Commission knows anything about the operation of golf courses, yet newspaper accounts reveal that Mr. Harry Wender has already predicted the profits for the future under his management. As Members of Congress and other businessmen know, meeting a payroll from profits and wise management is slightly different than meeting a payroll from a congressional appropriation. Mr. Wender is an optimistic soul. He sees only a profit for the future in District golf. Mr. Wender has never investigated the operation of courses in other cities under municipal management. If he had investigated he would find that with few exceptions all the cities operate their courses at higher fees and at a loss to the taxpayers. Yet, undaunted by lack of knowledge of the subject, Mr. Harry Wender has already indicated he proposes to reduce the rates to the golfer.

Citizens who will have to pay the bill for any of Mr. Wender's mistakes in management are asking where the money will come from if the golf courses show a loss under governmental management. Mr. Wender certainly isn't going to foot the bill. Mr. Wender thinks it is easy to get money out of Congress for deficits, so he is reported to be not uneasy about the future if he can get control of the courses.

Should Congress in its wisdom decide to loan Mr. Wender money to purchase the courses some time in the future, it should first examine the entire recreation program. It should set up a policy that would require the Recreation Commission to take over the pools and tennis courts too. It should put the parks under the Recreation Commission control, because the parks and the bridle paths are as much recreation to some people as golf is to others. Mr. Harry Wender doesn't know anything about the operation of these things either, but there may as well be a big deficit as a little one. The taxpayers will never know the difference.

No one, including the Recreation Commission Chairman, Mr. Harry Wender, knows why the Recreation Commission wants to operate the courses. The Commission can't submit a record of profitable management in other ventures. They can't show that present fees are too high. They can't show that the courses are not in good condition. They can't show an excess of employees in the operation of the courses. They can't show anything except a desire to get control of golf in the District. The golf courses under municipal management in other cities show that city employees play the courses at no cost in most cases. The courses become a private playground for officials and political cronies of those in control of the courses. This is one reason why the courses show a loss.

When the Recreation Commission decided they wanted to operate the courses they learned that the present operator could not be attacked on the basis of wise management. They decided that the personal smear angle would produce the best results. All sorts of charges irrelevant were put forward, but they fell flat before an onslaught of facts in the hands of the present operation of the courses.

The most significant statement coming out of the hearings on the transfer of the golf courses to the Recreation Department is the following:

"It is indicated that it was the intention of Congress that the Recreation Board should operate the golf courses. This is obviously inaccurate, since section 3 of article II of the Recreation Board Act specifically provides: 'That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as affecting any rights under any existing lease or leases lawfully entered into by any agency mentioned or affected by this act, nor shall anything in this act contained be construed as affecting the right of any such agency in the future lawfully to enter into leases of land or premises under its control for recreational purposes.' At that time, the golf courses were being operated by my company. By this provision, therefore, the Congress recognized and approved the continued operation of the golf courses by private concessioners.

"The Chairman of the Recreation Board has led the committee to believe that it was the intention of Congress to use the trust funds for operating the public golf courses, in addition to the other activities of the Recreation Board. Had this been true, in 1942 when the Board was created, the Congress of the United States would certainly not have placed a limitation of only $500 as the total which would be advanced to the Superintendent of Recreation at any one time to be used for the expenses of conducting the activities of the Board While this amount has since been raised to $2,000 it is still obviously impossible to operate the public golf courses, which do a gross business in excess of $500,000, on any such arrangement as was set up under the act creating the Recreation Board.

"In 28 years we, the present private operators of the golf courses, have paid the Government over $191,000, which was deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, District of Columbia, and have spent for capital improvements over $240,000. All of these capital improvements either are now or will become the property of the United States. We have done this, and still have given the golfers the cheapest rates in the United States where the courses have been self-supporting."

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. HEALY.

RECREATION BOARD,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1951.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLE: Thank you for sending me your letter of January 19 requesting comment on a communication from Mr.

Joseph C. Healy under date of January 15 concerning the operation of public golf courses in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Healy writes under a lawyer's letterhead with Covington, Ky., offices, but with a post-office box address at the Franklin Station in Washington, D. C. It appears that Mr. Healy is an employee of the Department of Justice residing in the National Capital area, and is therefore one of the general public for whom the public golf courses should be operated. His letter, however, indicates that he is poorly informed as to the history of the golf courses in the National Capital parks and also as to the reasons for the creation of the District of Columbia Recreation Board and the functions vested in it by act of Congress.

The letter will be dealt with paragraph by paragraph in order to point out its inaccuracies. The statements made in the following comments are based upon information set forth on the records of the Recreation Board and in a Brief History of Golf Courses in National Capital Parks, a mimeographed statement presented by the Department of the Interior before the Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee of the House in May 1949.

PARAGRAPHS 1 AND 2

In paragraph 1 Mr. Healy states that the operation of the golf courses "has cost the taxpayer not one cent." This statement is obviously intended to convey the impression that public golf in the National Capital parks has been operated by the present concessioner without cost to the taxpayer.

Paragraph 2 further states "that the courses, in part, were built by the present management of the courses from personal funds."

Of the 81 holes available for play Mr. Leoffler's various companies have built 27 holes. The 18 holes at Rock Creek were built by the Welfare and Recreational Association (now Government Services, Inc.), a semipublic organization. The nine holes at Fort Dupont were built and paid for out of profits due the United States, and the remaining 27 holes were built from appropriated tax money.

There are five clubhouses at the various courses. Those at East Potomac, Anacostia, and Langston were built with tax money. The house at Fort Dupont will be completely paid for out of United States share of profits. Under one contract Mr. Leoffler was required to make some alterations to the oldest of the buildings which is used as a clubhouse at Rock Creek. The major maintenance of these clubhouses is paid out of tax money and the National Capital Parks Office expends large sums annually on other items in maintenance and improvement of the golf courses.

It is implied that the Recreation Board will request public appropriation to help meet the cost of operating the golf courses. There is a firm understanding between the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of Interior that no direct appropriation will be requested for operating the golf courses. The advance requested by the Recreation Board in the 1952 budget estimate will be repaid out of funds received from operation of the courses.

Paragraph 2 contains the statement, "Year after year during the early stages of golf-course building the District Recreation Commission manifested no interest in the golf courses wh tever."

The Recreation Board of the District of Columbia was created by act of Congress April 20, 1942, and held its first formal meeting on June 1, 1942. The public golf courses had then been established for 22 years. During the first year of its existence, fiscal year 1943, the Board sought transfer of the golf courses upon expiration of the then existing contract, due to expire December 31, 1943. Due to war conditions and the short time available for obtaining the necessary funds, an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior was not reached and Mr. Leoffler received a new contract for 5 years to December 31, 1948.

In January 1948, a year before expiration of this new contract, the Board opened negotiations to obtain transfer of the courses, but despite repeated requests the National Capital Parks Office did not furnish the information as to history of receipts and disbursements and other information necessary to justify a request by the Board for an advance of funds to permit taking over the courses.

During the summer of 1948 the golfers using public courses held meetings and drew up complaints on the poor condition of the courses. As a result of these protests and the introduction of a resolution by Congressman RIVERS, of South Carolina, an investigation was made by the Subcommittee on Recreation and Parks of the House Public Lands Committee. Hearings were held beginning March 29, 1949. The information requested of the Department of the Interior by the Recreation Board was not furnished until February 1949, after the contract with Mr. Leoffler had expired. When the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation learned that there had been no audit of Mr. Leoffler's books since the beginning of that contract on January 1, 1943, they directed that an audit be made. After the submission of the audit report, the committee recommended that the golf courses be turned over to the Recreation Board. Mr. RIVERS introduced a bill directing this transfer.

On August 29, 1949, there was finally negotiated a basic agreement with the Interior Department permitting the Recreation Board to conduct programs on all areas under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department except the swimming pools and stipulating that supplemental agreements must be made for operation of the golf courses. The swimming pools were not included as the Interior considered they should be subject to a separate agreement. Throughout the negotiation of these agreements the Board has been assured that the present Secretary of the Interior desires to turn the golf courses over to the Board. The final supplemental agreement with the Interior for the operation of the gold courses has now been drafted, has received the approval of the District Commissioners and the national park authorities, and is the basis of the request now before Congress for an advance of $275,000 to be repaid over a period of years from the golf receipts.

PARAGRAPH 3

Mr. Healy suggests that all recreation facilities in the National Capital parks should be transferred to the Recreation Board The organic act creating the Recreation Board, Public Law 534 (56 Stat. 261), authorizes the Board to conduct a broad and varied program utilizing the public facilities "in major recreation centers, playfields, athletic fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, beaches, golf courses, community centers, and social centers in schools, parks, or other publicly owned buildings, as well as other recreational facilities which may be agreed upon between the Board and the agencies having jurisdiction over such facilities." The Recreation Board stands ready to assume the responsibility vested in it by Congress for the operation of all public recreation facilities in the District as rapidly as agreements can be reached with those agencies which have jurisdiction over the property where such facilities have been constructed. The Recreation Board does not own any land but operates on properties owned by the United States, by the District of Columbia government, including buildings and grounds assigned to the Board of Education, and by various public and private agencies. The Board does, however, in entering into these agreements, hold to its basic authority to determine all questions of general policy relating to public recreation in and for the District of Columbia. Any delay in the transfer of recreational facilities or in the completion of agreements between the Board and other governmental agencies is due only to differences of opinion as to the full authority of the Board in predetermining policy.

PARAGRAPH 4

Paragraph 4 questions the knowledge of the Board (Commission) about the operation of golf courses. Under authority granted by the Board, the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of the Recreation Department, the Chief of Operations and a representative of the Budget Officer of the District of Columbia have personally inspected and investigated the operation of other municipally owned and operated golf courses. The Superintendent is recognized as one of America's top recreation officials. The Assistant Superintendent is an engineer with excellent analytical abilities. The program staff of the Recreation Department is thoroughly trained in all phases of recreation work. Under the Recreation Board, direction of the golf courses would be placed in the hands of a thoroughly competent golf expert of recognized experience and ability.

No promise has ever been made to the public by me or the Recreation Board that rates would be reduced. The Board proposes, if and when it receives the operation of the golf courses, (1) to pay back its indebtedness on a clearly established schedule, (2) to be sure of a constant program of rehabilitation and improvement of the courses, (3) to extend existing courses and develop new ones, and (4) to give the public the benefit of whatever savings are accomplished by canceling out the "profit" payment now paid to the private concessioner. If, with the efficient operation and improvement of the courses, it is found possible to reduce rates, then, of course, this will be done. We would expect the public golfers themselves, through appropriate representation, to assist the Board in determining the extent to which improvements and extensions should be made before considering rate reductions.

PARAGRAPH 5

The statements of this paragraph have already been met in citing the firm agreement between the District and the Department of Interior that public appropriations will not be sought to operate the public golf courses.

PARAGRAPHS 6 AND 7

Congress has already set up in Public Law 534 a procedure by which the Recreation Board is authorized to accept the operation of all public recreation facilities subject to agreements between the Board and the agencies having jurisdiction over such facilities.

It is because the Board takes seriously the charge laid upon it by this law that it continues to seek the transfer of the golf courses.

PARAGRAPH 8

The writer refers in this paragraph to a "personal smear angle." This allegation is without basis, as at no time, either in its communications and conferences with Interior officials or in its public acts, has the Board or this writer made any personal charges against the present operation of the courses.

PARAGRAPH 9

Paragraph 9 quotes several paragraphs of the testimony of Mr. Leoffler before the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the House Public Lands Committee. This quotation indicates very clearly Mr. Leoffler's lack of understanding in regard to the operation of the trust fund of the Recreation Department and the authority of the Interior Department and of the Recreation Board to enter into agreements for the improved operation of public recreation facilities. It is the opinion of the writer that the really significant statements coming out of

the congressional hearings were made in the audit report of the Department of the Interior. These include:

(1) That the bookkeeping methods of the concessioner are "an indication of a lack of understanding as to modern methods of accounting."

(2) That in spending the rehabilitation reserve "individual job cost records were not maintained, making it difficult, if not impossible, to determine with any degree of accuracy the correct cost of the various projects."

(3) That the electric vending machines, only method of checking actual receipts "were disconnected or disregarded in accounting for number of tickets sold."

(4) That ticket "rolls, in many cases, were not entirely used up before a new roll would be started. Thus the effectiveness of using ticket numbers as a control of cash is diminished."

As to the trust fund of the Recreation Department, the advance of $2,000 allowed for the trust fund is made by the District of Columbia and serves as a form of petty cash fund. Large expenditures for pay rolls, etc., from the trust fund are made according to the regular disbursement procedures established by the District Auditor and the General Accounting Office. If the item carried in the budget now before Congress is granted the Board will have a cash operating fund of $100,000.

It is believed that it would have been in the interest of good public service if Mr. Healy as a Government employee and resident of this area had availed himself of the opportunity for clarifying numerous impressions and statements he has made. The offices of the District of Columbia Recreation Department and Board are always available to provide data and information on public recreation services and facilities in the District of Columbia.

We are attaching a significant document, Compendium of Significant Factors Relating to Transfer of Operation of the Public Golf Courses to the District of Columbia. This compendium is a chronological listing of various events and developments which briefly illustrate the problems and difficulties which have beset the Rrecreation Board in discharging the mandate given to it by the Congress in Public Law 534.

Also enclosed is the original correspondence that you requested be returned to you.

The writer makes no response to Mr. Healy's frequent personal references, as it is assumed that any statements attributed to or directed at me in fact concern the Recreation Board.

This opportunity to comment on Mr. Healy's letter is deeply appreciated and we trust that you will call upon us for any additional information you may desire.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. WENDER,
Chairman, Recreation Board,
District of Columbia.

To End the Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing on the editorial page from the Washington Post of Saturday, February 3, 1951, entitled "To End the Strike":

TO END THE STRIKE

The White House has properly taken account of the great public interest in the restoration of full railroad service in its statement condemning the trainmen's strike. No one can contradict the assertion that "while the unions did not ratify the (December 21) agreement, that does not give them the right to strike against the Government. Their obligation is to remain at work while they use whatever democratic processes are available to settle their dispute."

But court action, however necessary, will not settle the basic issue or restore harmony to rail labor relations. Nor will strong language. The mere fact of governmental control of the railroads implies an obligation upon the administration to see through the intervention it has begun. Yet in the current phase the administration so far has done nothing to bring top rail executives and union leaders face to face.

It became apparent shortly after Christmas that the agreement with the four major operating unions reached through the mediation of Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman was not going to work. The carriers charged the unions with repudiating the agreement; they hold—and the administration apparently agrees—that the contract signed December 21 was binding and must form the basis for any further discussions. The unions, on the other hand, maintain that no contract is firm until it is ratified by the members—and this contention has a solid history in labor relations. It is true that the contract agreed to by management provided a more generous wage raise than that recommended sometime ago by a Presidential emergency board. Union members, however, maintained that this was not enough in light of the fact that the dispute has dragged on almost 2 years; moreover, they objected to the provision enlisting Dr. Steelman as arbitrator for a 3-year period.

Whether or not there was bad faith on the part of the union leaders, whether or not they withheld from members certain items they had agreed to, the very fact of a strike attests the intensity of feeling. Undoubtedly union politics are involved, but an impasse exists and a way out must be found. Maybe Dr. Steelman has done all he can, but union heads have not seen him since January 18. Nor have they seen any top railway executives since December 21. What has set in, apparently, is much the same sort of stalling that took place after the Government seized the railroads last summer. If anyone expects this sort of treatment to cool the union feelings, it has had quite the opposite effect.

Although, according to Dr. Steelman, it was the unions who first sought his help, the plain fact is that they have lost confidence in him. Nor is it possible to see how the National Mediation Board can do much about the hot potato that was thrown back into its lap after White House intervention failed. Point one in any new attempt at governmental intervention, it seems to us, ought to be the recognition by President Truman that a new mediator is essential. The insistence of a management spokesman that this is mere "union propaganda" does not, of course, meet the issue, for confidence is a necessary prelude to workable agreement. There ought to be plenty of experienced men of the caliber of Dr. William Leiserson, former chairman of the Mediation Board, or Senator WAYNE MORSE who would be acceptable to both sides.

Governmental assurance that the wage freeze would not apply because of the history of the dispute would be a big help to a new mediator. But his fundamental job would be to end the dealing through intermediaries and get railroad presidents to sit down with union presidents and face the issues. That, in our opinion, is the only way to get both sides to cease bickering over petty grievances and start thinking of a lasting settlement in the national interest.

Appointment of Price Enforcement Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members of the Congress, I have viewed with concern the manner in which regional and district price enforcement directors are being appointed throughout the country. I have been particularly alarmed over the fact that the director named for the Los Angeles area is a left-wing Democrat who has consistently supported the socialistic philosophy of many of the radical thinking individuals in the present administration.

It is imperative that politics be kept out of our national defense program if we are to succeed in facing the demands of the present national emergency. The appointments now being made by the Price Director of the Office of Price Stabilization indicate that despite the national emergency, it is still politics as usual insofar as the Truman administration is concerned.

I am including an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of February 4, 1951, which points out that the political pork barrel is the main consideration in the appointments being made by the Director of the Office of Price Stabilization. The editorial follows:

NO BEST REPUBLICANS

Price Director DiSalle has denied that political pull is the magic formula for getting jobs in his Office of Price Stabilization. "It makes no difference whether a man is a Democrat or a Republican," Mr. DiSalle said, "we pick the best man we can get."

If that is the case, the Republicans must be a pretty sorry lot, or else they are not looking for jobs.

A check of OPS appointments reveals that 11 of 13 regional price enforcement directors are Democrats of one sort or another, and that 29 of 34 district directors are Democrats. The others who could be reached said they had no party affiliation, or refused to reveal it. Apparently there are no Republicans in the crop, or, if they are any, they are either afraid or ashamed to admit it.

This may be just a coincidence, as Mr. DiSalle's statement suggests. But it looks as though the OPS is rapidly becoming a haven for deserving Democrats whose services are not in demand elsewhere.

Will the United Nations, the Truman Administration, and General MacArthur Never Profit by Sad Experience?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is more than a favorable possibility that if the United Nations troops stop at the thirty-eighth parallel, the war in Korea will come to an end. It probably would have ended before if we had stopped at that parallel. We did not do it, and that weakened our argument that all we wanted was to drive the invaders out. It was finally left to General MacArthur and he proceeded across the line. The result was that we suffered the greatest defeat in the history of the United States.

Now again the papers report statements that indicate that we are not going to stop this time. Unless the United Nations or this country will insist upon going no farther, MacArthur will probably go right ahead and embroil us in an all-out war with China. When we crossed it before, General MacArthur went up to the front lines to watch his great and final —"clean 'em up by Christmas"—operation. He took some good photographs and got a lot of publicity, but the result was a major disaster.

Does anyone think it is good policy to allow him to repeat this mistake? That mistake brought anguish to thousands of homes in America. If the United Nations does not stop it, we can. Has our administration the wisdom and nerve to say "No" when the time comes and not be bound to obey the commands of a vascillating, incompetent, and unnecessary body. The people of the United States never voted any authority to this debating society that strips us of our sovereign power. Any claim to such authority is clearly unconstitutional. The people of this country still rule, or do they?

Federal Bureaucracy and Public Unmorality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an address by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, commissioner of social welfare, State of Vermont, before the Rotary Club at St. Albans, Vt., on January 15, 1951.

Speaking from the standpoint of over 30 years' experience and participation in public affairs, Mr. Simpson said he had witnessed the steady erosion of American character and much of this has been encouraged by accelerating Federal bureaucracy and public unmorality, emanating in the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Simpson continued as follows:

In spite of a national emergency more serious than any which has ever confronted the American people, the tentacles of the bureaucratic octopus are still reaching out to entangle us.

There has been no real halt in the creation of a welfare state. We know, moreover, that conditions which are wrecking the financial stability of both State and Federal Government are bringing war and want back to keep their everlasting companionship with man.

For 15 years I have resisted and fought Federal domination and control of State government. Because of our resistance we have avoided the crushing costs which have been imposed on other States. In the State of Washington, for example, the per capita State fund cost of public assistance has reached the sum of $91.54. This is an average of $366.16 for every family in the commonwealth. In Vermont the per capita cost is about $11.

During the past few months as a result of the passage of the Social Security Act of 1950, we have been enticed to adopt all the impractical, expensive and burdensome rules, regulations, and policies we have successfully resisted in the past. They would double our administrative costs to no good purpose and within 4 years add at least another million dollars to our biennial State budget. What can we afford: Where will it end?

One part of Government makes policies which increases prices, exhausts life savings, makes it difficult for a man to support his family, encourages divorce, desertion, dependency, and delinquency. Another part of Government is trying to catch up with the situation at greater and greater expense, and never the twain shall meet. Irrespective of location or conditions, cold weather or warm, each person on assistance must conform to a standard according to the Federal bureau. A standard item for food, a standard item for fuel, a standard item for lights, clothing, and medical service. They would destroy initiative and thrift. If one raises a garden or a pig it must be changed for a standard garden or a standard pig. So why raise a garden or a pig? Why work anyway? Truly, those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

And yet, the lure of Federal funds held out by the socialistic planners at the Nation's Capitol is a difficult bait to ignore, even when you know you are going to be hooked. Every State Administrator is bewitched, bothered, bewildered, and bedeviled by this unholy use of our own money.

The enemies of the Republican form of government and the democratic way of life are not all in Korea or Moscow. Some of them are here in America, insidious, persevering, and destructive. If successful, they will impose ultimate and complete regimentation in the United States of America.

We were led into a sense of false security by little men. It will require strong leadership, heroic measures, and such sacrifices as we have never known to save ourselves from disaster.

Why do we not have in Washington men of sufficient vision and courage to call a spade a spade and tell the people the truth? I have faith in their ultimate good sense and moral strength to fact momentous issues.

As chickens come home to roost, we are beginning to realize that no person is immune from the consequences of inflation and a crushing burden of taxation.

We must put iron into our democracy. Democracy creating its own world was hard and grim and poor. Democracy in years of national peril has been rich and soft and quarrelsome. Government has been actuated by selfish political motives. It failed tragically to make a peace. It failed dismally to prepare for war. These things are true. At a time to come, at a place not foretold, the life of liberty will be won or lost in an hour of trial. What happens thereon hinges on fate—will have been determined beforehand, by work done in the arsenal, in the shipyard, in the factory, on the farm, on the tank assembly line, a few man-hours or less. Liberty cannot be saved in its holiday clothes.

In his message to Congress in December 1925, Calvin Coolidge said:

"The functions which the Congress is to discharge are not those of local government but of national government. The greatest solicitude should be exercised to prevent any encroachment upon the rights of the States or their various political subdivisions. Local self-government is one of our most precious possessions. It is the greatest contributing factor to the stability, strength, liberty, and progress of the Nation. It ought not to be infringed by assault or undermined by purchase. It ought not to abdicate power through weakness or resign its authority through favor."

Calvin Coolidge may or may not have been a great President. That is for history to decide—but he was sound in his fundamental faith in the things which had made this a great nation. His feelings ran deep and and did not swerve. He was intelligent, he was wise, and, above all, he was honest. He possessed qualities very much needed in America today.

Welfare Needs Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star of February 3, 1951:

WELFARE NEEDS INVESTIGATION

A bipartisan committee to investigate the entire system of welfare in Indiana is being proposed by members of both political parties in the general assembly. We hope such a committee will be established. Enough evidence has been brought before the legislature to make it clear that the administration, the policies, the personnel, and the secrecy existing in the State welfare department need a thorough housecleaning.

It has taken a long time for the abuses and extravagances in welfare to come to light. There is still much that is hidden because of the iron curtain of secrecy imposed by Federal regulation and by State laws enacted under pressure by Federal bureaucrats. But the increases of expenditures in times of unprecedented prosperity have made it obvious that something is decidedly wrong in State welfare.

Welfare has become virtually an end in itself in Indiana. It is run by people who

are accountable to nobody but Federal officials and who are not bound by budgetary restrictions imposed within the State. They seem to believe that their prime duty is to put as many people as possible on relief in order to expand the scope of their own power and influence.

The Star agrees with Representative Jess Andrews who said on Wednesday that "what lies beneath the surface (of welfare activities) will shock the State if it can be brought into the open." We hope that members of both political parties in the assembly will join together in the public interest and establish a bipartisan committee that will bring all welfare activities out into the open.

Our Foreign Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Alf M. Landon:

I speak today not as a Republican. Obviously I cannot speak as a Democrat. I speak as an American citizen.

In recent speeches Governor Dewey, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Dulles—an American delegate to the United Nations—Senator Taft, and Governor James Byrnes all predicated the military policies they advocated on political policies.

Ordinarily that would be true. Eventually no military action is an end in itself. It merely provides the opportunity for negotiation and diplomacy. But we are now in a situation where our foreign policies depend on military events immediately confronting us.

Our decision to stay in Korea and our ability to do so completely alters the world political situation.

It forces definite and immediate act'on—either by the United Nations on our resolution branding Red China as an aggressor—or by ourselves in the realization that the grand idea of collective security has refused to work in a war-troubled world once again. It should be plain by this time to the members of the United Nations—and the Atlantic Pact—that doubts and questioning as to the value to America of our continued membership in both—are rapidly increasing in the United States.

We should make it plain to the United Nations that the adoption of our Red China Communist aggressor resolution does not mean that that is the end of it. We should make it plain that irreparable damage will be done to the grand idea of collective security—unless that resolution is fully supported when adopted, by concerted action, by other members of the United Nations, by the imposition at least of immediate economic sanctions and blockade.

There is too much strategic material like steel—petroleum products, and rubber—being supplied the Communists by our allies whose cause we are fighting in Korea.

There is no question that great quantities of strategic material are getting to Russia and its satellites. Europe is leaking them just like a sieve.

Of course, implicit in that policy of economic blockades is support for the national government of China—as soon as the United Nations faces up to its responsibility and duty of branding the Communist Chinese as an aggressor.

In asking for that resolution by the United Nations, America is only asking for a normal function because the United Nations was set up as an organization to prevent aggression and uphold peace.

All our diplomatic moves in the United Nations have set the stage for support for the official government of China.

After favorable action by the United Nations on the pending aggression resolution—thereby relieving the United States of any charge of imperialism in Asia—I favor lend-lease to the nationalist government and taking the fetters off Chiang Kai-shek.

Our military defense of Korea must have been upsetting to the Kremlin's timetable of world conquest—as we had practically invited them in there by our previous statements by the Secretary of State and the President that Korea was not of military value to us.

There are no railroads left in Korea. It is doubtful if the Chinese armies can live off the country. The only way they could be supplied with food and ammunition is by trucks. There is no production of trucks, automobiles, tanks, or airplanes in China. There is no rubber in China or Russia. The only available supply to both is from southeast Asia. There is no petroleum in China. Therefore, the only supply of gasoline available to Communist China is from Russia and England. There is not enough oil in Russia to fight a long war. Even to supply the Communist Chinese just with gasoline for the Korean campaign and to resist the forces of our officially recognized government of China is a drain on the petroleum supplies of Russia.

Therefore, instead of the forces of the United Nations being pinned down in Korea, the Russians are pinned down there. They cannot abandon their Chinese Communist satellites.

As a matter of logistics, it is easier for us to supply the United Nations Army on the tip of Korea by water—with our available ships and mechanical equipment—despite the greater mileage involved—than it is for the Communists to supply their forces on the tip of Korea by trucks.

Russia is also short of steel which further complicates its problems of supplying their Chinese satellites with not only motor vehicles and airplanes and fuel to run them, but also with guns and ammunition.

She might get the steel essential to fight a long war by seizing the Ruhr.

But the question of the essential petroleum supplies is not so easy.

The only place Russia can get the crude oil to supplement her own supply is from the Arab States. We are undoubtedly prepared to destroy the Arabian wells, pipelines, and refineries in the event of hostilities. But the oil is still there in the ground. The problem of getting the crude production back is not so great. But that of transportation and refining is. After they get the crude oil back to the top of the ground, they would still have the enormous job of getting it into the refined product and transporting it where they could use it.

Therefore, gasoline is as much of a vital item to Russia in fighting a war as the atom bomb itself.

The total number on hand and her annual rate of production of the atom bomb by Russia are unknown but her weakness in petroleum and steel and rubber in sufficient quantities for warfare is well known. Of these, the greatest of all is gasoline.

Therefore, instead of its being to Russia's interest to keep us involved in Korea, it is to our interest to keep Russia involved there.

Russia is being hurt a lot more than we are in Korea.

With all the Reds' shortages in war potentials, it's really costing them bitterly to stick with this Korean adventure. They thought it was going to be a short and cheap victory; instead, Russia is paying through the nose and now the Communist Chinese are beginning to do the same thing.

In the last few weeks they have really been hurting. They are on the receiving end in a big way.

Of course, they have vast manpower resources. But even with their millions—it still is very damaging to lose a couple of armies as they are now in the process of doing.

The plain matter of fact is that the Russians and Chinese Communists are suffering very severely in Korea and will continue to do so to an increasing extent as time goes on.

In other words, time is now playing into our hands.

Naturally, it is costing us something, too, but a lot less than it's costing the Commies. General Collins told the Senate Armed Services Committee the other day that our losses have been amazingly small.

It is our Asiatic policy that I am more concerned with right now rather than with our European policies, because it is there that we find ourselves at grip with Communist aggression.

There is another reason for concentrating on the job we have on our hands in Korea. That is that Russia, traditionally and by policy, has always tried to avoid a two-front war.

By staying in Korea through our superior fire power with a minimum of casualties to the United Nations Army, we relieve the Communist pressure on Indochina, India, and even Western Europe.

The United States has a greater industrial productive capacity and greater natural resources than any combination of the present Communist territories.

The Communist world, lacking necessary productive capacity for war, faces the vital necessity for the quick seizure of the industrial plants intact of Western Europe.

The question of how intact they would be is undoubtedly one of the reasons the Kremlin gangsters are hesitating to plunge into war.

Another reason is the growing revolt throughout the Communist territories by patriots fighting for freedom.

What is known as the underground movement should be vigorously and persistently encouraged and supported everywhere by all anti-Communists.

Another reason the gangsters of the Kremlin are hesitating is being daily demonstrated in the air battles over Korea.

Either the Communist's jet planes do not possess their boasted superiority or their pilots are no match for our American boys.

Either way, we are licking the pants off the vaunted Communist air forces to confound the prophets of gloom and doom.

Our patient efforts through the debates and discussions in the United Nations should enable all the peoples of the world to see and understand that the Communist Chinese are the true aggressors and its failure to brand them as such is the way to war and chaos.

The great idea of collective security is facing its supreme test. If it is to work, it must be all for one and not one for all.

Therein lies the great value of Mr. Hoover's last address to the country. To dismiss his talk as isolationist is simply an attempt to get away from realities.

The essence of his talk as I understand it is that you can't save people who are unwilling to make an effort to save themselves.

It seems to me the crucial thing we are up against is the lack of a will to fight for their own freedom in the western democracies.

People who are so lost to justice, the rights of the individual, to international friendship, to working out their own destinies and their own reforms in their own ways, all the basic elements of what we call the democratic processes, that they haven't the guts or the heart, whatever the reason,

to resist the iron-curtain gang, are a grim warning to us that it is time to make a cold reckoning of what we have in the way of collective security and then base our course on that.

If it means pulling in our horns in this place or that place, then that is what we have to do, for to do otherwise is to court sure disaster.

In other words, it is not our job to contain communism so much as it is our job to marshall the forces of freedom-loving people everywhere, to preserve the way of life, for which we are paying, and will continue to pay, a tremendous price.

We have already been grieviously hurt because of ineptness, stupidity, and working at cross purposes.

We have been kidding ourselves with a lot of words and huffing and puffing but it is too late for that mumbo-jumbo stuff and longer.

It is time we realized that fully and clearly.

I believe our national administration is on the right track in staying in Korea. I believe our national administration is on the beam in giving the United Nations time to brand the Communist Chinese as an aggressor. But I also believe the American people will not endure much longer the vacillation of the members of the United Nations and the failure to shoulder their share of the load.

The world political picture is completely altered by our decision and our ability to hold Korea. It may be altered for the worse or the better. But it is being completely altered. And I believe it will be for the better. Because, if for no other reason, out of the confusion and division in the United Nations will come a clear and logical policy for us to follow.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from two very dear friends of mine, Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Rosson, of Austin, Tex., who have asked me to read their letter to the membership of this House. Both of them are not only aged citizens, but are deeply interested in a fair and equitable program which will provide an income to our aged citizens without impairment of their dignity as American citizens.

I am glad to read the letter to you, not only because they are friends of mine, but because under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, they are entitled as a fundamental right to petition this Congress and their Government for consideration of their beliefs and their problems. I ask for your very careful consideration of their suggestions. The letter is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In compliance with the wishes of Townsend members in this community, I am respectfully requesting that you devote as much time as possible to the active promotion of the principles of the Townsend plan.

You must certainly be aware of the suffering of our aged citizens who are compelled to exist on an average of $42 per month old-age assistance, or $26 per month old-age insurance. Compare this income with the $150 per month which our Government suggests is the amount required to provide a decent standard of living. How are these people supposed to live? And now the cold hand of poverty knocks even louder on their doors with the latest increases in living costs making their meager incomes even less adequate in terms of food, clothing, and shelter.

It would seem that this problem is important enough to rank first on your list of congressional duties. As voters in your District we are asking that you use your influence to stop this injustice by actively supporting the principles of the Townsend plan, which guarantees dignified retirement on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Very truly yours,

A. B. ROSSON.
Mrs. A. B. ROSSON.

Are Farm Prices Too High?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement released to the press of this date by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. This statement and the accompanying figures based on data prepared by the committee staff answers many questions which are of widespread interest in the field of farm and food prices. I urge that it be read and studied by every Member of Congress.

ARE FARM PRICES TOO HIGH?

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, said today that those who are pointing the finger of blame at the American farmer for high food prices are demonstrating nothing but their own ignorance of elementary economics and price relationships.

Rather than farm prices being unreasonably high, he said, the January 15 price report just issued by the Department of Agriculture shows that most farm commodities are bringing less than a fair return to the farmer as measured by the parity index, less than the legal minimum price as established by the Defense Production Act and the Price Control Order of January 26, and far less than many of those same commodities were bringing to the farmer in 1948.

When the Department of Agriculture announced that the January 15 parity index stood at 110, many persons, including some who should have known better, immediately jumped to the conclusion that all farmers were receiving 110 percent of parity for all of the crops they had produced in the past year.

The principle of parity is very simple—it means merely a fair price for what the farmer sells in comparison to the cost of the things the farmer buys. The computation of this parity index for 172 different agricultural commodities is, however, a complicated mathematical process, one about which the average consumer or the average farmer knows very little.

The average consumer is not to be blamed therefore, when he accepts the written or spoken statement of those who should know what they are talking about, that a parity ratio of 110 means automatically that all farmers are getting 10 percent more than a fair price for everything they sell, although such an assumption is far from the truth.

If the people who make these statements would publish the complete facts and figures as released by the Department of Agriculture, everyone, consumer and farmer alike, would be able to see that the parity ratio has been pushed to its high level by only five or six commodities and that the great majority of the commodities farmers sell and consumers use are still bringing less than the parity price to the producer. Following is a complete table of parity ratios for the major agricultural commodities on January 15, 1951, as computed and released by the Department of Agriculture:

Effective parity prices for farm products and average prices received as a percentage of effective parity prices, United States, Jan. 15, 1951, with comparisons

Basic commodities:	
Cotton	125
Wheat	89
Rice	104
Corn	90
Peanuts	85
Designated nonbasic commodities:	
Potatoes	56
Butterfat	91
Milk	95
Mohair	---
Wool	[1] 153
Honey:	
Comb	---
Extracted	---
Other non-basic commodities:	
Barley	86
Beans, dry edible	86
Cottonseed	[1] 150
Flaxseed	---
Oats	92
Rye	---
Sorghum grain	72
Soybeans	107
Sweetpotatoes	79
Grapefruit	42
Lemons	75
Oranges	35
Apples	78
Beef cattle	141
Chickens, live	80
Eggs	82
Hogs	97
Lambs	143
Turkeys, live	[1] 91
Veal calves	143

[1] Unofficial estimate.

It will be noted that out of this whole list only cotton, rice, wool, cottonseed, soybeans, beef cattle, lambs, and veal calves were selling at prices above parity on January 15, 1951. Every other major food commodity was selling on that date below parity and some commodities very important to the consumer were selling far below parity. Potatoes were bringing farmers only 56 percent of parity. Dry edible beans, an important protein food, were selling at only 86 percent of parity. Sweetpotatoes were only 79 percent of parity; grapefruit 42 percent of parity; oranges 35 percent of parity; chickens 80 percent of parity; and eggs 82 percent of parity.

The prices of those few commodities which were selling above parity on January 15 were at that level not because the farmer has placed that price tag on his product, but because the buyers, representing 150,000,000 American consumers have placed that value on what the farmer produced. It should be clearly understood that unlike the manufacturer of automobiles, tractors, shirts, and millions of other products, the farmer does not place a selling price on his commodities.

The marketing of agricultural products in the United States is the one great free market left anywhere in the world. The farmer produces the commodities and offers it for sale. He doesn't put a price on his product. He sells it for whatever the consumer thinks

it is worth and is willing to pay. As a matter of fact, most of the commodities which are now selling above parity and a great many of the other major agricultural commodities are sold at open auction at prices over which the farmer has no control whatever.

When a farmer ships a load of cattle or hogs to the market he loses control over the price of these animals the minute they are unloaded at the stockyards. He receives for his investment and his labor in those animals the price that the buyers representing 150,000,000 consumers are willing to pay when the animals are put up for sale. If the farmer doesn't like that price, his only recourse (and even that may not be available to him under many circumstances) is to load the animals back onto the truck or freight car and bring them back to the farm in the hope of a better price later. This is obviously a costly and difficult procedure which can easily result in further loss and is seldom resorted to.

It should be unnecessary to point out that the farmer also has no control over the processing, handling, and marketing charges and the wholesale and retail mark-ups placed on a commodity after it leaves his hands—and that these charges contribute substantially to the retail prices against which consumers complain.

If, on the other hand, American consumers don't think the farmer's produce—let's say specifically, meat—is worth the price at which it is selling, they can bring that price down overnight by refusing to buy meat at the prices quoted. Poultry, eggs, dairy products, beans, fish, and beefsteak all contain high quantities of proteins in nutritious and palatable form. They are all selling below parity (except fish, for which there is no parity figure) with the exception of beefsteak and the relatively high price of beef, compared to the other protein foods, indicates the clear and understandable preference of American consumers to get their proteins in this form, instead of in some of the cheaper but equally nutritious protein foods.

As long as there is a reasonably adequate supply of beef—which there will be as long as farmers are left free to produce in abundance—the price of beef and other meats will continue to reflect not what the farmer would like to get for his animals, but what the consumer thinks it is worth in comparison to the other protein foods.

The price of cotton—another one of the half-dozen commodities that is pushing the parity ratio up—is the clear result of the supply and demand situation. The increased demand resulting from the defense program coincided last summer with the smallest cotton crop for many years. If farmers have the labor, machinery, and fertilizer they need, they will produce the 16,000,000-bale cotton crop the Secretary of Agriculture has requested for 1951 and take care of the cotton-supply situation.

Cottonseed—another commodity pushing the parity ratio up—is utterly insignificant in the cost of living and is, in fact, chiefly an added cost to farmers who use cottonseed meal for animal feed.

The price of wool, which stands in the vicinity of 150 percent of parity and helps to push the whole parity ratio up, means little to American farmers. We import more than two-thirds of the wool used in the United States and the price of wool on the American market is the world price—not the American farm price.

Many of the other woods important to the consumer are marketed like livestock, by open auction on a free market with consumers alone setting the price.

Everyone remembers the tremendous surge of prosperity after the war as the American economy shifted itself back into high gear for civilian production. Economic activity, civilian industrial production, incomes, prices, and many other indicators of economic conditions rose to new heights, reaching a top about July 1948.

At that point there began a leveling off in economic activity, as production caught up with consumption. Some prices fell off sharply—among them the prices of farm products. Nonagricultural income in the United States continued upward—from $164,575,000,000 in 1947 to $185,722,000,000 in 1948; $185,980,000,000 in 1949; and $198,000,000,000 in 1950.

The net income from farming followed the general trend for only 1 year—from $18,724,000,000 in 1947 to $19,169,000,000 in 1948. In 1949, however, net income from farming fell to $15,934,000,000 and dropped again in 1950 to $14,600,000,000, the lowest since 1945. In 1947 there was 19.3 percent of the population living on farms and the net income from farming was 10.1 percent of the national income. In 1950 the farm population was still about 18 percent of our total population, but the net income from farming had declined to a mere 6.8 percent of the national income.

While farm prices and incomes were falling, however, employment and wages continued upward to new highs. Average weekly wages of industrial workers went up from $53.37 in June 1948 to $64.15 in December 1950, an increase of more than 19 percent.

In spite of the sharp increases which have occurred in recent months in the price of beef, cotton, and the few other commodities which have pushed the parity ratio upward, the prices of most farm commodities are still sharply below the prices farmers were receiving for those same commodities in 1948, and retail food prices have just reached that level.

The following table, compiled by the committee staff and not previously published, shows the farm-price situation clearly:

Average prices received by farmers for farm products, Jan. 15, 1951, United States, with comparisons

Commodity and unit	1948 mid-month average prices	Legal minimum prices Jan. 15, 1951	Average price Jan. 15, 1951
Wheat, per bushel...dollars	[1] 2.81	2.35	2.09
Rye, per bushel.....do	[1] 2.47	1.73	1.48
Rice (rough), per hundredweight.....dollars	[2] 6.48	5.36	5.56
Corn, per bushel.....do	[1] 2.46	1.71	1.54
Oats, per bushel.....do	[1] 1.27	.954	.882
Barley, per bushel.....do	[1] 2.06	1.48	1.27
Sorghums, grain, per hundredweight.....dollars	[1] 3.77	2.90	2.10
Hay, per ton.....do	[3] 24.50	23.30	22.60
Cotton, per pound.....cents	[4] 35.27	32.98	41.31
Cottonseed, per ton...dollars	[3] 96.00	71.00	101.00
Soybeans, per bushel...do	[1] 4.11	3.06	2.90
Peanuts, per pound...cents	[5] 10.06	12.8	10.9
Flaxseed, per bushel.dollars	[1] 6.71	4.54	4.25
Potatoes, per bushel...do	[7] 2.05	1.76	.986
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel dollars	[8] 2.65	2.47	1.94
Beans, dry edible, per hundredweight.....dollars	[1] 11.90	8.92	7.69
Peas, dry field, per hundredweight.....dollars	[1] 6.51	5.49	3.51
Tobacco, per pound.....cents	[9] 50.6	.....	46.9
Apples, per bushel...dollars	[10] 2.53	2.77	2.17
Grapefruit, per box (equivalent on-tree returns for all methods of sale)...dollars	[9] 1.01	1.96	.83
Oranges, per box (equivalent on-tree returns for all methods of sale).....dollars	[11] 1.56	3.58	1.26
Lemons, per box (equivalent on-tree returns for all methods of sale).....dollars	[11] 3.65	3.25	2.37
Hogs, per hundredweight dollars	[11] 27.40	20.60	20.60

[1] January.
[2] February.
[3] March.
[4] May.
[5] July.
[6] November.
[7] April.
[8] August.
[9] October.
[10] December.
[11] September.

Average prices received by farmers for farm products, Jan. 15, 1951, United States, with comparisons—Continued

Commodity and unit	1948 mid-month average prices	Legal minimum prices Jan. 15, 1951	Average price Jan. 15, 1951
Beef cattle, per hundredweight.....dollars	[4] 25.20	28.80	27.00
Veal calves, per hundredweight.....dollars	[4] 26.40	28.80	30.00
Sheep, per hundredweight dollars	[4] 10.50	12.00	15.20
Lambs, per hundredweight dollars	26.10	26.40	30.00
Butter, per pound.....cents	[3] 72.0	.....	61.1
Butterfat, per pound...do	[3] 87.7	74.0	70.2
Milk, wholesale, per hundredweight.....dollars	[5] 5.13	4.62	4.66
Milk, retail, per quart (sold by farmers directly to consumers).....cents	[11] 19.4	.....	19.6
Chickens, live, per pound cents	[5] 32.1	30.2	24.3
Turkeys, live, per pound cents	[10] 51.4	38.6	33.9
Eggs, per dozen.....do	[1] 51.3	51.5	42.6
Wool, per pound.....do	[12] 50.7	56.2	68.0

[1] January.
[4] May.
[5] July.
[6] November.
[8] August.
[10] December.
[11] September.
[12] June.

This table will bear close study by anyone who is truly interested in the matter of farm prices. It shows clearly that while a few commodities are higher today than they were in 1948, most of the major farm commodities are selling today far below their 1948 price. Out of the 35 major commodities listed on this table, only 9 were priced as high on January 15, 1951, as they were during 1948. These commodities are cotton, cottonseed, peanuts, beef cattle, veal calves, sheep, lambs, retail farm milk, and wool. Of these, cottonseed, peanuts, and retail milk (milk sold by the farmer direct to the consumer) are up only minutely over their 1948 price.

On the other hand, a comparison of the 1951 prices (shown in column 3) with the highest mid-month price of 1948 (shown in column 1) disclosed that many important consumer commodities are selling today far below their 1948 level. Potatoes are about 99 cents per bushel compared to $2.05 in April 1948. Sweetpotatoes are $1.94 compared to $2.65 in August 1948. Wheat, the basic ingredient of bread, was $2.09 on January 15 of this year compared to $2.81 in January of 1948. Chickens are 24.3 cents this January compared to 32.5 in August of 1948. The farm price of eggs on January 15, 1951, was 42.6 cents compared to 48.3 cents in November 1948. Oranges were bringing farmers only $1.26 a box this January, against $1.96 a box in September 1948. How many nonagricultural commodities can you buy today for less than they cost in 1948?

Contrary to what appears to be the general belief, the price of hogs is 25 percent lower today than it was in 1948—$20 per hundredweight on January 15, 1951, compared to $27.40 per hundredweight in September 1948.

Column 2 of the table shows the legal minimum prices or ceilings which may be established for agricultural commodities under the Defense Production Act and the recent price control regulation. Study of these ceilings will indicate that they, too, are generally below the prices farmers received in 1948; so that even if the price of farm commodities should now come up to these ceilings, farmers would still be receiving a lower price for many of these commodities than they were receiving on a free market in 1948.

Suspension of the Copper-Import Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the short supply of copper continues to plague American industry. The trade barriers erected against the importation of this vital metal by the Eighty-first Congress is threatening the economic stability of the Nation.

I have received from the United States Independent Telephone Association a copy of a letter written to the Honorable ROBERT DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. This association represents 5,700 independent telephone companies in the United States—most of them in rural areas. Their continued operations are essential to the maintenance of our communications system. The utter foolishness of the import tax on copper becomes more evident daily as essential industries feel the pinch of low copper inventories and increased defense orders.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES INDEPENDENT
TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to tell you of the vital interest which the independent segment of the telephone industry has in the matter of suspension of import taxes on copper. There are two measures now pending before your committee upon this subject: H. R. 256, by Congressman PATTERSON, of Connecticut, and House Joint Resolution 37, by Congressman MILLS, of Arkansas.

The 5,700 independent operating telephone companies which provide telephone service in 11,000 urban and rural communities throughout the United States are under mandate, by the laws of the States in which they operate, to furnish service of such quality and to such extent as will best serve the public interest.

These companies are confronted with unprecedented demands for telephone service. Copper is one of the essential materials used in the manufacture of wire, cable, switchboards, and numerous other equipment items which are needed in order to meet these service demands.

Independent manufacturers and suppliers producing the various equipment items used by independent telephone companies in furnishing service are experiencing increasing difficulty in obtaining copper in sufficient quantity to meet their needs. The situation has become so serious that it is a matter of considerable concern.

One of our manufacturers has written us that, "the present emergency and the heavily stepped-up requirements for copper for defense and essential civilian purposes in the communications industry has made it all the more necessary that relief of the copper shortage be pursued through every available means. Our supply of copper has been extremely tight, and, aside from the military requirements covered by DO ratings, we have had to fight for every pound of copper and brass which we cannot do without in the production of telephone equipment."

Another manufacturer has written: "It is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain copper for the purpose of manufacturing components and equipment so vitally needed in the communications industry."

Another manufacturer has written: "Our requirements for copper-base alloys are far in excess of the material allocated to us and this condition in the future will not improve but, conversely, will grow progressively worse."

Still another manufacturer has written: "Vigorous action should be taken to increase the supply of copper in order that the vital communication and electronic industries may be furnished equipment to insure adequate communication facilities during the national emergency. It is our belief that the comparatively insignificant loss of import tax revenue from copper is far offset by the strengthened position which added communication and radio apparatus within our country affords us during this time. As copper is absolutely vital to the communications industry and even more essential in radio and electronic apparatus which we are presently under contract to supply for the defense program, we strongly urge that the import duties be promptly suspended."

In a report by the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate presented on January 15, 1951, the following reference to copper appears: "Even if the Korean situation had not developed, there would not have been sufficient copper to meet the demands of the civilian economy, no less the additional demands of the military programs. In light of this situation, certain actions are required to bring into balance the available supply of copper with the over-all United States demand, which includes military, stockpile, and civilian programs." (Rept. No. 2, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 19.)

Suspension of import taxes as called for in the pending measures above mentioned would increase the supply of this critical material and thus assist not only in the military stockpiling program but in maintaining essential telephone service. The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee several years ago reminded the country that "adequate communications facilities and the maintenance of a strong, cohesive, and far-flung communications system are as vital to the prosecution of the war as is the production of guns, airplanes, tanks, and ships."

Our association hopes, therefore, that you will do everything you can to bring about early and favorable consideration to this important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE S. BAILEY,
Executive Vice President.

Our Ruling Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is in a period of economic and military mobilization—a critical time in which the cooperation and sacrifice of all Americans will be required.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this administration continues to play politics as usual. Politics as usual for this administration, I might add, is quite a bit of politics. Those who act high and mighty about criticism, certainly ought to at least try to keep themselves above those things which merit the just criticism of the American people.

I cannot condemn too strongly the prevailing practice of placing into the hands of men chosen by the spoils system the power over critical matters affecting our country and our daily lives. I submit herewith a very pointed editorial which recently appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.:

OUR RULING CLASS

Wilbur Elston, a Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent in Washington, reported the other day that "price control offices being set up around the country are becoming a haven for defeated Democratic candidates and other Democratic politicians."

Everywhere, Mr. Elston reported, the answer is the same:

Top jobs are being cleared with the Democratic national committee, Democratic Senators and Congressmen, and State Democratic leaders.

The same practice, Elston discovered, "will be followed in staffing regional civilian defense agencies." The organization being set up to patrol wages likewise will be staffed by the party faithful.

It would be too much, of course, to expect the Truman administration to abandon its "politics as usual" slogan in the national emergency. After all, these emergency jobs are not covered by civil service regulations. And the pay is too good—$50 a day for consultants and $29.20 a day for public information men—to be wasted on the common people.

Elston cites specific examples of how the party hacks are being taken care of.

The defeated Democratic candidate for Congress from Minnesota's second district gets the district price assignment.

The defeated Democratic candidate for Governor of South Dakota will be a regional legal adviser.

A former Democratic member of the Montana unemployment compensation becomes an assistant regional price director.

Al Loveland, the defeated Democratic candidate for United States Senator from Iowa, will be Iowa district price consultant.

The regional director in Chicago is the defeated Democratic candidate for Illinois State treasurer.

The regional director for the Rocky Mountain States will be the man who in 1948 was president of the Truman-Barkley club. (A 5-man panel had recommended another man.)

In California, a defeated Democratic congressional candidate was named price consultant for the Los Angeles district.

Others slated for or already appointed to the well-paid jobs include a former Democratic Congresswoman from Connecticut; a defeated Democratic congressional candidate in Indiana; the father of a defeated Indiana Democratic Congressman; and a Democratic New York State legislator who was turned down by the voters.

In Wisconsin, of course, we know the story.

Carl Thompson, Democratic national committeeman and patronage boss who was defeated for governor last fall, was offered one of the $50-a-day jobs For reasons of his own, he rejected it, but will name his own successor.

Tom Fairchild, the defeated Democratic candidate for United States Senator, also was taken care of. He has been offered the district legal counsel's post.

Most citizens know that the days ahead require personal sacrifice. Most responsible citizens are ready to cooperate in the national effort to control wages and prices, and to get our civilian defense establishment in working order.

The Truman administration is making a mistake by using these necessary Federal programs as instruments of politics.

This country simply doesn't like a ruling class. And our citizens have a particular hatred for a ruling class when membership therein is limited to members of the political party in control.

That sort of thing is too much like the very political philosophy we are fighting against.

Anti-Inflation Policy Backed by Economists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, every one of us is anxious to protect and strengthen the American economy so that the Nation can come through the current and future period of high governmental costs in a sound state. The manner of accomplishing this involves some differences of opinion. Because I believe the information contained in the following article, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, will be useful to all of us, I am asking that it be included in our RECORD:

ANTI-INFLATION POLICY BACKED BY ECONOMISTS—RESEARCHERS' REPORT CALLS FOR FULL TAXATION, CURBS ON BANK CREDIT

(By Alfred Friendly)

Four of the Nation's leading economists yesterday gave firm backing to the administration's taxation and price-wage policies for inflation control, but took sharp issue with the Treasury's pegged-price program for Government securities.

They supported, instead, a view associated with the Federal Reserve Board that private credit extension should be cut through tightening of bank reserves, although this entails higher interest rates on Government bonds.

The economists stated their views in a report prepared for the influential Twentieth Century Fund, a research foundation endowed by the late Boston merchant, Edward A. Filene.

The team of experts was headed by John M. Clark, professor of economics at Columbia University. Other members were Theodore W. Schultz, chairman of the economics department of the University of Chicago; Arthur Smithies who holds the comparable post at Harvard; and Donald H. Wallace, director of the graduate program of Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Their study, one of the most forthright and uncomplicated to appear on the economics of the defense program, had as its basic theme the argument that direct controls on wages and prices can only be supplementary to, not substitutes for, the measures that attack the real roots of inflation.

The three basic methods, their report said, are:

1. Pay-as-you-go taxation to cover completely the costs of the defense program and regular Government expenses.

2. Limitation of bank credit, even at the cost of higher interest rates on Federal and other borrowing.

3. A truce on customary contests of bargaining power and pressure among the interest groups of labor, business, and farmers.

The report emphasized that the present situation was quite different from that at the outbreak of World War II. At that time, what was demanded was intense economic efforts of relatively short duration. Now, what is needed besides a rapid build-up of armed strength is a state of military readiness that may have to last for the indefinite future.

In World War II direct controls were necessary and worked, for the short term, with some effect. But now, the economists said, "price control must have far better support from fiscal, credit, and debt management policy if it is to have a chance for survival."

The report insisted that inflation cannot be controlled if excess demand for goods is allowed to compete for the limited supply.

The report said, "Inflation is, among other things, a sign that the country is giving divided support to the national effort. If we are willing to appropriate money for defense, but unwilling to take it away from ourselves, we are trying to escape the basic fact of diversion of resources, and the necessity of initial curtailments of civilian supply.

"We are supporting national defense with one hand and sabotaging it with the other."

Principal conclusions and recommendations of the four economists:

Taxation: "It is both possible and necessary to depend on taxation to finance the defense expenditures and to remove the bulk of inflationary pressure." The minimum objective should be an increase of tax revenues by $16,000,000,000. Of this, corporations can pay 4,000,000,000, through higher normal rather than excess profits rates; personal income tax should yield nine to ten billions; and the rest should come from excises.

"From a standpoint of absorbing purchasing power, there is a case for heavy excises on all goods in short supply."

Monetary and credit policy: "The Federal Reserve System must be enabled to tighten bank reserves." It failed to follow a restrictive credit policy since the outbreak of the Korean War, but if it had, it could have blocked the monetary expansion that occurred since then and "prevented much of the inflation."

The policy of not letting rates on Government securities rise has deprived the Federal Reserve of its major weapon to tighten bank lending. "It is long past time that this shortsighted policy be abandoned," even though reviving the Federal Reserve's power in the open market "would doubtless involve some increase in Treasury interest payments."

Wage and price controls: Some increases in wage and price ceilings will be necessary to obtain desirable increases in output. Therefore, "rigid adherence to the original frozen prices and wage rates would be undesirable and indeed self-defeating."

"It is clear that some upward drift of the average of commodity prices and wage rates is probably unavoidable."

Flexibility is seriously hampered by the provision in the present law providing that ceilings on farm products cannot be fixed at prices less than parity.

Rationing: Consumer rationing will probably be required for some commodities, such as meat, but the rationing device should be used most sparingly, particularly because it is so "very expensive in manpower" in its administration.

Social security: Now is an appropriate time to increase the size and coverage of the social-security program, because "increased payroll taxes will absorb purchasing power, and the prospect of increased benefits will create a sense of security in the future that is now badly needed."

Government economies: "The possibilities of economy in the nonmilitary field are frequently exaggerated. We doubt that the most rigorous economy could achieve a reduction of more than one or two billions from the budget estimates of 1951–52."

Col. Justice M. Chambers, USMCR—A Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the issues of war or peace in our world today are determined by political leaders. The issues of victory or defeat, however, are determined by the fighting man on the ground, in the air, or on the sea. Historians and statesmen may well tell of grand strategy and campaigns won or lost, but in the final analysis it is the leadership and heroism of officers and men on the scene of battle that really turn the tide.

For this reason, it is well today that we pause a moment from our solemn responsibilities of meeting a new and greater danger to a free world and pay tribute to a man among men, a hero among heroes, whom we of the Congress have been privileged to know and respect these past 4 years.

I refer to the staff advisor of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who recently received the Congressional Medal of Honor from President Truman for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life and above and beyond the call of duty.

Colonel Chambers was known and loved by Marines under his command as "Jumping Joe" because of his ever constant activity, his tireless and persistent training schedules, and his almost superhuman powers of endurance, both in and out of combat, from Guadalcanal to a narrow escape from death at Iwo Jima.

We of the Congress are particularly aware of Colonel Chambers' great contribution to his country in peace as staff advisor of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Maryland should be proud that one of her sons is the two hundredth marine to receive the Congressional Medal and the eightieth in World War II.

The blue rosette with the white stars has replaced the blue and white bar in his coat lapel. The Navy Cross previously awarded him is now replaced by the Medal of Honor for which he was originally recommended. Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Marine Commandant, who first made the recommendation brought additional evidence into the reexamination of his recommendations.

This evidence is most interesting. It reveals that while commanding the Third Battalion, Twenty-fifth Regiment, Fourth Marine Division, Colonel Chambers was as responsible as any one individual could be for securing the right

flank of the Fifth Amphibious Corps' Iwo Jima beachhead. This evidence shows that Colonel Chambers utterly disregarded his own safety under enemy plunging fire on his exposed flank that caused more than 50 percent casualties the first day among his officers and men. It further shows that he was seemingly everywhere at once on the shifting black sands of tortured Iwo Jima during the most dangerous hours of this amphibious operation.

The high ground flanking his battalion was an impossible military threat to the security of the entire Marine beachhead. By example rather than by command, Colonel Chambers succeeded in winning the key heights and anchoring the right flank of the two Marine divisions making the initial landing.

Bravery and leadership by this fighting Marine son of Maryland, who lives with his wonderful wife and family at Rockville, was no accident. It was the result of long years of training, of hard work. If any man can be said to have led a charmed life, it is Col. Joe Chambers.

Wounded on Tulagi during the Solomons landing, he received the Silver Star for heroism in directing the defense of a battalion aid station while he was a seriously wounded patient.

He commanded the Third Battalion, Twenty-fifth Marines across Roi-Namur, Saipan, and Tinian. Suffering from blast concussion on Saipan, he talked his way out of the sick bay to lead his battalion through the Tinian campaign for which he received the combat Legion of Merit.

Some simple arithmetic gives Joe Chambers three Purple Hearts, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, and the Medal of Honor, not to mention five combat stars and three Presidential unit citations. He is one of the few marines in a corps of heroes who wear three stars on the coveted Presidential unit citation.

Recently the Nation was pleased to see President Truman present Colonel Chambers with the Medal of Honor in the presence of the entire Chambers family, including Marine recruits Peter and Paul, twin sons aged 7 months. The twins made such a fuss over President Truman that they made the presentation front page news across the country. We have all seen pictures of the proud and happy father holding the twins while a beaming President tries to disengage himself from the chubby fingers of one of the twins.

Newspapermen have called this one of the truly fine human interest stories of the year. It was more than that. It was a perfect illustration of how our democracy works. It was a beautiful reminder of the importance of the individual and of his family to our society. And, it could not have happened to a nicer guy.

Last June, Colonel Chambers marched down New York's Broadway at the head of the Fourth Marine Division Association of which he is president. During the past year he has been named first vice president of the respected Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association. He is also active in Maryland civic and State circles.

Colonel Chambers has made several important contributions to the work of the Armed Services Committee, of which he is one of the valued staff workers. He served as staff counsel in Germany last year in connection with the Malmedy investigation and recently accompanied a group of Senators on a special inspection trip to our Alaskan frontier. He has also visited many American camps and bases on assignment from the committee. Always his keen legal mind and capacity for almost constant work have resulted in signal service.

Colonel Chambers has trained and trained well for a life of service to our Republic. His retirement from his beloved Marine Corps because of wounds has not quenched his will to serve others. On such men as this has our country depended since the American Revolution.

Born 42 years ago in Huntington, W. Va., educated at Marshall College there, at George Washington University, and National University, Colonel Chambers came up through the ranks of Washington's Fifth Marine Reserve Battalion during the days of peace. This year he rounds out 20 years of marine service. That service has been in the highest American and marine tradition.

That the Members of the Congress may understand what lies behind the blue and white rosette on this man's button hole, I am proud to repeat the citation read by the President of the United States:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to Col. Justice M. Chambers, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and trepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as commanding officer of the Third Assault Battalion Landing Team, Twenty-fifth Marines, Fourth Marine Division, in action against enemy Japanese forces on Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, from 19 to 22 February 1945. Under a furious barrage of enemy machine-gun and small-arms fire from the commanding cliffs on the right, Colonel Chambers, then lieutenant colonel, landed immediately after the initial assault waves of his battalion on D-day to find the momentum of the assault threatened by heavy casualties from withering Japanese artillery, mortar, rocket, machine-gun, and rifle fire. Exposed to relentless hostile fire, he cooly reorganized his battle-weary men, inspiring them to heroic efforts by his own valor and leading them in an attack on the critical, impregnable high ground from which the enemy was pouring an increasing volume of fire directly onto troops ashore as well as amphibious craft in succeeding waves. Constantly in the front lines encouraging his men to push forward against the enemy's savage resistance, Colonel Chambers led the 8-hour battle to carry the flanking ridge top and reduce the enemy's fields of aimed fire, thus protecting the vital foothold gained. In constant defiance of hostile fire while reconnoitering the entire regimental combat team zone of action, he maintained contact with adjacent units and forwarded vital information to the regimental commander. His zealous fighting spirit undiminished despite terrific casualties and the loss of most of his key officers, he again reorganized his troops for renewed attack against the enemy's main line of resistance and was directing the fire of the rocket platoon when he fell, critically wounded. Evacuated under heavy Japanese fire, Colonel Chambers, by forceful leadership, courage, and fortitude in the face of staggering odds, was directly instrumental in insuring the success of subsequent operations of the Fifth Amphibious Corps on Iwo Jima, thereby sustaining and enhancing the finest tradition of the United States Naval Service."

Report of Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the 1950 Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District report which has been sent to me by Mr. Rutland Cunningham, the very able chairman of the board of supervisors. The conservation of our soil and water resources is of real importance to the welfare of our country, and the splendid results achieved through this program in northwest Alabama are of outstanding significance. Mr. Cunningham and the district supervisors are to be commended for this splendid report:

ANNUAL REPORT OF NORTHWEST ALABAMA SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1950

To the People of the Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District:

This report is made to you for the purpose of giving you an accounting of the year's progress in the five counties which comprise this district. The Northwest Alabama District is made up of Lauderdale, Colbert, Franklin, Lawrence, and Morgan Counties.

The Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District has been in operation for 8 years. It is very satisfying to know that in the times we are facing, when agricultural productivity will be much needed for the defense of our way of life, the soils of this district are more capable of that needed productivity.

As in past years, we have promoted the new crops that seem to have the best possibilities for use in conservation farming.

Kentucky 31 fescue had its north Alabama beginning through the Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District. In 1946 we secured fescue seed from soil-conservation service nurseries to plant two 5-acre seed patches. As a result of farmers seeing this fescue and hearing about it through the district program, the acreage mounted each year. In 1950 farmers of the district planted approximately 25,000 acres of fescue. This is more pasture grass than was ever planted in any 1 year.

Caley peas are an excellent reseeding winter legume. We secured our first 100 pounds of seed in 1943. Over 500,000 pounds of Caley peas were planted in the district in 1950.

There have been similar increases in acreage of button clover, rescue grass, Lespedeza bicolor, and other new crops introduced by the district.

In 1950 we brought in additional new conservation crops on a field trial basis. Among the more promising are hairy Indigo, Wilmington Bahia grass, Tangier peas, Ala-Lu clover, and Hillsboro strain of white clover.

We appreciate the fact that the soil-conservation service nursery division is always on the lookout for new plants which show

promise in soil conservation, and that they produce these plants, for seed, and provide them to us for observational plantings.

In 1950 you, as cooperating farmers, did a fine conservation job. You, 433 of you, made application for complete soil and water conservation plans. The technicians assigned to us by the soil-conservation service completed plans for 402 of you. They helped 38 of you to revise your old plans. They helped you apply soil-conservation practices that were new to you or which required special technical know-how.

You did more in 1950 than in any previous year. At the present time, there are 2,543 of you cooperating with the district. You own 291,250 acres of land in the best section of Alabama.

You planted 15,579 acres of pasture in 1950. This was two and one-half times as much as you planted in 1949. You planted 64 percent more sericea in 1950 than you planted in 1949. You established 47 percent more sod waterways. You did 28 percent more drainage; built 67 percent more farm ponds; planted 52 percent more wildlife borders; established 32 percent more soil-conservation crop rotations; and planted 380 percent more trees. Your other accomplishments were outstanding. You harvested more seed of soil-conservation crops than ever in the history of Alabama.

You did a fine job on your farm. You have demonstrated that a sound conservation program results in increased production and protects the soil at the same time.

We hope you will share your soil-conservation know-how with your neighbors. Encourage them to take advantage of the assistance offered by the soil-conservation district

It would be impossible to list all of the folks that helped the district and helped you in doing this fine job. We do feel that the newspapers of the district should have a large share of the credit. They have constantly kept you informed through special soil conservation news articles and pictures.

As a farmer in the district, you are entitled to certain advantages that you may not have known about. By cooperating with the district you have access to the many facilities that are available to assist you with your erosion control and land use problems.

You can get a written soil conservation plan made on your farm with the help of qualified technicians. This plan will contain an aerial photograph of your farm which shows the capability of your soils to produce crops without damage to your land. Your plan will contain a map of your farm, showing the best use for each acre of land. You will be given specific recommendations for establishing and maintaining the conservation practices that you and the technicians decide are needed for your farm. If you need help in doing some of the new or difficult conservation jobs, the technicians will come out to your farm and help you.

There is no charge for this assistance. When you voted in, and organized, the Northwest Alabama Soil Conservation District, you created a Government subdivision of Alabama to secure this assistance for you. We hope you will take advantage of this assistance.

We are your five district supervisors. We are responsible for the proper management of your district.

However, we need your help. We are very busy on our own farms. All of us are farmers. We are also busy in other worth-while activities working for the farmer, including the REA electric cooperatives, Farm Bureau, and PMA committees. We are interested in the welfare of all your farmers in the district.

We enjoy working as supervisors of your district. We are not paid for our services. We do district work because we love the soil. We have seen the tragic destruction of our soils and its terrible effect on the people of our district. We have seen some of you harvest much greater yields as a result of your conservation work. We pleasantly anticipate the day when all of you will reap the great benefits that are yours through your district program.

With the help of the agricultural agencies, we made a careful study of our district this year and determined the conservation needs for each county. The combined efforts of farmers, businessmen, and all agencies and organizations are needed to do this conservation job, which is so necessary to sustain our Nation.

We ask the cooperation of all agencies and individuals in doing this important conservation job.

W. RUTLAND CUNNINGHAM,
Chairman, Florence, Ala.
JOHN M. LILE,
Leighton, Ala.
M. G. GLASS,
Route 5, Russellville, Ala.
J. W. COUNTS,
Mt. Hope, Ala.
A. D. SAMPLE,
Hartselle, Ala.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the sixth, seventh, and eighth short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

PAPINIAN: ANOTHER ROMAN LAWGIVER

Papinian, who died in A. D. 212, is generally considered to be the greatest of all Roman jurists. He was master of the rolls and later praetorian prefect under the Emperor Septimius Severus.

Papinian was known not only as a jurist of great comprehension but as a stern moralist. His works are known to the modern world through the numerous quotations in the Theodosian Code and in the Digest of the Corpus Juris Civilis, which has influenced all legal history.

He was the principal of five jurists set up as authorities to be cited in future decisions of the courts.

The Papinian plaque was sculptured by Laura Gardin Fraser, of Westport, Conn.

JUSTINIAN: COMPILER OF THE CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS (A. D. 483–565)

Justinian (A. D. 483–565) is probably the most famous of all emperors of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. He captured Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the Ostrogoths. But it is as a legislator that Justinian's name is most familiar in the modern world.

His greatest contribution was a huge volume entitled "Corpus Juris Civilis" which has influenced all subsequent legal history. The work was a consolidation of the imperial constitutions from the time of Hadrian, a collection of opinions of the classical jurists and many new laws instituted by Justinian.

Justinian undertook the work after finding the Roman Empire in great confusion.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere of Fredericksburg, Va.

TRIBONIAN: ANOTHER ROMAN JURIST WHO CARRIED ON JUSTINIAN'S WORK

Tribonian, who died in A. D. 545, was chief legal aide to Emperor Justinian. Under the Emperor's command, Tribonian supervised the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, the most important collection of Roman law and the basic document of modern civil law.

Historians surmise that he wrote a large portion of the document from his own vast knowledge of Roman law.

Tribonian probably was not a juridical thinker, but his background of Roman law was absolutely essential to the great project he directed, scholars say.

The Tribonian plaque was sculptured by Brenda Putnam, of New York City.

Rewriting the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, herewith is reprinted an article in the Wall Street Journal written by Garet Garrett on a subject so important that I sincerely believe it is worthy of the attention of every Member of this Congress:

The twelve most ominous words of legal meaning uttered in our time came from the Appellate Court of California last July. On striking down California's alien land law on the ground that it was in conflict with an international treaty, that court said unanimously:

"The United Nations Charter has become the supreme law of the land."

A Japanese person, insisting upon his right as an Asiatic to own land in California, had appealed from the State law to international treaty law and had been upheld. It is understood that the case will be carried to the Supreme Court for final decision.

Our form of government is involved in this question: Can the Constitution of the United States be superseded or rewritten by international treaty?

In an academic way that subject has been debated for many years; but now suddenly for reasons that will appear, it comes to have alarming urgency.

The California court stood on the Constitution. The Constitution says that treaties made by the President, the Senate concurring, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution, or laws of the State, to the contrary notwithstanding.

THE COURT'S DECISION

In a constitutional manner the United States subscribed to the United Nations Charter, as a treaty. Ergo, the Charter of the United Nations becomes the supreme law of the land. As simple as that. So the California court decided.

When the phrase that makes a treaty the supreme law of the land was written into the Constitution it was all right. An honorable nation must keep its word at any cost. It continued to be all right so long as treaties with foreign countries touched such things as boundaries, port amenities, fishery rights, and bird migration. It is a very different matter when international treaties begin to touch our internal social and economic arrangements, our civil rights, and our do-

mestic laws. Certainly the founders who wrote the Constitution never imagined that such a thing as the United Nations Charter would ever become the supreme law of the land.

And it is not only the Charter of the United Nations. The noblest single industry of the United Nations is to invent covenants and conventions and propose them to be adopted as treaties by the member nations. These covenants and conventions are designed in every case to implement or give teeth to articles of the Charter which, as they stand, represent only ideal intentions and are not in themselves mandatory. Thus we get, for example, the International Covenant on Human Rights, which will come presently before the Senate for consent, and the Genocide Convention, which President Truman has already placed before the Senate with an urgent plea for ratification. These treaties, if they are ratified, will become the supreme law of the land.

A VERY FINE POINT

Whether the International Covenant on Human Rights would supersede our own Bill of Rights is for the moment a speculative question. But whether it would or not, all legal minds agree that it would enable Congress to enact laws which otherwise would be unconstitutional Here is a fine point, and yet not too fine for the layman.

In 1913 Congress passed a migratory bird law. A year later the Supreme Court said the law was unconstitutional because the subject of migratory birds belonged entirely to the States and Congress could not legislate about it. But those who wanted the law were persistent. They persuaded the President to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain to regulate the killing of migratory birds, and when it had been ratified Congress passed a second law, almost exactly the same as the first one, and this second law was upheld by the Supreme Court on the ground that it was to implement a treaty.

Frank E. Holman, formerly president of the American Bar Association, said:

"This decision in effect and really for the first time opens the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as, and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject."

SUPREME COURT'S LAST WORD

That stands as the Supreme Court's last word in the matter. There is no sign whatever that it has changed its mind.

If you make a logical projection of that decision you will come to some startling possibilities.

For example, the Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of people peaceably to assemble." So our Bill of Rights makes these three freedoms—freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly—untouchable. The Congress is forbidden to pass any law about them at all.

But the International Covenant on Human Rights says:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary."

It says:

"Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression * * * subject to certain penalties and liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be only such as are provided by law and are necessary."

It says:

"The right to peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary."

OPENS OTHER AVENUES

Suppose this International Covenant on Human Rights were ratified as a treaty. Then, on the ground that the purpose was to implement a treaty, would the Supreme Court say the Congress could pass laws about religion, free speech, and freedom of assembly, which, according to our own Bill of Rights, it is forbidden to do? Unless the Supreme Court should change its mind, the answer is yes; and it may be noted that the Supreme Court has never yet invalidated a treaty.

A commission of the American Bar Association was appointed to study this question and it concluded that the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights would prostitute our fundamental and inalienable rights "to the readily invented emergency declarations of the all-powerful," that "the Government could close down newspapers just as in other emergencies it closed down banks," and that it "presents the doctrine of State regulation of religion, a codification of the rights of regulation, and complete destruction of the freedom of religion, if laws based on the alleged public safety and order of the state shall provide."

There is then the Genocide Convention. It is already before the Senate. Genocide means race murder. Who is not against race murder? The State Department's representative at the United Nations, addressing the General Assembly on the day the convention was approved, said: "The denial of the right of existence of entire human groups is the subject matter with which this convention deals."

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

As in so many cases, the preamble is unobjectionable. That is a feature of the technique. The truth nevertheless is that this Genocide Convention is so curiously and obscurely phrased that hardly any two legal minds could agree on what it means. Yet if it is ratified it will become the supreme law of the land. It defines genocide as any act committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such. So far you follow it sympathetically. Then it proceeds to describe the acts, and they may be such among others as (a) killing members of the group, and (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.

Try making an application of this description to the happenings of everyday life. The murder of a Negro for any reason might be called genocide. Imagine the many acts in hotels or restaurants or in regions of the South where segregation is practiced that might be construed as causing mental harm to members of a racial group. Nobody could be sure from a reading of the text how, when, or under what circumstances the provisions of this convention might overcross our domestic laws. It defines a new crime and persons or groups of persons (though apparently not a state) may be guilty of that new crime. The representatives of the United States on the legal committee of the United Nations agreed on this interpretation: "If an individual is murdered by another individual or by a group, with intent to destroy one of the groups enumerated in article III, the international crime of genocide is committed, as well as the municipal law crime of homicide."

And the State Department has said that the convention "is designed to ensure international liability where state responsibility has not been properly discharged."

Thus a race riot in Detroit or the lynching of a Negro anywhere would become the concern of international law, and American citizens might be brought before an international court to answer for it.

ANOTHER CONSTITUTIONAL BYPASS

So far, the most revolutionary departure from American tradition is in the North Atlantic Treaty, ratified in 1949, which voids the constitutional safeguard that only Congress can declare war. By this treaty we are bound to regard an attack upon one of the other 11 signatory nations as an attack upon ourselves, so that if 1 of the other 11 is attacked for any reason we are, ipso facto, at war, whether or not otherwise we should wish to be. It is under an unexpected construction of this treaty that the President now assumes the right to send an American Army to Europe, without the consent of Congress, just so it will be there if 1 of the other 11 nations is attacked.

Besides all that, the North Atlantic Treaty obliges us to strengthen our "free institutions," whatever that may mean. Certainly we should strengthen our free institutions, but how strange that we should undertake to do it under an international treaty.

The zealous internationalists say disarmingly that a treaty after all is not mandatory; it does not execute itself. After we have ratified a treaty, then we may decide for ourselves whether or not to pass a law to implement it. This, however leaves out such facts as—

1. Once a treaty has been ratified the pressure to implement it by law will be very strong, and we shall be accused of bad faith if we don't.

2. The nondiscriminatory articles of the United Nations Charter were not supposed to be mandatory, nor was it believed that they could touch matters which we held to be subject to domestic jurisdiction, and yet they were used to strike down California's alien land law.

3. A treaty within its own terms may oblige us to pass the implementing law. The Genocide Convention does that. It says: "The contracting parties undertake to enact * * * the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the convention."

CAN STRUCTURE OF LAW BE CHANGED?

So the question stands: How far can the structure of the American Government be changed by international treaty?

A former president of the American Bar Association goes so far as to say that lawmaking by treaty is "a blank check for writing a new Constitution." You will find his conclusion set forth in the September 1950 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

The American Bar Association has appointed a commission to consider an amendment of the Constitution to forbid the invasion of domestic laws by treaty unless specifically authorized by Congress, and to forbid Congress to make treaties effective by laws not otherwise authorized by the Constitution. A similar proposal to amend the Constitution in that manner will appear presently in Congress. The intention has already been announced.

Until we know for sure what we are doing, would it not be prudent to keep some of these treaties on the ice? It is much easier to get in than to get out. We cannot get out of the North Atlantic Treaty until the twenty-first year. Article 13 of the treaty reads:

"After the treaty has been in force for 20 years, any party may cease to be a party 1 year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the United States of America, which will inform the governments of the other parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation."

So you have the great oddity that in order to get out after 20 years the American Government would have to notify itself and then deposit the notice with itself.

The Martinsville Seven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star of Sunday has a very illuminating editorial entitled "The Martinsville Seven," which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article presents the facts which are sadly overlooked or ignored in the wild propaganda circulated by Communist newspapers and writers and given credence innocently by others who are ignorant of the facts in this case. A reading of this editorial will prove most enlightening.

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

THE MARTINSVILLE SEVEN

The case of the Martinsville seven affords an instructive lesson in the uses of propaganda.

Two years ago a white woman was raped in Martinsville, Va., and seven men, all Negroes, were brought to trial for the offense and convicted. The Virginia Supreme Court said that "one can hardly conceive of a more atrocious, a more beastly crime."

The evidence showed that the woman, wife of a Martinsville merchant, had gone into the Negro section of the town to collect for clothing that had been sold. In the course of the mass assault she was bitten, scratched, and suffered serious internal injuries. She is still under medical care.

All of the seven men made written confessions. Four of them testified in open court and gave details of the assault. Among the witnesses for the prosecution were a Negro boy, a Negro woman, and the wife of one of the defendants. So there was no substantial question as to their guilt, and, indeed, the attorneys who represented the men on appeal have not contended that they were innocent of the crime.

Nevertheless, after all seven had been sentenced to death (four have been executed and the three others are scheduled to die tomorrow) a tremendous campaign in their behalf was under way.

This campaign falls roughly into three phases: First came the strenuous efforts in behalf of the condemned men by their attorneys. The case was carried through the appellate processes of the Virginia courts and taken twice to the supreme court. The theory of the appeal was that the men had been discriminated against because of their race, and this rested on the contention that only Negroes are sentenced to death for rape in Virginia. It was not a meritorious appeal, and the courts uniformly rejected it. Still, a lawyer has a right, and a duty, to do all that he can in behalf of a client.

The second phase took the form of apparently sincere appeals to Virginia's Governor Battle for clemency. One such appeal came, for instance, from the president of the Richmond Ministerial Union. Appeals of this sort may seem to manifest a greater concern for guilty men than for the victim of their crime. Nevertheless, they are legitimate exercises of the right of petition.

It is the third phase that should be a matter of concern for all people, white or colored.

This phase was a propaganda campaign headed up by the Communist Daily Worker and the Civil Rights Congress, which is on the Attorney General's subversive list. The truth means nothing to these people. But they saw in the case of the Martinsville seven an opportunity to stir up racial discord in this country and to blacken the reputation of the United States abroad. And they did a masterful job of it.

These propagandists saw to it that Governor Battle was swamped with telegrams and protests, many of which were published in the Worker. From Red China came a cable signed in the names of three organizations. It said that news of the imminent executions had aroused the deepest indignation among the Chinese people, and added that the confessions had been extracted by inhuman torture and later repudiated by the accused in open court. This followed the line of material that had been put out by Civil Rights Congress.

In Moscow, all of the leading papers published a summary of a letter of protest signed by 30 Russian writers, composers, and scientists. Another protest came from Bucharest and there were still others from groups in England.

In this way, the case of men guilty of a brutal crime, men found guilty after receiving the benefit of all the safeguards afforded by American justice, becomes an instrument to be used in discrediting the United States abroad. And there is no doubt that the instrument has been used effectively, for the people in other parts of the world will hear only the Communist version. They will never have an opportunity to know the truth—certainly not from the Communist propagandists.

There is one other aspect of this matter which is entitled to some serious consideration.

Virginia has a drastic antilynch law, and there has not been a lynching in the State since the law was passed more than a quarter of a century ago. That law is respected by the people of Virginia because it rests on the eminently correct proposition that mob violence is intolerable, that any person, white or colored, who is accused or suspected of crime is entitled to a judicial trial.

The case of the Martinsville seven presents the shoe on the other foot. The vicious, lying propaganda, the march of hundreds of demonstrators into Richmond, the picketing of the White House—all of these things were designed to nullify the judicial process and to coerce elected officials into reversing or modifying the judgment of the courts. Of course, the effort did not succeed in this case. But the intent was there, and that should be a matter of some concern. For the position of those who still would resort to mob violence will be strengthened in direct proportion to the extent that pressure groups may succeed in interfering with the judicial function or in nullifying a judgment of the courts that has been rendered after a fair trial.

Joseph H. McGann, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that Joseph H. McGann, Sr., chief clerk of the House Committee on Public Works, has recently completed 49 years of service with the committee.

"Mack," as we affectionately know him, came from Cleveland, Ohio. He has served and is serving faithfully and well. He is always gracious and courteous and is willing to share his expert knowledge of the functions of the committee with all.

I congratulate him on his achievements, both for himself and his country, hoping that he will have many more years of satisfying service.

Unawarranted Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Jamestown Sun, of Jamestown, N. Y., in its issue of January 20, published an excellent and very penetrating editorial on the subject of Government expenditures for public assistance. This editorial points out that the defense program and the increased tempo of mobilization may increase the public assistance load rather than lighten it.

I ask unanimous consent to have this fine editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

UNWARRANTED CRITICISM

In an editorial which it entitles "Curiouser and Curiouser" the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday took President Truman to task on his budget because the section of it providing for social security, welfare, and health will cost $2,600,000,000 during the fiscal year of 1952. Of this amount $1,302,000,000 is earmarked for public assistance, more than three times the amount spent annually in 1943 through 1946.

The editorial raises the question, "Why should this hugely augmented sum be anticipated as needed for public assistance when we are already in a period of unprecedented full employment with a severe labor scarcity in the immediate offing?"

Then the editorial goes on to explain that we have just extended social-security old-age benefits. It assumes that "the tail continues to wag the dog."

We would, perhaps, have passed up comment on this editorial position under ordinary circumstances. The amount of money actually is small compared with the rest of the budget. But the attitude shown here is one that we have found common among many people in our own community.

The Tribune editorial cites Mr. Truman's explanation as being that the amendment to the law authorized grants to "totally and permanently disabled persons and greater aid to dependent children, plus medical care for persons receiving public assistance."

It doesn't consider this a sufficient cause for the increase. And it isn't a sufficient cause.

The Tribune editorial assumes that the bulk of the funds expended by public assistance go to persons who might find employment at times such as these.

That assumption is an error which can be confirmed by even a casual inspection of the rolls of any local department of public assistance.

There are a few facts about public assistance which can't be repeated too often.

The first is that the public assistance rolls during the past several years contained few employables, and these few have remained on the rolls for only short periods.

The second fact is that there are quite a few people who have come to the public assistance rolls in spite of the fact that they had made provision for old age. The attrition of inflation and, in many instances, misfortune, have wiped out their source of income. There is no longer any excuse for perpetuating the fallacy that the public assistance rolls are made up of the loafers, the improvident, and the indigent.

A third fact is that the people on public assistance rolls are living longer because they are getting better care. Medical costs have gone up. They need more medical care. All the related costs of public assistance have increased.

A fourth fact is that as the defense program gets going more elderly people will need help, not fewer. There is no indication that prices will not continue to rise. W r casualties and industrial hazards will remove means of support from many elderly people.

A fifth fact is that during the period of conversion to military necessities, we can expect in the United States some sharp and sudden increases in unemployment in specific areas. This unemployment may be temporary, but during that period of unemployment, a man's dependents have to live.

It is quite evident that, far from being reckless about the provision for public assistance in the new budget, the President's advisers in this field were extremely cautious in the right, but perhaps unpopular, direction. They show an understanding o. the problem that will be facing people on the public assistance rolls, and they don't want to impose upon them unnecessary hardships.

Some of your best friends are on the public assistance rolls. The only reason you don't know it is that public assistance today is not administered as poor relief, but in a way to protect recipients from those who regard our elderly people as wards of charity who should be clean and properly humble and grateful for being permitted to live.

Prices Received by Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the League Reporter for February 5, 1951:

FIGURES SHOW FARMER MAKES LESS ON MOST ITEMS THAN HE GOT IN 1947

Here's proof that farmers aren't responsible for high food prices.

The figures below show farmers were getting less for nine of the most important crops last December than they were 3 years earlier.

For only two crops—cotton and wool—were farmers receiving more last December than in 1947.

Although meat prices are not included in the list, corn, wheat, oats, and rye are. As cattle and hogs eat corn and grain, the prices of these four crops have a lot to do with the cost of meat.

Look at these figures, all official ones from the Agriculture Department:

Prices received by farmers

Commodity	Dec. 15, 1947	Dec. 15, 1950	Difference
Wheat.....bushel..	$2.79	$2.03	−$0.76
Corn ..... do....	2.37	1.45	−.92
Oats..... do....	1.18	.85	−.33
Rye ..... do....	2.45	1.37	−1.08
Flax..... do....	6.66	3.59	−3.07
Soybeans ..... do....	3.69	2.70	−.99
Rice .....100 pounds..	6.42	5.32	−1.10
Butterfat.....pound..	.88	.59	−.29
Eggs ..... dozen..	.59	.51	−.08
Wool. .....pound..	.42	.80	+.38
Cotton..... do....	.35	.40	+.05

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter to the editor written by Dale D. Dorman, Jr., of Graham, Mo. This letter was printed in the Maryville (Mo.) Daily Forum and a copy was sent to me by Mr. and Mrs. C. C. James, of that city. I believe the letter is of interest as showing the thinking of many people regarding the Korean War.

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

GRAHAM, MO., *January 27, 1951.*

MARYVILLE DAILY FORUM,
Maryville, Mo.

EDITOR, DAILY FORUM: It is said that while Nero fiddled, Rome burned. Today, while the United Nations fiddles, Korea burns.

Today the United States, with 90 percent of the UN forces in Korea and 90 percent of the casualties, is letting the United Nations, which includes many of our enemies, as well as our questionable friends, decide when and where Americans are to battle, to fight, and to die.

After America has poured out $42,552,000,000 to foreign nations since the end of World War II, we yet today have far fewer true friends than we had at the war's end. When, oh when, will we learn that we cannot buy friendship?

Our Government is still talking of spending more billions in Europe, even though there is little doubt but what Russia could sweep over Europe at her own discretion. Then why is she waiting? Russia's waiting for our Marshall plan to place more and more American industrial equipment and war materials there before she attacks.

At the close of World War II, only 5 years ago, Russia, with starvation and bankruptcy, was held up only by an infusion of $11,000,000,000 of lend-lease and other billions of relief from the United States. Of course, the murderous treason of giving Russia half the world at Tehran, Potsdam, and Yalta also helped.

Red China, too, was down and out when General Marshall visited China in 1945 and tried forcing Chiang Kai-shek to take the Communists into his national council and army. Marshall, it seems, even delayed shipments of arms and ammunition to Chiang until he accepted the Communists. Where's Chiang now? On an island in the Pacific. And where's Marshall now? Secretary of Defense in Washington, D. C.

Yes, who built the menacing power of Soviet Russia anyway?

A foreign policy which places anything ahead of American peace and freedom is betraying our great Nation. Yet never before have a free people been so deliberately deceived, so ruthlessly exploited, and so hideously betrayed. Today, America, once the land of the free and the home of the brave, is engulfed by foreign interests until we are reduced to the role of a feeding trough for an international Gargantua.

But if one opposes these insane acts of treason, he is termed by these so-called diplomats and fools as an isolationist. If we were to follow these global war rats they would call us all isolationists by saying we refused to give them enough power to meddle in other nations' affairs—because we had been too stingy in opening our pocketbooks—because we had never given them enough control over drafting our manpower, wasting our resources, and freely spending away our wealth.

It is this Communist-Fair-Deal-global conspiracy which would destroy us, and the governors of some of our most populous States have also joined this internationalist conspiracy for destruction.

It is time Americans took a stand for America.

Acheson and Marshall should be fired, and the wrath of the American people should force such action. Every last dime of foreign hand-outs should be halted, for friendship can only be secured by convincing other nations of our common interests.

The United States should immediately withdraw from the defunct United Nations, an organization which has only berated, obstructed, and paralyzed our forces, and which has refused to take action against the death, tragedy, and despair which Red China is causing in Korea.

America, and all nations which we are capable of defending by our air and sea power, must be defended; but not another dollar, not another dime, not another penny should be spent to aid the suicidal, foolhardy plans of the so-called internationalist-Fair Deal-Communist traitors in draining American resources, American wealth, and even American blood into the crevices and gullies of the earth.

Very truly yours,

DALE D. DORMAN, Jr.

A Protest Against Defeatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Protest Against Defeatism," published in a recent issue of the Newark, N. J., Star-Ledger.

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

A PROTEST AGAINST DEFEATISM

This is a protest against defeatism.

There is near-total defeatism in the doctrine that we can survive communism only

by sweeping militarization, rigid regimentation, and the thoughtless sacrifice of our Nation's youth.

We are willing to go along with this fearful program if it is the only way to fight communism. We would, in other words, make a fine distinction between outside communism and self-imposed communism.

We do not believe our situation is quite that desperate, and we protest the horrible defeatism of a leadership that is sadly lacking in imagination, faith, and confidence.

Defeatism arises from: (1) Exaggeration of the enemy's strength; and (2) belittling of our own strength and resources.

Our leaders have erred both ways.

Communism's drive for expansion and world conquest is born of the desperation of weakness, but has been generously nurtured by the fabulous errors of our policy makers in Eastern Europe and Asia.

The land of prison labor camps, government-by-terror and total secrecy is no less hollow than the late Adolf Hitler's thousand-year Reich.

Nor are we the weakling nation that some recent behavior would indicate us to be.

If some of our statesmen reflect weakness by their hysteria, we still possess the greatest production plant in the world, the most resourceful industrial management, and the most adaptable workers, not to mention the atom bomb and its related weapons.

Before we agree to sink to communism's level, let us see whether it is still not possible to wage the good fight—for peace and freedom and prosperity.

If it is an inescapable necessity at the moment that we scoop up precious manpower for the Army by steam-shovel methods, let us at least make it clear that in the near future we will have a thoughtful policy to make the most of every American individual and conserve our youth and our civilian values.

If it is really essential that at this moment we price control, wage control, and regiment our economy, then let us at least make it clear that we are working on plans to escape those un-American evils by an imaginative, hopeful program for expanding production under restored freedom.

The way to real victory—the victory for peace, freedom, and prosperity—is in showing ourselves, our friends, and our enemies that we have the will, the ability, and the resources to produce enough to support both military power and civilian life.

If we prove we can do that, there will be no war. For no enemy will dare to attack an invincible power.

When we announce that we can arm ourselves only by giving up our freedom and prosperity, we virtually declare ourselves half-beaten and thus encourage the enemy to make war.

Temporary retreat to regimentation may be inescapable because our policy makers have allowed events to take us by surprise.

Emphasis, however, should be on the temporary and limited character of any controls and sacrifices of freedom.

We must have a plan for expanding and improving civilian and military production and conservation of the individual in a free economy.

To achieve this goal, we should first overcome a childish obsession in Washington with excess profits. The Government, it seems, is prepared to make a thousand new black-market millionaires rather than see a single corporation earn excess dividends.

Obviously, it is far more important to stop inflation with stepped-up production than to play to the galleries, and to the pirates of the black market, with unsound taxes.

Tax incentives should be offered to any enterprise, whether it manufactures for the military or civilian, that is willing to expand and improve its plant to produce more and to produce efficiently.

If we offer industry and labor stimulating rewards for more and better production, we will astonish ourselves and the world, including our enemies, with our invincible power.

Just as we need to restore freedom as soon as practicable to stimulate production we need to restore freedom of discussion to stimulate wisdom.

There has been, to be sure, some regard in the administration and the Supreme Court for the civil rights of small and repressed minorities.

We also need some respect for the right of large minorities and majorities.

There is abroad in this land an hysterical and destructive intimidation of criticism and free discussion. We are being told that if some dissident statesman makes a displeasing statement, whether foolish or wise, all Europe will desert us and let the Kremlin's hordes walk to the Atlantic coast.

Let's stop that nonsense. If our alliance with Western Europe is that delicate, we should know it now. We don't believe that America should give up the right and the duty to debate its own fate for any consideration.

It is the rankest defeatism to argue that we must subdue decent and honest public discussion.

This country needs a program for the future in harmony with its dynamic past. We need a program to achieve security by strength and freedom and prosperity.

It is well enough to be prepared to make sacrifices and to die. But we do not want to make sacrifices for a dismal future and to die for the love of death.

Out of Washington has come as yet no clear program for the American way of overcoming the obstacle of belligerent communism. The people want such a program. It must come.

"Perfectionism" and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann, the distinguished columnist, recently published a series of columns, whose conclusion was roughly the same as that of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], namely, that collective security was unworkable. The Washington Post of January 22 carried an excellent commentary on that position by the Honorable Benjamin V. Cohen, one of our great authorities on international law and a member of the American delegation to the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cohen's reply to Mr. Lippmann, as published in the Washington Post, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

"PERFECTIONISM" AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Benjamin V. Cohen)

It is with deep regret that one finds Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his column of January 15, agreeing with Senator TAFT that collective security is an unworkable principle and that we should develop our own military policy and our own policy of alliances without regard to the nonexistent power of the United Nations to prevent aggression.

Both Senator TAFT and Mr. Lippmann seem to forget that under the Charter of the United Nations all members have agreed: (1) To settle their international disputes by peaceful means; and (2) to refrain in their international relations from threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations (art. 2, pars. 3 and 4).

So long as we adhere to the Charter we are not free, as Senator TAFT has suggested, "to engage in our own wars when we think we should engage in them." So long as we adhere to the Charter we are not free to use the United Nations as a mere diplomatic weapon in the cold war and disregard our obligation to refrain from the use of force except in defense of law.

The very first purpose of the United Nations, as stated in the Charter, is:

"to maintain peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of peace." (Art. I, par. 1.)

As long as we adhere to the Charter we are obligated to exercise an honest judgment as to what we can do to carry out this purpose. If the Security Council acts—but it cannot act without our approval or acquiescence—we are bound to carry out its orders. If the Assembly recommends, we are not bound to act, but we are morally and legally bound to exercise an honest judgment, giving due weight to the United Nations recommendations, as to what action on our part would be best calculated to further world peace and security.

The Assembly's recommendations are not subject to great power veto. The uniting-for-peace proposals adopted at the last session of the General Assembly provide effective means for the voluntary cooperation of member states in carrying out United Nations recommendations for the maintenance of peace and security.

We may go further, as we have in the Atlantic Pact and in the Inter-American Security Pact, and assume somewhat more specific obligations to maintain peace and security in certain areas as long as these arrangements do not conflict with the Charter. But we have no right to forswear concern and responsibility for world peace and security. To do so would not only be to emasculate the Charter but to invite the Soviet Union and its allies to move in wherever we are not prepared to give in advance specific guarantees.

The power of the United Nations in respect to collective security is not nonexistent because its exercise depends upon the good faith and voluntary cooperation of its members. The power of the United Nations in respect to collective security is not nonexistent because its exercise by military sanctions is not always practicable. The United Nations provides greater possibilities for uniting the moral and material strength of the law-abiding nations in maintaining peace and resisting aggression than can be secured by any system of alliances outside the framework of the United Nations.

But both Senator TAFT and Mr. Lippmann are in favor of abandoning the principle of collective security under the United Nations because it cannot be universally enforced. This is like asking the American people to abandon the Bill of Rights because it is not, and possibly cannot be, fully enforced everywhere in the United States. This is forsaking the good because it is not perfect.

The United Nations does not demand the impossible. It does not demand the use of force in every case. It does not demand abortive action to save face. In some cases only conciliation and mediation may be practicable. The United Nations demands only that its members individually and collectively exercise their best and honest judgment as to what will advance the cause of peace, security, and law in the world, taking into account not only the situation of immediate concern but the whole complex of the world situation.

It would, however, be a grave mistake to think that we could abandon our obligations to work with other nations in the United Nations to advance the cause of peace, security and law and still have the great moral support of the United Nations for action we take independently of the United Nations. It would be a grave mistake to think that other nations in the United Nations would support us in any effort to use the United Nations as a diplomatic weapon for our own purposes.

It is well to remember the warning of President Roosevelt in his last message of January 6, 1945, on the state of the Union:

"Perfectionism, no less than isolationism or power politics, may obstruct the paths to international peace. Let us not forget that the retreat to isolationism a quarter of a century ago was started not by a direct attack against international cooperation but against the alleged imperfections of the peace.

"In our disillusionment after the last war we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. We gave up the hope of gradually achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibility."

Imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, this week marks the second anniversary of one of the most despicable crimes in world history resulting in the imprisonment by the Communists of His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, prince primate of Hungary. This fearless churchman was sentenced to life imprisonment and is now broken in health for no other purpose than to stifle his condemnation of Communist doctrines. In commemoration of this occurence the Maryland Action Guild, a group of patriotic Americans, arranged for a special religious service presided over by the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough, D. D., archbishop of Baltimore. A most appropriate sermon was preached by the Reverend John L. Bazinet, S. S. Because the sermon is so challenging to free men of all religions it merits reading throughout the length and breadth of the United States and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

This morning, my beloved, you pay honor to a man who stands forth, indeed shines brilliantly, as a symbol before all religious-minded men in our age. That man, a churchman as you know, is the prince primate of Hungary, His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. You recall that 2 years ago, on February 8, 1949, to be exact, after a series of criminal farces including arrest, charges, drugging, torture, forced "confession," trial, His Eminence was sentenced to life imprisonment by the atheist stooges of Moscow wielding power in Budapest.

In Cardinal Mindszenty you see a symbol, a sign of the ferocious fight of the godless Communists against men of all faiths, and of no faith, but with conviction that freedom and justice are treasured values, a precious heritage of mankind. His Eminence in his suffering, you will agree, focused the attention of distracted men and women all over the whole civilized world.

Thousands of other unhappy victims, as you read in your papers and heard over your radio, had previously been tried on trumped-up charges, sentenced unjustly and most severely, but it was left for the cardinal like a hurricane to jar the most apathetic, the most skeptical, the most deaf and blind to the realities of your life in the mid-twentieth century.

Because we could not see close up the hatred of Red atheism for religion, more especially for the Catholic Church, you will admit it was hard to believe. In the person of their imprisoned primate of Hungary you saw close up, you drew back in blanched horror, you faced the living drama, the stark struggle of our times. See what happens to a strong man behind the iron curtain. The clash, you note, was public, undeniable, clear-cut, absolute. Amplified echoes of a little-known cardinal's Golgotha on a hardly understood spot of crucifixion, Budapest, stormed through the known world: London and Rio de Janeiro, Paris and Buenos Aires, Rome, Madrid and Peiping, Tokyo and Washington, New York and Baltimore.

He is after all a cardinal. What man or woman among you could then fail to heed? "Now, indeed," you must have reasoned, "is the time to rise from sleep."

For in fact the imprisoned cardinal-archbishop stands as a symbol. And you know what a symbol or sign is. On your way to this cathedral this morning you may have passed symbols of danger or safety, the mechanical green-and-red light flashing at the street corners, automatic signs; maybe the lifeless white arrow pointing out the right road for you; likely enough, too, the embodiment of law in the blue-coated officer on traffic duty, an indication of public power; even, perhaps, the Stars and Stripes hoisted on buildings, symbol of our country so dear to the hearts of us all.

But men by their acts can be signs, too, symbols of deep meaning, deeper maybe than we care to see without close inspection. Yet you will allow, my brethren, that men and women can hardly be automatons—lifeless, mechanical signs of anything really precious. By their thinking they stand for something or against something. By their speaking they make clear their beliefs and courage; by their acts also when such are free, and above all by what they are willing to suffer for, to risk their lives for—in all these you recognize men for what they truly are.

So with the cardinal-archbishop of Esztergom, whose very name, Mindszenty, stems from the root words meaning "all saints." Hence by his very name as well as by his eminence's thinking, speaking, acts, and suffering, Cardinal Mindszenty gives us some idea of the kind of courage needed to stand up to the Red menace at close quarters.

"Now we need men," he used to say repeatedly. Yes; you will concede, we need the kind of men and women who are not afraid to be big, to be heroic if need be, and to be stout-hearted, freely giving of self, grappling and beating down unspoken inner fears, finding new strength in prayer; heroic, indeed, is what it means to be saintly. Now in truth we need men.

American voices you have heard trying to confuse you. Was His Eminence not anti-Semitic? Anti-Semitic indeed, the man who had been more than once jailed by the Jew-hating Nazis for speaking out in Jewish defense, for organizing teams for their risky rescue from fiendish torture and sure death. You need read only the Jewish-produced Grey Book to sense the extent of his help. And what was His Eminence's gold medal for if not to honor him for this very fact? Why did the real anti-Semites sneer at him: "What about Your Reverence's Jewish doctor?"

You have perhaps heard him called a reactionary; but did you know, my beloved, that for 30 years Cardinal Mindszenty, as curate, parish priest and bishop, had been demanding reform: "Poverty must not be tolerated," he proclaimed. "Why is your rectory not heated?" Father Mindszenty was asked when he was pastor in Zala. "Until I know that every poor man has fuel," he admitted, "the parish priest will have no heat."

You may have heard him called uncompromising before the Reds. Yet have not you yourselves learned by now that there is no such thing as compromise with Communists on basic principles? You may have heard him carped at for being too outspoken, or heard it whispered maybe that His Eminence should not have stirred things up, that it was a bad time for public utterance, that his public relations were poor, that the whole affair Mindszenty was a "sectarian" matter. Yet what is a Christian bishop for if not to defend his flock, souls entrusted to his shepherding, from all tyranny and atheism masquerading under the forms of law?

As for sectarianism, you will not need to be reminded, dearly beloved, that whole congregations of Protestants, their pastors and ministers included, used to turn out publicly to do him honor when His Eminence went on his confirmation tours. Lutherans and Calvinists loved him, respected him, worked with him, joined him in his fight and theirs against Marxist monopoly-education, looked upon the Cardinal as their leader for true freedom and real religion. This is the man, my beloved, labeled the traitor Cardinal and an enemy of the people by the slaves of Moscow.

Having campaigned against His Eminence for months on end and tried to buy him with bribes, using too their well-rigged charges while shutting the Cardinal's voice off from all public reply, daring even to poison his very own people and bludgeoning them by foul means to sign statements against him, statements for which they had no stomach, heart, or conviction—the conditions under which the State collects signatures and arranges polls, he observed, are only too well known—these time-servers of atheism tortured his own typist to turn spy on His Eminence, his errand-boy, too, his own doorman, the postmaster at Esztergom, his own legal counselor, the manager of his Budapest office, in time even his own private secretary, since for these poor victims it meant submission or ignoble death.

Thus you see the Red Spider weave its stealthy steel threads around the Red Hat of the Cardinal of Esztergom. Thus you may observe how Red spokesmen whose strategy aims at confusion in the English-speaking world then as now furthered the vile

campaign against His Eminence. This even happened, beloved brethren, over one of America's largest radio chains. Indeed, ridiculous as it may sound in your ears, one eminent daily journal printed despatches from the Budapest trial itself written by its non-Hungarian-speaking fellow-traveler reporter finding fault with Cardinal Mindszenty's Hungarian pronunciation and even his Hungarian diction.

This should not surprise you, my beloved. After all, do you not recall Red master Lenin's own words: "All religious ideas * * * are an unspeakable abomination?" Mindszenty held out for religion, justice, freedom. So Communist sympathizers everywhere were following the Stalin line; dupes are rarely made without crafty cleverness.

Though again this may be hard to believe, my brethren, sympathizers and dupes are still doing so, subtley, sometimes at public expense. Why is it that broadcasts pouring from the West into this very same Red Hungary with its imprisoned Cardinal as of this hour give small comfort and no hope to the 70 percent Catholics locked there, none whatever to religious-minded Jews and Protestants?

Why is it that America is said to be paying with your dollars for the propaganda line that the United States does not oppose communism—only aggression? What hope can there be in this for God-fearing Hungarians? Is that the way to see in His Eminence's suffering what it really was and is? Is the symbol meaningless? Is the sign unread? Is atheism to your liking? Is Communist tyranny your friend? No, indeed, my beloved, you are not and will not be confused and deceived.

"Now we need men at home," the cardinal used to say. This, my beloved, ruled his thoughts. Surely no one of you can miss the fact that His Eminence knew whereof he spoke. Manfully, clearly, he championed true, lasting reform, not that so-called land reform that robbed owners of land, dividing it so that no one farmer, regardless of his skill, would have a big enough patch of ground on which he could possibly make a living; Mindszenty knew then that it was only step No. 1 to collectivization, farm socialism.

Repeatedly he spoke out for freedom. "For a small minority to impose its will on a huge majority," he warned in 1948, "is not democracy, but its very opposite." Not once but many times, dearly beloved, you can hear his voice crying out against poverty, calling for social justice.

And his acts, as you are well aware, matched his words. During the Nazi days of brutal occupation his name was a major target of their twisted smear propaganda. So much so, you do well to recall, beloved, that at the end of the terrible World War II the then Bishop Mindszenty was rewarded with a golden medal for his part in the resistance to Nazi tyranny. Yet when the time came for the Red masters to turn on His Eminence, the men who arrested him, jailed, tried, and convicted him were all former Nazis themselves, one-time members of the Hitler-run, green-shirted party of the Arrow Cross.

His very sufferings—why detail these for you, my beloved? You know them: Nazi-jailed, publicly campaigned against by the Reds, the secrets of 60 Andrassy Street (now renamed 60 Stalin Street), headquarters of the secret police make known to us by an escaped police officer who fled, unable to stand the sight any longer, expert forgers employed—these also escaped in time—the mental and moral suffering, the false friends, the slanders set down in the aptly named Communist Yellow Book. Can you wonder that United States Minister to Hungary Selden Chapin cried out, "He was a great man."

Yet until that time, dearly beloved brethren, many of you may not have realized what justice means behind the iron curtain. Now you know; now you fully understand that for the Communists, whether they are Hungarian, Russian, or American, "jurisprudence," in the words of a Hungarian commissar of such justice, "is one of the weapons of the class fight * * * make it a sharper weapon than ever"; to which another Marxian legist added this for your enlightenment: "The court is the instrument of politics" (Vishinsky).

But Mindszenty stood for religion, justice, freedom; His Eminence was a sign of another world, a word of man's dignity and brotherly love, dear brethren, a world hateful to and hated by the Stalinists, but beloved and cherished by you. The sign indeed was contradicted; but the sign stands firm even amid suffering Confusion vanishes.

Symbol as the cardinal is of the fight between God and the powers of anti-God, His Eminence, like a deep-toned bell, tolls as a warning to you and to me, an alarm as well as a spur and source of encouragement. You may have read a few days ago in a Baltimore labor paper of known integrity words pointing up that admonition for us locally.

"Often in the past," recalls its editor, "we have warned against the growth of communism in Maryland. Once again, we sound a solemn warning to industry and to labor in the Baltimore area. It is time to realize that in every large or extra large plant in Baltimore there exists a red thread of communism, which broadens out here and there to ribbon width, and finally * * * reaches the proportions of whole cloth."

"Why does the Red line widen and grow?" queries this writer. "Where is the leadership to restrain and contain, or to destroy it? * * * This infiltration goes on day and night." Is it true, dearly beloved, as this informed Marylander suggests, that it is "because the people lie supinely on their backs and snore through a Red revolution brewing in our midst?" If you will not heed the sign that is Cardinal Mindszenty, maybe you will realize that this labor thinker understands the very facts about you here and now.

Such alarm bells, whether from overseas or in our own city, should indeed be a spur and encouragement to you, my brethren. "Now we need men at home!" urged the Cardinal. His Eminence has set us that example. The cunning but sham legality of his hideous trial and barbarous sentence you have of course seen operate in other cases before and since. "The twisting of words and facts," protests our Holy Father Pius XII, "has become a classical weapon of deceit."

Was not our Saviour Himself unjustly accused of stirring up the people? Were there not legal pretexts aplenty used against St. Peter and St. John the apostle? In spite of his being a Roman citizen, coveted ancient privilege, you will note that St. Paul the apostle likewise fell victim to legal sophistry. So did Mindszenty.

Yet you will discern in the self-drawn, reluctant picture of the apostle of the Gentiles, Paul, the lifelike portrait of his Eminence today in Red hands. "Wherein any man is bold, I also am bold * * * in many more labors, in prisons more frequently, in lashes above measure, often exposed to death * * * Five times I received forty lashes less one. Three times I was scourged, once I was stoned; * * * in journeyings often * * * in perils from robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, * * * in perils from false brethren; in labor and hardships, in many sleepless nights, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those outer things, there is my daily pressing anxiety, the care of all the churches!"

Hunger and thirst, perils from my own nation, in the city, from false brethren, many sleepless nights * * * Cardinal Mindszenty and 60 Andrassy (Stalin) Street. Will you not draw out the parallel for yourselves, my brethren?

For Cardinal Mindszenty's struggle goes on day by day. At latest report, November past, the red haters of God still would leave His Eminence little peace in his hospital-prison, my beloved. As of a few weeks ago he was reported in a much weakened physical condition; specialists advised that his health had been so much undermined by his so-called "treatment" that he should not be kept in prison.

To which you hear the Red Hungarian dictator in reply: "Everything must be done that he should not pass out in prison"—fearful was the Red even to mention the Cardinal's name, my brethren. To the nerve specialists called in for consultation, the Red tyrant gave his threatening orders: "I will hold you responsible for his being freed in a condition in which not even the cleverest medical men can restore his health or his mental powers. If the priest (he meant the Cardinal) pretends to be out of his mind, drive him out of it, but do it for good." So the heartless war is waged, my beloved * * * "in many sleepless nights". Yet the Apostle Paul lived long before distorted science knew how to rob a man of his mind and his reason; Mindszenty knows that power all too keenly.

Still His Eminence's face may well haunt you, beloved, as you saw it 2 years ago in newspapers and magazines, whites of eyes showing abnormally, lines deep that were not there at all a few days before, upright in the courtroom withal as though he were sitting on his archiepiscopal throne at Esztergom. Can you fail to view that countenance as the modern "Ecce homo," "Behold the Man?" "A most serious outrage," asserts Pope Pius XII, "that inflicts a deep wound * * * on every upholder of the dignity and liberty of man."

So it is with reverence and admiration that you recall today, dearly beloved, the second anniversary of the Cardinal's life-sentence to prison. "I pray for a world of truth and love," His Eminence wrote shortly before his arrest. "I pray for those who, in the words of our Lord, 'know not what they do.' I forgive them from the bottom of my heart." This in his last pastoral letter. (November 18, 1948.)

Grateful indeed you may well be for the Cardinal's battle in behalf of loving religion, real justice, human freedom, against the powers of hating atheism, tyrannical force, wordy mouthings of "democracy" that really spell out the streamlined slave state.

Who among you will not be moved to pity at the sight of his plight? Yet proud, too. For he endures as the flaming symbol of all you hold dear: right thinking, brave speaking, courageous acting, suffering unspeakable silently borne without bitterness, merciful Christ-like forgiveness. His Eminence abides indeed as a warning as well as a stirring impulse to each of us to heed his insistent words: "Now we need men at home."

As if to explain this to us he had once made his mind clear beyond all doubt: "Rome can find another bishop if I die, but * * * believers are born through martyrdom."

Kneeling as we do today before this venerable altar, sacred historic nucleus radiating Catholic life through the United States

of America, we will this morning want to pray for Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, and at the same time mindful of our Saviour's will to pray for our enemies, doing good to those hating us, praying for them who persecute and calumniate us, we will want to pray for His Eminence's persecutors too. We pray that the Cardinal's strength of spirit may never falter, that his torturers may turn to the Spirit of God; that his mind may weather the devilish devices of the evil one, that their minds may come home to God; that his heart may spark off that courage which you and I both need as example in this modern world filled in our day with the same searing battle that he faced almost alone, that theirs may find love and higher courage instead of hate in Christ's Cross.

Your Eminence as a free man was the only clear voice in your country bold enough to speak up for the 600,000 slave laborers dragged from your homeland into the cruel depths of Soviet Russia. Today in gratitude we speak to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in your behalf. We beg Our Lady to intercede for you.

Pray for us, too. Our Golgotha may almost be upon us. "Now we too need men at home."

J. W. Hanley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the Natchitoches (La.) Times of Nov. 17, 1950]

J. W. HANLEY ON VISIT HERE

Joseph W. Hanley, of Chopin and Washington, D. C., Doorkeeper in the Senate, is visiting his relatives in the South. He timed his visit so as to be in the parish in time to cast his vote in Tuesday's election.

He is visiting relatives in Chopin, Boyce, Lena, Alexandria, and Natchitoches and stopped for a visit in Shreveport en route.

Hanley attended the National American Legion Convention in Los Angeles last month and also visited places of interest in the Pacific and Western States This completed a visit to every State in the Union.

[From the Beaumont Enterprise of November 17, 1950]

DOORKEEPER OF SENATE CHAMBER IS VISITING RELATIVES IN AREA

Joseph W. Hanley, a doorkeeper in the United States Senate Chamber, was in Beaumont yesterday, visiting a number of relatives in the Beaumont area. A resident of Chopin, La., he recently returned from the west coast where he attended the National American Legion Convention. He will return to his job in Washington by November 17 when Congress reconvenes.

He is visiting relatives in Nederland, including his mother, Mrs. Harriett Hanley, and brothers, Floyd, Sherman, Willie V., W. L. and Carvel. A sister, Mrs. Rsie Mae Beebe, lives in Orange.

Other Texas relatives include a sister, Mrs. Effie Pittman at Shiro, and a brother, Arthur, and sister, Mrs. Leona Parker, at Hondo.

Tax-Free Incomes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Tax Till It Hurts—Whom?" published in a recent issue of the United States News and World Report.

I also ask that immediately following the article there be printed three charts in which a comparison is given of the taxes paid by the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Members of Congress, as compared with those paid by average American citizens.

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

TAX TILL IT HURTS, WHOM?—TAX-FREE INCOME HELPS PRESIDENT, CONGRESS

Truman's tax until it hurts plan hurts him less than most. Being President has become quite a job from that standpoint.

Critics point to $50,000 expense account, tax free, on top of a $100,000 salary, a house, a plane, yacht, servants, etc.

After taxes, he has $105,000. Others must make $300,000 to do as well. As taxes go up, they'll need to make even more.

President Harry S. Truman wants Congress to tax the people until it hurts. He is asking for 16 to 20 billion dollars more even if it means a drastic squeeze on the taxpayers.

Mr. Truman, however, is among those to be hurt least in such a squeeze. Thus, his demand for a crackdown on taxpayers is starting to be a bit embarrassing. The reason is this: The President who asks the tax increases, the Vice President who helps put them through the Senate, the Speaker who guides them through the House, and Members of Congress who vote the increases, do not share the burden equally with the common people.

All of these public servants enjoy big, tax-free expense accounts that they granted to themselves. Congress passed the bills, and Mr. Truman signed them and made them law. The tax exemption applies to one-third of the pay of the President. It covers one-fourth of the pay of the Vice President and Speaker, and one-sixth of the pay of Congressmen.

The Presidential expense account is $50,000 a year. It is paid to Mr. Truman as income. The President does not have to account for what he does with the money, and the whole $50,000 is tax exempt. Congress voted the tax-free fund for the President 2 years ago, and raised his salary from $75,000 to $100,000 a year. In addition to the expense account and salary, totaling $150,000, Mr. Truman has many advantages. He pays no rent. He has the use of a yacht, an airplane, and a fleet of limousines.

The Vice President and Speaker each draw a salary of $30,000 and are given $10,000 a year tax-free free expense accounts. Members of Congress get $12,500 in salary plus $2,500 for expenses.

Like Mr. Truman, most Congressmen have residences both in Washington and back home, and extra entertainment costs. As they see it, that is part of the justification for their expense accounts.

How these officials benefit from a tax-exempt expense allowance is shown in the accompanying charts. Mr. Truman's income tax this year will be nearly $34,000 less than that of a private citizen who makes as much but has no such tax-free expense account. The President will have about $105,000 left after taxes. An ordinary person would have to make $300,000 a year to have that much left over for spending or saving.

The President, therefore, has a tax advantage over other taxpayers that is substantial even at the present level of taxation. A tax increase, moreover, will make that advantage still larger. It also will point up the fact that Members of Congress are going about the business of imposing higher taxes while enjoying tax exemptions they provided for themselves.

Pressure for a change is rising in Congress as a result. There is talk of removing the tax-free privilege for these officials, thus placing them on an equal footing with other taxpayers. Bills actually have been introduced to do away with the special tax exemption for Congressmen. Some Members even now are refusing to use their tax-free allowances. Others use only a part.

But there still are Congressmen, a good many of them, who are ready to make a fight to retain special tax privileges for themselves as well as for the President, Vice President, and Speaker. One Member of Congress is proposing to double Congressmen's expense allowances from $2,500 to $5,000.

Your Congressman probably will tell you, privately, if not publicly, that he is underpaid, not overpaid. Furthermore, he will insist that his $2,500 expense allowance actually isn't big enough to cover expenses that are essential.

For example, he usually must maintain two homes, not one. He keeps a residence in Washington where he spends most of his time. Back home, even though he may not spend much time there, he must keep another residence.

He has to do a lot of entertaining. That's expected of him. And he has no expense account other than his $2,500 allowance to cover the cost of the lunches and dinners he buys for visitors from his district. Nor does he have any expense account to cover his campaign costs. A Member of the House has to run for reelection every 2 years. A Senator has to run every 6 years. In figuring their income taxes, they can't deduct campaign costs as business expense.

The tax advantage of a Member of Congress over an ordinary citizen with the same income amounts to about $600 a year. Most Congressmen believe that, as a practical matter, they are not as well off as, for example, a business executive drawing $15,000 a year. Congressmen, in fact, are not doing as well as they were a year or two ago. Living costs are up sharply. But they have not had a raise in pay since January 1947.

The Vice President and Speaker, too, face rising living costs, and they have not had a pay raise for 2 years. But, by comparison with Members of Congress, they are well off. They get $40,000 a year, including $10,000 tax-free.

Vice President BARKLEY, as the chart shows, can pay taxes on his $40,000 pay, and still have $32,684 left. A private citizen with $40,000 of income, and no tax-free allowance, realises only about $28,500 after taxes. The Vice President and Speaker are furnished high-priced sedans for their own use, and the Government pays their chauffeurs.

A tax increase won't hit them as hard as it will hit the ordinary citizen, because one-fourth of their incomes is free of tax. But

they are placed in the embarrassing situation of having to steer that tax increase through Congress.

The President is in a class all by himself. He has what amounts to the best-paying job in the United States. His $100,000 salary and his $50,000 tax-free expense allowance are only the beginning of what is provided for him and his family by the Government.

His job, of course, has its disadvantages. There is very little real privacy. The hours are long and irregular. The problems and the pressures are immense. There are some heavy expenses that an ordinary citizen does not have to bear. But the ordinary citizen, even one whose pay gets up into seven figures, does not have the privileges and luxuries that are provided for the President.

He lives in a mansion. At the moment, the White House is being repaired at a cost of more than $5,000,000. So Mr. Truman and his family stay a short distance away in Blair House, normally reserved for visiting dignitaries from other lands.

His rent is free. The Government pays for heat, gas, electricity. It provides all the furnishings and trimmings. It supplies yardmen, housemen, maids, butlers, cooks, engineers, and guards.

Recreation and entertainment are his for the asking. Movies are brought into his home. Stars of the entertainment world are eager to appear at command performances. There is a fancy swimming pool in the White House where he takes a dip two or three times a week.

He can travel by special airplane, battleship, cruiser, special train, or on his yacht *Williamsburg*. A $40,000 fund, separate from his expense account, finances travel on official business.

These perquisites have been added gradually over the years. But, on a cash basis, Mr. Truman is far better off than any former President. It was just 2 years ago that his salary was raised from $75,000 to $100,000 a year. At the same time, he got his $50,000 tax-free allowance for expenses. In 1948, he had $48,275 left out of his salary after paying his taxes. In 1951, despite the recent tax increase, he will have $105,000 left out of his salary and allowance.

But that's the way Congress wanted it. Many pointed out, when the question of his pay came up 2 years ago, that executives in industry often had generous expense accounts. The Presidency was regarded as a top job that should be paid accordingly. Congress set about to give him independence and position.

The catch, however, is that now he wants to raise taxes all around. His tax-free allowances, and those of other officials, are becoming an issue when everybody else is being asked to pay taxes until it hurts.

TAX ADVANTAGE FOR PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Out of President Truman's annual pay of $150,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $105,276. Out of private citizen's annual income of $150,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $71,532.

Here's why. President Truman draws annual pay of $150,000. That includes a tax-free allowance of $50,000. So he pays income taxes on only $100,000. His tax in 1951 will be $44,724. Out of $150,000, he will have left $105,276.

The private citizen with an income of $150,000 gets no tax-free allowance. So he must pay taxes on $150,000. His tax on that amount in 1951 will be $78,468. Out of $150,000, he will have left $71,532.

SAVINGS FOR VICE PRESIDENT BARKLEY

Out of Vice President BARKLEY'S annual pay of $40,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $32,684. Out of private citizen's annual income of $40,000 he will have left to spend after taxes, $28,500.

Here's why. Vice President BARKLEY draws annual pay of $40,000. That includes a tax-free allowance of $10,000. So he pays income taxes on only $30,000. His tax in 1951 will be $7,316. Out of $40,000, he will have left $32,684.

The private citizen with an income of $40,000 gets no tax-free allowance. So he must pay taxes on $40,000. His tax on that amount in 1951 will be $11,500. Out of $40,000, he will have left $28,500.

AND FOR CONGRESSMEN TOO

Out of a Congressman's annual pay of $15,000 he will have left to spend after taxes $12,787. Out of private citizen's annual income of $15,000 he will have left to spend after taxes $12,190.

Here's why. A Congressman draws annual pay of $15,000. That includes a tax-free allowance of $2,500. So he pays income taxes on only $12,500. His tax in 1951 will be $2,213. Out of $15,000, he will have left $12,787.

The private citizen with an income of $15,000 gets no tax-free allowance. So he must pay taxes on $15,000. His tax on that amount in 1951 will be $2,810. Out of $15,000, he will have left $12,190.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the question is not whether the President and Members of Congress are overpaid; it is more a question of principle. At a time when taxes are taking such a large percentage of every individual's income, and at a time when the President is telling the American people that they must expect to be taxed until it hurts, I believe the first action of the President and the Members of Congress, who are receiving the special consideration referred to in the article, should be to repeal our own tax exemptions. In America we have no room for any privileged class, and it was with this thought in mind that on January 11, 1951, I introduced Senate bill 357, the purpose of which is to repeal these unfair exemptions.

Danger Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of national stress and uncertainty, in these days when America has undertaken, as a result of world conditions, to assume world leadership, it is well that all Americans take inventory of themselves and their country. To this end I am submitting for the perusal of my colleagues in the Congress and for Americans everywhere a sound and thought provoking sermon delivered recently by an old friend, a minister of the Gospel, the Reverend John W. Moore, pastor of the Methodist Church, at Hattiesburg, Miss. This splendid statement is as follows:

DANGER AHEAD

(By Rev. John W. Moore)

"But the children of Israel committed a trespass."—Joshua vii: 1.

Some years ago, within the memory of most of us, a great ship of the air was completing a prosperous trans-Atlantic voyage. The Zeppelin *Hindenburg* was crowded with travellers, many of whom were returning home from business or pleasure in Europe. Perhaps some of them had been a little dubious about this new mode of travel. Maybe some of them had been fearful during every hour of the voyage. But now the great ship was over solid ground once more. Behind, and all but forgotten, were the long leagues of watery wastes that for so many hours they had looked down upon. Already the lines had been connected to the mooring mast. Already the greatest airship on earth was settling down toward its place of rest and security. Greetings were already being waved through the portholes of the cabin to friends and relatives below. Already they were turning one to another and saying jubilantly, "We made it." And then there was a sullen roar followed by a searing flame that ran the length of the ship in a moment. The Zeppelin had exploded. Shrieks of agony from the dying took the places of smiles of welcome from the living. What a thing of horror. The ship and many of its crew and passengers were no more.

Such a voyage, with such an ending, is a parallel to so many of life's ventures. How often, for instance, is the denouement of the wedding festival, with all its promise of lasting bliss, unravelled in the court of law and in the broken home. Or how often do men start business careers amid most propitious circumstances, only to see their ventures crash into bankruptcy and loss. Or a fond mother and a proud father may look in rapture upon the tiny face of their first-born son, seeing him perfectly formed and robust. They may say (and their neighbors and friends may agree), "He will make a mark for himself in the world. He will be a great man." Twenty years later that babe, now grown into manhood, may stand before the bar of justice and hear the State announce that he is not fit to live and so must be done to death by the law of the land.

What makes our world like that? The answer is not far to seek. I had a neighbor once who was found guilty of the crime of murder. I followed the procession when he was led into court to receive sentence of death. As we passed under the arching entrance to the court building, there was a pause as every eye was lifted to an inscription chiseled into the facade of the courthouse, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." In those words of the Inspired Book is the answer to our question. How many times, by how many civilizations, by how many dozens of nations, and by how many millions of individuals has that old principle of sowing and reaping been proven true in practical test? And yet how slowly men and nations learn that truth. Each new civilization, each nation, rising to the zenith of its power and greatness; each person born into the world seems impelled to put it to the test in some sort of wickedness. Sowing to the wind, generation after generation needs must reap the whirlwind in bitterness of soul.

Our text finds a new nation, just trying its new found strength, reaping soon its earliest planting of bad seed in the soil of its promised land, amid the scenes of its destined greatness. Joshua had led Israel into Canaan, gaining military victories over their enemies as they went. In the enthusiasm generated by those victories, they had gone out against the small city of Ai. They had said, "We have nothing to worry about, for we are well able to overcome this insignificant people." A few hours later they were running pell-mell for dear life from those men of Ai. When they had time to be, they were dumfounded. They had a question.

You would suppose, perhaps, that they asked, "What's the matter with us?" But no; their question was, "What's the matter with God?" All our lives we have asked, or heard asked, this question in one form or another. During the Second World War, I heard a man put it in the positive form. He said, "We can't be defeated. God has too much at stake in America to let us go down." (I wondered how God got along before 1776.) It seems to me that God has always managed to get along without a champion nation, or armies, or navies, or atom bombs. For God's stake in the universe is not an individual, nor a nation, nor a civilization. It is rather truth and righteousness, and He is not afraid He'll lose it.

Israel was punished for Achan's sin. Why? God also punished Achan in a fearful manner. But after all, what was so wrong with Achan's act? He stole some of the spoils of war and hid it away for private use. What difference does it make what becomes of the spoils of war? I think I know something of the philosophy behind Achan's sin. I've seen it demonstrated so often among people I know. It's the philosophy behind a black-market tax that a great state levies with one hand on a commodity which it bans with the other hand. It's the rationalization that prompts organizations to promote bingo games for charity, in spite of the fact that bingo has been ruled illegal by the Supreme Court. It is the effort to purify the means by the end. It is to say, "Oh, well, its going to happen anyway, so let's capitalize on it for good." So Achan rationalized his conduct just like a modern man might do. After the battle there was a heap of booty piled in a public place. It was intended for the common good and was a part of the public treasury. Achan saw an opportunity to enrich himself from this common fund. A goodly Babylonish garment, 200 shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold would better his financial condition considerably without impoverishing the nation perceptibly. So he took it.

There are two ways to examine the morality of an act to determine whether it be right or wrong. The first is to judge it on its merits in the light of God's law. Ask the question, "Is it right?" and answer it honestly. If, from lack of strength one finds himself hedging on that method, then let him employ the second, which is to ask and honestly answer the question, "What would be the result if this thing were generally practiced?" An embezzler may justify his dishonesty on the grounds that, whatever God's law is, his defalcation is, after all, no grievous injury to anyone in particular, since he has robbed a corporation with hundreds of stockholders. But let him realize that, should a large percent of those entrusted with other people's money prove dishonest, the whole system of trusts and faith in the business world would collapse and then the matter takes on a different aspect. Similarly, a husband or a wife may lightly break the marriage vows on the assumption that somehow he or she is exempt from the moral laws that govern others. But when it is realized that if such practice should become common the homes of the land would disappear in a whirlpool of disaster, carrying with them our culture and our greatness, that transgression becomes a matter of terrible guilt. Thus it is that individual sins become national sins, and thus, for the transgressions of its citizens, one by one, a whole nation is penalized.

Sometimes, when a nation suffers for the sins of its citizens, it repents of its sins and calls on the name of God. And sometimes that is a good thing to do, but not always. For repentance without reform does not put the Nation in position to claim the protection of Almighty Providence. After Israel's defeat at Ai, Joshua fell on his face in prayer and God didn't like it. Joshua was not in position to pray and God said to him, "Get up off your face and clean up the immoral mess that is developing among the people. Then you can pray to me."

After America's set-back in Korea there arose in this Nation a great cry for prayer and a return to God. It wells up on every hand today from military men and high Government officials as well as from the leaders of the church. The bishops of Methodism have issued a strong appeal to our denomination to appoint special days and hours for simultaneous prayers on the part of our membership. But, in the light of our text, I raise the question whether we are in position to pray effectively.

Our Nation is in mortal danger, and the fact is recognized on every hand. But it seems to me that we are not in agreement among ourselves as to the enemy that threatens us most. In some circles it seems to be the consensus that our major enemy is communism. That is a fallacy. Communism will never destroy America. Not long ago we were traveling down one of our main highways when it became necessary to stop and let a flock of buzzards fly out of the road. On the shoulder of the highway was the carcass of a sheep and these repulsive birds were feeding on the carrion. Our little boy raised the question, "How did the birds kill the sheep?" Well, they didn't. They don't. In fact they can't. It isn't in their nature to kill. Their program is to be first on the scene after the killing takes place. Communism is a political vulture. It never destroyed a nation and never will. It just takes over when a nation is in its death throes. If America dies, it will die as every other great nation has died, at its own hands. Our mortal enemy is not something outside of us. It is selfishness and greed in high places and in low.

Joshua's men said they were defeated before the walls of Ai, but they were mistaken. Their defeat took place before the leveled walls of Jericho, when in the flush and enthusiasm of victory, Achan sinned. Similarly, our series of set-backs in Korea have stemmed from an attitude that developed among us during the Second World War. It is an attitude that, left unchecked, may eventually do us to death as a Nation. For, unless we mend our ways, there seems to be for us no justification for living. Our sin is the sin of Achan; the sin of selfish greed. Already in the cities and towns that are adjacent to Army camps, that greed evidences itself in the conversations and attitudes of the citizens who are ready to capitalize on the Nation's struggle for life and turn it into personal profit without rendering any substantial service in return. On the larger scale, among some of the country's largest business corporations, the situation is appalling. Perhaps as many as 20 veterans of the North African campaign of the Second World War told me the story of the amazing exhibition of that greed then. The Allied soldiers were being mauled by Rommel's men because of allied shortages of war material and supplies. Shipping was hard to find in sufficient quantity, our leaders told us. But time after time the great ships would pull into the north African docks and unload—not munitions of war—but vast quantities of beer and other merchandise that had no relation to the dire emergency of the hour. If this actually happened, then somebody was being enriched at the cost of the Nation's life blood. But since that time I have been told that it was not true, but was only the propaganda of the prohibitionists in this country. The other day I read an article in the January 1 edition of one of the country's largest magazines; a magazine that evidently derives vast revenue from beer and liquor advertising, and therefore is not open to the suspicion of being loaned to dry propaganda. This article expresses amazement that, despite our industrial greatness, our men, fighting a losing battle in Korea, were without many of the fundamental tools of war. It cites a British observer's comment on the "why" of that shortage. The Briton said he saw tanks held up for hours while beer and refrigerator trucks rolled toward the front. Here we have a straw in the wind. It's a big straw and the wind is strong. I do not insist that supplying beer to our soldiers will destroy the Nation, though I am quite certain it is a trend in that direction. But it seems to me that any unbiased person must admit that the spirit behind that sort of thing is destructive. A nation that will consent for its citizens to sell their sons for financial gain is a dying nation, ripe for the vultures of communism or any other "ism" that happens along. Our ears still ring with the cries of our teen-aged boys on the frozen hills of Korea for military supplies. We had sent them there to fight and die while we remained in solid comfort at home. Then when they began to freeze in subzero temperatures; when they lost arms and legs from frost; when their agonized cries for relief found us sitting snugly before our blazing hearths, we sent them beer. One of old asked a rhetorical question, "Which of you, if his son asks bread, will give him a stone?" It was a thing unheard of until our day and until our Nation outgrew its sense of moral responsibility. How many of our young men died while tanks were sidetracked to let the beer trucks roll?

During the Second World War the United States banned large-scale public gatherings in order to conserve transportation for the war effort. Our church, along with all the others, called off its large conventions. Other important groups did the same. By some sort of manipulation, the race tracks of the country got themselves exempted from this order. One of the country's foremost writers, delving into this queer situation, came up with the statement that in that year the tracks were responsible for the using up of 400,000,000 miles of transportation. That means that approximately 20,000,000 gallons of gasoline were thus consumed and that the equivalent of 20,000 automobile tires were worn out. At the same time all sorts of congratulatory messages were barred from the telegraph wires of the Nation. But the tracks maintained uninterrupted 24-hour service on its leased wires, carrying the daily-racing-form report.

These are additional straws in the same strong wind. They indicate a certain basic selfishness that seems to motivate the rank and file of our citizens. For some it shows itself in active participation in the business of strangling the Nation for profit. For the rest it is shown in stolid indifference to what goes on, so long as we are let alone in our complacency. They are symptoms of a terrible disease—the disease of sin. It is a disease that, left unchecked, will inevitably end in death for the Nation as it does for the individual. Unless America mends her morals, God will not hear her prayer for peace and safety. Having occupied for so long the role of the light of the world, and now hiding her light under a bushel of gross selfishness, her light bids fair to become darkness. Having been for so many of the world's people the salt of the earth and now being in rapid process of losing her salinity, she may indeed become, "From henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of men."

I have been asked to pray for the Nation. Here is my prayer. "Cleanse Thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins. Let them not have dominion over me. Then shall I be upright and I shall be innocent from the great transgression."

Fallacies of World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Frank Chodorov, editor of Analysis, in December 1950, wrote an inspired article for his paper entitled "One Worldism." Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

ONE WORLDISM

Five years ago the organization of the United Nations was ushered into the world as the guarantor of peace. It has failed. Despite that obvious fact, there are many whose faith in some sort of a superstate as an instrument of peace is unshaken, and who lay the failure of the UN to the limitations put upon it by the autonomy of its members. That is to say, they believe in peace through authoritarianism; the more authoritarian the more peace.

History cannot give this faith the slightest support. The glory that was Rome did not prevent its parts from coming into conflict with one another nor from rising up against the central authority. Even our American coalition of commonwealths came near breaking up in war, and uprisings have all but disintegrated the British Empire. Centralization of power has never been a guarantor of peace. On the contrary, every such centralization has been accomplished by war and its career has been one long preoccupation with war.

The best that can be said of any coalition of states is that it can keep smoldering fires from breaking out only so long as one of its members can exercise control over the others. It can maintain an armed truce. The UN has not done even that, simply because no one state has shown sufficient strength to take control. The two most powerful members have been in contention since its beginning and are now poised for a test of arms to determine the issue. Nothing is more certain than that the rivalry of these two powers will shortly reach the breaking point, that the UN shall collapse or shall be succeeded by another coalition in which one or the other will be on top.

The UN—it is moonshine to think otherwise—consists of two hostile camps, one held together by the American dollar, the other by fear of the Soviet Army. Neither law, morality, nor ideology is a cementing influence. If the American dollar is withdrawn the West will break up, its members entering into new alinements dictated by expediency; if the Soviet power shows weakness, Titoism will splinter the Red empire.

In short, it is evident now—even as it was to any one with some familiarity with the history of alliances—that the high moral purpose written into the charter of the UN charter is but a fairy tale. World peace is not to be achieved through this monstrosity. Like the League of Nations to which it succeeded, or the Holy Roman Empire, or any of the political coalitions in the history of the world, the UN is incapable of giving the world peace simply because it rests on the unsound assumption that peace is a function of politics. The fact is that peace and politics are antithetical.

When we look into the nature and substance of peace, and make comparison with the business of politics, we see how silly is this faith in the superstate. It is as irrational as the religions of totemism, animism, or fetishism. It is another magic-religion in which the hope of man for a better life rests on the mystic powers of an inscrutable authority, which must be propitiated into seeing things as man sees them. Just as primitive man sought the answers to all his questions in the totem pole, so does modern man look to political power to solve the problems of life. In both cases we have the same flight from self-reliance, the same escape from individual responsibility, the same mother-complex. That is the only way one can explain this blind faith in the efficacy of political power. The superstate idea is the most advanced form of this religion. The psychological identity of primitivism and statism is only obscured by the ritualism of charters, constitutions, and protocol.

SOCIETY IS PEOPLE

Peace is the business of society. Society is a cooperative effort, springing spontaneously from man's urge to improve on his circumstances. It is voluntary, completely free of force. It comes because man has learned that the task of life is easier of accomplishment through the exchange of goods, services, and ideas. The greater the volume and the fluidity of such exchanges the richer and fuller the life of every member of society. That is the law of association; it is also the law of peace.

It is in the market place that man's peaceful ways are expressed. Here the individual voluntarily gives up possession of what he has in abundance to gain possession of what he lacks. It is in the market place that society flourishes, because it is in the market place that the individual flourishes. Not only does he find here the satisfactions for which he craves, but he also learns of the desires of his fellowman so that he might the better serve him. More than that, he learns of and swaps ideas, hopes, and dreams, and comes away with values of greater worth to him than even those congealed in material things.

Society has no geographical limits; it is as big as its market place, its area of exchanges. The Malayan and the American are automatically enrolled in the same society by the exchange of rubber for a jukebox, and even the difficulties of language are overcome when a New Yorker confronts a Chinese menu. South American music became the idiom of the North American dance floor because automobiles are swapped for coffee and bananas. Society is the organization of people who do business with one another.

The law of association—the supreme law of society—is self-operating; it needs no enforcement agency. Its motor force is in the nature of man. His insatiable appetite for material, cultural, and spiritual desires drives him to join up. The compulsion is so strong that he makes an automobile out of an oxcart, a telephone system out of a drum, so as to overcome the handicaps of time and space; contact is of the essence in the market place technique. Society grows because the seed of it is in the human being; it is made of man, but not by men.

The only condition necessary for the growth of society into one worldism is the absence of force in the market place; which is another way of saying that politics is a hindrance to, and not an aid of, peace. Any intervention is the sphere of voluntary exchanges stunts the growth of society and tends to its disorganization. It is significant that in war, which is the ultimate of politics, every strategic move is aimed at the disorganization of the enemy's means of production and exchange—the disruption of his market place. Likewise, when the State intervenes in the business of society, which is production and exchange, a condition of war exists, even though open conflict is prevented by the superior physical force the State is able to employ. Politics in the market place is like a bull in the China shop.

POLITICS IS FRICTION

The essential characteristic of the State is force; it originates in force and exists by it. The rationale of the State is that conflict is inherent in the nature of man and he must be coerced into behaving, for his own good. That is a debatable doctrine, but even if we accept it the fact remains that the coercion must be exercised by men who are, by definition, as bad as those upon whom the coercion is exercised. The State is men. To cover up that disturbing fact, the doctrine of the superpersonal State is invented; it is more than human, it exists distinct from the people who staff it. That fiction is given plausibility by clothing it with constitutions, laws and litanies, like "my country right or wrong." A religion of authoritarianism is built up around an idol.

But, ritual does not give divinity to a golden calf. The hard fact remains that the priesthood of the State are just men, and the coercion they employ reflects their human capacities and frailties. They cannot get away from those limitations. Whatever badness is in them will show up in their use of force. They are not made good by the power to impose their will on other men.

Getting down to the facts of experience, political power has never been used for the general good, as advertised, but has always been used to further the interests of those in power or those who can support them in this purpose. To do so it must intervene in the market place. The advantages that political power confers upon its priesthood and their cohorts consists of what it skims from the abundance created by society. Since it cannot make a single good, it lives and thrives by what it takes. What it takes deprives producers of the fruits of their labors, impoverishes them, and this causes a feeling of hurt. Intervention in the market place can do nothing else, then, than to create friction. Friction is incipient war.

Now, if the business of the state is to cause friction within any given segment of society, any one country, by what logic can it be shown that a world-state will prevent friction? If a small state is an evil, as the one-worlders insist, why should a big state be a good? Can an institution that is essentially antisocial be made prosocial, by enlargement? No matter how high the totem pole it is not God.

Reason and fact are at great disadvantage in confronting blind faith, and those who worship at the shrine of authoritarianism will not be shaken by argument. Yet, one cannot help asking how the superstate will employ its army; the worshipers admit that an army is necessary to its proper functioning. The army will certainly be used to suppress something, to stop some people from doing something that to them seems good. For instance, there are many people in the world who practice polygamy, some who practice polyandry and a few who go in for monogamy. Will the omniscient priesthood of the superstate use its army to enforce a uniform conjugal practice? In that case, of course, friction will result.

Or, if it is decided that the world has too much oil—the over-production theory—will the army be sent to Texas or to Iran to shut down the excess wells? When such frictional situations are brought up, the devotees of authoritarianism answer that everything will be resolved by the democratic process—a process that has never stopped war.

ONE WORLD—ONE MARKET PLACE

One worldism is not an impossible ideal; but, it is not attainable through the medium of political power. On the contrary, the organization of the world into a single society—which is what the one-worlders really want—can be acomplished only if people can rid themselves of the fetish of authori-

tarianism. If men could come to a belief in themselves, if they could lose faith in the golden calf of politics, if they could once reach the maturity of manhood, the law of association would do the rest. It is not necessary to plan or build a world society; it is only necessary to remove the obstructions to its growth, all of which are political and all of which stem from faith in authoritarianism.

Our own country furnishes an illustration. In the beginning, before Americans had been completely converted to this political paganism, it was stipulated that their market place shall be as large as the country; the erection of trade barriers between the component commonwealths was prohibited. As the frontiers of the country were extended the market place grew apace, and, in time, goods, men, and ideas moved without hindrance from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Mexico to Canada. Therefore, an American society grew up. It was not planned; it grew. Several times the little separate political establishments set up blocks to trade at their respective borders, causing friction, but on the whole their efforts have been frustrated by the spirit of free trade. (It might be well to mention, in passing, that the prime cause of the Civil War was protectionism, which is a dogma of authoritarianism.)

Let us look at a contrary example. Europe, which, outside of Russia, compares in size with the United States, is cross-checked with tariff barriers, and Europe has been a battlefield for centuries. Political particularism has prevented the flowering of an European society. It is impossible for such a thing to get going in an area darkened by passports and customs regulations. Time and again the doctors of political science have prescribed some sort of political union for the ills of Europe, on the assumption that such a union will be followed by a customs union. Quite the contrary; the borders between countries lose all meaning if the peoples can do business with one another; which is another way of saying, if the states get out of the way of society. No political union can set up a society in Europe; that can only come from uninhibited higgling and haggling in a common market place.

If their sense were not dulled by their idolatry, the One Worlders could draw a sound conclusion from these two examples; namely, that the only way to a world society is through free trade. This does not mean that free trade alone would guarantee world peace, for there are other political institutions that make for friction, but, it would go a long way. After all, if the customer is always right, how could he be an enemy?

A Letter to Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "A Letter to Mr. Truman," delivered by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, at the Temple, Cleveland, Ohio, on December 17, 1950.

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

A LETTER TO MR. TRUMAN

(By Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver)

Were I inclined to write a letter to President Truman at this time, when letter writing seems to have become a rather explosive avocation, I would dwell on two matters: First, the manner in which his choleric letter writing and emotional outbursts of recent months are affecting his own status and that of the American people in the world at a time when, to use his own words, we are the leaders of the free world, and the eyes of the world are upon us; and secondly, about the implications of the national emergency which he has proclaimed, not so much as far as the American people are concerned, but as far as he himself and his administration are concerned. Every citizen is called upon to put aside his personal interests for the good of our country. What does this spell out for the President himself and for those in whose hands are he lives and fortunes of 150,000,000 of American citizens?

The first matter, that of the letter writing, is the lesser in importance by far, except as it has revealed an overcharged and uncontrolled spirit which has greatly troubled the American people. Long ago Samuel Johnson wrote: "In a man's letters his soul lies naked." The soul exposed in Mr. Truman s letters of recent date gives very little evidence of that wisdom and calmness which he solicited of the American people in his address the other evening. This has caused many Americans to wonder apprehensively whether major decisions of the Chief Executive in far more serious realms of national and international affairs are similarly determined by temper, pique, and resentment, and are likewise made in a headlong and impetuous fashion.

Everyone realizes, I am sure, the terrible strains and burdens of the office of the President of the United States, especially in these dreadful times. No one envies Mr. Truman the heavy and nigh overwhelming responsibilities which are his. The American people is inclined to overlook an occasional outburst of irritability on the part of a greatly harassed public official. However, when this irritability appears to be by way of becoming chronic and expresses itself in language which is not permissible even to a private citizen, there is proper cause for disquiet and criticism. The President of the United States, for as long as he holds that exalted office—and it is the most exalted and illustrious office in the world—is never a private citizen. He never can dissociate himself from his office. Whatever he says or writes or does has to a greater or lesser degree public significance and repercussions. What a music critic writes about Margaret, good or bad, is of little importance, of little importance, indeed, but what the President of the United States writes to a music critic, or to anyone else, and the manner of his writing, can bring a sense of shame and dismay to the entire Nation and make the office of the President of the United States the laughing stock of the world.

There is much sound counsel to be found in our Bible to which I should like to draw the attention of the President. The Bible counsels men not to give way to gusts of anger, temper, and passion. If these admonitions are applicable to ordinary citizens, how much more so are they to men who occupy high position, whose every word is freighted with consequence. Thus, we read in the Bible: "It is the discretion of a man to be slow to anger and it is his glory to pass over a grievous wrong."

One who was himself a ruler of men, Koheleth, writes in his book: "Be not hasty to get angry, for anger rests in the bosom of fools." The wise Hillel, likewise a leader of men, frequently cautioned his fellow men: "Guard your temper." And the rabbis declared: "The speech of the wise is always a clean and decent speech."

Were I inclined to write a letter to Mr. Truman, I would in all good will and earnestness bring these matters to his attention and suggest that he do not write letters when he is angry, and that all of his letters, like all of his speeches, should be checked by a second party before they are mailed, and, above all, not to make public statements "off the cuff." His latest ad lib about the use of the atomic bomb fell upon the world almost with the destructive effect of an atomic bomb and sent Minister Schumann hurrying to London and Prime Minister Attlee flying to Washington.

Our President owes it to himself and to our country in these desperate times to avoid anything that might cause unnecessary irritation and resentment among our people, or that might lower the dignity of the high office which he sought and to which the citizens of the United States elected him. What has happened has not been good for the morale of our people and cannot serve as an inspiring example for the emulation of our youth.

I pass on to the second and more serious matter about which I should like to write to President Truman. In his address to the country the other evening, he summoned the American people to unity and self-sacrifice because of the grave danger in which our country finds itself. "Those of us who work in the Government," he stated, "will do our best, but the outcome depends, as it has always depended, on the spirit and energy of our people."

In my humble judgment there has been very little wrong with the spirit and energy of the American people. They did not fail, either in unity or in the spirit of sacrifice, either in the First World War or in the Second World War. Whatever was asked of them they performed, competently and patriotically. They gave their sons to the war, and their daughters—as many as the Government demanded. On the battlefields our fighting men gave an excellent account of themselves, and withdrew from no sacrifice in life or blood. Our shops, our mines, our mills were adequately manned. Whatever taxes our Government imposed upon our people they paid. Whatever restrictions and rationings were imposed upon them were complied with. There never was and there is not now any reason to doubt the loyalty, the patriotism and the readiness to sacrifice on the part of the American people in defense of their country or their freedom. I doubt whether the proclamation of a state of national emergency was really required to make the American people aware of how serious the present situation is.

The American people is not illiterate. They read their newspapers, they listen to their radio, they know what is going on in Korea; they know what is going on in the United Nations. Their sons are even at this moment fighting and some of them dying in Korea.

But they, the American people, do not make our foreign policy. They did not send our armies unprepared into Korea. They were not consulted as to whether we should go into Korea. According to our Constitution, Congress, and Congress alone, has the power to declare war and make peace. The Congress of the United States was not consulted about sending our troops into Korea. President Truman alone decided this grave issue by the simple device of calling this intervention not a war, but a police action. This police action has already cost our people 40,000 casualties.

Our allies likewise were not consulted. In his speech last Friday evening the President said that we must work with a sense of real partnership and common purpose with the other free nations who need our help as we need theirs. These partners were ignored when President Truman ordered our troops into Korea. The question is, Why?

The United Nations, too, were not consulted. It is the prime responsibility of the United Nations, not of the United States, to resist aggression in the world. It was only after President Truman launched our military effort in Korea that the United States asked for the approval of the United Nations. This is not the procedure outlined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Why did not our Government wait for clear directives from the United Nations in the matter of Korea? Why did not our Government ascertain before we moved in who else was going along and to what extent and with how many troops? Why did we not learn of the widespread reluctance of the other free nations of the world to become involved in Korea, as was later evidenced by the rather slim and purely token participation on the part of only a few of these nations? Why did we not learn about this widespread reluctance before we committed ourselves to what has proved to be one of the most costly and disastrous enterprises in all the military history of the United States? Why?

The strong suspicion entertained by many Americans that the Korean move was inspired by domestic political considerations connected with an approaching fall election has not been satisfactorily resolved. The administration had for some time, prior to last June, been attacked and badgered, especially by the Republican opposition, with charges of Communist sympathies, with responsibility for the victory of the Communists in China and the defeat of Chiang-Kai-shek, and with widespread infiltration of Communists in the State Department and other Government departments. For weeks on end, before the Tydings committee of the Senate, wild charges were made by irresponsible political gentry and by publicity seekers of the type of Senator McCarthy. The administration found itself on the defensive, with an important congressional election approaching. The invasion of South Korea by the North Koreans last June offered a tempting opportunity to demonstrate to the country that the administration was all-out anti-Communist, and that it was ready to strike at communism wherever it raised its ugly head. It must have been assumed that the undertaking would be in the nature of a small-scale police action, that it would be brief and not too costly, and that the North Koreans would take to their heels as soon as they saw the American soldiers coming. President Truman also dispatched the Seventh Fleet to patrol the Strait of Formosa to see to it that the Chinese Communists did not take over Formosa, thereby intervening not alone in Korea, where a clear case of aggression could be established against the North Koreans, but also in the Chinese civil war, where the victorious Chinese regime had already been recognized by Great Britain, India, and other countries. Along with the intervention in China, we also promised to send aid to the French in Indochina where they were fighting to preserve French imperial interests in that country. The administration reversed its former line and permitted itself to be swayed by domestic political considerations and to be intimidated by the rantings of ex Communists, ex isolationists, pro-Fascists, and cranks of all kinds, and maneuvered itself and the American people into the disastrous Korean adventure.

Was it the American people that failed in Korea? Why was our military intelligence so faulty? Why did it underestimate so catastrophically the fighting numbers and the fighting quality of the North Korean Armies, to the point where we were almost driven into the sea at Pusan? And why did the same thing happen a second time, and more disastrously, as our soldiers were advancing so confidently toward the Manchurian border, having been assured of an easy victory and the prospect of returning home by Christmas? Was our intelligence aware of the size of the Chinese Armies on the Manchurian border waiting to strike at us? If aware, why were our men, who were so vastly outnumbered, ordered to move on to the Manchurian border? If unaware, why are the military commanders who are responsible for this shocking blunder continued in their posts to this day?

Did our State Department know that China would enter the war? If it did, what preparations did it make to meet it? Why was the American people lulled into a false sense of security by inspired spokesmen who in so many words assured them that China would not fight? If our State Department did not know whether China would enter the war, why did it take the dangerous gamble to move our forces beyond the thirty-eighth parallel? Why did it choose to ignore the clear declaration of the Chinese Foreign Minister and of Nehru of India, who warned the American people that if we crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, China would come into the war? Why did we move beyond the thirty-eighth parallel? Why are we asking for a cease fire now when the Chinese and North Korean armies are advancing across the thirty-eighth parallel? Why did we not ask for it when we had reached the thirty-eighth parallel? Why did we reject the proposal of a neutral zone between Korea and Manchuria, which was favored by our allies?

These mistakes, these blunders, these failures, military and political, are not to be charged to the American people, although the American people, of course, will in the final analysis, pay the entire cost. These are the responsibilities and failure of the Government and of the administration and of those outside the Government and in the opposition party who provoked the Government to hasty action, and of those in Government who succumbed to the provocation, who fondly believed that an easy-going victory against the Communists in Korea would be a strong political weapon in their hands against the opposition in an approaching election.

The American people is now being asked to give many more billions of dollars to our Military Establishment, to build up the military strength of our country. The House of Representatives has already voted an additional $17,800,000,000 emergency defense bill. This will bring our total defense budget for the year to almost $42,000,000,000. I suppose that conditions being what they are, with the President of the United States warning us that our homes, our Nation, all the things we believe in are in great danger, the approval of such military expenditures is a foregone conclusion, and no patriotic American would wish to stand in the way. But the American people has a right to ask why we received so little in terms of fighting effectiveness for the many billions of dollars which they gave to the Military Establishment during the past few years. The American people has never been niggardly with its Armed Forces. What became of the $50,000,000,000 which was given to the Armed Forces during the past 4 years? Why were we so unprepared in June 1950?

Before the Second World War, in 1939, we spent on our Armed Forces a billion four hundred million dollars. In the last 8 years—peace years, mind you—we spent on the average of $13,000,000,000 annually. Yet we were unprepared.

The President said the other evening that on June 25 of this year we had less than 1,500,000 men and women in our Army, Navy, and Air Force. Thirteen billion dollars is a powerful lot of money to spend on such a small fighting force. In 1941, when our Army and Navy numbered a million and three-quarters men, we spent $7,000,000,000. In 1950 we were spending twice that amount on a smaller Army and Navy and Air Force. Is the unpreparedness of our Armed Forces so glaringly demonstrated in the Korean affair due to the failure of the American people to provide adequately for them, or is it the failure of the men at the top to get a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar paid by the American taxpayer? Have those who work in the Government really done their best, as the President promises they will do in the future?

I cannot escape the feeling that these glaring, tragic failures have been at the top—lack of consistency, courage, and statesmanship on the part of our political leaders, and blunders, waste, and poor management on the part of our military commanders and administrators. Theirs is the major responsibility for the plight in which the American people finds itself today.

There is always the tendency on the part of our political and military leaders, when their policies or their actions result in failure, to shift responsibility from their own shoulders to those of the American people. Somehow it is always the American people who are responsible for all that goes wrong.

It is proper to alert the American people today to the grave dangers in which they find themselves, as the President has done, but more is needed to meet the dire emergency—much more. In the first place, there must be self-examination at the top level. A sense of omniscience is not conductive to sound government, nor is impatience and irritability with suggestions and criticism, and narrow partisanship and a desire to make political capital out of grave international situations.

There is in my judgment need for a reexamination of our entire foreign policy which has been going from bad to worse ever since President Truman, on his own responsibility announced the so-called Truman doctrine and pledged our country to resist communism all over the world, a commitment on which we are simply not able to make good and one which our allies are unwilling to back up. A reexamination of our entire foreign policy is called for. It is no loss of face for a government which has pursued a policy which has been found wanting or inadequate or dangerous to reconsider and reexamine and adopt a new policy. It is far better to change to a sounder policy than to be unchanging in catastrophic wrong-headedness. Finally, there is need for a reorganization of our Military Establishment with an eye to greater economy and efficiency.

Without leadership a people perishes. It is to leadership that we must look for our salvation, a leadership which will match words with action and which will treat the American people as mature people who know the score.

In his address the other evening the President announced four things which the American people must do and will do in this crisis. I am in perfect agreement with all these four things. First, he said, we will continue to uphold and, if necessary, to defend with arms, the principles of the United Nations, the principles of freedom and justice. Fine. But please, let the United Nations decide when the principles of freedom and justice are endangered, and what should be done about it. That is its business. Let the deliberations and decisions and actions be collective—not unilateral. Let us not act first and then get the approval of the United Nations for our actions. The United Nations has assumed the responsibility of keeping law and order in the world. Please, let us not have a private Truman doctrine of our own. Let us not do our own private policing. Let us not jump into Formosa or Indochina or Korea or elsewhere—and there are a hundred potential

danger spots in the world—until the United Nations directs us, along with all other nations, to act. We must avoid not only aggression, which we are not likely to indulge in, but aggressiveness as well. Let us strengthen the United Nations. Let us channel whatever help we can give to the world through the United Nations. Let us strengthen this international organization, which is the sole hope of a stable world to come.

Secondly, the President said he would continue to work with the other nations to strengthen our combined defenses. Excellent. But let us be practical about it. Let us make sure how far the other nations are prepared to go along and how much they are prepared to pay out of their own resources to strengthen their own defenses. Of course, they will permit us to help finance their military establishments, but they may not be willing to use them every time we think they should. Let us not drain our own resources too far to equip other nations militarily. Let us think first and foremost and always of our own defenses. Again, in our eagerness to organize the world against the Soviet Union and line up the free nations of the world against Communistic dictatorship, let us not undermine our moral position in the world by allying ourselves with Francos and Fascists and Titos and Nazis in Europe and reactionaries in Asia. It makes the Voice of America sound hollow in the ears of the world. In the long run that will undo everything that we are trying to do.

The President urged us further to build up our Army, Navy, and Air Force and to make more weapons for ourselves and our allies. By all means, let us build up to full strength, but let us not bankrupt ourselves by trying to arm half the world against the other half. Our resources are not limitless. Our Government is already $257,000,000,000 in debt. It is the hope of the Soviet Union that we will destroy ourselves through bankruptcy and sink our military strength into the great Serbonian bog of Asia.

The President finally urged that we expand our economy and keep it on an even keel. Nothing is more important than that. We must guard against inflation through greater production, higher taxes, and through price and wage control. In this connection, an American has the right to ask why the President of the United States did not use up till now the powers which were clearly his to control prices and wages, and why he permitted our country to move into the dangerous inflation spiral in which we already find ourselves.

These are some of the things about which I should like to write to Mr. Truman. I should also like to draw his attention to some words which he himself uttered the other evening and suggest that in those words lies the right direction of statesmanship in these dire days. He said, "There is no conflict between the legitimate interests of the free world and those of the Soviet Union that cannot be settled by peaceful means, and we will continue to take every honorable step we can to avoid general war." This is quite different from the dogmatism, the rantings, and the war-mongering of so many others which are so frequently heard these days.

Stalin, too, has declared more than once that the Communist world and the capitalist world could live side by side in one world. Truman does not trust Stalin. Stalin does not trust Truman. Hence the impasse. But it is clear that only in the direction of courageous and continuous exploration of every avenue for reaching understandings if only piecemeal, only in the direction of negotiation, earnestly sought and welcomed, lies the hope of the world. Negotiation is not appeasement. Let not the American people be persuaded into closing their minds at the sound of the word "appeasement." It is today a tabu device to paralyze thought and wise diplomatic action. There should be urgent and continuous exploration of every opportunity for coming to an understanding with the Soviet, a nation which we cannot defeat in war any more than it can defeat us.

Our defeat in Korea is not a fatal defeat. Bataan and Dunkerque did not determine the outcome of the Second World War. We are a strong and powerful Nation. We can become stronger and even more powerful. We are faced with most grave and menacing problems, and while we should do all that is practical and necessary to build up our military strength, we should bear in mind always that the basic solution lies not on the battlefield. It will have to be found at the conference table.

Our appeal to our national leadership in Washington, which we make in all good will, for we are all involved in one common destiny, is to be courageous and unafraid, not to be swayed by partisan political consideration and not to allow itself to be stampeded by warmongers, fanatics and cranks, and by those who would push us into war for reasons which have nothing to do with love of country. There are those in our country who do not want an understanding with Russia. There are those even in high Government posts who are ardently advocating a preventive war with Russia. There are those who will try to sabotage any possibility of agreement. These are our real enemies. When our President will give the American people the kind of leadership they need and crave for, the American people will back him up 100 percent. The American people have always rallied to the defense of their country whenever it found itself challenged and endangered.

Senate Bill 349

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter under date of January 29, 1951, from the Honorable Douglas McKay, Governor of Oregon, advising me that at a meeting of the Natural Resources Advisory Committee of the State held on January 24, 1951, the provisions of this bill were discussed. This committee is deeply concerned over the provisions of title 2, section 215, paragraph C of the bill which would seem to authorize the bypassing of State, municipal, and other local laws and believes that for that reason the bill should be modified to obviate this undesirable feature. The following is a copy of the letter:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Salem, January 29, 1951.

Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: At the meeting of my natural resources advisory committee on January 24, 1951, certain sections of Senate bill 349, which related to the construction and operation of community facilities and community services for defense housing projects, were discussed. The committee, which consists of the executive heads of State departments concerned with the development and conservation of natural resources, was particularly concerned with the provisions of title 2, section 205, in which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized, without regard to any Federal, State, or municipal laws, ordinances, rules, or regulations, to do all things which he determines necessary or desirable in the public interests for and in the planning, acquisition, construction, and maintenance of housing or community facilities.

"Community facilities," as defined in title 2, section 215, paragraph C, include waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage and refuse disposal facilities, police and fire protection facilities, public sanitary facilities works for treatment and purification of water, schools, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets and roads, and day-care centers.

The committee, by unanimous vote, objected to the provisions granted to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in regard to public water supplies, public water supply systems, sewers, sewage treatment works, public sanitary facilities, and water treatment or purification. The State of Oregon has been endeavoring for a number of years to remedy sanitary conditions in our streams and for public places. It has been conscious of the necessity for the conservation of its natural resources and for the protection of public health and, as stated above, planned programs for the improvement of water supplies and abatement of stream pollution are now under way, and for the Government to step in and ignore these things will not only disrupt the State's program but we will lose much valuable education on that subject that we now have.

The committee feels that it is very much against the public policy for the Federal Government to disregard State or municipal laws. Also, the committee feels that if public housing is constructed along this line it might be some time before we will be able to make a clearance and thus we will continue to have a disregard of sanitary authorities.

It is the belief of the committee that public policy, as expressed by paragraph 8 of section 2, is sound. It reads as follows:

"Any department or agency performing functions hereunder shall, in carrying out such functions, consult with the appropriate State and local agencies having responsibilities in connection with the planning, provision, construction, or operation of community facilities or services, so that, insofar as practicable, community facilities assisted or provided pursuant to this act may be integrated with State and local programs for such facilities and services."

It is my earnest request that everything possible be done to change this act before it becomes a law.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Governor.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 8, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the January 31, 1951, issue of the Southwest Citizen published at Lake Charles, La.:

WHY ROCK THE SHIP OF STATE?

For a number of years now, the New Deal's Fair Employment Practices Commission has

been a hot political potato. The greatest opposition to it has come from the South and passage of the bill has been effectively prevented in Congress.

The ostensible purpose of the FEPC is to protect minorities in competition for jobs and to assure them a square deal. What the bill actually does, however, is to give bureaucrats virtual control of the hiring and firing in private industry.

For instance, if the member of a minority group—and there are hundreds of these groups for they consist not only of persons of certain races but also those of various political and religious complexions—applies for a job as a bookkeeper and is not hired, he may, if he thinks he did not get the job because of his minority status, take his case to the bureaucrats who could force the employer to give specific reasons why the complainant didn't get the job. And if these reasons are not satisfactory, the employer can be forced to hire the man he rejected if, in the opinion of the Government, he is qualified to hold the job.

Our own feeling is that the proprietor of a business is entitled to hire or fire his workers as he sees fit and that it is not the Government's business what his reason is. If a businessman doesn't want to employ a Negro, an Indian, a Republican, or a member of any other minority group, he should not be forced to do it or even to be required to give his reasons therefor.

The South has borne the brunt of the fight against the FEPC and has thus been saddled with the public opprobrium generated by the professional tub-thumpers who get paid in money or in votes for their noise. Yet there is no real southerner who bears any ill will toward the Negro or who will not do more than his share to educate him, to give him work for which he is qualified, to help him get started in his own business. And we note on every side that the Negroes who are making the greatest progress economically are those who are getting the help of the southern white. Precious few of them are helped by the righteous orators who would exploit their minority status for political profit.

We believe it can be said truthfully that, on the whole, the white and colored elements of our southern population get along together very well. Our Negroes have always participated enthusiastically in every local civic drive and program to improve our community. The white population has voluntarily instituted, and is largely paying for, a program for better educational and sanitation facilities for our Negro friends. The end effect will be that colored men and women will continually improve their qualifications for better jobs. The white people know this and encourage it. And this effort will be continued.

The passage of an FEPC bill thus is an extremely controversial matter and tempers will boil if such an attempt would be made now. It would seem unwise to push such proposed legislation through Congress when our entire energies should be voted to the far more serious problems of organizing our national defenses and guiding the ship of state through the shoals of foreign threats. It would seem prudent to avoid intense wrangling over what are essentially peacetime side issues. It should be the logical purpose of everyone from President Truman down, to do all possible to promote a national unity of purpose.

Yet it is now reported that the President, who has failed to get an FEPC through Congress, will create it by executive fiat. Under the cloak of the war emergency, he is preparing to order FEPC into effect as a wartime necessity solely by means of a White House order. This may or may not be politically astute but the effect will be damaging to the Nation's effort for it would breed grave sentiments of distrust in his leadership.

We hope that the President will reconsider the matter or that those advisers around him will succeed in persuading him that now is no time to rock the ship of state.

An Irresponsible Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Irresponsible Budget," written by Henry Hazlitt, and published in Newsweek for January 29, 1951.

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

AN IRRESPONSIBLE BUDGET

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Senator BYRD was using the language of restraint when he declared that President Truman's budget of $71,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year was "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility." Mr. Truman no longer seems to attach any meaning to figures, or even to pledges. He has repeatedly promised "rigid economy in nondefense activities." And he solemnly continues his lip-service to "strict economy" in the very budget in which, as Senator BYRD points out, proposed nondefense spending is increased "to the highest level in the history of the Nation."

Mr. Truman threw in practically the whole Fair Deal spending program—compulsory health insurance, bigger unemployment benefits, Federal subsidies to education, including nursery schools, more public power projects, including the St. Lawrence seaway, more Government housing, more handouts to foreign countries for "economic recovery," and on top of all this, the Brannan farm plan, the year-to-year cost of which is indeterminable.

It may be doubted whether Mr. Truman seriously intended this as a budget or meant it only as a campaign document—so that, in 1952, he can tell the pressure groups that he asked for everything, and only a niggardly Congress denied it.

The response of Congress to this budget was much milder than it should have been. Senator BYRD's estimate that it could be sliced by $7,000,000,000 was very moderate. Representative TABER's contention that it could be cut by $4,000,000,000 was even more so. I hazard the guess that with proper Federal policies and proper administration of spending, the whole $16,000,000,000 difference between the proposed $71,000,000,000 of spending and the $55,000,000,000 of prospective tax yields could be cut, making it possible to balance the budget without increasing taxes any further. And the result could be both more production and better defense.

Mr. Truman still talks of Government expenditures as if they came out of some fourth dimension and bought more things than were bought before. All they do is to change the direction of spending. What the Government pays out to Paul it must take from Peter. What it spends on Government project X it must take away from unborn or unexpanded private projects Y and Z. For every speech Mr. Truman makes on how many "new needs" he is meeting by his $71,000,000,000 of expenditures, millions of mute inglorious taxpayers could make a speech on how many old and new needs they will be unable to meet because these billions will be taken away from them.

It is not enough for Government to prove (though it seldom attempts even this) that every dollar it spends meets some vague "need" or other; it must show that every dollar it spends meets a greater need than it would have met if the man who earned it had been allowed to spend it on his own family or for his own projects.

Nor should we allow the magic word "defense" to save a proposed expenditure from serious scrutiny. Once Congress permits the administration to set up a sacred and untouchable category of expenditures, it will find the administration shoving every proposed expenditure possible under that category. Today "defense" covers a multitude of fiscal sins.

If there is any fiscal responsibility in Congress itself, it will return Mr. Truman's 1952 budget to him without approval and request him to submit a responsible, balanced budget with a certain specified number of billions sliced off the expenditure side. It will bind itself, in return, not to increase by its own appropriations either the total or any individual item of this revised budget. But it will not bind itself not to make any further reductions in individual items when the individual appropriation bills come before it. And its separate committees—including the Armed Services and Military Affairs Committees—will increase their technical and research staffs and make a far less perfunctory scrutiny of expenditure requests than they have in the past.

Senator Lodge's Exposé of Soviet Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Too Clever for Vishinsky," published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of November 21, 1950. The editorial deals with one of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

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

TOO CLEVER FOR VISHINSKY

HENRY CABOT LODGE, United States Senator and delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, veteran soldier, too, who fought for the defense of Russia against the Nazis, in his statement last Sunday exposed Soviet planning, laid bare to the world the doctrine that Andrei Vishinsky, Russian Foreign Minister, is uproariously setting forth in orations.

Senator LODGE pointed to the declaration of the "great Lenin," as the Communists call him, that "a just war is not an aggressive war but a liberating war which is designed to defend people from foreign attack and from attempts to enslave it, or the liberation of people from capitalistic slavery"—a declaration that Vishinsky had incorpo-

rated in one of his deliverances with approval, with endorsement.

Senator LODGE stripped naked, he pilloried, Vishinsky as committed to belief that a war to demolish the capitalistic or free enterprise system in the United States would be a "just war," not a "war of aggression." This Communist scheming is not new to the Americans but Mr. LODGE pinned down Vishinsky with his own words.

Were the Russians to begin a war to free the Americans from capitalism it would sink the Russian people deeper in poverty even though the Kremlin were victorious. It would reduce the Americans and their allies to pauperism. Defense preparations are now making the Americans poorer.

In such a war, were it won by Communist nations, only the chieftains, the moguls, the masters, the overseers, would profit.

From the Russian point of view all able-bodied Americans drawing wages, whether bus drivers, weavers, doctors, preachers, or presidents of factories, are wicked capitalists, oppressors of the people. To Comrade Vishinsky the 75-cent-an-hour American is a capitalistic felon, an enslaver of the masses—and Comrade Vishinsky, Comrade Malik, Comrade Stalin, and the other whip handlers, scourgers in Moscow, are enjoying the life of princes of the blood. A czar by any other name can live as well.

Senator LODGE is too clever for a Vishinsky. One cannot hide from him.

Spies and Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, favorable editorial comment continues to press for early action on a bill to permit the FBI and other investigative agencies to intercept communications in order to apprehend spies, traitors, saboteurs, and disloyal elements in our country.

The people are justifiably aroused over the reversal of the conviction of Judith Coplon, a former Federal employee holding a highly responsible position. Unless Congress acts promptly, we may see the releasc of many other against whom the evidence of criminal acts is overwhelming, but who can evade punishment on technicalities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials, endorsing a measure I have introduced, from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, the Champaign-Urbana (Ill.) Courier, and the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union. The editorials follow:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of January 13, 1951]

SPIES AND LAWS

Congress has passed, at the Justice Department's request, a bill authorizing FBI agents to make arrests without warrants in cases involving espionage, sabotage and other felonies.

Another bill, introduced by Congressman K. B. KEATING of New York, would legalize FBI wiretapping to obtain evidence against suspected spies and saboteurs.

Both measures result from the New York Federal Appeals Court decision which voided Judith Coplon's conviction for stealing secret Government information and giving it to a Russian agent. The court held that, although her guilt was clear, Miss Coplon had been deprived of the constitutional right to due process of law because:

1. FBI agents, who arrested her without a warrant, failed to prove as present law requires that this was necessary to prevent her escape.

2. The Government failed to prove that FBI wiretaps led to none of the evidence used in obtaining her conviction.

Present Federal law makes it a crime to intercept and divulge communications. Yet the FBI does intercept—does tap wire—in its work of protecting the country from spies, saboteurs and other public enemies.

It first must get permission from the Attorney General, who acts by authority of an executive order issued by President Roosevelt in 1940. But if information the FBI obtains by wiretapping is divulged by its use as evidence in court, that can give a guilty spy basis for a successful appeal from conviction.

That is a ridiculous situation.

If FBI wiretapping was essential to national security in 1940, it is more essential now. It should be legalized. Information obtained by this method should be made admissible as evidence. And safeguards against its abuse, and for the rights of innocent persons, should be provided.

The Keating bill proposes that the FBI be required to obtain wiretap permits from Federal courts, upon showing of good reason to believe that information thus obtained is necessary to proper investigations. This would seem a much better safeguard than the present requirement for permits from the FBI's boss, the Attorney General.

[From the Champaign-Urbana (Ill.) Courier of Decemi r 24, 1950]

REVIEW WIRE-TAP BAN

Heightened concern over the national security may lead, it now appears, to a review of the use of wire taps as a means of gathering evidence against spies, traitors, and saboteurs. Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, made the first step when he introduced a bill to permit Federal Bureau of Investigation agents to obtain Federal court orders for wire tapping, if national security appears involved.

Some modification of the doctrine which bans the use of wir tap evidence clearly is needed. Representative KEATING calls the rule absurd and it certainly proved so recently when Judith Coplon's conviction for plotting to spy on this country for Russia was overruled on grounds that part of the evidence against her was gained by wiretapping.

The proposed change now becomes a matter of practical necessity. As the law stands, it permits spies to conduct their nefarious profession over American telephones. Government agents may suspect the tenor of the conversation, but are not authorized to listen in.

Permission to tap wires should be doled out sparingly, surely, for the private rights of the citizen must be guarded. The author of the bill, however, has provided against a possible danger of too free a use of the privilege when he asks that FBI men and military intelligence agents secure court permission before using the tapping system.

Fact is, the average citizen conducts business over the telephone of less importance than is ordinarily believed. If his conversation was really important, he would protest more vigorously than he does the party-line systems in use in all rural areas and in many city systems.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union]

KEATING BILL SHOULD PASS

A teapot tempest is still raging on the question of allowing the FBI to tap telephone conversations of suspected foreign agents.

With thousands of American boys already lying in Korean graves, we think it's high time to start helping instead of hindering the FBI. But many well-meaning persons still raise the bloody shirt of "martyred" civil liberties at such a suggestion.

Obviously, no sane person wants to start scrapping civil liberties wholesale. From Bunker Hill to Wonju our soldiers have fought to preserve a system of government whose core is the protection of the rights of the individual.

There are inconsistencies in the objections raised to FBI wire tapping. For example, it's permissible for an FBI man to eavesdrop on a conversation in a restaurant, but he can't eavesdrop on a telephone conversation.

Police of many States can use wiretap evidence on minor crimes, but the FBI can't use it in efforts to guard our Government against enemy espionage.

Representative KEATING has introduced a bill to remedy the situation. By making permission of a Federal judge necessary for such wiretapping, the bill attempts to protect the public against un warranted invasion of its rights.

This long overdue measure should be passed quickly.

Fighting Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement entitled "Fighting Inflation," published by the Life Insurance Association of America. The statement is dated January 1951.

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

FIGHTING INFLATION

Since the autumn of 1939 we have been experiencing a price inflation which has brought about a decline of 43 percent in the purchasing power of the dollar, with the largest part of this decline taking place since the end of World War II. This steady depreciation in the purchasing power of our money has inflicted hardship and privation on many whose incomes are fixed or relatively constant, and it has seriously reduced the real value of accumulated savings. The inflation which we have already experienced is bad enough, but with the outbreak of war in Korea we are suffering an acceleration in the upward movement of prices.

The basic cause of this development is that the demand for goods and services by the American people and Government, supported by a record-breaking volume of money outstanding, is running far ahead of the available supply at existing price levels. With the very high employment of labor and other resources which exists in our economy today, there is little opportunity for a rapid increase in national output to meet the expanding requirements of our military program. To an important degree, therefore, it is necessary to divert current output from civilian markets to the military program.

Under these circumstances, in order to prevent serious inflation we civilians must compensate for the increasing demand of the Government by restricting our demand to the supply of goods and services which can be made available at present price levels.

The 83,000,000 life-insurance policyholders have a vital stake in urging upon the Government that a stiff program be employed to fight inflation. This arises from the fact that an erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar cuts into the value of savings which policyholders have accumulated through life insurance. As a matter of fact, of course, inflation exerts an exceedingly adverse effect upon most savers, but it must not be assumed that inflation will affect only accumulated savings. The history of past inflations demonstrates clearly that when prices rise at a rapid rate they generally outstrip increases in wages and salaries and other forms of current income.

Moreover, experience also teaches us the lesson that every inflationary boom has ultimately led to a collapse. An economic collapse would be disastrous in that it would play into the hands of the Communist world and would involve in itself a serious threat to our freedom. It is noteworthy that Nikolai Lenin, the prophet of modern communism, held that debauching the currency is the best way to destroy a country.

Alarmed at the rise in prices which got under way with the outbreak of war in Korea, Congress acted promptly in passing the Defense Production Act and in enacting an increase in personal income taxes. In addition, the Federal Reserve Board and the various Government housing agencies have acted quickly to tighten consumer and real estate credit. The measures taken so far are commendable, but they must be broadened and strengthened if we are to win the battle against inflation.

We believe that inflation can be stopped and held in check if steps along the lines outlined below are taken in time by the Federal Government. For the present, at least, inflationary pressures can be halted through the use of indirect controls without the need to resort to direct controls such as general price and wage ceilings and rationing. Indirect controls, if stern enough, have the great advantage of getting at the heart of the inflationary process which lies in the excessive effective demand for goods and services. They also have the advantage of not interfering with the freedom of choice of individuals. On the other hand, direct controls deal merely with the symptoms of inflation without getting at the basic causes, and for this reason should be employed only as a last resort. Even then, to be effective they must be accompanied by powerful indirect controls.

THE MEASURES WHICH SHOULD BE TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT

The basic reason for the inflation we have been experiencing is that our money supply has expanded faster than the supply of goods and services, so that the key to an effective fight against rising prices is a well-rounded program by Government directed toward reducing the active money supply in the hands of the public.

The volume of bank deposits and currency held by the public has risen from $63,300,000,000 at the end of 1939 to $173,000,000,000 at the end of October 1950 with a sharp increase of $5,900,000,000 occurring from the end of March through October of this year. Furthermore, in recent months money has been turning over at a much faster rate. The measures adopted by Government, therefore, should restrict not only the current income of the public but also the accumulated money supply. These measures should include the following:

Increased Federal taxation: The military-preparedness program in its present dimensions and all other Government expenditures should be carried on a pay-as-you-go basis. The taxes chosen to raise additional revenue should be geared to cut directly into the mass purchasing power which has given rise to inflationary forces.

A broad extension of excise taxes, or the imposition of a general spending tax, should be given careful consideration. This form of taxation is a direct deterrent to spending and an encouragement to saving both because of the tax itself and because of the psychology of it. The tax should not be applicable to necessities such as food and clothing at the minimum level.

A further rise in personal income taxes, when required, should be levied across the board on a straight percentage increase. A sharply graduated income tax will fall short in yielding revenue and will weaken the incentive which is needed for harder and more efficient work to increase production. It should not be forgotten that over a period of time expanding production is probably the most effective way to combat inflation.

When it becomes necessary to place a heavier tax burden upon corporations, this should be done by increasing the present corporate income tax. An excess-profits tax should not be employed because it is distinctly inflationary in that it leads to unnecessary corporate expenditures and discourages efficiency and increased productivity.

Reduced Government expenditures: As all individuals and business concerns will be called upon to cut their expenditures drastically, clearly it follows that all nonmilitary expenditures by the Federal, State, and local governments likewise should be cut to the bone. This requires, particularly at the Federal level, a searching reexamination of the peacetime functions of Government and the elimination or pruning of many activities. With the additional demands of our military program the burden of Government expenditures will be crushing without continuing to carry many items which were put into the Federal budget in the postwar period. Furthermore, although our military program must be sufficiently large to play our proper role in the preservation of freedom throughout the world, at the same time rigorous care should be exerted to insure that military expenditures are made efficiently and with a minimum of waste.

Tightened monetary and credit controls: A pay-as-you-go tax program is the cornerstone in the fight against inflation, but it is not enough to do the job. Its restrictive effects could be defeated by an expansion of credit and a resultant increase in the money supply, as well as by the spending of liquid assets which are now held in very large volume by the American people.

The action which has already been taken by the Government to curb real-estate and consumer credit is highly commendable because much of the current inflationary boom lies in the housing and durable-consumer-goods fields. While we do not like to see housing, automobiles, or any other such goods denied to anyone, it is to the best interest of all of us that the Government restrictions have been put into effect. It is imperative that the real-estate and consumer credit controls be watched carefully in order to insure that they have the desired restrictive effect, but it is not enough to rely solely on selective credit controls.

The Federal Reserve Board should have freedom to employ its general credit-control powers in order to exert its maximum influence in the fight against inflation. Steps which have already been taken by the Federal Reserve Board to raise the rediscount rate, and its efforts through open-market operations to tighten commercial bank credit and thus to bring about a rise in short-term interest rates, have been in the right direction. The same is true of the Treasury's recent decision to raise the rate on 5-year notes. The guiding principle here should be that the Federal Reserve must be permitted to restrict bank credit even though as a result interest rates must rise. Neither the Government nor the American people can afford a policy of easy money and low interest rates in a period of strong inflation.

Anti-inflationary public-debt management: Through public-debt management the Treasury can and has influenced the money supply. Much of the Federal debt issued during the war and postwar period is lodged in the commercial banks or the Federal Reserve banks with the resultant effect of a greatly expanded money supply. During the next several years the Treasury will be faced with heavy refunding of maturing debt, and its policy in managing this debt should be directed toward getting a substantial part of the debt out of the banking system into the hands of savers.

The constructive effect of this policy would be to reduce the money supply in the hands of the general public. Any new issues of Government debt should be placed outside the banking system. In order to accomplish these goals, it will be necessary for the Treasury to make its securities more attractive to all types of investors, which means essentially a higher rate on Government securities.

Strong wage-price policy: The Government, through concerted efforts by its various branches and by means of appeal to public opinion, should strive to prevent further developments of the wage-price spiral. This means not only the avoidance of wage and salary increases designed to keep up with the cost of living—it also means the avoidance by business of unwarranted price increases. The various measures of indirect control urged in this statement will fail unless at the same time the Government, with the cooperation of labor and management, succeeds in holding down the wage-price spiral. By the same token, if the controls urged herein are used fully, much of the cause for the wage-price spiral will be removed.

COOPERATION BY INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESS

The measures outlined above can go far toward fighting further price inflation, but in the last analysis their success will depend upon a thorough understanding by individuals and business of the forces which give rise to inflation along with the measures needed to combat it. With this understanding the American public and business can be counted upon to cooperate with a determined program by Government along the lines set forth here to fight inflation.

The main elements of action by individuals and business concerns in the fight against inflation are clear. Both groups should keep their spending for nonessentials at an absolute minimum and should bend every effort to increase their current savings. Existing savings of individuals in the form of war bonds, bank deposits, and in other liquid forms should continue to be held out of the spending stream. Business concerns, as well as individuals, must refrain from hoarding goods. Scrupulous care should be exerted by both groups to conform with rules and regulations promulgated by the Government to control such things as real estate and consumer credit.

Finally, labor and management should cooperate in stopping a further rise in the wage-price spiral. Real sacrifice by all of us is needed to wage a successful fight against inflation. The objective is so compelling that we must make that sacrifice, and it will be made only if effective controls compel it to be made.

SUMMARY

Since the autumn of 1939 we have experienced a decline of 43 percent in the purchasing power of the dollar, and with the outbreak of the Korean War we are now suffering an acceleration in the upward

movement of prices. The basic cause of this development is that the demand for goods and services by the American people and Government, supported by a record-breaking money supply, is running far ahead of the available supply of goods and services at present price levels. Eighty-three million life insurance policyholders, in the interest of protecting the value of their insurance, have a vital stake in urging upon the Government that a stiff program be employed to fight inflation. The main elements of this program, which must be directed toward reducing the money supply in the hands of the public, are as follows:

1. Federal taxation should be geared to carry the military preparedness program, at least in its present dimensions, and all other Government expenditures on a pay-as-you-go basis. Taxes should be directed toward limiting civilian spending to the available supply of goods and services at existing price levels.

2. All nonmilitary expenditures by the Federal, State, and local governments should be cut to the bone and every effort should be made to insure that military expenditures are made efficiently and with a minimum of waste.

3. Selective credit controls such as those to control real estate and consumer credit should be employed as fully as necessary to restrict credit in certain boom areas, and the Federal Reserve authorities must have freedom to use their general credit control powers to curtail the money supply even though as a result interest rates must rise. Neither the Government nor the American people can afford a policy of easy money and low interest rates in a period of strong inflation.

4. In refunding the public debt, Treasury policy should be directed toward getting a substantial part of the debt out of the banking system into the hands of savers, thus reducing the money supply held by the general public. New issues should be made attractive enough to be placed outside the banking system.

5. The Government and business should pursue vigorously a policy of discouraging further rounds in the wage-price spiral.

These steps can be employed effectively by Government to halt inflation, but only if individuals and business concerns cooperate fully by cutting their spending to the bone and by increasing their savings, as well as by conforming in letter and spirit to the regulations issued by Government. It will require real economic sacrifice to combat the forces of Communist aggression successfully without incurring further inflation, but the American public, given sound leadership by Government, can be counted upon to make that sacrifice.

The Single Supply Catalog: An Essential Conservation Measure in Mobilization Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recent editorial comments indicate the impression prevails that nothing is being done toward the preparation of the single supply catalog for the Federal Government which was recommended by the Hoover Commission as an essential conservation measure. Accordingly, I inquired into the present status of this work. It is indeed gratifying to report the results of my inquiry to the Congress.

The supply catalog is now 45 percent complete, by the end of September 1951 it should be 75 to 80 percent complete, and the scheduled date of completion of the entire work is July 1, 1952. Already published in one form or other, and available for use of Government and industry, are 870,293 items.

The preparation of the catalog has necessarily included a vast program of simplification. For example, 1,000,000 gages of various types have been reduced to 186,000, of which 80,000 have been cataloged or published.

In addition to several hundred persons working on the stock catalog in Washington, there are more than 4,000 throughout the country. This staff, under the direction of the Munitions Board, is vigorously pushing to meet the scheduled dates of completion.

In view of the pending world crisis, conservation of our resources assumes a greatly increase significance in connection with mobilization. A most illuminating address on this broad subject, delivered on November 29, 1950, at the annual dinner and honors night of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in New York by Dr. Howard Coonley, Chief Conservation Planning Specialist of the National Security Resources Board, was published in the January 1951 issue of Mechanical Engineering.

Dr. Coonley's paper admirably summarizes the general conservation practices as developed in World War II, especially with respect to the supply catalog, and should remove much of the confusion in the public mind as to the scope of these activities.

To make Dr. Coonley's timely contribution more readily available to the Congress, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the Nation at large, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the indicated address which follows:

THE ROLE OF CONSERVATION IN MOBILIZATION PLANNING

(By Howard Coonley)

Conservation is not an American characteristic. Our people have ingenuity, adaptability, and driving power, but we are not by nature accustomed to make much out of little, to see how far we can stretch the cloth which is within easy reach. In short, we lack a spirit of thrift. It should not require a war or even a threat of war to make us aware of the necessity to save.

When I sat down to consider how I could impress upon this audience tonight their responsibility for the conservation that is essential if our country and our way of life are to survive, I realized that it would be wise to turn to our benefactor Noah Webster to define the word I am using as my text. The result of my investigation was not completely satisfying. Noah says: Conservation is, first, a process of conserving or preserving; second, official care or supervision as of a river or forest; third, keeping as of bees or domestic animals; and, fourth, making of conserves or preserves.

The conservation that I have in mind goes far deeper than these definitions. In our present crisis it is the ingredient that will expand the output of our mills and our machinery that urgently important additional amount which is needed to take care of civilian as well as military requirements, and thereby safeguard our Republic and assure the survival of the democratic nations of the world, whether our destiny be the terrors of another war or the blessings of long years of peace.

I am undertaking tonight to tell you briefly what your Government's present program is in the field of conservation and what is proposed for the future.

SIX ASPECTS OF CONSERVATION

The National Security Resources Board, to which I am giving a substantial portion of my time as chief conservation planning specialist, is not an operating agency such as was the War Production Board. Its responsibilities and its authorities are limited to the area of mobilization planning, to the coordination of Government activities, and to the inauguration and stimulation of such activities where necessary.

Conservation as practiced in World War II and as it must be considered in mobilization planning may be divided into six broad categories.

First on the list I should place standardization. Perhaps I should combine with standardization, specifications, for in Washington the two have quite different meanings. There, specifications are thought of as schedules set up for immediate production and procurement; standards are rules and regulations designed for longer-term use. They have the framework of permanency. Simplification is an important corollary of standardization. In these areas of standardization, specifications, and simplification, our ASME is deeply interested and plays a vital role.

My second category might be stated as measures to determine and safeguard supplies of critical materials. This is a subject that should have our complete backing whether or not an emergency is threatened.

Third on my list is the development of substitutes wherever necessary and possible. This should be the natural habit of prudent industrialists.

In fourth position I place a program of salvage and savings at the source.

Fifth is a cataloging of supplies under a system of standard identification to avoid duplication and waste.

And last but not least I place international cooperation in conservation measures. And I say last but not least deliberately, for it is my firm conviction that lasting world peace must be built upon an interchange of goods, services, and techniques on a basis of mutual benefit and friendly understanding.

In a brief statement of this kind I can only touch the high spots of my subject. Yet you should know and I hope you will approve and support the measures that are being taken.

USE BEING MADE OF RETIRED EXECUTIVES

The handful of specialists (I feel I can properly call them experts) that are responsible for the National Security Resources Board's conservation activities have been—with one exception—recruited from that great group of recently retired executives who are still charged with the necessary physical energy, and who have the priceless attributes of experience and knowledge to make them outstandingly valuable to our conservation planning efforts. I am letting no opportunity go by to recommend to other Government agencies that they turn to the rich field of the recently retired for the assistance they need in their expanding activities. I am further tempted to pause in my thesis long enough to say that it would be well, as it may be necessary, for our leaders of business to reappraise their theories of the mandatory retirement age for members of their organizations. One of the outstanding industrial economists attached to a great and successful corporation tells me that a recent survey indicates the useful years of life of our men and women workers are

rapidly increasing due, undoubtedly, to greater understanding of proper foods and broader knowledge of preventive medicine. He predicts that within the next generation the period of efficient service will have increased by 15 years over our earlier estimate. I believe it is in a large part due to the wisdom and maturity of our little band of "minute men" that we have been so universally welcomed by all Government agencies.

FUNCTION OF THE CONSERVATION SPECIALISTS

But to return to the work being done by our small group of specialists; our main duty is to keep open the channels of contact with all Government agencies to learn what each is doing in the area of conservation; to assist wherever possible; to offer suggestions where they are sought or needed; to develop methods of coordination and stimulation.

One of the first groups with which I became associated after I came to Washington in March of this year was the Interdepartmental Standards Council. In December 1949, this Council was set up to coordinate and direct the standardizing activities of all Government agencies and to prevent duplication and discrepancy. Sixteen Federal agencies, both military and civil, are represented on this Council, of which S. J. Kaidanovsky of the General Services Administration is chairman.

The conservation planning specialists of the National Security Resources Board who have wide industrial experience and many contacts both within and outside of the Federal agencies are very active in the deliberations of the Interdepartmental Standards Council. They have been able to offer guidance on problems of international as well as national scope and to suggest important opportunities for developing standards which justify the attention of the Council. One of their chief concerns is closer cooperation between Government and industry. There is far too little known by one group about the accomplishments of the other in the field of conservation, of which standardization is a tool. A group of liaison engineers such as the conservation specialists can perform a very valuable function in bringing Government and industry closer together for the accomplishment of common objectives.

The most active participation in the Interdepartmental Standards Council on the part of the military comes from the Standards Agency of the Munitions Board of which Col. A. E. Michelsen is chief. This agency is another miniature group whose functions are similar to those of the American Standards Association in that they develop no standards but provide the machinery through which the three divisions of the Department of Defense determine what standards are to be developed, select the members of the committees that do the actual work, and pass judgment on the standards when they are completed.

At the present time the Standards Agency of the Munitions Board is reviewing several of their standards for drawings and drafting-room practices and is planning on an expansion of these standards. In this program, we of the National Security Resources Board are giving them every encouragement. For we can conceive of no conservation measure that would prove of greater value to the mobilization effort than a unified set of industrial-military standards in this important area. Had there been available in World War II such a group of standards, millions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of skilled man-hours would have been saved. As sponsor for ASA Committee Z14, ASME has an outstandingly important position in this area. It is my deep hope that some way will be found for Committee Z14 and the Munitions Board Standards Agency to work together on this project, so that the standards may be truly representative of the best industrial as well as military thinking.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SUPPLY CATALOG

I will not attempt to speak further tonight on the need of a monthly list of critical materials, classified as to their current criticality or on the programs of substitutes for critical materials, on both of which our group is working. It is a matter which I am pursuing vigorously. But I do want to refer to the developments that are under way of a supply catalog, to which I referred as the fifth on my list of categories.

Confusion, delay, and unnecessary work were experienced during World War II because of the lack of a common language to describe the Government's supply needs. You all know the now famous story of a combat vessel turning 500 miles off its course to replace a broken bearing only to find that several bearings of the same dimensions were on board but stocked under different item numbers. At one time, 11 naval agencies and 3 Army agencies attempted to solve this exasperating problem by each developing its own system. Immediately after the war the Secretary of the Navy submitted this problem to the member bodies of the American Standards Association. As a result a standard method of testing bearings has been agreed upon. Another standard on dimensions and tolerances is about to be issued, and a numbering system is approaching completion. The antifriction-bearing incident is one of countless though less striking examples of the difficulties that have arisen because of the lack of a supply catalog.

The need for uniform Federal cataloging has long been recognized. Supply systems of Federal agencies have traditionally contained thousands of apparently different items when in reality many of them were thought to be different only because of the lack of uniform item names, descriptions, and stock numbers. As early as World War I, experience showed that the lack of a common language to identify the same item, or similar items, used by different branches of our Armed Forces, caused duplication and waste.

A Federal Standard Stock Catalog was published in a single series of volumes from 1930 to 1935. These volumes, together with the supplements that followed, contained only 350,000 items. Five million items are included in the supply lists of today. Use of this first catalog was limited to a few Government agencies that found it practicable to adopt a uniform system. By the beginning of World War II, most Federal agencies had developed separate cataloging systems thought to be best suited to their individual use.

Technological advances made during World War II flooded the various Federal supply systems with so many new items that the work of cataloging fell far behind that of procurement. As a result, identical articles were listed by separate branches of the same service under different numbers and descriptions and frequently under varying names. Out of the avalanche of demand for an adequate Federal supply catalog, facilities and appropriations for its development were ultimately provided.

The Federal catalog program is at present the joint responsibility of the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency, which represents Military Establishments, and the Federal Supply Service, which represents civilian agencies. Authority for coordination of the program has been delegated to the Munitions Board Cataloging Agency by the General Services Administration. The cooperative efforts of these agencies are expected to reduce the 3,500,000 supply items estimated to be in our military supply systems and the 1,500,000 supply items estimated to be in the supply systems of the Federal civilian agencies to approximately 3,000,000. In other words, the first goal in the cataloging program is to eliminate approximately 2,000,000 duplicate items.

IMPORTANCE OF THE CATALOG

It is obvious that the intelligent use of a uniform catalog will preclude the purchase of thousands of unnecessary items, but that is only the start of the conservation of materials that can be realized. A decrease in the number of items purchased by the Federal Government means less demand on our industrial capacity and less stress on overworked transportation facilities. It means savings in storage space, with a consequent decrease in warehouse construction and less demand for scarce building materials. It means fewer people required to handle Federal supplies. It means tremendous savings in taxpayers' dollars. And since a uniform catalog system is designed to facilitate delivery of the right item in the right place, at the right time, it will save precious lives in time of war.

Under the impetus of the war in Korea, the then Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson called for greatly accelerated effort in cataloging items of military supply. In a memorandum addressed to the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, in September, he asked that within a year cataloging be completed in certain selected categories, that contribute most significantly to national defense under conditions of either total mobilization or partial mobilization. It is estimated that from 75 to 80 percent of the items in military supply fall within these categories.

In this work the conservation specialists of the National Security Resources Board have played an important part. Largely through our efforts technical and trade-association executives are being called upon for assistance and advice, with the result that the catalog when completed will reflect to a large degree industrial practices. When you who are active in the industries that are still to be covered are requested to participate in this important undertaking, I trust you will recognize the obligation and the opportunity, and give freely of your time and experience.

THE FIELD OF COORDINATION

Perhaps the most important activity that will be undertaken by the National Security Resources Board in the field of conservation will be the re-creation of a Conservation Coordinating Committee which proved so helpful in World War II. In September 1942, Donald Nelson asked the Undersecretaries of the Army and Navy and the chairman of the Maritime Commission to appoint representatives to meet with the director of the then Conservation Bureau of the War Production Board to discuss ways and means of cooperating in an all-out drive for conservation. Later this small group was expanded to include Lend-Lease, Treasury Procure, the Aircraft Coordinating Committee, and the Board of Economic Warfare, and was given the name of the Conservation Coordinating Committee. The deliberations of this committee which resulted in broad unified programs of conservation were carried out with great success and with complete understanding and cooperation. Several weeks ago, Chairman Symington agreed that a similar committee should be set up under the chairmanship of the NSRB to include representation of all three divisions of the Department of Defense, the Munitions Board, the National Production Authority, and other Government departments and agenices that have a major concern with materials, facilities, manpower, and production. I have been spending my time for these several weeks visiting the heads of these departments and agencies so that the purposes and programs of the Conservation Coordinating Committee should be understood and

the ropriate representatives selected when the invitations from Mr. Symington are received. Nineteen departments and agencies will be represented. I am happy to say that the plan has met with enthusiastic approval.

In this somewhat disjointed outline I hope I have given you a preview of a united effort to make the most we can out of the materials, facilities, and manpower that are available to our Nation. The results should be fully as helpful in peace as in war.

A Young German Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the New York Times of January 31, 1951:

A YOUNG GERMAN SPEAKS UP

An 18-year-old German youth has become a hero of his people. Brought before a Communist tribunal in East Germany for distributing anti-Communist posters and injuring a policeman trying to arrest him, this young man, Josef Flade, told the court, "I love my liberty more than my life." When sentenced to the guillotine he calmly assured his judges that "thousands will avenge my death."

This act of courage has stirred all Germany as it has not been stirred since the heroic stand of Western Berlin during the Russian blockade. A wave of anger and protest not only in Germany but elsewhere in the world has now compelled the Communist regime to commute the sentence to 15 years' imprisonment. This means, of course, that Flade is likely to be shipped to Siberia to die a slower death. But his trial and conviction have made a mockery of Communist freedom and justice, and have brought home a warning which, more than the anonymous fate of millions, will, by its individual impact, make the Germans wary of Communist traps. What is more, the incident shows that even in East Germany the Russians still feel the necessity of yielding, at least on the public record, to the impact of popular opinion when it is aroused sufficiently.

Stop That Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, entitled "Stop That Leak," which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the DAR magazine.

Mr. Warren's outstanding career as a public servant in the House of Representatives and as Comptroller General is known to each and every one of us. I recommend his article for reading by every Member of Congress and by every American.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 2½ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

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

STOP THAT LEAK—TEAMWORK IN WASHINGTON MAKES THE TAXPAYER'S DOLLAR GO FURTHER

(By Lindsay C. Warren)

The Korean conflict has rudely awakened America from any dream of life-as-usual in the immediate future. A strong national defense has never been more urgently needed. The long arm of military necessity already has reached into thousands of homes. It will reach into every home, and touch each of us in some way. It will take an even larger share of our time and our effort and our money than it has before.

Americans never have shirked their assigned tasks in any fight. They stand ready to take up their belts to back up the firing line. They do not stint where their way of life is at stake. But they have always insisted that the time and the effort and the money they give freely be well used, particularly where it can mean the lives of fighting men.

In these critical days, we should take a good look at what has gone before. Now is the time to profit from past experience—not later. The hard lesson of past mistakes must be turned to our own advantage. We must search out and eliminate waste, and find new and better ways of doing whatever needs to be done. Every weapon must be brought to bear.

One of the most powerful weapons we command is our great national wealth. It is unmatched in world history. But, great as it is, it is by no means inexhaustible. Properly harnessed, it immeasurably strengthens the sinews of war. Wasted or misdirected, it can cost terrible hardship and even thousands of lives. It must be conserved, and carefully applied.

These are the watchwords of our leaders today. The whole Government is enlisted in the cause. The Congress worked day and night to enact wise legislation to provide the wherewithal to meet the emergency situation. The President has asked extraordinary powers to lead us in the crisis. Sweeping powers already have been given him to reorganize the executive branch, to consolidate functions and cut off those which are unnecessary, and to replace outmoded methods with modern ones. Vigorous action already has been taken, but much remains to be done. It is being done under forced draft, to be ready for whatever the future brings.

Mr. and Mrs. Citizen Taxpayer, and all the little Taxpayers, have a very special interest in all this. Already barely able to lift groaning heads under the assault of record peacetime spending, they face even heavier going. They look to their Government to see that it is not in vain.

As Comptroller General of the United States and the agent of the Congress, that is my vital concern. The General Accounting Office which I head is the Congress' own agency to check on the financial dealings of the Government. It is the great bulwark erected by the Congress against illegal and improper spending. Its task, and mine, is to see to it that the public moneys are utilized effectively, as directed by the Congress which controls the purse strings.

It has been said, also, that the Comptroller General is the personal Washington representative of every taxpayer. That is an apt expression of my feeling of responsibility. The fight against waste of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars is never ending. I intend to stay in the thick of it. Hardly less than the actual firing line, it is one for our children and our children's children. They will be called upon to pay for any weakening on our part now. That is why readers of this article have a very real and personal place in the fight.

Now, let's take a look at some of the things that have been and are being done with the public moneys. One bogeyman should be dispatched at the start. It is the popular misconception that fiscal matters are at best a dry subject, to be avoided at all cost. It is, unfortunately, a mental block to full understanding of how our money is used. At the risk of oversimplification, much of it can be easily dispelled.

The General Accounting Office—GAO in the Government vernacular—is one of the three central fiscal agencies of the Government. It is a part of the legislative branch. The other two are the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget. They are in the executive branch. These three central fiscal agencies together do for the United States just about the same job every housewife does for her home.

The money to run the Government is kept in the Treasury. It can be paid out of the Treasury only as Congress directs, by appropriations. It is spent, or disbursed, by disbursing officers.

The Bureau of the Budget prepares and presents the plan for use of the money to carry on the business of the Government. The plan, approved and financed by the Congress, is executed under direction of the President.

The General Accounting Office checks up for the Congress on receipts and expenditures. It watches where the money goes, to see that it is spent legally. More than $40,000,000,000 being paid out annually, involving 2,000,000 Government officers and employees, is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office.

Obviously, no household budget would be worth while without definite knowledge of what household income and expenses are. The operation would soon collapse. That is equally true of Government finances. Yet, during my 16 years as a Member of Congress before accepting the office of Comptroller General in 1940, I was forcibly struck by the lack of such essential information. No one could tell exactly how much was coming in from where, or how much was being spent for what.

Finding the answer to this perplexing problem was one of my first concerns as Comptroller General. The vast expenditures of World War II emphasized the need for prompt and vigorous action. With untold future demands facing us, solution of the problem is of paramount importance to every American.

The trouble was readily diagnosed. It was deep-seated in the hybrid structure of Federal accounting and financial reporting. That structure had been built, layer on layer and tier on tier, without any coordinated plan or supervision. No single agency or office had authority to enforce any corrective measures. It had just "growed like Topsy."

With the trouble isolated, the next and biggest step was to bring order out of chaos in the accounting and financial reporting. Simply stated, this means that those who receive and spend the money must be shown how to set down in their books of account clear and accurate records of how much money comes from what sources, and how much of it is spent for what purposes. Then

their transactions can be verified by an independent audit. They can be held responsible for any illegality. The audit is made by the General Accounting Office, which, being in the legislative branch, is entirely free of any dominance or influence from the executive branch where the bulk of the spending is done. Also, with proper accounting the public business can be more effectively planned and carried on, and the President, the Congress, and the taxpayers can be reliably informed of the state of the country's finances.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget came forward to join me in a concerted attack on this great task. Together we set up and nearly 3 years ago put into actual operation a joint program to improve and modernize accounting and financial reporting throughout the Government. All of the agencies were invited to participate as partners in the program, and have responded enthusiastically.

A special staff of highly skilled technicians was set up in the General Accounting Office to spearhead the program. They are working right in the agencies, in cooperation with their people. They are furnishing advice and all possible assistance to modernize and streamline accounts there and tie them in with others and with over-all Government accounting.

Tremendous progress already has been made under this joint accounting program. Each day brings substantial savings to the taxpayers and the promise of even greater ones in the future. The program is widely regarded as one of the most significant contributions in many years to economy and efficiency in government.

Although the joint accounting program already has yielded valuable returns, the work done has pointed up, also, weaknesses in the laws on the subject. New legislation has been badly needed to achieve maximum results. As the designated agency of the Congress on these matters, and one of the three central fiscal agencies, the General Accounting Office proposed such legislation in this session of Congress. The Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, as the other two central fiscal agencies, participated in the drafting and strongly supported the measure.

The Congress enacted a new Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. It provides additional means to bring about the complete revamping and modernization of Federal budgeting, accounting, and financial reporting. It is particularly timely as a new and potent weapon to strengthen our hands against the waste of public funds.

Some idea of the benefits which will come from the improvement and modernization of accounting and financial controls throughout the Government can be gained from what has been accomplished, in a smaller field, with Government corporations. World War I spawned a number of them, and many others were created in the ensuing years. They operated at public expense, but were not subject to financial control by the Congress. Some stayed in existence long after their work was completed. For example, one of them set up to requisition material for 1917–18 airplanes, still was being liquidated 30 years later.

In 1945 there were 101 of these corporations in what I told Congress was "an unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries." Often their charters were wide enough to drive a team of horses through. Some of the largest of questionable expenditures had been made by corporations. What was needed was to bring them under financial control of the Congress.

Congress passed the Government Corporation Control Act in 1945. It made the corporations subject to a commercial-type audit by the General Accounting Office and provisions of law relating to the Federal budget. Annual reports of audits are sent to the Congress. They have helped reduce the number of corporations by more than one-third, and to persuade them to pay millions upon millions in dividends into the Treasury.

It is not to be thought that the General Accounting Office itself has been overlooked in the program for greater economy and efficiency. It is not an office of professional do-gooders holding itself sacrosanct from panaceas prescribed for others. Quite to the contrary, it is the first place we look to see if new and better ways of doing our own job can't be worked out and passed on for the benefit of other agencies.

This inward turning of our scrutiny has wrought amazing changes. A Rip Van Winkle, waking today, would not recognize the General Accounting Office of old. Hidebound, antiquated procedures have been junked, and modern practices are replacing them. It is a continuing process, directed always toward greater efficiency and economy in our own operations so that we may help others achieve the same goals.

Each day the Office strives to do more and more of its growing duties, with less and less expense to the taxpayers. War-swollen payrolls stood at nearly 15,000 early in 1946. That figure now has been reduced by about one-half. Yet, at the same time far greater and more effective services are being rendered to the Congress, to other Government agencies, and to the taxpayers. By setting our sights higher, we are using our ammunition in more telling ways.

The best evidence of the accomplished results of this streamlining is the ever-increasing number of requests and calls for reports, advice, and assistance of the General Accounting Office. In 1 year, more reports are sent to Congress than in all of the years together before I came to the Office. Close cooperation and a helpful approach with the agencies in the executive branch have brought a similar response from that source.

Several other laws recently passed are scarcely less important, from the standpoint of potential economies and increased efficiency, than the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act mentioned previously. These, too, are parts fitting into the over-all pattern of coordinating and sensibly placing various Government functions which greatly affect the Public Treasury.

One of the new laws is the Post Office Financial Control Act. Under an old law, the accounting for the Post Office Department has been done in the General Accounting Office. One of the basic principles of the joint accounting program is that the agencies are responsible for the keeping of their own accounts. Consistent with that principle, this new law provides for the Department to keep its own accounts on a businesslike basis, subject to audit verification by the General Accounting Office.

Another one of these new laws is the Federal Records Management Act. It imposes on the Administrator of General Services the responsibility of leadership in an assault on the mountainous stacks and tomes of Federal records that threaten to engulf us.

The very size and volume of the piles of records, papers, documents, letters, reports, and the like is likely to completely defeat any value they may have had when made. Some idea of the magnitude of the problem and of the task undertaken may be gleaned from testimony given before a congressional committee by an expert. He showed that if just one page were added to each veteran's file in the Veterans' Administration, the total thickness of the files would be increased by one and a quarter miles. And that is the only one of hundreds of agencies.

This law will provide the means to scale and reduce the veritable mountain of Government records. Its aims are threefold. First, what is called the birth rate of records will be controlled. Only useful and necessary ones will be created, and those will be in proper form. Second, records now in being but not serving any useful purpose will be eliminated. Third, more effective use will be made of those in existence or created hereafter which actually are necessary.

The approach to the records management problem in this act has been likened to that which is working so well under the joint accounting program. Although primary authority to guide and coordinate the program is vested in the Administrator of General Services, all of the agencies also have been assigned their own special responsibilities and will participate as full partners. The General Accounting Office has given and will continue to give its full cooperation to get this program under way and make it a complete success.

So much for some of the work being done to realize on past experience in handling public funds. All of these activities are calculated to lighten the load on the taxpayers. They will pay handsome dividends in the form of real economies of operation and reduced waste, red tape, and duplication and overlapping of functions.

A great many other lessons, learned the hard way, should be kept fresh in our minds. They are the waste, extravagance, weaknesses, and ineptitude which plagued us in two world wars. If continued or repeated, they can seriously impede our defense efforts, and might end in defeat. With such practices rampant, the risks are multiplied. They must be rooted up and stamped out at all costs.

The great majority of World War II expenditures were for perfectly reasonable and proper purposes. But some were poorly conceived and executed; some were wasteful or wildly extravagant; some were so utterly ridiculous as to indicate a reckless disinterest in the national welfare; and some were actually criminal.

The scandalous waste was so shocking that even in the press of wartime business my sense of duty forced me to report to Congress how certain officers and employees were dishing out and giving away the property and money of the United States with reckless abandon. Contracting officers were obligating the Government for payment of hundreds of billions of dollars. Many of them, of course, were capable and efficient. However, some were highly inept and inefficient. Some showed unmistakable disposition or habit to ignore the taxpayers' rights. And some were downright thieves and crooks!

Our auditors found these officers allowing payments under cost-plus contracts for such extraordinary items as vitamin pills, juke boxes, and a $225 set of false teeth. These were not isolated instances; only the locale and things involved varied.

One aircraft manufacturer used some parts to make planes, charging the Government $10,000,000 for them under a cost-plus contract. The money was paid out, and everyone was happy—particularly the contractor. That is, until the General Accounting Office auditors came along and discovered that the parts actually had been bought and paid for by the Government from a different contractor. Every cent was collected back.

Another manufacturer charged the Government more than $1,000,000 as costs incurred under a cost-plus war contract. We found that he had been reimbursed for the identical costs long before, under previous contracts. This money was promptly recovered.

Three files are in my office, pulled at random from many records of war contract overpayments. In the first case a single bill was overpaid by $135,500. In the second the same thing happened, to the tune of $222,000. In the third a bill for $20,000 was paid twice. The General Accounting Office got back every cent in these and thousands of other like cases.

Small wonder that I strongly disapproved of the cost-plus type of contract and the way it was handled. Everyone was taken care of but the Government and the taxpayer. It was enough to make the blood boil. I told the Congress from my seat it looked as though everybody and his brother were out to get the Government during the lush war years.

These few examples are not intended to imply that we condone or countenance picayune obstruction. I see no economy in spending $100 to audit a $25 item. Nor should the purpose and the objectives of necessary audit controls be distorted so as to hamper an all-out war effort. General Accounting Office activities during World War II were geared to the war effort. I think it can be said with full justification that they in no way hindered that effort, but, in fact, were a real contribution.

For instance, every cent spent on the Manhattan Project was carefully audited. Highest commendations were given by the military on the way it was done. The auditors didn't ask, and didn't care to know, what was being produced. That project and many others of highest military priority involved billions upon billions of expenditures passing the watchful scrutiny of our auditors. Every conceivable type of payment and every kind of purchase and cost flowed by in an endless stream. Not once was the trust violated.

While on the subject of collection of illegal and erroneous payments, the General Accounting Office is one Government agency which pays its own way. It has caused the recovery and replacement in the Treasury of more than $700,000,000 just in the 10 years since I became Comptroller General. That is more than two and one-half times the cost of running the Office for the same period. But even this stupendous amount recovered in cash is relatively small beside the untold sums saved because the very existence of the Office prevents many more excesses. The sure knowledge that this independent congressional agency will examine into financial dealings is one of the most powerful of all deterrents to improper ones.

One of the most unfortunate schemes ever contrived to short change the taxpayer was the method adopted to settle terminated war contracts. Long before the end of hostilities some people urged that broad concessions must be granted to aid in reconversion to peacetime production. Cries of impending chaos if war contractors were not assured of all they might ask for terminated contracts led to legislation on the subject that was full of holes. Those who propagated it, viewing the profligacy of wartime contracting, seemed to think we had best "let the tail go with the hide."

I appeared before every congressional committee having jurisdiction and warned that an independent audit of these proposed billion-dollar termination settlements was essential to prevent tremendous losses. But the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 left such an audit completely out of the scheme of things. It directed that terminated contracts be settled by the very contracting officers who, as a class, had clearly demonstrated their incapacity for such an important assignment. Worse, it made the settlements final and conclusive.

The act wrote the General Accounting Office out of the picture, to all intents and purposes. The Office could not even look for or question or collect back excessive payments. It could step in only where there was fraud, and then only after the settlement was consummated. The limitations imposed made it virtually impossible to prove it even where it was reasonably certain that settlements were induced by fraud.

All that I warned of came about when terminated war contracts were settled under this act. Practically forbidden by law to rectify any of the damage, nevertheless the General Accounting Office found out enough to show by overwhelming evidence that the finality provision in the law was a whopping big mistake that was costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. The percentage of excessive payments and fraud reached an unprecedented high in the experience of the Office.

Contract termination settlements for World War II are about wound up. It is hoped that there will never be a recurrence of the costly results of this piece of hasty legislation. Such a law never again should be put on the statute books.

There was one unexpected, though perhaps small, bonus from the experience with World War II contracts. It was the actual knowledge gained of the unbelievably low moral standards of some officers and employees entrusted with the conduct of official business in a great emergency.

During the war I informed Congress of the dangerous habit of many officers and employees who accepted, or even themselves sought and solicited, wining and dining and expensive entertainment and all kinds of favors from war contractors. Such familiarity gives rise to a feeling of obligation, at the very least, and has a strong tendency to improperly influence those officers in the performance of their official duties for the Government. Heads of agencies issued directives strongly condemning it. But it persisted among the small fringe which is always ready to turn even national peril to personal profit.

Instance after instance has been found of former Government officers going to work for the very firms whose contracts they had handled while with the Government. The dealings in these cases are, of course, closely scrutinized, but obviously if any illegal or improper motive is present the guilty one generally has been clever enough and had ample opportunity to cover his tracks.

Existing statutes on the subject have had a salutary effect. Unfortunately, they are not broad enough to cover the present situation, and there has been a recent tendency to weaken them, particularly in wartime when they are most needed. Of course, no one would urge a law to penalize perfectly legal and ethical steps of Government employees to obtain private employment, or of private industry to obtain qualified employees. What should be guarded against are set-ups of the kind which are contrived at the expense of or risk of loss to the taxpayers.

After careful consideration of all phases of this matter, upon the special request of a United States Senator, I recently submitted suggestions for legislation designed to strengthen the law in this respect, while at the same time not in any way hampering normal and legal business activities.

These are a few of the more important things I have learned in over a quarter of a century in Washington. They are facts, pure and simple. They are not offered or intended to imply any undue criticism, or any pride of accomplishment. They will have served their purpose, and more, if from them we have gained the knowledge to save each of our taxpayers just a few dollars on his or her yearly tax bill.

Price Fixing Is An Economic Narcotic—The Record Proves It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a letter that appeared recently in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald.

In six paragraphs the writer has summed up the high lights of price-fixing attempts over 4,000 years of history.

As he indicates, price fixing has never worked. As a hot war economic narcotic, it may have merit. Under current conditions, it is at best a pious humbug; at worst, a cunning betrayal of trusting and patriotic citizens.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

CONTROLS

The history of controls is a record of 4,000 years of enslavement. Hammurabi (2285-2242 B. C.) had wage controls for boatmen, reapers, threshers, shepherds, laborers, artisans, bricklayers, tillers, stone cutters, milkmen, and carpenters. He regulated builders' fees and warehousing, and rentals of cows in milk, calves, oxen, wagons, freight and passenger boats. He brought nothing but poverty, destitution, and high taxes to the land between the two rivers.

The Hittite code (1350 B. C.) attempted to establish wage and price control but they had to be abolished. Henry III and George II tampered with the prices of grain and bread until an indignant Parliament kicked the royal edicts out the window. Edward II tried to control the production of seafood with the result that all fish disappeared from the markets of the British Isles.

France tried to put under iron control 39 necessities of life through the Committee of Public Safety. The law had under national compulsion "all who help handle, transport, and retail products of prime necessity." The people resisted these compulsions. Finally the battle became so violent that a counter-revolution took place, and on July 23, 1794, Robespierre, Saint-Just and Couthon were beheaded as enemies of the people.

The Roman Emperor Diocletian tried the same game. His words read like Truman talks. Diocletian's system was based on the highest motives of making the whole nation participate "in the blessings of that peace for which we have laboriously striven." It was necessary for the rulers like watchful parents of the whole human race to help the people from above. Finally on May 1, 305 A. D., the Romans gave Diocletian a swift kick in the pants. The previous partial controls of Tiberius, Commodus, and Alexander Severus also ended in failure.

A little perusal of American history shows we tried controls as far back as the Revolutionary War. On April 8, 1778, the Continental Congress record states: "It hath been found by experience that limitation on the prices of commodities is not only ineffective for the purpose proposed, but likewise productive of very evil consequences to the great detriment of the public service and grievous oppression of individuals."

There must be some other answer besides regimentation.

RUSSELL KEININGHAM,
Richmond, Va.

An Outstanding Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include three short articles from the annual progress edition of the Spokane Spokesman Review.

This year's progress edition is truly journalistic and printing art. All of the stories are short and very comprehensive. Each page is richly illustrated in full color.

The three articles included are short subjects with which, by their nature, Members of Congress are familiar and should prove interesting.

WORLD'S MOST USEFUL RIVER

Key to the economic development of the Pacific Northwest, including its inland empire, is Columbia River.

This stream and its tributaries drain 259,000 square miles, of which 220,000 square miles are within the United States. The other portion constitutes the southeastern corner of British Columbia.

That part of the Columbia Basin east of the Cascade Mountains comprises about 240,000 square miles, depending on the exact spot between Bonneville Dam and The Dalles where the line is drawn.

Waters of this basin were used to turn gristmill and sawmill wheels more than a century ago. Hydroelectric development came in the late 1880's, first on Spokane River.

Spokane, less than 15 years old at the time, was one of the first really electrified cities in the United States, and the first in the West

Waters were used for irrigation early in the last half of the nineteenth century, the Walla Walla Valley being the cradle of this development.

Mormon settlers from Utah also introduced irrigation into the Salmon River country.

Steamboats plied the rivers and many of the lakes long before railroads penetrated this part of the country.

First surveys of the Army engineers, looking toward development of the Columbia's main stream as far up as the international boundary, had navigation as the primary consideration, power as a secondary objective, and irrigation only as an incidental issue.

But in the last 35 years a program for comprehensive development of the basin has been shaping up, finally coming into official recognition as a joint project of the several States, the Army engineers, and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

It embraces power, irrigation, navigation, flood control, and fisheries.

Several ideas have been advanced as to how this over-all objective may best be accomplished. They include an improved voluntary association of interests such as now exists, an interstate and international compact under congressional sponsorship, a Federal authority or administration, and a superdistrict similar to the hundreds of districts that have already reclaimed 3,700,000 acres between the Cascades and the Rockies.

The number of separate projects grows from year to year as new possibilities are recognized, so that any estimate of the potential irrigated acreage or the possible power development is subject to change with every scientific advance.

A few years ago, for instance, the ultimate goal was 8,500,000 irrigated acres, and 30,000,000 kilowatts of electrical energy.

But both figures may be revised upward by a few simple devices such as sprinklers for irrigation (see page 24, part 4), and arrangements by which water already used for irrigation may be dropped through numerous small plants to produce still more juice.

These possibilities involve another controversial question—to what extent revenues of power may be used to subsidize reclamation projects in which the farmers could hardly charge enough for their products to make the irrigation installations profitable by themselves.

That also brings in a question as to uniform power rates.

More than 130 big and little dams now pour juice into a power pool that extends from central Utah to the British Columbia coast.

The Federal and municipal systems, public utilities and private industrial plants already joined into that Northwest power grid aid each other by displacements of electrical energy rather than by transmission over long distances.

The installations, including several steam plants, extend far beyond the Columbia Basin itself—into the Missouri Basin in Montana, into the Salt Lake Basin in Utah, and to the swift-flowing short rivers of the Washington and British Columbia coasts.

Power hook-ups with California hydroelectric systems are considered probable within the next 5 years.

Even before that, the independent systems on Kootenay River in British Columbia are likely to be added to the grid.

Existing power plants in the Northwest grid develop a total of 5,300,000 kilowatts, of which more than 3,000,000 kilowatts are within the basin.

Plants now under construction or authorized—including a few that have hard sledding because of objections by fisheries or other interests—will add about 3,750,000 kilowatts.

That includes a Washington Water Power Co. proposal at Cabinet Gorge, on Clark fork of the Columbia (Pend Oreille River), just below the Idaho-Montana State line.

Idaho Power Co. and Montana Power Co. are also building new plants in their respective areas, mostly on the upper Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, and on the upper Missouri.

ONE DOZEN INTERNATIONAL RIVERS

Twelve rivers cross the international boundary between the Rockies and the Cascades—three of them more than once. Farthest west is the Similkameen, which rises in Washington, flows north across the line and returns after receiving the waters of the American-sourced Pasayten and Ashnola. The Okanogan, which rises more than 100 miles north of the border, receives the Similkameen at Oroville, Wash. Kettle River, rising at Mount Monashee, 80 miles above the border, crosses the line thrice—at Ferry, Danville, and Laurier. The main Columbia crosses the line between Waneta, B. C., and Boundary, Wash., just below the mouth of the Pend Oreille, which has crossed into Canada some 1 mile east. Kootenay rises in Canada, enters the States at Gateway, Mont., and leaves at Porthill, Idaho. Two of its tributaries, the Yak and Moyle, rise in the Dominion and enter the States. Another, Wigwam River, rises in the States and flows into Canada. Finally, Flathead River rises in the Canadian Rockies and enters the United States, and as it is the principal branch of the Pend Oreille, it might be said to cross the border twice. Creeks and minor forks would make the list even longer.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY BILLION BOARD FEET GROWING

Thirteen billion board feet of Idaho white pine extend from the eastern suburbs of Spokane, across Idaho into Montana and southward about to Kooskia, Idaho.

Washington has about a billion feet, Montana half as much again. The rest is in Idaho. It is the greatest stand of white pine on earth.

Yet this is only about 8 percent of the standing timber of the inland empire, estimated by forest and lumber company experts as 180,000,000,000 board feet of potential houses, bridge timbers, pole lines, furniture, apple boxes, packing cases, ships and toothpicks—not to mention paper such as that on which these words are printed.

Taking the region as a whole, new timber is being grown as fast as ripe timber is cut. Literally, these forests are eternal. Trees are cut, but the forests under intelligent logging practices and the expanding sustained yield program will reseed themselves and last forever.

"Boxing the compass" from the gorge where the Columbia breaks through the Cascades, you find the Ponderosa pine dividing the landscape with the Douglas fir. The latter is predominantly a coast tree, but grows also on the east side of the Cascades, up through the Okanogan and across the Canadian line.

Larch becomes an important factor in Okanogan County. Ponderosa continues eastward almost to the Idaho line, mixed in with cedar, hemlock, and the true firs. Typical operation is Columbia Lumber Co. at Kettle Falls, Wash., which cuts 80 percent Ponderosa, 20 percent larch and fir.

Yakima county has better than 9,000,000,000 feet of standing softwood, Okanogan about the same.

In Montana, Flathead and Lincoln in the northwest corner have better than 20,000,000,000 feet together.

Idaho's leading timber counties are Clearwater and Idaho, with about 25,000,000,000 board feet between them.

Swinging west into Oregon, you find about 30,000,000,000 board feet in the Blue Mountains, where Ponderosa pine predominates, and some of the area's largest mills are situated.

The California Tie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Pacific Northwest Public Power Association, together with a letter to Mr. Ford Northrop from the Secretary of the Interior, and Mr. Northrop's reply:

[From the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin]

WHAT WILL BE THE PRICE?

The Bureau of Reclamation's proposed California intertie appears to have appreciable economic, engineering and national defense merit. However, the Bureau uses these reasons merely as camouflage to hide the real purpose of exacting a large toll gate profit which will subsidize the Central Valley project at the Northwest power user's expense.

The Bureau now sells Shasta power to Pacific Gas & Electric at 5.2 mills average and that company is a fairly willing customer in order to insure that no other customer steps in.

The 138-mile, 230,000-volt Klamath Falls-Shasta intertie would cost $6,000,000 on which operating expense, interest, amortization, and line losses might run 8 percent or $480,000 per year. If the line carries 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours southward each year, the Bureau's cost would be only 0.8 mills per kilowatt-hour or at most 1.0 mill. Since California rivers are low or dry in summer when irrigation pumping peaks demand the most power, the Bureau would be able to sell all Northwest summer dump as firm power and obtain at least 5.2 mills, and by taking off 1.00 mill for its costs, the Bureau could pay Bonneville Power Administration 4.2 mills for each kilowatt-hour at the California boundary. In light of these facts the Bureau's offer to pay the Northwest only 1.55 mills is ridiculous and outrageous.

But that is not all. Last year the Bureau's powerful lobby killed the authorization of Hells Canyon dam as a Corps of Engineers project. And furthermore the Bureau intends to kill the authorization of Hells Canyon dam unless a huge subsidy is provided from power for the Mountain Home irrigation project. The Bureau's plan is to have the Northwest absorb the artificially high priced Hells Canyon power by increasing the $17.50 (the Bureau never did like this low rate) wholesale rate. Then the Northwest is expected to transmit Hells Canyon power 400 miles, absorb line losses and downprice the power at the California boundary to 1.55 mills thereby enabling the Bureau to clean up a net profit of 26.5 percent annually on the $6,000,000 intertie in addition to a similar profit at the dam. No private power company has ever made such outrageous toll gate charge proposals.

The Pacific Northwest needs the revenue from the California intertie or from an equivalent summer industrial load in order to keep wholesale BPA rates from jumping at least 20 percent in 1954.

But the Northwest should insist on at least 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour at the California boundary for another reason, namely, as a partial safeguard against developing in the Bureau or in the Interior Department (in which the Bureau is the dominating force) any notion of squatter's rights on Northwest power. It is still our power and the Bureau can take it or leave it at the price desired by Northwest people.

This whole situation, particularly as it illustrates the Bureau's domination over the Interior Department, suggests the need for asking Congress to amend the Bonneville Act to make the Bonneville Power Administration a business-type, power wholesaling corporation independent of the Interior Department.

We also think the Army should build Hells Canyon Dam.

MY DEAR MR. NORTHROP: I have recommended to the President that the Federal budget for fiscal year 1952 include a request for authority and funds for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a 230,000-volt electric transmission line, which will connect the Bureau's Shasta project in California with the Columbia River Power System.

I call this matter to your attention pursuant to my conversations with you in Everett, Wash., on March 29, 1950. You will recall on that occasion we discussed the matter of this interconnection in some detail. At that time I told you that it was not my intention to seek authority for this intertie in the immediate future, and that I would communicate to you promptly any change of policy in this regard.

During the past few months international developments have made it necessary to reconsider this matter in the light of our rapidly developing defense requirements. Accordingly, the Defense Power Administration, which has been established within the Interior Department, has made a careful study of the Oregon-California interconnection, and has certified it as essential to the defense power program. The President is recommending authorization by the Congress as a defense measure.

The Oregon-California interconnection will provide relief to the serious power shortage that exists, and will continue for some time to exist, in the Pacific Northwest. This area will have important defense industries dependent, to the extent of approximately 300,000 kilowatts, upon interruptible power. In order to advance the production of aluminum, magnesium, and other metals and chemicals, including additional aluminum plant capacity scheduled for the region, the interruptible power supplies should be made firm as rapidly as possible, and additional firm power supplies should be provided. The Oregon-California interconnection will make substantial contributions to these objectives.

Specifically, the Northwest power pool will gain 200,000,000 to 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours for a 6 months' low-water period through the flow of steam energy from California, to be delivered over the Oregon-California interconnection. On a 12 months' basis, the kilowatt capacity to the Northwest will be increased on the order of 100,000 kilowatts. There will be gains of similar magnitude in the California area through the displacement of oil-fired steam generation by unusable excess hydro from the Columbia River system. There will be a still further gain in revenues accruing to the Federal Government from the sale of energy which otherwise would be unsold.

These are benefits which cannot be overlooked from a defense standpoint. Without them possible curtailment of power deliveries in the Pacific Northwest could be much more drastic than otherwise would be necessary.

As you know, I have been fully conscious of the concern which some interests in the Northwest have felt relative to the policy implications arising from the construction of this line. However, I believe pending defense power-load developments in the region should provide a basis for considerable reassurance.

I shall be pleased to have any comments or suggestions you may have to offer on this matter.

Sincerely,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

PRESIDENT NORTHROP DRAFTS NWPPA REPLY ON INTERTIE

MY DEAR SECRETARY CHAPMAN: I very much appreciate your January 4 letter, in which you indicate that the Defense Power Administration and the President have made a determination that a 230,000-volt intertie between the Columbia River Power System and the Shasta project is essential to the national defense.

On this subject I have noted (1) the Federal Power Commission report dated February 1950; (2) the address of Mr. William Dittmer, of the Bonneville Power Administration at the Eugene meeting of the BPA Advisory Council on April 29, 1948; (3) the address of Mr. Ben Creim, then Regional Power Manager, United States Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, at the Port Angeles convention of the Northwest Public Power Association on August 12, 1948; and (4) the address of Mr. Holland H. Houston, engineer for the Public Service Commission of the State of Washington, at that same convention and as later published in the November 1948 issue of Electrical West.

On the basis of this information there would appear to be an appreciable hydrological and electrical load diversity between the central California power system and the Northwest power pool. However, it is also appreciated that the load centers of the two power systems are separated by great distances, and that these diversities, appreciable as they appear today, will be considerably less in the future as there is a leveling off of the differences between power resources and loads within each power system.

Four factors appear to be in operation to reduce the present diversities: (1) As the central California system becomes more dependent on steam generation, the hazard of a dry year will diminish; (2) it is apparent the winter peak and energy loads in central California are rapidly overtaking the traditional summer peak caused by irrigation pumping; (3) as the Pacific Northwest adds upstream reservoir storage, the seriousness of a low-water year will lessen; and (4) the growth of Northwest irrigation loads and interruptible industrial loads will reduce summer surplus energy. I am not in the best position to fully evaluate the effects of these factors in reducing the diversities between the two regions on the economic feasibility of an intertie or on what might be the proper period for amortizing the cost of the new facilities.

In thinking how best to define the relationships which would be involved in interregional power transfers, I would like to submit the following principle as a premise: Just as there have developed in each river basin certain riparian rights and a right to the consumptive use of water, and just as such use of water within each region has become recognized as being the best use in the national interest, so also the rights of each region to prior use of its power must be regarded as the proper index of how such power can best be used in the national interest. Thus, the regional and national interests are identical.

In order to provide reasonable protection to the Pacific Northwest in regard to its greatest resource, namely, low-cost power, I trust that those who draft the necessary enabling legislation will give consideration to the following:

1. That this line shall not be authorized without prior establishment of at least the governing principles and policies which will apply to power transactions and financial accounting for benefits and obligations.

2. That no power shall be exported from either region if that power can be used within the region in which it was generated, and in any case that no prime power be exported.

3. That power scheduling shall be on a day to day basis only, and that any contracts entered into which may depend on imported power shall provide that the prower is interruptible.

4. That exported Northwest power shall be priced at the California boundary on the basis of the market value at the point of consumption in California less allowance for line losses and carrying charges on the facilities in California. Under present power marketing conditions, Northwest power shall be considered worth not less than two and one-half (2.5) bills per kilowatt-hour at the California boundary.

In stating the position of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Ben Creim, in his August 12, 1948, Port Angeles address, gave as one of the purposes of the Oregon-California intertie "an improvement in the basic feasibility of the very necessary Central Valley Project (the repayment schedule for which was predicated on oil at a dollar a barrel)."

I would like to state as a matter of record that the Northwest Public Power Association, through resolution of its Board of Trustees, does not subscribe to the use of power revenues for subsidizing irrigation. Rather

our view, like that of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, is that the full benefits from the power resources of a region shall accrue to the power users of that region.

The Federal Power Commission report on the intertie states: "Under normal conditions, the transfer of firm power from California to the Pacific Northwest would not be economic, owing to the relative high cost of hydro power with its steam support in California. It was concluded, therefore, that only secondary or steam-replacement power should be considered in this study." From this statement it would appear that instead of delivering steam generated energy from California to the Northwest as you propose it would be more advantageous to build a steam plan near the Northwest load center, which could be assumed to be the lower Columbia River area. Thus there would be saved the higher costs due to transmission capital outlay and large energy losses, and the use of critical materials required in the construction of transmission facilities. A steam plant near a load center is a valuable factor in furnishing continuity of service as well as eliminating much of the cost of transmission. It is my belief that a steam plant can be built in approximately the same length of time that is required to construct an industrial plant which would be engaged in the production of materials and equipment needed for war purposes.

Before making final plans for construction of the intertie, which would use scarce materials and manpower, there should be full explanation of how delivery of energy and payment for the same will be handled. The Bureau of Reclamation has no steam generation plants, therefore it must be assumed that the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. will furnish energy to a California power pool. The company must first state that it can and will supply energy, and second that the price will be equal or less than the cost of steam energy at the Northwest load center.

I understand that the Shasta Dam reservoir has never been full. This would indicate the Bureau does not have any, or at least very little, hydro which it could spare.

In considering the possibility of sending 200,000,000 to 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours over a 6-month low-water period to the Northwest from California, I am reminded, for comparison, that our small electric system of Eugene sold in 1950 to its general retail customers the total of 208,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Mr. Holland H. Houston points out in his address, that, at the historical rate of increase in use of power the optimistic hydro potential of the Northwest will be exhausted by the year 1972. When it is considered that two decades is a short time in the life of the Northwest, and that it takes from 4 to 6 years' time to build a major hydro plant, it is not to be wondered that the people of the Northwest are concerned about their most important resource. Long before the year 1972, consideration must be given to preparing for dry years through the building of steam plants. Should not now be the time to build a steam plant in a Northwest load center?

If the full benefit of the intertie could be assured to the power users of the respective regions on a fair and understanding basis, there would undoubtedly be greater support for the advantages which this interconnection might give, and there would be less opposition because of fears in the minds of Northwest people that some of their most valuable resource, low-cost power, would be lost to the region.

I thank you for the opportunity of commenting on your proposals and explanations.

Respectfully yours,

F. FORD NORTHROP,
President, Northwest Public Power Association.

JANUARY 19, 1951.

There Should Be One Basic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1951

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Carroll County Independent, published in Center Ossipee, N. H., Friday, February 2, 1951, entitled "There Should Be One Basic Policy":

THERE SHOULD BE ONE BASIC POLICY

There is more argument and uncertainty about the present draft laws and status of men subject or not subject to draft than perhaps any one phase of our current rearmament program.

Students in high schools and colleges do not know whether to wait to be called, or to volunteer now and pick the branch of the service they want. Brilliant students headed for medical, dental or scientific schools do not know if they can secure deferment. Educators say that 18-year-olds should or should not be drafted. Farmers want exemption for their sons and manufacturers want exemptions for certain skilled men.

Before there is any talk about exemptions there should be one basic policy, that a man on becoming 18 years of age, or graduating from high school or academy, whichever comes last, owes 18, 21 months, or 2 years service to his nation. No man should be allowed to spend more than 5 years in high school or academy, to complete the work, the reason being obvious.

With the basic principle accepted, then it will be time enough to talk about exemptions. It might be well to exempt the top 5 percent, or top 10 percent of men of high mental capacity who are going to medical, dental, and scientific schools. The Nation can allow no gap in the classes of men coming from these schools. They are absolutely necessary for national defense. Obviously such men would be subject to a 2-year draft as soon as they receive their diplomas and be assigned to such duties where they will make their talents most valuable.

We cannot hope to meet the Russians or the Chinese on a man to man basis. There are just too many of them. Even if our men could meet and defeat them when outnumbered 3 to 1, they would still win, for they can feed riflemen into the lines indefinitely.

To hold the Russians and the Chinese by power politics, or by actual combat, we must overmatch them with technical ability. That is, our superior machines and fewer men must hold their ordinary machine and greater number of men.

One swift way to national suicide is to take young men who promise to be outstanding physicists, mathematicians, chemists, and electricians and put them into the ranks.

Some may see that this is class legislation. It is not. Brains just do not care where they are born, or in what class of society or in what race. Handsome is as handsome does. It is impossible to take a student and say to him, you are going to be a specialist in electronics. The man has to be born with certain mathematical ability and a natural liking for figures and formulas.

But before anything else is done, the Nation should accept a basic draft policy. In every war we have been handicapped by drafting and attempting to train men by hurry-up methods.

There is no substitute for slow thorough steady training, done in an unhurried manner.

If we had had such a policy of universal military training, begun in 1912 and carried through to date, it is almost certain the First and Second World Wars would never have been fought. Now it is quite possible that we are headed straight for the third world war, all because of lack of such a policy, carried through on a long time, permanent basis.

Veterans' Administration Hospital at Deshon, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Deshon Hospital Takes it on the Chin," published in the Butler Eagle of February 2.

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

OUR DESHON HOSPITAL TAKES IT ON THE CHIN

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, in filing a protest with General Gray, VA Administrator, against closing the medical and surgical portions of Butler's Deshon Hospital, takes the position that this hospital facility is needed now more than ever.

He has asked for a complete report, inquiring how the action can be justified.

Senator MARTIN recalled that when the State sought to acquire the hospital, the Veterans' Administration resisted at every step.

Deshon, under present orders, is to be reduced from an 855-bed hospital to 500-bed capacity for tuberculosis patients only.

Butler's Deshon Hospital is the only hospital operated by the Veterans' Administration for the treatment of tuberculosis in the three States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Within 90 days, more than 200 patients must be transferred to Aspinwall and Erie, with a 50-percent reduction in the hospital staff.

It is difficult to understand the reason for the unexpected ruling.

Why was it necessary to launch construction of two huge VA hospitals in Pittsburgh to cost many millions of dollars when Deshon could easily have been enlarged?

Could this be politics?

Everywhere, you are told, veteran hospitals are crowded to capacity, but it turns out that 100 beds are vacant at Butler and 200 beds are unused at Aspinwall.

We understand Butler's Deshon never was filled to capacity since it was taken over by the Veterans' Administration a number of years ago.

"It seems absurd to be spending millions of dollars for additional bed capacity when the Butler hospital is available," Senator MARTIN said.

What Senator MARTIN said makes sense to us.

Ever since Butler's institution was built at a cost of several millions, it has been kicked around, first by the State, then by the Army, and finally by the Veterans' Administration.

Jesus, Prince of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the sermon of Rev. James W. Fifield, Jr., minister of the First Congregational Church, of Los Angeles, which he delivered on December 3, 1950:

JESUS, PRINCE OF PEACE

This sermon has been rankling within me for a long time. Last Friday a widow whose 19-year-old son has presumably been killed in Korea, telephoned me expressing shock, sadness, and also bitterness. When she said, "There is nothing much that I can do but bear my sorrow, for no one will listen to anything I can say," I resolved to be her spokesman. I think her bitterness is justified. Our casualties in Korea already are the third largest of any war in our history.

The day in which Jesus walked the earth as the Prince of Peace was not unlike our own. He indicated people must live together in order to live at all. Palestine had actually been fertilized by its best blood. The Assyrians and Babylonians had recurrently come from the north, the Egyptians from the south, and finally the Romans had made their conquest of Palestine. For generations there had been armistice after armistice but no peace.

Americans have been stunned by the developments within our country and the world during these past years. A friend of mine said two wrestlers banged their heads together so hard that they fell down senseless. The first one to come to and get up, jumped on the other, and won the bout. Our people, like those wrestlers, have been stunned. We hope that they will wake up before our mortal enemy pounces upon them.

We have not wanted to believe that there was betrayal in high places for we have always kept a halo around certain offices in our country. Even when we disliked things that were happening and were suspicious of things we saw, we were unwilling to "throw mud" because of patriotic devotion.

Here's a letter from a man who has just gone back into the Army after 3 years of civilian life. He comments that it is an "unrecognizable Army." He says that they have nothing to fight a war with and no will to fight one anyway. In my contacts with personnel at Army installations, I have heard young lads inquire, "What are we going to fight for?" They feel it is unfair to send them out to fight without adequate preparation to win another victory when the splendid victory so heroically won in World War II has been literally thrown away. Their question, "What would we fight for?" is not easy to answer. If there were clear and righteous issues and honorable, competent leadership, all would be ready to make whatever sacrifices were required and eagerly.

There is deepening anxiety everywhere and especially among more thoughful people. War budgets are expanding. Matériel and personnel are being drafted. New appropriations are being rushed. The use of atom bombs is being considered. The crisis comes nearer each passing day and our Nation, having been unprincipled in its policies, must now reap as it sowed, according to the teachings of Jesus and the laws of God.

We encouraged Russia's dream of world-domination. At Yalta and other conferences, our leaders betrayed us, sold us out, insisted that Stalin take even more than he had dared request, incredulous as that seems. We do not yet know the extent of our commitments because our State Department has resorted to secret diplomacy. We implemented Russia's visions with money and matériel, as well as by the betrayal of our allies in her behalf. Our betrayal of China and of European nations now behind the Iron Curtain is one of the blackest pages in American history. In South America, Europe, and the Orient, we have tried to purchase power, friendship, and good will with money, ignoring the Christian precept that spiritual values cannot be bought with money Tasting power, we have made commitments which we cannot possibly keep. "The chickens are just beginning to come home to roost" Korea is only the first of our pledges calling for redemption. Other commitments made by our officials represent betrayals of a rank and desperate sort.

We have used the United Nations as a screen, just as England and France used the old League of Nations. The League was conceived by idealists with the finest of motives but, alas, it was doomed through misuse. No doubt, the originators of the United Nations included many noble idealists. But Alger Hiss and others, who are at least suspect, implemented the vision in ways which caused the United Nations to hamstring the free world. It is not right for those guilty of treason or suspect to be out on bail when our boys are being killed in Korea.

Some of you still believe in the United Nations. I respect the sincerity of your belief but do not share it. Use your own judgment concerning the United Nations. We dare not be unrealistic or impractically idealistic in such matters when our boys are dying in Korea.

There are only two real powers in the world today—the United States and Russia. The other allies do not really count in determination of major issues. The United Nations is what America wills it to be. It is certainly true that the United Nations would not move contrary to America's will, because America's withdrawal would mean its total collapse. In practical effect it is the United States and Russia that are fighting in Korea.

While we have been engaged in this international debacle the moral and spiritual altitude in our Nation has dropped to a new low, in part because of the example of the Federal Government. The mass corruption of the population is the fault of pressure groups, unscrupulous politicians, and boss rule. Many in this congregation today stoop to things they would not have done a year or two years ago. Business ethics, social ethics, personal ethics are often gutter level, as reflected by comic sheets, gangster movies, radio programs, magazine articles, etc. It is probable that American morals are at the lowest level in our Nation's history, including the carpetbagger era at the close of the Civil War.

Many of the things which I am saying you have been thinking but have not said, because, stunned, like the wrestlers, you hoped they were not true or because you did not wish to offend. Perhaps you trusted our leaders because you or your relatives are on Government payrolls or receiving subsidies. Many have become unspeakably beholden to our Government.

This situation is so serious that there is no easy solution. However, the situation is not hopeless, and with courageous action and God's help, our Nation and our civilization can yet be redeemed. The pattern for redemption and for effective, practical action is as follows:

(1) First, repentance for past sins and errors. The starting point to forgiveness and redemption is repentance. There is no other starting point. This is no time for arrogance in high places or low. We need to admit the folly of our ways, and to repudiate leaders who have betrayed us and our Allies, whether knowingly or in ignorance. We cannot have too much sentiment about leaders in Washington when our youth are being killed in Korea.

(2) We must clean out our own fifth column. In Government this means that every person, either guilty or even suspect, should be summarily and immediately eliminated. This includes those who profess a so-called socialism which is veiled communism. But we must, also, eliminate those guilty and suspect of communism in our trade unions, our schools, our colleges, our newspapers, our magazines, our business organizations and even our church officiaries. We must ready ourselves for a finish fight—the stake being survival.

(3) We must aid every responsible nation that fights communism regardless of whether there is any other point of agreement in culture or religion or politics. We need every ally on which we can count in this great moral struggle.

(4) We must find ways and means to enlist anti-Communists behind the iron curtain and make them effective as rebels, arming them and directing them. This may be one of the most important steps which can be taken.

(5) We must break relations with Russia. We should never have recognized her present regime. We must, also, break relations with her satellites and drive out all Russian agents and agents of all satellite nations from our country. We must stop shipping matériel to Russia or to any satellite nation or to any other nation which will not give solemn assurance that it will not reach Russia or a satellite of Russia.

(6) We must eliminate Russia from the United Nations. If that cannot be done, then the United States must withdraw from the United Nations, and promptly. We must stop the daily insults and intrigues which emerge from hostile, plotting, scheming, dangerous delegates and hangers-on at the United Nations.

(7) We must require all our allies to take the same steps, terminating their associations with those whom we plainly label as our enemies. The resources of the United States cannot continue to support enemies or even neutrals. They must be used only for ourselves or for our allies in this great conflict.

It is not easy to speak thus of the United Nations. Sufficient to say that if those who set up this organization conspired to make it a handicap for world peace, they have succeeded too well.

Our so-called bypartisan foreign policy has been no foreign policy at all. Stalin is the foulest dictator and anti-Christ of all recorded history. He has been responsible for the murder of more than 15,000,000 persons. It is asserted on presumably responsible authority, that the Communists, who are now mopping up in China, are murdering ten thousand a day, so that Mao Tse tung, although second to Stalin as a murderer, is daily increasing his score. Until recently our Government's official position was that the Communists in China were not Communists at all; that they had no relationship to the Kremlin in Russia, and that they were only agrarian reformers. During the last 18 months, the policy of our State Department has been to let the dust settle, and it has settled all over us. It is the Chinese Communists, directed by Moscow, that are killing American soldiers in Korea.

If, as Gen. Omar Bradley states, all our Armed Forces are presently engaged in Korea where we are suffering serious reverses, then it is fair to say that the victory of World War II, achieved by the devotion of our fighting men, has been utterly thrown away. The billions spent for armament, etc., have been wasted and our huge debt has bought only destruction of American honor and ideals plus concentration of power in

unworthy bureaus and persons. This is betrayal. Critical and extreme as the words sound, it is fair to say that this Nation which, under God, had a special place of privilege and responsibility in the sun, has sold its glorious birthright for a mess of pottage and the pottage smells.

This crisis has been as much, or more, our making as Russia's. Indeed, Russia could not have done what she has to develop it without our active cooperation and even our leaders' prodding. There have not only been international blunders, but immoral sins against God which call for penitence and contrition. We must entreat God to forgive us for failing to meet our great responsibilities and opportunities as a Nation and must remember that we, individually, constitute our Nation. All the blame for its mistakes cannot be put on its leaders. The process of redemption, therefore, must start in us with positive and affirmative action. Each of us must vow to do and think and say only that which is wholly true and honorable without any compromise or any exception. We need to listen again to the voice of conscience illuminated by the teachings of Jesus concerning the laws of God. The time for wishful thinking is past. There must be an end to all shades of gray. Things must be black and white—not right or left but right or wrong.

We must respiritualize our family life and our home relationships. After that we must realine our relationships with individuals and organizations, revitalizing our devotion to the good and severing all other relations. What I am proposing is a herculean task, but it might save civilization. Nothing less will. Unless courageous, moral, and spiritual action of a sort which will secure the help of God is taken, we shall drift on and on along the road to Communist world domination in which life will become mere existence, in which God will be banished, or damned, and in which dark ages will again be the lot of humanity. By next May a billion two hundred million souls, more than half the people of this planet, will probably be within the orbit of Communist control. This need not be. We should not be defeatist. We cannot give up the future of our children and grandchildren to such a despicable outlook. God forbid—no, not God forbid. We must not put the responsibility for this upon God. Rather, let us, with God's help forbid and prevent this terrible tragedy.

It is time for the American people who, like the wrestlers have been stunned beyond expression, who have felt the very things they were seeing couldn't be true, who have been betrayed; to wake up, get right with God, and, realistically, face the situation. However well we have been doing, it has not been well enough for the forces of good and of God are losing ground daily in the world. Each of you must do better and at once. I shall endeavor to do better, too. This sermon is an earnest effort to help sound the alarm. I hope you will quote it widely, but accurately.

"If this be treason, then make the most of it." Let us pray.

Address of President Truman at Dedication of Chapel of the Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Truman at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains, reprinted from the New York Times of February 4, 1951:

This chapel commemorates something more than an act of bravery or courage. It commemorates a great act of faith in God.

The four chaplains in whose memory this shrine was built were not required to give their lives as they did. They gave their lives without being asked. When their ship was sinking, they handed out all the life preservers that were available and then took off their own and gave them away in order that four other men might be saved.

Those four chaplains actually carried out the moral code which we are all supposed to live by. They obeyed the Divine Commandment that men should love one another. They really lived up to the moral standard that declares:

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

CONQUERED DEATH BY FAITH

They were not afraid of death because they knew that the word of God is stronger than death. Their belief, their faith, in His word enabled them to conquer death.

This is an old faith in our country. It is shared by all our churches and all our denominations. These four men represented the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish beliefs. Each of these beliefs teaches that obedience to God and love for one's fellow man are the greatest and strongest things in the world.

We must never forget that this country was founded by men who came to these shores to worship God as they pleased. Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, all came here for this great purpose.

They did not come here to do as they pleased, but to worship God as they pleased, and that is an important distinction.

The unity of our country comes from this fact. The unity of our country is a unity under God. It is a unity in freedom, for the service of God is the perfect freedom.

If we remember our faith in God, if we live by it as our forefathers did, we need have no fear for the future.

Today many people have become fearful. If we reaffirm our common faith we can overcome these fears.

This does not mean that we can always be sure what the future will bring. We cannot always know what the outcome of events will be. As President Lincoln once said:

"The Almighty has His own purposes."

But we need not be afraid of the outcome if we go on trying to do the right thing as God gives us to see the right.

That is what we are trying to do in the world today. We are trying to establish world peace, so that all men can live together in brotherhood and in freedom. And to do that, we are working with other nations to create the rule of law in the world.

What does this rule of law mean? Let me give you an example. In the early days of our western frontier, law and order were not yet established. Disputes were settled in favor of the man who was quickest on the draw. Outlaws terrorized whole communities.

Men who wanted to see law and order prevail had to combine against the outlaws. They had to arm themselves. At times they had to fight. After they had put down lawless violence, the courts took over and justice was established. And then it was possible for all citizens to get on with the important work of building up their own communities, paving the streets and building new schools, and giving all people a chance at the right kind of life.

This is just what we are trying to do today in the international field. If we can put a stop to international aggression, order can be established and the people of the world can go ahead full speed with the constructive tasks of peace.

We are not trying to do this job by ourselves. We could not do it by ourselves if we tried. We are acting as one member of a whole community of nations dedicated to the concept of the rule of law in the world. As in all other communities, the members of this community of nations have many different ideas and interests and do not all speak with one voice. Some are cautious and some are impatient.

We cannot always have our own way in this community. But we have a tremendous responsibility to lead and not to hang back.

Fate has made this country a leader in the world. We shirked our responsibility in the 1920's. We cannot shirk it now. We must assume that responsibility now, and it will take everything we have—all the brains and all the resources that we can mobilize.

Leadership carries with it heavy responsibilities. Good leaders do not threaten to quit if things go wrong. They expect cooperation, of course, and they expect everyone to do his share, but they do not stop to measure sacrifices with a teaspoon while the fight is on.

We cannot lead the forces of freedom from behind.

The job we face is a hard one. Perhaps it will be harder in the few years immediately ahead than it will be in the years thereafter. If we can get over the present crisis successfully—if we can restrain aggression before it bursts out into another world war, then things will be easier in the future. And I think we can do this. We can't be sure, of course, but there is good reason to hope for success.

In recent months, the United Nations has been faced by a serious challenge. But it is meeting that challenge courageously, and it is still man's best hope of establishing the rule of law in the world.

NOTES EISENHOWER REPORT

General Eisenhower has brought home the report that the people of Europe, in spite of their difficulties and their many problems, want to preserve their freedom. He has told us of the effort they are making. They are working very hard, and if we all work together, we can be successful.

When things look hard, there are always a lot of people who want to quit. We had people like that in the Revolutionary War, and we have had them in every war and every crisis of our history. Thomas Paine called them the summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. If we had listened to them, we would never have been a free and independent nation. We would never have had a strong and prosperous country. We would not be strong enough now to stand up against Communist aggression and tyranny.

The sacrifices that are being made today by the men and women of this country are not being made in vain. Our men are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a world-wide war. The men who have died in Korea have died to save us from the terrible slaughter and destruction which another world war would surely bring.

Their sacrifices are being made in the spirit of the four chaplains to whose memory this chapel is dedicated. They are being made in defense of the great religious faiths which make this chapel a place of worship. These sacrifices are being made for the greatest things in this life, and for the things beyond this life.

I have faith that the great principles for which our men are fighting will prevail.

Rayburn's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer:

RAYBURN'S RECORD

SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, has just passed the tenure record for a Speaker of the House of Representatives of 8 years plus, set a century ago by Henry Clay, of Kentucky.

There is more to the Rayburn record than mere length of tenure. As Speaker he has a dual responsibility, to serve as the impartial presiding officer for the whole House and, at the same time, furnish effective leadership for his own party in a body where controversies sometimes become bitter.

These two functions are difficult to combine without neglecting one at the expense of the other. SAM RAYBURN has never failed to measure up to both responsibilities. The House may have had better presiding officers and the Democratic Party may have had a better leader, although no names come to mind readily in either category. But the House has never had a Speaker more highly regarded by both his own party and the opposing party, and it will be a long time, if ever, before it does.

The country hopes that Mr. Speaker RAYBURN will remain in his present post for a long time to come.

Education in Literature, Art, and Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today to authorize the Commissioner of Education to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities.

One of the purposes of general education should be understood in terms of performance, of behavior, not in terms of mastering particular bodies of knowledge. It is the task of general education to provide the kinds of learning and experience that will enable the student to attain certain basic outcomes, among them the following: To understand and enjoy literature, art, music, and other cultural activities as expressions of personal and social experience, and to participate to some extent in some form of creative activity.

It can scarcely be necessary to urge the importance of literature in the program of general education. Man's consuming interest is in man, and in this interest literature can serve. By means of great novels, poems, plays, and essays one can participate vicariously in many events that one's own life does not encompass, and so can gain as in no other way imaginative insight into the emotions, drives, and aspirations of one's fellow men.

Literature sets forth both the heights and the depths that man can reach. It is an avenue of communication with the great minds and the great souls of yesterday and of today. It can do as much as any other single form of experience to broaden and deepen the perceptions and sympathies of the individual.

This consequence does not, however, follow from the study of details of literary history, literary biography, literary techniques, or any other of the accompaniments to literature that make up specialization in the subject. The contribution of literature to insight and emotional maturity will come from one's own reading of the world's literary treasures, and from reflection upon them.

The world's literary treasures are not those of the West alone. They include the great intellectual statements of men everywhere and in all ages. There is probably no better way of promoting the intellectual and spiritual unity of mankind than through free trade in enduring literary expressions.

And in the graphic and plastic arts, too, man has recorded much of his thought and feeling about life through color, form, and sound. A signal defect in much of American education, and in American culture, is its failure to recognize that music, painting, sculpture, the dance, the drama, and others of the arts are authentic statements of experience.

One of the tasks of American democracy is to heighten and diffuse esthetic sensibility and good taste, to make our people sensitive to beauty in all its varied forms: in the commodities and services of everyday life, in private and public buildings, in community and regional planning.

The study of the arts in general education should not be directed toward the development of creative artists of exceptional gifts, though it may in some instances lead to this. It should aim at appreciation of the arts as forms of human expression, at awakening or intensifying the student's sensitivity to beauty and his desire to create beauty in his everyday surroundings, at developing bases for discrimination and interpretation, at inducing sympathy with arts and artists and active concern for their welfare. Support of the arts can no longer be left to the patronage of wealth; active encouragement of artistic expression in its various forms must become the responsibility of all citizens.

Before completing his general education, the student should acquire a measure of skill in at least one of the arts or crafts, in some form of musical expression or in dramatics. Participation in creative activity, even at a low level of proficiency, is one of the best means to understanding and appreciation of artistic expression.

Why Have Scientists Been a Weak Link Against Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, aside from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself, the function of full and free public discussion has been served by none of the American press so well as by the oldest of our business periodicals, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, established in 1839. Dr. Melchior Palyi, an ably conservative contributor to the columns of that paper, has recently voiced a fear, shared by the conservative element in Congress, that the diplomacy of the Kremlin may be leading us into "history's greatest trap" in Europe.

That which seems to be most blinding in this danger, has been our own conceit over the discovery of a source of energy which does not utilize but rather explains the solar radiation that warms the surface of the earth. We have been at once paralyzed with fear and puffed with pride by the demagoguery of the scientists who devised and steered the Atomic Energy Act to passage (in the Senate without even a record vote), a state of affairs hardly conducive to sound public judgment at a time when well considered action is imperative and we must act, but not over-act.

"Our real problem," says some invited comment in the columns of the Chronicle, "is how to stop the war of attrition by other than military containment on the long Russian periphery where it will cost us so much more than it does the Soviet that it is we, not they, who could not sustain a long war, but would be caught in domestic disorder. Only then could a bombing coup de grace become good Soviet tactics. It is in this context that we cannot afford to sit tight. How can we change the context so that the Voice of America will spread itself at no expense at all just because it is the patent truth and not a meaningless jumble of 'facts' supposed to offset Soviet lies?"

If we are to avoid biting off more than we can chew, it would be well to listen to the relatively few scientists who see, as does the scientist-author of the recent best seller, "Science is a Sacred Cow," by Dr. Anthony Standen, the distinct limitations upon the attainments of science. To bring this matter of the illusions of science before the Congress, I have obtained permission to quote further from Alden Potter's caustic but pertinent comment in the Chronicle, as follows:

The danger of entrapment lies, indeed, in the element of truth, not in communism (or socialism), but in the hope to which the Kremlin can cling, of industrial disorder due to conditions of monetary instability, that is inflation. The Soviet system has by no means found a way to eliminate inflation, even in peace. It has, on the contrary, tried to meet its effects by much the same sort

of measures here threatened, summed up by President Truman as the "police state." By such means it has eliminated one of the greatest dangers in modern war, namely, lawlessness in labor strife, by eliminating strikes as measures of collective "bargaining." With this advantage—for war—their problem is to so manage as to compel us to face that danger before their similar inflationary situation can be made to collapse into anarchy by our tactics. Both systems are highly susceptible; but it is not enough that the pot should call the kettle black in either case. The winner will be that side which remodels the system to take it out of the sooty category of inflationary methods of finance. Before that can be accomplished it becomes necessary to rule out socialistic remedies, that is, the elimination of private property or "monopoly." This will have to be approached, not "experimentally"—history proves nothing; there is always the idea that the cure for socialistic failure is more socialism—but with the certainty of logic and reason.

The fact that revolution in economic theory is imperative has been so tersely stated in Price Control by F. R. J. Jervis that it deserves a quote: "It is painfully obvious that in economic matters the democracy is at present not merely uneducated, but miseducated; not merely, like the African bushman, unable to count above five, but dogmatically convinced that five is the sum of two and two" The fact is that neither laissez faire nor a socialist state has presented any evidence of being effective in dealing with this cultural lag in modern industrial society. By finding an actual solution for it, through submitting it to careful, open-minded study devoid of traditional predilections—the writer has attemped to promote such study in "When and How Do Figures Lie?", in the Chronicle for July 5, 1945—the justification for the Kremlin's cynical hopes and our own defeatism on this score would be swept aside and the whole morale of the intelligentsia who are primarily responsible for the utopian fallacies of socialism, could thus be shifted overnight to the side of capitalism—but not, indeed, to side with any such anarchistic laissez faire as is presented by the Marxian ideal of a fully "withered" state, or the similar Keynesian utopia of a decline in interest to zero when paradise arrives to facilitate savings ad libitum and so assure an adequate "capitalistic"—but in a profit- and interest-free "capitalism"—investment solution for all problems in life by removing poverty and inflated prices all at one fell swoop of unlimited supply to satisfy all demand.

This naive, money-free theory of price level is what the Soviet has attempted to validate; but it has failed so often and so largely that one may well suspect that the Politburo looks with cynical glee upon the American delusion that the way to global law and order is by such Point Four plenty and "perfect" competition as robs price of any meaning and retires a monetary-profit system of competitive trading to the limbo of a primitive past when everyone was a "chiseler" and science, "the endless frontier," was being frustrated by the profit motive from fulfilling its self-appointed mission as a sacred cow that could never be milked dry (and so permit inflation).

It is, indeed, their bitter-end resistance to any and all suggestions that Utopia is impossible, even to their sacred cow, that has made our scientists, seeking abundant Manhattan Projects as a way to abundance (at least for them and their Science Foundation) into convinced Socialists or even self-styled Communists. This latest pressure-group lobby offers, indeed, an abundance of everything except common sense and moral stamina. This was well demonstrated by Lord Stamp's retort to their "optimistic" view that only "The Frustration of Science" (a book by well-known British "liberal" scientists) by "monopoly capitalism" prevents the paradise they have prepared. But his advice went in one ear and out the other, leaving free play for an insufferable conceit and an ego so inflated in the atomic technician that he ignores plain proof that population can outstrip anything that technology can produce. * * * Gerald Wendt, editor of "Science Illustrated," has illustrated this utopian materialism (which with Bishop Oxnam puts the material cart before the moral horse by saying that law and order depend upon better living standards, or "belly before brain in brotherhood") by this fatuous assertion in a "Harper's" article: "In that mastery (of atomic energy) is lodged the one great hope for a decent standard of living everywhere."

Contrast this fools' paradise with the restraint expressed by the "Rockefeller Foundation Review" for 1948 (p. 26): "Inherent in our systematic efforts to promote the welfare of mankind there may be an assumption that by taking thought we may add a cubit to our stature. * * * Some such hope is implicit, if not explicit, in Socialist doctine, but it is implied also in the dominant attitudes of American society. 'Planning' and 'control' are the common coins of American politics, American business, American education, and American science, despite the concurrent emphasis upon liberty, individualism, and democracy. The bombastic phrase, 'control of nature,' is a byword of the literature of the day. Do we mean that because we have learned to navigate the tides we shall also control them? * * * Where do we think we shall stop—with the control of the speed of rotation of the earth, of its revolution about the sun? Shall we also learn to control the chain reaction in the sun whence comes all our life and power? Pride goeth before a fall. All our efforts will promote only disaster if they are not done in the humility appropriate to our ignorance, never forgetting that we have not made the earth or the heavens above it."

The trouble is that organized science has developed no policy to see these differences through to a conclusion and then pursue that conclusion on into others even though these may tread on the toes of their sacred cow. It seems fair to charge that as a pressure group science abandoned its reverence for the truth and joined the demagogues when it produced the Bush report and lately the Gordon Gray report, to the President, presenting itself as an "endless frontier" capable of utopian service to mankind, even into the globaloney of Point Four, all of which is implicit in the bureaucratic paternalism of the UNO with its might-makes-right implications. That this would be no step toward world peace was foreseen clearly by the "Chronicle" on July 7, 1945, when it said editorially: "Neither agreements reached at San Francisco nor mechanisms there devised will have much bearing on the course of world affairs or in the maintenance of world peace."

It has proved worse than that; what we have taken into our gates is a Trojan horse in war. A scientific utopia and freedom from want was its outer framework—its false pretense. It was science that set the stage for all this—for the naively generous appeasements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and the disbandment of our armies and substitution of ECA. It is science that owes, not us alone, but humanity (including especially that segment in Korea), not merely its apologies, but a reversal of Modern Materialism (see "Philosophy for the Future," Macmillan, 1949, the American counterpart of Britain's "Frustration of Science") so as to point out the truth that the "cultural lag" is a moral, not a material, lag in general welfare.

It is not enough that the communistic personnel which organized UNESCO under Julian Huxley (specifically in the case of Dr. Joseph Needham, original head of the science section) is now out of control. The utopian materialism—communistic paternalism—implicit in the bureaucracy of the UNO, must be fully recanted. Then, and then only, need we no longer fear that the Kremlin can wage a successful cold war by boring from within and taking advantage of the naive scientism which sells itself down the river before it betrays democracy for no reason but its welfare-state "ideals" that are grounded in falsehood and hypocrisy. The world is finding socialism to be a flop. Only our own scientific utopians are preserving it as the nidus of subversive revolutions to be appeased and as something to fight about while glorifying the same utopians for their patriotic (and profitable) provision of the weapons of mass destruction.

The betrayal of truth penetrates beyond our own national welfare and prevents the moral and intellectual atmosphere necessary to worldwide understanding and peace through law and order, that is, through what ultimately must be a world government and not a nationalistic federation like the UNO to adjust imperialist disputes, each by negotiations having no law but only the compromises of power politics to govern the outcome. In the final analysis, of ideology rather than of power, it is not in any isolated nationalism that we can sit tight or stand pat. A common denominator that does not rest on power politics, but on truth, is essential in the conduct of the uncompromising diplomacy of peace.

India and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "India and the United States," by Dean Carl B. Spaeth, of Stanford Law School, before the Los Angeles Bar Association, November 30, 1950, as published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal, December 2, 1950:

This is a report on a conference in which I participated in India during the month of October.

The Lucknow conference was held under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The conference was concerned with nationalism in the Far East and, in particular, with the international consequences of that nationalism.

The countries represented included almost all of the independent nations of the Far East as well as Great Britain, Canada, France, and the United States. My colleagues around the table during the 2 weeks were Indians, Pakistani, Indonesians, and Japanese, as well as representatives from Ceylon, a spokesman for the Bao Dai regime of Indochina, and representatives of Australia and New Zealand. With the exception of the representative of Bao Dai, who spoke only French at the conference, and some of the Japanese delegation, all the participants had an excellent command of English. Neither the Soviet Union nor Communist China was represented.

The principal delegations were composed of representatives of business, and the professions, former government officials, and scholars who have devoted most of their lives to the study of far eastern affairs. No votes

were taken and no resolutions were adopted. The Institute of Pacific Relations is privately supported by the great educational foundations, by individuals, and by business concerns. As an organization the institute takes no policy position on the problems with which its members are concerned. Free of protocol and the limitations that often compel reserve by government spokesmen, there was a full and healthy exchange of views.

Ray Lyman Wilbur was the first president of the institute (began in 1925). It was Dr. Wilbur's view that, in unofficial conferences of representatives from all the Pacific countries, there would be a frank facing up to the truth disagreeable though it may be.

I hope that my report of my recent experience will give you an idea of the way in which some of the people of the Far East look at you and at me, at America, today—disagreeable though it may be.

My remarks are directed in large measure to relations between India and the United States because the discussions in which I participated were concerned with these relations.

Moreover, following the conference, the dean of the law school at Lucknow, aware that during the meetings I had seen only the relatively comfortable surroundings of a westernized hotel, a leading Indian university, and one of India's more fortunate urban communities, insisted that I join him on a visit to some of the villages that, in his phrase, "Are India." This we did in the vicinity of Benares, the shrine city on the Ganges.

I have seen poverty and disease the worst of it in parts of central and South Africa, but the worst in those areas was relatively well-being compared with the existence of the peasants, the physically ill villagers and the millions of the great cities of India. We went into tiny mud huts completely without sanitation facilities, where three or four families live huddled in the most sickening conditions. We went, as well, into the fields where the oxen, the wooden plow, a primitive system of irrigation, and workers at a wage of 4 cents plus 1 pound of grain per day, farm as their people have done for hundreds of years. After my trip to the villages had been followed by days in the worst of Benares and Calcutta, much of what had been said by Indian colleagues during the 2 weeks at Lucknow became meaningful.

In my limited time today, I shall discuss Indian-American relations by stating first the essence of the Indian position as my colleagues and I understood it at Lucknow, proceeding from there to an analysis of that position and finally to the recommendations I would make, if I were called upon to suggest the lines of a policy for the United States today.

One statement must precede my summary of Indian position. There is no doubt as to the depth of the distrust and suspicion of the western intention, the western purpose in the Far East. Today this means suspicion and doubt concerning the purpose and objective of the United States. Moreover—and this I would have you remember even though you forget everything else that I say—the important fact is not that the Indians and their neighbors may be wrong about us. The important fact for us is that they hold these views. We will miscalculate seriously if, because we believe they are wrong, we ignore their doubts and the strength of their convictions concerning us.

For the next few minutes, in the role of a spokesman for the Far East, I would like to speak to you Americans in the manner in which some of my Indian friends spoke to us during the Conference. This will be an effort to give you the essentials of the Indian challenge—the Indian question—to us.

"In both official and private statements by your western leaders there is frequent recognition of the movement for independence and of the spirit of revolution that have swept the Far East. But we of the west question seriously whether in the calculations and judgments of your western peoples and governments this recognition is given substantial practical effect. We feel that your judgments and your attitudes toward us are not significantly affected by the knowledge which you claim to have concerning our struggle for independence.

"This may be due to your failure to appreciate the scope and the depth of our revolution against the west. This revolution has been more than a struggle for political independence, whether in China, in its fight against western intervention by special treaties and concessions, or in Indonesia, or in India, in Pakistan, or Indochina. It has been a revolution against foreign political control. But it has been more than that. It is, as well, a social and economic revolution by people with a deep sense of their poverty and misery. Moreover, as one of your own scholars has expressed it, our struggle has been a 'racial revolt, a revolt of the east against the west, a determination that the destinies of Asia shall be decided by Asians, that the new nations of the east will be ends in themselves, not means to western ends.' It is this determination that affects our judgment and reaction to every deed, every proposal, of the west. We fear and will resist every action which, in using us to promote western ends, operates to restore the power and domination from which we have so recently been liberated.

"If you understand this, you will also begin to understand our determination not to be used as means or tools for the west in its struggle against the Soviet Union. We suspect that your interest in us springs not from a desire to help us and our people, but from your need to gain allies in your struggle against your enemy. It is in this context that we judge your apparently permanent occupation of Japan, your string of bases along the Asiatic periphery, your opposition to the Chinese Revolution, your defense of Formosa, your support for the French and Bao Dai. These actions are part of the struggle of the west against the Soviet Union; they are not actions that have been undertaken out of regard for the Asian view of the best interests of Asia.

"You, of course, claim that you are defending us against a common enemy, but this overlooks that Western Europe, with which you are now allied, has long been the enemy, and that each step which you claim to take in our defense now appears also to be one more step toward the restoration of western control, this time under the leadership of the most powerful Nation in the world.

"To declare that we refuse to be pawns in the western plan is not to say that we are about to cast our lot with the Soviet Union. In India, Pakistan and elsewhere we have moved vigorously against Communist leaders who, there is little doubt, have received and acted upon directives from Moscow. As Asia becomes more important in the Soviet Union's world strategy, that nation may be tempted increasingly to interfere in our affairs. But as the Communists or any other group in India or elsewhere in the east subordinate national independence or the economic welfare of their own country to the interest of the Soviet Union their prestige and power among us will be weakened.

"The net effect of our resistance to outside domination from any source whatever, whether from the west or from the Soviet Union is the neutrality which you deplore.

"To say that we are neutral does not mean that we will not meet our commitments under the United Nations Charter to join in putting down aggression. It does mean that we distinguish between collective action by the United Nations under the charter and the day-in-and-day-out struggles of the cold war.

"We are not prepared to join in the cold war. Moreover, because we believe you underestimate the determination of Asiatic peoples to resist threats to their independence, we may, in the councils of the United Nations, urge a greater measure of restraint than will be acceptable to you. It was this that induced our reservations with regard to the decision of the United Nations to press on to the Manchurian border. The Korean peninsula has served as the classical corridor both for the extension of Russian and Chinese power into the Sea of Japan, and for the extension of Japanese power into Manchuria and China. The advance of the forces of MacArthur toward the Manchurian frontier, coming at a time when Japanese power is being revived under the American occupation, would, we of India believed, not only arouse China's fears but also increase her reliance on Soviet Russia. Our reservations may have been wrong. We considered that your calculations should include a careful weighing of such a consequence.

"With regard to communism as a form of government—distinguishing now between the imperialism of Moscow and communism as a method of dealing with social and economic problems—there are also important reasons why our attitude differs from yours. We would prefer a system of government which not only achieves a decent standard of living but does so by democratic means. The danger is that the exercise of this preference, this choice, may not be open to us. We fear that countries as poor as ours may not be able to afford what seem to be the high economic costs of western democratic methods.

"Certain it is that in our part of the world no doctrine can hold its own with communism unless it also gives first place to the needs of ordinary people. The Communist emphasis on economic security has a strong appeal to those who live close to the bread or the rice line. People in the rice line have less concern with political and spiritual values than do those who have economic security. Our sick, underfed, and illiterate people, and we their leaders, believe that the Soviet internal program and the experiment which is now under way in China may hold at least a part of the answer for countries as poor as ours.

"We are told that we have been misled by a myth of Soviet accomplishment in the past 30 years. If this is the case, we must point out that the information which brought the myth into being came largely from English and American writers during the years between the wars, and to an even greater extent from Anglo-American propaganda which, during World War II, unqualifiedly praised and described the accomplishments of their great ally, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"Of one thing we are certain. Our miserable lot today is not the product of communism. We can hardly be blamed, therefore, if we take more than a passing interest in a system which appears to have done so much in so short a time for great numbers of a backward people.

"We are aware that the west, and particularly the United States, is possessed of financial and engineering know-how, of equipment and capital, which could be of the greatest assistance to countries such as ours. But on numerous occasions since the end of World War II both your President and your Secretaries of State have declared that the major initiative in developing the backward areas of the world must be taken by private capital. The difficulty here is not only that your business people demand privileges and guaranties which we venture to believe they no longer enjoy in their own country but

they require what they call a climate for investment which would compel us to abandon programs to which our governments are firmly committed. As to government aid rather than private aid from the west, although there has been much publicity concerning the bold new point 4 program, the action of the American Congress does not encourage us to believe that there will be a follow through that will make it a truly bold program. Moreover, we have been made to understand, by the Marshall plan example in Europe, that any direct assistance from the United States would be conditioned upon our abandonment of neutrality.

"We assure you that in the resulting impasse we realize that there may be danger to both of our interests."

Much more could be said to spell out the details of the Indian position. I have given you its essentials. In giving a composite picture, I have necessarily left out statements of members of the Indian and other delegations who departed from the position of the majority. At one extreme, was the member of the Pakistan delegation who declared that he could best demonstrate the extent of Asian distrust of the west, by reporting his own conviction, and that of many of his people, that the United States would never have dropped the atomic bomb on a white people. At the other extreme, one very able Indian representative took issue throughout the conference with the views of his colleagues. He was outspoken in his criticism of the failure to appreciate the real character of the Soviet threat he deplored acceptance of what he described as the myth of Communist accomplishment, and he favored unqualified adherence to the position which western leadership has taken in the United Nations. But his was almost the only dissenting eastern voice to the position as I have stated it.

Of course, the eastern position not only induced rather sharp responses from spokesmen for the west, but made all of us feel, after about a week of patient submission that the time had come to tell our side of the story. It was at the beginning of the second week that one American delegate stated his own reaction in terms of a frustrating dilemma. He pointed out "that western aid is condemned as imperialism, lack of aid as isolationism; keeping troops in Asia as expansionism, keeping troops out of Asia as inviting aggression, political neutrality as helping reactionaries, support of progressive forces as intervention. We are damned if we do and damned if we don't."

It is not my intention to argue the rights and wrongs of the positions taken by India, Pakistan, and other eastern representatives.

I share the view expressed by one of our leading papers that in today's world the neutral course of India leads to bottomless difficulties and inconsistencies. But I also feel that our impatience with the neutrals of today may be a good illustration of the American habit of looking only forward and regarding both the recent and distant past as dead weight. As I have thought about the neutral position of India, I have recalled that it was only a little more than 10 years ago that we were the great leaders of a neutral bloc, neutral as we ultimately came to acknowledge between the forces of Nazi evil, the forces that had overrun Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and France, and the forces of western democracy. Our neutrality had taken the form of a series of neutrality acts by which we legislated ourselves into the rigid position from which we were finally driven only by the attack on Pearl Harbor. Our neutrality had been dictated, at least in part, by the conviction that we could gain nothing by joining with either side. Our neutrality and isolationism went back over many years to a reluctance, among a powerful segment of the American people, to join in an alliance with any part of Europe, and in particular with the British Empire.

It is important in negotiating with countries like India that we not forget that a very short period of time has passed since the day when our motivations were comparable to those which induce their neutrality today. We must recall that India and Pakistan achieved independence in 1947 after a long struggle. It should not be surprising that in 1949–50 they are reluctant to join an alliance which includes nations from which eastern independence has been so recently won.

In urging a look-back to our recent and distant past with a view to more tolerant understanding, I do not propose that we abandon efforts to demonstrate that the neutral east may be misguided. I do this so that as we advance our own cause, we show a real appreciation of the considerations which influence the judgments of other peoples.

And as we take full account of the background of India's neutrality we should also give serious study to what many consider the real danger in India, both to India and to our interest in the Far East.

India has set a course for herself as a democracy in the western tradition. Her constitution is essentially democratic. The judiciary is independent. The army is subordinate to civil power. The press is protected by constitutional guaranties. During the coming year 170,000,000 citizens will go to the polls in one of Asia's first general and free elections. India is setting out on the road to democracy. The important question is:

"How far will she be able to travel on that road?"

She will probably be able to travel on that road only if she is able to respond to the growing demand of her people for food, clothing, and shelter.

Poverty is not new in Asia. What is new is that the people have learned to attribute their condition to the injustice or inadequacy of their rulers.

The view is shared by many who know India well that she stands a long, long way from an effective beginning on the comprehensive program required to meet the needs and growing demands of her people. There is a steady increase in population, approximately 1.4 percent or more than 4,000,000 per year; from 319,000,000 in 1941 to 342,000,000 at the end of 1946. The already low standard of living has been going down since 1942 and in some areas, for much longer than that. To meet the resulting need for increased agricultural and industrial production, the government is doing its best—some irrigation, some hydroelectric projects, but its best is not good enough. Consequently millions of people who had been led to believe that independence would bring the millennium, who believed that poverty would disappear after British rule ended, may become disillusioned. The independence movement, although of a dynamic revolutionary character, was essentially negative. That movement did not require and did not develop leaders to cope with the type of problem that has come after independence. Consequently, while there has been much talk in India of agrarian reform, industrial and commercial development, while speeches are made and some laws, such as that for the division of the large estates, have been put on the books, action has been, and promises to be, slow in coming. There is too much stress upon the defects and evils of the old, too little by way of concrete design for the new. As unrest grows, a preventive detention act is being used not only to lock up the Communists, but also Socialists and other troublemakers. There is concern that the one party system, the system of the powerful Congress Party, may feel increasingly compelled to limit basic freedoms of speech and press.

Failure to improve living conditions over a period of time would not necessarily mean communism in India. It might mean a move to the extreme right. The chaos that could conceivably precede or accompany a move either to the right or to the left would aid only the Soviet Union, not India, not the west.

What can the United States do to meet this and closely related problems in the Far East?

1. Almost every hour brings additional proof that the first and major task of the Nation today is military preparedness. Every hour brings additional evidence that our commitments for the maintenance of peace, our undertakings on the political level, are beyond our power to act. We are overextended. We must bring our forces up to our commitments. We must be prepared to meet force with force whenever and wherever there is a violation of the United Nations Charter. This is the first front. If the battle on this front is lost, everything is lost.

2. Calmly and with cold calculation we should reassess our strength and our weaknesses in the Far East. Such a calculation would give greater weight than we have given heretofore to the eastern attitudes about which I have been speaking today. Such a calculation would also consider how many of our Western Allies in the United Nations would join us in the kind of military operation on the Asiatic mainland which for a long time now has been the logical ultimate of the views expressed by flag-waving and speech-making Senators as they travel about the Far East.

3. I have said that overwhelming strength and military preparedness is imperative, but in the kind of struggle in which we are engaged, victory on the first front, military victory, does not necessarily mean ultimate victory. Whether we like it or not, we must continue to fight the battle on the second front, the battle on the front which has been so well fought under the Marshall plan in Europe. I refer to the front that my Indian colleague had in mind when he said that "in our part of the world no doctrine can hold its own with communism unless it also gives first place to the needs of ordinary people." This is what I mean by the second front in Asia. Greater wisdom than I shall ever possess is necessary to understand the motives and anticipate the strategy of the men in the Kremlin. Of one thing, however, I am reasonably certain. This is, that high on the list of their objectives is the determination to induce—to lead—to compel the United States and its allies not only to neglect, but to abandon the second front.

It is a second front—a standard of living—problem which is attaining serious proportions in countries like India. And because of the present neutral position of such countries our task is infinitely more difficult than it has been in Western Europe. It is more difficult because of Indian reluctance to abandon neutrality as a condition of aid. It is more difficult because, at a time when the demands on our resources seem overwhelming, our Congress and our people understandably draw back from proposals for aid to those who refuse to join our side. Can the impasse, the dilemma, be resolved?

This leads to my fourth point.

4. India and her neighbors have recently met in London under the auspices of the British Commonwealth of Nations and have agreed upon a program of economic development. Funds in the amount of over $5,000,000,000 are to be committed to the program.

The expressed objective is to resist the spread of communism in the Far East. A news dispatch from London yesterday stated that it was the hope of the Commonwealth nations that the United States would cooperate by tying in its efforts under point 4. Here then is an opportunity for United States collaboration on a multilateral basis which would avoid the delicate political problems presented by India's neutrality. We should seize this opportunity.

Nelson Rockefeller has been appointed Chairman of a United States Committee on the point 4 program. Rockefeller has had 15 years of experience on this kind of job in Latin America. During 10 of those years he was operating on development programs as head of his own private corporation. During five of those years he was at the same job in a Government capacity. He knows how to deal with foreign governments and with foreign business interests. He has learned that programs in aid of the economies of other countries must be safeguarded not only to prevent waste but also to insure that the development is in aid of those who need it most. Above all, in connection with the Standard Oil interests in Venezuela, with his own development company in Brazil and the Caribbean and with the Government, he has learned the importance of comprehensive programs to train the workers of underdeveloped countries to use the agricultural and industrial tools without which the standard of living cannot be raised.

As my point four then, I would urge that Rockefeller and his associates meet at the earliest possible time with representatives of India and the other Commonwealth countries of Asia so that there may soon be presented to the Congress a statement of what America should do on condition that these countries continue to help themselves.

5. And last on my list for today, I would tell the Indians and others of the east who are in the same neutral position that we know that the objectives of their neutrality—peace and security—are the same as the objectives which we pursue through collective action under the United Nations Charter. We should tell them further that we hope they will come to see, as we have so recently come to see that the establishment of a powerful collective force through and as a part of the United Nations is the more effective way to achieve their objectives and ours; peace and security. It may be that developments like those in Tibet and in North Korea will do to and for the Indian position what it took Greece, the Berlin blockade, and the fall of Czechoslovakia to do to and for the American attitude toward the Soviet Union. In a word, I would not pressure India to be on our side every time there is a vote in the United Nations. I venture the view that the mistakes of both the Soviet Union and Communist China will do more for our cause in India in this particular than any amount of pressure from us.

Whether you agree with any of my recommendations is not important. I shall have failed rather badly, however, if I have not given you some idea of the way in which Indians from many walks of life—wealthy business men, journalists, doctors, lawyers—look at the west, look at you and me today. I referred at the beginning of my remarks to Dr. Wilbur's association over the years with the work of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

In a commencement address in 1927, Dr. Wilbur had occasion to describe the purpose of the conferences of the Institute. One of his sentences sharply states the reason why I shall always consider my experience at Lucknow a great one. It is an effective statement of my major purpose in speaking here today.

"To see yourself as others see you, to view your own country through the questioning eyes of foreign neighbors, is a chastening and wholesome experience and one that millions must undergo if we are to deal successfully across the great ocean."

Bring the Boys Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert results of a poll conducted by the Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Mich.:

"BRING THE BOYS HOME"—PUBLIC OPINION VOTERS TURN THUMBS DOWN ON KOREAN WAR; SEEK STIFF CONTROLS; ASK FOR SLASH IN SPENDING

An additional week of voting did not change results in the Free Press survey of public opinion. Seven in 10 still favor withdrawal from Korea as quickly as possible.

Those who returned public opinion ballots largely continued other trends indicated in the first week.

There had been predictions that an additional week of balloting would upset results presented last week. It was argued that those who viewed unfavorably the published results would flood the mail with contrary views.

There was a flood of mail last week in the closing hours of the mail survey. But, as noted, it did not change results.

Most decisive vote was on price and wage controls—85 in 100 wanted stiff ones—and on the proposal to have foreign nations supply the bulk of UN forces. Again, 85 percent favorable. Almost as decisive was the vote in favor of cutting nondefense spending: 80 in 100 favorable.

Readers also indicated they are against dropping the A-bomb now, although they want it kept as a United States weapon. They oppose, 2 to 1, sending American troops to Europe; oppose by narrower margins drafting 18-year-olds and sending substantial aid to foreign countries.

Many of the one-quarter who favor admitting China to the United Nations explained their vote: They believe in facing facts and, as they see it, the Reds are the present rulers of China.

The plan to defend outlying bases but keep our armies at home, largely as proposed by ex-President Herbert Hoover, won favorable votes from about two-thirds of those who returned ballots.

One happening that seemed unusual to tabulators was the number who voted on only a few issues.

For example, in one case, 43 votes were cast. But of these nine did not choose to register an opinion on whether or not to stay in Korea.

For this reason the votes shown in the result table do not add up. To get a total of 4,000 votes on any one question, it was necessary to count well over 4,000 ballots.

The idea for the public opinion survey was suggested to the Free Press by Edward W. Sowers, editor of the Daily News in Rolla, Mo., after he used a similar ballot in Rolla to find out "what the public thinks."

Korea GI's are so busy they even receive their citations in fox holes. "Get the troops out of there" is the advice of the majority who voted in the public opinion survey. Exact results are shown in the table below:

Final ballot figures

Percentage		The question	Actual vote	
Yes	No		Yes	No
75	25	Should we withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible?	3,063	1,046
26	74	Should we stay until we can give Korea a government chosen by its people?	994	2,844
21	79	Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on reprisal?	822	3,107
22	78	Should we reject use of the A-bomb as a weapon of war?	888	3,085
38	62	Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries?	1,443	2,402
44	56	Should we draft 18-year-olds?	1,746	2,256
33	67	Should we send American troops to Europe?	1,286	2,605
80	20	Should nondefense spending be cut drastically?	3,236	785
27	73	Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	1,062	2,915
85	15	Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of UN armed forces?	3,296	600
66	34	Should we simply defend our outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home?	2,599	1,335
85	15	Should we have stiff price and wage controls?	3,466	601

Two Russian Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Two Russian Fronts," by Hugh Baillie, president, United Press Association, delivered before the annual conference of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, Inc., at Chicago, Ill., on January 22, 1951:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, having traveled from Korea to Europe and back to Washington, I am prepared to give you my reporter's observations of what I saw on those trips. I won't make any predictions or indulge in any editorial comment. What I am going to tell you is what was told me by other people. By the people who are running the show.

First, let me sketch lightly over where I went and who and what I saw. In Korea I saw General MacArthur. And I will say right at the outset that few military commanders in history ever did so much with so little, as General MacArthur has accomplished in Korea. How little won't be known until it's all over.

General MacArthur risked his reputation in this Korean War at the command of the United Nations. He told me that he was very much surprised when he was called to the telecom at 4 o'clock in the morning and saw there a directive for him to get in and fight in Korea.

We all remember the enthusiasm and the cheers which greeted the United Nations intervention in Korea. The enthusiasm of the United Nations evaporated under adversity. And now, some of our most powerful friends

are looking for the exits. And now that MacArthur has suffered reverses, most of which are attributable to not having enough troops, the popular thing is to second-guess him.

The thing for us to do in Korea is to get in or get out. You can't fight a half-war. You can't pull your punches. Yet that is exactly what we are doing in Asia. We are pulling our punches. We are pulling our punches because the United Nations is getting shaky on the issue, and because those back here who are running the show feel that we cannot risk a two-front war at this time. We now have about 2,500,000 men under arms. The last time we fought a two-front war, we had 12,864,000 men under arms. And corresponding munitions, ships, and supplies of all sorts.

But as to the question of whether there is going to be a war, why, the war's on now. The question is how fast it will spread. The cost of liberty is going up and up, as we all can see. Like everything else. The price is rising. But, we ain't seen nothing yet. This war is young.

Well, as I said, General MacArthur told me that he was surprised at being ordered into Korea. If there was anybody more surprised than General MacArthur, it was the Russians themselves. They did not expect the United States to show up. They had heard official pronouncements to the effect that we had written off Korea. When the Americans appeared on the field of battle, and in the air, and on the sea, I am sure the Russians felt they had been mousetrapped. They had been hoaxed.

People have asked me why the Chinese did not get into the war earlier, and come down into Korea and keep us from advancing so far. The answer to that is that the Chinese were not ready to enter the war earlier. It had never been supposed by the Russians they would need the Chinese in this particular campaign. They thought the North Koreans could handle it alone. It took several months for the Chinese army to move up into Manchuria and along the border and get ready to intervene.

By that time, under clearance from the United Nations, MacArthur had advanced so far that the Chinese obviously decided to lay back and let him come all the way up to the frontier. The Asiatic style of warfare, so I was told in Korea, is predicated on the annihilation of the enemy. The deeper we advanced the easier the Chinese thought it would be to annihilate us later. That's what they have been trying to do ever since last November.

General MacArthur achieved a military miracle in Korea by holding a line around the old Pusan perimeter. He was fabulously outnumbered at all times. When I was over there the artillery ammunition was rationed, 20 rounds to a gun per day. Then through the maneuver of the Inchon landing, and the constant air attacks which had weakened the Korean Communists to such an extent that they were ready to collapse, the tide was turned and the enemy army was virtually destroyed. When I accompanied MacArthur to Seoul, at the time he turned the government over to Syngman Rhee, the president of South Korea, MacArthur thought the war was over, and said so. During the ceremony MacArthur led in the Lord's Prayer, and thanked God for the victory. I was there in the assembly hall of the Korean capital building, and remember the broken glass that came tumbling down around our ears at intervals from the shattered dome, as MacArthur spoke and prayed. The Korean Red armies have ceased to exist as formidable antagonists, as was demonstrated by the rapidity with which we advanced into North Korea. But the Chinese were lying in watt.

They gave us plenty of advance warning. They issued statements, and made broadcasts, announcing that they would not tolerate the approach of the United Nations forces to their frontiers. Nobody believed them. Nobody believed the Chinese then, any more than we believe the Russians now, when they say they will not stand idly by and see us organize a Western European army, particularly with a backbone of German troops.

The Russians are making those threats at frequent intervals. They are discounted in this country. It is common knowledge that the Moscow correspondents are able to file through censorship only that news which the Russians want to get out. It is noticeable that during the last several days and weeks, our correspondent in Moscow, the United Press correspondent, has been able to file many stories, carrying the news that the Russians will not stand for the organization of the army, which has been undertaken by General Eisenhower. This is coming out because the Russians want it to get out. It is the first move, or one of the first moves, in their campaign to frustrate the organization of Eisenhower's army. They may be expected to try many other things.

First, they will try to scare the Germans out of joining General Eisenhower's army. They will also start an agitation in this country against arming the Nazis. They may be expected to create an incident, like the Berlin blockade, which will take our minds off the business of building this North Atlantic treaty army. Of course, the Russians don't want war, so to speak, if they can get what they want without war. Or at least, without getting into the war themselves, personally. They prefer wars like the one in Korea. As on distinguished British statesmen said to me, "The Russians are very generous with other people's lives."

Those who are on the ground and running the show in Germany believe that if the Russians get the idea that the Western European army is actually going to come into being, and emerge from the blueprint stage (and they aren't convinced yet that it will), they will do something drastic. Meanwhile they won't. They are not afraid of a blueprint army.

But I was told in Germany that if they decide to move, they will endeavor to create inside Germany, Korea No. 2. And this is the way they would go about it. The Russians have, in the eastern zone of Germany, an army which is called the alert police. I have heard its figures given as high as 100,000 men. This is a fully equipped army, with tanks and airplanes, read to roll. Now the East Germans are endeavoring to start negotiations with West German Chancellor Adenauer, looking toward a unification of Germany. It so happens that I was actually talking to Adenauer at his office located in a villa at Bonn, on the Rhine last month when the original note from President Grotewohl of East Germany was handed to him. I remember that Adenauer turned to me and said, "We certainly live in interesting times."

When the time comes that the Russians want to create this Korea No. 2 the formula is simple. The East Germans announce that Adenauer has been wasting their time. They would say that he, and he alone, was standing in the way of a unified fatherland. If they follow the classic formula, they will denounce him as a tool of Wall Street and the American cannibals, and they will call on all loyal Germans who want a unified fatherland, and who do not want to be "sold" into Eisenhower's army, to rise and put Adenauer out. And to help it along they will send their alert police army to take a hand in the proceedings. As soon as the German alert police army emerges from the Russian zone it will be met by the American forces in Germany. Two divisions. And maybe by the British also. Two more divisions. The ordinary German civilians will have a terrible time making up their minds what they want to do. If they join the German insurrection, they risk their necks, and if they don't, they risk their necks, because the East Germans will say to them that they will take care of them later. Meanwhile the German army from the Russian zone will be fighting the American army and possibly the British and maybe some French, with the Russians standing on the sidelines just like the Chinese stood on the sidelines for a while in Asia. And there you would have your Korea No. 2, according to what I heard in Germany. Americans fighting Germans who tell the world that all they want to do is to unify their country.

Now, you are going to be hearing more and more about this chap Konrad Adenauer, the Chancellor of West Germany, from now on. He is 75 years old, lean, jaunty, and seemingly tireless. He can take on the High Commissioners of the United States, Great Britain, and France and negotiate with them for hours at a stretch. After keeping them in session for 8 hours or so, they will emerge from the meeting looking all beaten up. Adenauer will come out looking fresh as a daisy. He thrives on negotiating and bargaining. If he were in this country, he would probably be a labor negotiator.

Adenauer is striving to drive a tough bargain with the victorious Allies. He wants the occupation statute converted into a treaty and he wants the High Commissioners to become ambassadors. He has no intention of paying Hitler's debts, nor has he any intention of continuing to pay the costs of the occupation. He wants the German scientists to be let loose to conduct their research for the benefit of Germany instead of for its conquerors. He wants Germany to have the right to build its own merchant marine and air fleet (no doubt with American money, like everybody else). And instead of furnishing combat teams to Eisenhower's army, to be commanded by Frenchmen, Americans, or British, Adenauer wants the Germans to have their own army with their own general staff. All this would have seemed fantastic only a few short months ago. It isn't fantastic any more. If the present trend continues, and the Russians don't succeed in frustrating the plan, in about 2 years you will see Germany back in business.

And since we are about to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan, to be followed by the organization of a Japanese army to lend a hand in the Far East, the chances are that two of our principal allies in the future will be the two countries that we brought to total defeat in the last war, Germany and Japan. That is, if Russia sits still and lets all this happen.

Adenauer makes no secret of his appreciation of the fact that he has been handed a tremendous break by the Russians. He intends to take full advantage of it. Adenauer is sure that if we keep fighting in Korea we will be playing the Russians' game. He told me the Russians desire to have us bled white in Korea so they could occupy Europe without a fight. As he put it when I interviewed him for the United Press the Russians would win the game without losing a man.

Adenauer told me there would be lasting peace only when the United States was able to confront Russia with a military force which the Soviets would consider dangerous. He said that to build such a force the United States needs Germany. And that America will get the whole-hearted cooperation of Germans only when they no longer feel they are a second-class power under occupation. That's the basis of his argument.

Adenauer in his desire to have us discontinue the war in Asia is in entire agreement with the other European statesmen with whom I talked last month. What they want, of course, is for us to liquidate the war in Korea and bring our Army over to Europe.

You have heard the question asked, if the Russians actually are going to move, why right now—this January. They'll never find Europe any flatter, or less able to resist, than right now this January. Well it could be, of course, they are waiting for the snow to thaw and the ground to harden so as to carry their armor.

Churchill believes it's the atom bomb. This, in his opinion, is the great deterrent to the Russians. They know we have more atom bombs than they have, and a better delivery system.

Other British authorities told me the Russians first would have to grab the Persian oil fields before they could enter into a full-scale war. The first move in such a war, therefore, would be Russian occupation of the rich Azerbaijan oil fields in Persia. However, it must be remembered that Russia is less dependent on oil than the west. Their armies don't use so much armor as we do. They take the form of another Asiatic horde, like the Chinese. One of the amazing features of the Korean War has been how the Chinese managed to do it, without air power and without extensive transport. The fact that they use human beings instead of trucks, very largely, gives them a big advantage. You can shoot up the roads and destroy the convoys, but it's harder to interrupt the supplies when they're all brought down on the heads or backs of people. As a matter of fact, in Korea we have a highly modernized European-style army fighting in a primitive country. The enemy knows how to use his legs. He hasn't been riding in automobiles since infancy. He can walk up a mountain like a fly going up the side of a house, and can keep on doing it day and night. He doesn't need a big plant behind his lines. And when he's wounded nobody worries about carrying him back, they just throw him into the ditch. There are always more where he came from.

The American soldier is a precision instrument, trained, a technician, with background and education. He is not expendable. Put him against a Chinese coolie of whom there are unlimited quantities, and give each of them an automatic weapon, and it's a standoff. Much the same situation would prevail in a war with Russia.

Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain is very anxious to have us out of Korea. He regards any war in Asia as a bottomless pit for the white race And this attitude is heartily echoed by Bevin, the Foreign Secretary.

In France, I found the same thing. Premier Pleven believes that we can be bled to death in Asia. Foreign Minister Schuman thinks the same thing. But Schuman doesn't believe that Stalin is going to strike a military blow in the immediate future. He feels that Stalin has become old and prudent, and that he would be too wise to risk everything in an open war when he can continue to attain his objectives by subversion. In this respect Schuman agrees with Attlee who also foresees an intensification of Russia's underground methods in seeking its objectives, without war. And two of Russia's prime objectives, of course, are Italy and France where the Communists are a large and powerful political party.

General Eisenhower has probably been handed the toughest assignment of all at this particular time. But I think he expects to succeed, or he wouldn't have undertaken it. To Europeans, of course, the appointment of General Eisenhower meant just one thing. That is, the Yanks are coming. They don't think Washington would ever let Ike down. If he comes back and says we can discourage the Russians, and encourage Europe in really rearming and joining up, but that he needs a certain number of American divisions as a starter, he'll get them. That's what they believe.

Ladies and gentlemen, the position today is that we have called Russia like Britain called Germany in 1939. You may recall the British told the Germans there would be war if they entered Poland. I remember being in London at that time and I asked the British what they could do to defend Poland from the Germans. The reply was they could do nothing; however Poland would be the chip that Germany would knock off Britain's shoulder and start the war.

Like the British, we have drawn a line. We drew a line against the Russians in Korea. We have drawn a line against the Russians in Europe. I have been on both fronts. On the Korean front where we are at grips with the Communists, and on the European front where we are preparing to come to grips with them if they advance.

The war has already started. The question is whether it will spread, and how fast. Russia is still calling the tune.

Never was there such a time when there was so much dissension in high places, so many contrary opinions of what ought to be done, or how to go about doing it.

I have been on a long trip and seen a lot of people—people who presumably know the answers—people who are in command—people who bear the responsibility. Yet I think I can say, without joking, that this is a case where the more you see and hear, the less you know.

The less you know for sure, anyway.

Twice before in our generation the lights of freedom have burned low all over the world. Twice before they have been rekindled by the United States. The question before us now is, whether we will have to rekindle them this third time?

Draft for "Sick" Railmen an Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of February 4, 1951, written by Austen Lake:

DRAFT FOR "SICK" RAILMEN AN IDEA

(By Austen Lake)

I am just old Joe Blunt, American, and pretty confused in the head by what I read in the newspapers. So here we are, the sovereign United States people, exhorted to stand unitedly behind President Truman in what is called a national emergency. But how can we stand behind him when he faces in so many directions on the same basic problems like wage-and-price controls? Because, no sooner do we stand behind him on one decision, then he pivots around and we are not behind him any more.

Also we are invited to show our loyalty by following our congressional leaders. And so we should. But how can we form a common procession when the leaders traipse off in separate parades and individual countermarches. Because, no sooner do we fall in line, than we find ourselves trailing a lot of men going nowhere in different ways.

Like I say I am just old Joe Blunt, American and father of four little Blunts, and I would like to do my democratic share. But, if President Truman and Congress don't know where they are heading on almost everything, how can the great commonality of Americans, like me, render realistic service.

JOE WILL DO HIS DUTY

Here last week the Nation gets a price-and-wage freeze as of January 25. So I say to old lady Blunt, "Well, costs are pretty stiff, but now we can try to budget the pay check." But next I read where Congress has changed its mind, and we have a price-and-wage thaw. So there goes my pay budget all to hell again.

That ain't what bothers me most. Here, today, comes a letter to my boy, Joe Blunt, Jr., which reads "Greetings from the President," and says for him to report for Army induction and physical examination next Thursday without fail. So young Joe says, "I guess that's it, Dad," and I say, "Yes, son, that's your duty as a good American boy." I got a daddy's unhappy feeling, of course, because young Joe is just 19 and fresh out of high school and don't know anything about what causes wars.

Still, when Uncle Sam stretches out his long arm and tells my kid, or your kid too, "Come on and no ifs, ands, or buts," we got to be good citizens. We haven't any choice like.

Then I see in the papers that the railroad switchmen are out on strike and paralyzing some 33 roads which are hauling essential war materials of our troops in Korea, where my nephew, Bill Blunt, is fighting with the marines. Only this ain't a regular, legal strike, because last December 14, the United States Department invoked a court injunction which made rail strikes unlawful.

So the paper says how the railroad switchmen are pretending to get sick all at once while their union bosses said "Tsk-tsk. It's some kind of epidemic over which we have no control." Now that, of course, is pure malarky which even a simple guy like old Joe Blunt can recognize, let alone a real smart man like President Truman. Then I think, "It seems strange that a Government which has the power to draft young boys, to fix prices, and freeze wages, to grab strategic materials and otherwise control the freedoms of individual action and the economic life of the Nation, can be so helpless to stop and punish wildcat strikers.

WHAT IF JOE GOT SICK?

So I say to old lady Blunt, "What would happen if young Joe decided to get sick and stay sick for the duration of the hostility in Korea and elsewhere?" And old lady Blunt gives me a queer look and says, "That would be rebellion against the Government, and young Joe would go to jail." Which, as I know, is the right answer.

But then I say, "Here the Justice Department has a court order, dated back to December 14, against railroad strikes. Yet the switchmen are defying Federal law and striking anyway, even when the Army is placed in control of the railroads. Isn't that rebellion, too, and shouldn't somebody go to jail?"

So, if the President and Congress don't stand firmly behind their own laws, how can old Joe Blunt or the American people be expected to stand behind the President and Congress? That is, unless the people somehow grow two faces and learn to stand facing opposite directions at the same time.

Then old lady Blunt, who is pretty cute in some matters said, "Well who would you

arrest—the entire brotherhood of railroad switchmen, numbering some 35,000?"

"No. But the Army is asking for 80,000 soldiers for immediate service and it seems kinda sensible to draft the 35,000 switchmen. It might not be a bad idea if Mr. Truman would mail them all a letter starting, 'Greetings from the President of the United States,' like he did today with young Joe. Then he could say, 'Now you are inducted into the Army and my first direct order, as your Commander in Chief, is to get back on the job switching trains, and no ifs, ands, or buts.'"

Old lady Blunt wrinkles up her nose and sniffs, "But that ain't the democratic way and, if nothing else, President Truman is a Democrat first. Not only that but the whole Truman administration is owned, body and soul, by the labor vote, or thinks it is. And Mr. Truman is never a man willfully to kick votes in the face."

SOME OF LIFE'S PUZZLES

The only conclusion I can manage from all this is that it constitutes "Government by drift" and Mr. Truman and Congress, as the captain and crew of our ship, are allowing the winds, cross currents and tides to carry the Nation willy-nilly, by guess and by accident. At which point old lady Blunt says, "Have you got a couple of dollars? I want to buy some pork chops to feed young Joe a good, last meal before he joins the Army." So I fish around and all I can find is $1.50, which I hand over, warning, "That is all we got till next Wednesday payday."

Old lady Blunt sighs and says, "Well I hoped to buy pork chops, but I guess we will have to eat cabbage soup again and maybe some eggs." So I turn to the part of the paper which says how the Government is still paying millions for farm subsidies and stock piling more mountains of eggs, butter and cereals to rot in order to keep prices at top levels. Which puzzles me some more on how the Government can boost prices up and freeze 'em down at the same time.

I will close by wondering which way Mr. Truman and Congress are facing today, so I can face that way too, and thus stand unitedly behind them.

United States Policy Must Be Based on Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, we have, in the City of Los Angeles, a comparatively new metropolitan newspaper which recently demonstrated the kind of journalistic leadership which we all greatly admire. The paper conducted a poll to ascertain the sentiment of its readers relative to our foreign policy. When the results of the poll showed the thinking of a majority of those writing in to be isolationist and contrary to what the editor deemed best for the safety of the United States, he promptly took an editorial position contrary to the majority expression of those answering the poll, and set forth his reasons for believing them to be in error. I think Mr. Virgil Pinkley, the editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Mirror, deserves to be commended, both for his forthrightness and the high quality of his editorial analysis of our situation. The editorial merits widespread dissemination, and I am therefore including it in our RECORD as follows:

UNITED STATES POLICY MUST BE BASED ON FACTS

Final results in the Mirror poll on the United Nations-European aid question show that the thinking of a majority of those who participated is ruggedly isolationist.

We respect and understand that viewpoint. But we disagree with it.

We have a certain sympathy with those who are annoyed and repelled by recent international developments. However, now more than ever, we should not let emotion outrun reason. This is a time for mature, reasoned decisions of long-range character. Analysis dictates the conclusion that isolationism is wrong for the United States at this point in history.

To us the fallacy of the isolationist position is clear. The world has shrunk so much in the past 10 years that the United States could not stand safely alone, even if it wished. That statement becomes truer and truer every time a faster plane and a stronger A-bomb are produced. Since we cannot stand alone we must learn to stand together against tyranny.

Standing alone looks deceptively simple. Just build our big wall and hide behind it, they say. Standing together is much harder, because it involves blending our American viewpoint with those of other nations. And though their basic aims may be the same, their ways of reaching the goal are bound to differ. That generates an appearance of confusion and uncertainty which makes it easy for the faint-hearted to say, "Aw, let's toss the whole United Nations out of the window."

Here are some answers to some of the most frequent isolationist charges:

1. Western Europe is not doing its part in the common defense.

Answer. The United States in 1950 had 14 men in uniform per 1,000 population. Britain and France each had 16 men in the armed services per 1,000 population.

2. Air and sea power can beat Russia in Europe; a land army isn't necessary.

Answer. That's what many thought about Korea, too. Our sad experience there, and that of World War II, are conclusive evidence that air attacks will not stop ground forces. The man with the rifle wins wars.

3. If the United States sends troops to Europe, Russia will start a war.

Answer. Russia respects only strength. She is far more likely to attack a weak foe than a strong one. She will never be offended into a war.

4. Western Europe isn't so vital; what if we do lose it to the Reds?

Answer. Take steel, for example, since it is a basic material of war power. In 1950, the United States produced 96,500,000 tons of steel. Russia and her satellites produced 34,900,000 tons. A far larger percentage of Soviet steel than American goes into military production. Western Europe produced 57,000,000 tons. If we desert Western Europe we have handed the Russians equality in steel output.

Most of the uranium for our atom bombs comes from the Belgian Congo. The air bases we need in event of war with Russia are controlled by our Western European allies. The airfields in Britain, French North Africa, Greece, Turkey, and Italy are the key to power strokes against Russia. If we are denied these bases we lose our No. 1 advantage over Russia.

On the strength of these facts alone, we urge those who would have us pull back inside a shell to reexamine their views.

The United States is the leader of the free world. The harsh facts of economic reality makes us so. What leader ever won a fight by putting his head in the sand?

Duty to Country—Or to Purse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune on Sunday, February 4, 1951, entitled "Duty to Country—Or to Purse?"

The action of the striking railroad workers has aroused the indignation of the people of the country and properly so.

As I have stated in previous insertions in the RECORD of other editorials on the same subject during the past few days, the time has come to not only halt the present strike but to strengthen the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley law so that the President will have adequate power to deal with Nation-wide strikes that affect the national health, welfare, or security.

The editorial follows:

DUTY TO COUNTRY—OR TO PURSE?

The current "sick call" by switchmen members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is the latest, most flagrant, and vicious abuse of the power the organized labor monopoly has created.

In a sickeningly transparent ruse to force the American public and its Government to comply with what otherwise might be legitimate needs, the switchmen are costing the United States incalculable damage.

The news reports tell of walkouts in at least 44 major cities and the consequent tangle of rail traffic. In Chicago, shipments of food and medical supplies bound for Americans fighting in Korea are halted. Bocked-up shipments have forced layoffs in industries manufacturing our defense needs, halting production which we may never regain.

The strike, and such it is no matter how much the sanctimonious aura of sick leave is spread, is technically against the United States Government. The Army assumed control of all major railroads last year in a Federal move to avert just such dangerous walkouts as we now face.

Now this newspaper has opposed the encroachment of Federal Government into the lives of citizens as much or more than the next one. We feel and always will feel that an individual is entitled to make his living and bargain for a better one without being seduced or coerced by Government in any case.

But the fact remains that Government intervenes in these cases only when the national security and the welfare of all citizens is threatened by the arbitrary and dictatorial attitude of the comparative few. And it is a proven fact that our particular administration, conscious of labor's political power as it is, will intercede only when the need is dire and after the great mass of the American people have brought their opinion

to bear. That has been established in the coal strikes and rail walkouts of the past few years.

Therefore the railroaders on strike today are deliberately flouting the order of a Government acting in the interest of all its people. They are sacrificing in no small degree the welfare and security of all Americans.

This strike is even more indefensible since the switchmen actually claim they are discriminated against by their own union. Their grievance is against their own leaders, not the GI in the snows of Korea. But it is the GI who suffers. Their claim for a reduction in their workweek may very well be legitimate. But the GI cannot discard his responsibility to his Nation by walking out on 7-day-a-week combat duty just because he thinks his gripe is legitimate.

Continued refusal by organized labor to recognize and shoulder its responsibilities may prove labor's downfall yet. Failure by union leadership to put duty to country before duty to purse can't be tolerated much longer.

Two New York Newspapers Whooping It Up for Internationalism and Urging That We Spend Ourselves Into Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, never in the entire history of our country have the American people been more keenly aware of the fact that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

There is a growing realization that the danger of war and the atom bomb are being deliberately overemphasized to blind us to the fact that we are being rushed headlong into a situation worse than war—total economic collapse. That would mean revolution and unbridled anarchy throughout the entire world—a throwback to the dark ages.

If we would defeat our enemies and save our country, we must see clearly who our enemies are. The struggle that goes on in the world today is not between communism and capitalism, but the age-old struggle between the forces of absolutism and the forces of freedom. Communism is merely one of the instruments used by the absolutists to set up the power state, and to achieve their objectives the absolutists have entered into an unholy alliance with the Communists, Fascists, fellow travelers, phony liberals and one-worlders. The tools with which they work and the vehicles on which they are riding to power are supplied by a debauched, manipulated, irredeemable paper currency which is so manipulated that we are financing communism in Europe while our sons are dying to stop communism in Asia. Prices are high because they have made our dollars cheap.

We must recognize that there is a national and international conspiracy to drain away our wealth, to gain control of our industry and commerce, replace our system of government with the power state, lower our standard of living to the world level, and reduce the United States to the status of a province in a world government in which we will be outnumbered and outvoted 15 to 1.

The leading absolutists of today are the one-worlders of Wall Street and the London counting houses. They are the real architects of our foreign policy. They want the American taxpayers to pay the interest on their foreign bonds; that explains our European policy. In Asia, they want to gain control of such strategic materials as raw rubber, tin, manganese, and tungsten, which are so essential in our economy, and thereby dominate our industry and commerce. Chiang Kai-shek and Nationalist China was in their way; they caused him to be eliminated, and as a consequence our boys are dying in Korea.

These international conspirators, through the press and radio which they seek to control, are softening us up for the kill; beating the war drums to justify the regimentation of the American people, the drafting of our sons, the rearmament of Western Europe, and spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

While giving lip service to small business they are pursuing a course that is destroying small business and forcing all business into monopolies which will be easier to take over when der tag comes.

The appended article from the Washington Times-Herald of February 6, 1951, tells you how two big New York newspapers are whooping it up for internationalism. These are not isolated examples; the internationalists are buying outright or gaining control of newspapers in all sections of America. They have their columnists and commentators—slick, tricky individuals who wave the flag with one hand while chiseling away the foundation of this Republic with the other—bleeding hearts who drool for the forgotten man while advocating policies which will place him in perpetual chains, and sell America down the river.

These international racketeers must be stopped—and stopped now. Show me an internationalist, and I will show you a potential traitor to the United States. The hour is late. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The article from the Washington Times-Herald follows:

TWO NEW YORK NEWSPAPERS WHOOPING UP INTERNATIONALISM—TIMES AND HERALD TRIBUNE AGAIN BACK UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN EUROPE'S TROUBLES

(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK, February 5.—For the third time in less than two score years, the eastern internationalist press is whooping it up for greater involvement in Europe's chronic troubles, wholesale drafting of youth, giving President Truman a blank check for shipping troops overseas, and building vast armaments.

The only new note is virtual subservience to the United Nations.

Constant embroilment in Europe's wars is salable here because of the large foreign-born population along the eastern seaboard—people not yet assimilated to the American way of life and still militant about issues in the old country.

VIOLENTLY PRO-BRITISH

Bellwethers for the internationalist line are the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. Both papers engaged in a saber-rattling campaign prior to Pearl Harbor. The Times in particular came under fire on the grounds it was violently pro-British and anti-German before this country's entry into World War I in 1917.

Generally speaking, the foreign inclinations of the two papers reflect the prevailing thought among the bankers and the Wall Street financial district. The publications have denied any connection, but the parallel is striking.

On the financial front in recent years this parallel has revealed itself in the newspapers' espousal of the Marshall plan. Billions have been poured into European "recovery" and many millions have found their way back into big banks here and corporations doing business abroad. Thousands of dollars have filtered back to the newspapers and magazines which support the Marshall plan.

According to the most recent figures, the Herald Tribune has received subsidies for its Paris edition amounting to $60,000 from the Economic Cooperation Administration. The Times did not participate in the first subsidy plan although the Herald Tribune did so.

AGREE WITH ALDRICH

On the political front, the Times and Herald Tribune see eye to eye with Winthrop Aldrich, board chairman of the Chase National Bank and undercover financier for Governor Dewey's me-too political campaigns. Aldrich was slated for appointment as Treasury Secretary or Ambassador to Britain had Dewey been elected President in 1948.

Currently the two newspapers are ballyhooing General Eisenhower and the North Atlantic Pact. While the two papers are separately owned, their editorial pages and play of the news are of "tweedledum and tweedledee" sameness.

Julius Ochs Adler, vice president and general manager of the Times, a member of the Citizens Committee on the Present Danger, is making public speeches these days in favor of the universal military service bill.

The pinko trend on the Herald Tribune is generally laid on the doorstep of Joseph Barnes, formerly foreign editor on the paper. Barnes was a Harvard buddy of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, millionaire supporter of Communist-front causes.

Barnes later threw in his lot with Bartley Crum in the ill-fated publication of the New York Star, an outgrowth of the failure of PM, the Marshall Field journalistic flop in this city. The Star twinkled only briefly.

BENNETT BORN IN SCOTLAND

Before the Herald Tribune fell upon these evil days, it was regarded as the organ of the British Foreign Office, the United States State Department, the Episcopal Church, and Wall Street.

James Gordon Bennett and his son, and Horace Greeley and Charles A. Dana built the newspapers that finally merged into the Herald Tribune. The elder Bennett, born in Scotland, established the Herald in 1835. His son obtained social position in England before he could get it in New York, where he was born in 1841.

The younger Bennett was horsewhipped by his fiancée's brother after his engagement was broken off in 1877 and thereafter he lived abroad. He became more European than American. The Herald became a British mouthpiece and was violently prowar in 1914.

While the Bennetts were establishing the Herald, Horace Greeley founded the Tribune

in 1841. Greeley, a newspaper genius, was succeeded by Whitelaw Reid, who married Elizabeth Mills, an heiress.

WAS UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR

Subsequently Reid became the American Ambassador to Britain and his paper went completely British, taking its editorial direction from Whitehall. The Herald was taken over in 1924 from Frank A. Munsey, who had acquired it in 1918, and the consolidated sheet became the present Herald Tribune. Ogden Reid, Whitelaw Reid's son, became the publisher.

The family acquired in-laws in the British nobility when Jean Reid, Ogden's sister, became Lady Ward by marrying John Hubert Ward, equerry-in-ordinary to the King and brother of the Earl of Dudley.

Ogden Reid had married Helen Rogers, a secretary in the American Embassy in London. When he died several years ago, she became president of the company, and a son, Whitelaw, took over as editor. Mrs. Reid is an energetic, international do-gooder whose one-time Republican principles have been diluted and distorted by the globalists.

The Times was a limping newspaper property toward the end of the century when Adolph S. Ochs, one-time printer's devil who had made a success of the Chattanooga Times came to New York City to make his mark. He took over the management of the Times in 1896 and made a great success of it. Ochs admired the Times of London and modeled his enterprise after it.

One of the reasons why the Times has been criticized for its foreign inclinations is that through the years a number of foreign nationals have been employed, particularly in the news service abroad.

EDITOR BORN IN ENGLAND

A case in point is Frederick T. Birchall, one-time acting managing editor, who was born in Warrington, England, in 1871. He came to the New York Times in 1905. During World War I he took a leave of absence to work for the British Government.

After Carl van Anda retired in 1926, Birchall was named acting managing editor and served in that capacity until 1932. The "acting" was never removed from his title because Birchall always remained a British subject. He went abroad in 1932 to take charge of the European news service and finally retired early in the war. He is now living in Nova Scotia.

Upon his death in 1935, Ochs left his controlling stock interest for the benefit of his grandchildren, the offspring of his daughter, Iphigene, and her husband, Arthur Hays Sulzberger. It was entrusted to three trustees, providing for a life interest for Mrs. Ochs and Mrs. Sulzberger.

The three trustees are Mr. and Mrs. Sulzberger and Adler Sulzberger is the publisher and real boss of the Times.

The Rail Strike and a 1948 Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave first obtained, I am introducing in the RECORD, with my own remarks, an editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Journal of February 2, 1951, entitled "The Rail Strike and a 1948 Manifesto."

It is every day becoming more apparent that the railroad labor law, as well as the Taft-Hartley Act, is too weak in its provisions for dealing with nationwide strikes that threaten the public health, welfare, and security.

I am in hearty accord with the Atlanta Journal editorial which follows and agree that the time has come, not only for action to halt the present railroad strike masquerading under the pretense of illness, called by some a hit and run strike, but also time for the Congress to take action to strengthen both the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley law so the President will have adequate power to protect the country from irresponsible labor union leaders and those who blindly and to their own hurt follow their lead.

The editorial follows:

THE RAIL STRIKE AND A 1948 MANIFESTO

Five years ago the engineers' and trainmen's brotherhoods rejected a Presidential fact-finding board's recommendation for a 16-cent wage increase, and also President Truman's subsequent proposal of 18½ cents. The unions struck the railroads, the President seized them in the name of the Nation. The President threatened to draft the strikers, public sentiment condemned the strike, and it was called off after 2 days. The two brotherhoods then accepted the President's wage proposal, although Whitney of the trainmen threatened to destroy Harry S. Truman.

Three years ago the engineers, firemen, and switchmen rejected a fact-finding board's award of a 15½-cent raise and called a Nation-wide strike. The President went through the formality of seizing the railroads, the Department of Justice got an injunction, and there was no strike. The Army went through the motions of running the roads for 2 months until management and the unions agreed on the 15½-cent wage increase, plus some rules changes.

Last year, some of the brotherhoods adopted a new tactic. They called it the hit-and-run strike. The President again made the gesture of taking over the railroads. The Nation still holds them in theoretical captivity to preserve the health and security of our 150,000,000 people, and court injunctions forbid any strike.

So there is no strike. Instead, a mysterious illness has hit a lot of switchmen in various strategic rail centers. In consequence we are suffering a paralysis of transportation.

That is, the men report that they are sick. Union leaders profess to be trying to persuade them to return to work.

The claim of illness is, of course, untrue.

It is a flouting of the Government of the United States and the law of the land.

It is a repudiation of the agreement signed at the White House on December 21, 1950, by the president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, by the president of the Order of Railway Conductors, by the president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, and by the grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

The union movement in this country won public support because it was predicated on the character and the responsibility of its leadership and its membership. They were forthright men who kept their contracts and whose word was good.

No greater disservice could be done the union movement than the insolent dishonesty which characterizes this present rebellion against the majesty of the Nation and its courts.

It is union irresponsibility at its worst.

On May 25, 1948, a manifesto was issued by the Railway Labor Executives' Association. This manifesto said it was speaking for an overwhelming majority of the Nation's rail workers.

It demanded that, as a matter of permanent policy, the Federal Government take over the ownership and operation of the country's railways.

The relationship between the actions of the rail unions in 1946, 1948, 1950–51, and the manifesto of 1948 should be brought into the open. It is a matter of national concern, one of the greater perils of the none-too-remote future.

How "Right" Settled a Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the entire country is becoming more and more alarmed over the serious impact of the current strike involving the railroads of this country. The issues involved appear to be serious and complex. It is to be hoped that all parties involved are attempting to settle this controversy, that is bringing so much hardship to the American people and the alarming slowdown to our defense program, on the basis of not who is right, but what is right.

Mr. Speaker, within recent days the National Assembly on Moral Rearmament was held here in Washington at the Shoreham Hotel. In attendance at these conferences were many Senators and Representatives, as well as delegates from many sections of the world. Many of us were greatly impressed with the impact for good that this conference brought, not only in the fight against communism, the conflict between management and labor, but the need for us individuals to analyze our own actions on the basis of certain absolute moral standards, involving honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following statement made by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, in the other body on the occasion of the appearance on Capitol Hill of many of the visiting delegates to this National Assembly.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a group of distinguished visitors who are seated in the gallery today. Among them are military, political, industrial, and labor leaders from the danger areas of Europe and Asia. They bring evidence of an ideological force for democracy that is seeking to bring an answer to communism in those areas.

Along with our military and economic strategy, America more than ever needs to develop ideological strength if we are to win what is primarily a struggle for the minds of men and women. We as a people must live and proclaim the inspired experience of our democracy based on moral standards in which alone can freedom survive and flourish.

These men and women of all races and all creeds, and of widely varying views on life, come together in one common purpose.

They are making a distinct contribution to the cause to which I refer. They merit our attention and support.

Mr. Speaker, several Members of the other body expressed similar statements as did our own esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who had this to say about the need of showing the world how to settle problems on the basis of what is right rather than who is right:

It has been encouraging at a time when we are compelled to appropriate billions of dollars and mobilize millions of men to meet the threat of world communism, that evidence should be presented in our midst of a world force which is answering communism in men's minds and hearts. Through the capture of key leadership in critical areas it has actually turned the tide of communism in some of the most vital danger spots in Europe and Asia.

I would like only to point out, as one example of the effectiveness of moral rearmament in producing national unity in this time of crisis, that the presidents of two of America's major airlines brought their top management personnel and the leaders of the pilots' associations in both companies and announced that serious strikes had been averted on both sides because of the influence in their companies in recent weeks of the program of moral rearmament.

It would be an interesting speculation to visualize how many millions—perhaps even billions—might be saved this Government in its present mobilization effort if such a spirit of honesty, teamwork, and unselfish cooperation and patriotism were to be multiplied throughout the length and breadth of this land.

Mr. Speaker, referring again to the serious railroad strike now costing not only American lives but millions of dollars, I think it most appropriate to include as a part of my remarks what the idealogy of moral rearmament accomplished in settling impending strikes involving the United Air Lines and the National Airlines as carried in the January 24 issue of the Pathfinder:

HOW "RIGHT" SETTLED A STRIKE

United Air Lines President William A. Patterson thought hardboiled Larry Shapiro was kidding. Three months ago Shapiro suggested that deep-seated company-union differences could be settled "on the basis of absolute honesty, purity, love, and unselfishness."

Speaking for the United Air Lines Pilots Association, he soon convinced Patterson he was dead serious. Contract talks—deadlocked for 16 months over 119 points of disagreement—were resumed. All but three of the differences have since been cleared up, and a strike which would have cost his company an estimated $12,000,000 has been averted. Patterson last week told 500 delegates to a National Assembly on Moral Rearmament in Washington. The quick settlement, Patterson said, came about by applying MRA principles to the dispute.

Sharing the platform with his boss, pilot Shapiro said he had been "an expert in damning management"—until he attended the 5-day Labor Conference of Moral Rearmament last September at Michigan's picturesque Mackinac Island. There, he said, he found in MRA principles a solution "so simple that even today I am amazed."

MIRACLE MEDICINE

Later in the week delegates were told of another airline strike—this time at National Airlines—sidestepped by negotiation based on the ideology and spirit of MRA. "Henceforth," said W. T. Babbitt, vice president of the Airline Pilots Association, "I shall refer to MRA as a wonder drug that makes real human beings out of people."

MRA's healing power was startlingly visible at the Washington assembly. Labor and management weren't the only ones to bury the hatchet publicly. Delegates from France trooped to the microphone to apologize to German delegates for "gloating" when Allied bombers rained death on Germany during World War II. The Germans, in turn, humbly assumed public blame for their country's three invasions of France. All speakers testified that their change of heart resulted from a pilgrimage to the European center for moral rearmament at Caux, Switzerland. There, during the last 5 summers, 80,000 persons from 104 countries and territories have gathered for training, indoctrination, and devotion.

FOUNDER

As he listened quietly last week to these protestations of brotherhood and good will, bright-eyed Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman (pronounced bookman), 72, wore the look of a man pleased but not at all surprised. He and his untold millions of followers (there are no membership lists) think that all problems can be solved by the application of the absolute standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love under God's daily guidance.

Criticized at one time as an upper-class Salvation Army, MRA today draws its members from all walks of life. Nonsectarian and nonpartisan, it is supported by voluntary contributions, has no denominational creed. Meeting places range from London dockers' houses to the huge Hollywood Bowl.

The doctrine is spread in round-table discussions, summer training schools in the United States and Switzerland, personal evangelism, radio broadcasts, extensive publications, and presentations of well-staged, forceful dramatic productions.

The Moral Re-Armament movement (also known as the First Century Fellowship, the Oxford Group, or simply Buchmanism) was born in 1921 as Frank Buchman strolled through the quiet college yards at Oxford, England, reflecting on the question, How can one man change the world?

DIRECT ORDER

Suddenly, he says, God gave him the answer, which he hurriedly jotted down:

"First one man changed, then two, then four, then eight. A million changed. A whole nation changed."

The Pennsylvania-born Buchman has since devoted his own life to changing the lives of others. Best statement of MRA's aims, ideology, and methods is in a book of his speeches, called Remaking the World (Robert M. McBride, New York: $3). A bachelor and a former Lutheran minister, Buchman summarizes MRA's precepts this way: "Be honest with yourself and with your family and with your neighbor. Be pure and genuine in what you do. You'll find that you're happy, that the people around you will become happy and friendly. Soon this feeling will spread to whole cities and then to nations and to the world. If you'd like to change the world, first try changing yourself."

Mr. Speaker, is it not reasonable to contend that if these great airlines and their employees can come together on the basis of what is right instead of who is right, then the same can be said of the problem involved in this great calamity involving the railroads of this country and the employees thereof? Somebody must make the first move as was the case with Larry Shapiro.

The Late Rear Adm. F. D. Berrien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a write-up from the New Haven (Conn.) Register giving notice of the last services for Admiral F. D. Berrien, an outstanding naval hero, a most distinguished constituent, a remarkable athlete, brilliant coach, a great American, gentleman, and leader:

LAST SERVICES FOR ADMIRAL BERRIEN—WAR HERO AND EX-COACH OF NAVY FOOTBALL DIES AFTER SHOVELING SNOW HERE

Funeral services were held Friday morning, February 2, in Center Church, New Haven, Conn., for Rear Adm. Frank Dunn Berrien, retired, 78, United States Navy hero and coach of one of the most successful of Annapolis football teams. He died suddenly in his home at 367 Prospect Street while resting after shoveling snow from his sidewalks.

During a 35-year active career, Admiral Berrien served all over the world and participated in several campaigns as well as two World Wars. Coach of the Naval Academy football squads from 1908 through 1910, the goal line of his last team was never crossed.

CAPTURED SUBMARINE

Nation-wide fame came to the naval officer during World War I when he commanded the destroyer *Nicholson*, which, in November, 1917, captured the German submarine U-58 and its crew. The *Nicholson* later rescued the freighter *Julia Luckenbach* from shelling by another German sub.

Surviving are his wife, the former Mary Elizabeth Whittelsey of New Haven; a son, Frank W. Berrien of Miami, Fla.; and a daughter, Mrs. Harry Lugg, of Rockville. Funeral services were held in Center Church at 10 a. m. with the Rev. David N. Beach, pastor, officiating. Interment was in the United States Naval Academy Cemetery, Annapolis.

A resident of New Haven since his retirement in 1935, Berrein was called back to service—he was the only member of his graduating class to return to active sea duty—during World War II and served as troop convoy commander between San Francisco and Australia.

Berrien, then a captain, commanded the United States Submarine Base at Groton from 1921 to 1923 and established the Naval ROTC at Yale University in 1926. He was commander of the unit here for 2 years.

Admiral Berrien was born in Galesburg, Ill., August 17, 1877, son of Leonard Budd and Harriet Mat Smith Berrien. His father was a manufacturer of agricultural machinery. Graduating in 1900 at the United States Naval Academy, he was commissioned as an ensign in 1902. At Annapolis he was an outstanding athlete. He played four years on the varsity baseball team, three years on the football team, and was a record-breaking hurdler, on the track squad of 1900. He rose to the rank of captain in 1918, and was commissioned rear admiral and retired June 30, 1935.

While a midshipman at the Naval Academy he saw service in the West Indies during the Spanish-American War. From 1900-1904 he was on Asiatic duty, participating in the Philippine and China Relief campaigns, and

between 1904 and 1908 served with the Atlantic fleet on the battleships *Kentucky, Missouri, Minnesota,* and *Connecticut.* In 1908 he returned to the Naval Academy as head football coach.

From 1910 to 1913 he commanded the destroyer *Trippe* of the Atlantic Fleet, participating in naval operations in the campaign against Mexico in 1913. From 1913 to 1915 he was in command of the naval magazine at Hingham, Mass., and then for 11 months was on duty at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., where he graduated in 1917.

CHIEF OF PATROL STAFF

When the United States entered World War I he served as chief of staff to the commander of the United States Patrol Squadron based at Hampton Roads, Va. In 1917 he was ordered to duty on the staff of Admiral William S Simms in London. From July 1917 to June 1918 he commanded the destroyers *Nicholson* and *Wilkes,* and destroyer division No. 9 at Queenstown, Ireland.

While in command of two destroyers operating in a convoy protecting merchant ships out of Queenstown, Berrien—aboard the *Nicholson*—captured officers and crew of the first German submarine taken by United States forces in World War 1.

When he returned to the United States in June 1918, Berrien was put in command of the hospital ship *Comfort,* in convoy from New York to Brest, France. After the armistice he was United States naval port officer at Bordeaux. Later he served as chief of staff to the commander of the destroyer squadron of the Pacific Fleet under Rear Adm. Henry A. Wiley.

After duty at the New London submarine base Berrien commanded all United States destroyers in European waters from 1923 to 1925 and then graduated from an Army War College in 1926.

KEPT TACOMA LIGHTED

He commanded the aircraft carrier *Lexington* following his service at Yale. In 1930 the "*Lex*" furnished electric power to the city of Tacoma, Wash., for a month. The feat was widely publicized and became a Navy legend. Captain Berrien pulled the carrier, then the largest Navy vessel in the world, up to a dock in Tacoma and while using only one-quarter of the electric power of the ship was able to keep Tacoma lighted.

Other assignments were as officer in charge of the hydrographic office in Boston and captain of the navy yard at Washington, D. C.

Admiral Berrien was a member of many organizations, including the Military Order of the Dragon, Order of the Carabao, Military Order of the World War, American Legion. Also the Faculty Club at Yale and the Graduates Club, New Haven.

He was awarded many service medals of the world wars, including the United States Distinguished Service Medal. Great Britain made him an honorary member of the Order of St. Michael and St. George and Greece made him a commander of the Order of St. Savior.

Church Endorses Food Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended resolution of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, of the Congregational denomination, points up the widespread support among religious groups for extending food aid to the Republic of India to avert impending famine there:

Resolution on wheat for India

Recognizing the tremendous need of India's people for food, intensified in recent months by a series of national disasters, and aware of large stores of food grain held by the Government of the United States of America: Be it

Resolved, That the members of Broadway Tabernacle Church, Congregational, 211 West Fifty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., assembled at a stated corporate meeting of the church on Wednesday evening, January 24, 1951, declare themselves in favor of the Government of the United States making available to the Government of India 2,000,000 tons of wheat upon mutually agreeable terms, and urge that everything possible be done to complete this transaction speedily.

JOSEPH E. CHOATE,
Clerk.

ALBERT J. PENNER,
Minister.

Congressman Doyle Explains How H. R. 2383 Would Stop Use of Power To Arbitrarily Destroy Legitimate Business—Remarks in Regard to Case of Ewing Versus Mytinger and Casselberry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I filed a bill which was given the number of H. R. 2383, the text of which follows:

H. R. 2383

A bill to amend section 304, subsections (a) and (b), of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331), is amended by striking the balance of the sentence following the words "dangerous to health" and changing the comma after "health" to a period.

And it is further amended by striking all that portion of the last sentence of such subsection following the words "between the parties" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, if no such stipulation be filed within a reasonable time, the court, on motion for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, may transfer the case for trial to any other district or division thereof."

That subsection (b) of section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331), is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following sentence:

"Cases brought hereunder shall be entitled to preference on the trial calendar."

And it is further amended by striking from the third to the last sentence all words following "such court", and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"On motion, for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, may transfer the consolidated proceedings for trial to any other district or division thereof."

In connection with the bill, I wish to further add that on August 17, 1950, in the Eighty-first Congress, I filed H. R. 9466; which bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill was not acted upon by this committee and, therefore, never had a chance to come to the floor of Congress for debate and decision. H. R. 9466, and H. R. 2383, which I introduced on February 5, 195[illegible], are identical bills.

At the time I filed H. R. 9466 in the Eighty-first Congress, I inserted remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 17, on page A5924, and related that I became interested in the situation therein described because of the location in the Eighteenth Congressional District, which I represent, of the important business of Nutrilite Products, Inc., the continuance of which business was placed in immediate jeopardy by reason of the manner and method applied to make effective section 304, subsections (a) and (b), of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Since that date, the matter has been litigated through the United States Supreme Court and finally determined as the case of Ewing against Mytinger and Casselberry, the defendant being the prosperous, important business located as aforesaid.

The issues concerned are of such importance and of such Nation-wide interest that I asked the assistance of the worthy legal counsel of my constituents, Mytinger and Casselberry, in the preparation of these remarks. The purpose in so doing was to have enunciated as fully as practical the issues involved and the practical situation which has developed as a result of the interpretation by the United States Supreme Court. Also it will give the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which H. R. 2383 has been referred, the earliest possible opportunity to have the basic arguments in support of this bill to its attention.

So my effort in connection with the bill last session and the bill this session is to be constructively cooperative to the end that the greatest good and the greatest number shall be served.

I will make further remarks about this subject tomorrow and I now respectively call you attention to the following:

The bill (H. R. 2383) I have just introduced is intended to correct a situation growing out of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Ewing against Mytinger and Casselberry, Inc., decided by a divided court on May 29, 1950, with rehearing denied on October 2, 1950. That Court has held that the Congress intended to confer such unbridled and such unstoppable power upon the Federal Security Agency as to irreparably injure—yes, even to destroy private businesses. And the Court goes so far as to hold that even though Mr. Ewing is acting arbitrarily, capriciously, and oppressively, the Congress intended to take from Federal district courts their traditional equity powers of protection to stop such action, even where the evidence establishes to the satisfaction of the trial court that Mr. Ewing is 100 percent wrong. As I will develop later, the Supreme Court blames this unprecedented grant of

power upon the Congress. I do not believe Congress intended to give such power to Mr. Ewing; and if Congress in using broad language did inadvertently grant the power; I propose that we immediately take it away. Under our system of government no man should have power.

My interest in this important matter goes back more than 2 years. Evidence was then presented to me showing that a valued and long-established business located in the Eighteenth District of California, which I represent, was in a life-and-death struggle with the Food and Drug Administration. Mr. Ewing had ordered multiple seizures of the vitamin and mineral product sold by this company throughout the Nation on the ground that certain parts of the company's advertising literature was misleading, although he and his subordinates conceded—as they must—that the product is harmless and in fact beneficial. Eleven seizures had been made, all carefully spaced and planned geographically so as to cause the maximum injury to my constitutent's reputation by the publicity attendant thereupon.

The seizures were made as follows: Belleville, N. J., Seattle, Wash., St. Petersburg, Fla., Chicago, Ill., two seizures; Clarkfield, Minn.; Spokane, Wash.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Hastings, Nebr.; and New York, N. Y. And these seizures were made with the purpose of destroying my constituent's business before a trial on the merits of Mr. Ewing's claims about the literature could be had. I pause here to say that the last two statements are not mine but are taken from the unanimous findings of a special three-judge court, which findings I will quote later herein.

Naturally no company could thus be universally attacked and disgraced all over the Nation by lawsuits and the attendant publicity by Government officials and hope to continue to exist. Judge David A. Pine of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, when appealed to for an injunction, said he would grant one unless Mr. Ewing agreed to make no more seizures. He said this decision was made "because I feel there has not been a strict and literal compliance with the statute and that there should be when such a drastic and harsh provision of the law permits the acts contemplated."

Mr. Ewing's counsel agreed Mr. Ewing would make no more seizures pending Mr. Ewing's compliance with the law. I then wrote to Mr. Ewing on January 27, 1949, as follows:

I trust that all of the persons passing upon the problem before it comes to your desk for your own personal finding and signature will make very sure that the finding they ask you to sign is true in fact, and that the finding they ask you to make is consistent with existing law and facts in the premises.

Furthermore, I respectfully request that, inasmuch as my constituents emphatically maintain to me that, under the Food and Drug Act, their product, "Nutrilite," is not misbranded by their printed matter. And inasmuch as the reported determination of the Department to consecutively libel the interstate shipments of this product could and would normally bust or break the corporation producing the same before the matter could get to a final court decision—it would appear reasonable, would it not, Mr. Ewing, that there be no finding by you which would result in forcing the producing company to insolvency until there had been a reasonable hearing opportunity given the producing corporation to the end that there be opportunity to make a showing before yourself as to their contention that this Nutrilite product is not misbranded.

Mr. Ewing did not grant the hearing I requested and his deputy made findings against my constituents without according them a hearing. Again the matter was brought before Judge Pine, who characterized the actions of the deputy on behalf of Mr. Ewing as unfair, drastic, and harsh, but the judge was forced reluctantly to conclude as he did at the first hearing:

Shocking as it may seem to you and me, Congress has certainly given him the right to do just this without a hearing.

My bill, which I now offer, strikes from the law the provision which shocked Judge Pine and which he labeled harsh, drastic, and unfair, for I do not believe Congress intended the interpretation given to that provision by Judge Pine and then later by the Supreme Court in the decision cited above.

And Judge Pine is not the only person in a highly responsible position who was shocked by the actions of Mr. Ewing and his subordinates against my constituents. My people then were allowed by Judge Pine to amend the complaint against Mr. Ewing and claim this harsh provision of law is unconstitutional, and a special three-judge court was set up to hear the case. Judge T. Alan Goldsborough, who served with distinction for so many years in this House, Judge Bennett Champ Clark, a very able former Member of the United States Senate, and Judge Edward A. Tamm were the members of this special court. After a long-drawn-out trial these three distinguished and able judges unanimously held that Mr. Ewing and his subordinates had acted "capriciously, arbitrarily, unreasonably, oppressively, and unlawfully" and should be and were enjoined from carrying out their unlawful scheme to destroy my constituent's business.

The court findings soundly castigated the public officials. The three judges in their findings said in part:

5. Nutrilite contains no substance or material or combination of substances or materials harmful or deleterious in any manner to human users thereof when taken in suggested dosage. No claim has been made by any Federal, State, or other governmental agency that Nutrilite is adulterated or harmful in any manner to the health of human users thereof, insofar as the record before the court shows.

6. The label of the package in which Nutrilite was and is sold complies with all requirements of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

7. The objection of the defendants to the sale of Nutrilite, which is the basis of this action, is the use by plaintiff of any advertising pamphlet entitled "How to Get Well and Stay Well." Nutrilite is sold directly to users thereof and this pamphlet is used in making about 40 percent of the initial sales of Nutrilite.

8. The product now sold as Nutrilite was first marketed about 1933; defendants' records show they received information about it in 1939 and had correspondence about it in 1940; plaintiff has been its exclusive national distributor since 1945; defendants received their first copies of the then current edition of the pamphlet How To Get Well and Stay Well, on December 5, 1946, together with names and addresses of certain of plaintiff's distributors outside of California.

* * * * *

32. (a) On December 30, 1948, the instant injunction action was filed. At this time it was the intention and plan of the defendants to file many more libel seizure actions and seize nutrilite throughout the Nation. The food and drug inspectors knew of this general policy.

* * * * *

(c) Defendants made no effort to secure an early trial in the libel cases and in order to effect seizures more quickly mimeographed copies of the booklets, How To Get Well and Stay Well were prepared for transmission to United States attorneys.

* * * * *

34. On January 24, 1949, Judge David A. Pine of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia found that the actions of the defendants in rendering said decisions were unfair, drastic, shocking, and harsh, and held that the decisions of defendants Crawford, Larrick, and Dunbar, described supra, were unlawful because the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency did not have the authority to delegate this power to make such decisions to said defendants.

* * * * *

39. The seizure actions caused plaintiff a sales loss of some $100,000 per month from the time of the first seizure until the instant action was filed, and the defendants were restrained from making further seizures. The seizures had the effect of frightening plaintiff's agents and distributors, so that they worked less, and some resigned, with the net result of loss of morale among agents and distributors, loss in sales volume, and loss of personnel. Unfavorable opinions and injurious information with respect to the labeling of plaintiff's product reached many private individuals and organizations. Publicity about the seizure cases initiated by defendants appeared in newspapers and magazines in a way which did injuriously damage plaintiff and this led to loss of customers. Plaintiff was compelled to hire counsel in the 10 libel cases and put up bonds and costs in each case. The value of the Nutrilite seized by defendants in the 10 libel actions is $6,822.17, and the product so seized will be unsalable if returned to plaintiff. The nature of plaintiff's business makes good will of the public one of its most valuable assets and the acts of the defendants in the embargoes and seizure actions in widely separated parts of the United States has caused the plaintiff's injury and damage. Defendants admit injury to plaintiff and that there has been a serious impact on plaintiff's rights by their actions, and that there is no provision of law requiring or permitting defendants to reimburse plaintiff for the damages herein found or for the injury or for destruction of its business and good will by the actions of the defendants, in the event of a determination of said libel actions in favor of plaintiff. The injury and damage to plaintiff which has occurred and which is threatened by defendants is therefore substantial and irreparable.

40. The defendants have never advised plaintiff of the particulars of plaintiff's literature considered to be objectionable by defendants. The defendants have not provided an opportunity to plaintiff whereby such literature could be corrected, revised, and amended in a manner which would conform to the views of and be acceptable to the defendants.

41. That plaintiff would have been subjected to many additional seizures of its

product throughout the United States in addition to the existing 11 seizures of its product if not enjoined from so doing is admitted by defendants. It was a general policy and plan of the defendants to make with all possible speed many seizures of plaintiff's product. Such additional seizures, and the product could be seized by defendants in the hands of more than 5,000 of plaintiff's distributors, would have the effect of destroying plaintiff's business prior to any possible adjudication of the disputed issues on plaintiff's labeling in any of the libel actions already filed or threatened.

42. There was and is no emergency involving injury or damage of any kind to the public or to any purchaser, consumer, or user of Nutrilite or in connection with Nutrilite and plaintiff's use of the three pamphlets which constitute defendants' sole objection to Nutrilite's sale. Defendants have not at any time indicated or contended that there is an emergency or situation of compelling public necessity with respect to the labeling of plaintiff's product and no such emergency or situation did, in fact, exist at or prior to any of the actions of defendants described herein.

43. The evidence herein on the actions, conduct, and course of action of defendants before and after the decisions of Crawford, Larrick, Dunbar, and Kingsley described above reveal, as do their decisions and actions in making said decisions, that the defendants in making said decisions acted capriciously, arbitrarily, unreasonably, oppressively, and unlawfully.

The three-judge court also held that the language my bill strikes from the law is so unreasonable as to be unconstitutional when used as Mr. Ewing was using it here against a harmless and beneficial product to destroy a business before trial of the merits of Mr. Ewing's charges.

Mr. Ewing appealed to the Supreme Court, and that Court held, as I stated above, that the injunction must be set aside, that Congress intended to confer this unbridled power upon Mr. Ewing and even if he exercises it in an arbitrary, capricious, and oppressive manner, Federal district courts have had their injunction jurisdiction removed by Congress so they are helpless to prevent the resulting irreparable injury. The Supreme Court in a nonunanimous opinion by Mr. Justice Douglas thus reversed the three-judge court's decision. Mr. Justice Jackson, one of the dissenting Justices, said:

The Court does not deal at all with what appears to be the ultimate issue decided by the court below.

The trial court of three judges wrote no opinion but made 43 detailed findings of fact which would require 20 of these printed pages to reproduce and which summarize a 1,500-page record of a long trial. Those findings are made largely on undisputed evidence and on evidence from Government sources. This Court does not criticize or reverse any of them.

The substance of these is to find that the Government instituted a multiplicity of court actions, with seizures in widely separated parts of the country, with a purpose to harass appellee and its dealers and intending that these actions and the attendant publicity would injure appellee's business before any of the issues in such cases could be tried. This, the court held, was justified by no emergency, the product being, at worst, harmless and having been marketed for years with knowledge of the Department.

Assuming as I do that the act on its face is not constitutionally defective, the question remains whether it has been so misused by refusal of administrative hearing, together with such irreparable injury in anticipation of judicial hearing, as to deny appellee due process of law or to amount to an abuse of process of the courts.

The Government has sought and received from this court protection against a multiplicity of suits under circumstances where injury was less apparent than in this (*Landis v. North American Co.* (229 U. S. 248)). The holding of the court below and the contention of the appellee here that the Government is not entitled to so apply the statute as to bring multiple actions designed to destroy a business before it can be heard in its own defense is not frivolous, to say the least.

I am constrained to withhold assent to a decision that passes in silence what I think presents a serious issue.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion stated that the findings of the three judges were justified by the evidence and the three-judge court should have been held to have jurisdiction to grant the relief given.

I introduced this bill last August, and it was H. R. 9466 of the Eighty-first Congress. Due to the international situation, and the short time that Congress was in session after the bill was introduced, hearings on my bill were not possible before that session ended. In reintroducing this bill today, I am ever mindful that today our Government is being held up to the international spotlight as one where democracy under law rather than dictatorial powers exist. I am in favor of carving out of our law every provision which allows bureaucratic abuse, without hearing, to destroy a lawful and honest business. I think it is our duty as Members of Congress to seek out such provisions—and some may slip by us inadvertently or as here be held to exist by court decision regardless of what Congress intended—and carve those provisions out of our law. That is my proposal in my bill. I hope you will all support it to the end that in the future when your constituents come in contact with Mr. Ewing you will not find the courts helpless to stop this arbitrary, capricious, and oppressive action.

Address of Frank A. Hecht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address of Frank A. Hecht, president of the Navy League of the United States, on December 7, 1950.

I believe this speech merits general reading. It follows:

Nine years ago today we went to war to resist aggression. Then we did not hesitate. There was no thought of appeasement. The odds were against us. But we were not intimidated. We buckled down, tightened our belts, and fought on to victory.

Today we are again at war. Whether we like it or not, whether we choose to admit it or not, we are at war with Communist China. They have attacked our forces. They are killing our men. What more is needed for one nation to make war on another? The Chinese Communists have killed many more Americans in Korea than the Japs killed at Pearl Harbor. And yet there are those timid souls who would pull the covers over their head and pretend that nothing has happened, that we were still engaged only in a police action. They will not recognize the fact that we and our allies in Korea have been the victims of an attack just as we were 9 years ago.

Once again we find ourselves assembled in annual meeting for the purpose of reviewing the record of the past year and planning for the coming year.

The past year has been a busy one for your officers. It has been one of transcendent importance, both for our country and the world. Decisions have been made and steps taken which will influence the course of free government in the world for good or for evil in our lifetime and in the times of our descendants.

Immediately following our annual meeting of last year at St. Paul, we found ourselves at variance with those in the Department of Defense who advocated a program of economy, which involved reducing our Armed Forces. We made this stand known in our publications, in our contacts with the Members of Congress, especially those who serve on the Armed Forces committees of the House and Senate, in speeches by our officers and directors, through press releases, and in other media. The reason for this stand was that we believed then, as we do now, that disarmament, whether it be complete or partial, not only renders us physically incapable of dealing with an international emergency but also it actually encourages aggression because of the fact that an aggressor nation will attack when it realizes our military weakness. We said then that Communist Russia was an aggressor nation. We say it now. It will be just as true in the future as it is today. We must always be ready to deal with Communist aggression wherever it breaks out.

We differed with the policy of the State Department with regard to Communist China. We did not believe that, through default and inaction on our part, we should allow a government which was friendly to be replaced by one which, of its very nature, we knew to be hostile.

We differed with and criticized the action of the former Secretary of Defense in canceling construction of the flush-deck carrier. We protested the threatened attrition of Marine Corps ground-support aviation and the reduction of the Marine Corps itself to a parade-outfit status. We publicly went on record, after a vote of our board of directors, as favoring the bill which would make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

We have continued our publications, and have encouraged increased activity on the part of local councils. During the year your directors went on record as favoring the resumption of the celebration of Navy Day under completely civilian auspices. Accordingly, on Navy Day, your president laid a wreath on the tomb of Theodore Roosevelt, the father of the modern American fleet, at Oyster Bay, Long Island. The birthday of this great American had been selected as Navy Day. Celebrations were held in various other parts of the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. Because of the limited time between the determination to resume the celebration of this day and the occurrence of the day, preparations and programs were, of necessity, curtailed. It is hoped that every local council will plan, initiate and carry out an appropriate celebration honoring the Navy and the men and women of the Navy on next October 27. It

is my sincere belief that it is much more becoming for a civilian organization to pay tribute, to laud, and to honor the Navy and the men and women of the Navy, than it is for the armed services themselves to indulge in eulogies of self-adulation, as was done when Armed Forces Day was celebrated under the auspices of the services themselves.

During the past year your president has traveled from coast to coast, visiting with local councils. The interest expressed by the various members in their local communities was encouraging. As much cannot be said for the organization of all local councils. Because of the inactivity of local officers in many instances the local council has not held meetings regularly and has, to a large extent, become merely a paper organization. It is hoped that State presidents will see to it that local councils hold elections. Members of the local councils are urged to elect as their officers men who have a genuine and sincere interest in our work, who are willing to devote time and effort to it and, as a result, can achieve an active local council. It is unfortunate that the local enthusiasm, interest, and desire to participate in behalf of a sound defense program is not better coordinated within the local councils. This situation must be corrected. We rely on you to see to it that it is done.

After every war there is always a wave of disinterest in the Armed Forces which sweeps the country. The period following the end of hostilities in World War II was no exception. People assumed the attitude that the size and composition of our Armed Forces was a matter for the experts, and was no proper concern of a busy professional man or industrialist. More time and interest was manifested in golf scores or the pennant races than was ever given to the questions of national defense. People, who knew what the current tax reductions were that they were entitled to, knew and cared nothing about the size of the budget for the Navy and the other armed services. How short-sighted they were. Because the Nation got, and perhaps wanted, economy, we are faced with a worse situation which will necessitate vast expenditures for our armed services in the years to come. This situation will undoubtedly bring about controls, shortages, inconveniences, and other things which will deeply affect the daily life of every one of us. Defense is everybody's business—always. That is true whether we are fighting in Korea or whether we are fighting in Europe or elsewhere. It is true even if we are not fighting anywhere. It will be true as long as aggressive communism remains a strong force in the world. We invite you and all who think along similar lines to join us in the Navy League to see that we do have an adequate defense, to urge a sound foreign policy and to keep a vigorous eye on our domestic economy. This can be done better through an organization than it can by individuals working separately. To that end we invite your coqperation.

Tonight as we sit here, American men are fighting and dying in Korea. We and the other of our peoples of the world are in retreat there before the forces of Communist aggression. It is one of the great crises of our national history. The situation calls for bold and courageous action. Temporizing and half-hearted measures will not suffice.

Korea has proved once again that there is no easy way to victory. It has disproved the claims of those apostles of push-button warfare, who say that warfare as we have waged it in the past is obsolete and that we can rely upon the atomic bomb as our principal means of defense. In the light of Korea, our defense policies must be re-examined. It has proved anew that we need balanced forces—strong ground troops, a strong fleet and tactical air power as well as a strategic bombing potential. In Korea we suffer from an inferiority in manpower. We need more ground troops. Those are available on Formosa. There the Chinese Nationalist Government, the duly constituted government of China, which we have and still do recognize as such, has available 600,000 troops. These have been offered for use in Korea. We refused to utilize them for fear of provoking attack by Communist China. Regardless of the intricasies of international diplomacy, the fact is that we are now at war with Communist China. If there were ever any reason for not utilizing these Chinese Nationalist troops, that reason has now disappeared. Accordingly, I respectfully propose that the following steps be undertaken immediately:

1. That we reaffirm our recognition of the Nationalist Government as the legal government of China and declare that the Communist government is controlled by a non-Chinese government, that it illegally seized power by force, with the assistance of a foreign government.

2. That, if the Nationalist Government is willing, we invite them to send a large army to fight with UN troops resisting Communist forces in Korea.

3. That we reaffirm our determination to defend Formosa from invasion and implement this by strengthening the Seventh Fleet.

4. That we announce that we will veto in the Security Council of the United Nations any proposal to hand Formosa over to the Communist forces.

5. That the authorization be immediately given to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to have our forces bomb logistic supply bases in Communist China, as well as enemy forces in the vicinity of the Korean fighting front.

6. That we request of Congress increased defense appropriations and increased manpower for the Armed Forces.

It would be unwise and unprofitable for us to undertake an all-out conquest of the mainland of Asia. Because of our inferiority in manpower and the vastness of the terrain, such undertaking would probably be doomed to failure. However, we can control the eastward spread of Communist forces from the mainland of Asia, if we hold the line which is now anchored on Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines. Although we are inferior in land forces, we have a definite superiority in seapower. If our island defense line is to be breached, it must be done through a landing operation. Such an operation can be successfully resisted, if we have a strong enough fleet. We know that the Russians possess a well-trained, well-equipped, and efficient submarine force, which is in excess of 270 submarines. The Communists, by utilizing this force, can inflict losses on our fleet. Therefore, it behooves us immediately to increase our Far East fleet, and to increase our training for and our potential to cope with enemy submarines.

If our island chain, which I mentioned, were breached in any part, the chain will be materially weakened. It is unthinkable that we would allow any diplomatic maneuver to allow the Communist forces to take over Formosa. Remember that Chiang Kai-shek was our faithful ally. In the early part of World War II when we were unable to send a single bullet or a single gun to the Nationalist forces, President Roosevelt repeatedly wrote Chiang, urging him to continue to fight against Japanese aggression. This he did. He kept faith. Unfortunately, as much cannot be said for us. Do you think in view of what has happened that Chiang can consider us a trustworthy and desirable ally?

Recently in the United Nations we have seen the extraordinary spectacle of the representatives of Communist aggression, the ambassadors of a government whose troops are now killing Americans in Korea, coming to appear before the United Nations to accuse us of aggression in Formosa. While they accuse us of aggression, they will not answer any questions about Chinese Communist aggression in Korea. We have wholeheartedly supported the objectives of the United Nations and will continue to do so. However, unless the United Nations is to go the way of the League of Nations, it must face up to the aggressors and take a positive stand in support of the United Nations forces in Korea.

Regardless of the outcome of the Korean situation, communism will still remain an aggressive force. It will be a continuing threat to us and to all free nations. Communism cannot reach its objectives while there are democratic, capitalistic, or free governments anywhere in the world. Never before in the history of the world has one nation subjugated so much territory and so many people as has Communist imperialism. The price of our survival will be our willingness to make sacrifices and our development and retention of the power to resist Communist aggression.

We are a maritime nation. Our entire economy is dependent upon imports. Without imports our industry will be greatly curtailed. Our economy would be disrupted and our war potential vastly diminished. In the last war we saw what happens when we cannot get a vital import such as rubber. The reason we could not get rubber was that the enemy was able to take over the island area where it was produced and that we did not retain control over the sea lanes. The same is true of manganese and many other products. We do not have enough oil resources in our country to supply ourselves and our allies in the event of an all-out shooting war. This means we must import oil from the Near East, South America, and from other points around the world. To make sure that this oil gets here, we must retain control of the sea lanes. The way to do that is with a strong fleet.

Believe me when I say that people in the service in the Navy count on us to say things which they cannot say. We are perfectly free to express ourselves, to criticize and to present our views to Congress. Those on active duty are not. This is one of the most important roles of the Navy League.

With due modesty and without any sense of boasting, I think that we can be justly proud of our activities of the past year and the correctness of the stand which we have taken on matters pertaining to the national defense. The year ahead offers tremendous opportunities and presents commensurate challenges. Whether or not we can and will live up to what is expected of us depends, in large measure, upon you, our members. Will you help by taking an active part in your local organization, by increasing our membership, by becoming familiar with the questions and the answers presented by the world situation? We honestly believe that within the Navy League you and your friends can achieve these objectives. Mistakes of the past and mistakes of the future, if they are permitted, are paid for in American blood They can be prevented if the facts are known, the issues are discussed, and if sound decisions with regard to national defense are reached. Now more than ever before it is apparent the Nation needs a strong Navy. The Navy needs the Navy League. The Navy League needs you.

God grant us today the courage, the intelligence, and the resolution which we had 9 years ago. God grant that once again we shall be victorious over the forces of aggression and then enemies of liberty. God be with us now as then. God be with us always.

Unions in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the contention that the Taft-Hartley Act has made it practically impossible for labor to exercise its right to organize is sustained by recent reports on the progress, or lack of progress, in legitimate labor organizing in the South. Here is one report, published in the Commonweal of February 2:

UNIONS IN THE SOUTH
(By John C. Cort)

In 1947 there were about 1,250,000 workers employed in textile mills, mostly strung along the eastern seaboard, of whom a little over half worked in the South. The major subdivision of the textile industry is cotton spinning and weaving. In 1925 about 80 percent of this industry was in New England and 20 percent in the South. Today the figures are exactly reversed, with 80 percent in the South and 20 percent in New England.

Many New England mills have closed up and moved bodily to the South to escape the unions and their high wage rates. Others have folded up in the face of southern competition. For more reasons than one, therefore, the Textile Workers have been forced to concentrate on the job of organizing the southern mills. They have spent several million dollars on the job and have conducted about 60 strikes in the last 5 years. And still only 15 percent, or less than 100,000 of these workers, are now represented by either the CIO or A. F. of L.

Consider some of the difficulties. In 1948 there were about 770 mills located in small southern villages which were owned in toto by the mill owners. If the workers went on strike the mill owner would simply evict them from their homes, pointing self-righteously to his lease, which specifies that the occupant must work in the local mill. If the union fought this outrage in court, there was usually a local judge who could see only that each tenant "refused to work for the plaintiff, quit his job, and walked off." No mention of a strike at all. Case dismissed. (See case of Plymouth Manufacturing Co. strike, McColl, S. C., 1949.)

Often the mill was owned by a large textile corporation which also owned anywhere from 10 to 44 (Burlington Mills) other factories. It could well afford to close one mill for a year or even forever. Many of these corporations are owned by northerners, including such big outfits as Goodyear, Firestone, U. S. Rubber, who do not hesitate to inflame every conceivable southern prejudice in order to lick the union and fatten their own money bags.

Last March the CIO set out to organize the Orr Mill in Anderson, S. C. A columnist in the local paper bristled with bigoted indignation, saying, "Yet from the so-called 'melting pots' of the northern cities, where people of strange races and imbued with alien ideologies are blended together to produce all manner of men, including numerous arrogant mongrels, come emissaries of misinformation and hate to tell textile workers in this section of America what they should think, believe, and do."

To this point I have summarized less than half of the textile workers' case against the South. The second half tells what happens when and if the CIO should overcome all these obstacles and still win a collective-bargaining election. Then the agony really starts. Here is a case which is only somewhat more painful than the average. It involves the Tower Hosiery Mills, a subsidiary of Burlington Mills, the giant that owns 45 mills and is the second largest employer of textile labor in the South. Note the timetable: 1943—union wins election, but does not feel strong enough to strike and no agreement results; 1944—union loses election; 1945—union wins election; 1946—again unable to negotiate a decent agreement, union files charge of failure to bargain in good faith; 1947 (14 months later)—National Labor Relations Board gets around to holding a hearing; 1948 (1 year later)—trial examiner makes report; 1949 (11 months later—NLRB agrees with union and orders Tower Hosiery to bargain in good faith; 1950 (13 months later)—United States court of appeals rejects company's appeal and sustains the NLRB. The textile workers' attorney concludes sadly: "Of course, no contract has been consummated. Indeed, there is now no local union at this plant."

One is reminded of the old saw, "The operation was successful, but the patient died." The National Labor Relations Act, even as amended by Taft-Hartley, is supposed to protect labor's right to organize and bargain in good faith. In the South this protection is a mockery, and, indeed, not only in the South. In the North as well. In my own local union we have just passed through negotiations in which two employers openly and unashamedly committed unfair-labor practices. But knowing that any appeal to the NLRB would take several years to process, we could do nothing but take it.

The southern industrialists no longer need the goon squad in white sheets, the tar and feathers, the free ride out of town on a fence rail that were so popular a few years back. They use them too, occasionally, even now, but today the better class of people doesn't soil its fingers with such vulgarity. Today they hire a high-priced lawyer and strangle the union to death with legal red tape and delay, to which homicide the Taft-Hartley Act lends itself with glad abandon.

They say that "justice delayed is justice denied." The textile workers filed 165 charges of unfair-labor practices against southern mills with the NLRB between August 22, 1947, and February 28, 1950. From the time the charges were filed these were the average periods of time before they could get action from the Labor Board and the courts; about 12 months before the NLRB issued a complaint; about 1 year and 4 months before the NLRB held a hearing before a trial examiner; about 1 year and 6 months before the examiner made his report; 2 years and 3 months before the Board handed down an order; 3 years and 8 months before the courts forced compliance in those few cases that the union was able and willing to push this far.

Total Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, an article by Max Eastman entitled "Total Blunder," in the February 1951 issue of Catholic Digest, warrants careful reading and thoughtful consideration. Although I do not necessarily make all of the thoughts in this article my thoughts also, I agree entirely with the main thesis that "America is without leadership in the most subtle and complex and implacable danger she ever confronted."

The article follows:

TOTAL BLUNDER
(By Max Eastman)

Everybody agrees that the present plight of the United States is bad, but nobody names the true cause. "Disloyalty in the State Department," "Stalin doublecrossed us," "Roosevelt died," "Truman is small town," "Acheson is stubborn," "The Republicans were ignored," "We can't support the whole world." None of these guesses fully explains what is the matter. The real, simple, and sole cause of our plight is ignorance.

We are up against a complex, mystical, pseudo-scientific religion, a well-armed crusade called Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. It differs from everything else in history, most of all from everything American. It has created a crisis that may well be the supreme crisis in the life of mankind. And yet, up to the present moment, no one in executive authority in this country has taken the trouble to study its dogmas, decrees, plans, and strategies, and find out what it is and how it works.

On February 11, 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt said to a bunch of Communist-minded young men and maidens on the White House lawn, "The Soviet Union, as everyone knows who has the courage to face fact, is a dictatorship as absolute as any dictatorship in the world." That was bold, true, and supremely important.

The Soviet Union, after Hitler attacked it, continued to be a dictatorship, as absolute as any dictatorship in the world. But Roosevelt lost the courage, more exactly, the intellectual clarity, to face the fact. He began to deceive himself, and deceive those about him. He became soft-headed; so did they. He became fuzzy-minded; so did they. He didn't know much about Stalin or Lenin, and nothing at all about Marxism, and instead of reading up on it, or calling in somebody who did know, he cultivated his ignorance. So did they. Aided by the war fever, he reached the point where he could habitually speak of the Soviet Union as a democracy, a liberty-loving, peace-loving nation. He could say of Stalin, who had then fully shown himself to be one of the bloodiest tyrants in history, "I got along fine with Marshal Stalin. I believe he is truly representative of the heart and soul of Russia. I do not think any insoluble differences will arise among Russia, Great Britain, and the United States. We came to the conferences with faith in each other, and now we have supplemented faith with definite knowledge." But it was definite knowledge of what was not true, the most fatal of all forms of ignorance.

Cultivated ignorance, not knowing because you don't want to know, extended into every department of our Government, and every phase of our political and military strategy in relation to Russia. Our statesmen didn't know and didn't want to know what Russia's foreign policy was, what Russia's internal regime was, what Stalin meant by democracy, what the great purge of 1936 to 1938 was about, why and by what means the fabulous confessions were extorted.

They didn't know or want to know that the Chinese Communists were hand-and-glove with Stalin in his plan to seize Manchuria, and then all China, and then all Asia, and then the world. They were taken in by the transparent hoax that the Chinese Communists were middle-of-the-road agrarian liberals, independent of Moscow. For 5 years

our whole Far Eastern policy was based on that Moscow-manufactured hoax.

And when the hoax was exploded, did they change their policy? Not for a second. They got out an enormous White Paper, 1,054 pages, trying to justify their policy. The makers of our foreign policy were more concerned to defend their own past than the future of our country.

However, I am not discussing the Democratic administration here. I am not campaigning for the Republicans. They have been just as ignorant. They joined the Democrats in what has been mistakenly called a bipartisan foreign policy. It was a nonpartisan no foreign policy, a harmony of ignorance, a clasping of hands on the fact that none of them had the slightest idea what to do.

I do not know how much Winston Churchill will be able to say in apology for his part in handing half the world to a tyrant; how far he was hoodwinked by Stalin, how far outvoted by the Stalin-Roosevelt combination. He has not yet told us about that. But he joined heartily in the conspiracy of self-deception.

He contributed to Roosevelt's cultivated ignorance of Soviet policy. His guilt is greater, too, for in him ignorance requires more cultivation. He does not decide on things by hunch, as Roosevelt did. In Great Contemporaries, published in 1937, he wrote two paragraphs containing the entire body of knowledge for the lack of which the delegates at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam threw away their opportunity to rebuild the world.

He wrote, "Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself. Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men. No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition and contrary opinion must be extinguished by death. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learned by rote is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation, progressively and forever.

"To be forewarned should be to be forearmed."

How shall we reconcile this penetrating wisdom, a warning to the free world against every mistake its leaders have made in the last 5 years, with the giant part Churchill played in making those mistakes? How shall we reconcile it with his saying to the House of Commons in November 1944: "I believe with deep conviction that the warrior statesman at the head of Russia will lead the Russian peoples, all the peoples of Russia, into the sunlight of a broader and happier age for all, and with him in this task will march the British Commonwealth of Nations and the mighty United States of America." He said this of a government which keeps in slavery 14,000,000 of its people.

Churchill has frankly stated that he gave up all other considerations in his determination to beat Hitler. He exclaimed in a broadcast June 22, 1941: "I will unsay no word that I have spoken about communism. But all this fades away before the spectacle which is now unfolding. We have but one aim and one single, irrevocable purpose. We are resolved to destroy Hitler and every vestige of the Nazi regime."

And more intimately he confided to his secretary: "I have only one purpose, the destruction of Hitler, and my life is much simplified thereby." His praise of Harry Hopkins, though little short of adulation, could rise no higher than this: "There he sat, slim, frail, ill, but absolutely glowing with refined comprehension of the cause. It was to be the defeat, ruin, and slaughter of Hitler to the exclusion of all other purposes, loyalties, or aims. In the history of the United States few brighter flames have burned."

It is unquestionable, indeed, whether such an abdication of intelligence in high places is to be found in the previous history of the United States, or such praise of it in England. Whatever may become of the British Empire, these words mark the end of the classic tradition of British diplomacy.

Churchill did unsay every word he had spoken about communism. He unknew every item of his knowledge about it. He achieved, by a somewhat strenuous exercise of will, the ignorance that our American leaders were naturally endowed with. But the result was the same—a second world-conquering tyrant is at our gates because a war against the first one was fought blindly.

Truman has wisely undertaken to get the truth about America into the minds of the Russians, but there remains the heavy task of getting the truth about Russia into the mind of Truman. Before a man can learn something, he has to know that he is ignorant of it. Even this preliminary knowledge is denied to those transfixed by the Churchill-Roosevelt tradition.

Truman got a merited horse laugh last year when he said, "I know Joe Stalin; he's a good fellow, but he's helpless in the hands of the Politburo." Yet that was only what his predecessors thought when Stalin failed to live up to his promises at Yalta. It was a notion that Stalin himself had been careful to plant in their minds in advance. Stalin has demonstrated by 5 solid years of treachery his unaltered belief that no faith need be, indeed, may be kept with non-Communists. That is the very simple truth which those must see who aspire to lead us from here on.

President Truman recently said to Arthur Krock, "The real trouble with the Russians is that they are suffering from a complex of fear and inferiority where we are concerned." If he really means that, America is without leadership in the most subtle and complex and implacable danger she ever confronted.

The real trouble with the Communists is that they believe that we are a degenerating society, and that they are the society of the future. They believe that in the long run they are bound to win. They are in a mood of belligerent superiority. They control one-third of the people and nearly half the earth, and threaten our national life as it has never been threatened before.

To the Truman-Marshall-Acheson school of diplomacy, last-ditch defenders of the policy of not knowing because you don't want to know, the attack in Korea must remain an impenetrable mystery. All they can learn from the sacrifice of American lives in that battle was summed up by Dean Acheson in the brilliant thought (not quoted verbatim): Because of the unprovoked attack in Korea, we must be all the more careful not to do or say anything that might provoke the Chinese Communists. The Chinese Communists are "provoked" by one thing and one only—an exposed point in our defenses, another chance to win a battle for the totalitarian world-Communist crusade of which they are a part.

Ignorance in the Executive, ignorance in the makers of our foreign policy is more dangerous than treason.

Address of John F. Nave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following speech made by John F. Nave, national commander of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at a dinner given in his honor on January 28, 1951, in Syracuse, N. Y.:

I find it extremely difficult tonight to speak at length; or on any particular subject.

It occurs rarely in a man's life that he is singled out to be honored by an affair of this nature.

With deep humility and great pride I accept the benevolence, good will, and confidence that this occasion inspires.

As National Commander, I realize the faith, trust, and vote of confidence placed in me by my fellow veterans and organizational members throughout our beloved country.

It has been stated that over 3,000,000 honorably discharged American War Veterans in the United States today have eligibility requirements for my present position.

It has been further stated that only 16 of them have attained this coveted position.

This great honor bestowed upon me by my fellow veterans is indeed something to be greatly proud of and forever remembered and cherished.

My great hope and ambition is to keep faith with the great office to which I have been elected for the fiscal year 1950-51; and to pass onto my successor accomplishments not in existence at the time of my assumption of office. This, I know, shall be.

Since, tonight, you honor the National Commander, it is only fair to reveal a few highlights of the national organization he has been entrusted to command.

My organization is nonprofit and nonpolitical.

It does not promote the candidacy of any person to public office. Its income does not go to any private individual or concern. The national, State, and local officers serve without salary or compensation. Charity and benevolence is the basis of our veterans' cause, which we so honorably and faithfully serve.

It is composed entirely of persons who were honorably discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States for service rendered in time of war.

It is a patriotic American veterans' organization.

It is against all Communist, Fascist, totalitarian, subversive, and un-American groups and organizations.

It is faithful and loyal to the Constitution and Government of the United States; and against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

Moreover, it reaffirms the privilege of all veterans' organizations to serve and aid veterans, their wives, widows, and dependent children and parents, regardless of their position or station in life.

In addition, it fosters and advances the true principles of democracy, freedom, and loyal Americanism.

Lastly, incorporated as a war veterans' nonprofit, nonpolitical membership corporation in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Rhode Island, it is

also specifically recognized by name as such under 23 different State laws, as well as sponsoring 67 bills in Congress during the last 4 years, in its individual name.

This, in brief, is a short synopsis of the national organization which I am entrusted to command for the ensuing year.

To paraphrase the words of the military, I am proud of my command and the assignments it entails. Its foundation consists of the cornerstone of democracy and freedom. One could not find a better cause to serve.

As I stated in my opening remarks, I find it extremely difficult to speak at length or on any particular subject this evening. I believe the reason is perhaps quite obvious.

Your presence here tonight on this gala occasion in my behalf is both touching and overwhelming. To be so honored is not only rare in a man's life, but also greatly inspiring.

This day is a memorable and joyful one for me. May the Lord be as gracious and kind to all of you present here tonight who made it possible.

If the Small Miners of America Could Have Produced During the Last 5 Years, We Would Not Face Our Present Shortage of Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the production of the small mines of this country is necessary if we are to have an adequate supply of the critical and strategic minerals and metals. For 5 years following World War II some of us from the far West urged a program which would continue the production of this large segment of the American mining industry. Our efforts were unsuccessful and today our Nation faces a desperate shortage of these materials. Why that happened is discussed in a speech I made at the annual convention of the American Mining Congress at Salt Lake City on August 25, 1950, which I include as part of the RECORD, as follows:

The problems of the small mine operator is a large subject. My association with those problems has been in the legislative field, and my discussion of them will be limited to the legislative problems of the small miner in which I have some first-hand knowledge.

The legislative problems of the small mine operator originate in the field. If he didn't have trouble in his operations in the field, he never would have been back in Washington having legislative problems. All I know about that is that the small miner—and some not so small—have been telling me that they are going broke—that they have had to close up their mines—that the present price will not support their operations—and that something has to be done about it.

Presumably, the small miner has exhausted his remedies in the field—whatever could be done in improving his operations by his own resources has been done. No one comes to Washington for help—least of all the little fellow unfamiliar with the labyrinthian ways of Washington—unless it is the last resort. So he has come, and the crescendo of his complaints has risen as the reports of more and more mine closures have piled up. Surely he has been in a sorry plight, and he wonders why something hasn't been done about it.

Let me tell you why.

The small miner in his effort to get help has been faced by an unusual and formidable coalition. He has been opposed in his own Government by the Interior Department. He has been opposed in his own Government by the State Department. He has been opposed in his own industry by some of the big operators. And he has been opposed in Congress by interests themselves getting fat on Government protection and subsidy.

I will be specific.

The Interior Department has vigorously opposed any legislation modeled on the World War II premium price plan. It has supported, but reluctantly, a very limited program for additional development and exploration and the salvaging of those minerals and metals which would be lost in presently closed or closing mines unless immediately taken out of the ground.

The record is clear.

In the Eightieth Congress the President on the recommendation of the Interior Department vetoed the Allen bill to continue temporarily a modified version of the premium price plan. Consistently thereafter, the Interior Department opposed a bill for a similar purpose authored by Congressman Russell, of Nevada. In this Congress—the Eighty-first—the Interior Department has turned thumbs down on a bill by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and me, to aid the small miner which was introduced after exhausting conferences with the Interior Department and after we had gotten what we believed was their agreement The bill was killed in the Rules Committee with their help.

Subsequently, on two different occasions, Senator O'MAHONEY and I worked up further compromises—bills that gave the Interior Department unlimited power to pick and choose between operators—which they demanded—the so-called selective contract system for incentive payments for the production of critical and strategic minerals and metals. These measures were twice defeated on the floor of the House—after taking them around the Rules Committee on a special rule. Those bills have had the approval of the Interior Department but not what I would call their enthusiastic support.

As this war emergency came upon us a new measure was locked up in the Rules Committee along with the others. This was a measure providing for limited help in exploration and development and in addition the salvaging of mineral and metal resources which would be forever lost to the Nation unless removed from the ground now—the deep mines in Michigan, which are closed and watering up, as an example. This measure had what I would call the half-hearted support of our Government agencies. Finally, reluctantly—beaten into it by the necessity of war—the leaders in Washington started to talk about the importance of minerals and metals—the deplorable condition of the stockpile—which had been called to their attention all along—and the expenditure of two or three billion dollars on essential materials.

Now what has brought this attitude about; what has been the reasoning which has supported this reluctance to aid the small mine operator?

Let me answer that question.

There are people in our Government who believe that our mineral resources have been grievously depleted by war; that the mineral resources of this Nation have been used up to an astonishing degree; that our minerals and metals have been scattered over the four corners of the earth, in almost every land and at the bottom of almost every sea in the extravagant expenditure of war. That this being true, we should conserve our resources by keeping them in the ground, and should use so far as possible, and stockpile so far as possible, the resources of other nations. That that was not only the wise, but the cunning thing to do, and was the policy of true conservation. And that certainly it is sheer folly to use any more of our resources than we had to—much less pay premium or incentive prices to bring them out of the ground and burn them up in industrial use.

Now our answer was as ancient as the lore of western mining—and as hard to understand without experience. It was the ancient proverb of mining—that ore begets ore. That the only way to develop and conserve our mineral resources is by mining them. And, our legislation provided that the mineral wealth produced as a direct result of incentives from the Government should go into indestructible stockpiles which would grow in value, and not be lost or used until needed—and that by this method we would not only bring to the surface in usable form our mineral wealth, but also—in effect—stockpile the manpower and transportation to make the resource available in event of war. Additionally, we would thereby maintain and keep the finest stockpile our Nation could hope to have—a healthy, going domestic mining industry producing and ready to produce more in a national emergency safely beyond the reach of the snorkel submarine.

But our arguments were unavailing, and policy was made in high places.

Linked in this dangerous and specious reasoning with the so-called conservationists has been the State Department. It fitted their necessities exactly.

The State Department needed to maintain the dollar balances of foreign nations. For that to be done, foreign nations must sell us something for which dollars could be paid. The thinking of the conservationists dovetailed neatly. Minerals and metals should be bought abroad. The domestic market should be supplied with foreign minerals and metals. Millions should be spent through ECA in developing foreign mineral and metal production for sale to the United States. And, the scattered and politically impotent domestic small miner was a perfect victim, whose murdered squeals would hardly be heard from the far west on the spot-lit Washington stage.

Moreover, even the political hazards were further minimized. The conservationists in the government departments and the dollar-balance policy in the State Department found an unexpected ally in some of the big mining operators.

And they—the big mining operators—had some ideas that make sense to them. Here they are:

They did not want the Government to get its meddling hand into their industry. Their observation proved that Federal regulation followed the Federal dollar. It made no difference that they were not required to participate unless they wanted to—or that their nonsubsidized mines would not have to compete in the free market with the subsidized small mines whose production would be required to go into the stockpile. It was the dread foot of Government through the peacetime door of their industry. And they wanted none of it. Further, a little mine nursed on a Government subsidy might grow to a big rough competitor who no longer needed a subsidy—or any odds from them in the free market. Others with foreign investments, presently or in prospect, could see no merit in reducing or endangering the home market. From any side it looked like a horned devil to them—and their emissaries

trod the high-ceilinged halls of the Capitol, button-holed Congressmen and whispered the mining industry is against it.

It is a fine tribute to the Congressmen from mining States—Republicans and Democrats alike—that in the face of these circumstances a bill ever got to the floor at all. There is no partisanship among the supporters of mining in Congress. They fought hard and well—on both sides of the aisle. Especially I want to pay tribute to the Representatives from this State, Colorado, Montana, Idaho, Arizona, and New Mexico, all of whom, regardless of party, have done everything in their power to repair the desperate situation of the domestic miner.

But there were not enough of us. The Senate, where mining is relatively stronger because each mining State—no matter how small—has as many Senators as New York, twice passed mining bills. In the House, where the thinly populated mining areas are submerged in representation from the great metropolitan areas, we did not do so well. The Congressmen from the East and South voted us down. Some didn't like subsidies for the mining industry—Congressmen from New York who shout their heads off for low cost public housing—we got 2 votes out of New York's 45. Congressmen from the South who will fight to the last breath for parity for cotton, tobacco, and peanuts—we did not get a single vote in Georgia. Congressmen from the Midwest—the land of wheat and corn—who not only want parity but cheap Government financed storage for their grain—and will vote Democratic if they don't get it from a Republican Congress. We got 6 votes out of Ohio's 23. And some just weren't interested—and "I have to cast one economy vote this session, don't I?"

In summary, then, the problem of the small mine operator is to convince the Interior Department that "ore begets ore"—that mining and developing our mineral resources is conservation; to convince the State Department that American dollars paid for foreign minerals and metals has a Siamese twin—a dangerous and costly dependence upon ocean-borne supplies from foreign lands constituting a serious threat to our national security and our long-range peace time needs; to convince some of the big operators that the national interest is above any private interest; and to convince the eastern and southern Congressmen that the security of their farms, factories, and homes requires a self-sufficiency of those things without which our industrial machine will collapse.

It is a big order. And I am sure the American small mine operator takes no satisfaction from the fact that the Korean crisis has made the hard realities plain: that our domestic mining industry has slowly gone out of existence; that the stockpile is deplorably short and unable to sustain any kind of a war effort; that we are tragically lacking in some of the very essentials of a war effort.

The damage can be repaired, but it will be costly, and in our present emergency we will suffer from our failure to have a well-balanced and long-range domestic mining policy. Government agencies will be given more power than contemplated in any of the measures I have referred to—and it may be a long time before we can limit that authority. Steps will be taken to maintain and increase the domestic production of critical and strategic minerals and metals by providing the assistance required to assure production from small and marginal mines and the undeveloped mineral deposits of the United States. In our haste we will again gouge our resources—as we did in the last war—rather than following orderly development and production. Manpower will be short and costs will be high. But what the Nation, Congress, Government officials—and I believe the industry—have finally been convinced must be done, will be done. The officials of our Government will be urged to counsel with all phases of the mining and related industries and to avoid if possible some of the pitfalls in our past experience. Out of all this I hope will come a balanced long-range domestic mining program based on the principle that it is sound for our economy and necessary for our security to have and to maintain at all times a healthy going domestic mining industry. I have confidence in the leadership in the mining industry represented here at this great convention, and know of your willingness, your anxiety, to do your part.

Cecil Dickson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cecil Dickson has resigned as coordinator of information for the House of Representatives to assume new duties with the Motion Picture Association of America.

We shall miss him very much. Mr. Dickson had character, ability, and integrity. He served this body well, and we sincerely hope for him great success in his new work.

OFFICE OF COORDINATOR
OF INFORMATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 1, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Serving under you as Coordinator of Information for the United States House of Representatives for the past 2 years has been a supreme privilege and honor, but now I must resign to assume new duties with the Motion Picture Association of America, which we have discussed.

The intimate association with you, the second most important official in our Government, and the confidence and trust you reposed in me constitute the highest tribute one could receive in 30 years of close personal friendship. I shall cherish the memory for all time.

It has been a challenging and interesting pleasure to work for you and the other Members of our great Congress. I am deeply grateful to you for the opportunity to serve, and I was so happy to be with you when you established a record for both accomplishments and tenure as Speaker of the greatest legislative body on earth.

May the coming years bring to you more honor, greater happiness, and genuine contentment which you so richly deserve.

With deep personal affection and high regard, I am,

Gratefully yours,

CECIL DICKSON.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1951.

Mr. CECIL DICKSON,
Pleasant Hill, Paeonian Springs, Va.

DEAR CECIL: I have received your letter of February 1, 1951, stating that you must resign as Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives to assume your new duties with the Motion Picture Association of America. Let me say that I accept your resignation with deepest regret, but I cannot stand in the way of your progress or bettering yourself and your family.

When I first met you, you were a correspondent with the Denison Herald at Denison, Tex., which is in the district I represent. Since that time I have watched your career with a friendly interest. You made good and reached a high place in the newspaper fraternity. No one could have made a greater or more satisfying Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives than you have. Your work has been thorough and intelligent to the highest degree. Throughout the years I have appreciated your friendship and your loyalty to me personally. You are not only loyal to men, you are loyal to principles. It has been a high privilege to have enjoyed the friendship of and worked with, throughout the years, a man of your steadfast honesty, your high degree of loyalty, and your marked ability.

You carry with you into your new field my unalloyed friendship and best wishes.

Affectionately yours,

SAM RAYBURN.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense held in Washington, D. C., January 25 to 27, 1951.

This resolution asks that the reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 be not extended and that in its place there be established the principle of flexible import fees.

Mr. Speaker, the Women's Patriotic Conference represented 40 organizations and more than 2,000,000 American women.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1934, AS EXTENDED, ADOPTED BY THE TWENTY-FIFTH WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 25-27, 1951

Whereas a healthy national economy is necessary to a strong national defense; and

Whereas good wages and full employment form the foundation of a healthy economy; and

Whereas the free trade importation of products of countries where workers are paid much less than workers producing comparable goods in the United States can only result in increasing unemployment here and a weakening of our economy and our potential for national defense; and

Whereas the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program has removed protection from our workers and investors against the unfair competition of the low-paid workers of other countries, thereby threatening jobs of workers in industries important to our national defense; and

Whereas as a result of the reduction of tariffs and import fees incident to the passage of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended, grave injury already has been inflicted upon various industries in this

country, important to our national defense program; and

Whereas imports into our country should be controlled by the imposition of import fees which would reflect the difference in our workers' wage standard and standard of living to those standards in other countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon Congress that the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as extended which expires in June of this year, be not extended further and that in its place there be established the principle of flexible import fees, to be decided upon by the Congress in keeping with the Constitution of the United States.

FORTY PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING MORE THAN 2,000,000 WOMEN

American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.; American Gold Star Sisters, Inc.; American Gold Star Wives, Inc.; American Legion Auxiliary; American War Dads Auxiliary; American War Mothers; American Women's Legion of World Wars; Auxiliary to Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; Blue Star Mothers of America; Catholic War Veterans of the U. S. A. Ladies Auxiliary; Dames of the Loyal Legion of the U. S. A.; Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War (1861-65), Inc.; Daughters of the United States Army; Ladies Auxiliary of the Military Order of the Purple Heart; Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; Marine Corps League Auxiliary; National Amvets Auxiliary; National Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States; National Patriotic Council; National Society for Constitutional Security; National Society Daughters of the Revolution; National Society Daughters of the Union (1861-1865), Inc.; National Society of New England Women; National Society Patriotic Women of America, Inc.; National Society of Service Star Legion, Inc.; National Society Women Descendants of the Anc. and Hon. Art. Co.; National Women's Relief Corps Auxiliary; National Yeomen F; Navy Club U. S. A. Auxiliary; Navy Mothers Club of America; New York City Colony, New England Women Society Sponsors of United States Navy; the Wheel of Progress; United States Army Mothers; Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States; Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia; Reserve Officers Association Ladies Clubs of the United States; the National Gold Star Mothers, Inc.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the ninth of a series of short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

MAIMONIDES: GREAT JEWISH LAW SCHOLAR AND PHILOSOPHER (1135-1204 A. D.)

Maimonides (1135-1204 A. D.) was born in Spain and migrated to Egypt, where he became the greatest Jewish scholar of medieval times, writing works on law, logic, astronomy, medicine, and philosophy.

His principal philosophical work, The Guide for the Perplexed, sought to harmonize Jewish teachings with philosophy, especially that of Aristotle. At the same time The Guide recognized that reason is limited and needs to be supplemented by revelation. The work influenced not only Maimonides' Jewish successors but also Arabian and Christian—among the latter St. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus.

In the Mishna Torah he gave a classified collection of Jewish oral law, which became a reference book for rabbis and judges.

His plaque was sculptured by Brenda Putnam, of New York City.

Unsnapping the Bear Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, other than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], there is no man in the present House so well equipped to speak upon the situation in Korea as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMENSKI]. Only a few weeks ago he was in Korea while the present action was being joined. He has first-hand knowledge of the psychology of the people in Korea and China. Today he is in this House clothed in the modesty of a new Member of this body. He is a pleasing and convincing speaker and above all he stands for something, as was so well evidenced by the way in which he beat the Hague machine last November in absentia.

This House stands well in need of information from a man so well informed. He should be encouraged to give it without further delay. I believe his observations while in Korea will be most helpful to all of us in Congress.

I include in the RECORD herewith an article written expressly for International News Service this month and which was published on January 19 in the Jersey Observer:

REPRESENTATIVE SIEMENSKI OFFERS WAR PLAN—JERSEY CITY CONGRESSMAN CALLS "RED HORDE" OF CHINA A MYTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A Member of Congress who only a few weeks ago was serving in Korea, herewith presents a five-point program for unsnapping the bear trap clamped on UN forces by the Chinese. An Army major and press chief for the Tenth Corps, Representative ALFRED D. SIEMENSKI was evacuated direct from the Hungnam beachhead to take his post in Congress, to which he was elected from New Jersey's Thirteenth District while serving in Korea. He fought in the Italian campaign in the last war and later served with the American Military Government in Austria under Gen. Mark Clark.)

(By Representative ALFRED D. SIEMENSKI, Democrat, of New Jersey)

WASHINGTON, January 19.—The alleged "Red horde" of China, capable of sweeping western democracy out of all Asia, is a myth.

China today is a mass of poverty-stricken people seething beneath the feet of a minority Red bloc.

Only the officer corps, for instance, in the Red army are Communists.

We can save China and the rest of the Orient for the free world by the political, economic, and psychological defeat and sterilization of that minority—and without committing American troops to any land campaign in China.

"WE MUST HOLD IN KOREA"

But we must hold in Korea. That is basic, because Korea, with its Yalu River power dams and its southern "rice bowl" is the key to domination of Manchuria and the frustration of Russian aims of conquest.

To unsnap the bear trap that the Chinese Reds have clamped on United Nation troops in Korea and to save the west from a catastrope in the Far East, I propose that:

1. We prevail on Chiang Kai-shek to become military adviser to General MacArthur and move Chiang's government-in-exile to Tokyo, leaving his troops under military, not political, command.

2. The Nationalists declare themselves "volunteers" at the disposal of the United Nations.

3. We employ Nationalist troops in Korea to kidnap the entire Chinese Red Army of Mao Tse-Tung. The Reds would desert to us by the tens of thousands, if given a decent chance.

4. We promote a triple entente comprising Free China, the Republic of Korea and Japan. The establishment of Chiang's exile government in Tokyo would facilitate this step.

GET DOWN TO ORIENTAL NEEDS

5. We quit wasting our time talking to the Orientals about vague intangibles and get down to their needs. Wars are fought for the right of a people to live as a nation—to give those people the opportunity of getting what they need to live. They need food, medical care, and housing.

Once they understand that we are fighting to see that they obtain those things, they will be convinced we have the right idea, without all the frills.

If this program is put into effect, any large scale landing on the Chinese mainland will not be necessary. But we should encourage raids and guerrilla warfare to keep Peiping off balance until the remainder of the program achieves success.

Perhaps I can wrap up what I'm trying to say here in one little incident that I witnessed:

One of our Chinese Red captives, after being fed and given warm accommodations, announced that he was ready now to fight for the United States.

He was a veteran of 60 campaigns and had been impressed first into the Nationalist army, then into the Red army.

He was told, "No, your fighting days are over. Why do you wish to fight for the United States?"

He replied, "Because I have gotten better food and care from you than I ever had before. If I can't fight, then I'll work for it."

Multiply him by the multitudes of China and the Orient and you see what I'm driving at.

But we should never try to appease the real Communists. They are vicious, cruel, and ruthless.

We Want What's Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to insert a timely editorial from the Detroit Free Press of January 27, 1951, by Frank B. Woodford, on the controversy now before the Civil Aeronautics Board between Nationwide Airlines and Wisconsin Central. As the article well points out, the issue at stake is whether the two great peninsulas of Michigan will at long last be united by adequate transportation or whether the Upper Peninsula will still be considered as the lost colony of the State of Michigan.

The editorial follows:

WE WANT WHAT'S OURS

(By Frank B. Woodford)

There's a battle going on between Michigan and Wisconsin and Illinois before the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and Michigan had better win it.

The fight is over whether the Upper Peninsula of this State will be served by an airline operating from points in the Lower Peninsula, or whether air service will be furnished by a line running between Chicago, Milwaukee, and Upper Peninsula points.

So far, with the skirmishing just started, it looks like our neighbor States to the west have the edge in this fight.

They probably will be able to bring enough political pressure to bear in Washington to emerge the winner, with half of the State of Michigan as the prize, unless Lower Peninsula folks bestir themselves and take an active interest in the contest.

The stakes are high.

They consist of an area about as big as the entire State of Connecticut, with a fairly heavy population, and a lot of cash business. Most of the latter is, by existing circumstances, now drained off into Milwaukee and Chicago.

Detroit and other cities in the lower part of the State get very little of this business. Undoubtedly they could use it. Certainly they are more entitled to it than either Wisconsin or Illinois.

Unfortunately for a great many years that part of the Upper Peninsula west of the straits always has been closer, economically, to Chicago than it has to Detroit or other Michigan localities.

Included in this "lost" area are such important towns as Marquette, Escanaba, Houghton, Iron Mountain, Ironwood, Stambaugh, and many others.

In these places the citizens have Michigan license plates on their automobiles; they pay a sales tax and other taxes to the State of Michigan; they send a few representatives and a senator or two to Lansing to help make the laws.

But beyond that, they are generally as remote from that part of Michigan which is "down under" as if they lived in Iowa or Minnesota.

The bulk of the things they buy comes either from Milwaukee or Chicago. They read the newspapers from those places, while it is almost impossible to obtain a Detroit paper up there. They listen to Chicago stations on their radios, and when they "go to town," as the saying has it, it's to Chicago that they buy their tickets.

They even root for the Cubs instead of the Tigers, and that's about the last straw.

This all came about because of the inadequacy of transportation between Detroit and that part of the State. It's almost as far by automobile from Detroit to Marquette as it is from Detroit to New York.

If you go by train from Detroit to Escanaba or Iron Mountain, you first have to go to Chicago. It's a trip requiring 2 days or a day and a night.

But by air from Detroit it's only 2½ or 3 hours to those Upper Peninsula points, and an airline now covers the distance on regular schedule in that time. Moreover, the air fare is about half the first-class train fare.

It's a small line, Nationwide Airlines, which runs out of Detroit for the north. Its competitor is Wisconsin Central Airlines.

"There isn't enough traffic to support both," says the CAA, and the hearings now being held are to determine which line will be certified to serve Upper Peninsula points exclusively.

If Wisconsin Central gets it—and it has powerful backing—business will continue to filter through Milwaukee and Chicago. If Nationwide is allowed to operate directly between Detroit, Lansing, Grand Rapids, and the Upper Peninsula, the latter will again become part of the State of Michigan, in fact as well as politically.

Certainly the results are important enough to the people of all of the State so that they ought to get busy writing to their Congressmen and to the CAA, demanding that the Upper Peninsula be returned to the fold.

We want our lost colony back again.

Attention, Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the criticisms that I have heard from the other side of the aisle, and which may be valid, I think it is appropriate that the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 5, 1951, be included in the RECORD:

ATTENTION, TAFT

A political check up on top defense officials shows them to be overwhelmingly Republican, 12 to 5. This is the way they line up:

Republicans:

Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization.

Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Administrator.

William H. Harrison, Defense Production Administrator.

Manly Fleischmann, National Production Administrator.

Cyrus Ching, Chairman, Wage Stabilization Board.

James Knudson, Defense Transportation Administrator.

Bruce Brown, Petroleum Administrator for Defense.

Charles W. Connor, Solid Fuels Administrator.

James Boyd, Defense Minerals Administrator.

Robert Goodwin, Director of Defense Manpower.

John Small, Chairman, Munitions Board.

Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman, Federal Reserve Board, which is in charge of credit restrictions.

Here are the Democrats:

Michael DiSalle, Price Stabilization Director.

Clifford B. McManus, Defense Power Administrator.

W. E. Barber, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Raymond Foley, Housing Administrator.

Millard Caldwell, Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

Let's Roll Back Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following radio address by Scott Bishop, program director for radio station WIOD, Miami, Fla. Mr. Scott Bishop gave this talk on the editor's report program on January 26, and repeated it on January 28.

I want to talk to you today about the price of food.

On February 1—next Thursday—the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics will begin a survey of Miami families of moderate income to determine how much they spent on food, clothing, rent, recreation, taxes, and other items during 1950.

Well, all this is very nice, very nice, indeed. But I think these families of moderate income know full well how much they spent last year for rent and food and for taxes. I don't think it will take a survey to tell these people about the present high cost of living. These people the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics is going to interview don't have to be surveyed to learn where their money is going.

That's why I want to talk to you today about the price of food.

And I want to ask you some questions, too. For instance, one question I want to ask is this:

"Why has the cost of food risen 247 percent right here in Miami since 1940?"

Why has food gone up almost two and one-half times over the cost of 10 years ago?

Why does it take $3.47 to buy the same amount of food today—that one dollar would have bought in 1940?

Take any grocery bill right here in Miami. If you spend $20 a week for groceries today, you would only have had to spend $8 a week in 1940. Eight dollars a week then—$20 a week now.

Has the average income increased 247 percent since 1940? Is the average worker now earning 2½ times as much as he did in 1940? Statistics prove he is not.

But statistics also show that the average employer has made every honest attempt to keep pace with the breakneck speed taken by rising prices. The average employer has been utterly unable to increase the wages of his employees 247 percent. Even now, our courts are overflowing with bankruptcy pleas from the smaller businessmen who have been completely crushed by the ever-rising tide; by the ever-demanding drain on their budgets and on their financial resources. Even now, businesses which once operated at a fair profit to the benefit of employer and employee alike—are now operating at a deficit, writing in their account books with red ink in the optimistic hope that the American economy will soon again find a more stable path to follow.

And, in the meantime, what? Let's look at the facts. Let's look at the record. Let's let the figures speak for themselves.

For instance, let's go back not 10 years but let's go back 5 years—to January 1946.

We had just ended a 4-year war with Germany and with Japan. During 1942, 1943, 1944, and most of 1945 our war-production output was at the most gigantic peak ever known to the human race. Food in those years was available, but food was not overplentiful. You could walk into any grocery

store in Miami and find the soap shelves empty. The sugar shelves empty. The gelatine-dessert shelves empty. The table sirup, black pepper, tapioca pudding, canned cherries, canned pineapple, preserves, and jelly shelves empty. The Kleenex and paper towel shelves empty. The coffee shelves empty. Shortening shelves empty. The gum and candy shelves empty. The meat counters sparsely filled, and with not-so-choice cuts at that.

Then came 1946. The war was over.

Foods which had been scarce for more than 3 years began to come back on the market. Shelves began to be stocked again. Sugar was available, shortening was becoming more plentiful, coffee was on the way back. So were the many, many items which had been scarce for so long.

But let's keep the facts still in mind. The American people had either done without—or had managed to struggle along for 3 or 4 years with very sparse supplies of all those scarce items which were missing so long from the grocers' shelves.

And when these scarcities did come back, what happened to the prices?

Let's examine the record again. Let's look at the facts again. Let's let the prices speak for themselves.

After all those years of rationing and of doing without, the American people, having, in most part, reaped a considerable harvest of good American dollars, were ready to go back to the good old days when meat and coffee, shortening and sugar were all plentiful. They had the money and they were willing to pay.

Prices remained higher than before the war—yes; that's true. But equally true is the fact that prices did not skyrocket.

The facts being what they were, prices had every logical reason under the sun to skyrocket. But they didn't. Today, you can step inside any store in the land and what do you see? Shelves heaped high with everything imaginable in the line of foodstuffs.

Bars of soap by the thousands, packages of soaps by the hundreds, tins of shortening by the dozens, pounds of coffee by the score. All you want—buy it and take it away. No limit. Help yourself. Load up your grocery basket and carry it out.

If you can pay the price. If you don't care what it costs you. If you can afford it.

Mrs. Homemaker bought liberally and in plentiful quantities back in 1946—only 5 years ago.

But let's see what her grocery dollar did for her 5 years ago. Let's compare what her grocery dollar did for her 5 years ago with what it will do for her today. Here are the facts. This is the record.

The comparison stands in black and white in the grocery ads of 1946 and in the grocery ads of 1951. For example:

Coffee: Coffee was 41 cents a pound in 1946. Today, coffee is selling at 90 cents a pound and still going higher. Coffee is 49 cents a pound more right now than it was in 1946. And yet a recent news story on the radio and in the newspapers reported that the crop for 1951 appears more promising than that of 1950.

Why, then, is coffee 220 percent higher now than it was at the close of World War II? Does it cost the grocer, the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer 220 percent more right along the line to get that coffee onto our tables? I doubt it. I very much doubt it.

Then let's consider shortening, put up in 3-pound tins. Vegetable shortening of this nature was 64 cents in 1946 for the 3-pound container. Today, that very same product is 91 cents for 3 pounds and still going higher.

What has caused vegetable shortening to increase in price more than 140 percent in 5 years? And just consider the small item of ground black pepper. Back in January of 1946, ground black pepper sold at 10 cents for the 1½-ounce size. Believe it or not, that same size tin of pepper now costs the Miami housewife 37 cents—27 cents more.

But what is there about the growing, processing, wholesaling, and retailing of ground black pepper that has caused it to go up in price 370 percent in 5 years?

Then consider today's meat prices. Plain, ordinary round steak. Up from 42 cents a pound in 1946 to $1.15 a pound today. That's an increase of 73 cents a pound in 5 years. That's an increase of 274 percent.

And hamburger. Hamburger was 29 cents in 1946. It is 69 cents today. Forty cents more a pound for hamburger.

Pork chops were 37 cents. Today, they're 89 cents a pound. That's 52 cents more a pound.

And look at these prices:

Chuck roast, 27 cents a pound in 1946; 73 cents today; 46 cents higher.

Pork roast, 35 cents a pound in 1946; 89 cents today; 54 cents higher.

Veal cutlets, 47 cents a pound in 1946; $1.39 today; 92 cents higher.

Cold cuts, 29 cents a pound in 1946; 79 cents today; 50 cents higher.

Beef liver, 40 cents a pound in 1946; 89 cents today; 49 cents higher.

Margarine, 21 cents a pound in 1946; 37 cents today; 16 cents higher.

Powdered soap, 23 cents a package in 1946; 31 cents today; 8 cents higher.

Paper towels, 10 cents a roll in 1946; 23 cents today; 13 cents higher.

Hand soap, 3 bars, 20 cents, in 1946; 3 bars, 39 cents today; 19 cents higher.

Salt, 2 boxes 9 cents in 1946; 2 boxes 16 cents today; 7 cents higher.

Crackers, 1-pound box, 18 cents in 1946; 1-pound box 25 cents today; 7 cents higher.

Sugar, 5 pounds 29 cents in 1946; 5 pounds 45 cents today; 16 cents higher.

Canned milk, 3 cans 25 cents in 1946; 3 cans 39 cents today; 14 cents higher.

Flour, 5 pounds 29 cents in 1946; 5 pounds 45 cents today; 16 cents higher.

Catsup, 14 cents in 1946; 39 cents today; 25 cents higher.

Baby food, 3 jars 19 cents in 1946, 3 jars 29 cents today; 10 cents higher.

And this could go on and on and on, this seemingly never-ending list of items which are so incredibly higher in cost now as compared to war's end in January of 1946. And why?

I don't know why, I am unable to determine. I can guess, and I don't think I'd be far from wrong. Someone is cleaning up, someone is turning the homemaker's pennies and dollars into fortunes.

But who? And how long will it continue?

I am not concerned here with price controls. I am not debating the usefulness or the uselessness of price controls. As an American citizen, I am not in favor of Government telling any man what he can or what he cannot ask for the goods he sells. But I am in favor of investigating any condition existing in America today which gouges the American housewife—the American mother. More and more, the high cost of food becomes a situation which should and must be investigated. Any rollback on prices existing at any time in the month of January this year is completely useless—except for the fact that such a rollback does act toward keeping already exorbitant prices from becoming even more outlandish. Reports are that an official investigation of high food prices soon is to get underway. All of us sincerely hope that this investigation will turn up facts—not double talk. That it will be carried out in a sincere, honest manner—not merely as an empty political gesture.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this broadcast, WIOD received 587 letters and 65 telephone calls, all of them complimentary to the station, and all of them very much concerned about the alarmingly high cost of food.

I thought you might be interested in this indication of the feeling of the people in south Florida in regard to the high cost of food.

Special Class Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which is most enlightening and interesting from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., January 28, 1951:

SPECIAL TRAINING CLASSES BENEFIT EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN HERE—GREATER LAWRENCE SPECIAL CLASS TEACHERS USE LATEST SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE OF MENTAL RETARDATION TO HELP YOUNGSTERS INCREASE UNDERSTANDING, TRAINING OF PARENTS IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT

(By Bill Collins, Jr.)

The trouble is so few people have the courage to voice the hurtful truth, and the truth is so important at a time like this.

The little girl with the golden hair laughed when her mother kissed her cheek, and sent her off to school. Her long and shiny ringlets danced as she skipped out of the yard, a green-blue pencil box held proudly in her hand. There was a prideful joy alight within the watching woman's eyes as she saw the happy gleam of laughter. This, she said within her heart, is all that was really needed—new friends, new interests. I hope it is, she prayed.

The child said nothing within her heart. Her eyes were eager for the adventures of a new, untouched day. A running dog stopped to wag its tail, and she smiled and touched its head. A pretty pasteboard lady waved from a drugstore window, and the child felt warm inside. She had no fears, nor trepidations. She had already forgotten yesterday.

Yesterday did not return until she sat down at her desk, there in the first-grade classroom. There was the cruel, unthinking giggling of children sitting near her. Then yesterday came back in all its chaos and confusion. Her heart raced and hammered against her tiny ribs, and she dug her knuckles into her eyes so no one would see the tears.

Yesterday had been the first day, her first day of school. How wonderfully it started. The teacher was a kindly, friendly lady. The blackboards were trimmed with marching, cut-out animals, and the desks were freshly cleaned. First they sang out loud, and then the teacher passed out crayons.

That was the beginning. She couldn't remember which color each one was. She couldn't understand what the teacher wanted. As the day progressed, she found more and more confusion in things that seemed to be so easy for the others. She couldn't remember the teacher's name. She couldn't count to five. She couldn't name any of the letters on the cards the teacher held. Then the laughter came, with the innocent cruelty of children.

Before the day was done, she was sitting stiffly, silent at her desk, her hands so tightly clenched, her knuckles were bloodless

blobs of bones. When the teacher tried to talk, she refused to answer.

Still, no one saw the truth.

It was not until almost 3 years later—three terrible, heartbroken years of humiliation, torture, stubborn silences, and intermittent fits of fury—that someone had the courage to voice the truth, to win the child another chance, to say, with forthright frankness, "this child is mentally retarded."

There is no machinery more complex than the workings of the human mind. "Ostrich-ism" has, for many years, even ages, made mental flaws a source of unearned shame. But now we are emerging from the dark ages of ignorance on such matters. People, today, are beginning to recognize the facts—and, more important, to do something about them. The undeserved stigma is being smashed by truth.

Mental retardation is nothing to be whispered about, nor hidden, nor ashamed of. It could happen to anyone, in any family, as easily as polio could strike, or cancer. And it is as free of shame as these. It must be fought, not skeletoned in a closet.

Almost one person in a hundred is, or will be, mentally retarded. Conservative estimates place the number of mentally retarded persons in these United States at 3,000,000 men, women, and children. With the right kind of training some 75 percent of them become partially, or wholly, self-supporting. These are facts.

Few people realize that there are millions of people in this country whose intelligence quota is 70 or lower. Even the best individuals in this group can never hold a job, except, perhaps, doing unskilled manual labor under close direction. They are facing one of the world's greatest problems—and they cannot face it alone.

Left to fend for himself, a mentally retarded youngster can become either an introvert—being an utterly impassive, vegetable-like being—or an extrovert, being overaggressive, restless, and excitable. With help, he might learn to be neither. Without help, he might easily become a delinquent.

Today the world is realizing.

The world is realizing, to quote a national magazine, "That a mentally retarded child * * * (can belong) * * * to any family, and is not a proof of some fault in the parents." Such realization—and it has been a long while in coming—has opened a new way to happiness for such unfortunate youngsters. It has made the parents of such children understand that such youngsters can be trained to live out their lives with much more happiness than was expected, and that they should not be a source of shame, to be "hidden away in an attic."

Science is now studying mental retardation. While some of its causes are still obscure, much has been learned. The cells of the brain are delicate. Damage to them is usually irreparable. Science says such damage might be caused by many things: Certain types of anesthetics, perhaps at childbirth; German measles, experienced by a mother-to-be; certain infections in early childhood, such as sleeping sickness; severe nutritional deficiency on the part of a mother-to-be; and various other factors. Heredity is the cause of only a small minority of cases.

Science has not only worked at finding causes; it is working at ways of remedy. There is a chemical substance which can improve the IQ perhaps as much as 15 to 20 points. This is a special form of glutamic acid, which may be administered only by experts. This treatment is given only to children who are seriously retarded. Aside from the chemical means of combatting this unfortunate circumstance, science is working out methods, main cog of which is training. Most important—the experts have found—is training, both of parents and children.

Perhaps one of the most fruitful efforts aimed at training parents of such children was the moving story noted authoress Pearl S. Buck wrote about her own mentally retarded daughter. Its publication in the May 1950 issue of Ladies' Home Journal must have been a blessing to thousands of parents whose children suffer the same misfortune. It also did much to open the eyes of others.

Even more important is the training of the children themselves. Today schools all over the world are working on the mental retardation problem, aided by the information gleaned in clinics which are studying the problem relentlessly. There are special classes for this work in Greater Lawrence: five in Lawrence, two in Andover, and one each in Methuen and North Andover.

Teachers in these classes realize the importance of the work they are doing. To my mind, they are a valiant group—handful size—waging a determined war for an American birthright; the pursuit of happiness.

I visited one of these special classrooms the other day, after the children had left for the afternoon. Three teachers and I sat at small desks which were arranged in a circle. They were the desks used by the children. As we talked, I tried to visualize the youngsters, sitting there in that circle, seeking a way to fuller understanding, fighting an uphill battle to knowledge, and I realized how much they deserve praise. Theirs is not the simple task of school work; theirs is the task of joining their fellow men.

The Present Policy of the Defense Minerals Administration Will Not Produce the Essential and Critical Minerals and Metals

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the effort of our Government to develop an adequate stockpile of critical and strategic minerals and metals is in hopeless confusion, and it will continue to be as long as the present policy is followed. In Denver, Colo., on February 3, 1951, at the annual meeting of the Colorado Mining Association, I discussed our present situation with regard to minerals and metals, the reasons for it, and what can and should be done about it. Under leave to extend, I include my remarks at this time in the RECORD:

Well, here we are again. It reminds me of an old film—a little flickery and dark in places, but thoroughly real. America had been the arsenal of democracy for 3 years, and the voracious appetite of great war machines for raw materials had already been demonstrated. And yet, when we entered the First World War—the one to make the world safe for democracy—on April 6, 1917, we had no stockpile, and our industries were facing dangerously low supplies of many essential materials.

In the light of our subsequent experience it may be worth while to remind you what followed. Three months after the declaration of war with Germany on July 9, 1917, President Wilson issued a proclamation prohibiting the exports of coal, food grains, meats, steel, and other products. The effect of this order was to control by license the entire foreign commerce of the United States. Less than 3 weeks later, the President created the War Industries Board.

Upon this Board fell the responsibility of mobilizing America's industrial forces and converting them from peace and construction to war and destruction. As described by its Chairman and now our elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch, "The War Industries Board is a method of control devised by the President to equalize the strain placed upon American industrial structure by the war." No one used the terms "essential, critical, and strategic materials," but steel, copper, aluminum, lead, nickel, mercury, antimony, and platinum were as essential to victory during the struggles of World War I as they are today.

In the concluding report of the War Industries Board, credit is given to the miners for having played their part and contributed to the successful prosecution of the war in a way second to no other industry. But prices fixed by the Government had worked hardships on many copper operators, and the signing of the armistice left them with large stocks on hand and with no large orders booked.

It would unnecessarily take your time for me to tell you about the last war. You all know about it. But there are certain parallels which I wish to draw. For 3 years at least prior to World War II we were again the arsenal of democracy. We again entered the war without any stockpile of essential materials. Instead of the War Industries Board we set up the WPB Again, the mining industry played a part in winning the war second to no other industry. And again the mining industry was left flat on its back by its Federal Government.

Now let's bring it up to date. For the past 3 years and mo e we have again been the arsenal of democracy—under the Marshall plan and under the arms-aid program to Greece, Turkey, and Europe. We now have the Defense Production Administration—instead of the old War Industries Board and the WPB We again have no stockpile of the essential materials adequate for our needs—we are perilously low on some items. And again the mining industry is being called upon to make a contribution to the defense effort second to no other industry.

These parallels—this repetition of history—reflects on our national intelligence. Three strikes in this country means "out"—and we are at bat facing what may be the last pitch. For the mining industry this parallel of history has a special significance which I will come to later.

In the light of this desperate situation, what has the Government done to promote the production of these critical and strategic minerals and metals? It has set up a bureaucratic obstacle course remarkable even for Washington, where they are experts in that sort of thing.

If you are a miner out in the field and want a production contract with the Government, here is what you have to do:

1. An application must be filed on National Security Resources Board 146, with additional data as required by the Defense Minerals Administration, or by letter with the form to be filed later. This form is a 12-page document which asks you questions which cannot be answered except by the highest military authorities in this country, and if they are asked, they will indignantly inform you that the answer to the question is classified material. As an illustration, the form requires you to state how granting the application will contribute to national defense, and what evidence exists as to future shortages of the materials. The form ends up with a promissory note which you are required to sign agreeing to reimburse the Government upon demand for any expenses incurred in connection with or arising out of this application or any loan made pursuant thereto.

2. Your application should be sent to the Defense Minerals Administration, who is Mr.

James Boyd, Director of the Bureau of Mines, Department of Interior, Washington 25, D. C.

3. All applications and correspondence clears through the Office of the Executive Secretary of the DMA (Defense Minerals Administration), where a certificate is attached and routing is determined. Thereupon it may take various courses.

4. If the application involves exploration and development on new properties, it is neatly stacked up pending policy determinations at the high level. Policy has not been determined.

5. If the application requires an over-the-market contract, it is neatly stacked up and held in abeyance pending policy determinations not yet made as to whether shortages are sufficiently acute in the particular field (except manganese and perhaps one or two rare items) to warrant an over-the-market contract. These policy determinations have not as yet been made.

6. Applications for financial aid for plant expansion by producers which are not marginal are channeled to the Supply Division of the Defense Minerals Administration.

7. In channeling the application to the appropriate commodity committee, it goes to the industry chairman, who has associated with him a Bureau of Mines member and a USGS member.

8. This committee either rejects the application or approves it for mine examination.

9. If approved for mine examination, the application is routed to the appropriate regional office.

10. It is then routed from the appropriate regional office to the appropriate field office.

11. It is then routed to the office of the field team, consisting of representatives of the USGA and the Bureau of Mines.

12. Then the mine examination occurs by the USGS and the Bureau of Mines field team, including physical examination, the preparation of necessary maps and field reports.

13. When the report is finally complete from the field team, it is routed back precisely over the same obstacle course to the field office, to the regional office, and to the industry chairman. In each of these it is carefully examined and finally, if it passes muster, the next step is taken by the industry chairman.

14. The industry chairman sends the application, plus the field report, plus all the appropriate comments, on the way to the Operating Committee of the Defense Minerals Administration, which perhaps rejects it, or returns it for more information, or holds it for changes in policy. But if none of those occur, then it is sent on the next step.

The industry chairman of the Operating Committee of the Defense Minerals Administration has a committee consisting of a Bureau of Mines member and a USGS member.

15. The application then goes to the Production Division of the Defense Minerals Administration, where it is properly routed into the next step.

16. The next step is the drafting of contracts based upon all of the information and all of the comments now attached to the original application. Thereafter it proceeds on again and goes—

17. to the Defense Production Administration for approval, which first sends it on another detour and by-path which is—

18. to the RFC to determine whether the loan can be made under its regular terms and pursuant to the usual policies of the RFC. If so, the loan is made there; if not, then—

19. a certification is prepared approving the application and the amount of moneys required to be secured from defense funds. Preliminary to this, however, it must be noted that the miner must not be able to obtain funds from private sources or government sources, including the RFC and Federal Reserve, to be eligible for a defense loan. All of these facts must be certified to. If they are all certified correctly, then the application is sent back to the RFC authorizing disbursement from the defense funds to the RFC as the disbursing agent.

20. The RFC then selects a trust bank for deposit and withdrawal on approved vouchers.

21. Finally, the miner is entitled to go to the trustee bank if he has survived all of these difficulties, and on the presentation of approved vouchers receives his money to proceed with plant expansion or increased production.

A mere recitation of these steps will indicate to you that this is one of the most intricate processes ever devised in the bureaucratic brain.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 was passed on September 8, 1950. What has been done since then to facilitate production of minerals and metals? The answer is precisely nothing.

The last check with the Defense Minerals Administration, and that was some days ago, showed that there are 507 applications pending. There have been no loans approved to date. And bear in mind that there has been no policy decision whatever as to the handling of exploration and development loans. And no policy decision as to over-the-market contracts. I am informed that the great majority of applications now pending before the Defense Minerals Administration are for exploration and development, but policy has not even been decided upon at the higher level.

There has been no contracts issued for production at the market price. In regard to these contracts, the DMA policy on December 5, 1950, was that "the applicant for the certification of a purchase contract * * * will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Defense Minerals Administration that ore reserves * * * are available and adequate to secure the requested contract, and the applicant will be required to satisfy the DMA that it can meet a firm delivery schedule." Further, as to loans, "projects to be approved by the DMA must, in its judgment, show definite promise of yielding material * * * in amounts that will significantly improve the minerals supply position for national defense."

How many miners can meet those requirements?

The present program for the production of minerals and metals is a complete and hopeless failure. I do not mean by that statement that many of the men responsible for this program are not doing the best they can, or the best that can be done. Jim Boyd has called in some able men from the field. But they have an impossible task, the present set-up will not and cannot be made to work.

It may be wondered why this should occur in the light of the experience of the last war, when the mining industry made magnificent contributions in the production of the essentials of our war effort. Why, if we did it during the last war, can't we do it now? The answer arises from a strange set of circumstances.

The record is replete with statements by the officials in charge of the program for the production of minerals and metals durin the last war that it was a success. There is an official report to that effect in the files of our committee. The representatives of the Interior Department connected with that program so testified before our committee. In 1946 the Stockpiling Act was passed, which had as its objective making this country safe from a repetition of the shortages of the last war. To implement that law after the war was over, and to save the rapidly collapsing domestic mining industry, we tried to get a continuation of the premium-price program, or some modification of it, on at least a minimum basis. The Allen bill for that purpose was vetoed by the President. The Russell bill in the Eightieth Congress could not be passed because of the opposition of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines.

In the Eighty-first Congress Senator MURRAY and I introduced a bill for a modified premium-price plan. In a speech last fall at Salt Lake City, I outlined in detail how the Interior Department, the State Department, and the big mining interests got together to defeat that legislaion—and the reasons for their strange alliance. I'm not going into that in detail here. But it should be explained that the Interior Department was willing to support a program calling for what they called "selective contracts" for the production of minerals and metals for the stockpile.

That approach was embodied in S. 2105, which passed the Senate and was finally turned down in the House because of lukewarm support from the Government. But after all that argument and effort going over a period of 5 years, the Department of the Interior had gotten itself committed to the philosophy of selective contracts—which simply means that the Government could make contracts with anyone it wanted, under any terms it wanted, for any amounts it wanted. We told them then that such a system was administratively impossible. That it wouldn't work. That it would leave the little fellow and the medium sized miner, who didn't have the organization to come to Washington and negotiate a contract, out in the cold. Further, that it would be completely bogged down in red tape, and confusion.

When the Defense Production Act of 1950 was passed last fall with its broad delegations of power—and it became apparent to everyone that the stockpiling program was a complete failure and that the production of these critical and strategic minerals and metals had to be encouraged—the Government, and especially the Bureau of Mines and the Interior Department, were completely committed to the selective contracting system—rather than the methods successfully used during the last war. You are now getting an object lesson—and they are too—in how that kind of a system works—or rather, fails to work.

The career officials who orginated the minerals program are like the old Bourbons of France, of whom Talleyrand once said "they never learn anything, and they never forget anything." It is only a question of how bull-headed they are, how long it will take for them to swallow their pride, and go back to the simple and tested methods we used for getting mineral production during the last war.

The Government held a meeting the other day with the tungsten producers. They were told that the national requirements are five times what the domestic industry can probably produce. But what kind of a contract will it give these producers? It offered a contract with a termination clause and subject to renegotiation at the end. The producers were assured that the Government would be fair if a 5-year contract was terminated in 2 years, leaving the producer stuck with a large capital investment and the Government could be depended on to do the right thing under the renegotiation clause.

But what does the record say? It says do not rely on these assurances, and do not trust the Government to keep its word. The memories of the last time are all too fresh.

It will be recalled that the Government at the beginning of the last war, and for many months after it commenced, urged the mining industry as its patriotic duty to go out and produce minerals and metals. The miners were assured that they would

not be left holding the sack; that Uncle Sam would be fair; and on these assurances in close cooperation with the various Federal agencies many mining operators went into the field to develop mining properties. They were given certificates from the War Manpower Commission entitling them to keep essential labor. They were given priorities by the War Production Board for essential materials and machinery to carry out their development program. Some of them had firm contracts, but others were told when they asked for a firm contract that there wasn't time to write out contracts, but to go ahead and get the production and get it in to the Government. They did precisely that.

And then the Government, finding its situation a little less desperate, refused to accept delivery of the production of many of these mining operators and they found themselves stuck with huge capital investments on which they had no chance whatever of recouping their principal, much less a fair profit. When they had contracts, those contracts were terminated. They were excluded from any sort of contract settlement. The Government washed its hands of them completely and told them that they were speculators and that they would have to take their losses. I introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress to compensate them only for their losses in capital investment—nothing whatever for the interest on their money or any profit on their operation.

This bill, H. R. 834, passed both Houses of Congress by large majorities, but was vetoed by the President of the United States. No amount of discussion of the matter, either with the agencies responsible for this unjust treatment, or the White House itself, brought any change in the Government's position. Finally, one mining company, the McArthur Mining Co., which happened to have funds enough to hire lawyers, brought suit in a Federal district court in Missouri. The Federal district court sustained in every particular the allegations of the mining company and held the Government not only liable for the return of the capital investment, but also for the profits lost in the mining operation, which altogether amounted to nearly $300,000. But even after a Federal district judge had declared that the Government had unfairly treated the mining industry and should keep the promises which it had made, and on which large mining operations had been undertaken, the Government still was unwilling to reimburse the injured miners for their capital losses, and no claim was made at any time for the lost profits or the interest on the ventured capital.

And today the Government is mauling the McArthur Mining Co. around in the circuit court of appeals and preventing them from recovering the amount of money already awarded in the Federal district court. The Government lawyers, paid by the year, will finally in all probability wear out the mining company—and at least the others are discouraged from undertaking the same procedure.

In the light of all of these facts, is it to be supposed that the mining people of this country, and especially the small miner, will again risk his capital on the glib assurance of some official in Washington that the Government will see that he is taken care of and that he has nothing whatever to fear from Uncle Sam? I am in hopes that such will not again be the case. The mining people of this country are willing to do their patriotic duty. They are willing to step forward in any national emergency, but they are not willing to be played for suckers three times in a row. There is a reciprocal responsibility on the part of Government officials to exercise some patriotism toward the miners themselves, some fairness in the way these Government programs are administered, and to give some kind of responsible assurance to the mining operators that they will not be left busted and forsaken as they have been before.

What, then, should the American miner say to the Government officials in Washington who are handling the mining production? They should tell the Defense Production Administration to abandon their whole ridiculous program and that they propose to have no part of it until it contains, first, a simple procedure which permits a practical participation in it, and, secondly, contains firm assurance that the mining operators who do participate will not be sacrificed to the eloquent speeches about patriotism and the callous indifference of the same public officials when this emergency is over.

Specifically, the miners should recommend as to production contracts that the Government: (1) publish the list of the needed materials; (2) publish the specifications of the needed materials; (3) publish the price it is willing to pay for the needed materials; (4) establish convenient places at which it will receive and pay for the needed materials meeting the specifications; and (5) that the Government agree in a simple form of application that any producer delivering to a depot will have acceptance of his product guaranteed at the market price for a period of not less than 2 years from the date of the first delivery, and that the longer-term contracts either at or above the market price can be arranged by negotiation.

Two years should be the absolute minimum. On some items, such as tungsten and quicksilver, the Government can very properly and safely guarantee to accept all production at market prices for the next 5 years.

As to over-the-market production, the miner should recommend that the premium-price program be put back into operation immediately and the application form made as simple as it was at the end of the premium-price program during the last war. The maximum price at which premiums will be paid and the specifications under which the material will be received should be established with the understanding that contracts for 2 years or longer periods of time may be negotiated with a guaranteed floor and a published ceiling.

As to contracts for exploration and development, the miner should recommend: That the current procedure should be completely junked; that the Government give public notice that it will advance a percentage of the exploration money requested by a mining operator ranging from 90 to 100 percent on small loans to a maximum of 50 percent on large loans—to those companies and individuals who can show the need for such money for exploration and development. Those loans will automatically police themselves without all the field inspections, 12-page applications, bankers' statements, etc., now completely swamping the Minerals Production Agency in Washington. A miner will not put up $5 of his own money to lose $5 of the Government's money. Moreover, he will rarely put up $1 of his own money, plus his time and effort, to lose $9 of the Government's money if the total amount is not very large. This is the program set forth in the bill, H. R. 976, pending in the last Congress and sponsored by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House. It was a good bill a year ago. What is wrong with it now? If it was good then, it is good now, and even more necessary.

These three simple steps will give the assured market which is essential to confidence in the mining industry. In doing so, they will expose the Government to no improper or unwise financial commitment. Government red tape will be reduced to a minimum. On sales at market price there will be no contracts to be negotiated, no mines to be examined. The Government should buy a miner's production whether it is a truckload or a wheelbarrow full. The Government does not pay except on delivery. The same thing is true on overmarket production except that the Government has to determine how much of the marginal production it wishes brought out and offer over-the-market premiums accordingly. The premium contracts will require some supervision but less than 50 people ran the whole premium-price program in the last war. DMA has more than that now, and I am informed that 200 additional field engineers will be needed. They just aren't available. An exploration and development program on a liberal matching basis will be as pointed out—largely self-policing.

With these three steps backed by firm contracts, domestic mining will have the assured market, the price levels, and the available financing to go to work, and a minimum burden will be put on our already overburdened Federal agencies.

Without them, I do not believe that the mining industry can or should proceed. And in closing I refer again to the history of this problem. Three times we have been the arsenal of the democracies of the world. Three times we have been caught with not only inadequate but dangerously low stocks of these essential materials. Three times we have set up Government agencies to build and gird the industrial strength of the Nation for war. Three times the mining industry has been called up to make a contribution to the successful prosecution of the defense of the Nation second to no other industry. Twice the mining industry has met that challenge and it will do so the third time. But it should not be three times the miners are left bankrupt by an ungrateful Government.

Now is the time for the mining industry to speak up—and I hope you will do so.

Congressman Clyde Doyle Cites Census Figures Proving Los Angeles County's Industrial Manufacturing 10-Year-Period Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, during my two previous terms of service in this legislative body as Representative from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California I have frequently called to the attention of you, Mr. Speaker and my other colleagues, as well as other officers in the executive and administrative branches of Government, the fact that increasingly and rapidly the just deserts and needs of the west coast of our Nation, with particular attention to the prominent growth of southern California, with a spotlight on Los Angeles County, must be given due heed and consideration in all matters relating to national expenditures, branches of national offices of administrative government, transportation and freight rates, flood control, and so forth.

The Eighteenth Congressional District is entirely within the borders of

Los Angeles County, and its largest city is Long Beach, the home of the battleship fleet and the Long Beach Navy Shipyard, which accomplished such noteworthy records of production and manpower results during the last war.

The facts and figures which I herewith give you are ultimately related to the very geographical area in which all of the manufacturing and industrial plants and establishments included in the figures are an integral part. It is well known and observed that the hundreds of important manufacturing and industrial plants in the great Eighteenth District in Los Angeles County make it one of the most important of the manufacturing and industrial areas in the whole Nation. The most detailed breakdown would prove this conclusively, for in the Eighteenth District of California is not only located the important city of Long Beach, but also the important communities of Compton, South Gate, Bellflower, Lynwood, Downey, Norwalk, Artesia, Signal Hill, Paramount, Dominguez, and Hollydale, and intervening important communities with slightly less population.

There is, in fact, now being rapidly concluded and sold to purchasers, all in one subdivision, 17,500 separate roofs and houses. Thus such increases logically bring great manufacturing and industrial plants. Thus our great Nation must bind its industrial and manufacturing plants and people together with the bonds of common interest and unity, and all move forward together as one great American people.

The following are the figures, which are self-explanatory:

SECTION I

POPULATION

A. The population of the 14 southern California counties totals 6,085,394. This amount is greater than the total population of any one of 41 States.

B. On a comparative basis 57.5 percent of the total population of California (58 counties) is found in the 14 southern California counties.

C. Southern California has 42 percent of the total population of the three Pacific Coast States (Washington, Oregon, and California).

D. The Los Angeles metropolitan area, according to the 1950 census, is the third largest in population in the Nation; it ranks only behind New York and Chicago.

E. The city of Los Angeles ranks fourth in population among American cities, behind New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, according to the 1950 census of population.

SECTION II

INDUSTRY

The importance of southern California as a center of industrial production is dramatically portrayed by the Los Angeles figures from the latest census of manufactures (1947).

A. These figures show that on a Nationwide comparative basis the Los Angeles metropolitan area ranks third in total number of manufacturing establishments and fifth in dollar measurement of products.

B. During the period 1939–47 the Los Angeles area led the nine leading American industrial areas with a 70-percent increase in number of plants and a 300-percent increase in value added to product by manufacturing.

C. Southern California has a total of 11,130 factories; this is 46 percent of all the factories on the Pacific coast (24,133).

D. Southern California employs 400,000 industrial workers. This is 44 percent of all the factory employees on the Pacific coast (913,789).

E. In the factor value added by manufacturing southern California accounts for 41 percent of the output of the entire Pacific coast.

Manufacturing statistics—Standard metropolitan areas

[Census of manufactures, 1947—U. S. Department of Commerce]

[Money figures in thousands

Area	1947		1939	
	Number of plants	Value added by manufacture	Number of plants	Value added by manufacture
New York	48,287	$9,319 7	34,102	$3,152.7
Chicago	12,278	5,524.9	9,921	1,910 1
Los Angeles	9,756	2,055.5	5,727	520.8
Philadelphia	7,295	2,803.6	6,082	1,040.6
Boston	5,407	1,391 2	4,679	511.7
Detroit	4,755	2,910 0	2,834	1,089.6
San Francisco-Oakland	3,668	1,048.5	3,483	365.9
Cleveland	3,259	1,546 1	2,627	596 9
St. Louis	2,958	1,292 3	2,549	461.8

RELATIVE POSITION

1947

By number of plants	By value added by manufacturing
1. New York	New York.
2. Chicago	Chicago.
3. Los Angeles	Detroit.
4. Philadelphia	Philadelphia
5 Boston	Los Angeles
6 Detroit	Cleveland.
7. San Francisco-Oakland	Boston.
8. Cleveland	St. Louis.
9. St. Louis	San Francisco-Oakland.

1939

1. New York	New York.
2. Chicago	Chicago.
3. Philadelphia	Detroit.
4. Los Angeles	Philadelphia.
5. Boston	Los Angeles.
6. San Francisco-Oakland	Boston
7. Detroit	Cleveland.
8. Cleveland	St. Louis
9. St. Louis	San Francisco-Oakland.

Percentage change 1939–1947

	In number of plants	In value added by manufacturing
New York	42	195
Chicago	24	190
Los Angeles	70	300
Philadelphia	21	170
Boston	16	170
Detroit	68	165
San Francisco-Oakland	5	185
Cleveland	24	210
St. Louis	16	180

F. There is a popular opinion that aircraft production and motion pictures make up the bulk of the industrial activity of the Los Angeles industrial area. While we do lead the Nation in these industries, the Census Bureau reports on the high degree of diversification of this area by showing that the Los Angeles area ranks third or better among major American industrial areas in the following industries:

First place in national ranking: Aircraft and aircraft parts, motion pictures, pumps and compressors, refrigeration equipment, heating and plumbing equipment, canned sea food; total, 6.

Second place in national ranking: Women's and misses' outerwear, automobile assembly, pressed and blown glass, rubber tires and tubes, wood millwork, oil field machinery and tools, jewelry and silverware, concrete and plaster products, storage batteries; total, 9.

Third place in national ranking: Petroleum refining, construction and mining machinery, nonferrous foundries, household furniture, fabricated textiles, pottery and related products, tractors and farm machinery, conveyor equipment, newspaper publishing, miscellaneous wood products, women's and misses' underwear; total, 11.

The Los Angeles industrial area ranks third or better nationally in 26 industries as measured by dollar value of output.

SECTION III

WHOLESALE TRADE

Los Angeles is the wholesale distribution center for the far western part of the United States.

A. The Census Bureau has announced that the figures of the latest census of wholesale trade in the United States (1948) indicate that total wholesale transactions in the Los Angeles area for that year were $5,686,479,000 as compared to $4,979,961,000 for the San Francisco-Oakland area. In other words, the dollar volume of wholesale trade exceeded that of San Francisco-Oakland by 14 percent.

B. The State of Washington, according to the same source, did a total volume of wholesale business in the same year of $2,658,504,000. The Los Angeles area exceeded this figure by 113 percent.

C. The State of Oregon did a total volume of wholesale business that year of $1,908,141,000. The Los Angeles area exceeded this figure by 198 percent.

SECTION IV

RETAIL DISTRIBUTION

The Los Angeles metropolitan area is the third largest retail market in the United States, according to the latest retail census (1948) of the Census Bureau.

A. The figure representing total retail sales for the Los Angeles area is $4,887,000,000; this represents an increase of 241 percent over 1939. Los Angeles dominates as California's leading retail center.

B. The total volume of retail trade of the State of Washington in the census year was $2,221,306,000; the Los Angeles area exceeded this by 120 percent.

C. The total for Oregon in the same year was $1,597,300,000; the Los Angeles area exceeded this figure by 143 percent.

Los Angeles is the first ranking retail market of the western United States.

SECTION V

ECONOMIC FACTORS

A. Two hundred and seventy nationally known industrial concerns have located their Pacific-coast factories in Los Angeles County since 1930; over 75 percent of the companies locating plants on the Pacific coast have selected southern California.

B. Sixty-eight nationally known companies doing business throughout the United States maintain their national headquarters in Los Angeles.

C. If the present rates of population growth continue in both areas, Los Angeles will be larger than Chicago within the next decade.

D. The population total of the city of Los Angeles is greater than the combined population total of Seattle, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.; Portland, Oreg.; and San Francisco, Calif.

E. Los Angeles County has maintained the greatest rate of industrial growth of any county of the Pacific coast during the postwar years as measured by capital investment in new facilities.

1946	$155,793,492
1947	124,811,500
1948	72,181,500
1949	93,415,500
1950	98,397,250

Germ Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD excerpts from a broadcast of the nationally known radio commentator of the American Broadcasting Co., Mr. Paul Harvey, of Chicago, on the evening of January 14, 1951. Paul Harvey is one of America's most brilliant and patriotic radio commentators. I want to personally thank and commend the Burton-Dixie Corp., manufacturers of Slumberon mattresses and kindred products, for sponsoring Paul Harvey on a Nation-wide hook-up, and particularly for providing a Washington outlet for his reports every Sunday evening at 10:15, eastern standard time.

Mr. Harvey's broadcast of January 14, 1951, pertains to one of the most important factors in any future war, namely, biological or germ warfare. I can personally attest to the soundness of his presentation of this subject, due to the fact that, as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Eightieth Congress, I was privileged to sit on the subcommittee that heard testimony in executive session in regard to this particular phase of war. While the United States has been emphasizing the need for and spending billions of dollars on atomic warfare and a defense against it, Soviet Russia has placed its emphasis on biological or germ warfare. In my opinion, our Department of Defense should give more attention to the problems of germ warfare than they have, especially in view of the fact that Communist saboteurs in our country could poison the entire water supply of every major city in America in less than 24 hours. The importance of this question has been brought out in a very vivid manner in Mr. Harvey's broadcast and I trust every Member of Congress will take time to read it carefully and thoughtfully.

I am aware that ever since gun powder some men have claimed that we'd progressed past the point where anyone would dare launch war.

But tonight it's true.

On this January night of 1951, the great nations of the earth have developed such weapons that we've reached the end of the line.

The only possible way any nation today could win a war would be to revert to the world's first weapon—a tainted apple. And in what minutes remain tonight I think there's time to prove it.

At the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals a certain document was admitted to evidence. A high command report to Hitler stating that the only way the Nazis could take over the United States would be to spread disease among humans, plants, and animals. The document recommended research along those lines. A subsequent report in the permanent files of those trials stated that the Nazis had experimented with spreading hoof and mouth disease among meat animals in Czechoslovakia. And with such complete effectiveness that there would be no need for further research along this line. Meaning the animal population of any nation could quickly and easily be destroyed.

By now you know I'm talking about germ warfare. Washington is still talking about A-bombs. Retired Admiral Ellis Zacharias, with a lifetime record of being right, says our A-bomb is now a fourth-rate weapon in the United States arsenal.

More: On September 26, 1947, a scarcely noticed memorandum was placed before the United Nations by the American Association of Scientific Workers. It read in part, "Germ warfare has now been developed into a major weapon for mass destruction. Contrasted to atomic warfare, it is cheap and simple. It could be used to destroy men, animals, or plants selectively, or merely to make them useless only temporarily."

If the Japanese had not surrendered after we'd used the A-bomb, we were prepared to distribute a synthetic hormone—airborne—which would have destroyed the Japanese rice crop. Diabolical, because it would have permitted the rice to grow normally, yet yield nothing.

Psittacosis and tularemia are classified as "weapons useful for debilitating a population rather than destroying it."

On the other hand, on April 16, 1948, Northwestern University announced that its chemists had isolated a substance of such toxicity that one-quarter pound dropped in the water supply of a city of 100,000 would kill every inhabitant. And I'm revealing to you only the small fraction of our germ weapons which are not classified.

Our atomic scientists got one exciting hour in the limelight in World War II when they could demonstrate their wares. Our germ scientists had labored just as hard, and even more effectively, but were denied their demonstration.

Understand, germ warfare is not chemical warfare. Germ warfare is the use of living organisms or their products to attack either human life or the food or drink which supports human life.

Give you an idea: At Hiroshima, in addition to the A-bomb, we could have poisoned the water supply, destroyed the rice crop, infected the surviving animals with rinderpest, and started an epidemic of both bubonic and pneumonic plagues.

Now you see why I say Russia is not going to start anything which we could finish that way.

But wait a minute.

I did not say we have outlived war. There is still one way Russia could do it. By weakening us from within without warning. World War II proved there's no profit in conquering rubble. Russia would like to capture our industry intact. And there is one way she can. To fly over Pittsburgh and scatter disease-bearing germs would be too obvious. That would start war. And we're better at that scientific kind of warfare than she is.

But Russia, with a trained army already behind our lines inside this country, has the perfect machine for launching germ warfare by slow degrees in a manner that would never be detected until too late. They are ready to commit sabotage.

In an unprecedented action, there was a meeting of the highest officers of seven railroads in Chicago this past week at which they were told by Civil Defense officials that there are now 5,000 trained saboteurs in Illinois ready to strike at our railroads in the event of war. But what nobody seems either to know or to notice or to dare to talk about—is the fact that enemy experiments in germ sabotage may already be under way.

You will recall the recent outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease in Mexico. In the November issue of Nation's Business, official publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, William Bradford Huie cites that incident as one of several unsolved mysteries. No one has traced the beginning of this strange and sudden 1946 epidemic. But it took an American army of 1,180 scientists 3 years to whip it. And not counting the money, it cost the lives of 523,000 cattle and 471,000 hogs. Just recently, near Mexico City, the deadly O virus was discovered for the first time on the North American Continent. A disease so easy to spread you can carry it on the sole of your shoe. Somebody's experiments? I don't know. But when 1,100 persons in Mercersburg, Pa., a city of only 2,300, when roughly every other person in town, went to bed violently ill just last month from some airborne something nobody has yet explained. I think it's time now to give ourselves the benefit of any doubt. Russia wouldn't have to destroy England to subdue her if one out of every three Englishmen, including soldiers and doctors and nurses, went to bed with the flu, as has happened within the past 2 weeks in Liverpool. One hundred and twenty-six great towns in England and Wales have been stricken. In the past 1 week 458 persons in those towns died from it. Tonight 250,000 are ill with it. Slow sabotage? Testing for something bigger? Checking on the efficiency of subversive agents? Probably not. Flu epidemics are not uncommon. But I am trying to show not what is happening, but what could happen.

Dr. Andrew Ivy, world renowned medical scientist, vice president of the University of Illinois, tells me it is entirely possible purposely and maliciously to spread influenza virus. Presumably by air or food or both.

In Mein Kampf, Hitler said, "A shrewd victor will always take what he wants by degrees."

At any event, I have here shown the only one way in which any nation now could conquer the United States. It would have to be by sneaking up on us. And they can. Just as long as we allow their agents to run loose behind our lines, yet shackle our own FBI by prohibiting them from making any arrests until after the overt act. If a toxin planted in a city's water supply takes 9 hours to work, then the FBI is going to be just a little too late. Our best devices for detecting airborne organisms require a culturing-out process which takes weeks.

If I were suddenly to announce that your United States had been invaded by an enemy army of half a million men, you'd close ranks then and come out fighting. All right. The hour is tonight. Fifty thousand Reds, and half a million who'll do their bidding, by the FBI's own estimates, already are inside our country, potentially armed. An advance echelon of 22,000 already has established itself in the key jobs in vital industry.

Technologically we have reached the point where no nation would dare wage offensive war against us, unless or until they first paralyze our trigger fingers. If we can prevent sabotage from within—do you see what it means? Americans, we have reached the long-sought saturation, the point of no more war. Now to erase that "if."

I respectfully recommend that you write your lawmaker in Washington now. Just a post card will do. Or send him a copy of this broadcast, if you like. Tell him we want no more stalling and no more double-talk about the so-called rights of this subversive Communist minority in our midst. That it's time for somebody to start looking out for the "rights" of the decent, God-fearing, loyal majority of the American people for a change. That if courts rule self-defense unconstitutional, then let's seriously investigate those courts. Let's dare to find out who in Washington is protecting the Communists in Michigan, and Indiana, and New York, and California, and Pennsylvania. And if these termites continue to crawl through legal loopholes in our Constitution, then let's turn that same weapon against them. I've found a loophole too, Earl,

Browder. The weakest and the strongest word in our Constitution is the word "welfare." Presidents have virtually led us to socialism in the interest of the public welfare. All right, then. Now, in protecting the public welfare, let's imprison and expel this illegal, disloyal, treasonous army from our shores. Write to your Congressman. If you don't get action there, write to your President. If you don't get it there, pray: "For each big job, demanding a big man, Almighty God, send us a leader. A man with his feet planted firmly in American tradition. A tall man, with his head above the fog of selfish interests. Not a common man. Send us, this time, an 'uncommon man,' a statesman. We don't deserve him, but send him anyway. And hurry please. The hour is late. The candle of freedom burns low."

Army Nurse Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, February 4, 1951:

A JOB WELL DONE FOR 50 YEARS

Through three wars and the intervening years of peace members of the Army Nurse Corps have distinguished themselves in their selfless care of servicemen. This month the nurses mark "50 years on a mission of mercy," as they celebrate their golden anniversary.

Indispensable members of the medical team, some 300 Army nurses are in Korea today supporting our troops in the combat zone. The Surgeon General of the Army reports that their work has been magnificent, that without their fearless assistance the high rate of recovery of combat casualties would be impossible. The chief surgeon of the Far East command, where many of our combat wounded are being cared for, also pays tribute to our gallant nurses: "The members of the Army Nurse Corps have all distinguished themselves by their devotion to duty, their utter disregard of working hours, and their willingness to do anything that needs to be done at any time. They have displayed courage, stamina, and determination. They have completed every task with which they have been confronted in a superior manner."

This record of service without regard for personal comfort or safety distinguished the Army Nurse Corps in two other wars. In World War I, some 10,400 Army nurses endured the uncertainties of combat nursing in England, France, Italy, Belgium, and in Siberia. Many were decorated—3 with the Distinguished Service Cross, 24 with the Distinguished Service Medal, 28 with the Croix de Guerre, 69 with the British Royal Cross, and 2 with the British Military Medal. In World War II, the Army Nurse Corps achieved its peak strength of 57,000—and sent almost half its number overseas. From Iceland to the jungles of the Southwest Pacific, and on the beachheads from North Africa to Normandy, they served close behind troops. They suffered bombings and strafings—died of wounds on the Anzio beachhead, were Japanese prisoners after the fall of Corregidor. One nurse out of every 40 who served was decorated; they received the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Soldier's Medal, the Air Medal, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart.

Army nursing began as far back as Revolutionary times when General Washington asked Congress for a matron to supervise the nurses, bedding, etc., and for nurses to attend the sick and obey the matron's orders. Women volunteered to nurse the sick and wounded during the Civil War, but it was not until the outbreak of the Spanish-American War in 1898 that Congress again authorized the employment of nurses under contract to the Army. The success of their pioneer venture convinced all skeptics of the value of women nurses to military medicine. In February 1901 Congress authorized the establishment of a Nurse Corps as a definite component of the Army. Pay in those days was $40 a month and nurses held no military rank. Today it is $213.75 for a second lieutenant and Army nurses, like all other officers, receive all allowances and benefits of commissioned status.

Army nurses held only relative rank until World War II, at which time they were granted temporary commissions. The struggle to achieve rank and the accompanying benefits of officer status went hand in hand with the struggle of the nursing profession itself to improve the pay of nurses and the living and working conditions. Military recognition of the professional worth of nurses gave impetus to the efforts of nursing leaders world-wide in their program to raise standards.

The final, and perhaps most significant, step in the evolution of the Nurse Corps came with passage of the Army-Navy Nurses Act in April 1947. This law created an Army Nurse Corps section in the Officers Reserve Corps and authorized a Regular Army component for nurses through which, for the first time in history, women became eligible for permanent commissions in the Regular Army. The present chief of the corps is Col. Mary G. Phillips.

Now, with the celebration of their golden anniversary, the Army nurse assumes a major and vital role in the care of our fighting men. The men who defend American security must be assured that doctors and nurses stand ready with professional skill, when needed. At this time the Nurse Corps estimates as its minimum need for the first 6 months of 1951, 3,000 graduate professional nurses. They are asking for 500 qualified nurses to volunteer each month to meet the needs of the military expansion.

The oldest of all the women's military services, and because of its long tradition of service to military sick and wounded, one of the most loved, the Army salutes its Nurse Corps on its "50 years of a mission of mercy."

Free-and-Easy Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, again there is offered an innocent-looking bill to extend for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1951, the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements which, in fact, represent no reciprocity but its use by the President in reducing tariffs have been helpful to foreign countries at the expense of American workers. This new extension of authority of the President does nothing to prevent damage to the American worker. Out in my district in Ohio, many industries are becoming affected by existing agreements and those proposed to be entered into. The hand glass industry at Tiffin, Ohio, has been affected by these imports, especially those from Czechoslovakia. These agreements were consummated even after it was overrun by Russian communism. Such plants are not only throughout Ohio and in West Virginia but in other States affecting thousands of workers. There is the cutlery industry making shears, scissors, and surgical instruments, that has been greatly affected by such imports, and one of the principal places of the industry is at Fremont, Ohio. Then there is the paperboard and strawboard industry affected by such imports and these are situated in many places throughout the country and at Sandusky, Ohio, and there is the parts industry, with reference to bicycles and motorcycles. During the war when companies in the United States were permitted practically no manufacture of bicycles, yet they were able to make them in England and sent into the United States. And now, due to the reduction of import duties, it is felt by suppliers in northwestern Ohio.

There is the refractory products industry used in the manufacture of steel centered in the limestone region of Sandusky and Seneca Counties where the imports again affect not only hundreds in the immediate area but places throughout the United States who are a part of the same industry. Probably other industries throughout northwestern Ohio are directly affected and many others indirectly affected throughout the State. But these are the particular ones in the Thirteenth Ohio District which are affected by the free-and-easy method of bringing in cheaply made foreign goods which not only cuts at the industry but strikes at the American workmen by eventually destroying his job like those in the New England watch industry. It would be most interesting to have a complete survey of the State of Ohio, where the free-and-easy importation of cheaply made foreign products will cut down and take away the employment of thousands directly as well as tens of thousands indirectly throughout the State of Ohio brought about by the free-and-easy favored foreign trade agreements entered into and proposed by the United States which can not only damage and destroy the industry, but the very workmen whose families depend on the continuance of these American industries.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to stop this damage to American workers and industries in northwestern Ohio. I have introduced legislation that the President should immediately take such action that would be necessary to modify, rescind and cancel and stop such damaging trade agreements now made and in the process of being made on the importation of foreign hand-made glassware and products, foreign-made paperboard, foreign-made shears, scissors, surgical and manicure implements, foreign motorcycles, bicycles and parts, and foreign magnesia refractory products all so that American workers will be protected in their jobs, protected in their standard of living, and assured the continuance of these American industries.

It's Happening on Your Own Front Lawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert T. Fallon:

IT'S HAPPENING ON YOUR OWN FRONT LAWN

(The writer of this article, reprinted from the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, by special arrangement, is presently in Walter Reed Hospital, recovering from five bullet wounds suffered in action in Korea. His mother, Mrs. John Fallon, lives at 1832 Jefferson Place NW. He attended Wilson High School and Sullivan Preparatory School here before moving on to West Point.)

(By Robert T. Fallon, first lieutenant, Seventeenth Infantry combat team)

I want to tell you something about a war.

I want you to imagine for a moment that it is a very cold, wet, wintry evening at about 10 o'clock. You have been sitting very comfortably by your fireside reading the evening paper. It's been a pleasant day, dismal outside, but warm and restful by the fire. You decide to step out on the porch for a breath of air before turning in. I'm sure you've done it often. But on this particular evening, a strange sight greets you.

There's a great hole right in the middle of your front lawn, and the dirt has been thrown up all around it, outlined sharply against the white, even snow. Squatting in the hole is a hunched figure.

Let me tell you something about him.

He's been in this area now for about three weeks, living in a dozen holes just like this one on your front lawn. The most apparent thing about him is that he is cold, and that's because out on your lawn it's about 20 degrees colder than where you're standing. Every now and then he'll grab his shovel and dig a little deeper in the hole just to keep warm. That's the only way he has, because he'll be seen if he builds a fire, and he may bring mortar fire into your living room.

He's been cold for a long time—and wet. He can't feel his feet, and he's getting worried because he's afraid they might be frostbitten. It's going to be a long night, and it's going to get colder.

He's very dirty. The grease from a hundred "C" rations is frozen to his parka and gloves, coating the two weeks' beard which covers his face. Soot from the small fires he dares to make during the day is all over his pants and boots.

But he's dirty all the way through. He hasn't changed his underclothes in over a month and he doesn't intend to for some time to come. It's too cold to go down that far. You can smell him, and it's bad.

He's pretty hungry, too. They didn't get his rations up to him until after dark, and he couldn't build a fire to thaw them out. He'll have to wait until morning. A cup of hot coffee would sure taste good. He looks old with that beard and sort of hunched over posture. But he's only about 19, though not like any 19-year-old you've ever seen.

You may wonder what he's thinking about as he sits there during those long solitary hours. Well, it's not much. Just how cold it is, and again how nice that coffee would be. Maybe every now and then he thinks of home, but that's a long ways off, and the cold, his feet, and his hunger are much more immediate. You'd be surprised how those three things can fill your mind.

You notice that he's cut a hole through your hedge, and his rifle is sitting on the pile of dirt pointing in readiness through the opening. That's another thing he's thinking: When are they coming again? He gets a little scared out there all alone. He'd like to go over and talk to his buddy in a similar hole about two houses up, but it's not a good idea to go crawling around at night. He wishes they weren't so far apart, but it seems they always have a big sector to cover with never enough men to cover it. It doesn't help being so far apart.

What would you like to do with this man? Ask him in to your fireside, get him a cup of coffee? Would you like to loan him your razor and let him take a hot shower? Give him a bed to sleep in instead of the dirt and cold of his foxhole? Sure you would. You wouldn't think twice about it. But I'm afraid you can't. There's someone on that hill over there who wants to get into your front door, and the man was told by his platoon leader that he's supposed to take care of your house and the one next door. So he can't come in, and you find that you can't reach him. He's very far away.

But you come out in the morning and he's still there, huddled over his little fire, thawing out his hands and his rations, trying to get the feeling back into his feet. By this time the hole is pretty deep from all the digging and he's cut down a little more of your hedge. He's there again when you come home from work. While you are greeted by a comfortable fire in a living room, the soldier is getting ready for another cold night.

I have told you about this soldier, and placed him on your front lawn, because I want you to realize that every desolate hill that soldier defends in that far-off land is in reality your front door. There are people who want to get in to do you harm, and it's his job to keep them away. He's going to do his job and he's not going to ask you to do it for him. If he has to sit on your front lawn in the cold, that's just the way things go. He's not going to begrudge you the comforts of your fireside or your dinner table, but he'll be mighty bitter if he finds out that you're not doing your part of the job.

What is "your job?" Well, it's not really important what I happen to think "your job" may be. But I think it is important that you find out soon what it is and start doing it, for whatever it is, it's a vital part of a country's struggle for existence. Perhaps it would be more clear to you what your job is if you returned home tonight to find that hunched, shivering figure sitting in a hole on your lawn.

Penny-Wise—Pound-Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Monday, February 5, 1951:

WHY CLOSE VA OFFICE?

Since, by the looks of things, there will be many more veterans before there are less, it seems hardly practical at this time to close the Veterans' Administration regional office in this city. As a matter of fact, it's rather difficult to understand why curtailment of the important service the VA renders to veterans and their families should be contemplated at a time when the world situation points up the debt of gratitude we owe veterans. It stands to reason that cessation of this service locally will impose some considerable hardship on Greater Lawrence citizens who have occasion to consult the VA about problems relating to their rights and privileges as veterans.

If it is the intention of the Government to serve the interests of economy in the matter, it's our feeling that the interests of economy would be better served by leaving the situation undisturbed. Maintenance of the local VA office certainly involves no such great sum of money that its expenditure reflects painfully upon the tax rate. Nor does it add a fraction of an inch to our mountainous national debt. Zeal for economy is laudable, but it misses the mark when it attacks so basic a function as the Veterans' Administration. Men who have served their country to the best of their ability—and may soon be called upon to do it again—have a right to expect that their country will serve them to the best of its ability.

Academy of Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and presented arguments in behalf of my bill, H. R. 235, which proposes to authorize the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service to provide specialized training and specialized education for young men and women who desire to make lifetime careers of serving in the State Department of the United States.

It is my conviction that such an academy will result in a substantial improvement in the personnel of the State Department. By obtaining improved personnel in the State Department, our chances of having better diplomacy will be improved and the chance of our becoming involved in future wars thereby decreased.

The cost of maintaining and operating such an academy I estimate at about $3,000,000 a year. Since the State Department now spends billions of dollars annually the cost of maintaining such a school would be only a fraction of 1 percent on the amount of money now being expended by the State Department each year. Better qualified men of sounder judgment in the State Department easily might result in a saving many times greater than the cost of operating and maintaining an Academy of Foreign Service.

I hope that further hearings will be granted by the committee and that all those in favor or opposed to the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service, including witnesses from the State Department, will be heard. It is my belief that the obtaining of improved State Department personnel is of paramount importance. I am confident that out of

adequate hearings on this subject great progress can and will be made toward improving State Department personnel.

The better the personnel in our State Department and other foreign service agencies the more likely we are to have amicable relations with other countries and the less likely we will be to become involved in wars.

My statement to the Foreign Affairs Committee follows:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for providing me this opportunity to explain to you and discuss with you my bill H. R. 235.

The bill H. R. 235 proposes to authorize the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service for the specialized training and specialized education of young men and young women who desire lifetime careers in the foreign service of this country, especially those of the State Department.

At the present time we have the Army's West Point, Navy's Annapolis, and a Coast Guard Academy to provide specially trained and educated young men as officer personnel for the armed services. It is the mission of these young officers to win our wars when and if we become involved in them.

It is the responsibility of the State Department and other foreign services, through the use of wise diplomatic and carefully planned foreign policies, to keep our Nation out of wars, honorably. The intricate and varied problems that now daily arise in our Nation's foreign service agencies demand that we have in the foreign services the best specialists it is possible to obtain. The personnel of the State Department, in my opinion, can be improved greatly by the specialized abilities that can be developed in an academy devoted exclusively to the training and education of future diplomats.

Several months ago, I was one of about 40 Congressmen present at a meeting where a former member of the Communist Party of the United States was the speaker. This man said he had been a sincere member of the Communist Party. He apparently had been an effective member for he was taken to Moscow and for several years was specially trained in a Russian Government college to become an officer in the coming Red revolution which the Soviets are planning in their efforts to sovietize the world.

This reformed Communist told us that there are three colleges in Moscow maintained by the Russian Government for the training of young men and women, who, it is expected, will go forth and endeavor to sell communism to the people of all nations.

It occurred to me that if Russia can afford to support three national colleges devoted to training young people to spearhead and serve the cause of communism in the world, that the United States ought to have an Academy of Foreign Service to sell Americanism to the world. Selling the American way of life, through wise diplomatic policies and effective propaganda, in my opinion, is one of the primary missions and functions of the State Department. Such salesmanship, involving as it does a thorough understanding of peoples of all nationalities, is a most complex business and demands, in my opinion, the high order of specialized training that only a specialized college can provide.

After I had listened for several hours to this reformed Communist tell of the specialized colleges in Russia, it occurred to me that if Russia could afford to maintain three of these specialized colleges in Moscow, that America, in an effort to preserve its own peace and security, ought to have one of these colleges.

I wrote to the Reference Service of the Library of Congress to ascertain if any bills proposing to establish a college of foreign service had been introduced in previous Congresses. Director Ernest Griffith of the Library Reference Service replied that 12 such bills had been introduced in the previous four Congresses—one in the Seventy-eighth Congress, five in the Seventy-ninth Congress, four in the Eightieth Congress, and two in the Eighty-first Congress. He sent me a copy of each of these 12 bills. After studying these 12 bills, I drafted the bill, H. R. 235, which I introduced on the opening day, January 3, of the present Congress.

WHAT H. R. 235 DOES

The bill H. R. 235 proposes to authorize the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service for the specialized training and specialized education of young men and women who desire to make a lifetime career out of work in the State Department and foreign services of the Nation.

The number of students who would be enrolled in the Academy of Foreign Service, as proposed in this bill, shall be "not less than one student for each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Commissioner" (that is, not less than 534 students to begin with).

Appointment of students to the Academy would be, as far as practicable, by the same methods as apply to appointments to the present Naval and Military Academies.

Candidates for admission to the Foreign Service Academy would have to be between the ages of 20 and 25 and to have had at least 2 years of college training. They would have to undergo such tests as to mental aptitude and unquestioned loyalty as the Board of Trustees of the Academy might prescribe.

Before admission to the Academy each student would be required to submit a statement in writing to the President of the Academy, stating that he or she will serve in the foreign services of the Government of the United States where assigned for a definite period of years.

The students in the Foreign Service Academy, it is proposed by H. R. 235, shall receive the same pay and allowances as cadets at West Point or midshipmen at Annapolis.

GOVERNMENT OF THE ACADEMY

The management of the Academy of Foreign Service, as proposed in H. R. 235, would be vested in a Board of five trustees to consist of the Secretary of State, two Members of the Senate, and two Members of the House, appointed respectively by the Vice President and the Speaker. The House and Senate Members would serve terms of two years each and not more than one of the Senate Members or the House Members could be of the same political party. This would assure, as far as possible, nonpartisan administration of the Academy.

The faculty of the Academy would consist of a President, at a salary not to exceed $20,000, to be selected by the trustees and such other professors, associate professors, and instructors as the trustees might deem necessary.

The bill provides that Foreign Service Academy students may be assigned to the Army's West Point and Navy's Annapolis for instruction or military observation, a provision which I regard as salutary, since military science often is related to the problems of the State Department and an able diplomat should have some understanding of military problems.

In addition to being assigned to the State Department, graduates of the Academy of Foreign Service may be assigned, under the provisions of H. R. 235, to the Department of Commerce for service in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Department of Agriculture in the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations; and to the Department of the Treasury for service in connection with international finance and currency, tariffs, debt adjustment, and related activities.

STATE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

The State Department on January 1 of this year had a total of 25,380 employees on its payrolls, of which 7,621 were departmental, 16,056 in Foreign Service, and 1,703 in international activities.

There are in addition to those in the State Department those who are engaged in the foreign services of the Commerce, Agriculture, and Treasury Departments. While I have no figures on the number of these, I would guess that their total probably is about 5,000. Thus, we have presumably about 30,000 Government employees in the State Department and in the other foreign-service agencies.

Assuming there is a 5 percent turn-over in these agencies, which I know you will agree is very low, this would create a demand for 1,500 replacements a year, of which possibly as many as 300 or 400 a year could be filled by graduates of the Academy of Foreign Service. I think the need for about 300 or more persons of the skills and training of Foreign Service Academy graduates exists. This figure is only a guess, but, based on the low rate of turn-over I have suggested, the 300 figure, if in error, is probably too low rather than too high.

WHAT WILL IT COST

Due to the present national debt of $257,000,000,000 and the unbalanced state of the budget, it is a certainty that someone will ask how much will it cost to operate such an Academy.

I obtained from the Library of Congress Reference Service a report on the maintenance and operating costs of the Naval and Military Academies over each of the past 11 years. I include the report as to cost of the two existing Academies herewith:

Operating costs of the U. S. Naval Academy and U. S. Military Academy, 1940 to 1951, inclusive

	U. S. Naval Academy	U. S. Military Academy
1940	$2,155,421.37	$3,243,201.45
1941	2,331,893.27	3,328,122.82
1942	2,830,978.79	3,533,915.49
1943	3,046,665.65	6,190,459.97
1944	3,879,991.61	6,729,467.39
1945	4,039,563.63	6,367,164.38
1946	3,391,272.83	7,289,268.43
1947	5,362,574.17	7,084,472.68
1948	4,968,690.77	7,325,139.25
1949	5,604,182.10	7,780,286.90
1950	[1] 5,090,000.00	[1] 8,150,000.00
1951	[1] 5,666,000.00	[1] 5,706,414.00

[1] Estimate.

Budget of the U. S. Government, 1951. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950, pp. A65, 726, 740 (1950-51).

U. S. Treasury Department. Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the U. S. Government, 1940-49.

This report shows, as you will note, that during the current year the estimated cost of operating the United States Naval Academy is $5,666,000 and of the United States Military Academy is $5,706,000.

Inasmuch as the proposed Academy of Foreign Service will have a much smaller enrollment, at least to begin with and probably always, the cost of operating and maintaining an Academy of Foreign Service will be very substantially less than that of either of the two Armed Forces academies.

Present enrollment at West Point is 2,448 and at Annapolis 3,663, each school having an

enrollment of about five to six times the contemplated enrollment in the proposed Academy of Foreign Service.

Among organizations interested in establishing an Academy of Foreign Service is the American Legion. I have had a letter from Miles D. Kennedy, director of the American Legion, in which he says in part:

"For your information I would advise that the American Legion is very much interested in creating a United States Academy of Foreign Service.

"Enclosed please find a copy of H. R. 8171, introduced by Representative SMITH of Wisconsin, April 24, 1950, at our request."

The Smith bill was one of the bills studied by me prior to the drafting and introduction of my bill, H. R. 235. The Smith bill does not go into the same detail as H. R. 235, but has the same purpose.

Two main arguments have been advanced heretofore by the State Department in opposition to the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service. One of these is the alleged great cost of such an academy and the other is based on the claim that there are established colleges already providing the same training as the proposed Academy of Foreign Service would offer.

Neither of these State Department arguments are convincing. The claim that the Academy of Foreign Service will cost too much is not a sound argument since its total cost, based on the low cost of operating West Point and Annapolis, would indicate that the total cost of maintaining and operating this Foreign Service Academy probably would be less than $3,000,000 a year. If the proposed Foreign Service Academy would contribute anything toward improving the competency of State Department personnel, this investment of $3,000,000 a year, aimed at preserving the peace of the Nation, would be very much worth while.

The State Department today is one of the Government's greatest spending agencies, its expenditures running into many millions of dollars annually. The more competent State Department personnel which an Academy of Foreign Service would tend to produce should result, in my opinion, in savings many times the cost of the proposed Foreign Service Academy.

It is true, as the State Department has contended in past years, that there are other colleges in the Nation that are teaching the same subjects that presumably will be taught in any Foreign Service Academy that is established.

These colleges, however, are not devoted exclusively and entirely to curriculums devoted to making outstanding experts in foreign service. The training of men and women for the foreign service is not their main and exclusive purpose. It is merely a sideline with them.

If this argument that we already have colleges that teach subjects of value to the education of future diplomats is sound, the same argument might with equal force be used against maintaining the Army's West Point and Navy's Annapolis, since there are many schools which provide a certain amount of military training to their students.

It seems to me that the creation of an Academy of Foreign Service, devoted solely and exclusively to the training and education of future diplomats, will provide an atmosphere where the student, surrounded by like students studying similar subjects, will live foreign-service problems every waking hour of his college days. The result, I feel, will be the development of an esprit de corps that will be most conducive to building a more effective State Department and foreign-service personnel.

The better State Department personnel we have the better will be our chances of selling the American way of life to the world and preserving the peace of the Nation.

Service Needed—Expenditure Justifiable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Quincy, Mass., Thursday, February 1, 1951:

FALSE ECONOMY

The Veterans' Administration in Washington has ordered the closing of 317 offices having only one contact representative and a clerk.

The reason: Lack of funds.

Perhaps nationally, a fairly sizeable sum would be saved at the expense of veterans of all ages—the younger men of the Korean War and World War II, the middle-aged of World War I, and the elderly of the Spanish-American War.

It would also be at the expense of the widows of heroes of all wars.

Closing of the Quincy office, one of the 317, on April 1, will bring hardships, particularly to the aged Spanish War veterans and to the widows whose small children prevent them from easily going into the Boston office for settlement of claims or for help in whatever problems that confront them.

Locally, how much will the VA save a year by closing the office to thousands of South Shore veterans—the office that handles, with no red tape, 1,000 inquiries a month plus 500 telephone calls, 100 pieces of correspondence, and 300 forms and applications?

It will save $720 a year rent. It will save another nominal sum paid for telephone service to Boston and south shore towns. This $60 a month rent includes heat and light, too, for the two rooms in the Chamber of Commerce Building.

It will not save anything on salaries because the contact representative and the clerk are to be assigned elsewhere.

It will not save enough to offset the invaluable services offered to the men who have done so much for their country.

One particular service given by Herbert F. Carroll, contact representative at the Quincy office for nearly 5 years, is personal calls at the homes of the seriously disabled, the infirm, and the widows tied down by youngsters.

All that these people now have to do is call the Quincy VA office. Mr. Carroll can probably make a heme call that very day or the following day at the latest.

When the office closes April 1, these same people will either have to go in personally to the Boston office, wait several hours before it is their turn to see one of the 35 contact representatives or telephone in and wait possibly 3 or 4 months before a home call can be made.

That certainly is a lot of time wasted. Once in a while it could happen that a veteran, desperately ill and in need of his monthly disability check, found it was all fouled up somewhere along the line. Under the new set-up after April 1, a long wait could conceivably mean that this veteran would die before his affairs could be straightened out.

If the Federal Government wants to show it intends to keep expenses down, it would be well to look with an economical eye at some other branches of service that are burdening the taxpayers.

It should not cast its economical eye at a service that offers so much to the men who did so much.

The Veterans' Administration itself cannot do anything to reopen the offices ordered closed for lack of funds.

It will be up to the veterans themselves, their families and their organizations.

Pressure from them in the form of protest letters to their Congressmen might do a lot of good.

We Must Preserve World's Greatest Pine Forest—Time Is Running Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of all the Members of the House to an important letter which I should like to include in our RECORD. A large group of outstanding Californians have joined together in the California War Memorial Park Association, under the leadership of Mr. John B. Elliott, of Los Angeles, to prevent imminent destruction of the world's finest stand of pine trees and to preserve the beautiful primeval forest, located in Tuolumne County, Calif., as a memorial to the valiant men who gave their lives in World War II. These magnificent pine trees have a majesty and strength which is a fitting symbol of the valor displayed by American boys who laid down their lives to preserve this Nation, for in the forest, too, there is a constant battle for survival, and these giant pines, hundreds of years old, have withstood the ravages of time and the perils of the forest. To see them towering silently in the sunlight is an inspiring sight that stirs the depths of the soul, and brings one to ponder the mysteries of life and the wonders of Nature. It is simply inconceivable that we should allow these trees to be destroyed, and yet they are in imminent danger. I hope every Member can find time to read the letter to which I referred a moment ago, which was written by Mr. Willard G. Van Name, known and respected throughout the world as an authority on living invertebrates.

The letter follows:

CALIFORNIA'S PINES—CREATION OF STATE PARK ASKED TO PRESERVE GIANT TREES

(The writer of the following letter is associate curator emeritus of living invertebrates at the American Museum of Natural History.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is probably pretty well known that most of the surviving groves of the famous giant sequoias, or big trees, of California are now safely preserved in National or State parks and no longer in danger of destruction. There is, however, one very large and fine grove that is still in private ownership. This is the South Calaveras Grove, situated in Tuolumne County, a little more than 60 miles from Sacramento, only a short distance from the North Calaveras grove, which has been a State park for many years.

There has long been a plan to have the State purchase the south grove also and enlarge the park to include both groves in its limits. This has never been carried out,

perhaps partly on account of the expense but more probably because the deep rocky gorge of the Stanislaus River separates the two groves, so that only the north grove is generally visited by tourists. The much finer south grove has up to the present been accessible only by poor roads and circuitous routes.

Though the two Calaveras groves were the first discovered of all the California big trees, and were famous in the early gold-mining days of a century ago, the most remarkable feature of the Calaveras area is still unknown to most people. It is not, as is pretended, the south sequoia grove but a small tract of forest lying near it on the north along Beaver Creek. Most visitors to the sequoias do not get much of a view of it.

UNIQUE STAND

This small area, hardly more than half a square mile in extent, bears the most remarkable stand of pine trees in the world—sugar pines—California's most beautiful forest trees, some of them 200 to 230 feet tall, with trunks over 8 feet in diameter; also some immense Ponderosa pines slightly less in height, but of immense size—trees little inferior to the average sequoia in size and magnificence, such as can be seen nowhere else in the world at the present time.

They are the last of their kind; probably eight centuries, if not a thousand years, would be required to reproduce them if destroyed, and they are much more important to save than the neighboring sequoias, many groves of which are under safe protection already.

Now, are the people of California (and for that matter of the whole country also, for this is a national, not a local matter) going to let the wool be pulled over their eyes and spend their money buying the sequoias which nobody wants to cut, as they make inferior lumber, and do nothing to secure this remarkable stand of pines for the park? That is what the lumber interests and their political allies hope. These wonderful pine stands must be bought now, along with the sequoias. Now or never. The lumber interests are trying to get the State to buy only the sequoias now, and "leave acquiring the pine stands until later on"; that is, to wait until the pines have been cut and there are none left to save.

This deceitful course would put an end to the last hope of having in the Calaveras region the most magnificent State park in the country. It is said that the difficulty is not financial, that the cost can be provided without the aid of any Federal appropriation, a most important matter in such times as these.

OPPOSITION TO PROJECT

Besides the desire of the owners to cut rather than to sell these trees the opposition comes chiefly from very short-sighted local commercial interests and the political influence they control, who prefer the immediate though short-lived increase of business. There is little Federal land involved, and no excuse for Forest Service opposition.

But not all hope of saving this remarkable forest area is gone, though immediate action will be needed. The project is in the hands of a well-organized association with a large membership of prominent and influential Californians, the California War Memorial Park Association of Los Angeles, whose name sufficiently explains its purpose to make this park a memorial to the Californians who lost their lives in the last war. The project has the expressed support of Governor Warren and of a majority of California's congressional delegation, and it is hoped that it may be put through in spite of opposition.

WILLARD G. VAN NAME.

NEW YORK, *January 22, 1951.*

Let the President Set the Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from three of my constituents, which very tersely expresses the thoughts and ideas that are contained in letters which I receive in every mail from the people of my congressional district, on the subjects referred to in their letter.

The letter in full follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *February 1, 1951.*

Representative GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In our opinion it is high time to call a halt to the wild schemes of the administration, therefore for the record we protest the following:

Taxes: The tax free $50,000 a year the President had himself voted. He is demanding exorbitant taxes for only part of the people. Everyone should share the burden. Cooperatives included. Taxes too high for middle incomes.

Food, money: We protest sending food and lending money to India, England, Yugoslavia, or any other country that votes with Russia and her satellites against the American people. We have been too soft with Socialist governments.

Politics as usual: We are sick and tired of the schemes of the administration and its politics as usual. Surely there are enough men of integrity in Congress to save the United States from enemies within and without.

Yours truly,

Mrs. BEN HEFFNER,
Mrs. H. H. OLIVER,
Mrs. WALTER OLIVER.

The President has asked the people to tighten their belts and deny themselves during the emergency. The people say they are willing to do this, but they think the President should set the example for the rest of the Nation. Above all, they think and say that there should be equality in the matter of taxation, and in this connection, they object vehemently to the President's receiving $50,000 a year tax exempt, or any other sum that may be tax exempt, while they have to pay on their full incomes.

They also object strenuously to the exemption from taxation in whole or in part, of the cooperatives and others, while the individually owned, tax-paying competitors have to pay on the conduct of like businesses and on like profits. They say that all should be put upon the same basis and the President and the cooperatives should not be exempted or favored above private citizens. They say that the great middle class is now, as always, bearing the brunt and the burden of high taxes.

The people are becoming thoroughly dissatisfied with the administration's handout program, and I dare say nearly all the people are disgusted with the way the administration has handled foreign aid, especially to the Russian satellite countries. We cannot agree that part of the taxpayers' money should be spent to subsidize and help maintain the governments of certain countries, while they are trading with the enemy, and perhaps letting them have some of our own commodities that were given to the nations which we are helping under our foreign-aid handouts.

The people are not altogether blind to what the administration is doing or not doing with reference to the influences of communism within our own borders and from without, and they are thoroughly disgusted with the way the situation has been and is now being handled.

Let the President set the example. Let the bureaucrats fall in line first. Why does not the President and his family of bureaucrats try tightening their belts before they ask the people to do so? That is what the people want. That is what should be done, for the case of those on the Federal payroll, living off the taxpayers are supposed to be hired people, the servants of the people, and they certainly should set the example for the rest of the people. If they will do this, our good citizens will follow much more willingly.

Friends Cannot Be Bought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Saturday, February 3, 1951:

MR. SMITH GOES TO TOWN

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of the First Wisconsin District, made a speech in the House on foreign policy Monday. As Mr. SMITH'S counsel was sensible, it goes without saying that his recommendations are not representative of the official line of the State Department.

Mr. SMITH said that, without the expenditure of a dollar or a man, the United States could win the friendship of 200,000,000 million people in the Mediterranean Basin by supporting opposition to British and French colonialism. He said that this would retrieve a great bloc of people now tempted by communism, and that it would serve American security by safeguarding 60 percent of the world's oil reserves, plus rich deposits of phosphate, magnesium, and potash. There is ample corroboration of the thesis that these repressed peoples may embrace communism simply because they are frustrated at every turn in their search for real independence. The Egyptian Government has openly stated that a continuation of Britain's refusal to withdraw her garrison and to recognize Egyptian claims in the Sudan could throw the country into the Communist camp. British troops, said Representative SMITH, are also in Iraq and

Transjordan, and French military forces are holding down 30,000,000 people in Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco.

Indeed, even as he spoke, a Committee for the Freedom of North Africa was lodging a complaint with President Truman that France, by moving fresh troops up from Dakar, was reinforcing its police-state regime in Morocco, where wholesale arrests are taking place. The protest, sent while the President was in conference with Premier Pleven of France, charged that the United States was serving the interests of communism by supporting French colonialism in North Africa and Indochina.

This, as Representative SMITH makes clear, is a self-defeating game for the State Department to play. If other confirmation of that obvious fact were required, it has been supplied by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, commander of the Marine Corps Department of the Pacific, who said, "Colonalism is through in Asia and in other parts of the world as well." General Erskine said that independent Thailand, which has showed much spunk in opposing the Soviet Union, is the only country in southeast Asia where a white man can venture out on the street without escort and not risk being knocked on the head.

Colonial countries do not love communism more; they like colonialism less. They will turn, however, to the people who seem willing to help them achieve their aspirations for liberty, and if the helpful are Russians, that is too bad for the west. As a Middle Westerner, with the unhampered outlook of this section of the country, Representative SMITH has no difficulty seeing these realities clearly. Why cannot the State Department see them, too? Is it because the Department really is not averse to throwing subject peoples into the arms of Stalin?

Resolution To Embody a Divine Acknowledgment in the Federal Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have risen to present a resolution that would embody a divine acknowledgment in the Federal Constitution.

In these days when we are calling upon the Almighty for guidance and victory and peace, it behooves us to give to Him the honor which is His due.

Our colonial forefathers did not hesitate to incorporate their recognition of God and His blessings into their public documents. The Mayflower Compact, the Great Law of Pennsylvania, the Compact of Rhode Island, and many other early civil documents including the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation, recognized "the power that has made and preserved us a nation." Today, 43 out of the 48 State constitutions contain their divine acknowledgments.

But our Federal Constitution, declared by Gladstone to be "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," is lacking in this respect. It fails to acknowledge the author of our Nation's liberties.

For Centuries Men Dreamed of Organizing a World To Keep the Peace—Only One Government, a Dictatorship, Now Stands in the Way of Achieving That End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 28, Dr. John R. Steelman and the National Broadcasting Co. brought to the American people—by way of television—the twenty-fourth Battle Report, Washington. I would have you believe, sir, that, while terse, brief, candid, and all-illuminating, this report of current happenings is one of the most complete expositions and statements on today's events ever brought to my notice.

On the occasion of this telecast, Dr. Steelman introduced a most distinguished group of Government officials. He first introduced the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Dean Rusk, who subsequently did exactly what Dr. Steelman said that he would do—bring us up to date on the situation in that troubled part of the world.

In his talk, Dean Rusk frankly and candidly posed, and gave forthright and true answer to the problem as to why we are now in Korea and why we are staying in Korea.

We are in Korea—

Said Mr. Rusk—

because we are trying to prevent a world-wide global war, and the frightful destruction of life which such war would produce. The thousands that have died in Korea have sacrificed their lives in a struggle to prevent the millions of deaths which a world-wide war would surely bring.

Let us not be discouraged too soon—

He said—

At the end of World War II the human race almost succeeded in doing what men have dreamed about for centuries—that is, in organizing the world to keep the peace. Only one government now stands in the way. That government is a dictatorship, which has behind it considerable power, but the peace-loving world itself is strong, and we cannot afford to give up our goal just when we have come so close.

Day before yesterday—

Bob McCormick, NBC commentator, declared—

Soviet-designed planes used by the enemy appeared for the first time to attack below the thirty-eighth parallel. But well has our Air Force reason to be confident. Russian MIG-15's in actual battle have proved no match for United States Air Force F-86 Sabers, capable of 700 miles per hour. Our Fourth Fighter Interceptor Group has already been credited definitely or probably with bringing down 17 Russian jets with no loss to ourselves. For an up-to-the-minute report on how our jets are doing in Korea—

Mr. McCormick continued—

we turn now to an officer just returned from there—rated as command pilot, combat observer, aircraft observer, and technical observer, from Air Force headquarters—here is Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of the Members of both Houses of Congress know Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White personally. They know him as an intrepid commander, a splendid gentleman, and a distinguished officer. Until quite recently he served as director of legislation and liaison, and in that capacity won the respect and the esteem not alone of all members of the Armed Services Committees in both Houses of Congress but of all with whom he came in contact.

General White, a flying officer, deputy commander of the Thirteenth Air Force, and later commander of the Seventh Air Force in the South Pacific, is no stranger to the situation in Korea. It was because of his knowledge of battle tactics that he was selected by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff as principal military adviser to Dr. Robert L. Stearnes, president of the University of Colorado, who recently, together with the general, conducted an evaluation and study of operations at the Korean battle front itself.

What General White reported, Sunday last, of their work in Korea and the use of the jet aircraft by the Russians, as well as our own Air Force, merits the reading not alone of every Member of this Congress but of all persons who have any personal responsibility or interest in the problem.

The report made by the Honorable John C. Green, Director of the United States Office of Technical Services, like General White's statement, touched on a most important subject, and one about which I knew but very little. His every word fired my imagination and made me more than ever appreciate the many facets attending the current problems facing the Federal Government in trying to maintain a war, and do so with a minimum of interference on the American manner and method of life.

At the conclusion of Mr. Green's splendid narration, Robert McCormick, NBC commentator, brought us still to a newer scene:

It was a training camp in Texas. The cast of characters—enlistees who responded to the hurry-up call for 150,000 Air Force Reserves and National Guard men. The result—the camp was swamped. A whole new tent city is born of the necessity to handle the 21,000 recruits. In the first 2 weeks of this month alone, the camp cleared 40,000 volunteers. For an informal report on the status of the Nation's Organized Reserves and National Guard—plus a revealing statement of the employment problems many of their members are now meeting—we turn to the special assistant to the Chief of Staff of the Army for civilian component affairs, Maj. Gen. Lawrence C. Jaynes.

At the conclusion of General Jaynes' talk, there was certainly nothing that remained to be reported to the American people with respect to our National Guard or Organized Reserve Corps or individual reservists.

With our Eighth Army spearheading back into Seoul, with the supreme commander of the Atlantic Pact nations returning from his tour of Western Europe

with his already-stated confidence in the strength of the democracies, the Special Assistant to the President, W. Averell Harriman, discussed, at some length and with great effect, the problem of bringing to our support the national forces in terms of manpower of all the nations that make up the North Atlantic Pact nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is in that manner that we come to the end of the twenty-fourth battle report, Washington, and, again, I state that John Steelman and the National Broadcasting Co., together with all who contributed to the wonderful success of this program, are to be congratulated upon the splendid presentation made last Sunday over NBC television.

Because of the importance of this program, under unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the twenty-fourth Battle Report, Washington:

Mr. MCCORMICK. As Gen. Matthew Ridgway, commander of our troops in Korea, pays a surprise visit to the front and reports the situation getting better all the time, NBC television once again turns its cameras of the Nation's Capital to reflect the fight for freedom, not only in Korea but at home and throughout the world.

Washington, now going into action on the economic front, as in Korea our planes match this action with action of their own, strafing support of our UN forces as they launch the greatest drive since our withdrawal from Seoul.

Today Battle Report scans, through its cameras and guests "the ramparts we watch" from Europe to the Far East, and pauses, too, for a report on our reservists and industrial security. But, first, the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Again during the past week another proposal to bring about peace in Korea was made through the United Nations. In commenting upon it, the President said: "Let me stress again that the American resolution contains—as all our proposals have contained—a method for bringing about a cease-fire and opening the way for peaceful settlement of outstanding issues."

Freemen all over the world are awaiting the reply from Communist China. They realize that the United Nations' police action in Korea is necessary to prevent aggression and to save millions from slavery. But they want peace. Let us hope the Chinese leaders will recognize they are mere puppets and have sold their people into slavery. Let us hope they will see the light and join in the work of building a peaceful, prosperous world.

This afternoon we will hear from a distinguished group of Government officials. The Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Dean Rusk, will bring us up to date on the situation in that troubled part of the world. Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, of the headquarters of the Air Force, has just returned from Korea, where he saw what our new jet planes are accomplishing. Mr. John Green, of the Department of Commerce, will tell us how the technical and scientific information of our great industries is being guarded. Maj. Gen. Lawrence C. Jaynes has a message of special interest to all reservists and National Guard men. And Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Special Assistant to the President, who has been working very closely with General Eisenhower, is here to tell us of the progress we are making in Europe.

All these men are working in different spheres—but all are working to create a world of peace—and a world where men are their own masters and not the slaves of a tyrant.

Mr. MCCORMICK. American GI's in Korea, literally "digging in" for the battles that loom ahead. And from this frozen, snow-covered battlefield comes words that spark their actions. Words from General MacArthur on his eighth flying visit: "No one is going to drive us into the sea." Words, too, from the third division's commanding general: "If they order us, we will go back and take Seoul. We can stop anything the Communists can throw at us." Despite the determination of our troops, here at home—in many corners—one hears the oft-repeated question: "What are we doing in Korea, anyway, and why are we hanging on?" For the answer, we invite your attention now to one who helps direct our Asian policy, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Dean Rusk.

Hon. DEAN RUSK. Today, I wish to say a word to those who ask why we stay in Korea. It is a serious question—because men's lives are at stake—and it deserves a serious answer.

We are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a world war and the frightful destruction of life which such a war would produce. The thousands who have died in Korea have sacrificed their lives in a struggle to prevent the millions of deaths which world war would surely bring. The issue in Korea is aggression. We can face it, or we can run away from it. If we face it, we have a chance to organize the determination of the world against aggression, to show the aggressor that his crime will not be accepted and that his crime will not pay. If we succeed, the aggressor may hold his hand. If we run away from it, the aggressor will learn that there is a great profit in crime, that he will not be resisted, and that his victims are weak and can be destroyed at will. These are not theories but hard facts. We Americans have already had one unforgettable lesson about what happens when unbridled ambition goes unchecked. We have seen the world go down the trail from Manchuria to Ethiopia to Munich to Poland and, finally, to Pearl Harbor. We must not tread this path again.

Let us not be discouraged too soon. At the end of World War II, the human race almost succeeded in doing what men have dreamed about for centuries; i. e., in organizing a world to keep the peace. Only one government stands in the way. That government is a dictatorship which has behind it considerable power. But the peace-loving world itself is strong and we cannot afford to give up our goal just when we have come so close.

We are in Korea because we cannot afford to leave Red China and its neighbors under the impression that the forces of Feiping are irresistible and that Red China's neighbors must now come to terms with communism at the cost of their freedom. The vaunted power of Red China is being unmasked in Korea. Chinese soldiers do not relish the punishment they are getting from our guns and planes. They are learning that their masters have tricked them into a war of foreign aggression. They are learning that their masters have put them into battle without provision for minimum care in case of wounds or sickness or frostbite. In other words, Red China is learning a great deal about the cost of aggression.

We are in Korea because we cannot abandon 20,000,000 Koreans to communism. We and they have fought side by side against aggression for several months, sometimes in defeat and sometimes in victory. Throughout the campaign the Korean forces have fought with spirit and courage and the Korean people have demonstrated their determination to be free. We cannot now abandon our comrades to the fate which would be theirs if the Communists took over.

Further, we cannot abandon Korea if by doing so we should leave our friends in the Philippines and in Japan under the impression that we do not take our commitments seriously and that we might lack courage in the face of adversity.

Our gallant force in Korea is fully able to take care of itself. We should not act like a defeated nation when, in fact, we have not been defeated and when, in fact, there is an excellent chance that we can deny the aggressor the object of his aggression.

The willingness and ability of the entire free world to increase its strength and to join its forces to insure their mutual defense depends, to a considerable extent, upon the attitude of the United States. Our strength is increasing rapidly as is that of our friends. Our ability to meet the world-wide threat which we now confront is improving steadily. If we can show that we have both the will and the ability to defend ourselves, the main attack may be averted. Our attitude in this situation may easily determine the course of history, which cannot say of us that we chose the road to disaster because we were unwilling to fight for peace.

Mr. MCCORMICK. In the skies over Korea, news comes that American jets like these are meeting increasing challenge from the enemy. Day before yesterday, Soviet-designed planes used by the enemy appeared for the first time to attack below the thirty-eighth parallel. But well has our Air Force reason to be confident. Russian MIG–15's in actual battle have proved no match for North American F–86 Sabres, capable of 700 miles per hour. Our Fourth Fighter Interceptor Group has already been credited "definitely or probably" with bringing down 17 Russian jets with no loss to ourselves. For an up-to-the-minute report on how our jets are doing in Korea, we turn now to an officer just returned from there, rated as command pilot, combat observer, aircraft observer, and technical observer, from Air Force Headquarters, here is Maj. Gen. Thomas White.

Maj. Gen. THOMAS D. WHITE. During the past week, there has been a marked increase in Communist air activity in Korea. More and more, enemy jet aircraft of modern design have come over from their sanctuary bases in Manchuria to challenge our control of the air over North Korea. So far, they have not penetrated very far south, but their penetrations are getting deeper and deeper, and the quantity of aircraft committed is growing larger.

There are three very significant facts about these air battles now going on.

Of course, the first and most important fact is that we are winning them. Our pilots report, however, that these enemy jets are very good, high-performance airplanes, and that enemy jet pilots are well trained. The lesson here is that we must spare no effort to continue improving our jet fighters.

The second significant fact about these air battles is that many people are being reminded of something they have been prone to forget up to now—and that is, the first and over-riding responsibility of the air commander is to destroy the enemy air forces and protect our Ground Forces against attack by enemy aircraft. During the early days of the war in Korea, the North Korean air force was small and inferior, but if it had been allowed to operate unrestricted it could have given our Ground Forces plenty of trouble. However, it was quickly disposed of, and to this very day practically no United Nations soldier in Korea has ever seen any but United Nations airplanes overhead. This very absence of effective enemy air opposition has caused many people to become preoccupied with the other missions of the Tactical Air Force, particularly with the close support mission. These air battles

you are now reading about underscore the threat which General Partridge, commander of the Fifth Air Force in Korea, has always had to be prepared to meet—this in addition to his difficult job of isolating the battlefield and closely supporting our Ground Forces.

The third significant fact about this commitment of the Communists jet air force is the likelihood that the Communists are trying to find some way to lessen the effect of our air attacks on enemy ground forces. General Stratemeyer's Far West Air Forces are continuing to hammer the enemy on the ground, day and night, every day, as they have since the first day the Air Force was committed to combat in Korea. This sustained air attack has taken a heavy toll of the enemy, and doubtless this is one of the main reasons why the Communists are now committing their jet aircraft.

In summary, General Stratemeyer now has a real air battle on his hands, as well as the job of other tactical support to our Ground Forces. It is gratifying to see that his airmen are handling the air battle with the same high degree of effectiveness that they have been performing the interdiction, close support reconnaissance, transport, and evacuation missions that are also included in full scale tactical air support.

Mr. McCormick. Loaded aboard ship for the fighting front go implements of war to combat the threats to peace. Behind this scene and feeding it with an ever-increasing supply so essential to ultimate victory. The rails hum with new war cargoes daily. And behind the trains, in turn, vast stockpiles of further supplies that sit in yards awaiting their moment to stream out to wherever freemen will take up arms in democracy's defense. But it is to a story behind all of this, America, that we next invite your attention. Namely, the delicate business of keeping our industrial processes and techniques secure from enemy knowledge and use. Concerned with this vital task, is the Department of Commerce official upon whom we next focus our cameras. He is Director of the United States Office of Technical Services, John C. Green.

Mr. John C. Green. In the last week I found that an eminent scientific society was sending critical information directly to Moscow. When I asked a representative of the society about it, he replied that they had been doing this for many years, it was a routine procedure to which no particular thought was given. Also, a manufacturer of precision equipment who is selling most of his product to the Armed Forces was prepared to send detailed technical literature to one of the Communist embassies. He felt that there might be danger in selling them the actual equipment but he could see no particular objection in making the technical details available to personnel in this country. These situations indicate a serious lack of awareness of the security importance of science and technology.

Basically every American wants to take all reasonable measures to preserve our security and avoid giving aid to the enemy. However, the free world to which we are accustomed, the full exchange of ideas and scientific information has become a national habit. We are accustomed to describing in detail our latest scientific and technological achievements for world audiences. Unfortunately, these are troubled times and we must develop a national awareness that these scientific and technical discoveries are a precious possession which should not be made generally available without careful consideration. At the same time, we must remember that the exchange of new facts can operate to our benefit. For example, in such important and diversified fields as penicillin, jet propulsion, radar, and even atomic energy much basic significant data was transferred here from friendly scientists abroad. In view of this situation, we must be careful not to design procedures which cut us off from important foreign discoveries available through reciprocal exchange of information but it should be truly reciprocal and not a one-way street.

Once technical data is published and generally circulated in this country, it is virtually impossible to keep it out of the hands of others who are actively seeking it. The best that can then be done is a delaying action. Therefore, the more intelligent approach is to use good sense before the release. This means that the American people who produce valuable segments of information should ask themselves a very simple question—will the general release of this information be of substantial benefit to our people and our friends or will it operate for the benefit of hostile nations? If this question is honestly asked and then the company or person acts according to common sense, good judgment and patriotism, a tremendous step will have been taken.

There will be times when these decisions will be difficult to make because of complex or conflicting factors involved. Recognizing this, your Government, through the Department of Commerce, is ready to offer direct and prompt advice as to whether or not the release of scientific information or technical data might compromise national security. This is not censorship, but a public service. Fundamentally, the decision must remain with the individual, the author or the company.

Every intelligent American knows that scientific superiority will be the decisive factor in future wars. He should equally realize that it is his patriotic duty to take reasonable measures which will safeguard our scientific secrets. Failure to do so is unconscious sabotage of our fighting forces.

Mr. McCormick. The scene: A training camp in Texas. The cast of characters—enlistees who responded to the hurry-up call for 150,000 Air Force Reserves and National Guard men. The result—the camp swamped. A whole new tent city is born of the necessity to handle the 21,000 recruits. In the first 2 weeks of this month alone, the camp cleared 40,000 volunteers. For an informed report on the status of the Nation's Organized Reserves and National Guards—plus a revealing statement of the employment problems many of their members are now meeting—we turn to the special assistant to the Chief of Staff of the Army for Civilian Component Affairs, Maj. Gen. Lawrence C. Jaynes.

Maj. Gen. L. C. Jaynes. As a direct result of the present national emergency it has been necessary to call upon our civilian components, those units and individuals who have a vital mission in the defense of our country. Their mission is to be trained and ready to serve in the event of a national emergency. This includes furnishing units effectively organized and trained in time of peace for rapid mobilization, expansion, and deployment. It also includes furnishing additional trained personnel for necessary expansion of the Army of the United States and providing a reservoir of civilians with military experience available for assignment. The National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps provide the civilian components to meet this mission.

The primary consideration has been the ordering into active military service certain National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps units; the screening of individual reservists for active duty, standards of training, grade and rank, promotion and assignment, all demanding the concentrated effort of our top military planners. In the sudden shift from peacetime to emergency footing, hardships were bound to occur. Rapid strides have been taken by the Army to correct resulting inequities and to insure the fair and impartial treatment of all guardsmen and reservists who are subject to being ordered into the active military service.

Mr. McCormick. Let's look at one of our most moving mobilization problems. Let's look at it from the standpoint of the aggrieved—reservists and National Guard men, subject to military duty at any time; their story: They offer their services to their country, ready to go in any emergency.

Their thanks, many of them complain, is to go jobless. Excellent qualification, perhaps, but that ever-present danger of being called into service—employers don't like the idea of losing a man just when he's been nicely broken in on a tough job. So, it's a chorus of "No's"—endless trudging, trudging, trudging, looking for a job.

So say many of the men involved. In a time of manpower shortages, no work for them, and only because they tried to do their duty.

If it's true, something must be done—but then the question of what can be done. These men need—deserve—jobs; the country needs every man.

And steps are being taken to straighten it out.

General Jaynes In connection with the mobilization problems, I have mentioned, I am very happy to say that most employers throughout the country are cooperating fully and patriotically with their employees who hold Reserve status. Such employees have pledged themselves to set aside the comforts and advantages of civilian pursuits whenever their country needs them in uniform. Certainly, they deserve at least equal consideration with their non-Reserve fellow employees. Most employers, as I have said, recognize this and resist any temptation to hesitate to employ or advance individuals who are reservists. We still get reports of some reservists, however, who had had difficulty in getting jobs, or in getting ahead on their present job, simply because their future status is somewhat uncertain. I hope we will hear less and less of such reports, and that all employers will accept the inconvenience of occasionally losing a key man as a small part of their contribution to our national effort. There is no such thing as "this man's Army"—it is your Army, whether civilian or reservist, whether employer or employee. When a man unselfishly contributes his spare time to prepare to serve that Army when he is needed, take pride in him, help him, don't penalize him.

Our Reserve forces are a vital part of our country's defense. These men and women have agreed to give up their civilian pursuits to serve their country when they are needed. They deserve the respect and admiration of every one of us.

Mr. McCormick. As Eighth Army spearheads probed north within 10 miles of Seoul, the riddle "Where's the Chinese Army?" seemed finally to find an answer. Maybe below Seoul, where reports indicate ominous heavy troop activity, and stiffening Communist resistance makes many feel we are about to collide with the main Chinese forces. Cautiously, our troops continue to feel out the enemy along the new 90-mile front. Meanwhile, the Atlantic Pact Nation's Supreme Commander, Ike Eisenhower—shown here in Paris where Communists staged a riot for him—returned from Western Europe confident of the strength of the democracies. For an experienced evaluation of the defense role of France and our other European Allies visited by General Eisenhower, we bring you now the Special Assistant to the President, W Averell Harriman.

Hon. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN. During the coming week, the arrival of two men in Washington will focus attention on the strengthening of the North Atlantic community for our mutual security.

The Prime Minister of France, Rene Pleven, will arrive tomorrow morning—followed 2 days later by our great general—Dwight Eisenhower.

The French Prime Minister is coming to discuss with the President the problems our two countries face together in Europe and the Far East.

I first met Rene Pleven in London in 1941, when he was one of the stalwart group of French leaders of the French resistance to Nazi tyranny. Today he is again a stalwart leader of France in resisting the new threat. He represents the spirit of the French people, which has made possible the reconstruction of France from the chaos left in the wake of war.

The French people, as well as the other people of Western Europe, have made good use of our help under the Marshall plan. Principally, through their own hard work, they have regained their economic vitality—in fact, in industry, production is now running well ahead of the prewar highs. As a result of the cooperative effort of the Marshall plan, the peoples of Europe are now in a position to undertake the new and arduous task of reestablishing their combined military strength. A start has been made.

Before Korea, our European partners were spending on their military forces about the same percentage of their national income as we were at that time, and since Korea, they are expanding substantially their military budgets.

But we can't judge military effort merely by a comparison of budgetary figures. In France, for instance, it is traditional for their young men to serve their country for nominal pay—in fact, less than what we would consider cigarette money. Then, too, they have been fighting a costly war for the past several years against Communist aggression in Indochina.

It is planned that our European allies will develop forces in terms of manpower greater than ours. They have the men. Their combined population, if we include Western Germany, is much larger than ours. But we must recognize, in facing the problem together, that their total output of industry and agriculture is less than half of ours. And on a per capita basis, they have only about one-third of the goods available that we have for both civilian and military needs. Thus they have not the capacity to arm the larger forces adequately for modern warfare. Because of our far greater productivity, we have undertaken to supply a considerable part of the required equipment and some other imports to make possible increased munitions production.

Later this week, General Eisenhower will report on what he has seen during his trip through Europe. Better than anyone, he can tell us the job that we and our European allies must do to build the forces in Europe needed for our mutual security. With the inspiration of his leadership, we can all move forward with confidence that this job can be done to convert our collective potential strength—vastly greater than the Soviet's—into a combined military force to deter aggression and to protect our security and our freedoms.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another "teledocumentary," this, then against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your twenty-fourth battle report, Washington.

United States Aid Can Win 200,000,000 Friends for Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on February 3, 1951:

HOW TO WIN 200,000,000 FRIENDS AT NO COST

General Eisenhower took to the air waves last night to give the taxpayers an imitation in shorter form of the persuasion he attempted upon Congress the day before.

So far as we have been able to learn up to this writing, nobody was thunderstruck.

There may have been citizens who thought it possible he would say of his European jaunt: "I went. I saw. You wouldn't want any."

WHY THE BIG IF?

But of course not. Even a child knows that Mr. Truman made very sure of the general before leading him up to be commander in chief of the international defense forces.

The general has now performed accordingly. He comes back with the novel suggestion that there is no doubt about the all-seeing, all-knowing wisdom of the Truman program in foreign affairs. And then he proceeds to talk against people daring to have doubts.

If the taxpayers and Congress are locked up, then why all the jawing? When the customer is sold, you just hand him the pen. Certainly you don't tell him that he has no doubts and that if he does they are beneath him.

It is, indeed, worth reflection that the general himself, in spite of his frontal positiveness, has dragged in plenty of hems and haws on the side.

Last night's speech was notable for the use of the big "if." In one single sentence of 80 words, the general found it necessary to protect himself 6 times with "if."

A clue to this necessity shows itself when one reads his detailed text. In rummaging around for evidence to support his claim of France's will to resist, he mentions the war in Indochina. When the British are his example, he cites Malaya.

In view of the fact that Britain's government is a Socialist bartender for communism and the Communists are the largest single section of seat holders in the French Chamber of Deputies, it may be argued that the general had no choice. He had to look half way around the world away from them for a likely story.

But to the world itself he could hardly have offered a more unhappy evidence of that ignorance, to call it by the best possible name, which inflames against America so many people who would gladly be our friends and allies if we would let them.

It would profit the general, at least we hope he is capable of it, to read an address to the House of Representatives on Monday last by Representative LAWRENCE W. SMITH, of the First Wisconsin District.

Mr. SMITH made it plain and clear how the United States can gain the support of 200,000,000 people living around the edges of the Mediterranean Sea in important regions as much threatened by Communist aggression as any in the world.

A REAL PROGRAM

Furthermore, he showed how this can be done without spending a dollar of taxpayers' money, and for that matter it can even be done in honor.

He proposes that the United States throw its sympathies with these exploited people against, not for, British and French colonialism. And, why not?

General Eisenhower, in his speech to Congress, made much of the danger that would follow Communist seizure of various places where raw materials lie that we might want to buy.

Well, in the Near East and north Africa there are enormous deposits of material wealth, of which 60 percent of the world's proved oil supply is just one.

The people who live there are not fooled. They know why the British and French denounce communism in the colonies and swallow it at home. And so it is no wonder these suppressed and exploited victims of colonialism grow more and more interested in what Russia has to say to them.

Communism is an enemy they have yet to know, but colonialism they can hate with certain knowledge born of bitter experience.

The American people, whether General Eisenhower will or no, have something to think about in the observation by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, commander of the Marine Corps Department of the Pacific, that "colonialism is through in Asia and in other parts of the world as well."

We can think about the fact that a committee for the freedom of north Africa complained to President Truman of French police action in Morocco even as French Premier Pleven and Mr. Truman were discussing "anti-Communist measures."

We can think about the fact that in Asia, it is independent, self-governing Thailand that stands up to the Soviets. General Erskine says Thailand is the only place in southeast Asia where a white man can walk the street without fear of being knocked on the head.

No wonder General Eisenhower's sales talk suffered from hems and haws. He should have listened to Representative SMITH, instead of expecting a nation to listen to him.

Internal Security Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the President recently announced the appointment of a Commission of Internal Security to examine this vital problem in these days of national emergency. Many of us have been concerned over the failure of the present administration to take adequate measures to guard the Nation's internal security during recent years. As a result of this past failure, many Communists and Communist sympathizers were allowed by the President to assume positions of influence and responsibility in our Government. Alger Hiss, who was defended by the President, is a classic example of the weakness in the Nation's internal security during recent years.

It is my hope that the new Internal Security Commission will properly exercise its functions to prevent the mistakes of the Truman administration on questions of internal security from being repeated in these critical times. In any event, it is my hope that the Congress will constantly be on the alert to see that our Nation is protected in the future from any possibility of Communists or Communist sympathizers obtaining employment in our Federal Government. I am including as part of my remarks an editorial published in the San Marino Tribune in my district on February 1, 1951. Mr. H. H. McCormack, the publisher of the San Marino Tribune, has pointed out the problem now before us in his editorial, and I recommend it to all the Members of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER COMMISSION TO BYPASS COMMIE-FIGHTING CONGRESS?

Verily, this is the day, as well as the heyday of bureaus, boards, and commissions, bringing to mind once again Lincoln's distrust of commissions. Said he: "I have done with commissions. I think they are contrivances to cheat the Government."

President Truman, far from having done with commissions, has just set up a nine-member Commission of Internal Security, headed by Admiral Nimitz, retired, to consider in all its aspects the question of how this Nation can best deal with the problem of protecting its internal security, at the same time maintaining the freedoms of its citizens.

The commission will examine existing legislation against treason, espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities. It will look into the doings and methods of State and local governments, of public groups, of private groups of all kinds and citizens in their daily work and in their homes, aimed at protection against such subversive activities. It will consider the harm that comes from the wrong kind of action as well as the good that comes from the right kind of action. It will investigate operation of Federal employee loyalty and security programs.

While it appears to be the President's purpose, from reports now at hand, that the commission shall direct its attention toward subversive activities, the language of its authority, to consider in all its aspects national security and freedoms of citizens, seems sufficiently comprehensive for delving into whatever may have bearing thereupon.

Regardless, however, of the intended scope of the commission's assignment, the larger fact is that no such inquisitional body is called for, inasmuch as the Congress is not only clothed with both duty and authority to act in the premises, but has already exercised its authority with telling effect, through disclosures of the Un-American Activities Committee, brought about mainly by the acumen and persistence of Congressman, now Senator, RICHARD NIXON, of California, whereby Alger Hiss, as a conspicuous example, was pried loose from his niche in the State Department and forced into the light of day for beholding of all the people; and this, in face of Mr. Truman's aspersion of red herring cast at the committee.

Furthermore, the Congress last fall enacted the so-called Communist control bill, designed to frustrate Communist and subversive activities. Far from having Mr. Truman's support in passing the measure, the Congress was compelled to override a Presidential veto—which it did, decisively.

The operation of the new commission will be not only a useless duplication of endeavor but also a manifest and wholly unwarranted trespass upon congressional prerogative.

Mr. Truman's commission will have complete access to FBI and other Government files, notwithstanding that the President has steadfastly refused like access to congressional committees, maintaining his stand by assertion of precedents.

The action now required of the President is that he bend every effort toward rooting out from Government departments every vestige of subversion of every kind and degree; and that he do so without further stalling or awaiting findings of a supernumerary and entirely needless commission.

There is something appallingly inconsistent in the administration's attitude of toleration toward communism and subversion on the home front, the while America's sons by thousands are compelled to go and meet Communist "aggression" in mortal combat on the other side of the world, with casualties thus far of more than 46,000 of whom not less than 7,500 are no longer concerned with what a commission decides about communism—they are dead—with naught by way of halting communism to show for their sacrifices.

Communism could be handled, ousted, from the home front by an aggressive administration minded so to do, without casualties. If the administration at Washington doesn't share that conclusion, make no mistake about it, American mothers and fathers do.

Is Truman Playing Into Stalin's Hands?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, March 18, 1947, contains a speech by the Honorable HOWARD H. BUFFETT, Congressman of Nebraska, entitled "Is Truman Playing Into Stalin's Hands?"

Mr. Speaker, Congressman BUFFETT apparently gave much thought to the preparation of this speech and collected an abundance of material and factual information set out in the premises of his address, from which he drew certain conclusions and made certain deductions.

Remember that this address was delivered by Congressman BUFFETT on March 18, 1947, now approximately 4 years ago. It was delivered 3 years before the hostilities in Korea began. It was delivered before a number of other things happened, which have transpired during the past 4 years.

Congressman BUFFETT, I am sure, makes no claims of being a prophet nor the son of a prophet. Nevertheless, Congressman BUFFETT'S address on this subject on that occasion was truly prophetic, and the Congressman undoubtedly spoke better than he knew at the time. Many things that he suggested might happen, could happen or would happen, actually have transpired, during the past 4 years since the Congressman's address was delivered.

On account of the well-reasoned argument presented in the address and because of the fact that Congressman BUFFETT clearly foresaw what he considered the inevitable results and termination of some of the activities of the Truman national administration in foreign affairs, I think it only fitting and proper that Congressman BUFFETT'S address on March 18, 1947, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, be reprinted for the benefit of those who would appreciate knowing how accurate his judgment was and how cogent his reasoning has been demonstrated to have been.

The following is the address of Congressman BUFFETT:

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman demands large-scale American intervention in the political, economic, and military affairs of the Balkans. He tells us other lands must have similar intervention.

This proposal prompts me to repeat a comment by Lord Welby, once treasury head for England. Shortly before World War I started the British Empire toward liquidation, Lord Welby declared:

"We are in the hands of an organization of crooks. They are politicians, generals, manufacturers of armaments, and journalists. All of them are anxious for unlimited expenditure, and go on inventing scares to terrify the public and to terrify Ministers of the Crown."

Probably Mr. Truman's demand does not reflect the kind of scare Lord Welby reported. And so, it may have another origin. Could that origin be that American intervention in Greece has been craftily connived for by the Kremlin, and that Mr. Truman has swallowed the bait?

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one fact clear. I am not happy talking about foreign affairs. I would prefer to leave that field to others.

But as an American, I am ashamed and appalled by the recent record of failure in foreign affairs. So I cannot remain silent while new and more ghastly blunders are concocted.

A TRAGIC RECORD OF FAILURE

Truly no one could possibly have handled our foreign affairs much worse than the present administration. It is tragic to have to confess that American blood and treasure was used to deliver into communistic tyranny the lands of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary, Manchukuo, and large parts of Germany, Austria, Finland, China, Korea, and Japan. But it is true.

Even yet it is hard to believe that 400,000 American boys died for the Atlantic Charter and that instead their sacrifice was used to expand communism over two continents.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to assess the enormity of this failure. A man from Mars reviewing it would come to one or the other of two conclusions—either our Government has been in the control of Communists, or it has been in the hands of terribly stupid people completely fooled by the Communists.

As the first conclusion would indicate unlimited treachery and treason, it must be ruled out. Left with the second alternative—that the administration has been terribly stupid and misled—we must consider the present Truman demands in the light of that record.

Lacking only the former head man and some minor characters, the present administration, including its Republican collaborators, is the same assortment of officials that have steered America to the brink of chaos. Surely then we must examine their schemes now with the utmost skepticism.

DOES THE LEOPARD CHANGE ITS SPOTS?

Mr. Speaker, for 14 years the New Deal Party brazenly carried water for communism in America and throughout the world. Now we are asked to believe that overnight it has changed into the world-wide champion of anticommunism.

While welcoming administration professions of anticommunism, Congress and the people should remember that the Good Book says, "By their fruits ye shall know them." A management which has committed 14 years of blunders for communism is hardly qualified, because of an almost overnight reformation, to be given a blank check for a crusade against communism.

Mr. Speaker, suppose this intervention proposal fits right into Stalin's plans? If American intervention in the Balkans is what the Communists want, we had better learn that fact now.

Most all Americans are agreed now on the dangers of communism. Some of us have been concerned about communism for a long time. Our warnings and our efforts, such as my amendment to prevent postwar lend-lease from going to Russia and others, were ignored.

But now is not a time for recriminations. It is a time to carefully appraise our position and chart our course. The decision involves unlimited consequences. Our intentions do not matter. The consequences follow automatically.

To get a clear understanding of our present situation, we must go back a long way. When our leaders precipitated us into World War I, they thereby committed us to the one lasting consequence of that war. What was that consequence? The establishment of communism in full control of a powerful government—Russia.

NEW DEAL SPARKS COMMUNIST EXPANSION

Following this initial victory, we did not hear much about communism between 1921 and 1933. But when the New Deal took over in 1933, it was not long until Roosevelt gave communism a tremendous boost by official recognition.

This recognition enabled communism to begin to expand its activities, both in Europe and America. At that time the Communists were secretly promoting World War II. Finally Stalin's deal with Hitler precipitated the conflict.

When Hitler attacked Russia in 1941, Roosevelt immediately pledged the Communists unlimited materials from America, with no questions asked and no pledges made in return. Billions of our resources went to Russia. But Russia's hostility toward us never lessened. Many of our officials knew of this continuing hostility, but kept that fact from our people.

Many strange things happened. America's then No. 1 Communist, Earl Browder, was in the Federal penitentiary for violating our statutes. The New Deal pardoned him. All through the war the New Deal high command, both civilian and military, catered to Russia's every whim and every demand. War materials reportedly went to Russia ahead of the necessities of our own troops.

But she returned less in reverse lend-lease than we received from the Fiji Islands.

The Communists saw that the longer the war lasted the greater would be their victory. Accordingly, they cunningly insisted on the barbaric demand for unconditional surrender to prolong enemy resistance.

REAL WAR TRIUMPH WAS STALIN'S

When hostilities ceased, we had the momentary elation of a great military victory. But the real triumph was Stalin's—achieved with the aid of 400,000 Americans who died believing they were fighting for the Atlantic Charter.

Even after VJ-day our foreign policy remained perfectly attuned to the wishes of the Kremlin. Using human distress in Europe as the bait, Communists promoted UNRRA, with Uncle Sam paying the bill.

Whatever the intentions were, UNRRA added to Stalin's conquests. Congress had been specifically warned that UNRRA would enable Stalin to extend his mastery over Europe. But the New Deal Congress, aided by the failure of the Republican leadership to explode this scheme, voted almost $3,000,000,000 of the savings of the American people for this arsenal of communism.

Our postwar policy in Germany also carried out the desires of the Kremlin. The Morgenthau plan, and the official hate-the-German doctrine were Moscow-approved and enabled the Communists to woo the German people. The New Deal Party carried out Moscow's order.

NOVEMBER ELECTION FORCES CHANGE IN STRATEGY

Then last November a titanic ballot-box uprising took place in America. The American people demonstrated overwhelming opposition to a foreign and domestic policy which, knowingly or unwittingly, was following the Communist Party line.

So the conspirators in the Kremlin had to revise their strategy for world conquest. Let us visualize the reaction of the top Communists to our election. Stalin knew that direct hand-outs from America were over. He also knew that America was entirely too strong to challenge militarily; so what should he do in his unswerving objective of world domination?

Surely Stalin would determine that he must reverse his tactics here to continue his conquests. Perhaps his mind would recall the famous prediction of Huey Long, who declared that if fascism ever comes to America, it will come in the name of antifascism.

What better tactic could Stalin now develop than to promote communism in America in the name of anticommunism. This tactic, of course, would require the continual creation of communistic scares outside America.

Likewise, if he were to exhibit traditional Russian cunning, an historical Russian tactic would suggest itself to him. He would recall how Czar Alexander I sucked Napoleon into advancing to Moscow, and how that overextended position so depleted Napoleon's strength that later he toppled easily at Waterloo.

Then Stalin might smile as he recalled Hitler's 1,600-mile supply line to Stalingrad. He would remember how the devouring logistics of that far-flung position decimated Hitler's military machine. So, Stalin would be determined that he must keep America overextended and off balance.

AMERICA "OUT ON LIMB"

That would be the political strategy, just as it always has been a favored Russian tactic. He would needle us and play hit-and-run infiltration wherever America could be sucked in, especially remembering, of course, our continued willingness to aid the outposts of the British Empire.

This strategy would have another especial value to Mr. Stalin. With American attention on an external campaign against communism, his army of stooges in the New Deal could quickly be enrobed in a concealing mantle of anticommunism.

So, besides involving the American people in bankrupting commitments abroad, a communistic drive would divert suspicion and attention from Stalin's agents in the New Deal.

This scheme would make use of the tactics long used by subway pickpockets. Do you remember that trick? It was for one thief to concentrate the victim's attention by frontal shoving and jostling, while the thievery was carried out by the accomplice in the rear. He picked the pocket while the victim's attention was on the disturber in front of him. It is a simple trick, but Mr. Stalin has apparently been dealing with simple minds in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Communists have started this strategy, and that Mr. Truman and his advisers have been taken in. He proposes to send large amounts of military aid to Greece and Turkey. Most certainly we will apparently stabilize the situation there for awhile. Probably the Communists will fold their tents like the Arabs and silently steal away.

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

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman intimating that the Communists are going to quit?

Mr. BUFFETT. Oh, no; just wait until the next paragraph.

UNCLE SAM, INTERNATIONAL FIREMAN

Then after we have spread ourselves in Greece and Turkey, and our leaders are patting themselves on the back for their successful firm stand, a new alarm will come in. Communistic outbreaks will be reported serious in another area. We will rush to that alarm. A $1,000,000,000 call will come from Korea. There will be renewed demands from China.

All over the world we would soon be answering alarms like an international fireman, maintaining garrisons, and pouring out our resources. Our position would become more overextended than Hitler's was at the height of his conquests—if it is not already.

In the meantime, what will have happened at home? Economy plans will have generally gone up in smoke. The futility of then attempting to stop the reckless spenders, aided by the sly inside agents of the Kremlin, would quickly become apparent to all. In the pattern developed through the war years of deficit spending, this administration combination would dress up every spending scheme as vital in their anti-Communist program.

Attempts at economy would again be smeared as reactionary efforts to save dollars at the cost of the lives of American boys. Patriots who try to bring about economy would be branded as Stalin lovers.

The misery of the people, from continued militarism and inflation, would soon become unbearable. As their anguished protests became vocal, the shackles of regimentation and coercion, so lately thrown off, could be refastened in the name of stopping communism at home.

Of course, all this spending over the world will both make certain and hasten a financial collapse in America—an economic Pearl Harbor. That is the ultimate goal of the current Red needling.

INFLATION—COMMUNISM'S SECRET WEAPON

Stalin knows, as Lenin taught him, that the surest way to overturn an existing social order is to debauch the currency. When the President mentioned inflation in Greece, he unconsciously touched on the very condition which Stalin is counting on to give the Communists victory in America.

And so, Mr. Speaker, if America is now sucked into a state of undeclared war in Greece and other places, we would seem to be paving the way for world triumph of communism. In World Wars I and II our noble objectives vanished when military victory was won. So it will be again if we take the road to war.

We will again learn too late the truth of William Graham Sumner's words:

"When a war is begun, it will run its course and bring its consequences. What the intention was makes no difference."

PARTIAL LIST OF CONSEQUENCES

But, Mr. Speaker, we should consider now what some of the ultimate consequences would be. Here are a few of the probable results:

First. Truth-telling would generally disappear in radio, press, and movie. The totalitarian tactics of smear, censorship, and lying propaganda would overwhelm those who resist. Those Americans who correctly anticipated the communistic victory in World War II were politically crucified and

silenced in most cases. The same terrorism will happen again if we are now maneuvered into thinly veiled armed conflict with Russia.

Second. Military conscription would soon be demanded to fill the ranks of garrisons for Palestine and the Near East oil fields.

Third. Laboring people would be in danger of a labor draft like President Truman wanted last May. As inflation mounted, class struggle, which the Communists have never yet been able to create in America, might rapidly develop. Every hidden force of inflation would be adding to the distress of the people—as far-flung military and economic operations exhausted our economy.

Fourth. OPA regimentation and coercion would be reimposed under the old forms or in some new sugar-coated version.

Fifth. GI benefits of World War II, when added to these new foreign hand-outs, would soon be an almost impossible financial load for the budget. Postponement by a moratorium, or serious dilution by inflation, could follow.

Sixth. Outstanding war bonds would probably be largely frozen in the hands of their owners.

Seventh. Within a few years our currency would become so diluted by inflation that it would have only a fraction of its 1939 purchasing power.

Eighth. Then the condition having been created here that Mr. Truman described in Greece of "savings wiped out by inflation," the people, beaten and bankrupt, would be ripe for a Communist dictatorship.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is presenting a problem which we ought to consider very carefully. The gentleman spoke of the likelihood of a communistic dictatorship developing. Does the gentleman agree with me that the dictator might not be an American?

Mr BUFFETT. Yes; that is entirely possible.

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

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Along the line of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] was saying, we have not had an American foreign policy which originated here for 10 or 12 years.

Mr. BUFFETT. My remarks take recognition of that possibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As I got it, he, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] was suggesting that this dictator might come from abroad. My understanding is that our foreign policy has been coming from abroad through the British Empire for something like 10 years. If I am wrong, I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio correct me.

Mr BUFFETT. As these consequences began to unfold, all effective political opposition would end. In fact, passage of this scheme, when added to the humbug presidential campaigns of 1940 and 1944, might indicate that one-party Government has already been largely accomplished.

The smear terrorism long used by the New Deal would be directed against every patriot who resisted successive moves in this so-called anti-Communist drive.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Members of this House to think long and earnestly before they vote us into a probable Stalin trap, either the immediate one in Greece or later ones which may be skillfully concocted to get us out on a limb everywhere.

PROBABLY POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY HAS TEMPTED ADMINISTRATION

I am afraid the Truman high command has been tempted by the domestic political attractions abounding in this scheme. It seems to enable them at one stroke to apparently cast off their long-ingrained Communist taint and simultaneously shift the blame for 14 years of inflation.

This scheme would lay the inflation headache right in the laps of the Republicans. Truman could then say that the end of OPA, not the foreign hand-outs, brought skyrocketing price levels. The Republicans could not point out that excessive foreign-handouts caused the inflation, because they would be recorded in favor of that policy. So the Balkan deal seems made to order to revive the New Deal domestically and likewise made to order for Stalin internationally.

Even if it were desirable, America is not strong enough to police the world by military force. If that attempt is made, the blessings of liberty will be replaced by coercion and tyranny at home.

Our Christian ideals cannot be exported to other lands by dollars and guns. Persuasion and example are the methods taught by the carpenter of Nazareth, and if we believe in Christianity we should try to advance our ideals by His methods.

IMPERIALISM ABROAD AND FREEDOM AT HOME WILL NOT WORK

We cannot practice might and force abroad and retain freedom at home. We cannot talk world cooperation and practice power politics. If we try to face both ways at once, we will repeat the sad lesson of the crusades. Ernest Barker summed up that tragedy in these words:

"The crusades may be written down as a failure. They ended not in the occupation of the east by the Christian west, but in the conquest of the west by the Mohammedan east."

Mr. Speaker, is the Truman administration truly trying to stop communism? Then its task begins at home. I suggest the same three-point program that I have long advocated, for a starter:

First. Clean out the Communists and the fellow travelers in our own Government.

Second. Stop giving foreign nations free economic support. End the administration policies that have used America as an arsenal for communism. Encourage genuine relief under nonpolitical auspices.

Third. Stop imitating communism. Communism arose out of the ashes of an economy destroyed by currency inflation and was welcomed by a people saddled with tyrannical bureaucracy. To stop communism we must balance the budget, reduce the debt, and cut taxes.

Mr. Speaker, long ago the admonition was offered, "Physician, heal thyself." If the Truman administration is now finally interested in stopping the spread of communism, it will take to heart that specific advice from the founder of the only effective antidote for communism, the Christian religion.

Congressman Doyle Further Explains How H. R. 2383 Would Stop Use of Power To Arbitrarily Destroy Legitimate Business—Remarks in Regard to Case of Ewing Versus Mytinger and Casselberry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in the Appendix of the RECORD beginning at page A610 I had printed the copy of the bill H. R. 2383 designed to amend section 304, subsections (a) and (b), of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Following the text of the bill I made certain remarks and explanations about the purpose of the bill and also related that in the preparation of said remarks I had asked and received the cooperation of the legal counsel for Nutrilite Products manufactured by the important firm of Mytinger and Casselberry, whose home office is in my important home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.

With the following additional remarks, I trust that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which H. R. 2383 has been referred; the Department of government concerned; and all persons interested will thus be more promptly informed as to the purport of the bill and the conditions which brought it to the fore.

I respectfully call your attention to the following which concludes the explanation of H. R. 2383:

While not directly related to the multiple seizures outlined above, the action of the administration in an injunction proceeding brought against these same constituents of mine under section 302 of the act shows another facet in Mr. Ewing and his Food and Drug Administration's arbitrary scheme to irreparably injure and which would destroy my constituent's business. While the three-judge district court case was pending, the Food and Drug Administration instituted their own injunction proceeding in Los Angeles, raising the same claim of misleading literature (which the three judges found to be 100 percent wrong) asking an order prohibiting shipment of the product in interstate commerce. This was not pursued, however, until after the Supreme Court had reversed the three-judge court. After that, the complaint was amended in the Los Angeles action by a prayer that the court require my constituents to refund all purchase moneys received from the sale of this valuable and beneficial vitamin and mineral product. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains no provision which even by the fondest stretch of the imagination would justify such a prayer. To insure maximum publicity, Mr. Ewing's Food and Drug Administration in its press statements and an assistant legal attorney for them mentioned fantastic amounts of millions of dollars as possible refunds. You can well imagine how damaging this has been and on charges which the three-judge court held to be absolutely false.

To those who know the provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act this latest publicity attack on my constituents is not only unlawful in origin but is obviously maliciously inspired. For example, the Drug Trade News, a periodical which usually applauds, as in many cases it should, the action of the Food and Drug Administration, stated in an editorial on November 27, 1950:

The court proceedings recently started by the Food and Drug Administration to compel a manufacturer to refund to the customer the price paid for a misbranded food and drug product, must be looked upon as a revolutionary development in the enforcement of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Such action would seem completely beyond the power of the act, and hence outside the lawful authority of the administrative agency. It can be pointed out, however, that if the manufacturer knew in advance that he would be required to refund the purchase price in the event his product was later found to be misbranded, a more meticulous observance of the act would be the direct result, provided he were willing to operate under such hazardous conditions.

But, however meritorious such a requirement may or may not be, its very character is such that it should rest upon congressional action and not on mere administrative interpretation. Certainly no such drastic proposal should be engrafted upon the act, either by the FDA ruling or by judicial sanction.

Congress is the lawmaking body, although many administrative agencies in Washington seem oblivious to this fact. There has been altogether too much extension of Federal law through administrative usurpation coupled with the hunch that the courts can be counted on to go along.

Not only is the Food and Drug Administration to be condemned for its arbitrary and capricious action which has caused incalculable damage to my constituents, but the agency should be taken to task for squandering public funds in such a fashion. This litigation, which has been going on for 2 years, and over what has been held by three judges to be the most innocuous of advertising, has not only cost the Government countless thousands of dollars but has expended thousands of hours of labor and fruitless effort on the part of Government attorneys and other personnel. This is all the more appalling when it is considered, as is obvious to anyone conversant with the facts of the situation, that the Food and Drug Administration could, if it had desired to be fair-minded, have sat down at a conference with my constituents and ironed out any real differences of opinion over the advertising which Mr. Ewing and his Food and Drug Administration seek to condemn.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS AND THE MULTIPLE SEIZURE POWER

My proposed amendments to section 304 (a) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are designed primarily to prevent the reoccurrence of the unparalleled and unprecedented absence of protection against the abuses just outlined. Insofar as the power to make multiple seizures is concerned, my amendments would have the effect of only taking away from the administration the power to institute multiple seizures for the same alleged misbranding when a product is harmless and, first, the Administrator determines without hearing that the labeling is fraudulent; or, second, when the Administrator determines without hearing that the labeling is misleading in a material respect. The Administrator, of course, would still have the power to institute a single seizure where he determines ex parte that labeling is misleading or fraudulent, and in that case the court would then determine whether his charges are true. If the charges are proved he could then and only then make multiple seizures all over the Nation.

My amendments would not affect, change, or alter the power to institute multiple seizures when, first, it is alleged that a product is harmful or adulterated; second, when the misbranding has been the basis of a prior judgment in favor of the United States in a criminal, injunction, or libel for condemnation proceeding; or, third, when the Administrator determines from facts found without hearing that the article is dangerous to health. As a practical matter there would seem to be complete justification for multiple seizures in the three categories just mentioned. Although the power of the Administrator to institute multiple libel proceedings when it is alleged a product is dangerous to health or is adulterated might be subject to arbitrary and capricious enforcement, the very nature of the charge involved would seem to warrant the assumption of that risk by individuals whose products come within the purview of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. My bill thus removes none of the essential protection of the public. All it does is insure that the carte blanche authority to destroy honest, harmless, and beneficial businesses on whims and caprice is ended once and for all.

REMOVAL AND CONSOLIDATION

Section 304 (a) of the act now provides that where a libel proceeding may be removed for trial to any district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties or, in the case of failure to stipulate, the claimant of the articles seized may apply to the court to have the trial removed to a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business. These removal provisions relate to cases where there has been only one seizure action. Substantially similar provisions are contained in subsection (b) of section 304 which provides that the multiple libels may be consolidated for trial in, first, any district selected by the claimant where one of the multiple libel proceedings is pending; second, a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties; or, third, a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business.

The relief ostensibly accorded the claimant by removal and consolidation of multiple libel proceedings is in many instances only partial relief and in others completely illusory. In each jurisdiction in which a libel action has been brought the claimant must file his claims, answers, and bonds unless he is willing to permit the various actions to go by default. Even if consolidation is effected, substantial burdens are placed on the claimant in attempting to try the consolidated proceeding in a jurisdiction far removed from his home district where his witnesses, records, and other materials are located. Of course, if the seizure has been effected in a claimant's home district other seizures predicated upon the same claim could be removed and consolidated in a claimant's home district for trial. Experience has shown, however, that seizures ordinarily are not effected in the claimant's home district, but rather in jurisdictions far removed. In practice, the statutory right to have multiple libel proceedings consolidated in one of the jurisdictions where a libel has been instituted is meaningless for often the closest jurisdiction in which a libel proceeding has been instituted is hundreds or thousands of miles removed from the claimant's principal place of business.

While it would appear that under the statutory provisions of section 304 that the parties to a libel proceeding could stipulate to removal to and consolidation for trial in the claimant's home district, the Food and Drug Administration has a declared policy never to agree to stipulate to removal to or consolidation in such a district. This policy apparently is applied under all circumstances regardless of the hardship in particular cases.

As has been noted previously, both subsections (a) and (b) do authorize a court to transfer a single proceeding or consolidate multiple procedings for trial in a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principle place of business. There are no appellate court decisions interpreting this provision, but the few district courts which have had occasion to pass upon it have held that a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business excludes the claimant's home district. Such a ruling does not work an apparent hardship where the claimant's home district is in the East where district courts are reasonably close together. Far different circumstances prevail in the West where district courts are frequently hundreds of miles apart.

If a claimant's principal place of business were in Los Angeles, for example, and a number of seizures were made in the East, what district would be one of reasonable proximity to the southern district court of California which holds court in Los Angeles? The closest adjoining districts are the northern district of California, located in San Francisco, and the district of Arizona in Phoenix. Each of these two cities is nearly 450 miles from Los Angeles. It is easy to conceive of circumstances where it would be difficult and expensive to properly try a lawsuit 450 miles removed from one's place of business. To take another example, suppose the claimant's principal place of business is in the district of Hawaii and seizures are made in various parts of the continental United States. It would appear that the claimant's only hope would be to have the multiple libels filed in the United States proper, consolidated for trial in either the northern or the southern districts of California, which are some 2,000 miles away from Hawaii.

The proposed amendments to section 304 (a) and (b) therefore seek to make adequate provision whereby a court in which a libel action has been filed may upon proper application consolidate multiple libel proceedings for trial to any district or division thereof. A similar provision is proposed to apply to a single libel proceeding brought under section 304 (a) of the act. It should be noted that under the proposed amendments, transfer of a single libel proceeding or consolidation of multiple libel proceedings to any other district or division is not mandatory, but is discretionary with the court for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice.

The Food and Drug Administration objects strenuously to the proposed

amendments which would authorize transfer for trial to the home district of the claimant. It is asserted that such a procedure would prejudice the Government's case and create false issues where local juries may be intimately bound up with an industry that is on trial. They overemphasize the probability of such a situation arising and overlook the fact that under the proposed bill removal for trial to the home district of the claimant is not automatic but rests solely in the discretion of the court which may order such removal "in the interest of justice," upon motion by the claimant. In the event that the agency feels that in a particular case possible prejudice might arise by transfer to the home district of the claimant, then he could contest any removal motion on the ground that removal would not be in the "interest of justice." The proposed bill would not only relieve some claimants from the onerous burden of trying lawsuits far removed from its home district where the interest of justice requires that the case be tried in some other jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

Experience in the administration and the administrative interpretation of legislation often indicate provisions which require change, revision, and repeal. This is particularly so when it is revealed that the "cold" words of a statute are interpreted by both the administrative agency and the judiciary as bestowing an unlimited and an uncontrollable grant of power which was never in fact contemplated by the Congress and where the administration has pursued a completely arbitrary course of conduct in applying legislation. Fortunately, statutory defects in legislation and administrative abuses of powers granted are soon discovered and the Congress in such instances harnessed the administrators to insure that our Government continues as a government of laws rather that a government according to the whims and caprice of dictatorial men.

Such is the situation in regard to the present so-called multiple seizure provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. As shocking as have been the abuses under these provisions, the courts have denied relief from the arbitrary administrative action on the ground that Congress by certain broad language in the statute, intended to withhold power from the judiciary in such cases. While believing the Federal courts have the inherent power to stop arbitrary administrative action, particularly where such action affects valuable property rights, there is no choice but to accept the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States blaming the Congress for lack of this power to stop this abuse. The administrative abuses of the Food and Drug Administration and the absence of an adequate remedy, compels the Congress to reexamine the so-called multiple seizure provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and furnish a remedy to our people against such abuses. The oppressive and destructive powers must be taken away, I believe. My bill does take these away and ends forever this existing unbridled power to inflict irreparable injury by arbitrary, capricious, and oppressive action. Ours must be a government regulated by the enactment of crystal clear laws in every instance possible and the administration thereof should not cause undeemed arbitrary action so far as the intent of Congress is concerned.

The Battle of Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, you hear a lot about the battle of ideas. One aspect of this is the battle of words. Under the Roosevelt administration there were introduced many terms and initials which became shorthand for agencies, programs, ideas, and categories. These standardized ideas were repeated and repeated through mass media until the public accepted the connotations that the administration wanted them to have. The term "reactionary" was applied to anyone who was not a New Dealer. The concept of conservatism was debunked. Anyone was either a liberal or a reactionary. And the term "liberal," which in Webster's dictionary is defined as "befitting a man of free birth; not restricted; not bound by orthodox tenets or established forms in political or religious philosophy; independent in opinion; not conservative"; was applied to those advocating centralization of power and control in the Federal Government. The New Deal calls its dreamers idealists. That is a misnomer. They are not idealists, but sentimentalists.

It is not only in domestic affairs that these term-makers work. They looked back at Henry Cabot Lodge's opposition to the League of Nations and dubbed him an isolationist. Lodge thought that collective security impotent to stop aggression—see Walter Lippmann's column of January 15, 1951, in the Washington Post. But there has never been a Cabot or a Lodge of Boston with isolationist outlook and he was not isolationist, just doubtful of collective security. Nevertheless, that label of isolationist has stuck. Now that term is again being used to brand anyone who questions the present foreign policy. Rather than answer the honest criticism of its foreign policy by the opposition the administration yells "Isolationist" just as if it meant "Stop, thief."

The apologists for the agrarian reformers—that is, the Chinese Communists—try to defame anyone who champions economic, military, and moral sanctions against the Chinese Communist regime by calling them members of the China lobby. This name implies that these individuals are part of a concerted action and are receiving personal financial benefits for criticizing the Communists. Many of these critics of Chinese Communists have had extensive personal experience in China and are speaking out against what they recognize as a great evil. Yet, they are dubbed lobbyist by the administration, whereas the greatest lobby in this country is the Government lobby which subtly floods the mails and papers with its version of every question.

Now the administration always refers to Russia and her satellite nations. That gives the impression of the great mother star with her little attendant stars revolving around her in reflected glory. Instead they should call Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and others, what they are—slave nations, captured by an imperialistic totalitarianism. This is one instance where the administration has been outsmarted at its own game.

Insults to My Family Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I can fight off below-the-belt attacks I receive from the Commies back home, but it is difficult for members of my family to bear the insults these rats heaped on them in last Sunday's press headline.

My wife and other family members have just as much right to work for me as does any other American citizen.

They are employees in my congressional office, and they will remain in those positions as long as they do satisfactory work and as long as they wish to work and they do work.

They will continue to be paid within the legal limit, just as they have been, on a strictly legal basis.

I am getting sick of the unwarranted attacks and inferences hurled at me and mine every 3 or 4 months by Pravda-minded headline writers whenever the payroll subject comes up.

As long as I serve in Congress, I will hire whom I alone want to work for me.

I run the show in your Congressman's office. If I did not run the show, these Reds would soon overwhelm me, and I would not be serving the people of my district but a handful of chimps.

These insults and smears hamper direct American representation in this district. While Commie headline writers care little for this fact, they should at least direct their abuse in other directions just once in a while.

Rest assured that no stooge of the enemy camp will ever be able to penetrate to a place on my payroll. I suppose that is what they are sore about, not being able to join my office staff, and then to wreck it, thus destroying the painstaking, thorough, quick, and efficient service which Americans of our section have become accustomed to.

There are six hard-working people on my congressional payroll. They are qualified to be there because they have

taken an oath to defend our Constitution and that they are not members of the Communist Party.

That is more than the chimps can say who were responsible for insulting my wife and family.

A Few Tax Tips to Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Fred Othman can make even tragic things sound almost funny. His needling of the administration in this particular instance is a masterpiece:

A FEW TAX TIPS TO TRUMAN
(By Fred Othman)

I'll be a good deal happier about paying my share of the $4,000,000,000 extra income taxes President Truman wants if this Government goes a little easy on buying sterling-silver finger bowls with gadroon borders for dainty-eating admirals.

Fancy dinner service for the big brass is a small matter maybe, but if I'm to make sacrifices, I'll be pleased if the Government makes a few small ones, too.

The sea-going finger bowls I learned about accidentally awhile back when a batch of them came up for sale as wartime surplus. They are just the beginning of economies among the Federals that I'll be thinking about on March 15.

I'll be delighted to learn that the Bureau of Standards never again will spend $1,000 per acre to beautify its front lawns; plain grass ought to be good enough during the emergency. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation can quit financing snake farms if it wants to maintain my high regard; it also can be a little more careful about investing my money in the juke-box business.

I trust the Federal Trade Commission will spend no more of its valuable time tossing encyclopedias into the air to see whether they bounce or break when they hit the floor. The Agriculture Department can quit publishing treaties on how to crack nuts without cracking your knuckles. This is a good thing to know, I will admit, but in times like these I believe nut crackers can be educated by cruel experience.

Uncle Samuel also would make me happier if he cut down a little on the black limousines for bigwigs and the four-engine flying machines for generals.

Then there is the matter of the President's $50,000-a-year expense account, which is tax free and for which he need make no accounting to the Internal Revenue Bureau. Congressmen have similar expense accounts, but for only $2,500 each.

There has been considerable criticism about these on the theory that if anybody else tried to get away with such a swindle sheet, he'd probably go to jail.

My own feeling is that the President and the lawgivers ought to be paid enough so that they could remit to the tax collector, like the rest of us. Their defenders insist that their expenses are so heavy, largely for entertaining visiting firemen (which is nondeductible), that they deserve to be treated different from other citizens.

There can be no defense of Federal clerks with little or nothing to do. This is a hard one to prove, but a friend of mine from a farm college some months ago had to visit the Agriculture Department. He was amazed. He said he never had seen so many feet on so many desks; he suggested that I take a stroll through the endless corridors and see for myself. I did and wrote a piece about it.

This resulted in considerable bitterness—my mail for awhile was too hot even for asbestos gloves—and the next time I called at the Agriculture Department the doors to all the offices were closed. The feet no longer were on view.

You see how it is, bureaucrats. I'll be thinking about you, every one, when I write that check for the tax collectors. You can help to make it hurt a little less.

India's Grain Request Delicate Problem for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I am quoting an article by James Daniel, columnist, discussing India's grain request, as follows:

INDIA'S GRAIN REQUEST
(By James Daniel)

Congress seems to be in a show-me mood on India's request for a gift of $180,000,000 worth of United States wheat to avert a threatened famine in that country.

If Congress, after a thorough study of the facts, is convinced that—

1. India's food shortage is real;
2. Is the result of natural causes; and
3. Cannot be met by increased importations of grain paid for in cash or by barter—

Then the gift of wheat is likely to be voted.

On the other hand, if Congress concludes that—

1. India's food shortage has been aggravated by the Indian Government's own ill-advised policies, or
2. Could be offset by using other cash or credit resources available to India—

Then India's request probably will be rejected.

The search for facts was begun yesterday when a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives called at the White House. They wanted to do something about the uproar created when the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee recently sidetracked a suggestion to help India, apparently because of disapproval of India's appeasement of Red China.

In a letter requesting the conference, the Congressmen told President Truman they were united in believing that it would be in the interest of the United States to help prevent a catastrophe in India—"within the reasonable limits of our capacities."

Moreover, they said they all believed that the desire to help the Indian people did not in any way lessen our opposition to India's foreign policy. Nor, they said, did their opposition to India's attitude on China lessen the desire to help the Indian people.

But beyond this, the White House conference showed some uncertainties as to the facts in the Indian matter.

Among questions asked were these:

1. Is it true, as reported, that India has been buying overseas grain at a higher cost than Pakistan, a surplus food area, has been offering it to India? The Pakistanis have so charged. The Indians reply that Pakistan has been unable to meet her grain commitments to other countries.

2. Is it true, as reported, that India has increased her cotton and jute acreage, which Pakistan formerly produced for the whole subcontinent, in order to carry out a boycott of Pakistan products? The Pakistanis have charged that actual food acreage has been diverted; the Indians admit their cotton and jute acreage has been subtantially increased.

3. Why won't India trade the United States raw materials such as manganese in return for grain? More than a year ago, when the Indian request was first made, the State Department suggested such a swap. But the Indians were not interested. They are now our principal source of manganese, the vital steel ingredient. And we are their principal customer. But they want cash for everything they sell to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I think the question of a barter of wheat for manganese would be to the mutual advantage of both the United States and India. India needs wheat, we need manganese. So why not? The United States has already assisted India to the extent of $200,000,000, and as one who has opposed many of our altruistic programs, I think it is preposterous to consider giving India, or for that matter other countries, $200,000,000 more gratitiously, be it wheat or money.

The resources of the United States are limited, and by our past largesse we have already weakened our strength, and in view of our defense preparedness program, I do not see how our economy can bear any further dissipation of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a discussion of the request of India for 2,000,000 tons of food grains by Mr. Creston B. Mullins, columnist, where Mr. Mullins states:

INDIA'S FOOD SHORTAGE CREATES DELICATE PROBLEM FOR AMERICA—FAR-REACHING POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS ARE INVOLVED IN REQUEST FOR GRAIN

(By Creston B. Mullins)

Congress soon may receive one of the most controversial proposals for foreign aid it has ever been called on to consider, when legislation is introduced to provide 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India.

The matter already is heavily overlaid with powerful political considerations which may delay, if not defeat, action on Capitol Hill. Prime Minister Nehru's leadership of the fight against branding Red China the aggressor in Korea will be remembered.

On the other hand, assisting the prospective legislation on its way through both Houses of Congress will be recognition of India's extremely powerful position among the Asian peoples and the necessity to avoid doing anything which resembles retaliation or deprivation of needy Indians of the food they will have to obtain abroad if famine is to be averted.

In response to India's formal request for 2,000,000 tons of grain, American Government agencies are now engaged in an intensive study of all phases of such a relief measure. The factors being inquired into are manifold and extremely complicated. What exactly is India's food situation? Is there real or only potential danger of starvation? Does 2,000,000 tons represent the actual need? Can India reasonably be expected to pay for such a quantity of grain—the value of which will run between $150,000,000 and $200,000,000—even if long-term credits are provided? Or would it be better to make an outright grant-in-aid and avoid the ill-feeling and recriminations which accompany pressure to collect a bill that may be defaulted?

UNCERTAINTIES AND FACTS

Furthermore, can the American Government readily spare such a quantity of grain? If so, what problems of transportation are involved? With our pressure on Europe to do more for its own rearmament, what demand will be made on America to make up loss of food production through diversion of manpower into war industries?

Congress will want to be satisfied both on the wisdom of rallying to India's assistance after what Americans regard as her strange behavior at the United Nations, and on the international political aspects of leaving susceptible to Russian intervention a sore spot in Asia.

Congress will want to be satisfied not only on the extent of the natural calamities which the Indian government claims are responsible for the plight of its people, but also on the character and extent of any man-made factors which have contributed to the food shortage.

There will be close scrutiny, too, of India's economic conflict with Pakistan and whether American food aid at this time would weight the scales against India's relatively small Moslem neighbor—population 80 million—which won partition from India in 1947.

In the maze of uncertainties which beset the whole problem, certain facts are clear. There is no question that there has been a series of natural calamities which have cut into India's own food production. There is no question about the existence of a food shortage, although no famine yet. There is no question that India has had to import vastly more food this year than it usually imports.

Outside these few certainties, however, the field is open and the path of the searcher for facts is beset with booby-traps of all kinds.

PARTITION BOOSTED DEFICIT

In support of its request for American food the Indian government presents a case substantially as follows:

The people of India—now totaling 350,000,000 and increasing at the rate of 4,000,000 annually—consume each year approximately 46,000,000 tons of food grains—wheat, rice, millet, corn, barley, and "gran," which is something like split peas. Indian diets vary widely, but the great basic staple food for everyone is grain.

India produces large quantities of each of the grains it needs, but the annual output of forty-three or forty-four million tons, in good crop years, is two or three million tons short of requirements.

Even before partition in 1947 India imported food. But before Pakistan was created out of the Moslem areas the country was more nearly self-sufficient. Agricultural areas which now comprise Pakistan were then part of India's food-producing machinery.

After partition, which assigned to Pakistan important wheat- and rice-growing areas, India's deficit in grain increased to about 2,000,000 tons a year and it was forced to lean more heavily on foreign—including Pakistan—sources of food. However, immediately after partition India set forth on a program to wipe out the food deficit by the end of 1951. As recently as 2 years ago progress had been so good that success was believed in sight.

A widespread program of intensified agricultural production was set in motion. This included reclamation of waste land, irrigation projects to put those lands into production, accelerated production of fertilizers, seed improvement, and hybridization of grains. Official figures for the 1949–50 crop year show an increase of 6,000,000 acres over the previous year in land devoted to food production, and an increase of 1,000,000 acres in that devoted to jute and cotton.

When Britain devalued the pound September 18, 1949, India, like many other countries, followed suit. Pakistan, however, being in an excellent financial condition in spite of its infancy as a nation, did not devalue its rupee. Consequently, prices of Pakistan's exports in terms of the Indian rupee rose between 30 and 40 percent. India immediately ceased buying Pakistan's food grains, jute and cotton. This loss of the Indian market, however, did not force Pakistan to devalue, and the Karachi Government has disposed of its agricultural surpluses in other foreign markets.

ELEMENTS CUT HARVEST

India obtained food imports elsewhere, too. The latter part of 1950 saw the occurrence of certain natural disorders which cut deeply into Indian food production and roughly tripled the amount of food which must be obtained from foreign sources this year.

A great earthquake occurred in Assam, in Northwest India. It was weeks before full reports of the disaster reached the outside world. Indian government officials now report that the quake caused extensive destruction of croplands. Later in the year local floods in many areas conspired with larger-than-usual swarms of locusts and partial failure of the monsoon in southern India to reduce grain crops even further.

The result was that when the winter harvest was in, India found itself seriously short of food. In addition, the natural disorders which hit the winter harvest also will reduce the smaller spring harvest, mainly wheat, which begins in May.

The net result was calculated by India's food ministry. On the basis of actual and anticipated loss, India will be short 6,000,000—not 2,000,000—tons of grain this year, with no relief in sight until next winter's harvest comes in.

India has a complex system of food rationing for its town and city population. For Indians it is a 12-month-a-year ration, for others it lasts only 4 months of the year. The provincial governments operate the ration system on policies set and supplies provided by the central government in New Delhi.

Of India's 350 million people, roughly one-third—110 millions who live in the cities and towns—are on full or partial ration. This was 12 ounces of food grains a day, substantially below the 16 ounces a day considered standard for Indians. Two weeks ago the daily ration was slashed to 9 ounces. Most Indians do not live entirely on this ration, but supplement it according to their means and dietary habits.

Further reduction of the ration for town and city dwellers is regarded as impossible by Indian officials. The rationing machinery, operating with present supplies, is not suited for expansion to take on the burden of millions of new beneficiaries, i.e., the marginal groups from the food-growing districts which have been worst hit by the natural calamities.

CRITICAL MONTHS AHEAD

The prospect for Indian officials is grim. The months of greatest emergency will be August, September, and October, when present food stocks run low and the new harvest is not yet in. It is in this period that the Indians fear a repetition of the great Bengal famine of 1943, which is reported to have taken—directly and indirectly—more than 3,500,000 lives.

India has attempted to deal with this year's 6,000,000-ton deficit in food grains with the means at hand for purchase abroad. It has contracted in world markets for the delivery during the rest of this crop year of 4,000,000 tons. It has not been able, however, to finance, with its strained foreign exchange resources, the purchase of the remaining 2,000,000 tons which, it contends, would save the lives of many who may die of starvation.

Indian estimates are that as many as 7,000,000 lives may be jeopardized by the growing shortage of food. Present calculated shortages, caused by natural phenomena, may be aggravated if growing uncertainties over the future cause producers to hold back on deliveries out of present stocks.

Not all of India's contentions with regard to existing conditions—and their causes—go unchallenged. The charge has frequently been made recently—even by those who concede the seriousness of potential famine conditions—that not all of India's troubles are the work of Mother Nature and that India's own policies have reduced to a considerable extent the availability of food from foreign sources.

Although the Government of Pakistan has not intervened officially against an American grant-in-aid of food grains to India, Pakistan officials are outspoken in their criticism of the pending Indian appeal and the prospects that the request will be granted.

Pakistan claims an interest in the situation because of the loss of its traditional markets for its jute, cotton, wheat, and rice in India. Although it has succeeded in selling its surpluses in other world markets, it feels the dislocation seriously and considers that the Indian government has gone out of its way to destroy its natural market.

Pakistan's complaint is based on the failure of India to purchase 600,000 tons of wheat which was surplus from its 1950 crop and which, the Pakistanis contend, was offered to the New Delhi government at prices well below the world market.

Although the price may have been substantially higher than before devaluation, the Pakistanis say, it was still lower than the price India finally paid for Australian and Argentine grain. This is adduced as evidence of Indian ill-will toward Pakistan and of a determination to throttle Pakistan's economy even if it costs India money.

Pakistan asserts that it now has a surplus of 350,000 tons of rice which India could purchase to help meet its food deficit, and it anticipates a surplus of 150,000 tons out of the coming wheat crop this May and June.

Another Pakistan argument is that India, striving desperately to make itself independent of Pakistan's jute and cotton, has diverted to these crops portions of reclaimed lands which could have been used for food production.

PAKISTAN'S ANGLE

The sum and substance of the Pakistan contention is that if India is threatened with famine it is due, in part at least, to India's own economic war which it has waged against Pakistan since partition, and that any American grant of food to India would put this country's resources behind India's campaign to throttle Pakistan economically.

Pakistan's interest is that of any merchant who hates to see a paying customer go on relief when he could still pay for his food. It is not clear yet, in the minds of American Government agencies, whether India could be reasonably expected to pay for food she may get from this country. Her financial situation is still under study.

The Indians have expressed a preference to pay. Two hundred million dollars, however, is a heavy drain on a country with India's resources in foreign exchange, and she could repay such a sum only over a period of years. Long-term credits in payment of food which is to be immediately consumed is not a good business proposition.

That is why the present trend of American official thinking is toward a grant-in-aid rather than a sale on extended payments.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the foregoing statement by Mr. Mullins brings out facts and important information on the question under discussion, and I will follow this statement by reading another letter from Mr. J. J. Singh, president, India League of America, of

New York, published in the Washington Star of this date and which gives a viewpoint and other pertinent facts in connection with the request from India to this country for 2,000,000 tons of wheat.

Mr. Singh states:

WHY INDIA MUST HAVE GRAIN FROM US

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Zulfequar Ali, in his letter which appeared in your paper of February 1, says that India's request to the United States for 2,000,000 tons of wheat should be looked upon from a humanitarian point of view because "human beings, wherever they may be, must be saved from starvation and famine."

He adds, however, that in connection with India's request for food grains from the United States, the "food position of India's neighboring areas should be studied. Burma has been a large exporter of rice. Pakistan is another area surplus in food."

It is true that, before World War II, Burma used to export large quantities of rice and India was one of her best customers. However, with the conquest of Burma by the Japanese, all import of food grains into India from Burma during the last war was stopped. And, unfortunately, ever since the end of the war, Burma has been afflicted with internal crisis. This conflict has greatly diminished the rice-exporting capacity of Burma.

However, the Indian Government has been able to make arrangements with the Burmese Government for importation of 50,000 tons of rice. That is all that Burma could spare. But India faces a shortage of 6,000,000 tons. So it can be easily seen that India cannot get enough food from Burma for her needs.

With regard to surplus food in Pakistan, Mr. Ali perhaps does not know that west Punjab, which usually has surplus wheat and for a long time has been considered the breadbasket of northern India, unfortunately suffered a tremendous loss of food, particularly wheat, because of unprecedented flood conditions in the summer of 1950. Pakistan just does not have any food whatsoever for export purposes.

Pakistan had contracted to supply 300,000 tons of wheat to Japan and a lesser quantity to West Germany, which contract she is now unable to fulfill. On October 18, 1950, the Pakistan Government issued a communiqué which clearly stated that there is no surplus food available for export in Pakistan.

Mr. Ali, who presumably comes from Pakistan, says that "while India claims paucity of funds to feed its population, it is spending millions upon millions of dollars on the purchase of arms and explosives, not against any external aggressor, but with only Pakistan in mind."

In 1950 India spent approximately $2,750,000 in the United States on military stores. And these military stores did not contain any arms and explosives, but consisted of spare parts for American vehicles, including trucks, Red Cross units, etc., that India bought from the United States war-surplus stocks. Compare this figure with $41,400,000 that India spent on food grains in the United States in the last 4 months of 1950, and further compare it to the $120,000,000 India is planning to spend for buying food grains in the United States in the first 3 months of 1951.

It is true that India spends almost 50 percent of her national budget on defense purposes. (Pakistan spends about 65 percent.) Under normal world conditions criticism for such heavy expenditures on defense would be legitimate. But with the world situation as it is today, and with India's borders exposed as they have never been before in her history, India can ill afford to reduce her defense expenditures. I suggest that even if there were no friction whatsoever between Pakistan and India, the new danger to her borders will force India to spend the same amount which she is spending today, and perhaps more.

The actual food situation in India is most critical. The Government of India has been forced to cut its basic ration from 12 ounces to 9 ounces—900 calories a day for an adult. If this situation is not alleviated, it will undoubtedly result in death by starvation for thousands, and great suffering for millions more.

Reports from India indicate that American observers in India and Indian friends of the United States are convinced that a generous response from the United States to the appeal of India would be the most effective demonstration that the United States could make to the Asian peoples of its altruistic intentions.

I would like to add that nationals of India living in the United States, like myself, to whom this has become a second motherland, and thousands of American friends of India in this country, most sincerely hope that this opportunity will not be lost to create stronger bonds of friendship and understanding between the people of India and the people of the United States.

J. J. SINGH,
President, India League of America.
NEW YORK.

Mr. Speaker, I have placed this discussion before the House, as I believe that it will be of interest to the Members, in view of this matter being probably submitted for consideration in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are humanitarian and generous, and we have demonstrated this fact time and again; however, as much as this country is willing to help others, under present circumstances, and in the present situation, and in view of the billions that our Government has given away to other countries all over the world, I do not see how we can be expected to continue to give away the resources of our country any further. As General Eisenhower well said a few days ago, "The United States cannot carry the rest of the world on its shoulders."

Salute to a Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Salute to a Hero, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of January 28, 1951:

SALUTE TO A HERO

Last fall, in Soviet-occupied East Germany, Hermann Joseph Flade was arrested for distributing leaflets urging people to vote against the Communists. Placed on "trial" as an "enemy of the state," he upset all the expectations of the Red "court." He refused to grovel before it. He refused to be cowed into saying that he had done wrong. He refused to go through the rigmarole of reviling himself and glorifying his persecutors over the broadcasting system that had been set up to carry his words to the public.

Instead, reminded by the "court" that he might be sentenced to death for the "crime" of advocating votes against the Reds, Hermann Joseph Flade—18 years old, just out of his boyhood—declared in a clear, strong voice, "I love my freedom more than my life." Whereupon, greatly embarrassed by the fact that his words got on the air before the loud speakers could be silenced, his "judges" condemned him to be beheaded. That was about 2 weeks ago. In the meantime, his story has been spread throughout the whole of Germany, and demonstrations have been staged both to honor his bravery and to protest against the decision to execute him. And up to now, as if inhibited by the popular reaction, the puppet Communist authorities have deferred the act of decapitation.

The probability is, of course, that Hermann Joseph Flade will be put to death in a little while. Be that as it may, however, he has already achieved, in his own way and despite his brief span of life, a kind of immortality. A German Patrick Henry, he has earned the right to a high and permanent place of honor, not merely in the history of his own country but in the larger history of mankind's age-old struggle for liberty. Let us salute him. Let free men everywhere be inspired by his shining example to stand firm, without ever wavering, against the vile system that seeks to devour all who dare to be Flades.

IV–F Athletes and the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present a telegram from Hon. Don Ewing, associate editor of the Shreveport Times, and an editorial taken from the Shreveport Times of Sunday, February 4, 1951. Both of these documents are self-explanatory.

The telegram is as follows:

SHREVEPORT, LA., *February 6, 1951.*
Representative OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Regarding Tittle editorial, he has informed Times that football league announcement that he is now IV–F was in error and that he is III–A, being married and having a child. He was IV–F in War II from chronic bronchial asthma, but during part of time at L. S. U. was not eligible for draft because he had not reached the age. We brought this out in editorial Sunday. I have put story on Associated Press, stating content of second editorial, and will forward you copy of editorial. It might be that you would want to insert second editorial or withdraw first editorial from final permanent publication in RECORD. Tittle case still offers good example of points at issue, but editorial does put him in unjust light, due to original misinformation from professional football league announcements which had listed him as IV–F now.

DON EWING.

The editorial is as follows:

IV–F ATHLETES AND THE DRAFT

Defense Department insistence that 18-year-olds must be drafted to meet manpower needs has more or less automatically centered public attention on professional and

amateur athletes who are classified as IV-F because of inability to meet Armed Forces physical standards, although perhaps able to buck a football line, hit a home run, or serve repeated aces in tennis.

Most of these men obviously could serve their country well in behind-the-lines posts even if unable, through chronic affliction of some kind, to meet the standards for combat service. But until very recently the Armed Forces have made no physical differentiation between physical fitness for combat duty and physical fitness for noncombat duty. That fact is partly responsible for whatever need now may exist to go outside of present manpower draft pools.

Unfortunately, this situation—which is purely one of laws made by Congress and administrative regulations made by the Armed Forces—has caused IV-F's to be placed, in the minds of some, in the usually undeserved light of trying to avoid military service when the fact is that they have nothing to say about it. There is no reflection on any IV-F through being a IV-F. No IV-F classified himself. Draft boards did that, and they acted under laws and regulations not of their making, either.

The case of Y. A. Tittle, former LSU star quarterback and professional football player since 1948, illustrates some of the points involved. Acting on broadcast announcements from professional football sources that Tittle had been taken by the San Francisco Forty-niners when his former team, the Baltimore Colts, disbanded, and that he was considered a desirable acquisition because of being classified IV-F, the Times recently used him as typical of athletes who cannot get into military service though able to earn a living in physical-contact vocations. As a public figure in the professional athletic world, and a past public figure in the LSU football world, he was subject to public discussion, and it was specifically pointed out that the reason he could not get into service was because he was one of the victims of laws and regulations which were not of his making and which he could not surmount.

Actually, the Tittle case turned out to be an unjustified example, as that athlete himself now has pointed out to the Times in a frank discussion of the matter. Tittle was only 17 years old when he first played at LSU in World War II. Most of his LSU football service was either when he was ineligible for draft by age or would not have been called because of the end of the war—entirely aside from physical exemption. Actually, Tittle was not given a draft classification until February 1945, when he was put in IV-F by a Dallas, Tex., board which certainly had no reason to want to help LSU athletically, and the end of the war then was only a few months away. (He is a Texan.) Tittle has been a victim of chronic asthma since he was 3 years old—he now is 25—and has to take "shots" before each gridiron game; sometimes during a game he has to be signaled to be taken out for another "shot."

Actually, the professional football publicity announcements that Tittle is IV-F in the present draft are incorrect for he now is III-A—married and with a child. There seems little question that Tittle is one of the many now exempted who would do most anything to get into service, but probably never will get there. The Times, of course, regrets that misinformation from seemingly official sources caused it to place him in the forefront in an undeserved manner in an issue of great public interest.

All of his detail is essential in fairness to Tittle, but it does not alter the fact that the Armed Forces philosophy that everyone in uniform must be physically fit, figuratively, to march 40 miles and tear a tiger apart at the end of the march is both wrong and unfair. There are nearly a million young men now classified as IV-F. Unquestionably a great portion of them are physically fit to take behind-the-lines uniformed posts and, as has been stated in these columns before, would like to be in uniform and out of IV-F. Putting them in service would release a comparable number of men, now in uniform, for combat duty. And, it probably would enhance rather than depreciate over-all efficiency in the Armed Forces, for many of the IV-F's may have especial qualifications which the Armed Forces need in noncombat posts.

Actually, the entire matter of IV-F athletes is minor. They form a very tiny part of the nearly million men now listed IV-F.

The whole point is that a IV-F system that, by Federal law or Armed Forces regulations, bars men capable of normally earning a living in normal civilian occupations from similar uniformed occupations is unfair to the IV-F's, to other young men of the day, and even to the military itself. It is wrong all the way through.

The Defense Department now states that it will reclassify many IV-F's through altering physical standards to permit them to serve in posts they are capable of filling. Brig. Gen. Raymond Hufft has announced that in Louisiana there will be a reexamination and reclassification for men rejected for educational reasons—with acceptance of those with 9 years of school regardless of their grades on aptitude tests. All of this is on the good side—for everyone concerned. In the meantime the IV-F problem needs more study and perhaps more action—but with realization from all that it's the Washington authorities and not the IV-F's who are to blame for whatever ills exists.

Idea of War Without Profit Uninspiring to Our Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, because of the penetrating insight, carefull analysis, and vivid interpretation, I include in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of January 28, 1951:

IDEA OF WAR WITHOUT PROFIT UNINSPIRING TO OUR ALLIES—ANALYST HOLDS MERCENARY ANGLE MAY BE REASON FOR DEFENSE APATHY IN EUROPE

(By Constantine Brown)

In World Wars I and II America was looked on by the nations which fought the aggression of the Central Powers and the Axis as the savior of western democracy.

At the time these wars started we had not committed ourselves to any action or assistance. Statesmen of the allied countries rushed to Washington to beg us to intervene. They pointed out that by our inactivity we would permit these forces of destruction to rule the world.

We eventually joined the Allies, in both wars, on condition that they make no territorial or other kind of profit from the blood which American boys would shed on foreign battlefields.

Now, when world war III is under way in Korea, we who have committed ourselves to defend the remnants of western civilization have to beg, cajole, and plead with our allies to prepare themselves to meet the new threat. The response, to say the least, is hesitating and weak.

The reason for this attitude is not alone the war weariness of most of our western allies and their discouragement after two heavy bloodlettings between 1914 and 1945. The real reason seems to be the failure of political leaders and the people themselves in Western Europe to see profit for themselves in another conflagration. And when they weigh the alternatives—rule for a generation or two by native Communists under Moscow's control, or physical resistance to a Russian onslaught with its inevitable losses in human life and property—they seem inclined toward the former.

This was made very clear to this reporter during a 4-month trip through Western Europe in the late fall of 1948. Politicians, men in the liberal professions, factory workers, farmers, and shopkeepers joined in similar expressions. In Germany the slogan heard incessantly was "Ohne uns" (without us). In France and the Benelux countries the refrain was that the next conflict will be between America and Russia. Western Europe could gain nothing but utter destruction by becoming involved in the struggle between the two giants.

PHILOSOPHY OPPOSES OURS

From many letters and other communications received since there seems to be even less enthusiasm for any "military adventure" among the peoples of continental Europe than there was a year ago. The Allied governments undoubtedly told General Eisenhower that they could mobilize some forces—about 40 divisions—within the next 2 or 3 years, provided American ground-aid air forces are sent in sufficient numbers to create a protective wall against an immediate Russian onslaught on Western Europe.

Whether these Prime Ministers and Defense Ministers, whose terms of office depend entirely on the temper of the man in the street, have been able to assure General Eisenhower that they express the temper of the public is another question. General Eisenhower will tell his story to the executive and legislative branches of our Government when he returns to Washington.

The philosophy of the Europeans regarding war is opposed to our own. For centuries the peoples of the world have waged wars for profit. Victory meant territorial expansion, indemnity money, and loot for the soldiers. Wars were considered like duels—gentlemen's affairs. Soldiers fought, but the civilian population, by and large, suffered relatively little. Since 1914, however, war has shed this gentlemanly aspect. Weapons of destruction have become more damaging to everybody, and civilian populations have suffered in many cases as much as soldiers.

SOVIET GOT THE SPOILS

By our participation in the European wars we introduced a new element. We attempted to remove the element of national profit. We were not particularly successful after World War I.

As a gesture toward the American people and their idealistic President, Woodrow Wilson, the Allies did not demand that the defeated Central Powers pay a war indemnity. This was camouflaged, however, under the more palatable name of "reparations." There were no direct annexations of enemy territory. These were called "mandates over backward areas."

The Allies, who disbelieved our lack of desire for territorial expansion, offered us the German possessions in the Pacific, the Marianas, Marshall, and Caroline Islands. We proudly turned them down, and they were turned over to the Japanese. In World War II the blood of 100,000 Americans was shed to remove the Japanese from these islands, which they had turned into fortresses.

But the British, the French, the newly created Polish Republic, and others who fought the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires got their pound of flesh. By and large, World War I was remunerative to the victors—except for America, which footed the bill.

World War II was more bitter and destructive than the first. At the end there was

only one actual victor—Russia. Britain and the Netherlands lost many of their colonies, which became free and independent nations. France inevitably became a second-rate power.

We occupied Japan—a financially costly proposition—but Russia obtained vast territories. She arbitrarily took over Eastern Germany, which is of little consequence in itself. But we gave her the green light to bring under the Kremlin's yoke entire nations—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria in Europe and the entire territory extending from the Urals to the Pacific Ocean in Asia. No nation in history has ever gained as much territory—containing hundreds of millions of people and untold natural resources—as Russia gained after World War II.

Our gain has been involuntarily, but succinctly, expressed by Gen. Mark Clark when, after the occupation of Naples, he was asked by a skeptical Italian what we expected to get out of this war. He replied: "All we hope to gain is a spot to bury our dead." And, indeed, that is all we obtained at the end of World War II—burial places for hundreds of thousands of Americans killed in the crusade to destroy despotism.

Unfortunately, we did not realize—all of us—that we had helped create a far worse and unhuman kind of oriental despotism, which now threatens our national existence.

NO PROFITS IN SIGHT

No wonder that there is a layer of idealism among the American people which cannot be matched by our friends across the Atlantic. With their background it is little wonder that the Europeans, especially the members of the Atlantic Pact, have been slow in responding to our frantic appeal to rearm against the threat from the Moscow dictators. There is nothing in this new war for them which even vaguely can be described as profit.

When the United Nations decreed last June that the North Korean aggression must be repelled, the American people did not hesitate to approve the order given by President Truman for our forces to move into Korea. The fact that 90 percent of the western forces in the UN police action were American did not bother the people of this country. Nor did they complain over the 50,000 casualties which we have suffered in a faraway land in which our only interest is the United Nations' interest.

Our people know that this heavy toll—to which must be added an expenditure of $14,000,000,000 up to December 1—will yield no profit except the knowledge that we are ready to stand against an aggressor regardless of cost.

Our Government and our country are willing to make far greater sacrifices to prepare Europe to resist aggression and maintain its liberties.

There is only one proviso in this picture. That is that the peoples of Europe themselves must share our willingness to make the utmost sacrifices so that future generations may remain free.

A Letter to Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the reading of my colleagues an editorial in the February 4, 1951, issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, which takes the form of an open letter to General Eisenhower.

Neither in his appearance before a joint meeting of Members of Congress nor in his subsequent public appearances did Eisenhower make the slightest effort to provide answers to the searching and pertinent questions set forth in this editorial.

When Eisenhower appeared before the Members of the House and Senate, he said this:

I do not believe * * * that the United States can pick up the world on its economic, financial, and material shoulders and carry it.

Yet, a few moments later he seemed to imply that Marshall-plan aid—on which we have already spent nearly $40,000,000,000—should be continued, and he left no doubt that he would urge the giving of vast quantities of military equipment to Western European nations.

A few hours later, before a congressional committee, he urged the sending of additional American divisions to Europe, the transportation and maintenance of which, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, would fall upon the shoulders of American taxpayers.

I have said, and I restate it here, that General Eisenhower gave Members of Congress and the American people, hungry for facts, a treatment in the form of glib generalities. The following questions can and should be answered now:

OPEN LETTER TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

DEAR GENERAL: The American people have confidence in your integrity, your judgment, and your sincere desire to protect the security of this country. Upon your return to the United States from an inspection trip abroad you declared (1) that the defense of Western Europe is essential to the defense of America, and (2) that there exists a firm will to resist Communist aggression among these Western European nations.

Therefore, you advocate sending American divisions to Europe to stiffen this will to resist and shipment of American equipment to arm the troops to be trained there.

Perhaps we should be willing to take policy decisions on faith and accept the sacrifices and hazards involved if our leaders declare these things necessary and wise. Certainly you have more authoritative information than we citizens can acquire and you are trained by education and experience to assess a military situation.

Yet the tragic and largely futile entanglement in Korea proves that military and political leaders do make serious blunders and that public doubts about the wisdom of a policy seriously weaken the Government in carrying it out. We therefore believe that the American people are entitled to the answers to certain questions which inevitably arise in connection with the sending of American troops in considerable numbers to Europe. Some of these questions are:

1. Key unions of Italy, France, and certain other countries are controlled by Communists. Is there any effective way to counter the national paralysis that would inevitably result in case Russia attacked?

2. Western Europe is one of the most advanced industrial areas in the world with a total capacity exceeding that of Russia and her satellites. How does it happen that such an area cannot provide its own arms for defense? Is it because the governments and peoples involved are unwilling to make the necessary sacrifices?

3. Britain and other European countries have plainly indicated that they want to recognize and do business with the Communist government in China. Are we compelled to furnish arms and troops for the defense of Europe while the countries involved will not even support us diplomatically in guarding essential American security in the Pacific?

4. Since Western Europe possesses such an immense military potential in comparison to the danger that confronts it, why cannot these countries at least build defenses capable of withstanding the first shock of a Russian attack? From the physical standpoint they are fully capable of doing that. What about morale?

Frankly, we do not believe that you or anyone else has answered such questions as these satisfactorily. We think they ought to be answered before any large troop commitments are made. It is notoriously bad military strategy to tie defense to that of countries which are not resolutely determined to defend themselves to the death.

Your prestige plus the political power of the administration will be sufficient to carry through the policy which you outline. But there would be much more solid public support if more detailed answers were given to the questions asked above. The public is willing to be convinced. But we do not believe it has yet received the conclusive evidence of European determination to resist that is needed to eliminate lingering and disquieting doubts about the wisdom of the administration's policy.

For Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from a recent issue of Aerie, concerning the Four Chaplains.

This is so important that President Truman appeared personally and gave his blessings upon them:

FOR FOUR CHAPLAINS

On the corner of Broad and Berks Streets, in the city of Philadelphia, workmen are completing a unique chapel. There on the campus of Temple University is to stand a Nation's shrine to the dream of human brotherhood.

You, as an Eagle, will have a part and place in that unique chapel of interfaith understanding. For your Aerie and the other lodges in Eagledom have the chance to join in an Eagle contribution that will erect and pay for the main chapel entrance, above which is to burn the eternal light of brotherhood and good will.

This Chapel of the Four Chaplains honors the four clergymen of three faiths, who, when the *Dorchester* was torpedoed in the North Atlantic, gave their life belts to the enlisted men and "arms linked as they steadied themselves in prayer" went down with the ship. For their heroic sacrifice, these men of the faiths were posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. The Chapel of the Four Chaplains, which the Eagles are privileged to participate in erecting, honors these four men who died to show all how men should live.

With its symbolical depicting of the three great faiths of our people—Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Hebrew—this living memorial exemplifies the need for solidarity among those who believe in the spiritual dignity of

mankind and the right of individuals to live in freedom and self-respect. Located in the City of Brotherly Love, it will be a shrine for a whole nation. Just as the Eagles chose a living memorial—the Eagles Memorial Foundation—to honor the members who fought and died in the wars of our Nation, and more recently took the lead in seeking a continuing tribute to the Secret Service men who die or risk death protecting our country and its public personalities, so the Eagles join in a living shrine to the memory of the four gallant chaplains who went down with the *Dorchester*.

When your aerie decides what it will give to the building of the universal entrance and erection of the eternal light at the chapel of the four chaplains, you will have to balance what you can afford to donate against what you'd like to do for so worthy a cause. Philadelphia aerie led off the parade with a gift of $1,000. Since the goal of the campaign is $25,000, far more modest donations from other aeries will take the drive over the top. But whether you give $10 or $100 or $1,000, your contribution will will be an appreciated one, for your aerie will become a partner in a most worth-while undertaking. You will join the poet, Joseph Auslander, in perpetuating the epic story of which he wrote:

"Four men of God put out to sea;
(Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode)
Their God was one, though their faiths were three;
And the men who worshiped their God were free
Where the cross and the star together stood.
Four men of God went down to sea,
(Washington, Poling, Fox, and Goode)
Bound by a passion for liberty
And a burning faith that keeps men free
In the bond of human brotherhood."

Address of Very Reverend Edward G. Jacklin, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Very Reverend Edward G. Jacklin, S. J., President, at the alumni dinner opening the centenary year of St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, 1851–1951:

May it please your excellencies, Right Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, honored guests, Sons of St. Joseph's, Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, tonight as we celebrate the opening of the centenary of St. Joseph's College I should like to express in the name of the college our deep appreciation and thanks to the guests who honor us with their distinguished presence this evening and to the alumni to whose generosity and devotion we owe this memorial hall. I should also like to express my warm gratitude to the very active president of the alumni association, Mr. Joseph P. Tully; to Mr. Joseph Trainer and his committees, and last but not least to the lovely and indefatigable ladies of the Bellarmine Guild, all of whom have worked so hard and so ably in staging this memorable opening of our centenary year. I should also like to express my deep personal appreciation to three past distinguished Presidents of St. Joseph's College, Father Talion, Father Love, and Father Long for their kindness in being with us this evening. No doubt they will share my sentiments when I say the quickest and most bewildering way to become a prominent citizen overnight, through no fault of one's own, is to be named the president of a college.

I am grateful too to detect in the audience this evening a number of faces of friends and classmates of mine, some of whom I have not had the pleasure of seeing in 27 years. As I note upon their faces the ravages of time and the surplus profits tax, an incident in the life of Ethel Barrymore comes to mind. After one of her brilliant and exciting performances, the great actress was relaxing in her dressing room, when she was told a party of people wished to see her. When she declined to entertain them, the messenger informed her they were old friends, in fact, classmates. "Classmates," boomed Ethel, "in that case, wheel them in."

On the other hand, time is relative. A few weeks after returning to the city last summer, the new dean of the college who preserves the illusion of youth extremely well, Father Sullivan, and myself were induced by the blandishments of Father Brown to run the gauntlet at a reception and tea party given by the ladies of the Bellarmine Guild. A bit shell-shocked and shaken by the exotic aroma of tea, I noticed a stately dowager of somewhat formidable mien fixing her eye on the new administration and surveying them with the cold precision of a social scientist. "Hmmm," she murmured in a slightly thunderous undertone, "they look like a couple of refugees from the Whiz Kids." If we manage to do one-half as well as they, we shall be quite content.

The fact that St. Joseph's College opened its doors 100 years ago may seem a bit antediluvian; but in fact its origin may be traced back further still. In 1639, just 5 years after the Catholic colonists of Cecil and Leonard Calvert stepped ashore near St. Mary's on the lower Potomac, Father Ferdinand Poulton, an English Jesuit, writes back home of his plan to open a school. In 1640, at Calverton Manor and again 37 years later at Newtown Manor, schools were founded only to be suppressed in each case by the dominant Puritan party that seized control of the colony and repealed the Toleration Act of the Calverts.

A few years later, in 1685, while Governor Dongan was in power, another English Jesuit, Father Thomas Harvey, opened the New York Latin School. This too quickly met the fate of its predecessors. However, in 1746, with the assistance of some Philadelphia Catholics, the Maryland Jesuits started a school at Bohemia Manor a few miles south of the present border in the no man's land then in dispute between Pennsylvania and Maryland. Among its first students were Charles Carroll of Carrollton who would later put his name to the Declaration of Independence, and John Carroll who would become a Jesuit in 1753, accompany the congressional committee to Canada in 1776, found Georgetown University, and be consecrated the first bishop and archbishop of Baltimore.

The story comes closer to home, however, when in 1722, a gentleman in knee breeches and buckled shoes, a broad brimmed Quaker hat and a snuff colored coat, began visiting Philadelphia. A Jesuit, Joseph Greaton by name, he established permanent residence in 1729, as the first Catholic pastor of the city. Within earshot of the hammers erecting the State House which would later become famous as Independence Hall, he built a two-storied brick residence and a small chapel which to all appearances was a kitchen with a chimney atop of it instead of a cross. In 1734, certain gentlemen, undoubtedly left-wing liberals of the day, viewing the twelfth and thirteenth law of King William with marked favor and the presence of the Popish chapel with a dim eye, objected to its existence. In reply Father Greaton presented his classic defense:

"We are and of right ought to be, free and independent of any civil law restricting or debarring our right to religious liberty. We claim the right from William Penn."

The upshot of the dispute was that Penn's principle of religious liberty for all, Catholics not excepted, continued in practice till time and usage completely confirmed it. Thus religious independence was established in the little church below Fourth and Walnut 40 years before civil liberty was proclaimed at Fifth and Chestnut Streets and Penn's principle of religious freedom embodied in the Constitution. To William Penn and his enlightened view on religious freedom and to the Friends of Philadelphia, who more than once persuaded angry mobs not to demolish Old St. Joseph's, we owe the original building that housed the first classes of the college. And to Father Greaton, we owe the earliest foundations of the college still to be.

That the hope of establishing a college still engrossed the minds of the Jesuits at Old St. Joseph's is clear from a letter to Bishop Carroll in 1785, in which Father Robert Molyneux announced the purchase of a property adjoining the old chapel for the sum of £600. He wrote somewhat quaintly:

"Besides these advantages and that of a spot for building a house for ourselves, there is room for building a college, should it ever be necessary, without incommoding the premises."

However, despite the commodiousness of the premises, some 50 by 60 feet, and despite the nearby location of the Blue Anchor Tavern and other patent advantages of Philadelphia, then the Nation's Capital, Bishop Carroll in 1789 founded the first Jesuit college at Georgetown and opened it to students of every religious profession. Among the reasons advanced in the first prospectus for choosing the location were: "The salubrity of the air, convenience of communication, and cheapness of living." In reviewing Bishop Carroll's action with all charity, a judicious historian might insert two comments at this point in the record: first, Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus (even Homer sometimes nods), and, secondly, this was obviously before the days of accurate thermometers and the Fair Deal.

Despite this blow, the hope of erecting a college in the city reared once again its bloody but unbowed head. Father Anthony Kohlmann writes on November 7, 1808:

"There is the finest prospect for establishing a college in Philadelphia. A certain J. W. Wellers, who by his unremitting exertions has carried on very important works for the good of religion has promised to build a college in 1 year, provided the society furnish him some masters."

I regret to note that the masters were not forthcoming; and I regret even more that we have lost contact with the heirs and assigns of Mr. Wellers. In 1844, Father Dubuisson reports:

"We are trying to build a college in Philadelphia. The one we have is rather a preparatory school than a college. A better building and more teachers are needed; and neither is forthcoming. We have great hopes for Philadelphia, but their fulfillment depends upon the means at our disposal."

Finally under the prodding of Father Brocard, Fr. Felix Barbelin, S. J., the little red-headed priest who was the curé d'ars of early Philadelphia, enlarged the colonial residence of Father Greaton and built the college on a lot fronting on Willings Alley. A modest beginning in all truth but so was the mustard seed.

On September 15, 1851, the school year was inaugurated with a Solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost. Ninety-seven boys, little knowing what was in store for them, happily chanted the te deum and were enrolled. Their school day ran from 8 to 5, with a modest lunch period of 2½ hours in the middle

of the day, a social amenity which our intense modern civilization has overlooked. It seems that loud talking and noise in Willings Alley, playing in the neighborhood and expressions savoring of low breeding were frowned upon. That they were men in those good old days is clear from the fact that the hours of study at home were from 6 to 8 in the evening and—an appalling item—from 6 to 7 in the morning. In addition to the courses in religion and ethical philosophy, the curriculum offered a commercial department and a classical department with side courses in French, German, music, and drawing.

Straightway, there was born the Philomelian Society, which is ominously described as "composed of those students who are remarkable for possession of a fine voice or who are learning to play on musical instruments." The organization counted 21 charter members, who made their first public appearance a few weeks later. By a strange coincidence, the neighborhood began to lose its charm as a residential district at this time and the general exodus of the better families began.

No doubt it would be not only proper but timely for me to remark here and now that I do not intend to give a blow-by-blow description of the next 100 years round by round.

However, suffice it to say that on January 14, 1856, the college was transferred to a new school building and a new debt at Juniper and Filbert Streets on the site where the present Bulletin Building now stands. At this time, the Reverend James A. Ward, S. J., a brilliant classicist, was president. Not having the assistance of a secretary, he devised an ingenious method of reducing his correspondence to a minimum by composing his letters in Latin verse. A few months after taking office, he created a motto which, because of its classical brevity and concentrated wisdom, all subsequent presidents of modest liberal arts colleges have made their own: "Nisi Deus memor sit nostri, omnis res nostra fracta est"; "without a miracle, we shall be bankrupt."

Perhaps bank tellers of the day had difficulty with Ciceronian latinity. Perhaps the fathers wished to return to guard the fabulous hoard of gold buried under old Saint Joseph's. Perhaps with customary Jesuit shrewdness, they foresaw that real estate at Juniper and Filbert had no future. At any rate the college returned to its old location in the summer of 1860, and languished through the difficult years of the Civil War and its aftermath.

Father Barbelin, once again at the helm of the college, finally realized a long-cherished desire to obtain a suitable property for a college when on November 20, 1866, he purchased the property at Seventeenth and Stiles Streets, described as being in the highest section of the city amid sparsely settled suburbs.

Father Villiger took up the task of rebuilding with energy and clarity of vision, though he entered upon it, as he himself said, without money or prospects, with a debt of $30,000, and nothing to rely on except the merciful providence of God. Step by step, however, the plan originally conceived by Father Villiger was executed in his own administration and in those of his successors, till the quadrangle of buildings was complete.

In 1886, the college received a bequest of $72,000 from the estate of Francis Anthony Drexel, a gift of princely proportions at the time for a struggling college. In 1899, Father Clark erected a new building, fronting on Stiles Street and extending back along Seventeenth Street; it was reserved for the college and the first step taken toward separating the college and preparatory department. In the same year, advanced courses in literature, science, and philosophy leading to a master's degree were undertaken. The golden jubilee exercises were held in November 1901, a feature of which was the presentation of Plautus' Duo Captivi in the original Latin.

In 1912, in the pioneer days of the science, a wireless receiving and sending station was installed, the first college station of its kind perhaps in the Nation. In February 1915, under the sponsorship of the alumni sodality, evening classes were inaugurated with 954 students pursuing 22 course offerings.

With entry into World War I, on April 4, 1917, the college pledged itself to the service of the Nation. So many of its students and alumni enlisted for the first Officers' Reserve training program at Fort Niagara that one of the daily papers truthfully reported: "In proportion to its size, St. Joseph's College has furnished more men for the camp than any other college or institution in the State." During the war, the institution was utilized by the War Department for military training of the Students' Army Training Corps. From the ranks of the college came 122 officers, 331 noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, 14 of whom yielded up their lives in service. In 1919, regular courses were resumed; and for the first time, distinct faculties for both the college and high-school divisions were appointed.

With the appointment of the Very Reverend Albert G. Brown, S. J., to the presidency of the college on October 1, 1921, the college entered upon a period of vigorous expansion. One of its distinguished sons, Bishop Gercke, of Tucson, Ariz., on November 18, 1923, laid the cornerstone for the new wing on Thompson Street that finally completed the group of buildings Father Villiger had originally envisoned. During the spring months of 1922, with the gracious approval and blessing of His Eminence, Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, plans for a universal appeal for funds to build a greater St. Joseph's College were formulated. The project was enthusiastically endorsed by a general meeting of the alumni, August 16, 1922. It was presented to the people of the archdiocese by His Eminence in a laudatory letter, concluding:

"I earnestly recommend this campaign to our reverend clergy and devoted laity. I ask their cooperation in this great work and I pray God to make it a success."

The drive was overwhelmingly successful, $1,147,857 being subscribed. In 1923, 20 acres of the present site were purchased for $280,000, and in October 1927 classes were opened in the new building.

That St. Joseph's College rears itself today in Gothic strength and beauty on its lofty site is due to the courage and vision of Father Albert G. Brown, S. J., and of Father Matthew G. Fortier, S. J., his able and tireless cooperator in all his plans, to the generosity of the clergy and laity of Philadelphia, to the active enthusiasm of its alumni and friends, particularly to the members of the Original Foundation Committee, some of whom are our guests this evening, and above all, to the gracious endorsement of all its plans and the hearty encouragement of its supporters by His Eminence Dennis Cardinal Dougherty.

From that day onward the progress of the college was steadily maintained under the able direction of Father Tallon, Father Higgins, Father Love, and Father Long. Finnesey field and the college stadium were completed; the Lonergan School of Mechanics was erected. The faculty residence and grounds, the Barry House, the Keenan House, three student halls, Greaton, Quirk, and Simpson, were all added to the steadily growing college. In October 1935 the St. Joseph's College School of Social Sciences was opened to combat communism. In January 1944 the St. Joseph's College Institute of Industrial Relations began, offering tuition-free courses in labor-management, its problems, and solutions.

In 1946 my immediate predecessor, Father Long, inaugurated the drive for the Alumni Memorial Field House, which was to commemorate the men of St. Joseph's College who gave their lives in both World Wars. As always, the response of the alumni was immediate and generous, and over $200,000 was raised. On November 11, 1949, the Alumni Memorial Field House and the Edward J. Flanigan Auditorium were dedicated.

In the barest outline such is the history of the college. Skipping over it lightly, but not irreverently, I trust I have recited in the main only external facts, "Things done that caught the eye and have the price," in Browning's phrase. But the real story could have been told far more tellingly and far more truly by many in the audience tonight who played key roles in the unfolding of its history. For the real drama of its birth and growth, its true significance and lasting value, lies hidden in the hearts of the men who as teachers, Jesuit and lay, down the decades created its traditions and brought wisdom and inspiration to its halls and who as students drank deep of living water at its intellectual and religious well springs.

Four basic elements, the religious, the socio-political, the scientific, and esthetic, are the dominant constituents of every culture. These are the stable roots from which the intellectual and spiritual life of a people springs, takes its shape and grows. Like genes and chromosomes that fix the physical characteristics of a race, these four cultural factors perpetuate the intellectual and spiritual properties of a people. To transmit these properties from generation to generation is the essential task of education. For unlike genes and chromosomes, they are not a native endowment, but must be slowly and often laboriously acquired. Just as it is necessary for a boy who hopes to become a sculptor to learn how his father handled a chisel and hammer before him, so it is imperative for a man who desires to become cultured to study the ways of his cultured forebears. Once mastery over the rudiments has been won, then, if he be graced with genius, he can devise new processes, create fresh forms, and contribute his bit to progress.

Such in fact has been the story of the cultural growth of Christendom and of western man. Into the making of its distinctive culture, four basic elements have entered in the course of centuries. First came the heritage of divinely revealed truth in the Judaeo-Christian tradition which freed western man from the bonds of pagan fatalism and revealed to him his human dignity and supernatural destiny. Next when Europe rose from the ruins of barbarism, the Roman law and its ancient socio-political institutions were resurrected and baptised in the Holy Roman Empire. Later in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the scientific thought of Greece and Rome was assimilated and transformed into Christian scholasticism. Finally with the rediscovery of Hellenic beauty during the Renaissance, western man refashioned the aesthetic forms of his literature and art. The distinct contribution of the Ratio Studiorum; the Jesuit code of liberal education that was 50 years in the making and has been tried and tested for four centuries, was to integrate the aesthetic element of beauty of speech and artistic form of expression with the religious, political, and scientific elements of culture and thus to provide perfect and viable expression for the wisdom of the west.

To the transmission of this intellectual heritage of Christian culture, St. Joseph's College has made its modest contribution for the past 100 years. For a century, in good days and ill, it has been the champion of a liberal humanistic and Christian tradition

which, it believes, is fundamentally the soundest and wisest ever conceived by man. Today the widespread trend toward general education indicates the correctness of its belief, and the record of its sons in medicine, law, business, scientific research, and education, government, and the church, confirms its judgment. In its educational endeavor and in its contribution to the community, the Church, and the country, St. Joseph's College boasts a tradition of which we are rightly proud.

Tonight as we cross over the threshold into a new century of growth and achievement, God grant us through the merits of His Divine Son the wisdom and strength to perpetuate and enrich it.

Sees Inertia Endangering Financial Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Frank Kent, one of the ablest, grandest persons I have ever known, a newspaperman who has written for many, many years, has expressed his opinion, and so has Bruce Barton, a former Member of this House who has made a grand success in his own right, and I extend their two articles which speak for themselves:

SEES INERTIA ENDANGERING FINANCIAL STRUCTURE—WRITER SAYS WASTE OF MONEY IS NATIONAL PERIL

(By Frank R. Kent)

What kind of people are we, anyhow? Are we largely a Nation of nitwits who supinely permit the perils that threaten us abroad to be needlessly enhanced by the idiocy and cowardice of our rulers at home? We smugly listen to the political and journalistic demagogues spout that old stuff about the fundamental intelligence of the great American people but, actually, are we not a conglomeration of fools without the gumption to avoid falling into the same pits out of which, at great cost, we have twice had to dig ourselves?

A strong case for an affirmative answer to the last two questions can be made. For example, look at the fiscal facts as they now exist. Regardless of party, all men of wisdom and experience agree that unchecked debts and deficits ultimately lead to financial disaster. Yet for nearly 20 years we have steadily piled up the one and deepened the other until at the beginning of the present fiscal year both had reached undreamed-of heights and depths. Then, last summer we were catapulted into Korea and the realization driven home that in Russia we had a powerful, potential enemy whose aggressions threaten our very existence.

The urgency of arming ourselves led to Presidential pronouncements and congressional action. The country was responsive. All it wanted was leadership. It was pointed out that we must not repeat the mistakes of the last two wars: That delay in the regulation of wages, profits and prices in World War II had cost us $100,000,000,000 and prolonged the conflict by 6 months; that the only way to control inflation is to control it at the start. Everybody agreed about this. Nevertheless, nothing was done and for months there was a continuous spiral of wage and price raises until the cost of living attained heights never before approached and inflation reached vast and menacing proportions.

The reason for this costly and dangerous delay is perfectly clear. Chiefly, it was the savage opposition of the labor unions to any controls until after they had gotten their fourth wave of wage increases through. This the administration, closely linked with them politically, permitted. This will always remain an indefensible attitude which has greatly damaged the national interests. As a result, inflation has been greatly advanced and the cost of all materials greatly increased. The freezing of wages and prices now ordered by Eric Johnston, Director of Economic Stabilization, comes after long months of terribly expensive inaction. This is not Mr. Johnston's fault. The fault is Mr. Truman's.

Here is the administration asking appropriations totaling many billions of dollars and urging Congress to levy an additional $16,000,000,000 in taxes. Conservative estimates fix the deficit for the next fiscal year at the unbelievable figure of $25,000,000,000. When you combine these astronomical figures with an astronomical debt of $275,000,000,000, one does not have to be a mathematical genius to grasp the fact that they involve grave fiscal peril; that they preclude all possibility of a pay-as-we-go policy or a balanced budget; that they mean Federal finances have become almost unmanageable; that we really are threatened with a governmental financial collapse that would cripple our defense effort, create a condition of chaos. If that happens—and it can happen—Russia could win the war without the loss of a soldier.

In such a situation it is impossible to conceive of an excuse for spending a needless dollar on nondefense activities. If there is any other way than rigid economy to keep the Federal financial structure from crumbling, no one has suggested it. The President himself has often spoken of the necessity for "rigid economy." Yet he has taken no real step toward that goal. Time and again it has been pointed out that Congress cannot make the essential reductions by itself. Any real reduction can only be achieved under Presidential leadership. That leadership Mr. Truman distinctly has not provided.

Not only has Mr. Truman exhibited no desire to lead but in his recent message to Congress, by advocating various nonessential and highly costly projects to which he committed himself in 1948, he made it clear he has no intention of supplying that kind of leadership. In light of these facts the inertia of the American people is shocking.

MANPOWER OR AIR POWER?

(By Bruce Barton)

As my friend Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky points out in his book, Air Power: Key to Survival, professional soldiers tend always to fight each new war with the strategy and weapons of the last.

The United States and its Allies won World War II by invasion forces, landed under the protection of naval guns. So now, in the air age, our generals and admirals want more Navy and more millions of men to wade ashore and fight on land.

The three departments of the military are jockeying for position, each demanding most men and most money. The result, says Major de Seversky, is the same as if three engineers were debating how to get our Armed Forces across a wide river.

The first says, "I will build a ferry." The second, "I will build a bridge." The third, "I will dig a tunnel." If we don't look out, our economy will be bankrupt, and the enemy will have won the war before any one of these projects is finished.

When I was in Congress we cheerfully voted every dollar for national defense that the Army and Navy asked. All of us assumed that the country was well protected, especially in the air. Hadn't the Wrights invented the airplane? Weren't our factories the biggest and most efficient in the world?

It came to us with a terrible shock when we learned—first from Colonel Lindbergh—that we had only a few hundred planes, mostly obsolete, while Germany had thousands.

Congress and all of us were shocked again when the war started in Korea. Billions and billions had been given to the Armed Forces in the preceding 5 years. What had they bought in the way of arms, ammunition, and implements of war? Seemingly almost nothing.

Generals and admirals are brave men who have sworn to give their lives, if need be, for their country. They are entitled to our respect and gratitude. But before we give them universal military training, let them tell us whether they plan to win the next war with manpower or with air power.

Ike and the Con Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of February 7, 1951:

IKE AND THE CON MEN

Gen. Eisenhower has told the American people that they must send some divisions of foot soldiers to Europe but, he is careful to add, America will never be called upon to contribute more than a small fraction of the total ground force.

BEFORE THE WAR

Once upon a time Winston Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." We gave him the tools but we finished the job, as Gen. Eisenhower should know better than any other man alive, for three quarters of the soldiers he commanded on the western front were Americans.

Before that the American people were told by their own Government that if they repealed the neutrality act we would avoid involvement in the war. The neutrality act was repealed and before long we were in the war. Likewise, the American people were told that if they adopted conscription and mobilized the National Guard we could stay out of war. Both measures were taken and we got into the war. Lend-lease was just another of the devices which would surely keep us out of war.

Then, after the shooting stopped, came the British loan. Our people were solemnly promised that the loan would put Britain on her feet and assure the stability of Europe, but before the last of the $3,750,000,000 had been squandered it was apparent that Britain was in no better shape than before. Then it was the turn for aid to Greece and Turkey.

AND AFTER

Mr. Acheson assured Senator HICKENLOOPER that the aid to Greece was not to be regarded as a precedent for loans to other European countries. Mr. Clayton said all other countries' requests for money would be handled by the International Bank and Export-Import Bank, thus avoiding any additional burden on the American taxpayers. Mr. Clayton said the Western European countries were

making great strides toward economic recovery. The implication was that the loans to Greece and Turkey would complete the job of European rehabilitation.

But it was only 3 months later, in January 1948 that Secretary Marshall proposed the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan, or ERP. In selling this project to Congress and the country, General Marshall said that his scheme would spare the United States the necessity of becoming "an armed camp, regulated and controlled."

The Marshall plan billions were voted, but just 3 years later Congress was debating whether to draft all the boys at 18 or wait until they were 18 years and 6 months old; price control and wage control had been instituted; the demands of the military had absolute priority in all factories and nobody could think of any detail of "an armed camp, regulated and controlled" that had been overlooked by General Marshall, now Secretary of Defense.

Another witness on behalf of the Marshall plan was Secretary of the Army Royall. He told Congress what would happen if the Marshall plan were not adopted. He said Army and Air Force appropriations would have to be increased by $2,500,000,000.

What's more, he said, the draft would have to be instituted. The Marshall plan was adopted but so, too, was the draft; and the military appropriations rose, not by the two and one-half billions which the Marshall plan was supposed to spare us, but by twenty-five billions, which is to say 10 times as much.

Still another witness was Secretary of Defense Forrestal, who said he did not want to leave with the committee "the impression that we were hoping to spend this money to create a great concert of military force. That is, I think, illusory. You cannot depend upon that to provide us with security."

Perish the thought of a military alliance against communism, said this spokesman of the administration, but 6 months later the Vandenberg resolution, foreshadowing the North Atlantic alliance, had been rammed through the Senate and the following year came the treaty itself.

THE UNITED STATES PAYS ALL BILLS

General Bradley, testifying in behalf of the treaty, said it did not imply any expenditure but a few weeks later the appropriation was declared to be a necessity. Mr. Acheson, in reply to Senator HICKENLOOPER'S now famous question, said there was absolutely no expectation that American foot soldiers would be sent to Europe as a consequence on the pact, and now General Eisenhower says American foot soldiers are the heart of the matter.

Anyone who wishes to go into the record in greater detail should read a couple of articles by Mr. William L. Neumann which were published in American Perspective, from which we have drawn some of the quotations given here.

The moral, of course, is obvious. There is no slightest reason to believe General Eisenhower when he now says that the American contribution will be relatively small. The only conclusion that anyone can draw from the unbroken record of bad faith and false promises by the principal spokesmen for this administration is that they are a pack of confidence men, wholly undeserving of belief. The token army they now talk about is the prelude to the huge army of Americans they intend to send into the colossal war they expect to fight.

The only remedy lies in the adoption of the Wherry resolution which says that no American foot soldiers may be sent to Europe without specific authorization from Congress.

Address of James B. Carey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following partial text of a speech by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of CIO and president of International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, at the Ohio State Industrial Union Council, CIO, Columbus, Ohio, January 6, 1951:

The world of 1951 is a world of uncertainty, of fear, of horrible danger, of treachery, of bravery. It is a year in which no one knows what the next months will bring, whether it be hope or gloom, or despair, or confidence, or life or death. Right now we have no way of knowing how far Russia's greed for power over men's minds and bodies will carry it. We have no way of knowing whether December 31, 1951, will see Soviet locusts eating up most of Asia and all of Europe—two-thirds of the world's population—or whether by some means, military or moral, Moscow will have lost or withdrawn its grand strategy.

The world will have to decide this year. There is no more time for equivocation; there is very little time for let's-make-another-appeal, no more time for anything but action. If we can prove to Russia that real peace pays, maybe Russia will learn the facts of life the hard way. If that succeeds quickly, we can really build a world bulwark of peace that no one could break.

As I appear here today, I want to talk about the dangers that are ours, and what I think is the road to take to prevent a crushing defeat for the free world we love. I want to focus your attention on what are the roles and responsibilities for government, for business, for labor in this struggle. I want to talk about you and me, about yours and mine.

It seems clear that we are all in this struggle together. If we lose to communism, capitalism is done for, free enterprise will vanish, there will be no free farmers, small business will become part of the Soviet machine, and instead of free labor there will be the kind of slave labor we now see in Eastern Europe and in China. There will be no difference between Democrats and Republicans in the Communist concentration camps, and the same bullets of the firing squads will kill Hoover and Acheson.

But America is coming to the parting of the ways on the question of how our freedom is to be preserved. There are two roads pointed out to us, and we will have to choose between them.

But they are completely opposite roads. By one road we can defeat Communist aggression, maintain and expand the free world and realize the blessings of not only liberty but also a higher standard of living for ourselves and hundreds of millions of others.

By the second road, we will at best maintain in America an armed camp that will steadily degenerate into a semi-Fascist state, that will resemble more and more the dictatorship that we are trying to defeat.

What are these two roads open to us?

First, there is the road proposed by the McCormick-Hearst-McCarthy Taft-Hoover Dixiecrat axis. This group proposes in effect that we abandon our democratic friends throughout the world as being "unreliable"; that we hold onto the only "reliable" fighters against Communist such as Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, the Emperor of Indochina, and others of that like and that we pull back to our shores and go into our storm cellars.

By whatever name this is called, whether it is TAFT'S "reexamination" or Hoover's isolationism, the theory is the same. This group feels that it is hopeless to try to defend democratic Britain and France, social democratic Norway or Switzerland, or Italy. We can only fight when America itself is invaded. Otherwise let the rest of the world go hang.

Now this theory is not new. The same people who advance it now in fighting Communism advanced it in 1940 when the issue was fighting Nazi-Fascism. You remember the America First group, whose political leaders were the same people, the Tafts, McCormick, Hearst, Hoover and whose big business backers supplied millions of dollars for propaganda. When Britain was fighting alone for democracy these "brave men" of the America First group wanted to abandon her and abandon Europe. They had no stomach to fight for democracy. It was too expensive. Here is what your own Senator TAFT said in 1940 after France had been overrun and Britain was staggering under the blitz.

"I do not know what the Germans may do, and no one knows what they may do until they are freed from the present war and have an opportunity to show. When they do, we can adopt the same methods. We can take the same steps that may be necessary to meet the particular kind of German blitzkrieg, if there is such a blitzkrieg, at the time we find out what it is."

In plain English this outstanding statemean meant—"Let the Nazis win the war and then if they attack us, we'll figure out what to do."

Isn't that exactly what TAFT is saying today in the fight against communism?

At that same time, in 1940 and 1941 when Roosevelt was trying to get this Nation to rearm, the big industrialists said we did not need to have more steel, more copper, more aluminum. They wanted business as usual, and profits as usual. It was organized labor that went out and demanded that this Nation mobilize to meet the Nazi challenge.

The policy of these reactionaries, the ones who always cry "free enterprise" and "democracy" was one of defeatism when it came to a showdown. They had no confidence in democracy or freedom. They were willing to throw in the sponge.

Today, they are pursuing the same policies. While the McCarthys, Tafts, Hoovers, McCormicks, Hearsts, beat their breasts in denouncing Communism in the State Department or on the radio and demand purges, when it comes to really fighting communism they want to throw in the sponge, retire to our storm cellars here.

Isolationism and communism are allies today just as isolationism and fascism were allies just 10 years ago, in 1940 and 1941. To a few naive souls it may still sound extreme to link Senator Taft, Herbert Hoover, and Colonel McCormick—supposedly relentless foes of communism—with the Kremlin's scheme for world conquest.

Nevertheless, wittingly or unwittingly, the Tafts and the Hoovers are as much in partnership with Joseph Stalin today as they were with Hitler and Mussolini a decade ago.

How? To begin with, not even an expert today can tell the difference between the Chicago Tribune's editorial policy and the editorial policy of the Communist Daily Worker. Since the invasion of the Republic of South Korea last June both papers have screamed incessantly for the withdrawal of

American troops from Korea. Both papers have demanded that American troops be pulled out of Asia and out of Europe. Both papers have declared, in effect, that both continents should be turned over to the tender mercies of Russian totalitarianism. Both papers constantly attacked and undermined every major decision and action undertaken by the United Nations.

There are other ways in which the Taft-Hoover-McCormick axis serves the Kremlin. These American isolationists today demand exactly what they demanded in 1940 and 1941—that this country retire behind its two oceans, that it turn itself into a kind of "Gibraltar," completely surrounded by a hostile world.

Stalin himself couldn't ask for more. He couldn't ask for a more gratifying surrender than for the United States to abandon the democratic nations of Europe and desert the nations of Asia where democracy is beginning to move forward for the first time. We would be handing over to Stalin's slave-labor machine countless millions of men and women and giving him, by default, the priceless natural resources of two continents to strengthen his war-making ability.

Is it any wonder that even the Nation's outstanding Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, can't even call this madness "isolationism." The Herald Tribune flatly terms it "retreatism."

I tell you as earnestly as I can: there is no place in this world today—this world of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb—where we can hide from totalitarianism. Neither the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans nor the North Pole are barriers.

We can no longer mince words or insist on the niceties of etiquette when our Nation's future is at stake, when democracy everywhere is in desperate danger. We have got to see and state it openly that those men who advocate our giving up our allies in this life-and-death struggle are virtual traitors. Isolationism today is communism's fifth column. Isolationism is as much our enemy as the communism it serves. Our own safety as a nation and the establishment of democracy and peace throughout the world depend on repudiation of everything that the Tafts, the Hoovers, and the McCormicks stand for. We must, for our own salvation and for the world's salvation, wipe out the poisonous illusion that we can survive without friends or that there can be peace in a world one-fifth free and four-fifths enslaved.

What would happen in America as a result of successful isolationism?

I think we already see the signs of it—I think we can see that the isolationism of this axis of defeatism is tied to a reactionary policy at home. Here is what they will aim for:

1. They will try to convert America into an armed camp for an indefinite period while the Communists nibble away at the Western Hemisphere—at Canada, South America, the West Indies.

2. They will use this situation they have created to panic the American people into giving them political power in 1952.

3. Once in power, they will use the Subversive Controls Act and similar acts to stamp out anyone or any group who disagree with them. Free labor, free farm groups, free citizens' groups will be placed under iron control. The jails will fill up with political prisoners.

4. The greater the Communist menace became from the outside, the tighter the controls would be placed on Americans until finally we would resemble the same dictatorship we are trying to fight.

This is no wild dream. This is a grim, ghastly possibility. This is what would have happened if the Tafts had won the 1940 elections and had controlled the Government then. Only then I think they would have made their peace with the Nazis.

I say this is a possible road. You may say that some of those who want to take us down that road don't believe in dictatorship. That may be true. But if we all end up in a Communist concentration camp or before a firing squad, will it make any difference to us whether TAFT or MCCARTHY was only an ignorant fool and not a scheming Fascist?

What is the second possible road that we can take in this decisive year of 1951? That road is the road of fellowship with the democratic world, realizing that we are all in a state of siege, and it's a matter of all for one and one for all. As freemen we all survive or perish together.

This means that we recognize that Europe, having gone through two devastating wars, is mortally afraid of a third, so instead of being impatient and dictatorial, we work with the free people of Europe in real comradeship and understanding. We let the people of Europe and of free Asia know that we will not only share military defense with them but also the possibilities of decent living standards. We make clear that this is not a fight between the philosophy of communism and capitalism, but between democracy and dictatorship.

We let them know that to the extent of our ability we will join with them to prevent a Communist aggression and will not desert them.

We let them know that America does not want to dictate but to be at one with them in partnership and comradeship.

This means that in America we will not only keep our freedoms but expand them. We will sacrifice in proportion to ability to do it. We will expand our industrial capacity because we have confidence that now and after this emergency there will be an unlimited market for the comforts and decencies of life.

We will make America a show place of democratic and civil rights because we are not afraid of the loyalty of Americans to freedom.

In this struggle that lies ahead, it will not be the McCarthys, the Hoovers, the Tafts, the McCormicks, who will be in the front lines in fighting communism. No, as always, it will be organized labor. For we have been fighting communism all over the world for 30 years, and it is the ICFTU that today is the first line of defense for democracy. It is strange and ironic, that the press is willing to play up these Tafts and McCarthys, yet it is labor who stands on the firing lines day after day, repelling the Communist onslaught.

It is an ironic and perhaps tragic thing that despite TAFT'S 10 years of complete blindness, first before the Nazi menace and now before the Communist menace, the press of this State of Ohio went all out for him. In its blind antagonism to liberalism and labor, the press of this State was willing to court disaster to the Nation by having men like TAFT in our national leadership.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations who yell about communism in Washington refuse to join the struggle against Communists unless they are guaranteed their enormous profits. The newspapers the other day said that United States Steel is building a $400,000,000 steel plant to expand production. But United States Steel only agreed to do that after the Government guaranteed that it could write off the cost of the plant in 5 years. That means that the Government will pay United States Steel $300,000,000 of the cost in terms of taxes that it will save. The company will actually pay only one-fourth of the cost and it will completely own the plant. The same thing is true with regard to Alcoa in aluminum, with the monopolistic copper companies. You read last week end the congressional report on the way our defense is being held up by the refusal of the monopolistic International Nickel Co. to expand nickel production.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations like General Electric, Westinghouse, and International Harvester cannot only continue to do business with Communist unions but even try to pit Communist and anti-Communist unions against each other. Yet these corporations beat their breasts about the danger to free enterprise and the American way of life.

And when I go to the Munitions Board to propose that defense contracts not be granted to plants where there are Communist unions, these great patriotic American corporations and the patriotic American press remain silent.

What is the difference between having the GE plant in Schenectady, whose union is run by Communists, than having the same plant located in Stalingrad where Communists are also in control?

We in labor have a tremendous job to do in this year 1951. We have got to make clear to the American people the two roads that they can travel and the dangers to them if they travel the road of isolationism and reaction. We must educate them on the real way to fight communism, with arms, with ideas, with economic aid. We must show that it is fatal to appease dictatorship in Europe and Asia—since the more concessions we feed to it, the stronger it gets and the weaker we get.

We have got to show likewise that it is fatal to feed reaction with concessions here, because the more we feed it the stronger it becomes and the weaker the forces of liberalism and freedom become.

We have got to demonstrate to all concerned, that the fight against communism by this Government cannot succeed if it is simply led by men from big business. There must be, in places of equality with them, leaders of American labor, directing the strategy, the policies, the operations of this vast operation freedom.

Already much damage has been done to our cause abroad by not having men from labor in the top policy and operating parts of our defense drive.

We have got to realize that the fight for civil liberties, the rights of labor, decent living standards, equality of sacrifice at home is a necessary part of the fight against dictatorship and aggression abroad. We can only remain free in the world by being free at home. All free American labor, through the united labor committee, has presented its program to President Truman. On that program we can go to the American people, and to the people of the world.

We have got to show the American people, despite the lies told about labor in the last election, that we have no interests that are separate and apart from the welfare of our country and its people. We have got to show by our actions and our educational work that, as in the whole history of our country, it has been organized labor that has led the way in this struggle for a better democracy. And today we are prepared again. We want to unite with all men and women of good will no matter whether they be Republicans or Democrats, business men or farmers, lawyers or doctors.

Blind or Brazen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the great newspapers in our country is the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. I will frankly state that it is more Republican than

Democratic, but regardless of our political beliefs or religious feelings I want to insert this article which will appeal to all sane thinking Americans:

BLIND OR BRAZEN?

The President has revealed to Congressmen his plan for a $16,500,000,000 tax boost, the heaviest demand ever made in the history of the United States. He calls this program essential for defense. Actually it embraces not only defense needs but his whole fat galaxy of social nostrums and Fair Deal whimsies.

No intelligent American fails to recognize that great sums must be spent for rearmament. If Soviet imperialism is to be checked short of war, it seems possible to accomplish only by matching might. We ought to foot the bill for our mobilization on a pay-as-we-go basis, or as nearly so as possible.

But Mr. Truman's budget and tax proposals pay scarcely any attention to slashing nondefense expenditures. His few gestures toward economy are thin lip service. He fools no one and probably doesn't intend to.

Senator BYRD, the capital's most outstanding champion of sound fiscal policy, has written the White House urging a cut in nondefense costs of more than $7,000,000,000. He analyzed the budget and showed specific categories where the cuts could be made. If his advice were followed, less than $10,000,000,000 more in tax levies would be necessary to put defense on a cash basis.

The President's comment was that Senator BYRD doesn't know very much about the Federal budget.

The Senator has been studying budgets, taxation and spending habits of the Federal Government for decades. He is probably the best informed man on the subject since Carter Glass. Yet he is blandly ignored and disparaged by the White House.

Mr. BYRD's recommendations are not politically partisan; he is a Democrat. They are not impractical. He would increase budget allotments for price-wage control, labor training, allocation agencies and revenue collection. But he demands a slash in such purely domestic schedules as farm supports, aid to education, public housing save for defense workers, the vast public works, highways and airport bounties. He wants to call a sharp halt to such Truman panaceas as the Brannan plan, lush Federal supports for the Commodity Credit Corporation, for socialized medicine, and aid to education.

The gigantic defense production program is going to give jobs to anyone who can do a day's work. We soon will face a labor shortage. This means social security spending can easily be curtailed. It should be.

Certainly the Nation faces bigger taxes. But they should be held to a minimum of necessity. The President has no such attitude of mind. He has larded his budget with every scheme and program dreamed up since he has been in the White House. Now these conceits are called defense projects. This is cloaking politics under a defense mantle. The guise should fool no one.

The President's demands will force people of the Nation to shoulder the greatest tax burden in our history. He insists on sacrifice for everybody—but the Government.

This refusal to accept the grim requirement for shearing economy in nondefense spending ought to meet with militant revolt of Congress. There would be no politics in a hard-boiled cut of lavish domestic expenditure. It is a simple, portentous matter of economics. Defense costs may continue at mountainous figures for 2, 3, 5, or 10 years. Unless Government carves out waste and experiment and nonessential drains, the Nation can be smashed in the Kremlin's war of economic attrition.

The President's failure to recognize the danger and retrench indicates either blindness or a brazen disregard of fiscal sanity.

What if Korea Were Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of February 5, 1951:

WHAT IF KOREA WERE GERMANY?—LONDON ECONOMIST POKES FUN AT BRITISH POLICY BY SPECULATING ON REACTION TO ATTACK IN WEST

(By David Lawrence)

Many people here have had a good laugh over an article in the London Economist twitting the British Government on its recent tactics in the UN in connection with the Korean situation. It is in the form of an imaginary dispatch dated about a year hence—January 22, 1952—from a British correspondent at Lake Success. It reads as follows:

"Since the withdrawal of the United Nations forces from Bonn, opinion in the Assembly has been veering in favor of the American view that it is necessary to abandon Germany altogether in order to restore peace in Europe. The British delegate, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, has, indeed, continued to press for the condemnation of Russia as an aggressor, arguing that the whole purpose of the United Nations would be stultified if the Assembly refused to stigmatize the Russian invasion of West Germany as an aggression.

"The American delegate, Mr. Warren Austin, however, is urging caution. He maintains that hasty action would not be in the interest of peace and that time is needed to study the latest Russian counterproposals, which should be given the most careful consideration.

"The proposal of the United Nations Political Committee for a cease-fire in Germany, to be followed by a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, was rejected by Russia, who insisted that Russian basic terms for a settlement must be accepted before the victorious Russian volunteers could be advised to desist from their offensive.

"The Russian demand is that all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Germany and that the internal affairs of Germany must be settled by the Germans themselves; as all German politicians who have not either escaped across the Rhine or joined the Communists have now been shot, Moscow is confident that Herr Ulbright will be able to handle the situation with difficulty. The Russians are willing to accept the proposal for a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers on condition that representatives of Italy, Iraq, and Mongolia are added to it and that the conference is held in Leningrad.

"The British Army having suffered 50,000 casualties in the fighting in Germany, British public opinion is in a somewhat excitable mood and the Government is being sharply criticized by the opposition for the ineffectiveness of its European policy. The Prime Minister has pointed out that the RAF cannot be used for bombing beyond the boundary of the British zone without a decision of the United Nations, but he has promised to do all he can to get the United Nations to declare Russia an aggressor, even though it is generally recognized that no sanctions are likely to be imposed.

"Opinion in well-informed circles in Washington, however, is that America must be wary of being drawn into an extension of hostilities; it is felt that the British are liable to be headstrong in their reactions to events in Europe and that their old imperial traditions are making them unduly bellicose. The State Department has not yet abandoned its hope of detaching Russia from China, and deprecates any policy which might have the effect of driving Stalin into the arms of Mao.

"Senator Bebop has made an important speech at Cincinnati, in which he warned the American people against allowing American troops to be tied up in Europe when there was such a serious danger of a Russo-Chinese attack on Alaska, Japan, and the Philippines. He said it was very unfortunate that nobody seemed to be able to exercise any control over General Eisenhower, who had evidently underestimated the prospects of Russian intervention when he pursued the East German invaders back across the zonal boundary. Everything should be done to restore peace as quickly as possible, so that there should be no damage to the old friendship between the Russian and American peoples. The Russians, he declared, were a proud people who would not long be subservient to the mandarins of the forbidden city.

"A deep impression has also been made by an address delivered to the Foreign Policy Association by Mr. John K. Poffenheimer of Adriatic Exports, Inc., who told his audience that he had been doing excellent business in trade from Trieste behind the iron curtain and that, if only America would do nothing to interfere with Russian expansion, there was no reason why this trade should not go on for a few years longer. He said that communism in Europe could not be stopped by force, and the sooner Britain realized this, the better.

"The Indian Prime Minister has also given a press conference in Mexico opposing the idea of declaring Russia an aggressor. The Russians, he said, had suffered great humiliations in the period before Peter the Great, and naturally it would take them a long time to get over it; they were very sensitive to criticism and, if they were to be branded as aggressors simply because they had committed an act of aggression, it might spoil the chances of peaceful negotiation. The Indian delegation in the Assembly has been taking a similar line with the support of the bloc of Asian and Arab countries.

"The latest news from Germany is that the Russians have crossed the Rhine on a broad front and that an armored spearhead has penetrated into Aachen. The Political Committee of the Assembly has today voted for an adjournment to consider Mr. Vishinsky's clarification of the Russian terms for a cease fire. Sir Gladwyn Jebb strongly opposed the adjournment, declaring that the new Russian statement was a transparent attempt to divide the free world and delay the exercise of the Pacific functions of the United Nations. Mr. Warren Austin, however, urged that delegates must have time to consult their governments about the 'new situation' and said that in the opinion of his Government the United Nations 'should not at this stage take a new and important decision.'"

The Chickens Are Coming Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the great "do-good" attitude of the New Deal in attempting to do everything for

the rest of the world at the expense of the United States is now bearing fruit in the form of vinegar. We are now beginning to pay the price.

Let's take the case of manganese. Several years ago representatives of the Bureau of Mines and other experts in this country appeared before the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee in executive session and told us that manganese was a strategic material of which there was a great shortage in this country. We were told that while we had an unlimited supply of low-grade manganese, and that it would produce steel with only 70 percent of the efficiency of the steel today, that processes could be developed and methods of manufacture devised to utilize this low-grade manganese and still produce top-grade steel. This, of course, would mean that we would either have to place a tariff on manganese to help our manganese industry during this period, or else subsidize the cost outright.

Of course, the "do-gooders" could not think of putting on a tariff and the President vetoed all the bills we had pertaining to a subsidy, and the administration, at the direction of the President, blocked in the various committees any attempts to subsidize mining interests.

Now, let us see where we are getting manganese. We were getting approximately one-third from Russia and anyone with any common sense could see that Russia, knowing our position, would sell it to us at such a low price that we could not possibly develop our own manganese and compete with her price. Then, when we get into the tough spot in which we are today, Russia cuts off the supply.

Our other source of supply is India and, of course, we all know India's weakness. She wants our 2,000,000 tons of wheat but will do nothing for us. The third source of supply is Africa.

Just see how dumb we have been.

Foolishly I have supported this legislation in the past, but now I am going to start thinking about my own country first, whether the administration does or not. I intend to vote for all the amendments and then vote against the bill.

Where Credit Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, last week announced that the United States Treasury has closed all American ports to the further importation of canned crab from Russia. Secretary Snyder based this action on the ground that Russian crab is caught or processed in whole or in part by slave or forced labor. When any product is so produced the Secretary may prohibit further imports of it into the United States.

Behind the Secretary's action of closing our ports to Russian canned crab lies the work of one Congressman, RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington. Our colleague, Mr. MACK, insistently and persistently for the past year has been carrying on a fighting campaign against the importation of this Russian crab meat.

Of Mr. MACK's efforts to stop these crab imports the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, one of the largest papers in the Pacific Northwest, recently said editorially:

WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

The entire American crabmeat industry will benefit from the recent Treasury Department order forbidding imports of Russian crab meat into the United States on the ground that it is produced by use of forced convict and indentured labor.

Let it be remembered for the record that two men from this State are entitled to all the credit for this.

They are Mr. Ray Webb, of Westport, spokesman for the crab fishermen of Washington, and Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK.

Mr. Webb called the Post-Intelligencer's attention more than a year ago to the unfair competition to which Washington crab fishermen and packers were being subjected by Russian imports, dumped at prices which Americans could not afford to meet.

As soon as Congressman MACK learned of the matter through the Post-Intelligencer he took it up on the floor of the House.

Congressman MACK'S fight undoubtedly was responsible for the Treasury Department's action—as prior to that time protests from the American crab-meat industry had apparently fallen on deaf ears.

But, Mr. MACK has not been satisfied with just stopping Russian crab meat imports. He says the importation of Russian canned crab is just a symbol of the far more extensive and dangerous practice of American citizens trading with the enemy.

In a recent speech Mr. MACK pointed out that in the first 10 months of 1950 that Britain, France, and Belgium sold Russia and her allies more than $200,000,000 of such war goods as iron, steel, copper, lead, zinc, rubber, ball bearings, automobile trucks, barbed wire, and such similar products.

Mr. MACK said we ought to demand that our so-called allies stop this kind of trading with the enemy. We cannot, however, very effectively, Mr. MACK rightly says, demand that our allies stop trading with the enemy until we, the United States, ourselves stop trading with the enemy.

Mr. MACK in his recent speech pointed out that the United States, in the first 10 months of 1950, bought more than $36,000,000 in goods from Russia and sold her less than $600,000 in goods during that same period.

"In other words," Mr. MACK said, "we have been supplying Russia about $3,000,000 of American money monthly which Russia has employed to buy war goods in other countries. If we want other countries to quit selling war supplies to Russia and her satellites," Mr. MACK correctly argues, "we, the United States, must stop supplying Russia with the money to pay for the war goods she is buying from our allies."

Concerning Mr. MACK'S activities in behalf of the United States trading with the enemy, the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., recently said editorially:

WE NEVER LEARN

Representative MACK of Washington makes a point when he says that the United States should quit trading with the enemy before asking other nations to do so. He told his colleagues that in the first 10 months of 1950 we imported $36,344,398 in goods from Russia, while in the same period we sold her only $563,396 worth. By this process, as Representative MACK observes, we are supplying the Russians some 3,000,000 United States dollars per month—dollars which Russia spends to buy war goods from our so-called good friends, Britain, France, and Belgium.

Russia has many things we need, but she also has some things we don't need, such as furs which compete with our own fur growers' products, with disastrous effects in many cases. We also have goods that the Russians need but they choose to get them elsewhere—mostly from the satellites.

Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, lately exposed the fact that Americans up to quite recently were shipping oil and used tires to Red China and large quantities of steel, aluminum, and copper to Russia. We never seem to learn.

Prevent Rail Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, three of my sisters married railroad men—conductors and brakemen. I happen to have a brother who is chief personnel officer of that same railroad, so I get all arguments, pro and con.

Regardless of what we think, I include, without endorsing everything, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 7, 1951:

PREVENT RAIL STRIKES

This country must find a way to prevent railroad strikes.

In peacetime or wartime such strikes are intolerable. Railway labor cannot fight out its controversies with railway managements without hurting millions of innocent bystanders and gravely endangering the whole Nation.

Most of the yardmen who took part in the "sick strikes" have gone back to work in response to Defense Mobilizer Wilson's appeal to their patriotism.

The damage they have done cannot soon be repaired. The public anger they have aroused is inspiring demands for law to draft strikers into the Army, or to compel arbitration, or to authorize other drastic measures.

Their controversy with the railroads is still unsettled.

Senator MORSE, of Oregon, urges President Truman to settle it by using his war powers and calling on unions and management to accept the decision of an arbitrator appointed by the President.

That might insure temporary peace on the railroads. It might produce an approximation of justice. But it is not a good plan, because it calls for more personal intervention by the President, whereas the need is for less.

For 15 years this country did have a way to prevent railroad strikes.

That way was provided by the Railway Labor Act of 1926, a law sponsored by the railroad unions.

Strikes were not forbidden. There was no compulsory arbitration. The law created good machinery for conciliation and mediation, which helped to settle a large majority of controversies. Those not thus settled were submitted to able fact-finding boards, appointed by the President. The recommendations of such boards were not binding. There was no power to enforce them except the power of public opinion.

Both sides often complained about the board's recommendations. But both sides customarily accepted them. Labor, management and the public were spared the economic loss and punishment of strikes.

The Railway Labor Act still is on the books but most of its effectiveness is gone, destroyed since 1941 when President Roosevelt first intervened to help strike-threatening unions get more than his own appointees to a fact-finding board had recommended.

Time after time since then, railroad unions have rejected conciliation, mediation and fact-finding recommendations, and carried their cases to the White House, seeking and too often getting Presidential intervention.

The ruin of a good law by bad administration and political interference, started under Mr. Roosevelt, has continued under Mr. Truman.

The fine machinery erected by the Railroad Labor Act has all but broken down. It has become almost impossible to persuade enough able, fair, experienced men to help operate that machinery.

Yet the principles of the Railway Labor Act are still sound.

What the country needs is not stern new laws to forbid strikes or to punish strikers, but a return to those sound principles.

The way that prevented railroad strikes for 15 years can prevent them again—not to the complete satisfaction of either labor or management but with happier results for all concerned than the last 10 years have produced.

Root politics and incompetence out of the operation of this law. Put ability and integrity back in. Encourage and help the railroad unions and their members to recover the keen sense of public responsibility they once displayed in such great measure. Help them to regain public confidence and gain public determination that, because they must not strike, they must be fairly treated.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, in the simple far-off days of 1934, the American people, tired of the arguments and squabbling in open congressional debate on the fixing of tariffs. They decided to turn tariff-making over to the President. They imagined he and his aids would sit down in an atmosphere of pure contemplation and study proposed tariffs with an eye single to the public good.

Since then Congress and the public has not known what was happening under executive control of tariff-making. Strangely enough it turned up in the State Departments. Its one-man government is shrouded in mystery.

Our colleagues are now telling us the full story of how our American industries have been injured by one-man State Department tariff agreements. As the complaints grew our guides and mentors in the State Department said that a few industries might suffer but it was all for the general good. They promised that their program would bring about one economic world of peace-loving nations, all trading freely with each other. So the traditional American concept that an individual American has rights even against the Government or the world of nations was scrapped for State Department concepts of the general good.

Today we see that the State Department's one economic world has failed as dismally as their one political world. We see the collapse of their peace program in the Asian debacle, but we must recognize the similar collapse of their world economic Utopia. Never in all history have so many restrictions been put on foreign trade as we have seen since the State Department took over management of foreign trade from Congress. By quotas, bilateral agreements, State monopolies, import licensing, and tinkering with the value of the currency, other nations have been closing their gates while we were opening ours wide to all comers. There was no such thing as reciprocal trade. It was all one way against us.

At home we found that the innocent-appearing plan for freeing world trade had somehow changed into a purely socialistic scheme for government control of all foreign transactions. The sinister result of this high-sounding word "reciprocal" now appears. The Soviet Union has been one of the principal one-sided beneficiaries. We got nothing in return. When the U. S. S. R. sold to us cheap furs and crab meat produced with slave labor over our lowered tariff walls, what did she take from us in exchange? She bought machine tools, chemicals, oil, and other products for her war industries to make the equipment now being used against our men in Korea. Or she took gold for her fifth column operating within our midst. Besides, she threw out of work our laborers in fur and fishing.

Now as the criticisms mount, the proponents of this program say the plan is good, but it has been badly administered. They will fix it directly. It is time we stopped being fooled. A bad law, which gives arbitrary power to one man, is not ever well administered. The reciprocal trade-agreements program is badly administered because it is in the nature of one-man government to be badly administered. Such government is carried on in the interests of the one man in power, and the advisers, toadies, and secret rivals who surround him. It becomes ridiculous, too. It appears that he let 10,000 carloads—or 10,000,000 bushels—of potatoes in from Canada free from tariffs. At the same time the Government burned 10,000 carloads of Maine surplus potatoes and charged it all to the taxpayers.

That is why congresses and parliaments were invented in the first place, to make one-man rule of special favors and corruption impossible. Americans once knew exactly what kind of government they would get if they let one man or a few men with absolute power fix taxes and tariffs and do as they pleased about matters vital to the Nation. They fought a revolutionary war about it.

Let us, before it is too late, correct the same evil. Let us say: We will no longer tolerate one-man tariff making. He shall not determine what industries are to live or die, what workers must learn a new trade or leave home. Under the law as amended he still has power to decide which sections of our country will have a windfall and which will be threatened with decay. Thus he determines the fate of industries vital to our national defense.

Tariffs are laws. They are not the business of the President or his advisers. They are the business of Congress, the representatives of the people.

When Congress voted the first reciprocal trade agreements bill it surrendered that vital principle. Congress gave the Executive its legislative power.

Let us do less talking about the mistakes of the Executive. Let us face our own mistakes. Logrolling is bad, but it is out in the open, and every interest is represented. Executive logrolling is hidden in dark places, and no interest is represented unless it can pay for favors with thousands of votes. The intrigues that go on in the depths of one-man government do far more damage to the Nation than the worst evils in Congress where the citizens can see them and correct them.

Let us for once boldly announce that we have faith in lawmaking by the Congress. Let us decide now that we are done with lawmaking by one-man government. He promised us peace through reciprocal trade. He brought us war and lost our trade. Let us decide we do not want Executive control of our tariff or taxes or wars.

The American Congress is about ready to make the laws, and tell the Executive to obey them.

Mr. Truman's Vicious Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

This is as true today as it was when Jefferson uttered his words, and, of course, we all know that Jefferson founded the Democratic Party and that Franklin Roosevelt dumbfounded it, but I am happy to include the following article which recently appeared in the Washington Times-Herald:

MR. TRUMAN'S VICIOUS TAX PROGRAM

Congress should wholly disregard Mr. Truman's tax proposals.

They are vicious in that they will put a premium on loafing and waste at a time

when the country is supposed to need greater output; and they are silly because they will raise far more money than the Government really needs.

TRIMMED TO WHOSE BONE?

Mr. Truman says he must have all this additional money, most of it to come from higher income taxes, because he can't cut expenses below the seventy-one and one-half billion set forth in his budget. He was vehement about that when some Republican Congressmen asked him whether he didn't think some economies were possible. He said they weren't. He said the budget was trimmed to the bone.

Of course it isn't, either on the civilian or on the military side.

So far as civilian spending goes, Mr. Truman hasn't recommended even a cut in his own vastly excessive personal expense accounts that he gets tax free. He hasn't called for a suspension of all reclamation schemes and money-wasting river and harbor improvements.

He hasn't called for an end to all farm subsidies. He hasn't taken politics out of the post office. He hasn't insisted that the Veterans' Administration cease giving service to gold bricks, but instead has allowed the arch enemy of the gold bricks, Dr. Magnuson, to be fired.

Mr. Truman won't cut the routine expenditures of Government back to the already fantastically extravagant level established by Mr. Roosevelt.

BILLIONS IN FAT

If Mr. Truman needs his vicious tax bill to balance the budget as it stands, he needs much less money than he is asking to balance a reasonable budget.

Senator BYRD, a Democrat, says he has found seven billions of fat in Mr. Truman's budget. Senator DOUGLAS, among others, is equally confident that great economies are possible on the civil side.

These are Democrats, one of them a confirmed New Dealer, and if they know that Mr. Truman is the most extravagant President by far that this country has ever known, surely the Republicans in Congress should have no trouble in proving the case and making it stick with the help of conservative southern Members.

The military budget is an even worse offender against the prosperity and welfare of the people. The President pretends that the Nation must have 3,500,000 men in service and he is quite obviously getting ready to raise the ante to 4,000,000 or more as soon as the 3,500,000 are under arms.

No one has shown the need for any such numbers and nobody ever can if Congress will demand an accounting of just what all these men are to do.

This country and its possessions can be fully protected against invasion with no more Navy than we now have, with some growth in our Air Force, and with no more troops than the Army now has. There is no need for the draft. There is no need for the enormous expenditures planned for equipment.

If Congress will adopt the Wherry resolution or something like it, and then restrict our contribution to Europe under the North Atlantic treaty to naval and air support and even some deliveries of munitions, the whole case for these tax increases blows up.

If, in addition, Mr. Truman will exert himself to find a way to end the war in Korea that never should have been begun, which has already cost us more than 7,000 lives, and from which nothing is to be gained, taxes actually can be reduced.

Of course, if this country is to support an enormously swollen and ever-swelling bureaucracy, if it is to subsidize everybody who wants a handout at home and abroad, if it is to engage in utile wars and seek other and bigger and more futile ones to fight, then no conceivable amount of taxation can balance the budget.

IT WILL SOAK EVERYBODY

Let there be no mistake about it. Mr. Truman's tax plan, if adopted, will ruin the country. It will grind the poor as well as the rich. It will take so large a part of everyone's earnings that there will be little incentive to work harder and therefore produce more.

And let there be no mistake, either, about the only approach to the problem that will succeed in defeating the Truman program. The only way to lick it is to slash the appropriations, civil and military, until they are brought within the capacity of the people to pay them.

That means an end to New Deal squandering and, more particularly, a revision of New Deal foreign policy. Everything else is economic and political quackery.

Your Public Relations in the National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended the following statement of Edward L. Bernays, well-known authority on public relations of New York City, which appeared as a public advertisement and which I believe to be of sufficient general interest to be included in the Appendix:

YOUR PUBLIC RELATIONS IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

(By Edward L. Bernays)

For some time now forward-looking Americans have recognized that private interest must coincide with public interest. This is particularly true in the present national emergency.

But some of us have not yet awakened to this truth. And unless everyone of us does, there may be no private interest left to worry about.

Our national strength is founded on a unified, powerful morale.

This morale is built by our common belief in our national goals and united action to achieve them.

The national emergency demands that all of us on all fronts work together for the general good.

Complete cooperation on the home front is as vital to national survival as it is on the military front.

For the sake of his own private interest, the individual must willingly sacrifice convenience, comfort, and profit for the common good, endure hardships and suffering.

For unless we maintain our continuity as a free, independent nation, we shall have nothing as individuals.

Every American is responsible for our morale. Our national morale is the sum of our individual morales. This means that all of us, men and women, old and young, corporation executives and employees, must be willing to serve wherever and whenever we are needed. Any man who acts at the country's expense helps the enemy. If he injures his country's strength, he destroys everything he values for himself.

Acting at America's expense includes profiteering, chiseling, black and gray marketeering, or doing anything which places personal profit above the public interest.

It also includes slander, hate, rumormongering, and scapegoating at the expense of public officials or private citizens.

Our national welfare in this emergency requires that individuals, groups, and corporations give the most painstaking attention to their public relationships.

They must ensure, in their own interest and in the public interest, that every action and utterance *raises* morale and does not lower or destroy it.

They must make certain that their policies, words, and acts are dictated not by narrow immediate expediency but by the broader interest of self and country.

If ever there was a time when such public relationships were indispensable, that time is now.

The Sixth Anniversary of Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, February 7 should be a day of national memory. This is the anniversary of Yalta, a conference which should live in history as a day of mourning.

On this day, 6 years ago, the people of Poland, whose heroic and tragic battle was the first resistance to Nazi aggression, were sold into the despotism of communism. To those who say that the people of central Europe have willingly accepted the domination of Soviet Russia, I give you the example of Poland.

The people of Poland were not consulted at Yalta. They were not asked to vote. They were not considered as human beings. On the contrary—they were traded as a commodity over a counter, turned over to the Kremlin as part of a bargaining deal.

By our Government's participation in this agreement, we forfeited our claim to moral leadership throughout the world. Lest we forget, Alger Hiss was at Yalta. By all accounts, he played a large role in its deliberations. Lest we forget, too, the agreements reached at Yalta have never been submitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification or examination. Our State Department does not regard them as treaties, but they are treaties in every other sense. They have bound us hand and foot in Poland. They have made it impossible for us to protest against the seizure of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

Thanks to these commitments, our Government has done what the armies of Stalin could never have done. We have literally pushed millions of our friends behind the iron curtain, never to emerge in our lifetime.

Let Americans who are confused by the march of events remember this day. February 7 is the anniversary of Yalta, another day that should live in infamy in the annals of history.

Address of Hon. John Sparkman, Senator From Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, Senator from Alabama, at the annual Democratic dinner in New York:

Mr. Chairman, Senator LEHMAN, ladies, and gentlemen, Democrats all, I am glad to join you tonight in this victory dinner paying honor to a great American. I may add that he is almost an Alabamian. His roots are in Alabama. Had his parents waited just a little longer about moving to New York from Alabama he would have been born there along with his older brothers and sisters.

This occasion is indeed an appropriate one.

We in Congress have not known Senator LEHMAN as long as you have, but he has already made a profound impression upon us. We all admire his integrity and honesty. Particularly do we like his characteristics of tolerance and open-mindedness. Never in any debate in which he was engaged, nor in any statement made by him, have I heard him in any way impugn the motives of his adversary or fail to respect fully the thoughts of others.

These are invaluable qualities. They are qualities which we all must cultivate and practice if we are to meet successfully the crisis that confronts us today.

We recognize that the problems produced by this crisis are so numerous and possible solutions so clouded by uncertain or unknown factors that there are bound to be honest differences of opinion on the best way to get the results we want.

In this land of ours, which has become the citadel of freedom and democracy for the entire world, it is necessary that the policy we pursue be submitted to free and open discussion and adopted by a meeting of minds. Our leaders do not, as does the Kremlin, submit only one choice and liquidate those who do not vote for it.

Of course, in the policy that we follow there is delay in determining just what our actions shall be. Free and open discussion, however, is a necessary process if there is to be an understanding by the American people of the realities of the situation, and if they are to be aware of the critical issues with which our leaders must deal. There must be such understanding and awareness if in the long run our relations with other countries are to receive the support of the American people.

Our leaders in the executive branch of the Government know this. The policies suggested by them have been reviewed before the Congress and laid before the people with reasonable regularity. This has been done in the hope that the proposed policies would be met with reason, modified with reason, and adopted with unity.

Unfortunately, in these times some who have means of reaching sizable audiences yield to the easy temptation to give forth utterances of impassioned but confusing nature. Too often do they dwell on the past, too frequently do they seek to find official scapegoats for conditions which they themselves helped to create. They, and all of us, should realize that to assume public responsibility in these days is to accept the heavy burden of dealing with inevitable problems, fears, and failures; and from these, to chart the course to ultimate success. This requires penetration, tolerance, and, above all, honesty.

In spite of the unnecessarily created confusion, it does seem to me that out of the great debate which has been raging during the past several weeks there is emerging a national unity. We have found many points of agreement.

Thus the great debate is now entering into a conclusive and constructive phase.

Even though valuable time has been lost, debate has been necessary to air our differences of opinion, to bring to our people a keener understanding of the great dangers which we face, and to enable us to work out a course which an overwhelming majority of us can follow. Isolationism and defeatism, twin sister of the disgruntled and the despairing, have again been thwarted in their fight to determine the Nation's policies.

Whatever discussions we have in the future, may they not be partisan, acrimonious, or selfish in aim. May our sole purpose be to bring about the unity so vital to our survival.

As Senator LEHMAN so aptly said in this same city when he addressed the Democratic National Committee at its dinner here last December, "If we are firm enough and wise enough we will avoid catastrophe. But a household divided against itself can be neither firm nor wise nor strong. We have the right to expect unity in the free world. But beyond this, we have the right to expect, nay, to insist, upon unity in the world affairs at home. If ever there was a time to merge our differences in a common cause, that time is now. United in determination as well as in action, or cause, and the cause of freedom in the world will prevail."

The same processes which enable people in a democracy like ours to reach a common goal on the national level are not only inevitable but desirable in world forums. It is necessary that we be just as patient and tolerant in dealing with peoples of other free countries as we are with one another if we are to reach understandings mutually helpful to us and to them.

We must recognize that many barriers such as language, background, and so forth, while surmountable, make our problem of reaching a common ground more difficult. Yet in the long run, it is absolutely essential that nations of the world, and especially the free nations, understand and respect one another's rights if there is ever to be a peaceful world in which the dignity of man has value.

We can never compromise our principles, and that is why we had to insist in the United Nations that the Communists of China be labeled the aggressor in Korea. This to the American people was a moral issue, and to have evaded or refused action would have caused a far greater lack of support for the United Nations than any military set-back in Korea.

The United Nations went into Korea in the first place because it was the moral thing to do.

The United Nations can suffer military defeats and survive; it cannot sacrifice principles and survive. It is indeed encouraging that an overwhelming number of United Nations members voted last week to uphold the moral principles necessary to keep that organization alive and virile.

What was and is the best course to follow regarding Korea is not the first nor will it be the last instance in which free member nations disagree.

In deciding our stand on problems that arise we must make every fair effort to reconcile our differences, if any, with other free nations. They expect leadership from us, not dictation.

They say, and with much truth, that agreeing with one another is a two-way street. They say, and again with much truth, that while they need us, we also need them.

No one can deny that on the whole we have been considerate of other nations' attitudes. No one can deny that there have been occasions in which we justifiably criticized the attitude of our allies. Such are some of the aspects of the Korean crisis. Yet some of us have been deeply concerned by the vigor with which some Americans insist that the United Nations accept completely and without any variation the views of the United States.

There can be complete subservience only by nations that are satellites. Few Americans, if any, want for us in the United Nations this Russian-like situation. Rather we want other nations' confidence. We want them to know that we have no imperialistic designs on them and that we are only interested in maintaining our freedom and helping other like-minded nations to do likewise. We want them to make their share of whatever sacrifices are necessary to crown our joint efforts with success, but we want to work with them in determining what these efforts shall be.

These, it seems to me, are elemental prerequisites if liberty-loving nations are to stand together to maintain liberty.

We know that the appeasement of communism does not pay. Certainly we should leave nothing undone to encourage other nations to resist communism. Most of them, however, are much closer to Communist armies and are in more immediate danger than are we. Their greater reluctance to make a move that might bring Communist retaliation can therefore be understood. Part of our job is to build a joint security, and to persuade these nations that further appeasement is even more dangerous than resisting pressure now.

Surely, we should be foolish to give up the United Nations in despair any time a crisis is upon us. What kind of a country would we have today if the Thirteen Colonies had taken a similar attitude under the Articles of Confederation? History records many crises, any one of which could have been fatal, through which this Nation has passed.

Instead of permitting these many threatening situations and differences to destroy us, wisdom prevailed and we emerged from each crisis stronger than ever. We may do the same in the United Nations. The possible good is worth the try.

Many forget that the United Nations is a very young organization. It has no great body for tradition on which it can stand. Before it has discovered its own two feet, unbelievably heavy burdens have been placed upon it. It is surprising when one reviews the many accomplishments of the United Nations. That within itself would take a long time to relate.

Some critics seem to expect from a 5-year-old organization the strength, the endurance, the character, and the abilities of a fully mature institution.

Others make the mistake of looking on the United Nations only from the standpoint of military security. It is true that this is and should be a major function of the United Nations. I wish we all could realize, however, the important part which member nations want the United Nations to play in building economic security. In fact, I dare say that a large majority of the 60 members would rank this No. 1 on their list of the most effective things the United Nations could do to check communism.

It is tragic that Russia and those who follow her make it necessary for other nations to use for defense purposes resources

which could go toward building a better economic life. Economic security is a goal, however, which must not be lost sight of even though temporarily dimmed by the necessity of military preparation. It is one which Russia intentionally strives to block because in the long run it is an effective bar to Communist expansion.

The importance of the United Nations working toward economic security can be appreciated when one realizes that one-half of the world's people have an average annual income of less than $100 a piece.

Two-thirds of the world's people live in poverty and suffer from hunger and disease. They are determined to make a change. The question so vital to our world is in what direction will they go.

This is a problem to which the United Nations has not yet been able to give proper attention. To condemn that organization, however, because some of its functions are not operating with perfection at the present time is as naive and dangerous as it would have been to condemn the Constitution of the United States because it failed to prevent the War Between the States, or because its eighteenth amendment was impossible to enforce. In an imperfect world, we have to learn to live with imperfections which we cannot immediately remedy.

I am not arguing that we should not try to remedy the imperfection in collective security today. I simply suggest that we should endeavor to analyze clearly and honestly the weaknesses in the United Nations, and then make every effort to eliminate them. If we do this and still fail, we can at least hold our heads high and honestly say that the resultant destruction was not of our making.

While it may never be that we can solve all our international problems through the United Nations, does anyone believe our problems would grow less outside that organization? Of course, Russia poses many problems inside the UN. Would we have less problems with Russia if either or both nations were on the outside? As I have indicated, the United Nations has solved several vexing problems, potentially dangerous to world peace.

Were we to abandon our goal of collective security through the United Nations, we would endanger more than moral and economic power. We would in the process jeopardize what limited security we might obtain through alliances with a chosen few. We would jeopardize the regional defense arrangements such as the North Atlantic Pact and the defense agreement with Latin America already made under the United Nations.

We would bring upon ourselves the multiple dangers of a half-hearted isolationism.

Just as we have learned the high costs of appeasement, so should we have learned the high cost of isolation. It did not prevent World Wars I and II; it would not prevent world war III. It would, however, virtually assure that the Communist would be able to take over the rich resources of Western Europe. It would also virtually assure that world war III would come as soon as the Communists had consolidated their ill-gotten gains. It would bring about the almost certain destruction of our form of government and our way of life.

The fact has been greatly publicized that in Western Europe alone lies one-third of the world's industrial potential. Should Western Europe fall into Communist hands, the Communist rulers would be able to challenge us on almost even terms. Their coal resources would be doubled. Their steel output would be tripled. Furthermore, their manpower would exceed ours overwhelmingly. How safe could the United States be in that situation?

It is possible, of course, that with superior air and sea power we could retaliate against the conquerors of Europe and destroy a large part of the industrial might they had gained. If we were to rest our defense and our security on such a plan, we would invoke the hatred of every human being now living in Western Europe.

General Eisenhower, in his recent report, makes clear that Western Europe will resist aggression if they can be sure of our help. Recent actions of England, France, and other West European countries, actions that compare favorably with our own efforts, should remove doubt that the countries value their freedoms and will fight, if need be, to retain them.

As General Eisenhower says, "We must give Europe assistance, not only because there is no acceptable alternative but because if we were left standing alone, isolated in a world of communism, our system would wither away."

No; there is neither wisdom nor justice nor safety in allowing American support of the free world to deteriorate, and I cannot believe that those who have proposed such a policy have its establishment as their goal.

The time draws near when we must compose our differences at home and enunciate a policy that will have the undivided support of the American people and the respect and allegiance of the free world.

I think the circumstances in which we find ourselves, and the experiences which we have already had, point clearly to the course which is in our best interest.

That course is a reaffirmation and a strengthening of the bonds that exist between the United States and other nations in the free world. It is a policy of mutual defense, of collective security to the greatest degree possible. It is a policy of economic, political, and military participation in the defense of Europe. It is a policy of unwavering faith in the United Nations, and persistent and patient efforts to bring its security functions to maturity.

It is not pleasant for our people to contemplate such a long, hard program. It is a program that brings few cheers. But I have seen the American people respond to crises before, and I know that once again our people will endure hardship courageously to remove another obstacle to world progress. It is the only program I know that will at the same time work to deter aggression and prepare us to defeat it.

Over the centuries man has dreamed of peace. Cooperative efforts by peace-minded nations to build peace is nothing new. It was tried as far back as the Greek city states and has been tried many times since. The failure of such efforts does not diminish the truth of the fact that only through international cooperation can there be built a world of freedom and justice.

As long as we remain people free to dream we must continue to work for this kind of world. We must do so because to the degree that freedom and justice do not exist elsewhere, freedom and justice are threatened in our own country.

We must do so because it is the righteous and moral thing to do. We must do so because it is our only hope for eventual world peace and for the preservation of the dignity of mankind.

We must never let the hope for peace die.

This, I know, is also the prayer and hope of the man whom we honor tonight. His whole life has been and is dedicated to humanitarianism, to freedom and justice for our people and for all people.

I need not relate the many honors that have been him. Few Americans have held so many positions of trust and confidence. Yet he has told me that of all his high honors and all his achievements the deepest satisfaction he has enjoyed came to him as Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

This was one of the most difficult tasks he ever undertook. His helping to relieve thousands and millions of hunger and suffering, however, more than compensated for the pain and trouble caused him. His outstanding work with UNRRA is certainly one job by which he wishes to be remembered.

The people of New York have done well by themselves and by the Nation in returning him to Washington for a full 6-year term in the United States Senate.

Investigate the Freeing of Nazi War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that other Members of this House must have been as shocked as I was when they learned that our American authorities had reprieved 21 Germans sentenced to death for alleged war crimes, and pardoned or commuted sentences of 68 others.

In my opinion, these reprieves, granted to persons who committed the worst crimes against humanity in all history, have struck a death blow at the very foundation of our American system of justice and have brought down upon us the derision and contempt of the world.

How dare our American authorities release these war criminals in the face of our Nation's promise that they would be punished to the limit for their horrible and unbelievable crimes? How dare they turn loose upon civilization that loyal Hitler ally, Alfred Krupp, the munitions king, who helped plan the conquest of the world? Six of Krupp's business directors are again free to help his new rise to power. Four former Nazi generals, thanks to us, are once again free to plot against democracy and to advance the cause of nazism. Others were forgiven for their monstrous massacre of American prisoners at Malmedy, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge. Surely, the parents and relatives of those massacred must be aghast at our unpardonable action, and embittered by this disregard of the sacrifices made in the name of freedom.

Krupp has stated that he intends to take over the active management of his vast iron, steel, and coal empire of the Ruhr. He will again control the tremendous properties restored to him by the recent order of United States High Commissioner, John J. McCloy. This is a stern reminder that in all these years since the shooting war stopped, we have failed in one of our chief aims—the breaking up of the great German cartels. Our objective was to prevent forever, their gaining control of the German Government again. Those cartels built

up the German war machine and restricted our own defense production. The reprieve of Krupp restores to power German Nazi industrialists, and his strategy, wealth, and control will unquestionably aid the cause of nazism.

We know that so far, our program to break up cartels has failed, and that former Nazi industrial leaders have slipped back into places of power in Germany. Now we have freed one of the greatest plotters against democracy of all time, who reaped millions of dollars of profits as a result of the wars he inspired, and whose industrial controls made them possible. It is reported that upon being questioned, Krupp said that he had not thought out philosophically the ramifications of his conduct. In other words, there is no feeling of guilt or shame on his part. His release from prison is another threat to our own liberty, for we cannot expect loyalty from such a man—rather we must fear him. His hunger for profits out of war, death, and destruction, far outweighs any other considerations.

On February 1, 1950, I wrote Commissioner McCloy, urging that he carry out immediately the execution of the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts on top Nazi war criminals, and whose cases were being reviewed. I received a reply giving weak excuses for the delay. I thereupon investigated, and found out that on March 9, 1950, official notification was sent by the State Department to Commissioner McCloy, informing him that he as High Commissioner, had complete and absolute authority to execute the death sentences. I again communicated with McCloy, insisting that it was his duty to obey the mandate given him, forthwith. I emphasized the fact that the criminals had had every opportunity to protect their legal rights; that they had failed to prove their innocence in the Nuremberg court; that their appeals had failed; and that after years of delay, the death-dealing Nazi criminals stood guilty as ever—but were still alive.

The campaign of forgiveness, of disgraceful reversal of our former judgments was under way then, as evidenced by the unconscionable disregard by our officials of the clear duties imposed upon them.

Who can forget the gruesome reports which reached us concerning the atrocities committed by Frau Ilse Koch—the mistress of Buchenwald. Reports of her sadistic killings of the tortured inmates of the concentration camp still fill us with revulsion and horror. Her ghoulish practices shocked the entire world. Who forgave her? Our own Gen. Lucius D. Clay, when American military governor in Germany, commuted her life sentence to 4 years when he decided that the charges against her were not satisfactorily proved. In answer to that stupid decision one might ask—Can a lampshade testify?

It remained for a German court, after a new trial had been ordered, to impose upon Ilse Koch the maximum sentence possible—imprisonment for life. Our fiasco in lessening her punishment added to our list of monumental failures in dealing with Nazi war criminals.

I consider the mass reprieves a boon to all those who would destroy freedom and democracy—particularly to the Communists who can point a finger of scorn at us and label our about-face as bribery.

I cannot countenance or condone this action by our American authorities in Germany. I am certain that countless other Americans, as well as myself, demand an explanation. So do many Germans who opposed nazism and who want no resurgence of it. What faith are they to place in us in the future? How can we expect democracy to flourish in Germany in the face of such actions on our part? We want to know what motives underlie the mass reprieve order. Any good which was anticipated by such reprieves is wholly destroyed by the resulting general distrust of American motives, and the assured rise to power of former Nazi war lords, whose dream of world conquest is now renewed.

I have introduced a resolution calling for a complete and immediate investigation of the United States military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, and a report as to why the mass clemency order was issued. My resolution requires an answer to the questions raised, and I shall do my utmost to get immediate action on it. I urge the Members of this House to give it their support.

I have also reintroduced my resolution calling for a complete investigation of the American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it, with reference to the extent to which they have permitted or encouraged the reestablishment of cartels, the resumption of power by former Nazis and the resurgence of fascism and antisemitism.

I first introduced the latter measure on January 4, 1950. It is apparent now that such an investigation is imperative and should have been ordered long ago. Had we been alert to the danger, had we anticipated and prevented the coddling of the Nazi leaders and criminals, we would not now be confronted with such an unwise and unjustifiable decision as that recently made by Commissioner McCloy.

Let us act now on this important question, before further irreparable damage is done.

Patuxent Produces Navy Test Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Patuxent Base Skips Glamor in Training Navy Test Pilots," which appeared in the Baltimore Sun, January 14, 1951. It describes the activities of the naval air test center, a function of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics, of which Rear Adm. A. M. Pride is Chief. The article follows:

PATUXENT BASE SKIPS GLAMOR IN TRAINING NAVY TEST PILOTS

(By Lt. Comdr. R. J. Boylan, U. S. Naval Reserve)

There's a school that isn't a school down along the Patuxent River.

It has a two-story building, an air-conditioned classroom with desks and blackboards, a faculty with college degrees, and hundreds of young men clamoring to get in.

But Rear Adm. Malcolm F. Schoeffel, the headman in the area, loathes many of the connotations that the word "school" implies. So it's known as TPT for test-pilot training at the naval air test center, a rolling 6,800-acre tract in southeast Maryland, where the third Lord Baltimore used to live.

The admiral believes that TPT is certainly a place of higher learning, and he is well aware of its grueling curriculum, but he just feels that calling it a school might tend to obscure its purpose and give the place a false impression of being a institution rather than a living organism.

WAS STARTED IN 1948

TPT was started in 1948 with a high ambition: To produce the best test pilots in the world. There is quite a gap in the world of military aviation between the aeronautical engineers who design airplanes and the pilots who fly them. The industry's test pilots help to bridge that gap. The Navy hopes that by training some test pilots of its own there will be a greater accord between the drawing board and the plane in flight.

Above all, the Navy and TPT do not want to turn out anything approaching the Hollywood comic strip or television version of test pilot—a glamour boy who risks his neck in screaming dives and comes up with a boyish grin and only a vague idea of what happened and why.

TPT takes only the cream of the applications—about 37 out of 375. It starts with the fact that the applicants are experienced Navy pilots. And in a difficult 6 months that combines academic classroom work in the mornings and flying along planned, practical and problem-filled lines in the afternoon, it attempts to produce a combination pilot-engineer who can write an intelligent, clear, concise report on his test experiences with piston and jet aircraft.

HIGH ENTRANCE STANDARDS

Pilots come to TPT from the fleet and from other air activities. They must have the recommendations of their commanding officer who fills out a form giving the applicant's experience in aircraft, a summary of his high-school and college courses but also adding an opinion of the applicant's energy and determination in performance of flying duties, his judgment, patience, and conscientiousness, and his intelligence and ability to analyze problems.

After examining the papers from the 375 applicants TPT can pick the makings of a really outstanding class for its 6-month course.

Although still young and currently instructing only its fifth class, TPT has ambitions to extend its length from 6 to 8 months and to keep its graduates employed on test projects at the Naval Air Test Center for 2 years after graduation. It also has ambitions along other lines.

One ambition, to be realized this spring, will be to invite nine manufacturers each to send a test pilot to the school to learn Navy methods of testing aircraft. Except for salary the Navy plans to bear all the expenses

of the test pilots while they go through the 6-month course. Manufacturers are Grumman, Martin, Curtiss-Wright, McDonnell, Chance Vought, Consolidated, North American, Douglas, and Lockheed.

BEGUN ON A SHOESTRING

The course will enable the manufacturers' test pilots to have broad experience in flying a wide variety of planes. The Navy also hopes it will give them increased status at their plants. Some company test pilots do not have enough status to convince engineers that certain flight qualities must be corrected.

TPT was started on a shoestring, with an appropriation of only $19,000. That meant that the founders had to borrow desks and beg equipment, but TPT proved its value with the first class of graduates. And although it's a school that isn't a school, its students behave very much like students everywhere. They have their names engraved on a metal plaque which hangs in the ready room adjoining the single classroom and at graduation they have diplomas and a dinner dance at the officers' club.

Graduation is a happy time because it means the end of a long period of working hard from early morning until late at night. Students attend classes in algebra, trigonometry, slide rule, physics, thermodynamics, structures, engines, aerodynamics, stability, armament, and other subjects from 8:15 a. m. until 11:45 a. m. with 10-minute breaks for coffee in the ready room.

AFTERNOONS OF FLYING

The afternoons of flying in one of TPT's stable of planes are carefully planned to complement what the pilot has learned mornings. Before lunch (for which he has a generous half hour, whether he needs it or not) he works out a problem with mathematics and slide rule. In the afternoon he takes up a 500-mile-per-hour-plus Banshee jet fighter and works it out in the upper air.

After 3 weeks of check-out flights in the planes, which range from a Catalina flying boat to late jets, a student advances to performance flights for 12 weeks and then "handling qualities" flights for the last 6 or 7 weeks. The first class of 20 flew 2,500 hours during their 5½ months at TPT. This included 900 hours of familiarization and 850 hours of instrument flying.

After a day like that the TPT student has little or no time for an evening of relaxation at the officers' club. One reason is that he probably either has some night flying or some late hours with the slide rule. Another is that it is a solid 7 miles from the bachelor officers' quarters to the club.

REASONS FOR PRIDE

TPT, despite its short history, has reason to be proud of its present and its past. Its small faculty is headed by Daniel Dommasch, who has an unusual combination of academic and practical background. After receiving a degree as master of aeronautical engineering from New York University, he became a structural analyst with Fairchild and later Brewster aircraft companies. Then he was a project engineer with the CAA for 4 years, a project engineer and engineering coordinator at Bell Aircraft in Buffalo, and assistant professor of Iowa State College in aeronautical engineering.

Another member is Walter Hesse, who has a master of science degree in mechanical engineering and who now is working on his Ph. D. His thesis is based on the development of a thrust meter and a means of testing thrust meters.

TPT also has been instrumental in landing at Patuxent an engineering extension course of the University of Maryland on the graduate level. This enables civilians and other personnel at the station to get a master's degree by night study. TPT's faculty helps out in presenting the university courses.

But the best test of any place of higher learning is its graduates. And there TPT can pridefully point to Capt. Marcel Guoin, coordinator of tests; Capt. R. E. Dixon, of flight test; Capt. W. J. Widhelm, of tactical test; Commander Turner F. Caldwell, Jr., assistant director of flight test, who was one of the test pilots for the Douglas Skystreak D558–1, which surpassed Mach 1 in its early flights; and many successful Navy test pilots.

Let's Hope the 1951 Method Employed in Negotiating Contract Will Set Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal which expresses eloquently the sentiments of many people with regard to the contract recently negotiated between the United Mine Workers and the coal operators:

LET'S HOPE THE 1951 METHOD EMPLOYED IN NEGOTIATING CONTRACT WILL SET PATTERN

For more than 30 years President Lewis has been pleading with the bituminous coal operators to set up a small official committee, representing their many separate organizations, with whom the UMWA could deal in promoting efficiency and peaceful settlement of wage matters.

The bituminous wage agreement signed January 18 represents the nearest approach to a peaceful, intelligent method of wage negotiations in the history of the industry.

The new organization of bituminous coal operators, headed by Harry Moses, is in a large measure responsible for the quiet negotiations that prevailed.

Of course, Mr. Moses consulted with his membership—which is largely composed of captive-mine operators, but also includes the largest commercial operators in the Nation.

The Southern Coal Producers Association was freely consulted after negotiations between the northerners and the UMWA had weighed the situation and had reached a measurable understanding and agreement.

The press and radio, as well as publicity bureaus, were equally surprised when the first news leak of progress being made toward the new agreement came 24 hours before its signing.

Signing of the new agreement without fanfare or Government interference—promoting legal action in one form or another—and without a division among operators as between the North and the South, is an achievement of such magnitude that the industry as a whole can feel justly proud.

It's a stand-out of collective bargaining that proves once again that the less the Government interferes in wage matters, and the more business organizations refrain from trumped-up misrepresentations in publicity attacks, the better off will be the lot of employers, employees, and the Nation.

Of course, the agreement was a sad blow to the year-round anti-Lewis, anti-UMWA writers, cartoonists, and commentators. As one wag put it:

"The peaceful settlement in coal means there'll be no spring training for many in these vocations."

Both coal operators and coal miners have learned a lot during the last decade about coal wage matters and working conditions being tried in the press and on the radio. A great deal of harm has resulted from the widespread misstatements about every phase of coal production and consumption during these wildcat publicity campaigns.

The war in Korea and the armament program gave impetus to the orderly procedure of negotiating both the bituminous and anthracite agreements.

The Nation is now reassured of an ample coal supply.

Coal miners will not be easily lured to other jobs.

The business of coal-mining communities will go ahead as best it can under whatever restrictions of price fixing and controls the Government imposes.

Coal miners and their families will bury the thought that they will be singled out for inequitable treatment as regards wages and rationing as was the case on numerous occasions during World War II.

President Lewis rightfully termed the agreement a "bread and butter contract" for, certainly, the increase in food prices fully justifies the 20-cents-an-hour, 10-percent increase agreed upon.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the southern coal operators—which group was ostensibly organized during the war period to deflate the UMWA at the war's end—also joined Mr. Moses in praising the settlement.

To the surprise of nearly everyone, John Battle, executive vice president of the National Coal Association, for the first time that we can recall, complimented both the industry and the UMWA.

The coal industry can well rejoice in the hope that the wage negotiations of January 1951, will set a pattern which will govern the industry's wage negotiations in the future.

The time lost, the money spent, and the streaming of representatives of Government agencies and politicians into coal disputes can and should be avoided.

The United States has the most productive coal mines in the world.

American coal miners are the most efficient.

American coal is the best prepared in the world.

Under common-sense procedure the American coal industry can continue to grow and prosper under a sound labor-management relationship policy.

Anthracite operators, following the custom of letting the bituminous operators negotiate in advance, quickly signed an agreement carrying the same wage increases.

In recent years the anthracite industry has greatly reduced negotiating periods. This has largely resulted from the reduction of negotiating committees to a minimum number and holding down on publicity releases dealing with the conference differences.

This, in turn, has resulted in vastly improved labor relations in the region. The old game of around-the-year open-season attacks on the anthracite miners and the UMWA has given way to joint action between management and miners for more efficient production and bigger markets.

In anthracite, as in bituminous, President Lewis has through the years preached the doctrine that cooperation between the producers and the UMWA could achieve a remarkable result for the coal industry as a whole.

Maybe some day the anti-union crowd, as well as some prominent present-day labor leaders who have reached the heights due to President Lewis' efforts, will appreciate his contribution in setting the pace for the betterment of American workers.

Letter of James Shea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my attention one of the most beautiful letters that I have ever read. The letter was written by a Canadian father to the Adjutant General of the United States Army just after he had been notified of the death in action of his son in Korea.

His beloved son, born in Newark, N. J., enlisted in the United States Army in Buffalo, N. Y., in April of 1950, and gave his life in the month of December of that year.

The beauty and thought expressed in his letter and the great faith and hope in the cause for which his son fought were so unselfishly revealed that I wrote and asked the father for permission to place his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may be read by all. Granted that permission, the letter follows:

ST. CATHARINES, ONTARIO,
December 14, 1950.

The ADJUTANT GENERAL,
United States Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some months ago it was my privilege to stand in the reconstructed House of Burgesses in Williamsburg, and a few days later to visit the home of Thomas Jefferson at Monticello. It was on a cool summer morning that Mrs. Shea and I stood in the old capitol, and as we stood there time rolled back for me. As I sat on one of the benches of the house I visualized that maybe from where I was sitting Patrick Henry had made his famous treason speech. That the men gathered around him were solemn faced in the decision to resist tyranny and oppression.

At about the same time, as we stood there in reverence, my son, James, was in the perimeter of the beachhead in Korea. No less a patriot than Washington, Jefferson, and Henry, because he, along with many other poor lads, was fighting the cause of liberty.

And now your letter of December 11 comes to me, that somewhere in that distant land he has found his final resting place. Well, let it be, and if need be, there are six other lives from the father of him, and the mother of him, to the youngest of his brothers, who will willingly give what he and countless others before him have given, and what countless others will give in the preservation of human rights and dignity.

God bless him, and you, and the rest of our leaders, who so nobly endeavor in the right. May my flag and your flag fly in the furthermost corners of the earth for where these flags fly shall we always find liberty and justice, and government of the people.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES SHEA.

Who Says Statistics Are Dry?—Just Look At These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from Labor, a national weekly newspaper, dated February 3, 1951:

WHO SAYS STATISTICS ARE DRY?—JUST LOOK AT THESE—NEW "NO-RUBBER YARDSTICK" PROVES AVERAGE AMERICAN TWICE AS WELL OFF AS IN HOOVER 1933

From now on, there's a complete and devastating answer to the shouts that high taxes and the welfare state are ruining this country. The answer is provided by a brand new kind of statistical report, issued by the conservative Department of Commerce.

Daily papers brushed off this report and distorted its significance. They tried to give the public the impression that, somehow, the new statistics puncture exaggerated claims about the economic progress made by America in the years of the New Deal and Fair Deal.

What does the report actually show? First, let's see what the Commerce Department says about it, and why it is important.

"Gross national product," the Department explains, "is a comprehensive measure of the Nation's output of goods and services."

In other words, gross national product is a figure which shows how much the American people produced in a year, and, therefore, how much they can consume and enjoy in a year. It's the best yardstick of the American standard of living.

Up to now, the Department points out, gross national product has been measured in current dollars. The value of a dollar increased during the depression, and since then the value of a dollar has decreased. So up to now, statisticians measured gross national product by what might be called a rubber yardstick.

But now, by long and scientific study, the Department's statisticians have taken all the "rubber" out of the yardstick. In the new report, the first of its kind, they measure gross national product in constant dollars—having the same value each and every year.

Thus, for all the years from 1929 through 1950, they have a real measure of gross national product—a measure making possible accurate comparison of any year's production with that of any other year.

Let's compare the gross national product in 1950, the latest year, with that of 1933, the year when Hoover stepped out of the White House and Roosevelt stepped in.

The propagandists who shout that high taxes and the welfare state are ruining the country want the people to forget that 1933 was a year of the Hoover hunger, when millions of Americans were tramping the streets in desperate search of jobs. They picture 1933 as a glorious time of low taxes and free enterprise.

Well, measured by the new "no-rubber" yardstick, the gross national product in 1933 was $61,500,000,000. That's what the American people then produced, and had to consume and enjoy.

In 1950, after 17 years of the New Deal and Fair Deal, the new "no-rubber" yardstick shows the gross national product was $153,000,000,000, a 149 percent increase over 1933.

In other words, in 1950 the American people produced, consumed, and enjoyed almost exactly two and one-half times as much goods and services as they did in 1933—the good old days of low taxes, no welfare state, and the Hoover hunger.

Let's be absolutely fair about it. In 1933, the population of this country was about 125,000,000, and in 1950 it was 150,000,000. So gross national product would have had to increase somewhat just to keep pace with population.

After making full allowance for that fact, however, this is clear:

In 1950, the average American produced, consumed, and enjoyed exactly twice as much goods and services as he did in 1933. Obviously, he was twice as well off after 17 years of the New Deal and Fair Deal.

In view of that fundamental fact—proven by the new "no-rubber" yardstick—the talk about high taxes and the welfare state ruining the country is just plain nonsense.

Wayne County District Commissioners' Annual Report, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, we have in my home county, Wayne County, Iowa, an unusually effective and efficient board of commissioners for the soil-conservation district. The annual report of this organization sets forth a surprisingly good record of accomplishments during 1950. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the report of this organization that other Members of Congress and others interested may note what has been accomplished by the soil-conservation program in one typical agricultural county in Iowa:

WAYNE COUNTY DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS' ANNUAL REPORT, 1950

INTRODUCTION

The year 1950 is past history and we, the commissioners, are proud to relate what has been accomplished in the Wayne County Soil Conservation District. True, we recognize our shortcomings for there are many more things that could have been accomplished.

We have no happenings to report more spectacular than what has been the usual trend in the past years. However, we feel that there is a movement toward a definite goal—that of accepting conscientiously a good, sound conservation program. We feel that the all-important development is this gradual, steady movement that is apparent each year—that we have forged ahead just a little further.

A LOOK AT THE WEATHER

The growing season of 1950 was one of the coolest on record, but despite this fact the crops have been only a little less than outstanding. Excess rainfall during the month of June caused damaging soil losses. Farmers in general felt the need for more rigid erosion control practices than what

were in operation at the time these rainstorms occurred.

During the latter part of the summer and continuing through fall exceptionally dry weather prevailed. This prompted the building of a number of farm ponds to ease the water shortage brought about by these dry periods. We have noticed, also, that the trend is toward the building of larger and deeper ponds.

This dry period has made it possible to do some conservation work that would be impossible during the average season. An example of this is the construction of surface drains and diversions in ordinarily wet areas. However, terrace construction was almost halted during early fall because of the hardness of the soil caused by the dry weather.

OUR DRIVE FOR LEGUMES

Because of their importance deep-rooted legumes are getting more attention in our district. Since Wayne County soils in general are made up of fine particles and are run together, the need for aeration has been realized. Without the deep roots of the legumes the soil cannot be aerated; and without proper aeration another essential for superior crops will be sorely missed—that of water percolation.

The increase in legume seedings has brought more hay into the district and has made better pasture, but utilization of this roughage has presented a problem. The need for more livestock is recognized, but most farmers are reluctant to pay the high prices for this livestock or are financially unable to meet this situation.

While we are on the subject of legumes, let us say that successful corn yields can be traced to fields that have grown legumes. Lime and fertilizer programs are also in close coordination with legume seedings. Farmers are realizing that it is not how many acres are in corn that count, but in how many bushels there are in the crib. The raising of proper legumes is the road to this goal and our district is on this road.

THE ANNUAL WAYNE COUNTY FIELD DAY

The top activity of the year was the Wayne County soil conservation field day, which was held on the Lyle Duncan farm 3½ miles north of Lineville. Attendance was limited due to rain which started in the morning when the plowing contest was in full swing, but even so an estimated 3,000 people attended the yearly demonstration. Some of the accomplishments of the day included the construction of a mile of terraces, filling a silo with a field cutter, plowing of 10 acres on the contour, establishing of one-half mile of multa flora rose fence, construction of a diversion dike, blading in several gullies, insulating the house and installing a water system.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Other events of the year consisted of obtaining several thousands of multa flora rose seeds for some 50 or more farmers, assisting in the planting of the seed in establishing permanent fence, helping farmers fill out applications for fish from the State conservation commission and attending various meetings held in the county. Also many groups worked together on terrace construction and other soil conservation practices on individual farms.

TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL ASSISTANCE

The following states the accomplishments of the State-employed technicians' aid and the clerical assistance in the Wayne County district. The figures given cover only the work completed for the first 9 months of each of the years 1949 and 1950. This gives a comparison during the sam part of the 2 years—before we had State aid and after State aid was in operation.

A year ago as of October 1, 1949, we had 34 farm plans prepared, signed and approved by the Commissioners. The accomplishment this year as of October 1, 1950, was 44 plans. Therefore, 10 additional plans were signed the first 9 months of 1950 as compared to the first 9 months of 1949, or a 29-percent increase.

Contour lines were laid out on 1,417 acres last year as compared to 2,183 acres this year, an increase of 766 acres or 47 percent. Last year 3 miles of terraces constructed compared with 4½ miles this year gives an increase of 1½ miles or 50 percent. Diversions constructed increased from 2 miles to 4 miles—a 2-mile increase or 43 percent. Waterways increased from .75 mile constructed in 1949 to 3.9 miles, an increase of 3.1 miles or 420 percent.

Farm ponds constructed to date show no increase over last year. Fence row management and planting for wildlife increased from 300 feet to 1,100 feet, an 800-foot increase or 266 percent.

The clerical help resulted in better relations with and more service to the public in addition to resulting in more accomplishment in the district. Being able to keep the office open part of the time resulted in 650 additional office visitors and over 300 additional telephone calls received.

In addition to this applications for plans increased from 46 to 53, an increase of 7 or 15 percent. Furthermore, it is estimated that we got about 160 more requests for layout assistance and information than if we had not had someone in the office.

Other incidental accomplishments are the coloring of approximately 65 soil maps, all of the new agreements as typewritten and assembled, periodic reports made up and the assemblying and distribution of newsletters.

YEARLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Listed below are accomplishments of the district for the calendar year 1950: Contouring, 3,490 acres; pasture improvement, 1,963 acres; farm ponds, 29; terraces, 6 6 miles; diversions, 6.7 miles; farm drainage, 185 acres; open drains, 3.5 miles; waterways, 12.2 miles.

A PUBLICITY PROGRAM

Through State aid the local district has purchased 35 millimeter Kodachrome color film, with which many pictures have been taken and made up into slides for projection purposes. With these slides we hope to show graphically the achievements and progress of our district from year to year.

The slides have been made available to many local organizations for lectures, entertainment, and various other purposes. At present the county superintendent of schools, W. A. Tock, has a set of conservation slides which he shows to rural schools and parents' and teachers' meetings in rural areas. The slides, all taken within our district, have also been shown before GI classes, high-school and grade-school groups, 4-H and Farm Bureau groups.

Another device for trying to bring soil conservation to the public eye was the proclamation of Iowa Soil Conservation Week by Governor Beardsley from June 12 through June 18. During this period tours of four outstanding farms in the county (Lloyd Greenlee, Harvey Holder, "Pete" Carpenter, and Rex Devore) were arranged by the Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and Farmers Home Administration. These tours were arranged to show the public the advantages of the different phases of soil conservation.

An interesting demonstration was held July 15 at the Wayne County Experimental Farm north of Seymour. The farm was laid off into test plots, planted, and cared for by Iowa State College representatives. On the selected date (July 15) these test plots were explained to and discussed with those who attended the demonstration; and the beneficial results obtained from these experiments will be adopted and publicized as a part of our soil conservation in future years.

EXTENSION SERVICE ACTIVITIES

One of the biggest problems confronting, and recognized by, most Wayne County farm families in the area of agricultural production is the low productivity of soils. One of the twofold objectives of farm families is to prevent further soil depletion caused by soil erosion and heavy cropping and to increase family income by building up and maintaining a more productive soil.

The educational program of the soils district cooperating with the extension service lies in helping farm families recognize the need for the various solutions to their problems in the area of soil conservation and in understanding all the various practices necessary to having a productive soil. Solving problems of soil conservation is done by people. The soils district through educational and technical service helps people help themselves.

The educational program on soil conservation pointed toward several things in 1950 and again in 1951.

1. Use greatly increased amounts of commercial fertilizers where economic increases in crop yields can be obtained.

2. Use fertilizers according to recommendations based on soil tests.

3. Greater use of supplementary erosion control practices, such as contouring, waterways, terrace outlets, terraces, diversions, etc.

4. Use of the most efficient and productive crop rotation adapted to soil resources.

5. Increase family income and decrease labor requirements in a soil-conservation program, through better utilization of forage crops by livestock and seed production.

6. Growing of higher yielding and better adapted forage crop varieties.

7. Increase of crop yields per acre by controlling crop insects, diseases, and noxious weeds.

8. To increase volume output on the farms by bringing unproductive pastures into a good rotation or by reestablishing in better pasture forages.

9. To increase capital input into many Wayne County farms for soil conservation purposes and to improve forage crop utilization through an efficient livestock program.

This educational program was carried out in various ways, including: Soil test interpretation, soil sampling, and fertilizer meetings; meetings and tours at the Seymour-Shelby soil area experimental farm; newspaper publicity of activities, results and approved practices, helps with soil conservation tours, field days, etc.; furnishing educational material and suggestions on soil conservation for special soil conservation programs for groups such as 4-H Clubs, Farm Bureau townships, rural women's organizations, PTA, etc.; educational information on soil conservation to vocational agriculture departments, on-the-farm-training instructors; work with county livestock men and livestock organizations on soil conservation.

ARLO NOBLE,
Chairman,
WALTER HICKMAN,
MAURICE GOODE,
JAMES H. GOODE,
Secretary,
Wayne County Soil Conservation District Governing Body.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Rev. Richard J. Cushing)

It is almost a dozen years since the invasion of Poland by the Nazis. Two weeks after that barbarous invasion, the world will recall with shame the no less brutal, even cowardly, attack made from behind on the Polish Army by Soviet Russia. Under this double attack, and this double treacherous contact of the Nazis and the Communists, came the surrender of heroic Poland. With this surrender, came the division of martyred Poland, between the two most ruthless, totalitarian dictatorships of our generation.

Henceforth, bitter memories were bequeathed to Polish people throughout the world. But bitter memories are not so disturbing as our memories of shame, and the Polish people need suffer from none of these. The peace came to Poland; but the shame lies elsewhere.

No American, no citizen of any of the Allied Nations can possibly think without shame, yea, without burning shame, of what Allied diplomats and political leaders did to Poland in 1945, and 1946, and 1947. Suffice it to say, that diplomats themselves, our own diplomats, have told a dreadful story of the Allied default of our commitments, our most solemn commitments to the Polish people. The United States Ambassador to Poland was so appalled by the treatment of the victor nations that he resigned his post in protest—an almost unique action in American diplomacy—and published in a book which bears the dramatic title, "I Saw Poland Betrayed." It is a shocking book; a book which future generations of Americans will read, I repeat, with shame. It is a story of murder, and fraud, and of double dealing, and brutality, and duplicity, rarely excelled in the history of these crimes.

In the hope that by our prayers, we may cancel some part of the national and international shame which other eyes must forever associate with the modern history of Poland, I am broadcasting this message.

The future freedom of the Polish people will surely come. We know that, because we know that there is a God; and we know that He will not be mocked forever. We know it because we know something of the spirit of the Poland, and we know that it will not be forever trampled underfoot. We know that Poland will one day be free, if only she can survive the present enslavement; and we know that she will survive it because we know her will to survive it. Poland will only lose her identity; Poland will only be lost if she becomes a Communist nation. It is true that the state or the political regime in Poland has become or has been violently taken over by the Communists. But there is a very sharp distinction, a distinction greater than that between the body and the soul between a nation and its political state. The state may be the expression of the will of the people, or it may be imposed upon them by violence from without. A nation is the people themselves.

The Polish nation will not be Communists because of the character of the Polish people themselves. First of all, the Polish people are Catholic Christians. They are among the most convinced and conscientious of Catholics. They are Catholics in the most complete sense. They are thoroughly Roman in their loyalty, and thoroughly devoted to Jesus and Mary in their piety. We know not what defects in the faith of a people make them susceptible to the scourge of communism, or materialism in any other of its forms. But this I do know; a people who give top place in their spiritual life to Jesus Christ, top place among their earthly loyalties to their unity with His vicar, and top place in their devotion to Mary, the mother of God: Such a people do not become infected with materialism, or adherence to aetheistic communism. Such a people are the Poles. And again, the Polish people are protected against becoming Communists because they well know the menace to their faith, and freedom of those who seek to impose upon them Red Fascist totalitarianism.

Someone has said that experience is the school of mankind, and that men will learn in no other school. If that is true, the Polish people have abundant experience, long and terrifying, of what must be expected if they permit within their gates, those who are presently bringing such pressure upon them to become Communists and partisans.

Today, the Polish are trying, under the watchful guidance of Almighty God, to maintain the same Catholic faith under Stalin, that they maintained for centuries under the grinding heels of the czars of Russia.

I hazard the statement that the Polish people are 96 percent Catholic, and 98 percent anti-Russian. Please God, this latter quality will be purged of all hatred, all antagonism, anything which might result in unchristian wrath or destructive war. Please God, the anti-Russian sentiments of the Polish people will only serve to keep them on their guard against the unchristian and inhuman philosophies by which the rulers of the Russian people have enslaved the Russians themselves, and seek now to enslave the people of Poland. People who are anti-Russian in this legitimate sense, will not become aetheistic Communists. Such as people are the Poles. Finally, the Polish people are 99 percent passionately Polish. They love their native land. They know how communism would change its fair face. They love their national customs, and they know how communism would destroy these. They love their traditions, patriotic and Christian; and they know how inconsistent with these is Red aetheism. They love their homes, and their families, and their churches, and their schools. They are resolved that the tyrants of the east shall not defile these.

Patriotism and religion are twin virtues. The passionate love of the Poles for their nation has a religious quality. Their love for their faith includes a patriotic aspect. All this is as it should be. A people thus patriotic and religious will not turn traitors and prove infidel. The Polish nation, I tell you, no matter what is happening, will not become Communists. God Almighty knows it will not be easy, whatever their national spirit and valor, for the Polish nation to persevere against the brutal force which has already broken so many and such great nations. It will take far more than national heroism, far more than human strength, to survive in the face of the mass materialism which strikes down and perverts mighty people so brazenly, so brutally, so systematically, as does atheistic communism. The people of Poland need strength from on high.

They need God's grace in measure overflowing. They need our prayers. I plead for this spiritual aid for Poland. Those prayers we promise the Polish people today. They must not cease until God Himself speaks to silence the enemies of faith. Until God Himself strikes to stop the enemies of His people. Let us pray in season and out of season for Poland, for faith, for freedom, and peace. We must also pray for the political leaders of the world, for those who are oppressing Poland, that their hearts may be softened; for those who profess to be friends of Poland, that their heads may be cleared.

To our prayers, we must add our practical efforts. We must be vigilant against treason in high places; and against unworthy acceptance of treason among the people. We must somehow control our representatives rather than allow them to control our fates; so that it will not be possible again for them to betray a whole people against knowledge.

To our prayers, we must add our practical efforts. We must be vigilant against treason in high places; and against unworthy acceptance of treason among people. We must somehow control our representatives rather than allow them to control our fates; so that it will not be possible again for them to betray a whole people against our knowledge and our moral judgment, as they did betray Poland.

We must in all things imitate the peaceful virtues of Christ, the Prince of Peace: His forbearance, His patience, His spirit of forgiveness, His will for peace, His desire to bring together all men in concord and unity. But we must not be unmindful of His righteous wrath against those who defiled His temple, and His people; and seek to impose upon them insupportable burdens acting in their name to do those things unworthy of men, and hateful to God.

So I ask you to pray for Poland. I ask you to pray for ourselves. Pray that Poland may keep the faith, and that we may grow in it. That we may not lose our freedom, and that Poland may regain hers. That Poland may be made holy, and that we may be cleansed for our sympathy. That we may be restored from our shame, and that Poland may be made strong, and pure, and pleasing to God. That we may enjoy together with Poland, with all the nations whose Lord is God, the blessings of peace and piety, and Christian joy. Amen.

Military Supply Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following exchange of correspondence between myself and the Defense Production Administration:

JANUARY 25, 1951.

Maj. Gen. WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
Administrator, Defense Production Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HARRISON: Permit me to tell you how pleased I am that you were selected to head the production and materials control activities of the Government during these critical days. Experience such as yours is of incalculable value in preparing the Nation to defend itself against aggression. As vice president for operations of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., president of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co.,

Director of Production of the War Production Board, Assistant to the Chief of Production of the Army Service Forces and Chief of the Army Signal Corps Production and Distribution Division, you have gained an insight into both civilian and military operations. Therefore, you can properly evaluate the relative needs and requirements of both the civilian and the military.

For a number of years I have been making a study of military-supply operations for the purpose of assisting the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, in seeing that our fighting men were the best trained and equipped soldiers in the world. We have found that military supplies cannot be procured and distributed with any degree of certainty unless a common language is used for all military-supply installations. Therefore, in 1949 I introduced a bill, H. R. 321, that would establish a single catalog system to be developed by the armed services but which could be used by all the Federal agencies. Action on this bill was postponed to give the Defense Department an opportunity to take steps without legislation toward the development and installation of a single catalog system.

At the same time the Congress approved Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, that included a provision for the establishment of a single catalog system. Unfortunately, this law did not define clearly what was meant by a single catalog system.

Advantage has been taken of the lack of definition of Public Law 152 and of the postponement of action on H. R. 321 to further delay the establishment and installation of a single catalog system for the Armed Forces. Recent reports issued jointly by the Munitions Board and the General Services Administration, although filled with high sounding phrases, make it clear that nothing has been accomplished and that their program does not even contemplate the use of a single catalog or the elimination of all existing catalogs with their duplicating names and numbers.

This should not be news to you. One of your outstanding contributions during your Army career was the development and installation of the single catalog system for the Signal Corps, replacing 13 existing catalog systems. This system was so efficient and so useful to supply operations that it was voluntarily adopted for communications items by the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and by the armed forces of other allied nations. With this as a tool, you were able to make the Signal Corps procurement and distribution operations the finest in the services.

In developing and installing a single catalog system, even though for communications items only, you have been able to accomplish something that has been attempted for almost 50 years without success.

You recognized what was later confirmed in great detail by the Hoover Commission that supply management is impossible without a single catalog system. You no doubt recognize that your present mission cannot be accomplished without it. It is impossible to control the allocation of critical materials or pass upon the necessity for new facilities where items are procured, stored, and issued under hundreds of duplicating names and numbers.

Without a common identification system and a common supply language it is difficult and many times impossible to coordinate supply activities; interchange of items between services is impossible; the difficulties of supplying arms and equipment to our allies are magnified; civil defense supply problems are multiplied; and the waste of materials, manpower, facilities, transportation costs, and storage space mounts to astronomical figures.

Therefore it would seem that the responsibility for seeing that a single catalog system is developed and used by the Armed Forces and the civilian agencies should be delegated to you by the Congress and by the President. At the same time the Congress should accept the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and enact legislation that would clearly define what is meant by the development and establishment of a single catalog system for the Federal Government. As the armed services, for obvious reasons, should be the agent of the Federal Government in carrying out this project, I have reentered H. R. 321 as H. R. 1033.

Your comments on these proposals would be appreciated. If I can be of assistance to you in any way please do not hesitate to call upon me. We realize that you are carrying a heavy burden.

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1951.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: As General Harrison will be away from the city for several days, I am acknowledging your letter to him of January 25 concerning the desirability of developing a single catalog system which would be used for procurement not only by the Armed Services, but also other Federal agencies. Your letter will, of course, be placed before General Harrison upon his return.

During the last war, I served as General Harrison's executive officer handling Signal Corps procurement and distribution operations. The cataloging system initiated by us during that period was, as you indicated in your letter, most helpful in carrying out our job. On the procurement side, it pointed up duplications of the same item having been procured under different nomenclature and description which, of course, would, if repeated, often lead to excessive purchases.

Where one can provide a common identification, there is no doubt that procurement work as well as the distribution end, would be materially assisted.

As the result of our procurement and distribution work in the Signal Corps, I can assure you that strong arguments may be made for placing responsibility of developing a single catalog system with the agencies doing the actual purchasing and distributing. The people doing the above work receive the direct benefits, and it is their understanding and acceptance of this which will bring forth an accurate and usable system.

Sincerely,

H. G. WILDE,
Assistant to the Administrator.

Passage on India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Tuesday, February 6, and which bears the title "Passage on India."

The editorial analyzes a subject which heretofore, from a publicity standpoint, has received little more than passive attention. Recently the attitude manifested by Nehru and his followers has demonstrated that considerable merit may be attributed to the facts as detailed in the editorial. Aside from the spotlights which Nehru occupies in this picture, the editorial contains much valuable factual information, the benefit of which cannot be overstressed at this time.

Undoubtedly, the American people will welcome an impartial exposé of Nehru's temporary rule in India and his adamant position recently taken by his representatives sitting at the United Nations table.

The editorial follows:

PASSAGE ON INDIA

Nehru and company, who temporarily rule India, have been having fun lately kicking Uncle Sam in the ribs at the meetings of the United Nations.

IMPOLITE BLACKMAIL FROM A RICH BEGGAR

At the same time, millions of people who live in India have been suffering what Nehru and company guardedly admit to be a technical inability to eat, due to no food.

Naturally, therefore, Messrs. Truman and Acheson are very much interested in a proposition to send Nehru and company some 2,000,000 tons of the United States taxpayers' wheat. Nehru and company may then distribute it to the taxpayers of India and perhaps thereby be saved from being kicked in the ribs, themselves, by the folks down at the Indian grassroots, if any.

There is some objection to this procedure, of course, but when all is said and done you may be sure the wheat will be on its way. Our masters in power always follow the form book, sooner or later.

So, since another huge chunk of our property looks outward bound, it may be of some interest to have a few facts on this further beggar at our gates.

India is a word that points vaguely at a wedge of land in Asia bounded on the north by the world's most rugged and fearsome mountain chain, and on the other two sides by an ocean open to the world.

In size, this wedge of land works out to about half as big as the United States. In natural resources and the means for wealth, it is tremendous. Properly run, India could give the United States of America plenty to think about as a rival in industry, agriculture or war.

For instance, its tremendous river system could be harnessed to electric power dams to give India potency second only to the United States of America and far more than Russia's.

India has one of the world's great reserves of coal and high-grade iron ore. It is a treasure house of other minerals and metals, ranging from gold, silver and copper through tungsten, bauxite, mica, chromite and magnesite. All these are commonly used throughout American industry to make your kitchen equipment and your automobile shiny, long-wearing and smooth-working—but now off to Truman's wars.

There are tremendous forests in India, too, and a herd of some 200,000,000 head of cattle, one-third of all the cows in the world. And above all, India has one of the world's richest farm belts.

The climate goes through many shifts. In the extreme north it is temperate and pleasant most of the year, with big winter sports in the celebrated Vale of Kashmir.

The wind is a big thing in India. In winter it is dry and keeps pulling the cover off the central land plain, to make deserts. In summer it sweeps in from the ocean and floods the coastal regions with rain as high as 60 inches a season. But in the United

States of America there are regions as hot and desert as any of India, and winds that rip and tear. Our climate is as harsh as any in the world, but here we've licked it for day-in-day-out purposes.

Taken all in all, India has no cause to complain against nature. It has the stuff for a great power.

Now, as to people, they number nearly 390,000,000 and average out to about 245 persons to the square mile. About 87 percent live in the country and 13 percent in the city. They range from almost prehistoric primitive tribesmen to a highly cultivated few. The great mass in between are underfed, fast-breeding, quick-dying, ignorant hand farmers.

WHY ARE WE DIFFERENT?

We have here a population running somewhere near 150,000,000, about 45 per square mile. We divide about 57 percent in the city, 43 percent on the farm.

Nowhere do we have any poverty to compare with India's. The great mass of the American people is the best educated, best fed, most skilled, healthiest, and longest lived of all the human race, in spite of the drains put upon us by reckless government in the past 50 years.

Why has India, with all her wealth, sunk so far?

Some blame the conflict of Hindu religion with Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Jainism, and the vast number of offshoots from these which develop such fantastic consequences as the caste systems, the refusal of Hindus to eat meat of sows, and Mohammedans even to so much as touch a piece of pigskin.

But the United States of America also has many religions at work in its national life, utterly unrestrained by law. Yet none has gone overboard against common sense.

Taken all in all, we would say the root cause of India's maladjustment is that the power of government there is traditionally from beyond the border.

Alexander the Great was her first well-known conqueror, back in 326 B. C. After him there came a Golden Age, significantly under the rule of native kings of the famous Gupta dynasty. Then the Mogul empire crashed in from the outside again, and there followed a turn-down that has never really been corrected. The British in the eighteenth century started picking up the leavings any others had missed.

Now this above-mentioned wedge of Asia has a supposed independent status, but actually not. It is split into two nations—Pakistan for the Mohammedans and India for the Hindus. The minorities get killed.

Pakistan has a long way to go, and India is governed by a gang of doctrinaire Socialists who can't wait to get into some kind of world order or other that submerges their own life to foreign domination.

The United States of America, which now for the first time in its history takes orders from beyond its own borders, by way of the United Nations, can look at India and think about what comes from that kind of thing.

Soviet Union's Plan for World Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following study is taken from an address delivered by the Very Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., regent of Georgetown's famed School of Foreign Service before an assembly of the National Guard of Massachusetts on Saturday, January 20, 1951. The address is entitled "Soviet Strategy and Soviet Tactics":

I invite your attention to the success of Soviet strategy and tactics in the broad field of world geography. It will be remembered that Nazi Germany made its own the celebrated theory of the British geographer, Sir Halford Mackinder respecting the influence of geographical environment on history. As early as 1904, and again in 1919, and finally in 1944, he warned the Western World that the pivot of history lay in that vast inner land mass of Eurasia to which he gave the pictureque title of the heartland. Describing it as roughly coinciding with what is now Soviet territory, he declared, with extraordinary foresight, that if this natural fortress, inaccessible, as it is, to sea power, should ever be properly garrisoned militarily and developed economically by a virile people, it could become the center of an empire capable of ruling the world. Mackinder's brilliant hypothesis ended with the warning: "Who rules East Europe commands the heartland; who rules heartland commands the world island; who rules the world island commands the world."

This thoughtful condensation of much human history and accurate observation of the influence of geography on history was conceived and formulated, to be sure, in an age when air power had not yet become a major component of military potential. Hence, the theory has been modified, but not entirely canceled out by the coming of the age of air power. Soviet Russia, consciously or unconsciously, is supplying the deficiency in terms of military aviation.

I believe the unknown geopoliticians behind the iron curtain have adapted Mackinder's formula to the new circumstances of the air age. They have probably changed and shifted some elements and emphasized others, so that their consolidation of land power in Central and Eastern Europe now leaves them free to accelerate control of marginal lands on the rim of the world island. It may well be that they are saying: "who controls the rimlands of Europe and Asia can protect the heartland of the world revolution." The growth of Soviet sea power, especially of submarines, is not without meaning in such a program.

Take a map of the world and follow with your finger the creeping progress of the Soviet Empire since the disappearance of the Nazi and the Japanese Empires. Through Petsamo on the north, acquired from Finland by force, she now has a new outlet to the Atlantic. Drop a line from that point, through central Europe, to Albania, her satellite on the Adriatic, noting as you pass Yugoslavia, which would be repossessed when Stalin finally decides to deal with Tito. At the terminus of this fringe of her power she has access to the Adriatic, and hence to the Mediterranean. Her march toward Greece was countered by the Truman doctrine and her hopes for Communist triumph there have been frustrated with American assistance. Had her plans succeeded in the Hellenic world, she would have been enabled to anchor her power firmly in the western end of the Mediterranean, then turn to a corresponding eastern anchor in Spain, which always remains a factor in her planning. But her hopes for gaining control of Spain, which go back even before 1935, have been frustrated thus far by the tough hidalgos. Should she ever succeed in fomenting civil war in the Iberian Peninsula, with the emergence of a satellite Communist state such as the Marxist pattern always assumes will follow a domestic revolution, Gibraltar would be the next target. Istanbul and the Dardanelles have always bulked large in the expansionist program of Russian imperialism, and this craving for that traditional objective, inherited from the czars, has not been neglected by the new autocrats. Unreasonable concessions have been demanded from Turkey in recent years but denied with equal determination, and the refusal backed up by American economic aid. But the demand will surely be renewed at a propitious moment.

SEA CONTACT SOUGHT

Meanwhile, the atmosphere of pressure will serve to maintain that psychological tension and expensive defense program along Dardanelles which Moscow utilizes so consistently in its war of nerves. The measure of validity in Russia's historical claims for free exit through the Dardanelles is not slight. More than one European statesman has gone so far in the past as to concede publicly that Russia should have Constantinople. Both England and France so declared in 1916, but that age-old controversy between Moscow and Constantinople was limited in its application to the ancient capital of the Byzantine emperors. It now carries a wholly different significance, in view of the Communist program of world revolution and the hope to overthrow all non-Communist governments such as Turkey. This new messianic universalism is, as we have already noted, what Soviet Russia has added to her inherited czarist tradition. This urge to the sea and the constant process of opening up new territories and colonization of them was noted by the greatest of Russian historians, V. O. Kluchevsky, as the principal fundamental factor in Russian history. "All other factors," he writes in volume I of his celebrated History of Russia, 'have been more or less inseparably connected therewith. * * * Debarred from settlement by the geographical features of their country, the eastern Slavs (in their historical evolution) were forced for centuries to maintain a nomad life, as well as to engage in ceaseless warfare with their neighbors. It was this particular conjunction of circumstances which caused the history of Russia to become the history of a country forever undergoing colonization—a movement continued up to, and given fresh impetus by, the emancipation of the serfs, and remaining in progress to the present day."

FORCES OF WORLD REVOLUTION

An entirely new factor, possessing the dynamic energy which Lenin imparted to it by dialectical materialism has now been superimposed on Kluchevsky's summation of Russian national history. The evangel of world revolution and the specific instruments to achieve it, whether in the form of the Third International or the Cominform are commonly ignored by those who seek to justify Soviet conduct. They keep referring to certain old grievances, such as her landlocked isolation, her legitimate striving to acquire warm-water ports, the ignoring of her existence at Versailles, the refusal to accord diplomatic recognition during so many years, and her exclusion from the powers which met at Munich, although the latter should now be cause for gratitude and not a stigma.

Soviet Russia was predestined to bellicosity from the very moment Lenin turned the successful domestic revolution of 1917 into an organized Marxist revolution on a world scale. And each decade as it passes will add to her manpower. Her population trend and fertility rate indicate an increase which should bring her population to something over 250,000,000 by the year 1970, whereas the rest of all Europe combined will probably not exceed 400,000,000. And if we consider the population of newly acquired territories, the Soviet total should reach 270,000,000. This is not to include non-Russian satellite countries of Europe, Manchuria, Mongolia, and China, in all of which fertility is high.

Since population is one of the important components of military power, these new acquisitions will progressively encourage the Politburo to more frequent use of its favorite weapon—aggression by proxy.

CONTROL OF RIMLANDS

Return now to the northern perimeter of Eurasia and continue along Soviet Russia's Arctic coasts with a geopolitical eye. She is dominant there, and has no contestant in those icy solitudes. She already claims approximately 50 percent of all offshore territory lying within the Arctic Circle, including such potential landing fields as Novaya Zemlya, Wrangel Island, Franz Josef Land, and the new Siberian group. Rounding the eastern shoulder of Siberia as it projects into the Bering Strait you will note that she possesses not only Kamchata, Sakhalin, the Kurile and Komandorskie Islands, exercises control over North Korea and still controls the important harbors of Port Arthur and Dairen, both of them strategic ports of China. The encirclement of East Asia, by control of its rimlands, is nearly complete.

These developments underscore a cardinal point in the program of world revolution; Communist strategists have always maintained that the way China goes furnishes the key to all problems on the international front. The general headquarters for the forthcoming struggle for Asia is believed to be located in Thailand, where Soviet personnel in Bangkok is reported to be enormously in excess of any legitimate diplomatic need. From the Pacific, then, to the iron curtain on the west, she will be in a position to mount an outer ring of offensive and defensive installations around her heartland, particularly in marginal regions adapted to land-based air power.

If her efforts to secure a base in Tripolitania, the western half of Libya, had not been refused in the United Nations, she would have gained a coveted foothold in the Mediterranean basin. That great inland sea, if ever dominated by Soviet influence, would prove of inestimable strategic value in sealing the outer rim of protective areas, providing at the same time a sea route to western Europe and the Atlantic world. That is why Tito's rebellion particularly enrages the Moscow geopoliticians.

LOOK TOWARD INDIA

The invasion of Tibet in early November 1950 by Communist troops from China reveals two constant factors in Soviet strategy. The geographical position of that hitherto inaccessible region makes it a strategic, though difficult, passageway for a military advance on India, provided suitable airfields can be located somewhere among its towering mountains. Reports are already current that locations for the first potential air bases have been surveyed by Russian agents on a flat plain in western Tibet between Lake Rakas and Lake Manasarowar. This would bring Soviet striking power dangerously near the heart of India. New Delhi, the capital, lies approximately 300 miles to the southwest, an easy two-way run for Soviet bombers through negotiable passes of the Himalayas.

To meet the requirements of political strategy, the planners of the aggression invoked their usual pretext. They welcomed the existence of a rival Dalai Lama—another claimant to the position of ruler and high priest—who was living in exile in China. By supporting the claims of a second living Buddha of mercy against the actual incumbent, the Communist politburo of China staged another "liberation." They activated the familiar pattern of a civil war to be instigated by Communists and utilized by the Soviet Union for hidden intervention. The device is an old one and was employed in Greece, China, and Korea. It was tried in Finland, where a Communist regime was first installed under Kusenin as prelude to the invasion of 1939. The erection of a puppet state usually follows and the iron curtain falls. Then, to preclude assistance from outside powers, the Communist legalists invoke international law as forbidding foreign intervention in a purely civil war.

This concept was introduced into the Soviet argument against the United Nations resolution to come to assistance of South Korea. It makes both the United Nations and the United States of America not only iniquitous warmongers, but actual aggressors by unilateral, legal definition. Since, according to Mr. Vishinsky and all Communist jurists, the Soviet concept of law is the only valid interpretation of legality in any situation, the invasion of Tibet, like that of South Korea, became an act of moral heroism and dialectical purity.

There may well be other considerations arising from the historical development of Tibetan autonomy. China, to be sure, has never officially acknowledged the separation of that remote province from her sovereignty, although for a long time Tibet has acted independently. The significant fact for humanity is the steady advance of the Communist World Revolution into another area of Asia and the establishment of new outposts in what has been called the roof of the world.

EYES ON WEST

This geographical pattern would seem to extend itself to other significant spots much nearer the Western World, where forward bases would be indispensable for logistical preparation of the eventuality prophesied so unequivocally by Mr. Stalin: "* * * a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable." Two other Soviet maneuvers acquire special geopolitical meaning when related to this persuasion of inevitability, and when integrated with the concrete position already taken by Soviet strategists and diplomats.

In December of 1946, Ecuador was requested to grant fishing rights to the Soviet Union in the waters adjacent to the Galapagos Islands, a highly strategic area off the west coast of South America approximately 1,000 miles from the Panama Canal. The distance could easily be covered in 4 hours by hostile war planes launched from the deck of a properly camouflaged fishing bark. One bomb would be enough to cripple the locks and sever one of the vital defense lines of the two Americas. Then, in January 1947 Norway was presented with a Soviet demand for bases on Spitsbergen, the ice-covered group of Arctic Islands, 3,500 miles from New York, Chicago, and the industrial heart of the United States. Modern bombers, with a 5,000 mile one-way cruising range from Spitsbergen, could reach not only industrial centers represented by Detroit and Pittsburgh, but penetrate deep into continental America. Should the Communist Empire ever advance as far as the English Channel on one side of the world and eventually dominate the full coastline of China and its pendants on the other, the position of the United States would indeed be perilous. North America would become in effect a huge island flanked east and west by a great power which hates us.

UNITED STATES ULTIMATE TARGET

The Russian Revolution, now at the very zenith of its accomplishments, is on the march from Berlin to Korea. Eight nations have had their freedom burned to ashes already. The United States will be the ultimate target with the richest booty in the world piled on the scales of the balance. The final confrontation has come and the first American blood has been shed. The two central figures whose emergence Stalin predicted sit facing each other across conference tables which stretch from the Kremlin to the English Channel, from Brussels and Berlin and Paris to New York and Washington. The unprecedented character and stark realism of the conflict became evident when the President of the United States could bluntly declare last year that he could no longer put faith or credence in any promise made by Soviet Russia.

In normal times such a statement from the head of a government would have meant instant rupture of diplomatic relations and a probable full mobilization for war on both sides. But we are not engaged in conventional diplomacy under accepted standards of international decency such as prevailed at Vienna in 1815, after the Napoleonic wars. We are embarked on a kind of cosmic poker game for the highest stakes in history. Some there are who believe one of the players has been prolonging a colossal bluff which began at Yalta and Tehran and which succeeded notably against the leading player on the opposite side, who was then in failing health. The Government of the United States finally decided to call for a show-down on the Korean crisis—and was supported by the United Nations. Had both done so earlier, the odds in favor of true peace in Europe and Asia would have been far more favorable and Soviet Russia would not have had the gains that began with the desertion of Poland by her former allies. On the issue, when the cards eventually fall, may well depend the quality and quantity of human freedom for generations to come.

WHAT ALTERNATIVE?

The record is clear and the designs of Soviet Russia were never unclear. Her gamble in Korea was logical perfidy. Edmund Burke in 1772 warned Europe that the partition of Poland by Prussia, Austria, and Russia would not be the end of the feasting. It was, he pointed out, only a breakfast for the great armed powers; but where would they dine? He knew that neither history nor appetite for power ever stops short.

The true question before the American people and before their Representatives in Congress is not so much the cost in dollars, though heavy, but the alternative possibilities. There is need of complete thinking at this point, not spurts of enthusiasm, of volatile sentiment, or unfounded fears, or programs for the partial containment of Soviet aggession. The cost of a needed commodity or of an essential service is not truly stated by the price tag but by the foreseeable consequences if it is not bought.

A fire extinguisher for a modest home or a sprinkler system for an industrial establishment may seem expensive in terms of the present income of the respective buyers; it can be immeasurably more expensive, possibly fatal, not to have them on hand and in working condition when a fire breaks out. If the grim record of the past 5 years of Soviet-American relations has achieved anything, it has clarified the cold war down to a basic consideration. The debate is not whether we can afford to do the necessary things for the defense of Christian civilization, but can we afford not to do them.

Big Hugh, the Father of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a book entitled "Big Hugh, the Father of Soil Conservation," written by Wellington Brink

with a preface by Louis Bromfield. I have not had an opportunity to read the book. I shall do so right away. I do want to say a word concerning Dr. Hugh Bennett, the subject of this book. Dr. Bennett is well known throughout the Nation. Many of us have had the great privilege to have known Dr. Bennett a long time personally. I met Dr. Bennett soon after I came to Congress 14 years ago and I have been with him on many occasions since that time. I have had an opportunity to observe his work and I think I know something of how he is regarded in the Nation. I consider Dr. Bennett not only the foremost man in soil conservation in the Nation, but I think he ranks among the very top men in the Nation in ability and achievement. As a man, he is a lovable character. He is a pioneer in his field. I am confident that the work which he has accomplished and the plans which he has launched to conserve the soils will forever remain the basic principles for our thinking and action in this most important field of endeavor in our Nation. The good which Dr. Bennett has done cannot be estimated. He has gone far toward turning this Nation around from a wasteful course to one of conservation of our land and natural resources. The United States is fortunate to have had a man of the energy, the foresight, and the practical common sense possessed by this outstanding public servant. The Nation owes to him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that tens of thousands of people all over the Nation will be able to read this book concerning Dr. Bennett. The preface to the book, by Louis Bromfield, is so well written and gives such an accurate picture of Dr. Bennett that I think it would be well to include this in my remarks. I so request. The above-mentioned follows:

PREFACE

A good many years ago while in the midst of the wasted cotton lands of Georgia I met a big hearty man named Hugh Bennett. I knew what his job was. At that time and today I think the biggest problems of this country and the world are food and the conservation of natural resources and real wealth. I had seen nation after nation in every part of the world reduced to poverty and virtual starvation by the very process which had been taking place in the United States since the first soil was dug up by the white man. Here, tramping about on the barren, eroded red soil of a Georgia cotton field, was the man who was doing something about the disaster.

The important thing was that he was getting the job done and getting it done largely through the force, vigor, and intelligence of his own personality. Within 5 minutes I knew that I was in the presence of a great man and a man to whom this Nation and the whole world owed a very great debt. Like all great men, he was simple and direct, with no time for shiftiness or pomposity. The farmer liked him, the average citizen liked him, the scientists recognized in him that most needed of all forces—the one which translates research and knowledge into action and achieves results.

In the many years which have intervened since that first meeting Hugh Bennett became one of my best friends. We have talked from the same platform many times and have traveled hundreds, perhaps thousands, of miles across country over back roads, past farmhouses where in summer you could look through the sides of a house and see the wasting gullies on the other side. I know him as well as I know any man alive and there is no man whom I respect and admire so much. I think this is because he has the old American virtues of integrity, simplicity, directness, and honor—virtues which are not too plentiful in these times or are, at least, obscured by the age in which we live.

In those same years I have traveled on an average fifty to sixty thousand miles a year mostly helping to fight the battle which Hugh Bennett started and organized for conservation of our natural resources and for a better agriculture which could stand on its own feet and contribute to the wealth and welfare and health of the Nation rather than simply devour its economy. And in all that traveling I have seen something miraculous happening. I have seen, perhaps for the first time in history, a whole Nation turning to right a wrong, to check an evil, before it was forced to do so by utter disaster. I doubt that this could have been accomplished without the leadership and wisdom of Hugh Bennett. Certainly without him the progress would have been infinitely slower.

It has not been an easy fight. There were and still are many enemies and many fools and many small men whose jealousies loomed larger than their interest in the Nation's welfare. Because we spend two to three billions a year in attempting to aid and educate the farmer, it is assumed by the average citizen that we have, and had, in this country a sound agriculture. Few errors of public thinking could be greater. In the past, particularly in the single-crop corn, cotton, and tobacco areas, we had one of the worst agricultures ever practiced by man and much of our agriculture is still upon that level. Except for the isolated "good" farmer, we practiced in the past a system of tillage which could certainly not be dignified by the word "agriculture" and could, indeed, scarcely have been called "farming." This fact has cost the Nation billions of dollars in real wealth and the individual citizens billions in high prices and in taxes, and industry billions in purchasing power.

Conditions fortunately have begun to change and every year there are more good farmers, and more bad farmers are economically liquidated regardless of subsidies, parity guaranties, and Government support buying. Eventually out of grim economic necessity the level of our agriculture will be raised and we shall have lower costs for consumers and higher profits for the farmer arising out of high and efficient production and the arresting of destruction by erosion and flood.

The progress already made is astonishing to any veteran in conservation and much of the progress can be credited to Hugh Bennett, who dramatized the situation, formulated the pattern of its cure, and then pressed forward to translate theory into action.

Every year there are more contoured and terraced farms; every year there are more grass and legumes planted; every year more sensible and effective crop rotations come into operation; and every acre properly treated can be measured in benefits to every citizen of the United States.

The battle has not been an easy one and in the field of erosion and floods Hugh Bennett has been in the bruised and bloody vanguard, fighting to get knowledge to the farmer—fighting, sometimes desperately, for appropriations from Congressmen who were willing to vote hundreds of millions in log-rolling, pork-barrel operations but grew penny-wise when it came to spending money for the benefit of the whole country instead of some single small area.

The word "bureaucrat" has come to be a term of opprobrium in the last generation and less. It is the story of a good word gone wrong, and perhaps we need another word to designate those good servants of the Government who work devotedly at low salaries for the welfare of all of us. Such men, in so vast and disorganized a Government as our own, are still in the minority. They deserve a fine and noble word to designate them—to distinguish them from the parasites and the meddlers. Perhaps "public servant" is the expression needed. There are many of them in the fields of research and action, of constructive public undertaking, who do not depend upon politics to provide them with jobs, but upon their own character and abilities and the contribution they can make to the good of all of us in terms of intelligence, integrity, and human dignity.

Such a man is Hugh Bennett, who deserves the greatest honor from the American people as one of the greatest benefactors since the beginning of their history.

LOUIS BROMFIELD.

Lustron Housing Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, a few evenings ago I sat in front of a television and observed and listened to what I considered one of the strongest and most conscientious appeals for unity and cooperation among the citizens of America that I have ever heard. I refer to the very strong and able speech delivered by the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, who at the present time probably possesses more administrative power than any man in the United States, with the exception of the President. As we all know, he is the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I respect Charlie Wilson and, having recently discussed matters with him on different occasions, I know that he is a man of sincerity and with devout respect for this Nation. His loyalty is unquestioned. He beams his love for America, the country that has been so good to him during the years that he has achieved such a remarkable financial success. I was intensely interested with what Administrator Wilson had to say with reference to the reaction that our railroad strike would have among our enemies.

I agree with every word that Charlie Wilson had to say, and sincerely hope and believe that his almost prayerful pleading will be heeded by the railroad men and that soon our transportation will be again up to par.

However, I could not help but wonder what caused such discontentment, disgruntlement, and unhappiness among the working classes of the American people. I refer to those of us in the lower-income bracket, and with prices so high as they are nowadays, that bracket embraces a very large percentage of our American citizens.

We in the Congress realize that taxes must be asseed in order to build up our defenses and, frankly, it is apparent that we in the lower income brackets are going to bear the brunt of the burden. So, hence, it should be easily understood why there is so much resentment and so much

bitter criticism of certain of our administrators in the Government who would absolutely destroy and throw away one of the finest manufacturing establishments that has ever been produced with taxpayers' money. I refer to the Lustron Housing Corp., near Columbus, Ohio. Such actions are what cause discontentment among those of us who have not been blessed financially to the extent that we can own a $50,000 home and live in luxuries and on the fat of the land.

The very same pleadings and the very same arguments that were so ably spoken by Director Wilson on last evening, apply in the case of the closing of the Lustron plant, only on a smaller scale. Thousands of workmen lost their jobs when the plant was closed, and many thousands of would-be home owners were denied the luxuries that only Lustron houses provide, in that particular price range.

Regardless of whether certain administrators' wishes are carried out or not, regardless of how much they detest reversing their former opinions, and regardless of how determined certain plutocrats may be, to have their way, or shylocks may be in their lust for gold, the wishes of the masses and taxpaying American public must be observed if this democracy is to continue to survive.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that, in my opinion, there are administrative officers in this Government who have absolutely no feeling or respect for a very large majority of the working people of this Nation. They are selfish to the core, and unless those in authority rid this Nation of that type of administrator, we will be paying through the nose when Gabriel blows his horn.

The history of the Lustron Corp. reads like a novel. At the close of World War II, the Navy made available to Lustron their present quarters, which are a part of the old Curtiss-Wright bomber factory. The site on which the Lustron plant is situated covers 210 acres of land. The Lustron plant embraces approximately 23 acres. I am advised that the North American Aviation Co. has been leased the remaining portion of the manufacturing establishment for the purpose of constructing airplanes.

Now it develops that the North American Aviation Co., is in need of space for modification and assembly centers. I have been untiring in my efforts to find out just how much additional space that the North American Aviation Co. needs for assembly and modification and have been given figures all the way from 200,000 to 1,000,000 square feet. There are more than 150 idle acres adjacent and contiguous to the North American plant and for the life of me I have not been able to ascertain why that any man who has attained sufficient success in life to be an administrator in the world's greatest Government and be in charge of the expenditure of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, would recommend the destruction of $55,000,000 worth of property in order to utilize a million feet of warehouse space.

Now here are the facts: The citizens and taxpayers of America loaned the Lustron Housing Corp. $37,500,000, $36,500,000 of which is unpaid and an outstanding obligation due the United States Government. The Lustron plant is now equipped with $15,500,000 worth of the most modern prefabricated housing machinery known to the engineers of America. In order to junk the $15,500,000 worth of machinery and remodel the building to suit the North American Aviation Co. for airplane assembly and modification uses, the Government must further expend some $2,500,000 to $3,000,000. Thus, the $36,500,000 loan to Lustron, plus the $15,500,000, the value of the equipment, plus $3,000,000 for remodeling of the building, equals a total of $55,000,000 initial losses that the Government incurs if we are to use the Lustron plant for airplane-assembly purposes.

Mr. Speaker, what manner of a brainstorm could any administrator be having when he would make a recommendation that would cost the American taxpayers $55,000,000, when he could just as easily expend not more than $6,000,000 at a maximum and get the type of assembly plant, according to specific specifications, and save the Lustron Corp. for the purposes for which it was originally constructed, namely, the building of houses that we so direly need?

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why that after weeks of investigation I am so definitely certain that the Lustron Corp. should be in full operation.

The method of construction and design used by the Lustron Corp. makes it possible to construct many types and sizes of buildings needed in our defense program. I refer to barracks, warehouses, hospitals, and field quarters, all of which are fireproof, acid resistant, rust proof, portable, clean, and healthful structures which require no paint and which may be cleaned by washing with soap and water, just like we scrub our ice boxes. They contain no refuge for vermin, insects, bedbugs, or disease germs. They are practically hermetically sealed, and thus are ideal for storing perishable items, explosives and ammunition or other materials that must be protected from fire or weather conditions as well as rodents and any other destructive element.

This is not speculation, as close to 3,000 homes were built and sold during the productive lifetime of the Lustron plant. For the past several weeks, I have been amazed at the testimonials received from the owners and occupants of Lustron houses. Everyone, without a single exception, with whom I have discussed this house have spoken in glowing terms.

Our best example of the value of this product for defense purposes is the fact that at the present time there are 60-odd houses in use at our marine base at Quantico, Va. In my remarks before this House on January 12, 1951, I inserted a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which appears on page 194, from Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps, and who is at the present time in charge of our gallant marines who have always and are now giving such a wonderful account of themselves in the fighting over in Korea. The general was lavish in his praise of the Lustron house. It is true that General Shepherd is detained in Korea, on a very important mission, and cannot appear and speak in person, but in his absence, I am happy to refer anyone who is interested in Lustron housing to Commander Davis, who is now the Public Works Officer at the said marine reservation at Quantico, Va. Commander Davis is proud of the Lustron house at Quantico and speaks in no uncertain terms of their value and regards them as probably the most satisfactory houses that we have on the base.

It is a known fact that it is a policy of this Government to spare no reasonable expenditure in research. I understand that the research that was made in connection with the machinery that has been installed in the Lustron plant was complete in every detail and that one of the finest engineers that this country has produced employed some of the best engineering minds in the Nation to work out a complete and satisfactory blueprint of what is now a reality. It is nothing short of stupidity or collusion on the part of administrators or competitors that would even dare to recommend that the Nation be denied the benefit of the information obtained in the expenditure of millions of dollars in this research.

Another thing in which we should be very definitely interested is the conservation of our natural resources. Lustron fits into this picture so far as coal, wood, and oil are concerned, because of the type of construction of the Lustron house. I am advised that considerable savings has been proved in heating these houses. When we take into consideration that oil, coal, and gas are in great demand, we must not overlook the fact that we can perfect material savings of these materials by utilizing the Lustron house.

One of the crucial problems facing this Government today is the question of manpower. The military is parading daily from the Pentagon to the congressional committees screaming their heads off for the Congress to give them permission to draft our 18-year-olds.

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, this is a serious matter. I know something of the hardships that are suffered by our fighting men and, in my opinion, a battle front is no place for our 18-year-olds.

Of course, it is necessary to use a large portion of our military manpower behind the lines, many of our men are utilized by the Engineering Corps in construction work. When we are so badly in need of housing, naturally it requires a large corps of men for this particular work. By reactivating the Lustron Corp. and permitting them to furnish their capacity of houses for our defense program, we can save four out of every five men for house construction purposes that we are using today. That is, after the house is delivered to the site or on the field where it is to be erected. Just think, 80 percent of manpower savings, men who are classed in the IV-F, can erect houses and

thus permit those of us who are in physical condition to do the fighting, but yet, apparently certain administrators in this democratic Government of ours care little for the hardships and the sorrows that they are forcing the mothers of this Nation to bear.

Another angle to be considered, and the one which is probably the most important to the future of this Nation, is the question of health. I understand that the Mayo brothers, who we all recognize as some of the world's finest physicians, have recommended on more than one occasion to sufferers of the dreaded disease known as asthma, that they live in a Lustron house. Insofar as I am concerned, if we have a product that can be manufactured at the proven reasonable figure of the Lustron house that will cure or relieve the sufferers of asthma, our expenditures for research are not in vain, and the cost was cheap at any price.

Furthermore, housing is one of the fields in which America has not progressed as fast as in numerous other undertakings. By that I mean that we now have many of our conventional houses constructed along the specific lines of our homes of 500 years ago. They are vulnerable to termites; they must be constantly repaired; they have joints, nicks, corners, and crevices; they harbor filth, vermin, cockroaches, water bugs, bedbugs, and insects of various kinds—all of which are carriers of disease and affect the very health and happiness of our people.

I recall that not so long ago some of the outstanding magazines of our country carried numerous pictures of living conditions in Spain and in various other foreign countries. The pictures were of the slum areas, showing the destruction caused by vermin, rats, and the filthy conditions under which some human beings were forced to live. Why, Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any reason why it is necessary that the photographers journey to foreign lands to procure pictures of such filth-infested slum areas when it has been to my extreme sorrow to walk not more than half a mile from the dome of this Capitol and observe Americans living under conditions just as bad, if not worse, than those described in France, England, and Spain, or any other country on the face of the globe; and yet we are offering to destroy the only plant that the engineers of this country have ever developed, after the expenditure of millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds, that is capable of constructing 100 prefabricated houses each day that are just about as sanitary as can be designed. They require no paint; they have no nicks and corners in which vermin can live; they are acid-resistant, will not absorb moisture, and, according to actual tests, are warmer in the wintertime and cooler in the summer, and can be procured at a savings in the United States of some $6,000 per unit over conventional houses, and from $14,000 up in savings outside of the continental United States.

Another thing in which we should be vitally interested when we consider purchasing a house is its resistance to fire. Hardly a day passes that we do not notice in the press such horrible happenings as persons, mostly the aged and infirm or little children, being burned to death when their homes are destroyed by fire. I have seen all kinds of bloodcurdling deaths, but for the life of me I cannot conceive of any more horrible way to die than to be burned to death. I am advised that the underwriters gave the Lustron house as low insurance rates as has ever been given on any structure in this country—the same rate as that given to completely concrete and steel houses. I know that we cannot overlook such improvements in the safety field.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many reasons why the Lustron plant should be in full production, operating three shifts, that there was bound to be skulduggery, inside maneuvering, competitive jealousy, and persons seeking hand-outs before a plant like Lustron could be ordered closed by sensible men.

The members of our legal profession tell me that it is not unusual that circumstantial evidence is much stronger than real evidence. Therefore, I would like to review a little of the evidence that has been uncovered concerning the Lustron loan and its subsequent closing or attempted foreclosure.

Whether or not the loan should have been originally made is no longer pertinent. The picture is just this. The loan was made. The money has been expended, the plant is completely equipped, ready for production; in fact, production of some 3,000 houses was accomplished and 8,000 orders were on hand at the time the plant was closed; in fact, the fires in the furnace are still lighted. Now that is the picture.

While Lustron was in operation, this financial genius, who has been identified to us as Merl Young, appeared on the scene. At the request of RFC officials Merl was placed upon the Lustron payroll at $12,000 a year. Later, at the request of an official of the RFC to the president of the Lustron Corp., his salary was raised to $18,000 a year, provided the increase was approved by the RFC Board in writing. That approval was given. It later developed that at the same time this financial wizard was drawing $10,000 a year from a firm headed by one Rex Jacobs.

A few months before Lustron was closed, Merl Young and others notified the officials of the Lustron Corp. that they were sending an engineer to inspect the Lustron plant. It turns out that the engineer was none other than one of Merl Young's employers and one of his old cronies, Rex Jacobs, with whom Merl often fraternized, and lolled in the Florida sunshine while visiting with Jacobs in his mansion down in the sunshine State of Florida.

According to the press, Merl Young originally was a messenger in the Government service, making $1,080 a year. At one time Merl resided at Greenbelt, Md., and, by the way, he had a brother who likewise resided at Greenbelt. His name is Herchel. Now I understand from reliable sources that all of a sudden, Merl came into the money. Then Herchel moved to swanky East Braddock Lane, Chevy Chase, Md., in a fine home which he reputedly purchased and later he opened an office in the Statler Hotel and claimed to be an industrial consultant. I understand further that Merl had another brother named Gene, who was induced to Washington from Dallas, Tex., and was likewise in some way connected with Rex Jacobs for some 7 months. Now I understand that Gene is holding one of the top jobs in the Government. According to Merl's own statement, his income many months ago was $60,000 a year.

This morning a person came to see me and asked that I endeavor to get the Government to investigate what he had understood to be a loan or a prospective loan to some furrier, and that according to his advice, that Mrs. Merl Young, who by the way is one of the confidential secretaries in the White House, was wearing a beautiful white mink or ermine coat, that he understood was a part of Merl's fee for interceding with the RFC.

Mr. Speaker, we know for a fact that many of these charges are true, and it goes without saying, that where there is smoke there is bound to be fire. Now after I appeared before this house on the 12th day of January, and made certain accusations, that have already been completely confirmed by the report that was recently submitted by the subcommittee investigating the RFC, I had a call from a White House confidant who came by to see me to ascertain whether or not I would confer personally with Merl Young. I told him that I would be happy to talk with anyone regarding any matter that could be helpful in my duties as a Representative in the Congress. Thereupon, Merl Young came to see me the next day. I had a very lengthy conference with Mr. Young, and he denied that he was ever on Rex Jacob's payroll. A few days thereafter, another former RFC employee appeared on the scene. I refer to the Honorable James Windham, who I understand is at the present time the secretary and treasurer of the F. L. Jacobs Manufacturing Co. of which Rex Jacobs is the president.

In my conversation with Mr. Windham, I learned that he was a former employee of the RFC, in fact being the Administrative Assistant to the Director of the Corporation at the time that Rex Jacobs procured a $3,000,000 loan from the RFC. Shortly after the loan was made, Mr. Windham joined the Jacobs firm and certainly he should know who was on their payrolls. I asked him—Mr. Windham—if Merl Young was ever on their rolls. His answer was "Yes." Then I heard that Mr. Windham had been visiting the Lustron plant.

Mr. Jacobs visited the Lustron plant and he had barely entered the office when a long-distance telephone call was received by the president of the Lustron Corp. from Washington inquiring if Mr. Jacobs had arrived. The president of the Lustron Corp. was prompted to talk to Jacobs freely and to show the said Jacobs through the Lustron plant. When his inspection tour was over Mr. Jacobs suggested that, although he was perfecting a sale for his washing-machine business, that he had made arrangements for the purchaser thereof to furnish the

washing machines that were to be installed in Lustron houses and that Merl Young would receive $15 apiece for each machine installed. Thus, if Lustron had been permitted to operate around the clock, they would have produced a minimum of 100 houses a day, which would have produced an additional income of $375,000 annually for the financier Merl Young. Not bad, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the Congress. I am reminded of the story of from "rags to riches." What a clique. Young, Young, Windham, Jacobs, administrators in the Government of the highest influence, Hunt, Robert Hagarty, et al.

In the renegotiation section of the Department of Justice Jacobs is a familiar name. At the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Jacobs is a most familiar name. Some of the courts of this Nation are thoroughly cognizant of the name of Jacobs. The F. L. Jacobs Co., of whom Rex Jacobs is the president, according to reliable information, was forced by the Department of Justice to renegotiate with the Government and repay many millions of dollars in excess profits growing out of contracts given to the said Jacobs Co. to produce necessities and munitions of war during World War II. I believe that I am right in saying that the case was so strong that when the Department of Justice appealed to the courts that Jacobs refused to contest their claims and voluntarily paid some $15,000,000 in excess profits.

If this is not the exact figure, it is in the neighborhood of right, because my informer is none other than James Windham, the former administrative assistant of the Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but at the present time the secretary and treasurer of the F. L. Jacobs Co.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of this Congress, if the administrators of this Government who are in charge of letting contracts under our present defense program are not required to stay on the alert in dealing with such concerns as the F. L. Jacobs Co., history is bound to repeat itself.

Oh, yes: now I am reminded of the proposal that Lustron stock be vested in a substantial part in the hands of Merl Young, Robert Hagarty, and Ed Hunt. Hagarty was later found to be a business associate of Merl Young and his brother Herchel, and Hunt was identified as an associate of Rex Jacobs. They proposed that enough stock be sold to these men to offset the 86,000 shares owned by the Lustron president at 1 percent per share or $860 for an equal number of shares. This proposition was turned down and Rex Jacobs was flatly refused in his suggestion that the Lustron Corp. use his washing machines in order that Merl Young could collect an additional $375,000 yearly.

Unfavorable publicity concerning the Lustron Corp. began to trickle out of the RFC. It was not long thereafter until they were set for the kill. Then the attempted foreclosure.

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, these are the simple facts of the case, and I am perfectly willing for the taxpaying public of America to be the jury and I will be contented with their verdict. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the many reasons that have heretofore been set out, why America needs Lustron, I want to call your attention to what 1 year's savings will buy in the way of munitions for war; 250 medium tanks; 250 jet-fighter planes; 10 aircraft carriers of the *Midway* class; 20 bombers; 10 modern subs; and 25 antiaircraft guns.

Scarcity of steel is now a legitimate reason fo refusing to reactivate this plant. Recently Administrator William Henry Harrison, head of the Defense Production Administration, and I had an extended conversation with regard to the subject of steel. At the time, he advised me that lumber was more of a problem than steel, and that we had more of a shortage of timber than of steel. The general stated further that so far as the material was concerned, that he could make out our case. So I assume that the general is the last word upon the production of the respective commodities, and fully aware of what is available. To say the least, it is like I stated before this House yesterday, the Lustron Corp. would use 80,000 tons less steel each year than we are now utilizing in the manufacture of beer cans. Lustron has become a matter of grave concern to the people of this Nation and I sincerely hope that the Members of Congress will rise up in their wrath, and defy any administrative officer of this Government to salvage and destroy the efforts of thousands of technical engineers and deny our defense agencies and citizens the benefit of this house.

Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from calling too many names, as it is not my nature to be jealous of or to harm anyone. Honesty and fair play is all that I demand, but I hope that by my refusal to accurately describe many persons who are as deep in the muck as the ones who have been named are in the mire will not be taken adversely. I trust that it will not be necessary for me to complete this "financeer" family tree through affinity, "consinquinity," or "goldinity" and specifically name and trace the maneuvers of the other members of this "almighty dollar fraternity."

If the American people are denied the progress that they have so dearly paid for in developing the Lustron house, during the weeks to come I assure you that the entire country will learn and realize that up until now the half has never been told.

February Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, February, our month of heroes, is again upon us. During the next few days our people will celebrate, each in his own way, the red-letter dates upon the calendar which mark again the anniversaries of the birth of two of our greatest national heroes: George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Here were two men who were ever willing servants of liberty; ever the guardsmen of national honor. The days in which they lived, served, and died were fraught with tragedy, but with the held of divine guidance they were able to not only rise above the turmoil of their times but above the horizon of history as well.

But there are other and darker anniversaries this month. There are February dates which are inscribed in our contemporary history in blood and are tragic in no less degree than were those through which Washington and Lincoln, each in his turn, bore the burden of sorrow. These, too, are dates which freemen should keep in their minds and hearts as we seek again to stem the onrush of tyranny and the oppression of tyrants. Many peoples, once proud and free, today stagger and groan under the merciless shackles of a servitude no less real to them because it is remote from us. These are the speechless and these are the human beings from whose shoulders has been stripped ruthlessly the mantle of human dignity. These are the slaves and the blood brothers of the millions who have gone to nameless graves under the lash of brutal masters whose lust for power drives them to their own eventual destruction. But for this moment the power mad wield the whip of absolute authority without thought of God, man, or constitutional governments. Judgment day is a long distance along the road of eternity, and to be hopeless, as many are, is to suffer a cancer of the soul. Little wonder, then, that men, women, and children of a dozen nations see no hope in the morning light and no promise in the sunset.

But we who are free can and should reaffirm that the prisoners of brute force are not without friends and not without a real and sincere pledge of succor in this hour of desperate need, for without hope the human soul is already half enslaved. We Americans are slow to anger and loath to violence, but once aroused we become a power and a fury in the defense of human liberty and the precepts of common international decency. We do not feel that because a brigand escapes with his loot, that he is forever free of judgment, nor that the murderer goes scot free because he escapes the dragnet in the first few hours after his crime. Neither do we believe that the welding of manacles on weaker hands means eternal slavery.

There is no desert so arid that tortured liberty cannot quench its thirst. There is no heaven so high and no ocean so deep that the soul of liberty can be deprived of its breath. The spirit of human liberty is far beyond the reach of a lash or the scalpel in the hand of the most able surgeon. It leaves the mortal frame when life itself departs, but until that instant it is the most elusive element in the entire spectrum of human emotions.

Thirty-three years ago today the Lithuanian nation came into being. February 16 is a date that will mock those Lithuanians who today are in bondage. February 6 is an infamous date on the calendars of the liberty-loving Polish people, for it was on that date that the vulture of Yalta cast its shadow over Warsaw. Our concern and our shame must be the part that this Nation played in the tragedy of Poland. That the Yalta agreement was never ratified by the representatives of the American people in no way diminishes the ravages and the terror which followed the implementation of our national policy at that time. Thus it is that we have a moral responsibility to insure that freedom shall again flower wherever a Pole places his foot. We have an even greater responsibility to ourselves and to those who follow us in our cherished tradition of American liberty.

If the millions of citizens of this great Nation could speak to the enslaved today they would say: "Be of good cheer and let hope be the star upon which your eyes rest. Keep liberty and the love of liberty the silent password on your lips and in your hearts. The free world is not the decadent creature depicted by your captors, but in its every manifestation it is a virile and living thing. We cannot in this moment commune together, but in spirit we stand beside you. As we increase our strength to meet the great test that appears with every passing day to be the more inevitable, we look to you as allies and as friends. Freedom will come again to the Poles, to the Lithuanians, to the Estonians, and to all of the others who place their faith in a divine being and an ordered world."

Mr. Speaker, there has been introduced into the Congress legislation to empower the Department of Defense to utilize the willing hands of those abroad who want to strike a blow for their own ideals and their national traditions. The bill would permit enlistments in the United States Army of aliens who are qualified to bear arms; bear arms not in the defense of this country or of an ally, but in support of their own principles. Hundreds of thousands of aliens have good reason to hate Communists and communism. The more intelligent, the more sincere, the more enlightened the service of these men to their own democratic institutions and governments, the more violent the punishment meted out to them and to their loved ones on the fall of those governments. Individually, they represent haunted shadows, drifting through the free world, stateless and embittered, or worse yet, hounded slaves behind the iron curtain. United, these men could and would represent a force designed to exact just retribution from the common enemy of free men. Their services should be utilized and quickly. To those who say that we have never employed mercenary troops, I would answer only that the spirit of liberty and the desire for freedom, which burns alike in the soul of every human creature, has no knowledge and no need of mercenary troops. We seek allies in the great struggle ahead. We have at hand, anxious and willing to strike a blow in their own behalf, uncounted thousands of recruits who ask only the opportunity to fight back with something more lethal than a hand sickle or a hoe. Are we to give them their chance in the common cause?

I hope so, Mr. Speaker.

Prominent Internationalists Who Have the Same Objective as Joe Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. WOOD
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on pages A607 and A608 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I showed how a powerful segment of the press and radio are diligently engaged in selling America down the river.

Today I am listing 33 prominent internationalists calling themselves the Committee on Present Danger, and the Crisis Committee, who are whooping it up to draft 18-year-olds, send an army and unlimited military supplies to Europe, and thereby hasten the day so fervently hoped for by Joe Stalin when we will have spent ourselves into bankruptcy.

This is the same gang who sold us the Marshall Plan on the promise that it would stop communism and furnish a market for our surplus production. Since then communism has spread over one-third of the globe and we now realize the Marshall plan was just a slick trick to force the American taxpayers to pay interest on foreign bonds held by international banker-racketeers of Wall Street and the London counting houses; and to tax free enterprise in the United States to build up socialistic-communistic regimes in Europe and Asia which are committed to the destruction of free enterprise everywhere.

What this committee of 33 advocates will accomplish from within could never be accomplished by any enemies from without.

Communist Russia is the greatest economic hoax in all history. The Balkans are seething with revolt, and Russia would fall apart from her own internal weaknesses if our enemies within and without would stop financing her.

It is time to think and talk and act American; and designate internationalists for what they are—potential traitors to the United States.

The real facts of the present situation are that the internationalists—deliberately, and the New Deal-Fair Deal—stupidly, have made such a mess of our economy that they must depend on war and the rumors of war to keep it going.

Unless the American people demand a return to sound monetary and fiscal policies in Government, they should stop complaining about high prices, high taxes, and the imminent danger that their sons be sent to fight more foreign wars; for in the last analysis, the American people have only themselves to blame for the kind of government they get.

The following article is from the Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1951:

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS SOUGHT FOR LOBBYING BY INTERNATIONALISTS

A drive to raise an initial $100,000 to lobby for sending troops to Europe and for the drafting of 18-year-olds was launched last night by a group of citizens supporting interventionism of the Truman administration.

Telegrams were sent to business men throughout the Nation asking them to listen to a radio speech on the world crisis by James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, and then make contributions to the $100,000 lobby goal. Conant, at the age of 24, served as a lieutenant in the Sanitary Corps in World War I.

HEADQUARTERS HERE

The drive is being pushed by the Committee on the Present Danger, which has headquarters in Washington. The committee has 33 members, all prominent internationalists. Nineteen of the thirty-three members of this committee are also members of a crisis committee, which is pleading for unity behind Truman foreign policy.

Many of the 33 committee members served on the committee for the Marshall plan, which spent almost $150,000 lobbying the multi-billion dollar Marshall plan through Congress as the sure means of promoting peace. Many of the members of the Marshall plan committee profited handsomely from the spending under the Marshall aid program. They will also profit from spending under the defense program.

MEMBERS LISTED

The 33 members of the committee, by States, are:

Alabama, William D, Arant, lawyer; California, Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president of the University of California; Colorado, Dr. Robert L. Strearns, president, University of Colorado; District of Columbia, Dr. Vannevar Bush, president, Carnegie Institution of Washington, and John Lord O'Brian, formerly general counsel for War Production Board.

Illinois, Laird Bell, chairman, board of trustees, University of Chicago; Truman K. Gibson, Jr., lawyer and member of President's Commission on Universal Military Training, 1947; and Theodore W. Schultz, professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Kansas, Dr. William C. Menninger of the Menninger Foundation; Louisiana, Monte M. Lemann, lawyer; Maryland, William L. Marbury, lawyer.

Massachusetts, Dr. James Phinney Baxter III, president, Williams College; Dr. James B. Conant, president, Harvard University; Gen. Robert Cutler, president, Old Colony Trust Co.; and R. Ammi Cutter, lawyer.

Minnesota, Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc.; Missouri, Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush, president, University of Missouri; New Jersey, Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president, Princeton University.

ADLER ON COMMITTEE

New York, Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, general manager, New York Times; Frank Altschul, chairman of committee on international policy, National Planning Association; Lewis H. Brown, chairman of the board, Johns-Manville Corp.; Dr. Charles Dollard, president, Carnegie Corporation of New York; Gen. William J. Donovan, former Director of Office of Strategic Services; Edward S. Greenbaum, lawyer; Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War; Stanley Resor, chairman of the board, J. Walter Thompson Co.; Robert E. Sherwood, author and playwright; and Tracy S. Voorhees, former Under Secretary of the Army.

Pennsylvania, Howard C. Petersen, president, Fidelity Philadelphia Trust Co.; Rhode Island, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president, Brown University; Texas, Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State; Virginia, Miss Meta Glass, former president, Sweet Briar College; Washington, Dr. Raymond B. Allen, president, University of Washington.

URGES SUPPORT FOR IKE

In his radio speech, Conant said there is "a good chance" a third global war may be avoided if the free world becomes strong and united behind the Eisenhower mission. He urged troops for Europe and drafting 18-year-olds.

He expressed belief the catastrophe of world war III may be avoided "if Europe is made defensible and without delay."

Lives at Stake in the Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article entitled "Lives, Not Profits, At Stake." The article is by Constantine Brown, and deals with the current railroad strike. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, inasmuch as it is a very impressive one.

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

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of February 6, 1951]

LIVES, NOT PROFITS, AT STAKE—RAIL STRIKE SORRY SPECTACLE TO FREE NATIONS; GIVES ENEMY PROPAGANDA AMMUNITION

(By Constantine Brown)

House-cleaning during a storm is difficult. But when the dirt under the rugs menaces the health of the family, the big broom must be used and the windows opened.

We are presenting a sorry spectacle today to the free nations of the world, whom we are supposed to lead in their struggle for survival against Communist imperialism. We are supposed to show a determination, through unity at home, to weather the Kremlin-raised hurricane. And what is the picture our allies and friends get from the United States?

Railroad men are on strike at a time when more than 100,000 American soldiers are fighting for their life in Korea.

The soldiers in Korea receive in the neighborhood of $100 a month. It is true that they also get board and lodging—the board represented by K rations and the lodging a foxhole in subzero weather. When they work only 18 hours a day they consider themselves lucky. Death and injury are the GIs' professional risks, and they get no workmen's compensation.

The strike is an inherent right of all workers. But a strike which affects men whose chances of survival depend largely on the arms and ammunition they receive from America, 7,000 miles away, is a crime, for it hits directly at those who are fighting for the preservation of American freedoms, which includes the right to strike.

The switchmen's strike not only has slowed the sending of military equipment to Korea, but it is also interfering with the production of desperately needed war materials. Strikes by railroad men, longshoremen, steel workers, and miners no longer interfere with profits, but menace the lives of the sons of the strikers themselves.

We pointed with scorn last year at the political strikes provoked by the Communists in Western Europe. We criticized them because they were jeopardizing the countries' chances of preparing themselves against the Russian threat. They now see the same thing happening in this country, when we are waging a full-fledged war against overwhelming odds. The strike is not caused by political subversion It is merely the result of economic dissatisfaction of a group of men who, however just their demands may be, do not have to place the lives of American boys in jeopardy.

In the past we have adopted a holier-than-thou attitude toward the lack of financial integrity among some of the governments with which we are associated. The wrath of the administration and of many radio and newspaper commentators was directed against the venality of the Chiang Kai-shek regime. We wanted no part of it, because Chiang's relatives and many members of the Kuomintang had dipped their hands into public funds.

What do we see today at home? "Five percenters" offer their services to contractors and are able to obtain favors through their connections with high Government officials. Only last week the Fulbright committee made public an unsavory story of how persons high in the Government—including the White House—were able to influence loans made by the tax-supported Reconstruction Finance Corp.

How many similar instances exist today is not known But there is an uneasy feeling in congressional quarters that the Fulbright committee has lifted only a corner of the rug under which much of Washington's daily dirt has been swept.

It is true that the country is still rich enough and the country, by and large, healthy enough that such peccadillos will not damage its fiber. But these disclosures give our enemies their best propaganda ammunition, and one which the Voice of America cannot offset.

Our Tragedy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the January 31, 1951, edition of the Kansas City Times there appeared an editorial entitled "Our Tragedy in China."

This editorial points out two fundamental truths which stand out in bold relief despite all the controversy that might develop over the position of individuals who have the courage to tell the American people what has been happening in China during the past several years.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

OUR TRAGEDY IN CHINA

At the Republican Party's Kansas Day celebration in Topeka Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, again developed his charge that a "crimson clique" in the State Department deliberately fostered the recent victory of communism on the Chinese mainland and so must be held directly accountable for the present fighting in Korea with its tragic cost in American lives.

The controversy which has raged over who specifically in the State Department was responsible for the formulation of our policy toward China, say between 1943 and 1949, and what their motives may have been—a controversy initially provoked by the extreme partisanship with which the Senator phrased his original indictment—should not be allowed to obscure two fundamental truths.

One is that our relations with China were grossly mishandled throughout the period in question. The other is that a whole series of evil consequences, of which the most conspicuous at the moment is the Korean conflict, has now resulted from our protracted blundering.

The basic facts are hardly open to dispute. Indeed, most of the factual material can readily be obtained from any careful reading of the State Department's own publication, entitled "United States Relations with China," which was released as long ago as August 1949. The weakness of this lengthy report to the American people lies in its failure to draw obvious conclusion, or, rather, in its tendency to draw false conclusions from the record by implication.

The Department asked us to believe, essentially, that the outlook in China (from the point of view of our interests) was hopeless from the start, that nothing we could have done would have halted the emergence of a Communist dictatorship on the mainland and that we made no mistakes, either of omission or commission, in dealing with the Chinese situation during and immediately after the Second World War.

Even before MCCARTHY launched his bitter attacks on the State Department, it was being pointed out by responsible observers on every hand that this reading of the record was not in the least persuasive and that on the most charitable estimate those in charge of our Chinese policy had shown themselves confused and inept.

Whether the situation in China was actually hopeless and whether the seizure of control of the country by the Communists could have been prevented, of course, will never be known. What seems perfectly clear is that the State Department's approach to the situation was hopeless and that our policy was not calculated to prevent that seizure.

We tried first to force a coalition between the Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists. And when those efforts broke down—as they were bound to break down—we then threw up our hands and did nothing. The outcome was inevitable. Instead of trying in any effective way to compel Chiang Kai-shek to clean his governmental and military house, by taking power away from a reactionary clique and giving it to the progressive and enlightened Chinese among his associates, we confronted the generalissimo with an impossible demand that he join forces with the Soviet-dominated Communist leaders.

The net result was that the Nationalist Government steadily lost the confidence of the Chinese people, its armies steadily became more inefficient, and Mao Tze-tung and his associates rode to power while we pronounced a futile curse "on both your houses" and watched helplessly the mergence of Red China as a springboard for Communist aggression in Asia.

Modern American diplomacy probably never made a greater error or one more terrible in its consequences. That is why, for all the extravagance of some of his statements (those at Topeka appeared more restrained than usual), the Wisconsin Senator can never be ignored or dismissed entirely from the foreign policy debate. Quite apart from the question of personal loyalty which he has injected, the State Department is simply too vulnerable to criticism on its past course in China.

The Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a broadcast by Raymond Swing over Station WOL on January 15, 1951, in regard to the point 4 program.

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

I wish to put in a word for point 4. Point 4 has become a term of world-wide meaning ever since President Truman, in a Presidential message, proposed that the United States make a policy of aiding underdeveloped areas with its unique technical assistance. In a foreign policy that has been otherwise heavily weighted with more immediate kinds of self-interest the point 4 program has beamed forth like a candle as the most effective expression of American ideology. However, Congress hasn't cared much for it. It takes a wide first-hand knowledge of the world, a vivid sense of the many hundreds of millions of people living in abject poverty and familiarity with the ways by which their living standards can be raised by modern technical methods you see what a power a point 4 program can be. It would be strong in the ideological fight with communism. It would be still stronger in assuring the United States the warm friendship of the great bulk of the world's population, as living standards come to be lifted. But, as I said, Congress hasn't eyes and ears attuned to these more-distant realities and has never been generous with point 4.

Last year it appropriated less than half the cost of a single cruiser to the entire point 4 program, $34,000,000. However, this small activity has given American foreign policy a slight sparkle and luster. I venture to say that the United States gets more positive prestige from this $34,000,000 than any other single outlay of similar size in the budget. It had been hoped to raise the sum of more than $100,000,000 this year—certainly a bagatelle in relation to the $71,000,000,000 of the budget. But instead of this amount, it now appears that the point 4 program is to be turned into a straight-cut device to get raw materials for defense purposes. Plans are being laid for this along with the reorganization of ECA. It is hoped to divest the State Department of all operational agencies and put the aid program throughout the world under ECA. Point 4, then, is to be something like the Board of Economic Warfare, with an eye on special possibilities where raw materials can be developed by timely financing and technical guidance. Now no one can object to the development of raw materials needed for defense. No one can object to ECA having charge of all technical assistance everywhere. But objection can be raised to the transformation of point 4 into a Board of Economic Warfare or anything like it. It deserves to be retained and expanded for its original objective, and instead of trying to sell Congress something that sounds more selfishly nationalistic, an effort should be made to interest Congress in point 4 as being one of the finest and least expensive expressions of Americanism in our foreign policy. It's not a foreign program out of which individual Americans can hope to get rich. It's not a program of capital expansion. It's not a Twentieth Century brand of enlightened imperialism. It is devoted simply to bringing to the neglected parts of the world and their neglected peoples the technical aid that can help them increase their own efforts on their own behalf. It's designed to expand their agriculture, develop their power, and get them started on the spiral of increased production. It's not done in the expectation of recruiting soldiers to stand on—stand against—the Soviet bloc or of combatting immediate communism infiltration. It simply makes a start on helping the vast majority of people in the world to improve their economic status. Obviously, the United States will share any expansion of the wealth of the world, but the share would not be in dividends on stocks and bonds; it would be in a closer and richer brotherhood and to drop this chapter from American foreign policy would be to lose the one many would like to consider most characteristically American.

Problems Confronting the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very unusual letter which I have received from Dr. Ericson, a medical doctor at LeSueur, Minn. Forty years ago he was an immigrant to the United States from Sweden. His letter is so unusual and so impressive that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LESUEUR, MINN., *January 13, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THYE: The reason for this letter is that the country is in a mess and may be in a worse one unless something can be done. What I write may do no more good than grandmother's onion poultice of long ago.

We need to get ready and also stay ready for many years. We need to conserve manpower. We need to find if our people will adjust themselves to go without many things, work harder for less and produce more with less manpower, and yet pay more taxes; all to the purpose of staying solvent. To do this we need to live democracy, not glibly talk about it. We must reinstate responsibility to the country in all citizens, not continue to make the country responsible for the people. Self-government imposes obligations on everyone—something that is often forgotten. To be free does not mean to have license to do what one wishes at all times—there must be regard for others.

Our foreign policy as of today should be: Keep ourselves free and strong without imposing our will on others; help those who are willing to help themselves and us to keep free, not by words but by deeds; improve the functioning of the UN (set up military force) so that it can do its work—assure peace.

If there is a will to do this, it can be done without national insolvency or ourselves becoming a dictatorship. We must keep a sense of proportion. We are only 7 to 100 in world population. We should conduct our affairs so that the rest of the people will choose our way of doing things. Then they will help us protect ourselves in common. We cannot garrison the world. We have neither the will nor the manpower.

Some 40 years ago I felt Sweden partly on account of forced military training, adopted by that country as a protection. Today, I am convinced that we should ask every young man to accept this obligation in this country as our safest way to avoid destruction, financially or militarily. A large standing army will prove so wasteful over the years as to endanger solvency, as well as tend to divide us. Universal training will give all available strength at all time, as in periods of stress it can be augmented by a fair process of draft of those who have served.

It should be possible to keep the cost of this training within reasonable limits, and also set up safeguards as to its use. The physical fitness could be started in the schools, and is an asset in peace as well. After high school the defense services could give the required training for a balanced defense, with refresher courses for a few years to remind them to keep fit. When the world situation improved the military training could be curtailed, but the fitness program would still be valuable. There would be about a 6 months' gap in the flow of students to the colleges, depending on length of the first training period. If the program is to continue for many years, as it seems now, it must be impartial, all contribute and share the dangers and burdens equally, or there will never be unity and wholehearted effort. The draft and exemptions are subject to too many errors or outright fraud. The problems of the colleges must be secondary, if we really are in danger and the whole thing is not a political expedient. Of primary importance is a system that is impartial, supplies the men when needed with the best training and in best condition, with the least dislocation of the national economy.

Therefore, the best time is after school, so that college or life work can be started after the initial period, and the refresher courses come during vacations. This would stagger work for both the schools and the services, so that less installations would be needed. In this way there would be the least interruption in getting higher training, except in times of stress, and that would be true no matter what system were used.

Above all, we must face the fact that we cannot displace communism by war. Proper individual and national conduct of affairs, coupled with faith and devotion, are more important. Then we can spread ideas that will win for us where bullets do only harm. In the meantime, we should keep strong so that no bully can overtake us or our friends.

Now, what should we do?

1. Adopt some form of UMT until the UN is ready, using a draft in addition if need be. I have served on the local board and am doubtful as to the selective part. The UMT is impartial. The services will have to get used to taking and using substandard men. That is the safest way to give us unity and enough men for all services. The older must get into their life work to keep the economy going. There is no sense in having protection if there is nothing to protect.

2. Let anti-Communist Chinese do what they can, with our supplies and technical help—no massed manpower. Our part to keep the Pacific open.

3. Assist Europe when those nations have shown determination to help themselves and do their share in actual accomplishments. If the people there are apathetic, we risk more than it is worth for them or us.

4. Conclude peace with Germany, Japan, and Austria, ignoring Russia if necessary.

5. Get Japan back in production to help stabilize Asia.

6. Keep Red China out of the UN, and drop Russia if need be to get things done. Russia has not acted in good faith and Red China is not behaving any better. Given time, the Russian people will overthrow the present rulers. With intelligent help, they can do it earlier. If we adopt a policy of live and let live, even if our living standards should drop for a time, the people there will know we are not only talking. There are enough DP's in Europe to let some of our ideas through the curtain. Giving something for nothing is not helping as much as helping people to help themselves. That should be our real foreign policy.

7. When it comes to setting up of national policy for the present emergency, we should be careful so as not to start another war in the future. There is much in the world history to hint that quotas, supports, and other means to protect certain groups or peoples may lead to such states and pressures that war results. These supports lead to higher prices—less people can enjoy the items protected—with envy and hate easily engendered by political opportunists. Our policy should be to encourage competitive cooperation so that prices can come down, with better living for more people. That is the only way to a possible permanent peace. By a competitive cooperation I mean competition among groups to improve production by cooperation among groups to improve the means of production—i. e., exchange processes and patents There is no better way to give the world population what it needs until human relations are better. In this respect the agricultural program here must be watched.

A rather long letter, but there are so many angles.

Yours very truly,

SWAN ERICSON, M. D.

Civilian Defense Activity in Manchester, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an account of a recent civilian defense activity in the State of New Hampshire.

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

The following is a report of what can be done by a civic-minded business organization in civilian defense planning and preparation.

Recently the residents of Manchester, N. H., witnessed a demonstration by a mobile disaster emergency relief unit which had just been established by the N. G. Gurnsey Distributing Co., of Manchester.

Modeling their equipment after that of the P. Ballantine & Sons large mobile disaster relief units, the Gurnsey Co. showed how the trucks of any private company could be equipped at no sacrifice of usual service to deal with an emergency.

Blankets, stretchers, tools, first-aid kits, flares, portable lights, ropes and ladders provided by the Gurnsey Co. converted their delivery trucks for services as evacuation vehicles, ambulances and first aid stations. The drivers are all Red Cross-trained in first aid.

Rear Adm. Miles R. Browning, (USN, Ret.), State Coordinator of Civilian Defense, was among the many officials and industrial leaders of New Hampshire who witnessed the demonstration. Already other firms in other cities in New Hampshire are adopting similar plans and are preparing their own trucks as units of the New Hampshire civilian defense.

Mr. Carl Badenhausen, president of P. Ballantine & Sons, first conceived the idea of civilian disaster units last May. They have been at the call of the New Jersey authorities twice already, in the South Amboy explosion and during the recent hurricane. These units are now enrolled in the civilian defense structures of New Jersey and New York. They also exist in Washington and in Boston. Several similar units are planned in other cities in the near future.

Recognition of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include two resolutions adopted by the twenty-fifth Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held at the Statler Hotel here in Washington from January 25 to 27 last. The many Members of the House and Senate who have introduced measures to accomplish the ends set forth in the following resolutions, welcome the support of the great organization, whose spendid work in the field of national defense has done much to spur production and to rekindle the spirit of patriotism and devotion to country.

As one of the sponsors of the proposed Marine Corps legislation, may I assure the resolutions committee and the members of the Patriotic Conference on National Defense that we shall continue in our efforts to obtain early hearings on the subject matters of the resolutions, and that we welcome their assistance in carrying the message back to their respective organizations.

The resolutions read as follows:

RECOGNITION OF THE MARINE CORPS

Whereas the Marine Corps has demonstrated its efficiency, loyalty, and capability in the defense of our country since 1775; and

Whereas the Marine Corps is a part of the United States Navy, trained in naval as well as other military strategy and tactics, having as their specialty amphibious landings in warfare; and

Whereas the Marine Corps has no representation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, except directly through the Chief of Naval Operations; and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this body that such representation is essential to the proper planning of any offensive or defensive action proposed or considered by our Armed Forces; and

Whereas the Commandant of the Marine Corps, by virtue of his position and training, is the logical and proper person to so represent his branch of the service and its specialty, the amphibious phase of warfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-Fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense do hereby endorse and heartily support all bills and/or resolutions introduced in the Congress of the United States to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

STRENGTHENING OF MARINE CORPS

Whereas the Marine Corps has been, and is, an efficient fighting force of the United States and the first combat group to be called on for service outside the limits of the continental United States in time of hostility or other emergency requiring force and arms; and

Whereas the recent peacetime history of the Marine Corps is replete with attempts to diminish the number of its personnel beyond a point requisite for the safety and welfare of our country; and

Whereas a permanent personnel strength within the Marine Corps of 400,000 persons is considered essential to the safety and security of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense endorse and bind itself to support those Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives who have introduced bills and/or resolutions in either House of Congress to fix the personnel strength of the Marine Corps at 400,000 persons; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of National Defense, and all Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

Possible Big Four Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following regular Tuesday broadcast, The Christian Science Monitor Views the News, over the American Broadcasting Co. network, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor:

THE DOOR IS STILL OPEN—DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Soviet Russia has answered the last Allied note concerning a possible meeting of the Big Four. Its note left open the door to a meeting, but there are still major points to iron out.

The big new fact is that Moscow is willing to discuss matters other than the arming of

Germany, as the Allies had demanded, although it insists that the German question must come first on the list.

Perhaps this attitude is partly a result of softening American policy on the arming of Western Germany. It was apparent from General Eisenhower's statements last week that the United States is not proceeding heedlessly with the preparation of German units in the European Army. Russian warnings against such action have been taken seriously. Moreover, German disinclination to participate—except, perhaps—on extortionate terms, was an element in slowing up Washington's pressure for arming the Germans.

This easing of the situation on German armament is very encouraging. That situation was one of the most difficult and dangerous elements in the world picture. But the United States, under General Eisenhower's apparent influence, seems now to have put Germany last on the list. This was only realistic, since we are far from being ready with enough war material to supply the western Allies in the immediate future.

Our threat to arm the Germans—a threat which the Germans themselves greeted with a mixture of alarm and bargaining zeal—was an obvious response to the Russians' act in arming the East Germans. We are therefore perhaps in a bargaining position ourselves, if and when the Big Four meeting is ever held.

The crucial question is whether, if the western powers drop their plans for arming Western Germany, the Russians will reduce or disband their already well-armed German police army in the east.

At any rate, Russian policy has now moved somewhat closer to Allied policy concerning the possible Big Four meeting. The door is still open, and it is up to state-craft to see if something substantial can pass through the portals. Nobody has much optimism about the results of such a meeting, but all rational men are glad that meetings can still take place, and that all contacts have not been broken off.

One reason for the present Russian willingness to meet is revealed in the results of a public opinion poll in West Germany made public in Frankfurt at the meeting of American diplomats. The Germans were asked which would be better for them: to join the West politically and militarily, or to try and unify Germany and remain neutral. While 44 percent favored linking with the West, 41 percent chose unity and neutrality. This shows plainly that if Russia at a Big Four meeting proposes unity and neutrality, which it is almost certain to do, it would have strong support even in West Germany.

It is emphasized on the other hand that an overwhelming majority of the Germans oppose communism. They oppose being drawn into a trap with the East German Communist state. But they manifestly fear that rearmament will make them the first victims of a possible war. Their viewpoint is thoroughly understandable.

The fifth and last of the atomic explosions has shaken Las Vegas. The Atomic Energy Commission says it has concluded its experiments for the present and is completely satisfied with the results. This blast was sighted by television from Los Angeles, and in Boise, Idaho, 500 miles away.

It is evident that these explosions are diplomatic and political as well as atomic and experimental. And the chain reaction they set up in Moscow may be even more vivd than the view from Las Vegas. They are blunt warning at a time when the physical strength of the West in other areas has yet to be mobilized.

In Korea, however, the strength of the UN forces continues to manifest itself. There are many signs that the Communist resistance has become much stiffer, and a major counteroffensive may be launched soon. But General Ridgway's troops are sure of themselves; they are extorting a tremendous toll of the Communists; and they seem quite able to maintain their positions and to make small gains. How long this sort of thing can continue remains to be seen. We are grinding the pick of the Chinese armies to pieces at little manpower cost to the UN forces.

There would seem to be every reason why Peiping would be willing to negotiate. And yet it is not. Presumably the Russians are supporting China in every way to continue this involvement of American troops. But it is obviously a bad business for the Chinese, and—in its way—for the United Nations. Yet the UN can take satisfaction in its struggle to resist and punish aggression, and to uphold the goal of collective security.

Questions and Answers in Which the Public Is Intensely Interested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a reprint of a radio broadcast over radio station WBT, Charlotte, N. C., which was made the early part of this week. As these questions are being propounded to Representatives throughout our great Nation, I am taking the liberty of inserting these questions and answers in the Appendix of the RECORD:

1. What do you think of General Eisenhower's report to Congress?

Answer. I was very much impressed by General Eisenhower's report to the Congress realizing that he had to be very guarded in the remarks to us. It would have been decidedly unwise for him to make any disclosures that would show Russia any vital part of the program which the United Nations plans for the settlement of the crisis with Korea. The information he furnished us could not be used in any strong or lengthy argument by the Members of Congress, but it was such as to impress this most distinguished body of the stupendous task that he had undertaken and the very practical and serious way that he had gone about a solution of preparing the United Nations countries for any emergencies.

2. How do you feel about drafting 18-year-olds?

Answer. The question of drafting 18-year-olds has probably produced more difference of opinion by people who are absolutely concerned over the welfare of this Nation than any other question before the United States at the present time. It is very plain that if young men at this early age are drafted they should not be sent into combat service until they have been in training for at least 1 year. This is in strict conflict with the Government's plan as announced by General Marshall and may be considered impractical, but these are my views at the present. There is another complexity to the situation in that it would be a serious handicap to the boy's education who would reach 18 in the middle of his graduating year and be drafted at that time, preventing his continuing his course for 6 months longer until he could complete his course. This might result in many boys not completing their education at all. It may be that General Eisenhower is right when he says that it does not make a great amount of difference if the boys are drafted at 18 or 19, providing they are not drafted at a later age.

3. How do you feel about taxes?

Answer. I feel that our taxes should not be increased any more than is necessary to adequately arm our three branches of the service so that we may resist any dangerous aggression on the part of Russia. And cut as much, as is possible, expenditures for nonmilitary purposes. Having spent so much in preparation, we should try to cut all we can in unnecessary civilian expenses.

4. Do you feel we can effect some economy in nondefense spending?

Answer. I do feel that some economy can be effected in nondefense spending which was indicated by a provision in the last appropriation bill providing for a $6,000,000,000 cut in civilian expenses.

5. How do you feel about prices and wage controls? Can they be effected?

Answer. I feel that price and wage controls will be effected, but that they need adjustment at the present time which can only be effected through trial and experience. If properly carried out, the program should have a strong effect on stabilizing our economy and controlling inflation as much as possible.

6. Regarding the international situation, how do you feel about withdrawing our troops from the Far East in order to strengthen Europe?

Answer. I would not be opposed to withdrawing our troops from the Far East if the effect was to strengthen the military set-up of our country and to bring us nearer to a permanent peace. But just how and on what terms our troops are to be withdrawn deserves careful consideration by our chiefs of staff and should be done in such a way as to maintain the prestige and honor of the United States of America.

7. Do you feel an international army in Europe under General Eisenhower would be a real deterrent to the Reds should they decide to attack in force through Western Europe?

Answer. I do feel that an international army in Europe under General Eisenhower would be a real deterrent to the Reds should they decide to attack in force through Western Europe.

8. Do you feel we are doing enough financially and diplomatically in Europe to counteract Communist propaganda?

Answer. I would say without trying to analyze just what is being done to counteract Communist propaganda in Europe that too much could not be done in this direction and until communism is beaten down in this strategic area, a permanent peace cannot be attained.

9. What should our future strategy be in Europe?

Answer. Our future strategy in Europe should be left to the decision of our chiefs of staff in the United States in collaboration with military leaders of all the countries represented in the United Nations.

10. Should we continue to fight in the United Nations for sanction against Red China?

Answer. I am satisfied that we should continue to fight in the United Nations for sanctions against Red China as I am satisfied that they are plainly the aggressors in the Korean conflict and have no reason whatsoever in inflicting themselves into the armed conflict between the United Nations on one hand and the North Koreans on the other.

11. How do you feel about the atomic bomb and should we use it?

Answer. The knowledge of the atomic bomb is of great defense power to the United States and the other countries of the United Nations and is probably the main reason that the Russians have not been more aggressive

and threatening to the Americans than already. Although her conduct has been quite disrespectful and intimidating and at times threatening, I do not believe that the atomic bomb should be used as an offensive weapon under present circumstances as the use of same might immediately precipitate a war.

12. How do you feel about Russia and the atomic bomb? Do you believe Russia can match us in atomic research?

Answer. I do not believe that Russia can match America in atomic reserve and that she is getting more and more behind America than ahead of her. I consider this the principal reason that Russia has not already attempted to humiliate us in a positive way or opened war on the United States and the Nations that are friendly to us.

13. Do you believe that Russia has the atomic bomb?

Answer. Frankly, I do not believe that Russia has the atomic bomb in the sense that America has. I have good reason to feel that she has not had the time nor means to perfect the atomic research in any manner comparable with that of the United States. In other words, it is my belief that they lack both the knowledge and the funds with which to produce an atomic bomb in the least comparable to the atomic bomb now being produced by the chemists and workmen in America.

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Mr. Carroll Binder, United States representative, in the Committee on Freedom of Information, on the Preamble of the Freedom of Information Convention submitted by the U. S. S. R., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment on the remarks of the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union concerning the preamble of this convention. Those of us who had been following this subject for the past 3 years see in this text the same old Soviet arguments, and indeed we could have anticipated almost all of them. I do not think it is necessary to present any detailed analyses of the real significance of the text he has proposed, but it may be of some usefulness to examine its relationship to the actions of the Soviet Union during the past 8 years.

Now the Soviet preamble begins on the premise—the false premise—that freedom of the press can only be secured if the press is free from pressure and dictation exercised by private publishing monopolies, trusts and syndicates. This is not the place nor the time to engage in an argument over the merits of the private enterprise press system. In another forum I would be delighted to engage in such a discussion with the delegate of the Soviet Union. But I do want to point out that the proposition he now puts before us ignores the greatest monopoly of all, the monopolistic, all-powerful Soviet information system. It ignores the elementary fact that there can be no semblance of a free press if a government, through a ruling party or otherwise, completely controls all press and information activities. In the Soviet Union these activities are conducted under the pressure and dictation exercised by the Soviet Government. It is therefore obvious that there is no freedom of the press in the Soviet Union. This fact is worth repeating now only if there are those who still find it possible to maintain that freedom of the press means complete and rigorous censorship by the state, that freedom of speech means freedom only to praise an absolute dictatorship, that freedom to receive information means freedom to be indoctrinated, without choice, in the dogmas of a single ruling party and to have access to no other sources of information.

But there is another aspect of this Soviet line that is somewhat more subtle. It is the thesis that there are principal tasks in the dissemination of information. Now this concept that the press must carry out certain "tasks" has had a certain allure for the unwary. From the premise that organs of information are a powerful means of influencing public opinion, they have been tempted to conclude that these organs should carry out certain tasks, that is, that they have a certain set of prescribed functions in the interest of society.

At this point one might logically inquire: Who is to assign these tasks? Who is to be the taskmaster to see that the tasks are carried out? In practice this can only be done, and in fact is only being done, by governments which have assumed the power to control the press. In essence then, the tasks which are assigned to the press are those which further the policies and objectives of those governments. Of course there are some who would contend that the press can assign itself such tasks. But in practice this would require, at least, control by a political party; and again we would not have a free press as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, the press does have one great responsibility. It is the responsibility to seek the truth and to report its findings as comprehensively and objectively as possible. The press succeeds in promoting desirable social, economic and political ends only to the extent that it succeeds in providing the general public with available facts and opinions and thus enables them to reach their own decisions. But it is not the function of the press to become an advocate or dispenser of party lines or governmental policies. It is not the function of the press to indoctrinate the reading public.

Now, I would like to turn to the tasks which are set forth in the Soviet preamble. The dissemination of truth and objective information is of course a favorite objective of the Soviet Union. In the context of this preamble and of the political line which the representative of the Soviet Union has laid down this really means the dissemination of such information as the government considers truthful and objective. This can be the truth or half-truths or complete falsehoods. If it is in the interest of the policy and grand strategy of a government to assert that the Republic of Korea attacked the North Korean regime, then the press of that government disseminates this as a fact, even in the face of conclusive evidence, accepted by the rest of the world, that precisely the opposite is true.

Another favorite task of the Soviet Union, of course, is the development of friendly relations among states based upon respect for the principles of the independence and sovereign equality of nations and the achievement of the lofty purposes of the United Nations. And once again the government assigning these tasks decides what nations are worthy of being treated as independent and sovereign equals and what the lofty purposes of the United Nations should be. I hardly think it necessary to cite any examples of the way in which the Soviet Union has carried out this great task. There is hardly a nation represented around this table that has not been the object of the Soviet Union's tender solicitude as expressed in this task of the Soviet press.

Another great task of the press as set forth in this Soviet preamble is to promote the application of measures against propoganda and the inciters of a new war and the countering of any propaganda of aggression capable of creating a threat to the peace or a breach of the peace. Now, the Soviet Union has labored long and hard to promote this notion. When this issue is presented in the United Nations, the effect always has been to pose the question, are you against war? It presumes the answer, yes, whereupon the reply is, "then you must support action curtailing propaganda which threatens to disturb the peace." The question is precisely the same as that posed by the familiar joke, used frequently in America and perhaps in other countries: "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?"

I am sure we need waste no time puzzling over the answer to the Soviet question. The root of the issue lies in the fact that this Soviet task poses the problem of who is going to decide what constitutes propaganda for war and aggression. Once again the Government is the taskmaster, and to enforce its decisions it would resort to censorship and suppression of news whenever it was in its interest to do so. Once again the Soviet formula for liberty becomes a prison for free minds.

But I think the time has come to take a good, hard look at this proposition from another angle. Obviously, we can assume that all peoples are against war and against propaganda for aggression. But what has been the real objective of the government which has labored so hard to promote this proposition? I suggest that an interesting answer to this would be provided if one were to plot on a chart the dates when these propositions were being urged in the United Nations and elsewhere, together with the dates when certain violent events were taking place, or about to take place—events in which these same governments were, shall we say, not exactly disinterested.

Note, for example, the timing of the first raising of this issue in the UN in the General Assembly of 1947 in relation to the violent assault on the independence of Greece. Note the timing of the repeat performances on antiwarmongering resolutions in the UN in relation to the Berlin blockade, and several other points of international tension during the past 2 years Note the timing of the false and treacherous Stockholm appeal in relation to recent events in Korea. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to push this exercise too far, but I do suggest that these coincidences are rather interesting.

The point is, Mr Chairman, how long shall we go on being the dupes in this treacherous game? Once more we are asked, Are you against war and the spreading of war propaganda? This may still be a legitimate question, but are we the ones who are called upon to answer it or is an answer forthcoming from the questioner? Mr. Chairman, this game has many aspects and ramifications. The Stockholm appeal, now somewhat more presentably disguised, has become the common-front device of the 1950's. It is a stealthy new device for entrapping the unwary, the confused, and the alarmed people who have a real horror of war and securing their innocent collaboration. It is the new tactic of infiltration and intrigue. In Eastern Europe, a succession of laws have recently been promulgated for punishing the propagation of war or incitement to war. The puppet regime of East Germany has already demonstrated how this law is to be used as a device to blackmail the weak and

the unwary in West Germany into collaboration with the party line.

Mr. Chairman, these tactics may continue to be successful, they may snare those who dare not voice their suspicion and fears, they may snare those who are not in possession of the facts. But, I repeat, is it still incumbent on us to play along with this game? We cannot plead ignorance of the facts. We need not give any further testimony of our desire for peace and genuine cooperation for the ends which the UN was established to serve. It is not we, but they who must now give some concrete evidence of these same intentions.

That is why I do not consider it necessary to give any further consideration to propositions of this nature. The United Nations has already gone on record. It is now time for those who have promoted these propositions to go on record.

Individualized War Against Red Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Eventful Present: Individualized War Against Red Leaders," by Arnold Perreton, of Concord, N. H., as it appeared in the Manchester Union Leader of January 27, 1951. I believe the article may be of interest to Members of the Congress.

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

THE EVENTFUL PRESENT—INDIVIDUALIZED WAR AGAINST RED LEADERS

(The article below was written expressly for the Union Leader by Arnold Perreton, of Concord. Mr. Perreton is well known as an architect and planning consultant.)

The United Nations is faced today with the critical problem of how to prevent the precipitation of World War II between the Soviet Union and the free nations. So far the Korean crisis has precipitated confusion among all leaders and people. Confusion reigns in the midst of impending great danger.

It is now a well known fact that the rulers of the Soviet Union are determined to destroy the free nations and to win domination over all people in the whole world. Unless we can defend it in time we face the possibility of the eventual fall of Japan and Europe. With ample war plants in Europe, Japan and its own hidden areas in Russia, along with immense military supplies, abundant resources and manpower, the Soviet Union will be able to concentrate on us from almost all directions. We pride ourselves on our vastly superior war production capacity to defend ourselves. But we must also face the very likely possibility of extensive sabotage and subversive activities in our poorly defended midst. Mighty France of World War II fell in 40 days and we may also have a similar fate.

Realizing this, a frenzied rush of delayed war production is on the way. Confiscatory tax measures and conscription of all manpower are ours to face. Alarmed at our scope of war preparation, it will also spur the Soviets to even greater effort of preparation; and a race of war preparation of a magnitude inconceivable by man may result. Our preparation of war, possible efforts at counter revolution and mass defense against aggression will also present the Soviets with the golden opportunity to use it as excellent hate propaganda to consolidate her people and strength. A war between two giants, leading to ultimate exhaustion and stalemate is a definite possibility. Continued chaos, loss of individual security and freedom over the whole world is ours to face.

If mass preparation and war will lead to chaos, what tactics can we use to make a quick end to war? How are the Soviets vulnerable?

The Soviet Union has a totalitarian Communist structure in which the rulers, members of a minority Communist Party, dominate and hold the majority of people in complete subjection to the state. The strength of the rulers is perpetuated by maintaining a state of fear and consequent obedience by all people. The weakness of the rulers rests on their own fear of revolt by the people. The strength and weakness of the Soviet Union is therefore based on fear. How can we capitalize on this fear? What precedent do we have for dealing with fears provoking totalitarian rulers?

A few short years ago World War II was fought. On termination of the war, after many thousands were killed and billions were spent, an international tribunal was created to try the heads of a nation for starting a war and for committing outrages in violation of international law. Two new principles were established by the convictions, namely: (1) That starting and waging aggressive war was declared to be a crime for which individuals were responsible, and (2) that violation of the laws of war such as extermination of civilians and the enslavement, deportation, and torture of prisoners were crimes for which individuals were responsible even when done under orders of a superior.

Here then is our clue, our basic tactic for combating and counterattacking the evils of totalitarian communism. For, haven't we sufficient evidence already of extensive violation by the rulers and leaders of the Soviet Union? Why must we now engage in another exhaustive mass war before we can apprehend these few rulers and leaders? Instead of conducting a mass war against the Soviet nation, why not conduct an individualized war against only the rulers of the Soviet Union and the leaders of the Communist Party; and invoke the support and revolt of the subjected Soviet people?

To instrument an individualized war against the rulers and leaders of the Soviet Union, the United Nations must be authorized to—

1. Suspend the representative members of the Soviet Union to the United Nations on the grounds of suspicion of having violated the principles of international law and having misused and discredited the United Nations by their conduct at its sessions.

2. Appoint an international tribunal to collect evidence of violation and prepare a case against the individual violators, and to summon them to stand trial.

3. Declare a state of war against all individual violators and members of the Communist Party in case the summons to stand trial are ignored and war activity is continued. No war shall be declared on the Soviet Union as a nation or any of its satellite nations.

4. Organize an international espionage—police force to effect the capture or elimination of each individual violator and leader of the Communist Party. Furthermore, all sessions of communistic controlled government, and communistic meeting and public rallies shall be reported and subjected to bombing of required scope.

5. Organize a propaganda force to invoke the aid of all non-Communist Party members in Soviet Union to assist in the capture and elimination of individual violators; and to invoke the subjected people to revolt from the Communist-controlled government.

The free nations must be authorized to—

1. Seize and imprison every known member of the Communist Party within the boundaries of its nation on the first evidence of any sabotage or incident of disorder.

2. Maintain a civilian defense force to defend all power installations, water-supply areas, and war-defense plants from any attempts at sabotage; and to provide the necessary help and protection in case of disorder, attack, and bombing.

3. Maintain a military force of Army, Navy, and Air to participate in only the defense of any and all areas of aggression by the Soviet Union. Penetration within the boundaries of the Soviet Union for the purpose of bombing military supply bases, war production plants, transportation facilities, and oil fields is to be construed here as a defense measure.

As indicated by these principles, the offensive war by the United Nations will be conducted entirely against individual violators and not against the nation of people as a whole; and the defensive war by the free nations will be conducted only as a means of defense against sabotage and military aggression by the Soviet Union. It is construed here that with the gradual elimination of the key violators and the adverse psychological effect on the remaining rulers and leaders of the Communist Party, the brain and heart of the Communist organization will be greatly endangered and a collapse of the Communist octopus will be inevitable. The winning of the war, consequently, can be accomplished in a comparatively quick, easy, and economical way.

Instead of the necessity of waging war, however, the effective threat of the individualized war may now be used as a potential factor to negotiate peace. By the enthusiastic manner in which all the people support this measure, they have now the opportunity to indicate that the prospect for the success of totalitarian communism in the advanced free nations is slight.

Also, the rulers of the Soviet Union may be prevailed upon to perform a great good by fostering amongst their backward people the inevitable democratic growth and gradually decrease their totalitarian control, and thereby enjoy the pleasure of seeing their creation serve a profound social need and, at the same time, live to an enjoyable and justifiable old age. On the contrary, if the rulers and leaders are despotic inclined and mad men bent on the domination of the whole world, they can be eliminated by means of the individualized war as quickly as necessary.

Whether for war or for peace, the instrument of individualized war presents to the United Nations the definite military policy to end the war and achieve and maintain everlasting peace. Since a mass war would inevitably lead to complete world chaos, the United Nations and all free nations must, therefore, be charged to supplement their preparation of mass-war tactics to include also the tactics of individualized war. With the danger of delay because of the confusion in the ranks of all leaders, it is the responsibility of the people to express their desire. Consequently, if the principles of individualized war as outlined here makes sense and appeals to their better judgment, each and every individual is enjoined to notify their Congressman, the President, and the delegate to the United Nations to adopt the principles of individualized war to make a quick end to war.

Draft Convention on Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, is one of the outstanding foreign affairs experts in America. Minnesota is proud of his accomplishments, and particularly proud of the fact that he was a representative of the United States Government on the drafting of a Convention on Freedom of Information in the United Nations.

It is a pleasure for me to ask unanimous consent that a statement by Mr. Binder on January 17, delivered in the Special Committee of the General Assembly on the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Mr. Chairman, During the 3 years of United Nations debates on freedom of information, my Government has had many opportunities to set forth its concept of this freedom and to suggest how it might be extended and safeguarded throughout the world. The record will show that the United States has been foremost among the governments urging the United Nations to promote and protect this freedom everywhere.

I shall confine myself now to matters which are directly relevant to the draft convention on freedom of information. I believe it is essential that our respective attitudes be made clear as possible at the outset in order that we may know from the beginning where we are heading. This is especially important because the long debate which has already taken place in this document has, I believe, confused rather than clarified the real issue.

To dispel this confusion we must lay bare the basic need for freedom of information in the world today. The setting in which we meet is one in which freedom itself is under attack. It is not a new attack. Freedom has been under constant, unremitting attack by totalitarian regimes—Nazi, Fascist, and now Communist—during much of the twentieth century. Use is made of every weapon—political intrigue, propaganda, and even military force.

In this setting each one of us must ask ourselves these basic questions: Will our actions here add strength to the force of freedom? Are we likely to advance and protect the principle of freedom of information?

Or will our efforts evolve into a document which in effect will utilize the prestige of the United Nations to legitimize certain restrictive governmental practices which do not now enjoy international respectability? I suggest that the answer to these questions should be the only determining factor in our work.

Each of us must seek to answer them in the light of his own understanding of this freedom. I should, therefore, like to summarize the principles which my Government strongly believes should underlie any convention in this field. I shall attempt to do so with all the candor which the subject warrants and I shall begin by asking: What is this freedom we are discussing?

Freedom of information is the basic communications system of a democratic society, and without it that society and that way of life cannot thrive. In my country, and in many other countries, it is the means by which common, every-day citizens seek and receive information about their work and about new methods of work; about their living conditions, good or bad, and the reasons for them; about their local officials, their state government, and their National Government. It is the process by which they reach their decisions and make them felt upon those who govern, so that their country is ruled according to the wishes of the people. Therefore, when information is inadequate, when it is incorrect, when it is false, the decisions of our society are warped and misshapen and the common good suffers.

But freedom is not only essential to a balanced political life. It is the source of intellectual, cultural, and scientific strength and independence. The individual must be free to express his aesthetic feelings according to his own motivations and to explore every avenue of thought. Whether he is an architect or artist, an engineer or writer, a stonemason or a teacher, his country develops and flourishes in its own richness only insofar as he is enabled to develop his own talents to the limit of his capacity and in his own way.

Freedom of information is the right of every person to have access to all available facts, ideas, and opinions regardless of source, and not only to the information approved by his government or any party. It is his right to test the official pronouncements of his government against the opinions of his fellow citizens, and those held by other peoples; his right to advocate his beliefs through organs of his choice. It is his right to state his frank opinion of his public officials, and those of other governments as well. It is his right to communicate freely with his fellow citizens, and with those of other nations.

We believe that the exercise of this freedom is the inalienable right of every person. We believe that this freedom belongs to that relatively small but vital area of the democratic process which must remain, as far as possible, immune from governmental interference. This is the absolute test of democratic government. To the extent that the exercise of this freedom is not free, no other liberty is secure.

Freedom of information, like all forms of freedom, is subject to abuse and must, therefore, be subject to certain restraints. But such limitations must never go so far as to impair the basic freedoms. A doctor never prescribes the abolition of food to cure a stomach ache, even though the food may be the direct cause of the discomfort. The doctor knows from long study and experience that there are certain specific remedies that will alleviate the local suffering without impairing the patient's basic health.

Following this simple analogy, we believe that such limitations as must be imposed on freedom of information must evolve out of long and democratic experience in the use of this freedom. They must be such as to safeguard the maximum of freedom for each person. They must not be experimental in character, like regulations to control traffic in our streets, nor must they be applied to every transient irritant. They must always be subject to public criticism and to review by impartial judicial authority. And finally, we believe that such limitations as are necessary must, whenever possible, operate after the fact, as a means of penalizing proven and serious abuses, and not as a prior gag on freedom of speech. That is our understanding of this freedom and its proper use.

Now to some this concept may appear to be impractical. It will appear so if this freedom is confused with less fundamental liberties. It will seem so to some governments which, for various reasons, do not consider their people capable of reaching sound conclusions in the light of all available facts, or to governments which feel that they cannot wait for the public to make up its mind. And, of course, this concept is extreme and completely impractical for totalitarian systems, since it is the strongest weapon against dictatorship. But this is the only concept which my Government believes capable of promoting freedom of information, and therefore the only concept we can support.

Now the debate which has taken place in the United Nations on this subject has shown that there are, broadly speaking, three other main points of view with respect to this convention. There is, first of all, the totalitarian view as exemplified by the Soviet Union, which does not believe in freedom of information. This view maintains that freedom of information is to be guaranteed only to the extent that it furthers the doctrines and objectives of communism as practiced in the U. S. S. R. This is essentially the meaning of the guaranty set forth in the Soviet constitution. In practice the governments which support this view have created a vast information control apparatus for the indoctrination of their peoples in the dogmas and dictates of the ruling party and for insulating them against all contrary facts and opinions.

These governments are engaged in a terrifying experiment to condition the minds of hundreds of millions of persons in an attempt to make them respond automatically to the commands of their rulers. In their hands information has been transformed from a means of enlightenment and understanding into a political weapon taking any form or shape required by the situation. It has become a knife to assassinate reputations, a drug to dull the senses, or a poison to instill suspicion and fear.

Of course, when they have sought support for their view in the United Nations, they have been careful to present it in the most disarming disguise. They have maintained that to promote friendly international relations it is first necessary to define what information is and then to suppress the dissemination of anything which does not conform to the definition. The suppression is, of course, to be accomplished by censorship and the definition is to be interpreted only by the government. With a few exceptions the United Nations has seen the danger in these proposals and I trust we shall not fail to do so now.

Another view apparently assumes that the real danger to freedom of information today is that it is abused by certain foreign correspondents and newspapers. Those who share this view seem to look upon this convention as a means of putting certain restraints on the work of journalists. They are willing to include in the convention some general language about freedom of information, but their primary concern seems to be to include certain specific curbs on journalists.

This is, I believe, a short-sighted and dangerous point of view. This convention was never, as I understand it, intended to deal primarily or even directly with the work of journalists. I have understood its intent to be the promotion and protection of everyone's right to freedom of information. To distort it into a punitive measure directed at journalists would certainly be a mockery of everything the United Nations has attempted

to do in this field. We must realize that undesirable checks placed on journalists would apply equally to artists and teachers, to lawyers and politicians—and in the last analysis to people like ourselves drawn from every walk of life. Even if the grievances against some journalists and newspapers are assumed to be real, this is certainly too high a price to pay to settle a few scores.

And finally there is what I have heard described as the middle view. This is the view which accepts the fundamental principles of genuine freedom of information, but it is preoccupied with ways and means of insuring that the freedom will be exercised responsibly and that abuses will be punished. It is dedicated to insuring responsibility by law and apparently it is not especially concerned that those who will administer the law may also determine the real content and meaning of the freedom.

Now the real danger posed by this view is its stress on the need and desirability of arriving at some sort of compromise among the other dominant points of view. Those who hold this view seek to harmonize the maximum of liberty with the highest degree of discipline, and while they shun the totalitarian conception of freedom, they do not rule out the possibility of arriving at some sort of working agreement with at least some aspects of it.

This is, in our opinion, the greatest danger facing this committee. Compromise is an essential part of the democratic process. The people of the United States have learned to regard it as the key to the successful functioning of their Government. My Government has on many occasions also demonstrated its willingness to apply it to its international relations. But we must make a careful distinction between compromises relating to the way in which fundamental principles are to be executed and compromises of the principles themselves.

We are convinced that the fundamental principles of freedom of information cannot be the subject of compromise. We must, therefore, ask those who urge compromises what they propose to achieve by them. It is obvious to all by now that the totalitarian states will not, and indeed they cannot, agree to any compromise as regards their basic doctrines. Clearly then, the likely result of a compromise in this area would be to weaken and dilute the democratic concept of freedom by pulling it down toward a lower common denominator. To seek compromises merely for the sake of reaching some sort of agreement, even among the nontotalitarian points of view, would hardly promote freedom. It is much more likely to restrict it.

There are those who sincerely feel that we must reach some agreement or the prestige of the United Nations will suffer. But it will suffer for more if we agree on measures which entail repressive limitations on free speech and the free press. I would summarize the position of the United States on this matter by saying that we are anxious to participate in any effort to reach agreement on measures to further the cause of freedom of information. But we are strongly opposed to any compromise which is likely to endanger that freedom, regardless of its motivation.

I have felt it necessary to review frankly the background of this convention in order to make absolutely clear the frame of mind in which my Government approaches the task before this committee. I must state with equal frankness that we do not believe that the cause of freedom of information will be furthered by an attempt to complete this convention now. The debates which have already taken place on this matter suggest that the convention, which was intended to advance this freedom, is more likely to restrict it. This is not a hasty conclusion, nor am I attempting to prejudge our work. It is a conclusion based on 3 years of discussion and negotiation, not only in formal committee meetings but in many informal talks and in exchanges of views with a majority of the foreign offices of the members of the United Nations. Unless many governments have now changed their minds and will no longer press some of the proposals advanced in the past, it is difficult to see how we can hope to arrive at any agreement, let alone a constructive agreement worthy of the United Nations.

My Government is convinced that it would be far preferable to acknowledge that we have reached a temporary impasse and to await the development of the draft International Covenant on Human Rights. The draft covenant now contains provisions in article 14 which, in our opinion, embody the maximum constructive agreement now attainable on this difficult subject. Moreover, we cannot see that this proposed covention would add anything of concrete and positive value to the guarantee now set forth in the draft covenant. But we do see clearly the prospect of adding undesirable limitations and restrictions.

That is why I would urge this committee to recommend that this convention be held in abeyance until we have taken definite action on the Covenant on Human Rights. Only then will we be in a position to determine to what extent it might be possible to advance still more the cause of this freedom. And only then would we really know what it might be desirable to add to the guarantee contained in the covenant. This is not only more logical; it is also more realistic and practical. To proceed now with the completion of a more specific convention would in our opinion, only add to the difficulties in the way of a successful covenant.

We do not consider it necessary to attempt once more, and in a small group of the United Nations, to reconcile views which have not been reconciled over a period of 3 years in the United Nations as a whole. If the committee should decide nevertheless to make still another attempt, we must stand on the principles I have outlined.

Mr. Chairman, we are a small group discussing a subject which has already been debated at great length. As we sit here, momentous decisions are being considered by the United Nations and we are apt to feel that our work has no great significance. But our work is of the greatest significance and, what is more, it is related to the discussions which are under way elsewhere in this organization.

We live in a world which, in terms of communciations, has been reduced to the size of what was once a small principality. The remarkable advances which have been made in the facilities for mass communications have created an instrument whose potentialities for good or evil have never before been available. It is being utilized by a few governments as means of forceful persuasion and as a cloak for policies and actions which their peoples would never willingly accept if given a free and informed choice. Now, more than ever before, it is vitally important to see to it that all facts and opinion receive the widest dissemination in order that people everywhere may have a chance to seek the truth and to make up their own minds.

We have a free choice. We can either face up to this great challenge and avoid any action which might hamper still more the spread of facts and ideas, or we can seek escape into the realm of purely verbal agreements which may only serve to strengthen the hand of those whose actions are responsible for the grave threat to world peace. I trust this committee will keep its eyes on the real issue and not permit itself to add to the confusion and indecision which endanger the free world at this moment.

This Way to Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Way to Suicide," which appeared in the January 22 edition of Life magazine.

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

THIS WAY TO SUICIDE

"If we build our strength—and we are building it—the Soviet rulers may face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world. That is what we hope will happen, and that is what we are trying to bring about. That is the only realistic road to peace."

The foregoing words should be read and reread by every American. They were spoken last week by President Truman in his sixth message on the state of the Union.

On their face they are attractive and reasonable words. They reflect a hope of peace and a dread of war which endure in millions of human hearts.

These words of the President occur in a message which, but for them, would deserve to be applauded as a fine and forceful speech.

It may very well be argued that the President's words are a useful concession to the universal desire for peace, a necessary recognition of the European and Asiatic state of mind.

But these words of the President cannot be dismissed in so easy a fashion. They cannot be dismissed on any ground.

The President has shown too many times that he believes in the capacity of the Soviet rulers to face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world.

Mr. Truman's principal adviser on world affairs, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, has shown too many times that he believes in what he has chosen to call the possibility of coexistence, a cooperative peace, a cooperative relationship with the rulers of Soviet communism.

On the record the passage quoted here from the President's message must be taken for what it unquestionably is—a considered restatement, made in all good faith and with full conviction, of the major conception and major purpose underlying American policy.

THE FATAL FALLACY

Taken for what they are, these words of the President are mistaken and dangerous.

Taken for what they are, these words demand the attention and the talents of all the participants in the great debate over United States policy, a debate which has explored almost every aspect of the subject except the corrosive and fatal fallacy which the President preserved and restated.

The nature of the fallacy is clear. The fallacy is that those whom Mr. Truman calls the Soviet rulers are capable of arriving, by their own decision, at a state of peace with the non-Communist world. There is no prospect whatever that they are capable of doing so. Not so long as they are the Soviet rulers. Not so long as the system which drives them to their conquests, feeds their purposes and gives them their power is in being. Not so long as the vast complex of doctrine, nations, governments, parties and

men called Soviet communism is intact, undefeated and undestroyed. Not until its power—its inherent compulsion—to harass, assault, and engulf the non-Communist world is effectively eliminated can there be any chance of peace in the world.

The defeat and abolition of Soviet Communist purpose and power are not enough; the forces of anticommunism must always have other and more positive objectives. But, to repeat, there can be no peace worth the name and no secure progress toward a better life and a better society everywhere so long as Soviet communism retains its power to obstruct all progress and to assault all non-Communist societies.

THE FALSE CONCEPT

Make no mistake: the President does not assume and require the defeat and dismemberment of the Soviet system. The official author of this fatal fallacy, Mr. Acheson, has recently said in so many words that to subvert the Soviet Union—that is, to bring about the downfall of Soviet communism—is neither required for peace nor a proper purpose of American policy. When Mr. Truman speaks of enforcing peace through strength, he must, on the record of what he and his Secretary of State have said, be supposed to mean peace with the present rulers of the present Soviet system.

Many Americans do not need to be told that this concept is false. With their minds, in their hearts and in their bones they know that it is false.

Many others would like to believe in the possibility that Mr. Truman says he believes in. Many Americans do believe in it still. But their number lessens. Events visible to all, and the actual behavior of the Soviet rulers, make any belief in the possibility of peace with the present rulers of the present Soviet system more unreal with every day that passes.

There is something nightmarish in the spectacle of a President of the United States who at this late and awful hour refuses to perceive that the concept which he restated last week is false. There is something nightmarish, too, in the continued presence at the President's right hand of a Secretary of State who has so long cultivated this pernicious fallacy. It is terrifying, it is wrong, that this proud priest of coexistence with Soviet communism, Dean Acheson, should still be in a position to shape the President's most vital conceptions and statements of American policy.

Here, Life once more submits, is a real and present danger to this Republic.

So long as the nature, the purposes, and the capacities of our enemy are misunderstood and underestimated at the very pinnacle of American policy, what hope is there that our policy will make sufficient sense? What hope is there that American power will be fully and effectively mobilized? What hope is there that, once mobilized, it will be used to maximum effect and with adequate awareness of the tasks before it? What price the great debate over policy when the declared objective of our policy is founded upon so glaring a fallacy?

This fallacy is a source of weakness—a cancer—which only the President can eradicate.

He can eradicate it. He can at long last drive from his councils all who have sold and fed him on the pap of coexistence with Soviet communism.

He can drive from his own mind, and drop from his utterances, the paralyzing illusion that the rulers of Soviet communism as it now exists can be persuaded to peace or forced to peace.

He can perceive that the situations of strength on which he relies can be effective only if they are used to bring about the dismemberment of the Soviet Communist system as it now exists and to remove from the world the threat of Soviet power at it is now exercised.

He can perceive that peaceful, stable coexistence with Soviet communism is utterly impossible. To hold that it is possible, as the President holds when he talks of forcing or persuading "the Soviet rulers" to "lay aside their plans," is to perpetrate a pietistic fraud.

THIS PRODIGIOUS EVIL

If coexistence with the present Soviet Communist system is impossible, is total war inevitable?

Maybe so. Maybe not. Given the pressures resulting from a full recognition on our part of what must be accomplished and a full determination to accomplish it, the Soviet empire may start to change within and to crumble. No man can say just how the pure wickedness of Soviet communism will ultimately be banished from the earth, as some day it will be banished. But what no man has a right to say is that we can live peaceably and happily with this prodigious evil.

Meanwhile what must be said is that the Soviet empire, far from retreating, will continue to expand unless it is opposed with all our strength and all our mind and all our will. That includes the steady, calm, and constant acceptance of the risk of all-out war.

The President said last week that his chosen road—the road to a contrived peace with the present rulers of the present Communist system—is "the only realistic road to peace."

It is not a realistic road to peace.

It is not a realistic road to anything.

It is the road our enemy wants us to take.

It is the road to our defeat.

It is the way to suicide.

Proposed Assistance to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "India's Need," from the Washington Post of last Tuesday.

The view of one newspaperman on the problem of India's famine is summed up in a New York Times dispatch from New Delhi by Robert Trumbull, which I also ask to have printed in the Appendix.

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

[From the Washington Post of February 6, 1951]

INDIA'S NEED

Considerable misapprehension has arisen over the position of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on relief of hunger in India. Senator CONNALLY has done well to point out that nothing has been sidetracked for the reason that no legislation has been presented to the committee. It would be unfortunate for the Indians or anyone else to conclude that the Senate is cool to the proposal to send 2,000,000 tons of grain to India.

What happened is that Assistant Secretary of State George McGhee went to the Senate last Friday to consult with a subcommittee headed by Senator GILLETTE and including Senators WILEY, FULBRIGHT, and TOBEY. Mr. McGhee told the Senators the facts of India's famine and added that the requisite amount of American grain and ships for transporting it are available, though some ships would have to be withdrawn from the reserve fleet. If the situation in India is as serious as it appears to be, the State Department had no course but to acquaint Congress with it now. This sort of consultation in advance of legislation is exactly what the Senate has clamored for.

Apart from the very real influence of drought and earthquakes, India has worsened her situation, as we recently pointed out, by continuing to divert food cropland to jute production. She refused to buy grain from Pakistan when grain was available, and it is by no means clear whether she has made full use of her sterling balances in London to obtain dollars to buy food. Her trade war with Pakistan, as a correspondent notes elsewhere on this page, has continued unabated. The statement of the Indian Minister of Agriculture this month relative to attempt to atain self-sufficiency in cotton and jute at the expense of food production seems to us a shocking piece of shortsightedness.

Regardless of mistakes in policy, however, the fact is that famine impends. No large amounts of food are available from India's neighbors, and if a catastrophe is to be prevented, aid will have to be forthcoming from the United States. Congress should ask some hard questions about the man-made factors in India's plight. But the food ought to be granted, and quickly. It would be a grave mistake for Congress in any way to connect the question of aid with Prime Minister Nehru's attitude toward Korea. However unrealistic that atitude may be in our eyes, hunger and politics do not mix, and any attempt to associate them would do this country incalculable harm in Asia.

[From the New York Times]

INDIA SEES FAMINE WITHOUT UNITED STATES GRAIN—COUNTRY LACKS RESERVE, FOOD MINISTER SAYS, EMPHASIZING DESPERATE SITUATION

(By Robert Trumbull)

NEW DELHI, INDIA, January 28.—India's central food reserve, which normally would be about 1,000,000 tons, are now down to zero, and, unless 2,000,000 tons of grain can be obtained from the United States on concessional terms, famine is virtually certain before the next crop is harvested in October, K. M. Munshi, Minister of Food and Agriculture, said today.

With newspapers lying before him headlining cold congressional reaction to India's request to Washington for help, the frail Food Minister's tone was despairing. He declined to discuss the political aspects of India's relations with the United States, which now turn on the Chinese situation, but dwelt on the cold figures that make India's desperate food position plain.

Elsewhere, however, indications are that if Congress rejects India's pleas, friends of the United States in the Government—of whom Mr. Munshi is known to be one—will suffer a great loss of influence in the wave of anti-American feeling that is likely to arise among Indian legislators, whose constituents are hungry. And this is India's election year.

[India's request for 2,000,000 tons of wheat has been referred to Congress by the State Department. The matter has been sent to committee, and the outlook for action by Congress appears unfavorable.]

ANTI-UNITED STATES PROPAGANDISTS BUSY

The question in India is not one of buying India's goodwill with food or of India's threatening the United States with ill will if grain is not forthcoming. What will happen, it is believed, will be the natural reaction of anyone who asks a prosperous friend for help in a desperate position and is rebuffed.

In recent days, as reports have been published here of the stand-offish attitude in Congress because of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's urging of negotiations with Communist China on Korea and other Far Eastern problems, anti-United States propagandists, both Indian and foreign, have been exceptionally busy.

Their first tactic was to point to published Washington reaction against a food loan or grant as proof that United States aid to needy peoples is merely a political bribe. False propaganda also has been made that the Soviet Union has offered large quantities of grain to India with no strings attached.

SOVIET AID REPORTS DENIED

This latter allegation is said by Government officials to be completely untrue. Russia has never been an important source of food for India. Indian officials know of no surplus in the Soviet Union, and no Russian offer has been made. However, there has been much informal and unofficial talk of prospective Soviet aid which responsible persons in the Indian Government are inclined to put down as propaganda, since there have been no formal approaches.

India, in her present situation, would accept grain from the Soviet Union or anyone else willing to make it available. That is official policy. Communist China's offer of 50,000 tons—a negligible amount—on a barter was accepted, and 30,000 tons are being purchased from Bao Dai's Vietnam, a Government that India does not recognize.

The food position, as outlined by Mr. Munshi in the interview today showed that the country was living, as he expressed it, "from ship to mouth."

Only 2 states out of 22—Punjab and Pepsu (Patiala and the East Punjab States Union)—are now rated as surplus areas because of crop failures elsewhere due to natural causes. They are expected to produce about 300,000 tons beyond their own needs by April and May. This amount, which is infinitesimal in a country that annually consumes 50,000,000 tons, will have to be spread over all the shortage areas.

SOME WITHOUT FOOD FOR DAYS

When a food ship is delayed a few days, which is a common occurrence, it means that some rationed area is without food for that period, unless reserves are in the immediate area for quick distribution. Such situations are handled by "pipeline" stocks constantly shuttled about the vast country from warehouses and railroad cars. India's pipeline contains 700,000 tons.

This amount is rock bottom. Normally, there would be another million tons or so available to the Central Government to take care of contingencies that continually arise and to provide a cushion. "Today," said Mr. Munshi, "no such reserve exists."

This year India, at a high price in foreign exchange, has contracted for 3,700,000 tons of grain from abroad, to arrive at the rate of about 300,000 tons monthly. Granted that these imports arrive on time, this will in no way alleviate the tightness of the present situation. "For instance," Mr. Munshi said "290,000 tons are scheduled to arrive in February and already 280,000 tons have been allocated to the deficit state for that month."

Mr. Munshi indicated that the 2,000,000 tons asked from the United States were urgently necessary to maintain the vital pipeline and keep the country's head above water. "Without it," he said, "a collapse in any one area would mean a national calamity."

He denied an assertion made in Washington that India had refused to buy 600,000 tons of grain offered by Pakistan.

Remit, Please!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Remit, Please!" which appeared recently in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick.

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

REMIT, PLEASE!

Corp. Earl Booth, of the Fifth Cavalry Division, has written to a collection agency in his home town of Louisville, Ky., enclosing a bundle of Korean currency as down payment on a $23.50 grocery bill.

The corporal wrote:

"I haven't been paid since July, so don't have much American currency at present.

"I am most grateful to you for informing me of the fact you are sending the cops after me. I will be very happy to see them because, you see, I am a policeman myself, presently engaged in a police action for a force called the United Nations.

"My police squad is located in central Korea, and I am sure you have heard of our chief, MacArthur.

"If you had sent the cops after me last August or September I would have been easy to locate in a hospital."

The collection agency gave the letter to the press, but didn't forget its business integrity. It sent Corporal Booth a receipt for the exchange amount represented by the depreciated Korean currency—American cash totaling 26 cents.

Somewhere hidden in this little yarn is a moral, or maybe a couple of them, having to do with thousands of doughboys who are giving everything, and with some civilians who are taking everything.

Welcome of Israeli Ambassador Abba Eban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 3, Hon. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, Governor of the State of Maryland, welcomed the Israeli Ambassador to the United States on his visit to Maryland. Since I believe that the Governor's remarks are of interest to the entire Nation, as well as to the State of Maryland, I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY GOV. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN

It is no merely routine duty of office to welcome the truly distinguished Israeli Ambassador to the United States, but I take it as one of the most congenial privileges that has fallen to my lot as Chief Executive of the State of Maryland.

Even if Mr. Eban's great reputation as scholar, orator, and statesman had not been heralded before him, we should nevertheless wish to greet with the greatest interest and friendliness the representative of the new State of Israel.

The land of Israel is the focal point of religious interest of everyone in the vast assemblage, be he Jew or Christian. We have been nurtured from infancy upon the stories of the Bible; and the ground which constitutes the modern State of Israel is hallowed by the footsteps of the ancient prophets and seers and singers of Israel, and of our own Lord and His apostles. The very mention of the land of Israel, therefore, stirs us with emotion as does no other place on earth outside our own, native country.

I am one of those Christians who believed completely and literally God's promise to restore Israel to its ancient home. We rejoice that it happened in our generation. We are filled with admiration for the valor and sacrifice of the small population of Israel which successfully withstood the attack of its more numerous enemies in the very hour of its birth. In the past two years we have been thrilled again and again by the magnitude of the successes they have achieved in the face of odds that would have spelled discouragement and failure for a less resolute people. We are proud that the United States, through the United Nations, had a part in establishing this new sister nation, thus fulfilling the Holy Bible's sacred promise, and allowing a people whose spirit and ideals are so much like our own to join the world's family of great democracies

When all this is symbolized for us in the person of Abba Eban, universally recognized, despite his youth, as a man of the highest intellectual powers, an accomplished scholar, an orator of renown and a statesman of the very first rank, I am double pleased to welcome him most heartily to Maryland; and with you, my friends, I anticipate with pleasure, the message he brings us.

The Rise in Coffee Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Who Made the Money on Coffee?" published in Cosmopolitan magazine.

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

WHO MADE THE MONEY ON COFFEE?—WHAT IS BEHIND THE PHENOMENAL RISE IN COFFEE PRICES?—THE REAL ANSWER WILL ASTOUND AND ANGER YOU

(By Leslie Gould)

When it comes mother's turn to glance at the family newspaper, she generally doesn't have much time or even the inclination to look at the stories buried in the back section on the financial pages. That's a pity because, if she'd been reading those pages two summers ago, she might have got some warning that once again the bite was about to be put on her purse. Maybe she couldn't have done anything about it, but she would now know why she is paying over 75 percent more for coffee, and why father's noontime cup of java has gone from 5 cents to 10 or 15 cents.

Those stories she missed—which, incidentally, didn't contain a word of truth—paved the way for some brazen market manipulations by a small band of speculators. These manipulations have cost her 40 cents on each pound of coffee she buys. While the price of her coffee rose, she kept denouncing the corner grocer as a bandit because he was handiest, but she was pointing her finger at the wrong man. The corner grocer was taking a bite, but his was just a measly nibble compared to what others were grabbing from her.

Within 10 weeks, behind-the-scene speculators in coffee—here and in South America—became richer by millions, and their unconscionable, artificial rigging of the market added six to seven hundred million dollars a year to America's annual coffee bill, or, roughly, around $25 a year for each coffee-drinking family.

This increase can be added to the cost of our State Department's good-neighbor policy. The State Department felt that exposing the South American speculators might have endangered the good-neighbor policy. Therefore, it actively worked to cover up the foreigners' manipulations on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. The State Department even went so far as to force a powerful senatorial investigating committee to tone down its report and soften its criticism of the boodlers.

The sly operation in the speculative coffee market had all the earmarks of the sort of stock manipulations common in the early twenties, before the stock market crash. Stories from South America appeared in United States newspapers alleging that coffee crops would be small because of storms and drought, and that Americans and Europeans were drinking more coffee than ever. All such stories were false.

A financial-page story said that drought in Brazil had reduced that country's crop severely; the truth was that Brazil had sufficient rain, and that the crop was about normal. "Floods in Guatemala," said another story, "damaged the crop there, and there was hurricane damage in Haiti"; the truth was that the production of coffee in Guatemala was within five percent of normal, and that Haiti's crop was normal that year.

Those were the stories the American housewife missed. The story that the consumption of coffee in America was rising was just as false. Actually, Americans drank no more and perhaps even slightly less coffee in 1949 than they had consumed the previous year. Although coffee consumption went down twenty-four percent just before the outbreak of the Korean war, the Pan-American Coffee Bureau issued a "survey" purporting to prove that there had been a great rise in coffee drinking!

All this, of course, was to justify the increase in the price of coffee.

Coffee is one of the few commodities under the control of interests outside the United States. The National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia is a $100,000,000 combine that buys and sells all the coffee produced in that country, and even operates the mills there. Its directors, acting through the headman, Manuel Mejia who is known, for good reason, as "Mr. Coffee"—can hold coffee off the market or release it for sale according to the condition of the market. Brazil controls the amount of coffee that can go out of its country.

The real trading in the coffee market, however, takes place on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. Half the purchase contracts are held by foreign interests, and 30 percent of that half is controlled by one Brazilian broker. In the early spring of 1949, the price of coffee on the exchange was 21 cents a pound. By September, in line with general inflation, the price had gone up to 28 cents a pound. There was no shortage of coffee, despite the planted stories, but in September the price went up another 3 cents, and then, in October, it went "through the roof," to use a speculator's term. The price reached 40 cents that month, and 52 cents the following month.

These rigged increases, to which the roasters, wholesalers, and retailers added increases all along the line, raised the price housewives paid for a leading chain-store brand from 42 cents to 59 cents between September and December 1949. The retail price of a nationally advertised brand jumped, during the same period, from 53 cents to 80 cents. The rise continued unabated in 1950. By last October, the chain-store coffee sold at 79 cents a pound, and in September, housewives were paying 90 cents for a nationally advertised brand.

Although the Central and South American coffee growers didn't get any of the loot mulcted from the United States housewife in 1949 (most of it went to the speculators), in 1950 a bag of coffee brought the growers twice as much. In Brazil a deficit of $48,000,000 was changed by 1950 into a surplus of more than $250,000,000. In addition to Brazil's all-time high in dollar earnings, that country has also obtained loans of $126,000,000 from the American Export-Import Bank and the World Bank. Colombia, too, thanks to the generosity of the American housewife, has increased its gold and foreign exchange from $68,000,000 to $130,000,000.

All this prosperity, naturally, makes the South Americans very fond of us.

The manipulations that raised the price of coffee and kept it so high as to make it a major item on the budget of the American housewife were easy for the South American speculators because the United States anti-trust and antimonopoly laws do not apply to them. And the State Department—which forced the Senate's Gillette committee, investigating the sudden and uncalled-for rise in coffe prices, to take the teeth out of its report—did not help the housewife.

The action of the State Department, which had the effect of concealing the identity of the speculators responsible for the price rise, has led to rumors that there may be some Washington politicians who are splitting some of the millions snatched from the American housewife's purse. It has happened before; several years ago investigation revealed that a member of the White House staff, a State Department official, and at least one Senator were in on the ride when the price of grains shot up.

Nobody likes a good neighbor better than the American housewife, but six or seven hundred million dollars a year added to her household budget seems to be too high a price for keeping her neighbor's love and affection.

Threat of Russian Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "You Can't Play Games With Gangsters," published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader on January 30, 1951.

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

YOU CAN'T PLAY GAMES WITH GANGSTERS

The absurdity and unreality of the United Nations trying to operate in a world facing the threat of Russian aggression with Soviet Russia sitting as one of its major members is beginning to filter into many minds.

This situation has been stated in a realistic way by George V. Denny, whose brilliant work as moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air has contributed so much to a public understanding of the grave problems facing us as a Nation today. Mr. Denny has shown rare ability in balancing opposing views on the various issues presented by Town Meeting, so as to enable the American people to reach intelligent conclusions.

Referring to Russia's place on the United Nations, Mr. Denny recently asked this pertinent question:

"When will we learn that we endanger our lives, our fortunes, and our honor when we try to play games with gangsters?"

Then he answered his own question by declaring that it would have been as sensible to give Al Capone a place on the Chicago city council at a time when he controlled much of that city's life, as it is to give Moscow's rulers a place in the UN. After which he added this pithy statement:

"The time has come for us to organize a real United Nations consisting of those who have demonstrated their desire and ability to live and work under law to stop our common enemy before he destroys us one by one."

The real issue facing the UN today is whether Soviet Russia shall be allowed to use that organization to promote its plan of world domination. That is what Soviet Russia has been doing since the UN was established. By the use of its veto power, it has blocked all effective UN action against Soviet aggression, except for the few months that it stayed home and sulked over the UN refusal to seat Red China. During that interim the non-Soviet members sought to remove the obstacle of the Russian veto by empowering the UN Assembly to take action if the Security Council was paralyzed. But today Russia is using this change in UN procedure to create division in that organization by playing on the fears of weaker and more credulous members and thereby restraining them from taking action against open aggression. Thus once more the purpose of the UN is defeated and the organization is made a tool of Soviet aggression.

The outcome therefore is perfectly plain. Either Soviet Russia should be kicked out of the UN and the organization remodeled to include only those who have the desire and ability to withstand aggression, or the UN should fold up and cease its make-believe. These are the two alternatives as Mr. Denny sees them. And Denny is absolutely right.

Lost Prestige in Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the letter I have here submitted for publication in the RECORD was published a few days ago in the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier.

The writer, the Reverend J. E. Pritchard, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, is performing a most vital service in calling attention to what is probably America's greatest need in this hour—that of real friends throughout the world.

The record shows that we do not have these friends, and why? Because, through international bribery, we have attempted to buy friends—because we have aided and abetted certain of our so-called European allies in their continued exploitation of millions of people in their colonial domains—and because our own Government has failed to stop the diabolical operations of our own internationalists-for-a-profit.

Here is the letter:

LOST PRESTIGE IN ORIENT

CEDAR FALLS, IOWA.

To the EDITOR:

The magazine, United States News and World Report, one of our top publications, under date of February 2, page 7, made this statement, "War in Asia is showing United States to have few real friends in a hard world."

To me, that is one of the most depressing lines I have read in these last few years. For, an individual with scarcely a friend is in a sad condition. It is true also for a nation.

When I was young, my country was loved all around the world. People came to America by the millions and we were busy welcoming them and helping them to obtain the blessings of democracy. The poor and the oppressed from the ends of the earth looked to us for freedom.

Not only that, we sent missionaries to faraway lands to establish schools, hospitals, and churches. We staffed these institutions with capable leaders who carried good will to benighted lands.

Thirty years ago our missionary bishop to China, Bishop Wilson Seeley Lewis spoke to the Methodist conference at Sioux City. He said, "China loves us. I can go anywhere in China without fear." He pulled a tiny American flag from his pocket. "This is all the bodyguard I need even among bandits." Then he said, "Remember, all of China loves us."

Now what has happened to change that? What has happened that our country has come to the place where it has few real friends in a hard world.

Two late books will shed considerable light on the question, Half of One World, by Hailey, and The Situation in Asia, by Owen Lattimore. Lattimore says that at the close of World War II all of the Far East respected us. We had knocked the Japs off their necks and they felt that we would support them in their efforts to establish their own governments. We failed them.

Our leaders supported Chiang and tried to keep him afloat. His corrupt regime finally failed. We gave our support to our European allies and tried to keep the rump end of decadent colonial empires alive. And lastly, our own country has become another white nation battling on the soil of Asia.

It is pathetic for a man who has reached the pinnacle of high esteem to fall to the gutter of disrespect. It is a tragedy for a Nation to take the wrong road and tumble until it has few real friends in a hard world.

Our leaders are trying to solve this problem by calling people to prayer. What answer will a righteous God give to a Nation that prays for peace and prepares and engages in obliteration?

There is a road to peace. When this Nation gets its cheeks wet with the hot tears of repentance and gets right with God, when it quits its wicked ways, then it will again be respected and loved and can live in peace.

Rev. J. E. PRITCHARD.

Television Channels for Educational Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram addressed by the Medical Society of the County of Queens, N. Y., to Commissioner Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, on the subject of assuring a certain number of television channels for educational purposes on the television band. The question raised and now being considered by the Federal Communications Commission is one which I believe merits consideration and study by Members of the Senate.

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

The Queens County Medical Society petitions the Federal Communications Commission to do all in its power to assure an adequate number of channels for educational purposes in the television band. The advantages to public health in keeping physicians abreast of the active modern advances in medicine makes the assignment of some television bands for this purpose an important public-health measure.

Is There a Military Supply Conspiracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following thought-provoking article by Col. P. Joseph Smith which appeared recently in the Reserve Officer magazine.

I commend it to my colleagues, particularly those who served in World Wars I and II:

IS THERE A MILITARY SUPPLY CONSPIRACY?

(By Col. P. Joseph Smith)

Since World War I, every effort to develop and install a unified supply catalog system for the services has met with failure. Now, Reservists want to know why their wartime knowledge and hard-won victories over supply problems are being casually cast aside.

A multitude of Reservists insist there is a conspiracy to prevent the President, the Secretary of Defense, the service secretaries, and the Congress from improving the efficiency and reducing the tax burden of the Armed Forces. And further, they contend that this resistance is being carried on ruthlessly and in complete disregard of the safety of the men at the fighting front and of the national security.

As proof of their contention, these experienced Reservists point to their own trials during the war and to the events in the military forces since the war.

Supply confusion was prevalent throughout the Armed Forces during the early stages of the war. Reserve officers, when first they came in contact with the situation, assumed that this was caused by the sudden expansion of military operations (wondering at the same time why plans, techniques, and methods were not available for this certain contingency) and went to work to overcome the mountainous obstacles that were clogging the movement of supplies and equipment.

Miles of red tape were cut, Colonel Blimp inhibitions were cast aside, ingenious new devices and methods were developed, duplications of staffs and facilities were eliminated, and by the end of the war the vast machinery of supplying our theaters scattered over the world as well as our allies had been streamlined and was being operated with improved efficiency.

The reservists found that the key to any supply improvement was a single catalog of supply items that provided a single designation and a standard reference symbol for all items. They found that such a system to include all the items used by all the services could be developed and installed within 2 years' time. This was tested out on supply functions that included almost all the allied armed services and was greater in magnitude than all the postwar supply functions of the Department of Defense.

The results were so spectacular that steps were immediately started toward the development of a single-catalog system to include all the Armed Forces. However, with the end of the war, the Reserves were released or transferred and the services lapsed into their old lethargy.

The reservists waited for the services to follow through with the programs and improvements that had been initiated during the war. Instead they learned through the Hoover reports that conditions in the Armed Forces had reverted to those prevailing in the Armed Forces when the war started; and it dawned on them that the supply confusion that they found and were on the way to overcoming, may not have been an accident of the war, but a result of a specific plan.

HOOVER REPORT EXPOSÉ

Their suspicions were confirmed by the Hoover Commission's reports that attributed the inefficiency and waste to "great and stubborn resistance of supply officials" and "to the realization by the technical services and the bureaus that a standard commodity catalog, when made mandatory in use, will require adjustments and changes in their time-honored methods of purchasing, storing, and distribution, and will provide the means for eliminating duplication of staffs and facilities"

The Reserves learned also from the Hoover reports that the discovery of the dependence of supply efficiency upon a single-catalog language was not unique to them or to this war—it had been known to supply personnel since before the First World War. Every effort of supply personnel to develop and install this tool of supply management had met with failure throughout two World Wars.

So the reservists set out to discover what the means were by which every attempt to install a single-catalog system had been defeated. One of them, Lt. Col. Vernon J. Nelson, of Idaho, wrote a letter to the President that appeared in the July 6, 1950, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He advised the President that he, along with former Presidents, had had the "wool pulled over their eyes" by the simple device of being told that "there was a program under way and great progress was being made."

By this deliberate distortion of the facts, every effort of the supply personnel since before the First World War to establish a single catalog system had been defeated. The same sort of statements have been issued for years.

LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS

By now these Reserve officers are up in arms. In 1949, Lt. Col. Glenn Rathbun, an infantry officer who had lost his sight in the Rhine battles, arranged for his Congressman, JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California, to propose a bill, H. R. 321, to establish a single catalog system for the Armed Forces. The hearings held before the House Armed Services Commitee brought out that there was a great need for the single catalog system, confirming the Hoover Commission findings, and that the solution was comparatively easy. It was disclosed that a system had been devised by the Office of the Secretary of Defense early in 1948, based upon the wartime experiences, that could have been completed and installed by last spring and by now all the duplicating, costly systems would have been eliminated.

The Reserves want to know why their wartime knowledge and experience is being disregarded and their hard-won victories over these supply problems are being thrown away, instead of preparing the Nation to meet a new and growing menace.

They want to know why the same old methods and systems that had caused them so much trouble have been brought back.

And above all they want action. They have written letters to the President, to the Secretary of Defense, and to their Congressman requesting that a full-scale investigation be made, pointing out that for 40 years there has been a plethora of committees, voluminous committee reports, directives, consultants, and fine speeches, all designed as stage scenery for the "fine program under way, great progress being made"—but no catalog.

REPORTS MEANINGLESS

Experienced Reserve officers say flatly that the present methods never have produced a functioning stock number system and never can. Also they point out that the attempt to give the impression of great progress by issuing glowing reports on numbers of cards processed is meaningless: that cards have been issued for years without any perceptible effect on the development of a catalog system.

The present reports of the Defense Department specifically omit any reference to the date when the system will be installed, promising only that by 1952 there will be several million cards available. With curious frankness it is specifically stated there will not result a single catalog.

So the veterans of the American Legion in the national convention at Los Angeles unanimously adopted a blistering indictment of the supply cataloging system as presently operated and sent a resolution to the Secretary of Defense that action be taken immediately to develop and install a sound working system in accordance with the experiences of the last war.

It was significant that shortly before the resignation of Secretary of Defense Johnson, a letter was sent him from Colonel Rathbun pointing out that the Secretary had been forced into a false economy program by his advisers; that had he helped to have passed Mr. ANDERSON'S catalog bill, he could have had more savings fall into his lap naturally than all the programs that had aroused so much antagonism and bitterness and brought down upon his head a national avalanche of criticism.

The Secretary of Defense, who had foolishly rejected a method for establishing a single catalog system, has passed from the Washington stage. It is perhaps more than a coincidence that during the same week of his passing, William H. Harrison, who had wielded a single catalog system so effectively during the war quietly moved into the national picture as Administrator of the National Production Administration.

A single catalog system when developed and made mandatory will act automatically as a surgeon's knife to expose the duplication of services and facilities and the enormous waste in supply operations; it will have the same effect on bloated bureaucratic empires as a sharp pin on an inflated balloon; and it would be the most powerful instrument toward unification of the services. Therefore, it is inevitable that the decisive battle between the bureaucrats and the reservists for the reforms in supply operations proposed by the Hoover Commission and so earnestly desired by the entire Nation will be fought over a single cataloging system—the key to our national security and sound economy.

Norway Is Ready To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Norway Is Ready To Fight," published in the United States News and World Report. This article is a direct report from Oslo, and is an encouraging and enthusiastic report from the tiny, rugged nation of Norway, which has fought and continues to fight against tyranny and aggression. I commend the article to the attention of all Senators.

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

NORWAY IS READY TO FIGHT

(There's no talk of appeasement in Norway. Once-occupied Norway is ready to fight to the last man if Russia moves. Defenses are being rushed. So is mobilization. Everything is being done to get a small but willing army in fighting trim. Here is a first-hand report from Norway by Robert Kleiman, regional editor of United States News and World Report in central Europe.)

OSLO.—Norwegians, strengthened by American aid, are showing a will to fight that promises the United States a better-than-even chance of holding a vital Scandinavian base against Russia. Norway's military planners do not expect a Russian assault now, but the country is grimly getting ready, just in case.

With Finland practically disarmed and Sweden neutral, Norway becomes the main northern outpost barring Russia's growing sea power from access to the Atlantic. Norway cannot defend itself unaided. But, with Norwegian cooperation now being offered enthusiastically, the United States hopes to—

Make it impossible for Russia to capture Norway by a sneak attack.

Hold vital Norwegian bases if Russia mounts a major assault.

In either case, Norwegians alone will take the full brunt of an initial attack. Atlantic Pact plans call for no non-Norwegian forces to be based in this country in peacetime. By 1952, the Allies expect to have a strategic reserve of ground troops in Britain earmarked for Norway's defense. But, until then, the United States is dependent on Norwegian ground forces and British-American sea and air power to hold this key strategic area.

At stake in Norway is an elongated country that for 1,100 miles lies athwart the shortest great-circle aerial route to New York from bomber and rocket bases in Russia.

In Allied hands, Norway's southern coast guards the exit from the Baltic, home of Russia's main submarine fleet. The Russians have more than 120 submarines in the Baltic, more than half of them modern, ocean-going craft, plus 5 cruisers and 20 destroyers.

Norway's North Cape dominates Russia's Arctic passage to the open sea. Fearful that the Baltic might be closed by allied blockade, Russia has built a costly Stalin Canal that can take warships, up to light-cruiser size, from Leningrad through Lake Ladoga to the White Sea.

In Russian hands, Norway would provide Stalin with the most dangerous series of natural submarine bases anywhere on the shore line of Western Europe. German built submarine bases at Trondheim and Bergen are still intact and can service a fleet of 80 U-boats. Too, the west coast is ice-free the year around and is indented by deep fiords.

Russia's Arctic ports are icy many months of the year. That is why allied strategists believe Norway will be one of Stalin's chief objectives if war comes.

Defending Norway, at this stage, depends heavily on the willingness of the Norwegians to fight. American officials find that the answer to that is clear. There is less talk of appeasement and neutrality here than in any other capital in the Atlantic Pact.

Partial mobilization already has been started. Since the Chinese attacked in Korea, the whole country has been put on a 24-hour alert.

Draftees scheduled to be released at the end of the year are being held over in service. Organized reserves are being called up as a first step to doubling military manpower this year. Mobilization plans are being rehearsed that can put almost half the trained men under arms in 3 hours or less.

Orders already have been issued to the 200,000 troops, reserves and national guardsmen to mobilize automatically and resist invasion, even if the Government is paralyzed by a sneak attack. These unprecedented orders say:

"Continue to resist despite orders to the contrary purporting to come from the King or Government. * * *

"Resist even if alone and the situation seems * * * hopeless. Disregard any threat of reprisals such as bombing of towns."

The Norwegians are preparing for extended guerrilla warfare, if that becomes necessary. A six months' supply of grain and other essentials has been stockpiled. Caches of food and arms are tucked away in mountain hideouts.

Air-raid shelters are under construction and alerts are being practiced in all the cities. Special police are being recruited to counter fifth columnists. The country is preparing to follow a scorched-earth policy. Universal military service, already in effect for all youths of 20, is backstopped by the recruiting of men 26 to 40 for a national guard.

All defense plans have been speeded up. Military goals originally set for 1954 have been moved ahead to 1952.

Armed strength of Norway, in manpower, doesn't amount to much when compared with the United States, despite the current build-up. About 35,000 men are under arms now. Target for the end of 1951 is 60,000 men—the equivalent, in terms of population, to a 3,000,000-man army in the United States.

The navy is small, with a backbone of seven former British destroyers. The United States is furnishing numbers of torpedo boats and considering the transfer of several destroyers to Norway.

The air force is small, but it is staffed by high-caliber personnel, many of whom fought with the RAF in World War II. The force is equipped with about 100 combat planes—40 of them British jet fighters. Two squadrons of pilots now are being trained in Texas on American jets.

Coastal and port defenses, vastly superior to those of 1940, are being strengthened by the addition of American antiaircraft batteries. The Norwegians have 80 modern coastal forts that were installed by the Germans during World War II occupation. Many of the big guns are like new.

Financing defense means major sacrifices for Norwegians, who have lived even more austerely than the British since the end of the war. Their taxes will have to go up, imports will be cut, and other belt-tightening measures applied.

Norway lives by importing food and manufactured goods, paying for them with the earnings of its large merchant fleet and exports of paper and pulp, fish, whale oil, and ores. A fifth of the country's physical assets, including half the merchant fleet, was destroyed in the war.

The country had just begun to turn the recovery corner in 1950, when new defense burdens came along. Rationing of some foods was dropped only last spring. There were prospects that the country would be able to support itself by 1952. Now, all this is out the window.

Living standards are frozen at the 1950 austerity level, and cuts are likely for later this year. The textile ration is so low it takes 18 months' ration to buy a man's suit. Women get three pairs of stockings a year. It is doubtful that a return to general food rationing can be avoided.

Defense planning is based largely on the assumption that if Russia moves she will strike at Norway with a massive land-sea-air attack. Russia could draw forces from 90 divisions for such an attack.

Chances of holding Norway, or essential bases there, against a major Soviet assault in 1951 are slim. But Norwegian defenses, already strong enough to counter a sneak attack of the Hitler variety, will give the Atlantic Treaty nations a fighting chance to deny Norwegian bases to Russia if war comes in 1952.

Military planners believe that, by 1952, chances will be fair and, by 1953, very good for holding at least a coastal foothold in Norway against a massive Russian attack. This gives the allies at least 15 months to prepare for a 1952 attack, since fighting weather doesn't come to Norway until April.

An American officer sums up the outlook in these words:

"Norway is the kind of area we are best suited to defend, because the invaders will have to come by air and sea and would be unable to mass overwhelming ground forces against us. The Norwegians are doing their share to hold a base vital to the defense of the United States. The question is whether we can supply the arms, the sea and air power that will be needed to counter a Russian attack."

Light in Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a front-page editorial entitled, "Light in Darkness," which appeared recently in the Washington Observer.

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

LIGHT IN DARKNESS

In this time of almost numb despair—of grief over the seeming failure of our hopes for a lasting peace and a working formula for the world, one gnawing responsibility is the anxiety of our young men in the colleges, who are unable to find assurance that they are doing the wise thing in continuing their studies, hoping to find later the proper place in some branch of the service.

In a letter to the parents of boys in such a tumult of indecision, the president of a southern university concludes: "While we wait for exactness of knowledge, we are telling our boys what I think would be the counsel of everybody responsibly placed from General Marshall to our faculty advisers: Wait until you know what is required of you. The country must be saved, of course, but it is the promise of boys like you that makes the country worth saving.

"If you are to be interrupted you will be immensely grateful and I know this fact as a verity, for every lap of progress you made before the interruption, there will be that much less to do when you come back older and hurried.

"Use now for coolest reasoning that excellent mind you have. After all, you are not children to be thrown into panic like a frightened herd of sheep. You are a picked group, tested and approved by all of life's standards up to the present moment. Live in terms of your best hope and your finest aspirations, and don't throw those things away in a desperate gesture of acceptance of what seems the inevitable.

"Do today's work today with full faith that tomorrow is in the hands of a loving God."

A 44-Hour Workweek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Wrong Medicine," from the January 27, 1951, edition of the Concord Daily Monitor, published at Concord, N. H.

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

THE WRONG MEDICINE

A member of the Federal Reserve Board has had the courage to tell Congress that the workweek, before payment of overtime, should be raised from the present 40 hours to 44.

The average workweek has crept up about 2 hours in length the past year, under the production demands induced by war and inflation fears. But it still is only 41.6 hours a week.

The payment of time and a half for overtime remains a definite deterrent to further production in a Nation in which there is no serious unemployment.

When originally enacted, at the bottom of depression, the law limiting the normal workweek to 40 hours was devised to spread employment, to make it necessary for more workers to be required to do a given job. If it was effective in doing that, and it was, then it follows that it is today an impediment to increasing production in a period during which there will develop serious manpower shortages.

The suggested 44-hour workweek at normal pay per hour is a compromise. The more natural workweek would be 48 hours, or six 8-hour days. Beyond that it is probably true that efficiency of workers declines and little is gained in actual boosting of total production. Longer hours than 48 a week, if worked occasionally, might further boost production.

The suggestion to lengthen the workweek is not being advanced to reduce wages paid. It is suggested to remove a psychological hindrance to the more efficient use of American manpower. Wages can be adjusted in a variety of ways so that no injustice is done anyone. Increased production, in itself, is the surest way to depress and keep prices under control, and if that can be done and inflation ended, then wages automatically are increased, for they will buy more.

Boosting the normal workweek under the wage-hour law would tend to establish a new maximum workweek, and in some kinds of employment the workweek would naturally continue at shorter hours. The 8-hour day, 6 days a week, fits into three-shift operation in any industry in which machinery is part of the production process. It is the only way that maximum production can be obtained from machinery, and if machine production can be kept efficient less machinery is needed at a time when the material and manpower to build it is needed for other purposes.

The changing of the wage-hour law would accomplish far more than will the freezing of wages.

There are other Federal laws, invoked in depression, which should also be repealed to permit the national economy to meet current conditions in such a way as to forestall further inflation. Some inflationary devices when millions are unemployed are one thing but in times like the present their continuation as national policy is an invitation to disaster. The various subsidies are among these other laws.

Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

the following article, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 28, 1951.

While not subscribing to everything said in this article, I think it is essential that all Americans should know some of the things that it states.

Personally, I am very happy that Spain has finally been recognized and that the United States and Spain are to exchange ambassadors.

The Honorable Jose Felix de Lequerica, the Spanish Ambassador to this country, is a very fine man, well educated, with a broad knowledge not only of Spain and America but of the whole world. His comprehensive outlook and good intentions will do much, I think, to dispel some of the fog that has surrounded our relations and will contribute much to full cooperation between his country and ours in establishing a just and lasting peace.

MADRID.—Spain's strategic geographical position—between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean and sheltered behind the Pyrenees Mountain barrier—is her prime military asset.

Franco has said and repeated that he has a million men to fight communism when his motherland's borders are endangered

The nation also has important mineral resources, such as mercury and wolfram, of which the western war machine is in short supply.

These important trumps are offset, however, by a rickety transportation network and creaking economic system which desperately needs dollars, raw materials, and electricity, and is largely deficient in agriculture.

TROOPS POORLY ARMED

Spain's troops are sketchily armed and almost completely ignorant of modern tactics and weapons. They are tough and courageous and make fine soldiers when properly trained, however, Franco has made no public statement that he would be willing to send them into battle before Spain's frontiers were attacked. Whether he would permit any part of them to be integrated into General Eisenhower's European defense forces in exchange for American arms and financial aid remains to be seen. (The new Spanish Ambassador to the United States has indicated that Spain would join in Europe's defenses.)

The nation presently has approximately 350,000 men comprising half of the 1948 and all of the 1949 classes under colors. The class of 1950 has been called for next month with the remainder of the 1948 troops freed a few months later if the international situation warrants.

These soldiers are plentifully supplied with small arms, although a majority are of the 1921 model. Artillery all dates from the Spanish civil war, although a prototype of a 105-millimeter cannon has been made and now is being tested. The tanks are a mixture of German, Italian, and Russian models used in the civil war.

Spain's navy is composed of 6 cruisers, the most modern of which is the 10,000-ton *Canarias*, which was completed in 1936 It also has a number of destroyers, gunboats, and minelayers.

The air force has about 300 planes, less than a hundred of which are in a condition to fly. Jets have never even been seen in this country.

From the military viewpoint Spain's worst drawback is a poor railroad and road system. Both would have to be completely overhauled before a modern army could move over them.

Last month the government announced a 5-year program to renovate trunk highways. It hopes for American dollar loans to make over the railroad system.

INDUSTRY LAGS

The nation's industry has been all but at a standstill the past 3 years, because the longest drought known here nearly emptied the reservoirs and exhausted the electricity reserves. Because of a lack of dollars industry has faced a continuous shortage of raw materials.

The country never has had enough grain to feed its population or livestock. It is also deficient in meat and sugar. A helping hand would be necessary to put all those difficulties right before the country could become a positive asset in western defense. But Spain's geographical position alone makes her important to Allied grand strategy:

Bombers and fighters based on the Iberian Peninsula would control the western Mediterranean up to Italy and the Atlantic from Britain to Dakar and as far west as the Azores.

Her closeness to Africa, just across the Straits of Gibraltar, would considerably simplify the supply problem.

Natural obstacles have less military value in these days of air-transported troops, but with peaks rising well over 10,000 feet in the Pyrenees Mountains, Spain enjoys a rugged bulwark on her northern frontier. If Spain were prepared in advance to receive it, an Allied army could hold out a long time behind this bulwark.

The Allies are anxious to bring Portugal into the defense setup. To do so, however, they must almost certainly include Spain.

The Portuguese themselves are insisting that Spain be brought into the Atlantic Pact. They argue that unless the Spaniards stop any Red assault at the Pyrenees, Portuguese defense efforts would be futile.

Use of Portugal's great port of Lisbon in any future war almost certainly would hinge on Spanish cooperation. If Lisbon were used as a supply unloading point, there would be no way to move war materials up to Europe except across Spain.

Address of Robert E. Smylie, Idaho's Brilliant Attorney General, at Ground-Breaking Ceremony for Albeni Falls Dam in Idaho

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we are building an empire in the Pacific Northwest by harnessing the mighty Columbia River and its tributaries to carry our ships, irrigate and reclaim our arid lands, and develop almost unlimited quantities of hydroelectric energy, at the lowest possible cost.

From a resources standpoint, the Columbia is the mightiest stream on the North American Continent with a power potential of 40 percent of the hydroelectric energy that can ever be generated in the entire United States. So stupendous is this natural resource that only by comparison can the mind comprehend it. The power potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries is nine times as great as the potential of the St. Lawrence waterway in both Canada and the United States, and 18 times as great as the share the United States will receive.

At a ground-breaking ceremony signifying the start of construction on Albeni Falls Dam in Idaho, one unit in this great river development system, the following address was made by Idaho's brilliant attorney general, Robert E. Smylie:

[From the Priest River (Idaho) Times of February 1, 1951]

Fellow Idahoans, this morning marks the ending of a long and arduous road for the people of the great inland empire—for all the people of the Pacific Northwest. And it marks a commencement. In 1937—13 years ago—the first recorded step leading to this morning's ceremony occurred when Senate Committee on Commerce directed Chief of Army Engineers to make a study of the feasibility of constructing a multipurpose dam at Albeini Falls. Since that date there has been frustration, contention and much delay. But as the plunger drives home to shoot the first dirt on the project this morning, the construction of Albeni Falls Dam is finally underway.

Here in this north country—land of timber, mines and mountains—this is a meaningful morning. This is a significant hour for all of the Columbia Basin. It is a meaningful morning for all of Idaho, north, south, and central. It marks the beginning of big construction on the upstream power sites in the Columbia River system. It brings the promise of power which will ultimately balance Idaho's economy between agriculture and industry, and finally free the upland States of the Columbia Basin from the colonial status of the past—a status induced by geography, by transportation differentials between the upland States and tidewater, and by the resultant character of our economy.

For those reasons alone it is entirely fitting that I bring you greetings this morning from our Governor, Len Jordan—and through him, from the government of the State of Idaho Further, it is entirely fitting that I extend the congratulations of your government to all who had a hand in bringing about the commencement of construction which begins here today.

It is unnecessary to relate once more that Albeni Falls Dam will figure strongly in the history of this area for many decades to come. It will be immediately important to the effort we are waging to stem the tide of aggression. The dam and the power plant when constructed will deliver a bloc of power that will make significant contributions to development of the industrial muscle that we need to man the ramparts of the free world against the dark forces of tyranny.

The part that Albeni Falls will play in the defense of our freedom need not claim our entire attention this morning. With expedited construction schedules we can count on power to turn the wheels of Northwest industry being "on the line" at an early date.

I would prefer, although it seems like dreaming, to consider for awhile the impact of this significant hour on the peacetime economy of our State and region. I prefer to do this because Idaho is an upland State in the Columbia River Basin. In common with the other upper-basin States, we have problems which must not be overlooked if total development of the basin is to become an accomplished fact.

Albeni Falls is one step toward complete utilization of the hydroelectric potential on the Columbia-Snake River system. There are other developments which should not, and will not, lag far behind. There is Palisades Dam on the Idaho-Wyoming border, the Scriver Creek development in the Boise area, and there is Libby Dam in Montana. All of these will generate power. And they will also provide additional upstream storage for the generators on the main stem of Columbia River.

As these generators are built, and come into use, they will commence multipurpose utilization of a resource in which the peoples of the upper-basin States have a very real equitable interest. That resource is water.

Those of you who know the arid reaches of the Snake River plain know the importance of water in southern Idaho. Water has strung a chain of verdant irrigated valleys along the great curve of Snake River from its source in Wyoming's mountains to where it turns north to meet the Columbia.

Those of you who know central Idaho will understand that water there means the dream of river-borne transportation to tidewater. It means that the produce of one of the world's finest stands of timber can be processed in the forest.

I could go on at considerable length to elucidate the meaning of water to the people of the upper basin. But realistically, on the morning of this new departure, we should solemnly assess our real interests; how they may be protected and served, and how Idaho may lift herself by proper use of this resource out of the unbalanced economy of the past, and, with the other States of the Northwest, face a bright new industrial future.

It is not dreaming to say Idaho's glorious history is only a beginning. With inexpensive power and fuel, we can overcome the transportation differential that has always held us captive to the tidewater States.

There is no dark guilt involved in this old captivity of our economy. Geography blessed Idaho with timber and mountains. But geography also pushed us up against the rim of the continent, far distant from our markets, and from the centers of industrial commerce. These rugged overland distances made it impossible to attract processing industry unless and until we could offer the compensating advantage of inexpensive power and fuel. With the development of the upper-basin generators, that power will be generated within our own boundaries. It is Idaho's task to see that at least some of that power is used to develop Idaho.

Plainly stated, Idaho and the rest of the upper Columbia Basin territory—and I include all of the Inland Empire—must insist that an equitable share of the actual power produced at the upper-basin power sites be allocated for use in the upper-basin States. In no other way can we make certain that Idaho's industrial development will keep in step with the tidewater areas of the Northwest.

This is no dog-in-the-manger attitude. The dams that generate the power will also firm up the storage for the downstream generators at power sites on the lower river system. All that this statement implies is that we want final freedom from our geographic disadvantage through application in this State of a resource that the same geography gives to this State in great measure. If an equitable share of the power that is developed here can be used here, and if the navigation system on the two rivers is operated to carry water-borne freight to and from Idaho, we can approach industrial and economic equality with the coastal areas of the basin. We can participate fully in the dispersal of existing manufacturing industry. We can attract and create new industry by bringing power and raw materials together. Then there will be an end to our heavy dependence on extractive industry. Then we can become an economy healthily in balance between agriculture, forestry, mining, and industry.

The development of the Northwest will go forward. No one disputes that proposition. No one contends that it should be otherwise. We are agreed almost completely on where the power sites should be located. Only the method by which we shall control, divide, and distribute this common resource, and how we shall live with it, remain to be decided. Idaho must make certain that when that decision is finally made we are assured of a unified, comprehensive, and basin-wide development which will serve all of the people all over the basin equally. Somewhere between the opposing positions of complete Federal control of the resource and local control of the resource we will find an answer. I, for one, will never willingly abdicate our opportunity to compel usage of these Idaho resources for Idaho's benefit. But common ground will and must be found between the battle lines now drawn up by the antagonists of this question to which a sensible man may in honor repair. For this common ground, all who are determined that the Pacific Northwest shall forge ahead, must search.

ROBERT E. SMYLIE,
Attorney General of Idaho.

The Mobilization Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

MR. WILSON'S CLARION CALL

That was a mighty powerful speech which Defense Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson delivered last night in a Nation-wide broadcast from the White House. Its effect on the striking railroad switchmen was almost instantaneous. The strike ended in the New York area this morning and appeared nearing its close in several other cities.

Mr. Wilson's appeal had the twin virtues of brevity and forcefulness. He didn't scold, he didn't harangue; he simply laid the situation the line in plain, but simple, potent language. His long experience in dealing with men as top executive of the General Electric Co. stood him in good stead last night as he fashioned his dramatic request that the men go back to work to end paralysis of the Nation at a time when it is in the greatest danger of its history.

The mobilization chief, well remembered by many Greater Lynn residents because of his appearance here last October to open the community fund drive, told the strikers that their actions now can hurt the Nation more every day than all the Communist armies in Korea put together. He said that tanks, ammunition, guns, clothing, and equipment destined for fighting American boys in Korea were being halted by the wildcat strike.

Unexpectedly moderate in tone—and therefore, that much more effective—the speech pointed out that the switchmen are entitled to fair wages and good working conditions, and have every right to use legitimate means to obtain them. "But a strike against the whole Nation, depriving millions of men, women, and children here at home of food is not a legitimate means in time of great peril," he said.

There is abundant evidence today that the Wilson speech hit home. Certainly, it left a profound impression on his fellow countrymen in all parts of the Nation. And, incidentally, while we're casting about for Presidential timber for 1952, it might be well to consider this outstanding American who has made so many notable contriputions to his country's service, not the least of which was his magnificent effort of last night.

It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the American people should read the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 6, 1951:

IT CAN BE DONE

The bad news from the tax front hit the streets yesterday. To raise a fast $10,000,000,000 for rearmament, Treasury Secretary Snyder proposed—

Twenty percent tax on new autos—up from 7 percent.

Twenty-five percent on refrigerators, radios, television sets—up from 10.

Ten cents per pack tax on cigarettes—up from 7.

Double the present 1½ cents a gallon tax on gasoline.

Twelve dollars a gallon tax on whisky, up from $9, and $12 a barrel on beer—up from $8.

And other whopping increases all along the line, including income and corporation tax rates.

Well, we've got to dig it up somewhere, if we pay as we go in the defense effort—which is the wise thing to do. But the worrisome fact is that there's a lot of fat in that $71,600,000,000 budget President Truman has set up.

The taxpayers could be a lot more cheerful above paying through the nose if they could only be sure their dollars were going for what they intended.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, a strong administration supporter, says the Truman budget can be trimmed by at least $2,500,000,000; and he puts the finger on a number of welfare-State items.

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, another administration supporter, set no specific figure, but he's for cutting to the bone nonessential spending.

Senator O'CONOR, Democrat, of Maryland, says $5,300,000,000 can be lopped off and Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, has offered a formula for knocking out $9,100,000,000. The United States Chamber of Commerce calls for a $7,000,000,000 cut.

Strike an average of these responsible, detailed estimates and you get $6,000,000,000. That's approximately what President Truman proposes to ask Congress for still later. It won't be necessary if Congress saves us the $6,000,000,000.

It can be done—if Congress resolutely eliminates or slices huge chunks from a lot of the nonessential items which Mr. Truman has palmed into the budget, as even his own backers now acknowledge.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the tenth and eleventh short

sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

GREGORY IX: HELPED CODIFY CANON LAW

Gregory IX was pope from 1227 to 1241, a nobleman of Anagni and probably a nephew of Innocent III. Gregory and Frederick II, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, were constantly in conflict.

He systematized the Inquisition and entrusted it to the Dominicans. Legal historians remember him for ordering the condensation of the decretals (papal decisions and decrees) into a single collection. The volume is considered an important step toward codifying canon law.

Gregory was known for his strong character and learning. He died on August 22, 1241, while Frederick II was advancing against him.

The Gregory plaque was done by Thomas Hudson Jones, of Washington.

INNOCENT III: ANOTHER ROMAN STUDENT OF CANON AND CIVIL LAW (1161-1216 A. D.)

Innocent III (1161-1216 A. D.) was elected Pope at the age of 37. Educated at the University of Paris, he became a profound student of civil and canon law. The outstanding characteristic of his reign was the assertion of world power and making supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal authority a working reality.

Innocent III had an active interest in law. He constantly presided over the court, instituted ecclesiastical reforms and centralized his administration at Rome.

His accomplishments during a dark period in history were much the same as those of Gregory IX—preservation of the remnants of Roman law.

Innocent's greatest triumph was his victory over King John of England. The quarrel arose over a dispute on the election to a vacant See of Canterbury. For years the Pope virtually ruled England through his legates.

His plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski of New York City.

Untold Facts in the Korean Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. I respect my obligation as a member of that committee. I strive to keep myself informed so that I may in turn inform my colleagues in this House of developments that affect the conduct of this Government's foreign affairs.

Here is a copy of a monthly magazine, the New American Mercury, published in New York. In this issue of this magazine, its editor, William Bradford Huie, reports on a treaty signed in Moscow in February of 1950—a treaty signed a year ago—between Soviet Russia and Communist China. Mr. Huie charges that this treaty set the stage for the Communist aggression in Korea. This American Mercury article says that the Chinese Reds "planned and manipulated" the Korean war from its beginning.

In this article which is titled "Untold Facts in the Korean Disaster," Mr. Huie enumerates six points in that treaty he says was signed by our enemies a year ago in Moscow. And he enumerates, from the letter "A" through the letter "H," the terms of the treaty concerning the Chinese Communist armed forces.

I will not repeat here the amazing terms of this treaty, since I intend to ask permission to incorporate in the RECORD the entire article as it appears in the New American Mercury. I recommend that the Members of this House study it carefully. I agree with Mr. Huie, and I quote:

Here is an amazing situation—a situation which should be of concern to every American. The signing of these agreements was one of the most significant events of our time. It meant, in effect, that a 5,000,000-man Chinese army had been assimilated into the Russian Army. Russia had accomplished what American diplomacy in the interest of mankind, should have prevented.

But were the American people warned of this pact? Were the terms of this pact published so that we could prepare accordingly? The tragic fact is this: There is reason to believe that the United States Government itself did not know the terms of the agreements, much less understand their significance.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I try to keep informed. I expect my Government to keep me and all other citizens inside and outside of Congress informed of such important events. But until this article reached my desk, I was as much in the dark as any other American about this treaty—signed a year ago—which has brought death to our soldiers, sailors, and Marines in Korea.

I ask why it is that a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House must get information—a year after the fact—about such actions that so vitally affect this Nation's welfare from a magazine instead of from the State Department. I commend Mr. Huie for the service rendered this country by informing us of this dastardly compact between our enemies.

But I ask, Why did not our Government discover the terms of this treaty? And if it did know of this treaty, why did it not inform the Congress and the people? And why did it not act to prevent the aggression which is taking American lives in Korea?

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article from the New American Mercury:

UNTOLD FACTS IN THE KOREAN DISASTER

(By William Bradford Huie)

(NOTE.—In the preparation of this article the author had the assistance of Ralph Wallace, who made a special trip to Formosa and Tokyo; of Freda Utley, author of numerous books on the Orient; and of intelligence officers of the British, American, and Chinese Nationalist Governments.)

When some future Gibbon considers the present period in American history, he probably will record that in the year 1950 the quality of leadership in this Nation reached a melancholy low. It was another of those tragic eras, he will write, when a vigorous, aspiring people found themselves defeated and despondent because they had neglected to seek out wise men to lead them.

Why, our Gibbon will ask, did the American people—a people who had known Washington and Hamilton and Madison and Lincoln, a commonsense people capable of giving substance to the Western ideal, a people who had survived Valley Forge and challenged the Rocky Mountains in covered wagons, a people whose cause Tom Paine had said was the cause of mankind—why did such a people allow mediocre men to exercise power when the demand so obviously was for greatness?

The story of how we wasted the warm young blood of Tarawa and Iwo Jima, and allowed the Asian masses to be armed against us—this is a story which American parents must understand so that, if we have the chance, we can recount it to our children. It's a bitter story, for first it's the story of a few Americans who were traitors: men whose minds and bodies were actually in the employ of the enemy. It's a dispiriting story because it's the story of men who were heroic, of men who were honest and sincere and patriotic, of men who wanted to do good, but who lacked vision, who lost sight of the realities, who did the bidding of traitors, and who, therefore, brought this Nation and the cause of mankind to disaster. It isn't traitors who do the most mischief to free men; it's the dupes of traitors. Finally, it's a warning story, a story of a people who knew more than their leaders but who had delegated too much, who had allowed their leaders to operate in secrecy, who had neglected to impose those checks and balances which the fathers of our liberties warned us to maintain.

The Mercury, in subsequent issues, will document this story so that no reasoning man can misunderstand it. Here, we erect the skeleton on which to work, and we detail events which led to the military disaster in Korea.

THE FIRST ERROR

Every American schoolboy should be required to repeat: "The key to power in the Orient is Manchuria." Only Manchuria contains the minerals necessary to modern industrial and military power. Japan fought Russia for Manchurian concessions in 1904. Japan invaded and took Manchuria in 1931. It was power from Manchuria that enabled the Japanese to thrust southward in 1937 and then challenge the United States in 1941. We fought Japan, essentially, for Manchuria; it was Manchuria that the blood of Tarawa and Iwo Jima should have purchased for the *cause of mankind*.

Roosevelt went to Yalta in February, 1945, to persuade the Russians to enter the war against Japan. The Russians had no intention of staying out of the war; they were just waiting until we had created the vacuum so that they could march in. And what they did the Russians want? Concessions in Manchuria. But it was our men who had died for Manchuria. How could we bargain away Manchuria without breaking faith with our own dead?

Among the President's advisers at Yalta was Alger Hiss; and Hiss was there because a large group of men in our State Department wanted Russia to have Manchuria.

Also among the President's advisers were General Marshall and General MacArthur. (General MacArthur did not accompany the President to Yalta; but his advice was sought and given on concessions to Russia.) And here is a saddening fact: Both General Marshall and General MacArthur were willing to make concessions in Manchuria to "induce" Russia to enter the war. The generals were victims of the world's poorest intelligence service. By 1945 Japan was on her knees, trying to make peace, yet General Marshall and General MacArthur both believed that Japan was still so strong that we should give away the prize for which we had

fought. So it's a fact that General Marshall and General MacArthur urged Roosevelt to make the same concessions to Russia which Hiss and the State Department traitors and fools were urging him to make.

Those who doubt that MacArthur could make such an error will have their evidence when the papers of James Forrestal are published. For here is another fact: Forrestal, alone among the major figures in our Government, opposed making any concession to get Russia into the war against Japan.

To know that Forrestal took this position—he was also supported by George F. Kennan in the State Department and by Admiral William D. Leahy—is important to us now; it reassures us that our Nation has not ceased to produce great men of vision; we have ceased placing them in positions of power.

THE FATAL ERROR

The error at Yalta, while serious, was not beyond correction in 1946. The Russians had their concessions in Manchuria—railroads and ports; they had looted its industries; but the Chinese Nationalist Government was struggling to exercise control and Russia was pledged to respect this control. There were no Chinese Communists in Manchuria; the Japs had kept them out.

It was then that Truman and Marshall, under the influence of the State Departrment knaves and fools, made the fatal error. Instead of sending Marshall to China with instructions to aid Chiang Kai-shek in the destruction of the Chinese Communists, Truman sent Marshall with instructions to compel Chiang Kai-shek to embrace the Communists.

THE EVENTS OF 1950

In February 1950 a treaty and a series of agreements were signed by the Russian and Chinese Communist governments. Our Government should have learned the terms of the pact. From its actions, apparently, it did not; our inteligence is so incompetent. Here, published for the first time, are the more important terms:

1. Russia was to send 45,100 Soviet personnel to China, of which 12,000 were to be assigned to the army, 8,000 to the air force, 8,000 to the navy, 5,000 to the political sphere, 12,000 to industrial development; and 5,000 to cultural and educational fields. Each company in the Chinese Army was to have at least one Russian political adviser, with the number of advisers being multiplied in the higher echelons.

2. All mineral, oil, forestry and food resources of China were to be developed by joint commissions of Russians and Chinese.

3. To ensure the solidarity of the ruling position of the laboring classes China and Russia would cooperate fully in the field of economics and culture. (Portraits of Lenin and Stalin now hang in every Chinese barracks and mess hall; all troops sing the Internationale; all Chinese teachers must take a course in Soviet culture and aspirations; and Chinese school books are being altered to tell the Russian story.).

4. There was to be complete cooperation between all persons of both countries connected with security. Under this term the Russians immediately installed in the Chinese Army the Russian system of compartmentation of secrets; and this system defies the best intelligence agents.

5. To help solve the economic difficulties of the Chinese Russia agreed to employ Chinese jobless laborers. This is the vicious term which enables the Chinese Reds to send to Russia all the political undesirables—and it enables Russia to recruit slave laborers from the inexhaustible Chinese pool. Already, under this term, more than 500,000 Chinese have been sent to Russia. When the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh Chinese armies rebelled in South China last year, the armies were broken up and the men sent to Siberian labor camps.

6. To meet Soviet emergency needs on the European front in a future war, the People's Government of China agreed to send laborers and expeditionary forces to serve under the Soviet high command.

On matters particularly concerning the Chinese armed forces here were the terms of the Moscow and Harbin agreements:

(a) The Chinese army was to consist of 5,700,000 men.

(b) Russia was to be in control of training the Chinese army.

(c) Russia was to control aviation, navy, radar, communications and meteorology.

(d) Russia was to begin the immediate training and equipping of 50 Chinese divisions.

(e) Russia was to transfer to China: 600 war planes and all the Japanese naval craft awarded to Russia at the end of World War II. Russia was also to send several regiments of antiaircraft troops to protect the Chinese airfields.

(f) Russia and China agreed to the intensive development of an International Army Corps with soldiers of all Asiatic nations serving in the ranks.

(g) Russia was given 12 air bases in China, from Hami to Shanghai. Russia was also given naval bases at Port Arthur, Dairen, Yongkow, Ching-Hwang-Lao, Hu-Lu-Tao, Taku, Chefoo, Tsingtao and Lien-Yung-Kang.

(h) China and Russia agreed to operate in all future military operations under a joint Sino-Soviet staff.

After the signing of this pact there was the usual all-night banquet in the Kremlin. Stalin's principal toast to the Chinese was this: "To your victory in all Asia." And Mao replied: "To world victory of communism in 1952."

Now here is an amazing situation—a situation which should be of concern to every American. The signing of these agreements was one of the most significant events of our time. It meant, in effect, that a 5,000,000-man Chinese army had been assimilated into the Russian army. Russia had accomplished what American diplomacy, in the interest of mankind, should have prevented.

But were the American people warned of this pact? Were the terms of the pact published so that we could prepare accordingly? The tragic fact is this: There is reason to believe that the United States Government itself did not know the terms of the agreements, much less understand their significance.

Most Americans, no doubt, assume that our Government, being reasonably intelligent, maintains agents in China to gather information on the activities of the Chinese Government. Here is the truth: In the first six months of 1950 our Government did not have a single agent in Peiping or in all of China.

The Chinese Nationalists, being enemies of the Chinese Communists, do maintain an excellent espionage network in China. So most Americans, no doubt, assume that our Government maintains expert liaison with Chinese Nationalist intelligence. Here is the truth: For a period of 9 months before June 15, 1950, not a single American intelligence officer had visited the headquarters of Chinese Nationalist intelligence on Formosa.

Why? Because our State Department was clearing the ground for the recognition of the Chinese Communist government; and there was a a State Department directive against our intelligence officers going to Formosa.

And here is one more point. Most Americans have been led to believe that our Central Intelligence Agency is of some importance. If that were so, in 1950, surely it would have been employing expert Chinese agents. The truth is this: During 1950 what few Chinese were employed by the CIA were first screened by John Davies, of the State Department, and Mr. Davies has written: "The destiny of China belongs to the Communists."

Since, however, our Government does formally recognize the Chinese Nationalist Government as the legal Government of China, there is a Chinese Embassy in Washington, and Chinese intelligence is submitted both to the Pentagon and to the State Department. The evaluation of the intelligence is left to Americans.

But here is the situation regarding the Chinese Nationalists in Washington. The head of our Defense Department is General Marshall. The Chinese Nationalists distrust General Marshall; they blame him for their defeat in China.

At the State Department, Acheson, Jessup, John Davies, Hiss—they have all believed that "the destiny of China lies with the Communists."[1] The State Department issued the directive against American intelligence officers consulting on Formosa with Chinese Nationalist intelligence. So how welcome are the reports of Chinese Nationalist intelligence at our State Department?

In May 1950—3 months after the signing of the Sino-Soviet pacts, and many months after the Russians had begun retraining and reequipping the Chinese Red armies—our press and our State Department were telling Americans that "Mao is developing into another Tito"; that "Red China's interests must conflict with those of Russia"; that "Russia cannot influence China's destiny."

Here is a sequence of facts which should demonstrate to any reasonable American the appalling inadequacy of our leadership.

1. The Sino-Soviet agreements were signed in February and March 1950. Our Government either didn't know the terms, or it didn't act accordingly.

2. In April 1950, the Chinese Red army of General Lin Piao captured the iron-rich island of Hainan, which is off the southernmost coast of China.

3. In May 1950, Lin Piao's troops began transferring from the far south of China to the far north—to Manchuria. Chinese Nationalist intelligence transmitted this information to the Pentagon and to the State Department. The intelligence transmittal also contained this information about Lin Piao: he is the youngest and ablest of the Chinese Red field commanders. His field army of about 1,500,000 men was the first to be reequipped and retrained under the Sino-Soviet pact Lin Piao is the protégé of Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, and is regarded by the Russians as completely trustworthy.

The jurisdiction of Lin Piao's field army is southern China; it had just concluded the occupation of Hainan. Now why, in May 1950, would Lin Piao's army start moving all the way across China to Manchuria?

Chinese Nationalist intelligence reported to the Pentagon in May 1950 that Lin Piao's movement to Manchuria could indicate only one thing: an imminent attack on South Korea.

4. Meanwhile, our Government had decided on a policy for South Korea: We had withdrawn our arms; if it were attacked, we would not defend it. No American military man believed that we could successfuly defend South Korea.

5. On June 25, 1950, there was an invasion of South Korea, and at 6 p. m. on

[1] State Department white paper on China, p. 573.

this date it was the policy of the United States not to intervene. No military man believed that we should intervene. But between 6 and 8 p. m., the President, in conference with Dean Acheson and General Marshall, decided on a policy of intervention.

6. The divisions which led the North Korean attack on the South Koreans were divisions which had been a part of Lin Piao's army. The Korean War, from the beginning, was a war between the United States and South Korea, on the one side, and Russia and Red China on the other. North Korean troops were employed during the period when no other troops seemed necessary.

7. During July and August of 1950 Chinese Nationalist intelligence informed the Pentagon and the State Department that more Chinese Red divisions were pouring into Manchuria. And what else could this possibly mean except that these troops were to be employed, if necessary, in Korea?

8. To this last question our Government came up with the most amazing answer of all. Every American should memorize this fact:

The American people were told by their Government that movement of Lin Piao's troops into Manchuria was a hopeful sign. It was hopeful because it indicated that China was stiffening her resistance to Russia.

9. Late in October 1950, just before the elections, the President flew to Wake Island to confer with General MacArthur. The President took along as his adviser, Dr. Philip Jessup. Dr. Jessup subscribes to the view that the future of China lies with the Communists; his advice has helped bring this country to disaster. And at Wake it was decided by MacArthur, Jessup, and Truman that our troops could push to the Manchuria border in safety because, obviously, the Chinese Communists would not intervene.

10. Early in November 1950, intelligence was transmitted to our Government to this effect: the troops opposing the United Nations Armies in North Korea are not North Koreans; they are troops of the International Army Corps of Russia and China. The whole invasion of South Korea was planned by the Sino-Soviet staff; Red China has been in the war from the beginning, and will commit whatever troops are necessary to drive the Americans from Korea.

11. On November 24, 1950, General MacArthur visited the front lines in Korea and launched his home-for-Christmas invasion. He said that he was now opposed by only "scattered remnants" of a defeated enemy.

12. On November 26, 1950, disaster was in the making, and MacArthur announced that "more than a million" Red Chinese troops were already in Korea.

Now the questions which every American citizen has the right to ask are these: If MacArthur knows the Orient, why did he completely misunderstand the character of the Korean War? Why was he so confident that the Chinese Reds would not enter a war which they had planned and manipulated from the beginning? If, when he launched his home-for-Christmas offensive, he knew that he was confronted by a million Red troops in Korea, why did he spread out his army in an insane offensive? And if he didn't know that "Chinese hordes" of a million men were immediately in front of him, why didn't he? Has our intelligence sunk to so low a state that even in the field, and with complete command of the air, we can't locate a million men in front of our armies?

In the Korean debacle the President, Acheson, Marshall, and MacArthur have given this Nation the sorriest military leadership in its history.

New England Wholesale Meat Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following telegram:

BOSTON, MASS., *February 7, 1951.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The New England Wholesale Meat Dealers Association has today sent the following telegram to Eric Johnston, Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, and Michael V. DiSalle, Director of Price Stabilization, in Washington, D. C.:

"An acute shortage of meat for consumers in the New England area threatens. We urge every effort be made to insure the necessary flow of meat to this area through the normal channels of distribution at once. Pending the formulation of over-all dollar-and-cents ceiling prices, it is imperative that dealers be permitted to purchase meat at prevailing offering prices and to resell said meat with a normal operating markup. The present price squeeze is most harmful to both meat dealers and the general consumer public in this area.

"Our organization is mindful of the magnitude and complexity of the problem confronting the Director of Price Stabilization, and desires to cooperate in every way. We stand ready to send our representatives to confer with you immediately and to assist in this emergency. We ask for your prompt response to this communication, and hope for favorable action and speedy relief."

We respectfully request your immediate assistance in this emergency, and urge that you take whatever action you deem appropriate to apprise the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency and the Director of Price Stabilization of the pressing need for immediate relief in the New England area.

NEW ENGLAND WHOLESALE MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
HAROLD WIDETT,
General Counsel.

Leaders of Organized Labor Should Think Twice Before Supporting Socialist Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, although their efforts have been remarkably unsuccessful, labor leaders in the United States, long have tried to deliver the union vote, for local, State, and National candidates, whose records have marked them as Socialists, in fact if not in name.

They did their best to help return the Truman administration to power in 1948. Possibly at that time, and under the circumstances then existing, they did help in small degree. At any rate, they made the welkin ring with claims that they reelected Harry S. Truman. It seems that he believes it, too.

But now we stand at the threshold of world war III. Things are far different from the cushy days of 2 years ago. Now it is clear to all of us, that the Truman administration's policies have brought this Nation face to face with a dreadful emergency; a peril more deadly than any since the infant days of the Republic.

The American people, organized labor included, now understand that they must forget the good old days. They know that now they must give us their easy way of living. They know they must buckle down to hard work and sacrifice. Work and sacrifice, while their sons fight, and many of them die, in God only knows what war theaters, in what parts of the world.

And in this last and greatest of national emergencies, the Truman administration falters. It vacillates from day to day, from hour to hour. It falls prey to the doubts and uncertainties, the fears which are common to leaders, who fall short of leadership; who are leaders only in name.

In the desperation begotten of total unwillingness to admit and correct its own mistakes, as might be expected, the Truman administration turns to the brand of British-type socialism, which it vainly imagines American labor supports.

The Truman administration seeks to discipline the American people for war by means of more socialistic regimentation instead of less. Evidently the administration distrusts the American people and feels it dare not leave them free to discipline themselves at all.

Possibly in this the administration suffers a misgiving that the American people are finally aware of its blundering incompetence; that most Americans harbor an even greater distrust of Truman administration leadership.

But, however that may be, in its uncertainty and confusion the administration seeks on the one hand to socialize the economy and regiment the people while on the other it makes gestures of appeasement to the supporters of free enterprise and individual liberty.

In trying to be all things to all men; in trying to please everyone, the Truman administration pleases nobody. And of all those who now are displeased, the labor leaders howl the loudest. They are learning something they never knew before about socialism and socialistic techniques.

The lesson they are just beginning to learn here is explicit in some things that are happening in labor-socialist Great Britain. The lesson is all the more easy to learn from what is happening in England because over there the process of nationalization is far advanced. It is a lesson which American labor supporters of socialism should study with close attention.

Now the story of what is happening in Britain is somewhat hard to follow. So I hope my listeners will bend a careful ear.

I shall begin by saying that sometimes a chance remark is more revealing of a situation, even one of national or worldwide importance, than is long discussion by those best qualified to formulate and express opinions.

This happened recently when an obscure Laborite member rose in the British Parliament to talk on a minor matter affecting his constituency.

The Member of Parliament said in effect: The trouble is that we have largely socialized our national economy, without socializing our trade unions.

Afterward he was quoted as admitting that he said more than he intended. He had meant only that British labor unions, while dominating the Labor-Socialist government, have retained merely a sectional, rather than a national outlook.

But his remark apparently made a deep impression. Political observers in England now point to the fact British labor has lost its smartest leaders to the Government, where they are forced to think on the national level.

It is said that British labor, having lost these men, has failed to maintain a level of intelligent thinking to comport with its dominant position politically.

Many important political writers in Britain now appear to think that trade unionism presently will be subordinated in government, to the fast growing influence of labor-socialist intellectuals.

These intellectuals comprise a lily-fingered clique outside the labor unions. Their interest in the labor movement and in socialism is purely ideological, and perhaps more opportunistic than idealistic. Certainly they have no practical interest in the advancement of trade unionism itself. Sir Stafford Cripps was leader of this group until his health failed.

Now, the comments of British political observers are based upon two glaringly obvious facts, with respect to the factions in the badly split Labor-Socialist Party.

One fact is that British trade-unions are strongly opposed to further nationalization. They call it a pause, to consolidate gains; but there is reason to think it something far different.

The other fact is that Labor-Socialist intellectuals are fighting to rush nationalization through to completion. This is to be expected of men, who are not interested in people, but solely in an ideology.

It is said that Prime Minister Attlee's willingness to compromise with the intellectuals, is all that holds the party together, against the assaults of Winston Churchill and his Conservatives.

And now the lesson for American labor leaders begins to emerge.

In Great Britain they have gone far toward socializing the entire economy; while neglecting, or refusing, to socialize the labor unions. To do this, would be to make the unions a part of the Government; or at least, to put them completely under Government control.

This is what was done in Soviet Russia. The realists of the Kremlin understood that when organized labor assumes control of the government, or even when it overtly tries to do so, it ceases to be organized labor. It becomes a political party.

Labor unions, as such, properly can be appurtenant only to a free-enterprise economy. Under a completely socialized economy, the government is the only employer. The government is dedicated, theoretically at least, to full employment, and highest possible living standards for everybody without exception. Under such conditions, labor unions have no valid reason for existence.

Yet in Great Britain, the labor unions continue their traditional fight for higher wages and easier working conditions, at the expense of other segments of the population. At the same time, they dominate the Government, which is committed to provide these things for everyone.

Organized labor in the British Isles would appear to be in the position of a man up against a judo expert, bound to be seriously hurt, if not destroyed, by its own strength.

Quite possibly the critics of the thinking now being done by the British trade-union leaders, as leaders of a faction within the Government, are completely wrong. Possibly those leaders are smarter than their critics think.

Perhaps they understand the real reason for the rising power of the Labor-Socialist intellectuals, who would rush socialism in Britain to its logical conclusion.

Could it be that they are beginning to realize that complete socialization means complete destruction of trade unionism in the British Isles? Is that why trade-union leaders now seek to halt the progress of socialization?

In view of these things, the enthusiasm of American labor leaders for socialism in this country might not be so great if they stopped to think. They might slow up, too, in their efforts to transform American organized labor into a Labor-Socialist political party.

It was unfortunate for British labor, as a political party, that its government had so far committed itself to nationalization of the iron and steel industries that it could not draw back.

Now let me draw a conclusion from all this. The wise old Samuel Gompers always held that organized labor, when it enters politics, carries with it the seeds of its own destruction.

No wiser decision ever was made by the rank and file of American organized labor than the decision which took them to the polls last November, as Americans first, and labor unionists afterward. As individuals, their wisdom was far greater than that of their leaders.

It was thinking along these lines, in part, which compelled me long ago to oppose any and all legislative measures toward socializing the American economy, and to look with disfavor on labor unions in politics.

The Sell-Out of Principles at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, February 7, 1945, will go down in the annals of American history as the day on which America sold her ideals for a mess of international politics. Until that day, 6 years ago, honor and a high regard for morality and justice had characterized our international dealings. We had not always been successful in our diplomacy, but we had acted with firm regard for moral principles.

At Yalta, however—let us face the facts—this democracy, which is dedicated to the ideals of human justice and equality, agreed to the partition of Poland and thereby sold millions of Polish patriots into lifelong slavery. The very people in that country who had been our most loyal and self-sacrificing allies were the ones who were most injured and endangered by this shameful negotiation at Yalta.

The time is past for futile and partisan recriminations. The results are a national disgrace, and the time is long overdue for national recognition of that fact. Repudiation of the persons involved is not enough. We should immediately proclaim that the Yalta agreement no longer forms any part of our present foreign policy, and pray that the international situation will improve sufficiently so that the glorious nation of Poland will be freed from its present terrible fate to which we contributed so materially.

Thinking Is Tremendous Moral Force in World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, we all hear a lot about the importance of little things. We hear that minor events often sway the fates of nations. The missing horseshoe nail is the classical illustration of this belief.

Nevertheless the fact remains that, almost invariably, great events grow out of great ideas. And sad to say, this is true whether those ideas be good or evil.

At any rate, behind all the happenings which determine the long-term trends of world affairs—behind the things men live by and for—always there is the thinking of individual men.

Sometimes that thinking is done in the press of public life, in the course of

debate over the policies which shall guide the life of a nation.

Sometimes it is done in the quiet of a college professor's study, or in the attic room of a man who lives in the world of ideas, with small thought of material things.

Such thinking has been known to take place even in the fields, as a plowman followed his plow; or, indeed, in such a spot as the forlorn office of a country lawyer in a raw frontier town.

But always this thinking, which serves as the seed of great events, is thinking of such originality and force, either for good or evil, that men take it into their hearts and nourish it, each after his own secret desire.

I believe that you will agree with me that such thinking is a tremendous moral force in the world. It is so because it appeals to the deepest instincts of the human heart.

Now it sometimes happens, as any student of history knows, that two or more of these forces find expression and wield their dynamic power upon mankind all at the same time.

In fact it is manifestly true that the world, as we know it, is the outward appearance of a sort of unstable compromise, in the unceasing conflict between differing ideologies—some of them good, some of them bad.

This conflict of ideas, and the unstable compromise, we see all about us today. The world we live in is a world wherein only the most temporary stability is achieved, in anything, anywhere.

The world-wide ideological conflict we have today has been fought economically and politically for a number of years. We have called it the cold war. Now it is being fought in part by force of arms. God grant that the present little war does not become a third global war.

This ideological conflict, of course, is between totalitarianism and communism on the one side, and free enterprise and individualism on the other.

On the one hand, the individual counts for nothing, and exists only for the welfare of the state. On the other, the individual is of first importance, and the state exists only for his welfare.

Now all of these considerations, and particularly that of the tremendous ideological forces set free in the world by the thinking of individual men, lead up to an observation I wish to make. And here it is.

In January 1848, almost exactly 102 years ago, when Karl Marx and Frederick Engels issued their infamous Manifesto, outlining and advocating the philosophy of socialism and communism, Abraham Lincoln was just beginning his term as a Member of the House of Representatives in Washington.

In the same month, of the same year, two great ideological forces came into being; forces which have battled for possession of the minds and hearts of all men, until this very day

Lincoln, the rail-splitter, and Lincoln, the young lawyer, in the frontier town of Springfield, must have thought some at least of the great thoughts, which he first expressed before the Congress of the United States.

As the farm boy, who read the Bible in the light of the rude fireplace in his father's log cabin, and as the young lawyer, who found it hard to make both ends meet, Lincoln must have been inspired to some degree with the concepts of moral grandeur, which made him great.

In those days of his boyhood and young manhood, Lincoln must have laid the groundwork of that compassionate philosophy, that ideology of human understanding, which guided him as President of the United States, when the institution of human slavery threatened the existence of the Federal Union.

Marx and Engels, as we know, stood for the enslavement of all men, at the hands of a few proletarian leaders, whom they thought would come into power through class conflict. They did not believe in the equality of all men.

Both were far removed from the ordinary lives of mankind. They knew little of the joys and sorrows, the triumphs and defeats, of the average man. They knew little of human affairs, and apparently, even less of moral and ethical considerations. To them, Christianity was a mockery. They were inhuman, because they dealt solely in theories.

But Lincoln was a man of the people. He understood them completely. He knew their joys and sorrows, their triumphs and defeats. And his deep religious faith colored all his thinking with gentle compassion, with a profound belief in the essential goodness of mankind. Lincoln had, above all, the common touch.

Yet Lincoln was not a materialist. He believed passionately in the spiritual concept of human life. He believed, perhaps more than anything else, that men, as spiritual beings, are born as brothers, equal in all things, and entitled to those essential liberties, without which human dignity cannot exist.

Lincoln's predecessors in the White House, great as some of them were, witnessed the institution of human slavery in this land, dedicated in the beginning to the proposition of human liberty. And they did not overtly condemn it.

So it remained for Lincoln to become the first great exponent of this proposition, that all men are created free. He became, and still remains in the hearts of all mankind, the world's truest and greatest symbol of freedom for every individual, regardless of race, color, creed, or economic condition.

But Lincoln believed that individual liberty is possible, only when accompanied by individual responsibility. And so it followed that he believed in, and supported by all that he said and did, the system of free enterprise, which has made this the happiest and strongest Nation on the globe.

Lincoln made all Americans free. He preserved the Federal Union. He taught the homely virtues of patience, humor, friendliness, and common honesty. And it was subsequent to the Civil War that the United States began its climb to unparalleled prosperity and world leadership.

Who can say, then, that it was not Lincoln's influence, in large measure, which made it possible for us to reach our present happy estate?

But as I said in the beginning, now it has happened that throughout more than half the world's land area, and among more than a third of the world's population, the evil teachings of Marx and Engels have gained the ascendancy.

Socialism and communism are on the march in the unhappy lands abroad. Indirect attempts are being made to impose the monstrous philosophy of totalitarian socialism on the American people.

Can it be that much of the trouble in the world today has come about because we, the Nation to which all the world has looked as the bulwark of human liberty, have become cynical?

Have we departed from the teachings of the Great Emancipator?

If we have, it is time that we turned back. If we do not, then all the world may descend into the ultimate darkness of slavery, under Marxian communism.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Omar B. Ketchum, National Legislative Director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

The Eighty-second Congress is in session and the Eighty-first Congress is now history. Insofar as veterans' legislation is concerned the Eighty-first could well be tagged the "Eighty-worst." The Eightieth Congress, roundly denounced in 1948 as the "worst Congress in history," was a giant of accomplishment compared to the Eighty-first.

By OMAR B. KETCHUM,
VFW National Legislative Director.

How To Get the World on Our Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Laffan Morse is president of Unicorn Press, one of America's largest book-publishing houses, and editor in chief of the New Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedia, America's newest encyclopedia, completed less than a year ago, and already recognized as one of the world's finest encyclopedias. He was always a close student and opponent of the Marxist theory and practice. As editor in chief of the encyclopedia he headed a large

staff for gathering facts from the far corners of the earth. An immense amount of data flowed through his office daily.

Before the great task of compiling and editing the 36 volumes of the encyclopedia was over, he had come to two frightening conclusions—that we were losing and would inevitably lose the cold war, and that for the same or similar reasons we might very well lose the hot war. He saw the Communists waging a new kind of war on the world—what he called ultra-modern war, in which the processes of the old-fashioned kind of war are reversed, the destruction of a people's will to resist being attacked and destroyed before the shooting begins. In this new type of war resistance forces, guerrilla armies, are created before the regular armies are thrown into battle, and frequently accomplish the overthrow of a nation without the use of regular troops at all.

This, we recognize, as the method of conquest of the Soviet Union. The important point he saw is that such warfare is carried on not by a governmental agency, which is powerless to do so unless it is actually at war with the nation under attack, but by a private, supra-governmental agency, the private organization of people called the Communist Party.

He, therefore, proposed over a year and a half ago the formation of a Democratic International, organized as the Comintern was organized, backed with substantial funds to begin its activities, and led by the best military and political brains the free nations can provide. It would constitute a sort of private army, similar in structure to the Communist Party, of skilled and trained men of all nations, whose aim would be to preserve democracy in the countries in danger of invasion by the iron curtain countries and to create revolution within the iron curtain itself.

Leading public opinion is today swinging toward a political solution of our difficulties, because the dangers of total military warfare to the free world itself are becoming daily more apparent. This daring plan Mr. Morse contends furnishes the outline of the instrumentality which could create and supply the revolutionary forces within the iron curtain and crush communism without the need of resort to world war III.

An article describing this plan appeared in the August 2, 1949, issue of Look magazine. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article and strongly urge that it be read by my colleagues:

HOW TO GET THE WORLD ON OUR SIDE—WE'VE GOT TO ORGANIZE OUR FRIENDS IN OTHER LANDS TO FIGHT THE COMMUNISTS WITH THEIR OWN WEAPONS

(By Joseph Laffan Morse, editor in chief, New Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedia)

We Americans bitterly hate war. We hate it so much we cannot bear to face the fact that it is coming. Military experts agree the Soviet armies could today march almost unopposed through Europe and Asia. The only thing that stops them is our possession of the atomic bomb.

We face this hard choice: Strike now in a preventive war or wait and hope—until Russia has a stockpile of atomic bombs. Both alternatives are bad. We do not wish to bring death to millions of innocent people; nor to gamble that we ourselves will suffer the indescribable horror of atom bombing.

What can we common people do? Is there no way out? I say there is a way, but it will take huge determination and ingenuity, courage, and sacrifice. The pattern of what we need to do already exists. It is the pattern followed by the men in the Kremlin as they have won their victories in Europe and Asia. We can use their own weapons to destroy them

We need to create a democratic international, similar to the Communist International, but for democratic purposes. The avowed aim of the Comintern was Communist revolution in all countries. The purpose of the democratic international should be democratic counterrevolution in all Communist countries, and the destruction of communism throughout the world.

The Democratic International should be a movement of democratic peoples, not their governments, in exactly the same way that the Comintern was an international movement of Communists and not of Soviet Russia.

As a first step, democratic leaders from all nations should assemble to plan for world-wide action. This great meeting, making public our goals, would parallel the historic Moscow meeting in 1919 of the Third Communist International.

Next, we should organize a secret invasion army—an international army of a million specialists. These must be spies, secret agents and organizers, saboteurs, propagandists, and agitators. Each must be carefully trained for his job in schools like the notorious Lenin school in Moscow and Gen. William Donovan's school for the Office of Strategic Services in World War II.

The secret army of the Democratic International should be directed by a general staff of the best brains on earth. It should be backed by almost unlimited funds. It should be recruited among the nationals of every country we need to invade—Russians, Poles, Bulgars, Czechs, Frenchmen, and many more—including even Americans.

Hundreds of thousands of such men everywhere are eagerly waiting to enlist. Literally millions of likely recruits are in Western Europe today—men who have risked death to escape from Soviet Russia and iron-curtain countries.

With our secret army, I propose that we invade every non-Communist nation, exactly as the Communists have invaded each such nation, but for democratic purposes, and to wipe out the sworn and trained Communist forces plotting to destroy them.

INVADE WITH TRUTH

More important, I propose the invasion of the Soviet satellite nations and of Soviet Russia itself.

It must be made clear that our secret army will not attempt to murder Communists nor to conquer Soviet Russia by force of arms. That is not the way of the kind of warfare I propose.

Instead, we should invade the iron-curtain countries armed only with the democratic truth. The weapons of the Democratic International should be words, ideas, information, not guns. Our invasion should be like the one accomplished by our OSS in World War II, under the noses of the German Army and the Gestapo, but on a much larger scale.

We should invade stealthily with the prospective leaders, organizers, and recruiters of underground armies. We should provide centers to which freedom-loving men may rally, to be trained and led in the ways of revolution against tyranny, protected from seizure and sudden death. We should invade with printing presses, books, pamphlets, radio transmitters. We should bring expert knowledge for forging identity papers and travel passes. We should set up underground newspapers and radio stations, secret meeting places, and escape routes.

We need to furnish the leadership, funds, and materials that underground armies require to grow. We need to build the revolutionary forces now existing within the iron curtain to the point at which the oppressed millions can overthrow their hated masters.

Do you think this plan for a democratic international is a wild and impossible scheme? You may at first, but only because democratic peoples have never conceived of waging ideological war on an all-out basis.

This much is certain. The scheme will work. It has made possible the victories of the Kremlin in nation after nation. It has been used first by the Comintern, and now the Cominform, with crushing effect, for over 30 years. Used by our enemies, it will soon drive us into a corner where we can fight our way out only by guns and bombs.

It will work better and faster for us than it ever did for the Communists, and here is why:

1. Consider the iron curtain. By erecting that invisible wall, the Soviet rulers have themselves told us they cannot withstand such an invasion. The measures they have taken to keep the curtain leak-proof are so fantastically extreme as to indicate more than a mere uneasiness; they reveal an abysmal fear—fear that their people will learn the truth about life outside the iron curtain. The democratic international will rip the iron curtain, expose their lives, give their people the means to unseat their oppressors.

KEEP RESISTANCE FORCES ALIVE

2. Consider the power of our ideological weapons. Even today, after the Soviet masters have killed and jailed millions of people, revolutionary forces still exist; not merely in the satellite countries, but in the heart of Russia itself. Every few weeks, we read of new purges, designed to wipe out every last vestige of resistance; but resistance lives on, fed by man's undying hope of freedom. And our propaganda weapons will feed this resistance until it sweeps all before it.

3. Consider our manpower and resources. Soviet Russia's biggest mistake in World War II was to send her armies past her borders, for hundreds of thousands, seeing the free world for the first time, never came back. But we can send out a countless army, backed by tremendous resources, sure that after seeing what is within the iron curtain, our men will return stronger democrats than before.

Further, the Comintern started with comparatively small groups in other nations. Today within the iron curtain, there are not merely a large number of armed partisan groups, fighting the Reds from hideaways, and large underground resistance groups; but there are literally millions of our friends, living in hope that we have not finally deserted them. They wait only word from us that the battle can begin.

4. Consider why we have been losing the ideological war thus far. One reason is that we have left it to our Government to act, and its power to carry on such warfare is severely limited. An official attempt to create revolution in another country would provoke a shooting war before we are ready for it. That is why our Voice of America radio broadcast, our biggest ideological weapon, is hamstrung in any attempt to attack the Soviet Government directly.

WE ARE ON THE DEFENSIVE

But there is a bigger reason. It is because we are constantly on the defensive, and so suffer defeat after defeat. Communist ideological strength is that it is anti; we are pro. We are for the government of Italy; hungry and discontented Italians are easily moved to be against. And in a world emptied of wealth by two world wars, the Communist secret armies thus find millions of followers:

But what happens at the point the Reds have gained control, as, for example, in Czechoslovakia? There, the Communists are the pro forces, defending the Communist Government. And we should become anti. We should move over to the offensive, using the powerful propaganda weapons they have laid down. But have we? You know we have not. Instead, we have ceased activity within conquered Czechoslovakia, abandoning to Communist slavery millions of one-time friends and potential allies.

That is the basic situation the Democratic International will quickly cure. Our Government is helpless when facing a Communist seizure of power. Its only choice is whether to recognize or not to recognize the new Communist Government; but no more than that, short of war. Only we, the people, have the power to go over to the offensive, to wage all-out propaganda warfare; to upset the Communist governments by fomenting revolution.

IT WILL COST US CASUALTIES

We must think of the cost of such invasion and propaganda warfare.

Our invading army will not escape without casualties. Many brave men will be caught and killed. Soviet officials and secret police will be on the alert. But each such death will make new recruits; violence nurtures resistance when men have the organization and weapons for resistance. Purges in Communist countries will trap the innocent with the guilty, enemy with friend, serving again to divide our enemies and provide us new recruits.

Finally and inevitably, the work of the Democratic International will gather power and speed. The grip of the Soviet dictators on their people will loosen. Then we shall unleash the people against them. And democratic leaders, already chosen in the counsels of the underground, will be ready to form new governments.

An ugly picture? Think of Hiroshima. The cost in lives? Measure it against those lost in a shooting war. The cost in dollars? Measure it against even this year's bill for armaments. The alternatives we have are unimaginably more costly.

I do not wish to minimize the difficulty of what is ahead. The structure of democratic governments doesn't lend itself readily to the establishment of a democratic international; whereas the dictatorship in Soviet Russia is peculiarly adaptable to such revolutionary activity. Let us consider that point:

The Communist Party is above and superior to Communist governments. Stalin's great power arises from the fact that he is boss of the Politburo, the governing body of the Communist Party. Hence, he is dictator not only of Soviet Russia but of all Communist governments and all Communists everywhere. So, when the Communists conquer a country, he can say it is not conquest by Soviet Russia but by the Communist Party—that Soviet Russia is not an aggressor.

Such a dictator can order the establishment of a Communist international which openly declares it will work to overthrow other nations. He can finance it secretly out of public funds, place high Soviet officials at the helm, and have it go into action overnight.

F. D. R. PROTESTED TO SOVIETS

That is exactly what Lenin did. Then, when other nations protested, the Soviet Government blandly replied that it had no connection with the Comintern and no power over its activities. President Roosevelt protested as late as 1935, after granting recognition to the Soviet Union, that Russia had broken its promise not to permit within its borders any organization "which has as its aim the overthrow * * * of the United States." Stalin rejected the protest and we withdrew it.

We have no such easy way of creating a democratic international. We have no dictator or international Democratic Party—similar to the world-wide Communist Party—to organize, finance, and operate the democratic international. We cannot even ask our Government to step in and help us. We must act on our own. But surely we shall have the inventiveness, the skill and ingenuity, the courage and determination to overcome our own handicaps—to preserve our lives, and our way of living.

When we create our democratic international, what can the Soviets do about it? Retaliation will do them no good; for at last they will be on the defensive. Actually, they will merely bluster and threaten, and our Government will coldly brush them off.

REDS WILL DENOUNCE PLAN

Next, they will use every means they can to keep Democrats everywhere from supporting the movement. Picket lines will appear; petitions will reach the President and Congress; fellow travelers will denounce the democratic international on the radio, in books and periodicals, and from platforms and street corners. Proponents of the plan will be smeared. Strikes will threaten contributing industries. Violence, bloodshed, riots if possible—and every weapon, legal or illegal, they have within reach—will be turned upon us in a panicky intensification of their propaganda warfare.

But that will be all. And it will be mostly just talk. But in talk lies our greatest danger; talk that can stall the democratic international under the weight of words; talk of peace—that we can make peace with conspirators intent on destroying us, and so need not go on the offensive. Talk to keep us so hopelessly confused that we will keep arguing until the time even for winning a shooting war will have passed.

Through it all, we must keep on remembering—that there can be no permanent peace except between peoples who control their governments; no peace at all until the dictators shall have been wiped from the face of the earth.

Walter Geist a Defender of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States should be made aware that we have lost a great and typical American. On January 29, last, Walter Geist, president of Allis-Chalmers Co. of Milwaukee, passed away.

During the critical days of the last war when our enemies began to know the power of American industry, it was the power of men like Geist and the workers under his direction that they were feeling. In the present emergency, Walter Geist was preparing again to bring to bear the great productive power of his organization in defense of his country. The strain of this may well have contributed to his death.

We Americans are too prone to forget the importance of the factor of American industrial power that obtained victory in the last two wars and is today giving Soviet Russia pause against her present inclination to attack us in all-out war.

If the Kremlin could get rid of the Walter Geists of America, it could effectively disarm us and expose our population to the overwhelming mass of manpower under the control of Soviet Russia.

Walter Geist not only turned his plant over to the defense of his country during war, but when peace was in prospect, devoted himself to great civic enterprises and to scientific efforts in the relief of human suffering.

An example of his concern for the welfare of his fellowmen was his direction of his firm's assistance in the development of the mechanical kidney; it has already saved the lives of many patients in danger of death because of kidney diseases. Another was the production of the high power betatron in the treatment of cancer; and more recently the research efforts of his firm to assist the scientitsts of Marquette University in the development of a substitute for blood plasma from okra, an extremely important advance in medicine.

As a leader of free enterprise, Walter Geist demonstrated how a great American industrial plant can produce the turbines to power our fighting ships at sea in the defense of our country against attack from a foreign enemy, or can help to produce the mechanism to combat the attack against disease and illness in a mission of mercy.

Milwaukee, Wis., and the Nation will miss Walter Geist, and I know the Congress will want to extend its sympathy to his widow and children, to his employees and to his associates in his company.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the privilege of submitting herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from my good friend, Raymond D. Moon, Bay County veterans' service officer, Panama City, Fla. This well-written letter speaks eloquently for the masses of the people. I hear from many persons daily about the necessity for a more adequate price-control structure. Notwithstanding the

date of January 11 on this letter, I know that Mr. Moon and the majority of others feel that much more must be done; in fact many persons have stated to me that they consider that the present price freeze is a rank insult to the public for it freezes profiteering and penalizes people who have honestly tried to hold down prices. I believe it is now generally agreed that should prices be rolled all the way back to the beginning of the Korean War some people would be penalized but the present freeze of inflation hurts everyone.

BAY COUNTY VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE,
Panama City, Fla., January 11, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT L. SIKES,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: In my daily work here in the office, I have the privilege of meeting people from all walks of life. The rich and poor, strong and weak, afflicted and disabled, all pass through the office sooner or later; that is, if they are veterans or dependents of deceased veterans.

In handling the work I am able to sense the pulse of public opinion and feel the needs of the different categories of the human element. It is interesting to note these things when one is a public servant, and it affords me a great deal of pleasure to be able to sense other persons' trials and troubles and to be able to share their burden.

What I am coming to is this: the rising, spiraling cost of living is hurting to the bone. The families in the low-income brackets are not able to have the essential bare necessities at the present time. To make it worse, prices are still leaping higher and higher.

In speaking of these conditions, prices here in Panama City have taken a terrible beating since the new Congress has convened, and the talk has spread about freezing prices. Within the last 2 weeks mark-ups on staple groceries have been from 5 percent to as much as 40 percent. Milk (dairy), bread, haircuts, and laundry and dry cleaning have skyrocketed from 4 percent to 33⅓ percent. These are actual facts, and it seems to be only the beginning, as there are no signs of prices reaching a static stage.

For the sake of our economy and also national security I feel that it is time for positive action to be taken to control prices. Talk only has a tendency to spur prices higher and make things worse. If positive action is not taken soon, we may have serious internal problems which will be difficult to cope with.

Thanking you for your consideration in this matter and with best regards, I am

Yours truly,

RAYMOND D. MOON.

Wanted: A Military Policy for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, Human Events on February 17, 1951, carried a very remarkable article written by Edna Lonigan entitled "Wanted: A Military Policy for Survival." I am particularly struck by the suggestion that the Voice of America be taken out of the State Department and turned over to the military which did such a good job of psychological warfare in Japan during the last war. It suggests that we are in a new kind of modern warfare and that we ought not to be bound down by the classical pattern.

WANTED: A MILITARY POLICY FOR SURVIVAL

(By Edna Lonigan)

Gradually the debate on foreign policy, opened by Hoover and pressed by TAFT, is working round to the primary issue—military policy. Neither foreign policy nor domestic policy can be set until we have a military policy. But first we must face the political question: Who is to make our military policy?

Because of the power of words, we assume the State Department makes foreign policy and Defense works out military strategy. This assumption is a hold-over from the days when we had a constitutional Executive, when Government agencies possessed clear-cut functions resting on statutory powers and duties, and respected the appropriate limitations.

We do not live under that form of government any more. We live under a pyramidal type of Executive, in which all money is paid to the President under loose general grants of power, and real policy making is determined amid a continual struggle within "the palace." In that struggle the State Department coterie now rules supreme. Professional military men or old-fashioned executive officers are no match for them.

The sound American doctrine that the political should take precedence over the military wherever possible has been perverted by State into a new and dangerous doctrine—that the political planners should make the decisions on which our survival as a nation rests. State, arrogating to itself sole responsibility for the strategy by which we are to counter Soviet aggression, has left to the military only technical military questions such as training or weapons—and the rescue of our men after they are committed.

The dividing line between political and military judgment does not run—as it should—between State and Defense, but between State and the top Defense officials on one side and the muzzled professional fighting men on the other. TAFT was profoundly right when he said he did not trust the plans of our top military men, but exempted the generals and admirals in the field from this criticism. He put his finger on the most important issue in our struggle for survival as a nation.

II

Arms and armies are not defense. A nation can spend billions, keep millions of men under arms, build atom-bomb plants and Maginot Lines; but if it follows bad strategical concepts, it will be defeated. Witness France in 1940. In fact, a certain elephantiasis in the Armed Forces, a rush for more men and spending, spells military sickness, not health.

Congressman WALTER JUDD tried, without success, to get to the root of the matter. When representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to testify for foreign aid, JUDD put the questions: Are you giving us what in your judgment is the best military plan for our defense? Or are you giving us merely the best military means to implement the plan the State Department has already decided upon? The Defense officials only hedged.

A nation cannot rely for its survival exclusively on political means. The military cannot start thinking on D-day. Only when Defense officials can plan their strategy wholly apart from our political hopes can they be ready to serve us if those hopes fail. Far from being subordinate to political policy, defense is the last line that protects us against all miscalculations in foreign policy.

The State Department's grand strategy rests ostensibly on the out-worn nineteenth-century doctrine that communism is a popular uprising, due to poverty among the masses. Therefore, they argued, the Soviet Union could be outgeneraled by our spending money to raise the standard of living in neighboring countries. But Communist revolution in the twentieth century arises out of a military coup d'etat, by a small band of conspirators directed by a foreign power.

The State Department—to put the best possible face on it—trusted for our survival to the thinking of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, while the Soviet strategy was by Clausewitz out of Genghis Khan.

The idea of opposing Communist strength by welfare work might have been debatable if it had been coupled with a strong defense program, as at first proposed. Congressmen JUDD, JACKSON of California, and others fought hard for such a military hedge. But the State Department took the position that spending was defense, that no military strategy was required in Europe or Asia. According to Paul Hoffman's testimony at ECA hearings, the administration promised that military rearmament would not be allowed to interfere with ECA.

We still have no military strategy to outwit Soviet military planners. In a global war, as in Korea, our Armed Forces will have to fight on Stalin's terms—in the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with only the shaky timbers of UN for diplomatic support.

III

How is it possible that our Defense officials have fallen into such a trap? The reason is the total change in the character of our foreign-policy-making agencies in the last 10 years. The dignified and comparatively effective State Department of 1939 has disappeared. All during the New Deal, Hull kept his Department rigorously within the constitutional framework of a limited, nonaggressive executive agency, spending money only as directed by statutory law. But by 1940 Hopkins, Wallace, and Morgenthau were moving over into making political and military strategy for World War II. They set up emergency agencies, like FEA, modeled on AAA and WPA. After VJ-day the personnel of these agencies was incorporated into State. Grew and other "old hands" were let out.

It is worth noting that this change from our historic methods of foreign-policy making coincided closely with the growth of Communist influence on our foreign and military policy.

Truman's State Department is a combative, aggressive agency like AAA and WPA. It builds its own political following and propaganda arm, by skillful use of large funds, as AAA and WPA built theirs. It is ruthless in its empire-building at the expense of other Federal departments. Its budget has mushroomed, its staff has been multiplied many times, at the expense of qualified, experienced career men. Control of free funds gives it the necessary means for politicking and propaganda against its rivals in the administration. It has carried on unremitting attack against everyone in the administration or outside who has dared to oppose its plans.

State hypnotized the military who stayed too long in Washington by the argument that the political planners should do their thinking for them. Even General Bradley was won over. It sent to "Siberia" the nonpolitical fighting men who tried to warn the country of its danger. Finally, intoxicated with success, the State Department cabal pushed even to the top places in our Defense Establishment men and women who would go along with its policies.

In theory, of course, the President makes these decisions, but as the executive establishment grows larger and larger, it becomes increasingly true, as Mosca pointed out,

that most of the decisions are made by the secondary ruling class, those officials who best understand the art of manipulating power. Today there is no question but that the State Department combine (including its satellite agencies like ECA) is the strongest influence in the palace guard. Acheson has taken the place in Truman's entourage occupied by Harry Hopkins in Roosevelt's day.

IV

How long can Congress trust our survival as a nation to the military planning of this global colossus? The cure is simple, if Congress has the will to take hold. It must divorce the State Department from all economic and spending programs, which are the sources of its power to compel other agencies in the administration to do its will. Only thus can our defense planning be divorced from State's ideological windmills.

Congress can then call in our best admirals and generals, and tell them to make a strategy for our security divorced from all political and ideological thinking. If they cannot do it, we can find men who will. Let us find the real fighting men who can decide, with no hedging and no politics, what is the line which can be held in Asia, in Europe, in Africa? Whom can we trust militarily as allies? What is the precise military significance of UN? Let us have done with talk of what we can do in 1952. What of today?

When they have cleaned house in Defense, Congress can turn ECA over to the Defense Department. All of ECA which is not defense can be liquidated. The rest can be managed without that colossal waste of time and manpower which Washington calls interdepartmental cooperation. The Armed Forces did a brilliant job of economic reconstruction in Korea through GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) because they were not concerned with undermining Syngman Rhee. They did equally well in Europe. In the little time that is left, Defense must fit ECA to a single purpose—our survival.

Straight loans can be turned over to the International Bank or Export-Import Bank. The Voice of America can be dismantled, and replaced by a program of psychological warfare, like that suggested by Gen. Bonner Fellers, wholly under control of the Armed Forces.

Without its spending funds, State will have no power to punish Members of Congress, members of the press or others who criticize its policies. Congress can then dismantle the empire which the Hopkins-Wallace-Frankfurter groups have built up behind the facade of the dignified old State Department, without fear of attack from mass organizations or the mocking-bird columnists who are part of State's propaganda machine.

When the present State Department has been stripped down to the Foreign Service and a desk for the Secretary, it will be possible for the President to induce a man of courage and intelligence to take over as Secretary of State, and rebuild an American foreign policy with a single aim—the survival of our country.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, this week Republicans throughout America pay homage to the founder of their party and the greatest symbol of liberty who ever lived, Abraham Lincoln. Regardless of party, all Americans honor the day of his birth. His life, his works, and his teachings carry a lesson for all of us that can be studied with profit today.

The reverence with which many of us regard Lincoln has been brought home to me here in Washington as I take visitors from time to time to see the Lincoln Memorial. Those of you who have seen it know how serene yet strong is the expression on the excellent likeness of Lincoln, sitting in his chair in the main hall of the memorial. On either side is inscribed quotations from his Gettysburg Address and the second inaugural. Most people are profoundly moved.

Lincoln's principles are the basic American ideals of honesty, integrity, hard work, plain living, good government, and freedom. His career as a pioneer boy, the rail splitter, country storekeeper, small-town lawyer, legislator, and President is the classic example of the opportunity our system of government affords every citizen—the opportunity to develop to the fullest extent his individual capabilities for the benefit not only of himself but of the entire community. That is the very basis of the American ideal—that freedom of each man to better himself through his own initiative and with the resources God gave him results in progress for everyone. It is impossible to define liberty or freedom—to do so limits them and they are limitless concepts—but there is no better way to describe it than this.

FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

Lincoln is known as the Great Emancipator, but his interest in freedom extended far beyond the problem of the American slaves. His every action was pointed toward the preservation and extension of the freedoms guaranteed in our Constitution, freedoms which he truly believed were the inalienable birthright of every man. Many of his words are applicable to problems we face today, as when he said:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can do individually as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

There is the perfect answer to the do-gooders, the Government economic planners, who are today endeavoring to extend the power of the Federal Government over the lives of individuals under the guise of social reform, with the excuse of emergency.

At another time, Lincoln said:

We hold the true republican position. In leaving the people's business in their hands, we cannot be wrong.

And again:

If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions.

FAITH IN THE PEOPLE

Lincoln's abiding faith in the American people and in our system included a true understanding of the division of power, the checks and balances of the Republic, which were written into the Constitution. How much more smoothly would our Government operate, and how much more wisely, if the present occupant of the White House had Lincoln's clear understanding of his duties and Lincoln's faith in the people, as shown in these remarks:

In a certain sense, and to a certain extent the President is the representative of the people. He is elected by the people, as well as the Congress is, but can he, in the nature of things, know the wants of the people as well as 300 other men, coming from all the various localities of the Nation? If so, where is the propriety of having a Congress?

By the Constitution, the Executive may recommend measures which he thinks proper, and he may veto those he thinks improper, and it is supposed that he may add to these certain indirect influences to affect the action of Congress. My political education strongly inclines me against a very free use of any of these means by the Executive to control the legislation of the country. As a rule, I think it better that Congress should originate as well as perfect its measures without external bias.

An excerpt from a letter Lincoln wrote in 1848 is especially applicable to current debate in the United States. To W. H. Herndon, he wrote:

The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

A LESSON FOR TODAY

One could continue at great length reciting the deeds and words of this great American. This much, it seems to me, is certain: if we are going to win through the present period of crisis, to settle peacefully if possible but otherwise if necessary the international difficulties of the present day, if we are to straighten out our fiscal affairs, and if we are to leave for future generations the heritage of freedom which was ours, we must turn our hearts and minds once more to the true Americanism exemplified by Abraham Lincoln. As he stated it:

What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army and Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors.

Here in Washington we had our celebration of Lincoln's Birthday this week, a "kick-off" dinner for others throughout the Nation. Nearly 12,000 people thronged the Uline Arena here for the program and box supper. At least a dozen Lincoln Day dinners are scheduled in Montana, and hundreds of others throughout the Nation. All true Americans, Republicans or Democrats, can

subscribe to Lincoln's philosophy. All of us can profit from refreshing our memories with his teachings.

I am proud to be a Member of the House of Representatives in which Lincoln was for several years an able and aggressive leader.

Draft of Farm Labor Threatens Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within a single decade, and the third time within a generation, America is again at war. This time we are less prepared, and confusion in executive agencies is greater than ever before.

Most of us viewed with deep misgiving administration weakness and delay with respect to economic controls, designed to halt inflation.

We have seen, with a feeling akin to despair, the final act of desperation, when temporary and unplanned wage and price freezes were imposed, after it became apparent that inflation was out of hand, after scores of billions had been added to war costs, and prices had far outrun average incomes.

That feeling was enhanced by submission of a Federal budget for 1952, proposing Federal expenditures on partisan-politically-inspired projects, which would waste the substance of the people, while contributing nothing to the security of the Nation.

The fact that these socialistic spending proposals, impudently were presented in the guise of measures to support the war effort, added still further to the general disquiet.

Industry is the source of our greatest strength from both economic and military standpoints. Yet industry was told to convert at once for large-scale war production, in the absence of definite plans and blueprints, on which alone production can be based.

At the same time the productiveness of industy, the incentives for efficient and economical production, were restricted by a mistaken tax policy, by a corporate tax law, politically conceived, and born of a desire to win votes, even though winning of a war might be jeopardized thereby. Congress did improve this situation, to some extent, by providing for war contract renegotiations.

But in every executive department of Government, confusion has persisted. Where planning was done, always it was piecemeal. No over-all plans for anything have appeared.

In the matter of military manpower, we have heard endless arguments as to which age groups should be drafted. For awhile we were told that the fate of the Nation hung on the necessity of drafting 18-year-olds. Then the argument swung away to the desirability of calling up older men, husbands, and 4-F's.

Throughout all this talk no consideration apparently was given, and none is being given today, to the really important questions with respect to military manpower. Perhaps the most important of all these is the question of food production.

It has been said that an army travels on its stomach. It can be said with equal truth that the American people, as a whole, will not be able to outproduce the Communist world and win the war that is now in its early stages, if they are asked to do so on empty stomachs.

Yet the present draft policy, which seems to be accepted without debate, is to draft all farm labor, except in extreme hardship or dependency cases.

Farm labor nowadays, as we all know, consists almost exclusively of farm owners—older men, who bore the brunt of farm production in World War II, and often in World War I—and their sons.

Scores of thousands of those sons are of draft age; but under the present policy, there will be no deferment for them, it would seem, unless they alone, in each instance, are responsible for operation of the farm.

Now Michigan is not only a great industrial State; it is a great farm State, as well. So in order to high light the situation with respect to food production and the drafting of farm labor, I shall give you some figures on conditions at home.

These figures comprise statistics gathered by the Michigan State College department of agricultural economics. As statistics, they deal with human beings percentagewise.

In 1945, the last year for which figures are available, the average Michigan farm employed about one and one-half persons; 1.55, to be exact.

On this 155 percent of a person the farm operator himself constituted 97 percent; unpaid family help, 48 percent; and hired help, 10 percent.

It is estimated that today less than 6.5 percent of the labor on Michigan farms is provided by regular hired help. Farmers just cannot compete with industry's more attractive wage scales.

About the only farmers' sons who remain on the farm nowadays are those who have studied scientific farming and who plan to make farm operation a career.

Small, 80-acre family farms, worked by one man, who labored from dawn until dark, furnished a large portion of the State's food supply during World War II. But those farms are not so common today as they were in 1940.

Mechanization has caused the small farms to be gobbled up into larger ones, so that machinery can be used more efficiently. Today the average Michigan farm consists of something over 105 acres.

In 1940, a total of 153,517 Michigan farms employed 261,331 men. In 1945, a total of 150,386 Michigan farms employed only 232,518. In 1940, the average Michigan farm had 1.7 employees; in 1945, it had 1.55 employees; and the downward trend has continued ever since.

From these figures it should be clear to everyone what a terrific, and possibly disastrous, effect on the farm labor supply, and hence on food production, the drafting of these young career farmers is bound to have.

But this is not all of the story. There is another factor of at least equal importance. This pertains to the age status of present farm owners and operators; the men who must take up the slack when their sons are drafted.

In 1945, slightly more than 16 percent of Michigan farm operators were 65 years old and older; 2 percent were between 55 and 64 years of age; and 47 percent were between 35 and 54. The average age in that year was 49.8. And since that time, of course, those who still survive are 5 years older.

When the young men are drafted, the load will fall back on these old-timers—men who worked day and night during World War II—men who now, on the average, are past the years when they could do two men's work, even in an emergency.

And this time, Michigan will not have more than 12,000 prisoners of war to ease the farm labor burden, as it had during World War II. Not if the debacle in Korea is any criterion of the future.

Because these conditions prevail, not only in Michigan, but in general throughout the country, it is pertinent to ask: Where does the farmer go from here?

Under the present farm labor draft policy, the pinch is expected in about 6 months. What will the farmers of Michigan do then? What will all American farmers do?

The answer to these questions is obvious. Farmers will cut down food production. They will have no choice, unless it be to change over to forms of farming which require less help. And this would result in an unbalanced food supply. Dairy herds, for example, would be abandoned for beef cattle, which take less time and return more profit.

Possibly Marlin R. Bigelow, manager of the Kalamazoo Milk Producers Cooperative, stated the situation best when he was quoted recently in the newspapers as saying that lack of farm labor probably will cut milk production in the cooperative's area as much as 30 percent in the next 6 to 12 months.

In the last few weeks, he said, two large dairy herds in the area have been sold off; and another one faces the same prospect when the only son in the family is taken by the Army.

Now the action of Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, in granting 30-day deferments to 30,000 college graduates a few days ago, may be all right, although on first thought it appears discriminatory against less fortunate boys. The idea, however, is to give them a chance for further deferments, in the cases of those who succeed in landing war-essential jobs.

The proposal to give President Truman powers to release 75,000 college students from military service, after their basic training, so they may continue their studies, may be all right, too. The idea is to maintain our system of higher education, and to keep the Nation

well supplied with technically trained younger men.

As I say, these things may be all right; but I am suspicious of them, if for no other reason than that they would be used as a means of vote-getting political favoritism. We have had too much of that kind of thing in the past.

But in the light of the administration attitude betrayed by these actions and proposals, there is one observation I must make.

Whereas the boys now in college, or who will graduate within the next few months, are potentially valuable to the country outside the Armed Services, the young men on the farms are now, at this moment, valuable in the nonmilitary service of food production.

Whereas the college boys and college graduates may obtain war essential jobs, the young men on the farms now, at this moment, have war essential jobs. Many thousands of them are in war essential food production jobs, from which they cannot be spared.

This Congress should make every effort to correct this latest and most dangerous blunder, of the confused Truman bureaucrats.

Let's Get Out of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am including a statement which I made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Tuesday, February 6, in support of my resolution to have the United States withdraw from the so-called United Nations.

The matter referred to follows:

Mr. RICHARDS (presiding). Mr. RANKIN, we will be glad to hear you on your resolution, House Joint Resolution 125.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, A REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I did not come here with any speech cut and dried, or any argument written out. I was notified that I would be heard for a few moments on my resolution to withdraw our country from the so-called United Nations, that Tower of Babel, that totem pole, which has been set up in our midst, and which is now laboring diligently, if not successfully, to destroy the Government of the United States, and to subordinate our people to the domination of foreign elements, many of whom do not have sense enough to run their own governments.

In my opinion, I speak the sentiments of a vast majority of the American people, as you will all find when you get back home. I would like to read the election results of a man running under the United Nations flag against a man with the United States flag, or even with a Confederate flag.

That so-called United Nations is Communist-controlled. It is a hotbed of communism and is literally swarming our country with Communist spies. To show you how far it is going in that direction, I want to call attention to some things it is doing to the United States of America.

I presume no man in Congress has fought communism harder than I have. I have taken all the punishment, all the lying attacks, all the abuse, that the Communists, their stooges, fellow travelers, and sympathizers could heap upon a man, and that at a time when we did not know whether Mr. Austin, of Vermont, was going east or coming west when he was in the Senate. I never heard a word from him about the danger of communism when I was leading the fight against communism, and exposing the activities of Communists in this country from William Z. Foster up and down.

The Senate of the United States had no right to commit the Government of the American people to the domination of foreign powers. If this country is saved, it seems to me that it will be by the Congress of the United States, and that means largely the House of Representatives.

Let me show you some things that have been done by this outfit. And we have not a representative up there, let me say to you gentlemen and ladies, we have not a representative from America up there that I ever heard of protesting when we were going through the tirades of the Communists, trying to enforce their policies upon the United States, some of which are now being imposed by this so-called United Nations.

In the first place, they assume to tell us when and where to go to war. Now, if you think that is popular, you go home and talk to the mothers and fathers and the wives or widows of those men who are dying in Korea. Congress has not declared war; its Members were not consulted. In fact, it was called a "police action." The United Nations declared it for the United States to fight. There is no telling where that outfit will want to send us to war next. We have already lost more men, killed and wounded, in this Korean "police action," as President Truman called it, than we did in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War, all combined.

I see now that certain interests want us to go to war in Iran to serve their selfish ends. I hope Congress will not sit idly by and let that happen.

You know we had the old League of Nations. One of the wisest things the Senate ever did was to refuse to enter the League of Nations, with its article 10.

I want to show you what it did. A certain big oil magnate gave the League a building in which to hold their meetings. Somebody said when he did so that he saturated the international mind with Standard Oil. A few years later those oil interests that owned the oil reserves down there attempted to find an outlet for Bolivia to get to the Pacific Ocean. You remember there were two small areas on the west coast of South America called Tacna and Arica, and they endeavored to take them for Bolivia, in order to give them pipeline outlets to the Pacific Ocean. But Chile, to which they belonged, would not give them up.

Then they turned and tried to drive down through Paraguay. They took the Bolivian Army and started to drive down through Paraguay to force an outlet to the Atlantic. To my surprise, and to the surprise of everyone else, Paraguay had developed one of the greatest generals in the world, a man named Estigarribia. He took his army and drove them out of Paraguay and back on to Bolivian soil. What did the League of Nations do? It branded Paraguay as the "aggressor."

Senator LONG, of Louisiana, took the floor and exposed that fraud so plainly and indisputably that the heads of the governments of South America called a meeting and stopped that war.

Now this United Nations has plunged us into another war, or "police action," worse than that was. And let me show you what it is attempting to do to you. Have you read where they had outlawed the alien land laws of the various States? Did you know that in many States of this Union it is unlawful for an alien to own land? California is one of them, Louisiana is one. I have been trying for years to get Mississippi to adopt the same law. The United Nations has outlawed the alien land laws in those States that have them.

What right have they to meddle in the internal affairs of the United States, or the internal affairs of an individual State?

Now they come along with their genocide law or "convention." If you commit physical or mental injury to a minority group, or a member of a minority group, then you are subject to be tried. Where? Why, before an international court, even in a foreign country.

In other words, it has taken precedence over all the courts of our land.

Now, if you call some fellow a dirty scoundrel, or a darned fool, you might be brought up and tried for genocide. You have injured that fellow mentally, evidently, because no man likes those ignominious terms when they are applied to him. You will have committed genocide, if he is of a different race or religion, or ethnic origin, whatever that may be. You are subject to be tried by an international court. Do you think the American people would approve of that, if they knew what was going on? Not on your life. That outfit is out to destroy the United States Government, and they have a gang of professors running around over this country advocating the abolition of the United States.

There is a professor in the University of Chicago who says in all his public speeches, "We must get rid of the United States."

Are we going to sit here and let them destroy the Government of the United States and subordinate us to the domination of foreign powers?

This genocide law was probably written by Malik, the Russian delegate. He has more influence up there than Mr. Austin has. About all Mr. Austin does, it seems, is to get in the movies and on the radio.

But behind the scene, the enemies of the United States wrote this genocide program. They would interfere in Alabama, Kansas, North Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas, New York, California, and every other State in this Union.

This is the beginning of the battle. We are going to get out of this thing and get back to the Government of the United States, or our country is going down. We might as well understand that now.

You take this war. Congress was not called on to vote on it, and probably would not be called on in case of war in Iran. I heard that argument awhile ago about the land-ownership proposition. Did you see where the Shah of Iran called his leaders in the other day and said he was going to sell his land to the little fellows who work it, and advised them to do this same thing? He said it would be cheaper than having a revolution. You know the big oil interests want us to go into Iran. You mark what I tell you, that is the next place. There are some oil interests down there, and the UN seems to follow the pipelines. Iraq is another one; our boys may be fighting a "police action" there before long.

Alger Hiss and his gang drew up the United Nations Charter at San Francisco. If any of you have any doubt about Alger Hiss' relations with Russia get the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities and read them.

Hiss and his crowd drew it up, and it subordinates the United States to the domination of foreign influences. They can come in and wipe out our immigration

laws, and that is the next drive, don't forget that, and flood this country with the riffraff of every other nation on earth.

I am telling you, this is the most dangerous thing that has ever been done to the American people.

We went through a war between the States, but we were all fighting for the same form of government. As I said on the floor of the House the other day, when you see a question arise that affects the safety of this Nation, the men who fly to its defense are the sons and grandsons and collateral relatives of the old Federal and Confederate soldiers who fought the War Between the States.

But here you have an alien element that is trying to destroy the sovereignty of the United States, as well as that of North Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Kansas, Ohio, New Jersey, Virginia, New York, and every other State in the Union.

Not only are they trying to destroy the sovereignty of the States, their rights to control their internal affairs; but they are trying to destroy the Government of the United States itself. You might as well get ready for it, the battle is now on. The sooner we withdraw from that monstrosity the better off we are going to be.

When General Patton was persecuted because he had shown himself to be the greatest general we had produced since the War Between the States, when that communistic influence was persecuting General Patton, I took his part on the floor of the House. After we got him back in action, and he had taken his Third Army and fought his way up to Berlin, he was ordered to move south and turn the victory over to Communist Russia.

We have just been through the most useless war in history. Our boys won the fight, but Russia got the proceeds of the victory. Our boys won the victory in the field, on the sea, and in the air, and then the same crowd of wild-eyed internationalists that now seem to have control turned the victory over to Russia, the worst enemy civilization ever knew.

General Patton came to see me, and said he wanted to thank me for defending him as he expressed it, "When I was on the battle front and could not defend myself."

I said, "Why General, you do not owe me anything compared to what we owed you." I told him he was the greatest general this country has produced since the War Between the States.

He said, "I want to ask you one question: What do you think of this United Nations?" I said, "General, don't you forget that Towers of Babel have been collapsing in confusion by the tongues ever since the days of Genesis. This will not be an exception."

He said, "I want to remember that if I don't remember another thing you have said."

I see somebody in yesterday's RECORD referred to the United Nations as a "totem pole" that some of the benighted people of the world worship and expect to get directions from.

We don't expect to get any blessings from it. We have already heard its voice, and our boys are dying in Korea as a result.

The quicker we get out of it, the longer America is going to survive. If we let them dominate this country, that freedom, that independence, that liberty, even that government, even those State governments our forebears built will disappear.

Mr. RICHARDS (presiding). You have 1 minute.

Mr. RANKIN. If there are any questions I shall be glad to answer them.

I did not want to come in here and take your time this morning without answering any questions you desire to ask.

Mr. RICHARDS (presiding). We wanted you to come.

Mr. RANKIN. This battle is going on. We are in more danger at home today than we have ever been before. Do not forget that the Reds have their agents permeating this Government. They are in key positions. I will call the names of some of them on the floor of the House. They are out to undermine and destroy everything for which our people have fought for the last 200 years.

God being my helper, I will never quit this fight until we get rid of that so-called United Nations, that supergovernment that, as I said, is swarming this country with spies and trying to undermine and destroy this Government, as well as every State government, and to subordinate our people to the domination of foreign elements who have proved incapable of governing themselves.

God save America!

The resolution referred to follows:

"House Joint Resolution 125

"Joint resolution terminating United States participation in the activities of the United Nations

"*Resolved, etc.*, That (1) membership of the United States in the United Nations shall be held and considered to be terminated, (2) no person may represent the United States on or in any of the organs, agencies, or activities of the United Nations, and (3) no funds appropriated by any law of the United States may be used to share in the expenses of, or otherwise to support, the United Nations or any of its organs, agencies, or activities.

"SEC. 2. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed: (1) The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (Public Law 264, 79th Cong.), and (2) all other laws or parts thereof to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect on the day after the date of its enactment."

Slaves of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, disregarding the lessons of history which teach us that war is destructive and ruinous, General Marshall and Anna Rosenberg, willing tools of those financially powerful and politically ambitious interests which got us into World War I and World War II, now would rob the cradle and cheat the grave by forcing every physically and mentally fit American young man, as he reaches the age of 18, to become subject to, and the slave of, a military machine for some 7 years.

The foregoing are harsh words, but they are justified by the present program of Mr. Truman, his British-loving, Communist-serving State Department, the internationalists, and one-worlders.

Without in any way questioning the sincerity or the loyalty of those who are back of the present program of aid to all the world, of involving us in an all-out war in Asia and in Europe, it may truthfully be said that, if Stalin seeks the destruction of our Republic, he could devise no better program than that formulated with the assistance of Alger Hiss, followed by Acheson and Mr. Truman—a policy of spending us into bankruptcy, stripping us of our natural resources, and, finally, conscripting our youth. That program, through attrition and exhaustion, will make this Nation as helpless as though it had been overrun by victorious armies.

We know that every military leader who has conscripted all able civilians into the armed services has, when confronted in battle by freemen, in the end been defeated.

The administration just a few days ago, through General Marshall, who insisted that he did not know where he was when the Japs descended on Pearl Harbor, and Anna Rosenberg, born in Hungary and now attempting to foist the Old World military despotism upon this country, announced its program for the future of young Americans.

Marshall and Rosenberg demand that the Congress conscript all young men, as they reach the age of 18, for 27 months' service with the Armed Forces. They further propose, following that service—and do not forget, once inducted for 27 months, the Congress might lengthen that service for another indefinite period, as it has in the past—to keep the young men in the service for an additional 5 years.

Their proposal is that, after the 27 months' service, these young men are to be assigned to fully organized drilling units, subject to combat duty when called by their Government. After the active combat service has expired, these young men would be subject to the orders of those at the head of the war machine. They might be ordered to drill part or all of the time. They might be required to attend the colleges and universities, study the courses designated by the military.

Think of it—7 years and 3 months taken out of the life of every young man physically and mentally fit—devoted to the service, not of his country, but to the service of any one of the 12 Atlantic Pact nations.

Is this a nation of free people? Are we to have a military dictator? Are our citizens compelled, as are the Russians, as were those under Hitler, Mussolini, to serve in the armed services at the will of some military man?

This administration now proposes to send 40 divisions—80,000 men—to Europe, to be followed shortly by an army of 200,000. Unless all signs fail, if the one-worlders and the Trumanites are permitted to have their way, this war—the end of which no one can see—may call for twelve, as did the last war—or perhaps fifteen—million men in Europe.

Is this war being staged so that Truman, the New Dealers, the one-worlders, the internationalists, can control our people for the next and succeeding generations? If that is not the purpose, will someone tell us the real purpose?

Do not answer that the purpose is to contain communism. That just does not go down, for the present and the preceding administrations have harbored and encouraged Communists right here in Washington and in China.

Do not answer that it is to carry the four freedoms throughout the world,

for the recent railroad strike, the current proposed tax bill and price-control with its regimentation, conscription for wars on foreign soil, teach us that we are losing our freedom here at home.

And do not suggest that all war will be ended by fighting another one.

The need of this country is for a Congress and a President who will think of the Republic, its people, its future; make us strong here at home.

Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the 1951 revised constitution and bylaws of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc. This organization is a patriotic American war veterans' organization, nonprofit and nonpolitical. It has advocated a policy against all Communist, Fascist, subversive, totalitarian, and un-American groups and philosophies. It has been recognized under the laws of various State legislatures; namely, New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and is incorporated under eight different States; namely, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Rhode Island. It has established local organizations from one end of the country to the other and has been most active in aiding and assisting veterans not only of Italian-American extraction but all veterans of all wars, their families and dependents. I for one am proud of the accomplishments of the Italian-American World War veterans, and I notice that year after year their numbers continue to increase due to the outstanding contribution that they are making in local and national affairs.

NATIONAL DEPARTMENT,
ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF UNITED STATES, INC,
Syracuse, N. Y., January 1, 1951.

Subject: National constitution and bylaws.
To: National, State, and local posts, departments, officers, and members.

SHORT TITLE

NATIONAL CONSTITUTION

Article I. Name.
Article II. Purpose.
Article III. Membership.
Article IV. General powers.
Article V. Assets of existing organizations.
Article VI. Nonpolitical.
Article VII. Not to engage in business.
Article VIII. State agents.
Article IX. Badges, emblems, and insignia.
Article X. Auxiliaries.
Article XI. Amendments.

NATIONAL BYLAWS

Article I. Organization.
Article II. Chapters.
Article III. Suspension and revocation of charters.
Article IV. Local posts.
Article V. State Departments.
Article VI. National convention.
Article VII. National executive committee.
Article VIII. National officers.
Article IX. Finances.
Article X. Life membership.
Article XI. Discipline of posts and post members.
Article XII. Field daisy.
Article XIII. Politics.
Article XIV. Amendments.

NATIONAL ONSTITUTION

PREAMBLE

For God and Nation, and for our Commonwealth, the former members of the Armed Forces of the United States, having aided in maintaining the honor, integrity, and supremacy of our country, holding in remembrance the sacrifices in common made and drawn together by strong bonds of respect and mutual suffering, solemnly and firmly associate ourselves together in creating the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., the principles and purposes of which shall be allegiance to the United States of America and fidelity to its constitution and laws. To hold aloft the torch of true patriotism; to strive for a better understanding between nations, that peace and good will may prevail; to cherish and preserve the memories of our military and naval associations; and to aid and assist veterans, their widows, and orphans.

Article I. Name

The name of this organization shall be Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

Article II. Purpose

The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(a) To aid and assist veterans and their families;

(b) To assist public and private agencies and institutions endeavoring to promote the public welfare;

(c) To foster, encourage, and promote social, civic, historical, athletic, patriotic, musical, and scientific activities and affairs;

(d) To uphold and maintain the honor and integrity of the United States and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies;

(e) To uphold and maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States and fidelity to the Constitution;

(f) To promote patriotism, advance the civic welfare, encourage benevolence, stimulate charity, champion the cause of education, and inspire friendship;

(g) To stimulate a feeling of mutual devotion, helpfulness, and comradeship among all veterans and their dependents, widows, and orphans; and

(h) To encourage and develop in all people a spirit of good will, fellowship, and understanding, as a guard against future wars and chaos.

Article III. Membership

SECTION 1. Any person who believes in the principles enunciated in the preamble to this constitution, and who is an American citizen, who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for, or was on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Air Force of the United States, in any war, campaign, or expedition recognized by the Congress, shall be eligible for membership in the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.: *Provided, however,* That no person the service of whom with the Armed Forces has terminated shall be eligible for membership unless such termination was honorable discharge or honorable separation: *And provided further,* That said service as a regularly enlisted, drafted, or inducted, or commissioned was accepted for and assigned during the period between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, or between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, all dates inclusive; and during any period in furtherance of any legal mandate of the United Nations. (This includes veterans of Korean War.)

SEC. 2. No person may be a member at any one time of more than one post.

SEC. 3. No person shall be entitled to membership who, being in such service during either of said period, refused on conscientious, political, or other grounds to subject himself to military discipline or unqualified service.

SEC. 4. No person who has been expelled by a post, shall be admitted to membership in another post, without the consent of the expelling post, except that where such consent has been asked for and denied by such post, he may then appeal to the department executive committee of the expelling post for permission to be admitted to membership in another post, and shall be ineligible for membership until such permission is granted.

SEC. 5. Any person who has been of service to this organization and has cooperated with it to help to further its high ideals, either through sacrifice or the rendition of material assistance, whether he be of Italian birth or extraction or not, may be elected to honorary membership, it being understood, however, that such membership shall give such person no voice in the affairs of the organization and such person shall not be liable for nor have to pay any dues. The honorary membership not to exceed one member per year in each post, State Department, and national department. All applications for honorary membership shall be forwarded by the sponsoring post, State department, or national department to the national executive committee for final approval.

SEC. 6. There shall be no form or class of membership except as specified in the constitution.

SEC. 7. No person shall be permitted to hold more than one membership in this organization.

SEC. 8. No member upon resigning his membership from any post shall be privileged to receive a remittance of any membership dues theretofore paid.

SEC. 9. No member may solicit funds or offer for sale any form or kind of merchandise as a veteran in the name of the organization except with approval of the post of the particular town in which he is operating.

SEC. 10. Transfers: A member of one post may secure a transfer of his membership to another post with the approval of the receiving post, whereupon the national organization shall notify all posts concerned.

SEC. 11. There shall be no transfer of dues, credit or voting strength to members of posts where members transfer from one post to another until the first of the next fiscal year.

Article IV. General powers

The corporation shall have perpetual succession and power—

(a) To sue and be sued;

(b) To receive, hold, lease, own, use, improve, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary for its corporate purposes;

(c) To accept gifts, legacies, and devises which will further its corporate purposes;

(d) To adopt and alter a corporate seal;

(e) To adopt and alter a constitution and bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State;

(f) To establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business;

(g) To establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate State or Territorial organizations and local chapters or posts;

(h) To promote the formation of ladies' auxiliaries to local chapter or post organizations existing within the jurisdiction of

the corporation, composed of mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces of veterans who are members of, or are eligible for membership in, the corporation, or mothers, widows, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces of deceased veterans who, if living, would be eligible for membership in the corporation;

(i) To publish a magazine or other publication;

(j) To adopt emblems and badges;

(k) To charge and collect membership dues; and

(l) To do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry into effect the objects and purposes of the corporations.

Article V. Assets of existing organization

The corporation may acquire any or all of the assets of the existing organization known as Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all its liabilities.

Article VI. Nonpolitical

The corporation shall be nonpolitical and, as an organization shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office.

Article VII. Not to engage in business

The corporation shall have no power to issue capital stock or engage in business for pecuniary profit or gain.

Article VIII. State agents

As a condition precedent in the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., shall file in the office of the Secretary of State of each State the name and post-office address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom legal process or demands against the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., may be served.

Article IX. Badges, emblems, and insignia

Exclusive right to name, corporate seal, emblems, and insignia. The corporation and its State and Territorial organizations and local chapters or posts shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use in carrying out its purposes the name of Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and the sole and exclusive right to the use of its corporate seal, emblems, and badges as adopted by said corporation.

Article X. Auxiliaries

SECTION 1. This organization recognizes a ladies' auxiliary, a national order of wreckers, Sons of Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and Junior Daughters and Sisters of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., as auxiliary units of this organization.

SEC. 2. The auxiliary shall be governed in each department of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the national executive committee and thereafter approved by such Department of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc.

SEC. 3. Eligibility: This organization recognizes an auxiliary organization to be composed of mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces (who are at least 16 years of age) of veterans eligible for membership in this organization, and any woman eligible to membership in this organization; and, in addition, mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and nieces who are at least 16 years of age of persons who were eligible and were killed in military or naval service of the United States in either World War I or World War II or were eligible for membership and have since died.

Article XI. Amendments

This constitution may be amended at any national convention by a vote of two-thirds of the total accredited delegates assembled, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been read to the convention at least one calendar day before they are voted thereon.

NATIONAL BYLAWS

Article I. Organization

SECTION 1. The governing body of this organization shall be the national convention, the national executive committee, the State departments, the posts, and such territorial organizations as may be approved.

SEC. 2. Each such body shall keep records of its proceedings which shall be open for inspection to any recognized officer of the organization duly appointed by the national commander.

Article II. Charters

SECTION 1. This organization may grant charters to State departments and local posts.

SEC. 2. Any ten persons eligible for membership in this organization, who desire to form a post, shall make application for a charter to the commander of the department of the State in which they reside, and if there be no State department, then to the national, using the regular form prescribed by the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. When there is already one post in a city, a charter may be granted for an additional post only upon the basis of an application for charter signed by at least 25 eligibles, except in cities of 100,000 population or less it is hereby provided that a charter may be granted on an application signed by not less than 25 eligibles.

SEC. 4. No new post shall bear the name of a living person, nor shall an existing post change its name to that of a living person. No post shall adopt the name already adopted by any other post in good standing, nor shall an existing post change its name to that already adopted by any other post in good standing. No post shall be named for a person who is not a veteran of either World War I or World War II.

SEC. 5. When a charter has been issued and signed by the national commander, it shall not thereafter be changed or amended except in the case of change of name, change of location and/or the dropping of names therefrom of ineligibles, and/or consolidation of posts as prescribed by the bylaws.

SEC. 6. All applications for post charters shall be accompanied by the current per capita tax for each signer of the application together with the officers' bond premium.

SEC. 7. The approval of the post charters shall be signified by countersignatures of the commander and the adjutant of the State departments to which the post is affiliated.

Article III. Suspension and revocation of charters

SECTION 1. Charters of local posts may be revoked or suspended by State executive committee with the approval of the national executive committee, or by the national executive committee where there is no State department; and shall be revoked by the national executive committee when a post has had less than 10 paid members for a period of 18 months.

SEC. 2. The national executive committee may, for cause, revoke the charter of any State department. The term "for cause," as used herein, shall refer only to matters specifically required or prohibited by the constitution and bylaws of the national or State department, or posts.

SEC. 3. All charters revoked by the State department shall stand suspended pending action of the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. When the charter of any post has been revoked all members of that post shall become members at large.

SEC. 5. Upon revocation of a State department or local post all property, money, and effects of the State department or local post shall revert to the national organization to be held in trust for a period of 18 months; in the event the State department or post charter is not reissued within a period of 18 months the said property shall become the absolute property of the national department.

SEC. 6. In addition to any other grounds therefore, a member may be suspended and tried and the charter of a post or State department may be suspended and revoked, should such member, post, or department resort to a civil court action against a post, department, or the national organization, or the officers thereof, as such, before exhausting all remedies available within the organization.

SEC. 7. While under suspension, no meetings shall be held in the name of the post or organization except for the sole purpose of the discussion of cause, effect, or removal of penalty. No funds of the post shall be expended or obligation incurred, except for the purpose of reinstatement from suspension during and while the order or suspension is in force and effect.

SEC. 8. Any post failing to meet the obligations imposed upon it by the constitution and bylaws, or ceasing to function for 6 months as an Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., post, or voluntarily ceasing to function as a post, or merging with one or more other posts, or refusing to pay the department and national per capita dues, or under such other conditions as might make such action necessary, shall upon order of the department executive committee, surrender its charter for cancellation. Upon failure to surrender such charter, immediate steps may be taken for its revocation, suspension, or cancellation.

Article IV. Local posts

SECTION 1. Each local post may adopt its own constitution, bylaws and regulations and levy its own membership fees, provided that such constitution, bylaws and regulations, do not conflict with those of this organization, or with those of the State department with which the post is affiliated.

SEC. 2. Each local post shall elect a commander, a senior vice commander, vice commander and quartermaster, and may elect or appoint such other officers as may be necessary to operate the post.

SEC. 3. Each local post shall keep complete and accurate records of minutes of meetings and financial records of all monies received, expended, and remitted; all money must be deposited in the name of the said post; and shall have an accounting made of the same once each quarter, a report of which shall be submitted to the State and national organization.

SEC. 4. Provision shall be made by each State department and local post for the expenditure of funds by it only on the basis of checks or vouchers signed by at least two officers thereof.

SEC. 5. Seniority: The department commander shall assign the numbers issued to posts under his jurisdiction and such numbers shall be issued according to the date of the charter under which they are acting, provided that in the case of new posts, the number shall be assigned as of rate of muster. When a post charter is canceled, the post number shall be held vacant for 1 year, but at the expiration of 1 year may be reissued to a new post authorized within that department. Numbers shall be issued only to posts for which charters have been authorized by the national commander.

SEC. 6. Revival of charter: A defunct post may be revived with its original name and number, provided these have not been reassigned. If such revival is desired, an application shall be submitted as provided for in the formation of a new post and a charter issued as though the post were a new post.

SEC. 7. Meetings, stated: The stated meetings of each post shall be held at least monthly.

SEC. 8. Meetings, special: The post commander may call a special meeting whenever, in his opinion, the same may be necessary for the welfare of the post. The post commander shall call a special meeting upon request, in writing, signed by seven members in good standing. The post adjutant shall notify all members in writing of the time and place of any special meeting and of the business to be transacted, such notice to be delivered to each member at least 48 hours in advance of the time set for the meeting. No business shall be transacted at any special meeting except that for which the meeting was called.

SEC. 9. Quorum: The post bylaws may specify the minimum number of members required to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business in no case to be less than six members in good standing.

SEC. 10. Change of name: Any post may change its name by a two-thirds vote of the members present at a regular or special meeting called for the purpose, of which meeting and proposed action at last 30 days' notice in writing has been given to all its members, and provided that such change shall be approved by the department executive committee and the national commander.

When permission for change of name has been granted by the national commander such post shall be issued a new charter at the expense of the post.

SEC. 11. Installation of officers: Post officers shall be installed into their respective offices at a regular or special meeting during the period of September 1 and November 1, and such installation may be conducted publicly at an open meeting to be held for that purpose.

The installation shall be conducted by the department commander or by a member in his stead who holds or held a rank at least as high as that of post commander.

Article V. State departments

SECTION 1. Formation: Whenever two or more posts have been organized in any State or Territory or foreign possession or country, a department may be organized in said State, Territory, or foreign possession, or country.

SEC. 2. Authorized body: The State departments shall be the authorized governing bodies of the posts and territorial organizations operating within the boundary lines in their respective States, and shall be composed of representatives of said posts and territorial organizations.

SEC. 3. Legislative powers: The legislative powers granted to a State department shall be vested in the State convention and shall be composed of the department officers and the accredited delegates representing the several posts and territorial organizations of the department.

SEC. 4. Administrative powers: The administrative affairs of the State department shall be vested in a department executive committee to be composed of representatives of the several posts or territorial organizations of the department, the department commander, the department senior vice commander, and such other department officers as the department constitution may provide.

SEC. 5. Officers: The State department shall elect a commander, a senior vice commander, a quartermaster, and shall elect or appoint such other department officers as may be provided by its constitution and bylaws.

SEC. 6. Constitution: Each State department shall adopt its own constitution, bylaws, and regulations and provide its own membership fees, provided that the provisions of such constitution, bylaws, and regulations do not conflict with those of the national organization.

SEC. 7. Organization: Each State department may establish such territorial organizations within its own State as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 8. Eligibility to office: Any person holding membership in this organization, whose current per capita tax has been duly received by the State and national organization, shall be eligible to any office in that department: *Provided,* That no member shall hold two elective department offices at the time or any post shall have more than two members elected to a department office. No person who being a paid employee of any other veterans' organization shall be eligible to hold an elective or appointive office in this organization or any unit thereof.

SEC. 9. Election of officers: The commander, senior vice commander, junior vice commander, quartermaster, judge advocate, officer of the day, and such other officers as may be prescribed by the department constitution and bylaws shall be elected by ballot or roll call at the annual meeting of the department convention in each year. A majority of all votes cast shall be necessary for a declaration of election.

SEC. 10. Term of office: Officers thus elected shall be installed before the adjournment of the convention at which they are elected and immediately enter upon their duties, and shall hold office until their successors are duly installed. A department officer appointed and installed in office shall continue to hold office during the pleasure of the appointive power unless otherwise provided. A department officer, elected or appointed, shall retain such office only while he remains a member in good standing in a post in the department of which he is an officer.

SEC. 11. Bylaws: A department convention may adopt bylaws for the government of the department, not conflicting with the constitution, bylaws, or orders of the national organization, and may provide for the alteration or amendment thereof.

SEC. 12. Revocation of charters: The national convention at its annual session or the national commander, with the consent of the national executive committee, may at any time revoke the charter of a department which for three-fourths of a year has failed to forward its reports, dues, or moneys properly payable to the national headquarters.

SEC. 13. Suspension of charter: The national commander may suspend the charter of a department for a period of 60 days for violation of the laws or usages of the organization or refusal to comply with lawful orders of the national convention or national executive committee, and if no appeal is taken within the period of 60 days, the charter of the department may be canceled: *Provided, however,* That before the charter is cancelled, the department commander in question shall be duly notified of the charges against it and upon request shall have a suitable opportunity to appear before the national executive committee to show cause, if it may have any, why its charter should not be canceled.

SEC. 14. Arrearage: Any department in arrears for returns, reports, per capita tax payments or other financial obligations, shall be deprived of all representation in the national convention until the same are paid to the proper authority.

Article VI. National convention

SECTION 1. Supreme body: The legislative power of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., shall be its annual national convention to be held within the last week of August ending the first Monday in September at a place to be determined by a majority vote of the voting delegates in attendance at each preceding convention: *Provided, however,* That if any convention fails to designate time and place of the succeeding convention, the national executive committee shall do so, making announcement thereof 60 days prior to the convention date.

SEC. 2. Delegates: At each national convention, each State department shall be entitled to two delegates and two alternates. One delegate shall be the department commander in office at the time of the national convention and the other shall be his immediate predecessor in office.

Each post shall be entitled to three delegates and three alternates for its charter. One delegate of which will be the post commander or next officer and for whom per capita tax has been paid to the national department and for whom the State capita tax has been received by the department quartermaster prior to the opening of the said national convention: *Provided, however,* That any such recognition shall not be extended to designated delegates of any post which is indebted to the national organization in the sum of more than $10; to the State department in the sum of more than $10.

All duly elected national officers by virtue of their office shall be delegates to the national convention. In addition to all post delegates, all elected national officers, past national commanders, and two national executive committeemen from each State, and all appointed national officers, in accordance with article VIII, section 3, are entitled to vote at the annual national convention: *Provided, however,* They have qualified with respect to the payment of national and State per capita tax and the convention fee.

SEC. 3. Voting: Each delegate shall be entitled to one vote. There shall be no form of unit rule or voting by proxy.

SEC. 4. Convention rules: The rules of the national convention shall be prescribed by the national executive committee, subject to amendment and approval by the national convention. All matters of parliamentary procedure not otherwise specifically covered by such rules or by these bylaws shall be governed by Demetere's Manual of Parliamentary Procedure. Copies of convention rules shall be prepared and distributed by the adjutant to the delegates upon their adoption.

SEC. 5. Credentials: The form of the convention credentials shall be designated by the national executive committee. The national commander shall appoint a credential committee composed of one member from each State, and shall, in accordance with the provisions of these bylaws and the convention rules determine the eligibility of all persons seated and voting in the national convention, and shall specifically notify the convention and the delegates as to the number of votes each delegation shall be entitled.

Article VII. National executive committee

SECTION 1. Administrative power and composition: Between national conventions, the administrative power shall be vested in the national executive committee which shall be composed of the national commander, national senior vice commander, five junior vice commanders, national quartermaster, judge advocate, national chaplain in office, national rehabilitation officer, two national executive committeemen from each department, and retiring national commander. National commander shall be presiding officer.

SEC. 2. Term of executive committeemen: The term of such national executive committeemen and alternates shall be 1 year.

SEC. 3. Meetings: The national executive committee shall hold its stated meetings as follows: One within 24 hours preceding the convention of and one within 24 hours following adjournment of the national convention.

SEC. 4. Special meetings: Whenever any seven members of the national executive committee deem it necessary they may request in writing, that a special meeting of the executive committee be held, and upon receipt of such request the national commander shall call a special meeting setting forth the time, place, and reasons for such.

During the period of the convention whenever the national commander deems it necessary, he may call a special meeting of the executive committee.

SEC. 5. Communications: The regular business of the organization requiring the consideration of the national executive committee between stated meetings shall be transacted through the office of the national commander by means of correspondence or referendum (mail or telegraph ballots).

SEC. 6. Quorum: A quorum shall exist in the national executive committee when seven members are present and seated.

SEC. 7. Powers: All legislative, administrative and executive matters not otherwise specifically covered by the provisions of the constitution, bylaws and regulations of this organization, or by any enactment of the national convention shall be determined by the national executive committee.

Article VIII. National officers

SECTION 1. Election of officers: The national convention shall elect a national commander, senior vice commander, five junior vice commanders, judge advocate, chaplain, quartermaster, rehabilitation officer, officer of the day, and two members at large for the national executive committee from each State. No person shall succeed himself as national commander.

SEC. 2. Vice commanders: No more than one vice commander shall be chosen from any State, and no more than one national executive committeeman shall be chosen from any one post.

SEC. 3. Appointed officers: By and with the consent of the national executive committee the national commander shall appoint a national adjutant, national legislative chairman, national sergeant-at-arms, national historian, Americanization officer, chief of staff, chief inspector, service officer, two aides-de-camp, and one deputy chief of staff from each State.

SEC. 4. Eligibility to office: All active members in good standing shall be eligible to any office: *Provided*, That no member shall hold two elective national offices at the same time or an elective national office and an appointed elective office.

SEC. 5. Past national commanders: All past national commanders, while in good standing in their respective posts, shall be members for life of the national executive committee, and shall also be life delegates to all national conventions of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., with vote, to be exercised by them with their respective departments.

SEC. 6. Presiding officer: The national commander shall be the presiding officer of the national convention and of the national executive committee meetings. He shall appoint such committees as may be provided for by these bylaws, and such committees as may be authorized by the convention or by the executive committee.

Duties of Officers

SEC. 7. National commander: The national commander shall be the executive head of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., with full power to enforce the provisions of the national constitution, national bylaws, and the will of the national convention. He shall be the chairman of the national convention and the national executive committee; sign all vouchers properly drawn on the quartermaster; make all appointments as prescribed by these bylaws, and may remove these officers at his pleasure. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office.

SEC. 8. Vice commanders: In case of the removal of the national commander from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the duties of his office, the same shall devolve upon the senior vice commander; and in the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the commander and senior vice commander, the duties shall devolve upon the office of the vice commander first elected.

SEC. 9. Adjutant: The national adjutant shall keep correct records of the proceedings of the national convention and executive committee; he shall conduct its correspondence and issue the necessary orders under the direction of the national commander. He shall keep proper files of all correspondence and copies of the applications for membership in the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc. He shall perform such other duties as are usually incident to the office. The national adjutant shall by and with the consent of the national commander appoint such employees as may be deemed necessary to conduct the business affairs of his office, and shall by and with the consent of the national executive committee determine the salaries of such employees.

SEC. 10. Quartermaster: The quartermaster shall take charge of the funds, securities, vouchers, and all other property of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc. He shall keep a true record and account of all moneys due and receivable from all sources. He shall pay all warrants drawn on the treasury when properly countersigned by the national commander. He shall retain one copy of such vouchers for his own files and shall submit one copy to the national adjutant.

He shall turn all bills over to the national commander for approval. No bills shall be paid by him until approved by the national commander or by the national executive committee. He shall keep a true record of all liabilities of the national department.

He shall purchase all supplies or other property necessary to conduct the business of the national department. When necessary to purchase such supplies, he shall fill out a requisition form provided by the national executive committee and submit same to the national commander for approval; and no supplies or property shall be purchased until said requisition is approved by the national commander or the national executive committee.

The quartermaster shall have charge of all supplies and furnish same to all State departments and all posts. He shall be treasurer of all committees of the national executive committee. He shall keep a systematic account between the national department and State departments and posts, debiting and crediting per capita tax, each item of supplies separate, so as to render a strict account of the cost of all revenue from all receipts and supplies.

He shall issue to each State department and to each post and each national department officer, at the last of every quarter through the magazine or in pamphlet form as directed by the national executive committee, his report showing receipts and disbursements. Said report shall be mailed not later than the 10th day of the following month, and shall show the total receipts from each State department, each post, or other sources for the quarter.

The quartermaster shall maintain a complete roll of our membership. He shall render an annual report in writing at the national convention. He shall compile a complete inventory of all property and report the same to the annual convention. The national quartermaster shall be bonded for $10,000 and the same shall be paid by the national department. The bond shall be kept by the national finance committee.

SEC. 11. Judge advocate: The national judge advocate shall be the legal adviser of this organization. He shall, upon the request of the national commander and the national executive committee or the national convention, render his opinion upon all existing and proposed amendments to the constitution and bylaws of this organization, or any unit thereof, upon all questions of parliamentary procedure and upon all questions arising out of the national organization, interpost, and interdepartment disputes. Upon receiving the opinion of the judge advocate upon any such questions, the national commander shall render a decision which shall be subject to appeal to the national executive committee and to the national convention, provided that notice of intention of appeal is given within 30 days after the decision of the national commander is made known.

In all such cases the decision of the national convention shall be final. He shall perform such duties as are incident to his office.

SEC. 12. Historian: The national historian shall be the publicity officer of the national department and shall be required to furnish publicity matters to the newspapers and only with the approval of the national commander.

SEC. 13. Patriotic and Americanization officer: The national patriotic and Americanization officer shall perform such duties as his office may require or the national commander may direct.

SEC. 14. Chaplain: The national chaplain shall perform such duties in connection with his office as the commander or the national convention may require.

SEC. 15. Officer of the day and sergeant at arms: The duties of the officer of the day and sergeant at arms shall be as prescribed and pertaining to his office.

SEC. 16. Chief of staff: The chief of staff shall have full charge under the national commander of the work of organizing new posts.

SEC. 17. Chief inspector: The chief inspector shall perform such duties as are required of him and incident to his office.

SEC. 18. Legislative chairman: The national legislative chairman, subject to the instructions of the national commander, national executive committee, or the national convention, shall direct and supervise all Federal legislative activities of this organization.

No Federal legislation shall be sponsored or endorsed by him, or by any national officer, or any member or officer of any subordinate unit, unless it has been approved by a national convention or by the national executive committee.

The national legislative chairman shall by and with the consent of the national commander appoint such employees as he may deem necessary to the conduct of the affairs of his office, and shall by and with the consent of the national executive committee determine the salaries of said employees.

SEC. 19. Rehabilitation officer: The rehabilitation officer shall concern himself with the rehabilitation program and hospital work of veterans confined in hospitals, and such other duties as are incidental to his office. The national rehabilitation officer shall by and with the consent of the national executive committee determine the salaries of the national rehabilitation officers and other employees of his department.

All national rehabilitation officers in the several national districts and States shall render a detailed monthly report of the work done by them to the national rehabilitation officer, and he shall, in turn, within 10 days from receipt of said report, transmit a consolidated report to the national department.

Article IX. Finances

SECTION 1. Finances: The revenue of this organization shall be derived from the per capita tax, contributions, and such other sources as may be approved by the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. Per capita tax: The amount of the national per capita tax shall be 75 cents for the fiscal year 1940–41, and thereafter shall be determined by the national convention and shall remain in effect until changed by the subsequent national convention.

SEC. 3. The national and State per capita tax shall be collected from the member by

each post and transmitted directly to the national organization together with the national and State record and subscription.

SEC. 4. Annual dues shall be payable October 1 of each year.

SEC. 5. All revenues and expenditures of this organization shall be under the direct supervision of a national executive committee.

SEC. 6. Budget: The national department shall operate under a budget which shall be set up by the national executive committee within 30 days after the national convention.

SEC. 7. Not more than 90 percent of the estimated income for the official year shall be budgeted. The remainder shall be set aside as a restricted reserve which shall not be expended except upon unanimous approval of the executive committee and two-thirds of the members present and voting.

SEC. 8. Depository: The national executive committee shall designate the national depository or depositories for all revenue of this organization, which shall be located in the same city as national quartermaster.

SEC. 9. Deposits: All funds received in the name of this organization by any officer or committee thereof shall be deposited forthwith in such depositories as may be designated by the national executive committee, where such funds shall be and remain the property of this organization until such time as they are properly expended or remitted in accordance with the regulations of the national executive committee; provided, however, that in case of any extraordinary fundraising enterprise entered into the committee in charge of such activities may, with the approval of the national executive committee, receive and expend from those receipts such amounts as may be necessary in the transaction of the particular business in which the committee is engaged. All such committees shall make a complete account of all receipts and expenditures which shall be submitted to the national executive committee for audit and approval.

SEC. 10. Bonds: All persons having custody of the funds of this organization shall give adequate surety bond of not less than $1,000 with the governing body under which they are functioning. Such bond shall be obtained by the national organization and the sum of $5 shall be charged against the posts or State departments whose officers are thus bonded. Each post shall have at least one bonded officer. Each State department shall have at least one bonded officer.

SEC. 11. Notification: Upon designating the officer to be so bonded each unit of the organization shall send notice giving name and address of such officer to the national organization, together with the required sum of $5 as prescribed.

SEC. 12. Salaries: The salaries of the national commander, the national adjutant, national legislative chairman, national rehabilitation officer, and all other national officers not otherwise specifically provided for in these bylaws shall be determined by the national executive committee with the approval of the national executive committee. It being further provided, however, that no one shall receive a salary greater than that paid the national commander.

Article X. Life membership

SECTION 1. Eligibility: Any person eligible to membership may become a life member. Those eligible, who were born before January 7, 1902, or who served in World War I, may become life members upon the payment of $50 to the life-memhership fund through national headquarters. Those eligible who were born on or after January 1, 1902, may become life members upon payment of $100 to the life-membership fund through national headquarters.

SEC. 2. Benefits: A life member shall have all the benefits and privileges of post, State, and National membership as long as he may live, without the further payment of any tax, fee, dues, or assessments whatsoever, subject, however, to the provisions of article X of the national bylaws.

Life membership may be secured on a monthly installment plan and under the following conditions: (a) If the total life-membership costs to be paid in monthly installments, the buyer shall have two fiscal years after making the first payment in which to complete payments; (b) if monthly installment payments extend beyond such time, such installments shall be used, first, to pay current membership dues (as hereinafter provided) for each fiscal year during the term of installment payments, and the balance applied to the cost of life membership. Life membership when paid in monthly payments will cost $50 or $100, plus $5 for each full fiscal year immediately following the date of payment of the first installment.

Money paid for life membership in full or in installments shall not be refunded under any circumstances to any member, his heirs, or estate. During the life of a fully paid life member, the life-membership fund shall pay current post dues not to exceed $2, and current State department dues not to exceed 50 cents in which the member is affiliated, and his current national dues.

SEC. 4. Special fund: All life-membership funds received by national headquarters shall be deposited in a life-membership account, the funds to be withdrawn only as required to pay annual National, State, and post dues during the life of each life member, or for investment purposes.

SEC. 5. Life-membership card: A fully paid up life membership entitles the member to a life-membership certificate without cost, plus a lasting life card to carry in pass case or wallet.

Article XI. Discipline of posts and post members

SECTION 1. Post sole judge of membership: Each post of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., shall be the judge of its own membership, subject to the restrictions of the constitution and bylaws.

SEC. 2. Charges: Charges may be preferred against any member or officer of this organization when put in writing, signed by five members in good standing. Such charges shall be filed with the governing body, who shall prescribe the mode, time, and place of trial for the accused, the penalties which may be imposed, and serve notice upon all parties concerned at least 10 days prior to date of hearing by registered mail.

Members may be expelled or suspended from the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., only upon a proper showing of a cause.

Charges shall be based upon disloyalty, neglect of duty, dishonesty, and conduct unbecoming a member of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and no member in good standing shall lose his membership until given a fair trial by the post or department in such manner and form as the department bylaws and department executive committee shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. Appeal: Any member who has been suspended or expelled has the right to appeal to his department executive committee, or to the department convention, according to the provisions in the bylaws of such department, and he may appeal to the next superior governing bodies in the order of their rank.

SEC. 4. Charge: Every charge must give the name and mailing address of each member therein accused and of the accusers, and shall set forth the charges with sufficient particularity so that the accused may adequately prepare a defense thereto.

SEC. 5. Trial: At the written request of the accused or accusers, when charges are properly filed with a State executive committee or the national executive committee, or when charges have been filed with the latter and referred by it to a State executive committee, the national commander shall appoint a trial board of not less than 5 or more than 20 members from the membership of the State executive committee, or of not less than 5 or more than 7 members of the national executive committee, as the case may be, who shall try the charges in lieu of a trial before a full committee, and whose decision shall be final, subject only to the right of appeal. No member of such board or any trial or appeal body shall be an accuser or an accused.

SEC. 6. Suspension from office: Any member or officer of this organization or any unit thereof, upon receiving notice that he is summoned for trial, by and with the approval of the national commander shall be suspended from membership and from every appointive and elective office held by him until thereafter acquitted of the charges preferred or until the charges are dismissed. Such charges shall be tried within 30 days after filing with a post, or within 60 days after filing with any higher governing body, or after any higher governing body assumes jurisdiction thereof.

SEC. 7. Manner of appeal: Either the accused or not less than a majority of the accusers may take an appeal from a finding of guilt or innocence or from any order made to the next superior governing body, in the order of their rank, by a written notice of appeal filed with the adjutant of such body within 30 days after mailing of notice of such finding or order. Such notice of appeal shall also be mailed to the accused or all accusers, as the case may be, and shall set forth all reasons and arguments upon which the appellant relies. All such notices shall be sent by registered mail. No appeal shall be effective if notice is not given at the time and in the manner provided in this paragraph.

SEC. 8. Retrial of charges: The governing body to which an appeal is taken shall not retry the case on its merits, but shall limit its determination as to whether the charges were substantial, and whether the accused had a fair trial. It may affirm, modify, or set aside any order made pursuant hereof, or affirm, modify, or set aside any penalty imposed, after trial, or order a retrial before the body to which the appeal is taken.

If dissatisfied with the decision of an appeal to the next higher governing body, either the accused or a majority of the accusers may appeal to the next higher governing body, if any. The decision made by the national convention, which is the highest governing body, as to an appeal to it, shall be final.

If an appeal is taken to a national convention, the national commander may appoint a committee to hear and consider the same and report its recommendations to the convention for ratification or other action. Notice of appeal to a national convention must be served on the national adjutant within 30 days after notice is mailed as to the action or decision which is the subject of appeal, but no such appeal shall be taken or entertained until the appellant has exhausted all other remedies as hereinbefore provided in these bylaws.

SEC. 9. Penalties: The following penalties may be imposed upon a finding of guilt: Reprimand, suspension for a term of not more than 1 year, or expulsion. In addition, a recommendation may be made to the national executive committee that the guilty member or officer be blacklisted; but only the national executive committee may order or approve the penalty of blacklisting, subject to an appeal to the next national convention to be held.

SEC. 10. What constitutes sufficient cause: The refusal of any member, post officer, auxiliary, State department, or other subordinate unit to fully accept, recognize, and abide by any order or finding made pursuant to these articles, after the same has become

final, shall be sufficient cause for the suspension of the charter of any such unit, and for the revocation of such charter or charters, and for the discipline of each member or officer found guilty thereof.

After a finding of guilt becomes final, the penalties imposed shall be self-executing: *Provided, however,* That the penalty of blacklisting shall not be effective until approved by the national executive committee or by the next national convention upon timely appeal to it; and if such penalty is approved, no inadvertent acceptance of the membership of the accused shall be effective for any purpose nor may he ever again become a member of this organization or of any subordinate unit or auxiliary thereof, until his application is approved by a national convention, upon the recommendation of the national executive committee.

Article XII. Field daisy

The field daisy shall be the official standard flower of the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc., and its auxiliaries; and that the poem known as The Field Daisy be adopted to symbolize the memories of our departed comrades. The official Field Daisy Day shall be the first Saturday of the month of June.

"THE FIELD DAISY

"Because you nod and smile in
Sun-drenched fields;
Because you are the eye of day
And known to all who live in these our States;
Because, by just the shadow that you cast,
You keep the sun away from small dewdrops;
Because you're pure with stainless spotless petals;
Because you have a heart of crimson warm;
To us, you symbolize the simplicity, devotion, and tenderness of
The common things of life.

"We take you as our flower; we look upon you with tears of pleasure;
You are not denied the poorest of us, and yet you are sought by the richest.
You speak with gentle whispers, to the failing heart;
Can you see us? Do you know our thoughts? As we place a floral tribute in our homes, are your eyes a-twinkle to make us gay?

"Field Daisy, lovely simple flower, you are ours.
No longer are you born to whither and die unnoticed; we mothers of fighting men have taken a sturdy, upright, friendly, hardy flower as our emblem.
To watch you grow, to see you smile, will help me meet my God,
Because He devised your pattern and your color and your life.

"Field Daisy you are ours, in meadows and in fields. Each friendly
Flower will remind us of one mother's son, one splendid lad,
One friendly smiling boy, who wants his home, his friends,
His peaceful life, his laughter, and
His Mother."

Our daisy is red bud, white petals, blue label.

Article XIII. Politics

SECTION 1. This organization shall be nonpolitical and nonsectarian, and the name of this organization or a name of any unit thereof shall not be used in representing the desires or wishes of its membership in any political, sectarian, or labor dispute, except as hereafter provided.

SEC. 2. Nothing in the above provisions shall prohibit this organization or any unit thereof from participating in political issues which have a direct bearing upon the welfare of World War I, World War II, and Korean campaign veterans.

Article XIV. Amendments

SECTION 1. These bylaws may be amended at any national convention by a vote of two-thirds of the total accredited delegates assembled: *Provided,* That the proposed amendment shall have been read to the national convention at least one calendar day before they are voted thereon.

SEC. 2. All matters of procedure not otherwise provided for in these bylaws or in rules of national convention shall be governed by Demeter's Manual of Parliamentary Procedure.

SEC. 3. A motion of interpretation shall be improper unless the matter sought to be interpreted is clearly ambiguous or uncertain of meaning.

SEC. 4. The national commander, on recommendation of a post or State department, may issue a certificate of merit for outstanding service to the Italian-American World War Veterans of United States, Inc.

Compiled and revised by John F. Nave, sixteenth national commander, 1950–51.

The 10 Major Gripes of Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, most of us who have followed the work of the Reserves know that there has been constant and increasing dissatisfaction with the way the military services have treated their reserves during the present emergency. I think we can sum it up with the statement that the Reserve programs as such have virtually been killed by the present policies. It will almost be impossible to enlist an adequate number of Reserves when the present emergency has ended. The United States News and World Report, one of the most informative and best written of the news magazines, has listed the 10 major gripes of Reserves.

They are well stated, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include them in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 10 MAJOR GRIPES OF RESERVISTS

WHY CONGRESS WANTS TO CHANGE THE SYSTEM

1. Advance notice of recall is too short—often a few days.

2. Authorities "lose" deferment pleas, or ignore them until a man is in the service. Then it's too late.

3. Promises—about length of service and a point system for release, for example—are abandoned almost as soon as announced.

4. Men who acquired new skills or professions after War II are recalled to unskilled military jobs they left 5 years ago and forgot.

5. Reservists often are turned down for active duty after they have torn up their lives in order to report on time.

6. Personnel records are out of date, thoroughly snarled up.

7. Men who want to be called cannot get called while others are taken against their will. Commands refuse to let their reservists volunteer for duty elsewhere—they hoard "availables."

8. The Army discriminates against reservists in promotions: 80 percent of Army officers on duty are reservists; they get 20 per cent of the promotions to grades above captain.

9. Unorganized reservists who never got drill pay are being taken before organized reservists who train every week.

10. Veterans with many years' service are returning to hazardous duty while nonveterans stay at home.

Protective Underground Office Space for Government Employees Proposed in District of Columbia To Reduce Dispersal Appropriations and Provide Emergency Bomb Shelters for District Without Extra Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, as a matter of interest, the testimony of Mr. Morris Kanfer before the House Committee on Public Works on his proposal to build and lease to the Government an underground bombproof office building.

The advantage of the proposal to me, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, is that this would appear to be one means of providing adequate bomb shelters for a substantial number of people without cost to the District of Columbia.

Since Mr. Kanfer's own description, as given to the committee, is clear and concise, I leave it to his words, except to add that he has assured me that national and local civil-defense officials have expressed strong approbation of the idea.

STATEMENT BY MORRIS KANFER, WOODWARD BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., AT HEARING ON DISPERSAL BILL, H. R. 1728, HELD BY THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, FEBRUARY 5, 1951, HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE, CHAIRMAN

The revised dispersal plan reducing the sites from 8 to 6 resulted in a reduction of $45,000,000 in the appropriation requested. It is entirely possible that a further substantial reduction in the appropriation requested can be achieved without jeopardizing the program for securing the continuity of important Government functions in the event of an attack.

Testimony before the Senate subcommittee hearing on January 30, 1951, indicated that of the 40,000 persons to be dispersed, 25,000 are related to the defense departments and the remaining 15,000 are personnel of departments other than defense. It is respectfully submitted that these 15,000 civilian personnel can be dispersed to suitable underground office space to be constructed in the outlying areas within the District.

The dispersal bill under consideration by this committee fails to take into consideration the feasibility of housing Government personnel in protective underground office buildings in the outlying sections of the District, removed from the White House approximately 4 to 5 miles. The General Services Administration has been offered such an office building to be constructed large enough to house 4,000 Government personnel, at a site on Connecticut Avenue at Albemarle Street NW., where a natural ravine runs

through the property, making it ideally suitable for the construction of such a building. The building would be constructed in accordance with the recommendations of the Civil Defense Administration for protective quarters to secure the occupants in the event of a bombing attack and such facilities would thus be available to the citizens of the District as emergency bomb shelters without requiring the District to expend millions of dollars to provide separate shelters under the civil defense program.

Some confusion as to policy concerning the construction of an underground office building in the District of Columbia has been evidenced in my discussions with various Government officials. I am advised that the National Security Resources Board has approved the principle of dispersal, decentralization, and underground protective space—all three, as the proper means of obtaining greater security for Government personnel and thus permitting the continuity of Government functions in event of an attack. Obviously, the greater number of Government employees are to remain in Washington and these would be safer in an underground office building than in apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue.

On December 10, 1950, Mr. Jess Larson, testifying before this subcommittee, stated that the underground citadels used by the British Government to carry on its functions were designed to withstand the impact of 200-pound bombs but before the war was over they had to adjust them to meet the impact of 2,000-pound bombs. Mr. Larson further stated that the reason we were not considering similar underground citadels for Washington was because it was believed that the Washington terrain was unsuited for constructing such citadels, and also because it would be too costly to provide such protective facilities for the 40,000 people to be dispersed.

This committee's attention is called to the fact that the Washington terrain does permit the construction of protective underground facilities in some areas away from the downtown section of Washington. For example, the altitude of the Connecticut Avenue and Albemarle Street site is approximately 260 to 300 feet above sea level. That site is particularly suitable for the construction of such underground facilities without great difficulty and without any exorbitant expense. It is estimated by the contractors who are planning the construction of the underground building on this site that it would cost little more to build an office building underground than it would cost to build it above ground where the site does not require much excavation.

It is suggested this committee consider the feasibility of modifying the dispersal program by moving out of the District 25,000 personnel offices instead of 40,000 and leaving the remaining 15,000 civilian personnel offices dispersed in underground office facilities scattered throughout the District of Columbia, removed from the White House a distance of 4 to 5 miles.

In order to finance the construction of an underground office building, however, it is necessary to obtain from General Services Administration a 10-year lease for such facilities, whereas its present statutory authority to lease property within the District of Columbia is limited to 1 year. It is therefore suggested that the dispersal bill, H. R. 1728, under consideration by this committee be amended to authorize and direct the Administrator to enter into long-term leases for the use of emergency underground facilities.

The utilization of such underground facilities by the Federal Government as office space in lieu of such space it now occupies in rented apartment houses in the District would not only provide greater protection for Government personnel, but would release these apartment houses for housing use, the sole purpose for which they were designed and built. Such underground facilities would thus become available in case of need as bomb shelters for District residents. The District would otherwise be required to incur substantial expense in constructing separate bomb shelters under the civil defense program, or do without such shelters.

The principal objective of the dispersal plan is to provide better protection for Government personnel, thereby assuring the continuity of important Government functions in the event of attack. The primary function of the Civil Defense Administration is to provide bomb shelter protection for civilians in the event of attack. Both objectives are so similar that it seems logical to combine, whenever and wherever possible, the methods of providing for the safety of Government personnel as well as of civilians, within the framework of the same structures, thus saving many millions of dollars by avoiding the duplication of such structures.

It is estimated that the rental cost to the Federal Government for such protective underground office space would be no greater than it now pays as rent for office space in apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue. The successful completion of such a project in the District might well set a pattern for utilizing similar underground space in other cities for Government offices and for civilian bomb shelters in the event of an emergency.

The following amendment to H. R. 1728 is respectfully submitted for this committee's consideration:

"SEC. 1–a. The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to contract for and acquire, on long-term leases not to exceed 10-year terms, emergency underground facilities within the District of Columbia and surrounding area suitable for office space and other uses, to be assigned to Government departments and agencies, provided plans for such underground facilities are either prepared or approved by General Services Administration or any other governmental agency having similar jurisdiction over such space and providing also such plans are approved in advance of construction by the Civil Defense Administration, or appropriate State, district, or regional director thereof, with respect to that portion of building to be used as general bomb shelters in event of emergency."

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a most interesting address regarding the difficulties which we have encountered in our attempts to secure an adequate supply of physicians, dentists, and nurses to meet the now critical needs of our country. This address was delivered by Mr. William A. Calvin, acting director of social insurance activities for the American Federation of Labor. I am sure that all of the Members of the Senate were very well acquainted with the ability and intelligence constantly displayed by Mr. Nelson Cruikshank, who held that position until recently. Mr. Cruikshank is now in France lending his best efforts to the fight against the spread of communism in Europe. Those Members of Congress who may not be acquainted with Mr. Cruikshank's successor will find in this address convincing evidence that Mr. Calvin will show that same intelligent and purposeful drive which characterized Mr. Cruikshank, together with a fiery command of language which is all his own.

I commend Mr. Calvin's address to the Senate and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Social insurance, or social security, has measured up to the full stature envisioned by the authors and sponsors of the original act. It has been evaluated by the naked rule of honesty and has proven to be a veritable bulwark buttressing the fortress of democracy against the paralyzing grasp of communism or other alien political philosophies.

Old-age survivors insurance removes the specter of fear of insecurity, if not abject impoverishment, and total dependency on some form of charity from the consciousness of the American people. However, there are still some serious gaps in the structure of our national health protective defense lines that must be sealed effectively as an inescapable obligation to our citizens of every station, and regardless of race, sex, or creed.

The administration-proposed plan for national health insurance which was enthusiastically supported by the American Federation of Labor, was defeated by American Medical Association-influenced Members of this National Congress who were gullible enough to accept the most malicious, vindictive, misleading propaganda ever conceived in the distorted minds of professional lobbyists as a valid reason for denying to all of the American people the benefits of adequate medical attention when needed, at a cost within their financial reach.

My remarks should not be construed as a blanket indictment of the great humanitarian American medical profession, as that would be entirely erroneous. Doctors, dentists, medical scientists, nures, technicians, etc., are by the large conscientious, sincere, hardworking people devoted to the commendable work of helping their fellow men. They are, however, the victims of as vicious a propaganda cesspool as has ever tarnished the Stars and Stripes.

In order to subtantiate the foregoing statements, and others to follow, it is advisable to examine the record of reaction and obstructionism to which the American Medical Association through its massive lobby has been committted.

We are confronted with a problem in the United States that seems scarcely within the boundaries of reason or logic. Here we have admittedly some of the outstanding doctors and finest hospitals in the world; yet, thousands of our citizens are sick and in need of medical attention at this moment, which is denied them because they cannot afford it. The dollar bill presents an insurmountable barrier between the doctor and the patient.

The national health-insurance plan would eliminate the financial iron curtain, making medical service available to the people who would have paid in advance for such service through a payroll deduction which would not exceed $1.40 per week or $72 per year. This would also insure the doctors of prompt payment for all of their services.

National health insurance has been branded as socialized medicine by the American Medical Association lobby. This is deliberate misrepresentation. Socialized medicine would place all medical practitioners on the payroll of the Government.

It would mean Government ownership and operation of all hospitals. It would mean regimentation of the medical profession.

The American Federation of Labor is uncompromisingly opposed to the socialization of medicine, and enactment of the national health insurance bill would be one of the most effective methods of combating any tendency to restrict the free selection of doctors by patients or the acceptance of patients by doctors. It would assuredly improve relationships between the doctor and patient.

The proposed national health insurance bill included among its various subsections provisions for Federal financial assistance to medical education designed to bolster the present weak, insecure framework of our source of medical professional supply by making possible the development of an increasing number of doctors annually and by expanding training facilities.

Due to the recognized urgency of maintaining a balanced ratio of doctors and other medical professionals with our constantly increasing population plus the mandatory demands for more doctors, dentists, and nurses for the Armed Forces, a separate bill was drawn dealing exclusively with Federal aid to medical education, which was overwhelmingly endorsed by the deans of our medical colleges, and after extensive revisions to meet every American Medical Association objection, was approved by the American Medical Association. This bill passed in the United States Senate without a single dissenting vote.

After passage by the Senate, the trickery of the professional lobbyists who represent the American Medical Association enters the picture, and to remove any possible allegation of bias I am going to quote herewith excerpts from an article carried in Collier's magazine, December 16, 1950, over the signature of Albert Q. Maisel:

"When the measure was reported on the floor of the Senate in August 1949, a routine objection was raised to its immediate passage by unanimous consent. At this juncture, both Senators PEPPER and TAFT, long bitter opponents on most other questions concerning the public health, stood up and urged their colleagues to support the measure. Two weeks later, when the bill again appeared on the calendar, it passed unanimously.

"FEARED TACTICS OF LOBBYISTS

"The worried deans and directors of the medical, dental, and nursing schools breathed a sigh of relief. For, they figured, if the American Medical Association were opposed to the bill its powerful Washington lobby would have shown its hand in the Senate, would have blocked this measure (as it had blocked many others) in committee or, at a very minimum, would have forced a debate and a counting of noses on the Senate floor.

"For the AMA lobby is powerful indeed. It operates through two channels. Officially the AMA is represented by Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director of its Washington office. But the real power behind the scenes is the California publicity firm of Whitaker & Baxter which, for the last 2 years, has been directing the American Medical Association's well-heeled national education campaign—aimed at preventing passage of the administration's compulsory health insurance program. Lawrence, Whitaker, and Baxter are registered with Congress as lobbyists.

"Many of the medical school deans, unversed in the intricacies of politics, felt so certain that the aid to medical education bill would easily pass the House that they authorized the enrollment of larger classes than their schools had handled at any time since the war. The number of freshmen admitted to medical schools jumped, in 1950, by 5.3 percent over the preceding year.

"AMENDED TO MEET OBJECTIONS

"In the House, the Biemiller bill, a duplicate of the Senate measure, again received bipartisan support. Representative HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania, former Republican National Committee Chairman and long-time opponent of socialized medicine, joined with Democratic Congressman ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin, in sponsoring amendments to the original House bill to make it meet the AMA objections brought forth in the Lowell Reed conferences. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce promptly reported favorably on the altered bill.

"By then, late in the session, it was necessary for the House Rules Committee to speed action on the measure if the whole House was to vote on it without delay. This procedure promised to be routine.

"But suddenly the applecart was upset.

"A small group of insurgent members of nurses' organizations in Georgia and North Carolina, and the owner of a private hospital in the latter State, got the impression that the measure would somehow set up the American Nursing Association as an accrediting body for all nursing schools—and thus force the closing down, for lack of accreditation, of some of the less qualified schools in the Southern States.

"On behalf of this group, Representative ROBERT L. (MULEY) DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, protested to the Rules Committee. The sponsors of the bill offered to amend the measure to overcome this objection. That satisfied DOUGHTON, and he withdrew his protest.

"But the Biemiller bill had, by then, been labeled 'controversial.' The Rules Committee, fearful of setting a precedent that would throw a host of other controversial measures onto the House floor in the last 2 weeks of the session, withheld its approval. The bill was held up till Congress could meet again, in 1950.

"Even after Congress adjourned, the American Medical Association's opposition had not crystallized. Early in December 1949, the house of delegates of the AMA met in Washington and approved a report of its council on medical education and hospitals which declared that, 'While the council is not entirely satisfied with the bill, it does incorporate several modifications suggested by the council's representatives and it is a distinct improvement over any other bill for Federal aid to medical education that has been introduced.'

"The report added, 'The council is aware that Federal aid to medical education creates definite hazards to the continued freedom and independence of the medical schools. With few exceptions, however, the medical schools and their parent universities have expressed the opinion that, unless additional aid is provided, medical education in this country cannot achieve its full development. The legislation which has been passed by the Senate contains safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interference in their affairs by the Federal Government.'

"SUDDEN CHANGE OF SENTIMENT

"Less than 2 months later the AMA completely changed its tune. At a conference of its national education campaign, Louis H. Bauer, M. D., chairman of the board of trustees, stated the AMA's position on pending legislation. The aid to medical education measure was added to the long list of bills which the AMA opposed.

"But the outbreak of the Korean war did two things. It changed plans for adjournment, and it served to highlight the urgency of drastic action to get medical education into high gear. When the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, our armed services had 5,844 physicians on their rolls. They needed about 1,550 more.

"The Army, whose need was the most desperate, sent out a call to 3,000 Reserve lieutenants and captains in the Medical Corps, requesting their return to service. Only 200 replied, and of these only 15 volunteered.

"By mid-August it became apparent that voluntary enlistments of physicians and nurses would never begin to meet the service's needs, even for a limited mobilization. The Defense Department found itself compelled to run to Congress for the hurried passage of a doctors' draft bill. First on the list were 7,500 young doctors and dentists who had received their medical education at Government expense while deferred from active military service during World War II. But the draft bill was not limited to these men alone. It authorized the President to order a general registration and induction of physicians up to the age of 55 and of dentists through the age of 45.

"To meet the needs of a 3,000,000-man force, the armed services will have to drain from civilian life substantially more than 5,000 physicians and proportionately large numbers of dentists, nurses, and technicians. * * *

"Facing up to this crisis, Representative Biemiller led a strenuous campaign in Congress all through last July and August to get aid-to-medical-education measure reported out to the House. Day after day he read into the RECORD endorsements of the bill's passage by Dean George W. Bakeman, of the Medical College of Virginia; by Dean Murray Kinsman, of the University of Louisville; by Dr. A. C. Ivy, vice president of the University of Illinois; Dean Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University; Chancelor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago; and many others.

"HOW MEDICAL SCHOOLS VOTED

"Dean Joseph C. Hinsey, of Cornell University, chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, wrote that a poll of its membership showed 47 schools favoring the bill and only 16 opposed. He disavowed the action of the AMA as 'taken independently of our association * * * and without a poll of our membership.'

"The deans of all the schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health in Massachusetts, including Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University, declared, 'We are convinced that the present desperate plight of our professional schools, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout the United States, has already interfered with the quality of professional education and is preventing the development of adequate medical and health personnel for the country.

" 'We make this statement,' they add, 'in full awareness of the position recently taken by the American Medical Association. We vigorously oppose that position.' "

The article which was accorded special attention and comment by the editor of Collier's concludes with the following ominous paragraph:

"But one thing is certain. Unless immediate steps are taken to solve our chronic and growing shortage of medical, dental, nursing, and public health personnel, your health—and that of your family, your neighbors, and your sons in the services—will be jeopardized for years to come."

Since the convening of the present session of Congress, a new aid-to-medical-education bill has been introduced which will undoubtedly have strong bipartisan support. It should be enacted into law with the universal approval of a grateful people.

The fate of this commendable legislative document will, to a very material degree, depend upon the attitude of the American Medical Association, and unless a transformation comparable to changing of the leopard spots takes place this bill will be opposed by the AMA on the fallacious unsupported allegation that it is a camouflaged scheme to bring

the medical profession under rigid Government control—socialized medicine.

Fortunately, under our form of government, a sufficiently aroused public consciousness can counteract the influence of any selfish group, no matter how heavily financed that group may be, and have no doubt that the AMA lobbyists have access to almost unlimited funds as evidenced by the advertising campaign costing $1,100,000 just prior to the November 1950 elections. This money was spent for the combined purpose of defeating candidates who were in favor of health protective legislation, and electing candidates who were committed to the campaign of obstructionism of the American Medical Association.

It is high time that we dust off that deathless document of liberty, the Magna Carta, and reread with intensified interest the dynamic words, "to no one shall we sell, deny, or delay the right to justice." The Magna Carta is the cornerstone of freedom; it is as significant today as it was over 700 years ago.

Back-seat driving in an automobile is not only disconcerting; at times it is dangerous. But when in the face of a national emergency we find our legislative vehicle swaying precariously because of the iniquitious influence of political back-seat drivers such as the AMA lobby, it is potentially disastrous.

Every Member of the National Congress should be advised by their constituents that the deficit in the number of professional medical personnel must be corrected, and that Federal aid to medical education presents an avenue of approach which will, if utilized effectively and intelligently, meet this menacing challenge to our Nation.

The Present Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Present Danger," by Mr. James B. Conant, for the Committee on the Present Danger. The address was delivered on February 7 over a national radio network. It is a clear, simple, forceful expression of the need for building up our armed strength, and the responsibilities of our youth with relation thereto.

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

THE PRESENT DANGER

(Address by James B. Conant for the Committee on the Present Danger)

(This address to the Nation was delivered Wednesday, February 7, 1951, over the National Broadcasting Co. network by President James B. Conant, of Harvard University, speaking for the Committee on the Present Danger, of which he is a member.)

Fellow citizens, the United States is in danger. Few would be inclined to question this simple statement. The danger is clearly of a military nature. On this much we can all agree. The Congress of the United States has, with almost no dissenting voices, authorized a vast program of rearmament and mobilization.

But as to the exact nature of the danger which confronts us there is far from being complete agreement among the citizens of this Republic. Nor are we by any means of one mind as to how we should mobilize the young men of the Nation. Indeed some few question even the need for an army of the size announced.

Now, if we are going to ask the youth of the country to serve 2 years in the Armed Forces—as I believe we must—if the Government is going to ask this sacrifice of them, each one of us who supports this program must be prepared to answer one simple question—why?

Why must we look forward to a period of austerity, of partial mobilization, of more weapons for war, fewer tools for peace?

The answer to these questions seems to me to be summed up in General Eisenhower's recent statement that we must build a secure wall for peace.

The free world has entered a new period—a highly disturbing and dangerous period. Let me recall to you the signals which announced the arrival of this new stage in our history in which prompt and bold measures are required for our survival.

The first clear sign was a year ago last September, when President Truman announced that the Soviet Union had exploded an atomic bomb. This marked the end of our monopoly of a weapon on which the security of the free world in no small measure depended.

The grim atomic age had dawned far sooner than all of us had hoped. It was evident that before long two major powers would have atomic bombs in sufficient quantity to constitute a military threat to one another. Whether such time was 3 or 5 years off might be a matter of opinion, but it was hardly to be questioned that the balance of power between the free world and the Soviet Union was about to be upset. This first clear danger signal could be read by all of us some 15 months ago.

The second signal flashed last June. Up till then the spread of Soviet communism had been by subversion and internal revolution as in the case of Czechoslovakia, not by military aggression. The aggression of the North Koreans established a new pattern. It could hardly be argued any longer that the dwellers in the Kremlin never intended to use military means to gain their objective, that their sole concern was with a battle of propaganda, of intrigue and sabotage.

The third signal was the action of Communist China and the justification of this action in the United Nations by the official representatives of the Soviet Union.

In short, within less than 18 months the free world has been confronted with two highly unpleasant facts. First, the Soviet military power is beginning to mount in terms of the most modern type of warfare, the United States monopoly of the atomic bomb has ended; second, the Soviet allies, at least, have shown a readiness and willingness to gain their ends by force of arms.

Place these facts against the background of the postwar military situation on the European continent and you can see the outlines of the present danger—a danger to the entire free world, a clear danger to the United States. The background is quite as important as the signals. Indeed the latter are so obvious as to warrant little comment, but the situation on the Continent is far harder to understand.

Let me give you my analysis if I may. For on the appraisal of this situation by each and every one of us as Americans, the course of history in the twentieth century may well depend.

Let me start with a question. Why has the Soviet Union not extended its power to the English Channel since the close of World War II? A few may argue that the failure is evidence of a lack of interest on the part of the Soviet Union—that the rulers in the Kremlin have no desire to spread their doctrine. In the light of recent history any such assumption appears not only improbable but highly dangerous. Others may think the failure reflects the inability of the Communist Party in France, Italy, and the Low Countries to pull off another revolution of the Czechoslovakian type. Certainly no such revolutions have occurred, and we Americans can take satisfaction in the fact that aid through the Marshall plan has been of prime importance. But surely the one deterrent to direct military aggression has been and is today, the overwhelming destructive power of the United States strategic air force armed with the atomic bomb.

Let me spell out this last point. If Russia tomorrow should move its troops toward the Atlantic Ocean, European territory would be conquered, but the Russian industrial centers would be destroyed from the air. This would be a bad swap from any point of view. It seems clear that we could strike a devastating series of blows against the Soviet's vital centers. Or so I read the newspapers, and so I believe the Russian rulers read their own sources of intelligence. As long as the United States strategic air force is in this commanding position, the danger of Russian troops marching to the channel is relatively slight.

But as the years go by, the deterrent power of strategic bombing will meet an ever-mounting counterthreat—a threat to the industrial centers of Great Britain and the United States, to the continental cities themselves. Any doubt about our being engaged in an arms race has certainly disappeared The Russians are building up their offensive strength and doubtless likewise their own defenses against strategic bombing. The time may well come when these defensive measures are far more effective than at present. Under their totalitarian system they have been able to direct as much of their industrial strength as they desired into the manufacture of military equipment; they have been able to concentrate on building radar networks, jet planes, and antiaircraft weapons.

Now an arms race today is a highly technical affair. Both sides have equipment on the production line, new developments being tested, blueprints of designs not yet off the drawing boards. No one can say with certainty when one side or the other has the predominance; for few military men will challenge the statement that the battle alone is the pay-off. But what determines the course of history is the estimate of men in control of national destinies as to the chances of success in a future war. Therefore the danger of a third global war, I am convinced, turns on the fact that a few years hence the handful of men who rule Russia may decide that the power of our strategic Air Force has been largely canceled out. If at that time Europe is defenseless on the ground, the Russian hordes will begin to move. Strengthening the defense of Europe in terms not of a deterrent threat against Russian cities but in terms of armies to stop an advance—this seems to me the top item on the agenda of the free nations of the world. Only then can we achieve a true global stalemate.

We need not only trained manpower but, as Dr. Vannevar Bush says, the most modern weapons for our men to use. We shall have them, perhaps including tactical atomic weapons. There will be a tactical air force. We shall not meet hordes with hordes. We can and must maintain superiority in the quality of weapons for perhaps a generation. Our Defense Establishment must be geared up to do the best possible job in research and the development of new instruments of war.

But at this point some listener may object. He or she may say it is impossible to defend Europe against the vast manpower of Russia and its satellites. This clearly is a question which only military men are capable of answering with authority. General Eisenhower, whose professional competence no one can challenge, has just returned from an inspection of the situation. If he believed Europe to be indefensible he would, as he said, "recommend that we abandon the North Atlantic Treaty alliance and—by ourselves—attempt however futilely, to build a separate fortress against aggression." He made no such recommendation. Quite the contrary. Such a recommendation, he said, was for him impossible. He reports, "In every capital, there is growing a desire to cooperate in this mutual security effort." The governments are taking measures to build up their defense establishments.

"On every side," General Eisenhower said, "I saw heartening evidence of a regeneration in Europe's spirit. Its morale, its will to fight, will grow with every accretion to physical strength. * * *

"The preservation of free America," General Eisenhower said, "requires our participation in the defense of Western Europe."

"While the transfer to Europe of American military units is essential," General Eisenhower continued, "our major and special contribution should be in the field of munitions and equipment."

"The arrival in Europe of new American land and air units, though modest in protective influence by themselves, will certainly produce added confidence and accelerate the production of military force throughout the member nations."

"Success," he held, "is attainable. Given unity in spirit and action, the job can be done."

That is General Eisenhower's conviction after a first-hand appraisal of the situation.

What must we do here at home?

What is required of the United States, if we are to play our part in the defense of the free world—in building this wall of security of which General Eisenhower has spoken? Clearly, the rapid production of arms and military equipment—and on this we are well embarked. But we must also be in a position to furnish men as well as arms.

To quote General Eisenhower once again: "We have to devise a scheme that we can support if necessary over the next 20 years, 30 years, whatever may be the time necessary, as long as the threat, the announced threat of aggression remains in the world."

In other words, General Eisenhower says that we in the United States must be prepared to stand by in a partially mobilized state for a long period of years. To this end we must have a system of universal military service.

Let me talk for a moment about universal military service and training. As you know, Congress now has before it a universal military service bill. The Committee on the Present Danger is supporting this bill. This measure needs to be understood by the American public, for there is much confusion as to what is in fact involved.

In any discussion of universal military service, it is important to separate certain issues which can all too easily become entangled. In the first place, we are not talking about the type of legislation which would be needed to mobilize the manpower of the country on a total basis if we became engaged in a global war. That is another subject. What would be required in such an eventuality would be a national service act such as was proposed in the closing days of World War II but never became law. I am not discussing this evening mobilization for an all-out war. I am discussing, rather, partial mobilization for a long-drawn-out period of international stress and strain. I am discussing the method of maintaining over many years three and a half to four million men in our Armed Forces.

What the situation requires is a universal military service act which will call into the Armed Forces all able-bodied young men when they graduate from high school or reach 18 years of age, whichever is later. This is a vital point in the argument; this is the essence of the bill which must not be destroyed by amendment. Those of us who support the bill believe that the interruption of a young man's education should be before college, not during college, and for those who go direct from high school to a job, before starting in an occupation.

After they have completed the 27 months of military service, these young men will be ready to enter college or go to work. The problems which bedeviled us in World War II in regard to deferring special types of students or essential men in industry will be eliminated if military service is performed between the ages of 18 and 20. To my mind, it is quite clear that a man's military service had best be done before he enters the productive life of the country or before he begins his collegiate or professional education.

On this point we have the testimony of Dr. William C. Menninger, who was chief psychiatrist of the Army in World War II.

"From the point of view of the mental health of our young men," Dr. Menninger said, "a program of universal military service and training is far more practical than our present system of selective service. The present system engenders hostility in the man who is selected because he must carry an unfair share of the burden. Because it is selective, it tends to stimulate men to seek deferment on whatever grounds they may be able to plead."

"With our present system," he continues, "a man of draft eligible age lives in uncertainty from mail to mail. The result is great unrest in our youth of this age, not only in colleges but in industry and business."

Dr. Menninger concludes that—

"A system which begins at a definite age, which distributes equally the responsibility and privileges among all youth, and which runs for a definite length of service, is far superior, from the mental health point of view, to our present indefinite and discriminatory system under the selective service law."

That is the testimony of the psychiatrist, Dr. William Menninger.

Now, there is one obvious difficulty in a scheme of universal service between 18 and 20. How is one to provide from each age group the required number of officers and specialists? I have become persuaded, contrary to my first opinion, that in order to accomplish the training of officers and specialists a small fraction of each age group should be selected after basic training by a civilian board and sent to the colleges for specialized education. This feed-back proposal, which first came before public attention as a result of recommendations of the Association of American Universities, is incorporated in the bill now before the Congress. The inclusion of this feed-back meets the objections that many educators first raised to a universal military service program.

Some scientists have been disturbed lest the passage of this bill strike a serious blow at the national defense by interfering with the continuous flow of trained men. I venture to think they are mistaken and I call as an expert witness Dr. Vannevar Bush, who headed all our scientific work during the last war.

Dr. Bush appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to urge the passage of this universal military service and training bill, and this is what he said:

"We should call all young men at 18 without exception, adjusting standards to defer only those who cannot be used somewhere in the widely varied efforts of the Military Establishment. Once the system is in full operation, the process of choice of men to receive advanced training to become officers or to develop new weapons, to maintain our public health, or to perform other professional duties should be on a secure basis of fair competition. There will be adjustments needed in a transition period, for it would be absurd to denude our laboratories just when we need them most, and it would be short-sighted to deny to industry the engineers it must have to build new weapons in adequate quantities in the next year or two.

"But when the system is in full operation," Dr. Bush went on, "every youth on reaching 18 should expect to go into the service of his country, with his subsequent advancement and the nature of his assignments during the entire age period until he emerges from the Reserves and goes his own way determined by competitive tests and the judgment of fair men."

I heartily agree with Dr. Bush. And it is hardly likely we shall be foolish enough to draft out of the colleges today students who are well on their way toward the completion of their specialized training.

Let me emphasize the distinction between universal service and selective service, for this point is often misunderstood. The bill before Congress is a real universal military service bill and not merely an extension of the Selective Service Act to include 18-year-olds. The power given the President to call up men by age groups and the establishment of a large reserve are the distinguishing features. When the call goes out for an age group the draft boards will make no deferments in this group on grounds of occupation or dependencies. When the program becomes fully operative the services could count on at least 700,000 to 750,000 men from each age group, and another 100,000 for limited service by lowering the present physical and mental standards for induction.

In addition to providing a force in being the continual flow into the Armed Forces of those who reach 18 and their release after about 2 years will provide over the years a pool of trained manpower—a large body of men in reserve status. I believe this to be imperative. The danger of all-out war is so serious that all our young men must have military training for their own protection as well as for the protection of their country.

The present selective service law expires in June. Clearly before that date Congress must act on the bill that is now before it. But one may hope that the matter may be settled in the coming weeks. Delay will not reassure the free peoples of the Continent; it will not contribute to the morale of our young men. Quite the contrary. Until it is settled how we are to recruit our armies there will be a feeling of uncertainty and confusion in many families throughout the land. I suppose all of us who are urging the rapid rearmament of the United States would agree that there is nothing we like about the whole business. Universal military service is a bitter pill to swallow, and I for one have come most reluctantly to support such a program. But the desperate need to build up our military strength cannot be denied. One of the chief reasons for the existence of the committee under whose auspices I speak tonight is the belief that we must take immediate steps to meet the national danger. We urge all our citizens to impress upon the Congress and the administration the imperative need for prompt and adequate action. We have no time to lose.

Many of us remember with what shock we read of the fall of France in 1940 and with what fear we awaited the outcome of the battle of Britain. Our military men,

we know now, were full of apprehension as to what would be the consequences to the United States of the loss of the British Isles. The margin of victory then was narrow enough, we all recall. But with the weapons of the 1950's an enemy in control of the channel ports would be far more dangerous, perhaps impossible to stop.

In short, while the defense of Europe is essential for the survival of Europe, it is just as essential for the survival of a free United States. Again on this point General Eisenhower speaks with authority:

"Western Europe," he reminds us, "has the greatest pool of skilled labor in the world and a vast industrial capacity second only to that of the United States. Now if we take that whole complex with its potential for military exploitation and transfer it from our side to another side, the military balance of power has shifted so drastically that our safety would be gravely imperiled."

Note carefully General Eisenhower's use of the words "gravely imperiled," which he repeated to emphasize the seriousness, to his mind, of the possibility of the loss of Europe. Europe lost—just sketch the outline of such a world and fill in the details yourself, all the terrible details. Imagine as in a nightmare the Soviet Union in control directly or through puppets of all of Europe, the Middle East, and the North of Africa—Great Britain neutralized, this hemisphere alone. Think in terms of military strategy, think in terms of raw materials, think in terms of western civilization. However you look at it the picture is too terrifying for contemplation.

What is the alternative? A third global war? Not to my mind. It may be forced upon us any day—that one must admit. Conceivably the masters of the Soviet Union have already decided to start world war III and given the necessary orders. If so, a global war is indeed inevitable. But otherwise peace or war hang precariously in the balance of the future. I believe there is still a chance, a good chance, of avoiding world war III—a war which can lead only to wholesale destruction with no clear victory possible for either side. I believe there is a good chance of avoiding this catastrophe, but only if Europe is made defensible and without delay. For today we are dealing with an inherently unstable situation. To be sure the free world has the ability to punish an aggressor who moves his troops by destroying his cities from the air. But matching possible retaliation against possible invasion provides no true opposition of military strengths; it provides no basis for successful negotiation. Not that we should cease discussing with the Soviet Union the settlement of disputed points in Europe. We must continue to explore every road to peace. But we cannot approach the heart of the present tensions, the technological arms race, we cannot even consider steps toward disarmament until the free peoples of Europe can be defended and feel secure.

I venture to conclude on a note that I trust will not seem unduly optimistic. If the United States will show leadership, be both calm and strong, prove that freedom can endure even long years of partial mobilization, then there is hope for the second half of the twentieth century. I see a radically altered international situation a decade or more hence, a free world secure on its own frontiers, a Soviet Union with vastly diminished ambitions and pretensions, yet itself secure against invasion. Under such conditions, the United Nations might well function as those who founded it first dreamed. Under such conditions, steps toward disarmament would no longer be regarded as utopian; the terror of modern weapons might slowly vanish from the skies.

But while the present danger lasts the peoples of the free world must be armed and ready. As General Eisenhower has so well said, we must meet the fearful unity of totalitarian force with a higher unity—the unity of freemen that will not be defeated.

Julius Ochs Adler, Raymond B. Allen, Frank Altschul, William Douglas Arant, James Henry Baxter III, Laird Bell, Lewis H. Brown, Harry A. Bullis, Vannevar Bush, Will L. Clayton, James B. Conant, Robert Cutler, R. Ammi Cutter, Harold W. Dodds, Charles Dollard, William J. Donovan, Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Meta Glass, Edward S. Greenbaum, Monte M. Lemann, William L. Marbury, William C. Menninger, Frederick A. Middlebush, John Lord O'Brian, Robert P. Patterson, Howard C. Petersen, Stanley Resor, Theodore W. Schultz, Robert E. Sherwood, Robert G. Sproul, Robert L. Stearns, Tracy S. Voorhees, Henry M. Wriston, Committee on the Present Danger.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 324, the purpose of which is to change our fiat currency, which is causing most of our troubles in the domestic field, to a sound currency with a metallic base. I shall not enlarge upon this subject at the present time, except to say that I still agree, as I always have, with Hon. William McKinley's definition of sound money. The essence of his sound money philosophy I quote in his own words:

The money of the United States, and every kind or form of it, whether paper, silver, or gold, must be as good as the best in the world. It must not only be current at its full face value at home, but it must be counted at par in any and every commercial center of the globe. The dollar paid to the farmer, the wage earner, and the pensioner must continue forever in equal purchasing and debt-paying power to the dollar paid to any government creditor.

To those who believe in sound money, and I know of no person connected with the New Deal who does, the article published by Mr. Herbert Bratter in the Sunday edition of the Washington Evening Star should give cause for serious reflection on this subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting Mr. Bratter's article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNITED STATES IS BARGAIN COUNTER OF THE WORLD GOLD MARKET—OTHER NATIONS BUY IT LOW HERE, SELL HIGH; BLACK MARKET MOCKS MONETARY FUND RULES

(By Herbert Bratter)

In Washington today a dollar is one-thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold. But no one cares about the price of gold in these days of inflation; gold, the only commodity that has remained fixed in price since 1934. No one cares, because you can't get gold legally to hoard.

The Treasury may care, though. The Treasury deals in gold with foreign governments and central banks. Gold is used as the measure of the relative values of the world's different currencies. The Treasury pays $35 an ounce for all gold offered to it; and charges foreign governments and the jewelry trade $35 an ounce when it sells gold.

Many people about the world do not think the dollar still worth one-thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold. In places abroad where the laws are not so rigid, or not so rigidly enforced as here, individuals trade in gold at prices well above the legal limit. This trade goes on with the use of local currencies. Frenchmen, for instances, buy and sell gold quite freely in Paris every day, using francs as money.

American dollars are also used in some of this gold trade abroad. And not all this trade is between private parties exclusively. Governments and central banks participate in it, sometimes through the subterfuge of selling "industrial" gold to "industry"; and sometimes just plain gold coins to any buyer at hand. This governmental activity keeps the world's black markets supplied with the yellow metal. And since black markets involve both gold and currencies, the rules to which the members of the International Monetary Fund are solemnly committed are daily being mocked.

TYPE OF GOLD DIGGING

What riles, or should rile, the United States Treasury is that governments which are free to turn in dollars here and get gold for them at $35 an ounce are busy selling gold for dollars and other currencies at premium prices. This means that they are using Uncle Sam's gold policy as a good thing. Recently, it is reliably reported the Bank of France was reproved for engaging in this type of gold digging. It is not a new practice with the Bank of France. It seems to be just a case where London got irked about it. Why Washington should wait for London to prod it, if it did wait, is not quite clear.

Other countries have been selling gold at high prices while simultaneously buying the metal from the United States at the fixed price of $35. Mexico, for instance. South Africa's battle with Secretary of the Treasury Snyder in the International Monetary Fund has long been a matter of record. South Africa seems to have won out. It has been busy since 1949 selling all the gold the traffic will bear at premium prices.

Now Canada is under pressure from its gold miners to go and do likewise. And Canada has always been held forth as a model of good international behavior, even though, along with many other countries, it has found a way to subsidize its gold miners and still be a member of the fund in good standing. For the miners, a subsidy is the same as a higher price.

As the residual buyer of the world's gold for these many years, the United States is the keystone which holds the structure of the international gold bullion standard together. If we stepped out, the arch would tumble. Since the dollar we use at home is completely of the paper variety and now daily losing some of its value in trade, the American gold standard has degenerated into a form of global charity from which the U. S. S. R., along with the rest of the world, is free to benefit. Temporarily, thanks to Korea, we are in such a hurry to buy materials abroad the while we are also developing and reconstructing the world with gifts and loans, that we have had to send gold away to balance the books.

Only a few days ago, for instance, one of the big London banks in an advertisement in the New York Times revealed how one country's loss can be another country's gain. While we are exporting gold for the above reasons, Britain's gold stock is rising. Said the chairman of Lloyds Bank, Ltd., to his shareholders:

"The elimination of the sterling area's current dollar deficit meant that during

1950 we were able to place the whole of our Marshall aid receipts to reserve."

In other words, the Marshall plan is now being used to give gold away.

BRITAIN'S STOCK RISES

The British, of course, like others, argue that a country needs a comfortable gold reserve against the time when the trouble with Russia has been settled and dollars again become scarce. At such time gold may again be expected to flow toward the United States "magnet."

Among the anomalies of American gold policy let us now turn to a recent announcement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the so-called World Bank, devised at Bretton Woods in 1944 along with the International Monetary Fund.

In January the World Bank announced in Washington conclusion of arrangements long under study to lend South Africa $50,000,000 for electric power and transport purposes. Simultaneously, South Africa obtained an additional $10,000,000 from eight American commercial banks, in effect, as part of the above-mentioned arrangement. The bank announced that the money will be used in part to finance the large expected industrial demands of the new Orange Free State gold fields. There, in what until recently was open country, rich deposits of gold have been discovered and huge mines and whole cities will be created to extract the precious yellow metal from the bowels of the earth.

A bank spokesman reports that South Africa, already the largest gold producer in the world, with the full development of the Orange Free State fields, hopes to increase its annual gold output by as much as 50 percent. In other words, with the aid of the World Bank's dollars, South Africa expects to dig out of the earth the gold with which to repay the loan. And if the trend in recent years proves to have been only interrupted by the conflict which began in Korea last June, one way or another the new South African gold will find its way into the vaults of Fort Knox.

NEED OUR OWN EQUIPMENT

What will South Africa buy with the dollars which it is now being lent and which, the bank has announced, may be supplemented by further lending in the future? The shopping list includes such items as turbo-generators, boilers and accessories, electrical apparatus including switch gear, transformers, power and control cable, cable for station lighting and grounding, pumps without which no deep mine can continue operations, piping and structural materials. During World War II South Africa was insistent in its requests for priorities for American mining equipment to keep the Rand gold mines working. Today, when we are turning our economy topsy-turvey for the defense of the Western World, it seems odd to be setting aside large productive resources for such equipment as is enumerated above, equipment which consumes not only valuable manpower but strategic and critical materials. However justifiable it might appear in normal times to finance the output of more gold, these are not normal times. If the United States Government lends its support to such ventures today, what can it answer tomorrow, when our own gold mining industry and that of other friendly countries ask for similar equipment?

The Orange Free State gold fields, it is said, may yield uranium as well as gold. South African gold ores, like the oil shales of Sweden and the marine prosphate deposits of the United States, are potential sources of that element as a byproduct. But the World Bank does not contend that its purpose in lending to South Africa is uranium production.

From one standpoint, it might be said that the World Bank is lending to South Africa to replenish that country's gold and dollar reserves. The bank states that without its loans South Africa could secure the desired equipment only at the expense of its foreign exchange reserves and maintenance of foreign exchange reserves at a satisfactory level is particularly important to South Africa. That is, South Africa would rather not use its own money.

FOREIGN-EXCHANGE ANGLE

But there is a more interesting foreign-exchange angle to the loan. Twenty percent of the loan proceeds will be spent in the dollar area, while the rest will be spent almost entirely in the United Kingdom, in sterling. Yet the bank is lending the $50,000,000 to South Africa in dollars. In explanation, the bank states that the type of equipment South Africa wants is in short supply here and at best could not be delivered within a reasonable time, whereas Europe and particularly Britain can supply what is needed. And to buy in Britain one requires pounds sterling.

The World Bank holds some two hundred and thirty million of uncommitted pounds sterling; that is, British currency paid in as part of Britain's subscription to the bank's capital. When the Bretton Woods Bank was launched, it was in part on the basis of the argument that all the member countries would contribute local currencies—plus a small gold payment—and that when a borrower needed one of those local currencies the bank would draw on its supply thereof.

TREASURY CONCERNED

But in this instance, as in others, it does not work out like that in practice. Bank spokesmen explain that the British do not consent to the bank lending pounds sterling to South Africa. Were the bank to do so, the South Africans would spend the sterling in Britain. British equipment would be shipped to South Africa and Britain would have nothing to show for the transaction. It would be what the British term as an "unrequited export." So the bank is going to have to take dollars and go out into the exchange markets and buy pounds sterling therewith, to the extent of about $40,000,000 the while its £230,000,000 remains untouched for lack of permission to use it.

When the deal is carried out, $40,000,000 of British equipment will be exported from that country to South Africa and $40,000,000 more will have been added to Britain's gold and dollar reserves. These dollars will be supplied by American investors in the World Bank's bonds.

Under a British-South Africa agreement, South Africa is paying regularly in gold for £50,000,000 of its purchases of goods in Britain.

The loan which the World Bank has made to South Africa necessarily had the approval of the National Advisory Council, whose Chairman is the Secretary of the Treasury. The Treasury has been not a little concerned in recent years over the tendency of other countries to operate in the gold market at premium prices. At the last two annual meetings of the World Fund, Secretary Snyder has resisted the forceful demands of South Africans for a higher price of gold. Latterly, South Africa's Government has encouraged the sale of South African gold on world free markets at prices which are illegal under the rules of the World Monetary Fund. Now, in effect, South Africa is being rewarded through the World Bank for its flouting of that other American-supported monetary institution, the World Fund.

In recent years we have had committees to formulate American policy on foreign aid, raw materials, and the like. Perhaps we should have a committee of able students to tell us in simple words what America's gold policy is or should be.

Roll Back the Prices and Tax Excess Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every one of us is being deluged with protests over the order freezing prices and wages, because the order failed to make the price controls retroactive for a reasonable period.

I am inserting at this point two typical complaints, received by me, which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. The first is a resolution of the City Council of Hamtramck, a progressive and dynamic community in my congressional district, of which I pride myself to be a citizen. The resolution is dated January 30, 1951, and reads, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY COUNCILMAN ROOKS

Resolved, That the common council does hereby protest the freezing of prices of commodities at the highest price level reached in the period of December 19 to January 25, and does hereby request that immediate steps be taken to roll back prices to at least December 1, 1950, to provide relief for workers whose wages did not increase in proportion to run-away prices; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of said resolution be forwarded to President Truman, the Price Director, Congressman T. M. Machrowicz, and Senators Homer Ferguson and Arthur Vandenberg.

Supported by Councilman Dulapa.

Carried by the following vote: Yeas: Councilmen Dulapa, Kozak, Wojtylo, Rooks, and Bielski. Nays: None. Absent: None.

The second is a letter which I received from one of the board of auditors of Wayne County, Mich., which expresses the sentiments of many of our citizens:

BOARD OF WAYNE COUNTY AUDITORS,
Detroit, Mich., February 7, 1951.

Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ,
Michigan Congressman, First District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACHROWICZ: Because of innumerable vigorous complaints on the part of my constituents regarding the inadequacy of price control, I am forced to address this communication to you in order that you may be advised of the widespread and deep-seated dissatisfaction on the part of our loyal Democratic supporters.

It is the feeling of these people that the proposed price-control formula is totally inadequate. Furthermore, it is my personal belief which is shared by many that if effective price controls were to be established, that the prices should be rolled back to approximately June 1, 1950, prior to the start of hostilities. It is also the opinion of my constituents, which is wholeheartedly supported by myself, that the formula as presented could hardly be termed even an idle gesture insofar as its effectiveness and equity is concerned, and it is my considered judgment that only by making price controls retroactive to a normal period, preferably June 1950, would any effective lasting benefits be realized by the public.

It is generally conceded by the wage earners and taxpayers in my community that the wages have not kept pace with the recent rapid advance in prices, etc., and unless some

adequate remedy is applied, I cannot see how the taxpaying public could make any further contribution in taxes, etc., to Government.

The inequity of the ill-conceived and ill-advised proposed price control without regard to wages, plus the proposed increase in income tax and other taxes has acted as a two-edged sword to sever and alienate the strongest and stanchest of our Democratic supporters.

Because of the seriousness of this situation, I am calling it to your personal attention in the hope that you may take an active part in correcting this very unsatisfactory situation.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR A. SUMERACKI,
Wayne County Auditor.

It cannot be denied that the general public in all parts of the country is greatly disappointed and dismayed that the price-freeze order failed to take cognizance of unwarranted and unjust price increases which became prevalent for several months before the price-freeze and particularly after the announcement that a price-freeze was imminent.

Prices were frozen at the highest levels and failed to give the public any real relief from inflation. The order gives little hope for relief for some time in the future. It rewards those who took advantage of advance notices to raise their prices and punishes those who patriotically held the line.

The times and the situation call for direct and courageous action, not for half-way steps. On February 8, 1951, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced H. R. 2515, a bill to roll prices back to June 25, 1950, and to impose a 100-percent tax on excess profits above the normal peacetime profit of the year 1949. I wish to commend the gentleman and express the sincere hope that this bill will soon be reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means and adopted by this Congress.

It is the best way that I can think of to prove to the people of this country that we are honest, sincere, and courageous in our determination to stop the vicious inflationary spiral and put our domestic economy on a sound and fair basis.

What About Conditions in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter I have written to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, together with an enclosure of said letter. I also wish to enclose portions of a letter received from a father who has a son in Korea. These documents are as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1951.

Gen. CLIFTON B. CATES,
Commandant,
The United States Marine Corps,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL CATES: An individual in whom I have great confidence and who is a friend and supporter of the marines has written me concerning the situation in Korea. Following is a portion of that letter:

"Another marine, who was at Chosin Reservoir and participated in the march to the Hungnam beachhead, reported to his mother that not only were many of his outfit without parkas but that the few who had them were relieved of them. He said that when he observed the servicing of the equipment for cold weather and deducted that he also should be prepared for duty where it was cold. Therefore, he decided he should find something to wear in place of the summer uniform provided him. Consequently, he proceeded to 'borrow' warm wool clothing from Army store aboard ship and went into the cold of Korea in these while others were clad in summer uniforms. This or another boy reported that they found men who failed to answer roll call frozen in their beds on the ground."

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which my informant sent to me, and which was received from a Nebraska marine.

I should like to have a report on these matters. Thanking you, I am,

Very truly yours,

CARL T. CURTIS.

POHANG, KOREA, *January 21, 1951.*

How are you all this cold Sunday afternoon? I am pretty good except it is very cold. It got down to about zero last night with a high wind.

Writing on this paper may seem to you as a joke, but it is not. We are that hard up for anything here. Fact is, we stole the toilet paper that I am writing on. We are out of paper, we are eating on very slim rations, because the Army rations them out to us. They figure we can eat and live on a little bit of nothing.

The PX is open, but all they have is shaving gear. You cannot eat or write on shaving cream. It is no fun to go to bed, or go to work, on only a half full stomach.

We look forward to a package from home because we know it will most likely be something to eat. We try to steal us some extra chow whenever we can, so we will have something in the tent to eat between meals.

Another thing, these are not as necessary as food, but we can hardly get a cigarette to smoke. The PX does not seem to have them. We are supposed to get a ration of beer but we do not get it most of the time. One night they even cut us down to half a can apiece. These things are not the necessities of life but it certainly helps the morale of the troops over here.

We moved up here onto a plateau not far from the beach. The mud was 6 inches deep up here. We sloshed around in the mud setting up our tents, then the commanding officer put out an order that there would be no straw bought off of the "gooks" and put on the ground.

The officers have cots, and some of us guys have cots, but a lot of the outfit are sleeping on the ground. Three of my squad do not have cots yet. We will most likely have to steal some someplace for them.

I am not writing this for sympathy for us. We are in hopes you can get something into the paper to do us some good.

A DISGUSTED MARINE.

FEBRUARY 7, 1951.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I have not bothered you with a letter for a couple of weeks. But this past week I received a letter from my dear boy in Korea that made me sick at heart and I decided to write to you again and ask you if you Congressmen can't do something to help our boys in Korea.

If you can't bring them out of that hopeless conflict then at least let them have the liberty to fight the enemy with everything available to gain the victory. Their hands are tied by the insane policy of the Government in refusing them permission to bomb Manchuria and China. I think that a few atom bombs on the cities of China would bring them to terms as it did with the Japanese.

My son, Dale, who has been through all the severe fighting ever since the first marines landed in Korea in August including that terrible battle from Chosin Reservoir to Hungnam has never written a single complaint till his last letter. In the letter we received from him last week he writes, "The Chinese are not the only ones who are cold, hungry, and weary of this war. We are cold, hungry, and weary of the war, too. We hope some kind of reasonable peace can be made with the Chinese and that we can come home." He says that he does not mind the combat but that the cold weather is the worst thing, that if it were summer it would not be so bad.

Fight To Win or Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, whatever else has happened as a result of Korea, the American people are finally awake and thinking. This time we have got to think through our great foreign problem. Here is a good example of American thought, an editorial from the New York World-Telegram as follows:

FIGHT TO WIN OR QUIT

General MacArthur says that the American Army fighting in Korea as the agent of the United Nations awaits political decisions from "the chancelleries of the world" on the problem confronting it.

That problem is the intervention of Red China, dating from last October.

"Considering that the entire military might of Communist China is available against this relatively small command (the UN forces)," General MacArthur warns, "only by maneuver may it avoid hazards inherent in the great odds which it now faces."

That is a clear challenge to the gentlemen representing the United Nations at Lake Success to make up their minds what they intend to do. And it must be answered.

The American resolution branding the Reds as aggressors, which has been presented to the UN, makes no provision for sanctions against Red China and carefully avoids anything that might be interpreted as authorizing Gen. MacArthur to strike directly at Peiping's homeland and supply bases. It is from China itself, and the bases there, that the Red forces fighting our troops are being supplied. But our troops have become the forgotten men in this war.

The Defense Department is trying to muzzle Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, who raised this same issue upon his recent return from Korea.

"We have been fighting distinctly under wraps since the Communists came into the war," General O'Donnell says. "I never thought I'd see the day when we would have to sit back with our hands tied * * * if we're going to fight, let's not hit 'em light, for heaven's sake. It's time people know that this is an all-out war."

TROOPS HAVE BEEN LET DOWN

That is mild to what the boys in the frozen foxholes are saying.

They have been let down. They know it. They want to come home.

They are tired of being shot at like sitting ducks while the United Nations exchanges notes with the outlaw Chinese government at Peiping.

The State Department seems determined to make General MacArthur the goat in this situation, just as it made former Defense Secretary Johnson the goat for the original debacle in Korea.

But it can't get away with that. The record is too clear.

The fault is not in Korea, but in Washington, in London, and at Lake Success.

The weakness of American political leadership was demonstrated when it was unable to persuade any of the great powers to join us in sponsoring the mild condemnation resolution presented to the UN.

Britain, Canada, and the other fair-weather friends will vote for this resolution on the show-down. But they'll do it with great reluctance. And they are not prepared to support any reprisal measures against the Chinese Reds. Yet this resolution would do nothing more than officially recognize a condition which has been fact for 3 months while ducking the question of what is to be done about it. So the resolution itself is an act of appeasement.

GENERALS GAGGED—ON CARPET

General MacArthur has been gagged and General O'Donnell has been called on the carpet, doubtless to be warned to make no more statements on the outrageous way the policy makers have bungled this whole affair. But the truth will out, despite gags and censorship. The record made at Lake Success is there for all to read.

Our Army in Korea has plenty of fight left in it, according to General Collins, the Army Chief of Staff.

But why should that Army fight when the cause it is supporting has been disowned by the organization it is representing? No effort is being made to reinforce it. Why should more men die on a mission that seems to have been abandoned?

The UN must answer these questions, or it will be faithless to the world which has placed its trust in it and faithless to the men who have died fighting in its name.

Economic sanctions should be voted against Red China. Its ports should be blockaded. The bases from which it is supplying its outlaw forces should be bombed. Aid should be extended to the guerrilla forces fighting the Reds on the China mainland. The Chinese Nationalists should be encouraged to return to China proper so that the Reds will be forced to fight on two fronts. That is the way to carry on this war if there is any desire to win it.

It cannot be won by the present half-hearted measures.

If the UN doesn't intend to fight to win, then our troops should be pulled out and the whole enterprise abandoned.

If the UN will not face up to this issue, then our own Government must. We should fight to win or quit.

Marquette Alumnae's Accomplishments for Their Alma Mater Shows Free Enterprise at Its Best

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the alumnae of Marquette University have done a marvelous job for the coed students at Marquette. In 1938, they started with $10 000 of borrowed money to provide housing for these girls. Now, only 12 short years later they are engaged in constructing a new $1,000,000 residence hall.

All this has been done through the energies and efforts of the Marquette alumnae. It shows what can be accomplished by an energetic and determined group of women. This shows free enterprise at its best. Free enterprise is not merely the right of a person to engage in a commercial business for profit. Rather, it encompasses all forms of action whereby an individual or a group of individuals band together to promote a program for the general good of society.

To detail more fully the job which these women have done, I include herewith an article from the Milwaukee Journal of January 28, 1951:

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S PROJECT OF BETTER LIVING FOR COEDS WORKS OUT WELL

(By Dorothy Witte)

Look at the abundance of bobbed heads and curly bangs, shoulder-length hairdos and sleekly waved heads when Marquette classes break on the avenue and you would think women had always been part of the Marquette scene. But there was a time, not too long ago, as many Milwaukeeans remember, when they were not.

Coeducation began slowly at Marquette University. In 1906 there was a training school for nurses, but it was not considered exactly a part of the University. In 1908 the first woman was graduated from the law school. In 1910 there were one or two women in the colleges of music and journalism. And in 1913 a scattered few women were graduated in dentistry and liberal arts and medicine.

Slim beginnings, to be sure, but the women of Marquette have been making up for it ever since. In those days, of course, there were no gathering places for the women students, and no housing for out-of-towners, most of whom stayed in private homes.

Now it is a different story, and the story has been written by the women of the university with the benevolent smile of the school fathers. Thirteen years ago the Jesuit priests who managed the university loaned a newly formed women's alumnae group $10,000. Since then the highly ambitious, loosely knit group has accomplished amazing things:

BUILDINGS BOUGHT, REBUILT

1. They have purchased and rehabilitated buildings to the amount of $205,092.

2. They have furnished and equipped and maintained these buildings to the amount of $32,608.

3. In addition, they have given $500 to Lisette Lodge, $500 to the university's library fund, $2,000 to the university building fund drive, and $3,000 to the union drive.

This is high finance, no doubt about it. How was it accomplished? Well, they borrowed $10,000, raised $10,000, paid off the loan, and borrowed some more. Borrowing the first $10,000 was the hardest, they say. Here's how it happened.

In the fall of 1937 there seemed to be a growing housing need at Marquette. It was this need which prompted the gathering together of 15 women, the alumnae from every department and college in which women were enrolled. Nucleus of the present Association of Marquette University Women, the women sent invitations to all Marquette women graduates. Five hundred came to the tea at Drexel Lodge, and among them was Hildegarde, who came and played the Drexel piano.

It was in February 1938 that the board issued another call to the women alumnae to come to a luncheon. Nearly 500 came, paid dues of $1, and took on the project of housing for out-of-town women students. (At that time there were 237 women at the university; now there are 1,800 enrolled.)

FIRST DORMITORY IN 1938

By June 1938 they had found the building suitable for the first dormitory, an apartment building at 1135 West Kilbourn Avenue. They borrowed $10,000 from the Jesuit Fathers, paid the apartment owners $4,000 for the first year's rent, and agreed to remodel the building. The owner was George Meyer, Sr., now deceased, who was later to be benefactor of the group. He said they had a free hand and could do anything they wished.

They had $6,000 to accomplish the renovation and furnish the dormitory. The architect father of one of the members, Constance Brielmaier (Mrs. Leo Donovan, now of Oakland, Calif.), donated his services. Housing committee members visited furniture factories, compared prices and bought carefully.

One committee made 98 pairs of draperies, for example. They came to the dormitory, named Alumnae House, cut the fabric lengths, and took them to their homes to sew. They cleaned, painted, waxed, and varnished, preferring to do all the work themselves in order to keep total costs under the $6,000 figure. Their husbands helped move in furniture, and the first women's dormitory was ready in September, 1938, to admit 80 students. Miss Wenonah Eis, 4112 North Ardmore, a member of the first board, took a leave of absence from her teaching duties to become the first house mother.

In the same way the alumnae group has bought, remodeled, refurnished and maintains Rigge Hall, 739 North Eighteenth Street; Nicholas Hall, 731 North Thirteenth Street; Merrity Hall, 1717 West Wisconsin Avenue. By early 1949, all borrowed funds were paid back, and the group decided to renovate a coach house behind Lizette Lodge, 3200 West Highland Boulevard, as a recreation center for all university students. By May 1, 1950, at a cost of $15,000, the remodeling was complete. Hilltop House is a headquarters for mixers, parties, and informal get-togethers, and there are clubrooms on the second floor, and toboggans in the loft. There are also a piano, radio, record player, pingpong table, and a rented television set.

CLEANING AND PARTIES

How were these things accomplished? Many committees worked on many events, large and small, to raise funds. Almost every year there was a card party and style show, for example, which brought in $1,000 to $1,500. A bazaar, at which 12 alumnae chapters of university clubs and sororities had booths, brought in a like amount, and a series of lectures accounted for a similar sum.

A new project of recent years is the Marquette University engagement book and calendar, which is sold to women alumnae members and their friends at $1 a copy. One year a journal photographer, John Alhauser, 2839 South Lenox Street, gave his services without cost and made the photographs for the book. Profits from the calendar book, an idea suggested by Miss Eis, increase every year. Last year, 3,000 copies were sold. This year 5,000 were ordered and requests are still coming in.

"When we borrowed the first $10,000," recalls Mrs. Eugene Wozny, 1642 South Layton Boulevard, president of the association, "we worked hard to pay it back, and as soon as we were solvent, we would borrow more, and that's the way it went." When additional houses were purchased for dormitories, the women would do the needed cleaning themselves. They washed windows and walls and floors, and never hired a workman for a task they could do themselves.

Describing the annual bazaar, a typical fund-raising operation, Mrs. Thomas Callen,

3856 North Thirty-eighth Street, president of the association last year, told of the extensive planning required.

"The chairmen, Kay Iding and Mary Ellen Schwalbach, sent out 4,000 circulars to women graduates 2 months before the bazaar, and the committees were working right up to the day of the event itself," she said.

Big coverall aprons were the best sellers, she reported, and "we had loads of them." The booth with knitted goods also did a large business, and articles which remained after the sale were saved and brought out again to sell at Christmas parties. Toy boxes, she added, went well as late as Valentine's Day.

Similar planning and care went into arrangements for the annual card party and style show. Four tickets were sent to every person on the alumnae list. If members were not able to come they were asked to pick up their table prize and play at home.

RESIDENCE HALL UNDER WAY

"We had no idea so many people would come," said Mrs. Callen. "There was an overflow crowd and we had to make announcements over the public address system, saying 'please don't go home, we're setting up more tables.'"

Five hundred members came, many with their husbands. The style show was a great drawing card, since it presented an opportunity for wives to broach the subject of spring wardrobes to their husbands.

By the end of summer, 1949, remarks Mrs. F. L. McElligott, Thiensville, Wis., dean of women and faculty adviser to the alumnae group, the women were well established. They were, in fact, in a position to borrow more money, and so they did.

Along about this time the Marquette alumni association wanted to reclaim the women's group, which was not altogether anxious to be reclaimed. However, a merger was effected and the two organizations are now associated. The women's group continues to hold its own meetings, manage its own program and raise its own money.

Now the association of Marquette University women is going ahead on a new project, the biggest of all. They are planning to build a new million-dollar H-shaped residence hall. Plans are drawn, contracts are signed, and digging has actually begun on the building, which will extend from Eighteenth Street to Nineteenth Street. Dr. Mary Neville Bielefeld, 2809 North Fifty-sixth Street, who served on the first association board and later as a president, is chairman of the new building project.

One board member remarked, "The new building is going to be out of this world. We are trying to have everything built in, so we've been spending hours with contractors."

So quiet and unobstrusive has the alumnae committee work been that most of the 351 girls who now live in Alumnae House, Merrity Hall, Rigge Hall, and Nicolas Hall, do not know that half the fun of their college lives, the dorm sessions, is directly attributable to the work of Marquette women of an earlier day.

Dead Animals on the Public Highways—Menace to Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I appealed to the various State and Federal authorities to clean the dead animals off of the public highways in order to prevent the spread of those infectious diseases carried by the decaying remains of those various animals. At that time, I published a report issued by Mr. S. W. Jackson, of Franklin, Pa., district engineer for district No. 1 of the highway department of that State.

I have just received another report from Mr. Jackson showing the number of dead animals of various kinds removed from the highways in the various counties of that district during each of the last 10 years.

If every highway official were as diligent as Mr. Jackson has been in removing dead birds and animals from the highways as soon as they are found, I feel sure that it would contribute greatly to the health of the Nation.

It is regretted that Mr. Jackson is now retiring from his position of district engineer, after 42 years of continuous service. I certainly hope his successor will follow his splendid example, and that every other highway official in America will do the same thing.

The report of Mr. Jackson referred to follows:

RECORD OF DEAD ANIMALS AND BIRDS KILLED BY MOTOR VEHICLES DURING THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FROM 1941 TO 1950, INCLUSIVE

This slaughter was confined to the 4,095 miles of State highways contained in district No. 1 located in northwestern Pennsylvania and includes the counties of Erie, Warren, Crawford, Forest, Mercer, Venango, and Lawrence. The number of animals and birds removed, is not an estimate, but an actual count, made by the department of caretakers who remove the bodies and report through the department maintenance superintendents to the district engineer's office in Franklin, where the annual report is compiled. The figures recorded below do not include Lawrence County for the years 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 which were not available. These figures do not make any allowance for escaped cripples or for bodies removed by carrion eaters, or by sources outside the department of highways.

WILD BIRDS AND ANIMALS

Species	County total for the year 1950							District total for the years										10 year grand total
	Erie	Warren	Crawford	Forest	Mercer	Venango	Lawrence	1950	1949	1948	1947	1946	1945	1944	1943	1942	1941	
Rabbits	1,543	1,127	3,026	548	2,577	1,249	1,297	11,367	11,727	8,734	5,428	6,603	6,894	6,525	7,155	9,125	8,728	82,286
Woodchucks	84	214	105	144	110	78	85	820	849	610	310	546	520	433	385	415	464	5,352
Squirrels	15	53	32	15	131	17	39	302	367	327	167	259	230	175	170	159	174	2,330
Skunks	155	203	148	95	213	67	137	1,018	1,502	1,205	516	801	925	1,065	1,417	1,797	1,748	11,994
Raccoon	19	42	42	19	90	20	47	279	232	100	31	60	37	36	43	25	27	870
Deer	7	75	6	39	16	9	5	157	142	103	61	40	29	37	21	23	31	644
Bear															2			2
Opossum	675	601	1,089	291	1,046	513	490	4,705	4,403	2,358	906	899	692	1,005	977	695	298	17,028
Weasel	10	2	8	1	2	6	8	37	53	34	10	12	26	20	33	18	10	253
Muskrat	11	7	28		44	5	6	101	105	87	54	80	71	73	141	59	49	820
Mink	1	1	1		2			5	4		2			1	2	2	1	17
Fox	1	4	1		3	2	3	14	13	12	1	5	3	1	8	4	3	64
Porcupine		55		74		12		141	141	135	56	69	41	36	46	17	16	698
Grouse		40	1	50	8	18	1	118	84	41	34	34	25	22	25	36	35	454
Quail			1			2	2	5	11	1	3	6	6	3	0	23	29	93
Ringneck pheasant	75	9	137	2	219	13	131	586	428	314	126	145	165	102	150	157	203	2,376
Woodcock		4	1		1	4	1	11	20	31	4	8	23	35	13	20	8	173
Beaver			1					1		4				1				6
Total	2,596	2,437	4,627	1,278	4,462	2,015	2,252	19,667	20,081	14,096	7,709	9,567	9,687	9,660	10,594	12,575	11,824	125,460

DOMESTIC FOWL AND ANIMALS

Chickens	41	15	105	2	75	25	31	294	371	394	251	356	359	345	382	442	348	3,542
Ducks		1	4		7			12	8	14	8	17	15	21	9	10	19	133
Geese					1			1	1	6	2		11	3				24
Turkeys				3	1		2	6	1	1		3				3	6	20
Guinea fowl		1			3			4	3	5	1	6	15	15		2		51
Cats	430	177	331	40	431	206	259	1,874	2,101	1,823	1,040	1,171	1,006	724	844	1,011	1,178	12,772
Dogs	343	79	154	8	245	99	227	1,055	1,078	954	641	666	594	418	510	594	544	6,964
Horses	1		1		2			4	2	2			1	1		2	5	17
Sheep										1			6	3	2	1	3	16
Cows									1	1	3	5	3	6		4	5	28
Pigs	2		1		3			6	3	1	4	9	7			2	3	35
Mules										1						1		2
Goats										2		2						4
Total	717	273	596	53	768	330	519	3,266	3,569	3,205	1,950	2,235	2,017	1,536	1,747	1,982	2,111	23,609

Hon. Herbert Hoover's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three editorials on Mr. Hoover's speech of February 9. The first is from the Washington Post of Saturday, February 10; the second from the Star of Sunday, February 11; and the third from this morning's Post. They are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 10, 1951]

MR. HOOVER'S REALITIES

There can be little doubt that Mr. Hoover's speech of December 20 helped to bestir the European nations to do more to help themselves. But, while recognizing this, we find his reasoning, a rehash of which was heard last night, as faulty as ever. He continues to misinterpret the North Atlantic alliance. He says that the pact merely provides that the nations shall aid each other in case of attack. But that is only one of the provisions—the ultimate one. The object and the essence of the pact is the clause enjoining the signatories to develop their collective capacity to resist attack. Here was a vow to replace a nationalistic system of defense with a collective system. Does Mr. Hoover think for one moment that there would have been one European signatory if all that Europe could expect was liberation by an American air armada? Before liberation could come, every one of the signatories would have been strung up as soon as the enemy appeared.

It is quite clear, as Mr. Hoover says, that there is no hope of matching the Russian hordes division for division. But no military strategy envisages any such posture. What is planned is the mobilization of enough of a collective force to hold up a Russian advance until such time as our bombers could enfeeble the attackers by demolishing communications and supply lines and bases of supply. We need air, in other words, for use not inside Western Europe but beyond it. Upon no other assumption is there a possibility of galvanizing a will to fight in Western Europe. It has hitherto been the task of American diplomacy to validate such an assumption in the eyes of the people of Europe. The progress to that end has lately been heartening. But there would be an immediate retrogression if the Hoover policy were adopted. The Europeans, seeing the basic assumption undermined, would sink back into an apathy produced by an awareness of their helplessness. There would be, indeed, that lack of cohesion and unity in the free nations which the former President takes for granted on the basis, forsooth, of the interallied arguments in the United Nations.

Adoption of the Hoover policy would ease the Stalinist task to such an extent that this country would find itself facing across an ocean (which Mr. Hoover still calls a "mot") a Russofied Western Europe. From Jefferson on no American statesman has been willing to accept such a prospect. Two world wars have been fought to prevent the Old Continent from falling under the sway of an aggressive power. Now the treatment is going to be different. The prevention of an attack has taken the place of resistance to attack as the guiding principle of American foreign policy. As Mr. Hoover says, "America is the major deterrent to the Kremlin's ambitions of world conquest," but it is a deterrent only as it puts itself in a position which will both command the aid of allies and the safeguarding of their bases and resources from conquest.

It is strange that Mr. Hoover fails to see the need of collective prevention based upon a unified command. He has long been aware of the grand design of Stalinist aggression. He would fight if Stalin seized the other rim of the Atlantic Ocean. The bold policy he eschews in the Atlantic he supports in the Pacific where there is less of a threat to the American interest and where the price is infinitely less precious to Moscow. The sum is that he would insure the very isolation which he fears will be forced upon this country by the failure of the other free nations to defend themselves. The logic of the world situation, surely, is to do what is humanly possible to prevent such a failure—to show Europe as well as Moscow that we mean business, and not by sounding a half-hearted and defeatist warning bell, either.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of February 11, 1951]

MR. HOOVER MISSES THE MARK

In his latest foreign policy talk Herbert Hoover retreats a bit from the position he took last December 20. In the earlier address he said he would not send another man or another dollar to Europe until the Europeans had created enough combat divisions to "erect a sure dam against the Red flood." Mr. Hoover did not repeat that condition Friday night. Instead, he seemed willing to have this country proceed with the extension of aid in the form of arms. But he remains opposed to the idea of sending any more American troops, in substantial numbers, at least, to Europe.

One of Mr. Hoover's troubles is that he tends to fight make-believe battles. Thus in his talk Friday night he said: "There is a stark reality upon which our foreign policies must be based. With any seeable land forces from non-Communist nations, even including the United States, a land offensive against the Communists could bring no military victory, no political conclusion." That may be true. But it is not a "stark reality" if Mr. Hoover is talking about our policy of aiding in the revival of Western Europe's military strength. That program has as its dual aim the creation of enough strength in the West to discourage a Russian attack, and, failing that, enough strength to keep the Russians from overrunning all of Europe. The program does not even remotely contemplate a land offensive against the Communists, and no responsible advocate of the program has ever made any such suggestion. So Mr. Hoover, on this score, is talking not about a stark reality but about an imaginary and unrealistic proposition.

The same thing is true when he says that Communist armies can no more get to Washington than any Allied armies can get to Moscow, and that no responsible military man denies these two conclusions. The answer to this, of course, is that no responsible military man, nor any other responsible person for that matter, has ever suggested that the force we hope to create in Western Europe is capable of getting to Moscow. No such thought is in anyone's mind. The whole purpose is to prevent the Russians from invading Western Europe, not to invade Moscow, and when Mr. Hoover suggests the contrary he is simply setting up a straw man and then knocking him down.

Beyond this, there is a tone of despair and defeatism about Mr. Hoover's speech which should not go unchallenged. He wants to concentrate on the air and sea arms of our defense. "The unbearable strain on our economic system," he said, "will come from trying to do five things at the same time. That is, to maintain armies in the Pacific; to build up an air force; a naval force; to furnish munitions to nations who are determined to defend themselves, and to send land armies to Europe. Our economy cannot carry this load for long."

But Mr. Hoover has said things like this, or very much like this, be ore.

In his speech Friday night he pointed out that the Kremlin has under arms and in reserve probably 300 divisions, with 30,000 tanks and 20,000 airplanes. And he recalled that in World War II, when Russia had no satellites, the Germans failed to overcome her with 240 well-equipped divisions. But at a comparable juncture in history—on November 19, 1941, just about 3 weeks before Pearl Harbor—he made another talk. Then he was opposing American intervention in the war against Hitler. He doubted that we could break the military stalemate in Europe, and he pointed out that "we can now observe that Russia could not overcome the German Army, even with her 10,000,000 men, 20,000 tanks, 20,000 planes, fighting on her own soil behind her own fortifications with her transportation wholly overland and on inside lines." It was an argument with an impressive and authoritative ring. But that German Army was chewed up and destroyed.

Mr. Hoover, in that same address, did not believe we could send an army to Europe and defeat the Germans. He thought our freedoms would be lost and our economy ruined. We would need 5,000,000 to 8,000,000 American boys in addition to the British, he said. It would take more than 5 years to build the necessary shipping. And no military expert believes we could land such an army in Europe even if we got it overseas. In Mr. Hoover's judgment, it couldn't be done. But we did it.

These old errors are not dredged up to embarrass the former President. All of us have made mistakes. The point is that, on the record, Mr. Hoover's crystal ball is filled with cracks and cloudy spots. He tends to think and counsel in terms of what we cannot do. We need to adopt a different approach. First, we must understand clearly what it is that we intend to do. Our intention is not to attack Moscow with land armies, but to assist in defending Europe as an essential part of our own defense. And second, we should make up our minds that, to this end, we are going to do what we can do; that we are not going to let the fears and the doubts and the hesitations cause us to lose the battle by default.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 12, 1951]

QUESTION TO MR. HOOVER

Former President Hoover should be called as a witness when the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees begin their joint hearings on the troops-for-Europe issue on Thursday if only for the clarification of one point. In his speech on Friday night Mr. Hoover seemed to imply that the United States could remain unscathed by supplying arms and munitions to Europe and preparing to overwhelm Soviet Russia by air and sea power if that country should attack Western Europe. But what of the American troops already in Germany? While Mr. Hoover noted that the two American divisions in Germany would become a part of the proposed North Atlantic Pact army, he seemed completely to forget them in outlining his strategy.

Although these two divisions would not add substantial strength to the forces that General Eisenhower is trying to assemble for the defense of Western Europe, they would be enough to involve the United States in any "land war in Europe" that is likely to break out in the foreseeable future. Is it conceivable that this country would be content to bomb and blockade Russia while two divisions of American boys were being wiped out by superior forces in central Europe? In the early days of World War II General MacArthur's troops in the Philippines were

left to their fate because there was no possibility of reinforcing them. But the situation would be entirely different in Europe. With command of the sea and easy access to European ports, this country would never leave two divisions to be slaughtered, captured or backed into the Atlantic without sending them reinforcements.

Since we should be in the land fighting from the beginning, therefore, would it not be far better to join with our allies in building up a defensive force as rapidly as possible? The "stark reality" of the situation is that, so long as the United States has an army of occupation in Germany, it is in effect an European power. Would Mr. Hoover have all the American soldiers in Germany brought back home immediately? Or does he regard them as being expendable?

Food Situation in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the India News Bulletin entitled "Food Situation in India," which contains information which should be helpful to our consideration of the proposed sale or gift by our country of a fairly large supply of grain to alleviate suffering among these people, and to evidence our sincere interest in aiding underprivileged peoples of the world, within our means. The article follows:

[From the India News Bulletin of February 9, 1951]

FOOD SITUATION IN INDIA—AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

One of the first things the Government of free India did was to set an early target for achieving self-sufficiency in food. This objective has been unfortunately retarded by a succession of natural calamities.

To understand the food situation in India it is necessary to have an idea of the main crops and of the time they are harvested. Speaking generally, the "rabi" crops, namely, wheat, barley, and gram, are harvested during the months of March, April, and May. The "kharif" crops—maize, jowar, and bajra (millets)—are harvested from August to December. Rice is on a different footing. There are three crops, the main crop being the winter crop, which is harvested from November to January. The summer crop is negligible, but the autumn crop, from September to November, represents a considerable portion of the crop in the States of Bengal, Assam, Bihar, Orissa, and the Gangetic Valley, which covers Uttar Pradesh. In Madras there are three crops, the first being harvested from September to January, the second from January to March and the third from April to June.

The current food shortage is due to the failure or anticipated failure of these three main crops. Droughts occurring in the north and central areas since the fourth week of September have caused considerable damage to the "kharif" and "rabi" crops. The rice crop in Bihar has been damaged, and the standing "rabi" crop is not satisfactory. In central India rice and millet crops have been affected to a great extent in unirrigated areas, and the young "rabi" plants in many cases have withered away. In the Gangetic Valley the rice crop has been considerably damaged. The germination of "rabi" crops in unirrigated areas in this state is unsatisfactory.

On the other hand, heavy rains and cyclone during the third week of November 1950 caused considerable damage to winter rice in parts of West Bengal and Assam. The seriousness of the damage in Assam was aggravated by severe earthquakes. Added to these, locust attacks and crop diseases have been reported from many areas. These calamities are primarily responsible for a reduction in the available supplies of food grains from local production to as low as 38,000,000 tons in the calendar year 1951.

TOTAL NEED

Even before partition of the country, India was a net importer of food grains. Imports were mainly rice from Burma, Thailand, and Indochina. The net amount of food grains available for consumption before partition averaged about 53,500,000 tons a year. Average annual production locally was about 52,000,000 tons, and average annual net imports were about 1,500,000 tons. These figures do not include available supplies for some of the Indian states ruled formerly by Indian princes, as statistics are not available for those states. However, it may be estimated roughly that the supplies from these areas averaged annually about 6,000,000 tons. Thus the average available supplies for consumption for the whole of India before partition was about 60,000,000 tons annually.

If the Republic of India were to maintain the level of consumption that prevailed before the partition of the country, available supplies should be over 48,000,000 tons. Estimated available supplies of food grains through local production for the calendar years 1948, 1949 and 1950, were 43,700,000, 42,800,000, and 43,300,000 tons, respectively. Imports of food grains during the same period were 2,800,000, 3,700,000, and 2,200,000 tons, respectively. Average annual consumption since 1948, taking into consideration changes in government stocks, may be estimated at 46,000,000 tons. The nature of this consumption is characterized by rationing of food grains in cities and small towns. If rationing is to be discontinued the net available supplies for the present population of India should be over 48,000,000 tons annually.

The year 1951 is a critical year for India as the hopes of an estimated increase in production during the 1950–51 season have been upset owing to natural calamities. Estimated production for 1951 is only 38,000,000 tons. Government stocks are at a record low level. The Government of India has been compelled in this situation to reduce the ration of food grains from 12 ounces to 9 ounces per day per adult. The number of people who will come under this scheme of rationing is expected to be 125,000,000 in 1951.

The Government of India, about the middle of 1950, expected to import about 4,000,000 tons in 1951 not only to increase the ration but also to build up reserves. However, when the prospect of available supplies of food in 1951 deteriorated considerably, the Government estimated that about 10,000,000 tons of grain would be necessary to enable it to meet its ration obligations in 1951. Out of this quantity, about 3,500,000 tons is expected to be procured locally and about 6,500,000 tons will have to be imported. Unless this quantity arrives in India during the year 1951, more than 50 percent of which should be available before June, the Government will not be able to prevent widespread famine in the country.

FOOD VERSUS MONEY CROPS

A misunderstanding exists in some quarters that the Government of India has reduced acreage under food crops in order to grow more cotton and jute. The facts are:

Food acreage was increased from 189,500,000 acres in 1948–49 to 195,500,000 acres in 1949–50. The area under commercial crops, including jute and cotton, during the same period rose from 41,500,000 to 43,000,000 acres. Thus, while the food acreage in 1 year increased by 6,000,000 acres, area under money crops by 1,500,000 acres only. The increase was made possible by the government's land reclamation projects. It may be pointed out here that the total cultivable wasteland in the country is 68,000,000 acres. Official plans aim at reclaiming 42,000,000 acres.

The increase in jute and cotton acreage is negligible compared to the total acreage under food grains. The total cotton acreage (i. e., 11,498,000) is only 5 percent of the total food acreage (i. e., 195,507,000). The total area under jute (i. e., 1,158,000) is only 0.5 percent. If only the increase is considered, the figures are: cotton 0.3 percent and jute 0.25 percent of the total food acreage. Besides all cultivatable land is not suitable for food production. The determining factors are the level of the land, accessibility of water, etc. Therefore, it does not follow that merely because a certain acreage has been put under jute or cotton, that much land is denied to food grains.

It may also be pointed out that jute is one of India's most important industries which earns nearly 45 percent of her dollar exchange. India can hardly afford to starve it. When India and Pakistan were one country, there was no difficulty; though most of the raw material came from what is now Pakistan and the mills were in India. What India is doing now is merely to insure a reasonable supply of raw material for the industry.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY TARGET

The Government's policy continues to be the attainment of self-sufficiency in food grains by March 31, 1952. Land improvement schemes and reclamation projects are progressing satisfactorily. Irrigation schemes, main plank of the "grow more food campaign," are being put into operation. If there is no grave calamity in 1951, such as widespread failure of crops, it is expected that large imports of food grains will be discontinued by the target date. Any import of food grains after that date will be to build up a central reserve which will serve as a buffer stock.

Roger Baldwin Accuses Us of Confusion—Reveals Himself Neck Deep in Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the Boston Herald under date of February 2, 1951.

THIS IS HOW I SEE IT—ROGER BALDWIN ACCUSES US OF CONFUSION—REVEALS HIMSELF NECK DEEP IN CONFUSION

(By W. E. Mullins)

Roger Baldwin, a somewhat vocal advocate of civil liberties, has written some letters to the Mail Bag chiding me for some comment

here on his activities on behalf of the oppressed and downtrodden. During the past few years he has been on a semi-government mission in Germany and Japan alerting our enemies to their civil rights.

The gist of the comment here was an expression of bewilderment at the processes of a government that could do no better than send a draft dodger and a notorious Communist and Soviet sympathizer to teach our enemies the ideals and the priceless benefits of all phases of freedom.

With Baldwin's right to object to what was written here I have no objection. His views are welcome. Nevertheless, buried in his first letter was an insinuation that I was confused. This assertion merits some examination in an effort to ascertain which of us really is confused.

Baldwin's letter contained a denial that he ever was a draft dodger. He said he had been sent to jail for being a conscientious objector. In his college year book he wrote: "When I was called in the draft, I refused to submit, was prosecuted at New York, and sent to prison for a year."

Let us ignore the circumstance that the patriotic young man who was drafted to fill the call to which Baldwin turned a deaf ear may have lost his life in the war. I ask for an analysis of the difference between draft evasion and conscientious objection. In the final analysis it's all the same. The Army needed a recruit. The citizen called refused to answer.

I merely made the point that this administration must have been able to select a better representative of Americanism than a citizen who was sent to prison for refusing to hasten to its aid in its hour of need.

CLASS POSITION CITED

In another statement Baldwin once declared: "But I also became a pacifist, opposed to iolence in all forms." He stated: "As a pacifist, I opposed the war." Now, that would seem to establish this particular bleeding heart as a genuine pacifist, so peaceful that he went to prison before he'd shoulder a rifle.

I dug up an article he once wrote for Soviet Russia Today, a magazine in the interest of—guess who? He wrote:

"Those of us who champion civil liberties in the United States and who at the same time support the proletarian dictatorship of the Soviet Union are charged with inconsistency and insincerity. 'How can you consistently support the right of free agitation in capitalist countries when you defend a dictatorship that tolerates no agitation against its rule?' we are asked. * * *

"Everybody takes a class position, conciously or unconsciously. * * * All my associates in the struggle for civil liberties take a class position, though many don't know it. * * *

"I, too, take a class position. It is anticapitalist and prorevolutionary. I believe in nonviolent methods of struggle as most effective in the long run for building up successful working class power. Where they cannot be followed * * * only violent tactics remain. I champion civil liberty as the best of the nonviolent means of building the power on which workers' rule must be based. If I aid the reactionaries to get free speech now and then, if I go outside the class struggle to fight against censorship, it is only because those liberties help to create a more hospitable atmosphere for working class liberties. The class struggle is the central conflict of the world; all others are incidental."

NOW WHO'S CONFUSED?

"When the power of the working class is once achieved as it has been only in the Soviet Union, I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever. Dictatorship is the obvious means in a world of enemies, at home and abroad."

Now, here is one of the more notorious champions of civil liberties who went to prison because, he said, as a pacifist he was opposed to all violence. In his magazine article he admitted that he would pursue nonviolent methods but where these are not successful only violent tactics remain. Later on he conceded that when the working class had grasped power, "I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever."

Look what has charged me with being confused.

In another part of his protest he pointed out that his defense of the Communist leaders who were convicted of trying to overthrow the Government was not his personal view but the view of the Civil Liberties Union, of which he is national chairman.

This finger pointer is entirely unconcerned about Baldwin's fantastic philosophies which seem to change with the weather. The facts are that he refused to bear arms for his country when it was in distress and that he is, on the record, a notorious Soviet sympathizer.

I thought 1 month ago and I think today that it was preposterous to give him even the slightest measure of status as an agent of this Government because I do not believe him to be capable of giving true expression to our genuine ideals. It is entirely characteristic of this administration that he should be so dignified. He is one of the best exhibits of Communist sympathizer in Government.

St. Lawrence Seaway Is a Peril to Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we who reside in Pennsylvania regard the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as the greatest threat faced by the industrial life of our Commonwealth.

On February 11, 1951, John Cummings, in his column in the Philadelphia Inquirer, spells out this threat to Pennsylvania in the following article:

REAL SEAWAY EMERGENCY IS PERIL TO PENNSYLVANIA

(By John M. Cummings)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—Advocates of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project have seized on the national emergency as an argument calculated to induce Congress to approve a scheme that has either been sidetracked or defeated outright every time it has been brought up on Capitol Hill.

The most sanguine supporters of the project concede it would take at least 4 years to complete it and then, because of weather conditions in that part of the country, it would be frozen to uselessness 5 months of the year. For this the taxpayers would be called on to provide countless millions at a time of loud and persistent clamor to limit major construction to projects directly concerned with defense.

The two United States Senators from Pennsylvania, ED MARTIN and JIM DUFF, are unalterably opposed to the seaway. Like other statesmen associated with the opposition, they see, among other things, the likelihood that the seaway would have a blighting influence on such major eastern ports as New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

In the South there is opposition because of the detrimental effect it would have on New Orleans, Houston, Galveston, Mobile, and other Gulf ports.

Nevertheless, the advocates of the seaway are more optimistic than at any time since the project was first launched more than 50 years ago. The Power Authority of the State of New York is for it because the seaway has been linked with power development. In a recent report to the New York Legislature the authority stated that if the project is once more defeated it is prepared to proceed with power development in the St. Lawrence in conjunction with the Canadian Government.

There is no serious objection to the power development. It's the seaway that stands at the center of the controversy. Congress is being told that with the Mesabi Range in Minnesota rapidly reaching the point of exhaustion, iron ore from Labrador is the one hope of the steel industry in the Middle West. To get this ore to the mills the seaway offers low-cost transportation, so the argument runs.

In other days supporters of the seaway were content to picture the prospect of seagoing vessels proceeding inland to Chicago and other cities along the lakes. This, of course, was a frank threat to the ports along the Atlantic seaboard and naturally the reaction was swift and strong.

Now, however, you find the seaway men on a different tack. It must be built because we are in an emergency period. President Truman long has been listed among the supporters of the project. It is not surprising, therefore, to find General Marshall and Secretary of State Acheson tossing their influence in the direction of the gigantic boondoggling program.

Senator MARTIN recalled today that while he was governor of Pennsylvania he fought the proposal every time it was advanced. On one occasion he sent his secretary of commerce down here to record the feeling of his administration at a public hearing.

"I was against this thing right along and I am against it now," said the Senator. "It can have no beneficial effect on the emergency we are facing. Not only that, it could prove a death blow to the railroads which must have freight to carry if they are to exist. And to my mind the continued existence of the railroads is vastly more important than a seaway that would be useless 5 months out of every 12."

Senator JIM DUFF was equally emphatic in his opposition. "I'll have no part of it," said Big Red. "It promises nothing of lasting good to the country."

A consistent opponent of the plan is Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This committee handled seaway legislation in the past because it is necessary to work out the scheme on a treaty basis with Canada.

Pennsylvania's stake in this thing is enormous. It is important enough to engage the attention of Governor Fine and Mayor Samuel—and the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia as well as the Pittsburgh chamber.

Qualified observers in Washington report the emergency argument is making headway. If the opposition doesn't express itself soon and forcefully we might wake up one of these fine mornings to discover the job had been accomplished.

Buffalo, N. Y., long an opponent of the seaway, is weakening. It was fearful its huge grain business would be lost to the city. Now the city is told it will soon need new sources of iron ore and it had better shift positions.

There is an emergency in this situation, all right. It applies to Pennsylvania perhaps more than to any other State. It might be of interest to the Fine administration and the chambers of commerce to know it's later than they think.

Lincoln and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article appearing in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1951:

HIS GENERALS WERE LESS PATIENT—LINCOLN ENDURED A RABID PRESS

(By J. R. Wiggins)

The appearance of this thoughtful book is well-timed. Its Civil War examples of newspaper behavior in a time of unparalleled crisis are instructive to newspapermen again struggling with the difficult problems of a national emergency. Its story of military and civil government reactions to newspaper policies is equally valuable reading for officials who have to deal with a free press in wartime.

The instruction in both cases consists often of examples of what to avoid.

The Civil War President, for the most part, exhibited an amazing patience and restraint in dealing with a dissident press that was shockingly irresponsible in its criticism as well as with newspapers of all political faiths that seemed to have no security consciousness whatever.

Military commanders, on the other hand, proceeded against editors in a manner that was often summary and arbitrary, although the provocation was sometimes very great.

Would we, in the midst of armed rebellion, with military operations in the heart of the country, preserve as well the freedom of the press, countenance as patiently the most violent criticism, endure as calmly real hardships resulting from the luxury of individual freedom? For all the bad spots in the Civil War record that Harper relates, it is a sobering question.

Mr. Harper's great contribution is not in divulging the new and novel facts about Lincoln's relationship with the press. Although he has unearthed some things new to this reviewer, it is the orderly arrangement of information hitherto available only in a dispersed form that makes this book valuable.

Lincoln's relationships with newspaper editors were very close, as this study makes clear. He understood the press. He knew how to use it. He did not hesitate to put his own writing into the press. He tried to influence others. He had a realistic and practical notion of newspaper propaganda.

The list of newspapermen Lincoln appointed to Federal office is a very long one. It reflects Lincoln's wide acquaintanceship among newspapermen and it reveals the active political role of most editors of the day. Greeley, of course, is the outstanding example of the politician-editor. Another is Henry J. Raymond, editor of the New York Times, who was chairman of the platform committee in the convention that gave Lincoln his second nomination.

The Civil War government made some bad mistakes in its press relations, however. W. H. Russell of the London Times was denied an Army pass and virtually driven from the country for a fair and objective story of Bull Run that was too accurate for administration comfort.

Dennis A. Mahony, editor of the Herald at Dubuque, Iowa, was seized by a Federal marshal, in the dead of night, and whisked away to prison in Washington, without charge.

C. C. Fulton, editor of the Baltimore American, only newspaper friend of the administration in Baltimore, was jailed in Fort McHenry for a schedule he sent the Associated Press, heralding the peninsular campaign as a great success just when it was bogging down.

General Burnside seized the Chicago Times because it favored slavery and released it only on President Lincoln's order.

Editor Wharton, proadministration owner of the Parkersburg Gazette, criticized the condition of the troops of Gen. David Hunter, in an editorial. He was jailed, his newspaper was seized and offending copies burned, his office was ransacked and all its records destroyed at Hunter's direction.

A forged AP dispatch caused President Lincoln to order the arrest of the editors of the New York Journal of Commerce and the World and the suppression of the papers. These actions were reconsidered when the culprit was found.

The military, in hundreds of cases, proceeded summarily against newspapers. No distinction was made, in many instances, between expression of opinion and reports of the news. Giving comfort to the enemy, in many cases, consisted of giving him the comfort of agreeing with him.

The situation was bad enough so that former President Franklin Pierce was moved to say, "Even here in the loyal States, the mailed hand of military usurpation strikes down the liberties of the people, and its foot tramples on a desecrated Constitution."

On the other hand, Samuel Medary continued his attacks on the Government throughout the war, up until his death, relatively unmolested. Newspaper attacks on Lincoln reached incredible violence just before his renomination. Not only the Copperhead press but newspapers hitherto friendly to Lincoln assailed him in the most savage terms.

Censorship of news dispatches filed in Washington was one of the most controversial press issues of the Civil War period. It began in April, 1861, and was badly handled, directly by the Treasury, the War Department, State Department, and then War Department again. Finally it resulted in Congressional inquiry.

The House Judiciary Committee, on March 20, 1862, resolved that "the Government shall not interfere with the free transmission of intelligence by telegraph, when the same will not aid the enemy in his military or naval operations, or give him information concerning such operations on the part of the Government."

The House agreed and gave its support to the principle of unobstructed military news in wartime, notwithstanding the fact that hostile troops were not far away across the Potomac.

Harper tells the story of the press and the Gettysburg Address most interestingly. He cites the Chicago Times' "diswatery utterances," editorial and others. He also points out, however, that the address was widely published (because of its very brevity), and that it was recognized at the time by the Springfield Republican, the Ohio State Journal and others as a great document.

THE NEW YORK HERALD of Sunday, April 16, 1865, after Lincoln's assassination, made the inevitable charge: "It is as clear as day that the real origin of this miserable act is to be found in the fiendish and malignant spirit developed and fostered by the rebel press, North and South. That press has, in the most devilish manner, urged men to the commission of this very deed."

This certainly was not the sober judgment of the country. It indicates, however, the violence and malevolence of the newspaper criticisms that Lincoln endured. That he submitted to it rather than impair rights he highly prized and well understood is not the least of his claims to greatness and to the gratitude of subsequent generations of Americans.

No press could be more irresponsible or partisan than some of the Civil War sheets. No threat to the Nation could be more immediate and direct. Somehow or other, a free press and a free country both survived. It was a feat of statesmanship pregnant with interest in a day when it seems equally difficult to defend freedom without abandoning it.

A Retired General of the Marine Corps Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest fallacy which confuses the people today in the matter of national defense is simply this—when our chief military leaders in the Armed Forces speak before Congress and to the press, they are not expressing their own independent judgment. They speak for a policy as laid down by their Commander in Chief. Consequently, we have seen it in the past that the Eisenhowers and the Marshalls are selected to make public statements because of their so-called high prestige and popularity with the people.

I am sure that the people expect and demand that on the battle fronts some one man or general must make the final decision. But in the field of diplomacy or foreign affairs, I am sure our top military leaders should not be made to make public statements in these fields. We are still a republic and the Constitution very wisely put the approval of treaties in the hands of the Senate and the power to declare war in the Congress.

The people are demanding an answer to just what is to be our policy in the matter of national defense. They full well know we have had no established policy in foreign affairs except to try to buy with tax dollars a false economy and well-being.

A righ-ranking officer flew to Europe to evaluate their will to fight. We are informed Luxemburg has a battalion. From France, this general flew to Italy but he did not stop in Spain, the only country in Europe which has fought communism. Did he bypass Spain on orders, because there are in Spain 400,000 troops that would fight.

The Marine Corps has always been the elite of our combat forces. Their motto, Semper Fidelis, has always been carried out and it is still the bright star in our fighting forces in Korea, even though some men in high places say they are simply a "police force."

Let us take a look at what Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, USMC, retired, has to say. General del Valle served more than 30 years in the Marine Corps and is a graduate of the Naval Academy. He has also served as naval attaché at many foreign embassies in Europe.

You will find his open letter to the President most interesting and thought-provoking. The letter follows:

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA,
December 18, 1950.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because we ordinary citizens in a free Republic have the duty of expressing our opinions to those who are elected to serve us in government, I have the honor to communicate to you the following comments upon your public emergency speech of December 15, 1950.

First, there can be little disagreement with the declaration that our homes, our nation, and all the things we believe in are in danger, and that this danger was created by the rulers of the Soviet Union. This establishes a frank and clear distinction between these rulers and the oppressed Russian people, as well as the Chinese people, and the other enslaved peoples of Central Europe which the masters of the Kremlin rule with but ill-disguised illusions of sovereignty. The very fact of this belated acknowledgement by the head of our free Republic will, of itself, bring a breath of hope to those suffering millions under the Kremlin's heel who are our true allies. There has been a notable reluctance to drive this natural wedge on the part of yourself and of your Department of State in sharp contrast to the course of action we once pursued in countries overcome by Hitler. It is to be hoped that henceforth, having made public recognition of this distinction and of its implications, you will pursue the logical policy of aiding and abetting the guerrilla forces and other underground movements which the desperate slaves of the Soviets everywhere maintain, which heretofore have been completely ignored.

It was scarcely to be expected that the chief executive would so far take the ordinary citizens into his confidence as to admit to them that the policies pursued by himself and by his Department of State, and by his predecessor in office are largely responsible for the present unfavorable juxtaposition of forces, moral, political, and military which constitute the danger of which he speaks, to our homes, our Nation, and all the things we believe in. The secret agreements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam; the admission of the Kremlin in Tokyo to a victory they had not won in a war they had themselves helped to incite; the leftist policy in China, which rejected the Nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek in favor of the agrarian reformers who are now slaying our sons in Korea; the soft policy toward our own communistic traitors at home; the lackadaisical security with regard to our atomic secrets; all these things, Mr. President, can be laid at the door of the White House advisers. It had been a great and noble thing, and of great promise to the Nation if you had seen fit to sketch into the picture this background of all our woes as now painted.

Secondly, Mr. President, I find myself involved in an incomprehensible muddle when examining the steps whereby you propose to meet this, our very dangerous situation.

1. To uphold, with arms, the principles of the United Nations, when that body includes Soviet Russia and most of its satellites, and very likely will shortly contain the Chinese Communists who are the immediate cause of our discomfiture, leaves one in very grievous doubt that your policy has changed at all. The United Nations, like its predecessor, the League of Nations, has served chiefly as a means of confusing our national patriotism and watering it with communistic internationalism, while draining away the real wealth of this country in grants of aid to tottering Socialist governments upon whose assistance we certainly cannot count in this our dark hour, and who even now pretend that everything is our fault, in Korea and in the whole world. Meanwhile they demand ever greater assistance, first economic recovery and now military supplies and equipment, while refusing to allow the arming of the one nation which could really defend Europe, Germany, and rejecting the only hope of a beachhead in Europe, Spain.

The time has come to speak plainly, Mr. President. We should no longer form part of an internationalist body whose influence has been the very reverse of peaceful. It has failed in its purpose of keeping the peace, not once, but a dozen times. It failed to save the satellites which the Kremlin has absorbed; it failed to prevent the torture of Mindszenty; or to effect the release of Robert Vogeler. It failed to prevent the assaults on Greece directed by the Kremlin. It does not serve notably as a shield in the coming advances against the Near East and Asia, nor does it permit Turkey to disarm and go about its lawful occasions. It did not prevent the political Zionists from seizing Arab territories in Palestine, leaving a million Arabs homeless; and it did not prevent the rape of Korea with its aftermath, nor indeed the absorption of China by the Politbureau. It has not kept the Kremlin from preventing peace in Europe. It now serves only to make us weak and indecisive because of our involvements in it. When we should be strong in the knowledge that right makes might, we are listening to an ally's plea to recognize the power of Mao over the suffering Chinese masses because might makes right in the bright new lexicon of socialism.

2. We shall continue to work with other free nations to strengthen our combined defenses, you say, is your second point. This is a vague and disquieting pronouncement, as the only interpretation we can put on it is that you intend to continue your costly policy of minding everyone else's business before our own. The fact that the next point was third instead of second gives color to this interpretation.

3. We shall build up our own forces and weapons and those of our allies. An afterthought of the provision to work with other free nations is to arm ourselves, and then only concurrently with arming these allies. I submit that we had better mind our own business first, and then that of these so-called allies. These allies against whose entanglements George Washington warned us, and who have manufactured weapons for centuries and used them in their eternal quarrels are perfectly capable of arming themselves—if they really mean to fight. The internal situation within most of them and their reaction to the proposals for rearmament of Germany and Spain give ample reason to doubt that these people do have any intention to fight. With us there is no choice, we have got to fight. Let us, then, arm ourselves.

If any arming of allies is going to be done then the first arms should go to Chiang Kai-shek, who has an army of over half a million trained men, and the anti-Communist guerrillas in China, who number over a million. The arms should go to them, and to Spain, which sits behind the Pyrenees with another army of nearly a half million, and which can put another equal number into the field on short notice; and to West Germany, with whose divisions our success in Europe would be assured; and to General Anders, whose influence with Polish groups could be decisive; and to the millions in the Ukraine, to whom a few dropped or smuggled weapons, mere token that they are not forgotten, would mean the birth of a new hope, and a thorn in the side of the police state which now rules them. All this would be merely a belated attempt to undo the harm done by your policies and those of your predecessor. The chief thing is to change the line of action which has been pursued from that of an unstable indecisive internationalist misalliance into a dynamic, American, forceful one.

4. In the fourth place, you plan to expand our economy and keep it on an even keel. This is an altogether laudable and acceptable objective, since the war effort will, as it always has, depend upon the national economic strength. This strength has been dissipated by grants and gifts to all and sundry, both by your own and your predecessor's governments, and viciously attacked from within by the leftists, who abhor capitalism. Both your own and your predecessor's governments further weakened our economy by a malicious and deliberate grant of excessive power to irresponsible labor leaders. The right of free Americans to work when and where they like has been seriously curtailed, and the right of free Americans to hire whom they please, when and how they please, has been beset by Socialist measures such as FEPC, which you saw fit to press upon us, even at the eleventh hour; and similar socialistic adventures calculated to destroy capital, which is the heart blood of the economy which you now say you want to strengthen. The very methods of taxation in vogue are designed for the destruction of capital, as Karl Marx himself foretold in advocating the income tax. John Marshall once said: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." In the use of this power your Government and that of your predecessor have tended indeed to destroy, not to strengthen capital and the economy which depends upon it. Let us turn away from this evil and destructive policy and we shall indeed strengthen economy.

That the policy is not to change is implied in the immediate establishment of controls within the state of emergency, and the intention to increase the already almost unbearable taxes, but not to control or reduce the expensive Socialist experiments, supports, grants, etc., and the excessive governmental interference with the life and commerce of the citizens; nor to cease the outpouring of our wealth abroad. Is the emergency then, merely to become a cover for the continuation and extension of the socialization of this Republic, which will then become as impotent and as ripe for communism as are the Socialist governments of Europe, and as are all Socialist governments everywhere? The man who labors will have no choice of wage, after controls, nor the citizen any freedom of choice whose buying and selling of goods is the real barometer of prices. Omniscient Government employees, filled with their power and importance, are to hold at bay the play of the free and natural forces of supply and demand. The demand for labor raises the price of that commodity just as all the others, in relation to the available supply. The modern King Canute will now order the tides to recede. Thus the economy is to be kept on an even keel and headed for the rocks of socialism.

You have the opportunity, Mr. President, of saving the American Republic and the entire Christian world from disaster and even destruction. If the men who surround you and counsel you have proved to be wrong thus far, and are indeed responsible for the sorry position we now occupy, can you not grant us, as a token of your good intentions, at least a change in your advisory personnel?

The men of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam; the men who guided our Far East affairs into the present debacle; the men who would sacrifice the American Republic to international socialism—are not these men still at your elbow?

The time has run out, Mr. President, and we are at war. Your actions will decide whether we live or perish, and the time is now.

Most respectfully,

P. A. DEL VALLE,
Lieutenant General, United States Marine Corps (Retired).

Rural Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to read an article in the Florence Times, of Florence, Ala., which described how the Farm Housing Act of 1949 increased the food-production possibilities of one of my constituents. It was because my studies on the need for better farm housing showed that there were hundreds of thousands of families such as the Benny Comers described in this article that I first began working for the passage of this act. It was because we knew that such an act could bring the same great improvement in the life and efficiency of many such farm families that men like Senator SPARKMAN and Senator HILL joined me in sponsoring this act.

I would like for all of you to read the story of the Benny Comer family as it was printed in the Times, because to each of you who joined with me in supporting this legislation, it should provide visible proof that the things we do here in Congress are good things:

RURAL HOUSING PROGRAM IS BRIGHTENING FAMILY'S LIFE

(By Bill Cade)

Christmas will be a whole lot brighter in at least one home in Lauderdale County this year, because there are new windows in which to hang wreaths, a new hardwood floor on which to set the traditional Christmas tree, a new and modern kitchen in which to prepare the traditional cakes and cookies and even a new chimney—in fact the whole house is new.

To some, it might seem a little facetious to intone so much enthusiasm into a description of a new home, but this particular home could not be considered ordinary.

But let's start at the beginning, and in this particular story in the Farmers Home Administration series, tell about a family which has already moved into its Government-financed home.

Back in 1947, three short years ago, W. B. "Benny" Comer, his wife, two sons, and daughter, moved onto a 40-acre farm in the Rogersville community, which Mr. Comer had purchased for $4,500.

On this farm the Comers found a much-used weather-beaten frame house out of which to make a home. They were anxious to start nourishing the earth to reap its harvests so they moved right into the existing building.

By January of 1950, "Benny" had his original loan on the farm about half paid. He and his wife had worked hard to feed, clothe, and educate their children and save enough money to decrease their indebtedness from $4,500 to $2,300 in that length of time.

They had heard about the relatively new aid to farmers through the Farmers Home Administration. Upon investigation and after talking with authorities on the subject, the Comers discovered that they were eligible for a loan to build a new home.

So on January 16, 1950, application for a $5,000 loan was filed. After due processing, including Government appraisal, the loan was granted in June, 1950.

The house was built under the scrutiny of a construction engineer who supervised the job from its foundation to completion.

After 3 months of anxious waiting the Comers moved into their new home with all the modern conveniences—literally, a few years from their original home, but figuratively, miles away in terms of improved standard of living.

And the repayment of the loan is not working any hardships for this family. The loan runs for a period of 33 years, with 4 percent interest on the unpaid balance. This figures to annual payments of $275.60, including both interest and principal, or $23.95 per month.

Still, the Comers are not satisfied. They yet have a lot of ambition and are anxious to improve their standard of living more and more. So the next target for improvement is their farming land. Mr. Comer plans to develop his farm in order to reap the full benefits from it. And he is considering another type loan which the Government makes especially for those interested in farm improvement.

At present, "Benny" is only a part-time farmer, deriving some of his income from working in a store. In addition to his 35 acres of row crops, he has five acres of pasture on which he raises dairy cattle and produces grade B milk, another source of income.

It is the purpose of the Government, in making its Farmers Home Administration loans, to provide farmers and their families standard housing with modern equipment and design on long-term payments which they can repay without jeopardizing their standard of living.

The "Benny" Comers at Rogersville are one of the several families who think the FHA loans are wonderful. In Mrs. Comer's words concerning their loan—"It's the finest thing that has ever happened. I don't know when we would have been able to build if it had not been for the FHA loan."

With the original house still in plain view from their modern home, the Comers have only to look backward to count their blessings.

Yes, Christmas will be a whole lot brighter for the Comers, and the future does not look so dim itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Times article, of course, described only what happened with one of the many families which have been helped by this legislation. In the 13 months since the first loan under this act was made, there have been a total of 6,882 families like the Comers. These 6,882 families received a total of $30,000,000 in credit. About 2,000 of these families have already completed their construction, like the Comers, and are now living in their new homes. Over 4,000 others are now building, repairing, or remodeling their homes or other farm buildings, and will soon be happy in their own new surroundings. About 500 others have received their loans so recently that they have progressed no farther than the selection of plans or the ordering of materials. Soon, however, they too will have new homes.

But the story does not stop there. We have authorized the loaning of many millions in addition during the next 2 years, and the steady flow of applicants to the Farmers Home Administration offices tell us that this additional loan fund will still be necessary if we want the farmers in our home districts to enjoy healthy, sanitary, efficient-working surroundings. Latest figures from the Farmers Home Administration indicate that they have received over 30,000 applications, so they have actually made loans to less than 20 percent of the families who have asked for this type of assistance.

But that is the national picture. I am far more familiar with what is happening in my own eighth congressional district, where I have some 28,000 farms among my constituency. In this area we have already helped 77 families have better buildings on their farms, and 30 of these are already living in their new quarters. Of the 77, 66 have been for new dwellings, 4 have made major repairs to existing dwellings, and 12 have added necessary buildings other than dwellings. Some of these latter 12 also had repairs or new construction on their homes.

The average loan made to a farmer in the eighth district was only $5,479, somewhat lower than we had anticipated in view of the fact that almost 85 percent of the money went for entirely new construction.

Despite the very evident need for materials and labor to be diverted to war construction, it is equally important that we have the food which this Nation needs to build a strong defense. Our farmers will produce more efficiently if their buildings help maintain the family's health or make their work easier. As we draft more and more men into the military services, we must depend on the womenfolk on our farms to help produce the cotton, wool, meat, grains, and vegetables we need. An efficient kitchen where the farm wife can do her housework quickly and effectively will let her have more time to work in the crops. A new barn on the farm may make it possible for the farmer to add a few more dairy cows or a few more hogs to give us more milk or meat.

How much is it costing the Government to provide this more healthful, more sanitary, more efficient construction, and to make it possible to increase food production for the war effort by providing farmers with the credit they need for new buildings? That average of $5,479 per dwelling is not a cost figure, because this money is loaned the farmers, and most or perhaps all of it will be repaid, plus interest. The program is too young, yet, to have anything too definite as to repayment records; but we have seen enough figures to date to see a definite trend established. In the eighth district, the 77 borrowers—or rather those of them who have scheduled repayments due as yet—have already repaid 103 percent of the matured principal, plus interest. For the whole State of Alabama the record is even better, with 127 percent of matured indebtedness paid. In nearby Georgia the Hubert Herndon family, who received their housing loan just a year ago and were allowed 33 years in which to complete repayments on it, have already repaid their loan in full.

How much is this program worth to America?

I sincerely believe that a farm family will work harder, make more money, and fight to maintain a farm home if—should adversity strike—that farm home is a comfortable and attractive one. If the place is dilapidated and run down, or if it lacks the modern conveniences which

make living worth while in America, the family is more likely to have an "Oh, what is the use?" attitude. They have less reason to desire to farm efficiently, participate in community affairs, or to share their homes with friends.

I also believe the rural church and the rural schools will benefit by this new housing program. Indirectly, perhaps, but the church or the school is no better than the component individuals who make up its congregation or assembly. The child will take more interest in its studies and do a better job of preparing its homework where there is a good lighting system in the home. There will be less chance to pass disease from one scholar to another if the sources of some of these diseases are wiped out by home improvements. There will be a better comradeship among the pupils if the child feels he can bring his companions home to also enjoy the modern conveniences. And the church, depending as it does upon contributions from persons who attend, will find that with the prosperity of a new home or more efficient farming buildings, the farmer can come to church more regularly and contribute more to its upkeep.

In the 4-year program set up by the Housing Act of 1949, a total of $275,000,000 was authorized for rural-housing loans, and this would make it possible for an estimated 140,000 farm families to have more adequate housing than in the past. With half the Nation's farm population in the South, and with the housing problems more acute in the South than elsewhere in the Nation, it is estimated that somewhere near 75,000 southern farm families will have better housing under this program within the next 4 years. A thousand or more of these probably will be in north Alabama.

Cautious Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, nearly every thoughtful person who is unbiased in the matter now feels that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be built. Our national defense would be greatly strengthened and if it is put on a self-liquidating basis it would eventually through the years pay for itself many times over. Mr. Charles E. Wilson's statement on the matter is heartening. The following is an editorial from the Watertown Daily Times, of Watertown, N. Y., whose editors have given thoughtful study over the years to this whole matter:

CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM

This newspaper's attitude concerning the chances of the St. Lawrence seaway proposal in the new Congress can best be described as one of cautious optimism. We do not believe that last fall's election greatly altered the line-up of proponents and opponents. On the other hand, we discern two factors that tend to improve the outlook for the legislation. The question is: Will these factors carry sufficient weight to convert a sufficient number of opponents?

No. 1 of these two factors is the evidence that President Truman really intends to make the seaway bill a piece of "must" legislation. Up to this year, like his predecessors, he was satisfied to recommend the project in his annual state of the Union messages and there let the matter rest. In 1951 he has not only appealed again to Congress to pass the bill, but he indicates that he proposes to go all out in its behalf. The dispatch Monday that Mr. Truman is considering a meeting with the opposition in an effort to break down resistance to the project is a case in point.

The other factor is, of course, the defense angle. There is no doubt that the St. Lawrence project can make a vast contribution to this program. No one can deny that we will need tremendous new sources of power, and there are few who will not concede that the proposed St. Lawrence canals will open up an avenue to new sources of iron ore. And, as we have noted before, if electric power and iron ore are not needed in mobilizing for defense, we would like to know what is.

We regard the change of attitude of Charles E. Wilson, the mobilization chief, as of great significance. As recently as December, this former president of General Electric was saying that there was no great urgency for constructing the seaway. Now, 2 months after taking the defense job, he is all for starting construction immediately.

No one can convince us that a tough-minded, practical man like Charles Wilson changed his views for some light or transient cause. No one can tell us he was motivated by politics. He wants the seaway started now because, and only because, he thinks it will contribute to the work he has been assigned to accomplish—namely, the building up of the Nation's defenses.

Let those who have opposed the seaway on political or sectional grounds follow Mr. Wilson's example.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *February 6, 1951.*
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Thirty-seventh Congressional District.

DEAR ED: I have just mailed a very important letter to Gov. Thomas Dewey in regard to the possible reapportionment of our district.

I have conveyed to him that if such a deal is to be made now is the time to bring it to the people of our district. In doing so it would enable you to put forth your platform and also to get acquainted with the people of the county or counties.

Jack Gordon, myself, and my dad attended a Townsend meeting on the first of February and Mr. Gordon spoke of the wonderful trip to Washington and so forth. Personally I would like to see you in office for 100 years and I sincerely believe that when next election comes around you will win again.

It is true that the Republican Party is not in power now but I think if we fight long and hard enough we are sure to come out victorious and then perhaps things will be done right.

I need not go into anything lengthy to tell you. I am a stanch supporter of your platform and have always been.

In closing I hope this finds you and your family in the best of health. I beg to remain.

Very respectfully yours,
ROBERT E. STEWART, Jr.

P. S.—My dad sends his kindest regards and personal success to you in the future.

Anniversary of the Battle of Trenton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Trentonian, of Trenton, N. J., entitled "Anniversary of the Battle of Trenton." On February 21, a joint celebration will be held in honor of this historical event and the occasion of Mayor Connolly's birthday. Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin and I will be on hand representing the Federal Government. The editorial follows:

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF TRENTON

(By Dr. R. R. Robinson)

No city in the world can surpass in importance the significance of the history of Trenton. It was perhaps only a coincidence that the beginnings of the modern age for mankind occurred here. After a long series of disheartening battles and retreats, Gen. George Washington led his army across the Delaware and won the first victory of his career, the Battle of Trenton, 175 years ago. Seven days later he destroyed five times as many British troops in the second Battle of Trenton.

FIRST SUCCESSFUL TRY AT FREEDOM

It must be remembered that the Revolutionary War was the first successful attempt in the history of the world to establish freedom for all its people. As a direct result of the events which happened in Trenton, we have been able to establish a democracy which recognizes and attempts to provide that all men must have as a God-given right an equal freedom of opportunity.

One of the coincidences in the history of Trenton is that our country's first President was elected here, when the Continental Congress elected Col. Richard Henry Lee to be its leader. Colonel Lee made the original motion in Congress for declaring the States of America independent.

Before the Colonies declared themselves independent of Great Britain, the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, with Samuel Tucker, of Trenton, as its president, declared itself an isolated colony independent of any royal sovereign. We were a separate little group of people proudly declaring that the greatest empire in the world could no longer claim ownership of our little colony of New Jersey.

Thirteen years later, General Washington returned to Trenton on his way to his inauguration in New York. He was received in a celebration which has been preserved in a gigantic oil painting, The White-Robed Choir, by Thomas P. Rossiter.

SEEK TO PRESERVE TRADITIONS

Mayor Donal J. Connolly and the citizens' committee want to preserve and revive the

traditions in which we can take such pride. When the Alice Bartlett Hunt Foundation presented to Trenton this long-lost oil painting, it was thought to be a marvelous opportunity to assemble the citizens and celebrate the occasion, on the eve of Washington's Birthday. The fact that Trenton's own Josiah Bartlett, an ancestor of the donor of the painting, was an original signer of the Declaration of Independence, makes the ceremony even more significant.

To make this occasion a momentous one in the history of our community, Maurice J. Tobin, United States Secretary of Labor, has volunteered to represent our Nation's capital at the presentation of the painting to the community. It is certainly fitting that the guest of honor should be the Cabinet representative of labor, indicating the progress the average man has made since the old days of subjugation of citizens and the enslaving of large minorities of our population. In our democracy all people have a voice, and we are grateful to Mr. Tobin for personifying that spirit and our progress.

The fact that Trenton was for some time the capital of the United States is apparently a fact that we have made little of in our history. President Adams moved his Cabinet to Trenton and conducted the Nation's business from the Phoenix Hotel on the corner of Hanover and Warren Streets. Of course, it was only by accident that Trenton was not selected as the permanent site of the capital of our country. Ironically enough, it was only the opposition of General Washington that prevented Trenton from being selected.

ELABORATE CEREMONIES PLANNED

Mayor Connolly's citizens committee desires to join with all the people in making the evening of February 21 a memorable occasion. It would be highly desirable to have Mr. Tobin repeat the Marquis de Lafayette's remark about Trenton: "I have never seen the States so handsomely represented." Lafayette visited Trenton on three different occasions to meet Joseph Bonaparte.

The ceremony which has been arranged will begin with a dinner at the Stacy-Trent. As part of the entertainment the original ode written by Gov. Richard Howell for Washington's visit will be sung. The white-robed choir which greeted General Washington will be reproduced, singing the songs which Washington and Lafayette both remarked have made such impressions as will never be effaced.

As in the past, the money raised by activities sponsored by the mayor's citizens committee will be used for juvenile welfare. It is planned to present Mayor Connolly with a check which shall be used solely for the purpose of sending 300 children to camp this summer.

The agencies which work with our young people will be asked to select children of all groups. Without any embarrassing publicity for them, the children will be sent away quietly to enjoy camping life under much different circumstances than those under which General Washington and his men camped at Valley Forge.

Lespedeza Was Good News From Korea Back in 1922

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the January issue of the Missouri Farmer, entitled "Lespedeza Was Good News From Korea Back in 1922":

LESPEDEZA WAS GOOD NEWS FROM KOREA BACK IN 1922

From a thimbleful of seed planted at the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station in 1922 by Dr. W. C. Etheridge, a hundred million dollar crop revenue has resulted for Missouri from Korean lespedeza. Dramatic instances have happened before, but none more so for Missouri agriculture than the story of the expansion in acreage of lespedeza on farms over the State.

In 1921, a specimen of this wonderful weed seed was obtained in Korea by a party who sent it to the United States Department of Agriculture Bureau of Plant Industry. This sample of strange seed was first sown at the United States Department of Agricultural Experiment Station at Arlington, Va. It grew and reproduced seed abundantly, which is the prime essential of any forage crop. But still little was known of this squatty legume, which was considered as a weed in Korea.

When this fabulous thimbleful of seed was planted in the spring by Dr. Etheridge it made lush growth during the summer months of 1922. Of course, this caused a quickened interest by all concerned, but experimentation was only in the process of beginning. The matured vines were pulled up in late October, and the precious seed was threshed in a miniature threshing machine. About a pint or so of the seed was recovered, and this was saved with growing hope.

PLANTED IN 1923

In the spring of 1923 all of this seed was planted. It was noted on last year's acreage extensive volunteer growth of this annual plant was present, thus proving the ability of "natural reseeding." Then there was discovered an enormous number of bacteria nodules on the last year's root systems. Ordinarily, seed of other legumes must be inoculated, but here was a legume that quickly associated itself with nitrogen-fixing bacteria. This was called natural inoculation, and another spoke was added to the rapidly turning wheel of Korean lespedeza.

A sharp May frost in 1923 was fatal to the clovers and it damaged the lespedeza stand, but it came back to grow on with vigor through the hot summer months. Here was a pasture crop that would stand late spring freezes and withstand the hot dry months which ordinarily checked the growth of all other pasture crops. In 1924 a mixture of lespedeza with oats was sown to see if the two crops had an affinity. The oats were harvested for their grain and the lespedeza was cut for hay. Experiments proved that the protein content was practically the same as alfalfa and that stock liked this little legume and there was very little stemmy waste to the hay.

A NOBLE EXPERIMENT

In 1925 a quarter of an acre was sown to lespedeza and two thin yearling heifers were borrowed from the animal husbandry department. It was not known at this time if in its growing state that the plant might be poisonous to animals. The plot was fenced off, pipes were laid to furnish water, and the two heifers were weighed in. Tremendous gains were achieved, proving that as summer pasturage lespedeza surpassed all other crops grown in Missouri.

Five-pound lots of seed were sent in 1927 to some 60 farmers throughout the State. Questionnaires were provided with the sample lots, so that a fairly representative account could be made of the practicability of this legume in various sectors of the State. It is needless to say that the reports were more than satisfying. From that date until now, lespedeza has spread like a tidal wave all over Missouri. Now it is being grown on 10,000,000 acres of farm land, either double-cropped or in single stands. This is twice the acreage of all corn grown, and twice the combined acreage of all wheat, oats, rye, and barley being grown in the State. Estimating at a very conservative sum of $10 return profit from each acre of lespedeza grown, it can be ascertained that a hundred million dollar business has resulted from this chance planting in 1922.

HERE'S WHAT IT'LL DO

To briefly sum up the attributes of lespedeza: it will grow on medium to poor soil, but will respond to fertile soil and soil treatments as well as any other crop; will provide succulent grazing during the summer months of July, August, September, and the first half of October, when no other pasturage will grow and produce equal feed value. It will reseed itself naturally, and will fit in nicely with crop rotation methods advocated in any balanced farming program. There are many other assets of lespedeza which are of equal importance, but which must be adapted to the individual farmer's needs.

The first bad drought in recent years was in 1932. At this time, approximately five or six thousand acres of lespedeza was in stands in Missouri. This drought proved the real worth of lespedeza on a large scale as a dry-weather plant. Then, there were the droughts of 1934 and 1935, but by this time lespedeza had become an institution rather than an experimentation.

NEWER LEGUMES

Since 1946 there has been a downward trend in acres established to lespedeza. A peak acreage of 10,702,440 acres was reached in 1946 and the 1949 acreage was 10,126,455. This shift in land utilization has come about through the increased popularity of other legumes such as ladino, birdsfoot trefoil, hairy vetch and increased acreages of land seeded to alfalfa and red clover.

But, with the ever-increasing menace of soil erosion, lespedeza will become a more vital asset to Missouri hill farmers. There is easily room for 10,000,000 more acres of this legume in the State. Land which now is practically wasteland due to erosion and poor crop management, could well be seeded to lespedeza as the first step in reclaiming the land. It alone cannot return the soil fertility which has been mined and leached from the soil, but should be used as a link between other crops and soil treatment.

The Treasury-Federal Reserve Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a thoughtful discussion by Mr. Aubrey G. Lanston, president of the Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., of the Treasury-Federal Reserve Board dispute over the management of the public debt.

I have previously expressed the belief, as well as the hope, which I now repeat, that an area of agreement can be reached. In that connection I wish to point out the fact that a higher interest

rate on long-term securities is not the only method by which the Federal Reserve Board can protect its open market committee. In exercising its control over national banks the Federal Reserve Board has the power to distinguish between risk loans and normally sound loans. It also has the power to ask Congress to increase its power over reserve requirements and as a temporary war emergency measure extend that power to all banks.

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

THE TREASURY-FEDERAL RESERVE DISPUTE

I would like to talk to you this morning about the differing convictions of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, because these involve questions of policy that are of great importance to our economy and, therefore, to you as bankers. Public opinion is being brought to bear on the impasse that exists, and it is being marshalled through statements that oversimplify the point at issue. It would be unfortunate, as we see it, if too many people accepted the thought that, if the Federal Reserve were freed of its compulsion to buy Treasury securities at fixed prices, the Federal could necessarily exercise a deflationary influence. Nor should we accept the generality that preys upon our love for tradition, namely, that the Federal Reserve was created as a supreme court of finance and that it would be a sacrilege if it were interfered with in any way.

Let me tell you at the outset where we stand on these matters. We believe it is most desirable that the Federal become more free than it has been in the past decade to follow a restrictive credit policy at times when this is needed. We agree with those who say that Treasury domination of Federal Reserve credit policy is dangerous. We do not go along, however, with the sophomoric contention that the Federal Reserve should be omnipotent or that it should be free to assume an attitude that might be described as "the Treasury be damned." There is much appeal in the thought advanced by Mr. Russell Leffingwell that the Treasury and the Federal Reserve be equal partners. On such a plane each can act to restrain the other or to goad the other as the case may be.

The question of domination or partnership is important largely as a matter of who holds the final say. The real problem involves many technical phases of debt and credit management and the need for a continuing understanding of investor psychology. Perhaps the outstanding problem in the technical field is whether 2½ percent Treasury bonds need be supported forever at par or better. We have long been of the firm belief that par support should not be a permanent practice. At the same time we are equally firm in our belief that we cannot depart from such a practice overnight, particularly in an atmosphere of contention between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. We also believe that if the two partners in money and debt management are so far apart in their convictions that agreement can be reached only by literally hitting one of the two of them over the head, the public cannot be blamed if it loses confidence in both, and in the dollar, and in Treasury securities.

We are inclined to place a great deal of weight on the importance of the state of mind of the investor and on the degree in which this must be considered in the management of both debt and credit.

The open-market operation is the principal instrument with which the Federal may affect the amount, availability, and cost of money. We know quite well how readily the Federal can expand the amount and can increase the availability of credit by the purchase of securities in the market.

We believe that some misconception exists as to the ability of the Federal to contract credit by the sale of Treasury securities. Success in this regard depends upon the Treasury's cash position. If the Treasury is operating with a substantial cash surplus, the Federal can contract reserve credit by selling securities in the market or by redeeming obligations as they mature.

If the Treasury does not have a cash surplus, attempts by the Federal to sell in the market cannot contract credit against the will of the market and may only expand the amount of credit in use.

At the present time the Treasury faces a deficit, and the prospect of the Treasury attaining a surplus seems remote. Therefore, in future open-market operations the Federal will be unable to contract credit to any appreciable extent by sales of Treasury securities on balance.

Perhaps this is why we are confronted with the demand that the Federal Reserve be restored to the independence conceived for it 37 years ago. Such independence would permit of an attempt to reduce the inflation problem by denying credit to the market, with the obvious result that a sharp upward trend in interest rates would follow. In the meanwhile the Federal Reserve creates, on occasion, a situation where there is no market for Treasury securities.

This brings us to the second phase of open-market operation, namely, the techniques employed by the Federal that would produce a trend toward higher interest rates. One can be certain that if the Federal were free to precipitate, directly or indirectly, a sharp upward trend in interest rates and if it were determined to use this mechanism to the necessary extent, it could stop the present inflation spiral. But once this had been accomplished, or during the process, another series of chain reactions would be started, such that the resultant inflation potential would cause our present problem to be dwarfted by comparison.

The February National City Bank letter offered a comment that was of great interest to us in this connection. It was directed primarily to the defense effort, but it applies equally to those phases of credit and debt management that have precipitated the Federal-Treasury dispute. The National City Bank noted that during most of the time since Korea, people have been uncertain as to the extent of the requirements of defense and what was expected of them. The bank went on to say that little authentic information had been available on the size of the defense program, and it admitted that, although such uncertainties may have been unavoidable, the lack of a firm basis for calculations left the way open for uninformed opinions, speculation, and extreme statements both public and private. The comment closed with the following quotation, "Undoubtedly there has been inflation by publicity, which has fostered a contagious state of alarm and scare buying."

We believe that the drawn-out public discussion over the clash between a fixed interest rate and credit control, a discussion in which Federal Reserve officials have taken a long lead, has contributed importantly to the expansion of bank credit.

How much weight should be given by the Federal to the impact of its credit policies on holders of Treasury securities such as businesses and individuals? For an idea we might turn to an estimate of the so-called inflationary gap that was recently made by a noted Federal Reserve economist. He said that the gap during the next year could be as much as $20,000,000,000 and will stem from a contraction of $10,000,000,000 in the goods available for civilian purchase and an increase of a like amount in consumer and business income. He cautions that the estimate is premised on (1) no further price or wage increases, (2) no substantial credit expansion, (3) no further tax increases, and (4) a consideration of particular potency to our discussion; namely, no large use of available liquid assets. He then points out that individuals and businesses hold $176,000,000,000 of bank deposits and currency and $90,000,000,000 of Treasury securities, a large part of which are redeemable on demand or have short maturities. The total is $266,000,000,000. The question, therefore, is whether attempts by the Federal to reduce the size of the inflation gap will suggest that some portion of the $90,000,000,000 of these Treasury securities be sold or whether such investors thereby will be encouraged to increase their holdings.

The Federal Reserve, as a special guardian of the purchasing power of the dollar, also must keep in mind that some $100,000,000,000 of Treasury securities rest in the portfolios of commercial banks, savings banks, insurance companies, and the like, and that such investors hold additional billions of other marketable securities, the value of which would be affected, along with their Treasury securities, should a sharply increasing trend in interest rates occur.

Managers of these portfolios, such as yourselves, are concerned with the decreasing purchasing power of the dollar, but you also take into consideration in the management of your portfolio the dollar prices that your security investments command in the market. Many of the decisions that you make with respect to the purchase, sale, or retention of these securities are based upon changes in market values. Collectively these decisions of yours, influenced as they must be by the Federal Reserve's policies, will bear importantly on whether individuals and businesses prefer to acquire additional securities or are inspired to bring their liquid assets into play in a manner that will heighten our inflation.

Thus the Federal Reserve is quite correct in saying that it must protect the purchasing power of the dollar, but the Treasury is also on sound ground when it says that investor confidence in Treasury securities should not be impaired by unexpected sharp fluctuations in the dollar prices of its securities. These two statements are the crux of the dispute.

Now let us digress for a moment in order to examine the weight that should be given to the Board's contention that it has a responsibility for credit that it is not able to discharge. There is nothing new about this. The Federal Reserve was charged just as fully in this connection 9 years ago as it is today. Yet 9 years ago, as a consequence of the war emergency, the Federal Reserve agreed to underwrite a pattern of rates for Treasury wartime financing. The Federal Reserve had no option because the Treasury faced an unprecedented deficit, the money had to be raised, and there was nothing else to do.

Since the Treasury again faces a deficit, is there any better way to resolve matters than to bring about an agreement between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve in the technical area of interest rates and support techniques?

Nine years ago when the Federal accepted the responsibility of protecting the prices of Treasury securities, the Secretary of the Treasury would have accepted a support price that was fractionally below par. When I say this I am not making an assumption. The choice of par, as a precise figure, was made by the Federal, and with the passage of time most Treasury security investors have come to believe that whenever "the cards were down," neither the Treasury nor the Federal would elect to drop the support price of the 2½ percent bonds below that figure.

Indeed, you will recall that by the time we had to face up to the inflationary problems of 1947 and 1948 a leading official of the Federal proclaimed that failure to sup-

port Treasury 2½ percent bonds at par would lead to a catastrophic condition. We repeat that we firmly believe that we need to get away from par support, and we believe that a program should have been and could have been worked out long before this. A period of national emergency and of bitter dispute between the Treasury and the Federal, however, is not a propitious moment to engage in drastic changes or to withdraw support.

Furthermore, if the reasons for supporting outstanding Treasury bonds were compelling in 1948, how do we justify ignoring similar reasons today?

The Federal has lived with its conscience for 9 years. Why must it suddenly choose a war emergency and a period when the Treasury faces a deficit of unknown size to suggest that it be free to act independently?

Indeed the differences between the type of inflation that we face today and that with which we were confronted in 1947 and 1948 should leave the Federal Reserve with less rather than more reason to have precipitated these questions. During 1947 and 1948 the inflationary problem arose primarily from activity in the private economy, at a time when the Treasury had a substantial cash surplus. The present inflation has been enlarged by the prospect of controls, of shortages, and of an undefined but large defense program.

Some portion of the plant and equipment expansion necessary to the defense program is yet to be met. The money needed from outside sources must come largely from either the insurance companies or the commercial banks. At the present time great emphasis is being placed on the expansion of bank credit. Few seem to realize that under existing conditions loans granted by banks are less inflationary than the extension of an equal amount of credit by insurance companies.

Now, the Treasury security and other bond markets have remained relatively calm throughout this drawn-out Federal Reserve-Treasury dispute and its accompanying publicity. This calm is the result of a general confidence that the Treasury long-term rate of 2½ percent will stand, and so will par support for outstanding long-term bonds. In other words the rank and file of investors do not believe that the Federal will be or will feel free, in the final analysis, to unstabilize the Treasury security market by decreasing the support prices or by withdrawing support.

My first question, therefore, is as follows: If against the contentious background of recent months, the Federal reduced its support price for Victory 2½'s to 100 and, at the same time, became a more-than-usually reluctant buyer of short-term Treasury securities, would investors continue to be calm or would their confidence be somewhat shaken?

Second, would a drop in the support price of 2½ percent bonds to 100 or an increasing denial of a market to some holders of Treasury securities produce an increased volume of precautionary sales?

Third, if the Federal Reserve were to drop the support price to 99½ or 99, how confident would institutional investors be that such support prices would hold?

If the Federal breaks par in support of Treasury bonds, will this be deemed, by investors, to be evidence that it has adopted a program of retreat to successively lower prices depending upon the volume of bonds offered to it?

If, to make its credit less readily available, the Federal decided to let the market decline to whatever point was necessary to dry up selling, how far would prices have to decline? Does anyone know? Can we afford to act on optimistic guesses?

Now let's go to the other side of these things. Let us assume that, to reduce the availability of credit, the Federal Reserve drops its support prices sufficiently low that it ultimately dries up any substantial selling. How many institutional investors would become buyers of Treasury securities?

We are asked to believe that more Treasury securities can be placed if the interest rate offered on them is made more attractive. When bond prices decline interest rates become more attractive, but I have never seen a bond market that was undergoing a major decine that could be characterized as a confident one. If the bond market is caused to decline sharply while institutional investors are net sellers on balance, where are the additional buyers of these bonds going to come from?

We believe that the important consideration is not whether interest rates become more attractive or whether a higher level of rates is brought about. It is the trend of rates that is important. As bankers, you may agree that there is a tendency to feel more "loaned-up" when the outlook is for higher rates of interest than is the case if the outlook is for lower ones. The same thing is true with respect to bond buyers. A given rate is unattractive if the trend of the market is down, but the same rate can appear attractive if the price trend is stable or rising.

Please do not misunderstand. We are not an advocate of low interest rates. We would have much preferred a Treasury decision calling for a long-term 2¾-percent bond or a long-term 2½-percent bond at a discount to yield 2.70 percent or 2.75 percent. Both of these would have been possible without disturbing the stability of outstanding bonds if the Treasury and the Federal had evidenced an ability to resolve their differences.

We have been told that market conditions have clearly shown that the Treasury has insisted upon interest rates that are too low. In justification, our attention is called to the natural forces of supply and demand as they appear in the market and to the amount of Treasury securities that the Federal has been forced to acquire The market for Treasury securities during the past year has been made almost entirely by the Federal Reserve, and the market has looked, most of the time, the way the Federal open-market operations caused it to look.

Let me illustrate this by comparing two financings a year apart. First, we will go back to November 1949. When the Treasury and the Federal Reserve were discussing the terms to be set on the approaching refunding of that period the market "looked" as though a 1⅛ percent rate were no longer suitable. The Treasury, nevertheless, decided to continue with a 1⅛-percent 1-year rate. It also offered a 1¾-percent note with a 4¼-year term This note quickly reached a premium of eleven thirty-seconds above 100. Why? Because investors took the financing decision of the Treasury as an indication that the Federal had lost the fight to advance the pattern toward higher yields. Both offerings were an outstanding success.

During the months following the Federal showed by its handling of the open market that it had not given up the fight. Even when the Treasury in the spring of last year acceded to somewhat higher interest rates for shorter-term securities, the Federal appeared to be dissatisfied. At least, that is the impression gained by close observers, an impression that was more than fully justified by the open break that occurred in August of last year.

Let us now consider the latest refunding in which the offering consisted of a single issue of 5-year 1¾-percent notes. The terms set by the Secretary of the Treasury were those recommended by the Federal Reserve, ones that were later characterized by the Federal as appropriate and attractive. Most market observers, and we believe the Treasury as well, were skeptical of the appropriateness and the attractiveness of a 5-year obligation for corporations who were large holders of the maturing securities. But there are grounds for believing that the Federal assured the Treasury that this refunding would be a success.

What is the record? Only about 52 percent of the public holdings of the maturing securities were exchanged for the new issue and held throughout the exchange period. The remaining 48 percent of the public holdings were sold to the Federal or redeemed for cash. This hardly could be construed as a successful exchange from the point of view of the sound objectives of debt management.

About 15 percent of the public holdings were redeemed for cash. This compares with a 21 percent cash redemption last September and October and with the more normal cash redemptions of 5 percent or less. The drain on the Treasury's balance resulting from these two refundings was $3,500,000,000.

The differences between the successful refunding of November 1949 and the unsuccessful exchange offering made in November 1950 are twofold. In the first place, it is a testimony to the deterioration in investor confidence that has been brought about by the public wrangling over differences. Second, it suggests that the Treasury is a better judge of the type of securities that investors will buy than is the Federal.

This brings to mind something that has occurred to us with increasing frequency over recent months. We have wondered whether the Governors of the Board and the other members of the Open Market Committee could possibly be too far removed from an intimate contact with the Treasury security market, that is, from the changing states of mind, the preferences, and the reactions of those whose activities create the supply and demand with which the Federal open-market operation must contend. These are details of great importance when it becomes necessary to refine the terms of Treasury offerings. We also have wondered whether an adequate exchange of technical information takes place between the Treasury and the Federal. We have wondered about these things, because if such situations were to exist they would explain why some of the misunderstandings arise.

But let us get back to more tangible things. The apparent calmness of institutional investors will be put to a full test when the Treasury begins to refund almost $40,000,000,000 of maturing or callable securities. The bulk of these refunding covers a span hardly longer than 4 months and begins this June.

Were the Treasury to experience the same percentage of cash redemptions that it suffered in the last refunding, it would have to pay out about $6,000,000,000. No wonder the Secretary of the Treasury believes a stable and confident Treasury security market is a prerequisite to financial mobilization.

If, therefore, the Federal Reserve were to endeavor to make credit unavailable by reducing support or by withdrawing it, what would be the attitude of holders of the maturing and callable Treasury securities?

Many have substantial forward commitments in mortgages and the like. A larger number would be offered good loans at rates substantially higher than those now prevailing. Some of those loans will be necessary to the defense program.

Would investors accept the refunding offerings to be made by the Treasury?

Or would they deem it prudent to redeem their securities in order to meet their commitments or to make loans?

If, in the final analysis, the Treasury met with no greater success in these financings than in those just past, would potential buyers of long-term Treasury bonds gain or lose in confidence?

And, wholly aside from the Treasury's cash position, if it must meet large-scale cash redemptions, from whom will it obtain funds? From the Federal Reserve banks? Or from the commercial banks?

In either event it would appear that banks as a whole might be forced to cope with some more or less unworkable plan such as a secondary reserve requirement, a ceiling reserve plan, higher cash reserves, or they may be told to accept Treasury certificates of deposit bearing interest at some rate, such as one-fourth percent. Yet none of these devises will insure an improvement in the credit condition over what it can be if debt management is permitted to work in our favor instead of against us.

This is not a question of interest costs. Surely many would prefer higher rates, but the determining element in the equation is the maintenance of investor confidence. This requires a stable and confident Treasury security market and confidence among Treasury-security investors that they will not be subjected to some abrupt manipulation of the market, by either the Federal Reserve or the Treasury.

It seems to us important that the attitude of the institutional investor toward the market for Treasury securities may determine the confidence that business corporations and individuals have in these same securities. To parlay the reduction in the value of the dollar by decreasing the dollar price of Treasury securities abruptly may be the worst way to deal with inflation.

In summation we suggest that the differences between the Federal and the Treasury involve questions of policy that are most important to the economy and to you. It is dangerous to accept oversimplifications, either of principle or of the technical aspects of the points at issue. Federal Reserve open-market operations designed to reduce the availability of credit cannot do so on a quantitative basis except as the Treasury is armed with a substantial cash surplus. The Treasury will soon be operating at a deficit. A substantial cash surplus is hardly a possibility. To reduce the support rendered to Treasury securities, against the present contentious background, or without warning, would be most dangerous. The withdrawal of support would be intolerable. Yet, we need to plan for its ultimate elimination. Of greater importance than an increase in interest rates, is the trend of rates. But, this is no time to attempt to control credit by starting a trend to higher rates. To do so would multiply not reduce the inflation potential. Neither the Federal nor the Treasury should be omnipotent or dominant. Each should consider itself to be an equal partner charged with responsibilities of equal weight.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article appearing in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1951:

UMT CAN BUILD IKE'S WALL FOR PEACE

(By James B. Conant)

(Following is a digest of a radio address delivered last Wednesday night under auspices of the Committee on the Present Danger.)

The United States is in danger. Few would be inclined to question this simple statement. The danger is clearly of a military nature. On this much we can all agree.

But as to the exact nature of the danger which confronts us, there is far from being complete agreement among the citizens of this Republic. Nor are we by any means of one mind as to how we should mobilize the young men of the Nation. Indeed, some few question even the need for an army of the size announced.

Now, if we are going to ask the youth of the country to serve two years in the Armed Forces—as I believe we must—each one of us who supports this program must be prepared to answer one question—why?

Why must we look forward to a period of austerity, of partial mobilization, of more weapons for war, fewer tools for peace?

The answer to these questions seem to me to be summed up in General Eisenhower's recent statement that we must "build a secure wall for peace."

Within less than 18 months, the free world has been confronted with two highly unpleasant facts. First, the Soviet military power is beginning to mount in terms of the most modern type of warfare—the United States monopoly of the atomic bomb has ended; second, the Soviet allies, at least, have shown a readiness to gain their ends by force of arms.

Place these facts against the background of the postwar military situation on the European Continent and you can see the outlines of the present danger.

If Russia tomorrow should move its troops toward the Atlantic Ocean, European territory would be conquered but the Russian industrial centers would be destroyed from the air. As long as the United States strategic Air Force is in this commanding position, the danger of Russian troops marching to the channel is relatively slight.

But as the years go by, the deterrent power of strategic bombing will meet an ever-mounting counterthreat—a threat to the industrial centers of Britain and the United States, to the continental cities themselves. The Russians are building up their offensive strength and doubtless likewise their own defenses against strategic bombing.

Therefore the danger of a third global war, I am convinced, turns on the fact that a few years hence the handful of men who rule Russia may decide that the power of our strategic Air Force has been largely canceled out. If at that time Europe is defenseless on the ground, the Russian hordes will begin to move.

Strengthening the defense of Europe in terms not of a deterrent threat against Russian cities but in terms of armies to stop an advance—this seems to me the top item on the agenda of the free nations of the world. Only then can we achieve a true global stalemate.

What is required of the United States, if we are to play our part in building this wall of security? Clearly, the rapid production of arms and military equipment—and on this we are well embarked. But we must also be in a position to furnish men.

General Eisenhower says that we must be prepared to stand by in a partially mobilized state for a long period of years. To this end, we must have a system of universal military service.

Congress has before it a universal military service bill. This measure needs to be understood by the American public, for there is much confusion as to what is in fact involved.

In the first place, we are not talking about the type of legislation which would be needed to mobilize the manpower of the country on a total basis if we became engaged in a global war. That is another subject. I am discussing, rather, partial mobilization for a long, drawn-out period of international stress and strain. I am discussing the method of maintaining over many years three and a half to four million men in our Armed Forces.

What the situation requires is a universal military service act which will call into the Armed Forces all able-bodied young men when they graduate from high school or reach 18, whichever is later. This is a vital point in the argument; this is the essence of the bill which must not be destroyed by amendment.

Those of us who support the bill believe that the interruption of a young man's education should be before college, not during college, and, for those who go direct from high school to a job, before starting in an occupation. After they have completed the 27 months of military service, these young men will be ready to enter college or go to work. The problems which bedeviled us in World War II in regard to deferring special types of students or essential men in industry will be eliminated if military service is performed between the ages of 18 and 20.

To my mind, it is quite clear that a man's military service had best be done before he enters the productive life of the country or before he begins his collegiate or professional education.

On this point, we have the testimony of Dr. William C. Menninger, who was chief psychiatrist of the Army in World War II.

"From the point of view of the mental health of our young men," Dr. Menninger said, "a program of universal military service and training is far more practical than our present system of selective service. The present system engenders hostility in the man who is selected because he must carry an unfair share of the burden. Because it is selective, it tends to stimulate men to seek deferment on whatever grounds they may be able to plead.

"With our present system a man of draft-eligible age lives in uncertainty from mail to mail. The result is great unrest in our youth of this age, not only in colleges but in industry and business.

"A system which begins at a definite age, which distributes equally the responsibility and privileges among all youth, and which runs for a definite length of service, is far superior, from any mental health point of view, to our present indefinite and discriminatory system under the selective service law."

There is one obvious difficulty in a scheme of universal service between 18 and 20. How is one to provide from each age group the required number of officers and specialists? I have become persuaded, contrary to my first opinion, that in order to accomplish the training of officers and specialists, a small fraction of each age group should be selected after basic training by a civilian board and sent to the colleges for specialized education. This feedback proposal is in the bill now before Congress. It meets the objections that many educators first raised to a universal military service program.

Some scientists have been disturbed lest the passage of this bill strike a serious blow at the national defense by interfering with the continuous flow of trained men. I venture to think they are mistaken, and call as an expert witness Dr. Vannevar Bush, who headed all our scientific work during the last war.

Dr. Bush appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to urge the passage of this universal military service and training bill, and this is what he said:

"We shall call all young men at 18 without exception, adjusting standards to defer only those who cannot be used somewhere in the widely varied efforts of the Military Establishment. Once the system is in full operation, the process of choice of men to receive advanced training to become officers or to develop new weapons, to maintain our public health, or to perform other profes-

sional duties should be on a secure basis of fair competition.

"There will be adjustments needed in a transition period, for it would be absurd to denude our laboratories just when we need them most, and it would be short-sighted to deny to industry the engineers it must have to build new weapons in adequate quantities in the next year or two.

"But when the system is in full operation, every youth on reaching 18 should expect to get into the service of his country, with his subsequent advancement and the nature of his assignments during the entire age period until he emerges from the Reserves and goes his own way determined by competitive tests and the judgment of fair men."

Let me emphasize the distinction between universal service and selective service, for this point is often misunderstood. The bill before Congress is a real universal military service bill and not merely an extension of the Selective Service Act to include 18-year-olds The power given the President to call up men by age groups and the establishment of a large Reserve are the distinguishing features

When the call goes out for an age group, the draft boards will make no deferments in this group on grounds of occupation or dependencies. When the program becomes fully operative, the services could count on at least 700,000 to 750,000 men from each age group, and another 100,000 for limited service by lowering the present physical and mental standards for induction.

In addition to providing a force in being, the continual flow into the Armed Forces of those who reach 18 and their release after about 2 years will provide over the years a pool of trained manpower—a large body of men in Reserve status. I believe this to be imperative. The danger of an all-out war is so serious that all our young men must have military training for their own protection as well as for the protection of their country.

The present selective-service law expires in June. Clearly, before that date Congress must act on the bill that is now before it. But one may hope that the matter may be settled in the coming weeks. Until it is settled how we are to recruit our armies, there will be a feeling of uncertainty and confusion in many families throughout the land.

I suppose all of us who are urging the rapid rearmament of the United States would agree that there is nothing we like about the whole business. Universal military service is a bitter pill to swallow, and I for one have come most reluctantly to support such a program. But the desperate need to build up our military strength cannot be denied.

Many of us remember with what shock we read of the fall of France in 1940 and with what fear we awaited the outcome of the battle of Britain. Our military men, we now know, were full of apprehension as to what would be the consequences to the United States of the loss of the British Isles. The margin of victory then was narrow enough, we all recall. But with the weapons of the 1950's, an enemy in control of the Channel ports would be far more dangerous, perhaps impossible to stop.

In short, while the defense of Europe is essential for the survival of Europe, it is just as essential for the survival of a free United States.

Europe lost—just sketch the outline of such a world and fill in the details yourself. Imagine the Soviet Union in control directly or through puppets of all Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa; Britain neutralized, this hemisphere alone. Think in terms of military strategy, think in terms of raw materials, think in terms of western civilization.

What is the alternative? A third global war? Not to my mind. It may be forced upon us any day—that one must admit. But I believe there is still a chance, a good chance, of avoiding world war III—a war which can lead only to wholesale destruction with no clear victory possible for either side. I believe there is a good chance of avoiding this catastrophe, but only if Europe is made defensible, and without delay.

Need Arms First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, [illegible]uary 29), 1951

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article appearing in the Kansas City Star of Wednesday, February 7, written in Paris by its foreign correspondent, Mr. Marcel Wallenstein.

Mr. Wallenstein is not a casual visitor to Europe, but has lived there for the past 15 years. During that time he has visited the various countries and has had an opportunity to become personally acquainted with their problems and their thinking.

I urge the Members of the Senate to read this splendid statement.

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

NEED ARMS FIRST—WITH PROPER AID AND LEADERSHIP FRANCE AND BRITAIN WOULD FIGHT THE RUSSIANS—TURN IN REICH FEELING—DESPITE WARRIOR TRADITION, GERMANS HAVE STRONG DESIRE TO AVOID ANY CONFLICT

(By Marcel Wallenstein)

PARIS, February 7.—A stream of letters has been received from readers asking: Will Europe fight if necessary?

One writer wants to know if we can depend on the British and French if we find ourselves up against it?

Perhaps the most interesting letter is from a man in northwest Kansas who says, "The Germans have always proved to be the best fighters in Europe. There are millions of them we could arm to help us if we have to fight Joe Stalin. Wouldn't we be better off if we shipped guns and tanks to Germany and forgot about the others?"

GIVES HIS ANSWER

The answers as this reported sees them:

Europe will fight if forced to do so—and if properly armed and properly led by European governments. By "Europe" is meant chiefly Britain and France. The British record of the last war should be too well known to need explanation here.

The French defeat in that war in less than 6 weeks was caused partly by bad leadership in the government and in the field and the lack of weapons. A badly armed French army—without air cover—lost more men killed in the battles of May and June 1940, than the American expeditionary force under Pershing in the Kaiser's war.

These two countries seem to appreciate the danger of remaining unarmed while an enormous Russian military machine sits in Europe. They are taking steps to the limit of their powers to correct their weakness. The report of General Eisenhower should show a willingness to cooperate in Britain and France.

TURN BY GERMANY

And now as to Germany. Here is the surprise. As the man from Kansas writes, the Germans have been the warriors of Europe. But it is no longer so. The Germans of the present have no stomach for war. They don't want it at any price. Perhaps never in German history have the people been so pacifistic as they are now.

This is true of the industrialists who s backing of previous war machines has been partly responsible for earlier wars, and true of the mass of people who formerly gave blind obedience to their rulers. The right and the middle of the German political framework look with distaste on rearmament. The most prevalent remark in Western Germany at the moment is "not for me" when one speaks of another war.

FEAR THE RUSSIANS

The people fear and hate the Russians, after the taste of Russian occupation. The Communist faith finds little sympathy from the average German workman. But he is not ready to take up a gun again in defense of Western Europe. He looks around him at his battered cities and knows they would be the first to come under attack.

The German iron masters are making money faster than at any time since the defeat of their country. The Allies of the west need their steel and buy it. The Russians also want it, and the German employers seem to have the idea that they can profitably do business with both sides if permitted to do so.

A German on a business mission to Paris recently said:

"You need us. The world needs us. We have something to sell. The Russians want to buy it, as well as you. The Russians wouldn't kill us. They would let us work."

SEES CONTINUED JOBS

This man actually believed men of his class would be permitted to continue at the heads of their industries if the Russians occupied the Ruhr. "Listen," he said, "the Allies swore we should never again be militarized. They made war a crime. They tore down our war plants. Now they are saying, "We want you back in another army—for another war." Then he took his fat cigar out of his mouth and said, "Count me out. Every German I know is saying the same thing."

There is of course an element of blackmail in this. The Bonn Government and the recovering Western Germany heavy industry leaders know how hard pressed the Western Allies are for manpower to meet the Russian threat. They, not unnaturally, wish to drive as hard a bargain as possible with former enemies before organizing a new German defense force to be enrolled with western armies.

WORK THEIR ADVANTAGE

Having been given an advantage by the political situation, the Germans are working it to the limit. The lawmakers of Bonn hesitate and stall on disarmament questions. Eisenhower was received with less animosity than was expected—even with certain reserved hospitality.

If there are people who have no wish to rearm or fight in any predictable future time they live in Western Germany. The same probably is true in that part of Germany which wears the Russian yoke.

Only the presence of German units in an international force can bring that force within measurable distance of an organization that could defend Europe against Russian aggression. Every observer agrees—and few Germans deny it—that German morale at present is unequal to playing its proper part in the defense of the west.

Mr. Truman Decided in Favor of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Mr. Truman Decided in Favor of Inflation," published in the Minneapolis Star of February 7, 1951. The editorial contains a number of questions which are answered by Mr. Arthur Upgren, economic consultant of the Star. It is a very thought-provoking editorial.

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

MR. TRUMAN DECIDED IN FAVOR OF INFLATION

For months the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have violently disagreed about Federal money policy. Secretary John W. Snyder wants to support par prices for Government bonds. The Reserve Board wants to let the open market make the price of Government bonds.

When the disagreement broke out in a public argument, President Truman intervened and decided in favor of the Treasury Department. To throw some needed light on that decision, the Star got its economic consultant, Arthur Upgren, to answer the following questions:

Question. How important was the decision made by President Truman after the White House meeting last Thursday?

Answer. The decision was more important than any other in giving the United States another dose of inflation.

Question. Who will be hurt by that inflation as it comes?

Answer. The Treasury of the United States for a large amount, and the American people will be hurt by a still larger amount.

Question. Will the housewife find it more difficult to buy food for her family?

Answer. Yes; because more money will compete with her at the butcher's counter.

Question. Are you willing to guess how much more a $20 basket of groceries will cost Mrs. Consumer a year from now under these policies?

Answer. If she goes to the legitimate markets, $2 more; if she goes to the black markets, something more than that and an awful lot of trouble.

Question. What is inflation?

Answer. Rising prices.

Question. Then we are already having inflation?

Answer. Yes; we have had a considerable amount of it already—cost of living is up 8 percent since last March; wholesale prices are up 17 percent; the price of farm land is up 5 percent; city real estate is up 5 to 10 percent; farm products are up 24 percent; 28 important raw materials are up 48 percent. That is a part of the inflation we have already had.

Question. What causes inflation?

Answer. Too much money, especially when that money is in the hands of people who already think prices are going higher.

Question. I take it you believe the decision at the White House last Thursday will mean still more money?

Answer. Yes; it can mean much more. That's what the idea of making this war production period another 2½ percent war means.

Question. Just how will 2½ percent bonds make more spending money?

Answer. In two ways. First, the Federal Reserve will buy anybody's bonds at par. Because there are $257,000,000,000 of bonds, a lot of cash money can be let loose that way. Second, which will be still more dangerous in the years ahead, the Government can borrow money so easily at 2½ percent that borrowing may truly become our way of life.

Question. Isn't it true that when the Federal Government sells bonds, that usually increases the capacity of banks to loan money to people in a position to borrow it?

Answer. That is especially true when the Federal Reserve takes bonds from all comers at par. Doing that gives the bank all the reserves they need to lend money.

Question. How many dollars worth of loans can be made for each dollar of bond face value?

Answer. More than $5.

Question. Secretary Snyder's argument that the Government should continue to borrow money cheap was based on a plea that every ½ percent increase in the interest rate means Uncle Sam has to pay a billion and a half more in interest for the national debt. Is that correct?

Answer. Yes. It does mean a tiny fraction more is paid in interest on the debt.

Question. But if a cheap money policy is followed, doesn't the cost of the defense program go up because of higher prices?

Answer. It goes up fast. I think of an example—Congress appropriated enough money early last summer to buy a thousand jet airplanes. But because of inflation the money bought only 770 jet planes. On $40,000,000,000 spent for defense, inflation now is costing the Government $6,000,000,000.

Question. You think President Truman made exactly the wrong decision last Thursday?

Answer. I think he did because a rise in prices of 10 percent can cost the American people $20,000,000,000 a year via inflation for the $1,500,000,000 the Treasury is trying to save.

Question. Do you think such a bad decision can remain final?

Answer. I feel sure the Treasury will have to reverse its policy. England did under a similar set of conditions.

Question. Then you think Governor Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board was right about stopping the Treasury's easy money policy and that Snyder is wrong?

Answer. Yes, entirely, because this time we start a war effort with tight, full employment and rising prices. Easy money will feed the fire of inflation. In 1941 we had 12,000,000 unemployed, and factory output was low. It is not that way this time. We can't produce a great deal more so the easy money will boost the prices of what we are producing.

Meeting the Problems Involved in the World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on January 6, 1951, Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, delivered a very important address before a meeting of the Ohio State Industrial Union Council at Columbus, Ohio.

In this address Mr. Carey presents a thorough analysis of the dangerous problems threatening our country. He points out that this fight against Communist imperialism is not merely a militaristic struggle. If we are to win in this contest, we must be able to show that capitalistic democracy can provide a way of life superior to Communist dictatorship. As he points out, we have to realize "that the fight for civil liberties, the rights of labor, decent living standards, and equality of sacrifice at home are a necessary part of the fight against Communist dictatorship and aggression abroad."

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Carey's address printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The world of 1951 is a world of uncertainty, of fear, of horrible danger, of treachery, of bravery. It is a year in which no one knows what the next months will bring, whether it be hope or gloom, or despair, or confidence, or life or death. Right now, we have no way of knowing how far Russia's greed for power over men's minds and bodies will carry it. We have no way of knowing whether December 31, 1951, will see Soviet locusts eating up most of Asia and all of Europe—two-thirds of the world's population—or whether by some means, military or moral, Moscow will have lost or withdrawn its grand strategy.

The world will have to decide this year. There is no more time for equivocation: there is very little time for let's-make-another-appeal, no more time for anything but action. If we can prove to Russia that real peace pays, maybe Russia will learn the facts of life the hard way. If that succeeds quickly, we can really build a world bulwark of peace that no one could break.

As I appear here today, I want to talk about the dangers that are ours, and what I think is the road to take to prevent a crushing defeat for the free world we love. I want to focus your attention on what are the roles and responsibilities for government, for business, for labor in this struggle. I want to talk about you and me, about yours and mine.

It seems clear that we are all in this struggle together. If we lose to communism, capitalism is done for, free enterprise will vanish, there will be no free farmers, small business will become part of the Soviet machine, and instead of free labor there will be the kind of slave labor we now see in Eastern Europe and in China. There will be no difference between Democrats and Republicans in the Communist concentration camps, and the same bullets of the firing squads will kill Hoover and Acheson.

But America is coming to the parting of the ways on the question of how our freedom is to be preserved. There are two roads pointed out to us, and we will have to choose between them.

But they are completely opposite roads. By one road we can defeat Communist aggression, maintain and expand the free world and realize the blessings of not only liberty but also a higher standard of living for ourselves and hundreds of millions of others.

By the second road, we will at best maintain in America an armed camp that will steadily degenerate into a semi-Fascist state, that will resemble more and more the dictorship that we are trying to defeat.

What are these two roads open to us?

First, there is the road proposed by the McCormick - Hearst - McCarthy-Taft-Hoover Dixiecrat axis. This group proposes in effect

that we abandon our democratic friends throughout the world as being "unreliable"; that we hold onto the only "reliable" fighters against communism such as Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, the Emperor of Indochina, and others of that like and that we pull back to our shores and go into our storm cellars.

By whatever name this is called, whether it is Taft's reexamination or Hoover's isolationism, the theory is the same. This group feels that it is hopeless to try to defend democratic Britain and France, social democratic Norway or Switzerland, or Italy. We can only fight when America itself is invaded. Otherwise let the rest of the world go hang.

Now this theory is not new. The same people who advance it now in fighting communism advanced it in 1940 when the issue was fighting Nazi-fascism. You remember the America First group, whose political leaders were the same people, the Tafts, McCormick, Hearst, Hoover, and whose big-business backers supplied millions of dollars for propaganda. When Britain was fighting alone for democracy these brave men of the America First group wanted to abandon her and abandon Europe. They had no stomach to fight for democracy. It was too expensive. Here is what your own Senator TAFT said in 1940 after France had been overrun and Britain was staggering under the blitz:

"I do not know what the Germans may do, and no one knows what they may do until they are freed from the present war and have an opportunity to show. When they do, we can adopt the same methods. We can take the same steps that may be necessary to meet the particular kind of German blitzkrieg, if there is such a blitzkrieg, at the time we find out what it is."

In plain English this outstanding statement meant "Let the Nazis win the war and then if they attack us, we'll figure out what to do."

Isn't that exactly what TAFT is saying today in the fight against communism?

At that same time, in 1940 and 1941 when Roosevelt was trying to get this Nation to rearm, the big industrialists said we did not need to have more steel, more copper, more aluminum. They wanted business as usual, and profits as usual. It was organized labor that went out and demanded that this Nation mobilize to meet the Nazi challenge.

The policy of these reactionaries, the ones who always cry "free enterprise," and "democracy," was one of defeatism when it came to a showdown. They had no confidence in democracy or freedom. They were willing to throw in the sponge.

Today, they are pursuing the same policies. While the McCarthys, Tafts, Hoovers, McCormicks, Hearsts beat their breasts in denouncing communism in the State Department or on the radio and demand purges, when it comes to really fighting communism they want to throw in the sponge, retire to our storm cellers here.

Isolationism and communism are allies today just as isolationism and fascism were allies just 10 years ago, in 1940 and 1941. To a few naive souls it may still sound extreme to link Senator Taft, Herbert Hoover, and Colonel McCormick—supposedly relentless foes of communism—with the Kremlin's scheme for world conquest.

Nevertheless, wittingly or unwittingly, the Tafts and the Hoovers are as much in partnership with Joseph Stalin today as they were with Hitler and Mussolini a decade ago.

How? To begin with, not even an expert today can tell the difference between the Chicago Tribune's editorial policy and the editorial policy of the Communist Daily worker. Since the invasion of the Republic of South Korea last June both papers have screamed incessantly for the withdrawal of American troops from Korea. Both papers have demanded that American troops be pulled out of Asia and out of Europe. Both papers have declared, in effect, that both continents should be turned over to the tender mercies of Russian totalitarianism. Both papers have constantly attacked and undermined every major decision and action undertaken by the United Nations.

There are other ways in which the Taft-Hoover-McCormick axis serves the Kremlin. These American isolationists today demand exactly what they demanded in 1940 and 1941—that this country retire behind its two oceans, that it turn itself into a kind of Gibraltar completely surrounded by a hostile world.

Stalin himself couldn't ask for more. He couldn't ask for a more gratifying surrender than for the United States to abandon the democratic nations of Europe and desert the nations of Asia where democracy is beginning to move forward for the first time. We would be handing over to Stalin's slave-labor machine countless millions of men and women and giving him, by default, the priceless natural resources of two continents to strengthen his war-making ability.

Is it any wonder that even the Nation's outstanding Republican newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune, can't even call this madness "isolationism." The Herald Tribune flatly terms it "retreatism."

I tell you as earnestly as I can: There is no place in this world today—this world of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb—where we can hide from totalitarianism. Neither the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans nor the North Pole are barriers.

We can no longer mince words or insist on the niceties of etiquette when our Nation's future is at stake, when democracy everywhere is in desperate danger. We have got to see and state it openly that those men who advocate our giving up our allies in this life-and-death struggle are virtual traitors. Isolationism today is communism's fifth column. Isolationism is as much our enemy as the communism it serves. Our own safety as a nation and the establishment of democracy and peace throughout the world depend on repudiation of everything that the Tafts, the Hoovers, and the McCormicks stand for. We must, for our own salvation and for the world's salvation, wipe out the poisonous illusion that we can survive without friends or that there can be peace in a world one-fifth free and four-fifths enslaved.

What would happen in America as a result of successful isolationism?

I think we already see the signs of it—I think we can see that the isolationism of this axis of defeatism is tied to a reactionary policy at home. Here is what they will aim for:

1. They will try to convert America into an armed camp for an indefinite period while the Communists nibble away at the Western Hemisphere—at Canada, South America, the West Indies.

2. They will use this situation they have created to panic the American people into giving them political power in 1952.

3. Once in power, they will use the Subversive Controls Act and similar acts to stamp out anyone or any group who disagree with them. Free labor, free farm groups, free citizens groups will be placed under iron control. The jails will fill up with political prisoners.

4. The greater the Communist menace becomes from the outside, the tighter the controls would be placed on Americans, until finally we would resemble the same dictatorship we are trying to fight.

This is no wild dream. This is a grim, ghastly possibility. This is what would have happened if the Tafts had won the 1940 elections and had controlled the Government then. Only then I think they would have had made their peace with the Nazis.

I say this is a possible road. You may say that some of those who want to take us down that road don't believe in dictatorship. That may be true. But if we all end up in a Communist concentration camp or before a firing squad will it make any difference to us whether TAFT or MCCARTHY was only an ignorant fool and not a scheming Fascist?

What is the second possible road that we can take in this decisive year of 1951? That road is the road of fellowship with the democratic world, realizing that we are all in a state of siege, and it's a matter of all for one and one for all. As free men we all survive or perish together.

This means that we recognize that Europe, having gone through two devastating wars, is mortally afraid of a third, so instead of being impatient and dictatorial, we work with the free people of Europe in real comradeship and understanding. We let the people of Europe and of free Asia know that we will not only share military defense with them but also the possibilities of decent living standards. We made clear that this is not a fight between the philosophy of communism and capitalism, but between democracy and dictatorship.

We let them know that to the extent of our ability we will join with them to prevent a Communist aggression and will not desert them.

We let them know that America does not want to dictate but to be at one with them in partnership and comradeship.

This means that in America, we will not only keep our freedoms but expand them. We will sacrifice in proportion to ability to do it. We will expand our industrial capacity because we have confidence that now and after this emergency there will be an unlimited market for the comforts and decencies of life.

We will make America a showplace of democratic and civil rights because we are not afraid of the loyalty of Americans to freedom.

In this struggle that lies ahead, it will not be the McCarthys, the Hoovers, the Tafts, the McCormicks, who will be in the front lines in fighting communism. No, as always, it will be organized labor. For we have been fighting communism all over the world for 30 years, and it is the ICFTU that today is the first line of defense for democracy. It is strange and ironic, that the press is willing to play up these Tafts and McCarthys, yet it is labor who stands on the firing lines day after day, repelling the Communist onslaught.

It is an ironic and perhaps tragic thing that despite TAFT'S 10 years of complete blindness, first before the Nazi menace and now before the Communist menace, the press of this State of Ohio went all out for him. In its blind antagonism to liberalism and labor, the press of this State was willing to court disaster to the Nation by having men like TAFT in our national leadership.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations who yell about communism in Washington, refuse to join the struggle against Communists unless they are guaranteed their enormous profits. The newspapers the other day said that U. S. Steel is building a $400,000,000 steel plant to expand production. But U. S. Steel only agreed to do that after the Government guaranteed that it could write off the cost of the plant in 5 years. That means that the Government will pay U. S. Steel $300,000,000 of the cost in terms of taxes that it will save. The company will actually pay only one-fourth of the cost and it will completely own the plant. The same thing is true with regard to Alcoa in aluminum, with the monopolistic copper companies. You read last week end the congressional report on the way our defense is being held up by the refusal of the monopolistic International Nickel Co. to expand nickel production.

It is a strange and ironic thing that these big business corporations like General Electric, Westinghouse, and International Harvester can not only continue to do business with Communist unions but even try to pit Communist and anti-Communist unions

against each other. Yet these corporations beat their breasts about the danger to free enterprise and the American way of life.

And when I go to the Munitions Board to propose that defense contracts not be granted to plants where there are Communist unions these great patriotic American corporations and the patriotic American press remain silent.

What is the difference between having the GE plant in Schenectady whose union is run by Communists, than having the same plant located in Stalingrad where Communists are also in control.

We in labor have a tremendous job to do in this year 1951. We have got to make clear to the American people the two roads that they can travel and the dangers to them if they travel the road of isolationism and reaction. We must educate them on the real way to fight communism, with arms, with ideas, with economic aid. We must show that it is fatal to appease dictatorship in Europe and Asia—since the more concessions we feed to it, the stronger it gets and the weaker we get.

We have got to show likewise that it is fatal to feed reaction with concessions here, because the more we feed it the stronger it becomes and the weaker the forces of liberalism and freedom become.

We have got to demonstrate to all concerned, that the fight against communism by this Government cannot succeed if it is simply led by men from big business. There must be, in places of equality with them, leaders of American labor, directing the strategy, the policies, the operations of this vast "Operation Freedom." Already much damage has been done to our cause abroad by not having men from labor in the top policy and operating parts of our defense drive.

We have got to realize that the fight for civil liberties, the rights of labor, decent living standards, equality of sacrifice at home is a necessary part of the fight against dictatorship and aggression abroad. We can only remain free in the world by being free at home. All free American labor, through the united labor committee, has presented its program to President Truman. On that program we can go to the American people, and to the people of the world.

We have got to show the American people, despite the lies told about labor in the last election, that we have no interests that are separate and apart from the welfare of our country and its people. We have got to show by our actions and our educational work that, as in the whole history of our country, it has been organized labor that has led the way in this struggle for a better democracy. And today, we are prepared again. We want to unite with all men and women of good will no matter whether they be Republicans or Democrats, businessmen or farmers, lawyers or doctors.

Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. J. S. Jones, secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, with which he sends me a statement issued by the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association on the subject of price controls. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PRICE CONTROLS

Livestock producers, having intimate knowledge of the livestock and marketing business and with their experience under World War II price controls fresh in their minds, strongly emphasize their belief that price ceilings and rationing on livestock and meats will not do what is expected of these measures; instead they urge the use of indirect economic controls, which take purchasing power out of the hands of all consumers, as a practical and effective means of maintaining equitable distribution of meat and livestock products during this present, and perhaps extended, emergency.

Price ceilings on livestock and meat tend to reduce production at a time when more production is badly needed. Such measures cause waste of both meat and essential by-products; they are costly to administer; the resulting black markets would not only bypass established market channels, but would also create serious health hazards.

Livestock producers believe that the meat price situation is not as critical as it has been made to appear. With livestock numbers and feed supplies at high levels, we can reasonably expect to increase meat output by 12 percent in the next 2 years by from 25 to 30 percent within the next 3 to 5 years.

For these reasons livestock producers would rather see indirect economic controls—which are inevitable and are developing, such as higher taxes, higher interest rates, restricted credit, and similar measures—used to combat inflation. They believe that price controls on meat and livestock are both unworkable and unenforceable; and that if inflationary pressures are controlled through indirect measures which strike at the causes of inflation, the increased production which can be reasonably achieved under present circumstances will result in reasonable prices for meat and livestock and will best serve the Nation's interests in the long run.

Political Basis Behind Antitrust Prosecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of Wednesday, January 24, 1951, entitled "Jackson Grows Candid," together with an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 26, 1951, entitled "Candor."

The article and editorial quote Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson as having told the New York State Bar Association that for some years antitrust cases had been picked by this administration on a political basis. I think this statement is one of the most damaging admissions of a prominent Government official, and confirms the low level to which the administration has sunk during recent years.

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

[From the New York Times of January 24, 1951]

JACKSON GROWS CANDID—SAYS POLITICAL BASIS IS BEHIND ANTITRUST PROSECUTIONS

Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson told the anti-trust section of the New York State Bar Association last night that anti-trust cases had been picked for prosecution on a political basis. The meeting was held at the Harvard Club, and Justice Jackson was the guest of honor.

Referring to his own experience in the Department of Justice before being appointed to the Supreme Court, he said with a laugh, in which the audience joined:

"After all, they had to be picked on some basis. We might as well be candid about it."

Justice Jackson said he believed the Government must depend more on administrative processes than on criminal conspiracy prosecutions in dealing with anti-trust problems.

Justice Jackson said he had favored the anti-trust laws because he believed they tended to prevent the socialization of industry. He added that he did not believe in too great concentration of power, either in industry, Government, or unions.

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 26, 1951]

CANDOR

The other evening Supreme Court Justice Jackson told the New York Bar Association that for some years anti-trust cases had been picked for prosecution on a political basis.

"After all," Mr. Jackson remarked, "they had to be picked on some basis. We might as well be candid about it."

Well, we admire his candor. Mr. Jackson, who was formerly Attorney General and before that long connected with the Justice Department, confirmed what a good many people had long suspected but were reluctant to believe.

Most people would prefer to believe that the Government's policemen brought their charges on some other basis—reasonable grounds for thinking there really was a violation of the law, for instance, or, if they had to choose between several possible cases for immediate prosecution, giving priority on the basis of the evidence, public interest or something similar.

So, though we admire the candor, we cannot join the laugh with which the Justice made his remark about the political basis and in which his audience joined the other evening.

We do not find it amusing.

Presentation of the George S. Bartlett Award for 1950 to Robert Hugh Baldock, State Highway Engineer of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Oregon residents were greatly pleased to learn

of the presentation of the George S. Bartlett Award for 1950 to Robert Hugh Baldock, State highway engineer for Oregon.

Mr. Baldock has been our State engineer for many years and has taken an active part in highway problems throughout the Nation and as a result has reached the pinnacle of success in the promotion of highway legislation and the effecting and carrying out of a program for integrated highway development not only in our own State but Nation-wide. This award to Mr. Baldock was highly deserved and as representative of the Third District of Oregon I want to add my word of personal appreciation for the honor thus bestowed upon my fellow citizen.

I include as part of these remarks an article by Hal H. Hale, executive secretary of the American Association of State Highway Officials, together with Mr. Baldock's brief response:

PRESENTATION OF THE GEORGE S. BARTLETT AWARD FOR 1950 TO ROBERT HUGH BALDOCK, STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER OF OREGON

(By Hal H. Hale)

For an unknown period of time before the recording of the history of mankind in written form, peoples, nations, and institutions followed the practice of publicly recognizing outstanding achievement and accomplishment by an individual with some special award or token. The earliest indication of this practice was in the so-called pagan era prior to the dawn of Christian civilization. In that period of worship of pagan gods the priests and various orders of the temples dispensed amulets or small tokens used in the rituals of worship of the day.

The practice was continued and further expanded following the advent of the Christian era. Many types of medals were, and still are, utilized in various forms of religious worship throughout the world, many of which bear some likeness of Christ or of the saints.

As might be anticipated, kings, potentates, and emperors were quick to seize upon the custom of using medals for purposes other than religious, and frequently substituted their own likenesses for the religious symbols of the church, a practice not unknown to us in this generation. Adoption of the practice by the military was also an early and natural development, and it is in this field that the widest use has perhaps occurred. The American Congressional Medal of Honor is typical of the custom of recognizing outstanding bravery in wartime with an award of great honor. The British have been noted for their use of the custom for a century and a half. Hardly any important event in British history is without recognition in the form of a medal or commemorative token of some kind.

In the field of technical awards, early records indicate that students were presented with an emblematic scroll upon their completion of some prescribed course of study, thus the custom of the high school or college diploma so widely used today. It would appear that the University of Naples was the first institution of higher learning to bring the presentation of a scroll and the conferring of a degree into general practice as an award of graduation.

Following this commendable custom there was created in 1931 what is known as the George S. Bartlett Award, to be conferred annually upon some individual who has made an outstanding contribution to highway progress. This is the most important such honor or recognition in America and the world.

In accordance with procedures established at the time the award was created, Robert Hugh Baldock, State highway engineer of Oregon, has been selected as the recipient of the George S. Bartlett Award for 1950. Mr. Baldock, or Sam as he is addressed by most of us, does not come before this group unknown and as a stranger. Few among us are better known and none more highly respected, nor is this the first high honor bestowed upon him. Mr. Baldock joined the Oregon Highway Department in 1915, shortly after being graduated from the University of Colorado. After having worked his way through the curricula of jobs afforded by such a department, he became chief engineer of the department in 1932, which position he still holds. Early in his highway experience he became an active participant in the affairs of the American Association of State Highway Officials. In 1947 he received the highest honor that the association can bestow, namely, the presidency of the American Association. He has been a thorough student and author, as well as engineer and administrator, through all these years. In 1946 the University of Oregon, in due recognition of his ability, conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of science.

It is of more than passing significance that in our search in the Library of Congress for historical material for this important occasion, there was found a volume under the heading of "Merit" titled "A System of Merit Ratings for Engineers," by Robert Hugh Baldock. To me this means more than finding that he is also listed in Who's Who in America.

Chesterfield, in his writings, left us this quotation: "Real merit of any kind cannot long be concealed; it will be discovered, and nothing can depreciate it but a man exhibiting it himself. It may not always be rewarded as it ought, but it will always be known."

Sam, I knew George Bartlett. Not so intimately as many present here knew him, but well enough to know that wherever he may be today, on the other side of the river of life, if he is privileged to glance back into this troubled world, that, as I am honored to place this plaque in your hands, he will smile, flip his halo with his finger, make a motion of straightening whatever he may be wearing for his bow tie, and say, "Fine; that's just the way I wanted it to be."

I could find no more fitting quotation for this occasion than that of Lord Halifax: "True merit, like a river, the deeper it is the less noise it makes." Congratulations.

RESPONSE BY R. H. BALDOCK

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the American Association of State Highway Officials, I am humbly grateful and feel deeply honored to be the recipient of this award.

Labor Unions Help Win Freedom Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Labor Unions Help in Freedom Fight," written by Mr. Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, and published in that newspaper, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LABOR UNIONS HELP WIN FREEDOM FIGHT

In the spring of 1947 I returned from several months' study in Central Europe with a trunk full of documents and observations proving that Red Russia expected to use organized labor as its main force in bringing all of Europe under Communist domination.

Some day, I hope, the inside story of how the Kremlin organized that great drive will be written. Then, and not before, will the American public learn that the decisive battle of the cold war in Europe was won for our side by organized labor—and not entirely by the Marshall plan and the architects who put the Atlantic Pact together.

It must not be forgotten that Russia had all of the advantage in the early days of the fight for control of organized labor in Europe. Workers were hungry, confused and in a general state of desperation. Industrial plants had been destroyed, workers' homes were gone, transportation was at a standstill, the currency systems had broken down, and there were no standards of employment.

Communism lost that fight, and every well-balanced American can take a deal of pride in the recent report by Harry Martin, president of the American Newspaper Guild and labor information director of ECA, on the part organized labor played in the Korean crisis.

Among other things, he told a Commonwealth Club of California audience:

"In Europe it was from the free trade unions that the earliest and strongest support for the United Nations action on Korea came. While other segments of European society debated, the unions rushed to our side.

"Only one day later the Norwegian labor movement issued a pamphlet totaling 500,000 copies called "War in Korea." Because of the swift action of the Norwegian labor movement, the Norwegian people were quickly informed on what had happened in Korea, a far-off country of which they knew little, but whose danger was also their own.

"Delegates of the Durham Mine Workers Association, representing 100,000 mine workers, adopted a resolution cabled to Stalin, calling on him to halt the invasion.

"International Mine Workers Federation delegates, representing unions in Great Britain, Sweden, Norway, Holland, and France also spoke out boldly following the Korean aggression at their meeting in Stockholm, almost on the borders of Russia.

"Danish Communists attempted to interfere with the unloading of arms-aid. But it was a phony strike, a political strike, a treasonable strike. Leaders of the Danish unions promised it would not take place. The shipments were unloaded.

"When Western Europe joined with the United States in the Atlantic Pact and the flow of arms began to move to our pact allies, the Cocos—as they are sometimes called in France—grew desperate. They called for a mass movement of European workers in protest against rearmament. Violence broke out along the water fronts all over Europe.

"But the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions exposed the program for what it was, a vicious campaign of treason carefully calculated to destroy Europe's chance to resist aggression. The great federations of transport workers, of dock workers and of seamen took the cue and struck back.

"Today, with a few notable exceptions, the much-needed weapons of defense are being unloaded in major ports of every European democracy.

"Just last month Austrian Communists, at first obviously encouraged by the Russians, had made plans for a coup to begin with a

general strike and to culminate in open revolt and the seizure of the government. There was much dissatisfaction among workers of all political persuasions with the new wage-price policy. So a general strike was called and the Reds mobilized for action.

"But the Austrian Federation of Trade Unions had been the major force responsible for keeping the total Communist vote down to barely 5 percent of the ballots cast. Its leaders now called conferences of the shop stewards in every factory in Austria—even in the Russian-occupied zone—on the day before the strike.

"Down the line went the word: the general strike is a phony, a trick to overthrow our government, and it must not succeed. The story of the next 4 or 5 days is essentially that of courageous and unarmed union members fighting with their bare fists, and with the sweat of their brows in the factories, against the well-trained and well-armed action squads of the Communists.

"There are two countries in free Europe where the Communist trade unions still hold a substantial edge over their unshackled opponents: France and Italy. Much has to be done before the Communist influence in these countries is wiped out. The workers there must have decent standards of living and a fair share of the fruits of recovery.

"In the countries where the unions are strong and free, the European recovery program is enjoying a genuine success; while in the countries where the unions are weak or are in the hands of the Communists, the recovery program has encountered its most discouraging problems.

"It is my firm conviction that these problems will be solved as free labor grows strong enough in France and Italy to make its voice heard and its influence felt."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from all over our Nation a continued avalanche of well-justified messages on behalf of the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. My own State of Wisconsin in particular has confirmed anew its historic position urging the Congress to complete this vital project.

New hearings on the seaway will be commenced on Tuesday, February 20, before the House Public Works Committee. These hearings, I trust, can be conducted with dispatch. I hope that they will not involve needless detailed repetition of the same old facts which have been presented a dozen times—pro and con—before other committees of the Congress and other authoritative groups. There are literally warehouses full of all of the duplicating and overlapping reports, hearings, documents, and so forth, which have been made on the seaway thus far. And while I appreciate the desire of my colleagues on both the Senate and House side to get whatever new information might be available, it is a fact that practically everything has already been said on both sides of this proposition. The case for the seaway is, I believe, complete and definitive.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain items on this vital issue:

(a) The text of a radio address which I delivered last Saturday by transcription on Station WGN.

(b) The text of an editorial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press endorsing the seaway.

(c) The text of a resolution from the Milwaukee Common Council along this same line.

I also ask that along the more general line of the position of the upper Midwest in the Nation's defense effort, there be printed an editorial from the Minneapolis Star.

There being no objection, the address, editorials, and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USING AMERICA'S RESOURCES

(Address by Senator WILEY over Station WGN, Chicago, Ill., on Congress Speaks program, Saturday, February 10, 1951, 1:45 p. m.)

It is a pleasure to speak to you this afternoon on a subject which I believe is important to every American, namely the adequate using of all of our basic resources.

I am grateful indeed to this great station for the opportunity to submit these thoughts to you. May I say, friends, that it will be a pleasure to receive your reactions to my remarks this afternoon.

You and I are well aware that our country is in the midst of a grave crisis. Every newspaper edition, every radio news broadcast tells us the grim story. Now, in this crisis, if we were sure that we were really using every resource that our country possesses, we would be less concerned. Unfortunately, however, we find that our country is somewhat like a man who is fighting for his life, but with one arm resting at his side.

I say to you, my friends, that America is not using her great resources as she should, and I should like to prove that point to you.

A FEW REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF SEAWAY

To us of the Midwest, there is one great resource which in particular has not been fully tapped. I refer to the 2,400-mile inland ship artery which can be ours through completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Now, my friends, I need not repeat to you all of the vast number of reasons why this St. Lawrence project should be approved by the present Congress. Let me mention, however, that the seaway will not cost the taxpayers a dime. It will pay for itself through ship tolls and electricity payments. It will, in fact, enable the cities and farms of the Midwest to have direct contact with the deep ocean ports of the world. It will help bring in vitally important Labrador iron ore which is so essential for midwestern industry and for American weapons. It will assure inexpensive transportation for farm products. It will give us a protected life line, free of the submarine threat which destroyed literally hundreds of ships off the Atlantic and Gulf coasts during World War II. Those are but a few of the reasons.

Unless we utilize the seaway we will find ourselves in the role of a second-class nation, depending on foreign imports of iron ore—imports from South America. We will be a second-class nation which won't be able to adequately defend itself.

RUSSIA HOPES SEAWAY WILL BE DEFEATED

There is nothing that Joe Stalin would like better than to see the St. Lawrence seaway bill this year defeated once again. Joe Stalin would laugh up his sleeve. He would probably say to himself: "Why, those foolish Americans. Here in Communist Russia we are building canals, dams, hydroelectric projects. We are utilizing our Russian resources to the fullest. But over there those foolish Americans have a tremendous source for electric power—2,200,000 horsepower—to meet their shortage of electricity. But they are wasting that hydroelectric power. They could have a tremendous shipping channel to supplement their overburdened transportation facilities. But do they use it? No; they allow a few selfish, obstinate lobbyists to sabotage the whole project." That is what Joe Stalin would say to himself. Do you want that to happen?

ARGUMENTS HASHED AND REHASHED

Now, my friends, this seaway has been debated for a quarter of a century. It has been studied, investigated, reviewed, analyzed. There are whole warehouses full of reports on it. All of the facts are known. All of the arguments have been hashed and rehashed. Let's quit talking about it. Let Congress do something about it.

Support of the seaway exists in every phase of American society. Every American President, regardless of his party, has supported it—Herbert Hoover, Harry Truman—Democrats and Republicans. In Wisconsin, my own State, every single Governor, every single legislature, has supported it.

Who opposes the seaway? Just a handful of blind, selfish interests. They may not realize it, but their action amounts to encouraging national suicide. Their action means that in effect America is fighting a defense effort with one arm hanging helplessly at its side. What a travesty, what ridiculous folly.

PORTS, RAILROADS OPPOSE SEAWAY

But what do we see in the opposition? A few ports and railroads fear that the seaway will provide them competition. But their fears are ridiculous, because there is more than enough transportation for the existing ports and railroads, plus tremendous new arteries.

America's railroads are already choked with traffic. They cannot possibly handle the increased tonnage that will be necessary during this national emergency. But still these certain railroads continue to spearhead the opposition to the seaway, just as they led the opposition to the Panama Canal 50 years ago.

Now, you, my friends, know that in this year of 1951 anyone who objected to the Panama Canal would be regarded as a candidate for a booby hatch. Why? Because that Canal has more than proven itself from a commercial standpoint, from a national defense standpoint, and from every other approach. And yet the same moth-eaten arguments which were originally raised against the Panama Canal back in the early 1900's, those same phony arguments are being raised once again today against the St. Lawrence seaway. Fifty years from now anybody who criticized the seaway would probably also be regarded as a candidate for a booby hatch. Why? Because this project is so sound, so fundamentally just, so absolutely necessary that it takes a blind man not to see its advantages. But we are told that "there are none so blind as those who will not see." Certain folks have put the blinders on their own eyes, but I say to them, that it is time to take those blinders off.

WE WILL NEED SEAWAY 6 YEARS FROM NOW

I say, let the Congress show that it has vision and judgment by approving the St. Lawrence seaway bill during the present

session. Let there be no further stalling, no further dilly-dallying, no further long, repetitious reports and expensive hearings. There is no reason for delay. Every minute is precious.

The seaway, we know, will take more than half a dozen years to construct. But remember, my friends, that we are in this emergency with Russia not just for 1951, but for perhaps as long as 10 or 20 years to come. If the seaway had been approved 6 years ago we would be using it today. The time for action is now

AMERICA SHOULD DECENTRALIZE

Now, my friends, I said at the start that we were not adequately utilizing our resources. Let us turn now to a second major field to prove that point.

I say we should better utilize the resources of the small communities of this land. I say that the time is overdue for the Government to decentralize its agencies and spread them out among the smaller communities of this land. It is ridiculous to continue to center a quarter of a million Federal workers in one bomb target, namely, Washington, D. C.

THREE TYPES OF ACTION NECESSARY

Folks, in this field of decentralization, we need basically three types of action:

(a) Decentralization of government.
(b) Decentralization of population.
(c) Decentralization of industry.

Of these three phases, it is obviously most difficult to decentralize huge factories and millions of people. But we can fairly readily disperse key Government agencies. Now, I don't consider it real decentralization of you merely disperse an agency from Washington, D C., to some other huge, crowded city. That merely amounts to moving the agency from one target center to another. On the contrary, decentralization must mean moving out to the "grass roots" of our country. By doing so, we will pump economic life blood into many of these small communities.

But what do we find?

PHONY DISPERSAL PLANS

At present, there are limited plans for so-called Federal decentralization or dispersal. But the plans are largely phony. Your Government is contemplating spending $150,000,000 to disperse agencies within a 20-mile or so radius of Washington, D C.

Let me repeat that point, my friends. At present, certain Government planners want the Congress to appropriate around $150,000,000 of your tax money to set up agencies in temporary buildings within 20 miles of Washington. Now, that my friends, is perfectly fantastic. In the first place, a high-speed bomber flying at 400 miles an hour can aim a bomb at Washington, and it is lucky to hit a target 10 to 20 miles away.

In other words, what these so-called Government planners are doing is saying that we trust that if Russian bombers aim their bombs at the Capitol or the White House, they will really hit those specific targets instead of having those bombs fall wide of their target.

You and I know that if America puts sufficient interceptor planes, radar sets, guided missiles around Washington, that will partly prevent attacking bombers from hitting the targets right on the nose. This will mean that many bombs will fall wide of the target, and where will they fall? Right on the agencies which have presumably been dispersed and decentralized 20 miles away.

So, my friends, merely spreading agencies 20 or 25 miles away from Washington will not satisfy the present need. I say that essential Government agencies should be spread out in the grass roots of the 48 States. Moreover, I don't want to see agencies coming into already overcongested cities. I want them placed, insofar as possible, in smaller communities.

Now, obviously to do so, it will take a considerable amount of money and planning. But this can and must be done. We know that in Russia they went literally back to the hills and built whole cities. They took their production plants and spread them over vast areas. But what has Washington done? It has simply put its head in the sand and failed to recognize the basic facts of history.

WHAT REAL DECENTRALIZATION MEANS

I say that units in Federal departments should be placed in those areas where the actual functions exist, for example, the United States Department of Agriculture divisions should be decentralized to the dairy areas, the cotton sections, the wheat sections of this vast Nation of ours.

The Department of the Interior units should be located primarily in the areas adjacent to their subject matters, and so forth.

WHAT ABOUT CONGRESS, COURTS, AND PRESIDENT?

Now, here is another fact, friends. The present decentralization planning of the Federal Government takes no account whatsoever of the fact that the White House, the United States Supreme Court, and the United States Congress could be completely put out of commission by a single atomic bomb. Well, I have been urging for years that our Government planners get down to earth and make some sensible plans for relocating the White House, the Supreme Court, and the Congress, as well as the central units of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy Commission in different areas of this country In this way, we will be utilizing the resources of these various areas and we will be making sure that we don't put all of our eggs in one basket, namely, Washington, D. C.

CONCLUSION

These then, are the two suggestions I submit to you this afternoon. First a suggestion for the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and second, a suggestion for genuine decentralization.

If we apply these suggestions, we will be better utilizing the great resources of the American people. We will be utilizing both hands, so to speak, instead of merely allowing one hand to dangle at our side.

I want to thank you for listening to me this afternoon. I hope that when you write to your Congressman and Senator, you will give him your reactions to these specific proposals.

Thanks again, too, to Station WGN for its courtesy, and thanks to you my listeners.

This is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY signing off from Washington.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press]

OPEN THE SEAWAY

Senator WILEY has asked support of the St Lawrence seaway project as a means of making North America "an atomic-age arsenal of democracy."

He said Tuesday that it would be an absolute sin to further delay construction of the seaway. The Senator made this comment in connection with the plans of a group of Senators to introduce a new seaway bill this week. Similar legislation already has been introduced in the House.

Senator WILEY notes that our industries eventually will need new sources of raw materials. The St. Lawrence offers a practical route for bringing these materials—particularly, iron ore from Labrador—to the mills in the Great Lakes region. As the situation now stands, we are wasting a precious resource by failing to open this water route to large vessels. The natural waterway is there for us to use, but we cannot gain full benefit until the necessary improvements are made. At the same time we are denying ourselves the benefit of a great source of power that would help meet the steadily increasing demands from our industries.

The arguments against the seaway are phony, Senator WILEY contends. He says the issue boils down to a "fight between certain selfish railroad and port interests on the one hand and the people of the United States on the other." He hopes the American people will succeed and persevere.

Members of the House Public Works Committee will hold hearings during February on the proposed legislation. Advocates of the seaway should be prepared to fight vigorously for their cause and to answer all the various excuses that undoubtedly will be brought forth in an effort to forestall the project. It will be said that the project is too big and too costly to undertake at this time, but we agree with Senator WILEY that the real objections will be based on selfishness. In spite of their steady growth, there always are some interests that are fearful they will be put out of business.

RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE (WIS.) COMMON COUNCIL

Whereas on May 23, 1947, this honorable body adopted a resolution urging the Congress of these United States to pass legislation for construction of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project; and

Whereas the present Congress is again considering the aforesaid project; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project would provide vast quantities of low cost hydro-electric power, would extend the benefits of direct ocean transportation to the City of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin and the entire Great Lakes area; would permit Milwaukee industries to import raw materials at low cost and, by utilizing direct ocean service, to expand greatly their foreign trade and to reach new foreign markets, and in general would enhance the economic prosperity and well-being of the Great Lakes area and the entire Nation; and

Whereas World War II demonstrated the absolute necessity of the St. Lawrence Seaway for the national defense and the military security of this Nation by providing a safe and landlocked basin for national defense industries, for storage of strategic materials and for construction of naval and merchant vessels; and

Whereas the agricultural and industrial resources of the Great Lakes area could have been effectively employed had the St. Lawrence Seaway project been completed and available for use at the outbreak of said World War II; and

Whereas the aforesaid is also true if this Nation of ours becomes involved in any future armed conflicts; therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That its members urge all Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin to lend their best efforts to assure the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway at as early a date as possible to permit expanded foreign trade and to insure the national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this honorable body reaffirm the unalterable belief of the city of Milwaukee and its citizens in the merits of this great project which holds vast potentialities for the future welfare and prosperity of the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin and the Nation at large; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Representatives CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI and CHARLES J. KERSTEN, and the other representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star of January 22, 1951]

THE UPPER MIDWEST IN THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

The defense program now getting under way presents the upper Midwest with some very serious, special problems. What is going to happen to the region in terms of industry and population, and what can the region legitimately do to maintain or strengthen its relative position in the Nation?

Before attempting to answer this question, the Star would like to make its own position clear. We do not intend to seek special favors for the upper Midwest. The region will insist, we are sure, on pulling its share of the national load, whatever that may be.

But we do purpose to do everything we can do to see that the upper Midwest gets its just deserts, and that it is not injured by avoidable blunders or official ignorance about the region's true capacities.

CLUES IN PAST 10 YEARS

There are some clues in the experience of the past 10 years to what kind of problem the upper Midwest faces for the next 10. We know from the 1950 census that a defense program sucks manpower out of the region. Minnesota, for instance, suffered a population loss of 170,000—the difference between the number of people we'd have had because of natural increase, and the number we actually have. The population loss of the upper Midwest region on this basis was close to half a million.

From 1940 to 1950 the region showed a net gain in industry, but it lost ground relatively to the rest of the country.

The same things—relative loss of population and industry—almost certainly will happen to the upper Midwest in the next 10 years under the impact of the kind of defense program that is being planned. They seem unavoidable because of the manpower shortages in the making.

Take aircraft production as an illustration. The present plan is to create plant capacity to produce 50,000 aircraft a year, but to hold production in such plants to one shift a day until events call for full production. The same pattern is to be followed for tanks, electronic gadgets, and other "hardware."

It is not to be realistically expected that a great deal of this plant capacity will be located in the upper Midwest. It will be located close to industrial centers where cutbacks in civilian production release the workers needed for one-shift-a-day operation.

Even in the initial stages this program will suck manpower out of the upper Midwest. If and when a signal is given for three-shift operation of new plants the suction will become irresistible for manpower not occupied with essential military work.

SOME THINGS TO BE DONE

In the face of this prospect there are some things the upper Midwest can demand in its own and in the national interest.

1. It can demand that no existing plant capacity here that could be used for military production be duplicated elsewhere unless such duplication is unavoidable.

2. It can demand that reasonable heed be given to unemployment problems that will be created here as locations for new plant capacity are determined.

The upper Midwest should press these demands in every possible way—through the influence of its business, industrial, and labor leaders; through its Members of Congress of both parties; through its civic and commercial organizations.

LOGICAL WAY TO START

There is, fortunately, a logical way to start pressing such demands. It is to insist now, with all the vigor the upper Midwest can muster, that Federal procurement agencies learn what our region has to offer in plant capacity and skilled manpower.

The region should ask that teams of competent procurement people come to the upper Midwest without delay and spend a month learning what we can do and who can do it. We have plenty of competent and experienced industrialists to plan the details of such a survey, and there's not the slightest doubt they'll put out the welcome mat.

If such a survey can be arranged—and it's reasonable to believe it can—the question of establishing branch procurement offices at some convenient central point in the upper Midwest should be discussed with the visiting survey teams. The teams should come prepared to dicuss such branch offices, and to make definite recommendations about their establishment.

The Star's editors do not pretend to know what the outcome of such a survey, and of frank discussion of the establishment of branch procurement offices, may be. But we strongly believe the survey must be made and the question of branch offices must be discussed.

If these things are done, and done before the defense program begins to dislocate the economy, the upper Midwest will have real confidence it is getting its just desserts. If that confidence exists the region can be depended upon to make its sacrifices without much complaining.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the twelfth and subsequent short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

SIMON DE MONTFORT: THE CELEBRATED ENGLISH STATESMAN (CIRCA A. D. 1200–1265)

Simon de Montfort (circa 1200–1265), Earl of Leicester, spent a good part of his active life leading the revolt against Henry III of England. At the famous Mad Parliament of Oxford, he was opposition leader.

De Montfort became almost a dictator of England after his victory on the battlefield at Lewes in May 1264.

He stands out as an important figure in legislative history because the Great Parliament he summoned was revolutionary in that it contained not only knights from each shire to represent the rural nobility, but also representatives from the towns and boroughs.

He left a heritage of championing the cause of the nobility and the people against the king. For years after his death, De Montfort was considered a martyr by the Commons.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere, of Fredericksburg, Va.

LOUIS IX: AUTHOR OF THE MISE OF AMIENS (A. D. 1214–70)

Louis IX (1214–70), King of France, stands in history as the ideal king of the middle ages. He became renowned for his ability as a compromiser, an arbiter who often was called upon to settle disputes between warring factions of his nobility and in succession disputes in neighboring countries.

Louis is said to have given charity to more than 100 beggars daily, but protected the royal decor by bringing them in the back door. He went on two crusades, and was canonized in 1297.

In his relatively uneventful reign, Louis IX simplified administration, improved the distribution of taxes, abolished the so-called judicial duel, and sought to introduce uniform Roman law.

ALPHONSO X: FAMOUS SPANISH KING OF THE MIDDLE AGES (A. D. 1221–84)

Alphonso X, the "Wise" (1221–1284), was King of Leon and Castile and is remembered as author of the code "Las Siete Partidas," which is the basis of Spanish jurisprudence. Historians set him down as perhaps the most interesting, though not the most capable, of the Spanish kings of the Middle Ages.

Alphonso was called the father of Castilian prose. Besides "Las Siete Partidas," several other important works were written under his editorship. They included the so-called Alphonsine Tables in astronomy, an illustrated book on games and a famous collection of medieval poetry and music.

Alphonso displayed legislative capacity and a desire to provide his kingdom with a code of law and a firm judicial system.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere, a Fredericksburg, Va., sculptor.

EDWARD I OF ENGLAND: FOUNDER OF THE PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND (A. D. 1239–1307)

Edward I (A. D. 1239–1307), as king of England, had such an important hand in the development of the law and the parliamentary constitution he was called the English Justinian.

He did, however, fail in his chief ambition—the conquest of Scotland—but succeeded in humiliating his northern neighbor by removing the coronation Stone of Scone to Westminster.

The general effect of Edward's work was to eliminate feudalism from public life. In 1295 he called a representative parliament of the three estates, which subsequently was called the Model Parliament, because it first illustrated the type to be perpetuated in subsequent parliaments.

"What touches all," said Edward's writ of summons, "should be approved of (by) all and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common."

The parliamentary constitution of England was established as result of Edward's action.

The Edward plaque was done by Laura Gardin Fraser, of Westport, Conn.

Ambassador Monnet B. Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during my service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I had occasion to study the unique and intricate relationship between the United States and the Republic of Panama. During a visit to the Canal Zone I observed the very excellent work being

done by our Ambassador, Monnet B. Davis. It seemed to me that he had an exceptional grasp of the situation and that he was performing an outstanding service to his Nation.

Evidently he was appreciated by the people of our neighboring Republic. When Ambassador Davis left his post in Panama a very fine editorial appeared in the Star and Herald commenting on his service. I take pleasure in placing this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMBASSADOR DAVIS LEAVES

Today we see a good friend of the Republic of Panama leaving our shores for other fields of endeavor to carry out new diplomatic missions for his country.

Ambassador Monnet B. Davis and Mrs. Davis are leaving for the United States today en route to Israel where Ambassador Davis will head his country's diplomatic missions. We feel sure that Mr. Davis will harvest the same success in his activities there that attended his mission here.

While not neglecting the high interests of his country in his dealings with the Republic of Panama, Ambassador Davis was able to so conduct his mission here that the people of Panama could feel they were getting a fair deal. There were no high-handed gestures or impossible demands, instead there was always helpfulness and an obvious effort to understand our problems and viewpoints as he moved to carry out the purposes of his mission.

And so Ambassador Davis won the respect and the friendship of the people who saw in him a sincere worker in the field of inter-American amity and cooperation, a worker filled with good will towards Panama.

It is unfortunate indeed that the requirements of the service should cause these constant changes in personnel. We no sooner get well acquainted with one envoy when he is shifted to some other post, and we must start all over again getting acquainted with his successor. In these days of continuing problems, it is hard to see men go who have threshed out issues with us and reached a thorough understanding of problems and their background. And Ambassador Davis is one of those men in whom we have developed confidence.

The gathering at the penthouse atop the embassy office building yesterday was proof of the departing envoy's popularity both among his fellow citizens and among citizens of Panama. The general comment was—"It is a pity that he must leave us." The Star and Herald joins wholeheartedly in this expression of regret at the departure of this wholesome couple who have endeared themselves to so many. But we do wish for them in their future activities the same measure of success that featured their stay in our midst.

Address of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN at a dinner in his honor sponsored by the Democratic State Committee in New York City on February 6, 1951:

My party and the people of my State and and Nation have long honored me beyond my dreams and desserts. I have tried my best to requite these honors with faithful service. This gathering tonight is additional evidence of your friendship and your confidence for which I thank you all from the bottom of my heart.

I am very proud that Senator SPARKMAN, colleague and friend, has honored us all by taking part in this occasion. Senator SPARKMAN has become one of our main bulwarks and supports for a dynamic foreign policy. It has been my privilege, on many occasions, confidently to follow his leadership. One of the rich satisfactions of being in the Senate is the association with rare minds and high characters such as his.

As far as I am concerned, personal gratification in holding high public office is far exceeded in these days of crisis by a sense of personal responsibility. Concern for the security of our country and the world is constant and unrelenting. The days are filled with questions, and many nights are filled with prayerful reflection.

But we in Washington share our anxieties with the whole Nation. And we draw fresh strength from the sure knowledge that our people have always risen to every need and every crisis. America will not fail the world now.

A few days ago, former Secretary Hull, who helped guide America through the perils of World War II, described the present situation as one of "chaos and unspeakable danger." Never was a phrase more fitting.

We are threatened with world chaos. We are confronted with unspeakable danger.

But we have not invoked this chaos, nor have we provoked these dangers. The men in the Kremlin have done that. We cannot wish the dangers away by hiding behind our ocean, by running away, or by retreating into isolationism. That is the fools' paradise, the course of irresponsibility and sure disaster.

In the face of these dangers, we must not retreat, but advance; we must not withdraw, but press ever onward. Ours is the dynamic faith and the dynamic way of life. If we believe in it and in ourselves, as I know we do, we must not give way to fear or panic.

What are the evil forces which have seized the world in their grip and have struck so many of us with dismay? They are the forces of an unlimited tyranny which seeks to justify itself by extending a ruthless power over the entire world. Shall we abandon ourselves to these forces?

Yet we cannot meet these forces with force alone. This tyranny parades under the false banner of universal hungers—hunger for equality, for national and individual dignity, for economic security, and social justice. Nowhere are these aspirations more totally denied than within Soviet Russia. But a diabolic and ingenious propaganda has kept this fact from large sections of mankind. This fact is least known among those peoples who feel these hungers most keenly—among the depressed and exploited peoples who for too long have been denied the benefits of modern technology and civilization, and who for too long have been oppressed by selfish economic and political forces.

It is our responsibility today to convince these peoples that the ways of freedom promise economic and political salvation far more surely than the ways of repression and slavery. We must show our desires to bring about for all men a higher standard of living and individual security in a world at peace; we must show that freedom is not only compatible with these goals, but essential to their achievement.

This approach must particularly characterize our policy in those areas where our motives are most misunderstood—our motives are misunderstood in many areas today, sometimes even by our friends. This must be the main weight of our policy in Asia, just as military aid must be the main weight of our policy in Western Europe.

Nor, in our concentration on the dangers from abroad, can we afford to forget or overlook the problem of policy at home. To arouse and maintain the confidence of the free peoples of the world we must not only teach free democracy abroad, but practice it here at home. We must intensify our efforts to eliminate these defects in our own democracy so that we may, with current example, prove that progress can be better achieved by evolution than by revolution.

The measure of social justice enjoyed by the American people is the measure by which we will be judged in the world. Equality and freedom and economic advancement are the great triumvirate which can command the hosts of mankind today.

We recognize, of course, that, as President Truman pointed out, some desirable social programs must temporarily be deferred in this country, because of the compelling demand in money and manpower of our defense effort. But we must not cease to proclaim our determination to fight for these programs as soon as the crushing burden of armament can safely be reduced.

In the last analysis, our national strength is in the health and welfare of our citizens. These are the chief resources of America. Factories and machines are but passing assemblies of metal and mortar. Our real power is in the skills, the vigor, the morale, the strength of heart, and the freedoms of the American people.

We must have—we will have—national unity in our purposes and objectives. We may, for the sake of unity and under the pressure of necessity, defer decisions on some of our domestic issues. But we must not sacrifice our ultimate purpose to serve temporary ends. The effort to achieve our immediate goals must not be used as an excuse to abandon our ideals or our program for a better life for all people.

We must proceed with clear mind and steady purpose. Our faith must be constant and strong. Our will must be unflinching. We must cherish one another, not only in this land of ours, but in all the free world. We must move as great tides, not with fearful and frantic impulse, but with sure and confident pace, gathering strength and power as we go, in numbers and in our depth of purpose, until at last we reach the goal of peace, world security, and justice under law.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1951.

Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: It will be deeply appreciated if you will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your earliest convenience the following excerpts from my article in the February issue of the National VFW Magazine:

"The failure of the Eighty-first Congress to face its responsibility to the Nation's

veterans can be placed squarely on the doorstep of the United States Senate. * * *

"The House of Representatives, stimulated by an aggressive and sympathetic Committee on Veterans Affairs, did a most commendable job in approving veteran legislation but their efforts were largely nullified by an indifferent Senate. * * *

"The two Senate committees to which important veteran legislation is referred are always too busy on other legislation which they consider of primary importance to give the necessary attention to bills affecting veterans and their dependents. There are many able Senators on both committees but they just don't want to be bothered with veteran problems, especially when they receive a little encouragement to let it alone. It is a defenseless and tragic situation that should be corrected by the Eighty-second Congress. * * *

"The solution to this problem would be the creation of a standing Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs comparable to the efficient, hard working House Committee on Veterans' Affairs which functions under the leadership of chairman JOHN E. RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi) and ranking minority member, Mrs. EDITH N. ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts). * * *

"The comparative speed with which the Senate can act when it wants to, and when the Chief Executive wants it to, was demonstrated in the passage of Public Law 894, Eighty-first Congress. On December 4, 1950, the President recommended to the Congress that the program of vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans, which was in effect during and after World War II, be extended to Korean veterans. The Senate passed the bill on December 15, the House passed it on December 18, and the President signed it on December 28. * * *

Thanking you in advance for this courtesy, I remain

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

Mississippi Gets Its Balance and Climbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Bicknell Eubanks, from the Christian Science Monitor:

MISSISSIPPI GETS ITS BALANCE AND CLIMBS—BAWI PLAN STARTS BOOM

(Southern success story—II)

(By Bicknell Eubanks)

JACKON, MISS.—"We're on our way. They can't call us the No. 1 economic problem any more."

These words, uttered by Mississippi's aggressive Secretary of State, Heber Ladner, typify the South of today, for the South is on its way toward industrial leadership, its leaders feel.

"Just take a look around," Mr. Ladner told me when I visited him in his office in Mississippi's beautiful capitol. This was my first trip to Jackson since 1936, and I was anxious to get first-hand the story of the State's climb from the economic morass it had wallowed in for decades.

I had come back to my native State of Mississippi to see if all the stories of progress were true. I remembered a State which was self-satisfied with its genteel poverty. In those days of the 1920's and 1930's when I first became aware of what was going on around me, a farmer did well to get a couple of hundred dollars a year. He lived on credit at the stores. The stores existed on bank loans. And the banks could do no more than hope that next year's cotton crop would turn out all right.

ECONOMY REBALANCED

"That's all gone now," Mr. Ladner told me. "Of course, we still are primarily agricultural, but our drive toward a balanced economy is showing up in a big way."

So I took his advice to "take a look around." I drove from one end of the State to the other. In almost every town of more than 1,500 population, I could see evidence of Mississippi's BAWI program to "Balance agriculture with industry."

This evidence ranges from small factories—such as a window-frame plant in Winona, Miss.—to multimillion-dollar projects like the International Paper Co.'s rayon pulp mill at Natchez, Miss.

To the visitor from the East, this growth presents an interesting feature—the absence of the dirty, congested, industrial sections of the older manufacturing centers on the Atlantic seaboard. In nearly every case, the new industries in Mississippi—as well as in the South in general—are away from built-up areas, so that land costs less, taxes are less high, and there is hardly any problem of waste disposal.

The International Paper Co.'s new plant at Natchez is one of the most dramatic developments in southern progress. It is located in a town which previously had been known only for its annual "pilgrimages" to its beautiful antebellum homes. Now Natchez is taking its place in the vanguard of the South's march toward economic self-sufficiency. It is rapidly becoming the most industrialized section in Mississippi. In addition to the rayon mill, Johns-Manville and Armstrong Tire & Rubber Co. have each built a $3,000,000 plant.

The rayon project is perhaps the biggest in the State. It is to cost a total of $20,000,000, with the first section, costing approximately $5,000,000, already in operation. It is Mississippi's largest wood-using industry. The capacity of this modern plant will be 100,000 tons a year, increasing the present estimated North American production of rayon 13 percent.

The three big factories at Natchez are being developed by private capital. But Mississippi is not dependng alone on corporations using their own funds to build in the Magnolia State. It has developed its BAWI program, under which communities or counties can float bond issues to be used in attracting new industry. While I was in Jackson, the State announced that the one-hundredth certificate of public convenience and necessity under the BAWI Act had been issued—to the city of Clarksdale. William E. Barksdale, director of the State Agricultural and Industrial Board, was quite pleased.

FORTY-TWO PLANTS OPENED

"It shows the progress we are making," he said. This former newspaperman said that during the past 6 years, 42 BAWI plants have been opened in the State, employing 12,410 persons and providing $27,368,000 annually in payrolls.

BAWI and other new factories range from $50,000 projects to gigantic ones costing up to $20,000,000. Some of them include: Shannon, garments, $55,000; Brandon, cement, $*,000,000; Purvis, women's slips, $190,000; Brookhaven, sweetpotato dehydrating, $30,000; Canton, milk processing, $60,000; Yazoo City, ammonia, $5,000,000; Hattiesburg, insecticides, $1,500,000; Crystal Springs, transformers, $100,000.

The effect of these and scores of other plants on Mississippi's economy cannot be overestimated. For more than 125 years, Mr. Ladner point out, the State had depended on a one-crop economy based on soil-depleting cotton. In the early history of the State, when the soil was rich and prices were good, money poured in. Then came the Civil War, the reconstruction era, and a decline in cotton prices. These factors, along with the draining of the growing power from the soil, pushed the State to the bottom of the heap.

STATISTICS SHOUT

Mr. Ladner had some powerful statistics to point up the economic gains in Mississippi. He cited them to back up his belief that these gains are mostly permanent.

"In 1932," he said, "the State tax was only $136,000. In 1949 it was more than $13,500,000. In 1932, the State collected less than $1,500,000 from the sales tax. This same levy brought in more than $35,000,000 in 1949."

He pointed out that Mississippi is the ninth ranking oil and gas producer in the United States, with a 1949 production of almost 38,000,000 barrels of crude oil and almost 109,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas. This provides a severance tax to the State of more than $500,000 a month.

As I talked with Mr. Ladner, I recalled the dark days of 1932, the last year of Theodore G. Bilbo's second term as governor. The State was almost bankrupt. Its bonds could find no market. Farms were being lost through foreclosure. Banks were going under. Teachers in many counties went unpaid. Outside sources of capital had dried up.

Since then, beginning with the sales tax started by Gov. Mike Sennett Conner in 1933, the State has literally pulled itself up by its bootstraps. Communities are booming, the State's bonds are selling well over par, schools are thriving, and out-of-State capital is pouring in.

The Korean People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, within the past several days, two great American newspapers on opposite coasts, the Los Angeles Daily News and the New York Times, have called attention to a phase of the Korean War that merits more interest by far than we have given to it—the pitiful plight of the uprooted millions of Korean citizens who are struggling for survival between and behind the battle lines and midst the cross-fire of opposing armies. Mr. Manchester Boddy, the eminent publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, a great humanitarian scholar and writer, commented editorially on February 5, as follows:

PLIGHT OF KOREAN PEOPLE OVERLOOKED

(By Manchester Boddy)

The long and intensive experience news-gathering services have had in reporting world affairs is being put to excellent use in supplying war news from Asia, but there is one important factor in the Korean situation, of profound interest to American newspaper readers, that I think is being overlooked.

I refer to the condition of the Korean people.

Some time ago Jim G. Lucas, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, wrote: "Returning United States pilots report streams of refugees heading north and others moving south. Apparently the Chinese Reds have cleared out the villages to make room for troops. Every village on 'the other side' is fair game. Most of them are troop concentrations, so we bomb and burn them."

One UP report quoted Gen. Robert B. McClure, of the Second Division, as ordering his men in the Wonju area to "kill ev rything that moves" to prevent the infiltration of Red soldiers who take advantage of our men, treacherously killing them, even in the back areas.

Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, after his first thorough inspection of the battle area, described what he saw as "perhaps the greatest tragedy to which Asia has ever been subjected in the course of its history. * * * Everything else is dwarfed by the pathos of this tragedy. * * * Our American people haven't the faintest conception of it."

That last sentence emphasizes the point I have in mind.

The American people should have a very thorough conception of just what is happening to the 30,000,000 Koreans whose homeland is the battleground in a new kind of war that may spread through Asia and to the continent of Europe.

What does the average Korean know about the United States? In his own words—why does he think our soldiers are in Korea? Does he know what the United Nations flag means? Who does he blame for the war? What does he think the war is all about? What does he hope for—dream about—work for?

We hear it said that life is cheap in Asia; that the average Korean does not look upon death as we do. How about that?

After all, it is his country that is being reduced to rubble; his home that is being destroyed; his cities, ports, factories, and railroads that are being demolished. Just what does he think about all this? Or does he think?

Does the average Korean fear the American as he does the Red soldier? Does he think that some day he will have a voice in shaping the affairs of his homeland? Or have long years of suppression under Japanese rule—and fear of Chinese aggression before that—burned out his hopes and ambitions?

Spokesmen for the Korean people are a dime a dozen. Some are good and some aren't. But all are suspected of doing the thinking and talking for the Koreans for purposes of creating favorable or unfavorable propaganda. Our readers would like to hear the average Korean speak for himself, answer the questions I have suggested and many more that on-the-spot reporters can ask. We would like to see the answers just as the Koreans give them.

Until early last summer Korea was little more than a name on the map to the vast majority of Americans; today it is a household word—and any bright youngster in grade school can make it into an outline map of sorts. But we have only a vague, shadowy notion about the Korean people.

If our civilization must engage in bloody warfare, we can at least realize that our fighting involves human beings and not geography alone.

One of these days a shocked America will want to rehabilitate what are left of the Korean people; to balance the horrors of destruction with an enlightened era of construction. We should get better acquainted with the Korean people.

On February 11, the New York Times Magazine carried an illustrated factual account of the unspeakable hardships suffered by the masses of Koreans who have been driven from their homes into the barren fields, crowded trails and roads, frantically seeking survival in subzero temperatures. This article was written by Gertrude Samuels who also took the pictures which appeared with her article. Like the editorial above, the article is worthy of our attention and I am having it printed in our RECORD:

KOREA'S REFUGEES—MISERY ON THE MARCH—NOT EVEN WORLD WAR II IN EUROPE PRODUCED SO PATHETIC A FLOW OF UPROOTED CIVILIANS

(By Gertrude Samuels)

PUSAN, KOREA.—Just behind and in front of the shifting lines where bitter military battles are being fought on this mountainous peninsula, and out of earshot of the battle of semantics at Lake Success, are the Korean people, swept up in the tides of war. Their fate makes a strange and terrible story—of refugee women and children and the old, hungry, sick, uprooted, torn from families, begging for survival. Not even in the Europe of World War II has there been so much collective human misery.

Everywhere one turns in the towns or villages, where frozen rice paddies are terraced into the mountains, are the pleading faces of hungry children, many dressed only in rice sacks, holding before them tin plates, or the mute, bewildered faces of mothers with young babies carried papoose fashion, trudging south to presumed safety.

The cruel condition of the babies and orphans is heartrending. I saw 200 of these youngsters without parents, who had been gathered off the streets of Pusan by the United Nations Civil Assistance Command (C. A. C.), dusted with DDT, vaccinated and given some cast-off clothing, as they were placed in the hold of a small cargo boat for transfer to one of the inhabited islands off the south coast of Korea.

One boy carried his crutches. Another, without legs, sat in a box. Their tired and pinched faces lit up momentarily as I focused the camera on them. Like kids anywhere, they shouted their own expression of amusement and approval, Ichi ban; (No. 1!)

In Taejon, within an area of about four square blocks, conditions were incredible, even for an oriental country. Perhaps 8,000 to 10,000 people were gathered on the bare earth and rubble, the women cooking the national dish of kimchi, a stew of cabbage, garlic, and red peppers, over open fires; old men striving to raise huts of rice straw mats; dirty and shivering children running, weeping, staring; and over the whole a wintry despair.

To understand the plight of the refugees, one has to picture a tiny, heavily populated country the size of England, the majority of the people farmers who eked out a living on the soil. Poverty they are used to, but not starvation. The total population is around 28,400,000 of whom some 20,000,000 lived below the fateful thirty-eighth parallel. Today there are an estimated 1,912,500 refugees who have been pouring from both above and below the parallel to the "safety" zones.

About 545,000 have found their way to 84 camps in the south. These are the lucky ones. But the great majority of the refugees, some 1,367,500, are literally on their own.

There are three main groups trying to meet the responsibilities created by the exodus. They are the Korean Government, itself a refugee here from Seoul; the United Nations Civil Assistance Command, under the unified command; and the seven-nation United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). The immediate concerns are for food and shelter. They may be partly answered by present plans to transfer some 300,000 refugees to the islands of Kotedo and Chejubo by LST's and cargo boats.

The operations of CAC and UNCURK are largely advisory and supervisory. Although their members feel the plight of the refugees acutely, they are handicapped by limited functions and lack of means. As one observer said: "The refugees can't eat advisers."

The mathematics of the situation makes this point sharper. For some months, United Nations relief goods coming into the Goverment's Office of Supply have ranged from skim powdered milk to charcoal and sleeping bags. But of 1,000,000 blankets promised by the United Nations, Government figures disclose that only 78,000 have been received; of 1,000 tents promised, fifty have arrived. (Incidentally all 7,000 CARE packages subscribed by individual Americans are marked "arrived")

But where agencies concerned with the refugees have been able to provide help, the results have been dramatic.

I witnessed a mass feeling of children under 13 years of age here in the Korean Women's Association building (there are three other similar centers in this crowded city), where the pinched and helpless look leaves children's faces at the sight of food. They queue up like tired, little old men and women, their eyes glued on the vat of hot rice soup, and as each receives half a bowlful and a spoon, he starts to eat before looking for a place to sit down. Then each one tries to get in line again.

I visited a tent camp on the outskirts of Pusan which can accommodate 7,000 refugees—in wooden sheds, huts of bamboo frames put up by the Government, 30 tents furnished by CAC. Here women and children are processed through a dusting station, sprayed with DDT and vaccinated against smallpox and typhus by a staff of Korean doctors and nurses.

There is obviously no simple answer for all this misery. There is a bitterness and a sense of helplessness on the part of the professional corps—international as well as American—that so few supplies are flowing in. The people of this country look to sympathetic Americans for help before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, these two great newspapers have performed a public service in supplying a reference that must not be neglected in the formulation of our plans relative to Korea. I recall all too vividly the indescribable condition of thousands of Filipinos huddling together in fear, cramped on a small stretch of beach near Dulag, Leyte Island, shortly after we landed there. They were without food, shelter, sanitation or safety but they displayed a spiritually inspired courage in their quiet resignation. They had faith that their liberation would be accomplished. This gave them courage.

How much worse must conditions be in Korea, where cold, destruction, shifting battle lines, and lack of advance planning for civilian relief, is aggravating the inevitable miseries that flow too relentlessly from the ravages of war. Even the outcome of the awful quandary in which they find themselves is still uncertain. As we come to a fuller understanding of the facts, the American people will respond as one to the needs of the harassed children of little Korea, where the cynical Kremlin puppets chose to arrogantly throw down the gauntlet to the free world.

Abraham Lincoln's Voice Still Clearly Heard for the Democratic Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this one hundred and forty-second birthday of Abraham Lincoln you and I sit as Members of the same great legislative body of which he was a Member from the State of Illinois from March 4, 1847, to March 4, 1849. He was elected as a Whig, and while here in Washington, lived at Mrs. Spriggs' boarding house here on the Hill where the Library of Congress now is.

Some of the other distinguished Representatives in the House at that time were Amos Abbott and John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts; Alexander H. Stephens and Robert Toombs, of Georgia; Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee. The Senators from Illinois were Sidney Breese, of Carlyle, and Stephen A. Douglas, of Quincy.

Lincoln was appointed to the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee and also to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

History records that the principal issues of those days were the War with Mexico, the extension of slavery, and the Wilmot Proviso, westward migration, discovery of gold in California, and relations with the Indians.

At the annual memorial service for this citizen of the ages, in the very next seat to me on my right was a Boy Scout in the uniform of the One Hundred and Second Troop of Washington, D C. We sat in the front row. My distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN H. MURDOCK, of Arizona, was presiding as chairman.

As I looked a few feet beyond this Boy Scout, there on the floor of the theater, in painted outline, were the footsteps of the assassin whose terrible deed almost caused a complete change and diametrically opposite course in the history of our beloved Nation. But thank God that then, as now, the American people rose in unity and strength and with common purpose to defeat fear and to come to common accord because of their recognition of the high purpose for which our America was given birth.

If my recollection does not do me disservice, it is a fact that on April 26, 1949, I also extended my remarks in observation of the anniversary of the untimely assassination of Abraham Lincoln; and then again on February 9, 1950, I, likewise, made remarks in observation of the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln during the Eighty-first Congress.

Naturally, because I sit in the United States House of Representatives where he once also worked and served God and humanity, I was interested to find the text of the following preamble and resolutions sponsored by Lincoln when he was a Member. This text is furnished me by the Library of Congress:

THE LINCOLN SPOT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Lincoln moved the following preamble and resolutions, which were read and laid over under the rule:

"Whereas the President of the United States, in his message of May 11, 1846, has declared that "the Mexican Government not only refused to receive him (the envoy of the United States) or listen to his propositions, but, after a long-continued series of menaces, have at last invaded our territory and shed the blood of our fellow-citizens on our own soil";

And again, in his message of December 8, 1846, that "we had ample cause of war against Mexico long before the breaking out of hostilities; but even then we forebore to take redress into our own hands until Mexico herself became the aggressor, by invading our soil in hostile array and shedding the blood of our citizens";

And yet again, in his message of December 7, 1847, that the "Mexican Government refused even to hear the terms of adjustment which he (our minister of peace) was authorized to propose, and finally, under wholly unjustifiable pretexts, involved the two countries in war by invading the territory of the State of Texas, striking the first blow, and shedding the blood of our citizens on our own soil";

And whereas this House is desirous to obtain a full knowledge of all the facts which go to establish whether the particular spot on which the blood of our citizens was so shed was or was not at that time our own soil: Therefore

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to inform this House—

First. Whether the spot on which the blood of our citizens was shed, as in his messages declared, was or was not within the territory of Spain, at least after the treaty of 1819, until the Mexican revolution.

Second. Whether that spot is or is not within the territory which was wrested from Spain by the revolutionary Government of Mexico.

Third. Whether that spot is or is not within a settlement of people, which settlement has existed ever since long before the Texas revolution, and until its inhabitants fled before the approach of the United States Army.

Fourth. Whether that settlement is or is not isolated from any and all other settlements by the Gulf and the Rio Grande, on the south and west, and by wide uninhabited regions on the north and east.

Fifth. Whether the people of that settlement, or a majority of them, or any of them, have ever submitted themselves to the government or laws of Texas or of the United States, by consent or by compulsion, either by accepting office, or voting at elections, or paying tax, or serving on juries, or having process served upon them, or in any other way.

Sixth. Whether the people of that settlement did or did not flee from the approach of the United States Army, leaving unprotected their homes and their growing crops, before the blood was shed, as in the messages stated; and whether the first blood, so shed, was or was not shed within the enclosure of one of the people who had thus fled from it.

Seventh. Whether our citizens, whose blood was shed, as in his message declared, were or were not, at that time, armed officers and soldiers, sent into that settlement by the military order of the President, through the Secretary of War.

Eighth. Whether the military force of the United States was or was not so sent into that settlement after General Taylor had more than once intimated to the War Department that, in his opinion, no such movement was necessary to the defense or protection of Texas.

(Source: The CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, December 22, 1847, p. 64.)

The great Lincoln author, Carl Sandburg, says of him:

To understand the humor of this merry, serious, sad man, one must remember his sympathy and understanding for men and his deep faith in God. He moved without the slightest jar from telling a funny story to a decision on some serious problem of government or to a declaration of his faith in the providence of Almighty God.

And historian Sandburg also writes that Lincoln was paid a visit by members of the Baltimore Presbyterian Synod, and that, when they voiced their confidence in him as President, Lincoln made to them an avowal of religious faith, as follows:

I have often wished that I was a more devout man than I am. Nevertheless, amid the greatest difficulties of my administration, when I could see no other resort, I would place my whole reliance in God, knowing that all would go well, and that he would decide for the right.

Am I in error when I say to you, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, that this Nation under God will only have a new birth when it follows the precept of President Lincoln in his statement to the Presbyterians as quoted by author Sandburg in his pages devoted to Lincoln's Laughter—and His Religion.

Each time I enter the magnificent, yet solemn, Lincoln Memorial here in Washington and view the following language engraved in marble over the great statue of our martyred President, I am inspired:

In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever.

Also, I remember that in this very place my own son, in his young boyhood, upon his first visit to this hallowed shrine, in his youthful vigor and inborn and inherited admiration and love for the life of Lincoln, sought to climb up the base of the marble seat where Lincoln sits and touch the right toe of his marble boot. I then remarked to his mother and my wife that I would to God that I might deserve to touch the toe of the boot of this man who so clearly lived and died for the sake of his conscious belief. Little did I then realize that some day I would also be a Member of the United States Congress.

One of the quotations which is most favorite to me and perhaps is particularly appropriate just now is as follows:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.

Another quotation by him was in a speech delivered at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854, as follows:

Stand with anyone that stands right. Stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

Again, on this return to Washington from Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., to take my seat as a reelected Member of this Congress, we deliberately drove hundreds of miles out of our way in order to again have the inspiration of visiting the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park about 3 miles south of Hodgenville, Ky., to the situs of the 110 acres of land, about 100 acres of which belonged to Thomas Lincoln, the father of Abraham. This park area was acquired by the United States Government in 1916 and thereat is now housed and preserved the Abraham Lincoln birthplace cabin. The Memorial Building, which protects the original cabin itself, is magnificently situated and is constructed of pink granite from Connecticut and of marble from Tennessee.

As entered this significant Memorial Building of the old Lincoln family farm just a few minutes after it was unlocked by the National Park guard and hours before any other visitors arrived, my eyes again read the following upon the inside rear wall of the beautiful marble Memorial Building:

He was the North, the South, the East, the West, the thrall, the master, all of us in one; there was no section that he had held the best; his love shown as impartial as the sun; and so revenge appealed to him in vain, he smiled at it, as at a thing forlorn, and gently put it from him, rose and stood a moment's space in pain.

Remembering the prairies and the corn and the glad voices of the field and wood. (Maurice Thompson.)

The color of the ground was in him—the red earth; the smell and smack of elemental things: the rectitude and patience of the cliff, and good will of the rain that loves all leaves; the friendly welcome of the wayside well; the courage of the bird that dares the sea; the gladness of the wind that shakes the corn; the mercy of the snow that hides all scars; the secrecy of streams that make their way beneath the mountain to the rifted rock; the undelaying justice of the light that gives as freely to the shrinking flower as to the great oak flaring to the wind, to the grave's low hill as to the Matterhorn that shoulders out the sky. (Edwin Markham.)

This very day, as I look about me in this House of Representatives, I note that there is marked absence of much of the distinguished leadership on the minority side, the Republican side of the aisle. And it is good it is so, in my judgment. For, with deliberation and purpose, the House again takes note of the fact that many distinguished Members of this legislative body are in other portions of our great Nation, yesterday and today, speaking of his high purpose and principle and reminding the American people that it is such high purpose and lives based on principles which are the only ones that, in fact, endure.

Again today I have been asked by a couple of my colleagues here why I, a Democrat, always speak a few words at least in observation of the birth and the life and the death of Abraham Lincoln. Just a few minutes ago, in fact, I replied, in answer to such question to me directed, that, amongst other reasons, it was because I felt that his memory must always be perpetuated as a voice being a true symbol of democracy and an enduring voice for a world at peace.

I should like to have lived here at Washington when he did. I think that his greatness must have been so visible that even the youth of his day recognized it. In fact, my own father told me of the several times when he drove a phaeton in which Mrs. Lincoln on occasion rode, and of the two or three times when he personally saw the President. My dad was then about 15 years of age, and it was during the Civil War.

I always feel that my words about Abraham Lincoln's life and its inspiring and strengthening influence upon me and my ideals and ambitions ever since I was a little boy are entirely inadequate and woefully lacking in making it clear to anyone else just how much the life of Lincoln has meant to me. But, nevertheless, I continue to increasingly realize that I am affected by what he actually was. So it is that I humbly speak with you and share the opinion that his position of enduring eminence among the great was such that he achieved it and possessed it without ever having anyone in his personal presence feel small. And each time I go to Gettysburg, the site of his world-famous speech of November 19, 1863, I am again very happy that as a young lad I came to feel that I must live to personally possess that attitude and spirit which Lincoln himself must have possessed and which he revealed in the words which begin: "Four score and seven years ago." And, because so few persons have ever known who else was on the platform with Abraham Lincoln on that historic day, I relate that my best information is that they were: Mrs. Wise; Secretary of State William H. Seward; Col. Gordon Lofland; Hon. Horatio Seymour; Secretary of War Edward M. Stanton; Postmaster General Montgomery Blair; Hon. Edward Everett; Hon. Oliver P. Morton, Governor of Indiana; Col. John Hay, Secretary to the President; the Misses Gilbert; Hon. Andrew G. Curtin, Governor of Pennsylvania; Col. John W. Forney.

And, now, with the world as it is, this Gettysburg Address again comes to us so intimately, I again repeat its text:

Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here has thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, because of what he was as a man and as an American citizen, and as a Member of Congress, and as a President of the United States; and because of what he did as such; and because I feel his voice still speaks to us as legislators in this House of Representatives in the United States Congress where he also was a Member—for these reasons amongst others, I could not do less than again thus simply and yet vigorously speak out to the end that you and I shall profit most and serve our country most if we also increasingly seek to have the spirit of Abraham Lincoln and live for the high principles and on the high plane which he patterned after to the very point of his untimely death at the hands of the assassin.

Lincoln and Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following delivered by me on February 11, 1951, at the monument of General Kosciusko in Washington, D. C.:

Tomorrow, the 12th of February, is a memorable day for liberty- and freedom-loving people everywhere. The hand of God must, in some way, have appeared in the selection of February 12, as the birthday of two great defenders and fighters for freedom and equality for all peoples.

The story of Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, who with his heart's blood wrote forever an unforgettable memorial to the sense of justice, is well known to all of us.

Few of us realize, however, how closely the life and ideals of Thaddeus Kosciusko parallel those of Abraham Lincoln.

Inspired by a fervent love of freedom and liberty, this great Pole's imagination was stirred by the announcement of the American Revolution. He borrowed money and came to America to offer his services to this Nation. His brilliant service in the American Army soon caught the attention of George Washington, who later placed him in charge of the building of the West Point fortifications, where a monument was erected by the American youth as a grateful tribute to his heroism and leadership.

Upon returning to Poland after the American Revolution there soon flamed under Kosciusko's leadership all through Poland once again the cause of freedom and liberty against a Russian tyrant. In the spring of 1792 he led a tiny but inspired army in its heroic resistance against the Russians.

Upon the termination of the insurrection he returned to the United States. Of this country he said: "I consider America my second country and feel very happy on returning to her."

Some insight into Kosciusko, the man, can be had from the oath which he took upon assuming leadership in the Polish insurrection.

"I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, swear to the Polish nation, in the presence of God, that I will never employ the power which has been entrusted to me against any citizen, but I will exert it only to defend the integrity of my country, to recover the nation's independence, and so strengthen the general liberty of our country. So help me God."

That oath he never violated. According to the testimony of his contemporaries, he taught soldiers and peasants that they are his brothers, his countrymen, that they have a common country for which they were fighting together; he aroused in them love, unbounded enthusiasm, and strength which overcame difficulties; he trained them by his example. He was democratic throughout, without ceremony visiting palaces and huts. Recognizing all men as his brothers, he discerned only two kinds among them, good and bad ones. He was not a terrorist. He was a pupil of Washington and similar to him by his nature. He was not very eloquent, but his deeds spoke well for him.

He reminded his people of "their incontestable right of defending themselves against tyranny and oppression." He told them: "No Pole can honestly look for personal good, except in common good; none can think of saving honors and estates, except in saving the country." He pledged the nation "to spare no sacrifices whatever, but to use all the means which sacred love of freedom can inspire in the breast of man; all that despair can suggest for its defense."

His profound love of freedom and keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering remained with him unto death. And he displayed his deep sympathy for the American Negro slave when he dictated his parting testament to the new world shortly before his death. This was indeed a remarkable document and read as follows:

"I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this."

The funds arising from the sale of his lands were used to found the Colored School at Newark, N. J., one of the first educational institutions for Negroes in America.

Such was the life of a great citizen of Poland and the world, Thaddeus Kosciusko. What a great travesty on justice that the Polish Nation which gave America and the world one of the greatest exponents of freedom and the dignity of man, today suffers under the yoke of the very same Russian tyrant against whom Kosciusko led the Polish Nation in revolt.

There is no nation on earth with ideology so similar to that of our American Nation. There is no nation on earth which by its sacrifices earned liberty and freedom more than the Polish Nation. Our own Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we also celebrate tomorrow, said: "No nation can endure half slave and half free." Were he alive today he certainly would have said, "The world cannot endure half slave and half free."

In these momentous and trying days, when the fate of the world and of our entire civilization is at stake, let us remember the example of those two great patriots whose memory we celebrate tomorrow.

Let us not forget the oppressed Polish nation. In seeking peace for the world, let us not lose sight of the fact that no just and permanent peace can endure in the world without doing justice and returning liberty and freedom to our great ally, the Polish Nation.

How Nebraskans Feel About Present Management of National Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from a group of my constituents.

Inasmuch as this letter reflects the sentiments of my mail generally, it occurs to me that it will be helpful if the thinking of these good substantial people is made available for other Members.

While this letter has only a handful of signatures, the men who signed it are successful citizens of mature judgment, and I am confident their views reflect a cross section of the thinking of the Second Nebraska Congressional District:

JANUARY 17, 1951.

Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUFFETT: We respectfully request that you call to the attention of this Congress the following facts, which we believe are most detrimental to the United States:

That every Congress since 1932 has shirked its duties in upholding the laws of the Constitution of this country. Both Republican and Democratic members of Congress have been either too lazy to do any sound thinking or planning for the good of this country, or for political reasons have given more and more powers to the President and the executive branch of this country.

We have heard propaganda how Mussolini was going to conquer the world, then Hitler, and now Stalin, but we are afraid that before the people in this country are aware of it, we will have a dictatorship here. We cannot take care of half the world and ourselves also.

If we are going to cure all the ills of the world, and spend all of our resources, and kill all of our men doing it, we will be the losers all along the line. Let us have the biggest and best Air Force, Navy, and Army in the world but let's keep them here to protect our country first, last, and always.

We believe the President and all others involved in getting us into this Korean war should be impeached and removed from office.

We must quit printing and spending money at the rate our President and bureaucrats want us too.

Respectfully submitted.

Ernest J. Jager, Harry A. Hoover, Paul Johnson, Vam Ampting, J. F. Vutzen, Ray Matson, Lee Wofford, F. Merion Mooberry, D. Fay Hosman, Violet S. Anderson, Theodore F. Donelson, C. A. Holsten, C. Susman, H. V. Johnson, Omaha, Nebr.

Postal Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the address of Mr. William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, at Cass Technical High School Auditorium, Detroit, Mich., on January 6. The text of this speech is from the January 1951 edition of the Postal Alliance, publication of the National Alliance of Postal Employees:

The year just ended witnessed troublesome times in your postal service. Moreover, it is unfortunate that the end is not in sight, and will not be unless and until you and your neighbor and a whole host of other public-spirited citizens band together and make known your protests in high places; that is, the Congress of the United States.

I have been actively identified with the postal service for more than a quarter of a century. Nearly 20 years of that time were spent as a working letter carrier; for the past 10 years I have represented letter carriers as president of their organization, the National Association of Letter Carriers. As their spokesman, I talk for approximately 100,000 letter carriers located throughout the length and breadth of our country.

During all the time I have been associated with the postal service, I have never before witnessed so much confusion, contradiction, bunk, and bluster as will now be found in the topmost echelon of the Post Office Department. The concept of service to the American public has been lost, even destroyed. Laws, rules, codes, and regulations that governed the conduct of the postal service and its relations with the public and employees have gone overboard.

Some of the things that are going on in the Post Office today will never lead to a savings in your tax dollar. A correct description of this administrative caprice would be "false economy."

Ben Franklin is popularly regarded as the founder of our postal system. Actually, a mail service was in operation in this Nation during its earliest days. It is historically correct, however, to credit Ben Franklin's administration as Postmaster General as the one where the idea of progress in the postal service started. Today, approximately 190 years after his time, we are faced with a halt in the progress of the service. Indeed, on some fronts, retrogression has already set in. It's time to get back on the road of progress.

All of you are familiar with the curtailment of postal functions that has been plaguing the Nation for the past 9 months. Your mail has been delayed for days in reaching you; letters and packages you deposited in the mails have been subjected to the same unreasonable delay in reaching your correspondents. Small business, as well as industrial giants, have been forced to stand by helplessly while the good will and patronage of their customers melted away after vainly waiting for a shipment that was put in postal channels for delivery.

One irate businessman has properly described the new order as "snail mail." A well-known columnist has called for a Deliver-a-Letter-Week campaign to replace Letter Writing Week. Another mail user finally decided why special delivery mail costs more money than ordinary postage—it's to pay for the extra delay in delivery.

Now all of the cutbacks and eliminations that have taken place in the postal service during the past year have been foisted on taxpayers under the pious guise of economy. In the light of what has transpired in the last several weeks, this so-called economy turns out to be the biggest flim-flam ever put over on the long-suffering taxpayers of this country.

The Postmaster General has been running up and down the country shouting, "Postal defict!" The press statements coming from the Post Office Department, no doubt, intended to explain the poor mail service you are getting, would have you believe we are only a hop, skip and jump from postal bankruptcy. Well, if we are—and I don't think we are—then I must say that the Postmaster General's cure is novel, to say the least.

First of all, his administration approved and encouraged legislation in the Congress of the United States that would increase postage rates in some instances as much as 200 percent. Stymied in that, the alternate cure was the wholesale firing of thousands of war veterans who were originally employed as a temporary stopgap for an undermanned permanent postal personnel. This cruel reduction in force was accompanied by a curtailment of mail deliveries, elimination of directory service for misaddressed mail, establishment of inconvenient hours of service in post offices and branches—in short, a slow, uncertain postal system in place of the swift, sure mail service you have a right to expect from your Government.

Now, going back to the Postmaster General's abortive attempt to raise postage rates all out of reason, I want to say that letter carriers take the stand that it is administrative caprice to expect people to pay higher prices for poorer service. Certainly, we do not expect a free mail service. No sensible person expects everything in life to be free. We do believe and we have long advocated a reasonable and fair postage rate but the term reasonable and fair does not mean to us that mail users should be gouged by exorbitant rates, while at the same time millions of dollars are shoveled out to corporations engaged to haul the mails. Reasonableness and fairness works two ways. Justice and equity is not a one-way street.

Permit me to give you one recent example of the Postmaster General's concept of postal economy; that is, at your expense and to the profit of the railroads.

The day after the recent national elections—November 8—when the press wires were loaded with election news, little attention was given to a big piece of news that affects every one of us whether we ever send or receive a letter or a parcel, or ever ride a train.

Announced at that time was a compromise agreement between the Postmaster General and the railroads that the Government would give to the railroads $312,000,000 in retroactive pay for carrying the mails—retroactive for 3 years. That's additional money you are going to pay which you never knew until now that you even owed. How would you like to be able to collect from those you work for on such basis? Isn't that nice work when you can get it?

In other words, the very same Postmaster General who tells you he cannot afford to give you good mail service, in the same breath wants you to believe that his Department can afford to spend six or seven times as much on retroactive mail haul pay to the railroads as he says it would cost to give you efficient postal service.

This deal was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission on December 4, just a few short weeks before Christmas. In releasing the report, the ICC said the $312,000,000 of your tax money was "back pay for carrying the mails." Santa Claus certainly came early and often with his bag filled to overflowing for the railroads.

At the time the postal authorities appeared before the ICC last November their testimony revealed that the railroads were to get this so-called back pay, but that in the future they were not to be paid for hauling empty mail cars across the country. I might say at this point that, at various times in the past, competent witnesses from the Post Office Department have testified before congressional committees that the Department uses only about 50 percent of the train space for which it pays with your money.

The Railway Mail Pay Act was established in 1916. Like most public laws of the land, the sponsors of the legislation and the men who caused its enactment were sincere and honest in their hopes for the legislation and the high purposes it was to attain. As happens in many of the laws put on our statute books, certain abuses developed and were allowed to grow. This happened under the law governing the mail pay system. Enormous millions of dollars have been given the railroads for hauling empty mail cars up and down and across the country. Your taxes pay the railroads an estimated $30,000,000 each year for empty "dead-head" mail cars.

Persons outside the railroad industry and the Post Office Department are not expected to know all the ramifications involved in the payment for mail haul. Let me give you an example of how the system worked for years to your disadvantage.

More mail goes west than goes east when you pass the Mississippi River. This condition creates empty mail hauling space coming east. Now no one is to blame for the fact that the mail volume headed west is greater than that coming east. In fact, it is not a blamable condition at all; but what I am finding fault with is that the Government, which is to say the Post Office Department in this case, paid the railroads the same rate for dragging these empty cars back to get new pay loads.

Profoundly, from time to time, it was recommended by the present Postmaster General that these return trips be abolished. The latest pronouncement to that effect was at the time of the public hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission last November. Well, let's see what the record shows at this date.

Although the hand-out was first agreed upon by the Postmaster General and the railroads before their ICC hearings, and it was agreed that the Post Office Department pay for no more empty mail cars in the future * * * the ICC announcement of approval of the deal merely authorized the paying of $312,000,000 and said nothing whatever about stopping payment of the same rate for empty railroad cars as for loaded mail cars. After attention was called to this gross omission, the ICC amended its previous decision.

Of course, there is always the chance that payment for return trips may be abolished; yes; abolished by the simple method of paying more for traveling in one direction, perhaps twice as much. Such a sum to be added to the $283,736,615 paid to the roads in 1949, for example, would bring the total payment to nearly a half billion dollars yearly, or an increase of about 300 percent since 1947.

It is interesting to note that one of the Commissioners of the ICC dissented. Said Commissioner Lee: "The Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 does not confer jurisdiction upon us to approve compromise agreement with respect to the total amounts which shall be paid by the Postmaster General to the railroads for past and future services. * * * In my opinion, we are without power to prescribe the lump-sum payment of $312,000,000 conditionally agreed upon by the railroads and the Postmaster General."

Another interesting point in this latest false economy stunt in the curtailed postal service era is the statement attributed to the president of a large midcontinental railroad. Last September—which is to say before the compromise agreement or stipulation was entered into—this railroad tycoon issued a statement that he was counting into his road's receipts some $2,000,000 in retroactive pay for mail hauling.

It is little wonder that the day this $312,000,000 hand-out was made by the Post Office Department, rail stocks hit their highest peak in 20 years.

This $312,000,000 is just the beginning. It covers only the period from February 1947 through December 1950. New hearings are now underway to fix a reasonable and fair rate for the period beginning January 1, 1951.

This $312,000,000 hand-out is by no means considered a subsidy to aid in the development of a surface transportation system as is done for air transportation.

The word "subsidy" has been bandied about quite loosely in connection with payments by the Post Office Department to carriers engaged in the haul of mail. Actually, there is only one outright subsidy in effect at this time. It is paid to carriers hired or engaged in the transportation of mail by air. There are, however, numerous hidden subsidies in the Post Office budget.

Section 406 of the Civil Aeronautics Act directs the Civil Aeronautics Board to fix rates for the transportation of mail by air, such rates not only to include carriage of mail, but for the sound development and maintenance of an adequate air trainsportation system. This latter injunction very plainly is a subsidy, even though carried in the postal financial reports as a deficit without distinction from other hidden subsidies.

There is no requirement under present law to show how much of a particular payment to an air carrier is for service and how much is a subsidy. It is indeed interesting to note that no other public-utility legislation lumps subsidy and rates into one figure. Prior to 1936, steamship lines were subsidized through the mechanism of mail payments, but this system was replaced by the direct operating and construction subsidies provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Neither I nor the organization I represent is attacking the financial aid to airlines. But we do hope to see a change in methods of procedures whereby actual service charges will be shown in one figure and subsidies reflected in a separate amount. There is much merit in this separation of subsidy from airmail pay.

By the same token, we would like to see a thorough investigation initiated with respect to the method of determining payments for railroads. If you are interested in stopping future multi-million-dollar hand-outs, about which I have been talking, I suggest that you make known your protest to Congress.

Included in this latest $312,000,000 deal is more than six or seven times enough to restore good mail service, but your mail service will not be restored unless you take the time to tell those in authority that you are now asking and demanding remedial action.

And like every other citizen of our beloved Republic, the letter carrier has his personal problems. Specifically, he is having a most difficult time trying to stretch his salary to meet current high prices. That perplexing question, I readily admit, confronts a great many other people.

The question of a wage adjustment and more important, the need for one, is not of the letter carriers' choosing. The simple truth of the matter is that he is no longer able to cope with rising prices. Unless something is done to bolster his purchasing power, the battle will go by default and with it his meager savings, his living standard, and his potential to share jointly and equitably in the many and grave problems of our time.

It may be that many of you are not familiar with the rather unique procedure that is involved in the adjustment of wages for Federal employees. It is almost entirely different from the accepted method in private industry. For instance, in one of your automobile plants here in the motor city, management and labor sit down at a conference table and iron out their differences in a wage dispute. Management can cease production and labor can withdraw its manpower, if either so decide. Not so in negotiations between the Federal Government and its employees. It is preposterous to think of the Federal Government or its employees quitting its functions at any time. But the important part, from the viewpoint of the employees, is that they do not have the same economic weapon other workers have—that is, the right to strike and bargain for improvements in their welfare, hours of work, and wages. And I hasten to add, Federal employees are not asking, nor do they want the right to strike against their Government. But they do insist on a quid pro quo arrangement.

Then, again, we find another difference in the manner of carrying out wage negotiations between the Federal Government and its employees as opposed to private industry and its employees. Let us again cite as an example one of your automobile plants and the union representing the men in the shops. When they sit down to negotiate, each side will be represented by two, three, or at the most five men. If the problem develops into a prolonged situation, an outside, disinterested member of the Federal Conciliation Board sits in on the discussions. So there you have 10 or 15 people to bring into agreement. Compare that with the problem of the Federal worker. He has to convince 96 Senators, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and finally the President of the United States.

Uncontrolled inflation will surely undermine our defense effort, destroy our American way of life, and raise taxes to ruinous levels. Perhaps the answer is controls. But they are unpopular in the minds of many people.

As spokesman for approximately 100,000 letter carriers, I want to go on record for controls—but only after certain conditions are met and only if controls are accompanied by certain other stipulations. Time does not permit a lengthy discussion of all the "ifs" and "ands" and the "whys" and "wherefores" of the complex question of controls.

I have told you that letter carriers find themselves in an economic strait-jacket because of their low wages and the rising cost of living. Briefly, permit me to give you a word picture of the situation in which the average letter carrier finds himself.

The average carrier earns $3,200 per year—those are his gross earnings. The average letter carrier is a married man; he has two children. Like yourself, the average letter carrier is confronted with an approximate 75 percent rise in living costs, using the period 1935-39 as the average. Now in 1939 the top wage for letter carrier was $2,100. The average salary level was slightly less. Therefore, it follows that, if his salary had kept pace with prices during the years from 1939 to 1950, he should have received money increases amounting to $1,575. That would means his average salary today should be $3,675. But it isn't, as I mentioned a moment ago, the average wage for a letter carrier today is $3,200. In other words, there is glaring deficit of $475 in his gross pay alone.

In 1939, a letter carrier, earning $2,100 a year, paid no income tax on himself, his wife, and two children. He did, however, pay $73.50 into the civil service retirement fund. That left him a net take-home pay of slightly more than $2,000—and the purchasing power of the dollar in 1939 was 100 cents per dollar.

Today, our average letter carrier is attempting to support his wife and two children on an average gross pay of $3,200—less about $195 contributed to the retirement fund; less approximately another $115 in withholding taxes; less an additional $150 required for uniforms—and I might say that the letter carrier is practically the only Federal employee required to wear a distinctive uniform on duty who has to pay for it himself. Well, when you add up all the deductions you find that our average letter carrier takes home approximately $2,750. Like everyone else, our average carrier has to contend with a purchasable dollar that has shrunken to 57 cents. It all adds up to a pretty dismal picture. The sum total of it all also dramatically points up the need for an immediate upward wage adjustment of postal salaries.

We have presented our case to the new Congress, which convened last Wednesday, January 3. I am happy to say that our appeal has met with an appreciative response in its phases. Several members of the House of Representatives have sponsored bills designed to increase postal wages up to 17 percent. As I explained to you, the successful prosecution of legislation that will benefit Federal employees is a long, tedious, and sometimes discouraging process. Merely introducing salary increase legislation is not enough; it is only the first step; your letter carrier will need lots of help along the way and it is on that note that I will close this discussion.

When your letter carrier approaches you and asks for your help in securing a much-needed boost in salary, I do hope you will lend a helping hand. We are convinced that our request for fair treatment with respect to wages is reasonable and I hope that I have been able to transmit some of our own conviction to you. I also trust that you will write to your Senators and your Congressman and tell them you want to see your letter carrier and other postal employees treated equitably in the matter of a living wage.

Remember Back in 1939 When You Could Shop and Get Change From $1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I assume it is natural for the average Member of this body to feel that his people are most patriotic. History will justify my contention that those living in our favored area of the South are indeed patriotic. Statistics show that we have more volunteers for the service than other sections. Ours is a proud but humble people. In view of such a high degress of patriotism, my folks seldom complain. In our all-out effort to increase necessary defense matters, they are anxious to bear their proportionate share. Most of the industrial people in my district are employed in the textile mills. The wages there are reasonable but not high. By living frugal lives, it is possible to make both ends meet under normal conditions. It is difficult to realize how most of our folks are living nowadays in view of the constant increase in the cost of the necessities of life. As one who has constantly and openly advocated general controls, I am of course disappointed in the slowness in the application of controls. To be sure, the word "control" itself is unpleasant. We are reconciled to the fact that many of our privileges and liberties must be temporarily foregone in order to meet present emergencies. Unless run-away prices are controlled, I fear the consequences. Attached hereto is an excerpt from the current issue of the United States News and World Report which points out very graphically what is happening. Let us put first things first and adjust these grave differences.

REMEMBER BACK IN 1939 WHEN YOU COULD SHOP AND GET CHANGE FROM $1

It looks like the same dollar. But it goes twice as fast as it did in 1939.

Take grocery bills: Food that cost $9 then costs $21 now. Take clothes: The price of a 1939 wardrobe buys one coat now.

It's the same all down the line, with a few exceptions.

The 1951 dollar, compared with 1939, is half gone before you get it.

If you want to see what has happened to the dollar, just look back to the "good old days" of 1939—12 years ago.

In those days a housewife could walk into a grocery store with a dollar and come out with a pound of coffee, a pound of hamburger, a dozen eggs, a quart of milk, a loaf of bread, and a pound of shortening—plus a few pennies in change.

Today she can get the coffee and bread for her dollar. The other items will take another $1.80.

The average individual, watching his pay check go, may find the talk about a 60-cent dollar, or a 50-cent dollar, a little on the theoretical side. He may need, instead, to look at actual prices and costs. When he does, he finds that a dollar goes about twice as fast today as it did in 1939. In other words, it goes only about half as far as it did in the year when World War II began in Europe.

Meals provide an example. A typical family of four was likely to eat up about $9 worth of food in an ordinary week of 1939. Today, if the family has not improved its diet, it finds the food bill taking about $21 out of the weekly pay check.

One reason is that the dollar that bought 3½ pounds of good round steak in 1939 will not buy even 1 pound of the same quality steak in 1951.

A quick backward glance is a help in understanding what has happened to the family's clothing dollar, too. For $60, back in 1939, a man could buy his wife a heavy wool coat with fur trim, and still have enough cash left to buy himself a wool suit, a pair of shoes, a hat, a dozen pairs of socks, a half-dozen shirts, five undershirts, and five pairs of shorts.

Today, if the man plans to buy the same medium-quality goods, he will be wise to get the items for himself first. If he gets the coat for his wife first he won't have enough left out of $60 to buy his shoes alone. The clothing for him will cost a total of about $102.50—if he manages to find such things as medium-quality shirts. And the medium-grade coat for his wife will take $55.

In that same 12 years, a rayon dress has gone up from $2.50 to $9.50, while the $1 cotton house dress has gone to $3.25, and a rayon slip that could be had for 85 cents has gone to $2.60. For a young boy's suit, $7 was ample in 1939. Today $16 is barely

enough. A pair of girl's shoes, of better than average quality, has jumped from $2.65 to $6.

Problems of furnishing a home and acquiring a car in 1939, too, seem simple by today's standards. Gasoline for the car has gone up only from about 18.5 cents a gallon to 26 or 27 cents a gallon in most places. But the car itself could be bought new for as little as $778 then. Today the same make—considerably improved—costs $1,720.

The bedroom suite that was marked $65 back in 1939 now carries a $185 tag. The "medium price" for an electric range in those prewar days was $160. Today $250 is "medium."

The housewife who wants to replace the $68 sewing machine she bought back in 1939 will need $170. If she wants to replace that $65 wool rug with one of similar quality she must be prepared to pay nearly $170.

Some things needed to keep the ordinary family going have changed relatively little in price.

Nylon hose, telephone service, cigarettes, a radio are examples. And electricity still costs most families less than it did back in 1939.

But the family that wonders what has happened to the value of its dollar since 1939 needs only to remember the days when a nickel bought a bar of good toilet soap or a ride on the streetcar, and a half dollar was a high price to pay for a haircut. That was a year in which only the town banker required a house big enough and fancy enough to cost $10,000.

What has happened to the dollar since 1939, in short, is the same thing that has happened to the 5-cent candy bar. About half of it is gone.

Prices then and now

Round steak, pound:	
1939	$0.29
Now	1.05
Man's suit:	
1939	25.00
Now	56.00
Auto:	
1939	778.00
Now	1,720.00
Coffee, pound:	
1939	.21
Now	.86
Wool rug:	
1939	65.00
Now	168.00

I Doubt if There Be a Single Worker's Home Anywhere in This Country Where the Cost of Foods and Other Necessities Is Not a Matter of Daily Family Concern and Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again I invite the attention of the House to another Battle Report, Washington, wherein Dr. John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s television station and cables, telecasted his weekly report to the people of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, the entire country is, each day, becoming more and more concerned with the terrific impact of inflation upon the Nation's price economy. I doubt if there be a single worker's home, anywhere in the country, where the cost of foodstuffs and other necessities is not the matter of daily discussion and concern.

The situation with respect to wage and prices on the home front is secondary only to national concern as to the well-being of our fighting forces in Korea.

It is because of these facts that the talks made by the various speakers on Battle Report, Washington proved of such tremendous interest to me. On Sunday last, in his personal statement to the Nation, Dr. Steelman said, in part:

On the domestic front, price and wage controls have been foremost in the news. All of us know that inflation is like a cancer gnawing at the vitals of our prosperity. It is threatening the future of all of us—and all of us must unite to fight it or sacrifice our economic security.

Two men in the vanguard of this fight are with us today. One is Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization; and the other, Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of the Wage Stabilization Board. They, together with the Honorable William V. Bailey, mayor of Battle Creek, Mich., will talk to you with respect to the matter pertaining to their administration and enforcement.

You will also hear from a young officer, Lt. Robert Fallon, wounded in the drive on the Manchurian border, and who is now undergoing treatment at the Army Medical Center here in Washington. He will tell us of some of the vicissitudes of infantry fighting at temperatures 30° lower than those suffered by Washington's troops at Valley Forge.

Additionally thereto, we shall hear from Donald E Heath, whom you will remember as the last Minister to Bulgaria, now stationed in Indochina, and who represents us in all three of the nations which constitute that unhappy land. He has come to us today with eyewitness report of the situation. Mr. Heath will tell of the courage and fortitude of those far-away and little-known people, and of how they, in struggling for freedom, are fighting desperately to hold back those who would enslave us.'

Altogether this teledocumentary was one of the most complete, understandable expositions as to how inflation can destroy government—and of the steps that have already been taken by the President and the Congress to control, if not avoid, it—which I have ever read.

No one can read that breath-taking, factual statement made by Lt. Robert Fallon—off-the-cuff and from right out of his heart, without knowing of the never-ending hell which is being suffered by the boys in Korea.

In answering the question—who is this infantry soldier—Lieutenant Fallon, of the Seventeenth Infantry Regiment makes answer:

He is a man who, but a short time ago, was sitting in a comfortable living room, even as you. Now, he is awaiting with dread the bitter, endless winter night when to sleep means often not to awaken. He is the next-door neighbor who took, with such relish, the extra piece of roast beef when you had him over for dinner last summer. Now, he is vainly hacking away at a can of beef stew which has frozen solid. He is the laundryman who used to deliver your bundle of spotless linen each week. Now, he is wearing a shirt he hasn't changed in 6 weeks.

This man, whom you know so well, has become a part of the finest group of fighting men in the world—the American infantry. He is you, your soldier—there, because you asked him to go.

Mr. Donald Heath, our last Minister to iron-curtained Bulgaria, and, now, our Minister to the Associated States of Indochina, made a statement with respect to the conditions in that far-off land, which, I know, is of deepest interest to every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of these facts that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the twenty-fifth Battle Report, Washington, as produced by Ted Ayers of the National Broadcasting Co., under the patronage of the assistant to the President, Dr. Steelman, and commented upon by Robert McCormick, one of NBC's aces and most popular commentators.

The telecast was, as follows:

Mr. McCORMICK. Back to snow-covered Washington comes General Eisenhower—returning with an optimistic report on his tour to build up a wall of security around the free nations. And, once again, upon the world capital of that security, NBC television turns its cameras.

Washington, concerned this week end with the Nation-wide rail strike imperiling the movement of supplies to our forces in Korea.

Korea, where our strafing jet pilots—very much on the job—help blast the way for our troops latest advance to within 8 miles from the Han River.

Today, Battle Report's cameras and guests combine to inform you on the infantry soldier in Korea, the price and wage freeze here at home, and the critical situation in Indochina. But first, the assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Mr STEELMAN. All over the world today men of good will are striving tirelessly in a gigantic task They realize that mad-dog despots are plotting to deprive them of freedom which is their God-given heritage. They know that the despots control huge armies, poised and ready for instant attack. Yet, they do not want war. They want peace—the right to live their own lives and to do their own thinking. Hence, the task they face is twofold. They must protect their freedom—without engaging in a terrible war.

Last week the Premier of France, Mr. Rene Pleven, visited Washington to confer with the President and Government officials. The communiqué issued at the close of the conference leaves no doubt that two great nations are united in their opposition to the would-be aggressors. General Eisenhower returned to the capital last Wednesday. He, too, brought encouraging news. Throughout his travels in Europe he saw with his own eyes and heard with his own ears how Europeans cherish the freedoms they have fought so long to win. Those who would betray them are losing ground constantly.

On the domestic front, price and wage controls have been foremost in the news. All of us know that inflation is like a cancer gnawing at the vitals of our prosperity. It is threatening the future of all of us—and all of us must unite to fight it or sacrifice our economic security.

Two men in the vanguard of this fight are with us today. One is Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, and the other, Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of the Wage Stabilization Board. They will talk to you with respect to the matter subject to their administration and enforcement.

You will also hear from a young officer, Lt. Robert Fallon, wounded in the drive on the

Manchurian border and who is now undergoing treatment at the Army Medical Center here in Washington.

He will tell us of some of the vicissitudes of infantry fighting at temperatures 30° lower than those that were suffered by Washington's troops at Valley Forge. Additionally thereto, we shall hear from Donald R. Heath, whom you will remember as the last Minister to Bulgaria, now stationed in Indochina and who represents us in all three of the nations which constitute that unhappy land. He has come to us today with eyewitness report of the situation. He will tell of the courage and fortitude of those little-known people—and of how they are struggling for freedom and fighting desperately to hold back those who would enslave us.

All over the world, men of good will are united. We cannot and will not fail in our struggle to win justice, freedom and prosperity for men everywhere.

Mr. McCORMICK. As the big guns we need to back up our desire for peace swing along our production lines, the Nation moves into action on the economic front. For clothes like these, and a thousand and one other articles. F-day came at 6 p. m. last Friday—for it was then that a big freeze was announced clamping a lid on prices and wages. Climbing prices on such items as cars and groceries were halted as stabilization officials prepared to consider the next step beyond this stopgap measure. Object: to combat inflation and put a firm footing under our economy. A foundation we must have if we are successfully to meet communism's challenge to our security. Throughout the Nation, crowds of wage earners were affected by the action taken jointly by the office of Price Stabilization and the Wage Stabilization Board. To housewives from coast to coast, any relief from the soaring prices they've been complaining about is good news, though many still have a lot of questions they'd like answered. One such housewife is here with us today, America.

Now, we'd like you to meet Mrs. Charles Schwartzel, of Louisville, Ky., Mrs. Schwartzel, you came up to Battle Report for a reason.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. As a homemaker, and a mother of two children, I believe I'm like a great many other women in the country when I say I'm a little confused. I'd like to get some answers to a few questions. Straight simple answers on this price and wage business.

Mr. McCORMICK. You may fire when ready, Mrs. Schwartzel. And here to supply the answers are Mr. Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, and Mr. Cyrus Ching, Director of the Wage Stabilization Board.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Mr. DiSalle, why were prices frozen? I'd like to know and without any gobbledygook.

Mr. DISALLE. Mrs. Schwartzel, as a mother and the person in your household who does most of the buying, you know that up until January 25, 1951, when the price freeze went into effect, the cost of living was at an all-time high and promised to go even higher. In other words, we were undergoing inflation, the deadly spiral that can knock the pins out from under even this powerful country. Some prices, since the start of the Korean fighting, had gone up 50 percent. I won't go into specific rises in textiles, metals, or industrial items. You know what I'm talking about because most everything you wanted to buy had a higher price tag. This inflation affects not only you and me but our defense program, too. Our Government set up a budget for defense buying. Those items, because of inflation, now cost more than was figured. We'll have to make that money up and a lot of it is going to come from you and me in the form of taxes. Why, did you know that every 2-percent increase in prices sends the cost of the defense program up a billion dollars a year? Now let's get down to some of the reasons for the inflation. In order to get our Armed Forces ready for any eventuality certain materials must be siphoned from the civilian market to put muscles in our Armed Forces. Even before any real shortages showed up, however, prices began to jump, due to a combination of things. There was and is more money than ever before in the hands of the consumer and so he began buying—scare buying—anticipating possible shortages. Then the profiteer jumped into the picture and again up went prices. And remember this: Real shortages haven't yet put in an appearance. It will be months until the effect of the expanded security program is felt. Plants are in the conversion stage; it takes time to retool and mobilize on a big scale. There's plenty of everything. There are no shortages today. Then, again, price rises brought about wage rises all along the line of production and distribution, and resulted in further price hikes. Looking ahead, more people than ever before in the history of this country will have jobs. Many families will have more than one breadwinner and more money to spend. There will be less to buy and more buyers for every item. This, too, would give prices another shove. Something had to be done and done quickly. Voluntary controls didn't work at all, and so we issued the price and wage freeze of January 25.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. I suppose, Mr. Ching, that with a ceiling on prices there had to be one on wages too.

Mr. CHING. Naturally, we're trying to achieve a balance between prices and wages. Let me say right here, that the price and wage freeze will not eliminate inflation, not by a long shot. But it will help keep the inflation we're experiencing from going completely wild. We haven't frozen wages permanently. This action gives us the time to study the situation in detail and to decide where and when certain wages should be raised. We want to be fair. You realize, I'm sure, that there's a balance to aim for on prices and wages in order to stabilize our whole economy. Please give us the time to do this thing correctly. You may be a little hot under the collar right now, but, believe me, we hope to iron things out to everyone's satisfaction.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Mr. Ching, my husband's earnings are pretty well fixed. It's become quite difficult for us to meet all our obligations. He hasn't had a raise for a year and now it seems he'll be stuck where he is.

Mr. CHING. I know just what you're up against. Men with fixed salaries, and they constitute the majority of our workingmen, are in a quandary right now. They're afraid, as your husband is, that their current income is as high as it will go. As I said a few moments ago, this order is strictly a stop-gap affair to give us time to adjust wages fairly. If we had taken the many weeks and perhaps months it would have involved to undertake a detailed study, wages and prices would have gone further out of line, to everyone's sorrow. Please assure your husband, Mrs. Schwartzel, that if his earnings are unfairly balanced as against the prices you're paying, he'll have his opportunity for an increase if our study shows it is called for. We are not bogeymen, determined to impose an iron law. We want everyone to get a fair deal and we're doing our best to see that policy through.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Mr. DiSalle, ceilings on prices do not cover everything, and you haven't really rolled back prices at all. You've just pegged them at their highest point. Are they going to stay there?

Mr. DISALLE. We're looking the price structure over right now and I can assure you that a number of prices will be rolled back. This freeze order was merely a point of beginning, to help prevent prices generally from going any higher. We realize that unnecessary scare buying or hoarding by consumers, and some apparent profiteering now being investigated, have spiraled many prices beyond a legitimate profit margin, and we intend to do something about that kind of thing. You've got to understand that price control in itself does not cure inflation. It is only one of three methods. Through tax and credit regulations your Government will hold down buying power when there aren't enough goods to go around. The Government is also doing everything it can to keep materials moving to the production lines. That should bring us higher production. Add price and wage controls and you have the triple attack we're making on inflation in order to achieve the stabilization you want. We think we've put a stop to the unholy spiral where higher prices gave way to higher wages, which in turn sent costs skyrocketing, and so on and on up the road to disaster. Now the price freeze does not prevent some prices from still rising. The reason? There are some agricultural products that we can't control simply because we have not been given the power to do so yet. The law doesn't permit them to come under price controls at this time. The order also specifically exempted fresh fruits, vegetables, fish, and seafood from controls. There are obvious reasons for that step. These products are highly seasonable, and are directly affected by weather and the means of transporting them to consumers, and they are highly perishable. Price controls for these items may become necessary; and if they do, they'll be worked out specially for them. And there are other exemptions I'd like to point out. Take certain oil-bearing seeds which we have to bring in from abroad. The seeds are used directly in the defense mobilization program. We were advised by the Department of Agriculture that price controls on there oil-bearing seeds would, in effect, cut down the amount of the product we could import. Then there's wool. This country imports most of its wool, and wool is a strategic item in defense production. Placing controls on wool imports would harm our defense planning. So you see, we didn't rush off in all directions at once in setting up the rules. But right now, more than anything else, what my office, and Mr. Ching's, desires most is the backing of every citizen to make the plan work out for the benefit of us all.

Mrs. SCHWARTZEL. Help out? Exactly how can everyone help? What can I do?

Mr. DISALLE. We've got to build our military strength and build it fast. But, at the same time we must keep our economy strong. Inflation can destroy both our objectives if we let it go rampant. As we see it, here are some of the things we must do to prevent inflation from sabotaging our efforts.

Mr. CHING. First. Production must go up to supply our armed forces with what they need, and to provide for the civilian market. As we go along we'll have to reduce civilian production. Every one of us, at every level, management and labor, should make a very searching investigation of any increases in wages which bring about higher prices without sending production higher.

Mr. DISALLE. Second. Higher taxes are coming. Pay higher taxes without grumbling because higher taxes help hold down prices now.

Mr. CHING. Third. Accept credit curbs gracefully, with the knowledge that credit restrictions help our supply of defense materials and help keep prices down by reducing competition for all supplies.

Mr. DISALLE. Fourth. Let's determine to save more money. Laying that money aside means we won't buy everything we see and that money is made available for investments so that production can be increased.

Fifth. Buy only what we need, when we need it. Remember that scare buying oper-

ates against ourselves, that bidding for items that may be short will shoot prices skyward. These aren't easy things to do, but I think we can and will do them. Our Nation has met other crises before and we've always risen to the job.

Mr. McCORMICK. Attacking inflation, suppressing it through wage and price freezes, certainly calls for real, unselfish cooperation, on every level. If this is going to work, every one of us must sincerely want it to work. Mr. Ching, Mr. DiSalle, you're looking for help, so I'd like you to meet Mayor William V. Bailey, of Battle Creek, Mich. Mayor Bailey has an idea percolating on how his city can pitch in.

Major BAILEY. Mr. DiSalle, it strikes me that until you have complete machinery in every city, town and hamlet to enforce the price and wage ceilings, you're going to need help. It's an enormous job, what with people clamoring for specific rulings and reports of violations and so forth. Well, I've thought it over and here's an idea I'd like to propose. I'm thinking of setting up a mayor's volunteer committee to work with the regional and district offices of price stabilization. They'll really work and on a purely voluntary basis. There's going to be a constant job of informing our people on the wisdom of the freeze and to iron out the kinks as they show up. Now the way I see this committee, it will be composed of representatives from many types of working and selling people. Someone from management, labor, civic organizations, retail establishments, women's clubs and so on. You just let them know what you want done and how to go about it, and I'm sure they'll volunteer their help. Well, that's the idea in brief. Now, do you think we could be useful?

Mr. DISALLE. Mayor Bailey, in the everyday English Mrs. Schwartzel asked for—you sure can be helpful. The idea is sound and we certainly can use your volunteer emergency committee. I'm not afraid to say we need all the help we can get. Your committee, working with the folks in the home town, and knowing so many of them personally, should inspire the confidence and the backing we need so badly. Fact is, I think, your idea is too good to keep just for yourself. What would you say if we borrowed it and applied it on a Nation-wide scale?

Mayor BAILEY. Go right ahead and take it. If it does some good I will be mighty proud.

Mr. DISALLE Then it's a deal. And as soon as we get off the air, I'm going to send word to thousands of mayors in the United States requesting the formation of the kind of committee you've been talking about. It's the type of voluntary cooperation which will go a long way toward building a greater understanding of our common problem.

Now, in winding this up, let me suggest that we think back only a few short years ago. We've lived through price and wage controls before. They are nothing completely new or revolutionary. Last time, I don't think anyone was hurt by them, and I don't think anyone will suffer now. Nobody loves controls. I certainly don't. But in our present situation they are absolutely necessary for the common good. And controls are part of the big plan to make us strong on the military side. A well-armed America will throw a shadow of strength that should cause any would-be aggressor to think twice before acting. You've heard the truth and so you know. And, in a democracy knowing is strength.

Mr. McCORMICK. In Korea, an ocean removed from the economic battle on the home front, steadily mounting enemy resistance continues to greet our advancing troops. Despite this, our Eighth Army has ripped new holes in the Red defenses below Seoul, proving itself far from the beaten yelping dog the Chinese radio is calling it. In reporting our new successes in Korea, well might we pause to mark the foot soldier for special citation—the Infantry men who are carrying the determination of this Nation through rain, mud, and snow. Lieutenant Fallon, from whom we hear next, led such men in the Seventeenth Infantry Regiment. Trained at West Point, wounded in the drive on the Manchurian border while directing mortar fire on the enemy, he is now undergoing treatment at the Army Medical Center here in Washington. For some moving words—his own words—on the men he led, listen to these from First Lt. Robert Fallon.

Lieutenant FALLON. This is the infantry soldier's war. And never in this country's history has any war required him to be so skillful. He has had to master the use of a dozen different weapons. He has had to learn the stealth of the Indian in night combat and patrols and the hardiness of the Eskimo in staying alive in subzero weather. Again, never has a military campaign required him to be so tough. These are the things that the American people are asking him to do. We have asked him to fight in a land thousands of miles from his home; we have asked him to risk his life daily, and the only reason he has is that we have told him that it is necessary. There is none of the compulsion of the Civil War when men were defending their homelands; none of the national dedication of the World Wars when the entire world was enflamed. No, his reason for fighting today is that the American people have asked him to fight. That is good enough for him.

We are asking this infantry soldier to endure temperatures 30 degrees colder than those known to the gallant men who followed George Washington to Valley Forge. We have asked him to undergo two trying and difficult withdrawals, one in the blistering, merciless heat of summer, the other in the misery and cold of a Manchurian winter, both against odds at times more staggering than those faced by the valiant defenders of Bataan. We have asked him twice to turn and stand against these odds. The infantryman dug his hole and manned his weapons and held. He held where ships and planes and tanks very often could not help him—on the frozen hillsides of Korea. He did this lonely job well at a time when it seemed that it could not be done.

And who is this infantry soldier. He is a man who but a short time ago was sitting in a comfortable living room even as you. Now he is awaiting with dread the bitter, endless winter night when to sleep means often not to awaken. He is the next-door neighbor who took with such relish the extra piece of roast beef when you had him over for dinner last summer. Now he is vainly hacking away at a can of beef stew which has frozen solid. He is the laundryman who used to deliver your bundle of spotless linen each week. Now he is wearing a shirt he hasn't changed in 6 weeks.

This man whom you know so well has become a part of the finest group of fighting men in the world—the American Infantry. He is you, your soldier, there because you asked him to go.

Mr. McCORMICK. Scene: Indochina, another border-in-the-balance in the Far East. Here French troops and the Vietnamese National Army, assisted by American military aid and equipment, struggle against the rebel Communist forces of Ho-Chi Minh. The question on everyone's mind—will the Chinese Reds join this fight too? It was to go into this critical matter, among others, that President Truman and French Premier Rene Pleven last week closed themselves in conference. And brought all the way from Indochina to lend his first-hand information to assist them, was the man we meet next. That you may hear his report yourself, we present now our last Minister to iron-curtain Bulgaria—up to the time we suspended diplomatic relations—who now serves as our Minister to the Associated States of Indochina, Donald R. Heath.

Mr. HEATH. French and Indochinese troops, helped by American arms aid, are holding the pass against the spread of communism to Southeast Asia. American arms aid is not, as the Communist propaganda pretends, being used to bolster up a French colonial regime in Indochina. The French colonial regime ended with the signature of the so-called Pau accords on December 16. On January 1, all Indochinese Government services were turned over to the Indochinese States. A relatively large number of French Government technical experts are being held temporarily, at the request of the Indochinese, in certain posts until Indochinese can be trained to take their places. In the case of many positions that will be a matter of only a few months. Meanwhile, French instructors and American arms are being devoted to building up a Vietnamese national army. It will take a good many months, however, to make Vietnamese troops equal in numbers and training to the rebel troops, who are trained and equipped by the Chinese Communists. The Vietnamese have asked for the continued assistance of the French forces until the Vietnamese army is ready to assure responsibility for the security of Indochina.

I have been asked many times in the past week about the nature of the Communist threat to Indochina and its insignificance to the free world. The menace is as old as the creed of Bolshevism and the Communist operation in Indochina with minor variations is the same experienced by other areas under Communist attack throughout the world. The Communists seek to gain control by disguising themselves as nationalists. They attempt to prevent the development of an independent nationalist government. They go to all imaginable extremes to prevent reconstruction of the country, new development and the alleviation of human suffering in areas not under their domination. Their tactics are those of murder, kidnap, arson, threats, and intimidation. The Communists know that the development of healthly, independent states and the development of the human and natural resources of Indochina would make their subversion and domination impossible.

The hope which I saw for the future of Indochina lies in those brave people of whom there are many who dare to work for security, freedom, and human betterment despite the threats of retaliation from the Communist-directed murderers and arsonists who stalk in every area. But despite attempts at intimidation, leaders from the village level to the highest positions in government are coming forward to take those risks and work to give meaning to their newly won independence.

The Chinese Communists have thrust into Korea and Tibet. There is saber rattling on Indochina's borders. The free nations of the world are banding together. The people of southeast Asia do not want the domination of Communist imperialism, they do not want to become the rice bowl to fuel the march of a Communist-directed Chinese war machine throughout the rest of Asia. By collective action the free world can be maintained and new hope given to captive nations now in the Communist orbit.

Mr. McCORMICK. Thus, until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again 2 weeks from today, for another "teledocumentary," this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your twenty-fifth Battle Report, Washington.

Nation Is Warned To Guard Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as we mobilize the resources of our country to meet the threat of a Communist aggression, we cannot afford to neglect the school system which we have built up over the years. During World War II our school system was too much neglected, and we are feeling the effects of this neglect today.

It would be the height of folly to restrict our present school program during this period when we need to utilize every possible resource. The training of our manpower to meet our military and civilian needs is not something that can be accomplished after an individual becomes of military age. The training for a proper role as a citizen is the full-time function of our school system. We cannot afford to neglect any portion of it. Our school system should be our chief resource in providing better citizens, better soldiers, and a strong civilian morale to resist the subversive efforts of communism. It will be a great tragedy if we permit the present mobilization to bring about a wholesale shift of our best teachers from their present jobs to temporary defense work. We will suffer another major set-back if we halt the construction of new school buildings.

We cannot afford to postpone essential school construction any longer. The proper education of our children is just as vital to our defense as any part of our military training program.

Those communities which are attempting to solve their problem of school facilities are being penalized today by mounting costs. These costs will become higher daily unless would-be bidders on construction have some assurance of being able to secure the necessary materials. Taxpayers will be called upon to meet these additional local costs unless we can head them off. The penalties of inflation are heavy enough without this added burden being forced upon us.

School trustees throughout the country are today faced with the virtually impossible problem of meeting the cost of construction within limits set up by available revenue and bond issues. Mounting costs and scarce supplies make it impossible to secure firm bids for the construction of badly needed educational buildings.

The one important step in the solution of this problem could be the establishment of priorities on building materials for school construction. I have requested the National Production Authority to establish these priorities and have also asked Dr. Earl McGrath, head of the Office of Education, to make the same request. I urge all of my colleagues interested in the country's school construction program to support this effort.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following article from the New York Times which further substantiates the need for guarding our schools during this crisis:

NATION IS WARNED TO GUARD SCHOOLS—IT WOULD BE CRIMINAL, WHILE PREPARING FOR WAR, TO NEGLECT THEM, DR. RUSSELL SAYS—PUBLIC'S ROLE STRESSED—IF A COMMUNITY KNOWS WHAT IT WANTS IN EDUCATION, IT CAN GET IT; TUITION PLAN IS TOLD

(By Benjamin Fine)

While preparing for total war it would be criminal for this Nation to neglect its schools, Dr. William F. Russell, president of Teachers College, Columbia University, warned yesterday.

Addressing 300 educators attending the eleventh annual Tuition Plan forum at Sherry's, Dr. Russell called for greater support of the country's schools. It would be dangerous at this time, he declared, to cut down on the schools, to fail to construct new buildings, or to permit teachers to leave their jobs.

It is the public's responsibility so to support and guide the schools as not only to realize the American dream, but also to protect our land from foreign enemies, he declared.

GRAVENESS OF TIMES STRESSED

"At this particular time," Dr. Russell said, "an especially grave responsibility falls upon us all. For we are going into a period, if not of war, at least of a long period of time apparently, in which we must be prepared to go to war at a moment's notice. And we must prepare for a war to be fought, not as in olden times, by a few hired mercenaries and hired soldiers, but for a total war, to be fought by all that we have and are.

"We must make the best of our total stock of raw materials, of our machines and factories, and equally we must make the best use of our human resources. That means that every item of ability, energy, and zeal in our population must be used to its maximum. The square peg in the round hole, in ordinary times thought to be unfortunate, in time of preparation for total war becomes a scandal and a waste. Just that much potential power is lost."

Five thousand citizens' groups concerned with the public schools, representing 500,000 individuals, are now actively engaged throughout the country in working for better schools, another speaker, Roy E. Larsen, president of Time, told the educators. He called this movement toward citizen support one of the most heartening developments in recent school history.

Mr. Larsen, who is chairman of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, said the primary responsibility for formal education belonged to all the citizens of this Nation. Our publicly supported and locally controlled schools were cited as examples of democracy in action. He added that the basic purpose of his commission was to encourage the formation of more independent local groups and to help those now working in every way possible.

"The citizen organization which represents all factions in the community, which works objectively without personal prejudice, which cooperates with administrators, teachers and the school board, will be able to carry out the citizens' primary responsibility," Mr. Larsen said. "They will be able to determine what kind of school system they want, and to go about getting that kind of school system to serve the needs of all children as individuals and the community as a whole."

Long Beach (Calif.) Newspaper Writes Constructive Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Long Beach Press-Telegram for February 4, 1951. It appears to me it is so crystal clear in its analysis and constructive suggestions and ideas that I am pleased to have the opportunity to share it with you:

RED LINE IS SHREWD, BUT DOESN'T FOOL PEOPLE WHO ASK QUESTIONS

Yesterday a reader called to report that he had received some printed material which sounded as if it might have come from a subversive source.

"But how can you be sure?" he asked.

The answer is—you can't make a sweeping definition of what constitutes a subversive influence. Such definitions catch too many innocent people who are merely exercising their privileges under the Bill of Rights.

But you can assume a questioning attitude which should help you determine whether a writer or speaker is trying to improve America or tear it down.

There is no doubt the propagandists for communism are busy across the land—in Long Beach as well as elsewhere. They use every device and medium; letters, public platform, microphone, pamphlets. Paradoxically they camouflage their propaganda with a false cloak of "patriotism."

They speak of "peace." Naturally, it is a term attractive at this time to so many. But the usual give-away is that their "peace" proposals are almost identical with those of the enemy and, of course, opposite to those of the United States. They represent communism as a peaceful ideology, hoping you will forget that its militaristic actions reveal it as an imperialistic doctrine of force and intrigue.

They attack the American press, for it is a great symbol of the American freedom. They tell you the press is muzzled and kept. But nothing can be done about this, they say, because the press is an example of private enterprise. They insinuate that it would be better if there were no private enterprise.

An ironical proof that this attack on the press has no foundation was demonstrated recently at a Long Beach meeting by a left-wing speaker from another city. He read example after example of news stories "which the 'free' press said nothing about." But the joker was his items of proof were clippings of those news stories from that same "muzzled" American press which he was criticizing. When this contradiction is pointed out, anyone can see how ridiculous was the speaker's argument. But many persons fail to probe beneath surface remarks, and therefore the propagandists get away with such things.

The Communists and fellow travelers exploit human sympathies to the full. They pretend they are being persecuted for trying to uphold the Bill of Rights. "Me against the world," they wail. Watch out for the men who proclaim themselves as martyrs.

While most of these vermilionized "patriots" are too subtle to declare baldly that everything Russia does is good and everything the United States does is bad, that, nevertheless, is the burden of their message.

Certainly, this country is not without its wrongs, and everybody has a right and duty of criticism. But there's a difference between criticism which seeks to improve our democratic system and criticism which attempts to replace our democratic system with communism.

Not that this latter criticism should be stifled—but it certainly ought to be recognized by everybody for what it is. The best way we can fight communism in America is by identifying its proponents, keeping them out in the open, and continually tossing verbal harpoons into their red tunics.

Here are some questions a citizen might ask himself when attempting to judge the convictions and affiliations of a speaker or a writer:

1. Is he offering a positive program of his own—or is he merely falling in step with the enemy?

2. Does he continually harp about "capitalistic" institutions which can't be punished for their "evil doings" because the system of Government protects them?

3. Does he appeal to your emotions instead of to your intelligence? That is, does he try to exploit your feelings of sympathy, resentment, etc., instead of trying to get you to reason out a situation?

4. Does he use concrete terms, or is his pitch full of glittering generalities such as "social mindedness" and "decadent democracy?"

5. Does he never say anything good about the United States? Does he talk about American imperialism.

Those five questions, of course, can't tell you the complete story. But they are a guide. If you ask them, you'll be well on the way to the necessary thinking which must be done in connection with the menace of Communist propaganda. The Red line is shrewd, but not too shrewd for people who ask questions.

Air Force Jet Fighters Spread an Air Umbrella Over All Vital Areas and Industries of Middle West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are continuing to vote every dollar and all else that is being asked to secure the defense of these United States, but I shall always continue to contend that we should not alone get a dollar's worth of defense value for every tax dollar collected and paid out of the Federal Treasury, but achieve the defense with a minimum of manpower and lives of our people.

The question which presents itself to the House now is whether those who are in charge of our Nation's defense plan to secure this country by the use of air power or by the unlimited use of manpower. One of the most heartening things which I have come upon in months, with respect to the situation of our Nation's security, is an article written by Mr. Max K. Gilstrap, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 29.

The article is entitled "Jet Fighters Spread Umbrella Over Midwest Plants."

Mr. Speaker, I know the great majority of my colleagues in this House share in my belief that the American people are not afraid of a practically nonexistent Russian surface navy. Neither are they afraid of amphibious attack being made against the cities of our east and west coasts—nor of Russian tanks rumbling either across the Alleghanies or the Rockies in endeavor to invade the great Mississippi Valley Corn Belt, and the great industrial empire that lies behind those mountains.

The thing our people fear above all else is the power and might of a Russian air force which could spread death and destruction out of Russian-built bombers flying over the great metropolitan areas, towns, and villages of these United States.

It was, indeed, heartening to read this article by Max Gilstrap, in which he pointed out how much the United States Air Force is on its toes in guarding our cities, towns, and the great industrial plants of the Nation.

In a mere matter of 30 seconds—

Mr. Gilstrap declares—

the men on the Selfridge Air Force Base in Michigan grab their helmets, parachutes, and "Mae West" life jackets, and race to their Sabre jets, where they find a crew chief waiting to button them in. With no engine to warm up, the ship roars off the runway in a scant 6 minutes—and, rocketlike, the pilot climbs to 40,000 feet to take a heading or degree direction given in his phone orders.

Mr. Speaker, accompanying the article is a fragment of a map of the North Central States, showing the principal metropolitan and industrial areas covered by different air bases.

What Max Gilstrap writes of the work of the Air Force in defending the area adjacent to Selfridge Field in Michigan is true with respect to Air Force defense activities on every base in these United States.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder, then, that this nationally known correspondent in charge of the Monitor's Chicago office states that—

An anxious America can find a bright spot in the all-too-slow national effort toward preparedness in the zest and bustle which is taking place on Air Force bases throughout the land.

It is altogether unfortunate that Louis Johnson, when Secretary of Defense, ignored the mandate given him by the Eightieth Congress and failed to strengthen the Air Force with the $850,000,000 voted by the Congress. This would have enabled us now to have an air-force-in-being of the strength recommended not alone by our own Congressional Aviation Policy Committee, but by that eminent board of business leaders headed by the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, now Secretary of the Department of the Air Force—and, as outlined in the Finletter report, acclaimed on every hand.

As Max Gilstrap states:

Needed air strength to assure national safety will not be achieved in a matter of months. It may take a year, according to top officials in Washington, to attain a strong air arm. But the United States has the happy knack, in a crisis, of moving faster than it thinks it can.

The hopeful note observed in this integral part of the broad Air Force defense mosaic is the general feeling that in speedy preparation lies America's greatest opportunity to prevent rather than to meet the threat of general war.

Mr. Speaker, this timely article by Max Gitstrap of the Christian Science Monitor is so heartening to every contemplative American citizen that I am asking unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert the same in the RECORD of our proceedings.

The article is as follows:

JET FIGHTERS SPREAD UMBRELLA OVER MIDWEST PLANTS

(By Max K. Gilstrap)

SELFRIDGE AIR FORCE BASE, MICH.—Ceiling zero Looming through the dense fog, birdlike F-86 Sabre jet fighters with swept-back wings sit on the wet runway, poised and ready.

It was a reassuring glimpse of a fast-growing arm of the Nation's air defense. It said better than words that the country has begun furnishing a protective air umbrella over its vital industries sprawled across the Middle West.

Jet fighter protection is part of a vast, complicated national air defense program being rushed to protect America preparing in the emergency. It is a vital link in the mushrooming network including antiaircraft stations, radar listening posts, and an intricate communications system being woven across the country.

GUARD INDUSTRIAL CENTERS

Col. James R. Gunn, Jr., commander of the Fifty-sixth Fighter-Interceptor Wing, component of the Eastern Air Force Defense, explained that his jet fighters serve as a powerful fist in the United States air arm. They help protect such industrial centers as Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago.

Several times a day these operational jets streak off into the skies above Lake St. Clair and out over mid-America to patrol the skies for unidentified aircraft.

Under the Fifty-sixth Fighter-Interceptor Wing command, the Sixty-first Fighter Squadron here joins the Sixty-third at Oscoda, Mich., north of Saginaw Bay, and the Sixty-second at Chicago in protecting areas within a 500-mile radius of their respective bases.

Assisted by the unblinking, cloud-piercing eyes of ground radar stations, they search for unindentified aircraft over the vital Sault locks, rail centers, and smoking factories. Orders require them to force down any plane which refuses to give its identification.

This puts teeth in the Civil Aeronautics Administration requirement that all planes file flight plans of any intended crossing of the American-Canadian border. A penalty for noncompliance with the CAA rule makes the pilot liable to a year in prison or $10,000 fine.

Heartening signs of America's determination to build its air strength quickly are visible despite the heavy mist that shrouds this home of the Tenth Air Force headquarters.

"It's busting out at the seams," a flight lieutenant remarked. He waved at the swarms of recruits arriving at this hub of a vast reserve training program of 110,000 air reservists spread over 13 North Central States.

In the squadron operations room we found the Sabre jet pilots. At first glance they appeared overly nonchalant, lounging in their flying togs, playing ping-pong and reading magazines. But their manner was brisk and an air of expectancy hung over the room as they kept their ears cocked toward the phone.

Action calls come frequently for these men on 24-hour alert duty.

Other fliers, off duty, are available for action within an hour's notice.

Capt. William T. Whisner, of Shreveport, La., and Lt. Curtis L. Utterback, of Brackettville, Tex., natty in blue Air Force uniforms, described what happens when they are alerted.

Over the phone comes an order, "Scramble red flight." Or it may say, "Scramble white or blue flight," the colors indicating the number of the flight. In a dash, the men grab their helmets, parachutes, and Mae West life jackets from the wall and are out of the door in 30 seconds. Racing to their Saber jets, they find a crew chief waiting to "button them in."

In the cockpit the pilot fastens his shoulder harness and safety belt, plugs in his head set for radio, connects his oxygen mask. No engine warm-up is necessary. Off he roars, a scant 6 minutes having elapsed since the moment he was alerted.

USUALLY FLY IN PAIRS

Rocketlike, the pilot climbs to 40,000 feet and takes a "heading" or degree direction given in the phone order. Then he listens for radio instructions. Ordinarily he is given the location of an unidentified aircraft to identify and he zooms off, usually with another plane to find it. Six 50-caliber machine guns are loaded and ready to fire.

Orders for opening fire would have to come from headquarters. But Captain Whisner remarked, "I wouldn't be likely to wait very long for orders if a plane opened fire or if I saw it's bomb bays begin to open."

Jet pilots are justly proud of their Sabres whose exploits and superior speed against the fastest Russian-built planes have been heard from in Korea. They hold the world's speed record of 670.981 miles per hour for operational jets. One attained an unofficial record of 710 miles per hour flying from Dayton, Ohio, to Washington in 33 minutes and 3 seconds.

HEARTENING SITUATION

An anxious America can find a bright spot in the all-too-slow national efforts toward preparedness in the zest and bustle at this air base.

Watching the flood of reservists, draftees, and enlistees arriving; hearing that 16 bases are scheduled for reactivation across the country, and seeing the flyers in action is to share some of their confidence that America will be able to prepare in time to prevent general war.

Needed air strength to assure national safety will not be achieved in a matter of months. It may take a year, according to top officials in Washington, to attain a strong air arm. But the United States has the happy knack in a crisis of moving faster than it thinks it can.

The hopeful note observed in this integral part of the broad Air Force defense mosaic is the general feeling that in speedy preparation lies America's greatest opportunity to prevent, rather than to meet, the threat of general war.

Compulsory Bond Subscription Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine has asked that his proposed compulsory subscription plan in relation to personal taxes be inserted into the RECORD. The plan is as follows:

A certain percentage of your wages, over and above the present tax, is levied at the same rate as that contemplated now in increased taxes. In return for this levy, which is withheld, as at present, you receive non-interest-bearing bonds as follows:

Twenty percent of new levy in 5-year maturity bonds.

Thirty percent of new levy in 7-year maturity bonds.

Fifty percent of new levy in 10-year maturity bonds.

Now, say Joe Doakes draws a wartime wage of $450 and his new levy is set at $80, he would then receive $16 in 5-year bonds, $24 in 7-year bonds, and $40 in 10-year bonds.

Now, these bonds are nonnegotiable, noninterest bearing, and nontransferable—except, of course, in case of death—and cannot be cashed in before maturity. The net and obvious end product of this compulsory subscription plan is that—

First. The war will be financed.

Second. There will not be excessive taxes to be repealed after the war—and who ever heard of a tax being repealed?

Third. The compulsory savings thus achieved will provide a long-term economic cushion.

Fourth. The morale of the taxpaying public will be kept at a higher level knowing that—in a reasonable number of years—they will get their money back.

Fifth. This part of the public debt will not be subject to the corroding effect of interest.

Sixth. This plan will not have any of the confiscatory elements present in all taxes.

Seventh. The knowledge that these bonds will have to be redeemed at maturity may possibly prod the people in our Government to arouse themselves out of their usual lethargy and so conduct public affairs that we may, in time, achieve a sound national fiscal policy. It may even make it necessary for the Treasury Department to collect income taxes from the higher bracket racketeers. Who knows?

The only argument that could, and probably will be raised is that this plan is far too simple. It offers none of the delectable vistas of overwhelming red tape.

Yea-and-Nay Votes on Appropriation Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER B. McMULLEN
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1951, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, my friend and colleague, Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS, introduced House Resolution 119. The purpose of this bill is to require the Members of Congress to vote yea or nay, and further that their vote shall be recorded, on any and all appropriations.

This bill has received wide publicity and in my opinion the people of the Nation feel that it should be passed. I have received a number of communications from my constituents urging the passage of this bill and I feel that the time has come when Members of Congress should be willing to stand up and be counted on how they vote to appropriate and spend the taxpayers' money. We of the Florida delegation intend to work for the passage of this bill.

I am including herewith the following editorial on the subject from the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of February 6, 1951, entitled "It's Our Taxes, Boys—Remember?":

IT'S OUR TAXES, BOYS—REMEMBER?

Just a year ago Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Fort Lauderdale, introduced a resolution in the House which would have required a roll-call vote on every appropriation bill.

In applauding Mr. ROGERS' move then, we editorially observed that "All too often the Congressmen would prefer not to have their constituents know where they stand."

We pointed out that this is one of the main reasons the two Houses have resisted installation of electric vote-recording devices such as many State legislatures use This coyness was one of the principal reasons for the establishment of Congressional Quarterly, the Washington news service, which polls the Members of Congress on votes where no record is kept.

Sure enough, Representative ROGERS' proposal disappeared into the limbo. Consequently billions of dollars were appropriated without record votes—in fact about two-thirds of all the tax-spending bills were so passed.

So now Mr. ROGERS is trying it again. He's going to introduce the same sort of resolution and see if the Eighty-second Congress is any more responsible than its predecessor.

All the sound reasons for this step last year are doubly valid this year. First, the appropriations to be voted this year are enormously increased. Second, the House Appropriations Committee has already pulled some hanky-panky by abandoning the one-package budget and going back to the old piecemeal system of appropriations for each department.

The one-package plan failed to produce the volume of savings its enthusiastic backers thought it would. But it did cut down in the log-rolling produced by the other system and, imperfect as it was, it gave a more comprehensive picture of the total expenditures.

With Congress due to spend about $70,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' hard-earned cash, and putting on the bite for far heavier taxes, certainly John Q is entitled to know how his Representative or Senator is spending his—John Q's—money.

We hope the whole Florida delegation in House and Senate gets behind the Rogers' resolution. We can't think of any better way to get the State favorable publicity than by upholding this fundamental right of the people.

Exemption of Certain Farm Boys From Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly sent appeals to Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, for the exemption of certain farm boys, and while he has replied that production

will not in any way be interfered with, the facts are that the draft is seriously affecting production. What Mr. Hershey says and what he does do not agree at all.

Appeals have been made to local boards, and the State board, but there seems to be no one interested in keeping up farm production. It just has not yet occurred to these officials and to Mr. Hershey in particular that the production of food is of the least importance. If we are to follow our policy of settling every disturbance on the globe's surface, we may expect a long contest, and if that is true, food will be the most important fact in our whole armed system. To bring this situation definitely to the attention of the Congress and the people, I quote a letter I just received from a farmer of Williams County, N. Dak., that speaks for itself:

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing you in regard to our son ———, who has just been called down and passed his physical examination for the Army.

I'd like to paint this picture to you and see if you can in some way help us get a deferment for our son.

Four years ago we left our farm on account of poor health. As you know, I've been so bad with rheumatism that it's left my back so I can hardly do any hard work or ride tractors. And my wife, too, has been fighting lung trouble, so doctor's orders were to leave the farm. So we established our home in town, leaving the farm to our son. He has been doing all our heavy farm work all his life and he is now 23 years old. He has established his home there, running the farm of approximately 1,000 acres under cultivation, of which 480 acres he owns. He also has a herd of 18 registered cattle and 20 other Black Angus. We have and own ample pasture land for a larger herd if help could be gotten. He has a full line of farm machinery consisting of three tractors, self-propelled combines and all other necessary farm equipment. Now all this equipment he still owes some money on, and where can we find one that can take over?

Now, we've appealed to our local draft board with an answer of rent it out or sell. Then we appealed to our State board, but it seems like nothing is being done for our farm boys.

So I'm appealing to you, wondering if in some way you could help us or tell us what to do.

Thanking you in advance for anything you do for us.

Respectfully.

Voting Records Should Be Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States:

VOTING RECORDS SHOULD BE PUBLIC

The most valued gage by which the folks at home can judge how well their elected representatives are serving in Congress is a record of their vote on any and all legislation.

Whether the lawmaker votes "aye" or "nay" is a specific indication of his stand on any issue. It is a much truer and more easily recognizable guide of his stewardship in office than what he says. Look at a lawmaker's voting record and you can tell whether he is doing right by his constituents.

Although the voting record is a simple method of determining a Congressman's worth, it is not easily accessible to the ordinary citizen. Perhaps Congress has wanted it that way—to make it easy for the Members of the House and Senate to talk one way and vote another, without the boys at the fork of the creek being any the wiser.

Under present arrangements, the Legislative Reference Service will not give to persons or organizations who request it, the voting record of any Member of Congress—unless permission from that Member is first obtained.

If nothing else, this lack of cooperation looks bad. It gives rise to the idea that the lawmakers would rather the public did not know too much about the individual record of the Members.

Congressman BOGGS of Louisiana is now attempting to remove the protective cloak which automatically protects the voting records. He has introduced a bill to change the regulations. It is the second time he has made the proposal. He tried last year to put over a similar bill, but nothing came of it.

What he proposes now is that the Legislative Reference Service shall be required "upon application by the editor of any newspaper or other publication published in the United States, or any group of 10 or more citizens of the United States, to compile and make available, without charge, to such applicant the voting record in Congress of any Member thereof for any period specified in such application."

In other words, an editor or any group of 10 people could get the voting record of any Congressman for any period simply by requesting it. Permission of the House or Senate Member would not be required.

That is as it should be. Primarily, this would be a service to the public, because most larger newspapers have such facilities as wire service and special representatives to obtain any desired voting records.

Mr. BOGGS' bill should be enacted.

Protecting America's Bald Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced H. R. 5507 for the protection of the bald eagle, and the bill was given favorable consideration by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and was passed by the House on July 10, 1950. However, it was not acted on by the Senate and I reintroduced the measure at this session and it was assigned the number H. R. 1870.

This measure has the support of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the American Museum of Natural History, the National Audubon Society, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Emergency Conservation Commission, the National Wildlife Institute, the National Park Association and Wilderness Society, and the American Nature Association. An editorial recently appeared in the Portland Oregonian urging the passage of this legislation. I am including the editorial as a part of these remarks, as follows:

PROTECTING AMERICA'S BIRD

If the national symbol of the United States is to survive, Congress should enact a bill just introduced by Representative HOMER ANGELL of Oregon. The measure seeks to extend to Alaska a law making it a crime to kill or capture a bald eagle. The Member from Portland succeeded in getting an identical bill through the House of Representatives in the previous session of Congress, but it died in the Senate.

Everywhere under our flag except in Alaska the bald eagle is protected. In Alaska, however, it is mercilessly hunted. Presentation of an eagle's talons brings a $2 bounty from the Territorial treasury. Pressure from commercial fishermen is responsible for this situation. They believe that the eagle makes heavy inroads on the salmon runs.

Ironically, in spite of the bounty, the Museum of Natural History points out that "it is only in Alaska that the bald eagle still exists in numbers sufficient to give hope for its permanent preservation." In other places, civilization has encroached on the crags and feeding grounds necessary to the continued existence of the great bird which is a synonym for Uncle Sam.

Many naturalists contend that overfishing by commercial interests in Alaska exceeds enormously any toll taken by bald eagles. The suspicion seems well founded that trollers and canneries are blaming on this lordly bird a fault which may be attributed to human beings. Passage of Congressman ANGELL's bill will make possible a final effort to preserve in its natural state the national bird of our country.

Raw Cotton Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Mr. Gerald Dearing published Saturday, February 10, in the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

COTTON COMMENT—BUREAUCRACY GAINS ITS ENDS BY WEARING OUT OPPOSITION THROUGH DELAYS, EVASIONS, REPORTS OF COMPROMISES, AND CREATING OF DISUNITY AMONG THOSE COMPLAINING

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

Cotton men, looking apprehensively toward Washington, then at the mounting red ink in their ledgers as expenses go on and business is at a standstill, are wondering when price ceilings will be lifted.

They are being given the full treatment of delay and evasion of Washington bureaucracy and any faltering on their part at this time can be disastrous.

Due to the heavy pressures which they have built up since price ceilings were made effective 2 weeks ago last night, they have been well on the way to winning their argument. They can win if they persist. Weakness, disunity, and doubt at this time can defeat them, or force them into compromises that are obnoxious.

It has long been the practice of bureaucracy to stall for time—because time works in their favor. They know that no matter how loud and strong the complaints against their actions are at first, that they grow

weaker and weaker as time progresses. They rely on the suggestion of compromise proposals on their part to get the protestants divided among themselves. They manage to raise doubts in the minds of the opposition, to create distrust between one segment and then another. The opposition gradually dies down.

Then they have their own way.

This must not happen to the cotton industry and the fight for the removal of price ceilings.

The battle is for more than the immediate opening of the futures market. It is for the life of the cotton trade. It is for survival of a major segment of the free-enterprise system.

Victory for the advocates of price ceilings on raw cotton can and probably will be the repetition of the history of the raw-cotton industry in England. It will close the exchanges, make the normal traders unable to function, just as they now are unable to trade, and result in the intrusion of Government into the cotton trade, which bureaucracy then would take over.

This would mean that Government would determine the price to be paid for cotton and the price for which it would be sold. The producer would have only one buyer—the mills could find but one seller. As the supply rose and fell the Government would order the farmer to plant according to the need—not voluntarily but as a matter of law.

Government-controlled economies are economies of artificial shortages. The evidence is in the price control and slaughtering order on meat, which has just been issued.

There has been no complaint that there is a shortage of meat, only that prices have advanced too far. So price ceilings are being clamped down. But, in addition to the ceilings, comes notice that packers will be assigned butchering quotas beginning April 1. Instead of being able to buy all the cattle and hogs offered by the farmers and butcher them to fill the demand of the public, the packers will be limited. This will create a shortage, artificial, of course, but a shortage nonetheless. Shortages lead to black markets, which create greater shortages. Then comes rationing for the public—less meat, smaller supplies. And the bureaucrat is in command again.

The cotton trade needs unity and persistence in their fight. There should be no talk of compromise, n slackening of effort.

This is not cotton's final battle against bureaucracy—unless it is lost. If this battle is lost, there can be no more cotton trade. If it is won, there is hope of victory in the next fight, which is inevitable as long as the Government-in-business termites are allowed to bore their way through the Government bureaus in Washington.

Criticism Should Be Constructive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the following excellent editorial by Mr. Manchester Boddy, the able editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, which deals with the subject of criticism and recommends standards which, if adhered to, would do much to preserve American democracy:

CRITICISM SHOULD BE KEYED TO UNITY

(By Manchester Boddy)

Being an optimist by nature, and having seen my optimism justified through experience, I have always been more than a little impatient with critics who deliberately refuse to point out the good along with the bad and thus prepare the reader for a plus or minus balance honestly arrived at; with critics who can do no constructive work.

Once I wrote something like this to a writer who was unfairly (I thought) criticizing a public official who was making a valiant effort to solve tough public problems. The critic replied on the back of a penny postcard with these words from Horace:

"I'll play a whetstone's part, which makes iron sharp, though unable itself to cut."

Quite a lot of people must think their mission in life is to be a whetstone, judging from the volume of criticism one reads and hears. Perhaps there is more now than in former years, although my editorial scrapbooks do not prove it.

In the field of national affairs, my collections of unbalanced criticism begin with "the mistakes of Woodrow Wilson" which, among other things, caused an uncontrolled war boom that ended in the sudden and disastrous bust of 1921.

I have a clear recollection of the year, but, like many others I was so "busted" at the time that the so-called economic crash made no impression; it just reduced some of the war profiteers to the status of the average veteran.

But now as I review all of the economic, military, and political mistakes charged against Woodrow Wilson, I wonder how the Nation managed to survive, much less win a war. If I had known about the mistakes at the time, I probably would have stayed home and grumbled (perhaps yelled) instead of going off with a gun to the western front, bubbling with enthusias m for the good, old United States of America, most perfect of all nations on earth.

My second collection is devoted to "the corruption of the Warren Harding administration," and "Calvin Coolidge's long sleep."

Each, of course, is a post mortem. The experts, with the detachment of autopsy surgeons, put the dead administrations under microscopes and discovered the "seeds of destruction" that could have been sterilized if Messrs. Harding and Coolidge had done what they oughter—but didn't. As I read the reports I wonder how we ever survived.

The most interesting collection is concerned with proving that Herbert Hoover was the chief architect of the great depression. Reading it makes me think of a building that collapsed because the builder just didn't know how to provide bracing, proper foundations, and allowances for sway and strain. The mistakes were so easily discovered after the collapse.

The most voluminous collection, naturally, is devoted to the tragic mistakes of F. D. R. It seems that no part of the United States or the world at large escaped the dire consequences of his ideas and actions, all of which could have been avoided—if.

Our latest collection grows fatter with each passing day: "The mistakes of Harry Truman." This is only a temporary file, concerned primarily with grumblings and scarepieces put out for propaganda purposes. The autopsy surgeons will not render the final verdicts until the administration has taken its place in history.

Intelligent, constructive criticism by competent critics is the essential vitamin that keeps our body politic alive and healthy. Without it our democracy would go the way of totalitarian governments and be destroyed. It is better to tolerate a lot of harmful criticism than to do away with all criticism.

Nevertheless, the rapid development of radio as a means of mass communication has brought with it an overburden of critics whose main stock-in-trade is a glib tongue, a pleasing voice, and the notion that a large audience is in itself complete justification for whatever is said.

The test of the value of too many critical dissertations on the state of the Union has become: "Does it attract a large audience? If so, it must be good. My sponsor pays for the audience, not for the soundness of my views."

The same, of course, can be said of critics who express themselves through the printed word, although time has developed a responsibility in this field that has not yet found its counterpart in the showmanship of many political critics who use the radio as their means of expression.

If we are to develop the degree of unity in the United States that alone can carry us through the perils of our time, we must be as careful with criticism as we are with all other potentially dangerous weapons.

Unpleased Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

UNPLEASED STATESMAN

Senator TAFT'S latest attack on administration policy strengthens the suspicion in many minds that the Ohio statesman wouldn't like any Trumanite proposition even if it were good.

When he limited his attack to domestic issues, Mr. TAFT could be sure of a hand from Democrats as well as Republicans. That was shown by his landslide victory in the Ohio senatorial contest last year after a campaign pitched almost totally on national questions. Since that triumph, however, the Senator has taken a running jump into the dispute over foreign policy and the overseas defense program. His attack from the Senate floor last Thursday indicated his purpose to wage an all-out fight against the defense plans formulated by the armed service chieftains—possibly because they have the support of the administration.

The Senator's repetition of his earl'er charge that Mr. Truman is assuming military authority he does not have in asserting his power to order American troops overseas without congressional consent. Perhaps he will force that issue to a vote in the Senate—unless a private canvass of the membership convinces him the test would go against him. That political quarrel will take care of itself in due course. But Mr. TAFT started an attack from another angle that will arouse Nation-wide interest.

In a roundhouse swing at General Eisenhower, the Ohio oracle questioned that world-famous officer's judgment and conclusions in the military field and intimated that he had been less than frank with the American people. General Eisenhower, according to the Senate's military expert, is exaggerating the danger of an unsuccessful war in Europe. His report on the European situation was hazy, the Senator complains. And finally he demands that Congress write its own order arbitrarily

defining and limiting the movement of American troops abroad from this time forth.

Senator TAFT's military judgments and prescience were tested by Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, and as we remember it he flunked all down the line. His pre-Pearl Harbor talks and votes revealed him as misinformed with respect to the international situation and perhaps the world's worst guesser on what was in store for the United States. Americans of all parties and of none welcomed the Senator's smashing victory in Ohio. But do any of them feel that his triumph at the polls on strictly domestic issues qualifies him to master mind the Nation's foreign and defense policies after the Pearl Harbor show-off and show-up of his judgment in that field? Maybe, after all, General Eisenhower knows more about the military situation and prospect than even Senator TAFT himself thinks Senator TAFT knows.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address made by me at the wreath-laying ceremony held at the Kosciusko Monument, Lafayette Park, Washington, D. C., Sunday, February 11, 1951:

We are observing today the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko, Poland's great patriot and American Revolutionary War general and aide to Washington.

We pay tribute today to a great crusader of freedom who devoted his life not only to the restoration of freedom in his own country but to the restoration of American independence as well. Thaddeus Kosciusko lives in the hearts of the Polish people today as a symbol of their dearest national hopes and aspirations and for the American people he represents a magnificent fulfillment of the moral obligation that every person on the face of the earth has toward freedom-loving people everywhere. After fighting a desperate battle against despotism in his own land, Kosciusko came to the aid of America in her hour of need. He stood by the cradle of American independence and helped to lay the foundation for a government in the New World dedicated to the principles of liberty and justice.

In life, actions, and words of this great man we find much that is pertinent today, and in paying tribute to him, let us not forget that his beloved country, Poland, has again been deprived, as in Kosciusko's time, of its freedom.

Poland today is under the ruthless domination of Soviet Russia, a power more terroristic in its methods than the Czar of Kosciusko's time. There is no freedom in Poland today. A puppet regime, completely subservient to the Kremlin, holds this unhappy land in a vicious vise of Communist tyranny and dictatorship. No amount of oppression can quench the burning love of freedom in Polish hearts, but Poland does need friends in its desperate fight for liberty today, as America did in Kosciusko's time. The United States, as the leading nation of the world, has a grave responsibility and a great mission to perform before God and man, that is, to lead the world back to the path of justice and freedom. There will be no free and independent Poland until the world of freemen will marshal all the moral and material forces at its disposal and brings them to bear upon the evil force which has enslaved Poland. Poland must rise again and take its rightful place among the free nations of the world—that a strong, freedom-loving people will not die and we, here in America, can and must help to speed the coming of the day when Poland shall be truly free again. Helping to restore the prewar independence of Poland is part of the battle for preserving American independence as well.

On this day, therefore, let us pledge ourselves to support every effort which would make the spirit of Kosciusko, the spirit of freedom and justice, live again in Poland as it is alive in America. May the memory of the great sacrifices this great son of Poland made for the cause of human liberty, strengthen the determination in our hearts to further the principles for which he stood, freedom and equality for all people.

What Is the Aim of the United Nations in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it never does any good to say "I told you so," but on this Korean matter I cannot refrain from stating that I announced in a news release that if the UN forces stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel there was better than a good chance of peace.

Rhee, president of South Korea stated that he would pay no attention to any orders from anyone to stop at the thirty-eighth parallel. One of the Senators had this to say, "the Republic of Korea will never be satisfied with having its country divided at the thirty-eighth parallel, because this means economic and political suicide." This same Senator protested the British request that the forces stop at the thirty-eighth parallel. The South Koreans did not stop at the thirty-eighth parallel but went on 5 miles farther into North Korea and the result many anticipated happened. The Chinese came roaring down from the north and not only drove the South Koreans out but drove into the UN lines 19 miles farther, and the plunge has not yet stopped. With a chance to bring about peace, this opportunity was shattered again by the headstrong Rhee and many more unthinking persons in responsible positions.

By this action we are playing the game Stalin wants—to meet his allied forces in ground battles in a place selected by him as a battleground. It is becoming more evident every moment that Herbert Hoover is thinking straight when he says that on the ground we cannot overcome the hordes of China and Russia.

There are some important facts to ascertain now. Did the UN order a stop of forces when they reached the thirty-eighth parallel? If they did who violated that order?

Our first purpose and the only purpose announced was to drive the invaders out. Now through the statements made by the Senator from California and others, our plan is to settle all of the Korean peninsula under one government and undo what this Government agreed to when the thirty-eighth parallel was set up.

Mr. Rhee should be told to stay in line and fight with the United Nations or shift for himself. The UN should state the case of what we are doing in Korea in no uncertain terms and any nation that disregards the purpose should do its own fighting and not call on the United States for the establishments on new government anywhere. Our only purpose has been to stop aggression, but if we have launched a campaign to change boundaries and set up new governments, the people of the United States ought to know it.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter addressed by me to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean G. Acheson, dated February 2, 1951:

FEBRUARY 2, 1951.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The people of India are facing a period of mass hunger and starvation, and their government has applied for 2,000,000 tons of grain from the United States to be paid over a long period of time. Our Government has agreed to ship 4,000,000 tons to be paid in dollars on the barrel head. We are the only country in the world which has resources to supply this food and thus avert a terrible catastrophe. Our bins are filled with grain, ready for shipment.

It is our bounden duty to help. It is a serious fact, indeed, that our Governments are in disagreement over the China-Korean problem, but it would be most unfortunate to put such differences in the way of relief from suffering. This is no bargaining issue, but an issue of immense simplicity: millions of Indians may starve and we can save them from this fate. I realize that it may be necessary to take cargo ships out of mothballs to transport this grain. So be it. But can we turn our backs upon the hungry, when we have it in our power to give?

On making a careful inquiry into all the ramifications of this subject, I find that the present food shortage in India is due to a series of unavoidable natural disasters, that the 2,000,000 tons of grain the Indian Government has asked for is a conservative figure and is designed only to sustain life on a minimum basis; that Indian's dollar resources available for food purchases have already been virtually exhausted; that India maintains an effective rationing and procurement system which will enable the Indian Government to make maximum use of imported food grains.

India has been struggling hard to meet her food shortage. She seeks to increase her food production. She has under construction a number of multipurpose projects on the lines of TVA to provide irrigation and electric power, and to control floods. New projects, on completion, will bring 42,000,000 kilowatts of electric power. Her official plan was to achieve self-sufficiency in food supplies by 1951, but a series of natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, locust plagues and droughts so seriously hampered the program, that she is unable to feed her teeming population.

There is a time-honored story which comes readily to mind: A beggar accosted two men and asked for alms. One man helped the beggar, but the other disdainfully refused. The latter soon feels the touch of the angel of death on his shoulder and guiltily rushes to give alms to the beggar he spurned. But the angel of death stops him and says: It is too late. One never repairs the holes in the ship after it has set out to sea.

It may be too late to help India, if we tarry much longer. I strongly urge that our Government address itself to this problem in the humanitarian terms it deserves, so that 2,000,000 tons of grain will be made available.

Mahatma Gandhi, India's great philosopher and mentor has wisely said, "My patriotism is not an exclusive thing. It is all-embracing and I should reject that patriotism which sought to mount upon the distress or the exploitation of other nationalities. The conception of my patriotism is nothing if it is not always, in every case, without exception, consistent with the broadest good of humanity at large." It is interesting to note that we are soon to erect a monument in the memory of Gandhi here in Washington.

Refusal or further delay to ship this grain would belie this tribute to India's great savant.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

City of Long Beach, Calif., Opposes Senate Joint Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131 and Petitions Congress To Disapprove Each of Said Resolutions—Congressman Doyle Cites City Council Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this morning I received from the City Council of the City of Long Beach, under the seal of the city clerk thereof, Resolution C–12838, which accompanies these remarks on the subject.

I am sure you recall that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, again in the Eighty-first Congress, and now in this Eighty-second Congress, I filed what is commonly termed as the State quitclaim tidelands bill. Each of the bills I filed in each of these three sessions of Congress have represented the theory adopted by my native State of California and by my home city of Long Beach in this important matter. The bill I filed in this Eighty-second Congress is H. R. 58, and it was filed on January 3, 1951. It is the same text as emanated from the Judiciary Committee in the Eighty-first Congress with approval.

Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, has again filed the same bill, and I am again in support of the Walters bill, which is before the Judiciary Committee. Also several other members of the California delegation have filed the same text as the Doyle bill and the Walter bill, and I believe they, too, are in support of the Walter bill.

While it is true that in the United States of America against State of California the Supreme Court enunciated the theory that the United States has paramount rights, there has not yet been determined, under that decision, the lines and boundaries of the base inland water areas, and so forth, involved in this history-making decision.

The important city of Long Beach did, many years ago by virtue of the city charter approved by the State legislature, extend its corporation limits out into the Pacific Ocean 3 miles from the beach shore of the ocean, this 3 miles being approximately to the point of the line upon which the Federal breakwater was constructed in front of our city so that comparatively few acres of water which are within the corporation limits of Long Beach extend upon the Federal breakwater line.

Senate Joint Resolution 20 by Senator O'MAHONEY would, I believe, allow others there in the city of Long Beach, to wit: the State of California or the Federal Government, to lease or drill for oil within the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach. In fact, about 4 miles of the municipal bathing and recreation beach could be, and logically might well be, absolutely destroyed for the purpose of recreation, if this should occur. A lessee of Senate Joint Resolution 20 could, I believe, not only drill up against the shore line of the city of Long Beach, but it could place storage tanks and other drilling equipment and paraphernalia on the bathing beach itself, all within the corporate limits of the city of Long Beach.

All these tidelands titles were granted by the State of California to the city of Long Beach by grants beginning in 1911 and ending in 1935. At the time of the first grant, there was no thought of there being oil or petroleum deposits within the confines of the said grant of the State to the city.

As House Joint Resolution 131 does not at all report what appears to be the best interest of the State of California and the city of Long Beach, I ask that my opposition be also registered thereto. If there is to be what is commonly termed "interim legislation" then this interim legislation must be amended so as to permanently protect the meritorious interest and welfare of the State charter in the city of Long Beach. If the interim legislation is to be enacted into law, then the important city of Long Beach of approximately 300,000 people, must be eliminated from legislation which, in fact, is interim and should be placed on permanent basis as far as that important city is concerned.

I am informed that hearings on the O'Mahoney interim resolution begin about February 19, 1951. I am also informed that no date has been set for the hearings on the Walter bill and its companion bill before the House Judiciary Committee.

The resolution of the City Council of the City of Long Beach follows:

Resolution C–12838

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Long Beach, Calif., opposing Senate Joint Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131, and petitioning the Congress of the United States to disapprove each of said proposed resolutions and reject favorable action thereon

Whereas under certain acts of the Legislature of the State of California (California Statutes 1911, p. 1304; California Statutes 1925, p. 235; and California Statutes 1935, p. 793), the State of California granted to the city of Long Beach all of its right, title, and interest held by it by virtue of its sovereignty in and to all the tidelands and submerged lands, whether filled or unfilled, situated below the mean high-tide line of the Pacific Ocean within the corporate limits of said city; said corporate limits of said city extend into San Pedro Bay, bordering the Pacific Ocean 3 miles from mean high-tide line; said tidelands and submerged lands consist of 13,027 acres, of which approximately 1,000 acres have been reclaimed and filled by said city, upon which port and harbor facilities, park and recreational improvements have been constructed, at a cost to said city in excess of $35,000,000; said lands and navigable waters constitute 8.11 miles of water frontage of said city on San Pedro Bay, all of which historically and by prior court decision lie within San Pedro Bay, an inland water area of the State of California; said tidelands and submerged lands and San Pedro Bay are shown upon the aerial photograph taken on December 26, 1947, attached hereto; and

Whereas on July 26, 1947, a stipulation was entered into by Tom C. Clark, as Attorney General of the United States, and the attorney general of the State of California, in the case of *United States of America* v. *State of California*, No. 12, Original, wherein it was stipulated that the United States of America does not claim in said litigation "that part of San Pedro Bay landward of a line drawn from Point Fermin in a northeasterly direction through a point 300 feet due south of the southeasterly extension of the Navy mole and breakwater to the line of ordinary low tide in the city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.," said area constituting inland waters of San Pedro Bay, and that said description of San Pedro Bay is "without prejudice to the right of California to claim" that the line separating said bay from the "3-mile marginal belt" lies farther seaward than the line therein described and that said bay includes a larger water area than therein described; and

Whereas there is attached hereto a map entitled, "California Coast Line—Point Fermin to Newport Beach," prepared by R. R. Shoemaker, chief engineer of the Long Beach harbor department, upon which is portrayed said proposed Government line fixing the seaward limit of the inland waters of San Pedro Bay substantially as described in the aforesaid stipulation, said line being located immediately adjacent to and seaward of reclaimed lands and harbor facilities of the city of Long Beach; said map portrays the boundaries of the city of Long Beach extending 3 miles into San Pedro Bay and said 13,027 acres of tidelands and submerged lands conveyed to the city by the State as aforesaid; only 3,028 acres of said 13,027 acres lie landward of said Government proposed line, 1,016 acres of which have been reclaimed and filled and 2,012 acres of which constitute navigable water areas; 9,999 acres of said tidelands and submerged lands con-

veyed to the city as aforesaid are located outside of and seaward of said Government proposed bay line, 9,847 acres of which constitute navigable water area and 152 acres of which consist of public-beach area, filled and improved by the city of Long Beach for public recreational uses; said public beach area extends 3.9 miles seaward of the line of ordinary low tide outside said Government proposed bay line along the bay and ocean front of said city; and

Whereas the city of Long Beach, by and through its board of harbor commissioners, has projected and planned future port and harbor development at an estimated cost of $85,000,108, seaward of said Government proposed bay line, also indicated upon said map; and

Whereas section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 20 and of House Joint Resolution 131 (82d Cong., 1st sess.) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the State of California respecting the issuance of new mineral leases covering said 9,999 acres of tidelands and submerged lands conveyed to the city by the State as aforesaid, outside of said Government proposed bay line, portrayed upon said map in white, light blue and yellow, all within the corporate limits of said city; said authority includes the granting of mineral leases upon the 152 acres of filled public beach lands extending 3.9 miles along the water front of said city, portrayed upon said map in yellow, all notwithstanding that the State of California has heretofore conveyed all of said lands to the city of Long Beach as heretofore mentioned; said 9,999 acres of land are the subject of controversy between the United States and the State of California in proceedings now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States as to whether or not the same constitute submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters; and

Whereas section 4 of said Senate Joint Resolution 20 and of said House Joint Resolution 131 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to grant oil and gas leases to qualified persons offering the highest bonuses plus the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent on said 9,999 acres of tidelands and submerged lands referred to in the preceding paragraph, and pursuant to which conv ert said 3.9 miles of public beach consisting of 152 acres into an oilfield, including oil-well derricks, tanks, and production equipment, notwithstanding that said 9,999 acres of submerged and reclaimed submerged lands have been granted to the city by the State of California and all but a small portion of which lie landward of the Federal breakwater and within the area contended by said State and city as a part of San Pedro Bay and inland waters of said State and in controversy as to whether or not the same are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, in proceedings now pending before the United States Supreme Court, as heretofore stated; and

Whereas the granting of the authority to the Secretary of the Interior by the provisions of said resolutions as heretofore stated may result in the serious impairment of the rights and equities of the city of Long Beach in the ownership and control of said lands, and incalculable damage to said city:

Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Long Beach resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. The city of Long Beach does hereby record its opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 20 and House Joint Resolution 131, and petitions the Congress of the United States to disapprove each of said proposed resolutions and reject favorable action thereon.

SEC. 2. That the city attorney be and he is hereby authorized and requested to present to the Members of Congress and the appropriate committees thereof all matters pertinent to the foregoing and transmit a copy of this resolution to the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and to the other Members of the Congress.

SEC. 3. The city clerk shall certify to the passage of this resolution by the City Council of the City of Long Beach, and shall cause the same to be posted in three conspicuous places in the city of Long Beach, and it shall thereupon take effect.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Long Beach, at its meeting of February 6, 1951.

[SEAL] C. G. ROSEBERRY,
City Clerk.

Mr. Speaker, the map and photograph referred to in the foregoing have been retained by me, but I will be pleased to have any of you, my colleagues, who are interested to indicate it to me for I will have them with me on the floor of the House for several days, and I will be glad to show them to you.

Speed Up Construction of the Natchez Trace To Provide Necessary Ingress and Egress To and From Our Atomic Bomb Plants

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate transportation to and from our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and also the one at Paducah, Ky., it is absolutely necessary that we speed up the construction of the Natchez Trace with all possible haste.

This great highway, which was authorized in 1934, extends from Nashville, Tenn., to Natchez, Miss., along the route traveled by Andrew Jackson on his march to New Orleans in 1814.

Practically all of the right-of-way has been secured, and a large portion of it has been graded and is now ready for surfacing.

There will not be a single surface crossing on it between Nashville and Natchez, a distance of more than 400 miles. All of the highways and railroads will either cross this road by overhead structures or underpasses. Therefore, in case of necessity, it could be used for a speedway to transport the necessary materials to and from our atomic-bomb plants with all possible haste.

These two great atomic bomb plants are vitally important to our national defense, and may mean our salvation in case of an attack.

This highway will go right between them and will connect with each of them by a splendid highway that is already constructed.

The National Park Service informs me that "if funds and rights-of-way were made available, this Service and the Bureau of Public Roads could place under construction during the 12 months thereafter approximately $10,000,000 worth of construction."

We cannot afford to neglect our defenses at home while sending our boys all over the world to fight foreign wars.

If this country is ever attacked by a foreign foe, the chances are that it will be an air attack, and that our main defense will be the Air Force and the atomic bomb; and the completion of this great highway will be just as necessary to our defense as it was in 1814 when it was thrown open by the Indians and Andrew Jackson was permitted to march his heroic army over it to New Orleans, and win one of the greatest victories in the history of the Nation.

This highway should be finished as quickly as possible. We cannot afford to wait until "our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb."

It would then be too late.

Korea and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by our colleague, Hon. ROBERT HALE, of Maine, to the League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia on February 12, 1951:

One question besets every American: "What are we going to do about the present danger from the Kremlin?" This question dominates our thoughts and even intrudes itself into our dreams. The urgency of the problem cost the life of as ardent a patriot as Jim Forrestal. To solve that problem, all of us in Congress would wish to make some contribution. Each of us perhaps nourishes the secret hope that he, and he alone, can offer the true solution to the riddle propounded by the Kremlin sphinx.

On the threshold of my remarks, I should like to say that there are two different attitudes of mind which can get us into great difficulty. Unless we can escape both these attitudes, we cannot hope to do any sound thinking about the problem.

One is the purblind, cocksure attitude which refuses to see any real danger and resists on a life-as-usual basis the thought of any sacrifice of comfort or convenience. This loosely optimistic thinking was very prevalent even in the highest places down to the moment of the North Korean attack last June. It found expression in remarks from the White House that we were further from war than we had been at any time since 1946. It found expression in numberless speeches by the then Secretary of Defense to the effect that if Russia struck at 4 a. m. we would be ready by 5. These statements now rank with Neville Chamberlain's immortal utterance in the fall of 1938 about "peace in our time."

We can thank the North Koreans and their masters in the Kremlin for doing much to put an end to this kind of wishful thinking. I believe that the President is now worried; I am certain that the Congress is worried. The great majority of thoughtful people in the country are profoundly worried.

The second dangerous attitude of mind lies at the other end of the emotional spectrum. It is the defeatist attitude. If the

easygoing attitude is infrared, the defeatist attitude is ultrapurple. It views the power of the Soviets as invincible. It considers that the people of Europe and Asia have all succumbed to the blandishments of the Kremlin and cannot be won by any appeal from the west. It regards communism as a wave of the future. It believes that the people of Europe are incapable of united action in their own behalf, and that, therefore, nothing remains for this country but to withdraw into its hemispheric dignity, where we shall have either what Winston Churchill has called a peace of mutual terror or else a war of intercontinental bombing, in which the great American cities will all be destroyed and we shall be lucky if we can bag even one or two great cities in the U. S. S. R.

I think it may be worth while to note and recognize various types of defeatism, so that we can be on guard against them.

There is, of course, the deliberate and subversive defeatist, who desires the success of our enemy, and contributes to it by spreading the philosophy of despair. These people may not be very numerous. Still I think the antecedents and environments of the defeatists are always worthy of examination, because they may enable us to detect and so to counteract subtly destructive influences in our society.

Apart from the subversive defeatist, we find the thoughtless defeatist who is so dismayed by the numerical superiority of the Soviet population and the satellite, or better, subjugated populations that he can think of nothing else. He does not seriously attempt to carry his thinking beyond the first road block. Or to use another metaphor he will paddle his canoe down a stream of thought until he comes to a difficult portage. There he gives up and takes to the woods.

But perhaps the most dangerous type of defeatist and certainly the most interesting psychologically is the man whom I would call the "defeatist in detail." This man will not tell you directly that our position is hopeless, and that there is no help in us. Not at all. His technique is a sophisticated one, and proceeds something like this. He will write a series of articles. The first one demonstrates conclusively that there is no salvation through course A. The next will show by very cogent reasoning that there is no salvation through course B. The third article discloses the utter hopelessness of achieving success through course C. The fourth article demonstrates that course D is attended by such hazards that we should not even consider it. This process goes on as long as the ingenuity of the writer and the patience of the public will permit. When all the articles have been added up, all that the reader knows is that there is an aggregate of things which we cannot do, and nothing has been indicated that we can do. There is a fine collection of negatives but no affirmative.

At least, so far as Asia is concerned, it seems to me that several prominent writers are defeatists in detail, because, although they never directly say that Asia must be given to the Soviets, they fail to point out any method by which it can be prevented. The man who says flatly "there is no answer" to such and such a problem, is less insidious than the man who examines a dozen possible answers and rejects them all without directing attention to the fact that he offers no solution.

Now let us leave the abstract and turn our attention to the actual course of events.

When the North Korean aggression began at the end of last June, public sentiment, in my opinion, fully supported the policy of resistance which was adopted by the UN upon, if not entirely as a result, of the urging of the Truman administration. In all the first months of our difficult enterprise, there was much and quite legitimate dissatisfaction with the unpreparedness of our forces and the grave mistakes which had led up to the outbreak of hostilities. After the Inchon landings in mid-September, complete victory appeared to be within our grasp and there was a feeling that our policy of resistance was about to pay off. When in late October or November the Chinese Communists first appeared on the scene in large numbers, not only were our brightened hopes blighted, but there was a panicky feeling that all was hopelessly lost. And this notwithstanding the fact that the possibility of Chinese intervention was apparent from the first. The cry was raised: "Get the boys out of Korea; we never should have gone in," etc.

I will not presume to predict the course of future events in Korea, nor will I pose as a military expert to say what may and what may not be possible from a military point of view in that country. However, I think that even now it may be said that there was too much pessimism when the Chinese Communists appeared, and that our troops, even when outnumbered, can make the course of the Chinese Communists anything but easy. There is evidence that the cost of the enterprise already far exceeds Soviet expectations.

Military defeat is a bitter medicine, but sometimes a necessary medicine. There were plenty of reverses to American arms in the early days of World War II. When we left the Philippines, General MacArthur's slogan was "I shall return." If we do have to leave Korea, as I hope we shall not, let it not be in any spirit of finality, but with the conviction that we have lost a battle without losing our cause. This was the spirit in which the British returned from Dunkerque.

Let no one feel that the men who have shed their blood or given their lives on Korean battlefields have made a needless or a worthless sacrifice. In my opinion, they have served their country as nobly as any men who have ever fought for it. Nothing can make their sacrifice vain but falseness, and feebleness on the part of those who direct our national destiny.

It is my firm belief that the best security of Europe is to keep the Soviets engaged, involved, and anxious in Asia. It seems to me we have not yet done a tithe of what we could do and I believe must do to frustrate communism in Asia. The most hopeful feature of our whole situation in Europe, Asia, and everywhere else in the world is that the people who have had a taste of communism all loathe it heartily. This loathing may be ineffectual when the iron curtain is tightly drawn, but when we can get even a toehold under the iron curtain, anti-Communist forces are released and can become effective. However, we cannot work too fast, because under the methods of the police state, resistance is ruthlessly suppressed, people of property, of education, and of potential leadership, are liquidated by millions and the task of resistance becomes steadily more difficult.

From the information which comes to me and which I believe reliable, I am certain that very important successes can be achieved through guerrilla activities on the mainland of China. If Chiang Kai-shek's armies can be permitted—not to say encouraged—to fight on the mainland of China, and given such assistance in material as is necessary, I feel fairly certain that they can create at least enough of a diversion to keep China in turmoil for many years. If even the southwest provinces of China could be conquered from the Communists, it might very effectively seal off Indochina, Burma, Malaya, to say nothing of Indonesia, from further Communist advances. The belated action of the UN in designating Red China an aggressor, seems to me a diplomatic victory. If this success could be followed up by economic sanctions against Red China, the Mao regime might be further weakened. I realize that economic sanctions may not be easy to work out but certainly an attempt should be made.

I am aware of the British view that hostility of the West to the Mao regime will simply throw him more firmly into the arms of Moscow. In my judgment, it is the merest wishful thinking to suppose that Mao is not already securely in the arms of Moscow, and that anything will dislodge him. He will never become a Tito. If he did, he would still be an unsatisfactory personality from the American standpoint. If Mao tried to secede from the Kremlin, he would almost certainly be liquidated and replaced by a faithful servant of the Kremlin. Probably Tito himself will be when the time comes. In fact, it seems to me not unlikely that sometime this spring Tito will fall out a window or die of a quite unsuspected heart ailment. We have got to learn, however, that we can work through stooges, as well as the Russians. We are in a game in which no holds are barred; this is simply not a Marquis of Queensberry world.

Our accomplishment in Korea even to date has probably been to upset the Russian timetable. It has certainly been the cause of our accelerating our own timetable, an acceleration which may yet prove to be our salvation. We may be able to upset the Russian timetable for some years—long enough for the West to arm. In the third volume of Winston Churchill's book on World War II he describes the campaign in Greece in the spring of 1941. At the time this campaign seemed a hopeless and humiliating failure. The British were driven out of Greece and even out of Crete. They suffered devastating naval losses. But we have since learned that this campaign upset the timing of Hitler's attack on Russia and very probably prevented the fall of Moscow. If such be the case, it may not even be too much to say that the British campaign in Greece saved the war. In another sense the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor which certainly brought this country into World War II, may have been a decisive contribution to the final destruction of Hitler and Tojo. The point to emphasize is that we cannot appraise events by examining them as isolated phenomena. We must see them in the long chain of causation.

People best qualified to judge believe that the next Soviet move will be against Jugoslavia. It will presumably be made by Soviet stooges in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and possibly other countries. I should expect no more direct Soviet participation than in Korea. Some well-informed people expect this attack to be made when the Balkan spring brings good weather. But I repeat my belief that continued resistance in Korea might well save Jugoslavia.

The Jugoslav Army will certainly resist, but Jugoslavia is at best a sadly divided country with the Serbs, the strongest group numerically, very unpopular with the Croatians and other racial and religious groups. How we may best assist in Jugoslavia is a matter which I hope is receiving the most careful study by our military authorities. It may well be impossible for us to put ground troops in Jugoslavia. On the other hand it will probably be impossible for the invaders of Jugoslavia to occupy the whole country. The Nazi occupation was one merely of railway lines, ports, and cities. There can be, should be, and probably will be continued and continuing guerrilla activity against any invaders of Jugoslavia. In this way it would be possible at least to keep the country in turmoil if not to expel all invaders.

We ought now, in my opinion, to serve notice on the Kremlin and its agents what acts on their part will be deemed acts of aggression. We can afford to leave Stalin uncertain about many things but we should leave no doubt in his mind about our view of certain acts on his part. For this pur-

pose I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 16 which seeks to designate as aggression any armed attack on any nation by the U. S. S. R., Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Russian occupied Germany, Albania, or Communist China.

I lack the time and the expert knowledge to discuss other probable specific acts of aggression, against such countries as Greece, Turkey, Iran, and so on. Obviously our present capacity to aid resistance varies from place to place on the Communist periphery. Let me say, however, that I think it wholly impractical for Congress to pass on actual troop movements. Military measures must nearly always be taken swiftly and secretly. In the nature of things the legislative process cannot produce results swiftly or secretly. No one is more jealous than I of the legislative prerogative of Congress but military strategy is not its role, even when military strategy has, as it often does, political implications.

All these resistance movements we can aid, equip, and inspire, without great expense and without serious prejudice, it seems to me, to our great armament program. If we can keep up resistance in Jugoslavia we shall almost certainly be able to delay the Soviet attack on the Middle East.

I realize that this all adds up to a very difficult war of nerves but it seems to me that a continuous series of local attacks and local resistance can forestall a general war. Then, if we are adroit enough, it might be possible to aid rebellion in the U. S. S. R., the potentiality of which is known to exist. We ought, I think, to attest daily our love for the Russian people enslaved by their wicked rulers. If we go in for any nonsense about unconditional surrender we shall solidify where there is now fluidity, and unite where there is now disunion. Only by great adroitness can we offset the enormous Soviet advantage in manpower.

More than any other philosophy communism carries with it the seeds of its own destruction. We must see to it that communism destroys itself, not us.

Address of Hon. O. C. Fisher, of Texas, Before Combined Service Clubs of Uvalde, Tex., on January 22, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered to a joint meeting of the Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Clubs of Uvalde, Tex., on January 22, 1951:

I am most grateful for this privilege, which I very highly esteem, of coming to Uvalde today and speaking to this large audience of Uvalde County citizens assembled here on this occasion. The generous introduction by my good friend, Jack Richardson—with whom I attended high school up at Junction a good many years ago—is likewise appreciated.

Now while the Congress is marking time, legislatively speaking, while committees are conducting hearings on bills, it's easier to get away for a few days than it is later in the session when weekly agendas are crowded with important measures.

It's a good thing for Members of Congress to get home as often as possible, talk and counsel with the people and draw upon the composite wisdom of those whom they represent. That is an essential part of the workings of a democracy under our representative system. Personally, I get a measure of inspiration just from seeing the parade of Stetson hats on the street corners and in the lobbies and in the market places. Somehow they typify the independence and sturdiness of the West, and I am inspired by listening to the clamp, clamp, clamp of boot heels on the sidewalks. Uvalde is a typical cross section of the great Southwest where men believe in the fundamentals of Americanism and know that two and two still make four.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

It was suggested that I talk to you today about some of the problems with which we are faced during these times—times which are probably more dangerous and perilous than any in our history. Actually I doubt that I can add much to your stock of information, though I welcome the honor and privilege of discussing some of the issues of the day in which you and I are interested and which now engage so much of our time and energies.

Only a few days ago the President sent his annual budget message to the Congress. It calls for an unprecedented peacetime expenditure of $71,600,000,000. A major portion of this will go for national defense, a program with which I am sure we are all in complete sympathy. Last year the Congress appropriated and authorized commitments of upwards of $50,000,000,000 for the stepped-up preparedness program. It takes a lot of money to train, equip, and maintain a modern American army, for example, it costs about $10,000 to recruit, train, equip, supply, and maintain one American soldier. That includes the armament and equipment for a fighting army. One B–36 requires more than a tank car of gasoline and 10,000 pounds of lubricating oil on a trip to Europe. A modern tank consumes a gallon of gasoline for each 2 miles it travels. This, of course, means more taxes, more sacrifices, more inconveniences on the part of all the people. It is of utmost importance that we balance the budget as nearly as possible. A balanced Federal budget is perhaps the strongest single deterrent to inflation. But I was disappointed in a number of the items recommended by the President in his budget message. For example, he recommended funds to finance such dubious programs as the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, nationalized housing, FEPC, and several others that are both nonessential and undesirable. It seems to me that if we are to have a strong America we must maintain a sound economy. That means we must cut nonessential expenditures to the bone and make an honest effort to pay our way during this emergency.

OUR INTEREST IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Now, let's consider the global situation for a moment and see where and how our interests and our security may be imperiled. There's some talk going around these days by those who say: "Let's get out of Korea, Asia, Europe, build our own defenses, and not spend taxpayer's money, the lives of our young men, and our Nation's resources involving ourselves in other people's affairs." If that is a valid argument, then it should be followed. If it is not valid, its weakness and its danger should be exposed. Certainly if it is valid it would greatly simplify the solution of most of our problems.

In order to intelligently answer the question thus raised, we must take stock of ourselves and the relationship of our economy, our strength, and our security to the rest of the free world. Let's first look at southeast Asia. Why are we interested in that vast area? Most of the countries of southeastern Asia are now under considerable Communist pressure. They face dire trouble, just as South Korea did. Most of the experts seem to be agreed that had it not been for the unexpected difficulties encountered by the Communists in South Korea, Red Chinese armies would long ago have marched into Indochina. It was marked for conquest last fall, but the timetable was upset in Korea. If Indochina should fall, then Malaya, Burma, Thailand, and Indonesia would likely be doomed, and Ceylon and possibly India would be in line for a like fate.

But, so what? What difference does that make to us so far as our own independence and our own security are concerned? After all, we live 6,000 or 8,000 miles away from Indochina and the rest of southeast Asia. Well, as a matter of fact it makes a lot of difference, and here are a few of the reasons:

INDIA: OUR MAIN SOURCE FOR MANGANESE

Did you ever stop to realize that the "rice bowl" of the world is in Thailand and Burma? India has been importing up to 750,000 tons of rice per year from those two countries to help feed her teeming millions who at best have but a submarginal existence. If Thailand and Burma are occupied by Mao Tse-tung and his Kremlin-directed Red armies, that source of food for India would be promptly diverted to meet a pressing need for more food for the Asian armies. Unrest, disease, civil strife, poverty, and internal weakness in India would undoubtedly result to some extent, and the Indians would surely pay through the nose for all imports thereafter obtained from southeast Asia. A most fertile field for Communist activity would thus be opened.

But, again, how does that directly affect us? According to Government statistics that have been released, we imported 552,000 tons of manganese from India last year. Steel cannot be manufactured without a mixture of manganese. In the past we got most of our manganese from Russia, but most of that has been cut off and now we must look primarily to India for our supply. Here at home we produce very little at present. It is a highly critical and strategic material that we have always had to import from faraway places. Without manganese we naturally would become a weaker nation, industrially. Our entire economy is geared to a vast steel production. So, it is to our interest that our Indian market be kept open and that it not be jeopardized by or fall into the hands of the Communists.

Another highly critical material of which we produce very little at present is tungsten. In the past we have looked to China for much of our supply, and Indochina is now an important source.

MOST OF OUR TIN AND RUBBER COMES FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA

Among other strategic materials which we must obtain from southeast Asia are tin and rubber. We import more than half of our tin from that area alone. Our tin consumption runs around 60,000 tons a year, and Bolivia—our next source of supply—produces a little more than 30,000 tons annually. We produce none in the United States.

Of even more importance to us is raw rubber. Did you realize that we import 95 percent of our natural rubber from Malaya, Indonesia, Indochina, Ceylon, and Thailand? Those countries produced more than a million and a half tons in 1950, and we imported 700,000 tons of it—95 percent of all we brought in. Indeed, those countries produce 90 percent of the world's supply.

To be sure, we have made great strides in developing synthetic rubber. But while synthetic rubber is good enough for your automobile tires, bomber and heavy-duty tires must have a sizeable content of natural rubber. Otherwise they will not stand up. Since we have but a limited stockpile, we must continue to look to southeast Asia for

this vital material if we are to maintain the strength of a great air force and keep the big trucks and mobile units moving.

It must be kept in mind, of course, that if we lose these sources of strategic materials we naturally become a little weaker as a result and the Communists, who would take over and exploit these same materials, would likewise become a little stronger. Along with the added raw materials, the Reds would at the same time become slaveholders over multiplied millions of additional people.

OUR INTEREST IN WESTERN EUROPE

Now, let's take a look at Western Europe. Why should we interest ourselves so much in that part of the world? Already we have spent billions over there, helping revive the war-devastated economies of Western Europe. Our help undoubtedly saved Greece from being behind the iron curtain today. And the same is probably true of Turkey and other countries as well. But why should we continue to spend taxpayers' hard-earned money to help re-arm those people? Why should we risk the spilling of American blood there? Suppose Soviet Russia should choose to occupy Western Europe, how would that affect our own security?

Actually, as I see it, it's not so much a matter of what we would lose—though that would be of enormous proportions—as it would be what the enemy would gain. Let's talk about steel for a moment. We produce, roughly, 100,000,000 tons of steel per year. Russia and all her satellites produce only a third of that amount. Western Europe (not counting Britain) has an annual steel capacity of 40,000,000 tons, and Britain produces about 18,000,000. So as it now stands, the United States and the other free countries produce 160,000,000 tons of steel a year compared with about 34,000,000 tons put out behind the iron curtain. But if Western Europe is taken by Russia, the Red's steel output would be immediately more than doubled. If Britain should also go down, then the steel potential under Communist domination would be about equal to our own. It must be kept in mind that Russia diverts a much higher percentage of her steel to military purposes than we do.

IF WESTERN EUROPE FALLS, WE MAY LOSE OUR SOURCE OF URANIUM FOR A-BOMBS

Moreover, we import many strategic raw materials from Europe and Africa. Indeed, from the Belgium Congo we get most of our highly critical uranium from which atom bombs are made. If Western Europe is occupied by the Russian hordes, they will then have submarine bases up and down the Atlantic coast, and to say the least our source of supply of uranium from Africa would be curtailed or possibly be cut off entirely. Our loss might be Russia's gain.

IF WESTERN EUROPE FALLS, STALIN MIGHT GET MIDDLE EAST OIL

Furthermore, the loss of Western Europe would probably mean the loss of the Near East, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East. Right now Stalin is suffering from a serious lack of steel production and of oil. It is estimated that Russia and the satellites produce no more than 320,000,000 barrels of oil per year. That represents only about 6 percent of the world's reserves. The Middle East has 42 percent of those reserves. By combining the two, Stalin would control one-half of the world's oil reserves. So our loss and the loss to our allies could conceivably become gains for our enemy.

I have been indulging in assumptions. It goes without saying that should the Kremlin provoke another global war, any military successes she might achieve would be at great expense and heavy loss. But since it is generally conceded that as of this time Western Europe is vulnerable and most of it could be occupied by the superior forces of Russia, we may very well appraise the possible effects upon our own security if a formidable defense for Western Europe is not provided before the Reds should decide to strike.

Along with these strategic and material advantages which would accrue to the benefit of the Communists, if they choose to occupy most of Western Europe and plunge the world into another world war, Stalin would at the same time gain control and domination over some 260,000,000 people, with their combined industrial and scientific capacity and know-how. He seems to have the capacity for making use of people even though they are in chains.

CONTROL OF UNITED STATES IS PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Now, as I see it, all these considerations achieve their real importance only when we recognize the fact that the control of the United States of America is undoubtedly the ultimate objective of Soviet Russia. In fact, since the time of Lenin, the Communists have openly affirmed that world domination is their final objective. They make no bones about it. Lenin said—and Stalin has reiterated—that communism and capitalism cannot live in peace side by side in this world, and they have sworn by violence and otherwise to destroy their opposition. Who is holding them up and preventing the realization of that plan today? It is, of course, the United States. Other free countries, weakened by war, could provide only feeble resistance without joint efforts and in conjunction with America. In a real sense, then, we constitute the only really formidable road block in the way.

SOVIETS CONCENTRATE THEIR PROPAGANDA AGAINST US—THEIR NO. 1 OBJECTIVE

This past fall I traveled in Europe, from the Baltic to the Caspian Sea—along the periphery of the iron curtain from Norway to Persia. Everywhere I found that a major part of all Russian propaganda, beamed over radios and in the Communist press, was directed at the United States. Every kind of fantastic lies—distorted half-truths—that could be conceived of were being manufactured and used against that "capitalistic, Wall Street-dominated, warmongering country called the United States."

Since we are beyond doubt the No. 1 stumbling block in the way of the Soviet determination to dominate the world, it is important that we keep in mind the enemy's strength and methods. We are told that the Russians now have 4,500,000 men under arms, with a trained reserve of some 14,000,000 who can be called up at 60 days' notice. They have more than 20,000 operational airplanes, including modern jets, and they have some 30,000 tanks. Moreover, since 1945 they have added 7,500,000 square miles of new territory and more than 500,000,000 people under their control. This Soviet expansion has wiped out Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and has reduced to servitude six nations that were independent before 1939.

The tentacles of the Soviet octopus now cover one half of Europe. All this has been accomplished without the loss of a single Russian soldier.

WE MUST LOOK TO FUTURE—PAST ERRORS WON'T HELP NOW

Now, recognizing our danger and our interests as they exist around the world, what can we do about it? We certainly cannot extricate ourselves from this peril by spending our time condemning the mistakes of the past, of which there have been many. If we wanted to take the time it would be easy to go back to Yalta and wonder why Russia was permitted to enter the Japanese war at its very end and yet, though scarcely firing a shot, being permitted to occupy Manchuria—the most hightly industrialized area in the whole of Asia. We can disagree with Secretary of State Atcheson's ill-considered action in announcing more than a year ago that our outer defenses in the Pacific did not include Formosa and South Korea. That amounted to an invitation to the Reds to move in. Yes, how tragic was the mistakes of concessions made in the occupation of Germany, isolating Berlin 120 miles inside the iron curtain. The same could be said of Vienna in Austria. Diplomatic blunders in the handling of the Chinese problem and elsewhere could be multiplied and explored at length.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

But we must be realistic and look to the future. What can we do?

1. We can step up our rearmament program, actually build, man and equip a hundred air groups, a strong army, and a powerful navy.

2. We can follow the leadership of General Eisenhower in cooperating with other free nations and build a really formidable international army in Western Europe. We, of course, cannot police the world alone. We can lose the war of exhaustion, as indeed Stalin is hoping we will. There is just so much we can do and remain sound and solvent. Western Europe can be successfully defended only if the European countries put their shoulders to the wheel, including providing a major portion of the needed manpower and by making full use of their industrial capacity. It will be recalled that in both of the last wars these Atlantic Pact nations were able to put in the field in 90 days 140 equipped and trained divisions, aside from naval and air forces. We are in a position to contribute much to the success of this collective security movement in the way of guns and military equipment, as indeed we already have done and shall continue to do if the Europeans show their willingness and determination to rearm in strength.

3. We can encourage, as our Government and that of Great Britain have already done, the rearming of some of the Germans in the western zone. Such troops can be integrated with the Atlantic Pact army and steps can be taken against any possible resurgence of Prussian militarism. This, of course, can only be done if the Germans themselves put their hearts into it and show an honest willingness to assist in the defense of the non-Communist countries of Europe, including their own. This program has the support of General Eisenhower, of the American Legion, and of Winston Churchill. The latter told Parliament only a month ago that Western Europe cannot be successfully defended without drawing upon the military strength of Germany.

4. We can likewise encourage, under proper supervision, the rearming of Japan on a scale that would protect that country from Communist aggression and also help to stabilize the balance of power in the Orient. General MacArthur has advocated it.

5. We can help and encourage France in Spain and Tito in Yugoslavia. Both of them advocate philosophies and engage in conduct contrary to our beliefs. But both of them are announced enemies of Russian communism and Russian imperialism. Both have large armies, and their soldiers have proven to be good fighters. I do not see why we should be too particular who our friends are so long as they are on our side and are enemies of Russian aggression. After all, we had Joe Stalin himself as one of our allies during the recent war. Survival itself may be involved and we can't be too particular about who is helping carry the water to put the fire out. We must, it seems to me, draw upon all available sources of manpower and resources in our cooperative and mutual effort to stem the tide of world communism and stay the hand of Russian thrusts at freedom and independence. Communism itself, with its world-dominating ambitions, must be destroyed or reduced to impotence if we are to ever again have peace on this earth. Otherwise these forces wil be a continuous menace to freemen.

6. We can, as we are doing, refuse to ship goods and commodities to our enemy, Red

China. Likewise, our Government some time ago put an embargo on shipment of strategic materials to Soviet Russia—our real enemy in Korea. An economic blockade of China by our Navy would be fully justified in view of the unprovoked war the Red Chinese have been making upon American boys in Korea. The Korean conflict, it must be kept in mind, is but one incident in the world-conquering strategy of Soviet Russia. The failure of Britain to fully go along with this trade-restriction program as applied to those now making war on us and on free peoples everywhere has been most disappointing.

7. Moreover, we can encourage Chiang Kai-shek and provide him with planes, guns, tanks, and military equipment. He has a half-million trained troops under his command in Formosa—a veritable unsinkable carrier, as General MacArthur has described it. With the help of hundreds of thousands of anti-Communist guerrillas now in China, the Chinese Nationalists operating from Formosa are in a position to seriously damage and harass the Red communcation lines and factories in China and Manchuria.

OUR STRENGTH AND ADVANTAGES

I have talked of the advantages enjoyed by Soviet Russia, and I have described her military strength. Before I conclude perhaps we should refer to some of our own advantages of which there are many. During World War I and World War II, the United States was the arsenal of democracy. Militarily, our industrial capacity has been our greatest asset, not discounting the brilliance and sacrifices of the millions of Americans who have distinguished themselves in battle. But men cannot fight without equipment to fight with.

During the last war we outproduced all the rest of the world combined and furnished most of the arms for our beleaguered and war-lashed allies. That great industrial capacity has been made possible by the use of our own raw materials coupled with the importations of many strategic materials. From this we were able to build a hundred thousand airplanes a year, quantities of tanks, bombs, trucks, and other military equipment. Those materials, put to use by American ingenuity and free labor under our free-enterprise system, have made of us an industrial giant. We can, therefore, say that industrially we are far superior to Soviet Russia, whose potential compared to our own is quite backward.

2. We have the atom bomb in considerable quantity, whereas the Russians have it in but limited supply at this time.

3. We have 10 times as much oil as does Stalin.

4. We have three times as much steel capacity.

5. We have some 200 B-36's and a like number of B-50's—all of which are capable of reaching every industrial city in Russia, and we have naval bombers that can do the same from carriers.

6. We have them outclassed in our great communication systems, including telephones, telegraph, railroads, highways, commercial airways and all other modern methods.

7. We have the psychological advantage of the declining favor of communism in free countries.

8. We have the benefit of the moral support of world opinion, and we are alined on the side of Christianity and enlightened civilization. History may record that these factors in the final analysis are decisive.

9. And, finally, we have the invincible faith and determination of the American people who through prayer and united effort can undertake to provide the leadership and rally the forces of right, decency, and justice all around the world, where free people can be reached, against the hideous hand of godless communism, slavery, and oppression.

The Need To Equalize Comparative Pay Levels in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that face us in Congress is the growing differential in pay scale between classified and nonclassified civil-service workers. Because I know that Members of Congress are anxious to do the fair thing and because many of them do not have the facts available, I wish to point out some of the inequities that now exist in the Federal pay scale.

The wage adjustment of January 1, 1951, granted to the nonclassified blue-collar workers of the San Diego area employed by the Navy has caused a marked wage differential between this group and the classified, or white-collar workers, who have to meet the same increase in living costs.

The tabulation which follows is based on the official pay schedules effective November 19, 1940, and those in effect as of January 8, 1951. This widespread differential in favor of the nonclassified group has been a progressive increase with each wage adjustment granted since 1940. In watching its effect on the caliber of employee initially recruited over the past 10 years, it is clearly indicated that there has been a gradual decline in the desire of young people to make a career of Government clerical and administrative work as compared with the blue-collar worker of today and of the previous 20 years of observation.

Without corrective action, this condition will become even more apparent in the higher grade levels in future years. Even with prompt recognition of these facts and with action taken to effect correction to induce the best personnel to enter Government work, it will take some years to bring about the required change for the better.

I, therefore, recommend that the Federal pay raise legislation now before Congress be amended to more adequately equalize the comparative pay levels between the various graded and ungraded workers and supervisory groups to the standards of 1940.

Comparative pay table, classified and nonclassified civil-service employees, naval activities, San Diego area

	Pay rates Nov. 19, 1940		Pay rates, Jan. 8, 1951		Increase	Percentage	Percent required to equalize classified with nonclassified
	Minimum	Third increment	Minimum	Third increment			
GS-2	$1,440.00		$2,450.00		$1,010.00	70.17	49.83
Laborer	.60		1.26		.66	110.00	
	1,248.00		2,630.00		1,382.00		
GS-2		$1,560.00		$2,610.00	1,050.00	67.3	21.5
Laborer		.72		1.36	.64	88.8	
		1,497.00		2,828.00	1,331.00		
GS-4	1,800.00		2,875.00		1,075.00	59.7	57.4
Helper	.64		1.39		.75	117.1	
	1,331.00		2,891.00		1,560.00		
GS-4		1,920.00		3,035.00	1,115.00	58.0	40.7
Helper		.76		1.51	.75	98.7	
		1,580.00		3,140.00	1,560.00		
GS-6	2,300.00		3,450.00		1,150.00	50.0	32.87
Machinist	.99		1.81		.82	82.87	
	2,059.00		3,764.00		1,705.00		
GS-6		2,500.00		3,700.00	1,200.00	48.0	29.5
Machinist		1.11		1.97	.86	77.5	
		2,308.00		4,097.00	1,789.00		
GS-8	2,900.00		4,200.00		1,300.00	44.8	20.4
Quartermaster machinist	1.55		2.56		1.01	65.2	
	3,224.00		5,324.00		2,100.00		
GS-8		3,100.00		4,450.00	1,350.00	43.5	28.1
Quartermaster machinist		1.55		2.66	1.11	71.6	
		3,224.00		5,532.00	2,308.00		
P-5	4,600.00		6,400.00		1,800.00	39.1	83.1
GS-12							
Foreman	10.80		24.60		13.20	122.2	
	2,808.00		6,245.00		3,437.00		
P-5		5,000.00		6,800.00	1,800.00	36.0	48.4
GS-12							
Foreman		14.40		20.56	12.16	84.4	
		3,744.00		6,905.00	3,161.00		

An Army With Control of the Air Is Almost Indestructible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks on Wednesday last, I pointed out to the House the wonderful work being done by the assistant to the President in the Sunday afternoon telecast, Battle Report, Washington. This is the television program on which Dr. Steelman, each week, arranges to have top-flight Government officials make reports on current happenings of factual import to all our people.

Among those whom Dr. Steelman introduced to the television audience that afternoon was Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, of the United States Air Force.

In commenting upon Air Force activities in Korea, Mr. Robert McCormick,

National Broadcasting Co.'s ace commentator on that program, spoke, in part, as follows:

Soviet-designed planes used by the enemy appeared for the first time to attack below the thirty-eighth parallel. But well has our Air Force reason to be confident. Russian MIG-15's, in actual battle, have proved no match for United States Air Force F-86 Sabres, capable of 700 miles per hour. Our Fourth Fighter Intercepter Group has already been credited definitely or probably with bringing down 17 Russian jets with no loss to ourselves. For an up-to-the-minute report on how our jets are doing in Korea, we turn now to an officer just returned from there, rated as command pilot, combat observer, aircraft observer, and technical observer, from Air Force headquarters, Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of the Members of both Houses of Congress know Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White personally. They know him as an intrepid commander, a splendid gentleman, and a distinguished officer. Until quite recently he served as Director of the Directorate of Legislation and Liaison, USAF, and in that capacity won the respect and the esteem not alone of all members of the Armed Services Committees in both Houses of Congress, but of all with whom he came in contact.

General White, a flying officer, deputy commander of the Thirteenth Air Force, and later commander of the Seventh Air Force in the South Pacific, is no stranger to the situation in Korea. It was because of his knowledge of battle tactics that he was selected by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff as principal military adviser to Dr. Robert L. Stearnes, president of the University of Colorado, who, recently, together with the general, conducted an evaluation and study of operations at the Korean battlefront itself.

Mr. Speaker, one of my business acquaintances in New York City who read the extension of my remarks in the RECORD of February 7, sent me a clipping of a news article written by Gill Robb Wilson, World War I pilot, nationally recognized top-flight authority on military aviation, and now aeronautics editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, we in this House have heard much pro and con about the use of modern jet planes in the tactical support of ground troops in Korea. My friend pointed out how completely the statement made by Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, in his talk on the "Battle Report—Washington" program, was corroborated by Gill Robb Wilson in his splendid article entitled "Air Power Decisive in Halting Chinese." Mr. Wilson declared: "The total adds up to the thesis that an army with controlling authority is almost indestructible." Further along in his article he pointed out that interrogation of enemy prisoners in Korea was a little surprising. "The consensus of prisoner testimony," he said, "is that aircraft machine-gun fire, napalm, and fragmentation bombs are the things most feared by the Chinese, and they are feared in that order."

It is because of the splendid achievements of our Air Forces and the wonderful support which they have afforded to all ground troops in Korea that I am including herein, and as part of my remarks, the short talk by Maj. Gen. Thomas D. White, as well as the article written by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson.

The talk by Major General White was as follows:

During the past week, there has been a marked increase in Communist air activity in Korea. More and more enemy jet aircraft of modern design have come over from their sanctuary bases in Manchuria to challenge our control of the air over North Korea. So far, they have not penetrated very far south, but their penetrations are getting deeper and deeper, and the quantity of aircraft committed is growing larger.

There are three very significant facts about these air battles now going on.

Of course, the first and most important fact is that we are winning them. Our pilots report, however, that these enemy jets are very good, high-performance airplanes, and that enemy jet pilots are well trained. The lesson here is that we must spare no effort to continue improving our jet fighters.

The second significant fact about these air battles is that many people are being reminded of something they have been prone to forget up to now, and that is, the first and overriding responsibility of the air commander is to destroy the enemy air forces and protect our ground forces against attack by enemy aircraft. During the early days of the war in Korea, the North Korean air force was small and inferior, but if it had been allowed to operate unrestricted, it could have given our ground forces plenty of trouble. However, it was quickly disposed of, and to this very day practically no United Nations soldier in Korea has ever seen any but United Nations airplanes overhead. This very absence of effective enemy air opposition has caused many people to become preoccupied with the other missions of the tactical Air Force, particularly with the close support mission. These air battles you are now reading about underscore the threat which General Partridge, commander of the Fifth Air Force in Korea, has always had to be prepared to meet—this in addition to his difficult job of isolating the battlefield and closely supporting our ground forces.

The third significant fact about this commitment of the Communists jet air force is the likelihood that the Communists are trying to find some way to lessen the effect of our air attacks on enemy ground forces. General Stratemeyer's far west air forces are continuing to hammer the enemy on the ground, day and night, every day, as they have since the first day the Air Force was committed to combat in Korea. This sustained air attack has taken a heavy toll of the enemy, and doubtless this is one of the main reasons why the Communists are now committing their jet aircraft.

In summary, General Stratemeyer now has a real air battle on his hands, as well as the job of other tactical support to our ground forces. It is gratifying to see that his airmen are handling the air battle with the same high degree of effectiveness that they have been performing the interdiction, close-support reconnaissance, transport and evacuation missions that are also included in full-scale tactical air support.

The article written by Mr. Gill Robb Wilson was as follows:

THE AIR WORLD

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

AIR POWER DECISIVE IN HALTING CHINESE

While the Chinese armies were sweeping over the vastly outnumbered United Nations forces and both the Tenth Corps and the Eighth Army appeared in jeopardy of capture or annihilation, the writer made the statement that an army with control of the air is almost indestructible.

In the face of the situation at the time, the statement appeared to be contrary to the evidence. However, subsequent development in Korea supported the writer's thesis.

Communist advances by night were stalemated when C-47 transports, each loaded with 150 illuminating flares, patrolled the Communist supply lines and enabled B-26 tactical bombers to strafe convoys and troops on the roads. This was the first time in aviation combat history that such an operation had been attempted but it proved extremely effective and brought the advancing Red armies under round-the-clock air attack.

Where United Nations troops were outflanked and surrounded time after time, C-119 combat transports parachuted ammunition and food to the beleaguered forces, which were thus enabled to maintain themselves against overwhelming numbers.

As a result of the air attacks, the veteran combat-tested Chinese divisions, despite their fanatical disregard for losses, were gradually brought to a stalemate and the offensive again was gained by our ground forces.

Air Force estimates of casualties inflicted on the Communists during the Korean campaign total almost 100,000, half of which occurred from November 21 to the end of the year and practically all of which were against front-line troops.

There has been much conjecture as to why Chinese armies ceased to follow the retiring United Nations armies. Some theorists attributed it to political reasons. Others called the Red retirement a trap. And now it is being asked if it could be possible that United States air power was decisive in stopping the Red Chinese armies.

It seems well to let the facts speak for themselves. What army in history was able to advance with its supply lines constantly shredded and its first-line troops suffering casualties of such proportion?

Air power alone did not stop the overwhelming Chinese armies, but air power imposed a large proportion of casualties on those created by heroic army and navy forces, winter weather and disease, and it supported the resistance capabilities of the surface forces. The total adds up to the thesis that "an army with control of the air is almost indestructible."

Interrogation of enemy prisoners in Korea is a little surprising. The consensus of prisoner testimony is that aircraft machine-gun fire, napalm and fragmentation bombs are feared in that order.

While it is true that a fighter plane carries 1,600 rounds of .50-caliber ammunition firing from six guns, it is news that casualties by machine-gun strafing exceed those of the terrible fire bombs and fragmentation projectiles. Naturally machine-gun fire can be aimed more accurately but the napalm and fragmentation bombs, covering a wider area, were generally supposed to inflict greater damage.

No theater of air operation ever has witnessed more ingenuity in the employment of tactical force than Korea. However, it must never be forgotten that air power in Korea, even at its best, has fought a war with one hand tied behind its back.

The genius of military air power is its ability to smash sources of supply and manufacture, rather than merely to aid ground forces. When Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, commander of the Far East Bomber Command, returned from Korea, he made clear in his statement that Korea was a frustrating field for air power because, for political reasons, it could only be utilized in an auxiliary capacity.

The Strength of the Democratic Party

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative EMANUEL CELLER at the New York State Democratic dinner honoring Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN which was held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on Tuesday evening, February 6:

I consider it one of the greatest privileges ever accorded me to be given this opportunity to say sincerely and directly what I feel about my friend and my colleague, HERBERT LEHMAN. I know I do not speak for myself alone; I know I express the affection and esteem in which Senator LEHMAN is held by all my colleagues in the House, who grace this dais.

The central core of the Senator from New York is integrity. On that his friends and even his political opponents agree. It is the rarest quality of man. It is this quality, so easily recognized and so eagerly applauded, which has carried the Senator from post to post of highest distinction. Let me point out here that in 1928 when Herbert was elected to the post of Lieutenant Governor in the State of New York, he received a plurality of 14,000 votes. Two years later he was reelected with a plurality of 565,000 votes. From 1932 to 1942 he served as Governor of the Empire State, and the peoples of the State with its millions of population bestowed upon him the respect, admiration, and affection that cannot be rivaled by any man now in public life in the State of New York.

In marked tribute to their former Governor, to the Director of UNRRA, to his humanitarianism, to the strength of his mind and heart, the people of the State of New York sent him to the Senate despite the fact that fortune had smiled upon the opposition party in other election contests.

HERBERT LEHMAN is a vote-getter, the politicos say. Certainly. But why? Not by reason of a shallow glamor. Not by reason of high-powered public-relation counsels. Not by reason of political bargaining, but by reason of his integrity. The country and the State and the party owe much to Senator LEHMAN, and we acknowledge our debt proudly.

Thinking about Senator LEHMAN, I found myself thinking about the Democratic Party as a whole. I determined then to speak out about some of the aspects, some of the behavior patterns, which seem to be developing within the party itself. I reviewed the last election returns and I came to the following conclusions: (1) We have not taken sufficient pride in both the tradition and the work of the Democratic Party; (2) the strength of the Democratic Party lies in its proclamation of principles—the Democratic platform of 1948—and in their fulfillment; (3) the election returns of 1950 have been misinterpreted as a loss in Democratic strength.

Let me quote from the Democratic Party platform of 1948: "Ours is the party which rebuilt a shattered economy, rescued our banking system, revived our agriculture, reinvigorated our industry, gave labor strength and security, and led the American people to the broadest prosperity in our history."

We have been the party in power since 1933, with a 2-year interval of congressional Republican domination. We remained in office and were returned to office on the strength of our fulfillment of the belief (and I quote again from the Democratic platform of 1948) "that democracy—when dedicated to the service of all and not to a privileged few—proves its superiority over all other forms of government" and further "to provide leadership in the world toward a realization of the 'four freedoms.'"

These are the principles to which Senator LEHMAN adhered until his name has become synonmous with these principles. The election of Senator LEHMAN to the Senate proves conclusively where the strength of the Democratic Party lies, both in the integrity of its principles and the integrity of the men who adhere to them.

Senator LEHMAN never forgot that upon our adherence to the New Deal of President Roosevelt and the Fair Deal of President Truman depends the allegiance of the people to the Democratic Party, then we are denying the ultimate source of our strength. If we do not adhere to the principles originally enunciated and summed up in the word "liberalism," we are erasing that vivid line of distinction between two political parties and making it a matter of indifference to the voter of which party occupies which seat.

The issues are clearly drawn—prosperity for the many as against privileges for the few; competitive free enterprise as against monopoly; social and political equity of opportunity as against social irresponsibility; civil liberties as against individual repression. The Democratic Party has a proud record—a record which again and again and again was placed before the public and approved When the people tried republicanism for 2 years, they quickly repudiated the change and turned once more to the Democratic Party. With enthusiasm, vision, imagination, the courage to experiment, the Democratic Party stirred the peoples' pulses and gave them an interest in government which had lain dormant in the earlier years of Republican control.

I maintain, moreover, that the 1950 election returns was not an indication that the Democratic Party with its principles of liberalisms has been repudiated by the people. As Mr. Bean puts it, 1950, the Democratic uptrend continues. There has been no repudiation of New Deal's and Fair Deal's social and economic policies. In all midterm elections, a normal loss of 25 to 30 seats of the party in power is expected. In 1950 the Democrats actually lost 28 seats in the House.

I repeat, this was no more than was to be expected. Let it be noted, in fact, that while the party in power lost a net of 71 seats in 1948, 45 in 1942, and 55 in 1946, in 1950 it lost only 28. In the midterm elections of 1938, 1942, and 1946, the number of Democratic seats went down from 332 in 1932 to 188 in 1946.

It still holds true that the larger the vote, the more Democratic votes are cast. While there was a turn-out of approximately 41,000,000, a larger turn-out than in previous mid-term elections, the fact still remains that in view of population increases, there was still a definite lack in the number of votes cast.

Again, let me note that between 1944 and 1948 the number of Democrats increased from 242 to 262 and that between 1946 and 1950 it increased from 188 to 234. Here are two 4-year spans, evidencing the upward trend of the Democratic Party continues.

In the Senate careful analysis proves the same thing. Normally in an off-year election, the party out of power picks up four or five seats. The Senate in the 1950 election gained five. Here again we find that the number of Democrats staying home in industrial areas played a large part and that the turnout in the midyear election continues with the national apathy which we must strive to overcome.

Last night the Republicans had a box supper shindig in Washington. There was much hysterical screeching against us, carping, nagging criticisms without the slightest shred of responsibility. These past masters of fiddle-faddle have a 20/20 vision in their hindsight. They are the usual Monday morning quarterbacks. They were madder than the hind feathers of a hen in a high wind. Well, let's keep 'em mad—by sticking to our principles, and we'll box them in again, with Truman in 1952, as we did 'n 1948.

The source of the strength of the Democratic Party, I cannot emphasize sufficiently, lies in its clear-cut and well-defined adoption of the principles of the New and Fair Deals We must not lower the distinction between our party and the opposition party. We have an identity as a party which the people have embraced. More than that, that identity has gained the country many friends abroad. More than the money we have been able to give or even the food we have sent, this identity as a liberal party of a party whose concern with the people as a whole has been demonstrated by legislation and executive action, has more than any one factor enabled the people of other countries to withstand Communist lies about the United States. This identity is as valuable to us, and I'm speaking of practical politics now, as is the trademark, or a copyright, or a patent granted to a commercial enterprise.

Our tribute tonight to Senator LEHMAN bespeaks plainly our recognition of his strength not only as a personality but as a leader in the Democratic Party. He has set an example to all of us, and we the New York Democratic delegation in the House humbly acknowledge our debt to him.

Speech of Mr. Homer D. Crotty, President, State Bar of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the supporters of a socialistic government in this country are now threatening to carry their totalitarian practices into the legal profession. Many members of the bench and bar throughout America are very much concerned over the attempt to bring about socialized law in this country. The socialization of the legal profession would destroy the very background of our American independence and individual freedom.

I am including in my remarks a recent address before the annual meeting of the Bar Association of San Francisco last month by Mr. Homer D. Crotty, of San Marino, Calif., an outstanding lawyer and president of the State bar of California. In his address Mr. Crotty discusses the threat to the legal profession and to our American way of life. I recommend his remarks to all of the Members of the Congress.

The address follows:

I would like to analyze a few of the tendencies which affect the lives as well as the practices of the lawyer today and which, if

unchecked, may prove disastrous to the profession.

So that we may have a proper perspective, let me make a few comparisons. It was just 50 years ago this month when Queen Victoria died. The age of Victoria has been looked at from various points of view. Some feel it to be a bit comical; others a hopelessly reactionary period; and still others look back at it as the age in which a few people enjoyed a very good life with its attendant magnificence—a high standard which will never be seen again. There was then an air of stability which seems totally lacking in this age of security seekers. It is difficult now to understand why Gladstone, a few years before Victoria died, remarked that he had presided over a revolution. That great liberal, it is admitted, would be utterly bewildered today. The Victorian age represented an ordered society in which most people thoroughly believed. Everywhere there was an increasing prosperity—a confidence in the age and in the future. No feeling of danger in the acceptance of new ideas disturbed anyone. The idea of progress was accepted without question. There was, moreover, profound belief in the value of our western civilization; in its free democratic institutions, its humanitarianism, and its obedience to law. There was no doubt that all was right with the world, and if a few flaws were pointed out by the critics, those were merely squeaks in the machinery which could be oiled and eliminated.

What has happened to this confidence in an ordered society? Today we have seen the most unbelievable progress in the sciences, both pure and applied. The advances in medicine alone would have been considered by the Victorians as fantastic. The rapidity of communication and travel are breathtaking. The advances in the weapons of war have been appalling.

But, now, we talk more about the collapse of civilization than of its continued upward progress. We await with increasing anxiety the advent of chaos. In the interim between Victoria's age and ours have occurred the two most destructive wars in history and their concomitant ills. There have been the most outrageous cruelties inflicted upon human beings since the Middle Ages and before. Tremendous masses of people have been murdered or have been moved from their ancestral homes for no better reason than the whim of a despot or from motives of revenge. Propaganda has developed to the ultimate in mendacity. Our conception of an ordered society has broken down.

In the international field we see all nations preparing for another war (if they are not already engaged), more cataclysmic in its horrors than anything heretofore imagined. There is a profound fear and unrest in the world. The quest for security has never been greater, and to attain it many things will be sacrificed. Sometimes I wonder whether in this quest for security, and in the willingness to make sacrifices to get it, we should not recall that the chained watchdog is the most vociferous guardian of his miserable status.

What I would like to pursue are some of the ideas which were held by an insignificant minority in the Victorian era and which today are so pervasive and so strong. The effect of these ideas upon the legal profession has been profound. These ideas, I submit, have had more than a little to do with the breakdown of an ordered society. Regardless of whether or not we are at war, these ideas have exercised their corroding influences. As we go into this coming difficult era, known as the garrison state, let us hope their progress can be arrested.

I will discuss them in the following order:

First. To insure justice for all, the legal profession should be supported and directed by the State.

Second. Private property in land should be abolished.

Third. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax should be imposed.

Fourth. Inheritance should be abolished.

The second, third and fourth of these are taken verbatim from the Communist Manifesto of 1848, and the first from the general philosophy of the Socialists. Moreover, the influence of these four ideas has been worldwide.

The protagonists for these ideas were originally the Socialists. In Europe, before the Hitler regime, they were adopted by the Social Democrats, and later by the Nazis. In England they are the principles of the Labor Party, and in America of the Socialist Party, and I think it will be seen as I go on that a considerable number of Democrats as well as Republicans adhere to some of their offshoots.

First of all, let us examine the first idea—to insure justice for all, the legal profession should be supported and directed by the State. At the outset, all will agree that every person, whether or not he is able to afford a fee, is entitled to the services of a lawyer. The board of governors of the State bar has gone on record to this effect and at its November 1950 meeting has declared that all lawyers should support legal aid and lawyer reference service with time or money or both. The need of the public must be supplied by our profession and not by the state. For the bar to fail its obligations to all, is simply suicidal. If the bar will aid only those who can pay a fee, it must expect the inevitable socialization of the profession, with state support and state direction. We have in theory the view that all the public, wealthy or indigent, is entitled to legal service. In practice it develops that with too few exceptions, only those who can pay are to be served. This attitude recalls the deep irony of Anatole France who said, "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to beg in the streets, to sleep under bridges, and to steal bread."

Because of what has happened to the profession in other lands, there is a far greater awareness of the dangers to the bar in this country than formerly. We have witnessed the liquidation of the organized bar in many countries. Behind the iron curtain, associations of lawyers have disappeared from one end of the area to the other. In serving a client the lawyer in these lands must first consider whether the interest of the state is involved. If it is, the state's need, not his client's is served. Those countries have, additionally, that travesty of justice known as the People's Courts. In Great Britain, along with its other nationalization programs, has come the first step in socializing its bar. This one is particularly seductive, and likely to appeal to our state planners here. The English plan is administered through the law society and the government is the paymaster, in those cases where the fee cannot be found from other sources. There was an overwhelming rush of English lawyers to climb on the gravy train, for, at least, fees were to be guaranteed and paid by the state. How much independence can be expected from a bar which has so willingly accepted the kiss of death? When the more moderate administrators are replaced in England by the more socially-minded, you may be sure the bar will go along with greater and more crushing restrictions, or be made to.

One may say that such could never happen in the United States. My answer is that it could. There are powerful advocates of this very course for us. One can expect that at many legislative sessions this year, throughout the Nation, there will be attempts to institute this socialized law.

The answer of our profession should be immediate and total resistance. But more positively, we should advance vigorously the legal aid and lawyer reference plans which are being sponsored by the State bar. San Francisco has had both for a number of years. By a judicious amount of advertising their usefulness could be expanded considerably. Our State bar is actively engaged in sponsoring this work throughout the State. We have before us the example of New Jersey, where last year these services were instituted in every county of that State.

At least, let our answer to this program of socialism be firm and positive. We should not be swept into the flood like a lot of unresisting corks, to be gathered into an eddy and disposed of at the will of the State. This program of ours must go on, regardless of whether there is a war or whether we live in a garrison state.

The second idea—private property in land should be abolished—at first blush seems to be a very remote prospect in this country, but is it really remote? Let us see how that idea has spread. In those countries in which the views of the Second International predominate, the course is gradual and insidious nationalization. The great industries of transportation and communication are the favorite first targets, then come coal, steel, gas, electricity, banking, and then all means of production and distribution, and finally the retail outlets and the land itself. Where the Bolsheviks gained control, the take-over was drastic and catastrophic. All real property and most forms of personal property were seized by the State, without compensation. The frightful suffering caused by the economic upheaval which followed was considered merely an incident to the liquidation process. Latterly the Soviets permit ownership of personal property and a few forms of real-estate holdings. When it comes to the socialization of property, you can take your choice—the slow and creeping methods of the Socialist International, or the violence of the Red International.

Perhaps we might hear that this widespread seizure never would happen in England, but to answer this, listen to the plans of the Labor Party. In 1948, to mark the centenary of the first publication of the Communist manifesto in 1848, the Labor Party of Great Britain issued a special edition in English of that important cornerstone of both internationals. Among other things cited to show the achievement of certain aims of the manifesto, the Labor Party, in a foreword to the manifesto, stated:

"Abolition of private property in land has long been a demand of the labor movement. A heavy progressive income tax is being enforced by the present Labor Government as a means of achieving social justice. We have gone far towards the abolition of the right of inheritance by our heavy death duties." (Communist Manifesto Socialist Landmark, p. 7, London (1948).)

Not even a notable deficit is a deterrent to nationalization. Witness the British coal industry. Only a few years ago England exported coal. It is true that not all mines then made a profit. But what do we see today—the entire industry operated at a loss and the country importing coal. The end is not yet. We seem to be strangely influenced by our English models. So I suggest that the further drift to socialization be fought at every step. If it is to continue, the legal profession can expect to become employees of the state. Where the state owns the industry, who but government-employed lawyers advise that industry? When there is but one buyer or one seller of a commodity for the entire nation, as in Soviet Russia, it is submitted that the field of commercial practice will be limited.

There may be some comfort to be found in the change of position in some few respects in the Soviet Union with regard to limited ownership of private property. Evidently the Kremlin discovered that with all incentive gone, an equality of misery did not work and that same incentive must be provided. Thus we have the Stakhonovites, who get exceptional rewards for exceptional work. On the other hand, there is Siberia awaiting the sluggard or the disobedient. Capitalism

still provides the incentives, although these are being whittled unmercifully by the income tax. But we do not have any convenient Siberia to which to send the recalcitrants.

The third idea which was absorbed by the democracies from the Communist manifesto with the greatest fervor is the imposition of a heavy, progressive or graduated income tax. The theory behind this point of the manifesto was that through this means social justice would be achieved. Using simple English, this means the elimination of the wealthy and middle class through this brutally effective device. You will note the reference above to the program of the Labor Party in Great Britain, that the heavy, progressive income tax there is being enforced by the labor government as a means of achieving social justice. When our Federal income tax was first adopted in 1913, the maximum rate was 7 percent on the net income. Today the rate in the topmost bracket has gone to 91 percent. In England, with certain refinements—the rate has gone to the point where a total net income, after taxes, is limited to approximately $24,000 in our money. Through the use of a special tax in 1948 it was possible for the government to take more than 100 percent of certain incomes. In this range the rates ran up to 125 percent of the income, and involved naturally the use of certain capital to pay the income tax. In the case of a trust for Lady Mountbatten, an act of Parliament was necessary to permit the trustees to use part of their trust corpus to pay the income tax for that year.

No political party, except perhaps the Communists, has been so frank as has the Labor Government in England to denominate the progressive income tax as a means of eliminating the wealthy and well-to-do, but it can no longer be doubted that these trends are firmly on the march in this country. It can be confidently prophesied, unless the people take a stand, that the same maximum income limitation will be enforced here as in England. Bare-faced confiscation of income would be resented violently, but the achievement of the same purpose by a progressive income tax is deemed eminently respectable and politically desirable. For example, it was calculated under wartime rates that for a person to leave an estate of $100,000, representing 20 years' accumulations, he would have to have annual net earnings, without counting any living expenses, of $32,000 a year. To leave an estate of $1,000,000 representing income accumulations over the same 20-year period, he would have to have a net income of $1,075,000 per annum, and spend nothing that is not deductible. The result of this progressive income tax has made it almost impossible for lawyers any longer to leave much of an estate, except possibly through the medium of life insurance. The same thing is true of their clients, who will face the same difficulty of accumulation through income. Capital gains appear to be the only way out. Corporate earnings have not been treated so ruthlessly, on the theory that the goose which lays the golden egg should not be crippled. Here again I feel that a very important incentive in American life is being eliminated by following this doctrine of the Communist manifesto, and a firm stand should be taken against further increases in income taxes.

It is true that great sacrifices are demanded and should be cheerfully given for our country at war, but it is submitted that the burden of these sacrifices should not rest unduly on either the wealthy or the middle classes. A retail sales tax would produce far more income than the income tax. Canada has a retail sales tax of 8 percent. Mr. Peter Drucker has suggested a consumption tax of 20 percent. It has been stated recently that if all incomes in excess of $100,000 were taxed 100 percent, the amount raised would be not more than $900,000,000. On the other hand, if all incomes of over $25,000 were taxed 100 percent, the tax would raise approximately $5,500,000,000—perhaps only a down payment on our war program. If Congress really wants to control inflation it can be done by taxation but not solely by taxation on incomes. The elimination of incentives because of the tax rate should have important adverse effects on American life.

The fourth idea, that inheritance should be abolished, was put into effect in Soviet Russia soon after the Bolsheviks seized power. Elsewhere in the world, it has taken the more socially acceptable form of inheritance taxes. Let us examine this point in detail. Were it to be advocated that in the United States or in California that all inheritance of property should be abolished, the outcry against such a doctrine would be earsplitting. Yet when a procedure to accomplish essentially the same purpose is dressed up in the form of inheritance taxation there is almost universal acceptance of the principle and practically no sound of protest. Perhaps it seems pleasant that this route of expropriation is reserved for the wealthy. There are, after all, only a few who are wealthy.

The tax is introduced at a nominal rate. In 1916 the top Federal rate was 10 percent. Time after time the rates have been advanced, and now the effect is felt not only by the wealthy but by the middle classes as well. Today the top bracket has 77 percent carved from it (exclusive of credits). Nearly everyone expects the advances to continue.

The amount of taxes raised by the estate and inheritance taxes is not large. Indeed, the whole amount produced by the Federal estate tax, it has been estimated, is about the same as the amount disbursed for the potato growers subsidy (172 Commercial and Financial Chronicle, No. 4968, Mayo Adams Shattuck, pp. 1, 34 ff.). In California, in 1948, the total death and gift tax collections were slightly over $20,000,000, altogether clear that the purpose of inheritance, estate, and gift taxes is principally social reform, and only incidentally, revenue raising. Our people have decided apparently to eliminate the man of wealth. There are still quite a few wealthy dinosaurs above ground, whose demise the tax gatherers eagerly await.

There is for all practical purposes no retreat in this march, for the people appear convinced of its righteousness. But the question remains, not whether substantial estates are to be all but confiscated, but whether the social reformers, regardless of party, are to extend their activities to eliminate the middle class. Should not the line be held at not greater than the rates provided in the present laws? If not, then please ask yourselves, how far will our law makers go? Will they carry out the mandate of the Communist manifesto, that inheritance shall be abolished by the more acceptable but equally effective method of taxation? If it is abolished, may we not assume that probate of estates will be a truly ministerial function, to be handled solely by the tax bureaus?

It is interesting to note that the realists in the Kremlin have retreated. They followed literally the Communist Manifesto and abolished all inheritances in 1918. But this law was abrogated 4 years later by a new law which permitted inheritances up to 10,000 rubles for each estate. Three years later, the 10,000 ruble limit was removed and now no limit is imposed.

The Russian inheritance tax formerly ran up to 90 percent. In 1943, the tax was abolished and now only a filing fee is charged, running to a maximum of 10 percent on the largest estates. (Social Meaning of Legal Concepts—1. Inheritance of Property and the Power of Testamentary Disposition, pp. 3, 4.) What the values of individual estates are now in the Soviet Union, I do not know. In 1943 the London Economist reported several 1,000,000 ruble contributions to the Russian war relief from farmers. So we must assume there are a number of substantial holdings.

The four ideas which I have mentioned above, are particular instances where the creeping paralysis of the Socialist International is affecting our society in general and our legal profession in particular.

I sincerely believe that the American people are thoroughly aroused over the dangers from the Third International, and that a violent overthrow of our Government is inconceivable. But why are they so complacent about the aims of the Second International, the aims of which accomplish the purpose of the Red International, not by revolution, but by the insidious routes of nationalization and taxation? Is confiscation unrecognizable when it happens gradually? May I ask what room there will be for lawyers if the nationalization process is complete, if the Government becomes the only buyer or the sole seller, if incomes and estates are reduced to the vanishing point, except a position as a Government employee?

Perhaps the fulfillment of these ideas may seem remote at this time. If so, please compare the situation in England, in the United States, and in California, between 1930 and 1940. Then make a comparison with 1930, and each preceding decade back to 1900, and you will be startled by the progress.

I submit that the burden of supporting our war program should be distributed equitably and not used as a means of accelerating social reform. Other effective revenue-producing means can be devised.

It is hoped that the lawyers will protest vigorously the persistent advance both on State and national levels to hold off further encroachments of the ideas of the Socialist International. We should object strenuously to a philosophy that will reduce us to an equality of misery.

If we take no steps to hold the line, you may be sure that the profession will be swirled about like leaves in a storm, and with about the same fate.

In conclusion, may I urge upon you an increasing interest and activity in public affairs. Nothing is more important in our daily lives. We should give these matters the same attention we give to the interest of our clients. If we do not, we may be sure progress in these four ideas will be progressively overwhelming. If we retire to our corners in dudgeon, we can only expect a more rapid progress in their fulfillment. Let the lawmaker know your views. That, at least, will be a start in holding the line. We cannot afford to be apathetic.

Postal Employees' Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News:

THEY EARN MORE PAY

The postal service is everybody's business, and any proposal likely to improve that service should have the support of all.

Postal employees are notoriously underpaid in the light of today's wage standards. Many are reported to be leaving the service to take better-paying jobs; in Detroit alone 550 have quit since last July.

Because of the poor pay—the workers say they must put in 11 years to get the top of

$8,670 annually—the service is attracting inferior replacements. This means poorer service.

Post office workers' pay is fixed by law, and an increase is possible only through legislation. Several bills for an increase have been introduced in Congress, but no action has been taken on them.

To get action postal workers have decided to stage a post-card campaign in which you will be asked to write to your Congressman and urge him to support pay-increase legislation. This cause strikes us as being a worthy one, deserving of the cooperation of all.

Address of Hon. James M. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Hon. James M. Mead, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, at the annual Notions Sales Conference, Statler Hotel, New York City, February 6, 1951:

The Federal Trade Commission and the vast retail business of the country, of which you are representatives, have much in common. We are both concerned with the practices and methods which adversely affect the business of selling and distributing merchandise to the buying public. We are both interested in maintaining the free functioning of industry and trade on a sound and constructive basis. In that manner the public as well as business itself is shielded from the harmful effects of unfair competitive methods and monopolistic controls. The present emergency emphasizes the importance of this common objective for good business.

In the commercial and industrial aspects of the present world struggle the contest is essentially between a system of free competitive enterprise, on the one hand, and a regimented totalitarianism on the other. The preservation of our liberties, the survival of our democratic way of life, depend in no little measure upon our ability to operate our economic system in such a way as to outstrip all others in production and distribution of materials and products for defense and for civilian requirements.

To accomplish this we must harness to the task our productive capacity to its fullest potential. We must see to it that private business, which serves us all, is not pushed, or allowed to drift, into the clutches of private monopoly. Trade must be carried on under principles of scrupulous practices. Methods which injure competition by deceiving or exploiting the consumer or undermining the confidence of the people in the integrity of business must be prevented.

These tasks call for greater vigilance on the part of the law-enforcement agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission.

President Truman has been mindful of the need for special alertness in these matters. In a directive of September 28, 1950, the President referred to the fact that during the last war the long standing tendency toward economic concentration was accelerated. He explained that mobilization, in the absence of protective measures, may again expose our economy to this threat and thereby imperil the very system we are seeking to protect.

He further pointed out the fact that in various provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, Congress likewise indicated its concern over this danger to free competitive enterprise. The President instructed the defense agencies to consult with the Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission for the purpose of determining and eliminating, without impairment of the defense effort, "factors which may tend to suppress competition unduly, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power."

Restraints of trade and other monopolistic conditions stemming from industrial combinations, and the use of deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition, are problems with which the Federal Trade Commission must deal. Because their harmful effects upon our economy are more deeply felt in times of emergency than in normal competitive periods, the Commission's task is more urgent than in normal times. It is not erased by the fact that we are mobilizing for defense. In periods of emergency some rights and privileges of peacetime must be temporarily abridged or restricted in the interests of national survival. However, that need not, and should not, entail the surrender or crippling of our competitive free enterprise system.

Last week I directed the Commission's staff to be on the watch for "opportunists in the business world," who may seek to exploit consumers and the Government during the national defense emergency. Based upon our experience of World Wars I and II, it is anticipated that unfair acts, practices, and methods in connection with obtaining defense contracts will be employed more extensively as the letting of such contracts expands. Experience has demonstrated that when the Government begins to take an increasing proportion of the output of industrial concerns, efforts are often shifted by some to securing a preferred position on Government work. By others a preferred position is sought with respect to scarce materials or products needed in the civilian economy. Then there are some who plan for a preferred position in respect to business operations after the emergency is over, in short, some special unwarranted advantage to the detriment of one's competitors.

During the last war, small and independent business found it necessary to organize, to seek the assistance of the Federal Trade Commission and committees of Congress in order to remain in business. The Commission was called upon to expend considerable time and effort on cases involving collusive bidding and fraudulent efforts to deprive the Government of a fair price on its defense purchases.

The impact of the present mobilization effort is already being felt in our economy. It is placing a strain upon our free enterprise system and increasing the threat of private monopolistic controls and unfair trade methods. If the accelerated growth of the concentration of economic power experienced in World Wars I and II is to be prevented in the present emergency, and small and independent business afforded opportunity to survive and offer real competition, intensive vigilance is required.

DECEPTIVE PRACTICES

When considering matters of importance to the protection of the competitive enterprise system under which our country has produced the highest standard of living in the world, we must not overlook the need for guarding against the types of acts or methods in selling merchandise which collectively fall under the heading "deceptive practices."

In times of war or, as in the present emergency, in all-out preparedness for adequate national defense, the functions of the Commission in this field likewise occupy a position of much importance. When there are shortages in essential materials, and substitutes must be used, the necessity for truth in advertising becomes greater than when such materials are in full supply. Particularly is this true of such things as food, clothing, household furnishings, and medicinal preparations.

As more and more physicians are called into the military service, self-medication inevitably increases. The civilian then must rely to an increasing extent upon the Federal Trade Commission to check promptly false and deceptive claims made for dangerous drugs, ineffective remedies, or fake nostrums. The citizen who must to a large extent treat himself is entitled to all the protection and safeguards that this Commission can throw around the advertisements of foods, drugs, and medical devices. Not only is this true with respect to the preservation of the public health, it is also true with respect to protection of the consumer's pocketbook. In times when taxes must be sufficiently high to support the military burden, it is important that the public should receive real value for its money. Purchase of ineffective remedies is not only a waste of the public's money, but it is also a hazard to health. The use of and the reliance upon such remedies postpone or prevent recourse to proper treatment.

It is also highly important to give such protection as can be given promptly to the public in its purchase of other necessary household supplies and requirements. Experience in World War II showed that as soon as some materials become scarce, the opportunist of light conscience will use substitutes, or materials of inferior value, and materials which may even be harmful. Use of substitutes may not in itself be objectionable, but we must prevent false advertising of such substitutes and stop the use of false claims which will be detrimental to the purchasing public and unfair to the honest competitor.

High wool prices, shortages of raw wool, and conditions arising from emergency controls will undoubtedly increase the use of shoddy and wool substitutes in the manufacture of consumer fabrics. Changes in fiber content, stresses which arise from shortages and attendant conditions, together with pressure to maintain accustomed price ranges in apparel merchandise, make it more urgent than ever that there be thorough enforcement of our Wool Products Labeling Act. I am happy to note that informative labeling generally has in recent years become an integral part of the merchandising practices of progressive manufacturers and merchants. Scrupulous manufacturers and merchants must be protected against dishonest competitors who would pass off their products as wool, when in reality they contained substitute fibers, or those who would falsely label their fabrics as new wool when they were made of shoddy, or who might otherwise conceal the true fiber content.

Proper wool labeling must be enforced as a necessary medium of protecting the civilian population. During the emergency period there will be many changes in quality and standards. Active enforcement is highly important to bring an adequate measure of protection to our fiber-producing industries; to our manufacturers and merchants against the evils of deception, confusion, and unfair competition.

Our field investigation staff is located in strategic industrial centers to expose false or unfair sales practices—practices in the form of advertisements, labels, and other forms. Our continuing surveys of radio and periodical advertising, as well as our unfair competition and antimonopoly work form part of the Government's effort to protect the public in the mobilization effort and to maintain our private-enterprise system.

Constant vigilance is required not only by the Government but also on the part of busi-

ness itself. Government alone cannot do the job adequately. Much depends on the active and moral support of the vast group of scrupulous and patriotic men and women in business who constantly keep their sights on that which is honest and fair in industry and trade. With business and Government working together in unity under the inspiring motive of doing what is best for our country, we can be assured of the ultimate triumph of our ideals of freedom and justice for all.

The Righteous Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church, and Chaplain of the United States Senate:

THE RIGHTEOUS SWORD

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

There is nothing inherently good or bad about a sword. The quality of sharpened steel may depend on whether it is in the hands of a surgeon or a bandit. Earth's greatest Teacher admonished, "Put up your sword; for he that takes it shall perish by it." That sword was drawn in anger and vengeance. It was a bad sword. But Jesus also said, "I am not come to bring peace, but a sword." That sword unsheathed against evil was a good sword. All depends upon the purpose for which the blade is to be used.

In ancient days, the walls of ruined Jerusalem were rebuilt by toiler-soldiers with trowels in one hand and swords in the other. And, as late as last summer, gardeners were seen with hoes in one hand and cans of poison spray in the other for the pests which attacked their growing plants.

Without swords, coerced men are compelled to cry peace when there is no peace and to surrender the most heavenly things to the most hellish forces. There is a sword bathed in heaven. If swords are in the hands only of those who cannot be trusted with them, then the only peace possible between the lion and the lamb, which, it is prophesied, shall some day lie down together, is for the lamb to lie down inside the lion. There are present-day appeasers of evil who would label that arrangement peace. But a peace dictated by unethical force is the peace of slaves.

When a prime minister took an umbrella to Munich and no righteous sword, a glorious little democracy in the midst of Europe was thrown to the wolves in appeasement, a perfidy committed for peace in our time. A show of weakness will never bring in any day of peace.

A nation must be strong to make its work for peace effective. A peace gained by constant retreat because of the threatening blackmail of superior force is not peace, but war. It will be a day of mourning for all the free world if ever our Nation, whose potential force is the greatest, refuses to back to the hilt its belief in universal brotherhood with its terrible swift sword against aggressors ready to pounce on new victims. There always is enough bad in the world to shatter any dream of an ethical peace, unless that ill will has a restraining fear of the power of organized good will. Whenever a nation with a completely unethical purpose to conquer the world reaches the stage of aggressive hostility a part of its technique always is to develop disarmament propaganda in the nation against whose life it is plotting. To weaken the national striking power is to vote to make it inevitable that the democracies shall be forced to do the bidding of moral perverts who have been allowed to fashion a preponderance of swords.

Of course, force never is the last word. At best, it but clears the way for the constructive agencies of friendship, good will, and cooperation to do their healing work, so that at last swords can be turned into plowshares. But when you face men who have put the state on the throne, instead of God, you cannot conquer them by kindly example or a friendly smile. No gentle charms can stay the fangs of the cobra when it is ready to strike. That callous deviltry is to be allowed at will to trample righteousness into the mire whenever it is powerful enough, while the forces of good stand impotently by, is a tragic travesty of justice and judgment.

In England, before World War II, a group of influential clergymen, ignoring Germany's rearmament, led a movement utterly to renounce the sword of defense.

Declaring they were willing to risk all on meeting Hitler's threat with understanding and good will, they secured hundreds of thousands of signed pledges of a virtual refusal to take up arms. That futile policy, sincerely followed, helped to bomb the churches of which these preachers were the ministers and to fill the land with lamentations for the mangled and the dead. That crusade was a definite factor in Britain's unpreparedness when the foe struck. Time tragically proved it was no hour to exchange a clean sword for an olive branch.

In America, a man stood up in a free pulpit to preach. He quoted detached sentences from the Christ whose hand held the lash when His Father's House was made a den of thieves, and whose eyes were often as a flame of fire. The preacher declared that evil, no matter how diabolical, was never to be resisted with any physical weapons. Rhetorically, he asked, "What has a sword ever accomplished worth while?" In a pew was a worshiper in whose heart was an aching void and in whose home was a Purple Heart, speaking of the valor of a young crusader who marched forth with a righteous sword and came not back. At the church door, following the service, that worshiper said to the clergyman: "I can tell you one thing that the righteous sword has done." "What?" asked the minister. Replied the listener with deep feeling, "The sword in the hand of those who have resisted militant evil has given you the right to stand here today and to proclaim your convictions without fear of being liquidated." The one who had publicly said that rampant evil was never to be resisted by force paused for a moment and then acknowledged, "I am afraid I cannot refute that."

There is no refutation in God's world and man's for the flash of the righteous sword.

A Prayer for the President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a prayer which I received from Sister Mary Samuel, of St. Clara Convent, Sinsinawa, Wis. This very kind lady informed me that this beautiful prayer is being recited every day by 1,500 professed sisters, residents in different parts of the United States. Sister Samuel stated in her letter to me, "I wish it could be framed and put on the two walls of Congress," and I most heartily agree with that sentiment.

A PRAYER FOR THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of these United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion, by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy, and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of the Congress and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

Food for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 195

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, resolution, and editorial:

COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF BUFFALO
AND ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 6, 1951.

The Honorable EDMUND P. RADWAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The annual meeting of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, assembled in session February 2, 1951, unanimously endorsed the resolution of the general board of the National Council of Churches supporting the provision for making available 2,000,000 tons of food grain to relieve the acute food shortage in India.

I write, therefore, to express the hope that the proper legislation will be drafted, introduced, and passed. There are those inclined to punish Nehru for his position on Korea by letting the people of India starve. The Christian conscience rejects this attitude as morally intolerable. Further, starving people are ripe for the spread of communism.

Very truly yours,

HARLAN M. FROST,
Executive Secretary.

FOOD FOR INDIA

Whereas the Government of the United States has been officially requested by the Government of India to make available 2,000,000 tons of food grain to relieve the acute food shortage in that country; and

Whereas such action on the part of our Government would be justified not only on humanitarian grounds but also for reason that it would strengthen bonds of friendship between the American and Indian peoples: be it

Resolved, That the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of

America recommend that the Congress and the executive branch of the Government of the United States take such steps as may be required to assist in meeting the present urgent needs of the Indian people for emergency food aid and that this food be made available on such terms as may be mutually acceptable to the two Governments.

Adopted by the General Board of the National Council of Churches, January 17, 1951.

NO TIME FOR GRUDGE POLITICS

Unless the Congress of the United States appropriates the price of 2,000,000 tons of grain for famished India, millions of humans may starve to death. It isn't in the American tradition to stand idly by so long as we have the wherewithal to avert such a catastrophe. We have it, and to spare.

Prime Minister Pandit Nehru alined himself with Soviet Russia in voting against the United States resolution in the United Nations identifying Red China as an aggressor in Korea, an attitude which soured Congress on India. But this is no time for a punitive gesture. Our grain elevators are bulging with what it takes to prevent a famine in India and common humanity demands that we spare some of it to save lives. Besides, think of the psychological effect such a gift would have in Asia—India stubbornly refuses to support us in the UN, but we send food to the starving millions anyway.

The administration delayed asking Congress to come to India's assistance largely because UN Delegate Warren Austin did not want to be wide open to Communist charges of blackmail if India retreated from appeasement and voted with the United States in condemning Communist China. In addition, a suspicious Nehru might have become convinced we were trying to buy his vote. If the grant was made before the vote, Congress might have considered it rank ingratitude if he didn't support the resolution of censure.

At the White House Friday, President Truman appealed to ranking Members of both parties for speedy congressional action to approve the gift. Some of the Congressmen demurred at dipping into our food grain reserves in a time of crisis. Others want to hold public hearings. However, the President received some unexpected support when Senator ROBERT A. TAFT declared himself in favor of the Indian-aid program.

Prime Minister Nehru has not asked for the grain as a handout. He pocketed his pride when he asked for it in the first place and salved it by proposing that India pay for it on a long-term credit basis. The Congress will cancel out the gesture of good will if it demands payment for the grain. Piling more debt on the burdened shoulders of the Indian people will spoil the effect. That is the common-sense attitude of Herbert Hoover, who was called to the White House this week to advise on the problem. "Let it be free. The United States has never in its history failed to be helpful to a famine-stricken people." That's the way it should be.

Evacuation of Boston by the British, March 17, 1776

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the approaching one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the fortification of Dorchester Heights by Gen. George Washington in 1776 calls attention to one of the most significant military actions of the American Revolution.

The now populous region known as South Boston constituted then the area known as Dorchester, Dorchester Neck, Dorchester Heights, and Dorchester Point. It forms a peninsula projecting eastward toward the Atlantic. Dorchester had been founded as early as 1630, and its scanty inhabitants had made very considerable contributions to the development of the colony. Its historians are particularly proud of the fact that here was established, in 1639, what is almost certainly the first free school supported by public taxation on this continent. It is believed also that a decision taken in 1633 to have the men of the colony meet every Monday "to settle and set down such orders as may tend to the general good" was the beginning of the "town meeting" system of local government, which became characteristic of New England and has had lasting effect on the development of democratic government in America. Dorchester citizens were active in the early measures of resistance to British tyranny, out of which emerged in time the War of Independence.

The Battle of Bunker Hill—which should be called the Battle of Breed's Hill, where it was really fought—took place on June 17, 1775. Tactically it was a defeat for the Colonials, for the British remained in possession of the area. Their losses were staggering, however, and left them greatly weakened as well as bewildered. On the American side there were almost the effects of a victory, so far as morale was concerned. Colonial militia had stood up successfully against British Regulars. The ground lost—a neck of land containing Bunker Hill and Breed's Hill—was not very important. The gathering American forces were able to surround the whole larger area. For the ensuing 9 months the British were more and more tightly contained in Boston itself. Their forces were strong and they had command of the sea approaches, but displayed singular inactivity. In part this was due to their distance from England; it took messages 5 or 6 weeks to cross the ocean from the home government.

Be this as it may, in the period following Bunker Hill the British were fairly tightly confined in Boston itself. There is evidence that they did not intend to stay there indefinitely, and planned to make some other central position such as New York or Philadelphia the base of their effort to subjugate the Colonies. They were in no hurry, however, to leave Boston, and when they did so it was not as they had planned but a very hasty evacuation under duress.

The Americans began building up their forces. Washington was appointed to the supreme command; he accepted June 15. Before him was a great task, to take the shifting Colonial volunteers and militia, little more than a motley aggregation of untrained men, and turn them into an army. He had all sorts of difficulty with discipline and enlistments and discord and supplies. In the last-named category the primary problem was gunpowder. There was never enough of it, then or throughout the war, and the quality was poor. The patriot James Warren wrote in July:

> The armies continue to look at each other and fortify themselves. No action or prospect of one. It is a barren time,
>
> But—

Adds a historian—

not barren for Washington. He needed this breathing space for the organizing of his Army and the training of his men, for studying his enemy and learning as well to know his friends. This was his first experience in command of New Englanders, and if at times he admired the Yankee temperament, at others it disappointed him. Weak as compared with his well-fortified enemy, at present Washington could not strike a blow. He began now to study that lesson of waiting and of preparation which he put to such good use in the years of the long war. (French, p. 310.)

There were some small operations. Washington made two raids on Charlestown, held by the British. Later Howe made his own attempt on Dorchester, caused by information that Americans were gathering fascines and gabions, preparing to fortify the place. In the early morning of February 14, 1776, he sent detachments from Boston and Castle William—in Boston Harbor—to the empty peninsula. They found no military materials, but burned some vacant houses and returned with captured sentinels. Content with this evidence that the Americans were doing nothing, Howe relaxed his attention.

The battle for powder described above had begun to be successful and Washington succeeded in building up a fairly substantial reserve; but there was also the battle for cannon. The only storehouses where any large cannons were available to the Colonials were at Ticonderoga and Crown Point. Winter made possible the portage of these great weights by sledge. Washington sent Col. Henry Knox after them. Knox reached Ticonderoga on December 5. He got 43 cannons and 16 mortars. Three of the latter were of 13-inch caliber, each weighing over a ton. Knox got these pieces to Lake George by sledge, took them on boats and scows to the end of the lake, then by road again to Albany, crossing the Hudson four times on the way. The boats sank several times. At Albany one of the largest cannons fell through the ice at a ferry. After a difficult time, this "drowned" cannon was recovered, and nicknamed "The Albany." From Claverack on the Hudson the pieces were sledged over the Berkshire hills, where the snow was now dependable. Thence to Springfield and then to Framingham, by the 25th of January, 1776.

Washington was at last ready to take up the long-cherished idea of fortifying Dorchester Heights. The difficulty now was the weather. If the work was to escape British interference it must be done in a single night, but experience of similar operations attempted when the ground was frozen indicated that it might take weeks. The dilemma was solved by a decision to build the breastworks of fascines, which were bundles of sticks held in place by wooden frames called chandeliers; these were prepared in large quantities.

The local militia were called in for the night of March 4, a date chosen as the anniversary of the massacre, when Massachusetts men might be expected to be at their fighting best. Teamsters with their carts and horses, entrenching tools, quantities of marsh hay, were all quietly assembled. On the third a blind was thrown up along the causeway between Roxbury and Dorchester. Two hundred and fifty axmen were set to fell the trees for the abattis. In addition to these and the large number who were to set the fascines and chandeliers in position, there were 750 men posted on the lower hills near the water, with sentries between, who would cover the workers. Barrels were prepared, filled with earth, to roll down from the higher hills if there was an attack. Another preparation was the misdirection of the enemy's attention by cannonading Boston from the land side for two nights. Not much damage was done to Boston, but the great brass mortar named the Nancy and three more exploded and split. The British replied with a noisy fire of their own.

The night of the fourth proved perfect for the enterprise. It was mild, with a bright moon on the hills, but near the water level a haze which cut off Dorchester from sight, both from the town and from the ships. The wind was of such a direction as to carry sounds away from the town, the ships, and Castle William.

The march began about 7 p. m. Certain low hills were immediately manned as cover for an attack by the enemy, which Washington expected.

Following the covering party came the working party, 1,200 men under Thomas, and after them 360 ox teams. The hay, in great bundles, was laid as a screen along the short neck, where the carts were to go back and forth. All went in silence; orders had been given in advance, and each detachment knew its business. On the two hills selected for fortification, the two summits of which towered above the anchorage of the British Fleet, the chandeliers were laid out on the plans already marked, the fascines were put in place; and with pick and shovel men fell to work on the frosty earth to make a ditch and raise and thicken the breastworks. The axmen were felling the orchards and making the abattis; and men were filling the gabions and the barrels for rolling down on the enemy. The carts, having been emptied, returned for more chandeliers and fascines; some of them before morning made three or four trips. The work was pushed with such tremendous energy that by 10 o'clock they had two forts, one on each hill, strong enough to be capable of defense against small arms and grapeshot. (French, p. 659.)

By 3 o'clock in the morning 3,000 fresh men came on, in part as relief and in part to man the works. There arrived also five companies of riflemen. By dawn, with the cannons brought up, the digging and heaving and ramming and firming completed, the work was done.

The British may have had intimation that something was going on during the night. If so they did nothing about it. By morning the work was discovered, and the British began shelling the fortifications, but found their shots falling short.

Their position was now untenable. The admiral is reported to have notified Lord Howe that his ships could not remain in their anchorage. The plunging fire from the forts commanded not only the anchorage, but Castle William, and the ship channels and the town itself. The new fort was so high and so far away that the British guns could not be elevated sufficiently to reach them. There was only one possible recourse for Howe, an attempt to drive the Yankees from the new position by the use of troops.

It would have been a spectacular battle, along the lines of Bunker Hill, but with much greater advantages on the Colonial side. Howe sent Brigadier General Jones with 2,200 men to undertake the task. Seven regiments were sent to the castle by boat intended to embark from thence in flatboats. An assault was to be made on the Dorchester Peninsula at a point nearest the island where the castle stood. The attack was to be made on the first fort while that fort itself shielded the attackers from the second fort. Main dependence was to be on the bayonet. Meanwhile other troops were prepared to attack Roxbury. Washington had made careful plans for receiving the attack.

Why did this assault on the new fortifications never come off? All that day, the 5th of March, it was expected, in vain, by the Americans. It seems the British were waiting for the coming of nightfall, and a favorable tide. But that night there arose what one writer describes as "a Hurrycane, or terrible sudden storm." Some of the transports were driven ashore, and boats could not live in the surf on Dorchester Beach. The tempest prevented the battle.

Such was the official British explanation. Historians, however have evidence to indicate that the real reason for calling off the battle was a realization that an attempt to force the new American position would be not only bloody but futile. A council of war decided that the attack must be abandoned and Boston evacuated. By the second day, the necessity for such an action was more obvious. The American parapets had risen higher and thicker, and more cannons had been mounted. The situation was hopeless for the British. To the dismay of the loyalists in Boston, preparations for evacuation began on the 6th.

The British had plenty of shipping, but all was haste and confusion. Many valuable stores were abandoned. Some 2,000 loyalists went along, most of them perhaps with the complete loss of their possessions and property. Stories were told of fine mahogany furniture found floating in the docks or driven on distant beaches. There was some plundering by British soldiers—against Howe's orders, however.

It is probable that Washington could have attacked at this time and destroyed the British Army. There were reasons against this. The town would have been destroyed, and probably many noncombatant Americans killed. He himself was running out of powder again, as a result of the bombarding. To "hold his hand," says the historian French, "was both human and wise." There were some negotiations, which fell through, but seem to have resulted in a kind of gentleman's agreement that if Howe would leave the town intact, Washington would not interfere with the evacuation. Washington was watchful for some last enemy attack, while the British ships were held up by bad weather, but no attempt was made.

Washington expected the British move to be toward New York and immediately began dispatching forces thither. To the surprise of all, however, by a decision, the reasons for which are not even now clear, Howe sailed for Halifax.

The fortification of Dorchester and the consequent forced evacuation of Boston by the British constitute the first signal victory of American forces in the Revolution. It was long ere there was another. So far as Washington's personal command was concerned, the only one that could be compared with it was the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown at the end of the war.

For Massachusetts this was the end of an era. When the fleet sailed away Boston at last stood free from its long struggle with Britain, and was not again the focus of action. For the Colonies as a whole, new hope existed. What seemed the long stalemate in New England was over, but had ended with an American triumph. There was new spirit in the Colonies now, which did much to sustain them in the hard years which were to follow. For Washington himself, his influence was consolidated, his skill acknowledged, and his own talents developed. Says the historian French:

At Boston were shown Washington's great characteristics: His power to wait, to confront a stronger enemy without yielding, to bear without disheartenment weakness and disaffection in his own army, to build up strength by whatever means he could, and at the right moment to strike suddenly and effectually.

Sources: Allen French, the First Year of the American Revolution, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934; William Dana Orcutt, Good Old Dorchester, Cambridge, 1893; Benson J. Lossing, the Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution, New York, 1850; Tercentenary Committee, Dorchester Old and New, Chapple Publishing Co., Dorchester, Mass., 1930; Sydney George Fisher, the Struggle for American Independence, 1908, volume 1.

Federal Job Holders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is much being said about nonessential expenditures in Government during these crucial times. We are all concerned about our budget, expenditures, high and increased taxes.

There is much talk about economy on those matters not related to our national defense and future security. The people of the country are not only interested in talk and agitation but action. I believe by far the majority Members of this Congress feel the same way. We are continually faced with the difficulty of requests for increased expenditures and the alarming trend of increased

Federal payrolls, much of which is under the guise of national defense.

Our people are willing to make all necessary sacrifices for our own protection and security to prevent aggression and to try to bring about peace and peaceful relationship among nations. We do not believe it is necessary to accede to the request of huge outlays and continuous large increases of Federal employees for many of these programs that have little or no relationship to the national defense.

An editorial on this important subject in the Washington Post today points to this problem in a most effective manner. The Appropriations Committees are meeting now, holding hearings for the next fiscal year. I desire to call to the attention of not only the members of that committee but every Member of Congress this appropriate discussion in the editorial and therefore under unanimous consent, I include it in this extension of remarks:

FEDERAL JOB HOLDERS

The congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures headed by Senator BYRD reports that since the outbreak of the Korean War, new civilian workers have been added to the Federal payroll at an average rate of about a thousand per day. By June payrolls will be above the World War II peak figure and will still be rising. California leads the District in the number of civilian Federal employees, with New York and Pennsylvania not far behind in second and third place, respectively. New York City alone harbors 114,000 civilians working for Uncle Sam; Chicago has 52,000; Philadelphia, 47,000, and St. Louis, 23,000.

To arrest this alarming trend, which not only increases the cost of running the Government, but aggravates industrial labor shortages, the Byrd committee has recommended that the National Security Resources Board be authorized to control proposed increases in civilian employment by Government agencies, and that the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate require an NSRB survey of personnel requirements to be made before approving appropriations for increased employment in any Federal agency.

The defense program has added to the work burdens of some Government agencies, and, of course, the new defense agencies are compelled to build up their staffs. However, many old-line departments and agencies are undoubtedly overstaffed. It is the will to save money through more economical use of manpower that is conspicuously lacking in such cases. Under pressure from an outside agency, such as the NSRB, they could make substantial cuts in expenditures, reduce the drain on our manpower reserves and lighten the burdens borne by taxpayers.

The Debate Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am placing in the RECORD a very timely statement by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann.

I believe the Members of the House and readers of the RECORD will be interested in Mr. Lippmann's analysis. It follows:

THE DEBATE GOES ON

(By Walter Lippmann)

It costs much sweat, and even a few tears, to work out who agrees and who differs with whom in the great debate. Subject to correction later when the hearings, which are to start this week, have produced their results, it is fair to say, I think, that there are no irreconcilable differences in the views of Taft, Dulles, and Eisenhower. The more one studies their remarks, the more it appears that their differences are matters of emphasis rather than of substance.

In the meantime I have found it helpful to realize that the whole business is difficult to follow because there are two debates going on simultaneously, each dealing with a great subject. The first has to do with the rights and powers of the President. The second has to do with the strategical question of how—not whether—Western Europe is to be made secure against invasion.

The extraordinary thing about this debate is that, thus far, the two men who ought to be leading it—the President and his Secretary of State—have refrained from giving the country an informative and reasoned description and explanation of the project. No one contradicted Senator TAFT last Thursday when he said in the Senate that Congress had been unable to obtain definite knowledge about whether or not we had made a commitment at Brussels, or about the size of the American Army that the administration was proposing to send to Europe, or about the status of General Eisenhower *himself* in relation to the other Atlantic governments.

But if all that is unclear and indefinite, Congress does have before it a clear and definite proposal to conscript 18-year-old men for 27 months. The contrast between the heavy concrete sacrifices which Congress has to vote and the generalities and abstractions in which the President and his Secretary of State communicate their purposes is striking. The issue of the President's powers has arisen, and will surely not easily be brushed aside in this Congress, because the administration has in effect taken the position that Congress must provide the men and the treasure, but that the President then has full power to decide where to deploy them.

This is not a tenable position. If the President were a wiser man than he is, he never would have dreamed of questioning the right of the Congress to participate in the unprecedented project of placing an American standing army in Europe and of merging it in an international army. He would not only have sought the advice of Congress but he would have insisted from the outset that Congress share his responsibility.

Because the President failed to do that, he laid himself open to and invited the kind of attack which Senator TAFT delivered at the Lincoln Day dinner in Chicago. It is that Harry S. Truman is too impulsive and not careful enough in his judgments to bear alone the responsibilities of life and death.

On Sunday, Governor Dewey came out strongly for the President's position. "I do not believe," he said, "that the deployment of our troops is a matter for congressional action. I believe the deployment is a matter for the experts and on that I will trust General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and the Chiefs of Staff rather than anyone else." I wonder whether this is Governor Dewey's considered view.

Can Governor Dewey argue seriously that the project of an American standing Army in Europe, involving perhaps three-quarters of a million men, can be called a mere deployment like sending troops to Hawaii, Alaska, or even by putting ground crews at some air strips in Great Britain. Does not the proposal to place a permanent American garrison on the European Continent call for a political decision of the greatest magnitude? Is this not in the substance, even if it is not in the form, a treaty? One need not contend that the decision should be presented as a treaty in order to believe that the administration ought to handle it with the same kind of respect and deference for Congress which it would show if it needed to obtain ratification of a treaty.

Governor Dewey, moreover, seems to feel that these decisions will not be made by Mr. Truman but that they will be made by the "experts" and "on that I will trust General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and the Chiefs of Staff, rather than anyone else." I myself do not think it is fair to the generals to expect them to take over the very highest responsibility of the Government. And we would certainly have fallen into an ignoble state of affairs if the elected Government were in these great matters to evade its responsibilities and to seek refuge and protection behind the general.

As a matter of fact, if Governor Dewey will recall the events of the past year, he will find little in the record to warrant his confidence that the military "experts" will decide military questions and that the civilian "experts" will decide political questions. One of the striking characteristics of the Truman administration has been the confusion which weakness and haphazardness have brought into the relations between the civilian and the military authorities. Many things that we now regret, many things we may perhaps live to regret, arise from that confusion.

Address of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1951, Northwestern University, which is located in Evanston, Ill., celebrated its one hundredth anniversary. Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, the distinguished Governor of the State of Illinois, delivered the principal address at the convocation ceremonies, an address which is truly thought-provoking at this time when the great debate is going on.

Not only has Governor Stevenson made an enviable reputation and record in his high post in the State of Illinois as one of the Nation's most capable State executives, but his background and experience qualify him extraordinarily to speak on foreign affairs. In 1943 he was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to head the mission in Italy which was established as a part of the newly created Foreign Economic Administration. His report on his mission contained recommendations for a plan of economic aid for the European nations which may very well have been the foundation for the Marshall plan.

In 1945 Governor Stevenson became a special assistant to Secretary of State James Byrnes. His ability in this position won him much acclaim, including

editorial approval of the New York Times.

When the United Nations Conference was organized in San Francisco, Governor Stevenson was press spokesman for the United States delegation. Successive appointments as minister and representative to the Preparatory Commission for the United Nations qualified him for his later role as senior adviser to the American delegation. Throughout 1946 and 1947, as an alternate delegate, he was appointed to various important committees of the United Nations.

Governor Stevenson's address follows:

Some 5 years ago this university, for reasons best known to its trustees, conferred an honorary degree on me. Having thus honored me I suppose the least the Governor of Illinois could do in appreciation was to decline President Miller's and Mr. Burgess' invitation to speak at this hundredth anniversary convocation. Instead, I accepted, after the manner of insensitive and egotistical politicians. I apologize.

Because there are others who can speak with authority about the founding of Northwestern University, I am, with, I am sure, your enthusiastic approval, going to resist the temptation to tell you of the faith and convictions of the founders who stood here 100 years ago and dreamed of a university of the highest order of excellence. All that we see about us testifies that they founded well and that their successors have wrought well upon those foundations. In the 100 years the dream by the lake here in Dr. Evans' town has become one of the world's large and honored communities of scholars.

Early Illinois was notoriously inhospitable to higher education and I recall the remark of a lusty legislator who said in opposition to a bill to charter the first three Illinois schools that he was "born in a briar thicket, rocked in a hog trough, and never had his genius cramped by the pestilential air of a college."

Northwestern, too, was born upon a scene on which the light of higher education shone but fitfully. But in our time one never sees a considered catalog of the assets of Illinois that does not always proudly list its universities at the top.

I once heard it said that Massachusetts Institute of Technology "humanized the scientist" while Harvard "simonized the humanist." Just what Northwestern does I don't know; perhaps both. But at all events its contributions to the sciences and the humanities and also to the wholesome goodness and gaiety we associate with American student life have brought to this campus imperishable distinction and affection.

Thanks to Northwestern, its neighbor, the University of Chicago, the great State university, and many distinguished lesser institutions, Illinois, and particularly this section of the State, is now one of the treasure houses, one of the major repositories, of the Western World's culture.

It is proper, therefore, that we pause to note the one hundredth birthday of this proud university; that we pause a moment in our feverish defense preparations to recall what we are defending. Certainly one of the things we are defending is the future security and health of privately supported universities such as Northwestern. In turn we confidently expect them to defend for generations to come the spirit of free inquiry and fearless scholarship which is a basic condition of free men. For that protection and for the contribution of the universities to "a large resolute breed of men" which Walt Whitman called the only bar against tyranny, we will have to trust to the future; we will have to trust that the guardians here and elsewhere of the riches of our learning will never forget what the treasure they guard is, what it is composed of. We will have to trust that the guardians of western thought will never permit its vitality and beauty to be smothered by strong, arrogant men who burn books and bend thought to their liking, nor obscured by timid men trembling in the darkness of anxiety.

The continuity of our heritage of scholarship, both bold and free, which is the peculiar and priceless possession of the university, must, then, be entrusted to the future. But what of the present which has such a bearing on the health and strength and continuity of the custodians of our culture?

Are the universities to be stripped of students in order to defend our cultural heritage? The young of college age are the seed corn of a society and a nation. To survive must we eat our seed corn? And if we do, can we survive? We must and we will, I think, find at least a partial answer to that disturbing question. And we will find it in calm deliberation, not in frantic fright.

Then, like you, after some experience, I have made the disturbing observation that absence of thought in war seems to be mandatory. And, of course, total abstinence from thought is very agreeable for most of us, and a uniformly popular condition among adolescents. But is it necessary in mobilization, in half war, if you please? Perhaps we have something to think about here as we enter the new and unexplored era of the garrison state.

Again, I must ask with a shudder if it will be largely women who enjoy the benefits of more advanced education in the new era? Is the ancient tradition of masculine primacy in jeopardy? Heaven forbid. And I should think a little reflection on this appalling possibility by the male leaders in all countries could do more to insure peace than a balance of power in the world. It is high time, it seems to me, that we males begin to think of survival in terms of gender as well as nationality and ideology.

There is another problem of which you are all soberly mindful. How are the privately endowed universities to survive financially; how can inflexible income meet flexible costs—costs that flex in only one direction? What will be the further ravages of inflation, of ever higher income taxes and sharply diminished student population and student fees? How will President Miller balance his budget? Actually I really don't feel very sorry for him because he can always tell the trustees to raise more money. But if I can't balance the budget of Illinois you'll tell me to find another job.

But there must be survival for the privately endowed institutions. By virtue of their very independence, they are indispensable to the kind of survival we are all talking about. We have long since accepted as right and just publicly supported primary and secondary education for all. But is that the destiny of higher education too? I hope not. It will be an ominous day indeed when all higher education is government subsidized. Yet simple economics point that way and already most of the great private universities must rely more and more on Government subventions, whether it be GI tuition or scentific research projects.

And in this connection we could well afford to examine critically the relative growth of the tax dollar and the private dollar contributed to higher education.

There are masses of statistics, but let me just refer to the immediate situation in our Illinois. As taxpayers you support six State universities and colleges. For this 2-year period the legislature appropriated $128,000,000 for them. In all of them tuition is but a fraction of the fees charged by private institutions. Three separate boards of trustees, elected or appointed, now divide control over these institutions. There is little coordination. Confusion and rivalry complicate just and wise decisions on appropriations and other legislation.

With the hope of improving this situation, I asked the United States Office of Education to survey the situation in Illinois. This week I published its interesting and informative study which does not attempt to say what plan of coordination Illinois should adopt, but offers several alternative plans to improve the present disorderly system.

With what emphasis I can command, I say that a public service so expensive and competing with privately supported colleges should be considered as a single program and coordinated on a State-wide basis. The budget requests of the several institutions should be equitably appraised on the basis of relative needs. There should be some competent over-all determination of the curriculum, the degrees offered, and the research programs at each institution. There should be a continuing evaluation of the operations at each, and a continuing study of the State's needs for tax-supported higher education.

If these controls are not exercised how can we assure the taxpayer his money's worth out of this costly service? And how can the legislature or the executive deal fairly, prudently and intelligently with such intricate problems at the six institutions.

I believe the time has come and gone when Illinois should attack disorder and disintegration in a major and expensive State service boldly and decisively, and with a considerate view to the plight of those private institutions of which the State is so proud.

Northwestern was born here in a quiet village on Lake Michigan by a burgeoning city a hundred years ago. That, too, was a time of revolution abroad and of transition here. In 1851 Illinois was filling up with immigrants from the South and East. A steel plow to cut the tough prairie sod had been invented. The reaper had come to our prairies. On plank roads, Illinois was rising out of the mud. A railroad was pushing westward. Europe was in political and economic ferment. The Irish and the Germans were coming in search of something better and more hopeful for the average man. With not 30,000 souls, Chicago was struggling out of the swamps. Illinois was passing from the log-cabin-frontier era and shouldering its way into the new industrial day that was breaking upon the Union.

A hundred years have passed, a hundred years which have seen the culmination of a great historic expansive movement of peoples from Europe to the west, and the conquest, development, and integration into the world community of the two great American continents, severed by revolutions but tied by cultural inheritance to their Western European roots.

At the same time, there came another great expansion—from west to east. The Slavic peoples and culture pushed through the Ural Mountains, across the vastness of Siberia to the Pacific, and on across the Bering Sea to Alaska and our own west coast. The Russian tide collided with the Japanese, just emerging from the hermits' hut, with vaulting ambitions, too. There it stopped—for a time—but the land mass over which the Russian expansion surged has for the most part remained firmly in Russian hands, while the European overseas expansion created a new and independent center of power here on our continent.

Twice in 25 years our new center of power, stretching from the tropics to the Arctic and facing both the Pacific and the Atlantic, has been compelled to intervene to redress the balance of power in the world. And now with Britain and France enfeebled by these wars, with the German and Japanese power crushed, the United States and Russia, which have risen from the mists of these short hundred years, even as this university, stand

face to face, with the other nations polarized around them, drawn by the gravitational pulls of proximity, coercion, self-interest, and kinship.

Believing as we do in a community of free nations and free peoples acting peacefully and responsibly through governments freely chosen, we conclude at last that we cannot live in comfortable security with a great imperial power which has seen the barriers to its expansion collapse and is on the move again, taking here, probing there, and pressing relentlessly against the uncommitted, discontented millions. Capitalizing the ancient racial xenophobia and the messianic zeal to missionize the world of the Russian people, the leaders of the new Russia, armed with force and the old weapon of fomented revolution, use the seductive new weapon of communism to soften their victims. But whatever the trappings, the methods, the weapons, the objective is domination—imperialism. I often think it would be both more accurate and more effective if we talked less of communism with all its appeal for ignorant, miserable peoples and more of imperialism which threatens the freedom and independence of everyone and has no appeal. Communism can be a fighting faith, but imperialism is subtle slavery.

So, as Northwestern University enters its second century, America, rich, peaceful, and undisciplined, finds itself face to face across both the seas with an inscrutable, ruthless conqueror, strong, cunning, and armed with an egalitarian idea that has great appeal for the miserable masses of humanity. No longer is there anyone to protect us. No longer can we sow when and where we are certain to reap. There is no safe investment, no certain harvest any longer. We cannot even measure the price of saving ourselves. Indeed, we seem to be in some doubt as to whether we should save ourselves at all; whether we are worth the cost.

The quiet past in which this great university grew to manhood is no more. Our bright land is troubled and sorely tried. Things are badly out of balance when we spend $260,000,000 for one aircraft carrier, four times the endowment of this university. Its future is in doubt. Our future is in doubt. Some say fight now. Some say despotism is the wave of the future. Some say abandon Asia. Some say abandon Europe. And worst of all, everybody says something—including me.

In our time peace has become as abnormal as war used to be because this is the revolution. And revolution is extremely irritating, vexatious, and bewildering to a prosperous, peaceful, contented people that wants nothing except to be left alone.

How have we reacted to this condition of perpetual danger? It seems to me that for 5 years we have suffered from the confusion and distraction of alternate moments of illusion and despair. Hoping always for a cheap and painless escape from the realities of a distasteful destiny, aided and abetted by politicians who will say anything to be popular and by editors either myopic or worse, public opinion has moved in violent pendular swings between optimism and pessimism, between the mountains of complacency and the marshes of despair.

In fatuous haste to be shut of war, worry, and expense, we obliterate our power and leave it to the United Nations to keep a peace that never existed. When things go right we gush paeans of praise for the United Nations; when they go wrong we damn it and even propose to forsake the good because it is not the perfect. In fear we overestimate the danger; imperil our liberties, exaggerate the foe's cunning and strength; even demand a show-down as though the certainty of doom were preferable to the uncertainty. Again, perpetual danger invites the complacency of status and we underestimate the peril by overconfidence in our virtue and power, as though that were enough in a moral contest. But the self hypnosis of loud and repeated talk about our righteousness and freedom will rally no allies nor blow the Kremlin walls down.

And now as things get tough and we find we can't buy, threaten, or preach our way to peace, we are menaced by amateur strategists. Even the isolationists have reappeared, flexing their muscles, or rather their tongues, and proclaiming "Let the whole world go. We should worry. We can defend ourselves with a strong Navy and Air Force." Haven't they heard about Pearl Harbor or the atom bomb? Was the last war all in vain? Haven't they heard that we are not self-sufficient? Won't a garrison state become a police state? And do they forget that nothing succeeds like success? If they do, conquerors don't. I suppose any moment even America First may emerge full blown again, except that I hope this time it is more properly entitled "America Last"—last on the Kremlin's list.

The reemergence of the straight isolationist doctrine—the same people saying the same things we heard before the whirlwind a decade ago—is to me the great regurgitation. They remind me of Charles Lamb's remark, "I cannot make present things present to me."

But fortunately the great debate about foreign policy, which was mostly a debate about military strategy and not foreign policy, appears to be about over. And, none too soon, it appears that we have about made up our mind to stop fighting each other, gather all the like-minded allies we can find, and settle down seriously to the very serious business of getting stronger than the brigands that are preying on the world.

Perhaps an occasional national debate like this one is a healthy thing. It clears the air, releases tensions, focuses torpid attention on great issues, and melts divisionist controversy into a mold of common conviction.

Maybe we have about reached a common conviction that peace through power is our salvation. Maybe we have decided that only by once again redressing the balance of power in the world and confronting Russia with a preponderance of force can we thwart an imperialism more sinister than the world has ever seen.

But we should profit from an experience like this, because it won't be the last time we get rattled; it won't be the last time we doubt our beliefs and believe our doubts.

I suppose, for example, we will have to assume that the isolationist argument will have at least nine lives, for the very human reason that it pleases the average man because it spares him any immediate inconvenience or sacrifice, and it flatters his sense of power to feel that America can live alone and like it.

And have we learned that while the whole Nation may debate the broad policy of whether to defend or not to defend, whether to defend alone or with allies, the details of the where, when, and how we will defend are sometimes questions of military, political, and diplomatic strategy which cannot be settled safely or wisely by public debate? Nor can they be wisely settled by men who behave, to borrow a line from King Lear, "as if they were God's spies," but who are neither military strategists nor geopoliticians.

Have we learned that what 160,000,000 Americans know about our plans the enemy knows too? Have we learned that hunting scapegoats is not a foreign policy?

Have we learned that our mission is the prevention, not just the survival of a major war? Have we discovered that there are no Gibraltars, no fortresses, impregnable to death or ideas anymore?

While the debate talks incessantly in terms of our national crisis and our national survival, it is not just our crisis, it is the crisis of the whole free world. Have we learned that making domestic political capital out of world crisis is not the way to win friends and influence people? Do we realize that the Russians have already gained a portion of their objectives by using our indecision and moral confusion to weaken our leadership in the free world? The Russians know the value of even reluctant allies in this final struggle for power. Do we? Or are we going to risk the slow strangulation that comes from whittling away the friendly world?

If we have not learned that having the most to lose we have the most to save, then I say, let us pray.

But if we have, if the immensity of the responsibility and the stakes has dawned upon us, then the great debate has been a great blessing and we are on the way to thwart this latest greatest threat to all this university symbolizes.

Why should we be poor in spirit? The task is great, the price is high, but the prize is better than life. With Europe and its great industrial concentration and forward bases shored up and steadfast, with access to the tin and rubber of south Asia, middle eastern oil, African manganese and uranium, the scales are still weighted to the west, and the waves of the future are still free. Aggression must be called aggression in the United Nations. But in insisting on no equivocation about the legal and moral position, we dare not forget that the allegiance of India, uncommitted to east or west, is the ultimate objective of both east and west in the Orient. And we dare not fall into the trap, the oubliette, Russia has prepared us in China. War there will drain our resources and at the same time make China completely dependent militarily on Russia. With every Russian jet at least six Russians go along. A weakened China means a stronger Russia pressing from behind against Hong Kong, Indochina, south Asia, and finally India. Hounded by people of small vision and great emotion it will not be easy to stand the pressure to help solve Russia's problems with China. And with us mired in the morass of the China mainland the Soviet could turn next summer to some unfinished business with Tito in Jugoslavia.

Pray heaven we can remember amid the discord and chagrin of defeat that military force alone cannot win the day for us in Asia. Our moral authority there is low because we are white and Asia is colored. Desperately poor, struggling to shake off the shackles of white colonialism, Asia is just now passing through the era of revolution, independence, and self-determination that swept the western world long ago. It will take great patience, great insight, great restraint for us who see the whole world in our own image and likeness to win confidence and faith in the great uncommitted areas of Asia. It can't be done with the white man's sword. But it can be done; they can be convinced that Communist imperialism is not liberation but a more deadly enemy of normal aspirations for freedom and social justice than colonialism.

Are we, I wonder, moving as a nation from our Greek period to our Roman period; from a period in which the validity of our ideas was the important consideration to one in which their effectiveness is crucial? Good intentions and reliance on the rightness of our cause will avail us little against an enemy that cares nothing about validity and is concerned only with effectiveness. The Greeks were right, but they died.

A danger greater, it seems to me, than Germany or Japan in the last war, or Communist imperialism now is moral fatigue, disintegration, half loyalty, timid faith—the "weakening of the central convictions to which Western man hitherto has pledged allegiance."

When freedom didn't exist it too was a fighting faith that men would die for. But now that it is old, it looks a little pale and

gentle and lacks the appeal to the militant, irrational sentiments once mobilized by conquering religions and now by imperial communism.

But communism resolves no anxieties. It multiplies them. It organizes terror. It is without spiritual content or comfort. It provides no basic security. In the long run it cannot cure the disease of this anxious age. But its short-term methods are grimly effective. We can't sit still and wait for the fever to run its course. Without combative faith in our spiritual heritage, we won't long hold out against the subtleties of selfishness and fear. If western civilization is to save its body, it must save its soul too. It must awake again the emotionalism, the confidence, the defiant faith of a resolute breed of men to whom liberty and justice mean something positive every day—not just when war has reduced us to the stark issue of self-preservation.

It's easy to care mightily then; it's hard now. It's easier to fight for principles than to live up to them. But now is the time that a passionate belief counts if we are to avoid another war, and if we are to avoid the greater menace of cowardly surrender to our own doubts and fears.

Don't the universities have a large, indeed the leading, role to play in articulating the purpose and the combative faith of a great people in this era of convulsive transition and this hour of discord and doubt? Don't they know best what we stand to lose?

We have proclaimed our military weakness, our vacillation, our hesitation, our fear. Enough of that. The test of a nation is defeat. The time has come to proclaim our faith in all its might and majesty. History will go on and "The Forfeiture of Freedom" would be a sorry title to this chapter; rather the historian must write that in arousing America to redefine and defend its ideals the ugliest despotism dug its grave in the twentieth century.

It was in 1776 that Tom Paine wrote: "The heart that feels not now is dead; the blood of his children will curse his cowardice, who shrinks back at a time when little might have saved the whole."

An Asian Replies to Asians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recently the United Nations took the historic action of declaring Communist China an aggressor. Many years from today historians will be writing about it and the debate that preceded the decision will be studied and analyzed. One of the most significant phases of that debate was the detailed analysis of the negotiations with the Peiping regime as made by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of Philippines (who served with distinction in this body), in which it is clearly shown that the Chinese Communists spurned all the peace-making attempts of the United Nations.

In his analysis, General Romulo makes a measured reply to India, Egypt, and the other members of the Asian Arab bloc, all of which took a stand against that of the United States on the question. Because it will help enlighten the American people on a matter that is vital to our freedom and national security, I include in the RECORD General Romulo's statement, as follows:

VERBATIM RECORD OF IMPROMPTU INTERVENTION OF PHILIPPINE FOREIGN SECRETARY CARLOS P. ROMULO DURING DEBATE ON CEASE-FIRE IN KOREA BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS POLITICAL AND SECURITY COMMITTEE JANUARY 22, 1951

General ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The adjournment of the debate has been moved by the delegate of Egypt to give our Governments time to consider the new communication from Peiping which has been read by Sir Benegal Rau. There is, however, a question of procedure that must first be settled.

The message read by Sir Benegal was received by the Ambassador of India in Peiping, ostensibly in answer to a request for elucidation by the Government of India.

I believe that it would be an essential first requirement for a proper consideration of the message from Peiping to have the text of the note sent by the Ambassador of India requesting clarification of certain points in Peiping's message of January 17.

It would then be necessary to make sure that the subsequent clarification from Peiping is clearly intended for the use and information of the first committee, and that therefore the Indian delegation be requested to convey the desire of the committee that this clarification be addressed directly to this body.

(After the interventions of Turkey, Greece, Ecuador, Honduras, and Chile, General Romulo again asked for the floor.)

General ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, I asked a few minutes ago for certain clarifications of procedure in order that the adjournment of debate suggested by the delegation of India and moved by the delegate of Egypt may be put to useful purpose. Let me restate the two suggestions I made: First, I requested that the full text of the notes exchanged by the governments of India and the Peoples Republic of China be given to the committee in order that we can understand the full scope and meaning of the new message from Peiping. Specifically, what questions about the cease-fire, its timing, and its relationship to the negotiations on other issues, did the Government of India ask?

Secondly, some means must be found of conveying to the Peiping government the need of communicating any new proposals directly and formally to the United Nations, in order that our governments may deal with them in an appropriate manner.

The third point, which I now wish to add to my previous observations, is this: If this latest message to the Government of India is merely a clarification or elucidation, then we must assume that the original message from Peiping of January 17 remains unchanged, and that this subsequent explanation does not alter the previous position adopted by Peiping. If this is so, then the statement that "a cease-fire for a limited time-period can be agreed upon in the first meeting of the seven-nation conference and put into effect so that the negotiations may proceed further. This apparently hopeful statement must be interpreted in the light of the Peiping message of January 17 which stated: "It must be pointed out, however, that the principle of a cease fire first and negotiations afterward * * * could never lead to genuine peace. Therefore, the Central Peoples Government of the Peoples Republic of China cannot agree to this principle." In other words, Mr. Chairman, this last message cannot alter the earlier point of the Peiping regime.

Is it possible to interpret this latest message not as elucidation but, in a sense, as a substitute proposal?

Mr. Chairman, we want to be enlightened. I therefore yield the floor to the delegate of India.

(The delegate of India intervened.)

General ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, with much regret I must say that the answer of the delegate of India was neither an answer nor was it enlightening.

In my previous statement on January 18, I made an analysis of the reply of the Peiping government to find out if there was any basis for believing that it embodies any "counterproposals" worthy of the name. I pointed out that the proposals contained in Peiping's cablegram of January 17 indicated no willingness whatsoever to make a new approach to the problem or to consider new terms for a peaceful settlement thereof.

An effort has since been made to present the reply of Peiping as embodying a set of so-called "counterproposals." This is an opinion that must be examined with the greatest care. One feels that it arises from the attempt to consider the first committee's five principles which were communicated to Peiping on January 13 and Peiping's reply thereto of January 17, in isolation from all that has gone before, as if this exchange of messages was the beginning rather than the culmination of the prolonged negotiations to bring about cessation of hostilities in Korea.

But Peiping's reply is the third communication we have received in answer to the third approach we have made to that government. On December 16 the Committee of Three sent a message to Peiping stating, among other things, that "the purpose of the cease-fire in Korea will be to prevent the conflict from spreading to other areas, to put an end to the fighting in Korea, and to provide an opportunity for considering what further steps should be taken for a peaceful settlement of existing issues, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations." The message then expressed the desire of the Committee of Three to meet with representatives of the Peiping regime with the least possible delay.

Five days later, on December 21, the Peiping government replied to the effect that it could not instruct its representatives to remain in Lake Success for negotiations with the "illegal three-man committee" which had been set up by what it described as an "illegal and null and void" resolution of the General Assembly.

On December 19, the group of three sent a further message to Peiping spelling out in some detail the plans of the cease-fire group in relation to the proposal of the 12 Asian Governments to appoint a committee which would meet as soon as possible to make recommendations for the peaceful settlement of existing issues in the Far East. It was intended by this message to reassure Peiping that once a cease-fire arrangement had been achieved, the negotiations visualized in the second resolution should be proceeded with at once, and that the Government of the People's Republic of China would be included in the negotiating committee referred to in the latter resolution.

It should be noted that in this second message, the group of three already made a considerable advance from the vague generalizations about a cease-fire which were contained in its message of December 16. Indeed, the cease-fire group, even without an explicit authorization by the first committee, went so far as to give the assurance that negotiations for the peaceful settlement of existing issues in the Far East would immediately follow the cease-fire and that the Peiping regime would be included in the negotiating committee. No one can deny that the group of three, by its second message of December 19, leaned over backwards to make a gesture of conciliation to the Peiping government.

Four days later, on December 23, the Peiping Government expressed doubt that the negotiating body to discuss existing issues in the Far East would ever be set up, and set forth its position as follows:

First, that the idea of cease fire first and negotiations afterward was totally unacceptable;

Second, that the only basis for negotiating a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem is the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the settlement of Korea's domestic affairs by the Korean people themselves;

Third, that the United States forces must be withdrawn from China; and

Fourth, that the People's Republic of China must be seated in the United Nations.

On January 13, the first committee approved the five principles and transmitted them to Peiping. Again, it must be noted that the first committee went out of its way to meet the objections and to resolve the doubts of the Peiping government. In establishing the sequence of cease fire before negotiations, the first committee made two notable advances toward conciliation; first, by declaring that the cease-fire arrangement would contain adequate safeguards for ensuring that it will not be used as a screen for mounting a new offensive, and secondly, by explicitly stating that the negotiating body would attempt to settle peacefully all existing issues in the Far East, including those of Formosa and the representation of China in the United Nations.

In contrast to the eager desire shown by the first committee to approximate the position of the Peiping government, to set its doubts and misgivings at rest, and to give a formal pledge that the two questions in which it is most deeply interested would be considered by the negotiating body as soon as agreement has been reached on a cease fire, the Peiping government has shown no inclination whatever to move from its previously established position. Its reply of January 17, except for the addition of two details, repeats almost word for word its demands of December 23.

In the light of this review of the whole course of our negotiations with the Peiping regime, we are constrained to reject the notion which regards the last message from Peiping as embodying any sort of counterproposals. The picture that emerges from this analysis is that of the United Nations making three separate gestures of conciliation, taking three long steps to reduce the distance that divides the parties, while the Peiping government continues to stand firm and unmoving on its original demands and its price for peace.

The Philippine Government is not insensitive to the argument that peace is so important that we must continue our search for it by exerting further efforts to reach an understanding with the Peiping government. The countries of Asia are understandably concerned that this quest be pursued, and none among them more deeply than my own. But the question that must now be resolved is whether we have a better chance of preserving peace if the United Nations continues to bend the knee to the aggressor than if it undertook finally to stand firmly on the principles that gave it birth. We believe that history rather than wishful thinking should be our guide in this dilemma, and history teaches us that the surrender of principle and the appeasement of the aggressor have never led to peace but only to further and larger aggressions.

But other events of recent history have been invoked to support the thesis of further appeasement. Mention has been made of the United Nations effort to settle the problem of Indonesia. It is true that the United Nations persevered in its effort to settle that dispute. But the Republic of Indonesia, with the support of the Government of India, the Philippines, and others, never at any time abandoned the principle that a breach of the peace and an act of aggression, within the terms of the Charter, had been committed there. A position of moral principle was taken without vacillation by the 15 countries of Asia and Africa that attended the Conference on Indonesia in January 1949 in New Delhi, which was held on the invitation of the Government of India. The conference included the following countries: Afghanistan, Australia, Burma, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen. On January 22, exactly 2 years ago today, the Conference adopted a resolution, later transmitted to the Security Council, which declared, among other things, that the Conference was "of the opinion that the Dutch military action launched on the 18th of December 1948 constitutes a flagrant breach of the Charter of the United Nations and defiance of the efforts of the Security Council and its Good Offices Committee to bring about a peaceful settlement," and that it was firmly convinced that the Security Council was properly seized of the Indonesian question "as a breach of the peace and an act of aggression, under article 39 of the United Nations Charter." The resolution further recommended that if the parties to the dispute did not comply with the recommendations of the Security Council, the Security Council "shall take effective action under the wide powers conferred upon it by the Charter to enforce said recommendations." This was an obvious reference to economic sanctions, which the Governments of India, the Philippines, and others had already adopted in some degree even without the authorization of the Council.

This was 2 years ago, and the dispute was between two states, not between one state and the United Nations. If I cite this admirable instance of the solidarity of the Asian and Arab States in a matter of principle which was of direct concern to them, it is because I feel that the reference that has been made to the Indonesian question argues not in favor of vacillation and surrender of principle but rather the contrary. It argues in favor of a stanch affirmation of the principles of the Charter and resolute opposition to aggression by whomever it may be committed. I daresay that it is greatly owing to the unshakable moral position then taken by Asian and Arab states that the Republic of Indonesia now sits with us around this table.

In New Delhi we also spoke of further measures that might be taken, without asking ourselves whether those measures would have any practical effect in halting the military action against the Republic of Indonesia. Today, on the other hand, we are being asked what further action we intend to take following the adoption of the draft resolution presented by the United States. We are being detained by the argument that to brand the Peiping regime as an aggressor may serve no useful purpose. We didn't ask ourselves such questions 2 years ago. I think the feeling among the states gathered in New Delhi was that fidelity to principle and reliance upon the moral power of the United Nations were things of great value in themselves, apart from the question of whether or not, in a particular case, their reaffirmation would serve a useful purpose.

In accordance with the views I have repeatedly expressed and in the light of the historic precedent I have just cited, my government gives its wholehearted support to the resolution submitted by the United States.

You Can Change the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book condensation from the Reader's Digest of April 1949:

YOU CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

(A condensation from the book by James Keller, founder, in 1945, of the Christophers)

"Better to light one candle than to curse the darkness"—so goes an old Chinese proverb.

In a small California town a young Negro, studying to be a teacher, took a part-time job at a filling station to help support himself and his wife until he got his degree. But some customers objected; they wanted to buy gasoline only from white men. The owner was about to fire the boy when a woman neighbor asked:

"How many customers will you lose if you stand by this fellow?"

"About 18; maybe 20."

"If I get you 20 new customers, you will keep him on?"

"You bet I will."

Not only did this aroused woman bring 20 new customers but 5 more for good measure. She was a Christopher—one of a growing band of men and women united in the purpose to help change the world into a better place.

What is a Christopher? He is one who believes in individual responsibility for the common good of all and sets himself a specific job to do; an average man or woman ready to work and make personal sacrifices. It is literally astounding to learn the results that are being achieved single-handed by little people of faith and zeal.

Although under Catholic auspices, the movement embraces all faiths among its followers. The movement has no chapters, no committees, no meetings; there are no membership lists and no dues. From a central office in New York occasional bulletins are mailed out to more than 100,000 interested persons; that is the sole unifying contact. Each believes that alone and unaided he has a post of his own in the war between good and evil, and he must believe in the power of himself, as an individual, to change the world.

How single-handed efforts multiply into power was symbolized at a patriotic meeting of 100,000 citizens jammed into the Los Angeles Coliseum one starless night. Suddenly the chairman startled the throng:

"Don't be afraid now. All the lights are going out."

In complete darkness he struck a match.

"All who can see this little light say 'Yes.'"

A deafening roar came from the audience.

"So shines a good deed in a naughty world. But suppose now every one of us here strikes a light."

Faster than it takes to tell, nearly 100,000 pinpricks of flame flooded the arena with light—the result of 100,000 individuals, each doing his own part. That is how the Christopher movement works.

No matter who you are, or what you are, or where you may be, you can do something to change the world for the better. You, as an individual, are important. You count.

Remember the gigantic letter-writing campaign which helped to smash the radical forces in the Italian elections recently. Literally millions of letters went out from people of Italian descent in the United States encouraging relatives in the old country to vote against totalitarianism. One of the men who fostered that dazzling campaign was a barber in Southampton, Long Island.

Irritated by Old World criticisms and lies about our American ways, he was also exasperated that people who resented such attacks did nothing to counteract them.

He decided to do something about it personally.

First he wrote to relatives in St. Catherine, Sicily, describing his happy life here. Next he wrote his wife's relatives. Then he persuaded his son, a doctor, and his daughter, a dietitian, to write. Meanwhile he appealed to newspaper editors and even to President Truman to help enlist the Nation. All agreed it was a good idea but too unwieldy. Various organizations wished him well, but that was all.

But the barber, enraptured with his cause, refused to quit. He kept on asking for help. Slowly the idea burned with its own fire. Businessmen, young GI brides from overseas, housewives, veterans' groups, civic societies, and religious leaders joined in. A steady trickle of letters to Italy swelled to a torrent; the Democratic victory heartened all Europe.

One man helped start this, because he lifted himself out of his own narrow, selfish sphere and into the larger world with all its breath-taking potentialities.

Not spectacularly, but in countless ways, tens of thousands of Christophers are busy and never before in history were such efforts needed so desperately. For today the world is ill of the disease of the soul called materialism. If the trend toward paganism continues, it is only a matter of time before our Nation will collapse from within. That is what happened in Germany.

Millions of decent Americans have long forgotten the basic truth that every human being gets his fundamental rights from God—not from the State. That, in fact, the chief purpose of the State—as the founding fathers repeatedly affirmed in the Declaration of Independence—is to protect those God-given rights.

To believe that these rights are safe today is to embrace illusion.

The stockbroker who, forsaking Wall Street, lowered his entire family's living standards to take a Government job and fight for good principles is a Christopher. So is the Baptist lawyer down in Texas who spends all his leisure time making speeches on the brotherhood of man. And so is a girl epileptic, bed-bound in a small California hospital, who started writing a column that would concentrate on the good in life around us, instead of just the opposite. A little newspaper printed her words; fan letters poured in—and, believe it or not, this girl is now almost completely recovered from epilepsy. Her doctors understand why; she got out of herself and out of her own narrow world, gave herself a purpose in life and so did away with mental and emotional frustration.

It is estimated that subversives who are trying to undermine the United States compose less than 1 percent of the people of our country. Christophers believe that 1 percent of the normal, decent citizens of America can be found ready and willing to work just as hard to restore divine truth and human integrity to American life.

The story of one American wife shows the inestimable power of a woman, working behind the scenes in her own home. Her husband told her the Reds were taking over his union. "Keep out of that," she advised him. "It'll only mean trouble."

But a Christopher explained how getting decent people to stay away from union meetings was just what the Reds wanted. From then on, she urged her husband to attend every meeting, she induced him to urge others, finally she egged him on to run for president of the union. In substance, that is the history of how a large union was taken away from an organized leftist minority. One woman with a Christopher purpose was all that was needed to start the fire.

In the home, in all our personal relationships, we must practice love and we must pass on the message of the good life. As you grow in love for others, you will find your own power increasing. You will learn how to disagree without being disagreeable. You will become more approachable. You will better understand why all people want to be truly loved and not just tolerated. You will emphasize more and more the good side of even the worst people. You will develop an inner warmth, an abiding sense of humor; naturally you will make mistakes, but you will always be able to laugh at yourself. Your never-say-die spirit will give courage to everyone you meet.

Life itself will take on a new and exhilarating meaning, because you will be fulfilling the purpose for which you were created: To love God above all things and your neighbor as yourself.

"We hate Christianity and Christians," proclaimed Anatole Lunacharsky, Soviet Commissar of Education. "Even the best of them must be considered our worst enemies. They preach love of one's neighbor and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. What we want is hate. * * * Only then will we conquer the universe." (Quoted in Izvestia.)

The one thing that terrifies the godless the world over is the fear that some day all those who believe in Christ will wake up—and start acting their beliefs.

Once that happens, most of the great problems which plague mankind will disappear overnight.

War—Russian Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr, United States Air Force, retired, the author of this article, has had a long and brilliant military career, which began in 1908 when he graduated from the United States Naval Academy. In 1912 he transferred to the Army seeking an aviator's rating and received flight training in 1917 as an officer of the Signal Corps. Later, when the Air Corps was established, he, of course, was transferred to the Air Corps.

After a brief retirement because of physical disability, he was returned to duty in 1942 and served as Commanding General of the Air Technical Service Command in Europe, and was Deputy Commanding General for Administration United States Strategic Air Forces in Europe throughout the war. In 1948 he was appointed Inspector General of the United States Air Force.

Just prior to General Knerr's appointment as Inspector General, United States Air Force, he served as alternate to Gen. H. H. ("Hap") Arnold, in the latter's capacity as Adviser to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which I had the honor to be Vice Chairman. His keen and penetrating understanding of the military problems of our country, not to mention its international political problems, was of immense value to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Hugh Knerr, as stated, graduated from the Naval Academy, served in the Army, and became Inspector General of the Air Force. His long and varied military career, covering 42 years of our country's most recent history, entitled him to speak with the authority he exhibits in his article which follows:

WAR—RUSSIAN STYLE

(By Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Knerr, USAF, retired)

We are losing a war without firing a shot. We are losing it because we do not seem to understand that the character of international conflict has completely changed since the close of World War II.

Psychological warfare is now the most potent weapon in the arsenal of the totalitarians. Although Hitler gave us a first-class course in how this weapon can be used, we have chosen to ignore it. That we should not choose to use it is understandable. That we do not recognize it in the hands of Russia is inexcusable.

Military arms are essential to this kind of warfare, not necessarily for use but to brandish under the noses of statesmen and politicians fearful of their own position or the safety of their country. That these arms may be inferior or lacking in substance does not appear to be important so long as they are there in great numbers.

Russia has retained a huge army primarily for psychological purposes and the control of her own and subjugated peoples. Reliable estimates indicate she can muster a ground force of 3,750,000 men. The Atlantic Pact nations will do well to raise 2,000,000. So what?

Would it not be perfectly stupid to enter a tiger's cage relying upon your teeth and fingernails simply because the tiger has only teeth and claws? Yet that appears to be exactly the attitude we and other nations are assuming.

We have become so hypnotized by the colossal manpower available to the Russians and their Asiatic cousins we think we must match them man for man and weapon for weapon in a conflict of their own choosing: A psychological victory for Russia of the first magnitude.

In a contest between ground forces western civilization is certain to take a licking again. It is impossible for us to stoop to the immorality inherent in total disregard for human life and dignity. Eastern materialism is no more inhibited in this regard than the tiger.

On the other hand, we are just as certain to control the situation if we but follow the example of experts in tiger handling and take a chair, pistol, and whip into the cage with us.

As with the tiger, the mere attitude of a willingness to fight with weapons he does not understand and that will hurt him when he steps out of line would be most effective in countering the Russian confidence in, and our fear of, superior ground forces. Fear of this obviously superior force and all the unknown forces that may be back of the iron curtain is the secret of Russian psychological success.

RUSSIAN TACTICS EXPOSE WEAKNESS

Fear of the unknown is a universal weakness of mankind. The oriental has played upon it for thousands of years. Cunning, indirection, cynicism are favored as naturally as the occidental prefers an immediate, direct settlement of differences.

The oriental employs his approach as a form of mental and psychological torture to wear down his opponent to the point where, in exasperation, he gives up or makes a mistake that may be seized upon to advantage. In this process the bait of apparent success is occasionally thrown out to the occidental who, in his desire to believe in the integrity of his fellow man, grabs it as proof that his opponent has been misunderstood. In spite of the rude awakening that inevitably follows, the same thing happens over and over again. Think back 10 years, or read tomorrow's newspaper.

This process of leading from weakness is as simple and effective as at cards. The same necessity exists for concealing what you do not have. The iron curtain is as necessary to Russia as the vest and sleeves are to the card sharp.

It is my conviction that we find ourselves in these unhappy circumstances as a consequence of honest people trying to beat an international sharper at his own game instead of letting him have it in good old western style when he is caught cheating.

It is strange how this myth of an all-powerful Russia has grown up in the mind of the average American, who normally is not too gullible. Or is it? This business of Russia overrunning Europe in 3 weeks and then putting it to work producing weapons for our defeat is a neat bit of psychological propaganda not entirely of Russian origin. That sort of stupidity is the product of considerable intelligence.

Certainly Russia can get to the Channel in 90 days. Napoleon made the Volga in less time than that. Russia is not going to make the same mistake in reverse, knowing full well that her real objective lies 3,000 miles beyond.

To win Russia knows she must devise means for canceling the ability of the Atlantic bloc to produce five times more steel, three times more coal, seven times more electric power, and 10 times more oil than she can. The key to the riddle facing Russia is the United States.

Why expose her front to war and her back to millions of desperate saboteurs among her own and subjugated populations?

Why not drive wedges in the western wall and allow the frost of suspicion to work for her?

Why not create a rift between England and France over the industrial resources of the Ruhr?

Why not founder the United States and England on the shoals of socialism?

Why not frighten us into dissipating our power among nations too cynical or decadent to fight for an ideal?

Just stop and think over what Russia and her agents have already accomplished along these lines.

Could a war have netted Russia as much in so short a space of time?

VISIBLY STRONG, WE CRINGE IN FEAR

Russia knows that if she cannot knock the United States out quickly she is doomed to eventual defeat. Confronted by the industrial might of this country, twice proven within a generation, Russia senses the folly of attempting to match her shortages in food, rubber, oil, transport, and skilled workers against our obvious plenty, for of such is war compounded.

Her home-made propaganda sours in the knowledge that a hundred of her cities are marked for destruction if she oversteps the bounds of our credulity and restraint. Burned by the lash of a few recent contacts with our air and naval power, she draws her curtain tighter and roars—in frustration. That we misinterpret the roar is not to our credit.

Now, what of our side of the story? Over the past century we have established a moral force in the world so far beyond any Russian concept as to be incomprehensible to her.

We have created an industrial capacity that is at once the envy and despair of Russia.

We have produced an army that had little difficulty in destroying the evil forces of nazism and fascism—then disbanded it.

We have built a Navy capable of controlling the seven seas—then moth balled it.

We have brought into being the incontestable thesis that air power is peace power—but have not supported it.

We have extended the hand of friendship to fallen enemies and bankrupt creditors without expectation of advantage.

A prodigal, lusty giant in the family of nations, it's time we snapped out of it. Time that we assumed sober leadership of mankind and stopped cringing at the taunt of imperialism.

Let us boldly proclaim that we are an imperialistic power intent upon establishing peace and justice throughout the world, Russian-style democracy notwithstanding. Let us make it clear there is a limit to fruitless debate, a limit to the money and material we will give away, a limit to the manpower we will drain from industry.

And let us inform the United Nations that we will lead in this crusade of 1951 but make it clear there can be no neutrals in this conflict with evil. Each must be for us or against us. Each must contribute a like proportionate share of national resource.

Let us lay down in no uncertain terms our intention to make maximum use of our industrial power, our air power, and our naval power. But by the same token we will not have our Army used as a pawn in an international chess game with the champion.

And finally, let us make it crystal clear we are through with the role of a genie in a bottle to be called forth or hustled back again at the whim of a beggar.

All of these we can do. The Congress of the United States has the power and authority to do them. The voter and the taxpayer have the final responsibility to see that they are done. This responsibility must be accepted sooner or later. Why wait?

Southern California Demands Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from the decisions of some of the heads of administrative agencies establishing regional headquarters for the southwest section of the United States at San Francisco that a special study of the map of the southwest section of the United States and a perusal of the latest comparative census figures for Los Angeles and San Francisco would be in order for these gentlemen.

The establishment of regional offices in San Francisco has created an unnecessary hardship for hundreds of residents of southern California who must journey north wasting many valuable days annually seeking the Government assistance and cooperation that should be available to them in southern California.

Recent census figures show that the population of the city of Los Angeles is now 1,957,692, while the population of San Francisco is only 760,381. Los Angeles also has 46 percent of all the factories on the Pacific coast with 44 percent of all the factory employees on the coast.

Certainly the people of southern California and the Southwest section of the United States are entitled to the facilities and services of a regional office of major administrative agencies in the southern part of California. The logical location for such offices is in the Los Angeles area.

The following is an editorial on this subject which appeared in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Daily News which clearly states the facts and the needs of the citizens of Los Angeles and southern California:

FACTS ABOUT LOS ANGELES FOR WASHINGTON BIGGIES

What some of our civilian brass in Washington, including possibly the President himself, seems to need is a lesson in geography.

This lesson should be equipped with adequate illustrations, diagrams, graphs, and a report on the latest census figures. These esteemed public servants do not seem to know, for example, that Los Angeles is a large city in southern California, 347 airline miles away from San Francisco, of which many of them think we are a suburb.

Pending assembly of the necessary maps and other exhibits for our higher echelon officials, here are certain outstanding facts for their immediate information and edification. The latest census figures, prepared by one of their own departments, shows the population of Los Angeles to be 1,957,692. The population of San Francisco is 760,381. These figures apply only to the city limits in both cases.

The metropolitan area of Los Angeles is the third largest in America, being exceeded only by New York and Chicago. This city also is the logical and strategic metropolis of the southwest and central to that area, to northwestern Mexico and to the broad Pacific.

Now, why is it that this geography lesson needs to be brought home to the men of the White House and sundry capital agencies? Why is it that it is deemed such a vital lesson by the southern California delegation to Congress that it has organized to march on the White House as a body to impress upon the officials there the facts to which we have adverted?

It is because Washington bureaucracy continues to make San Francisco regional headquarters for all Federal agencies and is in process of making it regional headquarters for more. The latest case in point is the establishment in San Francisco of regional headquarters of the Economic Stabilization agency which will have jurisdiction over California, Arizona and Nevada.

Some time ago the regional office of the Department of Commerce was established here. Later it was reduced to a district office and the regional office was moved to San Francisco. Edwin Bates, manager for the district of the Department of Commerce, says that his functions have not been reduced in actual status and that he will be able to render the same service as formerly to the businessmen of this area. This is fortunate and not the case with many other agencies.

Chamber of commerce officials, including Oscar Trippett, president, and Harold Wright, general manager, who went to Washington to protest against the continued treatment of Los Angeles as a hick town or a suburb, say that hundreds of residents of this city are forced to go to San Francisco, hat and briefcase in hand, and waste many valuable days annually in seeking what they need from the Government when they should be able to get it here. They point out, very appropriately,

that Los Angeles has not only more than twice San Francisco's population, but 46 percent of all the factories on the Pacific coast, with 44 percent of all the factory employees on the coast.

How is this absurd attitude in Washington accounted for? It is due largely to habits of mind. Since the Mother Lode and Barbary Coast days the east has thought of San Francisco as the big city on the Pacific coast. To this day people for miles in every direction say they are going "to the city" when they go to San Francisco. San Francisco is a delightful place and we gladly concede it. But Washington should be reminded that something has happened since Jack London made the place famous and Nob Hill was the center of the social universe.

Population and the stream of economic life in the West have moved south and southwest, and people have moved with it. Let's put it in terms which Washington understands best: In the 1948 presidential election California's voters cast 1,913,134 for President Truman. Out of that total Los Angeles County contributed 812,690, and San Francisco contributed 167,726. Let's put it another way: The State has 5,244,837 registered voters. Of these, 2,198,878 live in Los Angeles County and 429,866 live in San Francisco. See what we mean?

—L. E. C.

Labor Fights for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a very fine analysis of the role of free labor in the present struggle against communism and specifically in the current international situation is presented in an article by George P. Delaney, the international representative of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Delaney's article entitled "Labor Battles Reds Round the World" was published in the Washington Post, January 28, 1951. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

LABOR BATTLES REDS ROUND THE WORLD

(By George P. Delaney, international representative, American Federation of Labor)

One of the most important contributions of American labor to the preservation of freedom and the extension of the democratic way of life is its consistent fight against the spread of Communist ideology throughout the world.

While from all directions there is much effective opposition to Communist ideology, no group has done so much to supply aggressive resistance as free trade-union members and their representatives in the nations of the free world.

Everywhere the proponents of communism are attempting to persuade the working people that the Marxian ideology is the panacea for all ills, though the millions of slave laborers in Russia are a living contradiction of such false propaganda.

According to Communist theory, the working people are the segment of the population in each country that will spearhead a successful revolution. To stage a successful internal revolution, a hard core of Communists must capture the labor movement of a nation. It should be borne in mind that there is no greater achievement for a Communist than to convert or capture an important labor leader.

Theoretically, upon exposure to the pseudo truths of Stalinism, the worker will react by taking his place in the ranks of the Communists. In the free nations the opposite reaction has occurred, and the union members of the free nations, except in a few scattered instances, have forcefully opposed the party line.

Totalitarianism in any form breeds and grows strong in poverty and disease, in social reaction, and economic injustice. Workers who live in a free country, who enjoy a decent standard of life, who can join free unions, and who can bargain collectively will always reject communism.

In recent years when a small-scale struggle was on in the labor movement of the United States between revolutionary communism and a trade-unionism that would function within a democratic society, communism lost decisively. In Western Europe, when workers have been given a choice they have always chosen a democratic society over a Communist state. The elected representatives of free trade-unions have been the first victims of any form of totalitarian dictatorship. This was true in Italy and Germany in the twenties and thirties; in Argentina, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary in the forties.

In the total diplomacy of today labor's role in world affairs is of paramount importance. People to people, worker to worker communication of the message of vigorous dedication to the principles of democracy can be a decisive factor in the struggle between the free world and the slave world. Such an exchange of views is being effected through many organizations and channels.

Among these are the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Labor Organization, the A. F. of L. Free Trade Union Committee, the Inter-American Confederation of Workers, which is working to prevent the spread of Communist ideology particularly in Central and South American nations, and the International Secretariats.

The Free Trade Union Committee has been active in Europe and Asia, rendering material aid to the restoration of a free trade-union movement in those areas. The committee also assist free trade-union movements in exile and trade-unionists in distress.

Economic Cooperation Administration labor advisers in the Marshall plan countries and labor attachés in many United States embassies have made significant contributions. The Office of International Labor Affairs of the Labor Department is doing an excellent job. The A. F. of L., the CIO, and the independent unions maintain standing committees on international relations and have worked with great success in disseminating the concepts of freedom to foreign workers in both the free world and the slave world. In the United Nations, in the Economic and Social Council, and the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, free labor has been very active and articulate.

In November 1949 the trade-union centers of the free world sent delegates to London to establish the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. The machinations of labor representatives from the iron curtain countries in the World Federation of Trade Unions had revealed that they were government puppets and not free trade-union representatives. Every twist and turn of the party line was followed rigorously. Consequently, the bona fide trade unions withdrew from the WFTU and formed a common front against the slave world, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Thus, for the first time, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations joined forces in an international labor confederation.

The ICFTU has made a highly auspicious beginning. Its publications go to the far corners of the earth. An ICFTU delegation toured Asia, conferring with labor leaders on techniques of organization and foreign policy. The ICFTU is represented at the United Nations and maintains a branch office in New York. From its headquarters at Brussels are issued policy statements on foreign affairs formulated by affiliates of the ICFTU. On January 4, 1951, a conference of representative Western Hemisphere unions was held at Mexico City under the auspices of the ICFTU.

The International Labor Organization is an inter-governmental body composed of 62 member nations. Each country is represented at the annual ILO conferences by two delegates from government and one delegate each from the most representative voluntary organizations of workers and employers.

Today one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, the ILO was for many years an autonomous part of the League of Nations. This agency seeks to raise the working conditions of workers in all nations through the adoption of labor standards adopted by the conferences, and ratified by the member countries.

The ILO does important research work on international aspects of unemployment, industrial safety, minimum wages, social security, etc. It also sends teams of experts into the field to assist nations in formulating labor legislation, to assist groups of nations in such programs as planning for migration, and it is now playing an important part in the United Nations technical assistance program.

In the industrialized states of the free world, the standard of living is relatively high. Free trade unions have organized a large proportion of the labor force. Collective bargaining is at a fairly mature stage. Moscow propaganda falls on deaf ears among such workers.

In the underdeveloped nations of the world, the problem is much more complex and does not lend itself easily to generalizations. Some nations are trying to throw off forms of colonialism, while other peoples are attempting to form unions as instrumentalities for social and economic reform. Communists have frequently capitalized on such conditions and have taken over the leadership of the forces of revolution.

If communism is not to be allowed to spread to the underdeveloped nations, the standard of life of their people must be elevated substantially. Anyone who believes that we can remain an oasis of plenty in a world of hungry people and still build and maintain the friendship of those people, is blind to the facts.

The action of the economic survey mission to the Philippines in requiring certain internal reforms, including a minimum wage law, as a prerequisite to economic aid, pioneers a pattern that should be developed. No amount of economic aid is going to win the friendship of the working people of the free world if only the upper classes benefit.

In many underdeveloped nations, free trade unions are prohibited. Union leaders are persecuted, imprisoned, and shot. If workers are given an opportunity to secure jobs at a fair wage, under decent working conditions, to join a free union and to bargain collectively for wages and conditions of employment, they will not become communists.

In considering the whole situation, the above statement should be recognized as a truism. The idea of democracy is much more compelling than the idea of Communism, if each presupposes a decent standard of living.

Letter From Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, our people have been inspired by the leadership and ability of so many of our young men who are now carrying the fight to the Communist enemy in Korea. I am including at this point a letter from one of these young men, Maj. Volney F. Morin, of Los Angeles, because this letter indicates the high ideals and the fine courageous type of American manhood safeguarding our Nation during these critical days. This letter was addressed to the dean of students at the University of Michigan.

Before being recalled to active duty with the Four Hundred and Fifty-second Bombardment Wing (L) of the United States Air Force in Japan a few months ago, Major Morin was practicing law in Los Angeles and serving his community in many worth-while civic activities. He is an outstanding young man, and in his letter he helps to answer the question, "Why are we fighting in Korea?" I urge all of the Members of the Congress to read his letter:

HEADQUARTERS, FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND BOMBARDMENT WING (L),
APO 75, UNIT 1, CARE OF POSTMASTER,
San Francisco, Calif., January 15, 1951.

ERICH A. WALTER,
Dean of Students, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

DEAR DEAN WALTER: Thank you for your good etter of January 4.

You admonished me to preach a bit longer. While I am not an authority on international relations, I am obliged to admit there is a viewpoint of detached austerity associated with an APO number on the other side of the world. At an APO you are removed from the day to day argument, discussion, and passion of events in the United States. But—to preach a bit:

As a lawyer, it seems to me a person's ability to walk a dark alley alone is dependent upon the law and order of the society in which he lives. A bully lurking in the dark alley takes note of that law and order.

If you lived in a lawless society, you would have to take certain steps in order to walk that dark alley without fear of the bully—

First, you would have to be strong enough to beat him up.

Second, you would have to convince him that you could do it.

Third, you would have to let him know what act of his would cause you to fight.

It seems to me, the United States is now walking the dark alley of international trouble. At least one bully (and possibly more) lurks in that dark alley. The United States must take the same steps to protect itself that you would take. In short, it must be strong; others must know it is strong; it must announce what it will fight for (specifically: It cannot disclaim interest in Korea and then be surprised if the bully moves in). Moreover, it would seem prudent for the United States to gather whatever allies it can find to help it on it's travels. In walking an alley of peril the United States would be better off with an old ally (e. g. Chiang)—than without.

When I was in school in Ann Arbor (1937–41) it was fashionable to chew on the intellectual bone of socialism. Looking back on those days, we never cracked the bone to the marrow. But then, neither did anyone else. Stuart Chase had written glowingly in his Economy of Abundance of the benefits of a planned economy. As an aside, it is interesting to note he would have planned for a lessened food production in 1951 because experts had predicted a population decline by this time. In 1932 in the preface to his On the Meaning of Life, Will Durant lamented his loss of belief in the Socialist Utopia because, as he put it, of the avarice of men. No wonder we failed to reach the marrow of the planned economy. It wasn't avarice; it was a tougher problem.

It wasn't until 1945 that an English Socialist, Barbara Wooten, in her book, Freedom Under Planning, gave a somewhat accurate definition of a planned economy. She said it was: "A conscious and deliberate choice of economic priorities by some public authority" This was a forward step. For Marx and Engels never said how they would run the Socialist utopia. Moreover, they would not allow the disciples to discuss the question. They were right. Kill the enemy before you discuss the division of spoils.

Perhaps it is not surprising that it was almost 100 years from publication of the Communist manifesto in 1848 until Miss Wooten came close to defining a planned economy.

But it seems to me Miss Wooten still did not reach the issue. Simply stated, the marrow is: "How did you do it?" For example: How does a nation determine it will produce steel? Is it done by comparison with a capitalist economy? If not, how does it know it should produce steel rather than molybdenum or tungsten?

Assuming a determination to make steel; then how much? Clearly, it is not sufficient to have one Englishman making steel; nor is it feasible to have every Englishman making steel. As Mason said to Dixon: "We've got to draw the line someplace." The question is: Where? An English Socialist told me just before my departure from the United States that the determination of how much steel to make was based upon the capital goods requirements. But this only removes by a step the final question of how much.

Assuming ability to determine how much steel to make, the planner of the economy must then determine what to do with it. Does he make automobiles? If so, what kind. Does he make locomotives? Washing machines? Refrigerators? Or what?

In short, the planner of the economy is obliged to make goods for maximum human happiness. But he has no way of finding out what goods he should make. Human taste varies.

To my knowledge, all nations (and it is not too late to remember the word "Nazi" meant National Socialist Workers Party) that have tried the planned economy have stumbled on these questions. The only answer seems to be: A war machine. The military knows what it wants. The military answers the question of: What to produce? How much? What to make? What is left over is piecemealed to the civilians. If they don't like it, they can be shot or imprisoned in the name of patriotism.

Had we chewed harder on our intellectual bones when we were collegians we might have seen it was inevitable that socialism leads to war machines; and the war machine has never been built that has not been used. The conclusion is inescapable—we must fight to survive in the dark alleys of the world. A planned economy creates a bully.

I am glad to be able to relate to you that in a limited way America is ready to fight.

In June of 1948 the United States Air Force organized five tactical air support wings. One of these was located in southern California. This was the Four Hundred and Fifty-second Bombardment Wing (L), commanded by Brig. Gen. Luther W. Sweetzer, Jr. With a maximum of 10 days' notice (and in many cases individuals reported on the same day they received their notices) the Four Hundred and Fifty-second was ordered to active duty in the middle of the Mojave Desert. Approximately 3,000 civilians gathered in that desert. They lacked the seventy-five-thousand-odd pieces of equipment they were soon to acquire; they lacked clothing; inoculations; dog tags; identification cards; and all the fiddle-faddle that is required for American combat troops. It is interesting to recall that on that first morning there were only nine cooks. Most of the barracks were nailed shut. Beds were stacked in neat piles. General Sweetzer had only a desk and chair; and could not offer his staff a place to confer.

Suffice to say that within 60 days the Four Hundred Fifty-second Bombardment Wing had 92 percent of its seventy-five-thousand-odd pieces of equipment. Every man had a full issue of clothing, including three khaki uniforms, one blue uniform, one OD uniform, together with heavy shoes, overcoat, gloves, and all of his field equipment which in turn included two blankets and a sleeping bag. A movement order was received The wing then moved by bus, plane, truck, train, and ship a distance of 7,000 miles without loss of a single piece of equipment or injury to a man. Seventy-seven days after the Four Hundred Fifty-second was called to active duty it hit the enemy for the first time.

At this writing the Four Hundred Fifty-second has flown over 7,000 combat hours. It has hit the enemy with over 1,400 sorties. It has bombed, machine-gunned, rocketed, and napalmed the enemy with observed satisfaction.

Perhaps, in a small measure, the Four Hundred Fifty-second (led by an officer corps which is 97 percent Reserve and manned by enlisted personnel who are 70 percent reservists) is indicative of the potential of the United States.

This potential is further exemplified by the continued support the Four Hundred Fifty-second receives. For each combat mission of 40 planes there is required a freight train of 24 10-ton railroad cars. The cars supply only gasoline and ordnance. Further, daily trainloads of food, equipment, supplies and clothing are required.

It is interesting to note the combat record has been achieved in spite of a confused and conflicting policy at home. Individually, the men of the Four Hundred Fifty-second are not enthused about fighting and dying on the Asiatic mainland. They receive daily letters inquiring why they came and what they are doing. Due probably to home-front pressure, those having four dependents have been permitted to go home (without replacement). No more airmen will be called who do not volunteer for duty. In short, the men of the Four Hundred Fifty-second are fighting what is to them an all-out war (for no matter how small the theater of shooting—it's all-out) with confusion, doubt, and uncertainty at home.

If the Nation must continue to walk the dark alleys of the world, let's hope we shall be able to produce an unlimited number of these reserve wings.

With warm personal regards to you and yours, I am,

Cordially,

VOLNEY F. MORIN,
Major, USAF, Judge Advocate.

Approved for publication:

D. J. BRACKENBURY,
First Lieutenant, USAF, P. I. O. Officer.

Air Power Was Decisive in Halting Chinese—Gill Robb Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I noted in the Appendix to the RECORD of Wednesday last that the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee and, incidentally, one of the most realistic and best-informed authorities on military tactics ever to sit in Congress, quoted a recent article entitled "Man Power or Air Power." The article, written by our mutual good friend and former colleague, Bruce Barton, stated, in part:

Generals and admirals are brave men who have sworn to give their lives, if need be, for their country. They are entitled to our respect and gratitude. But before we give them universal military training, let them tell us whether they plan to win the next war with man power or with air power.

Mr. Speaker, every unbiased military authority in the world recognizes the proven fact that American air power is truly American peace power. I personally for years have contended that in any future contest in an all-out global war victory will perch on the standards of that nation which enjoys and is able to maintain supremacy in the air.

Few men in the world speak on both civil as well as military aeronautics with greater authority and clarity and with less service prejudice than Gill Robb Wilson, nationally known and accredited aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

In an article published last week headed "Air power was decisive in halting the Chinese" this intrepid World War I fighter pilot declared:

No theater of air operation ever has witnessed more ingenuity in the employment of tactical force than Korea. However, it must never be forgotten that air power in Korea, even at its best, has fought a war with one hand tied behind its back.

The genius of military air power lies in its ability to smash sources of supply and manufacture rather than merely to aid ground forces.

Mr. Speaker, that type of warfare—known as strategic—is but one of the established roles and missions of the United States Air Force. Noting the fact that our Air Force was not permitted, under rules established by the United Nations, to cross the Korean boundary, either to make observation of Russian strength or strategic attack, Mr. Wilson went on to say:

When Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, commander of the Far East bomber command, returned from Korea he made clear in his statement that Korea was a frustrating field for air power because for political reasons it could only be utilized in an auxiliary capacity.

Mr. Speaker, in these days, while we in Congress are weighing the necessity of drafting our 18-year-old boys, trying to understand the lessons that have been taught by the bloody struggle now going on in Korea, and evaluating the terrific impact of a $71,000,000,000 budget upon our national economy, to insure our peace and security, it behooves every Member of this body to read Gill Robb Wilson's article entitled "Air Power Was Decisive in Halting the Chinese."

For that reason I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD report of the splendid achievement of our Air Force in the Korean War.

The article is as follows:

AIR POWER DECISIVE IN HALTING CHINESE

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

While the Chinese armies were sweeping over the vastly outnumbered United Nations forces and both the Tenth Corps and the Eighth Army appeared in jeopardy of capture or annihilation, the writer made the statement that an army with control of the air is almost indestructible.

In the face of the situation at the time, the statement appeared to be contrary to the evidence. However, subsequent development in Korea supported the writer's thesis.

Communist advances by night were stalemated when C–47 transports, each loaded with 150 illuminating flares, patrolled the Communist supply lines and enabled B–26 tactical bombers to strafe convoys and troops on the roads. This was the first time in aviation combat history that such an operation had been attempted but it proved extremely effective and brought the advancing Red armies under round-the-clock air attack.

Where United Nations troops were outflanked and surrounded time after time, C–119 combat transports parachuted ammunition and food to the beleaguered forces, which were thus enabled to maintain themselves against overwhelming numbers.

As a result of the air attacks, the veteran combat-tested Chinese divisions, despite their fanatical disregard for losses, were gradually brought to a stalemate and the offensive again was gained by our Ground Forces.

Air Force estimates of casualties inflicted on the Communists during the Korean campaign total almost 100,000, half of which occurred from November 21 to the end of the year and practically all of which were against front-line troops.

There has been much conjecture as to why Chinese armies ceased to follow the retiring United Nations armies. Some theorists attributed it to political reasons. Others called the Red retirement a trap. And now it is being asked if it could be possible that United States air power was decisive in stopping the Red Chinese armies.

It seems well to let the facts speak for themselves. What army in history was able to advance with its supply lines constantly shredded and its first-line troops suffering casualties of such proportions?

Air power alone did not stop the overwhelming Chinese armies, but air power imposed a large proportion of casualties on those created by heroic Army and Navy forces, winter weather and disease, and it supported the resistance capabilities of the surface forces. The total adds up to the thesis that an army with control of the air is almost indestructible.

Interrogation of enemy prisoners in Korea is a little surprising. The consensus of prisoner testimony is that aircraft machine-gun fire, napalm, and fragmentation bombs are feared in that order.

While it is true that a fighter plane carries 1,600 rounds of .50-caliber ammunition firing from six guns, it is news that casualties by machine-gun strafing exceed those of the terrible fire bombs and fragmentation projectiles. Naturally machine-gun fire can be aimed more accurately but the napalm and fragmentation bombs, covering a wider area, were generally supposed to inflict greater damage.

No theater of air operation ever has witnessed more ingenuity in the employment of tactical force than Korea. However, it must never be forgotten that air power in Korea, even at its best, has fought a war with one hand tied behind its back.

The genius of military air power is its ability to smash sources of supply and manufacture, rather than merely to aid ground forces. When Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, commander of the Far East Bomber Command, returned from Korea, he made clear in his statement that Korea was a frustrating field for air power because, for political reasons, it could only be utilized in an auxiliary capacity.

A Pledge to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 11, 1951. Comment is unnecessary. Each of us should take the pledge.

A PLEDGE TO AMERICA

(By Russell Davenport)

A few years ago, in a poem called My Country, I wrote these lines: "America is not a land of ease, not a land of rest."

Today these words are being tested. Our country faces the threat of war. We feel the challenge to help her get ready for whatever happens. In the final count America's strength will be the sum total of us all.

If we love our country now, there are ways to prove it. We cannot all do big things, but everybody can do small, specific things. Judging by what our elected leaders have told us this far, here is a pledge that we can make today—to ourselves and to our country:

I will—

Recognize the need for higher taxes and willingly pay them.

Keep only a reasonable supply of the necessities of life. I will not hoard.

Be willing to work longer hours.

Make no undue profit out of the preparation for war. But I will also keep my business or farm prosperous and strong because my country may need its services.

Obey price and wage controls without asking for special favors.

Hold living costs to a minimum by giving up luxuries, and practice at home a pay-as-you-go policy. I will advocate the same policy for my community.

Urge my community to set up an adequate civil-defense program and do my full share in it.

Remember that the way to get things done in a democracy is through a positive attitude, not criticism that is purely destructive or despair that can lead to panic. I will strive through positive thoughts, sympathetic understanding, and courageous decisions to build a better and stronger America.

The needs of America are moving us onward together. And what each one of us does today, by deed or word, will help decide the destiny of our country.

Why Not Pull Out of Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, sincere, conscientious, patriotic citizens throughout the United States, believing that our own interests and those of the world could best be served by our participation in a world organization, have become disillusioned by the events of the months since the beginning of the present Korean conflict.

The present thinking of a majority of our people is expressed in the following editorial from the Three Rivers Commercial of February 9, 1951, published by Mr. William H. Shumaker, at Three Rivers, Mich.:

WHY NOT PULL OUT OF KOREA?

Now for the fourth time UN (mostly American) forces are locked in desperate battle near the latitude of Seoul. The ground was lost in June when the North Korean invasion swept southward. It was won back as we fought northward. It was lost as the Chinese Reds pushed southward. It now appears almost won again as we climb northward into what sometimes seems to be a military vacuum.

The Korean campaign begins to take on the horrible aspect of perpetual motion. We have a nightmarish, uncanny sense of having been through it all already as our forces advance and retire (censorship forbids the word "retreat") through cycle after cycle.

But the cycles aren't precisely identical. New men die in each advance and rebuff. New equipment is expended, new blood is shed, new cripples are created. The cost in blood and treasure mounts—and mounts—and mounts.

It is difficult to see what we can gain in Korea. It is difficult not to believe that Korea is a diabolical snare set for us—successfully—by the Kremlin.

The Russian boycott of the UN was simultaneous with the invasion of South Korea. The UN police action directive was not blocked by any Soviet veto, as the USSR did not vote. A step of this nature by the UN must, under the UN charter, article 27, have concurring votes from every permanent member of the Security Council, which includes Russia, but the Russians when they returned made no effort to revoke the intervention resolution.

Russia has not and need not lose one man in Korea. Chinese pawns do the dying for them. The Chinese reservoir is bottomless. We could continue to slaughter till the crack of doom, and the Chinese birth rate would replenish with more millions.

Yet the drain on America is sickening. Chinese superiority in numbers can keep us in Korea, never quite winning, never quite losing, wasting our strength ad infinitum, weakening our entire defense structure.

The nature of the Korean fighting lures us to overemphasize on land fighting in our defense preparations, whereas, as TAFT, Hoover, and others have reiterated, air and sea power are our surest weapons.

If allowed to win in Korea, we would hold a peninsula considered by military experts to be indefensible. Our overextended position would make us vulnerable to another disastrous experience whenever it best suited the Kremlin to push the button.

So why not get out of Korea? Why let Russia call the tune? Why not choose our own ground, if fight we must? It is argued that to leave would cause us loss of face in Asia. But if Red-informed Asians would see our departure as imperialism defeated, they must see the present war as imperialism embattled, and would see our victory as imperialism triumphant. Is any of these three worse than another?

No, the lost face should we abandon Korea would be in Washington, among those blunderers responsible for our Asian fiasco. Is the saving of face for a few politicians worth the terrible price we are paying in not pulling out of Korea as fast as possible?

What could possibly suit the Politburo better than to have the Truman-Acheson war in Korea continue undetermined for months or years even if in the end the United States should win the war?

Are We Deserting Our Boys in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, what is the situation in Korea? What are the true conditions under which our troops are fighting? Rumors are contradictory and the reports from our fighting men are not rosy. The complaints about inadequate clothing and lack of equipment which come from the GI in battle are brushed aside by denials from the Pentagon.

But while American men are dying in Korea and the United Nations debating society affords no help to them, it is time we learned the truth.

The following letter from a constituent of mine includes the words written by an American soldier in Korea to his mother:

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: I have a nephew in Korea. His outfit has been in some of the worst fighting of the war. His company won a citation last November. A few days ago his mother received a letter from him, which read in part:

"There are only a few members of my company left. Unless we get more equipment to fight with, or are pulled out of here soon, we will all be dead. We haven't a chance."

Over the radio, day after day, we hear that the morale of our troops is high and that everything is rosy over there. Then, from the boys themselves, we get the real story of the true situation. While wishy-washy little men squabble at the UN, our boys are left to die on foreign battlefields, with the bitter knowledge in their hearts that we have let them down.

Won't you please do whatever you can to see that needed equipment reaches these boys on time and in sufficient quantities to enable them to defend themselves? If this cannot be done, they should be brought home. In Heaven's name let's do something.

I know you will do all you can.

Respectfully,

MRS. MYRTLE SHAY.

The lack of equipment this boy writes about is vital to him. It is his life or death. If the administration which sent him and thousands of others from their homes to do battle in Korea, without the consent of Congress, is not supplying them with the necessary equipment to defend themselves, an investigation is in order and is, in fact, overdue. It is the duty of Congress to get the facts.

Address of Ex-President Herbert Hoover; Saving America for Americans

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misinformation concerning, so much distortion of, and so many false attacks made on the great speech delivered by ex-President Herbert Hoover on last Friday night that I am taking the privilege of inserting that splendid address in the RECORD.

I am well acquainted with ex-President Hoover. I knew him during his services as Secretary of Commerce and as President of the United States. While I have not always agreed with him on those fundamental issues that divide the two great parties in this country, I can safely say that I never found any reason for questioning his integrity or his patriotism.

He puts the welfare of his country first.

He is now approaching the sunset of life, and his warning to the American people has that same ring of sincerity as when expressed by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address, or by George Washington in his farewell message to the American people.

In 1941, Mr. Hoover delivered a great speech in which he warned us of the dangers of a world war. I inserted that address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I want to quote a short portion of it at this point. He said:

Finally we must not forget the price we shall have to pay if we join in this war.

It means the sacrifice of our most precious lives and the hopes of millions of mothers and wives. It means the sacrifice also of our own liberty to a dictatorship of our own, inevitable in total war.

If we go into war, we must pass through postwar bankruptcy. The savings of the people will be lost. The endowments of our universities, colleges, hospitals will be destroyed. * * * When we go to the peace table hate will again, as before, sit at that table endeavoring to destroy the hope of any real peace among men. Liberty will not recover on this continent for a generation.

How prophetic those words were.

We have now gone through World War II. What have we got out of it? Death, taxes, a pension roll, and hatred. Our boys won the fight in the field, on the ocean, and in the air, but the victory was turned over to the greatest enemy civilization has ever known.

As I said, ex-President Hoover's speech on last Friday night was a solemn warning to the American people and to the American Congress. If we continue to follow the program advocated by the wild-eyed internationalists, who are al-

ways demanding that we go to war in some foreign country, it will do just what Lenin gloatingly predicted in 1920. It will drag this country down to physical and financial exhaustion.

We had better change our course now, before it is too late, and follow the program laid down by Thomas Jefferson, George Washington and other great statesmen of the past, and now reemphasized by ex-President Hoover in his address of last Friday night which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point.

The speech referred to follows:

Fellow Americans, I have been urged by many thousands of you to again discuss with you our foreign policies.

A responsibility rests upon me to speak out from 50 years of personal experience with most of the peoples of the free world and with Russia and China. I have been entrusted during 35 years with high responsibilities by my countrymen.

I should like to address you through the rose-colored spectacles of idealism and the need of free nations to defend freemen.

But I would be doing my country a disservice if I did not take into account the realities in this endangered world.

There is nothing sacrosanct about foreign policies as witness the tombstones which have been erected over many of them in the last 10 years. They bear the inscriptions "Undeclared war," "The alliance with Stalin, Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam," "Dismantling of German peacetime industry," "The promoting of Mao Tse-tung."

Many men, including myself, have demanded the revision of these policies at each wrong turning.

The rightness of our many proposals has been proved by time. I shall recall only two of them for your test.

Seventeen years ago, as President, I refused recognition of the Soviet Government. I knew from ample experience, and their own documents, that this bloody conspiracy against mankind would flood our country through this open door with fifth columns and spies; that they would sabotage our national life and Government. Every American knows they have done just that.

About 10 years ago on June 29, 1941, in a great crisis I urged the revision of our policies to meet the greatest danger that had come to the American people.

Mr. Roosevelt had proposed a tacit alliance of the United States with Stalin and his Communist Russia. Britain was then safe because of the diversion of Hitler's armies to an attack on Russia. A few sentences from that address were:

"Now we find ourselves promising aid to Stalin and his militant Communist conspiracy against the whole democratic ideals of the world. * * *

"It makes the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the four freedoms to mankind a gargantuan jest. * * *

"If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world."

I said these two dictators—Stalin and Hitler—were locked in deadly combat, that statesmanship required the United States to stand aside in watchful waiting, armed to the teeth; that the day would come when these nations "will be sufficiently exhausted to listen to the military, economic and moral powers of the United States and at that moment and that moment only can the United States promote a just and lasting peace."

Remember this was in June 1941, almost 10 years ago. Need I remind you that the grip of communism in this decade has spread slavery from 200,000,000 to 800,000,000 people? And we have no peace.

I could recall a dozen more instances, some within the past 12 months.

OUR PROBLEMS NOW

In order to reach any conclusions as to the wise course for America to pursue in the critical issues which confront us we must again and again appraise the constantly-shifting forces moving in the world.

The problems which we face are of far larger dimensions than the current discussion on sending contingents of American boys to Europe. Their appraisal must also include:

1. Land war strengths.
2. The defense of the American people and the Western Hemisphere.
3. Our economic capacity over a long period.
4. The United Nations.
5. Our policies in the Far East.
6. The North Atlantic military alliance.

Policies in these six categories cannot be separated from each other—they are all interlocked.

We must appraise the somber facts around these points before we can map a national direction. We must not shrink from clear-minded appraisal of our strengths, our weaknesses and the attainment of the purposes to which the Congress has committed us.

LAND WAR STRENGTHS

We may again appraise as best we can the present military strength for land war in the world.

I am fully aware of the shortcomings of the term "divisions" as a measuring device for comparative military strength, but it is the nearest to a common descriptive unit that we have.

The Kremlin-directed horde has under arms and in reserves probably 300 combat divisions, with 30,000 tanks. I am now told they have over 20,000 mostly tactical planes and they have with their satellites 50,000,000 men available for cannon fodder.

In World War II, when Russia was without the satellites, the Germans failed with 240 well equipped divisions to overcome her. With her allies of general manpower, general space, general winter and general scorched earth, she had stopped the Germans even before lend-lease had reached her.

The nations of Europe in the Atlantic Pact have at the present moment less than 20 equipped and trained combat divisions available for European action.

There is here a stark reality upon which our foreign policies must be based. With any seeable land forces from non-Communist nations, even including the United States, a land offensive against the Communists could bring no military victory, no political conclusion. But that does not mean that there are no other methods of stopping the Kremlin's ambitions.

THE DEFENSE OF OUR GIBRALTAR OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

The second stark realism upon which our foreign policies must be based is the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Its defense is not only in our interests but in the interests of free men everywhere.

Much criticism is offered, even to a discussion of this question. An atmosphere of hurry, rush, anxiety is being developed, the effect of which is to make it difficult, if not impossible, for the American people to judge their own situation.

I may say at once that with proper economic action this hemisphere can be made self-contained in critical raw materials. From a long professional career and from years as Secretary of Commerce dealing with such questions, I might qualify in this field.

Further, unless we so dissipate our strength as to become a beaten and crushed people, we will be able to keep sea lanes open.

Moreover, this hemisphere can be defended from Communist armies come what will. It is still surrounded with a great moat. To transport such invading armies either 3,000 miles across the Atlantic or 6,000 miles across the Pacific would require transport ships and naval protection which the Russians do not possess and could not build or seize, no matter what further countries they occupy. If we have a proper naval and air strength, we could sink them in midocean. With somewhat more attention paid to our defense, this would apply to invasion via the Bering Straits. Hitler could not even cross the English Channel. Atomic bombs do not transport troops over the ocean. Communist armies can no more get to Washington than any Allied armies can get to Moscow.

No responsible military man denies these two conclusions.

The American people should not be frightened into rash action by fear that we cannot survive. I am not advocating isolationism. But if other nations should fail, we may be isolated by circumstances and against our will.

We might go into a period hard to endure, but this Nation can stick it out.

OUR AMERICAN ECONOMIC CAPACITY

The third stark realism upon which our policies must be built is our economic capacity. The bleak outlook of the world may well last more than a decade—possibly two of them.

The new budget calls for Federal spending of over $71,600,000,000. This $71,000,000,000 alone, plus State and local expenditures, is about 37 percent of our national income.

That is beyond the long endurance of any Nation and fatal to the preservation of a system of free men.

The President has asked for a large increase of taxes. We will need also to increase State and local government taxes.

This burden is going to fall on people with smaller incomes. The proof of this is easy.

If all personal incomes above the level of a United States Senator were confiscated it would yield only about $2,500,000,000 of additional revenues. But confiscation would stop most people earning the $2,000,000,000. We must also remember the excise and corporation taxes in most part are ultimately passed on to the consumer or these milch cows would die.

Grim austerity must enter the doors of every American home.

Even before these burdens are actually imposed there are stark signs of economic strain. The purchasing power of the dollar has fallen 20 percent in 6 months. The stock boom indicates that many people are seeking flight from inflation. Our already gigantic Government debts permit little expansion without inflation of credit. Two wars prove economic controls cannot wholly stop inflation. The surest road away from inflation is to accept the President's wise proposal to pay as you go.

But we simply cannot carry this expenditure or such tax load for long.

The economic destruction of the United States is one of the means by which Stalin hopes to overcome us.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The fourth focal point of our thinking must be the United Nations.

Our stark reality here is the lack of cohesion and unity in the free nations. Even some of our European allies are anxious to appease the Chinese branch of the Kremlin on policies of the United Nations.

Despite this, we must not forget that the aspiration of mankind for over a century has been to find peace by collective action against aggressors. The United Nations was built on this same central idea as the concert of Europe and the League of Nations. Halting and faulty as it may be, we cannot abandon this idea and this hope.

But it must be clear that the UN for the present will not be a substantial protection from Communist aggression.

OUR POLICIES IN THE FAR EAST

Our men are holding heroically to the mission assigned us by the United Nations in Korea. We are suffering great losses. General Marshall says we must send 15,000 men a month. We cannot yet see the end. But were we to drive all the enemy out of Korea, how much of our armies must remain there to protect it?

Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines are vital links in our national security. This must not be minimized by nations anxious to direct our energies to Europe. We will need retain much military strength in the Pacific to protect those areas.

Certainly there is little stark reality in talking about American ground divisions in Europe in view of our involvement in Asia.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

The sixth consideration in our decisions revolves around the North Atlantic Pact and the proposals to start another American expeditionary land army to Europe.

Current statistics stretch this pact far beyond its text. The pact provides that the nations shall aid each other in case of attack. There has been no attack.

Moreover, at the time of ratification of that alliance the administration, through the Secretary of State and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, gave positive assurances that under the pact no expeditions of American ground troops would be sent to Europe. That certainly meant no forces to Europe prior to attack. Our participation, prior to an attack, was to be limited to munitions. The pact being the will of the American people through the Congress, and in the faith of the text and those assurances, I supported the alliance.

But last fall it became evident that the administration was contemplating sending ground troops to Europe. It was also evident that after years of gigantic American subsidies, the European Atlantic Pact nations had done nothing of consequence toward their own defense. Former Prime Minister Churchill had repeatedly and forthrightly stated this fact—the last occasion being only a few weeks ago.

I made two addresses in protest. Judging by the scolding of the European press, I may have helped to start them thinking.

Then General Eisenhower was appointed to organize their military strength. And the General has become the potent symbol of the policy of at once sending American ground troops to Europe.

The American people are indebted to General Eisenhower for many great services. He has magnificient fitness both for the command and the stimulation of spirit and action among the Allies in Europe.

But his appointment does not commit the American people as to policy.

The stark reality in Western Continental Europe are their large Communist parties and the disunities which gnaw at their vitals. Their prejudices prevent taking Spain into the alliance with 20 divisions and the most defensible area in Europe. For some reason Turkey and Greece are excluded from the alliance.

Equally vital is the fact that there is little hope of adequate land defense of Europe without West German participatation. Two months ago detailed plans and great progress were announced. Now it is decided that West German military participation is out or can wait.

From press reports based on information from European officials and from General Eisenhower's statements, it would appear that his army, including the 2 American divisions now in Germany, will start with 9 or 10 divisions; by the end of 2 years, including American divisions, it would seem to be 35 or 40 divisions.

The stark reality is that such an army is small compared to the strength of the enemy. America is at present the major deterrent to the Kremlin's ambitions of world conquest. There is nothing that Stalin would like more than to get the United States into his clutches by fighting us on the ground in Europe. There lies his overwhelming strength.

Disaster could thus come to the American Hemisphere with no salvation to Europe.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NEED ANSWERS TO SOME QUESTIONS

The American people should have more information before they risk trying a third expedition of ground troops to Europe.

Any defense line in Europe must be over 400 miles long. Will our responsible leaders make a public statement that the forces so far proposed can defend this line against odds of 3 or 4 to 1? We have tried this in Korea.

Will our responsible leaders tell us whether they contemplate the proposed American contingent as only an installment? Does not this contribution and our huge increase in the Army budget imply many more American divisions? Do the American people know all the facts?

ALTERNATIVE POLICIES

Despite all these stark realities and these problems, I have believed there is a way to at least an uneasy peace for the world.

In my address of 6 weeks ago I stated that we should not land men or send money to Europe until large European forces were in sight. I was well aware of the obligation assumed by Congress to give aid in case of attack. It was my view that we should hold to that provision of the pact, and I urged "arming our Air and Navy to the teeth."

I suggest that air power and the Navy is the alternative to sending American land divisions to Europe. With our gigantic productive capacity and within our economic strength we can build and sustain overwhelming air and sea forces held on our home ground ready in case of attack.

Stalin well knows we could carry on that kind of war for his destruction for indefinite years.

The air threat has been during 4 years the most powerful deterrent to any attack on Western Europe. It is far more powerful than pouring American divisions into the reach of this Asiatic horde. I am suggesting no attack. I am suggesting the very protection for Western Europe and our own defense which the Senate contemplated when it ratified the Atlantic Pact.

There are other reasons for such a policy—both military and economic.

Manifestly if attack on Europe came the free world would be inferior in ground forces. Such a ground war would at best be a war of defense. In the air we would have the offensive. An Air Force has range, speed, flexibility, and striking power which can come nearer gaining a decision than allied ground armies. Especially is this true, for in an air war the Communist horde would be without a large part of its ground allies—General Manpower, General Space, General Winter, and General Scorched Earth.

The whole Korean tragedy is developing proof that the way to punish aggressors is from the air and sea, and not by land armies. It would be infinitely less costly in dead and disaster.

The unbearable strain on our economic system will come from trying to do five things at the same time. That is, to maintain armies in the Pacific; to build up an Air Force; a naval force; to furnish munitions to nations who are determined to defend themselves and to send land armies to Europe. Our economy cannot carry this load for long.

I can give you an indication of the lesser economic strain to attain the same or more power by air than ground forces. To train, equip, place in Europe, and maintain for 1 year, 10 of the usual combinations of American divisions would cost about $4,500,000,000. This same sum would, for example, purchase and man 390 B-36 long-range bombers compared to 60 of them at present. If neither went into battle, the annual cost of the 10 divisions would be about $3,000,000,000 and that of such a segment of the Air Force less than $1,000,000,000.

POINTS OF REVISION OF OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

I can most clearly state the points of foreign policies in which many of us believe at this time by summarizing a program. No program can be perfect—none without risk. For the present I suggest:

1. We should devote our overwhelming productive power to air and naval strength and supply of munitions.

2. If the Europeans are attacked, we should be prepared and use such overwhelming air and naval power to the limit and keep it up until they have had enough. The Kremlin knows that we are committed by the Congress to do so. I believe that reserve, if large enough, is Europe's real protection.

3. We should supply munitions to nations doing their utmost to defend themselves.

4. From the stark realistic, economic, political, and military reasons which I have given you, my personal conviction is that we should not create land armies for expeditions into the quicksands of either Europe or China I do not want to even start on the road to another Korea.

5. There are those who think we should send more divisions to Europe for their encouragement even before there is an attack. To them, I urge watchful waiting until much more military strength has been developed by Europe itself and there is more evidence they have resolved their disunities.

6. We must reduce our national expenditures to a level we can carry over a long term of years, and at the same time avoid economic disaster which can destroy freedom in America.

Senator BYRD estimates that $8,600,000,000 of proposed nondefense expenditures in the budget could be reduced or postponed. We should spend all we can afford on air, navy, and munitions rather than large armies.

7. We can and must defend Formosa, the Philippines, and Japan. We can do it by naval and air forces.

As to Korea, we should demand of the United Nations that they call for a stop of supplies to Communist China by the non-Communist nations.

Since Red China is making war on our American armies, we should free Chiang Kai-shek to do what he wishes in China and furnish him munitions.

8. I proposed 3 years ago that we should give full independence to Japan and Western Germany under representative governments. During 100 years these nations were the great dams against these Russian-controlled hordes. In the last war we may have been engaged in a great crusade for freedom of mankind, but we certainly destroyed these two dams. The sooner they are given their independence the sooner, for their own security, they will resume their ancient role.

9. Recently I proposed that if the nations of Europe failed we should, as a prudent Nation, have in mind a second line of air and naval defense based upon the foreign shores of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, both North and South, and I may add the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean.

10. Congress should recover its constitutional authority over starting wars. It could certainly do so through its power over the purse.

IN CONCLUSION

I have proposed no retreat, no withdrawal. I have proposed no repudiation of treaties or obligations. Rather I have proposed that the pledges to the Congress and the American people be kept. I have proposed that

we stop, look, and listen before we start on a road of land war that risks the loss of all civilization.

I propose no good to Stalin. His greatest hope is to get us into a land war.

Before we go off the deep end of steps toward another land war in Europe, let us remember that we fought two such wars hoping to bring peace and we have no peace. We should be prepared to make heavy sacrifices to help. But we should do it with common sense, within our strength, with the long view of history in mind.

The essence of the program I have proposed is to effectively restrain our enemies from attack upon our allies or themselves. It is the best chance of peace—even if it is an uneasy peace.

If we pursue the lines of our own genius and resources, we can meet this—the greatest menace of a century.

And being in the right the Almighty is on our side.

Charles Gilmer, Sulligent, Lamar County, Is Named Alabama Future Farmer of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Charles Gilmer, 17-year-old farm boy of Lamar County, has been chosen as Alabama's future farmer of the year. Thus he brings distinction to himself and reflects honor upon his fellow farm boys of the great Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

Young Gilmer's record is so outstanding that I desire to include as a part of my remarks a news story about it, written by Thomas F. Hill, and carried in the Sunday, February 11, 1951, edition of the Birmingham News. The article follows:

CHARLES GILMER IS NAMED FUTURE FARMER OF YEAR

(By Thomas F. Hill)

SULLIGENT, ALA., February 10.—Charles Gilmer, who this year has been honored as Alabama's Future Farmer of the Year, has found the secret of turning base materials into gold.

But his Midas touch has nothing to do with black magic. The secret is simple. It is hard work. It is steady work. And it is a genuine love for that work.

This year, the 17-year-old member of the Sulligent FFA chapter has been selected from 12,000 active FFA members as having the most outstanding farming and FFA program during the past year.

This came as a surprise only to Charles. All his friends and associates knew the recognition just had to come.

NO STRANGER

The smiling youngster is no stranger to livestock circles, and for the past 4 years the slogan among young beef showmen in Lamar County has been "Beat Gilmer."

And for the past 4 years, the slogan has been to no avail. In 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950. Young Gilmer showed the county champion at the fat stock shows. And each year he was awarded money for a steer by the Birmingham News-WGSN.

The "Beat Gilmer" slogan is working again this year, but again it may not work. S. S. Gibbs, Gilmer's vocational teacher, says it looks like Gilmer's fourth News calf might win again this year.

LOVE OF WORK

Gilmer's love of work was clearly shown one afternoon recently when Mr. Gibbs decided to drive out for a visit. It was Saturday, and Gilmer's parents and sister were in town, as were most of the youngsters of the county. When Gibbs drove by he saw Charles in the field driving a tractor-drawn plow.

Through several years of hard work and good management Charles has built his farming program up to an asset value of $34,112.50. His investments have been primarily in land, farm equipment, livestock, and pasture improvement.

In announcing its choice of Charles Gilmer, the Alabama FFA executive committee issued the following statement:

"To select Alabama's 'Future Farmer of the Year' is no easy task for the reason that many members of the Future Farmers of America have done and are doing outstanding jobs. Charles has, in the past 4 years, done an outstanding job in assuming a great responsibility in the operation and management of his farm home. He has accomplished much in his vocational agriculture and FFA work. The committee truly believes that Charles exemplifies the important part FFA members today are playing in Alabama's agricultural world."

HIS RECORD

Charles has a very oustanding record in leadership and other FFA activities during the past 4 years.

His first year FFA activities were as follows:

Assistant finance director of FFA chapter; assistant FFA store operator; represented chapter in calf scramble in Birmingham; won county fat-stock show; member of FFA string band; elected secretary of chapter for following year.

FFA activities for 1948–49: Elected vice president of county FFA; delegate to State convention at Auburn; awarded State farmer degree; member of chapter judging team; won county fat-stock show; won seventh place in class in Birmingham show; gave response for FFA at Birmingham News barbecue; entered second-place sow in county hog show; member of FFA quartet; operated FFA store with over $300 profit; member of chapter nursery committee; set 700 shrubs; 100-bushel club entry; elected chapter treasurer for next year.

1949–50: Main speaker on banquet program, nursery-committee chairman, setting 850 shrubs; member of FFA quartet, 100-bushel club entry, supervised FFA store, chairman arrangement committee of father-son banquet, won county fat stock show, placed third in Birmingham show with prime steer, member of beef-judging team, gave response for FFA at Birmingham News barbecue, showed grand champion dairy cow in county show and second place beef bull.

1950–51: Showed grand champion dairy cow, first- and second-place beef steers and second-place beef bull at county achievement-day festival; member of beef-judging team, member of FFA quartet, entered home-improvement contest, No. 1 member to be called upon by his chapter.

MORE PRAISE

His FFA Adviser, Mr. Gibbs, praised Charles' work highly. "Charles is a splendid worker," Mr. Gibbs said. "He can always be depended upon for a jam-up job as leader or chairman of any committee. He has a good personality and is liked by everyone. He is neat in appearance and wears nice clothes.

"Farming—with chief interest in livestock—is first and foremost with him. Pleasure and social life comes second. He is a most outstanding young man and has a very bright future ahead of him."

Charles developed an interest in livestock early in his high-school course. His herd now consists of two registered Jerseys, four registered Hereford cows, three grade cows, two steers for the spring fat stock show, two Hereford heifers, a registered bull which he plans to use as his beef-herd bull, a registered OIC sow, and a litter of pigs.

Working in partnership with his parents and sister, Claire Joan, Charles strives to improve the farm home each day. He also does tractor farming for neighbors in his spare time.

MORE FARMING

Being in the sawmill business, Charles' father, Stanton Gilmer, turned the farming over to Charles 3 years ago. Each year Charles has averaged 150 acres in cotton, corn, and hay. As a junior III student, he started his pasture program, sowing 5 acres of dallas, lespedeza sericea, and fescue.

Each year he has increased his pasture acreage, and this year he seeded 33 additional acres. Rapidly he has turned rolling, eroded hillsides into valuable green acres to furnish grazing for his livestock. He has his own crusher, with which he grinds and mixes his home-grown feeds. His 1½-acre fish pond is stocked and well fertilized.

Probably his proudest moment came last spring when his best calf graded Prime in the Birmingham stock show. It was placed third in the middleweight Hereford division, but the Federal grader put the Prime sticker on it after sticking Choice labels to the first- and second-place winners. Charles' steer also sold higher than the other two winners.

THREE PRIZES

Recently at the county Achievement Day festival in Vernon, Charles' dairy cow was declared grand champion; his two fat stock-show entries copped both first and second prizes.

As a result of his successes and capabilities, Charles was a natural selection in 1949 and again in 1950 to give the response at the Birmingham News barbecue, held in Birmingham, at which checks for News calves were awarded stock-show winners who participated at the Birmingham stock show.

Charles told his Alabama State fairgrounds audience of his interest in livestock farming and how the stock shows and FFA had inspired him to work with untiring interests toward a challenging goal.

He is a versatile high-school senior. He also is song leader for Sunday school and church services at his church and teaches the young people's Sunday school class. He is president of the Beta Club and plays trombone in the high-school band.

GRADUATES

Charles graduates from high school this spring. He plans to attend Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, next year. He will study animal husbandry.

His 4 years' FFA work have netted him over $1,000 in prizes alone. He could cover a wall of his room with blue ribbons he has won at shows.

His farm home shows the results of his vision and desire to attain the ultimate in convenience and beauty.

He did an excellent remodeling job on his home early this year, with electric lights and running water in his house and barn, bathroom, laundry unit, a freezer chest, radio, and electric fans.

THE KITCHEN

Labor has been cut to a minimum in Mrs. Gilmer's all-electric kitchen. It consists of a hot-water heater, stove, refrigerator and kitchen sink with attractive built-in cabinets.

Cement walks have been built around the house, and shrubbery from his FFA nursery makes the Gilmer home the equal of any to be found anywhere in appearance and neatness.

Charles' healthful living habits and love for hard work have kept him in excellent physical condition. This has led fellow students at the high school to "high pressure" him to adding an extra activity to his accomplishments—football.

Gilmer always turned them away and finally made it final by summarizing his attitude toward life and the farm.

"I've watched these players train," he said. "I'll stick to farming. I just can't see myself working that hard without any money coming in."

Need for Limited Wire Tapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal. The editorial follows:

NEED FOR LIMITED WIRE TAPPING

Among the unpleasant tasks that beset the new Congress is the apparent necessity of legalizing, within limits, and without further delay, a most unsavory procedure.

Nobody with moral sense claims that wire tapping is a nice thing to do, but catching and prosecuting criminals is not a nice business. Governor Dewey has experienced the dilemma; he has had to denounce wire tapping by the wrong people, although he freely used it himself when he was a whirlwind young prosecutor.

The Federal Communications Act of 1934 contains a blanket ban on intercepting any communication and divulging the information to any person unless authorized by the sender. Hence, even when enforcement officers resort to wire tapping, the evidence gained by it is not admissible. This has seriously embarrassed the prosecution of traitors.

The Judith Coplon spy case dramatized this fact. The appeal court was obliged to hold the evidence illegal and order a new trial, while conceding that her guilt was plain. But the court, headed by one of our great jurists, went on with what lawyers call obiter dictum. It suggested to Congress that legalization of limited official wire tapping would obviate such paradoxes in future cases of the kind.

Despite the ban, the FBI continued to tap wires when necessary. It acted under orders of the Attorney General and, during World War II, with the approval of President Roosevelt. The FBI has cited in its defense the "set a crook to catch a crook" theory and the tenuous legal argument that the offense is not in intercepting alone but in also divulging.

The FBI also has cited the paramount demands of national security.

So Congress would be merely recognizing and legitimatizing a method that the FBI already feels compelled to use and is using. Beyond that, however, it would specifically require the admission into court of evidence obtained by wire tapping or by following up wire-tap clews. That is where the FBI has been stymied.

The bill is H. R. 479, by KENNETH B. KEATING (Republican, New York). It would let only the FBI and military intelligence tap wires and use wire-tap evidence, and then only in cases of suspected treason, spying, sabotage, and others involving disloyalty to the United States. It would allow the tapping only if a Federal judge approved it in each instance, and only under rules of the Attorney General.

These would seem to be adequate safeguards and restrictions against abuse. As KEATING told Congress, the inhibition under which the Government now labors to protect itself against treason "is certainly carrying the right of privacy to an absurd and ridiculous length.

"No nation can survive which does not meet problems threatening its very existence with more realism than this."

If Lincoln Were Alive Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this week we are paying tribute to the memory of one of the greatest Americans and one of the greatest human beings of all times—Abraham Lincoln. What would Lincoln do if he were alive today and had to cope with the problems with which we are confronted? What would the Great Emancipator think or say about our present-day events if he were among the living?

A most interesting speculation on this subject is contained in a column by Walter Winchell, the noted columnist, which appeared several days ago. It is entitled "Abraham Lincoln in the Twentieth Century." I urge all Members of Congress to read this brief column.

[From the Washington Post of February 9, 1951]

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

ABRAHAM LINCOLN IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Wisdom is as enduring as time itself. Recurring storms sweep across history's horizon—but the sagacity of great men has the constancy of the sun and is as illuminating. The immortality achieved by prophets and sages does not stem solely from their past accomplishments. The sources of their everlasting glory are words and deeds that light up the future. The homage paid Lincoln has been inspired by the nobility of his tenets. He embodied mankind's brightest aspirations—and he fought with deep courage to make them a reality. The political and moral issues Lincoln faced differ in detail with current conflicts, but the principles involved have not changed. The Lincolnian concepts of the nineteenth century are applicable to twentieth century problems.

He was blessed with the moral strength that is so desperately needed in Washington today. Lincoln was one of the rare politicians who combined practical ability with moral ideals transcending political expediency. He could have compromised on the slavery issue and allowed the festering spiritual infection to afflict the Nation. But he refused to appease indecency. No man had a deeper devotion to peace. Yet he took drastic action when he discovered the conflict could not be reconciled amicably. Sometimes a leg must be amputated to save a life. Lincoln said this Nation could not exist half slave and half free, and that inexorable logic obviously applies to the world of 1951.

Men of little faith and less courage are always with us. They measure each challenge by the extent of their fears. They would surrender to the foes of peace in the name of peace. Lincoln knew amity could not be purchased by blackmail. When his opponents threatened that his election would lead to the destruction of the Union, he shot back: "You say you will destroy the Union and the great crime will be upon me? That reminds me of a thief who holds a pistol to your head and mutters: 'Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you—and then you will be the murdered.'"

One of the most disgraceful current episodes is the attempt of Communists here to use Lincoln's name for their own nefarious purposes. Just as a gangster disguises himself with an alias, so the Communists are using Lincoln's name for camouflage. Only the demented mentality essential to Communist fanaticism could believe democratic Lincoln would be an ally of despotic Stalin. You might as well expect an angel to shake the hand of the Devil.

Since atheism is a salient feature of communism, it is well to remember Lincoln's classic observation: "I never behold the stars that I do not feel that I am looking at the face of God. I can see how it might be possible for a man to look upon the earth and be an atheist, but I cannot conceive how he could look up into the heavens and say there is no God."

On the question of dealing with subversives, Lincoln made his position crystal-clear during the early days of the war. He did not believe freedom extended to treachery or that liberty included the right to destroy it. He boldly declared: "Under cover of liberty of speech and press the Copperheads hoped to keep on foot amongst us a most efficient corps of spies, informers, suppliers, and aiders and abettors of their cause in a thousand ways. Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of the wily agitator who induces him to desert? I think that in such a case, to silence the agitator and save the boy is not only constitutional, but withal a great mercy."

Lincoln also speaks in the debate now raging about whether a President can assume war powers during national emergencies without the consent of Congress. As many Chief Executives did before him—and after him—he dispensed with constitutional niceties when the survival of the Nation was at stake.

Lincoln assumed war powers directly after the guns of Gen. Pierre Beauregard fired upon Fort Sumter. It was 3 months later that Congress declared a state of war existed.

Front pages disclose political differences are rocking the Nation. But similar struggles were more savage during Lincoln's era. Although he attained the Presidency with a decisive majority in the electoral college, he had a minority of the popular vote. The Nation was split wide open on every major issue. As a result, the most shameful vituperation was leveled at President Lincoln by the press and politicians. Yet his faith in the people never wavered. His reaction to the political turmoil illustrated Lincoln's genius for stating the truth with humorous simplicity: "The people will decide. If they turn their backs to the fire and get scorched in the rear—they'll find they have to sit on a blister."

The words he delivered before a regiment in 1864 would be just as propitious if addressed to our troops in Korea: "I happen, temporarily, to occupy the White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here as my father's child has. It is in order that each of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance for your industry, enterprise and intelligence; that you may all have equal privileges in the race of life, with all its desirable human aspirations. It is for this that the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthrights. This Nation is worth fighting for to secure such an inestimable jewel."

Arizona's Water Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that California receive her proper share of the Colorado River water in order to provide this vital necessity of life to many millions of people in a State rapidly increasing in population. The population of California has doubled during the past 10 years and it is expected to double again in the next decade.

Despite these facts, certain Arizona land speculators are endeavoring to divert a great portion of the Colorado River to enrich themselves at a time when the Nation's efforts must be directed for national defense. These land speculators are sponsoring the central Arizona project and legislation has been introduced in the Congress to carry out their schemes. This project would not only cut off a vital supply of water to the people of California, but it would also add an additional and nonessential burden upon our Nation's taxpayers at this hour of national emergency.

I am including in my remarks an editorial from the Pasadena Star-News of February 4, 1951, which calls attention to the position taken in this matter by the land speculators of Arizona:

CALIFORNIA MUST RENEW EFFORTS TO THWART ARIZONA'S RIVER WATER PLAN

Californians with a clear eye to the future welfare of this State must gird themselves for another stiff fight in the Congress of the United States against an Arizona water grab at the Colorado River.

That Arizona-backed bill authorizing the Federal Government to construct the central Arizona water and irrigation project at a cost of $700,000,000 has been favorably reported by the Interior Committee of the Senate. This reporting out of the bill makes a very live measure indeed for Senate consideration. The bill was approved in Senate committee last year, but California opposition succeeded in blocking it in the Public Lands Committee of the House.

Action by the Senate committe indicates that the California delegation in both Houses of Congress must renew their efforts to stop the bill. California Senators and Representatives will need all the help they can get from groups, like the Colorado River Association in this State, and individual Californians. Since the California delegation will exert all its own energy the best way for other Californians to help is to engender friendliness for the California position with Representatives and citizens of other States. Many California citizens have connections in other States where the case for California can be fairly presented.

Arizonians like to picture California as a huge hog that wants more than its share of Colorado River water and is seeking to rob Arizona of water. This is Arizona, bias, and flagrant misrepresentation, and far from the truth. The truth is that California seeks only to protect rights to its share of the water as inherent in the Colorado River treaties. Yet in all fairness to Arizona and all the basin States California does not ask to be the arbiter of what its own rights are; on the contrary, it proposes that a resolution by Congress ask the United States Supreme Court to interpret the river treaties and expresses complete willingness to abide by the high Court's opinion. This reasonable proposal has been determinedly opposed by Arizona.

California believes that the central Arizona project would infringe upon the rights of Nevada and California to waters of the lower Colorado, and, furthermore, that the project would exact a cost from all taxpayers out of all proportion to the benefits to Arizona lands.

That is the proposition, with Arizona still ignoring the Supreme Court suggestion, clamoring for the central Arizona project and shouting charges that California is trying to rob Arizona of water. Arizona has reversed the true status of the controversy.

When Relief Is a Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune in the RECORD because it contains some information that must command the attention of Congress, and the sooner the better. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 1403, which would deal with part of the problem of growing abuses to the aid to dependent children program. This bill is now before the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand several other Members also have similar bills pending.

It should now be obvious to everyone that the Federal Security Agency has no intention or desire or authority, whichever you choose to accept, to cope with this growing menace to a fine program. And since the original fault lies with Congress, I think the only solution that can ever be obtained will have to be provided by Congress.

We hear many Members these days talking about cutting unnecessary Federal expenditures. Here is one way a substantial sum can be saved for the Federal Treasury, and at the same time a great contribution will have been made to make this a more moral and decent America. I suggest that all Members who sincerely want economy to give my bill and this problem more than a second glance.

The newspaper editorial follows:

WHEN RELIEF IS A RACKET

The Tribune has begun a series of articles on the type of people who get dependent children's aid in Oklahoma. Our reporter went directly where the relief checks are going—to the homes. He talked to the parents, particularly to the mothers. What he found in many cases is disgusting.

Many of the children who qualify for these checks are illegitimate. Many of the women who are supposed to be helped by this money to give their children a decent upbringing are promiscuous slatterns whose "boy friends" wander in and out at all hours. The welfare checks encourage this conceiving and bearing of illegitimate children. If the children are starved sufficiently the parents can even make a little profit out of them.

This isn't what Oklahomans had in mind at all when they voted to participate in the children's aid program. We wanted to reduce the number of unhappy children, not increase it. But our good intentions have gone sour.

The chief reason why they have gone sour is the secrecy that surrounds these payments. The taxpayers are not permitted to know who gets their money. The theory is that the feelings of the recipients should not be hurt by letting it be known that they are living in part on public charity. It is also an engraved invitation to grafters.

As long as these records are hidden, as long as the citizen who is tapped for taxes cannot learn whether his next door neighbor has his hand in his pocket or not these evils are going to grow. Politically-appointed case workers show that in many instances they cannot or will not rehabilitate people who demand and receive relief. Yet without rehabilitation this money is wasted.

Paying women to add to our population of miserable, illegitimate children is worse than bad sociology. It is bad Christianity. It is bad charity. It doesn't eliminate want. It compounds it. For it raises new generations of twisted, subnormal people, bred in the foulest environment, who are candidates for our swelling ranks of unemployables, criminals, and insane.

The people Oklahoma never intended to make laziness profitable or promiscuous living attractive. Yet what have we done? Read these case histories by our Investigator X.

The hard-working citizen, who labors to support his own family in these inflation-ridden and tax-loaded years, cannot long continue to share his paycheck with large groups of people who have no intention of taking care of themselves. The time is coming when we are going to have to stop cultivating weeds and thistles in our fields.

The cure is squarely up to the Federal Congress and State and county officials.

First of all, we must make public relief records public. As long as they are hidden dishonest men and women will succeed in taking money from the people without fear of detection, and dishonest politicians will build political machines by putting undeserving people on relief.

Secondly, the State should force the fathers of illegitimate children to support them, or these men should be thrown in jail for bastardy. The idea of these fathers loafing and looking at their television sets while the postman pads up to the door with a public baby-bonus is senseless and intolerable.

Thirdly, women who have had illegitimate children should not be permitted to draw checks on these children. If they can support these youngsters well and good, but these mothers have no right to ask the State to hand over money for them to spend as they see fit. Oklahomans supplied dependent children's relief checks to keep families together on the assumption that these would be families in which children could be properly reared.

The chronic unwed baby-breeder is an enemy of the people. She's not a mother; she's a racketeer. Her children should be taken from her and put in orphanages. That's expensive, but not nearly as expensive as the present situation in which she can actually qualify for a free living if she bears enough of these children. It's time we quit treating such people with sentimentality. It's time we charged a few of them with State vagrancy.

Fourthly, we've got to make it dangerous for fathers to abandon their legitimate children. This has been ridiculously easy in most counties. There have been few prosecutions of the men who walked off, and the burden of caring for their families has been quietly—and, of course, secretly—shifted to the taxpayers. Child abandonment costs the people much more than the

average burglary. County attorneys and judges should put it in the same class.

Oklahoma has the second highest per capita public welfare burden in the Nation. It's not because we have the second highest percentage of people in need. It is because sloppy administration, poor case work, and laziness among our county attorneys have all combined to make relief chiseling easy and profitable.

There will be a lot more money available for helping children of decent families that have suffered unavoidable hardship if we wipe the racketeers off our rolls.

When are we going to start?

Edwin Arthur Hall, Prognosticator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have been right many more times than wrong in predicting certain political events.

I believe I am right today when I state that the next congressional district of which Broome will be a part will consist of Broome, Chenango, Delaware, Otsego, and Tioga Counties.

Do not ask me how I found out. There is a never-failing source which always supplies me with the most valuable information.

The incident which gives most credence to such a set-up was the recent appearance in Binghamton of "Big Jim" MacDuff, wealthy country banker, and ruler of Otsego County's Republican machine.

"Big Jim" was pictured in the annual Lincoln Day huddle at the Arlington with some of the group we always see at those feasts.

To my knowledge, this is MacDuff's first fraternal get-together with the Binghamton boys since Otsego County left the district 9 years ago.

There is one sure thing. I have a host of friends up in that county and I have never failed to keep in touch with them. I have already received a nice lot of assurances from former supporters in that bailiwick that they will take their coats off and go to work for me just as soon as they know for sure that Otsego is coming back into the Broome fold.

Otsego is a wonderful county and I hope I get it back.

The Item Veto in Appropriation Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Decatur (Ill.) Herald:

UNWANTED WEAPON

A New York Republican Congressman has offered a bill and a constitutional amendment which would provide a weapon against pork-barrel projects in the House and Senate.

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING's proposals would allow the President to veto specific items in the annual omnibus appropriations bills. As matters stand now, the whole bill must either be vetoed or approved.

The rivers and harbors and flood-control sections of the appropriations measures traditionally contain a great many pork-barrel projects. Representative KEATING believes that allowing a specific-item veto would enable the President to get rid of a lot of nondefense, nonessential spending.

The New Yorker's idea is a good one, but its future looks doubtful. Neither the House nor the Senate has shown any inclination to interfere with this political spending. Even amid cries of economy in Government there is constant logrolling for these pet projects. Economy is always for somebody else. And any President is going to think twice about making his party members mad.

As long as politics remains the ruling force of Government, there will be useless and wasteful political spending.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16, is being observed in the United States by Lithuanians who have never abandoned the national dream of freedom under a democratic independent government for Lithuania.

It has been 12 long years since the lights went out in the Baltic States. I do not defend those Lithuanian quislings who had placed their own economic welfare above that of the nation in secretly allying themselves to the Nazi conquerors; nor to those other quislings who had entered into equally secret and traitorous allegiance to Soviet Russia.

The fact remains that the overwhelming majority of the people of Lithuania and of the other Baltic Republics were, like the Czechoslovakians, dedicated to the same democratic ideals and form of government which has endured in these United States for almost two centuries.

Lithuania was one of those sturdy, free countries of Europe which was demonstrating the capacity of small nations to lift themselves by their own bootstraps without resort to the desperation of communism or fascism. Many of them now lie prostrate, captives of Russian imperialism. Our sympathy goes out, not only to those who are still in the homeland but to those who in the United States keep alive the patriotic ideals of freedom and the democratic way of life.

I am happy to salute the American people of Lithuanian birth or descent and to join with them in observance of February 16 as the Lithuanian day of independence.

Where America Stands Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] delivered a very statesmanlike address at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Raleigh, N. C., on February 10. I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is the first speech of a major character which he has made outside the Senate since he became majority leader, and it is well worth perusing.

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

WHERE AMERICA STANDS TODAY
(By Hon. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Democrats. Your kind words of welcome and the friendly enthusiasm of this fine audience emphasizes the honor you have paid me in inviting my participation in your Jefferson-Jackson Day gathering. Your cordiality and friendship is warmly reciprocated.

I know that the spirit expressed by you is also an inspiration to the members of your great congressional delegation. Senator CLYDE HOEY is no ordinary public servant. He is an adornment to the Senate of the United States, not merely an able legislator but a distinguished Senator and so acknowledged by his peers. Senator WILLIS SMITH is a recent addition to our body but his ability and public record are well known and already he has won the admiration of his colleagues.

I am proud that I can count these men as my personal friends, just as I am proud that I have the friendship of your 12 distinguished Congressmen. All of them—Messrs. COOLEY, BONNER, KERR, BARDEN, CHATHAM, DURHAM, CARLYLE, DEANE, HAMILTON JONES, WOODROW JONES, my good friend MONROE REDDEN, of Hendersonville, and that great patriarch of the House, BOB DOUGHTON, have the high regard of their colleagues.

We meet here tonight in a noble tradition. Andrew Jackson—the man who breathed life into our great Democratic Party, the man who put into practice the principle of a people's government, was a guest 121 years ago at the first dinner honoring the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. It is altogether fitting and appropriate that we who attempt to follow in the paths of these two men honor them. Both fought for human rights, for justice, for equality and freedom of mankind. Jefferson and Jackson were traduced in their time just as Wilson and Roosevelt were in theirs. Jackson was called an illiterate, a liar, an atheist, a dictator, and worse.

Today the epithets continue, varying only to suit the times. All of us have seen personal friends reviled because they held steadfastly to ideals which we ourselves cherish. Always those who fight entrenched greed and oppression, whether at home or abroad, are ridiculed, castigated, and maligned. But we can take comfort from the fact that domestically and internationally our party has never deviated from the basic principle of establishing here a better land for all the people

and encouraging that policy throughout the world.

Those who differ with us in political faith like to pass these affairs off as mere political dinners. They are more than that—they are the warp and woof of our governmental history; at these dinners policies are expounded and affirmations made which help set our course in national and international affairs. Today, as in the past, we not only draw inspiration from what our forebears did, but we can and must affirm that the principles which guided them, guide us.

Is there a continuity of purpose and action by our Government? Of course, there is.

Are we following any different policy today than Jefferson and Jackson followed? Of course not.

The fundamental policy is as simple and clear today as it ever was. We believe in the right of man to be free; to choose his own form of government, his religion, and his way of life. We demand it for ourselves and we favor it for mankind everywhere, free of aggression and subversion.

Our tactics may change from generation to generation, from year to year, even from day to day, but our basic strategy—never. We have shed blood and spent our substance to achieve and maintain freedom here and to help bring it about elsewhere in the world on the very simple premise that wherever the bell of tyranny tolls it also tolls for us.

Let us analyze briefly the current situation and see if we are deviating from our basic American policy.

Where does America stand in the world today?

We are told over and over again—by some statesmen who have been wrong in all their prophecies of doom for the last 20 years—that we are in terrible shape.

These sad souls who weep for us on the radio and turn gloomy faces to our televison screens tell us that we have very few friends anywhere on earth.

Some of the experts who hailed our action in Korea last summer now are ready to write off our struggle against Communist aggression there as a total failure. These summer soldiers are not willing to fight in January as they were in June.

Other self-appointed statesmen of the air waves and the press are urging us to wash our hands of the United Nations. These petulant pundits want us to pull away and sulk behind our oceans, if the other members of the UN will not do exactly what we say at the exact moment when we call for action.

Now let us take up these points one by one—let us see whether the gloom peddlers and the defeatists are right or wrong.

Are we really in terrible shape—or is it possible that certain people are trying to make us think so for their own special interests?

The truth is that our country has never been stronger in its entire history than it is today—and it is growing stronger hourly.

The truth is that we have many millions of firm friends around the globe.

The truth is that an overwhelming majority of the United Nations have joined with us in every step we have taken to stop aggression and to restore peace with honor in the world.

Look at the power and prosperity of America at this very moment, and do not permit the weepers and the wailers to confuse or dismay you.

All Americans who want to work now have good jobs at good wages. Farmers are receiving the highest incomes in history. Businessmen are making the largest profits they have ever enjoyed.

Everywhere you go in America today, you see new homes and new automobiles—the solid signs of prosperity. You see factories operating at full capacity. You see great mills turning out record quantities of steel. You see oil wells producing tremendous streams of fuel. You see long lines of freight cars and trucks moving across the land, carrying the products of American farms and American industry.

The banners of smoke flying from our factory chimneys are signals of our strength of determination to uphold the rule of justice. The sound of jet engines in the sky is a warning to all aggressors that the mightiest air force on earth serves the cause of liberty. Our ships upon the seven seas remind mankind that the most powerful navy in history moves upon the oceans for America and the free world.

This great Nation is throbbing with energy, bursting with strength, and filled with industrious and intelligent people who have never accepted the idea that America could ever fail in any task.

So I say to you that the captious critics, the defeatists, the fearful men who urge us to abandon our leadership of the free world do not represent America today.

We did not seek the position of power we now hold. We did not force our way into the forefront of the free nations. Because of our strength and high ideals, the eyes of freedom-loving nations have turned to us for leadership.

If we have been misled and misruled as these critics cry, let the defeatists explain how America has gone from triumph to triumph.

Where is the confusion they shout about?

Is there confusion in the minds of the President and the bipartisan leaders of Congress who created the Marshall plan? Can a program which aided 270,000,000 people in Western Europe to throw off the poisons of communism be called a product of confusion?

Was the Berlin airlift, which raised the morale of Western Germany and frustrated the Communists, an example of confusion?

Was it confusion to sponsor the North Atlantic Pact which bound 12 free nations together against aggressors?

Was our aid to the Greeks which enabled them to throw out the Communists an evidence of confusion?

Are the encouragement and assistance we are giving nations everywhere to resist Soviet imperialism examples of confusion?

When we stop to think, my friends, we know that all these important steps of the last few years were entirely consistent

Every one of these bold and resolute actions checked and confounded the evil forces of communism. Every one of these decisive actions heartened and strengthened the forces of our side—the forces of decency and respect for law, the forces of humanitarian civilization and human honor.

After the Second World War, we Americans resolved that we would not fall back into the folly of isolationism which had led us to the disaster of Pearl Harbor.

In the Senate we ratified the United Nations Charter in June of 1945 by a vote of 89 to 2. That vote was a tremendous revelation of how many Americans looked to the United Nations as a great instrument of hope—a noble institution which might enable us to free ourselves and our children from the senseless scourge of war.

Our faith in the UN was fully justified last June when the Security Council acted swiftly to condemn the aggression of the North Koreans. We all remember the strong surge of approval which went through America and all over the world when the President heeded the call of the Security Council to meet the brutal challenge of the Communists.

As free Americans, we have never bowed to aggressors. Acting as our Commander in Chief, our great President, Harry Truman, met the issue last June as Jackson and Jefferson would have met it—without flinching, without fear.

Let us remember that we went into Korea to stop the forces of aggression before those forces engulfed the whole world in a total war.

Let us remember that Communist aggression is no academic issue; it is a live, dangerous, spitting serpent. Always it moves forward; always we must be on the alert to keep it from threatening the life of America.

Is there any question—is there any doubt in any American's mind that sometime, some place, sooner or later the United Nations would have to call a halt to this gobbling up of the world, this suppression of free people? Haven't we learned the folly of appeasement? Have we forgotten Hitler and Munich so soon?

It is the masters in the Kremlin who choose the time and the place for attack. Had we been fully prepared in Korea, the assault would have come in Iran, Iraq, Indochina, Western Germany, or some other place. Some may say we should have waited, allowed Korea to be overrun, and chosen a different time and place to meet the Soviet challenge. But none can deny that the challenge eventually had to be met. Let us remember that appeasement has never bought peace.

By acting as we did in Korea, we brought the monster of Communist aggression into the open. We proved to the free world that we would spill our blood and spend our treasure to halt Soviet aggression before it devoured more nations, before it brought the horror of war to the shores of America.

The firm determination and the fighting spirit we have shown in Korea may have disrupted the plans of the Kremlin for world conquest. That was our purpose.

I feel deeply the cost in lives in Korea. Certainly, all of us want that cruel carnage to end as soon as possible. We believe that every American life is very precious. But we have learned in the blood and sorrow of two great wars that we cannot have peace unless we are willing to fight for it.

The courage of our men and our UN allies there may have spared millions of Americans, millions of free men in other countries, from death or mutilation in a global conflict. Let us remember that a single atom bomb dropped here in Raleigh would snuff out the lives of several times our fatalities in Korea.

It is true that we have borne the brunt of the battle. France and Britain and our other allies have not contributed as many troops as we hoped they would. But they have lived under the grim necessity of building up their forces in Europe to prevent the onslaught of Soviet armies there.

We must always remember how much our allies endured in World War II. We must remember that they were bombed by enemy planes week after week, year after year. We must remember that many thousands of Englishmen saw their homes go up in flames. We must remember that Belgium and Holland were overrun by ruthless armies, and France was crushed by military occupation for four long years.

The horrors of war, devastation of homes, imprisonment, concentration camps, execution of loved ones—these destroy the will to resist, the urge to fight. They breed despair and a sense of futility. If we think of these things we will not be impatient with our friends in Europe. We will understand why they are not able to summon up strong forces as rapidly as we desire. It will take time for them to restore themselves, materially, and spiritually. But they are making great progress.

General Eisenhower has just returned from Europe. He conferred with responsible leaders; he asked questions; he saw facts at first hand. He dealt with men who were his companions in arms a few short years ago.

He knows them and they know him. What does General Eisenhower tell us?

Our friends in Europe will fight—they will resist the tide of Communist aggression. Their spirit has been revived by our example; by our own determination to rearm and checkmate the Kremlin at every turn. They believe in us, and Eisenhower assures us that we can believe in them. In fact, they are now not nearly so concerned about our troops as they are about arms—the munitions of war.

They know, as we know, that the test, if it comes, will come in Europe. They face up boldly to the fact that their homes and their lands may again be the first battleground.

Whom are we going to follow—General Eisenhower or the men who one day advocate that we isolate ourselves in this hemisphere and forget the rest of the world and the next day admit that perhaps it would be better to give Europe limited aid? Are we going to follow Eisenhower or the men who argue with each other about mathematical formulae on troops?

Who knows the military situation and the facts in Europe better—the great soldier who served as supreme commander in Europe or the timid men suddenly become military strategists? Whom are you willing to believe?

I prefer to believe General Eisenhower when he says quietly and plainly that we can count on the support of millions of freedom-loving people in Europe. I prefer to follow Eisenhower when he insists that he can, with our aid, build up a European fighting force which can deter Russia. I prefer to take Eisenhower's valuation that the governments in Europe are alive to the threat from the Kremlin and will fight to the death against it.

We cannot fail to build a better future for ourselves and all mankind—if we stand by the simple, straightforward ideals we have supported throughout our history.

We have maintained one fundamental principle in the east and in the west, in the Pacific regions and in the Atlantic areas, in North America and in South America—in the whole wide world.

Our basis principle has been the principle of devotion to the rights of man—the right of nations to be free and independent, the right of small nations to live without fear of big nations, the right of men to choose their own forms of government without threats of subversion or aggression.

This great principle can never be destroyed, as long as there are men who are willing to offer their lives to cherish and protect it. There will never be a shortage of such men in America. While the spirit of honor and brotherhood lives in our hearts and the hearts of free men everywhere, our cause must inevitably be victorious.

We have met every test in the past; we will do so in the future.

We are now well launched upon the tremendous task of arming ourselves and our allies to prevent the spread of war. We are not resigned to the idea that the terrible tragedy of a world conflagration is inevitable.

We are girding ourselves to make a mighty effort for the maintenance of peace with honor in the world.

In this noble cause, we are on the side of the angels. The world wants peace. The world wants hope. The world is ready to respond to cheerful, courageous leadership. And we can give it, if we rise now to the heights of heroism reached by our gallant fighters in Korea.

We can win the battle for peace—if we work and pray for the good of suffering humanity while we prepare to defend the ramparts of freedom.

Let us go forward together, united as Americans, united as free men under the banner of the United Nations. Let us guide ourselves calmly and confidently, with the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson and the fearless heritage of Andrew Jackson.

Then we will have no reason for fear. Then we will never be touched again by the cold fingers of despair. With the help of God, we will carry the flag of freedom to our coming victory.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Montgomery County Republicans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, February 12, it was my pleasure to address the Montgomery County Republicans at the Manor Club on the subject of the meaning in our times of Abraham Lincoln's birthday. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LINCOLN'S MEANING IN THE ATOMIC AGE

I am delighted to be back once again before your splendid Republican organization. It is a particular privilege to be among those who did such a tremendous job in the November 1950 election.

The resounding victory of the Republican cause in your great State of Maryland was a tremendous tonic to the entire country. It showed in particular that folks who work in our Nation's Capital and who are close in every other way to Washington itself clearly recognize the fact that there are grave deficiencies in the present administration. The fact that you are near to the scene has in no way blinded your eyes to the errors of the Fair Deal.

The celebration of Lincoln's birthday is more, of course, than just an occasion for our get-together as Republicans. You and I know that Abraham Lincoln was bigger than any political party. He was a Republican, but basically he was an American—a great and humble American.

FOUR MEANINGS OF LINCOLN'S LIFE

To us of our time there are many meanings of Lincoln's birthday, and I, for one, should like to spell out four such meanings to you today:

1. The political meaning.
2. The international meaning.
3. The national meaning.
4. The great spiritual meaning of Abraham Lincoln.

GOP IS PERFECT CHOICE FOR 1952

Now, first, my friends, we, as Republicans, know that Abraham Lincoln serves as a tremendous inspiration to our entire party. Just as the Republican Party came upon the American scene at exactly the right moment in our history, so, in November 1952, the Republican Party will once more emerge as exactly the right choice for the American people—a people tired of administration "bungling, burdens, and baloney."

DEMOCRATS IN POWER FOR TOO LONG

You and I know that the excessively long period which the present Democratic administration has held in office presents a grave danger to the future liberties of our country. I, for one, do not believe that any party is so wise, its leadership so sound, that it can be trusted with power virtually unbroken for 20 years. On the contrary, we have seen the danger of such long durations of power in the long succession of shocking scandals—the scandal of Democratic tie-ups with organized crime in Illinois and elsewhere, the scandal of Democratic meddling in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the scandal of administration tie-ups with the "five percenters," the scandal of Communists and other suspects in Government—the Hisses, the Coplons, the Remingtons, the Bentleys. We have seen on the basis of all of these scandals that the Democratic Party has outlived its usefulness as a majority party, if indeed it ever had such usefulness.

THE RIGHT IDEA AT THE RIGHT TIME

Abraham Lincoln came to the fore in the year 1860 as President of the United States. He and the newly born Republican Party had the answer to the great need of the hour, the need for preservation of the Union.

We recall the words of Victor Hugo "that there is nothing more powerful in the world than an idea whose time has come." Abraham Lincoln had the right idea, and there was no human power on earth that could triumph over his indomitable will to preserve this Union.

I should like to quote now and a bit later on from some of Lincoln's own words. In 1864 he said:

"This Government must be preserved in spite of the acts of any man or set of men. It is worthy of your every effort. * * * I have admonished you not to be turned from the stern purpose of defending our beloved country and its free institutions by any arguments urged by ambitious and designing men, but stand fast to the Union and the old flag."

THE RED MENACE FROM WITHIN

It was Abraham Lincoln who warned the American people of the danger from within. The Democratic Party has virtually ignored that danger. It has coddled a whole generation of traitorous individuals whose loyalty was not to our country, but rather to a vicious foreign ideology—an ideology that claims there is no God, that claims man is a materialist brute, that there must be a perpetual conflict between classes and nations until communism triumphs.

Now, friends, to summarize this point, the political meaning of Abraham Lincoln in our time is that we of the Republican Party are charged with a great mission to bring about Republican victory in 1952.

We should not presume that the accumulated blunders of the Democratic administration will automatically bring it down. On the contrary, we know that the Democratic Party, feeding on patronage (particularly on the basis of tens of thousands of defense jobs in Government and industry), we know that this Democratic Party is in many respects tremendously strong. It will take an invincible determination on our part to wrest control from it.

FRIENDSHIP TO ALL PEOPLES

Now, my friends, there is a second meaning of Abraham Lincoln in our time, and I refer to his meaning on the international scene. The man who spoke on March 4, 1865, in his

second inaugural address, said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right," that man was not simply a citizen of America, rather he was a citizen of the world.

What finer attitude could you and I have toward all peoples than to hold no malice toward them, to seek justice for them; yes, justice even for those who were our bitter enemies during World War II.

Moreover, we hold no malice even for the enslaved people of Soviet Russia and the satellite states under it. We know that if these humble peoples were given their freedom, they would eradicate the tyrannous group of men in the Kremlin, which has set them on a course of international aggression.

AMERICA MUST LEAD THE WEST

We know, however, that we must not be weak or timid in facing the leaders of the Kremlin. If we are to preserve that "government of the people, by the people and for the people" of which Abraham Lincoln spoke, we must in our international policy recognize our responsibilities to ourselves and to the world. Whether we like it or not, we are the leaders of western civilization—the economic, military, political, and spiritual leaders. We have inherited the legacy of other great countries whose prestige had previously dominated the globe. Each of our three great branches of Government must accordingly play its part, each neither exceeding its powers nor failing to exercise them.

As Lincoln said in his second annual message to Congress on December 1, 1862: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history."

I repeat, my friends, we of this generation cannot escape the responsibility of our times. We cannot stick our heads in the sand like ostriches, we cannot tell the world to go "hang"—(it is we who will go "hang" with it). We know that we are living in a contracted world in which man's ingenuity and inventiveness have practically annihilated space and time. We are every nation's neighbor. We are indeed our brothers' keeper.

But to be adequate, there must be no more secret agreements, no more blundering Yaltas, Tehrans, Potsdams, no more sellouts of the right of free peoples.

LIMITING GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Abraham Lincoln had a message for the world, but also he had a message for our own country insofar as our future national policy should be concerned. We come, therefore, to the third great meaning of Lincoln's life, the national meaning.

During this present era of crisis, we know that Government is unfortunately going to have to play an increasing role in the lives of all of our citizens. The controls which we are already experiencing are but the token of even more comprehensive controls which may come in the future, controls over strategic materials, over prices, over wages, and so forth.

We do not, however, want to allow these temporary controls to be used by the Administration as a cloak so as to cover up socialistic designs which would regiment our entire economy. The American people are willing to submit to a temporary system of Federal dictation, but they are not going to lose their great and lasting zeal for liberty.

SOCIALISTIC ITEMS MUST BE ELIMINATED FROM BUDGET

We know that in President Truman's $71,600,000,000 budget, there were a vast number of socialistic items that have absolutely no business being there. I refer, for example, to his proposal for socialized medicine, for socialized farming, and so forth. Those items in his budget must be completely eliminated.

What then, is the standard that we should pursue in evaluating proposals for new action by our Governmentn?

I think that there is no better standard than that which Lincoln himself recommended almost a hundred years ago. On July 1, 1854, he stated:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Would that Mr. Truman and his associates around him might remember that phrase:

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

DANGER OF LEANING ON GOVERNMENT

We know that if the people get into the habit of relying upon government, eventually they would not be in a position to do anything for themselves and government would have to do everything. Listen to the words of another great American President:

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * * When all government in little as in great things shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will become venal and oppressive."

The man who spoke these words was President Thomas Jefferson, a man with whom the Democratic Party nominally claims great friendship. But surely those words of Jefferson indicate what we feel to be a profound Republican view. In fact, Lincoln in his second inaugural address on March 4, 1865, said: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society."

SEEKING DIVINE GUIDANCE

Now, my friends, we have reviewed three of the great meanings of Abraham Lincoln's life. I refer to the political meaning, to us as Republicans, the international meaning, and the national meaning.

The fourth great meaning comes to each of us, to you and to me, as children of God. And I refer, of course, to the spiritual meaning of Lincoln's life. We all know that he freely told us that "when I have no other place to go, I go to my knees in prayer."

We know that Lincoln utilized divine power to master the problems around him. He did not have a college education. He was self-educated in the school of hard knocks. There was probably not a single member of his Cabinet who did not have more education than he did. And yet those Cabinet Members could not hold a candle to his great spirit which rose above the problems which his Cabinet members could not master.

Lincoln, you see, had three great techniques which he fully utilized: (1) The power of prayer, to which I have referred; (2) a wonderful sense of humor; his ability to tell a wholesome yarn that would release taut nerves and tense minds; (3) a deep and abiding love of the Republic to which he gave his all.

In your life and mine, whether we are private citizens or public officers, we, too, can utilize these three great approaches.

CONCLUSION

We have viewed, then, the four meanings of Abraham Lincoln's life. As the years go on, the shadow of his greatness lengthens and we see even more that his words, his thoughts, and his actions were worthy of the ages. He wrote himself large into the conscience of all mankind and into the history of western civilization. May we be as worthy of the challenges of 1951 as he was of those of 1861.

Thank you.

Lincoln Day Address by Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club on the evening of last Monday, February 12, 1951, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

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

TEXT OF DEWEY'S ADDRESS AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER IN THE WALDORF

As we join tonight to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, we are facing an issue that may decide the very existence of our country. As in Lincoln's day, it again involves the age-old issue of freedom or slavery. This time we are deciding whether we will all be slaves or whether we shall all be free.

Some progress has been made in the 2 months since I called in this room for a swift build-up of the Armed Forces of our country, for immediate all-out production for defense against aggression abroad and for a real fight against inflation at home.

At least, 8 months after Korea, our Government has actually begun to get orders out to industry for some of the weapons we needed before Korea. We finally have in that job the leadership of a really able man—and, I might add, a good Republican—Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson.

But the fight against inflation is still a sham battle, accompanied by much sound and fury, strong regulations and weak administration, a slow freeze and a quick thaw. It appears that our wage and price controls are being run by Annie Oakley. The Washington regulators toss up an order, shoot it full of holes, and then give somebody a free ride. Meanwhile the Treasury is, in effect, pumping Government bonds into the Federal Reserve at low interest rates, creating the most powerful engine of inflation this country has ever seen.

Having looked over some of the people running wage and price controls, I came to the conclusion that they are there, not for the purpose of fighting inflation, but to provide jobs for undeserving Democrats at the expense of the people.

Meanwhile, as every American bends his back to bear the new load of taxes, the President's budget includes every political spending device anybody has been able to think of to catch votes and wreck our defense program. It even includes that moth-eaten socialized medicine scheme that would wreck the health of our people, and the Brannan plan, which the farmers themselves don't want.

GET DOWN TO BUSINESS

If the national administration really wants to defend America, I suggest it quit politics as usual and get down to business.

Our country is the core of opposition to the spread of Russian barbarism and Communist slavery throughout the world. We are now engaged in a great debate over that issue of human slavery, even as in Lincoln's time, and as before it splits the members of the two great political parties.

The debate has hammered out agreement on many points and the issue has narrowed down to the simple question: How shall we meet the challenge and with what kind of force?

On one side is the group which contends that America's welfare and the defeat of communism requires that we inspire and strengthen our allies with arms and troops to preserve their freedom. This group holds that without united action by the free nations, acting within the United Nations, we ourselves are in great peril. These Americans believe we should make every sacrifice to mobilize swiftly to repel any new invasion of the free world in Europe, Asia, or Africa.

The other side, which also includes members of both political parties, says we cannot afford to undertake this great obligation. They say we would be spreading ourselves too thin. They say Europe is unwilling to defend itself, that it is riddled with socialism, weak economically, threatened with internal revolution by Communists, and does not even pay its debts. They say the free areas of Asia are too disorganized to avoid collapse whatever happens.

These Americans conclude that we should send only a few, if any, additional troops to Europe or Asia, and that we should concentrate on making the Western Hemisphere invincible; that we should keep our money and our boys at home, building our own strength. They say the Western Hemisphere is self-sufficient and unconquerable and we should not dissipate our treasure and risk the blood of our youth for lost causes all over the earth.

CITES LATIN AMERICA

This is a most appealing argument. I wish with all my heart and soul that I could believe in it. I have two sons who are going to be involved and I would gladly give my life to avoid sending them to far-away lands to risk being wounded or killed. But in all honesty I am compelled totally to reject the idea that America can live alone.

I say to you: We could not survive in a Communist world. First of all, how long do you think we would have South America with us? With all Europe in Russia's hands, to whom would South America sell all the essential exports she now sends to Europe? Many of South America's exports are farm products that we do not need and cannot absorb. Without a market for her exports, how long could we, in this country, make up the difference to keep South America on our side?

Clearly, we would very soon be isolated, here in North America. We would be the loneliest people on earth. What would we do, an island of freedom in a Communist world, outnumbered 14 to 1, with oceans which would no longer be our protecting moat but a broad highway to our front door?

We produce less than half our wool, only a portion of our sugar and none of our coffee and tea. We can survive without these things.

But with what would we defend ourselves? We are short 50 basic metals. We might get along without tungsten or chromium or even without natural rubber or tin, though it would be tough.

But some things are life and death. To make steel you need manganese—and where does our manganese come from? From overseas. For years Russia provided 50 percent of all our manganese. Today the largest sources are in Africa; the next largest is—where do you think? In India—halfway around the world.

Steel makes automobiles, trucks, tractors, plows, new buildings, new highways, new bridges, and machine tools. We might get along, perhaps, without all these—but only at a stone-age level of existence.

Meanwhile, what happens to Fortress America? Where do we get the steel to make guns and planes and tanks, or atom bombs? Without these, Fortress America is lost.

It is perfectly clear that Russia does not wish to challenge the United States in all-out war until she catches up with us on the atom bomb. The bomb had kept this shaky peace, and it has kept it because we had bases in Great Britain, Africa, and the Mediterranean from which to deliver the bomb.

But how do we make the atom bomb? With uranium—and our principal source of uranium is again in Africa, in the Belgian Congo. Suppose the Russians took Europe, including Belgium. Who gets the Belgian Congo and its uranium? The Russians. I suspect we would overnight find ourselves fighting a land war in Africa for the defense of the crucial uranium for the atom bomb. And we would be fighting that war thousands of miles from home, with no allies, against a triumphant enemy.

OPERATION SUICIDE

I do not need to labor the point. We cannot protect ourselves by withdrawing from the rest of the world.

Operation withdrawal is Operation Suicide.

The simple fact is that the front line of defense of our very existence—the only line of defense we have—is overseas, thousands of miles away, where lie the raw materials without which our country could not survive.

Now suppose a miracle occurred overnight and we suddenly discovered all these essential materials right here in the United States. Then how long would we survive, isolated and surrounded, with only 54 miles separating Soviet Russia from Alaska?

Last December I called for 100 divisions, or about 1,800,000 ground troops. That works out at about 35 combat divisions plus behind-the-lines organization. Isolated and alone, we would need not 35 but 100 combat divisions to have a ghost of a chance of defending our shores from Alaska to southern California to the Gulf of Mexico and from Florida to Maine, and this in addition to the enormous Navy and Air Force it would take to patrol the Pacific Canal—if we still had it—and then on down to Cape Horn. And still, with all the colossal industrial capacity of Russia, Japan, Germany, and the rest of Western Europe, the Russians could take their own sweet time and bomb us out.

No, ladies and gentlemen; I would rather see my country do its share as a part of a great free world than to see us isolated, suffocated and exterminated.

I do not want to see my country shrinking timidly from its obvious destiny and waiting for destruction. I want to see my country act with courage and honesty. I want it to stand up for the right and live in freedom.

Let me confess immediately that I do not relish entrusting the fate of freedom to the shifting whims and demonstrated incompetencies of the present national administration. I did my best to throw them out a couple of years ago. And I'm sure somebody else will succeed in that effort next year. But the inexorable march of human history does not wait for nations to settle their internal differences.

The day of decision is upon us. The issue should be decided upon the real facts which have been much ignored. For example, those who argue that we ought not to defend Western Europe forget that we have already decided that question. Twice in this country we have chosen to go to war because our freedom was imperiled by the armed conquests of a dictator in Europe.

Those who argue that we should not send an American Army to Europe forget that we already have an American Army in Europe—112,000 American troops who are performing their duties in the occupation of Germany. We have American troops in Austria, in Britain, Trieste, North Africa, and the Mediterranean. Those American boys would be at war the instant the Red Czar moved into Europe. They are our own flesh and blood, and who denies that America would send them everything we had in the air, on the sea and on the land? I say we should reinforce them now while Europe can still rearm and prevent a war.

SAYS UNITED STATES WILL WIN

Once and for all let's stop this business of waiting for wars and crises and then frantically improvising, going through the agonies each time of too little and too late. However much we would like to dream of doing things the easy way, we have absolutely no choice if we wish to stay free and keep our freedom without a war.

Freedom was never bought in a bargain basement. Freedom was never saved by timidity, selfishness, half-way measures, or appeasement. America is not going to close her eyes to the cause of freedom in this world. We are going to stand by our commitments; we are going to shore up the cause of freedom. We are going to win.

The face of the world has changed much in the last 2 months and other nations are beginning to know we will win, too.

In Europe the frozen spirit of despair has given way to a new spirit of defiance. The people see that America has again taken firm hold of freedom's sword and will not put it down while tyranny is on the march.

The peoples of Europe and their governments have been rallied to their own defense by the inspiring leadership of General Eisenhower. Everywhere he has gone his presence has dismayed the Communists and fired the courage of freemen.

Yugoslavia, once a Russian satellite, has become the greatest thorn in Stalin's side. Titoism threatens to spread behind the iron curtain. The former Red Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia is reported to have escaped and Stalin has had to send a marshal of the Red army to hold down the Czech people. Just last week key leaders of Italian communism deserted the Russian cause.

The British have won successes in their fight against Communist guerrillas in Malaya and there is new hope of French victory over communism in Indochina.

RECALLS ATOMIC TESTS

One of the greatest triumphs of recent months has been the abandonment by our own Government of the frightful follies of its appeasement of the Reds in China. For four long years I demanded and pleaded that we should back up the recognized Government of China. It took a war by Red China to wake up our administration but at last they are acting as though they are seeing the light and will start backing up the forces for a free China.

Another thrill of hope went around the world this last week as a result of those atomic tests in Nevada. Every one of those explosions said to freemen everywhere: "Take courage. America is arming. Be strong; you can remain free."

Each of the explosions said in thundering words to those 14 men darkly conspiring in the Kremlin: "Beware. Stop your plans of bloody conquest. America is strong and she means to be stronger. She has hundreds of bombs where those came from."

No, my friends, this is no time for us to follow the counsel of despair. It is a time to be strong. It is a time for boldness. This is a time for greatness.

We tried the other course. We tried isolationism twice and each time we were drawn into a bloody conflict, still unarmed and unprepared. We fought two wars for freedom in Europe and we won no peace.

This time let us win the peace without a war.

This time let us make sure that no dictator thinks he can pick off one nation after another and then swallow the world.

It is time—long since time—that we drew the line.

Let us decide as a nation that we can win this peace through strength. We must also let the rest of the world know what we will do and what we don't do. There is grave doubt that Stalin would ever have launched the attack in Korea if he had known America would respond. In fact the Government of the United States had officially taken the position that we would not defend Korea. We created a vacuum and dictators move into vacuums.

Let us not repeat that blunder.

We officially announced we would not help Chiang Kai-shek. Again we ourselves created the vacuum. Again Red satellites moved in and won domination over 450,000,000 Chinese who are right this minute killing American boys.

Let us stop handing armies and nations over to the Russians. The only way to stop it is to draw the line.

All the world knows what nations we will defend for sure and as a result no attack has been made on a single one of them.

Now let us go to the rest of the way. We should say where we stand as to the rest of the world. Let there be no more blundering into little wars or big wars. The United States with her allies should make clear their common purpose.

Greece and Turkey should be brought into the North Atlantic Treaty immediately. Then we should settle other questions.

Will we move into war if the Red czar invades Iran? If not, will we let him take all of Iran's oil and then take Iraq and Israel and then perhaps march down into Saudi-Arabia? Will we allow that crucial oil supply to fall into Russia's hands? Or would we bomb it out? Nobody knows. It is a vacuum and dictators move into vacuums.

There is strong reason to believe Russia intends to move on Yugoslavia this year. If she does so through satellites what will happen? Nobody knows. If Bulgaria and Rumania invade Yugoslavia will atom bombs fall on Sofia and Bucharest? Nobody knows.

If Yugoslavia should fall, how long then would Greece remain free. With Greece and the Dardanelles gone, the eastern Mediterranean would become a Red sea and our bombing bases there for the defense of America would be gone.

WANTS TO WARN WORLD

Let's make up our minds and then let's tell the world the answers, so nobody will ever have an excuse to drag us into an accidental war. And let's make sure of our friends—all of them.

The Turks have 25 divisions. The heroic conduct of their troops in Korea reminds us that the Moslem world contains great force and great courage. More than 200,000,000 Mohammedans have a devout religious fervor and they have no affinity for godless communism. Their world spreads from Egypt all the way to India and into China. In the last vote in the United Nations on the China issue a number of Moslem nations abstained from voting. It is time we brought the full power of Islam more securely to our side.

Spain has 22 divisions and Yugoslavia 30. I want them on our side. Brave little Greece which has already won one war in the last 5 years is stoutly prepared to do her share again. Greece can produce and is willing to produce 10 divisions right now. And yet there are some in this country who haggle over whether we should produce 35.

The memory of Lincoln reminds us that there have been dark days throughout all our history. When we lost battles in the War Between the States, the Copperheads demanded that Lincoln abandon his effort to preserve the Union and compromise. Fortunately for us and for the world Lincoln was no weakling, no appeaser. In the darkest hour he stood more steadfast than ever. Let us remember our great history. Let us not start running for cover every time things go badly in Korea or some place else.

Above all, we must have faith in ourselves. Prepared, we can out-produce, out-think, and out-fight the hordes of communism every day in the week. Free American industry can keep ahead of slave Russians forever and the Kremlin should never forget it.

SAYS ALL SEEK FREEDOM

We have the winning cause because every man on earth wants to be free. The world is discovering that communism is slavery. Let's help them discover it faster.

Every dictator is a craven, selfish bully, exploiting millions of others just to keep his job. Dictatorship is a rotten thing and there are millions of people who would rise in revolt even with the odds 100 to 1 against them if they thought they had a chance. Let's give them a chance. Let's give them arms and money and hope.

Once again the cause of freedom is rising in the world. We struck bottom in the last few months but nothing on earth can stop us now—that is, nothing except our own follies.

If we will resolve our doubts in favor of courage and action, I can see the day coming when Stalin will have too much trouble at home to think about tackling somebody else.

I can see the day coming when Europe will be united and her scattered forces will be welded into an unconquerable power which Russia will never dare attack.

I can see the day coming when a new emancipation proclamation will free the Soviet slaves in Czechoslovakia and Poland and Hungary and Bulgaria and Romania and China, even in Russia itself, and when that day comes the Kremlin will no longer be a safe place for dictators.

If we in America choose to live in Lincoln's tradition, we will keep our freedom because we have earned it. We will inspire others to do likewise. I have no doubt as to the outcome. America will always chose the path of freedom. We will make that choice because brave men and women, fearing God, can make no other. Ours is an abiding faith in the cause of human freedom. We know it is God's cause.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Although in this proud and freedom-loving land independence is only a cherished legend today, the respect and admiration which its brief career as a sovereign nation engendered among its friends in the rest of the free world have continued and grown stronger during this period of domination.

Before 1918, its history had been a bleak, but inspiring record of a 900-year fight against the oppressive and dictatorial rule of the Russian czars. When the opportune moment presented itself during World War I, Lithuania courageously proclaimed its independence which was then acknowledged by all the world.

During the all-too-brief lifespan of free Lithuania, its citizens prospered and lived happily as members of a modern, progressive society. The Government functioned smoothly in the new nation. Trade flourished, agrarian reforms were instituted, and the future seemed assured.

Now, there can only be a blind, desperate hope that the future will not be as horrible as the present, that the iron curtain cannot last forever. The enormity of Russian crimes against the small country of 3,000,000 people can be approximated by the fact that the estimates of persons murdered, starved, and tortured to death, or deported to a lingering death in Arctic work camps range from half a million to one million. Genocide is being ruthlessly practiced as a matter of national Russian policy, since the rulers know that the fierce desire for freedom will persist as long as there is breath in a native Lithuanian's body.

We can only be amazed and humbled at the accounts of the astonishing courage and personal integrity of these people. Here, in our warm clothes and comfortable homes, we can only ask ourselves if we would be a fraction as brave if confronted with the horrible prospect of the fate that faces a guerrilla captured by the Russians. Yet the resistance movement survives and with it the hope and spirit of these brave, pitiable people.

We as a Nation cannot escape the judgment of history that we must share the responsibility for their fate by our blindness and gullibility during the period of World War II, when we allowed the Russians to regain control over the fate of the Baltic Nations. The time must come when Lithuania and her sister nations along the North Sea will be free to enjoy a well-earned independence day once more. Let us hope and pray that that time will not be too long in arriving, that it will not be too late for the heroes of the present resistance.

An Anniversary Message to the Lithuanian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days of tenuous peace—when a United Nations force is repelling aggression in Asia—the fate of the free world hangs in the balance.

The combined efforts of all freedom-loving people are required to combat the insidious flow of Communist aggression. Whether it be by infiltration or by violence, the end result remains the same.

The course of Communist domination is evident in Lithuania today. A people noted through history for their love of liberty have been crushed by a godless dictatorship. All is not lost, however, as the flame of freedom still burns brightly in the hearts of Lithuanians everywhere. Those who have come to America and have contributed so greatly to our way of life still fight on and offer encouragement to those under Communist domination.

Freedom will and must once again come to the crushed nations of the world; the task is great, but the example of the Lithuanians is a beacon for all to follow in attaining our goal.

The celebration of Lithuania's thirty-third anniversary of independence on February 16 is a mark of the will to survive as a free people.

Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, another year of enslavement has passed for the struggling peoples of Lithuania—under the domination of the ruthless leadership of the Kremlin. February 16 marks the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by this brave little land, peopled by 3,000,000 souls, hundreds of thousands of whom have been deported in abject slavery to the frozen wastes of Russia. How many of them are still alive no one knows.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared its independence after 160 years of Russian rule. The liberty for which generation after generation had yearned and longed for, had fought and died for, had become a reality at last. There was great rejoicing throughout the land. The nightmare of serfdom had vanished. Hopes for the future were bright indeed. Its independence had been recognized, not only by all the free nations of the world, but by the Russian Government itself. This was 4 months prior to the fall of the czarist regime in Russia.

This freedom and liberty was to be all too short-lived however, for in 1940 the present rulers of Russia, in violation of a solemn treaty with the Lithuanian people again overran its countryside, imposing a tyranny more frightful than that of the czars. The world is well aware of the torture, persecution, imprisonment, and liquidation of the clergy, both Protestant and Catholic; the shocking fate of Cardinal Mindszenty; the treacherous effort to stamp out all religion. These actions are repulsive to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. All liberties enjoyed in the brief span of years from 1918 to 1940 were obliterated. Again terror and subjugation ruled the land.

On February 16 Americans of Lithuanian extraction, together with their fellow men throughout the world will gather together, heavy of heart and saddened by the thoughts of the plight of their homeland, to recall the more pleasant moments of the joy and exultation of their relatives, friends, and neighbors in the homeland on that day 33 years ago when liberty and freedom was theirs. They will offer anew their prayers and hopes for the speedy return of the new day of liberation which must and will come to oppressed peoples of all lands, including theirs.

All history has proven that the spirit of a brave people cannot die; that it cannot be crushed by ruthless dictators, by slavery, by despotism. The flame of liberty, ingrained in the hearts and souls of people by the God of love and justice is eternal in humankind; it is the eternal, unquenchable light. It burns today in the souls of all the inhabitants of this brave little land. It may be dimmed; it may seem to have been obliterated by those who never believed in light, but it will flare anew ere long, brighter and more enduring than ever.

I join with all Lithuanian-Americans on this occasion in the fervent hope and prayer that the day of the new liberation will soon, again, bring joy and happiness to the hearts of Lithuanians wherever they may be, and that the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will become a reality to them.

Hon. Will M. Whittington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am privileged to include the resolution passed unanimously by the American Association of State Highway Officials at their thirty-sixth annual meeting, held in Miami, Fla., on December 7 last, which gives high praise to the valued services of the Honorable Will M. Whittington, chairman of the Committee on Public Works in the House.

Many tributes have been paid to our distinguished colleague who voluntarily leaves service in the House of Representatives at the conclusion of this session of the Congress. From all over the land high tribute has been paid him, and while all of us know his fine character, his strict application to duty, his loyalty to country, his enormous capacity for work, and his fine leadership, I am glad to include in these remarks this fine expression from those who know how well he handled all of the affairs of the committee, and in this instance, particularly, the wise and efficient handling of highway legislation.

The resolution follows:

Resolution 7

Resolution in appreciation of the services of the Honorable Will M. Whittington

Whereas the Honorable Will M. Whittington, Representative from Mississippi in the Congress of the United States, is retiring this year after 26 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives, and nearly as many years of service on the Committee on Roads and as chairman of the Public Works Committee since 1948; and

Whereas in his championship of the cause of an adequate highway system, Representative Whittington made an outstanding contribution to good roads throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Mr. Whittington has at all times given wise counsel and advice and has cooperated to the greatest extent in furthering the objectives of the American Association of State Highway Officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association in convention assembled in Miami, Fla., on December 4–7, 1950, conveys to Mr. Whittington its sincere appreciation and best wishes.

Address of Chief Justice Benjamin C. Hilliard, of the Supreme Court of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by the Honorable Benjamin C. Hilliard, member of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado and twice chief justice thereof, and an honored member of this body serving from March 4, 1915, to March 4, 1919, and to include the introduction made by Mr. Roy G. Munroe, president of the Colorado Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, which is as follows:

For many years it has been the great privilege of the Colorado Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to have a prominent part in the annual celebration of the adoption of the Bill of Rights. It is, of course, a natural thing that the Sons of the American Revolution should be active in this celebration. Our great ancestors, of whose deeds we are so justly proud, were those men who by their bravery and their sacrifices made America a Nation. From their number came the men who met in Philadelphia and drafted the Constitution of the United States. And from their number came the leadership of the group who saw to it that the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution almost immediately after its adoption.

This year it is our purpose, through the use of the radio and through the use of transcriptions, to bring to as many of Colorado's adults and school children as may be reached by these methods, a reminder of the great heritage we have and of the great part the Bill of Rights plays in our heritage.

We have asked one of our own members, a distinguished citizen of Colorado, and one of the Nation's outstanding jurists, to speak to us on the Bill of Rights. He brings to his discussion a lifetime of service to the people of Colorado and the United States, an intimate and almost exhaustive knowledge of the subject, and a gift of phrase which, I am sure, you will find most enjoyable.

I take great pleasure in presenting to you, to speak to us on the Bill of Rights, Mr. Chief Justice Benjamin C. Hilliard, of the Supreme Court of Colorado.

Chief Justice HILLIARD. It is, of course, a great privilege to be allowed to speak on this subject in behalf of the Sons of the American Revolution. As do all of our members, I have pride in knowing that my ancestors were among those immortals who, against almost insuperable difficulties, wrested freedom from the then most powerful nation on this earth. A bare handful of men, scattered thinly along the fringes of the Atlantic, ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed, fought and vanquished the best that Europe could send against them. Through their prowess, their perserverance, and their faith, they established that the principles which had been laid down in the Declaration of Independence were worth all that it had cost to sustain them.

As Mr. Munroe has very well said, it was from our revolutionary ancestors that we obtained the freedom, the privileges, and the blessings which are our portion. From their ranks came the men who wrote the documents which proclaimed and have preserved those freedoms, privileges, and blessings. From their minds, steeped in knowledge of the evils that must be guarded against if men are to be free, came the great American charters: The Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. And of these, the greatest is the Bill of Rights.

As we all know, when the final draft of the Constitution of the United States had been signed, on September 17, 1787, by George Washington, and the representatives of all the former colonies, save Rhode Island, it was definitely understood that safeguarding amendments were immediately to be proposed. Indeed, had it not been for the pledge that these amendments would be proposed and adopted, the Constitution would never have been ratified. The reason for this is not far to seek. It was born out of the knowledge of the leaders in the colonies that unless certain things should be forbidden the new government, it would, no matter how high might be the ideals of its sponsors, fall into the evil courses which the Revolution had been fought to avoid.

It will be remembered that the Declaration of Independence had proclaimed that certain rights are inalienable. Recall the words, the most eloquent ever penned by man: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It was widely feared throughout all the colonies that unless the new Government, set up by the Constitution should be limited in its powers, that in time it would assume, and would be held to have, the power to trespass upon the rights which the Declaration of Independence had said should be inalienable. This fear came out of the lesson of history, that governments, unless they are circumscribed, will encroach upon and deny the rights which free men ought to have.

Hence, we find in a few short months after the Constitution was adopted the addition to it of the first ten amendments, which have come to be called, and rightly so, the Bill of Rights. Let us examine them in such detail as time will allow. Let us look at the evils they were designed to avoid. And let us look at the quaintness of their language.

An established church supported by taxation levied upon those who did not subscribe to its doctrines, was a crying evil. The first amendment forbade an established church but at the same time extended to every man the right to worship as he saw fit. Remembering the suppression of newspapers, the imprisonment of men for their opinions, the refusal of the English overlords to permit the people to assemble or to petition for redress of their grievances, the first amendment forbade the Government to abridge the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, the right peacefully to assemble, and the right of petition. So accustomed are we to these privileges that we have forgotten where these rights come from. We should remind ourselves and, as we look about the world, consider how little of these freedoms are vouchsafed to other nations.

The right of the people to bear arms as a way of putting in the people's hands the means of resisting oppression is guaranteed by the second amendment. Quaint to our ears and strange to our present customs is the interdiction laid down in the third amendment, against the quartering of soldiers in a citizen's house. But in its time the quartering of soldiers on the citizenry was as great an evil as could be imagined. The third amendment made it an impossibility in the United States.

In many places in this world today and in the times before the American Revolution, no man was safe in his house, his effects, or his papers. In the dead of night, the dread knock on the door, and the king's officers marched in without warrant, arrested the innocent, searched his premises, destroyed his effects, and carried off his papers and his property. Since the adoption of the fourth amendment no American has had to fear those things. And, as was said of the Englishman after American example had taught the English Government what freedom means, "The wind may enter an Englishman's poor cottage, and the rain may come in, but the king cannot."

Again we are forced to remind ourselves that what we consider our natural rights are really rights hard won from oppressive governments and oppressive men. How often do we recall that before the American Revolution men were held for crimes without information or indictment; that men were tried again and again for the same offense until a conviction could be had; that men could be compelled to be witnesses against themselves; that men's property could be taken from them for governmental use without compensation; and that men could be tried for acts which were made criminal by laws passed after the acts had been committed. The fifth amendment put an end to such abuses. Is it not fitting that we should at least annually, reexamine the source of our blessings?

In times not far gone, as history goes, a man accused of crime was not entitled to a jury; he could be taken hundreds of miles from his home and friends for trial; he was not entitled to be informed of the charges made against him, nor was he permitted to have counsel; and he could not have process to compel the attendance of witnesses in his behalf. Those monstrous abuses were abolished for all time for Americans by the sixth amendment.

The right of trial by jury in civil matters is the privilege which the seventh amendment gives to Americans. How important that right is. And how little do we remember whence came that right.

It is not long ago either when men could be imprisoned without the right of bail, tried unfairly and unjustly, fined excessively, and punished in cruel and unusual ways. Under the eighth amendment such things cannot—and do not—happen in the United States of America.

And finally the Bill of Rights contains the ninth and tenth amendments. Some writers have endeavored to say that the Bill of Rights is composed of only the first eight amendments. In a narrow sense, in the sense that the first eight deal with the rights of individuals, something may be said for that view. In the larger, and more accurate sense, however, the last two amendments are as important as the others and do confer and preserve rights which otherwise would not be ours.

Says the ninth amendment, "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." That is a rule of construction. It was intended to—and it does—discourage the usurpation of rights which the people reserved to themselves. And, finally, the tenth amendment provides that powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States, are reserved to the States or the people. Again, a rule of construction, so that the general Government may not usurp that which belongs to the States or the people.

The great blessing which has come to the American people is not the fact that our rights and privileges are set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is the fact that we have the courage and the tenacity to uphold those privileges. A constitution means nothing, a bill of rights means nothing, if the people do not demand and receive the rights which those documents provide.

There is no doubt that in the United States the people do demand and do receive their rights. That they do, if, considering my office, properly I may say, I think is due in great measure to the American courts. The courts of this country have been steadfast in preserving the sanctity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Many attempts have been made to thwart, to override, to evade the Constitution, but the courts have turned these efforts aside. That these attempts always arise in cases of great emergency makes the refusal of the courts to permit them a further tribute to the American judiciary. It can be summed up very fairly by a quotation from a decision of the Colorado Supreme Court handed down during the dark days of the great depression of the 1930's. The court said:

"* * * We must declare without hesitation that which our function demands. We pronounce as the most certain of law that there has never been, and can never be, an emergency confronting the State that will warrant the servants of the Constitution waiving so much as a word of its provisions. Armed men may destroy the Government. Military rule, or the rule of the mob, may replace the orderly processes that have been our fortune since sovereignty was granted us by the United States. But no species of reasoning, no ingenuity of construction, no degree of emergency can persuade us that the Constitution is without potency or dissuade us from performing our duty as its sworn officers."

So long as there are American courts and American judges, the liberties, the lives, and the happiness of the American people will be sustained, for the Bill of Rights will be safe and will be enforced.

Conservation Paying Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the critical emergency which faces the United States and all of the free world, awakens us to the need for conservation. It applies to industrial production, manpower, money, energy, and natural resources.

Even before the present emergency we were hearing stern warnings that we were using up the Nation's productive soil and that unless we practiced sound conservation measures the time was not too far distant when the Nation would be forced to turn elsewhere for part of its food supply. In our own Ninth District of Texas we have seen the initiation of sound soil-conservation practices.

A recent report from one of the districts inspired an editorial in the Rosenberg Herald, a grass-roots weekly published in Fort Bend County. Because it points out how well the soil-conservation program works, I take pleasure in inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information and enlightenment of every Member of Congress:

CONSERVATION PAYING OFF

The old adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating" is proving to be very true in the case of the Coastal Plains Soil Conservation District. Organized in the early part of 1941, the 1950 report, just released, reveals very clearly that soil-conservation work in Fort Bend County is paying off. Those responsible for the work of the district state that they feel that they are making and will continue to make steady progress toward the ultimate goal of improving the land and the productivity of the soil.

They have the proof, such as the 30-bushel-per-acre increase in corn production by Louis Band after applying phosphate and planting legumes; the 196-percent increase in cotton production in 5 years after completing conservation plans on the J. E. Junker farm; the increased beef and dairy production reported by the ones who have taken their conservation work seriously; the $300,000 increase in income to the cooperators of the district; and many other things outlined in their lengthy report.

Soil conservation and all the various practices connected with it are paying off in Fort Bend County, and we predict that in future years Fort Bend will be a more prosperous county and have a more stable economy as the result of the splendid work that has been done.

Speaker Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, great honor to a man is never so deeply felt, nor so long remembered, as when it is bestowed upon him by the people of his own State.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who now has presided over this Congress longer than any other man, won at an early age the love and respect of the people of Texas. Now the whole Nation honors him.

SAM RAYBURN cherishes his home folks in Texas.

What Texas thinks of SAM RAYBURN is contained in a magnificent document for all to see. This document is House Concurrent Resolution 22, adopted by the Texas House of Representatives on February 5, 1951, and concurred in by the Texas Senate on February 6, 1951. The document referred to voices the feeling of the great State of Texas for its distinguished son.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD a copy of that resolution of the Texas Legislature:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Whereas Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, broke an historic American record of 100 years' standing established by Henry Clay when he sat for the three thousand and fifty-seventh day as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and

Whereas he is admired and respected in the Congress by Democrats and Republicans alike for his patience, fairness, forthrightness, and ability as the presiding officer of the United States House of Representatives; and

Whereas he is one of the greatest statesmen of modern times, using wisely and effectively the powers and prerogatives of the high and honorable office he holds; and

Whereas he is not simply the holder of the Speakership tenure record, but is a warm-hearted, gracious gentleman, second in line of Presidential succession; and

Whereas Hon. SAM RAYBURN served as a member of the house of representatives of the State of Texas with honor and distinction in the thirtieth, thirty-first, and thirty-second legislatures and was elevated to the coveted speakership by his colleagues in the thirty-second legislature, 1911; and

Whereas Texans everywhere are justly proud of SAM RAYBURN and his unparalleled record of unselfish and devoted public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Texas (the senate concurring), That the legislature join with the citizens of Texas and all true Americans in congratulating SAM RAYBURN on the occasion of his three thousand and fifty-seventh day as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America and in commending his great devotion and service to the principles of Americanism; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
RUEBEN E. SENTERFITT,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 22 was adopted by the House on February 5, 1951.

[SEAL] CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 22 was adopted by the Senate on February 6, 1951.

LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

A Hard Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Alabama Courier on February 1, 1951. Mr. Steele McGrew, editor of this progressive and outstanding weekly newspaper, has written this splendid and pertinent editorial, and I wish to bring it to the attention of the Members:

A HARD DECISION

No parent wants the blood of an 18-year-old son shed on a far-flung battlefield. No person wants boys' lives snuffed out in war, whatever the age of the boy, unless that person is bestial.

The world's majority of people want peace, but peace they do not have, nor does it seem likely that peace is likely to come in the immediate future. Authorities say, therefore, that it becomes necessary to build an army of such strength that the 18-year-olds, their younger and older brothers, their parents and neighbors, may be safe from the enemy.

Lack of preparation now may lead to defeat later, should full war come to us. And, a defeated nation not only counts the terrific loss of life of those in battle, but also the infants, women, and old in the overrun land, as well as the principles for which it fought.

Also, when a country is faced with defeat, it drafts into service manpower that goes much below the 18-year-olds, as a last, desperate stand. This would be intolerable, but possible.

It is not an emotional battle we must fight with ourselves as much as one that concerns our depth of thinking for the safety of everyone. If we shudder at the fate of drafting 18-year-olds, would we not rather, through contemplating deeply the over-all conditions, have such an armed force in this country that the fate might not be possible due to our power?

If it is necessary, in order to insure our success, perhaps these boys should be drafted so that they may be well trained and able to hold their own, more safely and surely, and ready to meet an emergency.

None of us like to see them drafted, but it might be the wiser course in the final outcome.

Lincoln—Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an excerpt from the column, Taylor Made, published in the Grafton News, of Grafton, W. Va. This very popular feature is written by Mr. Charles W. T. Lockard, publisher of the Grafton News, and one of the finest weekly newspapermen in West Virginia, follows:

The current observance of the birthday of the now admittedly great Abraham Lincoln causes us to reflect and call the attention of our Republican friends on the similarities of Lincoln and President Truman. Both are men of the people; both were of humble birth; both received meager education; both failed in private business; both were or are the object of bitter ridicule; both were or are unpopular with the majority of the press of their day; both are said to be men of strong will; both are known champions of human liberty and freedom, regardless of race, color, or religion; both suffered antagonists within and without their parties; both had assassin's shots directed at them by fanatics (Lincoln was a shot victim, but Truman's would-be assassin was a poor

shot); Lincoln fought a dogged and determined battle to bring peace and freedom to all the people of this Nation and engaged in a war to accomplish this end; President Truman is now fighting a dogged and determined battle to bring peace and freedom to all the peoples of the world through the United Nations and is sending our fighting men to war to accomplish this aim; the fiscal policies of both were or are under attack; the administrations of both men are or were accused of committing great blunders. But today, Lincoln, who was hated in his day, was honored some generations later now has a great national shrine in his honor on the banks of the Potomac. Truman, fighting the same battle as Lincoln fought—but on a larger scale—is today getting the same treatment from his people as Lincoln did some 80-odd years ago. Many of us will live to see Truman honored as Lincoln now is. So think it over boys. Lincoln, a berated man in his time, is a great man in the eyes of posterity. Truman, too, is an equally great man and history will prove it. Just you wait and see.

Founding the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune and president of the Washington Times-Herald, Inc., delivered last night on the Chicago Theater of the Air over WEAM and the Mutual Broadcasting System:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 11, 1951]

FOUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

(By Col. Robert R. McCormick)

How our country was formed is certainly the most interesting and important story in the world. It is also the most important because it shows the unique conditions which made this particular United States possible.

The beginning of the movement was, of course, the departures from England—not only the original settlements of the individual colonies but the later migrations. The English settlements were predominantly made under charters of the Stuart kings. There were also Dutch and Swedish settlements, and French in Maine and South Carolina, abutting on Spanish colonies. The charters varied from the fantastic feudal ones of the Carolinas to the near republics of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

The first settlement, of course, was Virginia, which started out as an adventure in quest of gold and the subjugation of the natives. To this came a number of Englishmen ranking as gentlemen. In the absence of a nobility, they developed into a self-conscious aristocracy wearing, at the time of the Revolution, silk clothes and lace cuffs. The great political philosopher, Mason, preacher of equality, would have the sheriff summon the common people to listen to him. The self-made aristocrats of Virginia were the first to resent airs of superiority from England.

The New Englanders were tradesmen, people of the middle class. They gladly elected Bradford, the only gentleman among them, governor. Development of a merchant marine gave to them a hierarchial structure and a sense of discipline not shared by the New England farmers.

New York had English and Dutch aristocracies, composed of the recipients of large land grants; the former, grateful for their given wealth, became Tories and their descendants are still Tories.

Maryland was founded as a refuge for Catholics, and Pennsylvania as a home for Quakers and all other dissenters. A special character was imparted to western Pennsylvania and western Virginia by Scotch-Irish descending from the clan system rather than the feudal system of England. In Pennsylvania they quarreled with the Quakers over representation in the legislature. In Virginia they practiced their religion in defiance of the law of the Colony.

As we know, there were 13 colonies planted by England. A fourteenth, Nova Scotia, was planted by Scotland. It is not so generally known that they were inhabited by 14 nationalities: English, Scotch, Scotch-Irish, Irish, Welsh, Dutch, Swedish, Jews, Palatines, Swiss, French, Spanish, Russians, and Portuguese. Governor Oglethorpe brought with him to Georgia a guard of German mercenaries. They readily became assimilated.

Among all of these people, the only ones well disposed toward the mother country were some members of the Church of England. The others were all indifferent, cold, or hostile. There was considerable migration from the West Indies and between the Colonies. Puritans from New England imparted to the Church of England in Virginia a puritanism nonexistent at home.

Though there was little love of England, the different races, religions, and Colonies were slow to combine. The New England Colonies formed the New England Confederation to fight the Dutch and French, and later to fight the Indians, but it did not last.

Plans of colonial union were presented by Penn in 1698, Franklin in 1754, and Galloway in 1774 on the verge of the Revolution, but none of them was adopted, although Galloway's received only one vote less than a majority in the Continental Congress.

At different times, every Colony except Georgia was in revolt, beginning with Bacon's rebellion in Virginia in 1676. New England and New York rebelled against Governor Andros. Puritans in New Jersey revolted against the proprietors. The Scotch-Irish in Pennsylvania made an unofficial war on the Indians. There were the revolts against the Calverts in Maryland and, just before the Revolution, the Regulators of North Carolina fought a losing battle against the governor.

The Colonies were held to England in their fear of France and Spain, and England used them in her plans for further conquest. Only the northern Colonies from Massachusetts to Virginia fought the French. Only the southern Colonies fought the Spaniards, and South Carolina built a navy and fought the pirates.

In the absence of a nobility owning almost all property, the Colonies had a tendency to follow Pennsylvania in mitigating the harsh British criminal laws and laws against debtors.

After the defeat of France and Spain in 1763, neither Colonies nor mother country had the same need of each other. The King and Parliament took an increasingly overbearing attitude while the Colonies became more and more independent. Governor Dunmore, in his colonial victory over the Indians at Point Pleasant, had opened the way across the Appalachian Mountains. Settlements were made in the West and land speculation became common.

At the same time that the Parliament began to interfere more and more with colonial trade and taxes, the king proclaimed that the land west of the height of land was part of Quebec and not to be settled by the English-speaking colonials, while a revival of Church of England domination threatened to force conformity upon the Lutherans, Catholics, and the Calvinists of different degree of Calvinism who were thus driven together.

The first serious infringement upon colonial rights was the tax on molasses. This was passed before the defeat of France and was not enforced partly because of the need of conciliating the Colonies during the French war. It was followed by the stamp tax, including a tax on newspapers. This led to the first step toward union, the stamp-tax congress, participated in by nine Colonies, and prevented the appointed officials from operating.

After its repeal, the Townsend acts were passed, claiming the right and power of Parliament to tax the Colonies. The decisive act was the tax on tea. The killing of various citizens in a collision between the soldiers and a mob, called the Boston Massacre, added fuel to the flames. Later came the destruction of the British warship *Gaspee* in Rhode Island and the Boston Tea Party.

The association was created by the first Continental Congress, attended by 12 Colonies and a representative of one Georgia county, to prevent intercourse with England and to prevent the purchase of tea in the Colonies.

Nonintercourse at this time, as again before the War of 1812, was much more harmful to British than to American interests, in that it acted as a protective tariff under which American industries were started.

Washington's militia saved the British regulars after Braddock's defeat. Colonial troops prevented Montcalm from pursuing the regulars after his victory at Ticonderoga. Washington took Fort Duquesne after Major Grant was beaten by the French and Indians Jon Bradstreet made the decisive capture of Fort Frontenac, while, as we have seen before, Sir William Johnson took Fort Niagara and was decisive in the capture of Montreal.

The war against Spain was carried on entirely by Colonials, although some of the time under the leadership of Governor Oglethorpe.

In spite of these facts, upon which the British Government had acted during the crises, after the victory was won the British conceived a wholesale contempt and hatred for colonial soldiers. Even the defeated Major Grant said in Parliament: "That they were not soldiers, and never could be made so, being naturally pusillanimous and incapable of discipline; that a very slight force would be more than sufficient for their complete reduction."

The capture of Burgoyne and Cornwallis and all of the British guard regiments at Yorktown failed to change this attitude. The naval victories of 1812 and Jackson's defeat of Wellington's peninsular veterans at New Orleans are ignored. After the Civil War, Lord Wolesley said one Regular Army corps could have ended the war in a few months. Our winning of World War I and World War II has not changed it. Derogatory remarks have been heard within the last few weeks.

After Lexington and Concord, there was a wave of independence sentiment which forced the British governors to take refuge in warships or become prisoners.

The siege of Boston compelled the appointment of a commander in chief by the Second Continental Congress, which, however, was only arrived at after much hesitation. The actual conduct of war, necessitating foreign loans and foreign alliances, again made independence necessary and occasioned our first great document, the Declaration of Independence. Conduct of the war under the Continental Congress led to the next step—the Confederation—which, as I have said before, was not the weak instrument it has been called but one under which the country

might have been ruled if Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton had been in that Government. The Confederation passed the ordinance for the Northwest Territory, providing for the admission of more States into the Federation and these to be free States. Moreover, it called the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution was followed by the Bill of Rights, thus making our free and independent Republic.

Even then it took a great Civil War to free the slaves.

This is the long, hard history of our Government not paralleled by any other in the world. No other country wants to copy it. On the contrary, all countries want to draw us into a world government, modeled on their own evil institutions, and American Tories are plotting to that end in this country.

A Way Must Be Worked Out To Teach More Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Journal of Monday, February 12, 1951:

A WAY MUST BE WORKED OUT TO TEACH MORE DOCTORS

Financial necessity has forced the University of Louisville medical school to increase its tuition fees to $800 a year for Kentucky students, and $1,200 a year for students from out of State. From any aspect, this is disturbing news. Raising tuition rates may save the school from financial collapse, but it will not serve the purpose for which medical schools are established. It will not increase enrollment or help to ease Kentucky's doctor shortage. It will give the son of wealthy parents an unfair advantage over the boy of ambition and ability. Indeed, it will make it practically impossible for the son of the average Kentucky family to become a doctor.

This situation is not, of course, confined to Kentucky. The same thing is happening to medical schools all over the country. And unless medicine is to become the private province of the privileged few, something must be done soon to help the medical schools meet higher operating costs and still enlarge their enrollments.

For the second time within the past 2 years a bill has been introduced in the Senate to establish a Federal-aid program to train more doctors, dentists, and nurses. The men who framed the bill have wisely avoided any mention of health insurance or any of the other controversial measures which the medical profession has repeatedly condemned as leading to socialized medicine. Instead, the bill seeks merely to help existing medical schools remedy the national shortage of medical personnel. It would grant $10,000,000 a year to medical schools for expansion of training facilities and $41,000,000 a year for scholarships and financial aid to schools.

Like its predecessor, this measure was inspired by experiences during World War II, when it became painfully obvious that we did not have enough doctors, dentists, and nurses to protect the health both of the civilian population and an expanded military force. And chances for the bill's passage are undoubtedly improved by the difficulty the Armed Forces are having now in recruiting enough medical personnel.

This shortage is nothing new. In 1945 an official of the American Medical Association testified before a Senate subcommittee that we would need an additional 35,000 doctors by 1960 to supply civilian needs. Many medical authorities have contended this figure was too low. At any rate, we have not increased our output of doctors. On the contrary, enrollment has been cut back in many medical schools because of inflated operating costs. As a result, the Federal Security Administration has estimated that by 1960 we will have a shortage of at least 27,000 doctors, 23,000 dentists, and 163,000 nurses. If 20 percent of medical personnel is required for military service, the shortage will be commensurately worse.

It is doubtful that the limited Federal aid bill proposed can correct this deficiency. Two years ago the chairman of the American Medical Association's Council on Education testified that American medical schools needed an additional $15,000,000 annually to operate at the 1948 rate of production, and that they were desperately in need of $200,000,000 for enlargements. Since then, of course, these needs have grown with the increased costs of building and operation. But this is a situation accumulated over 50 years, and cannot be remedied overnight. The bill proposed will make a positive and vigorous start.

It will be interesting to see how the AMA reacts to the challenge. Doctors, of course, will benefit from the bill as much as will the American people. But you may recall that the AMA lobby managed to defeat a similar bill in 1949 on the excuse that, while the bill itself was innocuous it might lead to greater Government participation in the medical scene.

Since then our shortage of doctors has led the American people to wonder whether Government participation, to the extent of enlarging medical schools, is not essential. Such conservative voices as those of Senators TAFT and DONNELL have spoken for the Federal aid program. Herbert Hoover has warned that "our medical educational system is woefully inadequate for the conduct of national defense * * * and is doubly inadequate for the needs of our people generally." Deans of both public and private medical schools have endorsed the program almost unanimously, and even the AMA has recognized the need for action by voting $500,000 for a medical school fund. Its conduct concerning this latest bill will be revealing.

The Military Manpower Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this week, after more than 5 weeks of intensive study and hearings, the Senate Armed Services Committee ordered reported by unanimous vote, 13 to 0, a bill to provide the Nation with a realistic program for raising and maintaining the military manpower strength required for the national defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the leading papers of the Nation regarding the manpower hearings and bills.

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

[From the New York Times of February 11, 1951]

FOR THE NATION'S SAFETY

A Senate subcommittee has rounded out a month's hearings on the proposal to set up a program of universal military service and training. The group's findings now give substantial support to the plan as submitted by Defense Secretary Marshall. Some minor modifications have been recommended, and there may be further changes before the plan takes form in legislation, but thus far it has remained relatively intact. It calls for the induction of young men at 18 years for a period of training and service of about 2 years. After that they will pass into an available reserve. A small group, with special qualifications, will receive advanced technical training and be available for specialized services.

The Senate group has opened its doors to a wide range of opinion and judgment. The hearings have not been hasty, and there has been no evidence of predisposition or bias. Secretary Marshall and his assistant, Mrs. Rosenberg, have been questioned closely and at length on various aspects and implications of the program. There has been an obvious and highly commendable attitude of taking this very serious problem seriously. If the ultimate finding and the action based on it bring this plan into operation, we believe that the cause of the Nation's safety will have been well and thoughtfully served.

It should be borne in mind that this is not in itself an emergency program, although the circumstances that have brought it to this stage may be critical. It is not the purpose of this plan suddenly to raise a huge army to meet an instant need. That emergent character belongs rather to such operations as the Selective Service Act, whose purpose has been to deliver a required volume of manpower at a given moment. The universal service plan, in contrast, proposes to assure a steady flow of available manpower over a considerable period of time. It stems from the realization that we face a long-range as well as an immediate threat and must plan accordingly.

Two fears have been expressed in regard to this planning. The first is the feeling that the 18-year age level may be too low. The second is that a program of universal service may in some way undermine the democratic character of our state and our society. In our view, both of these fears are sufficiently groundless to be outweighed by the necessity for action.

The 18-year level is not an innovation. It is the age at which young men have been made liable for military service in each of the world wars. If our young men at that age were able to be soldiers in the time of combat they are able to become soldiers now in the time of peril. Their older brothers who were inducted at 18 have the right to expect that this group of young Americans can be called upon for service as readily as were its predecessors.

The 18-year level is a logical dividing place in our society and in our educational pattern. It marks the point at which an interruption can be made with the least likelihood of permanent dislocation. Our colleges and universities are prepared to make required adaptations to this program, and our society as a whole can likewise meet this required change in the normal course of civilian life.

We believe, moreover, that our democratic society can well meet any threat to its survival posed by a system of universal military training. There is no tendency to glorify a military caste or clique. There is no desire to perpetuate a system of training for one moment longer than it is imperative. The threat to our survival is from without rather

than from within and we must be strong to meet that threat. We may hope that the strength thus created may help to avoid the necessity for using that strength in battle. We know that we cannot hope for peace if we are weak. We may be able to keep the peace if we are sufficiently strong.

Finally, the essential idea of truly universal service is more democratic than a program of selection to raise an emergency army. Universal training and service can spread the physical burden of defense on the broadest possible base. It can do that, also, if the idea now being applied to the Armed Forces is applied, in spirit, to the whole of the body politic. The duty of defense is universal, just as the privileges that accrue from the liberties defended are universal. The plan for the armed services should be a symbol, in one field, of a state of mind and spirit that applies to all fields and to every citizen, of whatever age.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1951]

THE TIMES DEMAND IT

In both an immediate and long-term sense, the military manpower bill just approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee is so well tailored to these dangerously uncertain and explosive times that Congress as a whole should feel impelled to adopt it, or something very much like it, by an overwhelming vote.

Formally entitled "The Universal Military Training and Service Act," the bill is the end-result of more than a month of intensive and painstaking effort by the committee's preparedness subcommittee headed by Senator JOHNSON of Texas. Although its authors do not claim perfection for it, its critics will be hard put to show how any of its essentials can be cut away without leaving the security of the Nation on a woefully weak foundation.

For the bill, as explained in an admirably lucid and convincing statement by Senator JOHNSON, provides for two things that are absolutely indispensable to the safety of the United States in the kind of world we have now and the kind of world we are likely to have for years to come. The first is the manpower that is needed immediately to cope with the present crisis. And the second is the reservoir of trained strength that we must build up if we are to be adequately prepared to avert grave perils in the future.

Accordingly, to meet the immediate need for a minimum of 3,500,000 men in the Armed Forces by next June, the bill would lower the present induction age and authorize Selective Service to take 18-year-olds, but with this important proviso: That they would be called after, and only after, the manpower supply in the older groups had been exhausted. The first to go would be all the unmarried and physically fit, aged 19 through 25. Next in line would be all the 19-through-25 single youths with physical defects not serious enough to disqualify them from limited duty. Finally, before any 18-year-olds were drafted, all married individuals in the eligible bracket would be called, except fathers and veterans.

As for the long-range security objective, the bill would provide as follows: (1) Upon completing his tour of active duty (26 months, including 2 months of leave), each man trained for service would move into the Reserve for 6 years—an arrangement insuring the retention of soldierly skills and creating what Senator JOHNSON has called a predictable, dependable, constant, ever-ready force of militarily seasoned manpower serving as a base for strategic planning against future dangers. And (2) when the need for rapid mobilization ceases (in which case authority would exist to end the draft and shorten the 26-month service period), there would be established a program of universal training to guarantee the continued maintenance of adequate Reserves—a system which we should have long since put into operation.

Everything considered, the major provisions of this bill—under which most of the men affected would serve in the Army, because the Navy and Air Force are built on long-term enlistees—seem definitely to be quite as sound and as fair as they are essential. As far as the current situation is concerned, who can doubt that prompt affirmative action on just such legislation is sorely needed? After all, in Senator JOHNSON'S words, we have suffered about 50,000 casualties in Korea, we have only one ready division available for the defense of our country, and we are engaged in an inescapable struggle for survival—a struggle whose end is not in sight. And so—whether we like it or not—we must build up our military manpower, and we must do it as quickly as we can.

Of course, there is always the possibility that world tensions will suddenly ease and that the size of our Armed Forces in being will be out of proportion to our security needs. At the moment, however, no possibility could seem more remote than that, and what we must keep in mind, in any event, is that the sooner we develop military strength of the sort envisioned in the proposed bill, the better chance there will be to avert new Koreas and the catastrophe of a global war.

Clearly, this is no time for half measures. As Senator JOHNSON has said, "It is better for a prudent nation to have and not need, than to need and not have. Too often, the strength of American arms has been paper strength. Our greatest peril has been our own lack of preparation for hours of peril." Let us profit therefore from our past mistakes and do all that the present hour requires.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 14, 1951]

SOLID CORNERSTONE

The military manpower bill which, among other things, lowers the draft age to 18, is now before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In a notably clear statement on reporting the bill, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, which heard more than 100 witnesses, summarized:

"The choice is before us: We must have the men. Shall we call again upon our generation of veterans or shall we ask of the 18-year-olds the service which, in all moments of peril, our men have traditionally provided at age 18?

"Will you face the veteran father, his wife and family, and tell him he must again enter service because you are unwilling to require service of the unmarried 18-year-olds? That is the choice.

"I believe this is a good bill, an enduring bill, a wholly fair piece of legislation which can be a solid cornerstone to a half century of American strength."

The weight of evidence and testimony, in this newspaper's opinion, strongly supports these conclusions. The bill for universal military service and training, beginning at 18, should be passed.

[From the Chicago News of January 10, 1951]

FUTURE LEADERS

Congress will be called to referee a contest for the 18-year-old boys, and decide whether they shall go into colleges, into the armed services, into industry, or into some form of military training exempted from immediate combat.

It is a knotty problem and there will be no unanimity on the solution. But one thing we could learn from Russia is that an abundant supply of new engineers and technicians of all kinds should be a primary consideration. The Soviets are training 100,000 a year, several times the output of our own technical schools.

In time of war, the claim of the Armed Forces to the 18-year-olds is soundly based. At that age they have the resilience, the adaptability, the quick reflexes that—with proper training—make the ideal soldier.

A proposal for a year of compulsory military training for 18-year-olds is already before Congress. The bill calls for 4 months of active training and 8 months of academic courses. Thereafter, if need arose, the trainees would be expected to volunteer, or be drafted.

Any program of universal training runs up against the problem of finding instructors and housing. With the Armed Forces in the process of expanding to a total of 3,500,000 men and women, neither camps nor instructors enough to do the job properly will be available.

Representative VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has criticized the present practice of deferring college students. He contends that this amounts to an exemption for the sole reason that a youth can afford to continue his schooling.

A proposal which answers many of these objections is for a revival of something like the Students Army Training Corps of World War I. If the million youths turning 18 each year were given college aptitude tests, the top fifth, say, could be given deferments to enter college—with scholarships when necessary—for technical or professional training.

Those who failed to make the grade would take their places with the noncollege group, subject to military service or to such deferment as essential industry might dictate. Graduates would be subject either to military call, or to civilian service where needed.

None of these proposals is free from objections, and some injustice is doubtless inherent in all. Nevertheless, consideration of our long-range manpower problems makes it essential to come to grips with the problem. Any system will probably give some breaks to the more talented. But that is the way of the world, and those who get the advantages may be expected to return the favor by their services to society in the future.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of January 12, 1951]

EVERYBODY'S OBLIGATION

Everyone who is aware of America's tradition as a nonmilitary Nation will contemplate with regret the proposal for compulsory military service for every physically fit American boy of 18.

Nevertheless no one can doubt what Defense Secretary Marshall told the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee when he outlined the proposal: "The tensions that unsettle the world may persist through the lifetime of many of us."

That argues strongly for a permanent program. Along with it must go arrangements for everyone to bear his share of the job of making the Nation strong. There are military desk jobs that the physically unfit can do.

Looking back at the lessons taught by World War I, President Harding said in his inaugural address that:

"There is something inherently wrong, something out of accord with the ideals of representative democracy when one portion of our citizenship turns its activity to private gain amid defensive war, while another is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for national preservation."

Before the Senate subcommittee, Assistant Defense Secretary Anna Rosenberg asserted that the proposal "embodies the concept of universal participation and equal obligation."

Congress, when it writes a universal military service law, must steadfastly uphold that concept.

[From the Des Moines Register of January 12, 1951]

GENERAL MARSHALL'S DRAFT PLAN

There is no doubt that if we must maintain a high level of military preparedness in the years immediately ahead the fairest distribution of this burden upon our population can be achieved by the automatic draft of young men at a specified age.

General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, thinks the proper age is 18, and his Assistant Secretary for Manpower is therefore introducing in Congress a universal training and service program toward this end. Under it the draftees would be liable, at present, for 2¼ years of service. Those physically unfit for military duty would not necessarily be exempted, but assigned to service jobs compatible with their physical condition.

And because the Defense Department would be taking over young men at the age when normally many would be entering college, the plan is to send up to 50,000 of those on active duty into universities and colleges for special training. Eligible men already in higher education would be deferred in some cases or embraced in an expanded ROTC program, and the Federal Government would undertake to provide more scholarships for talented young men than in the past.

It is perfectly obvious that this kind of program would spread access to college education over a much wider cross-section of the American population in the long run. It would make the availability of higher education hinge more nearly on merit and less on economic circumstances. And this is a thing that some of our leading educators, including President Conant, of Harvard, have been driving at for a long time.

There are going to be a lot of us who dislike the prospect of universal military training, even for this extended emergency period. But if we are agreed that we must have the trained manpower, then the real problem is to get it in the way which will be most just to the whole population.

Under the Marshall proposal, the President would be authorized to reduce the service period to 6 months as soon as circumstances permit. Naturally, we will all hope, for every reason, that such a state of the world develops—the sooner the better.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of January 15, 1951]

TO SURVIVE IN FREEDOM WE'LL NEED UMS

If the United States is to survive in freedom its young men will have to devote some of the best years of their young manhood to its defense. This will be true whether the Communists limit their attacks to a series of local wars or plunge the whole world into a war to the death.

The American people cannot hope to preserve their free institutions in the critical years ahead unless at least several million men at all times are ready to go into action at a moment's notice and at least several million more constantly will be fit for active service on very short notice.

Those responsible for national defense feel they must have at least 3,462,000 men in active service by June 30. Marked deterioration in our relations with the Soviet power would require considerably larger Armed Forces. That size military establishment cannot be wholly manned by professionals. It cannot be staffed by volunteers. The only sound and equitable system of raising sufficient men for the Armed Forces in such a situation is compulsory universal military service.

The Tribune did not favor the sort of universal military training which was proposed before the crisis took such a grave turn. The training proposed under such schemes would not have produced soldiers fit for combat. The system would have been wasteful of the time of the youth being thus trained. It would have wasted the time of the men required to give such half-baked training. It would have wasted taxpayers' money without giving the Nation a dependable supply of well-trained troops available for service wherever needed.

The plan for universal military service drafted by Defense Secretary Marshall and Assistant Defense Secretary Rosenberg, which is now being considered by the Senate Armed Services Committee, is quite another matter. It is presented in quite a different world climate.

Without undertaking to say at this time whether the plan is correct in every particular we do not hesitate to endorse its broad concepts and recommend its speedy adoption in substantially its present form.

We are open to conviction as to whether our young men should become liable for military service at 18, as the committee proposes, or 18½, as many Members of Congress seem to favor; whether the period of active service should be 27 months, as the plan now proposes, or could safely be fixed at 24 months.

We are open to conviction as to whether the plan sufficiently provides for a continuing supply of men trained to serve the Nation as physicians, scientists, engineers, technicians, and in other skills which can be acquired only through prolonged training.

Such phases are subject to revision in the light of expert advice and experience.

What the citizen needs most to bear in mind is that the plan is a well-considered effort to provide the Nation with the soldiers it needs in a manner fairest to all and least likely to dislocate the lives of individuals or society in general.

It is hard for most American youths to leave home to serve in the Armed Forces at any age. It is hard for their parents, girl friends, schools, or employers to see them go away at any time. But it is imperative henceforth that millions of them go and go regularly. The age being considered is the one at which the going should cause least hardship and the Armed Forces can be provided with the sort of men they most need.

The plan is designed to avoid an aristocracy of either education or wealth. It envisages sound defense now and in the future at a price the Nation can afford to pay by providing a beginning rate of pay of $80 a month. Most of the nations of the world have had such systems (with much lower compensation) for many generations. Neutral countries such as Switzerland and Sweden require such service of their youth. The world's foremost democracy can ask no less of its youth in time of peril.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 12, 1951]

NO CHEAP SOLUTION

This country at last seems on the point of adopting a sound and sensible draft policy. The proposal set forth in Washington by Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall for a draft of 450,000 18-year-olds not only offers an effective means of meeting our present military requirements, it also provides a solid basis for a continuing system of service which outside pressures may force this country to retain for many years to come.

The prospect of sending all our young men into the armed services is essentially so repugnant to American hopes and ideals that we have deferred confronting it until the last possible moment. Homes which 10 years ago sent their children into uniform—for the last time, they hoped—are once again called upon to undergo pain and sacrifice. Secretary Marshall himself summarized the situation succinctly when he said: "I do not present it as a cheap solution, but there is no cheap or easy solution to our present security problems." Once we accept this hard fact, there is nothing left to do but see to it that the draft system is adequate, equitable, and honest.

The new Marshall plan meets all these requirements. It largely follows the recommendations set forth by the Committee on the Present Danger, headed by President James B. Conant, of Harvard University. Service is to be universal. Provision is made for deferment of those research workers and scientists currently working on vital projects. Interference with education is held to the minimum commensurate with establishment of an army well fortified in man power and brain power. This means that students now in college will be able to complete their academic year; that up to 50,000 men in service can be sent to college for special training; that 75,000 men a year can be deferred for scientific studies after first undergoing a 4-month basic military training course. Even these arrangements will make things difficult for many educational institutions, particularly the smaller colleges, but this simply is one more adjustment that will have to be added to a steadily growing list which all Americans are being called upon to make.

Speedy enactment of the Marshall proposals into law will constitute a key victory in our struggle for survival. Like all victories, it demands a heavy price, but there is no alternative to paying it.

Addresses at Reception of the Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1951, the Democratic National Committee gave a reception at the Shoreham Hotel to the Democratic Members of Congress.

The guests of honor were President Harry S. Truman, Vice President Alben W. Barkley, and our own genial and highly respected Speaker, Sam Rayburn. Our national chairman, William M. Boyle, Jr., presided.

I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD their remarks on that occasion. I commend them to the attention of all:

Chairman BOYLE. First on behalf of the Democratic National Committee and for myself personally I wish to express our deepest appreciation for your attendance here tonight. We are here tonight as Democrats to honor and to show by our presence here that we revere and back with our minds and our full strength, and our loyalty, three great Americans, three of the greatest Americans of our times, three of the greatest Americans of all times—the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House.

This great gathering tonight of the leadership of the Democratic Party, of the Members of the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, members of the Cabinet, heads of the Government departments, shows to the world and to the United States a determined effort on the part of the Democratic Party to band together, to bring to America the security that she needs now in this time of stress. Today we are Americans before we belong to any political party. For the Government to function we must have a strong, vigorous party behind the Administration in power to make it effective.

You by your presence here tonight indicate that backing that is so necessary for the

President to be able to function in the executive department properly and also to back up the leadership that you have under Vice President BARKLEY, ERNEST MCFARLAND, and LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate, Speaker RAYBURN, JOHN MCCORMACK, PERCY PRIEST in the House of Representatives.

In 1913 two great Americans came to Washington to represent two great States. One of those men went on to become the Vice President of the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, Vice President of the United States BARKLEY:

Vice President BARKLEY. Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and fellow statemen, Bill Boyle was supposed to present the Speaker at this time and give me an opportunity to answer him. Now he's twisted it around so that SAM can take my measure. And I want to say to you, SAM, in advance that I'm going to be awfully easy on you.

Now I'm going to say just a word more or less seriously. I deeply appreciate the compliment paid to SAM RAYBURN and me by the chairman when he said that in 1913 two great statesmen arrived in Washington—one of them from Texas and the other one from Kentucky. That was our opinion of ourselves when we arrived, and neither of us has had any occasion to change our viewpoint since.

Well, it's been a great pleasure for me to parallel SAM RAYBURN here for the last 38 years. I dare say that no two men in the history of Congress ever had such parallel careers and SAM and I have had. We came in at the same time, were sworn in on the same day, were assigned to the same committe—Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—and it being a major committee we could only have that one place. I outranked him because my name began with B and his with R, and then when I got off of the committee and went to the Senate, that made him ranking member. I got out of his way. He quit tramping on my heels—I thought for good. Well, he became chairman when the Democrats came into control of the committee. He became the majority leader of the House and I became majority leader of the Senate, and we worked together—when we were Members of the House together in the Wilson administration—so that SAM and I arrived at the same time, went on the same committee, cooperated closely during our membership in the House, which was 14 years in my case and has been 38 years in his. During my period in the Senate we were majority leaders of the two respective bodies at the same time under a Democratic administration, fighting for the same things. And now he is the Speaker of the House of Representatives and on the 30th of January will have been Speaker longer than any other man in the history of the country. And I am the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States. I dare say that no two men who ever came to Congress in the history of the country have parallel records of that sort. I'm very happy and very proud of my association with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not only as Speaker but as just plain old SAM RAYBURN as he was when he came here from Texas in 1913. I'm not only proud of our association legislatively but proud of our friendship, our intimacy during all those years. We have pretty much thought alike and worked alike and acted alike in our approach to and our efforts to solve the tremendous problems that have faced this country since the 4th of March 1913.

Now, when he and I came here, I dare say that neither of us could have foreseen that this country would have faced and would be facing today the great problems that confront our people and confront the world. We used to debate questions of domestic policy 50 years ago. I remember as a schoolboy in a debating society debating the question over and over again, "Resolved that the signs of the times point to the downfall of the Republic." Politicians used to come to the courthouse in the town where I lived back in that time and discuss the downfall of this Republic because of the maldistribution of wealth and because of the growing riches of some people and the growing poverty of others and so on. Well, since those days we have progressed in every sense of the word, in wealth and in population, and in power, in production, in the enjoyment of the things that make life worth while.

And notwithstanding the assertions sometimes made by the critics that we are losing or have lost our liberties, or some of them, I'd say that in view of the complexity of our lives, the interdependence of all of our people upon all of the rest—the interdependence of every community on every other community and every State on every other State and every group on every other group, we are enjoying more liberty today in the real sense of the world than we enjoyed 50 years ago.

When we talked 50 years ago in our schools and colleges about signs of the times indicating the downfall of the Republic, which was the subject for debate, we were talking about internal conditions. We were not talking about any danger that threatened us from without. There wasn't any. But now, we are subject to a danger but it is not a domestic danger. It's a danger that threatens us from without. It's one that in those days we didn't imagine could ever exist and it's one that SAM RAYBURN and I did not by any stretch of the imagination foresee, when 38 years ago we entered the House of Representatives as young, green, awkward Members from our States.

But we are threatened, my friends, by a greater danger than any that was ever concocted by any debating society on our domestic issues, or any accumulation of wealth in our country. We're threatened now by a danger that is more sinister, more powerful, and more determined—a danger that in order that we may avert it will require the sacifice, the determination, the toil, and the unity of our people.

As the President said in his message the other day, he didn't ask for unanimity—you can't ask 150,000,000 people to think the same thing about everything—but they may think different things about different questions that arise in this country. But there is only one thing they can think in regard to the danger that faces this country now, from without, and it faces it on both sides of the ocean.

And that is the determination of our people and of all the free peoples of the world, under our leadership, that these liberties which we have enjoyed and our forefathers won for us and handed down to us, and which we desire to hand down to our children and their children for a thousand years, these liberties cannot afford to be allowed to go down in this great world-wide contest. I have been in the countries where these liberties have been destroyed. I have within 2 years been in all the iron-curtain countries, except Yugoslavia and Russia. I saw what had happened and what is now happening in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Bulgaria, in Hungary, in Rumania.

I saw all these liberties—freedom of religion, freedom to educate your children, freedom to own your home, freedom to choose your own occupation, freedom to speak, freedom to have a free press, freedom to worship, freedom to do anything—destroyed—not by the will of the people but by their inability to prevent a strong power from without from overwhelming their country and destroying their liberties. That's the fight that the world is up against.

And it is therefore necessary that we give to the world, not merely a semblance, but the reality of unity here among the people of the United States. The unity of purpose among all the free nations and all the peoples who want to be free and are not free but who would relish the opportunity in my judgment to help make the fight for freedom.

We have been given the leadership of the world, not by any connivance of ours, not by any desire to exercise power, but in the very nature of things, we have been given the scepter of leadership. And that carries with it responsibility. And that carries with it not only a group responsibility among Members of the Congress of the United States but it carries with it individual responsibilities among the Members of the Congress of the United States and all public officers and all people who believe these things ought to be preserved.

Therefore, as we meet in this Eighty-second Congress, facing these dangers, and these grim times, recognizing that if we are not united behind our leader whom the people chose in a free election in 1948, if by any circumstances we are divided among ourselves, we will infinitely damage our own cause, and our own prestige in the world.

We will have difficulties—we'll have sad days probably before the thing is over, in the long run. But we must stand together and we must stand behind our authorized spokesman, the President of the United States, and those whom he has chosen or will choose to help him work out these terrific problems that face our country and face the world. I didn't intend to say all that when I got up here but I just had it in me and I wanted to do it. You see as Vice President, I don't get much chance any more to make a speech. I'm happy to be here, to be able to see so many Members of the House and the Senate and to be in this trio so beautifully complimented a while ago by Bill Boyle.

Chairman BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Vice President. I think the Speaker used some strong minded mental telepathy on me so he would speak last, after the Vice President tonight. So, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor to present to you the Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN.

Speaker RAYBURN. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Boyle, my fellow countrymen, and Democrats. I don't know whether Bill Boyle intended to be exceedingly kind to me this evening or not, but he was. Two years ago I was called on first, and I started out with the year 1913 and talked about BARKLEY slightly, or slightingly, and he told how I was tramping on his heels and he finally had to get out of the way. And I had a lot of fun out of him, I thought, and then he came on, and did he do a job on me. It was gruesomely funny—funny to him—but I want to say this in all seriousness, our association for 38 years has been fine. He has been as kind to me as anyone could be and frankly, there has never been any jealousy between Barkley and me. I chose to tread one path and he chose to tread another. I think he's pretty well satisfied at this turn in the road that he's reached. And by his getting out of my way several years ago I achieved the ambition of my life, and that was to be the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

And on the 30th of this month I will have achieved another distinction, and that is to have served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives than any other man in the history of this Republic. That's enough.

I am one man in public life who's satisfied, who has achieved every ambition of his youth. And so I am glad. But I want to say this about the Vice President of the United States. In my opinion, he is the greatest public speaker in America today. And he is one of the great good men that this country has produced.

And, Mr. President, it's mighty fine for you to come here and associate with us this evening. We know that you're glad to come, because you're one man that station and position does not change. No man that station or position changes is big enough for the position that he changes to. And so I'm glad to be here, Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Boyle, and with you, and meet and greet my associates in the House of Representatives, and I think, Mr. President, that most of the Senators that I greet

here this evening graduated from our school over in the House of Representatives.

I'm glad to be an American tonight, as I've been glad to be every day of my life. I'm glad to be a Democrat tonight, as I've been glad to be one every day of my life. You know, we've been accused of a lot of things, and as the Vice President so well said, there have been moaners and groaners from Jefferson to now; that at every step in progress some people sat back and said, "You're destroying the liberties of the people."

I don't know of a single so-called liberty in all of my lifetime that I have given up that hasn't benefited me.

I own some cotton acres down in Texas. I know if they let me plant all the acres that I want to plant in cotton and all of my neighbors in that State and in the other States that produce cotton, we'd have so much cotton that we'd return to Hoover days and 4½-cent cotton. I'd rather plant a third as much cotton and get three times as much for that third of cotton than I used to get for 100 percent of cotton. I'm better off.

And they want to tell us that we've spent the country into bankruptcy. When we came into power in 1933 the national income of the United States was the paltry sum of $39,000,000,000. Fourteen million people were unemployed. If the breadwinner in the family had a wife and one child—that made 42,000,000 Americans that had no buying power. And farmers—33,000,000 of us—who were selling the price of our product so far below the cost of production that our buying power had been reduced to the very vanishing point, 75,000,000 Americans that had no buying power or practically none.

We started out on a program of putting people to work, giving them a buying power, and before the war our income had been raised from thirty-nine billions a year to nearly ninety billions. Then the war came on and our income went up and up and up. And the moaners and the groaners said there'd never been a war that we didn't have a depression after. Our national income would go down and down and down. It would have unless there had been some statesmanship employed, unless there had been some vision and some planning.

But 1946 wasn't a war year. And our national income mounted to $176,000,000,000. Nineteen forty-seven wasn't a war year and our national income went to more than $200,000,000,000. Nineteen forty-eight was not a war year, but it was in the aftermath of the war and our income went to above $220,000,000,000. In 1950 I understand our income will run somewhere from $250,000,000,000 to $280,000,000,000. That's how this socialistic, this communistic, Democratic Party has spent the United States into bankruptcy.

Instead of 14,000,000 unemployed, more than 62,500,000 people are employed at good wages, at decent hours, and under decent working conditions. This is the way we have destroyed the liberties of the people. This is the way we've spent the country into bankruptcy. Our liberties have been destroyed? Do you know how free every man, woman, and child in America is? In this land of democracy everybody can say what they want to say, write what they want to write, speak what they want to speak as long as in the doing of that we do not take away from the other fellow the same rights, the same prerogatives, and the same privileges to exercise the same rights. That's how free we are. That's how our democracy has been destroyed. That's how we've been spent into bankruptcy.

We live in the most dangerous time—as I said to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the other day—that in my opinion any man or woman or child living in the United States of America today—has ever known. The time has come when we must speak and act together in the face of these dangers if we are to retain this matchless and marvelous liberty, and these great freedoms that we enjoy today.

Under the President's leadership America has been challenged. We must under his leadership lead this world, if it's to be a fit place for any people to live in decency.

And so I care not and I've said this to audiences from one end of the country to the other, I care not whether people love or hate Harry Truman. He is our President in these terrible times and he will be until January 20, 1953, at least.

He is our leader or we have none. He is the leader of the democracies of the world or the democracies of the world have no leader. What are we going to do about it? Are we with carping criticism going to try to tear down that leadership; Democrats, Republicans or what not, let me warn you, again we must speak and we must act together or the civilization that our fathers knew, that we know, may vanish from the face of the earth.

So let's join under the leadership that we have, that is grand. I know Harry Truman as not many of you do. For 10 of the 11 years he was in the Senate of the United States he and I were warm personal friends. When he moved into the Vice Presidency, as head of the Senate, while I was Speaker and the titular head of the other body, we were friends. I know his great heart; I know that every impulse of his being is to serve his day and generation well.

And if we, in our positions, charged with responsibility, will stand with him, then we will one day look forward to the sunshine of a better day, of peace in the world that every good man and every good woman in the United States and throughout the world is praying for tonight. Then we may do our job in our day and generation as our fathers did 163 years ago when they brought forth in Philadelphia from May until September that great charter known as the Constitution of the United States—representative democracy where the people spoke, where they chose their President each 4 years; their representatives in the Senate each 6 years, and their Representatives in the House each 2 years, a responsive Government.

Nobody's been smart enough yet to change that fundamental. Our fundamentals are the same as they were in 1787 and thank God I believe we have men and women in America today to preserve those fundamentals, and pass them on to the generations that are to come after us.

Mr. President, I greet you as our leader. I'm proud to follow you. Your announcement in the House of Representatives the other day was one of the greatest that it has ever been my privilege to listen to. You chartered our course and I am pleased to follow.

Chairman BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And now, ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

President TRUMAN. Thank you very much. I would like to know what chance a countryman from Missouri has after "that" and "that" (pointing to Vice President BARKLEY and Speaker SAM RAYBURN).

I heard the Vice President say that he and SAM considered themselves statesmen when they came into the Congress in 1913. I have an old definition for a statesman, a very old one: A statesman is a dead politician.

I have no desire yet to be in that class. I don't want to see my friend the Vice President or my friend the Speaker in that class, either. But they are living statesmen. They have done a job for their country that is unequaled in its history. As President of the United States, I am one of the luckiest of the Presidents to have a Vice President and a Speaker such as Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. RAYBURN. There have been Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents, and there have been Speakers and Speakers, but I don't think there has ever been a team as close togther and as anxious to do the country the best job possible as is now presiding over the Senate and presiding over the House of Representatives.

I have just received an engraving of a picture presented to Henry Clay in 1821, and they were presenting that picture to Henry Clay on account of the fact that he had succeeded in having a resolution passed in the House of Representatives, authorizing the then President of the United States to recognize the provinces of South America, when in his judgment they had become independent republics. Just a short time before that, Mr. Clay had been responsible for the Missouri Compromise which made Missouri a State along with Maine on a compromise basis—Maine got in first, Missouri almost never did. But in 1850 Mr. Clay agreed to another compromise, which in the middle fifties he changed into the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and brought on the War Between the States.

In going over these various things, and the people who have occupied these positions, you will remember that Andrew Jackson had about as much trouble as any President that was ever in office. He had a Vice President from South Carolina, and his name was Calhoun. And when Jackson was on his deathbed, someone asked him what were the two things he had left undone that he wished he had done while he was President; and he said one was that he should have hanged John C. Calhoun and shot Henry Clay. Well now, there is no such parallel here.

But you know, the Presidents of the United States who have apparently had the most trouble, and who have been most viciously attacked in the public prints, are those whom we class as the great Presidents. There never was any man as bitterly attacked as George Washington. You should go down to the Library of Congress some time and get out the papers from New York and New Orleans, and other places around all over the country, and read the things that were said about George Washington. They were terrific and terrible. The same thing was said about Jefferson. Of course, nobody has been as bitterly attacked as old Jackson was, and he didn't care—and neither do I.

And, one of the most misrepresented Presidents in the public prints was Abraham Lincoln. We went to Gettysburg one time, and made about a four-paragraph speech. And there was a gentleman there who spoke for 2 hours, and I'll bet there is hardly a man here who can name who that gentleman was who was the main speaker at the celebration.

On that day, when Lincoln made that famous speech, old Horace Greeley, and Dana and Medill in Chicago, said Lincoln had disgraced the country by the terrible speech he made on that day. There isn't a man here who has not at one time or another memorized that Gettysburg Address. I'll bet you can't say a word of what the other gentleman said, and I'll bet you can't name him—Edward Everett.

Well, another man who was viciously mistreated while he was President was Grover Cleveland. You should read some of the things they said about Grover while he was President of the United States.

And they hounded Wilson to his grave.

But those men made the impression on the country that has made the country great. I don't think I can make any such impression, but I want to say to you that I have the responsibility which belongs to the President of the United States. I am exercising that responsibility to the best of my ability, and I expect to do the very best I can for the United States of America, and for the world. That's all I can do.

In order to accomplish the purpose which I think Almighty God intended this country to carry out, we must, as the Government of the United States—and you are just as much a part of it as I am, and you are elected for that purpose—we must work together, not only for the welfare of the United States itself, but for the welfare of the whole world.

Since Mr. RAYBURN and Mr. BARKLEY have deemed it wise to go back into history, I am going back a little further than they did and draw analogies to the situation we face now.

All of you remember what happened to Xerxes when he attempted to pulverize the Greek republics. You all remember what a terrible time the Roman republic had when Hannibal was winning victories for 21 years in Italy. I don't know whether you remember it, but if it had not been for Charles Martel there would have been no Christian Europe. He prevented the downfall of Christian Europe at Tours. Then along about 500 years after that, there was a certain Mongol—and we are troubled with Mongols right now—who got as far west as Vienna; but he was stopped at Vienna and never got any further. The Christian world survived.

We are faced now with those people who believe in the individual, and who believe in a moral code based on the Sermon on the Mount—which is the best exposition of what a man ought to be that has ever been enunciated; and on the other side we are faced with those people who do not believe in a moral code, who only make commitments to break them. They are—I can't say they are immoral, because that has a definite meaning in our language—but they are unmoral. They believe in the material things and not the spiritual.

Now this country, and the free countries of Europe and Asia, must band together to make an effort to put morals above materials. That's all I am striving for.

I want peace in the world. But I don't want peace at any price. I want peace with freedom and justice.

I don't think there is a citizen in this country of ours who does not believe that, if he has been raised right—had the right sort of mother, and most of us have.

I hope—I sincerely hope—that this great organization, the Congress of the United States, will remember that honor and justice are greater for the welfare of your children and mine—and I hope my grandchildren—than fat and ease.

Resistance to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on January 28 the New York Times published a letter to its editor, written by Josiah E. DuBois, Jr., Esq., under the caption "To resist communism."

Mr. DuBois, a prominent member of the New Jersey bar, was raised in my own community, so I know something of his talents and his ability.

Because he treats in this letter with a vital subject upon which he is well qualified to speak, as the letter itself will indicate, I hope that the Members of the Senate will make appropriate use of his able counsel and advice. To this end I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

TO RESIST COMMUNISM—POLICY MEETING ASPIRATIONS AND NEEDS OF PEOPLES URGED

(The writer of the following letter, formerly general counsel to the War Refugee Board and chief prosecutor of the I. G. Farben trials, was counsel to Ambassador Edwin W. Pauley, whom he accompanied on reparations missions to Germany and the Far East)

CAMDEN, N. J., *January 25, 1951.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During the last 5 years we have lost one-half of Europe and a large part of Asia. Why?

It is the judgment of this writer that the reason lies in large measure in our own failures and not in the affirmative successes of the other side.

The failures of our statesmen in the diplomatic skirmishes of the last year are merely symbolic of more fundamental failures in our foreign policy during the last 5 years. The pattern of our actions in both Asia and Europe during this period demonstrates a complete unawareness on the part of our leaders of what has been actually occurring in these parts of the world during the last generation; and a concomitant failure to understand the wishes, hopes, and dreams of the over 1,000,000,000 people living in those parts of the world.

STRANGLED ECONOMIES

Before the end of World War II the peoples of China, Korea, and the Philippines had suffered for years under the Japanese New Order for Asia. The Japanese industrial cartels commonly known as the Zaibatsu had obtained a stranglehold over the economies of China and Korea and the Japanese had for a long time drained the life-blood of the economies of these countries.

All of our talk and our declarations at the end of World War II were to the effect that we would proceed to wipe out the domination of Asia by the Japanese and would rehabilitate and strengthen China, Korea, and other Asiatic countries.

In December 1945, I worked in Japan on a program which was submitted to President Truman whereby the great excessive industrial capacity built up in Japan for war purposes and for conquest would be distributed as quickly as possible to other countries in the Far East, particularly China, Korea, and the Philippines. This program, combined with other programs, was designed to rebuild the economic strength of China, Korea, and the other far eastern countries as quickly as possible. It was the purpose of these programs to wipe out the domination of these countries by Japan, particularly the economic domination of China and Korea by the Japanese industrialists.

The program submitted to President Truman by Ambassador Edwin Pauley specifically warned that unless China was strengthened economically and strengthened quickly China might well fall to the Communists. The President and our State Department issued declarations of policy in line with these recommended programs, specifically emphasizing this country's desire to strengthen China, Korea and other areas of Asia.

DEPARTURE FROM PROGRAM

Instead of following this program designed to rebuild China, Korea and the Far East generally as quickly as possible, our Government concentrated on keeping and rebuilding Japan as the industrial heart of the Far East. We permitted the Japanese cartelists to continue to maintain a stranglehold on certain key industries in the Far East vital to the well-being of China and South Korea. In China we formally backed Chiang Kai-shek. In South Korea, Syngman Rhee and a few large land owners and cotton millers, former collaborators with the Japanese and their New Order, became the leaders of the Korean people with our blessing. In Indochina we gave aid to the French-backed Bao Dai. Should we be surprised that we have lost large parts of Asia?

In Europe a similar pattern of talk and declarations of policy was the order of the day in 1945. As a member of the American delegation to the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, I saw this Government formally endorse a program designed to insure that Germany would no longer be the dominant power in Europe. The program agreed upon at Potsdam was designed to insure the announced purpose of this Government to give priority to the rebuilding of Germany's victims over the rebuilding of Germany itself. In the words of our leaders in 1945, "Last time we rebuilt Germany. This time any rebuilding that is done will be applied to Germany's victims."

AGREEMENT ON GERMANY

Actually there was no real meeting of minds at Potsdam, and the agreement which was eventually signed was worth no more than the paper it was written on. No sooner was the ink dry on the Potsdam agreement than both sides, the east and the west, began playing the old game of power politics and began bidding for the favor of Germany, paying only such attention to the actual provisions of the Potsdam agreement as seemed in their own best interests at the time. This policy of bidding for the favor of Germany reached its initial climax in 1946.

Our policy in Germany has justifiably increased the fear of the average European to the point where he feels insecure. This feeling of insecurity has played into the hands of the Russians and their stooges since April 1945. I was in Czechoslovakia twice during 1947—before the Russians took over. The Czech people to whom I talked were gravely disturbed about our policy in Germany. They emphasized the feeling of insecurity which it gave to the Czechs and how this fact played into the hands of the Communists. I have been in France several times since the war and can vouch for the fact that, if I am any judge at all, the average Frenchman has the same feeling.

I do not condone in any way the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia. It was nothing short of criminal aggression. However, I do believe that the will of the Czech people to resist such criminal aggression was greatly lessened, and the ability of the Russians to conquer Czechoslovakia from the inside was greatly strengthened, by the fact that our policy in Germany had caused such a feeling of insecurity among the Czech people.

Even in the case of Poland it is not at all clear to me that the Poles embrace Russia with open arms. In fact, the reverse is probably true. But our policy in Germany, as I see it, leaves them no choice.

The gigantic struggle being waged today for the hearts and souls of men will be won by deeds, not by words. The Voice of America must sound rather weak to the peoples of Asia and Europe who are forced by the actions of America to face the possibility of reliving the dark area before the end of World War II or choosing communism. The will of these peoples to resist communism is seriously weakened by our actions in facing them with such a black choice as the only alternative. We cannot afford to turn the clock back to the period preceding the end of World War II. The world cannot survive its repetition.

JOSIAH E. DUBOIS, Jr.

Growing of Guayule in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement I recently made to the press regarding the growing of guayule in the United States.

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

The first step has been taken in what might well make possible the growing of natural rubber within the United States.

The Department of Agriculture has agreed to undertake a project for growing guayule, a desert shrub successfully grown in the Southwest, and from which natural rubber may be obtained.

Additionally, the program contemplates expanding the production of guayule seed in California, where the shrub flowers and seeds rapidly.

More than 90 percent of the world's supply of natural rubber is now grown in the Far East. This dangerous position of our source of supply has been a paramount concern of the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee since it was formed. If the eastern nations crumble and communism chokes off our supply of natural rubber, the industrial might of this Nation would have its muscles slashed.

In its published reports the preparedness subcommittee has called attention to the perilous shortages. The committee's first report called for reactivation of the synthetic rubber program, and since that time plants have been reactivated which will add about 400 thousand long tons to our present supply of synthetic rubber. The committee in that initial report also urged an immediate study of the possibilites of growing rubber in the United States.

The necessary durability of the rubber needed for many products can be assured only by an adequate blending of the natural and synthetic products. We need all the natural rubber we can get.

This program which the Department of Agriculture has undertaken bears promise of getting that supply. Not tomorrow, since only 1,600 acres in the Winter Garden area of Texas will be devoted to the first seedlings. But today's problems would not be with us had we been sufficiently farsighted yesterday. We are looking to the future—we are looking at the long range picture when it is not beyond reason that all of the eastern sources of supply could be cut off.

The 1,600 acres for the nursery seedling program will at first require irrigation to provide seedlings, transplanting on dry land areas which will be selected west and south of San Antonio, Tex. Transplanting could begin this fall and if the world situation requires it, funds may be requested to put about 50,000 acres of dry land into cultivation.

The Department of Agriculture proposes to contract with private individuals, using existing farm equipment to the greatest extent possible. Small acreages will be used in order to experiment with diversified growing conditions and to give regional farmers experience in guayule cultivation. Areas selected for seedling nurseries are in the Texas counties of Zavala, Maverick, Dimmit, and Pecos and possibly in Reeves County.

The Texas seedling program will be under the direction of the Production and Marketing Administration, with the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture supplying needed services.

Control Order Disrupts Marketing of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, when the Director of Price Stabilization drafted general ceiling price regulations, it had the effect of closing every cotton exchange in the Nation. Cotton mills, cotton merchants, and others, who have at all times used the exchange to hedge with their sales or their purchases, are powerless to remove or place a hedge, a necessity in their regular business operations. The exchanges have long been performing such hedging operations.

All cotton interests are united in their efforts to modify this order, which freezes the price of cotton at all levels except that of the producer. The producer is interested in having the order rescinded, since it has the effect of depressing the price of cotton at a time when production costs are mounting. Labor costs are expected to be higher during 1951. Farm machinery prices have increased appreciably in the past few months, as well as the price of fertilizers and insecticides. It all adds up to a much shorter production of vitally needed cotton for the year 1951.

The Government has asked the farmer to increase his acreage from approximately twenty million acres to twenty-eight or thirty million acres in order to produce a 16,000,000-bale crop. Unless a modification of this ruling is made before the planting season, a much smaller acreage than is proposed will be planted this year.

I do not recall any action or lack of action on the part of the Federal Government that has created such widespread unrest among the people of the midsouth area as this general price control order has. Hundreds of telegrams have poured into the offices of the Senators and Representatives, urging the reopening of the cotton exchanges and a modification of the order.

It would be much simpler and more plausible to place ceilings on cotton goods rather than to attempt to control the price of raw cotton, as there are hundreds of various grades and staples of cotton which would make it very difficult to successfully operate a program of this kind. During World War II it was a simple matter to place ceilings on manufactured cotton goods. The experience gained in applying ceilings on the finished product could readily be utilized at this time. Only a few employees would be required to do this job.

It would be disastrous if regulations of the Office of Price Stabilization should result in the direct cause of the Nation's losing the increased production of cotton which is so badly needed this year. To get the large production this year is the only answer to the whole problem. Abundant production of any commodity is anti-inflationary and sets to work the time-honored law of supply and demand.

The cotton farmer wants to know at an early date what action will be taken in connection with this dilemma, as he is now engaged in preparations for the crop year 1951. It is necessary that he have absolute assurances from his Government that he will not only have adequate farm labor for cultivating and harvesting his crop, but also the necessary machinery, fertilizer, insecticide, and most of all a good price.

Justice Department: Prosecutor and Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Barrons on February 12 entitled "Whither Justice?" It points out the predicament of the Justice Department in trying to be on all sides of all questions. It is nothing short of a fantastic position. The article follows:

WHITHER JUSTICE?—THE DEPARTMENT'S PREDICAMENT POINTS AN ISSUE

About 2 years ago the Department of Justice filed a civil antitrust suit seeking the dissolution of the Big Four meat packers—Armour, Swift, Cudahy, and Wilson. The suit charged these firms with suppressing competition in the sale of meat and meat products by controlling the supply, by adopting uniform cost formulas, and by quoting identical prices.

Last week the same Department of Justice took upon itself the legal enforcement of price control. One of the first orders of the Office of Price Stabilization Justice will have to enforce concerns meat. The order establishes quotas limiting meat processors to slaughtering the same percentage of the total kill as they did in 1950. The idea is to combat black markets in meat by "keeping profiteering newcomers out of the business."

Put more bluntly the Department of Justice will now try to enforce on the meat industry the very practices which it claimed the big four were illegally using back in 1948. Instead of trying to expand competition in this field by letting new slaughterers into the business, the Department will try to limit competition by keeping them out and maintaining the status quo.

THE DOG CATCHER

This is a strange about-face for the Justice Department to have to make. If it were confined to the case of meat, one might let it go without comment. But the case of meat is only indicative of a larger reversal. The fact is that the Justice Department, for 60 years the guardian of the spirit of the Sherman Act, will now play dog-catcher for Messrs. DiSalle and Johnston. And in the process one cannot doubt that a great American tradition as well as a great institution find themselves in jeopardy.

The situation is the more ominous, as well as the more ironic, because it appears that Justice sought out its new role. In the last war the enforcement of price control was handled by the OPA—a good precedent since it at least emphasized that price control would be temporary. The Defense Act of 1950 is somewhat ambiguous on the question of enforcement. It states in one section that all litigation arising out of the Act shall be handled by the Attorney General. But another section states that agencies created under the Act cannot delegate authority to other agencies and departments.

Had Attorney General McGrath been anxious to keep his Department out of the whole price control imbroglio, he might well have urged the administration to go back to Congress for clarification on what the Defense Act meant, or at least let the matter be settled in the courts. But Mr. McGrath, like Mr. DiSalle himself, is a man in a hurry. He was apparently delighted when the President ruled Justice should take on the job of enforcement, and if now he burns his fingers in trying to hold down the vibrating price lid, he will have only himself to thank.

PITY ANTITRUST

Meanwhile, our sympathy goes out in particular to Mr. McGrath's lieutenant, Mr. H. Graham Morrison, head of the department's antitrust division, who only a few weeks ago in a speech before the New York Bar Association, evidenced considerable enthusiasm for his job. It was Mr. Morrison's contention then that, while the war effort might present his division with some special problems, it would still have plenty to do. Antitrust, according to Mr. Morrison, would press to see that small business got its due share of war orders. It would work for the dispersion of industry not only in the name of defense, but to foster competition. Above all, it would not, except in rare cases, give up any of its pending suits.

Said the enthusiastic Mr. Morrison: "Many of the cases now pending and many of those which will be filed will substantially aid our war effort. For example, cases involving price-fixing, limitation of production, withholding from the market, unauthorized market, and customer allocation."

We wonder how Mr. Morrison feels about those brave words today. For, as the case of meat indicates, the Department of Justice as agency for the price stabilizers must now be on the side of both price-fixing and market allocation. The Department may talk about warring on monopoly and restraint of trade, but this war has little meaning where prices are frozen. The essence of free enterprise is the free market, where prices are allowed to fluctuate up or down and where capital, materials and manpower, respond to such fluctuation. Against this, Mr. DiSalle and Mr. Johnston are committed for the duration. And if the Justice Department takes on not only the enforcement of price ceilings, but also some future controlled materials plan, its dilemma will be the more pronounced.

That dilemma, of course, goes beyond the Department of Justice. While the Department was foolhardy in plunging into the price-control mess, the mess itself derives from trying to wrap up the economy in a straitjacket of direct controls. If this sacrifice of enterprise were really necessary in the cause of rearming America, this publication would be the first to argue it should be made. Given the world situation, as Mr. Hoover himself pointed out last week, the United States must rearm, and we shall not save the enterprise system by abandoning that attempt and retreating into a new form of isolationism.

TIME FOR CHANGE

But does the present rearmament effort really need the battery of direct controls which Washington is imposing? On that point we remain unconvinced. Surely, as long as the administration fails to cut down on nonessential spending, and continues recklessly to inflate credit, the case for direct controls remains highly dubious and the case for a decent monetary and fiscal policy gains ground. If the fix in which the Justice Department now finds itself dramatizes the need for a reversal of Washington's domestic policies, it may still yield a certain amount of good. For it may hasten the day when the United States really attempts to maintain its flexible and dynamic economy while at the same time playing out its role as a world power.

True Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a thoughtful and encouraging letter recently circulated by the HQZ Co. in San Jose, Calif.

If more industries would adopt the attitude followed by this particular organization, this country would be a better place in which to live.

I commend this communication to the attention of my colleagues:

WHY THERE WILL BE NO PRICE INCREASE IN HQZ PRODUCTS

HQZ Co., *San Jose, Calif.*

Our costs are climbing too—just like yours and everyone else's. We could justify a retail price increase very easily before any accountant—and without a price increase we're going to have to watch every penny.

However, there will be no change in HQZ products, HQZ packages, or HQZ prices. First, we think any further move toward inflation is un-American. Second, we know the consumer is extremely sensitive to and resentful of climbing prices. Third, even if the consumer were to accept the price increase, the tax collector would relieve us of a good share of it anyway, so we have decided to hold the line, counting on hard work and added volume to provide the necessary revenues. We think that is the American way, and if this sounds like flag waving, perhaps you will agree, there is considerable room for idealism in America today.

This policy of voluntary price restraint gives HQZ products a very favorable position in your competitive consumer picture. Self-merchandising stores report a strong consumer response, with accelerated purchases of HQZ hair oil and HQZ castile shampoo. It looks like a buying trend is on the way which will make continuation of our price policy possible through added volume. When a merchant gets a chance to ride a healthy trend, if he is wise, he does all he can to encourage it and take full advantage of its benefits. In the present case, this is particularly gratifying because it is in a good cause for our country in general, and for your customers and neighbors in particular.

Won't you do what you legitimately can in the way of display and suggestive selling to promote HQZ sales so we can continue to hold the present price line?

Cordially yours,

HQZ DISTRIBUTORS, INC.,
R. W. CONWELL, *President.*

Forum of Public Opinion at Sunray, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Thursday evening, January 18, 202 citizens of the small town of Sunray, Tex., met together for the purpose of obtaining a cross-section of public opinion on national and international problems.

I have commended the Sunray citizens for their patriotism and public spiritedness in conducting this meeting, and in order that the conclusions reached may be available to all Members of Congress, I request permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. W. E. Simpson, chairman of the meeting, and report as to the consensus of local opinion there on a number of vital issues.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF SUNRAY,
Sunray, Tex., January 23, 1951.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: We sincerely hope that you find time to read the enclosure personally. Too, we should so much appreciate an acknowledgment of receipt, if possible.

Thursday evening, January 18, 1951, a group of 202 voting citizens of this community met for the purpose of obtaining a cross section of public opinion upon some of the current problems facing our country today, and forwarding the findings to some of our more influential representatives in Washington. Upon the enclosures we list the group reactions which were taken without any attempt at swaying anyone's opinion.

Trusting that this communication will be received in the same spirit in which it is offered, viz; honest patriotism and love for America and anxiety for the welfare of our great country.

Very truly yours,

W. E. SIMPSON,
Chairman.

Tabulations by: Messrs. John Worst, Horace Tompkins, and Paul Hamby.

GROUP OPINIONS POLLED AT SUNRAY, TEX., MASS MEETING HELD THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1951, FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC OFFICIALS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Question. Shall we withdraw from Korea?

Answer. No; unanimously.

Question. Should full-scale-war support be furnished there?

Answer. Use only as much of our resources as is necessary.

Question. Despite Atlantic Pact Treaty, should the United States of America furnish the major portion of defense aid to indifferent or lukewarm European nations?

Answer. No; help only those disposed to help themselves.

Question. As appears presently, do you favor the United States of America being made subservient to and its military policies being dictated by the UNO?

Answer. Positively no. Kick the Communist nations out and get down to business.

Question. Should President Truman or any other individual have the authority to commit troops and supplies to any foreign country without the sanction of the American Congress?

Answer. Absolutely not. We prefer congressional action upon all phases of national defense.

Question. Would changing men in key positions, such as Cabinet members, Supreme Court Justices, military and economic advisors, etc., weaken or strengthen our defense effort?

Answer. Definitely strengthen it. How could it be weakened?

Question. Do you favor full mobilization of all needed industry as well as manpower at this time?

Answer. Mobilize anything and everything needed to protect the United States of America.

Question. With full mobilization in effect, would some system of controls upon commodity prices, wages, and finances be necessary?

Answer. Majority of 170 believed that controls would be necessary while the minority believed controls should be effected only when needs arise.

Question. Should power to control and regulate our defense efforts be retained to Congress or delegated to individuals or small groups?

Answer. Too much power by individuals is extremely dangerous. Let Congress control all phases of American defense.

Question. Presently which branch or branches of our Armed Forces should be expanded most rapidly?

Answer. The armed services are a team, but apparently greatest need appears to be naval and Air Corps expansion.

Question. Do you believe wages and prices should be frozen during a full-scale war?

Answer. Unqualified yes.

Question. In case of all-out war, do you favor the Government letting cost-plus contracts, with their accompanying waste, or limiting war-contract profits to a maximum rate of not to exceed 10 percent?

Answer. No nation can long survive the waste of cost-plus deals.

Question. What should be done with admitted or proved Communists in the United States?

Answer. Either executed or removed from any contact with Americans.

Question. Do you think that our laws should be changed, if present laws do not cover the cases, so that known Communists could be refused job privileges, right to peaceful assembly, freedom to spread their doctrines, or appeal bonds upon conviction of subversive activities and other free rights?

Answer. Yes; treat them exactly as we would any other traitors.

Question. Should we use the atomic bomb in Korea, now?

Answer. No; save it for Russia or any nation who attacks America.

Question. Should our Air Force be allowed to attack military targets in Communist China?

Answer. Definitely, if Communist planes continue attacking our forces in Korea.

Question. Do you consider our watch-wait-prepare defense program sufficient to cope with our present crisis, or should we go into a highly accelerated program of preparedness?

Answer. Not adequate; get ready and fast.

Question. Measures passed to increase taxes to meet the emergency should or should not be repealed after the emergency ceases to exist.

Answer. End immediately upon ending of the emergency.

Question. Do you think that saboteurs should be tried and punished as traitors, even to assessing the death penalty in case sabotage causes someone's death?

Answer. Unqualified yes.

Question. Despite various reports, do you believe Russia has an atomic bomb equivalent to or possibly superior to ours?

Answer. No; they might possibly have an inferior one, and could eventually develop an effective one.

Question. Do you favor drafting 18-year-olds for training and after 6 months' or 9 months' training put them into combat?

Answer. For training, yes. For combat service, no.

Two Schools of Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, there are presently two schools of thought in the United States on the very vital and important subject relating to our over-all foreign policy. Ex-President Hoover and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT seem to speak for that group which is opposed to an all-out program of supplying foreign countries with unlimited troops which necessarily would require extensive drafting of American boys, and which armies are to be equipped and sustained at the expense of the American taxpayer. Both gentlemen subscribe to a policy of providing the United States with a substantial ground force; of materially adding to the strength of our Navy; and that we have at our disposal an air armada second to none in the world.

In this respect, their views are diametrically opposed to the foreign policy now being exploited by the Truman administration; conceding that the President's policy advocates strengthening our own military forces, nevertheless it advocates aggressive warfare in China and Korea, and that of sending large troop segments to Europe and Asia as a deterrent to Soviet aggression and attack. In the furtherance of this policy, the Truman administration has the support of such officials as Governor Dewey and General Eisenhower. Both of these gentlemen have expressed definite disapproval of the Hoover-Taft policy. Therefore, an all-out program of aid to foreign nations calls for drafting American boys from 18 years up, to be molded into a large armed force in order to provide Europe with an army of occupation ready and fully equipped to instantly meet Soviet aggression and attacks by Russia on her home territory if, and when, that should come to pass.

The Hoover-Taft policy is definitely confined to making America an impregnable fortress, and opposed to frittering away our American substance in manpower and material by participating and meddling in the many quarrels that now prevail in European and Asiatic sectors.

The latter group, for which Dewey and Eisenhower seem to speak, is espousing a program that is in full accord with the present policy promulgated by Secretary of State Acheson, and obviously by and with the consent of the President of the United States. These men are the mouthpieces for the internationalists, and represent the global aggressive policy.

In the not-too-distant future the people of the United States will have an opportunity to decide which policy is ultimately to prevail. The editorial published in the Chicago Herald-American on February 11, 1950, entitled "An American Policy," follows:

AN AMERICAN POLICY

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Once again Mr. Herbert Hoover has indicated the dangers confronting the Republic in our undertakings abroad, and has charted a sane course for survival and security.

The title of the former President's latest radio address expressed a fundamental fact, "We should revise our foreign policy."

From this basic premise, Mr. Hoover analyzed the misjudgments that placed us in an unsupportable position, the ruinous error of pursuing further a mistaken direction, and the line of action that is now necessary to avert military defeat and economic catastrophe.

The primary blunder, Mr. Hoover noted, was the New Deal's recognition of Soviet Russia—a boon to bolshevism which four preceding administrations had wisely withheld.

Out of this fatuous relationship came our wartime alliance with Stalin, involving enormous bounties in money and munitions, and our secret surrenders of principle at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam—a purblind set of procedures which "won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world."

Consequently, occidental civilization is now threatened by the specter of world conquest and world communism.

And we, as the only remaining strong non-Communist power, are seeking to repel the menace by measures that are insufficient and extremely hazardous.

We are already fighting a United Nations war in Korea, in which victory would be useless to us and which may engulf us in an Asian war.

The administration is preparing—by unconstitutional methods—to send American land troops across the Atlantic to defend reluctant nations in Europe from the hordes of the Orient.

This is a foolhardy venture for which we have not the population, hence the manpower.

To attempt to sustain such an effort would probably cost us millions of casualties and exhaust our material and financial resources.

The Hoover program, to call it such, would rectify that which is wrong and conserve, as well as mobilize, the invincible forces at our disposal.

First, we should abandon the pretense of friendly relations with Russia while the Soviets wage proxy war upon us.

Second, we should make the Western Hemisphere our base, immune from invasion—with Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines as outposts in the Pacific, and with the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean available to us in the East.

As Mr. Hoover said: "This hemisphere can be made self-contained in critical raw materials."

Third, if we are to arm the North Atlantic alliance, it should include Spain and the bastion of the Pyrenees, as well as Greece and Turkey.

Fourth, our main reliance should be upon naval power to keep the sea lanes open, and air power for pulverizing attack and continental protection.

Great expenditures would be required; yet not so great as to be beyond our means.

And assurance can be made doubly sure by eliminating socialistic squandering from the Federal budget.

In Mr. Hoover's words, our revised policies must "avoid economic disaster which can destroy freedom in America."

Rogers Renews Move for Record Vote on Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress I introduced House Resolution 450 which would require a yea-and-nay vote on all appropriation bills passed by the House of Representatives. I received favorable editorial comments, as well as radio comments, from all parts of the Nation endorsing this resolution and the principle that it sought to establish, but the resolution was never reported out by the Rules Committee for consideraiton by the House.

I, therefore, have introduced this same resolution and it is now known as House Resolution 119. I am again receiving enthusiastic endorsements from newspapers and radio commentators.

My colleague, Hon. CHESTER B. MCMULLEN, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on February 13, an editorial from the St. Petersburg Times carrying its endorsement to this resolution. I include herewith a splendid article written by John Pennekamp, who is associate editor of the Miami Herald and writes a column entitled "Behind the Front Page," which is read widely throughout the State of Florida, as well as other parts of the Nation. John Pennekamp is not only well known for his fine articles and editorials but for his civic leadership, and for the contribution he has made in the establishment of the Everglades National Park. The above-mentioned follows:

BEHIND THE FRONT PAGE—ROGERS RENEWS MOVE FOR RECORD VOTE ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

(By John Pennekamp)

Congress will spend something like $70,000,000,000 during this session. Would you like to know how each Senator and Representative votes on each appropriation?

Chances are you won't, unless a bill which DWIGHT L. ROGERS, Fort Lauderdale, United States Representative from the Sixth Florida District, fares better than it has in the past.

ROGERS wants to compel a recorded vote in the House on every measure that spends money.

He has made a compilation of the spending by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress—the current session is the first of the Eighty-second Congress—which shows:

It spent a total of $51,714,916,058, and there was a recorded vote in both Houses on only $16,420,620,879 of the total.

Thus two-thirds of the money was appropriated without the citizen being able to determine how his Senator or Representative voted.

Of the $51,000,000,000, approximately $30,000,000,000 was spent without a recorded vote in either House. Of the remainder, approximately $6,000,000,000 was spent with a recorded vote in only one House.

Here is a list of the appropriations which were made with no record vote:

Funds to UN for Palestine refugees, $16,000,000; independent offices, $7,600,000,000; Labor-Federal Security, $2,300,000; Agriculture, $715,000,000; Treasury-Postoffice, $3,000,000,000; State-Justice-Commerce, $667,000,000; Independent offices, $7,600,000,000; Interior, $584,000,000; supplemental, $75,000,000; and military, $13,000,000,000.

The House also shied away from a recorded vote on $5,600,000,000 for foreign aid, while the Senate left no record of how its Members voted on $100,000,000 for advanced planning for public works and $664,000,000 for Army civil functions.

That public sentiment has been overwhelmingly for the Rogers proposal has long since been established. In a survey which he made in Florida, ROGERS learned that it was favored at a ratio of 2,727 to 39.

Nationally the suggestion won general editorial approval, and was widely acclaimed by commentators.

But he could not get it out of the Rules Committee.

Whether it will have better going in this session will depend on what degree of attention is paid to public opinion. In periods of national crisis, it frequently is regarded as safe to ignore public opinion because the pressure of the times make for forgetfulness at election.

Congress has acted to eliminate one of its evils of its financing operations. Instead of an omnibus appropriations bill, it has gone back to separate appropriations.

This eliminates the dependency which some appropriations frequently relied upon from others in the same bill, and also enables the Congressmen to separate various items and vote for them individually.

That move, ROGERS thinks, also has improved the chances for his bill.

"I think," he says, "that it is important that this resolution be adopted so that the taxpayers can know how their representatives vote to spend their money. With Congress due to appropriate or spend $70,000,000,000 of the taxpayer's hard-earned cash, and putting on the bite for far heavier taxes, certainly John Q. is entitled to know how his Representative, or Senator, is spending John Q.'s money."

The Will To Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks, an editorial that appears in the current issue of the United States News and World Report which is a reprint of an editorial that appeared on December 6, 1940. As usual, Mr. David Lawrence rings the bell. The time has come for us to give serious consideration to the thoughts he has expressed for we all know that if another war comes it may be the end of civilization as we know it.

The above-mentioned follows:

THE WILL TO PEACE

(By David Lawrence)

(The excerpts which follow appeared a little more than 10 years ago—in our issue of December 6, 1940. The first year of World War II had passed, and the American people were discussing the possibility of being drawn directly into the conflict. The thoughts expressed then seem somehow applicable to our present-day situation and hence are reproduced this week.)

The urge is to meet force with force. Our own Nation waits patiently with a feeling of resignation—when shall our turn come? Every day seems to bring us nearer to the edge of the precipice. Entanglement appears assured despite our best effort to keep out of the war.

Whether our lot be peace or war, nations, like individuals, must discover for themselves again a basic relationship to the spiritual force that can move heaven and earth. It is this power of the Almighty which men from time immemorial have been slow to recognize except in times of adversity.

Such an era of desperation is here. The world leans heavily on thin reeds of tradition and wonders what it is that keeps the plague and the holocaust unabated as all around us reason and logic, unselfishness and justice, are pulverized by the bombs that blast the bodies, not solely of combatants, but of innocent men, women, and children.

When shall we turn the tide of this brutishness? How shall we penetrate the armor of the stolid dictatorships which hold millions within their frightful discipline?

For this the Pope urges prayer. We must pray, his holiness says, until the Lord shall hear our supplication. We must find within ourselves, moreover, that new approach to Him which will someday bring understanding to a bewildered world.

But, you will ask, where amidst these abstractions do we find concrete guidance?

There is always the risk that one's own exhortation will be clothed with self-righteousness. We as a Nation have done nothing wrong, we think. We have offended nobody else in the world, we say. Surely, we are not guilty of any international transgression, we argue.

But the penetrating examination which is so essential to any appraisal of self compels the admission that America and her citizenry have sinned by their prolonged indifference to the problems of a world which now entangle us despite our selfish desire to avoid their burdens.

When all around us men and women, young and old, begin to see that prayer is futile unless those who pray are ready to make each day the sacrifices that entail service to others, then perhaps the present generation of which we are a part will qualify for the blessings of peace which now are denied us.

The world has become too much rooted in the theme of mere possession, of acquisition, of quest for power, of the vanity of place, of compensation only through the coin of materialism. The compensations of the spirit and of genuine brotherhood do not yet gratify and this may be one reason why prayers die on our lips, silenced in fear and misgiving, because we have not ventured to do the work on earth that God would have us do.

The ego that guides us in our day-to-day bickerings slowly saps the strength of a nation, for the whole cannot be stronger than the sum of its parts. Creature comfort begets an idolatry that makes us indifferent to the woes of suffering humanity in other lands. We want our lives, our property, our fortunes, and our sacred honor—and we are willing to let the rest of the world shift for itself. Can it be that a higher force now challenges this principle of national policy,

this selfish tenet of individual behavior, and even as we pray asks us to prove that we really would pay the price that peace demands?

Peace is a hostile concept today because we are afraid of what it may mean to us. We are afraid of the pride that must bury as we admit our shortcomings. We are afraid of the property loss we must undergo as we concede that world trade and a world equilibrium require financial and material contributions as generous in the days of peace as they were extravagant in times of war.

But peace is inevitable. Our trust in the ultimate consummation of a peace with justice is not misplaced. Its realization is merely postponed till the human instinct for brotherhood emerges again. It can come only as nations, one by one, find in their revitalized individuals an understanding of the obligations of prayer.

For when we learn to pray, not for our comforts and our material wants but for the lives of others even in far distant lands, and when we, too, begin to find each day in our own lives the way to serve unselfishly the people all around us, then perhaps will the power of prayer well up to heaven, bringing us a peace whose rewards we have truly earned and whose blessings we have really deserved.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from the Lithuanian American Information Center:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N. Y., February 3, 1951.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.,
United States Representative
From Michigan, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LESINSKI: February 16, will mark the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Lithuanian Americans, as well as Lithuanians everywhere this side of the iron curtain, will observe the day with fitting ceremonies while Lithuanians in the homeland, completely shut off behind the iron curtain, will silently and secretly join in the observing an independence which has been temporarily put aside.

In the brief span between the two World Wars, Lithuania established her right to take her place in the family of free nations.

The cause of freedom was precious to her. Despite economic hardships, Lithuania showed remarkable vitality, great ability in self-government and economic development.

Today, as a nation, Lithuania is being exterminated. She is a victim of a consistently perpetrated genocide. The Soviet occupation has cost over 500,000 lives, victims of torture, planned starvation, political executions, and exile to death camps.

Lithuania, together with other nations behind the iron curtain is waging a great struggle against world Communist expansion. Their fight for their freedom is not only for their own liberation, but it is a fight for the freedom of the world.

Lithuania's underground is still waging a heroic fight against a mighty, vastly superior, ruthless force.

Lithuanian Americans have a stake in the survival of this ancient race. Almost every Lithuanian American family still has relatives in the old country, with whom all contact has been broken during the Soviet occupation.

The Lithuanian American Information Center, as spokesman for the Lithuanian American Council, which represents nearly 1,000,000 Lithuanian Americans, would like to call this anniversary to the attention of their good American friends who have helped in the past to appeal to the conscience of the world.

Please accept, sir, our expression of deep esteem.

Sincerely yours,
THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER.

The Barriers to Impeachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial that follows, and which was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune on February 13, 1951, is in line with the expressions contained in many letters that come to my desk practically every day. It must be evident to all of us that the people of America are disturbed about our foreign policy. They are disturbed and concerned with the large casualty list in Korea. They are sick and tired of hearing congressional debate and procrastination over who has the power to send American troops to participate in secondary and police wars. We need a clarification of this very much muddled question.

Once a law is passed by Congress which clearly forbids the method presently resorted to by President Truman—that is to say, a law that specifically provides that no American troops can be commandeered by the President to participate in hostilities akin to those now taking place in the far eastern sector—then the American people will have a more definite policy upon which to proceed in the event there is a violation or defiance of such a congressional mandate.

I can conceive of no better way to determine whether the President of the United States has laid himself open to impeachment than that of his continuation to stand in open defiance of a congressional act, a constitutional provision, or all treaties made in pursuance thereof. The editorial to follow lays special emphasis on the fact that a bill of impeachment should not be confused with a trial for a crime:

ARTICLES FOR A BILL OF IMPEACHMENT

Even many who concede President Truman's unfitness for his office question whether he can be removed by impeachment. Some argue that votes for impeachment cannot be obtained. This is a question of practicability, not principle, and it may be solved as the disastrous effects of the Truman policies are made apparent. Others, however, assert that Mr. Truman, whatever his failings, has done nothing for which he could be impeached.

This is a false defense, arising from the confusion of impeachment with a trial for crime. Crime may be the basis of impeachment, as in the cases of bribed judges, but impeachment, under the plain language of the Constitution, is not a process for punishment of crime. It is a legislative procedure for removing unfit officials, involving no other penalty than removal and future disqualification of the office holder.

The grounds for impeachment are thus as broad as human failings. One judge, early in the Republic, was impeached simply because he was crazy, and there was no other method of removing him from the bench. When the time comes for the impeachment of Truman, the articles of the bill will fall into two classes, each backed by overwhelming evidence. One is Truman's violations of the Constitution, which he is sworn to uphold and defend; the other is his repeated sponsorship and protection of grafters and influence peddlers in his official family, including the White House circle.

More than 7,000 young Americans have been killed already in Truman's unconstitutional war in Korea. The post-ratification of his act by the United Nations cannot save him, because he failed to observe the law that requires congressional assent for furnishing troops to UN. In his assertion that he will send troops to Europe without the permission of Congress the President has served notice of intention to violate the Constitution again.

Truman's institution of Pendergast spoils politics in the White House has brought the Presidency to its lowest position in history. His military aid, Major General Vaughan, accepted bribes, one of which was passed on to Mrs. Truman. Vaughan's friend, Maragon, now in prison, peddled influence from the White House with Vaughan's assistance.

The recent report of Senators FULBRIGHT, DOUGLAS, and CAPEHART on venality within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation again reached into the White House. An old family friend of the Trumans, after a meteoric rise in the bureaucracy, was shown to have steered bad loans through the RFC and then left public office to be paid off by the recipients. Another White House employee was found to have used his official position for the promotion of other political deals with RFC funds. Truman, instead of cleaning house, launched an angry attack on the Senators who had pointed out the crooks he sponsors.

Truman is crooked as well as incompetent. That is sufficient ground for the impeachment of any official.

Letter to Hon. Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to ex-President Hoover by a constituent of mine, Mr. Harry Meola:

MEOLA & MEOLA,
Middletown, N. Y., February 13, 1951.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
New York City.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: Your 10 points are to the physical well-being of the Republic what the 10 Commandments of Moses are to the soul.

So long as you and other loyal citizens do not compromise with the internationalist who would waste our heritage and abolish the United States for a world state, the day will soon pass when he may call a good American, isolationist, and then go to dinner.

There is no compromise with an Alger Hiss or an internationalist who would give his country the kiss of death—at Yalta or in Congress. Rather Benedict Arnold had not failed in his attempt to keep us in the folds of the Union Jack. Rather the Union had broken like humpty-dumpty at Gettysburg. Rather death at the end of a foreign bayonet within our own wall of iron than sacrifice one more American boy to the Red Moloch in Europe.

Sincerely,

HARRY A. MEOLA.

What Is To Become of the Family-Type Farm in the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, as the farm population in the Central West moved to cities and villages in the days of the Dust Bowl and effort was made by Congress to equip the people with means by which they might again establish homes on the land. Land loans, production loans were put in operation, and the rebuilding of farm homes seemed to be getting well under way.

But before we were quite out of the depression following World War I the Second World War began. We went at production again with full force. Boys were drafted from the farms and in such great numbers that production of crops seemed doomed. But another factor appeared for the first time. Tractor power on the farm had made marvelous strides in perfection. A gas tractor could do the work of 12 horses and 3 men—and every other farm device to save manpower came forward almost overnight. Production went ahead, but in the wake of this unheard-of production the farm population began to go down again. Some small-farm owners were unable to purchase this high-powered machinery, and if they did, they did not have land enough to farm an economical unit for the full utilization of tractor power. The large farms could operate all right and at the same time take on several small farms to give their tractor power full operation. Production went up again, and the smaller farms were abandoned and many of the buildings moved to the towns and villages. One time in North Dakota the highways were lined with buildings being moved to the larger centers of the country. Farm homes disappeared and small villages seemed like ghost towns compared to their former status. County-seat cities increased in population; business increased at these points, while the small-business places in the county either carried on a day-by-day trade or went out of business entirely.

Now we are threatened with another war, if we are not indeed already in it.

Restrictions have again been put on strategic materials. Farm machinery will not last forever and much of it needs replacement now. Two farmers apply for machines—one a small family-type farm with, say, 320 acres, and the other farmer operates 10,000 acres. Each needs a new tractor. Which one will get a tractor? The argument that those in authority use is that, after all, production is what is needed in wartime—and lots of it. The man farming 10,000 acres can produce more than a small farmer, therefore he receives a preference in obtaining machinery. Again, let us take the drafting of farm boys. One father has a son who operates his farm and without which this small farm cannot operate. He asks to have his son deferred. The 10,000-acre farmer has two sons who alone operate this very large farm unit. He asks to have his sons deferred. The Selective Service Administration is concerned with production—and lots of it. They argue that the large farm will produce so much more than a small farm that the result is as follows: The small farmer's son is drafted and the two sons of the large operator are deferred.

There seems to be no conception on the part of the managers of this Government that a farm home is necessary. They are not interested, in the least, in preserving the farm home. What they are concerned with is production, and production they will have if they put out of business every family-type farm in the United States.

These small farms will have to quit as the fathers, in many cases, are too "stove up" physically to operate their farms. In answer to this, the Army says, "Well, we will send you farm laborers to take the place of your boy." They do, and what does the farmer get? In the last war, Negroes from Alabama were sent out to run tractors; store clerks and soda-fountain jerks came out to run the combines. And how they ran them. There were not enough repairs between Ohio and Minneapolis to replace the parts smashed by these tractor experts sent out by the all-knowing Army. The tractor business is not learned overnight, and the very reason the Army is so red hot to get farm boys is because they know machinery, and practically every one of them is a mechanic. The Army must have these men and hand us a bunch of nondescripts, who know nothing about mechanics or anything else. They are so inferior that the Army will not take them for combat training.

Unless we can arrive at a place in our civilization where we can have peace for at least a few years, it is obvious that the old family-type farm, which has been the bulwark of our progress and development, will disappear and we can turn back to Goldsmith's Deserted Village and repeat with him:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

Need for Students To Influence Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Students for Democratic Action of New York State, a fine, anti-Communist group of liberal-minded young men and women, publishes a Newsletter whose March edition contains a very constructive outline of the principles and programs of this organization. It is an idealistic and at the same time a sound and practical set of principles. I am encouraged to see the young people of America thinking in these terms; it will be well for our country if more of them do so.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article written by Mr. Richard A. Givens in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ARTICLE FOR MARCH 1951 ISSUE OF NEW YORK STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION NEWSLETTER

(By Dick A. Givens, Students for Democratic Action national board member)

The dangerous international emergency makes it more vital than ever for students to participate in public affairs. The purpose of Students for Democratic Action (SDA) is to give students an opportunity to influence public affairs and to learn at first hand how politics works. SDA's stand in the current crisis, as decided and agreed on by SDA members, may be summarized as follows:

1. We favor full political freedom for all people everywhere, and hence—

(a) We strongly oppose all forms of totalitarianism, whether Communist or Fascist, and

(b) We favor full civil liberties and academic freedom for all, including those with whom we disagree.

2. We believe equal opportunity for all is not only desirable in itself, but also will help strengthen democracy against any form of totalitarianism. Therefore—

(a) We oppose all discrimination, including segregation, based on race, creed, color, or origin, and

(b) We favor public action wherever needed to assure equality of opportunity in social and economic life.

3. We recognize that in the atomic age, all nations are interdependent. As a result, we believe that in the present international emergency—

(a) No nation can stand alone, and we can survive only by full cooperation with other free peoples,

(b) Aggression anywhere must be resisted as strongly as conditions will permit, but

(c) Primary emphasis must be placed on defense of areas most vital to the survival of the free world—especially Western Europe.

4. We believe that by working together, liberal (and hence non-Communist) students can and must do something about such issues as foreign policy discrimination and extension of civil liberties. Hence SDA activities include—

(a) Support of liberal candidates in election campaigns,

(b) Work on campus to promote extensions of academic freedom and nondiscrimination (for example, at Columbia, SDA secured student body adoption of a plan to end bias clauses in the rules of student organizations, including fraternities),

(c) Educational meetings (on such issues as Franco Spain, atomic energy policy; and academic freedom), and

(d) Political work between elections (through publicity and direct representations to government).

SDA is proud of its achievements in promoting academic freedom and nondiscrimination, in educational projects, in election campaigns, and in political work between elections. But the continuing crisis calls for even greater efforts.

Democracy will be strong or weak depending on the vigor or apathy of its citizens. The democratic way of life cannot be strengthened by leaving things to the other fellow. And the necessary drafting of many students to help stop aggression means those remaining must be even more effective than before. Surely every enlightened citizen owes it to himself and his future as well as to his country to participate in the political life of his country.

For a New Middle East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Christian Century for January 24, 1951, entitled "United States Should Reexamine Near Eastern Policy":

UNITED STATES SHOULD REEXAMINE NEAR EASTERN POLICY

The role of the Arab nations in the current world crisis serves to confirm our repeated warning that American policy toward the Near Eastern countries has been poorly conceived. As leaders in the bloc of Arab-Asian nations who are striving to break the impasse in Korea, the Arab countries assume a new importance. Unhappily, our relations with them over the past 5 years are hardly calculated to impress them with either the honesty of our avowals or the objectivity of our interest in Korea—or any other area of the world. In view of the present precarious balance of power in the UN, it is distinctly our loss that these countries no longer possess their traditional faith in and friendship for the United States. If the present conflict should balloon into a world war, the disastrous effect of our short-sighted Near Eastern policy would become even more apparent. These are not days when nations can disregard human rights and put their trust in Singapores and Gibraltars. The friendship and active support of whole areas and peoples are now as much a factor in the conflict with communism as they have always been in keeping the world at peace. American Near Eastern policy has lost for us the respect and friendship of 40,000,000 oriental Arabs and of many million more among their kinsmen and coreligionists in North Africa and southern Asia. Certainly it is time that our policy makers took a more realistic view of the facts in the situation. It is not enough that we help provide the meager rations that keep body and soul together for some million Arab displaced persons. Despite any repercussions it may have on the partisan political scene in America, we should hasten to reexamine our Near Eastern policy. Concessions should be made to defensible Arab grievances. That is to say, we should take steps to help implement all UN decisions regarding Palestine. Beyond that central consideration, we should proceed to do what we can do—and we can do a great deal—to lift the level of economic life for the peoples of the Near and Middle East.

The Defense Construction Program in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I recently made to the press regarding the defense construction program in Alaska.

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

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, chairman, Preparedness Subcommittee, Senate Armed Services Committee, today announced that Senator LESTER HUNT, chairman of the Alaskan task force of the Preparedness Subcommittee, had informed him that the lagging program of defense construction in Alaska has received an urgently needed shot in the arm. Members of the task force in addition to Senator HUNT were Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and WAYNE MORSE.

Senator JOHNSON further stated as follows:

"As a result of recent labor-management conferences held at Anchorage, Alaska, it now appears that the Defense Establishment and other Government agencies engaged in vital construction in Alaska can be assured of 12 months of construction uninterrupted by labor disputes.

"During the past construction year a series of crippling strikes struck at the heart of defense construction in Alaska. Due to the gravity of the situation, the Alaskan task force of the Preparedness Subcommittee demanded that an interdepartmental labor-management conference be called in an attempt to stave off further work stoppages during construction season. As a result of this suggestion by the Alaskan task force, an interdepartmental committee was established by the Secretary of the Interior. The purpose of this committee was to acquaint both labor and management with the urgency of the situation. Dr. Frank Graham, special consultant for the Department of the Interior, was chairman of the meeting.

"After the first day's session, representatives of both labor and management requested that the conference recess in order that they could enter into direct negotiations. When the conference was concluded, January 26, 1951, contracts had been signed by all the unions and contractors to cover the next construction season. Each of these contracts contains a no-strike, no-lock-out clause. The committee has been informed that at least one and probably two of the major craft unions would now be on strike if this conference had not been arranged.

"In view of the fact that this conference was attended by all of the construction crafts within the Territory of Alaska and by most of the international construction trade unions, I feel that the results achieved set an example for our national preparedness effort.

"The spirit of cooperation shown by both labor and management in this conference was very stimulating and gratifying to us.

"It is my belief that this conference, called at the insistence of the Alaskan task force, has made an important and significant contribution to our defense effort."

Dean Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Loveland Reporter-Herald, whose editor is H. E. Holden, gives us some interesting sidelights on what our people back home are thinking. I commend this editorial to you for careful reading and consideration:

THIS FELLOW, ACHESON

No more glaring instances of Presidential bullheadedness and brash determination to have his own way regardless of the impact upon the country has ever been seen in America than President Truman's insistence upon keeping Dean Acheson as Secretary of State.

At a time when the United States is giving its very lifeblood to halt the spread of dangerous ideologies, we place our foreign policy in the hands of a man whose entire career reeks with procommunism. And our own President insists that it be this way.

Who is this Acheson? What has his record been? Who are his friends and coworkers?

Acheson is the man who in 1946 as Under Secretary of State, engineered the United States loan of $90,000,000 to the Communist puppet government of Poland. Acheson's own law firm helped press the request in the State Department.

Acheson was legal counsel to the Soviet Union before he entered United States Government service. (This by admission of Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland, his political mentor and close friend.)

Acheson is the man who, appearing before a Communist-front organization with Paul Robeson in Madison Square Garden in November 1945 said: "There is no specific reason to suppose (that) the vital interests of the American and Russian people" will ever be opposed.

Acheson is the same man who appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on June 19, 1946, and asked for lend-lease funds for China, a part of which would be used for the purpose of arming the Chinese Communists.

Acheson is the man who said: "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss." He also was counsel for Lauchlin Currie, another pro-Communist who ordered dumped into the Indian Ocean 120,000 tons of supplies destined for Chiang Kai-shek.

Acheson is one of those who has consistently sat upon the evidence in the notorious Amerasia case and is still keeping the facts from public scrutiny.

Acheson and his pals are the men who could have spared us the Korean war and our disgraceful humiliation in the Orient.

And who are his friends? Well, there were Alger and Don Hiss. There is Philip S. Jessup, Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, John Stewart Service, John J. Muccio, Justice Felix Frankfurter, and a host of others with similar records and similar ideas. Do you think any of them would be welcome in the American Legion or the VFW?

Yet this is the man on whom we are forced to rely to keep us at peace with the world or to guide our conversations with other nations in times of war. How can we expect to stop Russia with a pro-Communist doing our talking?

Perhaps it is as some of our GI's in Korea asked Congressman HUGH D. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, when he visited the battlefields:

"How about this guy Acheson, is he on our side?"

Fathoms and Feet, Acres and Tons: An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the implementation of the Atlantic Pact and the military-aid program—MAP—we realize that one of the most serious complications, although little thought of by the man on the street, is the fact that measurements, weights, gages, and so forth, the calibers of rifles and guns, the power ratings of engines and electrical equipment, even the scales by which maps are made, vary not only between countries, but even as between the different departments of the military services in one country, such as our own. French cartridges will not fit British rifles or machine guns and neither will American cartridges. British-made nuts and bolts generally are different from those made in other countries, including our own. The French kilogram and liter in no way correspond to the English pound and quart; even English quarts are different between dry and wet measure. The examples could be multiplied many fold, but the sum total is a terrific problem in supplying arms and equipment, spare parts, ammunition, food, clothing, airplane engines and instruments, and spare parts, and so forth. It means multiplication of confusion. It means a tremendous problem in the organization into a single effective striking force of military forces of different countries each of which must have its own separate supply train because its weights and measures, and so forth, its gages and power ratings are different from those of other countries involved in the same combined armed force.

This constitutes a serious problem of General Eisenhower and his staff. One of their first requirements must be standardization of as many of these items as possible. Therefore, I deem it appropriate at this time to present the following article which sets forth clearly and succinctly the genesis of the principal systems of weights and measures now employed in the industrial world, for the better understanding of all concerned. If one were to speculate, one might very well prognosticate that the proper and efficient implementation of the Atlantic Pact and MAP will require the member countries to adopt a common system of weights and measures of all kinds.

FATHOMS AND FEET, ACRES AND TONS: AN APPRAISAL

(By Keith Gordon Irwin)

(Professor emeritus in the Division of Science and Arts of Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Professor Irwin presents here some of the results of many years of library investigation, particularly in European books for the years 1200 to 1700. Eventually these results will be given a much fuller treatment in a book manuscript, which will deal also with the evolution of weighing devices and will include forms of early thermometers, barometers, and clocks.)

Who has not heard—and, hearing, perhaps believed—that our foot rule's length was set for all time by the boot length of an early English king? And that the size of the nose of another early monarch played, somehow, a part in setting the dimensions of our yardstick? And who has not read—and, reading, perhaps believed—that an acre's length was the furrow-long strip that a certain mythical yoke of oxen was able to plow between restings? And that the acre itself was the land that these oxen could turn over with the plow in a day's time? And who has not been told—and, listening, perhaps believed—that the entire system of weights and measures in common use in this country is but a hodgepodge of diverse units, in a plan that is without logic and with little merit?

It has long been recognized that historical facts may not square with the origins suggested in legendary tales. In the case of the common measures, there is convincing evidence that arrogant and whimsical kings and robust oxen were not the prime actors that the stories have implied. Nor is there truth behind the allegation that the common units were illogical in their nature or in their interrelationships. But is one to be condemned as a believer of fairy tales if he is inclined toward disturbing thoughts as to whether these age-old measures are either adequate or desirable for a modern world, and whether a proper and wholly defensible procedure might not be to discard the old system and start anew on a more modern one? Such thoughts need not be considered either irrelevant or inconsequential. Their consideration justifies the presentation of our common system against a background of history.

THE COMMON MEASURES OF LENGTH AND FARM AREAS AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF HISTORY

Our present system of measures for distances on land and sea is a direct heritage from the half-forgotten measures brought to England by the Anglo-Saxons of 15 centuries ago. The plan they used was so remarkable for its simplicity and high practicality that we might be pardoned for seeking to credit it to Saxon genius. But the plan itself antedated by at least half a thousand years the Saxon landing on British soil, for Greek literature left an ample record of its use along the shores and waterways of southeastern Europe even in early classical times.

The basic unit of this old plan was the arm stretch, or the distance spanned by the outstretched arms. The Greeks called this the orguia. In Europe it became the toise of the French, the faedm of the Danes, the fathom of the Saxons. Races of people differ in stature. So the actual length of this basic unit varied somewhat from one racial group to another. The classical metrologists report that the Greek arm stretch in Solon's time was equal to 72.90 of our inches. In medieval Europe its length in the Rhineland was equal to 79.06 inches. With the long-armed Saxons it reached 79.20 inches. But throughout Europe the same decimal plan was used for the smaller and larger units. The nature of the completely decimalized arrangement was worked out by the scholars first of all for the classical plan, for which Greek literature gave abundant clues. Under the name of the Greek Itinerary System, this plan may be found listed among the measures of antiquity. The entirely comparable old English plan as developed by England's eminent metrologist, the late W. M. F. Petrie, was worked out from such source material as old maps, old itineraries, old laws, and the measurements of ancient buildings. In words of today, the Saxon arrangement becomes:

Ten finger widths equal one doublehand.

Ten doublehands equal one Saxofathom.

Ten Saxofathoms equal one chain.

Ten chains equal one furlong (for land measures) or one cablelength (for offshore measures).

One thousand Saxofathoms equal one "thousand" (the old English sea-and-land mile).

Farm lands were laid out in a similar simple way:

A block of land 100 Saxofathoms wide by 100 Saxofathoms long equals 10 acres.

As this land would be plowed lengthwise, a strip of land 10 Saxofathoms wide by 100 Saxofathoms long equals 1 acre.

The Saxofathom, as a unit of length, has long since disappeared, being outlawed six centures ago in favor of a shorter fathom. Yet that ghostly arm stretch is still the basic measure for the farm lands of an English-speaking world. A modern contrivance for measuring small acreages has, perhaps unwittingly, restored for the moment the old Saxon measures and the simplicity of the old plan. Because it has done so, the contrivance is worth describing. Made of light material and triangular in form, it has a waist-high handle for the apex of the triangle and a strip of wood for the base. At either end of the strip, and jutting down a few inches, is a rounded peg. From center to center the pegs are 79.20 inches apart. This number is important, for it is the exact length of the old Saxofathom. The main measure is divided, on the baseboard, into 10 equal parts, and each of these, again, into 10 equal parts. These divisions correspond to the double-hand and finger-width units of the old plan. When in use the device is given a whirling, end-for-end motion as the operator walks down the boundary of the field he is measuring. For a square 10-acre field the count should be 100 Saxofathoms for width and the same for length, and the report is that even an inexperienced operator will not miss these results by more than an inch or so. For fractional acreages or plots of ground not dimensioned in any exact Saxofathom manner, the scale upon the base of the device is called into play, any part of the main unit being represented as a decimal fraction. For fields laid out with square corners the acreage is found in all cases by multiplying together the length and width, as measured in Saxofathoms, and dividing the result by 1,000. The plan is that of the Saxons. The use of the decimal point, if one is needed, is the only part of the plan that is modern.

Had the men of that long-ago time in England not been such tall men, with such a great reach of arm and long stride, a second development in English measures would certainly have followed a different course and a simpler one. In the year 1066 Saxon England was conquered by the Normans from across the English Channel. In the following centuries Norman castles took the place of the simple fortified homes of the Saxon thanes, and abbeys and Gothic cathedrals were reared on the sites of earlier

church structures. Skilled workers were needed for this construction—workers in carved wood and fashioned stone, forged metal and shaped glass, embossed leather and embroidered tapestry. Such craftsmen, brought to England from the Continent, were, in general, shorter in stature than the fair-haired, blue-eyed Saxons. As the Saxofathom was too long a distance for their outstretched arms to span, their measures, of necessity, were based upon shorter lengths. At first the units adopted by one craft may have had no close agreement with those of other crafts. And there must have been trouble between the various craft groups, between the hewers of wood and shapers of stone who knew only Saxon measures. A compromise plan was imperative if confusion was to be avoided.

About the year 1250 such a compromise plan was developed; by 1350 it was in virtually universal use in all but the most rural districts of England. This plan set up a new fathom exactly ten-elevenths as long as the old Saxofathom. This new unit was divided in half to get the cloth maker's yard, and into six parts for the craftsman's foot.

The new fathom met with no special objection from those who held the lands of England. The acre, of course, was no longer to be referred to as 10 fathoms by 100 fathoms in size, for the fathom itself had changed. It was now 11 new fathoms by 110 new fathoms. The plan had lost part of its decimal simplicity, but the boundaries of the acre were intact. And the rod—a common measuring stick of 2½ Saxofathoms—was not changed in length, though new notches were to be cut on it to mark off its length into sixteen ½ feet. The furlong was also intact. But for some reason the old mile of 10 furlongs was discarded. For it there was substituted a statute mile of 8-furlong length. This meant for the square mile of farm land a drop from 1,000 acres to 640 acres.

Of the subordinate units of the old plan, a few had to be forced out of existence to prevent confusion. Thus the old yard was legally abolished to make way for the new one, which was ten-elevenths as long. The finger width also gave way to the inch. For the hand—as a twentieth of the Saxofathom—there was a different fate. By a mere 1-percent increase in size it was to fit into the new plan as a .4-inch measure. Thus only a few changes were made in bringing the craftsman units into accord with those of old England, and none of these affected land areas or invaded property rights. Yet the full consummation of the shift of measures, small as it was, stretched almost across two centuries.

In 1624 an attempt was made to restore the simplicity of the Saxon plan for farm measurement. Edmund Gunter, a practical English mathematician, proposed in that year an arrangement of measures that bypassed the old Saxofathom and reintroduced the old double hand under the name of link. If we include the finger width as the smallest unit, we may write the Gunter plan as: 10 finger widths equal 1 link, 100 links equal 1 chain, 10 chains equal 1 furlong, 10 square chains equal 1 acre, 1 square furlong equals 10 acres.

On the practical side, Gunter devised for the surveyor a skillfully constructed chain with 100 equal links. With the aid of such a chain the surveyor could measure farm areas rapidly and accurately and report the result in simple, decimalized units. George Washington, as a young man, used Gunter's equipment and plan, as did all American surveyors from Washington's time almost to our own.

The Gunter measures did not gain common acceptance among farm people, for the plan neglected that versatile measuring unit of the farm, the rod. To the surveyor an acre would be 10 square chains of land; to the farm user it would be a block of land 4 rods wide by 40 rods long, or its equivalent. To that extent, the Gunter attempt to restore the decimal simplicity of the old measures fell short of accomplishment.

In Saxon days there had been no difference between the length-measure plan as used for distances on land and for distances out from the shore, except that the furlong of the landsman was the cable length of the seaman. The sea and land plans were to diverge, however, when the new fathom was adopted. The men of the sea were to retain the old system in its entirety, cutting all units to ten-elevenths their former size, in keeping with the change in the fathom. This meant that the sea mile of 1,000 new fathoms was, after this, considerably longer than the 8-furlong statute mile used for land measurement.

Some centuries later, a small but highly important change was made in the sea mile's length. By that time the ocean navigators had discovered that the length of a minute of arc on a great circle of the earth was slightly more than 1,000 fathoms. By increasing the sea mile to 1013.4 fathoms, the two would be brought into coincidence. In time this change was adopted officially, the new length becoming the nautical mile of the seaman, or the geographical mile of the cartographer.

As the result of these several stages of development, each entirely logical in itself, the English system of length and surface measures came to be not a single plan but a composite of three interwoven designs. The old English part had given the English-speaking nations their farmland unit of the acre and the statute mile. The craftsman part had contributed the yard, the foot, and the inch. The distance-at-sea part had furnished the nautical mile. And the units so developed may not readily be changed. The farms of the British nations and the United States would seem to have imposed an unbreakable rigidity upon the size of the acre. The foot that received its length when there were few crafts has, today, embroidered around it the workday measures of a thousand occupations. The size of the nautical mile is fixed by the very earth itself.

THE METRIC MEASURES AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF HISTORY

We shall now need to turn our attention to a modern plan that was devised to eliminate the more pronounced disadvantages inherent in such older systems as that of England.

In the decade that followed the American Revolution the use of decimal fractions took on practical importance. In the money system devised for our newly established country these fractions when used with decimalized money units made a combination that was startling in simplicity and usefulness. To carry this same idea to the whole field of measurement became the dream of scientists and others the world over.

Only a French Revolution could have brought such scientific dreams so swiftly to fruition, for that period was one of those rare times in history when old standards were swept away, without a word of protest, to make room for new ones carried on a wave of high idealism. There was no compromising, no counting of costs. Many of the plans pressed so urgently by the savants and accepted so enthusiastically by the revolutionary assembly were not, however, to become a permanent part of the structure of French measurement. The 10-day week ran too counter to human requirements to gain more than a transitory existence. The decimalized plan for the hours of the day and the new form in which the year's calendar was cast met a like fate. And so did the plan for measuring the earth in a new kind of degree—though the failure here was related to the international scope of the plan and the puny effect that the decisions of a revolutionary assembly of France would have in dictating the measures of a world. The plan itself proposed that the old method of dividing a quadrant of the earth into 90 degrees, with each degree marked off into 60 minutes of arc, be changed to give each quadrant 100 new-sized degrees and each of these, 100 new-sized minutes of arc. Although this novel plan soon passed into oblivion, it was to leave a permanent imprint on another part of the over-all plan, as we shall see.

The plan developed for the handling of measures and weights, unlike most of the others, was to outlast the French Revolution. It was intended to be ideal both for land and for sea, and its final form was a modernized version of the English nautical mile plan and that of the old Saxon-Teutonic sea-and-land system dovetailed to give a single composite. For all its attempt at high practicality, this French, or metric, plan was to fail at a point where success seemed most certain. And a chance factor was to prove of outstanding importance in its acceptance.

In the sea part of the plan, there is a close basic relationship between the metric measures and those of England. The nautical mile, as has been pointed out, matches the length of a minute of arc on a great circle of the earth. The metric mile was devised along the same line of reasoning. It was to match the length of a hundredth of a hundredth of the earth's quadrant, following the idea of the new-sized degree and new-sized minute of arc, whose existence in a sort of blueprint state we have already mentioned. Just as a thousandth of the nautical mile was (very nearly) a fathom, so a thousandth of the metric mile was to be (exactly) the length of the new French basic measure to be known as the meter.

This metric mile (later christened the kilometer) was, by nature of its relation to the size of the earth's quadrant, 540/1000 as long as the English nautical mile. That it failed as a useful sea measure may not be charged to any gross error in the measurement of that part of the earth that this unit was to represent. It came, instead, from the evanescent nature of the new-sized degree upon which its length had depended. Today in metric countries the same nautical mile is in use in the rest of the world, this length of a minute of arc on a great circle appearing, quite awkwardly, as 1,852 meters.

The newly devised measures were, however, successful as land units. This was not through design. It was due to a chance relationship, to the fact that the meter was half as long as the old north-Europe fathom. This ancient arm-stretch unit, which, among the Saxons, was the basis for all measurements on land and waterways, had its counterpart in the measures used by the Teutonic tribes that invaded the continental Roman provinces with the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. It was in terms of these fathoms that the captured Roman lands were laid out anew. There was, it is true, a little variation from tribe to tribe in the length of this almost universal measure. The Saxofathom was a little longer than most of the others. Its length, as mentioned previously, was that of 79.20 present-day inches. For the districts along the Rhine the corresponding length was 79.08; for some parts of France it was 78.24; and for Spain, 78.98. Strike an average of the last three, and you have 78.77. Double the length of the meter, and you have 78.74. The similarity is startling. It seems much too close to be the result of chance. But upon that accidental relationship was to rest much of the acceptance of the metric system as a land measure for continental Europe.

The importance of that relationship may, perhaps, best be shown by placing the metric plan of length beside the well-decimalized Saxon system. Had the meter been exactly half as long as the Saxofathom it would nec-

essarily follow that every Saxon unit of length from the finger width to the old English mile would be matched, unit for unit, by a metric measure of half its size. Extended to farm land, a block of ground that measured 100 Saxofathoms by 100 Saxofathoms would be 200 meters by 200 meters. In Saxon terms that much land would be 10 acres, in metric 4 hectares. Even the English statute mile, though not a part of the original Saxon plan, would fit into the simple scheme of relationships. Its length of 8 furlongs, or 800 Saxofathoms, would be equal to 1,600 meters.

In the average American relation of Saxon and metric measures that we have pointed out will arouse no particular interest. Propose to him that we could secure international uniformity in the matter of land areas by cutting down our 10-acre fields to 4-hectare size and our miles to 1,600-meter lengths, and he may but shrug his shoulders. He wants to know how much would have to be pared off. Tell him that it would amount to but 3.83 feet for each dimension of the 10-acre block and about 30 feet for the mile, and he may reply that 30 feet is almost as wide as a country road. You argue that this small change would make our measurements agree with those of continental Europe and the Americas to the south of us, and he responds, "If they really want unity that much, let them up the meter a bit to match what we have to offer." He does not consider himself a reactionist or a blockader of progress. His answer represents, to him, simply common sense.

THE BACKGROUND FOR THE COMMON AND METRIC UNITS OF WEIGHT

Up to this point we have followed only the story of the development of measures of length and surface. We should speak somewhat briefly of other units as well.

It has often been implied that the plan used by the founders of the metric system in arriving at weights units was unique. On the contrary, all comprehensive systems of measurement and weight from the time of Solon in ancient Athens down to the present appear to have used it. It would be more logical to stress the point that in the metric plan the relation of small weights to each other or to large weights was in every case a decimal one.

How the gram-weight of the metric system was to represent the weight of a cubic centimeter of pure water at a temperature of 4 degrees Centigrade is doubtless familiar to everyone who has studied the physical sciences. How the English craftsman obtained the weight of the pound is seldom told. This weight unit came into general use in England in the relatively brief period between the years 1300 and 1333. As may be judged from internal evidence and from a knowledge of similar methods used elsewhere in Europe, the English plan was to set the weight of a cubic foot of water equal to 1,000 ounces, that of 16 cubic feet of water equal to 1,000 pounds. The metric plan was to parallel the other, but with a more complete decimalization, when it set the weight of a cubic decimeter of water equal to 1,000 grams, and the weight of a cubic meter of water equal to 1,000 kilograms.

It is always far easier to prepare accurate replicas of a standard weight than to develop the standard itself from volume measurements, a fact that has been recognized since Solon's time. The original standard establishing the legal size of the pound was placed in the English exchequer in the time of Edward III. A new standard, conforming to the original one, was prepared in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Although neither of these is in existence now, close replicas of Elizabeth's pound constitute the standards of today in England and the United States. Whatever may have been the case in the earlier standards, those of today are too heavy by half a drop of water per ounce, if the cubic foot of water used in checking the weights is measured under the same refinement of conditions specified for metric weights. The error, which amounts to 8 parts in 6,992, or eleven one-hundredths of 1 percent, may have been introduced in connection with Elizabeth's standard. It appears reasonably certain that her advisory committee suggested that the weight of the pound should, for commercial convenience, be made equal to 7,000 troy grains. For pure water at a temperature of 4° C., the correct value is exactly 6,992 grains.

The similarity in basic plan between the cubic foot of water and the ounce, on the one hand, and the cubic decimeter (or liter) and the gram, on the other, explains certain relationships between English and metric measures that have been noted by technical and scientific workers. Thus, the weight of a liter of a gas as given in grams matches in number value that of a cubic foot of the gas as recorded in ounces. Also, the specific gravity of a solid or liquid has a numerical value that is the same as the weight of the solid or liquid in grams per cubic decimeter, or the weight in ounces per cubic foot, if these weights are divided by 1,000. For example, the specific gravity of mercury is 13.6; a cubic decimeter of it weighs 13,600 grams; a cubic foot will weigh 13,600 ounces. Or the weight of moisture present in a sample of air will be expressed by the same number whether given in grams per cubic meter or in ounces per thousand cubic feet. Or a solution of a certain strength may be made either by adding the required number of grams of the material to make up a liter of solution or by using the same number of ounces in making up a cubic foot of solution. Such similarities can be almost endlessly extended, but always, it should be noted, the results will match only to three figures, for there is an inherent error in the English plan of 8 parts in a total of 7,000.

OUR WINE MEASURES

The pint and gallon that we use for liquid measures are not, by their nature, comparable either to the cubic foot or to such metric measures as the liter. They represent wine measures set up under legislation for the wine-handling trade. The tun, a large unit not mentioned in a direct way in the early English laws, was the quantity of wine that in a vat measuring 4 feet by 4 feet on the inside would fill it to a depth of 25 inches. This much wine was considered to weigh 2,000 pounds. Since wine has an average specific gravity very close to 0.96 for wine-cellar temperatures, the results were always close to the 2,000-pound estimate. The basic small unit of this wine plan was the pint, a measure that was 1/2000 of a tun and so would hold a pound of wine.

In later times many commodities other than wine were, at one time or another, measured out in pints—that is, in capacity vessels of an assortment of sizes each designed to hold a pound of a certain kind of commodity. The Queen Anne bushel, which has been in use with us since colonial times, is an example of a 64-pint measure set up for grain.

During the nineteenth century the British Empire, plagued with a multiplicity of such pints, swept away the wine measures, the Queen Anne bushel, and a variety of other capacity devices, replacing them by a single system in which the imperial gallon, a new unit, was to have the volume of 10 pounds of water and the new bushel was to be 8 imperial gallons in size. The plan stopped short, however, of being adequate from a modern point of view. It failed to make the pint the volume of a pound of water, with the pint divided decimally into smaller units. These two points were important.

Our pint and gallon are not adapted to general work with liquids to the extent that the British imperial gallon and the metric liter are. It should be noted, however, that our pint is basically defined in terms of water, for it was to be a vessel holding one pound of a liquid whose weight (as indicated by the specific gravity) would be 96/100 that of water. It would follow then that 96 pints (12 gallons) of water would weigh exactly 100 pounds, and a sixteenth as much, or 6 pints of water, would weigh exactly 100 ounces. These values are completely correct for temperatures close to 60 degrees Fahrenheit, or wine-cellar conditions. Even the Queen Anne bushel is not so bizarre in its capacity as the legal content of 2150.42 cubic inches would imply. It is exactly 56/45 of a cubic foot in size; so 45 bushels of grain will just fill a bin whose inside measurements are 7 feet by 8 feet by 1 foot.

The tun of wine as a liquid capacity measure seems always to have been matched in the early days of the wine measures by the idea of a tun weight of 2,000 pounds, which is what such a quantity of wine would weigh. Given a more modern spelling and now applied to commodities in general, this weight unit is our 2,000-pound ton. And tunnage, or the number of tuns of wine that a boat might carry, is now tonnage and represents any load or cargo measured in tons.

Another tun-weight idea was in use, from the beginning, among seamen. It was a gross weight taking in the weight of the tun of wine and the containers for the wine. Whether the liquid was handled in barrels or casks, 12 pounds of container weight was estimated as being required for each 100 pounds of wine, or 240 pounds for each 2,000 pounds of wine. This gross ton of 2,240 pounds soon became fixed for all commodities carried by ships. Its continued use has long resulted in a moderate amount of confusion.

TROY AND APOTHECARY WEIGHTS

Not long before the development of the English weight plan, the thriving Italian cities of Venice, Florence, Genoa, and Milan had set up an integrated plan of a similar nature to fit their commercial needs. And the same had been true of the group of federated cities along the Rhine, the North Sea, and the Baltic known as the Hanseatic League. For all three—England, the Italian communes, and the Hansa cities—the weight units were derived from the weight of a cubic foot of water. England, as we have noted, divided the weight of their cubic foot into 1,000 ounces. The Hanseatic League split the weight of its somewhat larger cubic foot into 1,000 onzen. The Italian cities with a still larger basic cubic foot divided it into 1,333⅓ onzia. The result was an English ounce of 437.5 grains, a Hansa onze of 480.0 grains, and an Italian onzia of 436.2 grains.

The Oxford Historical Dictionary suggests that the abbreviation oz., as used for the common ounce, is, in reality, that of the Italian onzia. The difference between 437.5 and 436.2 grains was evidently so slight that the two weights must have been considered commercially equivalent for ordinary weighing.

The Hansa onze, nearly 10 percent heavier than the other two, was known in England as the troy ounce. This weight unit dominated the commercial dealings of Western Europe during the ascendency of the Hanseatic League, for the weighing of silver and gold, as well as for drugs and luxury items which, coming from the East, were distributed by the merchants of the Rhineland cities. By the close of the reign of Elizabeth of England the prime importance of the Rhineland onze and its companion weights of the drug trade was dwindling. Bitter religious wars had obliterated old trade routes. The products of India, China, and the Spice Islands were reaching Europe by cargo ships that ran directly to the cities that faced out on the Atlantic. There were new sources for silver and gold and new weight systems for their handling.

By the end of the nineteenth century the troy and apothecary weights which in an earlier day had been raised by the Hansa cities to a position of international importance had vanished in all countries but our own. The metric countries had built their pharmacopoeia around metric units. The British had abolished all the old weight units of these two systems except the troy ounce, using it only in the minting of coins. Even in the United States there has been a gradual shift away from the old apothecary weights to metric ones in the filling of prescriptions and the compounding of medicines and to common weights in wholesale drug handling. It is not improbable that another decade may see the end of the scruple and the drachm. Perhaps the "fine ounce" may be gone as well. They have all outlived their usefulness.

MODERNIZING CHANGES OF THE PAST THREE-QUARTERS OF A CENTURY

This brings the story of the development of the English and metric units down to the year 1870. The English system was by that time half a thousand years old; the metric system had not yet spanned a century. But neither had as yet reached a condition of immobility. Thus, in the decade following 1870 we find the metric system being improved for scientific purposes through the concerted efforts of an international group of scientists. New definitions were set for the meter, kilogram, and liter, and smaller units were added to the original plan. It was in this period that the meter changed its status from a French measure to an international one.

From that same period of time modernizing changes began to be applied to the common units, most of the modifications being along the line of decimal-fraction handling of the foot, inch, and pound. Thus the new engineer's chain, supplanting Gunter's chain for surveying and land measurement, was 100 feet long, with the foot divided decimally. Before the turn of the century the micrometer, a device that could be used to measure the parts of a machine to the hundredth or even thousandth of an inch, had been added to the mechanic's list of indispensable tools.

The shift to decimal dimensioning has been largest in the metal trades. In this connection we have the report of S. B. Elrod, of Purdue University, at the 1948 meeting of the American Society for Engineering Education:

"Fractional dimensions are giving way to decimal dismensions. The two place decimal system inaugurated by the late Carl E. Johanssen, in the Ford Motor Co. plants, has gained ground rapidly and is used by most of the automotive industry and over 80 percent of the aircraft industry. The system has the advantages of the metric system without requiring a reeducational and retooling program. Surveys conducted periodically show the shift to decimal dimensions continues steadily."

With us another movement has also been under way that is directly related to the idea of modernization. By the turn of the century, or shortly after, many devices had been perfected that could measure or weigh in an automatic and highly accurate manner, the results being reported to decimal-fraction parts of the unit used. There were odometers to measure the length of trips, chronometers to read time intervals, and vending machines to report on gasoline supplied and its cost. All were practical, all were illustrative of the ease with which decimally divided units can be handled in measurement and in calculation.

But something more than decimal dimensioning and mechanical devices is needed to give a real modernization to the common plan. As in the metric system, well-named large and small units are needed within the framework of the decimalized main measures of length and weight. Strangely enough, the know-how needed to design a machine that automatically measures liquids to thousandths of a pint, determines to the nearest pound the weight of a load of coal, or carries out the thousand and one things demanded of weighing and measuring devices does not include the know-how for the production of a modernized plan built about the common units. Nor have the engineering schools or industry itself presented a program that might effect such a plan, though each has made some contribution to the emerging pattern of modernization. Considering the present status of our capacity measures and the difference in such measures as used in this country from those of other English-speaking countries, it may be considered surprising that the more thoughtful representatives of engineering and industry have given but nominal approval to the proposed substitution of the pound-pint, or volume of a pound of water, for all other pints. By replacing our present wine pint and grain pint with such a pound-pint, and fitting it into the framework of the imperial gallon and British bushel, we could achieve a capacity plan having both logic and practicality. With such a plan we may envision a day when the kilopint and millipint of the English-speaking world would become the useful measures that the kiloliter and milliliter are for the metric countries.

THE POSSIBILITY OF WORLD UNITY IN THE MATTER OF MEASURES AND WEIGHTS

Even a well-modernized treatment of the common units cannot be expected to result in a plan that would equal that of the metric system. As a younger system, the metric units had a greater over-all simplicity of relationships. The weight standards were more accurately constructed. Each main unit was the center of a decimalized arrangement of both large and small secondary units, for which a simple and consistent naming plan had been developed. These things made it the best that the human mind could conceive and the human hand construct.

In 1866, by act of Congress, the use of metric units was legally sanctioned in this country. This meant that a duality of measures would, after that date, be permitted. And it was freely predicted that the meter, liter, hectare, and kilogram would soon supplant, in a comparative way, the foot, pint, acre, and pound of the older system. This prediction was based upon two premises: the appeal that an international system of measures and weights might be expected to have for the liberal-minded thinkers of America, and the practical advantages of the metric system itself.

The results were highly disappointing. America was definitely not international-minded. And the practical advantages were considered nebulous by a people whose life activities had been geared to the common units. Thus the farm population could see no advantage in the use of the hectare and kilometer over the acre and the mile that would justify the effort involved in making the change. Within the home a somewhat similar condition existed. Such craftsman units as the yard and foot had been built about the height, the arm-stretch, and the stride of men. And the American home, reflecting the life of the people who lived there, had used these units for the sizes of rugs, the heights of ceilings, and the dimensions of furniture and other equipment. It was quite understandable, then, that the housewife would discover no advantage in substituting the unfamiliar and awkwardly long meter for the homely, useful units about which her home and its life had been developed. Likewise in the shop the American worker discovered no advantage in the centimeter over the inch, as a small unit of length, that would justify the redesigning of the machinery in the shop to give whole-number dimensions in centimeters or millimeters for such things as bolts, steel thickness, gears, and shafting.

None of the population groups that we have mentioned—the farm people, the housewives, and the workers in the shops—had considered the metric system as a whole. Each group condemned the new system as impractical because it failed to offer advantages in some limited field. There is a reverse side to the picture. Gains have been made for metric units in such special areas as the scientific laboratory, where the handling of small lengths, volumes, and weights is almost universally done in such units. Even operational plants that handle raw materials by the ton or gallon may have a laboratory equipped only with metrically calibrated apparatus. In the field of machinery manufacture, the producer of scientific equipment normally makes products fitting whole-number metric dimensions. Those producing general equipment intended for metric countries may follow the same policy. But for the vast majority of the factories which, in this country, are producing tools and machine products for the American public only common-unit dimensioning will be used. To do otherwise would lose a hundred customers for one that might be gained. And the same general idea extends to all the major fields of human endeavor in the United States.

For many of us it is with reluctance that we acknowledge that our dream of world uniformity in weights and measures is, after all, but a dream. To be sure, England, centuries ago, shifted from the agrarian measures of the Saxons to the industrial measures of the craftsmen, and did it without devastating effects. But the units of the old plan and the new were fully commensurate, no property lines were affected, and the industrial workers were convinced of the need for the change. Any attempt to install the metric system in present-day American, supplanting the common units in a legal way, would be favored by none of the factors that supported the change to craftsman units. We may, of course, point out that France made such a shift and emerged successfully. But our present situation does not parallel that of France toward the close of the eighteenth century. Previous to the adoption of the metric plan that country was without any unified, national system. Several length standards were in use, each supreme in its own area. The weight units, though quite uniform throughout France, needed drastic redesigning. They represented the thousand-year-old coinage weights of Charlemagne, for which some worn coins of old Byzantium had been the model. For this peculiar combination of measurement ills the introduction of metric values could have the desirable effect of a compromise plan, not far out of line with old measures, yet capable of sweeping away all the old outmoded or conflicting standards. A somewhat similar set of conditions was present at the time of the establishment of the German Empire in 1871. The somewhat variant measure and weight standards of the numerous kingdoms, principalities, and duchies that were combined in empire formation were brushed aside, the meter and kilogram, as compromise units, taking their place.

For the system of common units found in this country and other English-speaking na-

tions there is present no mixture of rival measures that would call for eradication, no desperate need of a compromise proposal whose forceful adoption could bring order to a chaotic situation. No parallel to a France or a Germany exists.

In an indirect way the adoption of the metric system by continental Europe was to improve the situation for those countries which, like our own, use the foot, the acre, and the pound. By eliminating the older measures of that continent that went by the name of "foot," and "acre," and "pound," the widespread metric adoption left the world with but one foot and one meter, one acre and one hectare, one pound and one kilogram.

Thus we conclude our report on the origin and development of the English and metric systems. With such a background we should be able to make some rather reliable predictions as to the future.

The history of the past would seem to justify with certainty the following aspect of the future. These two systems—English and metric—that today dominate so completely the industrial world will continue, side by side, as the giants of the world of tomorrow. Neither has been able to absorb the other—a situation that will not change in any foreseeable future.

On a second point there would seem to be equal certainty. The common system is still in the process of change, with the future offering ample opportunity for further modernization.

Russia Speeds Up Construction of Waterway Connecting the Don and the Volga While Our Government Delays Construction of a Similar Project—The Missing Link in Our National Defense Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to fully evaluate the grave dangers that lie before us. But there is one thing we do know, and that is if the continental United States is ever attacked by a foreign power our main weapons of defense will be the airplane and the atomic bomb, with such naval and radar facilities as our Government is willing to provide.

The missing link in our defense program, as well as the missing link in our inland waterway transportation system, is that short connection between the Tennessee and the Tombigbee Rivers that would provide what would amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Great Lakes, the Ohio, the Tennessee, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Illinois Rivers, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

RUSSIA SPEEDS UP CONSTRUCTION OF A SIMILAR PROJECT

The Army engineers say that the only other project on earth that compares with it, when it comes to transferring the traffic from one major watershed to another, with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances, is the one connecting the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, the construction of which Stalin is now speeding up with all possible haste.

The engineers' report shows that this Tennessee-Tombigbee project will cut the water distance between the Gulf at Mobile and our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, by more than 800 miles, and cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to where this project enters the Tennessee River, by more than 75 percent, or from $39,060 to $8,680 on a barge load of 14,000 tons; a saving of $30,380—on its fuel bill alone.

Their report also shows that it will cut the water distance from Mobile to our new atomic-bomb plant at Paducah, Kentucky, by more than 350 miles, and cut the cost of transportation by more than 60 percent, or from $2.40 a ton down to 89 cents a ton; and that a barge load of 14,000 tons going from Mobile to Paducah would have its cost of transportation cut from $34,580 down to $12,460, or a savings of $22,120, on its fuel bill alone.

Now let us take the States that border on the Great Lakes, the Ohio River, the Missouri, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Tennessee, such as Illinois, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Tennessee—States in which our great steel plants, aluminum plants, and other large manufacturing establishments, necessary to our national defense, are located.

Everybody knows that our iron-ore deposit in the Mesabi Range is now being depleted. There are only two other sources from which that ore can be obtained—Labrador and Venezuela. The use of the iron ore from Labrador in this area is out of the question until the St. Lawrence project is constructed; and the use of the iron ore from Venezuela in this area is out of the question until this short missing link in the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is completed.

The Aluminum Company of America, whose plants are distributed throughout this area, is getting 95 percent of its bauxite from South America today. This inland waterway would greatly facilitate the importation of that raw material which is so necessary to our national defense.

The enemies of the St. Lawrence project continue to harp on the fact that it would be frozen up something like 5 or 6 months in the year.

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway will not be frozen at all, but will be open for traffic the year round.

It has already been authorized by law, and more than half of it has been completed, or will be when the Demopolis Dam, which is now under construction, is finished; and the planning of the rest of the project has already been done. What we need now is an ample appropriation to speed up the construction of this vital missing link with all possible haste.

It will give us a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Tennessee River, and then a downstream route along the Tennessee 215 miles to Paducah, Kentucky, and then 47 miles down the Ohio to Cairo, Illinois—making a downstream route from the point where this project connects with the Tennessee River on the Mississippi State line to Cairo, Illinois, of 262 miles.

There are 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River between Cairo and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; 8 on the Allegheny; and 13 on the Monongahela, which provides what amounts to a slack-water route along the entire length of those streams. Therefore, this project will provide what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf at Mobile, to Pittsburgh, and to all points along the streams mentioned, by which the raw materials so necessary to our national defense, as well as to the industries in that area, may be imported, and, at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

The barges that go down the Ohio, the Illinois, the Missouri, and the Mississippi to the Gulf, carrying the finished products produced in that area, could bring back the iron ore, bauxite, oil, salt, sulfur, lumber, cotton, cottonseed, and other raw materials necessary to their operations.

The average tow bargeload is 14,000 tons. Every load of that size going from the Gulf at Mobile to Cairo, Illinois, would save $20,160 on its fuel bill alone. That would be the saving on every bargeload of that size going to any point on the upper Mississippi up to Minneapolis and St. Paul, or to any point on the Illinois or the Missouri Rivers, or to any place along the Great Lakes.

Going to Paducah, Kentucky, or to any point between Paducah and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, or to any point on the Allegheny or the Monongahela, it would save $22,120 on its fuel bill alone. Going to Oak Ridge, or to any other point on the upper Tennessee, it would save $30,380 on its fuel bill alone.

Unless some cheap method of transporting these raw materials into that area, such as this inland waterway, is provided, many of those great industries are going to have to move.

I am appealing to the Members of Congress from those States to join us in our efforts to secure the necessary appropriations to speed up this construction with all possible haste.

At this point I am inserting a table that was worked out by the Army engineers showing the cost per ton of

barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

Remember these are the savings on the fuel bill alone.

The table referred to follows:

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee on its fuel bill alone

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$28,280	$18,480	$9,800
	Paducah	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	33,880	13,860	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	33,460	13,300	20,160
	Paducah	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,220	2,380	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	40,320	6,440	33,880
	Paducah	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,920	1,820	44,100
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	40,740	6,160	34,580
	Paducah	41,860	5,320	36,540
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,340	1,540	44,800
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,620	1,120	45,500

Remember that this is the only possible way to construct what will amount to a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Ohio, the Illinois, the Tennessee, the Missouri, and the upper Mississippi Rivers.

It is 1,768 miles from Cairo down the Mississippi to New Orleans, then along the intercoastal waterway to Mobile, then up this slack-water route along the Tombigbee to the Tennessee, and then downstream on the Tennessee and the Ohio to the point of beginning.

Of that 1,768 miles, 1,131 miles of it is downstream, and the rest of it is in slack water.

There is not another project like it on earth, or one that can be constructed to compare with it, unless it is the connection between the Don and the Volga, in Russia, which Stalin is now speeding up.

We cannot afford to wait.

Christianity and the World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the December 28, 1950, issue of the National News-Letter is devoted to a message by his grace, the archbishop of York, on the present world crisis. This most eminent churchman has set forth in a scholarly manner the difficulties which beset the civilized world. I believe that the message is deserving of widespread readership and include it as an extension of my remarks at this point.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE WORLD CRISIS

(A message from His Grace the Archbishop of York)

BISHOPTHORPE, YORK, *December 25, 1950.*

DEAR READER: Commander King-Hall has asked me to write the Christmas news letter, and suggested I should take as my subject Christianity and the World Crisis. I feel greatly honored that he should ask me to do this. I shall attempt to state concisely and plainly a Christian view of the crisis and the way in which it should be met.

THE UNIQUENESS OF THE CRISIS

It is a truism to say that we are living in an age of crisis. The self-confidence and security of the Victorians has gone, and we no longer look upon progress as certain. The crisis through which the world is now passing has two characteristics which distinguish it from all previous experiences. It is different in intensity, for it is shaking the foundations on which our civilization is built: the beliefs, the standards, and the ideals which for generations have been taken for granted are now threatened with destruction. It is different also in its extent: it is not limited to any one nation, or even to one continent. Modern inventions have linked up the world as never before: ideas are flashed within a few seconds of time from one end of the earth to the other. Restlessness, change, revolutionary movements are everywhere to be found.

Hope for the future is uncertain, for there is dread that man by using the destructive weapons he has invented may commit race suicide. The old age in which our forefathers and most of those who read this letter were brought up, is rapidly vanishing, and the new age has not yet come to the birth. The early church looked forward with hope to the passing away of the world and all that it held, but modern man dreads the ruin which will come upon civilization if atomic weapons are used in another war.

CAUSES OF THE CRISIS

There are three fundamental causes which have led to the world crisis.

1. First, the emergency of an unrestrained nationalism. Nationalism is far more than the patriotism which is selfless love of the fatherland; it is the passionate assertion "my country, right or wrong." The totalitarian state is the organ through which a nation both expresses and attempts to realize its most arrogant ideals. The state gradually makes unrestricted claims over all its subjects, and treats them as if they existed for the good of the state and not the state for their good. The interests and power of the state are set above all moral standards. Nations as well as its own subjects must yield to the will of the totalitarian state. The spirit of Deutschland Über Alles is not a disease limited to Germany alone; wherever it is found it shows the intolerance which disregards the rights of all other nations. Its supreme law is the welfare and glory of the nation; nothing must stand in the way of this; conduct is good or bad insofar as it furthers or hinders national power.

POVERTY AND HUNGER

2. Nationalism is intensified by poverty and hunger. Often its aggressiveness is due to the necessity of finding room and food for an overlarge population. In older histories the economic factors in the rise and fall of nations were usually ignored. Karl Marx went to the other extreme and treated economics as the cause of all historic movements. It is now generally accepted that Marx made a valuable contribution to the scientific writing of history by the emphasis he laid on the economic background of social and political changes. But he was wrong in regarding the economic motive as the sole explanation of human action. Man is far more than an economic animal. Thomas Carlyle once said that if a shoeblack were given the whole world he would still be dissatisfied, "for he has needs over and above his stomach." With this reservation, we may find in economics one of the main causes of world unrest. In many parts of Eastern Europe hunger and want have led to revolution. In the Far East famine is epidemic and hunger is normal; at brief intervals in India and China millions die of hunger, and even in favorable years a very narrow margin separates the peoples of the east from starvation. Where there is want there exists a fertile field for revolutionary propaganda.

In the past the people of these countries accepted their lot as inevitable; now through the cinema and through contact with the western armies they have discovered that their misery is not the universal fate of mankind, and they are told by the agitator that within their reach there is a new and better world if they only have the courage to rise against their masters and to break away from ancient traditions and customs. This teaching has an inflammatory effect on hungry people who already have felt some faint stirrings of revolutionary nationalism.

GODLESS RELIGION

3. Nationalism and hunger would not, however, by themselves account for the crisis of our age. The dynamic cause is to be found in a religion which denies God and proclaims a gospel of equality and plenty. The evangelists of Christianity were not more fervent than the apostles of communism. On a gigantic scale with all the modern methods of propaganda through the wireless, the cinema and the press, they conduct a relentless attack on western civilization, and attempt to replace it by a new social and political order. The headquarters of communism are in Moscow, but in every land it has its agents pledged to advance its cause regardless of truth and patriotism. The fifth columnist gives the whole of his allegiance to "the cause" and disregards all the ordinary ties of honor and loyalty. He is ready to betray his country, to spy out its secrets, to sabotage its industries,

to stir up strife between employers and employed, to foment suspicion between trades-union leaders and their followers, to incite his fellow workmen to useless strikes, and to obstruct the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes. Behind all the local movements of communism there stands the armed might of Russia with its great armies, its 25,000 tanks, its huge air forces, built up within the screen of peace propaganda, of which the Stockholm petition and the Warsaw Peace Congress were the latest manifestations.

When the guns ceased from firing there was expectation that the world would enter into a period of peace. These hopes have been cruelly disappointed. A new kind of war, the cold war, is being waged on a wide frontier. Already in Korea the cold war has become a shooting war, and the intervention of Communist China in the dispute has suddenly brought dangers of immeasurable gravity. The extensive frontiers of the Soviet Union enable it to stir up trouble at far distant points. It prompts the satellite states to action and meanwhile keeps its own armies intact. The western democracies are thus compelled to disperse and dissipate their forces in different parts of the world in the attempt to halt the advance of communism.

A false step may be taken by one of the powers, and suddenly the whole world will find itself on the brink of a catastrophic war in which the atomic bomb and every other destructive weapon would be used in the struggle.

CHRISTIANITY AND PEACE

Christianity is a religion of peace and condemns war as one of the greatest of evils. The recent Lambeth Conference reaffirmed a resolution passed by its predecessor in 1930 "that war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." It insisted also on "the duty of governments to work for the general reduction and control of armaments of every kind, and for their final elimination, except those which may be necessary for international peace protection." But the conference also recognized that in an imperfect world "there are occasions when both nations and individuals are compelled to resort to war as the lesser of two evils."

It is here that the conference and the great body of Christians differ from pacifists who regard peace not only as the greatest of blessings but also as the greatest good. Most Christians, hating war and seeking peace, hold that injustice is a greater moral evil than war and that justice is a greater virtue than peace. The Christian realizes that under present conditions unilateral disarmament is more likely to lead to war than to peace, for an aggressive state would be tempted to attack a nation with great possessions which had deprived itself of all possibility of effective defense. Peace petitions and congresses may weaken the resolution to resist injustice and serve as a convenient screen behind which the aggressor state can complete its arrangements to attack. The Christian must always urge the duty of reconciliation, but at the same time he recognizes that the state may call upon him to resist by force injustice and tyranny. It is easy for the pacifist to denounce all war, but most Christians have the harder duty of deciding when war is more tolerable than some intolerable injustice.

THE WITNESS OF THE CHURCHES

It is not sufficient therefore for the Christian churches to praise peace and to denounce war. They must attempt to remove the causes which are most likely to lead to it. The divisions of Christendom are a grievous scandal, but they must not be exaggerated, for there is remarkable unanimity among the different communions on the causes of war and the measures required to remove them. There is greater cooperation today between the Christian churches than at any previous time since the separation of the churches of the west and the east. The drawing together of so many churches is, as Archbishop Temple said, "the great new fact of our time." The Reformed churches meet and confer together in the World Council of Churches, and, though the Roman Catholic Church is unwilling to take part in these conferences, various papal encyclicals have shown how close is the agreement of the Roman Catholic Church with the other churches in its attitude to the world crisis. There are three great lines of agreement in the Christian approach to the crisis.

THE LIMITATION OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

First, the churches are united in their conviction that above the changing laws of nations there is the absolute, unchanging law of God binding on all races, nations, and individuals. All through western Christendom there was at one time the conception of a universal law. True, it was often broken or ignored, but, nevertheless, men judged themselves, and still more their neighbors, by their observance or rejection of this law. The Christian conception of universal law comes from belief in the sovereignty of God who reigns in righteousness on high above all nations and individuals. This is opposed to the theory that a nation can make for itself its standards of right and wrong. When a state does this it tramples underfoot the claims of weaker nations and destroys as scraps of paper the treaties it had made with them. The Pope, in an encyclical of October 1939, was expressing the mind of Christendom when he condemned the totalitarian states, for "they seek to dispense the civil authority from observing any of those higher laws which have their origin in God. The divine authority and the influence of its laws thus set aside, it necessarily follows that the civil power attributes to itself that absolute autonomy which belongs to the Creator alone."

The practical corollary of the recognition of the sovereignty of God is that there must be some limitation of the national sovereignty. As long as each state claims complete sovereignty in its relationship to other nations there is little hope of abolishing war as a means of settling disputes. International laws and covenants are the recognition that there must be some limitation to that complete sovereignty in the exercise of which a nation disregards the rights of its weaker neighbors. The old League of Nations and the United Nations organization were given a somewhat vague and shadowy supernational authority, but its exercise depended upon the support of the nations of which they are composed. The opposition of a powerful state or the exercise of the veto can cripple effective action by UNO. It is always difficult for a nation to accept any limitation to its sovereignty. Even the attempt to set up an international authority to control the making and use of atomic weapons failed through the refusal of Russia to allow the infringement of her sovereign rights to the extent of permitting effective inspection within her borders. But while Christians can hold different views as to the methods most suitable for limiting national sovereignty, they are united in accepting the principle that all nations are under the sovereignty of God, and therefore must not live for themselves alone. The Christian ideal of world order is a fellowship of nations under the rule of God, each making in freedom its distinctive contribution to the good of mankind. The United Nations has proved disappointing in many ways, but it is worthy of support as the only existing organisation for the exercise of international control.

THE BACKWARD NATIONS

The Christian churches are also united in demanding a fairer distribution of the world's goods, so that the poorer nations may be given opportunities for a higher standard of living than at present they possess. In the past the more powerful nations have often subjected backward peoples to shameless exploitation. They have sometimes given them good order and peace, but in exchange they have taken advantage of their want and ignorance to extract from them cheap labor. Little has been done to help the teeming populations of the east to overcome their poverty by teaching them improved methods of agriculture. Primitive cultivation produces far smaller crops than is the case in those countries where scientific methods are used.

Recently Mr. Malcolm Macdonald stated in a broadcast that in Great Britain 60 people depend on a thousand acres of cultivated land as against 900 in Asia; the yield of wheat per acre in India averages 600 pounds as against 1,000 pounds in the United States; in India there are 10,000 tractors compared with 2,400,000 in the United States, with a farming area only one-sixth greater. The Columbo Conference has recently made recommendations which, if carried out, would lead to the supply of the necessary capital, but this depends on the readiness both of the richer states and of private investors to grant the required money or to lend it on reasonable terms. The taxpayer will have to make sacrifices to save the backward peoples from starvation; he may even have to accept for a time a lower standard of living. Greater prosperity in the Far East and elsewhere would reduce the danger of revolution; but the Christian motive for supporting this policy is that of compassion for the children of the One Father who are suffering destitution and squalor. The last Lambeth Conference urged "the statesmen of the world, together with their people, to do their utmost to frame a world policy for the fuller development, and a juster distribution of the world's economic resources to meet the needs of men and women of all races."

COMMUNISM

The churches are also agreed that they must resist the materialistic communism which is now threatening the peace of the world. This will not be defeated only by physical force or by economic changes. It is a new religion bringing hope to millions. Its faith, therefore, must be outfought by a stronger faith, and the devotion its creed inspires must be met by a stronger devotion to a nobler creed. Ideas can be suppressed for a time by force; they can only be decisively defeated by ideas which are true and not merely attractive.

The predominant form of communism, Marxian, is opposed to Christianity on three matters of vital importance: it is materialistic, denying God and the spiritual; it degrades man into a mere instrument of the state; and it assumes that in this world there can be created a perfect order of classless justice. Against this the Christian asserts his belief in a personal God who is the supreme reality; that every individual is of value, with rights belonging to him as a man; and that man's disobedience to God prevents him from making a perfect order within history. Marxian communism everywhere sees in the Christian Church an enemy which it must persecute so as either to destroy or to intimidate it. On the other hand it is important that Christianity should never be treated merely as a convenient rampart against communism. Christianity is

too great to be a means to any end; it must be accepted because it is true, and not because it is expedient.

SPIRITUAL CRISIS

The roots of the world crisis are not so much economic, political, and social, as spiritual. Man has lost his belief in a living God, and with this he has lost the meaning and purpose of life. He is driven here and there without any clear and satisfactory goal in view. He is restless and disillusioned, sometimes wildly optimistic that the latest scientific discovery or political theory will inaugurate an earthly paradise, but at other times fearful lest some catastrophe may destroy the civilization he has built up and that death will extinguish forever his own individuality. He is intimidated by the size of the universe and his apparent insignificance amidst the vastness of the infinite spaces. Loss of belief in God has left him perplexed and helpless in the midst of forces which he has helped to unleash, but which he now finds he is unable to control.

Christianity offers to men the key of the riddle of life; it teaches that God created men to do His will; that He reveals in Christ His love for them, and what He intends them both to be and to do; that He calls them to love Him, and to live in peace and good will with their fellow men of all races and lands; that He promises them the help which the world cannot give, and a life which mortal death cannot destroy.

This faith has been largely abandoned; millions now never take the trouble even to consider if it might be true. But the failure of scientific materialism to give lasting happiness and peace should make men ask themselves again whether they have not been precipitate in abandoning the religion of their forefathers, and whether they should not seek the old ways of truth, mercy, and righteousness, and, still more, whether they should not follow One whom millions before them have found to be the way, the truth, and the life. A spiritual remedy, the return to the living God, will alone solve the crisis in the affairs of the world and in the lives of individuals.

It is difficult in these days of great anxiety to speak of a happy Christmas. Yet I venture to wish you all a happy Christmas, with the prayer and hope that the statesmen and peoples of the world may be given such wisdom and forbearance that this stricken world may soon see the cessation of strife and the first signs of the dawn of peace.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL EBOR.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the Independence Day of Lithuania. In commemorating this day it is proper and fitting to pause, at least briefly, at Lithuania's present-day plight, and to see where it fits or could fit into the framework of world problems.

Lithuania is forcibly occupied and illegally ruled by the Soviet Union. The independent state of Lithuania is being converted into a Soviet colony. Lithuania's economic, cultural, and political system, based on that of the free world, has been destroyed by the Soviets. Human rights and fundamental freedoms have been nullified and abolished. The people have been deprived of their property rights and their livelihood; they are being terrorized, persecuted, arrested, and deported to prisons and slave-labor camps in Siberia and the northern wastelands of Russia.

The criminal acts of the occupant of Lithuania constitute an international case of aggression and genocide. The unprovoked and forcible occupation of a sovereign and independent state and the persecution and annihilation of its innocent people, in accordance with international law, is a grave criminal offense. It follows, then, that the Soviet Union has committed an offense not only against Lithuania and the Lithuanian nation, but also against the entire civilized world.

The Soviet violations were perpetrated in the following manner:

First. By their conspiratorial agreements—of August 23 and September 28, 1939—with the Nazis to divide Lithuania, Poland, and other states between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany.

Second. By the seizure and plundering of the Lithuanian state.

Third. By the terrorization, deportation, and annihilation of the people of Lithuania.

Lithuania was one of the first victims of the Soviet expansion to the west and must be placed alongside other states in any plan guaranteeing the integrity and sovereignty of the states of Europe. Without securing the existence of Lithuania it is impossible to secure and maintain the existence and sovereignty of other small European states.

In solving the problem of the self-government of European states the decision should be based in a manner such as was stated by Talleyrand, the French delegate to the Vienna Congress in 1815, to wit: Russia must withdraw from Europe or the Western Powers must drive her back to her own borders. In settling the problem of liberating the states of Europe not only should the principles of international law be kept in mind, but also the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Declaration, by which all of the signatory nations, not excepting the Soviet Union, renounced all claims to foreign territory and expressed themselves in favor of liberating all of the enslaved countries. The New York Times recently proposed that the Western Powers come out "with a broad program of their own—a program which will not only expose the Soviet maneuvers but also carry new inspiration for all freemen and help to mobilize the moral forces of the world in the same way that the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter did in other days of stress. There is no better way of doing this than to revive the principles of both these charters, and to apply them to all nations, including those now held in bondage to the Soviets." This proposal deserves commendation and support.

Lithuania still is occupied and enslaved by foreign armed forces, just as she was during World War II. Lithuania and her people do not belong to Russia and must be distinguished from the Russians racially, culturally, and philosophically. Russia belongs to the east, Lithuania belongs to the west.

The Lithuanians have an ancient and glorious past, and they have every right to national independence, which was wrested from them by Soviet force. They are fighting and will continue to fight without let-up for their independence. Their struggle is not only for their own rights and freedom, but for the freedom of the democratic world. The enemy of the Lithuanians is also the enemy of the entire democratic world. The Lithuanians are in the front lines of the conflict, and the help of the democracies, from both near and far, is absolutely necessary for Lithuania.

The Lithuanians solicit and beg all freedom-loving people to support their crusade against the horror which destroys nations, against the enemy of freedom and mankind, against dictatorship, against despotic Red imperialism.

Thirty-third Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in a memorandum to the United Nations, on Lithuanian resistance sent from the underground toward the end of 1948, we read:

There is a little country in this weary world where since 1941, day and night, year in and year out, machine guns and automatic rifles roar, hand grenades explode, and fierce flames pierce the skies. * * * This is called Lietuva—Lithuania. Her people are fighting Attila, Tamerlane, and Genghis Khan reincarnated in communism. They are but one of a group of peoples still fighting for the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" which had been proclaimed by the western allies, which had been accepted by Russia, and violated at Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and San Francisco.

These freedoms have, indeed, been violated by Lithuania's protector and leader to socialism, the Soviet Union. Today, only a small number of the former population is still in Lithuania. Thousands of these brave people have been killed or sent to Siberia. Their crime? They believed with all their hearts in the right of peoples to order their own national existence. They refused to bow their heads to the Russian conquerors.

A few survivors of Soviet camps met, some months ago, in Jerusalem. Faithful to their country's old Catholic tradition, they placed a plaque in the Lithu-

anian language, on the altar of the third station of the cross. It read:

1940–50: Lord! save Lithuania. Jerusalem, January 22, 1950.

Many thousands of Lithuanians now live in America where they have found the freedom and the human decency that is presently denied to their mother country. But they do not forget Lithuania and their less fortunate brothers who suffer under Moscow's rule. They will never forget them and they will always be ready to fight the enemies of the democratic people of the world. On this day, February 16, which marks the anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is fitting that we pay tribute to those people who continue to resist with whatever means they have at hand the crushing domination of Soviet imperialism.

Why Not a National Holiday To Honor F. D. R.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Machinist, a publication of the International Association of Machinists, an A. F. of L. union, published an editorial in its issue of January 25 urging a national holiday to honor the late President Roosevelt.

I ask consent that this excellent editorial, setting forth a proposal to which I heartily subscribe, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

WHY NOT A NATIONAL HOLIDAY TO HONOR F. D. R.?

(Next Tuesday, January 30, would have been Franklin Roosevelt's sixty-ninth birthday. For the fourth year, we are reprinting our editorial, originally published on January 29, 1948, urging a national holiday to honor FDR. One State, Kentucky, has adopted this idea and made Roosevelt's birthday a State-wide holiday. The proposal is now being considered in several other States.)

Today Franklin Roosevelt occupies a place in our history beside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln as a leader who came to the American people in a time of great crisis and led them through.

We observe the birthday of Washington in every State and that of Lincoln in 31 States. Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, should be added to those two.

Most of us are not too young to remember the stark fear that faced this Nation in 1933. The United States was in the throes of a crisis unprecedented in time of peace. Most of all we needed something to restore our confidence. Franklin Roosevelt did that and more. He pulled us out of the crisis by main force. As one historian has written, the 99-day session of the Seventy-third Congress that began on March 9, 1933, witnessed the most daring Presidential leadership in American history.

He followed in the middle thirties with a program of social legislation—social security, labor relations, home loans, bank-deposit insurance, rural electrification, minimum wages—to name a few of the great New Deal laws. Roosevelt gave the common people of America the chance for security and self-respect.

During the second half of his administration, when we were plunged into the worst war in our history, Roosevelt led us to victory.

The forgotten men whom Roosevelt fought for can lead the way in making his birthday a national day of remembrance. National holidays can only be suggested by Congress. They must be officially proclaimed by State governors and local mayors. Any group of citizens has the right to petition a governor or mayor to proclaim a holiday.

Observance of Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays came slowly. Three months after Washington's death in 1799, Congress adopted a resolution urging a public noting of February 22. A few cities followed the suggestion in succeeding years, but it was not until the one hundredth anniversary of Washington's birthday in 1832 that the entire country made the day a holiday.

Almost the same held true in Lincoln's case. In 1866, a year after his assassination, Congress adopted a resolution urging observance of Lincoln's birthday. The idea grew, but again it was not until 1909, the one hundredth anniversary of the Great Emancipator's birth that the observance became a national custom.

For 10 years we have been observing Roosevelt's birthday as national infantile paralysis day. But his birthday must be remembered for more than the great personal handicap which he overcame. Working men and women will gladly honor him on his birthday, as one of the greatest friends they ever had. For more than that we must remember him. Roosevelt was one of America's beloved leaders. His ideals deserve to be remembered by every American this year and every year.

A Democratic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject A Democratic Foreign Policy, delivered by Mr. Michael Straight, editor of the New Republic, at Pittsburgh, Pa., at the annual Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 2¾ pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

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

All across America tonight, we in ADA are meeting to honor a great leader that we followed and loved.

He could not stand unaided, but he lifted this Nation to its feet.

He could not walk alone, but he led this Nation in the long march toward social justice and lasting peace.

Roosevelt was our field commander—in the greatest army ever formed in modern times—the army of the New Deal. Some, like the liberals, were scouts in that army, ranging ahead of the lines. Some, like the trade-unions, brought up the heavy battalions. A few, like our main speaker, were officers. Most of us were privates. All of us served under a gay and daring leader. His method in politics was to fire a star shell to outline the ranks of the enemy, alert the people with a battle order, and close to grapple, with all the Nation taking sides. The days of his Presidency were dramatic and exciting days. Those of us who marched with him loved what we fought for and fought for what we loved.

Six years ago we lost Roosevelt. And every one of us who remembers that day can bring back a sense of tears at the world's loss, and our own loss. Each day that we move without him, the magnitude of that loss grows. In his bold and militant spirit Roosevelt would have advanced the cause of freedom in all countries by a world New Deal. For all our efforts, we have retreated from his spirit and the magnitude of our difficulties is the measure of our retreat.

If we come tonight to honor Roosevelt, then we cannot ignore or conceal those difficulties. We must turn and face them as he would have done.

Roosevelt faced in fascism the challenge of the great lie. It sought world power through world war. It appealed to two chosen races that were a fraction of mankind.

We face in communism the challenge of corrupted truth. It seeks world power through world revolution. It appeals to all peoples to whom poverty and exploitation make unendurable the conditions of today.

We are a stronger Nation than the Nation Roosevelt led. But we face a far greater task. It is a harder task because we are divided. In Roosevelt's day the liberal movement, save for a few months between Munich and Dunkurque, knew where it was going. Today the liberal movement, which alone can save America, is in danger of being scattered to the winds.

Facing that danger, let us agree first on the nature of the challenge that confronts us.

The Soviet regime is a ruthless regime, committed to innate antagonism against the free world. It has failed to provide a better life for its peoples. So it must rule them by terror and justify the terror by driving fear and hatred of the outside world into every enslaved Russian mind.

The Soviet regime is a corrupt regime with little to offer free peoples. It seeks to crush the heritage of Europe, the faith of Latin America, the nationalist ambition of Asia to be independent and free. It is a weak system that gains by our greater weakness; it seizes leadership where we forfeit leadership; it enslaves people where we abandon people; it stands for progress where we deny progress; it wins by default.

The Soviet regime is an opportunist regime. It places a high value on world power. It places a still higher value on preserving its own power. It is patient and cautious. It fears and respects the might of industrial America. It avoids unnecessary risks. It launches aggression where aggression is unopposed. It incites revolution where revolutionary conditions prevail. Where strength and stability preclude aggression and revolution it retreats and waits.

The Soviet regime is a realistic regime. It recognizes that the free nations still hold two-thirds of the world's peoples, and three-quarters of the world's resources. It knows that as long as free people stand together aggression cannot pay. Its single, unswerving ambition is to break up the unity of free peoples, in order to overrun them one by one.

Too many Americans have given up all hope of world peace. But if this analysis is

right, there is no need yet to give up hope. For as long as the free peoples are strong and stand together peace is possible. Only when they are weak, and divided, is the world threatened by war.

In attacking the unity of free peoples the Soviet leaders are unprincipled and astute. They combine peace campaigns and campaigns of aggression. They play on labor's fear of capital and capital's fear of labor. They exploit the guilty conscience of the liberals, even while they plot sabotage and assassination. They force a wedge through every crack and crevice in the free world.

In Europe the Russians use the threat of force to terrorize all peoples. Eighty Soviet divisions stand on the borders of Europe. Twenty Polish divisions are being raised under a Soviet general to sweep through Germany. Ten Czech divisions are being raised to move into Austria and Bavaria. Six hundred thousand soldiers in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Albania are being trained, equipped, and indoctrinated to attack Tito, the insolent dwarf who defied Stalin's will.

To bring that force closer, the East German puppet parliament enacts the death penalty for West German resistance leaders and openly marks them down for execution when the Soviet armies roll.

The impact of this force and terror strikes in every European heart.

The West German Communist Party has been heavily subsidized by German industrialists as an insurance policy against the future. In France and Italy the Communist Parties conduct door-to-door canvasses, collecting contributions from washerwomen and elevator operators, and presenting them in return with receipts marked: "Present this for protection purposes when the Red army arrives."

In Yugoslavia the pressure is even more intense. Day by day the pattern of infiltration, subversion, and provocation by border incidents that preceded the attack on South Korea is being worked up against Tito.

Today, and for the foreseeable future, no land force stands between the Red armies and the British channel. Day by day the Russians warn that efforts to defend Europe may set those armies rolling. And yet the peoples of Europe are accepting the challenge, and taking the risks of defense. They are taking the risk on the assurance that they have the whole-hearted support of the one nation that can match Soviet power—the United States.

In Asia, Russia is working in the same way to divide Asia and the West and to break the resistance of Asia to aggression.

In colonial days, no force existed in Asia that would resist aggression. The oppressors were too weak, the oppressed lacked the will to resist. The leaders threw their weight against the Allies in the war, and collaborated with the Japanese. The Indian jurist who sat on the war crimes tribunal refused to join its finding that Japan was an aggressor on the ground that Japanese aggression was provoked by the imperialism of the West.

Fortunately for us, the rise of Soviet aggression has coincided with the rise of one force in Asia that is strong enough to resist it—Asian nationalism. For nationalism must clash with imperialism, and in Asia, as in Europe, communism is the cloak for Russian imperialism. So when the Communist fifth column in Asia was hurled against the Nationalist movement by Moscow it failed—it failed that is except in China, where Chiang Kai-shek forfeited the leadership of Chinese nationalism and it passed by default to Mao Tse-tung.

Today Russia is weak in non-Communist Asia. But democracy is also weak. No democracy in history has ever been created overnight. Yet the democratic nations of Asia are all less than 5 years old. No democracy has ever functioned under conditions of 90 percent illiteracy and the continuous threat of starvation. But those are the conditions under which the democracies of Asia are trying to function today. They are almost overwhelmed by inflation and falling living standards. They are working desperately against the timetable forced on them by Communist China without regard for human costs. They know that they cannot survive free in war and already war is raging in Korea. Yet they are committeed to democracy and to the United Nations, and against aggression, again in the belief that the one free nation which can help them will provide inspired leadership for progress and peace.

That is the challenge to great leadership that America faces in Europe and Asia. It is a challenge that Roosevelt would have gladly welcomed and one which in his spirit we can meet today.

Are we meeting that challenge in Roosevelt's spirit?

In Korea our soldiers are fighting with great courage so that we can be courageous. At home, we are moving to mobilize our own strength. But in providing inspired leadership to the world we are faltering at a critical hour.

We are not living under the shadow of the Soviet armies. We are not overwhelmed by poverty and famine. Yet we are becoming obsessed by fear. We are losing the quality that has made America and held it together—confidence in ourselves.

One group that incites fear and loss of confidence in America is the isolationists. They want us to dishonor our pledges to Europe. They want us to crawl back into a cave and wait for doom to overtake us. They propose that we surrender Western Europe to Russia and yet hold Britain, 20 miles away. They suggest that we triple the economic resources available to Stalin and then sit back and wait for him to collapse of his inner weaknesses. Their proposals have been condemned on economic grounds and military grounds and strategic grounds. And in God's name isn't it about time that it was condemned on moral and spiritual grounds? It seems to me perfectly clear that if we willingly surrendered a thousand million people to Soviet enslavement we would at the same time surrender our own moral and spiritual will to survive. No people who committed so enormous a crime could be left with the conviction that their society held out anything worth fighting for. We would sink into a morass of apathy and cynicism, and the last free nation would be lost without a shot being fired.

Americans know that. And they will reject the Hoover doctrine when it is placed before them honestly and openly. It will not be. Instead, men with praise of freedom and fine anti-Communist phrases on their lips will move this year to enforce the Hoover doctrine in a concealed dishonest form. They will attempt to withhold from our allies the vital lifeblood in manpower and military and economic aid that President Truman has asked for and that alone can save thousands of our lives later on.

I stated that a new Korea is in the making in Yugoslavia. I want to repeat now, that just as the refusal of Congress in 1950 to aid South Korea brought on the Communist attack against South Korea, so any evidence in 1951, that the Congress is abandoning Europe by withholding aid, will bring on a Communist attack against Yugoslavia and will lead to world war. But that is precisely what the Republican-controlled Congress may do, unless we act now.

One threat to American leadership comes from the isolationists. A second threat comes from the provocationists. The first group seek to isolate America. The second group makes it easy for Stalin to isolate us.

We went very far last year toward provoking Russia, and breaking up the new-formed partnership of free peoples, when we pressed for the immediate rearmament of Germany without any safeguards in the form of an economic or a military or a political federation of Europe. Our allies almost broke with us, because they knew that a remilitarized sovereign Western Germany is capable of provoking a third world war in order to reunite Germany, and to make Germany predominant after a war in which Russia and America have drained their life blood.

In the same reckless spirit we are going very far right now to provoke China, and to break up our partnership when we continue to intervene on the losing side in China's civil war. Once again our allies are ready to break with us, because they know that we are playing Russia's game. For not once but many times Chiang Kai-shek has declared that he would welcome a third world war as the one means by which he can march back to Chungking behind a phalanx of American planes, American guns, and American boys.

The Congress and the administration have piled error on top of error in our Asian policy. First, the administration surrendered the control of Asian policy to the generals. Then the generals passed it along to the China lobby. People talk of appeasing Communist China—the same people who spent the thirties fighting Roosevelt and appeasing Hitler. I am not concerned with appeasing China; I am very much concerned with continued appeasement of Knowland, McCarthy, Fulton Lewis, and Henry Luce.

Those men have succeeded in squandering America's moral standing in Asia. They have obscured completely the nature of our struggle against Soviet imperialism.

We want to arouse Asia against Soviet imperialism.

At the same time we assert our imperial control over an integral part of China in Formosa.

We want to stir Asia up against Stalin's use of puppet regimes.

At the same time we deliver our incomparable power to our puppet, Chiang Kai-shek, who could not survive a month on Formosa, let alone in China without our aid.

We want to mobilize Asia against Russia's efforts to ride roughshod over the interest of small countries in the United Nations.

At the same time we threaten that unless the UN falls in line when we crack the whip we will quit the UN and abandon our allies.

The Chinese Communists are engaged in selling their nation out to Stalin. And one day the people of China will punish them for that crime. That day is postponed because, when we oppose the legitimate nationalist aspirations of China to control its own territory, and to join the community of nations in the UN, we consolidate 400,000,000 nationalist Chinese behind their Communist oppressors. Still worse, we turn all the nationalist sentiment of Asia against us. That is what is happening now and it spells disunity, disaster, and war.

That is no reckless charge on my part. Last week Life magazine wrote:

"Life sees no choice but to acknowledge the existence of war with Red China and to set about its defeat in full awareness that this course will probably involve war with the Soviet Union as well."

Senator TAFT added that he favored cutting down our commitments in Europe in order to help Chiang Kai-shek inside the mainland of China.

"If this brings war between the United States and the Chinese Communists," he said, "it is nothing different from what we now have. In fact, it would be a much less dangerous war to us, much less fatal to our men, and much less expensive in material."

I suggest to you that that line amounts to strategic insanity and moral suicide.

The Chinese are doing their best to settle without a general war in Korea. There is only one nation that can gain from a war

between America and China, and that is Soviet Russia. Senator TAFT and the comfortable men in Rockefeller Center may see no difference between today's limited conflict in Korea and unlimited atomic war. But the peoples of the world who have suffered bombardment and occupation and famine know very well what the difference is. And if they believe that America has grown so callous and indifferent to human life as to seek unlimited war, then they will desert us, and we will be left entirely alone.

Certainly we are disillusioned with the failure of other nations to back us. Certainly we will find it hard to function with nations that challenge our decisions and dispute our will. Let's remember that patience as well as strength is the price of union among the free peoples today. Roosevelt foresaw that in his last message on the state of the Union.

"In our disillusionment after the last war we preferred international anarchy to international cooperation with nations which did not see and think exactly as we did. We gave up the hope of gradually achieving a better peace because we had not the courage to fulfill our responsibilities in an admittedly imperfect world.

"We must not let that happen again or we shall follow the same tragic road again—the road to a third world war."

A nation enters a war for one purpose—victory. In unlimited war against China there can be no victory. Our partnership with the free nations would break up. All Asia would oppose us. The United Nations would be against us. We would waste our lifeblood for nothing. Yet that is the drift of American policy, now that our policy is out of control. Certainly we must hold in Korea. But the one purpose of holding in a war we cannot win is to negotiate an honorable settlement. The liberals in America, who have rushed to the aid of Chiang Kai-shek and sanctioned the use of the atom bomb against China have done the liberal movement a grave disservice. We must regain our sanity and retrace our steps before it is too late.

None of us today dares to say what Roosevelt would do if he were with us.

We do know that he would tell us not to lose faith in peace, or give up trying for peace.

It is for us to ask how; I suggest that the answer may lie along these lines.

First, we must make war unprofitable for the aggressor.

That means sustaining General Eisenhower in his critical task of preventing aggression against Europe. It means sustaining Eisenhower with American soldiers.

It means sustaining Eisenhower with military aid to help our allies rearm.

It means sustaining him with economic aid so that our allies can turn their resources to rearmament.

It means supporting political federation in Europe without which Eisenhower is a military tyrant if he takes the actions he must take to defend Europe.

Making war unprofitable means raising a large armed force in the United States, and a just armed force. There is still Jim Crow in our Army, and no Jim Crow army is going to save world democracy.

Second, we must help others share the burden of resisting aggression. We have learned in Korea that we lack the resources to police the world alone. The answer is not to give the world over to Stalin, but to help other free peoples carry their share.

Only the Europeans can defend Europe. Only the Asians can hold Asia. Our task is to help them defend themselves, and us, in a common fight. They will carry their share of the common load only if we permit them to share in the determination of our common policies. That means that we must stop blustering and threatening in the United Nations. We must listen to what Asia is saying and what Europe is saying. We must recognize their ambitions and their deep-seated fears, and we must share our resources with them. We must remember that in Britain a family eats meat once a week, and that in India a man sent to jail gains weight on 18 cents worth of food a day. We must realize that the price of partnership is to treat others with the respect and understanding that partners deserve. We must act and think as part of the UN team.

Third, we must cut down the potential of communism.

We must remember that aggression and revolution strike where poverty and exploitation leave the free nations economically and socially weakened.

We must remember that the military victories of communism are prepared by our economic and social defeats.

Our people today are embittered by our losses in the Korean War. And they are fearful of the costs of rearmament.

It is for us to make it clear that as long as we attempt to prop up corrupt regimes against a tide of progress, no amount of arms and aid from America, for all our wealth, can provide stability.

It is for us to make it clear also that progress is the alternative to communism and that the more we can cut down the potential base of communism in human misery, the less we will have to spend in fighting communism where it takes hold.

Aid is sterile unless it is accompanied by reform. Reform, at least in Asia, is impossible through democratic procedures without aid. Both go together and, within limits, a policy of supporting reform can reduce the amount of aid necessary to halt communism.

Aid means military aid, and economic aid.

No Congressman will be caught voting against military appropriations. But very few will support President Truman's request for $4,000,000,000 in economic aid this year.

That is because we have failed to demonstrate that economic aid to our allies is as vital to our own security as military weapons.

In Asia today, living standards are falling, the situation is getting out of hand. At such a moment time is of the essence. Roughly, this is true:

The sooner we give aid, the more we can stress economic as against military aid and the less we will have to give.

The longer we delay aid, the more we will have to stress military assistance, including manpower, and the more we will have to give in order to retrieve a situation that is drifting out of control.

Aid, as I said, is part of the story. The rest is reform. We cannot easily explain democracy to Asian peoples unable to read or write. But if we can make it clear to the great majority of Asians that democracy means that the farmer owns his land, then democracy will take roots. This year the Government of the United States should declare that land reform is official United States policy, calling for land reform in feudal economies, supporting land reform in nations like India, where representative governments lack the means to carry their own sound programs out. That step alone can save untold resources and lives in our long struggle against Communist revolution that poses as reform.

Fourth, we must keep our own democracy moving forward.

That means strengthening the economic and social and spiritual foundations of our society that endures because it is stable and just and free.

The struggle we are waging is a long enduring struggle. If its duration were this year and next year only we could afford waste and luxury, and time misspent in snipping pennies from the luncheons given to school kids, and the social-security benefits paid to our old people. But this struggle is a long one, and if it means years in which the military budget is a hundred billion dollars or more we must confront the real problems—first of raising production in order to maintain living standards, secondly in preventing the continued erosion of our standards of education and welfare.

We must raise productivity, and we must share what we have. Roosevelt was disgusted with the inadequacy of the excess-profits tax he was given in the last war. How would he feel about today's tax which allows our corporations 60 percent more in excess profits than they earned in the profit-rich years of the last war?

A just society means a society that justly shares its burdens. It means also a society in which all participate. Today our Government is being turned over to the direction of one group—the manufacturers. We need their skills. But we need also the skills of labor. American labor is bitter today at the lack of realization of its problems in our representative Government. And unless labor feels that its voice is raised in the councils of government, its voice will be raised instead on the picket lines of costly strikes. We cannot afford that kind of disunity at home.

A free society means a society that gains strength and wisdom through tolerance and compassion. Freedom after all is not a relic of a bygone age, to be laid on the shelf as a sentimental keepsake. Freedom is the means by which a democratic society cleanses itself of forces of corruption and greed and selfishness and incompetence that threaten all human societies. Those forces exist in every society and unless they are exposed they multiply. They are exposed when society itself protests the right of its citizens to protest. When that right is withdrawn, far too often today, the efficient functioning of a free society is immediately imperiled. After all we are no greater in resources and manpower than our enemies. Freedom is our one unique weapon. If we forsake it to play the Russians at their own game of suppression we are lost. They play that game so much better than the worst of our intolerant men.

Last, we must stand for great ideas.

We cannot pretend that the burden of rearmament is easy to bear. We cannot deny that the outlook for generations is dark. For every one of us, the prospect of war is fearful. For our allies, living on the margins of misery, and under the shadow of the Soviet armies, facing again the horrors of bombardment and occupation, the future seems far worse.

Yet we have no alternative but to face our common future, and affirm our common destiny.

Behind the iron curtain, enslaved peoples face the same future. They go on working for their masters because they have no choice. The peril and the glory of freedom is that it offers free peoples a choice. We can be sure that they will make the right choice, whatever the cost, only if survival holds out to them the vision of a world of happiness and opportunity and lasting peace for their children or their grandchildren if not for themselves. Only the vision of a better world at the end of this struggle will give embattled peoples the strength to shoulder today's burden and to struggle forward.

Roosevelt knew that when he founded the United Nations during the darkest hours of Bataan. Churchill knew it and the knowledge summed up his greatness. "Those who serve supreme causes," Churchill said, "do not consider what they can get, but what they can give."

If we see communism simply as a threat, then we may be overwhelmed by communism in one form or another.

If we see communism as a challenge, then we can overcome that challenge, and in overcoming it we can make this time of

sweat and agony a time of advance toward a new time of peace.

The answer lies not in our governments or our leaders or our allies. It lies in every one of us. It is a challenge to every one of us. We can meet the challenge by working harder, by giving more, by taking less, by holding to our faith, and by joining together, in continuous, organized, disciplined action, in militant liberal groups like Americans for Democratic Action, knowing that only this extra effort as citizens can make all our other efforts worth while.

We all know that at heart. That is why we have met together tonight. We have met, not to mourn Roosevelt, but to draw from his life of service and his spirit of dedication, a new inspiration for ourselves: As Justice Holmes once said:

"At the grave of a hero we end, not in sorrow at the inevitable loss, but with a kind of fierce joy; and with the contagion of his courage we go back to the fight."

Thirty-third Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

The United States can well be proud of the fact that it was one of the sponsors of the re-creation of a free and independent Lithuania after the conclusion of World War I in 1918.

In the 20 years that followed, the people of Lithuania, through a progressive, liberal, and democratic government, and through its achievements in the field of education, social justice, and industry, have well established their right to a place in the family of free nations.

Unfortunately, Lithuania, just as Poland and other countries beyond the iron curtain, became the victim of Nazi aggression in 1939.

And just as in the case of Poland, after the Nazi invaders were defeated, Lithuania was trampled under the equally cruel and ruthless foot of the Communist Soviet invader. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanian victims have been brutally murdered or lost in concentration camps.

But the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people lives on. They continue to fight for their freedom and the freedom of the world.

I think it is entirely fitting and proper that we pause on this day to consider the plight of these Lithuanian people and of the freedom-loving people beyond the iron curtain.

In our search for a formula to establish world peace we cannot fail to resolve to include restoration of full independence and liberty to them as an essential and indispensable condition, without which there can be no hope for a just and permanent peace.

Aged and Disabled Retired Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to the President by John H. Hoeppel, founder of National Defense magazine, making an impassioned plea for more consideration for aged and disabled retired enlisted men. Inflation has taken a heavy toll from all in this country including veterans who are on fixed compensation. This is the source of most of the trouble about which this letter complains. It is addressed to the President, but it should have been addressed to Congress as well, and that is my reason, Mr. President, for asking permission to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMANDER IN CHIEF: In the interests of fair dealing to the aged and disabled retired enlisted men of the armed services who are today victims of discrimination and the increasing lower standard of living due to increased prices and higher taxes, we respectfully appeal to you to consider the following statement of facts—and if you feel as we do that they merit your consideration, will you please forward this letter to the Secretary of Defense recommending to that Office that the discriminations and injustices here complained of be corrected through legislation?

We have every confidence in the Congress of the United States to deal fairly and squarely with the aged and disabled retired enlisted men of the armed services if you as Commander in Chief and the National Defense Department will make the proper recommendations to the committees of the Senate and House on the Armed Services.

First and foremost, we ask your kind attention to the desperate plight of thousands of aged and disabled retired enlisted men in the lower pay categories who today are not receiving sufficient to live because of the depreciated dollar which buys ever and ever less.

We repeat, there are thousands of aged and disabled retired enlisted men, all of them veterans of an American war, who received $89.25 per month retired pay in in 1922 and who today receive only $96.25 per month retired pay. In other words, in the last 28 years these men have received only $7 per month increase in retired pay. If you will compare the cost of living in 1922 and the increase in taxes of at least 1,000 percent since that period, you can readily see that the income of these men is down to the vanishing point and that they are not far removed, especially if they have dependents, from the standpoint of charity.

Five different times industrial workers have received an increase in pay since World War II. So much so that many of them are today receiving 100 to 200 percent more pay than they received in 1940. Our industrial workers and civil-service workers have received substantial increases as here shown above that of thousands of retired enlisted men of long service.

An economist, writing in today's press, directing our attention to the vanishment in purchasing power of the dollar, stated with a presentation of concise figures that unless an individual today received 270 percent more pay than he did in 1935 that then such individual was a victim of our own shrinking economic policy. We are not qualified perhaps to compare this economist's analysis but we do know that with the exception of one group of retired enlisted men, all of them today are immeasurably in more desperate straits with the small increase which they receive than they ever were when compared with the retired pay they received in the yesterdays.

Illustrative of this, we mention that an enlisted man of the first grade received $133.87 per month in 1922. Today, his taxes have increased approximately 1,000 percent and with living costs up 200 or 300 percent, the same man today receives $220.50 per month. In other words, his living standards have been immeasurably and pathetically reduced. The foregoing comparison was made in respect to the first grade where their pay is highest. The comparison with men in the lower grades would show that virtually all of them have suffered an inordinate lowering of living standards so much so that ere long some of them will become—if not now—objects of charity.

At the moment Congress is deliberating on paying $50 per month combat pay in addition to foreign-duty pay for all enlisted men who are in the combat area in Korea. We offer no objection; rather, we heartily approve this proposal. However, those of us who served in combat in two to five wars and who were never considered for combat pay and who since our retirement have continued to be discriminated against because of apathy and indifference on the part of the department heads, we are not asking for retroactive combat pay but we do ask for a square deal so that our retired pay may be in keeping (measured in purchasing power) with the dollar which we received when we were retired after 30 years of creditable and honorable service. All industrial workers and public employees have recently received cost-of-living bonuses, and even Congress itself, not ignoring yourself, received substantial increases in pay, much of it income tax exempt, while those of us who served our Nation in combat abroad are thus far ignored for a cost-of-living bonus and we are even denied a square deal in the computation of our longevity pay which we gained fighting our Nation's battles abroad. We especially appeal to you to recommend to the Department of Defense that all retired enlisted men receive at least a cost-of-living increase of $20 per month. The coal miners recently received approximately $30 per month which was about the *n*th increase they have received since 1940. We have no criticism to make of this, but we do feel that those of us who faced bullets and who won Uncle Sam's battles in the yesterdays are entitled to be relieved from poverty today, due to the rapidly diminishing purchasing power of the dollar, and the addition of proportionate tax which is levied on a man whose income is only $600 per annum.

We further urge you as Commander in Chief to remove the abject discrimination practiced against individuals who are penalized under the provisions of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, because they had the ability and efficiency to be promoted during World War I. All such individuals who were promoted to commissioned rank have been denied longevity pay for their double time while at the same time men with whom they served in the yesterdays receive longevity pay

for their double time in all instances where they didn't have the ability or experience to be promoted to commissioned rank. We ask, Is it fair to penalize men who gained double time side by side to give one longevity pay for double time and to deny it to another because he was promoted to command men during the war?

The discriminations under which the retired enlisted men of the Army have suffered, unfortunately, are extensive and we are reluctant to take your time to call your attention to them, but we will conclude this appeal to you with a further statement and a request, to wit: Do you think it is fair and honest that an enlisted man of the Navy who never served in war and with only 16 years' experience, that such enlisted man should be treated free in a Navy hospital while at the same time an Army enlisted man with 30 years' service who served in combat in two or more wars should be forced to pay for hospitalisation in an Army hospital even though the disabilities for which he requires service are of combat origin? This abject, inhuman, and unfair discrimination along with the others described above are a matter of official record.

Will you kindly, as Commander in Chief, deal as fairly and squarely with those of us retired as you are seeking to deal with those now serving in Korea today? We believe that you will do this and it is with this degree of confidence that we conclude our appeal, thanking you for your consideration to this and wishing you well in your service to our Nation for a better America.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL DEFENSE MAGAZINE,
By JOHN H. HOEPPEL, *Founder*.

Chiang Kai-shek Should Be Permitted To Open a Second Front in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Kings County Republican Committee at Brooklyn, N. Y., on Monday evening, February 12, 1951:

It is a privilege to join tonight in this tribute to the great and noble spirit of Abraham Lincoln. It is an especial privilege to do so here in Brooklyn, a community of good will, good people, good homes, good churches—and the Dodgers. In this great Borough of Brooklyn lies a great cross section of families and homes that in themselves are a monument to the freedom and individual dignity for which Lincoln fought and died.

In Lincoln breathed the hopes and prayers of ordinary people like ourselves in all parts of the world. His uncompromising opposition to human slavery gave birth to a new political party which has served this Nation well through generations of constant development and progress.

Today, after 90 years of political service, the Republican Party still is the only party of freedom in these United States. It is still the only party which steadfastly has refused to accept the alien doctrines of socialism and communism, either in part or in whole.

Across this land of ours, the American people, weary of the trend toward a total state, have come to realize more and more that the lone champion of the basic freedoms that have made America great is the Republican Party. And they are going to translate that belief into action and elect a Republican Congress and a Republican President in 1952?

And why shouldn't they? Is there a person within the range of my voice who does not realize deep inside him that something is fundamentally wrong with the Democratic leadership in Washington? Is there anybody within the range of my voice who does not fervently hope that out of the election in 1952 will come an administration possessing the basic characteristics that made Abraham Lincoln great—intelligence of purpose, unflinching devotion to ideals, and, above all else, the courage to carry out what the brain and heart and soul dictate?

It is the great tragedy of our day that in a period of crisis we have an administration in Washington which is so bankrupt in leadership that its first measurement of every undertaking is whether it will help perpetuate those in power. Votes have become the yardstick of their policies.

This is not the true spirit nor the wisdom of our fine American heritage. And I am proud to stand here and tell you tonight that there are patriotic Democrats in and out of Congress, in and out of government, who tell me with the deepest sincerity that the only way to save America, the only way to achieve the leadership we so desperately need, is by a landslide Republican victory next year.

We welcome Democrats and independents everywhere to this crusade. Our task far transcends party lines.

The great issue before the world today—an issue so vital that it affects every man, woman, and child on earth—is: Which will triumph, the forces of Marxism as embodied in communism and socialism, or the free principles of liberty and individual dignity of man which our civilization has evolved out of 3,000 years of experience?

Shall it be the godless materialism of Marx, or the idealism instilled in us by the religious teachings of all faiths?

Shall it be the police state that triumphs, or shall political systems that recognize the essential dignity of man emerge victorious?

Shall we become the victims of secret police, or shall we walk the earth as free men fearing no one but God?

Shall our homes and our churches be liquidated, or shall the morality of the family and the basic religious teachings survive, mightier than ever?

Those are the questions. To meet them we must not only possess the finest qualities of spirit and the maximum of wisdom, but we must be able to translate those qualifications into practical action.

Let us apply ourselves tonight to examining the situation we are now in. Here briefly is what we see:

Since the end of World War II, due principally to the use of armed might and the tactics of infiltration, and due also to the incredible policies which the United States and other free nations have followed, the Soviet Union has managed to expand its domination from 170,000,000 people to 800,000,000 people. In other words, almost without firing a shot, Communist Russia in five so-called peacetime years has increased its domination fivefold over human beings and now physically controls half of Europe and half of Asia and threatens the other halves on both continents. That is fact No. 1.

The free countries, on the other hand, devoid of the guile and immorality which the Communists practice, have failed to produce the political weapons necessary to match the unprincipled tactics of the Soviet Union. True, ECA has been devised as a weapon, and it has had some success, but it has not been enough by any means. Our counterpropaganda, a political weapon so effectively used by the Soviet Union, has been long on quantity and pitifully short on quality. Our programs of technical assistance and capital loans have operated in dubious fashion and have not proved too effective. In short, we have permitted ourselves to be completely outmaneuvered in the employment of political weapons. That is fact No. 2.

Finally, while Russia has spent the last 5 years increasing its armed might, the free countries, and particularly the United States, have been busily engaged in reducing their military strength. In our own country, the record must show that the Republican Eightieth Congress passed laws directing the President of the United States to build the Air Force up to 70 groups, to strengthen the Marine Corps, and to broaden naval aviation by the construction of a super aircraft carrier. But unfortunately, the administration had other plans. These plans called for the armed services to be reduced, and by the President's own directive countermanding the action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Air Force was held to 48 groups, the Marine Corps was virtually consigned to oblivion, and construction of the super aircraft carrier, on which $4,000,000 already had been spent, was ordered halted by the White House in 1949.

The Republican Eightieth Congress, by passage of the Vandenberg resolution, laid the groundwork for the military assistance program, and the Eightieth Congress also voted funds over administration protests to send arms to the anti-Communist Chinese Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The military assistance program was commenced, but unfortunately the military aid that the administration permitted to reach the anti-Communist Chinese Government of the generalissimo was far short of what was needed—in fact, it was pitifully small. But that is not all. Because we had fuzzy-minded, pinko officials in our security setup, the Soviet Union was able to steal the secrets of the atomic and the hydrogen bombs. To sum up, Russia and its satellites have spent the last 5 years in an enormous armament program while the United States and the other free nations were disarming. That is fact No. 3.

No one regrets the Korean conflict more than the American people. But despite its terrific cost, Korea has finally awakened the world and certainly the United States to the fact that the Communist conspiracy is essentially a conspiracy employing deception and armed might. So, we are rearming—rearming at greatly increased cost to the United States and the free nations everywhere. The Air Force is at last being built to 70 groups, and construction of a superaircraft carrier has finally been started all over again. The Army is being expanded. The Marine Corps is coming back into its own. The Navy is being taken out of the mothballs.

I ask you—could it be that the Republican Eightieth Congress was right after all?

We long ago learned that no Nation can suddenly launch a huge rearmament program without throwing its entire economy badly out of joint. Because that is a fact, the administration found it necessary to seek, and Congress to vote, the imposition of wartime economic controls. So, once more America is plagued by arbitrary controls administered by political favorites and White House errand boys. Once more we are burdened with bureaucratic red tape, high prices, and shortages.

I think I can be pardoned for what I am about to say. Had the directives and policies of the Republican Eightieth Congress been followed instead of sabotaged, the Korean conflict might never have happened, wartime controls and sky-high taxes might

not be with us, and the world crisis which now exists might have been averted.

Now, let us examine what we are doing today from a practical standpoint.

We appear to have solidified our position along the Han River in the vicinity of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. That theater occupies approximately 200,000 of our troops, with Japan as a base of operations.

On Formosa to the south, the recognized Government of the Republic of China, headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, still holds out, together with its anti-Communist army of 600,000 troops. Despite the fact that the only Government of China that we officially recognize is the generalissimo's government, the administration in Washington refuses to back the generalissimo and his fighting forces. In fact, President Truman in his official announcement on Korea on June 27, 1950, declared that we were sending the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to prevent any more air and sea operations by the generalissimo's forces against the Chinese Reds, thus inactivating the 600,000 troops on the island.

On the Chinese mainland, anti-Communist guerrilla bands continue to make raids on the Chinese Reds. Approximately 1,500,000 anit-Communist Chinese guerrillas are engaged in these sorties.

In French Indochina, a so-called volunteer Communist army, composed substantially of Chinese Reds, engages a French force. The French have approximately 150,000 fighting men operating in that area.

In the balance of Asia, the operations of the Chinese Reds are a constant threat to the security of Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Pakistan, and India.

In Europe the forces of the Soviet Union and its puppet states are comparatively quiescent. However, military men are generally in agreement that the Soviet Union, with its 200 Red army divisions, could roll all the way to the English Channel on the west and to the Pyrenees on the south unless a miraculous rearmament program were undertaken by the free nations of Europe. At the present time, the free nations of the world combined could not muster more than 60 divisions to stop a Soviet advance in continental Europe.

Two nations in Europe are on the outside looking in. Yugoslavia, a former satellite, has broken with the Soviet Union, and Tito casts an occasional friendly glance at the western powers. Spain, the guardian of the Pyrenees and one of the strongest military powers in Europe today, remains isolated from the free nations, anti-Communist though the Franco regime is.

That briefly is the practical situation. Just where do we go from here?

Apparently it is the aim of the administration in Washington, as it has been for the past 5 years, to put our eggs in the European basket. We are told that American troops should be put on the continent of Europe. We are at this moment sending more and more military supplies to the members of the North Atlantic community. We are sending food to Tito. We are in consultation with the governments of Western Europe and their military leaders.

Everyone knows that we must have an effective aid program for Europe. Everyone knows that we must not, if we can possibly prevent it, allow the resources and productive capacity of the free European nations to fall into Communist control. It is essential to have a program that meets this problem.

But I protest with every resource at my command the formulation of any over-all strategy which virtually ignores the focal point of our trouble today—Asia. And I might add that Republicans in countless numbers, myself included, have been protesting such a policy, such a strategy, for years. Our protests date all the way back to 1948 when the first secret decisions were reached by the administration in Washington to give its blessings to the Chinese Communists as a political force in the Orient, as opposed to our great ally, the established government of the Republic of China.

How many Americans recall that on December 15, 1945, President Truman publicly announced to the world that unless the Republic of China admitted Chinese Reds to its government, American aid would be cut off? How many Americans recall that the aid was cut off and that General Marshall was sent to China to make sure that the troops of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek stopped their attacks on the Chinese Reds? How many Americans recall the protests against this policy made by such outstanding experts as General Wedemeyer, Patrick J. Hurley, and William C. Bullitt? How many people recall that General MacArthur declared that our failure to help the Republic of China may be "the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States"?

Stop and think.

We abandoned the anti-Communist forces of Asia once, and the Reds took over China. Are we going to make that same mistake twice?

America has suffered 50,000 casualties in Korea. Mr. Truman says we are going to stay in Korea.

Are we going to leave 200,000 American boys stranded in Korea? Or does some master planner think the pressure can be taken off them by deploying other hundreds of thousands of American boys to the scene in Europe?

If we really want to take the pressure off our forces in Korea, and if we want to diminish the threat of a Soviet sweep across Europe, why, may I ask, do we not employ the 600,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa?

There is no question whatsoever about the desire and the eagerness of the generalissimo and his troops to join in battle against the Chinese Reds. When the Korean conflict broke out, the generalissimo, within a week, offered to transport immediately 33,000 troops from Formosa to Korea. We turned him down cold.

Why?

Our State Department claimed that we did not want to antagonize the Chinese Reds and bring them into the conflict.

Well, the generalissimo's troops are still on Formosa, but our boys have been fighting the Chinese Reds since last November.

The State Department's reasoning is no longer valid today, if it was ever valid.

What could be sounder logic, both strategically and militarily, than to allow the anti-Communist forces of the generalissimo on Formosa to participate in the war against the Chinese Reds? Why not let them open a second front in Asia?

Let us consider the possibilities:

First, there is good reason to believe that the Chinese Reds could not support a two-front war. They have neither the railroads nor the highways nor the transportation to supply a force fighting in Korea and another on the Chinese mainland, where presumably the troops of the generalissimo would infiltrate if we gave them the necessary material aid.

Second, there is excellent reason to believe that if the generalissimo's 600,000 fighting men reached the mainland of China tomorrow, they would double the size of their army within six to eight weeks by the addition of anti-Communist guerrilla forces already fighting the Reds in South China.

Third, the opening up of a second front on the Chinese mainland by the forces of the established government of China, operating from Formosa, would not only take the pressure off our forces in Korea, but would reduce the pressure on the French in Indochina and the Communist threat to Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Pakistan, India, and Europe.

Fourth, according to responsible military opinion—yes, right in our own Pentagon—the establishment of a second front on China's mainland by the armies of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is not only feasible and practical with aid from us, but it would be the cheapest operation that we could promote in the terms of dollars and manpower.

The forces of the Generalissimo are mostly battle tested, and they are as well trained as the Chinese Reds. Their needs to make a second-front operation successful fall mainly in the categories of ammunition, transportation, planes, tanks, and food. The Generalissimo has planes and tanks, but he would need more. The Generalissimo has a navy, but it needs replacement parts and servicing.

Whether the second front would be opened up by an invasion of the mainland or whether it would be built up by a series of commando raids and night landings would depend on the number and strength of the Chinese Red forces in that area. For such purposes the Generalissimo already has assembled miscellaneous craft, but his operations would be much more successful if the United States provided amphibious craft, landing barges, and PT boats.

In addition, it would be desirable to have American experts to help train the Generalissimo's officers and men. Shipments of food—a critical item in Asia—would be a prime necessity.

What kind of logic is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea when, by shipping the proper supplies to the Generalissimo, a second front could be opened in China without a single GI being forced to place a foot on the soil of the Chinese mainland?

Certainly, if the Soviet Union can employ its puppet states to fight its wars even against their will, then the United States can call on its friends who are not only willing but begging for the opportunity.

Certainly we want a united and militarily strong Europe. Certainly we are willing to provide equipment and possibly some of the manpower necessary to achieve that goal.

But let us not place all our eggs in the European basket. Let us remember that we have friends in Asia and that we are fighting a war in Asia at this very moment.

If it is right for American boys to fight Chinese Reds in Korea, what can be wrong with American help to the anti-Communist Chinese fighting the Reds on their own soil?

What are we in Korea for, to win or to lose?

If we are in Korea to win, then we should do everything possible to bring that victory about. If we are not in Korea to win, then this administration should be indicted for the murder of thousands of American boys.

Some persons may ask: If a second front in Asia can be opened at very small cost to ourselves and without employing American troops, why haven't our generals done it?

The answer is that we do have military people who favor the employment of the anti-Communist forces of the Republic of China. There is good reason to believe that General MacArthur favors such an operation. There is good reason to believe that there are people in the Pentagon who favor such an operation.

Why hasn't a second front been opened? The reason is that the State Department is preventing it, the same State Department crowd that cut off aid to the Government of China back in 1946, thus allowing China to fall into Communist hands. Can anyone expect the State Department to admit 5 years too late that it was wrong? Can anyone expect the State Department to accept the blame for the fact that American boys are now being killed by Chinese Reds?

No; the State Department, as now constituted, is never going to permit a single soldier from Formosa to participate. Why? Because it would mean that the State Department would finally have to admit that we should have supported Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek all along.

If we want to develop a true global strategy that will wipe out the Communist threat of world domination, if we want a strategy that will save Europe and save Asia at the same time, if we want a strategy that will help save American lives not only in Korea, but wherever the next so-called police action may occur, then I say to you that we must clean out the State Department from top to bottom, starting with Dean Acheson.

The master planners in the Kremlin have had their eyé on Asia for a quarter of a century. All anyone has to do is to read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Daily Worker. William Z. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Daily Worker on December 2, 1945, "the war in China is the key of all problems on the international front."

Hitler in Mein Kampf stated emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation. Tojo knew that Asia was the key to the world situation. Military strategists of many governments have declared the same thing time and time again.

Almost everybody knows it except our State Department.

Time is running out in Asia. How long do you think 1,500,000 anti-Communist guerrillas can hold out against superior forces? How long will it be before the bottoms rust out of Chiang Kai-shek's small navy? How long will it be before his guns, tanks, and planes are completely outmoded? How long will it be before the Chinese Reds have perfected their defenses to such an extent as to make a second front impossible?

No; time is not on our side. If we permit the State Department's bankrupt policies to prevail, time will have run out completely, while more thousands of American boys die on foreign soil.

The people of Greece will never forget that the shipment of 50 of our Navy's Helldiver bombers was their salvation back in 1946. Those 50 planes, together with only three American military men to train Greek fliers, and a mere handful of mechanics to teach the Greeks to service the planes, turned the tide against the Communist forces in Greece.

Certainly, if we could afford to gamble in Greece and achieve such wonderful results, we can afford to take a chance on Formosa.

A little can go a long way if it is effectively applied. Successful policies are not measured in billions of dollars, millions of foot soldiers, and thousands of planes. The true measure is how effectively those dollars, those men, and those planes are employed. Nor is the measure of good government its multitude of controls and edicts, or the scarcities and hardships it imposes, or the lavishness of its spending and the harshness of its taxes.

Don't you think it is about time Washington learned that?

Yes, in this crisis, we need leadership and sound policies as we have never needed them before. As Americans, everyone of us must act in the full meaning of good citizenship. We must look to the year of 1952 for deliverance. It is up to every American to help obtain this leadership by promoting widespread discussion of the issues and the most careful selection of political candidates in both parties. Each of us can help; each of us should participate to the utmost.

As we near the end of this day of tribute to Abraham Lincoln, let us borrow from his wisdom, his simple principles and his frugality. Let us remember that it was the clear, high-principled thinking of Lincoln that saved this Union, and let us realize that without clarity of thought, without actions based on fundamental principles, without the moral values that he embraced, we cannot save the world we live in.

We have more than an opportunity. We have a duty. God grant us the wisdom and the strength to perform it.

Truman Did Not Exceed His Power in Sending Armed Forces to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in Congress and in the press about the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. On January 12 I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A113 a statement of my own in which I reviewed briefly my own views on the constitutional and military powers of the President.

One of the outstanding editors of my district, Wallace E. Sherlock, of Fairfield, Iowa, wrote an excellent editorial January 17 expressing his views of the President's powers, just prior to receiving the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my remarks.

I am including Mr. Sherlock's editorial and editor's note which appeared in the Fairfield Daily Ledger of Wednesday, January 24:

TRUMAN DID NOT EXCEED HIS POWER IN SENDING ARMED FORCES TO KOREA

There is much interest being aroused whether the President has the lawful right to send our troops into foreign countries without an act of the Congress. As we count the pros and cons, it appears to us that the cons are in the majority. However, we are convinced the pros have the better of the argument.

The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, and, unless the Congress enacts laws to the contrary, the President has the right to do about as he pleases with the Army.

As we read constitutional history, the Congress is superior to the President, but the latter can act in emergencies that relate to foreign affairs, especially military affairs, when the Congress fails to act or is not in session so it can act quickly. Of course, the President is supposed to follow precedents.

In defense of the proposition that the Congress is superior to the President, we need only to cite, as our first reason, the fact that the drafters of the Constitution provided for the legislative department of our Government first in that document. At that time, the Representatives were to be elected by the people and the Senators were to be chosen by the State legislatures.

The people were to be the sovereign power under the Constitution. Certain powers were given the House of Representatives that were not even given the Senate, because, as provided then, the Members of the House of Representatives were the only national officials who were elected by a direct vote of the people. An example is the provision that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

That the Congress was to be considered superior to the President is proven by such statements in the Constitution. It was to have the power, by a two-thirds vote, to pass an act over the President's veto; it has power to coin money and regulate the value thereof; to establish post offices and post roads; to declare war, and make rules concerning captures on land and sea; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and other powers.

The expressed powers of the President are limited. The two important powers are the right to veto laws enacted by the Congress and the power vested in him as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The Constitution does not go into detail as to the extent of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The Constitution does give the Congress the power to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide for and maintain a Navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces. If the Congress fails to make these rules, then the President in emergencies has the right as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to use the Army and Navy without waiting for Congress. So far as we can gather from reading constitutional and military histories, the Congress never has set up these rules—either general or specific.

The late President and late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court William Howard Taft is on record as saying: "The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. Under this (provision of the Constitution) he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation.

"Of course, this instrumentality which this power furnishes, gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly in effect.

"Under the Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and the Navy, the President can take action such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no option but to declare it or recognize its existence."

Mr. Taft went on to point out cases in which the President used the Army and Navy in foreign countries without waiting for the consent of the Congress. He cited the acts of Polk in ordering the Army into the disputed territory between the Nueces and Rio Grande Rivers which brought on the Mexican War.

There are numerous cases in United States history when the Presidents sent the Army and/or Navy into foreign areas without the consent of the Congress. Some of the countries invaded requested the presence of our armies—others did not.

There was the Nicaraguan case under Taft's administration. We landed a part of our Army in Vera Cruz in Mexico to bring the Huerta administration to its senses. President Wilson sent our Army into Mexico just before World War I.

Then there was the landing of our Army in China during the Boxer Rebellion under the McKinley administration. We could cite a number of other cases where similar acts have been committed by Presidents of the United States.

We are not writing these lines to defend President Truman for his invasion of Korea or his proposal to send a large force into Western Europe without asking the Congress for a declaration of war. But we are saying that he has had plenty of precedents.

But we are reviewing that part of our American history to impress on the Congress the importance of setting up some general rules to control under such circumstances.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The above editorial was written January 17, but we have not had the space for it till today. Since writing it, we have received daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD No. 7, volume 97, and we find on page A115 an extension of remarks of our own Congressman THOMAS E. MARTIN on this same subject.

Mr. MARTIN takes much the same stand we have taken above. He says among other

statements: "President Truman had the authority and power under section 2 of article II of our Constitution to order American troops into Korea.

"The President's obligation and liability for national security as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces necessarily leaves to him the matter of determining how far he must go within his powers to fulfill that obligation unless so limited by Congress."

Mr. MARTIN goes on to say: "Unless Congress places restrictions and limitations on the use to be made of the Armed Forces of the United States before additional troops are sent to Europe, the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces undoubtedly has the power to send additional Armed Forces to Europe even though he intends them to operate there as a part of a great international army.

"The power of Congress extends to all legislation essential to the prosecution of a war with vigor and success, except such as interferes with the command of the forces and the conduct of the campaigns."

We may add to Mr. MARTIN'S statements that if Congress fails to act then "the sky is the limit" for the President.

Vice President Barkley Receives 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following account of the presentation of the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award to Vice President BARKLEY by the National Committee for Labor Israel:

On Wednesday, February 7, 1951, at 11 a.m., leaders of the National Committee for Labor Israel met in the office of the Vice President at the Senate Office Building, to present to Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award. The committee headed by its general chairman, Joseph Schlossberg, included Isaac Hamlin, general secretary, Harry Greenberg and Joseph Breslaw, vice presidents of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union (A. F. of L.), and Charles M. Segal, a director of the National Committee for Labor Israel.

In a tribute to the Vice President, Mr. Schlossberg said:

"Mr. Vice President, as chairman of the National Committee for Labor Israel, it is a pleasure to present to you the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award in recognition of your selfless and devoted aid to the State of Israel and the Histadrut, the General Federation of Jewish Workers.

"Your efforts on behalf of the new state of Israel have done much to create the proper climate for the understanding of all people of the struggle of Israel for the preservation not only of its own life and future, but of the democratic principles which we as Americans hold so dear.

"The present international unrest underscores only too dramatically the urgent need of preserving democratic institutions in the world today. We consider Israel a vital flank in our fight against totalitarian aggression, and in view of this, we deem it of the utmost importance that Americans continue to give wholehearted support to the Jewish state and to its democratic instruments.

"Mr. Vice President, you have labored hard to support the cause of Israel and the Histadrut, which has laid the very foundation for the Jewish State. You have brought the message of Israel and freedom and democracy to the people of America, and in so doing you have made a great contribution to the very life of Israel.

"In presenting you with the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award we wish you health and many more years to continue your indispensable efforts on behalf of the United States and freedom and democracy everywhere."

The Vice President replied:

"Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of gratitude that I accept from you the 1950 Histadrut Humanitarian Award. I could not claim that anything I have done merits this distinction from you and from your committee. Nevertheless, I deeply appreciate the generous spirit which has constrained you and your organization to bestow this award upon me. I thank you and them for the distinct honor which you do me today.

"Whatever I have done in behalf of the freedom of Israel and the Jewish people who have found and are finding it a haven for applied democracy, I have done because I believe profoundly in democracy and in the ideals of free government for all people. The creation of the new State of Israel seems almost a miracle of our period. It came earlier than most people expected. I am happy that our Government, through the President, was the first to recognize it, and that our Government sponsored its admission to the United Nations.

"I am especially proud to be the recipient of this award because of its meaning in connection with labor Israel. All my life I have labored and sympathized with those who labor. All my life I have sought to advance the welfare of those who labor, and to recognize their worth in any democratic system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity.

"The recognition of this service by the State of Israel and by the friends of Israel is a fitting companion to their recognition of the individual rights of man and the dignity which men may attain under free institutions.

"It is needless for me to say that I wish for your organization, the Histadrut, the greatest possible success in its worthy efforts. I wish for the State of Israel permanent and increasing stability, and I wish for all the people who may find rescue and refuge under its institutions not only life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but that they may overtake happiness and clutch it to their bosoms as a part of their way of life.

"Again, let me thank you for this great honor which you have done me."

The UNESCO Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—is a UN agency devoted to the promotion of better understanding among the peoples of the earth through education and the interchange of ideas. Appended hereto is the foreword to the publication the UNESCO story and the preamble to the constitution of UNESCO, which outline the fields of work in which this international organization is engaging:

FOREWORD

The story of UNESCO is one of a great crusade for international understanding, based on the belief that cooperation and good will among the peoples of the world can be a deciding force in the search for a lasting peace.

UNESCO's high ideals and principles are expressed in the preamble to its constitution. To make their achievement a reality instead of a dream, however, its member nations must fashion a practical program on which the peoples of the world can work together. That is UNESCO's primary challenge today.

Each member nation faces another responsibility: providing information on UNESCO's program and objectives to its own citizens and making plain how communities, organizations, and individuals can contribute to them.

The UNESCO story embraces such long-range ambitions as teaching the illiterate half of the world to read and write—other far-reaching projects to raise standards of living which only the resources of governments can carry out—combating ignorance and prejudice throughout the world, freeing the minds of men.

It is a story of cooperation being fostered among nations and among great organizations, national and international, and of the contributions of leaders in education, science, and culture. But it also is the story of the things ordinary citizens of a fortunate land can do to help those in other lands to share in the progress of civilization, of what a community in any country can do toward playing its part in world affairs.

The UNESCO story in the United States, if told in terms of UNESCO objectives, is that of the great civic, religious, and student organizations which have sent medical missions and educational aid to war-devastated countries, and of scores of foundations and universities which have helped rebuild institutions and equip laboratories.

It is that of educators and scientists and writers seeking ways to better understanding, and of thousands of American teachers and youths who have gone abroad as ambassadors of good will. It is the story of courses on UNESCO and its objectives in scores of colleges and schools and of movements to end intolerance in our own cities and towns. It is a story to which hundreds of communities and groups are adding chapters day by day—of a little western town which staged an international festival in which half of its citizens participated and which drew 2,000 people from the surrounding countryside; of a grand piano sent to the Athens Symphony by music clubs; of an American children's art exhibit in a Japanese school; of thousands of groups in our own country trying to understand the problems and ways of the peoples of other lands.

UNESCO makes no claim to credit for all these activities. Most of them started in the United States through organizations which believed in the UNESCO idea before UNESCO got fairly under way. The UNESCO contribution has been to expand them and give them a firmer foundation for the future—and to point up new objectives. It is the achievements of these organizations, and the deep desire of individual citizens to take part in efforts seeking world cooperation and peace, that underlie the strength of the UNESCO program in this country today.

PREAMBLE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF UNESCO

The governments of the states parties to this Constitution on behalf of their peoples declare—

That, since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed;

That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war;

That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races;

That the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

Enlistment of 18-Year-Old Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 15 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress, official publication of the International Reform Federation, before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on January 31, 1951, which was published in the February 1951 issue of Progress.

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

SHALL WE ENLIST 18-YEAR-OLDS?

(Statement by the editor, Clinton N. Howard, before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, January 31, 1951, in opposition to the enlistment of 18-year-old boys)

Mr. Chairman, I am a "peace-i-fist," but when might challenges right I am a pacifist as were my fathers before me who belonged to the plain people of Pennsylvania. On one occasion when a boy of 10 I dined with my father in a public house where an old-fashioned dinner bell was rung in and around the house to call the help, hands, and guests who came tumbling in like hungry hounds.

TURNING OTHER CHEEK

My father was a rural reverend and sat at the table with his broad-brimmed hat on. A rude fellow of the baser sort rebuked his table manners, asking him whether he wore a crock when he cut his hair. He also inquired why he did not remove his hat when he "et." My father explained that he never uncovered except in the presence of his superior. The diner rejoined offensively. Father replied, "Friend, my name is Howard. What is thy name?" He replied, "My name is Bell." Said my peace-i-fist father, "Friend Bell, if thee does not hold thy tongue, I'll knock the clapper out of thy bell." The warrior subsided. Having turned the other cheek, my father argued that the Lord left him to his own valor and discretion.

THE RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

We are at war. It does not matter why, when, or where, we are at war. There are only two alternatives. We will either win or lose, and I favor our winning, either by honorable arbitration or by armed conflict. While war is always to be deplored, defense is better than suffering wrong, humiliation, and defeat. War is not always wrong. We read in the Divine Revelation, "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon: and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not. And the great dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world, was cast out and his angels were cast out with him." Where did he go? The Bible says, "He was cast out into the earth." Our Lord confirmed it, saying, "Behold, I saw Satan as lightning fall from heaven." And he has been waging war on the earth ever since.

MILITANT MOSES

If it was right to fight in heaven against an aggressor who rejected and defied Jehovah, it might be right to fight to stop communism when it resorts to force and uses an innocent infant nation as a shield. The Lord led the armies of Israel out of Egypt to the coast of the Red Sea, divided the waters and Israel crossed over on dry land. Moses and the children of Israel sang, "The Lord is Man of War; the Lord is His name. I will sing unto the Lord for He hath triumphed gloriously: the Lord is my strength and song and He is become my salvation. Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea." It was a song of victory, of right over might.

For 40 years he trained them to fight and to conquer the more powerful nations that inhabited Palestine. It was an army of invasion and God commanded them, saying, "Thou shalt utterly overthrow and destroy them, throw down their images, overthrow their altars and root out their groves." They marched victoriously, crossing the Jordan, leveling the walls of Jericho and establishing the capital of Israel at Jerusalem where David the King, sang in triumph, "Blessed be God my strength who teacheth my hands to war and my fingers to fight."

THE ARMY OF THE LORD

God was their commander in chief and named the conditions on which victory would be won. He did not send schoolboys to be slaughtered, but men to fight and He fixed the age of their enlistment.

Again and again He commanded Moses and his successor Joshua, saying, "Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel after their families, with the number of their names, every male by their polls; from 20 years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel." And when they ran short of young men above 20, that were fit to fight, the Lord said unto Moses, "Number the sons of Israel after their families and after the house of their fathers, from 30 years old and upward even unto 50 years old, every one that entereth into the service."

GOD SAID "EVERY MALE"

Mark the significant fact that the families, the young women, the mothers and the youth and the children were commanded to remain in the cities, only the males above 20 were to be drafted. That was the military age of service fixed by the Almighty. Not the windfalls but the handpicked, 20 years old and upward that were fit to fight. Not 18-year-old adolescents without sufficient military training, as we did in Korea, ill-clothed, ill-trained, ill-armed, soft-spoken youth, from our high schools, but 20 years old and upward was the law of the Lord.

SOBER SOLDIERS

And of still more importance than the matter of years, it was to be a sober army, a total-abstaining army, a water-drinking army. In his last address, when Moses turned over the military leadership to Joshua, we read, "And Moses called unto all Israel and said unto them: 'And I have led you 40 years in the wilderness; your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot. Ye have not eaten bread (but manna), neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink: that ye might know that I am the Lord your God'." When they were parched with thirst and cried out against Moses for bringing them into that desert place, saying, "What shall we drink?" God did not send them canned beer as a present from the brewers of Egypt, but water out of the smitten rock, and we are told in the divine revelation that the rock followed them, supplying potable water in a desert land. God gave them manna to eat and H_2O to drink. Total abstinence and Divine dependence brought deliverance.

THE WATER CURE

There Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, generals of the Army, and commander in chief of the American military forces in the White House, there is your cue: give our armies the water cure; enlist only those that are fit for military service, 20 years old and upward, and give them H_2O to drink instead of hooch and our enemies will lick the dust.

THREE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND FOOTMEN

It is not a question of numbers but of fitness. When God called Gideon to fight the Midianites he told him that his army was too large, and he reduced it by 22,000, and reduced it again until only 300 fighting men "who lapped water as they ran" remained, and the Midianites, "who filled the valley like grasshoppers for multitude; and their camels without number," fled in terror. God said, "By the 300 that lapped water will I deliver the Midianites unto they hand. * * * For the kingdom is the Lord's: and he is the governor among the nations. * * * The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms. * * * Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance." May that nation be the United States of America in peace and war.

An Interesting Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, those of us in positions of legislative responsibility cannot, of course, base our final judgments simply on the results of opinion polls. They are not necessarily scientific or a true reflection of the will of our constituents. Furthermore, there are times in our experience when we will reach the conclusion that the best interests of our country require us to follow a course which is not popular. Right rather than expediency must be our guide.

Nevertheless, it is helpful to know how various segments of our people are thinking. The policies pursued by our country, if they are to be completely successful, must be backed by the overwhelming sentiment of our citizens. It is a wholesome thing, therefore, for Members of Congress to be furnished

with the results of opinion sampling throughout the Nation.

A group of young people from the Fortieth Congressional District and adjoining territory in and around Rochester, N. Y., who have formed the Citizens Opinion Committee, have sent me a letter indicating an interesting project which they have just undertaken. With it they have transmitted the results of the first sampling of public opinion which they took.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter and accompanying summary of replies to specific questions dealing with United States foreign policy. The formulators of the questions and all those who participated in this venture are to be commended for their public-spirited interest in initiating this important undertaking.

The letter and summary follow:

THE CITIZENS' OPINION COMMITTEE,
Rochester, N. Y., January 16, 1951.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of our Representatives in Congress, you have undoubtedly wished many times that you might be better informed about the thinking of your constituents.

Nine of us in the Rochester area have volunteered our services to form a Citizens' Opinion Committee. Our ages range from 23 to 31, with most members in their late twenties.

The purposes of our committee are—

1. To present problems of governmental policy to citizens of voting age in this area, in such a way as to stimulate their thinking about these problems.

2. To determine the opinions of people on these policies.

3. To supply you and your other immediate Representatives and Senators with tabulations of our findings.

In carrying on this project, we are trying to present the policies without personal or political bias and without influencing the decisions of the survey participants. While we recognize this as probably an imperfect instrument by some standards, we believe it a worth-while one. It presents opinions from many people who have often felt the need, but have seldom found the opportunity, to write their Congressmen.

A copy of our survey statements, a tabulation by percents with graphs, and a list of the participants are enclosed. In the future we hope to have other surveys on governmental, foreign and domestic policies.

Briefly, here are some of the pertinent facts about our survey:

1. Twenty-one statements are included in the survey, dealing with general and Asiatic phases of the United States' foreign policy.

2. Two hundred survey sheets were distributed by members of the committee through personal contact with friends, business associates, and, in some cases, through them to their friends and associates. The survey covered persons of all ages and without regard for political affiliations.

3. The survey was conducted between January 8 and 13.

4. The final tabulation included 115 returns. In addition to this, 15 were returned too late to be counted.

5. Persons taking part in the survey include chiefly, executive, supervisory, and office personnel in Rochester industries; teachers in the public schools; staff personnel from the University of Rochester; and housewives. The following groups are represented in relatively fewer numbers: Skilled workers, farmers, merchants, engineers, State Teacher College faculty at Brockport, and retired persons. Approximately one-half of the returns are from college graduates.

Virtually everyone participating in the survey reported that our project had stimulated their thinking. In fact, many reported that it had provoked extensive discussions within family groups and with friends and associates. A few felt that they were not sufficiently informed to express opinions on Government foreign policy. For many, however, our undertaking has resulted in reconsideration of former opinions and formulation of new ones.

We shall be greatly interested in your reactions to this project and will welcome any comments you may care to make on its value to you or in any areas which might be similarly treated in the future.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD E. PULTZ.

Citizens' Opinion Committee: A. William Ashley, foreman, Delco appliance division, GMC; Myra Howes, secretary, Taylor Instrument Co.; Richard E. Pultz, methods investigator Eastman Kodak Co.; William H. Vandenbergh, attorney, Lumberman's Mutual Insurance Co.; Betty Cavanaugh, secretary, University of Rochester; William B. Nestle, campus school coordinator, State teachers college, Brockport; Jane Vandenbergh, housewife, 276 Ingomar Drive; Herman Walz, law student, Albany Law College; Jane Wilkins, assistant librarian, University of Rochester.

GENERAL FOREIGN POLICY

1. Dean Acheson should be relieved from his office as Secretary of State: Agree, 65 percent; disagree, 30 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

2. The United States should use the veto, if necessary, to prevent the seating of Communist China in the United Nations: Agree, 78 percent; disagree, 20 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

3. Under no circumstances should the atom bomb be used: Agree, 7 percent; disagree, 89 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

4. The United States should not use the atom bomb unless a state of open war exists between Russia and the United States: Agree, 58 percent; disagree, 32 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

5. The United States should immediately use the atom bomb on Russia: Agree, 2 percent; disagree, 96 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

6. Although we must continue to send aid to Europe, we should concentrate our greatest efforts in arming Asia: Agree, 8 percent; disagree, 87 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

7. The United States should give equal effort to the defense of Europe and Asia: Agree, 37 percent; disagree, 53 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

8. While we continue to send aid to Asia, we should concentrate our efforts in the defense of Europe: Agree, 46 percent; disagree, 43 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

9. Our defense effort should be devoted entirely to the Western Hemisphere: Agree, 16 percent; disagree, 76 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

10. The United States should not send armaments to other parts of the world beyond those required under our present commitments until the defenses of the United States against direct attack have been greatly improved: Agree, 78 percent; disagree, 18 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

11. The present crisis warrants embarking immediately on a wartime economy: Agree, 78 precent; disagree, 16 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN ASIA

KOREA

1. All United Nations forces and equipment should be evacuated from Korea as rapidly as consistent with the safety of these forces: Agree, 58 percent; disagree, 41 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

2. United Nations forces should remain in Korea to carry on a delaying action if possible, without greatly increased reinforcement: Agree, 30 percent; disagree, 61 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

3. United Nations should continue to make a stand in Korea at all costs: Agree 15 percent; disagree, 79 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

CHINA

1. The United States and other non-Communist countries should supply the Chinese Nationalist forces with the materials necessary for an invasion of the Chinese mainland: Agree, 68 percent; disagree, 27 percent; no opinion 5 percent.

2. The United States and other non-Communist countries should give sea and air force support to the Chinese Nationalists in any invasion of the Chinese mainland: Agree 46 percent; disagree 47 percent; no opinion 7 percent.

3. The United States and non-Communist nations should enforce an effective military blockade of the Chinese coast: Agree 70 percent; disagree, 21 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

4. The United States, in conjunction with other non-Communist countries, should discontinue all direct or indirect trade with Red China: Agree 93 percent; disagree, 4 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

5. The United States should establish a vast counter-Communist propaganda program throughout Asia: Agree, 90 percent; disagree, 7 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

6. The United States should supply military equipment to the French in Indochina: Agree, 51 percent; disagree, 35 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

7. The United States should seek the use of United Nations troops in Indochina: agree, 32 percent; disagree, 51 percent; no opinion, 17 percent.

PACIFIC—GENERAL

1. Further use of United States forces in Asia should be governed by United Nations policy only: agree, 48 percent; disagree, 40 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

2. The United States should encourage the Japanese to rearm for the purpose of defending their homeland: agree, 85 percent; disagree, 10 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

3. The United States should establish a strong Pacific defense line, which would include the Aleutians, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, and Australia: agree, 98 percent; disagree, 2 percent; no opinion, zero.

Congressman Hall's Invalid Mother Is Attacked by Frank Gannett's Newspaper

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, beaten back, snarling, and frustrated over EDWIN ARTHUR HALL'S never-failing defiance of its gangster journalism, Frank Gannett's Binghamton Press has just revealed a despicable attack on the Congressman's invalid mother.

Throwing all discretion to the winds, the unbridled fury of this wolf pack shows its true colors best in featuring a yellow poison-pen letter writer, a Press stooge, from which it quotes:

One of the first things HALL did was to appoint his father as his secretary and his mother as clerk. His mother stayed quietly at home and never did any Government work whatsoever. This went on for several years until exposed by the Washington Post.

My dearly loved and late lamented father worked day and night in my Washington office, usually putting in a 12- to 16-hour day.

But he was never safe from the smears the Gannett newspaper hurled at him and at me during all the time he worked in my office.

So great was the hatred which the editor held for my distinguished father, that his picture was withheld from Press columns at the time of his death, and the large funeral which he received was glossed over with scarcely a mention.

My mother was employed by me at the time she was on my payroll, taking important messages for my Binghamton office and addressing letters.

She has as much right to be on my payroll as any other American. She earned every penny she received and has taken a world of abuse from this Commie clique because she is loyal to your Congressman and her own son.

Whenever my mother desires to work for me again and is sufficiently well, I will put her back on my payroll, regardless of press smears.

It is well to point out that in 1946 my mother suffered a serious heart attack after a similar press tirade. Gannett's hounds are bent upon exterminating all of us to satiate their hateful desires.

Hitler's storm troopers used to go about rubbing out free representatives and their wives as in the case of Herr and Mrs. Von Sleicher in the early days of nazism.

Behind the iron curtain they liquidate whole families immediate to a person who dares speak his mind.

But I do not find anywhere in recent annals, at least, a case as degrading as the press feature of this wanton attack upon the character of my mother, helpless to defend herself, ill from prolonged sickness, and victimized by the storm-trooper slander of our local Gannett smear tabloid.

Mobilizing Our Farm Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on January 30, 1951, the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, delivered a notable address on the subject of mobilizing our farm power, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Cleveland, Ohio. The subject is of such general interest that I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Brannan's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MOBILIZING OUR FARM POWER

(By Charles F. Brannan)

Just about the first thing that comes to a person's mind at these meetings of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is the old saw: "Nothing succeeds like success."

Roughly 15 years ago only about 11 percent of the Nation's farms had central station electric service. At that time, how many of us would have dared to predict that today—only a decade and a half later—87 percent of our farms would have central-station service?

But that's the record.

Since 1935 the figures on farm electrification have been almost exactly turned around. Then, only about 1 farm out of 10 had power from a central station—now only about 1 farm out of 10 does not have power from a central station.

The initial successes of the rural electric co-ops have been steadily expanded into greater and more glowing achievements.

Your success is also an unanswerable rejoinder to those who argue that free enterprise is handicapped in these days by Government interference. Your co-ops are living examples of free enterprise. They are living proofs that free enterprise cannot only survive but that it can, and will, thrive in an atmosphere of intelligent governmental assistance.

So I want to tell you again, as I have in the past, that it is a real pleasure to meet with this great group of representatives of business-managed, tax-paying organizations. I want to tell you that you have every right to be proud of your business management—of the fact that 99 percent of the loans are being paid back on schedule or ahead of schedule—and especially of the fact that you are successfully operating power systems in many areas that the utility industry refused to electrify because it didn't think it would pay out.

As for the taxes you pay—well, I'm sure it would be news to you folks to find out that you didn't have to pay real-estates taxes, personal-property taxes on equipment, occupational-license taxes, social-security taxes, various excise taxes, sales and use taxes. Of course, you pay these taxes—all of them—just like any other business.

I never have believed that very many people are fooled by this phony tax-equality line—and I don't believe it today.

Once again, then, congratulations on the fine job you are doing. The tremendous success which you have achieved in helping to bring electric power to the great majority of our farms is one of the reasons why agriculture can face the future with real confidence in its ability to meet the food and fiber needs of the Nation.

I want to talk with you today along three principal lines. First, I want to review briefly the situation we face as a nation. Second, I'd like to discuss agriculture's part in today's challenge—what the Nation expects of its farms—how well farmers are equipped to meet the Nation's requirements—and what is being done to help equip them better. Finally, I want to talk with you specifically about the part electric power and the rural electric co-ops can play in the present emergency.

We are living in one of the most critical periods in all human history. We have got to realize that we are now facing probably the most serious threat to civilization of the past 20 centuries.

There is no longer time to put things off until tomorrow or to depend on somebody else doing our job for us.

We hope for peace—we want peace, earnestly and prayerfully. We have proved again and again that we are willing to go much more than halfway to achieve peace.

But who could be so blind as not to recognize that we must be prepared for anything?

Military preparedness is, of course, the most immediate essential. But military preparedness, in these times, has come to mean something much broader than ever before. It means more than planes, ships, tanks, and guns operated by trained manpower. Military preparedness involves industrial and agricultural preparedness.

Agriculture's job is to produce the food and fiber we need for the strength and vitality of our Armed Forces, for the health and productivity of our civilian population, for ample reserves, and for shipments to those other nations to which it is advisable to give aid.

Our material answer to the alleged superior manpower resources of the Soviet Union and its satellites is an economic answer—superior production. Man for man, there is a wide difference between the productivity of American producers on the farm, and those of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

In Asia today it takes four persons on the land to support themselves and one person off the land. In the United States the situation is just about reversed—less than one-fifth of our population is on farms, and they provide food and fiber for themselves and the other four-fifths of our population.

Not only does our agriculture provide food to keep the efficiency and vitality of our military forces and industrial producers at high level; it also provides raw materials without which American industry would be crippled.

We are fortunate, indeed, that our agriculture today is in a strong position to meet all foreseeable demands.

Let me list some of the outstanding facts in this regard.

Our farms are much more productive than they were 20, or even 10, years ago. Total food production is running about 40 percent above the years just before World War II. Our field-crop production in 1950 was bigger than in any year before 1948.

Agriculture as a whole is in a relatively good financial position. Farmers have plowed back a lot of their earnings into up-to-date machinery and equipment. Using the national programs available to them, they have built up reserves of soil fertility. We have developed programs and storage facilities to carry over reserves of corn, wheat, cotton, and other crops.

In the period of little more than a year, beginning in June 1949, 700,000,000 bushels of grain-storage facilities were added to our national capacity under the emergency storage program. This has been a big aid to our over-all defense position.

There are more than twice as many tractors on American farms now as there were in 1941, before Pearl Harbor. There are twice as many trucks on farms, nearly three times as many combines, and more than three times as many milking machines and mechanical corn pickers.

We have made fine progress in the use of various new plant varieties and hybrid seeds, insecticides, and fertilizer, and in better breeding and feeding of livestock.

The result of all these advances is that farm output per man-hour has risen about 50 percent above the 1935–39 average.

Our agriculture, in short, is far better able to face the problems and demands of the

present and future than it has ever been in any previous national crisis.

The Nation is depending on our agriculture to maintain this general high level of output this year and to step up production of the commodities that are in greatest demand. We particularly need more pork, beef, corn, cotton, and wool. But we know from past experience that when the Nation is fully employed and when incomes are high, most farm products are faced with big demand.

Our annual pig crops have been climbing for several years. In 1946 the crop amounted to 83,000,000 head. Last year the crop was over 100,000,000 head. We look for this year's spring crop to run about 6 percent ahead of last spring.

The number of cattle and calves on farms has also been on the upgrade every year since the end of 1947. We expect this trend to continue also.

We need a big cotton crop this year—we hope for 16,000,000 bales.

One of the big questions farmers are asking all over the country is this one: Are we going to have the manpower, supplies, and equipment to turn out the production that's needed?

Farmers know that they use a lot more motor fuel today than they did in 1941. Actually, they use twice as much. They need twice as many rubber tires for cars, trucks, and tractors.

Farmers know that they're using a lot more electric power than ever before. REA consumers used 25 percent more power last year than they had used the year before. Farmers in general, according to industry estimates, used eight times as much electricity last year as they did before World War II. Of course, most of this is due to the greater number of farms now hooked up to power lines. Nevertheless, the average consumption of electric power per electrified farm is now estimated by industry to be two and one-fourth times as much as in the prewar period.

The Department has set up a number of offices and facilities to aid farmers in getting essential equipment, manpower, and materials. In addition, we expect that the facilities of all the Department's bureaus and agencies will be used to help meet the objectives of agricultural preparedness. This means that we will not only help farmers get essential production tools and supplies, but that we are going to encourage them in every way we can to make the best possible use of what is available.

The important job in agriculture is going to need the whole-souled cooperation of organizations outside, as well as within, the Department.

We are depending heavily upon your contribution to national defense.

You folks are the leaders of rural electrification in your own communities and in your own States. You know the importance of electricity in wartime production. Many of you have been through this kind of emergency before and I am happy that you will therefore be better able to guide your co-ops through these troubled times.

Today more than 2,500,000 farm families are depending on you to supply an essential utility service in an adequate and dependable manner.

This job of providing adequate service is really a double job. You need to make sure first that you have plenty of power to deliver and, second, that your systems are maintained to deliver it.

The defense production program will seriously strain the Nation's entire power supply. It will be increasingly difficult to get power for your needs. I urge you to plan ahead as far as possible to provide power not only to meet wartime demands but also to take care of the normal increase in power consumption on farms.

It is vital also that you keep your systems in constant repair, so as to prevent trouble before it has a chance to develop into a major problem. This will call for expansion of, and added concentration on, your preventive maintenance program. If you have not already done so, I urge you to mobilize your forces for system maintenance.

In many cases you will need to increase the capacity of your systems to make sure that they will be able to carry the loads that defense farm production will put on them. Farmers are depending on you. They need all the assurance you can give them that power will be delivered on an uninterrupted basis.

But merely providing dependable power is not enough. If rural electrification is to be of maximum service to the defense program, your farmer members will need help in harnessing their electricity for top efficiency.

They will need guidance in substituting electricity for manpower.

On a great many farms, electric power can be more fully applied to heavy time-consuming farm chores.

Some of the most striking evidences of the labor-saving advantages of electricity may be found on dairy farms. It takes a lot of time to milk 10 cows twice a day by hand. An electric milker can do the job in about half the time, with only one-half kilowatt-hour of electricity.

Electricity can save time and labor in separating cream, pumping and heating water, hoisting hay, and grinding feed. It is important in processing and preserving foods. A farmer with a milk cooler can cool 10 gallons of milk with about 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. Rapid cooling keeps the bacteria count low and maintains the quality of the milk.

I urge you to step up your programs of member education, and to work in close collaboration with other organizations and agencies to make sure that every farmer knows how to use electricity in his production job. Many farmers need advice on the care of their appliances and equipment. These tools may have to last a long time.

Fortunately, you and your farmer members can do a lot to make the most of materials now on hand. The homemade pig brooder is a good example. By using baby-pig brooders, farmers can cut down the number of pig losses and produce an extra 30 percent or more of pork at weaning time. Looking at it another way, this means a saving of about 250 pounds of feed per litter.

It doesn't take expensive or hard-to-get equipment to make a brooder. A 150-watt bulb, some scraps of metal for a reflector, some pieces of lumber, and a little know-how are all you need.

I'm sure there are many other ways in which farm people can make equally effective use of electric power without heavy cash outlays.

Research is going ahead in the Department and elsewhere on new uses for electricity. I have no doubt that this emergency will give added impetus to this research. We all know that use of artificial light is an accepted practice in poultry enterprises. Light has also been employed to speed up plant growth, and it has been demonstrated that vegetable yields can be stepped up by its use. New types of plants have been developed by treating seed with X-rays. Black light has been used to eliminate defective seed. By the use of the germicidal lamp, it may be possible eventually to save a good deal of food that otherwise would be spoiled by mold.

In making these comments, I do not mean to evaluate any of the research that is now going on. I merely want to point out that in time of such national emergency as this, research takes on new importance. I am sure that you will do your part in making available to the American farmer as many new uses for electricity as possible in the months and years ahead.

Besides all of these responsibilities that I have mentioned, you have a responsibility to the half million or more farmers who still are without electric power. You will want to push line extensions as fast as possible to make power available to these farmers.

Though this is not an easy job, it is by no means an impossible one. The speed with which you have built power lines—more than a million miles of rural distribution lines in 15 years—indicates what American ingenuity and drive can do. These million miles of co-op poles and lines stand as a tribute to the initiative, determination, and perseverance of rural people. I know that you will continue your efforts to make the advantages of electric power even more widespread.

By taking full part in your own community civil defense programs, your co-ops can render still another service to the Nation. You can do this by working with the USDA agencies in your counties, by providing channels of communication to farm people for information on the defense program and its requirements, and by assisting your local civic groups in helping rural industries, especially decentralized war plants, to locate in your areas.

Born of a community need and nurtured by democratic ideals, rural electric cooperatives will surely shoulder all these responsibilities in the defense effort.

It is paradoxical that while the Nation has made great progress in rural electrification, the farmer's position with regard to telephones is worse today than it was 25 years ago. Even in normal times the rural telephone is much more than a luxury or a pleasant convenience. In the event of shortages of tires, gasoline, automobiles, and other equipment, adequate rural telephone service takes on increased importance. According to a recent survey in a Midwestern State, two-thirds of a farmer's phone calls are business calls. The telephone program may well play a vital role in enabling the farmer to be a better, more efficient producer.

From what I have already said, it should be obvious that the Department of Agriculture recognizes the importance of the electrified farm and of the rural electric co-ops to the farm production program for national defense.

I firmly believe that it would be a great error if the Nation allowed its potential for food and fiber production to be curtailed because of inadequate power supplies.

In his recent state of the Union message to the Congress, the President emphasized the necessity for us as a Nation to increase our capacity for production and to keep our economy strong for the long pull ahead. He pointed out that only by increasing our output can we carry the burden of preparedness for an indefinite time.

It was heartening to me—as I am sure it was to you—that he urged the Congress to give priority consideration to certain urgent activities, and that power development was among them.

We have all seen the close relationship existing between the REA program and the development of power by public agencies. One does not need to be a public power booster to recognize that the areas of our country where farmers have the cheapest power, and where they use the largest quantities of it, are generally those which have major Federal power projects. On the other hand, it is equally obvious that the area of highest wholesale rates is in the Northeast, where there is no Federal power development—now. Growing support of the St. Lawrence development project may yet change that picture.

Every addition to our power capacity, wherever it is made, increases our national wealth. Every addition to our power capacity, wherever it is made, increases our

ability to turn raw materials into armaments, clothing, and processed food for defense.

This country has undeveloped resources along rivers in the Northeast, the Northwest, the Southeast, the Southwest, and along the Missouri, that potentially are capable of doubling our national power generating capacity. It is in the national interest that these water power resources be developed as rapidly as possible.

As our Nation moves ahead, rural electric co-ops must hold fast to their principles. They must cherish the rights which you and other leaders before you have won—the right to generate your own power when there are no adequate sources available; the right to transmit your own power, and above all the right to buy from the Government, power developed by the Government, for all the people.

Well, I think that covers briefly the three principal topics that I wanted to talk over with you.

Before I close, however, I'd like to add just a few words about the general situation so far as agriculture and farm people are concerned. I have indicated that our agriculture is in a far sounder position to meet whatever demands may be made upon it than it has been in previous periods of national emergency.

I am convinced that this Nation as a whole is well able to take care of itself in any situation that may develop.

It would be foolish to underestimate the strength that might be arrayed against us in the event of an all-out struggle. But it would, I think, be equally foolish to underestimate the strength of the American Nation and of the American idea of freedom and justice.

In these times, let us give our wholehearted support to our own national mobilization program. Let us unite with a determination to do whatever needs to be done. Let us be resolute that this Nation shall remain free.

Rail Unions Are Called Unfair in Their Attack on Steelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of hysteria when the slogan appears to be "smear those in public office," it is, indeed, refreshing to be able to feast one's eyes upon comment that is laudatory of one in public office.

I am pleased to call your attention to an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 14, 1951, about a distinguished public servant, John Steelman, assistant to the President. He is only one of many who goes about his work quietly, unobtrusively, and with only the one thought in mind, and that is how he can best serve his country.

The item I refer to follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—RAIL UNIONS ARE CALLED UNFAIR IN THEIR ATTACK ON STEELMAN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—The railroads and the labor unions are getting closer toward a peace treaty. But there are some mysterious circumstances being revealed which show why the task of mediation at the White House has been made doubly difficult.

A controversy has developed over the part played by John R. Steelman, special assistant to the President. For several days now efforts have been made from labor sources to discredit Mr. Steelman's role, and this has been done partly by the dissemination of a report that he had set himself up as a sort of czar or 3-year arbitrator.

This report is wholly untrue but the reason for spreading it would appear to be to try to weaken Mr. Steelman's influence at the President's side. Actually, John Steelman is one of the ace mediators in the country. For 7 years he was the head of the United States Conciliation Service and was involved in the handling of more than 10,000 strikes or threatened strikes and more than 80,000 labor disputes of all types. Mr. Steelman is not assigned exclusively to labor matters at the White House, but assists in general administrative tasks and gets into labor problems only when they are sufficiently acute to require the attention of the President himself.

FACTS IN CASE LISTED

In the face of the long and efficient record of Mr. Steelman as a mediator, it came as a surprise to find the unions charging that he had set himself up as a 3-year arbitrator. The facts with reference to Mr. Steelman's part in the recent negotiations are these:

1. Mr. Steelman was not assigned to the railroad dispute by the White House but became involved in it at the special request of the four union presidents. He agreed to call meetings but with the understanding that the Railway Mediation Board would participate in the discussions.

2. When, on December 21, a memorandum agreement was signed in full by the four presidents of the railroad unions as well as by the representatives of the railroads, the documents set forth the understanding of both parties. It was not in legal language but it recited unequivocally the basic points of agreement in the form of a summary.

3. It was fully understood by both sides that the points in this memorandum would be put into legal language later. There was a provision which said that if the parties could not agree on the details before writing the actual agreement itself, John Steelman was to make the final decision.

4. This service to be rendered by Mr. Steelman was to end as soon as the agreement was drawn up in legal language and hence his part was to be temporary—probably for a few days.

5. There was an understanding at the time that a blank space was to be left on one of the points dealing with the price for coupling or uncoupling hose but, once the final agreement on this rule was reached, Mr. Steelman was no longer to arbitrate anything.

6. An understanding was reached also that after July 1, 1952, the parties would go to Mr. Steelman again in connection with wage stabilization but only to set in motion machinery whereby the President of the United States would appoint a referee to determine whether further wage increases were justified under Government policy.

ATTACK CALLED A REPRISAL

The foregoing sets forth the actual connection of Mr. Steelman with the entire affair, and yet for some odd reason there has been an effort to make it appear that somehow the President's assistant was setting himself up for some special job of a permanent nature out of which presumably he was to derive a benefit.

This type of unfair attack could only have been started as a reprisal against Mr. Steelman because he stood his ground—and so did the President—in insisting that the original memorandum of points signed on December 21 was binding and that the four union presidents who signed it should in good faith have recommended it to their organizations for ratification instead of backing down on it.

Mr. Steelman has been the center of controversy before when he settled the coal miners' dispute in 1941, as a special arbitrator appointed by the late President Roosevelt, but he was attacked then as too friendly to the unions. Plainly the lot of a mediator is a hard, hard lot, but John Steelman's record for fairness isn't going to be tarnished by insidious propaganda from rail unions which played "sick" and recently caused hundreds of millions of dollars in losses to the American people.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for several years the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the Radio-Television Manufacturers Association have been sponsoring the national voice of democracy contest among the secondary schools throughout the country. This is one of the best of the many excellent projects which contribute so greatly to the strengthening of our Republic. Through calling the attention of the younger people to the basic tenets upon which this Nation is founded, they are doing an exceptional job in encouraging this type of thought and in its dissemination among the citizens at large.

The residents of the Twelfth Congressional District of Missouri, including myself, are greatly honored that one of the winners of the fourth annual contest resides in that district. Robert Burnett of St. Mary's High School, who lives at 4209 Hartford Street, St. Louis, Mo., was one of the four final winners in this Nation-wide contest. The other three winners are Marcia Anne Harmon, 16, of Del Rosa, Calif.; Norita Newbrough, 16, of Baton Rouge, La., and Richard Romulo, 17, of Washington, D. C. I am very desirous of calling to your attention the high quality of the radio broadcast which brought to Robert Burnett this coveted award.

I also want to commend the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the Radio-Television Manufacturers Association for their fine public service in establishing this annual contest. Each of the four winners receive a $500 college scholarship and a trip to Washington, D. C. These young people are now in Washington, D. C. visiting the

various shrines of democracy and the living government which these shrines inspire.

I am happy to put into the RECORD a copy of Robert Burnett's winning radio script. It is regretted only that the full value of this broadcast cannot be retained when it is put into the printed word.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Do you know who I am? I am the voice of democracy.

Listen! Listen, American! Listen, citizen John Doe, to the most startling words in all history, for they are the beginning of my life's story.

"We, the people." Have you got that straight? Not, mind you, we the royal elect; or we, the sovereign king; but we, the people. Listen, citizen Doe, those words place my very life in your hands. I'm your personal responsibility. Do you hear that? Your personal responsibility.

Now what I've got to say here won't be very flowery, just straight American talk.

You know, there's a lot of people around today trying to tell you I'm no good; trying to tell you that democracy's got some weak spots. Well now, some of that's true. I've made my mistakes. Sometimes I've forgotten just what my job is, and made a slip here and there. But those mistakes are never too big, and never too many. I always manage to catch myself in time. That's because my blessings outnumber my weak spots a thousand to one. That's why I speak for democracy.

Now these blessings I talked about don't just happen. What I mean is this; you can't have rights unless you take the duties with them. And that's what a democracy is—a mixture of both—rights and duties. Rights and duties, John Doe. So John, the next time you say, "I've got my rights," then save a little breath to add, "but I've got my duties too."

You want to know something—something big? Well listen. Just what do I do for you, John Doe? What does democracy give you? Let's take a good look.

Anybody ever come to your house early in the morning and take you away because you had a different idea than the President? Any American cop ever invade your home without a warrant? I don't think so. And as long as I'm around, you'll never experience that fear.

And here's something even bigger, John Doe. You can walk into the church you want to. You're free to speak and write what you think. You can choose the kind of government you want.

Mighty good, John, mighty good.

Here's something else I mean to you—something fresh and clean. I'm that little farm of yours up in Vermont, with no big barbed wire fences around it. I'm that ranch and pasture land in California—big, free, windswept. No heavy iron curtain out there, John. Just a lot of land with a lot of freedom. And that's the way you want it to stay, isn't it? A lot of good things, and they're here. They're here because democracy is at work. Think it over John. You like it, don't you?

And, John Doe, if I ever die, it won't be a natural death. Because you'll have to kill me. You, yourself—John Doe. You'll have to kill me with negligence, with laziness, with indifference. Oh, don't vote. Don't run for office. Don't serve on juries. Don't support good men. Then I'll die. But you'll have to do it to me, Citizen Doe.

So John, don't start to use me next year—or next week; start to use me today. Yes, John Doe, start to use me today, for tomorrow may be too late.

Don't you ever forget it, Citizen Doe, democracy is your personal responsibility.

A House Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C. It strikes me as being an important and sensible point of view to reflect upon as we strive to unite our efforts in the common defense:

A HOUSE DIVIDED

Some Senators think General Marshall's announcement that our present policy contemplates the sending of only four additional American divisions to Europe will have a sobering influence on the great debate. It will be a good thing if the opinion of these gentlemen is correct. For this country, in a critical hour, is a house divided aga nst itself, and, as the Bible reminds us, such a house cannot stand.

The current scene is chaotic, Republican Senators have just returned from a swing around the Lincoln-day circuit, in the course of which they registered various degrees of dissent from our foreign policies. In the House of Representatives 118 of the 199 Republican Members signed a so-called declaration of policy which, with other things, calls upon this Nation to refuse further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. Just what that means the Republican Members do not say and may not know. But Representative WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, says there are those on the Democratic side of the House aisle who are not without sympathy for the Republican view, and Representative DORN, of South Carolina, reports that if his mail is an accurate barometer the people have lost confidence in the top executives of the country.

Against the background of this battle among ourselves, the so-called fight against communism goes on. General Eisenhower returns to Europe to try to persuade the Western Europeans that the United States is not going to let them down. Secretary Acheson—brave man—reminds the Communist countries that the President has warned that any aggression might well strain to the breaking point the fabric of world peace. Threatened Yugoslavia is visited by an assistant Secretary of State. Are the Yugoslavs expected to believe that an America which cannot make up its mind what to do about Western Europe can be counted upon for help in event of a Communist attack? Secretary Finletter of the Air Force has been in Turkey, a most valuable potential ally in event of war. It would be interesting to know what assurance he felt able to give the Turks, and how the Turks felt about any that may have been given.

The great tragedy in all this is that we may well be booting away the last hope of a free world. Unless General Eisenhower is a starry-eyed dreamer, and not even the rashest critic of the policy he advocates has called him that, there is an excellent chance that the free world can be saved from both Communist domination and war. All that is needed is understanding of the problem and the danger, plus a willingness to take reasonable preparatory measures. That will never be done, however, unless the United States takes the lead. We must encourage weaker nations by our example, but we will never do that by wrangling among ourselves, by eying allies with excessive suspicion, by anesthetizing ourselves with the notion that, after all, it won't matter too much if we let Europe go by the boards.

There are those who say that our foreign policy has been a costly failure. That simply is not true. Our policy has not achieved all that might have been hoped for. But it has achieved a great deal. Those areas of the world that are really vital to our economic well-being and our physical security remain threatened, but they also remain outside the Communist camp. If we had done nothing they surely would have been lost to us. Because of what we have done, there still is a chance—a good chance—that they can remain safely this side of the iron curtain. Let those who are so prone to reckless accusation, who say that our policy has failed and should be abandoned, consider the alternatives for a moment. Do they really believe that this proposed additional effort should not be made, that it would be better to chuck the whole business and resign ourselves to the prospect of withdrawing into an isolated armed camp in this hemisphere and trying to stay alive there from now until doomsday?

There can be only one rational answer: We must make reasonable effort to go forward with the work that we are engaged upon. And so the Star hopes that the Senators are right; that the four-division announcement will have a sobering effect; that we will stop tearing ourselves apart; that the Senate's indorsement of the principle of this program will be forthcoming, and that, before it is too late, we will be able to demonstrate to the rest of the world, both friendly and unfriendly, that we have made up our mind as to what we intend to do, and that we are determined to act on the basis of that decision.

Address of Gov. John S. Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia and her fine people are fortunate indeed in having as chief executive a man of ability, integrity, and foresight. The Honorable John S. Battle is truly a Christian gentleman of the old school and we in Virginia are proud to call him our Governor.

It is with pride that I include with my remarks the speech of the Honorable John S. Battle, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, which he made at the dedication exercises of the McLean Peace House on April 16, 1950, at old Appomattox Courthouse:

These ceremonies here today, in the truest sense of the word, commemorate not the close of an internal war but the real beginning of a firmly united nation which was envisioned by our first President. In his Farewell Address to the people of the United States, he said: "The name of America, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations."

The restoration of the Appomattox buildings, including this beautiful McLean House, does not represent a monument to the South or to the North; nor does it perpetuate any thought of victory or defeat. It simply gives

recognition to the fact that here honest, courageous, and patriotic men laid the ground-work for the rebirth of a strong America, dedicated to the principles of free government and free institutions upon which our country has risen to its present position of world leadership as the champion of individual freedom and representative democracy.

Suffice it to say of that April 9, 1865, that every man who trod this soil could reverently repeat the words of General Lee: "You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed."

Certainly devotion to duty and loyalty to principle are as essential today as ever before. In an era of world-wide conflict of ideologies, it is imperative that those who espouse democratic principles allow no extraneous matters to interfere with the fundamental goal of maintaining the type of government and the kind of institutions which make possible the enjoyment of the greatest good by the largest possible number.

The defense of our homeland and the democratic way of life we have maintained since the establishment of American Government has called for the expenditure of our finest resources in other wars since 1865. The closely knit union which grew from those troubled years reduced that cost in life and blood to an extent no man can accurately judge; but it is certain that without a strong, freedom-loving America, whose people always are ready and willing to resist the forces of oppression and tyranny, the life we have known in America through the centuries today would be no more.

I can think of no higher tribute to those valiant men who fought for what they believed in the War Between the States than to envision as their indestructible monument these great victories for democracy in two world wars.

The Commonwealth of Virginia is proud of this restored setting at Appomattox, which ultimately will take on the appearance of the original village. The National Government, through the National Park Service, has rendered a distinct public service in advancing the project to its present stage and I am sure the people of the entire country who have the opportunity of visiting it will draw inspiration of a value far out of proportion to the financial cost involved.

I am delighted that the Commonwealth can have a part in refurnishing the McLean House and can thereby assume a joint responsibility of reteaching the lessons of history which were written here. It is indeed a privilege and a high honor to accept, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Virginia, this addition to the public shrines of America.

Administration of Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following letter received from a veteran in my district. Judging from the mail received in our office, there is still considerable confusion in connection with the Selective Service System. It seems ridiculous that we should invest money in training men for the Navy and then draf them against their wishes into the Army. I trust other Members of Congress will speak out against the inequities that are so apparent. In my opinion, the manner in which our boys are being called into service is doing more to disrupt the morale of the American people than any single thing our Government is doing today. The letter follows:

AKRON, OHIO, *February 13, 1951.*
Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Congressman, Fourteenth District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I am writing you as a very much confused veteran. I realize you are busy but the matter I wish to discuss with you is of great concern to me.

I enlisted in the United States Navy September 5, 1945. Honorably discharged July 12, 1946, with the rate of seaman first class. My serial number is 792-55-67.

In order to keep my standing with the Navy I joined the Naval Reserve August 17, 1948, and was active for some time until my work necessitated me to go inactive.

On February 1, 1949, I received from the draft board (113) a notice classifying me as 1-D. My selective service number is 33-113-27-568. On February 6, 1951, I received a second notice that reclassified me into 1-A.

Upon receiving the latter notification, I was informed that inasmuch as I did not have a full year of service, I was not considered a veteran and was subject to the draft. I have received approximately 2 years of college and other rights under the GI bill due to the fact I had served over 90 days.

I have been under the impression that the Navy would call me back into service, but when I received the notice of a 1-C classification, it confused me. If it is necessary for me to go back into service, I would prefer going back into the Navy. With the training that I have had and my status as a reserve member I think it only right that I should try to protect this interest.

Hoping that you will be able to rectify this situation in which I find myself.

I remain,

LOWELL F. BOWMAN.

Frances Elizabeth Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered in Statuary Hall on last Friday at the memorial services for Frances E. Willard, former national president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

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

My friends, we are meeting today to honor the memory of a great woman—Frances Elizabeth Willard. She ranks among the very top of the great personages who have made America the great country that it is today, and a perusal of her life is an inspiration not only to the youth of this country, but to those of us in the legislative Halls of Congress who are constantly striving for those higher things in life which build up character.

Frances Elizabeth Willard was born in Churchville, N. Y., September 28, 1839. She died on February 17, 1898. It had always been her request that when the end came her friends should regard her passing not as death but as birth into the heavenly life. And so the organization which she did so much to build and establish, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, celebrates her "heavenly birthday" each year on February 17. Because of a request by the Architect of the Capitol, this ceremony is being held on the 16th instead of on a Saturday when few employees would be on duty.

Miss Willard was primarily an educator. She was the first woman to be elected the president of a college, the Evanston College for Ladies, a new venture in higher education for women. The experiment was not a success financially and in 1873 it was merged with Northwestern University, Miss Willard becoming dean of women and professor of aesthetics in the faculty of liberal arts.

She held the then radical belief in the feasibility of student self-government and on account of a disagreement over this with the president and trustees of the university, she resigned in 1874.

She had been interested in the woman's temperance crusade and went East to study the temperance movement, particularly in Maine. While in Cambridge, Mass., she received on the same day two offers. One was the position of lady principal of a fashionable New York finishing school at the then princely salary of $2,400 a year. The other was an urgent plea from Mrs. Louise S. Rounds, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Illinois to accept the presidency of the Chicago union without remuneration. Miss Willard declined the first and accepted the second invitation, and for some months went without lunch because she had no money to buy food and walked for lack of carfare. Finally she was persuaded to make known to the women her financial situation, and a small but living salary was raised for her.

When the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union was organized at Cleveland, Ohio, in November 1874, she was offered the presidency but declined, and was elected national corresponding secretary. She was elected national president in 1879.

Miss Willard was outstandingly an organizer. In 1881 she started a tour of the Southern States with her secretary, Miss Gordon, and eventually built up the WCTU to the then unheard of strength of 200,000 members.

In 1883 after a tour of San Francisco's opium dens, she conceived the idea of a world's WCTU and put it into practice the following year when the national WCTU sent Mary Clement Leavitt, of Boston, around the world carrying the polyglot petition signed in practically every known language, petitioning the world's governments for the abolition of the traffics in alcohol and opium and the protection of women and children. One fruit of this effort was the enactment of the Hague and Geneva Opium Conventions and the establishment under the League of Nations of the Permanent Central Opium Control Board. This has now been taken over by United Nations and its Commission on Narcotics. The world's WCTU promoting the sisterhood of women all over the world in the effort to defend their homes and give childhood full opportunity has been one of the great factors in making possible the understanding between the nations of the world on which our hope for a future of freedom for humanity must rest.

Because it was necessary to obtain legislation to unmuzzle the teachers before the facts about alcohol and narcotics could be taught in the public schools, the women, whose concern for the problem of the alcoholic had led them into the temperance crusade, were led to venture further into

the path of legislation. This again was another highly radical measure. Miss Willard, because of her immense personal prestige and the respect she commanded, became one of the most effective pleaders in her own day and generation for the ballot for women.

When she passed away in the Empire Hotel in New York City, Mary Lowe Dickinson said: "We know no other woman whose homegoing would have left so many other women feeling as if the sun had gone." And her funeral train resembled the funeral procession of the martyred President Abraham Lincoln.

Last of all, the great State of Illinois chose her to represent them here—the only woman in our Nation's hall of fame.

Frances E. Willard, educator, organizer, leader of women, and above all, servant of God.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, at the Lincoln Day Dinner in Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Lincoln Day dinner at Kansas City, Mo., on February 17, 1951.

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

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, first of all I bring you a "hands across the continent" greeting from the people of California to those of Missouri and also express the sincere regret of Gov. Earl Warren that because of illness he was unable to be with you tonight.

In a free nation the citizens must have the facts in order to make sound decisions. This administration and its predecessor have not been frank with the American people nor with their elected Representatives in Congress.

The time has come when the doings of the Executive Department must no longer be hidden from both the Congress and the Nation. There is, of course, a legitimate field of security to protect information about secret weapons or battle plans. Security must not be used to cover up mistakes, past or present.

Before commitments of far-reaching consequences are made the people of the United States are entitled to know the prospective cost in manpower and in dollars. They are also entitled to know the impact such policies will have on their economic and political life.

I am convinced that if the American people are treated as adults they will respond as such. But no person in the executive branch, be he the President or an official in one of the executive departments has the right to assume that he has constitutional or psychic powers which permits him to give the country one piece of the jigsaw puzzle at a time when he alone or in association with a handful of others knows what the entire picture will be when the pieces have been painstakingly put together.

In this country, as yet, the people run the Government rather than the Government running the people. But we have trod the path of big government about as far as a free people dare go without taking stock of the situation and determining what our future course of action should be.

Our budgets have grown to such astronomical figures that it is hard for our citizens to grasp the full significance of the amounts being spent and proposed.

As a boy I grew up part of the time in Washington, where my father represented the sixth district of California in the House of Representatives for the 12-year period 1903 to 1915. In 1910 the total appropriations for all functions of Government, including the military, reached $1,044,433,622.64. It was front-page news all over the country. We had become a "billion-dollar Government." For next fiscal year the President has proposed a $71,500,000,000 budget.

Our foreign policy has a direct relationship to our military policy. Our Armed Forces under the proposed budget for the next fiscal year will take over $41,500,000,000 out of a $71,500,000,000 total.

The total gold production of the entire world from the time of the voyage of Columbus to America down to the present has been $42,600,000,000. By next year, if not this, we will be spending almost double that amount annually.

The total value of all farm production in the United States for 1950 was an estimated $30,400,000,000. The budget already submitted by the President for next fiscal year will spend more than double that amount for the Federal Government alone. State and local costs of government are in addition.

After years of savings, the American people have accumulated in their savings banks, building and loan associations, and the Postal Savings System $59,690,000,000. This entire amount would only pay the cost of the Federal Government for 10 months at the President's budget proposed rate of spending.

In the 158 years from George Washington through 10 years of the administration of Franklin Roosevelt 32 Presidents spent approximately $250,000,000,000. During the 6 years Harry Truman has been President, together with his budget proposals for the next fiscal year, his administration will have spent over $275,000,000,000.

During 16 of the last 18 years that the Democrats have held the White House, the country has operated with a deficit. The exception was the 2 years of the Republican control of the Eightieth Congress. Can this Nation afford such fiscal policies and maintain a solvent Government or economy?

No business, large or small, could afford such management without leading to bankruptcy, nor can a government. History is replete with the sad tale of nations that have traveled this primrose path.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is the year for the American people to get rid of both red ink and red herrings.

Every American citizen having a sense of responsibility fully recognizes the fact that the free way of life is being challenged by international communism. He knows that the victory for international communism would be more costly in human liberty, in looting, and in reparations than even these vast astronomical figures we have discussed.

I believe that our people are prepared to carry the heavy burdens of necessary defense expenditures and for the essential functioning of the Government. They have a right to expect, however, that all unnecessary fat will be cut out of the budget and that a full dollar's worth of value is received for every dolar spent in the military as well as the civilian establishment.

Of the estimated $16,500,000,000 deficit at least $6,500,000,000 should be made up by the curtailing of nonessential expenditures and not to exceed $10,000,000,000 by new taxation. The President expects the country to practice austerity. He and the executive departments should go and do likewise.

The power to tax is the power to destroy and we must guard our political and economic system from destruction by bad fiscal policies as well as from the aggression of hostile foreign enemies.

This week we are celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. One of the primary faults of the Democratic administration has been that they lost sight of Lincoln's view that "What is morally wrong cannot be politically right."

At Yalta without the knowledge or consent of the American Congress or the American people the executive branch of the Government bartered away the rights of the Republic of China in Manchuria. This was done without the knowledge or consent of the Republic of China, our long-time friend and wartime ally. By this act of expediency we made certain Soviet domination of Manchuria, made inevitable Communist domination of the mainland of China, and paved the way for Communist aggression in Korea.

In 1947 Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was sent to the Far East to make a report on conditions in that area of the world. His very able report on China was suppressed for 2 years though it was many times requested by responsible committees and Members of the Congress.

His report on Korea made at the same time has been suppressed to this very day though there have been official requests made for it by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. It is my personal belief and I state it on my responsibility as a Senator that had the information contained in this report been made available prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea the Congress would have insisted that steps be taken to strengthen the defenses in Korea against the strong possibilities of aggression which were anticipated in the document.

There are many other examples that can be cited of pertinent information withheld from the Congress when if such information had been available tragic errors in executive judgment might have been prevented or steps taken in time to alleviate damage already done.

The President's judgment has not been demonstrated as being so sound that he should be entrusted with blank check powers over sending unlimited armed forces anywhere in the world for an unlimited period of time prior to approval being given by Congress.

Legislation dealing with economic controls should have a definite termination date and in addition should give Congress the power to terminate it by veto-proof congressional resolution.

In Korea since June 25 of last year we became engaged in support of international law and order against aggression. We are now furnishing 90 percent of the armed forces and suffering 90 percent of the casualties.

We have already suffered more casualties in this struggle against aggressive communism than we did in the Revolutionary War (12,200); War of 1812 (7,000); Mexican War (17,000); and the Spanish-American War (10,000) or a total for those four wars of 46,000. The latest Korean casualty list released by the Department of Defense gives a total of 48,035.

This Government and this Nation should not be satisfied with the part played by the United Nations as a whole and the part played by many individual members of that organization. Our casualties alone are considerably greater than the total number of armed forces all the other United Nations combined have in Korea.

The Republic of China alone (and the offer has not been accepted to date) was willing to send within 5 days of the invasion 33,000 of the best troops from Formosa to

help stem the tide of aggression in Korea. This is a greater number than all the other United Nations members, excepting the United States, have placed in Korea to date.

At least if they are not going to help us by carrying a fair share of the burden of supplying armed forces we should make it plain that we expect them to stop giving moral and material aid to Red China. If they are not willing and ready to cut off trade we should do so forthwith by a blockade of the China coast. Our Government has been weak and timid in dealing with our fellow members of the United Nations in this regard. Either they want a collective security system or they don't. This is the time to find out.

On January 11 in a speech on the Senate floor I stated that I would support the strengthening of the defenses of Western Europe against Communist aggression even in advance of our obligation to come to the aid of our North Atlantic Pact Allies in the event of aggression.

It was my belief then that some formula should be worked out that would make certain that our European allies were putting up their full share of the manpower for the common defense.

Without a declaration of a state of war by Congress or the bringing into effect of our treaty obligations by an act of aggression by the Soviet Union or its satellites or approval of such action by Congress I do not believe the President has blank-check powers, to place American troops in Europe without limit as to number or as to time.

The Congress has a constitutional obligation it cannot and should not abdicate to this or any other President be he Democrat or Republican. Many of our troubles today stem from the willingness of Congress to rubber stamp the acts of the President. It is long past time for Congress to reassert itself as a coequal branch of the Federal Government under the Constitution. Already there is far too great a concentration of power in the hands of the executive branch of the Government. The time to stop is now and the Congress can do it if it has the will.

Within the last 18 months two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development (as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949) and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course.

These events separately are sufficient to cause everyone who believes we should have a free world of freemen to examine his own conduct to determine if he is making his greatest contribution toward freedom. The combined events make it mandatory that we do it.

Our economic system is tied with Siamese-twin attachments to our constitutional form of government. If one is destroyed they both perish. There is no need for either catastrophe to happen if we get off the perpetual defensive and take the offensive.

There are too many people who have had our hospitality or advantages joining forces with Moscow and her satellites in spreading their views on "What's wrong with America?"

Those who believe in our system should start a crusade to tell "What is right with America?"

We, of course, will not close our eyes to the liability side of the ledger, but as citizens with our feet on the ground and common sense gained from experience and observation we know that America's assets in freedom of religion, speech, and press, and in agricultural, educational, fiscal, industrial, and governmental categories to mention but a few, greatly exceed our liabilities.

Seventy-eight million life-insurance policyholders own policies with a face value of an estimated $228,000,000,000. For contrast, our Federal public debt is now over $256,000,000,000.

Individuals who still believe that thrift is a virtue also own directly or through institutions for their account some $56,790,000,000 in savings institutions and $2,900,000,000 in the Postal Savings System. A substantial part of the $35,000,000,000 of time deposits in commercial banks is theirs. They also have a stake in annuities and pension funds amounting to an estimated $5,000,000,000 and a direct stake in the Social Security System (Federal, State, and local) of $29,000,000,000.

We have more stockholders than any other nation in the world. According to the 1950 census estimates we have 24,000,000 home owners.

To permit this solvent, going concern of ours to be liquidated by the strong-armed action of international communism or to consent to the voluntary bankruptcy proceedings of state socialism are both unthinkable and unnecessary. We need an alert and determined citizenry if the battle is not to be lost by default.

We must not let complacency destroy the spirit that has developed a great world power out of a small colony in less than 175 years. We must not build or depend upon military or economic Maginot lines.

This Nation has never been wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. Our economic as well as our political system broke away from Old World patterns.

Short-sighted European-style capitalism built the gallows for its own execution by allowing and encouraging monopolies, cartels, low wages, and great aggregations of capital narrowly held.

The lifeblood of our system to the contrary is competition, productivity, good wages, and widespread ownership of our economic structure.

We must continue to demonstrate to the world that here in America we have political and economic freedom. Here our people, since the founding of the Republic, have looked forward to leaving to their children a better land than they themselves found.

The challenge we face is to meet the economic, social, and political needs of the twentieth century while we maintain free institutions under a constitutional Government.

Certainly security alone is not the whole answer. The most secure man is the one who has his clothing, food, medical care, and housing guaranteed for life—as an inmate of a state prison.

The sustained stability and progress of our American system of capitalistic free enterprise requires high real wages, sustained buying power for abundant markets, and maximum production at low unit costs. American agriculture, labor, and industry must not be undermined by the dumping of goods produced by low-paid labor abroad while outside markets are closed to our products.

In meeting the growing challenge of socialism and communism the dynamic American system must continue to demonstrate that labor, management, and investors all have a vital interest in maintaining our way of life.

High productivity and widespread distribution of that which our Nation can produce is more sound than the doctrine of scarcity brought about by stoppages of production or by governmental action.

In the growth of our economy there have developed powerful groups in business and in labor. Not all of them have recognized that with power must go responsibility. No man or group of men in the ranks of labor or business have the right to strangle the economic life of 150,000,000 Americans and by so doing endanger the entire free world.

The Government of the United States established economic traffic laws many years ago to protect our businessmen and consumers against unregulated monopolies. These were the antitrust statutes.

More recently, first through the Labor Relations Act of 1935 and later through the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Government has sought to establish a national labor policy that would be fair and equitable, not alone to labor and management, but to the general public as well.

While some well thought-out amendments are in order, they should be weighed in the light of their effect upon the entire population, and not just one part.

Our entire national economy must not be at the mercy of one man or small group who can give an order that will cause a creeping paralysis to close down our mines, factories, and transportation systems and work a hardship on countless people. This is far too much power for any responsible man to want and any irresponsible man to have.

There are some in Government who apparently believe that if an individual spends his own money it is inflationary, whereas if the Government takes it from him and spends it such is not the case. This is economic nonsense and squirrel-cage thinking. Government spending has been and is a major inflationary factor.

I make no claim that we can "unscramble the eggs" of Government finance, but I do maintain that we should no longer ignore the warning lights that have led to disaster when ignored elsewhere in the world.

We are faced with the necessity of greatly increasing our defense expenditures. This makes all the more essential the cutting out of not essential fat from the President's budget.

The American position should be billions for the defense of freedom from aggressive communism, but not a penny for boondoggling or socialistic programs.

The problems facing us on the home front cannot be solved by Government alone. They cannot be solved by labor, management, or the farmer alone.

Here in America, as Lincoln put it, we have "this last best hope of earth." Each of us has an individual and collective responsibility for its preservation. We are interdependent one on the other. An American economic collapse would bring despair everywhere except in Soviet Russia.

There have never been so many people in the entire history of the world who have had as large a stake, as much to gain, or as much to lose as the people of the United States of America.

Nor does history record a people who have been as unselfish in their possession of their power, their resources, and their good will.

In this century, which is not yet half over, they have sacrificed blood and treasure in two World Wars and in the current operations in Korea to prevent the destruction of free institutions on the continent of Europe. Few dispute the fact that all of Western Europe and perhaps even Britain would today be behind the Communist iron curtain if it had not been for the firm stand taken by this Republic and a considerable contribution of our resources to prevent the complete economic collapse of those war-torn nations.

Communism thrives on chaos. A rehabilitated Europe was the only chance for survival had by free institutions in that area of the world. While communism has been at least temporarily stopped in Western Europe, it has made great gains in the Far East. At the end of the war communism ruled less than 200,000,000 people. Today 800,000,000 are within the iron curtain. By what standards do you measure success in foreign policy?

Four factors relating to the ability of the Western World to defend itself against Communist aggression are: (1) Industrial capacity; (2) population; (3) raw materials; (4) territory.

Except for the first, international communism now has the edge on all the others.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our people and our Government in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II, gave us the power, the prestige, and the opportunity for constructive action no western nation had ever before possessed. We could have pioneered in exporting the ideals that inspired men who loved freedom everywhere following our own break-away from colonial status.

All this opportunity has been frittered away by a small group of willful men who held positions in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and who had the backing of their superiors. They were aided by others in and out of Government who by design or ignorance helped to advance the cause of the Communists in China.

In Europe where the record of Soviet aims was clearly outlined in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, we finally stood up to communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Berlin, and Western Germany.

Knowing that communism thrives on economic and political chaos we gave economic aid through the ECA. With the North Atlantic Pact and the arms implementation legislation, we have given moral and material support for the protection of Western Europe and the Middle East from overt aggression. In that area we have given hope and support to those advancing the cause of a free world of freemen.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan. Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain 10 years ago, may have sincerely thought that he was gaining peace in our time by consenting to the destruction of a free and independent Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. We know now that paying such international blackmail only increased later demands that made World War II inevitable.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

In terms of ultimate destructive impact upon our free institutions, what difference does it make whether an American citizen, such as Gold betrays his country, or whether our country is betrayed by an alien such as Dr. Fuchs? What difference does it make whether the betrayal is done for pay or for love of the Soviet system? What difference does it make whether it is done by a card-carrying Communist member or by a pervert who, being in a key position, has been blackmailed to deliver State secrets? What difference does it make whether the secrets are stolen by a burglar from an office at night or whether they are carried out in daytime by a naive employee with a gold badge and a tarnished sense of responsibility? The end result is the same, and those who set the policies and were careless or tolerant or ignorant, cannot escape their responsibility at the bar of American public opinion.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly.

In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria Petkov was hanged; in Rumania the king was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the government regardless of the constitution; in Czechoslovakia Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

A chinese official put it clearly by saying to me recently: "There can be no real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger."

In Europe during the postwar period we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable.

In the Far East, during the same period, there has been no such bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress were not consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt China policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail.

The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for the debacle which has taken place on the continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

Yes; we have waited for the dust to settle, and the American people can now see the wreckage of the position once held by this great Nation in the Far East.

Alger Hiss at Yalta and the Amerasia Red network in Washington all contributed to losing in the Pacific that which our fighting men had won. It has been lost to the Soviet Union which participated in the Pacific war for 6 days.

In China, up to this very hour, the State Department has been more interested in saving face than in saving freedom.

The representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the Government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused, we placed an embargo against the shipment of any arms or ammunition to the legal government of the country while during those same months the Soviet Army of occupation, in Manchuria as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had Benedict Arnolds and men who betrayed their trust, needed no underscoring from us in the way and at the time it was done. Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet members down to ward bosses.

We have also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and 5 percenters at various times.

The basic objective the United States should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united, non-Communist China. In the postwar illness of that Nation, we prescribed that the strychnine of communism be taken. The State Department having contributed greatly to the Chinese disaster still proclaims that we must investigate some more. State Department China policies have been directed toward a postmortem rather than a consultation.

Had China been a former enemy, like Japan and Germany, we would have, since VJ-day, been giving large amounts of supervised material help and sending many of our ablest military and civilian leaders to stabilize her currency, feed her people, and protect her from Communist aggression.

Both of these former enemy nations have received more aid from us since VJ-day than has our wartime ally and long-time friend, the Republic of China.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country, in Great Britain, and in India who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

The question is asked: Can anything be done at this late date? I believe that it can. While desperate, the situation is not more desperate than it was at the time of Valley Forge or at Dunkerque.

First, of course, we need an understandable foreign policy in the Far East. As a basis for such a foreign policy, I suggest the following:

1. That we make clear that we have no intention of recognising the Communist regime in China and that we will give vigorous leadership to the free nations in the United Nations in opposing the seating of the Communist representatives.

It is inconceivable that the free nations of the world will yield to Soviet blackmail by seating the Communist regime of China in the United Nations. Such an abject surrender to the Soviet Union will be destructive of the ultimate objectives of the United Nations. Any such a surrender to Communist pressure will properly be acclaimed throughout the world as a Communist triumph and will have a tremendous psychological effect throughout the entire Far East.

Our Secretary of State at the time he announced that our own vote would be against removing the representatives of the Republic of China and seating the representatives of the Communist regime in their place also announced that we would not urge any other nation to vote for or against the proposition and that we would ourselves not use a veto. By these latter two announcements he largely destroyed the effectiveness of our own vote on the matter.

2. We should give supervised aid to the legal Government of China now on the island of Formosa in the same way we have given it to the legal Governments of Greece and Korea both of which have also been targets of aggressive communism.

There is a larger population on Formosa than in Greece or Australia. There are more anti-Communist troops than in all the other non-Communist areas of Asia combined.

The forces of the Republic of China, if given arms and ammunition, are in a position to attack the flanks and rear of the Communist forces fighting against the United Nations in Korea. They are willing and able to help and if we take off the neutralization restrictions they can make commando type raids on the long coast line of China and can supply the more than a million non-Communist guerrillas operating in south and central China.

A mission headed by a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer could supervise the requests for aid, advise with the Chinese Government relative to the training of troops in the use of equipment, and make certain from a logistical point of view that the supplies were received at the points where they were needed.

3. We should forthwith move in the United Nations for economic, political and military sanctions against the Chinese Communist aggressors in Korea.

(a) Economic sanctions would include the cutting off of trade by all nations with Communist China.

(b) Political sanctions would include the withdrawal of recognition of the Communist Chinese regime by United Nations members who have extended diplomatic recognition.

(c) Military sanctions would include a naval blockade of the China coast and the striking by the United Nations air forces of military targets north of the Yalu River from which arsenals, supply depots, and concentration points are coming the supplies and

reinforcements attempting to destroy the United Nations forces in Korea.

Neither the United States or the United Nations should use ground troops on the mainland of Asia outside of Korea. We should support with supplies, non-Communists of Asia who desire to fight for their freedom from Communist domination. There are still millions who are ready and able to do so if they get some moral support and equipment.

Yes; America has come of age. We can no more return to a policy of isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We must assume our responsibilities as a great world power without whose active support there can be no adequate international system of law and order.

We need a dynamic American foreign policy. Liberty is still a greater force than slavery. Our own fight for freedom electrified the world.

Let us rekindle the torch. We must assume a moral leadership that we lost at Yalta. Let us make it clear to freedom-loving Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Koreans, and Chinese that their desire for liberty is understandable to us.

Let us make clear to the Soviet Union and her satellites that we and they are on a diplomatic quid pro quo basis. The United States Government should serve notice that we will no longer tolerate our Ambassador and diplomatic officials being restricted to Moscow and occasional outside trips while theirs are free to roam from Pennsylvania to California, and from Maine to Texas.

We should make it clear that we will no longer permit five times the number of visas to be issued for Soviet citizens to visit this country as are issued to our citizens to visit Russia.

It should be made clear to all the Soviet satellites that they will treat our diplomatic representatives and our citizens with respect and international law, or we will break off diplomatic relations and tell their people why it is being done.

Of course, we should seek a just and lasting settlement of the cold war, but not by another Munich or another Yalta.

Any settlement to be worth while must include freedom from the tyranny under which millions of people suffer, in part at least, as a result of our past mistakes.

No nation or its leader had the moral right to barter the lives of millions of men, women, and children into the godless hands of international communism. The Soviet Union has long since violated various part of their wartime agreements with the West. To Polish and Chinese patriots a public denouncement of the Yalta executive agreement would clear the atmosphere and give them renewed hope and courage.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I recently visited the Nevada testing grounds and was there for the final explosion. I returned to Washington greatly encouraged by the splendid teamwork of our scientists and our armed services. This is no time to take a defeatist attitude vis-à-vis the Soviet world. It is no time for faint hearts to sell America short.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history * * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we, here have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need fear.

Address Delivered by Hon. Watkins M. Abbitt, of Virginia, at a Meeting of the Future Farmers of Americr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me at a meeting of the Hub Federation of the Future Farmers of America, at Appomattox, Va., Friday, January 26, 1951:

At no time in the history of our Nation has so much depended upon the young men and women on the farms. Today you in your teens and early twenties stand as a bulwark against the evil forces that would enslave your country.

You are in demand on the farm and in the Armed Forces. Many of you Future Farmers in the lower age groups are skilled through the training in your organization and your love of the land to the point that you become key men in farm production. This is particularly true where you have played a big part in the family-operated farm. On such farms you become a vital part in our Nation's agricultural production. The big part you play is indicated by the fact that farm operators and unpaid members of their families make up three-fourths of all farm workers.

With this in mind I understand that an assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture stated before the Preparedness Committee of the Senate that the availability of deferment authority is of particular importance so that some key workers may be retained on farms until qualified replacements are found or until persons who have completed their service are available. Of course, this means that agriculture and military service are definitely tied together as they always have been. The Minutemen at Concord and the soldiers at Valley Forge alternated between the farm and the battlefield in order that the freedom of their farms and families might be maintained.

So both the usefulness of youth on the battlefield and on the farms is brought into focus.

It is recognized, however, in making deferment that even though a farm-reared boy in the 18- or 19-year-age group may already possess substantial farm skill, the men in the higher age groups who might be liable for military service if the younger ones are not taken possess even greater farm skills. Under any circumstance on the farm or in the armed services, the Future Farmers of America stand solidly in the front line of forces fighting for our Nation's survival.

If the part played by the Future Farmers of America in our Nation's agriculture has always been a fundamentally important one, it now takes on far greater stature. Increased production of food and fiber is the foundation upon which the military and diplomatic forces of our country is built.

Although increased production is the watchword, that does not mean that we have alarming shortages or even mild shortages. It simply means that demand for farm products will continue to advance and that we must be prepared. Foodstuffs shipped to Yugoslavia and India recently represent food in diplomacy.

By aiding these hungry countries, we are able to point out to them the attitudes of free peoples toward their neighbors and the ability of democratic countries to produce more than they need. Although adequate supplies are now on hand, larger stocks to meet the anticipated increased demand will make a defense against inflation and lighten controls needed over food commodities.

In order to assure this abundance, acreage allotments have been removed for cotton. To be on the safe side, the Nation needs at least 16,000,000 bales from the next cotton crop.

Allotments for wheat and corn have been called off and larger plantings of both crops are being urged.

However, there need be, as I said, no alarm that we have present any severe shortage of food. In fact, we have quite large supplies of grains and other storable commodities on hand. For example, at the beginning of the corn marketing season (October 1), stocks stood at a new record high—859,000,000 bushels.

But the speeded-up demand is already making rapid inroads upon this all-time high stock. The increased demand for meat and other livestock will drain further from these large supplies as the months go on. So it is expected that our reserve carry-over of corn next October may be cut down by about 500,000,000 bushels.

The wheat situation is equally strong. The carry-over at the end of this current marketing season is expected to exceed 430,000,000 bushels, which would be about the same as at the beginning of the season. The withdrawal of wheat allotments gives the grower a chance to put in more spring wheat and at the same time have the advantage of price supports.

So it is that to these large piles of food laid away must be added still greater yields. You might ask why it takes more meat and protein foods to feed the military. Is not the military made up of the same men and women that were eating their daily quota of food in civilian life? Surely that is true. But the men and women in service, because of their strenuous and continuing expenditure of physical and mental energy, need more food. Then too, food stockpiles must be built up in every area where an enemy may possibly attack. Although only a few of them may actually ever be used as food.

And then there is another drain upon our food supplies that comes with an emergency. More people are employed at higher wages and harder work. They too have an appetite for heavier diets and the job creates an appetite which comes with higher wages—money enough to pay for the best of food.

Of equal interest to the production of food in the emergency is the price of food. The price the consumer pays and the price the farmer receives are both of dramatic concern to all. Here's where price control now being extensively discussed will come in. Factory workers look at it this way. They say they won't sit by for a freeze on wages while food prices go up. At the same time, the farmer cannot sell his crops unless he receives for them a price that is on a parity with the income of labor. (Parity stated quickly and simply is a figure arrived at through complex processes which establish the point at which the farm products prices are on a level with other prices.)

Now if we take this through easy I think we can work out just what the farm price situation is now and give real meaning to our price-control legislation.

Let us start back in 1949 and the first part of 1950 when farm prices had fallen so drastically as to bring most of the commodity prices out of line with the cost of things the farmer had to buy—all these costs as we recall being on a distinct upgrade.

To correct this situation, we in Congress inserted a provision in the national defense law—the one that empowers the President to put on price controls—that would permit farm prices to come back in line with parity before any price ceilings could be put upon them. To say it another way, the Defense

Production Act earnestly tries to give the farmer this protection by providing generally that no ceiling on agricultural commodities be imposed at levels below the higher of the two standards: (1) Parity or (2) the higher prices during the 30-day period in May and June prior to the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

The very strong position that agriculture finds itself in today so far as large stocks of grains and other storable commodities and so far as price is concerned, did not come about by chance or luck or just happen to happen.

The capacity of our farms to make the fabulous record of production that they achieved through the past 11 seasons came about through the intelligent planning and the hard work of the farmers working in team with broad-gage Government programs that helped them to increase production and to maintain an income that put them on a sound financial footing for continued big yields.

You and your fathers and your families all did your part in making each new year from the beginning of the last war to today a better year. Today the yields of American farmers are 40 percent greater than they were in the 1935-39 average.

All that you and other Future Farmers throughout the country have learned about soil conservation and all the projects of the various sorts from water holes on the limitless cattle ranges of the West to terracing on the steep slopes of Appomattox County farmland has made secure great areas of our Nation's soil. It has held the soil against wind and water. Grassland farming, better pastures, and legumes have encouraged the earth, adding humus and guarding it against erosion.

Each job that you did on your farm became a part of a vast improvement of our greatest natural resource—the land. Working with you was the Department of Agriculture. Through agricultural production programs it aided by paying in part the cost of soil-conserving practices and so assisted farmers who in most instances could not have carried on the project without help.

Let me take time just to quote a few figures. I think they are amazing enough to be worth while and give you a rough idea of how all of us working together have made a real and an astounding contribution to our national wealth and given assurance of a food supply for our citizens in war or peace.

Nearly 3,000,000 farmers are cooperating in the Agricultural conservation program. Since 1936 these cooperating farmers have seeded 51,000,000 acres of soil-conserving pasture. They have built a million dams, used 250,000,000 tons of lime. They applied 24,000,000 tons of superphosphate. Two hundred and fifty-five million acres of green manure crops were established and turned under to the continued enrichment of those millions of acres of hard pressed soil. Just a few more. One hundred and thirty million acres were contoured. And last but not least 225,000 acres of trees were planted.

In Virginia alone 47 percent of the farms, totaling almost 10,500,000 acres, took part in the ACP programs. Over 70 percent of the farmers received some assistance with the average gross assistance amounting to $67.36.

With such Paul Bunyan-like achievements going on across the Nation, the vast production that bulwarked our troops and war workers throughout the last war and enabled them to win is explained. So great was the ability of our farmers and the strength of our soil even after the drains in energy and demands made upon the soil, we were able to follow through by feeding the war-wrecked and soil-depleted nations of the democratic world until they could be back on their feet.

The cost of this gigantic operation in soil saving considered in the light of a basic defense move was indeed a bargain. Defense usually comes high with airplane carriers proposed at a cost of $300,000,000. Airplanes in experimental stages at $100,000,000 apiece are not out of the ordinary for the new supersonic models. The cost of the ACP program last year, in which nearly 3,000,000 farmers took part and 681,000,000 acres were benefited, came to $285,000,000.

Going alone hand in hand with the encouragement of better farming methods was the price-support program which gave the farmer reasonable assurance of an income adequate to keep his farming operations going.

The need for an economic protection to the farmer if we were to have a sound national economy and to keep our farms operating as going concerns was pointed up in the early thirties. Then with no economic protection we saw 32-cent wheat, 19-cent corn, 10-cent eggs, and 18-cent butter. Along with the wreckage of the price structure went the foreclosures. Millions of acres of land lay idle and naked to erosion. Farmers could not afford to put in the crops.

It was our good fortune that no marauding dictators saw fit at that time to take a crack at us. It would have been very bad for us had they.

This economic stability which has accrued to the farmer and has benefited the Nation as a whole by pouring untold billions of dollars into the national wealth and into trade, was bought very cheaply.

Before we consider the cost let's get price-control operations in focus by seeing what they have done for tobacco growers in Virginia.

As you may know, Brunswick and Mecklenburg Counties, along with Halifax and Pittsylvania, stand out as counties where tobacco is the most important product. Of course, in the counties of southside Virginia especially, tobacco represents a far greater portion of farm income than for the State as a whole.

And that means something because the proportion of Virginia income from tobacco is on the increase. Twenty-one years ago the value of all the tobacco produced in all the Commonwealth represented only one-fourth of our total income from farm crops. That is on an average from 1925 until 1929. That is a little before most of you Future Farmers were around here.

But from the period 1945 to 1949, which all of you remember well, tobacco represented one-third of the total income of the Commonwealth. And in this census Halifax, Pittsylvania, Mecklenburg and Brunswick Counties stand out. Four-fifths of their total cash income was from tobacco.

The farmers of this great Commonwealth have worked together and with their Government in the tobacco programs that have assured a fair return for labor expended. They are to be congratulated for having accepted their responsibilities in the promotion and operation of those programs. For when the farmer receives a good price for his tobacco, his neighbor shares in his prosperity. Good prices to the tobacco grower help to assure jobs and good income to all of the people in our Commonwealth.

In the 17 years of the operation of price supports, the total cost has been $736,800,000 or an average of $43,000,000 a year over the 17-year period. For most of this time only wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice—all storable commodities—constituted the basic crops protected by price supports. It was not until the recent war that an attempt was made to support perishables. The $43,000,000 average loss a year is attributable mostly to losses on potatoes, eggs, dried milk, butter, and cheese. In fact $593,000,000 of the loss was accounted for by these perishables letting the loss on the storable commodities at $132,800,000 or an average of $7,800,000 per year.

So far so good. You Future Farmers have had projects that have been fun to do and that have paid off in better crops, better livestock and given you the fun of trying for an honest goal.

Now how are these projects to be turned to the defense of our Nation?

Here are a few things that must be done—done right away. First, we have got to take care of our farm machinery and equipment. We have got to work with the soldiers at the front and those who are going to the front. Equipment and repairs for farm machinery will not have first priorities. The materials that go to make up tractors, plows, discs, and steel silos will first go into weapons of defense, planes, trucks, and all that are needed to keep the enemy from our shores. Of course, this means that there will be less farm machinery to be brought first hand from now on.

So it's up to the future farmers of America and the present farmers of America, if America is to have a future and farmers are to farm as we know it in America, to cooperate in order to maintain the mechanical efficiency of American farms.

Many of you future farmers took part during the last war in projects which helped keep crumbling farm equipment in order. If you didn't take part in it, you heard about it from elder brothers, your fathers, and your teachers. They told you what the setup was.

When we came into the last war we had even less farm machinery than we have today, and more of it was in bad repair. This was due to the fact that we had not recovered from the depression, and farmers had not yet obtained income enough to get all the machinery which they needed.

The comparative machinery situation lines up like this:

	1941	1950
Automobiles	4,300,000	5,800,000
Tractors	1,700,000	3,800,000
Trucks	1,100,000	2,200,000
Milking machines	210,000	710,000
Combines	225,000	650,000
Mechanical corn pickers	120,000	410,000

So here's what we can do with what we have. First, make a project of looking over your farm equipment in the light of future events. Look it over carefully. You will know what it needs and what it is going to need in the way of repairs. So the best thing to do is to order the repairs needed and the repairs that it looks like you are going to need. After you have got these lined up, order them at once. It will help your country and your farm and save you a lot of trouble later.

I am saying this despite the fact that your farm might be better equipped than it ever was mechanically. I would still look around for parts that are wearing out or that look like they are going to give out.

Out of 100,000,000 tons of steel normally used by farm implement manufacturers, 20,000,000 go into repair parts. Rationing indicates that 75,000,000 tons will go into new farm machinery and that by the same ratio 15,000,000 tons will go into repair parts. An effort is being made to adjust this relationship so that a larger percent of the material available will be used for parts.

Here's another way to make your farm a profit to yourself and to your country. Use fertilizer and lime. Get your order in for your lime and fertilizer now. Take the fertilizer now and store it on your farm until you are ready to use it. By doing so you can keep the factories and the mixers working steadily and save storage and transportation that can be used to further other defense efforts.

Your Future Farmers have had many projects in the efficient use of labor. The care of equipment, the ordering of new parts and the use of fertilizer in accordance with the anticipated demand for them is naturally labor

saving. If you have a machinery part that is faltering and you have already ordered and have on hand its replacement, much labor has been saved. It is a long trip to town and it may be a long time that you sit idle on the tractor while your implement dealer sends to the county distributor for the part and the county distributor sends to the factory for the part. All of that is labor saving. And there are others—

And last, but not least, we have the soil. In days when we do not know how long it will take to win the conflict that now faces us, we must be sure of one thing—and that is the efficiency of our soil.

As we talked before about how the production increased year by year through the last war and all through the world famine because we had care for our soil. Today there is a greater obligation on the part of the farmer and the Government to see that the agricultural conservation programs step out and fight the enemies on the home front—careless farming and its allies wind and water erosion—and protect us from the devasting raids upon our land that this pair make.

In other words, it is up to us to see that pasture improvement, cover crops, terracing, and all the other soil saving methods are practiced with even greater intensity in these times than in ordinary times.

It is up to all of us to help ourselves and each other in order that each of us may work our own farms, choose our own girls, and rear our own children in accordance with our own beliefs, and do our part to see that as many others as possible in this world have the same opportunities—opportunities of freedom.

Postwar Assistance to France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on February 14 it was my good fortune to be host at a small luncheon in honor of the Honorable Charles Delbruck, president of the Lutheran Churches of France. Unfortunately, many Members of the House and Senate were out of the city at the time, but we invited as many Lutherans as we could find, and most of them were present.

Mr. Delbruck is a lay Lutheran, and operates a textile manufacturing business. All of us present had a very profitable luncheon hour. Economic, political, and religious questions were discussed. Notes were not kept of the questions and answers, but I do have our distinguished visitor's eloquent opening statement, and I ask unanimous consent to insert the statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Dear brothers in Christ, I wish to express in the name of the Lutheran churches of France, the gratitude which is overflowing our hearts and that I cannot keep to myself any longer.

Let me tell you that following the last war we met your representatives in Europe to have the Lutheran World Federation and we have experienced a wonderful and most precious feeling of Christian love coming from over the ocean and surrounding us.

We are thoroughly thankful to you for the wonderful help you gave us and are still giving us; for the promptitude of your action and its efficiency coming as it did when our country was liberated of the occupant. It came at a time when everything was so difficult for us, when the tremendous task of reconstruction as well as moral and spiritual regeneration faced us, when we had to rebuild our churches, our parsonages, our parish houses and our homes, our schools, our factories, our roads and bridges, our railroads, and telephone and telegraphic systems; when such a work seemed far from possible, and when there was no food and no clothes for our children.

And just at that time, when we were not far from despair, answering our prayers to God to give us help, came the news that our brothers in faith from over the ocean had made a tremendous effort to help us, bringing to us a new hope and possibilities to stand again and little by little to resume life again.

We heard and rejoiced to hear that funds had been gathered, that this effort was to last, but, above all, we had the feeling that we were not alone before this heavy task awaiting us, that brothers in faith were praying with us and for the success of this task; that we were children of the big Lutheran world-wide church, that our brothers and sisters in faith stood by us and shoulder to shoulder with us. And this was the answer to our prayers to God when we felt so distressed and helpless.

And this is why I wish to say to you, quite simply today, but from the deepest of our hearts, "We thank you for all that you have given to us your brothers in Jesus Christ. Thank you for the brotherly and Christian way and for the spirit in which you have come to our help."

The Republican Party and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a speech entitled "The Republican Party and the Future," delivered by Malcolm Williamson, of Waynesville, N. C., at the Lincoln Day box supper, Uline Arena, Washington, D. C., on Monday, February 5, 1951.

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

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE FUTURE

On the eve of the celebration of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, whose name has become almost synonymous with the Republican Party, it is fitting that we consider the Republican Party and the future.

From the days when Lincoln, the dark horse candidate of the Republican Party, was elected President with only 1,866,000 popular votes, until now, 13 of the 17 Presidents of the United States have been members of the Republican Party. In the 90 years since 1860 our country has made such great strides that today we can truthfully say we are the most powerful and influential Nation on earth. The American way of life has become the envy of all peoples who long for the material and spiritual blessings which through the years of Republican guidance came to this land of freedom and opportunity. I need not remind you that the freedom and prosperity of our country, in large measure has been due to the Republican belief in free enterprise and despite the Democratic belief in creating prosperity through endless Government subsidies. The only way to increase a standard of living is to produce more. Fortunately, the Republican Party realizes this. Our party's history is adorned with the names of great national leaders like Lincoln, and McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt who demonstrated that America could not only become strong internally, but could become, in a short 40 years, the hope of freemen everywhere. The Republican Party has contributed much to America in the past. It can and it will contribute even more in the future.

The Republican Party has had days of adversity as well as days of prosperity. Though it is true that from 1932 until now our party has suffered a set-back in the national elections, this eclipse has never been total. These losses show that in many areas the party has suffered from disunity. In recent years many Republicans have meekly followed the leaders of "me-tooism." This me-too philosophy is the most dangerous enemy of the Republican Party today. Its futility is obvious. By the defeat of the Republican ticket in 1948, the people have shown that if they must have the Democratic program, they will elect Democrats to carry it out. This has been an expensive lesson, but I believe that we have learned it. As evidence of the abandonment of "me-tooism," in every 1950 Senatorial race where the Republican fought for Republican principles, he was elected. If the Republican Party is ever to regain power, we must say and do what we believe. Republican policy must not be merely a few vague principles. It must be manifested in the everyday decisions of the United States Government, as it was in the extremely constructive Eightieth Congress.

On the surface the future looks dark for America. The inevitable retribution for past mistakes is about to overtake us. The administration leaders realize that their past is catching up with them. They seem so worried about their political careers, however, that they can see no way out. Their only proposal is to arm to the teeth even if it bankrupts the Nation, which is exactly what Russia wants. Fortunately, we have Republicans in Washington with the ability to chart other courses for the ship of state. Largely through Republican efforts we are at long last telling our allies that they must either stand with us all the time, regardless of petty differences, or they must stand by themselves. Through Republican efforts the administration is being forced to consider allowing Chiang Kai-shek's troops to fight their enemies instead of making American boys bear all the sacrifices. Through Republican efforts America is about to construct its first real foreign policy since Franklin Roosevelt recognized the Soviet Union. Though it is true that the present predicament of the United States cannot be blamed on the Republican Party, we can be blamed if we do not fulfill our duty to work endlessly for a workable, peaceful solution to our tragic plight.

The Republican Party also has a great responsibility to the future of America in the field of domestic policy. The greatest blessing a government can bestow upon its people is to give them a sound currency. Through inflation the Socialist schemers have almost realized their dream of making old people dependent on the Government by destroying the value of their savings. Inflation can never be checked by minor controls around the edges. It can only be stopped at its source—reckless Government spending. Republicans have always realized the danger of an unbalanced budget and are at last achieving a measure of success against deficit

financing. Calvin Coolidge might have offered as a remedy to governmental extravagance, the simple statement, "I do not choose to spend." Republicans in Congress must balance the budget, reduce the national debt, eliminate unnecessary and undesirable Government agencies, and give the American people government at a cost they can afford to pay. If Republicans will take the lead in achieving these goals, I have no doubt that the Republican Party will receive its just reward.

To regain control of the National Government, the Republican Party must become strong in the South. This is a difficult task, but it is not a hopeless one. I believe that the average southerner is in symptathy with the Republican principles, but does not realize it. They call themselves southern Democrats, but everyone knows a southern Democrat is a Republican too stubborn to admit it. With a little education, work, organization, and perseverance the Republican Party can win the South.

The greatest need of the United States today is leadership. The Democratic Party has been unable to provide it. The Republican Party can. It offers an alternative to war. It offers economical government, labor-management stability, increased prosperity, a logical solution to inflation, and it offers hope to America. Surely the American people will eagerly accept the party with these policies and in 1952 we shall elect a Republican President.

Proposed Dispersal of Federal Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial from the Sun, published in Arlington, Va., with respect to the proposed plan for the dispersal of Federal agencies into Virginia and Maryland.

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

A VIEW ON DISPERSAL

We hope Congress takes a long and searching look at the current proposals for dispersal of Federal agencies into the Virginia and Maryland countryside. This week indications were that the ideas of the Federal planners were arousing a lot of questions on Capitol Hill.

Last week Senator BYRD told an Arlington audience he was reserving opinion on the dispersal plan. He pointed out that an enormous initial cost would by no means be the end of the expense involved, and more important, he pointed out that dispersal, as it is understood now, would still leave in Washington the really vital personnel and units of Government.

Additionally, we think it is high time something was said about the moral aspect of a flight from Washington. There is an element of what some might call cowardice in the prospect. At a time when, above all else, the United States should display complete firmness and faith in itself, it offers the rest of the world the picture of administrative bureaus running away from the Nation's capital.

If we admit, as under dispersal we would admit, that we can't defend our own capital city against a potential foe which must traverse thousands of air miles to reach it, then it seems to this newspaper we present a sorry sight for all to behold.

What can Washington expect the great manufacturing cities of its own country to think—Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, New York, and all the others? No one speaks of dispersing their factories or their teeming populations of producing workmen. Let dispersal of Washington bureaus become a fact, and it isn't hard to imagine the scorn and derision—to say nothing of the bitterness—with which the Capital would be regarded throughout the Nation.

No layman knows today what the authoritative judgment may be on the probability of a sneak attack on this country. Commonsense prudence would dictate that certain archives be removed and that preparations be made for a speedy shift from Washington of the heart of the military establishment, of the President's office, and of Congress, at the moment when a potential condition became critical. But that sort of preparation is a vastly different matter from the shifting now of thirty to fifty thousand administrative personnel a few miles outside the city.

As they think it over thoroughly, Members of Congress may find that the dispersal plan as it has so far been drafted will, if carried through, leave them open to some very embarrassing questions at home. And the Nation will, we think, find its prestige seriously undercut in every other capital.

The threat which Russian communism poses becomes greater, and bolder in action, exactly in proportion to the degree the rest of the world exhibits apprehension and uncertainty. Under present conditions, removal of a considerable segment of the machinery of Government from Washington would amount to a tacit admission of fear and doubt, which the Kremlin would find most cheering.

Benjamin Stolberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article and a statement relating to Benjamin Stolberg, who died recently. The article, written by George Sokolsky, was published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 29, 1951, and the statement was published in the January 31, 1951, issue of Human Events. Benjamin Stolberg was one of the outstanding figures in this country in the battle against communism. I believe the article and the statement pay to Mr. Stolberg a well-deserved tribute.

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

[From the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1951]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

I suppose when a man passes 50, he begins to go to funerals. For years, I never went to one. During the past week, I went to two and could have gone to a third were I in San Francisco, where my friend, Edgar Rickard, died after living a long and good life. Friends pass on and leave a void that is not filled too soon and sometimes never.

The death of Ben Stolberg is a greater loss to this country than is readily realizable. Ben might have been regarded as the theoretician, the guide and philosopher of anti-Marxism in America.

Long before many who today are shocked by the almost inhuman brutality of the Communists realized the dangers of an unmoral way of life, Ben Stolberg recognized the evil and the peril to mankind. He inspired a band of fighters.

Ben was a Jew from Germany who came to this country early enough to go to Harvard and the University of Chicago. Although not native in English, he developed a literary style that was pungent, sharp, and precise.

His use of words mirrored his mind, for he cut through dross and shams with the deftness of a surgeon and found the heart of the problem where it stood out uncovered, for better or for worse.

His integrity was so crystal clear that he suffered for being in advance of the times.

But in recent years, he talked more than he wrote. Many of us found in his mind a storehouse of precisely cataloged data and experience, and his wisdom a guide to the target.

We took his wares, hardly realizing that he could have used them to his own advantages. And he gave to whoever asked, without regard to himself. He lived a cause, and his cause was anticommunism. To put it more constructively, he had discovered the soul of America and made it his faith.

It is interesting—and surely of more than passing significance—that this immigrant should have loved America so uncompromisingly. This was no second home. This was no place of refuge. This was all to him.

Perhaps it may sound exaggerated to those who take everything for granted that they find here, but Ben Stolberg literally loved the United States, its traditions, its institutions, it soul. His only son, David, fights in Korea.

Perhaps the full sadness of this apparently jolly man's life was a consciousness that he might have done it all differently. For his convictions and beliefs and faith matured in his fifties as he could not have foreseen in his twenties and thirties. Once perhaps cynical, he had found faith.

He had become a conservative in the truest sense of the word; that is, a conservator, one who constructively seeks to preserve, to guard the richness of tradition, making progress within the disciplines of historic truth.

Had he lived longer, this mature view of life would have given his work a new and powerful direction. This I can tell you: Many articles written by many writers, many speeches spoken by great public figures found their inspiration in the conversation and in the notes which Ben Stolberg bestowed so lavishly.

And yet he had nothing of worldly goods, nor did he even live comfortably. I am certain that in recent years he was not disturbed by the income tax.

Boycotted and blacklisted by Communist and fellow-traveler magazine and publishing house editors, he regarded that, too, as part of the fight against Stalin. In fact, while he was dying, in his last hour, he smilingly said: "Yes, I did kill Joe Stalin."

And so our friends go and we weep for them and move on to our work. And then each of us goes, too, and a new generation takes over. Always the satisfaction must be that nothing really dies.

We plant our little seeds and the trees which we never live to see grow. We hurl ideas into the air and they do take root.

Stolberg lived long enough to see the day when most Americans are sure that communism is not just a political party, but an

evil out of the Apocalypse. He heard the hooves of the four horsemen long, long ago. We can all hear them now, for they are upon us.

[From Human Events of January 31, 1951]

BENJAMIN STOLBERG

The sudden death of Benjamin Stolberg last week is indeed a severe loss. A list of his books appearing in the obituary notices in the papers bears testimony to his erudition and knowledge of politics, especially in the labor field. Recent pieces in the American Mercury—one on TAFT, another on Lattimore—showed his talents undimmed. But it is not so much the loss of his pen, brilliant as it was. Ben was a Bohemian—somewhat like that artist in Balzac's Cousin Bette; many of his masterpieces were talked, not written. It was in that very role that his influence—the influence of the cenacle—was exerted. As George Sokolsky well pointed out the other day in his column, Ben's great background knowledge, the pyrotechnics of his conversation, and the shrewd alertness of his mind proved of inestimable inspiration not only to other writers and thinkers, but also to many figures in the arena of politics.

His death came with special cruelty, for the word had gone around that Ben was making a come-back. It may be recalled that he had been so bold, in the thirties, as to expose the Communist ramifications in the American labor movement. To use a journalist's expression, the story was "broken too soon." It was not too soon for the good of the country, but at that time the Communist infiltration and influence had risen to a new high; and "liberals," in and out of editorial offices, found the Stolberg frankness too strong a medicine. Within 10 years, of course, Phil Murray and his aides were sweating profusely in an effort to purge the Reds whom Stolberg had uncovered a decade before.

As a result of this cowardice, Ben was blacklisted and his hitherto familiar byline disappeared from national magazines. His is but one case of the general boycott imposed on writers of independence. There were others: John T. Flynn, William Henry Chamberlin, Eugene Lyons—to mention a few. They were punished for being "right too soon." But the events of the past year began to have effect; a few editorial doors closed to Ben were beginning to open. When we saw him a fortnight ago he was filled with plans for articles, books, a column, etc. Then suddenly it was all over.

Telegram From Senator Lehman to Lithuanian American Information Center on Thirty-third Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Friday, February 16, was the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. On the occasion of that day I was very pleased to address to the Lithuanian American Information Center a telegram greeting Americans of Lithuanian descent on the observance of this historic occasion.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my telegram in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 13, 1951.

Miss MARY KIZIS,

Executive Secretary, Lithuanian American Information Center, New York, N. Y.:

Following is message marking anniversary of Lithuanian independence:

"This thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania is for all a day when we must rededicate ourselves to the liberation of a people who after a century of Russian domination, and brief years of independence are again under the heavy yoke of foreign tyranny. It is the prayer of all of us that the spirit and courage of the people of Lithuania will remain steadfast and unchanged during these darks days of oppression. To those Americans with friends and relatives in their native country, I can offer only the continuing hope that they may again be reunited through the reestablishment of a free and independent Lithuania. All who are devoted to freedom, liberty, and justice are resolved to hasten that day of the deliverance of Lithuania into the family of free nations."

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

Soil for Peace or War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota is extremely fortunate to have as one of its leading farm editors Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, farm editor, St. Paul Dispatch-Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn. Mr. Stedman has had years of experience in agricultural matters, having served with honor and distinction as an official of the Department of Agriculture. His intimate knowledge of the agricultural economy of the Midwest is revealed by his penetrating and constructive articles concerning agricultural legislation and programs.

On February 8 last, Mr. Stedman addressed the Minnesota Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors. His comments pertaining to the value of soil conservation in our defense program are worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Stedman's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SOIL FOR PEACE OR WAR

The roots of the United States-Russian contest for world leadership go deep into the soil. The dead dynasties of the past lie buried under eroded earth. The modern maritime empires have failed or faded. But surviving are two landed nations. The contest of ideologies is between these landed giants. The United States has one of the world's great rich-land areas. Russia has the other. Today their contest moves toward some grand climax, or we hope anticlimax, that is still hidden and holding the world in suspense.

The rivals' strength comes from their resources of the earth—their metals, coal, oil, waters, timber and also vital food to feed their working, planning and fighting forces. Thus the soil producing the food has a key place in the preparedness program that aims above all to maintain peace by making war prohibitively dangerous to Russia or, if that aim should fail, to win World War III.

We have some land advantages, but so has Russia. We have the freedoms of our farms and homes that are not a dictator's but here can be our own in fee simple. We have superior food producing power conveyed by machines and know-how. Russia, however, has untapped soil resources east and west of the Urals that she is busily exploiting. In the Danube Basin, Poland, and East Germany, she has a grip on the bread lands of other countries. But we of the United States are compelled to stand or fall on the soil we've got.

So we are hit by the most urgent of all farm questions. What will our Nation do to safeguard its soil?

In the emergency, the United States is getting set to put great new strains on its remaining soil fertility. The official call is out to grow more, more and still more food.

This continuing burden is to fall on a shrinking soil reserve. More than 280 million acres already have been ruined or nearly so by erosion. Half a million more go down the drain each year. Scientists say the curve of our productive soil resources still slants sharply downward. The line of worn-out cash-cropped soils is moving westward across our state and Nation. Cropping alone is removing soil nutrients from Minnesota lands six to nine times faster than their replacement by fertilizers. All this is weakening the food foundation of our Nation and others depending heavily on us for food. And the too-precarious margin of food safety is exposed to imponderable dangers of drouth, of grain rust or livestock epidemics, either accidental or unloosed in biological war.

And now your soil conservation district work feels a deep and patriotic urge to get ahead faster. The goal is a technically sound soil conservation plan for every farm. But you have never had enough technicians to draw those plans and right now you urgently need more appropriations to supply them. In the Nation, the task of getting such farm plans in operation isn't yet one-fifth done. In Minnesota, it has reached only 1 farm in 15. At last year's rate, getting the whole job done nationally would take until 1987. At a stepped-up rate being proposed by Chief H. H. Bennett, it would take until 1971. For this essential, farm-by-farm conservation program, that would represent great progress.

But the United States now faces emergency as well as long-time soil needs. The need to hasten with gully control, contouring, terracing, and tree planting remains, and is more pressing. But besides that there are additional needs for easing the special, intensified drains of emergency farming. Rapid speed-up in adoption of crop rotation systems is urgent. More acres need to be returned to legumes and grasses. More acid soils ought to be limed. More humus and plant nutrients should be going back into the land. So the emergency side of the soil job will need close attention by you and the consolidated Federal agency that is soon to get the conservation job. We must come to grips with the question of how to win over many more of a very substantial minority of farmers to conservation farming. This is especially true when farm labor shortages fan the urge to farm in simple, familiar ways.

Conservation farming appeals powerfully to established, careful farmers, with pride in good work, in good soil, in service to the Nation, and a very warm spark of religion in their souls. It offers them bigger and surer long-time returns. From grass in rotation, they can get more feed units per acre and return more nutrients to the soil, with great savings in labor. Over the years, they can average more corn or oats or flax on fewer acres. Their built-up soil reserves are a fine investment for self, for posterity, and for country.

Why, then, do so many go right on straight cash-cropping, uphill and down, just mining the soil in the same old way? With some, the case for conservation has simply failed of any convincing presentations. Some find it hard to change long, ingrained habits of farming. Some want to take one more big gamble at selling off soil fertility while these prices hold. Maybe a few are emotionally "ag'in" it.

But many are up against very real troubles. Some of these have farm mortgages so heavy as virtually to compel the mining of their soil. Some renters have annual leases giving small assurance of return of long-time investments in building the land. Some just haven't the money to pay the first costs of conservation.

How can more of this large number be won to conservation farming in the emergency and after? A much better information job by all organs of information, including the press, can and should be done. Also, we can look into the chances for reforms in the lease laws. Further, we could ask the banking fraternity to help work out reforms in those conventional farm loan practices that are now virtually forcing vicious mining of the soil.

Also, we can continue to use inducements to offset first costs and get conservation practices started. That's not buying or bribing. Rather it is a familiar way to launch a selling job. Business far and wide uses inducements every day to get sales campaigns rolling. To increase defense plant capacity, Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson officially stresses the offer to business of inducements in the form of Government loans, tax assurances, and guaranties.

The Government has been offering conservation incentives in forms of technical aid, payments, or shares in the costs of fertilizers, lime, and seedling trees. If practical businessmen consider that a big scale offer to business of incentives is necessary to increase defense plant capacity, the moderate use may also be found wise for safeguarding soil-producing capacity. If not, then a great hunt will be needed at once for other effective means of greatly expanding the scope of soil conservation in the emergency.

America can, in that emergency, go on neglecting the soil foundation of her food supply. In that way seems to lie the greatest risk. Or America can do her best to safeguard her soil. In that way seems to lie the best chance of strengthening the preparedness program's bid for peace, and hence of serving the greatest safety for the Nation.

Liberation of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of February 12, 1951, by Dr. V. S. Krajcovic, chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia.

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

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR
LIBERATION OF SLOVAKIA,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1951.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, I like to express my deep appreciation for this opportunity to demonstrate the necessity for this solemn protest against the violation of religious freedom and the crimes against humanity perpetrated by the Red regime in Czechoslovakia, which on January 15, 1951, sentenced Bishop Michael Buzalka, of Bratislava, and Bishop Eugen Gojdic, of Presov, to life imprisonment, while the dean of Slovak hierarchy, Bishop Jan Vojtassak, of Spiska Kapitula, received 24 years of imprisonment.

These three Slovak bishops have been tried and imprisoned because they too—like Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinats—dared to oppose a totalitarian dictatorship for its ruthless suppression of religious freedom.

These three latest victims of religious persecution were tried at Bratislava, wartime capital of Slovakia, for high treason, military espionage, and other crimes. All three were arrested several months before the trial opened and were subjected to a conditioning treatment. Their arrest came after they criticized the Red regime's pseudo-Catholic seminary which opened last fall at Bratislava. Earlier these gallant prelates had scored Communist authorities for liquidation of Catholic convents and monasteries which the defendants were said to have opposed. The bishops were blamed for everything done by the Nazis and politicians during World War II. They were charged with having consecrated illegal bishops in their own dioceses on orders from the Vatican.

The Prague Red radio announced that all three defendants had confessed their crimes. But to the listeners to the excerpts of the trial broadcast there was every indication that the bishops were speaking completely out of character as they mechanically recited their confessions at the prompting of the Czech prosecutor, Karol Bedrna. One other proof of the conditioning of the three Slovak prelates is the fact that these confessions were replete with Communist ideology which was totally at variance with the usual manner of speaking of the bishops.

Bishop Buzalka, of Bratislava admitted at this travesty of justice and mock trial, that he maintained a negative attitude toward the people's uprising in 1944; that he was spreading antipeople propaganda at confirmation ceremonies, missions, and retreats; that he sent calumniating reports on church conditions under the Red regime. He expressed his scorn of false Vatican radio reports, admitted alleged illegal contacts and espionage reports. At one point in the mock trial, the Red stage managers had overplayed their hands. Prompted by two identical questions, Bishop Buzalka twice picked up and painfully recited the same paragraph. When the Red prosecutors realized that their tactic had misfired, they tried to drown out Bishop Buzalka's speech with a volley of new questions.

The 73-year-old dean of Slovak hierarchy, Bishop Vojtassak of Spiska Kapitula, hardly stood on his feet, but proudly uttered into the face of his Communist persecutors the belief that Slovakia will be free and that again the religious freedom and the high principles of humanity will prevail. He was charged of having received from American Slovak Catholics $10,000, but arranging to have the funds remitted to exiled Slovak leaders; for having announced excommunication decree against Communists; for withholding dispensation for Sunday work ordered by the Communists; and for mimeographing of illegal pastorals and distributing subversive leaflets.

Bishop Eugen Gojdic, of Presov, the only living Greek Catholic bishop behind the iron curtain, was charged with writing inciting pastoral letters and illegal leaflets; with sending espionage reports to the Vatican, and with helping the underground forces in Slovakia.

Thus, on January 15, 1951, Bishop Buzalka and Bishop Gojdic received the life sentence, while Bishop Vojtassak received 24 years of imprisonment from the hands of Communist perpetrators of crimes against humanity and crimes against religious freedom.

The shameless comedy of this mock trial buried the three great Slovak bishops in prison and thus the three most powerful bastions of the Slovak national resistance against communism have been annihilated.

Since then a month passed, and although the imprisonment of these three Slovak religious leaders was a case of flagrant violation of basic human rights and a case of violation of religious freedom, the democratic world was left apathetic to what goes on in Slovakia and behind the iron curtain.

Urged by such representants of American Slovaks like Rev. Emery Gottschall and Mr. John T. Kmetz, the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia laid its protest with the President of the United States, with the Secretary of State, and with the General Secretary of the United Nations, with the request to investigate these crimes and to protest officially by the Czechoslovak Government.

The three Slovak bishops became martyrs only because they committed the crime to worship their Master in their own way, and the crime to preach in their own way the essence of the four freedoms to their Slovak people. But the still free world did not protest, and the United Nations Commission for Human Rights did not even raise its voice for the defense of these democratic and religious leaders of a resisting Slovakia, which even now struggles for its survival.

In this world of apathy and darkness there was, however, one light which came from oppressed Slovakia itself. In the same time when the brave bishops received their sentence the Slovak anti-Communist resistance opened fire against the tyrants in order to convince the world that the hope for freedom is still alive in Slovakia, and that the Slovaks deserve the recognition of their national aspirations for freedom.

In conclusion, I urge you, dear Senator, in the name of all Slovaks who resist communism, to ask the President and the Congress of the United States of America to make an official protest to the Czechoslovak Government against the unjust imprisonment of the Slovak bishops and the persecution of religion and other crimes against humanity which are daily perpetrated in Slovakia, and to bring the case of Slovakia to the attention of the United Nations.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. V. S. KRAJCOVIC.

Edison's Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "Edison's Vision," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J., on February 8, 1951.

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

EDISON'S VISION

(By George E. Stringfellow)

Nothing is more impressive to our eyes and to our imagination than the rising sun, increasing the light from the faintest beginnings to the full splendor of a brilliant morning.

This planet was a dreadful place before the sun had done its work. Monsters infested the earth. The air was saturated with poison gases. No creature now living could possibly have breathed before the sun purified the air.

The sun has been working for a long time to improve things. We now have a planet upon which we can live and upon which we have made at least a start toward looking at the best side of nature.

King Solomon was said to be wise. But, when the thunder roared and the lightning flashed, his conscience troubled him. The king would turn away from his many wives and his own doubtful associates. Solomon would run to the bed and put his head under an embroidered pillow where he would lay shivering. Even Sheba could do nothing for him. The thought that lightning could be tamed and put to work never entered Solomon's mind.

I speak today of the man who made lightning our servant. I refer, of course, to Thomas Alva Edison, who was born in Milan, Ohio, 104 years ago next Sunday. You know much about his successes. Let me tell you something about his failures, for it is mainly from their failures and what they did in the face of their misfortunes that we learn most about the great men of history that will help us.

Edison lived to be 84. His formal education was limited to 3 months in the public schools. His teacher sent him home as a moron to be cared for by the State.

Edison insisted that he could not have succeeded without the lessons of his misfortunes and failures. In fact, he emphasized that even the misfortune of deafness, from which he never recovered, was a great asset.

When Edison was 12 years old he was working as a newsboy on a train between Port Huron and Detroit. One of the way stations on this run was Smiths Creek. It was there the happening occurred which made Edison deaf. Now we shall see what were the facts.

There are many vivid and contrary versions of the origin of Edison's affliction, but what actually happened may be told in his own words: "My train was standing by the platform at Smiths Creek station," said Edison, "and I was trying to climb into the freight car with both arms full of newspapers when the conductor lifted me by my ears. I felt something snap inside my head. My deafness started from that time and has continuously progressed," concluded the genius.

Here is a boy, 12 years old, seized by a man and lifted by his ears, to be made deaf to the end of his days. A word of complaint? Never throughout his long life. Bitterness toward the man—for this was the act of a man, not an act of nature—a feeling of self-pity, frustration, rancor, "Why did this have to happen to me?" Well, hardly. Look at the consequences.

Edison spoke of his deafness much as Helen Keller speaks of her blindness. "My deafness has not been a handicap but a help to me," said Edison. "From the very start, after the earache pain ceased, deafness probably drove me to reading."

He was, in his energy, courage, compassion, and sincerity, even thankful for the necessity of adapting his experiments to his affliction. He attributed at least two important developments to that necessity—the telephone as civilization knows it today and the phonograph.

"In experimenting on the telephone," Edison explained, "I had to improve the transmitter so I could hear it. This made the telephone commercially practical, as Bell's magneto telephone receiver was too weak to be used as a transmitter commercially.

"It was the same with the phonograph. The great defect of that instrument was the rendering of the overtones in the music and the hissing consonants in speech. I worked over a year, 20 hours a day, Sundays and all, to get the word 'specie' perfectly recorded. When this was done I knew that everything else could be recorded."

This greatest inventor of all time was never discouraged by his small knowledge of anything. It wasn't so much what he knew that helped him but what he tried to know. He was a true genius. When he was pressed for a definition of a genius he coined the famous adage: "Genius is 1-percent inspiration and 99-percent perspiration."

Edison knew that freedom and progress for an individual or a nation—or even a genius—does not mean "I do not have to work." He knew the future belongs to those who prepare for it. And he knew that the commonest form of opportunity is harder work and better work.

Edison knew that the heavy ball of progress needs a great deal of pushing. Said Edison, "I recall that after we had conducted thousands of experiments on a certain project without solving the problem, one of my associates expressed discouragement and disgust over having failed 'to find out anything.' But we had learned something. We had learned for a certainty that we couldn't do it that way, and that we would have to try some other way."

With a full measure of friendliness and good will Edison expressed gratitude to those who saw him through. He credited the American free-opportunity system as an essential factor in what he was able to do for all mankind.

In America's low-cost products, created by enterprises without which these products would not exist except for the rich and powerful, Edison saw an asset, like the assets flowing from the sun. "We live in a cooperative commonwealth," he said.

He often pointed to October 28, 1878. This was the date on which thirteen enterprising men who had resources and believed in Edison delivered to the New York County clerk's office the papers for incorporation of an undertaking to support and develop his work. Edison was one of the incorporators. They called it the Edison Electric Light Co. To the public it sounded as strange as if you or I were today to form the Atomic Household Products Co. This group risked $300,000 in an enterprise that had as its only asset the 31-year-old brain of Edison.

But this brain, alive and humming with effort and imagination, was searching for a filament that would glow brilliantly in a glass bulb when electricity passed through the filament. This was a problem of discovery which was buried in the mysteries of electric incandescence. In 361 days, with the support of his business associates, Edison produced a light which later illuminated the world.

Actually, the lamp itself was only a fraction of what Edison needed to accomplish if the light was to be useful on streets, in homes, in workplaces, and if the thousands of future tasks of electricity were to be born—in short, if men and women were to have an electrical age, electricity must be produced and distributed so effectively, so inexpensively, and so safely that people could afford to use it.

While the glowing lamp was the symbol of Edison's success, he had to develop, and his associates had to finance, an entire generating and distributing system including the invention and construction of giant dynamos, conduits, power lines, wires, insulators, sockets, meters, fuses—everything.

Of Edison's 1,097 patents, 360 dealt with the generation and distribution of power. The glow in that little lamp took up the task of light where the sun left off.

While Edison overcame the scientific difficulties in the delivery of power and the defeat of darkness, he pointed out that it was cooperation, vitality and risk-taking willingness of American business enterprise that sustained him and brought his results within reach of all. It was this enterprise, and the American opportunity for free enterprise, that left him free to develop his wonderful talents of invention and development. It ran the risk and supplied the vast capital needed to translate his inventions into tools for human advancement. In short, American enterprise made the inventions widely useful to average people, and at a low cost to all. And this is the essence of human progress. This is the system which our intellectual morons would take apart, tamper with and destroy in the name of liberalism. Oh, liberalism, what sins are committed in thy name against humanity.

But Edison's risks were not over. I spoke of failure a few minutes ago. This is what I meant.

About 1890, 11 years after the first success of his electric light, Edison set out to devise a system of mining and milling low-grade iron ore that would be economically sound. He was convinced that the country's known deposits of iron ore were disappearing. In short, he was now going beyond and even deeper than the wires in the bulb, the power stations, dynamos. He was going to the problem of the supply of iron ore itself.

His supporters stayed with him. Through his tremendous effort and what was for them an enormous expenditure of $3,000,000 Edison invented and put into operation a revolutionary method of reclaiming iron ore through ore refinement. It was called the magnetic ore separator.

But the undertaking did not work out. After 6 years, unforeseen developments left Edison and his backers with a terrible failure on their hands. New and immensely rich iron-ore deposits were discovered by other men of imagination, working in other progressive undertakings. Edison's refining methods just could not compete.

Looking back on this period, Edison said, "For a good many years I worried about my payroll; didn't know how I was always going to meet it. My trouble had been that I always had too much ambition and tried to do things that were financially too big for me. If I had not had so much ambition and had not tried to do so many things, I probably would have been much happier, but less useful."

Here is a good example of what is meant by the profit and loss system in our country, a term which should always be used in referring to the way enterprises live instead of merely saving the profit system. For losses, you know, occur even more frequently than profits in business life.

While the immediate outlook for civilization is not encouraging, yet this old world and our relatively new country have withstood many storms of adversity. In substantiation of that statement, may I quote briefly from an editorial from Harper's Weekly:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. * * * Not in the lifetime of men who will read this editorial has there been such a grave

and deep apprehension. Never has the future seemed so incalculable as the present. * * * The political pot seethes and hubbubs with uncertainty. Russia hangs like a dark and silent cloud over the horizon of Europe. * * * All resources and energies of the British Empire are sorely tried."

That editorial was written 95 years ago. Therefore, do not become too despondent about the immediate future.

Edison's last message to the American people was, "Be courageous. * * * History repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Edison lived a good life and when the game was over he turned and met the Great Referee smiling, unafraid, for he won without boasting and he lost without whimpering. He was a man of great courage. He was imbued with the spirit of our founding fathers. He was the essence of intellectual integrity.

Human progress is endless and continuous as the rising of the sun. Much has happened to this planet since the monsters disappeared. But more good things have happened to us than to men and women any place in the world. Look around your town, your home, your living room, your work place, your parks and streets, your stores. The greatest opportunities lie ahead.

The great days of America are by no means done. We have only touched the border of our achievement. If you and I did not believe this, we would not believe in America. Because that faith in America is America.

Unlimited possibilities are ahead through the new Edison being born today; the men and women of imagination and character who are each in their own way helping today and will help even more tomorrow to make America an even greater wonderland of the world.

The Mighty Men of Rushmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a poem dedicated to the Mount Rushmore Memorial.

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

[From the American Legion magazine of February 1951]

SPEAK! FATHERS OF OUR LAND

(By Daniel D. Coons)

Speak! great men on granite throne,
Your deeds shall ever stand
On history's scroll as America's soul,
Speak! fathers of our land.
You began our house with lasting stone,
Have we been building well
This house supreme—your zealous dream,
What does your vigil tell?

What see you now, brave Washington,
As on you gaze through storm and sun
At your democracy?
Think you that we have nourished well
Your hard-won freedom? Can you foretell
If time may see
Some act dispel
Our liberty?

Wise Jefferson, proclaimed your pen
Our independence; say you amen
In silent retrospection?
Grant you full sanction for our deeds,
Laws, diplomacy, political creeds?
Wise Jefferson,
What further needs
Must still be won?

Great martyr Lincoln, your guiding hand
Our Union saved in war-torn land.
Will world-wide unity
Yet gain United Nations goal,
To make mankind's afearing soul
Forever free
From tyrants' toll
And slavery?

Bold Theodore Roosevelt, your dauntless force
Gave to world trade the Isthmus course
Toward the setting sun.
What lies ahead for free estate?
Will despots' greed yet devastate
What trade has done?
Can UN re-create
What barter won?

Watch on, great men; through endless years
Watch on from boundless sky.
Your granite throne is freedom's dome
Your deeds shall never die.
God grant your land of joy and tears
Shall never cease to be,
The star of hope to all who grope
For priceless liberty.

Manpower for the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD several editorials from leading American newspapers concerning the manpower question. I ask consent now to have printed in the Appendix editorials on the same subject from the New York News, the New York Post, the New York Times, the New York World Telegram-Sun, and Philadelphia Inquirer.

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

[From the New York News of January 14, 1951]

WHAT KIND OF DRAFT?

One of the most urgent chores of the Eighty-second Congress is that of deciding which of many plans for easing America's young men into military service would be best for our national security—and fairest for all the youths involved.

Unfortunately, there's no longer any doubt that some sort of compulsory service is necessary. Officially, these are peace times, with some loud police action overtones. But we'd hate to try to convince any GI now in Korea that he isn't tangled in a genuine 18-carat war. And if you don't believe that Joe Stalin would pump us on a minute's notice, any time he thinks he has a jackal's chance of getting away with it, take a look at the latest maps of Europe and Asia.

The bitter fact: If we want to survive as the United States of America we've got to gather up and train enough young manpower to warn off any and all Red Napoleons or to rock them back on their heels when and if they do take an all-out swing at us.

So how has America handled this problem before?

As historians know, we war-loathing and free-wheeling Americans have never taken overkindly to any draft system. In our Revolutionary War plenty of patriots volunteered, but other rugged souls resisted all pressure to make them join up with the Continental Armies except at their convenience. Some took to hissing American officers or even got completely sore and signed up with the Redcoats.

In our Civil War all hell broke loose in many parts of the country. In New York City's own draft riots, July 13–16, 1863, some 1,000 men were killed. Most common protest against the Civil War draft was that any citizen with a few hundred spare dollars, and able to find a substitute, could hire said proxy to do his share of the fighting.

DRAFT DODGERS AND IV–F'S

In World Wars I and II draft reactions were still not entirely satisfactory. The smile-when-you-say-that word of 1917–18 was "draft dodger." In the last war the commonly used term of scorn was "IV–F"—though the too often forgotten fact was that most IV–F's weren't draft dodgers at all, but completely patriotic guys who had flunked a physical or mental examination. Nobody became a IV–F by applying for the title.

As we see it, the universal military service and training plan presented to Congress the other day by Defense Secretary George Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna M. Rosenberg should do away with many previous conscription headaches.

In essence, their proposal is to assign some sort of defense spot to every possible American male as he reaches the age of 18. At present 1,050,000 attain that age annually.

Of these, about 700,000 should be found physically and mentally fit for full combat service. Another 100,000 could be used in non-combat-service jobs.

Still another 20,000 could probably be brought up to snuff by means of a physical rehabilitation program. Of the remaining 230,000, about 150,000 could not qualify for military induction, but might be found capable of doing some useful work in connection with the defense effort.

Only 70,000 or 80,000, according to Defense Department estimates, would be incapable of any type of assignment because of "extreme physical, mental, or moral handicaps."

TRAINING AND JOBS

One big benefit of such fine-combing of our youth power, of course, will be to ease the discontent and irritation which accompanied our last war's 34-percent rejection rate. Under the new plan, all but completely disqualified youngsters will be doing their share, with or without a rifle.

As for pay and length of service, the recruits would get $30 a month for 4 months. Thereafter, for the duration of their draft hitch of 27 months, they would get a private's pay of $75 for 4 months, then $85 as privates first class.

To avoid cutting off the Nation's upcoming supply of young doctors, scientists, and highly trained specialists, the first 3 years of UMST make provision for the deferment of 75,000 promising students. But even these would get their 4 months' basic training first and then would "owe" the military 23 months' service.

Further details of UMST will have to be debated and decided in Congress, when and if. Right now, though, Uncle Sam needs as many of those 1,050,000 young men annually as he can get, and we have yet to see a draft plan that looks fairer or more effective than this one.

[From the New York Post of January 12, 1951]

THE 18's

These days many issues become intensely personal and we intrude almost timidly into what must seem like intimate family discussions. Who can pass righteous judgment on the Defense Department's proposal to draft 18-year-olds—except the kids and their parents? What soothing words are there to comfort a mother whose son faces induction? We don't own the words and we shall not try to borrow them. We know only that in Russia's slave empire conscription of all human beings is routine; no editorialist dares question it, and a mother airs her sorrow only at grave personal risk.

That is the short-run strength of the commissars. In their domain no single life is deemed worthy of lamentation; the anguish of parents is a publicly proscribed symptom of bourgeois weakness. In our way of life the projected draft of 18-year-olds is a kind of national tragedy, signifying the failure of so many hopes. Its advocates are as mournful as its opponents. We have no inside dope to refute General Marshall's plea for induction of the 18 group and we are sure it gave him no pleasure to propose it. If large-scale induction of the 18's will help to persuade the Kremlin that aggression won't pay off, the action may some day justify rejoicing. But there is no visible impulse now to let the brass bands play and to pretend that the 18's are lucky fellows. For that sanity, at least, let us all be thankful.

[From the New York Times of January 12, 1951]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE TRAINING

The question of universal military service and training has now been put before the country in a form that demands a speedy response from the Congress and the American people. Without prejudicing the necessary arguments and discussions on the details, it is our opinion that the time has come when a failure to enact a universal military service law would endanger the security and even the democratic survival of our country.

We are being forced in a number of fields to make some of the most crucial and comprehensive decisions in the history of the United States. This is one of them, and we must all face it with clear vision. It is not a simple emergency measure that we can handle with a feeling of "Let's get the agony over with." This is a proposal to change our national structure in a more or less permanent way. General Marshall mentioned 10 years; in reality the political situation in the world, with the vast forces of totalitarianism and democracy lined up in strength, does not allow the hope that we could abandon a powerful defensive structure in our generation. We must strike a high level of defense and keep it—what General Marshall called a durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of public alarm or complacency.

The democracies have always been reluctant to adopt UMST, although the equality of obligation that it assumes is of the essence of democracy. The French were the first to realize that fact, appropriately enough during their great revolutionary period, in 1798. Universal military service has always met opposition from the pacifistic point of view, and, in the case of a few, from religious scruples. Great Britain, for instance, struggled against it for years. Clement Attlee, as head of the Parliamentary Labor Party, led the opposition to it in the House of Commons on April 27, 1939. Yet, as Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, head of His Majesty's Government since 1945, continued wartime conscription. Reduced to 12 months under left-wing pressure, the term was raised first to 18 months and then, last October, to 2 years. France, too, in this postwar period cut its UMST term to 1 year, but last October raised it to 18 months. The 27-month maximum that is proposed for our service would be a little longer than that of any of the other democracies. But why not? We are urging other countries to step up military defense, and we should set an example.

No one will claim that a perfect, immutable plan is now being offered. The present program results from the best judgment of the administration, the Secretary of Defense, and the civilian and military heads of all our Armed Forces. It has features that are certainly admirable. Eighteen years is the right age to call up youth. The proposals would use up all but a small and permanently unqualified group, and there are careful plans to sustain our educational structure and keep up an uninterrupted flow of scientists, technicians, and professional men.

The economics of the program seems to be well worked out. General Marshall vouches for the fact that the new plan is best adapted "to give us protection at a cost in men and money that is within the capacity of our economy to bear." Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, indeed, claims that UMST will actually save the country money, since the alternative would be to call up married men and pay dependency allowances.

Possibly there are some risks in the program, but we live in a period when risks are unavoidable. The greatest risk of all lies in weaknesses and inaction. Despite divisions of opinion on what to do with our Armed Forces, the country is united in its determination to rearm and build up our defense. Former President Hoover and President Truman, Seator Taft and Secretary Acheson, Republican and Democrat, are all agreed on the basic necessity for armed defensive strength. UMST, in General Marshall's words, "is at once the most effective, the most economical, and the most democratic way to safeguard our Nation." We should put it into effect as soon as possible.

[From the New York World Telegram-Sun of January 12, 1951]

THE SOONER, THE BETTER

Defense Secretary Marshall and his manpower assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, made two impressive points when they presented the broad outline of a universal military service and training program before a congressional committee this week.

They made clear that universal military service and training is at once the least costly and the most effective means of attaining immediate partial mobilization and at the same time assuring a vitally necessary pool of trained men for the next decade.

Economically, there is this consideration: If we don't draft the 18-year-olds we shall have to tap the young married men, with and without dependents, who are now exempt. There are now 630,000 of these in the 19-26 age group potentially available for induction. If they were called up it would cost the Government $979,000,000 a year including their pay and dependency allowances.

If, instead, an equivalent number of 18-year-old were taken—as proposed under universal military service and training—since they are almost uniformly without dependents, the cost for a year at the proposed pay rate would be $466,000,000. Thus the annual payroll savings alone would be $513,000,000—not counting the loss to industries and farms and to the purchasing power of families that would be involved in calling up married men.

But something much more important than money is involved.

From his experience in World War II, General Marshall said that men of 18, 19, and 20 unquestionably made the best soldiers. They have stamina and recuperative power far beyond that of the older groups.

By starting the training of our young men at 18—instead of 19 as at present—we not only immediately solve the problem of reaching the 3,200,000-man Army goal by next July. We also start an ever-expanding flow of well-trained men into the Reserve components.

It is this important Reserve pool, now lacking, from which an army in being could be doubled or tripled almost overnight. It is the cushion, or durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of grave public alarm and complacency over the next decade. It could mean the difference between national survival or total defeat.

At the same time these youths whose combat training started at 18 will have greatly enhanced their own chances of survival if they are required to go into battle.

The urgency of the situation is beyond question. This newspaper believes, along with General Marshall and other advocates of universal military service and training, that the sooner it is put into effect the greater will be our national security and the stronger our voice for lasting world peace.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of January 17, 1951]

TIME TO GET TO WORK ON REAL NATIONAL SERVICE LAW

Defense Department decision to ask Congressional authority to extend enlistments due to expire in the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for one year sharply points up the persistent delays in the military manpower program.

The fairness of such extensions is decidedly in question. But the necessity for them may be unavoidable. This proposal, and others such as the plan to accept 21-month volunteers for the Army demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the present draft system.

It is plain that the goal of 3,462,205 in the defense forces by June 30 cannot be reached under the present setup, and perhaps not even if the new Universal—National—Military Training Act gets through Congress.

The Defense Department draft of that law has not yet been sent to Congress But prospects are not too good that if the draft is submitted within a day or two as now promised it will be dealt with expeditiously. Futher, there are indications that its effectiveness may be impaired by restrictions on the use of 18-year-olds and other changes.

One thing is sure: more speed on the part of the Defense Department and Congress is needed. In addition Congress itself should make certain that the law shall not have imbedded in it crippling amendments, such as the present Selective Service Act contains.

The importance of this problem is given new emphasis by clear indications that fresh troops will have to be forwarded soon to relieve the harried and battle-weary men who have been taking a pounding in Korea for months, and to replace heavy losses.

It is already late to act. No more valuable time should be lost in enacting a national training measure that will work.

Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Edison's Shining Example," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the other entitled "Thomas A. Edison, Man of Vision," published in the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of February 9, 1951.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 9, 1951]

EDISON'S SHINING EXAMPLE

George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., speaking in Paterson, N. J., has taken notice of the fact that in these times there is more moral significance in Edison's failures, hard work, and handicaps than in his successes.

Since Edison was born 104 years ago in Milan, Ohio, widespread changes have come about in American life. Some of them—electric lights, radio, television—were brought about directly or indirectly by Edison himself.

But if there is one thing clear about Edison it is that he didn't achieve his successes by observing a 40-hour week. He was able at the age of 31 to throw himself into the task of creating not only an incandescent bulb but an entire city generating and distribution system only because he had been conditioned from childhood to take 24-hour days as a matter of course for weeks on end.

The principal secret of Edison's method was to try all the wrong ways of doing a thing in order eventually to find the right one.

That called for patience and a unique ability to face repeated failures with courage and renewed optimism. Above all, it called for the will to work on against heavy odds. That is an attitude hard to find these days. Perhaps the majority of our research scientists do still have it. And there are others. It is upon them that America will have to depend for survival and the continuance of the basic ideals which have made it great.

[From the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of February 9, 1951]

THOMAS A. EDISON, MAN OF VISION

Members of the Paterson Rotary Club were fortunate yesterday in having as their speaker a man who was intimately associated with Thomas A. Edison through the later years of the great inventor's life. Their speaker was George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and one of New Jersey's leading citizens, and his subject was "Edison's Vision."

Mr. Stringfellow spoke eloquently not so much of Thomas A. Edison's successes as of his failures for it is from man's failures and from his misfortunes that much of progress comes. In working to perfect the phonograph, for instance, Edison had difficulty eliminating hissing consonants. Mr. Stringfellow recounts that Edison worked 20 hours a day, every day, for more than a year to get the word "specie" perfectly recorded. There were countless failures in this experimentation. But each failure was a step toward success. Each failure ruled out a faulty step. Success came eventually.

Edison had real and permanent failures, too. He devised a magnetic ore separator to utilize low grade iron ores. It cost him and his backers $3,000,000. Then rich iron ore deposits were discovered. There was no need for the magnetic separator. A technical success, it was a financial failure. But there may still come a day when our Nation, faced with an iron shortage, might practically use the Edison principle.

Mr. Stringfellow says that losses are more frequent than profits in business life, but as we learn from the rise above the losses, as Edison did, we triumph. And he adds eloquently, "Unlimited possibilities are ahead through the new Edisons being born today; the men and women of imagination and character who are each in their own way helping today and will help even more tomorrow to make America an even greater wonderland of the world."

Regional Shifts Will Offer Opportunities to Haverhill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent article entitled "Regional Shifts Will Offer Opportunities to Haverhill," written by Eugene L. Belisle, and published in the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of February 7, 1951. The article deals with the opportunities for the development of the natural resources in New England and in the Northeast, and places particular emphasis on the need for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway without delay.

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

REPORT TO HAVERHILL—REGIONAL SHIFTS WILL OFFER OPPORTUNITIES TO HAVERHILL

(By Eugene L. Belisle)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Gazette presents herewith another installment of Eugene L. Belisle's report to the Haverhill Industrial Commission on his studies preliminary to recommending a program to help the community meet its needs and opportunities for growth.)

Physics, chemistry, and electricity applied to natural resources have given entirely new meanings to old or previously unusable materials and substances.

The twentieth century has witnessed the rise of a whole group of industries requiring vast amounts of electricity for processing (such as abrasives, aluminum, sponge iron, heavy welding, heavy plating, etc.) with electric supply and costs a paramount factor. Industries requiring the largest and cheapest electricity supplies have in this century sought locations as near to major water power localities as posisble, insofar as reachable by low-cost (preferably water) transportation. Hence aluminum production in the Columbia Basin, the St. Lawrence Rapids, and the Saguenay River with bauxite moving all the way from South America to the latter point—1,000 miles past the New England coastline.

Harnessing or failing to harness new sources of energy available to a region has been of great significance to its industrial development during the last quarter century. Nor is by-passing of the task of harnessing available natural sources of energy in river and possibly tidal waters on the ground that atomic energy will in time render this unnecessary any answer for a region to make. Each major development of natural resources sets up a new center for development of related satellite industries and these in turn for secondary manufactures. Atomic energy installations will further focalize new industrial development and population and market growth in its peripheral areas.

New England has long neglected its admittedly limited but still substantial undeveloped hydroelectric potentials within its borders (principally in Maine) and its still larger potential resources of this type in the St. Lawrence and northern tidal waters (which admittedly require pilot plant development at high unit costs before the full potentials can be harnessed with resulting low unit costs). There is now a clear tendency to continue this neglect on the ground that atomic energy development will render the hydro potentials unnecessary. On the basis of a century of experience first with coal, then with oil, natural gas, and hydroelectric energy, this is wish-thinking.

Industries utilizing large amounts of high heat are a second major type of twentieth century industry (glass, ceramics, heater-reduction products, etc.); natural gas, oil, and coal are sources (except where electricity is required or can be used). Regions more distant from these carbon deposits, such as New England, must pay transportation on them which adds to cost of manufacture as compared with the originating region. But any new transportation development (such as the natural-gas pipeline) opens up new opportunities to develop such industries in the previously isolated market location.

Application of physics, chemistry, and electricity to either both exhaustible (mineral deposits) and renewable (soil products) resources has developed a whole range of new substances, products, and industries. For example: Nylon from coal; plastics from many substances, including peanuts, soybeans, and cellulose (wood, cornstalks, etc.), and many other products; sugar, alcohol, yeast, and many other products from sulphite liquors previously dumped into rivers by pulp and paper plants (the Northwest pioneered in this; New England still fails to follow suit); magnesium from brine, oyster shells and electricity (Michigan, not sea-girt New England pioneered in this); dairy products stabilizer from sea moss (Japan, Maryland, and various other areas beat New England to this). Karl T. Compton, former president of MIT, pointed out vigorously in 1939 that New England lost the rayon industry because of its failure to be awake to the magnitude and significance of the revolution in physics and chemistry underlying development of synthetic products.

This revolution has given new meaning and possibility to every old substance and resource under the surface of the earth, or growing or capable of being grown from the soil of the earth in forest or farm, and in the waters of the sea, and even in the atmosphere (nitrogen fixation via electricity). Yet, today, after 30 years of relative or absolute economic loss, including clear loss of opportunities in rayon, aluminum, abrasive, and some other industries, New England is not yet systematically reexamining its entire natural resources in the light of this revolution. Meanwhile, systematic, energetic, well-financed researches of this type are going on in numerous other regions of the United States whose natural growth potentials are such as to demand less effort of this kind on their part.

Unless we look searchingly at basic facts about our natural geography and natural resources in the light of such past, current, and anticipated future developments, appraising frankly both the assets and the liabilities thereby revealed, we will continue to build on the obscuring of liabilities and the neglect of assets, as we have been doing for at least 30 years. A series of fundamental studies in these respects was begun in the twenties by a few outstanding and foresighted New England minds in industry, business, and various branches of research. These beginnings have been neglected and lost—sometimes purposely. Despite continued thought and study by a few individuals and small re-

search agencies, the region lags behind other regions in its awareness, action, and applications.

Meanwhile the myth lives on of maintaining industrial advance solely on the basis of the presumed perpetual superiority of those assets most susceptible to migration—management, capital, and labor—simply because we once held the historical initiative in these respects (as a consequence of natural resource locational factors). This myth is New England's Achilles heel. Our leadership in research, in managerial and labor skills, in financing, and in the whole field of secondary manufactures (metals and machinery as well as nondurable products) is being, and will be even more seriously challenged by the rise of industries in the newer, younger regions. The only way to undergird these secondary durable and nondurable industries and to build a logical pattern of diversification is by the development of such new prime industries as the region is capable in the new light of its natural resources viewed through the eyes of modern physics and chemistry. We need indigenous industry of new types as a fundamental basis of our future development.

The developments going forward in eastern Canada, offer great new opportunities in these respects. But we will find it necessary to about-face on some of our most cherished blindness of the last quarter century if we are to see or use these natural opportunities.

The running out of the best ore grades and cheapest extractions of the Mesabi Range together with the discovery and prospective development (financing already well advanced) of vast iron ore deposits in Labrador point to the establishment of a new, major steel and heavy industry area in the North Atlantic Continent; it would lie in the St. Lawrence Basin below Montreal—unless joint United States and Canadian military and national security agencies decree otherwise. What will their thinking be? If war is to be the yardstick of the future, a strong case can be made for diverting these ores much farther inland. Nothing could more dramatically indicate the profound degree to which natural trends will be diverted by the assumption that war is the world's destiny.

Strict economic logic points to a vast industrial complex at a point along the navigable upper reaches of the St. Lawrence to embrace (1) ore by rail or river from Labrador and thence toward; (2) coal by rail, lake, and river from the Middle West or from Nova Scotia; (3) near the vast hydro developments and potentials of the St. Lawrence and its tributaries; (4) to which water-borne bauxite is already flowing for processing into aluminum; (5) with the Great Lakes and Ontario Basin tributary lands of farm and more distant forests. Canadian thinking with respect to its peacetime future has been understandably taken with this logical development for many years. And the development has been taking form; but with the major phase yet to come.

But the above is not all. Such a development would throw open the previously locked-up mineral resources of the upper eastern Adirondacks and Champlain Valley (including large reserves of titanium ore) and those of northern Vermont (including turpentine rock) and New England in general, which flanks the St. Lawrence. Involved in this development is the St. Lawrence deep waterway and power project. The seaway will eventually be built anyway by Canada perhaps on an all-Canadian route, if the United States does not ratify the agreement of 1932 with Canada to build it as a joint project. The power developments will be built respectively by Canada and New York State if not as a joint international project, as long planned.

For more than 20 years New England has been the chief center of national political opposition to the combined joint international projects for seaway and power development, originally prepared by Herbert Hoover. Yet the most competent and farsighted business and industrial leaders and engineers in New England favored this project after long and careful study during the 1920's. And all that has been accomplished by the opposition that has developed since that time—through arguments revealing a woeful lack of knowledge of natural geography and transportation and power economics—is to delay the project.

This delay has cost New England millions in inability to develop industries requiring large volumes of low-cost power, or based upon the new low-cost deep-water route between the New England coastline and the Great Lakes. When it is built—and it will be built within the next 2 decades—New England will get (1) some of the low-cost power, but less than if we had not opposed and thereby made it almost inevitable for New York to obtain more than its natural share of the power available to the United States; (2) some new industrial and trade opportunities, but less than if we had not delayed it and thereby given Canada the initiative to seize many of these opportunities for the St. Lawrence Valley.

Our opposition to this development has been "of a piece" with our general unintelligence regarding natural geography, natural resources, and transportation economics during much of this century—and which has been reflected in the withering and death of water-borne traffic in New England, in unnecessarily drastic collapse and losses in textiles and shoes, 1922–32, and in many other losses, either of industries or of industrial opportunities. Yet beginning with the first settlement until the end of the nineteenth century, a healthy respect for and relatively advanced knowledge of these very factors were omnipresent in New England's history.

One of the proofs of whether we have yet learned or are ready to learn anything will be when the St. Lawrence question next arises. Meanwhile, we might study and ponder the full significance to New England of the great potential development in the St. Lawrence Valley, of which Saguenay and St. Lawrence power; Labrador iron ore; sponge-process iron; seaborne bauxite; Niagara abrasives; the eastward plant movements of Republic Steel; Hanna Steel, National Lead; Nova Scotia coal; Adirondack titanium; Vermont minerals; surplus Maine potatoes; northern New England forests; Ontario farmlands; the St. Lawrence seaway; Passamaquoddy and Fundy tidal power; the natural gas pipeline; and ocean minerals and organic substances, are all among the present or potential components. Even the resources of Greenland are a part of this picture.

Does this square with the often-presented picture that New England has no important natural resources? That we must content ourselves with being ever more the marginal and dwindling manufacturers of low-wage, low-value-added-by-manufacture products of shoes, textiles, pulp and paper, apparel, novelties? Or, conversely, that our superior skill alone will save us by giving us the lion's share of new high-skill manufactures?

Yet the whole prospect of possibilities for more substantial undergirding of the livelihood and life of 9,000,000 people in this old and increasingly rundown region is bound up with the question: Does the future lie in war or peace? And if in war, what happens to this opportunity of our northern flank and with what consequences to our opportunities for averting this region's decline?

As we come to now to a closer view of the prospects of the specific region with whose destiny Haverhill's is mostly closely bound up, it will be clear that New England's chances of coping with its internal complex of developing conditions adverse to economic and industrial development and population maintenance will be materially and perhaps fatally reduced unless this great prime industry expansion to the northward can be assumed. For it alone among the regional shifts within the North American Continent offers natural opportunities clearly outweighing natural potential losses at least for two or three decades.

The development of eastern Canada would not bring many automatic benefits to New England; indeed, it would be a potential point to which New England industries and population might migrate, as some have already done. But this is not a natural trend except in a few cases.

The predicted developments in all other regions will work somewhat more to the disadvantage of New England during the next 20 years than to its advantage, even if New England puts itself into the best of shape.

But to put itself into the best of shape is precisely the problem. For the shape it is in has already been indicated in the discussion of "What Has Happened to the Land"—which can now no longer be escaped as a problem requiring vast capital investment in dollars and in labor before there will be either yield or safety. It has been indicated in the discussion of "What Has Happened to the People"—which will require a vast investment of capital, in both dollars and work, in order to preserve this ultimate resource. Finally, it will require a vast investment in both dollars and labor to reconstruct the environments for living—the cities, the road towns, the industrial and rural slums, the urban factory, commercial and civic centers and districts, the transportation and traffic arteries, the protective belts of restored open lands, enclosing neighborhoods, communities, secondary metropolitan areas, and primary metropolitan areas in order that each may begin to take form as a reflection of a design of developing social and physical order, arresting the present drift toward physical and social topsy-turviness and unmanageability.

These three interrelated investments and tasks represent a challenge of such magnitude that we cannot find a successful precedent in experience. They can be planned and undertaken only through a great searching through earlier and current related experience, and devising new designs and methods. Failure to perceive the overall dimensions of the task and to provide for living growth through the enlargement, not merely revision, of our perception of designs necessary for livelihood and living in our new technological era is resulting in the disorderly disintegration of our cities. The need is for an intelligently conceived decentralization, which is the only other alternative, and the only constructive one.

In order to do this we must simultaneously check the process of disintegration, and plan and develop the needed decentralization. We already have to grapple with the fact of declining old cities and new, haphazardly mushrooming intercity areas; this combination creates massive, mounting public costs and countless addition direct costs to industries and people: In the old city centers, we see direct economic wastes—such as those experienced in transportation, materials handling, distribution, time wastes, vehicle fuel wastes, trade volumes at lower levels than the market potentials, excessive public and private land-taking costs for widening, excessive operating costs in many aspects of public service and maintenance directly resulting from physical and land-use patterns, in the new road towns and intercity areas, the jumble is even worse with even heavier capital outlays and service costs in relation to revenues, than the old weakened city centers.

Mississippian Finds Herbert Hoover a Man of Frustrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "Mississippian Finds Herbert Hoover a Man of Frustrations." The article is written by Mr. David L. Cohn, who is one of the most powerful writers of our times. The article was published in the Delta Democrat-Times, of Greenville, Miss., whose editor is Mr. Hodding Carter, on January 28, 1951. I think the article is well worth the attention of the Senate.

I have an estimate of cost of printing of the article, which will occupy 2¼ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of $184.50. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MISSISSIPPIAN FINDS HERBERT HOOVER A MAN OF FRUSTRATIONS—HIS ISOLATIONISM IS BETRAYAL ON BIG SCALE

(By David L. Cohn)

When a Mississippian wants to describe a confused, frustrated man, he says of him that he is "acting like a blind dog in a meathouse." A current example is Mr. Herbert Hoover, whom the press describes as "our only living ex-President." This seems to me redundant as well as wasteful of high cost newsprint because the dead, filled with a mellow wisdom, preserve a becoming silence, while the people may be relied upon not to confuse Hoover, Herbert Clark, with Hoover, J. Edgar.

Mr. Hoover, the Iowa wrong-way Moses, who 25 years ago led the Republican Party into the poison-ivy patch from which it has never emerged, last month made a major speech on our foreign relations. It is also—especially as the pronouncement of a man whose massive dullness seems indicative of stolid virtue—devious, callous, pitiless, immoral; its only light the cold glint of glacier ice.

I find it a department store of the mind where one may shop under one roof for nearly anything. Your money returned—but not your life—if the goods should prove unsatisfactory. Military merchandise, sir? Step this way. Gift-wrapped, the defense of the United States looks good. But I'm afraid of it.

As most of us, I buy brand names on the assumption that the name on a product of a long-established manufacturer is a guaranty of its worth. Therefore I don't want the Hoover product because he has no competency in this field. His one venture into the military occurred during the depression when he chased a ragged mob of squatter unemployed from Washington's outskirts. This scarcely qualifies him even to lead men to defeat.

As a conservative and a conservator, I admire him extravagantly. Against great pressure he managed to hand over the depression intact to his successor who, ungrateful and wastrel, undid all the good work he had done by breaking up the depression and so acquired the affections of an unpredictable people, many of them filled with an unreasonable desire to eat. But militarily, I'd as soon trust Gen. Lew Wallace as General Hoover. He marched a regiment up and down for 24 hours almost within sight of the battle of Shiloh without finding it. (He was later rewarded with an ambassadorship to Turkey, and returned the compliment by writing Ben Hur.)

CAR IN EVERY POT

Over here is a package of Mr. Hoover's economics. But again, I'm afraid of it. Gazing backward into the mirage of that distant day when he sat ponderously upon the Constitution to prevent its violation by rude men, I can see the car in every pot, the chickens in every garage, and sad-faced men selling apples at every street corner. Mr. Hoover, by his actions and inactions when he filled the White House with the lightnings of inertia, has become our one classical economist. Classical in the sense that the country has long known what to avoid by not doing what he then did, and doing what he did not do.

Item: During the depression when wheat sold at 30 cents a bushel, this great economist doubling as President of the United States told farmers at Des Moines that their salvation lay in a higher tariff. Since wheat then sold for 30 cents, while the tariff on it was 40 cents a bushel, foreign wheat could have come in only if shippers lost a dime on every bushel and paid the freight besides.

Economics is not, I grant you, an exact science. Mr. Hoover, however, made it almost a science of inexactitude. Hence, without too much difficulty, I can restrain my enthusiasm for his offerings in this field.

NO GRAZING RIGHTS

In his lighter moments he sometimes appears as a tea-room mystic gazing into the dark future. Once he predicted that unless the country were run by sound men, grass would grow in Detroit's streets. The unsound men prevailed, but Detroit has sold no downtown grazing rights. He now reminds us, with equally flashing insight, that we may go broke. May I respectfully remind him that we face the imminent prospect of going blind?

If we should go broke and preserve our freedom, is this a high price as against the possible alternative of national death, degradation, slavery? The material wealth of the country lies in its farms, mines, ranches, factories, forests; in the skills, energies, inventiveness, and will of our people. These would remain if all our savings were lost. I have not observed that the amorous propensities of boar hogs are affected by Treasury statements.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

Spiritually this was a great country long before it became a big country. We shall sink into decline whenever we aspire to greater bigness instead of bigger greatness. Greatness was breathed into it at its birth by great men, and we profoundly moved the eighteenth century European world before we had scarcely moved a wheel. Then this tiny infant Nation, at a time when absolutism prevailed nearly everywhere and few men had rights, proclaimed the stupendous doctrine of the rights of man. Americans spoke more of a standard of life than a standard of living. Sometimes they expressed their mood in the phrase, "high thinking and plain living."

Materially, this country's bigness lies in its productive capacities. Its greatness resides in its incomparable unity in diversity; its Bill of Rights; its conscience; its sense of fair play. These are the glories of the Nation. They proceed, not from savings, but from the spirit, and, treasured up for a life beyond life, it may be assumed that they will survive the corruptions of inflation.

THE SURVIVAL

Some of us have gone broke before and survived. In April 1865 men of the Army of Northern Virginia rode home on the mules and horses that General Grant had magnanimously let them retain. They returned to their ruined farms, houses burned, stock destroyed, ditches caved in, slaves flown, fields grown up in weeds. But by June 1865 they had a cotton crop planted. The next year they produced a larger crop, and they eventually rose with help from nobody. Let no one drench the wines of the American spirit with the dirty crankcase oil of defeatism. Men must soar before they can walk.

If we should lose our savings we could begin over again and rise to bigness. But if we should lose those things that are the glories of the Nation, we could not arise again to greatness.

In his speech he assures us that he does not advocate isolationism, but something new called retreatism. This merely leaves one's head, not one's body, exposed to the enemy. Rejecting all actual or potential allies except the British Commonwealth—if it would cooperate—Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, we would thereby save ourselves. God, bringing up the rear in Mr. Hoover's wake as a celestial salvation army, would, it is presumed, save the rest.

Even the minority whom Mr. Hoover would graciously save shudder at his method: a thrown rope that falls just short of the drowning men. Western Europeans, noting us recklessly playing with destiny and toying with dishonor, fervently wish that one of their boys—Christopher Columbus—had stayed at home. They know that we can destroy them through our recklessness. They are less certain that we can save them through our wisdom as they observe our divided counsels, a polite euphemism for the cell fission of idiocy.

Nor are Europeans altogether touched to fire as they watch Senate debate upon the life-or-death crisis of our times descend to ward-heeler level; recrimination rushing in as reason, shrieking for her life, rushes out. Similarly, their confidence in our intelligence is not overstimulated as they see our compass pointing in all directions at once while we look for the villain who done us wrong. The plug-ugly is, variously, President Roosevelt, Mrs. Roosevelt, the whole Roosevelt family by affinity or consanguinity, Harry Hopkins, Harry Truman, Mr. Acheson, whose especial opprobrium it is that he cannot bear the sight of a split infinitive, the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, and all Europeans, wretched foreigners that they are.

TIED TO OUR APRON

Fearful, therefore, not of our intentions but of our dispensations, Western Europeans would like to get shet of us as much as Mr. Hoover would like to get shet of them. But they are tied to our apron strings. Consequently they sweat it out while we indulge in our favorite sport of being garrulous but inarticulate or alternately play possum or partisan. The New York Times reports that—

"To observers who attended the recent sixth conference of foreign ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty powers one fact seems to stand out: the universal—almost desperate—hope of Europeans is that the United States will close its ranks, stifle its domestic quarreling, and assume need to confront Soviet expansionism."

Lincoln said that a house divided against itself could not stand. How could he know that we should one day live in ideational trailers; here today and gone tomorrow? The Times continues—

"Republican attacks on the administration—especially personal condemnation of Secretary Acheson—have alarmed and depressed Europeans. They see in them signs of American wavering and the possibility of

a return to isolationism—making far easier the Soviet policy of terrorizing its weak opponents into paralysis."

Mr. Hoover would send no soldiers to Western Europe. He is doubtful of its will and good will. We could not send enough soldiers, even if we would, to protect it. Europeans must do the greater part of the job. Hence their request for American soldiers is not evidence of a desire to hide behind us. It is, on the contrary, nothing less than an invitation to at least short-run disaster. For by so doing Europeans are inviting us to make their homes our battleground in the event of war. But perhaps it is better to fight along the Missouri than the Marne.

AVOIDED COMMUNISM

As for the alleged decadence of Western Europe, implied by Mr. Hoover, it has, I suggest, done what we asked of it at the inception of the Marshall plan: avoid communism through economic health as the condition precedent to continued democracy and defense. It has not gone Communist. It has succeeded so brilliantly in doing what it set out to do that in 1950, for the first time in a generation—not merely since the end of the last war—it appeared that its economy might work.

This is not enough for Mr. Hoover. He bleats about the sacrifices we made in bringing about this miracle. Aside from the fact that we did not help the Marshall plan countries merely as a selfless philanthropy but helped them to save themselves as part of the plan to save ourselves, we made no sacrifice at all. The Marshall plan is the greatest bargain we ever bought since the Louisiana Purchase.

For a few billions we retained as potential allies 270,000,000 people. Nearly double our population, they are one-third more numerous than the Russians. Our intellectual, spiritual, and technical equals, they run the world's largest workshops outside our own. There are among them thousands of the earth's foremost scientists and technicians. (Radar, guided missiles, jet propulsion, the A-bomb: all these are essentially European in origin.) They are largely democrats from whom we derived the basic principles of our Government, and they are one with us in religious faith, traditions, aspirations.

Where should we now be if Italy and France had gone Communist 3 years ago? What victory have we scored over Soviet Russia except our great victory in Western Europe? Sacrifice nothing. Using crassness as a measure, let us spell out our bargain. It has cost us about $14 per capita per annum to save these great people to our side for the duration of the Marshall plan. During the same period we spent $85 per capita for booze and $200,000,000 annually for potato chips to create more thirst for more beer. Then we paid farmers $500,000,000 to produce the potatoes for part of the chips, throwing the remainder in a kind of keep-the-change mood to the hogs. Off-stage in this moment of sacrifice, the Eightieth Congress reduced taxes by $5,000,000, and only yesterday some of our great minds were addressing themselves to the sovereign question whether we should continue the tax on mink coats.

BLIND LEADING WEAK

Mr. Hoover is petulant because Western Europe did not rearm and recover at the same time. We might have rearmed but did not. Europe did not rearm because it could not. We could have had guns and butter. Europe's bleak alternative was between guns and bread. This presents not a choice but a compulsion. Had we armed, Europe would feel more secure. But unarmed ourselves, we are insecure in the presence of an unarmed Europe. This is the end result of the triumph of hope over experience; of the blind misdirecting the weak.

In his speech, Mr. Hoover wears at different times the uniform of the military, the gown of the academician (school of economics), and the garb of the preacher. In the latter capacity he upbraids Europeans for their alleged lack of spirituality. This holier-than-thou touch, this repulsive self-righteousness, seems scarcely equable with Christian humility. Lifting his eyes piously to Heaven, he says: "America cannot create their (Europeans') spiritual forces." Rome, abandon St. Peter's. Go out into the wilderness and there, like St. Anthony of Padua, seek that God whom you have so shamelessly abandoned. Chartres, draw a veil of rayon over your glorious stained-glass windows molded in the light of the Lord's grace in the great age of faith. You have sinned in Mr. Hoover's face and are unworthy.

Lacking the awful eye of God that peers into the inmost eyes of men, I cannot plumb the depths of European spirituality or chart its shallows. Europeans, however, might retort that our spirituality personified in Mr. Harding and the Ohio courthouse gang caused the United States to withdraw from the world not long ago in the name of "normalcy"—that is, to betray America's greatness in the name of shabbiness; and now it sees our spirituality, personified in Mr. Hoover, offering it a brimming draught of hemlock in a cup of thorns cunningly wrought.

BANKERS TO WORLD

Europe is poor. This, in the eyes of the rich, is original sin. But in 1914 Britons walked the alien earth lordly and secure. They held the gorgeous East in fee. Their King-Emperor's writ ran over half the earth. Everywhere it was the highest praise of a man's solvency and integrity to say that he was "as good as the Bank of England." They were bankers to the world while we were borrowers. They were a creditor nation but we were a debtor nation in 1914. They fetched and carried for the world on all the seas, and they also insured the ships and cargoes. The while, from Waterloo in 1815 to the outbreak of the war in 1914, we grew in security for a hundred dynamic years behind the shield of the British Navy as it policed the earth.

Let us recall—even if a dose of humility kills us—the days of the Battle of Britain. Then jitters swept this potentially mighty, but actually weak, nation. Then 130,000,000 Americans found security in the person of a handful of RAF fliers—many of them with the down of youth on their cheeks. Winning that battle, they gave us a chance for survival.

FRENCH AS EXAMPLE

In 1914 the French were the world's richest people per capita. Five francs then bought $1. Now it takes 400 francs to buy $1. Such were the fearful bloodlettings they suffered in the First World War, one-fourth of the men who went out in 1939 were orphans of that war. They could add that the Germans, during the last war, took into Germany as slaves 2,500,000 of their young men. (This, on the scale of our population, is equivalent to 7,500,000 men.) They kept them for nearly 5 years. Many died. Many went home diseased and broken. Then, by way of footnote tinging the whited page with more blood, they could write that they now monthly lose more officers in Indochina than their military schools can produce annually.

It cannot be pleasant—despite Mr. Hoover—for a once rich, powerful, and still proud people such as these, to rattle the tin cup on Capitol Hill. It cannot be pleasant, either, to hear themselves denounced as material and spiritual beggars. It might be salutary for Mr. Hoover to remember that pride not only goes before a downfall, but it also accelerates it.

The west now facing extermination, Mr. Hoover suggests isolationism; futility thrice compounded. What if it is the suicide of reason on the grave of frustration? What does it matter if it is panic parading as policy; delusion masked as doctrine; inertia become paralysis; magic ascendant over mind? It is something even if it is dishonor preceding eventual death. More sadly perhaps, it is the last remaining item in our bag of tricks that we have hitherto tried and found wanting as we sought to evade the inexorable responsibilities of our power.

WRONG FOR LIFETIME

The proposal is lent a certain weight because it comes from an elder statesman. (Agar jelly, injected into an ox tongue, also lends it weight if no nourishment.) For, in our theology—arthritis become art—when a man has achieved the feat of being consistently wrong for a lifetime and remains wrong longer than others by outliving them, he is elevated through common consent into the sacrosanct status of elder statesman. One might say of some of these cornland Ciceros what Bentley said of George the Third:

> "George the Third
> Ought never to have occurred.
> One can only wonder
> At so grotesque a blunder."

Resorting to magic, we proclaimed neutrality at the start of the First World War; the moral equivalent of proclaiming immunity to smallpox. It failed. The next time, some of our medicine men got up as elder statesmen, suggested cash and carry as an addendum to neutrality. Two monkey bones are a more powerful ju-ju than one. We were delighted with the cracker-barrel Machiavellianism of cash and carry even if it was so transparent a hoax that it could not have deceived even an adult. (A child-loving people, we do not attempt to deceive them. We merely betray them.) But it also failed. So we wearily fought a war again. We won it again. And we threw away the victory again; threw it away with our customary levity as though the cosmic were the comic.

DISASTER PRODUCTION

It is clear that international political error, in our hands, is an interchangeable part permitting the mass production of disaster. Thus, having made all the other mistakes possible, it is now proposed to return to the most ancient error of all—isolationism—happy in having before us the models that did not work in 1807, 1914, 1939. For old mistakes are cozier than new ones; the reason perhaps why so many men and women remarry their divorced mates.

Isolationism is a form of what psychologists call retreat to the womb; the yearning of an insecure adult to return to the place of prenatal security. It is the marsupial approach to international relations. Gather all Americans in the pouch of mama opossum (a native American animal) and no harm can come to them. But psychologists must be astonished to find what they identify as a malady in individuals being erected into a doctrine of fancied security for a nation.

Nor is this all. Isolationism is indicative of a dangerous—and perhaps ultimately fatal—flaw in our national character. It reveals that in our inmost heart we do not want to live up to the responsibilities of our power. We do not want to police the world. We do not want to keep our young men stationed in distant outposts. We do not see why we should be disturbed in the enjoyment of our abundant goods. We merely want to be let alone. (So did the Natchez and Tchopitoulas Indians. Dead at our hands they live on in the names of dingy New Orleans streets.) We want, in short, to evade destiny; to short circuit it; or, that failing, to exercise it by the voodoo of isolationism.

SEALING OUR DOOM

Materially, it would seal our doom. For, attempting to penetrate the clouds of Mr. Hoover's deviousness, he seems to be saying

that we ought to abandon Berlin, all European, and Middle East strategic bases for bombers, and the Belgian Congo whence we derive uranium ore for A-bombs. We would abandon nearly the whole world to Soviet Russia carrying on only with Britain if it should cooperate. He does not tell us how Britain could cooperate if its sea approaches reeked with Soviet submarines and Soviet guided missiles were launched upon her in fiery showers from Calais 20 miles distant. Proposing to give most of the world's population and its resources to Russia, Pravda paid Mr. Hoover a unique honor. It printed his speech in its entirety; majestic proof of Mr. Stalin's approval of his views.

Spiritually, Mr. Hoover's isolationism would spell our degradation preceding our death. It is betrayal on a world scale; the brutal renunciation of our treaties with, and our promises to, Western Europe and the United Nations. He indicates with callous cavalierness that if Russia should take Europe, it would one day rise again. This is frozen nonsense. If anyone doubts that a culture can be destroyed, let her go to Mexico. There the Spaniards quickly did to death the ancient Aztec culture. The Russians, taking Europe, would shoot every moral and intellectual leader so that each conquered land became a headless, amorphous mass of people. They would transfer large parts of the native populations to Siberia to die as slave laborers, replacing them with Cossacks, Kalmucks, Tadjiks. There would be no road back.

Yet Mr. Hoover, calmly contemplating the crucifixion of Europe, does not offer any of its people asylum here. They must die for their sins where they are.

(O America, compassionate mother, you who have offered asylum to the heavy-hearted, the sore-oppressed, the lost and homeless of this earth; you who have taken its hurt and weary children to your bosom and made them whole again; you who have been faith and hope and charity to all the world for so long as you have lived—is this your son speaking?)

Somehow I do not think that Mr. Hoover's isolationism would make us happy even if we should achieve it and walk for a little while directionless men on the cold crust of a cold dungheap. Imprisoned within our own fortress, hearts dead, consciences tortured, slowly choked by the contracting forces of the enemy, he could leave us alone to die of shame. Or, weakened, he could assail us with the force of the world at his back and destroy us. This might be our final triumph. For then we should have an all-American tableau as we died in the streets of our towns and perished on our doorsteps, every man wept over by his own mother and buried by his own father, until their turn came to mount the pyre, the sun sinking blood red on the final day of America and its all-American policy.

The Russians might then place an electric sign on the dome of the Nation's Capitol blinking this legend into the eyeless night:

"The only truly self-contained communities in the world are the cemeteries."

The Coal Industry in America and in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What a Difference," discussing the coal industry in the United States and in Britain, published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of February 14, 1951. The article deals with the mining of coal in the United States compared to the mining of coal in Great Britain under a socialistic plan.

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

WHAT A DIFFERENCE

Do you want to see the difference between socialized enterprise and free enterprise? Take a look at the coal industry here and in Britain.

In the last 5 years more than 220 large coal mines, each with a daily capacity of over 500 tons, have been opened or placed in development in this country. In addition, about 800 smaller mines have been opened, plus many new surface or strip operations. These new facilities alone have a productive capacity of 280,000,000 tons of coal a year—more than half of the expected production total of 1950. It all represents new growth, new risks, new ventures.

Now for Britain. In 1949 the total deep-mine production of British coal was 28,000,000 tons less than in 1939. Absenteeism, under government ownership, reached a peak and was largely responsible for the drop in production. England's mines were far inferior to ours even under private management. Under nationalization, which was supposed to produce Utopia in a hurry, the inferiority has become still more marked.

What it all amounts to is that free enterprise has scored another triumph in the United States. There has been a quiet revolution in our coal mining in recent years, characterized by a great and dramatic expansion of mechanization and research. This could have been accomplished only as it was accomplished—by the cumulative efforts of progressive, private management working for the greater good of all and striving to earn a profit at the same time. Here's one more case where the facts speak for themselves.

Selective Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Selective Controls," published in the Washington Post of February 19, 1951.

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

S. LECTIVE CONTROLS

The action of the Federal Reserve Board in tightening credit curbs on most new commercial construction was preceded by two regulations imposing similar curbs on residential building credit. Consumer credit has also been restricted by means of selective controls specifying minimum down payments and maximum maturities for instalment sales of specified goods. These selective real-estate and consumer-credit controls relieve the upward pressure on prices of labor and materials. At the same time they release scarce materials for defense production. They are, therefore, not only a very effective means of restricting loan expansion, they reenforce the efforts of other agencies to control prices and regulate production by cutting down the output of nonessential goods and stimulating expansion of defense industries.

Selective controls are, in fact, a much more effective means of restricting loan expansion than nonselective control—that is to say, control which curbs loan expansion by raising the cost of credit, or increasing interest charges on borrowed money. There is a good deal of truth in Secretary Snyder's contention that limited increases in interest rates have little deterrent effect on private borrowing, especially when business is booming. At any rate, the powerlessness of the Federal Reserve System to prevent an expansion of loans through nonselective overall credit control, so long as it is committed to support of the bond market, does not preclude effective use of selective controls reducing the volume of loans by limiting the amounts that may be advanced to private borrowers for specified purposes. These types of control can always be tightened or relaxed in response to changing conditions. They can also be extended to good advantage to cover other forms of lending. The blanket kind of control, on the contrary, makes it impossible to discriminate between credit advances that are in the public interest and those that are undesirable. Thus the Reserve Board's new regulation does not apply to certain classes of construction, such as schools, hospitals, churches, and public utilities.

If the Reserve Board were given broad authority to apply selective controls at its discretion, it could cooperate with the Treasury in stabilizing the bond market without increasing the upward pressure on prices that would be intensified by continued excessive expansion of bank loans.

Public-Private Power Truce Spells New Era for State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Public-Private Power Truce Spells New Era for State," published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of February 10, 1951.

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

PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER TRUCE SPELLS NEW ERA FOR STATE—LONG-TIME ENEMIES NOW ARE BUDDIES

(By Roger V. Devlin)

On a wall in an office of the Southwestern Power Administration is a huge map of the Southwest. A large area in the center of the map—embracing all of Oklahoma, a large section of Texas, most of southern Missouri and a big portion of western and northern Arkansas—is shaded in blue.

That blue is the color of an electric spark.

It defines the area which, says Douglas G. Wright, SPA Administrator, is being served by the Nation's only partnership of public and private power.

It is an area where industry can be offered, because of that partnership, lower power

rates than anywhere else in the country with the exception of the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley—and probably just as low as TVA.

"It solves a major problem," said Gov. Johnston Murray, after conferring with Wright. "I have every reason to believe we are in better shape than ever to draw new industry to our State."

That map, centering on Oklahoma, is cross-hatched with marks representing major electric lines. All are linked to each other.

It also is studded thickly with bright metal pins whose color identifies major power consumers on or near those lines—municipalities, Rural Electrification Administration units, key industries.

Until recently those power lines were divided into three sections. One was the system of the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma. A second was the Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. Both are private utilities.

The third system, consisting principally of a trunk line from north-central Arkansas into east-central Oklahoma, then bending south to reach the Denison Dam on the Red River, was that of the Southwestern Power Administration.

For years the two private systems have fought a no-holds-barred battle against the SPA.

But the battle now is ended. They have become partners in a program which, they have discovered will be mutually advantageous and will help materially in developing the State.

The Federal Power Commission put its final stamp of approval on the partnership agreement a few days ago. It earlier had been approved by the two companies and the Secretary of the Interior, who is top boss of the SPA.

Two basic factors make the agreement possible and workable: SPA gets its power from hydroelectric projects built and building; PSC and O. G. & E. get theirs from steam-generating plants.

But hydroelectric dams must contend with weather factors which provide them with plenty of water energy during flood periods and only small amounts during droughts.

They could operate at top speeds during the one period and close down entirely during the other, but that would be inefficient. They attempt to balance it out by generating at much less than capacity over the full year, or by operating at near capacity for short periods each day, then cutting back for the remainder of the day.

On the other hand, customers of Public Service and Oklahoma Gas & Electric don't require an even flow of power all day long. They turn on their lights in the mornings, again in the evenings, but use little or no electricity during the night and at midday.

But in order to meet the power demands during those peak periods, private utilities must install considerably greater generating capacity than they need during the rest of the day.

Both the steam and the hydro systems thus had a grave weakness, economically, when operating independently and fighting each other.

The partnership eliminated those weaknesses with the stroke of a pen. It tied the two systems together.

The steam plant can operate at a steady, efficient level 24 hours per day. When the peaks hit, hydroelectric generators go to work and handle the extra load. In exchange, the hydro system can draw on the steam plant's steady supply of energy during low-water periods.

A second major advantage also enters the picture. Scattered through the area are many small REA units and communities whose power consumption is so small or so scattered that a private power company cannot supply them except at a loss.

On the other hand, those customers are defined as "preferred" by the Government agency and they can buy hydroelectric power at wholesale rates.

In order to serve them, though, the SPA would have to build a whole network of transmission lines, which in many cases might duplicate private lines already in place.

The private-public power partnership also has solved that problem. Southwestern Power, for instance, has a preferred customer in western Oklahoma but no lines anywhere near it. So it sells a block of power to Oklahoma Gas & Electric at a junction point of their two lines. At the other end of an OG&E line, near the customer, SPA buys back that block of power for delivery to the REA.

The private utility is recompensed for what virtually amounts to use of its transmission line. The REA gets a low Government-power rate. Everyone is happy.

Obviously, the partnership—it is called an interchange agreement—is much more complicated and detailed than those illustrations.

But the important thing is that for the first time in history public and private power have gotten together for their mutual benefit, instead of fighting, and that their cooperation will be of tremendous benefit for Oklahoma and the Southwest.

"The power potentialities of this area, under this agreement, are terrific," says Wright. "We can handle any foreseeable industry.

"As far as power is concerned, this can become the most favorable area in the country."

And Governor Murray agrees: "This is the kind of spirit we must have to attract new industries."

The Legislator's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials entitled "The Legislator's Dilemma," published in the Arkansas Recorder on February 2, 1951. They were written by Mr. John Wells, who is a well-known journalist from my State, and one of the most penetrating writers on public affairs of whom I know.

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

THE LEGISLATOR'S DILEMMA

(Probably nothing is so flattering to an editor as a request to republish something. A member of the general assembly bestowed that sort of flattery on the recorder by asking us to carry again the editorials under the above title that appeared in the issues of August 18 and 25.

(Any similarity to current situations or political incumbents is strictly coincidental—it could happen in any administration.)

Before scolding the general assembly in general, or any member in particular, imagine yourself in the legislature.

You are the representative of Just-Any County.

You know that your people want Highway 00 blacktopped.

Furthermore, John Smones' oldest son is holding down a $250 per month job in the revenue department; and your own Uncle Jim is a longtime employee of the State comptroller's office.

Besides that, Mrs. Mary Splinther, a widow, whom everybody in the county admires for having laundered her children through college, wants you to get her daughter onto the education department staff.

Moreover, the publisher of the principal newspaper in your county is a member of one of the major commissions by appointment of the governor.

With all those factors in mind, what are you going to do when the administration shoves a bill at you that is in the interest of a few promoters rather than for the public's benefit? You know full well that it's bad legislation, and that, in time, if enacted, it will add millions to the sum which must be extracted from taxpayers.

What are you going to do?

You can attend the meeting of the committee to which the bill is referred, and attempt privately to talk the measure to death; but when you try that, you find the committee already pledged. Each member has been called to the governor's office, and "counseled" with. They, too, have patronage and road obligations.

So the committee rubber stamps the bill "Recommended do pass."

By that time, the word has seeped back to the governor's office that you are opposed to the legislation. You are invited to the governor's office but for the time being you dodge that interview.

That night you get a telephone call from John Smones, whose boy is in the revenue department. Mr. Smones can deliver his township, with 400 votes, 4 or 5 to 1; in fact he gave you that margin in the primary; you can't afford to be ungrateful.

Patiently and earnestly, you state the case against the bill. You point out to him that it is adding $100 in potential tax load for each member of his family, with nothing in return. That gets no rise out of him—then you catch on; why should he be concerned about $600 more tax load, while his son is being paid $3,000 a year plus expenses and has a State-owned car to drive?

Discouraged, you promise to review the proposal thoroughly, and, yes, you'll go to see the governor tomorrow. That is really what Mr. Smones is calling about, he confides. The governor was puzzled and a little miffed that his request for you to visit him had not been complied with.

Next morning Mrs. Splinther's daughter is waiting in the house chamber for you. She has been put on notice that her application for a position in the education department is going to be pigeonholed if you persist in bucking the administration's pet bill. You ask her to sit down, and then expound in detail the harm that the measure will do to every citizen, including her.

She listens, but she's thinking only about that job she wants. She doesn't know anything about the legislation, and she isn't interested; but she is interested in that job, and she knows it is in jeopardy—because of you. Her family and friends do not think it very considerate of you to let your personal views on a bill that the Governor wants interfere with Miss Splinther's ambition to advance in the educational field.

In desperation you write the newspaper publisher at home, pointing out the obvious faults in the proposed act. You suggest that an editorial setting the public straight would be a genuine service to his journal's readers.

Before you can mail the letter a page summons you to the telephone. It's a call from Mr. Publisher. He cannot understand your attitude. What are you trying to do? Deprive your county of improvements and your people of recognition from the administration?

You respond quickly that you had just written him about that very piece of legislation. Through the telephone, you sense his impatience, as he lectures you on the futility of tilting windmills. He declares emphatically that the bill is going to be passed anyway, so why knock him off the commission and prevent other fellow citizens from receiving honors and benefits that the administration can bestow?

You agree to try to find a basis for going along on the bill—and, yes, you will talk with the governor. Wearily you trudge back to your desk, tear up the letter to the publisher, and head downstairs to see the Governor. Shall you state your objections, or just listen?

You listen. The Governor, having publicly and privately plugged for the measure, is in no position to consider objections to it. His prestige is at stake, and he is counting on his friends to stand by him.

You muster up the courage to withhold a commitment, but—with the feeling that your publisher friend, Mrs. Splinther and daughter, Mr. Simones and son, and Uncle Jim are breathing down your neck—you repeat the promise to give the proposal further and sympathetic study.

As you walk out of the governor's private office into the reception room, you run smack into Uncle Jim—now who had tipped him off to be at that spot?—and he looks you squarely in the eye, and cautions you to be practical. He remind you that plenty of men would like to have his job, which he owes to the Governor. Oh, yes, he's been down there through two administrations, but today his obligation is to the incumbent and it would embarrass him if his nephew loomed up as a troublemaker in the house.

You figure that, here at least you can vent your irritation, and you cut Uncle Jim short with a flat statement, which you would like to believe, that you were elected to do what is best for the greatest number, and that's what you intend to do.

Your dander roused, you decide to solicit reinforcements. You've always regarded Representative Jamestone of an adjoining county as an especially able lawmaker, and he's been in the house for four terms. He surely must be aware of the bad features of this bill. You take a seat next to his, and proceed to interrogate him. Yes, he's read the bill; he knows that it's not what the State needs; but he is not going to sacrifice his county's interests.

Besides, he reminds you, the newspapers have endorsed the bill, and are going to give any legislator opposing it a rough time. You see that nothing is to be gained by arguing with him, so you retire to your desk. Awaiting you there is the senator from your district. He asks what's the idea of jeopardizing Mr. Publisher's reappointment to the commission, and cutting your neighbors out of that long-needed blacktop job from the county seat to the county line. The senator has talked with enough members to know that the administration has the votes to pass the bill—why mess us all up by creating ill will in high places?

With that, he abandons you to your meditations. Just then, a messenger drops 30 to 40 telegrams on your desk—they are demands from influential citizens back home that you vote for the bill that's bothering you. Not one of them could possibly have read it; but they are telling you how to vote.

* * * * *

The clerk is reading the bill. The speaker sends a page for you, and when you reach the speaker's stand, he leans over to say that he's going to be terribly disappointed unless you give this an "aye."

In your seat again—the drone of the reading clerk's voice is just background noise for your conflicting thoughts. Not even one constituent has suggested you should vote against the bill. Of course not, for the only constituents who know anything about it are those who have been flatttered with contacts from administration sources.

That can be your defense later on—that the only recommendations from home were that you support the bill. Then you think of your duty to that son of yours. Some day he is going to have to share the tax burden. At least you hope he does, for you would not like to see him leave Arkansas to live in some other state. This is where he belongs. Well, are you going to load more taxes onto his generation, and perhaps drive him from the State's borders?

You can't kick this one around any more. They are ready for a roll call. The moment of decision is at hand.

How are you voting?

More than once in the 60-day session, the lawmaker will have to make a decision which he would like to avoid.

Where lies his duty?

From all sides, he is besieged by demands from constituents with a financial stake in keeping the administration's good will, and from powerful individuals who may make or break him in the next campaign.

The average citizen not on the public payroll and not drawing money from the State does not make demands on his representative. He is not even aware of proposed legislation which may cost him dearly, either in direct levies or indirectly in the division of tax revenues from proper purposes to wasteful promotions.

If the legislator decides to vote contrary to the demands of those applying pressures, he is not likely to receive the plaudits of the taxpayers whose cause he has defended in the face of threats and promises.

No, his compensation must come from within—from the knowledge that his oath of office has not been merely the prating of a political parrot.

1. Consider the possible choices and the consequences.

The bill before the House is not in the public interest, but the only constituents who have been heard from want it passed—for only-to-obvious reasons. No one else who helped elect our man has expressed the faintest interest.

A public official does have an obligation to those who assisted him with their votes, support, and contributions. No one will condemn him too much for standing by those who stood by him—so he decides to vote "aye."

Its over now. The bill has been passed. The administration is satisfied. Uncle Jim rests easy once more in his job on the comptroller's staff; Mr. John Smones' son figures that his job with its $250 per month salary, expense account, and State-owned car is safe for the time being; the road from the county seat to the county line will be black-topped; Mrs. Mary Splinther's daughter has assurance that she will be selected for the education-department position for which her application is pending; the newspaper-publisher constituent is assured of reappointment to the commission on which he has been serving.

The lawmaker seeks consolation in the fact—and it is a fact—that his vote has gotten a road for his county and patronage and honors for constituents. After all, should he let his personal convictions penalize his home folks, the people who elected him?

He will explain all that to his son a decade hence when the young man is wondering what part his dad had in the general assembly when legislative enactments laid the foundation for ruinous debt without compensatory benefits in public improvements. Will the explanation suffice? Or will son shake the dust of Arkansas off his shoes and depart to the asphalt and concrete of other States whose politicians had not progressed to the point of corraling votes at whatever the price, in roads, jobs, contracts, and benefits from public funds?

What if there are no such States left? Then son might as well stay in Arkansas. Is that something to hope for, or not?

2. The legislator, heeding his conscience, backed by his best judgment, votes "No."

The newspaper back home lashes him for having obstructed the administration's program; but the publisher is told that, despite his fine editorial sentiments, he must reconcile himself to giving up his Commission appointment—all on account of his Representative's stubbornness.

Uncle Jim gets his dismissal notice from the comptroller. He'll have to look for a job. Horrible thought, isn't it?

And old John Smones is going to have to support his son in the style to which he has grown accustomed on the Revenue Department payroll, with his nice salary, expense account, and State car; or else the Smones boy will have to try self-reliance for a change.

Poor Mrs. Splinther. She wanted so much for her daughter to get that specialists' assignment in the education department. Now the young lady will have to apply for a teaching job somewhere.

All of them are off their Representative for life. He will get no more votes from them.

His conscience is clear, but what's it worth to the people of his county, who know that his vote cost them the blacktop on the road from the county seat to the county line?

ANOTHER DECISION TO MAKE

Another set of alternatives is before him.

He can take it lying down, and abandon hope of any satisfaction from political activity now or in the future; or he can go at it the hard way, and acquaint the people of his county with just what was involved in the bill he voted against.

He chooses the latter course. The first week-end at home provides an opportunity for a conference with friends whose only concern with State government is that it be properly conducted. He finds them inclined to regret that he voted as he did, against a bill which the administration wanted so badly it felt impelled to show its displeasure by disciplining the whole county and several of its residents.

The situation calls for careful, thorough preparation. He reads portions of the bill to the group, points out its promotional aspects, puts his finger on the sections and phrases that provide an outlet for public money to reach the bank accounts of promoters.

He convinces his listeners that he voted right; and they agree to work up a larger meeting for the next week end, so that others may be similarly informed. For this gathering the county is combed for leaders in all lines of endeavor. They, too, are won over to the lawmaker's view of the legislation.

An explanation and endorsement of his position is prepared by the group, and taken by a committee to the newspaper which had denounced his vote. They ask the publisher to carry a story about the endorsement. If he refuses, they buy advertising space for it.

Invitations to address various civic clubs come to the representative, and he has the chance for which he had wished in vain a few weeks before—to explain in detail why he could not in good conscience go with the administration on the bill under discussion.

His senator, by now, is busy explaining why he was for the bill.

And nearby counties have begun to take notice; their representatives who helped pass the bill are on the defensive. The administration by now wants it understood that it was the legislature's doing—the governor merely signed it after it had been overwhelmingly passed.

Democracy works if right-thinking politicians work. The lawmaker looks ahead to the next campaign with optimism and enthusiasm—his faith in the integrity and in-

telligence of the people, once they are informed of the truth, stronger than ever.

He concludes, with reason, that when people go wrong in an election, it can usually be put down to lack of information or mistaken impressions. In such instances, the blame belongs at the door of the press and the politicians who may have tried, but somehow missed, pointing out the right road.

When that no longer is true, elections will be a waste of time and money, and democracy will have died.

Doctor Shortages Ahead—Dr. Rusk Urges Larger Classes With Speeded Courses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the New York Times:

DOCTOR SHORTAGES AHEAD—DR. RUSK URGES LARGER CLASSES WITH SPEEDED COURSES

(By George Eckel)

Unless medical education is expanded and accelerated at once the Nation faces a deficit of 22,000 physicians by 1954, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman of the national advisory committees on mobilization, said here today. The deficit would be undiminished by 1960 in the absence of measures to counteract it, he added.

Even if both recommended measures were begun at once the deficit in 1954 would be 14,500 physicians, but by 1960 it would be reduced to 2,000, he asserted.

Any such deficits, he declared, meant "a serious threat to the health and welfare of our people."

He called on the medical profession and the medical schools to undertake the added workload necessary to cope with the situation.

Dr. Rusk, who is associate editor of the New York Times, addressed the forty-seventh annual Congress on Medical Education and Licensure, sponsored by the American Medical Association, the Advisory Board for Medical Specialists, and the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States.

TWO STUDIES SUMMARIZED

His presentation summarized the conclusions reached by two committees which he heads, the Health Resources Advisory Committee to the National Security Resources Board and the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists and Allied Specialists to the Selective Service System.

Dr. Rusk held, that unless the profession was to fail to meet the mobilization challenge, enrollments in medical schools must be increased by 15 percent and accelerated courses of studies must be instituted to turn out an extra class every 3 years.

Some 178,000 physicians were in active practice today, he stated, and by 1954 there would be a need for 210,600. The expected supply under present conditions would be about 188,600, he added.

The estimate, proceeded, was predicated on Armed Forces of 5,000,000 men by 1954 and continuing at that level through 1960. If the ceiling through 1960 was not raised above the 3,500,000 men in uniform contemplated by the end of this year the deficit could be reduced by 2,000 to 20,000, he said.

Dr. Rusk declared that the studies by two committees made these assumptions:

1. The emergency state of part or complete mobilization would continue for 10 years.

2. The 1949 ratio of physicians to population in the civilian population was accepted as adequate and was used as a base line.

3. The ratio of physicians to servicemen and women in the Armed Forces would have settled by 1954 to 2.7 per 1,000, a rate substantially below the World War II rate and below the present rate.

4. The estimate of physicians required for civilian defense must assume the possibility of catastrophe, not only physical but epidemic.

A 15-percent increase in enrollments of medical schools, which now graduate 6,000 physicians a year, would not produce any increase in graduates until June of 1955, or of graduates who have finished a 1-year interneship until June, 1956, at the earliest, Dr. Rusk stated.

GAIN BY MEASURE ESTIMATED

By 1960 this measure alone, he added, would reduce the prospective deficit of 22,000 by only 5,000. The increase per class in World War II was 12½ percent, he noted.

Acceleration of medical training, by running four 9-month school years together and completing them within 36 months, would yield 6,000 additional physiciains every 3 years, he said.

By 1954 this would reduce the deficit in active physicians from 22,000 to 14,500 and by 1960 to 10,000, he estimated.

After stating that, based on the Armed Forces reaching and keeping a level of 5,000,000, the two measures together would cut the deficit in 1954 to 14,500 and in 1960 to 2,000. He said that if the Armed Forces did not exceed 3,500,000 the two measures together would erase the deficit by 1960.

Physician requirements by category in 1954, if the Armed Forces had 5,000,000 men, were analyzed as follows by Dr. Rusk: 183,600 for the civilian population, 8,300 for civilian defense, 1,800 for industry and rehabilitation, 2,800 for public health, 500 for medical schools and 18,500 for the Armed Forces.

Dr. Rusk defended the measures he recommended, despite the known defects of acceleration, as the only solutions to a situation in which nothing is possible to avoid or even reduce this deficit before 1954.

"These plans are flexible, and no permanent oversupply is imposed," he declared. "Any part of the program could be adjusted if the situation eased enough to permit it.

"No account is taken of the increased aging of our population, or of the rehabilitation of the wounded veterans coming back from combat."

He noted that "we recognize the difficulties of an accelerated program."

"We should, however," he went on, "be able to profit by our experience in the last war. The depletion of teachers can be prevented, internships could be extended rather than curtailed, in as much as internes already are performing medical services."

Dr. Rusk stated that the present authorized physician ratio in the armed services was 5 per 1,000 men, calling for 17,500 this year in that category alone, but plans called for a tapering off to 3.7 per 1,000 men, as the requirements are less after the formative shakedown phase of mobilization.

A panel discussion on problems arising from mobilization following Dr. Rusk's presentation showed varying opinions on his recommendations.

Dr. Stockton Kimball, dean of the University of Buffalo medical school and chairman of the joint committee on medical education in time of national emergency, reported that three-fourths of the medical schools in the association of American Medical Colleges did not favor the principle of acceleration.

"Practically each of the errors in medical education during the last war we are now asked to repeat," he stated.

Dr. Kimball also produced estimates that for an expansion of 1,000 in enrollments by 1954, approximately the 15 percent recommended by Dr. Rusk, medical schools would require an additional $6,200,000 for operating expenses, an additional $67,000,000 for new school construction and an additional $32,000,000 for hospital construction.

On the question of financial aid to schools, Dr. Rusk said that the health resources advisory committee would, if necessary, back any reasonable program to provide adequate funds with adequate safeguards.

Dr. Victor Johnson, director of the Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Rochester, Minn., raised a question on Dr. Rusk's figures for civilian requirement of physicians.

If the 22,000-physician deficit developed, he said, it would be almost entirely at the expense of the civilian population. On the basis of Dr. Rusk's figures, he added, this would reduce the civilian physician ratio only from 1 in 850, the 1949 level, to 1 in 950, whereas during World War II the ratio was 1 to 1,350, admittedly too small. Would so slight a reduction make so much difference? he asked, in effect.

Dr Rusk replied that we needed the physician ratios we had in 1949, that in World War II we were lucky in having nothing that even looked like a major epidemic, and that the obstetrical case load was very low because of the absence of 16,000,000 men.

He remarked that many physicians were heavily overworked in the last war.

Col. Richard H. Eanes, chief medical officer of the Selective Service System, declared that a draft of physicians might not be necessary because military requirements might be met through the efforts of the profession.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very fine articles from the Christian Science Monitor on the subject of Alaska.

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

ALASKA'S NATIVES STRIVE WITH OLD AND NEW WAYS

(By Louis R. Huber)

JUNEAU, ALASKA.—About one-third of Alaska's present 128,000 population is made up of people who have always lived there—the natives.

They are now in various degrees of adaptation to the white man's way of living with which, inevitably, they will have to conform.

In Metlakatla, southernmost settlement in Alaska, 800 Tsimshian Indians live in what undoubtedly is the most prosperous town—white or native—in the entire Northland.

In the Brooks Range near the Arctic Ocean an undetermined number of Eskimos continue living happily in their traditional ways—their only concession to modernity being the use of guns rather than spears and bows and arrows, for hunting.

Each of these groups, the Metlakatla Tsimshians and the Brooks Range Eskimos, enjoys a stable economy. But the Tsimshians

have come full circle around to the white man's life and have made a success of it. The Brooks Range Eskimos are still living as their ancestors have for centuries.

In between these two poles of native life are thousands of other Alaska natives trying in varying degrees to turn to white men's ways. A few are succeeding, but many are worse off than before. The latter are those who are thrown without safeguard into contact with white folk.

The use of liquor undoubtedly contributes mightily to the frustration of many Alaska natives. This writer talked with Wayne Waldrip, United States deputy marshal at Dillinghom (southwestern Alaska), about the native liquor problem.

Mr. Waldrip is in the thick of it: Eskimos, Koniags, and mixed Alaska natives in his jurisdiction come to Bristol Bay each summer to work for the salmon canneries there. Each native earns what is, for him, a sizable amount of money during the short red-salmon season.

"But all too often the first thing he does is to turn to liquor when the fishing season is over. He may not spend much of his money for liquor—but somebody is sure to see to it that he is relieved of all he earned before he sobers up. He then goes home broke," said Mr. Waldrip.

He favors the enactment of a law which would prohibit the sale of liquor to natives, with stiff penalties for its violation. Not all Alaskans familiar with the native problem agree with this as a remedy, however.

This writer also talked with Judge Joseph W. Kehoe in Nome. Judge Kehoe has had long experience in Alaska; he is situated in the center of the largest group of natives in the Northland—the Eskimos—who, in his region, outnumber the whites.

"While I have no cure for the liquor problem," said Judge Kehoe, "I am not unfamiliar with the failure of the attempt to ban intoxicants during the many years the eighteenth amendment was in effect. The State of Washington once tried denying Indians liquor, and so did Alaska. Neither effort was entirely effective."

Judge Kehoe added that practically all the Eskimo people in the northern part of Alaska are themselves well aware of the menace of liquor. Annually they petition that no liquor-sale licenses be granted in or near their villages, and their petitions are granted.

"Any part of life is as good to the Eskimos as another—and they like it all. They have no sense whatever of urgency or schedule. Midnight is as good as noon—a feeling they may have got from the long summer days and the unending winter nights," a Nome resident said.

Where leadership has been provided, as at Metlakatla, the natives have come through with flying colors. But where no leadership is given and the natives have to fumble their own way, the results are usually disastrous.

It is significant that the Metlakatlans' advance into civilization was due to the work of a religious leader.

William Duncan, a lay missionary of the Church of England, was the man who led the Tsimshean Indians of Metlakatla in their rise from savagery. But before he ever thought of becoming a missionary, Mr. Duncan was a successful Yorkshire leather salesman.

And after he arrived in the midst of the Tsimshians (at Fort Simpson, British Columbia, where they then lived), Mr. Duncan spent a whole year learning the Tsimshean language before he attempted to interest the Indians in becoming Christians.

His program was a rigid one, but the Indians, already aware of the degradation coming to them through their untutored association with white men at Fort Simpson, followed Mr. Duncan almost without question.

The penetration with which this great leader perceived his task and the effectiveness with which he carried it out stand yet as a monument of missionary achievement.

In any discussion of Alaska natives the question of reservations naturally comes up, because reservations have been proposed time and time again in recent years—and a few, indeed, have been established in Alaska.

But the trouble with reservations, according to Alaskans who have lived longest with and studied hardest the native problem up north, is that reservations build a wall between aboriginal and civilized living. The reservation principle tells the native to take his spears and fishhooks and go on living as his ancestors did—often on land that the world needs in one way or another.

The northland natives themselves, mainly in southeastern Alaska, have taken a hand in their own affairs by forming the Alaska Native Brotherhood and the Alaska Native Sisterhood. Both are organizations actively seeking to forward the cause of natives.

And progress has been made. At Hydaburg, Kake, and Klawock the natives have developed an economic self-sufficiency approaching that of Metlakatla, and largely through their own efforts.

ONCE PROUD ALEUTS FACE THREAT OF EXTINCTION—LEADERS NEEDED, HELP ESSENTIAL

SEATTLE.—A thousand once-proud Aleuts, who numbered 16,000 in their island-chain homes 200 years ago, are well on their way to extinction.

This is the alarming forecast of natural scientists who have visited that region during the past several years.

"It is a familiar picture to anthropologists: that of a formerly vigorous and numerous people, physically and culturally well adapted to a rigorous environment," said Prof. William S. Laughlin, of the University of Oregon.

SITUATION SERIOUS

"The Aleuts themselves are aware of this condition," he added.

The Aleut village of Nikolski on Unimak Island, which his excavations have shown to be around 4,000 years old, was cited as an example of how the Aleuts are disappearing.

At the turn of the century Nikolski had approximately 125 inhabitants. In 1938 it had 85, and today it has only 59 inhabitants. Migration away from the village has been negligible, said Professor Laughlin.

Does this mean that extinction is inevitable for the Aleuts? Not at all, he says. The trend can be reversed and the Aleuts, whose intelligence he praises, can once again flourish. He blames bureaucratic indifference and mismanagement.

"It is one of the saddest ironies of history that these people should succumb now to American paternalistic neglect," said Professor Laughlin.

AGENCY AIDS NATIVES

The Aleuts, like nearly all Alaska natives, are ministered to by the Alaska Native Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, United States Department of the Interior.

This Agency, with headquarters in Juneau, the Territorial capital, is one of the largest—if not the largest—in Alaska. With a total of more than 800 employees, it has teachers, doctors, nurses, and institutions throughout the entire northland.

"The objectives of the Alaska Native Service are to discharge the moral and legal obligations of the United States Government to the native people of Alaska—particularly to bring to them health, education, and an economic base which will permit the native people to become an integral part of the social, economic, and political life of Alaska," says Hugh J. Wade, recently appointed area director of the ANS.

Professor Laughlin, whose views coincide with those of other natural scientists familiar with Alaska native problems, focuses his attention on the Aleuts and charges that the objectives of the ANS are not being reached.

RESULTS OF SURVEY

A seven-man research party from the Peabody Museum of Harvard University made a study in 1948 of the Aleut villages of Atka and Nikolski, he said, finding the average individual diet to have a value of approximately 800 to 1,400 calories a day. (About 3,000 calories are needed daily per individual for healthful living.)

The Aleuts are thus starving, says Professor Laughlin, because they have no economic base—no regular employment—and the ANS has done nothing to provide such.

"The only income the Aleuts have is what they may get from fur trapping; they catch fish and seals and, with other food supplied them, that is their entire diet," says Professor Laughlin. "They are starved physically and deeply frustrated mentally; it is no wonder if they take to drinking with economic oblivion staring them daily in the face."

He contrasted the Aleutian-chain life with that of the Aleuts on the Pribilof Islands. Under the Fish and Wildlife Service there, the Aleuts have regular annual employment at the seal rookeries and are healthier, have higher morale, and are on the increase.

Mr. Wade answered by saying that his agency could do more in providing an economic base in the island chain if Congress would provide funds—much was spent in building up the Pribiloff sealeries, a natural industry, he explained.

MODERN HOMES

The Aleuts live in houses built for them by the Government to replace homes they lost when war swept over their islands. The houses are of modern construction—but the occupants have no jobs.

The only regular contact the ANS has with these people is through the husband-and-wife teacher team in each village. Either the husband or the wife is the teacher; the other spouse then is classed as "special assistant."

Although officially prescribed duties may not include other offices than teaching, the husband-wife team through force of circumstances becomes, also, personal adviser, doctor, nurse, janitor, handyman, and moral and economic leader for the village.

Professor Laughlin's criticism falls heavily on the inadequacy with which, he charges, the husband-wife team fails in the latter categories. Even the teaching function, he says, is imperfectly carried out inasmuch as only English is taught.

"In order to help these people," insists Professor Laughlin, "the white leaders who come to them must speak their language and speak it well."

It is significant that the second in command in his research parties for the past several years has been Dr. Gordon H. Marsh, a linguist of Columbia University. He is an accomplished scholar in the field of Aleutian folklore and the Aleutian dialects.

Mr. Wade says that the ANS instructs its teachers to respect and encourage the use of native foods—and, indeed, this writer has seen circulars and pamphlets sent out by the ANS for that purpose—but Professor Laughlin declares his experience has shown that the teachers scorn both native foods and native traditions, many of which are wholesome.

Reforms in RFC End Some Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reforms in RFC End Some Abuses," written by Jack Steele, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, 1951.

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

REFORMS IN RFC END SOME ABUSES SENATORS ASSAILED—NEW AGENCY HEAD DESCRIBES CHANGES—HARBER TOOK OVER WHEN INQUIRY WAS ENDING, ACTED BEFORE ITS REPORT

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—A series of important reforms in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been put into effect quietly in recent months, it was disclosed today by W. Elmer Harber, who became Chairman of the lending agency 6 months ago.

The reforms abolish some of the RFC practices which were sharply criticized by the Senate Banking Subcommittee at its public and private hearings last year. They were instituted before the subcommittee issued its blistering report on favoritism and influence in the RFC 2 weeks ago.

The new regulations, among other things, bar RFC employees from taking high-paying jobs with borrowers whose loans they help arrange, require that at least three of the agency's five Directors approve all loans of more than $1,000,000 and seek to bar the RFC's doors to influence peddlers.

HARBER TELLS OF REFORMS

Mr. Harber, a homespun country banker from Shawnee, Okla., came to the RFC after the subcommittee's inquiry was virtually completed and was not named in its critical report. He outlined the RFC's own reform program in an interview.

He said the program is aimed primarily at setting up good business procedures in the RFC, although he conceded that it would alter practices which brought on some of the subcommittee's sharpest criticism.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the subcommittee, also has proposed that most of the same reforms be written into law through legislation he has introduced to abolish the five-man RFC Board and reshape its lending policies.

PROMISES FURTHER STEPS

Mr. Harber spoke with deep feeling as he outlined the steps already taken by the RFC and promised that others will follow to put its lending operations on a "business basis" and ban any "influence peddling" in connection with its loans.

He made no attempt to defend or apologize for some past actions of the RFC. Neither did he mention his fellow directors, three of whom were singled out for criticism by the subcommittee.

He said, however, that the changes already made had been authorized unanimously by the board.

In apparent anticipation of the reopening of the subcommittee hearings slated for Wednesday, he also said he was ready to fight any move to abolish the RFC or to fix any blame on the great majority of the agency's employees.

The reforms he listed include the following:

1. A rule barring any concern receiving RFC loans of more than $100,000 from hiring within 2 years any RFC employee who had a voice in RFC lending operations. Borrowers must sign such agreements under penalty of cancellation of their loans.

(This move will prevent repetition of many cases cited by the subcommittee in which RFC employees helped arrange loans and then turned up with high-paying jobs with the borrowing firm. One such case was that of John J. Hagerty, who helped arrange the $4,000,000 loan to the Waltham Watch Co. as manager of the Boston agency. He gave up his $10,000-a-year RFC job to become president of Waltham at $30,000 a year. When Waltham closed despite the loan, Mr. Hagerty went back to RFC as an assistant to the directors. Another was that of E. Merl Young, named by the subcommittee as a $60,000-a-year expediter of RFC loans. He left an examiner's post to take jobs simultaneously with two borrowers, the Lustron Corp. and F. L. Jacobs Co. Still another was that of Allen Freese, who went from assistant controller of the RFC at $10,750 to a $22,500 job with the Texmass Petroleum Corp., for which the RFC had approved a $10,100,000 loan.)

VOTE BY THREE DIRECTORS

2. A rule requiring that at least three directors vote affirmatively to authorize any RFC loan of $1,000,000 or over.

(The subcommittee assailed the RFC for approving the controversial $10,100,000 Texmass loan by vote of only two directors. One voted against it, one refrained from vote and one was absent. This loan marked the RFC's first venture into the highly speculative oil business. Jesse Jones, who guided the RFC for many years as Federal Loan Administrator, refused even to consider loans to oil companies.)

3. A regulation requiring all lawyers and expediters representing prospective borrowers to register with the RFC.

(The subcommittee charged that such agents, many of them former RFC employees, appeared to have easy access to RFC officials and were reported to be promising to arrange RFC loans for a fee.)

4. A companion rule requiring that such agents have letters of authorization from their clients before being permitted to discuss pending cases with RFC officials.

(The subcommittee did not mention this matter, but Mr. Harber noted that it would prevent influence peddlers from gaining inside information on RFC affairs unless authorized by prospective borrowers to represent them. "We are trying to tell people they don't need lawyers or influence peddlers to represent them before RFC," he said. "If they go ahead and hire the wrong kind of agent, RFC is not to blame.")

ECONOMY PROGRAM

5. A thorough economy program aimed to streamline RFC operations and save more than $5,000,000 a year. Mr. Harber said the aim was "to make both ends meet"—although the RFC has always claimed its operations were profitable. The agency is dropping 978 employees in its Washington and field offices to save $4,375,000 a year. It has raised its interest rate on new loans from 4 to 5 percent to bring in $1,000,000 a year. It has also instituted application fees and now charges interest to borrowers who do not use the full amount of a loan within 4 months after it is approved.

(The subcommittee at its hearings last year charged that the RFC was actually operating at a loss although the agency claimed a sizable profit. The subcommittee's argument was based on the fact that the RFC itself pays no interest on surplus funds it has built up or on some funds provided by the Treasury. Theodore Hers, the subcommittee's accountant, contended that the RFC lost about $6,500,000 on its lending operations in 1949 when it claimed a profit of $5,226,000.)

6. A change in regulations to permit field agencies to make final decisions on all loans of less than $100,000 without submitting them to the board of directors.

(The subcommittee found fault with the previous practice under which field agencies could grant such small loans, but had to submit to the board for final review all such applications they wanted to object to. Subcommittee members accused the directors of overriding the field agencies too frequently to grant small loans which had no public interest.)

Mr. Harber said the RFC directors were also considering another move to foreclose against all borrowers as soon as their loans become delinquent. In the past, the directors have often extended the loans of borrowers who fell behind in their payments.

The RFC Chairman indicated that these reforms were already producing results.

One of the first lawyers to be ordered to register was Archibald Palmer, New Yorker and one-time attorney for Judith Coplon.

What Price Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address entitled "What Price Gold," delivered by Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., before the Colorado Mining Association at Denver, Colo., on February 2, 1951.

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

WHAT PRICE GOLD

(By Frank Lilly)

The names of "the six honest serving men" who, Rudyard Kipling says, "taught me all I knew," were "Where and What and When and Why and How and Who."

I propose on this occasion to let these "six honest serving men," individually and as a group, teach us what we should know about gold with particular reference to what the price should be.

This is not designed as an argument in behalf of the gold producer or of any monetary policy except as the facts, "hewed to the line," speak for themselves.

TWO DAYS AND SEVENTEEN YEARS AGO

It was 2 days and 17 years ago today that President Roosevelt issued the proclamation which fixed the United States Treasury price of gold at $35 an ounce. In this single sentence we have the Who, When, What, Where, and How—everything but the Why.

The Why runs back to August 1914 when, at the outset of the First World War, Great Britain went off gold as a war measure. To her everlasting credit, Great Britain made an honest effort, in 1925, to restore the gold standard which she had maintained for nearly 100 years, but, because she made the mistake of pricing her gold too low at $20.67 an ounce, she was again forced to go off gold in September 1931—not, be it noted, because she wanted to do so but because she did not have enough gold to back her currency.

GOLD PRICE ALWAYS RISES

No inconvertible paper currency can, in the very nature of things, be as good as gold, hence the value or price of gold always rises in terms of such devalued currency. So the price of gold in Great Britain rose from 85 shillings 12 pence, the equivalent of $20.67 an ounce, to 92 shillings 6 pence in the last quarter of 1931, to 118 shillings in 1932 and in November of 1933 to a high of 143 shillings 2 pence, or the equivalent of $34.91 an ounce.

The United States, in the meantime, had remained steadfastly on the gold standard, and, both before and after his election, President Roosevelt had insisted that he had no intention of "tampering with the currency"; which I firmly believe he meant. However,

circumstances alter cases and wise men change their minds.

Since Great Britain, in going off gold, gave gold a higher measure of value in that country than it had in the United States, our exports to Great Britain declined and our imports increased, with the result that we lost gold in settlement of trade balances to the extent of $446,219,397 in 1932 and another $178,445,507 up to April 1933, when an embargo was placed on gold exports.

THIRTY-FIVE DOLLARS A "LUCKY" FIGURE

Meanwhile, in the confusion and hysteria of the time, Congress passed, in a single day and without any debate, a law nationalizing gold and making it a crime for a private citizen to own or trade in gold. In May 1933 the United States entered the world gold market through the RFC and brought back, on a rising scale, some of the gold that we had lost at $20.67 an ounce. Finally, the price was arbitrarily set at $35 because that figure was considered a "lucky" number and not because any investigation had been made to determine whether or not the figure of $35 was a true and proper price. Prima facie evidence that $35 an ounce was not an adequate price is furnished by the fact that the President and his advisors in the Treasury Department have never subsequently made any attempt to restore the gold standard. As a matter of fact, neither the President nor any Treasury official has ever made an attempt either to provide for currency convertibility into gold at any other price or to determine what the United States price of gold should now be, although this country is strictly "isolationist" in adhering to a $35 price.

NICE BUSINESS FOR FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

In this connection, it is of interest to note that the gold, which by law must be turned into the United States Treasury, is not paid for directly by the Treasury. The procedure is for the Treasury to issue gold certificates, which are turned over to the Federal Reserve System, and receive in return Federal Reserve note currency that is then used by the Treasury to pay for the gold. Incidentally, the Federal Reserve banks, which are privately owned banks, operating under what amounts to a Government franchise, could, under the law, issue additional currency against gold to an amount equal to three times $35 an ounce, or a total of $140 of currency on each ounce. Nice business if the gold producer could get it.

It is only fair to point out that the Federal Reserve has not so far taken full advantage of this inflationary privilege, but they do not need to do so when, under their monopoly over our currency, they are realizing enormous profits in their use of what should really be the people's gold—your money by inalienable right. This is how it is being done, but the why lies in the fact that the public does not realize what has been done and is being done.

THE WHY OF HIGH PRICES

When gold convertibility was taken out of the monetary system, the brake which would have prevented, or at least slowed down, inflation was removed. The why of today's high price is uncontrolled, debt-based, printing-press currency that has in the last 17 years reduced the purchasing power of an ounce of gold to approximately one-third of $35.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that $35 may have been a fair and proper price for gold in 1934, it does not necessarily follow that it is a proper fit for 1951 any more than the sizes of hat, shoes and clothes that junior wore at that time would be proper for the young collegiate of today. Incidentally, try to get your wife to wear today the styles of 1934—just try it.

Junior has grown up, styles have changed and the world of today is as far removed from the world of a decade ago as the iron age was from the stone age. This is now a world of approximately 2,500,000,000 people—more than there have ever been before, despite the losses of World War II. This is the atomic age, combined with speed, unprecedented production and a high scale of living, all of which call for a reexamination and revaluation of former standards.

FOREIGN CURRENCY DEVALUATIONS

The monetary systems of every other country in the world have undergone tremendous changes. Some of them: China, Greece and Hungary, for example, have been forced into complete repudiation of their paper currencies. Italy has devalued its currency to a figure equivalent to $1,145 an ounce for gold and France, to $486.50. Russia devalued its currency 10 to 1 as of January 1, 1948, and revalued in gold on March 2, 1950. Great Britain devalued the pound sterling to the equivalent of $2.80 in September of 1949 and her example was followed by 40 other countries, chiefly in the sterling bloc.

So what? says the average United States citizen. Just this: These devaluations, because they have given gold a higher measure of value abroad, are the "why" this country has lost a total of over two and one-quarter billions of its gold since Great Britain's devaluation in September 1949. Few realize that this is equivalent to more than one-third of all the gold produced in this country during the last 150 years; or that the total loss during the last 6 months is nearly three times as much as this country lost from 1931 to 1933, the 2 years preceding the raising of the price of gold to $35. As a matter of fact, the average weekly loss during the past 6 months has been as much as is now produced in the United States in an entire year.

ONLY ABOUT 10-PERCENT GOLD BACKING OF TOTAL UNITED STATES MONEY SUPPLY

It is true that, despite these losses, we still have nearly 60 percent of the world's monetary gold. This does not, however, necessarily mean that we have enough in relation to our monetary needs. Actually, we have a gold backing equivalent to only a little over 10 percent of our total supply of money, including bank deposits, but not including many billions of Government bonds and other obligations that could be converted into currency. Incidentally, our total supply of gold on the basis of $35 an ounce would pay only about one-third of the annual budget now before Congress.

We must not forget that world trade operates exclusively on gold in the settlement of trade balances. We hear much about the preeminence of the dollar but the cold fact is that over a billion of the world's population now operates within the sterling bloc and nearly a billion in the Russian gold ruble bloc, both of which give gold a much higher measure of value in their economies than the $35 an ounce price we use in paying foreign trade balances.

UNITED STATES PAYS IN CHEAPLY VALUED GOLD

The United States is currently paying extraordinarily high prices for the world's commodities and paying for them in cheaply valued gold. A year ago an ounce of gold would, for example, have bought nearly 60 pounds of tin; today it will buy only a little over 15 pounds. Just why we should cut off our nose and spite our face by stubbornly refusing to utilize the purchasing power of gold demonstrated by other countries cannot be answered by any of Kipling's "honest serving men."

A part of the confusion over the price of gold lies in the fact that there are actually several prices for it; namely, (1) an exchange price, (2) a commodity price, and (3) a monetary price, which is the measure of value given gold in a nation's monetary system. The price in the United States is the same for all three. In Great Britain, however, the exchange price, which is officially controlled and essentially a fiction, is maintained at approximately $35. The commodity price paid by processors, jewelers, dentists, etc., is equivalent to about $60 an ounce. The monetary value, on the basis of legal parity, is $102.17 an ounce, according to figures furnished me by the United States Mint. In other words, Great Britain's two devaluations, the first in September 1931 and the second in September 1949, have given gold the same measure of value in that country has if the price of gold had been raised to $102.17 an ounce.

You have no doubt read several newspaper reports about people who have risked the loss of large sums of gold in their efforts to smuggle gold out of this country so as to dispose of it at a large profit in Great Britain, India, and other foreign countries. These facts speak for themselves as to the true price of gold abroad.

NO PROOF $70 WOULD BE PROPER PRICE

In the course of my study of the question of What Price Gold, I have asked a large number of well-informed men for an expression of opinion as to what the price should be. The great majority have replied "$70 an ounce"; but in no case has anyone attempted to justify that figure by relating it to such factors as purchasing power in commodities and/or wages, foreign devaluations, and world or United States monetary requirements.

It is interesting, and probably significant, to note that if the price of gold were related to the present purchasing power and wages the price here would be approximately the same as the figure of $102.17, which is the London equivalent, on a legal parity basis, of the United States price; for commodity prices and wages have, on the average, trebled over that of the period of 1934–38. Accordingly, to justify, on a comparative basis, a price of $70 an ounce for gold, both commodity prices and wages would have to be rolled back to 1939–44 averages.

GOLD PRICE MUST BE INCREASED OR ELSE

One thing, therefore, seems crystal clear: Either commodity prices and wages must be rolled back or the price of gold must be increased—unless, of course, we continue on down the path of inflation via a debt-based paper currency to bankruptcy and repudiation. I believe all thinking men must agree on this conclusion.

TIMES CALL FOR QUICK DETERMINATION

A free market for gold would probably be the best way to determine what the price of gold should be, but we seem to have waited too long for that and must, accordingly, resort to some plan that will permit quicker action. Under the circumstances, the suggestion of the American Mining Congress that the price be determined by a Monetary Commission, should, I believe, be carried out without further delay. As a matter of fact, why wouldn't it be proper for the Colorado Mining Association to act and itself appoint such a commission instead of merely suggesting?

HOW A PROPER PRICE COULD BE DETERMINED

It would, it seems to me, be possible to arrive at a reasonable conclusion on a proper price for gold by way of the following steps:

1. Determine just what this country's overhead is or, in other words, the amount required to meet our fixed charges and living requirements.

2. Determine how much production is needed to provide the income and profits necessary to meet those fixed charges.

3. Determine how much money is required to attain and maintain that necessary production, because such production would not be possible without an adequate amount of money.

4. Having decided how much money is necessary, proceed to make our money sound by backing it with a minimum 40 percent of

gold and restoring the gold standard with convertibility of currency to gold.

Then, finally, if we do not now have enough gold to provide a 40-percent backing on the basis of $35 an ounce, or $70 an ounce, raise the price of gold to whatever figure is needed to give the necessary gold coverage to make our money sound.

THERE IS GOOD IN GOLD

Failure to use the atom bomb in the present world emergency can be justified on the grounds that its tremendous power to destroy is a two-edged sword. The power in gold, however, is constructive, and failure to use the larger measure of value inherent in it to attain and maintain the healthy economy that is a prerequisite to a peaceful world is not only inexcusable but comes close to being wicked. There is good in gold. Let's make the greatest possible use of it.

Why Not Try Christianity—Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an article entitled "Why Not Try Christianity—Now?" written by Dr. Clarence Poe, who is president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, one of the leading agricultural papers of the United States and which has an immense circulation. This article is followed by A Working Program For Peace, which supplements his discussion applying the principles of Christianity to our present world situation. I think this whole article is well worth perusing, and I trust that the suggestions which he makes will receive consideration in connection with the settlement of our international problems.

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

WHY NOT TRY CHRISTIANITY—NOW?

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor, the Progressive Farmer)

A few weeks ago I was talking with one of the ablest women I have ever known. A woman of great practical judgment, she has inherited and is active in directing large business interests. She also has a deep and sound interest in all movements for the development of her State, our underprivileged classes, and the South as a whole. Somehow the talk turned to religion, and she used one unforgettable expression:

"Every time I have tried to do anything that Jesus tells us to do," she said very simply, "I have found that it works."

Very often since then, as wars and rumors of war have all but drowned out the Christian message of "peace on earth, good will to men," I have thought of this woman's matter-of-fact tribute to the everyday practicability of Christianity.

"When we try to do what Christ tells us to do—it works." And if it works in our personal relations, why should it not work in international relations? If putting Christianity into practice among individuals brings returns in peace and good will, why should not putting Christianity into practice among nations do so? In other words, why not try Christianity as a way out of the present un-Christian threat of world war III and world destruction?

This does not mean that we should stop or lessen our present efforts to arm America with weapons of war so long as we are threatened with weapons of war. But it does certainly mean that we should try Christianity—and keep on trying Christianity—as a means of preventing such a war.

We in America profess to be a Christian nation. So do the people of Britain and all Europe. The President of the United States often praises the Sermon on the Mount. So do our Senators and Congressmen and our diplomats. Why, then, should they not get down on their knees along with all our common people and pray in all sincerity, "By God's help we will try to learn—and then to use—Christ's way of dealing with the gigantic devastation and destruction that now threatens our human race."

Suppose we should with all our hearts try to find Christ's way, what conclusions would we reach? Every reader must answer that question for himself. I can report only what my own sincere efforts lead me to conclude for myself.

1. First of all, most of all, I believe we should have to act in a spirit of Love. God is love, we are told, and love is certainly the keynote of all Christ's teaching. The King of England gave the world its noblest Christmas 1950 message when he declared:

"If our world is to survive in any sense that makes survival worth while, it must learn to love, not to hate; to create, not to destroy."

Every move of our diplomacy, every effort to strengthen our armaments, would have to be tested by the yardstick, is this in harmony with the spirit of love—a spirit of love not only for our own Nation, but for all nations; not only for our own people, but for all peoples?" Because war always kills the innocent many along with the guilty few, how can any Christian nation justify it so long as there remains any Christian way to avoid it? Should we not say with General Marshall, "Wherever there is a conference table, the United States should be the first one at it and the last one to leave it"?

2. If we have Christ's spirit, must we not also say, "Always the only justifiable use of force is to repel the use of force"? We must arm to prevent other nations from using arms against us and we must use arms if arms attack us, but we must not be rushed into any unnecessary or so-called preventive war by any foolish talk that war is inevitable and that we should start it whenever we believe we can win it by slaughtering millions of poor, plain men and women in other lands who no more wish to kill us than we to kill them.

3. If we have the spirit of Christ, we Americans must also learn a new sympathy for suffering in other lands. Why should the average American farmer boast of his prosperity when he thinks 100 acres of God's earth too little for his family while millions in Asia have less than 2 acres per family? Why should American businessmen take the credit for a prosperity that is so largely due to the fact that the rich resources of our country are divided only among 150,000,000 people instead of one thousand million as they would be in Asia? Instead of boasting of our superiority to other peoples, should we not rather humbly pray in the language of the Psalmist—

"Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy Name give glory."

4. Furthermore, if we have the spirit of Christ, should we not be ready to spend out of our abundance, not merely for war and guns but to help the poverty-stricken millions abroad who live half-starved, die pitifully young, and go through life almost without hope, all because they lack the privileges God has given us? A truly great "Christian Alternative to World Destruction" is found in Senator BRIEN MCMAHON's proposal first made last spring, namely—

(1) That all nations reduce armament and spend two-thirds of their then war budgets for a world program of reconstruction, irrigation, education, health, industrial progress, and human welfare.

(2) That if other nations agree to do this, the United States would itself give ten billion for this purpose.

No other program our President or Congress or our people or our Christian churches can support would likely do so much to check the world-wide trend toward communism and war and instead set the governments of all nations upon a new era of hope and progress and peace. Ten billions so spent might save world peace, while 50,000,000,000 to wage war or prepare for world war III may (or may not) end only in world war IV or world suicide.

A WORKING PROGRAM FOR PEACE

We have just presented the general principles that we believe should be followed if we try to apply the principles of Christ to present world conditions. Next—

1. As for specific policies, we believe first of all that the United Nations is indeed the hope of the world, the only alternative for the accursed war system of settling international disputes, and that we must use it as the one great agency for promoting world peace. It can be made effective now by transferring any question from the Security Council, where Russia has a veto, to General Assembly, where there is no veto, and giving UN greater military power.

2. The next great need is to turn the energies and purposes of all nations from war and destruction to a great program of peace and progress by adopting some such plan as Senator MCMAHON's for world peace and reconstruction.

3. We must also make easier the efforts for peace by remembering that Christ never called sincere peacemakers "appeasers." Rather, He called them "the children of God." Also, our foreign policy should be truly nonpartisan and our President and generals must quit making decisions without fully consulting the peoples of Asia and Western Europe who would be the first to be overrun in case of war.

4. There are three fatal mistakes Russia wants us to make: (1) To get hopelessly bogged down by a war with China, (2) to lose the support of other UN nations by insisting on our own way about everything, and (3) to spend ourselves into bankruptcy by trying to get peace by guns without also using UN and the principles of Christianity to prevent war. We must not make any of these mistakes.

5. Peace in Korea might possibly be brought about by using almost exactly such principles and policies as Dr. Frank Graham used to bring about peace in Indonesia and the principles Dr. Ralph Bunche used in Palestine.

6. Finally, we should have faith that if we can only delay war, we may also prevent war from happening at all. We should remember that the plain people of all nations want peace, that Russian leaders and policies could possibly change, and that tyranny nearly always breeds rebellion—and eventually successful rebellion. We may also well remember that the stages of the Russian Revolution have been not unlike those of the French Revolution: (1) Confiscation of land by the peasants, (2) chopping off the heads of opposition leaders, and (3) repudiation of religion. Yet France soon greatly changed. So may Russia and China. History seems to say to us in America, "If you will not only keep strong but also support such a Christian program for world unity, peace, and progress, as Senator MCMAHON proposes, you may not only delay world war III but possibly prevent it from happening at all."

Fight or Get Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fight or Get Out," appearing in the Morning World-Herald, of Omaha, Nebr., on February 13.

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

FIGHT OR GET OUT

Monday morning headlines related that the UN forces were back in Seoul.

But by Monday afternoon the Reds (Chinese and North Korean) had launched another thunderbolt, had smashed through the South Korean lines, and the UN divisions were tumbling backward all along the front.

So here we go again, up and down the peninsula. First one side grabs the ball and runs to the 5-yard line. Then a spectacular goal-line stand, and the other side takes the ball and runs back up the field.

In football this see-saw business can be very exciting. But in Korea men are being killed. Thousands of them in every offensive. And so far as can be observed from the side lines, nothing is being accomplished—nothing, at any rate, which is worth the cost in American lives.

The people and their Congress have been very patient. They have accepted the view that their leaders—military and diplomatic—knew what they were doing and that their plans would bear fruit in due season.

But the further the campaign proceeds, the more difficult it becomes to maintain that sublime confidence.

Two articles of American policy in Korea simply do not wash.

The first is the determination of the State Department to keep Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek out of the war. Chiang has an army variously estimated at from 300,000 to 600,000 men on Formosa. Some of them are experienced and well-equipped troops, eager to fight. Others need only American arms to make them formidable fighting units. But all of them are kept immobile on Formosa because the State Department does not wish to sully its lily-white fingers by joining hands with Chiang.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican leader of the House, discussed this issue yesterday in his Lincoln Day address in Brooklyn, and asked the question which must have occurred to millions of bewildered Americans:

"What kind of logic is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea when, by shipping the proper supplies to the Generalissimo, a second front could be opened in China without a single GI being forced to place a foot on the soil of the Chinese mainland?"

The second incomprehensible article of this country's Korean policy is the continued coddling of the Chinese Communists.

After weeks of nervous debate, the United Nations finally was persuaded to pass a resolution which timidly avowed that the Reds had committed an act of aggression. But there the matter lies. There has been no retaliation. Neither in trade nor in military ways has China been made to suffer. Even nations which voted for the aggressor resolution are still doing business with the enemy, and apparently the State Department is so weak, so lacking in good American qualities, that it does not even dare to protest.

If American soldiers are to be kept on Korea, they should be backed to the limit by their Government. They should have all the support, military and diplomatic, that their countrymen can give them.

If Washington is not ready to give them that kind of support, it should recall them from Korea at once.

In other words, America should fight or get out.

The young men on Korea should be supported, or they should be evacuated.

American blood should not be poured out in a seemingly endless series of inconclusive campaigns up and down the Korean Peninsula.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rushing for Seaway Bandwagon," published in the Detroit News of February 4, 1951; an editorial entitled "Senator DOUGLAS Scores Again," published in the Springfield (Ill.) State Register of February 6, 1951; an editorial entitled "Bringing the Ocean Closer to South Dakota," published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader of February 6, 1951; and an editorial entitled "The Seaway Again," published in the Cincinnati Inquirer of February 6, 1951.

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

[From the Detroit News of February 4, 1951]

RUSHING FOR SEAWAY BANDWAGON

Like a glacier suddenly enlivened by the big thaw, the inch-by-inch progress of the 40-year-old St. Lawrence seaway project has quickened to a pace daily more like that of an avalanche.

Rumblings of this movement begin to be heard throughout the land. Widening cracks are seen in the opposition so long solidly effective.

The time clearly has come for Michigan Congressmen and citizens to put their backs into boosting the movement's gathering headway. Now, if ever, opportunity is frantically beckoning. This 40-year-old dream of a deep-draft channel connecting the Great Lakes with tidewater and the oceans at last shows signs of coming true.

Stalin, it can be said, may be bringing to pass what both Hitler and the Kaiser failed to accomplish.

After each world war the fact was noted and attested by highest authority that neglect to build the dams and locks to flood out the St. Lawrence Rapids had prolonged the fighting. Lack of the seaway had denied to national defense the use of Great Lakes shipyards. It had multiplied difficulties of transporting war materials abroad and critical raw materials inland.

Lacking the seaway, the Nation had denied itself the ability to bring to bear on the enemy its maximum potential efficiency. It was much as though we had deliberately handicapped ourselves by partially blocking New York Harbor.

However, after each war, it was said this was the last. Hopeful of peace everlasting, those jealous of the seaway's promise of opening a great new trade route quickly resumed efforts to stop it at any cost.

This time history may not have to repeat itself. This time, at last, we may see to the development of our greatest remaining natural resource, before war comes.

The change is due as much as anything to Stalin's known possession of the most formidable submarine fleet of all time.

Along with that, it has been noted that Lake Superior iron deposits, depleted by two World Wars, cannot stand another one. If not, via the seaway from the newly discovered Labrador-Quebec deposits, the needed ore must be brought from overseas. It is either the seaway or exposure of the chief essential of our national defense to the hazards of undersea attack.

It has taken facts like these to inspire the Ohio State Chamber of Commerce to reconsider its traditional opposition to the project.

It was the facts, and patriotism, that induced Chairman BUCKLEY of the House Public Works Committee to announce after the recent White House conference, his conversion to the seaway. He comes from New York City and, like others in that hotbed of jealous opposition, heretofore has fought the project.

These are the signs, now accumulating, of what may achieve the irresistible power of an avalanche. But it still needs pushing, as those of us well know who recall how readily self-interest distorted and dismissed the facts of 1918 and 1945.

Now is the time for this Great Lakes region to throw off the habit of defeat and demand the project on which its own industrial future, no less than the safety of the Nation, depends.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Register of February 6, 1951]

SENATOR DOUGLAS SCORES AGAIN

Newsmen and radio commentators are kept busy by the tremendous constructive activities of United States Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. He has been talked and written about in connection with a variety of responsibilities, including Secretary of State and President of the United States.

The press story suggesting that Senator DOUGLAS is one of a number being considered as successor to former Senator "Happy" Chandler as high commissioner of baseball, while complimentary, is not to be taken too seriously. The Senator cannot be spared from the battle front of statesmanship.

One of the most recent public declarations of Senator DOUGLAS was as cosponsor of the bill for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

On this subject Senator DOUGLAS makes a specific six-point presentation of conclusions which command favorable public consideration and official action.

The Illinois Senator analyzes this project from the viewpoints of navigation, war supplies, national defense and that transcendent fundamental—to supply low-cost power to defense industries. Expansion in the northeast States will be seriously limited without this new source of power, as he points out.

Senator DOUGLAS has dared to strike a blow for liberty on a highly controversial issue which always arises when low-cost power is advocated. The expression is anathema to what has long been called the power trust.

It was the courage and initiative of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in advocating low-cost power and conservation of hydroelectric resources in New York State when he was Governor which placed him in line for the Presidency of the United States.

There may be a parallel in the Douglas case, but Senator DOUGLAS is placing the welfare of the people and the safety of the Na-

tion, as well as the peace of the world, above all considerations which relate to his own personal and political welfare.

In Senator DOUGLAS today the State and Nation are recognizing masterful leadership which is finding favor with unprejudiced authorities on the fundamentals of government throughout America.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader of February 6, 1951]

BRINGING THE OCEAN CLOSER TO SOUTH DAKOTA

From a reader who knows much about transportation comes the suggestion that the Argus-Leader give full endorsement to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway.

"You can help South Dakota a lot by supporting it," he writes.

Support of this project by the Argus-Leader would represent no change in thought on the part of this newspaper because we supported it some years ago when it was actively in limelight.

The reason for endorsement, of course, was the manner in which it would affect South Dakota beneficially in respect to transportation.

The St. Lawrence waterway project would make it possible for ocean vessels to reach the Great Lakes. This would mean that Duluth, Minn., actually would be an ocean port. Thus in effect the ocean would be that much closer to South Dakota, including the cheap water rates that prevail. Such a development would be helpful to the commerce of this State generally as well as to other inland States in the area of the Great Lakes.

The project is in the foreground again because President Truman has suggested prompt action in respect to it.

As a result, discussion of the project is again widespread.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, for example, refers to it as "costly hoax." But its special concern is well exemplified by one statement in its editorial, as follows:

"By diverting ocean traffic, including iron ore, to the Great Lakes, the seaway would cause untold losses to eastern United States ports, including Philadelphia."

But what would be Philadelphia's loss in this respect would be the gain of Duluth, South Dakota, and many other inland areas.

The Argus-Leader cannot agree, however, with President Truman's contention that immediate construction is in order as a defense measure. Years would be required to complete the project and its development would interfere with other more necessary and vital undertakings. And the cost would be at least $1,500,000,000.

So, let's forget about it for the present. But let's keep it in mind as a desirable project for the future.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 6, 1951]

THE SEAWAY AGAIN

The recurrent issue of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project comes to the fore again at a moment when its possible uses for national defense purposes are more engaging than ever before.

Powerful political and economic issues are involved in the project—as previously—but it seems to us that now if ever is the time to examine the proposal strictly on its material merits and in terms of its actual usefulness in continental defense.

Inland steel producers, including such imposing figures as W. W. Seebald, president of the Armco Steel Corp., have argued that unless the navigation phase of the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, the steel industry of the central United States will be starved for lack of quality ores, since the Mesabi Range bordering on Lake Superior is nearing depletion. If the seaway is completed, it would give the ore fleet of the Great Lakes access to the new and immense deposits in Labrador, via the St. Lawrence River, which at present will not accommodate deep-draft vessels at its mouth. This surely is a matter in which expert opinion is available, and therefore a decision could be made on the basis of practical need.

There are other, and for the moment possibly more important questions, of course. One is how long it would take to accomplish the project and how much of a diversion of manpower and materials it would require from the more pressing tasks of national defense. If it would not seriously conflict with the immediate needs of national defense and could be carried to completion within a relatively short space of years, it certainly recommends itself. On the other hand, if it cannot be finished inside of a decade or a decade and a half, and meanwhile would be in serious conflict with more urgent defense tasks, it certainly does not recommend itself.

All of these are questions which can be answered factually, and should be answered factually.

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on January 19, 1951, the Washington Daily News contained two excellent articles and the Washington Star an editorial on the wonderful work being done by the Preparedness Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I ask that the articles and editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News of February 19, 1951]

PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE CHARGES AIR FORCE HOARDS MEN

The Senate Preparedness Committee today accused the Air Force of Hoarding the best of the Nation's available manpower.

"This must stop," the committee said in a report charging overcrowding at the Lackland (Tex.) Air Force Base.

It blamed the overcrowding on Air Force greed for the elite of the Nation's manhood. The committee, headed by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) said the Air Force made a deliberate effort in December and January "to enlist beyond its capacity too great a share of the good material available."

The result, it said, was that 68,731 men and women were crowded into a base which can accommodate only 27,500 and men who might have made "invaluable" Army officers are now Air Force privates.

"STOP STOCKPILING"

"This is an illustration of the wrong kind of stockpiling," the committee said. "We don't have enough men for one service to build itself up as a mentally and physically elite corps. This must stop."

Accordingly, it demanded that all services hereafter draw their men from a single draft pool.

The Senate investigators said they found that conditions at Lackland were substandard, but concluded that "no undue hardship to enlisted personnel resulted from the housing, clothing, food, or medical care offered at the base."

They scuttled rumors of a pneumonia epidemic killing off men at the base, saying that only two deaths had occurred there in 18 months—one from an accident, one from cancer.

The investigators found that, because of congestion, 5,653 men were living in tents with dirt floors and thousands still were wearing civilian clothes. But they had abundant and good food and medical care, they said. There was "no evidence of oppressive discipline" and morale was high, but there were some "cry babies," the committee said.

CAPTAIN ROTH CRITICIZED

The committee castigated Capt. Myron Roth, base public information officer, for claiming without substantiating evidence that subversives had spawned the rumors about conditions at Lackland. It said Captain Roth's explanation was a "direct affront and served to discredit the Lackland command."

The report absolved the base command of any wrong doing, saying full guilt falls on Air Force headquarters here for a grab-the-best enlistment policy which is irresponsible and merits censure.

It said the policy was an inexcusable breach of the unification law and "was deliberately contrived to deprive the other services of manpower." The committee said this is reprehensible.

"The Air Force's apparent unconcern for the other services is not merely a rebuff to the spirit of unification, it is also an attitude detrimental to the best interests of the Nation," the committee said.

Despite appeals by base officers to headquarters to slow up enlistments, the committee said, it was not until January 16 that enlistments finally were suspended. By that time, it said, the base was hopelessly overcrowded and there was a complete breakdown in basic training.

"The Air Force," it concluded, "hoarded far more manpower than it was prepared to utilize. The committee is inclined to believe the Air Force knew what it was doing and, from all indications, did it for a calculated purpose."

COMMON POOL

It said if there ever was "a persuasive argument for compelling all the services to draw their manpower from a common pool through selective service, this performance by the Air Force is it."

Declaring that "we don't want any more Lackland situation arising," the committee said it is investigating indoctrination stations and camps for all three services. It said inquiries are under way at Fort Dix, N. J.; Camp Chaffee, Ark.; Fort Knox, Ky.; Camp Breckenridge, Ky.; Fort Jackson, S. C.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; Fort Riley, Kans.; Camp Roberts, Calif.; and Fort Ord, Calif., all Army installations.

Also being investigated are the Navy's Newport (R. I.) indoctrination center, Great Lakes (Ill.) Training Station, and San Diego (Calif.) Naval Station, and the Air Force's Sampson (N. Y.) Air Force Base, and Sheppard (Tex.) Air Force Base, and the Marine Corps Parris Island (S. C.) Base, and San Diego Marine Recruiting Barracks.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 19, 1951]

HOW LACKLAND INVESTIGATION BEGAN

(By Marshall McNeil)

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Senate Preparedness

Committee, told in an exclusive interview today the inside story of how his group investigated the Air Force's greedy and irresponsible handling of enlisted men at Lackland Air Force Base near San Antonio.

The technique used in this case is SOP—standard operating procedure—for the committee.

"I got the first complaint from a New England Senator," Senator JOHNSON said. "Then I got a couple of letters myself. I read them to Air Force officials in a closed session of our committee, asking them to check on the situation by telephone. They didn't do that. So we moved in."

FOUR PROBERS

First, Senator JOHNSON sent four investigators to Lackland, with orders to present their credentials to the commander. They did. The commander invited them to lunch. They declined.

"Instead, they dressed in Air Force uniforms and lived among the boys, in their crowded, uncomfortable, inadequate quarters, mostly tents," the Senator went on.

By letter and word of mouth there had been many wild rumors out of Lackland: stories about such overcrowding and substandard conditions as led to suicides, many deaths from pneumonia, poor food, and inadequate medical care. Sons had complained to their mothers, mothers their Senators. Senators raised cain with Air Force headquarters. Nothing much happened. There was an effort to brush off the whole thing as subversive rumors from some nebulous fifth column.

SLEPT ON COTS

"The four investigators slept on cots, sometimes without mattresses," Senator JOHNSON said. "Oh, sure, it was better than a frozen foxhole in Korea, but nevertheless darned uncomfortable—and inefficient, too, if you're trying to indoctrinate a young man with the idea that he is a vital cog in our Armed Forces."

Each night an investigator would telephone Washington and dictate a report to a stenographer in the Johnson office here.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 19, 1951]

WRONG WAY TO MOBILIZE

Strong language was used by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S Preparedness Subcommittee in reporting on overcrowding at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas, but the group's findings justify strong language. Although rumors of deplorable health and morale conditions proved to be unfounded, the subcommittee was shocked by the chaos created at the base by what the investigators described as the Air Force's "greed for the best of the Nation's available manpower."

The "inexcusable waste of manpower caused by the selfishness of the Air Force"—as the subcommittee put it—resulted in the jamming of 68,731 men at one time into a training camp with a rated emergency capacity of only 27,500. The inevitable happened. Thousands of recruits had to be housed in hastily erected tents, hundreds of them without floors, stoves, or lights. During part of last month many of the men slept on canvas cots without mattresses and with insufficient covering. Bathing and shaving facilities were overtaxed. Serious clothing shortages developed. (It was during this period that rumors were circulated that the hardships had caused numerous deaths from pneumonia or from suicide. Actually there had been no deaths from either cause.)

More serious than the discomforts of the men was the complete collapse of the training program for which the men were sent to Lackland. It became utterly impossible to give the recruits the preliminary training which is so important to soldiers or flyers. Undisclosed numbers of Air Force recruits were sent on to advanced bases under the handicap of little or no indoctrination. The subcommittee exonerated the Lackland command of blame for the mess, after it was shown that Washington had ignored repeated protests from the base. "What this adds up to is, bluntly," said the report, "that the Air Force made a deliberate effort to enlist beyond its capacity too great a share of the good material available." It was unfair hoarding of manpower by one service at a time when the Army was seeking good material, too. This destructive form of interservice competition is the reverse of the teamwork which unification was supposed to bring. The Defense Department should take whatever steps are necessary to prevent a recurrence of the mistakes of Lackland—including the mistake of trying to cover up the facts in misleading press releases.

The FBI Agent Who Cannot Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "The FBI Agent Who Cannot Quit," by Carol Hughes, which appeared in the February issue of Coronet:

THE FBI AGENT WHO CANNOT QUIT

(by Carol Hughes)

One day back in 1901, President Theodore Roosevelt was taking his daily horseback ride through Washington's Rock Creek Park. On duty in the park was Joseph F. Amos, a Negro mounted policeman whom the President knew.

On this day, Amos summoned his nerve and approached the Chief Executive. "Mr. President," he said hopefully, "I have a young son, but he's beyond my control. I know Jim's an all-right boy, Mr. President, and I wondered if you knew of a job he could get."

Roosevelt smiled. "Amos," he said, "you just send that boy around to me—I'll control him."

Like a startled deer, young Jim Amos popped from the bushes where he had been hiding to have his first close look at his future boss. If the most kindly fairy had waved her magic wand over his head that day, she could hardly have granted him a more fortunate future. For that was the beginning of a career that was to make him an almost intimate member of a President's household, and one of the most distinguished Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

For almost 11 years, James E. Amos was closer to "Teddy" Roosevelt than almost any man who entered the White House. He was a "nursemaid" to the Roosevelt children, a second butler at all state dinners, and finally was a bodyguard, major domo, friend, and idolator of the President. He was alone in the room with the ex-President's head cradled in his arms when the great man died.

As a trusted member of Roosevelt's staff, Amos came in contact with Washington's top statesmen, politicians, ambassadors, citizens. From this coveted position, he went on to one of the Nation's highest posts of trust and honor. Jim has been Special Agent Amos of the FBI for almost 30 years.

In his years with the FBI, Jim has played many roles, encountered many dangers, engaged in many secret cases. He has risked his life often; known much high adventure; and is today one of the firearms experts in the FBI.

There isn't a gun in existence that Jim Amos can't take apart blindfolded and put back together again. When Federal legislation finally permitted FBI men to carry guns, Jim assisted in training the men, and in setting up safety rules for the firing range. The final test of Amos' ability lies in the fact that J. Edgar Hoover has three times petitioned the President of the United States to retain Amos in the service, after he had passed the mandatory retirement age.

The bright young Negro boy who appeared in the President's office on that July day back in 1901 could hardly foresee what the future held for him. After serving first as nursemaid to the six lively and adventurous Roosevelt children, Jim moved up the White House ladder to the great dining room. Here, where State secrets were discussed, Jim quickly learned to keep his ears open and his mouth shut. So well did he do both jobs that he was soon Roosevelt's almost constant companion. Today he says: "Mr. Roosevelt was not only my employer, he was also my dear friend to whom I could always go with my most personal troubles. I loved him deeply and served him, I hope, faithfully."

When the President retired to his home at Oyster Bay, he insisted that Amos leave his service and go on to more profitable enterprises. But Jim always remained subject to call, and when finally Roosevelt knew that his time was short, he sent for his faithful friend.

No one else could quite handle the sick old Rough Rider. From then on, Jim never left the room at night. On the final night, Amos heard Roosevelt breathing irregularly. He went to the bed and held the ex-President's head in his arms until he breathed his last.

Jim entered the FBI in 1921, working at Washington headquarters. His main duties were encoding and decoding confidential messages and handling important mail. These duties gave him an enviable view of the entire operation of the fledgling bureau, and when he graduated to field work Jim was ready.

In hundreds of cases over the years, Amos has proven invaluable in tracking down his man. J. Edgar Hoover says: "He has sources and contacts enjoyed by few other agents in the service."

In the case of Ralph Richards, a bandit as well known for his escapes as for his armed robberies, Jim took up the trail when it seemed hopeless and finally located his quarry in Mount Vernon, N. Y. Richards was arrested, and Jim went on to other affairs.

Soon thereafter the call went out for Amos again, Richard had escaped. Week after week Jim investigated every clue, followed every lead. Finally he found Richards in a mid-Manhattan rooming house, and called for another agent to aid him in making the arrest.

As they entered the room it was the quick thinking, along with the agile body of Amos that saved both agents' lives. Amos, in the lead, saw the fugitive's hand dart under his pillow. Jim leaped from the door to the bed to land on his prisoner. Under the pillow was a .45 automatic.

On another occasion Amos found it necessary to arrest his prisoner without the aid of a second agent. As Jim moved in on the vicious hoodlum he handed over the warrant and stood there unarmed, waiting for the man to read it. "You don't think I'm going with you?" said the thug contemptuously.

Amos looked at him calmly. "What does that warrant say?"

The hoodlum said, "To bring me or my body."

Without changing expression Amos said, "Make up your mind."

The hoodlum went.

Today Amos' fabulous knowledge of criminals has made him a favorite of law-enforcement officers from coast to coast. For years he served as liaison between the New York field division of the FBI and the New York City Police Department. And although Jim as special agent has performed many services for the Negro people, there has never been any tendency on the part of the Bureau to make this a specialized duty. Today Jim looks back and chuckles over two of his favorite big cases—involving so-called Negro saviors.

One was the spectacular Garvey, who called himself the "provisional president of Africa"—leader of the colored races of the world. Jim was almost a rookie when he was assigned, in 1923, to get evidence to convict the swindler who had raised millions of dollars to transport his people back to their homeland. Garvey was selling stock in the Black Star Line, a corporation having for its purpose "the acquisition of steamships to transport to Africa members of the Negro race who would build the promised land."

Amos knew that Garvey's fraud appealed to many honest Negroes, so ploddingly he set out to become friendly with some of Garvey's followers, and to collect evidence of how money was collected and spent. Amos sent his man to 5 years in Atlanta Penitentiary, and thought his case was finished. But when word drifted back that Garvey yearned to start all over again, Amos got deportation papers for the swindler. When Garvey left prison, he was shuttled to the British West Indies—and Amos went on to nab his successor in Harlem.

This time it was "Father Abraham," who was passing himself off as the reincarnated Lord and speaking a gibberish that he told his disciples was the ancient Hebrew tongue. "Father Abraham" had established temples for his followers in which they could live free if they signed over all their worldly goods.

Jim kept him under surveillance while digging back into his past. He discovered that Abraham was a native of Georgia, where he had worked as a waiter. When Abraham began to transport young girls to his temples in New Jersey, he was arrested on white-slavery charges.

Although eligible for retirement as far back as 1941, Amos did not quit because of a special request from Hoover that he be allowed to remain on duty. A pleasant-faced keen-eyed man with graying hair, Amos at 70 does not appear to be more than 50 years old.

In all Jim's years of service, there have been a few times when heart ruled his head, but never to the detriment of the Bureau. One of the occasions involved one of the biggest cases he ever worked on. He was sent to the Midwest to join some 20 picked fellow agents in an investigation of a white-slave ring.

Amos soon unearthed a woman who went by the picturesque name of "Stack of Dollars," and persuaded her to act as undercover agent. With her help, Amos was able to turn over information which aided the FBI in netting 87 suspects who were later convicted on charges of protecting white slavers and dope peddlers.

During another white slave investigation in the East, Amos met a madame who freely answered all questions, until he began to inquire about her background. Finally, as Jim persisted, she broke down. She said she was willing to testify, that she knew she would have to go to jail, but would he grant her one favor. A 16-year-old daughter who knew nothing of her mother's life was coming home that night from boarding school and the mother would be in jail. She pleaded with Jim to meet her daughter at the train and take her home.

Jim was a very busy man that day. He helped transport the prisoners to the United States attorney's office in Trenton, N. J., filed his reports, and finished his day. Then Jim took a train for Philadelphia to meet an unsuspecting girl. He escorted her home and followed the mother's instructions to the letter. And to this day the girl knows nothing of her mother's past.

In presenting Special Agent Amos with a 25-year-service award, Mr. Hoover said: "The unselfish and willing contribution of hard work and personal sacrifices which you have made in the Bureau's behalf have earned for you a distinct share in whatever accomplishments it can claim. I should like you to accept this key as an expression of my gratitude and appreciation for your splendid services, and with a wish that, through our continued association, I shall be able to make a similar award to you on your thirtieth anniversary."

Jim Amos, who has lost none of the spirit of enthusiasm he has always shown in his work, is quite sure he will get his thirtieth-anniversary key. For as J. Edgar Hoover says: "He wears with distinction and honor of 'fidelity, bravery, integrity.'"

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the sixteenth and subsequent short sketches being published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

SULEIMAN: SULTAN OF TURKEY AND REFORMER OF CIVIL AND MILITARY LAW (A. D. 1494–1566)

Suleiman (1494–1566) was known in Turkey as the lawgiver. His claims as a legislator rest mainly on his organization of the Ulema, or clerical (religious) class, in its hierarchical order. The judges belonged to this class, while all executive and administrative power remained in the hands of the military.

He inaugurated a new system for feudal tenures and improved the lot of his Christian subjects.

Suleiman also is remembered for his encouragement of learning and the arts. He wrote verses and it is from his time that historians note the rise of the influence of the harem and Turkish political development.

His plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski, a New York City sculptor.

GROTIUS: DUTCH STATESMAN AND AUTHOR OF THE FIRST TREATISE ON INTERNATIONAL LAW (A. D. 1583–1645)

Grotius (1583–1645) was an extraordinary man. He wrote Latin verse at the age of 9, was ready for the university at 12 and at 15 edited an exhaustive work on Martianus Capella.

The Dutch jurist wrote important books on theology, history, and classical subjects, but gained his most lasting fame from writing the "De Jure Belli et Pacis"—considered the first definitive text on international law.

The work is a study of the principles of positive "natural" law. It recognizes that prior to any political organization, there still exists law, based on reason and the nature of man as a social being.

The Grotius plaque was done by Paul Jennewein, of New York City.

COLBERT: REFORMER OF THE FRENCH LEGAL SYSTEM (A. D. 1619–83)

Colbert (1619–1683) was the chief power in the administration of Louis XIV. His influence was felt in several fields of government. He overhauled the financial administration of France, including tax levying and collecting. He instituted rigid controls over production in both industry and agriculture.

His most lasting achievement was the establishment of the French marine. Not a champion of personal liberty, Colbert ordered judges to sentence as many men as possible to the oar to supply oarsmen for his galleys.

He reformed certain aspects of the judiciary by reducing the length and expense of trials and codifying ordinances.

The Colbert plaque was sculptured by Laura Gardin Fraser of Westport, Conn.

POTHIER: ANOTHER FRENCH JURIST (A. D. 1699–1772)

Pothier, Robert Joseph (1699–1772) was a French judge and professor of law. He studied law for the purpose of qualifying for the magistracy and was appointed judge of the presidial court of Orleans in 1720.

His "Pandectae Justininae in Novum Ordinem Digestae" is considered a classic in the study of Roman law. He wrote many monographs on French law, much of which was incorporated almost textually in the French Code Civil.

The Pothier plaque was done by Joseph Kiselewski, of New York City.

Two Ways To Do a Job: The Easy Way and the Washington Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leslie Gould, financial editor, in the New York Journal-American on the proposed ceilings on motor gasoline octane numbers:

HIGH OCTANE GAS CUT-BACK: TRUMAN WAY OR EASY WAY?

(By Leslie Gould)

There are two ways to do a job. The easy way and the Washington way.

A case in point is the Washington move to reduce civilian consumption of tetraethyl lead—the stuff that gives more power and zip to gasoline. If there is too little tetraethyl lead in your gasoline your car motor will ping or knock.

Instead of ordering a flat, across-the-board percentage cut in the amount of tetraethyl lead each company can have, Washington is dreaming up a ceiling on the octane rating of gasoline.

Under this proposal, premium gasoline must not have an octane rating in excess

of 90, intermediate grades, 86, and regular, 84.

This would require policing and checking, and in the end it might not save any lead. For motorists with cars requiring higher octane gas would move up from the regular grade to the intermediate or to the premium. Even those who can get by with a lower quality gas could make the shift to the better grade.

Such an order also would put a ceiling on individual company competition—for there would be no point in seeking improvements in gas quality. The ceilings are there, and a company could not exceed them.

The sound and easy way to handle it would be to cut everyone back 12½ to 15 percent in their use of tetraethyl lead, and how they use what lead they receive would be their business.

Each company would be on its own in research, and competition to improve the product would continue. There would be an incentive to find new and better ways for improving gas quality.

Another thing which an octane rating ceiling ignores is the effect of altitude on motor performance. Each thousand feet of elevation is equivalent to two octane numbers. A car at sea level using 90-octane premium gas would need at 2,000 feet altitude only 89-octane gas for the same performance.

A national ceiling on octane rating would mean nothing, and if there were a rush to premium grade, the next step would be rationing. That is what the Washington boys want anyway—full regimentation of the country.

To date, price control is a joke—but not funny, "ha, ha," as far as the average housewife is concerned. This kind of restriction as proposed for the oil industry would be about the same thing.

Civilian use of tetraethyl lead is about 370,000,000 pounds annually. Military aviation use currently is around 50,000,000 pounds. The stockpiling boys, who have been awful slow in accmulating almost everything, want 24,000,000 pounds set aside in the next 6 months. This would mean a cut-back of 12½ percent.

Will it be done the Truman way or the easy way?

Utilization of Western Land and Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult decisions to make during a time of threatened or real international disturbances is just how far we should go in continuing our programs to build those facilities which make for the development of our domestic economy. It is difficult because the intelligent citizens of America know that it is absolutely necessary to dispose of a common enemy. However, at the same time intelligent citizens of our Nation also appreciate the fact that if, in the disposing of a common enemy, there is a possibility of jeopardizing those values which make us desire the disposition of such common enemy we may not long continue to have the desire which causes us to be virile in the first place.

One of the problems confronting the people of the reclamation States—that is, the 17 Western States of the Nation—at this time, is the extent to which they should go to press their wishes in regard to continued construction of authorized projects, new authorizations, and new construction.

Recently, Judge Clifford H. Stone, one of the outstanding authorities on reclamation and irrigation, made a statement before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In my opinion, the logic of it demands the reading and study of Members of Congress. Accordingly, I am having it placed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that Members of Congress, especially those from the East, will understand the position of their fellow citizens of the West concerning the continuing development of this great storehouse of our Nation's natural resources.

STATEMENT BY CLIFFORD H. STONE, OF DENVER, COLO., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 14, 1951

It is a great honor and privilege to appear once again before this committee of the House of Representatives. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is concerned with prospects for continued prosecution of the country's program for the development, conservation, and utilization of western water and land resources. I, too, am concerned with the self-same matter.

I venture to address you today—not in my capacity as director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, nor in my capacity as vice chairman of the Upper Colorado River Commission, nor even in my capacity as first vice president of the National Reclamation Association. I speak to you rather as a citizen of the West, as one who has been living close to western water problems for more years than it may be wise to remember and, finally, as one who has been urged by his friends to make this statement today.

I do not propose to speak to you today of any particular interest that I may have in the authorization and in appropriations for one or another great reclamation project. For this is an occasion when we may not devote ourselves to the interests of one or another State or group of States. The answers to the question which is before this committee and before the country today transcend the interests of any one State, or group of States. They affect the interests of all 17 Western States. It is no exaggeration to say that they may well affect directly the economic welfare, strength, and survival of the Nation. They affect the interests of our Territories and insular possessions as well. Indeed, they go further than that. They affect the entire world.

The question I pose to you members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and, through you, to the Congress of the United States of America is this: What about the Federal reclamation program in this and in the years to come?

Now, I am well aware that one possible answer to such a question can consist simply in an expressive shrug of the shoulders, signifying hopelessness, accompanied by a reference to perilous world conditions, to the need for immense expenditures, both at home and abroad, and to the slight prospect, in the light of these conditions and of this need, for the authorization of new projects and for adequate appropriations for projects authorized or under construction. I have, however, too great a respect for this committee and for our great legislative branch of the Federal Government, to expect that I shall ever hear in these halls the counsel of despair that would be inherent in such an answer. The people of this Nation look to this committee and to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate for something better than that. I have referred to the Nation as a whole; for, remember, this cannot properly be viewed as a sectional program.

No doubt, every member of this committee has a better grasp of world conditions than I have. Yet I doubt that any one of you can say whether we shall be at war on a large scale tomorrow, or the next day, or 10, or 20 years hence. We may well continue in our present state of feverish preparation for years to come. Does this mean that the Federal reclamation program is to be virtually abandoned for such a period—whatever it may be? The blow to our economic system that would result from such a shut-down might well be beyond the endurance of the 17 Western States. It might well be reflected, too, in adverse economic effects on the country as a whole. Furthermore, quite aside from the economic disaster that would follow such a shut-down, there are other reasons why I think this country cannot afford an affirmative reply to that question.

It is authoritatively reported that the population of our country, during the period 1920–50, has increased by more than 40 percent. And the trend is even higher. But what about the rest of the world? Well—the same thing seems to be happening elsewhere. In many other parts of the world, according to an article published by the Population Reference Bureau, here in Washington, populations will more than double within the next 25 to 50 years.

It becomes clear, then, that the time is not far ahead when we shall be hard put to it to fulfill our domestic needs for the products of agriculture. It is clear, too, that the time lies not too far ahead—if, indeed, it is not already here—when we may need to ship food and fiber abroad in ever increasing quantities. We can strengthen the democratic governments abroad by shipments of food and fiber, as well as by the shipment of guns. Yet, we cannot maintain adequate food supplies for our own increasing population, at endurable prices, much less make needed shipments abroad, unless we continue to build our agricultural economic strength at home by continuing the programs of land and water resource development.

I have not said these things because I believe that we should seek to do the impossible. I realize full well that budgetary conditions may become such, from time to time, as to indicate the need for some retrenchment of domestic expenditures, including expenditures for reclamation, until most urgent defense requirements are met. The 17 Western States can and will do their patriotic bit to bear that part of the bitter fruit of man's apparent lack of capacity to wage peace as well as war. But—remember this—we cannot afford, by reductions in appropriations for projects authorized or under construction to throttle the reclamation program. That program must be kept going. And the conclusion is inescapable that you must also build a shelf of authorized projects, both large and small, that can be undertaken during periods of reduced stress. You should have these projects ready to go. Reclamation projects are not investigated, planned, and built over night. Their engineering takes a lot of time. The investigations that must precede them take a lot of time. This work should be done now. Projects should be authorized now. In other words, we should plan now for peace and, to the fullest practicable extent, we should build now for peace as we prepare for war.

There is much emphasis today on the power features of reclamation projects. This

is not improper. Nor is it unnatural. We must have power in large quantities for the processing of mineral resources which are acutely needed in the production of industrial and defense materials. Hydroelectric power has been a part of the reclamation picture in the 17 Western States since 1906. It plays a part, not only in its own right but as a companion to the agricultural phases of the reclamation program. We would have it continue so. And, in order to assure that it will so continue, we would urge that even in those cases where the need for power is deemed more acute than the need for increased agricultural production, the whole project of which power is a feature will nevertheless be authorized, even though construction of irrigation facilities be deferred, thus assuring the necessary protection of agricultural rights in water and suitable financial assistance in the return of irrigation costs.

What about the Federal reclamation program in this and in the years to come? The answer to that question is in your hands. I hope that you will agree with me: First, that the Nation cannot afford to throttle that program today; second, that the Nation cannot afford unduly to curtail that program; third, that the Nation cannot afford not to have a shelf of authorized projects ready for construction; and, fourth, that needed power production shall be obtained from features that derive their validity from the fact that they are parts of authorized reclamation projects. The country looks to your vision and to your courage. Even during this tragic period when we must put our minds and hearts to the task of preparing for defense, so we should also keep our minds and hearts on present domestic needs and on building for posterity.

Let us not be guilty at home of having provided too little too late.

A Problem for Generals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post-Tribune, sets out some practical thoughts regarding the size or number of our military forces to be sent to Europe:

A PROBLEM FOR GENERALS

The most responsible lawmakers of both political parties agree it is wholly fitting and desirable that Congress express its views on the big question of sending a sizable force of American soldiers to Europe.

In the Senate hearings now getting under way, that program will be thoroughly examined. And no doubt the Senate's final attitude will be given concrete character through action on a formal resolution of some sort.

If, as is likely, the decision is to approve dispatching more men to Europe, then it is fair also that Congress ask for definite assurances from the Atlantic Pact nations that their own contributions of manpower are proportionate to ours. Again, there appears to be no dispute among responsible men on the need for these assurances.

But it is quite something else for the Senate or the whole Congress or any other group of laymen to say exactly what that proportion should wisely be; or to place a rigid, arbitrary limit on the size of any force we shall send.

The basic military strategy affecting the defense both of the United States and the Atlantic community must be entrusted to our military leaders. They—and no others—are competent to judge how many men, how many planes, how many tanks, how many ships we need for the defensive tasks we have assumed.

It is a military—not a political—decision to state that only a certain number of troops, let's say 100,000, should be sent to Europe. That might be a perfectly satisfactory total. But it's for the generals to say, not our Senators.

The men in the Senate who today are contending it is their business are declaring in effect that our military men are unfit for their jobs. They are seeking to superimpose their judgments on those of the best military minds in this country.

Now if our military leaders are really as incompetent as this suggests, then we in America are in a very uncomfortable fix. We are in a position where we might have to fight a general war from the floor of the Senate and House. Anyone who has ever watched the day-to-day operations of our lawmakers must shrink from this prospect. However justifiable their tactics may be in legislative matters, they are totally out of place in the conduct of a military campaign.

Fortunately, though, the outlook is probably not that dark. In spite of the pronouncements of a growing force of Capitol Hill generals, there is a good chance that our military leaders really do know their business.

When the test comes, the American people almost certainly will rest their confidence in the generals to decide military issues. For they understand that we are beyond hope of saving if the men who must guide our military destinies are not equipped for their responsibilities, we would have no other place to turn.

The Soil Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have made it a practice to acquaint myself with the work of the Federal agencies in my district during every recess of Congress. The first-hand information thus obtained is invaluable. The experience so absorbed on the ground is educational. Moreover, thereby I am enabled to make up my mind on how the programs we devise in Congress are carried out and whether the funds we provide are well spent.

The Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States, is predominantly agricultural. I was born and reared on a farm and in addition to the practice of law, I am proud of the fact that for many years I have owned and operated my own farm. It is but natural, therefore, that I should pay close attention to our farm program.

A few weeks ago, I described an on-the-farm visit with a group charged with the administration of certain phases of the program. Today I want to talk about a tour I made with the local heads of the soil conservation program.

Almost 2,000 years ago we were admonished by infallible authority that as we sow, so shall we reap. This homely lesson reflects the experience of the ages. It cannot be violated with impunity. Nature will not stand for us to keep on taking everything out of the ground without putting something back into it. China did this for centuries until today Mother Earth there refuses to produce. She has been milked dry; she is exhausted. Stripped of once fertile topsoil, huge areas in China today are almost completely barren. The seeds produce only poverty, hunger, and pestilence—yes, and the fruits thereof, communism.

That simple is the lesson; that important is its observance. On this background was conceived the soil-conservation program, which was designed to encourage proper soil conservation practices throughout the United States. In the mountainous regions the problem addresses itself to combatting soil erosion. In the flat regions of my district we are mostly concerned with drainage, fertilization, pasturage, and similar problems peculiar to more or less level land areas.

The questions are, is the program worth while? Is its administration in competent hands? Is the money well spent? The best way to judge is to observe the results in specific cases.

The particular area I visited is within the jurisdiction of the Grand Coteau Ridge Soil Conservation District, in charge of or guided by Mr. A. C. Morris and Mr. De Louis Soileau. This particular unit has 311 farms receiving assistance and expert advice. The following are typical examples of actual performance, as explained by Mr. Morris.

D. B. Ozenne beef cattle ranch was the first place visited. Mr. Ozenne is one of the largest and most progressive cattlemen in southwest Louisiana. This place is located on the lowlands along the Atchafalaya River Spillway. Six years ago this land was covered with noncommercial underbrush and timber and providing little or no grazing for livestock. With the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service technicians, this 2,082-acre ranch has been changed from unprofitable land to highly productive pasture land. The first step necessary was to establish a few of the main drainage canals. From year to year Mr. Ozenne cleared from 200 to 250 acres, completing the drainage in this acreage as clearing was accomplished and preparing the seed bed and seeding to clovers and grasses. This procedure has been followed from year to year, and at present Mr. Ozenne has established about 1,500 acres of excellent pasture land. Mr. Ozenne raises Brahma cattle and has been carrying from 1,000 to 1,500 cattle on his pasture, which has been highly profitable. A lower portion of this ranch consists of approximately 800 acres which have been subject to backwater from the Atchafalaya River when the river is high. This area is being salvaged by constructing a levee around the area with a series of drainage canals inside the levee, with a floodgate at the lowest point, which will permit drainage and prevent backwater from flooding the land.

The second farm observed was the 85-acre Keystone farm belonging to Mr. L. Charles Willis. When Mr. Willis came in possession of this farm about 2 years ago, it was in a very low state of production, having been grown in sugarcane for probably half a century without applying proper soil conservation and soil building practices. Little was known of such practices at that time. Mr. Willis applied to the Grand Coteau Ridge Soil Conservation District for assistance in planning and applying proper soil conservation and soil building practices to produce pasture for raising beef cattle. A conservation survey was made, classifying the soil. A soil analysis was made to determine the plant food needs. With Mr. Willis a plan was prepared, setting forth the best known practices needed to be applied to obtain early and satisfactory results. These practices consisted of establishing proper drainage, applying needed fertilizer and lime, proper preparation of seed bed and seeding to a mixture of clovers and grasses. Sufficient pasture forage was produced the first year to graze one cow per acre for a period of 8 or 9 months and leave the pasture in good growing condition.

The third area observed was a pasture on the Expadie Laperouse farm near St. Martinville, La. Mr. Laperouse has been a successful farmer all of his life. This was an old pasture area which was converted from native grass without treatment to improve pasture, including land preparation, fertilization, and seeding to lespedeza and grasses. This work was relatively new but was furnishing splendid grazing.

The next farm we visited was that of Regis LaGrange. LaGrange is an outstanding planter and businessman in my parish. It is a 1,158-acre farm located in the lowland of the Atchafalaya River. Five or six years ago, as in the case of Mr. Ozenne, this farm was growing undesirable and noncommercial underbrush and timber. On the request of Mr. LaGrange, Soil Conservation Service technicians worked out a conservation plan for this farm. Drainage being one of the primary needs, a few of the main drains were established first. Mr. LaGrange cleared from 100 to 150 acres of this land each year. Following the clearing, a complete drainage system was established, and the land prepared and planted to farm crops. During the next 3 years 758 acres of this 1,158-acre farm were cleared, properly drained and put into cultivation of highland crops. This land has produced as much as two bales of cotton per acre and equally as productive in other crops grown, namely, sugarcane, sweetpotatoes, and corn. Thus, land that was unprofitable 3 years ago today is highly productive and occupying services of 14 families.

We then visited the Willis brothers' 1,000-acre farm. A large portion of this farm has been in operation for a number of years. Another portion of it extends into the lowland area of Bayou Portage. On request, a conservation plan was worked out with Mr. Charley Willis for this farm. One of the primary needs of a portion of this farm was proper drainage. A complete drainage plan was prepared and the principal portion established. This has resulted in increasing production on a large acreage which formerly was low in production because of lack of proper drainage. Other areas which because of soil type and lack of suitability for cultivation were prepared and seeded to clovers and pasture grasses. This is one of the best examples of diversified farming we have locally. There is a balance between cultivated crops, pasture land, and livestock. The principal cultivated crops consist of sugarcane, cotton, sweet potatoes, corn, and beans. The pasture land is divided into three areas, a portion on which beef cattle are raised and on another portion hogs. An additional acreage is cleared. This will be converted to improved pasture.

One of the local farmers, Mr. Robert Champagne of Patin community, made the tour with us. He, with a group of his neighbors, has obtained assistance through the Soil Conservation Service. He explained that this group of neighbors has cooperated in establishing a drainage system which improves their land to the extent that the production in many cases has been doubled. Other lands that were not in cultivation at all can now be converted into productive cultivated land. He expressed the appreciation and support of the community for this type of work and stated that no other work could assist farmers in a greater way in their community.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Soil Conservation Service could not be a success without local cooperation. In fact, the spark plug of the whole farm program in my parish is Mr. Stanley Angelle, our experienced county agent. We are fortunate also in having a police jury composed of outstanding farmers and businessmen. Mr. Paul (Dell) Angelle, Jr., has been president of our police jury for over 20 years and under his capable leadership the program could not be anything but a success in St. Martin Parish.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said about my own parish is true throughout the third district of Louisiana. For instance, I have just received the annual report of the Iberia-Vermilion Soil Conservation District. The members and officers of the Board of this district are as follows: Nedier J. Le Blanc, Delcambre, La., chairman; Paul Barras, Loreauville, La., vice chairman; J. F. Noel, Abbeville, La., secretary-treasurer; Joseph Zaunbrecher, Gueydan, La., member; J. Malcolm Duhe, Jeanerette, La., member.

The annual report is an outstanding record of accomplishment. I am glad to say that Mr. Nedier J. LeBlanc, the chairman, has extended me an invitation to visit the work in his district, and I look forward with pleasure to observe the planning and application of soil and water conservation practices from farm-to-farm in the Iberia-Vermilion Soil Conservation District.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the part I took in providing funds for the operation of the soil conservation program, because from actual observation I can testify to my colleagues of its success in my district.

Marketing Agreement on Raisin Grapes Seems To Favor Processors Rather Than Grape Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and administered by the United States Department of Agriculture is falling far short of accomplishing the fine objectives of its declared policy with respect to the Federal marketing agreement and order governing raisins grown in California. It appears that the division of the United States Department of Agriculture having executive authority over the marketing agreement and order to take care of the surplus crop of 1949 was administered in a negligent, incompetent, and unsatisfactory manner greatly to the detriment and loss of the raisin growers. To explain the matter more fully I submit a copy of a letter from Mr. Guard C. Darrah, attorney for the Biola Packing Co., Raisin Growers Association, and Raisin Growers Protective Association, a group of interested raisin producers. This letter was sent to Mr. S. R. Smith, of the Department of Agriculture, under whose supervision this agreement and order was administered.

I hope this letter will be read by all members of the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate, as it presents the views of one group of grape growers who believe they have a real grievance.

The letter follows:

STOCKTON, CALIF., *November 14, 1950.*
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Fruit and Vegetable Branch,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention: Mr. S. R. Smith.)

DEAR SIR: Your wire, addressed to me, dated November 9, 1950, apparently arrived in the evening of that day and was not delivered to my office until November 10, 1950, too late for me to catch a plane or any available train so that I could be in Fresno at 2 o'clock p. m., Pacific standard time, November 10, 1950, at the meeting you scheduled.

I am not convinced that it would have been of any avail to me to be there and present the views of myself and my clients. The program was inaugurated to take care of a very unfortunate market situation that existed in 1949. The spirit and purpose of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 is certainly laudable as well as justifiable. Almost any business can go broke in this country, but if farmers are not kept in business, we will starve and nobody will be in business.

Our group feels that so much money should be spent as is necessary to bring to a conclusion the program launched with such high hopes to take care of the surplus crop of 1949, although they feel that as administered, it developed an intolerable situation; in this, that although in its concept, it contemplated control of the program by growers, actually quite a number of the so-called growers on the advisory board and administrative committee were actually far more interested in packing houses or wineries. Consequently, the Raisin Administrative

Committee, which has administered the program seems in the eyes of many growers to have acted not in the growers' interest, but in the interest of the packers.

At the open hearing conducted in Fresno in May, I believe it was, of this year, it developed that wineries were paying $45 to $50 a ton for early deliveries of Thompson seedless green to start their winery operations with. The San Joaquin Valley produces sweet wine, which is fortified wine. In order to fortify the wine, alcohol taken from an equivalent amount of must, or crushed grapes, is added to the new crush to fortify it. This price of $45 to $50 a ton was higher than prevailed at the close of the 1949 glut season, but was justified by the current forecast of a short crop for 1950. For the purpose of a winery, raisins, which contain four times as much sugar per pound as grapes, would have served the purpose of producing fortified brandy just as well. This fact was brought out at the hearing. This justified a price for raisins of from $180 to $200 per ton. I am assuming that you understand that all of the alcohol produced by grapes or raisins comes from the sugar content; therefore, it is sugar alone that the winery is after when it wants material with which to produce fortifying brandy (alcohol). Notwithstanding this obvious demand, the Raisin Administrative Committee recommended a price of either $142.50 or $143 per ton for raisins. These raisins were not made available to the public, but were divided up, like cutting a melon, by the packers on a predetermined proportion with the proviso that should any packer fail to grab his allotment of the raisins of the poor farmers, who are being sold down the river, such packers should be reallocated to the packers who were so eager to get their hands on these raisins. At the time this price was arrived at, raisins were already selling in excess of that amount. The packers who bought them, took no chance whatsoever since they were like money in the bank in light of the strong demand. Actually, these raisins were sold in great part by the packers for $350 a ton in competition with the 1950 crop.

The current price, until the recent withdrawal from the market by the packers, has been $275 a ton to the grower and $350 a ton to the trade. The reserve pool was used throughout this program to prevent the price of raisins from approaching parity. Every time the market tended to rise, more of the reserve pool was released and the rise was checked by supplying the packers with all the raisins they needed at the moment.

It is the belief of a number of the growers that at the present time, the recession in demand is caused by the availability of large quantities of the 1949 crop. My clients would like to have a list of all of the buyers of the $620,743.87 worth of surplus raisins sold for livestock consumption. They believe that these same raisins are now entering the market in competition with their current crop.

When it was revealed that I was to write this letter to you, one of the growers just wrote and suggested that the following five statements would be in order:

1. This Marketing Agreement and Order contains a dishonest principle and is a disgrace to the United States Department of Agriculture.

2. It has been maladministered, and there is little prospect that its future administration will be improved.

3. The administration of this Marketing Agreement and Order has brought about a lower average price for raisins rather than correct such price level toward 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of parity, which is the declared policy of Congress in enacting the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

4. The administrators of the Marketing Agreement and Order have spent an unreasonable and fabulous amount of money in administering it, and have lost the raisin producers millions of dollars.

5. A continuation of this Marketing Agreement and Order in its present form and under present personnel which govern it would be a tremendous detriment to the interests of the raisin farmers.

In explanation of this rather blunt language, let me say that what the writer means when he says the order contains a dishonest principle, is that he feels it is dishonorable for any person to purport to act on behalf of growers, as the members of the Raisin Administrative Committee are doing, and then sell to themselves as packers, the growers raisins, and to a certain extent, he is right.

No packers, processor, or consumers should have any part in determining the price they are to be able to buy raisins for from a reserve or surplus pool. To permit such a thing violates the basic morals involved in the law of principal and agent.

At the present time there are many sources from which our statistics date necessary for the proper operation of any of our agricultural enterprises. It is our understanding that this and the expansion of public relations and grower informational phase of the program are the justification for raising by assessment the $97,500. The expression "expansion of the public relations and grower informational phase of the program" is hazy, nebulous, and cloudy. It is purposely vague to enshroud the real purpose of carrying on the program which in the opinion of myself and my clients is to keep entrenched those who control the raisin industry for their own benefit, to wit, the raisin packers.

If it had been the desire of the Raisin Administrative Committee to permit growers to know what they are doing, it would have invited them freely to attend their meeting, whether they allowed them a voice or not. If you had intended for them, or even a small segment of them, to have at the most a weak and quavering voice in the matter, you would not have given me less than one day's notice to break standing appointments and attend a meeting 120 miles from here.

We ask that the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture disapprove this proposed budget.

Yours very truly,

BIOLA PACKING CO.
RAISIN GROWERS ASSOCIATION.
RAISIN GROWERS PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

Poem by Enlistee in the Air Force at Lackland, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by a young enlistee in the Air Force at Lackland Field, Tex., which I think is rather interesting, in view of the investigation of conditions at Lackland, recently consummated.

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

Down in the Texas flatland
Lackland is the spot,
Down with the snakes and lizards
In the land that God forgot.

Down with the snakes and lizards
Where the airman gets his due.
Down in the middle of nowhere
A thousand miles from you.

No one knows we are living,
No one gives a damn;
Back home we are forgotten,
We belong to Uncle Sam.

Four years! Oh, how can we stand it!
We slave for our hard earned pay
To protect the people with millions
For two and a half a day.

Some day when life in this world is over
And we will go to a place known well,
St. Peter will say, "Those are the boys from Lackland,
They have served their time in Hell."

Universal Military Service: The Promise Is Security, the Record Is Disaster—Ambitious Leaders Always Involve Nation in War To Perpetuate Their Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress has before it a demand for a peacetime universal military service law. In 1948, Congress surrendered part of the American people's basic liberty by passing a temporary peacetime conscription bill.

But those who think military strength will result from compulsory military service are not satisfied. Using the current crisis as a backdrop, they propose permanent universal military service, taking each youth at 18.

Such a law would constitute a decisive repudiation of the unalienable rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, guaranteed in the Declaration of Independence.

Such a law would be a surrender to and imitation of Soviet Russia's system of slavery, for article 132 of the Soviet Constitution says: "Universal military service is law."

Significant as these facts are, I do not wish to dwell on them now.

Instead I propose to discuss peacetime universal military service on the ground chosen by its proponents—the claim that this scheme will bring national security and peace.

The necessity of adequate preparedness for national safety is not debatable. On this goal we all agree.

The issue here is: Will universal military service give us the security its sponsors claim? Will peacetime conscription prevent us from being attacked or assure us of victory in case of attack?

Fortunately, this proposal can be evaluated by facts instead of theory and

argument. Ample historical data can guide us to sound conclusions, if we will heed it.

FRANCE WAS FIRST VICTIM

The first modern major country in which universal military service became a national policy was France, where it was initiated in 1792. After a few exciting years of foreign conquest by Napoleon, France suffered overwhelming defeat at Waterloo.

Conscription was dropped, but was revived in 1848 by Napoleon III. It existed in France before World War I and World War II.

Never did it prevent France from being attacked.

Never did it provide France with the defense necessary for safety. In both World Wars the nations without universal military service saved France.

France, burdened by military service, has become one of the weak, second-rate powers of the world.

In Germany, conscription was started in 1814 as a defensive measure. What happened? Germany's tragic adventure in militarism began. Universal military service brought the same harvest. First military expansion, then foreign wars, then defeat and disaster.

What is the record in Japan? Japan adopted universal military service in 1873. Again came the telltale sequence of militarism, fomented war abroad, then defeat and disaster.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE FAILED IN ITALY AND RUSSIA

The fourth victim of conscription was Italy. The people of Italy have always been unusually peace loving, but when Italy adopted universal military service, it took the fatal step toward disaster. First costly militarism, then foreign war, then defeat and disaster.

The foregoing summarizes the result in every major nation permanently subjected to universal military training, excepting Russia. There the revolution in 1917 prevents a full comparison. However, the record is clear. Compulsory military training under the czar never kept Russia from being attacked, nor saved it from defeat.

In Communist Russia, universal training did not deter Hitler's attack in 1941. Moreover, Russia was close to catastrophe when saved by supplies from the nonconscription lands, England and the United States.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE IS A SELF-STARTER OF WAR

Was the disaster in these conscript nations brought about because the people were militaristic? Or was it because compulsory military service carried in it the seeds of calamity? A study of the workings of this scheme is revealing.

Each nation adopts compulsory training for national defense. In doing so, they authorize an enlarged military organization to train the mass of conscripts. From this point on the germs of disaster automatically do their deadly work.

The first action of the universal military training organization is to respond to nature's first law—self-preservation. This brings about expansion or, in military terminology, empire building. Here the military are not unlike other governmental bureaus or private business.

They know no organization stands still. They know that more pay, more generals, and more position security for themselves depends on their ability to get their spending classed as essential—imperative.

WAR ALARMS ARE CREATED OUT OF THIN AIR

So those in charge of universal military service, like any businessman or bureaucrat, begin to dig in and solidify their position. How is that done? An enemy must be located. Then their public-relations department begins to excite the fears of the people.

Vividly realistic propaganda about the military preparations of other nations is concocted. The capture of secret war plans and maps may be reported, when the truth is that the secret data is pure forgery. No lie becomes too big if it serves the purpose.

In Japan the military authorities indoctrinated conscripts with the imaginary danger of attack by the United States, and justified it in these words:

> To make a good soldier, there must always be an immediate enemy. He must be led to believe that this enemy may strike today. He must be convinced that the enemy is prepared to annihilate our country at the first opportunity.

Then activities of the military broaden. Every idea of the military becomes national defense. Military costs spiral.

At first the load is endured by the people without protest. But before very long the people begin to question the discouraging burden of armament and universal military service.

What happens?

OPPOSITION SILENCED BY WAR

The political and military are confronted by an overloaded citizenry demanding economy in Government. Here the military chiefs, unlike ordinary bureaucracy, have an ace to play.

They can stymie retrenchment and evade the loss of power and rank involved in reduced establishments. Their ace is to arrange an incident, and create a state of conflict.

Arranging an incident usually presents difficulties. But thus far no major nation whose politicians and generals needed a war has found that problem insurmountable.

Let us take a recent case or two. In 1931, Japan, like other powers, was suffering from the global depression. The people were demanding relief from the heavy burden of military expenditures. How did the military respond? They staged an incident in Manchuria. That ended the debate.

The economizers in the Japanese Diet were silenced. Public opposition became unpatriotic.

A recent incident in our own history, if we could get the truth about it, may provide sobering evidence of the attitude of politicians and generals toward war after defense preparations reach the war level tempo.

On November 25, 1941, President Roosevelt met with his War Cabinet. Of that meeting, Secretary of War Stimson wrote in his diary:

> The problem was how we should maneuver them (Japan) into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves. It was a difficult proposition.

Twelve days later America was at war with Japan.

WAR MAKERS SLYLY PIN FIRST SHOT ON PROPOSED ENEMY

Historians of military tactics emphasize the psychological importance of arranging to convince a people that the other side fired the first shot. The incidents that have sparked recent wars generally indicate mastery of this emotional problem.

Has every war provoked by the nations using conscription—France, Germany, Italy, Japan—since Napoleon's conquest has been generated in similar fashion?

Despite the cunning efforts of war-creators to hide their tracks, the telltale pattern is usually discovered sooner or later. The record is so parallel, in nations of diverse national characteristics, that this conclusion seems inescapable:

Wherever the rulers of a major nation have established universal military service, the people have been marched into militarism under the cloak of national defense. Foreign war, defeat, and disaster have always followed.

PROMOTERS FLATTER US

Against this record elsewhere, the advocates of universal military training in America insist that we are different. The promoters of universal military training claim that America will not follow the road of militarism, conquest, disaster, that has resulted elsewhere.

They claim that the United States is not militarily ambitious; that we have no imperialistic schemes; and that the rest of the world does not need to fear us.

They know such statements appeal to the people, because the people are peace-loving. But the people of other lands are also peace-loving.

Certainly, that is true of the Italian people, who are perhaps more peace-loving than almost any other. The fatal flaw in this argument is that the people do not start wars—nor are they able in a nation with conscription to prevent their rulers from involving them in war.

No, Mr. Speaker, compulsory military training will not bring military security for America. Militarily, the sure way to national safety is an alert and incorruptible intelligence service, a superior air force, plus a modern army and navy, equipped with ever-improving technical and scientific weapons.

Beyond these, an invigorated ROTC, CMTC, and National Guard in the several States can furnish specialized training for reserve forces. Of course, no amount of military preparedness will save us if our leaders abandon reasonable foreign policies.

WHY PUT AMERICA ON HISTORICAL ROAD TO NATIONAL SUICIDE?

Mr. Speaker, the advocates of universal military service build their case around what they call its practical military value. The record of compulsory

military training in major nations completely discredits this claim.

Universal military training brought defeat and disaster to France, Germany, Italy, and Japan. In none of these nations were the civilian components then able to maintain the necessary supremacy over the military. What is so different about America that the same consequences will not follow here?

What sound reason can anyone give to support the claim that the fatal germs contained in peacetime conscription elsewhere will not develop here? Where is the evidence to support such a conclusion—a conclusion contrary to the unanimous verdict of history for over 150 years?

Are our political rulers and military chiefs so different from similar humans elsewhere that they car be expected to perform directly contrary to human behavior for 150 years?

Where is the evidence?

I challenge the advocates of Universal Military Service to explain away the record of history on their principal arguments, namely:

First. That universal military training will prevent war.

Second. That it will assure victory in case of war.

Why are these assertions not substantiated in at least one major nation using compulsory training during the last 150 years?

The American people, who must sacrifice their sons and pay the bills, are entitled to full and forthright answers.

Mr. Speaker, universal military service does not prevent war.

It does not bring victory.

Instead, it has always brought defeat and disaster.

Congress should reject it for once and for all.

Freedom has been the high road to national security for America. Why give up the freedom principle by which America grew to greatness—and take in its place the European military regimentation that has unfailingly produced war, misery, and national decline?

The Last Stand of the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Last Stand of the GOP," delivered by one of the outstanding newspaper editors of America, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, of the Denver Post. The speech was delivered at a Lincoln Day banquet in Portland, Oreg., on February 12, 1951. I commend it to the reading of my Republican colleagues.

Mr. BENTON. I hope when the Senator's Republican colleagues are reading the editorial on the last stand of the GOP they will not overlook the speech, also inserted in the RECORD, by Mr. Erwin D. Canham, who certainly is one of the most distinguished journalists of the country.

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

THE LAST STAND OF THE GOP

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, 7 years ago, on February 12, 1944, I had the privilege of addressing a similar banquet in Portland. My opening remarks were: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. and Mrs. Willkie, Governor and Mrs. Snell." Also at that meeting were Robert S. Farrell, Jr., and Marshall Cornet. These great citizens have been sorely missed at the national and State level.

Tonight, it is a privilege to address interested and active Republicans such as you here attending this Lincoln Day banquet. You are the hope of the country and of the world. I believe and have often said that the two things which could quickest destroy our civilization are a shooting war with Russia and a collapse of the two party system in these United States. I am not here to defend the Republicans, for they stand indicted by their own failures, and will be defended by their own constructive victories.

I am here to suggest that the Republican Party should not be misled by its apparent successes in 1950. Any reasonable analysis will reveal that the vote was more a protest vote against the administration's vacillating policies at home and abroad rather than a constructive vote for constructive Republican policies.

As a matter of fact, there has been far too much blind defense of Republicans by Republicans because they were Republicans. This point of view was well illustrated in a little story I heard the other day. It is the story of a young farmer who assaulted a tramp with a stick of cordwood and wound up in jail. His lawyer finally came to see him and asked, "Jim, how did you come to hit this fellow? You know, you almost killed him. He is in the hospital now and may not live. Whatever made you do it?"

"Well, Mr. Smith," said Jim, "you see it was like this This feller came by the farm the other night, and I invited him in for dinner. Right away he started criticizing the furniture. Well, I let that pass because our furniture ain't any great shakes at best. Then he teed off on the food. Well, I let that pass, too. At lot of times my wife's cooking leaves a little something to be desired. Then my wife came in out of the kitchen, and he jumped on her. He said, 'Say, you ain't nothin' but an old bag, are you?' Well, I didn't do nothing about that 'cause as a matter of fact, when she gets that wrapper on, she don't exactly look like Cleopatra, anyway. But then, by jiminies, he started in on the Republican Party. That was too much for me, so I let him have it."

This is an important occasion, and one that we cannot afford to celebrate lightly. This day marks the one hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birth of a very great American, perhaps the greatest American who ever lived, Abraham Lincoln.

On this day, when we reflect on the profound crisis in which we find ourselves, it is comforting and helpful to remember Abraham Lincoln. For his greatness was not only the greatness of his era and his place, but also the greatness of all time. After his assassination on April 14, 1865, Edward M. Stanton, the Secretary of War, spoke a perfect requiem when he said, "Now he belongs to the ages."

In fact, Mr. Stanton spoke more truly than he knew. Mr. Lincoln belongs to the ages, to this particular age, to this time of crisis, and to us here tonight. His immortal words at Gettysburg: "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

That, if you please, ladies and gentlemen, connotes the crisis that is being faced today. For if this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people should perish, then man will slide clear to the bottom of the black pit from which he emerged a million years ago.

The issues were not greatly different in Mr. Lincoln's time. Then he faced the problem of saving the Union, but now we face the problem of saving the Union and of saving the world.

Despite our tendency to think increasingly that the struggle for the world is a military one, there are many more issues involved.

That Mr. Lincoln clearly recognized the issues of his time was often made apparent, but never more clearly than in his 1857 speech in Springfield. He had just received the Republican nomination for the senatorial seat from Illinois. Mr. Lincoln said, and I quote, "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

All we need to do is to substitute the word "world" for the word "government" to have, in these remarks of Lincoln's, a perfect description of the situation our country and the other nations of the free world find ourselves in today.

To paraphrase Lincoln, this world of ours cannot endure half slave and half free. Some day it will cease to be divided. Some day it must become all one thing or all the other. And whether the final victory will perch on the banners of freedom or the dark standard of twentieth-century slavery will depend, to an enormous extent, on us, on what we do, on our understanding, our will, our visceral fortitude.

Each year the Nation in general and the Republican Party in particular on this date, turn their thoughts backward to study our heroic past and the life and works of the great emancipator. It is fitting and proper that we should do this, particularly at this time when the Republican Party faces its most severe crisis, if not dissolution.

One of the dangers that faces the free world today is the fact that there are many appeasers in the world, in the Nation, and in our party. It is interesting to note that Abraham Lincoln was not an appeaser. Even though Lincoln made it clear that he did not propose and would not favor overthrowing the system of slavery in the South by force, neither was he willing to have peace through appeasement, as were others, including Stephen A. Douglas.

Nor if Abraham Lincoln were alive today would he atempt to appease either imperial communism or the atomic bomb.

Our land today is full of appeasers, but if Abraham Lincoln were alive, you can rest assured that he would not be one of them.

When, despite Lincoln's efforts and the efforts of others, war did come, Lincoln did not turn away from the bloody task that faced the Nation. There were those who said, with Horace Greeley, "Let the erring sisters go." Lincoln was not one of them. He would not let the Union be split apart. A severed Nation, Lincoln realized, would mean the end of the United States as the world had known it. It would also mean the end of the American system of freedom, the end of that American experiment in democracy which has served, and today more than ever, can

serve as a beacon of hope for the hundreds of millions struggling to be free. That was the pith and meaning of the immortal Gettysburg address and its resounding peroration: "that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

As an American, Lincoln's imperishable greatness rests on the fact that he saved the Union. As a world figure, whose significance for all nations and all peoples has steadily grown, Lincoln's greatness arises out of his role as a secular prophet of democracy.

"What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence?" he asked in one of his speeches. "It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, the guns of our war steamers, or the strength of our gallant Army. These are not our reliance against a resumption of tyranny in our land. All of them may be turned against our liberties without making us stronger or weaker for the struggle.

"Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

No truer words were ever spoken. In Korea today we are engaged in a bitter and bloody struggle against desperate odds. We are in that struggle for no selfish purposes. We do not desire any nation's territory. Long ago we turned our backs upon imperialism, a system of domination alien to our beliefs and our institutions. We are in Korea, when you get right down to it, because our defense lies, as Lincoln put it, in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere.

The fact is, and it has taken two costly wars to bring it home to us, we are safe only if the area of freedom expands in the world; our danger grows whenever the area of freedom shrinks. That was true when Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarists were on the rampage. It is no less true now that the heirs of Genghis Khan, Ivan the Terrible, Peter I, and Nikolai Lenin have made world domination through world enslavement their openly declared goal.

There were many timid, frightened men in Lincoln's day. That cowering breed is still with us. In the face of the Soviet menace, they would have us scurry to cover, hide behind our two oceans while totalitarian darkness covers the face of the earth beyond this hemisphere's borders.

They deny they are isolationists; that is a label nobody likes to have pinned on him these days. But whatever you may call them, the palpable fact is that what they are asking us to do is to ignore realities.

These realities are tough, unpleasant, and also inescapable. We can ignore them only to our own terrible hurt.

There are always those who shout loudly, when a battle is going badly, that it should never have been undertaken at all. They are saying that about our action in Korea.

Few were opposed to our moving in to help put down the aggressors when that move was first made. Many now insist that it was a mistake. But I say there was never a more glorious page in our national history than the page we wrote last June when we lifted high the banner of collective security and proved that, in this country, at least, there was the determination to prove to the aggressors that aggression does not pay.

For collective security to work, it must be collective, however. We have not stood alone in Korea. But no amount of explanation can change the fact that 90 percent of the United Nations forces which have given battle to the North Korean and Chinese Communist aggressors in Korea were American forces, and that among the nations which have clamored most loudly for the appeasement of Red China, were the very nations—such as the Arab nations and India—which did not contribute a single, solitary soldier to the common effort to enforce a system of world law and order.

This state of affairs is disturbing. But we cannot afford to let disappointment and chagrin over the failure of the United Nations to do what the principles and purposes should have compelled them to do—divert us from our high purposes. Let us never forget that in fighting for the freedom of the world, we are fighting for our own freedom and security as well.

Because of the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and other streamlined death-dealing devices, the issue today is even more clearly drawn than it was in Mr. Lincoln's time—today it is the issue of survival. If the crisis is unclear to anyone, it is merely because his vision is blurred by the myopic curtain of prejudice or partisan politics. The issue is as sharply drawn as the two words—slavery and freedom. We are in grave trouble, and only the supreme combination of courage and brains can get us out of it.

For many years, those who would save the world were considered do-gooders, but today if we are to survive, we must save the world, or else lose our freedom.

We have, unfortunately, passed from the halcyon days of Tom Marshall, when all the country needed was a good 5-cent cigar. There is a much more serious connotation in a new expression of the country's need. What our country needs today is a national policy. To whom can the country look for leadership today? From whom does the public expect leadership? Not from the administration, for it vacillates. Not from the Republicans, for they fail to agree.

There are those who point out that ROBERT ALPHONSO TAFT of Ohio is Mr. Republican, and he is the one to follow. But there are millions in this country who remember that Mr. TAFT only recently opined that he saw little reason to think that Russia might ever attack us. They also recall that Mr. TAFT took a very dim view of the chances of war with Germany and Japan in his speeches of 1940 and 1941.

Who, then, speaks for the Republicans?

Mr. Hoover, our only living ex-President? He frightened millions of Americans with his new concept of isolationism, in which Festung Europa became Fortress America. To me, as one American, it brought forth a nightmarish picture of two giants standing on adjacent islands, hurling A and H bombs at each other with vigorous abandon.

Is Mr. Dewey the spokesman? Today even Mr. Dewey's most stalwart admirers will admit that he has become a juvenile William Jennings Bryan.

Should the people listen to John Foster Dulles? No, too many think he speaks for the administration.

To Harold Stassen? Millions think that his recent predictions of peace were unfounded and millions more believe that his belief in the mails as a way to Stalin's ear is unwarranted.

The country and the Republican Party needs a Lincoln. But in lieu of a Lincoln, they could do with a policy. And there are many new voices to trumpet that policy through the land, voices like that of the Honorable JAMES DUFF, the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, and the Honorable WAYNE MORSE. And perhaps even one day, Dwight D. Eisenhower will decide he is a Republican and lend his effective voice to spreading the word.

What should a Republican policy cover? It seems to me that as a minimum:

1. It should admit the basic issue of our time is survival.

2. It should seek a permanent bipartisan foreign policy to cover that same survival.

3. It should aggressively understand that the maintenance of our economic position is second only to survival.

4. It should insist on drastic and immediate curtailment of non-war expenditures.

5. It should subscribe completely to the fact that production and more production is the answer to both the Russians and economic disaster.

6. It should recognize the sound principle of economic and military aid to threatened democracies and to allies.

7. It should insist on including Greece, Turkey and Spain in our arms aid pact.

8. It should recognize that unification of the armed services is still unproductive of proper economy and that the administration should reveal the necessary degree of military preparedness and its nature, because adventures into obsolescence are expensive and dangerous.

9. It should recognize as a party our full obligation to the United Nations.

10. It should recognize the existence of atomic bombs and other top-drawer weapons, and insist that aggressors be advised that they will be used against them.

11. It should recognize the necessity for the equalization of the tax load, both as to individuals and as to corporations, organized evasions by cooperatives, churches and educational organizations and the hoodlum empire of racetrack wires and slot machines, has cost this country billions of dollars.

12. It should stand for fair employment and equal opportunity for all, but should castigate the Democratic Party for its hypocrisy in attempting to pass unenforceable FEPC laws.

13. It should attempt to strengthen the weak portions of the Taft-Hartley Act and make it more acceptable to labor, looking forward to further cementing the identical interests of capital and labor.

14. Republicans should recognize that we have today in America a welfare state and the people like it very well.

15. It should renounce McCarthyism recognizing that only in totalitarian countries can the charge ever become more important than the proof, the law, the acquittal, or the trial.

16. It should recognize that today the Democratic Party is the party of special privilege: witness the activities of the 5-percenters and the current RFC scandals.

17. The Republican Party should recognize propaganda as a weapon of war and accept immediately the need for a much more enlarged and vigorous Voice of America. America, a Nation of salesmen, is still behind Russia in convincing the peoples of the earth.

18. Finally, the Republican Party should recognize the potential power of spiritual force and the need for spiritual unity among free men so that this world under God may have a new birth of freedom and shall not perish from the universe.

Finally, there are some facts of history that we, as Republicans, should remember tonight as we celebrate the birth of the man who more than anyone else created the Republican Party. We should remember, for example, that the GOP rose like Phoenix from the ashes of the Whig Party and that the Whig Party vanished in a cacophony of dissident voices. The Whig Party elected a President in 1848, Gen. Zachary Taylor, but by 1858 neither the House nor the Senate had a single Member bearing the Whig label. It is also interesting to note two other things in this connection: One, that the immediate rock on which the Whigs wrecked them-

selves was that of foreign policy—they opposed the annexation of Texas; and two, the Whig Party was a party of appeasement and compromise.

And so may we Republicans here tonight and those millions like us in this country highly resolve that this party shall be of the people, for the people, and by the people, and that neither this party nor this Nation shall ever perish.

Appeasement Can Never Satisfy Tyrant's Appetite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Florence (Ala.) Times, February 9, 1951. Mr. Louis Eckl, editor of this outstanding daily, has written an excellent and timely article which I want to call to the attention of every Member:

APPEASEMENT CAN NEVER SATISFY TYRANT'S APPETITE

Those who remember well how futile appeasement proved to be in staving off World War II find it hard to understand the eagerness of today's appeasers.

Both in Europe and Asia there are sincere men who honestly believe that the way to meet Communist aggression is to make concessions to it. The idea, of course, is that if you give the Reds what they say they want, then they'll stop bothering the world, and we can all have a secure peace.

The supreme fallacy in this view is that Communists, like any other tyrannical group bent on general conquest, never stop wanting things. Their appetites can't be satisfied until they have swallowed the globe.

When Hitler got what he supposedly wanted at Munich—the German Sudetenland region of Czechoslovakia—he genially announced to the world that he had no further territorial ambitions. A few months later his armies marched into Prague, and soon he was knocking at Poland's door. Had he gained Poland without a fight, there would have been some new demand by the Nazis upon the free world.

The technique of piecemeal, bloodless conquests was carefully refined by Hitler. He tried not to ask for too much at a time. Perhaps only the precipitate haste of his time schedule alarmed the democracies to the point where they determined to support resistance to further aggression in 1939.

Hitler conceived his scheme of bloodless invasion with a cynical calculation. It was his belief that if an aggressor did not demand too much at once, concession to his demand might seem reasonable and just.

But as each succeeding demand was granted—for the same reason—there would, he felt, be less and less point in holding out against the aggressor. The appeaser, having yielded so much, could not see the sense of turning about and resisting fresh demands. He would ask himself: Why stand here, at phase 3, when we did not stand in phase 2?

The men in the Kremlin have studied Hitler's methods well; they practice them better than he did. People who believe these men would be satisfied by a single series of concessions don't understand the workings of the totalitarian mind.

Any lull gained by concessions to Stalin or Mao would be only temporary—until they considered the moment right to seek new advances. Blackmailers are not by nature a charitable breed; they do not take pity on their victims and let them be.

One can sympathize with the war weariness and fear which dictate an appeasing mood in some places. But there can be no sympathy for appeasement that is based on ignorance of history. And in the end, if the free world is to save itself, that mood must everywhere give way to a resolve not to be hoodwinked again by the tyrants who now confront us.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr Speaker, the need for a program of universal military training has long been recognized. I have for many years advocated enactment of a practical and workable plan of universal military training. I have been glad to see that in the State of Georgia and in the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, the need for this training is recognized by women as well as men. On February 1, 1951, the executive board of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs endorsed universal military training, and on February 6, 1951, the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta also endorsed it.

Under leave previously obtained, I insert herewith the resolutions adopted by these two organizations:

RESOLUTION

Whereas it is the duty of all citizens to engage in training for civilian defense; and

Whereas Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, has introduced a bill known as H. R. 1752 calling for universal military training: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs in session February 1951, embrace H. R. 1752; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from Georgia, Mr. Earl Cocke, American Legion, and that copies be given to the press.

This the 1st day of February 1951.

GARTHA B. PETERSON,
Chairman, Legislation.

CERTIFICATE

The above resolution was adopted on the 1st day of February 1951.

Mrs. WRAY SMITH,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States House Resolution 1752, which provides for universal military training, which bill was introduced by Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas it is believed that such a measure is necessary in order to preserve the fundamentals of freedom and protection for the citizens of the United States: Be it, therefore,

Resolved by the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, That we endorse and urge the passage of the bill providing for universal military training; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta and that a copy thereof be forwarded to Hon. CARL VINSON as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and to each Member of the House of Representatives and the two Senators from the State of Georgia, and to the Atlanta Journal and the Atlanta Constitution.

This 6th day of February 1951.

THE WOMEN'S CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF ATLANTA,
By AMBER W. ANDERSON, *President.*
Attest:
LAURENCE L. THOMPSON,
Secretary.

Lies, Damned Lies, and Inflation Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a thoughtful and intelligent article by Edna Lonigan upholding the position of the Federal Reserve Board and pointing out the error and subterfuge of the Treasury's position in the present controversy:

[From Human Events, Washington, D. C., of February 14, 1951]

LIES, DAMNED LIES, AND INFLATION CONTROLS

(By Edna Lonigan)

Freedom is hard, uncompromising, even cruel. It demands the facing of the facts of life with real courage and the meeting of problems without recourse to the dream life of fancy. That kind of escapism is reserved for the managerial elite, to whom truth is what they wish it to be or what pleases their passion for power. Clear words, with precise meanings, hard money that can be counted and chartered accounting, are the necessary conditions of a free society; all three are abandoned, as unwarranted handicaps, by those who would fashion society to their personal ambition.

An instance of this conflict between reality and fantasy is the current controversy between the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury over inflation controls. The issue is clear: Shall the FRB continue to support the value of Government paper by buying in what the public will not absorb; or shall the true value of this paper be ascertained by permitting it to find its own level in the open market?

The FRB is in favor of the second course, which is realistic, while the Treasury, anxious to hide the fact that the market value of its bonds is below their advertised value, urges the continuance of the present support scheme. The FRB contends that the support price is decidedly inflationary (for reasons which will be explained), while the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, insists that the inflationary effects of support can be overcome by police controls. In line with political reasoning and considerations, Mr. Snyder ignores the impossibility (demonstrated in every country in which controls have been tried) of eliminating black-market operations.

II

Why does Mr. Snyder hang on to the fiction of supported bonds? Because he knows, and the FRB has informed him of the fact,

that to throw Government bonds on the open market would necessitate—if their price is to be maintained—a higher interest rate. The Government would have to compete with other securities offered, securities which not only yield a higher return but promise an appreciation in market value; the face value of the bonds stays put. The so-called stability of Government bond prices is maintained because the Government does not have to meet the lie detector test of the free market. It does not have to pay a price that fits the growing risk.

However, if the Government raises its interest rate the bubble of a low cost of financing its borrowings will be burst. Not only will the true cost of servicing the national debt be exposed, but the theory that interest rates can be arbitrarily fixed by Government economists will get its come-uppance. The managerial elite cannot afford to face the facts of life.

On the other hand, if the FRB is compelled to continue the policy of buying all the bonds the public will not buy, it can do so only by increasing the volume of credit money—which is, in actual practice, even more inflationary than the printing of bogus money. The FRB has no pool of money with which to buy bonds. For every bond that falls into the hands of the Federal Reserve System, a credit is issued, either to the Government or to the bank which sent it in for discount. That credit becomes purchasing power. That purchasing power shows itself in the market place; the more purchasing power the higher the price of milk, machines, and monkeyshines. Not all the controls ever thought up by the managerial elite can prevent it. Credit money or printing-press money, the cost of living must go up.

The issue between Mr. Snyder and the FRB comes down to this: Shall the cost of Government be hidden behind a low interest rate, while the cost of living rises, or shall the housewife be protected by curtailment of the power of the Government to increase indefinitely issuance of credit money? To put it another way, shall the true cost to society of Government wastage be exposed to view?

III

Inflation during war is inevitable. It results from the depletion of the Nation's annual output. A war is not fought with money, it is fought with wheat, lumber, steel—with things that, were they to come to market, would hold prices down. The economic effect of war is the same as that of a drought, or of a conflagration consuming so many factories, department stores, and warehouses in each town in the country.

The workers who produce what is destroyed in war cannot be paid in goods, simply because the consumers' goods have not been produced. In time of war, or the preparation for it, everybody's standard of living goes down. It must. Inflation controls can do nothing about it. There is simply not enough to go around.

The problem of a war economy is to get people to work harder and to live on less. A war economy is obviously and necessarily the opposite of a free economy; but, during previous wars, when the ideal of a free society still hung high in American life, the problem mentioned above was met in an honest and straightforward way: Wages, in terms of money, were increased even as the purchasing power of money decreased, but there was the expectation that the money would harden as soon as the crisis was over. This expectation was based on the fact that the vast technological development necessitated by war production would be turned to the production of consumable goods after the war, and the abundance of such goods would lower prices. (For, during wartime despite the vast destruction of wealth, there is one great economic gain: War brings a revolutionary upturn in the arts of industrial organization and technology.) Thus, the worker would at last be paid in real wages.

A corollary of what might be termed the "free war economy" is that with the cessation of hostilities the expenses of government are reduced. That is, the Government ceases to siphon goods off the market, except for necessary expenses and a good portion of the taxes go toward the liquidation of the national debt. The burden of servicing this debt is correspondingly reduced.

This process of returning to a normal and factual way of living characterized our economy after World War I. Bond prices fell, but money rose in value, so that even those who lost some of their savings profited by the greater purchasing power of the dollars they earned or the dollars they received for their bonds.

IV

The present conflict between the Treasury and the FRB is really the issue of whether the honest method of conducting a war economy shall prevail or the dishonest one that stems from socialism. If the Treasury prevails, the country will be pushed that much faster into the slave-pattern for which it has been preparing these past 20 years. If Congress supports the Federal Reserve Board, the descent can be reversed.

To repeat, inflation cannot be entirely prevented during war. There is a shortage of goods, and nothing can be done about that, war being what it is. But, inflation is not caused by a shortage of goods only; a concomitant cause is the increase in the amount of money or purchasing power. War does not necessarily bring on either a larger fund of greenbacks or credit dollars; the first must be printed and the larger must be authorized, and only the administration can do either. That's exactly what the administration is doing now.

The influx of credit dollars, or any other kind of dollars, pushes prices up faster than the war shortages alone could do. This causes unrest among the housewives, and, to assuage their sense of hurt, the Government throws the blame on the housewives themselves. The housewives are bidding too much for meat and lipsticks. They must not do that. Nor must the butchers and lipstick-makers accept what the housewives offer. Both are unpatriotic, and a law must be passed to prevent such reprehensible behavior.

So, there are fixed prices, priorities, allocations, compulsion and, of course, enforcement agencies. Also, black markets. None of which would be necessary if the Government stopped creating money out of nothing—if it stopped supporting its bonds. True, prices, would go up because of the war-created shortages but they would not go up as rapidly, nor reach the same heights. More important, the freedom of which we are so proud, and for which we are constantly fighting, would be preserved.

V

That is what the FRB, consciously or not, is fighting for. It may be that, as bankers, they are more conscious of the threat to their own existence involved in this support scheme. Regardless of such motives, the banks are inadvertently fighting the battle of freedom. For, it so happens that whatever impels any segment of society to oppose the encroachment of government on its freedom of action, in so doing it serves society as a whole. Nobody can be free at the expense of another. Society is so integrated that restrictions placed upon any part of it impinge on the freedom of its contiguous parts; contrariwise, the freer the banks the more can they help their customers to act as free men.

At bottom, then, the struggle of the FRB and the Treasury involves questions of social and political importance that far transcend the technical issue. It is the constant struggle between society and the state.

The theory of representative government is that the interests of society are entrusted to its agents, whose business it is to see that these interests are protected from the power of the state. In pursuance of that theory, Congress should see to it that the issue brought up by the Federal Reserve Board shall be decided in its favor. Put the bonds on the open market where they will find their true value, and if the citizens pass them up, increase the interest rates. Let's not have more counterfeit money—and more counterfeit freedom.

No Plunge in the Dark as Suggested by Secretary Snyder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in the morning Washington Post of February 16, 1951, entitled "No 'Quickie'," states perfectly the case for an over-all picture of the tax situation rather than a leap in the dark as proposed by the President.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting this editorial as a part of my remarks:

NO "QUICKIE"

We heartily approve the decision of the Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings on proposals to raise additional revenue instead of rubber-stamping the administration's tax program. For, as we pointed out in a recent editorial, without advance knowledge of the total amount of revenue to be raised, it is practically impossible for legislators to decide whether proposed tax increases will insure a fair distribution of the total contemplated tax burden.

The administration is proceeding on the assumption that $16,500,000,000 of additional revenue will be required to balance the budget in the next fiscal year. In the first place, the amount of money required to balance the cash budget, which measures the inflationary impact of deficit financing, is less than $13,000,000,000. That raises a question as to the total amount of taxes required as a curb on inflation. Second, the Ways and Means Committee wants to find out what is being done by the appropriations committees of Congress to pare budgeted spending recommendations before writing a tax bill. Otherwise there is no way of determining how much additional revenue will be needed to close the gap between receipts and expenditures. Third, the committee should investigate alternative means of raising revenue before acting on Administration recommendations. Fourth, the committee ought to have an opportunity to discuss Secretary Snyder's recommendations for raising such additional revenues as may be required to balance the budget. The Treasury's two-package tax approach is, in our opinion, an impediment to formulation of a well-balanced program aiming at a definite goal.

Nor is the need for so-called quickie tax legislation as pressing as administration spokesmen assert, since Government receipts are currently higher than expenditures. To be sure, new taxes should be voted as promptly as possible to offset the inflation-producing increase in purchasing power that will be felt when Government spend-

ing begins to outstrip Government income. But, as Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee says, a tax program such as that proposed can't be put through "before breakfast."

Speech at Commemoration of Thirty-third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me February 18, 1951, at Webster Hall, New York City:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, representatives of the Baltic States, members of the clergy, and my fellow citizens and friends, I am very happy to join with you in the commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of that eventful day, of that milestone in the long and honorable historical record of the Lithuanian people—the declaration of independence promulgated by the Council of Lithuania at Vilnius on the 16th day of February 1918.

It would be futile on my part to discourse on the historical achievements of the Lithuanian race; on their service to the peoples of Western and Central Europe in holding the nomadic invasions from Asia; on their centuries-old struggle with the Teutonic knights which saved Muscovy and Russia from the Drang Nach Osten; on their traditions of tolerance and freedom; on the valiant struggle of every generation of Lithuanians since 1795 for the reconstitution of their country's independence; on the inspiring martyrdom of Lithuanian Catholics in defense of their faith; on their unprecedented fight for the freedom of the press when, for 40 long years, Lithuanian men, women, and children had to smuggle in across the German frontier their prayer books and grammars and hide them from the Russian police. You know these things—I can only express my admiration for the excellent qualities and character of the people from which you sprang.

However, I wish to speak to you about the principles and aspirations which animate you and are common to Lithuanians, to Americans, and to mankind, about our joint defense of our Christian heritage, of our human dignity and freedom, of our ways of life, which are menaced by the evil men who presently control from the Kremlin of Moscow the destinies of hundreds of millions of human beings, and who hold the decision for war or peace.

My friends, until a few years ago the plaints of the Lithuanian people and of their good neighbors, the Latvians and Estonians, were frankly disbelieved by the rank and file citizens of this our great free country, and by statesmen of the world.

In a country where individual value and freedom of man are rated so high, it sounded almost unbelievable that in the present so-called enlightened age, the twentieth century of the Christian era, there are human beings who would exert every ounce of their strength, of their mental powers, who would subvert every modern invention toward enslaving the rest of the world, toward subjecting the former freemen to a police regime where the wife and child should spy on the husband and father, the brother upon his brother or sister, where every fifth person in civilian calling and every tenth person in the armed forces should be an agent-informer for the huge network of secret police serving the selfish interests of a single legitimate party which brooks no criticism of its evil deeds.

Who could have believed that there is a group of men, backed by vast armed forces and a network of spies, who would carefully select for extermination the very best elements of the peoples and countries which their Red army invaded?

Who could have believed that lands would be seized by foreign invaders, that freemen farmers would be converted into serfs of the State, that children would be claimed by the State as constituting the property of a single political party which claims supremacy over the people and the government?

Who could have believed that thousands of trucks, some of them lend-lease by the United States during the late war, would descend on peaceful farms and city homes in the dead of the night, rouse the inhabitants, separate the family heads from their wives and children, and would transport them all, regardless of their age and their innocence, for slave labor in the Arctic mines and forests thousands of miles away from their homes, for a slow death by starvation, cold, untended disease, and overwork?

Who could have believed that anywhere from fifteen to twenty or more million people of various races should be settled in such extermination camps, and that an average of one and a half million people should be dying annually in such slave camps?

Today, thanks in a large measure to fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent or extraction, to the self-effacing and untiring efforts of your coalition Lithuanian American Council and your information center, and to the living witnesses—some of whom are present in this very hall—the hundreds of thousands of former displaced persons—the American people know and believe, and the rest of the free world knows that this is true.

America is now girding in earnest for the defense of this country, of this continent, of the rest of the world. Once again we live on an emergency status, on borrowed time, and everyone realizes that the present emergency is greater than any that this country has ever faced.

We are paying huge taxes, and are prepared to pay more, for the support of our means of defense. We are compelled to increase our Armed Forces, our armaments, our facilities for telling the rest of the world the truth about our country and our intentions. Our men are fighting and dying in bleak and cold Korea, fighting in a war we did not start and in which we realize that the barbarian hordes attacking our boys are not our real enemies—that they are driven into slaughter by the evil masterminds who control the Communist-enslaved part of the world from the Kremlin. Once again our citizens have to give their blood for the Red Cross, to face the draft, to revive civil defense and the USO, to give relief to the homeless and the orphans and the hungry whom we can reach with our generous aid.

Just a few days ago we observed Lincoln's birthday. This year, more understanding than ever in the past, we pondered over the wise and significant words of Abraham Lincoln that the world cannot exist half free and half slave. We realize better than ever before that peace—and freedom—are indivisible. That a disturbance of peace in Korea or Greece, that enslavement of the Chinese or Lithuanians threaten our own security and peace and our own freedom.

This truth is brought to our consciousness ever more clearly when we learn that last Friday, on the 16th of February, the Lithuanian independence day, the Voice of America simultaneously began Lithuanian language radio broadcasts and increased broadcasts in Chinese dialects. China and Lithuania—both meet here in the United States, both need our exertions in behalf of spreading the truth about the events in the world. Both are enslaved by the same conspirators of the Kremlin. China, the nation with the oldest history, and Lithuania, the country speaking the oldest Indo-European language, both are objects of our attention in this one world of indivisible peace, of indivisible freedom. China and Lithuania, in both these far-removed countries a merciless underground struggle against the Soviet enslaver is active; drafted mongols are guarding the iron curtain separating Lithuania from the west; drafted Lithuanians are stationed at the far eastern outposts of the vast Eurasian Empire controlled by Russia.

Do we need a clearer reminder that freedom is indivisible? That the enslaved populations are our natural allies in our fight for freedom?

Ladies and gentlemen, in 1659, Alexander Carolus Curtius, a Lithuanian nobleman, arrived here in New York City, then called Nieuw Amsterdam by the Dutch settlers, to teach classics to the adolescent children of the colonists. He stayed here 2 years and is commonly titled "The Father of American High Schools," the first schoolmaster of New York. He came here to the American shores to help preserve the western Christian heritage of the settlers. Today the Lithuanians in their own homeland need our help in preserving their western Christian heritage, their birthright as freemen.

The Lithuanian contribution to the development of America continued practically unbroken since 1659. There were Lithuanians who had fought in the American Revolution to help our ancestors to secure their independence. Other Lithuanians had come here in the wake of the Napoleonic wars, and after the suppression of the Lithuanian insurrections of 1831 and 1863-64. The steady flow of Lithuanian immigration increased since 1864, particularly since the Russian ban on all Lithuanian printing and the institution of a 20-year military service for Russia.

Here the Lithuanians established an excellent name for themselves, as good citizens and men. You have 124 Roman Catholic parishes in this country. You maintain several academies and colleges, about 9 high schools, and 70 grammar schools. You publish about 50 newspapers and magazines in this country, in either Lithuanian or English, and thus you help maintain excellent standards of citizenship, of Americanism, of well-informed community influencing political consciousness of our masses. Everyone knows that you are not anti-Russian. You are antitotalitarians, anti-Communists, pro-Americans, pro-freemen.

Since 1940, since the invasion and enslavement of Lithuania by Russia in a conspiracy with Hitler's Germany, you have formed a nation-wide coalition Lithuanian-American Council, with the sole objective of burying for the duration your partisan differences in order to help the people of Lithuania to regain their freedom and independence. In your activities you never limited your scope to Lithuania alone. Rather, you spoke up for the Latvians and Estonians, for Poles with whom Lithuania had some differences, and for other enslaved nations. Is there a greater proof needed to show your Americanism, your devotion to the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy, which made this country great?

I am proud to note that, regardless of our deviations and errors in other fields, the Government of the United States has firmly held and continues to adhere to the principles enunciated on July 23, 1940, by the Department of State. I will read that statement:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the people of these republics first gained their independence and democratic form of government the people of the United States watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

My friends, this most excellent statement of the American policy still stands—every word of it.

The Lithuanian flag still flies in Washington. The Lithuanian Legation and consulates enjoy complete recognition and freedom of action. Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian ships are still plying the seas under the protection of our courts. Lithuanian passports are still internationally recognized travel papers, even though the country itself is occupied and oppressed by a most brutal enemy. Lithuanian language radio broadcasts are now going daily on the air across the Atlantic Ocean to bring a message of encouragement to Lithuanian freemen. The Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation has a sympathetic audience whenever it addresses memoranda to the United States. Tribute to the spirit of the Lithuanian people is paid in our congressional speeches.

Thanks to the indomitable spirit and love of freedom, Lithuania is still unconquered. While no public observations of the Lithuanian Independence Day are permitted and the national anthem is banned, and while tens of thousands of Russian armed troops and police are prowling all across the country—we may rest assured that, as in the past years, there were Lithuanian Independence Day observances in the forests still controlled by Lithuanian freedom fighters. Hundreds of thousands of people visited the few remaining open churches to thank the Almighty for the benefits enjoyed by Lithuania in the past and to pray for relief from the present enslavement. Other masses of people prayed in silence while at work in factories and state-controlled farms. The Russians failed to enslave the minds of the Lithuanians. They cannot control the thoughts of self-respecting Lithuanians who recall that they were born freemen endowed with certain God-given rights which no man and no government has the right to take away.

We know, and we shall let the Lithuanian people know that we are aware that Lithuania is a victim of genocide—and you are one audience to which I do not have to explain what this new term means. I am informed that, in addition to mass deportations and ravages of the past few years, the new Stalin 5-year plan calls for 100,000 Lithuanian workers to work on the Volga and Turkmenian Canals in 1951. Special committees were installed with every secretariat of the Communist Party in every country late last fall, and lists of prospective victims were drawn. The arrests started January 1, 1951. Twenty thousand people are being transported to Russia this month alone—and the Soviet radio and press are already praising these "volunteers"—but we must inform the Russians that, sooner or later, they will pay the penalty for their crimes, that genocide convention was negotiated for just such purpose, and that we mean business—in Korea or elsewhere.

Our first concern today should be to overcome the pacifism which has stagnated our former allies and some of our new ones. Pacifism has left a vacuum of power in these countries, making it easier for communism to move in. By revitalizing a brave people like the Lithuanians and all other freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, we can eventually defeat communism without war.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I am very happy to be here with you tonight and to be of any help to you at Washington. I am proud of your aspirations, and I am as one with you. May I reassure you, and through you the people of Lithuania, that justice and liberty shall win, that Lithuania shall be liberated and free again, and may the Almighty hasten that day.

Accept the Dare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeton (N. J.) News tells us that we must accept the President's dare to cut his $71,000,000,000 cash budget which actually amounts to nearly $95,000,000,000 when authorizations are added. For one, I am willing to accept the dare and cut the President's budget. I sincerely hope that a majority of the House is feeling the same way. The editorial to which I have referred follows:

MUST ACCEPT THE DARE

In a somewhat flamboyant manner, President Truman has dared Congress to cut his $71,000,000,000 budget. The President asserted that it was a good budget and he dared Congress to reduce it. He also asserted that 2 years ago Congress complained about the size of the budget, but before that body was through with the appropriations it had added $2,000,000,000 to the total. The President made a good point here. We do not recall how much Congress did add to some of the appropriations but we do know that it did add some.

But now the President has put the issue squarely up to Congress and that body cannot, must not, refuse to accept the dare. To do so would be an abject surrender on the part of that body to a browbeating threat on the part of the Executive, the surrender by the House of Representatives of its constitutional right to be the originator of all revenue bills and the creation of a one-man maker and director of our national finances.

There cannot be the slightest question to this issue. It is as clear as the noonday sun, and making the assertion as he did and the way he did, Mr. Truman intended it to be a direct challenge to Congress as to who should be controller of our finances, the direct representation of the people invested with power under the Constitution or Harry S. Truman, elected to carry out the will of the people as promulgated through Congress.

This is the issue which confronts the Nation.

The next move is on the part of Congress.

Mr. Truman says his budget is a good one.

Congressmen and Senators who will be called on to consider it, say that it is a bad one.

Senator BYRD, an expert in such matters, says $9,100,000,000 can be cut from the budget without impairing the efficiency of government. Other Senators of both political parties do not hesitate to say billions can be cut off.

Over in the House, where all revenue bills must originate, members of both parties declare the budget is a bad one and must be cut.

With the best financial minds in both Houses of the Congress thus agreed, it is impossible for Congress to fail to meet the dare of the President and cut his budget without mercy or else, by failure to do so, stultify itself in the eyes of the people.

Why even the general public knows the budget is a bad one, because it knows that under the guise of defense measures, the President is attempting to foist on the public the Brannan farm plan, which Congress has consigned to the garbage pail, the socialized medicine, educational, housing bills, the St. Lawrence waterway, civil rights, and other measures which Congress has refused to enact even in peace days. The appropriations for every one of these measures should be cut out completely and the President told flatly not one cent for any of them, and that appropriations for the civil branches of the Government are going to be cut to the bone, and above those figures he will have to find the money elsewhere, and if he wants to take the fight to the people he is welcome to do so.

The honor and power of Congress is at stake.

Let us see how well that honor and power will be upheld.

W. E. M.

Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1951, marks the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will observe this day with fitting and appropriate ceremonies. Yes; all over the world where Lithuanians live will there be retold the story of Lithuanian independence which, for the time being, has been temporarily put aside.

We here in the Congress should convey as best we can to the people of Lithuania a message of hope and friendship—a message of our hope that in the near future they will attain again their desire for a free government and become a member of the family of independent nations.

Today Lithuania as a nation is being exterminated. The Soviet occupation has cost over 500,000 lives—victims of torture, starvation, political executions, and exile to death camps.

On this day of anniversary it will be heartening to the people of Lithuania to know they have the lasting friendship of our people in America.

The Scandal of the Scandals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is deplorable that high officials of this administration have condoned "government by influence" and "government by favoritism." It is more deplorable that they are so brazen and defiant in the face of justifiable criticism. This cynical attitude represents a real danger to our form of government.

I insert hereafter a relevant editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.:

THE SCANDAL OF SCANDALS

One of the most scandalous things about the Truman administration scandals is the small amount of public indignation they arouse.

The quantity of them alone in their consistent quality of filth, corruption, and crookedness has sort of inured the electorate to shock and horror.

And therein, by countenancing if not encouraging their continuance. Mr. Truman has visited upon this and probably coming generations a deep and lasting sin.

Twenty years ago, one of the smallest of the comparatively most innocuous pieces of mischief pulled off in Washington under Harry Truman would have been enough to have blasted him and all his troop out of power.

There was a public conscience then. And the public expected conscience in high places.

But not any more.

The public has become too used to watching such things as influence being peddled from the very steps of the White House to the highest bidder, in cash or political advantage.

It has watched the callous stealing of elections, heard gangsters blithely admit their working arrangement with powerful politicians, seen old cronies mismanaging, cheapening, and poisoning Federal administration, lost count of traitors who have gained points of vantage from which they could betray the Nation to its enemies.

Yet through all of this the President has done nothing in the name of reformation, everything in his power to prevent it.

Thus today, a Senate committee controlled by his own party investigates the powerful Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), finds its loan policies dictated by a web of influence reaching into the White House itself.

And Mr. Truman calls their findings asinine, and demands reappointment of all five of the RFC's accused board members.

Sadly, Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS remarks that "influence is an illness of mediocre administration."

But this illness springs not from a mediocre but from a downright bad administration.

Still, few of the public which suffers because of it seem to care.

Like the people of Barcelona and London during the war, they have become so used to and weary with bombers overhead and fire screaming down upon them, that they don't even look up any more, they don't even pay attention to the air-raid sirens.

And that is the big curse of this whole business.

Americans have come to expect this stuff of their Government, and to figure nothing can be done about it. And when cynicism and hopelessness rule the mind of the land, decency and democracy—and thus liberty—have gone.

Smooth Sailing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent editorial written by Charles Francis Coe that appeared in the Palm Beach Post-Times of February 11, 1951. In his own rugged manner Mr. Coe calls attention to what the American people are thinking about, and asks the question many are asking, "If we have to make greater sacrifices for the war effort, why doesn't the President himself set an example for us all and give up some of his luxuries paid for by the taxpayer?" It is a simple question and the answer is equally simple. As long ago as August 3, 1950, I urged the President to practice the personal economy he was begging the American taxpayer to exercise, but my pleas were ignored and recently the Congress was dared to reduce his budget with many proposals which have nothing to do with the defense effort. Such leadership during these anxious times is alarming.

Charles Francis Coe, or "Socker" Coe as he is affectionately known by his many friends, has lived an active life and knows it from many angles. In his earlier days he was a heavyweight boxing champion of the United States Navy; later he became a successful automobile dealer in Massachusetts, and wrote articles for the Saturday Evening Post. He was so successful in this work that he went into semiretirement, and built a home in Florida. After the financial crash in 1929 he again took up his writing, studied law, passed his bar examinations in Florida, and became general counsel to the Motion Picture Producers & Distributors Association. When Will Hays died, "Socker" resigned and eventually became the chief editorialist of the string of about 25 Florida newspapers owned by John Perry.

"Socker" Coe is a man respected by his friends and one who hates hypocrisy in any form. His intense patriotism is needed in times like these, and acts as a stimulus to all who love their country.

SMOOTH SAILING

President Truman insists that we must all make greater sacrifices to the war mobilization. We agree with him. We hold it to be a moral certainty that the sacrifices will be imposed.

The Bureaus in Washington undoubtedly will grow in number rather than decrease. That villainous and mountainous Government payroll will embrace another horde of confused but ravenous grovellers in the public trough. The taxpayers will provide the trough and the slush therein. So we can be fairly certain of making the sacrifices the President so touchingly advances as pleasurable duties.

What about his own smooth sailing? A yacht for weekends, which might be put to more practical usages in a war. A mighty airplane which costs fabulous sums to run and ride in, might drop a load of bombs on troops just fixing to slay our fighting kids, were it not awaiting the Presidential whim. That fifty thousand a year salary raise tax exempt, might furnish a cup of coffee or a few cigarettes for the lads in the battlefields or hospitals.

It would appear that President Truman, sensing with consummate skill the fact that we cannot share the yacht, the airplane and the tax exempt salary, takes the position that, if we cannot share those, he will not share our sacrifices. That would match the reasoning of his screwy economic planning. That is the type logic we have learned to expect from him.

So he has smooth sailing. If the wake he churns in passing us common folks, causes undue turbulence about the rowboat which is our measure of participation, then we just pull a little harder on the oars to get to smoother water. If we break or lose an oar, that is our hard luck. There will be no destroyers, operated at colossal expense on our money, to stand guard over us. We are on our own.

If, by chance, we manage to earn a dollar or two more than we used to earn, we will pay the clickety-clack bracket through income tax, with none of that "exemption" relish, so delectable to the Presidential palate. Those who believe that this is a land where abides equal opportunity to all men, will wonder a bit about where the equality comes. These will sense the splendid wisdom which dictated that we must support but one President.

If we had two, with the appetite for special privilege so manifest in Mr. Truman, the country would go broke in a week. Whether or not the President knows it, there is widespread resentment against this churlish effrontery which scorns the fitness of things wheresoever that fitness is apt to limit the wanton spending and personal prerogatives of the White House gang. It were well for him, for his public prestige and for his party, that he take a little more accurate measure of the cumulative feeling in these matters.

Faith in the leadership of this country is at the lowest ebb in history. The hinterlands, which are the backbone of the Republic, feel deep apprehension. The sentiment is almost solid that Truman and Acheson are without knowledge of what cooks. The public ear is aching with double talk. The public heart is wearied with fear. The public conscience is outraged at the prodigal spending.

The public spirit wants defense, not bureaucracy. It wants strength, not wanton self-indulgence of the few. It seeks integrity, not insolvency of motive, of method and of mentality. It appraises the basics by weighing these greedy demonstrations. The resultant appraisals are shocking.

It sees a President weaseling around the lowering of exemptions for married taxpayers, while holding in his hand $50,000 a year with no tax to be paid. It recalls that this obnoxious conniving took place in the most flagrant political atmosphere, so that the President could sign the legislation into law before he undertook his new term, merely because, had he been serving at the time the law was passed, he could not have received the increase.

In this perilous and perilous hour of our national history, such shenanigans are barefaced assault upon the faith of our people. They breed deep discontent and abysmal

suspicion, through flaunting political skulduggery brazenly before the world. They destroy confidence not alone here but abroad. They reflect a cynical impiety in the top leadership of this God-loving people.

They do violence to every tradition and precept which have builded our national dignity and prestige. They fester in sacred places, fostered by the practices of Tammany and Pendergast. They expose the most venal and avaricious intent to fatten at public expense, while posing as faithful servants of our Nation. They are just as wrong as things can be wrong.

They cry out for rectification, that once again our people may look with pride upon our Capital, its public institutions, and public officials. They explain by inference, Mr. President, why Acheson remains at your side, why his loyalty to Hiss does not impress you as disloyalty to our country. Kick in with some of these sacrifices yourself, sir. Then we will understand.

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

Feed for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop Haggling Over Food for India," published in the Christian Century for February 7, 1951.

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

STOP HAGGLING OVER FOOD FOR INDIA

Shall the United States Senate be permitted to use starvation as an instrument of foreign policy? That question is raising its ugly head in the languid discussions which have now started in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on whether we shall make available to India the 2,000,000 tons of grain that country needs to avert famine. Nehru, it is said in the cloakrooms, is showing too much independence in the east-west conflict. Let's drag our feet a little on this food question and force him to come around. That attitude is utterly wrong. It shows contempt for the humanitarian tradition of the American people. It reveals a callousness to suffering which is shocking in its cruelty. Do the Senators want to present this Nation to the world as a monster which cannot be placated unless it has its way? That is what they are doing. No wonder we are losing the battle for the minds of men. Instead of gaining an ally, this course offers the surest method of alienating not only the second most populous nation on earth, not only the rest of Asia, but all people everywhere who have a spark of compassion left in their souls. It refuses to credit the Indian Prime Minister's peace efforts as the sincere attempts they are to avert the global catastrophe of war. It assumes instead that our position is the only one that can possibly be right. Nehru is risking everything on an effort to avert war, not only because he believes this to be his duty to mankind but also because he sees that war between the great powers could easily reduce India to a brawling chaos in which all ordered government would collapse. Who would benefit from that? If Senator CONNALLY and his colleagues cannot be statesmen, if they cannot rise to the demands of ordinary humanity, if they cannot be restrained from alienating our last friend on earth, the American people ought to demand that they quit misrepresenting us to the world. They will understand if they are told they must stop haggling over food for India.

Every Second Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the December 1950 issue of the American Federationist, the official monthly publication of the American Federation of Labor, carried a stirring article entitled "Every Second Counts," which so well epitomizes the nature of the crisis we are facing, and the action we must take to meet and beat that crisis, that I ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It should be noted that this article was prepared and printed prior to the reverses in Korea which were needed to awaken many to the seriousness of our situation. Labor, in general, had anticipated the need for all-out action, and was prepared to offer its support before it was called upon. In the midst of the smokescreens now being thrown up by many groups, decrying labor's willingness to take its full share of the burden in this emergency, I feel that the real courage and conviction of responsible labor groups and leaders in rising to meet and anticipate the country's demands merits fullest praise and recognition.

EVERY SECOND COUNTS—WE MUST REBUILD OUR STRENGTH VERY QUICKLY

The gravest challenge in history now confronts the American people. Communist Russia, armed to the teeth, is moving against the non-Communist world. The goal, as always since the Communist gang seized power by violence in Russia 33 years ago, is conquest and domination of all the nations and all the peoples of the earth. The No. 1 target is the United States, champion of the free way of life which shows up totalitarian communism for the tremendous fraud that it is.

At the moment Communist Russia is acting through her junior partner in crime against humanity, Communist China. Stalin has other puppets ready to kill, burn, and enslave whenever he decides to twitch the strings. Many countries are in great peril. Stalin has huge Soviet armies at his command, a tremendous air force, the atom bomb. His own essential industry, unlike ours, is widely dispersed and hidden. He has his covetous eyes on Western Europe, on the oil fields of the Middle East, on India, and Latin America. Of all the countries that he plans to conquer, the one he most wants to crush is our own great and free United States.

Where will the Communists move next? When will they strike next? Will they roll against Western Europe first? Will they bomb us? It is anyone's guess. Only Stalin and his fellow-gangsters in the Kremlin know the answers. But so long as the Communists' military strength is enormous and that of the free world tragically puny, the likelihood of further Communist aggression and the danger of the defeat and enslavement of all democratic nations continue very great.

The time has arrived for very plain talk. If we want to survive, there is no time whatsoever to be lost. Just as quickly as possible, with every loyal American rendering the maximum service where he is most needed, with all secondary objectives gracefully granting priority to the most important task in our history, we must build up our armed strength. Just as quickly as possible, we must establish equality in military potency with our ruthless enemy and then surge far ahead of him.

So long as we remain relatively weak and unprepared, the Red Fascists will be tempted to move again and again, to gobble up more defenseless countries or even to dump atom bombs on our large and exposed industrial cities. So long as we remain relatively weak, no realistic American or citizen of any other non-Communist country can justifiably feel secure.

Once we have rebuilt our strength, the situation will be entirely different. Then Communist Russia will know that the day of easy victories is over. The Communists may decide to commit new aggressions anyway, but if they do, the free world will then be in a position to repel the aggressors and make them rue their murderous deeds. More likely, the existence of overpowering American strength, ready to destroy the Communists if they make but one foul move, will suffice to persuade the Reds to behave. Stalin and his henchmen are slave masters, murderers, and bullies. Words never deter a bully. But he is always profoundly impressed by strength capable of smashing him.

Without question, the imperative task facing the United States and the American people is the rebuilding of our military strength. Every American must cooperate wholeheartedly. There will be many dull jobs, many unpleasant jobs, many dangerous jobs. All of these jobs will have to be done. Not only our precious liberty, not only our lofty principles and ideals, but our very lives—yes; our very lives—depend upon every American citizen now rolling up his sleeves and getting into the fight with all his ability, with all his strength.

We probably have far less time to get ready to defend ourselves than we did in 1940. There's not a minute to be wasted. Let's get going.

Famine Relief for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

FAMINE RELIEF FOR INDIA

The Commission on Evangelical Action of the National Association of Evangelicals, having received the eye-witness report of its secretary, Dr. Clyde W. Taylor, who just returned from a tour of the famine area of India, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas this commission has carefully studied the crisis that has arisen in India because of the devastating drought and has concluded that it is our Christian duty to share our food supplies with starving men and women in India; and

"Whereas the sending of such material does not imply that we necessarily approve of India's political alliances and attitudes: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we memorialize the Congress to give favorable and careful consideration to the request of India for allocation of wheat and other foodstuffs, and that we urge the Christians of America to share with those who are dying for want of food; and

"That we urge Congress to safeguard the interests of the United States and the people of India, first, by making it mandatory to the India Government that the people of India shall be fully informed that such foodstuffs are the gift of the people of the United States sharing with the needy of India the necessities of life; and second, that this foodstuff must be distributed to the people of India at actual cost, avoiding all irregular profits of merchants, millers, and all others;

"That such safeguards are urgent because in many lands our relief has been used to propagandize and spread the influence of some political party, religious hierarchy, or totalitarian regime, with neither appreciation nor public acknowledgment of America's sacrifice; and, furthermore, such American food has found its way either into illegal markets or has been sold through merchants who profiteered at the expense of starving humanity. These abuses must be avoided."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 12, 1951.*

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the House has acted to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and has included amendments which are of doubtful merit. During the years ahead it seems clear that more and more of our surplus will move into export channels and trade encouragement may not be necessary. But the following editorial, published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, does point out serious dangers and it is worthy of the attention of every Member:

NOW WE CAN RELAX

It seems odd that Congress should be worrying about foreign competition with our infant industries right now, but that's the fact. At least the House has been worried. Yesterday it amended the reciprocal trade agreements extension act by restoring the "peril point" provisions.

Under this amendment, a President must give Congress a chance to disapprove any tariff concessions under the act which in the opinion of the Tariff Commission would put an American industry under peril from competition of foreign goods. The provision was put into the law in the Eightieth Congress, was taken out by the Eighty-first, and now apparently is to be put back in.

No one wants to see young and struggling American industries, like United States Steel, General Motors, and du Pont, put in peril of their lives by the unfair competition from the big industrial bullies of Europe. If they and others are in peril, let them be protected by all means from the machinations of bureaucrats who want to increase our foreign trade.

But this does seem a strange time to be worrying on that score. We are entering on a new period of war production throughout the western industrial world. It is destined to be a period of indefinite duration and its chief characteristic will be a shortage of goods and raw materials. We shall be needing and wanting everything we can lay our hands on. In fact, the United States right now is bidding energetically for all the raw materials in sight, and if there is going to be any surplus manufactures lying around, doubtless we shall be wanting those too, but there won't be.

At the end of this period, whether it be with war or not in between, the situation that existed at the close of the last war will be repeated. The problem will not be to keep foreign goods out of the country, but how to get paid by foreign countries for the goods which will be available only in America.

However, if Congress does not have enough to worry about without adding the danger of foreign competition to the list, this furore about protecting home markets is as good a way to take it out as any. Of course, in the world situation that is going to exist for the foreseeable future, such measures are going to be as nearly completely meaningless and pointless as anything that could be struck off by the mind of man. But it gives a feeling of righteousness and of a duty performed, and that is perhaps enough.

Bewildered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "Bewildered," appearing in the Mount Holly (N. J.) Citizen. This column is written by our former colleague, Hon. Frank Mathews, Jr., who will be well remembered for his pungent observation on national affairs while he was a Member of the House:

BEWILDERED

(By Frank Mathews, Jr.)

A friend of mine said to me, "Why are we Americans so callous? Our boys are dying by the thousands in Korea. We read the headlines, shrug our shoulders and go about our business as usual."

People who have recently been in Europe tell us that Americans are hysterical while the Europeans who are nearest to and most in danger from Russia and communism are very little flustered about it but quite concerned about our hysteria.

These two views do not seem to jibe.

Perhaps we are neither callous nor hysterical. Perhaps we are just bewildered. Now finally awake to the terrible and insidious threat of communism, we are organizing ourselves on a totalitarian basis to fight a total war against it. Some of those who were previously the loudest shouters against communism because it was totalitarian and the wordiest proponents of our way of life, to combat it are now the most hysterical advocates of totalitarianism to fight it.

Anyhow, we are preparing as never before for a war greater than ever before. Against whom? Against Russia, of course.

To us who want completely adequate defense against whatever may threaten us, at least two things are confusing. First, how is Russia, which so recently was wholly inadequate to defend itself against a Germany fighting other large and strong nations at the same time, without $2,000,000,000 of lend-lease from us and a vast American military second front in Europe, now so strong; and secondly, is there no way to avoid totalitarianism than by becoming totalitarian?

This week let's take a look at the first of these problems.

How did Russia, in about 5 years, become so strong that we believe she can lick the whole world unless we and every other nation of that world sacrifice everything we have to stop her? Either we are grossly exaggerating the power of Russia or we are largely responsible for that power—or perhaps something of both.

My great overt national sin occurred in 1940, when I expressed the belief that nazism and fascism, bad as they were, were local diseases, but that communism was a virulent epidemic so contagious and deadly it could engulf the entire world, and advocated that we not give our all to enthrone communism merely to force nazism and fascism to abdicate.

I continued in this sin while I was a Member of the House of Representatives by voting against the $3,750,000,000 loan to Great Britain and opposing the Marshall plan as such. Both were sold by the administration to our people as sure-fire measures to stop communism, while at the same time that administration appeased and gave aid, succor and comfort to Russia, coddled communism within its own ranks and sent the author of the Marshall plan to China to return with a report that the Chinese Communists were not really Communists of the Russian type at all, but were just nice, harmless agrarian liberals, or something like that.

We now know that Great Britain and other nations who received our aid and goods are either reshipping or selling vital materials to Russia and Communist China and opposing our efforts in the United Nations to have both these outfits branded as what they really are. We seem to feel that we are honest, generous, sinless folk who have been fully betrayed, sold out, and double crossed by the nations we supposed were our friends and whom we so nobly aided in their time of need.

Next week I would like to give you a somewhat different slant on this situation.

Condemnation of Governmental Socialistic Endeavors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution condemning governmental socialistic endeavors, reecntly adopted by an outstanding group of Maine young men known as the State of Maine Junior Chamber of Commerce at the monthly meeting of that group held at Augusta, Maine, January 18, 1951:

CONDEMNATION OF GOVERNMENTAL SOCIALISTIC ENDEAVORS

Whereas the United States has the highest standards of living of any country in the

world, as a result of our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas socialization, wherever tried, becomes a cancerous growth which prostitutes its people at the feet of its Government and crucifies their freedom on the cross of political fortune, from which living death, no nation can be resurrected, and

Whereas powerful political figures encourage a program of a welfare state designated to buy tenure in office with an eternal mortgage upon our precious heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State of Maine Junior Chamber of Commerce in body duly convened at its January Board Meeting in Augusta, Maine, on this the 18th day of January, A. D. 1951, does hereby condemn governmental socialistic endeavors in violation thereof; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen of this State as an appeal paramount to party allegiance to give this Nation under God a new birth of freedom for individual endeavor.

ECA Plants 300,000,000 Seedlings a Year in Korea Prior to the Russian-Red China Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to note that the contribution to the defense of Korea against Communist aggression consisted of planting 300,000,000 seedlings a year by the ECA.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Frank P. Litschert giving some of the history of the bungling, fumbling jobs so characteristic of the New Deal:

(By Frank P. Litschert)

Congress is alert to grave shortcomings in the Truman-Acheson policy in Korea after our occupation forces were withdrawn in July 1949—just 1 year before the Communist aggression.

Reviewing the State Department's Korean policy for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 7, 1950, Secretary Acheson declared that "conditions of stability and public order have continued to improve, and the threat of Communist overthrow appears, at least temporarily, to have been contained."

How temporary was this happy situation may be judged by the fact that the Communist aggression broke on June 25, just about 16 weeks after Secretary Acheson's official estimate of his great success in containment.

So certain was the State Department of this success that it gave no military assistance to Korea after the withdrawal of our occupation forces.

House Report No. 2495 from the Foreign Affairs Committee, July 11, 1950, recalls two different congressional appropriations for military aid to Korea. These were $27,640,000 under Public Law 329 of the Eighty-first Congress, signed by President Truman on October 6, 1949, and $30,000,000 under Public Law 430, signed on October 28, 1949.

But on July 11, 1950 (3 weeks after the Communist aggression), the Foreign Affairs Committee reported: "No deliveries of any consequence have been made as yet * * * The reasons for lack of deliveries are these, etc."

This dismal report of inactivity, in the face of the gathering Communist mobilization in North Korea, was the basis of the statement a few days later by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan:

"Last October Congress voted millions for military aid to South Korea. When the Reds attacked 8 months later, exactly $200 forth of signal corps wire was all that had been delivered."

Of the $150,000,000 in nonmilitary aid to Korea voted in February 1950, not 1 cent had been delivered when the aggression broke on June 25.

Commenting on this sad record, President Syngman Rhee of the South Korean Republic declared publicly:

"I asked for antitank guns. I did not get antitank guns. I asked for antiaircraft guns. I got none. I asked for ammunition for what few rifles we had. I got no ammunition. When the dreaded blow fell, we were able to oppose the strong North Korean air force with only 10 trainer planes—the best we could afford."

What kind of aid were we giving to Korea before the aggression? The answer was given by Edgar A. J. Johnson, Director of the Korean Division of ECA, on March 7, 1950, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (hearings, p. 372): "There is a vigorous program of reforestation going on, and at the present time there are being planted about 300,000,000 seedlings a year."

Does this fit in with the statement of Prof. Owen Lattimore, State Department consultant on Asia, on July 17, 1949? Said Lattimore: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not let it look as though we pushed it. Hence the recommendation of a parting grant of $150,000,000."

This, in broad outline, is the story of the Truman-Acheson policy in Korea, which, to date, has cost 50,000 American casualties.

Not until the State Department is housecleaned from top to bottom may the American people hope for deliverance from such incompetence and treachery.

Temporary Reorganization Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Temporary Reorganization Powers," published in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star.

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

TEMPORARY REORGANIZATION POWERS

The Senate has made a reasonable compromise in agreeing to give the President modified reorganization powers during the present emergency. Although the White House had asked for unrestricted authority to shift agencies or to consolidate them while the current defense crisis continues, the Senate insisted on retaining the right to veto any proposal within 18 days of submission. This was a marked concession, in view of the requirement of the 1949 Reorganization Act that Congress be given 60 days in which to disapprove any Presidential plan for executive reform.

Mr. Truman wanted Congress to reactivate a section of the War Powers Act of 1941 which gave the President blanket reorganization powers in time of national emergency. It was under that section that the late President Roosevelt created the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board, and numerous other temporary agencies—without specific legislative action.

The Korean situation today is not such as to cause critics of blanket Executive powers to change their minds as to the need for some congressional check on Presidential plans. Nor was there any fight by administration stalwarts in the Senate for acceptance of the President's original proposal. The principal debate was over the period which should be allowed for congressional action. The suggestions ranged from 12 to 30 days, with 18 finally approved. This would allow sufficient time for committee study and report. If neither the Senate nor the House should veto a proposed reorganization by a majority of the full membership, the plan would become operative. The 18-day limit would apply only to temporary reorganizations related to national defense, however. The 1949 law for permanent reorganization of the Government would not be weakened in any way. It should not be, for Congress still has a lot of work to do in the field of reform covered by the Hoover Commission.

Radios Render Great Public Service; KROX Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in these times, when it seems to be popular to criticize and to find fault, we very often overlook the great good accomplished by Americans and American industry.

I would like to single out just one industry today for a word of commendation. I refer to the radio stations of our Nation.

In this day of confusion, when many lands are subject to the iron rule of a dictatorship, we should note the contrast between the operation of American radio stations and those in some other nations. There are countries in the world, especially those behind the iron curtain, where radio is used constantly to divide and subjugate the people, to thwart the freedom of mankind, and to instill hatred and greed into the hearts of the citizens.

Compare this use of radio with the operation of the radio stations in America. We are all familiar with the public service programs of the American radio industry, the free time made available for the purpose of education and the sharing of knowledge, the programs dedicated to humanitarian causes, the unselfish devotion to the ideals of freedom of thought and expression, and the constant effort to make life better for all our people as well as the people of all the world.

The radio industry of America stands unchallenged in its service to the ideals

which are America's heritage and the industry asks nothing in return, being content to operate freely in a land where freedom is the paramount tradition.

While I am proud to pay this tribute to the radio industry of America as a whole, I would like to single out, as an example of the public-service record of the industry, a radio station in my own district. I refer to radio station KROX at Crookston, Minn.

Carrying on in the great tradition of the radio industry, Station KROX exemplifies the spirit of community cooperation and service of all radio stations in our Nation. Last year the area around Crookston suffered one of the most disastrous floods in history. It is not possible to determine the number of lives that were saved and the property damage that was avoided because of the part Station KROX and other radio stations in that area played in flood operations. It is sufficient to say the station and others were a strong beacon of mercy and refuge in that disaster.

A recent service performed by the Crookston station is best described in a story from the wires of the United Press:

Crookston authorities have captured a suspected hit and run driver after a public campaign for his arrest was launched by radio station KROX.

KROX posted a $100 reward for the suspect's arrest and invited the public to add to the reward fund. The station also broadcast a series of programs which urged the citizens of the Crookston area to contact the local police with any information they might have regarding the accident. It was through a tip offered to the sheriff by a listener of the station that led to the arrest.

I am proud of these services KROX is giving to its community. I am more proud to know that hundreds of radio stations, all over America, are equally vigilant and equally public spirited.

We need have no fear for the future of our democratic way of life as long as we have free and unafraid avenues of information. Our free way of life is safer and more secure because of the services of America's radio stations, television stations, newspapers, magazines, and other publications.

Exploration for Petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, development and exploration for petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico, which a little over 3½ years ago occupied the time of large number of crews, has now fallen off to such an extent, according to the testimony of Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the Offshore Lessees Committee, that there are now only four geophysical crews in operation off the coast of Texas and only five drilling rigs operating in the entire Gulf of Mexico.

This statement was made today before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of Senate Joint Resolution 20, introduced by the junior Senator from New Mexico and myself, to provide for the continuation of operations under leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hallanan's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF WALTER S. HALLANAN, PRESIDENT OF PLYMOUTH OIL CO., BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

My name is Walter S. Hallanan. I am president of Plymouth Oil Co., an independent producer and refiner, which owns a substantial interest in approximately 120,000 acres of oil and gas leases acquired through competitive bidding from the State of Texas in 1947 on submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico. I am appearing before you as chairman of the Offshore Lessees Committee, which consists of representatives of most of the holders of leases on submerged lands off the coasts of Texas, Louisiana, and California.

The committee will recall that at the hearings held in October 1949 on the subject of submerged lands, the offshore lessees presented detailed and comprehensive testimony in order to give you as complete and accurate picture of our offshore operations as was possible. We showed you a motion picture of our operations. Mr. E. F. Bullard, president of the Standard Oil and Gas Co., described the geology of and the geophysical work accomplished on the submerged lands in the Gulf of Mexico. Mr. H. H. Kaveler, assistant to the vice president in charge of production of Phillips Petroleum Co., testified with respect to drilling operations and production practices. Mr. Hines H. Baker, president of Humble Oil and Refining Co., discussed the equities of the holders of leases acquired from the respective States. Mr. Ernie E. Pyles, vice president of Jergins Oil Co., presented the facts concerning offshore operations in California.

At the hearings held before this committee last August on Senate Joint Resolution 195, Mr. Clayton Orn, counsel for the Ohio Oil Co.; Mr. W. W. Clary, counsel for Signal Oil & Gas Co.; and myself appeared in behalf of the offshore lessees to supplement the testimony previously given you. It is my understanding that the records of both those hearings during the Eighty-first Congress have been formally adopted as a part of the record of this hearing. It is the purpose of my testimony today to bring up to date the record with respect to offshore operations for oil and gas.

I am advised that current production from State leases on submerged lands off California (exclusive of production from the city of Long Beach) averages about 50,000 barrels per day. These leases cover 10,600 acres of submerged land. This oil is being produced from about 400 wells, the wellheads of which are located on the uplands, but the wells are drilled at an angle and bottomed out under the water. Operations off California are continuing under a series of stipulations which have been entered into annually by the State and the United States pending the determination of the location of the seaward line of California's inland waters—that is the line where the rights of the State end and the paramount powers of the United States begin under the Supreme Court's opinion in the case.

Of the total of 2,925,000 acres leased since 1945 by 30 operators from the States of Texas and Louisiana through competitive bidding, there remain outstanding leases covering 1,550,000 acres, or about 50 percent of the area originally leased. Leases covering about 400,000 acres have been surrendered within the past 6 months.

As of February 14 of this year, 235 wells had been drilled on these leases, resulting in 91 oil wells, 28 gas condensate wells, 4 dry gas wells, and 112 dry holes. These wells are located at distances from shore varying from 1 to 27 miles. The total oil produced up to the present time is estimated to be about 9,500,000 barrels. Present production, practically all of which is off Louisiana, amounts to about 20,000 barrels per day. Offshore operators have expended in excess of $250,000,000 in the search for oil in the Gulf of Mexico. The gross revenue from the oil produced has amounted to about $20,000,000.

I would like to call to your attention these facts which illustrate the extent to which activities in the Gulf have declined. Three and one-half years ago 48 geophysical crews were in operation. At present there are only four in operation, all off the coast of Texas. Eighteen months ago 26 drilling rigs were in operation. Six months ago the number had dropped to 14. At present 5 rigs are drilling off Louisiana and none off Texas. Unless some relief is granted, when these five wells are completed, drilling in the Gulf will be at a complete standstill.

On last December 11 the Supreme Court of the United States entered its decrees in the Texas and Louisiana cases. In these decrees the lessees were enjoined from carrying on any activities on these submerged lands except under authorization first obtained from the United States. On the same day the Secretary of the Interior issued a notice which, in effect, authorized those then conducting operations to continue them for a period of 60 days. A subsequent notice has extended the period for an additional 30 days, or until March 11. In other words, drilling of the five wells now being drilled and production from existing wells can be continued, but no new wells can be commenced. The Secretary stated in his notice:

"The relationship between the known domestic supplies of petroleum and the present and potential national needs, military and civilian, for petroleum is such that undue interruption of the present operations in the Gulf of Mexico would involve the risk of injury to our national security and economy. Moreover, the producing wells and the elaborate facilities used in drilling for and producing oil and gas in the submerged coastal lands are subjected to unusual risks of loss, injury, and deterioration through action by the elements, which can only be avoided or minimized by continuous and vigilant operation and maintenance. Such loss, injury, and deterioration, if permitted to occur, would be an economic waste in an operation of benefit to the national security and economy and productive of income to the Federal Government."

Gentlemen of the committee, we cannot overemphasize the great importance of adequate petroleum supplies in these critical times. Petroleum is the lifeblood of the machines of production and mobilization—whether on the farm or in the factory. It is the propelling power of practically all forms of transportation—whether on land, on sea, or in the air. It is the motive power for all our military forces—whether the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. History shows that our superiority in oil was a vital and decisive weapon in winning the past two World Wars. Our enemies' inferiority in oil hastened their ultimate defeat. Lord Curzon said of World War I, "The allied cause floated to victory on a wave of oil." Fleet Admiral Nimitz said that World War II was won with "bullets, beans, and oil." No one knows now

what our petroleum requirements would be in the event of another world conflict. We all agree that they will be staggering—even beyond the requirements of previous wars.

Let us look for a moment at our present petroleum picture. Today our domestic production of crude oil is approaching 6,000,000 barrels a day, and our Nation's partial mobilization plan is just beginning. This production is 1,100,000 barrels a day in excess of the peak production in World War II.

Today we are importing both crude oil and refined products in sizable quantities. According to the latest published report of the Bureau of Mines, which is for the month of November, we imported an average of 465,000 barrels of crude oil a day, 100,000 barrels a day coming from the Middle East and 365,000 barrels a day coming from Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela. We also imported from the Caribbean area about 450,000 barrels per day of refined products, mostly residual fuel oil. Total imports of crude oil and refined products are currently in excess of 1,000,000 barrels daily.

The impact of a world conflict on these foreign sources of supply is unpredictable. Many believe that the Middle East supply would be lost. In that event, we would not only be deprived of that oil we now utilize here at home, but we would also face the responsibility of furnishing from our own supplies the necessary petroleum requirements of our allies overseas, who are now receiving supplies from the Middle East. Production in the Middle East for November averaged 1,900,000 barrels daily.

Many are also concerned about the possibility of a substantial reduction in supplies from South American sources which might result from sabotage in those countries where the oil fields are located or from extensive submarine warfare along the shipping lanes.

With respect to the relationship of petroleum to our national defense, this committee will be interested in a request made by the Department of the Interior on January 29 of the National Petroleum Council, of which I am chairman. The Department informed the council that preliminary studies by the Petroleum Administration for Defense indicated that in the event of war there would be a sharp increase in the demand for petroleum requirements which would require large quantities of capital and materials, and the Department stated that the magnitude of the quantities was not known. However, the Department, which is specifically charged with the responsibility of seeing that adequate petroleum supplies are obtained to meet our civilian and military demands, requested the council to make a study of the capital and materials needed in order to increase the availability of petroleum products in the Western Hemisphere by 1,000,000 barrels per day. That study is already under way. This assignment, which I consider to be one of the most important that the National Petroleum Council has been called upon to undertake, is certainly indicative of the staggering demands we may have to meet.

If the necessity arises, how can we be prepared to replace the petroleum imports which we might lose, to supply our allies who might be cut off from their present sources of supplies, and, at the same time, to satisfy the tremendous increases in military and essential civilian requirements at home which would result from another world conflict?

For one thing, we must intensify our exploratory activities. We must intensify our drilling activities, both exploratory and development, in an attempt to discover new oil fields as well as to develop fully and rapidly the existing fields. We must build up a reserve productive capacity which will be available immediately to meet the demands of any emergency. As the late Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, said: "I do wish to emphasize that undeveloped oil fields provide no power for machines of either war or peace."

When we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, we were in a position to increase our production immediately and within maximum efficient rates by more than 800,000 barrels a day. At present, according to the best informed opinion, our reserve productive capacity is only about 450,000 barrels per day. It is imperative that this cushion of safety so vital to our existence be very substantially increased with the utmost speed.

Of great importance to our Nation's energy supplies are the very large natural gas reserves that have been discovered off the coast of Louisiana. Natural gas is an essential fuel for many of our basic industries. Plans have been made and contracts entered into requiring the development of these gas fields, and the laying of marine pipelines to transport the gas to shore, where it will enter gas transportation lines for distribution throughout the eastern half of the United States, thereby adding substantially to the supplies we need to satisfy the ever-increasing fuel demands of our mobilization program.

These submerged lands which are the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 20 offer one of the largest potential producing areas in the continental United States yet to be extensively tested. Much of the time-consuming work of exploring any new area is already behind us. We have spent years on research and gained years of experience in the solution of the physical problems of operating on the submerged lands. We have designed, built, and assembled large quantities of equipment peculiarly adapted to the search for oil in the open sea. We estimate that about $100,000,000 has been spent on such equipment. We have employed and trained many men in this highly specialized, costly, and technical work. We have already located many prospects by means of geophysical surveys and have purchased leases on them. Some of these have been tested resulting in discoveries. Others have been failures. Many of them remain untested by the drill.

Unfortunately, however, we are in a position where we are powerless to move. We have been enjoined by the Supreme Court. The Secretary of the Interior cannot give us relief. As he stated in his report dated January 29 to the chairman of this committee concerning this joint resolution, "guidance from the Congress is needed for the program of expanded development referred to above."

If we are permitted to resume our work, I firmly believe we will substantially increase our producing capacity. I have talked with many offshore operators and I can assure this committee that if the necessary permission is granted, the extent of offshore operations will soon surpass the peak of all previous activities.

It is difficult to estimate how much additional production and reserves will be developed by these efforts. I understand it is the belief of some operators that the daily production from fields already discovered in the Gulf could be more than doubled in 6 to 8 months. I also know it is the opinion of some operators that, depending on the magnitude of new discoveries, it may be possible to increase production in the Gulf by two to three hundred thousand barrels daily within the next 2 to 3 years.

But in any event, to fail to permit the utilization of our experience, our special equipment, our trained personnel, and our geological and geophysical knowledge in an effort to discover and make available, for immediate use during the critical years ahead, this strategic material so essential to our Nation's very existence, would unnecessarily jeopardize our national security. It could even be disastrous.

The offshore lessees believe that the provisions relating to operations on the submerged lands contained in Senate Joint Resolution 20 will enable us to move forward and resume our earnest endeavors to discover and develop vitally needed petroleum reserves. The resumption of these operations will provide additional insurance for this Nation's security, which we just cannot afford to deny to the people of this country.

Gentlemen, we must not risk having too little, too late.

Farm Prices Not in Line With Farm Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, too often, in these days of high prices and high costs, we hear complaints that the farmer is getting too much. I would like to point out that the prices of things which the farmer must buy have risen many times more than have the prices of the things he sells.

Even in figuring parity the farmer is not brought into a true position regarding his costs and selling price of his products.

I would like to put into the RECORD a letter I received from a farmer in my district in Minnesota. Mr. Axel Burman, of Trail, Minn., points out some facts which prove the farmer is not over-paid, rather his position is not even equitable with the rest of the Nation because his costs have gone up so much faster than his income. Mr. Burman's letter follows:

TRAIL, MINN., *January 22, 1951.*
Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After sealing my other letter I come to wander back to 1915, when I started farming, before the First War I. A 7-foot binder was $125. An International 7-foot is now $650, same size, same make. A disk harrow—14 disk—was $40; in 1951, $180—1915, $40. Help was 25 cents per hour in 1915. Help now is $1 per hour, 1951, board and room included now as well as then in 1915. A bushel of wheat was $1 in 1915. A bushel of wheat is $2 now in 1951. No wonder the industry wants war.

At that time we raised our own horses, which was our power. We raised our own oats and hay, which was our fuel. Now we buy a tractor at somewhere around $2,000. This tractor eats about 30 gallons regular gasoline per day, or about $6 per day. It's all making a much expensive way of farming.

Still we are required to make both ends meet with double the price of wheat, whereas the industry not only asks but gets five times as much for their product, and most times, if not always, is producing poorer grades of merchandise, something a farmer cannot get by with.

Our wheat has to weigh up or you get No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, and down goes the price. This holds good on anything we raise or buy. Equally, horses now are worthless. Manpower is too high. Machinery must take the place, but not at a gain for the farmer. No; at a loss. The farmer struggles along, overworking himself, and many a time his wife putting in 14 to 18 hours per day, where industry only works 40 hours per week.

Hoping you will do something about it,
Sincerely,

AXEL BURMAN.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, few indeed are the men who have been equally famous in the military annals of America and of their own European homeland. Perhaps they could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Kosciusko is one of them.

In these days when the dark clouds of despotism threaten to veil the bright sun of freedom and leave the world in the old darkness, it is a happy task to recall the career of the first foreign patriot to come to the aid of America in 1776. Kosciusko did not have to come. This was not his country. But he loved liberty. He greatly desired it for his own Poland, but the time had not come. When will it come?

But across the sea was America fighting to be free. Perhaps he could help. And if he lived he could use his experience in freeing Poland, too. Thoroughly trained in the art of war and especially in military engineering, his services were invaluable to the American cause throughout the Revolution. For he came early and stayed late—as long as there was necessary work for him to do. As we review the record we wonder what our brave but untrained patriots would have done without his educated skill. America was unprepared for the engineering required by a full-scale war. Kosciusko had trained for years in the best schools of Europe. And as we read the story of this achievements we are impressed with the superiority of his plans. When his counsel was followed success came so far as success was dependent on engineering. When his suggestions were disregarded, the results were likely to be disastrous, as at Ticonderoga where he wanted to fortify Sugar Loaf Hill, but his superiors decided that it was unnecessary; and the British came and fortified the hill, forcing the Americans out of Ticonderoga. Among his accomplishments we may count a good portion of the success at Saratoga, which led to French intervention and victory; and the development of the fortifications at West Point where he spent 2 years rearing works which to this day bear indisputable testimony to his skill. From August 1780 until the last shot was fired Kosciusko aided the highly mobile southern campaign, planning transportation and at times fighting as a cavalry officer. His brilliant work elicited the highest praise from General Greene. Belatedly Congress made him a brigadier general.

Returning to Poland Kosciusko fought the Russians in 1792 and again in 1794, and might have saved his nation if all his countrymen had been like him. In the latter year he was defeated and captured while gallantly fighting against overwhelming odds.

Hope for a season, bade the world farewell,
And freedom shriek'd, as Kosciusko fell.

The Russians imprisoned him for 2 years. When released he made his way to America expecting to make this country his final home. Congress voted him money and lands, a part of which went to found one of the first schools for Negroes in the United States.

When Kosciusko heard that there was new hope of freeing Poland from the domination of other powers, he returned to France in 1798 and spent the rest of his life until his death in 1817 in efforts as earnest as they were futile to restore his native land to her once proud status among the nations.

He is enshrined forever in the hearts of all lovers of liberty. He does not need our few words of appreciation and praise. But we need now as never before to remember often and well the example he has left us of a broad love for human freedom, reaching out beyond the narrow borders of State and country to any people struggling against despotic tyranny.

His dust in Poland rests—
His urned heart a shrine!
Poland! He is thy son!
Columbia! Also thine!

Causes of Our Present Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration is trying to hide behind every possible screen rather than face the true reason for our present inflation. Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD an excerpt from an editorial which appears in the February 12, 1951, issue of the Freeman:

The domestic economic policy administered from Washington has now touched heights of absurdity beyond the reach of any satirist. The administration is permitting, encouraging, and ordering inflation at a mounting rate. At the end of 1939 the volume of money (as measured by demand deposits and currency outside of banks) totaled $86,000,000,000. In May of 1950 it totaled $109,000,000,000. At the end of December it reached $117,000,000,000. Here is the inflation. Here is the increase in monetary purchasing power bidding for goods. Here is the cause of the constant fall in the value of the dollar.

Yet the Secretary of the Treasury has chosen this moment to announce that the interest rate on long-term Government bonds will be kept down to 2½ percent. This inevitably means further inflation. For the Federal Reserve Banks will be forced to support the bonds at levels to yield that rate. In buying such bonds, they pay for them by creating still more money and bank deposits.

Then the administration turns around and pretends to protect the citizens from its own inflation by throwing blanket price and wage ceilings over the entire economy—with the usual political loopholes for the pressure groups. This order is so absurd that even the administrators who framed it won't defend it. An official of the Office of Price Stabilization immediately announced that it was working to cure the absurdities and inequities in yesterday's freeze. We may confidently predict that it will cure some absurdities and inequities only by creating new ones.

The truth is that price control is a completely spurious remedy for inflation. Its political function is to divert attention from the real cause, which is the Government's own fiscal and monetary policies, and to put the blame on the wicked businessmen.

Congress and a Knowledge of How It Serves Is the Crux of Real Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by Miss Virginia Eileen Miller, executive secretary of the Committee for Congress, to request publication of the article by Henry Stoner, former Washington newspaperman, which points out that the very crux of real Americanism is Congress. It is a pleasure for me to comply with this request because the Committee for Congress is trying to make available to schools, colleges, and adult study groups material which is now available about the work of the Congress of the United States and its Members.

(By Henry Stoner)

The very crux of the real Americanism is Congress. It is the last great institution of free government in the world. Too many people do not know much about it. Even doctors of philosophy in political science, for instance, have never read a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our Voice of America is missing a great bet in not plugging Congress more, Congress as an institution, Congress as individual men and women.

Congress is the one national institution which binds America together as a nation, as America, as the United States of America.

Congress is the only institution which truly differentiates America from Russia, or any other totalitarianism, in the final analysis.

Congress is the one element which makes America truly American. All governments, whether totalitarian or democratic or constitutional, etc., have executive branches, and all wise people know that all executive branches are finally controlled, whether totalitarian or democratic.

Only the legislative branch—and Russia and all other dictatorships have no legislative, truly free legislative branch—in the final analysis represents all the people for whatever they want, and I say not disdainfully, for as far as earthly affairs go, the voice of the people is the voice of right.

The legislative branch must consider, must reconsider, must be completely alert to what is called public opinion.

The executive branch of government is the power branch. The judicial branch is the legal branch. Common sense, where common sense is of a beneficent, ameliorative nature, is in full bloom in the people's, the legislative, the congressional branch. Five hundred and thirty-one men and women, 96 in the Senate and 435 in the House, are less apt to go wrong in expressing the wishes of the people, than 10 citizens, the President and 9 Justices of the Supreme Court.

The real America is, after all is said and done, the Congress. If America lives, Congress lives; if Congress lives, America lives.

This is my affirmative conception of my native land, the United States of America.

The one thing that the Hisses and the Remingtons and all the bright young men who went sour on about America, was that they failed to understand, to depend upon the legislative processes to achieve ends. America is means, not ends. The "Commies" say that life is the end, not the means.

America knows that honest ends presume honest means, and that the two are inseparable. You must first start with honest means, and always strive to be civilized and Christian, and it is only a matter of time until your ends are right, are righteous. And the discussion of means is with the legislative, the Congress.

That is my philosophy. I believe it to be correct. I have studied thoroughly to discern the right.

When I say that America is at her gravest hour I do not mean to be neurotic or hasty. This is the real hour of reexamination.

The older we get the more we crave the good old days. That phrase, that concept, viz, "the good old days," implies the days of peace, the days when we had understanding, the days when problems seemed to have ready answers. Yes, the days when a basic, honest, simple philosophy was held.

And like all beginners, we look back to our national parents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Ordinance of 1787. These constitute the American manifesto (sic), these are the same to Christian America that the Kremlin would like to make the cynical, devilish Marxian manifesto to Russia and the world the Russian tyrants seeks to dominate. Russian communism is an atheistic philosophy that denies the right of the free individual a voice in his own national destiny. That is why I believe that the voice of the people, as expressed through our Congress, holds the solution of our national and international problems today.

And I believe with Wilson that ours is primarily a congressional Government. Hence to promote, as the Committee for Congress is trying to promote, a better understanding of the Congress of the United States and the responsiblities and duties and accomplishments of our Representatives and Senators in Congress, is a sacred occupation. I, as an ordinary American, therefore congratulate the Committee for Congress in this undertaking. Ever yours for the Congress of the United States of America.

The Committee for Congress, 1060 National Press Building, RE-5399, Washington, D. C., is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, educational project using Your Congress Magazine, press, radio, television, motion pictures, and other education and informational media to create a better understanding of our legislative processes. All loyal citizens are invited to utilize its facilities or to assist in its work.

Postal Employees Need a Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt that the postal employees definitely need a raise in pay. As a group they have been discriminated against. At present the pay schedule for postal clerks ranges from $2,670 to $3,770 a year, divided into 11 pay grades, with a $100-per-year differential between each pay grade.

The only increase which postal clerks and letter carriers can receive above these pay grades are merit-grade increases. The merit-grade increase is $100 per year after 13 years of service, a second $100 increase after 18 years, and a third $100 increase after 28 years of service.

I have received hundreds of letters from postal employees in Milwaukee telling of their need for an increase in pay. These letters speak more eloquently than anything I can say.

I include herewith excerpts from some of these letters:

I make $2,970 a year on which I'm supposed to support my wife and child. Could you live on that amount of money?

I am going on my fifth year at the post office, yet a man working next to me who started to work at the same time I did or later, but who comes under another law gets $1,000 a year more than I.

We were much better off in 1939 when we were getting $2,100. Our rent at that time was $37 and now it's $82.

We allot no money for recreation inasmuch as our budget cannot stand it.

I have been in the postal service for going on 13 years. Never before have we had such difficulty making both ends meet. My wife has been forced to seek employment, leaving our two children home alone at night.

I had to acquire a part-time job to augment my postal salary.

It is very difficult for us to make our take-home pay meet the simplest necessities of life.

In my case, I'm married and have one child. I'm trying to pay off my home. My pay grade is $2,970.

I'm getting tired of working 12 to 14 hours a day to earn a living for my wife and three boys. To top this we live in a two-car garage.

My wife is working, but now that she is, we don't get to see each other very often. I see her about 15 minutes every morning.

I cannot make ends meet at this rate of pay. My take-home pay is $129.32 twice a month.

We have had to drop the hospital insurance we carried to ease the strain on our food budget.

With the overtime taken away from regular postal employees, can you blame any of our boys, some with 10 years service, leaving the postal service and looking for outside employment?

Only one thing has remained stationary and that is my wages.

I am compelled to take a part-time job to live decently.

I make $2,970 and it sure is tough to make ends meet.

I find I must buy very carefully, and then only the most essential things to make my pay check reach.

Whenever an unforseen emergency arises such as illness in the family, I am forced to borrow.

We are in dire need.

Living from one pay day to the next is no joy.

I have had one new suit in the last 5 years.

Expenses like insurance, medical, and so on, we must skimp on in order not to fall into debt.

We have no weapon such as strikes and walk-outs.

My family has been retrenching for the past 2 years, to the point where we are learning to fight.

Cigarettes is our only luxury. There is no entertainment. We have been to the show once in the past 2 years.

It's rough getting along on $2,870.

Even a movie for relaxation is an event.

I am tired of working 12 and 13 hours a day to give my family a decent place to live.

I am just barely hanging on to my insurance and Blue Cross.

My wife does part-time work whenever possible.

I just borrowed $1,500 to pay clothing and fuel bills.

My wife has been forced to obtain full-time employment in order to make ends meet.

The raise you Senators voted yourselves, $2,500 per year, practically represents my yearly salary.

Get rid of several hundred women in our Milwaukee office and give a man a chance to support his family in a good American way is accustomed to * * *

I can barely eke out an existence.

I am the mother of four children—in order to give them the necessities, I have worked part time, over a period of years.

The morale at the post office has hit an all-time low and the work being turned out is just as low.

We have had to cash savings bonds that were intended for future security, in order to meet our current bills.

I have not been fortunate enough, as yet, to find outside work to fit in with present tour of duty.

We have no children. Why? And leave them to run around like little unfed and underclothed bums.

I will have to seek additional work to make ends meet.

I have been in service for 2 years and have had to have a part-time job most of the time to make ends meet.

I would like a car, a home of my own, but that is out of the question.

I am making $2,870; after all living deductions, I have a total of $86 for foolishness such as clothes, car, and recreation.

It seems illogical to me that Congress will authorize billions of dollars to be spent under the Marshall plan and then leave their own employees in such a desperate financial strait.

After deductions, what is left for me? Zero.

In the past, I have had to take out three different loans to make ends meet.

I have to live with my in-laws to make ends meet.

I have been in the postal service for 14 years and our salary has never been up to par.

Postal service is steadily losing its attractiveness.

We clerks are way behind the eight ball since prices have started to zoom.

It is utterly impossible to meet today's needs and stay out of the red.

We are still getting along on our regular salaries as of before this high price fluctuation.

We simply cannot make ends meet.

Please help me to attain a fair standard of living.

Our salaries have not kept pace with those paid by private employers.

I am asking for enough of a wage raise to allow me to clothe, feed and provide adequate insurance protection for my family.

We are 2 years behind other labor in salary adjustments.

Our plight is deplorable.

If some misfortune strikes us, we are forced into debt or deeper into debt.

All I make is $3,070 a year and I pay out a year about $1,314.94.

My salary of $2,870 per annum is just a means of existing, not living.

I am a newly married man and I have my wife working as I cannot make things go on my salary.

We are taking an awful lot of punishment now for the future.

I realize the importance of economy in Government, but it should not be taken out of the workers' hide.

I am fortunate enough to be single yet. I could not even think of getting married and supporting a wife with wages of this kind.

The Government is sending billions of dollars overseas to help other countries and closes their eyes to their own employees.

This is not a shining example of our President's declaration of prosperity here in the United States.

The fixed income is one sad affair.

I am resigned to the absence of beer in the ice box.

My wife is employed. Before she went to work, we sold our savings bonds and borrowed money on life-insurance policies.

Congress, too often, waits, sidetracks, stalls, and what have you, to pass bills for the postal workers.

I am a clerk in the $3,870 grade and received my last longevity increase of $100 per year on October 1, 1950. Coupled with the fact that new taxes were imposed also on October 1, 1950, I wound up with the earth-shaking pay increase of 1 cent.

Who can be blamed but those in charge—namely, the President, Congress, and the Cabinet head, who seems to think that we, as his charges, should be satisfied with just anything.

We have an empty house. How can we ever buy furniture for it?

I buy a bond out of my pay check, but have to cash them in every time we buy something for the home.

I have worked as a letter carrier for 8 years and my take-home pay is $65.

This hand-to-mouth existence is disgusting, especially with the Democrats sending so much money overseas.

My wife and I have very little social enjoyment. We don't own a home or furniture.

Before I started to work part time, we had to borrow from a loan company between pay days so we had food in the house.

A married man with a family is unable to save anything or even put away a dollar for a rainy day.

Congress Ignored Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 16, 1951:

CONGRESS IGNORED AGAIN

Defense Secretary Marshall's announcement that the United States plans to send 100,000 more troops to Europe undoubtedly will take a lot of steam out of debate over America's participation in the integrated army of defense to be raised by the Atlantic Pact nations.

The extent to which the United States would provide Ground Forces for the European army under the supreme allied command of General Eisenhower has been one of the most controversial issues of the debate. The Defense Secretary's clarifying statement is expected to soften opposition to the troops-for-Europe plan, inasmuch as the announced strength this Nation will furnish is much less than previously had been indicated.

But the announcement still fails to remove one highly controversial question involved not only in the Atlantic Pact program, but in other critical matters of foreign policy. That is the right of Congress to express the will of its membership and to have a voice in the formulation of policies and commitments vitally affecting the welfare and security of the American people.

Consistently has the President refused to take Congress into his confidence or to consult with leaders other than those of his own political clique in the framing of policy during the grave international crisis. Nor has he seen fit to apprise the public at large of the true facts of the situation when such a revelation unquestionably would have brought greater unity and more concerted action on the part of the people.

The Marshall announcement is indicative that once again Congress has been ignored in the formulation of European policy. The number of troops to be dispatched to that continent apparently already has been decided upon and only under pressure has the figure been made available to Congress.

Repeatedly in the past few months has the President appealed for national unity, both on the part of Congress and the public. While making the appeal with one hand, however, he has seen fit to pursue with the other his stubborn, lone, and domineering role in the international game.

Never in the history of this Nation has the need for unified action been greater. But it cannot be achieved through mere lip service on the part of the President. He must demonstrate that the executive branch of the Government is ready to give the same cooperation to Congress that he demands of that body.

The value of having the Nation solidly behind the dispatch of additional American troops to Europe is great, and every reasonable effort should be made to obtain it.

Regardless of the President's authority to commit troops to combat in foreign areas without congressional consent, unity will be achieved far more readily and far more qickly if matters of such vital importance are submitted to the Congress, whose Members are the duly elected representatives of the people.

Induction of Conscientious Objectors Into the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Irven J. Blum Post, No. 1609, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of York, Nebr.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas during any period of national emergency it is the duty of all citizens called upon to serve their country in the Armed Forces; and

Whereas due to religious training and beliefs, certain persons object to serving in the Armed Forces during such time of national emergency; and

Whereas such persons could be of extreme value to the Armed Forces in other than combat units within those forces; and

Whereas it is felt that such persons should not be shown preference over those others who also hold life dear to themselves, but who are willing to forfeit their lives for the protection of our Nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Irven J. Blum Post, No. 1609, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of York, Nebr., in regular session, recommend to the national VFW, through channels, that a request be made to the Congress of the United States that the Selective Service Act of 1948 be revised to eliminate this situation; and be it further

Resolved, That such persons, known as conscientious objectors, be inducted into the Armed Forces with the understanding that they shall not bear actual arms, but that they shall be required to perform such other duties as may be needed and required.

L. HAROLD HAMLIN,
Commander, Department of Nebraska.
Adopted February 15, 1951.

Contributions of Massachusetts to the Development and Growth of the City of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by George T. Hines, representing Hon. Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on Sunday, February 11, 1951, on the occasion of the twenty-eighth annual Massachusetts State Sunday at Valley Forge, and conducted under the auspices of the Massachusetts State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

The address follows:

Anyone who has studied Washington, its origin, the long period of its growth, and its present-day maturity, must be struck with the fact that in a physical sense it was the work of many persons who brought it to fruition, persons who were called to the Capital City, brought their knowledge and their skills, made their contributions, and in most cases departed.

Each receding tide, however, left behind it some who remained, either to continue their labors, to direct the work of those arriving, or to finish projects of long duration.

The contributions of Massachusetts to the city and its governmental and private structures, the memorials and decorations by those who either were native or adopted citizens of the State are in the aggregate, outstanding, and predominant.

Massachusetts' men probably contributed more to the physical aspects of Washington than those from any other State, particularly during the years of great development and growth.

This was the period when the artistic history of Massachusetts was virtually the history of art in the United States, for many of the outstanding painters and sculptors were either born in Massachusetts, educated there, or made their homes there.

Legislators and governmental executives from Massachusetts who made decisions in these matters were well advanced in their thinking, chiefly concerned with the future and permanence, and by their decisions they have built into Washington some of the permanence that is Massachusetts.

The Washington of today was only a dream in the mind of the obscure French architect and military engineer, Pierre Charles L'Enfant, when he developed the plan for the Federal City under the supervision of President Washington, who selected the site, and the Congress of 1790, which authorized it.

Up to and through the Civil War, L'Enfant's plan was either forgotten or considered too large. In 1860, the city had not a street light. Pigs roamed the principal streets, the wastes of Washington were disposed in open sewers and there were no pavements except a few patches.

While the physical aspects of the sprawling metropolis gave glaring evidence of its uncompleteness, even this early period indicated it would be a big city some day. Some of the greatest minds America has produced were offering their contributions to make the Nation great and its center of government achieve the position it occupies today, the most outstanding capital city in the world.

The year 1870 marked the beginning of a new and effective physical development of Washington. The streets were paved, gas lamps installed and a central sewer system begun. Soon Washington had more paved streets than any city in the country.

The second great drastic change in the city's appearance was inaugurated by the Treasury Department under President Coolidge of Massachusetts whose administration started the huge Federal Triangle development and the reconstruction of the Mall program under the general plan of Frederick Law Olmsted of Brookline, Mass.

What is not so generally known and appreciated, however, is the great influence Massachusetts architects, planners, and landscape engineers had on the present aspects of the city, not to include the Massachusetts sculptors and painters who enhanced and ornamented the buildings, public squares, and left behind them probably greater contributions of art than those from any other state.

The work of developing Washington is never complete, and tomorrow may witness the influence of other persons who have either been born or received their education in Massachusetts, and who will continue the contributions that Massachusetts proudly makes to the capital city of all capital cities—Washington.

With the exception of Pierre Charles L'Enfant, no one has had so profound an influence on the development of Washington, or contributed more to the beautification of its physical lay-out and its parks as two Massachusett's men, Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., and his son, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.

Recognized as the foremost landscape architects in the country, they spent most of their lives in Brookline, Mass., where the company bearing their name still has its headquarters.

Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr. (1822–1903), planned the grounds immediately surrounding the Capitol and designed the terraces, which add so immeasurably to the dignity of the Capitol Building when viewed from the west. He also planned the landscaping of the Boston parks as well as the park systems of many other cities in the country.

Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., designed the present Mall and Union Square, and had a part in the developing of the Federal Triangle, containing most of the modern Government office buildings. The Mall, Union Square, and the Government buildings make up the area that lies between the Capitol and the Washington Monument.

The Jefferson Memorial landscape was designed by the Olmsteds. Olmsted made a special report on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, which is now under way, and designed the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial, which is to be erected on an island in the Potomac River. He also developed a plan for reconstructing the Washington Monument grounds, which is about to be started.

He was consulted in the development of the portion of the Capitol Grounds between the Capitol and the Union Station. At the present time, an effort is under way to have an Olmsted Park in Washington named after both father and son. While Mr. Olmsted, Jr., has maintained his interest in the planning and physical improvement of the city since his retirement in 1932, his place on the National Capital Park and Planning Commission was taken at that time by one of his associates in Boston, Henry V. Hubbard of Milton, Mass., professor of city planning at Harvard University, who died in 1947.

Mr. Hubbard carried through to completion a number of the plans developed by Mr. Olmsted, as well as contributing many of his own ideas, particularly in the recent development of the Jefferson Memorial and the lagoon, famous for the display of cherry blossoms every Easter season.

Mr. Hubbard was succeeded in the membership of the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission by Dean William Worcester, head of the School of Architecture and planning at MIT.

The position of Director of Planning of the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission has, with the exception of a few years at its inception, been always held by Massachusetts men.

Massachusetts may well take pride in the contributions of its citizens in the building of the Capitol, its contents, and surroundings. Charles Bulfinch, native of Boston, the first American-born architect, is one of the three men credited with developing the design of the Capitol.

Bulfinch, recognized as one of the greatest architects this country has produced, designed the present State House in Boston, the old Connecticut State House at Hartford, and the Maine State Capitol in Augusta. Many public and private buildings in New England, a number of the old residences in Boston, and many of the spires and edifices of New England churches are built from the designs of Bulfinch.

With the completion of the original structure, Bulfinch remained as Architect of the Capitol. It was he who determined that the front of the building was to be the eastern approach. It was he who laid out the original landscape design of the grounds, the western steps and fence that faces what is now the downtown section of the city.

Probably the most conspicuous statue in the Capital Grounds is on the west plaza. It is the seated figure of Chief Justice John Marshall and is the work of William W. Story, of Salem, son of Associate Justice Joseph Story, of the United States Supreme Court.

The bronze doors of the Capitol were cast in Chicopee, Mass. All through the Capitol Building, many statues and paintings are on display, some of them depicting Massachusetts events. A number of the statues and busts represent well-known Massachusetts men.

Of those most significant, however, a majority of the paintings and busts in the Capitol are the work of Massachusetts artists.

The erection and the expansion of the Library of Congress is a monument to Dr. Herbert Putnam, who in 1899 was called from the position of librarian of the Boston Public Library to accept the post of Librarian of the Congressional Library. Dr. Putnam is still living in Washington.

Much of the exterior and interior statues, murals, frescoes, and mosaics are the work of Massachusetts sculptors and painters.

Among the private collections in the Library are those loaned or contributed by Massachusetts men and women.

You may remember that President John Adams, of Massachusetts, was the first to occupy the White House. Many of the paintings in the White House are by George Peter Healy, born in Boston in 1813.

A few days ago I had the pleasure of inspecting the unfinished White House from cellar to roof. As you know, the old White House is now merely a shell, inside of which a modern building is being built. It is not generally known that several hundred people work in or are connected with the White House and apart from the danger of collapse of the old building was the fact that facilities were completely inadequate. So the new building, instead of being one-story deep, is now three stories deep and will extend well out underneath the White House lawn on the Pennsylvania Avenue side.

The old sandstone foundations to the front doors of the White House are being retained. On the underside of these stones can still be seen the black marks from the burning of the White House by the British in the War of 1812.

Incidentally, you can obtain pieces of wood, stone, bricks, and old hand-made nails from the old White House by writing to the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, Fort Meyer, Va. These souvenirs are given freely, but there is a charge made for shipping and transportation.

The story of the Washington Monument is most romantic; and while this monument to Washington had been first proposed in 1783, it was not until 1848 before the Monument was started, with a grant of land from Congress.

It took 37 years to complete the Monument; and curiously enough, Speaker of the House Robert C. Winthrop, of Boston, not alone officiated at the laying of the cornerstone in 1848, but he lived to dedicate it in 1885.

Part of the marble in the Monument was from Massachusetts, but the entire solid inside wall is of Massachusetts granite.

The Smithsonian Institution, the National Art Gallery, and the Corcoran Art Gallery have many paintings and works of art by Massachusetts men, most of whom are familiar to you; such men as, Whistler, Copley, Sargent, Homer, and Gilbert Stuart, whose painting of General Washington is probably the most distinguished portrait we have of the Father of our Country.

You may remember that this was the painting that Dolly Madison rescued when the British arrived to burn the White House. Cutting it from its frame, she fled across the street to the so-called Blair House, where the President now has his temporary home, and she watched the burning of the White House and her precious possessions from a window, with the painting still clutched tightly under her arm.

May I point out that the Blair House was built in 1810 and its first occupant was Dr. Joseph Lovell, of Boston, when he was Surgeon General of the Army. It was later the home of George Bancroft, of Massachusetts, Secretary of the Navy, who is credited with establishing the present Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Several of the great churches in Washington have interesting Massachusetts connections. The Episcopal Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul has practically, from its origin, been erected under the direction of distinguished Boston architects. This is also true of the great Catholic National Shrine on the grounds of Catholic University.

The All Souls Unitarian Church was designed by Boston men, and it was here that Dr. Edward Everett Hale, of Boston, author of "The Man Without a Country," began his ministerial career.

Significant to this day, is the fact that the original Lincoln Statue in Lincoln Square, Washington, showing the Great Emancipator freeing the slaves, is the work of Thomas Ball, of Charlestown, Mass. The present magnificant Lincoln Memorial was designed by Henry Bacon, descendant of an old Dedham, Mass., family and the statue itself is the work of Daniel Chester French, who while born in New Hampshire, spent practically his whole life in Massachusetts. May I at this point interject a little personal story, and it is, I believe, told for the first time here.

During the last war when Washington was almost completely blacked-out, I had occasion to take a walk down to the Lincoln Memorial, a huge, shadowy mass in the darkness. The only light in the vicinity was a faint, blue light, shining on the statue of Lincoln.

My son and I started up the stairs but were stopped by a chain stretched across and a guard who informed us that the monument was not open to the public after 5 p. m.

We stopped and chatted with the guard and he told us this very interesting story: The only people that were allowed up to the statue at night were distinguished leaders who came there alone—to think out their vexatious problems and crystallize their momentous decisions—in front of the statute of the Great Emancipator.

They would approach alone in the darkness, be recognized faintly in the very dim light, and after asking permission would proceed up the long stairs.

After they disappeared up the steps in the darkness, their footsteps—back and forth—in front of the statue—made the only sound that rose above the murmur of the great city. They would usually remain a half-hour or more, and their returning footsteps would bring the guard again to attention. With a friendly salute, they would disappear on their way back to their offices.

It is entirely believable to me that these men, oppressed with the weight of their decisions, found restoration and peace at the feet of the statue of the Great Emancipator—the great peace and restoration of spirit that we all find in other temples—dedicated to Christ.

When men such as these, living today in their public lives, can find clarity and decision and renewed strength before the statue of Lincoln, we can be sure that the lessons he taught us of tolerance, honesty, patience under overwhelming and bitter attack, fearlessness to do right as he saw it, still dominate the decisions and lives of our leaders, we can be convinced that the destiny of America still is in good hands.

The statue of Lincoln significantly faces the monument to his great predecessor, Washington, looking directly toward the Capitol. These three great structures dominate the Washington skyline, a constant reminder of the struggles our forefathers went through to establish and maintain our country, our liberties, and our national character. They are bound to be great inspiration and a guide to our national leaders as they decide on the future of our country today.

The wisdom of Washington and the humanity of Lincoln still guides our destinies.

Facts on Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in all the current debate about prices and the ever increasing cost of living, a determined effort is being made to paint the farmer as the chief villian. Those who point the finger of guilt at the American farmers as responsible for increased living costs just don't have the facts.

It is only fair to listen to the facts on both sides of the controversy. I am sure, when the American people have all the information about food costs, they will readily admit that prices paid to the farmer are not the chief factor in the high cost of living.

Facts on food prices are ably presented in the following article from the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press which was written by one of the country's ablest farm authorities, Alfred D. Stedman.

FACTS ON FOOD PRICES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In the hubbub over rising food prices, millions of fingers are now being pointed in accusation. A concert of voices names the alleged offender. The Washington storekeeper, selling dollar-a-dozen eggs to Sen. Thye put the bee on the popular culprit—the farmer, he said, and Government-supported egg prices. The baker, talking about higher bread prices, emphasized wheat and other ingredient costs.

The housewife, buying apples at 10 cents a pound; the soft drink consumer laying costs to sugar prices; even the cocktail hound soaking up highballs at 50 cents a drink while orating against milk prices at 18 cents a quart—all of these lately have seemed agreed as to where the blame belongs. That is on the farmer, on the huge Government stores of food bought in supporting farm prices, and on the allegedly fantastic Government losses on farm purchases and farm subsidies.

But reasonable people will no doubt be interested in knowing the relevant facts, not on just one side, but on both sides of that story.

As to eggs, it is true that farm prices did advance rather sharply (28 percent) above the unusually low price a year earlier. The price has been steadily moderating from the peak.

But as a farmer and producer of eggs on his farm near Northfield, Senator Thye talking to the Washington seller had the facts first about farm prices of eggs. Those prices on Thye's farm had been nowhere near $1 a dozen, but about 42 cents. The Government wasn't supporting them, but stopped that on December 31. So in blaming $1-a-dozen eggs on Government-supported farm prices, the Washington storekeeper was 100 percent wrong.

As to bread, not over one-fifth of what the consumer pays for his loaf goes to the wheat farmer. On December 15 wheat prices were up just 6 percent from their level a year earlier. That rise wouldn't account for a rise of one-fifth of a cent for a loaf of bread. All the farm ingredients put together, including lard as well as wheat, do not account for one-third of the consumer bread price. Almost two-thirds of the consumer price goes to the baker and retailer.

Recently one of THYE's colleagues, Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, made this statement: "In June 1948 the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel; the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread, 13.8 cents. But in October 1950 the price of wheat had dropped to $1.91 a bushel, whereas the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread had risen to 14.7 cents." Certainly the labor costs of baking, slicing, wrapping, and offering other services now demanded by consumers have been going up. But centering the blame for rising bread prices on the wheat farmer isn't in accord with the facts.

As to apples, the western farmer last autumn got 90 cents per 50-pound box, field run, delivered at the packing platform. That was 1.8 cents a pound to cover all his costs of growing, spraying, irrigating, picking, and hauling. The charges added by washing, sorting, wrapping, crating, storing, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing are what push the consumer price up to 8, 10, or 11 cents a pound.

As to sugar, the cost was actually lower in late December than it was on October 31, 1947, when sugar controls were removed. And the sugar price is so tiny an item, anyway, in the cost of a soft drink that it would be hard to find the effect of a 1-cent-a-pound sugar increase on a bottled drink.

The authentic facts about farm prices are available to all. They had, on December 15, risen 23 percent from the bottom a year earlier. Beef cattle and lamb prices were respectively 41 and 38 percent above their official parity or equality with general price levels. But milk, butterfat, grains, turkeys, and chickens were substantially below and potatoes, apples, sweetpotatoes, and citrus fruits far below parity.

The recovery of farm prices accompanies a national jump to $206,000,000,000 in disposable personal income, after taxes. Have farmers shared unfairly in that income rise? They have not. Net farm income for 1950 was actually below that of 1949 and much below the 1947–48 peak.

A higher disposable national income normally raises food prices because people spend a rather uniform share of such income for food. The $1.60 per day wage increase just won by John L. Lewis, for instance, will enable his coal miners to help in bidding food prices up. But is that, or the fact that greater coal costs of transporting or processing food will push in the same direction, the farmer's fault?

One hour's average labor will buy more food in this Nation than in others and many times more than in any regimented economy in the world. As Senator THYE told the Farm Bureau, the farmer's share of each dollar spent by the consumer for food was only 53 percent in 1946, and has slumped to 48 percent today.

Folks with a real liking for facts on both sides may be shocked also to learn of the gross inaccuracy of much of the recent so-called news of farm-price supports. Last Monday afternoon a Washington dispatch from a usually accurate news agency was widely published which said that "there was a net loss on price supports last year of $1,600,000,000."

People have been stirred up by vivid descriptions of such vast losses, of mountainous food purchases, of waste, and of farm demands for subsidies. And farmers have been told by newspapers and newspapermen to throw overboard their price-support programs or put them in a stand-by status for the duration.

An excellently informed and truthful agricultural correspondent, Fred Bailey, of Washington, recently reported that "the campaign to make the farmer the goat on rising food prices is now well under way in the big city press" supported by some city Congressmen who want to roll prices all the way back to the farmer.

Here are facts: The $1,600,000,000 referred to in last Monday's story as net loss, wasn't loss at all, but was the total amount loaned. The net realized loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the year ending last June was $249,230,000. The net realized loss in the current fiscal year through November was $100,281,000.

Said John W. Haw, agricultural development director of the Northern Pacific, to the Farm Bureau convention: "In its report to Congress on June 30, 1950, the Corporation showed a cumulative net realized loss in 17 years of $636,040,401. The Corporation has turned over its capital many times in this period; yet the net loss has been less than 5 cents on each dollar invested." He said the job has been substantially accomplished with economy to the taxpayer.

The recent big losses and big waste have been on potatoes and eggs. Both of those purchase programs were forced by Congress over repeated protests of the executive branch and many farmers. And from both of them the Government now has withdrawn. As to subsidies, the farmers producing the perishables that the Government sought to subsidize are up in arms against them. As to the storable products, the Government's holdings of these are now widely acknowledged as being a vital protection of the Nation's safety in the war emergency and a check on inflation. More stockpiling of this kind is considered absolutely essential, as a munition of war and as a safeguard against runaway prices.

So there are facts bearing on both sides of the farm-price story.

Father Raphael C. McCarthy, S. J., President of Regis College, Denver, Colo., Gives the Marquette University Graduates of Milwaukee a Patriot's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the welter of the great debate now confusing the minds of the American people, I want to present to the Members of Congress, by way of contrast, a most forceful and clear expression of the nature of today's crisis.

If American college students can be nurtured by the powerful ideas expressed in Father McCarthy's speech and gain inspiration from them, we need have no fear for the future of our country. His words will grip every patriot heart.

I wish to include in my remarks the speech of the Reverend Raphael C. McCarthy, S. J., president of Regis College, Denver, Colo., given in the Marquette University High School Auditorium, in Milwaukee, Wis., on February 6 last at the midyear commencement exercises for the graduates of Marquette University, as follows:

My dear graduates, you are finishing your course and leaving Marquette at a critical and challenging time. You are going out into an anxious, bewildered world where even those who are supposed to be our leaders seem uncertain about present policies and future actions. We are living in what is probably the most momentous period in history. Old values are being questioned and new experiments are being tried. The nature of future civilization may be determined in our time.

It is enoromously deplorable that within the short period of 33 years we have fought in two World Wars and are engaged in an undeclared war now. Your generation, like other graduating classes before you, are compelled to interrupt the careers for which you have been preparing in order to defend your country. That is justly regrettable, but it is a necessary evil. It is an evil for war is disastrous to victor and vanquished alike. It is necessary because it is imperative that we biuld up the strength of our resistance for we are confronted with the problem of survival. We stand for peace. We have fought for it. We have paid an apalling price in wealth and in American lives to win it and still we do not enjoy it, but we are not wiling to buy peace by forfeiting our freedom.

The struggle in which we are engaged is not primarily between forms of government, between demrocracies and dictatorships, between communism and facism, although many are deluded into thinking that it is. The issues at stake are far more fundamental. The conflict is between two philosophies of life and by a philosophy of life is meant a practical rule of living—a norm that tells a man what he is here for, what the world expects of him, what his responsibilities are.

There are two great forces today that are bidding for the adherence of men and of nations. They are diametrically opposed. They are incompatible with one another. They are religion and godlessness. They are paganism and Christianity. The most articulate, aggressive, and ruthless exponent of the new paganism is communism. It has already enslaved 800,000,000 people. One-third of all the inhabitants of the earth drag out their lives behind iron curtains. Its professed goal is to bring all nations under its domination and it regards the United States as its chief foe for, while our ideals and our resources endure, it can never reach its goal completely.

Communism is a far more imminent danger to us than many people imagine, or are willing to admit. Indifference to it constitutes our greatest weakness. According to Lenin, communism prefers to achieve its aims by revolutions and by violence. But when these agencies are not timely, as is the case in the United States at present, Communists resort to less brutal methods. They fall back upon deception and cunning; on sabotage; on infiltration into Government positions; on control of labor unions and the promotion of strikes; on worming their way into the channels that mold public opinion—the press for instance, the radio, and the movies. They try to plant their members in police systems and in the Armed Forces. That program has been actively and intelligently pursued among us for several years and not without success. The object of the program always is to foment discord, to arouse suspicions and class hatreds, so that the field is prepared for revolution when conditions favor it.

If we are to correct an evil we must first know what the evil is. The wisest and safest way to face an opponent is to try to know the truth about him; to be realistic as to his strength, his weakness, the time and place and method of his attack. It is less disastrous to overrate a foe than it is to undervalue him. For, to underrate his power or his determination is a suicidal strategy that invites destruction.

The great perplexity, the indecision, that obtains with respect to communism and that hampers our efforts to combat it is, in large part, due to ignorance of its true nature. That it is a malignant force is a simple fact that should be recognized by any open

minded person who has studied the movement at all. But the theory and the practices of communism are far from simple. It is a complex system made up of several very destructive elements. Unless it is understood as such it cannot be fought successfully, for the most brilliant remedies may fail to cure a disease that is incorrectly diagnosed. By many of our people communism is regarded only and principally as a political movement that is subversive of our way of life. And that is true. The Communist philosophy of government is that the state is supreme. The individual exists for the state, his worth is estimated by the contribution he makes to the common good. He is a cog in the machine and when he fails to mesh he should be discarded. Such rights and privileges he has he owes to the state and it may take them away as it sees fit, whether those rights are ownership, liberty, or life.

In such an organization the state is the only employer, the people work at the wages and under the conditions that the state imposes. There is no place for unions and bargaining and strikes. There is no such thing as liberty of the press or of speech or of teaching. A man acts and talks and even thinks as the state wants him to. If he behaves otherwise he loses his job and he and his family starve. He may join the uncounted multitudes whom Russia has sent to concentration camps or tortured to death.

Communism has another objective and it is the one that is attractive to many people. It proposes a subtle economic theory that is supposed to correct existing social inequalities. In theory it argues for a classless society in which wealth will be equally divided. Russia still preaches this theory but it has long since failed to practice it.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not a collection of classless states. The aristocracy of the czars was indeed effectively destroyed but it has been succeeded by another aristocracy, of commissars and party favorites. Experience taught Russia that a consistent, equal distribution of wealth is impossible, and when it is attempted it strangles progress, for why should the intelligent, the ambitious, and the industrious exert themselves when they receive no greater reward for their extra efforts than do the shiftless, the lazy, and the incompetent?

The basic idea of communism, and the one which we must unalterably oppose, is its materialistic philosophy of life. All its other theories and practices are logical conclusions from that conception. Communism is anti-God. It scoffs at His existence and in consequence it denies man's spiritual origin and destiny, since these truths are meaningless if there is no God. It is tireless in trying to rob people of faith. It is fanatically antireligious. In its creed man is but a glorified brute who has no more rights than other animals. He may be put to work as his decides, cooped up in deadly camps or slaughtered when the state deems such practices profitable to it.

This, in very brief outline, is the force that menaces the peace of the world. It is organized, it is unhampered by scruples, it is backed by an almost apostolic zeal and by a willingness to undergo heroic sacrifices in the achievement of its objectives. If it were satisfied to function only in the countries that have fallen victims to it we might feel that it is no concern of ours. But it ambitions the conquest of the earth and, according to its repeated declarations, the United States is the main obstacle to its progress and we must oppose it if we are to continue as a nation. For it is destructive of the very things which we believe make life worth living. It strangles liberty; it insults human dignity; it strives to banish God from His universe. It cannot live side by side with a Christian civilization and, therefore, from the very nature of the case it is our mortal enemy. For, although Europe and America today are not completely Christian, they still live by Christian traditions—the fundamental ideas of human freedom; the fatherhood of God; the common brotherhood of man; the intrinsic worth of the human person; the rejection of the principle that might makes right or that the state can determine what is moral or immoral—all these are Christian ideals. They are the foundations on which this country of ours was built, through the observance of which it has become great. If they were to go down what we have known and loved as the American way of life must perish.

In our struggle with communism we are faced by three possibilities—surrender, appeasement, or resistance.

Surrender means the loss of freedom, of hope, of faith, of love. It means a debasing slavery.

There can be no appeasement of Communists. For how can you compromise with those who recognize only one virtue and that is physical force, who know only one vice and that is weakness, whether it takes the form of mercy or charity or any kindly sentiment. Men with this philosophy of life regard concessions as marks of fear and of weakness. To them they are only invitations to make more stark demands. Chamberlain learned that when he tried to buy off the Nazis.

What bargaining can be done with people who pride themselves on following Lenin's command that truth and honesty and justice are to be used when these work to the advantage of communism and when they seem to hamper its purposes they are to be displaced by treachery, deceit, and lying. For such people peace treaties and agreements and signed promises are less than scraps of paper.

There remains for us, then, the only alternative of resistance. We have earnestly desired peace. We have striven for it against gangsterism and we have been denied it. Still we do not stand for peace at any price. We should stand for righteousness at any cost. A Christian cannot be neutral between right and wrong. We may hope, and we should pray, that we shall not be called upon to engage in another world war. But we must recognize its possibility and prepare for it. It is true indeed that ideas cannot be changed by mere physical force nor can we hide in security behind a stockpile of atomic bombs. The best that force can do is to insure a mimimum of external observance. But we face a foe who respects only power and we may avoid a war by causing him to fear our strength and if, which God forbid, we are attacked, we shall be prepared to protect ourselves from the fate of nations who were weak or trustful and who now know communism for what it is.

This preparation involves sacrifice. Those sacrifices are not so great as Communists endure in pursuing their plan of world conquest, yet they will be sufficiently trying; some of them may be grievous. For the majority they will take the form of privations of various kinds. Shortages, priorities, heavy taxes, perhaps rationing. For others, and many of you may be among them, the demand will be one of service. But we must pay the price for anything in life that is worth while. If it could be had for the asking, it would be of but little value and esteemed but very lightly. We must protect the greatest natural blessings that men can know; we must defend for ourselves and for those who come after us the liberties which we received from our ancestors. They wrenched the torch of freedom from the hands of unwilling oppressors and they kept it burning when it cost them hardships.

We are not unique in the fact that we are called upon to forego comforts and endure inconveniences in the defense of what we cherish. Men of every generation have faced that harsh demand. They have been facing it in other countries for many years. We have proved ourselves at other times. We shall not fail now. There is a disagreeable job ahead of us but if we keep faith, it will be done and perhaps sooner than we think.

War is brutal always and preparation for it is exacting. But it has a few compensations. It reveals lovely human traits which otherwise might lie unexpected. Virtues which in prosperous times are allowed to tarnish are taken down and dusted and brightened—loyalty, devotion, courage, unselfishness become potent, active forces in the lives of people.

Our present crisis will make great demands on our patriotism. I know that we shall not only be reconciled to them but shall meet those demands generously and cheerfully. We shall not feel abused or frustrated because we are called upon to fight for our self-preservation. Rather may our attitude be that of the boy in the last war whom a chaplain visited in a hospital. The priest expressed his sympathy because the boy had lost his leg and the soldier said, and he smiled as he said it: "Sir, I did not lose it, I gave it."

We could wish that we should never see another war, or the threat of it, but we must face harsh facts. For us the problem is one of survival. Our cause is a just one. Supporting it in whatever way we may be called to do we can be sure of God's help. The crusaders of old fought to deliver the holy places from the infidel. Our responsibility, and our privilege, is to safeguard our Christian culture, to enable ourselves and others to keep faith in God.

Joyce Kilmer who gave his life for his country in World War I, in a poem called The Peacemaker, wrote some words that are pertinent to us:

"What matters death, if Freedom be not dead?
Who fights for freedom goes with joyful tread
And has for Captain Him whose thorn-crowned head
Smiles from the Cross upon a conquered world."

May that Captain bring peace to the world and may He keep you in His hand.

Academy of Diplomatic Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 131.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas diplomacy is the vital keynote in affairs of the world today as always; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance that the United States of America have in its diplomatic service, men trained in the arts and ways of diplomacy, to better represent our Nation in world affairs; and

Whereas our Nation is too often at a loss when dealing with the diplomatic representatives of other nations because of their

training in this line, they being more in the class known as career diplomats; and

Whereas if our Nation could be served by men especially screened and trained in diplomacy, we would be represented on a far more equitable basis with other nations; and

Whereas the diplomatic bungling of the past and present is largely due to the lack of proper or sufficient knowledge of the ways of other nations and its peoples; and

Whereas past history has proven the fact that all of our military victories have been for naught because of diplomatic inefficiency, ignorance, and treachery; and

Whereas proper schooling and training over a period of time, would enable our Government to pick men of the highest caliber for the diplomatic service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, No. 131, in regular session January 10, 1951, recommend, through channels, that the national organization take the necessary steps to bring before the Congress of the United States, a request for the immediate formation and operation of an Academy of Diplomatic Science; and be it further

Resolved, That students be recommended for such an academy by the Congressmen of the various States, but that such a recommended student must pass certain entrance requirements as may be deemed necessary relative to scholastic and loyalty background; and be it further

Resolved, That lack of such schooling shall not hinder those having proper and sufficient practical training or experience, through years of service in the diplomatic services, and found capable, from being advanced to high positions in such service.

L. HAROLD HAMLIN,
Commander.

Adopted February 15, 1951.

Gold From Sand Piles at McNary Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, an interesting project in recovery of gold is going on at McNary Dam which is now under construction in the Columbia River, between the States of Oregon and Washington. I include as a part of these remarks an article by Herbert Jonas entitled "He Gets Gold From Sand Piles," from the Saturday Evening Post, which is a story about this gold-recovery project at McNary Dam:

GOODY STUDIES "PAY DIRT" FROM HIS PATENTED SLUICE BOX—HE GETS GOLD FROM SAND PILES

(By Herbert Jonas)

There's money to be made taking gold from low-grade river sand—if you know how.

A. H. Goody, a Tacoma mining engineer, has the knack. During the construction of the McNary Dam in Washington State, Goody worked stockpiles of sand profitably, although the pay dirt in them ran as little as half a cent a ton.

As the Government moves ahead with its Columbia River development program Goody stands to hitch-hike a fortune from the sands of the great stream and its tributaries. For each Federal dam yet to be built is in better mining territory than McNary, and upstream sands assay as high as 10 cents a ton.

Actually Goody prospers where other miners might not eke out a bare living. He succeeds for two reasons: He has a patented process for recovering "flour" gold, and he has a contract whereby sand dredged from the river for dam construction is sluiced through his gold trap on its way to stockpiles.

Flour gold is so powdery fine that it can't be stopped by the ordinary sluice boxes used in mining. A few prospectors have caught it by lining their miner's pans with mercury and then placing the mercury amalgam in a hollowed-out potato and baking it in an oven. The heat evaporates the mercury and leaves the gold. The process yields small quantities of flour gold, but also exposes the miners to mercury poisoning.

Goody's system uses no mercury. He has rigged up a special sluice box only 13 feet long, in which a series of centrifugal actions sucks heavy sand and fine gold from a stream fed into it by a sand-and-gravel machine. The box operates unattended.

Once a day Goody trucks a load of the gold-bearing concentrate, which assays over $500 a ton, to his home in Tacoma. There he turns a thin stream of water into a strainer-like gold trap, shovels in the concentrate and washes it until only gold dust remains.

The yellow residue isn't pure gold by Government standards because it contains a slight alloy. This fortunate imperfection allows Goody to sell the gold as he sees fit. If it met bullion requirements, he would be required under the law to sell it to the United States treasury at $35 a troy ounce.

As it is, a dollar's worth of the powdery metal makes a pendant design on a tie clasp which brings the resourceful Goody $7.50. And a nickel's worth in a plastic card labeled "Souvenir Flour Gold Recovered by Goody" nets a ready 25 cents from tourists who visit McNary Dam.

The Industrial West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Current Issue," published in the Columbia Basin (Wash.) News of January 13, 1951.

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

CURRENT ISSUE

Although Horace Greeley has long ceased to wield his potent pen, his immortal advice to the youth of his day, "Go west, young man," still bids the adventurous toward the Pacific, and strikes terror into the sooty hearts of eastern manufacturing interests.

Evidence of their fear of the lusty industrial infant that is the West is an article in the Contractors and Engineers Monthly, a trade publication of the heavy-equipment industry, centered in the East.

The article discredits western hydroelectric power development and reclamation projects, terming them luxuries. Specifically attacked was Ice Harbor Dam. This attitude is understandable coming from eastern interests.

What is not acceptable is the deliberate sabotage by California's Representative NORRIS POULSON, and an Astoria newspaper which reprinted the easterner's article.

POULSON, showing typical California jealousy of the Pacific Northwest, read the condemning article out of the Astoria paper into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Ice Harbor project has been brutally punted from one end of the political gridiron to another. Fearful, lest the need for power to operate more aluminum mills or other industries should cause rapid development of the West, eastern interests, and the coast fisheries groups have consistently blocked the dam when allocation of funds seemed imminent.

The Astoria paper's attitude is to oppose anything which might pose difficulty for commercial fishing. Dwindling fish runs in the Columbia have been blamed on various power dams, when in actuality overexploitation by commercial fishermen has been responsible for destruction of brood stock before the fish ever had a chance to run to headwater spawning grounds. Fish and game departments have been unwitting tools in aiding the commercial fishermen, by predicting the end of sport fishing, without biological proof that the dams are responsible. Commercial fishing laws have been notably lax, enforcement has been spasdomic, and violations are seldom persistently prosecuted.

Hydroelectric power and irrigation will go hand in hand in building the Columbia Basin. As one of the potentially rich productive areas of the Nation, the basin is battling sectional, regional, and national opposition, prompted by vested interests, long the foe and deterrent to progress.

Demonstration that western power can produce tremendous amounts of vital war materials is provided by the aluminum mill near Spokane, which supplied tons of material during World War II. What such development means to an area economically is apparent from tax statements of the Spokane area. In addition to hiring more than 30,000 men, the aluminum mills paid more taxes to the Spokane area coffers than did all the railroads in that area, noted as a rail center.

It is easy to see why eastern interests do not want more competitive developments out of the West. What Californians and selfish commercial interests on the coast do not realize is that they are helping to destroy themselves by contributing to disunity in western State's congressional representation.

Congress would be justified in showing reluctance to vote projects needed for development of the West, when western States bicker among themselves over their desirability.

Industrial power is one of the West's key drawing cards. Industries here can be free of the carboniferous pollution of coal smoke. There is room for unlimited expansion of plants, and living conditions free from the squalor of overcrowded eastern industrial cities.

"Go West, young industry" might well be the slogan for the modern day. As the need for more production increases, the tremendous power potential of the West will be realized. The luxury projects, objected to by commercial fishermen (whose business itself represents only a fraction of the industry created by adequate power supplies) and eastern industrialists, will be the backbone of electrochemical processing and other related power consuming productive activities.

Ice Harbor represents an economical, practical link in the West's power hookup. The history of the West has been a fighting saga. Our Washington congressional representatives are carrying on the westerner's traditional refusal to let ungrounded opposition interfere with expansion.

We are now engaged in a battle for our right to grow and expand our productive capacities. Cheap electric power is a necessity. Ice Harbor Dam would produce such power.

The power of the West lies in its electrical potential.

Gen. Carlos Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the activities in the United Nations of my friend, Gen. Carlos Romulo, Foreign Minister of the Philippines. One is from the New York Times of February 2, the other from the New York World-Telegram of February 3. I do not disparage the Times editorial when I say I prefer the heading used by the World-Telegram, "Romulo, the Scrapper."

Mr. President, it was my privilege, as chairman of the United States delegation at the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, in Geneva, Switzerland, in the spring of 1948, to support General Romulo's candidacy for election as president of that Conference. There I saw at first-hand his skill and courage in the conduct of the Conference. He is not only a great orator; he is one of the most able diplomats on the international scene. Again and again he has proved his faith in freedom and his willingness to fight for it. He is, of course, known to many Members of the Congress, and I am sure they will join me in congratulating him on these editorials, which record another brave fight well fought.

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

[From the New York Times of February 2, 1951]

AGGRESSION ON THE RECORD

The General Assembly of the United Nations has now acted to put the aggression of the Chinese Communists in Korea formally on the record. This seems to us to have been the only possible course if the United Nations valued its survival. There have been strong misgivings in some quarters and equally strong resolution in others. The contrast is brought out, typically, in the comments of the Indian and Philippine delegates in the Assembly. For India, Sir Benegal Rau stated:

"We should like to have it on the record that when the world was marching—that is, in our view—toward disaster, we, most of the Asian Powers, did all we could to halt the march. * * * I only hope the members will ponder carefully what the position will be if the (Asian-Arab) draft resolution is defeated: no early cease-fire; every problem in the Far East unsolved; the atmosphere for successful negotiation vitiated; the tensions in the Far East perpetuated."

A reply to that statement was made by General Romulo for the Philippines, when he said, in support of the United States resolution:

"We cannot allow to pass unanswered the invidious claim of any delegation that it alone, together with those that shared its views, was dedicated to the cause of peace, while others that did not share those views were, by implication, committed to the disastrous course of war. * * * We shall vote in favor of this resolution, as we did in committee, because we are convinced more than ever that of the two paths that were shown to us this is the surer way to peace. It is the surer way to peace to the extent that it is based on the recognition, not the avoidance, of truth, and on the affirmation, not the denial, of right principles."

General Romulo's position is surely the stronger, sounder and more courageous one. It is more in keeping with the whole character of the United Nations and its essential purposes.

There has been grave anxiety as to what the United Nations would or could do next. Some of that anxiety is misplaced. The real question is what the Chinese Communists propose to do next. They have been correctly named as aggressors by 44 members of the organization that they are determined to join. They can purge themselves of their guilt if they wish to do so. The choice that they make will speak more loudly than any of their rhetoric about their true aims and their basic character. The world will watch that choice with rightful concern. But the free world, meanwhile, has not stultified itself by confusion as to where aggression lay and as to what nations were obliged to act to rectify the wrong that has been done.

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 3, 1951]

ROMULO, THE SCRAPPER

In the months-old fight to keep the Chinese Red outlaws in proper perspective before the United Nations, Gen. Carlos Romulo has been one of the most consistent and valiant warriors against appeasement.

As chief UN delegate and Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, a free and independent country, he has always stood ready to take on all comers who insist that they and they alone, are the spokesmen for the Asiatic people.

Last December when Red China's vituperative Wu snarled his accusations against the United States before a timorous UN, it was General Romulo who made the most telling counterattack. Point by point he answered Wu's charges that American capitalism was trying to dominate Asia. And for a capper he devastated Wu's pretenses that the Chinese Red was speaking for the people of the Orient.

After Wu went home, Sir Benegal Rau of India took the lead in the appeasement bloc. He, too, assumed to be the voice of Asia. But fortunately, General Romulo was always there to challenge that.

When the UN voted to negotiate with the Chinese Reds on Korea, it was General Romulo who delivered the most stinging indictment of the sell-out—at a time when the United States delegation went along with the appeasement crowd.

Last Thursday the UN finally approved a watered-down resolution naming the Chinese Reds as aggressors—over the pious protest of India's delegate who said:

"We should like to have it on the record that when the world was marching—that is, in our view—toward disaster, we, most of the Asian powers, did all we could to halt the march."

Once more, General Romulo leaped to the challenge.

"We, cannot," he said, "allow to pass unanswered the invidious claim of any delegation that it alone, together with those that shared its views, was dedicated to the cause of peace, while others that did not share those views were, by implication, committed to the disastrous course of war. * * * We shall vote in favor of this resolution, as we did in committee, because we are convinced more than ever that, of the two paths that were shown to us, this is the surer way to peace."

Hats off to General Romulo. And, while quoting him, it's pertinent to add these wise words he said the other night when he was awarded a degree at Boston University.

"The true power of America does not rest on the dollar and the atom bomb.

"The strength of America still rests on the conviction held by the free peoples of the world that America stands for justice, for freedom, for equality, for progress, for all the great humane values of our civilization.

"If this faith in America is lost, the dollar cannot redeem it and the atom bomb cannot restore it."

Funeral Sermon for the Late John B. Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the funeral sermon for the late John B. Sullivan, a former Member of this body, delivered by the Reverend James P. Johnston at the Immaculate Conception Church in St. Louis, Mo., on February 2, 1951:

SERMON

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.

Down in the lowlands of Kentucky, my friends, not too far from the thriving city of Louisville, bandad together move a group of silent men. Some of them are ex-war veterans—soldiers tired of blood and carnage—seeking peace in the solitude of the Divine Prince of Peace. Living under the law of labor and prayer, they are called Christian Fathers or Trappist Monks. The world, though, may call them fools. They seldom speak only to say, when they do, "memento mori" (remember to die). Fools? Yes, but the wisest of fools. Fools for Christ's sake. He was a fool for their's—to the heights of holy Calvary.

Fools—but what's so foolish about the thought of death? Has, or will, anyone escape the eternal decree of the all-just God? Summed up in a few words, "It is appointed unto man—once to die." Once—no trying it over; no repeating; no second act. Figuratively, we are all actors on the great stage of life. We play our part, big or little; we take our bow; the curtain rings down and that's it. For it is appointed unto man, once to die.

Once to die and so important is our dying right that next Wednesday, Ash Wednesday, the grand old mother, the Catholic Church, will hold up an arresting finger and signal us to the altar rail and as she places the blessed ashes—the symbol of death—upon our forehead she will sign us with the sign of the cross. The sign of death, which is also the sign of eternal life. She will whisper the age-old admonition, "Remember man, thou art but dust and to dust thou shalt return." In a word, "Remember death."

Remember death. Ah, but the outside world, busy like Martha of old, has no time to think of death. Not today. Wait until I'm old. Wait until I've lost my outlook on life. So every sermon on death is for the fellow across the aisle, the old gent down the street, the aching woman, bedded down in the hospital ward. So today, big business finds the builder wanting to pierce the

heavens with another monument of stone, the banker is thrilled that the market is gaining in leaps and bounds and down in the land of flowers, the vacation lovers are tossing away their money like tomorrow brings the atomic bomb. The cry is "Business—more business."

Speaking of business—two score and a few years ago, Congressman John Sullivan (God rest him) knelt at his devoted Irish mother's knee but he soon pushed on to that day of days when he made his first holy communion. Then I say, he learned, lived and kept the greatest business God ever gave to man to keep—that was the business of saving his God-given immortal soul. In a word, why were you born? Created? Back comes the answer from your little catechism. It contains a college of truth. Invaluable platinum. Listen to it, "You were born (so was I) to know, to love, to serve God in this life that we might be happy with Him in the life to come." Thanks be to God, John Sullivan, to his dying day never forgot that lesson. Following after his King of Kings who pleaded, "My child, give me thy heart; follow me; I am the way, the only way; truth, the real truth; the life that spells eternal life."

It has been my privilege to know John for over 30 years. I watched him climb the political ladder of success, rung by rung. Honors didn't taint him, success didn't spoil him. He was a friend of the little man as well as the big. Charity saw him helping the less fortunate but first, last and always, he was a Catholic gentleman. Politics can be a dangerous game if the game isn't played square. The temptations are many and the fall is quick and easy but I say, "Gentleman John B. Sullivan" he was just that. Above reproach, steeled to the wishes of baser folk because, I repeat, he was a Catholic gentleman. It is regrettable that John died so young but though he did, his was a full life because he gave it the best he had day by day. A champion of the people, a real democratic son, following always the principle of the great party he represented. To know him was to love him. A credit to his faith, the Catholic Church, through whose doors he walked to adore his God and now his judge. Interested in the Cardinal Glennon Hospital, he forwarded me his check because he loved the memory of his friend and cardinal, the late Archbishop Glennon.

This morning, it was my privilege to offer up the adorable sacrifice of the spotless Lamb of God for your friend and mine, John Sullivan. God be good to him. Together, we offered this gift of gifts and at the memento of the dead we prayed, eternal rest—everlasting light. Then came the last gospel of this Mass that must ever lead us back over the corridors of time to that first and greatest of all Masses, celebrated by the great High Priest, Jesus Christ, on the altar of the cross. At the sad but holy hour of 3, we catch the consumatum est—it is finished. The story of divine infinite love is completely told, for greater love than this, no man hath, who lay down his life for his friends. John Sullivan, too, gave his all helping here and helping there, trying to throw the oil of his every effort on the turbulent ocean of these critical times. Oh, Good Fridays will come and go but don't take down the cross. Plant it deep in the fleshy soil of your human heart. It has the only answer to that eternal why of why these things must be. Sickness, sadness, disappointments, heartaches, and, then, death.

To Mrs. Sullivan, John's right arm, his devoted wife, secretary, and his all, we extend to you our every sympathy. Though it is hard, you must take your chalice of suffering and kneel with the Christ of Gethsemane and pray His prayers, "Father, not my will, but Thine be done." To the brother and sister and other relatives, we lavish our every condolence.

May I ask of you, who loved John in life, please don't forget him in death. It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins. So, let us take the roses of our rosaries, the violets of our prayerful aspirations, the lilies of our holy communions, the forget-me-nots of our many Masses, shape and fashion them into one large bouquet and place them at the feet of the Mother of God. She will give them to her Divine Son all for your friend and mine, John.

Since we are going to bid him good-by, it must be a prayerful good-by. A man of God and a champion of his country, this God blessed America. He served them both and served them well. God rest his soul.

National Officer of Military Order of Purple Heart Expresses Views on United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no group of American citizens is more entitled to have their say and be heard on American foreign policy than our veterans who have received the Military Order of the Purple Heart. These men have fought for our Nation on the battlefield and have sacrificed their blood for the defense of the United States and for the preservation of the American way of life.

In a recent edition of the Los Angeles Examiner there appeared the following editorial written by Adolph N. Sutro, national public relations director of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which also appeared in the California Purple Hearter, an official publication of the order. In this editorial Mr. Sutro has made a concise analysis of our foreign policy, and has pointed out the weakness that exists in this policy which permits other members of the United Nations to withhold an adequate share of men and materials to support our forces fighting in Korea, and has left us to bear the brunt of the battle. The Purple Heart veterans of America are concerned for the future of our Nation, and the recommendations on foreign policy by Mr. Sutro, as their spokesman, demands the attention of Congress.

ANTE UP OR ELSE

(By Adolph N. Sutro)

History will show Uncle Joe Stalin to have been the most unscrupulous, shrewd, and crafty ruler of the twentieth century. Without firing a single shot, he has conquered many lands.

In Korea, he set a trap for his arch enemy, Uncle Sam, who has done more than all other nations combined to halt the spread of his communistic doctrines.

After World War II, it was agreed that Russian troops should occupy that part of Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel, and our troops could occupy that part of Korea south of that parallel, pending both nations withdrawing their troops from Korea at the same time.

Joe Stalin laid a shrewd plan to trap Uncle Sam and make him keep large numbers of his troops pinned down over there, perhaps for years, without using any Russian troops. After a series of verbal clashes with Uncle Sam about Korea, Joe Stalin withdrew his Russian troops from Korea.

Before he did so, however, he armed the North Koreans, and not long thereafter, he ordered them to drive the foreign American troops out of South Korea.

In the meantime, the United Nations had been put into operation which on its face value appeared to be a good thing for all nations, and has proven to benefit everyone at the expense of Uncle Sam.

America and most parts of Western Europe are populated by freedom-loving occidentals, while on the other hand, Uncle Joe cracks his whip over lands populated for the most part by a Mongol people of oriental extraction, who are his slaves, as are practically all peoples behind the iron curtain.

Uncle Sam and Uncle Joe are both working to gain their objectives in the United Nations; Uncle Sam's objectives being to help other nations better themselves, while Uncle Joe uses the United Nations, to try to gain control of other nations or else try to make them destroy each other.

In the meantime, Uncle Joe is training many thousands of Communists to operate as termites within the borders of all freedom-loving countries with the destruction of our own democracy his ultimate goal.

Unfortunately, the United Nations has used Uncle Sam to pull its chestnuts out of the fire, by making us use our own manpower and material to fight the Korean and Chinese Reds. Each of the United Nations should have shared in this campaign on a population pro-rata basis, but, to date, none of them have.

If any one of the United Nations had lacked the finances or the ability to produce armament, then it should have increased its contribution of manpower to the United Nations armed forces in lieu of material, which also has not been done to date.

Mounting American casualties and miscalculation of the enemy's forces and armament in Korea are making our people demand that Uncle Sam insist on this immediate change of policy.

Should other United Nations fail to rectify at once this gross inequity for their own protection, then it is imperative that we withdraw from the United Nations and call our troops home for our own protection.

Joe Stalin has been crafty not to send his Russian troops into Korea, but he does send those of his puppets to take punches at us from time to time.

In the future, it may be weeks or months between such punches, between which he will have his puppets make unacceptable peace offers. Uncle Joe just stays home and "rattles his sabre," while planning where next to tie down more of our troops in some distant part of the world.

This can go on until the children of our fighting men grow up and their hair turns gray with age.

Our only hope to upset Uncle Joe Stalin's well-laid plans is to insist that the nations of Europe wake up and band themselves together as a United States of Europe for their own protection.

Then let us demand that our next Secretary of State be a man like John Quincy Adams, one of America's greatest statesmen who, as Secretary of State in 1823, wrote the Monroe Doctrine.

Let us then heed the words of President Washington against becoming involved in entangling alliances with Europe. Let us go back to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, build up the armed forces of the nations of the Western Hemisphere against

aggression from Europe and Asia, and get out of both.

We, of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which is composed entirely of American combat-wounded war veterans, pray that Uncle Sam will protect our country against all the crafty and well-laid communistic plans of Joe Stalin to bankrupt, conquer, and enslave all our people.

Hoover Writes of Boyhood in Oregon Quaker District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Oregonian of Sunday, February 11, 1951, is an interesting news item of our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover, in connection with his memoirs which are being presented in Collier's magazine. The item is about that portion of Mr. Hoover's life which was spent in my State of Oregon and pursuant to leave granted, I am including it as part of these remarks, as follows:

HOOVER WRITES OF BOYHOOD IN OREGON QUAKER DISTRICT

The only living ex-President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, tells of several years of his youth spent in Oregon in the current issue of Colliers' magazine.

Hoover, writing his personal memoirs in serial, tells of his move to Oregon at the age of 10 to live with an aunt and uncle at Newberg, a Quaker settlement in the Willamette Valley.

He arrived in 1884 to find his Aunt Laura Minthorn and her three daughters making the pear butter supply for the winter in a wash boiler over a fire in the yard. Young Hoover had never eaten pears before and after 2 days of an almost exclusively pear diet he did not eat pears again for years.

CHORES CHECK EXPLORATION

"I was at once put to school and the chores," Hoover writes. "These included feeding the doctor's team of ponies twice a day, hitching them up periodically, milking the cow and splitting the wood."

All this routine, Hoover stated, plus abundant religious occasions, somewhat interrupted the constant call to explore the Oregon forests and streams. That, he said, was accomplished in time.

The ex-President tells of a summer job at weeding onions in the great bottom lands north of Newberg for 50 cents a day and board.

Hoover writes of the family's move to Salem where Dr. Minthorn started a Quaker land-settlement business. He became office boy and attempted repair and sale of used sewing machines on the side. When a business college opened in Salem, he enrolled for the night session. The teacher knew much of mathematics and carried Hoover through algebra, geometry, and higher mathematics.

ENGINEERING TEST TAKEN

An engineer from the East drifted into the office and interested young Hoover in the study of engineering. After a year of mulling it over, young Hoover seemed decided upon an engineering career.

About this time a notice appeared of a public examination for entrance to the new free university founded by Senator Leland Stanford.

The future President took the examination in Portland but did not do too well. However, he was encouraged to go to the university, engage a tutor, and take the examination again. He did and thus enrolled at Stanford, leaving Oregon never to return as a resident.

Letter From a Constituent and Reply Thereto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission already granted, I submit herewith for the Appendix a letter from a friend and my answer thereto:

CENTRAL VALLEY EMPIRE ASSOCIATION,
Fresno, Calif., February 13, 1951.

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: It is good to read in the February 7 edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your remarks on the attacks which have been made on you by virtue of your wife working in your office.

I just want you to know that my wife works in my office and she does a swell job. As a matter of fact she does twice as much work as she gets paid for.

There is certainly nothing in American history which would indicate that a wife should not, if it is possible for her to do so, work along with her husband in his business.

I hope that you keep her right on there in spite of all the attacks.

With my kindest regards, I remain,
Sincerely,

CENTRAL VALLEY EMPIRE ASSOCIATION,
JOHN ARTHUR REYNOLDS,
General Manager, Secretary.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1951.

Mr. JOHN ARTHUR REYNOLDS,
General Manager, Central Valley Empire Association, Fresno, Calif.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: I am indeed appreciative of your helpful letter, defending my practice of employing my wife as secretary.

Naturally, it is difficult for you to understand why a few who consider themselves the elite in our community have nothing better to do than to try to stir up trouble over what you and any other rational person would consider logical and natural.

You cannot understand because you have never known anybody like the "squares" such as happen to occupy several of the so-called positions of responsibility in our fair city.

Suffice it to say there isn't any other place in the country where these characters could make a living. There just isn't anybody like them in the United States. They are tolerated only for the well-known reason they happen to have a lot of "dough" and have made everybody afraid of them.

Since they are financially well off and lazy, they do not have to work and wouldn't anyway. The alternative, of course, is to spend their useless hours trying to vent their spleen on the Congressman from our district who happens to be me.

They've been doing it for years, and as this particular matter is only a current gripe, they'll be on my neck about something else in another week or two, doubtless to rub it in by asking a favor.

Pardon this lengthy note, but in view of your never having seen anything so odd I thought these "punks" ought to be described in detail.

I wish to make it perfectly clear, however, that the thousands of patriotic Americans at home who back me up term after term in Congress compensate one a hundred times for the small handful of troublemakers and make me mindful of and thankful for the highest honor a man can possibly attain, that of representing in Congress as truly an American district as our own Thirty-seventh, New York.

With best wishes, I am
Most sincerely,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Wages of American Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a compilation which I call to the attention of Senators interested in the problem of the wages of American seamen. The statement shows the basic monthly pay of American seamen on all types of ships. The conclusion reached is that American seamen are today the highest paid in the world. This information is from the Merchant Marine Bulletin.

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

AMERICAN SEAMEN NOW HIGHEST PAID IN WORLD

Basic wages for American able seamen, the best paid in the world, have increased 201.1 percent since 1941, according to the American Merchant Marine Institute.

The prewar monthly basic income of an AB was $82.50, reaching $145 at the war's end. Since October 1945 there have been eight successive wage increases and these have upped the monthly rate to $248.41, a new high. Overtime earnings average 30 percent over basic wage. In addition seamen enjoy a pension and welfare plan along with food and lodging furnished by the steamship companies. The monthly basic wage rate for a typical United States-flag Liberty type ship follows:

Rating	Basic monthly pay
Master	$750.63
First officer	469.42
Second officer	411.89
Third officer	378.66
Chief engineer	698.95
First assistant engineer	469.42
Second assistant engineer	411.89
Third assistant engineer	378.66
Radio operator	352.13
Boatswain	315.35
Able seaman (6 per ship)	248.41
Deck utility	260.99
Ordinary seaman (3 per ship)	213.79
Deck engineer	283.01
Oiler (3 per ship)	248.41
Fireman watertender (3 per ship)	248.41
Wiper (2 per ship)	245.26
Chief steward	307.70
Chief cook	283.01
Second cook and baker	267.84
Messman (3 per ship)	213.79
Utility (2 per ship)	213.79

Sixth Anniversary of the Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago today, without the knowledge or the wish of the American people, the United States was committed to the dangerous and unscrupulous Yalta agreement. For 6 years this notorious agreement has remained a blot upon the record of American diplomacy. In the opinion of many, it represents an appeasement greater than that of Munich itself. Yalta, which should have marked the end of totalitarian expansion, marked instead the real beginning of the spread of Communist domination over one-third of the world.

At Yalta was laid much of the foundation for the postwar world, a foundation so undermined in the making that it is little wonder that the peace built upon it is badly crumbling today. When the conference ended it was pronounced a "good start on the road to a world of peace." Looking backward it is evident that only the Soviet schemers were given a "good start." Let us consider some of the agreements into which we were drawn at the Crimea 6 years ago.

In February 1945, while the world lay in a shambles, the vision of a lasting peace shone before the eyes of everyone. People everywhere staked their hope on an international organization which would be strong enough to make that vision a reality. However, engineered by a man since convicted of a terrible crime, the Yalta agreement forged shackles for that organization even before its formation. The veto, which the Russians have since used 47 times to defeat action in the UN Security Council, which all the rest of the world favored, was agreed to at Yalta. Further, the principle of equal representation for all nations in the General Assembly was compromised by allowing the Soviet Union to have three representatives when all the other nations of the world had only one.

The most cynical action of the Yalta conference, however, was the betrayal of Poland. Poland, the home of liberty and freedom, the first country to resist the Nazi blitzkrieg and the Soviet hordes, was sold out to Soviet Russia. A democratic Polish government in exile had maintained itself throughout its country's occupation, and several hundred thousand Poles fought with the greatest bravery and sacrifice as part of the Allied armies during World War II. But the Yalta agreement allowed, indeed forced, the entrance of Communists into the postwar government. Once entrenched in a coalition, as everyone now knows, it is only a matter of time, and usually a short time, before the Communists, with backing from Moscow, have come to control the key positions, force out the democratic elements, and seize control. This was the case in Poland, so that although the vast majority of Poles were freedom-loving, they were enslaved by a few Communists—Communists whose wedge was forged at Yalta.

The second treacherous betrayal of Poland at Yalta was the concession of half of Poland's territory to Russia. The Polish people are, and will long remain, embittered because the Western Powers let Poland down on this count. The 14 points, the Atlantic Charter, and other statements of ideals to which the United States has pledged itself, specifically denounce territorial changes which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. Yet at Yalta the United States participated in a breach of the principle of self-determination almost without parallel in our history.

The Polish people had no voice in the assignment of their territory to Soviet Russia. At Yalta the great powers, unmindful of the desires of the Polish people, took as the basis for a boundary settlement a line which put almost half the Polish nation within Russian boundaries. Because of this action millions of Poles have lost faith in us. As more appeasement was revealed bit by bit for 2 years after the conference, it became apparent that secret diplomacy reached its acme—or should we say its nadir—at Yalta.

Actually, the people of the United States, through their elected Representatives, never have given their approval to this agreement which in fact extended the Soviet empire to the heart of Europe. It is difficult to believe that the United States would be a party to an infamous agreement which allowed states liberated from fascism to be enslaved by communism and which turned Axis satellite states into Soviet satellites instead. What made the leader of the United States commit a deed so out of character with the fairness and idealism that have always distinguished this Nation in its international relations? Perhaps the explanation lies partly in the influence of a Presidential adviser—Alger Hiss. Both before and during the Yalta conference, Hiss had a power difficult to overestimate since the President had to depend on advisers to an unprecedented degree. Reports of the various discussions of the Crimean meetings show that he was one adviser almost always on hand.

This Yalta agreement, once understood by the American people, naturally has been denounced by the American press. On the ground that no nation has the authority to dispose of the rights and the territory of another nation without its own participation and consent, the Yalta agreement should be declared invalid. It should be declared invalid because it was never ratified by the United States Senate. It should be declared invalid because, in spite of the many advantages Stalin gained from Yalta, he has not fulfilled the few commitments which he did make.

This agreement can still be denounced. Until it is, the millions of people in Poland who were sold into slavery at Yalta can never have faith in our good intentions, no matter how loudly we may proclaim them. For 6 years we have contended with the handicap which has resulted from our ill-considered concessions at Yalta. For 6 years we have let the innocent victims suffer. For 6 years we have watched the Soviet system infiltrate, conquer and absorb more and more of the world's population. On this anniversay of shameful Yalta, let us inaugurate a serious effort to rid ourselves of the shackles of this agreement so that we may once again walk with honor among its victims.

Disposition of Surplus American Wheat—Recommendations of the Oregon Wheat Growers League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Don McKinnis, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, enclosing recommendations passed at the twenty-third annual meeting of the league, December 7, 8, and 9, 1950, regarding the disposition of American surplus wheat. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the recommendations be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., December 29, 1950.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I call your attention to the enclosed recommendations which were passed at the twenty-third annual meeting of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, December 7, 8, 9, 1950.

To save your time, I have chosen these resolutions from the five standing committee reports. They are the recommendations which should most properly be brought to your attention.

The executive committee of the wheat league will appreciate your consideration of these recommendations. Any advice or suggestions you care to make will be welcome.

Sincerely yours,

DON MCKINNIS,
President.

P. S.—Please note the new address of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. Any communications addressed to Mr. McKinnis will be promptly brought to his attention.

RECOMMENDATIONS PASSED AT THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE

THE CERTIFICATE BILL

We recommend that the Oregon Wheat Growers League continue to support the certificate bill and urge the passage of this bill in Congress. This plan would be self-supporting. It would allow United States wheat now in surplus to compete in export markets with foreign wheat and flour; it would make it easier for those nations short of food to buy it here; it would allow wheat not needed

for human food to be used for livestock feed; it would encourage the development of industrial uses of wheat, and would relieve our critical storage situation.

FOREIGN POLICY

During the past year a number of developments have reduced sales of our wheat and flour abroad. Canadian and Australian millers are selling flour in the Orient and Latin America at prices United States millers are unable to meet. Licensing regulations in Hong Kong, Singapore, and elsewhere exclude United States flour and give a monopoly in those markets to Canadian and Australian mills. These are part of the British Empire to which the United States gives billions of dollars through ECA. Flour purchased with United States funds for Korea is being milled in Japan from wheat produced in other countries.

The net effect of these and other developments is that all available wheat is bought from other exporting countries and the United States supplies only that portion of the world wheat market that cannot be supplied from other sources.

Bakers in the Orient and Latin America are becoming used to brands of flour from other countries. These have previously been established markets for Pacific Northwest flour. Such markets, once lost, will be exceedingly difficult to regain.

It is highly important to wheat producers that our mills be kept running and that we hold and expand markets for our wheat and flour in other countries.

We recommend, therefore, that the Wheat League do everything within its power to get our Government to take a more realistic, businesslike attitude toward promoting sales of United States wheat and flour abroad.

Specifically, we recommend—

1. The use of the certificate plan, or export subsidies that will enable our surplus wheat and flour to compete freely on the entire world market, outside of, as well as within, the international wheat agreement.

2. Insistence that our wheat and flour be given an even break in licensing regulations of importing nations which we are helping to finance.

3. Requiring that, where the United States Government puts up the money, our flour and wheat be given the preference over flour and wheat from other countries.

RESEARCH ON GRAINS

The United States Department of Agriculture has maintained a plant breeder at the Pendleton Branch Experiment Station for years. This position was discontinued during the summer of 1950. Plant breeding, varietal, insects, and plant disease research is needed at this station if the progress of our wheat breeding and research is to remain on the high level as in the past.

We therefore recommend that proper steps be taken by the Oregon Wheat Growers League to have funds earmarked for filling and maintaining this position at once.

We further recommend that copies of this resolution be sent to Cereal Division, Bureau of Plant Industry, Beltsville, Md., and to the dean of agriculture, Oregon State College.

CARRYING CHARGES ON LOAN WHEAT

In view of the fact that it is the intent of the law that the loan rate should be based on parity as of the beginning of the marketing year, the Oregon Wheat Growers League is of the opinion that the Commodity Credit Corporation should assume the carrying charges which accrue prior to the maturity date of the loan on warehouse-stored wheat, the same as they have in the past, and should continue to make a storage allowance on farm-stored wheat.

GROWER'S OPTION ON SURRENDER DATE OF CCC LOAN WHEAT

We recommend that the Oregon Wheat Growers League request the Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, to put in effect a program which would allow the wheat grower the option of delivering his wheat under loan 90 days before the maturity date of the loan or any time during this 90-day period. This action would facilitate the movement of wheat out of storage before a new marketing year and enable Commodity Credit to obtain wheat, if needed, before the loans are due, April 30.

COLUMBIA RIVER DEVELOPMENT

We are desperately short of electrical power, both for development of our area and for national defense. Navigation on this river is of great importance to our area. Speedier development of one of our greatest natural resources is essential; at the present rate it will be 8 years before there will be enough power to meet even present demands. We, therefore, recommend the Oregon Wheat Growers League use all of its influence to speed up the development of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

WHEAT VARIETY IMPROVEMENT AND SMUT CONTROL

With wheat smut becoming a more serious problem each year and with dwarf smut fast becoming a threat to all Oregon wheat producers, everything possible must be done to keep these losses at a minimum.

Elmar and Brevor, two newly released varieties, are among the few varieties that are more resistant to dwarf smut. It is understood that these varieties are not wholly resistant to dwarf smut and that there is a constant threat of new smuts developing. This threat can be at least partially controlled through proper seed treatment of all wheat seeded. Ceresan "M" by slurry treatment offers the best method of good seed treatment.

Elmar and Brevor, being the newest varieties released, and with no others in prospect of being released immediately, we recommend that farmers produce these as fast as seed becomes available. These two varieties are adapted to specific areas of rainfall and soil conditions and farmers should acquaint themselves with these requirements before large acreages are seeded.

BLACK STEM RUST FUNGUS

The common barberry is the alternate host for the black stem rust fungus, and the breeding place for new races of the fungus. Also it has been demonstrated that new races arising on the common barberry are frequently capable of infecting hitherto rust-resistant wheat varieties. Race 15-B, an extremely virulent new race of black stem rust, has been found and identified in the Pacific Northwest. Eight races not known to exist elsewhere in the world, and 11 races not known to occur in the Mississippi Valley, have been found in the Pacific Northwest. There being no commercial variety or advanced experimental variety of wheat in the United States or Canada that possesses resistance to race 15-B and other new races; and as the prevention of the spread of black stem rust is not only a regional problem but also a national problem, it is recommended by the Oregon Wheat Growers' League that the league request an immediate ground survey of the distribution of the common barberry in the wheat producing and adjacent areas of the State of Oregon by the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station and the State department of agriculture; and that following the survey, the eradication of this disease-propagating plant be carried out by the proper agencies.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Soil erosion continues to be a major problem in our wheat-producing areas. The importance of adequate soil conservation has long been recognized by our farmers. Continued emphasis should be made in getting everyone conservation minded.

We recommend that the Pendleton Branch Experiment Station erosion research project, and that Merrill Oveson, superintendent, be commended on the fine work on conservation tillage practice research carried on there.

We further recommend that steps be taken to provide adequate funds for continued research at the Pendleton station on this major problem. We believe that further research is needed before farmers can be fully confident of the place that such implements as the rotary subsoiler, chisels, subsurface tillers and others have on their farm.

EQUALIZING LOAN VALUES ON BARGE WHEAT—COLUMBIA RIVER TERMINALS

Historically, our Pacific Northwest wheat depends on export market. Normally, large amounts of our crop move to Columbia River port elevators for storage and subsequent loading onto ships. These Columbia River port elevators presently have a total receiving and storage capacity of approximately 15,000,000 bushels.[1] During the past 5 years, 1945 through 1949, over 135,000,000 bushels[2] have been exported from these Columbia River terminals, or an average of about 27,000,000 per year. During this same 5-year period the movement of barge wheat down the Columbia River to these terminal elevators has averaged about 2,600,000 bushels per year, with an average of 875,000 bushels of this amount during the harvest months of July, August and September. Thus barge delivery wheat to the Columbia River terminals is not large in relation to total capacity of the terminals, and amounts to about 9 percent of annual exports from these terminals. However, the movement of wheat by barge is a major factor in the storage, handling and marketing of the grower's crop, especially during the harvest season.

Presently, the Commodity Credit Corporation loan rates provide an 8 cents per bushel discount on wheat delivered to Columbia River terminals by barge. This discount unfairly penalizes that volume of grower wheat which is moved by barge. Especially is this true of the volume during the harvest period when, often due to boxcar shortages, barge movement is the only method of shipping which can keep many of our country facilities and river subterminals open. This 8-cent discount is so great that, as a practical measure, the growers do not take loans on barge wheat. The grain is either sold or consigned. These growers are penalized for a movement of grain which benefits every grower in the Pacific Northwest.

Establishment of the same terminal loan value on rail and barge wheat should be considered in the light of this special area problem. Equalization between rail and barge rates would correct the inequities and would have the following advantages:

1. Barge wheat would not cost the Government any more money than rail because large quantities are exported in excess of barge deliveries. Rail transit is not needed at the export location.

2. Encourage and facilitate movement of surplus grain at harvest time to terminal elevators, thereby relieving country facilities, and providing adequate export stocks in immediate export loading position.

3. Relieve boxcar shortages. Wheat shipped by barge from river counties means more boxcars for areas away from the river. Barge companies now have equipment sufficient to move 900,000 bushels[3] of wheat per month. This volume is equal to about 500 boxcar loadings per month.

[1] Figures developed from trade survey of terminal storage capacities.

[2] Figures obtained from records of Portland Grain Exchange, Portland, Oreg.

[3] Figures obtained directly from Inland Navigation Co. and Tidewater Shaver Barge Lines and compiled by Pendleton Grain Growers, Inc.

4. Eliminate basic cause underlying the forced sale or consignment of barge wheat, and thus make the support price equal for qualified growers.

5. Provide conditions favorable to the maximum and most efficient use of all transportation, handling and storing methods during emergency and scarcity periods.

Therefore, it is recommended—

1. That the Oregon Wheat Growers League go on record in favor of equal loan rates on barge and rail wheat delivered at Columbia River terminals.

2. That immediate action be taken to contact PMA and CCC in regard to getting favorable action well in advance of the 1951 crop.

AGRICULTURAL MANPOWER

The present world situation is becoming more acute from day to day. Realizing that agriculture will suffer labor shortages, we recommend that the executive committee of the Oregon Wheat Growers League take immediate steps to have a State manpower board set up with county boards to review labor needs of the counties for the reclassification of farm labor by selective service.

With the very possible acute labor shortages we further recommend that the enlistees within a county be counted in favor of the county draft quota. We ask that the executive committee take immediate action and contact proper authorities.

CONSERVATION RESEARCH

That effective research in the field of soil conservation should be continued and expanded in order to carry on an efficient soil-conservation program.

CONSERVATION PRACTICES NECESSARY FOR LOANS OR CERTIFICATES

That where allotments are established, or certificates are issued, a certain percentage of the acres of each farm be utilized by a recognized soil-building practice before eligibility for loans or conservation payments or certificates is established. And be it further resolved that each farmer shall be eligible for price support on all of his crops before being eligible for loans or price supports on any one of his crops.

ADJUSTMENT OF WHEAT LOAN RATES IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

That wheat growers as well as other interests be given a hearing before any action is taken toward adjusting wheat loan rates in the Pacific Northwest. Further, that the Oregon Wheat League make a thorough study prior to the hearing of the loan rate structure to determine whether the possible increase in movement of wheat out of the Pacific Northwest would justify a change in the loan rate structure.

Thirty-Third Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War I many submerged and suppressed national groups regained their independence. The Lithuanian people, one of the three Baltic nationalities who for more than a century had suffered Russian rule, declared their independence on February 16, 1918. That day was and still remains a day of commemoration.

The Lithuanians have a distinct place in the turbulent history of northern Europe. They are the most numerous of the three Baltic nationalities—about 3,000,000—and they have always been sturdy defenders of liberty. Although they have borne the heavy yoke of the Russian Government for more than a century, they have managed always to keep their love of liberty and their patriotism alive. Their sturdy and unyielding spirit, fortified by their firm belief in Christian principles, has served them well. They have clung to Christianity with the same tenacity as they have to their unhappy homeland.

Both in the attainment of their Lithuanian independence and in its sustenance during more than two decades, I am happy to say, the United States has made important contributions, officially and unofficially. The Lithuanians received great encouragement from the Fourteen Points declaration of our former President Wilson. It was a source of inspiration to them to know that their struggle for liberty and independence had the support of our wartime President and our people. Nor was the moral and material aid given to Lithuania by the people of this country, especially by the worthy citizens of Lithuanian descent, of less significance.

This latter group, totaling more than 500,000, have served their adopted country well. As law-abiding, hard-working, and loyal citizens in wartime and in peacetime, they have contributed their full share in the making of this country and in the shaping of American civilization. It is the independence day of the brethren of these people who, today, in northeastern Europe suffer under the most oppressive of tyrannies, that is being celebrated on this 16th day of February.

In 1918 when the Lithuanians earned their freedom they and the friends of freedom all over the world thought that the servitude and misery of foreign rule had come to an end. This brave people who had struggled against Teutonic knights in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, against foreign overlords through the next four centuries and finally, against the regime of the Russian Czars for more than a hundred years, had at last broken the chains of their involuntary servitude. A new day had dawned for them, and a new, promising life began for them as a nation. During the twenty-odd years of her independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania made tremendous advances and became a model democracy in northeastern Europe.

Today this unhappy country, and its people, once more finds itself in chains and sealed off from friendly contacts with the Western World. In 1940 the Soviet Union descended upon the little country and swallowed it; a year later it was overrun by the Germans, and the Soviets were expelled. In 1944 the dreaded Russians returned, to complete their absorption of this unhappy people. Last year it was reported that some 600,000 Lithuanians had been deported to slave-labor camps in Asiatic regions of the Soviet Union. According to the New York Times of February 16, 1950, these people were being killed, were starving to death, and were undergoing deportation at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 each month. Against this terrible campaign of attrition the Lithuanian underground patriots are still active, still striving to gain their independence. It is to the credit of this country that our Government still accords diplomatic recognition to the Government of Lithuania—a clear indication that we believe that on some February 16 to come, the Lithuanian people once again will celebrate their day of independence in full freedom and in peace.

Fundamentals of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 19 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 15 entitled "Fundamentals of Inflation." This editorial deals with the current research into public policy of the famed business group, the Committee for Economic Development, on the first board of trustees of which I had the honor of serving as the vice chairman.

Since its founding 9 years ago the CED has taken leadership in the clarification of our fiscal policy. Now, as this editorial indicates, it is concerning itself also with monetary policy, a subject of such vital significance that many distinguished economists think our ineptitude in this area largely accounts for our failure to control the rise in prices of the past 7 or 8 months. Much of the recent testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has dealt with this and kindred subjects touched on in the editorial.

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

FUNDAMENTALS OF INFLATION

We think the country as a whole will echo the demand of the Committee for Economic Development that it is high time the administration established a clear and consistent anti-inflation program.

The Committee for Economic Development points out that while so-called direct price-wage controls have their place in a major defense effort, they do not deal with the causes of inflation, and unless those causes are removed such controls can do more harm than good. This, of course, is sound common sense. Direct controls, in this respect, are like a loan granted to a State on condition that it undertake certain constructive financial reforms needed to insure its solvency.

Unless it moves immediately to put those reforms into effect the whole benefit of the loan may be negated, leaving the borrower worse off than before. And in the hands of an administration that is uncertain in its convictions and inclined, all else being equal, to pursue the course of least political resistance, controls partake of the nature of such a stop-gap loan in another respect. They serve to create temporarily an impression of economic stability, and thus are a temptation to the administration to relax its fight on inflation by those techniques which deal with its real causes.

There is nothing complicated about dealing with price inflation, given the will to deal with it courageously, no matter what group is hurt politically. But we may just as well abandon any hope that we can defeat it so long as we continue to protect the vested interest of the wage-earner in the 40-hour week and escalator wage clauses; so long as we permit the farm bloc in Congress to tell us that we must make an exception to the over-all commodity price freeze of the products in which it is particularly interested; and so long as we place the protection of an artificial parity for Government securities higher in our scale of values than the protection of the dollar.

Fundamentally, price inflation is the result of an unbalance between the volume of goods and services available, on the one hand, and the volume of purchasing power, on the other hand. The only way it can be overcome, therefore, is by increasing the supply of goods and services, or by reducing the supply of purchasing power, or both. There has been a good deal of lip service in Washington recently to the idea of solving the problem by increasing production. The Committee for Economic Development points out that while increased production may be a long-term solution, it won't immediately stabilize the economy.

We would go further than this. We think that the talk about defeating inflation by increased production is largely irrelevant so long as the defense effort continues. The reason it is virtually impossible to attack inflation from the supply side, once a war or a major rearmament program has gotten under way, is that you are dealing with an economy that is operating at total capacity, or close to it. Even if we could double production tomorrow the inflation gap represented by rearmament production would still remain. For while such production creates purchasing power just as effectively as the production of civilian goods, not a dollar of that newly created purchasing power is offset, inflationwise, by increased civilian consumption.

The sooner we put increased production out of our minds, therefore, as a practicable solution of the inflation problem and concentrate on the demand side the sooner we can hope to see some tangible results. And when we start to concentrate on demand or purchasing power we should be on guard lest we be misled by the oversimplificationists. The expansion of bank credit, for example, is not the sum total of increased purchasing power. Broadly speaking, three different kinds of purchasing power enter into the problem of price inflation. They are: Purchasing power that is created currently, such as wages; purchasing power previously accumulated (savings); and what may be called future purchasing power, which would be purchasing power created by the banks to be used now and repaid later.

This is the basic situation that has to be met in formulating and carrying out an anti-inflation program. That being so, the general thesis of the Committee for Economic Development is completely logical. It calls for drastic steps to cut Government spending; sharp and prompt tax increases, designed to restrain consumer spending as well as to increase revenues; a national program to encourage saving, and, finally, the adoption of a policy under which the Federal Reserve would be freed from its responsibility to peg the Government securities market, so that it could devote itself to the task for which it was created, the task of stabilizing the money market and protecting the purchasing power of the dollar.

Fight Winning War in Korea or Get Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my home State of Michigan where I found the majority of the people demanding a clarified policy in Korea. The situation in Michigan is well stated in an editorial by John S. Knight, one of our foremost American publishers, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, Sunday, February 18.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

FIGHT WINNING WAR IN KOREA OR GET OUT

According to Fred Sparks, recently returned Chicago Daily News foreign-service correspondent, the "kids" in Korea are living with one foot in a fox hole and the other planted on Main Street, U. S. A.

Putting it another way, they sense that the big decision as to whether we stay in Korea or pull out has not yet been made.

In the absence of any clearly defined policy by the military brass, the political big shots, or the United Nations, our troops in Korea just don't have that "let's get it over and go home" spirit which was such a strong morale factor in World War II.

Nor do they clearly understand why they are in Korea; why they can't bomb enemy supply arsenals in Manchuria; why they alternately advance and retreat; or what our real objectives are.

They know only from the limited information which comes to them from the Stars and Stripes or an occasional broadcast that a great debate over foreign policy is raging in Washington.

They read, too, that the United Nations has branded Red China as an aggressor. "Why then," they ask with the candor characteristic of youth, "can't we bomb the daylights out of the Chinese Reds where it really hurts?"

When they get no satisfying reply, should these "kids" be blamed for thinking that maybe it's just a politicians' war, and the hell with it.

In fact, that's what a good many people are thinking right here at home.

MAC ARTHUR'S PREDICAMENT

General MacArthur is the victim of much undeserved criticism from Drew Pearson and other "typewriter warriors" for our reverses in Korea.

Conceding that "Mac" has pulled a few boners, the facts are that MacArthur has had to fight a war with one arm tied behind his back.

He has repeatedly said that the "restrictions" placed upon him are "unparalleled in military history." In his most recent statement, MacArthur hinted at his predicament by saying that "the future of Korea continues to be dependent upon international considerations and decisions not yet known here."

In other words, even the Commander in Chief of all forces in Asia is without adequate instructions from his superiors and knows not where he stands.

Can you blame MacArthur for describing Manchuria as a privileged sanctuary and complaining that he is unable to see clearly the outcome of the war under present limitations?

WHY WE HAVE NO POLICY

In the early days of the Korean conflict a decision was taken against bombing Manchurian supply centers for fear of bringing the Chinese Reds into the war.

At the time it was reached, this conclusion seemed justified. Now that the Chinese Reds are killing our boys, it seems fantastic that we sheathe our most effective weapon.

The diplomats at Lake Success passed a watered-down resolution terming Red China an aggressor nation, but they literally wring their hands over the suggestion that sanctions be employed.

Ernie Hill, our correspondent at the UN, says. "Delegates frankly state that under present circumstances they will never vote to press the war across the Chinese border."

Peter Lisagor, member of our Washington staff, reports United States diplomatic officials feel that the original resolution to pacify and restore security to Korea applies well enough. There is no great urgency to change it.

No great urgency, my eye. We should either fight a winning war in Korea, or get out

What sense is there in committing thousands of our best young men to the "meat grinding" process—MacArthur's term for the Korean fighting—to satisfy the United Nations diplomatic front?

The "meat grinding" type of war could last for years without decisive results.

Another reason why we have no firm policy in Korea is that the British shudder at the thought of antagonizing Red China and losing their important commercial foothold in Hong Kong.

Fred Sparks told a Chicago audience that the British are even permitting a trickle of strategic supplies, including crude rubber, to reach the Chinese Communists.

This is the age-old diplomatic practice of two nations professing friendship while their sons are killing one another on the battlefield

In World War II when Dictator Franco was firmly allied with Hitler and Mussolini, Great Britain allowed this same trickle of strategic materials to reach the enemy they were presumed to be fighting.

This procedure was justified by the British on the ground that it kept Spain as a neutral nation.

As David Lawrence said recently, "The belief grows that the Korean situation has become more and more of a political problem, as pressure is exerted against Prime Minister Attlee from the left wingers inside the Labor Party. The affinity of the left wing Laborites with Communist objectives in the Far East has manifested itself in a demand that the Peiping regime be recognized by the United Nations and in the campaign to prevent the Red Chinese from being branded as aggressors."

What manner of allies are these?

BRING MAC ARTHUR HOME

Since we have had an Eisenhower report on Europe, how about a MacArthur report on Korea?

What greater service could General MacArthur perform for his country than to tell Congress and the people the plain, unvarnished facts about Korea?

His critics hint darkly that Mac wants to undertake an all-out war against the Chinese Reds. The accusation is false, but let MacArthur answer the question.

Let him outline his problems, amplify his remarks about diplomatic restrictions and tell us what he would do, and when, if he were in a position of final authority.

It isn't only the kids in Korea who are confused. It's all of us.

The suspicion grows that the United States is being inextricably caught in the web of old world diplomacy. This is a pattern of diplomacy which settles nothing permanently, nor makes more than a gesture toward reaching final and lasting agreement.

The American heritage is different. We knew what we were fighting for at Valley Forge, New Orleans, Missionary Ridge, and Manila Bay.

We thought we knew what we were fighting for at Belleau Wood, St. Mihiel, Bastogne, and Okinawa.

Are we as sure today about Seoul, Inchon, and Wonju?

Or our 50,000 casualties in Korea?

Are we satisfied to accept the view that the United States of America must send the flower of its youth to fight communism on every front, or will we insist that our objectives must be clearly defined so we will know the reason for and the price of our sacrifice?

While the thought of war is repugnant to all of us, no good American shrinks from the conflict if he knows why we're fighting and what we are attempting to achieve.

The situation in Korea is beclouded by the inconclusive vaporings of timid men at Lake Success and the foggy bottom pontification of those sitting in the seats of the departed mighty at Washington.

Walter Lippmann hints that we have long since put aside the political objectives declared in the UN resolution of October 7 to establish by arms "a unified independent and democratic government in Korea."

What, then, are our objectives? A military partition of Korea which would again divide that country into two spheres of influence?

What is the truth?

A personal report by MacArthur would either confirm or dispel our doubts. It is a story that no other man could tell.

After 8 months of diplomatic double talk about Korea, and for the sake of our sons in combat, it's time to find out, or get out.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Substitute for Blood-Plasma Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add further to the remarks I made recently with regard to the discovery of okra as a substitute for blood plasma by Marquette University.

I include herewith an article that appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel of January 28, 1951:

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PLASMA SUBSTITUTE OUTPUT CENTERED HERE

The manufacture and distribution of the okra substitute for human plasma will be centered here in Milwaukee.

They will be supervised by Marquette University Medical School, where the new discovery was developed.

Patents for control of the manufacturing process have been applied for by three of the men concerned in the research. Dr. Hiram Benjamin, staff member of the medical school and chief of the research team, has applied for the basic patent.

Subsidiary patents, which concern the purification process by which the okra product is reduced to a powder, have been applied for by Dr. Harry Ihrig, Ph. D., vice president in charge of research at the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., and Darwin Kaestner, plant and production manager of Lakeside Laboratories here.

The three men have agreed to turn their patents over to the medical school. They are giving up the patent rights on the principle that control of a product of such potential importance to humanity should not be vested in individuals but in a nonprofit medical institution.

Lakeside Laboratories, at 1707 East North Avenue, will be licensed to manufacture the plasma replacement, according to Dr. John S. Hirschboeck, dean of the medical school.

CAN BE SUBLET

Lakeside will be able to sublet manufacturing contracts to other laboratories if the demand for the new product exceeds Lakeside's capacity, but all such agreements will be subject to the approval of the medical school.

In this way, Dr. Hirschboeck explained, Marquette will be in direct control of the standards governing the manufacture and distribution of the plasma substitute.

Marquette's royalties from sale of the product will be used to promote and expand the university's medical research program, Dr. Hirschboeck said.

EXCELLENT TEAMWORK

One phase of the research which led to the okra plasma replacement is a fine example of teamwork between science and industry. This was the task of working out a method by which large quantities of the okra extract could be reduced to a powder without sacrificing any of its useful elements.

The Globe Steel Tubes Co. started this problem on the way to solution by loaning the medical school Dr. Ihrig, then director of laboratories for the company. Globe Steel also provided the use of laboratory facilities which were not available at Marquette.

Dr. Ihrig's services as research consultant were continued by the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. after he had gone to that firm as vice president in charge of research. Further steps in the purification process were worked out in the Allis-Chalmers laboratories.

Members of the Lakeside Laboratories staff who cooperated in the development of the plasma replacement included Kaestner; Dr. Harvey L. Daiell, scientific director; Harris L. Friedman, director of laboratories; and Joseph M. Jacques, chemist.

The Social Security Act Should Be Amended To Permit Recipients of Earned Benefits To Earn $100 Monthly Without Loss of Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the Eighty-first Congress I had a bill pending before the House Ways and Means Committee to amend the Social Security Act to permit recipients of earned benefits to earn up to $50 monthly without loss of benefits. At that time the ceiling on such earnings was $14.99 monthly, and a retired person drawing earned social-security benefits did not dare to accept any employment that would pay over $14.99 monthly or face the loss of his monthly benefit check.

When the House Ways and Means Committee perfected the amendments to the Social Security Act, the proposal contained in my bill that the ceiling on wages earned be increased to $50 monthly was adopted. It has since become law and is in effect at the present time.

No doubt many of you have found, as I have, that with the cost of living continually on the increase there is ample justification for increasing the ceiling on earnings to $100 monthly and still preserve eligibility for earned profits under the Social Security Act. For that reason I have introduced a bill this date to amend the Social Security Act by allowing a person entitled to earned benefits to earn an income of $100 monthly and not suffer the loss of social-security benefits he is receiving.

After all, the recipient of earned benefits contributed his share of payroll taxes along with his employer while he was working in covered employment. Since he purchased the benefits he receives by his contributions from wages earned, he is not receiving any handout from the Federal Government when he cashes his monthly social-security check.

These retired persons represent a large group of good American citizens who through toil and taxes have helped build this great Nation. There is no good reason why they should be denied the right in their retirement years to increase their income by accepting employment that does not pay them over $100 monthly and still be able to retain their status as recipients of earned social-security benefits that they and their employers purchased through payroll deductions.

The increase of the present ceiling on earnings of from $50 to $100 monthly provided in my bill will prove a morale builder to many retired persons who are able and eager to accept employment because they find it impossible to meet the high cost of living on their fixed income from present social-security benefits. These deserving citizens buy their groceries and other necessities of life in the same stores that are patronized by their neighbors who are gainfully employed. Therefore, it requires no stretch of the imagination to realize the desperate plight facing these fine American citizens, and with that thought in mind, I sincerely hope that my proposal to increase the present ceiling on income from $50 to $100 will receive the immediate and enthusiastic approval of Congress without any further delay.

Radio Address of Miss Marcia Anne Harmon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Miss Marcia Anne Harmon, of St. Bernardine High School, Del Rosa, Calif.:

(By Marcia Anne Harmon, age 16, St. Bernardine High School, Del Rosa, Calif.)

When I pondered on the title of this year's contest, I asked myself, "Who really should speak for Democracy?"

In my mind's eye I saw the battlefields of Korea and the boys who are fighting and dying over there for the ideals of democracy. And I thought—yes, these could probably speak, but then, no. These soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen of ours, fight and die, but they remain strangely silent concerning those sacred principles so dear to them. They act; they do; but they do not boast, nor speak.

Who or what, then, would represent democracy's case? Across my mind floated two symbols of democracy.

One was that of a tall, graceful, alluring statue, standing, holding aloft the torch of freedom at the entrance of New York Harbor. Lady Liberty expresses all that democracy means. Her famed sculptor would have her say to all: "Welcome to my home, a shrine of freedom, O you oppressed of other lands. Here is your chance to use and share your talents in your own way for the good of all. Here, you can carve out your fame, embellish your name, lay the foundations of your home and family, and participate in the cultural, economic and political betterment of your equals and on the same footing with them. My torch, burning brightly, symbolizes light for your paths, truth for your minds, and a promise of freedom for your God-given rights."

While I was still considering Lady Liberty's words, her picture faded out, introducing another symbol of democracy—the ballot box. I wondered what this symbol would say and then realized this would be its proclamation: "I am your voice of democracy. In your desire to procure democracy, to protect it, and to dedicate yourselves to the ideals of freedom, I act as a depository for your conscientiously considered attempts to maintain honorable men in official positions. You choose me to secure for you the treasure of good laws, through legislation, initiative, and referendum. You are a person, thinking and doing; I am your voice in proclaiming the good for all.

"True, you are," I thought, but then I realized the ballot box was saying to me: "You are a person; I am only your voice." And I suddenly realized it is the voice of youth, the youth of our times, who must bespeak democracy's worth. And this is what youth would say. This is what I would say:

"I speak for democracy, because I want the freedom that democracy is. I want the right to such education as I am capable of receiving; the right to choose and pursue a career, to travel where I wish, to live as simply or as luxuriously as my income or taste indicate. I want the right to individuality, and accepting the good and discarding the evil, I want the right to expect that my life will have been of some value in the Creator's great plan. I want to worship God in my own faith. I do not want to be the henchman or stooge of some power-mad monster, and know only what he chooses to allow me to know, and do only what fits his purpose. Neither do I want to be the tool of greed, envy, or hate. I want to be true to myself and a vital part of my own democratic Government—a Government of which I, as much as any one person, am responsible. I want to accept that responsibility with intelligence and gratitude, and share in the work, the costs, and the benefits of democracy."

Many great minds have blended their wisdom to build this democracy of ours. Many brave deeds and many noble lives have been required to keep it alive. To extend it on to others in other centuries will call for even deeper wisdom and greater bravery than ever before, but with God's help, the youth of America for whom I speak will learn to live wisely and bravely in order to keep democracy shining.

Yes, I speak for democracy.

Speech of Ricardo Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a speech made by Ricardo Romulo, a student at St. John's College High School, Washington, D. C., a son of General Romulo, a former honored Representative of this House from the Philippines.

Mr. Romulo was one of the four winners of the 1950–51 Voice of Democracy contest. This outstanding feat deserves the attention and respect of every Member of Congress.

I am certain everyone in the House will enjoy reading this excellent speech, which won for Mr. Romulo a $500 college scholarship and a trip to Washington, D. C.

(By Ricardo Romulo, age 17, St. John's College High School, Washington, D. C.)

I speak for democracy.

Because I hail from the Philippines where my forefathers, generations ago, did not know it, and now thanks to America, my country is democracy's outpost in Asia.

Because I know what democracy has meant to my country where before its advent there was no freedom; but now freedom has given us progress, better standards of living, unity, happiness, and contentment.

Because whence I came my people were benighted and enslaved until democracy came.

I speak for democracy—

And I speak the language of courage, because at this critical juncture in history, when there are evil forces that would destroy it, only the strength that comes from the united will of a people can overwhelm those that would subvert it.

I also speak the language of faith because in the history of mankind never has there been a beacon light that has offered such guidance and inspiration to millions of people everywhere as democracy has done and shall ever do.

Here in America, democracy is the living mortar of the American people's unity. It belongs to all of us, even to those who are its guests, because democracy has many interpretations within the pattern of our daily lives.

In America, we accept freedom of religion as a divine right under the proposition that all men are created equal before God. Today, throughout the 48 States, stand some 250,000 churches, representing almost every known creed, denomination, and faith. For democracy means a faith for every seeker. And in this land wherever and however religious services are held, democracy means the right of every man to seek out God in his own way.

Democracy means more than casting a vote and abiding by the will of the majority. America's system of government demands of every citizen a deep sense of personal responsibility and vigilance. For democracy works like a wheel, with government at its hub. Between the Congress, which guards the people's liberties and the people it leads, there must be constant interaction along the spokes of public opinion.

Democracy has made America a land of opportunity—where energy, enthusiasm, and an economy of free enterprise have converted its natural wealth into the highest standard of living on earth. This year Americans at work will earn more than $200,000,000,000. But behind this enormous national pay check lies a vital meaning of democracy—the right of every man to choose his own trade. And whatever his trade or profession, here every worker has the chance of becoming the boss. For free enterprise is the economic dividend of democracy.

In action, democracy can never be selective. It is a give-and-take p position, by which the God-given right of any one man to speak his mind must be the right of all without prejudice or restriction.

To work, democracy must com from the people. It means inquiring into the workings and problems of government at all levels. It means thinking through critically—yet with common sense.

This, then, is democracy. To each of us it conveys a different personal meaning. But to all it means freedom, opportunity, and happiness.

Thus I have spoken for democracy because I want to live a useful full life as a good citizen and because I want to die a free man.

How Do Gasoline Prices Do It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent article from Texaco Star on gasoline prices:

HOW DO GASOLINE PRICES DO IT?

(By Don Herold)

I'm glad I didn't try to hedge against general inflation by buying a billion dollars' worth of gasoline in 1925.

It sells for less these days than it did in 1925.

I could have made money by buying up almost any other commodity in 1925 and salting it away and selling it at today's prices—from collar buttons to canned tomatoes. But not gasoline.

Leaving off taxes, the average price of a gallon of so-called regular gasoline in 1925 was 21.93 cents. On July 1, 1950, it was 20.17 cents.

In this same span of time, general living costs went up 37.5 percent, food up 58 percent, apparel up 51 percent, house furnishings up 53 percent.

Apparently, the oil business is a whole lot more competitive than some people think, or gasoline would be 30 or 40 cents a gallon (exclusive of taxes) today—if it had followed the general skyrocketing trend.

While nearly all commodity prices have zoomed heavenward, gasoline prices have stayed low because of technological improvements in production, lower unit costs made possible through increased volume, and efficiencies put into effect at every stage of handling oil.

This story is even better, too, than the naked arithmetic reveals.

Gasoline of today has more git-up-and-go in it than gasoline of 1925. On the basis of car performance, two gallons of present-day gasoline do the work of three gallons of 1925 gasoline. In other words, your gasoline dollar today is worth 50 percent more than it was in 1925.

Spurred by the rival forces of free competition, the thousands of companies that make up the oil industry have constantly improved their gasolines. Increasing the quality of its products is a competitive habit of the oil industry. Thousands of companies spending millions of dollars on research and thousands of millions of dollars on new equipment in the competitive effort to win business has produced the usual byproduct of American industry: better products for Mr. and Mrs. Public.

Now, you may think everybody knows all this. But public-opinion surveys show that the motoring public at large thinks that gasoline is a whole lot more expensive than it used to be.

Part of the public's confusion is due to the fact that gasoline has been loaded harder and harder with taxes.

Today, Federal and State taxes on gasoline average 6 70 cents a gallon—nearly a third of the average retail price of regular gasoline, ex-tax. The oil industry isn't to blame for this—in fact, doesn't love it at all.

The oil companies act as tax collectors for Federal, State, and local governments. In 1949 the oil companies collected nearly $2,000,000,000 in gasoline taxes for Uncle Sam and for the States.

Furthermore, although gasoline prices have remained reasonable, the oil industry has had to meet greatly increased wage and material costs all along the line.

So, I think anybody who is in any way connected with the oil business has reason to crow. A stockholder or an employee of an oil company should have fun—should make a regular habit of—telling what his industry has done about this matter of retail prices.

The public in general is misinformed on this matter of gasoline prices. I, for one, enjoy helping to set 'em straight.

Building of Strategic Bombers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ANDERSON-TULLY CO.,
Memphis, Tenn., February 16, 1951.

The Honorable W. J. B. DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DORN: This morning's Memphis Commercial Appeal carried a news item under date of February 15, 1951, that you had urged the building of 5,000 B-36 and B-50 strategic bombers.

I want to take this opportunity of congratulating you and assuring you that at least this writer is in complete agreement with you.

The cost of training, equipping, and transporting one division of American troops to Western Europe would be about $450,000,000. Ten divisions, which is the lowest figure I have heard for General Eisenhower's European army, would run around $4,500,000,000. In World War II, the United States Navy's Task Force 58, consisting of 16 aircraft carriers, 8 battleships, 17 cruisers, 75 destroyers, and an array of other vessels, of which it lost 10 percent in 3 days of action, and with a personnel of nearly 100,000 succeeded in dropping on Japan or'y 513 tons of bombs and represented an investment of over $4,500,000,000.

Five thousand strategic bombers of the B-36 and B-50 class, or even larger and more powerful bombers, at an average cost of $3,000,000 each, would represent an investment of some $15,000,000,000, with comparatively small personnel, operating, and maintenance costs.

Long-range, strategic bomber task forces carrying atomic weapons, rockets, guided missiles, and electronic devices for navigation, target sighting, and radar jamming are our most effective method of carrying war to Soviet Russia—and cost-wise, the only method our economy can support without serious and dangerous strain.

We cannot hope to win against Russian mass by using mass. Nor can we hope to win against Russia by naval power, as Russia has no navy to defeat. Our surest hope lies in American technology, American technique, and American industrial production, the finest expression of which is the long-range, strategic bomber, manned by a crew of alert, well-trained, well-disciplined, and quick-thinking American men. Any military planning which does not utilize such airpower as the spearhead of our strategy is fallacious and will do much to defeat us militarily and economically. Furthermore, Russia cannot build such great armadas of long-range, strategic bombers because she is forced to concentrate on tactical aviation to support 'ier land armies.

Those of us who have been adherents of the same viewpoint you hold wish you success in this serious hour.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM R. KENT,
Vice President and Treasurer.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter to the editor that appeared in the Washington Post Monday, February 19, endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway. The writer of this letter, Mr. John Edelman, of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO. He probably, as well as anyone, represents labor in the northeastern part of the country and his letter shows that he has studied the St. Lawrence seaway and realizes the great benefit that it would be to our country at large as well as to the laboring men of the Northeastern States. I hope that every Member of the House will read the following letter:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

In your issue of February 5, there was a letter from Mr. Carroll B. Huntress, chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, taking exception to your editorial of January 29 supporting the St. Lawrence seaway. Mr. Huntress' principal point is to belittle those segments of the steel industry which are supporting the project in order to bring Labrador-Quebec ore to the middlewestern steel mills.

The whole CIO supports the St. Lawrence seaway project authorized by successive resolutions of its convention, and has been supporting it for a longer period than the steel companies. The National Grange similarly has been an active supporter of this project. The same is true of the Army, the Navy, and other defense agencies of the Government. It is obviously nonsense to imply that all of these supporting forces are mere stooges of a few steel companies.

The 6,000,000 members of the CIO are for St. Lawrence on the broad grounds of public policy. My union has some very slight measure of self-interest in this project; it is essential that manufacturing industries in New England find sources of cheaper electric power.

The industrialists who have recently switched to the St. Lawrence project have done so simply because they now recognize certain physical and economic facts that have been recognized for a long time by the quite widely varying interests which have been for the project. Until very recently this country was self-sufficient in the matter of iron-ore supply; it is now clear that we may have to import more than 40 percent of our national requirements from abroad. Our ore imports may have to rise from 7,000,000 tons in 1950 to as high as 65,000,000 tons in 1960.

As we see it, the crux of the problem is this: Which is the cheapest and safest way of bringing ore to the centers of steel production? The eastern railroads want to insure themselves the revenue involved in shipping the ore from the Atlantic to the Middle West mills. It just happens that it is more expensive to bring this ore by Atlantic sea lanes. In addition, ships hauling ore from South America are peculiarly vulnerable to submarine attack.

JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Washington Representative,
Textile Workers' Union of America, CIO.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is a Spendthrift Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Salt Lake City Deseret News, in an editorial in the January 5, 1951, issue, said:

This is no time to spend money out of fear of a bogeyman myth.

The editor was referring to the St. Lawrence seaway project that has been before Congress since time immemorial.

Every Member of Congress should read the editorial which follows:

THIS IS NO TIME TO SPEND MONEY OUT OF FEAR OF A BOGEYMAN MYTH

One of the spendthrift measures certain to be lobby-pressured hard on the Eighty-second Congress will be a St. Lawrence River lakes-to-the-sea deep waterway bill.

Already its propagandists are ranging the land armed with what they argue are two inescapable demands of patriotism.

One is that the Canadian-United States power scheme associated with the deep waterway aspect of the project is a defense necessity required to supply electricity needed by New York State and New England armament industries. This is questionable.

The other is that if the St. Lawrence is made deep water for its length it will open the Great Lakes ports to oceangoing vessels so that our mid-States steel industry can get Labrador iron ore which we'll need, because the Lake Superior ores are running out.

With scarce more than a glance at the tangled problems associated with the socialized production of electric power by Government works, which the St. Lawrence project would aggravate, let's look at that notion about our vanishing iron ore supply.

This myth was born about 10 years ago. We were told that the high grade deposits of the Lake Superior region were going to run out not only pretty soon but quickly; specifically the Mesabi Range, largest of the sources, was on the verge of exhaustion and that the steel industry from Chicago east would have to contrive a new pattern, perhaps before World War II was done.

In May 1942 the Mesabi alarm was rung loudest by E. W. Davis, the director of the Minnesota Mines Experiment Station, in a report to the War Production Board.

"At war production rates," Mr. Davis said, "the known reserves of the Lake Superior district will be exhausted in 1950, but without Government financing a shortage of ore may be expected several years previous to complete exhaustion."

Government money was not provided; the Lake Superior ores are not exhausted; and what happened in 1950 was that Lake Superior ore production had so maintained that close to $50,000,000 is now in process of being spent for nine new carriers of the largest size to freight ore down the century-old Great Lakes route.

What went wrong with the forecast of ore exhaustion which the St. Lawrence waterway drumbeaters are still using as a talking point, was what goes wrong with practically every estimate of the life of a mineral deposit. It never (at least rarely) turns out quite as expected.

Not many years before the tale of iron-ore exhaustion was hatched, we were hearing the same sort of scare forecasts about the exhausting of United States petroleum reserves. When the wailing was loudest the biggest fields in the country's history were discovered and the industry was pretty nearly drowned in new oil.

The Government financing that Mr. Davis wanted for Minnesota ore would have been for developing methods of using the low-grade sources of iron called taconite. Huge quantities of such ore, with 20 to 30 percent iron content, are available in the Lake Superior country, if it can be worked up without too much expense.

But the ore still coming down the Great Lakes is 50 percent iron or better; 82,000,000 tons of the stuff in 1948; 78,200,000 tons last year. The biggest year was 92,000,000 tons in 1942. Annual deliveries vary because ice makes the Great Lakes shipping season undependable. Last year it was short, which is one reason for the nine new ore freighters. A St. Lawrence seaway could not lengthen the ice-free season.

What has turned out to be true about iron ore, as in the case of petroleum, is that as more is needed more is found.

As for the taconite, progress is being made in the separation of the ore from the rock; close followers of the processing think the main problem will be solved in 5 years or so.

The iron-ore and steel companies which have contracted for the nine big new ore boats, at any rate, believe they are making no great speculation on the life of the iron trade on the Great Lakes. Labrador supplies can await proven need.

Or they can be delivered by coastal routes, just as Venezuelan ore will be brought to the United States Steel Corp.'s newly authorized plant on the Delaware, at Morrisville, Pa. In case of a "hot" war with Russia, if the Soviets have as good a submarine fleet as we are told they have, these oceangoing ore carriers would be vulnerable just as bauxite carriers were to German submarines during the last big war.

But the lower reaches of the St. Lawrence could be equally vulnerable to submarines, and the whole deep-water stretch an open invitation to bombers; a better target, because closer to Russian bases than the Panama Canal.

The St Lawrence project has waited safely a good many years. A decent regard for realism dictates that it can still safely wait. This is no fit time to divert millions of dollars and thousands of men and machines and massive quantities of steel and copper and concrete and suchlike strategic materials in short supply, to a controversial construction project.

The Hardin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the Hardin project in south-central Montana and its central feature, Yellowtail Dam, are of great importance in the Missouri Basin development program. Over the years I have endeavored to advance this vital irrigation and hydroelectric power project, but have been unable to do so because some members of the Appropriations Committee have been reluctant to grant funds for the construction until they were assured that proper arrangements had been made with the Crow Indians, on whose land the dam will be constructed, for any loss that might accrue to them.

Two years ago I began an effort to reach a just and fair settlement with the Indians. As a first step, I secured, through the Public Lands Committee, an estimate from the Federal Power Commission as to the effect of the project upon the Crow Indians. At the same time the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Reclamation conducted independent studies to determine what compensation should be made to the Crow Indians for the use of the reservoir and dam site. I am glad to report that these efforts have materialized into a concrete offer to the Crow Indians. The Indians are now considering whether they will accept the offer. I hope that we are near a fair and just agreement with the Crow Tribe which will settle this problem, and that with this news, the Appropriations Committee will see fit at an early date to recommend that construction begin.

I include an article from the Hardin Tribune-Herald of February 8, 1951, concerning the offer to the Crow Indians:

CROWS ARE OFFERED $1,500,000 FOR YELLOWTAIL SITE

The Crow Indians were asked this week to consider an offer of $1,500,000 to pay them for their land and their interest in the proposed Yellowtail Dam project on the Big Horn River, 35 miles southwest of Hardin.

The offer was transmitted to them by Paul L. Fickinger, Billings area director of the Indian Service, on instruction from the Secretary of the Interior.

The dam would be built in the Big Horn Canyon, which the Indian Service ranks as the third largest in North America, and would back up water for a total distance of about 71 miles from a point 42 miles north of the Montana-Wyoming line. The plan for the project was enacted by Congress on December 22, 1944, but actual construction has been indefinitely postponed for lack of funds.

The offer conveyed by Fickinger in a letter to Robert Yellowtail, chairman of the Crow tribal council, concerns an application of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation for rights-of-way on Indian lands for the proposed reservoir, camp site, and recreational area, and for the right to build and operate the dam on tribal lands. The application was made to the Secretary of the Interior.

Unlike the situation which developed 2 years ago when members of three small tribes in North Dakota faced the prospect of having to give up their homes to make way for the Fort Berthold Reservoir, no dispossession of Crows would be involved in the Yellowtail project. According to Fickinger's letter, a total of 6,846⅓ acres would be required, but it would be for the most part uninhabited land in the wild, craggy depths of Big Horn and its tributary canyons.

In his letter to Yellowtail, Fickinger related that A. L. Alin, Omaha consulting engineer, had been engaged to make a study of the Crow's interests in the project and had arrived at a valuation of $28,952 for the land, $7,904 for timber on it and $1,374,000 for relinquishment of rights in the dam site, making a total of $1,401,856.

"This amount," Fickinger wrote, "was determined by amortizing the annual net power return from the hydroelectric development capitalized on the basis of 100 years life and interest at 2½ percent with half of the sum thereby determined for credit to the tribe as owners of the site and half for credit to the investor for his contribution."

Fickinger said that the Bureau of Reclamation at the same time had made an independent study and arrived at a figure of $1,410,800 as a fair reimbursement for the Crows.

"After completion of these two independent studies," he wrote, "the two bureaus entered into discussions which resulted in an agreement that in order further to protect the interests of the tribe and at the same time simplify negotiations, a rounded sum of $1,500,000 would be a fair offer to the members of the Crow Tribe for the Indian lands and interests in the dam and reservoir sites. This recommendation was approved by the Secretary of the Interior for presentation to the Crow people."

Fickinger asked Yellowtail to present the secretary's offer of $1,500,000 to the Crows for consideration and to make reply through the tribal council to the Billings area office of the Indian service. He said he was sending mimeographed copies of the appraisal

report for distribution among the Indians and he offered the services of his staff for consultation with the tribal council on the matter.

Double-Talk Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from St. Marys Press, St. Marys, Pa., for February 17, 1951:

DOUBLE-TALK STALIN

When double talk to its most polished degree breaks into public print, Premier Joseph Stalin can be seen the author.

He broke a 2-year silence Friday to sum up what he thinks of the world situation today and a finer job of Soviet propaganda was never unleashed by a Red disciple.

Mr. Stalin in Pravda, his official mouthpiece, calls United States a warmongering nation, and says American forces are bound to lose out in Korea, and why.

Mr. Stalin has the answer to that and here it is neatly rolled up in a capsule: "American soldiers fought gallantly against Germans and Japanese in the last war, but they do not have their hearts in the Korean War, hence the reverses."

Mr. Stalin says we are headed for certain defeat unless we pull all our troops off the Korean Peninsula and agree to a peace conference on the soil of Communist China. Can you beat that for gall?

Mr. Stalin is not only beating the drums for his own cause, but is also carrying the torch for the Chinese Reds, whom he would like to have pictured before the world as victims of Yankee aggression.

That is the worst distortion of truth that could be uttered by any human being, but the world has become accustomed to nothing but deception from Stalin, the greatest mass killer of all time.

The Soviet premier said further "war is not inevitable at this time." Those, indeed, are kind words coming from the man who has the power of life and death over millions of people behind the iron curtain.

There would be no talk of war today or in the future if Stalin would have lived up to terms of the Atlantic Charter to which he attached his signature in August 1941.

That document, drawn up at the instance of Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt said all nations on conclusion of hostilities if this country should become involved, would permit self-determination by the people themselves in various lands.

This was supposed to apply specifically to Poland and the Baltic States, but Mr. Stalin conveniently forgot his written pledges once victory perched on his banners and by sheer conquest placed the iron heel of despotism on millions of innocent people, who today have no idea of what freedom means to man.

Mr. Roosevelt, let it be pointed out, gave him a couple of assists (A) by later repudiation of the Atlantic Charter as a mere scrap of paper and (B) turning over to Stalin all the rich resources of Manchuria after they had been promised Gen. Chiang Kai-shek as his proper spoils of war.

Without this country's aid, assisted no little by the espionage system that was given tacit birth by recognition of Russia in 1933 by such men as Dr. Klaus Fuchs and Harry Gold, Stalin would still be the master of a small area of land peopled by less than 100,000,000 people.

Stalin claims this country is trying to make the United Nations an instrument of war, just about the silliest thing he could have said. Residents of this country have stood amazed at the actions of United Nations delegates walking the tightrope in efforts to avoid mentioning Red China as an aggressor power.

And none of them outside bold-spoken Warren Austin, chief United States delegate has had the courage to blame Soviet Russia for what has taken place in Korea.

Of course, the Russian people whose press and radio are subservient to the state, don't know the truth of the situation. They hear or read only what is approved by the Kremlin.

They should be told the truth, that Americans are as anxious to live in a peaceful world as the average Russian family, but with Stalin at the helm they will never learn that fact.

Mr. Hoover's Second Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

MR. HOOVER'S SECOND LOOK

Some weeks ago our only living ex-President told the world in a radio broadcast what he thought this country should do in the current world crisis. Specializing in its military problems and policy, he advised cancellation of any plan to send troops to Europe to strengthen the defense of the free nations against Communist attack—unless and until they grow strong enough to defend themselves. In effect, as most Americans understood his message, he advocated what used to be known as the isolationist policy—concentration upon defense of the Western Hemisphere while leaving Western Europe to defend itself or go under the Communist yoke.

This bit of master minding drew some applause from isolationist circles but left the main body of American opinion unconvinced that Mr. Hoover has acquired omniscience with advancing years. So he made a second try last Friday night. The military phases of the problem still fascinate him and he puts most of his new emphasis on an argument that the United States must not create land armies to send on expeditions to Europe or Asia. Admitting our obligation to aid the Atlantic Pact nations in case they are attacked, he contends in effect that our obligation can be fulfilled after the attack is launched, by harassing the aggressors with air and naval bombardments until they have had enough.

The harassment would be unpleasant, no doubt, but the aggressor probably could bear it with some degree of cheerfulness while he overran Western Europe and seized its industries for the build up of his own weapons and facilities for further conquest and more effective harassment of Mr. Hoover's own "Gibraltar," these United States.

Even as revised, Mr. Hoover's textbook on national defense causes us to doubt a little the only living ex-President's infallibility as a military strategist. If it is his ambition to play second violin in Senator TAFT's orchestra, we think his performance qualifies him for that post. But we cannot believe that Mr. Hoover's military program as he outlines it would serve our imminent national needs or lead toward secure freedom for the peoples who crave it—or benefit anybody save Stalin, who should welcome its tacit invitation to invade and occupy Western Europe while we stuck to the watchful waiting role for which Mr. Hoover casts us.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore placed in the RECORD some guest editorials by Col. C. H. Lindsay, vice president and general manager of the Tremont Lumber Co., Winnfield, La., dealing with the question of communism. Colonel Lindsay is an outstanding industrialist and has given considerable thought to the question. I wish to include in the RECORD another guest editorial by Colonel Lindsay. It is as follows:

A PRICE FOR COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

We spent billions of dollars from our Treasury along with priceless blood and suffering by all to save Russia from the Germans and billions more in money and sacrifices to save China from the Japs; now, Russia and China, former friends, are foes—all from the basis of communism.

Big hearted United States of America has given foreign nations by gift, grant, and otherwise, billions of dollars during World War II; we have given this to buy good will and purchase peace. Take inventory and see what we have facing us. You can clearly see a dark future which will always add up if we support any plan that will take our free enterprise.

Just as the stars shine out as soon as it is dark so will communism. For that reason, we must not let it become any darker by supporting any move or scheme that surely leads to present-day chaotic conditions by upholding or assisting any group that will hinder our freedom.

A man must stand erect, not be kept erect by others. A man in the right, with God on his side, is in the majority though he be alone. We as a Nation must stand for a free world, even though we stand alone.

If our dollars and sacrifices had been spent fortifying ourselves and building our own strength, there would not be an ingrate Communist who would dare to thumb his nose at us. We must not buy communism at a high price and lose our democratic freedom.

Water Conservation Official Issues Statement Relating to Proposed Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for fiscal year 1952 in-

cludes $8,000,000 which is proposed as a supplemental appropriation, subject to project authorization, to initiate construction of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon.

It is the fear of the people of my State that this project might be authorized without reference or benefit to irrigation requirements of the Snake River Basin or to the interests of the State of Idaho. Such must not be the case.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a statement by H. W. Morrison, president of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., published in the Idaho Daily Statesman, February 15, 1951, setting forth some of the controversial items on this proposed project:

WATER CONSERVATION OFFICIAL ISSUES STATEMENT RELATING TO PROPOSED HELLS CANYON DAM

H. W. Morrison, president of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., Wednesday issued this statement on the Hells Canyon Dam issue:

"The developing controversy growing out of the proposed construction of Hells Canyon Dam should, in my opinion, be clarified. This can be accomplished only if our people are afforded an opportunity to review all factors and interests which are involved in the proposed project, and the efforts which have been made to harmonize such interests.

"As you know, our organization, Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., is broadly representative of all groups interested in the development of Idaho's water resources. Our primary objective has been the creation of reliable sources of supplemental water for lands already under irrigation. Over the past 10 years, we have advocated and furthered the construction of Anderson Dam, Cascade Dam, and Lucky Peak Dam. These structures are providing the long-range solutions to our agriculturists' problems of crop failures in short water years and flood hazards in high-run-off years. We have also assisted the Snake River water development committee in obtaining congressional approval of the construction of Palisades Dam, as the answer to a similar problem confronting agriculturists in eastern Idaho.

"The second principal objective of our southwestern Idaho organization is development of the arid Mountain Home lands lying east of Boise through fuller utilization of Idaho's ample water resources. The Mountain Home project would reclaim approximately 250,000 acres of some of the finest soil in Idaho and would create agricultural development, employment, and income opportunities and taxable values almost equal to those of the entire Boise Valley as we now know it.

"At one time, when its cost was estimated at approximately $100,000,000, authorization of the Mountain Home project was considered imminent since repayable costs to be collected from farmers plus revenues to be derived from the electric power features of the project, were in total sufficient to enable the project to stand on its own feet, financially, and thus to render it feasible under the terms of the reclamation act. World War II not only prevented authorization of the Mountain Home and all other new reclamation projects, but its lingering economic effects increased the estimated cost of the Mountain Home project to in excess of $200,000,000.

"The United States Bureau of Reclamation, particularly the regional office located here in Boise under the former direction of R. J. Newell and now headed by H. T. Nelson, has always been sympathetic and cooperative in our efforts to bring about reclamation of the arid Mountain Home project lands. However, we have been told repeatedly that under the terms of the present reclamation act there could be no opportunity for bringing about this development unless its greatly increased cost could be met with the assistance of revenues from electric power, larger than the amount which would be available from power developed by the project's own features. The only alternative would be a direct appropriation by the Congress of the amount by which the project failed to qualify under the reclamation act's financial feasibility requirement; but this alternative method is wholly impractical since the Congress and the Nation could not afford to establish such a precedent.

"Early last December, I was advised by Mr. Nelson that his office had been directed to prepare immediately a draft of legislation proposed to be submitted to the Eighty-second Congress for authorization of the construction of Hells Canyon Dam. It was our understanding that the proposed legislation contemplated the construction of Hells Canyon Dam as a power and flood control project exclusively, to meet the desires and urgent needs of the States of Oregon and Washington. To the officers of our southwestern Idaho organization, it appeared grossly inequitable that Idaho's water resouces should be utilized on so vast a scale without guaranteeing to Idaho a fair measure of the benefits resulting from such utilization. We therefore entered promptly into conferences with members of our organization's executive committee and board of directors, Governor Robins, the commissioner of reclamation of the State of Idaho, and with representatives of the Idaho State reclamation association, Snake River water development committee, Mountain Home Improvement Association, officials of Idaho Power Co., and representatives of reclamation interests in the Twin Falls and Idaho Falls areas.

"As a result of these conferences, we prepared what we believe is a sound and reasonable statement of the Idaho position, meaning that if the Hells Canyon project is to be built Idaho is entitled to receive consideration in the manner and to the extent outlined in our statement. This statement was submitted to Mr. Nelson, as the director of the Bureau of Reclamation in this region, and discussed thoroughly. Mr. Nelson in turn recommended that we make known our position to (a) the Commissioner of Reclamation and his assistants in Washington, D. C.; (b) the Secretary of the Interior and his staff; and (c) the Director of the Budget and representatives from the White House. Accordingly, as president of the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., I headed a delegation which included Governor Robins and representatives of Idaho Power Co., Snake River Water Development Committee, and Mountain Home Improvement Association, as well as other individuals of recognized standing in reclamation activities in the Idaho Falls and Twin Falls areas. E. W. Rising, our organization's representative in Washington, D. C., joined this delegation upon its arrival there.

"We were received courteously by all of the Washington officials and were accorded the opportunity of presenting completely our requests. As a result of our visit to Washington, the Boise office of the Bureau of Reclamation was allowed more time in which to prepare the draft of the proposed legislation, and it was directed by the Secretary of the Interior that in the framing of the proposed legislation consideration be given to our thinking as expressed at the conference in Washington.

"For the past month, at the request of Mr. Nelson, the Bureau's regional director, conferences have continued locally for the purpose of agreeing upon language in the bill which would protect Idaho's rights. These conferences have been attended by Governor Jordan and other State officials, as well as by representatives of reclamation and water resource development groups. Publicity concerning these meetings had been deferred pending general agreement among the conferees and finalization of the proposed legislative draft and its submission to the Secretary of the Interior at Washington, D. C. This has just been accomplished within the past few days; and while we here have no way of knowing whether or not this draft will meet the approval of the Washington officials, we feel that the interests of Idaho will be quite well protected if the provisions we have requested are retained in the legislation proposed to be enacted to authorize the project. The requested protective provisions are, briefly:

"1. Full and complete reservation of Idaho's right to present and future upstream consumptive uses of water for all domestic and irrigation purposes.

"2. A definite statement in the bill's preamble to the effect that the purposes of the legislation include the reclamation of arid lands of the Snake River Basin, as well as the production of electric power at Hells Canyon Dam.

"3. An allocation of benefits from the sale of Hell's Canyon power in amounts sufficient, together with revenues from the proposed Scrivner Creek power development, to make financially feasible development of the Mountain Home project.

"4. The protection of rights of the Idaho Power Co., owner of the Oxbow site which would be inundated by construction of Hells Canyon Dam, through an allocation to the company of a block of firm Hell's Canyon power equivalent to that which could be produced by the Oxbow development.

"5. An allocation to the State of Idaho of a substantial block of Hells Canyon power in lieu of taxable values which would be lost through the inundation of other low-head dam sites upstream from the Hell's Canyon site, it being understood that the State of Idaho would have the right to contract for the sale of this power and to receive substantial kilowatt-tax revenues annually therefrom.

"It should be definitely understood that we have neither promoted the construction of the proposed Hells Canyon project, nor endeavored to oppose it. We believe that we are scarcely in position to deny the States of Oregon and Washington their proportional benefits from this natural power resource if the Congress decides to authorize the dam's construction. We do feel, however, that since Idaho's most important water resource is involved, Idaho's interest in the utilization of this resource is paramount. Therefore, Idaho's rights should be protected, and we have accordingly made every effort to accomplish this objective fairly and with proper consideration of the rights of other States. Should the legislation as finally proposed by the Secretary of the Interior fail to embody the protective provisions which we have recommended, then our southwestern Idaho organization, like other public-minded groups, would feel obliged to reexamine our present position in this matter.

"We recognize, as do all others, that it is questionable whether this is the proper time to undertake the expenditure of large sums of money such as would be required to build this project. This is a decision, in our opinion, for the Congress to make. We are agreeing that, with the exception of the Scriver Creek unit, no funds will be requested to inaugurate construction of the Mountain Home project until the national emergency is declared at an end by the President, or, alternatively, until a period of 6 years has elapsed. The Scriver Creek unit is a power producer and may properly be undertaken for the purpose of developing power for the defense effort under proper safeguards for the State of Idaho. The Scriver Creek unit can be constructed in about 3 years and

would produce approximately 150,000 kilowatts of power, the sale of which would assist in financing the development of irrigation features of the Mountain Home project."

Is This Our Nation's Twilight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune on February 10, 1951:

A LESSON FOR THE SENATE
(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight? Congressman HARRISON, of Virginia, wants to know. Every thinking citizen is pondering this question. Our unthinking citizen, like the ostrich of legend, is content to see nothing and listen to less. If we are in the twilight of our country, it is because of the failure of the parasitic citizen to do his duty. The greatest peril that confronts us is not our foreign enemies, nor the pinks and commies here at home, but the unconcerned don't-give-a-whoop citizen who takes no interest in our fate. That citizen's indifference has elected indifference to high offices of public trust.

If we are to be saved from our stupidity and complacent indifference, it will be because of the uncompromising devotion to our country of such Senators as JOE MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin; NIXON, of California; and those who stand with them. We are encumbered with Democrats who, to protect the seditions their party has sponsored, are more anxious to save their party than their country.

In the process of recognizing the time-honored practice of seniority in committee, Senator MCCARTHY was recently assigned to the subcommittee which determines State Department appropriations.

There is no one in the Senate who knows as much as does MCCARTHY about the active seditious agencies of treachery and treason. As no other Member of Congress, he has brought out into the open the revelation that our State Department has been, and still is, honeycombed with subversive workers. And MCCARTHY has done this work against the obstructions of sneering, ridiculing Members of the United States Senate; politicians who are afraid of our politically active foes.

While other Senators rested, indifferent to our dangers, MCCARTHY found work to do, and went to work. He worked. Early and late, MCCARTHY worked. Long hours of work. Long days of work. Weeks, months of self-sacrificing work, and this work taxed his own purse heavily. It has taken all he had and all that his unknown volunteer could hand him to do this work, work which other Senators should have shared, but work which others shamefully shirked. It is because of our shirking Senators that the gentleman from Virginia asked the other day: "Is this the hour of our Nation's twilight?"

Timid Senators who are afraid of the political power of our traitors have been slow to rally to the support of JOE MCCARTHY. They failed him when he needed them.

Future historians are going to write the name of JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, high among the heroes of this twilight hour of our country's years.

The Democratic Party, which has permitted the termites of treason to creep into our Government, has made a political record that will never be told in song and story. If America survives we will build no monuments to those who brought us to this twilight hour.

Pretty much alone, JOE MCCARTHY brought the people to see the red herrings. He has revealed the rats as well as those who have been infected by the rats.

Under MCCARTHY's investigations a lot of rats have been fired but still the administration holds on tenaciously to those that are left. But the more effective MCCARTHY's now generally supported work becomes, the less likely is our danger that this may be our country's twilight hour.

Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, the other day said, "MCCARTHY has done more to establish confidence in the hearts of Americans than any other man in recent years." Yet a Member of the Senate, a chap from Connecticut, one WILLIAM BENTON, so stoutly denounced MCCARTHY on the Senate floor the other day that he was ordered to sit down because he had violated the traditions of Senatorial decency. After twice being ordered to take his seat for such offense, his Democratic colleagues voted him on his feet again, a shocking picture of pale patriotism.

This fellow BENTON got mad because MCCARTHY had excused from committee service the Republican lady whom the stanch Americans in Maine sent to the Senate. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH is reported to have suffered embarrassment and chagrin (poor thing), at being let out of a committee of importance to our country's defense. She was removed by MCCARTHY. She had ridiculed, smeared, and belittled his service to our country, which was beyond the lady's power to match. But because she could not match it, she would better have cheered it than smeared it. She deserved no place on any committee whose work is related to our national security. She is not among those who defend us against the twilight of our existence as a free people. Let the lady blush.

The second reason, and a better one, MCCARTHY dropped the lady from Maine because he needed her place for an American defender. In her place, MCCARTHY put the new Senator from California, RICHARD M. NIXON. Such a Senator was needed right there.

While the lady from Maine was belittling MCCARTHY, NIXON knit together the conclusive clues that landed Hiss where his own perfidy properly placed him.

Historians record trifling incidents that have affected the course of nations. Perhaps the whimper of the lady from Maine, with its resultant volcanic eruption from the Senator from Connecticut, will have done us an incalculable national service in this twilight hour.

Things were getting pretty dark. The black clouds of treachery and treason were gathering. A futile attitude has been growing among the people. Bribes are now being parceled out in Washington in the form of war contracts, weapon factories, and munition plants, to induce a lot of the seething and recalcitrant party boys to behave. But neither the Democratic Bentons, nor the Republican Smiths, can longer hide the hideous fact that the people have lost all confidence in Dean Acheson and the whole State Department of his making.

If this be, as feared, our Nation's twilight hour, we are in this growing confusion and darkness because of the capricious irresponsibility of citizens we have elected to lead us.

MARGARET SMITH of Maine has a lot to learn from the Senator from Wisconsin. Shades of Thomas B. Reed and James G. Blaine. Maine deserves a Senator who can match MCCARTHY in the service of our country.

Neither the sensitive lady from Maine, nor the volcanic Senator from Connecticut can deny that the termites of treason have eaten deep into the foundations of our freedoms.

BENTON would do well to go back to his Yale and again look into the bronze face of Nathan Hale.

JOE MCCARTHY has been a lone soldier. His devotion and his purpose are so right no traducers can destroy them. They have grown little who have tried to belittle him.

In our own country's twilight hour, so filled with our own made fears, the Senator from Wisconsin has shown the people in every State what a United States Senator should be. If the Senate Chamber in our country's Capitol were filled with McCarthys all of Europe would respect us, and Russia would fear us. The Senator who today is not impatient to defend us against our foes is an encumbrance on the country. When our Senators do their full duty, we will be freed from fear.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert three editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway project, which appeared in three Michigan newspapers recently:

[From the Escanaba (Mich.) Press of February 6, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT IS VITAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

The arguments in support of the St. Lawrence seaway are so overwhelming that many of the political leaders who have long opposed the seaway project are now supporting it. The converts include Senator TAFT, Ohio Republican; Chairman BUCKLEY, of the House Public Works Committee; Economic Stabilizer Wilson; and many more. Steel company officials, once allined with the seaway opponents, are now supporting the project because of the development of the rich ore fields in Labrador.

The cost of the navigation-power project has been the subject of much of the controversy, with seaway opponents greatly distorting the financial picture. The project will cost $800,000,000, but only half of the cost will be borne by the American Government. The other half will be paid by Canada.

About half of the American cost of the project would be the power phase of the seaway development and this is self-liquidating—beyond question. That leaves $200,000,000 that could be assessable against taxpayers if the navigation tolls failed to meet construction costs, as opponents claim.

This is about the cost of a single battleship at today's prices. But the navigation and power phases of the St. Lawrence seaway would strengthen our national defense resources to a far greater degree than a battleship or even a couple battleships.

In fact, unless the St. Lawrence project is developed, we will be greatly handicapped if war develops on a broad scale. Our high-grade iron ore reserves are being rapidly depleted, and we will have to rely heavily upon the Labrador ore fields to keep our great steel industries operating at capacity

production. There simply are not enough railroad ore cars to move this vital raw material to our steel mills. Even if the railroads could do it, the cost would be so great that it would mean at least a $10 per ton boost in the price of steel.

The power phase of the project is at least of equal importance. The great industries of the East are facing a serious power shortage, and they need the electrical energy that can be tapped from the St. Lawrence River. Canada's needs are equally great. Unless the United States acts soon to develop the St. Lawrence project, Canada probably will proceed to do it alone—and we will have to pay tolls to Canada forever.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of February 3, 1951]

THE SEAWAY FOR DEFENSE

The St. Lawrence seaway proposal definitely will be hashed over in Congress again this year. The inclusion of it in President Truman's list of defense projects makes that certain. But informed Washington opinion gives the project little chance for approval. The argument being used against it now is that the country has neither the money nor materials to spend on it in this critical period. Yet, for lack of the St. Lawrence development the defense effort may be seriously handicapped.

Two new aluminum plants are being built in the Northwest instead of New England, which is a more ideal location for them. The reason New England isn't getting the plants is that it doesn't have sufficient electric power and the Northwest does. A serious shortage of electric power exists all through New England and New York. This shortage is the chief reason why New York's Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has tried desperately to get the Federal Government to approve a joint New York-Ontario power development on the St. Lawrence.

Canada is confronted with a similar shortage. The St. Lawrence has the best undeveloped hydroelectric power resources in North America. Canada says that if the United States hangs back any longer it will undertake the seaway-power project on its own. Canada also is thinking about the great iron-ore deposits in the Labrador region and of how to get the ore to the great steel-manufacturing centers. Nothing would prove more vital to the United States defense in a prolonged conflict than a dependable source of iron. The Mesabi deposits in the Lake Superior region have a limit; another source on the North American Continent is essential to this country's defense.

The ore is in Labrador. The problem is getting it to Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and other steel cities. A railroad to bring it to the St. Lawrence is to be completed within the next 5 years. But without the proposed seaway, only the smaller vessels will be able to transport it from that point to Great Lakes ports. This would be both costly and inadequate.

For the last 10 years the United States has been talking as though it actually intended to do something about the seaway. It is about time that it made up its mind. Congress should stop playing dog-in-the-manger. Either it should approve the project this year or tell Canada to go ahead with it on its own. Further, if the Federal Government doesn't intend to develop the St. Lawrence's power possibilities, it should authorize New York to go ahead with its plans in cooperation with Ontario. If Congress had acted favorably 10 years ago the United States would be in a much more secure position than it is today. This country may have dire need of the seaway and the river's power before another decade elapses. Maybe Canada and New York can save the United States from the results of its shortsightedness if given the chance.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of February 8, 1951]

SEAWAY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Prospects for favorable action in Congress on the St. Lawrence seaway projects are considered brighter at this session than at any in the several decades it has been a perennial subject of futile debate.

The Middle West is joining in a concerted move to get it going. Detroit is vitally interested. So is our next-door neighbor, Muskegon. So are other cities in the Great Lakes region, including Grand Rapids.

President Truman says that the project now has "a new and special urgency."

That, of course, is the keynote of the present campaign.

If the seaway is to be built now, it must be justified almost entirely on its potential contribution to the national defense. The long-range benefits to the industrial Great Lakes region fall into second place, although they are no less important than they have been or will be at any other time.

The economic value of turning Detroit and Bay City and Saginaw, our own Lake Michigan ports, Chicago and all the other harbors into ocean ports is obvious.

Defense, however, has priority now.

Only this week Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Director, notified the State of New York that little or no structural steel will be available for the New York throughway.

Very little steel can be allocated for new highway work other than access roads to new defense projects. New building construction, after defense projects, schools, and hospitals, will be practically nil.

The St. Lawrence seaway undeniably would make our country more secure. It would serve the heart of the steel industry on which almost all industry depends, particularly war industry.

Lake Superior iron ore deposits have been seriously depleted by two world wars. They must in the near future be supplemented by ore from the newly discovered Labrador-Quebec deposits, which require a seaway for transportation, or by ore from overseas which, in wartime, is subject to the hazards of submarine attacks. Already, big steel plants are being built on the Atlantic seaboard—but their supply of ore might readily be cut off by the most formidable submarine fleet of all time, Stalin's.

There is the added defense possibility of loading tanks and trucks and other impedimenta of war on ships at Detroit for transportation overseas.

This country is far from self-sufficient. We still must get vital minerals such as manganese and chrome from Asia and Africa and the Middle East. Congress must determine whether we can afford the additional hazards of trying to import our ore from across the oceans or even along the sea route from Labrador through submarine-infested waters. Congress must determine whether the cost of the seaway is offset by the expense of moving steel plants away from the Great Lakes region or of bringing ore to them by rail.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which will consider the matter, recently was reported 8 to 4 in favor of it, with Senator SMITH of New Jersey, undecided, and one Senate observer who has followed seaway legislation for years has estimated that 56 Senators are for it or open to reason with 31 against it and 9 doubtful.

Politics and special interests still are factors in the discussion, but the decision now must be made almost solely on the basis of national security.

United States Zone of Germany—Occupation Costs and Who Pays Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended article from the Information Bulletin issued by the Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany for January 1951, is valuable in giving Members a picture of the financial conditions under which our occupation is proceeding and the very fair arrangements which are made to cover our occupation costs as far as the German government is concerned:

OCCUPATION COSTS—SUMMARY OF BASIC PERTINENT FACTS

With threatening forces close to her frontiers and no army of her own, Germany has been assured Allied protection against attack. The Allied governments "will treat any attack against the Federal Republic or Berlin from any quarter as an attack upon themselves," says the recent New York communiqué of the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Germany's outlay for occupation costs, paying but partial support for Allied armies stationed here, has to be considered therefore as the cost of national defense.

The cost of such defense is not, as critics maintain, prohibitive. For Germans it totals about 25 percent of the Federal and State budgets. In contrast, defense costs for the allied powers take a far larger bite: in the United States it totals 42 percent of the Federal budget, in the United Kingdom, 25 percent, and in France, 35 percent.

But defense is certainly not the only advantage Germany is receiving. Occupation costs pay for thousands of jobs; they pay for services provided by Federal agencies; they pay for investments in the revival of the German economy—investments which eventually will belong to Germans exclusively.

In addition, America, through their Government or through spending out of their own pockets, are pouring vast sums of money into the German economy—an amount which far exceeds the total bill for occupation costs.

Why should Americans, pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into building up Germany's economy, use occupation costs as a method of tearing it down? The lack of logic in this false philosophy can be clearly illustrated by an analysis of the financing of occupation requirements.

From May 8, 1945 (VE-day) to March 31, 1951 (end of current fiscal year), the United States will have extended a total of DM. 16,669,880,000 ($3,969,000,000)[1] in aid to Germany. Of that sum:

Government and Relief in Occupied Areas (GARIOA) contributed DM. 8,349,600,000 ($1,988,000,000);

ECA contributed DM. 5,040,000,000 ($1,200,000,000);

The voluntary relief agencies of the United States contributed DM. 571,200,000 ($136,000,000);

Private gifts to the German people contributed DM. 1,470,000,000 ($350,000,000);

[1] All monetary figures in this article are given in Deutschemarks (DM.) for which conversion into United States dollars is at the official rate of one Deutschemark to 23.8 cents.

STEG (a German public corporation given United States Army surplus goods to sell) contributed DM. 840,000,000 ($200,000,000);

United States share of International Refugee Organization (IRO) contribution was DM. 399,000,000 ($95,000,000) in United States funds.

The total of this aid—DM. 16,800,800,000, or $3,969,000,000—far exceeds the cost to Germany of the United States zone occupation, which in the same period comes to DM. 11,244,600,000 ($2,677,214,800).

Not only has Germany received vastly more United States aid than she has paid, but the United States Government itself has spent far more money than the Federal Republic to maintain the occupation. So far, the United States cost amounts to DM. 17,388,-000,000—a staggering $4,140,000,000.

This figure includes the salaries of United States occupation personnel, which are paid by the United States Government and not from occupation costs as popularly assumed. United States-supplied money not only pays these American salaries, but supports periodicals like Die Neue Zeitung and Heute, radio stations like Berlin's RIAS, visiting experts, German Youth Activities' centers, and similar institutions, and the offices of United States resident officers (with the exception of rental and electricity costs).

The figure does not include, however, the many millions spent by the United States State Department on the exchange program. That is an additional item of United States expenditure. Not only do the German exchangees—scientists, farmers, students, trade unionists, specialists of all kinds—gain subjective knowledge and understanding but valuable practical experience which can efficiently be applied in reconstructing the homeland.

But even to compare American and German costs is a specious argument, for Germany does not by any means forfeit the use of the money she pays out for the occupation. Every penny of these costs remains inside Germany and is channeled right back into the German economy.

The total occupation cost budget to the republic is DM. 5,462,860,300 ($1,300,160,751) for the fiscal year which will end in March. From this approximately DM. 1,747,405,000 ($415,882,390) is going into the pockets of some 471,500 Germans who are employed by the three Allied Powers. DM. 388,120,760 ($92,172,726) represents utilities and rents being paid to Germans whose facilities are being used by allied personnel. DM. 489,089,-000 ($116,403,182) is going directly to the federally-operated postal and railroad systems. DM. 964,190,000 ($229,477,220) represents capital expenditures in the three zones—the majority of which are new buildings which will later become German property. These four items alone amount to DM. 3,586,804,760 ($854,135,518), all of which is channeling back into the Germany economy.

Moreover, DM. 188,000,000 ($44,744,000) of the occupation costs is being used to support displaced persons and DM. 71,000,000 ($16,-898,000) to pay restitution, burdens resulting from the war which in any case Germany would have to bear.

In the American zone the major part of the occupation-costs budget—36 percent—is used to pay 140,000 German employees. Added to these are 59,000 Germans employed by American authorities and establishments whose wages and salaries are not paid from occupation costs. That means that close to 200,000 persons—unskilled workers as well as university graduates—in the American zone alone earn their living with the Allied Powers. If they were discharged the majority of them would, judging from the federal unemployment problem, have to be supported from public funds—and that would mean an added drain on the taxpayer's wallet.

Newspapers which tell in vibrating headlines of nine German employees for every two Americans seem to ignore this West German unemployment burden which at the beginning of 1951 stood at almost 1,690,000 persons. But even so, since Germans on the occupation-costs payroll in the United States zone total 140,000, and there are more than that number of American personnel in the zone, there is actually less than one German employee for each American. Moreover, these employees are not the handmaidens of occupation personnel; the great majority are office workers and technicians.

Typical of the difficulties which would arise if German employees of the Allied Powers were released is the city of Heidelberg. That city's Tageblatt (daily newspaper) recently published a report stating that in Heidelberg 8,000 Germans are working for Americans. The paper estimates an average monthly income of DM. 250 ($59.50) for these workers, or approximately DM. 24,000,-000 ($5,712,000) each year. This purchasing power is substantial, and if it suddenly disappeared would cause serious dislocations in city industry and trade. Moreover, it would throw 8,000 persons on a labor market which couldn't support them. Tageblatt uses these arguments to show the city administration what difficulties would be forthcoming if occupation employees were discharged.

"Such savings in occupation costs, to be welcomed in the interest of the federal republic and the taxpayer, would result in a heavy burden for Heidelberg. It is only reasonable to ask that funds which are saved by personnel reductions be transferred to Heidelberg for financing new jobs to counteract the increase in unemployed. The funds which the state is prepared to contribute in recognition of the emergency already existing in the town is an entirely different matter. They would be no help in solving the problems which is apparent in the discussion of occupation costs."

Heidelberg is no isolated case. The problem illustrated here exists in all communities where large troop contingents are stationed or HICOG agencies are established. Often these localities are spas or districts with very little industry where other employment would be scarce.

United States policy in selection of employees has likewise ameliorated what might have become an overwhelming social problem. Americans have employed those Germans nobody wanted to employ, for example, the war veterans who left school to go into the army. Depending not so much on written references as on the good will of applicants, Americans have likewise given jobs to thousands of refugees. Many a prisoner of war returning from Russia is thankful for jobs offered by the occupation powers. And no less thankful are students in university cities when Americans give them side-line jobs as baby sitters, language teachers, visitors' guides, and youth-camp leaders.

Here are more financial benefits which have accrued to Germany as a direct result of the occupation for which Germans partially pay:

The Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany is financing from its own funds a series of housing projects (for example, the DM. 3,000,000 ($714,000) project of 500 apartments in Frankfurt) which will one day be turned over to the German economy.

Large sums of foreign-exchange credits are accumulated in West Germany when United States occupation personnel shop and travel; their total spending amounts to at least $50,000,000 (DM. 210,000,000) a year.

The establishment of recreation centers for occupation personnel has guaranteed visitors and a steady income to many spas and health resorts which otherwise might have stood empty.

So far as the United States is concerned, there is one more trenchant argument for those who would chafe at paying the cost of occupation. This revolves around the annual cost to the United States of its debt directly attributable to the war. The occupation grew out of the war and the debt did, too. Germany ended the war with practically no debt. The United States debt was increased by $220,000,000,000 (equal to DM. 924,370,000,000 at current conversion rate) during the war years. The annual interest charge on this war-contracted debt is slightly less than $5,000,000,000, or somewhere near DM. 21,000,000,000. This is an annual charge for interest only and does not provide for any repayment. It is a figure which should be kept in mind when viewing the United States occupation's cost to Germany: this year, just DM. 2,404,000,000.

In making such comparisons, American policy-makers are well aware that the United States capacity to pay is far greater than Germany's. Studies are now under way to determine what Germany's reasonable capacity for expenditures—defense expenditures—is.

With these considerations in mind, it can be legitimately pointed out that the most recent United States appropriation for defense is $42,000,000,000. This represents about 14 percent of the gross national product of the United States. Under Hitler's Reich, 19 percent of Germany's gross national product went into rearmament. Germany today pays for the total of Allied occupation costs about 5.5 percent.

While attributes of national health, resources and other economic factors determine how much of a country's gross national product can be siphoned off for defense purposes, nonetheless percentages of gross national product are the fairest comparison of capacity to pay.

This enormous disparity between the German and United States percentages of gross national products used for defense purposes should convince even the most skeptical that Germany is not being asked to pay anywhere near the limit of its capacity.

For a National Day of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 16, 1951, issue of the Cotton Trade Journal, Memphis, Tenn.:

FOR A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

The fate of mankind, perhaps for the next century, depends on events immediately ahead.

The free world is looking to the United States for leadership in this critical period. The future of civilization depends largely on the thoughts, the words, and the works of America and Americans today and tomorrow.

For many years we have worshipped at false altars, seeking material pleasures, amassing material wealth, boosting of material power. Now our national energies are directed toward building a preponderance of

such power for defense against the menace of aggressive communism.

Let us ponder this thought:

As long as we rely solely on material might we are placing ourselves on the same level with the godless forces of the Kremlin, whose philosophy sneers at religion as the opiate of the people.

Now, if ever, is the time to get down to bedrock, to face fundamentals.

Now, if ever, is the time to rise to a higher concept of life and its significance.

As a nation and individually, our greatest need today is actively to seek divine guidance in our daily affairs; to recognize that the kingdom is the Lord's; and He is the governor among the nations.

Nothing is more important than that we lay all other duties and tasks aside and turn humbly, in audible prayer and silent meditation, to the one Creator and Giver of all good, seeking His direction, asking that His will be done.

We therefore respectfully urge the President of the United States to set aside by official proclamation a National Day of Prayer.

That to emphasize its significance this be a week day rather than a Sunday, and that it be declared a legal holiday, on which all workday activities cease, with the exception of vital maintenance and health services; that all theaters, clubs, and other places of entertainment close on that day.

On this day let Americans of all faiths and creeds, as a people united in God, gather in their houses of worship and in family prayer circles and neighborhood prayer meetings to seek earnestly that guidance which alone can bring unfailing strength and security, and the blessings of peace.

The spiritual power engendered in mass observance of a National Day of Prayer would, by comparison, render insignificant the material strength created by a day's industrial production.

The tremendous spectacle of the world's mightiest Nation humbly turning to God as the source of all true power would inspire our allies and friends throughout the world, multiplying their faith and endowing them, as well as us, with a new, indomitable, and enduring strength.

Let us remember that this Nation was founded on faith in God.

The framers of the Declaration of Independence, in concluding their epochal document, emphasized their reliance on the protection of divine providence.

As our forefathers turned to God in the critical hours of the birth of this Nation, so let us now turn to Him in this, the most fateful period of its history.

Jotham Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared recently in the Washington Times-Herald by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

We were discussing plays and the question naturally arose as to what plays could youngsters of 10 and 14 be taken. Not being converted speakeasy sophisticates, we were weary of discovering that the playwright suffered the tortures of the damned seeking for a curtain line and finally came up with the novelty of a foul word, spoken by an apparently innocent ingenue.

That always gets a laugh.

Also we wanted the children to feel that because they went to the theater, they were not being influenced to believe that sex is all there is to American life; that life has some finer aspects, some very decent moments, a moral side, if you please.

So we went to see Jotham Valley, a play put on with all the skill of professional showmanship by a group who call themselves Moral Rearmament.

This is a musical, with songs occasionally comparable to Oklahoma and with a story that is so real that it does happen in every home. A very good time was had by all.

The essence of Jotham Valley is the melodrama of two quarreling brothers, whose hatred brings misery to all their neighbors, particularly when one brother deprives the valley of water, because he, legally but not morally, controls the water rights.

Here is a struggle that is universal, for legal rights do not suffice in a world that requires constructive living.

Law passed by legislators is often not only inadequate but, being the product of man, unsound. We have to live by the laws of man, but natural law, the law of God, transcends the laws of man.

So, in the end, in this play, the key of truth opens the hardened heart of the brother and he permits the water to gush forth, so that the cattle drink of God's bounty, and life is good. Also the brothers make up.

This plot is as simple as Romeo and Juliet, which is the simplest and most usual of stories, being nothing more than that boy loves girl, but the parents say no.

Most really important plots are simple, just as great symphonies are written around little tunes. (To wit, those notes in Beethoven's Fifth, which Winston Churchill turned into a V for victory.)

Simplicity, of itself, may not only be truth but interesting and even exciting. What is more simple than a single tree, growing out of a rock along a granite seashore, standing proudly in a gale.

All the smudge that a modernist can hurl at canvas cannot equal the majesty of that one object against a barren sky. And yet, as the poet said, only God can make a tree.

So in Jotham Valley, it is the simplicity of plot, in a musical and engaging setting, which opens the mind to the truth that man can and does change his nature through the humility of faith.

It is not surprising that this play has encountered the opposition of Communists and the homosexuals in the theater, the former because they do not want men to think that the nature of man can be elevated by his own will, and the homosexuals because they excuse their indecencies on the ground that they cannot help themselves.

They say they are not evil but just that way because they are just that way.

Jotham Valley is as good a play for adults, but it is important that children and youth should see it. With grace and ease, it projects the idea that life can be made worth living once the human wants to live a worthwhile life.

This idea is not novel, but it needs to be constantly reiterated. Men live by hate because they like to hate. When they cease to like to hate, they will cease to hate. The causes for hatred are often so trivial, so unimportant as to be ridiculous when analyzed.

I know of groups of men who hate each other with violence. Knowing both sides, I also know that the hatreds are the product not of conviction but of suspicion and habit.

Reconciliation is difficult because who is the first to say, "I have been wrong and a fool," when both have been wrong and both are fools?

So goes the world and in the end comes war and death. If children and young people could see Jotham Valley, maybe they, too, might find the key to better living.

George Scott Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on the Judiciary had the honor of accepting an oil painting of George Scott Graham presented to the committee by his daughter, Mrs. Marian McFadden, of Memphis, Tenn.

Present at the ceremonies before the Committee on the Judiciary were Mr. and Mrs. Guilford Jameson. Mr. Jameson, who made the formal presentation, had been clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time of Mr. Graham's chairmanship. Also present were former Congressman and Mrs. Addison T. Smith. Mrs. Smith had served as secretary to Mr. Graham many years. Also present were Mrs. Charles Semmes and Miss Irene Lupuld, both old friends of the man we honored. Attending the ceremonies were some members of the Pennsylvania delegation, headed by Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, dean of the Republican Pennsylvania delegation. Mr. Harry Williams, who had served as messenger to the Committee on the Judiciary at the time of Mr. Graham's chairmanship, was also present, and spoke with great feeling of his years of service with him. Representatives LOUIS E. GRAHAM and FRANCIS E. WALTER, as well as the chairman, paid tribute to Mr. Graham, to his qualities of leadership and to his humanity. As dean of the Republican Pennsylvania delegation, Representative SIMPSON spoke of the inspiration the work of such men as former Representative Graham gave to him and to all Members of Congress.

I am happy to include in these remarks the statement made by Mr. Guilford Jameson in the formal presentation of Mr. Graham's portrait:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee, George Scott Graham, of Philadelphia, Pa., was a member of this committee from the beginning of his service in Congress in 1913, and became its Chairman in the Sixty-eighth Congress. He held that office until his death on July 4, 1931. He brought to the office a rich and broad experience achieved at the bar. For 18 years he had served as District Attorney of Philadelphia County, and upon leaving that office resumed the practice of law in Philadelphia and New York City as the senior partner of eminent law firms in each of those cities.

This committee meets here today to accept an oil painting of him but neither the artist's brush, the pen or the spoken word will be adequate to portray him as he lives in the memory of those who knew him. He

was a man of fine stature and noble countenance. His carriage was that of a military leader and he possessed a rich and resonant voice, to enhance his persuasive powers of debate. While from his public activities one would be chiefly impressed by his strength, in private life graciousness and wit were his forte. I do not know of a higher tribute that I can pay to his memory than to say of him that no care or adversity, of which he knew many, was equal to the courage and gaiety of his spirit.

The records of this committee show how devoted he was to its work. Measures affecting the courts, Federal prisoners, labor relations, and veterans' affairs were sponsored by him and enacted into law. But it was as a defender of our constitutional form of government that he rose to the greatest heights.

Soon after he became chairman his political philosophy was challenged by the proposed child-labor amendment. One of our Government bureaus, enlarging upon its role as a fact-finding and information center for the Nation, had become a protagonist for a constitutional amendment to yield the power of the States over child labor to the Federal Government. Financed by Government appropriations, and with the prestige and power that goes with being a Federal agency, this bureau had succeeded in the previous election campaign, in stirring up the emotions of the people, particularly the women's organizations, into a political crusade for the adoption of the amendment. There was no question but that the committee and the Congress would vote for its submission. But George Graham saw in the proposal the dangers of further centralization of power and a threat to our dual form of government. With characteristic fidelity to principle in the face of overwhelming odds, he vigorously opposed its submission. His minority report, written nearly three decades ago, has proved so prophetic and contains such pointed observations on the needs of this hour that I quote from it here as a mark of his statesmanship. He said:

"The care of children both as to their labor and education is primarily conceded to be within the control of the parents, and the State should only invade the dominion of parental control to such an extent as will correct abuses. The love which the god of nature has planted in the breasts of fathers and mothers is a sufficient guaranty in the great majority of cases for the careful nurture, training, education, and development of children. We hope there never may come a time in the history of our country when either the State or the Federal entity will absorb into itself the entire care and control of childhood. The Russian Soviet presents a lamentable spectacle of the dangerous growth which might possibly be obtained in that direction. We, however, do not fear that this state of affairs can ever exist in our beloved America."

"It is not only the dynamic forces of nature that destroy the hills but the elemental changes through trituration which will wear them down, and if given time enough, finally destroy them. Our perfect system of checks and balances and duality of government are not more imperiled by destructive war than they are by the insidious efforts of idealists and earnest reformers in time of peace. * * *

"It is this unwise tendency to centralize all power in Washington to which we object.

"It is this tendency with its resulting creation of new bureaus, a new army of office-holders under the National Government, to which we object.

"It is to the creation of a bureaucracy with all its tyrannous proclivities and increase of expenses to which we object.

"It is to compelling citizens to seek redress of their grievances under a bureaucratic government and to travel thousands of miles to Washington in order to do so that we object."

"Our country has an area of 3,000,000 square miles and a population of 110,000,000 people. The sections of our country differ greatly in their industries and in their peoples. The conditions of life and of being are greatly diversified, and to rule and control this vast area and this vast population, ever increasing, from Washington as a central point, will mean practically the end of local self-government. The principle of local self-government to the greatest practical extent and applying to the widest possible range of subjects, administered by the smallest governmental unit reasonably adequate for the purpose, has been the cornerstone of our existence. The tendency to centralize represents the antipodal principle. The individual citizen is unable to follow, feels himself powerless to influence, what a Government far removed from his locality, operating through unknown and inaccessible bureaus and commissions, may be doing. Consultation with his fellow citizens is useless and for the most part impossible. The United States by creating a multitude of Government agencies, involving the country in vast expenses and these agencies being inaccessible to the average citizen, will result in the creation of a vast lobbying system at the capitol. It will deny to the citizen the primary principles of local self-government."

The political battle against this centralization still rages, and there are many of us who firmly believe that our country's true course lies in the direction he so forcefully presented on that historic occasion.

In 1930 the fallacy of attempting to regulate the personal habits of the people by the bludgeon of Federal law was becoming more and more apparent. Again, notwithstanding the fact that this committee and the Congress was composed of a membership predominantly dry, Mr. Graham boldly decided to hold a hearing on the results of 10 years of the eighteenth amendment. This was the first time since the adoption of the eighteenth amendment that those who advocated its repeal would have the privilege of opening and closing the hearings. These hearings lasted over a period of several weeks, and the information there presented and the national attention which it received laid the foundation which later brought about the repeal of the amendment. His philosophy of the limits of Government on man's freedom is set forth in his statement opening this hearing, from which I quote:

"No one wants the restoration of the old conditions or the saloon. We may well ask, 'Cannot control and regulation of the liquor traffic supply the place of prohibition?' What use of more laws, drastic and partaking of the spirit of vengeance rather than justice? Natural liberty of the individual has never been totally surrendered to society, but only so much as is needed to preserve the organized entity. Freedom of decision as to what one may drink, eat, or wear is as fundamental as freedom of belief in religion. Like in the delegation of powers to the Federal Government by the sovereign States—all not delegated were reserved—individual man has a large reservoir of powers. Only when one's choice by overt act breaks the peace or injures society can the individual decision be assailed, and then only to punish the overt acts. * * * Cannot some system be devised to control and not prohibit that will lessen the evils portrayed? The use of wine has been countenanced throughout the ages. Cana, of Galilee, is not exceptional. Had God wished automatons, He could have changed the nature of the grape or destroyed the human appetite. He wanted character. He wanted the man who met temptations and conquered."

I realize that what I have said here today is but a meager tribute to the man and his statesmanship. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him will always cherish his memory. It is therefore with pride and renewed devotion that I have the privilege of presenting this portrait of him, a gracious gift to the committee from his daughter, Mrs. Marian McFadden, of Memphis, Tenn.

How Pleasant It Is for Brethren To Dwell Together in Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brotherhood Week is being celebrated throughout the country this week. The idea, which has originated with the American people, has also begun to spread to other countries and this year several European countries have instituted Brotherhood Week and are celebrating it jointly with us.

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Thus sang the Hebrew psalmist in ancient Israel. The annual observance of Brotherhood Week has become a most constructive method of interfaith understanding. At a time when religion and our way of life are under attack by evil forces in the world, utmost cooperation among the great faiths is needed to spread religious tolerance and better understanding of our fellow men. In fact, in these days of moral crisis it has become a dire necessity.

I commend to your attention the following editorial from the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., of February 18:

BROTHERHOOD, A PRACTICAL IDEAL

Threescore and three years have passed since William Morris, the great British artist-craftsman wrote: "Fellowship is Heaven, and lack of fellowship is Hell; fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death; and the deeds that ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them." But the passing of time has served only to confirm the humane sentiment thus expressed. Events have sharpened the need for mutuality. We require each other as earlier generations did not. Our destiny is one, we are a unit in the fate we face. Either we will have fellowship and life or we will have fear and hatred and strife and death.

This is what Brotherhood Week, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, signifies. The 7 days of the calendar set aside for rededication to the principles and purposes of fellowship represent an opportunity which all individuals of good will should welcome—an opportunity consciously to take one's place with one's civilized neighbors as a fellow worker in the common endeavor to save and to improve civilization. A background of Judeo-Christian tradition dating back 50 centuries supports the objective sought. The challenge of the gravest menace to freedom ever seen in modern times gives it direction.

Every American has a duty in the circumstances. The prevailing emergency touches us all, puts upon each of us a heavier responsibility to think and speak and act in

terms of fellowship. We must stand together, sharing resistance to evil so that the good values of our comomn social and cultural heritage may survive into the future. The ideal of Brotherhood Week is an intensely practical ideal, and it must be practiced as such.

What are the alternatives? Conscience answers that they are defeat, disaster, and the disappearance of our natural humanitarian way of life. No American deserving of the name will choose catastrophe rather than cooperation, destruction rather than constructive solidarity. Each of us remembers the words of an earlier prophet than generous William Morris, the ancient Hebrew psalmist who said: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." The observation has more meaning now than when it first was expressed ages ago.

The Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paragould (Ark.) Daily Press of Thursday, February 1, 1951:

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS

A perennial subject of vigorous argument has been presented to the new Congress. This is the question of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It seems only yesterday that Congress finished the last round of debate on this matter, but the act expires June 12 and hence there must be action by Congress before that date if the program is to be continued.

One trouble with the program is that its benefits have been less easily observed than the results which become the basis of objections. The attacks against it come chiefly if not entirely from supporters of the protective tariff principle. Since they see the purpose of tariffs as the protection of American industry from foreign competition, any lowering of tariffs appears bad. An agreement negotiated under the act always involves reduction of some American tariff, and this effect is immediately apparent. The entrance of the benefiting foreign goods also can often be observed.

The benefits are mostly on a broader, longer term basis. One immediate gain at home is that American consumers are able to buy certain imported goods at lower prices, and this is what the opponents object to. Another is that some American firms find an enlarged foreign market for their goods. Over the longer term, the trade agreements stimulate the general flow of foreign trade, which is an important element in the margin of profit for a great number of American industries and lines of business. This is important also to our general aim of promoting economic progress throughout the world, and specifically to the objective of maintaining an even balance of trade. If we believe in these goals, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is one means of achieving them.

Occupation Policy in the United States Zone of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1949 I was a member of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee which undertook a European study mission which included a study of occupation policies in the United States occupation zone of Western Germany. As my part of the work of the study mission I concentrated on this phase of its activities.

The objective of our occupation policy being the democratization of the German people, the question of the extent to which there has been a return of Nazi or ultra-nationalist influences in key places in government, education, business and society was a critically important inquiry. This led directly to the question of the growth and utilization of the liberal forces in German life and the extent to which our occupation policies have fostered such growth and utilization. On this subject I am appending an exchange of correspondence from June 1950 to January 1951, with High Commissioner McCloy. It shows the scope of the efforts which have been made along this line and the development of the liberal forces to help attain the objectives of our occupation mission in Germany.

From this exchange of correspondence it is clear that much remains to be done both in Germany and by American organizations in this activity. Germany is rightly considered the fulcrum of Europe and a vital part of an adequate defense for the security of Western Europe against Communist aggression, but this security can be compromised seriously by creating an unreliable Germany, a possible future Soviet ally, as in 1939. General Eisenhower has made this clear for the people of the United States and all the free peoples in his refusal to accept unwilling German help in a federated European defense force.

The mission of our occupation policy in Germany, therefore, was never more important than it is today, for the security of Europe itself is seen to be tied directly to the democratization of the German people in the western zones, to the strength of free institutions there and to their understanding of and their will to fight for their liberties. The correspondence is as follows:

JUNE 12, 19[illegible]

Hon. JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany,
APO 757, New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMISSIONER MCCLOY: One point which I think troubles so many of us here is whether any inventory has been made of the liberal forces to which you refer. For example, in your appraisal of the situation you speak of the dearth of non-Nazi teachers. This is an illustration of what I have in mind. It prompts me to ask whether any inventory has ever been made of the "liberal forces" in the various fields of activity which will determine which way Germany will go. The value of such an inventory would be that at least the resources available could be assessed and scrutinized.

Another factor which has concerned me as we have gone along is whether or not the great number of American organizations in a position to influence their German counterparts have been employed effectively in our occupation efforts. They would range all the way from the Masonic order to the trade-unions, and I see no reasons why they should not include religious denominations, sports organizations, the theater, and the arts and a host of similar activities. You certainly are a person of enough top experience to know the accumulated enthusiasm in these quarters which exists in the United States for any new job. Undoubtedly this would all take some handling, but I am thoroughly convinced that when the imagination of the American people is stirred by action they have never shown themselves to be remiss in supplying the means. Your job is, I believe, even bigger than you think.

With best wishes, believe me

Sincerely,

J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY,
Frankfurt, Germany, August 16, 1950.

Hon. J. K. JAVITS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: In your letter of June 12, 1950, you ask whether an inventory of liberal forces in Germany has been made. No formal list of liberals has ever been drawn up by us, and I do not think a mere listing of names would mean very much. But in a sense, the reports of our field observers on developments in Germany, the results of public-opinion surveys, and the participation by Germans in the hundreds of democratization projects we are carrying on represent such an inventory.

We must keep in mind that there are thousands of men and women all over Western Germany who are honestly and sincerely devoting themselves to building up democratic forces and opposing the return of Nazi ideas and methods. I think the people of Berlin in their inspiring struggle against communism have also shown that there is a readiness to fight a new totalitarianism.

While names are not conclusive, here are a few of the more prominent people in Germany whom I count among the leading liberal spirits:

Dr. Theodor Heuss, president of the Bundesrepublic, is a man of progressive mind and persuasion. He is trying to strengthen the liberal forces of Germany without regard to party or creed; and his influence is considerable, both with the masses and with the leaders of public opinion.

In the Bundestag, though not in the majority, there are a number of liberals of influence and authority. For example, Helene Wessel, the leader of the Center Party; Carlo Schmidt, of the SPD; Dr. Herman Schaefer; Brentano, of CDU; and Dr. Gerhard Schroeder, of Dusseldorf. Parenthetically, I want to say that though a majority of the Bundestag members may not be progressive in the American sense, they are not narrowly and aggressively nationalistic as is proven by their support of Marshall aid, the Schuman plan, and the Council of Europe. Moreover, many of them, including Dr. Adenauer, were victims of Nazi concentration camps themselves and are strong anti-Nazis.

In the Laender governments, among the progressive men and women are: Brauer, of Hamburg, Kaisen, of Bremen, Frau Brankslepe, of the Westphalian CDU, Waldemar von Knoerringen, of Bavaria. And there are many progressive and forward-looking mayors: Reuter, of Berlin, Klett, of Stuttgart, Heimmerich, of Mannheim, for example.

In the intellectual and professional life of Germany might be mentioned: Edwin Redslob, of the Freie Universitaet in Berlin, Dolf Sternberger, of the German Voters Association, Dirks, of Frankfurt, the 80-year-old Alfred Weber, of Heidelberg and Paul Loebe, former president of the Reichstag. As for the newspapers and radio, I could list a large number of names, including Reger, of the "Tagesspiegel," Kogon, of "Frankfurter Hefte," the publishers of the "Frankfurter Rundschau" and the "Sueddeutsche Zeitung" of Munich.

Also there are developing a number of organizations with progressive goals: the Europa Bewegung, the Weber Vereinigung, the Civil Liberties Union, and so forth.

As I have said, the liberal forces in Germany are not the most powerful element in office today; but they are active in civic affairs, trade unions, churches, industry, and politics, conscious of their responsibilities and alert to the possibilities; and they have our support. In the coming year I hope we shall be able to make our all-out effort to extend this liberal circle. I hope it will be possible to focus public attention and rally public support to the forward-looking organizations, institutions, and individuals of Western Germany so that the people of Germany and of the world will join together in the good fight for a full and useful life for all.

American universities are already at work here. American trade unions are here, American civic and community organizations are cooperating. Through the Offices of Public and Political Affairs we are trying to expand such connections. Anything you can do in your private or public capacity in the United States to forward the idea of participation by private organizations will be most welcome.

In closing may I express my appreciation for the interest and understanding you have in our common problem. Your positive approach has been of great help to us here.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany.

DECEMBER 12, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany, APO 757, New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMISSIONER MCCLOY: Reference is made to your letter to me of August 16 which followed my question regarding an inventory of the liberal forces in Germany with whom our occupation authorities find it practicable to work. I have submitted this reply to associates in the United States who are most interested in the subject, and who have gone to a great deal of trouble to give their views and comments and to obtain information on your letter of August 16. All concerned realize the critical importance of being sure we are working with as many of the liberal and democratic forces of Germany as can be mustered. The purpose of this letter is to give you the comments I have received. It is in no sense a criticism but only is looking toward a widening and deepening of the relationships between us and the elements in Germany who will work toward the same objectives of general peace, human rights and security, and well-being toward which we are working.

One of the first comments made is that your list is largely devoid of young people and that reliance is mainly on elements prominent before the Third Reich but which have not been successful in saving Germany before.

One suggestion which has been made and which seems to be appealing is that, say, 24 members from a delegation of nongovernmental representatives of labor, the self-employed groups, and those engaged in the professions, in education, and public opinion forming be called to the State Department for a frank discussion in Washington as to the state of liberal and democratic ideals and actions in Germany and why their prestige has declined, or is declining, which is the view of this particular informant. I am sending a copy of this letter to Colonel Byroade of the State Department with a specific reference to this last suggestion for his consideration.

I would very much appreciate your views upon this letter.

Sincerely,

J. K. JAVITS,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY,
APO 757-A, New York, N. Y.,
January 16, 1951.

Hon. J. K. JAVITS,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAVITS: I have received your letter of December 12, 1950, commenting on my letter of August 16 which, unfortunately, appears to have slighted the civil liberties' groups, church leaders, women's organizations, labor unions, youth groups, schools and universities with which this office maintains most excellent working relations.

In connection with any comment on the absence of youthful liberal leaders in Germany today, I would like to point out that over half of our exchanges program is devoted to teenagers, college students, and trainees. During the past year, for example, of the 2,565 exchangees sent to the United States, 358 were rural teenagers, 122 were urban teenagers, 447 were college students, and 409 were trainees. More than 200 United States schools and universities participated in this program.

I also would like to call attention to our work with the following leaders of private German social agencies and institutions: Bert Evan, chairman of the Junge Union in Rhineland-Westphalia; Dr. Guenter Olzog, of the Hochschule fuer Politische Wissenschaften in Munich; Prof. W. Grewe, of the political science faculty, Freiburg; Dr. Dirk Oncken, Bund fuer Buergerrechte in Frankfurt; Dr. Herman Heimlich, oberbuergermeister of Hamburg; and Frau Myer-Kuhlenkampff, director of the Pestalozzi-Froebel Institute of Berlin, and chairman of the Leadership Training Subcommittee of Youth Work and Youth Welfare in Bonn.

Unfortunately, such men and women rarely can afford the time for a prolonged study-tour of the United States. However, there are in the United States, at the present time, other adult and student exchangees who might contribute to a discussion on the state of liberal ideals in Germany today, as you suggested in your letter. I am informed that the State Department is considering calling such a meeting, possibly early in February, to coincide with the visit of representative leaders of the Bundestag.

I have asked that a copy of our two-volume report on the "Exchanges Reorientation Program—Fiscal Year 1951" be forwarded to your office for the information of yourself and your associates. As you read, you will note the wide coverage given by this program to Germany's youth and educational problems.

Again, let me assure you of my appreciation for the interest and understanding which you have in our common problems.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany.

Statement to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Proposed Bills and Resolutions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I submitted to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding five of my legislative proposals which have been referred to that committee for consideration:

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON PROPOSED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS, FEBRUARY 15, 1951

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for granting me the opportunity to present this statement in connection with several of my bills and resolutions which have been referred to your committee. Permit me to take a moment to compliment you for instituting this new and very logical procedure whereby the authors of the proposed legislation are afforded an opportunity to present their views and the benefit of their opinions on such bills to the committee. Your innovation is a commendable step forward in our democratic parliamentary system.

Five of my proposals have been referred to this committee: One bill (H. R. 1391), two House resolutions (H. Res. 65 and H. Res. 98), and two concurrent resolutions (H. Con. Res. 21 and H. Con. Res. 22).

H. R. 1391

H. R. 1391 seeks to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress by adding a proviso to withhold Marshall-plan aid from countries engaging in acts of aggression, as determined by proclamation of the President of the United States or by the United Nations. I have supported a similar amendment back in 1948 at the time the law was enacted. At that time Great Britain was the aggressor nation because of her misconduct in fomenting hostilities in the Middle East. Later, the Netherlands engaged in open warfare to destroy the Republic of Indonesia, disregarding for a time world opinion in the United Nations and public opinion in our own country.

It is my sincere conviction that neither Great Britain nor the Netherlands would have dared to encourage or engage in hostilities had they known beforehand that as a result of their actions they would stand to lose the economic assistance of the United States. The same holds true for other nations. I feel certain that if not for British intervention there may never have taken place an Arab-Israeli war, the whole Middle East would have long ago been pacified, and we would be far advanced today in safeguarding the security of that area and its strategic raw materials against communism. In a similar manner, we lost precious time in Indonesia where the ill-fated Dutch in-

tervention has alienated large segments of the native population, so that today Indonesia constitutes one of our weak links in the Far East, at a time when we need the cooperation of all freedom-loving people.

We should try to prevent the repetition of such acts of aggression so that we may have the fullest opportunity to concentrate on the problem of problems—how to deal with the ruthless aggressors of Communist Russia and Communist China.

We can do so by the adoption of my amendment to withhold all financial or other aid from all those participating directly or indirectly in acts of aggression. It will be a friendly but stern warning and should serve to prevent many future international headaches for us. It will prove helpful in this crisis that confronts us now.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 65

House Resolution 65 calls on the President of the United States to appoint a bipartisan commission which is to undertake an investigation of the conduct and status of American policy in Germany. So much has happened during the past year concerning Germany and our attitude toward the people of that country that it would take me too far afield to go into a detailed account on this subject. I believe the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee are well aware of these developments and the events which prompted this change.

The committee will agree with me, I am sure, that we have failed in our major purposes—to democratize Germany, to break up the German cartels, to stamp out Nazi and other antidemocratic ideologies, to eliminate anti-Semitism, and other equally important goals for which we fought a bloody 4-year war against Hitler. Large sections of our population today are distrustful of Germany. They fear we may be building up a new Frankenstein that may someday come back to plague us. Others fear that, since there is little difference in the ideologies and methods of Nazi totalitarianism and Communist totalitarianism, we may someday again see an alliance between these antidemocratic elements aimed against the free nations of the world.

We must move cautiously in Germany and only with as complete knowledge as we can obtain about the true conditions there concerning all matters relating to American policy. It is for this reason that I urge you to approve this resolution.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 98

House Resolution 98 suggests the establishment of a Joint Committee on International Economic Development of 30 members, 10 to be drawn from the Senate and 20 from the House, which shall, in cooperation with the United Nations, inquire into the economic development of other countries, particularly in underdeveloped areas.

Specifically, the joint committee should investigate, make interim reports, and submit a final report to Congress by the end of the present Congress concerning the following: (1) The improvement of the standards of living and social services in those countries; (2) the development of agricultural and industrial projects capable of increasing productivity and the standard of living; (3) the improvement of educational opportunities, including technical and university training; (4) the integration of such projects with similar projects initiated by the United Nations.

Only by such a committee can we be kept fully apprised of how our point 4 is developing and how much further, if at all, we should proceed with it.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

House Concurrent Resolution 21 establishes as a fundamental objective of United States foreign policy our intent to support and strengthen the United Nations and to work for its development into a world federation which would be able to preserve peace through the enactment and enforcement of world law. Since similar resolutions urging a world federation have been introduced by several of my colleagues in the House and have been referred to your committee, I shall refrain at this time from presenting lengthy argumentation in its favor. In general, I aline myself with the views already expressed by those colleagues in support of the idea.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

Finally House Concurrent Resolution 22 requests the President of the United States to convene a Federal convention with delegates representing the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty and of the United States, in order to explore the application of the principles of a free Federal union within the framework of the United Nations. Such principles have attained notable success in this country, in Canada and in Switzerland, as well as other countries. By the adoption of these principles on the part of the North Atlantic Treaty countries, it may be further possible to safeguard and strengthen their free institutions, unite their defensive efforts, encourage fullest economic cooperation, and achieve other goals set by the democracies of the world.

I urge you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, to give my proposals your fullest attention and your early consideration.

Effective Disarmament Our Real Aim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks made by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] at the Lyric Theater in Baltimore, Md., on February 18:

EFFECTIVE DISARMAMENT OUR REAL AIM

What is it that we are talking about here tonight? Perhaps it is an idiosyncracy of mine, but at least it has always been a strong conviction on my part that politicians as well as ordinary mortals should keep silent unless they, in their own minds, are pretty clear as to what they are talking about. Unfortunately, the phrases "world government" or "world federalist" have some very unhappy connotations and lead to much fuzziness in thinking. They inevitably arouse the specter of a world bureaucracy attempting to run the details of our everyday lives, or millions of Asiatics or Africans outvoting the United States in some parliamentary body and imposing upon us some sort of unwanted treatment. That is certainly not my concept of what we are talking about tonight.

My concept of our discussion is that we are talking about the creation within the United Nations of such limited machinery as can assure the peoples of the world really effective disarmament. That limited machinery, because it will require the binding assent of many nations, might well be termed "government." In a sense, the term is correct, but the field of its operation would encompass so small a part of the sphere of action which we usually associate with the word "government" that the phrase "enforceable treaty mechanism" might well be a clearer form of definition.

There is no need of my developing the blessing to mankind of genuine disarmament. Justice under law enforced with a minimum of police machinery was the goal which the Original Thirteen States in our federation made a reality for our Nation. True disarmament throughout the world is only a natural extension of the same principle. It is the concept which must remain basic and continuous in our thinking about foreign policy. It is not a utopian dream, even though many of us may find that the road blocks on the way to its achievement are much easier to visualize than the realization of the objective itself.

Foreign policy, as indeed all public policy, must have a strong underlying purpose in order that it may have a continuity of direction no matter how many bypasses have to be traveled from time to time. As of this moment it would appear as though we were traveling a number of endless bypasses. Few, if any of us, know where our present fighting in Korea is leading us. We know that when the fighting began against the North Korean Government, we were engaged in an effort to make collective security a reality for a small and helpless nation. At one time that objective appeared near to success, but as of this moment, the moral justification for the action seems lost in a welter of confusion between expediency and face saving.

Our present preparedness program and our efforts to encourage our colleagues of the North Atlantic Pact to increase their armed strength also appear to be the antithesis of the goal which we are talking about. Of course they are by-passes—bypasses necessitated by the primary need for ensuring survival, but by-passes which can and should bring us back to the goal we are discussing. If we let the goal slip from our minds—if we forget the determination to reach that goal because of our preoccupation with the necessities of the moment, then indeed we have no foreign policy worthy of the name.

On the other hand, if the disarmament of which I speak is really our fundamental purpose, then we should keep reiterating it constantly, not alone to reassure ourselves that there is a better world ahead, but to give purpose, direction, and inspiration to each step as we move along. It is not only we alone who must have convictions with respect to what lies at the end of the path we are traveling; it is also the hundreds of millions of peoples of Europe and Asia and Africa who at times doubt the profoundness of our convictions and have difficulty in distinguishing between those who talk peace and actually make aggressive war, and those who prepare for war but in reality are using that preparation only as a means to try to ensure peace.

If we could state our convictions in concise and understandable language, it would do much to dispell the listlessness and despair to which General Eisenhower recently referred on his return from Europe. It would do much to keep Communist Russia on the defensive, both morally and politically. It could turn our foreign policy from one which appears to be essentially defensive to one which could continuously boast of real offensive strength.

Where does the Congress of the United States enter into this concept? Not only we, but the whole world, know that the executive branch of the Government alone cannot establish a lasting foreign policy. There is no need of my recalling the disillusionment which followed the congressional rejection of the League of Nations.

There is, however, real point in recalling the fact that the United Nations was created after the Fulbright resolution had been adopted by the Congress, and the North Atlantic Pact was negotiated after the Vandenberg resolution had been adopted by the United States Senate. An expression of opinion by the Congress of the United States gives infinitely greater assurance of a continuity of policy than any improvised action which might be taken by the executive branch. Certainly the many shifts in our policy with respect to Korea and the Far East during the last 5 years cannot give the world too great a confidence in the stability of purely executive action.

During the last session of the Congress a resolution was introduced and supported by 115 Members of the House and by 22 Members of the Senate, which made a declaration of policy in substantial accord with the very matter which we are discussing. I doubt whether any resolution which has come before the Congress has had so many individual Congressmen and Senators eager to sponsor it at its inception. It never came to the floor of either branch for debate. A similar resolution is being introduced into the present session of the Congress. What course it may take I cannot predict. But I do know this: Members of Congress are extremely sensitive to the voice of the people at home. It will be passed when enough people insist upon it.

However, the time is short. There is real danger that we shall get bogged down in the bypasses and fail to return to the main road. The clear voice of thousands of people expressing their conviction can hold us to a steady course. I believe that those voices will be heard and will be heeded. I believe that given time and courage we can make of their convictions a reality.

Oil Shortage Seen Facing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting article from the New York Times dated Sunday, February 18, 1951:

OIL SHORTAGE SEEN FACING INDUSTRY—EXPANSION PROGRAM, COSTING BILLIONS, INVOLVES AID FROM WASHINGTON—DEPLETION RATE A FACTOR—INDUSTRY SURE OF FINANCING PROVIDED TAX CHANGES DON'T MAKE BURDEN TOO HEAVY

(By J. H. Carmical)

Despite its huge expansion since World War II it is becoming increasingly clear that the oil industry is facing a gigantic task in supplying military and civilian demand in the present emergency. In an effort to meet these demands the industry has embarked on a program to increase its capacity by an additional 1,000,000 barrels daily. The chief difficulty in meeting that goal is expected to be in the crude oil branch. The first step is at the request of the Petroleum Administration for Defense. A committee has been appointed by the National Petroleum Council. This committee is headed by Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

The program is expected to cost billions of dollars. In addition, there will be materials and labor. However, as to materials, particularly steel, industry expects to have the aid of authorities in Washington.

Despite the huge cost, the steel industry is confident that the necessary financing can be provided by itself or through private sources provided that the tax laws are not changed so that it will have to bear too heavy a burden. Already, it is maintained that the Treasury Department's tax recommendations to Congress would make the oil industry carry an undue portion of the total tax burden.

BILLION IN REVENUE

Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, last week estimated that, if these recommendations were enacted into law, the oil industry would be asked to account for $1,000,000,000 in revenue over and above the proposed increase in rates applicable to all other corporations and individuals.

In addition to increasing the Government levy on gasoline to 3 cents a gallon from 1½ cents, the Treasury would drastically reduce the 27½ percent tax exemption now permitted for depletion of producing wells. Although there is some opposition to increasing the gasoline levy, which would bring the Federal take to roughly 25 percent of the refinery selling price, the chief objection, particularly to those engaged in crude oil production, is to the proposed change in the depletion provision of the law.

Mr. Brown pointed out that during the 25 years in which the present depletion rate has been in effect the oil industry has explored for, found, and produced ever-increasing supplies of crude oil. He said that Congress established the present rate of depletion because it had to find a method and an amount "that would insure proper tax payments and at the same time not discourage capital investments in such risk industries."

TO ENCOURAGE RESEARCH

Originally, the depletion provision was placed in the tax law so as not to discourage the search for oil. If all the net profit resulting from the discovery of an oil well should be taxed, Congress felt that the incentive to search for oil would be lessened. For that reason, it was determined that 27½ percent of the gross income resulting from the production of oil and gas wells should be exempt from income-tax payments.

With each of the 48 States levying a sales tax on gasoline and also some municipalities collecting an additional tax, many persons feel that gasoline is already paying more than its share.

Although the price freeze placed on crude oil and petroleum products in December has not appreciably influenced production, the belief in the industry is that it should be reviewed from time to time in order to maintain a proper margin of profit. In recent months nearly every item entering into the cost of petroleum products has advanced and the chances are that there will be further increases.

General Price Ceiling Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Texas, by House Concurrent Resolution 27, has clearly and ably set forth the dangers and pitfalls of the general price ceiling order of January 26, 1951, imposing price ceilings on cotton. Cotton is second only to steel as a war material, and, in my opinion, should not have been included in its raw state under the price-freeze order. The very logical reasons upon which I base this statement have been briefly and ably set out in the House concurrent resolution referred to, and I, therefore, place it in the RECORD with the request that all Members read it so that they may better understand some of the problems that can be created by such an order:

House Concurrent Resolution 27

Whereas the Federal Government's general price ceiling order of January 26, 1951, imposed price freezes on most agricultural commodities, while exempting materials classed as necessary to the defense program; and

Whereas cotton, which is second only to steel as a critical war material, was included in this general price freeze; and

Whereas past experience has demonstrated that, for many reasons, a price ceiling on raw cotton is unworkable and unenforceable, some of these reasons being the following:

1. Sufficient cotton must be produced to supply the Armed Forces as well as take care of our domestic and foreign requirements. Price ceilings on raw cotton might well discourage cotton planters, who have been asked by the Government to produce a 16,000,000-bale crop.

2. Raw cotton prices have little to do with the cost of the finished article. Only through controls of the finished products could price control be effective.

3. A short supply of labor and increased wages, as well as increased costs of machinery, equipment, fertilizer and insecticides, will greatly increase the cost of producing the 1951 crop.

4. The very nature of cotton marketing, involving hundreds of grades, staples and growths, makes it impracticable to place or enforce any ceiling on the raw product.

5. The nature of the cotton market is such that it must function freely; otherwise, with every potential buyer having a guarantee that the price could not rise any higher, the whole system of spot and future marketing would be adversely affected.

Whereas, in World War II price ceilings were not placed on raw cotton but rather on the finished products made therefrom, which arrangement permitted the prices of raw cotton to find levels consistent with control of textile prices; and

Whereas this method worked satisfactorily then and should be applied in the present situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States and the officials charged with the formulation and execution of price stabilization policies are hereby respectfully urged to reestablish the proven method of controlling cotton prices in the present emergency and thereby make possible the orderly financing, production and marketing of the 1951 cotton crop.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
REUBEN E. SEUTERFITT,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 27 was adopted by the house on February 13, 1951.

CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that House Concurrent Resolution 27 was adopted by the senate on February 13, 1951.

LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Freedom's Open Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the women's auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars post in Ruleville, Miss., recently conducted an essay contest open to senior class members in the Ruleville High School. The winner of this essay contest was Miss Nell Eastland, of Doddsville, Miss.

Miss Eastland's essay is a fine expression of faith in the American system. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S OPEN DOOR
(By Nell Eastland)

"Freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, these are principles that have guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation." Thus Thomas Jefferson expressed the sentiments which were in the minds and hearts of the Pilgrims and Puritans when they left their ancestral homes and came to a wild and unsettled new continent. America to them was freedom's open door.

These sturdy souls, who had for so long been persecuted by King James I for refusing to conform to the worship of the Anglican Church, left England to seek in America a refuge where they could worship God according to their own beliefs. Here they laid the foundation for the democratic form of government. They never allowed themselves to be enslaved.

As the Colonies grew, England put more and more restrictions upon them—taxes on practically every article, restrictions and more restrictions. The colonists resisted, at first verbally, but then as the injustices continued their desire for independence became stronger, and they fought for their independence. Once again they had refused to be enslaved.

The burning desire in the hearts of the men who met in Philadelphia in 1787 to draw up the Constitution was to set up a democratic government, a government in which certain freedoms would be preserved for the coming generations. They drew up the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees these rights: Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of petition.

One of the most important and most desired of all freedoms is that of religions. Not all of the people in the world had this freedom then or have it now. In many countries the government still dictates to the church. Recently we have heard of the purging of ministers and high church officials by the dictatorial governments of the East European countries. These churchmen, by their words and deeds, had stood in the way of the complete domination of the people by the government.

America is one of the few countries of the world where any citizen can express verbally or in writing his private opinions even though they are contrary to the policies of the government. A democracy thrives on constructive criticism, but in dictatorial governments and their satellites a citizen does not dare express anything critical of the individuals in power. Such peoples are not free. Only in a free country can public opinion mold the policies of the government.

Fifty nations of the world have gladly banded together in the United Nations organization and pledged themselves to promote and protect the independence and liberty of all peoples and all countries. Almost every generation has been called to arms to defend their ideals of freedom. Sometimes men fight for their own liberty, often to insure the rights of others. As the freedom bells rang out around the globe on October 24 the armed forces of the United Nations organization continued their fight to protect the rights of one of the weaker nations. So by promoting friendly understanding and cooperation between nations and the use of force only as a last desperate resort we hope to keep open freedom's door.

The Lesson of a Motto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are many institutions in our country which have made a distinct contribution to American life and have helped make the United States the great country that it is. One of these institutions is the famous Boys Home in Boys Town, Nebr., which was founded and led for many years by the late Father Flanagan, a Catholic priest and a distinguished American. Boys Home was established and flourishes to this day as a nonsectarian institution, offering a home, affection, belonging, and an education to homeless youths, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. On its board of directors sit prominent Americans of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths.

This institution continues to teach the American people a great and timely lesson through its motto, which is acquiring universal recognition. The well-known poet Joseph Auslander voices some very fine, soul-stirring thoughts concerning this motto which should touch the heart of every man, woman, and child in this country. His brief remarks were published in the magazine This Week, February 18, under a picture showing a GI in Korea carrying one of his wounded comrades. Both picture and words teach a beautiful message. The words follow:

A HAND TO HELP
(By Joseph Auslander)

"He ain't heavy, Father. He's my brother." Motto of Father Flanagan's Boys' Town.

One of the first things that strikes you as you enter Father Flanagan's world-famous Boys Town, in Boys Town, Nebr., is the simple, inspiring plaque which has become a kind of symbol of the spirit and work of that wonderful experiment in affection and faith—the picture of a sturdy young lad carrying a crippled little boy in his arms. Beneath this is written: "He ain't heavy, Father. He's my brother."

Today, against the background of current news stories and news pictures like the one shown above, it is impossible to read these words without a catch at the throat and a thrill at the heart. What a lesson for all of us—individuals, families, communities, and nations—that utterance carries.

If only, in our daily lives, at home or at our business, or in our dealings with our neighbors, we could share the burden, reach out a hand to help, lift another's load onto our shoulders for a while.

If only, in their intercourse with each other, the countries of the world could apply this warm and generous human impulse to their councils and deliberations, the poisons of fear and envy and suspicion would surely evaporate in peace.

If only everyone everywhere in the world, of whatever race, creed, color, or conviction, could stand before his God and say, "He ain't heavy, Father. He's my brother."

If only——

Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on February 14, 1951:

WHERE IS THE "BATORY"?

Do you remember the *Batory*, the Polish liner in which the Communist spy, Gebhart Eisler, escaped after his conviction here, landed in England, and was permitted to go free? Well, the *Batory* is again in Southampton, England, getting the overhaul and cleaning which the shipyard workers at Brooklyn, N. Y., refused to do on the ground that she is a Communist ship. She will now be fitted out by the English workers to continue her service to the common enemy.

Why, we wonder, does the British Government maintain such friendly relations with Russia, China, and the Red satellites? Why are British factories turning out great machine tools for Russia, the very things that Russia most desperately needs to build up her armament? Why are Russian engineers being entertained in British factories and being shown how to make such things so necessary to the making of war? Why, again, are British merchants doing a booming business with Red China through Hong Kong, reputedly the greatest boom in the history of that British outpost? Oil, rubber, and steel, the things the Red Chinese need most to carry on the war in Korea against British and American soldiers, are pouring into China to fatten English merchants.

When the question arises as to whether General MacArthur may order his forces to go north across the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea to run the Red army down, Mr. Attlee, the British Prime Minister, says "no." Is England to dominate our foreign policy even to the point of dictating to our Armed Forces, while we supply the main bulk of the forces engaged in putting down the Communists?

All these things are arousing deep resentment here in America and the friendly relations between Britain and America are being sadly frayed. The character of the present Labor Government in Britain is strikingly shown by the fact that they have now put up an out-and-out pacifist for a by-election to Parliament.

There is only one strong man in England in whom the American people have unbounded confidence. He is, of course, the former Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, who currently is vigorously battling to throw Mr. Attlee's Labor government out of office.

Years ago Mr. Churchill said that Labor was not fit to govern. He did not say that in a snobbish spirit. He simply meant that the British Labor Party was so essentially socialistic that it would bring about Britain's

downfall, and apparently his convictions are being borne out by Britain's present policy.

Britain and her satellites in the past year, even after the Korean fighting broke out, have time and again consistently voted against the United States in the UN. Britain hurriedly recognized Red China to preserve her trade with that country and to bribe the Chinese not to take over the British colony of Hong Kong. It is high time for Britain to make up her mind whether she is going to put the dollar first in her foreign policy, or whether she is earnestly and honestly going to join heartily with the free peoples of the world in the fight against communism.

At Cross-Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the following article by W. M. Jablonski, petroleum editor of the New York Journal of Commerce, deals with a subject of taxation which is now before the Congress. For this reason I believe the article will be of real information and interest to the Members.

The article follows:

President Truman's request for a reduction in the traditional tax depletion allowance for oil drilling reveals a startling lack of coordination in the administration's national defense objectives.

To be sure, Congress will be hard pressed to finance our huge mobilization program. All of us will have to carry the increased tax burden. No group or industry can ask for, or expect, special privileges.

But tampering with the depletion allowance for oil exploration and drilling is something else again. For a quarter of a century Congress repeatedly has upheld this 27½-percent allowance in recognition of the extraordinary hazards in oil drilling (82.3 percent of the exploratory wells drilled in the United States last year were dry) and of the need for encouraging risk capital to insure adequate national petroleum supplies. Only last year Congress again upheld this allowance as no tax loophole but as a necessary measure in the national interest.

To reduce the oil-drilling incentive now in order to help pay for the expanded military machine we are building—when additional oil capacity will be needed to oil that same military machine—would be working at cross-purposes.

This is the time to do everything possible to encourage—not discourage—domestic oil development.

The Government itself has recognized the need for offering special tax incentives (accelerated depreciation) to encourage expansion of vital defense plants. Yet at the same time the President would cut away a long-standing incentive for oil development.

The President's proposal is also hard to reconcile with the urgent request from another branch of the administration—the Interior Department—for the oil industry to study ways of expanding its productive capacity by 1,000,000 barrels per day for military needs in case of war.

A glance at current oil figures will show the weakness of the tax proposal. Our crude oil producing capacity has been estimated by the oil States at about 6,700,000 barrels daily. Industry sources put the figure closer to 6,400,000.

To meet current requirements alone, domestic oil production has been stepped up above 6,000,000 barrels daily in recent weeks, supplemented by crude imports of over 600,000 barrels per day (plus imports of 400,000 barrels daily of heavy fuel oil).

Our margin of petroleum self-sufficiency, without the benefit of imports, thus has dwindled to just about nothing, compared to the million-barrel-a-day domestic reserve that proved so vital in the last war.

This situation is too tight for comfort right now. When it comes to oiling the military machine we propose to build it is alarmingly small. Only through the most drastic civilian rationing or an uninterrupted flow of overseas imports on a vastly expanded scale could we meet the needs of all-out war.

To tamper with the long-standing oil drilling tax incentive at this point would be little short of national folly.

Illinois Central Railroad Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Central Railroad, one of the great institutions of the Mississippi Valley, is this year celebrating its centennial. I include an article from the Christian Science Monitor on the history of the Illinois Central:

TO CHANGE THE SUBJECT—CASEY JONES: RAILROAD'S COLORFUL ERA

(By Bicknell Eubanks)

This year marks the one hundredth year of operation for the Illinois Central—the "main line of mid-America." This 6,500-mile line, which numbered Abraham Lincoln among its legal staff, can boast that nearly every ton of freight which moves across the United States either passes over or crosses its lines at one or more points.

The railroad's current president, Wayne A. Johnston, recently told a dinner gathering in New York City that "a study of the railroad's history tells one a great deal about the development of America since 1850, when four-fifths of its area was in a primitive state and when there were fewer people in the United States than there are today in its four leading metropolitan centers.

"The history of the Illinois Central is the history of mid-America. When the railroad was organized there were only seven cities or towns on the 921-mile route from Chicago to New Orleans along what is now the main line of the railroad. Chicago then was little more than a trading post, with a population of less than 30,000."

The Illinois Central had a brilliant cast of supporters in the Congress—Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, and Jefferson Davis. Lincoln represented the Illinois Central from 1853 to 1860, when he was elected President. He received from the railroad the largest fee earned during his legal career—$5,000.

But all this history meant not nearly so much to me when I was growing up in Mississippi. My father was a conductor on the Aberdeen branch of the IC, and I used to hear some wonderful tales about what used to be the most colorful business in the United States—railroading.

Dad is now retired, but it doesn't take much to get him started on stories of some of those colorful figures of the early part of this century. Among his most famous acquaintances was a dashing engineer whose handling of the whistle put him in the class of a symphonic French horn player, and whose exploits are recorded—a bit erroneously—in the famous folk song Casey Jones. I used to hear Dad talk about Casey Jones, but I was quite big before I connected him with the song I heard in those days in less aesthetic company than now will admit to its existence.

Dad was a young telegrapher in Durant, Miss., around 1900, when he first met Casey. Dad found a $50 bill wadded up in a bunch of discarded train orders, and tossed into a corner of the station.

"That much money in those days scared me," he always said. "I saw that it was in some orders which Casey had thrown away, so I took it to the station agent, Mr. Neely. When Casey came back the next night on No. 2 (then the IC's fastest passenger train) he was mighty glad to get back the money. He wanted to reward me, but I couldn't let him do that. The next trip north, though, he climbed down from the cab with a big bundle under his arm. It was a dressed turkey. He gave it to me."

Dad says that all the stories about Casey's handling of a locomotive are very nearly correct. But Dad always waxes wroth when anyone suggests that Casey was a reckless engineer. Far from it. He was a skillful engineer who knew how to get the most out of a locomotive.

Dad recalls one time when No. 1, going south, had to pull into the hole to let No 2, going north, by. In spite of the fact that No. 1, with Casey at the throttle, had to pull out of the sidetrack onto the main line, wait for the flagman to throw the switch, then get started again, Casey pulled in to Canton, 20 miles south, as No. 2 pulled into Durant, about five miles north.

Dad always contends that it wasn't carelessness or disregard of orders that got Casey killed. In fact, paradoxically enough, Dad feels it was Casey's own brilliance as an engineer. He was good, and he knew it. When he pulled into Durant that night he had picked up about 1½ hours since leaving Memphis. He was sure he could go into Canton, his division point, on time.

Dad gave Casey his last orders, and, like most railroaders of that day will tell you, Casey wasn't going too fast; he already had made up his time when he started around that long curve near Vaughn, Miss. That is just about the most terrifying curve on any railroad. It seems to begin everywhere and wind up nowhere. But as Casey came around it, going slow, in fact, from his viewpoint, he saw that a couple of boxcars and the caboose of a freight train were sticking out.

Casey grabbed hold of the air brakes, yelled to his fireman, Sim Webb, to jump, and tried to stop the train. He almost made it. No one else was even hurt.

It wasn't long after that that a Negro roustabout in a Memphis roundhouse started humming a tune, then fitting words to it, that is now one of the most famous of all folk songs. It was never copyrighted by the IC.

Alex Stirewalt, Outstanding Arkansas Citizen, Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding man whose recent passing after a brief ill-

ness is mourned by a host of friends throughout eastern Arkansas. For many years he served as chairman of the Crittenden County Production and Marketing Administration Board and held various other offices with great distinction. He was a farmer, merchant, and patriotic citizen. He gave of his time and his talents most willingly. He was in the forefront of all movements which had for their purpose the betterment for his county, State, and Nation. He was a Christian gentleman in the truest sense. A real American. He was loyal to his friends.

The West Memphis (Ark.) Crittenden County Times carried an editorial on January 26, 1951, depicting the life, character, and services of this outstanding leader of men. The full text of the editorial is as follows:

ALEX STIREWALT

"That's one man whom I never heard anyone say a bad thing about."

"Whenever there was a job that required a lot of work to be done, they gave it to him, he took it and did it well."

"The flowers at his funeral depicted his nature—the red, the richness of his heart; the pastel, his softness; and the white, purity."

Such were a few of the tributes paid to Alex Stirewalt, esteemed by all who knew him and recognized by all as one of Crittenden County's most outstanding citizens.

As the minister said at his final rites, Mr. Alex would have suggested: "Don't say anything about me, just something for the family." That's the manner in which he lived, always retiring and never seeking credit for the many duties which he discharged so faithfully.

Mr. Alex had about all the free jobs there are to bestow upon an individual. Every time a secretary-treasurer was needed—without compensation—it was Mr. Alex who got elected. He not only did these assignments efficiently, but served as a leader for his community for every worth-while campaign that was launched.

His place as a leader in our county cannot be filled. His absence will be one felt more keenly with the passage of the days. Would that the world had more men who possessed his fine qualifications.

What We Are Fighting for in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times of February 9, 1951:

AN ANSWER

Back in June when the North Koreans crossed the fatal thirty-eighth parallel in open aggressive attack, the whole Nation and most of the free world applauded the quick and resolute action of President Truman, speaking for the people of the United States.

For the first time in a long while Republicans, Dixiecrats, Truman Democrats, and just plain Democrats found themselves thoroughly in accord and acting in unison. The spirit of a united Nation put new life into a battered and defeatist world.

But only for a short time. As disaster threatened on the heels of defeat, people everywhere, including the troops who were doing the fighting, began to ask what we were doing in Korea anyhow. The strong purpose of an aroused people frittered away into the dispirited isolationism of prime home-body ROBERT A. TAFT and the sincere but fantastically impractical "Gibraltar of the West" proposal of Elder Statesman Herbert Hoover, who should have known better.

Why are we there? What are we fighting for? Gen. Matthew Ridgway had an answer for his troops.

It is also a good answer to all the questioning people of this bewildered country:

"It is not a question of this or that Korean town. The real issues are whether the power of western civilization as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands shall defy and defeat communism; whether the rule of men who shoot their prisoners, enslave their citizens and deride the dignity of man shall displace the rule of those to whom the individual and his rights are sacred. * * *

"The sacrifices we have made are not offered vicariously for others, but in our own direct defense. * * * The issue now joined is whether * * * the next flight of fear-driven people * * * shall be checked and defeated overseas or permitted step by step to close in on our own homeland. * * * Never have members of any military command had a finer opportunity to prove an honor to the profession of arms and a credit to those who bred us."

Salem's Position Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Robert Letts Jones in the Salem (Oreg.) Capitol-Journal concerning proposals before the CAB for a change of airline service at that city. I thoroughly agree with the position which Mr. Jones has taken. I trust that the Civil Aeronautics Board will give full consideration to the position expressed in this editorial as reflecting the views of the people of the community involved.

SALEM'S POSITION UNCHANGED

Off to Washington, D. C., this week goes the final argument of the city of Salem in the Civil Aeronautics Board case which would substitute West Coast Airlines, a feeder line, for United Air Lines service here. The case developed more than a year and one-half ago from a CAB show-cause order why West Coast shouldn't be substituted. It is hoped the case is nearing a decision.

Salem's position in this matter which would substitute a feeder-line service for the main-line service of United has not changed during the proceedings. Since the case affects the city, business, farmers, and industry in and around the city, and the well-being of McNary Field, Salem's position is plainly this:

United Air Lines service is essential to the position of Salem as capital of the State of Oregon. Furthermore, the city needs more, not a change or less, air-transport service. Growth of Salem from 30,908 in 1940 to 43,-664 in 1950 indicates the expanding needs of the community.

Salem feels that main-line facilities of United are imperative considering geographical considerations for Oregon's capital which is presently served by main-line air transport, highway, and railroad facilities. In this connection, United Air Lines has pioneered commercial air travel for the city since United was granted permission by the CAB to serve the city in 1941. That was the time when Governor McKay was the city's representative before the CAB in Washington on the proposal.

The economy of the city and surrounding territory demands adequate main-line, speedy air-express, and air-freight service such as offered by United. Local business and industry have geared operations to an expanding through air-express and air-freight service. This is illustrated, for example, by the 64-percent increase in air-freight poundage outgoing from Salem for 1950 over 1949, and by the 90-percent increase of air freight off at Salem for 1950 over 1949.

Another argument is that airport development at McNary Field is dependent on United Air Lines service. Rental and landing fees paid by United are such as to become a vital part of the operating budget of the field. In fact, expansion of the airport and the new administration building on the field, occupied last July, are predicated on an expanding service by United for the city.

* * * * *

The stand-by status of the city's airport is not to be overlooked, either. McNary Field is the only adequate alternate field in this part of the State for air-transport traffic to the Portland airport. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has recognized this fact. The expensive instrument-landing system, along with the 24-hour weather and control-tower service, bears out that fact. Salem is forced to maintain an airport and administration building capable of handling Portland's air-transport service when the Portland field is closed in by weather.

The facts clearly indicate Salem's need for keeping and developing United Air Lines service here—as was realized when the threat to present air service for the city developed more than a year and one-half ago.

A Small United States Army for Europe—German Participation in Europe's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended analysis by the distinguished commentator, Walter Lippmann, from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, February 19, 1951, puts in realistic terms the reasons for our action and gets away from the unrealism of assuming we are trying to match the U. S. S. R. man for man on the ground in Europe.

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
A SMALL ARMY FOR EUROPE

In giving the figures—four ground divisions added to the two already in Europe—Secretary Marshall was only making somewhat more specific what General of the Army Eisenhower had already told Congress.

The figures are not sensational in the sense that they give away closely guarded

military secrets. There is no such thing as hiding the long business of mobilizing and training American divisions, putting them on ships, landing them in European ports, and moving them to their stations in Germany. The Russians are in a position to know exactly at all times what ground forces are in front of them in Europe and vice versa.

Even during an all-out war, when passing back and forth across the lines is difficult and dangerous, it is only occasionally that as much as a division is hidden successfully for any length of time. Hiding an American division of talkative and letter-writing GI's is like hiding an elephant with a siren attached to him on the stage of Constitution Hall.

In the literal and obvious sense no question of military security is involved. But in another and less obvious sense there are very important military and political implications, some of them which must be secret indeed, in the decision to plan at present for a small army unit of high efficiency.

Why, it will be asked by many here and abroad, should we believe that a small American Army of this kind is of great military importance? How, it might be said, can any army small enough not to frighten Mr. Hoover too much be strong enough to impress Stalin at all? For obvious reasons so small an army would not, as General Marshall put it, "appear to represent in pure fighting power a large contribution to the immediate defensive strength of Western Europe."

The key word, I believe, in General Marshall's remarks is the word "defensive." As a defensive force, in Mr. Hoover's sense of a "dam" against the Red Army, these six divisions, or even double that number, would be fantastically insufficient. These six divisions make sense only if we look at the part they are meant to play in the grand strategy—not of defense but of deterrence.

Then they make big sense and are in fact of great importance to the security of the Western World and in the prevention of a great war. The grand strategy of deterrence rests fundamentally, of course, upon making it the indubitable fact that the Soviet Union could not win a world war because its main adversary, the United States, could not be defeated and would grow even stronger as the war continued. This is, and always has been, the military fact which protects the west, which protects otherwise indefensible places, such as west Berlin, Vienna, Iran. This is the military fact which protects General of the Army MacArthur's bases and supply lines, having given him unchallenged freedom of the air and sea over and around Korea and Japan. This military fact is becoming, happily, more and more of a military fact from month to month.

Nevertheless, the west will not feel secure, nor will it be so secure as it is entitled to be, if Western Europe could be had without a fight. There is here a temptation which needs to be removed. For if Europe could be had without a fight, by surrender if the Red Army started to march, then Europe would be a hostage held in order to neutralize American power.

The presence of an American Army is a guaranty that Europe cannot be taken or surrendered without a fight. Thus it will serve to rally those Europeans who do not wish to surrender without a fight and it will serve to prevent the Russians from thinking that Europe can be had without a war. All will see that—if there is the kind of fight that very modern weapons produce—there will not be much of military value in Western Europe to surrender or to capture. In military parlance, the power to deter, which is paramount, will have been reinforced by the power to deny.

Within this strategic conception many things that are otherwise confusing become intelligible. It makes intelligible the fact that General Eisenhower expresses so much confidence in the success of his mission, which is to prevent war, though in fact he will command a small army. It also makes intelligible the fact that he is not counting on a German army.

The whole business would be less bewildering to the American people—and to the Germans—if it could be admitted frankly that it reflects a radical change in the strategic and political plans which, from August to November, the administration talked so much about. It was then that they taught Mr. Hoover and the Republicans and the general public to think that Western Europe could not be saved without a very large ground army to which we would have to make a very large contribution in order to induce the Germans to make a still larger contribution. The whole discussion of rearmament by Germans in Germany has rested on this notion.

That is why Dr. Adenauer, who has realized what General Eisenhower's report signifies, is making it publicly known how deeply distressed he is. His political position inside Germany is indeed weakened by our change, let us say, of emphasis about the indispensability and urgency of German rearmament. But Dr. Adenauer is more disturbed than he needs to be if what he fears is that we would or that we could make a deal with Russia at the expense of Germany's chance to be again an independent nation. We do not betray nations in that fashion. But that the role of Germany in the Atlantic community is not now what it appeared, quite falsely, in September is certainly true.

That is a good thing for Germany, as it is for all of us. For if the proceeds of peace depend primarily on our power to deter, and then on our power to deny, they can be improved still more by eliminating from our activities, as General Eisenhower so manifestly wishes to do, the element of provocation. Nothing would be so provocative as the formation of a big German-American army capable of striking offensively on the ground to the Vistula and beyond.

Strikes Against the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, the Atlantic City (N. J.) Tribune published an editorial entitled "United States Antistrike Law Needed."

The thoughts that are expressed in this editorial are worthy of the careful attention of the membership.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced H. R. 525 which sought to have the Labor Committee investigate equitable means to prevent the interruption of work in any industry or establishment the continuous operation of which is necessary to life and health.

My resolution particularly limited itself to operations now defined as public utilities and to hospitals, and the processing and transportation of essential foods and fuel.

My resolution further particularly provided for full attention to special compensation, pension rights, and other forms of security to workers in such industries, on the theory that if such workers were to give up their normal and inherent right to strike, they were entitled to special protection in their rights as workers.

While the right to strike in the normal course of employment should not be subject to the slightest question, there is, indeed, a grave question as to the right to strike in those limited areas where the national defense efforts may be brought to a standstill, or where the health and even the lives of American people are endangered.

Having for many years advocated action in this special field, I was much interested in the editorial which now follows in part:

UNITED STATES ANTI STRIKE LAW NEEDED

Th state of paralysis and confusion experienced by most of the Nation during the past few days when transportation workers have either called a strike or reported "sick," should be ample reason for the President to request Congress to enact a public utility antistrike law.

A similar bill has been in force in this State for a few years, and has been moderately successful in keeping utility workers on their jobs while wage disputes and other working conditions are ironed out during arbitration.

Strikes by utility workers are not merely against an employer to gain their demands, but involve untold hardship inflicted upon the innocent public, and cause dangers to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the United States and the security of their Government.

We have stringent regulations governing the operations of utility companies that protect the public from being at the mercy of even the most monopolistic utilities, but we cannot at present do anything to control utility workers who can, at the drop of a union leader's hat, tie up the Nation's railroad system. Millions of dollars are lost by firms that cannot conduct their business during strikes, and unemployment is forced upon thousands of other workers due to plants having to shut down.

* * * * *

We are all being asked to face sacrifices in these critical times, and it would seem that the same sacrifices are incumbent upon union workers as are expected from civilians who are joining our Armed Forces.

A Federal public utility antistrike law should be broad enough to include unions and workers upon whom the public is dependent for health and welfare. This would include the mine workers, munition workers, food processors, transportation workers, and those upon whose productivity the Nation is dependent for food, power, communications, medical supplies, and armament.

Address by Hon. Willis Smith, of North Carolina, at the Annual Convention of the North Carolina Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful address delivered by my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMITH] from North Carolina at the annual conven-

tion of the North Carolina Farm Bureau in Asheville, N. C., on February 14, 1951.

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

Ladies and gentlemen of the farm bureau organization in North Carolina, I do not come to speak to you today with any definite feeling that I can tell you anything that you do not already know, or that I can offer accurate solutions for the difficult problems that you have already considered. But I will talk about some paramount problems of our Government. And I may go away feeling that I have in turn acquired from you impressions and understanding of how you feel about some of these questions that so sorely perplex us.

IDENTIFIED WITH YOUR ORGANIZATION

While I have not been active in your particular organization, nevertheless it has been my privilege to be rather closely identified for many years with some of your subsidiaries where legal services were required. I found those associations most pleasant, and at times profitable. I have been interested in learning from time to time more about the basic and fundamental policies and practices of your group and its affiliated organizations.

OUR NATION IN PERIL—A RELENTLESS FOE

Today our Nation is in peril. We find ourselves confronted by what appears to be a relentless foe, determined not merely upon securing for itself a temporary or even a lasting advantage in its own system of thought and life, but rather intent upon bringing all the world under the domination of its ideas, its policies, and its power. America stands between that philosophy and that power and the rest of the free world.

What shall we do with this power, and how shall we meet the challenge to our type of civilization and to our mode of life—this civilization, and this mode of living that has meant so much to our forebears, to us, and we trust to our posterity?

METHODS OF MEETING THE CHALLENGE

We can meet the challange with reckless abandon and hysterical emotion, attempting to change suddenly our way of life, as some would feel necessary. In that process we may sink ourselves into the morass of additional problems that would be sure to arise and confuse us.

Or, we can meet this challenge calmly and soremely, insofar as that is possible, and determine upon a course of action that will be participated in patriotically by all of our citizens, with a will, a determination, and an inspiration that can assure us of victory. That will be the way of calm and sound judgment, confidence in our institutions, and a collective determination that we will not in time of war abandon those instrumentalities and safeguards in our Government that have made us the greatest Nation on earth. Let us not abandon our own basic freedoms.

I do not believe that any one man or any one small group knows how to have us meet the challenge unerringly, at first blush. Rather I believe that the opportunity and the necessity is for every group to cooperate, submerge their independent ideas, and attempt to reach a common understanding that will provide the ambition and the inspiration to a successful endeavor by all our people.

AT WAR—NOT A POLICE ACTION

We are at war—and make no mistake about that. We are in a serious war, and not merely a police action. We are in this war not by the usual and constitutional congressional declaration of war as has been one of the cardinal provisions of our Constitution since the foundation of the Republic. Rather we are in war because we assumed certain obligations under the Charter of the United Nations—whether wisely or unwisely we cannot for certainty know.

Out of that obligation and in accordance with the determination and dictation of the executive branch of the Government, thousands of American boys have been sent 7,000 miles away from home. The contest is with a foe, not because of any activity of that foe against the territory of the United States, but rather in pursuit of a moral idea that may have been extended a little too far. We call the force United Nations, but that is hardly more than just a name.

The result of this today is that thousands of American boys have lost their lives and lie in unmarked graves on Korean soil; that thousands upon thousands of other boys have lost their arms, their legs, their eyes, and the use of other functions of their bodies. All of these things have been done, we know, without any idea of self-aggrandizement, but because we believe in the ideals of self-government and democratic action among all peoples, and some at least imagine that such a course was necessary. Whether our rulers acted wisely will have to be one of the verdicts of history. Whether we have benefited or injured Korea will be answered only in the years ahead. We have at least assumed a tremendous responsibility in the destruction of not only lives but of human habitations, such as they were, in the land of Korea, where so many Christian missionaries over so long a time had endeavored to keep precepts of the Christian religion.

WAR: BY WISDOM OR BY BLUNDER

I realize, as you do, that regardless of how we got into this war, whether by wise design or by colossal blundering, we are in it now. American prestige and freedom must be preserved. Some contend that only an endless conflict of fighting and killing can "save our face." We have slain thousands, and maybe slaying hundreds of thousands more may add to our glory. Few know precisely how and why we went into Korea so alone—and they are not saying much about it. There are millions of Americans who do not believe that we should ever have gone into Korea. There are other millions who believe that even today we should retire from the field. There are these conflicts in reasoning and in emotion which are permeating the minds of millions of Americans. Regardless of the dissimilarity of these views, they are all entitled to be presented and to be heard without suppression.

DISCUSSION WITHOUT SUPPRESSION

It is well indeed that there has been discussion. Out of this situation and the realization of the relentless foe that we face in the world at large, there has arisen the question of what we shall do with respect to Europe—that section of the earth's globe which has been called so frequently the cradle of civilization, and where the achievements of human beings have been so great—save only for their failure to erect a barrier against the possibility of war.

AID IN DEFENSE OF EUROPE

War has indeed devastated Europe from time to time since the earliest dawn of history, and war is again hovering over its life. Shall we join with the Europeans in all-out defense of what we are pleased to term our American way of life and the freedoms of mankind of which we talk so much? I think that the average American citizen will feel that having joined the United Nations with the hope that it could eliminate war from the human program of life, we should assist in some reasonable measures in carrying forward the objectives of that organization, as long as it appears that it can hope to accomplish anything. At times amidst the bickering at Lake Success that hope becomes faint, and yet there is still some chance for effective cooperation of the civilized nations through that agency. My hope is somewhat dim for any real accomplishment, but yet I am willing to see America do its part to preserve what little chance may be left in that organization. But I said:

AMERICA'S PART—JOINT ENTERPRISE

I do believe that if we are to furnish support and sustenance for the United Nations, and if we are to have American boys die 7,000 miles from home for an idea or ideal, we should likewise expect from the other participants in that organization, who believe in democracy as we do, equal sacrifices of men and matériel, to the end that our efforts may indeed constitute a joint enterprise. I do not believe that we should rush hastily into the sending of millions of American boys to Europe, and certainly not until we have made sure that the Europeans are willing to do something substantial for themselves and in their own defense.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF CONGRESS AND EXECUTIVE

I know that it is claimed that the Executive and not Congress has the power to send American armies anywhere on earth, but to that theory I do not subscribe. Section VIII of Article I of our Constitution gives to the Congress the duty of providing for the common defense, the declaration of war, the raising and support of armies, the providing and maintenance of a navy, and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." And then in the eighteenth paragraph of that section VIII of Article I, Congress is given the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." Congress is given this power in the Constitution because Congressmen are the direct representatives of the people, with elections frequently—that is to say, every 2 years.

Nowhere in the Constitution is the Executive given the power to abrogate the terms of the Constitution above set forth. It would seem, therefore, that there should be no effort by any person in the executive department to ride roughshod over the powers of the Congress, or to challenge or defy its authority, as provided in the Constitution. I hope that we may be able to reach a common understanding of what is a proper interpretation of these powers of government. Let us maintain our constitutional processes. They are our hope for the success of democracy.

YOUR ORGANIZATION'S RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Your organization is interested in the preservation of rights under our Constitution. I know you believe in the principles of democracy, and I also know that you are opposed to dictatorship in any form, whether by one group in Government or by another. You and your policymakers look askance, as I do, at every unnecessary proposed innovation in our Government—at every restriction upon the rights of citizens—at every effort to impose unnecessary controls on the people.

Reforms we do wish, but not at the cost of democratic freedom. It was with this in mind that the founding fathers of our Government placed restrictions upon the representatives of the Government. They knew that in the history of the world nations had risen to heights of glory and then declined because governments had reached too far into the control of everyday lives of citizens. Such abuses have generally been by the executive branch of the Government. Let us therefore be on guard to protect those rights and liberties which we have treasured for so long.

CONTROLS ONLY WHERE CLEARLY NECESSARY

I appreciate fully that your organizations are opposed to all controls that are not absolutely necessary, in order to protect our national independence, and in that I can join you. I believe that one of the best expositions of this principle that I have seen anywhere is the address of Mr. Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, made at the annual meeting of the National Cotton Council in Biloxi, Miss., on January 22, 1951. Many of you have doubtless read it, but those who have not should do so for the fine understanding which it will most assuredly give of the dangerous subject of controls. Some of them we may have to have, but I believe Mr. Fleming's interpretation of the dangers thereof is indeed pertinent.

FARM BUREAU INDEPENDENCE—BRANNAN PLAN

Your organization has shown independence and courage, as witness its magnificent fight against the so-called Brannan plan, which apparently was conceived for the purpose and with the intent of seducing the unthinking voters of America. But the members of your organization were not deceived, and you saw it for what it was, a political expedient based upon unsound economic reasoning. I was glad to have a small part in the condemnation of that scheme which you so quickly recognized as an enslaving possibility for the American farmer. Let me commend you for the wisdom which your organization showed.

MEAT RATIONING AND MY HOGS

I do not have the time to talk to you about price controls and rationing as I would like to, but I must tell you about my own experience in the rationing of meat in the last war. I had a farmer client living about 25 miles from my city, who said that if I would buy two pigs and furnish the feed he would raise them for me so that my family and the members of my law firm and their families would not have to go to the open market and compete for available meat. I thought I was doing a patriotic thing, so I wrote him a check for the cost of the two pigs and for sufficient feed to carry those pigs to their maturity.

When the fall of the year rolled around, I spoke in great glee to some friends about my meat supply. And then one of them inquired, with a twinkle in his eye and a smile upon his face, as to whether or not the hogs had yet been killed, cured, and were in my possession. I replied in the negative, but said that process we expected to enter upon very shortly. Then to my surprise I was told that the law was against me; that I could not kill those pigs without permission from Government representatives, and that in order to keep the meat I would have to have sufficient red ration points, which of course I did not have.

Then, the fun began. I asked for permission to kill the pigs and was told that I could not do so in the absence of sufficient red points. I then asked if I could not kill them upon the basis that they were mine, that I had raised them and fed them. I was asked the question, how often had I seen them, and was told that if I hadn't visited them at least once every 2 weeks I had no authority to kill them and to take the meat. I replied that I had not been able to visit the pigs every 2 weeks because there was such a thing as gasoline rationing in effect, and I had not been able to get enough gasoline to visit my pigs regularly. The answer was again, "No," I could not do that which I thought I was entitled to do. I then asked what should I do with the hogs. Nobody in the rationing department could give me any advice. Then suddenly someone called to my attention that there was a law or a regulation that after a hog had reached the weight of 200 pounds no more feed could be purchased for him. There I was, with two hogs, reaching the weight of 200 pounds, and I unable to purchase further feed to keep them alive. I inquired at length as to what I should do, but until this good hour I have never received a satisfactory answer. And, then, one day nature settled the whole problem. Cholera got into a neighboring herd, was transmitted to the farm of my friend, and before very long he came to advise me that my two hogs were dead—dead of cholera, because I had not been able to give them a respectable death months before—dead, if you please, and four or five hundred pounds of meat lost to human beings with whom I would have shared that meat. So, you can understand that I have some misgivings about rationing and control systems.

CONFIDENCE IN YOUR ORGANIZATION

Let me assure you that it will be my desire to work with your organization to the end that we may produce for that great and substantial mass of our citizens, the farmers, the soundest economy that can be constructed. There is, of course, the possibility that we could not always agree upon everything, but, in reading the resolutions as adopted at your national convention, I see little with which I would differ. I hope, therefore, that I may be of some benefit in carrying out a sane, sound, and satisfactory program for the farmers of North Carolina, and of America as well.

The interests of every group will have to be considered, and I shall not fail to give heed to what I consider to be sound economic doctrine from whatever source it may come. We must maintain a high and profitable wage scale, in line with the purchasing power of the dollar, because only by the economic stability of the great mass of our citizens can the industries and the farmers of America hope to permanently profit. I know that you would not desire that the wage earners of America be subordinated to your interests, but rather that they be made successful and financially independent to the end that they in turn could create the great demand for the products of farm and forest.

DISLOYALTY IN GOVERNMENTAL DEPARTMENTS

One other matter about which you have seen much in the papers that I wish to mention—disloyalty in governmental departments. Apparently there has been some—how much we do not know. As a member of the new subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I hope that we may conduct an efficient, exhaustive, but withal a fair investigation. We wish to smear no one. We wish to protect no one. I saw first-hand in Czechoslovakia in 1947 Communists in government disguised as Christian Social Democrats, or some such high-sounding name. The No. 2 communist there so disguised sat next to me at a luncheon given by President Benes. He was under suspicion then by Mr. Benes and the late Jan Masaryk and Lawrence Steinhardt. He proved to be what they suspected but what the people generally did not believe. He arose to take his Communist spot when the time arrived. If there are such in our midst, they should be exposed. They should not be coddled nor their activities condoned. The dangers from such in our State are not many, as generally we know one another, but nevertheless, we should be constantly on guard against encouraging or harboring any such enemies of our society.

May I thank you one and all for your attention.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] before the Middlesex Club in Boston, Mass., on February 12, 1951.

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

In any meeting of Republicans celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, it is supremely important to remember that Lincoln achieved greatness, and through him the Republican Party came to power by facing courageously and frankly the great social, political, and economic problems of that critical period.

Lincoln came from the common people. He always kept himself in sympathetic contact with the common people, with their hopes, with their aspirations, and with their problems. Lincoln was sensitive to public opinion. And he understood public opinion because he was sensitive to it. So long as the Republican Party has kept to the course charted by Lincoln, we have enjoyed the confidence and support of the people. Only when we have veered from the paths that led to our greatness have we lost public confidence and thereby the support of the people in the election of our candidates to the highest office within the gift of the people.

After a series of defeats such as we have suffered in the past four national elections for the Presidency, there are those who have been willing to spend their energies berating what happened, without giving effort either to formulate a new course of action or to prepare for future success.

At the outset, may I say that I feel it is a tremendous mistake to attempt to channel the thinking of all groups of the party within the confines of the thinking of certain segments in the party. In my Republicanism it is not heresy if what one believes does not happen to coincide with what prominent leaders of the party may believe on certain issues or problems; provided there is substantial agreement on final objectives.

Disagreement within the party should not be interpreted as a sign of party weakness. Strong disagreement on policy, actually reflecting sincere conviction rather than an endeavor to gain political advantage, is a mark of strength, not weakness. The fact is that disagreement within the party, based upon conviction, is one sure way that the party will grow strong enough again to gain control of the National Government. Conflict of opinion certainly develops strength just as surely as it discloses weaknesses necessary to be corrected. As in college athletics, a strong scrub team always makes a better varsity.

The important thing is for the party as a whole to possess the wisdom to make the right choice between the different ideas expressed by various leaders within the party. Certainly if the party leaders do not make these choices correctly the people certainly will, if given a free chance both on issues and on candidates.

Instead of becoming steamed up on possible candidates for the Presidency for 1952, instead of factional fights to secure and hold delegates to the national convention, instead of wasting energy on the petty distinctions of the band wagon, let us spend our energy and our initiative as a party in developing a clean line of party philosophy. Let us decide where we are going and how we expect to get there. Then, as in Lincoln's time, those who give character to a true philosophy and to a true course of action, and those who prove best able to furnish the strategy and tactics to make that course effective will furnish the vital natural leadership that neither propaganda nor political manipulation nor organized publicity will ever successfully produce.

The time has come for the Republican Party to make some important decisions. But in making those decisions, there are some mighty important distinctions to be observed. Unless we start with a clear knowledge of those distinctions, we will not get as far as we should and certainly not so far as we will go if we are willing to make them.

As a party we must be positive and affirmative; not merely negative and critical. When we are opposed we should be opposed because we have a definite constructive alternative policy of our own. We need to have both a clear understanding and a clear definition of our attitude with respect to foreign policy, both in Europe and in the Far East. We need a clean-cut policy on military preparations and all the important phases of those preparations. We need a definite and constructive policy on taxes, on domestic spending, on the use of atomic weapons, and a definite decision on party attitude with respect to how and when and under what circumstances American troops are to be used.

If this means that we have to have some rough scrapping within the party, let's have it now. The sooner it's over, the better. The country will be for it and the right thinking people will be for us if we are right in our decisions.

No endeavor to gain party advantage by appeal to emotions ought to be tolerated in reaching these decisions. These are decisions of such supreme importance that they ought to be decided on the merits without respect to any other consideration whatsoever except what is right and best in the circumstances. Let the great debate go on, but above all else let great decisions be arrived at, because what we need in this critical period is action, and our party must be a party of decision and action.

It is true that this is a time when it is necessary for those in responsible positions in government to use "no" as a frequent word in their vocabulary. The demands upon government are so great, and from such various sources, that unless responsible officials can get around to saying "no" when "no" is necessary, we will bankrupt government at every level. But while it is imperatively necessary to realize that there are a tremendous number of "no's" to be said, there are also certain essential places where it will be equally fatal if we don't say "yes" when "yes" is the proper answer to the problem.

We need to say a clear and unmistakable "no"—so unmistakable that everybody in this country knows what we mean—to every item in the Federal budget where the administration and the social planners have packed fat in that budget, when all we can afford right now is lean meat. We need to say this, and we must say it, no matter whether it affects a Democratic district or a Republican district. We must say "no" to the waste of money in any form.

And above all, we must remember that we can't do logrolling and back scratching as Republicans on favorite items of our own and expect to achieve what we will demand, namely a budget free of everything except the most vital necessities of this enormously critical period.

The men and women who built this country were not negative. They were positive and aggressive and bold. They were imaginative and hopeful. They went about their tasks with the determination to make them turn in the direction they wanted them to turn.

The Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock to found the Massachusetts Bay colony and to create a New England in America; those who went through the terrible hardships and deprivation to found Virginia; those who crossed the Alleghenies and won Fort Duquesne and the Ohio; those who settled the Carolinas and Georgia and spread southward through the Gulf States and westward through Tennessee and Kentucky; those who crossed the plains and followed the Oregon Trail to the Pacific; and the Santa Fe Trail to the Southwest; all these were men and women who took every necessary risk for the future. They did not balance nicely the chance they took in comparing those risks with the objective they sought; they strove with courage, with hope, with imagination, and also with sacrifice and thrifty living, to do what they were determined to do in order to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity.

We in our day are of the same faiths and the same hopes as were they. To be leaders as they were we must exhibit the same affirmative qualities and the same boldness of action with respect to the objectives we now seek as they did in their day and generation in building this country. Above all else we must hold high the torch of hope and freedom at a time when it has gone out in so many other places in the world.

Someone said of Cromwell that hope shone in him like a pillar of fire when it had gone out in other men. And that same hope must shine like a pillar of fire in us at a time when the deep shadow of communism is falling more darkly over large portions of today's world.

These are days of great challenge—days that try men's souls as our fathers' souls were tried in the great days of the Revolution. This is a time when everything we believe in, everything that has made us what we are is challenged by the evil force of a new tide of barbarism in the world.

Surely if we are to successfully stand against this onslaught against our civilization, we must adhere to our ideals as a people. We must join with those in other lands of like ideals, of like laws, of like manners, of like ethics, and of like religious beliefs in a power in the universe greater than ourselves. We must realize in this day of challenge and change that if those of us with common ideals do not stick together, we will probably fail together.

I am confident as you are that we will be equal to the ordeal that confronts us. These are great days. They are days of trial and sacrifice. But they are days of opportunity and responsibility and of nobility of action that come to few generations of men.

Here in the renowned Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in the great city of Boston, in the critical days that led to the Revolution, Paul Revere had a conviction of the coming danger and by a midnight ride became the symbol of alertness and preparedness that preceded the conflict on the morrow when the embattled farmers at Concord fired the shot heard round the world.

We are in need of Paul Reveres today to arouse the people in the free world to their danger and to awaken them as he did in those glorious days in the past to the privilege of sacrifice for those things more wonderful than life itself.

In Pennsylvania last month before the end of my term as governor, a ceremony was arranged in which a replica of the Liberty Bell was to be presented to the people of Pennsylvania. Before attending the ceremony I imagined that it was to be a small reproduction, merely a miniature token of that bell that means so much to everyone who loves liberty. But when I attended the ceremonies I observed the great size of the bell; then I realized it was an identical size with the bell of the revolution. I learned that the original bell had been reproduced exactly in all its dimensions even to the size of the clapper; that a chemical analysis had been made of the metal in the original bell; that even the wood on which the reproduced bell hung was procured from the same oak forests in the mountains of Switzerland as the original bell. Thus the replica given our people conformed in every particular with the original bell except that the replica was not broken as the old bell was when it cracked more than 100 years ago while being tolled for the death of Chief Justice Marshall. A cracked bell loses tone and resonance and is a mere dead, hollow imitation. It no longer is live and full of vibration and of resonance and soul.

Thus those of us who heard the tolling of this complete replica of the Liberty Bell heard a sound that had not been heard ever before by any of us or those of our citizenry for many generations. We heard for the first time the true sound and tone and voice of the Liberty Bell of the Revolution.

That stirred in every one of us, as it will stir in the heart of every one of us who hears it, a new call to duty of authentic tone, the tone that requires the best of everything that we have and everything that we are.

It is only by the ringing out of that bell in all the States and by the appeal that it can make and by our response to that appeal that we of this day and generation are to be equal to the responsibilities of the cause that confronts us and to be worthy to be numbered with the great men and women of the Revolution, who in their day and generation responded to the call of that bell, as we in our day must do likewise if we are to transmit to those who come after us those blessings of liberty which our fathers who heard the original bell had transmitted to us and which makes America the best of all the places in the whole world.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] recently addressed a group in Portland, Maine, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Lincoln Club of Portland. What he said to that group, I think, merits the attention and consideration of every Member of this body. I, therefore, invite the attention of my colleagues to this excellent address and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

I am sincerely grateful for the privilege of addressing this meeting of true Americans and loyal Republicans in the grand old State of Maine.

We are assembled to honor the memory of the greatest of all Republicans—a plain man of the people who rose from the depths of poverty and hardship to a commanding place among the world's immortals.

In celebrating the one hundred and forty-second birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln we recall the vast contribution of his faith, tolerance, good will, and courage to the preservation of the Union.

We pay tribute to his greatness as a foremost champion of freedom and human rights.

We praise him as a stanch exponent of the American way of life which we are now fighting to preserve.

And we remember with deep gratitude his service to the Nation as one of the founders of the Republican Party and as a stalwart advocate of Republican principles which guided our Nation during three generations of its greatest progress.

I am happy to be here tonight because of the bonds which join your State of Maine with my State of Pennsylvania in historic association.

I am proud that West Brownsville, in my home county of Washington, Pa., was the birthplace of your distinguished statesman, James G. Blaine.

It was in Washington County that the future Speaker of the House, United States Senator, Secretary of State, and Republican nominee for President spent his boyhood and received his education.

In Pennsylvania also we are proud of the valiant service of the men of Maine on the battlefield of Gettysburg. Enshrined in honored memory are the names of Gen. Joshua L. Chamberlain, a hero of Little Round Top, and Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, who held Cemetery Hill in the center of the Union line.

Another link between Maine and Pennsylvania was established a few years ago when we gained the services of your distinguished former Governor, Horace A. Hildreth, as president of Bucknell College. We hope to keep Governor Hildreth and to convert him into a real Pennsylvanian, but I'm afraid he retains strong and enduring ties with the State of Maine.

I welcome this opportunity to express my high regard and warm admiration for your distinguished United States Senators, OWEN BREWSTER and Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH. They serve your State and the Nation with patriotism, courage, and outstanding ability.

Senator BREWSTER is recognized as one of the outstanding leaders of the Senate. He is a great American and a great Republican. The substantial Republican gains in the Eighty-second Congress were, to a large extent, due to the hard work of Senator BREWSTER as chairman of the senatorial campaign committee.

Mrs. SMITH'S sturdy independence, her tireless energy, and her high sense of public duty reflect her deep understanding of real Americanism.

In these days of critical and momentous decisions it is appropriate to consider American policies. It is fitting to hold such discussions in a Republican meeting.

In Lincoln's time the Nation was torn asunder by a great internal upheaval. The preservation of the Union was the sacred cause to which Lincoln dedicated all of his loyalty, his patriotism, and his passionate love of the United States.

He succeeded in saving the Republic because he rallied all the Union strength to his side by the power of his faith in the people.

Through the dark days of defeat, disappointment, and discouragement he held firmly to faith in himself, faith in the righteousness of the Union cause, and faith in God.

Today we face a crisis just as grave and just as challenging as in Lincoln's time. The basic issue confronting us is the preservation of freedom in the United States and in the world.

We face a well-organized, well-prepared, and well-disciplined enemy who knows no truth, no honor, no justice, and no God. His weapons are lies, deceit, treachery, and force.

Since the end of World War II the Communist dictators of Soviet Russia have gained control of one-third of the world. They have placed 700,000,000 people in Europe and Asia under the iron rule of terror and tyranny. They have prepared the plans and have stockpiled the weapons for world conquest and the enslavement of all free people who dare resist their fiendish purpose.

That, my fellow Americans, is the grim picture of a world in which the future civilization hangs in the balance. It is a world tottering on the brink of a third world war, more terrible, more destructive of human values, than any conflict in recorded history.

The time has come when the American people must know the plain truth. We the people are the American Government—not the President, not the State Department, not the Congress, not the courts—but we the people.

Our objectives, our foreign policy, and the commitments into which we have entered must be set forth in the language the people can understand.

Within the limits of security they have a right to know the obligations we have undertaken in secret agreements. We know that much of the trouble we face today is the result of secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the terrible mistakes, the glaring blunders, and the confused bungling of the past. But it is pathetic to look back only 5 years and to realize that in that short period we have dissipated and squandered so much of the strength that made us the most powerful Nation of all time.

In five short years we bartered away the victory won at great cost in precious lives and treasure. We have crushed the hopes and aspirations of millions of freedom-loving people in many nations who looked to us for moral leadership and the betterment of the human race.

And when the Communist forces of aggression launched their brutal invasion of South Korea we were totally unprepared, even though nearly $50,000,000,000 had been appropriated to prepare for such an emergency.

In recent weeks I visited a number of camps where our boys of the Armed Forces are training for whatever duty may lie ahead. Everywhere I went I heard the same questions:

What is our defense plan?

What is our objective?

Why are we fighting in Korea?

Are we fighting the Koreans, the Chinese, or the Russians?

Why isn't General MacArthur allowed to bomb the Communist supply bases, communication lines, and reserve positions?

Why don't we let the hundreds of thousands of trained Chinese Nationalist soldiers fight the Chinese Reds?

Should America send ground forces to Europe?

The soldiers and the American people are demanding the answers to these questions.

It's high time for those who have been operating in secret to take the people into their confidence. And it's high time for Mr. Truman and his State Department to take the Congress of the United States into their confidence.

I can tell you that the Members of Congress have been just as much in the dark about the defense policies and the foreign policies of our country as the average citizen.

How can we arrive at the right decisions when the true facts are withheld and concealed? How can Congress have a real bipartisan policy under such conditions?

Abraham Lincoln trusted the people of the United States. One of his outstanding characteristics was his undeviating faith in the capacity of free men to govern themselves.

He realized that they might be led astray for a time by false hopes and deceptive promises. But he was firm in his belief that the good judgment of the American people and their love of freedom would lead them, in the end, to the right decisions.

Government that does not trust the people is not representative government.

Government that is not responsive to the people will degenerate into dictatorship.

The American people are aroused. They are fully aware of the dangers forced upon us by Communist aggression. They are prepared to make every sacrifice demanded for the defense of the American way of life. They are ready to fight to the death to preserve their rich heritage of liberty and independence.

All they ask is leadership. In this hour of peril they want leadership in which they can place their full trust and confidence.

They look in vain to Washington for leadership that will rise above deception, double-talk, and the shifty trickery of the machine politician.

With nearly 50,000 casualties in the frozen mountains of Korea, the cry is for leadership that will prevent further bloodshed and needless loss of life in new and worse political blunders.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the White House.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the State Department.

That, fellow Americans, is one of the reasons why our people are worried, confused, and perplexed.

In my opinion, there is another reason that strikes at the fundamentals of American moral strength. Eighteen years of New Deal and Fair Deal philosophy has misguided many of our citizens into believing that they must look to the bureaucrats at Washington to solve all their problems. They have been taught to believe that the great white father in Washington would assume all their responsibilities. The false promise of something for nothing has led so many to forget that initiative, industry, self-reliance, and thrift are the only sound foundation for individual progress and national security.

Today they are bewildered and dismayed. They have learned at great cost that those who offered the doubtful blessings of a planned and controlled economy lack the leadership so badly needed in these days of crisis.

Universal military training will help drive out this false philosophy.

Just a month ago President Truman, in his state of the Union message, raised the hopes of Congress and the American people when he said, and I quote:

"The Government must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

Yet a week later he submitted a budget for the 1952 fiscal year calling for the highest nondefense expenditures in our Nation's history.

Instead of cutting spending not related to national defense, he proposed nonmilitary expenditures estimated at over $30,000,000,000. That unbelievable sum represents an

increase of more than $6,000,000,000 over this year's figure.

In that amazing budget message President Truman made it clear that his administration has no intention whatsoever of practicing "rigid economy in its nondefense activities."

He left no doubt that if his recommendations are adopted nothing that the Fair Dealers normally demand will be curtailed or postponed.

My good Jeffersonian Democratic friend, the able and distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD, had this to say about Mr. Truman's budget, and I quote:

"In my experience of 18 years, considering the perils that confront our country, this message represents the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

With all the sincerity at my command I submit that this is no time for fiscal or any other kind of irresponsibility on the part of those at the head of our Government.

Even greater and more shocking disregard for the critical times in which we live was manifested when Mr. Truman loaded into his budget all the excess baggage of his socialistic proposals.

Rejected and discredited by one Congress after another, these fantastic spending programs are again pushed forward, not as part of a so-called social-welfare program, but in the guise of measures essential to national defense.

Included are the Brannan plan, to regiment agriculture at a cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers, the vicious scheme to socialize the practice of medicine, the dangerous proposal to place education under Federal regulation, and other socialistic schemes.

Are these consistent with the President's pledge to practice rigid economy in nondefense activities of the Government?

Are they in line with the sacrifices which our citizens will have to make in their daily lives?

Are they justified in view of the tremendous burden of new taxation which must be imposed upon every man and woman?

The American people are ready and willing to accept the vast burden growing out of the defense program. But they must have unmistakable assurance that the additional taxes will not be squandered by continued wasteful extravagance.

First and foremost in the hearts and minds of the American people is the security of our Republic.

In my opinion we can be spared the tragedies of another world war.

There are certain steps we must take.

We must know the friends we can depend upon.

We must have a navy and an air force so strong that we will have absolute supremacy on the sea and in the air.

We must have the best-trained, best-equipped, and most mobile ground force so that it can be speedily sent to any part of the world. This does not mean a large and expensive professional army.

The manpower for defense must be made ready through universal military training. There must be no exemptions.

We must not send any man into combat service without at least 1 year of intensive training.

Before we send our soldiers to Europe or anywhere else we must have a carefully thought-out plan that the people can understand and will approve.

Three-fourths of the strength of an American army is morale. You cannot have that morale unless our people give wholehearted support to attaining our objectives.

In advocating universal military training I am guided by the principle laid down by Gen. George Washington, who said, "Every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal service to the defense of it."

The defense plan of Washington placed reliance upon the citizen soldier. Washington was right. The citizen soldier has won our battles. He has kept us a stable, powerful, and progressive nation because he believes in the American way of life.

Wars are not won by people who put politics first, or business first, or profits or special advantages first. Not for many years will we return to the easy peacetime ways.

Babies born today may reach selective-service age before the Communist drive to conquer the world is defeated.

We must keep in mind that military preparation is only one phase of our defense effort.

Stalin's greatest fear is not the number of divisions we have in the field. He will fear our potential military strength if we have universal military training. He would then know the number of well-trained Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserve divisions that we can throw into battle. He will know that the number will increase each year.

Stalin will also fear a financially strong America.

To achieve that end we must work for a balanced budget.

We must meet the costs of defense as far as humanly possible out of current revenues.

We must have a stable currency and maintain the purchasing power of the dollar by defeating inflation.

We must have sound fiscal policies, not only in the Federal Government but also at the State and local levels.

Stalin will also fear a powerful industrial America, producing an endless stream of planes, ships, tanks, arms and munitions.

Stalin will also fear a rearmed moral and spiritual America—an America that believes and practices the American way of life—tolerance, good will, and love of God.

In reflecting upon the greatness of Abraham Lincoln we are reminded of his deep religious convictions, his humility, and his sound common sense.

In an address at Springfield, Ill., he set forth a lesson in right living which gives new patriotic inspiration with every reading.

I quote from Lincoln's speech as follows:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate, in the least particular, the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice."

We can strengthen our country if we all resolve to live by Lincoln's precepts.

We can strengthen our country if we turn again to God for guidance.

In the struggle that will determine the course of civilization we need the revitalizing spark of a great spiritual and moral awakening to rekindle the flame of righteousness and freedom in the dark days ahead.

We are committed to a task of unprecedented magnitude.

The greatest honor we can pay Lincoln is to plan to preserve the Nation he so nobly served and in the words of the great emancipator:

"With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

America's Opportunity for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject America's Opportunity for Leadership, delivered by me before the American Business Association, at the Hotel Statler, in this city, on February 20, 1951.

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

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY FOR LEADERSHIP

As we read history, we see that leadership has come to various nations through the centuries. It is our hour now, and the question is whether we will be adequate. This leadership that we are called to requires that we spearhead the defense of the great human freedoms. This Nation has physically been unharmed in the last two World Wars. She has sacrificed much of her wealth and her blood, but the dynamic free-enterprise system, her great political values, and the vitality of 151,000,000 people are all intact.

As there has been no formal treaty of peace with Germany and Japan and no declaration of the Congress, we are still at war with these nations. We are at war in Korea with Communist China, who is backed up by the Kremlin, and all over the world our armed forces from land, air, and sea, are poised for action, if Russia begins anything.

Leadership today calls for offensive peace. That offensive calls for the highest type of statesmanship and generalship to open the eyes of the Kremlin so that it will see the utter futility of pursuing its course in attempting to take over the earth. Leadership calls also for building adequate air, land, and sea forces to be ready for any emergency. It is impossible for us to crawl into our shell and think that by so doing we can serve our own best interests and provide the leadership that the world is hungering for. We dare not allow a vacuum to be created throughout the world for Russia to take over, and we dare no longer permit Joseph Stalin to carry on his policy of divide and conquer, which would divide us from our Atlantic Pact allies and permit him to gobble up these nations, one by one. In our offensive for peace and for adequate defense, there is no place for retreat.

THE GREAT DEBATE IN CONGRESS

You have read a lot about the great debate in Congress. Right now, we are holding hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee on the Wherry resolution.

Everyone agrees it is necessary to build a defense that is adequate. The simple issue is, Should the President, should the Congress, or should the two of them knock their heads together and try to agree on what percentage of our land forces should be available to send to Europe under the Atlantic Pact?

At present it appears that any peace offensive that has been launched has been ineffective. The Kremlin continues its international criminal activities. If another war should start, Europe would be the prize. The judgment of our military is that while we could knock out Russia's industrial potential, because she has stockpiled so much war material, unless she could be stopped in

Europe, she could take over Europe. Therefore, it appears that America should be prepared to send such further military contingents, air, sea, and land, to Europe as will accord with the recommendations made by our highest military chieftains. Of course, our land forces should go, when and if determined, only in an amount proportionate to Western Europe's own contribution.

We feel that under the circumstances that exist that Congress and the Executive should cooperate as partners, each fulfilling its responsibility—Congress in control of appropriations and the President spearheading the policy. Congress should not become a "rubber stamp" of the President; but neither should it attempt to take over constitutional executive functions. Our aid abroad has for its purpose to build up the morale and bring about the improvements of the military potential of our western allies.

ANOTHER TYPE OF LEADERSHIP

Some time ago I recommended that there be created a Board of Counter-Revolutionary Strategy along the lines of the work of the Office of Strategic Services during World War II. You and I know that in all the satellite countries, in the Ukraine and elsewhere, the serfs and the slaves under the iron hand of the Kremlin are not happy. We know that here is an opportunity to stir up the flames of revolt and dissension in Josef Stalin's own camp. Silver bullets—which means dollars—spent in this direction, by utilizing the right kind of propaganda and by penetrating behind the iron curtain, would get results and save a great deal of money and lives. We read in the paper that already some of Josef Stalin's front in Italy and elsewhere is cracking up. Let's add fuel to that situation. Let's exemplify that leadership that is so necessary so that a real shooting war will not result.

AMERICA SHOULD DECENTRALIZE

While we are putting on an offensive for peace and while we are getting ready for an emergency, let us remember that there is another step that should be taken. I have been arguing about this for years. The time is overdue for the Government to decentralize its agencies and spread them out among the small communities of this land. We need basically three types of action:

(a) Decentralization of Government.
(b) Decentralization of population.
(c) Decentralization of industry.

If you merely disperse an agency from Washington to some other huge, crowded city, that merely amounts to moving the agency from one target center to another. You know that there is at present in contemplation the idea of spending a hundred and fifty million dollars to disperse agencies within 20 miles or so of Washington, D. C. That, to me, is ridiculous. These agencies should be spread out to the "grass roots." A bomber might well miss the heart of the target and get the agency 20 miles away. The whole plan is indicative of an utter lack of what the world situation means.

ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP

We are called upon as leaders to demonstrate not only to the world but to ourselves that, economically speaking, we have the vision that will save the Republic. This calls for—

(a) Paying for our offensive for peace and our rearmament as we go. We have a national income approximating $250,000,000,000. If you are going to save the goose that lays the golden egg (I mean America's economic and political system), you've got to "tax until it hurts" but not "until it kills."

(b) We've got to get a system of procurement into the military (Army, Air, and Navy) that will return a dollar's worth of value for every taxpayer's dollar expended.

(c) We've got to get the criminals, Commies, the chiselers, and the grafters behind the bars.

(d) The best brains in America must be gotten into the positions of trust and execution.

A hundred and fifty-four million of us Americans have to be thinking a little differently than we have before. We've got to realize that this is our job. Like Lincoln, we will have to get on our knees and pray that we may be adequate to fulfill the job before us.

Lincoln, the Man of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for many years Vermont was represented in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Charles A. Plumley. Recently, at the Pavilion, in Montpelier, Vt., at a dinner given by the Women's Republican Club of Washington County, he delivered an address entitled "Lincoln, the Man of the People." I think this address is well worth printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have that done.

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

Mr. Toastmaster, on my way to the Capitol one morning last December, I stopped once more to look at that classic memorial, where sits the marble statue of Abraham Lincoln, the man who needs no monument, the recurring anniversary of whose birth we honor ourselves today by observing.

Rugged, honest, steadfast—his perseverance, his unwavering loyalty to the fundamentals of American government, his genuine respect for the Constitution, his grave concern for the destiny of the Republic that he saved, ended only with his untimely death.

Strong without symmetry, humorous without levity, religious without cant, tender, merciful, forgiving, a profound believer in divine love, an earnest worker for human brotherhood—Abraham Lincoln was perhaps the best contribution which America has made to history. His origin among humble laborers, his native judgment, better than the wisdom of the schools, his perfect integrity, his very ruggedness and angularities, made him a fit representative of the young Nation which loved and honored him.

So many people have so well said those things which all of us would be proud to put in words that little remains to be said or can be said which has not already been spoken. One poet has said:

"Some opulent force of genius, soul, and race,
Some deep life current from far centuries,
Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes,
And gave his name, among great names, high place."

No monarch ever had greater power than he; none ever employed it so tenderly, so benevolently, so graciously. No power of pardon, except that of Providence, was ever exercised so mercifully, so benignly. No other human being dried so many tears, stopped so many heartaches, revived so many hopes.

In the words of Edwin Markham in his poem, Lincoln, the Man of the People:

"Up from the log cabin to the Capitol,
One fire was on his spirit, one resolve—
To send the keen axe to the root of wrong,
Clearing a free way for the feet of God,
The eyes of conscience testing every stroke,
To make his deed the measure of a man.
He built the rail-pile as he built the State,
Pouring his spendid strength through every blow;
The grip that swung the axe in Illinois
Was on the pen that set a people free."

Though Lincoln is dead, wet today and for all time, and to eternity, he stands upon the earth—

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm."

"With malice toward none; with charity for all, following the right as God (gave him) to see the right," there he stands, like the Christ of the Andes, at the top of man's world.

A redeemed and reunited Republic is his monument.

Today, as in his time, the United States of America faces a crisis—only greater because we have no right to lose what those who sacrificed and died for it made possible for us. A momentous peril portends, involving the destiny of civilization and destruction of all that we hold dear and that Lincoln saved for us, a catastrophe of such magnitude threatens such as the world has never experienced, growing out of the maddened strife across the sea.

Trapped between two hostile oceans, the flooding problems of the world have already submerged those problems of our own on the correct solution of which our own perpetuity depends and is predicated, and in high tide the destructive isms undertake to sweep on to destroy the peace, order, and security of the world.

We stand today, a solid wall so destined against the further encroachment and seeping in of these atheistic and medieval doctrines of the Old World, as the last haven for free men. As Jefferson wrote with respect to his day and time, so today:

"Sole depositaries of the remains of human liberty, our duty to ourselves, to posterity, and to mankind, calls on us by every motive which is sacred or honorable, to watch over the safety of our beloved country during the troubles which agitate and convulse the residue of the world."

It is an unsatisfactory and empty philosophy which suggests that the way to bring peace and order and security and abundance to the world is for us to undertake to settle the problems of the world, alone and first.

Was it not this man Lincoln, looking far ahead and beyond his day, who said, "At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer," said Abraham Lincoln, "if it ever reaches us it must spring up amongst us, it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

So far as the future is concerned, I wonder if there will be a future for my grandchildren, or if they will ever enjoy the privileges and opportunities which have been accorded me and you, if such a standard of living as we have enjoyed shall be maintained, or is it worth the price? So I wonder, and have wondered, and one night, believe it or not,

I wrote what I call a poem. I called it "I Wonder," and this is what I said:

"As once I wandered at eventide alone
In rain-drenched garden paths through flowers and weeds,
I wondered if any day and sun would ever follow to atone
For all the wind and dark had done; to which no heed in world at large
Is paid for by those who idly pass to waste both lives and time and money never earned,
Lightly burdened by thought or care of whence these came or what a burden some must bear
To save us from the catastrophic flair
For reckless, wicked waste of things they claim do make men great.

"Still stand I wondering what will be their fate—
The fate of those who measure not nor calculate
The depth to which by ill-considered recklessness with lives of other people's sons, and dollars, not their own,
They have condemned those generations yet unborn
To travail such as other age has never known."

The unvarnished truth is that as we solve or fail to solve our own domestic, economic, social, and internal problems, so in the last analysis shall we and the western democracies stand or fall. We alone are responsible for our own welfare and the stability of our cherished form of government. Our own domestic problem should be our greatest concern. Yet, as Wordsworth said:

"We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
Which Shakespeare spoke;
The faith and morals hold which Milton held."

Let me tell you that in this crisis our responsibility is as great only, and just so great as is our opportunity. We must not sacrifice our democracy in an effort, emotionally superinduced, to help maintain a democratic ideology world wide. What we shall do must be the result of our calm, cool, courageous consideration of all the angles that the situation, forced upon us, now presents.

The question that confronts the American people today is: Which road, if we take it, will lead us away from rather than toward our possible destruction and involvement in the age-old controversies now seething and boiling anew

Which is the way out for America and the world? Quo vadis?

So we look again tonight to Lincoln, uncommon commoner, great emancipator, saviour of a Nation, and say reverently as does Hermann Hagerdorn in his poem, Lincoln:

"Be with us, Master! These unseeing eyes
Waken to light, our erring, groping hands
Unfetter for a world's great needs!
Till, like Creation's dawning, golden through the lands
Leaping, and up the unlit, unconquered skies
Surging with myriad steeds,
There shall arise
Out of the maze of clashing destinies
Out of the servitude of race and blood
One flag, one law, one hope, one brotherhood."

The question then that confronts us is what price are we willing to pay for liberty to save civilization? What is our responsibility? This question gave me great concern, and has always given me great concern, but particularly in the latter years of my service as your representative. It is one only to be answered by the people.

I am proud of the fact, and justly so, that I served in one Congress in the nine terms which I did serve when the Republicans were in a majority in the House of Representatives. That was the much maligned Eightieth Congress. The American people never made a greater mistake in their lives than they did when they returned to power those who are entirely responsible for the mess in which we find ourselves today. What did the Eightieth Congress do? I will tell you very briefly, viz:

It gave the people the promise of accomplishment incident to a change in administration. It afforded an opportunity for deliverance to those people corrupted by the gratuities of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and the Welfare State. It is too bad, but it is true, that a majority were content to continue in power an administration based upon the postulate that this was a good government in which to live so long as one could live off it.

That day has passed. We have scraped or will have scraped the bottom of the bucket. Only by terrific sacrifices, personal, such as our friends and neighbors in Europe have experienced, which God save us from, shall we ever be able to survive. I mean just that. Few folks realize the truth. They have too long lived on a Santa Claus no longer existent. The future which confronts them involves a fight for survival which will cost sweat and blood and tears in comparison with which that suffered and sustained by European neighbors is nothing but a drop in the bucket.

Why will people be so dumb as not to realize that today we face the executioner. Why do they not realize that we shall survive or go down into the limbo of lost nations if we do not appreciate the fact that this is our day of decision?

The Eightieth Congress and its record will go down in history as one of the greatest of achievement under most adverse circumstances ever accomplished in a most trying era. What did it do? Let me tell you very briefly. It was confronted by the disastrous results of 14 years of New Deal Democratic bad government. The country was threatened by economic disintegration of our free economy and a revolutionary change in our free government. The Eightieth Congress with understanding, courage, and foresight met the challenge to the preservation of the Republic and undertook to reverse the ruinous New Deal policies and establish solid foundations upon which our country could grow and go on forever. For the first time in 16 years it balanced the Federal budget.

It shaved $7,000,000,000 off the public debt.

It cut President Truman's padded budget more than $6,000,000,000.

Despite three Presidential vetoes, it reduced taxes $4,800,000,000, 71 percent of the tax relief therein found going to those with incomes under $5,000.

It improved labor-management relations by the passage, over the Presidential veto, of the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Act, which provides for fair and just procedures for peaceful settlement of labor-management disputes.

It exposed the Communist infiltration in Government and labor unions, and in the Hollywood film industry. It caused the jailing of Communists for contempt of Congress. It undertook to ascertain wherein the Communist influence had spread to schools and colleges in our land.

It passed 128 bills meeting the needs of war veterans.

It expanded social security over Presidential veto.

It aided small business.

It extended reciprocal trade agreements with reasonable safeguards.

It passed hundreds of other measures benefiting every segment of our population, creating wholesome conditions for prosperity and happiness.

Responsibility for the bankrupt diplomacies of the Truman administration cannot be escaped by it, for an administration which harbors so many who see in the Russian way of doing things greater benefit than in our own could not be expected to follow a consistent and firm position in dealing with Communists at home or abroad. The major issue of today is the same as it was in 1945. It is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, deficit spending, as against American freedom for the individual, a pay-as-you-go economy; and the protection of the American way of life against Fascist or communistic trends. The Republican Party rejects the alien ideology which calls for an all-powerful central government. We have faith in our free people and believe that freemen in our Republic have accomplished more and will continue to accomplish more for the happiness and contentment of humanity than has been or can be accomplished by men in any other kind of system. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress pledged themselves for economy as against the fact that President Truman holds the record for the biggest peacetime expenditure of all time. The Eightieth Congress cut the President's budgets to the tune of over $2,000,000,000 and more, to the extent that the total savings accomplished during the first session of the Eightieth Congress amounted to approximately $4,500,000,000. The Eightieth Congress went on record by example and by precedent to insist that taxes must be so imposed as to stimulate creative enterprise, not destroy it, and to afford the individual adequate purchasing power. Three times President Truman vetoed tax-reduction bills, but the third time this Congress passed it over his veto.

The Eightieth Congress was relentless in battling communism, fascism, and other alienisms. Senator NIXON, then a Republican Representative, compelled the exposing under protest, and caused the trial of Alger Hiss and others. Each time the Eightieth Congress revealed that there were disloyal persons on the Federal payroll and elsewhere, no determined efforts were made by those in top authority to purge those charged from the Government household or to locate subversive, un-American groups spotlighted by the House of Representatives committee without fear or without favor.

I should say to you that the founding fathers never intended that our foreign policy should be made by only one man. The people reserved that right for themselves, acting through their Representatives in the Congress and their President. I regret that New Deal Democrat Presidents, past and present, have stretched their constitutional rights to make agreement with foreign governments. Neither the Republican leadership in Congress nor the American people were consulted when the secret deals were made at Quebec, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam; deals to remap much of the world; deals to freeze the future of our war enemies; deals that bypassed Congress and the American people.

The Truman administration record in foreign affairs is serious in reversals, vascillation, fumbling, and bungling which cannot be escaped, nor can it be tossed into the lap of the Republican Party, for we were not consulted. The Eightieth Congress delivered on its pledges to the people. Its progress was made despite obstruction every step of the way by an administration whose philosophy of government revolves around radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, Government extravagance,

stifling and destructive taxation, centralization of power and authority in Washington, coddling of Communists, and corrupt big-city politics.

The Eightieth Congress undertook to show the people the way out. This is a Government of, for, and by the people, although that very fact may spell the end of the democracy our founding fathers undertook to establish.

President Truman called the Eightieth Congress the worst, but even so, from his standpoint, in addition to what I have enumerated, this so-called worst Congress did something that the New Deal and Fair Deal never could do during their long years of mismanagement—it balanced the Federal budget. Furthermore, it created a surplus of some $8,000,000,000.

And while it was pursuing this worst possible course, it made substantial payments on the national debt, and it took 7,000,000 low-income Americans completely off the Federal tax rolls, saving them some $5,500,000,000 a year in taxes.

Do the voters everywhere know that despite President Truman's promise that there would be no nonessential spending in next year's budget, almost $10,000,000,000 has been earmarked for nonessential spending, including every socialistic plan ever dreamed up by the administration schemers—socialized agriculture, medicine, and industry?

Under the proposed $71,500,000,000 budget, only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 of expenditures has been justified through itemization. The remainder is only a blanket request for lump sums, and we don't know how these sums are to be employed, or for what purposes.

In other words, the President has sent to Congress an arbitrary figure for his new budget, but he does not justify more than a small portion of his request. This is one budget at which both Houses of Congress will take a long look and, I feel certain, trim out all the nonessentials, particularly as they apply to the socialistic program of the miscalled Fair Deal.

While the budget appears to be tops at $75,500,000,000, it actually is much higher. The budget requests permission to authorize, not appropriate, a total of $94,500,000,000, plus another $4,000,000,000. Does the administration think that the United States economy can take the punch to the jaw that an almost $100,000,000,000 budget would deliver? Do the people realize what an additional $16,500,000,000 tax burden this year will do to their standard of living? And do they know that while the administration is preaching austerity for the populace, it is practicing luxury for Government?

Do the people realize fully that the same administration and State Department crowd that fumbled us into the Korean war still is on the job and still fumbling?

We must recognize the evils of reckless spending and inflation; of weak, fumbling policies, and of the loss of traditional liberties through creeping socialism.

If I were to say what I think should be done, which nobody has asked me to say, I would say:

1. We shall have to stop regarding world politics as a game of chance. We must devise practical strategy—political, economic, psychological, and military—to meet the Soviet threat in the most effective way.

2. We must end the dangerous neglect of our home defenses by building up our strongest fighting weapons—sea and air power.

3. We must keep the United States financially and economically sound by a realistic arrangement of the national budget so that we do not spend ourselves into ruinous inflation; nor tax our system into national bankruptcy.

4. There must be an abrupt end to foreign policy by secret agreements and by Executive authority; the people are tired of the consequences of both.

5. See to it that the people are aroused to elect a Congress which may duplicate that of one of the greatest—the Eightieth.

In conclusion, upon this occasion and of this date, may I repeat the statement I have made before, in substance, to the effect that once I stood in admiration before the tomb of Shakespeare in the church at Stratford; another time I stood in awe before the tomb of the mighty Napoleon in the Invalides at Paris. Often I have stood in suspense before the tomb of the father of our country at Mount Vernon. Before I left Washington I went again to the tomb of Lincoln. I wanted a message from him to give to Vermonters. His spirit seemed to say:

"The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in. * * * To do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

"Go tell my Vermont friends," he continued to say, "and all my fellow Americans everywhere, in these days of stress and conflict everywhere, to be brave and have no fear. Tell them to stand by any man who stands right; stand by him while he is right and part from him when he goes wrong. Tell them that we here highly resolve * * * that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Dinner of the Traffic Club of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Massachusetts has had the honor of having both distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania address our citizens recently. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] before the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New England in the Statler Hotel, Boston, Mass., on February 13, 1951.

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

I know that those of you who have come from many points in the United States and Canada share with me the great pleasure of being here tonight.

The historic Commonwealth of Massachusetts has contributed so much to the preservation of the ideals of the patriots, heroes, and founders of American independence.

In the proud pageant of American history Massachusetts has a place of honor and glory. Here were enacted the opening scenes in the drama which electrified the struggling Colonies and inflamed the spark of freedom in the New World.

Here the first American blood was shed in resistance to tyranny and oppression. Here the embattled farmers defied the armed might of the world's most powerful empire. The inspiring story of Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill should be told wherever free men meet to champion the inalienable human rights we hold to be God's gift to all mankind.

The heroic past of Massachusetts lives on in its greatness of today and in its loyalty to everything that is American.

That loyalty and devotion to all that is best in American way of life is exemplified in the patriotic and unselfish service of your distinguished United States Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

It is a great honor to be associated with these outstanding sons of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States. Both served with honor and distinction in time of war. Both serve their State and the Nation with the highest degree of constructive statesmanship in these days of troubled peace.

In the House of Representatives both great political parties have turned to Massachusetts for leadership, with your distinguished Congressman, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, as leader of the Democratic majority and the distinguished former Speaker of the House, JOE MARTIN, as the leader of the Republican minority.

If I may be permitted to say so at this nonpolitical meeting, we Republicans are confident that in the next Congress we will reverse the situation with respect to the minority and the majority.

It is an honor to be here tonight because the railroad men of America represent one of the strongest and most constructive forces for a powerful, progressive, and prosperous nation.

I am happy to pay tribute to the American railroads and to the men who run them. We are proud of their accomplishments under the American free-enterprise system in the face of the restraint that is placed upon them by taxation and regulation.

The advance of the railroads to their present greatness is an outstanding achievement of American initiative, enterprise, and courage. From the small wood-burning engine of the early days to the giant Diesel of today, their record is one of continuous progress and improvement. No other country in the world is served by such a vast network of railroads as we have here in the United States.

The American people owe a great deal to the American railroads—more than they know—and more than they appreciate. No country is any greater than its natural resources. No country is any greater than its transportation system. Transportation in America has meant, and still means, principally the railroads.

This country was developed by transportation, tied together by transportation, and preserved by transportation.

Railroads are not only essential for their peacetime function, but they are of extreme importance in our national defense.

They must never become Government owned or operated.

A little more than a century ago my State of Pennsylvania ventured into public ownership of transportation. A system of canals was constructed at a cost of more than $40,000,000, a stupendous sum in those days.

It was held out by the promoters of the system that the revenues would remove forever the necessity of levying State taxes.

But that hope quickly vanished in thin air. The venture of government in business was so badly managed and proved so unprofitable that it placed the State in danger of bankruptcy. The project was abandoned and the bonds which financed the system were not finally paid off until 1918.

There should be a lesson in Pennsylvania's experience for those who advocate the nationalization of power, transportation, and other basic industries.

In World War I, under Government administration, railroad operating costs more than doubled and the taxpayers footed the

bill. You gentlemen who battled your way through those trying times know more about the disastrous results than I can tell you.

During World War II the American railroads, under the efficient control of private management, paid millions of dollars in Federal and State taxes and, in addition, continued the payment of dividends to the stockholders.

If it had not been for the performance of railroads—a performance no one thought possible—the great armada that went to the far reaches of both the Atlantic and Pacific to bring victory to the American Republic and our allies would never have been possible.

As railroad men you have many problems but I will leave the discussion of those questions to men better qualified to do so than I am.

I feel that this is an appropriate time to consider the dangers that face our country and the world today.

The paramount issue is the preservation of freedom in the United States and in the world. If we fail to solve that issue nothing else will matter because freedom is the most precious possession of the human race.

Today we face a well organized, well prepared, and well disciplined enemy who knows no truth, no honor, no justice, and no God. His weapons are lies, deceit, treachery, and force.

Since the end of World War II the Communist dictators of Soviet Russia, by armed aggression and diplomatic trickery, have gained control of one-third of the world. They have placed 700,000,000 people in Europe and Asia under the iron rule of terror and tyranny. They have prepared the plans and stockpiled the weapons for world conquest and the enslavement of all free people who value freedom of the individual and respect the dignity of man.

That, gentlemen, is the grim picture of a world in which the future of civilization hangs in the balance. It is a world tottering on the brink of a third world war which, if it comes, will be more terrible, more destructive of human values, than any conflict in recorded history.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the terrible mistakes, the glaring blunders, and the confused bungling of the past. I shall not attempt to fix the responsibility, but it is tragic to look back only 5 years and realize that in that short period we have dissipated and squandered so much of the strength that made us the most powerful Nation of all time.

In five short years we have bartered away the victory won at great cost in precious lives and treasure. We have crushed the hopes and aspirations of millions of freedom-loving people in many nations who looked to us for moral leadership and the betterment of the human race.

The question that is worrying the people of America is not how did we get here, but where are we going? They are asking, What are we going to do about it? How are we going to defend freedom against Communist aggression?

In recent weeks these questions have been discussed by American statesmen in what has become known as the great debate.

In my opinion, ex-President Herbert Hoover, Senator Taft, General Eisenhower, and the others who have expressed their views on foreign policy have rendered a great service to the American people. They have brought the issues out into the open where they should be. They have given the American people an opportunity to hear the situation analyzed from the military point of view, the economic point of view, and from the standpoint of our resources and our abilities. The people should know the facts because if we are to succeed we must have the patriotic support and backing of every real American.

There are some in high places who seem to be without a plan. They seem to meet each new development as it comes along without any well conceived notion of the direction they are taking. They are upset by fright and misguided by emotion. They fear political repudiation by the people for the cumulative errors of Yalta and Potsdam and the irresponsible course they have taken in recent years.

In this time of grave decision we should forget the errors of the past. It is a time for all of us to work together. It is a time for cool, hard-headed thinking and sound common sense.

I have always felt that the position of the United States in international relations would be greatly strengthened if we had a foreign policy which the people could understand and approve.

In February of 1949, before China had been taken over by Communist Russia, I said:

"We must call forcefully to the attention of the people the shameful outcome of a foreign policy which has placed millions of people in Europe and Asia under the tyranny of Soviet Russia. * * * We must point out so all may understand the fallacy of spending billions of dollars to prop up Western Europe while we leave the back door wide open for Communist domination over 450,000,000 helpless people in China."

I voted to approve the Charter of the United Nations in the hope that it would develop into an instrument for peace in the world.

I supported the North Atlantic Pact in which the free nations of Western Europe agreed to develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. They pledged each other that an attack against one shall be considered an attack against all.

Since the close of World War I, I have continuously advocated a defensive pact of the free nations of the world and preparedness to meet any emergency. On May 5, 1947, speaking to the American Legion in Indianapolis, I said:

"While war with Russia may not be imminent, we must be ready for any eventuality—strong, alert, and united at home. We have got to keep America a powerful enemy and a powerful friend abroad * * *. Until the nations of the world indicate their willingness to live in peace, let us go our way with an atomic bomb in one hand and the spirit of the Cross in the other * * *. Then every nation can choose which hand it prefers."

Continuing, I said:

"Our national defense must be based upon the ideals of our Republic. That means equal obligation as well as equal rights for every citizen. In the kind of world we live in today, in which things happen swiftly, equal obligation means to me universal military training. That is the only way to be ready on time when an emergency occurs * * *. I stand for a highly trained Regular Army, backed by a well-organized, well-trained civilian Reserve. We should have the best and strongest Navy and the best and strongest Air Force we can conceive * * *. Our fiscal policies must include a balanced budget, reduction of the debt and equitable distribution of the tax burden. Every expenditure of our Government, whether for use at home or abroad, must be carefully scrutinized * * *. If we collapse financially or if uncontrolled inflation results, America could easily drift into a dictatorship."

I believe that statement was sound then and *I believe it is sound now.*

Again in March of 1948 I warned in these words:

"Congress should provide a plan to train our young men in the fundamentals of protecting themselves under fire. Otherwise, they may have to learn under the hell fire of bombs, shot, and shell. We must, therefore, without delay take leadership in bringing the God-fearing, peace-loving nations of the world together in a defensive pact joining the Old World and the New for mutual protection against Communist domination and enslavement. We must tell the aggressors, clearly and forcefully, that if any one of these nations is molested all will fight to preserve its freedom. We must leave no room for doubt. That policy, if backed by powerful military strength, will avert war * * *. We must take decisive action before it is too late. Delay will prove costly to us and the world."

Tonight I want to outline what I think should be done to meet the present situation and how we should approach it.

Certainly no one wants to abandon Europe. We have given billions of dollars during and since World War II toward the preservation of the free nations of Europe.

Nearly all of us here in America are descendants of people from those countries.

Our civilization, our culture, and our religion are interwoven. They are dependent, in a large measure, upon us and we are dependent upon them in trade and commercial relations. It is, therefore, to our mutual advantage to work together and cooperate with each other. From a selfish point of view on our part, it is much better that we stand together against Communist aggression than to be placed in a position where we may have to face it alone.

It is equally clear, however, that if the nations of Europe are not ready and willing to assume their share of the responsibility, if they lack the spirit to sacrifice, to endure hardship, and fight for freedom, we can accomplish nothing but harm to ourselves if we continue to pour our substance into Europe.

I have the greatest respect for General Eisenhower, his love of country, his patriotism, his sincerity and his judgment. I am sure he does not want the Congress or the American people to accept his judgment blindly. I am confident he wants the Congress and the people of America to think carefully, to obtain all the information possible, and to arrive at a sound decision.

So the first question we must resolve, giving full consideration to General Eisenhower's report, is whether or not the free people of Europe are willing to face up to the facts and make the necessary sacrifices. If they are, then we must help them build the necessary defense.

The second decision we should make is that we must pay for the cost of building our defense out of current revenue. It must be on a pay-as-you-go basis. To do otherwise would lead to further inflation, which could destroy us through national bankruptcy.

The third question to be decided is this: How much can we tax American people each year without destroying our economy?

After we have determined this amount we then must go forward with a defense plan that is within our means—one that is practical and in the best interests of our country and the free nations of Europe.

Regardless of the conclusions we may reach, certain steps should be taken without delay.

We must have the best and strongest Air Force in the world so that we will have complete supremacy in the air.

We must build up the most powerful Navy so thatwe, together with Great Britain, will have complete command of the sea all over the world.

We must speed up and put into high gear all our industrial capacity for defense. We must produce ships, tanks, weapons, munitions, and equipment on a scale surpassing anything we have ever done before.

To achieve that tremendous production for ourselves and the friendly nations of Europe is the most important job we have right now. It will require a great force of manpower on the home front.

It is therefore clear to me that we cannot at the same time maintain a ground force of millions of men in the field over a long period of time. To do so would rob us and our allies of the critical defense material without which no army can fight.

Some have suggested that we should organize an army of 100 divisions as quickly as possible.

Let me explain why any attempt to maintain such a force indefinitely would spell out national bankruptcy in the boldest letters.

Each infantry division is made up of approximately 18,000 men. Behind that fighting force are the soldiers at the corps and Army level as well as the supply and other auxiliary troops. With these, each division comprises more than 60,000 men. One hundred divisions, therefore, means upward of 6,000,000 men.

The cost of maintaining a soldier in the Regular Army is approximately $5,000 per year. That covers the cost of shelter, food, clothing, and pay. It does not include the weapons and equipment he is trained to use. Translating these figures into an army of 100 divisions, it would represent approximately $30,000,000,000 a year for shelter, food, clothing, and pay. The other costs would just about double that staggering figure.

A ground force of 6,000,000 men would cut so deeply into our manpower that we would not be able to turn out the ships, the tanks, the planes, the bombs, and the other equipment so necessary for ourselves and our allies.

It is, therefore, clear to me that the other Atlantic Pact nations, with more than 200,000,000 people, must provide the ground forces for the initial defense of western Europe. They are in a better position to supply this manpower if we are to mobilize the productive capacity of America for the giant task of furnishing them with food, arms, and equipment.

While they are building up the ground troops of Europe we would be building our Navy and Air Force to be the air and sea arm of a well-rounded defense force operating from bases in the Atlantic or such other places as the military leaders might decide.

This question naturally arises: "Don't you intend to have an American ground force?"

The answer is "Yes," but we cannot maintain a huge ground force in Europe and in Asia and here in America except at a cost which would mean national bankruptcy.

And, in addition, it would be bad military strategy because we would be dividing our forces and would be spreading ourselves out too thin.

The ground forces of Asia must come from the islands of the Pacific, Japan and the Chinese nationalists. With our help they must supply the army for the initial defense of the Pacific. Our responsibility will be to provide the air and sea power both in the Atlantic and the Pacific. It must be remembered that the greater distance we take our soldiers away from America the longer the supply lines become. That means more men and more money are required behind the lines to maintain the soldier in the front line.

I am, therefore, opposed to sending American ground troops to the far corners of the earth at this time without knowing if and when they will be needed.

I would substitute another plan which in my opinion would provide a much more effective means of strengthening the United States and of helping our Allies.

I would maintain here at home a well trained regular Army of modest size, drawn from Selective Service under the present age limits. It would be equipped with the most modern and finest weapons. It would be the fastest and most powerful striking force, with the greatest fire power the world has ever known. It would be completely motorized on the ground and could be moved by air or sea to wherever it might be needed.

I would adopt universal military training for every boy in America, beginning at the age of 18 or upon graduation from high school, whichever occurs later. He would be given 1 year of intensive military training. From my own experience as a soldier covering half a century, I know that no young man should be sent into combat without a year of such training. It trains him to protect himself and teaches him that he has an obligation to his comrades and to the flag.

The well trained soldier has a better chance of coming home alive.

The soil of Europe and Asia is the final resting place of many American boys who would have returned had they been properly trained and if we had not been forced to throw them into battle before they were ready.

After a year of universal military training the boys would return home to pursue their education or to enter upon civilian jobs. They would then become members of the organized Reserve or the National Guard.

Under that system approximately 1,000,000 young men each year would be fitted into a definite military organization, trained and ready to be called to the colors in a matter of days.

I have tried to emphasize the fact that manpower is the thing that wins wars. Manpower provides the cutting front on the battlefield. It produces the food, the transportation, the weapons, the munitions, and the equipment.

It is most important, therefore, that we save manpower wherever possible. We must cut it down in Government. We must eliminate every possible nonessential function and every unnecessary job in the Government service. This should be done not only in the Federal Government but also at the State and local levels. Many men unable to pass selective-service requirements could be used in noncombat jobs to replace able-bodied men in uniform.

Government spending for nondefense purposes should be slashed to the bone. We must have sound fiscal policies that will preserve the solvency of the Nation. We must have a stable currency to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar and check the destructive force of inflation.

We must never forget that we can be destroyed from within.

It is not enough to build up our military strength alone.

We must have in America a great moral and spiritual rearmament. We must live in righteousness, obeying the laws of God and man.

If we do these things we can overcome the forces of evil and preserve peace in the world.

If we fail it will be because we have neglected our duty to our country and to posterity.

God helping us, we will not fail.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the speech I delivered in observance of Lithuanian Independence Day by the parishoners of St. Francis' Church, Lawrence, Mass., Sunday, February 18, 1951:

When Lithuania was robbed of her independence, that loss was felt by all Americans.

Because our own country was established on the belief that all men are created equal.

The progress of the human race toward emancipation has been long and difficult. Sometimes the freedom once gained has been lost to an aggressor. Whenever that happens, the one great hope of mankind is endangered. That is why we are fighting in Korea. That is why we sincerely grieve with the people of Lithuania.

In every age there have been tyrants, men who wanted to get complete control over the lives of the people by reducing them to slavery.

History is filled with stories of the devastation and the suffering inflicted by these evil men.

In the end they were always defeated because the people knew them to be conquerors and resisted them from the beginning.

The would-be dictators of the twentieth century are more cunning.

They come like the wolf in sheep's clothing, pretending to be gentle and kind so that they can get into the house. Once inside, they attack and overwhelm the victim before he knows what has happened.

That is the tragic fate of Lithuania and of every other free country that has been taken over by the trickery and force of Red Russian imperialism.

But that is not the whole story.

We, the people of the United States, of Great Britain, and France, and other nations allowed ourselves to become weak and indifferent. We stood by while these crimes took place without lifting a finger to help our brothers in humanity. Perhaps we kidded ourselves at the time into believing that the Communists were not as bad as they had been pictured.

Whatever the reasons, or lack of reasons, we know better now.

Because we are in danger.

We are rearming fast, because we now know the facts of life in dealing with communism.

Pretty words won't protect us.

And we can't survive all by ourselves.

We need friends and allies.

Like Lithuania and others, who cannot help us now because we did not help them in their time of peril.

I said at the opening of my remarks that when your homeland was seized by the Reds your loss was felt by all Americans.

I want to qualify that statement.

In August of 1944 when the Nazis were expelled, we thought that Lithuania and the other small Baltic countries were simply occupied by the Russian Communists. Just as we occupied a part of Germany and all of Japan.

But what a difference there was in the two methods.

We came to bring peace, to rebuild, and finally, to restore the countries we occupied to the full control of their own people.

But the Communists had other ideas.

They moved in for keeps, either by complete incorporation of these nations into the Soviet Union or through the device of puppet governments which fools nobody, not even the traitors who played the Soviet game. Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, held out against complete domination of his country by the Kremlin. Other quislings waited too long, and now they cannot escape from the trap of their own making.

The lesson in this is that anyone who thinks that he can be half-Communist or a Communist for the sake of his own individual country as he sees it will be either liquidated

or enslaved in the end by the tin gods who play the one-way game of tyranny from the control center at Moscow.

Even the leaders of Red China will learn this bitter lesson, if they haven't learned it already. We know that they are the prisoners of Stalin, even though they appear to be acting on their own. The question is, do the Chinese Reds know how they have been fooled by Stalin yet?

We, as Americans, cannot afford the luxury of being against communism 1 day a week, and then forgetting about it the other 6 days, because the Reds are plotting against us and working against us 7 days and 7 nights in every week.

Toward the close of 1945, immediately after the war's end, we began to break up our Army, Navy, and Air Force as if our defenders were our own worst enemies.

Everybody wanted to get back into the personal game of life again and to forget about everything else.

We wanted to retreat into the childhood days of this Nation, when two vast oceans did separate us from the rest of the world, and we could tend to our own business.

But Stalin knew better. He did not disband his power. He did not start to build new homes and automobiles and television sets for his people. He went right on building up his military power while we were tearing ours down.

Of course our possession of the A-bomb secret did make him think twice about expanding too far and too fast.

But he could shove a little here in one country, making it look like a civil war, or he could buy a few traitors in another country. Gradually he would be able to eliminate our friends one by one while we did nothing to help them, always creeping closer and closer to us—the main prize. And he knew that sooner or later he would get the A-bomb and thereby cancel out the one advantage that we had.

Meanwhile, he felt that the United States would retire to the deep freeze of isolationism, permitting him to build up for the final blow that would give him conquest of the world.

But we did wake up suddenly, although a little late, and now we are feverishly trying to make up for the lost time during which we permitted the Communists to extend their gains.

Why did we make this startling about-face?

It began with Lithuania.

We were a little disturbed by the few rumors we heard as to what was going on in that country under Russian occupation. But then we conveniently put this problem out of our minds on the excuse that it was none of our business anyway.

And besides, it was too far away.

In 1950, however, we decided that Korea, even though it was a greater distance away, needed UN troops to protect its independence. We have made a little progress in our thinking since 1944.

Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia were gobbled up by the Russian bear without even a real protest from us.

Then came Poland. Here the Reds tried to conceal their greed behind the flimflam of words. Sure, they promised democracy and free elections, and then proceeded to eat up that country after it had been flavored with "Russian dressing."

Czechoslovakia was next on the menu.

The way it was swallowed up really warned us that there was no limit to the appetite of communism.

When Moscow tried to bite off Turkey and then wash it down with Iranian oil, we got worried because the Reds were threatening to clean up everything in sight. We stopped the reach of the Russian bear in that direction, at least temporarily.

And we helped the people of France and Italy to feed themselves before the Reds fooled them into giving up the little they then had for themselves.

The Russian bear has a tapeworm that demands more the larger it grows. When the Communists took over China, we thought it would take a long, long time for them to digest that huge country.

But when it pounced on little Korea soon afterward that was the last straw.

The line had to be drawn somewhere, and the sooner the better.

Communism would never be satisfied until it ate the dessert, which was us.

It was then that our counter-move, called operation tapeworm, went to work to hold the Communist appetite in check. Whether we will ever be able to physic communism out of Russia remains to be seen, but at least we must tame the bear and make it give up what it has devoured.

To say this is one thing, to do it is another.

If we could read the unknown future we might find that our hopes will come true and see there the end of the Communist menace where it began—in Moscow—and as a result of a house-cleaning by the Russian people who were the first to be enslaved.

But it would be folly to rely upon that alone.

Strength to resist aggression anywhere is the first order of business, and the most important business in the world today, because it is the price of collective security.

A man who does not stand up for his friends, who fails to come to their aid when they are attacked, will wind up by having no friends when he needs them. And the same goes for any nation.

The trouble is that we have failed to look ahead in the field of foreign affairs, to do something before and not after the fact.

That is why we must share some part of the blame for the present misfortune of Lithuania.

If we had stated clearly and courageously, even before World War II was over, that we would never tolerate the taking over of any one nation by any other, Lithuania might have been saved.

But we didn't do it then.

And the result is that we must make up for this neglect the hard way now.

To rally the support that we must have from the God-fearing nations of this world and from the peoples who exist under the hammer and sickle, we must declare that we will work for the liberation of all nations that have been conquered by Red Russian imperialism. Nothing less will suffice if there is to be peace and freedom for all the peoples of this earth.

High on the list of the wrongs that must be righted is the restoration of independence to the brave people of Lithuania.

Peace Pilgrimage to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my letter of February 12, 1951, to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and his reply of February 16, 1951:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1951.

Mr. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has recently been called to stories in the newspapers concerning a so-called Peace Pilgrimage to Washington, on March 1.

A number of my constituents would like to know the nature, objectives, and affiliations of the American Peace Crusade, which is the name of the group sponsoring the pilgrimage.

I would very much appreciate any information you can give me.

Very respectfully yours,

A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 16, 1951.

MY DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I have received your letter of February 12 concerning the American peace crusade, and its plans for a peace pilgrimage to Washington on March 1. From the membership of the group, and the general tenor of its pronouncements, it is obvious that this American peace crusade is merely a continuation or regrouping of the spurious partisans of peace movement, which as you know has been the most concentrated and far-flung propaganda effort of the international Communist movement in the postwar period.

The partisans of peace movement was organized by several Communist-controlled groups in Paris in 1949. The focal point of its original effort was a world-wide drive to collect 400,000,000 signatures to the so-called Stockholm appeal, an adroitly framed petition which superficially appeared merely to be an affirmation of the world-wide desire for peace and the universal desire for effective control of atomic energy. What the Stockholm appeal actually called for, however, was the adoption of the Soviet plan for the regulation of atomic energy, a plan which has been overwhelmingly rejected again and again by the majority of the United Nations.

The partisans of peace and its partner, the Cominform, announced that one goal of the movement was to collect 5,000,000 signatures in the United States. In spite of the most intensive campaign by Communist agents and those deceived by them, a final count of 2,000,000 signatures was officially claimed by the Cominform as having been collected in this country. I know it is as shocking to you as it is to me to think that even that small percentage of our citizens would sign their names to a petition which by its very nature had as its objective the weakening, if not the destruction, of the bonds which unite the free world. What the appeal in effect called for was the banning of any use of the atomic bomb, without any admission of the desirability of banning the tremendous armies and armament the U. S. S. R. and its satellites have maintained since 1945, not to speak of the illegal rearmament of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania beyond the limits imposed in the peace treaties.

In this latest manifestation of the partisans of peace, American peace crusade or peace pilgrimage, or whatever name it goes by at the time, the same people are calling for the same things, but this time they have added two more points.

The first is that the peace crusade calls for the UN forces to withdraw from Korea. The

Cominform has been calling for an immediate withdrawal from Korea, too. The Cominform wants us to withdraw from Korea because if we do withdraw, it will mean that we are not willing to resist aggression wherever it may break out. Voluntary withdrawal from Korea would be a clear indication to the forces of international communism that the United States, as the leader of the forces of the United Nations, was abdicating its responsibilities, abandoning its allies, and renouncing the moral force which has made this country what it is.

The second point these peace crusaders stress is that we should immediately seat Communist China in the United Nations. When you consider that by an overwhelming vote Communist China was recently condemned by the UN as an aggressor, a sudden seating of Communist China would in effect be an invitation to other aggressive-minded governments to flout the principles of the Charter, and would, indeed, offer a premium for the very sort of aggression we are combatting.

Of ocurse, the peace crusaders call for atomic arms control. We know what they mean by this, too. They mean the highly propagandized Soviet plan for atomic arms control which the partisans of peace so zealously promoted while ignoring the United States proposal overwhelmingly supported by the United Nations with the exception of the Soviet bloc.

There is no doubt that this crusade for peace will try to use the standard weapons of the partisans of peace—divide and conquer, infiltrate, and confuse. I am sure you will agree with me that it is the duty of every American to reject and expose the false motives of this group.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. Wherry's Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. WHERRY'S Courage," published in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

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

MR. WHERRY'S COURAGE

Once again, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, showed himself on Monday to be as valiant a fighter for America as this generation has produced.

The Senate's Foreign Relations and Military Affairs Committees were meeting in joint session to take testimony on Mr. WHERRY'S resolution declaring that the President may not send foot soldiers to garrison Europe without congressional approval. Many of the members of the committees are unfriendly to the Wherry proposal, and such of them as are in agreement with him had little to say. The burden fell upon him and he carried it manfully.

HE'S NOT A COWARD

The witnesses were the highest brass in the Pentagon. They had their orders and they had their story well prepared, but unlike his colleagues, Mr. WHERRY was not weak-kneed and he was not intimidated.

Mr. WHERRY elicited some information of great value. In response to a question, General Collins, the Army chief of staff, said that in the last war France contributed little to the Army on the western front because she had been overrun. This time, said General Collins, the French might be expected to provide from 90 to 100 divisions.

But if that is so, as Mr. WHERRY can now argue, what need is there for any American divisions in Europe? If France, to say nothing of the other allies, has all that potential strength and is being provided with the most modern of arms as a gift from America, how can anyone say that half a dozen American divisions are all that stand between Western Europe and catastrophe?

If the French wish not to be overrun by the Russians, the means to save themselves are in their own hands, and any troops that we send will merely encourage the French to depend upon us instead of themselves.

Senator WHERRY was contending for the principle of governmental responsibility to the people and their Congress. He was seeking to save the lives of American young men and to save the National Treasury from bankruptcy. He had the courage of a man who knew he was in the right. With the same moral armament, Washington stood firmly at Valley Forge.

I Decline to Accept the End of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following statement by Mr. William Faulkner, distinguished American author, upon the occasion of the award to him of the Nobel prize in literature. Mr. Faulkner's statement is in itself worthy of taking rank as one of the great challenges to humanity in this period when defeatism and despair are all too prevalent. The above-mentioned statement follows:

I DECLINE TO ACCEPT THE END OF MAN

(By William Faulkner)

I feel that this award was not made to me as a man, but to my work—a life's work in the agony and sweat of the human spirit, not for glory and least of all for profit, but to create out of the materials of the human spirit something which did not exist before. So this award is only mine in trust. It will not be difficult to find a dedication for the money part of it commensurate with the purpose and significance of its origin. But I would like to do the same with the acclaim, to, by using this moment as a pinnacle from which I might be listened to by the young men and women already dedicated to the same anguish and travail, among whom is already that one who will some day stand here where I am standing.

Our tragedy today is a general and universal physical fear so long sustained by now that we can even bear it. There are no longer problems of the spirit. There is only the question: When will I be blown up? Because of this, the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself which alone can make good writing, because only that is worth writing about, worth the agony and the sweat.

He must learn them again. He must teach himself that the basest of all things is to be afraid, and, teaching himself that, forget it forever, leaving no room in his workshop for anything but the old verities and truths of the heart, the old universal truths lacking which any story is ephemeral and doomed—love and honor and pity and pride and compassion and sacrifice. Until he does so, he labors under a curse. He writes not of love but of lust, of defeats in which nobody loses anything of value, of victories without hope, and, worst of all, without pity or compassion. His griefs grieve on no universal bones, leaving no scars. He writes not of the heart but of the glands.

Until he relearns these things, he will write as though he stood among and watched the end of man. I decline to accept the end of man. It is easy enough to say that man is immortal simply because he will endure; that when the last dingdong of doom has clanged and faded from the last worthless rock hanging tideless in the last red and dying evening, that even then there will still be one more sound; that of his puny, inexhaustible voice, still talking. I refuse to accept this. I believe that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance. The poet's, the writer's, duty is to write about these things. It is his privilege to help man endure by lifting his heart, by reminding him of the courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice which have been the glory of his past. The poet's voice need not merely be the record of man, it can be one of the props, the pillars to help him endure and prevail.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on February 11, I heard a great address by a great and spiritual American, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. The subject was Abraham Lincoln. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The devout souls who founded the Washington Hebrew Congregation first met for worship in the year 1852. The President of the United States whose signature later appeared on our charter from Congress was Franklin Pierce. Whenever I look at our charter in the library of our temple I am reminded of the kind of America we had in the fifties of the last century. Franklin Pierce, the youngest man to have become President, had been the nominee of the Democratic Party, a coalition of southern planters and conservative eastern businessmen, and on a platform of opposition to anti-slavery agitation had been swept into office by all but four of the States of the Union. In

his inaugural address Franklin Pierce rightly interpreted his election as a mandate from the people to bury the antislavery controversy and to permit human bondage to continue wherever it existed in our States.

Never had the old slave society seemed more assured of its future in our land as in the 1850's. Thomas Jefferson had wanted to erase it, for he had said, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever." It is true George Washington had repeated these words, "Not only do I pray for the rooting out of slavery on the score of human dignity but I can clearly foresee that nothing but the rooting out of slavery can perpetuate the existence of our Union by consolidating it into a common bond of principle." It is true many of the planting aristocracy had begun to realize that slavery was undesirable and in 1820 had gone so far as to accept the Missouri Compromise whereby the larger portion of the Louisiana Territory was dedicated to freedom. It is true the agitation in the North against slavery had become increasingly bitter: William Lloyd Garrison had started his magazine, the Liberator, in 1831 and for nearly a quarter of a century had thundered in the condemnation of slavery as crime and demanded the emancipation of the slaves; there were Wendel Phillips, the eloquent New England aristocrat; Whittier, the poet; James Russell Lowell, the author; and Emerson, the philosopher—all had labored to raise the moral issue of human bondage. In 1852 Harriet Beecher Stowe had dramatized the abolitionist creed in her play Uncle Tom's Cabin; but as someone said, "it deepened the horror of slavery but did not change a single vote." For in spite of all these, in 1852 the Democratic Party on a proslavery platform had carried every State except four in the entire Union.

Indeed, from 1820 on it seemed that slavery had become stronger than ever. The use of steam and steel in the new textile looms of the North had produced a great need for cotton; and the invention by Whitney of his cotton gin had increased the picking power of every slave even a thousandfold. To feed the hungry mills of England and New England there had been a transformation of the old gentle plantation life gradually veering toward freedom to a new feverish hunger for new land for cotton, where overseers could drive slave gangs across new areas in mad search for new profits. To justify their slave system a great corpus of learning—in the fields of history, and law, of economics, philosophy, and even religion had been gathered, where with profound sincerity and eloquence they won many to the acceptance of the rightness of slavery.

They were so convincing that in 1835 Garrison, the abolitionist, was dragged by a mob through the streets of Boston—a mob composed of some of the most respectable as well as the street urchins—and Garrison's life was only saved because the police put him in jail. The attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts addressed a mass meeting of some of the leading citizens in the sacred confines of Faneuil Hall, the cradle of liberty, where he praised the mobs that attacked and even killed some abolitionists and compared them to the patriot fathers of the Boston Tea Party. In the famous debates in the Senate in 1850 of Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, even Webster asked only for compromise acceptance of sectional slavery. In the few years that followed new concessions were made to it. In 1854 the Congress repealed the Missouri Compromise and threw open vast areas of the Louisiana Purchase to slavery, once closed to it for decades. In 1857 Chief Justice Taney in his Dred Scott decision had ruled the Missouri Compromise had been void from the beginning, that Congress had no power to forbid slavery anywhere. This was followed 2 years later by another decision of our highest courts upholding the fugitive-slave laws and their drastic enforcement. When the new Republican Party had run on a platform opposed only to extension of slavery but permitting it to thrive where it was, in spite of the decades of abolitionist agitation in our land, they were hopelessly outvoted. It seemed as if slavery was not only here permanently but was about to sweep westward and southward into a vast slave empire of the entire hemisphere. As Wendell Phillips, the lover of freedom, said, "The sky was never so black."

But in a few years, just a little more than one decade, so much of that past that seemed so ominously threatening or rigidly secure was trust aside. All this cannot be grasped without understanding Abraham Lincoln. He was born in a Kentucky log cabin, but he was swept westward to the frontiers of the Ohio. He was early aroused by the inhumanity of the slave trade, but as he said, "I bit my lips and kept quiet." He did even less, for when he ran for Congress he condemned the abolitionists as agitators endangering the cause of freedom, and even joined a group of southern Whigs to name a slaveholder as the candidate for the Presidency. It was only after he had retired from Congress that he began to sense the dangers of the ethics of slavery to the workingman's charter of freedom. As late as 1858 in his debates with Senator Douglas we find in his "house divided" speech these words: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all of one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South." Lincoln challenges the justice and the political honesty of the Dred Scott decision that extended slavery to the new West, but he does not object to it in the Old South. In fact, he had won the Republican nomination in 1860 precisely because he was a conservative in his views on southern slavery. At his inauguration Lincoln appealed for union, peace, and friendship. He spoke up against secession, but could anything be more conciliatory than this plea to the few Southern States that had seceded? He said:

"If the Almighty Ruler of nations, with His eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of the great tribunal of the American people. * * * My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it. We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break, our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot's grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature." These words were said in March of 1862 but by September of the next year Lincoln had issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves in great areas of the Old South. Why? Was Lincoln really an abolitionist who had pretended to be a conservative and had taken advantage of his position to destroy the old slavery? No. The evidence is all against it. The answer is that the same flood that moved Lincoln from a log cabin in Kentucky to the western frontier, a similar tide swept Lincoln forward by the tragic necessity of his duty to a beckoning new frontier of the American dream. We find it stated with abounding earnestness in the Gettysburg Address he delivered in November of the same year, in these noble words it is ever wise to repeat:

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

These noble words that speak of man's dedication as part of a divine compulsion is even clearer when Lincoln said in the following year:

"I claim not to have controlled events but I confess the events have controlled me. The Nation's condition is not what either party or any man devised or expected. God alone can claim it."

The Civil War was not only a tragedy that Lincoln tried his best to prevent but had come as the result of moral imperatives arousing out of great social forces he could not ignore.

The historians of our time point out that these States thought they had the power to win their extremist demands, which they deemed just. They thought that even though fewer in number their control of the flow of cotton and other raw materials would ruin the North and win the aid of England and France, whose upper classes were with them and whose mills needed them. They thought that nearly all the military skill and munition supplies were in the South—which for years had kept the Federal Government without military strength—and that through their control of New Orleans they could easily capture the Mississippi Valley, the granary of the North. They thought that because the North was not only unarmed but divided into so many different factions—with a President elected by a minority—and a crude citizenry of, to use this snob term, greasy mechanics with all kinds of conflicting opinions—though the North may be larger and richer—it could not or would not fight. The South thought it had the power to secede from the Union and to build a new

kind of Nation based on slavery and sweeping forward to a new kind of racial destiny. Thus the South which seemed so secure in the 1850's, refusing to take the steps toward conciliation and compromise—it fought on heroically until its last straggling armies were dispersed, all its homes were in ruins—and the old plantation aristocracy was left crushed and impoverished in a ruined land.

It had sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind. There is a power greater than man that brings retribution for our moral failures. Thus many of the people who in this very city of Washington were in the seats of the mighty in the 1850's were either ruined or killed in the 1860's, because of what they and others had done or failed to do to face the moral challenge of their time. How wasteful that Civil War was. It not only cost us more than 600,000 lives but if we had paid every master for every slave it would have cost less than the money we spent in the bloodshed. But it had to be, for so many men require suffering before they can understand the error of their ways; so many drift selfishly without thought of a nobler vista of tomorrow; so many are blighted by the ethical impotence of the countless numbers who felt the horror in Uncle Tom's Cabin but would not change even their vote from the old ways and certainly could not rise to the new moral disciplines for a new age.

The greatness of Abraham Lincoln was that he had the vision and the strength of character to see his duty and rise to it. Lincoln was not an Abolitionist even after he had won the election. Lincoln was not aware of the long-range effects of the impending changes of the new industrial America developing in the North; a remarkable political pattern never before achieved—that combined an empty land beckoning to the Old World's homeless, in a continental economy whose open frontier gave its new immigrant labor the bargaining power for its freedom and whose tariff walls helped its new industry to grow mightily without foreign competition. Lincoln was not aware of the inevitable military superiority of this combination of free men and machines in any battle with a preindustrial feudalism.

But, Lincoln was aware of the moral superiority of the American ideal of liberty and union and by the logic of his duty to that ideal and by the bitter reality of his fruitless efforts to keep the peace with feudalists who could not be satisfied with any concessions—feudalists who did not know how to merge their good with the higher good. Thus, Lincoln by his sad experience was gradually transformed from an appeasing compromiser into the harbinger of a new age. He began to see that in this young Republic of the west the oldest institution of human bondage was in a wrestle of death with the youngest and most hopeful vision of the new freedom. Here a new industrialism was developing without the shackles of a hereditary aristocracy and a military caste; borrowing the inventions and using the credits of the Old World but using them with the generous resourcefulness of freemen whose technological power would take giant strides to build America into a homeland of the world's oppressed. Lincoln felt that the future was on their side for, they were on God's side—on the side of the free and the just. The great Lincoln grasped that moral truth of the impending struggle and had the courage to there take his stand: with the moral vision of one who felt that for him there was no alternative to one's sacred duty.

We can see this insight most clearly in one of the closing paragraphs of his second inaugural address: "Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsmen's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

Lincoln was true to the heart of the best of the democratic tradition not because he was of humble origin or of sincere devotion. Look at the autocracies of our own day that have cast their bleeding shadow over our world. Hitler was born in a village hut in Bohemia and Mussolini knew poverty in the blacksmith home of his father. In utter sincerity one arose from humble origin to outdo the atrocities of Attila and the other to don the toga of a modern Caesar. No; it is not because he became the country's leader out of humble origins and served it with wholehearted sincerity but it is because of the principles of life that he affirmed in his leadership that makes Lincoln a towering figure of the American tradition. Further it was not only the nature of his life but of his death that had made Lincoln into the great myth of the soul of America. Every generation must find inspiration in new saints to strengthen its own faith, and that is why men instinctively turn to revere those who have died in the path of duty; for it is in the heroism of the martyr that we come the closest to the pure flame of human aspiration and feel the rocklike strength of human integrity. Around that flame men have brought their loftiest hopes and into its rock they have carved the scriptures of their hearts.

When we think of the lovely closing words of his second inaugural speech, uttered only 1 month before his death, we can understand why the tomb of this sad backwoodsman has become the shrine of American patriotism. In these words he uttered the faith that all Americans, whatever be their creed, can share; a faith in the supreme value of a homely kindliness and neighborly charity; a faith that not only with malice toward none and with charity for all but "with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right"; a faith in the necessity of the courageous integrity of free souls dedicated to the discipline a free conscience dictates, knowing that charity without a firm conscience can become a sentimental mask that permits weakness in ourselves and injustice to others; a faith that only when goodness is combined with integrity can goodness achieve the heights of true righteousness; a faith that it is the duty of every one of us to bless this land with more than a spirit of tolerance and charity—that alone did not build the best of America nor can that alone build a better world after the defeat of Hitler—but we must also be true to the light which God reveals to us; to be firm; to know where we stand on the issues of our day that deny the liberty of the soul of any man, of any race or creed, and to make these standards live by the honest militance of our sincere convictions and by the strength of our own devotions; to be firm; to stand for something in the spirit that God grants to the courageous minds and hearts of free men. It is to have strength without hardness, to have courage without cruelty, to have convictions without being malicious, to make high decisions without being uncharitable, to do what is right and still to be kind—that is the message the name of Lincoln has come to mean to all Americans today.

In that sense the figure of Lincoln looms on the spiritual horizon of America, to use the words of Walt Whitman, as "a man to match the mountains and the sea" of this free land, uttering the scriptural wisdom of a prairie sage, the parables of a frontier saint, the ideals of an American prophet "grounded in a righteousness as immovable as one of the giant ranges of the Rocky Mountains," an eternal symbol of the lofty frontier of our American hope, and to his name, in the words of the poet, "men will come as to a shrine and temple of the good to be made sweet and strong of heart in Lincoln's brotherhood." Amen.

The Cure for Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on February 2, 1951, there appeared in the Haviland (Kans.) Journal an editorial entitled "Production Is the Only Cure."

In these days of continuing, run-away inflation, demands for higher taxes, and hesitancy on the part of those in authority and power in our Government to meet the issues head-on, it would be well to read and reread this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

PRODUCTION IS THE ONLY CURE

The people of the United States have become reconciled to the necessity of the Nation embarking on the greatest defense program in what some like to call our peacetime history. It will be costly and because of it a still greater portion of our national income will be diverted to the Government. But one thing we do not seem to realize is that this cost must come from the pockets of us all. Instead, most of us have the idea that the other fellow should pay the bill. It's the other fellow's profits which should be limited and the other fellow's business which should be regulated. We are in favor of any tax and any regulation so long as it is placed on somebody else.

For many years, the tax laws were directed toward forcing the cost of government onto the shoulders of corporations and individuals with large incomes. A part of this was pure politics, because these corporations and individuals did not have many votes. As the cost of government increased, an attempt was made to cover the increase without touching the pocketbooks of the great mass of voters. That can no longer be done. Every worker is beginning to feel the cost of military preparation and the continuing high cost of government. Unless he learns the truth about taxes, he will suffer far more than he has to date.

All the cost of Government is not for military purposes by any means. As a matter of fact, the principal cause of the present inflation has been Government spending for nonessential purposes. Even in the face of a threat of an all-out war, President Truman insists that he will not drop his social and welfare schemes, socialized medicine, the enormously expensive St. Lawrence waterway, and other visionary experiments. Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, in an itemized statement, has shown that $10,500,000,000 could be taken out of the President's proposed budget without affecting the military budget. All such spending only aggravates inflation. It adds nothing whatever to production, puts more money in circulation, and thereby still further cheapens the dollar.

Any kind of control is only a stop-gap measure. It is not a cure. Production is the only thing that will stop inflation, along with a decrease in Government spending. Since 1932 the Government has had a deficit every year, except for the 2 years when that "do nothing, good for nothing Eightieth Congress" was in control. Most people agree that control of prices is needed, although the administration waited until everything was at its highest to put it on. No one, even those in Washington, knows what the present control will do or how it will be made to work. But no control will stop inflation until the Government stops holding up the prices of foodstuffs artificially; until it stops financing the inflationary housing boom; until it stops subsidizing an inflationary export boom. It must stop its bond-pegging policy and its low inflationary interest rates. If such steps are taken, and other unnecessary spending stopped, we will get the all-out production that only free markets and a free economy can provide.

Regardless of whom we may agree with or differ from, one thing should be kept in mind—the first responsibility of every American citizen is the perpetuation of individual liberty and our representative form of government. This primary objective must always remain ahead of personal comfort and security for civilians as well as the troops in the front lines.

F. J. C.

Dividends From UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dividends From UN," published in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

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

DIVIDENDS FROM UN

In the first 5 years of its life the United Nations has succeeded in spending almost $857,000,000. Of this the United States contributed $424,000,000—almost half of the total. By June 30, UN outlays will approach $1,000,000,000, and of this sum the United States will have contributed $543,000,000.

HALF-BAKED EXCURSIONS

Can any American explain what possible benefit the United States has received from a single dollar contributed to UN, let alone half a billion of them? We have been treated to a never-ending wrangle, to a wholly useless and costly war in Korea, to the threat of another world war with unimaginable destruction, to military and economic regimentation in preparation for war, and to some half-baked, wholly unrealistic, and dangerous excursions into social uplift on a global scale. The Declaration of Human Rights and Genocide Convention are typical of these.

The facts and figures on UN have been the subject of study by a Senate subcommittee under the direction of Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, and the report of this group leaves no doubt that UN has degenerated into a racket. The only people who profit directly from its operations are the new class of global bureaucrats who draw tax-free salaries. Trygve Lie, the Secretary-General, benefiting from 11 forms of allowance and 6 of benefits, draws $53,000 a year, free of tax. He may be worth $53,000 to himself, but to no one else.

The Senators speak of the vested interests that have been created in UN by international bureaucrats whose principal object is to keep every existing project going and to invent new ones constantly. Among these is a study of the effect of chewing coca leaves.

Others proposed or in existence are world clinics for alcoholics, the improvement of obstetrical practice in China so that the ranks of the Chinese Red armies may be kept up to quota, a world compact to end divorce mills, a study of the social problems of South American aborigines, the standardization of map symbols, legal procedure for the issuance of death certificates of persons missing in war, an Asiatic flood-control program, and an investigation of the scientific basis of Yogi.

WHO GETS THE DIVIDENDS?

There are almost 10,000 UN bureaucrats living largely off the American people. The old League of Nations was able to stagger to the grave with only a fraction of this horde of payrollers and at only a fraction of the cost. With each passing year UN grows more grandiose in its pretensions and more futile in its effect.

The common stockholders in the organization are supposed to be the citizens of the United States and of other governments. For them there are no dividends. The preferred stockholders are presidents, premiers, and dictators who regularly collect through the ability of UN to keep international tensions strung tight so that there are always wars and threats of wars with which to keep the people cowed and quiescent so that they will submit to the constantly increasing exactions of the state upon their incomes and their very lives.

When are the people of the world going to get onto this gigantic fraud?

Religion's Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Religion's Part," published in the Somerset (Pa.) Daily American of February 17, 1951.

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

RELIGION'S PART

Because the United States has become strong and rich, there is a disposition in some quarters to slight, or ignore the part that has been played by religion in its development.

Indeed, throughout the Western Hemisphere the part of religion in the making of a great continent, has been fundamental.

Along with the Spanish explorers there came friars to spread the gospel among the Indians.

The French colonization projects in Canada failed until Henry IV sent missionaries to convert the Indians. The commercial endeavors of the first Frenchmen who came to America aroused the suspicions of the red men. They heard the gospel gladly.

But the Spanish had slight influence upon the people who comprise American citizenship and the French influence did not extend far into the United States.

Freedom of religion was not immediate in the colonies. Different colonies were settled by men of different faiths. The Church of England dominance in Georgia, the Carolinas and Virginia left no place for other faiths there. And the union of church and state in those colonies made it possible for the colonies to collect taxes for the church, for the parishes to employ no clergy and then at the end of each year to declare a dividend out of the revenue that had been provided by the state for the support of religion.

The New England colonists were insistent upon freedom for their own religious faiths, but none for those who dissented. Roger Williams fled to what we know as Rhode Island to escape the tortures of the Puritans.

Maryland, under the Roman Catholic Calverts, and Pennsylvania, under the Quaker Penn, were exceptions. These colonies set the pattern that was followed when the Constitution was adopted. New Jersey was perhaps the last State to throw off intolerance. Not until the adoption of the constitution of 1844 did Roman Catholics enjoy all the privileges of American citizens, there. Although they did have freedom to worship according to their consciences, there were privileges of importance denied them.

Because of the fundamental seriousness attached to religion, the French statesman de Tocqueville, after visiting the United States, in 1831, wrote his Democracy in America and states that in the United States religion is the chief concern of the people.

It is therefore quite appropriate that during the Lenten season respect should be paid to a subject that from the beginnings of this country has been foremost.

It is interesting to observe, further, that Somerset churches were more largely attended Sunday morning than they had been for months.

The civilization under which Americans live is known as the Western civilization and it is founded upon the doctrines of western Christianity.

Universal Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on February 13, 1951, there appeared in the Topeka State Journal an editorial entitled "Do We Want Universal Service?"

This editorial points to some fundamental positions once familiar to all of us. Since in the near future this body will be called upon to consider the question of universal military training it is well for us to have before us frank and clear points of view on this most important proposed change in our fundamental policy.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

DO WE WANT UNIVERSAL SERVICE?

Should the country adopt the universal military service plan which is before Congress? One citizen group called the Committee on the Present Danger, made up of assorted educational, scientific, and professional VIP's, believes emphatically that the country should. Let's look at this interesting movement.

The Committee on the Present Danger supports a bill which, as the committee says in its recent statement, would cause military service in this country to begin at the age of 18 or at the end of the high school year after reaching 18. The 27 months of service and training authorized in the bill—after deduction for customary terminal leave—in reality means about 25 months to total actual military service. As such it need represent for students a break of only two academic years."

"We support the bill," says the committee, "because it is a real universal military service bill and not merely an extension of the Selective Service Act to include 18-year-olds. The power given the President to call up men by age group is the distinguishing feature. When this call goes out, the draft boards will make no deferments for this age group on grounds of occupation or dependencies. When the program becomes fully operative, the services could count on at least 700,000 to 750,000 men from each age group under present physical standards, and another 100,000 for limited service by lowering present physical and mental standards for induction."

Then follows the old argument that over the years this would provide a pool of trained manpower, though not mentioning that in the event of later war the pool of trained manpower would have to be completely retrained to catch up on new weapons and ways of waging war, for nothing grows obsolete faster than an ultra-modern war.

The committee's integrity and great sincerity is immediately acknowledged, but we hope it will realize that even the judgments of its VIP's in all walks are fallible, and that there are two sides to this question of adopting a permanent military class or reservist training system. The other side has been hinted at by Pearl Buck, Nobel prize winner in literature, who wrote a letter to Look magazine (February 13 issue) "profoundly deploring" Dr. James Bryant Conant's earlier Look article, "A Stern Proposal for Survival." Harvard's President Conant, a chemist by calling, is a member of the afore-mentioned Committee for the Present Danger. Mrs. Buck wrote:

"Dr. Conant * * * proposes that all young men be put under military control. Their teachers are to be men trained in the inevitable narrowness of the military outlook, men experienced only in the ways of physical and mechanical force, and in a type of strategy oblivious to human psychology. For the two most educable years of young manhood our men must live in an environment of low standards of personal behavior and moral integrity. * * * What is the gain if we commit our national life to militarism? Dr. Conant does not know. He hopes at best for 'a global stalemate.' But he cannot promise it. * * * Many Americans will consider victory not worth while if, in order to avoid tyranny from abroad, we put ourselves under military control at home, for tyranny has always begun with military control. * * * The mistake of military men has always been that they see problems too simply and have only the one simple remedy of more militarism. * * * a program which has nowhere ever been finally successful in achieving even its own purposes."

It might be said further that this plan for systematic militarization would change something very fundamental about this country and what it has meant as a beacon to the world. Do you recall that millions of Europeans emigrated to this country—perhaps your own ancestors—to escape compulsory military service and Europe's round of wars, fed and readied by the class reservist system? Further, Europe has had this universal service and training for a long time, yet Europe is chronically diseased with war. Germany had it and lost. The system has done nothing whatever to further or insure peace, yet many of its American advocates promise such a benefit here. Again Europe has universal service now, but the debate is over Europe's ability or willingness to supply divisions of men to defend itself.

Shall we continue to say there are two sides to such a fundamental change and not rush into it? Congress probably will not. That doesn't mean that Selective Service couldn't use a complete overhauling to stop leaks and equalize standards. The Committee's point about lowering present physical and mental standards for induction should be applied as matters stand.

Senator Lodge and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the February 14 issue of the Boston Herald there appeared, under the caption "LODGE and labor," a letter to the editor, over the signature of James F. Hughes, past president of the Central Labor Union, A. F. of L., at Lawrence, Mass. Inasmuch as his communication pays a very just and fitting tribute to our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I hope it will receive the serious consideration of every one of his colleagues in this body. To that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LODGE AND LABOR

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

The unofficial announcement that Governor Dever will seek Senator LODGE's seat, were it authentic, would place organized labor in Massachusetts and in the Nation, in a rather embarrassing position, provided labor adhered to its policy of electing its friends.

Fortunately, Senator LODGE and Governor Dever are friendly to labor, making it difficult, but mandatory for labor to support both when seeking reelection to their present respective positions.

The official organ, the League Reporter, of the American Federation of Labor lists LODGE in its columns as a liberal. Why?

1. Senator LODGE voted in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

2. Senator LODGE voted in favor of a minimum wage.

3. Senator LODGE voted in favor of liberalizing the social-security law.

4. Senator LODGE voted in favor of higher monthly compensation to pensioners under the old-age and survivors insurance law.

5. Senator LODGE voted in favor of extending the old-age and survivors insurance law so that farm help, domestic help, and numerous other groups of workers be included.

6. Senator LODGE favors the union shop with adequate safeguards.

7. Senator LODGE opposes the issuing of injunction in labor disputes without first hearing labor's side of the case.

8. Senator LODGE favors extending Federal financial aid to private and parochial schools.

9. Senator LODGE introduced a bill to have the President and Vice President of the United States elected by popular vote, the vote of the people.

10. Senator LODGE, in the years from 1947 to 1951 sponsored an all-out program of preparedness, a preparedness program which would be the dagger in the ribs of the Russian and Chinese Reds.

11. Because of his determination, clear-mindedness, and his patriotism President Truman appointed Senator LODGE as United States representative to the UN.

This brilliant, unblemished, and fearless record of Senator LODGE marks him as an outstanding public official, worthy of the support of labor and all fair-minded citizens, Democrats as well as Republicans, in the State of Massachusetts.

Those who may try to unseat the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., would do well to consider his smashing victory over the late popular and beloved Senator, David I. Walsh.

JAMES F. HUGHES,
Past President, Central Labor Union, A. F. of L., Lawrence, Mass

Food Price Amendment to the Defense Production Act Still Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the lead editorial in the New York Times of February 17, 1951, entitled "Stabilization Without Tears":

STABILIZATION WITHOUT TEARS

The House Ways and Means Committee has rejected President Truman's request for immediate action on a $10,000,000,000 tax bill and let it be known that it is going to hold full hearings and listen to all proposals for dealing with the financing of the rearmament program.

The idea of getting an uncomplicated "quickie" tax bill passed first and following it up later with a second revenue bill has much to recommend it from the standpoint of keeping revenue receipts ahead of spending. However, we think the Ways and Means Committee has acted wisely in its decision to canvass the entire tax field before committing itself on the program outlined by the President. And we are the more convinced of this after reading news reports on the testimony given before the committee by Eric Johnston, Economic Stabilization Director, and his Price Administrator, Michael DiSalle.

The fact is that, whatever its previous intention might have been, the Ways and Means Committee might well have been moved to reconsider its whole approach to the revenue program simply on the basis of this testimony. Consider the situation for

a moment. Never before in history has a nation financed a major war entirely out of taxes. Now we are undertaking to do what is the equivalent of that. The American taxpayer is told that the Government expects him to provide the prodigious sum of $71,600,000,000 in taxes to finance the defense effort in 1951–52. And the Nation's chief stabilizer, appearing before the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of the program, warns that "failure to tax—and tax hard now—will be perilous to our country's strength and safety." It will not be possible, this spokesman for the administration tells us, "to hold the inflation line unless Congress votes a tax bill sufficiently high to pay for our defense program as we go." Yet this witness, the chief stabilizing authority of the administration * * * apparently supports the powerful farm bloc in giving a special position of favoritism to farm prices in the stabilization program. Asked whether legislation now being considered would involve any change in this section of the Defense Production Act, Mr. Johnston is quoted as replying: "I didn't say that. The farmer is certainly entitled to his parity." Does Mr. Johnston know that farm prices as a whole are already above parity in relation to November farm prices? And if he regards parity as a sacrosanct concept, does he believe it works both ways? Does he believe that farm commodities that are selling far above parity should be rolled back to that level?

Mr. DiSalle is quoted to the effect that "we ought to be able to do better than the OPA did in World War II, when it held the rise in the cost of living to 9.1 percent in the first year." One wonders how America's housewives must feel now. A day or two ago Secretary Brannan assured them that the special dispensation to subparity farm prices would mean an annual addition of only $4,000,000,000 to their food bill. Now they are consoled with the thought that their cost of living should be held to a rise of less than 9 percent over the next 12 months. By the figures of the OPS itself, that maximum comes to the fairly generous figure of $18,000,000,000

It is time the administration realized that pay-as-you-go means something more than simply imposing back-breaking taxes on the American public. If, as Mr. Johnston says, it is impossible to stabilize the economy without high taxes, then it is little less than fantastic to propose a program of pay-as-you-go taxation while conducting the price-wage policy on the basis of giving a minimum of political offense to every group in the economy.

General Eisenhower's Earlier Appearance Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "General Eisenhower's Earlier Appearance Before Congress," published in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of February 3, 1951. The article discusses the demobilization of the Army at the end of World War II, and a statement made at that time by General Eisenhower.

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

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S EARLIER APPEARANCE BEFORE CONGRESS

General Eisenhower's appearance before the Congress this week recalls that once before, on January 15, 1946, he also addressed the joint House and Senate membership. It is with some irony that one recalls that 5 years ago General Eisenhower, as Chief of Staff of the Army, was called upon to explain to the Legislature why the troops were not being demobilized faster. His opening sentence at that time is significant in light of developments since. He said: "I have come here this morning because a very human desire has clashed with the Army's manpower needs to do the job which has been assigned to us by the Government."

What was the situation then? General Eisenhower said: "Now just where does this leave us? On VE-day we had 8,300,000 troops. We have already discharged 5,000,000, and by July 1 we shall have discharged another 2,750,000 men who were in the Army the day Germany collapsed. This leaves but half a million or so of the VE-day men. Except for veteran volunteers, that is all that will be left of our own VE-day Army on July 1, 1946, less than 14 months after the last shot was fired in Europe. All the rest will be recruits. It is with this relatively untrained Army in the throes of reconversion that we must undertake the grave tasks still ahead. * * * My sole purpose, which I am certain you share, is that the Army that did so much to win the victory will be left fit to preserve it."

It is difficult to tell how much the rapid break-up of our World War II Army (which in those days included the Air Force) contributed to our present dilemma.

Rev. Martin Niemoeller's Opposition to Rearmament of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Niemoeller's Visit," published in the Washington Post of today. I suggest that any Senator who is interested in obtaining the German viewpoint regarding rearmament read the editorial.

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

NIEMOELLER'S VISIT

When General Eisenhower administered the coup de grace to the arming of Germany as a primary object of American policy toward Atlantic defense, that aspect of the policy was already moribund, as a result of an opposition which arose in Germany itself. The opposition sprang from a one-man crusade conducted by that extraordinary Lutheran cleric, Martin Niemoeller. Pastor Niemoeller, who is a presiding bishop of United Protestantism in Germany, came to Washington for the day on Monday. He was on his way to other parts of the country on a tour arranged by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. The State Department knew he was coming. Whether he was asked to call or whether he asked to be received—he visited the Department, but was received by several subordinates headed by the deputy of the official in charge of the German desk. Undoubtedly Pastor Niemoeller was put out, though the Department might have a good case for what seemed a slight, in view of the curious and unique position of Pastor Niemoeller as a leader in the opposition to the established government at Bonn.

Pastor Niemoeller has been in the habit of speaking his mind freely throughout his tempestuous life, and suffering for it. Since the war he seems to have expressed the thoughts of millions of his countrymen. Such a man, with his hold on so many people in Germany, cannot be ignored. He has to be understood, or Germany itself will not be understood. Even a minimal curiosity should have caused the policy makers to make some effort to get at first-hand his observations and conclusions and an appraisal of the man himself. Why did he raise his powerful voice against a proposal which would have recreated a German army? Whence his ability to make that voice whisper throughout Germany, East and West, and have it echo back as the conviction of millions of Germans? The answers go to the heart of things in the east-west struggle. Pastor Niemoeller believes that diplomatic resources are not yet exhausted, and that even if those resources are spurned in Moscow, the west must always keep its eye on the impact of its diplomacy upon public opinion. He fears that the Stalinists are increasing their lead in the battle for the public mind. On defense he believes that the proper approach is the development of a European army; indeed, he thinks that all measures of defense should be dovetailed in the building up of a united Europe.

The policy on the rearmament of Germany seems to have developed in a vacuum by persons who felt that the Germans themselves could be ignored. Niemoeller merely reminded the world that there are Germans in Germany, not militarily worthless puppets. The problem of talking to oppositionists is a thorny but by no means an insuperable problem. It has arisen before in respect of important personalities—Rene Pleven, when he was here as De Gaulle's representative; Yukio Ozaki, the perennial oppositionist in Japan; and Feng Yu-hsiang, the vice generalissimo to Chiang Kai-shek before the split in the Kuomintang. Policy in foreign affairs should rest upon knowledge of the forces at work in the countries in which we are operating, and some means should be found for knowing non-Communist oppositionists to Allied policy as well as Communist oppositionists to Stalinist policy.

Vanishing Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Vanishing Surpluses," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of recent date. In this connection I call the attention of my colleagues to the danger of having to depend upon a crisis of war to keep up our economy.

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

VANISHING SURPLUSES

Impact of war and preparation for war on the Nation's economy is illustrated by the change in farm surpluses. A few months ago they were a mounting problem calling for a new approach.

New Government holdings of cheese, butter, cotton, and wool have almost disappeared and the surpluses of the major grains—corn and wheat—are so highly regarded they are being stockpiled against future emergency. The Government has already called upon the farmers to produce more of them. Potato control has been abandoned.

Wheat is needed against the possibility of feeding allies in a war, and there is a high priority on corn to keep meat supplies adequate. The changed prospect is reflected in prices, wheat quotations being at their high in several years despite a large surplus.

The Commodity Credit Corporation claims a loss of only $773,000,000 in its 17-year history. This, however, does not include administrative costs, interest, and storage charges, which exceed the sales losses. CCC has authority to use nearly $5,000,000,000, and currently has $2,888,000,000 invested in price supports. It would appear that a considerable saving could be effected in this field, holding the budget down and avoiding some of the proposed new taxes.

This general situation of challenging economic problems that can be solved only by war calls for searching analysis. Is the American economic system so decadent that it must be supported by emergency after emergency to keep it working at top speed and stave off collapse of the standard of living? And what happens when the Nation runs out of emergencies? Will it then be necessary to create another?

Proposed Amendments to Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act. These include editorials from the Washington News, the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the Birmingham Post-Herald.

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

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of January 15, 1951]

TOO MANY DEFERMENTS

Overhauling of the draft law, with a severe tightening of the present deferment policy, will be one of the most pressing problems before the new Congress.

The grim fact is that under the present set-up Selective Service is going to have a hard time furnishing enough men to provide an army of 3,500,000 by next July, President Truman's goal.

As in the case of so many other problems of the emergency, the whole question of manpower supply is still in the discussion stage, with no firm policy taking shape.

Selective Service is operating now under a 1-year extension, to next June 30, of a postwar draft law altogether too lenient and top-heavy with exemptions. Bypassed are the World War II veterans, all fathers, men with dependents, students, youths under 19, and men over 25, and those mentally or physically unfit for general service. Certain occupational deferments are also permitted, mostly agricultural.

At the current rate of demand, under these limitations, Selective Service will be running out of men before summer.

In that light, and in the face of the compelling need, we don't think much of the proposal advanced last month by one of Selective Service's own advisory groups. It would defer indefinitely "superior" university students so that they could continue their studies. Their superiority would be determined by giving them an aptitude test similar to that now given by the armed services and certifying them as "promising students."

The time is past for such unfair and unequal selectivity. The need now is for men, and in large numbers, regardless of how "promising" they may be as plotted by an "aptitude" test.

General Eisenhower, who is still adding to the luster of his name, as the preceding editorial points out, was not particularly "promising" as a student. He was in the lower half of his class at West Point. And it took General Patton 5 years to get through.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of January 20, 1951]

DON'T WEAKEN UMST

The long-awaited bill for universal military service and training finally has been introduced in Congress.

In recent hearings before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, the main target of attack has been the starting age—the draft of 18-year-olds. This opposition undoubtedly reflects the sentiments voiced in letters that have been pouring in on Congressmen from parents who, understandably, dislike to see their youthful sons called into service.

Yet this newspaper believes the principal arguments against the draft of 18-year-olds have been categorically and satisfactorily answered by competent witnesses before the Senate committee. These facts seem to have been established:

There are barely enough men in the 19-to-26-age bracket to provide an army of 3,500,000 men, and not enough if that goal is raised or the present call-up rate is increased.

The alternatives are to take fathers, veterans, or 18-year-olds. And, as Draft Director Lewis Hershey pointed out: "The mortgage is on the 18-year-olds since they've got to serve at 19 anyway."

Young men drafted at 18 would, in most cases, return to civilian life between their twentieth and twenty-first birthdays—still young enough to get a college education. Those in high school would not be drafted until they had finished, or reached age 19, whichever came first. Youths in college before they became 18 could finish the school year. In addition, each year 75,000 promising students would have their active military service deferred to study a wide variety of courses for specialized training, though they would be obligated to complete their military service time after graduation. It seems to us there is an even better argument for placing military service first.

There has been some talk of 18½ as a compromise age. But this is offset by the Defense Department's pledge that no 18-year-old will be sent overseas without at least four, and possibly six, months of basic military training.

The 18-year-olds are not yet an important factor in the country's labor force. Their induction would not greatly disrupt industry's manpower.

The stamina, endurance, and recuperative powers of 18- and 19-year-olds unquestionably make them superior soldiers. By starting their training early they improve their own chances of survival if eventually they must be sent into combat.

And, important from a long-range view, UMST beginning at 18 will provide the country with an ever-expanding pool of trained reserves for the next 10 years. Yet the system is flexible enough to meet any world change for the better—the President can reduce or eliminate service requirements as the emergency eases.

This newspaper believes that Congress should enact UMST promptly without change or compromise on the 18-year-old age requirement.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 13, 1951]

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS

The harshest and most far-reaching sacrifice required in the interest of national security has now been set plainly before Congress. It entails something unprecedented and profoundly unwelcome in American life—the peacetime impressment into military service of all physically fit youths reaching the age of 18. This means not only hardship for the boys called into uniform and heartache for the families they must leave, but also a profound wrench to the traditions of a country which has always abhorred militarism and has never until now considered a large standing army in peacetime necessary to its safety. Only necessity could justify such a course. Unhappily, the necessity appears to be at hand.

Secretary of Defense Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, who presented the plan for universal military service and training to the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee, made no attempt to gloss over its harshness. This break with the past is not likely to be of brief duration. The Secretary spoke of it as a 10-year burden. But there is no way to measure its duration just as there is no way to measure the duration of the world crisis compelling it. As General Marshall observed, "There is no cheap or easy solution to our present security problems."

We need to create speedily an armed force of 3,200,000 men and we need also to maintain a large corps of trained reserves. Patently the best way to accomplish both of these aims is to induct and train the youngest men fit for military service. They make the best fighters, their induction will entail the least dislocation of the national economy and the least disruption of family life, and they will be available longest for the defense of the Nation. The alternative, induction of older men now deferred, would impose even graver hardships.

The UMST program outlined by Defense Department officials appears to have taken into account intelligently the importance of continued education for some of the young men to be called to duty. It would permit students now in college to complete their academic year. It would provide for a return to college after basic training of perhaps 100,000 to 125,000 of the most apt students each year—so that the national need for skilled scientific workers and for educated men equipped to assume the responsibilities of future leadership would not be ignored.

Whether induction should be authorized to begin at 18 or, as Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has suggested, at 18½, and whether the

term of service should be for the full 27 months requested by the Defense authorities or limited to 2 years, are details which Congress will need to study carefully. What we do in the present crisis will be looked upon by the rest of the world as a demonstration of our resolution. It will be taken as a standard, no doubt, by those nations upon whom we are urging increased military preparedness. We cannot afford at this stage to falter or to equivocate in our own program.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 22, 1951]

COLLEGE PROGRAMS

American colleges have already been hit very hard by mobilization. The uncertainties of the draft situation have led great numbers of young men to leave their campuses or to forego higher education in order to enlist in the armed services. If universal service for 18-year-olds is made a national policy, it is estimated by the executive director of the Association of American Colleges that enrollment of male students will drop by as much as 80 percent. The needs of national defense are paramount, of course. And there does not seem to be any way short of a no-deferment program to raise an army of three and a half million. But the cost of such a program in terms of its impact on education ought to be reckoned realistically.

One effect of a sudden drop in student enrollment will perhaps be the destruction of a number of colleges—particularly those without large endowments and dependent for their operation on income derived from tuition fees. A number of institutions have already been obliged to reduce the size of their faculties. They may, if the pinch becomes severe enough, be obliged to close their doors altogether. This loss of educational facilities would entail a very severe cost to the Nation.

Universal military service would also mean a serious gap in the training of young men for future professional careers. Four or 5 years hence this might present the Nation with a disastrous shortage of doctors, engineers, research chemists, physicists and experts in other fields where knowledge cannot be acquired quickly. In a world where military strength is to a great extent dependent upon scientific supremacy, we can scarcely afford to be indifferent to the supply of skilled scientists. Nor can we recklessly forsake the training of young men for future national leadership. Provision for a student training program in the universal military service and training plan submitted to Congress by the Defense Department is a wise form of conservation. It will help substantially to stabilize the country's educational structure.

The colleges themselves, however, will be obliged to make important adjustments to the hard realities of the present situation. President James Bryant Conant, of Harvard University, recognized the need in his annual report to the board of overseers just released. Planning for the future, he declared, must be based on the assumption "that we shall be partially mobilized but not in a global war for many years." The situation today is not analogous to that which faced us after Pearl Harbor when education as usual was abruptly suspended and teachers as well as students enlisted for the duration.

The duration now is indefinite. After the transitional period of draft induction, college enrollment will probably return to normal or even in excess of it as young men are released to resume their studies. Speeded programs may be necessary for them, although Mr. Conant considers the 3-year college course, improvised after the last war, unsatisfactory; professional schools will have to make some modifications, too; and faculties will have to ration their contributions to Government service in order "to prevent a dissipation of their highly specialized manpower." Colleges are a national asset far too valuable to be lightly or needlessly sacrificed.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 21, 1951]

TEEN-AGERS IN BATTLE

One of the reasons most frequently given for opposition to the lowering of the draft age to 18 is the fear that youngsters might be sent into battle without adequate training. That is an understandable fear, but it needs analysis. Why were 18-year-olds pressed hurriedly into combat during World War II? Because a sudden desperate need for fighting men arose, and there was no time to train the teen-agers or to bring in reinforcements from elsewhere.

There can be no sure guaranty that such an emergency will not arise again. But there is a protection against unpreparedness. That is to make sure that every young man receives ample training as a matter of course. That means universal training and service starting at 18. It is a tragedy whenever men go into battle unprepared; whether they are 18, or 19, as is now legally possible, makes little difference. The aim of current legislation is to build military strength and a reservoir of trained men so that this will not happen. Eighteen-year-olds are needed to keep the Armed Forces at strength and to place the reservoir of trained men on a sustaining basis. No wishful thinking can blot out the fact that international tension is likely to be with us for a long time. The kindest thing that can be done for the 18-year-olds, who sooner or later would be involved anyhow, is to train them adequately to meet their responsibility.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of January 12, 1951]

COMBINING TRAINING AND SERVICE

Defense Secretary Marshall has presented to Congress a combined military service and training program that has the advantage of meeting both immediate and long-range manpower needs of national defense. It would supply the trained men required in the present emergency to build our military strength to 3,200,000 men. Yet the program would be flexible enough to provide universal training facilities after immediate goals of the armed services are attained. The plan, therefore, would end what Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON, of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee calls the dangerous luxury of sporadic, piecemeal manpower measures to which we have become addicted.

As outlined in general scope by General Marshall and Assistant Secretary Rosenberg, the plan calls for the induction of 18-year-olds for training and service in the Regular Establishment or assignment to Reserve components. Induction now begins at 19. All physically fit 18-year-olds would be given from 4 to 6 months' training before being sent on to one of the regular fighting branches. The policy would be not to send men under 19 overseas except in dire emergency. The training and service period would cover 27 months, after which they would become members of the Reserve for from 8 to 6 years, the Reserve term depending on whether membership was in an organized unit or an inactive class.

Once the emergency needs of the Regular services are satisfied, however, the induction machinery would become more a source of trained reservists than of regulars. The President would have authority not only to reduce service requirements but to eliminate them altogether if conditions warranted. Thus, the Defense Department's plan would be adaptable to the long-view program of building up a strong body of reservists in all branches. The theory is that the larger and stronger this stand-by citizens' reserve, the less need there will be for maintaining a huge standing army at great cost to the Nation.

Even this compromise between development of a garrison state and the inadequacies of past and present patchwork measures will be costly and inconvenient. It will mean readjustments in the home, in education, and in industry. If the program is made truly universal, it will, in effect, ration the services of all of the country's manpower, young and in the older brackets. But, as General Marshall told the Johnson subcommittee, this is a reasonable price which "a resolute people will be willing to pay for their liberties."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of January 10, 1951]

UMT STILL NECESSARY

Many persons share Senator TAFT's misgivings over the maintenance of a large standing Army in this country in time of so-called peace. He told the Senate he had heard talk of an American Army twice the size of that now planned and warned that such an increase in armed strength as a long-range program would put the Nation perpetually on a deficit basis. In addition, he said, "It would pose serious problems in the fields of military morale and industrial manpower."

There is an alternative, however, to what the Ohio Senator termed "a garrison state." Universal military training would provide a constant reservoir of trained manpower that would enable the country safely to reduce the size of its Regular Army. It is the lack of such a training program in the past that has complicated the task of raising the minimum Armed Forces required in the present emergency. And, still lacking such a program, there is no satisfactory source of trained manpower except selective service and the system of camp training now under way. Once the required strength is attained, induction of men for training and service in the standing Army is the only method which Congress has provided to keep our strength at the level deemed necessary for security.

General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other authorities have told Congress repeatedly that the only way to avoid the burdens of a large standing Army in time of peace—and yet remain potentially strong—is by creating a stand-by reserve of young men trained in the rudiments of warfare. Such a permanent reserve could be built up within a few years under a universal military-training program of the type advocated by defense officials on numerous occasions in the past. It has been said the UMT would not be feasible right now, because of a shortage of instructors and camp facilities. It is true that these facilities are being taxed beyond capacity by the selective-service remobilization program. There is no good reason, however, why the new Congress should not pass stand-by legislation of the type just introduced to authorize UMT whenever facilities for carrying out the plan become available. We would be far better prepared to meet aggression today had we started the training of our youth before the emergency developed.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald of January 13, 1951]

THE SOONER, THE BETTER

Defense Secretary Marshall and his manpower assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, made

two impressive points when they presented the broad outline of a universal military service and training program before a congressional committee this week.

They made clear that UMST is at once the least costly and the most effective means of attaining immediate partial mobilization and at the same time assuring a vitally necessary pool of trained men for the next decade.

It is, as Mrs. Rosenberg summed up, the only device "for providing a sound defense now and in the future at a price we can afford to pay."

Economically, there is this consideration: If we don't draft the 18-year-olds we shall have to tap the young married men, with and without dependents, who are now exempt. There are now 630,000 of these in the 19–26 age group potentially available for induction. If they were called up it would cost the Government $979,000,000 a year including their pay and dependency allowances.

If, instead, an equivalent number of 18-year-olds were taken—as proposed under UMST—since they are almost uniformly without dependents, the cost for a year at the proposed pay rate would be $466,000,000. Thus the annual payroll savings alone would be $513,000,000—not counting the loss to industries and farms and to the purchasing power of families that would be involved in calling up married men.

But something much more important than money is involved.

From his experience in World War II, General Marshall said that men of 18, 19, and 20 unquestionably made the best soldiers. They have stamina and recuperative power far beyond that of the older groups.

By starting the training of our young men at 18—instead of 19 as at present—we not only immediately solve the problem of reaching the 3,200,000-man Army goal by next July, we also start an ever-expanding flow of well-trained men into the Reserve components.

It is this important reserve pool, now lacking, from which an army in being could be doubled or tripled almost overnight. It is the cushion, or "durable layer of military protection," that would survive the alternate moods of grave public alarm and complacency over the next decade. It could mean the difference between national survival or total defeat.

At the same time, these youths whose combat training started at 18 will have greatly enhanced their own chances of survival if they are required to go into battle.

The urgency of the situation is beyond question. The sooner UMST is put into effect the greater will be our national security and the stronger our voice for lasting world peace.

Congress Should Insist on a Share in Policy Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1951

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the January 27 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

CONGRESS SHOULD INSIST ON A SHARE IN POLICY MAKING

The constitutional crisis through which we are supposed to have been passing is not so much a constitutional crisis as a crisis of confidence. Few people seriously believe that the President lacks legal power to send troops abroad for specific missions, although his right to involve the country in a major undeclared war is certainly questionable. What is definitely doubted by millions of Americans is the ability of President Truman, Secretary Acheson and our leaders generally to decide where to send anybody. The November elections constituted a repudiation of the administration which neither the people nor Congress is in a position to carry through to a logical conclusion. That is the source of the crisis which does involve differences in constitutional interpretation, but is actually brought about by doubts regarding our present leadership.

In these circumstances it is not only natural but necessary that Congress should more and more edge into the picture and insist on a larger share in planning and responsibility. Korea gives the leaders of Congress their opportunity and points out their duty. In addition to merely consulting with the State Department and saying "Yes," Congress will have to exert pressure. Specifically it might well insist upon an explanation of our persistent refusal to release the troops of Chiang Kai-shek for an attack from Formosa, and the strange ins and outs of our attitudes on the proposal for a cease fire in Korea. The State Department first consented to a proposal for a conference on Korea which excluded from the proposed discussions the Nationalist government of China, the regime which we recognize and which has a seat on the Security Council. Later the United States representative at Lake Success reversed our position and insisted that Chiang Kai-shek be represented at any conference about Asia.

The official explanation at the time was that we had no expectation that the Chinese Reds would consent to the cease-fire proposal, and that when it had been rejected we could proceed to tell them off as aggressors. But it is strange diplomacy which announces in advance that we are not acting in good faith, but only to prove a point that we have decided already. And suppose the Chinese Communists had accepted, and we had found ourselves in a conference stacked three to one against us; were we prepared to hand over Formosa and a UN membership to the Communists as the price of a toehold in an unprofitable Korea? Or what was the deal?

The State Department's attitude on the Formosa question has been explained by a commendable desire not to become further involved in an Asiatic war. It is also a survival of the left-wing nonsense to the effect that we must have no traffic with Nationalist China lest we alienate our friends in Asia. Now that our friends in Asia are revealed even to the most starry-eyed as our enemies in Asia, Congress might well ask why we can't aid the enemies of our enemies even if Mr. Acheson and his group aren't prepared to treat them as friends. Here again there has been a mighty change since the January slap by Mao Tse-tung. Formosa is apparently to be regarded as essential to American security, after all these years of State Department insistence that it wasn't.

There are indications that Congress is alive to this. Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada (Democrat), has introduced a resolution calling for aid to Chiang Kai-shek, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, one of the ablest on Mr. Truman's side of the floor, also urges support of Chiang, Franco, and Tito, not because they are Democrats, but because they are anti-Communists. Here it might be observed that the State Department's eagerness to help Tito, who prides himself of being a purer Communist than Stalin, is in curious contrast to its attitude toward Franco and Chiang. These are items in our foreign policy which Congress might well probe. There must be some reason behind attitudes so defiant of logic.

The Dilemma of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines and Permanent Delegate to the United Nations, when the honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon him by Boston University on January 31, 1951.

General Romulo was cited by Boston University as one "whose life and achievements reflect glory and honor upon that island country" and as a "patriot who has held the freedom of native land dearer than life, and whose fervent patriotism now encompasses all mankind." The citation also said that General Romulo is a "soldier whose efficiency and loyalty have been proclaimed by promotion to the rank of brigadier general, a diplomat who knows that 'peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war,' and who is winning renown by the consecration of superb mental and personality powers to the establishment of peace on earth and good will among the nations of the earth."

His speech entitled "The Dilemma of the Free World" was favorably commented upon editorially by leading American newspapers, because it underscores the fact that the objectives of the free world of today are to keep alive the will to freedom and the will to resist those who would destroy freedom.

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

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, if we go by the allotted span of human life, silver anniversaries are not a rare or unusual observance. The Biblical threescore and ten, if cherished with care and husbanded without haste, do permit a man the proud achievement of sticking to something—a useful profession or a beloved spouse—with fidelity and affection, and in the end receiving the plaudits of admiring friends and neighbors.

The achievement of Dr. Daniel L. Marsh is rare in this: That, having passed the Biblical span, he can point to 25 years of faithful service as a university president in the noblest profession there is—a profession to which he has been wedded as to a beloved spouse—and that, having reached this milestone, he has yet the vitality and the vision to go from hence toward a future of undiminished usefulness to his country and people. Anyone can have a silver anniversary of some kind, but the pleasures of a silver anniversary as one of the great educators of America are given to but a few. You, Dr. Marsh, are one of these fortunate few, and I am happy to have you come to join thousands of your friends and neighbors in paying you this just and affectionate tribute of admiration. Humbly, yet sincerely, I add my voice to the paean of praise that comes to you today from all those, in this land and in other lands, who have watched Boston University flourish into greatness under your patient and devoted leadership.

Manila is almost halfway around the world from Boston. But the world has be-

come so small and history has moved so fast that while Boston, 200 years ago, was the farthest outpost of western civilization in the New World of America, Manila, today, is the farthest outpost of western civilization in the Old World of Asia. The expanse between Boston and Manila represents the area covered by the advancing wave of western culture. If that area is to be held and defended as an area of freedom, the common faith and ideals of these two cities, and of the lands for which they stand as symbols, must remain strong and enduring as hoops of steel. The outpost in Manila will be held if the people of Boston keep the faith.

This is not a modern Tale of Two Cities. It is an attempt to reduce to simple terms the dilemma of the free world. America, which has become the arsenal of the free world, must soon make a difficult choice. America must choose between a policy of withdrawing to its frontiers to safeguard its freedom and its way of life, and a policy of assisting free peoples everywhere to defend their freedom against the menace of a new and more terrible despotism. America must choose between defending its own freedom in Boston and San Francisco and defending that same freedom in Paris and London, in Sydney and Manila.

Whatever the decision, it will not be an easy one to make. But the difficulty should be the measure of our invention and imagination. This Nation was made great through courage and vision. These same qualities will be needed to defend and protect it. To follow the counsel of fear is to embark on the road to disaster.

Last night, at Lake Success, there took place an event of truly historic proportions. After 2 months of protracted debate and much searching of hearts and consciences the Political and Security Committee of the United Nations General Assembly decided by a substantial vote to pin the label of aggressor on the Government of Communist China.

The decision is not so simple as it sounds. What make it significant are the premise on which it stands and the united action that now must follow it. The free world has had the courage to identify the aggressor and stands ready to take additional measures to meet the aggression.

The United States should be proud of the leadership it assumed in the making of this historic decision. The emotional pressures that tended toward a rash and impulsive decision were greater than any nation in a similar situation has ever borne. But the patience and forbearance of the United States have been rewarded by the support of its friends and allies. Today the free world stands forth united and strong in the sight of the aggressor.

The Philippines is one of the two states of Asia (Thailand being the other) that rejected the repeated invitations to weakness and surrender. Though they frightened us with new threats by the aggressor and scared us with the danger of another world war, we stood firmly by the conviction that the surest way to whet the appetite of the aggressor and to bring on the tragedy of another war is to surrender to intimidation and blackmail.

I cannot say, standing here before you, that by this decision we in the United Nations have avoided the risk of war. But I do say that if this risk does exist we could not avoid it by bending the knee to the aggressor. What we have done is to give notice to the aggressor that the free world has made up its mind to resist his further aggressions or attempts at aggression, as we resisted them a few years back in Iran, Greece, and Berlin. This time, instead of half-hearted resistance or unilateral decisions to resist, we have proclaimed our unified purpose and determination to maintain the peace and security of the world.

My country made a difficult decision in breaking away from the group of 12 Asian and Arab states which favored further negotiations with the aggressor in Korea. This decision is symptomatic of what is going on in the mind of Asia. Back of the neutralism of Asia and its reluctance to join forces with the west are the fears and suspicions which centuries of unhappy contact with the Western Powers have bred. Almost alone in Asia, the Philippines was spared this experience and memory of colonial subjection and exploitation. The United States must feel proud that today, once again, as in the days of Bataan and Corregidor, the people of the Philippines have decided to stand beside the people of the United States in the great political crisis of the United Nations.

Nevertheless, the problem of keeping the free countries of Asia within the democratic camp remains urgent and pressing. If the Philippines remains an outpost and promontory of the free world in Asia, then it must be held not only for its own sake but also for the sake of advancing the cause of freedom and democracy in that part of the world. To this end the United States must do two things. It must insist that the American experiment in the Philippines become the measure of the present and future colonial policy of the Western Powers in Asia. And the United States must act in regard to the Philippines in a manner to reassure the other countries of Asia of its friendly and generous intentions.

The Philippines is the pilot plant of freedom and democracy in Asia, and what America does there in terms of friendly understanding and fair dealing will have a vastly more persuasive effect upon our neighbors than the broadcasts of the Voice of America and the squadrons of American bombers and battleships.

The true power of America does not rest on the dollar and the atom bomb. If these were the only source of American power, it would not last. The strength of America still rests on the conviction held by the free peoples of the world that America stands for justice, for freedom, for equality, for progress, for all the great humane values of our civilization. If this faith in America is lost, the dollar cannot redeem it and the atom bomb cannot restore it.

The decision that was taken last night at Lake Success reveals the true dimensions of the problem that America must face. America's responsibilities as the leader of the free world cannot be met by military strength alone. Those responsibilities can be met only if its relations with the free countries of the world are placed on a basis of mutual consideration and respect, and if its legitimate concern for the security of Europe and of European interests in Asia does not overshadow its equally legitimate concern for the freedom and progress of the Asian peoples.

Some bitterness will have been caused by the refusal of the majority of the Asian countries to support the antiaggression resolution of the General Assembly, but I trust that American statesmanship will overcome this natural disappointment and resolutely apply itself to the vital task of repairing the rifts that have appeared in the ranks of the free world. I dare, above all, to express the fervent hope that retaliatory measures shall not even be thought of, that the American policy of assisting the underdeveloped countries shall not suffer as a consequence, and that food or any other form of relief and assistance shall not be used as a weapon of political pressure or as an instrument of national policy. Tolerance, not resentment, becomes as of today the essential ingredient of the common faith and purpose of the free world.

The crisis that confronts us will bring with it the evil of narrow perspectives and short-term objectives. Though these may assume the appearance of necessity, they cannot take the place of wisdom. A basic ingredient of the wisdom which we now require is the capacity to fix our eyes on the long-term objectives of the free world. Those objectives are to keep alive the will to freedom and the will to resist those who would destroy freedom.

In this city of Paul Revere, it is a supererogation to stress the virtue of alertness to danger. We have been awakened to the peril of aggression and the risk of general war. The modern Paul Reveres of the press and the radio have done their job well, so well, in fact, that we seem to feel the need of a little serenity and reassurance. We need to order our thoughts, to ponder our course of action, to look beyond the horizon, to lift our eyes, as the Psalmist said, to the hills whence cometh our help.

We need, above all, to avoid the pitfall of despair and the rash actions which despair inspires. If American freedom was born at Bunker Hill, it is well to remember that Bunker Hill commemorates a military defeat. Even so was the freedom of the Philippines assured at Bataan, though Bataan brought only tragic disaster to our arms.

That we may lose the first encounters with the enemies of our freedom is not an occasion for despair. The principle of freedom will triumph in the end because we have refused to bargain with it, because from the first, as on Bunker Hill and in Bataan, we have resolved together to cherish it with courage and devotion till final victory is won.

(Dr. Marsh at this juncture conferred upon General Romulo the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa. It was the second time in its history that Boston University awarded an honorary degree at special exercises. Five years ago Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was similarly honored.)

Dr. Marsh, that this day should have been chosen to invest me with the honorary degree of doctor of laws is pleasure and satisfaction enough. It is like being served a rare and delicious fruit that is not in season. But to savor such a fruit in this company and on such an occasion is to compound the value of the gift. The personal honor that I feel I lay before you, Dr. Marsh, as a token of my high personal esteem and regard. But the honor that this award signifies for my country and my people I lay before this great Nation as a symbol of the mighty bonds of affection and gratitude that shall unite forever the people of America and the people of the Philippines.

Wage-Price Fiasco Another Symptom of Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wage-Price Fiasco Another Symptom of Anarchy," by Ralph A. Lee, managing editor, which appeared in the Southwest-Times Record, of Fort Smith, Ark., in the issue for Sunday, February 18, 1951.

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

WAGE-PRICE FIASCO ANOTHER SYMPTOM OF ANARCHY—GOVERNMENT APPEARS INCAPABLE NOW OF DEALING WITH FORCES IT SET IN MOTION

(By Ralph A. Lee)

In view of the wage-price fiasco and other disquieting symptoms of approaching anarchy, there is a real question whether Government as now constituted is capable of dealing with the disruptive forces that are developing.

Legislation by faction and by ballot pressure has grown so enormously that there is a question now whether Government creates circumstance or is the creature of circumstance. In the lackadaisical and belated attempt at wage-price control, Government obviously is a captive of some of the very circumstances it created.

Government is laying the basis for its eventual destruction when it deliberately prostitutes itself to the prejudices and the political innocence of its voters. Decadence is hastened when the electorate learns that by voting group interests it can obtain temporary benefits not available by voting individual convictions with only the general welfare in mind.

When a republic is subjected to this contamination, it gradually loses character and degenerates by degrees from one nameless form to another, ending usually in absolute dictatorship. The tragic story has been repeated time and again in history.

From all sides, there are warnings that inflation cynically set in motion 18 years ago is on the verge of getting completely out of hand. There is abundant evidence also that neither Congress nor the administration knows quite what to do about it.

The wage-price control effort has bogged down in a fruitless chicken-and-egg argument between labor and industry. Labor argues that wages have not caught up with prices, and for the unorganized majority this is true. It will be true a year from now, for it is the history of every inflation that wages never catch up with prices.

On the other hand, industry rightly insists that wages are the principal ingredient of prices, and that even a beginning of control is impossible until the wage factor is stabilized.

At this point the six members of the Wage Stabilization Board representing industry and the public voted approval of a formula limiting increases to 10 percent, and the three labor members resigned in protest. The 10-percent formula which produced the labor resignations was inflationary in itself, of course, and would have entailed an immediate increase in prices.

Without representation on the Board labor will feel itself under no obligation to abide by any of the Board's decisions. There will be strikes as usual, culminating as usual in further wage increases and further price increases.

No one wins or possesses even a worthwhile temporary advantage in this insane roundelay, but it will continue as long as people continue to think strictly in terms of group interests and without regard for the welfare of the country.

In the large sense, however, the temporary success of any wage-price scheme would have no important bearing on the basic forces which threaten disaster. Controls deal with the symptoms and not the origins of inflation. What is wrong fundamentally is the fact that the country for 18 years has been deceiving itself with printing-press money.

When an inflation has progressed as far as this one, a nation's economy can move only in one direction, and that direction is up. Public and private debt is accumulating to such an astronomical extent that it can be supported only in terms of dollars which are depreciating in value proportionately to the debt increase.

As a matter of practical economics, it would not be possible for this country to support its existing debt in terms of sound dollars of inflexible value. Any real attempt to stabilize the dollar at this point would tend to freeze the business expansion which has produced constantly increasing tax revenues and made municipal, State, and Federal debt management possible.

At the municipal and State levels a point of diminishing returns already is appearing and there are serious difficulties in the maintenance of governmental functions and in the provisions of debt service. As the inflation continues these subdivisions of government will bog down in fiscal chaos, and there will be pressure for the Federal Government to assume the responsibilities that the municipalities and States are unable to discharge.

With its own affairs in disorder, the Federal Government could not assume new responsibilities unless it disregarded completely the conflicting wills of the people and their pressure organizations.

Along that road lies rule by bullet and not by ballot.

The Atlantic Union Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial about the Atlantic Union resolution which appeared in the January 18, 1951, issue of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle.

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

CONGRESS ACTION ON ATLANTIC UNION MORE URGENT AS RED CRISIS GROWS

The Atlantic Union resolution, which we endorsed when it was introduced in Congress more than a year ago, has again been put forth by a large group of Senators and Representatives. The changed character of world affairs has given the sponsors of the resolution a feeling of urgency in their proposal, a feeling which seems completely justified.

Who can deny that the world is at the threshold—indeed, well into the area of danger—where the struggle is clearly between freemen and the enslaved puppets of tyranny? Whether the ultimate victory will be won through political prowess or by force of arms, the outcome will ring the death knell of one or the other—freedom or slavery.

On the one hand the Communist despots are firmly welded in the tight hand of Russian domination. The threatened democracies, on the other hand, are still dangerously asunder and unable to act in concert, even for their own salvation.

It is this historic division which the Atlantic Union resolution aims to correct. The sponsors, Senators LEHMAN, GEORGE, AIKEN, NIXON, KEFAUVER, and 22 others, are practical, hard-headed men. A mere military alliance, such as that under which General Eisenhower must collect his force against aggression, does not seem strong or final enough to these men. It is too easily broken, too confusing and impermanent to guarantee success.

Even General Eisenhower himself emphasized this need in London early this week when he said "the only way the free world can defend itself is for the free world to stick together." Surely we are not so politically immature as to refuse to explore the best way of accomplishing this.

The present alliance must be given political and economic force. The loose, 12-headed Atlantic Council which advises Eisenhower must be forged into a civil power with adhesion and strength.

The question is this:

Which type of valor is the best course for the democracies: To drown separately, though gallantly, in the sweeping tide of Communist imperialism or to unite and stem the tide with the same principles of free federal union which launched into the world this great Federal Union we now call the United States?

Nonsegregation Policy Vindicated in Combat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, clear evidence that a policy of nonsegregation in the Army pays off to the country is found in the appended dispatch in the New York Times of February 9, 1951:

MIXING OF GI UNITS PAYS OFF IN KOREA—MANY COMMANDERS HAIL END OF NEGRO SEGREGATION AS AID IN RECENT VICTORIES

(By George Barrett)

WITH THE EIGHTH ARMY, EAST OF SUWON, KOREA, February 8.—United States Army infantry outfits that are discarding Negro segregation practices in Korea are discovering that removal of the color line among fighting troops is paying good dividends both in morale and in battle.

For some weeks now the Army has been assigning white replacements to Negro units and Negro replacements to white units. In most cases this occurred because local commanders had to get whatever replacements they could without delay to bring their units back to fighting strength. This development has been for many Regular Army commanders a clue to their recent victories.

OBJECTIVE IS CAPTURED

Some days ago in this sector a battalion of white and Negro officers and Negro enlisted men took a double-barreled objective. They scaled two 1,200-foot heights and routed the Chinese Communist defenders, killing at least 250 of the enemy, wounding two to three times as many, and capturing 38 prisoners, an unusually high number.

When the fighting ended the men were ordered back down off the hill for the night to prevent a possible Chinese ambush, but they delayed their withdrawal for several dangerous hours to scour the heights for their wounded.

A Negro civil-affairs officer who voluntarily left his rear echelon sinecure to go

forward during the bitter fighting to lead a platoon that had been badly battered was killed in action.

The regimental commander is Col. Dennis M. Moore, of Clarksville, Tex., a veteran of the Corregidor fighting and a survivor of the Bataan death march. Colonel Moore said the Negro unit had as nasty an assignment as any United Nations outfit in Korea and had done a good job.

NO BAR TO FRIENDSHIPS

As the replacements intermingle more and more in the units, the officers are finding out that the new friendships are in nowise hampered by the soldiers' color. One lieutenant asked for volunteers and got the choice of one team of buddies—a Negro and a white soldier—or none. One regimental surgeon on another sector is a Negro lieutenant colonel and the other is white. To the Negro soldiers in the regiment both are respectfully known as Doc.

There are instances now of Negro officers having command of white troops and Negro officers outranking white officers, without any special friction in either case.

Probably typical of most white officers and soldiers is Lt. George M. Richardson, of Macon, Mo., who told this correspondent that when he was assigned to work with Negroes and whites together he told his superiors that as a deeply indoctrinated southerner he would try his best to go half way and even more. Actually, he added, he found he had never had a single case where he had to go more than half way. In most cases, he was not conscious of making any special effort at all.

He said that in combat in Korea the principle of mixed ranks had proved itself many times, but he predicted it would still be a long time before it would be accepted as a practice at home by the officers and men who were close in Korea.

Un-American Handwriting on the Walls of the House of Representatives

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to remove from the walls of the House of Representatives those ancient caricatures with which we are confronted, and to replace them with figures of distinguished Americans. Those alien figures are merely the handwriting of un-Americanism on our walls. There has been a concerted effort on the part of a lot of radicals in some of our educational institutions for 20 years, or more, to destroy American history and to discredit those great Americans who helped to establish and build this great Republic. Today we are told that two-thirds of the colleges in this country do not require any knowledge of American history.

I wonder why.

Now, let us take some of the individuals whose supposed likenesses have been placed on the walls of this House, at the suggestion of some of those radicals, and see how great Americans have been bypassed by this stupid procedure.

In the first place, that distorted figure of the American eagle overhead, which looks as if Stalin might have stamped on it, should be removed and replaced by that splendid figure of the American eagle which appears on the Government seal.

We could easily select from the list of great Americans who have served in this body, and whose names will ring down the centuries, regardless of the attempts now being made to undermine and destroy them, figures to fill every space occupied by these imitations of alleged ancient leadership.

We might place the figure of Christ up there beside that of Moses, to remind the world that this is still a Christian country. If Moses had lived during the time of Christ the chances are that he would have been the greatest Christian leader of all time.

Prior to the turn of the last century there were 18 Presidents of the United States who had served in this House or in the Continental Congress.

George Washington not only served in the Continental Congress but led our forces in the Revolutionary War, presided over the Constitutional Convention, and served 8 years as President of the United States. We have that glorious painting of Washington before us, delivering his Farewell Address to the American people. God grant that his majestic figure may forever be before the eyes of Members of this House. His Farewell Address was the greatest message of its kind ever issued. It warned us against the very dangers with which we are now threatened.

But if Washington were here today, he would be branded as an isolationist.

Thomas Jefferson served in the Continental Congress, as Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, Secretary of State, and Vice President, and then served as President of the United States for 8 years. The figure of Jefferson is already before us, so we need not worry about him. He followed the policy laid down by Washington in his Farewell Address and warned us in his first inaugural address that our foreign policy should be that of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

He would also be called an isolationist. We had better follow his sage advice, if we expect this Nation to endure.

He and George Mason are the only two Americans in that entire panorama. Let us keep them there.

We might remove that caricature of Hammurabi, who is said to have reigned in Babylon about 2,000 years before the Christian era, more than 1,000 years before Belshazzar's feast, and 600 years before King Tut began his centuries of peaceful slumber, and replace him with the likeness of glorious old Benjamin Franklin, one of the wisest men that ever lived. He served in the Continental Congress that declared our independence, and also in the Convention that wrote our Constitution—which has been described by one of the leading English statesmen of all time, as "the greatest document ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

You might replace that mythical figure of Lycurgus, a reputed Spartan lawmaker, who is said to have lived eight or nine hundred years before Christ, with the likeness of John Adams, who served in the Continental Congress, served as Vice President of the United States, and then served as President for 4 years.

Remember it was John Adams who seconded the motion for the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

James Madison served in the Continental Congress and in this House of Representatives, served as Secretary of State for 8 years, and then served 8 years as President of the United States. We might well substitute him for that figure of William Blackstone, said to have been placed there because of his commentary on the common law. As a matter of fact, Blackstone was a Member of Parliament just prior to the Revolution, and one of the greatest enemies the American Colonists ever had. He did not write the common law, but merely wrote a commentary on it. We might as well have used the figure of Greenleaf and credited him with having originated the Rules of Evidence because of his great work on that subject. I would suggest that the figure of Blackstone be removed and be replaced either by James Madison or by John Marshall, a former Member of this House, a brave soldier of the Revolution, and the greatest Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States this Nation has ever known.

We might remove that ghastly figure of Maimonides, who is said to have been a Jewish Rabbi in Egypt about 900 years ago. We could afford to replace him with Alexander Hamilton, one of the leading Members of the Continental Congress, a hero of the Battle of Yorktown, and a great Secretary of the Treasury under George Washington. He was largely responsible for the development of our monetary system.

Or we might replace him with James Monroe, one of the greatest Americans of all time, who was father of the Monroe Doctrine which has protected all American countries from invasion for more than 100 years. He was a Member of the Continental Congress, a Senator from Virginia, Minister to France, Governor of his native State, Minister to England, Secretary of State, and President of the United States for 8 years.

We could not find a better figure to fill that vacancy.

Why not remove that antiquated figure of Papinian up there, who is said to have been a great Roman lawyer more than 1,700 years ago, and replace him with old Patrick Henry, a Member of the Continental Congress, whose famous appeal for American independence stands today as the most powerful speech of its kind ever delivered in the same number of words in all the history of mankind.

Or, we might replace him with the figure of John Quincy Adams, a former President of the United States, and the only man who ever served in that capacity who later became a Member of this

House of Representatives, in which he served with honor and distinction up to the time of his death.

That figure of Napoleon Bonaparte up there by the side of that of Thomas Jefferson would probably make Jefferson turn over in his grave. Jefferson knew Napoleon personally, but did not admire him.

Why not replace him with the figure of Henry Lee, known as Gen. Light-Horse Harry Lee, one of the great heroes of the Revolution, as well as a great member of the Continental Congress, who led the fight in his own State for the adoption of the American Constitution, and who paid that great tribute to Washington in which he said he was "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

He was also the father of Robert E. Lee, who has long since been recognized as the "greatest commander of the English-speaking race."

Or, we might replace him with the figure of one of the greatest Presidents, as well as one of the greatest soldiers this Nation ever saw—Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, who served as a Member of this House, led our forces to victory in the War of 1812, and served as President of the United States for 8 years. Why leave him out and place the figure of Napoleon Bonaparte on the walls of this Chamber?

The American people would applaud such a change.

That ghastly figure of Solon, who is said to have been an Athenian statesman and lawgiver more than 600 years before Christ, might well be replaced by John Jay, a member of the Continental Congress from New York, Governor of New York, and the first Chief Justice of the United States, upon whose motion the Legislature of New York approved the Constitution of the United States on July 9, 1776.

Or, we might replace him with the figure of William Henry Harrison, a former Member of this House, who served as President of the United States, or that of his successor, John Tyler, who had also served as a Member of this body before he became Vice President, and who succeeded William Henry Harrison as President.

If you want the figure of a real Christian leader who was a real patriot and who served with distinction in this body, we might remove that figure up there of Innocent III, who is said to have lived about 800 years ago, and replace it with the figure of Frederick August Conrad Muhlenberg, a great Christian minister from Pennsylvania, a leading member in the Continental Congress, president of the State constitutional convention in 1777, and the first Speaker ever to preside over this House of Representatives under the Constitution of the United States. His people have been leaders in that State from the Revolution down. At least four of them have served in this body, the last one being his great, great grandson, Frederick A. Muhlenberg, who served in the Eightieth Congress.

Or, he might be replaced with the figure of James K. Polk, a former Speaker of this House, who later became President of the United States, or with that of William Jennings Bryan, one of the greatest Christian leaders of all time, who also served in this body, and whose famous lecture on the "Prince of Peace," will ring down the centuries as one of the outstanding Christian lectures of all time.

Jonathan Trumbull, of Connecticut, aide de camp to General Washington and Speaker of this House of Representatives in the Second Congress, might well replace that ancient figure of Gaius, a Roman lawyer or jurist, who lived 1800 years ago.

Or, his likeness might be replaced with that of Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, or James Buchanan, all of whom served as Members of this House, and later served as President of the United States.

We might replace that figure of Gregory IX, who was Pope of Rome about a thousand years ago, with that of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, a member of the Continental Congress, signer of the Declaration of Independence, who later became a leading Member of the United States Senate from the State of Maryland.

Or, we might replace him with the figure of either Abraham Lincoln or Jefferson Davis, both of whom served in this body, and who fought together in the Blackhawk War. Lincoln later served as President of the United States, and Davis as President of the Confederacy. I can think of nothing that would more clearly indicate that we have a reunited country than to place the figures of those two great Americans on the walls of this House, in which they both served.

We might replace that figure of Justinian over there, a Roman emperor who lived more than 1400 years ago, and also that of Tribonian, one of his chief flunkies, with Rutherford B. Hayes, who served in this body, and who later became President of the United States. It was his order taking the Federal troops out of the South that did more to reunite the country than anything else that had taken place up to that time.

We might remove that deceptive figure of Simon de Montfort, a British earl, who lived more than a thousand years ago, and whose main claim to distinction is that of being on both sides of a great issue. We might replace him with James A. Garfield, a former Member of this House, who also became President of the United States, or William McKinley, one of the leaders in this body, who later became President and served until his assassination by a ruthless anarchist who seemed to be a pioneer in this communistic movement to destroy the Government of the United States.

We might remove that alleged likeness of Louis IX, who served as King of France about 900 years ago, and that of Alphonso X, who is said to have served as King of Spain about the same time, as well as that of Edward I, who once served as King of England and failed in his life's ambition to overrun and conquer Scotland. We might replace either one of these three figures with Henry Clay or James C. Calhoun, both great Americans who served in this body and later served in the United States Senate with honor and distinction. It might not be a bad idea to replace a couple of them with the figures of U. S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, the two great military leaders in that unfortunate conflict known as the War Between the States.

Then there is the figure of Suleiman, Sultan of Turkey about 500 years ago, and Grotius, a Dutch humorist, according to the description in the RECORD, and Colbert, a French politician, who lived more than 300 years ago and of whom the average American never heard, and Pothier, a French professor, who lived a hundred years before the American Revolution—they should all be removed and replaced by distinguished Americans who have served in this body, such as Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, one of the greatest orators of all time, Benjamin H. Hill, who also served in this body, as well as in the United States Senate, and whose tribute to Robert E. Lee is unsurpassed, and hardly equaled, in all literature. We might replace one of them with L. Q. C. Lamar, a great leader from my own State, who served in this body, as well as in the United States Senate, in the Cabinet, and on the Supreme Court of the United States.

That would still leave us an almost inexhaustible list of great Americans who have served in this body, including Alexander H. Stephens, who served as Vice President of the Confederacy during the War Between the States, John J. Engles, whose tribute to Benjamin H. Hill will go down the centuries, or James G. Blaine, whose tribute to Garfield is one of the greatest orations ever delivered on the life of a great American.

We could come on down, Mr. Speaker, and invade the State of Texas and take glorious old Sam Houston, who served in this body, served as Governor of his great State, led the forces of Texas in their war for independence, served as President of the Texas Republic, and as a Member of the United States Senate. Why not substitute the likeness of Sam Houston for that of some of these ancient figures with which we are now confronted—or that of David Crockett, who also served in this body, and who gave his life at the Alamo that Texas might be free.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and name almost an endless list of great Americans who have served in this and the other body, or who have served our people with credit, honor, and distinction, in private life, such as Thomas Alva Edison, the greatest inventive genius of all times, who illuminated this old earth and made it mock the starry splendor of the skies, or Walter Reed, who probably did more to improve the health of the world and to relieve human suffering than any other man who ever lived. It was he who showed the world how to get rid of yellow fever, one of the greatest plagues the world ever knew, and inci-

dentally, how to prevent malaria, typhoid, and other similar diseases. He deserves a monument almost as high as that of Washington's.

I could name other great Presidents, as well as great Members of this body or of the United States Senate, great military leaders, great writers, great inventors, and great religious leaders, who are far more entitled to the distinction of having their figures placed upon these walls than are these ancient representatives of foreign lands, alien tongues, and anti-American sentiments with which the walls of this magnificent Chamber are now disgraced.

We should replace them all with the figures of great Americans.

A Reminiscence of Grover Hall by Carroll Kilpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we in Alabama are proud of having given to the Nation the late Grover C. Hall, editor of the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser. Grover Hall was a brilliant warrior for the freedom and dignity of the individual, a Pulitzer prize winner, and an editor acclaimed throughout the Nation. His one-time associate, Mr. Carroll Kilpatrick, of Alabama, a distinguished author, has done a portrait of Grover Hall for Nieman Reports, January 1951. I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PORTRAIT OF A NATIVE—A REMINISCENCE OF GROVER HALL

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

One hot summer day in Montgomery, Ala., nearly 15 years ago, a distinguished looking man in a handsome double-breasted suit, a cane on his arm, and a talisman rose in his buttonhole, walked spryly down the main street, attracting much attention. He tipped his hat to his friends, who looked a bit startled but warmly returned his greeting. Not until he sat down in his favorite restaurant did he realize why there had been so many lifted eyebrows. His carefully trimmed mustache was in order, but he had left his collar and tie behind, hanging on the old-fashioned hatrack in his office, under the portraits of Lee, Jackson, and Cleveland.

That was one of the few times that Grover Cleveland Hall, editor in chief of the Montgomery Advertiser, was not equal to the occasion.

Grover Hall was one of the South's greatest editors in a day when fighting, personal editors were largely a thing of the past in American history. He was a human being with a greater passion for life and people—and a greater passion for the basic human decencies—than anyone I have known. His religion was freedom—freedom of the human spirit—and he practiced his religion faithfully and fearlessly. For so doing he was honored with the love of thousands of people, and he won Nation-wide applause.

Hall was the product of our eroded soil. He lived all his life in a State once ruled by the Ku Klux Klan. He had only a meager education and he was untraveled. But he believed in the dignity of man, and he spent his life trying to lighten the burdens of his fellow men.

In his youth, Hall knew the deepest poverty. His later life was not without tragedy, for his wife was long an invalid. Yet this man, without inheritance except the great freedom to make his own life, was an example of the blessing that freedom can be and of how it can enrich our soil. To a whole generation who knew his tremendous buoyancy, his relish for life and his essential goodness, Hall was a symbol and a guide. In this present time of troubles, when we are confronted with another terrible challenge to our faith in our heritage of freedom, the thing that Hall was and the faith he maintained stand as proof of the genius of this free land.

Hall was born in 1888 on a farm in one of the poorest parts of Alabama. It was 9 miles from his home to the nearest railroad. His town had never known, he once said, a football player, a Roman Catholic, or a Harvard graduate.

When still a plowboy in Henry County, he was invited by his older brother, then editing a paper in Dotham called the Daily Siftings, to join the paper as a printer's devil. Not long thereafter the paper folded and Hall spent several years on several different nearby small town papers.

In 1910, he moved to the capital of his State to become associate editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, a vigorous, conservative newspaper with a strong political bent. His first editorial was in defense of the right of Alice Roosevelt to smoke cigarettes. From that day on he fought against prohibition and blue laws, against antisedition and antievolution laws and for the right of man to govern himself. He continued as associate editor until 1926, when he became chief editor of a paper that always gave the editor very great freedom of action.

When Hall moved into the editor's office at the age of 38, Alabama was dominated by the KKK. Senator J. Thomas Heflin, Gov. Bibb Graves, a large part of the legislature, much of the Baptist and Methodist clergy, and many of the small-town editors were pro-Klan. Hall attacked them all, savagely and by name. Physical floggings increased. Night riders could be seen almost every week performing their vicious missions against the weak and unprotected.

Hall's vigor and his anger were equal to the challenge, and he gave no quarter. He wrote powerful, vitriolic editorials, highly readable and effective. "What a callous and wretched demagog Heflin is," he wrote.

Finally, the inevitable threat on Hall's life was made one night in a telephone call as he worked late, as usual, in his office. Hall bought a pistol and carried it for 2 days. "Then I put it aside with scorn and shame," he told me later. "I'm no gunman, anyhow. I can't shoot." He was never threatened again. But the violence of the fight continued.

In January 1928, as if to throw further defiance at the Klan, Hall declared for the nomination for President on the Democratic ticket of Alfred E. Smith, a Catholic and a wet and a darling of the anti-Klan forces throughout the country.

Tom Heflin immediately went after Hall and the Advertiser. "When I said the Advertiser had come out for Al Smith," Heflin solemnly informed the United States Senate, "I said the whisky interests and the Roman Catholics had gone down there and put sugar in their coffee." Heflin later pledged more than 35 large audiences to boycott the Advertiser. But the paper's circulation increased steadily as the campaign developed, and Smith carried Alabama in November. His majority was assured by the vote he won in the middle- and south-Atlantic counties where the Advertiser was the Democratic bible.

Hall's unrelenting fight against Heflin and the Klan won him the Pulitzer prize for the best editorial writing in 1928. His campaign against gangism, flogging, and racial and religious intolerance had brought him national attention.

Two years later the victory was complete. Hall saw Heflin's strength as a towering Alabama politician broken at the polls, and the Advertiser's candidate for governor on an anti-Klan platform carried the State.

The new Governor unmasked the Klan, broke its grip on the jury boxes, and reformed the primary voting laws which had made many Klan victories possible. The Klan was a thing of the past in the State which once had been the home of the Confederacy.

A few years later, Hall, sentimental human being that he was, appealed to Alabama's Senators to help Heflin find a job. The two old enemies, who had little in common but their love of politics and good yarns, became reconciled.

But when Heflin later tried to make a political comeback, Hall dipped his pen in the old ink and helped block the former Senator's last attempt to gain public office. "Heflin is Heflin, a buffoon, and a hog-bladder," Hall wrote in summarizing his opposition to Tom.

"I know I'm a softie," Hall used to say after spending a few hours swapping stories with Heflin. "I have never really hated anyone—and I've known some of the lousiest men ever born of woman. Stump speakers have called me variously 'liar,' 'buzzard,' 'kept,' 'atheist,' and 'Roman Catholic.' But most of them have been courteous and generous, and we usually became friends in the end."

The Klan in Alabama in the twenties was primarily anti-Catholic, directing only secondary attention to the Jew and the Negro. It was the effrontery of a majority attacking a tiny minority that aroused Hall's burning contempt.

Hall's anger was aroused again a few years later when the Nazis sought to make a scapegoat of the Jew. "In Nazi Germany," he said, "I should probably be accounted eligible for all the current benefits of citizenship. My line must have been purged soon after the panic in the Garden of Eden. I am Anglo-Saxon-Pict-Celt-Welsh, out of an interminable line of deep-water Baptists. My forebears on both sides 'Lindberghed' across the Atlantic, the biggest ocean then known to them, and some of them later became involved in the American Revolution."

Hall said he was either born tolerant or learned tolerance early. "At any rate," he wrote, "I came early in my days to like minorities and to distrust majorities with regard to all questions involving delicate human relationships and prejudice. I had Jewish neighbors along with Catholic and Protestant neighbors, but that was after—or maybe it was how—I came to know that Jews were people like other people, a part of the warp and woof of the same country that had nurtured my ancestors and me."

Despite his qualifications in forebears, Hall could not have survived a day in a country where one group ruled over another and where one man claimed superior wisdom. If he had not been shot for defying the regime, he would have died of suffocation. In a

letter to me that could apply just as well today to another monstrous totalitarianism, Hall outlined his basic philosophy.

"The Advertiser," he said, "has but one dogma—freedom of the human spirit. It believes in the right of each and every human being in the two hemispheres to think and say what he likes, and it will angrily attack anyone who questions that right.

"With reference to all other social and political questions, the Advertiser is purely pragmatic. It supports what it likes, rejects what it does not like. The Advertiser pleads always for the utmost freedom of the human mind, at last the only friend of man, the only known link with what we call God. It affirms that the man has not yet lived who has the right to say what another human being, however lowly, shall think and say. This is the Advertiser's primary passion."

When Hall offered me his old job as associate editor, he said I would never be asked to write anything I didn't want to write except the anniversary and "drive" editorials. "You would be expected to whoop for the YMCA, the Salvation Army, and the Community Chest once a year," he said. Hall thoroughly disliked the task of writing anniversary and "drive" editorials. He had done only one that had really pleased him—a Christmas editorial 14 words long, written one year when he was engaged in a particularly bitter fight with a couple of political bosses. Hall's editorial that Christmas morning said:

"With one or two well-chosen exceptions, we wish everyone a very merry Christmas."

Everyone got the point.

The anniversary that almost proved Hall's nemesis (and confirmed his opposition to anniversary editorials) was a Fourth of July—a Fourth that Hall never forgot. Just before the holiday he stuck his head into his assistant's office and said:

"We have a lot of Fourth of July fans. I think I'll write a piece in honor of the great day."

He did. He wrote a long, glowing editorial about the birth of the Federal Constitution. The next morning as he drank his coffee he looked over his handiwork.

"I read the editorial and nearly fainted," he confessed afterwards. "As soon as I saw it I realized that the Fourth is the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, not of the Constitution. I expected to be kidded outrageously from one end of the State to the other. But my original theory was confirmed—nobody takes note of an anniversary editorial."

The next day Hall wrote a nice editorial about the Declaration of Independence, but he did not stop to explain that the day to celebrate the birth of the Constitution is September 17, not July 4.

Hall's lighter side, which endeared him to thousands of people and won him an amazingly large audience, found its best vehicle in Clarabelle. One day as Hall sat at his typewriter in the old building that had been a hotel during the Civil War he was interrupted by a purring noise. A stray cat, dirty and hungry, had made its way to his office.

Hall fed the visitor, gave her a name, and began writing occasional short paragraphs about her activities. The reaction of his readers was spontaneous. "We have decided to name the office cat Clarabelle," he wrote, "but actually she does not deserve so swell and lovely a name. She has dirt all over her body. She is the most ungrateful bum among all the retainers of the Advertiser."

To satisfy the demands of his customers, Hall wrote more and more about the cat, of her views on Hitler and other disturbers of the peace. Before long his mail became so heavy with comments about his feline visitor—one reader sent him a cat encyclopedia—that he threatened to be rid of the animal.

But Clarabelle was an institution.

"The Advertiser is asked to write more about Clarabelle," he said one morning. "But what is it to say of such an unworthy, unreliable member of the staff? She comes by this office only to eat her beef and sip her cream and take a nap."

For 2 years, Hall reported on Clarabelle's love life, her offspring, which were numerous, her unruly disposition and her ability to absorb great quantities of coffee cream.

Whenever Hall made a speech, there were demands from the floor for the latest intelligence on Clarabelle. Hall spent hours trying to pet the sullen cat, all the while insisting that he did not like cats. Once, when he couldn't find her kittens after he had promised one to a neighbor's child, he wrote:

"Clarabelle never hides herself, being without reticence, but always hides her kittens. She is a chiseler, a cynic and a dead-beat. The Advertiser is on the point of breaking with her once and for all."

But as long as Clarabelle survived, she was fed and humored—and talked about wherever Advertiser readers lived.

Hall loved the cat, but his greatest love was the newspaper business. He thought that it was favored above all others. And he thought that newspapermen were a race apart. Every young writer had Hall's help and encouragement. "Read David and Solomon," he would say to them. "They were the best columnists of their time. They could do their stuff and bring down the curtain in a flash.

"Pour your souls into your work. Write no witticism that does not spring from conviction, or some principle of philosophy, but take liberties with style. Get fresh about pompous utterances of vast wigs. Speak softly of the sad—and quit when you are through. Spoof, sympathize, interpret—but quit writing when the sap stops flowing."

When the time came to speak softly, Hall could speak as Father Montgomery. When a local dignitary deserved honoring, Hall knew how to do it well. When a friend died, he was deeply shaken and his obituary editorials came from the heart. Here is the first paragraph of one on the death of a local clergyman:

"Dr. Charles A. Stakely came quietly into this strange world, remained for 78 years to study some of its mysteries, but never to be bowed down by any of them, and then at last breathed softly and made a characteristically quiet exit. He was a compassionate wondrously understanding man. He never said a harsh thing about those who were destined to live this unpredictable life. He counseled them and strengthened them, but he never condemned them beyond their grace to bear."

The Advertiser was founded in 1828 by a Jacksonian editor, who soon thereafter was run out of town by the Whigs. "The Advertiser remained from its birth until 1929 a hardy States-rights newspaper, always under vigorous editorship," Hall once told me in the mid-thirties. "But after the depression I compromised to conform to the unexpected needs of society, and today I do not know whether we are for States rights or human rights first. Lately I have endeavored to reconcile Bourbons to the facts of a changing life and a novel experience."

Hall was a poor economist, however able he may have been as a philosopher. He was bored by statistics. He was often swayed more by human appeals than by factual analyses. The New Deal often disturbed and perplexed him, but the personality and humanity of Roosevelt won him. Hall supported Roosevelt in three elections and unquestionably would have a fourth time had Hall lived.

Hall was proud of the staff he organized on the Advertiser, and he spent hours with the men who worked for him. "The Advertiser is the least bossed newspaper gang I ever saw," he said one day. "I don't like to have people around me who need bossing. I like gentlemen who love their work and will respond to suggestion and their native instincts."

The publisher of the Advertiser and Hall were on good terms, but Hall did not hide the fact that he looked askance at business-office publishers. Once he was invited to address the American Society of Newspaper Editors on the subject The Problem of the American Editor. A few days after he accepted the invitation to make the speech, he received a telegram explaining that he would have to keep it to 15 minutes. "I don't need that much time to expound the problems of the American editor," Hall replied. "The problem can be put in one sentence, to wit, how to get the publishers out of the second grade."

Grover Hall's heroes were the famous personal editors—Frank Cobb, Henry Watterson, William Allen White. He had their gift of an easy, readable style as well as a Mencken-esque invective when the occasion warranted. Hall did not feel a close kinship with the latter-day editors of some of the more serious and solemn dailies.

"They have native wisdom and acquired culture," he said. "They are bright and entertaining. But they lack passion."

And that is what Grover Hall never lacked.

Senator Frear: Delaware's Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Dover (Del.) Index relating to the activities of the distinguished junior Senator from the first State [Mr. FREAR].

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

THE MAN OF THE YEAR

Even though 1951 is only 7 weeks old, we've just about made up our minds that Delaware's man of the year is United States Senator J. ALLEN FREAR. In seven short weeks Senator FREAR—Delaware's freshman in Congress—has achieved an amazing record that is fast making him one of the most important men in congressional circles.

What makes Senator FREAR such an important figure in Washington today is his sincere conviction to do what is right for the people he represents, regardless of political dictates. It didn't take the Joe McCarthy headline technique to win recognition for Senator FREAR in this present session of Congress. It took the realization of political leaders of both parties to recognize that in times such as these the guidance of able, conscientious, and politically tolerant leaders is sorely needed. And Senator FREAR is one of those leaders.

During the last political campaign in Delaware we noticed that Senator FREAR had refrained active participation. Why? We do not know. We can only speculate. But if it was because the State political leaders didn't feel that his advice was necessary, they certainly must have had a rude awakening when the Democratic leaders of the

Eighty-second Congress offered him two prize political leadership posts on the floor of the United States Senate—and he turned them down to maintain that independence of action that has won him the respect of Delawareans from one end of the State to the other regardless of political affiliations.

Senator FREAR is a member of the most important and powerful committees of the Congress there are today. The fact that a Senator from Delaware—considered a "political nobody" because of his State's smallness in size and population—should achieve such important assignments is indeed indicative of the respect Washington has placed upon Senator FREAR.

Last Friday night Senator FREAR addressed the Nation from coast to coast on an important issue in the present economy of our country which is gearing itself for all-out defense production. He spoke of the importance of defense housing needs. But unlike most speakers from the congressional seats, he told the Nation about his own State and how its problems in a little boom town like Newark could be applied anywhere in the Nation. In that one broadcast, Senator FREAR became a one-man chamber of commerce.

We have a feeling that Senator FREAR will be called upon more and more to take before the people of the Nation the important problems that face our country. We feel that when Senator FREAR does present these problems, the listeners of the United States can be assured that they are not listening to a mouthpiece for an administration or political party, but to an able leader with the sincerest confidence in the problems he presents.

Indian Bureau Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the headline "CHAVEZ scores Myer's control," dealing with the Indian Service, and published in the Denver Post of February 14, 1951.

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

CHAVEZ SCORES MYER'S CONTROL

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., February 14.—Strong criticism of Indian Bureau Administration was voiced here Tuesday by United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ (Democrat), of New Mexico.

He indicated that a shake-up of Indian Bureau officials was in the wind and that he was dissatisfied with the work of Indian Commissioner Dillon S. Myer.

"There's been entirely too much attention to the interests of the Indian Bureau and not enough attention to the interest of the Indians," CHAVEZ said.

"When I return to Washington I intend to look into the matter thoroughly."

The senior New Mexico Senator said that the purpose of the Indian Bureau is to advise, not control, the lives of the Indians.

INDIANS PROTESTING

"If you needed a doctor or a lawyer or a dentist," CHAVEZ said, "you shouldn't have to go to the Government to find out which one you should employ. I understand that Commissioner Myer has now made it impossible for an Indian to consult an attorney of his choice without the consent of the Indian Service."

In the last few months both Navajo and Mescalero Indians have voiced strong protests of Federal management of their affairs. The Navajos have been particularly bitter since uranium has been found on their lands and little has been done by the Indian Bureau to aid them in obtaining mining equipment or attracting outside aid.

"I feel sure," CHAVEZ said, "that the entire New Mexico congressional delegation will be solidly behind any investigation to protect the Indians in all their rights, personal or property. And if there is any attempt being made to exploit his rights in minerals or other details, it is high time we looked into the situation."

CHAVEZ cited several cases where Indians capable of caring for their own affairs are being harassed by bureaucratic dictation. He said that the Indians need education, water rights, and medical care, and beyond that a nearly free hand in their own administration.

"We have Indian boys fighting in Korea," CHAVEZ said, "and we had them fighting all over the world in the last war. If they are good enough citizens to fight in our Army and Navy, then it's high time we realized that they are citizens in the full sense."

URGES LESS CONTROL

He advocated immediate limited self-government for most of the Indian tribes. He was more definite about the Navajos of New Mexico and Arizona.

"The Navajo can be made self-sufficient by protecting his property rights and training him to his duties as a full citizen," the Senator declared.

"But the biggest thing we can do for them," he added, "is to leave them alone."

Presidential Pettiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Presidential Pettiness," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1951. The editorial speaks for itself.

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

PRESIDENTIAL PETTINESS

If it be true that the small things a man does are apt to reveal his true stature, there is not much comfort for anyone in the President's latest tilt with Senator BYRD.

As President of the United States, Mr. Truman occupies what is certainly one of the most important offices in the world. It is not an exaggeration to say that the decisions he makes can and probably will have the most profound effect on the future of our civilization. What is one to think, then, when the President stoops to a level of petty politics that would be unworthy of a county political boss?

After a 2-year feud with southern Democrats, Mr. Truman last week sent to the Senate a long list of postmasterships. Included were eight that had been recommended by Representative BURR HARRISON, of Virginia. But a ninth Harrison recommendation—that for Berryville—was held up.

Berryville, of course, is Senator BYRD's home town, and the withholding of that nomination was a slap at him. Actually, Senator BYRD did not make the selection. Ordinarily Representatives make the recommendations for postmasters, but as a matter of courtesy they defer to the wishes of a Senator where his home town is concerned. In this instance Senator BYRD made no recommendation of his own, merely concurring in Mr. HARRISON'S preference. So the rebuff intended for the Senator falls somewhat wide of the mark.

An injury, however, has been done, although not to Senator BYRD. If Mr. Truman thinks he can undermine the Senator in Virginia by such small-minded tactics as this, he had better think again. But the postmaster in question, one H. B. Harris, will have to continue on an acting basis, which means that he cannot earn retirement credit despite the fact that his service has been wholly satisfactory. So Mr. Harris, because he serves in Senator BYRD'S home town, will suffer to some extent.

The real victim, however, will be the office of the President of the United States. It is hard to think of anything more damaging to the prestige of the Presidency, or more likely to impair confidence in the stature of the man who holds the office, than such petty, picayunish politicking as th'

George Washington's Faith in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, once again we celebrate the birthday of our first President, whose military genius won for us our independence, and whose wisdom and love for freedom safely guided our struggling new Nation through the crucial early years of its existence. He fought for liberty with the sword, and once having gained it for his people, he devoted his life to preserving it.

We have revered the memory of the father of our country for so many generations that it is difficult to realize that he was made to suffer heartache because of his zeal to preserve liberty for the people of his country.

Walter Winchell, outstanding columnist, gives us a most enlightening and touching account of the outrageous assaults directed against Washington while he was serving his country and the first President's reactions to the attacks. In his column, Washington Meets the Press, Mr. Winchell shows us the man Washington setting the example of preserving liberty, although at untold cost to himself in frustration and personal anguish. It is such an inspiring article that I urge all Members of Congress to read it:

[From the Washington Post of February 22, 1951]

WASHINGTON MEETS THE PRESS

(By Walter Winchell)

The military genius of our initial Chief Executive has been faithfully recorded and

rightfully acclaimed. The shimmer of the 48 stars reflects the gleam of his sword. However, his triumphs did not end at Yorktown. Some of Washington's most inspiring victories were attained on the bloodless battleground of political strife. In some ways the battles in this field inflicted deeper spiritual agony than the physical rigors at Valley Forge. A lie can cause more pain than bruised flesh—the flesh heals more quickly than the spirit. He was the victim of outrageous journalistic assaults. A portion of the criticism was honest—but most of the attacks were sheer vituperation. It is the measure of Washington's greatness that his devotion to liberty was not undermined by Americans who perverted it. Despite the savagery of editorial blasts, he not only struggled to keep freedom intact, but sought to strengthen it.

The virulence of the abuse directed at Washington has seldom been surpassed. The personal vilification also extended to his family. But he rejected the counsel of advisers who urged him to suppress the instigators of the venomous press campaign. Washington never condoned treason, sedition, or lawlessness. When Pennsylvania citizens defied an excise law and threatened insurrection, he used force to crush the rebellion. His restraint in dealing with press attackers stemmed from his faith in liberty and the knowledge that freedom is indivisible. He knew that suppressing opposition newspapers would shatter the keystone of the democratic structure.

He noted: "Freedom will survive a minority who do not use it wisely. It gives wisdom to the majority who love it deeply."

He retaliated against vilifiers with a crackling display of wit. When one detractor ranted: "Washington is suffocating the truth," he calmly responded: "My enemies say I suffocate the truth. My friends know that I embrace it."

He had journalistic defenders as well as belittlers, of course. J. W. Fenno, a pro-Washington editor, once whipped the critics with this lashing: "They are the most base, false, servile, and venal publications that ever polluted the fountains of society—their editors the most ignorant, mercenary, and vulgar automatons that ever were moved by the continually rustling wires of sordid avarice." Whew.

The following is Editor D. C. Claypoole's description of his quaint interview with President Washington: "He received me kindly, and after paying my respects to him, desired me to take a seat near him; then, addressing himself to me, said that he had for some time past contemplated retiring from public life, and had at length concluded to do so at the end of the present term. He had some thoughts and reflections on the occasion, which he deemed proper to communicate to the people of the United States in the form of an address, and which he wished to appear in the Daily Advertiser—of which I was editor. He paused and I took the opportunity of thanking him for having preferred that paper as the channel of communication with the people, then I quietly withdrew."

Such was the formal dignity of eighteenth century interviews. The result of that interview was a historic scoop. But Editor Claypoole didn't rush into print in the frenzied manner of modern journalism. It took over a week for the big news to reach print—when the Gazette published Washington's Farewell Address.

When the scurrilous press campaign began his reaction was expressed in a letter to a friend: "But in what will this abuse terminate? For the result, as it respects itself, I care not; for I have a consolation within that no earthly effort can deprive me of, and that is that neither ambition nor interested motives have influenced my conduct. The arrows of malevolence, therefore, however barbed and well pointed, never can reach the most vulnerable part of me; though, whilst I am up as a mark, they will continually be aimed."

The foregoing analysis of his bitter battle with the press was correct. But the constant barrage of invective finally shattered his philosophic calm. A man of great dignity, Washington was unable to descend to the level of meeting mud with mud. The resulting frustration caused deep personal anguish. Shortly before he retired to Mount Vernon, he made his private heartache public by declaring: "I never dreamed that I should be accused of being the enemy of this Nation, that every act of my administration would be tortured, and the grossest and most insidious misrepresentation of them be made as could scarcely be applied to a Nero or a common pickpocket."

Amidst the storms of vilification Washington never lost sight of the essential need for a free press. He always endeavored to extend the beams of liberty's beacons. He knew the greatest wealth of a free nation was not in its farms and factories—but in the liberty of its people. That is our priceless legacy, and Washington sought to preserve the treasure—by helping newspapers enlighten the people. He urged Congress to repeal the transportation tax on newspapers by reminding the legislators: "No resource is so firm for the Government of the United States as the affection of the people, guided by an enlightened policy; and to this primary good nothing can conduce more than a faithful representation of public proceedings, diffused without restraint throughout the United States."

Washington's exalted position today makes it difficult for us to believe the widespread bitterness engendered by the torrent of abuse. His pictures were publicly defaced; he was denounced at mass meetings; and there was one assassination attempt. Not a dirty trick was missed by his attackers. A New York Gazette published forged letters in an effort to embarrass the President.

When the fraud was exposed Washington observed: "Falsehood can wound a man, but truth strikes the final blow."

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Brotherhood Week this year is particularly timely, because of the stress of the critical position in which this country finds itself. In such periods of tension and danger, it is especially vital that we face the crisis as a united people, as citizens of the Unites States first and foremost. We cannot afford to be weakened by prejudices and preconceived ideas. For this reason, Brotherhood Week takes on added meaning for all of us this year.

Being unified, however, does not mean being stereotyped or being reduced to a common denominator in which we would lose all our individuality. Rather, being unified means the recognition of the true and inimitable worth of individuality. Unity through tolerance and freedom from prejudice means recognition that religious faith and racial origins contribute to each person's make-up, his unique personality, but only contribute. They are not the only molding factors which cause a person to think and react as he does. A person is a complex combination of all his family background, religious and secular teachings, plus all his experiences since the date of his birth. Each human being is a completely irreplaceable and separate entity and an entity of priceless value.

Thus, the deepest meaning that Brotherhood Week can have for us—the greatest lesson it can teach—is that each person has the inalienable right to be judged as an individual, not prejudged because of his origin, religion, or racial background. Human and therefore fallible, all of us need to be reminded of the ideals on which this country was founded and which constitute our moral and spiritual heritage. "All men are created equal"—that is the meaning of Brotherhood Week.

Because we need reminding occasionally, I have introduced a resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September as Interfaith Day. This resolution—House Joint Resolution 22—sets forth the basic principle that the fomenting of antagonism between Americans on the basis of sectarian creed is contrary to American traditions and to the spirit of the guaranties of freedom of worship embodied in the Constitution, and since it should be the policy of Congress to encourage mutual understanding of all people of good will, that this September Sunday shall be observed as Interfaith Day.

America is the guardian and stronghold of freedom, equality, and tolerance in this troubled world. Anything that can be done to encourage and strengthen the practice of these prime virtues must not be neglected. If we are to succeed in the spiritual and moral battle for men's minds—if we are to succeed in selling this democracy, equality, and freedom abroad—we must maintain our domestic vitality and strength by the daily practice of these fundamental principles at home.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle:

TEST OF AN IDEAL

Many moving phrases will be penned this week to the ideal of Brotherhood Week, in which annually the National Conference of Christians and Jews tries to strengthen the family ties that unite all peoples, everywhere. The real test of an ideal is not the homage that is paid to it, but the concrete results that can be measured from it. By that test we believe all Americans this week may take renewed heart, for by all standards we are a more tolerant, united, and understanding people than were our ancestors in the days of slavery, religious rivalries, and the Ku Klux Klan.

Reminders of the old evils exist, too abundantly, yet all in all we are less concerned about our neighbor's religion today, more concerned about his character and worth, than were earlier generations. People of all faiths work together, serve side by side in humanitarian causes, form firm

friendships. In divisions based on color and race we have farther to go, yet even there the new laws continually added to our statute books and the widening front of the battle against prejudice are heartening signs of progress.

Brotherhood in its highest conception is world-wide, and we Americans, who represent almost all the national blood lines of the world and who have made democracy work, are the people who ought to take the lead in showing the world what can be done. The world may take note from us that brotherhood does not mean giving up individuality, it does not mean agreement on everything, it does not mean planing everyone down to a common pattern. The germ of what brotherhood really does mean is in the United Nations. People can be united and at the same time have their national characteristics. They need not all be alike; they need only recognize their common humanity and the right of every nation to its own way of life.

A certain lawyer, thinking to trick Jesus, asked Him, "Who is my neighbor?" And Jesus proceeded to tell of the Samaritan who came upon a wounded man by the roadside, and without asking any questions picked him up, tended him, and got a room for him. Really, that's about all there is to brotherhood. It is trite but eternally true to remind ourselves that if it were put to practice everywhere, we would not today be scrambling on the brink of disaster.

A Spokesman for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate in the United Nations on the Korean cease-fire question, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines and permanent delegate to the United Nations, led in the discussion to brand Communist China an aggressor. Long before this debate, however, on December 7, 1950, General Romulo replied to the accusations against the United States made by Chinese Communist Delegate Wu in a manner that won for him the admiration and the gratitude of the American people. His speech in reply to Wu was inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD in volume 96, part 18, pages 7892–7894.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two editorials, one by the Daily Mirror of December 9, 1950, and another by the New York Times of December 10, 1950, both of which I believe accurately express the sentiments of the people of the United States regarding General Romulo's courageous and forthright stand:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of December 9, 1950]

GOOD FRIEND CARLOS

That wonderful big guy, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, foreign secretary of the Philippines, gave it to the Russians in their teeth at the UN Thursday—an Asian speaking to Asians, exposing the Red liars' blackest lie. Hear:

"I say, sir, that you can make this false accusation against so-called American imperialism in Russian, but you cannot say it in Chinese.

"You cannot say it in Chinese unless you are speaking in translation from Russian. You cannot say it in Chinese because no Chinese who knows the history of his country and who is aware of the long historic friendship between the Chinese people and the American people can make this accusation without sounding as if he were faithfully parroting the stale phrases of Russian propaganda."

General Romulo then related the story of American imperialism in the Philippines:

"Instead of oppressing the people, they taught them to cherish freedom. Instead of ruling the country with an iron hand, they trained the people in the art of self-government. Instead of keeping the people in ignorance, the better to keep them docile, they built schools, libraries, colleges, and state university. Instead of destroying their national consciousness, they developed the people's pride in their own history and traditions. And as for profits, it is a matter of record that America never did make money in the Philippines. Even the American troops stationed there never lived off the land or the taxes of the people; they were paid out of the United States Treasury.

"In 1946 * * * the United States fulfilled its pledge to the letter and recognized the independence of the Philippines."

The Voice should get this statesman's speech to all Asia. One million copies of it should be dropped over the Communist Chinese army.

General Romulo is a true friend of ours—and of freedom's.

[From the New York Times of December 10, 1950]

TESTIMONY FROM ASIA

The western powers in general and the United States in particular are placed in a somewhat embarrassing position by the barrage of false Communist propaganda in respect to their imperialism and aggressive intentions. They have given assurances and these are ignored. They can protest against falsehood but they cannot justify themselves in detail without the appearance of self-righteousness.

Into this situation General Romulo stepped on Thursday with an eloquent and detailed answer to the Chinese Communist diatribe against the United States. He made it plain that he was speaking as an Asian for the benefit of other Asians. He recounted his first-hand acquaintance with American imperialism and its fruits in the Philippines. He contrasted American actions, both there and in China, with actions of the Soviet Union "in the same region and at the same point of time," he said, because he believed this was "the most effective way to refute the charges of so-called American imperialism in Asia."

It was this record that he presented to the Chinese Communist representative in these words:

"I say, sir, that you can make this false accusation against so-called American imperialism in Russian, but you cannot say it in Chinese. You cannot say it in Chinese unless you are speaking in translation from Russian. You cannot say it in Chinese because no Chinese who knows the history of his country and who is aware of the long historic friendship between the Chinese people and the American people can make this accusation without sounding as if he were faithfully parroting the stale phrases of Russian propaganda. This country, which has never been at war with China, which was the one great power that took no part in the spoliation of China, which has consistently championed the cause of the Chinese people against their traditional enemies—the Japanese and the Russians—which has generously given help to the Chinese people in adversity, this great country, with such a record, can face the representative of the Peiping regime and shame him into silence."

This is testimony from Asia and it is friendly and welcome at this point. If the Chinese Communists are not willing to accept the expressions of good faith of the West, the Chinese people, whom they misrepresent, may eventually hear the tones of other voices. This certainly is General Romulo's belief and it is for that reason that he speaks. It will serve the cause of freedom if more and more perceptive Asians will raise their voices to join him in his expression of faith and hope when he says:

"In the face of the historical facts and the facts of record we do not believe that the peoples of Asia and, in particular, the Chinese people will remain deceived for a long time regarding the motives and policies of the United States and the Soviet Union. We understand full well that today the Chinese people are not free, that access to these facts has been barred to them by the machinations of vicious and lying propaganda."

A Message to the People of Western Europe by Hon. H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Wednesday, February 21, I recorded a message to the people of Western Europe, in which I discussed the efforts of the Atlantic community to strengthen itself against Russian Communist aggression and the importance of the so-called war of ideas. This is one of a series of messages by various individuals in American public life which the World Wide Broadcasting Corp. intends to broadcast by short wave to Europe.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN EUROPE

This is United States Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH. I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate and in connection with my responsibilities on that committee I am, of course, very much concerned with all matters of American foreign policy. I am happy, therefore, to have this opportunity to speak for a few minutes to the people of Western Europe. My own ancestors, on both my father's side and my mother's side, came from Western Europe. I believe that blood flows in my veins from all the countries whose people may be listening to this broadcast.

For many years I have been deeply interested in foreign affairs, and beginning over 30 years ago at the time of World War I, I have been much concerned with the problem of war and peace and I have been devoting my thinking and efforts to trying to discover ways by which our international difficulties might be settled by the rule of law and justice and not by the rule of might.

As a participant in World War I and as a friend of many years' standing and a great admirer of President Woodrow Wilson, who was the author of the League of Nations, I felt from those days that there must be ways and means to preserve the peace that would prevent these ever-recurring struggles which have brought such suffering to the world. From my experience both in World War I and in World War II I have come to the conclusion that had it been known before both of those wars began that the United States could mobilize its resources and would be a part in the big struggle, the wars might actually have been prevented. Certainly the Kaiser of Germany would not have precipitated World War I if he could have foreseen that the power of the United States would be added to that of his enemies in Europe. I think the same could be said of Hitler in the case of World War II.

Because of my deep feeling on this matter I was determined after victory was won in 1945 that my efforts in the United States Senate, in which I was then a new member, would be directed in support of all efforts to organize the world to preserve the peace. I was a strong supporter of the steps leading up to the final ratification of the United Nations Charter. I was a strong supporter of the so-called Marshall plan, the European recovery program, which I felt was necessary if our former allies were to recover their economic stability and play their full part in the effort to build peace and freedom in the world.

It will be recalled that when Secretary of State Marshall first suggested the program for economic recovery in Europe he included all the European countries and that meant Russia and her satellites as well as those countries which ultimately took part in the Marshall plan. We were all deeply concerned when it became clear that Russia would not join in this collective effort and that she was using her control of her satellite countries to keep them from participating. We were perfectly well aware that Poland, Finland, and Czechoslovakia desired to join the Marshall plan countries and participate in the recovery program, and we were aware that it was only the power of Russia that prevented them from joining.

It soon became apparent that the policy of Russian communism was to sow seeds of discord and hatred among the non-Communist European countries with the intention of so disrupting the economies of these countries that in despair they would go over to the Communist ideology. Yet in spite of the efforts of Moscow the Marshall plan succeeded dramatically and served as a powerful bulwark against the spread of Russian communism in Europe. I am sure that my hearers will agree that the success of the Marshall plan in restoring economic stability had much to do with preventing the spread of communism in Europe, and especially in such countries as France and Italy, whose economic situations were so desperately serious.

With the success of the Marshall plan in its early days in Europe we were all hopeful that we were on the road to recovery in spite of Russian opposition, but we were soon disillusioned when we discovered Russia was using another weapon in her movement for world domination by attempting to cut off the Allied Powers in the free zones of Western Germany from all access to Berlin, and thus to absorb that free city in the Communist empire. From this experience we realized clearly that Russia was prepared to use force if necessary to attain her ends where economic disruption was successfully opposed. Here again we were able to outmaneuver the Russian Communist attempts by the miraculous Allied airlift which was developed immediately to take care of our friends in the free western part of the city of Berlin.

The Berlin airlift was victorious, but the attempt by Russia to take over Berlin by force was a warning of the danger that we were all in. We saw clearly that Western Germany and our Marshall-plan partners in Europe were in real danger of an aggression by Russia. The Russian military divisions in the west were being maintained in large numbers and satellite armies also were being built up, ready to strike at an appropriate time by military force if the methods of Communist subversive infiltration did not succeed in taking over these countries. This realization and the Berlin airlift experience brought about the deliberations that ultimately led to the setting up of the so-called North Atlantic Pact. This pact, which was a defensive treaty between the cooperating countries concerned, provided simply that an attack on one of these countries was to be looked upon as an attack on all and that the countries participating would join in building up a collective defense to meet any possible aggressions.

The 12 nations which joined in this North Atlantic Treaty thus announced to the world that aggression by force against any one of them would be resisted by all. Thus we established for the whole North Atlantic community the principle of preserving peace through collective security which had been frustrated in the United Nations by Russian obstruction. We confronted Stalin with the very kind of clear warning which had never been given to the Kaiser or to Hitler, as I mentioned a moment ago. I am convinced that by this action we greatly strengthened the prospects for peace.

While these defensive moves were being developed among the Western nations we were suddenly aware that in the Far East another danger loomed because of the swift conquest of China by Russia, through the usual methods of subversive infiltration followed by taking over by force. While we were concerned with our dangers in Western Europe, the same danger swept over Asia and poor defenseless China was the first to be the victim. This has led to the subsequent Korean problem and the doubts and uncertainty that surround the entire far-eastern area, including Japan, the Philippines, Formosa, and the other countries in southeast Asia, yearning to be free from superimposed controls such as the new Republic of Indonesia, Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and even India and Pakistan.

The threat of world conquest by Russian communism by force of arms is very real. I have tried to indicate in this broadcast the developments of these critical dangers, but before I conclude I wish to emphasize to those of you who are listening that although I consider military defense of vital importance, the really great battle that is going on in this world of ours is the battle for the minds of men and women. It is what is called an ideological struggle, the battle of ideas. Up to this time the very skillfully managed Russian propaganda has seemed to be winning this battle for the minds of men throughout the world. The Moscow radio has dramatized a picture of its own invention, which seems to portray to the world a struggle between two great powers—Russia with her communism on the one hand, the champion of the downtrodden and exploited people of the earth, against a great rich imperialistic, capitalistic America, aligned with capitalistic powers trying to control the destinies of all people.

We all know how false this picture of the world struggle is. We all know that the countries that have become great under the western tradition have become so because our forefathers yearned for those human freedoms which alone can make great civilizations possible. The story of America is a story of men and women of European origin who were willing to make any sacrifice in order that they might be free from the domination or control of any human power and that they might be free to worship the God in whom they believed and follow their faith in the divine guidance of all human destiny. America's growth, America's success spring from the same source as the greatness of modern Europe—faith in those fundamental principles of human freedom which our ancestors brought to the new world. With this truth, which is nothing less than freedom under Almighty God, we in America have gone back to the countries of our ancestors and have asked them to join with us in preserving the supreme values which all of us cherish in common.

The really great issue in the world today is not communism versus capitalism or imperialism, as Moscow would have us believe. It is the atheistic materialism of the totalitarian state versus the idea of freedom under God, the idea of self-governing peoples who believe that the state is made for man and man's emancipation and that man is not made merely to be subservient to the state. This is the great challenge to free men everywhere. This is a cause to which the people of the west European countries who are joined together in the North Atlantic Pact, can well dedicate their lives and their destinies.

Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, Before Conference of Grand Masters of Masons in North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] before the Conference of the Grand Masters of Masons in North America at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on February 20, 1951. I commend a reading of the address to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the entire country.

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

TALK BEFORE GRAND MASTERS OF MASONS

The answers to the problems that face us now as we strive for peace in the world and security in our country must, I believe, be based on six general principles which I offer as a suggested chart for America as we strive to set a true course. Upon these our thinking and our decisions must rest. Certainly there must be an end to indecision and the feeling of insecurity that comes with indecision.

1. We can never gain our security through a program that leads to isolationism.

2. We can never gain our security by a program that follows a path of appeasement.

3. We can only gain our security by supporting our agreements by our actions, at least until we know that the other parties to those agreements do not intend to do their share.

4. We must move ever forward on a policy of strength and confidence. Our actions cannot be dictated by fear. We have the strength, the resources, and the tradition, materially and spiritually, to take the initiative against all threats to our security.

5. We can never make this Nation secure by hesitation, faltering, backing-and-filling.

6. We must strive for unity of purpose and of action even as Lincoln did in the darkest of Civil War days. There is a tremendous difference, as he knew so well, between honest criticism and mere obstructionism. The former is vital in a democracy at all times. The latter cannot be tolerated when the safety of our country and the security of our citizens are at stake.

At the moment, there are two issues in the forefront of everyone's mind here in Washington: our policy in Asia and our policy in Europe. These two issues are now constantly before us in the United States Senate. Questions being thoroughly discussed regarding these issues are many. Should we get out of Korea? Should we aid Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist forces? Should we declare sanctions against the regime of Mao Tse-tung in the United Nations now that the United Nations has finally proclaimed that regime to be the aggressor? What are our responsibilities in the Far East?

What steps should we now take in Europe? What is the best way for us to protect the safety and security of our country against a possible Russian advance in Europe? Should we send ground troops to Europe? Should we merely support Europe in the air and on the sea? Should Congress approve before troops are sent to Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty?

These two great issues also raise many questions of domestic policy here in the United States. Congress is now asked to raise our Armed Forces to 3,500,000 men. The President has recommended huge appropriations, increases in taxes. It has become only too clear that controls of our civilian economy must be firmly administered if we are to arm and equip this large increase in our armed strength adequately, and at the same time provide military equipment to our allies of the North Atlantic Treaty. These are truly tough decisions. Making them is not easy. The results of these decisions certainly will entail sacrifices on the part of every citizen.

Today every thoughtful American citizen is worried. That can't be denied. Many are greatly disturbed and those who have lost their loved ones in Korea are heartbroken. But if we are to live up to our responsibilities as the leaders of the freedom-loving peoples of the world, we must build up that confidence that inspires faith in our ultimate success—that gives the feeling that our actions are based on the calm judgment of prudent men.

From the present safety of our own land, we have watched the troops of the United Nations in Korea defend themselves bravely as they were pushed back last summer to Pusan. Then we witnessed a brilliant advance through practically all of Korea. We have followed grimly in recent weeks alternating retreats and advances which still leave the issue much in doubt. The brave men assembled under the banner of the United Nations have proved they know how to fight the advancing hordes of Communists and will fight to the death if need be. They are daily demonstrating the superiority of our fire power and the speed and maneuverability of our airplanes.

But there is grave doubt in the minds of many of those boys and in the minds of many of our citizens as to why we are now fighting in Korea. When the North Koreans, stimulated by Chinese and Russian Communists, crossed the thirty-eighth parallel last June, they became aggressors under the terms of the United Nations Charter. If the United Nations is to be a lasting force for peace, the violators of its resolutions must be resisted. The Security Council of the United Nations immediately ordered the Korean aggression resisted. Our boys are there to fight aggression, to make the United Nations a force for peace in the world. They are fighting to preserve life as we know it here at home and to make the future more secure for us all. We must win that battle which they are waging so valiantly, even if it cannot be won in Korea. Certainly we cannot win it by appeasement. Most recently, the Chinese have been overwhelmingly branded by the United Nations as aggressors themselves. That is a true statement of fact—it is not a yielding to false propaganda.

Certainly it would seem to be much wiser, hard though it may be to do so, to leave Korea if our military leaders say that we cannot expect ultimately to win there, or if the fighting drags out to a stalemate, but be unfettered by any agreements favorable to the Communists—like the proposed cease-fire suggestion—as would undoubtedly end in the loss of Formosa and the ultimate recognition of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations. This would be 100 percent appeasement.

Meanwhile, elsewhere in Asia the forces of communism are weakening by intrigue what cannot be overcome by military violence. Tibet has been invaded. The infiltration of Iran reportedly is taking place. While the situation in Indochina is bad, the French have become more aggressive. Under the inspired leadership of General de Tassigny, they are recovering some of the gains of the Communists. But final success is still far in the distance.

On Formosa, Nationalist Chinese forces are in active training and are, we are told, prepared for vigorous fighting. Our Navy is under orders to prevent these forces from engaging in commando raids or amphibious attacks on the mainland. They are equally under orders to prevent Communist attack on Formosa. Formosa is one of those islands in the Far East that are considered part of our line of security with Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. The present Nationalist forces are prepared to defend it. They may be able to stimulate commando raids and amphibious attacks or assist guerrilla efforts on the Chinese mainland. We should certainly encourage these undertakings in every way we can.

Possibly our Navy should blockade the Chinese coast if the Communists insist in their efforts on Korea or in other parts of Asia. But there are many difficulties involved in such a blockade. Certainly we should not put troops in China at the present time, nor should our Air Force make bombing sorties on the mainland of China. But that does not mean that we have to prevent the Nationalist Chinese forces from making active efforts to the limits of their own strength. That does not mean that it may not be wise to provide them with arms and equipment. Certainly it does not mean that we should turn over Formosa to the Chinese Reds at any United Nations conference table or elsewhere.

In Berlin and throughout Western and Southern Europe, the free nations stand constantly on the alert against possible further aggression by Communists. They look to us for that strong moral support and that material assistance they feel certain we can give them.

Tremendously important decisions are now in the making as to the extent of and the manner in which we are to provide assistance to Europe. Under our Constitution the President is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He has the responsibility of deciding whether to send forces outside of the continental United States in the interests of our security. Congress has the responsibility of appropriating at its discretion the funds with which our forces are maintained and supported.

Our Government has signed and the Senate has ratified the North Atlantic Treaty. Under its terms we have organized the military assistance pact. But, the North Atlantic Treaty does not provide specifically for sending men abroad except to repel aggression. Consequently, the question arises: Can the President send troops as well as equipment under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty without prior approval of Congress? When the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified, the administration definitely stated that under article 3 materials but not men were intended. Now the President has stated that he expects to send men also.

General Eisenhower has testified that he believed we should send men, although at the same time he stated that the bulk of the manpower must necessarily come from the countries of Europe. While the interpretation given to the Senate by the administration when the treaty was ratified clearly did not include men, the Senate can in its wisdom join with the President in broadening that interpretation or it can appropriate funds under its constitutional power to permit the President under his constitutional power as Commander in Chief to send troops to Europe. Personally, I believe that a wiser move would be to recognize a more liberal interpretation of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Secretary Acheson has testified that he believes the Executive and the Congress should move forward in accord.

With compelling sincerity General Eisenhower stressed the need of our setting an example of vigorous leadership, for only by such vigorous leadership can we hope to inspire our European friends to their maximum efforts. Only by our example can we expect their doubts to be resolved and their energies to be fully channeled into our common cause of a mutual defense of freedom. It gave me personally much confidence to have him state his conclusions regarding manpower and production from first-hand observations, for I have felt for many weeks that Europe is our first line of defense and that as such we must contribute not only leadership but materials, energy, and some men. General Marshall now states that the plans call for four more, or a total of six, divisions to be stationed in Europe.

We all know that the implementing of the North Atlantic Treaty has gone ahead far too slowly in Europe. But there can be no doubt that our friends in Europe need us and we need our friends in Europe. We have made commitments in the form of a treaty. We have implied commitments from a moral point of view. We cannot go back on these obligations, expressed or implied, no matter how difficult the days ahead appear to be. To do so might well lose us the respect of the other nations of the world forever.

If on the other hand it becomes clear that these nations do not intend to live up to their side of these mutual obligations, we cannot and must not attempt to help defend Europe. We must review our position in that light when we know those are the factors upon which our decisions must rest, but until we do, we must go ahead with inspired leadership and renewed efforts and sacrifices that come with those efforts if we are to expect those who have suffered so much in World War II to do the same.

If we are to win through to victory over these grave threats to our Nation's freedom, we must look clearly and with courage at the problems which we face—problems that arise here in the United States very largely because we are not prepared for an emergency. The price of that unpreparedness we must now pay regardless of cost. And to those who bear the administrative responsibility for that unpreparedness, we look with more critical eyes. A Universal Military Training

and Service Act is now made necessary by certain self-evident realities: (1) The United States is now a participant in a struggle for survival, the dimensions and duration of which cannot be accurately calculated; (2) we do not now have under arms sufficient manpower to sustain a respectable military posture nor to provide a defense adequate to the immediate peril; (3) so long as the fighting continues in Korea, and the outcome of the struggle with our enemy remains undecided, there exists an ever-present need for readiness to increase the strength of our armed services; (4) we must build up a force of trained reserves so that we will not be caught again by another Pearl Harbor.

Our present laws authorizing the mobilization of manpower are inflexible. Congress has removed the statutory ceilings on the size of our armed services. But more legislation is needed to provide the manpower to build our forces to the needed level of strength.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that our minimum defense requirements necessitate an armed force of approximately 3,500,000 men by June 1951. This determination is the result of their best military judgment. If we accept that judgment, then we must provide the minimum manpower which these responsible officers have determined to be our need.

Reduced to the simplest terms, the two most pressing needs for this legislation are (1) the security of the Nation requires the most prompt possible build-up of our Armed Forces, and (2) we must now decide upon an enduring system of training and manpower readiness to meet the demands of a danger which now has no foreseeable end.

The bill proposed by our Armed Services Committee makes the manpower available so that if a further emergency arises it will not be necessary for Congress to act hastily in broadening eligibility to increase the pool of strength available. We believe that for the best interests of national security, it is imperative that the piecemeal manpower mobilization approach be abandoned and this more flexible approach substituted.

Right now to get that build-up and to maintain it will take all the qualified men from the Selective Service pool, the married nonveterans, husbands, some now in the IV–F group, and some now deferred as students, and finally about 400,000 not yet in the selective-service pool. So Congress has not many alternatives if it agrees with Secretary Marshall and the Chiefs of Staff that a force of 3,500,000 men is needed.

Economically we must expect a drastic change in our manner of living if we are to provide our defenses with needed materials and manpower. The solid solution of this problem is to raise to new levels our production of essentials.

In the meantime, controls are inevitable. It seems to me entirely likely that if we impose and accept adequate controls on our civilian economy now, we may in a shorter space of time than we now believe possible find ways and means of returning thereafter to a more normal situation, perhaps even in 2 years. It is estimated that the demands for our military production for 1951 and 1952 will amount to probably 50 billions of dollars in each of these years. When we consider that our present national gross product amounts to about 275 billions of dollars and realize that this military burden represents an addition of almost 18 percent to that figure, the enormity of the problem before us is clear.

Needless to say, this means sacrifices and a lower standard of living until we build up these military defenses, having allowed them to get much too low. It is, however, equally clear, a burden that must be carried if we are to survive as a free nation. When the build-up has been accomplished and if no war has come, just think how much more productive facilities we will have than we now possess.

Congress can pass legislation, but the order to freeze prices and wages must be issued by the administration. Congress can pass laws regarding enforcement of such orders, but the Executive must set up the machinery to enforce them. That machinery is even now not yet adequately in being. It should be implemented at once with proper and adequate powers and with forthright action on the part of its administrators.

Let us never forget that no sacrifices made by any individual or group here on the home front can be comparable to those being made and perhaps to be made by our soldiers on Korea's frozen hills and plains. Economic justice can always be restored; it is different with the life of a man.

In recent weeks a number of patriotic and well-intentioned proposals have been made for our guidance in the days to come. We Members of Congress welcome friendly and open discussion of our policies overseas and at home, but that does not mean necessarily that we agree with them. I find myself unable to agree with any proposal which recommends a backyard defense of this country. If we subscribe merely to a theory of the defense of this continent, we will surely find ourselves trying to protect North and South America and a few islands offshore against the strength and resources of all the rest of the world.

Can we survive in the United States with Europe with all its people and their resources in Communist hands? Such a theory and such a situation are unthinkable. Nor can I agree that an increased armed strength may provoke the Communists to more aggression in the immediate future. If this view is right, then why do anything? Why don't we drop our hands to our sides and let the blows fall? If aggression is to be provoked, I want to see that aggression provoked by strength and not by weakness.

In two world wars we have sent our manhood and our treasure overseas. Thousands and thousands of American boys have died on the European battlefields. Shall we now abandon all that they fought for, side by side with our European allies? Shall we willingly yield the Ruhr and the Saar, with their tremendous industrial potential, to the Soviet Union? Shall we say to Great Britain and France and Denmark and Holland and Belgium and the other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty that we didn't mean what we said when we joined with them to try to contain communism?

Shall we abandon Rome to barbarian invasion? Shall we hand to the Reds—on what would amount to a uranium platter—the vast ore deposits of Africa? What are we going to do about the great oil resources of the Middle East? Most important of all, shall we leave completely in the lurch, by withdrawing behind our own continental defenses, those valiant peoples of Europe who have so long looked to us for strength and help? American leadership, if it is to be worthy of the name and the things for which America has always stood—freedom and fair play—must be moral always, as well as military, diplomatic, and economic. We cannot and we must not go back on our word. To do otherwise makes us indistinguishable from the enemy we face.

Our paramount object in our struggle today is to preserve peace in order that our Nation may go forward in security and permit the undertakings of free men to make us happier, healthier, and build up the standard of our way of life. This unity is an expression of an all-American effort. We must have that "enduring system of defense" that General Marshall has described. We must be fully prepared for further sacrifices on the part of every one of us.

We can never subscribe to a backyard defense of our country and our homes. We can never abandon to barbaric violence the free peoples and the free institutions of the free world. We must never go back upon our pledged word. Such an effort is one dictated by an enlightened self-protection on our part and that of our allies. The clear minds of the people of our country and their clear voices can make their impact felt all over the world if dedicated to that single end.

In this time of our trial, Abraham Lincoln's voice saying, "My paramount object in this struggle is to preserve the Union," has thrilling echoes for every American citizen, Republican or Democratic, for it means in this day and age the preservation of these United States as a free and independent country. By our determination, with God's help, it will be done.

Lincoln Day Dinner Address by Governor Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut, in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 17, 1951.

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

Governor Youngdahl, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very real pleasure for me to come to your great city of Minneapolis and join with you on this significant occasion.

To us in the East, the words "Minneapolis" and "Minnesota" are freighted with meaning. The unsurpassed scenic beauty of your State, with its vast natural resources, your storied Mesabi Range, your useful and varied industries, your turbulent early history, and your sturdy and self-sufficient citizenry all go to make a legend upon which we dwell with pleasure and interest.

I may say also that we in New England have long been aware of Minneapolis as a cultural center. Your writers, like Sinclair Lewis and others, have deeply enriched American thought and literature. The fame of your great university and other institutions of higher learning is well known to us. We are familiar, too, with the renown of your symphony orchestra; and may I say that we are grateful to you for sending us an Ormandy and a Mitropolous to lead our own famous orchestras to new heights of accomplishment.

Hence, my own great enjoyment in being privileged to visit Minneapolis and to have the honor of addressing you here this evening.

We are gathered to observe the one hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Yet this occasion should not be merely one of commemoration but should be rather a time for our rededication to the timeless truths for which Lincoln worked, for which he suffered and for which he died. These truths have, I think, been well understood by many people in Minnesota. For you have, during the past few years, elected to the high office of Governor of your great State such outstanding public servants as Harold Stassen,

now president of the University of Pennsylvania; EDWARD THYE, now United States Senator, and your present great humanitarian, Luther W. Youngdahl. These are all men of whom the State of Minnesota can be justly proud. They have shown that they truly understand the function of the Republican Party. During a time of rapid change and increasing international tension they have demonstrated a vigorous comprehension of the needs and aspirations of the people of our country.

I have read with deep interest and real profit the penetrating inaugural address of Governor Youngdahl to your legislature. He speaks from tested experience and with a warm and understanding heart. The people of Minnesota are fortunate to have a man of his calibre at the head of the State.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve during my 4 years in Congress with the Congressmen whom you have sent to represent you in Washington. In particular I have had the stimulating pleasure of serving as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota, WALTER H. JUDD. He is my good friend. When I decided to run for Governor of Connecticut one of the real regrets which I had was that I would no longer be in frequent and close contact with this splendid man. There can be no more rewarding experience in life than that of a fine friendship. During my time in Washington I developed for WALTER JUDD not only a high regard but a real affection. WALTER JUDD's standard of service is truly Lincolnian in its high-mindedness and in its simplicity. The usual words of praise seem to lose their meaning when applied to a man of such remarkable intellectual attainments and of such significant moral purpose. I recall reading some years back an article in Readers Digest entitled "Wanted: More Men Like Dr. JUDD." I underscore that exclamation with emphasis. For WALTER JUDD has brought to his service in Congress not only a love of humanity, not only a zest for work, not only unimpeachable honesty, not only a deep sense of honor but in addition a lively understanding of the problems which afflict mankind and a breadth of vision in the field of foreign affairs which have marked him as a leader. He is the first to deplore that recent events have proved him to be tragically right. It is a tribute to the people of his district that they have understood this exceptional citizen and have returned him to Washington, this last time by a wide majority. He richly deserves this expression of confidence. He is a shining light of truth and honor in a world which has a desperate need of both. WALTER JUDD is the kind of Republican who acts in the true spirit of Abraham Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, is very much alive. In a real sense he belongs to the ages, to our age. For in his 56 years of life he stamped an image of himself on the tapestry of history and made an enduring impression on the minds of men and women the world over. He was a pioneer. He pioneered in the remote reaches of uncharted thought; in the field of action, and in the lonely depths of the human soul. His memory has a very special meaning in this fateful year. It has a meaning particularly for us Republicans who, while we bear much responsibility, have not yet received from the people sufficient power to discharge it.

Lincoln felt humble before his grave responsibilities. We feel humble as we contemplate his towering figure. But it is not enough to talk about Abraham Lincoln—the Republican Party must act like Lincoln. We must translate into effective action the inarticulate aspirations of millions of Americans in order that we may meet the challenge of leadership which is presented to us.

Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

I believe that our Republican platforms, both in Minnesota and in Connecticut, reflect an urgent understanding of this inspiring exhortation.

The words of Lincoln constitute a veritable bible for the guidance of our party.

We must think of freedom not as a right to be used, but as a privilege to be earned and passed on undiminished to those who come after us. We must be alert to defend and deserve that privilege. We must recognize that the concept of freedom is still the most modern, the most revolutionary idea which man has discovered as a basis for his spiritual, political, and economic life on this planet. We must so lead our individual lives as to vindicate the enormous sacrifices made in the cause of freedom by millions of people. We must fulfill our daily obligations to the system which we enjoy in order that when we have been gathered to our fathers we shall have made a lasting contribution to the cause of liberty—in order that we too shall have earned for our generation a grateful remembrance. We must give more than lip service to the memory of the great man whose birth we are gathered here to celebrate.

The Republican Party was born in 1856 in the midst of the turmoil and terrible disagreements which preceded the Civil War. In this year of crisis the Republican Party must inspire a fresh, vital, and vigorous approach to the problems which face our people in order that a ravaged and devastated world may have a new birth of freedom. In 1951 as in 1861 the issue is freedom or slavery.

Never before in the history of our party, never since this Nation was founded, has any group had such a magnificent opportunity for service and leadership as the Republican Party has today. If we Republicans fail to grasp that opportunity our failure will be as final as the opportunity is fleeting. If we fail America fails. If America fails then western civilization with all its culture and capacity for growth will be swallowed up in the maw of godless Soviet aggression.

Accordingly, we are faced with exciting opportunities for service to mankind which are equalled only by our responsibilities in this trembling hour of destiny. Lincoln's deep understanding of human affairs can and must serve as a beacon light to guide our troubled footsteps.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

We shall find the truth in Lincoln.

"The legitimate object of government," said Lincoln, "is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the government ought not to interfere."

How admirably this expresses the true function of government. How brilliantly it declares the right purpose of the Republican Party. That we are not faced with the choice of being horse-and-buggy die-hards on the one hand or advocates of the me-too philosophy on the other is illustrated by the modern-minded programs under way in Minnesota and Connecticut. For example, we Republicans in Connecticut declare: "Whenever social or economic problems can be solved only by public effort, we believe the power of government should be used in their full solution."

It is not enough to do as so many Democrats suggest—turn our social problems over to the Federal Government; nor should we turn our backs on these problems. There is a happy middle ground for industrious, resourceful, and creative action. Certainly these social ills demand attention. But the remedy, the method is all important. Our party is not anchored to a dead past but to the constructive and timeless philosophy of Lincoln. Ours is not to imitate and follow while others lead. Neither should we oppose the opposition when it is doing something right. It is not enough to criticize and condemn. We must, above all, conserve, construct, and create.

Lincoln recognized the dangers inherent in the high cost of government. He had a systematic interest in the problems which face the working people. He said: "To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor or as nearly as possible is a worthy object of any good government." We know how large a share of the worker's salary is absorbed in Federal, State, and municipal taxes. We know, too, that the function of government is to perform services for the people. But in order to retain the right to enjoy the fruits of their labor, it is imperative that the working people should not be weighted down with exhorbitant taxes.

Of course, we cannot pay for the defense of our country without levying higher taxes. But I deplore the fact that, in the President's $71,500,000,000 budget, the items for nonessential spending are larger than at any time in our history. These can and should be substantially reduced. We must hold in abeyance some of our cherished plans in order to create a world in which these plans can be fulfilled.

Lincoln understood that there is no natural antagonism between capital and labor. The interests of the people who work come ahead of the interests of capital and this, may I remind you, is traditional Republican policy. Lincoln said: "Capital is only the fruit of labor, could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves the much higher consideration." But he went on to say that it is right: "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interests should, after awhile, accumulate property and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace." Labor and capital are component parts of a cooperative effort.

Stressing the community of interest which binds the several segments of our society together, Lincoln said: "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

This community of interest is founded on equality of opportunity. Listen again to Lincoln: "We feel, therefore, that all legal distinction between individuals of the same community founded in any such circumstances as color, origin, and the like, are hostile to the genius of our institutions, and incompatible with the true history of American liberty."

I have grown weary of the hypocritical incantations on the altar of civil rights in which the Democratic Party seasonally indulges. The Democrats find this a convenient issue to drag out during election years, to kick around for vote-getting purposes and then put back on the shelf to gather dust while they are in power. The Republican Party traditionally has stood for equality of opportunity. It stands for equality of opportunity today. Lincoln said: "Let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man, this race and that race and the other race, being inferior and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal."

Let us enlarge our concepts to the circle of our duties. Men who are good enough to

die for their country are good enough to receive equal treatment under our laws.

Lincoln believed in the dignity of the individual. He believed that the individual is the complex heart of society. He was an eloquent exponent of the whole concept of individual freedom. We must not allow the rigors of the present emergency to obscure the central truth that freedoms and responsibilities are inseparable.

Indeed the world-wide attack on freedom by the ruthless forces of Soviet imperialism underscore the validity, the urgency of this thesis.

Just as we must continue our efforts to assure equal freedom in our own land so after two world wars we must now be convinced that we in the United States cannot remain indifferent to a threat to freedom in other parts of the world. We know deep down in that region of the heart in which we dwell alone that a world contracted by science must be united by freedom if peace is to prevail.

On the subject of foreign affairs also we find that Lincoln had profound and challenging thoughts. He said: "In our dealings with other nations let us by all means give a little here and give a little there but never should we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long and threatening emergency let us prepare for the worst and work for the best."

We are preparing for the worst in Minnesota and Connecticut. I know that in addition to safeguarding human life and property you in Minneapolis have the problem of protecting a large and important railway center and defending key industries against sabotage and enemy assault. In Connecticut we also are concerned with the safety of our citizens and with the security of factories vital to the defense effort.

In spite of the prolonged lack and guidance from Washington, civil-defense plans are now under way in most of our States. Interstate compacts are being signed. Although the Federal Government will provide financial assistance in certain aspects of civil defense the problem of protecting the homes, the lives, the industries of the people of Minnesota and Connecticut is primarily a State problem. I commend your distinguished Governor for all that he is undertaking in this field.

We must prepare for the worst in other ways also. Our economy cannot be effectively mobilized in a period of inflation. This means that the Treasury Department should stop forcing Government bonds at low-interest rates into the Federal Reserve System. It means that the President should make better use than he has yet made of his control powers so that the consumer with fixed wages and fixed income is not heavily penalized. We must create a spirit of national unity. This means discarding the discredited, threadbare plan for socialized medicine. It means taking labor legislation out of politics. It means really cutting nondefense spending to the bone. It means true bipartisan consultation in the field of foreign affairs. It means the mobilization of our manpower for our Armed Forces in sufficient strength to discharge our international commitments and to insure our national security in a dangerous world.

It has been the fashion in recent weeks to talk about the great debate that is going on regarding our foreign policy.

And yet if we examine this debate closely, we find that the area of agreement is much larger than the area of disagreement. We find for instance that despite the heartbreaking ebb and flow of battle in Korea there is no public clamor for the withdrawal of American troops. Yet we cannot long postpone a high policy decision regarding this anxious question. We find that there is substantial agreement as to the need for collective action in Europe in case of war. There is substantial agreement that we must have a vast rearmament program, that we must render military assistance to the Atlantic Pact nations and to the French in Indochina. It is not suggested that we should cut either our own military budget or the amounts provided under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. There is some disagreement regarding the part that Western Germany should play in the defense of Western Europe. There is also some disagreement regarding the number of troops which we should send to Europe. Certainly we should not have to bear the full load of combat alone. Certainly we should accept and encourage help from the anti-Communist forces in Formosa and in China, from Greece, from Yugoslavia, from former enemy nations, from Turkey and Spain, from all former neutral nations, and of course, from our allies in the Atlantic Pact. We should also make it possible for anti-Communists from countries now under Soviet domination to play their part in the struggle. We need all the friends we can get.

It is a tragic fact that our lamentable far-eastern policy has resulted not in stability but in a war which so far has cost us the frightening total of 60,000 casualties. Those who are responsible for that policy are fond of saying that the Republicans who attack their far-eastern policy are the same Republicans who are isolationists when it comes to Europe. While the word "isolation" has become a weasel word through much misuse and abuse, I can say that I know many Republicans in Congress, including by good friend WALTER JUDD, who have not found it necessary to forget Europe while looking at China. We favored Marshall-plan aid, aid to Greece and Turkey, the Atlantic Pact, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, and many other measures which have as their purpose the creation in Europe of a political climate propitious for the preservation of freedom. The inconsistency rests with those in high office who chose to label the Communist surge in China as simply an agrarian reform movement and who were opposed to Chiang Kai-shek because, said they, the anti-Communist forces had lost their will to fight. How much will to fight would there be in Europe, I ask you, if we were to withdraw our support? I favor aid to anti-Communist China. I favor aid to the anti-Communists in Europe. I believe that it is not only in our national self-interest, that it is not only in accordance with our commitments but that it is our moral obligation to help our friends in Europe to withstand the Red tide. For us to postpone our assistance until they have erected a sure dam against the Red flood is to postpone it until such aid is no longer necessary. Moreover we need the bases; we need the manganese and other raw materials which might well be denied to us if Western Europe were to succumb; we need their manpower. We need to encourage their will to fight just as we should have done in Asia.

Certainly the people of Western Europe can provide manpower and skills even though they cannot provide dollars or all the equipment and arms which they need. Certainly also they need to know that we will not wait until they have been conquered before we take action, that our policy is not one of liberating Europe but one of protecting Europe from conquest. They need the assurance that this whole affair is a copartnership. Because of our predominance and general national health we must provide the leadership.

I do not believe that the Congress is in a position to decide on the exact number of our troops which should be sent to Europe, although the decision to send them is a matter of the highest policy on which the Congress should be consulted.

I am content not to linger over past mistakes. I have no desire to rake over the old dead coals of Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and the arrangements by which the city of Berlin became an island completely surrounded by Red territory. I am glad not to stress the lack of vision and the appalling series of blunders and betrayals which permitted the Soviet empire almost unimpeded to swallow up one-third of the world's total population. But I do think that our leaders in Washington should stop defending these indefensible acts, should stop trying to justify their incredible mistakes and should instead attempt to create unity by trying to correct these errors. This is a time for concerted and resolute action.

We must mobilize, yes, but we shall not win this struggle without generating in our own land the great motive moral forces which for so many decades have guided our people onward on their great adventure. We know that our material world will crash in splinters around us unless it has some lofty thoughts to hold it up. There is a need for unity, yes, but there is an even greater need for the spiritual fervor, the deep convictions without which we cannot emerge victorious. Peace is a product of strength; war is a derivative of weakness. Our salvation lies in a dynamic faith in freedom. It lies in our determination not to yield or to be overcome. It is inherent in our resolve to ignite throughout the free world the temper, the energy, and the zeal which alone can bring us peace.

This, I believe, is the challenge confronting us this evening as our thoughts turn toward the great founder of our party. Let us hearken anew to Lincoln's luminous words: "Theirs (our American ancestors') was the task—and nobly they performed it—to possess themselves, and through themselves us, of this goodly land, and to uprear upon its hills and its valleys a political edifice of liberty and equal rights; 'tis ours only to transmit these—the former unprofaned by the foot of an invader, the latter undecayed by the lapse of time and untorn by usurpation—to the latest generation that fate shall permit the world to know."

If we are to avoid the "twin gulfs of immorality and inefficiency," if we are to meet the challenge of leadership in this troubled world, if we are to maintain America as a bastion of liberty, if we are to bestow the blessings of freedom on those millions who are languishing in bondage, a revitalized, vibrant and enlarged Republican Party must take the helm and press stanchly forward to new frontiers of achievement. On this historic mission we shall be propelled by the mighty spirit of an enfranchised people and inspired by the simple greatness of Abraham Lincoln.

We, the Republican Party, have the will; we have the vigor; we have the talent to match with consummate leadership the towering challenge of our time. We await only the mandate of our fellow-citizens. And when that Nation-wide mandate comes, as come soon it must, let us be ready, full-girt and resolute, to pilot America, her people, and her beloved institutions, safely across today's darkling waters to the longed-for haven of a peaceful, prosperous, and confident tomorrow.

American Committee on United Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 13, at the

Belvedere Hotel in Baltimore, Mr. Howard Bruce, formerly Deputy ECA Administrator, was host to a large gathering of civic leaders of the city of Baltimore. Mr. Bruce's guest of honor was the Honorable Paul-Henri Spaak, formerly Prime Minister of Belgium, and who is now President of the so-called European Council, which is undertaking the unification and integration of the European states.

Mr. Spaak, who was introduced by the Honorable Paul Hoffman, formerly ECA Administrator, spoke under the auspices of the American Committee on United Europe.

Mr. President, I consider the address of Mr. Spaak of such importance in the present crisis that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The Public Printer advises me that the address will cover about 3½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $287.

I call the special attention of my colleagues to the closing portion of this significant address which deals with the subject of rearmament of Europe, a matter of urgent interest to all of us at the present time.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, a year ago I had the honor of being a guest of the University of Pennsylvania. Reading the speech I made then, I quote the few sentences that follow:

"In my eyes nothing is more important for the future of our civilization and for the peace of the world than a strong solidarity between the United States of America and Europe.

"Misunderstandings can arise between us; our relations could become less frank, less friendly. It must not happen. It would be a great misfortune.

"For Europe to understand and know the United States of America, for the United States of America to understand and know Europe is one of the greatest topics of our times."

As I read these lines again, two thoughts come to my mind: First, that I was more than right to emphasize that nothing was more important than a close understanding between the United States of America and Europe, and, second, that events travel swiftly.

I want to speak very frankly to you.

If you sometimes feel that I am wrong in my judgments or if I hurt your feelings, do not bear me any ill will, my intentions are good. What I want is both to enlighten you about certain problems and to enlighten myself by studying your reactions.

I shall therefore say at once, somewhat bluntly: for a year the relationship between the United States of America and democratic Europe has been spoiled. A deep gap of mutual incomprehension has widened between both continents. Nothing can be more dangerous. For me, it is the great problem at the beginning of this year. Were this ill will to increase, were we to prove unable to go back, we would face disaster.

It is the duty of the Europeans who love the United States of America, just as it is the duty of the Americans who love Europe to consider that problem and above all to speak frankly to each other, so as to have a thoroughly loyal explanation and make a great effort of comprehension.

If I had to summarize my opinion of the present situation, I would say that we are today, in Europe, in the position in which your isolationists found themselves in 1914 and 1939. They did not believe then that to fight against German aggression was to fight for the freedom of the United States.

We in turn have nowadays some difficulty in making the people in Europe understand that to fight in Korea is to fight for European independence and that we must not mistrust a forward America, in the front lines of battle, as we ourselves were twice.

As for you, it seems to me that your confidence in Europe's vitality has greatly diminished; that you doubt her possibilities and even her willingness to share in the struggle against communism; that you suspect her of wanting an Asiatic Munich; that you feel that the efforts you have made to help her both economically and militarily are not in proportion with the results that have been attained and, little by little, a little sad and perhaps a little scornful too, you are ready to withdraw within yourselves.

If the problem is thus well stated, I would now like to develop it and the first part of my demonstration ought to be called: Introduction and defense of Europe.

For you will no doubt agree with me: before judging Europe, you must know and understand her.

You must never forget that in the course of 25 years she has been through two terrible wars.

I do not like to burden you with figures and statistics but I wonder if it is generally understood by the people of your country how great a trial the two World Wars constituted for Western Europe.

Let us take the example of France.

Do you know, or do you still remember that during the First World War, France lost 1,400,000 killed, which represents a proportion of one killed for every 27 inhabitants. That to this million and a half dead, one must add 4,266,000 wounded, 537,000 prisoners and missing, or a total of 6,160,000 men stricken in their flesh, in their physical integrity for a population of 40,500,000. What a dreadful loss of her very blood. A loss from which the France of 1939 had not yet recovered, a loss which is at the root of her defeat.

The balance of the Second World War, in loss of lives, wounded, disabled is fortunately slightly less cruel, but this time material destructions have been tremendous.

The total amount of these losses for France alone is more than $21,000,000,000.

The losses of Great Britain are even more important. In the First World War their casualties were over 3,000,000; in the Second World War over 1,000,000. And for the second war the total amount of her material losses $29,000,000,000.

To understand what happened, one must add to these losses of the allies, those of Germany. More than 7,000,000 German casualties in 1914, more than 20,000,000 in 1940 and for the Second World War, the material losses are estimated at $48,000,000,000.

Before finishing with this picture of Europe, I owe it to myself to ask the Americans to think about one of the characteristics of the war in Western Europe: I want to speak of the occupation of certain countries by enemy armies.

Those who never knew occupation cannot measure the ordeal it represents for a country: her whole administrative structure disrupted, her unity both political and moral threatened by those who collaborated with the enemy; hatred which sets in and divides, and in her very flesh the wound that those condemned for disloyalty will constitute for years and years.

It is something of a miracle that countries like France and Belgium, who in a quarter of a century have known such a trial twice have nevertheless managed to rise again, to regain their unity, and to start living once more.

It is of this that you have to think, American friends, when you think about Europe.

But you are going to tell me: Haven't we felt these misfortunes, this tragedy? Didn't we come to Europe's help in war and in peace? Did we not send our sons in 1917 and 1942? Are they not numerous those who died on the heights of the Meuse, and on the beaches of Normandy? Did we not accept the heavy burden of lend-lease, of UNRRA, of Marshall aid? Have we not lent, given, invested in Europe since 1920 hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of which very little will be paid back to us? What was the use of all this? Are people even grateful to us for it? To this last question I immediately answer in the affirmative.

European people, everyone of those who think and reflect, everyone of those who have some education and some knowledge, are aware of what Europe owes to the United States of America and are deeply grateful to them.

Of course, there is criticism, but it is only superficial and does not reach the real depth of the matter. It does not go further than the criticism Europeans have for one another. As for the practical result of the United States policy of material aid to Europe you would be very much mistaken if you believed that it has been useless or even of very little use.

First of all, and this is essential, without this aid Europe would not have been able to solve the problem both economic and political presented by her reconstruction in 1945. Without this help it seems undisputable to me that Europe would have known years of dark poverty, a situation even harder than the one she had to bear during the war itself, and her entire population would have known a most inadequate standing of life with the triumph of communism as an almost inevitable consequence.

Thanks to Marshall aid, communism, still powerful in France and Italy, it is true, is nonexistent in Great Britain. In the Scandinavian countries, Western Germany, the Netherlands and in Belgium it suffered such set-backs during the last few years that it has practically ceased to be a political factor.

However, it would be a mistake to look at the results of that policy from the single viewpoint of resistance to communism.

The truth is that Western Europe has made the most of Marshall aid and notwithstanding what is sometimes said in America, her recovery has been swift and even spectacular.

Of course, Europe's situation immediately after the Second World War was frankly bad.

The statement of her balance of payments can best make things clear.

In 1947, Europe showed a deficit of $6,500,000,000. This deficit is estimated at $2,300,000,000 for 1950–51, which means a profit of $3,700,000,000 in 2 years. This is the result of increased production and productivity in every field.

While the general index of production for the countries receiving Marshall aid was 86 in 1947, it is 124 in 1950, say an increase of 50 percent and this general and favorable indication can be found in every sector, industrial as well as agricultural.

Therefore, not the slightest doubt must remain in the minds of the Americans: The policy of aid has had important results. Those have been recently characterized by the rather spectacular fact of Great Britain's statement that she can dispense with Marshall aid from now on, and Sweden followed her example.

This great success is due to those who generously and intelligently conceived the plan, to General Marshall first of all; but it is also due to those who executed it.

How can I let pass the occasion offered me this evening to say publicly how grateful I am to Mr. Paul Hoffman? He gave himself devotedly to the work of rebuilding Europe. His accomplishment was enormous. It would be greater still if some of those to whom he gave advice had better followed it.

Let us summarize the situation: Europe, horribly hit by the war, ruined, driven to a position that seemed hopeless in 1946, has

mightily risen again; she has carried very far the reconstruction of her damaged properties; she has, in many countries, considerably bettered the standard of life of the working classes, and she could see ahead a more favorable future if it were not for the uncertain political situation and the threats of war. Honestly, I must underline this progress:

But, if looking at the situation from another angle, people were to ask me: Are these results sufficient? Shouldn't they have been bigger still? Then, with the same frankness, I have to answer: Yes, they could have been better.

Here we are at the heart of what I do not fear to call the European tragedy:

In spite of her recovery, it is obvious to me that Europe is going through a serious crisis. She no longer has, and by far, the place that used to be hers in the world, in the course of past centuries. For 25 centuries of history, Mediterranean and Western Europe was the center of the world. Athens, Rome, Madrid, Paris, London have been, one after the other, the capital cities where political strength as well as economic power and spiritual radiance were concentrated. Today, all this is nothing more than a very brilliant memory. The center of the world has moved. It is now in Washington, but it is also in Moscow, that major decisions are taken, from which will determine in the end, for us Europeans, our fate, our very life.

It is in the United States of America that we find the United Nations. It is an American general who is going to lead the armed forces in Europe. It is the United States who recently gave $10,000,000,000 to Europe in less than 2 years. It is also an American writer who was awarded the Nobel prize for literature. It is on the possible conflict between Russian communism and American democracy that the future of the world depends. Europe plays but second fiddle. It is obvious that in her present state of affairs she is unable to solve properly the economic problems that confront her, crushed as she is between the all-powerful United States and the U. S. S. R. and the development of new countries. It is even more obvious that she is incapable of solving alone the problem of her defense against an invasion coming from the U. S. S. R.

It is with a dreadful anguish that the clear-sighted minds of Europe are obliged to acknowledge these facts. Having done so, there remains for them but the choice between two positions: Either let things go, react no longer, resign themselves, hoping only for a miracle, or, on the contrary, pull themselves together, rebel, and, having made the balance of Europe's forces and the critical survey of her position, decide to save herself by putting an end to her obsolete divisions by uniting her at the beginning and unifying her in the end.

What is magnificent and thrilling about this task is that it is practically possible. Fundamentally, the situation of Western Europe is far from being desperate. The point is to organize her on a new basis, to take better advantage of her wealth and to rationalize her efforts.

What gives the right to speak with such assurance? The mere examination of some statistical data.

We Europeans look toward the United States and admire their might, the prodigious development of their economy, the standard of living of their population; but if we count up our own resources, our own assets, we have no cause for jealousy; we must however confess that here, much more has been made of the possibilities than at home, in Europe.

Let us make a few comparisons. The United States covers an area of 3,027,000 square miles. Western Europe has an area of 1,000,551 square miles, but the comparison is nevertheless to the advantage of Europe, if to the purely European territories one adds those controlled in Africa by European powers.

There are 150,000,000 Americans; there are 290,000,000 Europeans in Western Europe.

On these bases, Europe produces 451,000,000 tons of coal and the United States of America 570,500,000 tons. Europe produces 55,000,000 tons of steel and the United States 100,000,000. Europe uses 198,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours yearly and the United States 385,000,000,000. Why? Essentially, because in the United States for 150,000,000 inhabitants, there is 1 border, 1 market, 1 economy, 1 currency, and because in Europe, for 290,000,000 inhabitants, there are 15 borders, 15 markets, 15 economies, and 15 currencies.

Let us have the courage and the audacity to do, today, in Europe, what the Americans had the audacity and the courage of doing in the second half of the eighteenth century, and our problems are solved. Western Europe can then hope to become as powerful as the United States of America and more powerful than the U. S. S. R. and her satellites, and most certainly the alliance of the United States and the new Europe will constitute a force sufficient to hold communism in check and to maintain peace. Here is the stake of the battle, here is the victory that we may win without waging war.

But it is evidently much easier to state the problem than to solve it. However, it is already a great deal to know that a solution exists.

Evidently, in the course of action one comes across every kind of difficulties, both intellectual and material.

National feelings are still extremely strong in Europe. We must not forget that the people of Europe have been waging war against one another with a terrible continuity. Between 1790 and 1945, that is to say during 150 years, there were 40 years of war. It is obvious that it left traces, bad memories, susceptibilities that are still alive.

There is in Europe the very serious drawback of the different languages. At first, it may seem but of little importance, but when one thinks more seriously about it, what an obstacle it constitutes to mutual understanding; try to realize what would be your life, here in the United States, if all over your territory people spoke 15 different languages. Well, this is the case of Europe.

But there is even worse. When in the eighteenth century the 13 States of America decided to unite, their national life had been relatively short, their economy was in the middle of evolution. At home, in Europe, it is a world that became conscious of itself more than 1,000 years ago that we have to change, and there are age-long private interests that have to be modified and sometimes upset. Protected by borders, customs duties, industries more or less artificial were created, giving work to thousands of workmen and being sometimes a source of wealth for an entire region. A new organization of Europe, more rational, mainly more rational, could very well cause the collapse of all this, necessitating a long and probably painful readaptation.

There is no doubt about it, and everybody must know it: To make Europe is first of all to accept some sacrifices. To make Europe is to bring into being the most difficult of all policies, one that demands the maximum of wisdom, one through which one has to accept to lose something at once, but with the certainty that the whole collectivity will get back its equilibrium later on, and at a much higher level.

I have the impression that here in the United States many people think that Europe is incapable of making such an effort. Many people somewhat deceived by their own historical knowledge wonder why they do not see once more in twentieth-century Europe make the American experience of the eighteenth century.

I have tried to show that to reason thus was to see things from a much too simple point of view, and without trying to deny what is similar between the two situations I feel that it would be a grievous mistake to consider them as identical. Nobody knows exactly how the new Europe will be made, but personally I am convinced that she will be made, and I can honestly say that, in spite of appearances, she is already in the making.

It is at this point of my statement that I must thank the members of the American Committee on United Europe, who have organized the series of lectures that I am going to give under their auspices. It is a most remarkable thing to see so many important and distinguished American citizens, and I shall not name any of them because I should have to name too many, understand the paramount importance of the idea of a new Europe, and to see them give so much time, show so much faith, and spend so much money for the defense of that idea. They are, here, the correspondents of the Members of the European movement of which Messrs. Churchill, de Gasperi, Schumann, and myself are the honorary presidents. When the new Europe has become a reality people will understand what was the share of the European movement in that great undertaking.

It is the European movement which in the spring of 1948 convened at The Hague a congress of historical importance. Of course, it was not the first time that men had assembled to discuss Europe's future, but it was the first time that one could see, seated on the benches reserved for the members of a congress, some of the most prominent European statesmen, such as Winston Churchill, of Britain, Paul Reynaud, of France, van Zeeland, of Belgium, whose sole presence meant that the unity of European countries was no longer a dream that was supposed to come true in a hundred years, but a problem of the day the solution of which was urgent.

The Congress of The Hague separated after voting a resolution asking for the creation of an extra-European organization entrusted with the study of the European problems and capable of submitting some solution to them.

The idea was accepted and taken up by the Governments of France and Belgium. A draft was proposed to the signatories to the Brussels pact and in the spring of 1949 the texts creating the Council of Europe were accepted by the government of 12 states.

After rather long and laborious talks, it was decided that the Council of Europe would be composed of two organizations; a Consultative Assembly to formulate recommendations and a Council of the Ministers to examine them.

The first session of the Council of Europe was held in Strasburg in August 1949. Some greeted it with enthusiasm. The others were skeptical and doubted that this new parliament could work. They did not believe it possible to get such different representatives to work together.

The First Assembly was not a triumphant success, but it gave honest results.

First of all the skeptics were wrong. An efficient method of parliamentary work was very soon discovered and the machinery started working without too many shocks. Then it appeared, and that was very comforting, that a certain number of the delegates quite often very prominent men in their own countries were willing and capable of studying certain problems from a truly European point of view.

In a way, this first session was characterized by the revolt of the Assembly against the Council of the Ministers whose powers are immense but whose tendencies are extremely moderate and, let us say it, overcautious.

To tell you the whole truth, the second session of the Assembly which was held in August 1950 started in a real atmosphere of crisis, the basic cause of which lies in Great Britain's attitude toward Europe.

Today, it appears clearly that Great Britain refuses to commit herself thoroughly in the constitution of a new Europe.

Of course, it would be unfair to condemn the British attitude without trying to understand it and it would be unwise to discard their reasons, without studying them carefully.

First of all, it is clear that the English do not want in any way, to run the risk of changing their relations with the Commonwealth, by engaging themselves too closely with the European countries. One can, one must understand it. But what the British seem to ignore is that, on that point, even the warmest supporters of an United Europe, agree with them. Nobody in Europe, nobody wise, in any case, would dream of confronting Great Britain with a choice between Europe and the Commonwealth, first of all because we know very well that, confronted with such a choice, Great Britain would choose the Commonwealth and that she would be right in doing so; but also because in Europe, we want to keep or create with th Commonwealth, the closest possible ties, and that in that respect British intervention is indispensable.

The British do not want either to create, by integrating into Europe, what is sometimes called a third force, the objectives of which would be to maintain a kind of neutrality between the United States and the U. S. S. R. On this point, too, the English are entirely right. According to me, an organized Europe would inevitably become a force and even a force with which one would have to count, but, in my mind, there is not the shadow of a doubt this force must choose its side, and that side can only be that of democracy and of the free countries.

Finally, more particularly, members of the British Labor Party are afraid that a united Europe would endanger their reforms, both economic and social. As a matter of fact, they refuse to take the chance of any sacrifice—the sacrifice about which I have already spoken. I think, in that respect, that their policy is a little short-sighted.

Nevertheless, this refusal of the British to commit themselves has confronted, in their turn, the continental Europeans with a difficult choice.

Must they try, forestalling Great Britain, to make a united Europe without her, or must they, on the contrary, feeling Great Britain's presence to be indispensable, walk side by side with her, give up doing things r. pidly and be satisfied with slow—very slow—progress?

On this point in Europe, and particularly in Strasburg, the controversy remains acute, and I admit that I am, myself, hesitant.

On the one hand, I would like to create Europe and to create her quickly. On the other hand, I am fully aware that the Europe about whom we are speaking today is already a terribly mutilated Europe. Because of the Russians, the whole Eastern Europe and a great part of Central Europe are outside our influence. To deprive ourselves now of British experience is, of course, to make a caricature of our dream of a united Europe.

All these explanations, very incomplete, though already very long, aim at showing you the complexity of the European problem.

What reasons, besides faith, do we have that we will succeed?

First of all, the attitude of the French Government.

The year 1950 has shown that for the French Government the adhesion to the idea of a European solution was no longer a theoretical adhesion to some principles, but the elaboration of practical propositions.

At the beginning of the year Mr. Robert Schumann, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, proposed to create in Europe one single market for steel and coal. Politically, he was seeking a lasting solution to the old Franco-German rivalry and, economically, the success of his plan would constitute the first effective step in the way of European integration.

A few months later the French Government proposed the creation of a European army. I know that this idea was not received very well in the United States; that it was considered as a dilatory maneuver aiming at putting off the rearming of Germany. But for us, who have known three Franco-German wars in less than a century, the idea of seeing the tools, which permitted these conflicts, destroyed once and for all, is a great idea and you will certainly understand it. The prospect of seeing the forces of Europe assemble in a single army to fight against an eventual aggression from the U. S. S. R. is without a doubt a prospect that to us seems like salvation.

But it is not only the position taken by the French Government which makes me believe that the idea of a new Europe is definitely on the march, it is also the work of the Assembly in Strasburg and it is above all the evolution of the mentality of the masses in Europe.

In Strasburg, in spite of all the difficulties, things are beginning to take shape.

The Assembly has already become a European rostrum unique of its kind.

It is there, and there only, that the different European viewpoints can be confronted publicly and contradictorily. I do not exaggerate in saying that without the Assembly of Strasburg, there would have been neither the Schumann plan nor the proposal for a European army. It is at the Assembly of Strasburg that the atmosphere making such tentatives possible was created.

But there is more. Efforts directed at giving a more realistic and a more effective authority to the Council of Europe are beginning to succeed. A way has now been found and I trust that in the course of this year, the statute will be modified in a manner enabling the Council of Europe to solve efficaciously a certain number of problems.

But what is more important is that public opinion, in all classes, is beginning to stem. Last year, in Philadelphia, I had to confess honestly that the movement for a united Europe was, so far, the movement of the elite. Today, I have the right to say that it is beginning to be a movement of the masses.

Why this change in the course of 1 year? Of course because of the effects of propaganda, but no propaganda in the world would have succeeded if events had not forced Europeans to awaken.

In less than 6 months, the Korean war and the question of the rearming of Germany have shown the Europeans that in questions vitally important to them, questions from which depended their very existence, they had but little say.

This conviction has been the reason for Europeans to awaken and will be, in the months to come, the basis of a more audacious will, which will permit, I am convinced, important progress in the cause of European unity.

It seems to me impossible to end this explanation without saying something about the rearmament of Europe.

It is not at all my intention to take part in the great debate that you are holding and upon which all depends.

But a clear understanding of the facts in Europe and of the European reactions can only aid the American people and their leaders to resolve the formidable problem which has been put before them. And it is that which gives me, I believe, the right to speak frankly.

In truth, a formidable problem. Because on the answer to the question raised in this debate hangs the fate of the United States, and that is much, but at the same time, on the answer to this question hangs also the fate of Europe, the choice between peace and war, and the destiny of our common civilization.

Let me say at first, and I repeat it to you and underline it with force, that in Europe, all the responsible leaders are perfectly conscious of the absolute obligation in which they find themselves, each in his own country, to do their part in the construction of the European defense.

No one thinks that he can leave to others, least of all to the United States, the responsibility of defending Europe. This is the principle that the immense majority of Europeans accept: the greatest burden in the defense of Europe must fall to Europe. American aid constitutes only an addition, but an addition of inestimable value because it transforms a defense which would be insufficient into a defense that will be victorious.

Let me say to you next that it is totally unjust and totally wrong to say that until now Europe had done nothing to solve the problem of rearmament.

As I have tried to explain to you, our principal activity during the last 2 years has been to reconstruct our land. It is for our reconstruction that you placed at our disposition the Marshall funds. It was for our reconstruction that we used them.

Now, in the past few months, we have faced a new problem, a problem altogether different, that of our rearmament.

We began to tackle this problem with the Brussels Treaty, signed 1 year before the Atlantic Pact by Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg.

In the framework of this treaty, our military chiefs went to work. They asked the different governments to build by the end of 1952 an army which would comprise at least 40 divisions. All of the governments accepted this plan and all began their work.

In France, the draft was extended from 12 to 24 months. The budget for defense, which in 1950 was 420,000,000,000 French francs, is, in 1951, 724,000,000,000, an increase of 70 percent. France will put 10 divisions on the ground in 1951 and then more in 1952.

In Great Britain, the period of general service has been extended from 18 to 24 months. Great Britain has promised 10 regular divisions and 12 territorial national guard divisions by 1952. Defense expenditures are now 33 percent of Britain's total budget.

In Belgium, the government proposes to extend the draft from 12 to 24 months. Expenses for rearmament will be, in 1951, 2,400,000,000 Belgian francs, or 10 times that of 1949. And Belgium will place five divisions in the field in 1952. In Europe, we can provide most of the men for our defense, and we will.

We can produce, also, certain arms; but it is absolutely clear that these divisions, which are indispensable to us, can only be equipped for modern war with the help of weapons from the United States. For this help, we hope.

All of this was decided and under way before General Eisenhower was designated to command the European forces.

The nomination of General Eisenhower is the best news received in Europe for many long months. It has been taken as a definite manifestation of American solidarity; as proof that the people of the United States attach to the defense of Europe the greatest importance.

In my opinion, General Eisenhower will succeed in his mission. His authority in Europe is great. He inspires respect and confidence. He will succeed, but on one condition: it is that the political problems posed by the defense of Europe and the American-European alliance are promptly and clearly resolved. It is absolutely necessary that on two sides of the Atlantic, we decide to look upon the problems of our defense as one problem, as a single problem; no longer the defense of France, or Belgium, or England, or the United States, but the

common defense of all the democratic and free nations.

What is the great fear of Europe? That America might refuse to declare war if Europe is attacked by the Russians? No. The great fear is that the United States will decide that to defend Europe on the ground is impossible; that the United States will accept the idea that Europe must inevitably fall to the Russian conquerors in the first phase of war and eventually be delivered by the victorious Americans after 2 years, 3 years, 10 years of occupation.

But I ask you, "What would be left of Europe after years of Soviet occupation?"

What we hope in Europe is that the United States will reject this fatalistic conception and that, from the very beginning of a war, they will be with us with all their strengths and with the precise objective of preventing the conquest of Europe.

I have been asked several times about the fighting spirit of Europe. My answer is clear. For a people or an army to be possessed of a true fighting spirit it is absolutely necessary to give them the conviction that they have a chance—a serious chance—of victory. Those who believe in inevitable defeat do not win battles.

There is for Europe only one hypothesis on which the chance of victory is great: It is that aid from America is given from the very beginning and completely; that the United States will engage itself without limit.

I understand very well that you are confronted with a very serious problem. Believe me, the question is not of deciding whether you will or will not send to Europe one division for each 10 European divisions. That is not in my mind the right approach to the difficulty. The question you must decide clearly and courageously is whether the defense of the United States begins in Europe, whether "Yes" or "No."

If you answer "No," in my opinion you are wrong, but then be logical and don't send any troops to Europe, because I do not see the advantage of sending a few American soldiers to participate in the fall of Europe by being beaten along with the Europeans in battle against Russia.

But if you say "Yes," and there are a hundred good reasons for you to say "Yes," then let your military leaders speak. Let them say what is required for the common defense of the United States and Europe. Since they are also the military chiefs of Europe, they will at the same time be able to insure that Europe makes the effort necessary for your effort to be worth while.

The hour of courageous decision is upon us. I am sometimes concerned when I see in Europe and also in the United States certain men who reason as if all were easy for the Russians; as if they had not themselves great difficulties to overcome; as if they held all the trumps in their hands.

What a fatal mistake. I am convinced that they already have and will have in the case of war more problems to resolve than we. Their internal situation, the atomic bomb, the possible revolt of their satellites, the length of their communication lines, their insufficient reserves of strategic materials are only examples of their troubles.

We have also our trumps and, up to now, when we have played well, we have won. In Greece, in Iran, in Berlin, and, on balance, in Korea also.

Let us be courageous and confident and above all, let us defend the just cause—peace, collective security, and the freedom of the people, the principles of democracy—and we will win again.

Is it not now the time—now or never—to repeat the immortal sentence that you have placed in stone on one of the most beautiful of your monuments:

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, modern wars more and more are changing into chemical-warfare wars. Since we must win whatever wars we enter, I am pleased that this is true, since these United States are not backward in the basic sciences utilized in chemical warfare. In this connection I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Chemical Men Hit United States Delay on Expansion," published February 19, 1951, in the Journal of Commerce.

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

CHEMICAL MEN HIT UNITED STATES DELAY ON EXPANSION—WAIT, SEE POLICY ON QUICK AMORTIZATION BLAMED AS PLAN LAGS

(By B. J. Slotky)

WASHINGTON, February 18.—The Government's cautious wait and see policy in granting certificates of necessity for quick amortization to some growth industries was blamed today by segments of the chemical industry for bogging down essential defense expansion.

At the same time, a number of industry officials here said the delay in granting certificates to some stepchild industries may mean policy makers are trying to decide how far they should go with a program of building Government-owned plants, like those of World War II.

BIG BACKLOG OF BIDS

One National Production Authority chemical expert admitted last week there is a considerable backlog of applications for certificates still to be acted upon, although a number have already been cleared. However, pending policy agreement, no information has been released by the Defense Production Administration on these applications.

Top Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson is known to be drafting a bill to get authority and funds to start a Federal defense building program. However, such a program, when it emerges, is expected to be far less extensive than in World War II and will probably stress expansion that industry is hesitant to undertake.

The problem of certification delay is said here to be particularly hard on growth industries such as chemicals and nonintegrated steel. In responding to earlier Government demands for all-out expansion, some spokesmen say these industries are using up their cash and credit and exhausting working capital to build new facilities.

FEAR INTERPRETATIONS

They say that unless prompt amortization is available some companies cannot replenish empty tills and obtain the working capital they need to operate plants already under construction.

Another bottleneck, they fear, is Government amortizing agency interpretation of the amortization provisions in the 1950 Revenue Act. These agencies maintain that less than full 20 percent a year amortization must be granted if a facility will be economically useful at the end of an arbitrary 5-year emergency period.

DPA is now the Government's top amortizing authority. The Revenue Act authorizes the administration to permit corporations to write off needed new facilities for tax purposes in 5 years rather than 25, as formerly.

SAY "GLAMOR" GETS NOD

Such a determination, spokesmen feel, means in practical terms that "glamorous" products like aluminum, steel, and benzene get the right-of-way while other basic products are subjected to lengthy scrutiny before being approved for expansion.

During the last war amortization was granted on a 100-percent basis when expansion was needed for defense, until near the end of the war when the percentage was dropped to 85 percent because of the tapering demand for war materials. At that time if only one-half of the plant was needed for defense, only one-half was amortized.

The present amortization procedures stipulate up to 100-percent amortization for emergency facilities but the Government now subjects applications to scrutiny on whether they have postwar usefulness. If so, the amortization percentage is lowered in order to prevent industry from getting something for nothing. Mobilizer Wilson has taken the position that no percentage granted should exceed 80 percent.

JOHNSON MOVE

In an effort to eliminate restrictive interpretations of the Revenue Act, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON (Democrat, Colorado), late last year offered an amendment to the excess profits tax bill which would deprive the administration of power it has exercised to grant less than 100-percent amortization.

JOHNSON explained his amendment would make it possible to grant certificates for facilities that were to be used partly but simultaneously for defense and nondefense purposes.

NSRB and later DPA have apparently based their interpretation of the act on the phrasing which authorizes a rapid write-off for only such portion of the cost as the certifying authority says is attributable to defense purposes.

The amendment, which finds high favor with the chemical industry, was dropped in conference with the understanding it would be brought up in connection with the next revenue bill. However, enactment of a revenue measure does not now appear immediately forthcoming.

Chemical spokesmen point out although Secretary of Interior Oscar L. Chapman has said 300 certificates of necessity totaling $2,000,000,000 have been authorized by the Government, none of these, so far as they know, has been granted to the chemical industry.

Does GOP Foreign Policy Rest Somewhere Between Diverse Views of Taft and Dewey?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Does GOP Foreign Policy Rest Somewhere Between Diverse Views of TAFT, Dewey?", which appeared in the February 14 issue of the

Salt Lake Tribune, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

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

DOES GOP FOREIGN POLICY REST SOMEWHERE BETWEEN DIVERSE VIEWS OF TAFT, DEWEY?

The wide divergence of Republican views on American foreign policy was dramatized by the Lincoln Day addresses of Senator TAFT, currently the most likely 1952 presidential candidate, and Governor Dewey, twice the GOP nominee and titular head of the party.

Speaking in Salt Lake City, "Mr. Republican" TAFT reiterated his belief that we must limit our military commitments, especially with regard to Europe's defense. Mr. Dewey, speaking in New York, called for a world-wide Monroe Doctrine, with all-out war the penalty if Russia steps over the global line.

Mr. TAFT goes a little beyond the Herbert Hoover proposal of "air power and the navy is the alternative to sending American land divisions to Europe," but he insists that the United States limit the scope of its European defense project and that Congress have the say-so on the number of troops to be sent abroad.

Mr. Dewey has gone beyond anything yet advocated by any administrative spokesman in calling for a registration of every American above 17, an Army of 100 divisions and a greatly enlarged Army, Navy, and Air Force. He rejects "any idea that America can live alone" and says "the only way to stop" Soviet aggression is "to draw the line."

Mr. TAFT would limit our land army contribution to Europe to five or six divisions, which would mean about a million men in the country's entire land Army. "The Army's plan provides 27 divisions. Surely we cannot send 15 of them to Europe, considering our requirements in the Far East, in America itself, in Alaska, backing up the sea and air control throughout the world."

The Ohio Senator warned that the current administration program, if carried through the years, would result in surrendering our liberties, making this country a "garrison state." That danger is very real, but can we really do a great deal about it? After all, the Kremlin is still calling the tune. We are resolved against a preventive war. Can we wait for an attack before going on a war footing?

If the Republican leadership hopes to supplant the administration foreign policy there will have to be considerable compromising between the various schools of thought within the party. In the Taft-Hoover camp are Utah's Senator WATKINS, Nebraska's Senator WHERRY (though much more isolationist), Senators BREWSTER, CAIN, CAPEHART, JENNER, KEM, MALONE, and others. Senators DIRKSEN and KNOWLAND are thumping so hard for aid to Chiang Kai-shek that they give the impression they would risk a full-scale war with the Communists in the Far East. Mr. BRIDGES would be tough to the point of breaking at once all diplomatic ties with Russia and her satellites.

In the internationalist school, with Dewey the most ardent spokesman, now are Senators LODGE, SALTONSTALL, IVES, TOBEY, AIKEN, MORSE, and VANDENBERG. Unfortunately, the latter is still too ill to take an active part. So far as Europe is concerned, this group is not far from the administration in foreign policy views.

Mr. TAFT is strongest on domestic problems and he effectively tied the international program with the home front economic situation in his address Monday night. He is correctly concerned about the load limit the United States economy will bear over a long period of time and favors limitations to expenditures to avoid disastrous inflation. He doubts that taxes can take more than 30 percent of the national income without damaging the economy.

"I believe about $65,000,000,000 a year on our present national income, or perhaps $75,000,000,000 with an increased income, is about the limit we can stand. As I see it, the administration program will cost at least $55,000,000,000 a year for the Armed Forces and $30,000,000,000 for other purposes. The program, I feel, must be reduced and can be reduced without endangering the safety of this country."

Mr. TAFT made a fine impression during his 2 days in Utah. He commands great respect. His tremendous energy, his sincerity, his encyclopedic mind and unique courage impressed those who met and heard him speak. As someone has aptly said, he speaks simply and candidly; he does not wrap himself in the American flag.

Perhaps with a little more wrestling with his conscience, and the hard realities of the world situation, Mr. TAFT will emerge truly as Mr. Republican in foreign affairs—which he is not now—as well as domestic affairs.

Proposed Amendments to Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act.

These include editorials from the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Boston Herald, the Grand Rapids Press, the Syracuse Herald-Journal, the Rochester Times-Union, and the New York Times.

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

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 13, 1951]

WHY SHOULD THEY START DRAFTING 18-YEAR-OLDS?

A sort of plural ogre steps into the lives of most young men when they are drafted for military service. The ogre's name is "They." "They" draft the youth. "They" ship him off to camp. "They" give him a uniform that feels uncomfortable after civilian clothes. Indeed, the young victim may convince himself "They" have been planning all this for his especial torment for a long, long time. Fortunately, the youth grows out of his hostility to "They" and he becomes a soldier. Some mothers don't, and become the moms.

In the end, of course "They" are the Congress of the United States. And Congress is not drafting boys for the fun of it. Congress is responsive not only to the moms but to the demands of economy, and it is not going to legislate a slice out of young men's lives unless it must. Right now it must. And the people who are advising Congress—Secretary of Defense George Marshall and his assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg—are proposing a wise course. There isn't any easy one.

What they want Congress to do is to make every 18-year-old boy subject to 27 months of military training and service, and to put him into a Reserve military organization for 3 to 6 years afterward. These are the reasons:

From now on, perhaps, the United States will have to keep a much stronger military muscle than it has ever had before except in the midst of major war. But Secretary Marshall doesn't want to build a tremendous peacetime army to fret its time away in training camps.

"How about the Reserves?" we can hear the draftees asking "Why did they stay in if it wasn't for a time like this? And how about the veterans of the last war, don't they already have the training and experience?"

Yes, they did stay in for such a time as this, and many of them already have been recalled to active duty. They not only have training and experience (though some of it may have worn rather rough at the elbows), they also have more years than they did before. Besides, most o. them have formed places in the productive capacity of this country. And production is as much a part of armament and defense as an army is. The Defense Department—"They," if you like—doesn't want to tear up industrial production while it builds an army. That would be like setting up an enemy to defeat our own effort.

The Regular Army, however, is big enough to do a great job of training. It and the Reserve and National Guard units now on duty can serve as a sort of faculty (the Army calls it a cadre) to organize and train the young Army. President Truman is talking of 3,462,000 men in the Armed Forces by the end of June. That is little more than a fourth of the Armed Forces at World War II peak. After the first 2 years there will be a yearly turn-over as 20-year-olds return to civilian life. Yet in event of war the Nation will have on tap an Army of respectable proportions, vigorous youth, and better training and skills than it has been able to muster in the past.

"They" are not trying to persecute mom's boy. "They" are doing the best they know how to protect his country, his very world.

[From the Boston Herald of January 12, 1951]

THE 18-YEAR-OLDS

It could not have been a pleasant duty for Secretary of Defense Marshall to ask Congress this week for a call-up of 18-year-olds. No form of compulsory military service is pleasant and we have rarely before demanded the services of such young citizens except in time of actual war.

But we are now in a state of emergency verging upon war. And for the particular set of circumstances which we face the Secretary seems to have produced as painless a solution as we can hope to get.

The Secretary's program is essentially the same as the one advocated by President Conant of Harvard. Under it universal military service for 18- and 19-year-olds would, at first supplement and later replace the present selective service. The immediate aim is to help raise the quick strength we need to meet our enemies in Korea and Europe. The long term is to provide a mechanism for maintaining reserve strength without the cost and waste of a huge standing army.

In the long period of semimobilization which lies ahead the great problem for America will be to set up a balance of economic and human strength which will not collapse of its own weight before it has to be used. We have great manpower reserves. It is estimated that the potential United States labor force will number more than 70,000,000 by 1953 and we can spare the 3,500,000 the President seeks for the Armed Forces—perhaps even a little more—without slowing our economy. But we cannot match Russia's manpower in arms without weakening ourselves fatally in other lines.

The universal military service program would call upon everybody as he came of age to perform military duty, but the maximum period of compulsory service (except in actual war) would be 27 months. Thus the effect would be merely to postpone the entry of most young men into productive civilian pursuits, including higher education, and it would eventually release many, if not all of the older age groups, now subject to draft, from the obligation of military service.

Such an arrangement, if it can be made to work, would certainly put a minimum pressure on the civilian economy. And, if it is assumed that some kind of compulsory service is inevitable, the 18- and 19-year call-up is probably the easiest on servicemen, in that it catches them for the most part before they are committed either to college or to a profession.

The chief objectors are apt to be the colleges and universities, which are already being depopulated under selective service pressure. But generous exceptions are provided in the new proposal to care for their need. During the transition period some 75,000 exemptions would be granted to students to "keep educational pipelines from drying up," and ROTC and other military education projects would be expanded to utilize higher educational facilities.

Secretary Marshall's program is not ideal, but we do not live in a world whose problems always permit of ideal solution. Congress should approve universal military service promptly unless a demonstrably more practical program is offered during the current hearings.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of January 11, 1951]

DRAFT 18-YEAR-OLDS

Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall's combination universal military service and training program makes sense for these times. What Marshall is proposing is a program that would be flexible enough to meet the Nation's needs in times of crisis while shoring up the national defense in less critical periods.

To accomplish this twin purpose, Marshall would draft all 18-year-olds for 27 months' service. If world tension eased, the program would be altered to provide for up to 6 months of training and reserve service.

What should appeal to the public in this is the fact that the Nation would be assured of a reservoir of trained men at a minimum cost. It would cost less than trying to maintain a huge Regular Army for an indefinite period, and it would cost the individual the minimum in time away from school or other preparations for the future. Moreover, by taking the 18-year-olds, the country would be guaranteed a trained force for many years to come.

The hesitation which Congress has shown in drafting 18-year-olds can't be defended on anything but sentimental grounds. Military leaders have testified that men in this age group make excellent soldiers—better ones than do men around the 30-mark. Moreover, the younger men have fewer responsibilities and have not yet become essential cogs in the Nation's industrial machine. They can be spared far more readily than can the older men. Yet much of the talk in Congress about meeting the Armed Forces' manpower needs has been along the line that the draft age limit should be raised. Marshall's plan is much sounder from every angle and ought to be adopted ahead of any program to draft older men.

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal of January 12, 1951]

CALLING UPON YOUTH

Secretary of Defense Marshall's plan for compulsory universal military service and training of 27 months for all men on reaching the age of 18 is a far-reaching measure. In the weeks to come it will be carefully studied and debated, not only in Congress but throughout America—that America which it is designed to protect and whose millions of young men will be affected.

Secretary Marshall stated clearly the objective. It is to solve the problem of providing adequate, trained military manpower with the least possible impairment of the Nation's productive processes over a long period of years. Even after enactment the plan will be subject to change as experience suggests improvements.

To the formulation of this plan the Secretary and Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of manpower and personnel problems, have devoted much thought. Solving the problem calls for such a detailed knowledge of conditions that the average person will feel unqualified to pass a final judgment on it. It will profoundly affect not only the young men concerned but our colleges also.

General Marshall speaks by the book when he pays tribute to the fighting ability of young men because of their energy and resilience. These qualities were amply proved in the recent war. If actual combat should be deferred a few years, a reservoir of trained youth would be still available while if older men were taken their usefulness would rapidly decline.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of January 13, 1951]

YOUTH KNOWS THE SCORE

"We should get 'em young and get 'em ready."

"If there isn't going to be a war it will be because our strengthened forces are too much for Russia."

"If it's for the common defense I think it's good."

"If we have to have a war I'd rather be trained and ready."

"I think the 18-year-olds should be drafted."

There you are, folks. These are quotes from 17- and 18-year-olds in Rochester high schools who were questioned about universal service beginning at 18.

These young men evidently understand the score better than many adults. Every young generation is said to be irresponsible, but two have proved to the contrary when the chips were down and here comes a third one. How many generations does it take to convince the skeptical?

[From the New York Times of January 19, 1951]

FOR UMST

In the letter sent to Congress by Secretary of Defense Marshall, in support of the new measure which would provide for a system of universal military service and training, there occurs this passage:

"What we need, and what this bill would provide, is the assurance that we would be able to build up our combat force with all possible speed * * * that we would be able to maintain whatever strength might be needed for as long as might be necessary to insure world peace * * * [and that] we could achieve these ends with the minimum cost in men and money, and with the least necessary dislocation of industry, agriculture, education, and family life."

The new bill for UMST conforms faithfully to these sound principles. Let us consider, briefly, what it would and would not do:

It would not saddle the country with the gigantic cost of maintaining a standing army large enough to meet emergency needs; it would provide instead an adequate body of trained reserves—trained, and kept in training.

It would not make the safety of the United States the special business of a fractional part of its young able-bodied population; this responsibility would be universal, automatic, democratic.

It would not disrupt the normal procedures of each young man's life more than is necessary to achieve this purpose; the age 18 is deliberately chosen as coming between the period of high school and college education.

It would not drain the colleges themselves of the young scientific brains whose specialized training is also a necessary factor in the Nation's safety; provision is made for a temporary suspension of active military service, with this end in view, though the obligation for a later, post-graduate period of service would properly remain.

It would not set up a riches-and-poverty system of security, under which the armed services were overwhelmed with personnel one year and starved the next; instead, the supply of needed men would be constant, steady and predictable.

It would not fasten upon the country an inflexible, hard-and-fast system of national defense, impervious to changes elsewhere in the world; instead, if the present emergency should abate, the President would have power to reduce or eliminate the service requirement for all inductees and all services.

These are some among other strong advantages of the new bill. They are strong reasons for hoping that action on it by Congress will be prompt and favorable.

South Dakota Melody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, currently there is considerable interest in State songs. Locally, a contest is being conducted to bring out a song for the District of Columbia.

It is not easy for a poem of a few stanzas to convey the beauty, strength, and varied interests of any of our great States. A very fine picture of South Dakota is given in Marie Christopherson's South Dakota Melody, which, by the permission of the author and the Senate, I place in the RECORD.

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

SOUTH DAKOTA MELODY

(By Marie Christopherson)

From the fertile green Sioux valley
To the hills that kiss the blue,
There's a land of rugged beauty
Flaming sunsets and spacious view,
Where the golden pheasant crows at dawn
And cattle graze the plain,
Where the wind sings a refrain
To the fields of waving grain,
And the people smile at you.

Like a mammoth organ rumbling
Is the music of the pines,
And the mountain streams keep tumbling
Into clear ringing bell-like chimes,
There is music in the starlit night
Filled with love and mystery,
And there's music in the day
As we swing along our way,
South Dakota melody.

Here the mighty old Missouri
Rolling onward to the sea,
Sing a saga of our progress
As we work out our destiny,
There is music in her many moods
And music from above—
As the honking wild geese fly
There is music from the sky,
South Dakota melody.

Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Analyzes Our Responsibility and Competence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator TAFT Analyzes Our Responsibility and Competence," published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, of February 14.

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

SENATOR TAFT ANALYZES OUR RESPONSIBILITY AND COMPETENCE

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, one of the strong men of his political party and presently Mr. Republican in the United States Senate, spoke in Salt Lake City at the Lincoln Day dinner on Monday evening. The audience that filled the banquet room at the Newhouse Hotel represented only a fraction of his hearers, since his talk was broadcast over KSL.

Senator TAFT's long experience in the Senate qualifies him to look with a critical and discriminating eye on problems of national import that may seem pretty remote or complex to the ordinary citizen. But he brought, in his address, some of these problems very near to the heart of the average man, and reduced many of their complexities to two simple categories: First, What should we do? And second, What can we do?

Under the first heading, he indicated strongly the fundamental constitutional questions in which we are involved, as a consequence of the clouds of war that are hovering about our heads.

He dealt with principles, not with personalities. Without questioning the right of the President as Commander in Chief to issue any order for emergency military action, anywhere, when the lives or property of American citizens are critically endangered, he boldly challenged the right of any President to make commitments otherwise which would enthroll this Nation in a war without the consent of Congress.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole right to declare war. This was the constitutional fact which Mr. TAFT stressed—the reason for his reiterated insistence that we should operate, in both domestic and foreign relations, strictly within our constitutional framework; the elaboration of his fear that past agreements of various sorts have mushroomed or snowballed to the point where we are facing emergencies created by commitments unconfirmed by Congress and the people—and that these commitments are getting out of hand.

On this second question—What can we do?—Senator TAFT marshaled an imposing array of physical and fiscal figures. We have only 6 percent of the world's population, and so we cannot, on a basis of simple arithmetic, hope to compete in raw manpower with Asia's teeming millions, who outnumber us nearly 2 to 1.

We do have some 75 percent of the world's skilled manufacturing production, and so can beat any nation or all other nations in the output of nonagricultural materials necessary, for either war or peace.

As a consequence, our part in preserving the peace of the world, Mr. TAFT pointed out, cannot be primarily that of furnishing soldiers, particularly to garrison Europe.

He did not urge that we furnish no troops at all for the Atlantic Pact defense army which General Eisenhower has been named to recruit and command.

Rather, he urged—in effect—that our contribution to those forces be no more than the cadre necessary to stiffen—and to make effective the Eisenhower-type staff methods and operational training—an army the great bulk of which the European nations should provide.

Specifically he estimated that such an American contribution of ground troops should not go beyond 10 percent of the total Atlantic Pact European garrison force, as opposed to the plus 85 percent of American contingent in the Army now fighting under General MacArthur's UN banner in Korea. Thus he did not go quite as far on the ground-troops-for-Europe issue as Herbert Hoover urges; but he did stand staunchly at Mr. Hoover's side on the point of building up our Air Force and Navy to the point where we can safely put the brakes on some of the increased-ground-forces proposals that we are hearing these days.

Then he talked about money—taxation limits, fiscal policy, and the like; and he talked very soundly indeed. His major points are recited in our news columns.

The rest of the address was—as was to be expected and could be only proper at a Lincoln Day dinner held by and for Republican Party stalwarts—frankly and earnestly political.

If Mr. TAFT is not an active and overt candidate for the presidency today his admirers hope that he is, or hope soon to make him so.

He did not disappoint them. Altogether he fulfilled his engagement with a first-rate job of work.

Rain Making: Twentieth Century Legal Phenomenon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the subject of rain making involves a great many new legal questions, not the least of which is the question of how much responsibility rainmakers have for floods and for unusual disturbances of the weather.

The Harvard Law School Record in two installments carried an article by Ralph E. Corey entitled "Rain Making: Twentieth Century Legal Phenomenon." It has occurred to me that the article should have a wider circulation than it may have received through the Law School Record. In order that it may be available to businessmen, farmers, cattlemen, and others who recently have become interested in rain making, I am asking permission to reprint it in full in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it may freely circulate to those who are particularly interested.

I have received from the Government Printing Office an estimate that the cost of printing this article will be $266.

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

[From the Harvard Law School Record of February 14, 1951]

RAIN MAKING, TWENTIETH CENTURY STYLE, INCHOATE HEADACHE FOR LEGISLATORS, JURISTS, COREY SAYS AFTER NATIONAL SURVEY

Some wag has declared in not-too-original paraphrase: "Weather is just like women—we can't live with her, and we can't live without her."

Since the dawn of history, man has been obliged to live with weather—and accept it, because he could not control it. But like the element of fire a few thousand years before, control it he did in 1946. As a result of an outdoor dry-ice experiment by Vincent J. Schaefer, a General Electric Co. chemist, an 8-inch snowfall fell in upper New York and Vermont, although the local weather bureau had forecast fair and warmer weather.

It is a rare treat, indeed, to be present at the birth of a new science. But the process of artificial rain making and weather control is more than just another scientific experience. It is a legal phenomenon of the twentieth century.

Since that snowy December afternoon in New England, the science of weather control has made considerable advances. But on the heels of these advances important legal problems have arisen which still remain unsolved and unadjudicated by the law courts of this country.

WHAT IS RAIN MAKING?

Before exploring the legal issues raised by the birth of this new phenomenon, a brief explanation of the artificial rain-making process seems in order. Rainfall is mechanically produced by a human operator who passes dry ice (or silver iodide) particles through a supercooled cloud (moisture cloud containing droplets in a liquid water state). A high instability in temperature, air pressure, and humidity factors occurs just prior to precipitation. The sudden introduction of dry-ice particles creates nuclei of ice particles. A chain reaction and contraction is set up within the cloud body, and rain falls. Man-induced rain may be accomplished in several ways. Airplanes may fly above the cloud and "seed" dry-ice particles over and directly into the cloud. Rockets and ground generators can shoot up silver-iodide mist or dry-ice particles into the cloud. Then, by estimating wind velocities and direction of air currents, a situs of proposed rainfall can be calculated and forecast.

Controlled rainfall is only one of several benefits which can result from man's interference with weather. Weather control may be employed negatively, as well. Rain clouds can be made to drop their rain burden prematurely. Hurricanes and tornadoes may be detoured from their courses by altering the weather factors in their paths. Extensive droughts, floods, and consuming forest fires can possibly be averted. Weather can also be harnessed for military purposes, and made to serve in the fields of atomic, bacterial, and chemical warfare.

RESPONSIBLE CONTROL NEEDED

These public benefits may result only if weather is controlled by some responsible agency. The possibility of grave damage to private and public interests from irresponsible attempts to control weather is great. The haphazard unscientific efforts of amateur

rain makers may actually be upsetting the balance of nature. It is alleged that private experimenters tend to strew every rain cloud which hoves into sight with dry ice. These clouds may float hundreds of miles away from the semiarid zones which need rain. They may dump their moisture in places like the Red River Valley, N. Dak., which last spring had an incredible 5,000 percent of normal rainfall. It has also been noted that widespread modification of the weather pattern over much of the United States may have resulted from a systematic silver iodide seeding operation conducted during 1950 in New Mexico. Possible applications and benefits of artificial weather control should not be permitted to overshadow the ultimate objective: To render calculable the effects of any hypothetical human intervention, and to introduce responsible control, as distinguished from haphazard interference.

NO ADJUDICATED CASES

With the exception of one recent New York case, *Slutsky* v. *City of New York* (18 Law Week 2523 (May 11, 1950)), weather control or artificial rain-making problems have not yet been adjudicated by the American courts. In an attempt to discover possible adjudication in this new field, the author sent a questionnaire to the attorneys general of the 48 States. The questionnaire asked: (a) Do you know of any rain-making or weather-control litigation in your State? (b) Have any weather-control bills been introduced into your State legislature, or into Congress by your Representatives or Senators? (c) What is your opinion as to possible grounds for legal liability arising out of damage resulting from artificial rain making and weather control? Over 40 replies were received. The majority replied in the negative to the questions asked, and none admitted to any knowledge of State litigation or legislation in this field. Most officials queried declined to offer opinions on the subject of possible legal liability.

Among those who offered helpful comment was Mr. Harold R. Fatzer, attorney general of the State of Kansas: "About 1900 this State was beset with professional rain makers who had enormous machinery with a funnel extending into the sky.

"The people of Kansas generally rely upon prayer as to such matters, but there is little evidence that they have ever been heard, and if such a method was either successful or unsuccessful nobody knew where and how they could litigate any damage resulting from the success or failure."

SEVERAL QUESTIONS

Several questions develop out of an attempt to relate artificial rain making and weather control to legal liability. Some apparent issues are: (a) Is there an ownership in clouds? (b) What is the liability at common law, if any, for injuries caused by artificial rain making? (c) If human control is to be exercised over weather, who should exercise it—private persons, the State, or the Nation? (d) If weather is controlled by the Federal Government, what legislation and factors of liability should be created?

WHO OWNS THE CLOUDS?

Until recently, no one has ever asserted a property right in clouds. The common law has long recognized certain so-called natural rights, or essential natural advantages which are inherent in land and air space. Pure air, the right of support, benefits from flowing water, freedom from nuisance, and pollution have long been considered natural rights. They represent essential portions of the value of the land in its natural condition. Without them, there would be little security in the enjoyment of land by its owner.

An Albany Law Review writer suggests applying the well-known water-rights doctrines in an endeavor to determine possible property rights in clouds. Eli Goldston, inquiring into the legal aspects of artificial rain making for the first time in the Harvard Law School Record in early 1948, suggested that the legal concept of natural watercourse should be extended to cover the entire precipitation-evaporation cycle. He noted that in recent years courts have increasingly applied surface-water rules to percolating water problems. Goldston further suggested that the best of present watercourse law be used, rather than treat celestial water as some mineral ferae naturae.

However, established water-rights doctrines appear to be of doubtful applicability to the field of weather control. These doctrines apply to earth-bound waters, and their judicial interpretations vary considerably throughout the United States. Moisture-bearing clouds are transitory and free moving. They form and disintegrate at pleasure in the course of their travels. They are not earth-bound like lakes and streams, and follow no predetermined, defined course, or existence.

Several theories exist in the common law on which a court might base liability for alleged damages to property caused by artificial rain making and weather control. Three such theories are trespass, negligence, and nuisance.

TRESPASS

The authorities seem to be in general agreement that intended trespass to property is made actionable by existing tort law. Prosser on Torts notes that "trespass may consist of any entry of a person or thing upon land in the possession of the plaintiff, or in remaining upon it, or allowing a thing to remain upon it, where there is a duty of removal." The Restatement of Torts finds liability for trespass only in the case of intentional intrusion, negligence, or some extra-hazardous activity. Liability is imposed for ground damage, regardless of negligence or intent. A recent opinion of the attorney general of Minnesota holds that when drift from aerial spraying is carried over into neighboring fields, a trespass to real estate is committed. The decision effectively allows recovery of nominal damages by all owners of possessory interests whose land or effectively tenable airspace has been trespassed.

NEGLIGENCE

The Restatement of Torts also impresses a strict tort liability for negligence in conducting an activity without due notice or warning, if an unreasonable risk and harm is created to persons and property on the ground. Persons damaged may recover for all harms caused by the actor's negligence. One case closely related to the field of artificial precipitation dealt with steam coming from a vent in defendant's building. The steam condensed in a cold wind, and fell, forming a coat of ice on the pavement adjoining defendant's property. Defendant had notice that this was happening. Held, Defendant's conduct was the proximate cause of plaintiff's fall on the ice, and defendant was held liable for his negligence. *Diehl* v. *Fidelity Philadelphia Trust Co.* (159 Pa. Sup. Ct. 513, 49 A. 2d 190 (1946)). In a similar instance, defendant was held liable for his negligence in allowing steam to escape across a public highway, obscuring plaintiff's vision and causing him to collide with another car. In other cases, liability was established in aerial crop dusting, and several States have passed legislation controlling crop-dusting activities.

The common law remedy for nuisance is a temporary or permanent injunction ordering its immediate abatement, on penalty of contempt of court. Statutory liability for nuisance in the field of aviation has been inserted in the Civil Air Regulations. The regulations provide for the seizure of aircraft, recovery of a civil penalty, and the suspension or revocation of the pilot's certificate for violating the provision which states that "no person piloting an aircraft shall permit anything to be dropped from an aircraft in flight which might create any hazard to persons or property."

PROXIMATE CAUSE

One of the most difficult questions with which a court will have to deal in determining weather control liability on a strict tort basis will be the pricking question of proximate cause. Proof of what happened during a rain-making experiment requires a laborious, if not impossible, reconstruction of scientific events in an air column whose volume may range up to thousands of cubic miles. The air column may be inclined at various degrees from the earth's surface. It may be moving 20 miles an hour, or with the fearsome velocity of a hurricane. Tremendous distances are involved at which such natural effects take place. It is unlikely that a plaintiff who alleges harm from an isolated rain-making experiment will be able to prove factually to the satisfaction of a court or jury that the precise experiment itself proximately caused the rain which, in turn, caused his damage. Moreover, technical meteorological equipment and specially trained weather personnel are required to record and evaluate the causal effects of the rain-making experiment upon a rain cloud. Such facilities would usually not be available to either of the parties in litigation, nor to the court.

As scientific knowledge and control in the weather field increases, proof of causation should become easier. However, the difficult burden of proof now placed upon the plaintiff to establish proximate cause may keep most aggrieved parties out of court, or will tend to promote pretrial settlements.

Whether or not a strict tort liability develops out of the application of these tort doctrines would seem in part to depend upon the relative responsibility of the person or agency conducting the weather control experiment, and upon the relative importance of the purpose for which the experiment is conducted. The restatement of torts states that where the Government activity is reasonable, despite imminent risks, the rule of ultra-hazardous activity should not apply. The restatement also observes that the utility and social value of the activity will dispel most of the charges of public nuisance.

RAIN MAKER'S DEFENSE

A rain maker might assert that he is privileged to make rain—that liability should not follow normal rainfall injury or incidental inconvenience (damnum absque injuria). He might also maintain that he is privileged on the grounds of public necessity or emergency. He might argue that an absolute privilege should exist to artifically create rain in the public interest, in event of emergency. In *Slutsky* v. *City of New York*, the only reported antificial rain-making case in this country, Mr. Justice Pecora of the New York Supreme Court reaffirmed the ancient privilege of public necessity, and refused to grant an injunction against the city of New York to restrain its recent emergency rain-making efforts. Justice Pecora said:

"The court must balance the conflicting interests between a remote possibility of inconvenience to plaintiffs' resort and its guests with the problem of maintaining and supplying the inhabitants of the city of New York and surrounding areas, with a population of about 10,000,000 inhabitants, with an adequate supply of pure and wholesome water. The relief which plaintiffs ask is opposed to the general welfare and the public good; and the dangers which plaintiffs apprehend are purely speculative. This court will not protect a possible private injury at the expense of a positive public advantage."

[From the Harvard Law School Record of February 21, 1951]

RAIN MAKING CALLS FOR UNITED STATES CONTROL IS COREY'S CONCLUSION IN FINAL ARTICLE

One of many issues which a court might be called upon to settle in an artificial rain-making case is: What is the liability for intentionally or negligently diverting rain away from another's land, or for causing rain to fall upon another's land, without his consent? In most agricultural regions of this country, the presence or absence of rain can spell prosperity or disaster. Rain may not always be considered a benefit.

Once the court has solved this initial issue, a further question might arise: Does one have a legal right to normal rainfall, free from human intervention or control? This is a most difficult issue to solve, since private property rights in clouds have not yet been established. Furthermore, how is a court to determine whether or not a cloud would normally have dropped its rain, had not human control intervened?

If the second major question should be answered in the affirmative, still other issues might arise to test the judicial temper: Should defendant be liable irrespective of fault, or only if he was negligent? Should he be liable only for the results he intended, or for those which were unintended as well?

Another factor is also important. If rain makers and weather-control experts are stopped from carrying on their experimentations by restraining injunctions and tests of absolute tort liability, progress in this important field is likely to stop. Whether this will be salutary or not will depend upon the inherent value of weather control to the national community. There seems to be little doubt that experimentation should continue in this field. But some responsible, over-all control may be necessary.

ADJUDICATION OR LEGISLATION?

In September 1950 the office of the Attorney General of the State of California submitted to the State water resources board a progress report dealing with the legal responsibilities and liabilities involved in artificial rain making. The report also dealt with the power of the State to regulate and control such activities. In the opinion of the writers of this report, there seemed to be little difficulty in sustaining the broad power of the State to regulate artificial rain making, both for the purpose of preventing damage to property, and to conserve the water resources of the State. This opinion was based upon the reasonable exercise by the State of its police power in the general fields of public health, safety, and morals, and the preservation and promotion of the field of weather control.

If adjudication of weather-control issues is left to State and local courts, the answers promise to be slow in coming. Almost 5 years have passed since Schaefer's snow-making experiment took place. Yet only a single artificial rain-making case has been brought before a court for adjudication. Goldston observes that when lawmaking runs ahead of scientific development, as it did in the subterranean water cases, much harm may result from the application of unsound rules. He reasserts that the genius of the common law lies in its case-by-case development. Whether the science of weather control can afford to wait for deliberate case-by-case adjudication is the question. If weather control problems are left to the courts for solution, it is also doubtful that a uniform, Nation-wide solution will result. Divergent statutes and judicial interpretations, which can seriously inhibit progress in this field, may result within different jurisdictions.

It appears, then, that a possible answer lies in the realm of Federal legislation and adjudication. Legislation by the Federal Government would tend to foreclose possible controversies between the States regarding interstate liability for rain-making and weather-control damage. Federal legislation would bring into play the vast resources and specialized civil-service manpower of the Federal Government. Undoubtedly such legislation would also establish uniform licensing requirements and regulations defining and limiting liability for rain-making damage. Federal courts would exercise jurisdiction over litigation arising out of violations of the Federal weather-control statutes.

WEATHER CONTROL ACT OF 1951

An example of such suggested legislation is the Federal Weather Control Act of 1951 (S. 4236) submitted to the United States Senate on December 8, 1950, and sponsored by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. This proposed legislation generally follows the outline of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. It effectively places weather modification and control activities exclusively under the control of the Federal Government. Senator ANDERSON observes that, from a scientific standpoint, it is just as important to deal with weather modification and control at an early stage in its development as it was necessary to deal with atomic energy in 1946. In his mind, the issue is relatively clear: It is a question of intelligent Federal regulation now, or continued, haphazard private interference with weather, with no central authority to channel the course of its development in the national interest.

The bill provides for four major programs: (1) A program of assisting and fostering private research and development; (2) a program of federally conducted research and development; (3) a program for Government control of experiments and operations; and (4) a program of administration. These four programs will be supervised and administered by the Weather Control Commission, assisted by a general advisory committee, Military Liaison Committee, and an Interdepartmental Advisory Board. The Commission is directed to exercise its powers in such a manner as to insure the continued conduct of research and development activities in the field of weather modification and control by private and public institutions or persons. It may also conduct its own research and experimentation.

ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY

The act also provides for Government assumption of the liability of its contractors growing out of the performance of their weather-control contracts. The factors of liability are stated in section 10 of the act, which, among other things, provides that—

With the approval of the Commission, any contract with a Government agency relating to weather modification or control may provide that the Government will assume and will become solely responsible for either or both of the following, to the extent that they arise out of the performance of said contract, are not compensated by insurance or otherwise, and do not result from a willful violation on the part of the contractor of any regulation or order established by the Commission pursuant to section 8 (a) (2):

1. All liability on account of claims by third persons, including employees of the contractor, for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, whether due to the negligence of the contractor or otherwise; but any contract so providing shall also contain appropriate provisions for notice to the Government of any claims made against the contractor, with respect to any alleged liability for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property; and

2. Loss of or damage to property of the contractor arising as a result of a risk defined in the contract as unusual.

The act further provides that—

No cause of action with respect to any such claims may be maintained against the contractor, but such third person's sole cause of action and only remedy shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation with respect to such claims.

Another provision specifies that the United States may avail itself of any and all general or special defenses which might be pleaded by the contractor, were he to be a defendant in the suit.

There seems to be lacking in the act the designation of a liability factor which would aid adjudication in this hypothetical case. Suppose that Bingling, a circus owner, schedules a 3-day show stand in Ames City, located deep in the heart of the upper Rio Grande Valley, an irrigated, agricultural region of great economic value to the Nation. Government rain makers seed clouds in the region. A heavy, 3-day downpour results, and farmers in the Ames City area rejoice. However, Bingling angrily folds his tents after 3 days of "no show," steals away and sues the United States in the Court of Claims for damage to his economic interest. What is the liability, and what are the factors of liability?

What appears to be lacking in the bill is the presence of a factor of liability which is based upon an express authority to balance relative economic and social interests which might be damaged or benefited by Government weather-control activities. In the hypothetical case just stated, the farmers' collective need of rain would seem to overbalance the private right of the circus owner to three rainless performances. With an express statutory authority to balance the interests, the Court of Claims would be aided in deciding the case above cited.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

Congress should be able to find constitutional authority to support its legislation in this field. The authority granted to Congress by the Federal Constitution to legislate in matters involving interstate commerce furnishes the basic authority. Clouds are valuable and usable properties which move freely in interstate and international commerce. Weather control substantially affects the commerce between the several States. Current Federal regulation in analogous fields may be cited in the cases of migratory birds, radio waves, Federal regulation of airways and navigable waterways.

If irrigation, water-power, flood-control, and navigation projects are considered to be objects worthy of Federal subsidization, it seems evident that weather control, with its foreseeable saving of human lives and property, should also be supported by public funds and efforts. It has previously been pointed out that the Federal Government is logically more able than private individuals or local governments to bear the huge burden of scientific research, personnel expense, or extensive damage claims.

When the period of strict Federal regulation has run its course, and when a conclusive control of weather has been achieved, it might then be feasible to amend or curtail the Federal statute in such a way as to grant State governments concurrent powers over supervision, regulation, and licensing of weather-control activities. Federal funds could still be made available to the several States for experimentation and regulation, either on a pro rata or total basis.

Rain making, the legal phenomenon of the twentieth century, is rapidly losing its phenomenal characteristics. If such legislation as the proposed Weather Control Act of 1951 becomes law, most of the legal problems discussed will no longer exist. The ultimate extent to which weather control may be utilized in the public interest is still speculative.

"Shooting for the Moon"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, one bit of strategy habitually practiced by the administration is that of "shooting for the moon" in its requests and recommendations to the Congress.

This procedure makes it possible for the administration to settle for less than originally asked for, while actually gaining more than either the merits of the case or the public interest warrant.

Thus, an illusion is created that Congress has won a victory or that the administration has graciously made a concession, whereas, so far as the net results are concerned, neither has actually occurred, and the public is still the loser. Fathers sometimes encounter this same type of maneuver with small, and not so small, children. The youngster—who has heard about inflation, too—asks for a dollar. The father settles for half a dollar, whereas, in reality, the youngster actually needed a quarter. An indulgent father may tolerate the practice with the full realization of what is going on, and even be amused by it.

There is no excuse, however, for a similar laxity on the part of the Congress when what is involved is billions of dollars of tax moneys and, in many instances, the lives and careers of the Nation's youth.

In its current dealings with the Eighty-second Congress, the administration is indulging, more than ever, in this practice of "shooting for the moon."

For example, consider the $71,500,000,000 budget proposed for 1951–52, and its accompanying tax-increase proposal of $16,500,000,000. Incidentally, the true 1951–52 budget is actually $98,500,000,000 instead of $71,500,000,000, since the higher figure is the recommended new obligational authority for 1951–52.

Please bear in mind that this budget and appalling tax-boost proposal were submitted by the President despite his earlier statement, in his state of the Union message, that the Government "must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities," and that "many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed." This high-sounding profession is, of course, completely belied by the President's inclusion in the budget of his entire Fair Deal socialistic program, most of which has already been rejected by the American people.

This is "shooting for the moon" with a vengeance, and the President's dare to the Congress to cut the budget further sets the stage for a phony congressional victory unless the Congress is alert to the maneuver. Note this point: The largest estimate of a possible budget cut thus far reported—that mentioned by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia—is only $8,000,000,000, and even with this cut the proposed $71,500,000,000 budget would still total $63,500,000,000, compared with a $47,200,000,000 estimated budget for 1950–51 and $40,100,000,000 actually authorized for 1949–50.

Thus, the trap is adroitly set whereby even a victory for the Congress in the form of a budget cut would still be a defeat for the taxpayer. The one ray of hope in the picture is the mounting evidence that even old-line Democrats are fed up with these tactics.

It is not alone in matter of finance that the administration uses "shooting for the moon" tactics.

The same procedure is involved in the effort of the Defense Department to tie in universal military training with the present emergency draft program. One of my Republican colleagues on the Armed Services Committee aptly described the proposal as a shotgun marriage.

For that matter, the currently proposed compromise arrangement for drafting boys at 18½, with the dubious proviso that they may not be used in combat until they are 19—when everyone knows there will not be any careful sorting of trainees in case of urgent need—suggests that the administration was again "shooting for the moon" in its original 18-year-old proposal.

And there are good reasons for believing that the administration was planning a "shoot for the moon" maneuver on the matter of troops to Europe until aroused public sentiment and congressional pressure, sparked by former President Hoover and Senator TAFT, forced Secretary Marshall to come up with the "only four divisions now" announcement.

And, of course, they can try "shooting for the moon" later, so far as the troops-to-Europe proposition is concerned.

Conservation of Pheasants and Other Game in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the weekly newspaper, the Reporter and Farmer, of Webster, S. Dak., pertaining to the work done by the Soil Conservation Service in cooperating with various groups to provide cover for pheasants.

It is significant that the practices discussed in the article will also provide cover for other game and will result in a complete conservation program for farmers who follow other suggestions of the conservation group. In view of the appropriations which Congress makes under the Pittman-Robertson Act and other acts, I believe this article is worthy of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

WOODY PLANTINGS FURNISH WINTER HABITAT FOR CHINESE PHEASANTS

(By Louis M. Moos)

The decrease in the pheasant population in sections of South Dakota has created a growing interest in the establishment of food and cover as a wildlife-management practice. Pheasants require several different kinds of cover, namely, nesting cover, loafing cover, roosting cover, escape cover and cover that provides protection from wind and blowing snow during the winter. All are essential, but the most pressing need at present is winter cover to protect the birds from cold and blowing snow.

Many of the measures included in a complete conservation plan for a farm are beneficial to pheasants and other wildlife. Among these are the establishment of woody plantings, strip cropping, grass buffers, grass waterways, seeding permanent hay, conservation management of range and pastures.

Correctly designed windbreaks and other woody plantings are of the greatest value for winter cover. That is, providing consideration is given to the protection required by pheasants in the selection of the tree and shrub species, their arrangement and the location in the planting in order to make it of greatest value to wildlife.

Such a planting must be wide enough to prevent its being completely filled with snow. It must have shrub rows to prevent the winds from sweeping through the plantings; it must include some shrubs that provide food for pheasants; and it must be located near enough to the principal food supplies.

A minimum width of 300 feet is recommended when a tree planting is designed for wildlife use. In addition to the rows of trees, such a planting should have at least one row, preferably two rows, of shrubs on the windward side, and a row of conifers and a row of shrubs on the leeward side. This will give the birds protection from the cold winds as well as keep snow from being blown entirely through the planting.

A snow tray will improve the planting for wildlife. It is provided by planting two rows of shrubs at least 30 feet, but preferably somewhat farther, to the windward side of the main planting. Snow will accumulate in the area between the shrubs and the main planting, instead of in the trees themselves. The snow tray is a good place to plant grass for hay and seed production, since it receives additional moisture from the snow when it melts. The snow tray will also provide a good nesting area for pheasants and other game birds.

Of the shrubs, Russian olive is most important for providing winter food. It produces much fruit, which stays on the trees all winter and is available to the birds even when snow in the planting is deep. Chokecherry, sandcherry, wild plum, and honeysuckle provide summer food for pheasants and many other kinds of birds.

Woody plantings must be located near available food or they will not be used by pheasants. Cover areas without available food within a quarter of a mile are seldom, if ever, used by pheasants.

Such plantings provide loafing and roosting cover, as well as protection from winds and snow. When the snow gets deep in such a planting, the pheasants will often roost in the trees. And they like to loaf in the protection of woody cover before going to feed in the morning, during the middle of the day, and before going to roost at night.

All types of cover help in protecting pheasants from their enemies, but a good

clump of woody plants is the best escape cover.

The South Dakota Game and Fish Department has initiated a cover-development program in cooperation with local soil-conservation districts. Most of the plantings are being established in those areas most critically in need of winter cover. The soil-conservation service helps to locate and plan the cover plantings when aiding farmers in developing complete soil- and water-conservation plans for their farms. These plantings are mostly windbreaks that also provide livestock protection, help to control erosion and slow down evaporation.

Roosting cover can be provided by leaving stands of grasses and other vegetation around potholes, odd areas, fence rows, and adjacent to woody plantings. Vegetation not over 40 inches in height provides the best roosting cover.

The elimination of fall burning and protection of areas around marshes and potholes from grazing greatly increases available roosting cover. Any necessary burning should be left until spring, so that winter protection will be provided.

Fence rows, roadsides, pothole vegetation, and small uncultivated or ungrazed areas provide the chief nesting cover for pheasants in intensively cultivated areas. Protection of these areas is necessary during the nesting season if the pheasant hatch is to be successful. Studies by the South Dakota Game and Fish Department in Brown County showed that all nests in alfalfa fields were destroyed and 32 percent of the hens on the nests were killed during mowing operations. In these areas it is doubly important that desirable cover be supplied around the alfalfa fields so that the birds will be attracted to the better nesting places instead of the alfalfa.

A cover-development program should be designed to disperse the birds, keep them in better condition, and bring more of them through to the spring breeding season. The practices which increase cover for pheasants will also improve conditions for other types of wildlife.

Washington's Birthday Speech by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered yesterday in New York City to the Nonpartisan League of New York, in commemoration of the birthday of George Washington.

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

My fellow Americans, the Nonpartisan League represents the rank and file of the American people. It represents those independents who do not blindly follow the leadership of either the Democratic or the Republican Parties; it represents those who believe that the President of the United States should be elected by the direct vote of the people themselves.

At the present time, as you know, the people do not select the President. A group of politicians meet and nominate a man on the Republican ticket and 2 weeks later or so another group of politicians meet and select another man on the Democratic ticket. Then these politicians of both faiths get together and say, "Well, we don't care which of the two the people select. He is our man anyhow."

For illustration, in 1940, from an international standpoint there was no difference between the foreign policy advocated by President Roosevelt, nominated on the Democratic ticket, and Wendell Willkie, nominated on the Republican ticket. About that time Senator Burton K. Wheeler spoke at Los Angeles, Calif., and 180,000 people turned out to hear him. He was speaking on a platform of keeping America out of World War II, and yet the people of this country were unable to vote for a candidate embodying the ideas of Mr. Wheeler and those who agreed with him because there were only two names on the ballot of the two major parties.

You will be glad to know that the constitutional amendment I introduced last year, which is similar to one that the late Senator George Norris advocated while he was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, received 32 votes—exactly one-third of the Senate. In addition to that, Senator LONG, of Louisiana, was paired for it. This was by far the most votes the resolution has ever received.

But until we do have it, and the States ratify the constitutional amendment, it will be impossible for the people to select their own President. In my opinion, this is one reason why over 45,000,000 people did not go and vote in the last election; they simply weren't interested because there wasn't enough difference between the Democratic and the Republican Parties on foreign policy.

We have a great Constitution. Some time ago the Daughters of the American Revolution got out a manual for citizenship for new citizens, and they listed benefits and prerogatives that the Constitution gives to the average citizen of this country, and they said:

"WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS TO YOU

"It establishes for you a stable and responsible Government.

"It makes you a citizen of the United States if native-born.

"It gives you citizenship, if foreign-born, on complying with liberal naturalization laws.

"It allows you a voice in the Government through the officials whom you help to elect.

"It guarantees you life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"It defends your rights even against the Government itself.

"It makes you equal with all men before the law.

"It confirms your religious freedom and liberty of conscience.

"It accords you free lawful speech.

"It guarantees you together with all people the right of peaceable assembly.

"It permits you to petition the Government to right your wrongs.

"It guards your property rights.

"It prohibits the Government from taking your property without due process of law.

"It lets you hold any office in the gift of the Nation for which you are qualified.

"It enables you to become a citizen of any State.

"It prevents you from being held to answer to a complaint unless you have been lawfully accused.

"It insures your right of trial by jury of your fellow men.

"It grants you the right of habeas corpus, that is, the right to know why you are held a prisoner.

"It assures you a speedy trial.

"It permits your having counsel for defense.

"It prevents your being tried again if once acquitted.

"It permits you to have a trial in the State and district in which you may be charged with an offense against the laws.

"It lends you the power of government to compel witnesses to appear in your behalf.

"It relieves you from compulsion to testify against yourself.

"It forbids excessive bail.

"It forbids excessive fines or cruel punishment.

"It protects you from slavery in any form.

"It keeps any State from depriving you of your constitutional rights.

"It sanctions your bearing arms for the protection of your life and home.

"It secures your home from search except by lawful warrant.

"It guarantees you that the legal obligation of contracts shall not be impaired.

"It permits you to participate in amendment of the Constitution from time to time."

My friends, the Nonpartisan League advocates the strictest adherence to the Constitution but agrees with Abraham Lincoln that a peaceful resolution which changes the Constitution is desirable if it effects and brings into execution what the people at large really want. The Nonpartisan League has never elected a United States Senator from Lynn J. Frazier and E. F. Ladd down to the present time who has not advocated keeping out of war and I know that this large group here today is united solidly behind the principles espoused by the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota 37 years ago. It is a great organization, this National Nonpartisan League of ours, and when we have a national convention, I know that you men and women will be in there battling for America.

The Tax Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Mrs. Grace C. Solomon, of Salt Lake City, has written a very interesting and pungent verse on one phase of the tax situation.

It was written specifically for the States' Council of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and was read at their convention here in Washington. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

IT'S THE LIMIT

There's a speed limit on the highway
Time limit on a note
Credit limit on a bank
And passenger limit on a boat.

There's voltage limit on powerlines
All kinds of limits in our lives
There's an age limit in the Army
Even a limit on how many wives.

But there are limits worse than that
Each month, each day, each minute
It's the tax on real estate we own
And on that, the sky's the limit.

—*By Grace C. Solomon.*

The Obstructionists Are at It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, reprinting of a Wenatchee (Wash.) Daily World editorial entitled "The Obstructionists Are at It Again" seems called for by the indecision of the Securities and Exchange Commission as to its jurisdiction in the case of the sale of a public utility to public organizations in the State of Washington.

The Federal law seems very clear on the point. The Holding Company Act of 1935 in section 2 (c) states that "no provision in this title shall apply to, or be deemed to include a State, or any political subdivision of a State."

This Federal legislation became law 5 years after the State of Washington made it possible for local political subdivisions known as public utility districts to operate electric utilities.

Such public utility districts are now seeking to purchase the Washington Water Power Co. Assumption of jurisdiction by the SEC would delay consummation of the sale.

The editorial of the conservative Wenatchee newspaper, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD, is very definite as to the cost of delay.

THE OBSTRUCTIONISTS ARE AT IT AGAIN
(By Wilfred R. Woods)

The same groups who fought Grand Coulee Dam, fought Chief Joseph Dam, and have fought the development of our water resources are at it again.

What is it this time?

A lawsuit has been filed here to stop the acquisition of Washington Water Power Co. properties by the Chelan County Public Utility District.

The situation is this: The owner of the Washington Water Power Co. is anxious to sell out. This is the American Power & Light Co., an eastern holding company which controls the Washington Water Power stock. The people, through the public utility district law passed in 1935, want to buy.

Then who is behind this move to stymie the whole deal?

Could it be that the management of the Washington Water Power Co. itself is behind it?

Who else could it be, when the law firm pressing the case are Metzger, Blair, Gardner & Boldt, of Tacoma, who specialize in representing power companies.

Just read the record of what these attorneys have done. They have sought for years to block the people's efforts to get benefits from hydro resources.

The public utility districts had a chance to acquire and expand Rock Island Dam for the good of the region. These attorneys opposed the purchase—the famous Skagit County Public Utility District case—whereby Rock Island Dam could have been completed years ago.

They were the ones who brought suit in Thurston County to block the purchase of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. That case is now pending in the Supreme Court. And now this firm comes up with the same kind of a suit on the Washington Water Power Co.

This situation is unique. The owner of the Washington Water Power Co., the American Power & Light Co., wants to sell. The people want to buy.

Now a few high-salaried managers, legal firms, and other employees are trying to thwart the stockholders and the people.

We protest. This must not be. Our region has too much at stake in the orderly development of our water power to let this happen.

The Washington Water Power Co.'s propaganda activities have been exposed in an independent engineering report filed with the Public Service Commission in Olympia. Anyone can read for himself the report, made by the Stone & Webster Service Corp., which shows how money has been squandered.

This Washington Water Power Co. is asking for a rate increase now of $1,000,000 a year, asking for more money to spend on propaganda.

The company tells of its efficient management and that its private ownership should be continued. But private ownership in this case means monopoly—guaranteed profits and no competition.

What businessman could not operate this way—squandering present earnings, without any competition, and asking more money? Anyone could run a power company, or anything else, if he had a deal like the Washington Water Power Co.

This is not free enterprise and this is not private enterprise. It is not enterprise, period.

The record of the Chelan County Public Utility District is in sharp contrast to these Washington Water Co.'s activities. In less than 2½ years the public utility district has improved its system, raised wages, and put aside a reserve. Its books show an increase in equity of nearly $500,000 and without an increase in rates.

This suit follows a familiar technique. It is typical of Washington Water Power intrigue, the kind used for years to block Jim O'Sullivan and others who were working for Grand Coulee Dam.

The plaintiffs in the suit are being used to stop the people of the State of Washington from delivering power at the cheapest possible rates, from enabling the farmer, the businessman, and the manufacturer to expand real free enterprise.

These plaintiffs are being used by power-company attorneys to sue the power company so that the management can block both the public and the stockholders.

Remember, there are some high-salaried jobs at stake in continued operation of the Washington Water Power Co.—$20,000, $30,000, and $40,000 a year. Big fees and expenses—several hundred thousand dollars a year, were also reported by the Stone and Webster exposure of Washington Water Power Co. mismanagement.

Undoubtedly it's a new high in power lobby double-cross of stockholders and power users.

Now for a word about the principle under which a power company operates.

A private utility company is not in the category of a private business. A utility is a privately owned monopoly; it is not a business.

The word "enterprise" does not apply where there is monopoly—a protected monopoly, which operates under license and which is guaranteed a profit.

In this category is the power company, which goes under the guise of profit business. And now it asks a rate increase to make the power user help continue the propaganda work. Because of this propaganda, many people in our own region do not understand the issue.

The very license under which the private power company operates assures it a monopoly.

The Washington Water Power Co. pays a lot of employees—presidents and executives and lawyers and propaganda outfits. It pays them high fees to run a business which has no competition and is guaranteed a fixed income on its investment. These fellows are paid many times what they are worth, parading around as free enterprise. They get free rights to operate on the streets, on the highways, and everywhere they want to run lines.

It's time we awakened to the insidiousness of this monopoly with a guaranteed income which is spending large sums of the people's own money to keep the public hoodwinked.

When a private monopoly gets to a point where it abuses its privileges, it's time for the people to take over.

We think the distribution of low-cost Grand Coulee power should be owned by the people, just the same as the streets and bridges and irrigation canals.

It was a terrific battle for municipalities to get their own domestic water system; the owners pulled all kinds of tricks.

But surely none of them was ever such a farce as this, where the employees spend the owners' money—squander it—and then ask more money to fight both the owner and the people.

And don't forget Kinsey Robinson and his people fought our power developments, including Grand Coulee and Chief Joseph Dams. Our dams and power-transmission systems would never have been built if they had won. And now they are trying to prevent us from improving what we have.

This firm of attorneys—Metzger, Blair, Gardner & Boldt—highly paid power attorneys, has been hired in a suit which would hinder the people from benefiting from the dams and other resources which the people have built with their own money.

Now the Washington Water Power Co. asks a rate increase to pay the propaganda bills, and even while doing so is guaranteed against competition and against loss of revenue.

We protest. This is not right.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter from Mr. R. S. Logan, president of the Logan Co., of Louisville, Ky. The figures contained in his communication should make us all stop and think. The letter follows:

LOGAN CO., INC.,
Louisville, Ky., February 14, 1951.

Actual expenditures for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1950:

	1940	1950
Department of Commerce	$75,116,535	$983,092,852
Department of Interior	71,385,280	568,435,344
Department of Labor	18,576,698	257,043,907
Department of Justice	89,813,162	131,200,804
State Department	20,829,427	361,226,112
Independent offices	3,269,254,403	9,033,499,925

Hon. THRUSTON MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR THRUSTON: Don't the above figures indicate that the Board of Directors of the biggest business on earth have fallen down on their job?

Sincerely,

R. S. LOGAN.

The North Dakota Winter Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "The Governor Was Right," published in the February 17 issue of the Dakota Farmer.

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

THE GOVERNOR WAS RIGHT

North Dakota's WILLIAM LANGER, in all his experiences as businessman and statesman, has probably never made a more accurate analysis and prediction than when he officially opened the first North Dakota Winter Show in Valley City in 1938. Some people may remember Governor LANGER saying: "The show is something which belongs not only to Valley City and Barnes County but to North Dakota as a whole, and people throughout the State will become increasingly proud of this event."

Administrators of the show, exhibitors, and visitors set out that very first year to make Governor LANGER's prediction come true. People who visited the North Dakota Winter Show one or more times during the past 14 years have spread the word that here is an event which, for worthwhile contributions to agriculture, measures up to any in the United States. The winter show has featured all the time-proven ways in which an agricultural exposition can be of value to farmers and livestock men, and has also been responsible for the introduction and wide acceptance of a few new promotion methods.

One of the most valuable features of any such event is the visiting, and exchanging of information. Talk of new varieties of small grain, types of pastures, and feeding rations for livestock helps to scatter valuable farming hints. In 1938, for example, one of the outstanding wheat exhibitors passed along the information that he liked Reward because it had done better than other varieties in dry years, but cautioned his friends not to sow Reward on poor land. A well-known swine exhibitor gave out the information that he had good results with barley as a spring pasture for his hogs. Another swine grower explained that he liked a mixture of oats, barley, and rape for pasture because the rape made good pasture after the hogs had the oats and barley pretty well cleaned up. A booth sponsored by the agronomy department at North Dakota State College exhibited 13 kinds of wheat, and farmers could see for themselves the comparative rust damage suffered by the different wheats. Farmers learned that Thatcher, Ceres, Reward, and Hope were the best yielding wheats at that time. The Valley City show has always been a good place to catch up on the latest farming developments.

Machines still had competition from horses on North Dakota farms in 1938, and the exhibitor and breeder of a prize Percheron stallion was confident of the future. He predicted that there would always be a demand for good horses, and he looked for 1938 to be a good year for horse production in North Dakota. Sale spectators at the first show saw the top Hereford bull go for $175, and thought the sale a success when 28 bulls averaged $121. Senator Gerald P. Nye, speaking on the farmer and war, stunned hundreds of listeners with the assertion: "If we were to engage in another war to make the world safe for democracy, after the war was over there wouldn't be anything left that would resemble a democracy, not even in our own land."

The 1938 exposition got the winter show off to a flying start, and interest and participation has picked up every year since. Many people and attractions have contributed to the growth, but it is doubtful if any single part of the show has had such tremendous success as the futurity. Organized by A. J. Dexter, agricultural development agent of the Northern Pacific Railway, the futurity was a novel effort at promoting livestock improvement when it was presented for the first time in 1942. The practicability of Mr. Dexter's rules regarding entry in the first futurity was openly questioned by breeders. According to the rules, breeders had to pay a $10 entry fee on each calf on or before September 1, 1941, and the show calves had to be identified before January 1, 1942. Each breeder was limited to eight calves, and the event was strictly show, not a sale. Only 33 breeders thought enough of the futurity idea to enter 40 calves that first year.

Today, all doubts about the value of the futurity as a means of promoting livestock improvement are gone. Spectator interest in the futurity is higher than in any other type of livestock exhibit at the winter show. Breeders have accepted the idea because the event places emphasis on young purebred stock—future breeding stock. A first prize in the futurity is a real tribute to the exhibitor's ability to select young breeding stock, because show calves must be picked out months before show time. One of the most important accomplishments of the futurity is the encouragement it has given small breeders and beginners in the purebred business. Strict enforcement of the rules enables owners of small herds to step right into the show ring with breeders of long-standing reputations, and not be overwhelmed by sheer weight of numbers. The familiar sight at many livestock shows where a few large breeders take all the space, is eliminated in this event. Ample proof of the effectiveness of the futurity in increasing interest in purebred cattle is furnished by this year's entry list of 105 breeders.

JUNIOR FUTURITY

By 1947, the futurity had gained such wide approval that it was decided to organize a junior futurity. The purpose of the junior futurity is to start young farm people toward the establishment of new purebred herds. Approximately 84 4-H and FFA members secured heifer calves for the 1947 junior futurity. In order to be eligible, the youngsters had to have the heifers in their possession before November 15 of the preceding year, and all care and feeding was supposed to be done by the exhibitors. Organizers of the junior futurity recognized the fact that very few 4-H or FFA members would be able to obtain high quality stock of the type desired, so a system was worked out whereby established breeders could help out. These breeders were called cooperating breeders, and they have consistently furnished young beginners with top quality heifers at prices below the open selling price. Most cooperating breeders work out easy-pay and incentive arrangements with their young customers. To illustrate, a breeder may let a 4-H member have a calf for half down at the time of purchase and the balance due at the time of the show. Other breeders agree to reduce the price if the calf places well up in its class.

Young breeders have been further encouraged in establishing purebred herds by a provision which enables the best calves in each junior class to show in similar classes in the senior futurity without payment of entry fees. It gives beginners a feeling of real accomplishment to compete with breeders whom they have regarded with utmost respect for years. Every junior entrant in the 1949 show was thrilled and inspired when Marlene Henke, Oliver County, topped 102 adult breeders and won the highest possible honor in the futurity—grand champion heifer over all breeds. Marlene's spectacular victory undoubtedly has inspired many prospective young breeders to devote more careful attention to the selection, feeding, and fitting of livestock. In 1950, 101 4-H and FFA members entered purebred Hereford, Angus, or Shorthorn heifers. About half of these entrants purchased their calves from cooperating breeders.

Al Dexter has performed a great service as manager of the futurity, but his long record of continuous service to the winter show was interrupted recently when the Federal Government called him for an important overseas job. Mr. Dexter has taken a year's leave of absence from the Northern Pacific Railway to become food and agricultural officer in Ireland for the Economic Cooperation Administration. The job of futurity manager for this year's show has been taken over by M. H. McDonald, North Dakota Agricultural College livestock extension agent. Mr. McDonald has made many valuable contributions to North Dakota's livestock industry, and it is certain that the futurity will be a success under his management.

LIVESTOCK SALES

Livestock sales have always been a top attraction at the winter show, and the increased interest in the sales has coincided with the general development of the show. From the modest beginning in 1938 ($175 top), the show expanded, and by 1940 it was a 2-day event. A total of 105 head of livestock brought $9,700 that year, and the sale was topped by a Hereford bull at $245. Figures from the 1947 sale illustrate the increasing interest in the event, and speak for the quality of livestock offered. The top Hereford bull brought $2,000, and the average for Hereford bulls was $528.10. Average sale price for Shorthorn heifers was $372.14, and Angus heifers brought an average of $407.70. Hereford heifers brought an average of $496.20, and the top Duroc gilt sold for an even $500.

The North Dakota winter show program has been revised from year to year, always with the idea of promoting and improving the State's basic industry. Visitors to the 1951 show will see features that have proven their worth in past years, plus a few additions and improvements. People who have been disappointed in past years because there were no seats for them at the livestock sales and futurity shows will be glad to know that seating capacity at the arena has been doubled. Extensive commercial exhibits will inform visitors of the latest developments in machinery and appliances. A complete home-economics program has been arranged, and matinee and evening programs featuring professional entertainers have been scheduled for Tuesday through Friday.

HIGH LIGHTS OF 1951 SHOW

Here are a few high lights of this year's show, which will begin Monday, March 5, and run through Saturday, March 10:

Monday: A livestock judging contest for 4-H and FFA members, in which about 500 youth are expected to compete.

Tuesday: Junior futurity and crops judging for 4-H and FFA members, and the annual swine and sheep show.

Wednesday: Senior futurity show, and North Dakota futurity banquet in the evening.

Thursday: Crops day. Also, swine and Shorthorn sales.

Friday: Sheep and Angus sales.

Saturday: Hereford sale.

The Marble Plaques Adorning the Walls of the Chamber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the twentieth through the twenty-third and last of a series of short sketches published by the Washington Post with respect to the men honored by the plaques which adorn the walls of the Chamber:

BLACKSTONE: CELEBRATED ENGLISH JURIST (A. D. 1723-80)

Blackstone (1723-80) achieved lasting fame with his Commentaries on the Laws of England. The work has been regarded as the most thorough treatment of the whole of English law ever produced by one man. It has been used as the standard textbook in English law for generations.

In the United States, the Commentaries was, for many years, almost the only source of knowledge of English law.

Blackstone inaugurated teaching of English law at the British universities, which previously had confined themselves to Roman law.

His plaque was sculptured by Thomas Hudson Jones of this city.

GEORGE MASON: DRAFTED THE VIRGINIA DECLARATION OF RIGHTS (1725-92 A. D.)

George Mason (1725-92), called the "Pen of the Revolution in Virginia," and whose homestead, Gunston Hall, is a public show place 25 miles south of Washington, exercised great influence in local and Virginia politics.

As member of the Virginia convention, he drafted the Virginia Constitution and its famous declaration of rights which became the cornerstone of our Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution.

At Philadelphia Mason objected to portions of the Constitution which gave broad, indefinite powers to Congress and its failure to include a bill of rights. He refused to sign the Constitution, and with Patrick Henry, led the fight in Virginia against its ratification.

Failing this, he suggested amendments, substance of which later was embodied in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the American Constitution.

Mason believed that local governments should be kept strong and central government weak.

His plaque was done by Gaetano Cecere, of Fredericksburg, Va.

NAPOLEON (1769-1821 A. D.)

Napoleon I (1769-1821), the spectacular military genius, also left a tremendous mark upon the geography, administration, and jurisprudence of France during his reign as Emperor.

He centralized the administration, established the Bank of France, inaugurated financial reforms, made peace with the church, and instituted legal reforms to pave the way for the Code Napoleon. That was the first code of French civil law.

The code, fusing the Germanic and Roman civil law, has been in force since it was promulgated.

The Spanish code and those of several South American states, Louisiana, and Quebec were largely based on Napoleon's work.

His plaque was done by C. Paul Jennewein, of New York City.

THOMAS JEFFERSON (A. D. 1743-1826)

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) gained his greatest fame as the author of the Declaration of Independence. Years later, as third President of the United States, it was one of the achievements of his administration to increase the Nation's territory by more than 800,000 square miles through the Louisiana Purchase.

Among the greatest of his other achievements was his authorship of the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty and the effecting of various reforms in the laws of his native State.

He was also the father of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, which in substance held that the Constitution established a compact of States and the Federal Government had no right to exercise powers not specifically delegated to it by the Constitution.

Jefferson, who made many contributions to American thinking, was also the founder of the University of Virginia, founder of the first professorship of law—at William and Mary—in the United States, and author of a Manual of Parliamentary Practice still used in both Houses of Congress.

Before serving as President, he was at various times a member of the Virginia Legislature and the Continental Congresses, Governor of Virginia, Minister to France, Secretary of State, and Vice President.

The Jefferson plaque was done by C. Paul Jennewein, of New York City.

Marquis Childs' Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 17, 1951:

MARQUIS CHILDS' EXPERIENCE

After having been barred as a speaker at the Miner Teachers' College, Washington, D. C., because his name listed in the unevaluated files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Columnist Marquis Childs has been cleared. He and two other speakers who found themselves in the same difficulty have received renewed invitations from the school.

It was all but inevitable that Mr. Childs, a former Washington correspondent of the Post-Dispatch, should have emerged from this experience with flying colors. He is widely and well known, so the implied reflection on his character was quickly publicized and evoked the sharpest of protests.

We cannot help wondering, however, if a less advantageously placed citizen would have fared as well. Certainly, more than a few people, especially governmental employees, are reluctant these days to avail themselves fully of the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution. Discretion, they are compelled to remind themselves, is the better part of valor. When free citizens thus feel that they had better not avail themselves of their freedom, there is something unhealthy in the state.

We sincerely hope that Mr. Childs' experience will bear the good fruit of helping make Washington's atmosphere as sane as it ought to be for all law-abiding Americans.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty Census Shows Home Owners Exceed Renters First Time in United States History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the 1950 Census of Housing Report has proven again that the average American cherishes independence and the privilege of private ownership, and prefers to buy and own his home rather than rental of private-housing facilities or Government-owned projects.

The trend toward home ownership has swung upward in the United States, and according to the census report, in 1950 for the first time since such information was first collected by the census in 1890, home owners have exceeded renters.

Today in the United States there are a total of 23,383,000 home owners out of 45,875,000 dwelling units. Fifty-one percent of all the dwelling units in our Nation are now owner occupied, and the percentage of home owners has increased since the 1940 census by 54 percent.

This should serve notice on the world that free enterprise and private ownership will not be relinquished by the American people in favor of any form of socialism or collectivism. Communism will never find fertile ground in this Nation as long as the majority of our people enjoy the privileges of private ownership of home and property.

Communism and socialism destroy initiative and reduce the individual to a state of serfdom subject to the will of an all powerful state. Reports from countries which have adopted socialism invariably show that production in socialized industry falls far below the production standard set under private ownership. Even such reports as have come from Soviet Russia indicate that the maximum production of which the individual worker should be capable is not achieved.

But in the United States under our free enterprise system we have outproduced the world. During World War II with the least restrictions imposed on manpower of any allied nation, we outproduced them all.

The United States was founded on the principles of individual liberty. It has expanded and grown in strength and power under the free enterprise system. Its future will be secure so long as the rights of private ownership and free en-

terprise are safeguarded from any socialistic planners in government.

To safeguard these rights is the job of Congress, and one that requires constant vigilance on the part of every Member in the interest of our national security.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Sets Good Example for Others To Follow in Radio Use To Promote Rail Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been deeply interested in the promotion of greater safety on American railroads through the use of radio and other electronic devices, I rise in the House this afternoon to congratulate the Missouri Pacific Railroad for the leadership it has taken in the development and use of radio on both passenger and freight trains over its vast system.

The Missouri Pacific is setting a good example that all other American railroads should follow and I am certain that in time they will. But in the business of protecting the lives of passengers and workers every day is important. I believe all railroads should be putting in a major effort in this field now.

It is unfortunate that every railroad is not as far advanced in the use of radio as the Missouri Pacific. Because, traditionally, there are laggards in every field I have proposed in legislation I have offered in this Congress that the Interstate Commerce Commission be given a strong hand in promoting rail safety through the development and use of radio on our rail systems. It is pleasing to see a great railroad like the Missouri Pacific proceed on its own initiative.

Let me enumerate to the Members of the House the progress the Missouri Pacific has made in the use of radio for passenger trains:

Radio will be installed in the cab of every Diesel-powered train—passenger and freight—on the Missouri Pacific system. The engine crews of Diesel trains will be able to keep in direct communication with one another. In freight train service the cabooses will be similarly equipped so two-way communication can be carried on between the engine crew and the conductor. All Diesel locomotives delivered in the future will be radio equipped.

Missouri Pacific will have more train radio than any other railroad in the world when the installations are completed this summer. Here are the high lights:

Missouri Pacific now has in operation radio equipped: 61 Diesel freight locomotives, 80 cabooses.

By summer, Missouri Pacific lines will have 312 Diesel locomotives radio equipped—41 passenger locomotives, 271 freight locomotives, 290 cabooses.

More than 75 percent of all Missouri Pacific's passenger-train mileage, more than 80 percent of all main line passenger train mileage will be radio equipped.

Three thousand two hundred and forty-three miles—one-third of Missouri Pacific's total—will be entirely Dieselized and entirely radio equipped—passenger trains, through and local freight trains, most of the balance will be partially Dieselized and radio equipped.

In addition to the foregoing, Missouri Pacific's initial train-radio experiment with 15 steam locomotives and 15 cabooses in southern Arkansas and northern Louisiana continues in operation.

In the Nation—The President's Mood in These Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles by the distinguished newspaperman, Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times of February 20, 22, and 23, in which Mr. Krock in his inimitable and excellent style paints a word picture that is typically interesting and constructive. Interest in these articles was expressed to me by the distinguished County Clerk of Kings County, the Honorable Francis J. Sinnott, and upon his suggestion I have requested and obtained permission to insert them in the RECORD so that they might be read by all before whom they come:

[From the New York Times of February 20, 1951]

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S MOOD IN THESE TIMES: I

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—In a world of trouble, uncertainty, and open peril, with the responsibility for resolving these conditions resting more heavily on the President than on any other Chief of State, Mr. Truman's visitors find him still free of any tendency toward defeatism and intensely concerned with a wide range of interests—historic, present, and future. Persons who called on the President recently in his library said today that they were astonished at this diversity of subjects and the amount of study Mr. Truman obviously had given to them all. For many reasons this should go on the public record.

The President, when these visitors appeared, had just finished reading for the third time Stalin's answers to the questions of Pravda and was forming an analysis of their meaning and motive independent of the appraisal of his expert advisers. He would read them again—maybe several times more—to make sure his analysis was sound.

But Mr. Truman turned from that labor to a delighted inspection of a new edition of one of his favorite biographers, Plutarch, and was checking his memory of a famous passage in the life of Cicero about honest government. The type font attracted him by its beauty; and because of the esthetic fact that, except for not making an "s" look like an "f," the publisher had reproduced the format of Mr. Truman's old set of Plutarch. This led the President to show admiringly his special copy of the Koran, a diplomatic gift, and to comment that it is harder to read than the Bible.

Before these visitors departed, as they recalled today, in the hour they spent in the library it developed that the President has also been reading with great pleasure Herbert Hoover's serial autobiography in Collier's and Bernard De Voto's blockbuster against the American Medical Association in the January issue of Harper's magazine. Nor had he missed—also in Collier's—Jonathan Daniels' explanation of Why Mr. Truman Writes Those Letters (a personal interpretation, his visitors felt sure he greatly enjoyed).

But it was not long before the President was talking to the visitors of what he called his one great goal—enduring world peace—and, with what is represented to this correspondent as amazing versatility, was discussing his now familiar humanitarian plans which he said must accompany the armed defense program of the West if world peace, when attained, is to be stable. It should be noted that at the time the news was casting these heavy shadows:

Labor had withdrawn from an economic front of the defense mobilization program in the United States and created a crisis for which the solution was far from clear. Inflation had become a mounting fact in the United States. Soviet war tensions were increasing on the borders of Yugoslavia. In nearly all respects the world and the Nation were flaming with perilous controversy. In the United States certain impulsive words and acts of the President had created among many the uneasy feeling that he was emotionally upset in a time when this might well become a national danger.

For these reasons the following description is significant of a conversation that also dealt with eminent issues:

"The President turned to that big globe of his and put the point of a paper knife on the map of the Middle East. There, said the President, is one square mile which contains more oil than there is in the whole State of Texas. There is one of the places where the full exercise of point 4, within the screen of adequate defense from aggression, can make one of its greatest contributions to the attainment of world peace. Nearby are peoples who need the fruits of modern industrial and agricultural development which the United States can produce for them.

"The President said that before point 4 became an administration measure he sent experts on agriculture and water power to this area. And there is a tableland in Ethiopia of 60,000 square miles (he pointed to it with the paper knife) where the greatest cattle industry in the world could be established. He spoke with accurate detail of waterfalls far exceeding Niagara in height and potential power development, saying that to materialize all this was far better and simpler than to shoot away the products of mankind."

A peaceful world so organized, said the President to these visitors, could support twice its present population, with good standards of living, and of the two great powers, the United States, not Soviet Russia, was in a position to organize it. The cost, he said, would be small, the spiritual, moral, and financial returns immense, and the capital for the purpose, which could be protected, is in this country. The financing of American railroad building was done largely by the city (financial district) of London when the bulk of caiptal was there. And the only reason these sound foreign investments were liquidated was because of the need of gold at home to fight a war.

As the President revolved the globe to Indonesia (good "natural mechanics" there)

and South America to continue his presentation, the visitors said, his examples multiplied; his mind seemed capable of remarkable concentration on any subject he selected, and he looked like a man of 50."

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1951]

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S MOOD IN THESE TIMES: II

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—The atmosphere of partisan, intra-partisan, and world conflict which surrounds the President in this period of history, and which lately he has made more sulfurous by certain words and actions, vanishes in his private presence. This is the testimony of persons who have talked with him at length recently on all kinds of subjects and discovered a calm man, as convinced of the correctness of his policies as he is aware of the criticisms and the arguments in their support.

In these off-guard conversations the President, according to an account given to this correspondent, provides no basis for fears which have been expressed that he is rattled, or otherwise emotionally upset, or uninformed on the vast problems confronting him.

His own account, of course, and in his own words, can be the only accurate summary of the turn of his mind. The following are merely the impressions he recently has left with the persons referred to:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In the Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson, the President chose as his deputy in this field a man whom he regards as the best trained for this purpose. That the Secretary's political and congressional following may be small in the personal sense Mr. Truman regards as far less important than his equipment, and as a transient factor and one which has most of its source in petty politics.

Even if Mr. Acheson desired to be replaced, the field of competent replacement is very limited, though the President agrees that it contains two or three citizens whose names came into the conversations. But he remains enthusiastic about Mr. Acheson's services. And he is firm in the belief that the foreign policy of his administration has been sound, wisely flexed for the impact of unforeseen events and world changes, and is moving steadily toward the attainment of durable world peace.

Mr. Truman regards himself as the best-informed President in history, though he ruefully concedes that the confinement of office obliges him to see many things through the eyes of others. He would like to observe Western Europe, for instance, at first-hand, since he must make the momentous decisions with respect to it. But he has confidence in the competence of his sources to identify facts and appraise them, and among these are the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal departments and our diplomats abroad.

The President believes he has a good record of appointments to the Foreign Service and has given unusual recognition to career men. But he has an idea how to improve their equipment. This is to require chiefs of missions to spend 1 year periodically at home, but not only that. Governors of the States would be invited to borrow these officers as their advisers on State matters which impinge on foreign policy. A year, say, in Jefferson City after 3 years in Paris would bring foreign policy home to Missouri and refresh the diplomatic mind with the thinking of Americans on this subject.

NATIONAL SECURITY

There would have been no inflation, the Presidential opinion seemed to be, if Congress in the last 5 years had followed his recommendations on several economic and fiscal problems. Inflation can yet be checked and the damage ultimately repaired if popular groups accept equality of sacrifice and if Congress follows his current proposals—the "quickie" tax bill, the pay-as-you-go policy, and so forth. He respects the convictions of those who oppose the Treasury's low-interest policy, but he cannot accept their theory in the present circumstances.

Parts of the huge costs of defense mobilization is the result of the repeated refusal of Congress since 1946 to provide for universal training of American youth to make it ready for military service if and when. Now that world conditions require this training to be directly military, and on a vast scale, it imposes costs which could have been far less. And the toll of the wasted time cannot be estimated.

But, on the brighter side are our new weapons—miracles of scientific research and engineering. We are in a position to destroy any tanks which can be sent against us, and swift and sure killers of submarines are in sight against a time when they may be the immediate primary weapon. There are other military tools of security in aviation and elsewhere that obviously should not be discussed But an aggressor will have to take the heaviest punishment in the history of war.

APPROPRIATIONS AND INCOME

When the President spoke of an early goal of $300,000,000,000 of national income he was derided. Now the immediate prospect is of $270,000,000,000, and in dollars with the purchasing power of 1939, not 1951. In 1945–46, the first fiscal year of his administration, Federal appropriations were $67,800,000,000, which he reduced to $36,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1947, and $31,200,000,000 in fiscal 1948. The cold war brought them up to $37,300,000,000, and $40,300,000,000, and now perhaps as much as $66,000,000,000 will be required for fiscal 1951. But this reflects the pressure of global events, not internal policy. Maybe the budget can be somewhat reduced in the 17-percent area outside military expenses. But Congress has the responsibility of showing safe methods of doing this instead of again loading a percentage cut requirement on the President.

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1951]

IN THE NATION—THE PRESIDENT'S MOOD IN THESE TIMES: III

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—In two previous accounts of the attitude the President reveals toward many subjects in current private conversations it was noted that he leaves on the persons who have talked with him an impression of firm, but patient and calm, resolution quite at variance with the one some of his recent letters and press conference statements have created. His visitors, it was reported, found not the slightest trace of an emotional upset or other imbalance.

When their conversations with the President were ended they departed with these further ideas of his attitude on certain controversial matters:

The RFC: The report of the Fulbright subcommittee, charging an improper response of the RFC directors to outside personal and political influence, merited his appraisal as "asinine."

BEFORE THE REPORT

Mr. Truman was not referring to the Senators' proposal to put the Corporation under a single administrator instead of a board. The proof of this is that his own recommendation this week to the same general effect was decided on and in process of being drafted before the subcommittee made its report. The President changed his mind about covering the RFC into the Department of Commerce, concluding that an advisory and loan review board would serve his purpose. But he had reached the major conclusions previously.

The subcommittee made insinuations about individuals that left the effect of discrediting charges and then piously declaimed that it was not making charges. Mr. Truman as a Senator produced many reports on Government methods but never did he employ such a method.

His renomination of the five RFC Directors, among them men who were directly criticized in the report, was attacked as an act of defiance and disregard of congressional finding. But that was the only way to enable these Directors to draw their salaries until the RFC is reorganized, which the critics should know if they didn't.

HANDLING A STRIKE

The switchmen's strike: Their leaders did run out on their agreement "like Russians," as the President described it. It was an accurate description. First, they had asked his assistant, Dr. Steelman, to aid in settling the controversy with management. Second, they had signed the agreement he had negotiated. And then they endeavored to escape the responsibility they assumed by their signatures and which was imposed by their official union authority.

The appeal to the "sick" strikers made by Charles E. Wilson came from the proper source—the Director of that defense mobilization which the strike was seriously impeding. Also, it was the proper first approach (the Army has not the experienced manpower to switch trains), just as the legal sanctions represented a second correct approach.

Before the President intervenes directly in a situation, by broadcast or otherwise, other Government means should be exhausted. The end of the strike demonstrated these had not yet been exhausted.

LETTERS AND THE PRESS

Those letters, etc.: This subject appears to have had the lightest kind of treatment in the conversations. But the President's visitors left with the opinion that Mr. Truman stoutly reserves the right to express himself indignantly and forcefully, when he thinks the situation warrants; and to become President does not require a waiver on normal human responses to traduction, misrepresentation, and so forth, of the individual who chances to occupy the White House. This was when his visitors noted that the President cast a smiling glance at Jonathan Daniel's article on this subject.

President and press: Mr. Truman's friends found him as convinced as ever that many newspapers in the country—they seem to recall that he mentioned a percentage—are out to prove a certain thing. This is that the man who had not wanted the Presidency, or the Vice Presidency which preceded it and who inherited it through circumstances over which he had no control, was not qualified to administer the office. From that time on, whenever the occasion made it possible to afford even the pretense of a footing for this attitude, these newspapers had sought to prove their theory.

PRESIDENTIAL POWERS

Apparently in the long session in the President's private library a number of other items came into the conversations. (But, in the three articles of which this is the concluding one, the account has been confined to the subjects which best delineate Mr. Truman's present mood and touch great problems of the day.) Among them the enduring controversy over Presidential powers was not forgotten, with historical citations to prove that Lincoln's and Jefferson's limited view of these powers, before they assumed them, were sharply expanded when they were confronted with the assigned responsibilities of the President for national security and the general welfare.

This composite portrait of the President's mood is only a news-shot; it was not posed.

It does not answer, and was not intended to answer, his critics, who will continue to find flaws in his personal deportment, his comprehension of issues, his policies and his factional and partisan practices.

Our Comic-Opera Spy Set-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times it has been shown that conflicts among our intelligence agencies result in confusion and danger to the Nation, there has yet been no effort expended on the part of the Federal Government to set up a separate, independent, and consolidated intelligence system. The article entitled "Our Comic-Opera Spy Set-Up" in the February 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine, highlights the effect of our present divided authority upon the security of America.

The article follows:

OUR COMIC-OPERA SPY SET-UP

(By Donald Robinson)

The Federal Bureau of Investigation moved fast the day it learned that a Soviet espionage ring in San Francisco had penetrated the atomic-bomb project. It was not its fault that the Red spies got away.

What happened was this:

From an undercover source the FBI received a report that two MVD men—Gregori Kheifitz and Gregori Kasperov—had made contact with an important scientist working on the A-bomb. The report stated that the trio was to meet that very evening at a seafood restaurant on Powell Street.

Instantly the FBI went into action, dispatching several of its best agents, with special listening and movie-making equipment, to cover the meeting.

The FBI men raced to the restaurant. There they found the scientist and the Russians huddled together in a wallside booth. And there they also found something else.

The one booth from which the FBI men could operate their equipment had already been reserved. It had been taken by two operatives of the Army Counterintelligence Corps. The CIC men were working on the same case and trying to listen in on the very same conversation.

As one Government official ruefully remarked later:

"There were more investigators in that restaurant than customers."

It took precious minutes before arrangements could be made for the CIC men to relinquish their booth to the FBI agents—and then it was too late. No complete record of that sinister meeting could be made.

Did the scientist supply the Russians with a list of the experts working on the A-bomb? He was heard to speak of Niels Bohr, E. O. Lawrence, and others.

Did he disclose the secrets of Oak Ridge? He spoke of the big Tennessee atomic plant.

Did he give the Russians secret A-bomb plans? He was seen to hand them a batch of papers.

To this day no one knows the answers to these questions. The scientist was quietly dropped from the atomic project but no steps could be taken against the Red spies. The evidence was incomplete and they escaped scot free.

Imbroglios like this one are typical of the jungle-like chaos in America's counter-espionage machinery, a chaos which has been hamstringing the Nation's safeguards against foreign spies.

No less than 25 separate Government agencies have been—and still are—involved in the fight against spies, and it can be authoritatively stated that many of them have been more active in battling one another than in combating espionage.

"Internal security deserves more careful and intelligent attention than it seems thus far to have received," the Hoover Commission bluntly declared, and it was right.

This writer has just completed a searching, months-long investigation into the espionage situation during which he talked with the leading specialists in the intelligence field, both inside and outside the Government.

On the basis of this probe, it can be categorically said that the United States Government's safeguards against foreign spies have been crucially weakened, over a long period, by inter-agency rivalries, overlapping jurisdictions, and a shocking lack of centralized direction.

That was the reason Gerhart Eisler, the notorious Comintern official, was able to flee the country after he had been sentenced to 8 years' imprisonment for passport fraud.

When Eisler was released on $23,500 bail pending appeal, the FBI assumed that Bureau of Immigration men were watching him. The Immigration Bureau figured the FBI was tailing him. Neither checked with the other and Eisler—the man described as Russia's most dangerous agent—found it simple to sneak aboard the out-bound Polish liner *Batory*.

It can now be revealed that this also was why the MVD was able to get Lt. Anatole Barsoff back to the Russia he'd quit in fear and terror. It was how the MVD almost managed to shanghai Barsoff's partner, Lt. Peter Pirigoff—who loves America—and drag him off to certain death.

After these two Red army fliers fled Russia in a stolen plane, they were brought to the United States, praised for their courage, feted, and cast adrift.

The State Department didn't keep an eye on them. Neither did the Bureau of Immigration. Nor the FBI.

No one in Washington even knew about it when the Russian Embassy sent MVD men to look up Barsoff in the Brooklyn, N. Y., shop where he was working as a $35-a-week dress presser. No one knew about it when they talked him into returning to the U. S. S. R.

Not even when Barsoff, acting under the orders of the MVD, laid a trap for Pirigoff did Washington wake up.

Barsoff asked Pirigoff to meet him for dinner. Pirigoff agreed. He was smart, though, and tipped off the Government.

The two pilots met at a Washington, D. C., restaurant named Aux Trois Mousquetaires.

"Come back with me to Russia," Barsoff pleaded.

"You're crazy," Pirigoff replied. "You'll be dead within a year."

"Not me," said Barsoff. "It's you who's going to swing in Red Square."

He gave a signal and a gang of men surrounded the table.

"You, Pirigoff," one of them said, "come with us."

Pirigoff looked around for help but no one came to his aid. He got up and started to fight anyway.

A gun butt smashed on his skull.

United States Government men arrived then and put the MVD agents to flight. They saved Pirigoff and took Barsoff into custody. But the tragedy of errors was not yet over.

The Air Force urged the State Department not to allow Barsoff to return to the Soviet Union. It pointed out that when the Russian first came here he had been told a great deal—too much—about American intelligence procedure and tactics. The Army also begged the State Department not to let him go. He'd been given information on the American underground in Germany. It would mean a complete reshuffling of the underground, the Army warned.

In spite of the Pentagon's strong plea, the State Department permitted Barsoff to go back to Russia.

The results of this civil war in counter-espionage have been catastrophic to the national defense.

Because of it, Soviet spies have been able to steal some of the most secret formulas in the manufacture of the atomic bomb and vital information on the new hydrogen bomb, too.

And that is only a little of what they have gotten here.

This writer has learned on unimpeachable authority that Soviet spies have also secured and transmitted to Russia vast stores of confidential data on American submarines and military planes. Recently the Kremlin decorated two of its agents for stealing the blueprints of a new United States Air Force bomber.

In the Department of Defense files today is a sworn statement by Lieut. Gen. Izydor Modelski, the former Polish Military Attaché in Washington, divulging that a spy network established here by his Government has obtained essential details—including maps and photographs—on key industrial plants all over America.

All this and more is due to the amazing lack of coordination among the Federal agencies responsible for protecting the Nation's secrets. There are countless examples of this.

One of the most glaring is the coast-to-coast inspection tour that the State Department arranged for a group of Russian technicians.

Overlooking the tensions between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R., the State Department authorized these Russian engineers to survey bridges, power plants, and utilities in all parts of the country. It even included certain defense plants.

Not one official of the State Department consulted the military authorities or the FBI as to the wisdom of such a tour. In fact, the first the military people heard about it was when the owner of a big chemical plant in Wisconsin burst in on the Pentagon, frantically waving a letter in his hand.

"I got this letter from the State Department and I took the next plane for Washington," he said.

The letter was signed by an Assistant Secretary of State and asked the Wisconsinite to allow the Russian group to inspect his chemical plant.

"Are these people crazy?" the Wisconsin man shouted. "Don't they know that my plant is busy on confidential work?"

"There's nothing we can do," he was told. "This is a State Department matter."

Although the Wisconsin manufacturer refused to let the Russian party in his plant, the Russians did get to see other big utilities and plants throughout the United States.

"Is it any wonder," a ranking Air Force general fumed to this writer, "that the Russian Government has been able to prepare a thick volume showing, in pictures, maps and words, every important dam, power plant, bridge, and railroad siding in America? It's a perfect manual for enemy bombers."

Without even consulting the FBI, the State Department issued a visa allowing Mme. Irene Joliot-Curie, the French scientist, to enter the United States. At the time Mme.

Joliot-Curie, the wife of an admitted Communist, was on the FBI list of subversive agents.

When Mme. Joliot-Curie landed at New York, on March 18, 1948, the Bureau of Immigration, which maintains its own subversive files, had her detained at Ellis Island. The State Department, however, made representations to the Justice Department, which ordered her admitted to the country.

Nor is this the only time that the bars have been let down to dangerous elements.

Not long ago it was revealed by the Central Intelligence Agency, the organization in charge of all American espionage operations overseas, that 61 men whom it had identified as Russian spies were in the United States under visas granted by the State Department.

According to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, there are three techniques for dealing with foreign spies. These are:

1. Arrest and try them for violation of the Espionage Act.

2. Provide for public exposure of their activities through congressional hearings, newspaper publicity, etc.

3. Follow them and get to know their sources, contacts, and means of communications so that you can make use of them for your own purposes.

Hoover believes that the third system is the most effective method for handling espionage. He feels, of course, that spies should eventually be arrested and prosecuted but he thinks that full use should be made of them first.

However, the utmost integration of all Government agencies concerned with counter-espionage is required, Hoover declares, if proper tabs are to be kept on enemy spies.

And the stark truth is, there has been no such integration.

Under the law, the FBI is supposed to have prime responsibility for counter-espionage in the United States. It is specifically charged with enforcement of the Espionage Act. Nevertheless, two dozen other Federal agencies also have extensive powers in the field.

The three armed services have exclusive jurisdiction over tracking down spies among their personnel and in the industrial plants supplying them. The State Department controls the issuance of visas to suspected espionage agents. It also has two other units with counter-espionage functions—its Intelligence Section and its Special Agents group. The Bureau of Immigration is supposed to prevent spies from entering the country illegally. The Coast Guard checks on spies in the merchant marine. So does the Maritime Commission. The security section of the Atomic Energy Commission has the job of safeguarding atomic plants from spies. The Secret Service does the same for the White House. The Intelligence Unit of the Treasury Department makes special inquiries along these lines for the President and other high Government officials. Then there is the Central Intelligence Agency. It handles all counter-espionage work overseas.

But these aren't all. There are at least 11 others in the internal security picture, ranging all the way from the Bureau of Customs to the National Security Resources Board.

The two principal organizations are the FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency, and of necessity there should be 100 percent cooperation between them. This is a life-and-death matter inasmuch as the FBI works solely inside the United States and its possessions, and must rely entirely on CIA to cover the overseas outlets of any foreign espionage ring known to be operating in America.

Here is what an expert says on this score. He is Allen Dulles, the star performer of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, whose agents penetrated Hitler's own cabinet.

"You cannot cut off counterespionage at the water's edge. You have to be able to coordinate information which you get here with the information you get overseas. You have to follow espionage agents as they are sent here by foreign powers, while they are here, and then as they return from here.

"You have to follow their lines of communication which cut across the water's edge, and over the water, and you have to keep an eye on the feeder agents which they have here and elsewhere.

"For this, you need the closest liaison between the FBI and the CIA."

In this connection, this writer was told that Great Britain, the world's most expert nation in espionage matters, insists on absolutely perfect liaison between MI-5, its intelligence service, and MI-6, its counter-espionage organization. MI-6 has agents assigned to MI-5 offices all over the world. Right now, in the British Embassy in Paris, there is an MI-6 agent working in the same office with the MI-5 operatives, screening all their findings for information on spies heading toward England.

In no foreign locality, however, is an FBI agent assigned to a CIA office today. It may be denied, but liaison between the two organizations has been at a low ebb.

Such a lack of liaison created endless difficulties during the war between the FBI and Gen. "Wild Bill" Donovan's cloak-and-dagger Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor of today's CIA.

On one occasion FBI agents had a Nazi spy ring here "taped" and were planting "fake" secrets in its New York City "mail-drop" for transmission to Berlin. No one notified the OSS though, a blunder that had shocking consequences.

OSS men abroad, who were continually seeking to foil Axis spies, unearthed the European outlets of this same Nazi espionage ring and went to work on it, too.

Slowly, tortuously, risking the Gestapo at every step, the OSS men traced the ring's operations and found that all of its mail from America was being posted to Berlin via Spain.

A group of OSS men made a special trip to Spain and succeeded in making contact with the ring's Madrid representatives.

"You're wasting your time working for the Germans," the OSS men said to him.

"They're going to lose the war."

"Señors, with me it is a question of pesos," this Spaniard declared.

That was what the OSS men were waiting for.

"Why don't you do business with us instead of the Germans," they said. "We'll pay well."

A deal was made and soon the OSS men were buying, at a huge price, the very fake secrets planted in New York by the FBI.

Many months went by and thousands upon thousands of dollars were wasted before this situation could be straightened out.

Even now there is a serious lack of liaison between the Armed Forces and the FBI.

Not long ago the Army received reports that a Soviet espionage ring had launched a campaign to collect data on a number of American war plants.

The ring, which had its headquarters in the Soviet zone of Germany, was using every means in its power to get information on munitions production in such towns as Wichita, Kans., Rockford, Ill., and San Antonio, Tex.

The Army did not even inform the FBI of this development.

Recently the Office of Naval Intelligence and A-2, the Air Force intelligence division, gave clearance to the Department of Commerce to sell several hundred nautical, aeronautical, and topographical maps, showing every key point in the United States, to a concern known as the Four Continent Book Corp. of New York.

Not one of these agencies checked with the FBI.

Had they done so, they would have learned that the Four Continent Book Corp. was registered as an official agent of the U. S. S. R.

The Armed Forces themselves have been racked by internal feuds. The Navy recently went so far as to snub an ultra-important conference on intelligence matters which the Army held in Paris.

The Air Force sent representatives. So did CIA. The State Department, which had not been invited, actually asked that one of its intelligence specialists be allowed to attend. Its request was granted. However, the Navy, which had been invited, declined to attend.

No explanation was given and, as one Department of the Army official remarked:

"All we can assume is that the Navy is not interested in the coordination of intelligence activities."

None of these instances, though, are as bad as the muddling that has keynoted the Government's efforts to safeguard the atomic bomb.

The case of the Soviet spy Adams is characteristic.

The FBI espionage squad ran across Adams' trail in connection with an investigation of an atomic scientist named Dr. Clarence F. Hiskey. Hiskey, a University of Chicago chemist, was suspected of supplying the Russians with confidential data on atomic bomb research.

In its probe, the FBI learned that Hiskey's contact was a mysterious Russian by the name of Arthur Alexandrovitch Adams.

Agents were put to investigating Adams. They searched his room at the Hotel Peter Cooper in New York. In it they found not only highly secret information on the Oak Ridge atomic-bomb plant but also vital—stolen—facts on the development of atomic energy by our allies.

Day and night, then, the FBI espionage squad followed Adams. It was on his tail the night he conferred with Hiskey's friend and coworker, Dr. John H. Chapin, in the Stevens Hotel in Chicago. It was on his tail the evening he met Pavel Mikhailov, the Soviet vice consul in New York, and drove with him to the Russian consulate. He was carrying a big black attaché case that evening. It was on his tail the day he tried to board a Soviet freighter in Portland, Oreg., and flee the country. FBI men kept him from departing.

But the FBI's efficiency was all in vain. When it finally decided that Adams' usefulness was over and that he should be jailed as an example to other Red spies, it was prevented by State Department interference from doing as it wished.

The State Department actually ordered the FBI not to serve the warrant it had obtained for Adams' arrest.

"It might annoy the Russian Government," the State Department said.

As a result, Adams—the Russian master spy—is back in Russia today, safe and sound.

(The same thing happened when the FBI moved to arrest—after making use of him for 3 years—a Russian spy named Andrei Schevchenko who had penetrated the Bell Aircraft Corp. plant in Buffalo.

(As FBI Special Agent "Buzz" Roberts told Loren G. Hass, a Bell engineer, "Mr. Byrnes, of the State Department, says we can't touch him.")

Such interagency muddling has been more the rule than the exception.

There was another vivid example of it last year when a bottle containing all-important U-235 disappeared from the Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago.

Under the law, the security section of the AEC should have notified the FBI of the loss within minutes.

It didn't.

Not for 4 weeks did the AEC security section bother to tell the FBI of this baffling disappearance.

The most graphic instance of all was the case of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, the atomic physicist who is now serving 14 years in a British prison for espionage on behalf of the Russians.

For more than 2½ years Dr. Fuchs worked inside the American atomic-bomb project as a member of the British Atomic Energy Mission. There was no secret at Los Alamos that was not available to him. Yet he was known to be a former member of the Communist Party.

Throughout the period he was at Los Alamos, Fuchs was in almost daily touch with a Russian spy courier, feeding him the innermost secrets of the A-bomb. Yet no one detected him.

Why?

Army intelligence took the word of the British Government that Fuchs was "all right." It didn't even ask the FBI to make a check on him.

It is true, of course, that after Fuchs returned to England and was given a high post in the British atomic set-up, the FBI supplied the tip which led to his arrest. However, regardless of all stories to the contrary, the FBI never had any suspicion of him personally.

The real truth about the incident is this.

Through an undercover man, the FBI discovered that someone in the British atomic-energy system was "leaking" large quantities of information to the MVD. It couldn't find out who the "leak" was, though.

It was MI-6, the British counterspy outfit, which actually tracked Fuchs down.

Although no word of it has hit the headlines, many of the top leaders of our Government have been deeply concerned over the situation in the counterespionage field.

The late Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal was very worried about it and urged the National Security Council to take drastic remedial measures. He called for the appointment of a single director of internal security with full power over all counterespionage and other internal security matters.

The Council agreed that the situation required correction but it wouldn't go as far—or even one-tenth as far—as Forrestal recommended. The most it has consented to—to date—is a program for voluntary action.

Under the terms of this program, two interdepartmental committees have been established and charged, in the words of a Council directive, with "effecting more adequate and coordinated internal security" on a voluntary basis.

One of these committees, the Interdepartmental Intelligence Conference, consisting of FBI, Army, Navy, and Air Force representatives, is supposed to coordinate the investigation of espionage, sabotage, and subversion cases.

The other, the Interdepartmental Committee on Internal Security, comprising officials of the Justice, State, and Treasury Departments, plus the National Military Establishment, is supposed to evolve broad policies.

Neither of these committees has any genuine authority. There is still no one in over-all command, still no one with power to keep the various agencies from cutting one another's—and the country's—throat. The program is a step in the right direction, but with world conditions as they are, it is not enough.

Never has the United States been so menaced by spies and saboteurs.

In World War II the internal Nazi threat was a slight one, involving only a few thousand bundists. Today the United States has to cope with a fifth column of over 500,000 Communists and fellow travelers, working under the direct orders of Kremlin agents. (The American Slav Congress, for example, gets its disruptive policies directly from two officials of an iron-curtain country's Washington Embassy. So does that other Communist front, the United Committee of South Slavic Americans. Members of the American-Russian Institute, a third front, serve as the medium of exchange between the consulate of an iron-curtain country and the Communist Party of the United States.) The United States is infiltrated through and through with Russian agents. At last count, the Department of Justice had espionage investigations pending concerning 685 aliens alone.

At this moment more than 120 foreign-espionage rings are reported to be functioning, clandestinely, inside the United States, prying into our most precious secrets.

Recently, United States counterespionage agents got their hands on some ultraconfidential orders which the Kremlin sent to its spies here. In these orders, the Kremlin directed its agents to make every effort—at once—to obtain information on new-type atomic weapons, robot missiles, and, above all, developments in bacteriological warfare.

That is why every expert to whom this writer spoke said:

"America must strengthen its defenses against spies. Otherwise, it is inviting disaster."

Poll on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from the president of the student council of the University of Nebraska which carries a result of a poll recently taken:

STUDENT COUNCIL,
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., February 10, 1951.

Representative CARL T. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The student council of the University of Nebraska recently conducted an opinion poll on universal military training. One thousand five hundred and sixty-seven students, both men and women, were selected at random during registration for the second semester and asked to complete our opinion questionnaire.

This project was undertaken as a result of action taken at the annual convention of the Big Seven Association of Student Government held in Norman, Okla., last December 8 and 9. All of the schools in the Big Seven are taking similar polls and the results for the entire conference will be released by the association chairman at the University of Colorado in the near future.

The poll is being taken for the purpose of informing the public and our Congressmen as to how students in this region feel about universal military training. Nearly all of our students are in the age group involved in selective service and any universal military training program that might be adopted. Many are not old enough to vote, but we believe that their feelings should be given serious consideration. Only about 20 percent of our current enrollment is made up of veterans; therefore any prejudice on the part of veterans has not influenced this poll to any great extent.

The results of this poll show that over three-fourths of the students polled are in favor of universal military training, and that most of those in favor want a training period of 12 to 21 months after completion of high school or upon reaching the age of 18. The final tabulation of this poll is given below. It is hoped that you will consider this carefully in voting on proposed universal military training and selective-service legislation.

	Men	Women	All
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
For universal military training	79	73	77
Against universal military training	21	27	23

Length of training period favored by those for universal military training

	Men	Women	All
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
3 months	3	5	3
6 months	5	16	8
12 months	46	33	50
21 months	45	13	37
No preference	1	3	1

Time of training period favored by those for universal military training

	Men	Women	All
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
After high school or at 18	83	74	78
Anytime between 17 and 20	16	25	17
No preference	1	1	5

Of the 1,567 students polled, 1,155 were men and 412 were women.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT RAUN,
President, Student Council.

The Truth About Our Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the February 17, 1951, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. This excellent appraisal by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg is of vital interest to every American who is concerned with the military strength of his Nation:

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR AIR POWER

(By Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, U. S. Air Force, as told to Stanley Frank)

In this time of crisis, when world peace and the security of the United States are immeasurably more important than the prestige of the United States Air Force or any other military service, certain fundamentals need restatement. Air superiority alone cannot win a war. The loss of air superiority could lose it. Although all military authorities agree air superiority must be held where full-scale land or sea operations are launched against a major opponent, I do not believe the Air Force should be allocated illogical amounts of the men and money available to the Defense Establishment. I concede the airplane as a weapon

is a two-edged sword that can be turned, vitally and directly against every American.

The American people must realize it is impossible to amass or invent an absolute, impregnable defense against bombing attacks by a strong, determined enemy. The Soviet Union, for example, now has at least 480 planes that can strike our major population and industrial centers from bases in the U. S. S. R. Since we cannot afford to underestimate a potential enemy's capabilities, we must anticipate that the Soviets will build known improvements into their aircraft that will counterbalance in large measure the improvements we can make in our continental defense. The grim contingencies must be faced squarely along with the urgent necessity for supporting a civil-defense program that can save countless lives in the event, God forbid, of an atomic bombing.

Should war come, we can be expected to destroy no more than 30 percent of the planes making an attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are completed. And our preparations today are not yet beefed up to achieve even that figure. Even if we had many more interceptor planes and antiaircraft guns and a radar screen that blanketed all approaches to our boundaries, a predictable 70 percent of the enemy's planes would penetrate our defenses despite the extraordinary valor and skill of our pilots.

My estimate of a 30-percent loss inflicted on an enemy air attack is based on the assumption that the raid would be made by at least 100 heavy bombers. If an enemy attempted to sneak through one plane or five, it is entirely possible no American city would be damaged. But the bleak and blunt evidence of the last war proved conclusively that no bombing attack mounted in sufficient strength by the Americans, British, or Germans ever was turned back by the most strenuous defensive action. The offense always has had a crushing advantage in aerial warfare, and there is no prospect that the balance will change in the foreseeable future.

Americans will be shocked by the admission that we are so vulnerable from the air. They will want to know why the billions of dollars in taxes poured into the military cannot buy better protection. They have every right in the world to demand straightforward answers to their question—answers stripped of technical gobbledegook. But that incontestable right carries with it the obligation to attempt to undersand the problems confronting military planners and the assigned function of the Air Force in the over-all security of the Nation.

Efforts toward that understanding have been confused by the contradictory claims of friends of air power, who believe air power is everything, and traditionalists, those who belittle air power, who fail to recognize that control of the air is a decisive factor in winning wars. One school has oversold air power to the public as an easy substitute for the harsh realities of war. The other has misinterpreted the role and distorted the results of air power—the direct cause of the controversy involving the Air Force's close support of ground troops in Korea.

Much of the dissension can be clarified, I believe, by a sober analysis of air power and by projecting its potentialities and limitations into the future. A lot of romantic, wild-blue-yonder nonsense can be dispelled by the concise, down-to-earth truth about air power.

First of all, it should be pointed out that the role of the air in the defense program is not determined by the Air Force alone. Broad policy decisions are made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, an executive planning board on which I serve with Gen. Omar N. Bradley, the chairman, the Army's Gen. J. Lawton Collins, and the Navy's Adm. Forrest P. Sherman. Our conclusions on Joint Chiefs of Staff are influenced by the needs and unique contributions each branch of the Armed Forces can make to the most effective military set-up with the appropriations and manpower at our disposal. Based on those considerations, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have given the Air Force three jobs—strategic bombing, the air defense of the United States, and tactical support of surface forces.

Although those three jobs seem pegged to different objectives, it is impossible to separate them in practice because—and this is a principle ignored too often—air power is indivisible. We don't speak of a "strategic" or a "tactical" army or navy, yet those terms constantly are applied to the Air Force. I suppose the habit is rooted too deeply in common usage to do anything about it after all these years, but the terms are misleading. The functions of so-called strategic and tactical air overlap and supplement each other.

The overriding purpose of every plane, whether it is a bomber or a fighter, is to win the air battle on which final victory on land or sea is predicated. In carrying out that mission, all types of aircraft collaborate in destroying enemy planes that endanger both combatants and civilians. A big, intercontinental strategic bomber is designed to attack the enemy's industrial capacity for waging war. In the process it cripples the enemy's ability to hurt civilians at home and soldiers in fox holes by smashing the plants that sustain his air force. His heavy bombers are wrecked on assembly lines before they can challenge our defenses; every fighter plane that is mauled in the air or on the ground is one less that can be thrown against grounds troops in the battle area. Conversely, our tactical planes attack strategic targets, thereby relieving the pressure on the big bombers and the units assigned to continental defense.

The last war provided any number of striking examples of the interchangeable nature of air power. The greatest concentration of heavy bombers ever seen was assembled to give direct support to ground troops for the breakthrough at St. Lo on July 25, 1944. Fifteen hundred B–17's and B–24's teamed up with 1,500 lighter bombers and fighter planes to plaster a small area, approximately 9,000 by 2,000 yards, and helped catapult the Allies from Normandy to the Siegfried Line in 6 weeks. Similar sorties by the biggest planes we had in Europe were laid on to assist the ground at Caen and the Anzio beachhead. Alter Gen. Douglas MacArthur returned to the Philippines in October 1944, big bombers operated from Clark Field, near Manila, against Japanese troops less than 10 miles away. MacArthur, incidentally, once described the island-hopping campaign in the Pacific as a series of battles for airfields. Last August 40,000 North Koreans massed along the Naktong River threatened to shatter our precarious lines in the Waegwan area. The ground put in a hurry call for help and B–29's dropped 1,000 tons of bombs on the North Korean positions.

"I don't know if they killed even a single cow or horse," Maj. Gen. Robert B. Gay, commander of the First Cavalry Division, said. "All I know is that we didn't get hit with that attack we were sweating out."

In the atomic age, more than ever before, a strong offense is the best defense. An attrition rate of 30 percent on their planes never would stop the Soviets from attacking us, and the United States Air Force is not fooling itself on that count. The awful destruction produced by one atomic bomb would compensate the Red aggressors a thousandfold for the loss of 30, or even 100, planes and crews. Every democratic leader in possession of the facts has recognized publicly the one deterrent to overt Communist aggression—the certainty that we can retaliate swiftly and bring more destruction to them than they can inflict on us.

General Bradley spelled out the proposition on November 17: "It is a bruising and shocking fact that when we Americans were committed in Korea, we were left without an adequate margin of military strength with which to face an enemy at any other specific point. Certainly we were left without the strength to meet a general attack. In the military sense, the free world was left without adequate reserves except for the atom bomb."

Our stockpile of A-bombs is not the sole deterrent to aggression. It is our ability to deliver the bomb anywhere in the world that has been forestalling international communism's avowed design for world domination. Our strategic air power, poised to ram the atomic bomb down the throat of an aggressor in the event it is used against us, has been the cork keeping communism from spilling over the democratic nations.

The muscle of our strategic air arm is the B–36, which has more speed, range, armament, and carries a heavier bomb load than any big plane in operation today, or any plane the Moscow regime can get into mass production in the next few years. The B–36 can fly faster than 400 miles an hour and has a combat radius of more than 4,000 miles. This means it can fly 4,000 miles to perform a bombing mission, then return with a safe margin of fuel to land at its home base.

The Soviet Union's best bomber, the TU–4, a copy of our B–29, has a top speed of some 325 miles an hour and a combat radius of about 2,000 miles. Combat radius is the key to the advantage we hold in the air. Every industrial and communication center in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is well within the combat radius of B–36's flying from North American bases. Our other heavy bombers, the B–29, B–47, and B–50, can perform similar missions from overseas bases or, with refueling techniques, from this continent. Many would be shot down if the air battle were joined—no responsible airman ever claimed any plane was indestructible—but the point is that every American plane that returned would fly and bomb again. The Soviets' TU–4 can just about reach America's nerve center on a one-way mission; it doesn't carry enough gas to fly home.

If planes carried only conventional demolition and fire bombs, Communist air power would pose no serious threat to us at home, but the atomic bomb has changed the picture drastically. I do not discount the possibility, therefore, that the Soviet high command might sacrifice aircraft in the hope of knocking out America's productive capacity with a few massive blows. We cannot ignore the possibility, either, that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics might attempt to refuel her heavy bombers from mother ships over the polar regions to give them round-trip range, a factor that has been given the closest attention in our defensive planning.

One thing we know for sure: The Soviet Union has been working intensively on a heavy bomber to match the B–36. She will unquestionably build it, but the B–36 does not represent the limit of our invention. An intercontinental jet bomber is almost ready for test flights; an atomic-powered plane is more feasible than most people imagine. Soviet developments with big planes will call for radically different measures, but right now I am speaking in practical terms of the immediate situation and the probabilities of the next 2 or 3 years.

Right now, frankly, the increasing power of our strategic bombers cancels out the numerical superiority of the Soviet air force. The Soviet Union has about 20,000 first-line planes in all components. A good part of that strength consists of fighters, a mount-

ing proportion of which are modern jets. The MIG-15 is, for speed, in the same with our fastest standard interceptor.

I don't go along with the widespread belief that the Communists don't know how to fly, design, or maintain aircraft. I was air adviser to Ambassador W. Averell Harriman in the U. S. S. R. for 4 months during the war and I saw enough to convince me that the Soviets would be formidable adversaries in the event of war. They also showed me the most stunning combat pilot I've ever seen—a magnificent woman, a 6-foot blond Amazon who had shot down a dozen German planes.

Individually, Communist pilots are about as good as Americans in normal weather. American pilots are superior to those of the Soviet Union in two areas. They have more training in night as well as all-weather flying.

I have compared American and Russian air power at some length to high light the importance of strategic bombing. Although it is essentially an offensive weapon, it actually is our first line of defense. The most effective method of knocking out the enemy's air power, and keeping it knocked out, is to destroy the means that keep it alive. If war should come, the United States Air Force would attack simultaneously two targets—the industries feeding the enemy's war economy and the enemy air force itself.

Now that you know the B-36 is a 4,000-mile extension of our home defenses, my estimate of a 30-percent loss inflicted on an enemy air fleet over the United States may not be so terrifying as it first appeared—but don't get me wrong. I still say we are not invulnerable to atomic bombing with its frightful loss of life and attendant property damage. I repeat that people must cooperate with civil-defense authorities to increase their chances for survival. The people also can save themselves from another threat to their own and the country's welfare.

There is a dangerous delusion that radar screens and complicated electronic devices will give us an airtight defense against bombing. We could tackle an engineering project that would make the Great Wall of China look like the sand trenches children dig at the seashore. We could build a steel fence 5 miles high around the 17,936-mile perimeter of the United States. We could place an unbroken line of radar screens on top of the fence, ring our cities with automatic antiaircraft guns, and perfect a foolproof warning system for distinguishing between friendly and hostile aircraft approaching our boundaries around the clock. We could put an umbrella of interceptor planes over the entire country—and we could not keep out a determined enemy attacking in strength.

Sure, our radar network needs strengthening. So does every other aspect of the Military Establishment. I do not recommend, however, sinking limitless funds into static defenses because: (1) The returns are not commensurate with the investment; (2) the remaining military effort would be reduced to impotency. I'm not thinking of money alone. The millions of highly trained men required to maintain an elaborate defensive system would impose an intolerable drain on our manpower pool. Total victory in modern war is the product of ground, sea, and air power. Nothing can be gained, everything will be lost, if one component is sacrificed to such a point that it is unable to contribute to the grand objective.

Winning the air war, for example, would avail us little if the United States and the nations subscribing to the North Atlantic Pact were not rearmed for a determined stand in Europe. The proposition is as obvious as it is simple: The Soviet Union, which has vast supply dumps scattered throughout its zone in Germany, could wind up with a greater war potential than strategic bombing can knock out in the heartland of the U. S. S. R. if they were not prevented from seizing the industries of the Western European countries. Ground forces must be strong enough to stop the enemy from capturing those sources of production. At the same time, the Navy must be strong enough the fight off the Soviet Union's large fleet of snorkel submarines and keep the supply life line to Europe open.

It is a physical impossibility to build an adequate army, navy, or air force if disproportionate manpower and matériel are diverted to continental defenses. Further, the diminishing returns quickly reached on what has been called aptly an electronic Maginot line make the staggering expenditure utterly impractical. I wish I could tell the people of the United States that they are immune to attack from the air, but I have one consolation. I promise Americans the best air defense any civilian population ever has had.

The Germans, for all their other failings, had an excellent warning system and defense in depth from the French coast to Poland. They had 2 years to test their preparations against the RAF before we got into the war. From 1942 on, most German aircraft production was devoted to fighter planes, although Germans used their bombers as fighter planes after D-day in Europe. The Luftwaffe mauled the Eighth Air Force savagely on many occasions, notably at Schweinfurt and Regensburg, but the average loss we suffered in daylight strategic strikes on Germany was less than 4 percent.

Take the magnificent performance of the RAF, which shot down 1,178 German planes in the battle of Britain during August and September of 1940. The back of the Luftwaffe was broken in that abortive attempt to knock England out of the war, yet as late as February 1944 it was able to mount tremendous raids on London. The Germans had no heavy bombers, and their concept of strategic airpower was incredibly inept. British authorities and our own Gens. Tooey Spaatz and Jimmy Doolittle agree that the Germans would have won the battle of Britain had they gone after RAF installations and key plants instead of trying to terrorize the civilian population. The British knew the Germans were coming across the short southern coast line, and they knew London—except for several severe raids on Liverpool—generally was the target. Yet the RAF throughout the war destroyed slightly less than 10 percent of the German planes that attacked England.

No air force ever will exceed the gallantry of the RAF, but with the help of their lessons, I am expecting our pilots to be three times more effective. I am committing them to that achievement despite the pertinent facts that the area they patrol is more than 30 times larger than the United Kingdom, that enemy planes will carry far greater armament and firepower than the Germans built into their machines and they must be prepared to fight at night and in all weather.

I expect to be picked up on one factor favoring the defense that I've omitted. It will be pointed out that intercontinental bombers will not be escorted by fighter planes and, as a consequence, should be liable to much greater losses. That is absolutely true—if reference is made to World War II, when German bombers lumbered along at 200 miles an hour at altitudes that rarely exceeded 12,000 feet. The decisive air battles of the future will be fought at night and in foul weather at speeds in excess of 400 miles an hour and altitudes of more than 30,000 feet.

Up around 40,000 feet, the wild blue yonder isn't blue, even on the sunniest day. It is a purplish, cloudless void that plays queer tricks on the human eye. Pilos report they have difficulty judging distance and depth perception because there is no background for comparing the relative positions of planes. Ground radar can vector in interceptor planes to the approximate positions of bombers, but the fighter pilot is largely on his own in finding the enemy.

Jets must be used for interception because they alone have the speed to overtake an attacker and, equally important, the ability to gain altitude quickly. With approaching bombers flying 100 miles in slightly more than 15 minutes, a conventional piston plane is useless for defense work. It takes three times as long to climb from the ground to 40,000 feet as a jet—and the last half of the climb is twice as long as the first for both types of planes. Once contact is made with the enemy, a jet must score a kill quickly, since it carries only enough ammunition for four or five passes. Added firepower can be built into a jet only at the cost of sacrificing its speed and maneuverability. Even 200 pounds of added equipment will seriously affect its advantages over a bomber. Anyway, regardless of its armament, a jet always will be outgunned by the interlocking firepower of a bomber formation.

Downing a plane flying 7 miles or more above the earth with antiaircraft fire is extremely difficult. Instruments can calculate the speed and direction of a plane instantly and precisely, and fire at the exact spot where it should be when the shell explodes in the air. But it takes a high-velocity shell more than 20 seconds to reach 40,000 feet and in that time a plane going only 350 miles an hour will travel 2 miles. Here's the kicker: If the pilot changes his course by only 2 degrees—up or down, right or left—the shell will miss him by 375 yards. At that distance, the plane will not even be rocked, much less damaged. During the last war, bomber pilots had to hold a steady course over the target area and literally plow through a curtain of flak. New radar bombsights can draw a bead on the target throughout the most violent evasive action. A pilot can zigzag all over the sky and his bombardier still can pinpoint the objective. It all adds up to the conclusion that we still must rely principally on men going up in machines to meet the enemy in direct combat.

Under no circumstances will we be caught with our planes down. The most direct route for an attack by the Soviet Union is from the north over land radar stations. A quick glance at a globe map will show that the U. S. S. R. is directly opposite the United States on the other side of the earth and the shortest distance between the two countries is by way of the North Pole. While you're reading this, regardless of the time of day or night, pilots in critical areas are sitting in planes ready to respond instantly to an alert.

We need more interceptor planes, to be sure. More than that, perhaps, we'll need the help of divine providence to shoot down hostile planes with atomic bombs before they unload. Only a fraction of the planes making an attack in strength would carry atomic bombs. Even if the enemy had 100 bombs—which she hasn't now—she could not afford to throw all into one raid. The atomic bomb is the product of such tremendous industrial effort that it cannot be used indiscriminately. The planes carrying them probably would be in the middle of formations protected by interlocking firepower. They would be the most difficult to destroy, but with luck—and I hate to rely on that capricious element with so much at stake—we'd get some among the planes knocked down. We can be hurt, but I do not believe the wounds can be fatal to our will and capacity to fight back with terrible vengeance. American industry already is decentralized in more than 40 key cities. The American people, aware at last of the grave danger to their freedoms, are putting meat and muscle on the Military Establishment. We still have far to go, but the blinders have been stripped from our complacency.

It has been put in the record that Air Force support of ground operations in Korea was eminently satisfactory. United Nations troops were given more uninterrupted assistance by fighter planes than any army in history. The Far Eastern Air Force had flown on combat missions for 181 consecutive days on December 20, and the end was nowhere in sight. I claim that the Air Force's use of tactical air power, including jets previously untested in battle, was completely vindicated by the results achieved.

Before getting down to particulars, the public should know several pertinent facts:

1. General MacArthur, before the outbreak in Korea, asked the Far Eastern Air Force to make its primary role the defense of the Japanese islands against possible seaborne or airborne attack.

2. The Air Force and the Army last spring discussed the conduct of exercises in ground-air cooperation in Japan, but the requirements of occupation duties and the limitations of maneuver areas made the training plan impracticable.

3. The Air Force's appropriations made it impossible for us to support each Army division with more than one group—75 planes.

4. Tactical air support was not neglected. Air-control parties were working with South Korean troops in the field 2 days after the fighting erupted before soldiers or marines were committed to action.

Tactical air support was inadequate during the early days of the fighting in Korea. It was inadequate for the identical reason that there were not enough soldiers, marines, tanks, and guns to stop the Communists. America was not prepared to fight. Two and a half years ago I testified in open congressional hearings that the United States needed a 70-group Air Force for the minimum calculated risk it could afford to take. On June 25, 1950, the Air Force had 48 groups.

There was absolutely no disposition on my or any other high officer's part to treat close support casually before Korea. If training and experience are the yardsticks, I'm basically a tactical airman. After graduating from West Point in 1923, my first assignment was with an attack group at Kelly Field, where we flew orange crates that barely staggered off the ground when machine guns were put on the wings. The first 15 years of my career were devoted exclusively to flying, teaching, and studying tactical aircraft. The biggest job I had before my present one was command of the Ninth Air Force, which supported the First, Third, and Ninth United States Armies from Normandy to the Elbe. The ninth flew more combat sorties than all other American, allied, and enemy tactical forces combined. I don't profess to know all the answers, but I've had as much experience in ground-air work as any man alive.

People who don't appreciate the true value of air power think they are getting fine support when they see a plane blast a mortar, tank, or machine-gun nest directly in front of them. That's the most ineffective assistance the plane can give. The idea is to get the enemy's troops and weapons before they get into position to hurt our side.

The same bomb that knocks out 1 mortar on the battlefield can knock out a convoy of 10 mortars 50 miles behind the front. Five hundred miles farther back that same bomb can blow up a railroad engine or a bridge, preventing the arrival of 100 mortars in the battle area.

A plane patrolling the battlefield can hit only a limited number of widely scattered strong points that are, properly speaking, more suitable artillery targets. Artillery is much more accurate than a plane barreling along at a couple of hundred miles an hour. Field guns can zero in on a target until it is leveled, whereas a plane cannot keep up a steady stream of fire. A plane's punch is wrapped up in its speed and range, assets that are best exploited by turning it loose to hunt for targets of opportunity far beyond the reach of artillery—troop concentrations, convoys, ammunition dumps, supply trains, and motor pools.

The damage from the air to the North Koreans was not immediately apparent in the early stages of the war, of course. To have implied, as many did, that tactical air power failed was as ridiculous as saying the Navy's submarines were worthless in the Pacific simply because their depredations on Japan's wartime shipping could not be seen at first hand.

The airplane was never meant to be employed as an antipersonnel weapon in the battle zone. Its low efficiency when put to this use was demonstrated when the Chinese Communist hordes were thrown into Korea late in November. Hundreds of thousands of troops concentrated in even a relatively small area like North Korea still were dispersed so widely that intense aerial bombardment and strafing were unable to stop their advance. The events in Korea proved, once and for all, that tactical air power is a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, ground strength. This is especially true against the Chinese soldier, whose ability to live on a handful of rice and to carry unbelievable burdens simplifies logistical problems.

It is not my province or my intention to criticize the decision of the United Nations which prevented air strikes at the Manchurian troop and supply depots supporting the Chinese. Isolating the battlefield from reinforcements is the prime function of tactical air, and I am simply stating the military fact that air power was rendered practically inoperative when the UN, in an effort to avoid a diplomatic rupture with the Chinese Communists, halted offensive action at the Yalu River, the boundary between Manchuria and Korea. UN pilots scrupulously obeyed orders by cutting bridges across the Yalu only on the Korean side, but those measures were nullified when the Yalu froze solidly, forming a natural bridge for the Chinese to move up with enough food and light-arms ammunition on their backs to sustain them for weeks. Accustomed to traveling on foot over long stretches of rough terrain, the Chinese hardly were inconvenienced when they were forced to take back-country trails. Sheer mass more than compensated for the Chinese Reds' lack of mobility and heavy equipment. When they encountered an obstacle, they merely flowed around our positions and continued to press forward inexorably.

We lost a battle in Korea, but air power kept us from losing a war. The Chinese, denied the use of roads during the day by UN air patrols, could not follow our forces fast enough to turn an orderly withdrawal into a rout. Everything from blood plasma to portable bridges was dropped to isolated units, saving them from annihilation. And when an evacuation beachhead was established at Hungnam, command of the air prevented the Chinese from bringing up the heavy artillery that could have riddled our troops at close range while they were jammed into the staging area waiting to board ships.

Critics who disparaged the Air Force's performance earlier in Korea failed to understand or consider the difference between close support—attacks in their immediate battle sectors—and genuine tactical air power—attacks behind the lines to isolate the battlefield. I can't blame infantrymen who suffer the greatest personal hardships in war, for feeling bitter and losing perspective of the "big picture"—an expression that has driven every man in uniform wild.

It is significant that commanders whose responsibilities embraced a wider area had nothing but commendation for the Air Force. Maj. Gens. L. B. Keiser, William B. Kean, and Hobart R. Gay, of the Second, Twenty-fifth, and First Cavalry Divisions, respectively, said the Air had saved their units repeatedly. Lt. Gen. Walton Walker, of the Eighth Army, announced officially that the Air's claims of destroyed enemy matériel were too low—a switch that will bowl over World War II veterans. Col. John H. Michaelis, of the famous Twenty-seventh Regimental Combat Team, expressed the "deep appreciation of all members of this command" for the Air support given them. On November 15, General MacArthur's headquarters announced the Air Force had accounted for 75 percent of the 900 to 1,000 Communist tanks destroyed. Three months earlier General MacArthur wrote Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer: "The contribution of the far-eastern air forces in the Korean conflict has been magnificent. They have performed their mission beyond all expectations."

A controversy affecting the lives of soldiers cannot be settled by lining up votes as in a popularity contest. It is resolved by weighing the best methods for achieving desired results. All right. The job of tactical aviation is to help win the air war and to weaken the ability of the enemy's ground forces to impede and damage your people. In trying to create the impression that the Air Force did not do all it could to help the Army, opponents promoted the conventional propeller, piston plane as superior to the jet for close support. It was a sucker play with few parallels.

The piston planes used in Korea would have been slaughtered had they been opposed by jets. The Air Force's tactical arm is being converted to jet propulsion as rapidly as possible, on the assumption that it must be prepared to fight a major power for control of the air. That vital battle can be won only with jets—and the Soviet Union has them in great numbers.

Trying to evaluate the lessons of air power in Korea in the utter absence of enemy opposition is a waste of time. The piston planes that hovered over the battlefield would have been forced to high-tail for home by one enemy jet. You can give pretty fair ground support with an observation plane or a helicopter if the pilot can tool around without interference.

I can see the inevitable question coming. Suppose we are committed to other Koreas, in Asia or Europe, where there is no enemy air? Isn't the slower, more reliable piston plane better for close support than the hot, erratic jet?

The answer to that one is a cinch. Jets are superior for every conceivable job demanded of a fighter plane, including flying at treetop level to silence one machine gun. It has been proved by every test in the book.

A jet pilot's view of the target is clearer because there is no propeller obstructing his view, and the plane's power plant is behind him, rather than in front as in a piston. A jet is a more stable gun platform because its cleaner configuration reduces vibration and torque. In competitions at Las Vegas, Nev., last March, jet pilots outscored piston pilots for accuracy in aerial gunnery, ground strafing, dive bombing, and skip bombing. The jets were not equipped to fire rockets, but actual combat in Korea since has demonstrated that a jet is a more accurate platform for launching such projectiles. The tremendous speed of a jet has given rise to the fallacy that it is too fast to hit a target on the nose. If necessary, a jet can be slowed down to within 10 miles an hour of the speed of a piston plane, but even at 500 miles per hour it is a more precise weapon than a piston plane doing 250 miles per hour.

You look for ruggedness in a fighter plane. The jet, previously untried in combat, confounded the experts with its toughness in Korea. As of November 9, the F-80 jet had flown 16,141 sorties against 12,188 sorties by the F-51 piston. Enemy ground fire brought down 21 F-80's and 50 F-51's. The jet is easier to maintain in the field because it is

a less complicated machine. The jet is twice as fast and can respond, therefore, quicker to an emergency call from the ground. The piston plane's range is greater, but it must be remembered that the piston engine is in the final stage of development, whereas the jet is in its infancy. The first jets we had 5 years ago could fly only 300 miles. Today the F-84E standard fighter can travel more than 2,000 miles nonstop. Jet pilots require more training, but they'll live and fight longer. Summing up, the jet is an all-purpose plane that can do everything better than a piston, including close support. Above all, it has the first "must"—the ability to help win the air battle.

Air power alone does not guarantee America's security, but I believe it best exploits the Nation's greatest asset—our technological skill. For all our productive genius, we cannot roll bodies off assembly lines to match the massive manpower of Russia and her satellites. We will be outnumbered more hopelessly than ever during the next few years when, due to the low birth rate of the depression-ridden 1930's, fewer men will be reaching military age than a decade ago. But we can, as in the last war, produce more and better airplanes than the rest of the world combined, and we have a reservoir of kids with the mechanical facility for flying all the planes we build.

I am not alluding to a cheap or a safe war. Both terms are harsh contradictions. The cost of war staggers comprehension, although, as Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury, once said, "It is a billion times cheaper to win a war than to lose it." Victory in the air is a long, laborious struggle. It took the United States and England 4 years to gain air superiority over the Nazis, and that was just the opening wedge. Death strikes as ruthlessly in the air as on the land or sea. The United States Air Force lost 53,793 men in World War II more than any branch of the service except the Army.

Air power holds catastrophe—and the hope of peace. How long the fear of retaliation of strategic bombing will restrain the Russians from plunging the world into chaos is something only the masters of the Kremlin know. But every day statesmen confer is a reprieve for civilization, sustaining the prayer that all hope will not vanish in atomic dust.

Socialism in Governmental Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks, I include a letter from Mr. Louis J. Bosse, managing director of the Associated Industries of Kentucky. The letter speaks for itself. I bring it to the attention of all the members of the Appropriations Committee in the hope that by following the suggestions contained therein, we might insure the preservation of American institutions and, at the same time, save money:

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF KENTUCKY,
Louisville, Ky., February 15, 1951.

Hon. THRUSTON B MORTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: We wish to call your attention to a shocking piece of evidence pointing to the trend toward socialism within governmental agencies.

We have a pamphlet entitled "Common Human Needs" issued by the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social Security Board of the Federal Security Agency, which was prepared under the direction of Jane M. Hoey, with the subtitle "An Interpretation for the Staff in Public Assistance Agencies." In chapter 4, page 57, there appears this sentence:

"Social security and public assistance programs are a basis essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

Bearing in mind that the pamphlet was prepared, printed, and circulated at the expense of the American taxpayer, we wish to protest the activities of the Federal Security Agency which promulgates and publishes at the taxpayers expense, such false ideologies.

We wish to request that the Appropriations Committees of Congress eliminate the spending of taxpayers' money on booklets which not only disseminate such un-American philosophy to employees of Government, but to the citizens generally.

We enlist your aid to prevent further circulation of such material from Government sources, the purpose of which is to indoctrinate Americans with a philosophy even at this very moment causing world-wide strife.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS J. BOSSE,
Managing Director.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., Sixteenth District of Pennsylvania, at the Lincoln Day dinner, February 12, 1951, at Fond du Lac, Wis.:

High up on the bank of the Potomac River, facing the Washington Monument and beyond that the dome of the Capitol, stands a building. Beautiful of line and form, surrounded by well-kept shrubbery, and majestic in every detail, there is a structure of real loveliness for all to see. Within that edifice sits the huge form of a man. He has the rugged face of a pioneer, of one acquainted with poverty and with toil. The face is lined with deep hollows, and over it play shadows of seeming depth. The craggy brow, the dropping eyelids, the tousled hair, and the melancholy gray eyes, all produce an effect not easily forgotten. Depth of character and emotion, steadfastness, kindliness and patience, all combine to give one the impression of a man in tune with the ages. Abraham Lincoln sits calmly thinking and brooding over the Washington scene.

I have watched him under a starry moonlit sky; I have seen him during a storm; and through the dreary atmosphere of a cloudy foggy night. Time and again I have whispered, "If you were alive today, what would you say to the average man on the street—to the plain citizen of this Republic? How would you react to our complex baffling problems? Speak Abraham Lincoln, and tell us what is in your heart and mind."

But there is no response; only that quiet, steady, sorrow-etched face gazes back at me. "No, you cannot be with us physically, but your spirit, and the principles you espoused so nobly are with us yet, and they will endure throughout all eternity."

We are meeting tonight to honor the memory of Lincoln. To recapture some of the ideals and beliefs which dominated every fiber of his being. To find out, if possible, what could have inspired that humble man with principles so great and character so rugged, and to feel a certain amount of partisan pride in his Republicanism.

It has been aptly said that little men fret themselves into obscurity, while a "great soul forgets himself into immortality." Elbert Hubbard wrote of Abraham Lincoln, "Lincoln sought to lose himself among the people. And to the people at length he gave his time, his talents, his love and his life. The memory of his gentleness, his patience, and his firm faith, is the priceless heritage of a united land."

But we are a badly divided Nation today. Even within the family circle there are grave differences of opinion at the present time. The great debate over foreign policies only emphasizes and brings out into the open the divisions which have been smouldering for a long while.

The thought of home had united them. Forgotten for the moment was the strife that had divided them. If only someone could say the words or do the deeds which would unify us. I am convinced that only by a rededication to high principles, and the development of a strong faith, can we hope to stir the hearts and emotions of the people. The vital need of the free peoples today is just that.

Like Lincoln, we are living in troubled times. The world of our day is large, complex and involved. Our problems are international in scope. They are not new, although on a more vast scale. Essentially, they deal with strife and bloodshed, with despair and misery, and with survival itself. We are witnessing the awakened revolutionary movements of backward suppressed races, of dictators on the march, and of sharp challenges to the human values of Christian beliefs. These are the critical years which are casting their shadows over a frightened globe.

At such a time the weak, the timid, and the excessively prudent, are attempting to avoid the hard realities. They naturally shrink from assuming risks, and, taking counsel of their fears they seek a safe harbor within which to ride out the storm.

There is no assurance of safety or security, no matter what our course may be. Those who seek security may end up losing both security and liberty. Life from its earliest days has been a struggle—a fight against inequalities, poverty, injustice, disease, war—but man has moved forward and made progress in spite of terrific odds.

The vital necessity and the big question mark today—will freemen everywhere become inflamed with a deep-abiding love of liberty; and then, in that spirit, work wholeheartedly to use every resource within their power to offset the destructive forces now on the march? Will, they, like Lincoln, have faith that right makes might, and in that faith to the end, do their duty as they understand it?

A great national debate is in full progress. The air waves and newspapers are filled with the diverse opinions of individuals. They agree on the identity of the major nation opposing us. There is a growing realization that our enemies will do their sly best to weaken and destroy us. And there is overwhelming accord that the United States must get prepared.

It is obvious that we cannot sit idly by and do nothing. It is also crystal clear that

unless America is militarily and economically strong and united, the major source of resistance to Russia and her satellites will not be effective. To waste or not use efficiently our great potentialities would be senseless and dangerous. Ignore the terms "isolationist," "internationalist," "reactionary," "radical," and "liberal." I get so bored with labels which actually reveal very little. We don't have to be extremists, nor should we be foolish and neglect the welfare of our families and our country.

We need stanch allies who will share, and I mean share, the strains and stresses of resistance to aggression. We cannot emulate Atlas and carry the whole world on our own shoulders, no matter how sturdy they may be.

Two principal ideas appeal to me with great force.

First. Deter aggression by having defense forces so strategically located they would be effective in depriving Soviet Russia of those factors which would help her to wage war. At the same time, try to keep those factors available to us and to our allies. I refer particularly to oil, rubber, manganese, tin, uranium, the areas of iron and steel production, and skilled workmen. Middle East oil, the Ruhr, and certain countries in Southeast Asia, become of vital importance when viewed in this light.

Second. Assist those allies who show a willingness to cooperate, and whose national interests and background assure their continued opposition to Soviet Russia. Included among our potential allies should be Spain and Nationalist China. In China, and behind the iron curtain, we should constantly enlist the help of anti-Communists. Guerrilla warfare and underground movements demonstrated their effectiveness during the last war. I believe encouragement of such actions when needed would bring amazing results again.

Nations have been destroyed from within before being conquered from without. Here at home we must be constantly on guard against the subversive forces which would undermine us. A serious error of the past has been our failure to understand the aims and ambitions of the small coterie of ruthless men in control of Russia, and to appraise the real meaning of communism, spelled with a capital "C." We were encouraged to believe here in America that communism was a forward-looking liberal social movement, led by great idealists with a high code of ethics. That Soviet Russia was eager to follow the road of progress and peace. How wrong the judgment of our leaders was.

Several years too late we have finally become aware of our terrible mistake. Now we must work with the fervor of a zealot to rid ourselves of the poisons of Communist infiltration in our political, social, and economic lives. The destiny of a great people is on the scales, and mankind breathlessly awaits the results.

War is a ghastly business, and its devastating results are costly beyond measure. But not all the casualties are physical. Moral values deteriorate, and freedom takes wings and flies away. In order to fight a war there is of necessity a concentration of power, and only by sacrifice and heroic effort can it be restored again to the people.

Now we are concentrating authority in anticipation of another world war. I think many of us recognize with uneasiness that our Federal Government, perhaps for years to come, will exercise a firm control over large areas of our daily lives.

After strife has ended will we have the vision and the courage to do what so few nations have been able to do? Will we be able to repel the selfish drive of ambitious groups and individuals who will try to retain in their control the powers surrendered by the people under the spur of war necessity?

If this Nation is to see again what is so often referred to as our American way of life, then the fires of freedom must be kept burning in the hearts and minds of a substantial segment of our people. That will require constant study and a deep understanding of the fundamental concepts of our system of government, culture, and economics.

A group like this could do such a job in this community, if you would only become interested enough to act. Organize study groups and learn the great truths which have guided mankind through the ages. Life has proven in unmistakable actions that small groups or even a single individual can literally accomplish the impossible. Less than 100 persons brought about the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe, and 10 men were mainly responsible for the establishment of the American Republic. A small band of men along the shores of Galilee substantially altered the course of human events. Ignore the weeping and the wailing of the defeatists who claim that trends cannot be reversed. American history proves that they are wrong.

In 1805 William Lloyd Garrison was born. As he grew to manhood he thought about the existence of human slavery in America, and then announced he would destroy it. People laughed at him, and sneered at him, and denounced him as a fool. Hadn't slavery existed for thousands of years? The great empires of Egypt, Greece, and Rome had been built on it. Some of the leading men in the United States had praised it. It was an established institution in America. How silly for one man to think he could do anything about it.

But that did not daunt Garrison. Day in and day out for weeks, and then years, he worked, he talked, he fought, and finally he began to make some progress. Fifty-eight years after he was born, human slavery was abolished in the United States.

Perhaps you are saying to yourself at this point, "I want to help, but what am I to do? How will *I* proceed from here?"

First. It is essential that you possess a historical background. Go all the way back to the beginning of civilization. Observe especially the problems of earlier years. You will realize that in spite of modern trimmings, the fundamental differences are not new. You will see that the main conflict has been between centralized authority and human freedom. The problem arose very prominently during the times of the Greeks and the Romans. Four thousand years ago, Abraham was attempting to teach his people the need for personal responsibility, and Moses, after leading the Hebrew people out of captivity through the Red Sea, tried to tell them they were free and should govern themselves. He gave them the Ten Commandments, the most individualistic code of conduct known to mankind, but they were not happy when he continued to refuse to be their ruler. They were used to authority, and were fearful of the challenges of freedom and hence continued to seek someone who would rule over them.

Christ appeared on the earth, and He reenergized the ancient truths. He emphasized the need for individual action and personal responsibility. Still the people did not comprehend the full meaning of His teachings, and when He refused to be their king, they crucified him. Shortly thereafter, the centralization of authority in Rome reached its zenith during the reign of Diocletian, with the complete regimentation of the lives of the people. Then came the collapse of the Roman Empire.

The Dark Ages contributed virtually nothing to the cause of human freedom. For centuries there were relatively few opportunities for the free action of the peoples of this earth. And suddenly, the light of freedom burst forth with renewed vigor on the North American Continent with the establishment of the American Republic. You are familiar with that most amazing success story. But now, that form of government, like others which preceded it, is threatened from within and from without its borders.

Second. Learn the basic facts concerning our American type of government.

Our forefathers were essentially religious, and it was natural that the government they established would be effected by those ideas. They believed that each human being was created by God, and therefore, if a majority of such divinely created individuals, after full and free discussion, came to a decision, it must be close to God's will—majority rule. They also believed, that each such Divinely created person, was endowed with certain inalienable rights, that no one could justly take away from him. Thus, they tried to make effective the will of the majority, and at the same time protect individual and minority rights.

They established a government of laws, and not of men, with a written Constitution, and a Bill of Rights. They provided for government by representatives rather than by direct action. Three coordinate branches were set up, with provision for a system of checks and balances. The process for amending the Constitution was purposely made long and difficult. Every move was directed toward cushioning the effect of hasty actions by a temporary majority. Protection against too much centralized authority, by a balancing of power, was the dominant idea running all through the Constitution. I shall leave it to your own good judgment how much the present trend is away from that idea.

Third. Set a good example by maintaining an active interest in your local government.

How far should the Federal Government go in the exercise of its powers in relationship to the States and local communities? That same problem of balance between central power and local action arose a long time ago in Greece and Rome.

If we are to retain our American Republic, with its sound balance of power between local and Federal Government, we must continue to retain an active interest in local affairs.

We will fight and win our wars in vain, and lose out in the end, unless there are individuals and groups like this who will be ready to carry on in later years to preserve our way of life. The real battle of the future will be for the minds of people, here and abroad.

All this will not be easy, but that should not deter you. Life itself is not easy. Last Easter, as I watched the people joyously celebrating the glories of the Resurrection, I thought of Good Friday which preceded it—the cross. Before every triumph there is drudgery, there is hard work, and often there are severe disappointments; in other words, there is a cross.

While at college, I read a poem which I have never forgotten and I would like to share it with you.

"Across the fields of yesterday
He sometimes comes to me;
A little lad, just back from play
The lad I used to be,
And yet, he smiles so wistfully
Once he has crept within,
I wonder if he hoped to see
The man I might have been."

Oh, the Nation this might be. If groups like this throughout the length and breadth of America could be persuaded to throw off their lethargy and indifference and join enthusiastically with others in the noble cause of preserving the American Republic, what a difference it would make. The words of the man whose birthday we are celebrating reverberate through the year—"We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

The decision is yours.

Fortresses of the Spirit—Libraries and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post of February 22, 1951, entitled "Fortresses of the Spirit—Libraries and Defense" by Malvina Lindsay:

FORTRESSES OF THE SPIRIT
(By Malvina Lindsay)
LIBRARIES AND DEFENSE

Typical of today's material viewpoint on civil defense was a recent suggestion that libraries might function effectively as bomb shelters. Concern with civil defense seems to be directed almost wholly toward saving our hides rather than our minds. Yet a poised approach to action in time of atomic danger might at least prevent our hiding among stacks of books that would embalm us for future archaeologists.

The defense housing bill, now pending in both Houses of Congress, provides that in communities, new and old, in which defense workers congregate, educational, recreational, and other community facilities be provided. It is generally understood that library service would be included. Yet the vital role that the library can assume in defense activities, especially in the new, bleak, industrial communities where adults as well as children need mental fortresses, is not generally understood.

The library's practical value in helping disseminate defense information is admitted. So also is its value in helping workers get retraining for defense duties. But it has even greater value in the building of morale and informed citizenship so urgently needed in times of national crisis.

During the last war a young librarian held her first important job in a Minnesota town of about 20,000 population. Living there were many wives and children of absent servicemen. The women knew great anxiety. Many of them also faced the problem of getting along on very little.

The young librarian discovered their problems and organized her library facilities, including her displays, to meet their needs. She suggested books that would help them, both mentally and in their practical make-it-do activities. She guided older women and men in the study of new skills they needed in order to qualify for jobs. She interested the more anxious ones in hobbies. She made the library a cheerful, helpful refuge for both children and grown-ups. It was the most rewarding experience of her career.

If ever there was a time when libraries needed to be fostered, in old as well as new communities, it is now. For aside from their so-called practical services, there are two fields in which they can make greatly needed intangible contributions. One is in promoting mental stability, the other in improving citizenship.

The dangerous weeks, months, years ahead call for stockpiles of self-control, confidence, and courage quite as much as for bomb shelters and radar screens. They call for volunteers, not only to spot aircraft but to keep invigorated the spirit of free-thought inquiry, research, mental growth, which is primarily what we are arming to defend.

In those few communities in which homes are crowded, often uncomfortable, the library may be at first a physical refuge. But in time it will be more. It will be found to offer an escape to the mind and spirit more solid and satisfying than that found on the television screen or in commercial entertainment.

Arming of the mind is a part of civil defense. But this cannot be done merely by getting out posters saying, "Be calm," "Be self-confident," "Be mature." People have to be helped to arm their own minds, and the library can provide tools for this.

Another service the library may be able to render in some communities is that of bringing together people with like problems to study and talk about the things that are troubling them. At least it can provide the means for many to work their way out of their own confusions by contact through books with great minds of the past and of the present.

An increasingly urgent need of today that the library can help meet is the Nation's lack of informed citizenship. At a time when the most critical decisions in the country's history are being made, the people who must render judgment on these decisions, or even dictate them, are uninformed about and indifferent to public affairs to an alarming degree.

Lester Markel, editor of the New York Times magazine, recently cited studies to show that only 25 of every 100 voters were reasonably informed about public affairs, that as late as a month ago, a third of a sample of voters were unable to identify Secretary Acheson.

Another danger to intelligent government is off-the-cuff decision by voters who accept misinformation and popular generalizations. The man in the library at least has to use his own mind and judgment in seeking information, and the use of the library is likely to quicken his zest for personal inquiry. A more aggressive salesmanship of library wares is needed everywhere to compete with the thrills of television and theatrics of demagogs for dominance of men's minds.

Not Charity, but a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I enjoyed a visit from George Barr, a citizen of my great State, a fine American, and a great humanitarian. For 16 years George Barr has conducted in the city of Chicago a successful business employing almost entirely handicapped people. The amazing thing about the undertaking is the labor record. There has never been the least sign of labor difficulty, and absenteeism among the employees is practically nonexistent. The morale of the employees is high, because they love their work and have regained confidence in themselves.

Several years ago an officer of a certain union in Chicago decided to organize the employees of G. Barr & Co. The union organizer called on Mr. Barr and requested permission to discuss the matter with his employees or, as Mr. Barr prefers to call them, his coworkers. Permission was readily given. In about an hour the organizer returned to Mr. Barr's office and said that he had decided the plant did not need organizing and although he had talked at some length to three employees, they simply looked completely blank and disinterested and would not even discuss the matter with him. Mr. Barr later ascertained that the three employees to whom the organizer talked were deaf and dumb.

The following article entitled "Not Charity, but a Chance," that appeared in the Reader's Digest January 1946, tells the story of George Barr's humanitarian work with the physically handicapped better than I can, so I include it as a part of my remarks:

NOT CHARITY, BUT A CHANCE
(Condensed from the Progressive)
(By William F. McDermott)

Nine years ago George Barr, a young chemist working for a firm in St. Paul, lost a leg and then his job. Unable to land another position, he launched out for himself. Today his medical-supply company in Chicago grosses $5,000,000 annually, and employs 147 men and women—130 of whom have such serious physical handicaps that they once seemed doomed to lives of dependency and idleness. They are paid good wages, plus bonuses.

"It's amazing how many jobs can be satisfactorily filled by the crippled," he told me. "Correctly placed, a handicapped person will do more work than a normal person. A man who uses crutches develops strong arms and shoulders and can feed a heavy machine with greater ease than an ordinary man. A deaf mute can do better work requiring finger dexterity, while a blind person, used to reading Braille, can do better where sensitivity of touch is required."

When you visit G. Barr & Co., George warns you to check your pity at the door. "These people don't need it or want it," he explains proudly. And you soon understand that; the place is electric with cheerfulness.

At one assembly line are 25 blind men and women. Their fingers fly fast and sure, and as they work they gossip and wisecrack with each other. At another long table are 30 deaf mutes, their faces alight with expression when they "talk." And here are 15 men and women who have lost an arm or a leg; 10 victims of infantile paralysis; some who have lost an eye. They operate machines, work on assembly lines, weigh, measure, pack and ship products, and do office work, fully as well as and often better than the average nonhandicapped employee.

The plant reflects the buoyant personality of its 32-year-old president. George Barr was graduated with honors from the University of Wisconsin in 1933. Three months after he got his first job he lost his leg in an automobile accident. With an artificial leg, he learned to walk without a limp; today he goes about his job like a whirlwind.

Barr couldn't find work because of his handicap, yet he refused to be doomed to pencil peddling. He developed a new formula for a hair-wave set, made it at night, and sold it in daytime to beauty shops and drug stores.

A deaf mute, Mitchell Echikovitz, was given a job. As sales increased, George and Mitchell needed another helper. Mitchell knew a jobless deaf-mute girl, and she was hired to label bottles. She still works for the company—and is now Mitchell's wife.

At the end of 4 years the concern was manufacturing a number of drugs and cosmetics and had 18 employees, all deaf mutes. Then, one day, while George was operating the labeling machine he realized that a man needed only one leg to press the pedal. So he promptly hired a one-legged man, and from that time on he has hired handicapped persons.

At the Barr & Co. switchboard is an alert, smiling girl who apparently has no handicap. Then in the corner you notice a pair of

crutches. A legless man operates a tube-filling machine. A 35-year-old factory worker who lost his sight 3 years ago now earns more than when he could see. A 32-year-old woman, born blind, started to work 3 months ago; it's her first job and she's as happy as a child with a new toy.

When employees know of crippled people unable to find work, Barr says, "Bring 'em in," and he does his best to provide jobs.

Barr finds it easy to maintain high morale in his factory because handicapped workers secure confidence and gratification through being gainfully employed. Moreover, being among their own kind gives them a feeling of normalcy which is lacking when they are among fully active people. For that reason, Barr recommends to other industrialists that handicapped persons of like affliction be given the same type of work, and that they be grouped together.

The labor turnover is less than 1 percent. Absenteeism is only one half of 1 percent. Employees are on the job "on time, all the time." The plant's safety record is excellent, for the crippled have learned to be careful.

Much of the plant's present production is devoted to war medical supplies, but civilian business on its 35 items has doubled in the last 2 years.

"There are plenty of opportunities for peacetime industry to give every handicapped person a self-supporting job," Barr said. "They will earn their pay. Moreover, if the handicapped have to live in idleness they're a burden to relatives or to the State. Our little factory has taken 30 blind people off pensions, saving the State of Illinois more than $10,000 a year. Multiply that a few thousand times and you really have something."

When the company won the coveted Army-Navy E award, the ceremony was unique. The presentation was made by an Army private on crutches, who had lost his leg at Anzio. Two deaf mutes, a blind boy, and a girl who had lost an arm received the award on behalf of the company. The blind lad made the speech of acceptance, which was translated into sign language for the benefit of the deaf mutes.

Barr's employees believe that their experience points the way to self-support and happiness for thousands of maimed war veterans. They insist that, if industry will give the handicapped not charity but a chance, they'll prove their usefulness. It looks as if George Barr and his employees had already proved their case.

A Report to the American Library Association Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the American Library Association. The president of the Council of the American Library Association is Mr. C. R. Graham, of Louisville, Ky. As director of the Louisville Free Public Library, Mr. Graham has made an outstanding record of achievement. To my knowledge, this is the only free public library which owns and operates its own radio station. This station is used for cultural and educational purposes and has been of great service to the people of the Louisville area. I take this opportunity to insert President Graham's report to the American Library Association Council which was unanimously accepted by that council. I recommend it to my colleagues as a clear-cut and positive statement of aims and purposes. In this day of defense mobilization, it is also well to remember spiritual and cultural mobilization.

A REPORT TO THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

(By C. R. Graham, president)

(Accepted unanimously by council)

In its 75 crowded years the American Library Association has faced many crises—internally and in the areas of its service to the profession and the Nation. It has always responded with vigor and imagination and I feel sure it will continue to do so. We now face a new national emergency—or, more accurately, a continuation of the crisis which many of us have witnessed throughout our lives. Through long familiarity with this crisis we are more aware of its nature than ever before and better prepared for it. We also face the danger of underestimating it from sheer frustration and weariness. This we must not do. My single message to the American Library Association Council is a call to service—I count on you to respond, as always, energetically and wholeheartedly.

Only 10 years ago at an American Library Association midwinter meeting, one of my distinguished predecessors in office reported the official declaration of a national emergency, the appropriation of billions of dollars for defense and the inauguration of selective service. On that occasion the American Library Association dedicated itself to national and world-wide service and libraries everywhere responded with expanded and redirected activities. We now face many of the same problems, some of them more acute than ever because of the more explosive weapons—and ideas—which we have and which we face from our antagonists. Once again the first duties of every American library are to assist in the national defense and to help build a peaceful world.

The American Library Association has not been inactive as the emergency has developed. We have strengthened our Washington office and redirected many of our own activities toward the demands of the emergency. We have worked closely on defense projects with other agencies such as the American Council on Education, the National Conference on Mobilization of Education, the American Book Publishers Council, and with the United States Office of Education which has been designated by the National Security Resources Board as the focal Government agency on matters relating to education. We have strengthened our Committee on Intellectual Freedom which helps to guard the chief target of our enemies—the free American mind. Now we are calling on all libraries and friends of libraries to mobilize.

We face many problems: Centralization of population in the so-called "war-impacted areas"; decentralization of population in the case of imminent attack; shortage of materials even for matters as essential to our future world as education; danger to our research resources—the physical embodiment of our heritage; shortage of staff as manpower demands increase; attacks on our integrity and on the controversial materials in our collections—physical evidence of the very freedom for which we stand ready to fight; and we face a world not yet ready to support the constructive weapons of the mind as fully as it recognizes it must support the destructive weapons for our physical defense.

Nevertheless, we also have tremendous advantages and opportunities: The chance to strike at the very root of the crisis and supply information and understanding—for defense and for future peace alike; the knowledge of community needs and the confidence of our various kinds of communities; the necessary technical materials to aid vocational training, civilian defense, and the other tangible programs on which our country is now embarked; and a front-line role in the conflict of ideas. We have enduring and penetrating weapons and we stand ready to use them with energy stemming from the special knowledge which our training and experience give us.

I ask you, therefore, to adopt, as a pledge, the following resolution on libraries and the national emergency:

"The peace and security of the world being threatened by despotism and aggression, the librarians and friends of libraries of the United States, speaking through the American Library Association, pledge themselves—

"1. To strengthen and extend the services of their libraries to meet the needs of national defense and world security.

"2. To conserve their resources for the national welfare.

"3. To sacrifice, economize, and improvise wherever possible and necessary.

"4. To meet the increasing need for information, knowledge, and education on which the future world depends for peace and prosperity.

"5. To preserve the open market of ideas which libraries represent as a symbol and guarantee of freedom.

"6. To lift the morale of a mobilized world through provision of the greatest recorded thoughts of men of all the ages.

"7. To cooperate with all agencies seeking to establish a world of decency, security, and human dignity."

Let us realize anew the power which we librarians hold and its basic role in the present world conflict. Our weapons—free ideas, freely expressed—are the strongest weapons and, therefore, are not only the first but the ultimate target of our enemies. Let us cast off modesty, timidity, and fear and wield these weapons with full confidence in victory.

Oil Industry Is Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 8, 1951:

OIL INDUSTRY IS THREATENED

The misfits of the Truman administration are on the prowl again.

At a time when industry is going all out to provide the stepped-up production required for the rearmament program, one of the businesses most vital to the Nation's welfare and security must take time off to fight for its very existence against an asinine administration proposal.

The industry is oil. The proposal is that made to Congress by Treasury Secretary Snyder for substantially reducing the rate in the depletion allowance clause of the revenue act. This clause recognizes the tremendous risks involved in the search for new oil reserves and permits a special tax adjustment to return to producers a portion of

the capital invested in this continuing exploratory work.

The attack upon the depletion allowance, which also is permitted the gas and mineral industries, is not new. It is one of the pet objectives in the Truman administration's continued harassment of business, but a wise and intelligent Congress has stymied repeated efforts to eliminate or seriously curtail the allowance and thus prevent the welfare staters from strangling the petroleum industry.

Any substantial downward revision of the depletion allowance could wreck the independent oil-producing business in the United States. It would prevent producers from getting back capital invested which is necessary if they are to continue in business. It would reduce exploratory work and the finding of new oil reserves so essential to maintain the production necessary to meet security demands. It would make us, within a few years, dependent on foreign oil which might be cut off in case of war.

No other industry is as hazardous as that of producing oil. Last year, 82 percent of all wildcat, or exploratory wells drilled in the United States were dry. Only 15 percent found oil and 3 percent found gas. Even in areas where oil already has been found, drilling still is a big gamble. Of all such wells drilled in the Nation last year, more than 28 percent were dry.

As early as 1916, Congress realized the hazardous situation of the oil industry and the necessity, if exploratory work were to continue, of returning to producers, tax free, capital invested in finding and producing oil. Capital is not taxed. Only income is taxable.

In that year, the cost depletion method of returning capital to producers was enacted and it was supplanted in 1918 by a recovery depletion method. Both involved endless engineering and accounting work, however, so an exhaustive survey was instituted by the Government for the years from 1918 to 1925 to determine a fair and simple depletion law. That survey, which formed the basis for the present law enacted in 1926, showed that the annual average depletion of capital invested in finding oil and producing it was between 32 and 33 percent of the gross income of producers.

The present depletion law, which has stood the test of time and proved its necessity in expanding the Nation's oil reserves, permits the owner of an oil or gas well to deduct from taxes 27½ percent of the gross income of his property up to a limit of half the net income from that property. This figure actually is between 5 and 6 percent lower than the Government survey on which the law was based showed what the depletion allowance for the industry as a whole should be.

Running true to form, administration officials in calling for a reduction of the depletion allowance from 27½ to 15 percent, do not reveal the true facts, either through misinformation or in a deliberate attempt to falsify the issue. They merely contend that the allowance is deducted year after year, even after the full original investment has been recovered.

But they fail to point out that when oil or gas is produced from a property, there is a reduction in the capital represented by that oil or gas in place. Nor do they cite that each individual producing property, or lease, is considered separately in figuring the depletion allowance. Some producers may drill 20 wells before finding oil. Thus, their capital investment is far greater than the capital invested in that twenty-first well. While the depletion allowance for one producing property may, over a period of years, total more than the investment in that one propery, it still falls far short in most instances of returning to the producer the capital he has invested in various properties in search of production. This was clearly shown by the Government's own survey which found this loss of capital amounted to between 32 and 33 percent.

It is generally recognized that the depletion allowance is the incentive that has kept the Nation's reserves abreast of the steadily growing demands for oil and oil products. Without it the search for new fields would be seriously curtailed. For oilmen simply cannot afford to gamble away their capital.

Oil is vital to the welfare of this Nation. Any attempt to stymie the industry, such as by curtailment of the depletion allowance, can be disastrous. Congress should turn a deaf ear to the socialistic schemers and leave undisturbed a proven plan that oiled the way to victory in World Wars I and II and will safeguard the future petroleum needs of the Nation.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an address that I delivered on January 20 at the Department of Interior observance of Brotherhood Week. The spirit of brotherhood should not be confined to 1 week of the year but should be practiced by everyone, day in and day out, for the 52 weeks of the year.

If the success of this meeting today is reflected by the sincerity of this audience and—in fact—of the full sponsorship of Brotherhood Week, then we can indeed look forward with confidence to the results of this program. In the first place, the very fact that we are convening in the Department of the Interior auditorium is in itself symbolic of the objective for which we plead, for who has been a more outstanding practitioner of our cause than Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman?

It is also most encouraging that members of this audience, and those elsewhere who are enthusiastically observing Brotherhood Week, have subordinated all other interests in order that you might demonstrate your determination to dissolve intolerance in this land and in other nations of the globe.

These extraordinary steps to promote and preserve human dignity should not be necessary, of course. It is not at all complimentary to the prevailing moral state that such steps are necessary. Tolerance is an element of charity, and—unfortunately—charity is the least practiced of all virtues. Whether the contemporary disdain for this virtue is more dominant than in the past is problematical, inasmuch as the history of civilization records a procession of individuals, groups, and even nations that—by their very intolerant behavior—brought strife and suffering to the world. But we do know that, within our own range of memory, there has been little progress in the right direction. Whether such a situation can long endure is doubtful, because I question whether civilization can survive under continued defiance of the laws of Divine Providence. Certainly this program in which we are participating today will go far toward improving these conditions, but we will all have to make the intent of this project a 52-week proposition, and we will all have to impress upon succeeding generations that there is no work on this earth more important than that of cultivating the love and forbearance of all men, regardless of their faith, color, race, or nationality.

The basis of all charity, and, therefore, of all tolerance, is religious teachings. We have been paying entirely too little attention to the Lord's commandment—love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God. We have departed so far from this precept that we have permitted intolerance to rage throughout the world.

One of the most notorious examples of individual, then group, then nationalistic development of intolerance, was in Nazi Germany. It was like the crime of arson where the fire was to spread far and wide and blacken the hearts of millions. It penetrated every phase of German society. I remember so well in the summer of 1936 when one of our own boys from western Pennsylvania was made the target of a most disgusting display of intolerance—discrimination in the sports arena. John Woodruff, a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh and one of the greatest middle-distance runners of all time, won the 800-meter race at the Berlin Olympic Games in a spectacular run that deserved the acclaim of every sports enthusiast in the world. But, like Jesse Owens, who won three events in those games, Johnny Woodruff was a colored boy, and the Nazi leaders attempted to belittle their triumphs. Naturally, the effort backfired, and Woodruff and Owens became international heroes; but the revolting exhibition on the part of the German warlords provided an unerring insight into events that were sure to follow in any nation where intolerance is a governing principle.

Now, 15 years later, we find ourselves faced with another common enemy and disciple of the evil of intolerance. Communism has no place for the rights and the dignity of the individual. It must carry out an insidious campaign against the virtue of charity and other teachings of God. It, therefore, behooves us to unify our own peoples to a greater extent than ever before because only through such unison—through the recognition and practice of true brotherhood—can we cope with that dangerous and venomous state of intolerance that has enveloped and made captive many millions of human beings to our east and to our west.

Our recognition of brotherhood week and our willingness to expand and encourage the virtue it represents will give us the strength and the courage to carry on against all oppressors. But we must, in keeping with divine precepts—and, in reality, for our own welfare—never relax in forwarding the principles of this program.

We are approaching the anniversary of the birth of the father of this country, George Washington, who laid down the sound precept: "Give bigotry no sanction."

Military Housing in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to bring to the attention of the Congress the first of a series of articles written by Mr. Andrew Tully, of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, now appearing in those papers. Mr. Tully is at this time in Alaska and his writings

are particularly timely; they coincide with and substantiate with reference to inadequate military housing the findings of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate in a report released by that committee late last week.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, February 21.—If official Washington can spare the time from its cocktail parties, it ought to be ashamed of the way the wives and children of American servicemen are living in this near-Arctic community.

For security reasons, exact numbers of people involved can't be used. But at least several hundred servicemen and their families—mostly enlisted men—are living in one-room shacks without plumbing. In many cases, families with three or four children are crowded into these hovels. And they pay rents from $85 to $100 a month plus an average of $50 a month for heat.

Come visit in the home of Staff Sgt. Eugene Grueschow in an outlying section of Anchorage known as Mountain View.

It's a pretty warm day, only 5 above zero, compared with temperatures of 20 below a month ago.

In an unpainted shack covered with tarpaper lives Sergeant Grueschow, his wife, and three children. The shack is one room, about 15 by 15. Mrs. Grueschow is sitting on the couch chatting with a neighbor. Against one wall there's a two-tiered Army-type bunk bed. Robert, age 3, is sleeping on the lower bunk. Katherine, 2, a towhead, has just waked up in the upper berth against another wall.

There's a bassinet in which Paul, 3 weeks old, cries fretfully. A curtain in the corner conceals the family's single closet. There is a counter with closets above the chest. There are also drawers, a cupboard, a chest, and a combination desk-table. Heat is furnished by an oil cooking range.

Being a staff sergeant, Gene Grueschow has been able to buy on terms a small, 4-cubic-foot electric refrigerator. There is no toilet. There is no wash basin. There is no sink for drinking water. The Grueschows have to walk up the street to a community pump used by thirty-odd other families. Water flows freely from the pump except when the pump freezes. Then Gene Grueschow has to go 3 miles for water.

To go to the toilet, the Grueschows have to walk 50 or 60 yards to a community utility room. This is poorly heated if at all. The shack has space on one side for men and on the other for women. There are also showers which often have hot water and tubs for doing the family laundry.

The Grueschows are lucky because they are buying their shack. They've made the down payment and now are paying only $60 a month on the mortgage. Of course, they still have to shell out $50 or so a month for heat. And, since they're buying, they're also charged $5 a nonth for electricity, $5 a month for ground rent until they buy the lot for the shack, and $5 a month for use of the utility room. Their outlay comes to only $75 a month instead of the $85 most tenants pay. That's not counting the money for heat.

Yes, the Grueschows are lucky. They're not like the family over on Lane Street, several blocks away, who don't even have a pump. The corporal who is head of this family of four—the kids are 2 and 3—doesn't want any trouble with anybody so he asked to stay anonymous. You might call him Daniel Boone considering the way he and his family live.

Anyway, all the water used by this family is carried by the corporal in big pickle jugs from Elmendorf Air Base, a couple of miles away. When he can hitch rides that's fine. When he can't—well, his legs are still young and strong.

Of course, the corporal and his family share their privy with only three other families and it rarely gets colder than 10 below or so in the little structure except around midnight.

Then there's the family of Corp. William H. Epperson—a wife and two children, aged 4 and 8. Like other families existing in these subhuman accommodations; they rented their shack furnished. But when they moved in they found no dishes except a few chipped cups and saucers and no pots and pans. There's one bed, a couple of chairs and a chest. Corporal Epperson bought a cot. Now the kids have a place to sleep.

Surprisingly, most of the tenants of Mountain View and similar spots around Anchorage are fairly cheerful. At least the family's together, they say, and that's something. Only sometimes the smell kind of gets you. You know how it is.

Phony Communist Peace Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1951, I called the attention of my colleagues in the House to the sudden blossoming out of phony peace organizations obviously founded for the purpose of disseminating Communist propaganda. The Communists are determined to take advantage of the concern of our people over the proposed drafting of young men for military service.

At that time I suggested that the great American press expose the phony peace groups and their activities, for the protection of patriotic citizens who might otherwise be misled into signing petitions circulated by the Communists. The press of my home city has already responded to the need for publicity concerning the Communist peace organizations and I should like my colleagues to have the opportunity to read four excellent articles, one a column by Dora H. Moore which appeared in the Los Angeles Sentinel February 15, 1951; a news story by Ernest Brashear which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News; a news report which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News a few days after Mr. Brashear's story; and an excerpt from the February 19 column of the famous Los Angeles Daily News columnist, Mr. Matt Weinstock. I hope newspapers in other cities will join with our Los Angeles papers in exposing the current Communist tactics. The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Sentinel of February 15, 1951]

THIS WAY, FOLKS

(By Dora H. Moore)

I would like to reemphasize and elaborate on a warning recently issued by Fourteenth District Congressman SAM YORTY who claims "sneaking Communist traitors are setting up fake peace councils to prey on parents of 18-year-olds who may be taken into military service under the proposed new draft."

He cited petitions being circulated by an organization called the Southern California Peace Council, the petitions are headed, "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier" and are followed by what YORTY called the "usual Communist propaganda." YORTY said he has asked the FBI to look into the organization and hopes the Attorney General will place such phony peace councils on his list of subversive organizations.

During the past months the east-side community has been deluged with petitions of every description, some honest proposals, but unfortunately too many shady (particularly Red shaded) petitions are circulating in this area. I would like to warn citizens in this area against indiscriminately signing their names to these petitions until they have carefully evaluated them. Ask where they originate, who backs the organization, and be generally discreet in signing papers carried by complete strangers.

It's just this serious. If you sign a petition sponsored by a Communist-front or other subversive organization, you immediately leave yourself wide open for a continuous appeal for sympathy for the publicly undesirable cause. The first thing you know, Government agencies will be making an embarrassing investigation into your private affairs, not necessarily to be snooping, but furthering a continuous effort to sift out followers and supporters of subversive organizations. Besides, no one likes to be a sucker—a set-up for every sharp operator that comes along.

Exercising discretion in signing things does not end with avoiding questionable petitions, but even more diligence is required when you sign notes, agreements, leases, and all other legal documents.

Not too long ago a couple contacted me in regard to a legal technicality that had cost them the down payment on a home (it was over $1,000). Simply because of a lack of even elemental knowledge of the law they had lost their life savings, their chance for a home of their own, and their swindlers couldn't be legally touched.

When making a sale or purchase that involves contract agreement, before you sign your rights away, contact a competent lawyer. If you are financially unable to do this, for a negligible sum the Legal Aid Society, California Bar Association, the legal section of the Red Cross, and other public organizations offer competent aid. The Sentinel will be interested in helping expose unfair deals. Remember, your taxes also pay for the services of a public defender. Let him earn his salary.

However, the surest way to avoid entangling tie-ups is to guard your signature as you would your life. A bad error of judgment may be that costly.

[From the Los Angeles Daily News]

LEFTIES START PHONY PEACE CRUSADE HERE

(By Ernest Brashear)

As a reporter I've been booted out of some pretty strange places, but last night was the first time I ever got ousted from a peace conference.

Of course, this peace conference was different. It was left-wing style, calculated to please the friends of Joe Stalin.

They tried to make people think it was a labor-union affair.

They called it the labor conference for peace.

But not a single A. F. of L. or CIO leader was there. In fact, I didn't see any labor-union leaders.

What was supposed to be a labor-union function turned out to be, instead, the first local move in a new phony drive called the American peace crusade.

The meeting, at the Park View Manor, 2200 West Seventh Street, was chaired by Olive Thompson, a member of the United Electrical Workers kicked out of CIO for Communist-line activities.

She introduced Elsie Monjar, who may be reached by phone at the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, another outfit dropped by CIO in last year's housecleaning.

Elsie told about the enthusiasm at a Chicago meeting where some of the plans were made for a march on Washington to tell the President and Congress they better give us peace or else.

She sounded quite warlike.

Then came a talk from Jackie Clack, who attended the Communist-inspired Warsaw peace meet and also collected 8,700 signatures on the Stockholm peace petition, a little document that is said to have come straight off the Kremlin's private printing presses.

Jackie told about how proud she'd been while visiting Russia to stand beside women soldiers of the Red Army and how dreadful it felt to come back here after feeling the freedom of the Soviet Union.

Then they got down to the business of presenting "awards of merit for outstanding service in the cause of world peace * * * to some 25 Los Angeles trade-unionists," as the announcement bulletin described it.

The awards were little silver pins. Jackie Clack got the first one.

About this time, the woman who had been standing looking over my shoulder and watching me take notes started to fidget. I missed the next name.

Then came somebody supposed to be from the CIO United Auto Workers.

He wasn't there.

Then came a girl—not a union member—who was supposed to have gotten 700 names on the Stockholm petition. She wasn't there either.

Next came Homer Safford, secretary-treasurer of the Labor Conference for Peace. He got his.

Elsie then asked Jackie to give the awards to those being honored for Stockholm petition signatures.

A guy named Morrison got his, and that's where I went out.

The woman who'd been fidgeting asked if she could see me outside. I went. We were followed by two young punks disguised as workingmen.

They wanted to see my credentials. I showed 'em. They said they thought maybe I was an FBI man. Maybe that was just to make me feel good, because then they said it was a closed meeting, and I couldn't go back in.

I told them Elsie had said I could attend (as she had over the phone), and I pointed out I was a union member (CIO American Newspaper Guild). The invitation had said trade unionists are invited.

No; they said, the people are getting nervous (about 100 were there) about your taking notes, so you are not welcome. They sounded warlike. Being of a peaceful turn of mind, I didn't argue further.

I left.

Here are some other things I found out about the group:

They share offices with the Southern California Peace Council, which was branded last Monday by Representative SAM YORTY as one of the phony Communist peace fronts aimed at keeping this country unprepared.

The address is 326 West Third Street, room 310.

Included among the names of those proposing this so-called American Peace Crusade are those of Harry Bridges, Hugh Bryson, Mrs. Charlotta Bass, of Los Angeles, Rev. Stephen Fritchman, of Los Angeles, and a string of others commonly found on left-wing material.

There are three big ideas involved in this peace crusade deal. One is what they call the big debate, a kind of Gallup poll where everybody is supposed to vote for war or peace. The ballots are then to be shown to Truman to prove we want peace—and who doesn't?

Then there's the crusade itself, scheduled for March 1, when 8,000 crusaders are supposed to invade Washington to demand peace.

Last, they've dreamed up a grievance form by which American union men are supposed to tell the President he's violating their union contract by raising taxes.

And, just in case you wan' to drop around, the boys and girls are going to have another little pink tea Saturday night at the Nikabob Cafe on Western Avenue.

Principal speaker will be Harry Bridges, boss of the longshoremen's union.

That was announced after I left the meeting last night, so don't let anybody know who told you. I won't.

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of February 16, 1951]

OUSTING OF REPORTER FROM LEFT-WING "PEACE" MEET HIT

Ousting of Daily News reporter Ernest Brashear from a left-wing "peace" meeting last Tuesday night was protested today by Ben Nathanson, administrative officer of the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild, CIO.

"This is no isolated incident," Nathanson said. "Every newspaperman knows that reporters were barred from covering the recent convention of the Communist Party held in New York, and the United Electrical Workers, an organization thrown out of the CIO because it was top-heavy with Communists, never allows newspaper photographers to cover its conventions."

Brashear was covering the meeting which was sponsored by an organization that had been denounced by both CIO and A. F. of L. leaders as Communist dominated.

When the reporter was observed taking notes for his story, he was asked to leave.

"It was an outright violation of one of our basic democratic principles—freedom of the press," Nathanson said. "Now these people are attempting to drop the iron curtain in Los Angeles. They won't get away with it."

[From the Los Angeles Daily News of February 19, 1951]

ON THE BIAS

Ernie Brashear, this paper's labor reporter, last week described how he was ejected from a so-called labor conference for peace meeting at a West Seventh Street hotel, when he was detected taking notes. He identified himself as a member of the American Newspaper Guild, but was asked to leave anyway. He was there long enough, however, to detect a left-wing tinge to the proceedings.

The irony is that 2 years ago, at a State Federation of Labor convention, the People's World reporter was barred and Ernie was named to a two-man delegation to appeal to the federation to admit the reporter, in the name of free speech. Through his efforts the People's World man was permitted to stay.

Problems of Mine Operation and Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1951, I submitted to the RECORD a copy of a letter which I sent to Mr. William Henry Harrison, Defense Production Administrator, in regard to our domestic mines. Today I am putting into the RECORD a copy of the answer to my letter which was written by Mr. E. T. Gibson, Deputy Administrator of the Defense Production Administration. I might add that I am both irked and indignant over his unsatisfactory reply. My reply to Mr. Gibson is also herewith submitted to the RECORD so that the Congress may be fully informed of the apparent lackadaisical attitude and the dilatory manner which the DPA has been following. It is my hope that the United States Congress will get behind me with remedial legislation which will put the minerals program on a simple and direct operating basis and once again assure the American public that it is the Congress which runs the Nation's business, and not the bureaucrats.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 14, 1951.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARING: Your letter of January 31 has been received, and I have reviewed carefully the various points you have brought up with reference to the problems of exploration and encouraging increased production from small and marginal mine operations.

Undoubtedly, you have read by this time the statement of Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman on the defense programs of his Department before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in executive session on February 12, 1951. A copy of Secretary Chapman's statement is enclosed.

This office has been in close touch with Dr. James Boyd, the Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration. He has been deeply concerned with this specific problem and the fact that the Defense Minerals Administration has been unable thus far to tackle in detail the question of mine exploration in accordance with the instructions under section 303 of the Defense Production Act. You will recall that whereas aid for loans and purchase contracts has been specifically spelled out, the act did not do other than state "to assist in carrying out the objectives of this act, the President may make provisions * * * for the encouragement of the exploration, development, and mining of strategic minerals and metals." As you undoubtedly know, the interpretation of that particular phrase in the act has been subject to considerable debate and also to a determination based upon modification or changes in the tax laws. This latter has been done since the first of the year.

At the present moment, the Defense Minerals Administration is moving forward toward the establishment of procedures for handling the problem of minerals exploration. As indicated in Secretary Chapman's statement and in statements made by Dr. Boyd before this same committee, a plan will be in operation at an early date.

I think it is important to remember that although to the man in the field the processing of applications and the establishment of procedures appears to be infinitely slow, more damage can be done by hasty action than by delay under circumstances where a program is as diversified as the minerals program for the United States. It is important to remember that more than 70 commodities are involved on the essential list of minerals, although possibly only 20 or more would qualify under an exploration program. However, these 20 commodities are sufficiently complex problems of their own—undoubtedly you will understand that the problems of mica are quite different from those of zinc, and the problems of quicksilver bear no relationship directly to the problems of beryllium. It is obvious

that the establishment of a workable program, covering as diverse a number of mineral commodities as must be considered in this instance is a task of major proportions.

This question is equally complex with respect to procurement of strategic metals and minerals at above market prices. No over-market price determination can be made by the contracting agencies until requirements have been established and until there are indications as to the critical essentiality of the metals or minerals involved. Obviously such determinations are tied in with the requirements of our military forces.

Coupled to this, Dr. Boyd informs me that he has had the problem of attempting to expand facilities of existing operations with a very small staff available to assist in the operation. He is hoping to expand this staff in order to take care of the workload, but as you probably know, mining engineers are difficult to find and men skilled in this highly specialized field are already engaged in work for our minerals companies.

It is proposed, under the new exploration plan which is modeled somewhat after the exploration portion of S. 2105, that the objectives you have indicated as necessary in your letter will be achieved. I can assure you that this office is making every effort to facilitate this work, and it is my hope that within the next 60 days an exploration plan will be in full operation.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. GIBSON,
Deputy Administrator.

FEBRUARY 22, 1951.

Mr. E. T. GIBSON,
Deputy Administrator, Defense Production Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GIBSON: Your answer of February 14 to my letter addressed to Mr. Harrison is at hand.

I am under the impression that my letter was not given detailed study before the answer was drafted as it is in the large part unresponsive. I know of Mr. Chapman's statement, and of many other statements made during the past year by officials of the Interior Department. The bare, blunt truth is that in spite of the output of words, little or nothing has been done to increase the output of minerals.

The Chapman exploration plan, if followed as announced, mostly on a 50–50 basis will be a flop. If the small and marginal miners had that sort of money they would already be spending it digging, as an official of the Mining Association of Montana has written me.

The Defense Minerals Administration may be moving forward, as you say, but the progress is too microscopic for me readily to observe.

We did not do any damage by "hasty action" during World War II and we got out the ore. There were a lot of strategic and critical minerals to handle then, also. It seems as though the experience of the past has been completely rejected.

Dr. Boyd, I believe, with Defense Minerals Administration, Bureau of Mines, and USGS, already has a larger staff than was engaged in the Premium Price Plan, the Metals Reserve Company operations, and the RFC mine loan division, and it appears that in 6 months only half a dozen procurement contracts have been let, no loans made, and no exploration projects allowed. Please correct me if I am wrong. Congress has granted the authority and the money. The reasons for lack of policy and lack of results in the agency operations do not interest the Congress. The lack of results does.

If would seem that the only cure for the demands our constituents are making is remedial legislation to put the minerals program on a simple and direct basis.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman from Nevada.

Letter of House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church to the membership of the church, issued at the meeting of the House of Bishops in El Paso, Tex., on January 12, 1951.

The communication is entirely nonsectarian and contains so much sound philosophy that it should be read by every American family.

While it points up our own shortcomings as individuals and as a Nation, it holds a torch of hope and faith to all Christian people.

The letter follows:

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. (Galatians 5: 1.)

Brethren, the minds of many are filled today with dread and gloom, for the future seems to hold for them little of hope, certitude, or peace. Since the attitude with which men face the future is itself a great factor in determining the future, we want in this letter to hold before all people teachings and insights of the Christian faith which can enable us to stand firm and wise in a difficult day.

First, remember that the great periods of history to which we look with pride in church and Nation have been those when God-fearing men stood fast in the face of adversity. We are not proud of the prodigal and cheap years in our history, and we are ashamed of the comfortable and half-hearted eras of the church's life. We cherish in memory the men and women, who, with patience and wisdom, tolerance and courage, and an unfaltering adherence to principle, worked and fought to achieve our liberties, and by their resolution turned the direction of history.

Since we all share this heritage of patriots, martyrs, and prophets, what we should dread is not difficulty, but rather the continuation of so much that is cheap and irresponsible in our way of life. God in His Providence has called us, as He called our forefathers, to greatness; to play in our day for the sake of all mankind a leading role in the struggle for freedom. It will require of us the same dependence upon God and self-denial, wisdom and patience, tolerance and courage which others have shown before us. We are called to accept this role and to join hands with the mighty fellowship of free men across the ages. If we want a comfortable material future, no encouraging word can be spoken: if we want strength of soul in the company of brave and faithful men, we can make this a great age.

Secondly, remember that if the future is uncertain, that is no new thing. Washington, Lincoln, and Lee were not able to foresee in their time of testing what lay ahead. Their greatness consisted in their willingness to place the future in God's hands while they in obedience performed the immediate duties before them. Consider Washington's words, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair. The event is in the hands of God"; or Lincoln's words, "With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right"; or the words of the hymn, "Keep Thou my feet. I do not ask to see the distant scene; one step enough for me." These men placed themselves in the hands of God, fulfilled day by day, sometimes in darkness, their duties and responsibilities, and left the success or failure of their efforts to Providence.

The greatness of these men reveals an enervating gloom for what it is: faithlessness to God and our present responsibility. There is no man who cannot see his present duty, and to do it at this significant moment in history is a rare privilege given to us by God. Nothing can take the place in our life together of integrity and character, and we must remember in the fear of God that we are threatened not only by outward forces, but by any lack of responsibility from within. Every man who lives irresponsibly today, who seeks his own security or gain without counting the costs to others· every politician who plays recklessly on the present crisis for partisan advantage or his own advancement; every injustice in our common life, every hypocrisy in our democratic profession, weakens us and makes us less able to fulfill the role laid upon us. Even though we cannot see the pattern of the future, we can see the duties that lie at hand and the value of hard and self-denying work in the present. We, too, in our day, by what we do, can help to shape the course of history.

In addition to the tasks directly before us in our daily lives God requires of us vital concern, in spite of all discouragements, for peace and a world order rising above the anarchy of nationalism; an outgoing compassion for any of God's children who are suffering and in need; imaginative efforts in the strengthening of our common defense; and personal and community service to the men and women in the armed services.

"Away with gloomy doubt and faithless fear!
No arm so weak but may do service here."

Finally, we urge upon all men fervent prayer and a deeper understanding of the riches and gifts of the Christian faith. Since ages of adversity reveal to men their deepest needs, it is becoming clear to an increasing number of people that no one can be inwardly secure unless he walk with God. In a day when other foundations are shaking He alone is our strong Fortress and Friend. It also is becoming clear to an increasing number as they are shaken from comfortable assumptions that faith in God is the great source of the freedoms and values which are now threatened. Never in its history has the church faced a greater task or opportunity.

The immediate and obvious enemy of western civilization is Russian communism, but the deepest enemy is the godless materialism which bred the illusions and cynicism of communism and weakens us now from within. Beneath much of our own life there are assumptions which must be fought by every member of the church, for they are part of the total enemy we face. With the Communists there are members of all nations who share false and evil convictions:

1. This life is all there is; therefore, let's make the most of it, forgetful of any higher law.

2. Man's economic activity is his most important activity.

3. The more material things we possess the happier we will be as a people.

Since there is an inner struggle for the soul of our world which crosses all frontiers, we must realize that no final victory can take place on the field of battle. Since ideas are not destroyed by guns, the only way to overcome a false view of life is by the militant preaching and living of a true view of life.

We write this not only with the hope that non-church people will read and be led to a concern with the inner life of America and

the world, but chiefly to impress church people with the great significance of their responsibility. While the Communists sent their missionaries to the ends of the earth, there have been comfortable people who have said it made no difference what a man believed. The great freedom for which our ancestors fought has been for others a petty and negative thing: Freedom from great convictions and discipline, freedom from zeal and sacrifice.

We are entering a new age in which we are called by our sovereign Lord to write a great chapter in His church's militant history. We can become by His grace and power finer, deeper, and more obedient people. There is in our life with Christ in His church comfort and strength in this world and comforting assurance to those who love Him of a world to come. There is in the midst of an uncertain world the comfort of Christ's presence with us and the divine assurance that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His church. But we would remind all members of the church that there is no assurance whatever that the church will increase to be largely effective without the devotion, discipline, and zeal of its members. Only by apostolic missionary endeavor will Christianity again become the soul of this world. Our responsibility is to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and to bear with power our witness in a sick world to God's saving and healing truth.

Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a press release of the Alaska Development Board at Juneau, Alaska, which demonstrates clearly the use to which the Alaska Highway is being put by the citizens of the United States and Canada:

For the first time in history, more people traveled to Alaska by automobile in 1950 than by boat, the Alaska Development Board revealed today in releasing its annual compilation of highway traffic figures.

The number entering the northern Territory by highway last year was 22,507 while the number of visitors by sea was 17,430. In outbound passengers, however, those going on the four ship lines regularly serving Alaska slightly exceeded those by automobile, 16,971 to 16,623.

The great preponderance of northbound over southbound travelers is accounted for, the Alaska Development Board says, by visitors who like the Territory so well they settle down to stay. Alaska's population has increased 77.4 percent, more than any State, in the past 10 years.

Growing importance of the Alaska Highway as a travel artery between the United States and the Territory is illustrated clearly in the 1950 traffic figures.

During the year a total of 16,907 vehicles traveled northbound and southbound over the wartime-constructed highway. This represents an increase of 4,361 vehicles and 10,663 passengers over 1949, and 8,368 vehicles and 20,446 passengers over 1948 traffic. The total highway traffic entering Alaska in 1950 amounted to 9,733 vehicles, while 7,174 left the Territory via the highway.

With road improvements continually being made along the Canadian section by the Canadian Government and long stretches of the highway system within Alaska being hard-surfaced by the Alaska Road Commission, substantial increases are anticipated during 1951.

Economic difficulties encountered by Alaska Highway trucking operations were reflected by a large decrease in truck movements. In 1950 a total of 1,476 trucks moved over the road, compared with 4,098 in 1949, a decrease of 2,622. Present operators appear to have sufficient capacity to meet current requirements of the region.

A slight decrease also was noted in bus traffic, a total of 212 busses making the trip, just 22 less than the previous year. Low-cost, round-trip bus tours to Alaska now being featured should result in increased traffic during the coming year.

The popularity of the Alaska Highway as a tourist route is evidenced by the large increase in vacation travel over it. A total of 23,279 persons traveled over the highway during the 1950 tourist season, an increase of more than 13,000 over 1949. The peak month was July when 6,331 persons moved over the 1,523-mile road.

Traffic also was heavy during the winter months, a total of 8,968 persons moving over the highway during the months of January, February, March, November, and December. The highway is open throughout the year.

Detailed information pertaining to personal travel over the highway may be obtained by writing the Alaska Development Board, Box 50, Juneau, Alaska.

Justice for Our Friends in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, which is the same as H. R. 4540, introduced during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. This bill would provide benefits for the men and women who served in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II. It would give them educational benefits similar to those received by other members of the American Armed Forces. Those of us who served with the brave and loyal Filipino soldiers will all agree, I am sure, that they certainly deserve every benefit given to us. They fought as members of the American Armed Forces, and the fact that the Philippine Islands were later given their independence should in no way be used as an excuse for denying them equal benefits with the rest of us.

We have been rightfully proud of the relationship between the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands. All factors considered, that relationship has been praiseworthy and has cemented firm bands of friendship between the United States and the Philippine Republic. Aside from the decisive need for equal justice in dealing with the Filipino soldiers, if we must always assert a selfish reason for doing what is right in foreign affairs, it is obvious that our relationship with the Republic of the Philippines is of such inestimable value from a standpoint of our defense that we should most certainly make every effort to demonstrate our desire to reciprocate their friendship by giving to the citizens of the Philippines, who fought as members of the American Armed Forces, the same benefits we have given to other members of our Armed Forces.

Lack of Virile Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from a patriotic young man in my district who is convinced that the great trouble with our international situation today as it affects this country and the welfare of our people is a lack of virile leadership.

I am sure that the mail which I am receiving daily is typical of that which is being received by many of my colleagues in Congress. It shows an utter lack of confidence in the leadership of the national administration in this country. These letters, as in this instance, come in ever-increasing numbers from the young men and women who are beginning to assume the burdens and responsibilities of leadership and citizenship in local affairs. Their minds are active and they are alert to the possibilities that the future holds in store for them and succeeding generations, if only we could supply our Government with virile leadership.

While I do not pretend to endorse all that this young man said in his letter, and do not agree in all details in his line of reasoning and conclusions, on the whole, I submit that it is a good illustration of the active and constructive thinking of the younger generation. It shows they are not completely in the dark as to where the real trouble lies. They are demanding virile leadership in the development and execution of national and international policies.

For the benefit of my colleagues and those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I quote verbatim and in full the following letter, which is an intelligent recitation of one of the younger generation, typical of the thinking of so many of them:

Representative GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Quite reasonably you may not remember, but during your previous session in Congress I visited your office several times while I was employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington. My home address then, as now, was Tulsa—but it's been a long jump from the FBI to pipelining.

My purpose in writing to you at this time is to attempt to set forth my views regarding some of the critical issues facing our country—issues which the Congress is being asked to resolve, but issues about which I

feel every American should forthrightly voice his opinions. These views are not necessarily those of my company or of any other person—they are the opinions of a young lawyer, a veteran and Reserve officer, of a former newspaperman and Government employee, of a conscientious civic worker and youth leader, a God-fearing Christian, and of a loyal American.

I think the most difficult problem facing our Government is for that Government to make up its mind on a course of action. It is the administration's completely negative policy that has most of us more worried than Russia's possession of the atomic bomb. They taught us in OCS at Fort Benning: Determine the situation, locate your objective, then decide on a course of action.

I am confident that the intelligence available to our leaders in Washington is sufficient for an adequate analysis of the situation. Surely it must be clear to all concerned that the U. S. S. R. intends to destroy the freedom that we all take so much for granted. Certainly the evidence is ample that the Korean conflict was spawned by the master minds in the Kremlin, whether the result is what they intended or not. Furthermore, the facts unmistakably reveal that the United Nations as presently constituted cannot effectively cope with the situation. The vote in favor of branding Communist China as an aggressor made front-page news one day, but the simple fact that most of the member nations are afraid to even invoke sanctions was hidden on page 17 the next day. While we may be able to rally the support of a few friendly nations, the burden is still on Uncle Sam to provide the leadership and furnish the means to stop Soviet imperialism.

Our Constitution and Bill of Rights set forth the very noble aspirations of the founders of this Republic. If these still be our objectives, why is it necessary to continue vacillating over a foreign policy? Cannot a clear-cut, intelligent pronouncement be made by the President of this policy, followed by forceful action to carry it out? Our country is willing and able to fulfill whatever task is necessary to free the world from the menace of Communist enslavement. But we are far from ready, our will to accomplish this tremendous task may soon be decimated by indecision, and our ability could easily disappear through lack of virile leadership. I confidently believe that the people of these United States will respond in an unprecedented fashion to any call for duty or sacrifice if only the Government will decide upon a firm and resolute program of action. Unfortunately it is later than we think—but I believe we should do something about it.

I believe the draft age should be lowered to 18 and raised to 32. All men in this bracket who did not serve at least 12 months in the last war should be called to active duty. All men who did see service should be required to join Reserve units that would be called to duty only after the nonveterans were in service. The minimum mental and physical requirements should be lowered. Even an incompetent is capable of some type of service, and certainly a man who can hold a civilian job can do something of value in the Army or Navy. The principal problem here would be to require that the Armed Forces exercise more discrimination in their use of manpower, with careful appraisal of a man's ability upon induction.

I believe that industry should be fully mobilized. The military undoubtedly know what is needed to give our forces a fighting chance against the Russians. Emphasis should be placed on developing a superior Air Force, protection against enemy submarines, and a streamlined Army trained to combat Russian tactics.

The inequities so apparent in the last war between wages received by defense workers, civilian employees, and members of the Armed Forces should be eliminated. Naturally, a man is entitled to some premium for giving up his job to work in a defense plant, but it shouldn't be an excessive wage that increases the tax load and disturbs the Nation's morale.

I believe that a tax program should be inaugurated that would put defense spending on a pay-as-you-go basis, but that strict economies be enforced throughout the Government and all nonessential spending be discontinued. Certainly this is no time to even consider further social-security measures, unnecessary public works, or the like. Furthermore, I don't believe it wise to impose such a heavy tax burden on industry that incentive is destroyed, production curtailed, and dollar volume decreased to a point that the tax take is actually depleted. At the same time, price, wage, and profit ceilings should be extended to effectively curb the inflation spiral. Our dollar economy cannot stand a much greater strain than it is now carrying without splitting asunder.

America is at the cross roads—which way are we going from here? It is time for decision, for only by an aggressive, forward-looking policy can we expect to gain the support of the free world and unite our own people behind the effort and sacrifices needed to overcome the threat of destruction.

I appreciate your indulgence in this lengthy letter and trust that the views expressed may be of some benefit as you help to shape the destiny of our country and the entire world. Yours is a tremendous responsibility, and the hopes and prayers of your constituents go with you and your colleagues.

With best wishes and kindest regards.

Expansion of Mineral Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the expansion of mineral production in the United States and to encourage exploration and development of additional ore bodies.

The reasons for my action are made plain by an exchange of correspondence with Mr. Harrison and Mr. Gibson of the Defense Production Administration, printed in the RECORD February 2 and February 26.

In my letter to Mr. Gibson I pointed out that there has been a great outpouring of words from the Interior Department, telling the mining industry what is to be done for them, but there has been no outpouring of minerals and metals stimulated by the Defense Minerals Administration program. So far, the results of the expenditure of a vast amount of time and effort by a combination of the staffs of DMA, Bureau of Mines, and USGS appears to have been net, nothing.

Since 1947 committees of the Congress, especially the then House Public Lands Committee, of which I am a member, has been trying to work out a plan and legislation satisfactory to the Government. A number of bills have been introduced, hearings held and reported, which were acceptable to the largest part of the mining industry. These bills would have put into operation systems of mining aid which were thoroughly tried out during World War II and found to be successful. Each time they were killed by the opposition of the agencies, which wanted their own way or nothing. You have heard during these years the words "automatic incentive payments" and "selective contract system."

Well, under the Defense Production Act, the agencies were able to put into operation the Selective Contract System which had been discredited during the first part of World War II after a brief trial. Prior to the passage of the Defense Production Act early last September, there had been ample time to make plans for such a system as the Government had been pushing legislation to that end and should have known what it was doing. The horrible fact is, however, that when the authority finally was granted, either there were no concrete plans or they got snarled up in the bureaucratic process.

At any rate, the thing does not work. As Congressman ENGLE pointed out in a speech he made on February 3 in Denver, Colo., the Government "has set up a bureaucratic obstacle course remarkable even for Washington, where there are experts in that sort of thing." The people in DMA who are dealing with the program admit freely that it is literally unworkable.

The basic trouble seems to be a diametrically opposed theory as to whom these programs are supposed to help, and whether or not the small miner is honest in his endeavors to help the Government as well as himself.

I take the position that exploration money is appropriated to increase the total ore reserves of the country, for the benefit of the whole country. I believe that mining work is done better, more cheaply and more efficiently by a mining company than by a Government bureau. The theory of the exploration portion of my bill, then, is that we should appoint the miner the agent of the Government to explore for ore on the ground he knows best, with his own expert staff. The overall gain will be for the benefit of our economy; especially during this emergency. If there is an incidental gain to the mining company, that will benefit the economy in the long run. The Government apparently takes the stand that the miner should be carefully watched; that he is out to take money with both hands for his own benefit and not for the benefit of the United States of America. I do not for a moment believe this, but in any case there is no doubt that my plan will result in more exploration, more economically, and with better results than any devised so far. Perhaps Secretary Chapman's matching funds and repayment device will cost less, but it is not the sort of a program to set every miner looking for ore and in these desperate times that is what we need.

Exploration grants were made freely under the 1946 premium price plan. By

that time a good many of the war mines had already closed but yet, 463 mines located in 20 States helped with the exploration program, according to Bureau of Mines figures. What agency could match that? With the expenditure of $6,000,000, 271,000,000 pounds of new metals was uncovered. What is wrong with that? The average exploration cost was 1.65 cents per pound of metal found. Cheap enough. Let us do it again.

There seems to be a curious feeling in the Government that although the small and marginal miner, being vocal, should be jollied along, his actual contribution to the war effort is negligible. Fred Searls, Jr., stated the position when he said that putting small mines into operation decreases the total production of metal by robbing the big mines of labor. For this, among other things, Searls is against an incentive-payment plan of the automatic type. This theory, first stated by Searls in the early nineteen forties was definitely proved to be completely fallacious. Surveys showed that small mines use a labor force that otherwise largely would be wasted as the men either cannot, or will not, work for large outfits. In order to meet Searl's objections, I have provided that if labor pirating can be proved, the Director may cancel the company's incentive payments. Further, the statistics of the premium price plan, widely published, show that mineral production was increased, and that under any system of price ceilings an incentive payment plan is imperative if we are not to deal only with a favored few.

We are getting no results from the present plan. The old one worked. Let us do it again.

I know already that the House Interior Committee will receive adverse reports on my bill. I can almost visualize the exact phrasing. How, however, the officials of the Defense Minerals Administration and the Interior Department will dare to appear in hearings and oppose my bill and at the same time attempt to defend the present disgraceful record is something quite beyond my imagination.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the mining industry will rally behind this bill. I hope all of my colleagues here who want to see the United States make its maximum contribution to the war emergency effort will do likewise.

Where Are We Traveling?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Welding Engineer for March 1951:

WHERE ARE WE TRAVELING?

The Constitution of the United States holds that certain inalienable rights of every human being are derived from God. These include the right to live, to hold property, and to freedom from unjust imprisonment.

According to the theory (and practice) of socialism and communism, the only rights that an individual has are those granted to him by the state. He is entitled to nothing except what the all-powerful state says he may have. And that usually isn't very much.

We are wondering which of these two conflicting philosophies is prevalent in high circles in Washington these days.

A trip to our Nation's Capital reveals many disheartening facts. One of the most discouraging is that our national leaders seem to be just as unsure of what lies ahead as the American public. The pilots guiding the American ship through these dangerous waters will answer the most simple questions regarding what to expect with a candid, "I don't know." Yet they do not hesitate to impose curbs and controls when they know neither where we are going nor what is required to take us there.

What we need in this country is more straight thinking. It might be a good idea if our present leadership would devote less time to the planning of reckless spending of money and men and more time to the study of history.

History can be like a road map—to point a way to travel through the confused maze of time. If the road map shows only a bottomless chasm ahead, we should turn back before it's too late.

By history we don't necessarily mean ancient history. The Greeks and the Romans are too far away for their problems to have much in common with ours. But let's go back to, say, 1917 and see what the tolerance displayed to a handful of Communists did to the Government of Russia. Or trace back the history of the proud British Empire for the past 15 years to find out what socialism aimed at and has achieved there.

Or go back less than 10 years, to the beginning of World War II. Haphazard thinking with regard to controls and curbs cost us thousands of man-hours of production. The new controls include the same old mistakes of the past.

Our metals are scarce so their use has been restricted. Aluminum, for example, is banned from the manufacture of 200 civilian items, beginning with airfoil tubing (for windmills) and continuing straight down the alphabetical line to wheelbarrows and whistles. Yet nowhere is there any suggestion of the possible savings of critical metals that might be effected by the use of welding.

Fabrication by welding, where it is applicable, would make it possible to spread the curtailed metals 10 percent further since welded fabrication usually requires only 90 percent as much material as other joining methods.

Also, the present single-band priority set-up fails to provide for maintenance and repair welding, an absolute necessity of our industrial life. What's going to happen when machines break down if there's no welded repair?

Something has to be done to awaken production authorities to the dangers of such a shortsighted policy. Somebody has to do an educational as well as a selling job, and that somebody is we of the welding industry.

Even though our leaders have failed to read the signposts of history, we must not let their lack of knowledge of the advantages of welding impair our national progress. We in the welding industry must take on the responsibilities of leadership. We must show production authorities the way to the greater conservation of vital metals that is made possible by the judicious use of welding. We must point out the codes and specifications that have been evolved to cover practically every welding need.

If it is necessary that we conserve metals, let's do it in the most effective way through economical fabrication. Nothing offers the advantages of welding for production, maintenance or repair applications wherever metal parts are joined.

T. B. JEFFERSON.

Boy Under the Dome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, of Tulsa, Okla., under date of February 17, 1951, written by one of the great editorial writers of the Southwest, entitled "Boy Under the Dome":

BOY UNDER THE DOME

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Every day there move through the corridors of our Capitol at Washington groups of visitors, sightseers, piloted by interpreters, who give a touring talk on the history of the Capitol. They tell the stories that are revealed in paintings, murals, decorations, and sculptural ornamentations. They do well what our schools and colleges do poorly, or not at all.

Our educators avoid introducing students to the greatest culture ever known. Most of our college teachers today know more about the lands of the dead languages and the lives that were lived under tyrants than they know about the freedoms that made America.

But the people are now just beginning to be concerned. As in our country's beginning we are paying the tax cost of political corruptions. Instead of appraising the American people, our colleges are now being appraised by the people. Those who trail behind the public guides in our National Capitol leave with at least a slight acquaintance with our country.

On a recent trip to Washington I found myself blocked in a corridor by a typical visitors' group of about a hundred. So I joined them. They were just finishing their tour. As they paid off their pilot, I found myself speculating on the kind of folks they were. They were the mill run of holiday travelers from Vermont, Indiana, or Alabama, tradespeople, school teachers, middle-aged people, young people, and old people. Just looking over their Capitol.

I was attracted to a boy who seemed loath to leave. I followed him. As he walked away he was apparently looking again at everything he had been shown. When he got under the great dome, he lifted his cap, looked up, and after a moment he turned to me and said:

"It's great, isn't it?"

"It is great," I agreed.

"What a dome," exclaimed the boy.

"It's a great dome," I answered, "because it's the great home of a great country."

"How do you mean?" he asked.

"Dome" is an ancient word, I told him. It means home. A place of shelter. We get our word "domicile" from it. This great dome, I told the boy, symbolized the home of our country. To match our country, it had to be impressively big, mighty, strong. Great home of a great country.

"Oh yes," said the boy, "That's nice to know. Ours is a great country, isn't it?"

The lad and I sat down to visit under the great dome. I was astonished at the lad. He knew our country like a geographer. He talked about the Aroostook forests, the Appalachians, and the Sierras. He talked of our harbors, New York, San Francisco, Puget Sound. He knew where the Piedmont country lay. He recited names of grandeur, like the Blue Ridge of Virginia, and the Alleghenies of Pennsylvania, the Adirondacks, and Catskills of New York, the White Mountains of New Hampshire, and the Green of Vermont. He knew the kind of crops that are grown in Missouri, in Michigan, in Montana, and in Mississippi.

"You've been around, haven't you?" I remarked. "You've seen a lot of the country." "No, sir," he answered, "I've never been anywhere. I live in Ohio. This is my first trip. My uncle is here on business and he brought me so I could see Washington."

"Then you've been going to a pretty good school," I prompted, "they taught you a lot about your country."

"No," said the boy, "I never learned anything much about America at school; my father taught me. My father is always telling me about the difference between this country and the countries that have kings."

For a lad of 14, he was a find. What a father. Our country could use a million such dads. The boy began to explain that it wasn't the largeness of our land, but the largeness of our liberties that made America good. Philosopher.

In that one sentence, that lad had recited all there is to learn in a thousand college courses in economics and sociology. One father who had seen and comprehended the plan and purpose of this constitutional Republic had done the teaching job which the schools neglect.

Among the triumphs of American genius, we have been ushered into the photographic age. If our schools were equal to the public trust imposed upon them, they would equip themselves to take our boys and girls through the Capitol corridors, as the official guides now do. The youth of the land would become acquainted with their country. They now just accept it and live in ignorance of it.

The Turks did not invent the cotton gin. The Italians did not find the chilled plow. The English never fashioned the mowing machine, the reaper, or the harvester. The telegraph and the telephone did not originate in Brussels. Such simple things as the match, vulcanized rubber, ether, the turret lathe, and rotary and web printing presses, sewing machines, the electric light, elevators, block signals, air brakes, lawn mowers, refrigerators, typewriters, phonographs, fountain pens, washing machines, and automobiles, the gadgets that lighten the labors of life, were all born here.

The human freedoms that were made secure by the Constitution of our country emancipated minds. Individual initiative and enterprise, instead of being confiscated and curbed, were encouraged under the American flag. That's a story to tell youth. One boy had a father who told it while the boy's school failed to tell it.

Something more than the lure of fertile fields, virgin forests, and exhaustless mines lured your forebears and mine to seek our shores. Romance. Nothing in human history like it. What a culture to comprehend. The largeness of liberty brought the productive power and progress out of the soil. No other plow or seeder can bring the harvest that freedom grew here.

We fellows who make newspapers frequently fail to give the emphasis of importance to an inconspicuous item that flashes over the wire. It happened so the other day. A dispatch from Prague reported that a 15-year-old lad, proclaiming his love for liberty, was arrested by the Communist police. Jerked to jail, he was quickly put on trial (trial so-called). The stupid cruel court found him guilty of treason—treason against tyranny. The court condemned the boy to death.

When the sentence was pronounced the boy shrieked, "I would rather have death than live without liberty." A Patrick Henry across the sea. That lad's challenge to the cruel and autocratic court—his defiance of the beast-serving military tools of Moscow—found its escape from the court chambers through the open doors; it spread over the country.

Just as Patrick Henry roused the early Virginians to take their stand for human freedom, this Czech lad inspired a revolution for righteousness that became so impelling that, to quell it, the court changed the death sentence to a term of years which subsequent history is sure to shorten.

The boy in Prague was willing to die for the liberties Washington won and bequeathed to the boy under the dome.

The Inflation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from my constituent, Mr. Remsen Brinckerhoff, of Englewood, N. J.:

FEBRUARY 9, 1951.

Hon. HARRY L. TOWE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOWE: I am writing as one of your constituents regarding the manner in which the President and Secretary of the Treasury are stimulating inflation by blackjacking the Federal Reserve Board, a body created by Congress. This Board was established by Congress to curb inflation (and deflation when it exists) by taking measures to control the money supply. After all, what is inflation but an increase in the amount of money in relation to the goods and services it can buy. Simply the old principle of supply and demand.

It is not a rise in prices any more than a temperature of 102 is the grippe. Those are but the resulting symptoms of the basic disease. And to think that it can be cured by freezing prices is just about as likely to succeed as trying to cure pneumonia by packing the patient with ice to cool him off. The basic fallacy is the same—attacking the symptoms and not the cause.

But not satisfied with that, they are going one step further and making the patient even sicker by continuing to force more germs into him—or more dollars into circulation. At the same time they hog-tie the doctor (Federal Reserve Board) who wants to try to eliminate the overbalance of pneumonia virus that makes the patient sick. It is like fighting fire with gasoline.

I hope you see the vicious circle. In an economy already containing a number of inflationary forces, such as the large national debt and the war emergency, this administration policy of pouring more money into circulation to peg the price of low-interest (cheap money for the Government) bonds, creates a continuous additional inflationary force. The inevitable result for an increase of money supply occurs—prices rise. Then the President screams politically about war profiteers, puts ice packs (ceilings) on the patient in an alleged effort to cure the disease he has created, disregards the doctor's advice, and tells him to be a nice fellow and cooperate, and then asks us to dig down in our pockets in terms of increased taxes to pay for the rising costs he has by his and the Treasury's policy created. In the meantime his policies continue and the same spiral or vicious circle goes on. He must realize this subconsciously, because he is already anticipating a further tax rise to pay for it in June.

Let's see the Congress put the trained doctor (Federal Reserve Board), whom it created for this very purpose, back in his job in place of the medicine man who is usurping it, before the patient becomes permanently injured.

Yours respectfully,
REMSEN BRINCKERHOFF.

Lax Immigration-Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Daily News is currently running a series of articles by a staff writer, Mr. Ernest Brashear, which articles describe the deplorable lack of enforcement of our immigration laws supposedly controlling the immigration of Mexican nationals into the southwestern part of the United States. These articles call attention to the fact that the ease with which the American border is crossed has resulted in infiltration of Communists into the United States to an extent which cannot be accurately determined.

American citizens of Mexican descent are a colorful and constructive force in the United States and particularly in southern California. They are cooperating fully in the search for a solution to the problem caused by the illegal immigrants, called "wetbacks" because of their wading across the river separating the United States and Mexico. Any confusion of our American citizens of Mexican descent with the "wetbacks" would be a decided disservice to a large group of fine American citizens, many of whom reside in my district in Los Angeles and are counted among our most outstanding citizens and leaders.

The "wetbacks" can hardly be blamed for their desire to find employment in the United States. It is the lack of patriotic responsibility on the part of some Americans added to lax immigration law enforcement, which makes Communist infiltration possible by inviting border violations. Without connivance, open or covert, on the part of some American employers, there would be no encouragement of entry by "wetbacks," and no jobs for them after their entry. If there were no jobs, word would get around, and the scramble across our border would abate.

Anyone who has studied the problem knows that in addition to lack of Federal

law enforcement, there is a lack of adequate State laws controlling labor contractors who recruit and handle agricultural workers. There is evidence to indicate that these labor contractors, some of their foremen, and no doubt some of the agricultural employers, benefit from the fact that "wetbacks" cannot complain when they are exploited, treated like animals, and even required to kick back some of their pay. Some of the people who scream loudest about subversive activities are actually conniving to make Communist infiltration possible, by their refusal to cooperate with the Immigration Department in the curbing of illegal entry of workers whom they encourage by making no reasonable effort to determine their right to be in the United States before hiring them.

It is very obvious that our immigration laws must be revised where necessary and vigorously enforced, not only for the protection of our own workers, whose wages are driven down and whose living conditions are kept at a low level by the entrance of "wetbacks," but also for our protection against entrance of Communist agents. We must crack down not just on the poor "wetbacks," who are only seeking a livelihood, but on the labor contractors and employers, large and small, who harbor and conceal these people by giving them employment, thereby knowingly, wilfully, and deliberately violating Federal laws in order to achieve their own selfish purposes. These Americans are, in my opinion, more culpable than the "wetbacks."

There have been enough investigations of this problem. No more are needed. In concluding these remarks, I should like to include a part of the preliminary report of one group of investigators—the Governor's Committee To Survey the Agricultural Labor Resources of the San Joaquin Valley. The chairman of the committee is Mr. J. Earl Coke, and the executive director, Dr. Paul Prasow. In its preliminary report dated December 15, 1950, the section dealing with the "wetback" problem said: "It has been asserted that the presence of Mexican "wetbacks" in the California agricultural labor market displaces native workers and therefore aggravates unemployment. In this connection, an immigration and naturalization official, testifying at the Bakersfield hearing, indicated that there were 167,000 deportations to Mexico from July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950, from the southern part of California, and two western counties in Arizona. Mr. Del Guercio of the Immigration and Naturalization Service estimated that approximately 60 percent of deported Mexican "wetbacks" were employed in agriculture. The northern California district of the Immigration and Naturalization Service reported 10,000 Mexicans were deported in the same year.

While Mexico "wetbacks" have presented some problems to the San Joaquin Valley, the committee desires to express public recognition of the truly significant contributions of Mexican-Americans to the social and economic structure, and to the culture of the valley, State, and Nation. The Mexican-American has not only played a vital historical role in the agricultural development of the San Joaquin Valley but has also made invaluable contributions to the culture and development of the community in which he resides.

Under present law, there are penalties of a fine up to $2,000 and imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years for knowingly harboring or concealing an alien who has entered the country illegally. The law asserts that such action shall be deemed a misdemeanor. According to immigration and naturalization officials, practically no prosecutions are attempted under this Federal statute because of the ambiguity of the severe penalty and misdemeanor stipulations. In addition, because of the comparatively small staff of enforcement officers, the main phase of the Immigration and Naturalization Service work is concerned with the return of those aliens who have been either arrested or convicted for criminal violations in this country. There is a real need for expanding enforcement service and personnel. The lack of detention facilities, and ease with which the Mexican "wetbacks" can enter the country are added problems. At one point alone in the border, it was estimated that as many as 2,500 "wetbacks" were entering weekly.

Sealing the border seems essential to reducing the number of illegal entrants. However, some responsibility should be borne by individual employers in determining the legal status of their agricultural workers. It is recognized that there is difficulty in discerning the legal status of Spanish-speaking workers. Nevertheless, there are indications that some farmers, as well as labor contractors, are aware when the "wetback" is employed. Testimony from a labor contractor indicated that he preferred using "wetbacks," although no wage differentials were made.

It is the expressed public policy of major farm organizations, including the San Joaquin Agricultural Labor Bureau, Associated Farmers, Agricultural Committee of the California Chamber of Commerce, Farm Bureau Federation, and others, not to condone the practice of using "wetbacks."

Recommendations to adequately cope with this problem are admittedly difficult. A restatement of policy by California agriculture on the hiring and use of "wetbacks" would seem essential. More frequent reporting by farmers to Immigration Service personnel, when some doubt of nationality status exists, would be another aid to better enforcement.

It is reported that there are no Mexican Nationals presently employed in the valley, who were admitted under the Mexican-American Treaty. The Governor's Conference on Employment reported that not a single agricultural employer in the San Joaquin Valley requested certification for Mexican Nationals for 1950. However, recent international developments have stimulated greater economic and agricultural activity in the valley. Thus, many of those testifying observed that the problem of unemployment in the valley will very likely diminish and corresponding problems of recruiting an adequate agricultural labo · supply will increase. Therefore, it has been suggested that the door be left open with respect to use of Mexican Nationals to meet abnormal labor shortages in the future.

Recommendation: To decrease the current flow of Mexican illegal entrants, it is suggested that the Governor, in concert with other western governors, request the Federal Government to increase their border patrol. A better integrated State and Federal program is desirable, since it is a problem of mutual concern.

A Visualized Program for Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech which I recently made before the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture:

A VISUALIZED PROGRAM FOR MARKETING

I appreciate the honor of speaking on this series of lectures on agricultural marketing. If I understand my assignment correctly, it is to discuss some of the history and background of title II of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 and to express an opinion as to the progress which has been made in carrying out the program contemplated under that title.

Many of you were in the Department when this legislation was considered in Congress. All of you, I am sure, are familiar with it in a general way and know something of its background. I believe, however, that the history and background of this legislation is so important in showing what Congress had in mind at the time the legislation was passed that I should review the matter quite extensively even at the risk of going over ground with which some of you at least are already quite familiar.

This legislation, and I am speaking now of title II, was the direct result of an intense interest in the marketing of agricultural products which developed during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. It was not an effort to meeet an acute problem then in existence; rather it contemplated setting up a program which, while of a long time nature, might give some effective relief to conditions which were expected to develop during the period following the end of World War II. The discussions which took place in the Committee on Agriculture of the House and in the Congress during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses clearly indicate that Members of Congress had a great appreciation of what had been accomplished for agriculture during many years of research in the field of production. The fact that American farmers were able almost overnight to increase agricultural production by more than 60 percent, in spite of shortages of labor, machinery, fertilizer, and transportation, made a great impression upon Members of Congress and with it came the realization that this spectacular development was due in large

part to many years of patient research in the laboratory and test plot.

There was a feeling that, while this increase in the ability of farmers to produce was a Godsend during the war, it might create serious problems following the war unless consumption during normal times was sufficient to absorb it. It was natural under those circumstances for many to reach the conclusion that, if we could approach the problems of marketing and distribution in the same way and with the same success we had met the problems of production, we would have the answer.

There was also a strong feeling in Congress and also among farmers that the only permanent and satisfactory solution of the problem of surpluses, particularly of the perishable commodities, lay in the development of a better system of marketing and distribution rather than through Government price-support programs.

The first definite step in the way of action on this subject came with the introduction in the Seventy-eighth Congress by the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the late Hampton P. Fulmer, of South Carolina, of House Resolution 38, which passed the House unanimously on May 27, 1943. That resolution authorized and directed the House Committee on Agriculture "to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers." The following were named as specific subjects for investigation:

1. The effectiveness of the present system of marketing and the adequacy of marketing facilities with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers.

2. The effect of transactions on the commodity exchanges upon farmers and consumers.

3. The existence of any practices in connection with grading, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products which adversely affect farmers and consumers.

4. The part which transportation plays in the distribution of farm products and the possible existence of discrimination in transportation rates.

5. The feasibility of setting up a cooperative program of marketing and distribution through local, State, and National marketing agencies which would provide facilities for grading, distribution, storage, and other essential activities.

The committee was directed to make a report to the House after the conclusion of its investigation and make such recommendations as it felt proper with respect to legislation.

I think it might be pertinent to point out that Chairman Fulmer, the author of the resolution, was a South Carolina farmer who produced a wide variety of crops, including fresh fruits and vegetables for the commercial market. Through long experience he came to feel the frustration which every producer of perishable commodities must feel when he contemplates the risks which must be taken not only by the producer but by the handlers of perishable agricultural commodities under our present marketing system. He was indignant at the low price which producers received and the high price which people in consuming centers were compelled to pay. On many occasions I have heard him express his views on the subject in the course of which he compared the actual price he received for fresh vegetables at his farm in South Carolina with the price quoted in Washington wholesale and retail markets. I think it should be noted that the concern which was expressed by Mr. Fulmer was directed just as much to the high price which the consumer had to pay as it was to the low price which the farmer received.[1]

In the beginning Mr. Fulmer appointed a subcommittee consisting of Hon. John W. Flannagan, Jr., as chairman, Hon. Stephen Pace, and myself as the other members, to formulate plans and set up an organization to carry out the studies authorized under the resolution. Despite the great interest in the subject matter, this investigation was slow in getting under way. We were in the midst of a war. Members of Congress were exceedingly busy on problems arising out of the war. Qualified staff personnel members to conduct the investigation were hard to secure.

The subcommittee, however, worked out a program of study which was outlined in a speech made on the floor of the House by Mr. Flannagan on June 21, 1944.[2] This program contemplated a study of every phase of marketing activity, beginning with shipping-point organizations, facilities and practices and going right down through every phase of marketing activity until the product reached the consumer. However, for reasons already stated, the committee was not able to complete its study during the life of the Seventy-eighth Congress. So great was the interest in this subject that much disappointment was expressed by Members of Congress from both rural and urban districts because the committee was not able to complete this investigation.

Consequently, early in the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mr. Flannagan, who had succeeded to the chairmanship of the Committee on Agriculture following the death of Mr. Fulmer, introduced House Resolution 54 to authorize the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to make an investigation of the existing system of marketing, transportation and distribution of farm products. Investigation called for by this resolution was of somewhat greater scope than that provided for in the Seventy-eighth Congress. In addition to the subject matter included in the Seventy-eighth Congress resolution, the new resolution called for a study of "the adequacy of present facilities, local, State and Federal, for (1) furnishing producers, distributors and consumers with market reports and marketing information; (2) the development of standards and grades; (3) the inspection and certification of the quality and condition of farm products; (4) the development, analysis and publication currently of information showing the cost of marketing farm products through the various channels of distribution; (5) the inspection of meat and meat products and the influence of such facilities on the marketing of livestock; (6) protecting producers, distributors and consumers from unfair trade practices in the marketing of farm products."

Reference is made to this expansion in the scope of the committee inquiry for the reason that it indicates the interest of the committee in the service and regulatory activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, together with the part which those activities played in the marketing of agricultural commodities. Significantly also the new resolution called for a study of the effect of price-support activities upon the marketing and distribution of farm products.

House Resolution 54 was reported by the Committee on Rules on February 20, 1945.[3] A number of Members of the House spoke in favor of the resolution when it came up for consideration on February 26, 1945, and the only definite opposition was on the part of one Member of Congress, who explained it by saying that he was against all investigating committees. In the discussion of this resolution it was remarked by several Members that agriculture had made tremendous progress in the field of production through research and education, but that nothing comparable had been done in the field of marketing.[4]

So widespread was the interest in this subject that activity was not confined to the investigation being conducted by the Committee on Agriculture. Because of this interest Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., had appointed a Republican Food Study Committee under the chairmanship of Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio. The purpose of this committee was to make a thorough study of all problems concerned with the production, marketing, and distribution of food, both from the standpoint of the producer and the consumer. This committee held hearings in various parts of the country and through its staff made comprehensive studies on the subject. As a result of these studies the Food Study Committee concluded that some action should be taken by Congress in the field of research on agricultural marketing and distribution, and that better use should be made of existing Government agencies dealing with food distribution, processing, and consumption. As a result of the conclusions reached by the committee a bill was prepared which was introduced in the House by myself on March 28, 1946, and given the number H. R. 5925. Because this bill is the direct ancestor of title II of the Research and Marketing Act and because it represented the thinking of a number of Members of Congress at the time, it might be pertinent to read to you now the title of the bill and its declaration of policy. The title reads as follows:

"To improve nutritional standards, reduce the cost of food distribution, provide a broader outlet for American farm products, and promote scientific development of food processing, distribution, and marketing, by establishing a National Food Research Institute."

The declaration of policy read as follows:

"The Congress hereby declares that full production of food and farm commodities and effective utilization of all that is produced is essential to the welfare of the Nation and the health and prosperity of its people. The Congress further declares that the application of scientific methods to the production of food and fiber having been highly successful during the past 84 years, a similar scientific approach to the problems of utilization of all agricultural products shall be the policy of the United States, so that we may learn how to make effective and profitable use of the food and fiber we now know how to produce in abundance. The Congress further declares that establishment and operation of a National Food Research Institute for the purpose of concentrating scientific research, skill, and methods on the problems of food and fiber utilization is essential to the welfare, health, and prosperity of the people of the United States. The policies to be followed in attaining these objectives shall be (1) improvement of the operation of the private marketing system to eliminate waste and inefficiency and thereby to reduce the relative cost to the consumer; (2) making available to the food production, processing, and distribution industry scientific laboratory and research facilities and personnel so that opportunity for scientific research and development shall be available on reasonable terms to all members of the industry; (3) improvement of dietary and nutritional standards through research, processing, and marketing improvements and education; (4) development of new and wider markets for American food and fiber products, both in the United States

[1] See p. 4986, vol. 89, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[2] P. 6388, vol. 90, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[3] H. Rept. 182, 79th Cong.

[4] Pp. 1449–1460, vol. 91, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

and other countries, with a view to making it possible for the full production of American farms to be disposed of usefully and profitably without resort to subsidies or artificial price-support programs."

In order to carry out the purposes of the legislation as set out in the declaration of policy, the bill provided for the transfer to the National Food Research Institute of "all functions, powers, duties, and authority of each and every agency, division in or under the executive branch of the Government which, in the opinion of the President, as expressed pursuant to subsection B hereof, is primarily concerned with food processing, marketing, distribution, or utilization, or which would, if continued, substantially duplicate any function by this act authorized to be performed by the Institute."

Thus it will be seen that it was the purpose of this legislation to bring together in one bureau all of the agencies, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but in every branch of the Government which dealt with the marketing, processing, distribution, or utilization of food products.

H. R. 5925 aroused a great deal of interest in Congress and out. It was submitted to officials in the Department of Agriculture and in other agencies for their consideration and suggestions. Farm organizations, officials of marketing groups, and many individuals engaged in the distribution, transportation, and processing of food were asked to give their advice and opinions. On the whole, the objectives and purposes of the legislation met with a very favorable response and the extent of the interest manifested was indicated by the many helpful suggestions which were made as to possible changes and improvements.

All of this occurred at about the same time the Committee on Agriculture was concluding its marketing studies under House Resolution 54. That committee, as a result of these studies, reached the conclusion that the subject matter was so important, so complex, and so much of a continuing situation that it was beyond the ability of any congressional committee to find the answer to all of the many problems involved in the course of a congressional session. Instead, it was felt that the only way that these problems could be adequately considered and solved would be through a program of extensive and continuous research comparable to the research which had heretofore been carried out so successfully in the field of agricultural production. This meant, in effect, that the committee agreed with the approach to the problem which was suggested by H. R. 5925. However, it was felt that further consideration should be given to the matter, and that H. R. 5925 should be revised with a view of incorporating the results of the studies of the special committee and some of the suggestions which had been made by marketing experts in the Department of Agriculture and by men with practical experience in the field of marketing and distributing farm and food products.

On June 6, 1946, H. R. 6692 was introduced in the House as a substitute for H. R. 5925. This bill covered very much the same field as the earlier measure but was a much improved bill, embodying many practical and helpful ideas which had been suggested by those who had studied H. R. 5925. H. R. 6692 provided for a new agency in the Department to be known as the Agricultural Marketing Administration. Like the earlier bill, it provided for bringing together all governmental agencies dealing with the processing, distribution, and marketing of food and in addition provided for the transfer to the new agency of all the service and regulatory activities of the Department of Agriculture. This might have been implicit in the earlier measure, but in H. R. 6692 it was specifically set out. Thus we find that, as a result of the thought and study and experience of a great many men in Congress and out who were interested in improving the marketing of agricultural products, there evolved the program contained in H. R. 6692.

About this time, there was introduced in the House by Chairman Flannagan H. R. 6546 to expand agricultural research as previously carried out under the Bankhead-Jones and prior acts. This measure incorporated some new features, such as the authority to contract with agencies outside of the Government for research work, and broadened the scope of research especially in the field of utilization, but fundamentally it was a continuation and expansion of the program of research which had been carried on by the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges for many years. Because each of these bills (H. R. 6546 and H. R. 6692) dealt with the subject of research, because there was intense interest in each of them, because most of those who were interested in one bill were also interested in the other and because the end of the session was approaching, it was decided by the committee to hold a joint hearing on the two bills.

Many of those who appeared before the committee expressed their approval of both bills. Among those appearing who were particularly interested in H. R. 6692 were the late Albert S. Goss, Master of the National Grange; John H. Davis, executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; C. W. Kitchen, executive vice president of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, whose long experience in the field of marketing activities in the Department of Agriculture was well known to everyone; F. R. Wilcox, assistant general manager of the California Fruit Growers Exchange; Albert J. Garner, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Maine; H. K. Thatcher, director of the Division of Agriculture and Industry from the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission; L. M. Walker, Jr., commissioner of agriculture for the State of Virginia; Warren W. Oley, chief of the Bureau of Markets of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture; and W. Kerr Scott, then commissioner of agriculture of the State of North Carolina and now the Governor of that State; and others.

During the course of the hearings, the committee reached a decision to combine the two bills—H. R. 6546 becoming title I, and H. R. 6692 becoming title II. To these were added the third title covering the appointment of advisory committees. A committee print was drafted containing the three titles and the hearings were continued on this committee print. Both of the original bills had been submitted to the Department of Agriculture for a report with the result that the Department expressed its approval with some slight amendments of 6546 and expressed its approval of most of the objectives and purposes of 6692, but objected to those provisions which brought together all of the many and scattered agencies dealing with agricultural marketing into the Agricultural Marketing Administration. Mr. Norris Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, appearing before the committee on behalf of the Department, urged that instead of setting up the new administration that the bill be amended so as to simply give the Secretary authority to carry out all of the provisions contained in the bill. The committee was very reluctant to make the change. As far as I know, and I think I do know, every member of the committee favored the provision setting up an Agricultural Marketing Administration and felt that this was the heart of title II. However, responding to the plea of the representatives of the Department that they did not want to be bound to the exact type of organization set up in the measure and because of the lateness of the session and the desire to enact the legislation before adjournment, the committee acceded to the Department's suggestions and deleted the provision specifically setting up the Agricultural Marketing Administration. However, in section 206 of the bill the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to transfer all of the agencies dealing with "research, service, or regulatory activities in connection with the marketing, transportation, storage, processing, distribution of, or service or regulatory activities in connection with the utilization of agricultural products into a single administrative agency."

In order that there might be no mistake as to the views of the committee on this point, the committee report deals specifically with the subject as follows:

"One of the principal aims of title II is to facilitate administration of, and to increase the effectiveness of, the marketing work of the Department of Agriculture, and to give it the emphasis and attention that it should receive by providing for the integration of all the marketing functions of the Department, including marketing research, service, and regulatory activities into a single agency, whose primary responsibility shall be to conduct and administer programs designed to improve the marketing and distribution of agricultural products.

"Testimony introduced at the hearings shows that such activities as the Department has developed to improve the private marketing system have been shifted about through a long series of departmental reorganizations, and at present the marketing research, service, and regulatory activities are spread among various bureaus, agencies, and branches, of the Department. Such agencies all have numerous other duties in addition to their marketing functions. The agency in the Department of Agriculture that has a major share of the responsibilities for administering marketing services and improving distribution is also charged with the responsibility of production goals, support price activities, activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, purchase and sale activities, and other action programs, all of which are very important and necessarily make strong demands upon the time and energies of the Administrator. In view of the great importance of the marketing and distribution problems to the welfare of agriculture and of the Nation, and of the fact that so little effective work has been done in this field in comparison with the magnitude of the problem, this committee has reached the conclusion that research in marketing and the closely related marketing services and regulatory activities of the Department of Agriculture should be handled by an integrated, administrative unit within the Department, responsible to the Secretary. Such a unit should be staffed with qualified marketing experts and should be permitted to utilize all its energies and resources for promoting, improving, and developing a sound marketing system without its administrative officers being burdened with other complicated problems and heavy responsibilities incident to other important functions of the Department of Agriculture, much as they are at present. This is the method which has been used to achieve notable success in the field of production research. This committee is of the opinion that under such an administrative organization great progress can rapidly be made in the field of marketing. Accordingly, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer and consolidate the marketing research, service, and regulatory activities." [1]

The combined bill which bore the number H. R. 6932 and was reported on July 6, 1946,

[1] H. Rept. 2458, 79th Cong.

came before the House on July 15, 1946. It passed the House as it later passed the Senate by unanimous vote. Many Members of the House expressed their approval of the legislation on that occasion as well as their gratification that the committee had brought out such a comprehensive research program. On the question of how the authority given the Secretary in title II should be handled, Chairman Flannagan said, "The marketing program will never be a success until the marketing research, services, and regulatory work of the Department of Agriculture is coordinated under one directing head. While I believe the Secretary should be given a free hand in bringing about the proper coordination and consolidation of the respective marketing research, service, and regulatory agencies, as provided for in section 206, I am strongly of the opinion that unless this is done, the marketing program will be a failure. It is the unanimous opinion of the House Committee on Agriculture that the Secretary should carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in section 206 at the earliest date possible."[6]

I can say without any hesitation whatever that Mr. Flannagan was speaking for the entire committee in making this statement, and I think I can say he was expressing the viewpoint of practically everyone who contributed in any way to the formulation of this legislation.

For reasons which will appear later, I have devoted what may seem to be an excessive amount of time and detail in going into the legislative and historical background of title II of the Research and Marketing Act. In doing so I have not depended upon my recollection of the matter but have reviewed and restudied the legislative proposals and hearings which led up to the enactment of both titles I and II, as well as title III of that act.

Let me now briefly summarize what was covered in titles I and II. Title I was an amendment of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. It contained little that was new. Its principal purposes were (1) to provide for contract research, (2) bring agricultural research activities up-to-date, and (3) authorize more appropriations for the same.

Title II, on the other hand, was entirely new. Its over-all purpose was to improve the marketing and distribution of agricultural products. This was to be achieved in three principal ways: (1) to bring together into a single agency all administrative units in the Department of Agriculture dealing with the distribution of agricultural products, whether in the fields of research, service, or regulation, (2) to carry out marketing research on a scale where it ultimately would be comparable with production research, (3) to separate marketing activity programs from those dealing with price supports, production controls and government purchasing programs.

It was the feeling of those who sponsored and supported title II that throughout the years most of our agricultural efforts had been devoted to production and practically none to marketing. It was believed that as a result of this emphasis on production, that phase of agriculture had far outstripped the equally important function of marketing. It was further believed that, if all agricultural marketing activities could be combined in one agency, it would give marketing a tremendous impetus and enable it to match production.

It is not necessary for me to say that the results under the Research and Marketing Act have been disappointing. Let me hasten to say that in stating this I mean no criticism whatever of those who have been in charge of its administration. I have an extremely high regard for the work of Mr. E. A. Meyer, the first Administrator of the act, and I am sure that Dr. Cardon and his associates know that I feel they have done the best possible job under the circumstances. Nor do I think the Appropriations Committees of the Congress should be criticized for their failure to make the full amount of appropriations authorized by law.

It is my view that the partial failure of the act is due primarily to the fact that the intent of Congress with respect to the administration of title II has never been carried out. Following the enactment of the law and on more than one occasion, a number of Members of Congress as well as others interested in the program conferred with Secretary Anderson and urged him to make the organizational changes authorized by the act. However, we were never able to convince him that this should be done, possibly because he had recently completed a reorganization of the Department based on a different theory. I have never discussed the matter with Secretary Brannan and I do not know that anyone else has, but for reasons which he doubtless considers good and sufficient, he has followed the same policy as his predecessor in this matter. But while I am not criticizing those who oppose the program called for in title II, I want to reiterate my belief in its merit and practicability and urge its further consideration.

No doubt most of you are familiar with the study of the operations of the Research and Marketing Act made last year by a study group headed by Mr. D. Howard Doane. This study was initiated by the House Committee on Agriculture through a subcommittee headed by Hon. Stephen Pace The Doane group was composed of able and experienced men and its studies were thorough and conscientious. It had the complete and hearty cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture and other departmental officials, particularly Dr. Lambert and his associates. The committee wisely covered the whole field of agricultural research and developed some very interesting and helpful information. For instance, it found that there are on the books now some sixty separate acts of Congress which authorize appropriations for agricultural research.[7] The committee's report makes some excellent recommendations with respect to agricultural research generally, but it seems to me it fell down rather badly in attempting to deal with title II, never really agreeing on anything in that connection, although some members of the committee sized up the situation correctly and urged that an effort be made to carry out the real objectives and purposes of that title.[8]

I have spoken of the helpfulness of Dr. Cardon in connection with the Doane Committee's activities. One of the most helpful and illuminating statements which came out of the investigation was that made by Dr. Cardon on May 26, pursuant to a request by Subcommittee Chairman Pace.[9] In this statement Dr. Cardon put his finger squarely on the principal source of the confusion surrounding the administration of the Research and Marketing Act. Dr. Cardon stated that this confusion stemmed from two concepts, one being that the Research and Marketing Act had to be administered as an integral whole, the other being that the Research and Marketing Act program should be regarded as of a different character than the research, education, and service work previously carried out by the Department. I agree with Dr. Cardon that these concepts existed, and in my opinion, both were erroneous. I think I can give you the reason for these erroneous concepts. They stem from the fact that title II was never carried out as Congress intended it should be. I have already pointed out that title I and title II were entirely different types of legislation springing from an entirely different background and that their consolidation into one act was simply a marriage of convenience for the purpose of expediting consideration and enactment. There is no reason on earth why title I should not have been considered then and now as an extension of existing law, which it was, and administered along with other legislation relating to the same subject. Nor is there any reason why appropriations authorized under title I should not have been considered in connection with appropriations for previously existing research activities. I think it would have been so considered had there been no title II. And had title II been carried out as intended by Congress and a new agency set up as contemplated, the two bills would have had to be administered separately. Thus all the difficulties which have arisen over the administration of both titles could have been averted had the intent of Congress been carried out at to title II

I hope I have not given the impression that nothing has been accomplished in the field of marketing research during the past 4 years. There is plenty in the record to belie any such conclusion. Considering the funds which have been available, much has been done, but it is only a fraction of what had been hoped for. No doubt more could have been done with larger appropriations, but a look at the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee from 1947 and thereafter indicates that there is little likelihood of larger appropriations unless something substantially like the original program is carried out. In this the Appropriations Committees are probably wise.[10] Likewise, it seems to me that under existing conditions it will be hard to impress the Bureau of the Budget with the importance of increased appropriations for this work.

If the program whereby all marketing activities in the Department were to be brought together had been carried out, it would have given such an impetus to marketing that there would have been some hope that it could attain the status of production in the Department's activities. Because marketing research ties in so closely with service and regulatory activities, such an arrangement would have made a greatly expanded research program possible. It would have enabled all those in the Department who work with marketing to give their undivided attention and energy to such program. That, it seems to me, is impossible as long as marketing activities are widely scattered, and in many cases, closely tied in with action programs like price supports, production adjustments, and buying and selling operations.

It is still my hope that eventually the advantages to be secured from the reorganization authority contained in title II will be so persuasive that some Secretary of Agriculture will use it. Until that is done, I see little opportunity for carrying out any program which will give marketing the same importance as production as far as Government activities are concerned.

[6] P. 9030, vol. 92, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[7] Appendixes G1, G2, G3, pp. 94–98, Hearings on Federal Agricultural Research, House Committee on Agriculture, 2d sess., 81st Cong., serial ZZ.

[8] Ibid., exhibit 2, pp. 62–69.

[9] Ibid., p. 51, also Report of Activities Under Research and Marketing Act, 1950, Agricultural Research Administration, p. 3.

[10] See pt. 1, Hearings on Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1948, especially p. 53 and pp. 206–239; also, hearings in subsequent years on appropriations for Research and Marketing Act.

Penalty on Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a column by the distinguished writer, Mark Sullivan. As he suggests, the whole American tradition of saving is being penalized by the special interests and the inflation that is going on. Thrift and free enterprise built our country up and thrift is being discouraged and much of our free enterprise is being taken over by the Government. We simply have to stop the present trend if we are to remain strong and free.

PENALTY ON SAVING

(By Mark Sullivan)

INFLATION AND SPECIAL INTERESTS

After the three labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board had resigned in protest against a ceiling proposed to be put upon wages; after the United Labor Policy Committee had protested threateningly against policies of Defense Mobilization Wilson generally; and after four high labor leaders had called on President Truman to express their protest—after these events accompanying controversy, a brief statement was given out by the President's press secretary. It read:

"The President * * * assured them that the administration was trying to work out the problem in a manner equitable for everyone without special privilege for any group."

"Without special privilege for any group" is familiar as a phrase though less so as a fact. What glaringly calls for attention just now, however, is a group which not only has no special privilege but even lacks a simple and fundamental right. This group is the savers, there are tens of millions of them, who have put their savings into life insurance, United States savings bonds, savings banks, and similar institutions. Between Government's treatment of these and its treatment of two other groups—labor and farmers—the contrast is an indictment of Government itself.

To labor the Wage Stabilization Board promises a ceiling higher than the present wage level and labor truculently demands still more. To farmers the Defense Production Act gives protection and immunity. It forbids the price stabilization agency to put a ceiling on any farm crop that is now selling below the parity price which the Department of Agriculture fixes; in effect farmers are given assurance of higher prices.

The sum of the condition is: For labor and farmers, more; for the savers, sacrifice. The nature of the sacrifice has been made familiar by experience. The saver puts a dollar into savings but when he gets it back later, 10 years in the case of United States savings bonds, for example, it is no longer a dollar in purchasing power. The dollar that he saved 10 years ago was, in effect, some 4 pounds of bacon. The dollar he gets back the present year is in effect less than 2 pounds of bacon. And so, with negligible variations, as to practically all forms of food, clothing, and manufactured goods.

This is the concrete picture of what goes by several names—reduction in purchasing power of the dollar, rise in cost of living, inflation. It was to stop this that the control agencies, now much in the public eye, were set up. While they have put ceilings on the prices of many goods, they have as to others encountered contention and complexity and have postponed the dates for imposing ceilings. One agency head has said that two important kinds of goods, clothing and food, will continue to rise for several months. Nevertheless the purpose of the control agencies continues and so apparently does their determination. We had all better hope they succeed and help them to.

The interest of the country as a whole in having inflation checked is second only to their concern about war. If indeed it is second at all, for one of the means by which Russian communism hopes to overcome us is through economic collapse of the kind that would result from inflation if it becomes extreme. And in this supreme national interest, if the people as a whole are to be looked upon as groups, the one group that should be the last to be called upon for sacrifice is the savers. They, more than any other detachable group, have paid the price of inflation. Over a period of 10 years they have seen every dollar of their savings fall in purchasing power to what was formerly 60 cents. During the brief priod of 8 months past they have seen the fall grow in quantity and momentum.

Again, if the people are to be looked upon as groups, two that are fair to be looked to for sacrifice are labor and farmers. So far as it is possible to separate temporary beneficiaries of an early stage of inflation from victims of it, labor and farmers have been beneficiaries. Within the past 6 years there have been five rounds of wage raises in industry. Within the same period agriculture as an industry has had the highest national income in history, and some of the increase has been due to a Government policy, price support of farm crops.

For protecting the savers against further sacrifice thorugh continuation of inflation and of reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar, the Government has a special reason. The Government needs to make large borrowings from the savers through sale of bonds to them, and the savers will lend with more readiness and satisfaction if they know it is a Government policy to stabilize the purchasing power of their saved dollars.

The Late Dan Clingaman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wauseon (Ohio) Republican for February 22, 1951:

CITIZENS PAY FINAL TRIBUTE TO LAST OHIO CIVIL WAR VET DAN CLINGAMAN

The beloved citizen and patriot, "Uncle" Dan Clingaman, died at the home of his daughter and husband, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Fauver, on East Oak Street, at dawn Sunday morning, February 18, after an illness of 3 weeks, at the age of 104 years 4 months and 23 days. He was the last Civil War veteran and the last member of the Grand Army of the Republic in Ohio. The citizens throughout the State join those of Fulton County in paying honor and respect to this, the last member of the Boys in Blue who from 1861 to 1865 preserved the Union.

Ohio gave 310,000 of her sons to the Union Army and of these about 2,000 were from Fulton County. Of this gallant army that helped save the Union, "Uncle" Dan was the last survivor.

HONORED AT NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT

"Uncle" Dan Clingaman was a charter member and a past commander of Losure Post 35, Grand Army of the Republic. He was loved and respected by his comrades and at one of the national encampments of the Grand Army of the Republic, when he was the lone survivor of the Civil War veterans in Fulton County, he was made an honored guest, the cost of transportation of himself and an attendant was paid to the encampment, as well as their entertainment.

When Gov. Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio, visited the Fulton County Fair some 3 or 4 years ago, he stopped at the home to pay honor to "Uncle" Dan, and this always remained a treasured and pleasant memory to Mr. Clingaman.

For many years Mr. Clingaman occupied an honored place in the parades of veterans of all the wars in which this country has been engaged. He attended every Memorial Day service held May 30 when his health or the weather would permit. He attended the services held in Wauseon, on the last Memorial Day.

At the homecomings and other occasions where the welfare of the community and loyalty was a part of the program, Mr. Clingaman had an honored place.

Daniel A. Clingaman was born near Melmore, Seneca County, on September 25, 1846. Six years later, his parents, by covered wagon, moved to a tract of wild land in German Township, near Burlington. His father died that fall. Here he worked on the farm and helped to clear the farm for cultivation and attended school during the winters until April 1865, when he answered the call for volunteers in the Union Army. He enlisted as a private in General Sheridan's army. His outfit was Company D of the One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry. He saw hard service in the campaign of the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. He served until the war ended and received an honorable discharge.

LOCATES IN TEDROW

Upon being mustered out, he opened a blacksmith shop at Tedrow which he operated for 15 years. Selling the shop, he purchased the farm which he owned at the time of his death, 1½ miles north of Wauseon and where he lived for more than 70 years.

Mr. Clingaman was a very successful farmer and was an active member of the Fulton County Agricultural Society for many years, serving as one of the directors of the board that managed the fair until he declined to serve longer on account of advancing years. His value to the society was recognized and he was elected an honorary member for life.

He united with the First Christian Church of Wauseon in 1880 and was a faithful attendant at Sunday school and worship services. At his advanced age only the condition of his health or the weather kept him away.

Mr. Clingaman frequently spoke of his early years on the farm when the forests had to be cleared away and the land drained and the team work done with oxen in order to produce a crop. As a fatherless boy he knew what hard work on the farm was and the trials that the pioneers of Fulton County endured.

WIFE DIED IN 1923

He was united in marriage to Miss Louise Minnich, who died in 1923. Since then his daughter and son-in-law gave him devoted

love, care, and attention to add to his pleasures in life.

He is survived by his daughter, Mrs. Carl Fauver, and grandchildren, David Clingaman, Defiance; Daniel Clingaman, Springfield; John Clingaman, Wauseon; Charlotte Clingaman, Piqua; Mrs. Lowell Geringer, Wauseon; Mrs. Alfred Reighard, Delta; and Stanley Fauver, near Wauseon.

The Robinson-Gibbs Post, American Legion, conducted the services in the Penrod funeral home, Tuesday afternoon at 2 o'clock. His pastor, Rev. Ralph Richardson, assisted by Rev. John Osborne, pastor of the Church of God, officiating. Burial was in the Wauseon Cemetery.

Flags were flown at half mast during the day and all places of business were closed during the funeral hour.

A floral piece from the Department of Ohio, W. R. C., from Medina was received by the Clingaman family as well as a long distance call of condolence from the Civil War Veterans Association of Dayton. There are four Civil War Veterans left in the United States.

Address Before Future Farmers of America Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Future Farmers of America Federation at Spartanburg, S. C., February 22, 1951:

It is a pleasure to be here in Spartanburg with you this evening. I consider it a great privilege to address this splendid group of young men and their fathers.

I like the enthusiastic spirit with which the Future Farmers of America work to develop leadership, cooperation, citizenship, improved agriculture, and patriotism. You represent democracy in its truest sense—a vital force of teamwork among individuals with deep-rooted ideals, working incessantly for the common objective of human betterment. I have always been a firm believer in the underlying principles upon which the Future Farmers of America Federation was founded and feel that it has grown to be one of our great youth organizations.

Agriculture and the Nation as a whole needs leadership and I am confident that this leadership will emerge from among our young people as a result of the training received in our schools and through such organizations as the Future Farmers of America.

You farm boys of today are the citizens who will be supplying the food and other agricultural products for our country in just a few years. Many of you young men will, beyond a doubt, help determine agricultural policies in the future. The United States of America will be stronger because of the training you are receiving in the Future Farmers of America.

In these grave times agricultural productivity is a great source of national strength. But the role of agriculture in the present struggle for freedom in the world goes far beyond the ability to produce in abundance. Farming is more than just another industry; it is a way of life which we here in the United States must strive to preserve. Agriculture always has made and is still making more than material contributions to our economy and our national strength. Through the years since the founding of this Nation, people who owned their farms and tilled their soil have contributed a strong moral influence upon our national life. Such farmers are still a strong bulwark of democracy and a real safeguard against the inroads of communism in our own country. But we shall say more about this later.

This evening I would like to say a few words to you about three of our basic agricultural problems, for all of which you Future Farmers of America will be called upon to help find a solution. The first of these problems is that of raising the level of farm income. We have heard much about how this should be accomplished.

We in America are the best-fed and best-clothed people in the world. This did not just happen. Back of our abundant production are millions of farm people who have learned how to produce and live as no other people have ever done. These farmers have not been content with science in the laboratory. They have taken the results of the laboratory and applied them to their farms and in their homes. This has meant progress, and in times of trial a lifesaver, not only for themselves but for the Nation and the rest of the world.

And still while so much progress has been made in agriculture I don't need to remind you that the income per farm worker in many sectors of our agricultural economy is far too low. The question of how to raise this level of farm income is still before us. How can it be solved? Many of us today, I believe, are convinced that it cannot be done by raising prices of agricultural commodities alone. Much has been accomplished by Government price programs to give farmers equitable prices for their products, but we still find the average income per farm worker far below the average wage per industrial worker. For example, in 1949 the average income per farm worker was $1,587, while the average wage per industrial worker was $2,900. How may we raise the income per worker on our farms? It appears to me that this can be done only by increasing the productivity per worker on our farms through more efficient farming methods, more scientific farming, and farm mechanization.

Farm mechanization, on the other hand, raises another problem. How large must a farm be to justify the use of machinery? The answer to this question is a difficult one and will depend to a great extent on the scale of our farming operations, the kind of crops grown, whether it is a dairy farm or a cattle ranch or a diversified farm. One thing is certain, however, farms must be large enough to make it possible to use mechanized equipment efficiently. Mechanization is extremely important at this particular time when so many young people are needed in the Armed Forces and in our factories to produce the materials required for national defense.

This brings me to the problem of the family farm and a farm ownership. Our present family-farm system didn't happen by accident, it has been made possible by our Government's land policies. These policies were motivated to a very great extent by the philosophy of our founding fathers and early leaders that the freehold principle was essential to a strong democracy. Operator ownership of the family farms in the United States has long been one of the chief goals of agricultural policy. Numerous farm laws have been enacted toward that objective. It is true that many farms are still operated by tenant farmers, but the opportunity is now and must be always kept open for farmers to become farm owners if they choose to do so.

Statistics indicate that there has been a rapid gain in operator-ownership during the past decade, but there are developments which tend to make it more difficult for young men to get started in farming. The high cost of land, buildings, machinery, and livestock tend to limit rather than encourage expansion of the family farming tradition. We should therefore constantly strive to preserve the family farm concept and to make it possible for those who wish to farm, and who will do all in their power to farm efficiently, to eventually own their farms. What our farm policies will be in the years to come will depend a great deal upon you young men, the Future Farmers of America.

Finally, I wish to call your attention to the importance of abundant agricultural production in this present world emergency. You all remember the fine job done by the farmers of the United States during World War II and thus far in the postwar period. We were able to increase production during the war to supply the needs of the United States and our allies. During the early postwar years we produced sufficient quantities of food and fiber to aid a number of countries faced with shortages of agricultural commodities as a result of the war. Now we are confronted with another emergency. In the near future there will probably be shortages of some important agricultural products such as cotton, wool, grains, meats, and dairy products. Again we must stand ready to produce sufficient quantities of these foods and fibers, not only for this country but for our allies who are fighting with us in this great struggle to maintain peace and freedom for all peace-loving people throughout the world.

And now, my friends, I wish to congratulate you for continuing your education and preparing for your future occupation. I also feel that your parents should be highly commended for making it possible for you to attend school to become better citizens, better leaders, and more efficient farmers.

General Bradley's Address at Freedom Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by General of the Army Omar N. Bradley at the presentation of the Freedoms Foundation awards:

Here at Valley Forge, at the bleak, winter retreat of a defeated American Army, we have gathered to warm our hands and our hearts to a greater task—a global struggle for freedom's eternal survival.

I am convinced that we will win this struggle. In this righteous crusade we shall succeed. And all those nations joined with us in spirit and in action will remain alive and free.

That winter at Valley Forge was a battle without gunfire, a struggle without glory. Because of their suffering and their defeats, the American troops almost abandoned the cause. But their leader, General Washington, never lost faith.

Now there is little chance that the march toward freedom will ever falter. Too many generations have been sustained by the miracle of individual liberty; too many men have lived in freedom to abandon it without a fight.

The survival of freedom depends on the collective industrial and political power of the nations who have joined in this crusade. In this torn world the backbone of freedom takes its strength from the power we have to defend it.

The United States, and the freedom-loving nations of the world, have a greater industrial potential than our combined enemies. In the long run this industrial production and skill will assure our military supremacy if we need it.

Among the free nations we are attaining an international political understanding. The North Atlantic Treaty, as a first step, is a stronger combination than the compulsory league of Soviet satellites. In our individual nations we are stronger because each of us is free. In every satellite nation, where communism rules through the tyranny of a power-hungry minority, there exists a fundamental political weakness.

Morally and fundamentally, the free world has the undeniable power of a better idea. In our way of life no worship is denied, no abandonment of religion is required, no elections are counterfeited, no automatic "yes" is demanded.

WE NEED HUMILITY

The sum total of our strength in these broad areas will assure ultimate victory over communism. And for the moment, we are the trusted leaders of this crusade. But in order to win we must provide the kind of leadership that freemen can respect and support.

In this great responsibility we Americans need humility.

Many of us are caught in the illusion that we—of all the people in this world—are self-sufficient. Because of the supreme confidence we have in our strength, in our faith, and in ourselves, it is difficult to admit the need of help.

However, the American people, for all their strength and abundant charity, need guidance, courage and inspiration. In our American pride at being the arsenal of democracy, we must remember that we are also regarded as the arsenal of hope. Great leadership in such a righteous cause requires that a nation be humble—before its God and its fellowmen.

As we seek to protect the freedom which we hold in trust, we must provide more than material things. We must provide more than guns for soldiers, more than food for starving people, more than thoughts for hungry minds. We must show them our faith to bolster theirs.

We should realize that our Nation is distinguished in this world by the great quality of freedom which sets us apart. There are civilizations, religions, and ways of life much older than ours, which mark other countries and other people for special regard. Many of our precepts, and some of our modes of life, have been drawn from this background.

But it is this devotion to freedom that marks the American way of life. So long as the American people sustain this devotion, and cherish and protect and continue to earn the liberty which we hold so dear, this Nation will deserve a great place in the history of humanity.

Nature's resources, and our genius for development of them, were placed in this bright area of the world to be shared unselfishly in times of need. I believe that the American people will be endowed with the genius for development and invention only so long as their energies are devoted to the greater good. Realistically, we must acknowledge that the greater good for the world requires continued contribution of energy, faith, and cooperation from all peoples who hope to share the American abundance.

Frequently the cry is heard, "How can we go on giving and sharing indefinitely; won't we spread it all too thin and dissipate our strength?" We hope that friendly nations will some day become self-sufficient and independent of our aid. For the present, our assistance is needed to hasten their recovery. For the American people to falter or hesitate is unthinkable, for we are provided with ample strength upon which to draw.

A TRUISM IS CITED

We have friends—stanch, courageous, and worthy people who respect our leadership and join us in support of freedom.

We are provided with the strength of diversity which no regimented people can equal. When we apply the initiative and imagination of enterprising men to a difficult problem, we can count on a solution.

Divine providence gives us another, and greater, strength which has never surrendered to any threat or peril. This is the spiritual strength of our religious freedom—every man looking to his God, with faith and with prayer, for the guidance and the courage that human minds alone never quite provide.

There is an old truism that if something too big is given to someone too small to carry, either the load must be lightened or the carrier must grow big enough, strong enough, for the burden. There is little chance, as I read the avowed intentions of communism, that the load will be lightened soon, or that we may be able to shift it entirely to other shoulders. Since we now bear the burden, there is only one solution—we and our friends must become strong enough to carry it lightly, and with great endurance, and for a long time.

Our own confidence is essential to our leadership. We must maintain the basic quality of a right estimate of ourselves and our abilities. I believe it is this kind of humility which is required of a leader-nation in these times of peril. I would not have us think less of ourselves than we should.

I believe that we can take some inspiration in our present trouble from the words of a famous American, Thomas Paine, who wrote of our earlier crisis just before Washington's troops wintered here at Valley Forge:

"I have as little superstition in me as any man living, but my secret opinion has ever been, and still is, that God Almighty will not give up a people to military destruction, or leave them unsupportedly to perish, who have so earnestly and so repeatedly sought to avoid the calamities of war, by every decent method which wisdom could invent. Neither have I so much of the infidel in me, as to suppose that He has relinquished the government of the world and given us up to the care of devils."

In this assemblage today at Valley Forge we have tried to capture some of the spirit and humility so necessary to the task of preserving freedom. These awards presented by the Freedoms Foundation mark significant contributions to this great cause for which free men crusade.

A New "Uncontrollable" State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in New York, United Nations owns a piece of land and a towering skyscraper in which some 4,000 to 4,500 people are working.

All but a few of these people are citizens of other countries, although some 91 Communists or near-Communists are employed there by the United States, which is, as you know, a member of United Nations.

All of these people, being in some way diplomatic representatives of other governments, are immune from the laws and penalties which apply to you and me. Most of their salaries are tax exempt. Should one of them get drunk or violate a traffic regulation, he can, and ordinarily does, claim diplomatic immunity.

I have never been able to understand the policy which sanctions the residence and activities of these people—many of whom mean our Government no good here in America.

That we pay—to use the old expression—"through the nose," is indicated by the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of February 21, 1951:

DIVIDENDS FROM UN

In the first 5 years of its life the United Nations has succeeded in spending almost $857,000,000. Of this, the United States contributed four hundred and twenty-four million, almost half of the total. By June 30 UN outlays will approach $1,000,000,000, and of this sum the United States will have contributed five hundred and forty-three million.

Can any American explain what possible benefit the United States has received from a single dollar contributed to UN, let alone half a billion of them? We have been treated to a never-ending wrangle, to a wholly useless and costly war in Korea to the threat of another world war with unimaginable destruction, to military and economic regimentation in preparation for war, and to some half baked, wholly unrealistic, and dangerous excursions into social uplift on a global scale. The declaration of human rights and genocide convention are typical of these.

The facts and figures on UN have been the subject of study by a Senate subcommittee under the direction of Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, and the report of this group leaves no doubt that UN has degenerated into a racket. The only people who profit directly from its operations are the new class of global bureaucrats who draw tax-free salaries. Trygve Lie, the Secretary General, benefiting from 11 forms of allowance and 6 of benefits, draws $53,000 a year, free of tax. He may be worth $53,000 to himself, but to no one else.

The Senators speak of the vested interests that have been created in UN by international bureaucrats whose principal object is to keep every existing project going and to invent new ones constantly. Among these is a study of the effect of chewing coca leaves. Others proposed or in existence are world clinics for alcoholics, the improvement of obstetrical practice in China so that the ranks of the Chinese Red armies may be kept up to quota, a world compact to end divorce mills, a study of the social problems of South American aborigines, the standardization of map symbols, legal procedure for the issuance of death certificates of persons missing in war, an Asiatic flood-control program, and an investigation of the scientific basis of yogi.

This only suggests the fertility of bureaucratic resourcefulness in making work and finding devices to spend money. There are hundreds more of such boondoggles in the files.

There are almost 10,000 UN bureaucrats living largely off the American people. The old League of Nations was able to stagger to the grave with only a fraction of this horde of payrollers and at only a fraction of the

cost. With each passing year UN grows more grandiose in its pretensions and more futile in its effect.

The common-stock holders in the organization are supposed to be the citizens of the United States and of other governments. For them there are no dividends. The preferred-stock holders are presidents, premiers, and dictators, who regularly collect through the ability of UN to keep international tensions strung tight, so that there are always wars and threats of wars with which to keep the people cowed and quiescent so that they will submit to the constantly increasing exactions of the state upon their incomes and their very lives.

When are the people of the world going to get onto this gigantic fraud?

Idaho Legislature Memorializes Congress Regarding the Sending of Troops to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN T. WOOD
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the people of Idaho are so resentful of sending troops to Europe without the approval of the Congress that they have importuned the members of their State legislature to memorialize the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary and expedient to prevent the sending of American troops to foreign lands by the President without first obtaining the consent of the Congress in the absence of a declaration of war. The resolution follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 3 (as amended)

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of these United States of America in Congress assembled:

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

"Whereas the present world situation insofar as it affects the peace and welfare of these United States of America is at one of its most critical and uncertain stages; and

"Whereas the President of these United States of America contemplates sending greater numbers of our ground troops to foreign countries in order to protect said countries against invasion by aggressor nations; and

"Whereas we, your memorialists, believe that ground troops of the United States should not be sent to any foreign country for such purpose by the President of these United States, without first having obtained the advice and consent of the Congress of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of these United States to take such action as may be necessary and expedient to prevent the sending of the ground troops of these United States of America to foreign countries by the President of these United States without first obtaining the advice and consent of the Congress of these United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of these United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Idaho."

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 15th day of February 1951.

EDSON H. DEAL,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 8th day of February 1951.

W. L. MILLS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 3 originated in the senate during the thirty-first session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

BERT NEMAT,
Assistant Secretary of the Senate.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Is an Economic Monstrosity and Would Prove To Be a Wasteful Expenditure of Money, Manpower, and Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years the St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been paraded before Congress, and during that time its construction has been urged by its advocates for practically every reason under the sun.

During the period of 25 years this Nation found itself engaged in two World Wars, and during that time we heard the argument that the St. Lawrence project was necessary if victory were to be achieved. Fortunately for the American people and the welfare of the Nation, Congress did not listen to such a specious argument and we concentrated on utilizing our manpower, money, and materials for increasing our standards of production so essential in meeting the needs of our national defense.

Today we find ourselves involved in another world crisis, and as usual the age-old statement is again being bandied about that our security rests in no small degree on construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

In fact, not only have the proponents of this boondoggling project attired it in the garb of national defense, but they have given it the "new look," or in everyday language, "something new has been added," by stating that it is needed to transport ore for several Midwest steel companies who are developing ore deposits in the Labrador-Quebec area, and who claim the seaway is needed to solve their transportation problems. In other words, the American taxpayers are being asked to subsidize these steel companies by providing the St. Lawrence seaway for their own selfish interests.

The far-reaching potentialities of atomic energy as a source of power have been carefully avoided by advocates of the St. Lawrence project despite the fact that they know rapid progress is being made in the field of atomic energy, and that there is the possibility that before the St. Lawrence seaway can be completed in the 5 or 7 years time required for its construction we may find that the development of atomic energy has revolutionized the power industry and rendered such a project as obsolete, useless, and a sheer waste of billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

There are many manifold reasons why the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is an economic monstrosity and should not be foisted upon the American taxpayers who are already overburdened by taxes that take about 35 cents out of every dollar they earn.

The following speech was delivered by me on February 21, 1951, over the American Broadcasting Co. network and should be of interest to every American citizen because it sounds a warning of the evil effects that would befall this Nation, its commerce, and its industries if the St. Lawrence project should be constructed.

The address is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am opposed to the St. Lawrence project because I represent thousands of coal miners and railroaders in the great State of Pennsylvania whose jobs will be seriously menaced by the proposed international ditch. The people of Pennsylvania are not selfish; hence I am not going to spend the time allotted to me in describing the devastating effect that the St. Lawrence project will have on the State of Pennsylvania. Instead, it is my purpose to discuss the effect that the proposed St. Lawrence project will have on the economic life of the entire United States.

In the interest of clarity of thought, let us remember that the proposed St. Lawrence project is divided into two component parts—first, as a seaway which contemplates the establishment of a 27-foot channel from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to Duluth, Minn., a distance of 1,977 miles. While utilization of existing facilities will lessen the construction work in some of the area, the greatest and most costly portion of the work remains to be done. This will necessitate the construction of a series of channels, canals, and large dams.

The second part of the St. Lawrence project involves the construction of a large hydroelectric power dam estimated to produce for the American side, 570,000 kilowatt-hours of firm electric current. The cost of the dam will be paid for by the American taxpayers.

In this connection, when you consider the progress being made in the field of atomic energy and the billions of dollars being spent in developing its use in the generation of power, it is readily apparent that the 7 years required to complete the St. Lawrence seaway might well find that atomic energy has revolutionized the power industry and the billions spent on the St. Lawrence seaway power project would be a sheer waste of the American taxpayer's money.

When you view the project in two parts, namely, as a seaway and power project, the natural question arises, What is the total cost? Those in favor of such a project are ultra conservatives in arriving at a cost figure, while those opposed to the project are unable to accept the modest cost claims of the advocates of the St. Lawrence project. On the other hand, 10 years ago leading and reliable industrial engineers in Canada and

the United States placed the cost in excess of $1,000,000,000, some contending that $1,350,000,000 is a sensible and sane estimate.

That these industrial engineers are proceeding on a sound basis is very evident when we recall the estimates that were given for the construction of the Panama Canal. The original estimate of $160,000,000 was absurd when the final cost was revealed as $375,000,000. Then, too, the Suez Canal was estimated at $30,000,000, but when completed the total cost was $80,000,000.

It must also be borne in mind that production costs are now at a high point, and since we are again in a period of war emergency further increases are very likely.

Aside from the great cost of this proposed project, let us keep in mind that we are being asked to construct this project at a time when the American people are faced with the necessity of building an adequate national defense against the threat of world communism that has engulfed us in war in Korea—a war that many regard as the stepping-stone to world war III. Why should we be asked at this critical period in world history to divert our manpower, materials, and financial resources to a project that cannot possibly be completed before 1956 or 1958, and when completed the seaway portion will be frozen over 5 months of each year? We have fought two World Wars in a space of 25 years and we did not need the St. Lawrence seaway to achieve victory. In fact, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Mobilization said in a recent speech, "The development of the St. Lawrence would take a long time. There are much more pressing problems if we are to win the war of production."

In addition, only 15 percent of the population of the United States will benefit from the St. Lawrence project, with the remaining 85 percent of American citizens being called upon to pay their share of the cost of construction, estimated to exceed $1,000,000,000.

In estimating the cost of construction, there has been little said concerning the cost of defending the St. Lawrence project. Military experts, however, are of the opinion that it will require over $1,000,000,000 to erect the necessary defenses at strategic locations along the 1,677-mile front. In addition, the maintenance cost of these defense posts cannot be ignored. For the maintenance cost of the channel and locks alone, more than $20,000,000 will be expended annually for the seaway part of the project.

When we consider the cost of construction estimated to exceed $1,000,000,000 and add another $1,000,000,000 for the erection of defense posts requiring additional millions for maintenance costs, we can readily see that this proposed St. Lawrence project is destined to cost us billions of dollars. I am sure you will agree that this is a tidy sum of money to saddle on the already overburdened taxpayers of America, who are now paying the tax collector 35 cents out of every $1 they earn.

For a moment, let us dwell on the effect the St. Lawrence seaway will have on the American market and transportation facilities. Upon completion, the St. Lawrence project will open the Great Lakes to world shipping and within a few months you will have dirty, cheap, ill-manned foreign tramp steamers flying foreign flags dumping their cargoes at Great Lakes ports instead of on the Atlantic seaboard, as is being done at the present time. These foreign vessels do not meet the standards of American shipping—in wages, living or sanitary conditions. As a result, it costs $500 a day more to operate an American vessel as compared to the cost of operating a foreign tramp steamer. The average wage paid foreign seamen is about half of the amount paid our American seamen. In addition the foreign vessels or their crews pay no taxes. On the other hand, American shipping interests pay large taxes, only to see such revenue applied to building a project that is establishing ruinous competition and threatening to sabotage American shipping and the American market.

We have spent over $19,000,000,000 developing our merchant marine, in which we take great pride. Yet, because of the size of American-flag ships and the fact they are being built larger, only about 9 percent of our merchant ships could use the proposed seaway, while a greater number of larger foreign vessels than are now using the 14-foot waterway will be able to use the new seaway.

Industries in the Great Lakes area should realize that if this St. Lawrence seaway is completed their fields, mines, factories, and forests will be brought into direct competition with the slave type of labor that prevails in foreign countries.

These foreign tramp steamers in addition to disrupting the American market will deal a death blow to the transportation facilities of our Nation, and to the anthracite and bituminous coal industry.

At the present time American railroads employ more than a million American citizens, and long trains carry millions of tons of freight to and from seaboard ports. It is estimated that American railroads will suffer an annual loss in freight revenue from $100,000,000 to $250,000,000 should the St. Lawrence seaway become a reality. These foreign tramp steamers will deprive the railroads of this freight traffic and the devastating effect is more fully realized since every thousand tons of freight lost to the American railroads means the elimination of one freight train. When you remove freight trains you destroy the jobs of railroaders. Thus we have foreign seamen on these dirty tramp steamers benefiting at the expense of the American railroad employees.

Nor can we ignore the ill effects of the St. Lawrence project on the coal industry of the United States. We must not forget that these tramp steamers coming into the Great Lakes region with cargoes of foreign coal will create a greater import market for subsidized and tariff-preferred coal of Great Britain, Nova Scotia, and Russia. This foreign coal, produced by cheap labor and transported at distress rates, will displace American coal produced at American mines under American working conditions. This would be in addition to the competition of crude and fuel oil produced from foreign sources under the same conditions.

The power part of the St. Lawrence project will produce hydroelectric power which will displace both in Canada and the United States the use of American-mined coal. And let us keep in mind that while this hydroelectric power may appear cheap, it, too, is subsidized by the American taxpayer.

Taking the importation of foreign-mined coal, and crude and fuel oil, together with the coal displaced by the power part of the St. Lawrence project, you will have destroyed a 35,000,000-ton American coal market. For every million tons of coal displaced we must keep in mind 1,000,000 man-days are lost to good American citizens in the mining and transportation industries.

The St. Lawrence project is nothing new. For the past 50 years it has been talked of at different intervals, only to be shunted aside as impractical and unsound. Now that we are engaged again in a gigantic effort to build an adequate national defense, advocates of this economic monstrosity have garbed it in the armor of national defense and present it to the American people, hopeful that patriotic fervor will cause the Nation to accept it lock, stock, and barrel.

In addition, the St. Lawrence seaway has been given the "new look" in the sudden interest taken in it by several small Midwest steel companies who are developing ore deposits in the Labrador-Quebec area and who claim the seaway is needed to transport their ore to their respective plants. I submit that these midwestern steel companies should solve their problem of transportation themselves and not expect the American taxpayers to subsidize them by providing the St. Lawrence seaway for their own selfish interests.

Surely you good people in the State of Minnesota are not going to accept a project that will permit iron ore to be dumped on the American market at a cheaper price and in competition with the ore from the great Minnesota iron range; you good people in Michigan and Wisconsin are not content to see your great agricultural market destroyed by foreign competition and the wages of labor seriously menaced; you good people of the great Mississippi Valley should not be expected by your Government to see your great import and export market destroyed by foreign vessels plying our inland waters.

We who live in the industrial States and on the seaboard are not being fooled by parading an old political pet—the St. Lawrence seaway—in the garb of national defense. Nor are we fooled by the efforts of the great State of New York, through political affiliations, to secure a power project benefiting mostly a small section of the State of New York.

In joining us in defeating this political and economic monstrosity—the St. Lawrence project—you are enlisting in a cause that will repel an invasion of the rights of the American workingman and contribute to the general welfare of every American citizen. Yes, you will be giving voice to the sentiments that should be inscribed on every heart—let us preserve the home and the job of every American workingman.

A Real Peace Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, in its lead editorial of Tuesday, February 20, suggests a basis for a program which if the Soviet Union agreed could really give the world the "long peace." To this seven-point program I would add two additional points making nine points in all, as follows: (8) Agreement on the majority UN plan for inspection and control of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction; and (9) cooperation on broad-scale technical assistance and stimulation of requisite investment in undeveloped and underdeveloped areas to raise standards of living and materially improve conditions of health and education. The editorial follows:

AGENDA FOR THE BIG FOUR

Despite Premier Stalin's latest blast against the West, the United States, Britain, and France have proposed to Moscow a March 5 meeting of their deputies in Paris to work out a program for a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the four powers. The new western notes represent the sixth diplomatic exchange on the project of such a conference, launched by the Soviets last November. They reply particularly to the Soviet note of February 5, which appeared to accept the western demand for extending the discussions to all problems causing present world-wide tensions, but which did so in such a conditional form as to leave Moscow's final meaning obscure. However, rather than engage in further exchanges, the western powers have followed the French

suggestion of leaving the clarification of these obscurities to the deputies. Their latest communication is phrased in such a manner as to require only a Soviet "Yes" to get the preliminary meeting under way.

If a new four-power conference is to accomplish anything worth while it must show a willingness to get down to business on the actual issues now agitating the world. These issues hinge not so much on German rearmament, however much the Soviets may wish to keep that question in the foreground, as on the whole problem of Soviet imperialism, as manifested in various aggressive actions since the war, and on the urgent need for western self-defense. These actions are best summarized in the latest British note relating to the Soviet-British pact, and the points made in that note should form the basis for the agenda of any four-power conference to which the western democracies can agree.

These points, and the western position regarding them, are and should be:

1. The imbalance between the vast Soviet armies and the western defensive forces, present or proposed—an imbalance which can be cured only by establishing a balance of power which will reassure the world.

2. Soviet subjugation and rearmament of Eastern Europe in violation of all wartime agreements and the peace treaties—a threatening situation which can be corrected only by the restoration of national and individual liberties.

3. Cessation of Soviet attempts to conquer nations by subversion, infiltration, coups d'état, and "civil wars," as in Czechoslovakia, Greece, and Korea—a situation which calls for dissolution of the Cominform.

4. For Austria a treaty of independence—which entails the withdrawal from Eastern Europe of Soviet forces now supposed to be guarding Soviet communications to that country.

5. For Germany, unification—which involves the determination of borders now legally fixed as of December 31, 1937; the restoration of personal and political liberties in the Soviet zone, as decreed in the Potsdam agreement; restoration of German sovereignty and a peace treaty with an all-German Government, as provided in the Potsdam agreement; and finally, assurance of German security by the dissolution of the budding German Red army in the Soviet zone and the establishment of adequate German security forces within a European framework.

6. Cessation of Soviet sabotage of the United Nations and sincere participation in its work, including Soviet support for collective security and cessation of Soviet aid to aggressors.

7. Finally, lifting of the iron curtain.

Such a settlement is not likely to provoke enthusiasm in Moscow, but would be a settlement in keeping with all wartime agreements, beginning with the Atlantic Charter, and a settlement that would restore real peace. Until some such settlement is achieved the western powers must beware of dictators talking peace while preparing for war.

Increase in Cost of Living Brings Additional Worry for American Pensioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, no group of Americans is suffering more from the high cost of living than those who have to rely on pension checks. Sylvia Porter in her column in the February 6, 1951, issue of the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times tells the truth about the predicament of our elderly citizens in their battle with the high cost of living.

Miss Porter's article follows:

INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING BRINGS ADDITIONAL WORRY FOR AMERICAN PENSIONERS

(By Sylvia Porter)

In 1938, the cost of providing an elderly couple with a decent, healthy standard of living was $70 a month.

Today, that same budget—allowing few, if any, of the small luxuries of living—demands $115 and $120.

Most elderly folks, dependent on pensions and living in decidedly moderate circumstances, simply cannot obtain that extra $45 to $60.

Thus, somehow, some way, they now must struggle along with only three-fifths of the goods and services considered necessities by the most objective nutrition experts.

And if they are to live above the subsistence level—are to have a few things beyond their absolutely minimum physical needs—their monthly budget today runs to $150.

Again, most elderly couples, relying on pension checks and either too bewildered or too feeble to get outside jobs find this even more impossible of attainment.

Thus, to them, luxuries are just a dream. Subsistence is their way of life.

And the pensions that just a short while ago they thought would give them comfort in their older years are a cruel mockery.

This dramatic illustration of what inflation is doing to the millions of pensioners in our land was outlined to me this week by Laurence D. De Trude of the National Industrial Conference Board.

What is particularly painful about the figures is that they emphasize that this is happening to our older folks—to our fathers and our mothers who worked a lifetime, scrimped and saved in the expectation of enjoying independent, proud later years.

And what is particularly pertinent about this story now is that it shouts a deeply vital message and warning to those groups who insist on fighting for greater and greater financial security—and yet, who are ignoring what inflation is doing to that security.

Pensions and (pay checks) in terms of dollars mean little in periods of this sort.

The benefits make sense only when translated into terms of food, clothing, shelter—what the money will buy in the market place.

The food that cost $1 in January 1939 now costs $2.15.

The clothing that cost $1 then now costs $1.49.

The housing that cost $1 then now costs $1.16.

And on the same $1 comparison, house furnishings cost $1.63.

Fuel, gas, and electricity cost $1.33.

Sundries cost $1.59.

The cost of food and shelter alone is now as great as the total budget for an elderly couple before World War II—leaving nothing, just nothing, for all the rest.

And as De Trude added, "the farther down the scale of living you go, the more disastrous the inflationary effect has been. As funds diminish, an increasing percentage of income is spent on food.

"The cost of foods commonly consumed by elderly couples has increased much more than the average for all items over the past 10 years, cutting in half the purchasing power of those living on smaller incomes."

Instead of being laggards or indifferent followers in the battle to stabilize the dollar's buying power, all those with pension arrangements, with private retirement income policies, with special corporation retirement deals, should be far in the lead.

Otherwise their benefits won't mean much when they get around to collecting them.

There can be no financial security to all unless we stop this insane cost-of-living spiral. Just glance back at the few figures in this report if you still wonder why.

Cotton Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., on Wednesday, February 21, 1951:

COTTON COMMENT—COST OF COTTON IN MAN'S SHIRT INCREASED 10 CENTS FROM 1946 TO 1950, BUT THE COST OF THE SHIRT GAINED $1.16 IN SAME PERIOD—DISALLE HAS SOLUTION

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

If Price Stabilizer DiSalle means what he says in his price-control edicts—that wholesale, retail, and other price margins will be held to the same dollars and cents level and not allowed to fluctuate on a percentage basis—the price of raw cotton will have little, if any, effect on the selling price of the finished product.

If, however, he allows the spinner, the weaver, the finisher, the converter, the jobber, the wholesaler, and the retailer to maintain percentage markups—that may be another story.

It may surprise some people to learn that cotton goods have only a small place in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index. Cotton's place in the total is only 2.3 percent. So, if the price of cotton products advanced 100 percent, it would have only a minor effect on the over-all index.

Men's business shirts of the type which sold for $3.65 last December have a weight of only three-tenths percent in the over-all index, but there are other figures of more interest than that.

It takes three-quarters of a pound of raw cotton to make a shirt of this type. This allows for the waste in spinning, weaving, and in cutting the shirt. This information is supported by statistics from the War Production Board, the Civilian Production Administration, trade associations, and private manufacturers.

Believe it or not, the cost of raw cotton is only 8 percent of the retail price.

This cotton shirt, which required three-quarters of a pound of middling 1 1/16-inch white cotton in 1946 still requires the same amount of cotton. The price of such cotton on January 3, 1946, was 27.20 cents a pound and the price of the cotton in the shirt was 20 cents. The shirt retailed at $2.49, which made the cost of cotton in the shirt a mere 20 cents.

The same shirt in December 1950 sold for $3.65, which reflects a price of 39 cents a pound for raw cotton or slightly more than 29 cents for the cotton in the shirt.

While the cotton in the shirt has increased by less than 10 cents a pound, the retail price of the shirt has increased $1.16.

This $1.16 represents increased labor costs, the maintenance of percentage of cost markups from the spinner to the retailer.

It works this way. The cost of raw cotton increased 10 cents in the shirt, but the re-

tailers' mark-up, assuming that it was 40 percent of the selling price, was 99 cents on the shirt that sold for $2.49, and $1.46 on the same shirt at $3.65. Other percentage mark-ups on the original cotton cost, plus mark-up on the labor and transportation costs, account for the boost of price from $2.49 to $3.65.

If Mr. DiSalle can eliminate this percentage mark-up, and hold the margins of the handlers of finished cottons to a flat figure per unit, he will have accomplished much more savings for the consumer than any ceilings that he could place on raw cotton.

Those who believe he can or will do it should be able to hold their discussion sessions in any convenient phone booth.

Here's One Way To Eliminate Government Nonessentials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks today and the introduction of a bill to reconstitute the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union of February 13, 1951.

The editorial follows:

HERE'S ONE WAY TO ELIMINATE GOVERNMENT NONESSENTIALS

The Federal Government has long lists of specific commodities which it classifies as strategic and nonstrategic. It uses them to control exports.

It has lists of specific types of construction that are essential and nonessential. It uses these to allocate scarce commodities.

But there is no master list of functions of government itself which are essential to the defense effort and those which are nonessential.

The administration goes to great lengths, and quickly, to draw up such lists and use them when it is determined to regulate somebody else. But it consistently refuses to do a job of regulating itself.

Therefore it is time to call back the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government to do the other half of its original job.

When the Hoover Commission was set up in 1947 it was instructed not only to recommend means of making government more efficient and economical but also to make recommendations for eliminating unnecessary Govenrment functions, services, and activities.

Congress realized even then that only by turning off some of the taps could real economies be made. That necessity is even more obvious today with the Federal budget at $71,600,000,000.

But because the Commission membership was equally divided between Democrats and Republicans, the reelection of Mr. Truman in 1948 on a "gimme" platform tipped the scales in favor of overlooking this half of the Commission's instructions.

The Commission decided that if it got anywhere at all it would have to confine itself to trying to get done efficiently all the things that Government was attempting to do.

As a result, the Commission's reports make practically no recommendations for eliminating nonessential services.

Just this is a necessary preliminary now to holding the Federal budget within limits that can be borne. Whatever the reasons for being wary of this task in 1947 and 1948, they have vanished now.

Lopping off nonessential tax-eating activities is the joint responsibility of Congress and the President. But it never gets done. Having once embarked on an activity there is no test for its continued usefulness.

The Hoover Commission has a vast background of material it gathered in its original investigations. Its members know better than any other group of men where tax money goes.

We suggest that Congress call it back, renew the second half of its instructions in 1947 and give it, say 6 weeks, to make up a list of activities essential to defense and the Nation's financial integrity, and those that can be dispensed with.

Then dump the nonessential ones as quickly and finally as an NPA order dumps other nonessentials.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose a resolution which was passed and adopted at the regular promenade of La Societe Des 40 Hommes et Chevaux, Voiture No. 290, February 13, 1951. Voyageur militair, Clyde Trammell, was authorized to prepare this resolution and sign the same as a committee of one representing Voiture Locale, No. 290.

"Whereas our hearts are sorely troubled because of the present wars and rumors of wars and fears and expectancies in addition to the actual reports of casualties from our war effort; and

"Whereas the basic cause of such conflict and rumors of more conflicts is freedom and liberty against communism; and

"Whereas communism has a great appeal to the mind of man, whose life is filled with trouble and burdens almost unbearable, because it is a form of mental and religious ideology, twisting the fact that, from the earth we came and to dust we shall return, the state is therefore God; and

"Whereas such communistic weaklings are taught to sabotage our American way of life by creating dissension, disunity, even to the extent of overthrowing our form of government by force; and

"Whereas our Government bends backward under our constitutional rights and immunities in the handling of such traitors, otherwise known as Communists, to the end that it seems justice and freedom and liberty, under our Constitution, is preserved to those who should not be entitled to that protection; and

"Whereas the facts of Government and of life lead us to know that an agreement with communistic Russia, or China, or any other communistic government is not worthy of trust or confidence because honor and an oath and belief in God are unknown to them: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by Voiture No. 290 of the Honor Society of the American Legion, known as the 40 and 8, as follows:

"1. That this Government first protect its own form of liberty and preserve its own life before it so strenuously protects and preserves the life and liberty of convicted outlaws in America, it being earnestly suggested that it is better to deprive some dishonorable American citizens of such protection than to have them destroy this Government.

"2. That this Government do something about it now, to limit the activities of the known Communists, to prevent further sabotage and unpatriotic actions on their part, either through limitations of travel or limitations of immigration or sanctions, even to the extent of breaking off relations with communistic countries.

"3. That this country use such force as may be necessary to stop forever the war of liberty and freedom versus communism, even to the extent of scorching all Russian soil with the atom bomb, if such action be deemed necessary, in order to save the youth of our land, now dying on the field of battle, and may America be forever preserved as the 'land of the free and the home of the brave' against all enemies within and without our borders; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, and to our Senators and Congressmen, Washington, D. C.; and to the Governor of Florida, the attorney general, secretary of state, and president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; and the grand chef de Gare, Norman E. Hagen, 1117 Inwood Terrace, Jacksonville, Fla., urging such action and recommendations by them as they may deem advisable."

This resolution was passed and adopted at the regular promonade of La Societé Des 40 Hommes et Chevaux, Voiture No. 290, February 13, 1951. Voyageur militair, Clyde Trammell, was authorized to prepare this resolution and sign the same as a committee of one representing Voiture Locale, No. 290.

CLYDE TRAMMELL.

Federal Payrolls Soar and Waste Mounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a survey by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce reveals that 1,000 new civilian employees are being added to the Federal payroll each day. This rate of increase began June 30, 1950—after President Truman decided to send troops to Korea. The survey further shows that there are now 2,181,000 Federal payrollers and that an estimated 500,000 will be added by the end of the current fiscal year.

This wild hiring of Federal payrollers is adequate proof that the Hoover Commission should be revived, as provided for in a resolution which I introduced in the House today. Other convincing reasons why my resolution should be adopted are contained in an editorial which appeared in the Detroit Free Press Sunday, February 25. Permission has been granted me to extend that editorial, which follows:

FEDERAL PAYROLLS SOAR; WASTE MOUNTS

President Truman, in his manpower mobilization directive, urged all employers, both

private and in Government, to eliminate overmanning and overstaffing.

His argument runs that conservation of our human resources is of vital importance in any prolonged effort to keep the strength of the United States at a high level."

Without questioning the soundness of the President's advice, we rise to inquire why the Federal Government doesn't set the example for the rest of the country by putting its own house in order.

According to the research department of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, since last June 30 our Government at Washington has been adding new civilian employees at the rate of more than 1,000 per day.

The total number of such employees now exceeds 2,181,000, with the prospect that another 500,000 will be added by the end of the next fiscal year.

If we grant that expansion of the Military Establishment means additional civilian employees as well, is there any good reason why overstaffing and duplication of effort should not be eliminated in other agencies of Government?

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported recently that executive agencies "could do a better job with fewer employees * * * improved labor-saving techniques have not been placed in general practice * * * some of the key budget officers confide they would welcome the opportunity to reduce budget requirements * * * instead they are obliged to bolster justifications for increased appropriation requests * * * this kind of frustration was observed in all of the agencies surveyed."

This sorry state of affairs is a sad commentary on the lack of efficiency in a Federal Government whose leaders tell us, the rest of the country, how to "conserve our human resources."

The committee found a shocking waste of man-hours in the personnel management functions of the departments and agencies under study. Although the Budget Bureau has fixed a standard or optimum ratio of 1 personnel employee to every 103 persons employed and the Hoover Commission suggested a ratio of 1 to every 130 workers, the committee discovered that:

The Federal Security Agency has 1 personnel employee for every 69 persons on its payroll; the Bureau of the Mint 1 for every 59; the Southwestern Power Administration 1 for every 28; the Bureau of Reclamation 1 for every 83, and the General Counsel's office in the Treasury Department 1 for every 44.

In Government purchasing, 40 percent of the 44,261 purchase orders issued in the Treasury Department were for less than $20 each. Yet the average cost of processing these orders was a sizable $7.06 per order.

In the Bureau of the Mint, the average cost was $13.98, and in the Coast Guard it was $23.94. The Office of Education spent $10,293, or 33 percent, in overhead for $31,148 worth of goods and supplies.

Purchase orders in the Department of the Interior averaged $9.95 each, including a 50-cent order for the August 1950 issue of Esquire, requested by the Director of the National Park Service.

The committee found that the average daily work load of the 425 purchasing employees of four agencies was only two orders a day. In the Interior Department, it was only 1.4 orders per worker a day.

According to the council of State Chambers of Commerce, in one agency, the Southwestern Power Administration, "purchase orders were found to be whizzing through at a rate of seven-tenths of one order per worker per day."

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has repeatedly directed attention to the overly generous vacation and sick leave privileges given Federal employees.

A study of 48,000 employees in four departments revealed an average off-duty record of seven workweeks per year.

In three old-line nonmilitary agencies, Treasury Department personnel soared from 56,143 in January 1940, to 89,298 in June 1950; Interior Department from 45,690 to 60,144, and in the Federal Security Agency, from 20,780 to 31,642.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs had 13,565 employees on its payroll last June 30, or an average of one bureaucrat to every 30 Indians in the United States.

In such a small agency as the Prices and Cost of Living Division of the Department of Labor, there are five branches subdivided into 10 sections. One of these, the Statistical Services Section, is in turn broken down into three units, six subunits and 17 supervisory units.

The Federal Supply Service of the General Services Administration is divided into 4 branches, 17 sections, 27 units, 24 subunits, 13 groups, and 1 inquiry office.

How this burgeoning bureaucracy comes into being is explained by the committee's survey:

"Generally, the over-all job of an agency is broken down into such minute segments that it is difficult to determine the precise division of responsibility assigned to each part. When this condition remains unchecked, duplication and overlapping increases. The positions take on a high degree of specialization. As the size of a division increases, the director will request a personnel officer, an administrative and office services officer to look after division files, mail, mimeographing, and sundry duties.

"If a division's responsibilities can be made to assume the appearance and stature of a program the division director will ultimately obtain his own budget and accounting assistants. In time, the division may be raised to bureau of service status. Then it will be divided into several subsidiary divisions and the same process will begin again. It is a vicious circle that breeds waste and inefficiency. It is a prime cause of overstaffing."

Who pays for this outrageous waste of public money?

No one but you, the weary taxpayer who is being constantly exhorted to conserve your resources, fight inflation and buy Government bonds.

An even more insidious development was reported last week by Paul Leach, chief of the Free Press Washington Bureau.

Leach says the American people are supporting 45,000 Federal employees who are engaged directly or indirectly, full or part time, in dispensing information, publicity, and propaganda.

The Hoover Commission called much of this activity thought control.

The facts show that many of these 45,000 are used to further administration ideas, stir up pressure groups to influence legislation, and condition the American mind to ready acceptance of the Truman program.

The State Department alone employs at home and abroad 5,029 persons in publicity work, at a total salary cost of $14,015,670.

ECA has a total working budget for salaries, radio, publication, movies, and still pictures of over $17,000,000.

But as Correspondent William Stoneman writes from Paris: "Here, in Europe, at least, there is no evidence that any of the barbed stories written on this subject ever has resulted in the firing of a single useless employee, the reduction of a single inflated budget, or the trimming of a single bloated allowance."

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, said last Tuesday that plans are now in the making to swell the education and information staff of the Voice of America to 13,000 persons, an increase of 45 percent over the number now employed by that activity.

"The presently contemplated 13,000-man operating force will be larger than the combined full-time staffs of the Associated Press, the National Broadcasting Co., and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer," BENTON told the Senate.

Senator BENTON, who once directed the Voice as Assistant Secretary of State, now feels that his baby has grown too large to be part of the State Department and is urging the creation of a separate Government nursery for its care and development.

Summed up, the administration at Washington wants you and me to accept austerity thinking, lower living standards, and higher taxes without complaint.

But there are no indications that the President intends to give up his $50,000 tax-free allowance, or that the merry bureaucrats have any funny notions about cutting expenses.

Big government is riding high, wide, and handsome, but you're being taken for the ride.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Resolution of Disabled Veterans of Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, worthy of preservation is the communication and resolution by the Disabled American Veterans of the Oahu County Council of Honolulu, T. H. It is an indication that the veterans who gave most for their country are determined that the press shall remain free and uncontrolled:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, *February 12, 1951.*

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Because of your perfect House voting record, and hence, we feel that you must be a good friend of D. P., we want you to have a copy of our recently passed "keep Drew Pearson on the air" resolution, enclosed herewith.

We are sending more than 60 of these resolutions to that many mainland dailies.

With kindest regards and every good wish,

Sincerely,

JOE CAPSIN.

(Committees on good government, publicity, and rehabilitation, DAV Oahu County Council, Honolulu.)

RESOLUTION BY DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, OAHU CHAPTER NO. 1, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Whereas Mr. Drew Pearson, well-known columnist and commentator, is believed by the members of this chapter to be a loyal American imbued with the most exemplary ideals of citizenship; and

Whereas a notorious attempt has recently been made to still his voice by a threatened boycott of the product of the present sponsor of his new commentary; and

Whereas this chapter is convinced that the courageous and factual reporting of Mr. Pearson during the last two decades has saved our taxpayers millions of dollars; and

Whereas with Drew Pearson off the air small farmers, small-business men, war veterans, rank-and-file laborers, and small professional people who are a part of his thirty million or more audience would be deprived of facts concerning what goes on in the

National Capitol and throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Mr. Pearson in his fearless reporting has always been in the forefront of the honorable members of his profession who have taken the lead in exposing Communists, Fascists, Ku Klux Klanners, and other subversives and vigilante groups; and

Whereas at this serious moment of crisis in our national affairs, this chapter believes in accordance with the guaranties of the first amendment that not only the voice but also the pen of Drew Pearson and of all our great journalists should be freely available to the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oahu Chapter No. 1, Territory of Hawaii, Disabled American Veterans, hereby records in unanimity its recommendation that Mr. Drew Pearson, in recognition of his forthright, courageous, objective, and factual reporting, not be taken off the air; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution requesting support of this endorsement be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States: Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States; Tom Connally, United States Senator; Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; national commander, DAV; Adam Hats, Bell Syndicate, and the Weintraub Advertising Agency.

Certified, a true copy of resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Oahu Chapter No. 1, Territory of Hawaii, at a regular meeting of the chapter of administration held in Honolulu, Hawaii, January 13, 1951.

PHILIP P. MINN,
Commander, Oahu Chapter No. 1, Territory of Hawaii, Disabled American Veterans.

Hon. Basil O'Connor, of New York, Sees Key to Peace in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD an article concerning some of the views expressed February 11, 1947, by a great American, Hon. Basil O'Connor:

O'CONNOR SEES KEY TO PEACE IN HEALTH
(By L. A. Chapin)

Basil O'Connor, of New York City, Chairman of the American Red Cross, former law partner of the late President Roosevelt, and one of the busiest men in the country has an idea which has been growing on him for more than a year.

He believes it may hold the key to world peace, the solution of all economic problems for the next 100 years and the problem of making all countries democratic and resistant to the forces of totalitarianism.

While in Denver Monday on a Red Cross trip, O'Connor took the time from a round of heavy duties to explain his idea. It is so simple that at first the listener doesn't catch its full significance and when he does, he begins to wonder why no one ever thought of it—at least in the same way—before.

"What is the thing the world needs most, or, to put it another way, of what does the world have the least?" O'Connor began by asking. He then supplied his own answer. "It is health," he said.

"By health, I don't mean perfect health but a degree of health. I mean health in a broad sense—proper food, proper clothing, proper housing, proper sanitation, and a degree of cleanliness."

KEY TO DICTATORSHIP

"Look at parts of our own country. Look at almost any other country in the world. You find a universal need for health. Less than 20 percent of all the peoples of the world have a degree of health.

"I believe you can judge the progress of civilization better by noting what progress has been made from filth to cleanliness than in any other war. The amount of filth in the world is terrible. It has been made worse by the war.

"Lack of health is illness—a condition of not being well.

"The importance of this world-wide condition of illness, from my point of view, is that you can't have a proper economy or democracy in a world which does not have health.

"People who are not well cannot resist dictatorship. They cannot do productive work. The relationship between lack of health on the one hand and poor economy and dictatorship on the other can be traced throughout history."

MARKETING OPPORTUNITY

"I'm not trying to make the world a place full of hypochondriacs," O'Connor went on. "But what does this lack of health mean?

"It means this: If any considerable part of the peoples of the world were to be given health, it would require all the clothing, all the buildings, all the shoes, all the refrigerators, all the pasteurizing equipment, all the plumbing, all the pipe, all of thousands of other products which all the industries of all countries could produce in the next 100 years.

"Consider almost any small country and try to calculate the amount of steel alone which would be required to provide proper plumbing and you will see what I mean.

"People who can't stand, don't need shoes. If a fraction of 1 percent of all such people in the world were put on their feet and given health, the market for shoes would exceed all productive capacity."

OPPORTUNITY OVERLOOKED

"If a degree of health were given a considerable proportion of the world population, what would happen? A person who is well and possesses even a degree of awareness—I mean awareness and not education—begins to want things and begins to do the work to get them.

"I can't understand why business and industry as well as governments haven't realized what it would do to the economy of the world if some health were furnished to people.

"Health is the biggest business in the world. Economists are always looking for new ways to stimulate trade and stave off econmic disaster. Here is the answer—health—right in their own front yard."

SAFE INVESTMENT

"Every investment in health would come back many times over as health served to increase the power of people to work and produce and buy. What good would it do to restore the physical facilities, merely the buildings and factories, of any war-torn country in the world if its people were left in a condition of illness?

"Instead of furnishing milk to a few children of such a country would it not be better for America to furnish the pasteurization and refrigeration which would bring about a genuine increase in health?

"When you get down to brass tacks, economic ills are due fundamentally to lack of health. There is nothing any family dreads more than the possible illness of the wage earner. Romantic stories of countries in which peasants sleep away many hours of their lives lying in the sun are not romantic at all. Those people aren't lazy—they just don't have the stamina to keep going."

WOULD AID PEACE

World peace, O'Connor believes, can come only through sane thinking.

"People who are sick do not think sanely," he said. "Without healthy bodies they cannot think straight."

O'Connor in the last year has discussed his idea with many people but he never talked of it for publication until he came to Denver.

"I have been considering getting a group of people together to see what they could do with the idea," O'Connor concluded. Maybe I'll find time one of these days. I am convinced it has unbelivable possibilities."

Poland's Freedom and Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress, Inc., will hold the second solemn commemoration of the atrocious Katyn Massacre in the city of South Bend, Ind., on May 6 of this year. All persons interested in the fight for a free and independent government for Poland, whether of Polish extraction or otherwise, should attend this commemorative assembly to protest this flagrant and unprecedented violation of international law.

The committee of commemorations and special activities of the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress, Inc., hereby submits the following resolution which was adopted at Gary, Ind., on the 7th day of October, 1950:

We, American citizens gathered on this 7th day of October 1950 at the Gary Hotel to participate in this program of decorating Congressman of the First Indiana District, Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, and several Americans of Polish descent by the Polish Government-in-exile, of London, set forth the following declarations:

1. Referring to the resolution unanimously passed and adopted in Gary, Ind., on the 18th day of September 1949, we again earnestly call the attention of the American public, our President, Harry S. Truman, and our Government, to the shockingly inhuman crime of genocide perpetrated in 1940 on Polish prisoners of war in the Soviet Union; also to similar barbaric treatment to which our sons, heroically fighting in defense of democracy, are now being subjected by the Red hordes in Korea; and

We demand that the United States Government, through its Representative to the United Nations, Hon. Warren Austin, initiate and bring before that body the following proposals:

(a) Press for the formation of an international tribunal to investigate and pass judgment on war criminals who coldbloodedly and with complete disregard of international law, murdered 4,500 Polish prisoners of war. These victims were transported from the camp of Kozielsk and brutally killed in the forest of Katyn.

(b) Ascertain the whereabouts and locate the graves of the Polish prisoners of war, who, in the spring of 1940, were interned in Starobielsk (4,000 officers) and in Ostashkov (6,500 officers) in the Soviet Union territory;

(c) Bring to justice those war criminals, who are guilty of wanton killings of American prisoners of war on the Korean front, where our young and heroic sons, defenders of the ideals of democracy, are being savagely murdered by their Red captors in complete disregard of international law protecting war prisoners;

2. Declare null and void all agreements concluded with the Soviet Union at Tehran and Yalta, where, without the consent of the American and Polish peoples, Poland, and other sovereign nations now suffering behind the iron curtain, were recklessly sold into communistic slavery;

3. Demand that liberty, justice and territorial integrity be restored to 140,000,000 peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, now enslaved by Red Imperialism;

4. Demand that—

(a) The Soviet Union pulls back its armed, political, cultural and economic slavery to the frontiers of 1938;

(b) The Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms incorporated in it, be sincerely and effectively applied to all international dealings;

(c) In the name of international justice, of historical truths and of Christian ethics, Poland be restored to its sovereign status as a free, indivisible and independent state with its legal Government now functioning in exile.

Deeply cognizant of mortal dangers instigated by the Soviet Union bent on destroying our civilization, and our American way of life, we call upon our Government and our Nation to valiantly, ceaselessly, and steadfastly watch the ramparts of democracy and freedom, to spread the message of good will and faith beyond the iron curtain, and, through our acts, sacrifices, wisdom and noble concepts of freedom, justify the faith in America, professed by the hundreds of millions of people all over the world;

Let us strive unerringly to show the troubled humanity that our way of living, that our democracy, that our ideals of freedom are the embodiment of truly Christian precepts of the dignity of man who was created in God's own image and endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

JOHN ROSZKOWSKI,
Chairman.
BENJAMIN J. LESNIAK,
CHESTER WALASIEWICZ,
CAROLINE CZECH,
VICTORIA BASINSYA,
Committee of Resolutions.

Passed and unanimously approved by participants.

EUGENE H. SWARTE,
Mayor of Gary, Ind., Chairman.
JOSEPH WIEWIORA,
Secretary.

A Republican Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the often-repeated statement that Republicans could criticize but never offered anything constructive never was true.

Rank and file members of the Republican Party criticizing the New Deal, the lack of a consistent foreign policy of the administration, almost invariably offered constructive criticism, many times proposed legislation, to remedy the error, correct the evil.

Last week 121 Republican Members of the House joined by 2 Democrats, outlined a foreign policy for their party.

Foreign policy—truly designed—as all policies should be, for the protection of the homeland, should receive the support of all. No doubt many Democrats are in accord with the policy outlined by our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], but for obvious reasons did not choose at this time to sign this manifesto.

All Members of Congress are receiving letters which indicate that the people are sick of Acheson, of unnecessary wars.

Editorial comment from the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times-Herald—and similar comment comes from other papers—is as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 18, 1951]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TAKES ITS STAND

It was surely no suprise to anyone that of the 18 Republicans from Illinois in the National House of Representatives, 14 signed the declaration circulated last week, expressing opposition to the Truman foreign and military policy in general and in detail.

Everybody knows or should know that the great majority of middle westerners are of that mind. Their Representatives in Congress were reflecting the sentiment of the voters. Of Wisconsin's 9 Republican Representatives, 7 signed the declaration. Of Michigan's 12, all but 2 signed. Nebraska delivered 3 out of 4; Kansas, 5 out of 6; Iowa, 5 out of 8; Minnesota, 3 out of 5; Ohio, 9 out of 14. Indiana was an exception, with only two out of nine signing, but this is explained, in part at least, by the absence of many of the others from Washington.

There was nothing astonishing about the showing of the Middle West, but it will be genuinely astonishing to those who think that the internationalist press in the East reflects opinion in that section to see what happened in New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. In each of these States, exactly half of the Republican Members signed the declaration and surely many more would have done so but for fear of offending Governor Dewey and the noisy committees which are shouting "crisis" and "present danger."

Mr. Dewey has been campaigning for a draft big enough to produce 100 divisions. He has declared that Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson are correct in their assertion that the President has the power to send as large a part of the United States Army to Europe as he wishes to send, without asking for the approval of Congress.

Mr. Dewey is obviously not speaking for the majority of the Republicans in his State and his section because of the 22 New York Republicans who sit in the House, 11 signed the paper which called for congressional control of the size of our army in Europe. Of the 20 Pennsylvania Republicans, 10 signed. Of the four Connecticut Representatives, two signed. On this reckoning, he speaks for only half of the Republicans of the area, and, in truth, he speaks for less than half.

Every Member who signed the declaration is for it. Not every Member who did not sign is against it. Some are still thinking the matter over. Others, for one reason or another, have not yet been approached. At any rate, of the 199 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, 120 had signed by Saturday. That is a shade better than three-fifths of the whole Republican representation in the House and furnishes impressive evidence of Republican sentiment across the Nation.

Look at the Pacific coast. Of Washington's four Republican Representatives, three signed. Of Oregon's four, two signed. Of California's 18, 8 signed.

Look at the Mountain States. In Colorado, two out of two, and the same in Idaho. In Montana, one out of one, and the same in Wyoming. The Republicans of the Mountain States were unanimous.

Look at the border States. Of the two Republicans in Congress from Kentucky, one signed the declaration. Both Republicans from Tennessee signed. Of three in Maryland, two signed. Likewise, of three in Missouri, two signed.

Even in New England, generally regarded as almost unanimously interventionist, nearly half of the Republicans declared for the principles for which Hoover, Taft, and Wherry have been battling. Among the signers were only two out of eight in Massachusetts, but Maine showed two in three; New Hampshire, one in two; Connecticut, two in four; and Vermont, none for one. The total is 7 out of 18 in the region whose Republicans are supposed to be wholly committed to the bipartisan policy.

What the support given to this declaration shows, among other things, is that the Republican Party, nationally considered, is in favor of the Wherry resolution and its counterpart, the Coudert resolution in the House. It is on this issue that the Republicans should take their stand. They will lose few Republican votes by doing so. They will gain millions of Democratic votes.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 19, 1951]

THIS IS REPUBLICAN POLICY

Of the 199 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, 120 have already signed a declaration on foreign policy that looks good to us and no doubt will look just as good to Mr. Hoover, Mr. Taft, and Mr. Wherry. The declaration will not please the Dewey-Vandenberg wing of the party, but it suits all of us who have been denounced as isolationists just fine.

The most remarkable thing about this declaration is that it comes from the grass roots.

Representative MARTIN, the official leader of the Republican Party in the House, and his chief lieutenants didn't think it up and weren't among the original 118 who signed it. The prime mover was Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Racine, Wis., ably seconded by Representative O'HARA, of Minnesota, another middle westerner, and three easterners, Representatives ST. GEORGE, of New York, and TOWE and HAND, of New Jersey. Mr. Dewey's claim to leadership in his own section has been directly challenged.

DEWEY REPUDIATED

There is no longer any question of where the Republican Party stands on foreign policy. We now know that with no pressure from party bigwigs, no promises of anything for signing, no threats of retaliation for not signing, 60 percent of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives placed their signatures on a document committing themselves to opposition to the foreign policy that has been called bipartisan.

Every signature on the declaration is the signature of a Representative who was elected no longer ago than last November. Every one of the 120 has characterized the so-called bipartisan policy as in large part a costly failure. Every one of them has put himself on record in favor of a reexamination and a revision of it. And every one has declared for full participation of Congress in deciding whether American soldiers are to be sent to Europe to serve in General Eisenhower's European army and, if so, how many.

As everybody might have expected, the Republicans from the Middle West were overwhelmingly in favor of the declaration. Of the 18 Republicans from Illinois, 14 signed. Of Wisconsin's 9, 7 signed. Of Michigan's 12, all but 2 signed.

Indiana's Republicans, perhaps because of absence from Washington when signatures were solicited, made a miserable showing, with only 2 out of 9 enlisted, but Nebraska delivered 3 out of 4, Kansas 5 out of 6, Iowa 5 out of 8, Minnesota 3 in 5, and Ohio 9 out of 14.

As we said, there was nothing astonishing about that; but it is genuinely astonishing to find that half of the Republican delegation from Governor Dewey's New York—11 out of 22—voted in direct opposition to Governor Dewey's declared views on foreign policy.

Again in Pennsylvania, exactly half of the Republicans—10 out of 20—voted for the Hoover-Taft-Wherry line. So did half the delegation—2 out of 4—from Connecticut.

These are among the States in which Republicans were supposed to be strongly internationalist. Here is clear proof to the contrary.

HOW WE CAN SAVE TIME

A few Democrats also signed. Representative WILLIAMS of Mississippi, we do not doubt, spoke for many of his colleagues who are deeply troubled over the Acheson-Eisenhower policies when he said that there were men on his side of the aisle who were in full sympathy with the movement, even though they had not lent their names.

At any rate, we now know that the bipartisan Republicans are a minority in their own party in Congress. Republican leaders in Washington and in the national committee who do not accept this verdict have no place in the party and certainly no claim to leadership.

The American people are pro-American; they believe that the foreign policy of this country and its military policy must be directed primarily toward the safety and welfare of the American people, not foreign nations. They are eager to repudiate the false and dangerous doctrines of the Trumans, the Deweys, and the Eisenhowers. If the Republicans in Congress stand firm for their principles, they cannot be defeated in 1952. If they revert to "me, tooism," they cannot win.

The declaration of principles is the most important document to have come out of Washington in a decade. Representative SMITH and his colleagues have earned the gratitude of their countrymen. This declaration can save the lives of a million American boys and tens of billions of the taxpayers' money.

Our Fantastic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when Communist aggression threatened in Korea last spring, President Truman was given a defense plan drafted by the military leaders that compose our War College. The plan called for punishing the Communist aggressors without sending any ground troops into Korea. It called for blockading Korea with our Navy and the systematic destruction of the industry and transportation system of North Korea with our heavy bombers. The Communists were to be allowed to push into South Korea but their war supplies were to be cut off, thereby making them helpless to carry on an offensive campaign. Standing off in safety out of reach of the Communists we would be able to pound them to death. Thus we would have been in the smart position of being able to punish without being made to suffer; while the Communists would be in the helpless position of having to take punishment from a foe they could not get at.

When President Truman scrapped the War College plan, following the advice of Acheson and Marshall, and ordered MacArthur to send our boys into Korea, he made a terrible blunder. That blunder has cost us in wounded and dead some 50,000 American boys, and we still are no better off than when we went into Korea last June.

Mr. Speaker, are we now to repeat our Korean blunder in Europe? Why not establish a chain of bases in Spain and North Africa? Then if Russia invades Europe we could attack her industrial centers and her transportation system by air, using our atom bombs where they will do the most damage. We hold an advantage over Russia in the air; she has an advantage over us on land. Why not use our advantage in the air and save our manpower? Why not follow the advice of our military leaders instead of following the advice of such men as Acheson?

Under permission previously granted, I include part of an editorial taken from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Saturday, February 24, 1951:

REPUBLICAN LEADERS WHOSE FEET DRAG

Of the 199 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, 124 have now signed the declaration of principles circulated by Representative LAWRENCE SMITH of Wisconsin.

This declaration is in direct opposition not only to the Truman-Acheson line of foreign and military policy but, more particularly, to the Dewey-Vandenberg line in the Republican Party. The declaration contains, among other things, an unequivocal endorsement of the Hoover-Wherry-Taft contention that more American troops should not be sent to Europe without specific congressional approval.

Although more than three-fifths of the Republican Members of the House have signed the paper, none of the Republican leaders in the House has done so.

The time has come to call a House Republican conference on the issue raised by the declaration. More than three-fifths of the members of the conference have gone on record in favor of the principles announced, and still others are known to be of like mind. Obviously, then, this declaration is in every sense but the merely formal one the official party doctrine.

It should, therefore, command the allegiance of the party leaders. They should be battling for it every day and every hour.

We do not say yet that the party leadership must be displaced. We do say that unless the party leadership accepts the will of the party majority without reservation the leadership must be changed.

The sooner a party conference is called to settle this matter the better for the country and, needless to say, the better for the party. The present situation in which the leaders are dragging their feet is intolerable.

Resolution Adopted by the New Jersey Republican State Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following resolution adopted by the New Jersey Republican State Committee:

Whereas Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll has submitted to the New Jersey Legislature a budget for the 1951–52 fiscal year which, in its demand for Spartan economy at all levels of government, sets a pattern for the drastic curtailment of all but the most necessary expenditures; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress a budget proposal by the President of the United States for the same period which constitutes an invitation to fiscal disaster for our country and which, unlike our own State budget, utterly fails to recognize the needs of the times: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Republican State Committee does hereby commend the Governor of New Jersey for his practical and realistic approach to the budgetary problems of our State and at the same time condemns the budget proposal of the President of the United States for the following reasons:

1. While purporting to call for expenditures of $71,500,000,000, it actually asks authorization to spend nearly $100,000,000,000.

2. Of this vast amount, the President has seen fit to itemize expenditures totaling only slightly more than $20,000,000,000 and has in effect, asked Congress for a blank check for the remainder.

3. In complete disregard of congressional responsibility, he has refused to state how many billions of dollars will be spent for defense. This committee, while fully aware of the need for high expenditures for the defense of our Nation, nevertheless believes it to be the duty of the President to confide in our elected representatives to the extent that they can make an honest examination of all proposals for defense expenditures before they are called upon to vote vast new taxes on the American people.

4. The President has claimed savings of $5,000,000,000 below last year in nondefense items. Many of these savings are not real. For example, examination shows one of these savings to be the amount expended last year for the 1950 census (a nonrecurring item). He also claims as a saving, the more than $500,000,000 which the Congress forced the President to cut from the 1950–51 budget before its adoption. In other words, he is claiming savings below a nonexisting budget.

5. These are but two of 130 items submitted by the President in which he has claimed to have effected savings. Examination shows most of them to be based upon transfers which, in many cases, turn out to be increases and not savings.

6. Despite widespread demands for rigid economy in nondefense spending, the President, often under the guise of defense preparation, has continued to foist his Fair Deal, socialistic program on the American people. For example, he has asked:

(a) Three hundred million dollars to "equalize education opportunities" among the States (as a defense measure on the grounds that the Armed Forces do not have time to teach draftees how to read and write): plus $106,000,000 for Federal aid to education in certain areas.

(b) A $275,000,000 payroll tax to set up the machinery for socialized medicine.

(c) Direct payments to producers of perishable farm products in lieu of price supports (the Brannan plan).

(d) Seven new waterways projects costing $1,500,000,000 as follows: Hell's Canyon, The Dalles and Ice Harbor projects in the Columbia Basin; Old Hickory on the Cumberland; a steam plant for TVA; Gavins Point on the Missouri and $20,000,000 to start the St. Lawrence seaway.

7. Although the President states that his budget totals $7,500,000,000, he has, in fact, asked for contract authorizations and appropriations of $94,500,000,000, plus an additional $4,000,000,000 to pay old bills. Inasmuch as the books of the United States Government are carried on a cash basis, the President's budget should state that he seeks a total of $98,500,000,000—or $27,000,000,000 more than he has admitted; and be it further

Resolved, That the Republican State committee calls on the Republican Members of the Senate and House from New Jersey to continue their efforts to compel the Federal Government to give the American people an honest accounting of their money, and to examine carefully all proposed expenditures, both defense and otherwise, to the end that this Nation may be saved from the fiscal disaster which will surely follow if the Federal Government is permitted to engage in the confused and illogical practices exemplified by the President's budget proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That our representatives shall bring this resolution to the attention of the Congress in the hope that the Congress shall see fit to follow the pattern established by the Governor of New Jersey in setting an example for prudent management which present circumstances demand at all levels of government.

One Bale Cotton on 4 Acres—Cost Producer $81.84 To Sell It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have received from Mr. H. R. Spivey. Farmers are being called or to produce more cotton. I am wondering if Mr. Spivey would be in the attitude to increase his acreage in view of the following language which was in a letter written to me December 15, 1950, by Mr. C. J. McCormick, Under Secretary of Agriculture. I quote the language:

Therefore, if all farmers in a county should double their cotton acreage in 1951 over 1950, the 1952 farm allotments may be changed considerably or none at all or somewhere between depending on how farmers in the particular county vary their cotton acreage in proportion to cropland.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

BULLARD, TEX., *February 6, 1951.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I produced 1 bale of cotton on about 4 acres in 1950 and had to pay $81.84 to sell it. Why? Because I didn't have and couldn't get a white selling card. This was a hard financial blow—a gross injustice—at the hands of the Production Marketing Administration. I realize that it wasn't the intention of anyone in that department to work a hardship of disaster proportions to a farmer anywhere. Still, because of red-tape regulations, I was compelled to suffer a serious financial loss.

I operate a very small farm on the cash-rent basis and grew 4 acres of cotton to help pay the rent. I planted without an allotment because I understood that you intended to help us get at least a minimum of 5 acres anyhow. But I guess the bigger growers got the extra allotments because I never could get a permit to plant a single seed. Still, after I learned all this, it was too late, as I had already planted 4 acres, and I let it go on through and make. I didn't think it right at all for any farm regulation to say to a man that he couldn't plant any cotton, and to a neighbor just across the fence to go ahead and plant a sizable crop.

Well, since the PMA classified this cotton crop of mine as non-tax-free, I had to pay the penalty. The injustice of it is what burns me up. I didn't overplant. Just trying to make a living on my few acres. Everyone around here said it was a dirty shame that such hardship could be worked on a man just because he grew and sold a bale of his own cotton without PMA's permit.

MR. BECKWORTH, can you help me get this money refunded to me? I need it much worse than they do. I understand that hardship cases receive special consideration, and I would appreciate it greatly if you would do what you can to help me.

Thanking you, I am,
Sincerely,

H. R. SPIVEY.

Democracy's Sentinel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have followed the deliberations of the United Nations in Lake Success with much interest and concern. There have been times when I have been assailed by a feeling of frustration at the seemingly interminable debates and the exasperating lies and distortions dished out by the delegates of Soviet Russia and its four satellites. But there were times when I felt within me both elation and pride and when I envisioned a better world of order and law emerging out of today's suspicion and mistrust.

During the recent General Assembly debate on the question of Chinese Communist intervention in Korea, I noted with disappointment the stand taken by 12 Asian and Arab nations against the United States resolution branding Communist China an aggressor. But I was heartened by the firm attitude of the Philippines which was uncompromisingly in support of the American resolution; and the repeated interventions of Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, in the course of the debate, won for him and his people the admiration and gratitude of the United States.

The role played by General Romulo and the leadership he is displaying in Lake Success today are best described in the following news dispatch published generally and which I clipped from the issue of December 17, 1950, of the Oregon Journal and which herein appears. It was written by Pierre J. Huss, chief correspondent of the International News Service in Lake Success, and one of the veteran diplomatic correspondents of America:

PHILIPPINES' ROMULO WATCHDOG FOR UN AGAINST APPEASEMENT

(By Pierre J. Huss)

FLUSHING MEADOW, N. Y., December 16.—An antiappeasement watchdog stands on guard at the United Nations today against well-meaning but ill-guided diplomacy which might fall easy prey to the wiles of communism and make a deal with Red China.

Carlos P. Romulo, foreign minister of the Philippines, is a man of peace, but he wants none of the appeasement which leads to bending the knee to communism at any cost. Consequently, he rapped knuckles right and left this week—whether of India or Britain—and made them wince and think again.

The tough little general from Bataan, who earned his star in the hard school of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as his aide-de-camp on Bataan and elsewhere, became outraged and walked out on 12 little delegates from Asia and Arab lands whose knees were knocking together over the prospect of facing up to Communist China's defiance of United Nations in Korea.

Before doing that, Romulo read the "riot act" to the assembled group, emphasizing that nations whose soldiers are dying on the battlefields must stand by their dead and wounded, and not "sell them down the river." He said it was "ridiculous" for this group to act as if Communist China had complied with every line of the UN Charter instead of having defied it in exact marching step with the Communist expansionism of Moscow.

"Over my dead body they'll appease the Commies," the hard-jawed former president of the UN Assembly told newsmen later.

Romulo's dander rose high during closed-door meetings of a 13-member Asia-Arab bloc mobilized by Sir Benegal Rau of India to forestall an assembly demand that Peiping get her troops out of Korea.

Rau—possibly reflecting the lofty ideals of Prime Minister Pandit Nehru in New Delhi—is absolutely sure that the UN can do business with Communist China. Rau refuses to consider himself an appeaser and has maintained all along that force cannot settle the issue in Korea.

Last Monday he and Egyptian delegate Fawzi Bey produced a draft resolution which carefully wrapped up the "peace settlement" in Korea into a single package covering all the Far East. By implication, it foreshadowed the surrender to Communist China of Formosa and actually named Mao Tse-tung's government as the rightful representative for a seven-power peace conference to be held on all Asia.

Romulo came out with both fists flying and rocked the "Cliveden set" in the UN with verbal rights and lefts. (The Cliveden set was a pro-Nazi British group which engineered the fatal Munich appeasement pact of 1938 and enabled Hitler to get ready for the blitzkrieg of 1939.)

Romulo fairly yelled at them that their resolution stood in rancid rejection of the Security Council resolution of June 27, which condemned North Korea as an aggressor.

"Has Communist China done any less than North Korea in defying the UN and fighting us with crack divisions poured out of Manchuria? Isn't it ridiculous to stick our heads in the sand and treat the Peiping aggressor as an equal? Gentlemen, you may—but I won't."

The impact of his Sunday punch in effect knocked the appeasers off their feet. After a recess, in which a number of the somewhat

startled group thought it over in the diplomatic lounge—which has a large bar—Romulo came up with a separate cease-fire resolution empowering the President of the Assembly and two other representatives to sound out both MacArthur and the Chinese Communists on prospects for a cease fire.

This course, Romulo pointed out, gives the United Nations a chance to acquaint itself with the situation on the field of battle, and to adjust itself to political developments before taking any decisions. The abashed group quickly approved the Romulo plan and sheepishly turned to what was left of the second part of the original "package" resolution on the Far East.

Romulo thumped the table and again lashed out at them for trying to make fools of themselves and the UN. He refused to have any part of their appeasement conference and walked out, leaving behind him a dozen unhappy diplomats. They finally introduced their second part in the form of a separate resolution—but minus the outright appeasement provisions. In particular, they dropped any reference to China and so gave up the move which Romulo said was an attempt to get Mao into the UN by the back door.

Romulo is staying at the UN to the last moments of the Assembly, even if that means canceling his Christmas in Manila. He can be relied on to be a sharp watchdog ready to tear apart those who would sabotage genuine peace efforts in United Nations or sell out to appeasement.

President Truman's Speech to DeMolay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's remarks at a breakfast meeting of Masonic leaders:

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S ADDRESS TO DEMOLAY

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Frank [Frank Land, head of the DeMolay], and distinguished guests from all over the country, and the Supreme Court and legislative branch of the Government, and the secretaries of the executive branch:

This seems to have been a rather fixed-up proposition, to inform the President what his Cabinet and the Court and the legislative branch think of him. I am glad to know it. It is very satisfactory. I appreciate it most highly, but what I had expected to discuss with you this morning is a continuation of what these able and distinguished gentlemen have brought to your attention.

We have an emergency. I declared an emergency back in the latter part of 1950, because it was really on us—and it is on us now. And it is difficult—very difficult—for people to realize, as things go along as usual, that the Government is faced with the most tremendous emergency that any government has ever been faced with in the history of the country, and I say that because I know the history of the country very well. I know that we are going through some of the same things that were gone through in 1860, and 1916, and 1941.

CITES PROFIT FROM EXPERIENCE

We have made every effort possible to avoid a great many of those mistakes. We have not been able to avoid them all, but we are profiting by experience, and I think that I am very, very fortunate in having experienced men in every key position who understand the situation and who are honestly working it out on the basis as it should be worked out.

It was necessary for me to appoint a production manager, an administrator for the Defense Production Authority. He has had his difficulties, because it is very difficult to get people to understand that now is not the time to get all the traffic will bear, now is not the time to "get," because the Government is in a position where it has to have certain materials to meet the thing that General Marshall is working on: To keep the peace.

That is all this is for. It is an effort to prevent a third world war. And we are gradually approaching a position in the world where that can be prevented, if we have the support and cooperation of all the segments of the population. And that means industry, labor, the farmer, and you gentlemen—and all the white-collar people who do the inside work to make these other things operate.

Now, it is necessary, I think, in this country, as well as around the world, to try to mobilize the moral forces of the world against the unmoral forces.

SAYS ALL MUST SACRIFICE

We need to mobilize the moral forces in this country of ours, to prevent selfishness of certain groups from an endeavor to take advantage of this situation.

Everybody, I don't care who he is, or what his condition or his position is—from the President of the United States to the laborer who digs in the trench—must make some sacrifice in order that the whole country may be mobilized to meet the serious situation with which we are faced.

Now, for 5 years I have been endeavoring to mobilize the moral forces of the world, those forces which believe in the Sermon on the Mount, those forces which believe in a God, those forces which believe in the welfare of the individual, who believe that the Government is formed for the welfare of the individual and not that the individual is formed to be a slave to the Government.

That is what we are faced with. That is what we are trying to implant in the world.

I am here to say to you that if we could have expended the tremendous sums of money which were necessary to meet Hitler and Mussolini in the development of the resources of this world there would have been no necessity for the slaughter of all the young men of that generation in Europe. Not at all.

It is a tremendous outlook that we have for the future of the world as a whole if we can develop the undeveloped parts of the world to meet the pressure of populations in countries like China and India and Central Europe.

It can be done. It is not impossible. But we have to understand that we are faced with an unmoral force which does not keep its agreements, which does not believe in the things for which this Government stands, and for which the other free governments in the world do stand.

Now, it is your duty—you come from every section of the United States—to see if you can't revive that moral force in our own population that causes a man to give some sacrifice for the welfare of the rest of the human race.

That is your business. You are taught that. That is a part of your creed. All I am asking you to do is to help the President of the United States to mobilize the moral forces in the world to meet the unmoral forces in the world.

ASKS COOPERATION OF ALL

It can be done, and we are doing it—with some handicaps, I will admit. We have our troubles. Mr. Wilson—Mobilization Director Charles E. Wilson—has had his troubles, and he will have some more before we get through. But Mr. Wilson and the President of the United States will work those troubles out. This Government is going forward, not backward.

We are not in the midst of any political campaign at the present time. In all probability, we will be in the midst of one next year, and we will meet that situation as we have met it before.

But that is not the object now. The object now is to meet the emergency with which we are faced, and to meet it on a basis so that everybody will make his proper contribution, and nobody will come out with any special privilege.

Now, if you gentlemen will give me a lift on that this breakfast will have been worth while.

Thank you very much.

Banker Dawes Could Tell Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the American Banker:

BANKER DAWES COULD TELL THEM—FEDERAL EXPENSES WERE CUT OR ELSE WHEN HE WAS BUDGET DIRECTOR

If there is anyone around the White House or on Capitol Hill who is seriously interested in economizing on nondefense items in the Federal budget, there is a banker who could tell them in a very few words how to do it.

That banker is Brig. Gen. Charles Gates Dawes, former Vice President of the United States, and previous to that first Director of the Budget, under President Harding, and from 1897 to 1901 Comptroller of the Currency.

After World War I, the problem of cutting Government costs back developed after the 1920–21 slump in business and prices. The high cost of living had been a factor in popular resentment toward the Government's policies, and the consequent recession and collapse in prices had had a sobering economic effect. Wherefore the back-to-normalcy slogan and objectives of the incoming Harding regime in 1921.

General Dawes was given the budget post. A man of authority, character, and respect among both Government and business circles, General Dawes was given full responsibility by the President for seeing that Federal departmental spending was reduced, and the authority to make that objective effective. The President let it be known that the Dawes orders were law, and when he ordered a sizable percent lopped off some department's expenses, no one was permitted to interfere. Expenses were cut or else.

Cabinet members who tried to protest to the President were told General Dawes' word was law, and it is surprising how many ways departments found to economize. And General Dawes became known by newspaper readers as "Hell and Maria Dawes."

Of course, there were the same arguments then as now, that to reduce this or that item of spending would cripple an essential Government service, and cause great political repercussions. The budget chief, however, was firm, and within the year, a substantial budgetary surplus was achieved, which continued through 10 years of Republican administrations. The budgetary surplus fed the capital markets with debt retirement

payments, and thus aided in the upswing of business. This in turn brought about a situation in which taxes could be reduced, which aided still further in the stimulation of business. The political repercussions were all favorable.

General Dawes, now in his eighty-sixth year, and serving in an advisory capacity as chairman of the board of the City National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, is the prototype of the sort of executive who sooner or later must be given budget balancing authority in Washington. As was the case nearly 80 years ago, that authority must be absolute, and absolutely effective, so far as reducing nonessential Federal expenses are concerned. If the Truman administration cannot bring itself to this decision and find the right man for the job, then some future administration will. But the fiscal economy of the United States will not be sound until the right man is given this job with full authority to require economy, and real prosperity for the United States will continue to be an inflationary mirage.

Forest Service Spoils System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, this week I formally requested our colleague, HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to hold hearings for the purpose of limiting the power of the United States Forest Service over the sale and distribution of national forest timber. At these hearings I intend to propose amendments to the present sustained-yield law which will prevent the Forest Service from arbitrarily picking and choosing among competitors for public timber.

This action is the result of the decision by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan in sustaining the establishment of the Lakeview sustained-yield unit, which limits competition for the timber around Lakeview to the mills very near to Lakeview itself and puts the Willow Ranch Co., the oldest and most substantial lumber company in the area, out of business.

CAN LIMIT COMPETITORS

The decision of the Secretary of Agriculture was not surprising. Cabinet officers hardly have the time to make the detailed investigation of individual cases which is required and must and do depend on their subordinates for information, which in this instance, of course, was the Forest Service.

The basic issue involved in this matter is not whether a sustained-yield program should be followed. We all agree with the sustained-yield program. But sustained yield can be secured by limiting the cut out of the national forests. The Forest Service proposes, and under the present law not only has the power, to limit the cut, but to limit the competitors. I am in favor of limiting the cut in order to follow sustained-yield practices in the national forests, but I am against giving any Government bureau the power to pick and choose among competitors in an area for this valuable natural resource.

FOREST SERVICE SPOILS SYSTEM

The language of the present law is the framework for one of the biggest scandals in history. These national forests are worth literally billions of dollars. They do not belong to the Forest Service, or its present employees, to be peddled noncompetitively to Forest Service favorites—or used to reward the friends and punish the enemies of the Forest Service. While Congress was preoccupied with the war in 1944, and under the favored title of "sustained yield," the Forest Service slipped language into the statute giving them unprecedented and dangerous powers in distributing a fabulous public resource. You would have the same thing if the Secretary of the Interior could hand the oil reserves of the Nation around to his friends, or anyone he pleased, on a noncompetitive basis—just he and the friend agreeing on the price.

SHOULD AMEND LAW

In my opinion, the law should be amended in such a way as to continue the power of the Forest Service to limit the cut out of the national forests, thereby assuring a sustained yield, but eliminating the power of the Forest Service to pick and choose among the bidders for public timber in the particular area. Open, competitive, and public bidding has been the traditional method of protecting the public interest in the buying and selling of public property. There is no reason or excuse for varying that traditional rule in dealing with the national forests—and it is not necessary to do so to maintain a sustained yield program.

I am in hopes the Committee on Agriculture will give me an early hearing. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and the entire sustained-yield program, worthy in itself, can be permanently lost in one or two flagrant cases of Forest Service mismanagement.

The Late June Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to June Green, who was called by her Maker on the 21st day of February 1951. June was a member of the Negro race and lived at Pampa, Tex. She had been employed in my household for several years, and her ministrations to my children in sickness and in health, her wholesome philosophy, and her sterling character provided my children with an understanding that will serve them well in treating the problems of life. June's greatness was not evidenced by public proclamations and was perhaps not known by a great number of people, but her greatness was indelibly attested by the love, respect, and confidence of children, a greatness that is sought by many but attained by few. The color of her skin did not dim the vision of those children nor detract their ability to see and appreciate the understanding, the tenderness, the kindness, and the sterling qualities of Christian character with which she was so richly endowed. She was truly one of God's children—one of his better children.

Congress Must Safeguard Food Production in New Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, new proof comes to light daily of the damaging effects to the Nation's economy and war effort of a bureaucratic program which does not let its left hand know what its right hand is doing.

The following is from a news item appearing in the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News of February 16, 1951:

The first outright request for Michigan farmers to increase production came from the Government today. The Federal Production and Marketing Administration now asks farmers to step up their 1951 acreage of corn, barley, and soybeans—crops vital to defense.

The State as a whole was asked to boost corn acreage 130,000 acres to 1,820,000; barley acreage, 24,000 acres to 150,000 acres; and soybeans, 13,000 acres to 130,000.

Consider this call for more production—farm defense production, if you please—in the light of the present selective-service policy of drafting all farm labor except in extreme hardship or dependency cases.

Of course, the impact of the Government's call for increased farm production has not been felt yet on Michigan farms. But the impact of the farm-labor shortage, aggravated gravely by the draft, is being felt already.

One Calhoun County, Mich., farmer, who happens also to be the supervisor of his township, wrote me February 17:

The condition of the farm-labor situation in Calhoun County has become very critical. We are now unable to replace farm labor with younger or older men. This has caused a striking reduction in the numbers of livestock on our farms today and is going to decrease more. The number of farm-auction sales, due to lack of farm labor, are increasing.

All of this is causing a reduction in the assessment of personal property, which already has become startling. I will compile and send to you in the near future the exact amount of this reduction.

Coupled with the demand for increased farm production and the farm-labor shortage, aggravated by the draft, is the marked trend toward fewer and larger farms in Michigan. I have previously cited some impressive figures on this subject, under extension of remarks February 6, 1951, page A694 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Information provided in an article by Robert Enlow, Enquirer and News farm reporter, under date of February 18, throws new light on this trend in the Third Congressional District of Michigan. It shows the following decrease in the number of farms as between 1945 and 1950: Branch, 2,446 in 1945 and 2,240 in 1950; Calhoun, 3,106 and 3,060; Eaton, 3,326 and 3,107; Hillsdale, 3,329 and 3,295; and Kalamazoo, 2,703 and 2,516. That represents a total of 692 fewer farms in my district in 5 years.

This reduction in the number of farms means, in the main, larger farm units, made possible through increased mechanization. It may be argued that, in some respects, the trend is beneficial, from the standpoint of more efficient, economical, and profitable farm operation, with greater output from less labor.

But by the same token, this trend makes it increasingly imperative that the farm labor be highly skilled. And it means that the fewer the persons employed on the individual farm—whether they are members of the owner's or tenant's family, or hired hands—the more indispensable those few are to the interrupted operation of the farm.

It means something else, too. It means that there will be—indeed already is—much less of an actual or potential pool of farm help for the busy season or for the emergency periods of increased farm production such as the Nation now faces. The effect is fewer opportunities for farm youth to become farmers; fewer opportunities for the type of individual who worked on farms, by day or month, or season, years ago. The trend of this potential farm labor is more and more to the cities and the factories—a trend further stimulated by higher wages.

Thus we find it reported that already in Calhoun County farmers are short of help 2 months before the critical period normally begins, and that there are four or five farmers after every available man.

All of that, incidentally, before receipt of the word from Washington to increase production of specific defense food items anywhere from 6 to 14 times.

Unless food production is to be thrown into utter chaos, the Congress must see to it that the draft law is modified to safeguard, fairly but surely, the manpower already on the farms and essential to farm operations.

There is no more vital defense or war production in the entire economy of the Nation.

Mandel Nieder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the late Mandel Nieder, one of the Pacific Northwest's outstanding citizens, appeared recently in the Roosevelt American. I feel a great personal loss in Mr. Nieder's passing, as do many others who were inspired by his constancy of purpose and high ideals:

MANDEL NIEDER
(By Adele Parker)

Mandel Nieder, a well-known and popular figure in liberal politics in Seattle, Wash., has departed this life, remembered by thousands of friends, especially for his devotion to public power, to the cooperative movement in all its phases, and for his hearty support of the New Deal in American politics.

Mandel was born in Chicago in 1890. He came to Seattle in 1901. His father, a little earlier, had been attracted to the Pacific Northwest by the Alaska gold rush in the Yukon, where he made himself famous by being the first of the gold seekers to build himself a boat out of a tree.

Mandel secured his formal education at the Old South School, at Broadway High School, and as a graduate from the University of Washington. He served in France in the First World War in the Medical Corps of the Ninety-first Division, and was cited by Gen. John J. Pershing for bravery under enemy fire.

Active in the Norris-LaGuardia organization for the reelection of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to his later terms, Mandel was also president of the Washington Public Power League, he was treasurer of the committee known as the League for CVA, and he was appointed by Gov. Mon C. Wallgren to the Washington State Resources Council.

Taking an active part in the original organization of Seattle's Group Health Cooperative, Mandel also helped organize the first group called the Progressive Citizens of Washington—a group which later became the Americans for Democratic Action, and in recent years he also served on the Committee for Academic Freedom at the University of Washington.

In the past 10 years Mandel's health had been precarious, yet, with frequent periods of rest, he accomplished a huge amount of work in the interest of democracy and the general welfare. On January 20, 1951, the end came quietly while sitting with his family at home listening to the opera on the radio. Not only Seattle but the entire State of Washington will miss his pleasant smile and his devotion to the cause of freedom, peace, and brotherhood.

Indians Will Be Made Homeless by Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, for those who follow the affairs of the American Indians, the Hualapi Tribe of Arizona will present an interesting case history. Twice the Supreme Court has intervened to keep the white man from chasing these Indians off the ground belonging to them by agreement with the Federal Government. Their long struggle to stay on their land will be lost, however, if Congress approves of the central Arizona project. I wish at this point to insert in the RECORD a memorandum on the history of this Indian tribe and the effect the central Arizona project will have upon it.

MEMORANDUM RE PROVISIONS OF S. 75 AND H. R. 1500, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, AFFECTING RIGHTS OF INDIANS OF THE HUALAPAI TRIBE

I. IN GENERAL

This memorandum reviews provisions of S. 75, H. R. 1500, and related bills to authorize the central Arizona project, which authorize the Secretary of the Interior to divest the Hualapai Indians of lands within their reservation, for flooding, for construction of camp sites, and for other uses incidental to the project.

II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HUALAPAI (WALAPAI) RESERVATION

The ancestral home of the Indians of the Hualapai Tribe is located along the Colorado River in northwestern Arizona. In 1874, over their vigorous objection, the Hualapai were forcibly removed from their home range to the Colorado River Reservation, created by act of Congress in 1865, by the Indian Office of the United States Government. Referring to this attempt the Supreme Court has stated that "their forcible removal in 1874 was not pursuant to any mandate of Congress. It was a high-handed endeavor to wrest from these Indians lands which Congress had never declared forfeited."[1] The following year, 1875, the Hualapai left the reservation and returned to their own lands after which it was decided "to allow them to remain in their own range during good behavior."[2] Speaking of the forced removal of the Hualapai, General Scholfield reported on May 24, 1875, to the Adjutant General, as follows:

"The Hualapai Indians have been our firm friends for many years, and our active allies whenever their services have been required against the hostile Apaches. In return for their fidelity they have been treated with great injustice and cruelty. They were forced to leave their homes in the mountains and go upon a reservation in the Colorado desert, where they have suffered from the extreme heat, to which they were unaccustomed, from disease, and from hunger.

* * * * *

"The injustice and bad faith shown by the Government toward the Hualapais and the Indians which General Crook had collected upon the Verde Reservation are calculated to undo as far as possible the good work which General Crook and his troops had accomplished with so much wisdom and gallantry. It is useless to attempt to disguise the fact that such treatment of the Indians is in violation of the just and humane policy prescribed by the President and a disgrace to any civilized country."[3]

In 1881 the Hualapai, assembled in council, proposed to an officer of the United States that he "aid them to represent to the proper authorities," the following proposal:

"They say that in the country, over which they used to roam so free, the white men have appropriated all the water; that large numbers of cattle have been introduced and have rapidly increased during the past year or two; that in many places the water is fenced in and locked up; and they are driven from all waters. They say that the railroad is now coming, which will require more water, and will bring more men who will take up all the small springs remaining. They urge that the following reservation be set aside for them while there is still time; that the land can never be of any great use to the whites; that there are no mineral deposits upon it, as it has been thoroughly prospected; that there is little or no arable land; that the water is in such small quantities, and the country is so rocky and void

[1] *United States* v. *Santa Fe Railroad Co.* (314 U. S. 339, 355, 86 L. Ed. 260, 274).
[2] Walapai Papers, S. Doc. 273, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 104.
[3] Walapai Papers, op. cit., p. 108.

of grass that it would not be available for stock raising. I am credibly informed, and from my observations believe, the above facts to be true. I, therefore, earnestly recommend that the hereafter described reservation be, at as early a date as practicable, set aside from them."[4]

Pursuant to the above proposal a reservation consisting of some 1,000,000 acres was constituted on July 8, 1881, subject to the approval of the President. President Arthur signed an Executive order creating the Walapai (Hualapai) Indian Reservation on January 4, 1883.

The Hualapai Tribe today consists of some 500 members. It is one of the most self-reliant Indian bands in the United States, the members of which make their livings primarily from livestock. The tribe is today entirely self-sustaining and is not a drain upon the United States. They own and maintain some of the finest cattle herds in Arizona. Within a 2-day period in June 1948 they sold $150,000 worth of cattle on their reservation.[5]

III. SUBSEQUENT EFFORTS TO DIVEST THE HUALAPAI

The rights of the Hualapai to the lands within the reservation granted to it were affirmed in 1941 by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Santa Fe Railroad Company* (314 U. S. 339, 86 L. Ed. 260). That case arose out of efforts of the Department of the Interior to give a railroad, predecessor to the Santa Fe, some of the land within and without the Hualapai Reservation. The United States in its own right and as guardian of the Indians brought suit to enjoin the railroad from interfering with possession and occupancy by the Hualapai of the lands. In an opinion rendered on December 8, 1941, the Supreme Court decided that the land within the reservation was created by agreement between the United States and the Indians as a permanent, not a temporary, reservation which could not be taken from them and given to a railroad. "Such statements by the Secretary of the Interior," said Mr. Justice Douglas in the opinion of the Court, "as that 'title to the odd numbered sections' was in the respondent (railroad) do not estop the United States from maintaining this suit, for they could not deprive the Indians of their rights any more than could the unauthorized leases in *Cramer* v. *United States* (261 U. S. 219)."[6]

IV. PENDING EFFORTS TO OUST THE HUALAPAI FROM THEIR RESERVATION

If after the 1941 Supreme Court decision in the Santa Fe case, the Hualapai felt secure in their tenure of their reservation, they did not reckon with the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation or the other proponents of the Central Arizona (Bridge Canyon) project.

Section 14 of S. 75 and H. R. 1500, the present bills to authorize the project, contains the following provisions re the Hualapai lands:

1. That in aid of construction, operation, and maintenance of the project "there is hereby granted to the United States" all the right, title, and interest of the Indians, including easements, rights-of-way, etc., in and to such tribal and allotted lands, including sites of agency and school buildings and related structures," as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of said works and any facilities incidental thereto, or for the relocation or reconstruction of highways, railroads, and other properties affected by said works"; it is also provided that before designation of lands or interests the Secretary shall endeavor to negotiate a contract of purchase from the Indians and failing in that, shall proceed with the designation.

2. That the Secretary of the Interior shall himself "determine the just and equitable compensation to be made" to the Indians, which compensation shall be in money, property, or other assets, including rights to electric energy developed at any of the plants authorized in the legislation.

3. Amounts of money determined by the Secretary as compensation for tribal lands are required to be transferred to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribe. Amounts due individual Indian allottees are require to be paid "to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such officer as may be designated" by the Secretary of the Interior for credit to the accounts of the individual concerned.

4. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to use funds deposited to the credit of allottees, in his discretion, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, the relocation of existing improvements, the construction of new improvements on the land so acquired, etc.

5. Where required for the purposes of the act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to remove Indian cemeteries, and in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on such other lands as he may select and acquire for the purpose.

6. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts . . . to carry out the provisions of this section.

In short, we find that section 14 of S. 75 grants to the United States as of the date the bill becomes law, all rights, title, and interest of the Hualapai Indians to lands, cemeteries, facilities, etc., within their reservation as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as needed "in aid" of the central Arizona project. Furthermore, it constitutes the Secretary of the Interior as the judge of what lands shall be taken and the amount and form of compensation to be paid therefor. Provision is made that the Secretary shall before designating tribal lands make every reasonable effort to negotiate with the owners, but he alone is the judge of what constitutes a reasonable effort. Compensation is required, but it may be in the form of "money, property, or other assets" at the discretion of the Secretary. Although the lands may be taken at the time of the passage of the bill, compensation may be paid some time later, also at the discretion of the Secretary. The Secretary is to pay whatever compensation he deems just, not to the Indians whose lands are taken but to the United States Treasury in the case of tribal lands, and to the Superintendent of the Indian Agency, in the case of individual allottees.

The powers granted to the Secretary under section 14 of S. 75 and H. R. 1500 are so broad and all embracing as to recall the attempt of the Indian Department in 1874 to remove the Hualapai from their aboriginal home to the Colorado River reservation, an attempt which as previously stated the Supreme Court labeled "a high-handed endeavor to wrest from these Indians"[7] lands which belonged to them. It is to be noted that the entire section 14 of S. 75 and H. R. 1500, save for two paragraphs, was submitted to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the Department of the Interior.

V. HUALAPAI EFFORTS TO RESIST TAKING OF THEIR LANDS

The Hualapai made representations before the Senate and House committees considering the central Arizona project authorizing bills during the last Congress, protesting the arbitrary seizures of their lands which it authorized. The tribe council passed a resolution approved March 8, 1949, which was sent to members of the Arizona delegation praying "a recognition of the rights of the Hualapai Tribe" in connection with the central Arizona project bill. To date, their prayer has met with no success.

[4] Walapai Papers, op. cit., pp. 134–135.

[5] Testimony of Barnett E. Marks at hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Public Lands on H. R. 934 and 935, 81st Cong., 1st sess., serial No. 11, pt. 2, p. 858.

[6] *United States* v. *Santa Fe Railroad Co.* (314 U. S. 339, 360, 86 L. Ed. 262, 277).

[7] Supra, n. 1.

Cut Unnecessary Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. R. D. Scamehorn, president of the Morgan Co., of Oshkosh, Wis., on the need for reducing unnecessary Government expenditures. The letter is typical of others reaching my office pleading for economy. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There has just come to my desk from the National Small Business Men's Association figures on actual expenditures in peacetime by several different departments of our Government showing the terrific increase that has occurred between fiscal years ended June 30, 1940, and June 30, 1950. All of us know that Government spending has been increased by leaps and bounds but actually, I, for one, did not realize that some of the increases had been so fantastic as this report shows.

Frankly, I had not realized that the Department of Commerce expenditures had been increased more than 1,100 percent, nor that Department of Interior expenditures had been increased about 800 percent. Department of Labor shows even a larger increase, being approximately 1,400 percent.

While the Department of Justice shows increased expenditures of a little less than 20 percent, I can understand the reasons why there would be such increased personnel costs. I can also understand why there would be a great increase in the operating expenses of the State Department because of increased personnel, etc. Nevertheless, the increase that has occurred in the State Department in the last 10 years would seem to indicate that our Government authorities have lost all sense of balance. In the matter of independent offices, I don't understand an increase of nearly 300 percent, however, it still isn't so fantastic as the increased costs in the Department of Commerce, Department of Interior, Department of Labor, and the State Department.

I realize that here and there businessmen, as well as others, have been asking for more Government services, and all these things cost money. Nevertheless, I feel there is no excuse for Government bureaus attempting to not only satisfy every whim but also to provide great quantities of statistical and factual information, little of which is ever used.

Also in this morning's mail has come to my desk the regular monthly copy from the United States Department of Labor covering "Monthly report of current wage developments, No. 3." This is a regional report from the Chicago office. Also in this morning's mail was a monthly report entitled "Current Wage Developments" which gives the national picture. The regional report covers some 19 pages full of information regarding reported wage changes in this area in different industries. The monthly report entitled "Current Wage Developments," from Secretary Tobin's office, has 66 pages of similar information, some of it being a duplication. It is nice for business to have this information, but totally unnecessary, and if the cost of providing this and many other kinds of data is the reason for an increase in the budget in 10 years of 1,400 percent, then it seems to me that we had better dispense with a lot of these nice but unessential services.

So long as the taxpayers' money is being spent for things of this kind, business interests would be foolish if they didn't accept them for whatever the information contained therein may be worth. However, many thoughtful people feel that there must be a sharp and immediate reduction in a lot of unnecessary Government expenses, and right now is the time to do it.

When our Nation is threatened, most of us are willing to accept added tax burdens to cover the cost of defense preparation. I say this in spite of the fact that many wonder where the so-called best implements of warfare that we had only a few years ago have gone to (this statement allows for obsolescence). We also wonder what has happened to the billions that have been appropriated in the last 3 or 4 years for defense efforts, which apparently had not shown up in completed implements of warfare when trouble appeared in Korea a few months ago. Nevertheless, I fully believe we must be ready for all real (not purposely concocted) emergencies. Because we make ready to defend ourselves at a cost of billions is all the more reason why a lot of other unnecessary billions of expenditure should be cut out. It will take drastic thinking and drastic action to accomplish the objective, and I am writing you again on matters of national legislation because I feel so strongly that the welfare of our Nation is hanging in the balance. Let's have the courage to really pare off every penny of nonessential spending and then see to it that the personnel of overstaffed Government bureaus is trimmed off and available to make up the manpower shortage which now obtains in many parts of the country and which other Government bureaus are talking so much about. A substantial number of your constituency with whom I am acquainted subscribe thoroughly to this viewpoint.

Yours very truly,

R. D. SCAMEHORN,
President.

Our Most Precious Possession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Albert C. Jacobs, chancelor, University of Denver, entitled "Our Most Precious Possession," before the Civitan Club, February 14, 1951:

Mr. President and members of the Civitan Club, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to meet with you today and to discuss more fully a proposal which a week ago I outlined rather briefly to the University of Denver faculty. This proposal concerns our most priceless possession—the Nation's manpower.

In this time of crisis the wise and intelligent use of our manpower is the Nation's most crucial problem. Upon the effective resolution of this vexing question depend the solution of many major current issues, the morale of the youth of our land who have the courage to face anything but uncertainty, and the preservation of our cherished freedoms.

In resolving this critical problem, it is imperative that two vitally important necessities be coordinated with the greatest of wisdom: First, the strengthening in the defense of our way of life of our military forces; and, second, the preservation of the enduring objectives of higher education, namely, basic research, training of specialists of all kinds, and, through education in the liberal arts building the citizens and leaders of tomorrow. The second necessity demands that educational opportunities be available to a sufficient number of qualified students. These two basic necessities must be constantly before us. How then are we to guarantee their effective and coordinated accomplishment?

We start out with a fundamental premise. Our Nation and the civilized world today face an emergency of grave import; freedom is undergoing a challenge without parallel in our history. We are involved in a world-wide conflict testing not merely our military, political, and economic strength, but also our spiritual and moral foundations. The struggle is one of life and death between two entirely irreconcilable concepts of political organization and human relationships; two entirely irreconcilable concepts as to the dignity and integrity of the individual.

What form the conflict in which we are now engaged will ultimately take is not at the moment clear. At present it threatens world war III. The Korean situation, due to the menacing activity of Communist China, for months has been a keg of dynamite. Western Europe and certain other areas continue zones of potential explosion. But then if the current conflict does not result in the catastrophe of total war—and we pray it will not—and I am by no means convinced that our opponents mean a full-scale shooting war—the tension creating this emergency threatens to dominate world affairs for years to come.

We must therefore strive unceasingly to make our Nation strong—strong physically and economically, strong intellectually, and strong morally and spiritually. If we are to build and maintain this essential strength, if we are to gird for the defense of our free society, we must be strong in conviction and strong in action, tough with ourselves and tough with those who seek to enslave the world. Let it never be forgotten—we have not and never have had imperialistic aims—we seek only to allow the people of the world self-determination and the right to enjoy the freedoms of freemen. According to the tenets of God and the principles of democracy, we seek respect for the individual.

If we are to be tough with ourselves, if we are to gird for the effective defense of freedom, all Americans today, and perhaps for many years to come, must actively accept the concept of service to the Nation. Each and every one must according to his particular ability do his part in maintaining the blessed freedoms upon which our Nation was founded.

In time of emergency, and our Government has recognized its existence, the individual citizens to some extent at least may have to subjugate personal desires to the greater needs of the Nation. One of our present needs is for trained men who can be called upon if there is further actual physical threat to our security. We do not want war, in fact, we loathe it, but we cannot tolerate additional aggression against us. We must be ready to back up our beliefs and convictions with proof to aggressors that we are ready with men, trained and tough, and with materials, the best our scientific and technical know-how can produce. The men in the Kremlin, just like other dictators before them, respect only military might and physical strength.

The material phase of America's strength causes me no concern. The preparation of materials is and always will be easy for us. Our factories can readily gear up to emergency needs. We can out-produce any nation on earth. No one can rival our productive genius.

The preparation of men, however, is our major problem. Getting tough with ourselves and gearing up our manpower is much more difficult than our material productivity which the whole world respects. We do not and will never relish the thought of becoming a warlike people. We love peace and abhor the interruption of normal peacetime pursuits. The unnecessary injury or death of one human being is contrary to our total philosophy and to our religious outlook.

What then, in view of the nature of the emergency, is the most effective resolution of our manpower problem? Our Nation, I repeat, today and during the emergency requires services on two broad bases. The Armed Forces, which everyone agrees must be strengthened, must have intelligent, trained young leaders and personnel. At the same time our Nation must maintain its scientific, technical, industrial, professional, and cultural leadership.

In seeking a solution of the all important manpower problem, one of the Nation's most distinguished educators, President James B. Conant, of Harvard University, has sponsored the universal military service plan whereby every man, at the age of 18, would be drafted; there would be no exceptions—those who might ordinarily be IV-F's would be inducted for limited service, or put into activities which they could perform. Note carefully—all at 18 would be required for a period of time to perform service according to their capabilities.

This plan would provide the Nation with the needed physical and military strength so sorely needed, thereby attaining the first of the major requirements I have noted. But it would not provide a solution to the second, namely, the continuance of the enduring objectives of higher education; basic research, training specialists of all kinds, and through education in the liberal arts building the citizens and leaders of tomorrow. At the best, under this plan, education would be postponed in the hope it would be resumed at a later date. Furthermore, the military would have complete control over these young men during their most formative years.

On the other hand, Selective Service, with the difficult questions of deferment and assignment—deferring Dick and calling Tom—cannot of itself insure our needed military strength nor guarantee the continuance of the enduring objectives of higher education. In favor, however, of such a plan, my former colleague, now the very able president of Amherst College, Dr. Charles W. Cole, argues: "Defer young men capable of profiting from further training (as revealed by tests). Let them go to college at their own or private scholarship expense. Permit them to remain only so long as they meet specified high standards. Require them to serve, after training, 1 month for every month of deferment." I cannot agree that such a plan

would most effectively meet our Nation's long-time needs.

After much thought and with due humility I venture to suggest that the most effective handling of our manpower would be by means of a National Service Act which would require all young men from 18 through at lease 25 to devote a minimum of 2 years to national service, longer if the emergency should so demand. Note, I say national instead of military service. I do not contemplate sending all young men into military service. I am proposing during the continuance of the emergency a total draft; there would be no IV-F's; all would be required to render some kind of service, even though it be limited in character.

Why do I urge a suggestion so drastic in nature? I do so frankly because of the character of the emergency in which we are involved. We are constantly threatened with devastating war, a war in which the releasing of the atom could well destroy the civilization we have known. But with World War I, and again, in incomparably greater degree in World War II, war became a great destructive, systematic business, a business in which today, more than ever before, it is necessary for a nation, and for all individuals in that nation, to stand together when the dire emergency comes. Our 150,000,000 citizens must be ready for that day. And war, as we now know it, is not merely a battle of military forces; it is an all-out test of a nation's entire strength.

I therefore propose a minimum period of 2 years in the national service not only to provide urgent military strength, but to insure the scientific, technical, professional, and cultural leadership so desperately required. Everyone must perform service of some kind. In this performance the largest freedom of choice consistent with national security should be allowed.

Those young men who, on the basis of adequate and effective testing, are found to have a superior capacity for training in higher education or who possess special technical aptitudes, should be given the opportunity by the Government to go to institutions of higher learning or to technical or trade schools. In the case of institutions of higher learning, these should be, if possible, schools in which there are ROTC units, which units could be utilized for military training purposes. These young men, while continuing their education, would receive basic and further military training. They would not, however, be exempt from active military service, but would be called upon for such when required by the Nation. The colleges would be in charge of the admission of students and in control of education except the military training. Except, however, in rare cases no one should be required in the performance of his national service to continue against his will his educational activity.

In developing this part of my program, I want to make one point clear. What happens in this emergency to any one institution of learning is not my main concern. What happens to the Nation and to all free nations is my prime concern.

The young men not qualified to continue education, or who do not desire to do so, and who are found fit for military service, would immediately be given the necessary military training. I want to make it clear, however, that no boy would be sent to combat duty until he had passed his nineteenth birthday.

Young men found not qualified for further education or technical training, or for service with the Army, Navy or Air Force, would be utilized according to their capacities for limited service of other kinds. There would, as I have said, be no 4-F's.

The program which I have had the temerity to suggest would, of course, involve a most careful survey of our American youth in all three categories. Testing services which have been developed over the years are fully capable of assuming this great responsibility and would be effectively utilized to complement the selective-service mechanism now in use. Selection must of course be in the hands of highly competent experts—testers and educators—free from all pressures of special groups and individuals.

The program which I have outlined would permit the strengthening of our Armed Forces as well as the continuance of essential education. In the assignment to national service, the individual's freedom of choice should be respected wherever possible. And it would in a great number of cases, I submit, since the desire of an individual is inextricably a part of his natural aptitude. Control, however, would be necessary to prevent large numbers of young men who, irrespective of their capacities, desire to take up arms. This has happened in every war. And, in every war, America has lost great numbers of young men whom the Nation should later have had as civilian leaders. The young man who, on the basis of conclusive tests, showed superior potentialities for a career in the science laboratory, in medicine, in dentistry, in languages, in teaching, in government, or in work in the skilled crafts, would have the opportunity for further classroom training in the interests of greater usefulness to the Nation during and after the conflict, while at the same time receiving military training.

Remember, if we fail to produce replacement crops of scientists and technicians, administrators, and humanists, our national health and welfare, our scientific progress, our material production, our cultural growth will be seriously impaired. While the educational cost to the Government might be large, it would be small in comparison with the loss the Nation otherwise would suffer.

The purpose of this proposal is to employ to the fullest degree possible the young manpower of this Nation, our most priceless possession, to the end that during and after the emergency we would continue to have an adequate group of leaders in the professions, occupations, and pursuits upon which our Nation must fundamentally depend in the maintenance of our way of life. We would also have the physical strength which we will sorely need for years to come. And further, in the interest of economy, we would be utilizing to the utmost the existing and available facilities of our institutions of learnings, institutions which have throughout our history been the strongest guardians of our freedom.

To be frank with you, I dislike intensely the idea of requiring anyone to perform service of any kind. Would that we lived in a world where such would never be necessary, but unfortunately we do not at this moment. We have had to have price and wage controls, priorities on basic materials. And, if we are to emerge victorious, we must during the current emergency have certain personnel controls. American youth must be asked temporarily by their fellow citizens to serve their country in the most effective manner so that the wellsprings of strength which virtually dried up in World War II will not again be impaired.

My proposal is the opposite of regimentation, which is so contrary to the American way of life. It is built upon the major premise of permitting the fullest possible development of an individual's capacities, consistent of course with the national welfare in the time of emergency. It aims to permit the maximum of education for those qualified therefor, but at the same time providing them with military training. It is not in the national interest for a boy obviously qualified for treatment of the sick or wounded to be assigned arbitrarily for a period of time to guard duty or to flying an airplane.

We are not doing business as usual today. We are in a serious emergency. It is a stepped-up, accelerated education and training about which I am talking, a realistic facing of needs, and of action appropriate to the needs. But on this stepped-up plane, we must allow a new business-as-usual attitude if our Nation is to survive the attacks from without and be strong from within. With this in mind, I have submitted my plan.

I appreciate sincerely the opportunity to discuss these important matters with such an intelligent citizenry and to develop more fully the views I presented to our faculty. You and I have but one interest—the preservation of our freedoms and the American way of life.

A Sordid Story of Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Ames Daily Tribune, Ames, Iowa:

GENERAL FILTER AND THE AIR FORCE—OR A BID IN THE HAND IS WORTH TWO IN THE BUSH—MAYBE

(By Bernie Kooser)

Winston Churchill had once said it something like this:

"Never have so many owed so much to so few."

Mr. Churchill was referring to Great Britain's beleaguered millions in the position of the debtor and to an air force as the creditor.

Last week as a small-business man from the Middle West boarded his plane for home after a week's visit to the Nation's Capital, Congressmen, taxpayers, and believers in governmental efficiency were phrasing it thus:

"Never have so few owed so much to so many."

TRUTH WANTED

In the position of the debtor was an air force. The commodity owed was truth as to why a low bid for Air Force demineralizers had been rejected. The small-business representative tiredly hurrying back to his business was Joe P. Lawlor, president of the General Filter Co., of Ames.

TARGET AIR FORCE

The Ames man, a veteran of both World War I and World War II, had operated in close support of the United States Air Force as a commander in the United States Navy, Civil Engineer Corps during the last war, but as he moved in on Washington, he was attempting to bring down to earth that same air force—and he found willing helpers.

Lawlor, who last month estimated that 50 percent of his business dealings have been with governments, had increased that percentage considerably in the 10 days he spent in Washington, as he talked with Representatives and Senators, newsmen, and all others—and there were scores—who would listen to his story.

That story included, if one may draw conclusions:

1. One of the best run-arounds since the epic chase of the monkey and the weasel around the mulberry bush.

2. Behind-the-scenes maneuvering on war contracts bids.

3. An apparent abandonment of the idea that to the low bidders—other things being approximately equal—go the contracts.

4. A hint as to how millions of dollars of defense money is being spent, or misspent.

FLYING SAUCER

Those who listened to the story told by the businesslike Mr. Lawlor also could find in it a hint that the United States does possess flying saucers several times faster than anything yet conceived by man.

There also was a tip-off that the United States Air Force, which was having troubles on the filter market, had itself developed a filter, apparently of revolutionary concept, which screened out and discarded lowest-cost bids while allowing bids more costly to the Government to pass through.

As he returned to Ames, Saturday afternoon, Lawlor was resigned to having lost the contract for 105 demineralizers for the Air Force, was proud of the newspapers and newsmen who had carried the story of his fight to get the contract.

That fight had included months of planning, research, analyzing, contacting suppliers, screening quotations, assembling data, making arrangements for testing and finally submitting, on November 13, 1950, a bid of $348,591, as compared to the bid of $409,842 which won the contract for another corporation.

The fight also was marked by General Filters careful following of regulation channels and rules for bidders on Government contracts.

But while he returned to Ames resigned to having lost the contract, the headman of the Ames firm was not reconciled to certain statements reflecting on his company, and he was not reconciled to the way the Government was spending money.

AID PROMISED

Behind him in Washington, D. C., he had left several who promised aid.

Senator GUY GILLETTE, the Democratic Iowa Senator, had promised to help.

In complete agreement with Senator GILLETTE was Republican Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER. Senator GILLETTE was on the Senate Small Business Committee and in position to level guns at the high-flying Air Force.

In the House, Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM had taken the floor to tell his colleagues:

"No satisfactory explanation has been given to the General Filter Co., of Ames, Iowa, as to why its bid was rejected. Explanations have been offered as a result of protests filed by the General Filter Co., of Ames, and each explanation is different than the previous one, and each one is just about as ridiculous and unfounded as the fact that $61,250 of the taxpayers' money was spent unnecessarily on a $350,000 to $400,000 contract. I have computed the amount of money lost to the taxpayers by rejecting the bid of the General Filter Co. and awarding the contract to the Rifinite Corp. of Omaha to be approximately 15 percent.

"Mr. Speaker, if all the contracts now being let, and to be let, by the Government are to be awarded on this kind of basis, it means that $150,000,000 out of every $1,000,000,000 will be an absolute loss to the taxpayers, or $1,500,000,000 out of every $10,000,000,000; $3,000,000,000 out of every $20,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000 out of every $100,000,000,000.

"Is it any wonder that the people are dissatisfied with the way the Government is handling its business affairs? Is it any wonder they are protesting additional taxes when they know things like this are going on? Just why, Mr. Speaker, when sealed bids are called for and a responsible company submits a bid, supported by a sufficient performance bond and proper financial statements, is such a bid rejected, and it awarded another company whose bid is 15-percent higher. Is this favoritism, or is it just plain stupidity?

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which reports many things, reported no answers to PAUL CUNNINGHAM'S question.

UNEASINESS

But there seemed to be an increasing uneasiness accompanying an increasing awareness by the Nation's lawmakers that all has not turned out well with legislation giving blanket authority to the President.

Most recent of the Executive orders resulting from that blanket authority had carried this illuminating paragraph in authorizing the Department of Defense to enter into contracts:

"Advertising, competitive bidding and bid, payment, performance or other bonds or other forms of security need not be required."

Several thousand words later, the Executive, apparently as after-thought, said:

"The provisions of * * * this order are hereby extended to the Department of Commerce."

It wouldn't have surprised lots of people had another paragraph made the order retroactive to the Civil War. But that may come later.

Still coming up in the case of General Filter and its bid is a hearing by the Senate Small Business Committee at which Lawlor will seek a retraction of the statement by the Air Force that the local firm did not have the facilities to handle the order for 105 mineralizers.

But though the full story of the case was discouraging to taxpayers, there were certain phases of it which might possibly be regarded as amusing if they had not been part of the whole. One of them concerned a telephone call made by Mr. Lawlor to Maj. W. C. Nichols, chief of section of the Procurement Field Office at Chicago. Mr. Lawlor asked the whereabouts of Albert King who was supposed to have been in Ames at the time of the phone call, inspecting facilities of the local company for Major Nichols.

Before the call was ended, King walked into the office of Major Nichols and was put on the phone.

A possible explanation of this is that King was transported back to Chicago from Wichita in time to talk to Lawlor and that this may be the tip-off that the United States does possess flying saucers capable of meeting just such schedules, but up to now used only in such emergencies.

As Lawlor today scouted around for other work for his company to do, he estimated that the unsuccessful attempt to secure the contract for demineralizers had cost his company about $3,000. It was agreed generally that it would be the best $3,000 ever spent if it could do anything to make government more efficient.

Manchester Boddy on the Struggle for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a part of the RECORD the thought-provoking article by Manchester Boddy in the Los Angeles Daily News of February 16, 1951. Manchester Boddy has an extremely broad grasp of the world situation, and although his penetrating analysis of our current troubles is not consoling, it does, I think, help us to face up to the basic problems. The article referred to follows:

GREAT DEBATE STIRS BROTH OF CYNICISM

The great debate continues. There is a wider gulf between former President Herbert Hoover and his fellow Republican, Gov. Tom Dewey, than ever there was between Democrats and Republicans in a national election.

While Herbert Hoover has changed his position somewhat since his so-called isolationist pronouncement of December 20, 1950, he is still opposed to sending masses of American land soldiers and huge quantities of things to Europe as the most effective means of stopping aggression by Russia.

Governor Dewey, on the other hand, speaks for a very large section of the Republican Party that believes the United States should consider Europe and Asia as front-line battlegrounds in the defense of the United States.

Listening to the debaters one gets the uncomfortable feeling that there are two sure ways in which the United States can commit suicide: one, by following Herbert Hoover's advice; the other, by not following it.

As usual, even the great debate with all of its implications is being studied by a relatively small minority of American citizens. The vast majorty assumes that the problems of the moment have been created by the blunders of irresponsible, stupid politicians.

These impatient people, annoyed by the inconveniences of a national emergency, like to do their duty by repeating over and over: "Aren't we all silly? Why don't the world leaders just sit down around a table and say: 'Come now, let's have peace.'" Or, they suggest some other bit of magic that could cure the world of its ills practically overnight if our leaders had the courage, or the sense, or the patriotism to act. "But," the talk goes on, "since they won't do the right thing, why should I be bothered?"

Constant criticism of the Government gives moral support to the citizen who wants to find an excuse for business, politics, and social life as usual. "After all," he argues, "if the people in Washington are all wrong, why should I be right? When the powers that be decide to run the Government and its foreign policies my way, they can count on my support—but not until then."

The wise individual, it seems to me, will think through and beyond the loud and convincing words of the current debate and seek a solid foundation of fact. If he succeeds, he will be able to measure the true value of speeches, editorials, radio comment, laws, policies, and actions dealing with the world crisis.

For what it is worth, here is an outline of my own thinking on the matter of our world crisis:

1. All nature is constantly seeking balance.

2. The relatively sudden advent and development of modern science has created a temporary state of terrific unbalance in the world:

(a) Western civilization did not expand the area of its growth. (b) World populations jumped from approximately 860,000,000 at the turn of the eighteenth century to more than 2,250,000,000.

3. Instead of using science to produce the means of survival for this new mass man, western civilization used it to destroy productive wealth:

(a) The last two world wars destroyed more wealth than all other wars combined.

4. Mass man could win his struggle for survival in only two ways:

(a) Using science to produce sufficient food, clothing and shelter, and (b) using a world organization through which injustices in

distribution of opportunities could be corrected and basic freedoms guaranteed, or

5. Western civilization could solve the problem by continuing warfare until world populations have been reduced to the point where people and earth are once more in balance.

6. After making the best efforts possible, considering the state of the world and the degree of wisdom possessed by its people, western civilization has been forced to adopt war, and preparation for war, as the means of insuring survival.

This being true, we may expect the years ahead to be filled with peril. The incessant, irresistible movement toward balance will be characterized by bloodshed, disease, abject poverty—and eventually the destruction of vast numbers of people.

The United States has enjoyed vertical growth and today towers high above the quivering, struggling population mass of the world. Can we maintain our position?

I find it worth while to study the great debate with that question in mind.

Dr. Lee de Forest, the Father of the Electronic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the President to award the Medal for Merit in the name of Congress to Dr. Lee de Forest, "The Father of the Electronic Age."

Congress established the Medal for Merit in 1942 to honor civilians who "distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services." Most awards of the medal were made before 1948 to honor those making particularly valuable contributions to the prosecution and winning of World War II.

A total of 404 persons have received the award, leaders in industry, government, and science. The most recent recipient was Ambassador John J. Muccio, who served as United States Ambassador in Seoul, Korea, through the evacuation. President Truman presented the Medal for Merit to Muccio at his historic meeting with General MacArthur in the mid-Pacific last fall.

It is my belief that the recognition extended to the scientists who developed the atomic bomb and radar should also be given to Dr. de Forest, who invented the three-electrode tube upon which radio, recording, radar, and even splitting the atom are based.

Modern living and modern warfare would be impossible without the contributions made by Dr. de Forest.

In 1906 Lee de Forest invented the audion, or three-electrode tube, first as the most sensitive radio detector known, later as an amplifier capable of amplifying infinitesimal electric currents by more than 100,000,000 times, and later as an oscillator, or generator of electric currents of any frequency up to 10,000,000,000 cycles per second—a generator destined shortly to replace every other type of radio—telegraph and telephone—transmitter. This promethean tube has been recognized by the highest authorities as the most important and most useful invention of the twentieth century—Nobel prize winner Dr. I. I. Rabbi describes the three-electrode tube as "so outstanding in its consequences that it ranks with the greatest inventions of all time."

Charles F. Kettering wrote:

> The spectacular growth of electronics to an enormous industry employing over a million workers and benefiting untold millions of people in all parts of the world may be said to have begun with that event—
>
> The creation of the tube.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, Nobel prize winner, wrote:

> The revolution—brought about by this tube—has been as great in its way as that which may now be envisioned in other fields through our new control of nuclear power.

This electronic amplifier of Lee de Forest has made possible all long-distance wire telephone, transoceanic radio telephony and picture transmission, facsimile, radio broadcasting, the public address system, the talking-motion picture, perfect recording and reproduction of phonograph music. Modern aviation and the automatic pilot would be impossible without it. Our guided missiles and the proximity fuse—the present rapid calculating machines for range finding—all attest its priceless value in warfare. Radar, loran, and sonar depend throughout on its magical aid. Even the atom bomb requires the tube in the manufacture of its ingredients. With it the engineer can now command the electron to do his bidding. For the first time he has a hold on electricity itself, not just its manifestations. The electron tube enables the scientist to split the atom, and measure the heat from stars infinitely distant, extending boundlessly man's knowledge of his universe.

Already this thermionic tube is at work in a thousand industries. It will enter thousands more. Electronic devices control highspeed wrapping of packages, delicately fill bottles to the proper level, remove slate from coal at the mines, level elevators, open doors, detect smoke and fumes, measure vibrations and thickness. In uncounted factories electronic energy heats, welds, cements, selects, and counts, saving man from limitless hours of tedious toil. A hundred technical institutes devote their resources to research and study in electronics.

Not content with the achievements of this promethean tube, Dr. de Forest devoted 10 years of his active manhood to the pioneer development of sound-on-film talking pictures. Years before the Jazz Singer film was heard, the de Forest phonofilm was installed in New York Broadway theaters, and in various cities over the East and South. He it was whose heroic efforts in the early twenties broke down the skeptical producers' insistence that "the public did not want motion pictures." Here was another instance of his heroic pioneering which has completely revolutionized another gigantic industry, just as the radio broadcast and television have totally metamorphosed our home life and the political thinking of every civilized people the world over. Dr. de Forest has been awarded many honors, among which are the Legion of Honor and Prix la Tour by France, the Elliott Cresson Medal of the Franklin Institution, the John Scott Medal of the city of Philadelphia, the gold medal of the Institute of Radio Engineers, of which he has been president and cofounder, gold medals of St. Louis World Exposition and Pan-Pacific Exposition, and the Edison Medal of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers. Honorary degrees have been conferred upon him by Yale University, Syracuse University, and the Lewis Institute of Chicago. He has been awarded nearly 300 United States patents.

Dr. Lee de Forest, now in his seventy-eighth year, is still busily at work on electronic problems in his Los Angeles laboratory, a hale and hearty American, universally honored for his priceless contributions to our modern living. He most richly deserves the honor which the here-proposed bill will confer upon him.

Will War Come in 1951?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in reading the mail that comes to me from the district and from throughout Arkansas, I find that many questions are asked which are most pertinent to the issues with which we are confronted. What are the chances of war with Russia? Will war come this spring or during the year 1951? Should the satellites, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, attack Yugoslavia, would that mean all-out war? These questions indicate the thinking of the American people; they are concerned about the danger which our Nation faces. They want to know what measures are being taken to protect our interests.

Should Moscow order a march on Yugoslavia, it would mean the start of world war III. There is little doubt about it. The Western Powers would join hands with Tito's forces in an all-out defense of that country in order to prevent the spread of the aggression to other countries in Europe. The United Nations would be appealed to for an immediate declaration of aggression against the satellite countries and, further, would ask for troop aid for Yugoslavia.

The steps that are being taken by America in the present crisis would provide only partial mobilization. Enough of an effort is being made which is intended to bring out unequivocally that this Nation means to prepare on a sound

basis to meet any threat which might ensue. The door is left open at all times to discuss fully with Russia a complete settlement of all differences which exist.

The Government of the United States is engaged in a long-range program of preparedness—not an overnight mobilization effort. Apparently the leaders in our Armed Forces set-up feel that the chances are better than a 50–50 proposition that Russia will not move in 1951. It is felt that to increase our forces to 3,500,000 is most desirable. The Air Force has moved up from 54 groups to 70 and is undergoing another expansion at this particular moment to a 96-group force. General Spaatz is urging a 300-group Air Force. This, in my opinion, is quite a bit optimistic.

More emphasis is being placed on providing a reservoir of trained men through the medium of universal military training. Under UMT the young man would enter the service of his country immediately upon completion of his high school course or upon attaining his eighteenth birthday, whichever is later. The idea is to give him 27 months service prior to his entering college or business.

The stockpile of atomic weapons being produced by the Nation is steadily increasing. This alone has been one of the principal factors in no aggressive move being made by Russia in the Middle East, Yugoslavia, Berlin, or Vienna. There are advantages in Russia moving this spring. Yet it is believed that the disadvantages outweigh whatever gains she might have by attempting to overrun Western Europe. The main deterrent to such an aggression by Russia is the known fact that should she start a war in Western Europe, every industrial center in Russia would be hit by atomic attack through the medium of the long range bombers which could be based at fairly close range.

There are many significant factors which attest to the futility of Russia's attacking in 1951. Among them are:

First. Russia could not win a long war with the United States.

Second. It would be unlikely for the Soviet Union to attempt a war in Europe while the Korean conflict is in progress.

Third. Russia's oil supplies are short.

Fourth. The Soviets are dubious about the reliability of the satellite nations.

Russia is strong today, and America is just beginning a real program of defense. To strike now would be tempting, as the industrial capacity of Western Europe or the Middle East oil resources would be prizes of major proportions. The gamble, however, is too big.

United States Needs Press Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bay Ridge Record:

UNITED STATES NEEDS PRESS AGENT

What this country needs is a good press agent, a competent man or woman who will publicise the power and the might and the ability of the United States.

The nearest we have come to this point in recent years is the series of stories that are coming out of Las Vegas, Nev. In truth and in fact these, stories, true or false, are enough to put real fear into the hearts of the communistic Russians and to make them think a dozen times before they tempt us to drop our bombs on Russian territory.

"Flash Seen 500 Miles Away"—"Explosions felt hundreds of miles from the testing grounds"—"Radioactive clouds hover at 11,000 feet over Sunrise Mountain." Power of such stories should not be underestimated. It is to be assumed the Russians have imagination and that they can visualize what would happen to their country if the bombs were dropped on Russia rather than in mere experiments in Nevada.

For too great a time we have had disgruntled people in the United States who constantly kick and gripe at everything, the taxes, the draft, the high cost of living, our foreign policy, the actions of the President, and scores of other matters and while there may be and doubtless is considerable basis for such discontent it would be far better, particularly at this time, to keep such thoughts and kicks to our individual selves.

It gives Russia much happiness to read and learn that there is so much apparent discontent here. It would be real smart if the people here would reverse their attitudes for the time being and have every man, woman, and child, start acting like high-priced, high-powered press agents for the United States. We receive little, if any, bad news about the Russians but we do hear enough to give us the impression that everything in Russia is hunky dory; that everyone is happy, well fed, and contented and able to take on the United States and the world at any time it wishes to do so.

Small Businesses and Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter sent to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] by Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

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

FEBRUARY 1, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Joint Committee on the Economic Report,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We are happy to reply to your letter of January 24, inquiring the reaction of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., to "the main recommendations made by the President in his Economic Report * * *."

First. The membership of the federation has expressed itself repeatedly in favor of balanced Federal budgets. Therefore, we feel safe in stating that they would favor a pay-as-you-go tax program. Their approval of such a program is contingent, however, on two factors: (a) That the weight of the tax load be not so great as to promote the same inflation as would follow from deficit financing; and (b) that the weight of the tax load be not so great, or so inequitably distributed, as to destroy small and independent business, whose continued vital existence is proof of the presence of freedom of opportunity and competitive enterprise in our country, and which can make such great contributions to national stability.

Your attention is called to the fact that during the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress, efforts which happily failed, were made by giant industry groups to "sell" Congress on a substitute for the proposed excess-profits tax law which would have burdened consumers, unincorporated businesses (which are mainly small and independent enterprises), and small and independent corporations very heavily, while permitting giant firms to get off with much lighter tax loads than under the excess-profits law (see copy of our testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, Dec. 8, 1950). These efforts would have gone far, had they been successful, to accomplish the damage to small and independent business outlined in the paragraph above.

In this connection we point out that small and independent enterprise is particularly susceptible to tax damage at this time because of the impact of the defense program, or, shall we say, the inequitable administration of this program. Letters are received by us daily from small and independent businessmen who have been foreclosed from their normal civilian production because of materials shortages. Yet these businessmen in many instances have not been able to secure compensating defense production orders. In face of these facts, they are having to contend with the inflationary upsurge which is continually raising their costs of operation. They are undergoing a squeeze, and any tax program which will add overheavily to their burden may destroy them and deprive the Nation of their needed services. Elimination of these small and independent businesses will deprive Government of an important source of tax revenue. In our opinion, the consequent expansion of giant enterprise to fill the gap will not provide sufficient tax compensation to overcome the revenue loss caused.

Also in this connection we strongly urge Congress to close the loopholes in present tax law. Our membership has recommended repeatedly that cooperative business enterprises be compelled to pay taxes in the same manner as their unincorporated and corporate enterprise competitors. We are conscious of the fact that differences in tax structures exist between unincorporated and corporate forms of business organization, that even within these forms of organization disparities exist. However, these differences, both external and internal, are not so great, neither are they so lethal, as those existing between unincorporated and corporate forms of business organization, on the one hand, and cooperative forms of business organization, on the other. It seems that a greater question than that of raising money for defense expenditures is here involved, and that that question is one of fair sharing of burdens. It is in this spirit that we recommend action on the tax loopholes available to cooperatives.

Second. It is the sense of our membership that economies can be effected by Government in both the defense and nondefense fields.

Defense-spending economies can be effected, first, through extension rather than contraction (as is now the case) in advertised-bids methods of procurement. The advertised-bid method of procurement permits

more widespread small and independent business participation in the defense production effort, strengthens the element of competition for Government procurement, and logically should result in lower costs for the military and lessened Government spending. Substitution of the advertised-bid method of procurement for negotiated-type procurement should effect great savings, particularly in highly concentrated industries, like steel, aluminum, copper, and rubber, where the tendency on the part of smaller firms is to conform to the price leadership of giant firms.

Greater use of small and independent business facilities in the defense effort should have other economy-making effects. First, it will eliminate the necessity for construction of additional big-business plants, which is a drain on stocks of short-supply materials, and in many instances on United States Treasury funds—either through direct Government spending or tax favors. Second, it should stimulate technological advances, resulting in the manufacture of better products for the same costs or products of equal quality at lower costs. Third, it should help eliminate wasteful build-up of backlogs in giant plants and wasteful use of manpower productive.

In this connection, members of the federation have recommended to their Congressmen favorable action on bills introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, House Small Business Committee chairman, and Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Senate Small Business Committee chairman, for establishment of a Small Defense Plants Corporation. These bills, with which Members of Congress are familiar, would, it is felt, establish an agency in Government which would be capable of providing the small and independent business participation in the defense program which is so badly needed.

Economies can also be effected in this defense effort by more willingness on the part of the military to listen to small and independent business suggestions. For instance, within the past few months, one of our members, a firm in the motor-vehicle-rebuilding field, suggested to the military that the recondition surplus World War II vehicles now in the hands of exporters and dealers for military and civilian defense use within the confines of the continental United States. This federation member suggested that such rehabilitation of these old vehicles could be accomplished at a fraction of the cost to Government of new vehicles. At the same time, it is logical to comment that this suggestion would curtail the drain on short-supply materials and release manpower for other tasks. Yet, so far as we have been able to determine, his suggestions have gone into the scrap basket somewhere along the line. We are sure that this condition has been repeated, and is being repeated, over and over again by the military in their procurement and spending program.

In this general connection we strongly urge that greater care be taken to secure appointment of bona fide small and independent business representatives in the various Government agencies supervising and consulting on the defense program, that the recommendations of presently existing bona fide small and independent business representatives in these agencies be given greater weight in the reaching of decisions. We are happy that such representation as does exist in these agencies does exist. But we know from practical day to day dealings that this representation is not adequate. And we know that this inadequacy is to a great degree robbing the fine small and independent business policies ordered by the administration and the Congress of much of their vitality.

In the field of nondefense spending, economies can be effected through curtailment or complete elimination of Government subsidy programs to business as well as to agriculture and of so-called social welfare programs. We are now entering on a period of high business activity and high wages and salaries promoted to a great degree by Government spending for defense. Government subsidies to agriculture, in the form of price support programs, seem dangerous and senseless, dangerous in the sense that they inject Federal competition with consumers, senseless in the sense that with high stabilized wages sufficient demand exists to care for farm output. Government subsidies to business are in the same category—for business activity is equally assured. The social welfare program—such as compulsory national health insurance and expanded security programs—seem equally unnecessary in this period of assured employment at relatively stable, high personal income. Briefly, at a time when the drain on the Federal purse is so great, what is the point in trying to help those who are able to help themselves?

Third, there is considerable opposition among our members to indirect controls such as consumer and business credit controls. However, our membership has indicated that the indirect controls are favored over direct price controls and wage controls and rationing. There is a considerable segment of our membership which feels that controls now existing in certain lines are useless since they do not go far enough, that they merely restate the conditions of sale which soundly operating independents had been imposing all along. Some feel that the controls have brought about some greater equality between giant and small and independent sellers. Others of our members who had complained of the dampening effect of the controls now state they are no factor in the demand situation, since materials shortages are dominant. In all this we strongly recommend that the Congress consider the fact that the controls as they exist are no deterrent on well-fixed consumers, of which there evidently are a considerable number, but that they definitely are a serious deterrent on lower wage groups whose actual needs are more real and more pressing than those of their financial betters.

Fourth, the Federation membership has voted time and again against Government price and wage controls and rationing. Generally it can be said that there is preference within limits as set forth in the preceding paragraph, for indirect controls. However, it may be significant to note that in 1947 only 15 percent of our members favored reimposition of price and wage controls, while in September 1950, 44 percent favored imposition of these controls. The big question, so far as small and independent business is concerned, on price and wage controls is that of administration. Surveys by this organization during mid-World War II revealed general small and independent business backing of such controls, but as time passed and regulations adversely affecting independent enterprise were enforced, this backing turned to opposition. This is a matter which might be given some deep consideration by those in the Price Stabilization Office who desire to limit black marketing (which we heartily despise) by freezing the channels of particular business vocations, evidently indiscriminately. In any event, personal contact with some of our members desiring direct controls indicates that they desire the controls across the board; in short, the feeling is that you can't regulate prices unless you regulate costs. How, logically, Government could regulate prices and wages without rationing, as much as it is despised, is a question we do not feel competent to answer.

Finally, we cannot urge too strongly the importance of a continuing, vigorous antitrust enforcement program to our Nation. Had such enforcement taken place in years past it is entirely possible that many of the dire shortages which now confront us and which are being used to plague both the Nation and small and independent business would not exist. Albeit, vigilant enforcement of these laws at the present will do much to preserve the vitality of small and independent enterprise and insure its continued ability to serve the Nation's needs. More than this, such enforcement will safeguard our American tradition of freedom of opportunity, which so sharply differentiates our Nation from the dictatorships whom we are fighting, and which makes our system such an inspiring beacon of hope to oppressed peoples all over the world. Our membership has voted time and again for continued, vigorous enforcement of these laws, and insists that now is not the time to discontinue such enforcement on specious pleas of war necessity by companies under prosecution. Periods of grave national emergency like this are traditionally times of great expansion on the part of giant enterprise. We must be on guard to insure that this expansion, as so easily could happen, does not occur at the expense unfairly of small and independent enterprise.

In this connection, we call your attention at this point to the fact that our vice president, George J. Burger, a member of the Business Advisory Committee to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has repeatedly stressed, in Business Advisory Committee meetings, the need for continuing vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws to bring about increased production. It is needless to belabor this sound point, since it is only necessary to recall to memory the deadening effect of monopolies and cartels on the productive resources of Europe and Asia.

We thank you for this opportunity to present our viewpoint to your committee, and assure you of our continued cooperation in any and all of your committee's important endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

C. WILSON HARDER,
President, National Federation of Independent Business.

A Distorted Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Philadelphia Bulletin:

A DISTORTED PICTURE—TRUMAN IS NOT THE SMALL, INCOMPETENT MAN HIS DETRACTORS WOULD PAINT HIM

(By Ralph W. Page)

A serious handicap to the effectiveness of the national effort in times of stress is our custom of deprecating our own chosen leaders.

Popular appraisal of public figures is based upon stereotyped descriptions incessantly broadcast by partisan political propagandists. These consist almost exclusively of detractions and belittlements.

The resulting picture is usually a distortion so absurd that it takes years for serious historians to dispel the muck and present a factual portrait.

This consistent defamation has applied particularly to our Presidents. The more capable they appear in retrospect, the greater was the intemperate abuse to which they were subjected when in office.

Grotesque and indecent representations and accusations were common currency against Washington, Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt.

Now it is the fashion to turn this customary flood of criticism and sneer upon President Truman. He is the chosen leader of our people carrying an impossible burden of choice in a dread crisis, unavoidably compelled to make decisions unpopular with one or another of our powerful conflicting factions.

SAME AMMUNITION ALWAYS USED

People who accept and retail the version of his detractors that he is a small, incompetent, uninformed mistake should reflect that precisely the same thing has always been, and would be, proclaimed about any conceivable man in the same position.

The bane, of course, is all-pervading politics. Opinion is not either realistic or objective. It is directed either by intent to influence future elections, or by particular protagonists whose personal interests are interfered with by the inevitable regulations of the crisis.

In a series of articles in the New York Times Arthur Krock, the dean of Washington correspondents—who usually doesn't agree with Presidential policy—has rendered the Nation a great service by stripping this veil of belittlement and presenting a reasonably true picture of the earnest, capable, studious, and purposeful captain of the American team, a captain who would enlist the support and consideration of the members if he were captain of any other kind of American team.

Take Your Choice, Buddy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged, for the second time, to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a Freedoms Foundation award editorial written by Charles Francis Coe, chief editorialist for the Perry newspapers of Florida. This editorial was published in the Palm Beach Post-Times, March 16, 1950, and won third place in the 1950 Freedoms Foundation awards. The editorial is a repeater as Mr. Coe won Freedoms first prize editorial award for the best editorial in the United States during 1949.

As long as I have an editor in my congressional district who writes such splendid editorials and obtains such recognition among the editorial writers of this Nation, then indeed it is a pleasure to ask the privilege of placing such editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a part of my remarks I include this editorial:

TAKE YOUR CHOICE, BUDDY

(By Charles Francis Coe)

Americanism: Trust in God; freedom of worship; government by elected representatives; trial by jury; human freedom.

Communism: Denial of God; worship of dictator; government by Politburo; "purge" by politicians; human bondage.

Here it is. Step right up, Mr. and Mrs. America. The curtain has risen. The big show is on. The chips are down. "You pays your money and you takes your choice." Americanism. Communism.

Take a good look at Mr. Enright's cartoon. Weigh in your mind the offerings shown on opposite pages of the ledger, as Uncle Sam points them out. Soberly, in deep conscience and impartial solemnity, make your choice. It is yours for the taking. Uncle Sam will follow your direction. You are the boss. He is your ready and able servant.

The citizens of Florida are given outstanding opportunity to make resonant over the whole world, the choice they determine. The issue is clearly laid for them. This Nation joins the civilized world in palpitant interest in that choice. That you may make it in the presence of Almighty God; that you may know the composure of duty honorably done, we attempt this brief inventory of the philosophies between which you must choose.

AMERICANISM

Places its trust in God, who created mankind and endowed it with powers to achieve His own image.

Declares that man has a soul, which deserves individual dignity and demands the freedom of self government.

Grants constitutional liberty with rights certain, among which are the pursuit of happiness, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the home.

Provides government by the governed.

Maintains courts created by the citizen. Grants trial by a jury of citizens.

Provides a fair trial for all men and demands immediate action against any accused.

Enforces education. Maintains public schools. Develops private enterprise. Rewards individual initiative. Accords the right of succession by will, but denies estates in tail.

Stands firmly upon the precept that all men are equal before the law.

Keeps its military accountable to the citizens. Governs by representatives chosen by the citizens.

COMMUNISM

Denies the existence of God and prohibits His worship.

Recognizes a supreme state, of which individual man is the vassal, not the master.

Sets up privileged classes under permanent rulers.

Scorns property rights, as it does human rights. Confiscates all, in the name of the state supreme.

Makes a mockery of law by "drumhead justice" and the murder of those accused for the convenience of dictators.

Purges humans in their search of freedom from bondage.

Permits humans to rot in dungeons while awaiting trial on trumped-up charges.

Denies education, except in the interest of the state.

Patterns the steps of the son in those of the father, so denying individual opportunity.

Invades the home without due process of law.

Governs by the dicta of rulers.

Centers all power in a dozen men. Denies men representation in their governance.

These are a few comparisons. Only a few. They are the roots from which the future will be grown. Americanism is the truest, the most dignified, the freest and the most productive plan ever devised for human liberty.

Communism is the most centered, dictatorial, ruinous blasphemy ever imposed upon the souls of men. It is human degradation in its concept; human bondage in its results.

Take your choice, buddy. The campaign now waging in our State of Florida gives you that choice. You have alternatives clearly defined, a choice inescapable. You take Americanism or you take communism.

May the God of the Republic abide with you as you choose.

Hindsight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a short article in Human Events by Frank C. Hanighen entitled "Hindsight," which in reality proves the prophetic foresight of many of our colleagues in the House of Representatives:

HINDSIGHT

The word "hindsight" comes readily, and inevitably, from the apologists of our foreign policy of the last 15 years. When a political administration errs gravely in its acts, what course is more obvious than to accuse its critics of being wise after the event? Unfortunately for the State Department spokesmen, a number of Members of Congress can produce their own prophetic speeches in re the Marshall plan, or the administration policy in China as an effective answer. Yet the cases of ECA and China are comparatively recent items in the long record of blunder. How about earlier, more fundamental mistakes, such as our affectionate embrace of the Russian bear in 1941 and following years?

There is, in fact, a splendid handbook which offers rich documentation—although the editor of the volume hardly anticipated such a use for his labors. The editor was none other than Mr. Rex Stout, now returned to the more grateful pursuit of "whodunit" fiction, but a decade ago one of the great proponents of a crusade against Hitler and a love affair with Stalin. The book was entitled "The Magnificent Dunderheads," published in 1942 at a time when so-called isolationists were even more fair game than now, and any Member of Congress who tried to talk sense to the public became per se an object of hate and ridicule.

Anyway, for the Magnificent Dunderheads, Mr. Stout provided a preface by Frank Sullivan, who was, may still be, a professional funnyman. In his prefatory remarks, Sullivan was alternately righteously angry and satirical at the "dunderheads." Quoth Sullivan: "The book is a collection of some of the silliest, stupidest, and most dangerous statements that have been made by men laying claim to being leaders of the American people." We would like to see the pans of Stout and Sullivan as they now read some of the "dangerous" statements from the Magnificent Dunderheads.

First, let us lead with Congressman Hamilton Fish, one of the major butts of this pair of elves. On August 5, 1941, he was guilty of the following: "I think the best thing that could happen on the vast steppes of Russia would be to have the Nazis and Communists continue to fight it out and destroy each other." Oddly enough, a certain Senator Truman, from Missouri, said much the same thing about the same time. But he is not quoted in the book.

Next, there was Representative JOHN VORYS, of Ohio, who (Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 13, p. A3917) said: "We know that peace is not made wisely in the flush of victory. For this reason we do not want to see the peace dominated by a triumphant Germany, or Russia, or Japan, or Britain. We can make peace better now when there is no victor." Simply killing, isn't it?

As for Senator Bennett Champ Clark, he dundered thus, on June 24, 1941: "Once we have crawled in bed with 'Bloody Joe' no restraints are possible on the spread of Com-

munist propaganda in this country. What profit is it to a God-fearing people to gain dominion over the earth in union with communism and lose our own souls? Why should American money, made by the toil and sweat of her taxpayers, be poured out to protect Russia?"

Then there was Representative Frederick Smith from Ohio who declared: "In defending Russia, the President is forcing our Nation to defend communism and everything that this hellish cult has done since it started in Russia 24 years ago." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 5, p. 5669.)

And Representative Mason, from Illinois, said: "One of these days the policy of collaboration with the totalitarian tyrant in Moscow is going to be revealed as one of the tragic mistakes of the era." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 7, p. 7543.) We note similar sentiments from Senator Wheeler, Congressmen Stratton, Robsion, James O'Connor, Jonkman, etc.

Now these ideas may still seem perfectly preposterous to Mr. Stout. But since those quoted who are still in Congress continue to say much the same things, one fact is certain, they are not guilty of hindsight.

Extract From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, Before Republican State Convention of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an extract from the address delivered by me before the Republican State Convention of Michigan on Saturday, February 17, 1951, at Detroit, Mich.

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

As a general proposition I am convinced it is well established that it is a constitutional duty of the President to consult the Congress with respect to policy for the use of troops unless the situation is so immediately critical that to spend time in consultation and debate might increase the national peril. When there is time, there ought to be consultation.

But in the so-called great debate now sporadically raging with respect to the use of our troops in Europe, it should be clearly remembered that the United States has continuously used our troops in Europe for more than 5 years since the end of World War II. Our military forces in Europe have even been used aggressively during this period as in the instance of the Berlin airlift. This use has been sanctioned by more or less general acquiescence of a bipartisan nature.

I am purposely eliminating a discussion of the President in connection with this point, because I strongly feel this should not be a political matter. We all have the common goal of preserving the peace. We must all join in attempting to arrive at a forceful American foreign policy tending to secure peace, shorn of all political consideration whatsoever.

In reality, what is now being debated is whether or not the judgment of our military high command is sound in seeking at this time to increase the number of our troops employed in the European theater. This is not a matter of foreign policy; actually it is interference with due military procedures and military estimates of the over-all situation.

The men in charge of our Military Establishment are substantially the same group of generals who were responsible in World War II in the European theater for the greatest military success in the history of the American people. There is no reason to suppose that either their patriotism or their military judgment at this hour of grave crisis are less valuable or less dependable than they were at that other great time of crisis during World War II. And if they are, and I am sure they are, it would seem to be unwise to attempt to interfere and hamstring them now in the exercise of their judgment of what is best in a military way for the protection of this country. In World War II their judgment was completely trusted. It is necessary that they be trusted on this decision unless we propose to permit a nonmilitary branch of the government to fix arbitrary limits within which the military branch may be permitted to exercise their discretion.

We have been assured by the military high command that the purpose of more troops for Europe at this time is to make world war III less inevitable.

We all realize that world war III, if it comes, with all its terrible means of annihilation, will destroy victor and vanquished alike.

We also know that as a result of demobilizing our troops at the end of the shooting in World War II, without securing the peace, by permitting Russia to build a vast military machine while we have allowed ours to deteriorate, that we face the most serious crisis in our history.

The immediate problem is not how to be strong enough to win world war III. But how to be strong enough to prevent world war III from taking place as a consequence of the tremendous disparity right now between Russian military might and our own.

Getting Western Europe on our side, and, even more, denying it to the Russians, is a vital United States interest.

It is wrong to say, "The Europeans aren't doing enough, let's pull out."

It is equally wrong to retort, "The Europeans are doing fine, so let's help them."

It is correct to say, "The Europeans are not doing enough. Neither are we. Let us urge them to do more, and do more ourselves—because all our lives depend upon what happens."

The crucial necessity at this time is for the United States to regain the initiative. So long as Russia has the initiative (and she has had it for the past 5 years) war is inevitable. Because Russia will continue the policy of aggression that has characterized her continuous action since World War II. If, on the other hand, the United States can regain the initiative, we may be able to avert another war by channeling the energies of the world, and particularly of the free peoples of the world, into peacetime pursuits.

We can never gain the initiative merely while waiting for the Europeans to act. If they believe our policy is to wait until they are attacked before committing troops to help them, they will hold off. They dread, of course, another war upon their own soil. They will join us, but they will not lead us. We must lead them. But above all else we must follow the judgment of our military advisers as to what is necessary to be done in a military way in this situation. We have been advised that it would be a fatal mistake to arbitrarily limit our military leaders in the exercise of their best and considered judgment.

In the debate on European policy, the area of agreement is greater than the area of disagreement. Almost all the leading figures in this debate concede the necessity of more troops to Europe. They differ on limitation of number. In this phase of their argument I feel they are clearly wrong, because that decision is a military decision and not a civilian one.

But since the debate has tended to divide the country into camps; and to confuse our people with respect to the essential character of the problem, I feel that the President of the United States at this time can render a tremendous service to the American people by doing something specific to insure the constant and consistent formation of a bipartisan foreign policy. Then the debaters will have no excuse for ranging themselves along party lines. On the other hand they will be obliged to commit their arguments solely to the basis of how to best unify the country and to build up a bipartisan policy. Such a policy at this critical juncture will command both the respect and the support of the American people. All the best efforts of both parties should be directed to that end.

South Dakota Newspaper Poll on Foreign Policy and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think Members of Congress will be interested in the results of a recent poll conducted by the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a daily newspaper which is the largest of its kind in a great five-State area of the upper Midwest.

The results of this poll indicate rather clearly that the citizens of this country have some definite ideas of their own concerning the problems which have grown out of the collapse of our American foreign policy and the tendency to permit the palace politicians in the White House to usurp or exercise the authorities of Government which the Constitution clearly reposes in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

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

VERDICT OF POLL: LEAVE KOREA—MAJORITY FOR KEEPING TROOPS HOME

Withdraw from Korea. Keep American troops at home. Foreign nations should supply the bulk of United Nations armed forces.

That's the consensus of 3,453 Argus-Leader readers who voted in this newspaper's United States foreign policy poll.

The majority of readers also are against drafting 18-year-olds, don't want the A-bomb rejected as a weapon of war, don't want the A-bomb dropped now, and don't want to continue sending substantial aid to foreign countries.

GOOD REPRESENTATION

The number of readers who sent in completed ballots is considered an excellent representation of opinion on important questions, particularly when compared with ballot returns of the Chicago Daily News and the Detroit Free Press.

These two papers, the News, with a circulation of 560,000 and the Press with 460,000 circulation, received only 3,347 and 4,109 ballots respectively from the same poll.

The Argus-Leader, with a circulation of 33,500, collected 3,458 votes, an overwhelmingly greater percentage of reader participation than was evidenced in the two larger papers.

Results of the Argus-Leader poll are being forwarded today to Senators KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE, and Representatives HAROLD LOVRE and E. Y. BERRY.

LETTER FROM EDITOR

To each of these Senators and Representatives, Fred C. Christopherson, editor, wrote an accompanying letter which stated:

"The Argus-Leader just has concluded a poll among its readers on various aspects of American policy.

"When the poll was announced it was explained that the votes would be tabulated and the results forwarded to the South Dakota Members of Congress so that they could study this expression of sentiment in connection with their own deliberations.

"In accordance with that promise I am enclosing herewith a copy of the final tabulation of the poll, as published in the Argus-Leader today.

"You will note that the vote was abnormally heavy—far larger than usually obtained in such polls. This suggests a deep interest in the subjects.

"Our readers would like very much, I am sure, to have comments from you on the poll generally and the specific topics included in it. I am hopeful, therefore, that each of you will be kind enough to forward to the Argus-Leader, as promptly as possible, a statement for publication on these matters."

As soon as those statements are received, Christopherson said, they will be presented to the readers of the Argus-Leader to allow them to study the reaction of our Members of Congress.

How the readers voted

Percent		The questions	Actual vote	
Yes	No		Yes	No
78	22	Should we withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible?	2,667	755
27	73	Should we stay until we can give Korea a government chosen by its people?	870	2,328
14	86	Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on reprisals?	450	2,822
25	75	Should we reject use of the A-bomb as a weapon of war?	828	2,451
30	70	Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries?	938	2,269
27	73	Should we draft 18-year-olds?	918	2,518
21	79	Should we send American troops to Europe?	727	2,663
89	11	Should nondefense spending be cut drastically?	2,902	395
18	82	Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	579	2,654
92	8	Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of U. N. armed forces?	3,006	268
79	21	Should we simply defend our outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home?	2,655	722
74	26	Should we have stiff price and wage controls?	2,358	797

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have read a great deal recently about investigation of the RFC, its directors, and the transfer of correspondence between RFC files and the White House. I simply take this opportunity to make the public statement that the President is welcome to publish in every newspaper in the United States every letter I have written to the RFC during the past 16 years. There is nothing there of a confidential nature. I am delighted to know this investigation has been and is being made, and I think we ought to clean house down there, generally speaking.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Washington-Lincoln Celebration, Frederick, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, last Saturday evening, February 24, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] delivered a very excellent and enlightening address upon the occasion of the meeting of the Washington-Lincoln celebration of the Republican clubs of Frederick County at Frederick, Md. I know this speech is of great interest not only to the people of Maryland, but to the people of the United States generally, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

I deeply appreciate the high honor of addressing this meeting of patriotic Americans who are loyal to the principles of the Republican Party.

It is an honor and a privilege to come to the Free State of Maryland and to tell you of my high regard and admiration for your Republican United States Senator and your Republican Members of the House of Representatives.

The great Republican victory of last fall was a real tribute to their Americanism and their devotion to public service.

During the last 4 years the Republican members of your delegation have been attending the luncheon meetings of Pennsylvania's Republican delegation. That has given me an opportunity to know the splendid caliber of the men who represent your State in Congress.

It is a sincere pleasure to report that your distinguished Senator, JOHN BUTLER, has already become recognized as one of the strong men of the Senate. He is taking an outstanding part in the battle for sound American principles.

I need not tell you how much we value the vigorous and courageous services of your Republican Congressmen, BEALL, MILLER, and DEVEREUX. You know them as great patriots and great Americans and as fighters for our country and our flag in peace and war.

The people of Maryland are to be congratulated on having Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin as their Governor. He became a national figure when he won on American issues. His election points the way to greater Republican victory in the national election of 1952.

We are assembled to honor the memory of George Washington, the military genius of American independence, and Abraham Lincoln, a plain man of the people, who preserved the Union.

Historic Frederick is a most appropriate place to pay tribute to the illustrious achievements of these greatest of all Americans. Each in his day was called by destiny to serve God and humanity.

We honor all that is truly American when we assemble each year in the month of February to observe the birthday anniversaries of Washington, our first President, and Lincoln, our first Republican President.

In Pennsylvania we look upon the fine people of Maryland as good neighbors. We know that so much of the spirit of America has gone into the building of your State. We share your pride in its glorious history.

Like Pennsylvania, Maryland is the home of many faiths and creeds, living in tolerance and good will. Three hundred years ago the Provincial Assembly passed the Maryland Toleration Act which has been described as one of the great landmarks of religious liberty.

Many events worthy of patriotic commemoration were enacted within your borders. Thomas Johnson, a member of the Continental Congress and later your first State Governor, nominated George Washington for commander in chief of the continental armies.

The Continental Congress was in session at Baltimore in December 1776, when it granted General Washington full military powers for the prosecution of the war for independence. Seven years later, when Annapolis was the temporary National Capital, Congress received Washington's resignation as the military leader of the new Nation.

As we turn back the pages of history we recall that among the first settlers of old Frederick Town were 100 German families, who came down from Pennsylvania. They were sturdy, hard-working, God-fearing men and women. Their descendants, both here and in Pennsylvania, represent all that is best in American citizenship.

We recall the great westward migration over the National Road, much of it passing through Frederick and across the mountains to open new frontiers of American progress.

We recall General Braddock and his British regulars stopping here to prepare for his ill-fated expedition against the French and Indians at Fort Duquesne.

In Lincoln's time the great internal upheaval tore at the heart of Maryland. Brave sons of Maryland fought with equal valor on both sides of the conflict.

Twice occupied by Confederate forces, Frederick endured its share of war's hardship and tragedy. After the battles of South Mountain and Antietam the women of Frederick worked side by side, caring for the wounded of both armies, no matter whether their sympathies were with the blue or the gray.

Names which loom large in the history of our Nation are associated with Frederick. Francis Scott Key won immortal fame as he watched "o'er the ramparts" at Fort McHenry and was inspired by the sight of the flag to write our National Anthem. Roger Brooke Taney rose from the practice of law here in Frederick to become John Marshall's successor as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Familiar to every school boy and girl is the legend of Barbara Fritchie and her defiance of Gen. Stonewall Jackson as she waved the Union Flag from her window.

I have discussed these high lights of history because memories of the heroic past enrich our patriotism. They stimulate a deeper appreciation of the freedom we enjoy through the toil, struggle, and sacrifice of our forefathers.

In these days of crisis, when the future of freedom in the United States and in the world hangs in the balance, we can find

guidance in the virtues of Washington and Lincoln.

Today our Republic faces a crisis just as grave and just as challenging as it did in 1776 and 1861. The basic issue confronting us is the preservation of freedom and peace in the United States and in the world.

We face a well organized, well prepared and well disciplined enemy who knows no truth, no honor, no justice, and no God. His weapons are lies, deceit, treachery, and force.

The time has come when the American people must know the plain truth. "We the people" are the American Government—not the President, not the State Department, not the Congress, not the courts—but "We the people."

Our objectives and our foreign policy must be set forth in the language the people can understand.

Within the limits of security they have a right to know the obligations we have undertaken in secret agreements. We know that much of the trouble we face today is the result of secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. We know also that one of the men who influenced those agreements was disloyal to our country.

It is not my purpose tonight to review the terrible mistakes, the glaring blunders and the confused bungling of the past. But it is pathetic to look back only 5 years and to realize that in that short period we have dissipated and squandered so much of the strength that made us the most powerful Nation of all time.

And when the Communist forces of aggression launched their brutal invasion of South Korea we were totally unprepared, even though nearly $50,000,000,000 had been appropriated to prepare for such an emergency.

The American people are aroused. They are fully aware of the dangers forced upon us by Communist aggression. They are prepared to make every sacrifice demanded for the defense of the American way of life. They are ready to fight to the death to preserve their rich heritage of liberty and independence.

All they ask is leadership. In this hour of peril they want leadership in which they can place their full trust and confidence.

They look in vain to Washington for leadership that will rise above deception, double talk, and the shifty trickery of the machine politician.

They look for leadership that will respond, honestly and sincerely, to the overwhelming demand for the strictest economy in Government spending not related to national defense.

We Republicans are not alone in that demand. It comes also from patriotic Democrats. Every right-thinking American sees danger of national bankruptcy in the determination of the Truman administration to continue its reckless and extravagant spending for nonessential purposes.

In the face of a great national emergency, and with the greatest debt ever carried by any nation in the history of the world—a debt which might destroy us—President Truman has ignored the demand that domestic spending be reduced.

His budget for 1952 recommends spending for nonmilitary purposes of over $80,000,000,000.

That is an increase of more than $6,000,000,000 over this year's figure.

And furthermore, the budget is loaded with all the excess baggage of the Truman administration's socialistic programs which have been rejected by one Congress after another.

Let me remind you that President Truman, in his state of the Union speech, made this statement, and I quote:

"The Government must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

I charge that President Truman violated that pledge when he included in his budget such dangerous and extravagant proposals as the Brannan plan, to regiment agriculture at a cost of billions of dollars, the vicious scheme to socialize the practice of medicine, the outrageous proposal to place education under Federal regulation, and other socialistic schemes which would restrict freedom of the individual.

My good Jeffersonian Democrat friend, the able and distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD, had this to say about Mr. Truman's budget, and I quote:

"In my experience of 18 years, considering the perils that confront our country, this message represents the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

With all the sincerity at my command I submit that this is no time for fiscal irresponsibility or any other nonsense, on the part of those at the head of our Government.

I repeat, the American people want leadership to which they can safely entrust the security of the Republic.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the White House.

We do not have that kind of leadership in the State Department.

That, my fellow Americans, is one of the reasons why our people are worried, confused, and perplexed.

In considering our problems it seems to me we should direct our aims toward four essential elements of our national strength—military, industrial, financial, and spiritual.

We must not be swayed by emotion or hysteria. We must remain cool. We must resist the call of the demagogue. Our decisions must be based on sound, hard, common sense. Name calling has no place in our present critical situation.

One of the big problems is whether the President is authorized to send troops outside the United States. While that may be a question for constitutional lawyers, yet the people are vitally interested and gravely concerned in the decision.

I have the greatest confidence in our military, naval, and air force leaders, but the sending of troops to Europe is only a part of the problem. It is not entirely a military issue. It involves economics, diplomacy, and leadership for peace. Sending divisions to Europe may open the door to war.

It seems to me the President should desire the advice of Congress because Congress is the direct representative of the sovereign will of the people.

Government that ignores the will of the people will degenerate into dictatorship.

I should like to offer, in brief outline, some steps which, to my mind, should be taken for the preservation of freedom and peace in the world.

1. We should develop the greatest potential military strength the world has ever known. Reserve military power must be provided by universal military training. There must be no exceptions.

Every American must have military training. In that way he will become a better American. He will learn how to protect himself under conditions of hardship and danger. He will learn that he has an obligation to his comrades and to the flag.

2. We should have the most powerful navy and the strongest air force in the world. American supremacy on the sea and in the air might preserve peace in the world.

3. The ground forces should consist of a small Regular Army. It should be the fastest, the best trained, and with the greatest fire power of any army in the world.

4. We should have enough Regular Army officers selected by merit to instruct the men of universal military training age and aid in the training of the Reserve components.

5. A military and economic survey should be made of the whole situation. We should know the extent to which the other free nations are willing to sacrifice in defense against Communist aggression. We should have a complete understanding that they will stand by their commitments.

We should know the strength of our enemies and particularly the morale of their people.

With this information we can arrive at intelligent decisions as to how we can defend ourselves.

6. We must place in high gear all of the great productive capacity of the United States, industrial and agricultural. Our production of planes, ships, tanks, munitions, equipment, and food must surpass any of our past outstanding records.

7. We must do everything possible to save manpower. Wars are won by men, not by machines or appropriations. We must cut down unnecessary personnel in government, in industry, and even in the armed services.

For example, the Federal Government has been increasing its payrolls by 1,000 employees a day. That is equal to a battalion of infantry. In 150 days we have increased the Federal employees by a number equal to the total of our Armed Forces in Korea.

If war comes, every man saved hastens the day of peace. We must avoid strikes and slow downs. The soldier who goes a. w. o. l. is frowned upon by his comrades. One absentee worker in war production may deprive a soldier of a rifle, an overcoat, or an emergency ration. It may also mean a military casualty.

8. We must have economy in government. We must eliminate or drastically reduce every function not related to national defense, including services which may be desirable. We must have sound fiscal policies which will preserve the value of the dollar against the destructive power of inflation. Even though we defeat Communist aggression in battle, our freedom can be lost if our country is plunged into financial collapse.

The strongest line of defense against inflation includes economy in government, a balanced budget, adequate taxation, and restriction of credit.

If we have economical government we can lower the tax burden. Therefore, in all levels of government we must have sentinels on the ramparts, on the quarterdecks, and in the cockpits who make economy the watchword.

9. We must have none but loyal Americans in government, in our industries, our schools and colleges, and in our churches.

10. Every American should be a part of civilian defense. Our provisions for the education of our children and the protection of the health and safety of our people must be the best that can be conceived.

11. The United States must never depart from its historic position as a leader for world peace and disarmament. While we cannot take our guard down we must not abandon hope that we can have peace. We must win the cold war of propaganda so that the world will know that the United States has no plan for aggression or conquest.

Before we commit Army divisions into any part of the world we must give careful thought to the possibility that it will be considered aggression on our part.

12. Finally, let us, by our example of right living and by obeying the laws of God and man, show the world that the American system has given more of the good things of life to more people than any other form of government ever conceived.

Let us live in peace, righteousness, and good will, doing our full duty as Americans.

In conclusion I would like to quote the words of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. In his famous Farewell Address, Washington admonished the people of the young Republic that religion and morality are indispensable supports of political prosperity—the great pillars of human happiness.

"Observe good faith and justice to all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all," Washington said.

In an address at Springfield, Ill., Abraham Lincoln expounded a lesson in right living which gives new patriotic inspiration with every reading.

I quote from Lincoln's speech as follows:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his posterity swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate, in the least particular, the laws of the country, and never tolerate their violation by others. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice."

We can strengthen our country if we all resolve to live by the precepts of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

In a country blessed like the United States there should be no law evasion.

There should be no racketeers lurking in the dark shadows of the criminal underworld. There should be no black markets, no profiteering, and no tax dodging.

Everyone should accept personal responsibility to maintain the highest standard of honesty in our dealings with one another. The strong should realize that each of us is his brother's keeper.

We must have a moral and spiritual rearmament in the United States. Our churches should be filled with people who love God and realize that individual liberty and the dignity of man are the greatest gift to mankind—that they are God given.

We should be organized in strong battalions willing to go out and teach to the world the blessings of peace and good will.

If we are strong enough in the faith and patriotism of Washington and Lincoln and strive in our daily lives to exemplify the American way of life, we can overcome threat of war and bring peace to the world.

Son Dies in Korea; "Why?" Asks His Dad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Son Dies in Korea; 'Why?' Asks His Dad," published in the Rochester Times-Union of Rochester, N. Y., on December 12, 1950.

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

SON DIES IN KOREA; "WHY?" ASKS HIS DAD

"Where does the responsibility for this whole nasty mess (in Korea) rest?"

That's the question asked—and answered—by the father of a central New York marine who died in action in Korea November 29.

The father, W. J. Corwin, was an assistant professor at the University of Minnesota College of Agriculture until 1929, when he moved to New York to farm. His son was Master Sgt. Mac R. Corwin.

The letter, to the Syracuse Post-Standard, says:

"This afternoon, Mrs. Corwin and I received a wire that our son was killed in Korea on November 29.

"Now, this is no harder for us to bear than for thousands and thousands of other parents. But right now I want to call attention to one question: Where does the responsibility for this whole nasty mess rest? It is easy to say, 'In Moscow.'

"But is it?

"In my opinion, it rests not with our President, not with the State Department, and not with any particular individual or group or class of individuals, but with me, with you, and every mature voter in this great United States. They are the ones who have the death of our boys in Korea on their heads tonight.

"There will be more tomorrow night.

"When so many voters fail to vote or see to it that only the best qualified, high caliber men are chosen and delegated to do our work as we want it done, there are always plenty of misfits, cheap politicians, and gangsters standing ready to slip in and very adroitly take over.

"When we, the public, wake up, the damage is done and your son's and my son's lives are sacrificed to the voter's indolence and failure to choose and keep strong, qualified, fearless men on our job, men able and willing to kick all quislings out as soon as spotted.

"Yes; such men are scarce and the entangling meshes of money and influence are great but the power of an aroused, demanding electorate is more powerful. We have the power and the privilege today, but unless the voters use that power and transmit their demands to our present employees in the White House and Congress, soon more homes will get that sad message and more American boys will die from American-made materials while the men in Moscow smile at our gullibility.

"Now is the time to act and write your Senator and Congressman.

"W. J. CORWIN."

MEXICO.

Proposed Amendment of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act. These include editorials from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Providence Journal, and the Galveston Tribune, and the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 22, 1951]

END THESE DELAYS IN DRAFT DECISIONS

Week follows week in Washington with plenty of argument but no action on the vital problem of military manpower. Both House and Senate committees still have a week or 10 days of hearings.

Raising a little more than 3,500,000 men by June 30 of this year demands early decisions. There are not 5½ months remaining to whip legislation for national—universal—training and service into shape and get it into operation.

Fateful questions press for prompt dispositions. Our problems of national safety and survival have become insistent.

With Russia building a war machine even more mighty than the huge one it has maintained since the end of the Second World War, the controversial issue in America of drafting 18-year-old boys cannot be permitted to stall the whole manpower program.

The question is whether, by excluding the 18-year-olds, we could raise 3,500,000 men or anything like that number, by June 30. It is recognized that leaving them out of the present draft would be a seriously limiting condition, in conjunction with the exclusion of veterans, sweeping rejections for disability, and various deferment loopholes.

These matters must be considered dispassionately and with appreciation of the urgency of the Nation's needs in the face of illimitable perils. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall has stated the case about drafting 18-year-olds in well-weighed terms in his explanation that under the service and training program "virtually every able-bodied man would be inducted at 18 and given 4 to 6 months of basic training; after that some would be sent to college and some would finish out their term in one of the armed services."

The question for Members of Congress and just plain citizens to answer for themselves is whether adequate defenses of America can be established without 18-year-old recruits. The cold statistics regarding the manpower pool under the present draft say that the job cannot be done without taking in the younger soldiers.

But it isn't the whole job. Top military leaders, returning from the Far East, declare it is more than likely that our defense forces will have to be enlarged much above the currently proposed figure of 3,500,000.

Congress should be looking now toward that possibility. It has to consider—whatever the size of our manpower demand—the importance of preserving, so far as it can be done, the supply of workers in agriculture and industry without which tremendously increased programs of production in both fields cannot be realized. Early attention should be given, in whipping new draft legislation into shape, to drafting also large forces of men not physically acceptable for combat duty and using them for the innumerable bookkeeping and housekeeping jobs of the Armed Forces.

We don't have to scan the unhappy stories of fighting in Korea to realize the need for larger forces of capable combat troops. We had to create them in the Second World War—sometimes on the fields of battle. We've always had to improvise them, spending months getting them equipped and ready.

No one can possibly cherish the idea that Russia would give us time to build up and train our fighting men. But the democratic process of discussion—so long protracted—has lost enormously valuable time. Both Congress and the administration are to blame for this.

The situation should be immediately corrected. Washington must reach proper decisions and translate them into action swiftly on the basis of this unassailable condition: The United States must have, as rapidly as it can be procured, a powerful defense force, well trained, fully equipped, and backed up by vast production of food and weapons. While we delay we invite war. The sooner we act the better our prospects of preserving peace, or at any rate, ourselves, will become.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 18, 1951]

DRAFT ALTERNATIVES

Support by two of the Nation's leading educators for the plan to draft 18-year-olds for a period of training and military service serves to focus the argument on the real issue of the military manpower question.

Nobody likes the idea of drafting 18-year-olds, and particularly of sending them abroad, if the need should develop. We don't like to take them out of school or jobs, and we don't like the idea of sending young men—who seem to their elders to be mere boys—off to learn to be soldiers or sailors.

But the alternative, as Karl Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harold Dodds, president of Princeton University, told a Senate Committee, is to draft older men. This might mean taking veterans, or family men, or both.

Our big problem is to make sure we have the military strength necessary to face the present emergency. As long as there is no all-out war we must get the manpower with the least possible dislocation to homes and careers. We must prepare for a long emergency by insisting that all young men get at least basic training, even if they are sent back to school for training in the technical and scientific skills we need. And it is important that those physically or mentally unqualified for service be given compulsory jobs to aid defense.

Those are the principles indorsed by educators whose own institutions would be seriously affected by the proposed draft. They deserve sober consideration by Congress in deciding on a military manpower program.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 12, 1951]

UMT WOULD STABILIZE OUR MILITARY FORCES

Defense Secretary George Marshall's proposal for compulsory military training and service of 27 months for all men reaching the age of 18 makes a heap of sense. It would, as he put it so succinctly, "give us a durable layer of military protection that would survive the alternate moods of public alarm or complacency."

We have never had universal military training in this country, the traditionalists will promptly note. And the realists must reply, this country has never been prepared to meet a war emergency. In past wars, fortunately, we have been able to buy enough time to build adequate military forces. But in this age of supersonic planes and atomic weapons the next gamble with a lack of trained manpower could prove fatal.

"We must not," said General Marshall, "continue to make short-term plans for immediate emergencies to be followed by abrupt demobilization and the withdrawal of authority to train the men necessary to a reasonable posture of defense."

It may be argued that 27 months is too long a time to ask the Nation's youth to sacrifice in the cause of preparedness. But this objection is met in a provision that "when emergency abates the President would have the right to reduce or eliminate service requirements on a uniform basis for all inductees and all services. Training requirements of 4 to 6 months would remain, but the President could modify the type of training."

In other words, every youth sound in mind and body would be required to take basic military training for not more than 6 months. After that active service in the Regular Armed Forces could range from zero to 23 months at the discretion of the President on the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Provision would be made to keep the educational pipelines open. Eighteen-year-olds would be allowed to graduate from high school before being called for training, provided graduation was prior to the nineteenth birthday. Those who started a college year before the eighteenth birthday would be permitted to finish the year. The President would be authorized to suspend temporarily the active service of up to 75,000 students so they could complete college training important to the national interest, following which they would owe the Government 23 months of service. Another 50,000 in active service would receive college training on military scholarships.

The Marshall plan represents a departure from the administration's pre-Korea UMT proposals, which would have provided brief sugar-coated military training separate from the Regular Military Establishment.

It recognizes that the Nation is going to have to raise military manpower either through the draft, which now takes those between 19 and 26 for 21 months and is turned on and off as the world situation changes, or through universal training and service aimed at a stabilized flow of manpower.

Of the two courses, we much prefer the latter. It would give assurance both at home and abroad, where our major allies have long had similar programs, that we will not continue to fluctuate dangerously between mobilization and demobilization. It seems to us a conscientious and realistic effort to meet our present and future military manpower needs with a minimum of sacrifice.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of January 15, 1951]

UNIVERSAL SERVICE

It should be understood at the outset that the universal military service and training program outlined to a Senate committee by Secretary of Defense Marshall and his assistant, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, is long-range in character—10 years at least—and not merely for the immediate emergency.

This is in line with Secretary Marshall's fundamental thinking on military manpower in a volatile democracy. The program is designated, in Secretary Marshall's words, "to train the men necessary to a reasonable posture of defense" in order to eliminate, in Mrs. Rosenberg's words, "the peaks of panicky rearmament in periods of emergency and the valleys of post-haste demobilization when the situation eases."

The problem before Secretary Marshall was twofold: One, military, how to secure an enlarged combat force for the emergency and a continuing base for military strength for defense; two, economic, how to secure these forces with the least harm to the Nation's productive power and without sacrifice of medical, scientific, and technical skills necessary for future balance and leadership.

Secretary Marshall, as a seasoned soldier and statesman, understood, when tackling the problem, that our people are hot for building a gigantic military establishment when emergency breathes down their backs (witness Governor Dewey's recent speech) and then for disbanding it as speedily when a pause comes and the gigantic standing army is literally standing around at tremendous cost to the taxpayers. Moreover, a moral rot sets in among the soldiers themselves when the purpose of their military life is vague and indistinct.

Therefore, the proposal is to call youths of 18 into service for 27 months—4 to 6 in basic training and the rest in regular military service—and then to pass them into the National Guard or Organized Reserves. The Marshall proposal differs from the Conant-Wriston plan primarily in that it offers greater flexibility in officer training in colleges and wider deferments for specialized training in medicine, science, and technology. The principle of universal service for 18-year-olds is the same.

Through this steady and consistent flow, it is anticipated that the Military Establishment will get manpower for immediate emergency needs and also will be building an ever-growing reserve that will be the backlog and bulwark of our armed strength and preparedness over the years.

It is argued reasonably that 18-year-olds (they probably would not enter for 4 or 5 months beyond their birthday) are for the most part not married and without children and that family life would not be disturbed; that they are at the turn from high school to college; that they have no roots sunk and have not entered into permanent vocations; that the domestic, financial, and emotional shock would be less for a boy of 18 than an older person; that they can be trained with a minimum of drain on business, science, education, and the life of the community generally. Secretary Marshall quoted his own words from an earlier report that the 18- to 20-year-old group made the best, toughest, and most alert fighters in the other wars.

It is also pointed out that whereas the induction and training of married men, with or without children, would cost $978,000,000 annually, the same for unattached 18-year-olds would cost $466,000,000—a difference of $513,000,000.

Outside of deferments for special training, only physical, mental, or moral unfitness would disbar an 18-year-old from universal service. The needs of industry and agriculture would be met by deferments in the 19- to 26-year-old group under selective service.

It is apparent from the testimony of Secretary Marshall and Mrs. Rosenberg and the general outlines of legislation later to be introduced that great thought has gone into every avenue of exploration, with the security and the best interests of the Nation as a whole the criterion of judgment. Its design is to gain essential military strength in the most efficient and least painful manner, without fits and starts, advances and retreats, on the basic assumption (which we believe holds) that public opinion is favorable to universal military service until tension in the world is satisfactorily resolved.

[From the Galveston (Tex.) Tribune of January 11, 1951]

WAR SERVICE MANPOWER

The Defense Department, which is to say the Armed Forces, wants to draft as quickly as possible some 450,000 boys in the 18-year-old age bracket. The Department also wants to put more young women in the uniforms of the WACS, WAVES, and Marines. How many more has not as yet been made clear.

Gen. George C. Marshall, the Secretary of Defense, so advised Congress Wednesday. He asked for speedy revision of the draft act and lifting of the 2 percent ceiling on the feminine branches of the services.

By coincidence, almost at the same time, General Marshall was making his request, American Legion National Commander Earle Cocke said in St. Louis that 18-year-olds should be drafted because they made better combat soldiers than men over 27 years old.

However, there was an implication the 18-year-olds would not be sent into combat until they have reached their nineteenth birthday anniversary. That, however, would be subject to change without notice, of course, dependent on conditions and the size of the trained forces.

Boys in the 18-year-old bracket should be cautioned, though, by their parents and their teachers not to rush pell-mell to the nearest recruiting station to enlist. It would be far wiser, if they are in school, to continue on with their education until called. Deferments probably would be granted for that purpose.

Increasing the size of the feminine contingents in uniform would release, as it did during World War II, a comparable number of uniformed soldiers, sailors, and marines for active duty. That, of course, is desirable because it would lessen the demand for manpower which might adversely affect war production.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 18, 1951]

UMST IS HIGHLY NECESSARY, BUT DETAILS ARE DEBATABLE

The case for the drafting of 18-year-olds into the armed services for universal military service and training, as urged by Defense Secretary George C. Marshall, has not been well presented to the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Committee. This has brought a poor reception for the proposal at the hands of that body.

One trouble was that Secretary Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg changed their figures in the middle of the hearings last week. They called first for a total of 3,200,000 in the Armed Forces, but some days later upped the number to 3,462,000. This gave enemies of the whole idea of UMST an opening and they took advantage of it.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, one of those chiefly responsible for the hysteria after World War II which resulted in "bringing the boys home," leaped upon the UMST plan as "undemocratic and un-American." Although it had been fully approved by General Marshall, Senator JOHNSON persisted in calling it "the Rosenberg plan," and he pronounced it, absurdly, "the most brash and shocking ever made to the Congress in 162 years of existence."

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, chairman of the committee and another critic of the plan, kept his feet much more definitely on the ground, and his opposition may have been more damaging for that reason. He contended that it is unnecessary to draft 18-year-olds in order to make up a total of 3,500,000 in the Armed Forces by June 30. He also lectured Mrs. Rosenberg for the delay in producing an actual bill. He said there have been promises of a bill "every day or two" since last September.

Mrs. Rosenberg suggested, in reply, that the committee was in some measure responsible for the delay, since it had said that before the bill was presented, it should have the approval of all interested Government agencies. She said it was undergoing last-minute revisions at the hands of those agencies.

An actual bill is important, of course, before the committee can make up its mind. Final and authoritative information as to whether the draft of 18-year-olds is essential to achieve the goal fixed for the Armed Forces also is necessary.

Undoubtedly a lot of opposition to the drafting of 18-year-olds is building up in the country. But as Dr. Karl T. Compton, of MIT, told the committee yesterday, "simply to say that we do not like the drafting of 18-year-olds means almost nothing."

The alternatives have to be considered. Is it better to draft those from 19 to 26, even though many are married men with children to support? Chairman JOHNSON contends that this group will furnish the needed manpower. It is up to him to produce the evidence of this, if he has it.

Nobody likes to draft boys of 18 into the armed services if it can be avoided. The question is whether it can. Nor does anybody want to send them out of the country until they are 19, but General Marshall says that to prohibit this would cause much confusion and greatly hamper the defense of the country.

We must get all the light we can on this matter, especially with respect to the conflicting statistics involved. If a force of 3,500,000 can be had 6 months hence without dipping below age 19, that will be one thing. If it can't, that will be something quite different.

It does seem necessary to set up a system of universal military service and training for the defense of the Nation. The details remain to be fully worked out, but the basic idea is sound.

Peace or World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the question, Will it be peace or world war III? delivered by me last Sunday evening over the ABC network.

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

My fellow Americans, will it be peace or world war III? That question is on every tongue. Properly so too because the lives of everyone of us are affected by that question. In anticipation of the answer our youth are again called from the usual routines of peaceful American living—from their homes, their schools, and from the farms, mills, mines, and workshops all over America. Every purse is affected. The ordinary expenses of living are mounting beyond reach. More and more restrictions are daily imposed upon our ordinary living. Soon the whole population will be groaning under the heaviest load of taxes we have known. This complete disruption of our lives is occasioned by that fateful question—will it be peace or war?

No one has a right to doubt the peaceful intentions of the United States. America cannot possibly gain anything from another world war. We must have peace. Because if we have war, it will be horrible beyond imagination with atomic bombing, with possible H bombing and with chemical and bacterial warfare, so that all of us may be destroyed—victor and vanquished alike.

Despite America's peaceful intentions, despite the inconceivable horrors of another world war, the evil men in the Kremlin are nevertheless stirring up hatred everywhere in the world. The puppets of the Kremlin are carrying on war in Korea, in Indochina, in Tibet, and fomenting possible additional war in peril points everywhere. Both our lives and liberties are theatened thereby.

The world has become so small that America is affected by what takes place in Europe as though it were on our own soil. Last week a British bomber flew from an airfield in Ireland across the Atlantic to Gander Air Field at Newfoundland in Canada in 4 hours and 37 minutes. That flight ought to convince even the most skeptical that what happens in Europe can happen fast right here in America. Four hours and 37 minutes from Europe to America. It takes the fastest express train almost twice that long to run from east to west across the State of Pennsylvania.

We must approach this problem facing us, not under the fear that we will have war; but with the fixed determination that by constructive action we can and will have peace.

The world is divided into two camps. The Russian camp that wants war and the free nations who want peace. Theirs is a camp of slavery—ours of freedom. In this division we must have England, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Italy and the other free peoples on our side. There is little time left. We must decide right now. We will either have them as our allies in this struggle for freedom, or they will fall and become satellites of Russia, by our refusing now to collaborate with them effectively for peace.

The American people must be united in a determination to prevent another world war. We can only be so united when everyone takes the time to understand clearly the ramifications of this tremendously important problem.

General Eisenhower submitted a report to the Congress of the United States and to the American people. I had the honor to hear that report. In my judgment it was able, sincere, and above all other things hopeful in its attitude of what could be done in a constructive way for a build-up to prevent world war III. General Eisenhower's report was concurred in by General Marshall, General Bradley, and other high military authorities, who in World War II were the very men upon whose shoulders we placed the supreme responsibility of guiding us to victory. Are we to repudiate them today when they tell us now how to protect ourselves best against world war III. These men have already proved they are entitled to the best consideration of the American people; not on the basis of mere promises but as the result of proven performance of the first order. These men now join in recommending certain military dispositions of our troops, whereby some will be stationed in Europe. These troops are to be sent to Europe not to bring on world war III, but in an endeavor to prevent world war III, by taking proper measures to that end with our allies under the Atlantic pact. They are troops for peace, not for war. Surely the one best way to protect our future is to follow the advice of the men who in the past have successfully guided us to victory and to peace.

To prevent world war III Europe must be denied to Russia, because Russia must have the productive capacity of Europe to successfully attack the United States. Let us in America constantly remember that the people in western Europe have the same know-how as we do. Take the automobile for example. Without the discoveries and inventions of Western Europe we would not have today's automobile. The fact is that the people of western Europe, plus the people of the United States, are responsible for more than 90 percent of all the inventions and improvements responsible for modern living. America cannot risk being deprived of that enormous know-how that with our own know-how can rule the world for peace; but split can arm Russia with power that might rule the whole world.

While Europe is closer to the Russian menace than we in America; nevertheless the final objective and goal of Russia is the destruction of the United States. We are the nation Russia must destroy if it is to rule the whole world as it seems determined to try.

While the United States was the sole possessor of the atomic bomb, we were constantly shown diagrams of how far it was from the United States to Moscow and to Stalingrad and to other prime targets in Russia. Now that the Russians have acquired the same secret we must surely realize that it is no further from the United States to Russia than it is from Russia to the United States. Atomic bombing will move on a two-way street in the event of world war III.

Russia has surrounded herself with satellites. Her method is like a wolf pack with

a flock of sheep—pick off the outside stragglers one at a time until they are all gone. Ultimately this process will swallow up all of Europe unless something is done now to prevent it. Eastern Germany has already been Sovietized. Now Russia's clear purpose is to cave in Western Germany.

We in America are the leaders of the free people in today's world. We must act as that leader since we have the responsibility or the whole cause of freedom will fail.

The free peoples of the world must unite. We must stand together against communism—because communism is united. Unless we stand together, we will ultimately fall together. There is no easy way to peace. Although clearly there is a very easy road to war. The free people must stand together with a united front, and with a full determination to resist to the end. That is the one conceivable means of preventing the horror of world war III.

If we are to be successful, we must follow the judgment of our top military men—men in whose patriotism and in whose judgment we have every reason to believe on the basis of past performance. It may well be a fatal mistake in this critical hour if we substitute political opinion for military judgment in what is clearly a military matter. This is no time for politics. This is a time for Americanism. As a united people with a common purpose, with a common determination, and with a bipartisan policy with respect to world affairs, we may be able to preserve world peace—nothing less will prevent world war III. In today's tortured world troops for Europe are not troops for war, they are troops for peace. And the only possible hope for peace is to follow the judgment of those whose business it is to know the way to have peace if peace is possible to be found.

During World War I, Theodore Roosevelt defined our responsibilities when he said:

"We here in America hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years. And the shame and the disgrace be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve be dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men."

Civil Defense and Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there is growing awareness, I believe, among the Members of Congress, and particularly of those who have been State officials before coming to Washington, of the necessity of strengthening Government on the local and State levels against the possibility of too much centralization in Washington.

Lack of initiative by State and local officials in handling successfully vital problems that are constantly developing often has been cited by those who would further centralize operations in Government on the Federal level. For this reason it is particularly gratifying to note that the American Public Welfare Association has established a Committee on Civil Defense and Public Welfare which will concern itself with the duties of public-welfare agencies in organizing welfare services under the civil defense program, so that fullest use may be made of all community resources in the event of enemy attack.

It is particularly appropriate that a Marylander, Mr. J. Milton Patterson, director of the Maryland Department of Public Welfare and deputy director of Civilian Defense, should be named chairman of the new committee, for the people of Maryland have always been strong in the conviction that government should be close to the people, and have been outstandingly successful in governmental operations on the State and local levels.

This concrete evidence of the readiness of the States and localities to take the initiative in moving forward in the field of welfare and rehabilitation deserves to be given widespread attention, and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that an enclosed statement released by the American Public Welfare Association be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

CIVIL DEFENSE AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Fred Hoehler, president of the American Public Welfare Association, today announced the establishment of a Committee on Civil Defense and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of Mr. J. Milton Patterson, director of the Maryland Department of Public Welfare and Deputy Director of Civil Defense for that State. This committee, composed of representative public welfare officials from all parts of the United States will concern itself with the responsibilities of public welfare agencies in advancing the organization of welfare services under the civil defense program in order to assure full utilization of all potential community resources in the event of enemy attack. Among the State welfare departments already well advanced in developing these plans, according to reports reaching the association, are those in New York, California, Washington, Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina, Nevada, Tennessee, Minnesota, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

"The emphasis in the present civil defense program on the utilization of existing governmental agencies to carry out the responsibilities of civil defense makes it particularly important that State and local public welfare departments mobilize themselves for the crucial tasks assigned them," Mr. Hoehler pointed out. "In most States and in key communities throughout the country public welfare departments, under the supervision of the civil defense organization, are already at work preparing plans for registration and information units, for mass feeding, housing, shelter arrangements, for the provision of clothing, and for welfare services related to possible evacuation. Arrangements are being developed for the mobilization of all available voluntary social agencies and volunteer personnel as a part of the total plan."

The American Public Welfare Association, organization of State and local public welfare departments and public welfare personnel at all levels of Government, has offered the services of its committee to Governor Millard Caldwell, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in helping to advance this program. Mr. Fred Hoehler, president of the association, is director of public welfare for the State of Illinois and is responsible for the welfare aspects of civil defense in that State.

Other members of the committee are: Vice chairman, Charles I. Schottland, director, California State Department of Social Welfare; Alden E. Bevier, administrative staff officer, New York State Department of Social Welfare; Raymond M. Hilliard, commissioner, New York City Department of Welfare; Maurice O. Hunt, administrator, Indiana State Department of Public Welfare; W. J. Maxey, director, Michigan State Department of Social Welfare; J. O. McMahan, commissioner, Tennessee State Department of Public Welfare; George P. Mills, executive director, Allegheny County Board of Assistance, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Roderic Olzendam, director, Washington State Department of Social Security; Alvin E. Rose, commissioner, Chicago Department of Welfare; E. H. Schuneman, director, Wyoming State Department of Public Welfare; Gerard M. Shea, director, District of Columbia Board of Public Welfare; Sherwood H. Smith, commissioner, Florida State Welfare Board; Patrick A. Tompkins, commissioner, Massachusetts State Department of Public Welfare; Robert W. Beasley, Social Security Administration.

Excessive Taxation

REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received in the mail some rather unusual presentations to Congress: a pair of pants and the pockets from a pair of pants. The man who sent these pants that I hold in my hands was a printer. He had been doing some praying, apparently, because the knees are out, and the pockets are also well worn.

These taxpayers are protesting the high taxes being imposed upon them. They are willing to pay the taxes if the Government will show a willingness to cut down on some of the unnecessary spending. It is quite evident that the New Deal, in packing the Appropriations Committee, has made it almost impossible to make any substantial cuts. They certainly are going to control the purse strings. While the Republicans have a representation of 46 percent in the House, some of the subcommittees are represented by only 29 percent Republicans.

A Senator from the other body has insisted that nearly $9,000,000,000 of fat could be trimmed from the Federal budget. This should be done.

Mr. Speaker, there are two Frankenstein monsters who can destroy this country just as well as a military defeat. They are inflation and excessive taxes. This Congress has a solemn obligation to tackle both these problems without fear or hesitation.

The letters follow:

QUIZ INDUSTRIES, *Ord, Nebr.*

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There were many times out in the South Pacific that I knew it would be necessary to turn loose, quite unwillingly, of something quite precious in order that my country might live.

But I never dreamed it would be my pants.

But if other taxpayers, like myself, are willing to give up their pants, it would seem entirely logical that our Government would be willing to unshackle itself from the countless useless bureaus, commissions, and prac-

tions which are dragging it down to the police-state level just as surely and as quickly as the Reds would drag us down to communism. The latter, I believe, is just another name for the type of government which our dreamers and planners would like for us to have, whether they call it communism, facism, socialism, New Dealism, or what. Some onions, you know, are red, some are white, but they all stink.

Congress alone has the power to cast off these shackles. I thank you for your work in the past, but you're not swinging hard enough.

Very sincerely,

EDGAR R. APKING.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.,
February 23, 1951.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the movement of your pants to your Congressman, being immodest by nature and teachings and having only one pair of pants left, have cut the bottoms of the pockets to show you their condition from digging for taxes. Now the serious side of the affair, am glad to tell you that some of the most radical Democrats have really turned against the present administration.

Yours very respectfully,

A CONSTITUENT.

Federal Taxation of State and Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is now holding hearings on the President's $16,500,000,000 tax bill. One of his proposals is to tax the interest on State and municipal bonds, thus imposing heavier taxes on the citizens of our several States and upon the taxpayers of our cities and villages.

There appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on Monday, February 26, 1951, Mr. Austin J. Tobin, secretary, Conference on State Defense, in opposition to the Truman tax proposal. Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as part of my remarks the statement of Mr. Austin J. Tobin heretofore named:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appear here as secretary of the Conference on State Defense which was organized in 1938 by the attorneys general of the States, and other State and municipal officers, who considered it essential at that time, and, since that time, to take a united stand in opposition to this proposal which seeks to establish Federal control through the power of taxation of State and local financing. I have been asked by my fellow public officers, the president of the National Association of Attorneys General, the United States Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and the Municipal Finance Officers Association—all of whom will be represented at these hearings—to outline for the convenience of the committee the points which we will submit once again in opposition to this proposal.

The telegram which we have received from the clerk of the committee asks that we limit our testimony to methods of raising additional revenue. In accordance with your wishes I shall first address myself to that problem. I will demonstrate that the Federal revenues which can be obtained from this proposal are nonexistent or insignificant.

However, before I turn to this first point I should like to recall that this proposal has been submitted to Congress upon one theory or another on many occasions over the past 30 years, and that on each of those occasions it has been overwhelmingly rejected. It was rejected in 1918 and in 1924 when it was supported by the utility companies in a misguided effort to block the development of municipal light, power, and transit systems. It was rejected in the early 1930's. It was rejected by this committee in 1939 and again in 1942.

It was rejected on the floor of the Senate in 1940 by a vote of 44 to 30, and again in 1942 by a vote of 52 to 34.

After Congress had so decisively rejected the proposal the Treasury and the Department of Justice turned to the courts and commenced test actions against bondholders of the Port of New York Authority and the Triborough Bridge Authority. In a press release issued when these cases were started the Treasury said that they were intended ultimately to prove in the courts that the Federal Government has the right under the Constitution to tax the income from all State and municipal securities. The courts rejected that contention. It was rejected by The Tax Court of the United States and in the circuit court of appeals for the second circuit in an opinion written by Judge Augustus Hand. In 1945 the Supreme Court of the United States rejected the Government's petition for a writ of certiorari reviewing the decisions of those courts.

In 1939 and 1940 and 1942 the officers of the States and cities considered it their duty to come here, as they do again today, and to appeal to their Representatives in Congress to prevent the damage to local institutions that is implicit in this destructive proposal. We believe that this committee will conclude, as did the report submitted to the Senate by the Honorable Warren Austin in 1940 that—

"We have not here the partisan testimony of persons interested in pecuniary gain for themselves, or in the accomplishment of some ulterior objective. These witnesses were public officials charged with the duty of protecting the interests of their communities. They had no personal ax to grind. Anyone who sat through the hearings must have been impressed with their sincerity and their conviction that it would jeopardize the financial welfare of their communities and that it was their duty to oppose it.

"In the face of such unanimous State and municipal opposition, our duties here, as representatives of the States under a Federal system, based upon a constitutional guaranty of their sovereignty, compel the conclusion that we, too, must oppose this measure."

I turn, then, to the first point of the States and cities: That no Federal revenues can be obtained through this proposal.

The responsibility placed upon this committee in providing the resources with which to pay for our national defense is a grievous one. In meeting that responsibility the committee has been urged to look to new sources of revenue and to recommend a tax program including such additional revenue at an early date. The inclusion of this proposal in the Treasury's recommendations at this time is therefore quite perplexing, for the Treasury itself has always admitted that the taxation of future issues of municipal bonds would produce practically no Federal revenues for the next 10 years, and no substantial revenues for the next 20 to 30 years. In 1939, Under Secretary of the Treasury John Hanes said that the revenues which could be obtained from this proposal were unimportant. And Secretary Snyder's statement to this committee of a few weeks ago made no claims that the proposal would add to the Federal revenues at this time.

While the Secretary's statement was phrased in rather general language I assume that the proposal to which he directed the committee's attention had to do only with Federal taxation of future issues of State and local bonds. Now, the average rate of issuance of municipal bonds over the past 20 years has been about $1,000,000,000 a year, so that we are talking about a tax next year on the interest paid by the States and cities on about $1,000,000,000 of bonds. The present average interest rate on State and local bonds is 2 percent, but it is generally recognized that a Federal tax would increase that rate to at least 3 percent. That means that the theoretical maximum in the way of additional Federal revenues is a tax on 3 percent of $1,000,000,000, which is to say a tax base of only $30,000,000.

But not all of this base could be taxed. The Treasury reports that Government funds, pension systems, mutual insurance companies, and savings banks, which pay no Federal income tax, hold about 25 percent of all State and local bonds. With the higher interest rates available on taxable bonds, these investors would increase their holdings from 25 percent to, let us say, one-third of the total of new issues. That brings us down to a tax base of $20,000,000 on which a Federal tax could be imposed next year. However, we must allow for the average amount of bonds which are bought by corporations and by individuals in the lower income-tax brackets. The Treasury itself reports that individuals only buy about 40 percent of our State and local bonds. So that, if the tax payable by individuals on such interest runs as high as 50 percent, individuals would pay about $6,000,000, and corporations, even at the new 55-percent rate proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury, would pay about $4,000,000.

The end result is a maximum Federal tax potential of $10,000,000 from a tax next year on new issues of State and local bonds; a revenue yield so small that you could hardly find it in the estimates of Federal revenue.

It would take at least 20 years for such a tax to reach its maximum potential. Even then, with income taxes at the present rate, it is estimated that the Federal Government would derive no more than $200,000,000 by taxing our State and local financing.

The task of this committee in this time of emergency is to find new revenue sources which now, during the next few years, will meet the Government's revenue requirements. This source could not possibly average more than twenty-five to thirty million dollars a year over the next 5 years. In the field of Federal financing this is hardly a sum attractive enough to justify the disruption of our constitutional system, by the establishment of a Federal power to tax and so to control the financial operations of the States.

And that immediately brings us to the view which will be expressed here today by the attorneys general of the States and the city attorneys who will appear here in opposition to any proposal to tax local securities. They will tell the committee that such a tax is unconstitutional and would be so held if it came before the Supreme Court.

This committee is looking for money to buy tanks, ships, and planes now. They cannot be paid for by 3 or 4 years of litigation leading up to the Supreme Court and depending there on a reversal of the established law of constitutional immunities, which the Court has upheld since *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* And the Court's

most recent rulings in the test case on the bonds of the Port of New York Authority, and the opinions of the majority of the Justices in the Saratoga Springs decision of 1946 encourage no hope for a reversal of the doctrine of the Pollock case. Even before the set-back of the Treasury and the Department of Justice in the Port Authority test case in 1945, and the opinions expressed by the majority of the Court in the Saratoga Springs case in 1946, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation had reported to this committee that—

"It is the opinion of this office that a constitutional amendment is the only effective way by which the Federal income tax may be applied to this interest (on State and municipal bonds)."

When I said, therefore, at the outset that the additional Federal revenues to be gained through this proposal were unsubstantial or nonexistent I meant it quite literally.

In his recent statement before the committee the Secretary of the Treasury referred to the immunity of State and local bonds as "a long standing barrier to the achievement of equity in the distribution of the individual income-tax burden." We submit to the committee that this so-called loophole has been grossly exaggerated.

The report which Senator Warren Austin submitted to the Senate in 1940 and 1942, and which was supported on the floor of the Senate, said:

"(This proposal) is based upon a theory of tax evasion that is not supported by the facts. Though it has been popularized with the public as a device to obtain additional taxes from the wealthy, it would in reality place upon the States, and particularly upon the cities, a heavy burden of increased local taxation. Stripped of its popular catch phrases, it would simply shift a further, and perhaps, unsupportable burden on the home owner and the rent payer."

The Teasury's own statistics admit that about 60 percent of our municipal bonds are held, not by individuals, but by Government agencies, pension systems, sinking funds and other institutional investors which are not subject to progressive personal surtaxes. With reference to the remaining 40 percent of these bonds held by individuals, the estate tax returns show substantial holdings in smaller estates.

The Treasury's statistics reveal also that the severity of income tax rates has had no relation whatsoever to the percentage of municipal bonds held by individuals. Although taxes rose steeply from 1937 to 1945 the percentage of State and local bonds held by individuals in 1945 was actually somewhat less than in 1937. So also consider the fact that in 1937, with an effective tax rate on a $50,000 net income of 17.8 percent, the percentage of outstanding municipal bonds held by individuals was 45 percent; whereas in 1947 with an effective tax rate on a $50,000 net income of 49.6 percent the percentage of municipal bonds outstanding in the hands of individuals had dropped to 41 percent.

The fact is, also, that the State and local bonds held by individuals do not on the average constitute any substantial portion of their wealth. The Treasury's analysis of returns for taxable decedents' estates since 1927 shows that on the average only 12 percent of the wealth in estates of $1,000,000 and over has been invested in State and municipal securities. In other words, over seven-eighths of their wealth has been invested in corporate and other forms of securities. So, too, a study prepared by the staff of your own Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in 1939 shows that only 6 percent of the incomes in the million dollar brackets were derived from interest on State and local securities. Such percentages fit the picture of normal diversification of investments far better than the Treasury's picture of tax avoidance.

Finally, as the committee knows, anyone who purchases a municipal bond pays a heavy tax to the State or local issuing body at the time he buys the bond in the form of a much lower interest rate than he would accept if the same bond was taxable.

I think that most of the members of this committee are familiar with the heavy impact of this proposal on the cost of providing State and municipal facilities. There would seem to be general agreement that that increase would probably be about 1 percent or more in the interest rate, or an increase in State and local borrowing costs of 50 percent on a 2 percent municipal bond. On the present volume of State and local debt, that means that this proposal would undoubtedly impose a burden of added costs on local government running upward of $200,000,000.

It is true that this total would be reached gradually, just as the relatively meager Federal revenues could only be realized gradually. However, the full weight of the tax on individual States and cities and on local projects would be felt immediately. If the city or town you live in needs a new school, a new hospital, a sewage-disposal project, or an irrigation facility next year your local taxpayers will feel the heavy impact of this proposal at once. If the States of Ohio or Pennsylvania or New Jersey or New York wish to construct or add to their new systems of turnpikes and through ways next year, or the year after that, the full weight of this Federal tax proposal on those projects will be felt at once. If the Chicago Transit Authority must purchase new busses by the sale of bonds next year it must anticipate a 30-percent or a 50-percent increase in its financing cost.

The difficulties faced by local government since the last war in providing the essential services which the people of your localities require are, I believe, well known to the members of this committee. Population increases of 50 percent in new suburban areas and a well-defined shift of population to the Western States have created needs for schools, roads, and utilities which would be hit at once by this proposal. You will bear in mind too that the immediate needs and requirements for the extension of utilities, the construction and repair of streets, and for schools and fire and police protection, brought about by the construction and expansion of defense plants, must be met, and are being met today, by the municipalities.

Some 90 percent of all State and municipal bonds are issued by the local governments. As you know, our cities and towns are hard pressed themselves to find sources of revenue, or perhaps I should say in just squeezing the old real property tax to meet the needs of their people for hospitals, schools, streets, sewers, transit, and a decent standard of living for their civil servants. There is no fair comparison in this proposal between the impact of a 50-percent increase in the cost of local financing, and the comparatively meager return that could be hoped for by the Federal Government.

Much has been said about the necessity of perfecting the progressive character of the Federal income tax. We submit that not enough thought has been given to the fact that this proposal would have just the reverse effect on the local tax structure, where its burden would be borne almost entirely by property owners whose taxes are not levied in accordance with ability to pay. The municipalities, as I have said, issue 90 percent of our State and local debt, and they derive almost 65 percent of their revenue from real-estate taxes. Yet the same tax perfectionists who keep bringing this issue back to this committee year after year, would admit that the real-estate tax is one of the most regressive forms of taxation.

In many circumstances, however, the consequences of this proposal would be even more serious than the increase in cost and the consequent increase in local property taxes. It would frequently involve the ability of the community to finance a needed improvement at all. When we were before this committee in 1942 Mayor LaGuardia and Commissioner Moses emphasized the fact, as will Mayor Impellitteri today, that the heavy addition of interest costs would mean that many of our new self-supporting public projects in New York City could not be financed at all. The estimates of cost and revenue upon which we must go to the market for the financing of transit systems and toll bridges and tunnels and turnpikes and airports and public terminals are frequently quite marginal. It requires close figuring to demonstrate that these projects can meet their operation and maintenance charges and their debt service. In these estimates interest costs are frequently the deciding factor. The Chicago Transit Authority could not have been financed if its bonds were taxable by the Federal Government. Detroit could never have effected its tremendous refunding program after its depression of the 1930's if its bonds were subject to Federal tax.

We must build a new tunnel under the Hudson to cope with metropolitan congestion in northern New Jersey and New York. We have been working on the estimates for that project for the past year, and I must say frankly to this committee that there is no possibility of financing such a tunnel on a self-supporting basis if the Treasury succeeds in its efforts to tax our bonds.

Is it the purpose or objective of this proposal to increase the need and pressures for Federal aid? Are the States and cities to be forced to call upon the Federal Government to finance projects which they could have financed themselves if the Federal Government had not disrupted local financing by taxing municipal bonds? That would certainly be a wry outcome of a revenue bill addressed to the problem of additional Federal revenue.

We submit that much of the misunderstanding of this proposal arises because the Treasury discusses it simply as a problem in taxation or in alleged tax evasion. But this is not a problem in abstract economics. The answer is not to be found by adding up possible Federal tax revenues on the one hand, increased interest costs to local government on the other, and then substracting the two totals. The real nature of this problem is one of the preservation of independent local government, of the continuance of true federalism under our Constitution. It is a problem that reaches into the very nature and quality of the democratic process. As Senator Bailey, of North Carolina, said when this proposal was debated on the floor of the Senate in 1940 "the really great issue here is not one of revenue. The really great issue here is the power of one sovereignty to tax another, and the wisdom of it, even conceding that the Federal Government has the right to tax the credit of my State, for that is what it all amounts to."

If the functioning of local government is vital to our liberties in times of peace, it is vital to our national existence in times of war. This is particularly true in a war that will be fought in city streets and by the cities themselves.

National defense calls for the fullest cooperation of States and municipalities in the maintenance of city services and the construction of municipal facilities vital to the war effort. It requires the strengthening of their credit standing and the utmost efficiency in the administration of their local affairs. The cities are loyally meeting these proper demands; local government is enlisting "for the duration." Nothing would injure this unity of purpose and effort more

than for the Federal Government to attempt to tax municipal securities, to increase our local interest costs and to move, at this time, toward the disestablishment of that federalism which is the real strength of these 48 United States.

The power to tax always carries with it the power to exempt and to classify the subjects of taxation. Thus, any future administration controlling the Federal Government could, through the power to tax our securities, and through the power to exempt and to classify within the activities of local government, control every operation of the States and cities. This was pointed out by Justices Douglas and Black in 1946 in the Saratoga Springs decision when they said:

"A tax is a powerful, regulatory instrument * * * the power to tax lightly is the power to tax severely. The power to tax is, indeed, one of the most effective forms of regulation. And no more powerful instrument for centralization of government could be devised. For with the Federal Government immune and the States subject to tax, the economic ability of the Federal Government to expand its activities at the expense of the States is at once apparent."

We understand that when the Secretary of the Treasury submitted this proposal a few weeks ago he said in response to a question by one of the members of this committee that the Treasury relied in its claim for the constitutionality of this proposal on the study submitted to the Senate in 1939 by the Department of Justice. We submit to the committee that the propositions of law advanced in that study were completely repudiated in the opinions of Chief Justice Stone and Justices Reed, Murphy, Burton, Douglas, and Black in the Saratoga Springs case in 1946.

That study, on which the Secretary of the Treasury told this committee that he relied upon, frankly asserted the supremacy of the Federal taxing power over the functions of local government. That proposition was rejected by the Chief Justice in the Saratoga Springs case when he said:

"The counterpart of such undue interference has been recognized since Marshall's day as the implied immunity of each of the dual sovereignties of our constitutional system from taxation by the other" *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316).

And by Justices Douglas and Black when they said:

"The power of one sovereign to tax another is an innovation so startling as to require explicit authority if it is to be allowed. If the power of the Federal Government to tax the States is conceded, the reserved power of the States guaranteed by the tenth amendment does not give them the independence which they have always been assumed to have. They are relegated to a more servile status. They become subject to interference and control both in the functions which they exercise and the methods which they employ. They must pay the Federal Government for the privilege of exercising the powers of sovereignty guaranteed them by the Constitution, (when) they issue securities or perform any other acts within the scope of their police power."

So too in the Department of Justice study of 1939, which the Secretary of the Treasury has said he relies upon, it was argued that many of the activities of the States were proprietary and so taxable. This distinction was rejected by all eight justices in the Saratoga Springs case.

In short the Supreme Court seems to have left nothing but shreds of the opinion on which the Department of Justice relied when it went into the test cases involving the bonds of the Port of New York Authority and the Triborough Bridge Authority and on which it relied also in the Saratoga Springs case.

Chief Justice Vinson became a member of the Supreme Court after the decision in the Saratoga Springs case. He had led the fight against Federal taxation of municipal bonds, even by constitutional amendment, when he was a Member of the House in 1924. And it was Mr. Justice Burton who led the fight against taxation of municipal bonds on the floor of the Senate in 1942.

The real issue here should be very clear. It is an issue that transcends the field of taxation or the field of mere fiscal argument. It rises beyond the niceties of legal debate and distinctions.

If Congress has the power by simple statute to tax State and municipal bonds, it has inevitably the power to control State and municipal financing.

Without control of its own financing no government can continue as a free and independent state.

That is why the States and cities believe that this is the chosen battleground upon which they must make their stand for the preservation of local government and all that it means under our constitutional system.

Under that system democracy itself is completely dependent upon the continued freedom of the States to carry on the functions of local government without Federal interference. So long as such a system is to be maintained, tax interference by one government with the functions of the other can only be prevented by reciprocal constitutional immunity.

In the words of the memorandum in opposition which the American Federation of Labor submitted to this committee in 1942: "To preserve the sovereignty to our several and separate State governments, and the home rule of our cities, the credit and borrowing capacity of our several States and political subdivisions should be taxable only by the respective States, thus reserving to the States exclusively this field of taxation, preventing the coercion of the States by the Federal Government and preserving local self-government."

The States and cities are confident that this committee will reject this destructive recommendation as it has on every occasion in the past when it has examined its demerits.

Retreat From Victors' Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by William Henry Chamberlin showing once more the crimes committed by us and our allies as victors in the name of justice from Human Events of February 21, 1951:

RETREAT FROM VICTORS' JUSTICE
(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is remarkable how fast we are retreating, or attempting to retreat, from the consequences of a military victory so abused and so bungled that it has become a major national security risk. As the sixth anniversary of Yalta passes and the sixth anniversary of Potsdam approaches not a single achievement of these wartime conferences seems either durable or desirable.

What intelligent American today feels happy over the mutilation and abandonment of Poland, the giving of Manchuria to Stalin, the grotesque, new Polish-German and Polish-Soviet frontiers, the uprooting of many millions from homes which their ancestors had occupied for generations, the total disarmament of Germany and Japan? Most of these decisions were crimes against elementary humanity; all were grave blunders from the cold-blooded standpoint of American national interest.

Now there has been a substantial and welcome, if belated retreat from the unsound conception of "victors' justice," to use the phrase of the British publicist, Montgomery Belgion, which found expression in the Nuremberg trial and in the many subsequent trials of alleged German war criminals by American courts.

High Commissioner John J. McCloy and Gen. Thomas T. Handy, commander of United States forces in Europe, recently announced the completion of their review of 101 sentences imposed on prisoners held in the Landsberg prison. The revision of these sentences was so drastic as to throw considerable doubt on the justice of the original sentences. Twenty-one out of 28 death penalties were commuted.

Thirty-three criminals, including all the industrialists who had been sentenced in one of the filmiest of the trials, were released. Mr. McCloy offered the comment that the confiscation of the property of Alfred Krupp was generally repugnant to American concepts of justice and reversed this sentence. Thirty-five prison terms were reduced.

It was natural that this decision should be met by outcries of enraged criticism by two groups in this country and abroad. There are those who want their pound of flesh of vengeance. And there are others who, because of active participation or expressed approval, have built up an emotional vested interest in vindicating the justice of the war-crimes trials.

However, there seems no reason to question the sincerity of Mr. McCloy's statement:

"I have made every effort to decide each individual case objectively, dispassionately, and on its merits. All of my decisions have been rooted in the firm belief in the basic principle of the rule of law which all must respect and to which all are answerable. With this principle I have striven to temper justice with mercy."

Indeed, one might well go further and, in the retrospect of the years which have elapsed since the end of the war, say that the decisions to set up victors' courts to try members of the vanquished nation for war crimes was a moral, judicial, and political mistake and should never be repeated.

II

The most obvious objection to the war-crimes trials, and it is one which a less intelligent and literate people than the Germans would scarcely have failed to appreciate, was the complete absence of two indispensable attributes of any genuine legal tribunal: impartiality and universality. The Germans were judged and condemned not because they had committed crimes of appalling character, as some of the defendants unquestionably had; but because they were defeated.

One could offer many concrete illustrations of this proposition; but two may suffice. The planning and waging of aggressive war was one of the principal items in the Nuremberg indictment. But it was widely known at the time, and has subsequently been proved by documentary evidence, that Stalin was a full-fledged partner in the first phase of Hitler's aggressive war, up to the point of concluding advance agreements as to how the human and territorial spoils of aggression in Eastern Europe should be shared. But representatives of the U. S. S. R. were not in the dock at Nuremberg; they sat on the bench with the other judges.

Few war crimes exceed in atrocity the cold-blooded massacre of thousands of Polish war prisoners whose bodies were discovered in 1943 in the Katyn Forest, near the town of Smolensk, in western Russia. The circumstantial evidence that this massacre was carried out by the Soviet political police in the spring of 1940 is overwhelming. The Nuremberg tribunal itself, certainly not inclined to give the Germans the benefit of any doubt, refused to find them guilty of this particular outrage, although it had been listed in the indictment. But no one proposed to call the Soviet authorities responsible for this violation of international law and elementary humanity to account.

And Count Stauffenberg, cousin of the officer who was one of the leaders of the plot against Hitler of July 20, 1944, voiced a not unnatural sentiment when he recently proposed the prosecution of "those Allied war criminals who were guilty of raping and plundering the German people when the Allies advanced into Germany."

III

It is this obvious absence of any attempt to apply even-handed justice in the punishment of offenses against humanity that explains the cynical apathy with which most Germans have reacted to the war crimes trials. Had a genuinely international tribunal, including judges selected from neutral countries and from non-Nazi Germans, been set up after the war for the purpose of investigating all offenses against humanity, the effect would have been impressive and edifying.

But a long series of trials of vanquished by victors could only be expected to produce among the vanquished at best indifference, in some cases sympathy with the accused. The inconsistency was too glaring, especially after the cold war heated up and the western powers and the Soviet Union began to accuse each other of the crime of preparing a new aggressive war.

Apart from this general inconsistency, there were grave objections in detail to the conduct of many of the war crimes trials and the assumptions on which these trials were based. In the trial of 12 members of the Krupp firm there was an avowed determination of the prosecution to get a Krupp, regardless of how little evidence there might be against him. As Alfred Krupp wrote to General Clay after his conviction:

"During the whole procedure I felt that I was standing before prejudiced and biased judges."

The counsel for the defendants, in their appeal, asserted that all the questions put by the judges aimed at implicating the accused, that no witness for the prosecution was cross-examined for credibility, whereas this method was applied to witnesses for the defense, that documents were misused and cited out of context. The court held the Krupp firm responsible for measures prescribed by the Nazi government for the treatment of foreign laborers and paid no attention to evidence that the firm did what it could to improve this treatment.

As in many other cases, notably in the trial of such former members of the Foreign Office staff as Weizsaecker and Woermann, there was a deliberate or unconscious ignoring of the psychological condition under which men lived and worked under Hitler's dictatorship. Long prison sentences were imposed not for acts of spontaneous cruelty and inhumanity, but because industrialists and diplomats did not file protests which would have been useless to the victims of the Nazis and self-destructive for themselves.

IV

Still more sinister were the methods used to extort confessions from German soldiers accused of having killed American prisoners in the Malmedy region of Belgium during the Battle of the Bulge. According to Judge Edward Van Roden of Pennsylvania, who investigated this case for the Army, physical torture and mock trials and threats to families of the accused were employed on such a scale that "it is impossible to know whether the men being hanged are guilty or innocent."

Senator McCARTHY of Wisconsin, who denounced this perversion of the ideals of American justice on the floor of the Senate, suggested one of the explanations: "Many members of the interrogation team were American citizens of very recent origin—German political refugees from Hitlerian Germany—employed by the Army because of their hatred for the defendants for the purpose of getting confessions from the accused."

All in all, the purposes of justice and American political interests were badly served by the war crimes trials. High credit is due to a few men who spoke out against the abuses of these trials, to investigators like Judge Van Roden, to Judge Wennerstrum, who sharply disassociated himself from the spirit and methods of a trial of German generals, to Judge Powers, who presented a powerful dissenting argument in the case of the Foreign Office officials.

A German of outstanding political intelligence, with whom I discussed the recent revision of sentences, predicted that this would lead to better understanding and added:

"There is nothing to be said personally in favor of the seven men whose death sentences were upheld. They were proved mass murderers. The only argument for commutation in these cases is that the death penalty has been abolished in the German Federal Republic. I think there is a case for further modifications of the sentences passed on some of the generals. They have been condemned for dealing harshly with guerrillas; but your own experience in Korea shows that guerrillas cannot be handled with silk gloves."

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the remarks of Earl J. McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, made at a luncheon honoring the four high-school winners of the Voice of Democracy contest, held at the Hotel Statler in Washington on February 22, 1951.

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

This is a time for fundamentals—for straight talk about freedom, democracy, and brotherhood—for clear thinking about the spiritual values that have made our Nation great. If we mean to preserve our heritage and save western civilization, we must grasp the full meaning of individual dignity and equal opportunity, and we must put these ideas to work in our daily lives.

Sham, hesitation, or double-talk will not suffice on this anniversary of Washington's birthday, for the hour is perilously late and the danger to our way of life is total and relentless. At this moment, the disciples of Communist imperialism are beaming their great lies about the free world, about the United Nations, and about the United States to every corner of the globe. Their "upside-down talk" makes mockery of our institutions and our beliefs. It is of crucial importance that we seize every opportunity to speak out against the evils of totalitarianism, and at the same time affirm our belief in and devotion to the ideals of democratic living.

It is especially significant, therefore, that today in Washington we are paying special tribute to four young people who speak for democracy. These high school students—two girls, age 16, and two boys, age 17—have shown that they know how to talk straight and think straight about the fundamentals and about the moral principles that really count in this free society of ours. They are about to receive scholarship awards honoring them as winners of the fourth annual Voice of Democracy contest. In this contest the United States Office of Education has taken a part since its inception in 1947. One and one-half million young people took part in this year's contest in the second, third, and fourth years of high school.

It has been apparent to those who have heard their words that our young people fully understand the meaning of democracy and appreciate the significance of the present attack upon its values. Their statements bear eloquent testimony to the fact that in our schools young people learn that democracy is as democracy does. Our youth know what they believe in and what they are willing to defend. In these words a former winner of the Voice of Democracy contest recently explained why it is important that young people speak out for democracy. He said:

"America never has had, and most likely never again will have such a need for reaffirming support of democratic principles. The Voice of Democracy contest did this for me, for I can see that only democracy and its degree of individual freedom can stand as the ray of hope beyond the blackness of tomorrow. Working among America's high school generation, the contest is of highest importance in helping young Americans grasp that thread of idealism which is the only hope for maintaining our national integrity."

The contest awards to 1951's eloquent spokesmen for democracy will be presented by the Honorable Frank Pace, Secretary of the Army.

(At this point, Commissioner McGrath introduced Secretary Pace who spoke in tribute to the Voice of Democracy contest and presented the 1951 awards to the four winners: Robert A. Burnett, of St. Louis, Mo.; Marcia Anne Harmon, of San Bernardino, Calif.; Norita Newbrough, of Baton Rouge, La.; and Ricardo Romulo, of Washington, D. C. Portions of the award-winning broadcasts were then read, after which Dr. McGrath adjourned the luncheon with the following remarks):

I believe that you, like me, must get a great elevation of spirit in hearing the expressions by these young people of the ideals and the ideas for which this country stands. I am sure, too, that you, the adult members of this audience, feel very humble. I am sure you feel some soul-searching is necessary to discover to what extent we live up to these high ideals. I never leave these meetings without feeling a great deal of satisfaction and a great sense of security with respect to the future of this great country. The other members of this audience will forgive an educator if he says that in a small way he gets personal satisfaction out of being associated with a profession which, to be sure, is not entirely responsible for these performances because it shares that responsibility with the church and the home, but which nevertheless has these young people in hand for a large portion of their daily lives. I feel, when I hear these state-

ments, that the school teachers of the Nation are doing a pretty good job in perpetuating the traditions and the ideals of our country. For you I express to these two young ladies and two young gentlemen a great admiration for what they have done and through them to a million and a half others. I am sure that I on their behalf express their gratitude for the distinguished group that has come to meet with us here today.

No Indians Will Be Made Homeless by Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on pages A989–A990 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 26, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of California, extended his remarks under the title "Indians Will Be Made Homeless by Central Arizona Project." In the course of his introductory remarks Congressman ENGLE says concerning the Hualapai Tribe of Arizona:

Their long struggle to stay on their land will be lost, however, if Congress approves of the central Arizona project.

Following this Congressman ENGLE inserts a lengthy memorandum on this Indian tribe to substantiate his statement.

Perhaps Congressman ENGLE has not seen the canyon area in which the Bridge Canyon Dam is to be built. I urge him to go with other members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to see whether any land occupied by dwellings of these Indians will be taken from them should a dam at the Bridge Canyon site be built. This is about the wildest terrain on the North American Continent. Although it lies outside the Grand Canyon National Monument and many miles outside the Grand Canyon National Park, it is a region just about as rough as the Grand Canyon area itself. The Hualapai Indians do not live in and never have lived in, their livestock do not use and never have used, that part of the canyon which would be flooded. It is erroneous to assume that because the Fort Peck Dam on the Missouri River will flood some Indian homeland, causing villages and cemeteries to be moved, that the same is true concerning the Hualapai Indians in the deep canyon where the Bridge Canyon Dam is to be built. The two cases are not at all similar.

The only land which the Government would require of these Hualapai Indians—and that part is worthless land for Indian purposes—is just enough canyon wall and bed rock on which to build the dam, plus the bottom of the canyon where the river flows, a temporary site for the work plant during the construction, and a right-of-way for a road to bring in materials, and so forth. Ample provision is made in the bill to recompense the Indians justly for any loss incurred because of this construction.

Furthermore there would be great benefits accruing to these Indians temporarily and permanently should this construction be done, and the Hualapai Tribe would be exceedingly heavy losers if this dam were not built. As proof that the Hualapai Council does not agree with Congressman ENGLE I cite a resolution passed by the governing body of the Hualapai Tribe and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 2, pp. 2043–2044. The Hualapai Indians have officially sanctioned the program as contained in the legislation before Congress. Their resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION 209 OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE HUALAPAI TRIBE OF THE HUALAPAI RESERVATION, A FEDERALLY CHARTERED INDIAN CORPORATION

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States legislation known as Senate bill 75 covering the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam on the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, and for other purposes; and

Whereas in the event said Bridge Canyon Dam project should be constructed and operated, the lands and rights of the Hualapai Tribe would be materially affected in that the dam, and the townsite for the dam and a great many of the rights-of-way would be on the Hualapai Reservation, and unless said lands and rights of the tribe are protected, the tribe and its members will be severely damaged; and

Whereas there has now been proposed a compromise amendment to section 14 of said Senate bill 75 which compromise amendment in substance meets the major requests of the Hualapai Tribe for the protection of their rights and interests by giving the Indians a chance to negotiate a voluntary sale of their land and a right to a fair jury trial on compensation if no voluntary agreement is reached; and

Whereas the Hualapai Tribe realizes the great importance of the Bridge Canyon project to the State of Arizona and in the interest of the people of the State of Arizona the Hualapai Tribe now desires to lend their endorsement and support to S. 75 with the attached proposed amendment to section 14 being made a part thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Hualapai Tribal Council in meeting assembled this 16th day of February 1950, That it endorse S. 75 as amended by the attached proposed amendment; and by it further

Resolved, That the Hualapai Tribal Council, expressing deep appreciation for the sympathetic support for the protection of the tribe, given by civic and labor organizations, and by many Senators, respectfully urges Senate endorsement of S. 75 as amended; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the Arizona congressional delegation and to other Members of Congress and other organizations concerned with the protection of Indian rights.

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, as secretary of the Hualapai Tribal Council, hereby certify that the Tribal Council of the Hualapai Tribe is composed of nine members, of whom eight, constituting a quorum, were present at a meeting thereof this 16th day of February 1950, and that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by an affirmative vote of eight members.

LEO B. ANDREWS,
Secretary.

"Things Past Redress Are Now With Me Past Care"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, Political Observer Bob McManus, of the Binghamton Press, now covering the Albany scene, reports that reapportionment of New York's congressional districts will not be made known until long after next September.

I could have told him that. I had just talked with the oracle who visits me every time he gets something hot off the wire.

The last story he related was perfectly amazing. It was about face from the one before.

He said he was in a well-known pub a few days ago in the State capital when a couple of boys "in the know" accosted him.

"Tell that guy HALL," they spluttered, deep in their cups, "we're going to carve his district into beefsteaks."

"We've got plans, and he ain't goin' to like 'em. Only he won't know soon enough to do him any good. We'll show him what a gerrymander job really is."

This latest report upset me no end, because it was an about face from what I was told would be the new congressional district.

I find it difficult to believe that the underlings my friend refers to would deliberately go out on a limb contrary to the wishes of just about everybody.

The Governor himself expressed publicly, several weeks ago, that they ought to get the redistricting job out of the way as soon as possible.

I fail to see how anyone can profit by our being kept in the dark until the eve of the next election as to where the new districts will lie.

They seem to take special delight in rubbing this into me. They gloat over the idea that they are accomplishing a grand coup by worrying me over the make-up of the counties I must run in next year.

This is strictly small potatoes. I long ago made my plans. I am keeping them to myself, but I can assure you this much: I will be campaigning in every direction at once and I will be lining up support in every prospective county.

After all, they cannot eliminate all the other counties up-State from the Broome orbit, regardless of how much they might want to declare us a foreign State. Moreover, they cannot keep me from campaigning in the other counties. It is still a free country, I guess.

Of course, it is an insult to up-State to try to take a single Congressman away from that mighty area.

But, as I say, I have made my plans. I have tried my best to see an open, aboveboard fight out of this thing, but I am doomed to disappointment.

Come what may, I will be in there pitching. It will be necessary to expend a little more energy going all over the territory, because I am not absolutely sure of the new district set-up, but it will be good exercise. I will get better acquainted this way also.

So, for the benefit of those who think their procrastination on the most important subject before the people this year, that of preserving our American system, is annoying or irritating me, I say, have your fun.

In the words of a line from Richard II, "Things past redress are now with me past care."

Let Us Utilize Our Defense Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in these perilous times, when the very preservation of our Nation may depend upon our wisdom in properly utilizing our resources, it is inconceivable that our defense authorities would close their eyes to the value of any of the important facilities constructed at such great cost during World War II. Yet that is just what is happening to a major air installation in the heart of our country. I refer to George Field, located in eastern Illinois and in the center of a network of rail and highway facilities vital to the defense effort.

In the light of present conditions, calling for greatly expanded military effort, it would seem logical to utilize George Field, for it represents a modern, complete air center available for immediate use. Residents of the area, realizing its possibilities and alert to the needs of the hour, are very properly calling on their Government for an immediate consideration of reactivating the base.

Under permission granted to me, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a communication I have just received, signed by a large number of prominent residents of Lawrenceville, Ill. The communication sets forth once more the salient facts in connection with this important matter. It follows:

LAWRENCEVILLE, ILL., *February 10, 1951.*

Hon. EDWARD JENISON,
United States Representative,
Paris, Ill.

DEAR SIR: We have not bothered you much until now for we have felt that the Government would open up George Field. We see where they are opening up many fields in other places, and we cannot understand why we are being passed up. Recently a letter to the chamber of commerce here in Lawrenceville stated that George Field is not included in the present Air Force expansion program. It went on to say that the field is being constantly reviewed and that means that there might be a future possibility that George Field may be reactivated.

Indiana people are doing all they can and are getting letters back from Washington stating that they are inclined to believe that as our defense program develops that George Field will be utilized.

It looks to us like that if our Indiana and Illinois men in Washington would get together on this they could do a lot of good.

There are plenty of good reasons in favor of reactivating, and our asking your help is not altogether selfish. Before this field was put on a stand-by basis we prepared a book on the advantages of George Field. This book was a lengthy explanation of the many advantages and was prepared by good men, and presents enough good reasons to back up any request you might make for us.

These books, giving the advantages of George Field were sent to our Representatives from both States in Washington at that time, and we received letters back telling us that these books were being filed with the War Department. We suppose that they are still there and think they should be dug out of the moth balls and reread as they present the best possible reasons in our favor.

There are hundreds of good reasons in favor of George Field, but to look at its location should be enough. It is also entirely owned by the Government and there are dozens of good buildings and hangars in good condition just standing there, also acre after acre of thick good concrete runways large and good enough to take care of the largest type of planes. Roads, water system, electric system, large well-built housing area, railroad switch into field from main line of B. & O., warehouse, store, post office; in fact everything is standing there ready to be put back in operation. They tell us that field cost about $100,000,000 in 1941 and was only used in the last war so it is not old enough to be worn out or obsolete.

This field has never been flooded, and has been cut off by high waters only twice as far back as anyone can remember. This field is definitely above any and all high water, and by raising the road to the field a couple of feet in some low places, the road would be above any and all high water.

George Field was inspected as a possible location for the proposed West Point of the air and the engineers told us at that time a small levee could be built for nearly nothing that would forever stop any threat from high water. Surely a $100,000,000 investment won't let a few hundred dollars stand in the way of its being used.

When George Field was in operation planes from other fields were flown here to get them out of the heavy winds that destroy planes at other fields. George Field's location would save the Government enormous amounts of money every month, being located in the center of the densely populated area that it is; there would be less freight and transportation cost on personnel and supplies; and, being on the main line of three prominent railroads, the B. & O. running east and west and the C. & E.-I. and the Big Four running north and south, and on the two most prominent highways in the country, U S 50 running east and west and U S 41 running north and south. In fact, we challenge anybody to find a location that even comes close to George Field.

It is true, of course, that the reactivation of military bases is a primary responsibility of the Defense Establishment, and the representatives of the area involved will continue to press diligently for consideration of the problem in that quarter. But the Members of Congress, as a whole, will want to be informed on this and similar problems across the country at a time when vast funds are being sought for the creation of new facilities connected with the defense effort. It should be remembered that our resources are not unlimited, and we should first make the best use of available facilities before we embark on any program of new construction. It is to be hoped that our defense authorities will see both the wisdom and the necessity for such a course in the immediate future.

Fred Earle Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to announce the death of one of the outstanding citizens of my congressional district, Fred Earle Taylor, which occurred on February 19, last.

I deem it of importance to many of us in Government to make this announcement here due to the fact that Mr. Taylor performed an outstanding service during both World War I and World War II. He was president of the Realty Board of Portland, Oreg., in 1916 and in 1920 was president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In 1939 he represented the national association at an international housing conference in Stockholm, Sweden.

Throughout his entire career, Mr. Taylor devoted a substantial amount of time and effort toward raising the standards of the real-estate profession and assisting his country and community. It was largely through his efforts that one of the first real-estate license laws in the United States was adopted in Oregon in 1919. During World War I, he was a dollar-a-year man with the United States Housing Corporation. As NAREB president, Mr. Taylor traveled 28,599 miles and saw NAREB board membership double. During his tenure seven State associations were formed, and convention attendance that year was almost triple that of any previous year.

With the advent of World War II Mr. Taylor returned to Government as head of the Office of Decentralisation Service. Under his guidance, the Decentralization Service accomplished the difficult task of moving 14 Federal peacetime agencies and 40,000 employees from Washington to other cities. The celerity and smoothness of the operation won high official praise.

Mr. Taylor leaves surviving him his wife, Fanny S.; a son, Arthur, of Portland, Oreg.; and a daughter, Mrs. Glen W. Lundberg, of Los Angeles, Calif.

I join with the many friends of Fred Taylor in sorrow at his passing. My State and the Nation has lost a devout and loyal worker in the cause of good government.

Man of the South for 1950—Article by Huber F. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Man of the South for 1950," which appeared in a recent issue of Dixie Business.

This relates to Reuben B. Robertson, of Asheville, N. C., who established and developed one of the greatest industrial plants in our State, the Champion Paper and Fibre Co., located in Canton, N. C.

The selection of Mr. Robertson as "the Man of the South for 1950" had the hearty endorsement of the people throughout the country, and this article gives an account of the Reuben B. Robertson Day Observance at Asheville on December 16, 1950.

I also wish to have included the editorial from the Asheville Times of December 16, 1950.

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

MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1950

(By Hubert F. Lee)

The man who in the days of his young manhood had come to the tree-covered mountains of North Carolina nearly a half century ago to help build a paper and pulp mill, and stayed to become one of America's greatest industrialists and leaders, was honored by friends he had made over the years on December 16 as few men are honored during their lifetime.

And on the evening of the day that had been designated "Reuben B. Robertson Day" in western North Carolina he heard his life and works praised to the heights of the Land of the Sky by some of the South's outstanding leaders of business, education, industry, finance, and government * * * and the Dixie Business "distinguished service award" presented to him, formally proclaiming him "Man of the South for 1950."

It was an impressive testimonial dinner his friends gave him by their presence and their words and handclasps. He termed it one of the highest honors ever to be bestowed upon him. The testimonial had been arranged by some of his old friends who had formed a sponsoring committee to do him honor when he was elected "Man of the South for 1950" by some 6,000 votes from more than half of the States over the Nation.

Reuben B. Robertson, the "Man of the South for the Year 1950," stands at the gates of the second half of the twentieth century as a symbol of all the great leaders and men of achievement over the South who in their lifetime have set in motion forces that will work for the betterment of mankind through the years.

And some 175 of his friends let him know it at the testimonial dinner in the ballroom of the swank Battery Park Hotel in Asheville, and at the mill in Canton, and in letters and telegrams from leaders over the Nation.

The theme was "Free Enterprise and the Community—A Case History," and the story of the chairman of the board of the Champion Paper & Fibre Co. was reviewed in retrospect by old friends * * * when bread had been broken and Rev. C. Grier Davis had delivered the invocation.

The character and greatness of Reuben B. Robertson, the man, was formed by the influence of his mother and his father when he was a child in Cincinnati, Judge and Mrs. Charles Robertson, an old friend of his father, Judge Alfred K. Nippert, said in reviewing the life of Robertson and tracing the history of his forebears. Judge Nippert told of Robertson's home life, his childhood, his boyhood, and of his courting and marrying Hope Thomson on June 7, 1905, and how she had gone with him for the rendezvous with destiny in the mountains of North Carolina. He said Robertson had inherited his father's "Viking spirit." His words were intimate and heart-stirring as the distinguished judge turned back the pages of time for a glance at the beginning. And hearing him were Reuben L., Jr., and Dr. Logan Thomson Robertson, the two sons of the Robertsons who were born in North Carolina, and Dwight J. Thomson and the nieces and nephews of the Robertsons. They heard tributes paid also to Mrs. Robertson's father, the late Peter Thomson, who founded the Champion Paper & Fiber Co., with a few thousand dollars of borrowed capital in 1894 * * * at Hamilton, Ohio, and whose vision it was that led to the selection of Canton, N. C., as the site for the second pulp mill that was built in 1907.

In the keynote address, United States Senator CLYDE R. HOEY, Democrat, North Carolina, expressed the sentiments of those present and thousands who were unable to be there in person:

"We do honor to ourselves for by his many acts of service, his wisdom, and his judgment, Reuben B. Robertson has honored us far more than we are honoring him.

"His unfailing faith and courage is the type of spirit needed by Americans to meet the present world crisis.

"Under the leadership of men like Reuben B Robertson America has demonstrated the great power of the free enterprise system—a system which has survived many crises before, and will prove equally strong to meet the present emergencies.

"He makes me able to say, in the words of William Allen White: 'I have seen yesterday, I have loved today, and I face tomorrow unafraid'."

Senator HOEY paid gracious tribute to Mrs. Robertson, saying she had walked the road of high adventure with Robertson and shared all his triumphs and disappointments.

Tull L. Jamison, who had helped make paper at Canton for 41 years and is now retired, rose from his seat of honor at the speakers table and traced the history of Champion at Canton from the beginning to the present and there was a note of high praise as he declared Reuben B. Robertson has "built up a spirit of friendship and cooperation that nothing can shake loose."

Dr. Frank Graham, with whom Robertson had served during World War II on the National War Labor Board, credited him with helping stabilize "through the creative cooperation of organized business and organized labor, the mighty American production which helped to defeat the Fascist dictatorship and is now getting ready to resist, if necessary, to the utmost another monstrous enemy."

Dr. Graham declared Robertson is "a much beloved man of the North Carolina mountains and an enterprising and distinguished pioneer in the development of the Southern wood and pulp industry; that he has been an important factor in the growth of the South * * *."

North Carolina's Commissioner of Labor, Hon. Forrest H. Shuford, termed Mr. Robertson's industrial labor program "one of the finest labor relations programs in the Nation."

R. J. Stockham, president of the Stockham Valves & Fittings Co., Birmingham, immediate past chairman of the Southern Industrial Relations Conference, said that "much of the superior relations enjoyed in human relations in industry resulted from Reuben B. Robertson's leadership and example."

Robert M. Hanes, back from 2 years as head of the ECA mission in Belgium and Germany and head of the Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., and one of the South's 50 foremost leaders named with Robertson in 1949, praised Robertson's ability as a banker and his "unquestioned integrity and good judgment."

Earlier in the evening, when Mr. and Mrs. Robertson had been escorted to the dais, it was Robert M. Hanes who rose and led the assemblage in singing For He's a Jolly Good Fellow.

Ernest E. Norris, president of the Southern Railway System, was unable to attend but his words of high praise were read by Robert Darden.

William A. Kirkland, executive vice president of the First National Bank of Houston, Tex., praised Mr. Robertson "Texas style" and said that "Texas has tried hard to lure him from North Carolina, so we'd have something more to brag about."

Also, from Texas, were the "Four Flats From Houston," a quartet, including Leon Shiro Rolland Storey, Charles Underwood, and Charles Wallace, who provided mirth and comedy and entertainment and brought loud applause when they sang one of Mrs. Robertson's own compositions and a song of their own, The Man of the South.

The editor of Dixie Business, in making the Man of the South award, traced the history of the "South's hall of fame for the living" movement back to 1946 when Thomas W. Martin was named for the honor. He gave full credit to the editors of trade publications and magazines and newspapers and hundreds of others who, more than himself, had started a chain reaction of interest that has spread over the Nation. He unveiled and presented the illuminated scroll in the name of the 6,000 who had voted for Robertson and for the editors of Dixie Business.

In his response, Mr. Robertson said the testimonial was, to him, "a focal point in an adventure in kindliness."

"I have been given personal credit for what, in the most part, has been done in a representative capacity. I have endeavored to represent stockholders, workers, and associates to the best of my ability * * *."

He said the growth of the Champion Paper & Fiber Co. was due to many people. "It constitutes a tribute, not only to the loyal men who made these things possible but to the enduring principles of free enterprise without which no such progress would have been possible."

He gave credit to Mrs. Robertson, who had shared all the things of his life for 45 years and given him encouragement and understanding and inspiration.

And as I listened to him sharing his honors with so many others, I thought back to a day when his name first came to have a meaning to me. I was 22 and the year 1923. And already the leadership of Reuben B. Robertson had become a legend in the paper industry and in the leadership of men.

The late L. A. Thomas, a great paper maker and inventor, and I were embarked on an adventure in trying to build a newsprint mill to use southern pine—he to furnish the know-how and supervision and me to raise the capital. The plan failed because of my lack of ability to promote the idea. Mr. Thomas told me of what others were doing in the pulp and paper industry and what we could do.

Had Reuben B. Robertson remained with his father's firm of Robertson & Buchwalter in Cincinnati, he would have been a member of the Supreme Court today, no doubt.

Had his leadership talents turned to the military, he would be wearing the five stars of a general. As it is, today he has been the dynamo that has built his company from a small enterprise of a half a century ago to one with an annual sales of $100,000,000, giving employment to workers in North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Georgia, and furnishing a pulpwood market to hundreds in other States.

The Human Relations in Industrial Relations that 20 years later was to inspire the founding of the Southern Industrial Relations Conference began with Mr. Robertson when he first came to the mountain country.

Donald Comer, Man of the South for 1947, whose example at Avondale Mills is one of the finest, in his letter of ratification wrote:

"Back toward the beginning of my association with Avondale I have been much interested in the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. This is a conference of a cross section of southern industry, employer and employee, union and nonunion. For several days we live together under the same roof; we sit together for three meals a day and we listen to speakers from all walks of life and we discuss together our common problems and come away inspired and refreshed in our determination to improve industrial relations.

"I mention this because Mr. Reuben Robertson has been the inspiration and leader in all of these conferences year after year. His enthusiasm has permeated the group.

"It is a boost to the hope for the future that a man like Mr. Robertson can be selected Man of the South of the year * * *."

Perhaps it was because Mr. Robertson came into the woods before the mill was built and helped with its planning and came to know the men who worked to cut the trees and saw the lumber and helped construct the mill.

And in January of 1908, while his workers were learning the science of making pulp and paper, he was learning how to operate a mill.

He respected the dignity and integrity and intelligence of the men whose forebears had come as pioneers when the Nation was young and settled the area. He liked them and they liked him. They like his sense of fair play in all his dealings with them. They admired his sound business judgment and his executive ability. They liked him for his human qualities * * * his dynamic energy and his jovial disposition.

Thus began the epic story of free enterprise and the community as exemplified by Reuben B. Robertson and the men who make the Nation's finest paper and pulp.

It was in the days of the horse and buggy and mule and wagon and the slow mode of transportation may have influenced a program that has become far reaching and made Mr. Robertson a pioneer in reforestation and protection.

At any rate, he saw that a pulp mill could not be pulled up and moved like a small sawmill.

For him and his workers and associates and stockholders there could be no policy of "cut out and get out" so far as the supply of pulpwood was concerned.

So he set about on a program of reforestation and protection. Not only were seedlings planted to replace the trees cut for pulpwood in Champion's own forest holdings, Mr. Robertson set in motion a crusade to encourage others to do the same.

He was one of the first to apply the technique of extracting tannin materials from chestnut wood and making bleached pulp from the spent wood. As a result of his early efforts there is today at Canton the largest single tannin extract plant ever built.

Thirty years ago, Mr. Robertson realized the importance of developing the full potentialities of the rapidly growing southern pine and began working on the problem of developing a satisfactory bleached pulp from pine. He overcame many technical difficulties and the Canton division became the first mill in the Nation to produce an excellent quality of this bleached pulp from southern pine. His success led to the construction of the Houston, Tex., division of Champion in 1936.

He was an early promoter of a systematic program of safety and accident prevention. He has led in adopting many employee programs now in general practice in industry. He authorized the publishing of the Log, one of the early company house organs to keep his workers informed about what other workers were doing and giving them features on many subjects.

The North Carolina State College in 1932 bestowed on him the honorary degree of doctor of science for his achievements in science, in industry, and in promoting social welfare.

Not only has Mr. Robertson been a leader in the pulp and paper industry, he has been in the forefront of many movements for the advancement of his fellow man.

At various times he has served as president of the Canton Civitan Club, president of the Asheville Pen and Plate Club, chairman of the City-County Debt Committee of Asheville, director of the Wachovia Bank and Trust Co., member of the North Carolina State Planning Board, member of the advisory board of the Charlotte branch of the Reconstruction Finance Committee, president of the North Carolina State Planning Board, president of the North Carolina Forestry Association, a member of the North Carolina Highway County Debt Commission, trustee of the Asheville School for Boys, and where a large dormitory bears the name "Reuben Robertson Hall," chairman of the board of trustees of Western Carolina Teachers College, and trustee of the University of North Carolina.

He has served as chairman of the Asheville community chest and chairman of the American Red Cross fund for Canton.

He served with great success this fall as regional director of the Crusade for Freedom.

As one of the Nation's top leaders, he served as a member of President Roosevelt's labor-industry conference of 1941, as a member of the National War Labor Board, as a member of the war committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, and director of the National Association of Manufacturers. He was president of the American Pulp and Paper Association.

He is a graduate member of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, a member of the Industrial Relations Counselors of New York City and a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development.

Whenever the call for service comes, Reuben B. Robertson is ready today, as he has been for half a century, to give his time and talents.

THE ANNUAL ELECTION

In the beginning of the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" movement the title given to the man of greatest achievement in all the South was "South's Man of the Year."

The idea of honoring one man a year to honor many met with such a response that the editors of Dixie Business in 1949 changed the title to "Man of the South" to closer conform to the evolution that was taking place in the movement to give "flowers to the living."

When it was decided to expand the program by naming the South's 50 Foremost Business Leaders in 1949, Reuben B. Robertson was one of the first to be named and in the winter of 1948 issue of Dixie Business the announcement article by the editor said:

"* * * I quote these letters as Mr. Kurth will be among the South's 50 Foremost Business Leaders—as will Reuben B. Robertson * * *."

Ernest L. Kurth was elected Man of the South for 1949 and Reuben B. Robertson for 1950.

This year the concept of permitting leaders in all fields to be nominated and 50 more top leaders were selected. Mr. Robertson was thus elected from 100 of the South's foremost leaders who were named in recognition of a lifetime of distinguished service to the South.

Mr. Robertson's election was ratified by the four past Men of the South: Thomas W. Martin for 1946; Donald Comer for 1947; C. Hamilton Moses for 1948; and Ernest L. Kurth for 1949.

The news of the election electrified Mr. Robertson's many friends in Canton, Asheville, Houston, Tex., Hamilton, Ohio, and over the Nation.

A group of outstanding leaders formed a committee to sponsor Reuben B. Robertson Day and the testimonial dinner for the presentation of the man-of-the-South award.

The committee included J. Gerald Cowan, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., Asheville, chairman; Ernest E. Norris, Southern Railway System, Washington, D. C.; Don S. Elias, the Citizen-Times Co., Asheville; Richard W. (Dick) Wortham, Jr., Southland Paper Mills (headed by Ernest L. Kurth, man-of-the-South for 1949) Lufkin, Tex.; Harrison Jones, the Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta; Robert E. Henry, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Greenville, S. C.; and Richard J. Stockham, Stockham Valves & Fittings Co., Birmingham.

Thus another honor is accorded a man who over his lifetime has merited honor.

There are thousands who echo in their hearts the sentiments expressed by C. Hamilton Moses, man-of-the-South for 1948, who wrote:

"I am proud of this selection. His business and civic accomplishments are known throughout the Nation. Mr. Reuben Robertson is a credit to our American system, and the story of his life work with its great contribution to his people could have been written in no country besides America."

[From the Asheville Times of December 16, 1950]

REUBEN B. ROBERTSON, 1950 MAN OF THE SOUTH

This is Reuben B. Robertson Day in western North Carolina. Some of Mr. Robertson's special friends and admirers have designated it that because this evening the "Man of the South" award for 1950 will be presented to him at a testimonial dinner in his honor.

If all the people in this mountain region who know Mr. Robertson personally or by reputation—and who doesn't?—had been asked to pass on the decision and plans for this occasion we are confident the vote of approval would have been unanimous.

Now in his seventy-first year, Mr. Robertson has been intimately associated with the life, growth, and progress of western North Carolina for 43 years. He joined the Champion Fibre Co. in 1907 and in 1912 became general manager of the Canton plant. He became president of that company and held that position until 1935 when it merged with the Champion Paper & Fibre Co. and he was appointed executive vice president. He became president of that great industrial organization in 1946 and in July of this year was named chairman of the board. At that time his son, Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., succeeded him as president.

For many years now Mr. Robertson has been one of the top industrial leaders not only of the South but of all America. Many honors have been bestowed upon him for his

distinguished achievements in science, in industry, and in promoting the social welfare. During World War II he served for nearly 2 years on the War Labor Board by appointment of the late President Roosevelt.

Mr. Robertson's counsel and support have been sought in innumerable worthy causes and enterprises for the good of his community, region, State, and Nation. His response was always generous, wholehearted, and effective. His words, his deeds, and attitude have marked him as a man of outstanding vision, wisdom, tolerance, and humanity.

As one of the Nation's great industrialists Mr. Robertson has been a leader in the movement to better employee relations. He has practiced as well as preached his conviction that high morale and good teamwork are essential to successful business. This quotation from a speech Mr. Robertson made some years ago gives the gist of his philosophy and policy as head of a vast industry:

"The building and maintaining of congenial and constructive attitudes and relationships within the human organization of enterprise can be successfully achieved only as the methods employed are of the kind that stimulate the better emotions of people, promote loyalty, inspire cooperation in a search for mutual welfare, create confidence, and remove distrust."

We salute Reuben B. Roberston, the "Man of the South" for 1950. He deserves this and all the other honors that have come to him because he is a big man by any yardstick—big physically, big mentally, big in heart, and big in achievement. This man is truly one to match our mountains.

Our Present Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy relative to our postal service. The Postmaster General on April 17 issued extremely drastic orders curtailing vital and important services to the American people. The majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, by a decisive vote, demonstrated that they thought these orders were unnecessary and unwarranted.

Appearing in the Postal Record for March 1951 is an article by a very distinguished retired postal official, who voluntarily retired on October 1, 1950. James J. Doran has a most distinguished career. He started his service as a letter carrier in Waterbury, Conn., in 1906. He succeeded the present Postmaster General as Chief Inspector in August 1945, which position he held until July 1949. He was Director of Budget and Planning in the Post Office Department from July 1949 to August 1950, and Director of Rates from August 1950 to October 1, 1950, when he voluntarily retired.

He has written a most thoughtful article on the subject of our present postal service. This article should be read by every Member of the House of Representatives, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It follows:

OUR PRESENT POSTAL SERVICE

(By James J. Doran)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
January 18, 1951.

Mr. JAMES J. DORAN,
Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR MR. DORAN: You are undoubtedly familiar with the present postal curtailment program and the existing controversy resulting from the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, 1950. As one who has spent a lifetime in the United States Postal Service, I am convinced beyond words that a statement from you would be of great importance at this particular time.

I am in a position to publish whatever statement you care to make in the monthly organ of this association, the Postal Record. It goes without saying that whatever your approach to the postal problem, this association will publish your views verbatim.

It is my firm conviction that you will be rendering a great public service by making known your views on the present-day postal system.

With kind regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *February 14, 1951.*

WM. C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. DOHERTY. I have given a great deal of consideration to your letter of January 18, 1951, in which you invite me to make a statement on our present day postal service to be published in your official organ, the Postal Record. I note that you have agreed that anything I might offer in the way of an article will be published verbatim.

I have decided to accept your offer and I do so in the hope that some part of the article which I will submit may in a small measure lead to a settlement of the present-day postal controversy. Some of my friends will perhaps think that it was unwise on my part to become involved in this controversy, but to those who would form such an opinion, I call their attention to the possibility that any dispute, disagreement, or controversy stands a better chance of being adjusted and settled equitably if all of the truth is known and understood and not just a part of the truth. I believe that I have in my possession and I am setting forth in the article certain features of the rate situation and the postal curtailment matter that have not been given very much publicity in the past.

I thank you for your offer.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DORAN.

Until shortly after World War II the average American, and in fact all Americans, took our postal service for granted. It was looked upon with confidence and faith in its honesty and efficiency. Its rank and file could, if they so desired, boast of a fidelity not easily equaled and never surpassed. If its laws were broken or violated its inspection service went into action and stayed at it until the law breakers were in custody and punished. It could match its performance with any of its fellows in the National Government and do so without apology or explanation.

It was generally credited with doing a fine job during the war and was praised highly for contributing a great deal to our fighting men's morale by its prompt and efficient handling of the military mail. It did all this in spite of the absence of thousands of its best employees who were in the war. After the war rising costs of operation brought on staggering deficits which aroused Congress and brought considerable criticism from a variety of sources. This made a strange and not easily understood picture—with a less experienced force during the war we were praised; with our experience and efficient men and women back at work, we were being charged with waste and inefficiency.

There had to be a reason for this change and the reason was not hard to find. The Department wanted a raise in postal rates and the publishers and heavy mail users said, "No. It was not justified. Cut your costs. Put in up-to-date methods. Avoid your duplication. Dispose of useless records," and on and on. The deficit had grown steadily until in each of the fiscal years of 1949 and 1950 it exceeded $550,000,000. All concerned became postal deficit conscious.

The Department and other parts of the Federal Government had been investigated by the Hoover Commission. After the task force that spent the greater part of a year in its work on the postal service made its report a claim arose that a yearly savings of more than $200,000,000 was possible if up-to-date methods were used and modern mechanical equipment bought for the field service. This was just the kind of charge the opponents of the increased postal rate bill wanted and they used it to the best of their ability and capacity.

Just about the time it seemed nothing more could happen to or be said about the postal service that would add to its worries and troubles, the Post Office Department, yes the Department itself, decided otherwise. The Department reached the conclusion it had to curtail and eliminate postal service throughout the country. Accordingly on April 18, 1950, there appeared in the Postal Bulletin one of the most drastic orders ever written by a Postmaster General. You are familiar with the order which has been properly labeled the curtailment order.

Now for the reasons for the order. The Postmaster General said Congress and the Bureau of the Budget has reduced his requests for appropriation by such amounts as to compel a curtailment in postal service all over the Nation. He explained there was no other way in which to meet the situation and the order was placed in effect despite the opposition of Congress, the public, business, and the labor unions of postal employees. There had been substantial reduction in the amounts asked by the Department by the House of Representatives, and the Postmaster General took the viewpoint the Department would not be allowed to proceed on a deficit-spending basis. The Senate had not yet acted on the appropriation bill.

If I or any other person were to say the order was a mistake, that there were other means of reducing the over-all costs of operating the postal service, and failed to produce evidence to support and substantiate such a contention, you the reader would promptly and properly proceed to the conclusions my views and opinions were worthless. In place of setting my views and opinions on whether the order was a mistake, I am going to place before you facts, clear undisputed facts, all of which have been published by the Department at one time or another. All that is contained in this article is public property and a matter of public record. If perchance some of these public documents conflict with or contradict the efforts and representations of the Department in its fight for higher postal rates, then the Department must truly accept the responsibility so created. And if these public papers or some of them cast an element of doubt on the validity of the Department's case before Congress and the

people, then the Department can blame itself for a not too carefully prepared and presented line of evidence to establish the proof that higher rates and service curtailment were absolutely necessary.

Your organization contends the postal establishment is a public service and the need for a balanced postal budget is not as vital as the Department claims. You have called attention to other departments of the National Government that produce little or no revenue and yet obtain their appropriations without apparently too much trouble. All Americans use the postal service. Therefore it is a public service. As to the value of the contention that it should be supported by congressional appropriation regardless of the disparity between income and expense, that at first glance seems a wide departure from what might be considered the good, old-fashioned "earn your own keep" American methods. But if we look into the history of the postal service right down to the present moment we find considerable support for that very theory. Yes, the records of the Department will show that more than 39,000 of the more than 41,000 post offices of the country could not operate without what is truly a postal subsidy.

These 39,000 offices are of the second, third, and fourth class and are called district offices. At none of them are the receipts more than $40,000 a year and many have annual revenue of only a few hundred dollars. But they are necessary and perform good service, a service that our people could not and would not be expected to give up. Far from being self-supporting they cause an annual deficit of about $130,000,000 and this does not include the cost of mail transportation to and from these offices. The Department says its mail transportation costs amount to over $420,000,000 a year. It would be difficult to apportion the exact amount of the total transportation charges to these district offices, but recalling they are located in 39,000 different places in all 48 States and our possessions, an estimate of $50,000,000, which is slightly over 10 percent of the whole cost, would certainly not seem too high. At any rate a very substantial deficit is to be expected year after year and it can only be met by congressional appropriation.

Suppose the Department got a 20 percent increase in rates, the added revenue at these district offices would amount to probably not more than $10,000,000 unless the rate on first-class matter were raised. All the efforts of the Department up to the present were for increases on everything except first-class mail. Congress can never be expected to hike postal rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit in these district offices and it should not attempt to do so.

The Postmaster General and other officials of the Department have stated on many occasions that the cost of free postal services to other Government Departments and agencies, free in county newspaper handling, etc., amount to $160,000,000 a year. Add this to the annual deficit at the district offices and you have $290,000,000 or more than one-half of the entire postal deficit. And if we add the $50,000,000 (estimated) for mail transportation to these 39,000 offices we have a total of $330,000,000. This amount we will agree takes quite a slice out of the total postal deficit of $570,000,000. And if you add to that the subsidies given the air lines and other carriers of mail, you have accounted for at least $400,000,000 of the deficit. Subsidies should be recognized and labeled as such and there is no justification for the postal service being saddled with them. If Congress decides to reduce the amount of postal subsidies given, it can do so by increasing postal rates, but it cannot wipe out either now or in the future the subsidy it is giving to support the district offices.

The 39,000 represent 94 percent of all the offices in our postal service. The other 6 percent make a profit, and they, the 6 percent, were the ones most affected by the curtailment order. If a postal rate increase is granted it is their profits which will be increased. But is it a fair arrangement to expect the larger offices to produce enough revenue to wipe out the deficit, excluding the $150,000,000 which is the cost of the free services? Any increase in postal rates will be effective at all offices, but unless the Department changes its stand and asks for an increase on letter mail postage—on which it claims to make a profit—the added revenue at the district offices will be slight compared to that of the 6 percent now more than earning their expenses. Until this subsidy to the postal service is recognized and treated as such and not placed on the mail users at the profit making offices there can be little or no hope of proceeding in a fair and equitable manner in this matter of rates. Certain rates should be raised, particularly those on second- and fourth-class, but all concerned should be certain of the equity involved in the increases requested.

The Department's basis for asking for increase in postal rates is to be found in its cost ascertainment figures and statistics. Cost ascertainment is a time, weight and count study on all the mail handling and special service operatioins made at more than 500 offices of all four classes located in various parts of the country. From this study the Department puts forth the information that certain specified losses are incurred in handling second-, third- and fourth-class mail, and all the special services excepting postal savings. The opposition to the rate increases, and this opposition is numerous and forceful, says the cost figures are not accurate; that the Department does not know what its costs are, and furthermore it cannot be expected to find out what its costs with relation to each operation are under its present system of cost ascertainment.

Congress has a real interest in the postal service. True it has not passed the rate bill; probably because the Department said we lose so much on each operation and each class of mail except first, but it apparently did not produce enough proof to satisfy Congress on that issue.

The postal service should pay its personnel good wages, better than at present, and improve working conditions where possible; and the personnel owes it to itself, the Department and the people to do the best job possible. Postal employees have a great investment in the service. The best and greatest investment possible. It is themselves as people and their future, and it is upon them that the country must depend for an efficient service. The employee, like the Department must be realistic and recognize conditions and facts as they exist, if they can be changed for the better, well and good. If not, they must be faced. And one of the important facts to face is the cost of operation in the largest offices.

Cost-ascertainment figures show there is a difference in cost, a great difference; and, until it is wiped out or plainly explained and accounted for, the entire service is on weak ground in trying to convince anyone, especially Congress and the publishers, that an appreciable boost in rates is justified.

The Department has accepted cost-ascertainment figures and bases its efforts for increased rates on these figures. The Department claimed it could not continue to give the country the postal service that was in existence on April 17, 1950, and for some time prior thereto, because it was not getting the money needed for that service, and curtailment was the answer to the problem created by reduced appropriations. The head of the Department said he disliked to curtail the service, but as the entire postal service was operated economically there was nothing else to do. Savings were not possible in any other way. Sounds reasonable; doesn't it? A frank statement made about a frank and drastic order.

Now, no one who knows the officials and those holding high places in the Cost Ascertainment Division as I do, would charge these officials and employees with a desire to work against the Postmaster General. On the contrary, they are loyal honest people. Their responsibility is to put the data and statistics together in the form of reports of costs on different postal activities. These figures are gathered in the field. Under date of March 15, 1950, such a report was prepared and it was issued about the time of the April 18 bulletin—perhaps a few days later. This particular report contradicts the assertions that savings could only be made through curtailment. Yes—if the report is accurate, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary it should be accepted as accurate—this particular report dealt with the cost of operation in the 20 largest offices of the country. On one item, the cost of handling first-class mail, one office showed a cost of 133 percent more than the one that operated at the least cost. The average cost for the 20 offices was almost double that of the best office. Just imagine spending $5 for a piece of work in one office and getting that same piece of work done in another for $2.75.

Would it seem that savings could be made with such conditions existing? Yes, if the report accurately portrays present conditions and costs in the 20 offices in question, a savings of over $45,000,000 a year could be made in the handling of first-class mail alone. There was no explanation why such difference in operations cost should exist. There are bound to be some differences in costs of many postal activities but any report which showed such glaring disparity costs should be most carefully examined and analyzed before being made public. There were other differences of costs in other operations at these same 20 offices, but I might be considered as trying to build up a case if I offered additional detail. The report in question is not a secret. I am quite sure the congressional committee got copies of it and your organization may also have one.

The question will naturally arise in the minds of men of good sense—was this condition known to the officials of the Department and, if known, what, if any, action was taken? Let us again look at the record. The report of March 15, 1950, was not the first of its kind to be printed and issued. Others in years and months past had been distributed and showed similar conditions existing at the time specified on each report. The Department officials were aware of this disparagement in costs for the same kinds of work and in some of the reports discussions were had on what was termed "variables." Variables were introduced to offer some reasons why a difference might justifiably exist. But what kind of a variable it is that permits one office to spend the $5 for the same amount and kind of work and another only $2.75.

Could it be that the over-all management was satisfied to obtain and print cost figures and their related data and then go on to something else? Is it possible that the present postal management considered it had adequately and competently discharged its duties and responsibilities by gathering and publishing these very detailed reports on the operation costs in the 20 largest offices and then ignored the very conditions its own reports brought to light? If so the conclusion is and must be there is something wrong in that kind of management.

Each and every matter I have discussed in this article I brought to the attention (in writing) of the present postal management at one time or another. Only two of my memoranda were acknowledged. I felt I owed it to the postal officials to call to their attention the conditions, some of which at least, were in strong contrast to the repre-

sentations that savings could only be made through curtailment of service. I have always considered it disloyal to keep from my superiors any information which had a bearing on any of their policies or programs. It was a duty to call attention to the unpleasant and contradictory conditions—and one I tried to carry out under all conditions. There may be some who disagree with such procedure.

I Need Not Point Out to the Members of This House the Great Service Which Stu Symington Is Rendering His Country—We Know and Love Him as an Able, Sincere, Trustworthy, and Great Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, many Members share my belief that one of the best-known, highly regarded, and most popular National Broadcasting Co. programs, either on radio or television, is the program, Meet the Press, which follows Battle Report, Washington, Sunday afternoon.

On this program, high-ranking Government officials are, each week, interviewed by top-flight Washington newspaper correspondents on questions with respect to their own or the activities of the organizations over which they preside.

Members of the Senate and House, of the President's Cabinet, of the diplomatic corps, together with other top-rank military, as well as civilian executives, have appeared as guests on this program at various times.

There is no prior rehearsal. No holds are barred. Nothing but a high sense of propriety and of common respect, one for the other, establishes the criteria as to the questions asked by the news correspondents of their various guests.

I have long tuned in this program. I have done so in order to avail myself of the wealth of information imparted with respect to current problems which this half-hour question-and-answer period provides.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably no board ever established by Congress or appointed by the President, the results of whose influence could be of greater importance to the Nation, in peace as well as in war, than those of the National Security Resources Board, established under Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress.

The major function of that Board is to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. These include advices as to policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization that would insure maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower—the Nation's maximum effective use of natural and industrial resources—the maintenance and stabilization of civilian economy in time of war to implement the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions. Moreover, the National Security Resources Board establishes policies for unifying Federal Agencies and Departments of Government concerned with the production, procurement, distribution, and transportation of all supplies, materials, and products—civilian as well as military. Additionally thereto, it advises the President with respect to policies for establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical materials, and the conservation of the same, as well as strategic relocation of industries, Government, economic, and other activities essential to the Nation's security.

Mr. Speaker, some several weeks ago, the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, was the guest of the afternoon on the Meet-the-Press program.

While I well know that newspapermen always regard Stu Symington as good news copy—I want to say that no public official who has appeared, to my knowledge, on Meet the Press, has evidenced more complete, forthright, and greater alertness, or ever made a more unequivocal statement—than did Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

At the conclusion of the telecast one could not help but feel that here was a business executive of great ability, of great power, courage, and the will-to-do—who was unselfishly sacrificing much of his own personal interests—in order to serve his Government in these troublesome times.

Mr. Speaker, I need not elaborate on or even point out to the Members of this House the great service which the Honorable Stu Symington is rendering his country as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. We know him and love him as an able, sincere, trustworthy, and a great public servant.

It is because of these facts, and in order to bring the Meet-the-Press interview with Stu Symington to the attention of all Members of this House, that I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include same in the RECORD.

The program was as follows:

The ANNOUNCER. Our guest of the afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, will be Mr. W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. And, now, ladies and gentlemen, meet the press.

Ready for today's unrehearsed, spontaneous press conference are four of America's top reporters. Please remember that their questions do not necessarily reveal their point of view. It's their way of getting a story for you.

Now, meet Mr. Frank McNaughton, of Time magazine; Mrs. May Craig, of the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald; Mr. William White, of the New York Times; Mr. Marshall McNeil, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Finally, Miss Martha Rountree, moderator of Meet the Press.

Miss ROUNTREE. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, members of the press, and Mr. Symington. I understand, Mr. Symington, this is actually your first appearance on any radio or television program, so we are not going to waste any time breaking in.

I see Mrs. Craig has the first question.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, as a member of the Security Council, you are a very close top-level adviser of the President, aren't you?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I am a member of the Council and I am an adviser.

Mrs. CRAIG. And it is a very small top-level body?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, Mr. Symington, I understand that you have made some pretty strong proposals to the President as to what we ought to do in the Far East. Would you tell us today what you think we ought to do about Red China?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, it's a difficult question to answer from the standpoint of what I personally feel.

Mrs. CRAIG. Yes, I know.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But I believe that in the Far East we should utilize to the fullest our sea power and our air power where I believe we are superior.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, do you think that we can stay in Korea if we do not get the full backing of the United Nations?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think that we should stay in Korea if our military people think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, would the recommendations of your Board have a good deal to do with strategy in the end? Don't they go from you to the National Security Council of which the President is Chairman?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That's right, Mr. White, but our recommendations would be primarily on the basis of resources and not on the basis of strategy.

Mr. WHITE. Not on a military basis?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; they wouldn't be, except from the standpoint of resources.

Mr. WHITE. Well, what resources do you refer to?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, for example, the question of shortage of materials, and where we would stand if we lost Asia or Africa, South America. How self-sufficient we were. I don't mean by that as members of the Council that we nevertheless don't feel that we have a right to talk about those matters, but we try to have more of a positive position on those matters which directly affect resources.

Mr. WHITE. Would that affect manpower?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Oh, yes; that's a resource.

Mr. WHITE. Military manpower?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That's right, sir. That's a resource.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. To get back to your mention, Mr. Symington, before of the utilization of air power and sea power, do you mean a blockade of the China coast as recommended by some Senators and the bombing of bases in Manchuria from which the attack is coming?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I don't think I should answer that question because whatever my own personal recommendations were, they would not be final, nor is it my primary responsibility.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Well, you said in your speech out in St. Louis the other day that Russia had a 5-year lead on us in preparing for war. You were a former Secretary for Air. I want to ask you if you think this country is preparing fast enough now?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I'll put it to you this way: The faster we go, I think the better we are.

Mr. MCNEIL. Mr. Symington, in that same speech in St. Louis you said, "Soviet-built jet fighters sent against our airmen in Korea proved truly superlative in performance." In a speech on the same day at Philadelphia, Charles E. Wilson, the defense man, said: "Their"—meaning the Russians—"jet planes under war conditions have been no match for our newer jets." There seems to be some sort of a conflict there. What about these Russian jets?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I don't think there is a conflict. We have three type jets: P-80,

P–84, P–86. It's my belief that the P–86 is probably superior to the MG–15, the Russian-built Chinese jet, both with swept-back wings. It's my understanding that the Russian plane is superior to the P–84 and the P–80.

Mr. McNEIL. We have got one that is better than that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think we have, or just as good.

Mr. McNEIL. What about their bombers?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, as we know, they have a great many of the so-called TU–4 bomber, which is a B–29 type, and presumably they have improved it like we have improved the B–29 type into the B–50, which is primarily an improvement in engines. Also, they have some jet bombers which presumably are better than the B–29 type.

Mr. McNEIL. You spoke a minute ago of this using of air power in the Far East. Who stopped the Air Force from bombing those hydroelectric plants on the Yalu?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That I couldn't answer, Mr. McNeil.

Mr. McNEIL. If you were Secretary of the Air Force, would you be in favor of bombing them?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, if I were Secretary of the Air Force, I'd like to see air power used just as much to our advantage as it was possible because, certainly, manpower, one of the assets of our opponents, is being used to its fullest advantage.

Mr. McNEIL. Well, you stand with Rosie O'Donnell?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I don't know exactly what it was that Rosie said, but I will always stand with Rosie O'Donnell, if possible, because I think he is a fine American and a great fighting man.

Mr. McNEIL. He wants to use the big bomb. At least, that's what the papers reported, some of them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. On the basis of using the big bomb in China—and, again, I am out of my field, I think it would probably be a mistake.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, you are Washington's greatest advocate of airpower, I think. Certainly, you were when you were Secretary of the Air Force. Do you think that the success of the air arm in Korea has been enough to justify your own earlier conclusions and predictions?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I certainly do. We didn't build an Air Force to fight Korea. We built an Air Force to defend ourselves against all people and primarily against the Soviet. When we had to cut because we didn't have enough money, we cut the two things that we thought would be less necessary if we were attacked as against the two we thought would be more necessary.

Mr. WHITE. What were the two that you cut?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Air lift and tactical air considerably more than air defense and strategic air.

Mr. WHITE. Has tactical air been, rather, well, not too good in Korea?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it's been—I think, considering what we had, they have done a magnificent job, and people who have come back, Mr. White, told me we would have been out of Korea long ago if it weren't for the wonderful job being done by the Air Force and naval aviation.

Mr. WHITE. I'd like to ask one other question; going back to Mr. McNeil's on this Russian bomber you mentioned, what is its effective range?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, the effective range of all bombers that I know of, except the B–36, means that they cannot hit this country and return home if they were coming from Soviet territory. On the other hand, people should realize that they could come here on a suicide mission and parachute down and be imprisoned and protected—as we don't shoot prisoners—or through the process of refueling in which, as you know, nearly 2 years ago we sent a plane around the world that never came down once; on the basis of refueling, they could come over and they could go back.

Mr. WHITE. When you say "here," do you mean anywhere in the United States?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Oh, yes; anywhere in the United States.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, Senator DOUGLAS in his great speech in the Senate the other day said that we should let Russia know that the next satellite that strikes, we will hold Russia responsible. Do you agree with that, and how long do you think we ought to be bled by satellite wars?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, Mrs. Craig, I think that what we should do as much as possible is to face up to whatever the problem is. I believe our policies should be based in the future on policies of action as against policies or reaction to action. In other words, if I may just for a minute add to that, I think from here out, regardless of what anybody else does, this country should get strong and stay strong and should get strong just as soon and as quickly as possible and then stay strong.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, Mr. Symington, I'd like to go back to my first question. I'd like you to tell me a little more fully as to what you think we ought to do about Red China now because that is a very pressing problem, isn't it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it's a very pressing problem and one of the most important problems in the world. I don't think I ought to answer that question based on my position on this program publicly.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, let me ask you then a side question. Do you think that we should assent to the seating of Red China in the United Nations?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My personal opinion on that is that the President is a hundred percent right, and we should not agree to the seating of China in the United Nations.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. I'd like to revert back to the question along the line Mrs. Craig asked. How long can we continue, Mr. Symington, to put up with allowing the Soviets to bleed us white in actions like Korea or maybe in Western Europe? Where do we draw the line? Senator DOUGLAS said we ought to draw it now. Do you agree that we should?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, if I had as many constituents as Senator DOUGLAS had, I think I'd be more sympathetic with his position.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Do you agree with him that we ought to have 6,000,000 men in the Army as soon as we could by the end of this year, in the Army and Navy?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the number of men that we have in the services depends upon the over-all decision with respect to strategic planning, because the one thing that we do have in this country is productive capacity, and if we put so many people into the Army and the Navy and the Air Force, when our allies have a lot of people, to the point where we affect our civilian productive capacity, then I think that would probably be a mistake. When I say "civilian productive capacity," of course, I mean for war materials and essential civilian economy to support those materials.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. When you said in answer to my first question that the faster we went and the farther we went, the better it would be so that the more we get in right away, the more defense we will have, won't it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think so, but I think it's more important to approach the problem as it is today, considering the world situation, from the standpoint of all-out production than it is to approach it from the standpoint of all-out people in uniform and production, because all-out production, as we move into that type of mobilization, requires an awful lot of people in the plants themselves.

Mr. MCNEIL. I want to ask you something else about that St. Louis speech—that's a darn good speech about it, wasn't it? You said that equality of sacrifice is now the only path left to our security. Well, there are a lot of folks around here who are wringing their hands by inflation, "It's bad, it's terrible," they say, but do you know anybody that's really doing anything about it? Do you share the belief of some that the administration wants inflation and that perhaps they want a little of it, but they got too much and now don't know what to do about it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, answering the last part of your question first, I am absolutely certain that our President not only doesn't want inflation but wants to do whatever is necessary to prevent inflation.

Mr MCNEIL. Well, why don't he do something? Why don't they freeze wages and prices? Why haven't they done that since Korea? They have the authority, I believe, haven't they?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, can I try and answer it?

Miss ROUNTREE. Go ahead, Mr. Symington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, it was very difficult to freeze prices before you had the beginning of an organization, but more important to me was the fact that we had very little military orders for months after Korea going into the economy. Now that has been corrected and the justification for the freezing of prices and wages, which, incidentally, I am for and have been for for some time——

Mr. MCNEIL. Yes; I know.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is based on the fact that you now are getting a military impact and that you now have the core of an organization.

Mr. MCNEIL. Well, there was some difference on that, of course. A very smart cookie, Mr. Baruch, said that you should have done that a long time ago, and he's no novice at this thing. He said you could have done it at the start, so there is a conflict of opinion about that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That's right. I used to get quite a few letters and telegrams and have conversations with him about it, but I claim that the military should force the recognition of the importance of it because I thought the horse should be the military orders and the cart should be a result in the form of price and wage controls, that military orders should be first and price and wage controls should be second. That's the way it's going to be now. You have already got a great deal of new military orders coming into the economy.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, a lot of people are interested in your future. When you left being Secretary of Air, there were many people who thought you would come back eventually as Secretary of National Defense. Could you tell us anything about that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I certainly can. I am certain that I will not go back as Secretary of National Defense. I believe that the American people have great confidence in General Marshall and in his aide, Mr. Lovett, and I am quite happy where I am.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, there are three great boards in Washington about which the people know very little. One of them, of course, is the National Security Council—you mentioned one as your own board—and one is the Atomic Energy Commission. Do you feel comfortable that people know so little about what is going on in those agencies since they affect them so much?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think you have a very good point there. I believe the more we tell the American people about what we are doing, provided it's not obvious that what we say helps the enemy, the better off it will be for the country.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask this question—if it is unfair, please consider it withdrawn. You are almost uniquely qualified to express an opinion, if you care to do so—I suppose no one but Stalin knows the answer—but what is your opinion, is it your opinion that a world war is more probable than a mere long period of tension like we have now or not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I'd like to answer you one that would fit the way I did in that speech. I think if we get strong and stay strong, regardless of the cost, that we might avert a world war. If we don't, I think we are going to have one, and I think we are going to lose it.

Mr. WHITE. Would you define a little more what you mean by strong? That is something with generality. You mean a great deal stronger than we are today, or a great deal stronger than we may be in a year?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think last year we were putting around 5 to 6 percent of our gross national product into our defense, and I think in 1944 we were putting about 40 percent in our gross national product in the 1 year. Now, I'd rather see—and I don't know yet, I don't think anybody knows too much just how much of that gross national product is going into our national defense—before I state "yes" or "no" whether I felt that we were going fast enough. Does that answer your question?

Mr. WHITE. Thank you very much.

Miss ROUNTREE. Do you still feel that the B–36 is as powerful and effective a weapon as you testified when you were Secretary for Air?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I certainly do.

Miss ROUNTREE. Do we have enough of them now? If we really tomorrow had to fight up to a war, could we do an effective job?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I'd like to answer this way: Based on the size of the ship and the job it has to do, I don't think we can have too many of them.

Miss ROUNTREE. Do we have enough now?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, the more we get, the better. I don't know what the figure is. I know we are building more, and I know we are going to build a lot more than originally planned.

Mr. MCNEIL. Mr. Symington, this job of yours as head of the Security and Resources Board, you are supposed to know whether we got the stuff to win this war if we ever get in it. You are supposed to know whether we got the tin and the lumber and the oil and the manpower and everything else; isn't that right?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, that was—primarily, Mr. McNeil, I am an adviser to the President on the integration of the military and the industrial with the civilian.

Mr. MCNEIL. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Now, many of the normal peacetime duties of the Resources Board will be taken over by Mr. Wilson as Director of the department of OPD. He'll handle those.

Mr. MCNEIL. Still aren't you the man that signs the final certification for handling the steel plant?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, I do; but I am only doing that until he is ready to take it over because we have agreed together, with complete agreement, that he should take that over because primarily that's an operating matter.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. I'd like to nail this down a little harder on just what we should do, Mr. Symington. Since you advise the President on these matters, let's hear just how many men you think we should have in the Army, say, at the end of this year? How many air squadrons you think we should have, and what you think about that? You have talked in generalities here. You said if we didn't get going, we might lose the war. Now, what does it take within this next year so that we can be sure that we are not going to lose it? How many men in the Army? How many men in the Navy? How many air squadrons?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My impression is that we are putting just as many people in the Army and we are building just as many groups and we are having just as many task forces as we believe it is necessary from the standpoint of stategic planning which, of course, is not discussible at this meeting, and we think we can handle. In other words, we could only digest so many people into the economy—or, rather, into the military from the economy, and I honestly couldn't answer how many people I thought should be in the Military Establishment at this time.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Well, do you say then that the defense preparations are going fast enough to suit you?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thought I answered that to Mr. McNeil when I'd rather see how much of our gross national product we are putting into the defense effort as against, for example, what we put in in 1942 or 1944—I think was our biggest year when we know we were in trouble.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, in that speech you said that it was vital for us to be fully mobilized now. Do you think we are even planning full mobilization?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think that we are planning for as many people now as we can use. I think in the last few weeks the decision has been made on materials and men to go faster than was the previous decision. To be frank, not too long ago I didn't think we were going fast enough, but I happened to have a chance to digest the new situation and again I say that I think that how fast we go depends upon how much of our national product we are going to put into it—in other words, how many guns we think we can have and how much butter we think we can have based on the emergency.

Mrs. CRAIG. There has been a good deal said here about men and manpower and people today. Now, it seems to me that when you were Secretary of Air, you did not like that idea of balance between air, ground and sea, that you felt air power should have preponderance. Now, do you still think that today? Is air power sufficiently preponderant in this mobilization?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, there is a big difference between what it is today and what it was then, because then we had an arbitrary shielding established on the amount of money we were allowed to spend. Now, I believe, in the Air Force—and that was good because I thought we should have a greater proportion of that limited amount of money, but, on the other hand, I was fully sympathetic with those of the other services who felt that they should have a greater proportion of that amount of money. Today, there isn't a limitation, and they go based on a plan which is a military plan presumably, as against a fiscal limitation as a premise to their development.

Mrs. CRAIG. But as a top-level adviser looking at all three, do you think that the air is getting the preponderance you always believed in?

Mr. SYMINGTON. From the figures that I have heard—now, I am out of the Air Force and I can only speak personally—but from the figures that I have heard, I believe we are building an air force which is an adequate air force to face up to the emergency. Now, if at any time for any reason like conciliatory gestures or any other reason we don't go through with the plans that we have, then I reverse myself and say that we are not carrying out our planning on an action basis. We are reacting to what other people do and I think that's wrong.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator Taft, you know, as you recollect, said we should concentrate on sea and air power and not on ground forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think that what we should concentrate on depends upon what the President and General Marshall and the military chiefs think is right. I believe implicitly that air power is absolutely essential to the security of the United States, and I think that sea power, control of the seas, is essential to the security of the United States, and I also believe that we have got to have a good army.

Mr. MCNEIL. You said something about conciliating somebody a minute ago, and earlier you talked about a whole strategic plan that we have. Are we building up something here to conciliate somebody about something?

Mr. SYMINGTON. What I meant is if we listened to what the Nazis said they were going to do, why, we would have been better off than not believing them. If we listen now to what the Russians said they are going to do and then don't when they say, "We are only fooling," in my opinion we would be better off and I'd like to see us go ahead regardless of any conciliation. I have always been willing to negotiate for peace, but negotiate on the basis of a strong background instead of the basis of a weak background.

Mr. MCNEIL. As a man who did more selling around this town of the necessity for a big air force, I think you'd feel pretty happy about "Stu" Symington now—they are talking about a hundred group air force.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, bygones are bygones.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Well, it was about 3 years ago here, I think, Mr. Symington, that you were walking around with some nine hundred million in your vest pocket for airplanes that you couldn't spend. That was withheld from you, wasn't it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Withheld?

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. You weren't allowed to spend it at any rate. Do you think it was a mistake to have taken that action at that time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think anybody who did anything to reduce our strength 3 or 4 years ago now realizes that was a mistake at that time.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. Who did that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I think it was done by—I think it was done by the administration and also by the Congress, and I'd rather stick to issues than to get into personalities on that point.

Mr. MCNAUGHTON. They started us out late on our actual rearmament, didn't they, the action taken then?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; but that was only one point. I think our greatest mistake for 5 years has been that we were fighting for peace while these other fellows have been fighting to get ready for war.

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Symington, how long do you think we have before we have got to be ready to fight? It's an opinion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I couldn't answer you directly because I might be giving a date away of being an established date, but my own is the sooner that we are ready to defend this country with that strength we think is essential to defend it, the better it will be for the American people.

Mrs. CRAIG. Maybe this year?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The sooner the better.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Symington, I have heard it said in the Pentagon that in 18 months, if we go fast, we might be in a position where we couldn't be challenged by the Russians. Is that too optimistic?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, I wouldn't want to date myself on that.

Mr. WHITE. Thank you.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The sooner we are ready, I think, the better it is for the country.

Miss ROUNTREE. I am sorry, we don't have time for any more questions, Mr. McNaughton. Our time is up. This concludes our latest edition of Meet the Press; and thank you, Mr. Symington, very much for being with us.

Wisconsin's Quality Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under its competent and dynamic director, Don McDowell, the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture is doing much to expand and justify Wisconsin's Nation-wide reputation as America's dairyland.

Since Wisconsin supplies such a large amount of dairy products to all parts of the country, its quality milk program is of interest far beyond the boundaries of the State.

I am inserting herewith, Mr. Speaker, that portion of Mr. McDowell's biennial report which deals with the department's quality milk program:

QUALITY MILK FROM FARM TO TABLE: A MID-CENTURY CHALLENGE—AS DAIRYING GOES, SO GOES WISCONSIN

The dairy business, from the farm to the table, is the economic lifeblood of Wisconsin's agriculture. No other business enterprise means so much to the general welfare of Wisconsin people. It supplies the Nation with protective, health-giving dairy foods. It is the greatest single factor in conserving the soil resources of the State. The dairy industry provides the home and livelihood for 160,000 Wisconsin dairy farmers and their families. In addition, the dairy industry employs the largest number of people of any agricultural pursuit in the State. On the farm alone it represents an investment of over $2,000,000,000.

Wisconsin citizens cannot afford to take lightly the welfare of dairying. The dairyman's welfare is the State's economic barometer. While the future success of dairying in Wisconsin rests largely with farmers themselves, no other social or economic group can prosper in the face of a distressed dairy industry.

DAIRYING NO ACCIDENT

Wisconsin's leadership in the Nation's dairy industry is the result of hard work and the practical use of the State's natural resources. Pioneers who settled this State came largely from the Northeastern States or from northern Europe. They saw in Wisconsin's rich soil, favorable climate, and rolling countryside a land particularly suited to dairying.

Early dairying in the State did not follow an orderly and well-planned course. In the pioneer days wheat-growing was the main source of income. It was the day of the family cow. But as transportation improved and markets were created through the growth of villages and cities, a dairy industry slowly emerged. Scientific developments like the cream separator, the Babcock test, and improved factory processing equipment spurred the growth of the industry.

In 1916 income from milk amounted to $93,000,000, or about 38 percent of Wisconsin's cash farm income. By 1949 income from milk had soared to $453,000,000—nearly 50 percent of the State's gross farm income.

STABILITY IN DAIRYING

Cash receipts from milk are vital to the stability of Wisconsin life and business. Milk checks received monthly or semimonthly by farmers provide the purchasing power for most of the necessities of farm living. Except for 3 years, the cash income from milk has accounted for at least one-half of the annual total farm income since 1923. Even during the depression, when milk prices were at an unusually low level, the percentage of the total farm income from this source was the highest on record for Wisconsin.

Often the income from sales of cattle, hogs, and other livestock are used for taxes, new equipment, repairs, and payments on loans. Compared with the 46.7 percent of 1949 cash farm income from milk, the sale of cattle and calves accounted for 15.3 percent, hogs 12.1 percent, poultry 11.2 percent, other livestock less than 1 percent, and crops 13 percent.

Not all of the importance of dairying in Wisconsin can be measured in terms of income from milk. Wisconsin is internationally known for its dairy breeding stock. Income from breeding cattle sold makes up a large part of the returns from the sale of cattle and calves, which in 1949 were estimated at $146,000,000, or about 15 percent of the annual cash farm income.

TAKES BIG INVESTMENT

With today's heavy use of machinery and the inflated costs of equipment, the investment in Wisconsin's dairy industry is staggering. In many instances a dairy farmer's investment equals or exceeds the capital investment of the merchant he trades with in his home town. In addition to land, buildings, and machinery for crop production, he has a substantial investment in his herd and the dairy equipment so essential for efficient production of top quality milk.

Wisconsin's dairy herds alone had a farm value of $520,000,000 at the beginning of 1950. The total value of all cattle was $647,000,000.

Farm investment is only one part of the capital required in the entire dairy industry. Millions are invested by farmers and others in the State's 2,274 dairy processing plants. The investment in Wisconsin's 5,800 milk trucks alone probably exceeds $20,000,000.

A LIVELIHOOD FOR OTHERS

Wisconsin's billion-dollar dairy industry is the largest single factor in the State's economic system. The State's 160,000 dairy farmers are heavy purchasers of machinery, equipment, feed, fertilizer, household and personal goods which directly affect thousands of nonfarm citizens. The dairy farm creates business for truckers, cattle buyers, wholesalers, retail stores and many others. Thousands are employed in the processing, distributing, and marketing of more than a billion pounds of Wisconsin's milk every month.

WHAT IS SOMETIMES OVERLOOKED

Our dairy industry provides 150,000,000 Americans with an economical and dependable source of health-giving protective minerals, vitamins, and complete protein essential to good health.

Our dairy industry encourages the conservation of our soil and natural resources through the encouragement of grassland farming. It is the only system of agriculture which improves rather than depletes the priceless fertility of our cropland. The dairy cow is the most efficient machine the world has ever known for converting plant roughage into a palatable, concentrated human food.

Wisconsin's dairy industry plays a vital role in our American way of life. Today, as a Nation, we find ourselves assuming difficult and complex responsibilities in attaining and maintaining a peaceful world. America must be strong. A well-fed Nation has strength.

The stakes are high—we all have a share in the future of America's dairyland.

MEETING TODAY'S CHALLENGES

The continued success of any business in America today depends largely upon how well it can cope with sudden as well as long run changes. Keeping up with the times in such a complex decentralized industry as the dairy business is an ever-present challenge.

AN OUTSTANDING PRODUCTION RECORD

Wisconsin dairy farmers have proved that they can produce dairy products. Wisconsin today produces 15,500,000,000 pounds of milk a year—about twice as much as its closest competitor. This is 18 percent of all the milk produced in the United States. We rank first in production of cheese, condensed and evaporated milk, powdered milk and malted milk. We lead in the number of milk cows. We rate third among the States in the production of butter.

A large part of the Nation's total dairy production comes from Wisconsin. We produce one-half of the Nation's cheese, slightly less than one-half of the powdered whole and skim milk. Three-fourths of the Nation's malted milk powder is produced in Wisconsin and one-fourth of the condensed and evaporated milk.

NEED NATIONAL MARKETS

Our major outlets, therefore, are beyond the State's borders. Wisconsin has more at stake in developing national dairy markets than any other State.

About 21 percent of our total milk production was marketed as fluid milk in 1949. Twelve percent was shipped to out-of-State fluid markets, and another 9 percent consumed in the State in fluid form.

Approximately 70 percent of our total milk production was used for the manufacture of dairy foods. In 1948, 87 percent of these foods found markets in other States. This included 95 percent of our cheese, 95 percent of our evaporated milk, 96 percent of our powdered whole and skim milk, and 65 percent of our butter.

These foods move through a complex network of trade channels which are very hard to trace. But we do have reports from several large market centers which give an indication of how widely some of our products are distributed.

First let us look at cheese, one of our most important dairy foods. Reports are available of receipts of cheese at 10 major markets and the origin of these shipments. They show that in 1948 these markets received about 286,000,000 pounds of cheese, with more than 166,000,000 pounds coming from Wisconsin—58 percent of all the cheese received and one-third of Wisconsin's total cheese production. We still had nearly two-thirds of our cheese to be sold in hundreds of other markets throughout the Nation.

Or we might look at butter: These 10 major markets in the same year received about 33,000,000 pounds of Wisconsin butter—again about one-third of all the butter we produced in 1948. Another third went to other widely scattered markets.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION AMERICANS IS OUR MARKET

In the final analysis our market is every one of the 150,000,000 of American people—men, women, and children. For many years much emphasis has been given to the importance of plenty of milk and dairy products for children. Today, with the average life span greatly lengthened, we are just beginning to realize that milk is also very essential to good health among adults—particularly older people. Recent research has shown that one of the essentials to a vigorous old age is plenty of calcium. Milk and dairy foods are the chief sources of calcium in the diet. They also supply many other food elements essential to good health during the later years of life.

During the past 10 years there have been some important shifts in the consumption of dairy foods which have brought about corresponding marketing developments. Because of the greater emphasis upon the use of all food elements found in milk, particularly during the war years, there has been a marked trend toward marketing whole milk. In Wisconsin, for example, deliveries of whole milk to dairy plants increased 64 per-

cent, while deliveries of cream dropped 84 percent.

This brought widespread changes in the type of products manufactured, including a much greater use of milk solids and a drop in the production of butter.

Today the American people drink more whole milk and eat more cheese, ice cream, and evaporated and powdered milk than ever, but consume less butter. Here are the comparative figures for per capita consumption during 1949 and the average for the five prewar years:

	1935–39 average	1949	Increase	Decrease
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Cheese	5.5	7.2	1.7	
Butter	16.7	10.6		6.1
Ice cream	9.5	16.3	6.8	
Evaporated milk	15.0	17.7	2.7	
Fluid milk and cream	340.0	382.0	42.0	
Total consumption (milk equivalent)[1]	801.0	758.0		43.0

[1] Milk equivalent means the total amount of milk represented by all the various types of dairy foods.

A GREAT POTENTIAL MARKET

The question of too many dairy products is not new. Sixty years ago many Wisconsin people thought we had expanded our dairy industry to the point where we had too much milk and too much cheese and butter. At that time we were producing less than 3,000,000,000 pounds of milk a year. Since then we have increased our output to five times that amount.

Immediately someone is going to ask: "But what about the surplus of milk and dairy products?" Without digging into the deeper fundamentals of today's situation, there may seem to be justification for the question. Let's look at it for a moment.

We have pointed out that the United States consumption of milk and dairy foods in 1949 totaled 758 pounds. Our peak national consumption was 839 pounds per capita in 1942. If we had had a per capita consumption in 1949 equal to that of 1942 we would have had no surplus. Instead, we would have been 6 percent short of having enough milk to go around.

But that isn't the whole story. Americans consume much more milk and dairy products than do the people of most other countries, Dr. Hazel K. Stiebeling, Chief of the United States Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, says "we cannot be satisfied with only passable nutrition." Recent surveys point out that some 40 percent of the families need more calcium in diets, 20 percent need more food supplying the B vitamins, and 10 percent need more protein and iron in their diets. Dairy foods are excellent suppliers of all these important requirements.

Nutritionists recommend 1 quart of milk a day for children and at least a pint a day for adults for adequate nutrition. Based on our present distribution of population, this would require nearly double the amount of milk now being consumed.

On the basis of all these studies and years of painstaking research into the part an adequate nutrition plays in good health, the United States Department of Agriculture has suggested that an annual consumption of 150,000,000,000 quarts a year is a goal that can be achieved in the Nation. Our present national production is about 60,000,000,000 quarts a year.

MARKETING CHALLENGES CAN BE MET

Wisconsin's dairy industry has outstripped the production records of any other industry in the past 10 years. Dairy farmers have proved they can produce. But nutrition authorities tell us that American families should consume nearly double their present consumption of milk and dairy foods.

Some people will argue that families do not consume more dairy foods because they don't have the money to buy them. Certainly our dairy industry must constantly strive for more efficient production and marketing methods to give consumers dairy foods at the most economical cost. But the facts do not bear out the claim that the purchasing power of consumers is the only factor affecting consumption. Dr. Stiebeling, of the United States Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, points out, in a recent survey, that almost 40 percent of our families even with incomes as high as $7,500 per year live on diets which are low in calcium. Why don't these families consume enough dairy products to make up this deficiency when a quart of milk per day or its equivalent in other dairy foods supplies 100 percent of an adult's calcium needs?

The dairy industry must face this question squarely. It presents one of the basic needs of our marketing program. The answer can come only from the dairy industry through a new and more vigorous use of three age-old marketing tools:

1. An all-out sincere quality program.
2. A greatly expanded advertising and promotion program.
3. Continuation and expansion of sound research to lead the way.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR QUALITY

Consumers demand good quality dairy products. They want the quality of their products to be good day in and day out. If Madam Consumer buys dairy foods on Monday and likes them she'll be back to buy more on Thursday. If she doesn't like the product she gets on Thursday she won't be back to buy more on Saturday.

If Wisconsin cannot live up to this challenge for uniform quality products which are attractive to consumers the results to dairy marketing will not be pleasant. These are among the possibilities:

First, Wisconsin may lose the markets it now has, as well as lose the opportunity to develop any future potential outlets for dairy foods.

In the second place, synthetic and substitute products will have a better chance to take over our markets. Herein lies a constant and serious challenge.

Finally, consumers will continue to insist on good quality products, and they will be supplied by other areas which can give them the products they want.

NOT A NEW PROBLEM

Quality-wise thinking is not new in the Wisconsin dairy industry. It is as old as the industry itself, and during the past 75 years it has passed through a long process of gradual growth and evolution. No word has been heard more frequently among dairy farmers, field men, plant operators and others in the dairy industry than the word "quality."

Better quality was taught by the early Wisconsin dairy leaders. Then, as dairying expanded, it became a cooperative job, spearheaded by the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association. This association not only talked quality, but it took the lead in actually showing how cheesemakers and buttermakers could do a better job.

When the dairy and food commission was created in 1889, quality became its watchword. It took over the field work started by the Dairymen's Association, and its field inspectors became an important part of the State quality program. When the dairy and food commission, the Department of Markets and the old Department of Agriculture were consolidated into the present Department of Agriculture, dairy quality continued to be one of its major activities.

When we speak of quality milk today we have in mind something quite different from the generally accepted concept of that term 50 years ago. As our dairying has changed so have our ideas of quality. Quality standards have moved steadily forward as the industry changed from a small-scale production for home or community consumption into a modern large-scale operation for the national markets.

QUALITY EVERYONE'S JOB

Quality dairy production in Wisconsin today means the continuing cooperation of 160,000 individual dairy farmers. Producers must make a sincere, consistent, and diligent effort every day to meet many routine but important details.

Production of top quality dairy products on the farm is a wonderful beginning. But milk haulers, dairy plant fieldmen, employees and managers of over 2,200 dairy plants must work together and with the farmer to make certain that the natural goodness of the milk and dairy products are preserved all the way from the farm to the consumer's table.

Dairy plant operators and fieldmen, dairy organization leaders, extension specialists and State inspectors serve the industry all the way along, helping to keep it alert to undesirable practices affecting the salability of dairy foods.

Quality milk today means good quality dairy foods on the tables of 150,000,000 Americans from Maine to California and from Washington to Florida. That brings into the team all of those who assemble, transport, wholesale, and distribute these dairy products at retail to all the homes in the Nation.

TEAMWORK BEGINS ON THE FARM

High quality dairy products cannot be legislated. It is not enough to produce them in a scientific laboratory. They can be made only through sound quality production practices on the farm, followed by careful handling in transportation and skilled processing in clean, well-equipped, and properly managed dairy plants.

It is fundamental that our dairy products cannot be better than the quality of the milk from which they are made. Healthy dairy cows are the beginning.

HERD HEALTH VITAL

Wisconsin began its fight against livestock diseases when our dairy industry was still in its infancy. Much progress has been made, but the job is not finished.

One of the first diseases against which a State-wide campaign was launched was tuberculosis in cattle. Wisconsin has been a leader in the eradication of this disease. It too was accomplished through teamwork between dairymen, veterinarians, and State and Federal agencies over a period of 20 years. Latest tests indicate that Wisconsin has virtually eradicated this disease.

Another cattle disease which has more recently come into the spotlight is brucellosis, or Bang's disease. Concerted action against this disease was started about 15 years ago, and while considerable progress has been made, much greater strides will be necessary if we are to eradicate it completely. Attention was directed to the need for prompt action against brucellosis by recent announcements that future milk market requirements may exclude any milk except that produced from brucellosis-free herds.

Recent area tests in certain sections of Wisconsin indicate that less than 5 percent of our livestock is infected with brucellosis. These tests show that less than 20 percent of the herds in these areas have any infection at all. A recent survey in one county further shows that about 40 percent of the infected herds had less than 1 cow out of 10 infected with the disease.

Like any quality program, fighting livestock disease also requires teamwork. Only through the cooperation of farmers, livestock dealers, and veterinarians, and with the help of latest scientific developments, Wisconsin can eradicate brucellosis.

Another livestock disease which is causing dairymen concern is mastitis. Much progress is being made in controlling it through good herd-management practices and through new discoveries in the field of medicine.

A QUALITY CODE DEVELOPED

Although there had been much earlier talk about better dairy products, dairy farmers during the 1920's began to realize that a greater insistence on quality was inevitable. The immediate cause for this realization was the interest shown in sanitation by the United States Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Administration and a tightening of requirements in certain milk markets.

No concerted action was taken, however, until a bill to create milk production standards was introduced in the 1937 legislature. While the bill failed to pass, it probably laid the foundation for the adoption of a dairy quality enabling act by the 1939 legislature. This measure authorized the department of agriculture to establish standards and regulations for the production of quality milk.

Immediately after the passage of this law, farmers, other members of the dairy industry, and governmental and educational agencies joined hands in launching a State-wide educational program for the production of clean milk. This program, set up on a county basis, was voluntary. Quality meetings were scheduled in almost every schoolhouse in the State. This program continued until 1942 when war demands for increased production overshadowed everything else.

NEW INTEREST AFTER WORLD WAR II

After the war, interest in quality improvement was renewed. The Wisconsin Dairy Industry Committee, which had been active in the prewar quality campaign, was reorganized into the Wisconsin Dairy Federation. This industry-wide group represents every major segment of the dairy industry.

As its first job the federation made a study of the problems of dairying. On the basis of its findings, quality improvement in milk and cream was selected as the No. 1 need of the industry. A quality improvement committee was therefore named.

For nearly 2 years this committee studied dairy quality, and at the end of that time submitted a set of proposed standards based on the provisions of the 1939 law. Then followed months of further study and deliberation and consultation with farmers, dairy plant operators, educators, and scientists. The revised draft was then submitted to the board of directors of the federation and in February 1948 the proposed standards were presented to the State department of agriculture with a request that steps be taken to embody their provisions in a new department regulation.

In May 1948 the department announced a series of nine hearings at which all interested persons would be given an opportunity to express their opinions for or against the proposed regulations. When the hearings were completed all testimony was carefully studied, and changes made in the standards to comply with the needs of the dairy industry.

Between January 1949 and November 15, 1949, when the regulations went into effect, hundreds of meetings were held with farmers, milk haulers, dairy plant employees, quality fieldmen, inspectors, and others. The purpose was to explain the reasons for the new standards, how they had been prepared, and the purpose they were designed to serve. Announcement of the regulations in final form as General Order 124 was made by the department of agriculture on August 15, 1949.

HELP DEVELOP TEAMWORK

The purpose of the milk quality standards is to help dairy farmers develop teamwork in their industry. Their goal was the production of high quality milk—a uniform minimum code to encourage cooperation and participation by all.

The standards were developed in recognition of the fundamental fact that it is the quality of the product when it reaches the consumer that determines whether or not we maintain and expand our dairy markets. As William F. Groves, president of the Wisconsin Dairy Federation, has so often said, "It is the consumer that writes the ticket."

Leaders in the dairy industry, as well as other industries, have long recognized that the success of new business depends upon consistent production of high quality products. Consumers want to feel confident that the goods they buy are of uniformly good quality—day in and day out.

But the problems of the dairy industry are more complex than those of many other industries. Consistent production and marketing of high quality dairy products involves the cooperation and teamwork of thousands of individuals in the many steps which lead from the farm to the consumer's table.

A year of operation under the minimum quality standards has not solved all quality problems. They have not performed miracles and they have not been a complete cure-all. But great forward strides have been made. Results this past year have been acclaimed by many as the greatest forward step in improving dairy quality ever taken in the history of Wisconsin's dairy industry.

These standards have given farmers a better understanding of the part they must play in any quality improvement program. At the same time, processors, and handlers of milk have gotten a clearer understanding of the farmer's quality problems.

Here are a few typical quotations from a large number of statements by dairy fieldmen and plant operators:

"Quality is a lot better than it used to be."

"Milk has improved this year over last."

"Butter scores are improving."

"Cheese working better than ever. No trouble at all this year."

"Best sediments this year we have ever had."

"We have never had such good milk in the history of our company. Made the best cheese this year in the 35 years we have been in business."

"The effect of this program is quite evident in the improved quality of milk being delivered by our patrons."

Other accomplishments during the past year include doubling the number of covered milk trucks, a rapid increase in milk house construction, improved farm conditions, and a marked improvement in the general level of milk quality.

The Wisconsin dairy industry should be commended for its progress in improving the quality of its finished products. The heroes are the thousands of farmers who have had enough pride in their business to take the extra care needed to make sure they are doing the best job at all times. Credit is also due dairy industry leaders who have been farsighted and constructive, even in the face of many obstacles, in developing the teamwork required within the industry to put the over-all program into high gear.

PLANT STANDARDS NEXT STEP

Nor are these standards the final step in the evolution of our dairy quality program. As a further help in developing better teamwork in the industry, the Dairy Federation is now working on a set of minimum quality standards for all Wisconsin dairy plants. Like many farmers, a number of our dairy plants are today operating under quality standards which are as stringent, or even more exacting than those set up in the proposed plant regulations. But again, these standards are being prepared as a means of developing better teamwork, and as guideposts for the further improvement in the quality of our products.

As we have seen, the purpose of quality dairy production is to put the best food on the dinner table of Mr. and Mrs. America—today, tomorrow, and every day. To accomplish this requires quality on the farm, in transportation, in processing, in storage, and retailing, and good methods of handling dairy foods in the home.

Any break in this quality chain spells doom. Farmers can't do it alone. Neither can processors or salesmen, nor laws and regulations. Real progress is being made through teamwork. Pulling together for quality will play a major role in the future success of Wisconsin's dairy industry.

LET'S TELL THE WORLD

"We farmers have done a wonderful job of producing but we have been the world's poorest salesmen." This bit of wisdom has been repeated often by Milo K. Swanton, Wisconsin dairy farmer and farm organization leader.

Wisconsin's dairy industry has met a real challenge in setting the enviable record of production it holds today. But in meeting this production challenge so much of the industry's power has been used up that there hasn't been enough steam left to blow the whistle. Certainly the industry is doing a much bigger and better job in consumer education and advertising than it did 50 years ago. However, it must be recognized that today's economy calls for many times the sales effort than was necessary a half century ago.

Conditions today are not the same. Families no longer get their milk from the family cow. Butter no longer comes from the family churn. Today's dairy producers and consumers are often thousands of miles away from each other. These miles of separation have done more than increase the cost of the finished product on consumers' tables—they have caused lack of understanding. Producers are not always aware of the desires of the modern consumer. Consumers do not always appreciate the many complex problems involved in putting their daily milk supply on their doorsteps and dairy foods on the food counters. All this means that the dairy industry must do a better job in consumer information and selling than ever before.

WE HAVE A THRILLING STORY TO TELL

The dairy industry has a much better story to tell its customers about milk and dairy products than we had 50 years ago. Only during recent years have we realized the importance of milk as a food. We are learning more every day. We have the advantages of better manufacturing methods, more attractive packaging and improved means of distribution and display. We also have more media for bringing our message to our potential customers than ever before. We are improving our distribution system. Refrigeration has opened up new markets.

Our markets are growing as science explores new fields in the study of nutrition. We have heard much about the importance of plenty of milk for growing children. Only during the last few years have we begun to realize its value for good mental and physical health among adults and for older folks. As medical science increases the average length of life the importance of proper nutrition during the sunset years becomes increasingly important. Here again milk plays a vital role.

MILK IS OUR MOST NEARLY PERFECT FOOD

Dairy foods—milk and its products—are universally recognized as the most nearly perfect food. This makes a strong dairy industry, furnishing a large and constant supply of these essential foods, a matter of public necessity. A sound dairy industry is very much a matter of public interest.

Dr. E. B. Hart, famous University of Wisconsin biochemist, has said that "if you had to choose a single food on which to live for the rest of your life, your wisest possible choice would be milk."

Milk and dairy products, scientific studies show, provide a major part of the daily nutritive needs of the American people. They supply one-half of the average family's nutritive needs and do it at a cost of only one-fourth of the total food budget!

A quart of milk or its equivalent in other dairy products supplies approximately the following percentages of the daily nutritive requirements of an average man:

	Percent
Calcium	100
Riboflavin	82
Phosphorus	67
Protein	49
Vitamin A	30
Vitamin B	22
Calories	22
Vitamin C	19
Niacin	6
Iron	3

Nutrition studies leave no doubt of the importance of dairy foods in the diet. These facts substantiate the claim that milk is the most nearly perfect food. As Americans, in spite of our high nutritional standards, we are not consuming nearly as many dairy foods as we should. Increased use of these products is one of the foundation stones of good national health and strength.

TRANSLATE NEEDS INTO WANTS

The fact that Americans need more milk and dairy products does not necessarily mean that they will buy and consume them. We don't always buy things because we need them. Frequently we buy the things we want.

Here then, is today's big problem: We know that the American people need more dairy foods. We know that the dairy industry has these foods to sell. How can we translate these needs into wants? Here is where education of consumers through Nation-wide advertising and promotion can make a real contribution.

In this part of our program of moving dairy products from the farm to the table we have failed to do the job on the scale it must be done today. We have failed to tell the story of milk and milk products with the power, the continuity, and the drama that it deserves.

FIELD IS HIGHLY COMPETITIVE

Today's food field is extremely competitive, with scores of products fighting for the consumers' dollar. On every side advertising dollars are being spent in record-breaking amounts, all for the purpose of making the consumer want the foods being advertised. National magazines, newspapers, radio, and television networks are all being used to sell food.

During the first 6 months of this year nearly $61,000,000 were spent for food advertising through magazines, radio and television networks. For every dollar spent for advertising dairy products, $15 are spent for advertising other foods.

Nutritionists tell us that dairy foods should account for one-fourth of the family food budget. On that basis we should have spent about $15,000,000, or nearly four times our actual advertising budget.

DIMES AGAINST DOLLARS

When we look at advertising for other products we are even further behind. Less than $6,000,000 were spent in national newspaper advertising for all agricultural products in 1949. Expenditures for competing products include one hundred and twelve millions for groceries, forty-two millions for alcoholic beverages, eighty-five millions for automobiles, and twenty millions for tobacco.

These are heavy odds. Because of this intensive advertising barrage, the consumer now wants these other products. These desires are like powerful magnets pulling at the consumers' pocketbooks.

There is only one effective way of counteracting this magnetic pull. That is to create a desire for more dairy products, to change needs into wants. It can be done only by effective advertising telling the story of dairy products with all the dramatic intensity the dairy industry can develop.

TEAMWORK CAN DO THE JOB

How can the job be done? There is only one answer: more teamwork. No one group, no single unit in the dairy industry can carry the load alone.

For many years the American Dairy Association has served as the backfield for our dairy advertising team. Small contributions from hundreds of thousands of dairy farmers have provided an advertising fund which has made it possible for dairy products to meet, at least in part, the advertising pull exerted by competing foods. Starting in a small way with three States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa—the ADA now unites the efforts of dairy producers in 41 States. Within the limits of the available funds it has done a marvelous job of year-around advertising to create an increased desire for dairy products throughout the Nation.

Your Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, through its dairy promotion section, has added its voice in proclaiming the story of dairy foods. Its work is made possible by the cooperation of the State legislature in making funds available for the promotion of dairy foods. Through the dairy promotion program your department of agriculture over the years has teamed up with the industry in "spreading the gospel" about dairy foods across the country. Most large national conventions now have a small carton of Cheddar cheese at each plate, made possible through dairy promotion funds. Dairy cookbooks, menus, and place mats are being universally distributed. All these have helped in Wisconsin's dairy food sales efforts.

Large dairy companies have joined their dollars and the power of their sales organizations. Nationally and in the communities where they operate, they have preached the thrilling story of better health and greater vigor through dairy foods.

Other allied food industries have also cooperated—foods which are logically used in combination with dairy products. The influence of their assistance is hard to measure but it has been extremely effective.

HAVE ONLY SCRATCHED THE SURFACE

But in spite of all we have done, we have only scratched the surface. Since 1940, dairy products have gained 4 percent in volume of sales (by weight). Using the same period, fresh produce sales gained 13 percent, meats 17 percent, and eggs and poultry 32 percent. Is the dairy industry keeping pace?

Perhaps what is needed is more emphasis upon taste-appeal—dairy products taste good, they are refreshing, you will enjoy eating them—in addition to the appeal they are good for you and you need them. More emphasis upon the pleasure of good eating may be more effective.

Today's greatest need is for increased advertising teamwork—teamwork where everyone gets into the game of boosting the product. Wisconsin's dairy industry can and should sell dairy foods, the greatest family of foods known to civilization.

RESEARCH: THE KEY TO PROGRESS

Through research, the dairy industry has made great progress. Not only have increased nutritional values been brought to light, but great strides have been made in the fields of better production, processing, and distribution methods. Research efforts have given us new labor-saving equipment, together with improved tools to measure quality.

Several agencies are today's members of the dairy research team. Through the National Dairy Council and other organizations, the industry itself has made important contributions. Research laboratories in our own university and agricultural college and other schools have offered many discoveries to the dairy industry, not to mention the vital role which private industry has played in progress through research.

But in spite of the knowledge which has been gathered about milk, there is still much to learn. Each day brings new horizons in the possible uses of dairy products.

MILK IS REAL BRAIN FOOD

For example, only recently we have learned that a direct relationship exists between the amount of sugar in milk and the size of the brain. A compound known as galactose, found only in milk sugar, plays a big part in brain development. Here is the key to the added mental alertness obtained from milk and dairy foods; here is the real brain food—milk.

Research leads the way in discovering new uses and new products in the dairy industry. It has revealed that whey, a dairy byproduct, contains forms of hydrolized proteins. These same proteins, when injected into the blood stream, exhibit remarkable properties in reviving human beings suffering from starvation. It is research such as this that must lead the way in developing and expanding the use of dairy products.

FEARFULLY AND WONDERFULLY MADE

In spite of the many discoveries already made, milk continues to be an inexhaustible source of new marvels. Says a famous biochemist: "Milk is fearfully and wonderfully made. The more science studies milk, the more wonderful milk becomes, the more there is to discover of nature's secrets. Nature put something into milk that cannot be duplicated in the laboratory."

To strengthen this observation, one recent study lists 274 known constituents and properties of milk and 255 chemical components. And there remain unknowns which science, as yet, has not been able to isolate.

These new facts are the basis of a program to inform consumers about dairy products. The unknowns in milk serve as a challenge to research to continue patiently the hunt for more information to aid in improving the health and well-being of our people through the use of dairy products.

By developing new products, finding new uses for our present products and byproducts, helping to reduce manufacturing costs, improving our methods of packaging, seeking new ways of merchandising, research renders a great service to the dairy industry. Research and progress are inseparable.

Research must lead the way. It must be miles ahead of actual practice.

SUMMARY

The future welfare of dairying is vital to all citizens of Wisconsin. Splendid progress has been made among the State's 160,000 dairy farmers and 2,274 dairy plants in maintaining a record production of dairy foods so essential to the State and Nation. But 1950 finds the industry facing new problems and new challenges. Marketing is the No. 1 challenge facing America's dairyland today. The dairy marketing program is being strengthened through teamwork in an industry-wide milk-quality program, combined with more emphasis on advertising, promotion, and research. Wisconsin's State Department of Agriculture has a part to play in helping the dairy industry meet this midcentury challenge.

A Representative of the Free Nations of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass.:

AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL—LYNN GI IN KOREA LAUDED BY BUDDIES

How a Lynn soldier is serving as an ambassador of good will in Korea was revealed today in a letter to the Telegram-News from two buddies in the war zone.

Impressed with the philanthropy of Pfc William F. Pierce, whom they said has gone far to instill confidence of the Korean people toward the Americans, Corp. Bennie C. Rich and Corp. L. P. Fennessey wrote the following letter:

"EDITOR, TELEGRAM-NEWS:

"Since the beginning of time, people have sung the praises of great deeds done on the battlefields, but often as not the man behind the man, is forgotten. His is an important job also, since the front line men can't function without him.

"Many such stories as the following have probably crossed your desk, and no doubt after a period of time they become boring. But in all sincerity we feel that this one should be shown to the public. It portrays the American soldier, who has been called upon for every conceivable task since the beginning of the Army.

"We feel sure that when and if the people of Lynn read this they will be proud of the fact that one of their boys has gone a long way toward showing the Korean people our way, the democratic way, of life.

"Pfc William F. Pierce since his arrival in Korea has continuously dreamed of his home town, his family, friends, and his girl that he has left behind, but has not forgotten his duty as a representative of the free nations of the world. He has shown a remarkable ability in improving the relationship and general feeling among the Korean people toward the Americans as a whole. He has gone far in teaching the people of the world the wisdom in the old adage: 'Build your house by the side of the road and be a friend to man.'

"Bill staged an 'amateur show,' with candy and chewing gum as prizes, among the children of a wayside town that the train on which we were riding stopped for a few hours. If the people of Lynn or any other American city or town could have seen their expressions, different from the ones seen on the faces of our own American children, different because of their clothes, which for the most part were ragged and torn, covered with dirt and filth, shoes that were not shoes at all, potbellies caused by malnutrition, children, both male and female, of school age, with younger brothers and sisters strapped to their backs in the Oriental manner, although this does not call for these children to be bearing the burden of hunger and want; yes, these children were different because they had seldom been treated with the kindness and consideration that was shown to them in the following few hours, the consideration that they would probably never have received if it had not been for Bill. If the people of America could have seen this, they would grasp a firmer understanding of the way of life we are attempting to, and will, preserve. The expression of fear and awe that showed on their faces as they looked at the dusty, tired American soldiers who stepped out of that train to get a breath of fresh air and stretch their legs.

"They approached singly and in pairs, and then they seemed to appear out of nowhere, when they discovered that we did not come to loot, burn, and destroy as other nations had before us. They stood in line, if it might be called that, as we all know how hard it is to have children line up in an orderly fashion, but they came to Bill as he passed out candy and then when he tried to have them sing, they pulled away as any other child would, but with them it was more pronounced. But Bill's overwhelming smile and personality turned the trick.

"He called them over and overcame the language barrier by signs and actions. The girls at first, they sang their quaint native songs in a reserved manner at first, and then with increased gusto. When the boys chimed in they sang in a boisterous and braggard manner, symbolic of an adolescent who is trying his best to outshine the girls. When the initial prizes, which he got from his own personal rations, were distributed, donations were made by the other GI's who were affected by the spontaneous response by the children. When the train continued on its weary journey it left many a saddened heart behind, but left many a pocket bulging with candy, gum, and other goodies, also a group of better citizens of a nation now in jeopardy because of the aggressive tactics of the North Koreans. This was made possible only by the philanthropy of Pfc William F. Pierce.

"Truly, sirs, this epitaph of an ambassador of good will, as well as a representative of our country, in the present crisis, will be remembered long; and as it is retold along with countless others, the beauty of the scene will undoubtedly be enhanced.

"The soldier, Bill Pierce, does not know that this is being sent to you, for if he did, we feel sure that he wouldn't approve of its being written.

"Sincerely yours,
"Corp. BENNIE C. RICH.
"Corp. L. P. FENNESSEY."

Not a Word About Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Liberty (Ind.) Herald of February 22, 1951:

NOT A WORD ABOUT ECONOMY

The administration's tax message to Congress calls for very heavy increases in corporation and individual income taxes, on top of the boost which went into effect last October. It also asks for big jumps in the excise taxes on automobiles, household appliances, and other commodities.

All of this was generally anticipated before the message was made public. But the startling part of the matter is that not a word is said about cutting nonessential Government costs. That was also true of the President's budget message, which went to Congress early in January. This blueprint for the coming fiscal year actually envisioned substantial increases in nondefense spending, to be piled onto a huge military budget.

Here is a policy which, if we accept it, can only lead to the impoverishment of our people, the sapping of our energies and resources, and, in time, to the breakdown of our system of government. We are in a very different position now than we were in 1940, when the last defense program got rolling. Then taxes—local and State, as well as Federal—were low by comparison with the present. So was the national debt. And the family cost of living was about half of today's figure.

It has been authoritatively said that the budget can be cut by as much as $8,000,000,000 in fields which have nothing to do with the defense effort. That is not far from the amount the currently proposed tax bill is designed to raise. It is the plain duty of Congress to make every possible economy before approving new taxes. The people will pay what they have to pay, and make whatever sacrifices are necessary—but they cannot be expected to supinely accept "politics as usual" in this grim era of our history.

Plenty To Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 7 relative to the increase in retail stocks. This article should make very interesting reading.

PLENTY TO BUY—RETAIL STOCKS TOWER, SUPPLIES KEEP COMING AS SCARE SALES EGE—DETROIT STORE'S REFRIGERATOR STOCK UP 120 PERCENT IN YEAR; BIG TV RISE IN PITTSBURGH; SOME MERCHANTS ARE NERVOUS

When New Yorkers thumbed through their ad-fat newspapers last Sunday they found big Macy's department store sale-ballyhooing a $550 television set for $329.

The sale was symptomatic of a little noted fact of the hour: Despite the cry of "shortages," and despite the drain of January's pell-mell scare buying, the Nation's retailers are still loaded to the gunwales with consumer goods.

The pattern is the same everywhere. A Wall Street Journal 10-city survey finds store after store with the biggest stocks ever—and continuing to receive a tremendous flow of goods from manufacturers.

"No items are short, not even ammunition in our sporting goods department," says a Los Angeles department store executive.

SOME ARE NERVOUS

Some merchants are growing a little nervous about their lapful. They've had several psychological jolts this week. After watching Nation-wide department sales roar 32 percent above a year ago in the 4 weeks through January 27, they saw sales in New York stores reported only 6 percent over 1950 in the week through February 3—and Philadelphia sales charted 6 percent under 1950.

Sales trends have been zigzagging so much in recent months, of course, that there's no assurance this slow-up will continue long. It's possible another burst of consumer buying could be induced soon by Treasury Secretary Snyder's call for a 25-percent manufacturers excise on big home appliances. Since retailers' present inventories would be

free from this tax, these might move out in a hurry.

Consumer hard goods—on which most of the shortage talk centers—is the field in which the retailers appear to be most heavily loaded.

A big department store in Detroit has on hand nearly five times as many television receivers as at this time last year. Its stocks of refrigerators are up 120 percent, of furniture 11 percent.

ACROSS THE BOARD

One of Pittsburgh's biggest stores gives this account of its inventory situation, compared with a year ago: Television sets, up 200 percent; rugs, up 75 percent; refrigerators and stoves, up 40 percent; furniture, up 35 percent; toiletries and perfumes, up 25 percent; clothing, up 10 percent.

In Cambridge, Mass., Filler's, a furniture and appliance emporium, says its stocks average 20 percent greater than a year ago, with the biggest increases coming in washing machines, refrigerators, and television sets.

And one of the owners of the Good Housekeeping Shops, Inc., a chain of five furniture and appliance stores in Chicago, says his firm now has the largest inventories ever carried. Each store, he adds, has an average 90-day supply of television receivers, refrigerators, washing machines, and furniture; a normal stock, he figures, would be enough to last 30 days.

MORE COMING IN

On top of the higher inventories is the continuing heavy delivery of goods by manufacturers. Robert Gorman, appliance manager for Plunkett-Rogers Co., an appliance and furniture shop on Chicago's West Side, calculates television sets are pouring in at a clip 50 percent faster than a year ago. The pace on refrigerators, washing machines, and stoves, he says, is up 30 percent.

An official of a Detroit department store puts its receipts of goods of all kinds in January at 20 percent above the like 1950 month. And he thinks deliveries will continue to outstrip last year's for some months to come.

For another indication of irony in shortage talk, listen to Marvin Cossy, partner in Edward B. Dublin & Son, Chicago appliance store: "Television sets are supposed to be on an allocation basis, but it's a funny thing that manufacturers keep calling up and asking if I want more merchandise."

"ALWAYS THE LAST"

The Los Angeles store which finds not even ammunition in short supply adds that it recently received more of the stuff. "And though we've been told by the manufacturers this was the last shipment," says a spokesman, "we've been told that for the last several orders."

And retailers have some sizable orders still sitting in manufacturers' files. If any considerable percentage of these is filled, retail stocks may be heaped higher yet.

The Plunkett-Rogers store in Chicago now has on order six times as many refrigerators, stoves, and washing machines as a year ago.

In Boston, Harry Sussman, president of appliance-vending National Sales Co., says he's put in blanket orders with all his supply sources and will take all they can give him.

MORE MEN'S WEAR, MORE MUSIC

The general manager of a big Detroit men's wear store has ordered about 10 percent more than last year for the forthcoming spring season, and he's trying to get the spring finery delivered in February instead of March.

And Robert Benson, proprietor of Chicago's Benson Music Shop, Inc., reports: "I'm buying further ahead now than last year, about 60 days against 30 days last February."

If a peace scare should come along soon, the resultant dip in public purchasing might prove a severe blow for some stores with heavy inventories, say some retailers.

In case of such a slump, predicts a Boston TV dealer, "a lot of banks will find themselves in the television-set business."

R. C. Bernier, of Bernier's Radio & Electric Co., in Cleveland, who's not ordering far in advance, observes, "The grass will be awfully brown if we should suddenly come into a peacetime economy."

THE TREND IS STINKO

The merchandise manager of a big Pittsburgh department store sees the present buying trend as a possible index to the future, and remarks: "The scare buying spree started to taper off the last week in January. The first day in February was stinko."

And Jim Earle, who runs Chicago's Woodlawn Radio & Music Co., utters this word of caution: "The combination of an early Easter and a continuation of the cold weather may give a set-back to a lot of dealers getting up to their neck in merchandise that is costing plenty to finance."

The general abundance of things to buy doesn't mean, of course, that absolutely every consumer item is still untouched by war. There are exceptions. The copper-bottomed frying pan situation, for example, is not so good.

Titche-Goettinger Co., one of Dallas' leading department stores, reports its supplies of copper-bottomed frying pans are just about cleaned out. An official order has banned their manufacture after March 1. Other stores the country over are running short of this ware.

Foam-rubber mattresses are increasingly scarce, finds Arthur Larson, advertising and sales promotion manager for big Powers Furniture Co., in Portland, Oreg. And a Pittsburgher reports low-price bed sheets hard to come by.

A Lesson in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 22, 1951:

A LESSON IN SOCIALISM

Students in a Yonkers, N. Y., high school have a far better understanding of the fallacy of the Socialist theory of "take" and "give" as result of the ingenuity of a teacher of economics and history in that institution of learning.

Recognizing that these students had lived their lives exclusively in an atmosphere polluted by the propaganda of the Socialist planners who held the reins of government, the teacher struck upon a novel method to show how false is the theory which his pupils generally had been led to accept.

But we'll let the teacher tell his own story that you, too, may recognize the dangers that lie ahead if we blindly follow the preachments of those who would guide us down the path to a welfare state.

"As a teacher in the public schools, I find that the Socialist-Communist idea of taking 'from each according to his ability,' and giving 'to each according to his need' is now generally accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes try this approach with my pupils:

"When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on his test. Thus each would contribute according to his ability and—since both would have a passing mark—each would receive according to his need. After I have juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion, the result is usually a common-ownership grade of between 75 and 80—the minimum needed for passing or for survival. Then I speculate with the pupils as to the probable results if I actually used the socialistic theory for grading papers.

"First, the highly productive pupils—and they are always a minority in school as well as in life—would soon lose all incentive for producing. Why strive to make a high grade if part of it is taken from you by authority and given to someone else?

"Second, the less productive pupils—a majority in school as elsewhere—would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity to study or to produce. This Socialist-Communist system would continue until the high producers had sunk—or had been driven down—to the level of the low producers. At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the authority would have no alternative but to begin a system of compulsory labor and punishments against even the low producers. They, of course, would then complain bitterly, but without understanding.

"Finally, I return the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise—the market economy—where each person has freedom of choice, and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare.

"Gratifyingly enough, most of my pupils then understand what I mean when I explain that socialism—even in a democracy—will eventually result in a living death for all except the authorities and a few of their favorite lackeys."

A Sly Back-Stabber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission given, there is printed herewith one of Drew Pearson's recent syndicated articles:

THE DAILY WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—The bitter row over labor participation in the mobilization picture boils down partly to a clash with Gen. Lucius Clay, former military governor of Germany, now right-hand man to Defense Mobilization Czar Charles E. Wilson. There is also a lot of peeve against Harry S. Truman personally.

Clay, a hard-hitting, hard-working Army officer, accustomed to giving and taking orders, was continually clashing with civilians when he served as right-hand man to War Mobilizer Jimmy Byrnes in World War II. Later, while in Germany, he established what is probably a record for any American official. He cabled his resignation to the State Department as military governor of Germany three times in 1 day.

Illustrative of Clay's difficulties with labor leaders is one backstage incident involving the appointment of a manpower commissioner.

President Truman had telephoned Mobilization Czar Wilson asking him to appoint ex-Senator Frank Graham, of North Carolina, as Manpower Commissioner. Former

president of the University of North Carolina, Dr. Graham served as a member of the War Labor Board in World War II and played a potent part in keeping labor relations on an even keel.

Wilson seemed to welcome Truman's suggestion, but later, when Graham called on Wilson and General Clay, the latter made it clear that Graham would be only one of six assistants, and would report not to Mobilizer Boss Wilson but to Clay through Wall Street Investment Banker Sidney Weinberg.

Under these hamstringing conditions Graham politely declined.

NOTE: Graham subsequently went to Alaska, showed how skillful he was in handling labor relations by smoothing out a difficult situation threatening to stop vital construction of Air Force housing and Army fortifications.

CLAY STAGES A VISHINSKY

On another occasion General Clay had called a closed-door conference attended by Secretary of Labor Tobin, Selective Service Director Hershey, and Presidential Aide Daniel H. Stowe to discuss manpower problems.

Clay at that time was all set to announce his own man as Manpower Commissioner, but he had scarcely begun to talk when White House Assistant Stowe interrupted. He advised that he had instructions from the President that the manpower commissionership was not to be discussed.

Stowe did not say so, but the President knew, even then, how vigorously labor felt on the subject, and he did not want General Clay dictating the appointment.

Faced with this message from the White House, Clay got red under the collar and stamped out.

Later he got his way. His own candidate, Arthur Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission, became Manpower Commissioner—after being pushed through by Wilson himself.

This is one of the reasons labor is so sore.

BIG-BUSINESS TYCOONS

Another reason is the number of big-business tycoons around Wilson and the manner in which they dominate the mobilization picture. Here are some of them:

General Clay, on leave from Continental Can; Fred Searls, on leave from Newmont Mining, a J. P. Morgan firm; Sidney Weinberg, head of Goldman, Sachs, investment bankers; Howard Chase, of General Mills; Alfred Howse, of the Forest Land Development Co., general economic adviser to Wilson. The operations of Weinberg's Goldman, Sachs investment house during the depression, incidentally, was one of the reasons why Congress passed the Securities and Exchange Act.

While these are skilled businessmen, they serve as "no dollar" men. In other words, they are paid not by the Government but by their own companies, thus are in the difficult position of serving one master but being paid by another.

Federal Patronage in Mississippi

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, betrayal of a public trust is one of the most despicable of all crimes. Charges were made in the other body last Wednesday, and with good reason, that Federal patronage jobs in Mississippi were being bought and sold like sardines across the counter. These charges are serious. They have long been the subject of common, everyday conversation in the State of Mississippi. There is evidence that in some instances jobs have been sold. I hope in the interest of honest government and sound administration the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will see that these charges are thoroughly aired, and, if substantiated, those responsible for perpetuating these crimes will be brought to the bar of justice.

Shipment of Critical Materials by Great Britain to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to me from Judge Henry Ellenbogen, of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa., a former Member of this body, dated February 23, 1951, and an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press dated Thursday, February 15, 1951, on the subject of sale and shipment of critical defense materials by Great Britain to Soviet Russia:

JUDGES' CHAMBERS,
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 23, 1951.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Thursday, February 15.

The editorial is startling, and it appears to be absurd that we and our allies should fight Communists in Korea, while, at the same time, we or our allies should supply our enemies with the means to fight us. Many of our brave boys have been killed or wounded with the material furnished to the enemy, and many others will suffer and die in the trying days ahead.

The legal situation appears to be that the United Nations has branded both China and North Korea as aggressors. Great Britain is an important member of the United Nations. A decent respect for the resolution of the UN should cause England to suspend further shipment of all materials to China—at least until the United Nations has decided what sanctions should be applied against the aggressor nations.

If a resolution of the United Nations does not carry that much weight among its own members—and Great Britain voted for the resolution—then such a resolution would appear to have little value.

If all free nations stand together in a determined resistance against the Communist aggressors, who would enslave all peoples and degrade mankind, the cause of freedom is sure to triumph. But if Great Britain pays no attention to resolutions of the United Nations, which have been solemnly adopted after much deliberation, and sells critical materials to China that strengthen her in the fight against the United Nations, then the free world is indeed in jeopardy.

I hope that you will call this matter to the attention of our Government, with the view that our Government may take effective steps to cause Great Britain to suspend its trade with China. I would also appreciate it if you would bring this matter to the attention of your fellow Congressmen, and the country at large, by having this letter and the enclosed editorial inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY ELLENBO[illegible]

BRITISH LET US DOWN

British shipments of iron and steel to Red China last December alone were almost as much as her total shipments for 12 months of 1949.

British woolen goods exports to Red China shot up from $2,000 in December 1949 to $300,000 in December 1950. And in the same related periods, British shipments of assorted machinery, also vehicles of various kinds, rose from a few thousand dollars to hundred of thousands.

Britain in 1950 sold 20 times as much raw rubber to the Soviet Union as in 1949.

Right now two shiploads of rubber totaling 10,000 tons are at sea between Singapore and Hong Kong, destined for a Communist enemy which British troops are fighting on two fronts.

And the socialistic British Government says it has no intention of stopping these shipments.

A Conservative member of Commons got a brush off this week when he asked Prime Minister Attlee whether he was aware that British rubber was moving to Hong Kong and what he proposed to do to prevent the loss of this strategic material.

An under secretary merely confirmed that the rubber, worth $10,000,000, was on the way and said the Government intended to do nothing about it.

No British paper printed the story, or mentioned the huge rubber shipments, according to a London dispatch.

Small wonder. Reports from Korea yesterday said that Red tanks and self-propelled guns spearheaded a drive which threatened to cut off 100,000 Allied troops including British around Seoul.

If those tanks weren't made of British steel, if those self-propelled guns weren't moving on British rubber, they could have been—or more like them will be.

How can we win a war when an ally persists in selling much needed raw materials to the enemy?

Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland, repeatedly has called attention to the "alarming proportions" of strategic materials exports from Britain to the iron-curtain countries. In the first 10 months of 1950 these exports have aggregated $68,000,000.

His subcommittee on export controls and policies is doing valuable work in disclosing Britain's trade with the enemy. Its findings should get closest attention as Congress looks into the foreign-aid proposals in the Truman budget.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously passed by the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors representing 61

county-wide districts in the State of Wisconsin. This resolution was sent to me by Mr. Herbert Meyer, secretary of the association.

It is needless for me to extol at this time the virtues of soil conservation. We are accomplishing great things in Wisconsin through the application of intelligent soil-conservation methods. All groups are working in harmony, which probably is greatly accountable for the results being obtained.

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS,
Baraboo, Wis., February 2, 1951.

Hon. GARDNER R. WITHROW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WITHROW: As secretary of the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, representing 61 county-wide districts in the State, I have been instructed to transmit to you the following resolution:

"Whereas conservation of our soil and water resources is essential to the vigorous health and high morale of our people, a strong national defense, and our democratic system of government, is an established and accepted truth; and

"Whereas soil-conservation districts, democratically organized and locally controlled local units of State government, have proved to be an effective group through which this vitally important national assignment can be accomplished; and

"Whereas soil-conservation district supervisors have secured excellent cooperation from State and Federal agencies and organizations, particularly the Soil Conservation Service, in working toward a well-rounded program of proper land use and soil and water conservation, and since continuation of this essential work is dependent on keeping a strong and adequately financed Soil Conservation Service; and

"Whereas rumors in the press indicate that various reorganization ideas are under consideration, which would weaken or destroy the direct technical assistance the Soil Conservation Service is giving districts: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Members of Congress, and the United States Secretary of Agriculture be informed that soil-conservation district supervisors in assembly at a State meeting in Madison, Wis., on February 1, 1951, hereby enthusiastically endorse the work of the Soil Conservation Service and do further petition that this agency be administratively strengthened, kept a separate bureau in the United States Department of Agriculture, given full responsibility for Federal help on soil and water conservation, and given adequate appropriations to take care of technical needs of farmers of the Nation through the medium of our soil-conservation districts."

Your consideration and support of our resolution will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT R. MEYER,
Secretary.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article which appeared in the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass., on February 26, 1951:

T. G. M.'s COLUMN

RFC NEED MAKE NO APOLOGIES FOR ITS SMALL LOANS

These are unhappy days for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The agency seems to be up to its neck in a hot brew of Lustron (housing), Texmass (oil) and various other none too savory ingredients. Presiding, of course, is chief chef Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, and assistant chefs, Senators TOBEY and PAUL DOUGLAS.

The RFC, in short, stands charged with yielding to political influence in the granting of loans.

A secondary but almost equally uncomfortable situation has been brought about by the curious coincidence that about 11 different employees of the agency have resigned over the past few years and then shown up a few weeks later with fat jobs with some of the agency's largest borrowers—by chance only a few weeks after these companies had been loaned money.

All in all the giant $2,000,000,000 lending agency is in a mess, a fact which causes no great sadness in the hearts of the many who for some years have had their scalping knife out for the RFC anyway on the theory that it represented an infringement of the principles of free enterprise and offered a dangerous degradation to the whole structure of private credit.

Even the White House has gone skittish in this mess, ordering copies of the agency's correspondence with Members of Congress on the subject of applications for loans and playing a sort of on-again-off-again game as to whether to turn control of the agency over to a single man or to continue its present five-man Board of Directors.

NINETY PERCENT OF LOANS UNDER $100,000

All of this is too bad.

It is too bad because over the years the RFC has done a rather remarkable job of playing "poor man's bank" to thousands of small-business men who might otherwise have gone to the wall.

Less than 10 percent of the agency's loans are for an amount in excess of $100,000, and hence come to the Washington office for approval—and it is in the Washington office where the political pressure has been applied apparently.

The average small-business man must first go to his commercial bank. Only if this and other sources of private credit have been exhausted may he apply to the RFC, which thus gets only risks which commercial banks either cannot, or do not, wish to undertake.

If his application is among the 90 percent under $100,000—4,904 last year out of a total of 5,506 loans, for instance—it is authorized or rejected by the regional office having jurisdiction in the city where he lives. Only if he is after big money does he enter the Washington picture.

Even with such political abuses as have no doubt occurred, the RFC has an interesting lending record.

It has authorized a total of 89,000 loans amounting to $4,600,000,000 since it was founded by Congress in 1932, a pet antidepression measure of President Hoover.

Although these loans include the so-called defense loans during World War II and loans under the National Housing Act, total losses have been only $101,000,000, out of which $35,000,000 was in the one loan to Lustron, which was made only after its O. K. by a highly respected private engineering firm and receipt of a signed letter urging its granting from Dr. John Steelman on White House stationery.

On its normal peacetime lending program the agency has suffered a ratio of loss of less than three-fourths of 1 percent, a record comparable to that of most banking institutions.

AID TO AUTO DEALERS AND SMALL GROCERIES

The big loans that the agency makes—the ones that perhaps go sour or turn up with suggestions of improper political influence—are the ones that make the headlines and hold public attention.

But what of these—the 159 motor vehicle dealers who last year borrowed $4,795,000 from the agency, an average of $30,000 each—the 119 grocery stores which borrowed on the average of $1,500—the 103 motels and auto courts which borrowed less than $3,000 each—and the other 2,800 borrowers for amounts less than $25,000? Or the other 2,000 who borrowed between $25,000 and $100,000?

These loans—not the politically pressured Lustron, nor the rich man's tax high jinks of Texmass—make up the great mass of RFC loans.

These are almost entirely term loans of the sort which commercial banks do not make, so-called capital or term loans in order to expand or resuscitate a small business.

Perhaps the RFC should have its ears pinned back by being prevented by statute from making loans in the larger amounts, and be forced in the future to confine its activities to the small business loans with which it has done such a spectacular job.

It has been big business, not the little fellows, which has been singing siren songs to the agency.

JOHN HARRIMAN.

America the New Canaan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 22, we listened to the reading of Gen. George Washington's immortal address. This wonderful speech, and the unselfish patriotic and distinguished service of this great man always serves as an inspiration to me, and, I believe, to this body.

I am wondering if it would not be well that we consider the omnipotent hand of God in the fashioning of a man like General Washington and every other citizen that has made any enduring contribution to our Republic and way of life, and in the creation of our country?

The day of miracles has not passed. Our country is a miracle, for it had a spiritual birth. No one can ever convince me that the winning of our independence was not a miracle performed under the approval and guidance of Almighty God by patriotic, poor but pious, men and women, willing to be led by God and that God looked down from heaven and smiled on their ambitions to set up a Republic, governed by representatives of the people.

I will always believe that God intended this country to be a new Canaan. A home for disciplined and godly people. God disciplined the people of old Canaan before permitting them to set foot upon that land.

Anyone studying history, especially biblical history, must be impressed with

the similarity of the people's ambitions for old Canaan and the ambitions of our forefathers for this new Canaan, in that they desired God as their King and their guide, and must be impressed with the similarity of God's omnipotent hand in His provision for leadership.

As Joshua was the leader into old Canaan, George Washington was the leader of the new. The comparison of these two figures is interesting to me. Both of these men were permitted to see the lands before fighting upon them. Joshua saw old Canaan when he went as a spy. General Washington saw the land he was to fight for as a citizen, as a surveyor and as a soldier. Both were commanders in chief of their respective armies. They both fought a 7 years' war. They both fought against terrifying odds numerically, and both had their tempers and faith sorely tried. They both established 13 colonies, one of which was my native State of Georgia. One might say, there were only 12 tribes of Israel, and that is correct, but we must not forget that the portion of Joseph was divided between Ephraim and Manessah. Both were the first presidents of their respective republics. Both were humble enough, and thank God, big enough and wise enough to give God the entire credit for their victories, and to remind their people that their country's destiny was dependent upon their submissiveness to God.

Consequently, our form of government was spiritual in its origin. Democracy is not, and cannot be for other than spiritual people. In some quarters today it is considered smart to deny God. Yet, those people are now partaking of fruits, and reaping generously where they have not sown, all the gifts of the God they deny.

Our forefathers had their problems. General Washington had his. There was the atheist then as now. Then there were the Tories. As a boy, I wondered what manner of men were those Tories. What was their thinking that they could object to a government by men? And, how could anyone object to such a Government as our patriots had conceived? I searched the books for the answer, and found it. I read many of their speeches, and was startled to find that these people opposed our freedoms upon the premise that history had indubitably proven that no democracy had existed more than 200 years, and contended that within 200 years the people would become so corrupt, so greedy, so power-conscious, so demanding of the Government's obligations to them whether real or supposed, while so thoroughly forgetful of the practical fact that the Government could give nothing that the citizens had not already in the performance of their obligations given the Government, that they would pull down the pillars that supported the temple of democracy.

Our forefathers knew this history, and they did not deny the arguments of facts the Tories set forth. But our people and General Washington said: "That need not be the case at all, for so long as we walk with God and serve Him. He will be merciful and our Government will endure." That has been the touchstone of America. That explains the fact that from our humble but spiritual beginning we have become the greatest and richest nation the world has ever know. In the light of the Tories' argument, however, it is exceedingly worth while that we now appraise their predictions. We are now approaching 200 years as a Republic. What is the situation today concerning the greed, corruption, power madness, and demands of the people without any thought of those people as to their duties and obligations to the Government?

It is pitiful to see so many in the so-called name of higher education attempting to destroy God as our leader, and to wipe out every concept that made our country great. In these times of crisis surpassing any other crisis of the human race, we could do no finer thing or more patriotic thing than to firmly resolve to go back to the God and the faith and the concepts of our founding fathers and General Washington.

Mr. Speaker, February 22, was not only Gen. George Washington's birthday, but was also the birthday of another great American, and a product of the little, but fine county, Lee County, Ga., where I was born and reared. I refer to Hon. Frank Lebby Stanton. This man and his weekly newspaper published at Smithville, Lee County, Ga., caught the eye and won the admiration of all America. Born in poverty, he did not consider poverty a disgrace, nor did he appeal for help from his Government. Living as he did, shortly after the War Between the States, he in common with his people and section knew the touch of poverty, famine, and oppression. But he knew and his people and section knew the promise of America. Our Government had said to him and to his and to every citizen, "You can go as far as your will to work and ability will permit you to go." He knew, and we know, that is all that any honest government can say. That is all any honest man can desire that his government say. With a heart full of love for his people, his family, and his country, and a belief in all of them, he put his head, his hands, and his heart to work. In a short while this country boy was with the Atlanta Constitution, then the South's greatest newspaper, and with the immortal Henry W. Grady, who was one of the greatest orators, newspaper writers, and Americans this world has ever seen.

Mr. Stanton was a poet. The South's sweetest singer. Everyone has heard that beautiful song, Mighty Lak a Rose. Perhaps you do not know Mr. Stanton wrote that song in the matter of a few minutes and immediately after he had stood by the bedside of his little son who was stricken with infantile paralysis. As that little mite of humanity lay on his bed in pain with cheeks reddened by the heat of a high fever, Mr. Stanton's mother said, "He looks like a rose." Mr. Stanton left the sick room, took up his pencil and wrote that song which the people of this Nation still sing.

Mr. Stanton loved his family. On one occasion, Mrs. Stanton went to South Carolina to visit relatives, leaving Mr. Stanton at home. Mr. Stanton, coming home from work, immediately missed the companionship of his wonderful wife. There was the empty chair, so he sat down and wrote his wife a letter in song. You know it, and America sings it, the title being "Just a Wearyin' for You."

Mr. Stanton loved our country. On one occasion a depression visited our country and section. Our people were in despair. There were problems to be faced and to be solved by a resolute people, and not by people who despaired. In his desire to build up the morale of the people by a message in song, he wrote those words:

This old world we are living in, is mighty hard to beat;
Oh, you get a thorn with every rose, but ain't the roses sweet.

The heartthrobs of America were always sweet to Frank L. Stanton, of Lee County, Ga. Mr. Stanton left that feeling with his people. Today I proudly say to you that the people of our section love this country with a devotion second to none. And our section loves God also. Some writers and newspapers have referred to us in tones of disparagement, criticism, and pity as "the Bible Belt." We take that reference as a great compliment and accept the title with thankfulness. As our junior Senator, Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, observed, however:

It is refreshing to note that some of those higher critics now realizing the dangers of an atomic bomb, have suddenly become quite anxious that we move over a little and let them claim the protection of a God they had denied.

Wherever you see godly men and women, and ministers of God, those whom God has put his infallible finger upon and said, "I want you," preaching the Book as it was written and not the interpretations some men placed on it about 10 years ago, there you will see the principles of General Washington and Frank L. Stanton not only enduring, but prospering every hour.

I thank God for these men I have mentioned, and for all men and women of like mind over the 48 States and the world. And we have many, and no section has a complete monopoly, and I hope they rise up with the courage God gives his true servants and assert themselves boldly in this critical hour.

The Selective Service Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the present operation of the selective-service draft, if continued, will have a disastrous effect on the farm production in North Dakota for 1951 and 1952.

As everyone ought to know, farming is now done by tractor power—practically everything is done by power machinery on a farm. The old men were used to horses and horsedrawn machinery, and it is the younger men who are

operating the tractor power. Practically every one of these boys is a mechanic, many schooled in that work, and the old men cannot operate without some of these boys. I understand that the Army wants them—more than any other class—because they are mechanics and the Army is now tractor-propelled.

The Army seems to think other men can be supplied and the production will go right along. We had experience in that in the last war. Men were sent out to the farms that could not tell a combine from a road grader. They attempted to operate tractors and combines. They smashed up more machinery than they were worth even if they had worked for nothing. Evidently the Army does not want these men and is trying to pawn them off on the farmers of the Northwest.

Production of food is an important business to this country and to those of our allies who are actually fighting with us. This food must be produced.

I know any number of farmers who produce twenty to thirty thousand bushels of grain annually where their boys are being drafted and the old men will simply have to quit farming. The draft boards, the appeal boards, and the whole machinery of the selective service is guided by one thing and one thing only. What does the Army say about this? If the general of the selective service says draft, draft it is.

Congressmen do not like to interfere and ask deferments, as it would look like a sabotage of the war effort. It seems to me the Army ought to know, without any congressional appeals, that production is vital to the war effort.

The Legislature of North Dakota has spoken of this subject by a concurrent resolution and I submit the resolution herewith:

House Concurrent Resolution C

Concurrent resolution urging that the draft of essential agricultural labor be kept at a minimum and not materially reduce essential agricultural production and the harvest and care of agricultural resources

Whereas it is absolutely essential for the best interests of the people of the United States and of the State of North Dakota that maximum and uninterrupted production of all agricultural crops and livestock ordinarily raised and grown in the State of North Dakota be maintained during the period of the present emergency; and

Whereas, to produce and harvest a crop in North Dakota and otherwise to engage in agricultural pursuits to the maximum capacity of the farmers of this State, it is absolutely necessary that adequate help be available on the farms of this State; and

Whereas it now appears to be the policy of selective service to draft and induct into the service of the United States farm boys essential to the operation of the farms of the State of North Dakota and to the production of the maximum amount of crops and the proper harvest and care of our agricultural resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That we do hereby urge and request that the drafting of essential farm help in the State of North Dakota be kept at a minimum, and that no farm boys or farm help be drafted or inducted into the service of the United States where such draft will materially reduce the operation of farm units to maximum capacity; and be it further

Resolved, That veterans of World War II who are now actively engaged in farming be given priority over nonveterans, insofar as agricultural deferments are concerned; be it further

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be apprised of the action of the thirty-second legislative assembly by the adoption of this resolution, and that a copy be forwarded to him; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the entire congressional delegation from the State of North Dakota.

LEO STUKA,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Whisky Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article, which appeared in the February 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal, which deals with and points out the fact that ever since the Korean crisis, the distillers of this country have been upping their output in some instances more than 50 percent. There is no shortages; in reality, there is a "glut."

WHISKY OCEAN—DISTILLERS HIKE BOURBON, RYE OUTPUT BY 50 PERCENT; TIPPLERS ARE LETHARGIC—WHOLESALERS, RETAILERS BOOST STOCKS AGAINST SHORTAGES; COULD THERE BE A GLUT?

(By T. A. Wise and Michael J. Saada)

Whisky, whisky everywhere.

Since Korea, the pipelines from still to retail store have filled to near the bursting point. The Nation's distillers have hiked their whisky output by 50 percent. Wholesalers have built their stocks from a 47-day supply to an estimated 60-day one. Retailers have increased their buying by 17 percent.

"There's more bourbon, rye, and blends in this country today than at any time in history," declares one big eastern wholesaler. "There's enough in stock to fill demand for eight peacetime years; when World War II broke out stocks were equal to about 4 years' demand."

Adds one in New York: "There's so much whisky stacked on Manhattan that an A-bomb blast would plaster half of Philadelphia."

TIPPLING NOT BRISK

The reason for this feverish stockpiling of firewater, of course, is the fear that the Government may restrict whisky output as it did in World War II. But how about the Nation's tipplers? They've barely increased their buying of potent beverages. Most retailers report little or no gain in whisky sales. At best the storemen find sales up 3 percent from this time last year.

Question: Could either a "peace scare" or a sharp demand drop bring inventory discomfort to the whisky merchants?

A stiff hike in the Federal excise tax from $9 a gallon to $12, as proposed by President Truman, might bring a sharp sag in demand. In November 1942, when excises were raised, case sales of whisky plunged. In Michigan, for example, the drop was nearly 40 percent. In North Carolina it was 43 percent.

WORRY SIGNS SLIGHT

If the whisky makers are worried they show little sign of it. Big distillers like Publicker and Schenley and little ones like Glenmore are still operating full blast. And they are increasing their bulging storage space to cram in more whisky.

For example, National Distillers, which just finished building two new warehouses, is building five more. Brown-Forman recently purchased an old lumber mill in Louisville and turned it into a warehouse.

Calvert Distilling Co., a subsidiary of Distillers Corp.-Seagram, is putting up six 500,000-gallon tanks for storage of spirits at its Relay, Md., plant. Each of those tanks could theoretically take care of 1 day's whisky consumption for the entire Nation. Calvert has also leased more space for aging whisky—some 60,000 square feet, or nearly the area of three football fields.

And it isn't just the giants of the industry that are acquiring more space to cache their product. Stitzel-Weller Distillery of Louisville is one of the smaller concerns which is doing the same thing. It has jumped storage capacity by building four new warehouses.

"MONOPOLY" STATE BUYING UP

The whisky trade, from distiller to retailer, has long been chary about releasing figures on stocks. But a good indication of how they are mounting at the wholesale level comes from the public figures of the 17 "monopoly" States. Liquor boards in these states buy from the distillers and direct retail sales.

These commissions have been among the heaviest stocker-uppers. Present supplies on hand in the warehouses of the various States run from 15 percent to 50 percent greater than at this time last year.

Take Virginia. On the 1st of January that State had 108,000 cases of one well-known brand of blended whisky. A year earlier it had well under half that number—about 49,000.

Normally the State carries a 6- to 7-week supply of all brands. It is now carrying a 15-week stock and steadily expanding this inventory. The State has rented an extra warehouse on the James River to "freeze" a large supply of liquor; it would be "thawed" only in an absolute emergency.

Michigan, another monopoly State, has been placing orders with distillers in bulk quantities for the first time, asking for delivery over regularly spaced intervals. The State's liquor commissioners think they'll have a better chance of getting orders filled by taking this tack; it permits the distiller to schedule his own purchases of bottles, cartons, and caps, for example. For the first quarter Michigan has ordered 15 percent more whisky than in the like period a year ago.

JOBBERS' STOCKS HIGH

Monopoly States are not alone in building up their stocks, of course. Jobbers and retail stores in big cities of free States also have been putting away spirits. One distiller knows that a New York City jobber has 30 percent more stocks in his own and rented warehouses today than he had last October, when supplies are normally at their annual peak, just before the holidays.

A spot check of liquor stores in New York shows inventories up sharply. Liquor dealers in the big city were carrying about a 4-weeks' supply last June—about half what they consider normal. Now they've built stocks to a point where a 12-weeks' inventory is standard. On some items like low-priced blends and scotch they're piling up a 16-weeks' supply—perhaps more in some cases.

Many retailers expect a marked spurt in business from tipplers rushing to beat the proposed Federal tax hike. It would lift the price of a fifth of whisky by about $1.

One likely result of the tax hike will be an increase in moonshining—clandestine whisky-making to avoid the Federal tax.

Illicit distilling has already jumped markedly since 1947. No one knows how many sub-rosa stills there are, but one measure is the number seized by Bureau of Internal Revenue agents each year. In 1947 the "revenuers" closed up 6,000 stills. The following year the number mounted to 6,700 and in 1948 leaped to over 8,000. Last year 10,000 were put out of business.

Moonshining is by no means confined to the backwoods of Kentucky and Tennessee. Within the past 2 months a 1,500-gallon still was closed in Haverhill, Mass. A 700-gallon outfit was seized at Liberty, N. Y., in the heart of a big resort area. A 500-gallon still was also taken at Babylon on New York's Long Island.

Your Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the American Legion magazine of March 1951:

WILL YOU PAY MORE THAN YOUR SHARE OF INCOME TAXES?

Income taxes have increased tremendously in this country in the last 11 years—and the man who has borne a heavy share of the burden of the increase is the taxpayer in the low and middle income brackets. From 1939 to 1945, the tax of a man making $5,000 a year actually rose 689 percent. And taxes are going up again.

This is a shocking and frightening thing, especially since large taxes (without wage stabilization) taken out of middle incomes are apt to have an inflationary effect on everything we buy. And the situation is complicated further by inequities in the tax law that make the $5,000-a-year wage earner the butt of some very unpleasant and unfair practices.

Before we get into the bad things, however, let us take a look at some breaks the new tax law gives to two groups of taxpayers: the veterans, and present members of our Armed Forces.

If you are an enlisted man or a commissioned warrant officer you are not taxed on any pay you get for time spent in a combat zone. Even if you serve in the combat zone (combat zones are designated by the President) for only a single day in a month, the entire month's pay is tax-exempt.

This is admittedly earning a tax exemption the hard way, but is nonetheless a benefit which is given solely to members of the Armed Forces. Commissioned officers get the same break on the first $200 of each month's military pay earned in a combat zone.

For all ranks there will be no more withholding tax on any pay earned in combat zones.

Other breaks given servicemen, ex-servicemen and their families are: Family allotments are not taxable; dividends on GI insurance are not taxed; armed-service members can apply for extensions on paying income tax until 6 months after service ends.

There are other important details to know about income taxes paid by former members of the Armed Forces. If you are receiving retirement pay for disability, you may get a break by electing to have that pay recomputed under the new Career Compensation Act. Your collector of internal revenue can supply details. But for the great mass of those out of service, even these small advantages are missing.

The tax law contains a number of practices which are, to say the least, illogical. At worst, they can be called downright unfair and unjust.

As Government gets more expensive, and taxes go up, these inequities in our tax law give one man an even greater advantage over another man. And, more than ever, it becomes necessary to do something about them. Agreeing on the principle that we all have to pay more taxes, and being 100 percent unified on the purpose for which the money is being spent, still, as Americans, we reserve the right to protest when the law that raises the money is unfair.

The tax law was written by Americans to extract money equitably from Americans. When it fails in its purpose, it is high time not only to protest but to get a new law.

One of the things that ought to be changed is the forms themselves. When a man is supposed not only to keep tabs on what he owes and to pay it in hard cash, but he has to go through a set of mathematical computations that would baffle the average atomic scientist in order to do it, then it is time to call a halt and to simplify the tax returns. It can be done. It has been done for some of us. Let's get it done for all of us.

One of the most unfair aspects of the tax law is the different treatment received by a business and by an individual. For instance, when a Midwestern corporation decided to train its salesmen in a special school, the total expense of the course to the firm was allowable as an income deduction. But when the salesmen who attended the course were inspired to do some studying on their own, and subscribed to correspondence courses to further their progress in their company, they were not allowed to deduct the expense from their taxable income.

It is a known fact that there are business people who pay for their homes, servants, liquor, speedboats, baseball tickets, automobiles, and just about everything else on expense accounts that are eliminated from taxed income. You remember the fabulous expense accounts of some of our Washington 5-percenters. The parties thrown by them for all sorts of people, including some who work for the Government, may be counted as legitimate business expense items and deducted as tax-free from their income. And Restaurateur Toots Shor is allowed to deduct the cost of his baseball tickets from his income tax as a business expense.

An employee who decided to entertain his boss in lavish style, in the hopes of getting a raise or a better job, would not be allowed to deduct the cost from his income. And whereas a businessman can travel tax-free around the world, if necessary, to get an order for his factory (and take his wife with his as secretary, if he wishes), the man who has to commute to work because he can't find a home near enough to his job, is not allowed to deduct this necessary travel expense from his income.

And here's another example of the illogic of our tax law: A large company recently decided to move from New England to New York City. Now it is very expensive to move a business, especially since important records must be kept in order so that the operation can start functioning the minute the staff is set down in the new location. All of this tremendous expense—thousands of dollars—was considered part of the company's normal overhead, and was tax-deductible.

The company also paid for the moving expenses of some of its top brass. But there were hundreds of other employees affected by the move. If they wanted to keep their jobs, they had to sell their homes—either at a profit, which was taxed, or at a loss, which was not deductible. Then they had to buy new homes on today's inflated market. On top of this they had to pay for moving their furniture several hundred miles. None of what this cost them was considered, under the present tax laws, to entitle them to any deductions.

Perhaps the most glaring inequity of all is the medical expense allowance. As you know, you're allowed only the medical costs over 5 percent of your income as a medical deduction. So a man with a $5,000 annual salary has to spend $250 on which he pays a tax before he is able to start curing himself, or his family, tax-free.

This, it seems to us, is the most ridiculously illogical of the injustices under the present tax law. The least the Government can do is to apply the same logic in treating the cost of keeping its citizens in good repair which it uses in handling the maintenance cost of machinery in factories.

A business is allowed to deduct the full cost of repairing any and all of its equipment from taxable income. If an executive uses his car for business, he can even deduct the cost of a smashed fender—all of it—from his tax base. But if one of his employees becomes seriously ill, the man is not allowed to start deducting the cost of his operation and hospital bill until he has spent 5 percent of his already tax-pared income on curing himself.

And if, as in one family with a $10,000 income, disaster strikes, the tax law again shows how inadequate it really is. In the family we mean, the mother was stricken with cancer, the child got polio, and the father, worn out by sleeplessness and worry, fell asleep while driving his car and smashed into a telegraph pole. His total cost for medical and hospital bills that year was more than $6,000. He had to go deeply into debt to meet the expense. His salary was mortgaged for the next 4 years. Yet only $3,750 of his $6,000 cost was tax-free. This seems patently unfair. It is bad enough to have to suffer worse to pay for it. By what logic must the Government add its burden of tax onto these unfortunate people?

There are many other inequities in the income tax laws that should be corrected. Some of them don't hurt individual taxpayers as much as they hurt all of us together. For instance, charity. Charitable deductions are limited by law to 15 percent of adjusted gross income. Many wealthy people would give much more than that if their donations were exempt from taxation. And many people would like to help others directly, but the law prohibits any except certain specified charities from receiving gifts if the donations are to be tax-deductible. So many deserving individuals never get the help they need.

One reason the small taxpayer gets so many bad breaks is simply that he is not organized. Of all the lobbies in Washington, none represents him. Unless he organizes himself, or unless some organization takes up the cudgels in his defense, the small taxpayer will pay more than his share of our ever-growing tax burden.

Even organized pressure will not correct the abuses of the income-tax law overnight, however. If Congress should suddenly become aware of all inequities and decide to correct them, it would take months of legislative maneuvering before the law was actually changed. And it could not take effect on your tax for at least another year.

What can you do about your tax meanwhile? The answer is, plenty. Not all the unnecessary costs of income tax are in the law. Many people pay more than they owe because of their own ignorance of the law. Their own mistakes cost them real money.

Knowing your rights can save you hard cash. Remember, you are not tipping the Government when you follow the tax rules. You are merely doing your duty as a well-informed citizen. And you have nothing to fear so long as your return is honestly computed.

One of the most frequent errors is the choice of the wrong income-tax blank. Most people do not know that there may be several different ways of figuring their income tax—and that each way may give a different result. On a $5,000 income, the difference in tax between using one method of figuring and another may be as much as $162. Each case is different, so no blanket rule can be given, except figure your tax in all ways open to you before selecting your form for filing.

It is wise to do this early because, contrary to what most people believe, it is not possible to change your method of filing after the due date of the tax. You can change your method of filing even though you may have filed if you refile before the tax due date.

Possibly the biggest source of overpayment by small taxpayers is in their failure to take legitimate deductions. There are literally hundreds of items which are not listed on income-tax blanks and which are nevertheless, perfectly legitimate deductions from taxable income. It would take too much space to list them here. Those most frequently omitted include many medical expenses (such items as nursing care, surgical appliances, and even necessary travel prescribed by a physician).

Many people also forget to claim all their dependents' medical expenses, as well as all of their own charitable contributions, up to 15 percent of their income. You may deduct the value of clothing and furniture contributed to charity; even gas and oil used in legitimate charitable work are deductible. Other people overlook the full value of legitimate deductions from compensation income. Many professionals and businessmen do not take all the deductions pertaining to their occupations to which they are entitled.

Many husbands and wives frequently ignore the benefits of one of the biggest breaks all married people get: joint filing. The advantage is that it is cheaper to pay the tax on two small incomes than on just one that is twice as large. Under joint filing you may declare your own and your wife's income as two equal incomes—one yours, one your wife's. You may do this even if you earned all the money. But don't forget that both husband and wife must sign a joint return.

There are many other sources of common error resulting in overpayment of many millions of dollars to the United States Treasury every year. Not claiming all the exemptions due you is one. Not spreading income over prior years is another. Authors, composers, inventors as well as others can get quite a break here. Some people mistakenly pay tax on exempt interest or dividends. Some pay too much on annuities or pensions. Others include in their income money paid by estates that are not taxed. Still others fail to claim all deductible taxes. These are only a few of the errors you, too, may make that can cost you money.

If you discover you've overpaid on your income tax, you can file a claim any time up to 3 years after the tax was due. Likewise, the Government has 3 years to get after you if you've underestimated your tax. After this 3-year period set by the statute of limitation neither party can do anything about mistakes, if nothing has yet been questioned. However, there is no statute of limitations on fraud. The Government can prosecute on a fraudulent tax return any time.

Federal Judge Learned Hand once said, "Nobody owes any public duty to pay more than the law demands; taxes are enforced exactions, not voluntary contributions." In other words, the Government neither expects nor wants you to pay more than the law requires of you.

Many people make mistakes, both of commission and omission, on their tax returns which are never caught and which, after the 3-year limitation, go into the limbo of dead files forever. But even the small taxpayer is not immune from Government inspection.

The first thing that happens after returns are sent in is that all returns are checked for mathematical errors. Then about 15 percent of returns (the big personal incomes, the big corporate returns), go to Washington for more careful reading. Of the 85 percent which remain right where they were sent, a certain percentage is spot-checked.

If an error, excluding a mathematical one, is found on your return, then upon examination the agent is given a report of your past returns. Your name does not go on a blacklist for future checking, however. Once you've been called in and have either explained your case satisfactorily or have paid up, you've nothing more to worry about—except that the Government expects you to be routinely honest.

The income tax law is unique in that you must prove your deductions to the tax authorities if it is decided to question you. You may plead that you've kept no records, but that does you no good at all. If you can't prove that you're right, you can be held wrong. This is the reverse of our theory of criminal law, which holds every man innocent until he is proved guilty.

Two Terms Only for Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the good news today is that in the future no President will be permitted to serve more than two 4-year terms. The twenty-second amendment to the Constitution will prevent it.

Upon the occasion of the ratification of the twenty-second amendment to the United States Constitution yesterday by Nevada making the necessary majority, I wish to express the deep satisfaction I feel in the fact that this great reform has now become a permanent part of our Constitution.

The Republican Eightieth Congress was a Congress of significant accomplishment. Of the many valuable pieces of legislation that were enacted by that Congress, I believe the most important will prove to be the resolution limiting the President to two terms. In the years ahead historians will undoubtedly look back on the record of the Eightieth Congress and agree that it was the twenty-second amendment that had the greatest effect in shaping the future course of our Republic. The twenty-second amendment will prove to be our strongest barrier against a totalitarian government in this country. It will prevent any President of either party from acquiring a monopoly on the office and perpetuating himself in power by building up a huge machine that will control millions of votes. America does not want one-man government. That principle is the source of our strength, for it assures that ours will always be a government of the people—not of one man.

For 150 years every President of the United States obeyed the unwritten law against more than two terms. Many of them, including Washington, Jefferson and Jackson, spoke out emphatically against third or fourth terms. But we realized in 1940 that an unwritten law was not enough. The tradition had to be put in writing and given the force of a Constitutional amendment. The conduct of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations with their relentless drive toward a socialistic America is the best proof of the wisdom of the twenty-second amendment. Socialism is totalitarianism; the twenty-second amendment is directed against totalitarianism.

It is fitting that ratification of the new amendment has occurred so close to the anniversary of the birthday of Washington, who refused to serve more than two terms and believed he was establishing a precedent. I salute the 36 States that have already ratified the twenty-second amendment, and I hope that before long the remaining 12 States will see fit to approve the amendment as well. The people of America will always be grateful for what they have done.

Let's Build the St. Lawrence Waterway Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a most important project, and one that has been discussed for a number of years, is the St. Lawrence waterway. The close economic ties between the United States and Canada and the unity of the two Nations is now more important than ever from a standpoint of hemisphere defense.

We should draw the hearings and debate to a close and seek action in the very near future.

A number of important facts on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway have been brought out in an article published in the magazine, Inspiration, published at Duluth, Minn., by Charles L. Hood. For the information of the Members of Congress, I am inserting this article in the RECORD. It follows:

BUILD THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The St. Lawrence waterway is nothing new. In 1826 the Assembly of Lower Canada considered the idea of building canals around the rapids between Lake Ontario and Montreal. The thought developed and they were built wholly on Canadian soil and still today are the only aids to navigation. Smaller ocean boats make use of them but for many years the building of larger canals, dredging of channels and the generation of hydroelectric power has been urged by a joint commission of Canadians and Americans. Complete development of the river requires a treaty ratified by both governments. The only obstacle to opening the

Great Lakes to international communication are the small canals around the rapids in the river; the international section covering a distance of about 45 miles. Canada built the new Welland Canal around the Niagara; we built the larger Soo canal and did a lot of dredging. Opening these lakes by enlarging the waterway will create a fourth coastline reaching into the heart of North America. It has been said that a 27-foot channel will admit 90 percent of ocean-going craft. Doing so means that our productive power will forge ahead to new and greater heights.

Already a power shortage confronts this Nation, and although millions have been spent building power dams yet we continue neglecting the greatest undeveloped source of power on the St. Lawrence River. It is said that a total of 6,000,000 horsepower of electric energy is waiting to be made available, although present plans contemplate the generation of only 2,200,000 horsepower. The power-hungry districts of New York, New England, and Quebec are not only in dire need but will quickly use it for the common good.

Nature's law is inexorable: Either grow or die. Too long the progress of this Nation has been locked by failure to develop low-cost water-borne transportation and the wasted energy of a mighty river force whose aid would promote growth. Manufacturers cannot compete in world markets if over 300 miles from ocean coast. An illustration is that of a Duluth manufacturer who responded to a call for bids supplying some machinery to an English firm and notified of its acceptance. Seeking to learn about getting it there, he found that the all-rail shipment to the coast, and also the combined lake and rail shipment, plus the ocean haul and final rail shipment to its destination would eat up all the profit, resulting in rejecting the offered contract. Were it possible to have loaded that shipment in Duluth and unloaded it in Liverpool, the contract could have been accepted and money earned. Long rail haul and frequent handling bars such competition. While we are willing to spend billions for defense, yet the cost of failure to promote and develop national growth is much more expensive. Without St. Lawrence River power which can be produced at a third of the cost of steam-generated power, New York's only possibility of meeting demands to supply growth and defense would be to build steam plants. With the power shortage now existing, current rates are high, growth stifled, old industries consider moving out, new ones hesitate moving in, and 10 years of steam-generated power would pay New York's share for developing the St. Lawrence.

Four things are necessary to create a high standard of living:

1. Freedom to think and act.
2. Raw materials.
3. Creation of productive means.
4. Transportation.

Consider them:

1. Freedom of thought and action is guaranteed by our Constitution.

2. While we have large quantities of some raw materials, yet others must be bought in world markets.

3. No nation has equaled the United States in producing such vast quantities of agricultural and manufactured products, but great as that is it still can be multiplied.

4. Adequate transportation is necessary to get raw materials to producers at lowest cost and to consumers of finished products. Some must be transported in quicker time, hence all form of water, rail, and air communications are needed.

Consider the Department of Commerce report on potential traffic via the St. Lawrence waterway, listing four bulk commodities moving through it.

1. Grain: Six and one-half million tons annually to eleven and a half million tons. Estimates of savings to farmers amounting to 10 cents per bushel are not excessive, but realizing that agriculturists constitute such a large part of our citizenry, and one of the largest buying groups, money added to their income is reflected in greater prosperity.

2. Petroleum: Six million tons likely increasing to 20,000,000 tons. The demand for oil is constantly increasing. Imports of oil will move upward but with Canadian Oil going down the Lakes and an open waterway, it likely will become an export product thereby increasing tonnage movement.

3. Coal: Four to six million tons. A few million tons will enter our ports but it affords a far greater opportunity to export American coal abroad. Look to Buffalo to become a great coal export center.

4. Iron: Thirty to thirty-seven and a half million tons annually. This latter item is of intense concern because the right answer will yield increased national prosperity. The wrong answer will be a serious blow to millions of Midwest citizens. Waterways are instruments of commerce, increasing the value of merchandise by transporting from producer to consumer at lower cost, or the obtaining of raw materials. As lower cost increases the number of buyers, a clear understanding for the necessity of bringing Labrador ore to central State smelters and mills will be gained by considering the related facts.

This Nation has drawn heavily on its raw material resources. Particularly is this true of iron. For many years the Lake Superior region has supplied 85 percent of national requirements of iron ore, and the Mesaba Range contributed most of it, supplying American industry with the iron that made possible the greatest productive power the world has ever known, but building our industrial machine, plus two wars have exhausted the major part. Another war would so far exhaust the balance that with Mesaba ores depleted, other United States mines could not supply more than a third of the amount necessary to keep mills operating at full capacity. Knowing that the last war subtracted 121,000,000 tons from the Hull-Rust group of mines at Hibbing, Minn., surely it will not be difficult to realize that no mine can operate indefinitely at that rate of withdrawal. Other mines were correspondingly affected.

Labrador ores are vitally needed to conserve the remaining Mesaba ores, at least while the processing of taconite ore is being sought. It is true that there are billions of tons of this low-grade ore, but methods of effecting commercial recovery is still in the making. Mining companies have spent millions of dollars in building test or pilot plants and research but the big question remains—can a merchantable ore be produced at costs that will meet the competition of other ores? Although much time has been spent in seeking a solution, yet up to date no commercial plant has been evolved. The iron occurs in two forms: a magnetite and a hematite. Both need crushing to a powdery form to extract the iron particles. From there on, different processes are used to effect a final recovery. Heavy, expensive machinery is necessary; solidly built plants to house them, separation and washing plants, and finally a method of fusing the fine ore to prepare it for the smelter. To produce the equivalent amount of iron as is now mined will require the best part of a billion-dollar investment and upwards of 20 years of time obtaining the necessary equipment, installing and getting it to working satisfactorily. What will Midwest mills do in the meantime?

This will be best understood by considering the location of mills and smelters and why they are there. The automobile industry is an excellent example of cost. High cost of early autos meant only a few buyers. Selling later ones for a few hundred dollars put America on wheels. Reducing cost increased the number of purchasers. What applies to autos applies also to every other product. As this Nation operates under the profit system and costs of assembling raw materials is a factor, then the area where all materials can be brought together at lowest cost is the best. Doubly so when it also is the largest consuming market.

Ten States, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri represent that low-cost section. More than 50 percent of iron and steel products are produced within those States. Competent authority says that the section comprising Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Chicago contribute more than 75 percent of blast furnace capacity. These mills are there because Lake Superior ore is unloaded from the boats with only short rail hauls, 126 miles from Ashtabula to Pittsburgh; 177 miles, Toledo to Hamilton, Ohio; 249 miles to Ashland, Ky. Where then can these Midwest mills turn for a supply? Consider relative distances. From Duluth to Ashtabula, 876 miles; from Seven Islands (shipping point for Labrador ore) to Ashtabula, 952 miles. If the St. Lawrence is not opened to general navigation so that Labrador ore can be unloaded at lake ports, then that ore will go down the coast some 1,550 miles to Baltimore, or other coast towns. The distance from Baltimore to Pittsburgh, Ashland, or Hamilton by rail is more than double that now used to transport ore. Longer hauls mean extra cost in getting raw materials, thereby increasing the cost of steel. When costs of assembly become too high, moving to a more suitable location is a solution. This being true, stockholders will resist the idea of letting their investments wither on the limb and quickly demand that plants be moved to the ocean coast or north into Canada where large supplies of high-grade ore are available. It literally means that two of every three Midwest plants are threatened with being torn up by the roots and relocated in congested areas along the coast. That such a move would be little short of a calamity to millions of people is readily understood. Such a dislocation of our economic structure as it would create will take years to effect a readjustment. Viewing the enormous national debt, any let down in production may have serious consequences.

Finally, the problem of our national defense must be thoroughly and intelligently considered. Bringing Labrador ore through an interior waterway affords greater protection to transport than can be given boats on the open sea. During the last war, one convoy bound for Murmansk, Russia, lost more than half its fleet on a single trip. Today's improved means of destruction has a serious import. In fact we dare not depend, in time of war, on ocean transport for a supply of iron. Interior waterways can be protected by submarines, submarine nets, coast artillery, and antiaircraft guns. Boats plying between the Seven Islands and lake ports would have maximum protection.

Moving steel plants to the coast adds greatly to the hazard of protection. In the last war, flights of enemy bombers bent on attack, clearly indicated that a majority of them would be successful in reaching the area of objective. Can coast mills successfully hope to escape? Guided missiles from surfacing submarines may well be within the picture. Instead of concentrating industry in vulnerable spots along the sea coast, move them into the interior for greater safety.

Needless delay in ratifying the treaty is retarding the growth of this country and Canada. If the Canadians are restless because of our unwarranted delay in carrying out the agreement to build the waterway, then realize that they have an escape route from the enforced stagnation. They can

enlarge their own small canals or build bigger ones on their own soil, and that without a treaty. That some have been urging such a course is not surprising. Should they do so, the power developed will be their own and we will pay such tolls for using the waterway as they impose. Considering what we have already invested toward completing the waterway, will it be wisdom to sacrifice the millions of dollars already spent by failing to go ahead, when Canada has already invested four times the amount we have and yet ready to join with us in mutual promotion of that great enterprise? Dare we neglect developing the power resource when that at Massena would equal the entire output of the Tennessee Valley project.

Decentralization of industry has long been urged, but industry cannot be decentralized unless adequate low-cost transportation enables them to supply their customers. Firms located on the sea coast and competing in world markets dare not move inland unless ocean shipping follows them. Only the seaway will make decentralization possible.

Tolls will repay the cost of building. We pay only our share for navigation. New York State pays the cost of electric power installations.

With these Lakes open to international navigation, the power thus made available would have shortened the last war. It would have furnished the energy necessary to sustain the increased war effort. Lake shipyards could have aided such construction and all would have forged ahead much faster.

Realizing that 75 percent of blast furnace capacity is between the points mentioned; that more than 50 percent of iron and steel products are made and consumed within that same section, surely then before deciding to plunge the country into an economic readjustment by moving the steel mills, the resulting loss of employment and necessary slow down before we could get moving again, some soul searching may help determine whether national welfare precedes that of selfish interest. Ratify that treaty and build for the future on sound grounds of live and let live.

How to Surprise Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Farm Journal entitled "How To Surprise Congress":

HOW TO SURPRISE CONGRESS

Not spending money apparently is the hardest thing a government faces. Spending is easy. Everybody seems to like that. Paying the bill is not so pleasant.

The President urges economy in all but defense. That's what he says.

What he does is quite different. He has asked Congress to appropriate nearly $10,000,000,000 for purposes other than defense. For the same class of purposes back in 1946 Government got along with $3,000,000,000—nearly two-thirds less—and that seemed needlessly extravagant then.

Unless public opinion sharply notifies Congress that the people do not want $10,000,000,000 added to their tax burden, the money no doubt will be voted.

Senator BYRD suggests that by watching a few corners on defense and by trimming closely on other expenditures, the total budget for next year can be reduced by $9,100,000,000. That would be a long step toward making things come out more nearly even, so that the Government would not be putting out more than it would be taking in.

Someone will be in Washington to appear before the Appropriations Committees in favor of every one of the vast expenditures proposed by the President. Some one, probably some one now on the Federal payroll, will be there to argue that the money is badly needed; probably to argue that it will help the defense program.

Nearly every Member of Congress will get a few letters from home, perhaps receive a delegation or so, pressing him to support and get other Members to support this or that little appropriation of interest to his district or State. He will also get some letters urging him to economize, but on something else. He will take all this in stride as part of his job.

One thing, though, will make him sit up and take notice. If he begins to get letters saying: "Sure, we want this, but not now. We can get along at least until after the defense business has been paid for"—if he gets a few letters like that he will be so surprised that he will do something about them. He will realize that some people put a solvent country and a safe dollar above their other immediate interests.

Is there a spending proposal affecting your area or your particular interests that can wait? If so, your letter to a Congressman, or the resolution of your organization, can serve your country well.

For involved in all this is far more than the ordinary prudence of Government economy. The future value of the dollar is at stake. Needless spending now will not only cause needless taxes, but more deficit borrowing; and that means higher prices and more inflation.

Here is a time and a place where responsible citizenship has a job to do.

Pearson: Always Sniping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a piece by Westbrook Pegler and his own column shed light on Drew Pearson's almost daily efforts to smear anyone and everyone who opposes the New Deal or who is disliked by Red sympathizers:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

This will be an unadorned statement showing that Drew Pearson plugged for Army commissions for Communists in his column which was published in many papers.

Already, I have exposed Pearson's ballyhoo in behalf of John Gates, who became a Communist in 1933 and was editor-in-chief of the Daily Worker. Gates was one of the notorious 11 Communist Party leaders who were convicted in Judge Medina's Federal court in New York of conspiring to overthrow the National Government.

Pearson apparently was in close communication with Gates, because, in his column in the Washington Post of April 14, 1949, he quoted verbatim from a letter which he said Gates had written to President Roosevelt demanding that he be allowed to "fight for his country."

Subsequently, Gates testified that he would not fight for the United States against Russia. In no case where he pleaded for a commission for an individual did Pearson intimate that the individual was a Communist.

Not only was Gates editor in chief of the Worker, he had been a colonel in Stalin's foreign legion in the Spanish civil war. He had been an organizer of the Young Communist League in Youngstown, Ohio, in 1933, where he was active in the riotous insurrections against the authority of our Government.

He was also director of veterans' affairs for the Communist Party and director of its legislative program. He joined the party in 1933. Pearson did not say that Gates was an assumed name.

In the same column, Pearson lauded Capt. Hermann Battcher, whom he described as the Sergeant York of the Pacific. Without any reference to communism, Pearson wrote that when men who had joined the Lincoln brigade in Spain enlisted in the American Army, they were cross-questioned as though they were social outcasts.

He did not say that the Lincoln brigade was Stalin's foreign legion. Captain Battcher got into the American Army early before the War Department clamped down a thinly veiled discrimination against veterans of the Abraham Lincoln brigade, and thus was able to become a captain.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, an analysis of Pearson's pro-Communist propaganda, inserted by Senator JOE MCCARTHY, states that Battcher was a member of the Communist Party.

In his column of June 1, 1948, in the Washington Post, Pearson complained that Malcolm C. Dobbs had the duty at one Army post of helping his colonel keep a record of his winnings on the races. Presently he was sent to a post which serves as a dumping ground for undesirables. He depicted Dobbs as an admirable young man and good officer material.

The Daily Worker, the official Communist paper, on December 19, 1940, listed Dobbs as one of a group who signed a petition to waive criminal charges against a notorious Communist.

In its story on the American Peace Mobilization, in Chicago, in September 1940, the Worker published a picture of Dobbs and identified him as "one of three young southerners" who took part in the mobilization, and as "president of the League of Young Southerners." This Chicago meeting, held during the alliance between Hitler and Stalin, opposed "war and conscription." Pearson said nothing about that.

On April 14, 1948, Pearson wrote that Sgt. Irving Fajans, on the eve of graduation from an officers' school at Fort Benning, had been told he could not graduate and was transferred to another post. The Daily Worker of March 28, 1948, listed a man of the same name as a member of the Communist Party.

Irving Fajans also is listed as a member of the national board of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Also on April 14, 1948, Pearson complained that "for some mysterious and unexplained reason" Morris Brier, who had soldiered in Spain, was denied a commission after he had qualified for one in an officer candidates' school.

"These," Pearson wrote "are only a few of many cases in which an unseen hand, similar to the influences found in both the State and War Departments in the past, have (sic) reached in to penalize youngsters who were farsighted enough to see what was going on in Spain and to risk their lives to stop it."

A man of the same name, Morris Brier, is listed as a leader of the Young Communist League in New York, in the Young Communist Weekly Review of May 19, 1942. A man of the same name is listed also as a speaker

along with the old battle-ax, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, on a program at the Premier Palace, Brownsville, Brooklyn, January 16, 1950, to get subscriptions for the Daily Worker.

A man of the same name also is shown in a picture in the Daily Worker, May 19, 1942, feeding a belt into a machinegun. The scene was said to be Spain.

THE DAILY WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Probably the only American who has ever met Stalin's mother is Carleton Smith, director of the National Arts Foundation, who, while traveling near Tiflis in 1936, was taken to a village where Stalin's mother lived.

Her home was a mud hut dug out of the side of a hill, and she proved to be a wrinkled, kindly old lady. Telling Smith how she had raised her son to be a priest, the old lady added:

"I hear he's now running all of Russia, but I don't believe it."

A year later Smith was in Moscow at the Bolshoi Theater when Stalin was also present, and had an interview with the Russian dictator. Among other things, he told him about the visit to his mother.

Stalin maintained an icy silence. He did not seem interested in his mother.

VICTORY IN KOREA

Gen. Matthew Ridgway personally is largely credited with turning the most humiliating defeat in 85 years of American military history into gradual victory in Korea.

Military men say that Ridgway has done an amazing job. Yet he did it with almost no reinforcements and with a larger number of enemy forces against him than faced UN forces when General MacArthur was in direct command. For an estimated Chinese force of 276,000 men plus 191,000 revitalized North Koreans face Ridgway today, more than the Communist army that knocked MacArthur off balance in North Korea and drove him back across the thirty-eighth parallel.

Not generally publicized is that almost sole responsibility in Korea has now been given to General Ridgway. For all practical purposes, MacArthur has been relieved of the fighting Korean command. Technically, of course, this is not true, because MacArthur still remains supreme commander. Actually, however, MacArthur virtually washed his hands of the Korean War after Washington refused to send him the four National Guard divisions he requested early in January.

Furthermore, Ridgway, coming direct to Korea from the United States has been more independent than the field generals who had served under MacArthur in Japan and who, having been close to him, looked to him for direction.

Pentagon officials emphasize that there has been no friction between MacArthur and General Ridgway. The latter has merely used different tactics. He has quietly shaken up his command at the divisional level, has profited from MacArthur's mistakes, has given the UN Army a new shot in the arm and has turned a defeat complex on the part of the troops into a new fighting spirit.

THE DAILY WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Some Senators seem to believe that it is a criminal matter for a newspaper to criticize military mistakes. This is a view also shared by many brass hats, though not all.

However, mistakes are sometimes rectified chiefly through knowing about them, and a case in point is the magnificent manner in which Gen. Matthew Ridgway has profited from the mistakes of General MacArthur in turning a tragic defeat into Korean victory.

While the very loyal MacArthur clique may argue that he is still supreme commander in Tokyo and, therefore, deserves credit for the current victory, the indisputable facts are that General Ridgway was sent to Korea direct from Washington where he had been deputy Chief of Staff and, as such, was in close contact with the Pentagon's views of warfare. It is also an indisputable fact that Ridgway won his victory with no fresh troops and facing a somewhat strong r enemy than MacArthur.

According to military observers who read the battle dispatches, here is how Ridgway profited by mistakes and accomplished his remarkable feat.

Careful intelligence: MacArthur conducted only limited patrolling for 3 or 4 days before launching his attack. Then after the attack boomeranged, the Eighthy Army retreated so fast it lost all contact with the enemy and for several weeks didn't know where the Communists were.

In contrast, Ridgway conducted aggressive patrolling for 8 to 10 days before kicking off his offensive. He sent heavy patrols deep into enemy territory in so-called "reconnaissance in force." His orders were to disrupt any Communist build-up, to inflict as many casualties as possible, and to survey enemy positions. The lack of patrolling by MacArthur failed to detect the Chinese Communist build-up that swept our armies back to the 38th parallel. However, Ridgway's troops knew exactly what to expect.

Public relations: MacArthur announced his offensive the same morning it was launched, predicting his troops would be "home by Christmas." Ridgway waited until his offensive had been rolling over 24 hours before announcing it.

Poor battle liaison: MacArthur struck in all directions at once. His troops were fanned out from one end of North Korea to the other, in no position to head off a surprise counterattack. The Eighth Army and Tenth Corps also had no battle liaison, had to coordinate their actions through Tokyo.

In contrast, Ridgway opened his attack on the western front, but didn't order his eastern front to move until 9 days later—after he was sure all was going well. He had the added advantage of being in full command in the field, and wasn't forced to direct two fronts by remote control from Tokyo.

Contrast in casualties: MacArthur suffered devastating casualties after the Chinese hit, lost more than 15,000 casualties in 2 weeks. Later, the Marines, who broke out of the Chosin Reservoir trap, mowed down the Chinese at a ratio of 20 to 1. However, Ridgway's losses during the first 2 weeks of his offensive were the lightest of the Korean War. He suffered less than 1,500 casualties, at the same time taking a toll of 52,000 Communist casualties.

In fairness to MacArthur and in tribute to the Air Force, Ridgway has been meeting more scattered opposition. This is largely because the Air Force has raked enemy positions with devastating fire bombs and rocket fire. Ridgway's aggressive armored patrols also killed and rooted out Communists along the path of the offensive.

Stop Abolition of VA Contact Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass.:

NEEDED: MORE PRESSURE

It is indeed heartening to see that at least one local veterans' organization and the Chelsea Board of Aldermen are awake to the threat of a needless hardship which is due to be imposed on veterans and their dependents from this city and surrounding areas.

But if enough pressure is to be brought to bear on those who can do something about the impending closing of the Chelsea VA office, added strength must be forthcoming from areas outside this city which have hundreds of veterans who have been aided in their VA problem here in the past and who will need this aid in the future.

Statistics compiled at the Chelsea city hall VA office show that during 1950, 13,919 contacts had been made between the officials here and veterans, their wives and children in need of aid and advice. In addition, 831 correspondence forms were prepared here, 2,753 other forms, and 2,026 benefit applications handled through this office.

Of the thousands of persons helped, 50 percent were from this city; 30 percent from Revere; 10 percent from Winthrop and the remainder from East Boston and Everett.

For all this service, the VA has had only to pay the salaries of its two-person office staff. All other costs are borne by the city.

The closing of the Chelsea office on April 1 will hurt these out-of-towners just as much as those Chelsea veterans who will be forced to undergo the trip to Boston and the confusion and hub-bub of the intown headquarters.

If a protest movement is to be of any value, all the local vet organizations must make their feelings known to our national legislators, as well as the municipal governments and veteran groups of other cities whose veterans have been courteously and efficiently served here.

Address of Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the RECORD a copy of a speech by Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C., director of the bureau of economic research, Notre Dame University, which he delivered at Los Angeles.

Father Keller is an able economist and a great American. He has made and is making a fine contribution to the religious and civic life here.

Father Keller points the way in this speech to maintain the American way of life here in America.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE LOS ANGELES ROTARY CLUB, JANUARY 26, 1951, BY REV. EDWARD A. KELLER, C. S. C., DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH, NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY

The present emergency has created an hysteria which makes very difficult, if not impossible, a clear, rational appraisal of the problems that confront us as a Nation. Such an appraisal would necessarily take into consideration the fact that we are entering upon a period of emergency which will extend over many years, 10, 15, maybe even 25 years; we really are entering upon a new way of life not merely a temporary emergency. Because of the lengthy duration of the emergency, programs should not be adopted except those which will assure,

at the termination of the emergency, the preservation of our free institutions.

The actual policies adopted have not been carefully and objectively thought out. We have adopted or are about to adopt policies of such rigid controls over the life of our Nation, that their only effect can be a totalitarian type of regimentation. Now for the first time in our history, either in peace or war, plans to draft and regiment all manpower are being seriously proposed. It would be a tragic victory, indeed, if in defeating world communism we enslaved ourselves with the same chains of totalitarian regimentation that have destroyed all personal freedom in the Communist countries of the world. The Council of Economic Advisers in their December 1950 report to the President advised: "It is superficial and dangerous to conclude that a defense emergency must convert us into a totalitarian state."

The Council of Economic Advisers further stated:

"The popular discussion of controls versus voluntary action has tended to obscure a very basic issue. This issue is what middle ground between the freedoms we enjoy in normal peacetime and the unlimited compulsions of a State economy will maximize our strength for the task ahead. To assume that there is no middle ground would be to acknowledge that we can contest Stalin's aggressive designs effectively only by aping all of his methods. That would also assume that in peacetime there are many differences between our kind of economy and political institutions and those of the Soviets, but that in a hot or cold war there are no differences. The whole history of our achievements in war no less than in peace belies these naive assumptions." (The Economics of National Defense, Fifth Annual Report to the President by the Council of Economic Advisers, December 1950, p. 24.)

I would question the advisability of scrapping, without trial, the middle way of voluntary cooperative action to solve the problems that lie ahead with a minimum of mandatory controls. Such a program was advocated by former President Hoover at the beginning of the Second World War before a congressional committee on December 16, 1941, on the basis of experience gained from the First World War. Mr. Hoover pointed out that the controls in the First World War were exercised by committees representing industry, trade, agriculture, etc. These committees did the policing required by the voluntary controls. They operated under the direction of Government officials, with the full authority of the law back of them. In other words, the controls were operated by private citizens, not by bureaucrats. The results were outstanding: Under the Food Control Act of World War I, 250,000 licenses were issued, of which only 200 were canceled for repeated and most grievous violations. There were 8,000 cases of violation of the Food Control Act, of which most were dismissed; the others were dismissed upon the making of a contribution to the Red Cross. Mr. Hoover in his testimony made the following wise comments:

"I should like to emphasize the necessity of more organized voluntary cooperation to effect these ends now that we are actually in war. Nothing affects so many people and requires such delicate handling if morale is not to be impaired as these control measures. It is a job of steering between the rocks of economic disturbance through rising costs of living, legitimate and stimulative prices to producers, avoidance of the appearance of dictatorial action which creates resentment and trespasses upon the accepted freedoms of men as little as possible.

"It seems to me that every industry, trade, and calling involved in war action that is not already organized (and some are already set up) should be organized by calling upon such groups to appoint their own committees, whose leadership they will accept, freely to represent them. Before any of these measures are put in action effort should be made to come to voluntary agreements covering many of these problems. The industries and trades can invent and put into action far more increased production and conservation measures than any governmental agency can think of. They can in most cases be brought to agree upon prices, margins, and other measures in this category. They can do a large job in rationing, especially of industrial commodities, among their members where that is necessary. The only force necessary in such cases would be upon the small fringe that will not comply.

"I need scarcely mention that this was the fundamental basis of our actions in World War I. And I may mention here that the Commodity Control Act in that war contained the following provision: 'That in carrying out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to enter into any voluntary arrangements or agreements, to create and use any agency or agencies, to accept the services of any person without compensation, to cooperate with any agency or person.'

"We availed ourselves of this authority every hour of the day, and 90 percent of restraint on prices and the other measures was accomplished in this fashion.

"That a large measure of controls as to price and other measures can be effected by voluntary agreement and cooperation is therefore not conjecture. And in many fields the powers to enforce were rarely, if ever, required. The whole Food Administration, the War Industries Board, and the Commercial Economy Board, under Mr. Arch W. Shaw, which subsequently became the Conservation Division of the War Industries Board, from the first relied upon agreement and persuasive powers, although always conscious of the fact that there was authority behind them.

"At once our great industrial raw materials, which are produced and distributed by limited groups, can be controlled by voluntary agreements with a modicum of legal authority to compel some minor dissenter to go along. It is more difficult in the widespread consumption industries, but it can be done to large extent.

"We have to remember also that we have 130,000,000 people widely spread and in varying economic surroundings in which cooperation is far more flexible than forced regulation. Our basis of action in the United States during World War I was entirely different from the formula applied during that time in France, England, and Germany. They were all pretty hard and fast mandatory systems. Often enough these systems were accepted as a challenge to a battle of evasion and ingenious violation. They required elaborate and exasperating policing that resulted in large expense and a great waste of energy. Their effect on the popular morale was most demoralizing and the results were not as effective as our American methods. * * *

"I dwell upon this subject of voluntary agreement for reasons which I believe are of the first importance. I may repeat that we are 130,000,000 ingenious and intelligent people. Our fundamental sense of freedoms makes force measures most irksome. We are naturally suspicious of all governmental interference even in war. Yet, on the other hand, ours are the most cooperative people in the world and the most willing to make sacrifice. It is this spirit which I hope will be invoked in the formulation and administration of these measures. Moreover, nothing will more greatly give confidence that our social and economic system will be preserved than cooperative action." (Addresses Upon the American Road, 1941-45, by Herbert Hoover, pp. 151-154.)

As you all know, Mr. Hoover's advice was not followed. Instead of adopting a voluntary, cooperative system of controls, the Government imposed a system of rigid, mandatory controls operated by bureaucrats. "Rigid general price and wage controls do not fit the present situation, for they only postpone the effects but do not prevent inflation as we learned in World War II." (A. F. of L.'s Labor's Monthly Survey November-December 1950.) The rigid controls of the last war curtailed production, created black markets whose prices became the real market prices once the controls were taken off.

It is very doubtful whether during this very long-drawn-out emergency the effects of inflation can be postponed for 10 or 25 years. Most likely the controls, which merely put the lid on the steaming kettle of inflation, will at some time be blown off by the inflation. The only way this could be prevented would be by converting us into a totalitarian state.

But it is argued with prices rising as rapidly as they have in the last 6 months, mandatory controls had to be imposed; voluntary cooperation simply could not work. I maintain that voluntary controls could not work because an all-out effort to make them work was never tried. With their war experience of shortages and black-market prices so vividly in their minds, our people could not be expected to act any differently than they have done in the last 6 month.

Despite the fact that it is now idle speculation, I think, that if our Government had promised the people that no rationing or price or wage controls would be imposed and if the Federal Government had appealed to the American people in their own self-interest for cooperative action in fighting inflation and meeting the other problems of the emergency, the American people would have responded wholeheartedly. However, with the beginning of the Korean war the impression was given that controls would be inevitable. The natural effect could only have been the panic buying of last summer and the drive since by organized labor to increase its wages to beat the wage freeze, and the drive by management to increase prices to beat the price freeze.

This does not preclude, however, the adoption even now or at a later date when the hysteria has died down, of an all-out effort to try the middle-ground system of voluntary controls advocated by Mr. Hoover and bolstered by the indirect controls of tax and fiscal policies.

I am convinced that the rigid controls that we have already imposed and in the future will impose, if continued for 10, 15, or 25 years, will make it impossible for us to survive a free nation. While there might be justification for the imposition of such rigid controls at the beginning of a hot war whose termination is expected to be a matter of a few years, the imposition of such controls over the period of the present emergency will mean that our people will be so conditioned over the next 10 or 15 years to such regimentation that it will be impossible ever to take off the controls. It is my firm conviction, therefore, that we cannot and will not emerge from this period of so-called emergency, with our fundamental freedoms intact.

I realize full well the grave problems confronting this Nation at the present time; the problem of avoiding inflation and of getting sufficient productivity to make possible our keeping a step ahead of the Communist regime.

The best method of controlling inflation is by the indirect controls of tax and credit policies. We must adopt as an anti-inflation program the pay-as-you-go policy. This would necessarily entail the increasing of taxes all down the line to get as much revenue by this method as possible, and

to sop up defense-created excess income. It would be grossly misleading, however, to permit our people to believe that adequate tax return can be obtained by soaking the rich. If all the income of those in the upper income bracket were taken by taxation the revenue obtained would not cover Government expenses except for a short period. Therefore, a pay-as-you-go program necessarily will mean that most of the increased tax burden will have to be borne by individuals and families in the middle and lower income brackets.

Even the American Federation of Labor admitted this when it said:

"Millions of workers will have more money to spend in 1951. Overtime pay will increase, more will be employed, and wages are rising. Business' income will increase too, but more of this will be taken in taxes and much of the rest must be spent for plant expansion. This new income, earned by workers and management in manufacturing military equipment, will total at least $20,000,000,000 per year * * * Most of the new income will be paid to workers * * * Much of the new tax money will be raised by heavier taxes on business; but business cannot foot the whole bill. As workers we must bear our share of the tax load. For total workers' income is 40 percent more than all other groups combined—business, farmers, management and investors." (Labor's Monthly Survey, American Federation of Labor, November-December 1950.)

However, with an announced budget next year of $71,000,000,000, I doubt if adequate tax revenue can be raised. Therefore, the Government will be forced to adopt a program of borrowing. If the borrowing is from private individuals and nonfinancial corporations, such borrowing would not be inflationary because it would result in the transfer of already existing purchasing power in the hands of private individuals to the Government. If, however, the Government, for whatever reason, refuses to face up to the realities and refuses, by taxation and by borrowing from private individuals to take the necessary income from the great mass of the people, the Government will be forced to resort again to deficit-financing on a large scale. Such a program will by its very nature, be extremely inflationary, since it would amount merely to the creation of new money through the monetization of the national debt. If, over the long period of the emergency the Federal Government resorts to such monetization of the national debt it will create such an inflation as to make even the most mandatory rigid controls ineffective. Such an inflation would destroy our economy as surely as a military defeat.

I would point out that if the Federal Government demands such sacrifices of its citizens the Government itself should set the example of equal or greater sacrifices by the elimination of all unnecessary nondefense expenditure. A recent report of a House Investigating Committee showed a very large amount of overstaffing in all the agencies of the executive branch of our Federal Government. The report stated that there are a minimum of 500,000 unnecessary Government employees. Discharging of these unnecessary civilian employees would bring a saving of at least $2,000,000,000 a year. At the same time it would give to our economy 500,000 much needed workers. Other gains by way of elimination of unnecessary expenditures by Federal, State, and local governments would bring an estimated savings of at least $10,000,000,000 a year.

The recent budget message of the President showed no evidence on the part of the Federal Government to effect any real economy in nondefense spending despite the fact that in his state of the Union message the President promised that nondefense would be cut to the bone. Fortunately, we have in Congress such men as Senator BYRD who said Congress would cut $7,000,000,000 out of the proposed budget.

The second great problem confronting this Nation is that of maintaining and increasing the productivity of our industrial and agricultural plant. Since the enemy which confronts us both on the battle front and on the home front outnumbers us on a ratio of about 15 to 1, obviously our only hope of ultimate victory is to close that great gap by increasing the productivity of our outnumbered workers. Increased productivity is also the second most important curb on inflation.

Three things will be essential to increase productivity at the required rate:

1. More efficient management in the utilization of our limited natural resources.

2. Greater work effort on the part of our workers (which might necessitate a return to a 44-hour week).

3. The giving to our workers more and better tools to work with.

However, the improvement and expansion of the tools of production to meet the extraordinary defense demands and maintain our standard of living will require tremendous capital funds. In the five postwar years most of the funds for the great expansion and improvement program we have enjoyed came from plowed-back earnings. From 1946 through 1949 corporations plowed back, after taxes, 62 percent of their earnings and paid out in dividends to the stockholders only 38 percent. In the 1950 report of the Council of Economic Advisers it was pointed out that profits over the next 5 or 10 years would have to be maintained at the present level or increased to get the necessary funds for expansion and improvement since in their estimation profits would remain the main source of capital funds for the expansion and improvement of the tools of production.

The grave problem confronting us then is that with increased taxation upon corporation earnings and especially with the imposition of an excess-profits tax, capital funds will not be adequate from this source to finance the absolutely essential program of increasing production per worker. True, some relief will be obtained by permitting rapid amortization of defense facilities; this, however, will not be sufficient.

The only remaining private source of capital funds will be the savings of individuals in the middle-income brackets, because savings as well as income are concentrated in their hands. I would, therefore, advocate a program of austerity savings by all our people and the investment of these savings in corporate stock. We would by this method make as broad as possible the ownership of American business; prevent socialism by keeping the ownership of business in the hands of private individuals and lastly prevent inflation by curtailing spending and by furnishing adequate capital funds for the expansion and improvement of the tools of production upon which will depend our survival in this long drawn-out war against world communism. I fully realize what a burden will be imposed on those in the middle-income bracket by heavy taxes and the purchase of Government bonds and corporate stock, but I am certain that if the great mass of Americans realize that their survival as a free people depends on this, they will come through with flying colors.

If adequate funds cannot be obtained by this means then it looks as though the main source of funds will be the Federal Government. The financing of a program of expansion by Government funds over a long emergency will spell the death knell of our private-enterprise system because we will end the period with such a large amount of Government ownership as to have effective socialism.

In conclusion, I would advocate eternal vigilance on the part of our people of their basic liberties. They should demand that Congress set up a "watchdog committee" to see that any controls imposed do not encroach more than is absolutely essential upon their liberties. They should further demand that a time limit of 1 year be put upon every control so Congress can each year scrutinize the effect of the control and question its renewal. Finally, they should demand that mandatory controls be completely terminated as soon as possible and that a system of voluntary controls by cooperative action be substituted as soon as possible.

I could not conclude with a better quotation than that of the American Federation of Labor:

"Because Moscow's war against the free world may last 10 or even 20 years, and because we face a long period of sacrifice and hard work on the home front, it is essential that we organize our effort so that those free and voluntary institutions which are our greatest strength may be preserved and may serve us now. The dynamic quality of our economy which has its roots in free alert citizens has made America the most productive country in the world. This will be our basic weapon in fighting an enemy that hopes to force its tyrannical controls on all nations, and to eliminate self-government throughout the world. The people know how grave the situation is. If labor, management, and farmers are consulted and given the facts to make clear their duties and responsibilities, they will do their part.

"A self-governing country cannot mobilize its full powers without voluntary organization through which to channel the joint efforts of its free citizens who are responsible for economic life—whether they are management, labor, farmers, bankers, or consumers, and so forth. We are fortunate that dependable voluntary organizations already exist in these groups. It remains only to coordinate them under the Defense Administration so that a united effort will result—to get out defense equipment with all speed and to maintain the life and welfare of our Nation. Such coordination can easily be accomplished, as President Green has suggested. He proposes that Defense Authorities consult with joint committees composed of representatives from management, labor, farm, and other organizations, and that these committees be responsible (1) to cooperate in formulating defense policies, (2) to mobilize their membership for compliance and maximum effort. By providing for such joint committees at national, industry, and plant levels and by arranging for periodic meetings with factual information on developments and reports on compliance, this voluntary organization could become the basic force for effective action on the home front in the years ahead. Free men will find the best way when they have the *facts* before them and an organization through which they can participate.

"Production and inflation control require joint effort in which each group performs a necessary agreed-on function in accord with plans made by the joint committee. The effort to stop increases in automobile prices was an example of the unnecessary difficulties arising when representatives of the industry are not called in to work with the Defense Administration, study the facts and develop satisfactory methods for voluntary controls. Obviously what happens in steel affects automobiles and many other industries and all must hold the line if a price ceiling is to stay firm. The defense effort must be based on the principle of equal sacrifice. The main function of Government is to see that sacrifices are equal, to furnish information, call together the organizations of labor, management, and others, and coordinate all plans and activies, but not to dominate or dictate." (Labor's Monthly Survey, November-December 1950, pp. 2–3.)

Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include part of my remarks at the dedication of the Armenian Community Center at Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 25, 1951:

The Armenian people are one of the oldest races in this world.

Your homeland lies between the Black and Caspian Seas, partly in Russia and partly in Turkey.

It is the northern gateway to the rich and important oil fields of the Middle East, and to the land bridge between Europe and Asia.

Your ancestors had to be tough in order to survive.

Small in number, they have come through wars and conquests, because they have strong bodies and strong will-power.

Love of their land and of their families are the reasons why Armenians are a brave and a proud people.

Many times through history, conquerors have swept across your country, killing and stealing and leaving only the bare, scorched earth behind them.

Time and time again, Armenia seemed doomed by the cruel and savage lust of invaders who resented the fact that you would not bow the knee to them, and in their fury tried to turn your meadows and your mountains into lifeless desert.

But Armenians had an inner source of strength that neither sword nor fire could reach.

That unconquerable spirit was based on your belief in the Creator of all things—and of your right to live according to His teachings, devoted to your families, at peace with your neighbors, filling the years with good and productive effort.

Having weathered all the fierce moods of Nature, from the piercing winds and blazing summer suns that tried to rout you from the highlands, you had developed the vigor to endure the persecutions of man.

After each wave of aggression had passed over you, and the crimes of evil men had been locked up in history, you struggled to your feet once more and out of the ruins began to build again.

Armenia is not too far away from the place where the Son of God came upon this earth. As His message spread to you, there came the wisdom of His infinite patience.

The experience of your people, tested as they have been by physical and human forces that seemed to be completely lacking in mercy, has proved to you that the faith of man in God gives him a power greater than all others combined, and more.

It is this that has enabled the people of Armenia to rise above all fear and suffering. And they sent it as a gift through their sons and daughters to America.

You and I, and the descendants of all those other people who were persecuted elsewhere, have found sanctuary in this New World where we are building together a society of mutual understanding and respect.

I am of Irish ancestry. I am naturally proud of the culture that I inherit, and I am glad to see the contributions it is making to the glorious progress of the United States.

But that is not all.

If I confined myself narrowly to this I would miss the splendid talent and character that all other peoples are pouring into the veins of our Nation.

Never before has there been such an experience in human fellowship like the one that is succeeding in the United States today.

Here we are witnessing the intermarriage of races and the creation of one human family where all are partners.

And the secret of this is that one does not try to dominate the other and force the surrender of that precious quality that is known as the soul of a man or a woman.

This Sunday marks a real achievement for those citizens of Greater Lawrence who treasure the values that are honored by the name of Armenian.

At last you have a community center of your own where you can meet in a group larger than your immediate family circle to enjoy the comradeship of men and women who share your memories and your customs.

No race or creed can ever claim a preferred position in this great American Republic.

We are here as equals.

I know that I will visit this friendly center many times in the years to come so that I may learn your ways as you learn mine.

You and I are making an important discovery on this 25th of February in 1951. We are related, and we are united, without having to think and act and pray alike. We are happy and progressive in the variety of our brotherhood.

We used to think of American freedom as an escape from the oppressions of the Old World.

That was our first thought.

Now we know that freedom also means the right and the responsibility to do for ourselves and our neighbors. To be true to ourselves, in a way that will be good for us, and for our fellow citizens no matter what their origin may be.

This community center is your contribution to the social life of the city, that we welcome with open hearts.

It will preserve and propagate Armenian culture for the enrichment of every man, woman, and child in the big and generous home that we call Lawrence.

An American Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Mr. Harold Riegelman, a leading citizen and distinguished member of the New York Bar Association to the People's League for World Order at Gramercy Park Hotel February 24, 1951:

AN AMERICAN POLICY IN ASIA

(By Harold Riegelman)

You have asked me to speak about an American policy in Asia. Obviously, our policy in Asia should not, and cannot sensibly, be separated from our total foreign policy. That policy has had a constant base throughout our history: To insure to America the security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness through the medium of a form of government which is subordinated and consecrated to the inviolability of human rights.

Our foreign policy has been reoriented from time to time to meet circumstances affecting that security. It has at different periods pivoted upon Great Britain, South and Central America, Germany, and Japan. Presently it pivots on Russia. The basic factor there is a Communist philosophy centering in Russia which, by its very nature, is expansionist. It has preached and demonstrated its incapacity to thrive in contact and competition with those institutions which we and other free nations accept and are determined to preserve.

It is hardly possible to avoid the conviction that Communist leadership is dedicated to the destruction of our political, social, and economic concepts, and has been so dedicated from the beginning. The pattern of Russian behavior during all but a few of the past 34 years indicates to many observers that this has been, and is, a long-range dedication from which there will be no voluntary, lasting deviation. That pattern also indicates that the Soviet program has been planned in logical, progressive, and overlapping phases. I believe these phases are discernible, and that the first phase has naturally been to make communism secure in Russia. The second phase, to soften other countries by propaganda, infiltration, subversion, and fifth columns. The third, to create as many satellite nations as possible by sabotage, coup d'état, and civil war. The fourth, to use the satellite countries as agents of aggression, without commitment of Russian manpower but with a significant flow of Russian matériel and guidance. This fourth phase is war by proxy. Its objectives would be to build up control of a vast preponderance of manpower, to create an acceptance of Communist invincibility, to seize and deny to the free nations main sources of uranium, manganese, tin, rubber, and oil, and to sap the productive and human resources of the free nations by engaging and dissipating their power in many widely separated areas while the Russian war machine is left intact and unexposed.

Credible reports, some issued by the Soviets themselves, disclose that concurrently with these phases, stockpiling of war materials and the training and equipment of vast armies go on apace. The very size and power of those forces are strong evidence that there is yet another, probably a final, phase. That final phase would logically be the full employment of those forces when conditions promise greatest success at lowest cost in overrunning those portions of the free world which shall not have yet succumbed to the techniques of the preceding phases. This means global war.

We had a revealing foretaste of the fourth or proxy war phase in Greece. But now we have entered in earnest upon that fourth phase which may well be the last step before a cataclysmic war. If we interpret the Russian pattern aright, it would seem that the only chance of avoiding such a cataclysmic war is to prevent the fourth phase from progressing to a point where conditions favorable to that war are fulfilled. I would suppose that such a war could occur in three contingencies:

1. The substantial achievement of the objectives of the fourth or proxy phase.

2. An economic collapse of America and Western Europe.

3. A miscalculation as to whether the objectives of the fourth phase have been sufficiently achieved, or as to whether the economy of America and Western Europe has been sufficiently sapped to assure impotent resistance against a determined attack.

One may not exclude the additional possibility that a failure of the fourth phase could catapult Russia into war regardless of our economic vigor, but the whole course of Russian history greatly discounts that contingency.

There is a sufficient foundation in the pattern of the last few decades of Russian behavior to require that our foreign policy face the first three of these contingencies realistically and practically the world over.

The application of that policy to Asia is clear. Nowhere else does the fourth phase of the Communist program reveal itself more plainly. When satellite North Korean forces were inadequate to enforce Communist rule south of the thirty-eighth parallel, satellite Chinese Communist forces were thrown into that war with every expectation, I am sure, that the entire peninsula would speedily fall under Communist control.

There is evidence of the fourth phase in Tibet and in Indochina. It is not too difficult to project this pattern into Burma, Thailand, and Malaya, and from thence to Indonesia and the Philippines. In those circumstances Japan and Formosa could hardly be held, and our Pacific line of defense might well be forced back to the shores of Washington, Oregon, and California. Certainly the successful exploitation of the fourth or proxy phase in Asia could release 700,000 crack Russian troops presently in Siberia, for reinforcement of already overwhelmingly large Communist armies in Europe, or even for an assault upon Alaska.

If this reasoning is correct or partially correct, it would appear vital to stop phase four in its tracks now, before it is too late. This would explain and justify our action in defense of South Korea.

It would follow that in Formosa our policy should be to give an adequate measure of supply and guidance to the anti-Communist forces. We would withdraw our prohibition against attacks by those forces against the mainland, and provide them with the means of making their attacks effective. We would aid them to aid the anti-Communist guerrillas on the mainland with small arms, mobile ordnance, and ammunition.

I see no possible justification for using any American troops in these operations. Their use is unnecessary. Their use would be the kind of dispersion of the most precious of our resources, which should be avoided except when military contingencies leave us no alternative.

I submit that the immediate aim of our China policy should be to provide within practicable limits munitions sufficient to enable the anti-Communists to seize, hold, organize, administer, and defend all of China south of the Yangtze River, thereby insulating the Communist Indochinese from further Chinese Communist reinforcement and ending further armed Communist penetration in Burma. It would seem needful that the coast of Communist China be blockaded by the free nations, if the Communist supply of essential fuels, metals, food, and munitions is to be cut off.

That the United Nations would support this policy is devoutly to be wished. But we must face the fact that that potentially great instrumentality for peace might be slow to respond to the challenge. We should press the need for action with patience and restraint, but with an eye on the clock, lest what comes may come too little or too late.

Within and outside of the United Nations we must consider the problems peculiar to our friends and to the far-eastern area.

In Asia, France's part is chiefly in Indochina, and I believe that in that extraordinarily complex situation she is doing what she can with what help she can get from us.

Britain, for reasons which have seemed proper to her, has been an unwilling partner in the Far East. Her traditional aptitude for getting along with competitor nations has served her well in the past. And this experience perhaps obscures the fact that communism is not that kind of competition. There are able British leaders who are aware of that unpleasant truth. We can hope that their counsels may prevail.

As to India, it may well be that her own internal problems are so critical that she will not risk external complications any sooner than she has to.

The political attitudes of the great mass of Asiatics is not quite the same as ours. We think of our freedoms as multiple and abstract. Too many Asiatics are of stark necessity concerned with but one material freedom: freedom from misery. To millions who are under constant threat of starvation, rice and wheat can be a more compelling motivation than a yearning for freedom of speech, press, assembly, or worship. If any political economy will promise freedom from misery, its underlying philosophy is not likely to be too carefully tested.

These are circumstances, and there are others, which make the containment of communism more difficult.

A sound foreign-relations policy would recognize that we may not wisely withhold from starvation areas our excess food staples. We should not at any time relax our efforts to acquaint the Asiatic people in every way we can with the real spirit and purpose of our institutions, without insisting that these institutions are the sole and only possible vehicles of those purposes. Where inexperience or centuries-old tradition create weaknesses in administration, we should be slow to condemn, and should make some effort to encourage the building up of reservoirs of trained indigenous administrative talent. In offering advice, we should be humbly aware that our own governmental practices often fall far short of standards we proudly profess.

We must recognize, too, that the gap between our precept and our practice is not limited to government. For there are also areas of our conduct in relation to people of color in America which do not make good anti-Communist propaganda among the colored races of Asia or elsewhere.

Time may well be on our side if we make good use of it. Long before this, people have been subjugated for extended periods, and have at last freed themselves from yokes as securely fastened upon them as communism appears to be upon those whom it has enslaved.

There are indeed signs that all is not well behind the iron as well as the bamboo curtains. In time, these portents can materialize. This is not wishful thinking. If communism is bad for people; if communism cannot compete or even survive in free contact with liberal political philosophies; if communism must conquer the world or die, and its aggression is effectively blocked, an end must come to this menace. I believe an end will come, and in our generation. But only if we possess a conscious and resolute awareness of what needs to be done and have the wisdom, imagination, courage, and discipline to do it.

Philanthropist Finds Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Montreal Daily Star of November 11, 1950, about Mr. Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

PHILANTHROPIST FINDS PEACE HERE
(By Frank Lowe)

If this ever seeps back to "da Borough of Dem Bums" the repercussions could be serious, but in the interests of truth it should be printed here that the man who is known as "Brooklyn's official ambassador of good will" always comes to Montreal when he wants to relax.

This startling information regarding his deviationist tendencies came from none other than the good-will ambassador himself, genial Max Abelman.

"Whenever I feel the need of a change and a rest," he said today as he rested in the Mount Royal Hotel, "I come to Montreal."

This love for a community not bordered by the Gowanus Canal springs from the fact that for the last several decades Mr. Abelman has found in this area the peace and quiet he desires, after such herculean feats as raising $1,000,000 for charity (Brooklyn charity, of course) at a single dinner.

In 40 years of philanthropic endeavor in the world's most publicized community (Brooklyn again, of course) he has, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, raised more than $100,000,000 for various charities and war bond drives.

Right now his interest is the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, an institution he has served by acting as both secretary and public relations director. This spot he has turned into something of an art center as well as a medical center by insisting that the walls of the institution would be better aids to healing if they were decorated.

So he hired artists to turn the drab walls into art galleries—and then brought public attention to bear by having such men as the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie autograph the works.

Lord Halifax, the suave British Ambassador to the United States during the difficult war years, was another famous figure who helped Mr. Abelman to make these walls the keepers of priceless autographs. Gen. George Marshall, Gov. Tom Dewey, and Cardinal Spellman are others who found themselves contributing to the worthy cause of making a hospital in Brooklyn the most written-about health institution in the world.

Mr. Abelman's biggest fund-raising chore, though, was in World War I, when he had quit the job of banking to devote himself to philanthropy, and was asked to sell Liberty bonds. He held just one meeting at the Brooklyn Academy of Music and there sold $49,000,000 (count those zeros) worth of bonds. Now a man in his 60's Mr. Abelman has slowed down a bit. He would probably not promise to raise more than a few million in one evening—and indicative of his slacking off is the fact that he has resigned as secretary of the Jewish Hospital and now acts as public relations director exclusively.

"The other day, though, I felt I needed a rest even from this," he said. "So I packed a bag and came to Montreal. Now I feel a lot better."

But don't think a chubby dynamo like this can relax completely. While in Montreal he visited quite a few of the friends he has made over the years—one of them being Dr. Cyril F. James, principal and vice chancelor of McGill University.

"Now there's a fine man," he said, "the kind of man I'd like tc have visit our hospital."

And, knowing Mr. Abelman's powers of persuasion, don't be surprised if you read of Dr. James making a trip to Brooklyn in the near future.

Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted

by the Megaro Welfare Association of Newark, N. J., endorsing H. R. 2473, which I introduced on February 7, providing for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor in the District of Columbia:

Whereas the members of the Megaro Welfare Association, 335 Roseville Avenue, in the city of Newark, county of Essex, State of New Jersey, at a meeting held on the 19th of February 1951, having been apprised of the present legislation before Congress concerning the Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor; and

Whereas the members of this association, having been organized primarily for the purpose of aiding the underprivileged youth of the community, feel that this movement to honor Christopher Columbus will aid in the harmonious relationship between the peoples of the American and Italian race: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization go on record as officially endorsing the views of the honorable Congressman, PETER W. RODINO, Jr., and HUGH ADDONIZIO, who have introduced legislation before Congress to set up a memorial which is to consist of the planting of trees in arbor effect, representing each State of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in a Federal park, in the Nation's Capital, and be it resolved further that since the cost of building this memorial is to be met by private citizens through the Citizens Committee for a Christopher Columbus Memorial Arbor, we, the members of the Megaro Welfare Association, agree to contribute to the cost of building said memorial as soon as the proper legislation is passed upon.

Signed by the officers of the Megaro Welfare Association, on the date and year first above written.

ANTHONY MARINELLO,
President.

Attest:

FRANK ROSANIA,
Secretary.

The Republican Party Can Lead This Nation Out of the Valley of Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of many Republican Members of Congress who participated in the Nation-wide celebration of Lincoln's Birthday. All of the Lincoln Day dinners were well attended and abounded with enthusiasm which gave every indication that the Grand Old Party is steadily gaining ground.

One of the several addresses I delivered was at Butler, Pa., at the annual Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Butler County Republican Committee.

My address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor to accept your kind invitation and to join such a representative group of Americans in honoring the memory of the immortal Lincoln.

My remarks this evening are going to be straight from the shoulder and while they will not be devoted entirely to the Great Emancipator, they will reveal conditions today comparable to those faced by Lincoln as he labored to hold this Nation together.

Before discussing present-day conditions, let us refresh our memories of Abraham Lincoln. We all know of his humility, his hardship, his deep reverence for God, his unfailing faith and determination, and his honesty and integrity that have become a symbol for all mankind. Even foreign nations revere the qualities of Abraham Lincoln and point to him as an example of the leadership needed in the conduct of public affairs.

This great Republican President did not reach the heights of world acclaim without experiencing heartaches and bitter disappointments. A close study of his many reverses in life reveal that few men could have weathered such a series of trials and tribulations.

When you read of Lincoln's life you are reminded of his statement in speaking of his lack of formal education when he said, "I didn't know much—my schooling was limited to readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule of three." This statement reveals the humility and sincerity of Lincoln, who was not ashamed of his early life and his humble surroundings.

This humility of Abraham Lincoln was reflected in his first campaign for a political office when he was a candidate for the State legislature in Illinois in 1832. At that time Lincoln said, "I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal-improvement system, and high protective tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles."

Yes. On clearly defined political principles Abraham Lincoln was content to place his future in the hands of the American people. It took courage on his part to stand on his principles and to bypass the political magic of promising everybody everything in the hope of garnering a vote, a practice so popular today with the New Dealers and Fair Dealers. Lincoln, because of his courage and convictions, went down to defeat in 1832 as a candidate for the legislature.

He was defeated again in business in 1833 and lost everything of a material value. In 1838 as candidate for speaker he was again defeated.

In 1840 he lost as a candidate for elector. In 1843 he was defeated as a candidate for Commissioner of the General Land Office, and also as a candidate for nomination to Congress.

In 1848 he lost in his campaign for reelection to Congress.

In 1855 he was the losing candidate for United States Senator.

In 1856 he was defeated as candidate for Vice President.

In 1858 he was defeated as candidate for United States Senator.

But in 1860 he was elected as the sixteenth President of the United States. What a glowing tribute to Lincoln's perseverance and to the truth of the old saying, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit."

When Abraham Lincoln assumed the Presidency of the United States he became the first Republican ever to hold that high office. He became the leader of a new political party born in 1856 in the midst of the turmoil and terrible disagreements which preceded the Civil War.

While Lincoln was President he gave to the American people a type of leadership that preserved the Union and its cherished ideals handed to us by the founders of this great Republic. Last, but not least, he gave all of us a symbol of hope by the manner in which he met the challenges to American unity and emerged victorious under most trying conditions.

It was 142 years ago that Abraham Lincoln was born, and for nearly 20 years we have heard over and over again these words: "God grant that we had another Lincoln to lead us out of the present-day wilderness of despair."

Yes, we Americans are reminded of the conditions that prevailed when Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg Address—conditions that are comparable to those facing us today.

At that time this Nation was threatened with destruction by disunity within, and its future hung in the balance. It was Lincoln's stirring reminder that we could not "live permanently half slave and half free" that fired men's hearts and resulted in saving this Nation.

If Lincoln had failed we would have found ourselves a divided nation as Korea was when the Communist hordes descended upon it. We would have had a North and a South working at cross purposes and against each other. Yes. We could have suffered the fate of Korea instead of welding ourselves into the greatest and strongest nation on earth financially and physically.

We reached this pinnacle of strength among all nations because we followed the philosophy of government conceived by our forefathers and embodied in that historic document—the Constitution of the United States.

For nearly 20 years we have lived under the banner of the so-called New Deal-Fair Deal and in reality Raw Deal concept of government. As a result we have seen the Constitution of the United States ridiculed and ignored while socialism and communism have been encouraged.

The word democracy was given a new definition and used as a cloak by the New Deal-Fair Deal forces in Government, in carrying out their program of deception. They have been so successful in applying the term democracy that the American people have been fooled into using this New Deal word in describing our form of government. Yes; even some Republicans have fallen into the trap, by discarding the word republic when speaking of the type of Government intended for this nation.

It is well to recall at this time the inspiring words contained in the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible with liberty and justice to all."

I say to you in all fairness that this is not a democracy—it is a republic!

The New Dealers in following their program of deceit experimented with every phase of our economic life and to such an extent that they lulled the American people into a sense of false security. They promised everybody something for nothing—even luring many Republicans with their sugar-coated economic remedies.

To be frank, in 1936 and again in 1940, the New Dealers had convinced many Republicans that their party had no future and it has not been so long ago that some Republicans actually apologized for their Republican faith. With such a condition prevalent throughout the Nation our party was faced with extinction and serious consideration was asked that the name Republican be changed and another adopted in its place. Mind you, this is the same party founded by Abraham Lincoln.

Fortunately, some of us refused to accept the New Deal philosophy of a more abundant life, and girded ourselves for an all-out battle against the New Deal forces. Those of us who were in Congress recall that during the early days of the Roosevelt regime we were publicly ridiculed because we refused to follow the dictates of the Chief Executive, who at that time had as his advisers, Harry Hopkins, Rex Tugwell, Henry Wallace, Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, and others of their stripe.

From this loyal opposition to the devastating policies of the New Deal clique there developed a growing resentment against the socialistic and communistic trends that were discernible at that time. It was difficult to convince a lot of good Americans that they were being used as pawns in the New Deal program which Rex Tugwell aptly described when he said, "Let us roll up our sleeves and make over America."

In our opposition to the New Deal policies we continued to rebuild our party with the result that in 1944 we showed signs of regaining our former strength. We were still pitted against the master politician in our bid for control of the White House and Congress and with swollen Government payrolls and millions of people who regarded Uncle Sam as Santa Claus, we found that millions still voted against us.

By 1946, the Second World War had been concluded and the American people began to realize that the double-talk, the distortion of facts, the coddling of Communists, and the general mismanagement of government with its enormous cost and mounting taxation had brought this Nation to the brink of disaster. It was then that the American people gave control of the Eightieth Congress to the Republican Party.

When the Republican-controlled Congress convened in January 1947, it inherited the colossal mess resulting from 14 years of New Deal blundering, boondoggling and inefficiency in Government reflected in countless bureaus, and commissions whose overlapping functions and duplication of efforts saddled the American people with high taxes and 76,000 useless Government directives that controlled their daily lives.

We found that Communists, fellow-travelers, and parlor-pinks were occupying high positions of Government and had a firm foothold in the State Department. This radical-minded mob on the Federal payroll were writing directives designed to regiment the American people and destroy our form of government.

Regardless of the iron curtain of secrecy that the Truman administration threw around the affairs of the various departments of Government, the Republican Eightieth Congress reduced the national debt by $7,000,000,000 and at the same time cut income taxes despite several vetoes by our letter-writing President. These income-tax reductions benefited millions of persons in the lower-income group. We freed the American people of some 76,000 Government rules, regulations, directives, and orders, and balanced the national budget for the first time in 16 years. In fact, the fiscal year of 1948 ended with a surplus of $8,500,000,000—the biggest Treasury surplus in the history of the Nation.

Despite the fine record of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the American people allowed President Truman to label the Eightieth Congress as the worst Congress in existence. The Chief Executive was aided unknowingly by the marked apathy on the part of members of the Republican Party who preferred to consider the election "in the bag," and who were lulled into a deep sleep. Those who refused to listen to the President or to be lulled to sleep went fishing. As a result, we failed to get out the vote—even our own Republican vote. Because 52 percent of all eligible Americans failed to vote in 1948, this Nation suffered the greatest political catastrophe in its history. We Republicans can accept the blame, for we are responsible for the listless campaign we waged in the belief that victory was assured.

As we compare 1948 with the election held on November 7, 1950, we find significant results of our efforts to expose the New Deal-Fair Deal regime. Last fall's election brought forth a definite vote of protest against the mismanagement of the biggest business on the face of the earth today—the Government of the United States. Yes, it revealed that the American people at last began to realize that they had been outrageously betrayed by the Roosevelt-Truman regime.

Never before in the history of our country has our national honor suffered such humiliation and disgrace as by the crimes committed at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. The crimes of Pearl Harbor, the partitioning of Germany, the appeasement of Russia, the coddling of Communists in high Government positions, the dismantling of our national defense, and our blundering foreign policy which plunged us into the so-called police action in Korea constitute national sins that cry to heaven for vengeance.

Today Washington is in a state of confusion. We have the national administration controlling Congress—the legislative arm of Government—and dominating the executive branch of Government as well, yet it has no blueprint for the present or future problems of our country. As a result, the fate of this Nation hangs in the balance. With scandals being unearthed daily in various Government departments and the cost of government mounting to where taxes are oppressive, our Nation lacks the leadership sorely needed to lead us out of this period of national crisis.

Speaking of the high cost of government, the President in his annual budget message requested $71,600,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1. To provide the money the President has asked that new taxes be levied and present taxes increased. His proposal will impose upon the shoulders of the American people the greatest tax load in the history of this Nation.

In one breath the American people are told to tighten their belts and to practice economy in all phases of daily life. But hidden away in the President's budget proposals are large amounts of money for the Truman socialistic program, which includes socialized medicine, the Brannan plan, and the eventual socialization of all industry.

Jeffersonian Democrats in Congress and even some administration wheel horses admit publicly that the budget can be reduced if the President has the will to do so. They are of the opinion that over $9,000,000,000 can be eliminated if the President will heed their advice and drop his socialistic program.

The old New Deal philosophy enunciated by the late Harry Hopkins when he said, "Tax, spend, elect, for the people are too dumb to understand," is still the accepted doctrine of President Truman and the New Deal-Fair Deal forces. Even though we are on the brink of economic ruin and faced with the most critical period in our history, the administration is trying to change our form of government by deception or in plain words by trying to fool the American people.

They fail, however, to realize that the overwhelming majority of the American people are utterly disgusted with the present administration in Washington and if the 1952 election were to be held today, they would repudiate the Truman clique with an avalanche of votes in protest against the monumental blundering and stupidity that have characterized the handling of the affairs of government.

As I said previously, for nearly 20 years now we have been hearing the prayerful utterance over and over again, "God grant that we had another Lincoln to lead us out of the present-day wilderness of despair."

The Republican Party can again lead this Nation out of the valley of destruction if it accepts the challenge that we are confronted with today in providing real leadership. We must bury any selfish desires, settle peaceably any party squabbles, and determine to build a fighting party of real Americans who revere the Constitution of the United States as the cornerstone of our liberty and freedom.

The time has arrived to stand up and be counted. We must erase from our minds any defeatist attitude and recall how Abraham Lincoln after suffering 10 crushing defeats from 1832 to 1858 finally emerged triumphant in 1860 by being elected the sixteenth President of the United States.

Let us at this time rededicate ourselves to the principles of Abraham Lincoln and to the Republican Party. In so doing we are simply rededicating ourselves to the principles of Americanism as embodied in our republican form of Government.

The American way of life—yes, the fate of our great Republic—is at stake—and facing such a challenge, let us as loyal Republicans leave this banquet room tonight with the determination to remember the truth of the old saying about Abraham Lincoln, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit!" In such a spirit let us sound this clarion call: "We Republicans have just begun to fight!"

John Steelman, the Assistant to the President, One of the Most Able Men in All the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, this marks the twenty-sixth Battle Report, Washington, made by Dr. John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President, in his series of documentary telecasts produced by Ted Ayers and sent out over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network and cables to the American people each Sunday afternoon for the last half year.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago, in an address to this House, I told of hearing the president of one of the largest corporations in the United States at one time declare that John Steelman, the Assistant to the President, is one of the most able men in all the world, and, Mr. Speaker, he has grown immeasurably in stature every single day since I made that prophetic statement.

I venture the suggestion that no one in the White House is earlier at his desk than John Steelman. To him, it is still midday when others go home. His is not a 9 to 5 o'clock job—it is a 24-hour-a-day, round-the-clock job—and President Truman knows where he can get in touch with his trusted assistant, Mr. Steelman, every minute of every night, as well as every day.

While many persons associate Mr. Steelman largely with labor relations and labor problems, I know that these are but only a part of his daily duties.

Noted for his humanities, he is probably the greatest living labor economist. In his mediation and labor conciliation experience activities, and between the years 1937 to 1944, John Steelman induced embattled protagonists, in more than 80,000 cases involving labor-management shut-downs, to settle their labor problems and squabbles without lay-offs and without strikes. Yet, Mr. Speaker, his labor activities today are but one in a long catalog of assignments which he accomplishes each day.

Characterized by his integrity, all men, from the most obscure representatives of labor or management to the

highest, can each look forward to receiving equity and justice under law—from the head, the heart, and the hand of this able Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, Battle Report, Washington, as sent to the American people last Sunday afternoon, was peculiar and unique in more ways than one. It was unique in the tremendous listener interest aroused by the masterful work done on that part of the program devoted to a description of conditions in Berlin, as depicted by Lou Hazam.

For his radio and television writings Lou Hazam has long been distinguished by his receipt of many awards. The magnificent word picture which he painted of the sociological, ethical, moral, physical, educational, spiritual, financial, military, and political values as they exist in Berlin today stamp him as probably the greatest documentary writer in the business today.

Additionally thereto Mr. Steelman brought to NBC television, and to the American people, the Honorable Earl D. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army, just returned from an inspection trip to Korea. Secretary Johnson discussed the reasons which give rise to the existent high morale of our troops in Korea as well as to the quality of leadership which he found in the combined troops of the United Nations—inclusive of the Turks, Greeks, Australians, British, New Zealanders, and our own boys from the United States of America.

Also on the program was the Honorable Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Mr. Thorp discussed the many causes which led to the famine conditions prevailing in India and the proposal to ship the 2,000,000 tons of American wheat.

Mr. Geoffrey Lewis, Director of the Bureau of German Affairs of our State Department, spoke briefly on the attitude of the people in Berlin that lent factual support to the brilliant exposé of actual conditions so eloquently expressed by Lou Hazam.

Mr. Speaker, last but not least, was the unfoldment and presentation of the soul-stirring pictures taken by the Jones brothers behind the iron curtain within the last 10 days, and about which I advised you 2 weeks ago would be available to the American people within a fortnight.

Thanks to the magnificent teamwork of these colorful twin newsreel photographers, the National Broadcasting Co. was able to bring to television and pictorialize Hazam's writings, by way of Battle Report, Washington, the actual scenes, taken but a few days prior, of conditions as they exist today behind the iron curtain.

Because of the tremendous reader interest in these subjects, I am making unanimous request for insertion into the RECORD as part of my remarks the twenty-sixth teledocumentary, Battle Report, Washington.

This reads as follows:

BATTLE REPORT, WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMICK. As the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hears our top defense officials on the subject of troops for Europe, NBC television in the Nation's Capitol turns its cameras upon some top guests of its own, that you may hear your twenty-sixth Battle Report, Washington.

Washington, its streets revealing the stepped-up tempo of mobilization as more men in uniform fill the city—while in Korea our troops battle new Communist attempts to breach the UN line of the central front.

But, first, let us hear from the Assistant to the President, Dr. John R. Steelman.

Dr. STEELMAN. Behind the iron curtain the tyrannical exploitation of human beings still goes unabated. The propaganda machines of the Kremlin still give out their messages of hatred day in and day out. In Korea, the mad fury of the power-drunk despots is sending tens of thousands to their deaths—tens of thousands of peace-loving, generous men who ask only for an opportunity to find happiness in their own way.

We know these men who are being sent to the slaughter. They have been our friends for generations. We hope and pray the day is not far distant when they will break their chains and see their greedy masters for what they really are.

And so—on to agenda of Battle Report today. First, we will hear from the Assistant Secretary of the Army who has just returned from an inspection trip to Korea, Secretary Earl D. Johnson.

Next, a word about the starvation crisis in India, and American response to its call for help, from Mr. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Then, Mr. Geoffrey Lewis, Acting Director of the State Department's Bureau of German Affairs to put a spotlight on Germany. Germany, from which today we will show the first of the films that NBC's Jones Boys are shooting to document Europe for you.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Stand by, then, for Battle Report, Washington.

As China rang in its new year—the year of the rabbit—the Chinese Communists on the battlefront in Korea began this belated new year—to abuse a pun—definitely "in the red." Up to 78,000 of them fell before the persistent limited offensive of our UN troops. Apparently regrouped again, they are now seeking to break through the Allied line along the Han. Latest reports concede them certain successful penetrations. But they appear to have broken off their Wonju drive, and far from accomplished the damage they hoped. To report to you on what he found to be the all-important factor bolstering our troops in Korea, we focus now upon one of our top Defense Department officials who has just returned. He is the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Earl D. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. Morale is a term which is very difficult to define, and over the years I have tried to determine in my own mind just what it means and what it implies.

From my experience in the past I have come to the conclusion that it is largely an expression of the degree of confidence possessed by the soldier. This confidence is related to the quality of his equipment, the state of his training, the support he receives from the home front, the support he receives from his sister services, and the quality of his leadership. Perhaps it would be advisable to review each one of these in turn.

First, in regard to his equipment, our soldier knows from actual experience in the battlefield through the use of his equipment that it is equal to any and superior to most of the similar equipment that the enemy has. Also, he knows that he has a larger supply and a more ready supply of equipment than his enemy. Next, in regard to training, his proficiency in the use of his superior equipment has constantly increased. He knows that the replacements who are coming in to fight alongside of him have achieved a higher degree of training than was possible in the initial operation in the beginning of the Korean campaign, so that today he has real confidence in his force's capacity.

Next, in regard to the support from the home front, he, just like you and I, can pick up the paper and the various periodicals, and listen to the various broadcasts, and realize that there is an increasing flexing of the military muscles of the Nation and that the public is rallying to his support in ever increasing numbers.

Next, in regard to the support from his sister services, he has the demonstrated success of the Inchon landings, the valiant withdrawal of the Marines and his brother soldiers from the Chosin Reservoir, the constant support from tactical aircraft, the combat cargo command, and all the related services in the rear areas. He knows that they have confidence in their own field equipment as he has in his.

Next, in regard to the quality of his leadership, just as the individual soldier has grown in military stature in the discharge of his daily duties, so have his officers. He has seen the superb tactics of withdrawal and the manipulation of limited reserves which General Walker has displayed He has seen how brilliantly his commander conducted the offensive which swept the Korean forces back to the Yalu River. More recently, he has seen again the use of our troops' greater mobility by their withdrawal sufficiently far beyond the reach of the Communists to allow complete regrouping of forces and equipment, and now he has seen the magnificent, dynamic leadership of a new Commander, General Ridgway, who, having had time to achieve an estimate of the enemy's capacities, is leading our troops in a stubborn offensive.

In addition to this, he has come to know his enemy and knows that, in virtually every respect, the UN soldier is superior.

One last point that has added greatly to his morale is the fact that this is not an individual action of the United States but is the combined action of the United Nations. This is important because he has now fought alongside the Turk, the Greek, the Australian, the British, the New Zealander, and he knows that they are companions in arms who can well carry their end of the burden.

All of these have combined to add to the growing high morale of our forces.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You are looking at film shot by NBC front-line cameramen showing our forces at the height of their offensive in Korea. Heavy fire from ships like these, laid down by the battleship Missouri off shore. UN forces were sparked by tanks covered by tremendous artillery barrage. Not until our troops reach the open plain below Seoul do the Reds surge forward in a suicidal charge, waving their flags and blowing their horns as they go to their death by the thousands. Not too far from this scene of fighting, another kind of struggle is going on, a struggle against starvation in India. To report to you upon that struggle, we bring you now Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Mr. THORP. This is Sunday, and many of us have eaten a good American dinner. However, on the other side of the world, in the crowded country of India, families are less fortunate. Let me tell you what a poor family in the famine area of northern India had for its Sunday dinner. There was only a thin wheat pancake, with a sauce made of chickpeas. If the family is fortunate enough to own a cow, there might have been some milk or butter.

Food like this would be a starvation diet, according to American standards, but in India, even that simple meal is threatened by the famine that hangs over the lives of millions of people.

Many factors caused this famine—earthquakes, floods, droughts, and plagues of locusts. Unless India imports 6,000,000 tons of grain this year, millions of people will die from starvation, or from disease against which undernourished bodies cannot survive.

The Government of India has already made arrangements to buy 4,000,000 of those tons with her own funds. Last December, India asked the United States to help her to secure the remaining 2,000,000 tons. The President ordered an intensive study of the Indian famine situation and of our own supply of grain. The experts arrived at two general conclusions: (1) that the need was real and urgent; and (2) that the United States could supply the grain from its reserve.

The President has asked Congress to pass legislation authorizing the Government to give the grain to India, as a grant, not as a loan. The cost to us would be about $190,000,000. India would pay the shipping costs. The grain would be distributed to the people through India's ration system, at the special low prices fixed for that system. The Indian Government would be expected to deposit in a special account the rupees which it received for the grain. The money in this account—known as counterpart funds—would be used for economic development programs with special emphasis on projects to increase agricultural production. The Indian Government would agree to insure that the grain is distributed fairly and to make certain that the Indian people are told that the grain which helped to save their lives came as a gift from the American people.

There have been differences of opinion between the United States and India, but I know that all Americans of good will agree that we shall do all we can for starving people. We don't make our help conditional on whether they completely agree with us.

We have already shown our real interest in India's future. For example, United States point 4 projects are being carried out in India to improve farming methods and solve the water shortage so that famines may be eliminated.

India is the largest and potentially the richest democracy in Asia. The 350,000,000 people of India cherish their freedom as ardently as we do. Freedom doesn't thrive in the face of famine. Our 2,000,000 tons of grain will save millions of lives, and also help to preserve freedom for the Indians and for us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Remember this? Germany under the mad administrations of Adolf Hitler. The hour of the dictator, the concentration camp, the book-burning—one of the darkest chapters in man's long history. But today—far different from the scenes you see here—there is a new Germany aborning—at least in that part of it occupied by the West. The spirit of this new Germany—symbolized by free Berlin—gives hope that the Germans will be among our stanchest allies in Europe in our struggle against communism. Today, we turn the spotlight on Berlin, and our cameras upon one of the Nation's leading German experts, that you may hear from his lips the significance of what is transpiring there—the State Department's Deputy Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Geoffrey W. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS. Every man in the world today is involved in a struggle to determine whether he will be a free man or a slave. In Korea, in Indochina, that struggle is joined in open warfare. Elsewhere, it takes other insidious forms.

Europe in the last 5 years has experienced the struggle with Soviet communism in every way short of formal war. By subversion, by treachery, and the threat of the Red army, many of Europe's peoples have already been swallowed up by imperialistic communism. The countries which have resisted Soviet pressure thus far face the possibility—now an ugly fact in Korea—that Communist dictatorship will commit aggressive war, if lesser means fail, in its march toward world domination.

Today the United States and the other North Atlantic Treaty nations are embarked on a joint effort to build military strength to convince the Kremlin that aggression against the free world will not pay. But until this strength is a reality, we, our allies, and the free peoples everywhere, must endure sacrifice and tension, sometimes under the very shadow of the evil force which seeks to impose a way of life we despise.

At the very center of the European struggle is Germany. That is why Germany is one of the tension areas of the world today. Germany doesn't yet have the protection offered by members of the North Atlantic Treaty organization to one another. As I see it, there are three big reasons why Germany has not fallen before the onslaught of the Communists. For one thing, we are there. While our occupation forces are not large, they are symbolic of both American power and American determination to resist Soviet aggression. For another thing, we have let the Kremlin know that, as far as we are concerned, an attack on Western Germany or on Western Berlin will be considered an attack on us. But thirdly, and perhaps most important, there are the indomitable people of Western Germany and Western Berlin. Berliners, particularly, are strong on one item—courage. They refuse to be intimidated. They were blockaded for almost a year, and at the end of that time they were even more anti-Communist than before.

What does Berlin have to do with us? The people of Berlin lead their daily lives amid sacrifice, tension, and heartbreak. These tragic people are surrounded by that evil force and despised way of life. How do the Berliners feel about it? How do they keep their courage, their nerve, their will to go on? What are they like now, after daily exposure to both worlds—the world of freedom, and the world of terror and the secret police?

You and I—across a small ocean from Berlin—are just beginning to feel the great struggle come close to us. Our mettle is beginning to be tested by the Communist threat of world domination. How we meet the test can well determine whether we have peace and freedom or total war. As a people who have already met the test, we may well take a look at the men, women, and children of Berlin.

Mr. McCORMICK. To bring Europe into your living room, America, NBC television recently sent abroad its prize-winning cameramen, the Jones brothers, whose pictures from Korea—shown time and again on this program—made news-reporting history. We asked them to train their cameras first on Berlin. Berlin, because in no other city in the world is the struggle between East and West—the most pressing problem of this mid-twentieth century—so symbolized and so concentrated. The pictorial evidence Battle Report, Washington now invites your attention to the first of NBC's exclusive teledocumentary reports on Europe—Battle Report, Berlin.

"This . . . this is Berlin.
Out of the rubble of postwar Germany,
Out of the bomb-rocked horror that
shattered all normal existence.

"And from a fate
That found it stripped by the Russians
Of everything of real value,
And looted with so-called invasion
currency,
Slowly,
By the sweat of the brow
And the pain of the back—
Stone by stone,
Building upon building,
Street by street,
Like a giant stirring to life,
Was born a new city—
A dynamic city,
A vibrant city,
An island of freedom in a sea of tyranny!
The key to Europe's future
And perhaps to our own destiny as well!

"From the beginning—
Over this new city—
Loomed the threatening shadow of communism,
Symbolized by this Soviet war memorial
Built in the British sector by the Russians
Even before our armies entered.

"At first, through the Kommandatura,
The four allied powers—
Each responsible for his own sector—
Sought to administer the city jointly
Result? Red arguments . . . threats . . .
recriminations.
Finally came the day
When Russia refused to 'hang its hat' in
the Kommandatura
Alongside the French,
The British,
The U. S. A.

"Thus the city was divided—
Divided as if a gigantic axe
Had crashed upon it.
And so now Berlin—
As this fenced street which marks the division shows,
Is two Berlins:
Free Berlin—under the democratic Allies,
And slave Berlin—
The Russian sector.

"Determined to resist Russia's attempts
To force us
From this city behind the iron curtain—
This 'democratic thorn in communism's
hide'—
Allied forces still patrol the western sectors,
Determined to hold our ground!
And lending courage to the people—
People who have proved their dislike of
communism—
Are the troops of the Western Powers on
duty there.
Troops like these famed Scots of the Black
Watch,
Making the streets echo with their marching
As if to say—
'We are here, Berlin.
We mean to stay here.
We will not forsake those of you who love
freedom!'

"Hand in hand with the Germans,
American architects are helping to rebuild
the capital.
Marshall plan aid—
Converted into lumber, paint, bricks—
Is literally changing the face of the city
That not long ago lay prone beneath the
paralysis of destruction.
We are lifting the spirit, too,
By feeding the body.
In a free school-lunch program throughout
Berlin,
American-financed meat, potatoes, and vegetables
Are being invested in the future of Germany,
Strengthening further the will to resist
Being stamped with the label 'Made in
Moscow.'

"And do not think
That Berlin has not responded.
Time and again
Berliners have physically demonstrated
their faith in the West,
(As you see them here—
Defying the Soviet terror!)
And when the first democratic election in
14 years was held
Ninety-three percent chose western democracy over eastern communism.
Put in office Mayor Reuter,
The greatest single opponent of communism
In all Germany!

"When Russia,
Seeking to chastise this spirit,
Cut off the electric power it controlled
From the western zones,

We flew in this new power plant,
Piece by piece,
By way of the dramatic Berlin airlift.

"We said:
'Let there be light.'
And throughout the free sectors of Berlin,
There was light.

"Power to light up the truth
Through this, the biggest news sign in the world.
Truth flying on kilowatt wings
Across the boundary that Russia has drawn in Berlin.
Erected by the free German newspapers on the west
Without a nickel of American money.
Each night this sign flashes uncensored news
Into the Russian sector.
Yes; despite a canvas shield
The Reds once built to try to hide it,
Only to have it blown down in a storm.
Despite a brick wall
They raised before it,
Only to see people step to one side of the wall.
And despite the time they turned a hose upon it,
Hoping to short it.
Today, thanks to these brilliant letters,
In defiance of the Russians
The truth burns bright the western sky
To challenge their lies.

'RIAS' is still another way
By which we penetrate the Communist darkness.
'RIAS' stands for 'Radio in the American Sector.'
Operated by a staff of 976 people.
Broadcasting round the clock, day and night, in the German language.
It is the most powerful station in western Europe—
Covers not only Berlin
But all of Germany
That is under the hammer and sickle!
Add, too,
As a 'winner of friends and influencer of people' for democracy,
The free university in Western Berlin
To which many from the Russian section come.
This was built brick upon brick
By the students themselves,
Fed up with being taught the Communist line
In the university the Reds control.

"But perhaps one of the most courageous stories
To come out of Berlin today.
Is how men are risking their safety
To spread the truth behind the iron curtain
In the form of the printed word.
To follow this 'verboten' tabloid edition of a regular German newspaper
Into Russian-controlled territory,
The Jones brothers themselves risked danger
Being smuggled with their cameras
Late at night into the Russian zone,
And hidden in a house overlooking the borderline.
The whole time they saw no one
But the stranger who brought them
And took them out,
And the whole time they were there
It was so dark,
They didn't even know what part of the Russian zone
They were in.
For an exclusive story
Such as never before screened,
Let us—with the Jones boys—
Keep our eyes on this man
With his brief case stuffed with
The newspapers to be sneaked into Russian territory.

"Through the streets of Berlin
Starts—the truth!
The truth, in this instance—
As the Jones brothers wrote—
'A small, scared little man
With death in his bag—
Headed east.'
Up one street
And down the next,
He carries the paper dynamite in his brief case.
His rundown heels,
And his shabby attire,
Purposely designed to disguise a hero.
Then—suddenly—
An abrupt turn in the opposite direction.
Passing women gossiping on the street corner,
Like women anywhere,
He takes a deep breath and
Passes from the 'land of the free'
Into the 'home of the slave.'
Then, as the Jones boys remember it,
A policeman patrolling the Russian zone
Stops him, asking for identification.
We kept shooting for what seemed an eternity
But he was passed
After a few terrible seconds.
Into the east
Disappears the scared little man with the truth,
Pointing at the heart of the Soviets
The moral—
'In the beginning was the word.'
'Thus, though inside the iron curtain
'And connected only by a narrow corridor with Western Europe,
'Berlin stands as both a fortress and a showcase
'For democracy—
'Its people—who know communism best—
'Among the most anticommunistic in the whole world.'
Even the young, as the Jones boys discovered,
Prizing their freedom.

"From this 'other side' that's bad.
From the totalitarian zone of Germany
To this island of democracy that is Berlin,
Come the oppressed refugees,
Who can see and compare for themselves
The differences in the two ways of life.
Some 250 a day escape to the West.
Like this man you see being interviewed.
Military men say
They add their knowledge and strength
To the struggle against communism—
A struggle that wins from our new top commander
Of our military in Berlin—
General Mathewson—
This appraisal.
'The role that free Germany will play
In the broader defense of freedom
Is still unclear.'
But this much we can count on—
That if Russia should march tomorrow,
These German police of the West
Will be on our first line of defense.

"This, then, is Berlin, America—
Where the Second World War in Europe
And the third could officially begin.
So far,
Communists' coercion, threats, propaganda, and political action
Have failed to rock it—
And because we have stood firm,
Berlin stands today
As a symbol of political and social freedom
To all down-trodden Europe.
Look well, then, upon these faces.
The faces of the people of Berlin
Who have proved their passion for democracy.
For these are the faces of your future allies
In the struggle for peace."

Mr. LEWIS. Yes; Berlin's is a story of courage. Those of us in the Government, dealing every day with the people of our occupation areas in Germany, never cease to be amazed and encouraged by the kind of spirit depicted in the television documentary you have just seen. I hope you share my feeling that such spirit is ringing proof that humanity can rise above the paralysis and despair the Stalinists would make the means of erasing freedom from the earth.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Until we turn our cameras upon the Nation again next week for another Teledocumentary—this, then, against the background of battlefront Korea, is Robert McCormick putting a period on your twenty-sixth Battle Report, Washington.

They Are Truman's Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium of February 22, 1951:

THEY ARE TRUMAN'S POLICIES

President Truman's foreign policies are not popular here at home. They are shot through with inconsistencies and they mirror great confusion.

Many persons who have subscribed to the New Deal and Fair Deal leadership know this. Some want to remove the weight of guilt from Mr. Truman's shoulders.

The Forum article printed in another column of this page is an example of this wriggling to find a hole to squeeze through. But it cannot be done.

Mr. Truman will not let us forget for a moment that he is Commander in Chief. And he makes our foreign policy.

Not long ago he criticized longshoremen who refused to unload Russian goods sent here. Truman said he made our foreign policy.

He told the Congress to keep its fingers out of the pie. He does that even in the face of the truth that he has no right under the Constitution to wage war whenever and wherever he pleases.

The authority to go to war is vested in the Congress. But Truman insists on being a law unto himself.

Exception is taken in the Forum article to our statement February 15 that "President Truman refuses to release Nationalist Chinese troops against the Communist Reds."

It was Mr. Truman who, on June 27, 1950, directed that the United States Seventh Fleet be prepared to intervene to prevent any Communist attack on Formosa. In the same order he told Chiang Kai-shek to cease attacks on the mainland of China.

Mr. Truman has never rescinded that order.

To this day, the Nationalist troops are bottled up by our Seventh Fleet. Truman's order stopped attacks of the Nationalists against the Communists who took over China. It protects the Reds in China.

Offers of Chiang of troops to be used in fighting the Reds in Korea have been refused.

The only time that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, top military commander in the Far East, tried to express himself on this and other policies of defense he was rebuked by Truman who ordered MacArthur's letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars withheld from the public.

Truman, he wants everyone to know, is Commander in Chief.

With this point clear, the references in the Forum article to Republicans serving in the Truman administration are side issues. There always are men in both major political parties who would rather hold office than be right.

But the real bungling is done by the top man. That's Truman. The men holding posts under him are appointed because they eat out of the same bowl. The trouble now is the milk has soured.

My Countrywomen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, last, the anniversary of the birth of the first President of our Nation, there appeared in the Oregon Journal a guest editorial by Lillian Porter Say, a Washington correspondent of the Journal, which is most apropos today.

This excellent editorial in the form of a letter which might have been written by Martha Washington, will appeal to all who have or have had loved ones in the service, as well as to the many who have great compassion for the families of those serving our country through its military ranks. I include the editorial as a part of these remarks:

DEAR COUNTRYWOMEN

(Today's guest editorial takes the form of a letter written by Lillian Porter Say, Journal Washington correspondent, as one which might have come from the pen of Martha Washington addressed to the wives and mothers of men in the armed services.)

MOUNT VERNON, VA., *February 22, 1951.*

DEAR COUNTRYWOMEN: On the eve of the birthday of the general I am thinking of you whose men are in the armed services of our country.

I am not unacquainted with your sufferings consequent upon parting with your husbands and sons. As the wife of a military man, I lived always in the shadow of war. Our very marriage was postponed until the French and Indian wars were successfully ended at Fort Duquesne. I heard the first shot of the Revolutionary War and the last.

My son by my first marriage, John Parke Custis (I called him "Jackey"), served the general as aide-de-camp. During the siege of Yorktown, Jackey was stricken with camp fever and died. He left a young wife, Eleanor Calvert, of Mount Airy, Md., and four small children. George Washington Parke Custis and Nellie Parke Custis were then in our home at Mount Vernon. At the time of their father's death, the general turned to me and said tenderly, "I adopt the two younger children as my own."

Most carefully he cherished these grandchildren of mine. He supervised their morals and their learning. When he returned home after the Revolutionary War he wrote to the overseer: "Let the house in the upper garden called the 'schoolhouse' be cleaned and got in order against I return."

During that bitter winter at Valley Forge my heart bled for our soldiers. If you visit the house that the general and I lived in, you may see my sewing bag. It was a minor hardship to wear the harsh cotton woven in our own colony. Previous to the Revolutionary War, material for the general's and my clothing—silks, velvets, satins—came directly from the mother country. Now I personally assisted in the making of cotton dresses striped with silk from the ravelings of old silk stockings and faded damask chair covers. My spinning wheels were never idle.

You have complained that at my husband's passing I burned his letters to me—that you have read but the one written before he left for Boston as head of the Continental Army:

"You may believe me, my dear Patsy, when I assure you, in the most solemn manner, that, so far from seeking this appointment, I have used every endeavor to avoid it * * * that I should enjoy more happiness in 1 month with you at home than I have the most distant prospect of finding abroad."

You women married to men in public life can surely understand that I was impelled to keep his communications to me sacred forever. We had so little private life together. The one time that we dined alone at Mount Vernon the general noted in his diary: "Mrs. Washington and myself will do what I believe has not been done within the last 20 years by us—that is sit down to dinner by ourselves."

On his last birthday Nellie was married to his nephew, Lawrence Lewis. Maidenlike, she asked the general to wear his best uniform on this occasion. She envisioned the one with the epaulets and gold embroideries.

Those of you who cherish worn khaki in old chests will know my emotion on Nellie's wedding day. The general did indeed wear his best uniform:

"He had spoken true.
He stood there in the worn old buff and blue.
Faded in great campaigns, long, long before."

Finally, my countrywomen, let us remember, "We are placed among the nations of the earth and have a character to establish. * * *"

I am, my dear countrywomen,
Your most respectful,
Mistress MARTHA WASHINGTON.

The Farmer's Fair Share

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Farmer's Fair Share," written by me and published in the February 1951 number of the Ohio Farm Bureau News.

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

THE FARMER'S FAIR SHARE

(By Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE)

We farmers are no strangers to the problem of surplus crops. Farmers have worried over these recurring surpluses for many years. Not only our annual income, but sometimes even our whole way of life on the farm have been at stake.

For decades we were accustomed to see our crops and those of all our neighbors and those of all the Nation's farmers pile up at the end of the season so much in excess of the capacity of the market, either national or international, to absorb them that the prices paid us dropped below even what we had invested in time and money to produce the crop.

ABUNDANCE A BURDEN

Surpluses, not so long ago, used to spell black ruin to the farmer. Abundance often proved a burden instead of a blessing.

During the past few years the whole American people has begun to worry about this problem. Whereas, in the past, surpluses were of primary concern only to those in agriculture, today they are a national problem. This problem should always have been one of national concern.

NATIONAL CONCERN

Whatever difficulties this newly awakened public interest in agriculture may temporarily cause us, we farmers should welcome this national concern as an encouraging sign. The task of those who speak for agriculture in these days is to assure, to the extent they can, that the public's understanding of the farm problem shall be equal to public concern.

The questions about agriculture asked most frequently by citizens appear to be these: Why are farm surpluses a problem while millions of people in the world are starving? Why must food rot in warehouses while our own poor people go hungry? Why are food prices for the consumer so high, when there is so much food produced each year beyond what is consumed? What's wrong about our national agricultural program? What's the matter with our system of distribution? Who's to blame and why can't something be done about it?

REASONS FOR SURPLUSES

The recent great war gave a demonstration of the gigantic strides in productivity that have been made on our farms. By a prodigious effort American farmers met and surpassed the combined demands of the civilian population, the Armed Forces, and our allies.

Production in agriculture during the war came as the fruition of long, patient, and arduous study, experimentation, and labor in the laboratory and in the field. The gains made then were gains that won't be unmade.

World War II solved the problem of surpluses. Perhaps the present world crisis will solve the surplus problem by liquidating the stocks once again. This is the greater reason why we must find a solution that doesn't depend on destruction by war and famine caused by war.

New seeds, new fertilizers, and new techniques have raised the productivity of each acre faster than the population is growing. The prospects now are that America will always be able to keep ahead of any really dangerous shortage in food.

PERISHABLE SURPLUSES

It is this kind of surplus—in perishable foods—that worries people the most. It is impossible for a moral individual to view dispassionately the piling up of huge stocks of milk, eggs, butter, potatoes, etc., while he knows that millions of people are undernourished and that millions of others are prevented from buying them because of sky-high retail prices.

No farmer really wants not to produce as much as he can. His purpose in life is producing the greatest possible amount of foods and fibers and forest products from his land. No farmer ever liked plowing under every other pig or keeping part of his acreage out of cultivation. Every farmer likes it even less when he knows that new methods make his potential production so much greater.

Finally, as we so often point out, the agriculture industry, unlike other types, must produce in accordance with the seasons of the year. Once the crop is in the ground, the farmer cannot halt production, lay off workers, or close his plant if he sees the market for his crops disappearing. Yet his market does sometimes virtually disappear, just when his crop is ready to harvest.

FARMER'S LOSS IS NATION'S LOSS

In the past the farmers themselves took the losses when they had to sell their produce at a certain time for whatever the buyer would offer. The farmers' losses, of course, meant a drop in purchasing power for goods produced in the cities, and thus contributed to lower income not only for the farmer and his family but for the rest of the Nation as well.

To help meet the physical and psychological conditions under which farmers work, the Government now provides crop loans. The Government takes the losses. One big question is whether this is a full answer to the farm problem.

The price-support system which our present agricultural law has set up to help the farmer maintain his income level is by no means perfect. I have grave doubts about certain applications of this law.

There is no doubt that price supports have encouraged overproduction in many commodities, especially perishables, which would not otherwise have been produced in quantities so far beyond the power of the Nation's consumers to purchase them at the prices asked. In these instances price supports are working neither in the best interest of the whole country nor in the best interest of the farmers. We are all aware of what happens when prices go too high—the market for a given food product dwindles or disappears.

For all these reasons, farmers are thinking as never before about a long-range agriculture program that will eliminate the unsatisfactory effects of the present law, and that will at the same time solve the farmer's special problem.

LESS THAN HALF OF CONSUMER'S DOLLAR

In recent months, especially since the start of the Korean war, food consumption has risen substantially. This fall, I am informed, per capita food consumption was running about 11 percent above the 1935–39 average, although some 6 percent under the 1946 postwar high. Demand this year has been heaviest for livestock products, as is normally the case when money for food is relatively plentiful. At the same time, supplies of food have proven to be more than ample, despite military purchases and foreign-aid shipments. Still, even now, we all know that millions of our lower income people are not receiving sufficient nourishment. They simply can't afford it at these prices.

We have found, in our months of investigation, one striking fact to be true: On the average, the farmer—without whom there would be no food to process, distribute, or sell—is receiving less than half of the consumer's food dollar; that is, more than 50 percent of the dollars paid out by the consumer at the grocery counter goes to the various middlemen who stand between the farmer and the consumer for processing, packaging, handling, transporting, wholesaling, and retailing.

Much of these in-between charges, of course, are absolutely necessary. But some of them, we are convinced, are absolutely unnecessary, and add a heavy burden on the consumer who buys the finished product. We are sure that great gains are possible in reducing distribution costs and thus narrowing the spread between what the farmer receives and the consumer pays.

DISTRIBUTION COSTS

Sometimes, it must be acknowledged, the consumer insists on too fancy a packaging and servicing for an otherwise simple item. Many city dwellers insist on milk being delivered to their doorsteps, or buy a handful of potatoes neatly wrapped in cellophane, or one dill pickle in a plastic sack. Whether the customer insists on this special treatment or the merchant presses it upon him is a question with many arguments pro and con.

There is much that can be done to simplify, speed up, and cut costs of distribution in the food industry. It may be, for example, that the present method of milk distribution in cities could stand a change. Studies made recently in Buffalo, N. Y., indicate that to deliver a single quart a day to a household and collect cash for it each time costs 18 cents per quart, while to deliver 4 quarts each delivery and collect payment at the end of the month costs only 3 cents per quart. Yet the person buying 1 quart pays the same price as the person buying 4.

Also the charge for home delivery is partly levied against those who buy their milk at the store. It is certainly unfair to spread these high costs of delivery to all who buy milk. An improvement can be made here.

Another factor rarely noted as contributing to price inflation is the use of the percentage mark-up instead of what can be called a unit mark-up. The percentage-type of mark-up is widely employed by both wholesalers and retailers. In effect, those who use it assure themselves a higher profit per unit the more they pay for the item originally.

An item which once cost 50 cents and which the grocer marked up his usual 20 percent—or 10 cents—may now cost him $1. He doesn't add a 10-cent mark-up as before, however, but rather his usual 20 percent—that is, 20 cents on the dollar. The consumer pays the grocer $1.20. Yet the labor of handling this item on the shelves of the store is no more, when the item costs $100 than when it cost 50 cents. The difference is that the customer is charged 20 cents instead of only 10.

Naturally, this is supposed to work the other way when prices descend—but today we are in a period of price inflation and prices are not descending. Too few customers realize the importance of this method of mark-up in their cost of living.

FARM PRICES DROP

In the past 3½ years we have watched the prices paid to the farmer for his produce drift downward—not, of course, to the point of ruin—but, nonetheless, lower. At the same time we have seen the prices paid for food by the consumer rise higher and higher. This is an unhealthy state of affairs.

Of course, wages and other costs have risen in the food-processing industry as in others. We all realize that. But, have they risen to the point of justifying the current, unprecedentedly high food prices? Such investigations as we have conducted indicate that some processors are demanding and receiving—exorbitant profits at the expense of the consumer and without benefit to the farmer.

Unfortunately, the philosophy of too many food processors is summed up in the statement expressed before our subcommittee by a vice president of a major meat-packing company, who declared: "In the meat business you take advantage of any increased demand by the raising of your price."

My own opinion, based on testimony heard over the past year, is that certain processors tend to anticipate increased demand by raising their price in advance, and later letting it drop a bit if the pill is too bitter for the consumer to swallow.

The over-all picture is one of a few powerful companies strategically placed in the economy who operate on the principle of charging whatever the traffic will bear.

It would seem reasonable for the consumer to expect that a drop in prices to the farmer would be reflected in a comparable drop at the retail store at least as soon as the normal turn-over of inventory takes place. It would also seem proper that when the commodity prices are rising the consumer should expect to pay higher retail prices as soon as stocks on hand at the earlier price level have been exhausted.

What we have learned, however, in our studies of domestic food and fiber price spreads—as well as in our look at coffee prices—is that food processors do not readily lower their prices in accordance with lower costs of raw materials (that is, when they pay the farmers less for the crop), but that they are ready, willing, and eager to raise prices the minute the basic commodity market begins to advance—and even to ask more than the advances could possibly warrant.

The food processors have been exacting full benefit from the inflation, and using the abnormal profits therefrom to finance an expansion of facilities rather than passing profits on to their stockholders in the form of dividends.

CONSUMERS GOT BILL

Were the consumers now or in the future likely to benefit from this increased plant capacity by lower prices based on greater output, one might well make a case justifying this strange form of consumer investment. I fear, however, that there are few signs of such a happy outcome. The stockholder, at least, got new equity from this expansion but the consumers got the bill.

Since the start of warfare in Korea, food prices once again have begun their upward spiral. The farmer, as you farmers know, has seen little change for the better in terms of higher prices for what he produces.

It now seems almost impossible that we can avoid imposition of strict price controls by the Federal Government.

None of us wanted this if it could possibly be avoided. A heavy share of the responsibility for Government price controls will have to be borne by those who have driven up retail prices in the past several months.

Another potent influence on prices, we are finding, is the concentration of industry. The Big Threes, the Big Fours, and the Big Fives in soap, baking, dairy products, and son on, seem to have reached such dominant positions in their industries as to allow them to set prices without too much regard to competition. Although Congress has for nearly 60 years sought to control or limit the concentration of industry by antitrust laws, the problem is more acute today than ever before.

AIDED BY ADVERTISING

The great aggregations in the food industry have certainly been assisted in attaining their dominant positions in the market by the use of extensive advertising. For example, in the prepared cereal industry we have found it not unusual for advertising expenditures to run from 10 to 15 percent of the sales. In some cases, when a new product is being introduced on the market, advertising has taken 20 percent of the sales.

We have learned that large food-producing groups spend from 5 to 10 percent of the sales income on advertising their brands. Vegetable and meat canners spend only about 1½ to 3 percent of their sales revenue on advertising. Chain-store advertising, while large in quantity, generally runs less than 1 percent of total sales, as does that of the large meat packers.

All these expenditures for advertising, of course, are deducted from taxable income as costs of doing business, and, like the individual package for the humble dill pickle or the fancy pants on a lamb chop or chicken leg, are all paid ultimately by the consumer.

There is no doubt in my mind that heavy advertising for brand A as against brand B—both being practically identical products from different companies—adds measurably to the retail price paid by the consumer.

BOLSTER ANTITRUST

Unless we have hard-hitting prosecution under existing antitrust laws and unless present loopholes in those laws are plugged, the trend toward gigantic aggregations of corporate power will surely lead to absolute control by them of the market for food and, thus, control of the prices consumers have to pay for food. Most likely, too, in such a framework, the farmers would receive an even smaller part of the consumers' dollar.

Every farmer in the United States has a vested interest in the success of anti-monopoly legislation and antitrust prosecution. It's too bad they don't make their voice heard more loudly on this in Washington.

Beyond this, however, we must find another way of handling the so-called surpluses in perishables. Either we must rigorously curtail production or we must somehow expand the consumption of perishable foods. It is impractical and immoral to continue amassing them in storage.

EGG SUPPORTS REMOVED

The Secretary of Agriculture has announced that as of December 31 price supports on eggs have been withdrawn. This is drastic action, taken reluctantly, after the Government has invested about $100,000,000 in dried eggs purchased under the support program. Dropping the support rate 10 cents a dozen from last year's rate still failed to discourage overproduction. Now all supports are removed.

This may not help dispose of much of the surplus eggs now in stock but it ought to discourage farmers from producing too many eggs next year. Yet, if it is proper to remove price supports from one perishable, is it not equally proper, under similar conditions, to remove them from others? But how, then, can it be considered fair to spend taxpayers' money to support some groups of farmers but not others?

In the past 20 years we have tried to settle the question, first, by controlling production on the farm, then by controlling surpluses after the harvest. We are still far from finding a full solution.

One thing is certain: We must find a closer balance among effective demand, available supply and consumer prices. There is no logic and no justice, for example, in storing away tons of butter, letting it turn rancid, giving it away or selling it for next to nothing abroad, and keeping the market price to the consumer at a rate which cuts down consumption. This holds equally true for other perishables as well.

Our rule must be to find a price that is neither so high as to discourage consumption, nor so high as to encourage excessive production, nor so low as to endanger the income of the farmer. This won't be easy. We have not succeeded with the price-support program in perishables, however well that program may appear to be working in storables.

I do not regard the food-price problem as unsolvable. I do not believe, either, that it can be solved by any single, simple panaceas. Solution will demand a concerted attack from all angles at once, an attack that gives proper weight to the farmer's right to a living income, the middleman's right to a sufficient profit, and the consumers right to adequate nourishment at prices he can afford to pay.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

My own plan of attack is a multiple attack. It does not by any means include all the possible or necessary steps that will have to be taken. But it operates in an area where much more can be done than has been done.

First, I hope to see created a special, independent, continuing Senate watchdog committee on prices to stand guard in the present war economy over the just interests of all our citizens in their role as consumers—and we are all consumers.

Second, we must have rigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, especially in the food-processing and distributing industry, as well as enactment of such additional legislation as will curb the trend toward greater and greater concentration of industrial power and as will flatten the trade barriers that are rising in our economic system.

Third, we need constant efforts by industry, under the watchful eye of the public's representatives in Congress, to improve current methods and practices in food processing and distribution, with a view to reducing costs, eliminating duplication where wasteful, and bringing food to the Nation's tables at the lowest price consonant with reasonable profit to those in business.

Fourth, we need thorough reevaluation by farm organizations, by the USDA, and by the Congress, of the present farm laws as they affect surpluses and consumer prices, and amendment of those laws in the interest of the greatest possible market for farm products at prices farmers can afford to work for and consumers can afford to pay.

Finally, we need continued exploration of industrial uses for agricultural products to put existing surpluses to work and to expand markets for farm crops.

The Fantastic Arizona Project Denounced in All the Hearst Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Members to the editorial published in all Hearst newspapers on February 15, 1951, on the fantastic central Arizona project—S. 75 and H. R. 1500—now the subject of hearings before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editorial follows:

A FANTASTIC PROJECT

While the Nation's economy ponders how it can underwrite the staggering cost of the rearmament program, support foreign beneficiaries, finance cherished administration schemes like the Brannan plan, and still survive, the State of Arizona is trying to force through Congress the greatest of all boondoggling projects.

Aptly called the Nation's most fantastic project, the central Arizona irrigation district would spend $2,075,720,000 over 75 years to pour Colorado River water on land worth $300 an acre at the cost of $1,838 per acre.

All but 1 percent of this sum would be paid by the other 47 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. Between New York's share of $304,509,000 to Nevada's $2,698,000, the other States would be mulcted in proportion.

This represents benefits of $550,000 each to the landowners of the irrigation district, more than half of which is held by 420 individuals.

These figures, preposterous to the point of incredibility, were compiled by Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman.

Undeterred by the astronomic cost and the palpable injustice of demanding that the entire country stand the expense of benefiting a handful of land speculators, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has reported favorably on the project.

After debate in the Senate it will pass to the House Public Lands Committee, and may in time become law unless Senators and Representatives from all States but Arizona again defeat it as they did in the last Congress.

Arizona's raid on the national resources and Treasury, proceeding by the light of "politics as usual," depends largely on the presence of her Congressmen in positions and on committees of importance: Senator MCFARLAND, the majority leader; Senator HAYDEN, of the Appropriations Committee; and Representative MURDOCK, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee.

To southern California alone this claim on the precious and strictly limited waters of the Colorado is a deadly threat against her continued development as the country's third largest center of industrial production, and the home of 5,000,000 people.

To other States it is a heavy drain on their funds with no promise whatever of any benefit. Many of them, in fact, would be paying for a prodigal gift of new arable lands to Arizona while their own agricultures have been cut back 20,000,000 acres.

No wonder the President, the Departments of the Army and the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget have all opposed the proposal.

Determined opposition in both Senate and House by Members whose viewpoint and conviction extend beyond the commercial ambition of a privileged few can and should stop this dangerous and extravagant scheme.

Simple Justice Demands Lithuania's Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the address I gave, and the resolutions adopted, at a mass meeting of Lithuanians on February 18, 1951, in Our Lady of Vilna Parish Hall at Worcester, Mass., held to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuania's independence day. The resolutions were adopted at the conclusion of the speaking program.

The address and resolutions follow:

MR. DONOHUE'S SPEECH

I am very glad to be able to accept the kind invitation to take part in this commemoration tonight of the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, not so much as your Congressman, but more as your friend and neighbor.

This annual program is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians and their friends, because it is held to recollect that day of February 18, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule.

Thirty-three years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

In this year of 1951, our observance here tonight is, unfortunately, shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The world does not know all the terrible details of what has happened and is happening to Lithuanians behind the dark, impenetrable iron curtain. However, we do know that behind that dreadful iron curtain

hundreds of thousands of God-fearing Lithuanians have been liquidated, martyred for their patriotism, their religious faith, their steadfast resistance to tyranny.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that Stalin is using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and, perhaps, even for war, and a substantial part of the slave force has been kidnaped from Lithuania.

Certainly we cannot continue, and must not continue to close our eyes to this injustice, to close our ears to the calls for help, to close our hearts to the suffering we know is going on behind the iron curtain. Without losing our honor, we cannot much longer ignore the human tragedy the iron curtain conceals. We cannot much longer endure the shame we feel by tolerating the maintenance of such brutality. We cannot much longer hold up our heads in self-respect, if we continue to give silent approval to a group of aethistic political leaders who have demonstrated themselves to be devoid of Christian humanity and any sense of Christian justice.

The principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration by the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter, is a hollow mockery in the present suppression of the Lithuanian people. Lithuania is undergoing a shameless conquest, the victim of as bold and cynical a diplomatic campaign as any big state has ever waged against a gallant, honorable, but weaker neighbor.

Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering, at this time, to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. Here in the United States, I earnestly believe that most Americans are becoming increasingly more concerned about the fate of Lithuania, which stands in accusing testimony to our failure to live and act according to the principles for which our people have fought and died in two world wars. I consider it the solemn duty of every officer of our National Government to reveal the truth of the extinguishment of self-government, that is being forced upon the smaller nations, like Lithuania, by the Russian Government policy of expansion through fraud, intimidation, and coercion. World War II was fought with the clear understanding and pledged purpose that common victory should bring restoration of self-government and territorial integrity to the oppressed nations of the world. That pledge must be carried out.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

You must dedicate yourselves today to the determined revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania, so that the United Nations shall accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania. May God grant that this will be accomplished within the year.

RESOLUTION

At a mass meeting of Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., held under the auspices of the Knights of Lithuania, Chapter 116, the Lithuanian Catholic Federation, the Lithuanian Societies and the parish of Our Lady of Vilna, on February 18, 1951, at Our Lady of Vilno Parish Hall at Worcester, Mass., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas Russia, by force of arms and in utter violation of all legal and moral laws, continues to occupy the Republic of Lithuania, to deport, execute, and imprison Lithuania's Nationals, to commit atrocities against the government and civil population of Lithuania, to systematically destroy Lithuania's democratic form of government: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful, by force of arms, occupation of the Republic of Lithuania; against Russia's deportation, execution, and imprisonment of Lithuania's Nationals; against Russia's commitment of atrocities against the Government and the civilian population of Lithuania; against Russia's systematic destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do hereby most fervently petition Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, to use to the utmost, the influence of the Government of the United States of America, to the end that, all Russian military forces and government be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, and that Lithuania and her people be liberated and Lithuania be restored as a free and independent republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the press."

WILLIAM J. KISSELL,
Chairman.
Mrs. TEKLA B. MAZEIKA,
Secretary.

Air Travel From Puerto Rico to the Mainland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, including extraneous material, I am including herewith an editorial from the newspaper El Mundo, one of the most important papers in the island of Puerto Rico, concerning air travel between Puerto Rico and the mainland.

I believe that the position of the editorialist of El Mundo is very well taken. The people of Puerto Rico, as citizens of the United States, have a right to ample and convenient transportation service from their island to the mainland at fair rates. There is no better way to attain this end than by competition. Monopoly in air travel between Puerto Rico and the mainland would have the same bad effect that monopoly has wherever it is present. Puerto Rico has been subject to such monopoly for a long time. The time has surely come when it should be freed from this very undesirable situation.

The editorial follows:

A STEP BACKWARD?

Pan-American Airways has made a petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider the authorization given to Eastern Air Lines to supply service for passengers and cargo on the route between San Juan and New York.

Pan-American is trying to protect their monopoly which they have had for some time on this route, but we doubt that whatever their reasons and arguments may be, they would carry more weight than the convenience and the well-being of the people of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico also have their rights.

It should be understood that the certificate given to Eastern by the Civil Aeronautics Board is not only the result of the efforts of Eastern Air Lines to extend their services to this part of the national territory, but the authorization, which has been delayed through a number of years, is the answer to the demands of the people of Puerto Rico for better services and lower rates in air transportation.

The Government of Puerto Rico through their most distinguished representatives was heard through the press and in a long and detailed campaign; also numerous local industries and civic clubs were heard in this case giving all their efforts to promote what they considered the best for the public of the island and most convenient for their economic development.

The Civil Aeronautics Board did not decide this case right away. It took them many months and years to study and restudy the case notwithstanding the efforts of those interested parties in giving the island a better air service. The Civil Aeronautics Board took all the time needed and even more in checking and investigating the arguments on both sides, particularly those arguments against the granting of a new franchise.

The situation was a rather difficult one, not because it was difficult to decide what was evidently a necessity and a convenience to the island, but because there were many petitions before the Civil Aeronautics Board from different airlines offering new services to Puerto Rico. Eastern requested much more than what was given to them. Finally the Civil Aeronautics Board decided the case granting Eastern the direct route from New York to San Juan and Riddle Aviation the route Miami-San Juan for cargo.

And now that the situation is about to start with more ample services and competition between two of the first-class airlines, Pan-American wants us to go back and start all over again. Is not this an injustice to the public that has given Pan-American Airways so much business and had to struggle so much for its demands to be heard?

The funny part of it is that Pan-American has given us a definite proof of how healthy it is for Puerto Rico to cope with a competitive situation as this. Their directors announced a few days ago a reduction in their tourist and excursion rates, also the increase of some of their services. The reduction of these rates is to become effective precisely at the same time that Eastern have announced the beginning of their new services and precisely the same reduced rates on their direct route to New York.

Unless there are more serious reasons, we believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board should not hurt the interests of the Puerto Ricans by leaving this matter in the air again.

The case has been studied, analyzed, and solved. Let us give this island the opportunity to enjoy their success.

Manpower Is Vital to Milk Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the ability of a country to supply both civilians and soldiers with adequate food is one of the most important considerations in the conduct of war. Without food, the people cannot live, work, or fight. To produce necessary food, we must have adequate manpower, machinery, and equipment. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that the Selective Service System adopt a uniform manpower policy that will properly classify essential farm workers, so that such essential farm workers can continue in food production.

The dairy industry is one segment of agriculture, which is being particularly hard hit by the drafting of men into the armed services. This week I received a petition signed by 351 dairymen, 7 creameries, and 1 large dairymen's association in my district, protesting the injury to the dairy industry, which is resulting from the loss of manpower through the draft. These dairymen own in the aggregate thousands of acres of land, on which are raised thousands of dairy cows which produce millions of gallons of milk.

The petition follows:

To Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Lewis B. Hershey, Director of National Headquarters of the Selective Service System; Chairman, National Selective Service Appeal Board; Director, California State Director of Selective Service:

We, the undersigned residents of the San Joaquin Valley in the State of California, do respectfully petition the President of the United States, and the officers and directors of the Selective Service System, to interpret the present selective-service laws and regulations or to amend the same if necessary, in order to protect the welfare of these United States, by protecting the milk industry, which is an agricultural industry necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, and interest.

We request that agricultural workers in the milk and dairy business be classified in class II–C, as set forth in the rules and regulations of the Selective Service System, as being engaged in a necessary agricultural occupation on the ground of the following reasons and conditions:

1. Where the registrant dairy employee is and has been engaged in that agricultural pursuit.

2. Where the registrant dairy employee cannot be replaced because a shortage of qualified persons exists to do that type of work.

3. Where the removal of the registrant dairy employee is and will cause a material loss to the dairy industry, in that many dairies will have to be closed down, the stock sold or depleted resulting in a decrease in the production of essential milk and butterfat products, thus endangering not only the industry, but the welfare of the people of the United States at large and of the Armed Forces of the United States.

(Signatures omitted.)

Campbell "Doc" White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would today like to pay tribute to a man whose fearless nature has led him through a career of law enforcement which make him the envy of all who fight to uphold justice and to insure a safer way of life for the citizens in this country.

Although he is now retired, and lives a relatively quiet life with his wife in Austin, Tex., Mr. Campbell "Doc" White has unselfishly given 42 years of his life to the pursuit of those who would endanger the lives of you and me. It is courageous men like "Doc" White to whom we owe a debt of gratitude. Although this country is by no means free of crime, it is the work of men like "Doc" White which has practically exterminated the lawless, brazen desperadoes of the past.

In the February issue of the Texas Parade, a monthly publication of the Texas Good Roads Association, there appeared an article about "Doc" White which I would like to call to the attention of every Member of Congress. I respectfully submit this article for insertion in the RECORD:

A RANGER REMINISCES

(By Leonard Mohrman)

The chickens had started to roost, two Chihuahua pups—Tita and Pancho—and a terrier nestled in corner bunks. Dolly and her colt were up for the night.

Campbell "Doc" White, 66, retired FBI agent and former Austin policeman, United States customs service agent, and Texas Ranger—42 years of criminal chasing in all—settled into an easy chair.

His rock home 14 miles west of Austin was a long way from Chicago and the menacing thirties—"Ma" Barker, "Machinegun" Kelly, and Dillinger.

Doc lighted a cigarette; its smoke curled up under a mounted 11-point deer's head. Mrs. White sat alongside in her wheelchair. The invalid descendant of Texas' famed Gen. Benjamin McCulloch had covered her pet parrot's cage. She no longer worried when the telephone rang, and when it didn't.

"I used to tell her," laughed Doc, "it was like Big Foot Wallace said. "A man born to hang would never die of shot."

The veteran of FBI special squad duty was back home—returned from a heap of travel to the Cedar Valley tract once his father's. It is just 9 miles from Doc's log cabin birthplace.

Twilight had come. Doc could think serenely about that fence he plans, the garden or, like the crack of a pistol, snap his thoughts back to those fabulous yesteryears.

They started in 1905. Doc's father, Robert Emmitt White, was Austin's mayor when Congress Avenue was paved, a Travis County sheriff, then the county judge when the South Congress Bridge went up over the Colorado River. His father waived juvenile rights on the 20-year-old son and Doc reported to Capt. John R. Hughes as a Texas Ranger.

Brother Tom also was a ranger and later, too, became an FBI agent. Tom, warden of the Federal correctional institution at La-Tuna, Tex., still nurses a left arm shot-riddled in 1931. It was at Leavenworth, Kans., Federal prison that seven convicts took Warden Tom White hostage in a brazen escape plot.

And John Dudley, the third Ranger White. He was shot down while on duty in east Texas. Doc's eyes narrowed as he told how a wife and three children were left—a son, John Dudley, Jr., is now a ranger.

Crockett "Coley" White, another brother, served as Travis County sheriff. He lives in Austin as does a sister, Mrs. Della Carwin.

Little wonder a long-time Austin resident commented that he had never known a White who knew fear.

In 1909 Doc had switched from the rangers to Austin's police force.

In 1913 Doc left Austin for the United States customs service and rode the valley and along the border until 1917 when World War I bugles sounded.

A military intelligence major, Doc grudgingly recalls, thwarted his only chance to see Europe. "I fooled around over here," growled Doc, "and went back into the customs service when I got out."

It wasn't long until Doc thoroughly tested his father's teachings. "Get all the evidence you can, son," Robert Emmitt White had instructed, as Doc recalls, "then put yourself in the criminal's place * * * think it out * * * plug up those holes, son."

In 1924 Doc joined the FBI and later heard Director J. Edgar Hoover admonish: "Don't think you have a corner on brains * * * if a county constable has a better plan, use it."

"It worked many a time," Doc nodded, adding, "Mr. Hoover is the greatest organizer of law enforcement."

"It's interesting to match wits with a criminal," Doc said, "but," he added with a growl which aroused the dozing pups, "most gangsters will shoot you where your suspenders cross."

A slight undertone of respect threaded his bellowing mention of Ma Barker. She was tabbed by G-man Hoover as the most dangerous lawbreaker in my experience.

When Ma, who with her gang had run up a string of bank robberies, hold-ups, and murders, stepped over the Federal line with the $200,000 kidnaping of Edward G. Bremer, the FBI moved in.

Doc was there—behind a shrinking tree, as he recalls—when Ma met her match at her Oklawaha, Fla., hide-out. Her favorite son, Freddie, fell with her in the FBI's hail of bullets.

"But old Creepy Karpis—he was hooked up with them—was yellow as a pumpkin," scoffed Doc. "The boys tell me that when Karpis and Harry Campbell were caught in New Orleans," Doc snarled, "old Creepy darn near pushed out the top of the car getting his hands up; he had a pistol and rifle in that car, too."

"The nerviest gunman I ever saw," Doc confided, "was Harvey Bailey." Wanted for bank robbery, Bailey joined the Machinegun Kellys and the Texas Shannons. Kelly kidnaped wealthy Charles F. Urschel, Oklahoma City oilman. The hunt was on.

"The Kelly gang's hide-out was in Wise County near Paradise, Tex.; we moved in at night," Doc recounted.

"Harvey awoke looking into a gun muzzle; he didn't budge," said Doc.

"Why don't you go for your gun?" an FBI agent taunted Bailey.

Harvey just looked around, grinned, and replied:

"Hell, I don't want it now."

Address of Hon. W. Averell Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, delivered on February 25, 1951, at the Emergency Conference sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations, held at Chicago, Ill.

I highly commend to my colleagues this very important and thought-provoking address:

I appreciate greatly the opportunity to open this Emergency Conference of the American Association for the United Nations.

First, I want to congratulate you on the subject selected for this conference—Our Responsibility for World Leadership. The free peoples of the world look to us for leadership. Their hopes for the future rest on their faith in us. Their faith comes from the fact that we have not used our preeminent position to dominate others, but rather to inspire cooperative action among nations and to give a helping hand to others in an effort to build a neighborly, decent, and peaceful world. They have confidence in us because they have seen us carry out this new concept of leadership through imaginative and vigorous action.

Yes; we have made mistakes. Some of our expectations have not been fulfilled. We have not always been foresighted. But the truth is that never in history has a nation acted with such high purpose and with such vision as has the United States during the past decade. As Americans we can all take pride in the role that our country has played. Yet, with humility, we must recognize that the tasks ahead may require a measure of greatness even beyond that which we have already achieved.

I need not speak to you of the noble part we played in the war to destroy the Axis. I do want to review briefly our policies and actions in the more complex field of world-wide human relations which is commonly called foreign affairs.

Our postwar objectives were first defined in August 1941—even before we were at war—when President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met at sea and framed the Atlantic Charter. In this historic document the principles were set forth on which hopes for a better future for the world could be based. These principles included the respect of the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they would live; the desire to bring about the fullest collaboration among all nations for economic and social advancement; the right of every nation, great or small, to access on equal terms to raw materials; the establishment of peace under which all men might live in freedom from fear and want; and the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security. The principles of the Charter have guided our actions during the past decade.

In January of 1942, 26 nations, including the Soviet Union, subscribed to the Atlantic Charter in the declaration by United Nations. Later the other nations who joined in forming the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945 subscribed to these principles.

In attempting to develop the collective action envisioned by the Charter, it was recognized from the beginning that, because of the ideology of its rulers, we would encounter great difficulties with the Soviet Union. Special efforts were therefore made during the period when we were united in war to try to find a common basis on which to build a peaceful world community.

In spite of everything that has been said to the contrary, there is actually no mystery about our wartime relations with the Soviet Union. The prime objective of the British Government and ourselves was to maintain the Soviet Union as an effective ally in the war against Hitler. In this we were successful. They were effective allies. At the time we landed on Normandy the Russians were fighting the major Nazi armies, some 180 divisions.

Concurrently with our military negotiations we discussed postwar problems. You will recall that in October 1943, at the Moscow Conference, Mr. Hull and Mr. Eden negotiated with Mr. Molotov an agreement known as the Moscow declaration. In this declaration the Soviet Union joined with the United States, the United Kingdom, and China in recognizing the necessity of establishing an international organization, based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations, for the maintenance of international peace and security. This conference laid the foundation for the United Nations.

Subsequently we discussed specific political matters in Europe where difficulties were most likely to occur. It was evident that the Red Army would occupy the countries of Eastern Europe and the Balkans. We were fearful that the Soviet Union might use its military power to take them over. These discussions culminated at Yalta.

At Yalta the Soviet Union undertook definite commitments with the United States and the United Kingdom to respect the sovereignty of these liberated countries and to work with us to assist the people in holding free and unfettered elections to establish independent democratic governments. If the Soviet Union had honored these commitments, Poland and Eastern Europe would be free today, and the whole scene in Europe would be different.

We also carried on discussions with the Soviets about the war in the Pacific. I always believed that they would attack Japan before the war was over. In fact, Stalin told me as early as 1942, when I was in Moscow with Churchill, that he intended to do so after the defeat of Hitler. What was not clear, however, was whether the Soviets would come into the war in time to help us defeat Japan, or whether they would hold off until the going was easy. They could then readily occupy and retain control of Manchuria and Korea.

These discussions also culminated at Yalta, where Stalin agreed to enter the war against Japan within 3 months after VE-day. We must remember that at the time of Yalta the atomic bomb was not a reality and that the military estimated that unless the Russians tied down the Japanese armies in Manchuria the defeat of Japan would be long delayed at great cost in American lives.

In the Yalta agreement Stalin also undertook to enter into a treaty of friendship with the Chinese National Government and to recognize the sovereignty of that Government over Manchuria. A treaty of friendship between the Soviet Union and Chiang Kai-shek's government was subsequently concluded. In that treaty the Soviet Government and the Chinese National Government promised to work together in close and friendly collaboration, to respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and not to interfere in each other's internal affairs. The Soviet Union went further and promised to give the Chinese National Government, and only that Government, moral support and military and other supplies. The Chinese Government for its part agreed to the return to Russia of limited railroad, port, and naval base rights. However, the Soviet Union never lived up to its pledges to the Chinese National Government, and this started the postwar difficulties in the Far East.

The strength of the moral position of the free world today is founded on the fact that the United States and Great Britain made every effort during the war to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union. The fact that the Soviet Union broke its agreements helped to awaken the people of the free world to the duplicity and the aggressive designs of the Kremlin.

What are the designs of the Kremlin? The men of the Kremlin were a part of an international Communist revolutionary movement. It so happened that in the chaos caused by World War I they were able to seize control of Russia. Russia is now the base of the operations of this international movement, and the men in the Kremlin are now the leaders of that movement. I remember when I was in Russia 25 years ago, one of the commissars with whom I talked said that it was unfortunate for them that it happened to be Russia. He said that the Communists would have preferred to have seized control of a more developed, a more industrialized country than Russia, for instance, the United States. Actually, they had expected to seize Germany too.

This Communist international movement is determined to force its will on the peoples of the world. In fact, its teachings have been that a Communist state cannot, in the long run, survive in a capitalist world.

Within the Kremlin thinking there are two divergent pressures: One, the need to strengthen Russia as the base of operations, and the other, the program for world domination. After World War I, having failed to seize control of other countries, they soft-pedaled external aggression and brutally regimented the Russian people to industrialize the country. They might have followed a similar policy after the devastation of World War II. The failure to carry out the Yalta agreements definitely indicated a decision to pursue a plan of external aggression. The extent of their schemes has been revealed by their subsequent actions.

They have maintained vast military forces. They have exploited their satellites for their own purposes. They have oppressed and impoverished the peoples behind the iron curtain. The effect of this program is causing increasing discontent and unrest, particularly among the satellites, but also within Russia. We see clearly the difficulties Kremlin aggression is causing the free world, but it is hard to appraise fully the difficulties behind the iron curtain.

We should not confuse the aggressive intentions of the Kremlin with historic Russian imperialism. Russian imperialism had limited objectives, whereas Soviet Communist imperialism has unlimited objectives—the domination of the world. The men of the Kremlin are convinced that societies based on freedom will destroy themselves and that their totalitarian system offers the only lasting organization of human life.

Theirs is a long-term plan. They have developed a strategy on a global basis. They encourage dissension and discontent. Wherever possible they fan racial conflicts. They foment insurrections. They attempt to control and subvert labor unions to bring about political strikes to create economic chaos. They have developed a world-wide propaganda machine. Through rumors and lies, they engender fear and confusion.

In Greece, Malaya, and Indochina they have incited and supported civil war, causing untold death and misery to their subservient puppets and unhappy victims alike. They have plunged their North Korean satellite and the Chinese Communists into war with utter disregard for the welfare or the wishes of the people of Korea or China.

They have maintained strong military forces to support their puppets in the countries they took from the Nazis. They are also using these forces to intimidate their neighbors, but as yet they have not used them directly in a manner which they felt would involve them in a major war.

They believe by these tactics they can undermine the life of free peoples everywhere. They are convinced that the free world cannot stay united, and that they will be able to divide and take over the free nations one by one.

The policies of the United States have been exactly the reverse—to build unity among nations for human welfare.

After the war the United States took leadership in organizing united efforts to help people who had suffered so greatly from the war to get back on their feet. And as the Communist aggression has unfolded we have taken vigorous steps to deal with it. Our aid to Greece and Turkey has enabled those countries to maintain their freedom. Working with the peopl of Western Europe through the Marshall plan, we have checked and rolled back the Communist advance. We have joined with the nations of Western Europe in the North Atlantic Treaty. Together we are now organizing unified forces to deter or to deal enectively with military aggression. A supreme commander has been selected for these unified forces—our great Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In Western Europe the free people have taken the initiative and we are gaining the initiative in other parts of the world. The effect of the initiative in Europe has already penetrated the iron curtain in the defection of Yugoslavia. Tito was unwilling to have his country exploited by the Kremlin and wanted to participate in the improvement he saw developing in the West. This has been a major set-back for the Kremlin.

In the Far East events have not moved as well. With its progress checked in Europe, the Kremlin put greater pressure on the east. Both Lenin and Stalin have in the past stated that Europe can be brought to its knees through the East, through denial of raw materials upon which both Europe and our own country depend.

It is interesting that Karl Marx taught that the exploited industrial workers would be the fertile ground for Communist revolution, and that it would be difficult to subvert those living on the land because of their strong individualism. Industrial workers, however, have shared in the economic expansion of the West and have now a real stake in a free society. On the other hand, the misery of peasants in the East has provided the fertile field for Communist penetration.

The Economic Cooperation Administration, under Paul Hoffman's leadership, has developed a program of rural rehabilitation which brings to the individual peasant some of the simple technology of the West which can vastly improve conditions. This was started in China, but was too late to be effective. It is working in Formosa and is beginning to work in other eastern countries. It requires a minimum of money and a maximum of technical assistance. It includes malaria control, innoculation of people and their livestock against disease so devastating in those countries, simple improvements in tools, in fertilizer, in irrigation and drainage.

In Korea we have seen the results of our assistance. The people of Southern Korea have shown that they have a real stake in the independence which we helped them to gain. Their troops have fought gallantly and the civilian population have supported military operations in every way they could.

In dealing with the people of the Far East, we must recognize their sensitivity to anything which looks like western interference. They have pride in their ancient culture, and have today a strong determination to free themselves from western exploitation and colonialism. Our policies have recognized the justness of these aspirations. We have given the Philippines its independence and are assisting that young republic to get on its feet. We welcomed the decision of the British Government to give independence to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma, as well as that of the Netherlands to work out the independence of Indonesia.

So many people in the Far East have never had any hope for a better life. They are therefore more susceptible to the false promises of communism than are the people of the West. All western countries, including ourselves, must show the peoples of the Far East and the Near East that we consider that their welfare is our welfare, that they are a part of and a full partner in the political and economic life of the free world. The point 4 concept has been hailed in all of the underdeveloped countries. We must press forward and expand this program. There is a great field for useful work by private organizations of labor of farmers, of business, and of schools to interest themselves as the missionaries have done, in the welfare of the people of the East. With new hope through association with the West, it will be easier for these peoples to understand clearly that communism is merely a tool of Soviet imperialism.

We have a great opportunity in India today. As a result of a series of disasters—drought, floods, earthquakes, and locusts—there is a grave food shortage. I hope that President Truman's proposal to give food to India, which is supported by many members of both parties in the Congress, will be approved promptly. This is a unique occasion for the American people to show their friendship for the people of India at the very moment when there are some political differences between the Indian Government and our own. It will be further proof to the people of the world that we have no intention of using economic aid to interfere with the political decisions of other free countries.

Of profound importance in the East, and in fact everywhere, has been our support of the United Nations in resisting aggression in Korea. Fifty-three countries, all the free members of the United Nations, have endorsed this action. Fourteen have contributed fighting forces and 40 have given some form of assistance. It is inspiring to the people of the free world that their soldiers are fighting with great courage under one flag. We are deeply moved by the stories of heroism of our own men, of the men of Britain, of France, of Greece, of Turkey, and of other nations. They are fighting to prevent another world war.

I wonder whether it is fitting for us to question the will of our allies to fight. I was in Britain during the year that nation stood alone. I saw the spirit of the British people—men, women, and children. I was in Italy when the French Army fought bravely with us. For over 3 years the French have been fighting Communist aggression in Indochina, suffering severe losses. Now we see in Korea that with leadership and with adequate equipment, our allies fight for our common freedoms with the same gallantry as is the pride of the American tradition.

The preponderance of economic strength lies with the West. The North Atlantic community has 80 percent of the heavy industry of the world. Our job is to convert that strength to support an effective military force. Two-thirds of that strength is in the United States. Europe can supply more men for the armies because of its greater population, but a major part of the equipment must come from our factories.

To do this job will require sacrifice on the part of all our people and deeper sacrifices on the part of our European friends. When we think of our own sacrifices, let us stop to think for a moment of what this new effort means to the British housewife. For over 10 years she has had a weekly ration of meat which would be barely enough for one serving in an American family. Except for children, milk has been scarce and often unobtainable. She has been closely rationed on many items of food, clothing, and other household needs. Now she faces a new austerity.

American leadership and American participation have brought confidence to our European associates that an adequate defense force can be created—with confidence has come determination to do the job.

I have more faith today than at any time since my return from Moscow 5 years ago that the free world can win the struggle against the new form of tyranny we face. My confidence stems from the leadership which the people of the United States have already taken. They have supported, year after year, unprecedented programs to meet the situation as it unfolded—programs proposed by President Truman and developed in cooperation with the leaders of both parties in the Congress. I cannot believe that we will turn back now.

I firmly believe that not only can we win this struggle, but that we can prevent another world war, provided we carry on with our policies and programs and take advantage of every opportunity to press forward the cause of freedom throughout the world.

The Kremlin has a global strategy. Our strategy must always be on a global basis. Of first importance is unity in the free world. The United Nations has been a forum where issues could be discussed on a world-wide basis. It has been an effective forum in uniting public opinion in the free world. I need only to recall the fact that 53 countries supported the action in Korea.

We should not be discouraged by failure to attain unanimity of the free nations on all issues. One of our basic principles is that all countries, large and small, have a full right of independent expression. We have fostered this democratic principle among nations. Let us always remember this is the basis of the confidence of the free world in our leadership.

We must understand that other countries have varying problems and aspirations, that things don't always look the same to people in Europe, the Near East, the Far East, or Latin America as they do to us in the United States.

The responsibilities of world leadership call for patience, humility, and understanding, combined with vision, vigor, and determination. We must show these qualities in our support of the United Nations and in all of our relations with other countries. Only in this way can we cement unity in the free world.

On the military side we must press forward unhesitatingly in the development of our own military strength and give help to other free countries who are prepared to do the same. The free world cannot remain exposed. The Kremlin will use force if it believes that victory is easy.

On the economic side, we must continue assistance not only to help other countries develop their military potential, but also to increase their productivity. This is not a one-way street. An expanding economy at

home requires an expanding economy throughout the free world. Increased quantities of raw materials are needed not only for ourselves but for other industrial countries.

But above all we are fighting an ideological battle—truth against false doctrine. We must expose the international Communist revolution for what it is, a reactionary counter revolution. Ours is the true revolutionary cause for which man has struggled through the centuries—freedom, the dignity of the individual, the right of man to worship as he chooses, the state as the servant of the people.

The creed from Moscow that people are a mass, fit only to serve the State, is old stuff. That concept has been beaten in the past by men who loved freedom. It must be repudiated again. It will be a long and arduous struggle. Unlike military conflicts, ideological conflicts have never been settled by victory in battle on a given day. One concept grows in vitality, while the other recedes and decays. I can only believe that with the growing strength and unity of the free world—militarily, economically, and spiritually—the pressures behind the iron curtain will increase; the rulers of the Kremlin will find greater and greater difficulty in keeping their unhappy people subjugated.

If we fully accept our responsibilities for world leadership on a global basis, if we act with wisdom and vigor, prepared to make present-day sacrifices for the cause of freedom, there can be no doubt of the outcome. We have written an honorable page in history during the past 5 years. I believe that we will write a glorious chapter in the days ahead.

The Shield of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes a phrase tells more than a sentence, a paragraph, or any speech. Such a phrase is one used by Joseph and Stewart Alsop to describe American strategic air power, and its value as a deterrent of war. The Alsops call it "The shield of the free world."

Our primary purpose in strengthening our military establishment is not to wage war but to prevent war—and to be able to end it quickly if war should come in spite of the best efforts of diplomacy to prevent it. If we say that the purpose of our military establishment is to defend America we are saying the same thing with a different emphasis. We defend America better if we maintain the peace, than if we have to fight a war to restore it.

Our strategic air power is growing so strong, the Alsops remind us, that "there is no reason why the veiled threats of the Kremlin should have the shattering effect which the Kremlin so clearly desires." The Alsops conclude that, in order to prevent our building a solid ground defense in the west as an accompaniment of our crushing air superiority, Stalin and the Politburo may yet defy American strategic air power and accept war. "Yet at least," their column ends, "it is still possible to entertain the perfectly rational hope that a sort of long armed truce, based on a true power balance, may yet ensue. This is now the best that we can hope for. And it is thanks to American strategic air power, the shield of the free world, that we can hope for this."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in the Washington Post of February 21, 1951:

The column is as follows:

THE SHIELD

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Josef Stalin's recent menacing statement hinted very clearly that really serious preparations by the Western nations to defend themselves would make war inevitable. This is why it is deeply important to understand that American strategic air power is increasing by a sort of arithmetical progression. If this is understood, there is no reason why the veiled threats of the Kremlin should have the shattering effect which the Kremlin so clearly desires.

There is one way to measure the growth of our striking power. If war comes, the task of the Strategic Air Command will be, of course, to smash the industrial war potential of the Soviet Union decisively, and as rapidly as possible. The power to accomplish this task will be doubled within 6 months. And a year later, it will be doubled again.

Assume, for purposes of illustration, that the Strategic Air Force could now complete its mission within about 60 days of the outbreak of war (which is probably a reasonable estimate, provided forward bases were not neutralized). Then, 6 months from now, the mission could be completed within 30 days. And 18 months from now, the strategic air force should be able to finish its terrible task in little more than 2 weeks.

This extraordinary rapid increase in projected strategic power does not derive simply from increased production of atomic bombs and heavy bombers—neither the atomic bomb nor the B-36 can be rolled off production lines, like passenger cars. Much of the increased power comes, instead, from simple efficiency in operation.

The case of the B-36 provides the best example of this increased efficiency. An operational altitude of 40,000 feet has for a long time been publicly claimed for the B-36. This claim was true, but only in a literal sense. The B-36 could indeed climb to 40,000 feet. But it could maintain this altitude only at great risk of engine failure, for short periods, and with much sacrifice of speed, range, and load.

This is no longer so. A number of technical and necessarily secret improvements now permit the B-36 to fly many thousands of miles at 40,000 feet and more, without essential sacrifice of efficiency. What this means is very simple. The best of the Soviet jet fighters, like the MIG-15, are known to operate sluggishly at this height. One expert guess is that a Soviet jet which actually located a massed flight of B-36 bombers flying at full speed at 40,000 feet could get in at best a single pass against the concentrated firepower of the bombers.

Thus a very much higher proportion of any given flight of long-range bombers would get through to target than would have been possible only very recently. It is true that the best estimates are that if forward bases for the shorter range jet bombers were neutralized, the time required for the strategic air command to complete its mission would be more than doubled. But B-29s and B-50s could also reach Soviet targets from bases in this hemisphere, using refuelling techniques, although these planes are, of course, more vulnerable than of B-36s. Thus the important fact is that the strategic air mission could still be performed, even under the worst possible circumstances.

Moreover, the Soviet Union simply cannot match this country in the air. Careful analysis by Air Force experts has led to a startling conclusion. Even assuming that the Soviet Union were capable of producing an air force equivalent to the air force this country will soon have, it could not be maintained. To maintain it, for example, under training conditions for 1 year, and under combat conditions for only 3 months, would require more than half the yearly production of oil in the entire Soviet empire.

No nation, of course, could conceivably commit half its entire oil resources to its air force alone. Moreover, the Kremlin could not solve the problem simply by capturing the Middle East. Largely because of lack of transport, there would be no more than a trickle of oil to Russia for at least 3 years after the Middle East had fallen to the Kremlin.

In short, what is now in prospect is a crushing American air strength, which the Kremlin simply will not be able to equal. To be sure, this gives no grounds for complacency. For the Kremlin will nevertheless quite soon be able to deliver large numbers of atomic bombs to targets in this country and elsewhere. Moreover, this country and its allies will also never be able to match Soviet ground strength in terms of numbers of men on the ground.

Yet by a determined effort, a balance of power can still be achieved by combining a solid ground defense in the West with crushing air superiority. This is what Stalin and the Politburo are now determined to prevent. It may be that, in order to prevent it, Stalin will defy American strategic air power and accept war. Yet at least it is still possible to entertain the perfectly rational hope that a sort of long armed truce, based on a true power balance, may yet ensue. This is now the best that we can hope for. And it is thanks to American strategic air power, the shield of the free world, that we can hope even for this.

Capital-Gains Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President in his proposals for a $16,000,000,000 increase in the Federal tax burden has recommended that the maximum tax on capital gains be increased from 25 to 37½ percent. There may be some need and justification for an over-all increase in this rate, but such an increase would accentuate in at least one instance what is already a gross inequity in the law. I refer specifically to the imposition of the capital gains tax on the profit on the sale of a home where the individual reinvests the proceeds in another home.

Recent testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means has

brought to the forefront the need for a revision in existing law. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation 2 years ago recognized the gross inequity in the present law and recommended that legislative action be taken to remedy the situation. The Treasury Department says it has the matter under study.

I firmly believe the Congress should take the necessary action during this session. In January of 1950 I introduced H. R. 6815 which would to a substantial degree handle the situation. On January 9, 1951, I reintroduced the same bill in the Eighty-second Congress. It is my understanding that other proposals of a similar nature are before the Committee on Ways and Means.

At the present time the Treasury, and it would be worse if the President's tax recommendations are approved, has a heads-I-win-tails-you-lose policy. The Federal Government says to its citizens, you cannot deduct a real loss on the sale of your home in computing your income tax and at the same time makes its taxpayers pay a tax on purely theoretical gains.

Recently a witness before the Committee on Ways and Means gave the following testimony in reference to this problem:

Let me give you a glaring example of what the present law does. Suppose that in 1946 I bought a home in Detroit for $10,000 and my brother bought one in Cleveland for $10,000. As a result of the cheapening of the value of the dollar the fair market value of my home in Detroit is now $15,000 and the fair market value of my brother's home in Cleveland is similarly $15,000. I am transferred to Cleveland from Detroit and my brother is transferred to Detroit from Cleveland, and we decide simply to trade homes.

The law now says that I realize a taxable gain of $5,000 when I take over my brother's house, and he realizes a taxable gain of $5,000 when he takes over my house. Because we were transferred in our jobs, we are each penalized to the extent of the tax on $5,000 worth of increased value which is not real gain.

Let us take another example. I have been employed by the X Corporation in Midville, United States of America, for 20 years. Midville is essentially a one-industry town. The X Corporation at its plant in Midville produces aluminum windows. It also has a plant in Centerville, United States of America, where it produces various other aluminum products. The National Production Authority prohibits the Midville plant from making any more aluminum windows, and the Centerville plant has received a large order from the Military Establishment for the production of vital parts for military aircraft. Because of the National Production Authority order it is necessary to the X Corporation to close down, at least temporarily, its Midville plant, but it needs all of its key Midville employees to work on the military contracts at its Centerville plant. I am one of the employees transferred to Centerville.

Because of the closing down of the plant at Midville, I, along with many other employees in Midville, am forced to sell my home. But because Midville is essentially a one-industry town, and the industry is shutting down, I cannot sell my home even for what I paid for it and I am forced to take a substantial loss. Yet, when I purchase a new home in Centerville, I am compelled to pay a higher price.

Here is another situation. Under existing law, if for example Mr. Jones' home is destroyed by fire, or by flood, or by some other catastrophe, or if it is taken by the Government for public purposes, the gain, if any, resulting from the insurance indemnity or the condemnation award is not recognized, provided I use the proceeds thereof to acquire another home. But if Jones is forced to move from one city to another because of a change in his job, he is caught in a trap. If his old home has increased in value over the original purchase price, this increase will be taxed to him as a gain, yet at the same time he is required to pay a comparable price for his new home. Jones had a home, and now all he has is another one, the cost of which takes all the proceeds from the sale of his first home. Neither residence is worth any more or any less than the other. But in changing his home, he has incurred a substantial tax liability to the Federal Government. Naturally the home owner does not believe that this sort of treatment is fair.

It is most important during the critical mobilization period that the Congress help rather than hinder the mobility of our working men and women. The adoption of the President's tax recommendations without a change in the Internal Revenue Code along the lines contained in my bill will definitely penalize citizens who must move from one place to another in order to find employment in the defense rearmament program. The perpetuation of the present law with a 20-percent increase in the penalty for small income home owners will hamper and impede our mobilization effort. Furthermore, it is morally indefensible to continue this "heads-I-win-tails-you-lose" policy. Congress must do something this year to alleviate this unwarranted hardship on a vast segment of the American people.

Shipment of Vital Materials to Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following from the minutes of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor executive board meeting of December 9, 1950.

Board Member Kennell moved and Board Member Parker seconded that the executive board of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor go on record in this meeting protesting the shipments of vital materials to Communist China and a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary of Commerce, Charles Sawyer, and asking that the names of companies that have shipped these materials be published in the public press. Also included in this motion was that the Senators and Congressmen from the State of West Virginia receive copies of this resolution.

Whereas the United States Government is now engaged in one of the most costly wars in its entire history, both financially and in lives lost;

Whereas there seems to be a number of citizens and business organizations that seemingly think more of profits than they do of the lives of our young men by continuing to do business with Communist China;

Whereas we want to preserve this Government of ours and we feel that most of our citizens feel the same as we do and will pledge their full support. However, we do not think that any firm, business or citizen should be allowed to sell, barter or trade vital materials with a nation that is sending its soldiers on the battlefields and killing and wounding our soldiers. Such are not worthy of being harbored under our flag: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in this executive board meeting of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor we protest to the Honorable Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, United States, Washington, D. C., asking that the shipping of all vital materials to Communist China be stopped immediately; furthermore that the names of people and firms who have been shipping vital materials to Communist China be made public.

E. A. CARTER,
President.
VOLNEY ANDREWS,
Secretary-Treasurer.
J. M. PARKER,
H. RICHARD KENNELL,
A. H. BISHOFF,
MRS. ELIZABETH KERR,
EARL TINNEY,
Board Members.

No further business appearing, on a motion by Board Member Parker, seconded by all, we adjourned at 2:45 p. m.

Revised Indiana Plan for the Maintenance of National Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 I inserted in the RECORD of that date a copy of the Indiana plan for the maintenance of national manpower, which was presented by the Indiana Conference of Higher Education representing 31 public and private colleges and universities of the State of Indiana. Since that time this organization has kept in close touch with the development of legislation on this subject and on February 12, 1951, at a special meeting revised the original plan. I wish to insert a copy of the revised plan in the RECORD for the benefit of those who have expressed interest in the plan as previously presented:

THE INDIANA PLAN FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF NATIONAL MANPOWER—REVISED

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

1. The American college and university recognizes the gravity of the present crisis

in world affairs and is sensitively aware of the fact that the national welfare must take precedence over other considerations.

2. Charged with the responsibility of leadership in American thought and life we must constantly point to the clear and present danger of the short view which would seriously impair our tradition of freedom under God. We must proceed on the commonly accepted assumption that our present situation must be viewed as a long term phase of our national preparation for any eventuality. Though victorious in our conflict with an alien and vicious ideology we could lose so many cultural and spiritual values that our victory would be empty.

In the light of these considerations we strongly take the position that present proposed legislation should not constitute a permanent national commitment to any program of universal military training and service. Proposed legislation should be enacted for a limited period of time and made subject to review by each succeeding Congress.

3. It is our profound conviction that in any plan of national mobilization we must maintain the values for which American colleges and universities have stood throughout their history as an expression of the heritage of our people. This means that definite and intelligent provisions must be made, even in a time of national emergency, for the uninterrupted training of the leaders of tomorrow. The American college and university must make a continuous contribution to the national welfare in terms of supplying manpower needs in every field of learning during this crisis and beyond it. Thus it is in the national interest that every man pursue his formal education for as long a period as he is willing and able and so long as he can be spared from military service.

STATEMENT OF PLAN

1. Upon the basis of these principles we affirm our conviction that those sections of the present selective-service law which provide for registration at age 18 with induction not before age 19 should be retained.

2. The length of military service should be extended from 21 months to 27 months.

3. Standards of induction should be lowered until approximately 78 percent of all young men are taken into the Armed Forces.

4. All freshmen who are attending college and are doing passing work at the time they receive their call should be deferred to the end of the academic year. All students who during their freshman year ranked in the upper half of their class should be deferred to the end of the sophomore year. All students who ranked in the upper two-thirds of their sophomore class should be deferred to the end of their junior year. All students who ranked in the upper three-fourths of their junior class should be deferred to the end of their senior year. Students should be deferred for graduate study if they have graduated in the upper one-half of their senior class, have been accepted by an established graduate school, and continue to maintain satisfactory progress in a program leading toward an advance degree.

5. All students who are deferred to continue in college shall attend college on a round-the-year program consistent with high academic standards.

6. Because continuance in college on a year-round program will impose a significant additional financial burden on the average American family and because participation in this plan should not depend upon the financial circumstance of the student, it is recommended that the Eighty-second Congress pass enabling legislation which will permit any student who is deferred under this program to borrow from the Government up to $100 per month during the period he is attending college.

It is further recommended that interest on this loan shall be at a rate of one-half of 1 percent greater than the going rate on long-term Government bonds at the time the loan is made, and repayment of the loan shall be made on the basis of annual payments equal to 25 percent of the participant's Federal income tax.

STATEMENT OF MANPOWER SITUATION

The testimony of Mrs. Rosenberg and General Hershey before the House Armed Services Committee established the fact that if the strength of the Armed Forces is raised to 3,500,000 men by June 30, 1951, and if present standards of induction and deferments are maintained, the national pool of acceptable inductees will be reduced to 411,000 by that date.

It was also established by the same testimony that this pool can be increased to 1,218,000 men in the following manner:

Number in pool by present standards June 30, 1951	411,000
Addition of college students by graduation and nondeferment	200,000
Reclaimed by lowering standards of IV-F deferments	250,000
Reclaimed from deferments by induction of men with one dependent	220,000
Inducted draftees now in National Guard and Reservist units	137,000
Total	1,218,000

In an Armed Force of 3,500,000 it is estimated there will be approximately 1,500,000 career men and men who serve for more than 27 months. This means that approximately 2,000,000 men will need to be replaced every 27 months or at a rate of about 900,000 each year.

Approximately 1,050,000 men reach a given age annually. Of these about 800,000 can be used in the Armed Forces if approximately 100,000 are used on limited service. This leaves a deficit of 100,000 per year which will be subtracted from the pool of 1,218,000. Allowing 600,000 as the minimum safety margin to be kept as a cushion in this pool, it is clear that there is no present need for lowering the induction age below 19 nor to modify the existing regulations with regard to the deferment of college students.

MEMBERS OF INDIANA CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Anderson College, Ball State Teachers College, Butler University, Canterbury College, DePauw University, Earlham College, Evansville College, Franklin College, Goshen College, Hanover College, Huntington College, Indiana Central College, Indiana State Teachers College, Indiana Technical College, Indiana University, Jordan College of Music, Manchester College, Marian College, Marion College, Oakland City College, Purdue University, Rose Polytechnic Institute, St. Joseph College, St. Mary's College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Taylor University, Tri-State College, University of Notre Dame, Valparaiso University, Vincennes University, Wabash College.

The Preservation of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial written by Clifford B. Ward, which appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel on February 15, 1951. Certainly the ideas embodied in this editorial are representative of the thinking of many people in our Nation today:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

What is needed most in this country is a conference of national leaders, whose patriotism is unquestionable, to sit down and work out a program or outline a set of principles to guide our national course. What is the general over-all principle that must always be kept in mind by our Nation? I think the answer to that is very simple: The preservation of the United States. Is there any American who does not agree to that?

When we speak of the United States, we do not speak of a geographical thing only, but of a spiritual thing comprised of our beliefs and traditions.

Now how best can we work for the preservation of the United States, while at the same time not being indifferent to the obligations which we have in common decency to see to it that other nations like us, also survive? The only justification that we can have for belonging to the UN or any world organization is to work ultimately for the preservation of the United States. The only justification we can have for the Marshall plan or anything like it is to preserve ultimately the United States. If we do not have in mind at all times and in all things that we do, the preservation of the United States, then we are wrong.

NECESSARY FOR ALL

The preservation of the United States is not only necessary to us who are Americans, but it is very necessary to every nation in the world that thinks as we do. The greatest blow that could happen to England, France, Italy, Spain, Canada, Australia, South America, and all the rest of the so-called free world would be the downfall of the United States. These nations have a stake in our survival, almost equivalent to their stake in their own survival because without us they are in for evil days.

The UN, looked upon by many as a step forward which it might have seemed to be in some respects, can actually be a step backward. This country, by reason of its political philosophy about the importance of the individual as a creature of God, was unique among nations.

It was unique because it alone said that man's rights come from his Creator. It is now a member of the UN and has subscribed to the Old World principle that man gets his rights from the State by parliamentary grant. The UN doctrine of human rights, which threatens to supersede the American constitutional freedom of unalienable individual rights, is all based on the notion that government can give rights and because it can give them can limit them when necessary and take them away completely when necessary. In our subscription to this principle we have taken a step right back into the oldest forms of tyranny.

IN WRONG SPOT

Our spokesmen in these UN formulations of a doctrine of human rights was Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. Even the most charitable individual in the United States would have difficulty in declaring Mrs. Roosevelt's mind to be one of our best. Even giving Mrs. Roosevelt the most generous treatment that charity could give her, she cannot be compared to any one of the founding fathers of this country whose works on human rights she is in a very real sense editing and revising. Our Bill of Rights compared with what

the UN has come up with is like comparing a child's scribbling on his nursery walls with the literary skill of a Thomas Jefferson, yet we are putting ourselves in a position to be bound by the UN formula, not our own.

Are there brains in this country? There certainly are and in both political parties. But these brains are not in charge of our national destiny at present and the present time is one that is testing whether this Nation or anyone like it shall survive. There is indeed need for prayer by everyone.

Drafting Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leland J. Melrose, editor, Minnesota Farm Bureau News, St. Paul, Minn., wrote to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Chief of Selective Service, a letter which so well describes the farm-labor situation in our State that I am inserting that letter herewith, in accordance with permission previously received. We cannot afford to have idle land and vacant dairy barns, as Mr. Melrose writes, because of mistakes made by selective service in its zeal to obtain needed men for our armed services. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1951.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Chief, Selective Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: Proof mounts up that the selective-service set-up as currently administered in rural areas is a menace to any hopes we may hold for victory. Your military experience and mine has taught us that soldiers cannot fight on empty bellies.

We here at the Minnesota Farm Bureau office have read everything available on selective-service rules. On their surface, the rules seem to be based on common sense. But we have also read with deep dismay the reports that come to us from Minnesota farmers.

There will be idle land and vacant dairy barns unless some semblance of judgment is applied by local draft boards. Proof of that is seen in letters received from aged farmers, whose irreplaceable help has been ordered into uniform.

Local draft boards have high authority and appeal boards are loath to upset their findings. Many farmers will not carry their cases beyond the local level. Some of these local boards have little conception of their responsibilities. Their responsibility is to serve America rather than to sabotage the production program which is the first essential to military victory.

There will be no strikes on the farms of America; there will be no slowdown in production, except that decreed by inept application of selective-service regulations. But even on farms, where the part-time work day and the part-time workweek are unknown, there are definite limitations on what men may do.

Editorials in Minnesota's largest newspapers, within the past month, have praised the attitude of Minnesota Farm Bureau members on the question of selective service. The Farm Bureau does not seek to make the farm a haven for slackers. But the Farm Bureau does have a major responsibility in the field of farm production.

We here at Farm Bureau headquarters maintain contacts with State selective-service officials. We hold them to be men of good judgment, but somewhere, either above or below them, conditions have developed that strike at the very heart of America's effort to defend herself.

Specific cases will be furnished you if you desire.

Yours very truly,

LELAND J. MELROSE,
Editor, Farm Bureau.

We Shall Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech which was given by the Honorable A. A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, at the convocation exercises at Hollins College, Virginia, on February 21, 1951. This speech entitled "We Shall Prevail," represents what I believe to be a very sound and sensible approach to the present world situation. His ideas about pressing our present campaign on peacemaking set forth objectives which all of us should strive to attain both on a long-range and short-range basis.

WE SHALL PREVAIL

(Speech of Congressman A. A. RIBICOFF delivered at convocation exercises, Hollins College, Va., February 21, 1951)

We meet together on founders day to talk about our world. Many Americans are perhaps thinking about little else than the world situation—and deeply resenting the fact that they must.

Unquestionably, there is on the part of our people a feeling both of danger and of frustration. There is a general desire to understand how it got like this and why it got like this. There is a gnawing sentiment of our own failure. And there is an overpowering urge to see how we can properly get out of the present grim crisis. This problem is to us the more oppressive because we never faced anything like it before. In fact, habitually, most of us have never paid much attention to international affairs. The United States seemed so snugly sheltered behind the two great oceans that most of what went on over the rest of the globe seemed no concern of ours.

Today—as we are learning the hard way—the whole position is different.

Over the last few decades, the whole world has undergone radical change. For this the scientists are chiefly responsible. Their theories, inventions, and technological wonders have altered the world we live in.

Because we can travel so swiftly and communicate with each other almost instantaneously, we sometimes speak of our rapidly shrinking world. This phrase conjures up a picture of millions of little, antlike creatures who have been taken off a football and put to live on a marble. That is only one side of the picture.

Our world, as far as experience and range of activities are concerned, has expanded astronomically. Human relationships have been modified on a global scale. Contacts between peoples in the remotest areas have become possible. Their culture, politics, philosophy, and strategy have repercussions on all other peoples.

It is but a half century since the United States came into a position of great power. Our country lies in both the Northern and Western Hemispheres, the hemispheres of great land mass and population. It lies on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, the two greatest highways of commerce and strategy. No other great power has found itself in such a situation. Yet we are new on the world's stage. The implications of our changed status have been slow to sink into the national consciousness. We do not yet realize that everything we do affects other nations. Nor have we learned that we ourselves can now be subjected to pressures and new kinds of attacks that could never have touched us before.

All this is true. And yet in many respects the crisis we face is not entirely different from that faced by other peoples at other times. One such crisis occurred in ancient Greece. The Greek city-states—tiny, divided, jealous of their independence—found themselves threatened by what we would call the national state of Macedonia. Together, the city-states had nothing to fear; they were stronger than their adversary. But they could not unite. One man saw the danger, the statesman and orator, Demosthenes. In a famous series of speeches, directed against King Philip of Macedonia, he urged the Athenians to realize that Philip was aiming to take their cities one by one and that they must act in time.

"It is shameful to cry out, when some event hath surprised us, heaven who could have expected this? We should have acted thus and thus to have avoided these and these errors * * *. Every state that hath been destroyed can mention such things * * *. Therefore, Athenians, while ye are yet safe, possessed of a powerful city, favored with resources, prepare your transports, your forces and all necessities of war * * * at present your conduct must expose you to derision * * * opportunities escape you, your treasures are wasted, you incriminate each other * * *. By the powers you are acting as if Philip's wishes were directing you! You have never, Athenians, armed yourselves in time.

"Call on other states to do their duty that ye may have sharers in the dangers and expense which may arise. I do not mean we should try to raise that spirit abroad which we ourselves are unwilling to assume, but all were willing to confederate with those whom they see prepared and resolved to exert themselves as they ought. In the name of heaven, can any man be so weak as not to know, that by neglecting this war, we are transferring it from that country to our own."

But the Athenians adopted the delaying tactics urged by Philip's agents in their midst, and this led to their downfall. I read you this today because, like the Greeks, many Americans still do not realize their danger. They simply do not grasp the fact that for the first time in history our very national existence is at stake.

We know that other great nations, before us, have perished. It is indeed the fate of mighty civilizations to flourish for a period, then decay and vanish. We can count many such on our fingers. There were the Syrian and the Egyptian before the Greek and Roman. Others, too, have had their day and disappeared. It is high time we realize that our fate could be a similar one.

A friend of mine once remarked that one of the great fallacies of history arises from the fact that history books are divided into chapters. We tend to think that history

occurs in chapters too. We try to estimate events year by year and crowd its entire course within our own lifetime. Yet history is an endless process. Consequences have a way of reverberating down the ages. Epics are long. The great test of courage and determination between the free nations and the slave system, whose headquarters is in Moscow, has not yet run its course. The next 50 years may well determine the course of civilization for the next 2,000 years. And it is our country's task to determine whether freedom or slavery is to be the principle to survive.

Why did catastrophe overtake those early civilizations? The historian Arnold Toynbee reminds us that it was essentially their inability to meet some challenge. It was a failure of mind and spirit to rise to a new and great opportunity. It stemmed from the leaders first They lost their creative power, that magic compound of vision and resolute action which compels the loyal allegiance of the people. The people are quick to sense this loss; they become bewildered, passive, callous.

One of the greatest threats to civilization has been the outstripping of spiritual values by material development. Rome did not fall because it was physically weak. Rome was rich and still great—on paper. A mere two of its legions of ancient days could have dealt with the barbarians at its gates. But the Romans were soft with easy living. The people were sharply divided into opposing factions A narrow selfishness kept them blind when their own preservation demanded a world-wide outlook and the most heroic resistance measures.

In today's great debate on foreign policy, we have heard much about the American standard of living. Do we mean by that the amount of physical goods consumed, or shall we widen the expression to include all the standards by which men have measured the essentials of civilized life? If the latter, then we shall sense in its meaning the common destiny between ourselves and the rest of the human race.

This means that our relations to other peoples are a matter of vital concern to all of us. It forces us to learn—what every nation has had to learn at some period or other—that foreign policy takes precedence over domestic.

Domestic problems are very visible and direct. But the really decisive events are those which involve international action. Foreign policy makes history and we cannot escape history.

We know that Russia is engaged in a campaign of hate against us, the like of which has never been heard before. Mixed with this attack is a phony campaign for peace intended to confuse peoples and separate them from their governments.

This peace propaganda is just another tactic used by the enemy to destroy society and further the Communist revolution. Yet, so deep is the world's desire for peace, that the Russians can use it as an effective weapon against us.

Today the world is in crisis. This dangerous crisis exists because the two last great wars upset world equilibrium. Formerly important countries have fallen into secondary positions. Two nations alone remain at the center of power—the United States and the Soviet Union. They are worlds apart, with the United States standing as champion of the peoples who still respect the values of freedom and justice in international life.

For the first time in history one nation has strayed into a position of leadership without wanting it. Yet, nonetheless, the whole free world economically and militarily depends on us. It is this brutal fact that helps increase our frustration and our soul searching. Why, O God, we cry, just we? If we do not lead, no other free nation can take our place. If we do not lead, Soviet Russia will rush into the vacuum created by our abdication.

Matters are further complicated by the fact that in 1945, along with other western countries, we disarmed, confidently expecting permanent peace.

But Russia did not disarm.

It talked disarmament in the United Nations, but meanwhile increased its forces. It created new armies in the captive countries of Eastern Europe, and has succeeded in turning the oriental hordes of North Korea and China into first-class fighting units.

Thus the world has drifted into two camps. One is centrally controlled from the Kremlin, a solid bloc united around a crusading idea that is superficially attractive to the unthinking It is made up of 800,000,000 people, all of them expendable.

The other, the free world, comprises about two-thirds of mankind, with considerably more than half the world's production. It has a superiority of A-bombs and H-bombs, together with a widespread reluctance to use them. It has a sure majority in the United Nations Assembly. The United States is the nucleus of this non-Communist world, but there is no central control, no compelling unifying idea. We have associates, some of them firm and close allies; others spiritless and unconvinced of the necessity of self-defense.

This division came to a head in the Korean conflict.

That conflict has had two important results.

It has dramatically opened our eyes to the dangers that confront us. It has also revealed the weakness of ourselves and our allies.

In consequence, one fact overshadows all others Our present policy is bigger than our present means. On this issue we divide. One group of Americans argues that we should shorten our commitments to our means. The other answers that we should multiply our means to cope with our commitments I belong to the second camp. To me, those who would abdicate and decrease our commitments appear to be overlooking some very grave realities.

We no longer live in the carefree times when we could ignore the rest of the planet. No portion of the world can defend itself against Soviet aggression without the help of the United States. What we announce we will not defend, the other side automatically takes. Whatever cards we throw away, the Kremlin will pick up—as it tried to pick up South Korea once we proclaimed our lack of interest.

Second, no portion of the non-Communist world is without importance to the defense of the whole. While I, too, believe that Western Europe is our primary concern, in south and eastern Asia, let me observe, there are hundreds of millions of people of the type that Russians have shown they can turn into first-class soldiers. There are also proven soldiers like the Japanese. There are our old friends and allies, the Filipinos. In this section, too, there are the largest known sources of tin and rubber which, if lost, would be very hard to replace.

With Asia gone, the Middle East would surely go too. Apart from its immense oil reserves, this is an area of such critical strategic importance that its loss would make the defense of Western Europe well-nigh impossible. Think what this would entail:

1. We should be deprived of the largest single pool of skilled technicians;

2. Of the second largest industrial complex;

3. Of the largest number of people politically, socially, and religiously akin to us.

Moreover, we should lose Europe's legal title to the African continent.

If we abandon Europe, consider for a moment how we should stand with regard to Africa. From there comes most of the uranium we need for our super bombs. Renunciation of Europe, then, would mean renunciation of Africa as well, unless we fight to keep it. And if we are going to fight to prevent Russia getting the uranium, what would have been gained by the abandonment of West and South Europe?

To me these facts are eloquent to show that the global policy rather than the Kennedy-Hoover policy is the right one. If so, then we must increase our power. The simplest, easiest way is to bring as much of the non-Communist two-thirds of mankind into a single defense bloc with the United States.

This does not mean that we might not be forced out of one or another area if war comes. But there must be no voluntary renunciation of any large area.

Outside the United States, we must try to create a single, automatic military alliance embracing all countries willing to join, concentrating on Western Europe as the most valuable, but not overlooking other localities.

We should create local centers of strength able to deal with second-degree aggression, beginning with a far eastern pact—not unlike the North Atlantic Pact—and a Mediterranean pact. For if this second-degree aggression cannot be handled chiefly by local forces, we either have to submit to it or else fritter away our strength as we are being forced to do in Korea. Those who fear the 800,000,000 Communist-inspired peoples forget that the non-Communist world numbers 1,600,000,000 people. An example of local defense is the Greek-Yugoslav-Turkish combined forces which can probably handle possible aggression from the captive countries of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, now threatening Marshal Tito. Earlier rearmament of the Japanese, for instance, would probably have prevented Chinese intervention in Korea.

This Nation's policy was a good policy, a necessary policy. Its weakness was that it was built on sand. We boldly stated we would contain Russia everywhere—then we went on with business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual. Korea suddenly showed us that we were living in a dream of blueprint defense. Apart from atomic weapons we were woefully weak. The jolt shocked us into reality. As a nation we must be sure that our commitments and our capacity march side by side.

Today at long last we are turning potential military power into actual military power at home. Even so, there are limits to what we can do by ourselves. If we alone must individually police the world, we shall end up exhausted and defeated. That is why we must have as many allies as possible and learn to get along with them.

It is clear that the American people cannot continue to defend peoples unwilling to defend themselves and their associates. On the other hand, it is also clear that if we show such peoples we are going to throw them to the wolves, they are not going to stick their necks out. Instead, they will try a little appeasement in an effort to remain neutral. They will turn their backs on us and try to form a "third force." But Russia permits no third force. Eventually, having lost our protection, they will be taken over, just as Czechoslovakia was taken over.

Our Nation, moreover, has to keep in mind always the peculiar position of the United States as the one great source of military, political, and economic strength for the entire free world.

Because of our geographical position and interests in both the Northern and Western Hemispheres and between the Atlantic and the Pacific, we must keep in balance our policies as to Europe, Asia, and the Americas. We cannot separate our world relations and responsibilities and treat them separately from one another. A commitment in one

area must not be permitted to endanger our capacity to act in others.

We cannot unilaterally promise each nation and each segment of the globe that we will defend it without getting in return its promise to help us when necessary. Since defense, moreover, is global in scale, we must have commitments from those with whom we are allied to help us in the other areas of the world. By the Rio Pact and the North Atlantic Pact we have stabilized common defense. We must do the same in the Far East, as President Quirino of the Philippines and Prime Minister Holland of New Zealand have been urging.

Our friends must understand our situation. At the same time we have to understand the difficulty of acting as one nation, even though the leading one, in a coalition. We need allies as much as they need us. Our interests are in common. Unlike the Russians, we cannot treat our allies as satellites. No nation sees all the world's problems from the same point of view. It takes time, humility, and patience to find common denominators of purpose so that nations can stand together rather than apart. There is nothing easier to conquer than those who are divided. To impress Russia we must agree among ourselves. We must constantly consult, deliberate, and use all our strength to establish the position of the free world on a solid foundation, and be united before the event instead of falling out with one another and then reconciling in a spirit of bitterness and recrimination. To hammer out our differences in the United Nations in the presence of our opponents plays into the hands of Moscow. Division between friends makes the victory of the tyrant so much easier. We must find a common policy, and then follow it together. We, as a nation, cannot afford to lose friends. We cannot afford to undermine mutual trust. To do so plays into the hands of the Communists. Coercion is not effective between allies in an alliance, and an alliance is a relationship among equals. Differences must be worked out by compromise. We need a common world-wide policy with our closest allies. We will indeed fail if we think that we can act unilaterally at all times.

Finally, by appropriate organs, we should try to weld our camp into an effective instrument to make it as solid as that of our opponent. There are signs that we have made some progress. There is, for example, the pooling of military components under General Eisenhower in Europe; there is the proposal to pool European economic interests under the Schuman plan.

'Til now I have been talking about some corrections in the short-term basis of our foreign policy, and of the necessity of building up our military strength in the most effective way.

But along with this military strength must go a positive plan to offset the lure of Russia's false appeal. We need to develop a dynamic policy to weld our side into a single crusading unit. We must recapture from the Communists not only the military initiative but the political, social, economic, spiritual, and psychological factors without which military strength usually fails.

The Communists have stolen our symbols of freedom and democracy—they who have no freedom and whose democracy is a farce. Their offer of bread and land is as fraudulent as their peace campaign. Nationalized farms, famine, and disease follow in the wake of their so-called liberation; their confessed intention to destroy us makes their peace the peace of a soldier's grave.

Yet we offer no alternative to Russia's glittering promises. We have mounted no political and social offensive of our own.

Just to be against communism is not enough; antisomething is no weapon of offense.

We know that Russia aims to split us from our allies, to sow discord and to stimulate distrust. But while we struggle with short-range policies and day-to-day arrangements, we overlook the chance to create an all-embracing, long-range plan for peace and freedom.

We falter because, all unconsciously, we have been befuddled by the Communist argument. Because the American promise of security and equality is not 100 percent perfect, we concentrate on our failures and lose our energies in domestic squabbles. We must believe in ourselves again before we can inspire others.

Now is the time to renew our faith in our own institutions. With this change in our inward being we shall regain the sense of national purpose which gives vitality and confidence to life—whether of individuals or the whole Nation.

No great civilization has ever been destroyed from outside unless it has already decayed from within; no nation falls prey to invaders unless it has first destroyed itself. We are still the masters of our own destiny; not spectators of our own downfall.

We can take courage from what we have already achieved. For it is we who have won a battle in Western Europe with our food and credits and raw materials. It is we who are sending technicians and field workers to backward and undeveloped countries. It is we who in all the specialized agencies and commissions of the United Nations struggle daily with the long, slow process of facing world problems and working out their solutions.

Spiritual power is the ultimate key to the world's ills. We must supply that power. As a nation we must set peace and freedom as our goals, believe in them and find a way to achieve these goals. The heart of the world must be touched. Minds can still be influenced. While we rearm, we must not sidetrack other methods of avoiding war. Along with freedom and democracy, the Soviet has also stolen the symbols of peace. With the best moral case in the world we still remain on the defensive. We cannot lead if we are not guided by a moral and spiritual force of our own. We must work for a cause that appeals to the world. We must have the vision and imagination to contribute ideas as well as dollars and soldiers.

Together, let's discuss some of our available ideas. The cynical will say that these ideas are difficult, impractical or impossible to accomplish. But we as a nation must set a goal, believe it can be achieved and then use our energies, our resources, our imaginations, and our faith to figure out the way to accomplish the goals we have decided upon. If we are to remain the great leader in the cause of peace and freedom, we cannot let discussion of the means obscure or hide the ends we have in view. This Nation never became great because it was disheartened or cynical or afraid of difficulties. Only to the extent that we voluntarily involve ourselves in a spiritual and moral rebirth can we expect to rejuvenate others. The world wants to know that we seek the end of war.

Though terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to rearm, we must never forget that war is the last push that topples civilizations. Let us press the campaign on the front of peacemaking and not only the front of armed opposition.

1. As a nation, we must proclaim that our goals for the world are similar to the goals of this Nation from its founding. Paraphrasing the Constitution of the United States, they are: A more perfect world, common security, the establishment of justice, universal tranquillity, the securing of peace in our own land and throughout the world, general welfare of all peoples, the securing of the blessings of liberty for all peoples and for posterity. As a young nation, we represented the most revolutionary force in the world. Yet we allowed the most reactionary of all governments, one which would take the peoples of the world back to the middle ages of slavery and feudalism, the Soviet Union, to capture and use the revolutionary ferment now going on in the world. Let us renew our birthright with zeal and offer it to all who need it.

2. As a nation, we must proclaim that we are for universal disarmament and international control of weapons. That means international control of atom bombs, based on a system of adequate inspection and enforcement. The hydrogen bomb, too, must be included under a similar system. The system must extend to the equally frightful weapons of chemical and biological warfare. Inspection and control must not stop there. It would be vain to regulate and forbid production of the so-called unconventional weapons, as advocated by the Stockholm peace petition, while leaving nations free to exploit the advantages of superior resources in manpower and conventional arms. The system must extend to all types of weapons and must be undertaken simultaneously and proportionately throughout the world.

3. As a Nation we must proclaim that American wealth, American resources, America herself, are not the ends but the means to an end. The Creator did not endow this Nation with all its vast potential merely that Americans might luxuriate in the midst of a depleted, dismayed, and disheartened world. We hold this wealth in trust for mankind's betterment, free from exploitation. We should tell the world that this is the hope and aspiration of our people and our Government. We should tell them that we are willing to adopt a peace budget instead of a military budget once we eliminate the scourge of war. Under an international program similar to point 4, we shall raise the backward peoples of the world out of ignorance, poverty, and disease. This is a worthy purpose for a great people. It would be the most potent weapon against communistic imperialism, which promises everything to all men and never delivers. A satisfactory economy is the keystone to political stability. As we unanimously and without a quibble commit all our resources for war, we should be ready to commit a fraction of it for peace.

4. The McMahon-Ribicoff resolution introduced in Congress 2 weeks ago has its place in this program. This resolution is a declaration of friendship of the American people for all other peoples of the world. It emphasizes the desire of the American people for peace, friendship, and brotherhood with all men throughout the world, including those of the Soviet Union, and calls upon the government of the U. S. S. R. to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution. This resolution places Congress on record as standing for peace, not war; for life, not death. By adopting this resolution, we can get our story across to the people of Russia. It would really give strength to the Voice of America. Common sense in the place of confusion is a must.

5. Finally, to make all this possible, we must take the lead in transforming the United Nations into a world organization able to enact, administer, and enforce world law. This will require fundamental revisions in the United Nations Charter. These changes can be limited and confined to those matters relating to the prevention of war. Such a body would have to have adequate military strength through a world police force that has unquestionable power to enforce disarmament and suppress any threats to its authority.

For our generation and all mankind one question overshadows all others. Are we

going to be able to work out the problems that came in the Second World War, or will world war III follow?

Big though our task may be, it is not beyond our ability if we have the will. It is a challenge for American leadership. We shall accept. We shall prevail.

Monsignor Bela Varga Expressed Views of Exiles From Countries Behind Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, a celebration of immense significance was held in Philadelphia. Its significance should not be lost to the Congress.

Gathered in front of Independence Hall were 225 exiles from 10 countries behind the iron curtain. These men—political, cultural, and religious leaders, driven from their country by communism—signed a declaration asserting the unity of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe and their solidarity with the free world. The celebration was sponsored by the National Committee for Free Europe.

We hear doubts—absurd doubts to my way of thinking—about whether our allies in Western Europe can be counted on, whether they are willing to follow our leadership. One quotation from the document signed in Philadelphia by 225 exiles manifests the support for our cause from the oppressed peoples behind the iron curtain and their expectation that our purposes will ultimately prevail. Representatives of the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes declared:

> All our people from the Baltic to the Black and Adriatic Seas, from the iron curtain into the heart of the Russian lands * * * are confident that the spiritual and material forces gathering under the leadership of the United States of America are capable of establishing a peace based on freedom and justice.

It was propitious that this demonstration was held at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. The Declaration of Liberation read and subscribed to on February 11 owes much of its inspiration, I am convinced, to the American Declaration of Independence signed on that same spot. Like the Founding Fathers of America, these national leaders from the iron-curtain countries asserted their belief in man's inalienable right to liberty. Both declarations point to the source of natural rights in man's equal creation by God.

Another feature of the declaration signed by the exiles that merits the attention of the Congress, it seems to me, is its insistence on the unity of Europe. Culturally and economically, Europe is a single community. We must never narrow our vision when we think of Europe merely to Western Europe. We must not forget the 120,000,000 people of Central and Eastern Europe for whom these exiled leaders spoke. In their declaration they reminded us that—

> The world can have no peace so long as no real peace remains in Europe. This cannot be achieved so long as that continent is sundered in two. The iron curtain divides Europe into halves which are vitally necessary to each other. * * * Liberation of Central and Eastern Europe is, therefore, a condition essential to the establishment of international, democratic order, justice, and lasting peace.

The specific aims set forth in the declaration are of such interest that I have asked leave to have them printed in the RECORD for the perusal of the Members.

After the ceremony at Independence Hall there was a luncheon. Spokesman for the peoples of the 10 iron-curtain countries at that luncheon was Msgr. Bela Varga, president of the Hungarian National Council, exiled speaker of the Hungarian Parliament. His address, pointing up the significance of the occasion, strikes me as being worthy of the attention of this House, and I, accordingly, have asked leave to have that speech printed in the RECORD.

Monsignor Varga has an interesting background—one that gives added significance to the words he spoke in Philadelphia on February 11. As a leader—with Ferenc Nagy and Tibor Eckhardt—of the Small Holders Party in Hungary, Bela Varga fought the Nazis in his mother country from 1936 on. In 1939 the German Panzer Divisions forced a flood of 120,000 Polish refugees—20,000 of them Jews—across Hungary's borders, seeking asylum. Most active in the program for the care of these refugees was Msgr. Bela Varga, who established a special home for Jewish children. His rectory at the Balaton Boglar housed a secret radio connecting the Polish underground with the government in exile in London. The first documents and microfilms of the Warsaw ghetto and of the Auschwitz horror camp were brought out of Poland in August 1942 by Taddeus Dzsidek, a paratrooper now living in Paris. Bela Varga guided Dzsidek through Croatia and Italy to Switzerland in clerical clothes and on a passport issued to his Jesuit brother, Andrew Varga. Funds for the Jewish community in Poland, sent to the chargé d'affairs in Budapest, Edmund Fietovics, were smuggled across the border into Poland by Monsignor Varga's underground. The monsignor was later assigned by Cardinal Mindszenty to organize the hiding of Budapest's Jews in convents and monasteries as the Nazi terror reached its hideous climax.

America is fortunate to have men like Bela Varga—and his associates from Central and Eastern Europe who formulated and signed the declaration of liberation—on its side today.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include remarks of Msgr. Bela Varga:

REMARKS OF MONSIGNOR BELA VARGA

It is a signal of honor to arise as the spokesman of 10 ancient nations, 10 nations now shackled in Soviet slavery. It is heartening for us, representatives of these enslaved nations, to be privileged today to associate ourselves—and our cause—with such outstanding representatives of the democracy and freedom that is America. It was a thrilling experience for all of us to make this pilgrimage to Independence Hall to renew our faith at your historic shrine in the imperishable principles of your Declaration of Independence. No more significant site could have been chosen for the reading of our declaration of liberty and the signing of our pledges to that document. It is a document which owes much of its content and its inspiration to the declaration American patriots signed in this city, more than 150 years ago.

Finally it is especially gratifying for all of us from the 10 enslaved countries that this ceremony takes place on the eve of the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. For it was Lincoln, who realized that freedom is indivisible. It was Lincoln who said that the world cannot for long endure, half slave and half free.

It is a source of great satisfaction that all of us—Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Yugoslavs, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, Albanians—are united today in such a strong and striking demonstration of solidarity. At such a solemn hour, however, we cannot forget what we owe to you Americans—the proud, great, free people who produced Abraham Lincoln. My words today, therefore, will be an expression of the yearnings of the millions and millions of oppressed peoples behind the iron curtain.

Those oppressed peoples—our peoples—are today silenced by an alien tyrant. But they are anxious to send you words of thanks, of gratitude and of their abiding faith. For their faith is unshakeable in the persistent devotion of the American people to freedom everywhere in the world, to the ultimate freedom of the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain. Our people are strengthened in their hour of bitter suffering by the assurance of Abraham Lincoln. The Great Emancipator spoke not merely for his own country when he said that the world cannot long endure half slave and half free.

Before the war there were disagreements among some of our nations. Today, behind the iron curtain, all peoples are united, united by a common bond of slavery. The Kremlin has forged a single chain of tyranny. That chain lies heavily on the bodies, the minds and the hearts of every man and woman, from the Baltic to the Adriatic. That monstrous chain has tied to the tyrant 120,000,000 people. But it has also united them in a common, unshakeable belief, a belief nobly expressed by the man whose memory we honor today, a belief that the world cannot long endure half slave and half free.

Gathered here today you see a group of exiles from the iron curtain countries. We represent not only 10 nations. We represent also all shades of political opinion, the whole range of political parties, all categories of personalities from the national life of our oppressed countries. We are all united by a common determination. We are determined that the sacred soil of our countries will never, never become provinces of a greater Siberia. We are united in another common determination. We are also determined that the common experiences and hard-learned realizations which have united

us in our sorrow, our misery and our exile, shall be the cement of a closer union of our nations, a union created by our common struggle, a union continuing beyond the final liberation of our countries.

On these two common determinations—the determination of unceasing resistance to Soviet slavery and the determination of perpetual solidarity—we humbly and earnestly ask the blessings of God. Your Declaration of Independence declared that all men are created equal by God and that, in consequence, all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These same rights God gave the peoples behind the iron curtain. We ask His help that these rights may soon be secured for our suffering people.

We are united, I said, in a common determination that our common experience will produce a closer union of our peoples. The former Thirteen Colonies of this blessed land found their unity in a common struggle. That unity has lasted and has raised America to the lofty heights of world leadership.

Our people are united behind the iron curtain in a common yoke of Soviet slavery. How were they enslaved? In the presence of representatives of these ten nations, I feel it is my imperative duty to remind the free world that the 120,000,000 people behind the iron curtain are not responsible for their present desperate fate. One by one our countries were swallowed up by the most rapacious empire the world has ever seen. The might of the Soviet military machine is today challenging even the greatest of the democracies, the United States of America. What, then, I ask, ladies and gentlemen, could our 10 small nations have done when faced by the lying propaganda backed by the naked power of the Soviet empire?

Today the free world, accepting the courageous leadership of the United States, has taken up the challenge of world communism. For it is world communism that invaded our countries and now is invading Korea. I am sure that I am expressing the sincere sentiment of all my fellow exiles, when I declare that our fellow countrymen at home would count it a privilege to be fighting shoulder to shoulder with the heroic troops of America. Penned up behind the iron curtain, our fellow countrymen are absent in body. But they are with the Americans in Korea in spirit. They are wherever freedom is pitted against Communist savagery and Soviet tyranny.

Indeed, they are with you in more than spirit. Behind the iron curtain at this very minute, on the banks of the Danube and the Vistula, in the mountains of the Balkans, and the plains of the Baltic, countless heroes are waging their silent struggle for freedom. In those almost forgotten countries hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children of our 10 nations are ready to lay down their lives rather than submit to despotism. Countless numbers of them have already given their lives for freedom. They are the nameless and unsung heroes of a cause in whose service Abraham Lincoln laid down his life. They are witnesses to the words of the Great Emancipator, that the world cannot long endure half-slave and half-free. Like the Unknown Soldier of Arlington, these unknown heroes behind the iron curtain will be the honored dead of a free world of the future.

Let us not forget them today. By their bitter suffering and by their blood spilled in the torture chambers of the secret police, they are demonstrating their determination to translate into reality the ideas of freedom enshrined in your Declaration of Independence. Their sufferings, their supreme sacrifices have sealed a bond between us and you, between the iron-curtain countries and the free world that America, under God, today leads. Such a bond is more enduring than formal alliances and treaties. It is a bond of the spirit. It is a bond based on eternal principles of freedom under God as expressed in your Declaration of Independence.

Let us hope that this bond between our nations will lead eventually to a union in brotherhood of all men, to a solidarity established in sacrifice sustaining a world of freedom and peace. The peoples of our 10 countries are just as determined as you are that there will come a time—and may God grant that it will be soon—when no iron curtain will block the free union of all men, a union founded on the principles that are the fabric of American democracy, a union on a worldwide scale that will be enduring. Abraham Lincoln warned not merely America, but all mankind, that the world cannot long endure half-slave and half-free.

We must, in conclusion, turn our minds to the memory of the heroic dead of Korea and the heroic dead of the lands behind the iron curtain. There is no message, more noble in meaning nor splendid in form, to pierce the iron curtain with greater sharpness and deeper penetration, than the words which came from the Great Emancipator's lips, as he stood over the nameless graves of Gettysburg: "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Text of Liberation Declaration by Exiles From Communist Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include text of Liberation Declaration by exiles from Communist lands:

TEXT OF LIBERATION DECLARATION BY EXILES FROM COMMUNIST LANDS

I

Whereas the peace ardently desired by the peoples of the whole world requires conditions of order and justice;

These times of great trouble will persist in the world so long as peoples aspiring to liberty are kept in isolation from the free world and in slavery;

This trouble prevails particularly in Europe, where the peoples, brutally separated from each other by an arbitrary will, see the ancient ties, both spiritual and material, ties formed by history and a common civilization, severed between them;

This division in Europe keeps the West in a continual state of insecurity and weakness, depriving the countries that are still free of conditions indispensable to well-being and to the reestablishment of strength;

This division isolates the countries of Eastern Europe and, despite their aspirations and natural tendencies, confines them against their will in the sphere subjected to Soviet communism;

Whereas the isolation of an entire part of Europe can be maintained only by constraint and terror exercised equally against nations and individuals;

The nations held prisoners in an enemy camp are arrayed against the West as the advance guard of the new aggression which is being prepared;

Individuals tortured in mind and in body must suffer an unnatural warping of their spirit by a despotic rule or perish;

In the domain of fact, the Communist experiment is doomed to failure; the economy of a country subjected to incessant levies, deprived of its markets and its natural outlets, moves toward catastrophe; the social order succumbs under a dictatorship which abolishes liberty of thought, creativeness, research, and enterprise, deprives the peasant of his land, the worker of the product of his labor, separates the child from the customs, faith, education and patriotic inspiration of his parents, and denies to an entire category of citizens the right of life;

In the domain of the spirit, the pitiless struggle of communism against man leads to the debasement of the human being; in spite of the heroic resistance of our martyrs, to whom we render a tribute of deep emotion, our most precious heritage and our highest values, the very groundwork of our civilization, must suffer outrage and violence from a hostile mentality; in the systematic spreading of moral confusion, with no distinction between good and evil; the only law is an immense and brazen falsehood;

Under cover of a treacherous system of thought, designed to gain command of the mass mind but incapable of fulfilling its promises, obscure forces are at work hostile to the entire world, whose only aim is to exercise absolute and limitless power; the exercise of this power becomes an end in itself, with the world as its victim; and the unlawful occupation of the Eastern European countries is the starting point for new conquests.

II

Whereas, moreover, the dangerous process of disintegration which threatens to extend over all Europe cannot be checked without restoring a rule of liberty to the countries in the East; and these countries are worthy of such a rule, having fought through centuries on the front lines of Europe to win freedom for themselves and for the continent;

The word "liberty" has gained heightened meaning and new value through the sufferings endured by these countries, sustaining their peoples in hope of the deliverance for which they long with all their hearts;

Whereas such a deliverance calls for a great effort of constructive organization fired by a creative urge;

This effort must air at the liberation of man as well as nations;

The liberation of man must restore his natural rights—fundamental, inalienable, not to be proscribed, but protected in their very finality against the abuses of power and the interference of public authority;

This liberation, consecrated by legal guaranties of a national and international order, must deliver man from the fear that has permeated his being and give back his indispensable sense of physical and spiritual security; the freedom thus assured must be the essential element in the formation of states, and of those ties which are destined to draw more and more closely together the commonwealth of man;

The freeing of the nations must put an end to unlawful dominion by any alien power acting through the intermediary of servile government imposed and maintained by violence;

It must restore to the people their right of adopting freely the laws and institutions of their choice, so that the just power of

governments shall derive from the consent of the governed;

Further, it must provide means for remedying as promptly as possible the social ills produced by Communist rule, which has created a much sharper social division than existed before between ruled and rulers, between the mass of half-starving and downtrodden people and a small upper ruling group, politically and economically privileged and self-perpetuating, which wields power of life and death unrestrained by any civil or moral law; this deadly distinction must be abolished; and

Whereas the reconstruction of Eastern Europe involves problems of a political, economic, and social order beyond the capabilities and powers of nations to resolve separately; the dangers to which they remain exposed have prepared them to seek salvation through union; this tendency toward close international collaboration is in harmony with the present order of events; the federal principle, signifying union in liberty and implying the creation of organic ties, is the most appropriate and sure means of uniting the states; the peoples of the East are resolved to apply this principle to the regional organization which they envisage; these same peoples proclaim their right and their desire to take part in a united Europe on a federal basis, which they regard as the realization of all their prayers; and in spirit these continental and regional unions signify further steps along the road to the indispensable organization of the free world as a whole;

The great movement which carries the people of the East toward union springs likewise from a desire for security, from their need of opposing unitedly the menace of any totalitarian dictatorships whatsoever and of preventing any imperialist power from subordinating their countries to its will—as happened with Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia;

Consequently the peoples of the East feel themselves brothers not only to all the free nations of the West but also to the Russian people and all the other peoples of the Soviet Union aspiring to a common deliverance; and

III

Whereas, finally, continents, like men, are related to each other, and in the sense of the words spoken by the great American, Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor at this time, the world cannot live half free and half slave;

The principles written into the Atlantic Charter could assure peace to the world under conditions of order and freedom; the present crisis results from the fact that certain of these principles have been abandoned; to cope with this crisis, and with the grave disorder provoked by the division of the world, there is no better way than to return to these principles and to restore to the Charter its original authority; in order to bring about this restoration it is necessary to possess a definite program and real strength;

The people of the United States of America, conscious of the mission before them, have resolutely given leadership to the free world in order to create, through new efforts and sacrifices, the preponderant strength able to assure a just and durable peace;

The free world is the bearer of a political idea which it must share with all people eager to rally in a great and just cause; it is now for the United States of America, the Nation which marches at the head of the line, to speak the word; here where the representatives of the people, in a time of revolution against autocracy and in touch with the most enlightened minds of the Western World, once gathered to inspire the Constitution of a free people, and where the wisdom of a free people with authority gained from glorious experience can restore to the world, in a time more infinitely troubled, the belief in liberty.

IV

Now, therefore we exiles from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, loyally united and single in thought, dedicated by the profound sufferings and the high aspirations of our native lands;

Faithful to the example predecessors who, in the course of centuries have forged, in exile but in contact with the free world, the framework of the institutions, the laws, the liberties of their countries.

Wish to send from the great Republic of the United States of America, where we have the good fortune to see the forces of freedom assembling, a message of confidence to our far away peoples;

And to proclaim solemnly together the principles and aims of liberation:

1. All men and all nations are endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to liberty. The cause of freedom is, like the cause of peace, one and indivisible. The suppression of freedom in one part of the world endangers the freedom of all nations and of all men.

2. The principles of law and liberty embodied in the Atlantic Charter offer solid foundations for just peace in our time. Therefore, as an earnest of the determination in the free world to replace lawlessness and tyranny now rampant, with liberty under law, there must be a return to the principles of the Charter.

3. The world can have no peace so long as no real peace reigns in Europe. This cannot be achieved so long as that Continent is sundered in two. The iron curtain divides Europe into halves which are vitally necessary to each other. In the eastern half a ruling group irresponsible to the will of its own people is forging powerful arms for an aggressive war. Liberation of Central and Eastern Europe is therefore a condition essential to the establishment of international democratic order, justice, and lasting peace.

Having been violated by the same Soviet Communist aggressor, the freedom and independence of our peoples deserve to be defended with the same determination as that with which the United Nations are defending the freedom of the Korean people.

4. The great powers cannot achieve their purpose of safeguarding Western Europe if they base their endeavors upon a recognition, even implied, of the present enslavement of Central and Eastern Europe. Let the free world give to the oppressed peoples of Eastern and Central Europe at every possible opportunity assurance that its purpose is to bring the principles of the Atlantic Charter into effect in their unhappy lands. It is for the free world to demand that all further deportations from our countries cease, that prisoners of war and persons deported from their homes be repatriated immediately, that all Soviet troops and foreign police units be withdrawn, and that all political prisoners wherever they are held be set free. The deliberate destruction of the best in our nations, steadily pursued, must be stopped. The first goal is the establishment of democratic governments and the holding of free elections under effective international supervision.

5. All our peoples, from the Baltic to the Black and Adriatic Seas, from the iron curtain into the heart of the Russian lands, anxiously await action that would herald their approaching liberation. They are confident that the spiritual and material forces gathering under the leadership of the United States of America are capable of establishing a peace based on freedom and justice. Despite its impressive military might, the ruthless power confronting the free world is undermined by hatred and latent revolt among the peoples it oppresses. Their contribution to the fight for freedom can lead to decisive results only if it is related to positive and determined action by the free world.

6. The peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are firmly resolved, upon their liberation, to join the community of free nations and to establish government of the people by the people and for the people. The right of habeas corpus, as well as freedom of religion, freedom of research and artistic creation, freedom of opinion and of information, freedom of assembly, among other essential freedoms and fundamental political and social rights, shall be assured. No one shall be barred from education because of national origin, religious or political belief, or social and economic circumstances. Parents shall have the right to send children to such schools as they may establish or choose. There shall be special care for the oncoming generation of the young, who have a right to the widest opportunities to use their enthusiasm and capacity in building a better new order of society. The machine of mutual extermination shall no longer roll through our countries. Crimes against humanity shall be dealt with through the regular process of justice and on grounds of personal responsibility for definite acts. Eastern European democracy cannot be revived through vengeance. Thou shall not kill is the basic commandment for us.

7. The movement of ideas and persons, goods, and services shall be free. Individual initiative shall be stimulated. Choice between private and public enterprise should be determined on the basis of merit; those methods which can produce better results both for consumers and workers should have preference.

There shall be no more iron curtains. Our countries shall again be integrated into the world economy and be able to raise their standard of living and add their contribution to general welfare.

8. The land shall be owned by the peasant as his private property in accordance with the desire of the whole peasantry, which forms a major part of our populations and the backbone of our nations. Cooperatives and other forms of association voluntarily entered into by the peasants for economic ends shall be free from Government interference. Advanced scientific methods and modern implements will help to raise the standard of living of the rural and urban populations.

9. The workers, manual and intellectual, shall be protected against exploitation whether by private or by public enterprise and shall be free from the fetters of arbitrary and competitive forced standards in work as from repressive labor laws. They shall be free to choose their employment and the places where they wish to live and work. Free and independent trade unions and organizations shall be the guardians of workers' rights and interests. There shall be responsibility on the part of the public authorities and private administrators that technological and scientific resources be employed to increase output and improve levels of living. The workers shall be entitled to a just share in the profits earned by their industries. Before the interest of the machine comes the interest of man.

10. The peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are eager to take their natural place in the great movement of free peoples toward better relationship and closer union. They are desirous of establishing among themselves strong ties of a Federal character and of jointing in the formation of a United Europe. Such a fraternal federation must prize and respect the distinctive values of each nation, for the common good

of our European civilization and for the cultural heritage of mankind throughout the world.

Our belief in the need of close and loyal cooperation has prompted us to come forward with this joint declaration. We pledge ourselves to remain faithful to this belief after liberation.

In this great country, where the idea of liberty is so closely bound to that of union, we pray God to give us the strength we need to bring to a successful outcome the fight for the freedom and the union of our nations.

Insurance Has Total War Ally in Grand Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anthony W. Fitzgerald, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

INSURANCE HAS TOTAL WAR ALLY IN GRAND JURY—REGARD BOTH AS INTERDEPENDENT IN UNIFIED PATTERN OF DEMOCRACY—INSURANCE BOTH DIRECTLY AND INDIRECTLY AFFECTED BY GRAND JURY WORK—PROPOSED GOAL FOR INSURANCE ADVERTISING SUGGESTED

(By Anthony W. Fitzgerald)

In this age of revolutionary movements and international crises, it is interesting to recall that the product of one of the most noteworthy attacks on vested power was the Bill of Rights, the embodiment of much that our own American revolutionaries fought and died for amid upheavals similar to those we witness today. One hundred and fifty-nine years ago last December 15 the Bill of Rights became the law of the land and one of its most important provisions, article V, reads in part as follows: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury * * *" and since that time the grand jury has continued to be, as it was for many centuries prior to the revolt of the American Colonies, a bulwark of our liberties, a defender of the individual against unjust prosecution, an arm of justice in bringing malefactors to punishment. The reader may well wonder by what tenuous thread the two apparently widely diverse ideas—of insurance, a complex world in itself, and of the grand jury, an essentially judicial body—are entwined. The answer is simple: In this highly developed civilization that we call democracy each component part is mutually interdependent to such an extent that it forms a unified pattern in a total war of ideas against a barbarous concept of life, also unified but on a quite different ground, the negative principle of annihilating whatever stands in its way.

GRAND JURY A SAFEGUARD

Whether the grand jury had its origins in the perfect democracy that was Athens or in the feudal system of justice in Normandy, legal historians generally agree that by the fourteenth century in England, during the reign of Edward III, it had assumed the peculiar characteristics and functions which it still possesses today. Then, as now, it served as a buffer between overweening power (of king or nobleman) and the helpless commoner and acted as an arm of the judicial branch of the government in tracking down crime within its bailiwick and assaying the strength of the prosecution's case before actual trial. Today its ancient home, England, has abolished its services and many States of the Union have followed suit; but in the majority of States and in the Federal courts the grand jury is still regarded as a vital force both as a shield and a spear of justice. The very nature of the grand jury, namely, the selection by lot of 23 representative and intelligent members of the community, insures impartiality and careful weighing of evidence for the protection of the accused and for the counterbalancing check on an overzealous prosecutor. The community is served especially by the unique power of the body to initiate an investigation of its own motion, without regard for the district attorney who acts as its counsel or the very court which brought it into being; it derives from its own strength the power to subpena witnesses and possesses the mighty weapon of punishment for contempt for the recalcitrant ones who defy its authority. Another safeguard of our liberties—although it may seem much abused in these days of a national emergency—accompanies certain testimony before the grand jury, namely, the waiver of immunity, the cloak of protection against self-incrimination which the same article V of the Bill of Rights assures every person in reasonable fear of prosecution.

Cases appearing before a grand jury in which insurance is directly interested, are many: Arson matters, offenses of bonded public officials, larceny cases where a cargo or truckload is insured are commonplaces in the grand-jury room. Even life insurance may enter collaterally into a case before the body, as for example an occasional homicide caused by an overeager beneficiary or an attempt to cheat tax laws or bankruptcy statutes by secreting of assets.

Indirectly insurance is connected with other types of cases handled by the grand jury and not the least of these was exhibited at the trial of the 11 alleged Communists in the southern district of New York during most of 1949. At that trial defense counsel assailed the system of selecting grand jurors in the district for seven long weeks and more than 2,500 pages of testimony. Every effort was made by the defense to drag in the whipping-boy of discrimination in order to discredit the grand jury which had rendered the true bill of indictment against the 11 accused. The mere fact that a grand juror worked for an insurance company caused loud cries and moans of pain among their thespian attorneys; and if a grand juror happened to live in one of the large housing developments owned by an insurance company, the defendants hastened again to scream "discrimination" and to try in every way their ingenious minds could twist to tie up insurance with hatred of certain races and the "capitalistic, fascistic, warmongering aggressors of Wall Street." Somehow insurance withstood the blasts of rage from Foley Square even as did the learned Judge Medina on the bench and the trial jury which found the 11 guilty as charged.

INSURANCE A VITAL FACTOR

An interesting side-line in this connection has been the realization by insurance companies of the possibility of great damage being wrought by Communists and fellow-travelers of various hues, should they infiltrate into grand or petit juries. In the latter type of jury there has long been a suspicion that verdicts, excessively high in accident or injury cases, were brought about by persons "planted" on juries with the express purpose of causing trouble for the "capitalistic" insurers. Does it seem far-fetched when we consider that quite frequently repeaters occur on juries as volunteers with little or no check on their backgrounds? The Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York has gone so far on this point as to sponsor legislation in Congress to compel all jurors, grand or petit, to take a solemn loyalty oath in addition to possessing other qualifications so that a charge of perjury will await any one thus falsely swearing upon entering into his duties as a juror. Granted that one who does not believe in the sanctity of an oath will not hesitate in performing what he considers an empty ritual; nevertheless, by so binding himself under oath the perjurer would subject himself to penalties under the law.

It is also interesting to note that insurance executives as well as employees of insurance firms make excellent grand jurors. In most jurisdictions representative groups of citizens such as clergymen, doctors, dentists, druggists, attorneys, and newspaper editors are exempt from grand jury service and the result is that the jury board has great difficulties in finding individuals to serve who are competent, impartial, and intelligent enough to weigh the evidence and reach a just verdict. In the New York City area it is to be noted that a large number of insurance men not only serve gladly on grand juries but also participate actively in the work of the various grand jury associations which aid the courts in their work and attempt to educate the general public in the important part played by the grand jury in the life of the community. Insurance men bring a wealth of experience and training to jury work and, although generally they are challenged, especially in petit jury trials involving liability, they are welcome on the grand jury as an invaluable aid in its work.

Whether the temperature of the war be hot or cold, our way of life is faced with a mortal enemy, a cunning foe who probes and seeks out and then exploits our weaknesses and faults, no matter how insignificant or seemingly unrelated to the general pattern of our democracy that they may be. We have noted with amazement and concern Communist infiltration into our classrooms—for they know how important to the continuance of democracy the education of the young is—and Communist seizure of control of labor unions, communications, Government positions—for, according to Marxist doctrine, each of those fields is a critical one in the life of a nation. We have been aware of their use of the very constitutional safeguards which were intended not as a shield for the evil, but as protection for the good citizen: the plea of self-incrimination, the disavowal of guilt by association, the claim to the right of self-expression. Is it surprising then that the enemy has attacked directly two important institutions of our national life, the grand jury and insurance, which each contribute in its own way to the interrelated whole called democracy? Anything which affords security must be assailed by the enemy both because it encourages our own citizens to uphold their form of government and because it is an encouragement and a goal for others, not as fortunate as ourselves, to yearn for and to seek. Both insurance and the grand jury are a bulwark for the individual and for the state; for the individual because they protect him against the hazards of daily life whether these threaten his property or his very existence; for the state because they assure a protected continuance of those principles for which the original Bill of Rights was enacted.

Could the Communists convince the common man that the grand jury is an anomaly, a mere judicial appendage which should be discarded without any loss to him, and could they succeed in urging upon the individual

that insurance companies are indeed soulless aggregations of wealth and power in the hands of a few mercenary capitalists, then their ultimate remote goal would be fully realized in the distrust and dislike the common man would feel for both insurance and the grand jury. There might be a lesson in this for our insurers, a guide for their advertising programs and contacts with the general public. Should they not emphasize the salient part they play in today's titanic conflict between contentment and greed, between the haves and the have-nots, between civilization as we know it and the utter barbarism of the East? Surely it would not be too ambitious an undertaking for insurance companies to match the efforts of our grand jurors' associations in trying to educate the public to an awareness of all the vast blessings of our national life, whether these be found in the existence of the grand jury or in the prosperity of insurance companies—both controlled not by selfish and venal prosecutors or moneyed tycoons, but by the common man himself as participant or owner.

Congress Falls Heir to Perplexing Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

I

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this Congress falls heir to the greatest volume of perplexing problems of any Congress of which I have had the honor of being a Member.

We fall heir to the accumulated mistakes of the past 5 years, and we cannot in conscience, as representatives of the American people, deny that the responsibility for their solution rests upon us.

One virtue in looking back over the incredibly stupid statesmanship that preceded our present dilemma and which culminated at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, is to understand how inescapable our responsibility is.

It is true that part of the responsibility for the solution of the present day international problems must rest with other free nations of the world, but no American can deny that the Frankenstein monster now at large bears the label "Made in America."

The astounding and frightening concessions made to communism by a pitifully sick, old man under tremendous intellectual pressure from advisers, whom we shall charitably term incompetent, although we now know many of them, like Alger Hiss with whom he went to Yalta, were downright subversive, were not made with the consent of the nations now in imminent peril of being crushed under the red boots of the Communist horde.

While it would be naive to ask our free allies to do nothing but give our troops access to the enemy, it would be unjust and dishonorable to ask them to bear the full burden of destroying a menace for which we alone are responsible.

Because of this we must as an honorable nation bend our backs to the greatest financial, economic, and military burden in our history.

II

As a result, our Nation now faces a new period of Government intervention in the personal and economic life of the people.

No one will deny the need for this.

But it behooves this Congress to make certain that the emergency powers extended for this purpose be applied properly and wisely so that there is a minimum of disruption of the people's daily lives consistent with adequate national defense.

I am frightened sometimes by the sweeping powers being demanded by the Federal, and by some State, executives. The startling implications of the legislation requested by the President to guard against air attack authorizing peacetime seizure of property on an unparalleled scale and paralyzation of the Nation by Presidential order is one fearful example.

This thing we call an emergency may last the rest of our natural lives, and every time this Congress surrenders any given power to the executive branch, it must be with the realization that it may never be returned in our lifetime.

Even if we were to engage in, and win, an all-out war within the next few years, the production emergency would simply shift over to a rehabilitation program.

And we would probably still have to police the peace for the balance of the century.

III

All this points to the need of maintaining civilian life on as high a plane as possible, because whatever our way of life is to become, it will probably be, to all practical purpose, our permanent way of life.

I am deeply convinced that this Congress has a sacred duty to the American people to keep the military burden on the economy as light as is possible without endangering their safety.

As we all know, and as General Eisenhower recently—NAM convention, New York, December 1950—stated, every general asks for far more than he needs, and I say bluntly and without apology that we, in Congress, owe it to our constituents not to be timid about examining and evaluating the magnitude of military requests.

Hand in hand with that goes the responsibility to courageously deny unreasonable requests for power on the part of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

IV

Here again I wish to speak bluntly.

There are in the executive branch today many influential administrators who would like to use this permanent emergency to socialize America.

This is their golden opportunity to panic the Congress into hasty, unwise, and destructive decisions, all cloaked in the impressive language of national defense and preparation for survival in the event of atomic attack.

These administrators do not call themselves Socialists or Communists, they call themselves planners, and their goal is the British type of welfare state.

I believe that I have a pretty good idea as to how they might be approaching this campaign of economic sabotage.

The job could be done in three steps.

The first step would be to impose so many unworkable economic controls and embark upon so much unjustified stockpiling of basic materials that production—and, therefore, employment—would unavoidably drop to a dangerous low.

The second step could be to take advantage of the suffering caused by unemployment and by the shortages of goods and impose rationing and planned production.

The third step would be to continue the policy of deficit spending, piling up the national debt with all of its inflationary forces, and adopt a socialistic policy of taxation which would destroy the incentive and ambition of our people to produce.

They could say: "Private industry has tragically demonstrated that it is incapable of meeting the Nation's production goals. In the interests of national health and safety, Government must plan the national production and control the instruments of production."

Thus, 100 years of industrial progress and well-being could be swept away and this great Nation would sink to the drab sustenance level common to all state-administered economies.

V

The resulting tragedy would be played in two parts.

First, the people would be stripped of the right to make personal economic decisions or to better their economic condition except through the political patronage framework of the state.

Second, their productivity, without incentive, would dwindle to the point that one of two things would happen: either the state administration would stimulate production with bayonets and work permits, or the production would be allowed to sink to a point where our national defense could not be maintained, making us easy prey for the Red Fascists of the East.

We may as well face two facts: A free America must remain strong in order to survive, and America cannot remain strong in the absence of individual economic decisions and personal incentives.

The only guardians of the people's freedoms are the people's elected representatives in Washington.

What this Congress does will be written—for good or for bad—in big red letters on the pages of twentieth century history.

We, alone, stand between the endless requests of the administration and the welfare of the people.

We must be aware of our dual responsibility to support adequate arms and proper regulations for defense, and to oppose unnecessary inroads upon the people's purse and upon their freedoms.

VI

It seems to me that, in the past, some of the committees of Congress have suffered from a form of inferiority complex

in dealing with administrative experts in the fields of economics and fiscal policy.

It also seems to me that this stems from undue modesty in applying the basic laws of common sense to superficially complex situations.

Needless to say, there are very few of us who qualify as technical experts in these fields, but it is also needless to say that there are very few among us who do not or could not easily understand the underlying principles of production and finance.

In our dealings with administration spokesmen, we cannot, in conscience, forget that in a very real sense of the word, each is a special pleader for a special cause—a member of a superlobby.

Unfortunately, some of them consider Congress an unnecessary road block to the achievement of their specific programs.

As a result, they show at times a tendency to either overwhelm us with their special knowledge and prestige, or retire in the ivory towers of their postgraduate scholastic honors.

As some of my older colleagues may recall, I used to be a school teacher.

In fact, I taught economics at New York University, which might qualify me as an expert.

I can tell you, however, that there is very little in classical economics that would be useful in running a war-production program or finding the money with which to pay for it.

Every intelligent adult can master the fundamentals involved by simply calling upon his common sense.

VII

I want to say at this time that I am very optimistic about America's ability to retain a high standard of living in spite of the military burden upon our economy—if the people are allowed the proper degree of freedom to produce.

There is, to my knowledge, no acute shortage of anything that could not be overcome within 2 or 3 years at the most.

America has doubled its productive capacity with the last quarter century and can do it again if the conditions are suitable.

We can have both guns and butter, after a short intermission for intensive rearmament, if the productive processes are not hamstrung by bureaucracy.

The other day I saw an article on this subject. It is a good summary of the problem:

There is nothing impossible about our production problem unless we think there is.

After all, what is production—what are its elements?

Anything and everything manufactured is no more than some natural resources whose form, condition, and place have been changed by somebody applying to them some human energy with the aid of some tools.

That's all there is to production—natural resources, human energy, and tools.

So if we cannot increase production, it will be because we cannot or do not have enough of these three things.

First, let's see how we are off for natural resources.

The most important of these is steel, and we now have 30 percent more capacity than we had during the last war.

On top of this, the Government does not need as much steel this time—we have an enormous amount of things made of steel left over from the last war.

Unless we bungle the handling of our steel supply, we will get along pretty well.

As for copper, zinc, nickel, etc., there is as yet no evidence that their present short supply is going to be a long or insurmountable problem.

We have made good progress toward reducing our need for the tin and natural rubber from which we could conceivably be cut off in Asia.

We have the best food production in all the world.

We will probably be short of cotton and wool for a while, but the situation does not look alarming.

The plastic supply is in real trouble due to the benzol shortage, but that can be solved by making it synthetically.

In fact, any and every shortage must be looked upon as temporary and as a challenge to our ingenuity and determination, and Government must allow us as much freedom as possible to overcome them.

If we have trouble with lumber, tile, brick, etc., it will be because of a shortage in our second factor of production—human energy.

How are we off for human energy—our working force?

No one believes that mobilization will cut down the total number of people engaged in productive work.

There is an enormous force of highly capable women (and retired men) able and willing to step into industry.

So the quantity of human energy does not seem to present any serious problem.

But the quantity is only half the human-energy problem—in most industries the quality is just as important.

This quality problem is not a problem of the people themselves: it is a problem of whether the people are given an understanding of the importance of their production and properly trained in the work they are asked to do.

If all of us know that the quality of our work will largely control our standard of living, we need not worry very much about that work being well done.

To bring out this high quality of human energy, all we need to do is be sure that we do know what the problem is.

Last but not least, we come to the third factor of production—tools.

Here we have two problems: (1) the existing tools must be replaced as they wear out, and (2) extra tools must be added.

The excess-profits tax on the payments for the use of the tools (business profits) makes both of these problems extremely serious.

The best-kept secret in American business is that the high profits of 1948, 1949, and 1950 are not high at all: They simply look high because the tools being worn out are carried on the company books at the acquisition price instead of their greatly increased replacement price.

The cost expense item called "depreciation of plant and equipment" should be at least twice as large as it is.

As matters now stand, business is not able to put aside enough money to replace the tools that will soon have to be scrapped, let alone attract new investment to increase its stock of tools.

For the moment, let's ignore the welfare of the investors who own these tools and look at the other people who will suffer if tools disappear.

Those other people are everybody, because these tools account for 94.7 percent of our production.

These tools make the difference between the American worker and the Chinese coolie—they make the difference between the American standard of living and mediocre poverty.

In the long run, our material welfare is going to be what our tools of production make it.

We can make some immediate progress by using the tools better, but that will never be a substitute for adding more and better tools.

If we do not do that, then nothing else we can do will save our living standards.

It can be done, however, if our Government will let industry correct its cost accounting.

VIII

The ideas set forth in that rather heartening quotation seem to me to be the basis of a pretty good checklist of the things that Congress could and should keep its eye on.

Naturally, no administration and no bureau of the administration wants to be heckled while it works, but any good administration or good bureau welcomes constructive criticism.

And the people have a right to demand that Congress keep a watchful and helpful eye on the people who are carrying out the intentions of the Nation.

For example, there seems reason to believe that there is considerable confusion regarding certain scarce metals because of the administration's policy regarding stockpiling.

The criticism that has appeared in the press concerning the plans for the stockpiling of aluminum in ingot form when there are idle facilities for converting it into sheets seems well grounded.

Another example, one which has been going on for many years, is the administration's stockpiling of tungsten, a metal supposedly in short supply.

I quote from the Wall Street Journal of October 25, 1950, written by R. C. McKenna, a recognized authority on the subject:

The folly of additional stockpiling—

Writes Mr. McKenna—

is well illustrated by the fact that at the time of Pearl Harbor the Government stockpile was approximately 6,000,000 pounds of contained tungsten metal, and by the end of the war this emergency stock had been increased to 33,000,000 pounds.

Thirty-three million pounds represented more than sufficient for three war years of maximum production.

As a matter of fact, during a world-wide war, the 6,000,000 pounds on stockpile at the time of Pearl Harbor were not used.

The records show that the stockpile was increased by 27,000,000 pounds.

It can be assumed that since VJ-day, the Government has added approximately 14,000,000 pounds to the stockpile.

That would indicate a total stockpile now of about 47,000,000 pounds.

Since the average annual consumption in this country during 1945–49 was about 8,000,000 pounds, this would mean enough tungsten for 6 years' use.

Yet the Government plans to add 10,000,000 pounds more to its stockpile.

The price of metallic tungsten in ore has increased since the invasion of Korea from $1.50 a pound to $2.25 a pound.

Even the $1.50 price was artificial, for it was at this price that our Government was buying all the production of American mines.

The complaint involved here seems to me to justify serious consideration.

After all, the purpose of stockpiles should be to prevent shortages during emergencies.

In the case of tungsten, however, the stockpile seems to be aggravating the shortage.

IX

It goes without saying that no sensible person would deny the existence of some critical shortages.

But that is all the more reason why the handling of the available supplies should be scrutinized.

The people's living standards and, in some cases, the people's employment require that government should not unnecessarily withhold scarce materials from civilian production.

I believe it the duty of Congress to appoint committees to listen to any citizen or group of citizens wishing to present proper protests or to make constructive suggestions.

We must not be deterred by emotional claims that such action would penalize our chances of victory or give aid and comfort to the enemy.

It is all very well to dramatize the situation and to tell the people that they must make heavy personal sacrifices for the sake of survival, but there is no sense in imposing a single sacrifice that is not necessary, and there is no justification for Congress not doing all it can to detect and prevent needless hardship.

Moreover, the speed with which we can overcome these shortages will, to a large extent, depend upon the degree of freedom with which business can exercise its ingenuity and resourcefulness. Any unnecessary restrictions placed upon practically applied imagination and creative determination of our industrial leaders only means prolonged shortages and prolonged sacrifices on the part of the people.

The creation of new methods, the discovery of new sources, both natural and synthetic, must be encouraged by giving man the freedom to develop them.

X

Another responsibility which, in my opinion, rests squarely upon the shoulders of Congress is that of insuring proper revenue methods.

We know, by now, the deteriorating effects of deficit spending. We know from experience that monetization of the public debt is just as inflationary as the printing of greenbacks.

We also know that the sale of Government bonds to the people will not close the gap between tax receipts and Federal expenditures.

It is a healthy sign, therefore, that the administration has asked for a balanced budget.

The question, however, is how to balance the budget—and the Constitution places the burden of solution squarely upon the House of Representatives.

The first question regarding the budget should be the size of the budget. Until we decide that we will not know the magnitude of the problem.

This will also be affected by the size and type of our Armed Forces, a matter which Congress should not fail to examine with great care and speak upon with complete candor.

It is futile to wrangle with the administrators of our Federal bureaus as to which nonmilitary expenses shall be cut and how much.

In my opinion it is up to Congress to tell the nonmilitary bureaus how much money they can have and let them decide where the reductions are to be made.

That is what we all, as private citizens, must do when we get into a financial emergency: we see how much we have left and then decide how to use it.

The administration has submitted to Congress a budget of 71,500,000,000 "bucks"; in addition to this, the continuing obligations, loan and contract authorizations amount to about another $20,000,000,000, which brings the actual budget submitted up to about $90,000,000,000.

XI

Even after Congress fries much of the fat out of this budget it will still be several billion higher than our present revenue, which means that taxes must be raised if the budget is to be balanced.

The question now is how they should be raised.

Will this revenue emergency be used to further extend the socialistic principle of progressive or graduated taxation of personal and corporate income?

The pressure upon Congress to do so will be tremendous.

We will hear impassioned speeches extolling the virtues of the tax methods used in Socialist Britain—the methods which are destroying Britain's creative middle class.

We will be urged to require equality of sacrifice from the so-called privileged classes.

What is equality of sacrifice in regard to personal income tax?

If a man who makes $50,000 a year pays 10 times as much as a man who makes $5,000 per year, is that equality of sacrifice?

Very few Americans today seem to think so. We are mostly agreed that the $50,000 man should pay more than 10 times as much as the $5,000 man.

But how much more?

The $50,000 man is now taxed about $25,000, while the $5,000 man is taxed about $1,000.

That is 25 times as much.

And there will be, appearing before the Ways and Means Committee, people who will want to make it much more.

I am profoundly convinced that unless this Congress stands firm and holds the line on this Socialist-inspired principle of taxation, we will destroy the most precious asset we have: the aggressive initiative, imagination, and ambition of the producing members of our society.

And, again I say, whatever we do this year will not be undone for many, many years to come.

To all practical purposes we simply must regard the present situation as being permanent.

XII

What then should be the principle behind our 1951 revenue policy? The principle should be one that will preserve and encourage the incentive and ambition of our people. Our forefathers gave us a political system that was unique in the world. It was the only private-property system in existence at that time.

The Constitution, which is the basis for our private-property system, is the greatest political invention in all history, and it embodied the idea that every man, regardless of origin or station in life, could become just as prosperous as his energy, ability, and determination could make him.

This idea was the atomic power of the eighteenth century. It split the atom of human energy in the North American wilderness and released a current of activity and individual planning that carried our people farther and faster down the road of progress than any other people had ever traveled before.

Call it anything you wish—sales tax; most of our taxes embody some form of tax on spending; excise or corporation income tax—the result is the same: the people who do the spending pay the tax in proportion to what they spend.

In my opinion, the most practical, inexpensive, and painless method would be a flat increase—not a graduated increase—on corporate income.

The collection of such a tax is certain, inexpensive, and the volume of revenue to be derived from it can be pretty accurately forecast.

A flat sales tax would be even more predictable, but it would be more expensive to collect and more unpopular with the people.

This so-called corporation tax would not actually be a tax on the corporations. That idea is fiction because all corporation taxes have always been anticipated by management and made part of the price that must be collected from the customer.

The law may state with all piety that corporation taxes must not be passed on to the customer, but common sense tells us that there is no place for the corporation to get the money except from the customer.

This tax, therefore, would be an invisible war tax collected from the people by the corporations and passed on to the Internal Revenue Department.

There is no reason to believe that corporations would object to this role of tax collector because they have been doing it ever since corporate incomes have been subject to Federal taxes.

XIII

There is another phase of corporate taxatiton to which, in my humble opinion, this Congress should address its careful attention.

As was mentioned a few minutes ago, there has been no provision made in the present law governing corporation income taxes for the recovery of the replacement cost of the assets of production—the tools which are responsible for the amazing productivity of our Nation.

Every man who owns a house knows how the cost of replacing it would compare with the amount he paid for it.

The reason, as we all know, is the monetary inflation—the deficit spending on the part of the Federal Government.

This inflation affects industry the same way it affects individuals.

An industrial plant that cost $10,000,000 ten years ago would cost about $25,000,000 to replace today.

Yet the tax law forbids the corporation to apply more than $10,000,000 to its depreciation reserve.

As a result, the corporation is forced to overstate its profits, pay profit taxes on amounts that are not in any sense of the word profits, and put part of the proceeds into what is erroneously called the surplus account.

Using this method, which is the only method available to business, the corporation wishing to replace the $10,000,000 plant would have to overstate its profits by $25,000,000 and pay about $10,000,000 tax.

That would leave it the extra $15,000,000 needed to make up the deficit in the replacement reserve account.

XIV

This is not an academic problem.

It is one that must be solved in order to protect the tools of production which constitute the big difference between America and the rest of the world.

The tools may be precious to the people who own them and get dividends for their use, but they are far more precious to the men who make their living using them.

As matters now stand, if the corporations collect enough so-called profit to be able to replace the tools when they wear out, they are castigated as profiteers and there is a renewed hue and cry to raise their taxes.

American business has probably overstated its profits by $50,000,000,000 during the past 4 years and has been subjected to a vicious campaign of vituperation for having apparently made exorbitant amounts.

The central problem involved here, however, is not the welfare of the corporations, but the welfare of the Nation as a whole, which depends upon the proper renewal of these corporate assets.

It is naive for us to assume that the Internal Revenue Department will voluntarily take any action to grant relief to the corporations: their business is to collect taxes and collect as much as they can.

But Congress cannot ignore the long-term implications of this situation.

Without its magnificent stock of tools of production, America would be no more than a third-rate nation.

The Communists have often boasted that if they could not conquer American capitalism, they could trick it into spending and taxing itself to death.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and we of the Eighty-second Congress must not be guilty of introducing or perpetuating destructive methods of taxation.

Drafting of Ex-Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 months my congressional office, like many others, has received numerous complaints in connection with the drafting of ex-service men. In my humble opinion the inactive reservist is being discriminated against. He has not been receiving pay for his services and never thought he would be recalled just to build up a defense program. The active reservist who has been drawing money is in an entirely different category than is the inactive man.

It does not seem fair to recall those in the inactive reserve until all those who have been receiving money for their services have been recalled. The following letters are self-explanatory:

TROUBLES, AGE, AND WORRY SAP MORALE OF RESERVISTS

EDITOR, BEACON JOURNAL:

I have just returned from a 6-day visit to Fort Lawton, Wash., where, living on the post during that time, I was in an excellent position to observe the general morale in the camp.

I found that the morale of the Regular Army officers and enlisted men there is good. I did not find, however, that this condition exists with the inactive reservists, category four, who were activated only a month ago and were already packed up and waiting shipment there for Japan and Korea.

My observations, of course, deal with more than 100 Ohio inactive reservists who have received direct overseas orders and not with the many thousands of other inactive reservists who have been called recently into the armed services. But I imagine that if they, too, received direct orders for overseas, this same lack of morale probably exists in their cases also.

The chief complaints of these men are:

They have been called back into the service with no consideration shown them by the Army in regard to their personal responsibilities at home or for hardships which are being suffered by many of their families while they are away. Many of the men made application for hardship appeals while at Fort Lawton, but these applications were turned down.

They also complain bitterly against the Army's system of calling them directly to overseas active service (combat in most cases) while much of the Regular Army and many of the active reservist units remain comfortably safe in the States.

They further complain that they, who have had no Army training since their release several years ago, are being given a mere 96-hour refreaher classaroom and field training course before they are shipped to Japan and Korea. Furthermore they are angered that the firing weapon they trained with during this 96 hours was an old type carbine. As far as the men could learn, they will use a new type carbine in the Korean battle.

They also were instructed that they would use a new 57-millimeter recoilless gun. The men received classroom instruction on firing this gun. But not one of the men who will use this gun has ever seen it fired.

There are other complaints, but I feel they can be set down to the usual Army spirit of grousing.

For your added information I would like to list a few personal hardship cases which I ran across in this group of men. Worries at home are one of the chief reasons why these men feel they should not be sent overseas and into battle for a second time.

One case is a first lieutenant from Cuyahoga Falls. He went into the Army for the first time when he was 18. Of his 4 years in World War II service, two of them were spent overseas. He had three tanks shot out from under him. He was hospitalized twice for wounds received in action and his feet were frozen once.

This man was an outstanding soldier in the Second World War. He was commissioned on the battlefield and also received the Silver and Bronze Stars. But he had had enough of Army life and upon his release he refused to sign a paper joining a reservist unit.

Today this man is on a ship heading for Japan en route to Korea. His orders are that he will lead a platoon of tanks.

At home he leaves an 18-month-old daughter and a wife who, in a few days, will undergo an operation. He has the usual mortgage and other financial responsibilities, and his Army pay is about half what he was receiving in civilian life.

The lieutenant is more than mad. He feels he has been literally shanghaied.

What is his attitude about going overseas again? He says, "I hope my men are brave, because they are going to have the yellowest platoon leader that ever set foot in Korea."

There is the infantry captain from Youngstown with a bad case of varicose veins. The Army passed him on his physical. But at Fort Lawton one Army doctor advised the captain "not to be on your feet much."

Another captain comes from Perry, Ohio. The man has already spent 6 years in the Army. Now his wife must sell their home because they cannot afford to keep it. The captain has two sons, aged 6 and 2. The oldest son has been and will be bedfast for some time with rheumatic fever. The captain stated also that he would probably be more of a hindrance than a help to the defense effort.

Other men with problems just as bad or even worse are more inclined to brooding rather than talking about the positions in which they find themselves and their families. Others are making more of a career of silent, gloomy drinking than of learning to be handy with a rifle or bayonet.

The average age for infantry platoon leaders in this group is over 30. The men not only feel their responsibilities weighing on their shoulders but they also feel their age.

One captain from Painesville spent 18 months overseas in World War II. The man is now 40 years old. He feels he is hardly at an age when he can keep up with 19- or 20-year-olds, much less lead them in battle.

An Akron lieutenant served 4 years in World War II, two of these years being spent in Africa and Europe. Up until the Army recalled him he was receiving 20-percent disability compensation for wounds he received in Europe. During field training at Fort Lawton the wounded leg flared up again. The lieutenant was still limping badly when I saw him 5 days after his training was finished.

He is also angry. Besides the leg trouble the lieutenant has a wife, two small stepchildren, a mortgage on the house, and his wife had just written him that they will have a child in August.

The man honestly does not want to be away from home under these circumstances. His worries are certainly not about how to fight the enemy. Like the rest of the officers he will spend his waking hours thinking of ways to protect himself so as to get home safely.

I wonder if something can be done to help relieve some of the worst hardship cases of these inactive reservists who have been sent overseas. I feel that a directive releasing those with three dependents or those who have already seen combat duty in World War II and were wounded in this combat would be extremely helpful to the morale of these men.

At least, thereby, even those who would not be affected by such directives would realize that they have not been entirely forgotten by their Government.

I also believe that for efficiency purposes these men now are unhelpful, uneconomical, and a liability to our defense effort. Many of them would be more helpful as civilians than if they continue to serve their country grudgingly.

VIRGINIA ROLLER BATDORFF.

THE MID-WEST INSURANCE AGENCY CO.,
CLEVELAND, OHIO, *February 22, 1951.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. AYRES: During a recent address before a group of our local executives, at the Akron City Club, I am informed you expressed disfavor of the method now employed by the armed services of recalling inactive reservists to active duty when no apparent critical need or actual duty assignment exists. The above was relayed to me by my father, W. H. Hackett, of B. F. Goodrich, whom you may recall having met after the dinner.

It is particularly heartening to learn of your views toward this subject as I am one of those inactive reservists apparently looked upon by the Army as essential to the redevelopment of the service. I am inactive to the extent of never having participated in a single Reserve activity since release from active duty in 1946. I have never spent 5 minutes on Reserve matters or accepted 5 cents of the so-called participation pay for spending 2 hours an evening for a full day's salary.

My Reserve activity has so far consisted of signing my name on the Reserve list when separated at Camp Shelby, after I had been asked, "If your country was attacked again would you be willing to serve?" There is but one answer to that question and my signature followed. Attempting not to burden you with a lengthy letter, the following is my present status:

1. Head up insurance agency business (six employees) which would be forced to cease operations with my recall to the service. No available successor.

2. Four-year veteran (Capt., MI), age 34, wife and two small children. Health questionable.

3. Now on 90-day delay in call, ordered to report to Reception Center, Fort Meade, Md., April 16, 1951.

My situation obviously parallels hundreds of those in similar circumstances and like others of our generation I ask the question, "Just where does the end of our responsibility to the Government lie?" I do not believe it fair or just, nor do I believe the Government feels it so that any veteran of 4 years service should be recalled at the expense of his financial ruin, personal and family hardship. To be uprooted from a position which has taken years to obtain and faced with the proposition of starting all over again (?) years later is a burden unfairly imposed upon the writer or any other person similarly situated. If I honestly felt that my efforts in an Army uniform could be of any measurable assistance to the present effort I might feel less embittered toward having to make the required sacrifices. Ten years ago the burden of my responsibilities was not an issue; let those of fewer responsibilities fill the required quotas now.

The consensus appears that inactive reservists are receiving little if any consideration in matters relating to their personal, family, or business responsibilities. To substantiate this I enclose copy of my letter written December 18, 1950, requesting a 6-month delay in call, which, I was informed, was in every event required prior to making application for discharge from the Reserve program altogether. Instead of 6 months, I received 90 days. As one small-business man to another, would your reaction to the prospect of losing your business and fortune be much different than mine?

All that is asked is an honest review of individual cases rather than the present cursory treatment all too frequently afforded by lower echelon subordinates. If such a review was made many injustices would be obviated. Your voice in behalf of those of our unfortunate generation, or category, will be greatly appreciated.

Looking forward to your early reply, I am,

Very truly yours,

J. R. HACKETT.

AKRON, OHIO, *December 19, 1950.*

Subject: Delay in call to active duty, Capt. James R. Hackett, MI, United States Air Reserve.

ADJUTANT GENERAL, STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is respectfully invited and thorough consideration earnestly solicited to the following circumstances responsible for prompting the writer's request for a maximum or indefinite delay in call to active duty.

The undersigned is president of a company, employing six persons, which would be forced to cease operations with my departure. The writer would, in addition, experience extreme personal and financial hardship in being called to active duty as of January 17, 1951. My leaving would unquestionably cause a dissolution of a business enterprise, founded and incorporated in 1925, and involve loss of personal fortune.

The unfortunate aspect of the situation lies in the lack of an available successor or adequate replacement who could carry on in the writer's absence. Our personnel includes but one other man, whose health will not permit his working more than a maximum of 2 hours per day. This person (Mr. M. J. O'Connor) has but within the past month returned to work following a third heart attack within the past 14 months and his condition will not permit an additional burden without risk of fatal consequences.

The business of the Mid-West Insurance Agency Co. primarily involves the procurement of insurance protection for large manufacturing concerns who are presently engaged in the production of vitally essential war material, including airplanes, airships, rubber, and classified weapons. In order to serve these industries, the services of qualified and experienced persons are necessarily required. As such persons are not readily obtainable on such short notice, a delay in call is of paramount importance to our clients as well as the future existence of our company.

In view of the above, the undersigned indeed trusts and most urgently requests that favorable consideration be made for a 6-month delay in call. I shall indeed be pleased to supply any additional information required, or appear in person, at my expense, to further enlarge upon the paramount importance of my request.

Yours very truly,

J. R. HACKETT,
Captain, MI, United States Air Reserve.

Legalized Scientific Pocket Picking of American Taxpayers Must End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have now reached the stage in the New Deal-Fair Deal administration where the pockets of the American people are being legally and scientifically picked to support all kinds of programs entirely foreign to the concepts of constitutional government and the ideals of the founders of this Republic.

Our people are being taxed to provide gifts, hand-outs, and bribes, or loans, if you please, to nations in various parts of the world.

The tax burden is now almost unbearable for those in the lower-income groups; and if this burden gets any heavier, it will remove one of the principal incentives to the competitive free-enterprise system which has made this country truly a free nation.

Today many of our small-business men find that they are unable to buy the necessary nonferrous metals needed in their normal trade.

Already copper, lead, zinc, nickel, and many other nonferrous metals have been placed under strict controls.

Meanwhile, the American consumer or businessman who cannot get these nonferrous metals is being taxed to supply the gift dollars with which the Marshall-plan nations have been and still are obtaining these critical and strategic metals from this country.

Mr. Speaker, in the period from April 3, 1948, through September 30, 1950, the Marshall-plan countries have received over $100,000,000 worth of copper, lead, zinc, and nickel from United States production. Besides, we have paid for many millions of pounds bought from Canada, Latin-American countries, and other sources. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress must act to stop this legalized pocket picking of the American people for the benefit of the people of other countries.

To illustrate the folly of our ways, I submit as a part of my remarks, under consent heretofore granted, a table from the Washington News Bulletin of February 28, 1951, detailing the shipments of nonferrous metals to the Marshall-plan countries from the United States:

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN STRATEGIC NONFERROUS METALS SHIPPED TO EUROPE UNDER ECA PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS

From the commencement of the ECA aid programs, cumulative paid shipments of copper, lead, zinc, nickel, brass, and bronze, and other nonferrous metals, through September 30, 1950, total well over $100,000,000. Other procurement authorizations made in the past 5 months will considerably increase the total of our gift shipments to the Marshall-plan countries. Many of the shipments were authorized at the very time the

Economic Stabilization Agency was placing restrictions on domestic uses of such strategic nonferrous metals.

The details of the cumulative paid shipments, in dollar volume, are shown in the table following:

Paid shipments of nonferrous metals to ECA countries for the period from Apr. 3, 1948, to Sept. 30, 1950

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Copper	Lead	Zinc	Nickel	Brass, bronze
Austria	2,077		222	24	722
Belgium-Luxemburg				10	
Denmark	3,788	43	923		77
France	18,876	1,370	1,736	440	4,952
Germany	7,874		1,640	3	
Greece	222		10	3	16
Italy	11,125				
Iceland	10				3
Netherlands	16,983	49	2,663	202	608
Norway	1,233				5
Sweden	10				58
Trieste			34		
United Kingdom	4,711	527	17,840		
Total	66,909	1,989	25,068	682	6,441

Besides the metals listed above, a total of $8,846,000 in other nonferrous metals, excluding aluminum, but including precious and semiprecious metals were also shipped.

As the further shipments authorized by ECA go forward, the domestic supplies in our own stockpiles will dwindle, so that American consumers and especially small-business men who handle items requiring these metals will be sorely pressed to find appropriate substitutes.

Tribute to Lewis H. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1951, which is a particularly appropriate tribute to a great American, Mr. Lewis H. Brown, whose death occurred on Monday, February 26, 1951. I also ask that there be printed an editorial from the Herald Tribune of February 28 relative to Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown devoted himself unselfishly to public affairs as well as to his personal business, in which he was an outstanding success.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1951]

LEWIS BROWN, JOHNS-MANVILLE CHAIRMAN, DIES—SUFFERED HEART ATTACK IN FLORIDA; NOTED FOR LIBERAL CREED OF MANAGEMENT

DELRAY BEACH, FLA., February 26.—Lewis H. Brown, 57, chairman of the board and chief executive of the Johns-Manville Corp., died unexpectedly of a heart ailment here this morning. Apparently in good health, he had come here for a few days' rest. His home was in Deer Park, Greenwich, Conn.

Mr. Brown was born in Creston, Iowa, and began working on a farm at the age of 10. He worked his way through the University of Iowa and was graduated in 1915. He began his business career in the sales department of the Fort Wayne Corrugated Paper Co., but left in May 1917 to join the Army. He served in France as a captain of infantry until May 1919.

On his return he was engaged by Montgomery Ward & Co. in the personnel department, and within 8 years was assistant general operating manager of all plants. The late T. F. Merseles, then president of Montgomery & Ward, took Mr. Brown with him as assistant when he became president of Johns-Manville in 1927. Mr. Brown succeeded him to that post on his death in 1929.

As a manufacturer of housing materials, Mr. Brown pioneered in encouraging self-liquidating mortgages during the depression. He was also among the first business executives to adopt the 40-hour week and collective bargaining polices before they became law, to hold regional informal stockholders' meetings and make financial reports to employees, and to indemnify directors for expenses resulting from litigation involving the company. In 1938 he promulgated a creed of management embodying the principle that business management is a trusteeship for the mutual benefit of stockholders, employees, customers, and the public.

Mr. Brown was the first recipient of the Vermilye Medal of the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania in 1939. He also received the Medal for Merit in 1946 as a result of his services as adviser to the Army Chief of Ordnance during World War II.

He was elected chairman of the board of Johns-Manville in 1946. He was also a director of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Surviving are his wife, the former Mary A. Allen, and three daughters, Mrs. Edward Townsend, Mrs. William Homer Sweney, Jr., and Mrs. Charles E. B. Griggs.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1951]

LEWIS H. BROWN

Lewis H. Brown, who at 35 became president of one of the country's great corporations, lived well and usefully throughout his 57 years. A farmer in his youth, a captain of infantry in France during the First World War, an outstanding leader of the business world, he knew many kinds of work and responsibility, facing them all with energy and breadth of view. It was in the Johns-Manville Corp., however, that he found the chief outlet for both his administrative ability and his vision. He pioneered in the field of self-liquidating mortgages during the depression; was in the van in introducing the 40-hour week and collective bargaining, and brought both stockholders and employees into close participation in the company's progress. As president and later as chairman of the board, Mr. Brown made the name of Johns-Manville synonymous with sound products and enlightened management.

Inevitably there came to him calls for a wider service, and he responded to these in a characteristic spirit. His best known governmental work was his survey of Western Germany, made in 1947 at the request of General Clay. His conclusions, set forth in a lively volume, foreshadowed many of the economic developments which have since taken place in that area. But this was only one of many public undertakings; and the last began this month, when Mr. Eric Johnston named him to an advisory committee to help in problems of economic stabilization. His unexpected death has deprived the country of a citizen whose services would have been of great and growing value in difficult days.

Responsibility of Public in Guarding Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington newspapers recently an article by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which cites the responsibility of the public in guarding our security. This article was prepared at the request of the Associated Press. It diagrams the responsibility in the security field, including the role of the private citizen. I ask that the article be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

FBI CHIEF CITES RESPONSIBILITY OF PUBLIC IN GUARDING SECURITY

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The internal security of the United States can be maintained only with the full cooperation of all patriotic Americans. As our mobilization program becomes a reality we must expect that those who would like to weaken America will move into action.

The Communist Party, United States of America, has become more and more an underground organization.

It is imperative that the public understand the present program of security and know the duties of the various agencies which have been designated to guard the Nation's military and economic secrets from foreign agents and its vital industrial facilities and critical areas from potential saboteurs and subversive groups within the country.

Every loyal citizen has a share in this responsibility and if he knows and understands the importance of his role as it relates to the general program, the task ahead will be approached with national unity and full confidence. The plan is cast on a Nation-wide basis. Certain investigative responsibilities have been delegated to various agencies of the Federal Government.

RESPONSIBILITIES ARE OUTLINED

The public is aware that the FBI has been given the general responsibility for the investigation of espionage, sabotage and subversive activities within the United States under the security program as defined by Executive orders and congressional enactments. Other phases of the responsibility have been assigned to various other agencies of the Government, for instance:

The United States Coast Guard has the primary responsibility for the security and safety of the Nation's harbors and water fronts.

The prevention of the illegal entry of aliens into the United States is the responsibility of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The United States customs service of the Treasury Department has the responsibility for detecting the entry of contraband into the country as well as the export of restricted materials from the United States. This includes the exporting of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which require an export license.

The exportation of critical materials from the United States is prohibited by the Export Control Act unless such shipments are licensed by the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce. Such shipments are policed by the Bureau of Customs and the Office of International Trade investigates violations of the Export Control Act. Also in the Department of Commerce, the Office of Technical Services acts as a clearing house for businessmen, scientists, public officials, and private citizens who would like to get the views of appropriate Government agencies regarding the advisability of releasing or withholding specific technical information in their possession.

RADIO CONTROL UNDER FCC

The Federal Communications Commission has the responsibility for detecting the operation of unauthorized and clandestine radio transmitting stations within the confines of the United States and the Territorial possessions.

The issuance of visas for aliens to visit this country and passports for Americans going abroad is strictly a function of the State Department.

The Atomic Energy Commission has the responsibility for the physical security of all atomic installations. It is also responsible for the security of classified documents and records within the confines of these installations and for personnel security.

The security of military and naval reservations as well as the investigation of civilian personnel for employment on these reservations is the duty of the intelligence and security agencies of the armed services.

The physical protection of the Nation's industrial plants engaged in the manufacture of materials vital to the defense effort is handled by the Munitions Board under the Office of Secretary of Defense. The Munitions Board is responsible for formulating the policies, procedures, and standards from a security standpoint in those plants manufacturing defense materials.

FBI COMBATS ESPIONAGE

The general responsibility for coordinating the investigations of espionage, counter-espionage, sabotage, subversive, and other related intelligence matters within the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico is a specific responsibility of the FBI.

Intelligence operations outside the continental limits of the United States and its Territories and possessions are handled by the Central Intelligence Agency and not by the FBI.

Through established channels of liaison there is a free flow of information between the various agencies which have designated responsibilities in the various fields pertaining to our national security.

In the Presidential directives of 1939, 1943, and July 24, 1950, which established the FBI's basic responsibilities in the internal security field, each individual citizen was requested by the President to assist in carrying out these duties by promptly reporting directly to the FBI all information which relates to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities. This is a responsibility placed on all loyal citizens and patriotic organizations and a role which is vital to the successful operation of the Nation's general security program.

The FBI's function in the security field is purely investigative in nature. It does not grant clearances of any type, nor does it classify any individual or organization as subversive.

Espionage may be generally defined as the obtaining of confidential information regarding the national defense and furnishing it to unauthorized persons to the detriment of the United States or the advantage of a foreign power.

Sabotage is any act designed to destroy or damage national defense materials—to impede production, injure plant premises, to destroy public utilities, or to produce defective national defense goods.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY STRESSED

Under the term "subversive activities" would be activities on the part of any individual or organization which are intended to forcibly overthrow the American Government or to give aid to its enemies.

While these are only general definitions, the public should be alert to report all information directly to the FBI which relates to the following specific matters:

1. Allegations of espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities.
2. Foreign submarine landings.
3. Suspicious parachute landings.
4. Possession and distribution of foreign-inspired propaganda.
5. Theft or unauthorized possession or purchase of large quantities of firearms, ammunition, or explosives, or short-wave transmitters and receivers.
6. Poisoning of public water supplies.
7. Chartering of airplanes for flights over restricted areas.
8. Fires and explosions of an unusual nature affecting any phase of the defense program.
9. Suspicious individuals loitering near restricted areas.
10. Possession of radio-active materials.

The protection of the Nation's internal security is a twofold responsibility. It must encompass not only the safeguarding of the Nation's secrets and vital areas, but also guarantee that the civil liberties of the citizen himself will not be violated.

Private citizens are warned against attempting to conduct their own investigations or engage in the circulation of malicious gossip or idle rumor. Vigilante action and "witch-hunts" only contribute to hysteria. The task at hand must be carried out in a calm and organized manner if the results are to be effective.

Local, county, and State police agencies since the inception of the emergency have been lending their assistance to the FBI and plans have been worked out to meet any eventuality which might arise.

By making their information available to the FBI and the other interested agencies of the Government, without attempts at evaluation or to draw conclusions, private citizens, law enforcement agencies, and patriotic organizations will not only be safeguarding the rights of the innocent, but will also be making their own important contribution to the Nation's general internal security program.

Development of the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on February 14, 1951, Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power Development, addressed the annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association in Lincoln, Nebr.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Secretary Warne's speech inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

AN ACHIEVEMENT IN COORDINATION

(By William E. Warne)

A new standard in cooperation and coordination has been established by the Federal and State agencies engaged in the development of water resources in the Missouri River Basin. The differing backgrounds, interests, and authorities of these agencies have been successfully blended in the spirit of doing well a very large and complex task.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, incorporating the approval of the Pick-Sloan plan, enunciated a refreshingly new concept of basin-wide development. It was the first clear policy statement by the Federal Government on the problem in the West of the interrelationship of water and other resources. It recognized conservation and control of water and soil as the key to broad-scale use of all resources and to general economic expansion in the Missouri River Basin. It placed irrigation and other repayment determinations on a regional basis for the first time. This made possible the carrying out of an irrigation program in the high plains where the reclamation law, by itself, had proved inadequate.

The legislation approving the Missouri Basin project created no new Federal department or agency. Instead it provided a vehicle whereby the existing agencies, through joint effort, could do the job that needed to be done. The Missouri Basin plan put all the Federal programs for water and related resource development into the same hopper where they were fed into an over-all plan, and provided a means for drawing out the elements one by one in accordance with that plan. Some of the individual programs had to be speeded up. Some had to be broadened. Every one of them had to be geared to the needs of the whole and to the tempo of all the others.

The strength of the plan is derived in large part from its flexibility and its responsiveness to the needs of the people in the basin.

But the authorization of the program was only the foundation. We can be proud of the structure which is being erected on that foundation.

The Missouri River Basin occupies one-sixth of all the area in the continental United States. Ten States are drained in whole or in part by the Missouri River. Water use and control, or lack of it, in the upstream States obviously has a profound effect on those downstream. Clearly the task was beyond the scope and authority of the State governments. Nevertheless, each State has its own rightful interests in the

way its resources are developed through the Federal project.

The Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was established to provide a formal means whereby coordination could be achieved among the Federal agencies involved and, no less importantly, between these Federal agencies and agencies of the States of the basin. This committee was established in 1945 by the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee, just a few months after the Missouri Basin plan was enacted into law. The Missouri Basin Interagency Committee includes representatives of five departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and five State governors, selected by the chief executives of the 10 Missouri Basin States. All 10 governors belong to a parallel Missouri River States Committee. The five Federal members of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee are the Departments of the Army, the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission. Since its organization, the committee has held 45 meetings in cities throughout the region.

At each meeting of the committee, the Federal representatives discuss what is being done and what is being planned. The host State and local agencies discuss their programs that are affected by the Federal project. These presentations are frank and open. They are fully reported to the people through the press and radio.

Many times there has been disagreement in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. Strenuous opposition has developed to a number of the proposals advanced by the Federal or State members. But from the discussion there has come understanding and adjustment, and there has developed strong support for the coordinated plan and the way it is being carried out. Never in its 5-year history has the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee faced a difference it was unable to settle. Machinery exists whereby unresolved questions can be referred by the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee to the top level Federal Interagency River Basin Committee in Washington. But the Missouri group has so far not found it necessary to use that machinery.

One of the most useful contributions of the Interagency Committee to the orderly development of the Missouri River Basin project has been the publication annually of a moving 6-year program. This program contains the advance plans for investigation, construction, and operation of the related features of the project by all of the Federal and State agencies having an interest in it throughout the basin. By this means, every agency, Federal or State, engaged in the program is advised 6 years in advance as to exactly what is contemplated by all the other agencies. Through the same medium, the people of the basin learn of the work contemplated and can see what adjustments in the program they might find to be desirable.

The coordination machinery operates in a broad field. The Interagency Committee deals not only with dams, reservoirs, and levees, power plants, and transmission lines—the impressive engineering structures. The committee also deals with other phases of resource development such as soil conservation, enhancement of fish and wildlife values, investigation and development of minerals, acquisition of basic data, and watershed management.

The recently issued report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission advocates the principle of "One basin—one plan." This is the same objective we have been pursuing here in the Missouri River Basin. That report may lead to further strengthening of river-basin planning, carried out on an integrated basis.

The policy of coordination in the Missouri Basin has been effectively applied at levels of Government below that of the Interagency Committee. The Missouri Basin Field Committee of the Interior Department, for example, brings together for coordination and long-range program development the principal field administrators of the seven departmental bureaus working on the Missouri Basin project. This type of coordination is geared to the work of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. The field committee chairman represents the Department of the Interior on the Interagency Committee.

Another example of secondary coordination, this time on the State level, is found right here in Nebraska. In all of the States of the basin, there are agencies whose business is resource development. In your own State, you have the Department of Roads and Irrigation. But you also have the recently formed Nebraska Coordinating Committee.

The job of this coordinating committee, as Governor Peterson so aptly put it, is to act as a clearing house and to provide a means of facilitating and implementing the Missouri River Basin project as it concerns the State. The Governor said that he was anxious that the State should not be found wanting. He wanted the committee to be in a position properly to inform him of the developments, the possibilities, the problems, and the suggested action programs in order to assist him in his work in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee.

The Nebraska Coordinating Committee held its first meeting a little over a year ago. Since that time it has done a yeoman service toward bringing an understanding of the Missouri River Basin project into every farm and town in Nebraska. This is the sort of cooperation and coordination that will guarantee the successful culmination of the Missouri Basin project.

Let's look at a couple of specific examples of how this coordination machinery has worked in providing recognition of State views on the development of the Missouri River Basin.

Some time ago, Avery Batson, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, explained in an interagency meeting the plan for Glendo Dam and Reservoir on the North Platte River in Wyoming. The North Platte River, as you know, is an interstate stream and involves Nebraska, Wyoming, and to some extent, Colorado. Governor Peterson told the committee that the State of Nebraska would not go along with the Glendo plan the way it was originally drawn. He asked that more study be given to the plan with particular reference to the height of the dam and its effect on the water supply for projects already built in Nebraska and those in prospect. The Bureau of Reclamation took another look; in fact, it took several looks. The Bureau drew up a number of alternative plans for the operation of the reservoir. It also made additional extensive studies of the effect of the reservoir on the water in the stream. The discussions continued until a plan was proposed which seemed agreeable to all the parties concerned. As soon as that plan is formally agreed to, construction at Glendo can proceed.

Here's another example. About a year ago, at one of the regular interagency meetings, Governor Mickelson, of South Dakota, and Governor Aandahl, of North Dakota, expressed concern lest their States be precluded from securing power from the main-stem hydroelectric plants. The two Governors urged that the power policy of the Interior Department be set forth clearly in order that their States could plan to make the best use of the power that was to become available. The Secretary of the Interior enunciated a policy. Everyone concerned took another look at the immediate needs for power. Your Governor announced that he felt North Dakota and South Dakota should have their fair share of the kilowatts available. Action followed in those two States. Transmission lines are being constructed there today. An equitable solution was found for another knotty problem.

The machinery of coordination in the Missouri Basin has been a revelation to all of us, even those of us who helped to plan it. This pattern of coordination and cooperation is getting results in the Missouri Basin, results in terms of control of floods, of concrete and steel placed in dams, results in the form of irrigated agriculture and in kilowatts of low-cost energy.

As of today 17 dams in the basin with an aggregate storage capacity of somewhat more than 3,000,000 acre-feet have been completed or nearly so since the Missouri Basin overall plan was approved. These are in addition to the two score Federal reservoirs in the basin which were constructed under previous authorizations and which have a total capacity of about 23,000,000 acre-feet.

In 1946 Federal hydroelectric power plants in the Missouri River Basin generated 384,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power. In 1950, the Federal power plants increased their generation by approximately 75 percent to over 607,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

During 1950, two additional power plants were put into initial operation, Estes in Colorado and Kortes in Wyoming. Kortes is the first power plant to be finished under the Pick-Sloan authorizations. The two new plants have an ultimate capacity of 81,000 kilowatts.

Irrigation development has proceeded at a somewhat slower pace primarily because it must await development of storage facilities. So far irrigation water has been supplied to 50,000 acres of new lands, largely in extensions of projects authorized prior to the adoption of the Pick-Sloan plan.

Already a great deal of effective flood control has been provided by the dams, reservoirs, and other works which have been built. Even now many communities which formerly were devastated by floodwaters are relatively safe from further damage on this account. Last year, floods which would have caused hundreds of thousands of dollars in damages at Mandan, N. Dak., were averted by the storage in the Heart Butte Dam, completed shortly before. Here in Nebraska, the people who live in the upper Republican River Valley have new security, provided by the Enders and Medicine Creek Dams, against the flood rampages of that unruly stream.

Fish and wildlife resources have been maintained and improved, and the beginnings of development of new recreational sites are taking shape.

Construction is now going on at 11 dams with reservoirs having a combined storage capacity of 56,000,000 acre-feet. When they are all completed, major floods arising in the upper main stem of the Missouri River will be only an unhappy memory. The hydroelectric power plants of projects under construction will have an aggregate installed capacity exceeding 750,000 kilowatts by the middle 1950's. Another 750,000 kilowatts will be ready by the end of the decade. The Missouri Basin project backbone transmission lines completed or under construction have a combined length of over 2,400 miles. Irrigation distribution systems to serve 850,000 acres are under way.

It will be apparent, from these facts, that construction of the Missouri River Basin project is in high gear. The region is on the verge of realizing tremendous benefits. Now is the time to push forward harder than ever.

Let us look for a moment at the activities of the Missouri River Basin project in the Cornhusker State. Nebraska's share of the over-all basin project will include, ultimately, the irrigation of approximately 1,400,000 acres of new land, the provision of supplemental water supplies for an additional 400,000 acres now irrigated, and the installation of hydroelectric generating capacity totaling 67,000 kilowatts. In addi-

tion, Nebraska will share in the production from main-stem power plants, notably Fort Randall and Gavins Point, near its borders. Storage reservoirs planned for Nebraska call for 4,000,000 acre-feet behind 23 dams.

So far, the Medicine Creek and Enders Dams have been completed, providing 167,000 acre-feet of storage capacity. Harlan County and Trenton Dams, currently under construction, will provide an additional 1,100,000 acre-feet of storage.

In August 1950, a 115-kilovolt line was completed from the Fort Randall dam site in South Dakota to O'Neill, Nebr. Lines from Casper, Wyo., to Gering, from Gering to Sidney and Alliance, and from Sidney to Sterling, Colo., were also finished during 1950. Construction is under way on lines from Alliance to Chadron, from Sidney to Ogallala, and from Pine Bluff, Wyo., to Kimball.

These lines will strengthen the State network bringing power to markets which need it urgently. Negotiations are now under way to coordinate the Federal power development with the State public power developments for the benefit of the people in Nebraska. This coordination is expected to make available to Nebraskans adequate low-cost power without jeopardizing State investments already made. We expect that public-power Nebraska will share fully in the Federal hydroelectric power development of the basin.

Recently 11,500 acres were added to the Mirage Flats project in the Niobrara Valley near Hay Springs. Investigations are being made to determine the feasibility of other irrigation in the Platte and Niobrara Valleys.

On the Missouri itself, the major construction job in Nebraska has been the Omaha project of the corps of engineers. It consists of levees and flood walls which proved very effective in the 1950 flood. Remaining work consists of completion of internal drainage and pumping station facilities and revetment work. Bank stabilization and channel improvement continues as funds permit.

The coordination which has achieved such fine results in the planning and construction of the project thus far will be carried on and intensified. It will be continued, I hope, into the operation phase of the project to assure that the benefits of basin-wide development on a coordinated basis will be fully realized.

An interagency subcommittee is now collecting data on water supplies, use, and requirements in the Missouri River Basin. These data will be useful in the development of a plan for coordinated reservoir operations so that the reservoir system will provide maximum benefits in the generation of power, the control of floods, the irrigation of land, and the other purposes of the project. Here again these results are expected to be achieved through existing agencies by means of voluntary coordination, with adequate recognition of State interests.

The spirit behind the coordination in the Missouri River Basin, the universal desire to see the project carried to its conclusion, is something that you can't write into law and you can't create artificially. Fortunately, it was here in the Missouri Basin, even before the Missouri Basin plan was formulated, and it has grown stronger as the Missouri Basin project has evolved.

The economic power that the project has added and will add to the Nation stems not alone from the reservoirs and the hydroelectric plants. The vigor of the project and its benefits to America are founded no less in the demonstrated desire of the people in the Missouri Basin to work in harmony with their Federal and State Governments, a desire which has been fully reciprocated by these governments in pushing toward the splendid goals of the project.

Conditions in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a special dispatch from India, recently published in the Saturday Review of Literature. This dispatch was sent by Mr. Norman L. Cousins, the editor of the Saturday Review, who has been touring in Asia. He makes some very interesting observations on conditions in India which are pertinent in connection with our forthcoming consideration of legislation for emergency food aid to India.

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

NEW DELHI.—Once you have seen the look of hunger on the face of a man it is difficult to put it out of your mind. I have seen the look of hunger on the faces of thousands of men, and I know I shall never forget it.

I first saw the hungry in a jail on the island of Ceylon. They were illegal immigrants fleeing the famine in the south of India, and the Government of Ceylon was detaining them in a prison in Jaffna until arrangements could be worked out for their return to India. They had come by small boat, landing during the night on the north coast of Ceylon, where some of them had been picked up by the police. No one knew how many Indians had fled to Ceylon in this manner.

In the jail at Jaffna I spoke to a woman of 55 who looked closer to 80. I doubt that she weighed 80 pounds. Her face was little more than a bare skull out of which small eyes glowed feverishly. She had come to Ceylon to join her married daughter, who had escaped successfully 2 months earlier. This much she was willing to tell, but she would not tell the police where her daughter might be found, even though it meant she herself would be returned to India alone.

I next saw the hungry in the south of India, where the suffering is most acute. I saw them against a background of parched and browned fields, with pale stubbles where rich rice paddies should have been. The reason for it was that the rains never came this year. They didn't come last year either, or the year before that, or the year before that.

"Four years, no monsoon," one of the elders in a village 40 miles from Madras told me. "The older people have thought hard but they do not remember when before the fields have been so dry. The wells are very low."

He looked up at the scudding clouds.

"Clouds like this used to bring rain. Now they go out to sea and drop their rain where there is no need of it. The old people can eat little. If they are thin, it is no great harm. Gandhi was thin. But the children are thin and they become sick quickly. Smallpox has killed many of them. Thirty had smallpox in this village. Sixteen died.

"We send men into the cities to work so they can buy rice to bring back to the village. But there is so little rice and the rations have been cut again, and what they bring back cannot fill the bowls of many persons. We eat what we can—bananas and some cocoanuts—but very many people here are starving."

I next saw the faces of the hungry on the streets of Calcutta. Many of them were homeless. They had lost their homes during the partition of India when Pakistan was created. They were Hindus, who feared the Muslims, and they had abandoned their homes in Pakistan and crossed over into India. In India there are perhaps twelve or fifteen million such refugees—it might be millions more; no one knows exactly how many. Thousands of them came into Calcutta, the world's largest city, looking for food and homes. They slept in the street. Wherever you went at night, on the main thoroughfares or in the alleys or in the hallways, you could see the human forms huddled together against the cool night. During the day they waited in lines for Government food or they begged.

Near the luxurious Grand Hotel in Calcutta was a child of 8 or 9, with not enough clothes to conceal the bloated, empty belly of hunger. He was looking in the streets for scraps of food. Near by was a young woman of about 20, her body covered by the rags of what once must have been a handsome sari. A child of 2 was on her hip. The child was badly undernourished and his head rested on his mother's shoulder. His face was empty and expressionless.

I also saw the hungry of Bangalore. They sat against the walls of buildings and waited.

Then I saw them in Delhi. There are more of the hungry and homeless in Delhi than in any other city in the world. As in Calcutta, many of them are refugees—maybe 500,000 or 600,000—and they have crowded into the city, setting up crude wood-and-straw shelters, most of them closet size. And every day the dead are carried out—by men who are little more than half-alive themselves. I stood on the corner of a busy street in Delhi and watched the refugees as they passed. For a full hour I watched to see whether I could spot a single person out of thousands who would be considered plump by American standards. I saw only two.

The Indians are reluctant to talk about themselves or their hardships, but after a while I was able to win over the confidence of the attendant assigned to my room. He told me about his 6-year-old son, the one with tuberculosis. He said his son had been praying a great deal recently, much more than usual, and he had asked his son what he had been praying for. "My son was praying that he might die. He wanted to die and he wanted God to make him into a crow. I had told him about the crows that fly into the open windows of the hotel rooms and pick up food on the tables and then carry the food off. My son said he wanted to be a crow so he could fly wherever there was food and bring it back to our family."

Then the attendant, whose name was Arun, turned away from me and knelt down to fix the fire. "India has been hungry for many months," he said. "They are saying that America has known about this need and that America has not wished to send us food."

I replied that what he had been told was not true. What had happened was that we had been too slow in responding to India's need, and that was bad enough. Americans had to operate through their Government and often democratic government is slow in doing what has to be done promptly. I asked him to believe that millions of Americans were deeply concerned and were prodding our Government to action. I told him that we would do our best, our very best, and that the American people would be angry if any attempt were made to deprive other people of food because we might disagree with their leaders. * * *

Should we be so short-sighted as to send no wheat, let Congress finish the job. Let

Congress recall the appropriation for the Voice of America and for all our information services abroad. Let us shut down all our efforts to combat Communist propaganda against us. There is no point telling our story to the world if there is nothing for us to say. All the Voice of America can do is to try to provide a real, true account of what is happening in America. What we say can and should be a reflection of what we do.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need to speak to peoples and not only to governments. The most powerful language in the world today is food. It is clearly understood. It builds bridges mightier by far than radio broadcasts or published material, especially when people have no radios or cannot read.

My purpose in coming to India was to try to tell the Indian people about America and to try to answer the many lies being told about us. Those lies are aimed at splitting America off from the rest of the world.

Yet there is nothing Soviet propaganda can say about us that can do nearly the harm that we can do to ourselves if we should turn our back today not only on India but on the meaning of America itself.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Dispute Could Have Been Settled in 24 Hours," published in the February 1951 edition of Labor.

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

RAIL DISPUTE COULD HAVE BEEN SETTLED IN 24 HOURS—GOVERNMENT REFUSED RESPONSIBILITY AFTER SEIZING CARRIERS; CRACKED DOWN ON WORKERS

Labor wants to say once more—and it's an appropriate occasion to say it—the controversy over hours, wages, and rules on the railroads could have been settled at any time, and within 24 hours—if the Government, after seizing the railroads, had assumed the responsibility which attaches to control and operation of the Nation's transportation system.

Instead, an Army officer was made a mere figurehead for Uncle Sam, and the same old hard-boiled managements were left in full control of the carriers, their profits, and their employees' wages and working conditions. The managements felt they were sitting pretty, because railroad employees could not strike against the Government. The Government, so far as we know, did not make the slightest effort to adjust the employees' grievances.

Under those circumstances, management saw no need to make concessions. It was content to operate as usual, ignore the union's offers of settlement, and pocket the profits.

This was a deplorable and unnecessary situation and it has had, and will continue to have, most deplorable consequences. The best that can be said is that the President was ill-advised by his assistant, Dr. John R. Steelman. The latter did not know how to meet the problem, or did not desire to do so. But the President of the United States, busy as he is, could afford to take the time to acquaint himself with issues so vitally affecting railroad workers, the great railroad industry, and the entire Nation.

Labor repeats: If this controversy had been handled with ordinary common sense, it could have been settled within 24 hours on a basis just to the employees, the carriers, and the Nation.

Senatorial Election in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Miss Bertha Adkins, Republican national committeewoman from Maryland.

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

SALISBURY, MD., February 21, 1951.—Miss Bertha Adkins, Republican national committeewoman from Maryland, today issued the following statement:

"The voters of Maryland will resent the reflection upon their intelligence in the surprising statement of Millard E. Tydings before a subcommittee of the United States Senate.

"Ex-Senator Tydings now claims he was beaten last November by last-minute campaign literature. This statement contrasts strangely with the interview he gave to the United States News and World Report immediately following the election. Then he attributed his defeat to a factional fight within the Democratic Party in Maryland.

"Does Mr. Tydings feel compelled to blame his defeat on somebody—anybody—rather than himself? Has it ever occurred to him that Maryland voters, to the tune of a 43,000 plurality, preferred Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER?

"Let Mr. Tydings honestly face the facts. The recent election reflected the desire of Maryland citizens for a change. Our Republican Governor, Theodore M. McKeldin, received the biggest vote given any gubernatorial candidate—Democrat or Republican—in our State's history. Representative GLENN BEALL's plurality of 27,178 was the largest he ever received. Representative EDWARD T. MILLER's majority was 8,910 compared to 2,600 in 1948. General JAMES P. DEVEREUX carried the Second District by 3,000 votes against a Democratic plurality of 22,922 in 1948.

"The people of Maryland are intelligent, independent voters who want good government—and they vote their convictions. If the election for Senator were held tomorrow, I am convinced the plurality of the Republican candidate would be even larger than Senator BUTLER's because of the obviously inept and scandal-ridden administration of President Truman.

"Mr. Tydings said the pamphlet, From the Record, was sent into 500,000 Maryland homes in the last minute of the campaign. I have checked with Republican officials in the counties where Senator BUTLER received his large majorities. These officials have advised me that they didn't distribute this material nor can they find it was used in their counties. Here are the counties, and the majorities they gave Senator BUTLER:

"Montgomery, 5,000; Prince Georges, 5,000; Anne Arundel, 4,000; Allegany, 6,000; Washington, 4,000; Frederick, 2,000; Baltimore, 8,000; Wicomico, 500.

"How could the voters have been influenced by something which they never saw?

"Mr. Tydings has been in politics long enough to know that the custom of sending out last-minute campaign literature is so well established in Maryland that the voters have become immune to such appeals, whether true or false.

"He should accept his defeat with good grace."

Establish the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman KLEIN and I have introduced a bill to establish the office of Assistant Secretary of Fine Arts of the Department of the Interior. For as long as our great country has been in existence, the encouragement and development of the culture of the Nation has been an all-pervading and consistent desire. Many cultural institutions and organizations have thrived and added a dimension of color, brilliance, sensitivity, and understanding to our lives, and their significance increases as they preserve the cultural heritage and yearnings of our people. The infinite lift of morale which they engender can hardly be measured both in times of stress and in times of peace. It is the purpose of this bill further to encourage and assist the growth of the fine arts in the United States.

The Assistant Secretary of Fine Arts would be appointed by the President, not to control or direct but only to assist entities which are now engaged in the presentation, perpetuation, or development of the fine arts, and to aid civic nonprofit organizations in their endeavor to develop the fine arts, as expressed in the living drama, music, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet, dance, and the like. Civic nonprofit organizations are defined as any public or private foundation, charitable trust, accredited college or university, or other organization—whether or not incorporated—no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any of its stockholders or members.

In addition, performances and productions of civic nonprofit organizations would be exempt from the Federal admissions taxes. Educational, charitable, and other civic nonprofit institutions are tax exempt except in their presentations of fine-arts programs, one of the great cultural tasks which they were designed to perform. It is manifestly unfair to put obstacles in their development.

The widening horizon of cultural attainments and greatness which can be envisaged in our Nation is a limitless one.

No thought of domination, no inkling of control over the fine arts, can have a place in this endeavor, and is so stated specifically in the bill. The purpose of this bill, as clearly outlined in its provisions, is only to promote, encourage, and develop a richness already latent in our heritage.

The following is the text of the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act, in recognition of the tremendous contributions made by the fine arts to the morale, health, and general welfare of the Nation, to aid in preserving the priceless American cultural heritage from destruction by its enemies, foreign and domestic, and to encourage the growth and development of the fine arts throughout the United States.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. There shall be in the Department of the Interior an Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

SEC. 102. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fine Arts, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall—

(1) administer and have jurisdiction and control over the agencies, and exercise the functions, transferred by the President to the Department of the Interior under section 108 of this act;

(2) encourage and assist but not dominate or control civic nonprofit organizations in the presentation, perpetuation, and development of the fine arts in the United States.

SEC. 103. All agencies primarily engaged in the presentation, perpetuation, or development of the fine arts in the United States, and all functions exercised by other agencies with respect to the presentation, perpetuation, or development of the fine arts in the United States shall, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 104. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "fine arts" includes living drama and music, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet, and dance.

(2) The term "agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, including all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof; but such term does not include the Library of Congress or any agency under its jurisdiction or control.

(3) The term "civic nonprofit organization" means any public or private foundation, charitable trust, accredited college or university, or other organization (whether or not incorporated), no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any of its stockholders or members.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. Subchapter A of chapter 10 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on admissions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1705. Exemption From Tax.

"No tax shall be levied under this subchapter in respect of any admission to a performance, show, exhibit, or other production in the field of the fine arts conducted or presented by an organization engaged primarily in the conduct or presentation of such performances, shows, exhibits, or other productions, if no part of the net earnings of such organizations inures to the benefit of any of its stockholders or members. For the purposes of this section, the term 'fine arts' includes living drama and music, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet, and dance."

SEC. 202. The amendment made by this title shall be applicable only with respect to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 5 days after the date of enactment of this act for admissions on or after such first day.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, with the ready response this bill has received and include herewith an article by Richard L. Coe, drama editor of the Washington Post, which appeared on February 28, 1951:

BILL GIVES BREAK TO THE FINE ARTS

(By Richard L. Coe)

A sensible approach to the matter of American fine arts seems to have been made in a bill introduced in the House Monday by New York's EMANUEL CELLER and ARTHUR G. KLEIN.

This would provide for an Assistant Secretary of Fine Arts in the Interior Department. Such an official, to be appointed by the President, would:

1. Coordinate existing agencies in the Government which have to do with the fine arts.

2. Aid civic nonprofit oranizations devoted to such spheres as music, dama, painting, architecture, ballet, and sculpture.

Such enterprises of nonprofit organizations would be exempt from Federal taxes which, as things now stand, are anywhere from 50 to 100 percent of the annual deficits of such groups. It would, for instance, cut down or even eradicate the increasingly troublesome annual fund drives of such oranizations as the Metropolitan Opera, the National Symphony, and the New York Philharmonic Symphony.

The most importan point of their bill, its cosponsors feel, is that the duty of the new Assistant Secretary would be not to control or direct, but to encourage and assist the growth of the fine arts.

This, they emphasize, is to remove any taint of politicking and also to forestall criticism that arose against the public works programs of the early Roosevelt administration.

The good that the Federal Theater and the art projects under Edward Bruce did in vitalizing the best of past and contemporary culture for the masses of the present is something that detractors of government-in-the-arts cannot effectively argue about.

Viewed from the perspective of history, the artists of the past were encouraged by a handful of the wealthy; with the rise of the masses, the most significant development of our time, has come the need to encourage a growth whose previous source of income has vanished.

Both CELLER and KLEIN have been identified in the past with efforts to bring official recognition to the fine arts and so have numerous other Members of Congress. This bill, H. R. 2890, however, is the first this session to take a soundly practical approach, noting in the tax-exemption clause that while the income to the Federal Government is but a drop in an enormous bucket, the figure can mean life or death to culturally inavaluable organizations.

Their bill has been referred to the House Ways and Means (money) committee, and while it would be entirely too rosy to think it has a fruitful immediate future, it is at least a step which merits the thoughtful consideration of all concerned with the preservation and growth of our rich land's fine arts.

One can expect the sneers of the cheaper sections of the press and the hate-provoking commentators as well as cracks that Democrats CELLER and KLEIN are simply thinking of their New York constituents, but the fact remains that something must be found to replace the great, ebbing fortunes, long the chief supporters of the arts.

The Switchmen's Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is the Truth," published in Trainman News of February 5, 1951. The editorial deals with the switchmen's strike.

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

THIS IS THE TRUTH

On the 21st of December 1950, at the conclusion of a White House session which lasted almost continuously for 25 hours, Presidential Assistant John Steelman presented to us a proposal leading to the settlement of our nearly 2-year-old dispute with the railroads.

We advised Dr. Steelman and the railroad representatives that we would present this proposal to our organizations for consideration. Dr. Steelman announced at a press conference held in the White House that the proposal was subject to ratification.

General chairmen, representing members of all four organizations, shortly thereafter assembled and considered the Steelman proposal. It was unanimously rejected by all four organizations and the respective chief executives and their negotiating committees were directed to return to Washington and to continue negotiations leading to a satisfactory and just settlement.

The presidents of all four organizations notified Steelman at the White House that the Steelman proposal had been unanimously rejected, and that they were available to resume negotiations. (These telegrams are at the White House.)

Through the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, the presidents of the four organizations were requested to return to Washington for a meeting at the White House scheduled for 10 a. m., January 17, 1951. The chief executives and their negotiating committees respected this request from the White House, and on January 17, 1951, they were in Washington, and notified the White House that they were available to resume negotiations.

The presidents of the four organizations met with Steelman at the White House for 2 hours and 50 minutes, commencing at noon, January 18, 1951. Representatives of the negotiating committees were not present at this session in keeping with Dr. Steelman's request. At the conclusion of this session it was agreed that negotiations would be resumed as of 10 a. m., the following day, under the jurisdiction and in the presence of the National Mediation Board.

Accordingly, the four presidents and representatives of their negotiating committees met with the National Mediation Board as of 10 a. m., Friday, January 19, 1951, until 1 p. m., that day.

At the conclusion of this session they were told by the National Mediation Board that the Board would meet with representatives of the railroads that same afternoon, and that a joint session with representatives of the four operating brotherhoods and the railroads would probably take place the same day, or perhaps Saturday morning, January 20, 1951. Late the evening of January 19, 1951, the brotherhood presidents were advised that the National Mediation Board again wished to confer with them at 10 a. m., the following day, Saturday, January 20, 1951. This request was respected.

The four brotherhood presidents and representatives of their negotiating committees did meet with the National Mediation Board for 1 hour and 30 minutes. The presidents of the brotherhoods and their committee representatives were advised that the railroads had taken the position that the Steelman proposal was, in fact, a firm contract, and that they, the representatives of the railroads, would meet with the negotiating committees of the four organizations only to complete the unfinished details relating to the Steelman proposal.

To all intents and purposes, this attitude on the part of the railroads can be regarded as a refusal to bargain collectively, for Dr. Steelman, as the President's assistant and appointed mediator in this dispute, had directed that renegotiations commence under the jurisdiction of the National Mediation Board as of January 19, 1951.

Every day since the 20th of January 1951, with the exception of Sunday, January 21, the presidents of the four organizations and representatives of their negotiating committees have responded to requests to meet with the National Mediation Board, and in every instance representatives of the railroads have not been present in joint session to bargain collectively for a settlement of this nearly 2-year-old controversy.

The contention in newspaper ads throughout the country, over the signature of the eastern, southeastern, and western railroads, in view of the above, is of course untrue and absurd.

Gambling With American Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Dangerous Gambling," published in the Washington Daily News of February 27, 1951.

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

DANGEROUS GAMBLING

"Our basic problem in manpower is this: We must, with fewer men, do more than our enemy does with abundant men.

"America's manpower pool is shallow; our enemy's pool is deep. From this fact there is no relief. We must stand or fall, succeed or fail, with what we have.

"Obviously, we can gamble on getting by for a few more months without making additional manpower eligible for military service. But the gamble is dangerous. Under present circumstances, it could be fatal."

That is the cogent warning of able Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in reporting out the universal military training and service bill. The measure goes before the Senate for debate today.

The Senate bill authorizes the drafting of men at 18, but only after local boards have exhausted their pool of eligibles in the present 19–26 bracket, including nonveterans with not more than one dependent.

The House Armed Services Committee is still trying for a compromise on the age issue. A bill introduced by Chairman VINSON puts the draft age at 18½. And the committee has started another long series of hearings to listen to the arguments of Defense Secretary Marshall, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, General Bradley, and the Chiefs of Staff on the administration program—particularly on the eligibility age.

This newspaper believes a clear and strong case has been made for drafting the 18-year-olds and for universal training and service in general. We gamble against time as we quibble and search for compromise. Congress should act with all speed possible to equalize the odds.

Mayor Impellitteri Opposes Taxation of Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Vincent R. Impellitteri, mayor of the city of New York, before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 26, 1951:

It is a token of the seriousness of the issue we are discussing today that the greatest city in the country is as deeply concerned as the thousands of small municipalities throughout the country. Size is no protection against the devastating effect of the proposed tax on municipal securities.

Nor are political differences involved. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, one of my predecessors as mayor of New York City, had a very different political background. Yet, when the Treasury Department proposed that the exemption of municipal bonds should be ended, Mayor LaGuardia, faced with the same problems of preserving the financial credit of the city of New York, spoke from this witness chair against this proposal, as all municipal officials must. He said that this proposal came 150 years too late because the present exemptions are part of the scheme of our Federal system. They are a part of the whole fabric of our financial structure. Twelve additional years have done nothing to alter the soundness of that basic truth.

This committee, after hearing the evidence of State and municipal officers from all over the country, declined then even to report the matter to the floor of the House. And when the matter was moved in the Senate by way of floor amendments, it was decisively defeated in 1940 and 1942 by large nonpartisan majorities. Nothing has happened since to change the judgment of Congress. Then, as now, the argument was raised that a war emergency required the tax. Then, as now, the exaggerated issue of tax loophole was raised, and then, as now, the serious consequences to local governments were clear.

I hesitated quite a while before asking for time to be heard on this subject. I respect the opinions of such well-known authorities as Secretary Snyder and those who advise him. I did not decide to oppose this proposal until I had fully convinced myself that their perspective was wrong. Knowing some of the history of this question and the problems it poses, I cannot understand how it can be pressed now as an urgent measure required to meet an emergency. Contrary to what has been inferred, this recommendation, whatever its merits may be, shifts the tax burden to the millions of home owners throughout the country who must under our present tax system carry the onerous burden of paying the cost of local government. This proposal will rob Peter to pay Paul, and Peter is already up to his ears in financial difficulties.

This proposed tax is designed to increase Federal revenue by shifting the burden to municipalities in the form of increased interest costs. If adopted, however, it will achieve only one of these two aims. The shocking fact is that the increase in Federal revenue will be relatively small, but a crushing burden will be placed on local governmental bodies.

Let me demonstrate this. As I understand it, this is to apply to future bond issues only. There has been no serious suggestion that good faith be abandon d and suits for breach of contract invited by imposing the tax on interest from outstanding bonds. On its face, it is obvious that a tax on new issues can, at best, bring in only limited revenue for a number of years to come. When the issue was debated in this room a decade ago, Under Secretary of the Tresury Hanes conceded that the measure could hardly be supported on its revenue aspects alone. We may assume that some of these tax-exempt bonds are owned by millionaires and other wealthy investors, although this assumption is to a large extent contradicted by inheritance tax and other available statistics. It is well known, however, that a very substantial proportion of these bonds are owned by institutional investors which are not affected by the progressive rates of the individual income tax or are not at all subject to tax. It is conceded that the imposition of the tax will increase the rate of interest which municipalities and States will have to pay in order to market future bond issues. Experts in the field of municipal bonds agree that the increase in interest on New York City bonds would at present be about 1 percent. But, consider how this would affect the individual of wealth who is seeking to reduce his taxes by ownership of tax-exempt bonds. Would he be hampered? Would his taxes increase? For many years he can continue to escape taxes to the same extent as at present. The tax-exempt bonds that are now his, he can continue to own until they mature, and most of these bonds were issued for long terms. Nor will he have any great problem in purchasing additional tax-exempt bonds. They will be readily available on the market since the corporations and institutions which do not pay a progressive tax or are tax-exempt will be glad to sell their holdings to be replaced by the new municipal bonds issued at the higher interest rate.

The proposal is a delusion. It will not effectively close tax loopholes for years to come; it will not greatly increase Federal revenue.

One thing alone will be accomplished. The costs of local government will be increased—increased to a point which will curtail vital improvements. Municipalities which have to come into the market next year to finance needed public improvements or refund outstanding issues will be hit hard.

and hit hard at once, by the extra interest cost they will be asked to pay. That extra interest cost is not a matter of conjecture. The Secretary of the Treasury in his opening statement to this committee 2 weeks ago very frankly said that he was, in effect, asking this committee to recommend an increase in the cost of local borrowing.

You gentlemen know as well as I that the one level of government where there is almost no remaining ability and elasticity to meet fixed added costs is municipal government. When the mayor of an American city recognizes that the cost of living has far outstripped the salary scale of faithful municipal employees, he has a titanic and frequently impossible burden to rectify the inequity because of his inability to raise the money needed to meet the pay raises. Our power to tax is strictly controlled by the State and by existing taxes imposed by the Federal Government. Local government has been left only the financial crumbs in taxes which are the most unpopular and the hardest to impose and collect. This is the equivalent of pilfering governmental poor boxes. The income tax, the estate tax, and all the other taxes that have any relationship to ability to pay have been preempted at the Federal and State levels. Real-estate taxes are concededly at the limit presently permitted by law. My city has already imposed the sales tax, and we are seeking to increase it. We have imposed a gross-receipts business tax, a utility tax, and an occupancy tax. We are planning to impose the other taxes, nuisance taxes though they are, which the State has given us power to impose. All this is essential to meet the current needs. We in municipal finance and our citizens who must pay the bill are at our wit's end and simply cannot stand the additional burden you propose to ask us to assume.

The imposition of this tax would not hit the target aimed at. It would really hit the local governments of the country. We would be forced to pay the bill in the form of increased interest costs or to give up many needed local improvements which, since they are essential to our community life, would then have to be financed by the Federal Government with the taxes you hope to collect by taxing our securities. All that would have been accomplished would be a shift in powers and a further weakening of the democracy which inheres in strong and free local self-government.

The city of New York, and the huge metropolitan area of which it is the heart, have specific plans for municipal improvements essential to our millions of citizens. These are not luxury items but badly needed public improvements and improved services. We have not yet caught up with the need for schools which our increasing and shifting population forces upon us and which the postponements of World War II have aggravated. We need approximately $200,000,000 to catch up on our deferred needs without even attempting to meet the petitions for an expanded school system. We are fighting a transit problem with which we can hold our own only by the expenditure of more than one-half billion dollars for new construction of rapid transit. We have on the drawing boards plans for a Second Avenue subway which cannot be fulfilled too soon to keep abreast of the need. We have approval from the State for the issuance of $150,000,000 of debt for badly needed hospital construction. To meet increased costs and needs, this must be increased to $300,000,000. Our port facilities, upon which the Nation must call for wartime shipments, need one hundred millions for modernization. We are plagued, as most cities are, with an enormous parking and traffic problem which requires capital expenditures of at least $100,000,000 to alleviate the problem and millions more to solve it. You have passed a civilian defense law which asks New York State and New York City to raise $250,000,000.

The foreseeable program within the city of New York for the next 6 years will require an expenditure of more than three and one-half billion dollars. An increase of 1 percent, which is equivalent to 50 percent in the present interest cost, on this program would mean a substantial curtailment in the amount of work done and in some cases complete abandonment of essential improvements. The above figure includes a $1,315,000,000 for public housing. In the case of public housing, the increase in interest cost would mean either higher rent for people who cannot afford it, or an increase in subsidy by the Federal and State Governments, which means you again increase your own problem. The taxing of municipal bonds which must be sold to finance the public improvements mentioned above, would in the present market mean an increase in interest cost to the city of as much as $35,000,000 in a peak year. If this increase were effected, only a small portion of this amount would finally reach the Federal tax collector. The main effect would be the serious curtailment of our program.

Municipal governments have had their full share of financial concerns during the last two decades. With the ability to issue our securities on the traditional tax-exempt basis, we have done, in my opinion, an amazing job in meeting the major responsibilities of local government. If we are to continue to meet the tremendous problems which are so close to the lives of our people, we cannot stand the new and unreasonable costs which taxation of our instruments of credit would thrust upon us. In recent years, it is only by means of the ability to issue our securities without Federal taxation that we have been able to keep pace with the growth of our population and the demands which the Nation has placed upon us as the major metropolis of the country and the principal port on the eastern seaboard.

Frankly, gentlemen, I am surprised that you who have such close ties and such intimate knowledge of your home communities are considering seriously the proposal to tax State and municipal obligations. These are times when the Federal Government must extend itself to foster unity and cooperation between it on the one hand and State and local governments on the other. We must march shoulder to shoulder to achieve the solution of the great problems which have been thrust upon us. At a time of crisis which calls for strength, we should not weaken local governments by placing added and crushing burdens upon them.

I feel sure that at the close of this hearing you will reach the conclusion, as did your predecessors, that this proposal must be rejected.

Wake Up, Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Wake Up, Labor," published in Trainman News for February 19, 1951.

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

WAKE UP, LABOR

If the rest of the labor movement still has any Fair Deal stardust flecks obscuring its vision, now is the time to apply the towel and face reality.

Those timid elements which feared that the railroad man was rocking the boat should be told that the old tub was full of holes like a sieve and ready to sink anyway.

The unstable wedding of President Truman to the basic principles of his Fair Deal program was evident to us long before he lowered the boom on the long-suffering railroad worker.

It showed up in many ways but especially in his handling of the defense mobilization program and the stabilization safeguards which American workers needed to keep them from being swallowed up by the fires of inflation.

Labor's interests were sidetracked in practically every move and major appointment the President has made since his reelection by the votes of the United States working men and women. While the big business point of view is being protected—and projected—in Government by a galaxy of big business appointments to high offices, labor must be content with second- or third-string places in the picture.

The result of this has been fantastic profits for industry and an invitation to malnutrition for laboring men and their children.

We have a great deal of respect for the integrity and ability of George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, but his appointment as an underling to Stabilizer Eric Johnston is nothing but window dressing calculated to fool labor into thinking it finally was going to get some protection.

President William Green of the A. F. of L., which, along with the CIO, is trying to keep diplomatic relations going with the White House while it searches its heart and mind for the best move to make in the interests of labor and the Nation, had this to say:

"The American worker is expected to carry a disproportionate share of the fight against inflation.

"We find, for example, that under the Defense Production Act the Government has unlimited and effective powers over the worker's income. On the other hand, under the same act, the Government's power over the prices of goods and services the worker has to buy are limited and substantially less effective. Food prices, in particular, cannot be subject to effective price control. Control over rents at the present time is only partially effective.

"On top of this burden, the worker is expected to pay substantially higher taxes, while, at the same time loopholes in our present tax structure are likely to remain open for use by higher-income families and corporations."

If Mr. Truman as Chief Executive had remembered his pledges to the American people made at Philadelphia when he was nominated and upon which this brotherhood and almost the entire labor movement based their support of his candidacy, the mess described by President Green just could not have occurred.

This bungling not only threatens the interests of railroad men and labor generally, it jeopardises national welfare since it fans discontent and unrest at a time when unshakable unity is needed to fight an unscrupulous and propaganda-wise foreign foe.

Communism is nurtured and thrives on the kind of unrest that grows hourly in America. When men are oppressed they are unreasonable.

The Russian press must be having great sport today showing how American rail workers like those of Argentina, a dictatorship

country, are under the heel of the military and big business and that their just grievances have been turned aside to the vindictiveness of a head of state.

We hasten to explain that Russian rail workers are not as well off under their yoke of totalitarianism but that doesn't prevent the U. S. S. R. from using this insidious weapon against us in our fight to save democracy elsewhere in the world.

When the late A. F. Whitney made peace with Mr. Truman in a move which he sincerely believed to be in the interest of labor, and we believe that at the time it was, President Truman said that the 1946 disagreement was the result of bad advice. The President is still surrounded with those bad advisers and apparently he still follows their advice, much to the sorrow of the workers of this country.

Those men are weak, shallow men who haven't the slightest conception or appreciation of the grave problems that face our people at this late hour. The liberal, capable assistants Mr. Truman inherited from Franklin D. Roosevelt have long since either quit in disgust or been fired. At any rate they did not fit in with the shocking mediocrity of the administration.

At a time when depth and statesmanship are desperately needed, the President's cabinet, aside from two or three, are limited men who have peculiar persuasion to big business' point of view and an aversion to broad national interest.

How, in a dispute as old as ours and in which the union case is so sound and where the workers involved have been so patient, could the President make or cause to be made three separate appeals during the unauthorized strikes that ignored any management responsibility at all for the trouble and challenged only the patriotism of the workers?

More bad advice? Whatever it was, great and grievous damage has again been done, as in 1946, against a fine, loyal group of American workers and humiliated those working hard to sell democracy abroad.

This bitter piece is not to be construed as a blanket indictment of the Democratic Party or a bid to labor to team up with any other party. Although we have good friends in the Republican Party, the fact remains the bulk of the Democrats have shown a more favorable action and attitude toward the interest of the working man.

We are suggesting that labor make its plans now for 1952 and that the eligibles of both major parties be studied for support in the primaries and at the national conventions.

Some consideration should be given to Senator WAYNE MORSE as a Republican standard bearer and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS as a Democratic standard bearer. Both are courageous, honest liberals, who, regardless of the complexion of Congress, simply are incapable of leading the country into a mess like today's but would surely lead us out of it.

Television Channels for Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I submitted a resolution, which has not yet been acted upon, asking that the Senate express as its opinion that the Federal Communications Commission should reserve for educational institutions certain channels available for television transmission and reception. At that time I was asked by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for the names of the land-grant colleges in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the list, together with three articles dealing with the subject matter covered by the resolution, published in the Chicago Daily News, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

LIST OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES

Alabama A. & M., Normal, Ala.
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
Alaska, University of, College, Alaska.
Alcorn, A. & M., Alcorn, Miss.
Arizona, University of, Tucson, Ariz.
Arkansas A., M. & N., Pine Bluff, Ark.
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville, Ark.
California, University of, Berkeley, Calif.
Clemson Agricultural, Clemson, S. C.
Colorado A. & M., Fort Collins, Colo.
Connecticut, University of, Storrs, Conn.
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Delaware State, Dover, Del.
Delaware, University of, Newark, Del.
Florida A. & M., Tallahassee, Fla.
Florida, University of, Gainesville, Fla.
Georgia State, Savannah, Ga.
Georgia, University of, Athens, Ga.
Hawaii, University of, Honolulu, T. H.
Idaho, University of, Moscow, Idaho.
Illinois, University of, Urbana and Chicago, Ill.
Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Ames, Iowa.
Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, Manhattan, Kans.
Kentucky State, Frankfort, Ky.
Kentucky, University of, Lexington, Ky.
Langston University, Langston, Okla.
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.
Louisiana State University and A. & M. College, Baton Rouge, La.
Maine, University of, Orono, Maine.
Maryland State, Princess Anne, Md.
Maryland, University of, College Park and Baltimore, Md.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.
Massachusets, University of, Amherst, Mass.
Michigan State, East Lansing, Mich.
Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mississippi State, State College, Miss.
Missouri, University of, Columbia, Mo.
Montana State, Bozeman, Mont.
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln, Nebr.
Nevada, University of, Reno, Nev.
New Hampshire, University of, Durham, N. H.
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, State College, N. Mex.
North Carolina A. & T., Greensboro, N. C.
North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill, N. C.
North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, Raleigh, N. C.
North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dak.
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla.
Oregon State, Corvallis, Oreg.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View, Tex.
Puerto Rico, University of, Rio Piedras, P. R.
Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Rhode Island State, Kingston, R. I.
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, Brookings, S. Dak.
Southern University Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, La.
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College, Nashville, Tenn.
Tennessee, University of, Knoxville, Tenn.
Utah State Agricultural, Logan, Utah.
Vermont, University of, and State Agricultural College, Burlington, Vt.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
Virginia State, Petersburg, Va.
Washington, State College of, Pullman, Wash.
West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va.
West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
Wisconsin, University of, Madison, Wis.
Wyoming, University of, Laramie, Wyo.
State Colored Normal, Industrial, Agricultural, and Mechanical College of South Carolina, Orangeburg, S. C.

[From the Chicago Daily News of November 25, 1950]

FCC GETS PLAN—URGES TV CHANNEL FOR EDUCATION

(By Jack Mabley)

No proposal before the Federal Communications Commission makes more sense than the request of educators that one TV channel in every city be set aside for noncommercial use in education and public service.

Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles have seven channels each. Can there be any normal person in these cities who does not want one of the seven channels put to constructive use?

The channels—the space in the broadcasting spectrum—do not belong to the broadcasters or the advertisers or the FCC. They belong to the people.

If the people do not make themselves heard, everything in television is going by default to commercial broadcasters to use to sell soap and used cars and mouthwash.

The Joint Committee on Education Television, made up of seven of the most important educational groups, is carrying the request to the FCC.

They said they are acting because of experience learned from "commercial radio's unkept promises."

There is absolutely no indication today, after 2 years of full-scale commercial television, that television is going to pay any more attention to the welfare of the public than has radio.

It certainly is not unreasonable to ask that 1 station in 7, or an eventual 25 percent of the 2,000 TV stations, be used for noncommercial purposes.

Getting the channels will take some doing.

Freida Hennock, the only woman member of the FCC, is strongly for it, and recognizes the struggle ahead.

"The boys in education move so slowly," she said, "that the boys with profit motive move in ahead."

I can think of few worthier projects for Chicago organizations, or for individual TV owners, than to make their opinions of the educators' plan heard in Washington.

Wayne Coy is Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The address is Washington, 25, D. C.

[From the Chicago Daily News of January 27, 1951]

LEADER ROLE—TV IGNORING A DUTY?

(By Jack Mabley)

A week ago Thursday night, at about 5 minutes after 9, a reader phoned the Daily News city desk.

He had just seen a television show in which a game of Russian roulette was played.

In Russian roulette, you put one bullet in a revolver, spin the chamber, put the gun to your head, and pull the trigger. The chances are one in six that you'll kill yourself.

The caller was irate. "Have they no sense at all," he asked. "Don't they realize that kids are up at that hour, and watch these shows, and pick up these ideas?"

On Monday, this newspaper carried on page 1 a story about five South Side teenagers who watched the game on television, and decided to try it.

One of them, 16, shot himself on his third try. He has since died.

This was not an isolated incident. It was merely more dramatic and more immediate in its results.

It would be good if American youngsters could take care of themselves. Unfortunately they can't. They need leading.

Leading them to Russian roulette, to crime, to passion, to horror, as shown on so many television shows, is the height of irresponsibility.

The death of this boy makes rather hollow the protest of a radio-TV spokesman that educators, who want some TV channels, "have failed dismally" in realizing the full potentialities of broadcasting.

The implication is that the commercial broadcasters have succeeded—that they alone are capable of assuming the new responsibilities that television has brought to the Nation.

The stupidity of such statements only emphasizes the need for educational and noncommercial control of at least one TV channel in every large community.

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 6, 1951]

FULL POTENTIALITY

The Federal Communications Commission has been asked to reserve 25 percent of television channels for educational purposes. Commercial television asserts that education really is not entitled, on past performance, to any part of the broadcast spectrum. It cites the record in radio.

With one or two exceptions, the TV spokesman told the FCC, educators in their use of radio have shown a dismal failure to realize the full potentialities of the medium.

This criticism is probably to some extent justified. And 25 percent of the channels sound like a lot of channels. But television would seem to have tremendous possibilities for visual education.

TV's statement may lift a few eyebrows even among the frank lowbrows. Are we to assume that commercial video itself has been realizing the full potentialities of the newer medium? Would "full" include wrestlers' biceps and girl singers' necklines?

Pegler Says the Judge Mistakes the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted there is printed herewith a recent article by Westbrook Pegler:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

My respect for Judge Michael L. Igoe, of Chicago, exceeds my regard for most of our judiciary, but it would be well to read him a lesson on the essentially evil nature of our unionism. Judge Igoe revealed a want of knowledge in his pointless lecture from the bench in the switchmen's case at an hour when most of the railroads were out of business.

He teed off with several irrelevancies, such as the hard and hazardous nature of the switchmen's work and the debatable conditions of their employment.

"Nobody has questioned the patriotism of these men," he continued. "The only issue here is whether or not the sovereignty of the United States is going to be sustained."

The judge tipped his hand, disclosing an ignorance common to even the best of that sordid bund known as the New Deal, when he said the issue here was an issue of the sovereignty of the United States. No such issue was present.

A fraudulent edifice of assumptions had been erected since 1933 by a great band of traitors and racketeers on the pretext of a spontaneous, peaceful revolution by labor.

In the fateful days which debauched the workers, Judge Igoe may not have been able to grasp the deep meaning of the acts that were put over. They were contrived to confuse. One, which seemed benevolent, was the assumption that the Government could umpire disputes over wages without becoming, in the end, the arbiter of wages.

When the Government says how much you shall get and no more, that is fascism. That interference violates your right of contract. Then, having delivered you into this fix under unionism, the Government appoints a judge out of its own political ranks who says you violated the sovereignty of your country in going off the job, en masse, in protest against the insufficiency of the wages which the Government has fixed.

It is sedition to flout the sovereignty of government. The penalty of sedition may be death.

Why didn't Judge Igoe get to grips with those facts?

The railroads were put under legal compulsions right away. But the unions are a political annex of the party in power and a source of campaign funds. The unions never have been put under serious compulsions.

Theoretically, the union in the case before Judge Igoe was guilty of a crime. But the total punishment which he imposed on both civil and criminal counts was a mere fine of $25,000. So, working men are, constructively, subject to the punishment for treason for going sick in concert, but the union, which managed this challenge to national sovereignty was dealt with almost affectionately.

Why didn't the union bosses go to prison for the maximum term?

Judge Igoe was nasty to the civilian railroad executives, poor, embarassed masqueraders in soldier suits who were ordered into the Army months ago to accommodate a fraudulent subterfuge of the President.

These men are not soldiers. They are railroad men. They include some of the best railroad men in the world. As soldiers they couldn't make corporal, but when Truman again invoked the fraudulent device of "seizing" the railroads and turning them over to the Army the process consisted solely of a change of clothing by a few hundred sedentary civilians who can't even salute.

But, even in their masquerade, these railroad men still couldn't cope with the unions which Roosevelt and Truman had embraced as their political partners in crime.

Finally, the farce exploded in the sick-strike. The railroad executives weren't malingering. They were on the job long hours, doing their best while Truman's friends in the unions were holding up supplies for the Army that he sends away and disowns as soon as the ships tie loose from our ports.

Igoe bawled out "some of those Army officers who have been strutting around this courtroom. Not men from the Fifth Army but the individuals who have been appointed to run the railroads. If they were performing the duties of an officer of the Army, they would get some men to run the trains and they would get some soldiers to see that the roads operate.

"They might better be concerned with that kind of activity rather than sitting around this courtroom and displaying the uniform that the Government has put on them."

Even a New Deal jurist could wish he never had said that. Those men weren't strutting. They were in uniform against their own will to help a corrupt political administration to redeem its mischief.

If we are ever to untangle this horrible situation we will have to first abandon such hypocrisy and start fresh.

Drafting of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., February 18, 1951:

DRAFTING OF WOMEN WOULD MEAN THE END OF AMERICAN LIFE WE CHERISH—SHOULD KAYO PROPOSAL PROMPTLY—PEOPLE WERE REVOLTED WHEN IDEA SIMILAR TO IT CAME OUT OF POLICE STATES

(By John Griffin)

Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, former commander of the WAVES and former president of Wellesley College, has suggested that the women of the United States be drafted for the armed services. And the proposal is being taken seriously.

That, more than anything else in recent days, gives an idea of the twisted thinking that is dominating America's emergency period, and is indicative of the change in values that certain American leaders are trying to foist onto the people.

Of course, Mrs. Horton's suggestion is not new, because it was advocated several years ago in wartime by Mrs. Roosevelt and by Miss Virginia Gildersleeve, president of Barnard College. Now, in peacetime, we have it again, and the strange thing about it is that it will be taken seriously by many people.

One editorialist referred to the suggestion in a wishy-washy manner, ending up by stating that the idea is "premature." Well, if Americans stand for that kind of nonsense, there isn't much cause for optimism as to the future of this country.

The very fact that the suggestion isn't ridiculed into obscurity indicates the length to which confused thinking has gone in this country. And that source of the suggestion is really quite remarkable, for Mrs. Horton's reason for the idea is that the present manpower policy "implies a fundamental dissimilarity between manpower and womanpower, which tends to put all women in the category of a national luxury instead of an available asset."

ONLY THE FIRST STEP

In the first place, there is no need for the drafting of women, for General Hershey, director of the draft, stated explicitly that they aren't needed. But that, of course, has little to do with Mrs. Horton's suggestion or the

approval of Mrs. Roosevelt, for that is just an excuse they are using to put over a change in the status of women and to help remake the American system of life.

Remember when such a suggestion was made in Hitler's Germany and all America was horrified? Remember the revulsion in this country when it was reported that the Russians and Japanese had women and girls in their combat units?

But, these new remakers of America would say, this draft of women would not be for combat but would be for services connected with the Army in order to permit more men to be in combat. You can believe that one or not, but one thing is sure, that the move proposed now is only the first step and combat training would come after a while.

This is the time to stop the nonsense, not when the first step has been taken, not when girls are torn away from their families and their place in life as part of a scheme designed to turn America into something different from what it has been.

Apparently some people are convinced that Army service is something that is great for the character and the moral and spiritual well-being. For Americans it has always been a duty of the male population to be ready to fight to protect the country, but it has never been a work that appeals to democratic Americans. It is something that the young men of the country must be prepared to do when the necessity arises; it is definitely not an excuse to reduce the freedom and opportunity for peacetime pursuits.

STANDARDS BROKEN DOWN

As a matter of fact, the principal motive for young men in fighting for America has been to protect and preserve the home and the way of life. Which is another way of saying that they want to protect the women of America.

I suppose that sounds pretty corny in these days of strange activities, but a little analysis, based on fundamentals, will surely bring most people to a realization of its basic truth.

What sort of faith in America have these people who want to disrupt the homes more than is necessary? One of them at least ought to qualify as an expert on broken homes. Another, Mrs. Horton, apparently has had some regard for traditional home life, for the reason she gave up her position as president of Wellesley College was to be with her husband in New York.

Over the recent years, so many strange proposals have been taken seriously that a large number of Americans have become inured to suggestions that are obviously designed to change the American way of life. They became astonished, alarmed, and indignant at the start, but constant assailing of moral positions has served to make them lethargic.

And unless this proposal for the drafting of women and girls meets with an intense and resentful opposition it will be pretty clear that the standards are being broken down through a sort of moral erosion.

SHOULD TAKE ANOTHER LOOK

There has been, for the last few weeks, a sharp difference of opinion about the drafting of 18-year-old boys. Would the advocates of drafting of women support the drafting of 18-year-old girls? And would any appreciable number of people go along with that idea?

Well, at least one editorialist has no aversion to the proposal except that he thinks it might be a little premature. And another, whose editorials run in a paper with the greatest circulation in the country, thinks Congress ought to look into it, and "adopt it if it is found to have as much merit as it seems to have at first glance." Let's hope he takes another look.

If the suggestion for the drafting of women is just a trial balloon, which is a practice of trying out an idea on the people in order to learn their reaction, we can only hope that the reaction is as violent and immediate as it should be, so that once and for all, such proposals will be ended.

Maybe it is just nonsense but it looks suspiciously like part of the scheme to break down the family and home life of this country, to obliterate all moral sense and set up the theory that the State is all.

Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman and his political leaders in Congress are always yelling about the need for unity; always crying and insisting that Republicans should join in backing the President's policies, whatever they may be.

Then Mr. Truman and his northern leaders insist that we must have FEPC, so everyone will be dealt with fairly, justly.

But, when it comes to something that concerns Mr. Truman or his program, or even just a little part of it, how he and his leaders in the House put on the squeeze.

One of the latest examples of Mr. Truman's high-handed, arbitrary maneuvering was when—defeated in the drive for the one-package appropriation bill, in which he was able to hide many of his requests for so-called social legislation under the guise of appropriations for the national defense—Mr. CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, tyrannically—and, I might add, with malice aforethought and because he was motivated by revenge—set up subcommittees to which will be assigned the task of passing upon the requests for money which come up from the Government agencies.

Because party control of Congress may shift from time to time, it has always been the custom, in order to maintain some degree of fairness, to give the minority membership on subcommittees in the same ratio that the minority has in the House itself; that is, if the House was divided 5 to 3 between Democrats and Republicans, membership on committees and on subcommittees would be 5 to 3.

But Mr. CANNON, who is determined to have his way, come heck or high water, mad and revengeful because his pet scheme of considering all requests for appropriations in one bill was turned down, refused to follow the old, equitable rule in setting up subcommittees.

To two of the subcommittees, he named five Democrats and two Republicans. On three other subcommittees, he named four Democrats and two Republicans.

Now, in the House, there are 233 Democrats and 199 Republicans—a ratio of approximately 5.4 Democrats to 4.6 Republicans. That is, 46 percent of the membership is Republican.

But again just take a look at what Mr. CANNON, with his great, big heart, did to the Republicans. Five to two on two subcommittees; four to two on three subcommittees.

Mr. CANNON surely must have been afraid of those Republicans. Or was he afraid that some Democrats might show a little independence and refuse to trail along at his chariot wheels? You figure it out. I don't know.

But one thing I do know—if the Republican leadership takes it lying down, Republicans will not deserve anything better than they are getting.

If they will not even fight against an outrageous insult like that and if the fair-minded Democrats who do believe in fairness and precedent—and there are plenty of them—will not go along, and right this grievous wrong, then Congress might just as well fold up; let Mr. Truman, Dean Acheson—Hiss' sponsor; Mrs. Rosenberg and General Marshall run the show.

Louis Henna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, during these days of strife and worry, when selfish interests seem to predominate, it is often difficult to realize that there are still some people to be found whose love of mankind and desire to do for others rather than for one's self enrich the lives of all who know them.

Mr. Louis Henna, who lives in Round Rock, Tex., is such a man. His life is one which is filled with acts of generosity and a strong desire to do good for his fellow man. His sincere endeavor to help those around him is evidenced throughout the community.

In the February issue of the Texas Parade, a monthly publication by the Texas Good Roads Association, there appeared an article about Mr. Henna which I believe should be read by every Member of Congress. I, therefore, respectfully request that this article be inserted in the RECORD:

LOUIS HENNA: HOBBY—ORPHANS
(By Jimmy Banks)

Louis Henna has made and given away several fortunes since 1931, when he borrowed enough money to buy a Round Rock filling station that was famous for going broke. Henna, now only 36 years old, stood toe-to-toe with the great depression, slugged it out, and won.

He found hard work, the ability to make wise decisions quickly, and the American free enterprise system a winning combination. Those 16-hour days he used to work regularly—and which he still puts in when necessary—paid big dividends. Henna now owns three automobile agencies and large chunks of valuable real estate.

But more important to Henna, and to his pretty young wife, than the things he owns are those he has given away. They include a $200,000 haven for homeless children, $14,000 toward the cost of a new church, a modern, $8,000 dental clinic, a truck for an orphanage, and many miles of paved streets.

You have to find out about those things from Henna's friends. That takes in just about every one of Round Rock's 1,486 citizens. Louis is much too modest to talk about his own accomplishments and his generosity.

Quiet and unassuming, Henna is tall, handsome, has black wavy hair and friendly, sincere eyes. He always has been deeply religious.

His pride and joy is the $200,000 Texas Baptist Children's Home, a friendly, cheerful place that was opened last fall. It is a home for 60 children of all faiths, including other unfortunates as well as orphans.

Henna, who had owned the 112 acres of fertile land on which the home is situated, built it and then presented a debt-free deed on the whole thing to Texas Baptists.

Twenty children are housed in each of the three main buildings. They are modern, cut-stone dwellings of colonial-type architecture. In them, children live in real, home-like units. Even the menus of the three dormitories are different each day because Henna and H. D. Dollahite, the home's superintendent, want it to be different from most institutions.

The children attend the public schools and the churches of their choice in Round Rock.

Henna did the contracting on the home. He also did a lot of the hard labor that went into it. Other workmen followed the example he set and, as a result, the home was built in the near record time of just 3 months.

"It was just like prewar days," Henna said in praising the efforts of workmen who toiled at unusually low hourly wage rates and worked as fast as possible. Henna estimated the home would have cost at least $100,000 more without the wonderful cooperation he got from workers, contractors, and lumber dealers. All of the materials that went into the home were the best that money could buy, but for this worthy cause practically all of them were sold at cut rates.

Henna's only regret is that he could not make the home bigger. But he hopes to help it expand to an eventual capacity of 300 or 400 kids.

"Louis can do anything but make a speech," Dollahite said when the home was formally dedicated. "I feel sure he could do a wonderful job of that, too, if he would just try."

Henna was too modest to even take part in the dedication program other than to actually hand the deed to the Baptist leaders for the benefit of the photographers. He had been scheduled to make a speech, but instead he persuaded Dollahite, a friend of long standing, to substitute for him in performing that chore.

Round Rock brags that it has more miles of paved streets than any other town its size in Texas. And it brags that Louis Henna put most of them there. He is a hometown hero who has been interested in Round Rock's civic welfare practically all of his life. In addition to providing most of the leadership necessary to get the streets paved, he put in a great deal of the money.

When Louis' father casually mentioned one day that the town badly needed a dentist, young Henna went to work on the problem immediately. His efforts unearthed a prominent dentist's opinion that no member of his profession would go to such a small town, where "he would probably have an office in the back of a drug store or something."

Henna constructed a 2-story dental clinic. When it was completed, he advertised in the Texas Dental Journal for a dentist. A few weeks later, Round Rock got a capable, popular young dentist who saves the townspeople countless trips to larger towns.

Henna noticed one day that a truck belonging to the Lutheran Children's Home was about ready for the last mile. He bought a new truck, drove it out to the home and left it there without further ado.

When told that construction of the First Baptist Church in Round Rock would have to be stopped for lack of funds, Henna went to the pastor and asked how much was needed. When he was told $14,000, he calmly sat down and wrote a check for that amount. When the church runs low on operating funds, Louis usually deeds it a piece of property to tide it over.

Henna got a private flier's license before the start of World War II and after Pearl Harbor served for a while as a civilian instructor for the Army Air Corps. Later, without trying to pull strings and get a commission, he went into the Army as a private.

Most of his business ventures have been highly successful, but even this modern Midas who apparently has the touch of gold has had his failures. He has drilled a few wildcat oil wells around Round Rock. His friends are convinced he was aiming more at the prosperity oil would bring to the town rather than personal gains. At any rate, his wildcatters were all dry holes.

Henna, his wife, and their two children live in a very modest house.

But the big-hearted, kind Louis has provided a comfort for his big St. Bernard dog that few dogs have, even in such fabulous places as Hollywood, Calif. When he noticed his pet suffering from the Texas heat, Louis went down and bought a big fan that he installed in his garage. He then turned the air-cooled garage over to his St. Bernard.

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Patriotic Citizenship Association, Thomas F. Flynn, chairman:

RESOLUTION SPONSORED BY THE PATRIOTIC CITIZENSHIP ASSOCIATION

Whereas the flag of the United States of America was first adopted by the American Congress on June 14, 1777, with 13 stripes, alternate red and white, and the union of 13 stars, white with a blue field, representing a new constellation and said date is now observed as Flag Day throughout America; and

Whereas our flag took the permanent form as we have it today under an enactment of Congress on April 4, 1819, decreeing that the flag of the United States be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; that the union have 20 stars, white in a blue field; that on the admission of every new State into the Union, 1 star be added to the union of the flag, and that such addition shall take effect on the 4th of July next succeeding such admission; and

Whereas the colors of the flag of our country depict and represent the following attributes: The red is for valor, zeal, and fervency; the white is for hope, purity, cleanliness of life, and rectitude of conduct; the blue, the color of heaven, for reverence to God, loyalty, sincerity, justice, and truth, all of which commend themselves to their invocation by the youth of America; and

Whereas George Washington, the Father of our Country, in interpreting the symbolism of our flag enunciated: "We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty"; and

Whereas the flag of the United States is unique in the deep and noble significance of its message to the entire world, a message of national independence, of individual liberty, of idealism, of patriotism; and

Whereas, our flag symbolizes national independence and popular sovereignty, in that it is not the flag of a reigning family or royal house, but of a hundred and fifty million free people welded into a nation, one and inseparable, united not only by community of interest but by vital unity of sentiment and purpose; a nation distinguished for the clear individual conception of its citizens alike of their duties and their privileges, their obligations and their rights; and

Whereas the flag incarnates for all mankind the spirit of liberty and the glorious ideal of human freedom; not the freedom of unrestraint or the liberty of license, but the ideal of equal opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, safeguarded by the stern and lofty principles of duty, righteousness and justice, and attainable by obedience to self-imposed laws; it embodies the essence of patriotism; its spirit is the spirit of the American nation; its history is the history of the American people, emblazoned upon its folds in letters of living light are the names and fame of our heroic dead, the fathers of the Republic who devoted upon its altars their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor; twice told tales of national honor and glory cluster thickly about it; and

Whereas our late President Theodore Roosevelt, in a last plea for Americanism, proclaimed: "We have room for but one flag, the American flag, and this excludes the red flag, which symbolizes all wars against liberal government and civilization just as much as it excludes any foreign flag of a nation to which we are hostile"; and

Whereas for generations our school children have been taught the loyalty pledge as follows: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I, therefore, believe it is my duty to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag and to defend it against all enemies, for I am an American"; and

Whereas such pledge necessarily includes and constitutes a commitment to support the authority of the Nation in its effort to safeguard this and future generations of our people by promoting the objectives of just world order and international peace; and

Whereas this Nation, by solemn treaty, is now a member of the United Nations, a group of many independent nations, organized to further those objectives; and

Whereas it is contemplated by certain school authorities that the flag of the United

Nations is being distributed or is about to be distributed for display in the assembly rooms of the public school systems throughout the several States of the Nation is to be displayed and flown continuously from our public school buildings; and

Whereas it appears that such continuous display, as distinguished from a display on particular occasions for educative or informative purposes, may tend to confuse and dim the obligation of loyalty to this Nation and its flag by the introduction of a dual, divided, or additional allegiance; and

Whereas such continuous display of the flag of the United Nations beside and accompanying the national flag may likewise tend to cloud and confuse the understanding of our people and particularly of our children respecting the functioning of the organization of the United Nations itself, and so to limit the usefulness of the United Nations in advancing the salutary purposes to which it is dedicated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this organization petition the Congress and President of the United States to enact a law forbidding the continuous display on school buildings or other public buildings of any flag constituting the emblem of any nation or group of nations other than the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for ratification by the several States of the Union in essence adopting the flag of the United States in its permanent form as the standard emblem of our Nation; and to adopt a loyalty pledge of allegiance to our flag and to no other standard; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to pass punitive legislation in respect to the compliance and enactment of the provisions of such proposed amendment to the United States Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the Eighty-second Congress of the United States and members of the State legislative bodies of the several States of the Union.

THOMAS F. FLYNN,
Chairman.

Attest:

CHARLES O'HARA,
Secretary.

Investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Final Touch," which appeared in the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., on Tuesday, February 27, 1951.

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

THE FINAL TOUCH

When a liberal Senator like CHARLES W. TOBEY recommends that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be abolished and when one of the directors of the Corporation itself admits that the board is bad the rest of us need no longer be in doubt as to the manner in which this organization has been administered. It is true that Mr. TOBEY is listed as a Republican but he is sympathetic to many of the aims of the Fair Deal and he has often voted with the political opposition.

As anyone who has read the testimony will agree, Mr. TOBEY's declaration that the RFC has become a political trading bureau rests on a sound basis of fact. It is as sordid a story as has come out of Washington in years. It is a story of fast and loose play with the taxpayers' money, of loans of small amounts made for useless purposes and of loans of large amounts made as the result of influence, friendship, and favoritism. Compared to this performance the 5-percenter affair, ill-smelling though it may have been, was picayune business.

If Mr. Truman still thinks that the charges which have been made against the RFC are asinine he is either completely blind to what is going on around him or ready to overlook the moral and ethical delinquencies of the men he has appointed to office. So far as we are concerned he can have his choice.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the House Public Works Committee is holding hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway project. Important new factors are thus being made available to the Congress.

On February 21, Mr. John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, Department of Defense, stated that the St. Lawrence seaway project is needed in the mobilization program from a logistic point of view, because it will supply a short inland transportation route for raw materials and a short transportation route for goods and material to our Armed Forces abroad. Mr. Small proved that the St. Lawrence project would save the country large amounts of short supply materials because it would provide needed transportation and hydroelectric power where otherwise they would have to be provided by more costly and more insecure means.

He stated that there was a possibility of growing danger to industrial plants on our sea coasts from guided missiles fired from submarines which would be able to approach fairly close to our coast line.

The St. Lawrence seaway, he went on to point out, would reduce the task of providing patrols and convoys and would decrease loss from enemy action.

Mr. President, the testimony of Mr. Small indicates that those who are opposing and obstructing the St. Lawrence seaway and its related power plant are, in fact, opposing the national defense program.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Small's testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

(Statement of Mr. John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives in connection with hearings on House joint resolution, to authorize the St. Lawrence project, February 1951)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been designated by the Secretary of Defense to explain in detail the Department of Defense views with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which legislation now before you would authorize. The Department of Defense and its predecessor departments have consistently supported this legislation which would permit initiation of work on the St. Lawrense seaway and power project. We are favoring this legislation now, even more strongly than in the past.

Much has been said and written on this subject. Practically every facet of the problem has been carefully examined for many years. The project is important from a Defense Department point of view, and has our full support.

In summary—the projected seaway will give us an alternate transportation link to the Midwest of tremendous industrial and logistic value. In time of war, it would relieve the heavy rail traffic toward east coast ports and some of the Atlantic port congestion. The power project will furnish large quantities of additional cheap and dependable electric power. The seaway and power projects would permit a good spread in the build up of our heavy industry, such as aluminum plants and shipyards. Fortunately the construction of these projects at this time requires so small a fraction of the available supply of such materials as steel, copper, and cement, as well as of manpower, that we need not hesitate to make this investment in additional productive capacity and industrial strength.

A factor with which we must steadily live is the gradual depletion of the Mesabi deposits of high-grade iron ore. This was stressed in our testimony last spring and it warrants renewed emphasis today. There are two alternate sources of supply open to us, namely the use of low-grade domestic deposits and the importation of foreign high-grade ores. The importation and development of foreign ore must be accelerated, because the extensive and costly research and development work and the construction of facilities required to perfect the beneficiation and use of taconite is a slow process requiring years to complete.

There are two principal sources of foreign high-grade iron ore in this hemisphere, South America and Labrador. The high-grade ores of Labrador are of particular importance to national security. In time of war, if the seaway were completed, ore from Labrador could move to the Lake area by a sheltered route as contrasted with the hazardous open ocean routes from that source and from South America. To the extent that the seaway will be available instead of ocean routes the demands on our Navy for convoy escort will be reduced accordingly, permitting that branch of the armed services to devote its attention to the other pressing demands it will have to meet.

Another important aspect of the availability of the seaway for the shipment of Labrador ore is that it provides a much more direct route to the steel mills than if

we must rely on open sea transport to east coast ports, where the ore would have to be transferred to what will then be an already heavily burdened rail system. The shorter and more direct route will result in a much shorter turn-around period. Fewer vessels can carry the same quantity of ore from Labrador than would be required for the longer open-ocean route to east-coast ports. These vessels would be of the lake bulk carrier type. Ore carriers designed for ocean services require 11 percent more steel than lake-type carriers of the same capacity. This potential lessening of the drain on our steel supplies is worth striving for. Benefits of the more direct route, I might point out, will be equally available when we are not engaged in hostilities to the extent that the ultimate price of steel and steel products should be lower than it would be if longer routes are used with consequent higher shipping charges.

Still another important factor affecting industrial mobilization is that when the need arises these Labrador sources, which are open pit operations, can be expanded readily by the simple expedient of using more mining equipment. This has a great advantage when considered in connection with the availability of the seaway, for it would not be reasonable to expand this source of iron ore unless transportation of the ore could be accommodated readily. The seaway is a highly expandable traffic artery, which means that its availability will vastly increase the possibilities of exploiting the Labrador fields.

There are other logistic implications in the seaway which are of very substantial importance. The additional transportation facilities would remove, to some extent, the strain on other types of transportation in time of war. Cargo from the Middle West destined for overseas points could be loaded at Great Lakes ports for final discharge at destination, thereby saving the rehandling of thousands of tons of cargo at seacoast ports. This would effect a very considerable saving of manpower and thus permit speedier delivery to points of destination. Direct shipment from the Great Lakes ports would have the additional advantages of providing a wide distribution of port facilities and of reducing transportation and storage bottlenecks. Short hauls from factories to shipping ports would release rolling stock and other inland transport facilities for other uses.

Another important logistical consideration is that the seaway would reduce, by about 1,000 miles, the open sea route between the lake ports of the United States and the British Isles. This would reduce the task of providing our naval patrols and convoys, and would decrease losses from enemy action.

The hydroelectric power which the St. Lawrence project can furnish will be both plentiful and cheap, both characteristics which make it particularly desirable in defense production. Experience has demonstrated that defense production must be expected to add very substantially to power demand. This is being superimposed upon the steady rise of normal demand, one which was earlier estimated to require by 1960 in the region served by the St. Lawrence several times as much power (in addition to that already planned) as the St. Lawrence project can supply.

With respect to the effect of the proposed Seaway on the shipbuilding and ship repair industry, a study of the experience of the last war indicates that it was necessary to use such facilities on the Great Lakes as were available to their maximum capacity at that time in carrying on a small boat and bulk-type lake carrier program and in the construction of combat-service and supply ocean vessels for the armed services. Vessels constructed in Great Lakes shipyards designed for ocean service were routed to the open sea by way of the existing 14-foot St. Lawrence Channel, which limited the size of those which could be built in the St. Lawrence area, or, with the aid of pontoons fitted at the expense of time, manpower, and materials, had to be floated to the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Mississippi River system.

The St. Lawrence seaway would provide a gateway for vessels directly to or from the open sea, thereby permitting the Great Lakes shipyards to build practically all types of cargo vessels designed for use with the United States sea-going merchant fleets. It would also permit Great Lakes shipyards to do part of the repair and reconversion work now performed by the tidewater shipyards. While shipbuilding and repair yards on the seacoast are now capable of caring for peacetime construction or repair programs, the additional facilities that would be available in the Great Lakes would be of distinct advantage in the event of war.

This advantage has another side. There is a possibility, which has been mentioned in the press, of a growing danger that industrial plants on sea coasts may be subject to attack in future wars by guided missiles fired from submarines which would be able to approach fairly close to our coast line. To the extent that an industry vital to our war machine, such as our shipbuilding industry, can be maintained at locations remote from coastal areas the possibility of damage by such attacks will be reduced. In effect, then, the seaway is a contribution in the direction of dispersion of manufacturing and industrial facilities.

Question has been raised as to the vulnerability of the major installations of the project to determined air attack. That vulnerability is recognized. However, the same objection could be raised to any future project of a similar nature at any continental point. If this objection were to be the controlling factor we would be limited to the development of only minor and widely dispersed natural resources. Further, the area is already one of high defense priority. The project will, therefore, not require commitments for defense of the area that do not already exist in large part.

It is also recognized that the seaway is admittedly susceptible to serious traffic interruptions by enemy action, particularly sabotage. Although precautions against sabotage would be necessary, vital portions of the project can be given defense protection on a par with that accorded other comparatively vital installations. Reasonable protective measures will to a large extent minimize the risks. In this connection, it has been pointed out that to destroy locks or render them inoperable for an appreciable period is one matter when done as a defensive measure and another when performed as a matter of sabotage. To accomplish such damage would normally require prolonged access to the lock and the installation of a considerable quantity of explosives.

In summary, the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects are assuming an ever increasing importance, especially from industrial and logistical viewpoints. We need the power which it can produce. We need this reasonably safe and sure means of supplying the steel industry of the size which our industrial progress warrants and our security demands.

We can use to full advantage a new water-communications link from our industrial Midwest to the areas of our national interest throughout the world. We believe that a prompt start must be made so that these projects may be completed as soon as possible. The payoff may be sooner than we think. Thank you.

Twenty Years of Ridiculing the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest Lincoln Day speeches delivered in my congressional district last month was by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress from the Blair-Centre-Clearfield district in Pennsylvania. The occasion was the Lincoln-Victory dinner sponsored by the Council of Republican Women of Erie County and held in the Lawrence Hotel, Erie, Pa., on the evening of February 15.

Representative VAN ZANDT was elected to Congress in 1938 and before that time he had served three consecutive terms as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. He later served in the United States Navy during World War II, resigning his seat in Congress when called for active duty. He was discharged in 1946 with the rank of captain, United States Naval Reserve.

Representative VAN ZANDT'S speech was well received by the large number of persons in attendance at the Lincoln-Victory dinner and was also the subject of several editorials in Erie County newspapers.

The following editorial is taken from the February 17 issue of the Erie Daily Times:

[From the Erie (Pa.) Daily Times of February 17, 1951]

TWENTY YEARS OF RIDICULING THE CONSTITUTION

Representative JAMES VAN ZANDT has long been a Member of Congress. He represents the district embracing Altoona. He is known for his straightforwardness, no pussyfooting, determined stand on national problems. He is a veteran of World War I.

His congressional record matches his war record—outstanding. His constituency representing all planes of life and political beliefs, must have faith in him. They've reelected him again and again.

Representative VAN ZANDT gave one of his straight-from-the-shoulder talks in Erie, Thursday night. The occasion was the Lincoln-Victory dinner by the Council of Republican Women. Whether the occasion was partisan-sponsored would make no difference to the Pennsylvania Representative, who has observed at close range the operations in Washington for many years.

"For nearly 20 years we have lived under the banner of the so-called New Deal-Fair Deal and in reality raw deal concept of government. As a result we have seen the Constitution of the United States ridiculed and ignored while socialism and communism have been encouraged," he declared.

"The New Dealers in following their program of deceit experimented with every phase of our economic life and to such an extent that they lulled the American people into a sense of false security. They promised everybody something for nothing, even luring many Republicans with their sugar-coated remedies."

And putting the finger on wishy-washy Republicans, he said:

"To be frank, in 1936 and again in 1940, the New Dealers had convinced many Republicans that their party had no future and it has not been so long ago that some Republicans actually apologized for their Republican faith.

"With such a condition prevalent throughout the Nation the Republican Party was faced with extinction and serious consideration was asked that the name "Republican" be changed and another adopted in its place. Mind you, this is the same party founded by Abraham Lincoln."

Representative VAN ZANDT recalled that during the early days of the Roosevelt regime, he, with other Members of Congress, were publicly ridiculed because they refused to follow the dictates of the Chief Executive, who, at the time, had as his advisers Harry Hopkins, Rex Tugwell, Henry Wallace, Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, and others of infamous Commie stamp.

Like many other America-loving Members of Congress, Representative VAN ZANDT was pilloried for his defense of the ideals that made this country great.

He fought the battle with little support from the White House and even his own colleagues of his own party, against the fellow travelers and parlor pinks occupying high positions of Government and who had a firm foothold in the State Department. This radical-minded mob on the Federal payroll were writing directives designed to regiment the American people and destroy our form of government.

What did JIMMY VAN ZANDT do about this? He knew that the situation existed. He fought the battle, the good fight, but he was outnumbered; he was smeared, like many of his sincere colleagues. But he kept up the battle as he is today.

"Never before in the history of our country has our national honor suffered such humiliation and disgrace as by the crimes committed at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. The crimes of Pearl Harbor, the partitioning of Germany, the appeasement of Russia, the coddling of Communists in high Government positions, the dismantling of our national defense, and our blundering foreign policy which plunged us into the so-called police action in Korea, constitute national sins that cry to heaven for vengeance."

That is the picture he gave to his listeners. Harsh, fiery, but unfortunately truthful. The confusion in Washington is appalling, and the American people are entitled to be told the truth, and it would take an army of JIMMY VAN ZANDTS to give America the scandalous picture, with the hope that such revelation would stir up patriotism and a drive to the ballot box for a change to some form of honest administration of our country.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 the Council of Lithuanian Societies in Baltimore again joined with Lithuanians all over the world, in celebrating the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, this celebration could not be a very joyous occasion, in view of the situation which still exists in Lithuania. But such an occasion can serve to remind us that we must continue our efforts to fight the spread of communism and to endeavor to work out, through the United Nations, a plan for the liberation of the countries enslaved by Russia.

It was my privilege to attend the banquet held by the Council of Lithuanian Societies in Baltimore and I would like to place in the RECORD the address delivered by the Honorable J. Kajeckas, counselor of the Lithuanian Legation on that occasion:

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

(By J. Kajeckas)

One more anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuania's Independence is being commemorated in mourning. An anniversary without a krivule (a crooked staff used by Lithuanians in olden days to convoke their meetings), without a trumpet, without any propaganda whatsoever, dispelling everything that divides us, and in the name of that Lithuania, Lithuanians all over the world are united by common pain, common longing for right and justice for the Lithuanian Nation, by common aspiration for Lithuania's independence. Wherever a Lithuanian may be today, in his homeland or in exile, free or enslaved, he lives with the one and the same thought, that Lithuania be freed.

This anniversary is accompanied by numerous tears, especially in the homeland and in exile in Russia. It is not Herodotus' envoys today who rage in Judea to murder innocent children; neither is it Nero's hangmen raging in the streets of Rome in hunt of a Christian victim. According to Maironis:

"The famous power of Caesar is asleep.
The joyfulness of the Colosseum is long silent.
'Circenses,' screams are no longer heard."

But this time, it is the terrible scourge of the twentieth century, far more bloody and brutal than that of Herodotus, or Nero, of Genghis Khan, or of Attilla that has affected holy Lithuania. It carries death, suffering, enslavement. The Kremlin's Bolshevik imperialism, violence, the violation of the Lithuanian Nation's rights, are the causes of our pain.

The Golgotha of the Lithuanian Nation has been going on for nearly 11 years. But in that Golgotha we note rays of hope which are both comforting and encouraging. During all these years the Governor of the State of Maryland has solemnly and publicly proclaimed Lithuanian Day. Today again he reminds the world that the first victim of Bolshevik violence is not Korea but Lithuania. These proclamations have announced and continue to announce that the trampled rights and freedoms in Lithuania must be restored. We witness every year on this anniversary the brave proclamations of the mayor of Baltimore and the appropriate resolutions of the House of Delegates of Maryland. On this anniversary we have had here in our midst, as we have today, either the Governor himself or his delegate, the mayor of Baltimore, honorable Senators and Congressmen, and numerous friends who are in sympathy with the Lithuanian cause. To all of them is due the deepest appreciation of the Lithuanian Nation.

Significant rays of hope during the last several weeks have multiplied. Here are but a few examples:

1. On the radio and in the world press we hear the following responsible statements:

"We are struggling * * * to uphold the basic values of freedom—of peace based on justice. * * *

"We must remember that the fighting in Korea is but one part of the tremendous struggle of our time—the struggle between freedom and Communist imperialism.

"Our objective is to build a world order based on freedom and justice.

"The moral and spiritual dangers that flow from communism are a more serious threat to freedom than its military power." (From President Truman's address to Youth Conference, New York Times, December 6, 1950.)

"The threat of world conquest by Soviet Russia endangers our liberty and endangers the kind of world in which the free spirit of men can survive. This threat is aimed at all peoples who strive to win or defend their own freedom and national independence. * * *

"The threat is a total threat and the danger is a total danger. All free nations are exposed and all are in peril. * * *

"The imperialism of the czars has been replaced by the even more ambitious, more crafty, and more menacing imperialism of the rulers of the Soviet Union. * * *

"The free nations believe in the dignity and the worth of man. We believe in independence for all nations.

"Korea * * * is also a symbol. It stands for right and justice in the world against oppression and slavery. * * * The free world must always stand for these principles—and we will stand with the free world. * * *

"We will continue to work for peaceful settlements in international disputes.

"But we will not engage in appeasement." (From President Truman's annual address to joint session of Congress on State of the Union, New York Times, January 9, 1951.)

These words are the words of the President of the United States. The Lithuanians understood their meaning and they are close to their hearts. They mean that we are not alone in our struggle and that the greatest enemy of Lithuania is also the greatest enemy of the free world and of all mankind. They also mean that our aspirations are based on solid principles and that Lithuania's freedom is not an empty dream.

2. Hon. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, spoke as follows:

"It gives me particular pleasure to participate in the opening program of the Lithuanian language transmissions of the Voice of America, on this day, February 16, when Lithuanians and their many friends everywhere are celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day.

"The people and the Government of the United States, through these broadcasts, will seek to convey the genuine interest and concern which they take in the welfare of the Lithuanian people. The concern which is felt for the position of the Lithuanian people is not new. It was most forcefully expressed in a statement issued by the United States Government on July 23, 1940. On that date the United States Government issued the following declaration:

" 'During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

" 'From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

" 'The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United

States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"'These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"'The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.'

"That was a United States Government statement issued July 23, 1940.

"The adherence of the United States to the fundamental principles expressed at that time is indicated by the fact that this Government has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. and continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of Lithuania in the United States.

"The Lithuanian broadcasts of the Voice of America will convey to the Lithuanian people a factual unbiased picture of the motives and aims which guide the United States in its international relations. Our aims are: Peace, freedom, and justice for all.

"These broadcasts will also endeavor to bring to the people of Lithuania a true report on the contemporary American scene and the efforts of the people of the United States to achieve a fuller and richer life for all those who cherish freedom and liberty.

"It is with these thoughts that I transmit to the people of Lithuania my own greetings as well as the greetings of the people and of the Government of the United States." (Department of State, Press Release No. 119, February 15, 1951.)

3. On this same occasion today the Lithuanian Minister to the United States, Hon. P. Zadeikis, spoke as follows:

"Beloved brothers and sisters, as the song goes, today is a holiday in my soul, so, it is for me today. As the duly accredited Minister and Envoy of the free Republic of Lithuania in the United States, I have the significant and memorable honor and duty of greeting my countrymen in our native language on this 16th day of February, which commemorates the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration in Vilnius of Lithuania's independence.

"The inauguration of broadcasts by the Voice of America in the Lithuanian language on our national holiday indicates the importance which the free world continues to attach to the commemoration of Lithuania's Independence Day. On this significant occasion, the thoughts of Lithuanians and their many friends abroad everywhere turn to you who remain in the homeland carrying silently but steadfastly in your hearts an abiding faith in the future of free Lithuania. That faith receives a mighty measure of assurance from the fact that the right, which must ultimately prevail, is on our side.

"The difficult conditions under which you must keep that faith and the tragic situation in Lithuania since 1940 are well known and viewed with the greatest sympathy in the Western World. As your official representative in this great land of freedom, the United States of America, I assure you that the American people are outstanding in their friendship and sympathy toward the Lithuanian people and I remind you that this attitude of the American people is reflected in the official refusal of the United States Government to recognize the enforced incorporation of our country into the Soviet Union. I also wish to remind you that the United States is not alone among the countries who have refused to recognize Soviet sovereignty over Lithuania, which reflects the friendliness and sympathy of other peoples as well. I should like to mention finally that the plight of Lithuanian people in the homeland has also been the subject of concern to delegates of various nations to the United Nations who have expressed their anxiety and sympathy on many occasions.

"May this first attempt by the Voice of America to speak to you in the Lithuanian language, despite the so-called iron curtain established by the Soviets, be a signal to you of renewed hope for the restoration of the right of self-determination in Lithuania and the other countries of the world presently enslaved by the Communist horde.

"Bowing my head before the altar of great hopes and of supreme sacrifices placed there by the fighters for Lithuania's independence, I conclude my remarks with the conviction that, with God's help, the sun of freedom will again shine upon our native country and that we must work in unity toward that great goal.

"Such broadcasts in the Lithuanian language are of great value. They are a great comfort to the crucified Lithuanian nation in general and to its underground in particular.

"One could mention in this connection also the Declaration of the Aims and Principles of Liberation of the Central and Eastern European Peoples, adopted and signed in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pa., on February 11, 1951, by representatives of nations behind the iron curtain, including Lithuania."

4. The New York Times of this morning commenting on the above-mentioned wrote in an editorial which I quote:

"THE VOICE OF LIBERTY

"In a further effort to penetrate the iron curtain the Voice of America adds today another foreign-language program to the many it is broadcasting around the world. The new program is in Lithuanian and is timed to begin on the thirty-third anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence during the First World War. That independence has since been obliterated by Soviet Russia, which annexed Lithuania and the two other Baltic states, Latvia and Estonia, as a result of its deal with Hitler.

"Lithuanians who have managed to escape from behind the iron curtain have joined with representatives of other East European nations under the Soviet yoke in a continuing struggle for liberty. Several hundred such representatives from 10 countries met this week in Independence Hall in Philadelphia to issue a declaration of their own independence from communism. This declaration calls for the formation of a European federation modeled after the United States. The new program of the Voice of America offers evidence that our Government continues to recognize the independence of the Baltic states." (The New York Times, February 16, 1951.)

These are all rays of hope, they are the first swallows announcing the approach of spring for the oppressed peoples. This time it comes not along the Carpathian Mountains but from along the shores of the Atlantic.

No despot is eternal. Each and every one of them has reached the same end. According to the Lithuanian poet prophet:

"Each scourge
After scourging justice breaks each day."

Let us have confidence in Lithuania's freedom of tomorrow, let us work and let us sacrifice toward that end. The chains of slavery are breaking. Freedom's sun will rise again. The future belongs to the free nations, to oppressed peoples, including Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to insert in the RECORD a copy of the resolution approved by all those present at the banquet:

We, citizens of Baltimore, Md., gathered under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, in commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people Lithuania, held on the 16th day of February 1951 at Lithuanian Hall, after due deliberations regarding the present international situation, take note of the following:

The United States of America, together with other United Nations members, is engaged in a bloody struggle in Korea defending the freedom of peace-loving people against Communist aggressors.

We believe the bold and determined steps taken by the United States of America to protect a defenseless people emerging into a status of independent statehood rallied the forces of freedom everywhere and revived suffering mankind's faith in American policy objectives.

Let it not be forgotten, however, that the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia constitute the original "Korea," since they were the first to be overrun by the Communist forces more than 10 years ago. These same nations are still under Communist domination and they are being inhumanly subjected to extermination by the genocidal policy of the Soviet rulers.

Furthermore, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were members in good standing of the League of Nations. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, which had been expelled from the League because of the aggressive war it waged against Finland, is a member of the United Nations with a veto power to block the complaints of the victimized Baltic States.

We agree with the statement of the President of the United States in his last state of the Union message to Congress, that free and independent nations can band together in a world order based on law, and that the cornerstone of such a peaceful world has been laid in the United Nations. But the President's further statement: "The imperialism of the czars has been replaced by the even more ambitious, more crafty and menacing imperialism of the rulers of the Soviet Union," indicates to us that the Soviet Union does not intend to abide by the Charter of the United Nations.

Wherefore it is respectfully requested that the United States of America continue to maintain its world leadership in its efforts to achieve international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice and we urge the President and the Secretary of State to adopt appropriate measures in order to accomplish the following:

1. To bring up the matter of the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, in the open international forum of the UN;

2. To invoke the aid of the UN in condemning and stopping the crime of genocide which is being perpetrated in Lithuania and other Baltic countries by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its ruling Communist Party;

3. The release of all of the political prisoners now in concentration camps and under forced labor in the Soviet Union;

4. To allow freedom of religion to all people;

5. To assist the Lithuanian Nation and the other Baltic States when the forces of Communist imperialism are crushed, in the reestablishment of a separate national sovereignty and true freedom and independence; and

6. To demand the ouster of the Soviet Union from membership in the UN if it continues with its flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES,
ANTHONY J. MICKEIKA, *President.*
MARTIN RAILA, *Secretary.*

Thought for the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following Thought of the Week address delivered by the Reverend Philip E. Dobson, S. J., director of St. Peter's College Institute of Industrial Relations, to 600 adult students at the institute on Wednesday, February 21, 1951. St. Peter's College Institute was founded in 1945, and nearly 3,000 members of labor unions and leaders in management have availed themselves of the courses in labor-management problems given each fall and winter. The main purpose of the institute is to build up moral armament in labor and management against the evils of communism. I commend to my colleagues this thought-provoking address by Father Dobson:

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK—THE REAL BATTLE FRONT: YOUR HOME AND YOUR JOB

In this hour of our country's gravest peril, when our natural resources, our manpower, and our production machinery are being geared and channeled into the building of a great war machine, some may have a mistaken impression about the true nature of the titanic struggle in which we are being involved. In the frantic rush to turn out battleships, airplanes, guns, and tanks when there is little time for meditation and quiet thinking, there is a danger that our people will pour out their very lifeblood to beat the Communist world menace, in vain, unless they realize just what is at stake, unless they comprehend what it is that makes inevitable the fight to the death which we are facing between Christianity and communism.

The cause for the spread of communism goes further and deeper than the imperialistic ambitions of Josef Stalin and the Politburo. The spread of communism is an effect. It is not the basic cause of the present world conflict. Communism is rolling in to fill the vacuum caused by the crumbling of a decadent western civilization.

Father Gorman, in this month's issue of the Sign, dissects masterfully the diseased carcass of our western so-called Christian civilization, and lays bare the wounds, the sores, the deterioration which have left that body a ready prey to all types of social diseases. That it is communism now is quite incidental.

To paraphrase Father Gorman: Why does communism have such a tremendous appeal to so many millions? Let us roam the world and find out. Why do our arguments against communism avail so little? Let us stack our arguments against reality and soon we shall know. The answer is that we have been false to our Christian religion. We have given it lip service, but in our daily lives we have been greedy materialists. We have sacrificed our ideals on the altar of pomp and power and pagan worship of our bodies with its pleasures.

What does the share cropper in the South, wringing a miserable existence out of the wretched soil, care about our argument that the Soviet farms are collectivized? He couldn't be worse off than he is. We think we can turn people away from communism by pointing out that there is one ballot in Soviet Russia. To the Negro in the South that is better than no ballot.

The French dock worker who lives like the rats that scurry around the wharves is not impressed by statistics pointing out Soviet Russia's low standard of living. Rhetoric on the glories of Christian civilization hardly impresses the Italian tenant farmer living with his family in a cave, whose very lifeblood, so to speak, is drawn off by an absentee landlord to purchase a mink coat for his mistress. For that farmer, any change would be for the better.

Certainly our appeals to the Asiatics and the people of Africa fall on deaf ears. The white man's record on these continents should make decent men blush with shame. The imperialism of the western nations gouged these countries of their wealth and their resources. The white lords condemned and despised the natives. They degraded them, ground them down, prevented their realizing the advantages of education and their rich native culture.

Is the white man qualified, then, to warn the people of Asia and Africa that with communism comes slavery?

Society can be compared to a building. Just as a building is erected by placing one brick upon another and the quality of the building is known by the quality of the bricks, so society consists of you, and you, and you, as individuals and the moral texture of society is the sum of the moral characters of the individual citizens. When a society consists, for the most part, of people who observe the law of God, abstain from debilitating vices, are hard working, healthfully independent, and dedicated to high ideals in life, that is a sound society. With this description of a healthy society as a background, I ask you to estimate the caliber of our present so-called Christian civilization.

With the passage of time every empire the world has known has decayed, crumbled, and fallen. The classic example is that of the Roman Empire. These empires crumbled, not because they lacked men with brains and ability at the top. They decayed and fell apart because the great mass of citizens, the bricks of society, became soft, amoral, and unprincipled. The empires crumbled because the human bricks individually crumbled.

These considerations should bring home to each of you, with devastating clarity, how important each and every one of you are in the crisis which looms before us. Unless we can point to Joe Citizen after Joe Citizen and claim that they are moral, God-fearing, good-living, upright, hard-working, dedicated citizens, it is in order to ask the questions, "Have we anything worth fighting for?" I say this because if, after estimating citizen after citizen, we should find them wanting, then we are forced to conclude that our civilization resembles the decadent state of the crumbled empires and certainly such a civilization is not worth the outpouring of the blood of millions of people.

I say then, that the real battleground in this crisis is found in your homes and on your jobs. Military might is undermined and sapped of its strength unless it has as its foundation morally healthy homes and members of labor and management who practice justice and charity. Should we squeeze through to victory in the present crisis, just before we become too decadent, the hosannas of triumph will turn to the rattle of despair and the statues of victory will be pulverized into ashes.

This will be so unless our homes and unless our families are free of the debilitating vices which have undermined other world powers. This will be true unless social justice and social charity are practiced by labor and management in their wage policies, in their handling of grievances, in their attitudes toward each other, in the setting of production policies and in their attitudes toward the public.

Our Lost Spiritual Fortitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "Our Lost Spiritual Fortitude," which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, published at Tulsa, Okla., Saturday, April 8, 1950, is worthy of being reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This editorial was written by my fellow townsman, Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, one of America's great editorial writers.

This editorial was awarded an honor medal award from the Freedoms Foundation. The award was announced at Valley Forge, Pa., by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in an address by General Bradley on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1951. The news item from Valley Forge giving an account of the announcement of the award by General Bradley and reciting that the recipient of the award was chosen by a distinguished awards jury composed of State supreme court jurists and executive officers of national patriotic and service organizations, whose chairman was Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State College, follows the quotation of the editorial to which I have referred.

May we have more such spontaneous declarations and patriotic reminders and pronouncements of those capable of influencing the citizens of this country in the right direction—America-ward.

The editorial follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of April 8, 1950]

OUR LOST SPIRITUAL FORTITUDE

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Everywhere, on every land, in every clime, life should be lovely. Every human being, who is not crazy, loves to live. He wants to see, see the color of the earth, the green of the trees, the blue of the seas, the radiance of the flowers, the brilliance of the sun, the beauty of the stars, the majesty of the moon. He wants to see.

He wants to hear. Hear the voices of kinfolk, neighbor, and friend. He wants to speak and be spoken to. Most of all he cherishes that interchange of thought that induces laughter. He wants to smell the sweetness of the air, the aroma of the new-tilled earth, and the fresh-mown hay. His nostrils sniff life with rapture.

War is waste, wreckage. War is murder. Why must we have mass murder? No sane mind wants it.

We Americans are worried, fearful that we may again be drawn into another war. Our scientists have made mass murder appallingly massive. Life can be annihilated if we war again. Then why do we have it?

Our is a beautiful country. America is a land worth loving. As each loves his own home, every good American has learned to love our collective home. We have rules to make home pleasant. By those rules we live happy home lives. We have rules to make our collective living pleasant.

The makers of our Republic recognized the individual's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. No less they recognized the common responsibility that every citizen must accept if we are to protect the freedoms in which we may live our lives in largeness.

We have rules for living together. They make the Oregonian feel happily at home in Ohio or Oklahoma. And the Missourian in Massachusetts or Mississippi.

All that any of us want is the right to live in freedom, in peace, unafraid of any wild and ferocious beast who, like the untamed Russian bear, watches with covetous eyes, ready to pounce upon us, and destroy us.

We talk of World War II as a triumph for our fighting forces. But we lost that war. America never carried the Stars and Stripes onto any field of battle except to widen the horizon line of human freedom until this Second World War. The military historian insists we won that war. But the honest historian is already telling the tragic truth of our surrender. Our Commander in Chief surrendered at Yalta, at Quebec, and at Tehran.

All people, even the Russian people, want peace. They all want to live, they all want liberty and the right to pursue happiness.

The world was eager to believe we meant what we said about "four freedoms." But we no sooner proclaimed the "four freedoms" than we sat down with Stalin, the mad marshal of mass murder, and wiped out the freedoms of millions. Instead of being free from fear, we hurled the whole world headlong into fear. Free men became slaves, armies rushed again to their gun racks.

Because of betrayals, the war that does not end, now compels us to fear devastating attacks upon our own soil. Something has happened to us that our house, so long in order, is falling in decay. The greatest danger that confronts us is not Stalin, nor the loss of the liberties of millions of people that we betrayed into slavery, but the indifference of our own people to the menace of the political mess we have made. This indifference has already gone far to destroy our own freedoms.

At long last we have begun to convict some who have betrayed public trust. It is shocking to learn in the Hiss case, as one, that 10 years before he was brought to trial all the truths and facts that convicted him were known to such men in positions of public trust as Dean Acheson, A. A. Berle, William C. Bullitt, Ley Henderson, Cordell Hull when he was Secretary of State and Frank Murphy when he was our Attorney General. And nothing was done. They had all the records, and they hid them.

Have we Americans become a guileless, gullible people? We ourselves have given administrative powers to men who care little about our life, our liberty, and our pursuit of happiness.

Freedoms are firm. Every courthouse is built to so testify. In every State, in every county and in every town we have laws that protect the invasions of our homes by bandits, burglars, sneak thieves, murderers. But it has come to pass that the Supreme Court of the United States has so far departed from the constitutional foundations of our Republic that it defends any alien who comes onto our shores as a spy, as a foe, of our freedoms.

This is not fantastic. Our highest judicial tribunal has thrown hurdles and stumbling blocks in the way of our peace officers who would protect us from the subversive spies. Our highest tribunal befriends the alien who pilfers the secrets of our defenses. Our State Department and our courts throw their protection around Communist agents. If these public officials are not smart enough to cope with insidious criminals, then they are not competent to be the defenders of our freedoms. If they are smart enough to recognize an enemy, and shield him, then we should not allow our liberties to be entrusted to their care.

Why are our life, liberty, and our pursuit of happiness subjected to this studied encroachment on our freedoms? We have done this to ourselves. While we listened to the pleasing platitudes of four freedoms they were repudiated. We have listened to two Presidents hold in contempt the patriotism that made America. Love of country has been scoffed at, treated with sneers. Ridicule of our country has become the thesis which conscienceless book publishers and periodical makers have smiled upon with favor and promoted.

When the bugles blare and the drums rattle our flag flies before marching men. We become patriots again. Something is wrong when it takes a war to make us patriots. It takes a war to silence the contemptuous sneer of the shallow conceited intellectuals who betray us and bring to our lovely land the fear of Communist tyranny.

Something beside fertile soil and vast resources made us the richest Nation on earth. Because we have been the richest Nation we can and should be the most powerful Nation on earth. A power for peace. We betray our heritage. We betray our children and our children's children so long as we keep electing public officials who have been responsible for the growth of the New Deal and Fair Deal, both of which have repudiated the laws and principles that made us mighty. And we are going to grow weaker so long as we keep a President who has shown a disposition to protect aliens who wish to destroy us.

There is a hopeful trend dawning. Sensible writers and commentators are in revolt. They are beginning to tell the truth about the betrayals that have been destroying our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There is an increasing number of nonprofessional historical writers who are reviewing the years of our Nation's creation. As our national existence is threatened we are becoming once again interested in our heritage. Once again we learn that our seemingly insuperable obstacles were overcome by the spiritual fortitude of our fathers. The spiritual fortitude we have been schooled to lose.

We do not want to destroy ourselves. Nor do we want to lose our liberty. We want to live. We love life. We want all peoples to have the right to live as they choose to live. But we have weakened ourselves by choosing weak leaders. Observing this, spiritually impoverished but physically mighty powers seize upon our sleeping patriotism. If we are to save the life we love and live it as we all want to live it, we must again be Americans.

MEDAL FOR FREEDOM EDITORIAL AWARDED TO TRIBUNE PUBLISHER

Richard Lloyd Jones, publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, will receive an honor medal award from the Freedoms Foundation for an editorial titled "Our Lost Spiritual Fortitude," it was announced today at Valley Forge, Pa.

The award was announced by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and was among a series of honors bestowed on leading Americans and organizations for "outstanding contributions to freedom during 1950."

General Bradley, in his speech prepared for the Freedoms Foundation's presentation ceremony, said the United States has "ample strength" to share with its free-world allies until they become "self-sufficient and independent of our aid."

And the combined industrial production and skill of the free nations "will assure our military supremacy if we need it," the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said.

He added, however, that the avowed intentions of communism provide little chance that America's military load can be lightened soon.

The North Atlantic treaty organization is a stronger combination than "the compulsory league of Soviet satellites," Bradley said.

Naming of the recipients was part of a special Washington's birthday ceremony.

They were chosen by a distinguished awards jury composed of State supreme court jurists and executive officers of national patriotic and service organizations. Chairman of the jury was Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State College.

Basis for the judging is the official credo of the Freedoms Foundation, which defines the American way of life as an indivisible bundle of economic and political freedoms as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, based in turn on a fundamental belief in God.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, over 90 percent of every 1,000,000 postal cards sent through the mails are sent by business enterprises such as advertising agencies and other business firms. For every million such postal cards so mailed, those business enterprises pay $10,000, and the taxpayers pay $18,000, resulting in a clear subsidy to business. A like subsidy at taxpayers' expense is also enjoyed by newspapers and magazines.

I was pleased to see both the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News strongly support the adjustment of rates to eliminate this hand-out of public funds. I ask unanimous consent to include with these remarks in the RECORD a copy of each of those editorials, the first one from the Washington Daily News of February 28, and the second from the Washington Post of March 1. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 28, 1951]

RAISE POSTAL RATES

President Truman has sent Congress his annual plea for higher postal rates. Congress should, by all means, raise rates.

He estimates that, at present rates, the post office deficit would be $521,000,000 in the 12 months beginning next July.

Unsound at any time, such a deficit would, as he says, be worse than unsound now when the taxpayers must carry a heavy burden of defense costs.

Mr. Truman proposes to cut the deficit to $160,000,000—the cost, he figures, of services the post office performs for the Government itself.

But there is no assurance that the rate increases he seeks would make the deficit that small, for, as he points out, postal costs will rise if railroad and airline mail-carrying charges are boosted, and—though he doesn't mention this—those costs will rise further if Congress gives postal workers the higher wages they want, need, and deserve.

However, judging by past performances, there will be a lot of boggling in Congress over Mr. Truman's request for $861,000,000 in additional postal revenue, to be raised by—

Doubling the 1-cent rate on postcards, circulars, and advertising matter; doubling the rates on newspapers, magazines, and other publications; making parcel-post rates high enough to cover costs; and raising charges for registry, insurance, c. o. d. mail, and special-delivery services.

This newspaper agrees with the President that now, more than ever, it is wrong to ask the taxpayers to bear costs that should be borne by users of the mail service, many of whom have enjoyed large special privileges in the form of low, subsidized postal rates.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers have said repeatedly that they want no subsidy from the Government; that they are willing to pay the full, accurately determined cost of delivering that part of their circulation which goes by mail.

The increases, of course, should be fairly applied. There should be few, if any, exceptions to the rule that private users of postal services must pay their own way. The Government should cut down its own extravagant use of those services, and Congress should put into effect without more delay the Hoover Commission recommendations for divorcing the Post Office Department from politics and making it a more efficient, more economical business institution.

[From the Washington Post of March 1, 1951]

POSTAL RATES

There is an inescapable logic in the President's message to Congress asking for increased postal rates. Under the rates now in force the Post Office Department anticipates a deficit for the 1952 fiscal year of $521,000,000. As the President pointed out, "a postal deficit of more than half a billion dollars is obviously unsound, especially at a time when every effort must be made to reduce the size of the Federal budget." It must be considered irrational and peculiarly exasperating, as well as unsound, when it is considered that this particular deficit has to be borne by the whole public for the special benefit of those using the postal service.

A portion of the deficit, approximately $160,000,000, is incurred through the handling of mail sent on official business by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. Since this serves general public purposes, the general public must pay for it in one way or another. But the balance of the deficit is incurred in providing service for private users and amounts to a subsidy of their business enterprises. For instance, penny post cards, used in large part for commercial and advertising purposes, entail a handling cost of 2.8 cents each. The cost ought to be borne by the users.

But the largest loss to the Post Office Department comes from the handling of second-class mail. The rates in this category, which covers newspapers and magazines, were intentionally set low on the theory that they would encourage the spread of information and education. But since newspapers and magazines are sold for private profit, subsidization of them—at least on a scale so generous as that now prevailing—involves a serious inequity. The cost of carrying them exceeds the postage paid by their publishers in the amount of $200,000,000 annually. A theory applicable when the country was in its infancy can scarcely be held to justify such a hand-out to mass circulation media with a large advertising content today.

The President has recommended that Congress provide for modest rate increases in respect of post cards, periodicals, and also third- and fourth-class mail. He does not seek an immediate wiping out of the whole deficit in post office operations, but asks that the Postmaster General be given authority to revise rates from time to time in order to keep them in line with costs. This newspaper urged the same remedy some months ago. Postal deficits represent a burden imposed on the many for the benefit of the relatively few. There is neither reason nor fairness in this kind of financing.

Propaganda Machine of Stalin & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excerpts of a speech given by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of Suffolk Superior Civil Court to members of the Dorchester Kiwanis Club at this luncheon at the Uphams Corner Market Restaurant on Tuesday, February 27, at 12:15. Mr. Sidney G. Harris, president of the organization, presided at the meeting. The above-mentioned follows:

It is an amazing fact that during the past 5 years, Stalin's empire has grown from 190,000,000 people to more than 900,000,000. Thirty-seven out of every hundred people in the world today are under the domination of the Communists because of the deceptive ideas given to the workers of the world. It is still more amazing that all the land and peoples taken over by the Communists were acquired through propaganda and infiltration by the fifth columns within those countries.

Americans are considered experts in the mechanical know-how but when it comes to propaganda we are babes in the woods compared to Stalin and company. The basic policy of Stalin and company is to achieve world conquest by force, violence, trickery, fraud, and the big lie. If we can draft boys to carry a gun, why not draft them to carry the principles of American democracy, based on justice and truth, to all the nations of the world?

The biggest lie of all that has been sold to the workers of the world is the part of the Communist Manifesto which read, "Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains." Instead of the workers losing their chains, the Commies have put a lock and key on them all over the world. However, it is not enough to abuse Russian communism and to publish the horrors of its physical application and it will not be enough to defeat it physically. We must defeat it by a stronger idea and we have that idea here in America—the Constitution of the United States. We should sell it to the world—not by land lease, gifts, or loans—but by training our bright young men in our colleges and universities and sending them to every country in the world as ambassadors of good will to spread the principles of American democracy. We could draft many of our best students in our colleges, being sure that they possess not only ability, character, and integrity, but, most important, loyalty to the American way of life.

We must get rid of the fifth column of Russian conspirators in this country, we have tolerated them for too long. The Kremlin conspirators train their students to destroy the true way of life such as freedom, liberty, and religion. We should see to it that the students in our colleges are trained to sell our way of life, which is based on truth and justice for all, to the nations of the world. This would be in keeping with the wishes of the founding fathers who commanded the preceptors of our colleges "to go forward and teach the youth ideals of love of country, chastity, obedience, and all those virtues which are the ornament of human society and upon which our Constitution was founded.

Our Lord sent His Apostles out to the highways and the byways to sell the common people the true way of life. Can you imagine the force of 12,000 or 20,000 students imbued with knowledge of our Constitution and our way of life going forth to the nations all over the earth—a sixth column for justice and truth? In World War I and World War II, we won the war but lost the peace. You cannot win peace by guns alone, it must be accomplished by truthful propaganda. That is the only way to destroy for all time the big lies which have been planted in the minds of the workers of the world by tyrannical dictators

---

The Houston Port and Traffic Bureau, Inc., Houston, Tex., Adopts Resolution Opposing the St. Lawrence Seaway Project Because It Is Unsound and Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Port and Traffic Bureau, Inc., of Houston, Tex., conscious of the devastating effect of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project on the economy of the entire United States, adopted the following resolution January 23, 1951, condemning such an economic monstrosity.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it has been reported in the press that a bill has been presented to the Congress recommending that the United States Government participate with Canada in the construction, maintenance, and expense attendant upon the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas this project has been defeated several times in recent years because it is both unsound and unnecessary; and

Whereas this project would result in diverting export and import business originating and terminating in the Midwest area from the Gulf ports to Canadian ports by enabling oceangoing vessels to call as far West as Lake Superior; and

Whereas land-transportation rates from a large portion of the West and Midwest to the Great Lakes ports are more favorable than to the Gulf ports there would be a resultant loss of revenue detrimental to the Gulf ports and the citizens of Texas; and

Whereas large sums of Government and private funds have been expended to build Gulf ports and terminal facilities for the purpose of handling midwestern business that would be diverted to Canadian ports; and

Whereas unnecessary Government spending when economy is in order as the means of aiding our national defense program, is contrary to public interest; and

Whereas the 27-foot channel proposed would not be able to carry fully loaded modern cargo vessels, and cost to deepen it later to 34 or 36 feet would be extremely heavy; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence River is unusable due to ice conditions during a considerable part of a year: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Houston Port and Traffic Bureau urge the Senate and the House of the United States Congress to oppose this proposed legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Congressmen and Senators in all States of the Union that are affected by the proposed project; to all salt-water ports in the United States and to the Association of American Railroads in Washington, D. C.

A Challenge to the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 19, 1951:

A CHALLENGE TO THE SCHOOLS

Figures on Army draft rejections do not afford a sound basis for scientific generalizations, since they merely reflect an opinion as to the minimum requirements for a good soldier. It is disheartening nonetheless to learn that one out of every three young men called up fails to qualify, that about one in six the country over is turned down for "mental" reasons, and that in the South rejections for "mental" reasons run to 38.7 percent. It is wise to put "mental" in quotation marks, for the wide variance here is certainly more related to education than to native intelligence. In the country as a whole, as well as in the South, illiteracy has been steadily declining, but there are many who are "functionally illiterate"—that is, able to read but unable to make easy use of printed matter—and their plight is the result of poor schooling.

The most loyal southerner would not maintain that Negro schools in the South have had as much money spent on them, or have been as good, as the white schools. Efforts are being made to improve the situation, but the disparity largely remains. It must be admitted, too, that schools in the poorer parts of the South, white and Negro, have suffered because there was too little money to support them adequately. This has been true even when a given southern State spent a larger fraction of its total income on education than is common in the North.

If we are to have universal military service and training, which the world situation demands, the argument for Federal aid to education will be strengthened. It is both unfair and unwise to let young men come to military age without the basic schooling which will enable them to make the most of military training. We can take some comfort from the fact that rejections for functional illiteracy dropped greatly between the two World Wars. Nevertheless it is clear that the task of educating our people to be effective citizens as well as good soldiers is far from completed and has become a national responsibility.

A Second Try

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by Walter Lippmann, which I hope everyone will read. The Federal Reserve System should be above any pressure from outside and I hope they follow through on their position regardless of those pressures. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 1, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)

A SECOND TRY

The President has now intervened for the second time in the controversy between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. This meeting differed from the first one, which was held on January 31, in that the President has now come to see that the issue is not one that can be settled by calling in the Federal Open Market Committee and asking them to be good boys and to do what John Snyder wants to have done.

At the meeting this week the President recognized—at least in theory—that there is a problem still to be solved, that there are divergent policies which have still to be reconciled. This time the Treasury, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Council of Economic Advisers were also present, and the President instead of talking off the cuff read a memorandum, appointed a committee to make a report, and expressly did "not ask those present for any commitments on the subjects under discussion."

This is a decidedly better way to come at a great question of this sort. But it is not nearly good enough. The report which the President asked for is to be made by Messrs. Snyder, Keyserling, McCabe, and Wilson. What two out of the four members of the committee—namely, Mr. Snyder and Mr. Keyserling—are going to report we already know; they have put out a preview of it in the memorandum that the President read and that they—or their staffs—must have written. Thus half of the committee to study the problem has written its own views about the conclusions of the committee into the directive which the committee is to follow.

Mr. Wilson, the third member, has a tremendous interest in any measure which will reduce the inflationary pressure on the price and wage ceilings for which he is responsible. But Mr. Wilson has been subjected to pressure. In fact to unfair pressure. In effect he has been put in a position where he cannot side with the Federal Reserve without coming into open disagreement with the President of the United States, who is his immediate superior.

The fourth member of the committee is Mr. McCabe, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. His position is even more difficult than Mr. Wilson's. For Mr. McCabe has duties under the law which direct the Federal Reserve to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction. It is, I believe, the fact that all the members of the Federal Reserve Board and of the Federal Open Market Committee are agreed—including in his private views even Governor Vardaman—that the Treasury's insistence on the rigid support of a fixed-interest pattern is causing injurious credit expansion that is highly inflationary.

Mr. McCabe and his colleagues of the Federal Reserve are under the law an independent Government establishment. They are not supposed to take orders from or to be subjected to the pressure of the administration. President Wilson, who was responsible for the creation of the Federal Reserve System, treated the members of the Board with the same scrupulous respect for their independence that he gave to the judges of the Federal courts. There can be no doubt that it has been the intention of Congress that the Federal Reserve System should be independent. To emphasize this view Congress in the Banking Act of 1935 removed the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency from the Federal Reserve Board. Congress acted then upon the advice of Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, who had been Secretary of the Treasury under President Wilson. Senator Glass told the Senate that all Secretaries of the Treasury including himself have exercised undue influence over the board and have treated it rather as a bureau of the Treasury instead of as a board independent of the Government * * * not to be used to finance the Federal Government, which was assumed always to be able to finance itself.

Mr. Truman does not, it appears, recognize that the Federal Reserve is an independent establishment with duties which are laid upon it by the law, duties which it cannot, or at least should not, abandon because he asks the Board to do that. Mr. McCabe and his colleagues are in the awkward predicament of being asked, indeed, heavily pressed, by the President of the United States to do what under the law and their own unanimous judgment under that law they ought not to do.

The President's memorandum comes close to saying that if they do not obey the Treasury, they will be interfering with the defense effort. This is duress employed to override their independence of judgment. It is not fair, indeed, it is highly improper, for the President to place them in a dilemma where if they do their duty under the law, they are made to appear as obstructors of the national defense. If the President believes the emergency is such that the Federal Reserve System should cease to be independent and should become, as Senator Glass put it, a bureau of the Treasury, then he should accomplish that by asking Congress to amend the law and not by pressure from the White House.

In what was surely one of the ablest speeches delivered in the Senate for many a long day, Senator DOUGLAS said at the end, "I conclude with the plea that the Treasury abate its policies and yield on this issue. May I also enter a plea that the Federal Reserve Board gird its legal loins and fulfill the responsibilities which I believe Congress intended it to have?"

It is asking a good deal of any board—especially in a time of national emergency, especially in a field which so few understand well enough to have strong views—that it should gird its legal loins and defy the President and his administration. Since Mr. Truman seems determined to make the issue one where the Federal Reserve must choose between following its own judgment and obeying his instructions, there is an issue which Congress alone can decide. Senator DOUGLAS has a resolution which would

decide it, and it should be brought forward—far enough forward at least to offset the heavy pressure which is being exercised upon the President's committee by the White House.

Trim the Fat From the Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the Sanger (Calif.) Herald of February 22, 1951. Certainly the ideas expressed in this editorial are representative of the thinking of many people in our Nation today. There is nothing sacred about the military budget. The nature of military operations makes some waste inevitable; nevertheless, every effort should be made to get the most out of money appropriated for defense.

The editorial follows:

There is an old adage that says where there's smoke there's fire. Experience has proven that this is true in many cases. Experience has also proved that in the Federal Government investigation has shown this to be true even when nothing was done to correct the faults. The wishy-washy military situation as far as manpower and efficiency is concerned seems to have thrown up a lot of smoke. Certain investigation has shown that there is a certain amount of fire in back of this.

But the military has always been more or less of a sacred cow in this country, without too many persons paying attention to it in peacetime. In wartime everyone treats the brass with kid gloves and gives them accolades if they happen to succeed in doing a job for which they have been trained and paid.

The citizens of this country must awaken to the realization that money does not grow on trees—for the Government no more than for the private citizen. The tie-up between the Government and the military from the supply and manpower standpoint is extremely loose and inefficient, many times stupid and wasteful. The excess money being spent to keep the armed services going must be eliminated or the country's taxpayers will be in bad shape and worse humor.

It has come to light that it takes four men to keep an American soldier at the front, while in Russian and Chinese operations one man can keep from two to four men at the front. It is logical to assume that if we are to fight the Chinese and Russians and use our manpower to the utmost, we must take steps to cut down this huge differential.

Everyone who has been in the Army knows the waste of money there. This extends from the Pentagon in Washington down to the mess halls in the camps. The men in the military service should be treated well, but they need not be pampered and feted. Special services, entertainment teams, waste in the kitchens, and too many personnel for the same job are but a few instances.

The biggest waste of money is the jealous purchasing end of the deal. With millions of pounds of butter and eggs stored in caves around the country, the Army officials went into the open market and placed orders running into the millions of dollars for butter and eggs. There was no effort at cooperation between the Agriculture Department and the Army. And the stored butter and eggs? They were practically given to European countries who have been extorting the United States ever since the war for money and materials with the threat that they will go Communist if not taken care of.

All this is quite senseless. And it means money out of the pocket of every taxpayer. And who isn't a taxpayer these days? It is up to the people to put the pressure on Congress to put the pressure on the Government bureaus and the armed services to straighten up and begin acting in the interests of the United States. We are in for a long siege of military preparation and action. Let us trim our Armed Forces down to a fighting organization and take out the hoopla and drug store generals.

Let us prepare to fight anywhere in the world, but in doing so let us not simper around the foreign countries and hand them lots of goodies just so they will say, "I might be on your side some time." Time has shown that when the chips are down, most of these countries say, "I am on your side (just a little bit)." There are too many countries with vacillating Great Britain the chief offender and pussyfooter, doing business with the Russians to make a dollar and then standing up in the United Nations and saying what bad boys they are.

Lest We Forget the Conspiracy To Defame Anna Rosenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the newspaper column by Walter Winchell which appeared in most newspapers subscribing to the column on January 11, 1951. This particular column is from the New York Daily Mirror.

Since the column was printed the Committee on the Armed Services of another House has acted wisely and magnanimously in referring to the Department of Justice for appropriate action the perjured and vicious testimony offered in derogation of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who has been confirmed as the Assistant Secretary for National Defense in charge of manpower problems, and who already has proved the astuteness of the Secretary, General Marshall, in choosing her.

It is my sincere hope, and I know that it is the sincere hope of every decent American, that grounds can and will be found for appropriate legal action against the witnesses who falsely accused her of a multitude of sins.

Our libel laws do not permit of action against others, not witnesses, who pursued this valiant and intelligent woman with crude vulgarities and unspeakable innuendoes; I hope that some good can come from the evil that has been done by increasing the possibility of enactment of group libel laws as Members realize how little protection the individual has against political vilification.

Ordinarily I would see little point in the insertion of matter almost 2 months old.

Here, however, we have an example of deliberate effort to destroy the character and reputation created by a lifetime of hard work—an effort which seems to have many of the components of a conspiracy, and definitely to bear the infamous brands of perjury and malice.

We must not forget, and we must not allow the law enforcement agencies to forget, that this happened. Mr. Winchell's column is a concise summary of events and an excellent reminder.

I am sure that you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that what we seek here is not any limitation on the right of individuals to come forward with views and opinions on pending legislation, including the examination of nominees for high office.

What we do want is to make sure that no person, in the name of free speech and democratic privilege, shall needlessly defame a public figure from malice or from mere publicity-seeking. We are protecting the right of free speech and the sanctity of the oath as well as protecting public servants from baseless canards.

The text of the column follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of January 11, 1951]

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

MEMO TO THE EDITORS (AND THE U. S. SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE)

Three weeks ago 18 members of the United States Senate completed taking testimony against the new Assistant Secretary of Defense, Anna M. Rosenberg. When all the evidence was in, the committee—and the Nation—were convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that the accusers were guilty of making charges based only on hearsay, unsupported rumor, and probable falsehood.

Mrs. Rosenberg was cleared, though her reputation was tarred and feathered without mercy. The committee itself had been forced to waste 10 important days at a time when the Senators and Mrs. Rosenberg could have been making vital decisions in preparing America's defenses against an imminent war with Russia.

There was talk of perjury indictments—but only talk. Nothing has been done to bring the culprits to task. Here's the whole dirty behind-the-scenes story. We offer it in the hope it will prompt the Senate committee to recommend indictments—in order that this near "Dreyfus case" never be permitted to happen again in this country.

On December 5 the committee announced it was reopening the hearings on the nomination of Mrs. Rosenberg. A Congressman had advised he had a witness who wished to testify that Mrs. Rosenberg had been a Communist fellow traveler, active in the John Reed Club movement.

The witness presented was one Benjamin Freedman. Let's lift the manhole cover just a little and take a peek at this man's sewer: Freedman is an ardent admirer of Hitler's friend, the Grand Mufti. Two years ago Freedman was described by a New York judge as a "crackpot and international meddler." For the last couple of years he has been the financial angel of Common Sense, the dirtiest hate sheet in the East.

What was Freedman's testimony? That other people told him the new Assistant Secretary of Defense had planted Commie agents in the New York City educational system; that she was an active worker in a

Communist transmission-belt organization, and that the FBI files would prove Mrs. Rosenberg was a serious security risk.

Were these statements true? The person named as Mrs. Rosenberg's "agent" for planting spies in schools appeared before the committee and testified that the accusation was an outrageous lie. The charge that the Assistant Defense Secretary was active in the Commie-front known as the John Reed Club was also proved false when the FBI produced the "Anna Rosenberg" actually involved. Freedman's sworn testimony that the FBI files challenged Mrs. Rosenberg's loyalty was exploded when J. Edgar Hoover opened his records. Senator CAIN, who examined them, reported that the file "was highly complimentary to the personal character, to the competence and capacity and to the loyalty" of Mrs. Rosenberg.

(Freedman named a former Dies committee investigator as his source for the alleged FBI opinion. When that source was called to testify, he swore that his source was two ex-FBI agents, one of whom was Ted Kirkpatrick, editor of Red Channels. The G-men had told him, the ex-Dies committee detective said, that a William Harris had informed the Bureau that Mrs Rosenberg had been a member of his (Harris') Commie cell, but Kirkpatrick appeared and testified that he had never told the Dies man or anyone else any such thing—and that in fact he had never heard any such story from Harris. Then Harris appeared before the committee and confirmed Kirkpatrick's testimony. Harris swore he never made the statement.)

The second witness against Mrs. Rosenberg was one Ralph DeSola. A glance at his record· DeSola was a member of the Communist Party from September 1934 to January 1937. During that period he was the managing editor of two Commie publications and a leading figure in the John Reed Club.

DeSola swore to the committee that he was a member of the John Reed Club with Mrs. Rosenberg. He named James Magraw as the individual who had identified Mrs. Rosenberg to him as an important CP member. But Magraw came before the committee to swear that he (Magraw) was never a member of the John Reed Club; never knew Anna Rosenberg and never identified her to DeSola.

DeSola also swore to the committee that he had talked about Mrs. Rosenberg several times to George Starr, an FBI agent. But ex-FBI Agent George Starr (who later became State Department security officer for New York) then came to testify DeSola had never mentioned Mrs. Rosenberg to him in any way whatsoever.

This is to tell the Senate committee that Freedman and DeSola were not operating alone. They were part and parcel of a whole bigoted movement, created to destroy the new Assistant Secretary of Defense. Take a look at some of the hate rags and hate mongers who supported the efforts of the two discredited witnesses:

(1) West coast bigot, Maj. Robert H. Williams, professional pamphleteer (who uses his former Army rank for prestige), published all the false charges and advised his readers to urge Congress to act against Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment.

(2) Wesley Swift, Gerald Smith's California stooge, urged his followers to write to Washington to protest Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment. Swift told his suckers General Marshall's new assistant was not only a Jewess, but an alien from Budapest with socialistic ideas.

(3) From Arcadia, Calif., came a filth sheet called National Defense, published by ex-Congressman John P. Hoeppel (the former mis-Representative who went to prison for selling West Point appointments). Hoeppel urged Mrs. Rosenberg be turned down as a menace.

Of course, Gerald Smith was active behind the scenes from the very dirty beginning. Smith distributed an anti-Rosenberg circular throughout Washington, mailing it to every Senator and Representative.

From Washington, Smith sent his followers a series of messages during the course of the Senate investigation. Smith took a major share of credit for bringing Anna Rosenberg's Red record to the attention of the Armed Services Committee Excerpts from Smith's drivel: "I spent all of yesterday working on a very important and strategic enterprise. * * * I organized a staff of three people who immediately began to contact Members of Congress and the United States Senate, while I, in turn, contacted several. We succeeded in delaying the confirmation of the Rosenberg appointment. * * * We contacted three important committees and 10 Members of the United States Senate."

Obviously, a fraud has been perpetrated on the Senate of the United States. The only way to guarantee against a repetition of this kind of slimy racket is to indict those responsible for it.

Testimony of Hon. Albert W. Hawkes at the Joint Hearing on the Wherry Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony of Hon. Albert W. Hawkes at the joint hearing on the Wherry resolution before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, on February 20, 1951.

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

My name is Albert W. Hawkes, of Montclair, N. J. I am a former United States Senator from New Jersey and have been president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and am now chairman of the executive committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies of the United States.

I appear here today at the invitation of this joint committee and my testimony will be offered both as that of an individual American citizen and as an expression of the position undertaken by the American Coalition.

May I explain that the American Coalition is comprised of 96 societies representing more than 5,000,000 Americans from all sections of the United States. It doe: not necessarily speak for every individual in these societies, but the results from a vote in these organizations is similar to the election vote in our Nation—it speaks for the majority. As it is constituted, its board of directors is made up of the heads of these individual societies, and the head of each individual organization votes as the representative of his group at the American Coalition meetings.

Last Saturday, February 17, 1951, at a meeting of 570 members of 58 societies participating in the American Coalition in New York City, the following resolution was unanimously adopted as the American Coalition's position on the vital question before the country as to the advisability of garrisoning a large standing army in Europe for an unknown period of time:

"As representative of 58 patriotic organizations in convention assembled—

"We pledge to the Congress of the United States our support in the exercise of its constitutional authority to determine when and where American troops shall be garrisoned in foreign lands.

"We urge the President and the Congress to avoid commitments abroad of our military and economic resources which may weaken the defense of this hemisphere, or jeopardize the independent action of our own Government.

"We further urge that the President and the Congress, in the exercise of their separate constitutional functions, exact from our allies adequate military guaranty to avoid another Korea in which American troops are called upon to do most of the fighting and dying."

In appearing here today, I wish to emphatically state that I am not a military expert, nor do I appear here for any other purpose than to bring about unity among our Representatives and the people of the United States on this vital question before the committee.

Unity of purpose, if possible to obtain, is more important than anything I can think of, except fidelity to the Constitution and one's own conscience.

In an 8,000-mile trip I have made from coast to coast, on which I have talked to thousands of our citizens, I find them all wondering why the President of the United States does not crave congressional authorization and approval of such a momentous question as sending hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our boys into foreign countries to engage in a possible world war III. Some of his supporters say the Congress is too slow to act. Hence, they would circumvent, if not violate, the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

His supporters are willing to violate the intent, if not the letter, of the Constitution, as well as the intent, if not the letter, of the so-called North Atlantic Pact.

The people generally controvert this statement by referring to the fact that it took less than an hour for the Congress of the United States to declare war at the start of World War II. Some Senators even failed to be in their seats for the vote because it happened so quickly.

I think the Representatives of the people in Congress can be trusted to do what is necessary to protect the welfare of the people if we or the nations party to the Atlantic Pact are attacked by some other nation determined to make war.

Even the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, said in the report of his committee to the Senate on June 6, 1949, referring to the North Atlantic Treaty (and I quote from page 19, as follows):

"It has been questioned whether a treaty subordinating action to the constitutional processes of 12 democratic nations offers sufficient certainty and immediacy of action effectively to deter aggression. The committee is convinced that it does. The expression of the will of a whole people offers far more certainty than any commitment by a dictator. The action of the democracies in the past great war is concrete evidence of their ability to act with the necessary speed in the event of an emergency."

It was statements like that and the reply of Secretary of State Acheson to Senator HICKENLOOPER and the statements of the senior Republican Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, as well as the telegram sent by President Truman from Potsdam at the time of our entering into the United Nations, all of which statements were to the effect that the

question of sending troops to fight under the United Nations and the question of sending troops abroad to function under the North Atlantic Pact, should be left to Congress—which influenced many Senators in voting for both the United Nations and the North Atlantic Pact.

One of the great objections the American people have against a dictatorship is that one man, supplemented by a few members of the inner circle, deems himself wise enough to decide the fate of vast numbers of people without consulting them through their chosen representatives. Again, I say, I should think the President of the United States would welcome the acceptance of responsibility in this vitally important question by the Congress of the United States.

My experience in my interviews with great numbers of the American people is that our efforts to stop war and fulfill our obligations under the North Atlantic Pact will be fruitful only if the will of the people is back of them—only if they are satisfied that their chosen representatives are acting wisely in the use of our manpower and economic means. Our people are fast becoming aware of two things: (1) That the waste of our economic means, if continued, leads to national bankruptcy, and that leads to socialism or communism, and (2) the waste and destruction of our manpower and the brains required to lead the Nation likewise leads to socialism or communism. If anyone doubts this, let him talk to the best informed Britishers.

It is for these reasons and many others, with which I will not take up your time, but which reasons are in the minds of all alerted Americans today, that I personally, and as the representative of the American Coalition above referred to, am wholeheartedly in favor of the resolution adopted by the representatives of 58 of the participating organizations assembled in New York City last Saturday, February 17. It is for these reasons that I favor the Wherry resolution (S. Res. 8) of January 8, 1951, which reads:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area for the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress."

My only son is buried in Arlington Cemetery as one of the casualties of World War II. I am certain, gentlemen, if I had two or three more boys subject to draft or enlistment I would not want them precipitated into a situation which borders on war and precipitated from that border into a fighting war on foreign soil because of the opinion and decision of one man, even though he be the President of the United States. I would want them to respect the law. I would want them to do their full duty in military service to defend their country. But I would want the chosen representatives of the people in Congress assembled to determine their fate of life or death.

I would like to have inserted in the minutes of this hearing my address before the Sons of the American Revolution and Daughters of the American Revolution on February 18, 1951, in New Jersey.

The Big Steal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks, I include therein an editorial which appeared in the February 24, 1951, Vet-Times, the national newspaper of veterans' affairs. As a Member of Congress, I sincerely hope that the conferees will be able to work out a satisfactory solution to the problems presented by the passage of H. R. 1 by the House of Representatives. The editorial follows:

THE BIG STEAL

The big steal is on.

A lazy Congress—playing puppet to the inefficient Veterans' Administration and looking for a cheap way out—was prepared this week to rob past, present, and future veterans of their long-cherished and valuable right to obtain and retain low cost Government life insurance, one of the few permanent benefits veterans derive from service to their country in time of war.

Aside from the traditional laziness of Congress and the extravagant inefficiency of VA, we think the blame for this unconscionable robbery lies directly at the doorsteps of three of the major veterans' organizations—the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS). To a lesser degree, it also lies with the American Legion.

Under the temporary free-insurance plan, which the House has twice passed and which the Senate is scheduled to pass at this writing, the Government assumes no greater responsibility for paying benefits to survivors of insured men killed in action than it already shoulders. The plan does deny to those not killed or disabled the opportunity to retain and pay for low-cost Government insurance after their separation from service. It sends them back into civilian life uninsured, subject to high commercial rates which increased during their service, and in many cases economically unable immediately to take out the commercial protection which their families need.

The major vet organizations advance the rather specious argument that failure of some 9,000,000 World War II veterans to keep their national service life insurance policies indicates that there was no real interest in retaining this benefit. This is nonsense, pure and simple.

Just what significance do the VFW, DAV, and AMVETS attach to the fact that more than 6,000,000 did hold onto their policies; that a great many of them converted to permanent plans of insurance; or to the fact that thousands upon thousands of War I veterans still retain—and pay for—United States Government life insurance protection?

We appreciate the desire of the veterans' organizations to make certain that the families—or the survivors—of servicemen are equally and adequately protected against the extra hazards of war. On that score we agree that every man entering the service should be given a free $10,000 policy. But this should be in addition to any other Government insurance which he has or would like to have—and for which he pays out of his own pocket.

Since the end of World War II, the veterans' organizations have been in the vanguard of those urging that compensation rates be increased to meet the ever-rising cost of living. Certainly, the harsh economic facts of life justify such agitation.

Why then do these same organizations completely ignore the effect of the cost of living on those families whose bread winner has given his life to his country?

The free insurance bill soon to become law limits total Government insurance—either free or in the form of paid NSLI or USGLI—to a maximum of $10,000, payable over a 10-year period, in monthly installments of $92.90—about $23 a week.

If a veterans already is carrying NSLI—and is paying for it out of his own pocket—why can't he, too, receive a $10,000 free insurance policy so that his family will be protected adequately in the event of his death? Similarly, why can't a young man entering the service for the first time receive the free indemnity insurance and also buy and pay for additional NSLI insurance?

A $10,000 insurance policy today is worth just about half what it was worth during World War I or the early days of World War II. Yet the major veterans' organizations which presume to represent the Nation's fighting men have not even suggested that Congress make some adjustment. Clearly, those organizations which support the $10,000 maximum coverage are either blind to economic reality, hypnotized by tradition, or careless of the welfare of those whose dollars and support they seek.

We'd venture to assert that a commercial life insurance agent would lose his job tomorrow if he failed to advise a prospective client that a $10,000 policy today is worth only half as much as a similar policy 15 or 20 years ago.

If, in these days, the leaders of our major veterans' organizations think that the widows and children of men killed in action can exist—let alone survive—on a meager $23 a week, they are living in a fool's paradise.

Universal Training: A Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "Universal Training: A Fraud," by Hoffman Nickerson.

I recommend its reading to my colleagues:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING: A FRAUD

(By Hoffman Nickerson)

Compulsory universal military training without automatic liability for service is an absolute fraud. Universal military training and service are frauds as far as the present emergency is concerned because it is physically impossible to start such a system quickly. Universal liability for service and compulsory selective service are necessary evils in an emergency.

On the other hand, since compulsion is at best a necessary evil, and since one of the worst features of our time is the widespread enthusiasm for clubbing people into uniformity, lovers of liberty should do their level best to make certain that the present emergency shall not be used to put our country into a permanent strait-jacket. The iron logic of military necessity and military efficiency should be our sole guide, and the "mania for compulsion"—as a recent number of the Freeman aptly called it—should be shunned like the plague.

Of course, a minimum of compulsion is necessary in every organized society; there must be laws and policemen to enforce those laws. In war and in preparing for war this compulsion must take a harsh form; the members of the armed services must be protected against their natural weaknesses, such as dislike for hardships and fear of getting hurt, by knowing that they will be heavily punished in one way or another if they yield to those weaknesses. In other words, war is a communal thing, and the great wars of our time make huge doses of compulsion necessary. Thus, war has been the food on

which the monstrous leviathan states of today have grown so great. Historically, the longest single invasion of individual liberties was perpetrated when the Revolutionary French Republic proclaimed the levy in mass not merely for home defense but for general military service. Napoleon continued the system; after his fall, Prussia added compulsory and universal peacetime training, and, after 1870, all Europe more or less copied Prussia. Oddly enough, although sociologists are now as thick as flies in summertime, the relation between war and the social order has been little studied. If the statement that mass armies and great wars have been a chief factor in pushing Europe toward Marxism seems a little bold, at least they have not prevented most of Europe from going Marxist.

For years past an active propaganda has tried to blur the truth that compulsion is at best a necessary evil. The ink was hardly dry on the German and Japanese surrenders before the War Department began hollering for universal compulsion; not for any emergency then visible to the public or apparently to our leaders but just for the hell of it. In the first place, a peacetime mass army is inappropriate to the geographical situation and therefore to the national strategy of the United States—a fundamental point to which we shall return later in this article. In the second place, the raising of a mass army would have flatly contradicted the wholesale demobilization of our Ground Forces then in progress, which demobilization was based upon the idea that the Soviets would honor their obligations; nor is there the slightest reason to believe that the high command of our Army was more foreseeing than our political leaders, as to what the Soviets would actually do, for not one Army officer risked his career in order to protest publicly against the general demobilization of 1945, as various naval officers afterward protested against what now appears to have been a subsequent error in military policy; i. e., overemphasis upon that form of wholesale baby killing politely known as strategic bombing.

The high point of compulsion plus military inefficiency was reached in the 1947 report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. That military monstrosity would have forced all our young men into uniform for 6 months without adding a single recruit to any of the active services, and would have increased the civilian components only slowly and uncertainly by means of a complicated series of options, which in many cases could have been juggled around until the cows came home. This feat of now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't prestidigitation would have been accomplished by setting up an enormous training corps, not under military law but only under a watered-down version thereof. The resulting need for a considerable army of instructors and caretakers from the regular services would have seriously diminished the available striking power of those services. The scheme also sprouted a lush crop of political jokers, all calculated to increase centralized Federal power without even a pretense of genuine military advantage. Congress rightly refused to enact the absurd proposal, but its soul still goes marching on—or rather lurching on—as we shall see in a moment.

Instead, in 1948, Congress enacted a sensible selective service law under which the drafted men, after a necessary minimum of recruit training, go directly into organized, regular units where they can learn from their more experienced comrades as well as from their instructors. A notable merit of such a system is that it is flexible. Within wide limits it permits the speeding up or slowing down of recruitment according to the evident necessities of the near future.

So matters stood when our President took the doubtful step of scrapping the Defense Department war plan which called for only the use of American naval and air forces in case of an invasion of South Korea.

The hell which promptly broke loose after the landing of United States ground troops in Korea has at least had the melancholy merit of reminding us of realities.

Alas, our military age of innocence is not yet over. Only the other day Oscar Ewing proposed high-school universal military training. That apostle of socialized medicine said that "if * * * necessary the high-school period might be * * * 5 years instead of the present 4 in order to achieve the basic training goal," and that under his plan the young would be "kept out of Army camps almost until the time they were ready for field service." In other words, near readiness for field service is to be developed on the athletic fields of high schools. Similarly, the senior high-school students of a New York Times youth forum unanimously agreed that universal military training should be instituted now.

Disregarding these straws in the wind, a sinister symptom of the attempt to rivet permanent compulsions upon us under cover of the present emergency appears in the current circular of the Military Training Camps Association. That body is the successor of the so-called Plattsburg group which, in collaboration with the late Gen. Leonard Wood, did admirable work in training prospective officer candidates just before our entry into World War I. Today its letter paper is headed by the names of three civilian aides to the Secretary of the Army, and its executive committee includes a number of eminent and greatly respected men, most of them from the New York area and practically all of them of a conservative sort.

Unfortunately, however, they consider that permanent universal military training and service would strengthen our institutions and our social order, and seem blind to the social aspect of the matter as a step toward socialism by increasing the already excessive powers of our nominally Federal Government. Accordingly, their circular recommends "a durable military manpower law suited as well for times of peace as for partial and for total mobilization." The first of their alternative proposals is "universal military training at 18 for 1 year with service only if called"; their second "universal military service at 19 for 2 years"; and only in third place do they speak of "selective service at ages 19 to 26 or 2 years."

Proposal No. 1 is unrealistic in itself and unrelated to the present emergency. As far as purely military policy is concerned, training without liability for service is only a complicated mumbo-jumbo which would produce a minimum of actual military results at a maximum cost in money and loss of manpower. No. 2, although not a sham like No. 1, is nevertheless unsatisfactory in point of age, and still more because it would be an inflexible, rigid method of raising a large army. The average company commander would much prefer to have a sprinkling of men in their early twenties and even in their late twenties as ballast for his 19-year-old recruits. The personnel section of any general staff would like to be able to regulate the flow of recruits according to the need for them instead of having to train an annual "class" of fixed numbers.

The same fault of rigidity characterizes the plan proposed by President Conant, of Harvard, who would like to see all valid young men drafted for 2 years or 27 months of military service at 18 or at the end of high school, whichever is later. He also suggests that those physically incapable of armed service should be drafted for such duties as they can perform. Those familiar with his political attitudes, his scandalous tolerance of fellow-traveling professors, his enthusiasm for raising the already confiscatory rates of the inheritance tax, his desire to put our universities under Federal control by grants of Federal tax moneys, and his repetitions of the Communist slogan of "a classless society," will not be astonished at his desire to regiment even those physically handicapped.

Fortunately, the Conant plan has been promptly attacked by the executive committee of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, which committee has pointed out the educational and military unwisdom of calling up entire age groups at one time. General Hershey's Selective Service Scientific Advisory Service Committee has done even better. Under the leadership, so it is said, of President Charles W. Cole, of Amherst, that body has opposed universal training altogether, and is advocating extended selective service instead.

When counsels are divided, it is wise to go back to first principles. First, where and for what purposes was universal training developed? Next, how does geography necessarily affect our national strategy? Finally, what is—so far—the nature of the present emergency?

Universal training originated in Europe among nations separated only by land frontiers across which men can walk, or by rivers across which bridges can be thrown. Under these conditions military efficiency meant the cheapest possible method of raising the largest possible trained army which could be hurled into action at the utmost possible speed. Before World War I every valid Frenchman was trained and kept with the colors for 3 years, while other countries followed the same pattern a little less strenuously. The essence of the system was the enormous mass of trained reserves, of which the younger classes in various countries were kept up to scratch by frequently recalling them for maneuvers. After about 20 years of universal training, a general mobilization would call up a tenth of the entire population, say roughly a fifth of all males. Every reservist knew the exact place at which he must report within a few hours, and at that place his entire equipment was waiting for him. Next to numbers, the prime necessity was speed. One day saved in mobilizing might well make all the difference between triumph and disaster. For instance, in 1914 it was the Germans' ability to use reserve divisions from the first days of mobilization which brought France to the ragged edge of immediate and total defeat. But note well that in order to get the full benefit from such a system you must have land frontiers, numbers rather than highly specialized equipment must be decisive, and the system must have been practiced continuously for the better part of a generation.

Now as far as all other great powers are concerned, the United States is strategically an island. Flying has, indeed, altered the applications of this truth, but the basic truth remains. If anyone thinks that airplanes have abolished the effect of distance and salt water upon strategy, he should get his head examined. In any great war we or our opponents must cross either vast oceans or almost uninhabitable Arctic wastes. Command of the sea, insofar as the sea and the air over it can be commanded, is vital.

Thus the bottleneck of military effort on either side cannot be merely the number of trained men available. It must be the fighting and carrying capacity of the available planes and ships. Since shipping and plane tonnage are the necessary foundation of all United States strategy, the ideal United States Army would be a sort of glorified Marine Corps, an elite body which strives for quality rather than quantity for the simple reason that one good shot makes at least as many hits on the enemy as two bad shots, and requires only half as much cargo-carrying tonnage to support him overseas. Of course, there must also be a cadre of officers

and noncoms to train replacements and reserves. But no United States mass army, even if complete to the last button, could ever be rushed into action like the continental European armed hordes. The reader may ponder the title of a book on the supply system for the Normandy campaign, Ten Million Tons to Eisenhower.

Finally, even the outlines of the present emergency are not clear. This is by no means a plea for sitting back and taking things easy—far from it. It is a mere statement of fact that our chief possible enemy, who is known to hold strong cards, has not yet fully shown his hand, and that there is grave doubt as to who would really be on our side in a show-down, and to what extent.

These uncertainties demand the utmost elasticity in our own military policy. In any case we must be strong at sea and in the air—the two are today inextricable. We must also be much stronger on the ground than we now are; the idea of getting a military decision by air alone against an enemy who holds a vast continental land mass is too doubtful to bother about. The real questions are: How much of our total resources should go into armed preparedness and how much into strengthening our own economy? Also, what proportion of our armed preparedness should go into a ground army?

The present emergency results from the clash between Communist expansion and Soviet imperialism on one side and the Truman doctrine of "containing communism everywhere" on the other side. Since the United States has only about 6 percent of the world's population, the simon-pure Truman doctrine is bunk—if any sufficiently large local group of the remaining 94 percent choose or permit themselves to go Communist, we could not stop them with United States armed force alone. Even if we made ourselves a semi-Sovietized slave state, still our resources would be insufficient if we did not have strong non-American support.

If we do not limit our military commitments, we should prepare our minds for a series of bigger and worse Koreas. In the Far East we have little choice except either to get off the Asiatic mainland or to use armies of Asiatics to do most of the fighting. In Europe, General Eisenhower, as Hanson Baldwin truly says, commands only a "shadow force" of 19 western divisions, whereas the Soviets have 30 divisions in Eastern Germany, 60 in their European satellites, and 145 in the U. S. S. R., a total of 235. Should the Red Army march, we would be lucky if any European front forward of the Pyrenees could be held.

The proposition is up to the west Europeans. If they cannot begin promptly to do a great deal more for themselves than they have been doing, then our only logical moves will be either back to pan-Americanism or the holding of minimum footholds in the Old World from which future offensives could be launched. For such strategies, sea and air power plus a moderate-sized army would suffice. The existing situation puts a premium on the flexibility which selective service can give, and universal service by "classes" cannot.

Joseph H. McGann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the article appearing in yesterday's Evening Star by Mary McGrory about one of the finest and most faithful men who has ever served his country, Joseph H. McGann, the clerk of the Committee on Public Works.

Ever since I came to Congress about 8 years ago, when I became a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I have had the pleasure of being more or less closely associated with Mr. McGann and in a position to observe him. For about 50 years he has served on the staff of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and he continued when later it was absorbed into the Committee on Public Works. His patience and unfailing courtesy is only matched by his sincere love for the work that he is doing and the vast knowledge which he has acquired about the physical problems and the natural resources of the United States.

His character and trustworthiness have been recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike throughout the years because he has always been selected to continue at his important post, no matter what party was in control.

Mary McGrory in her article tells the story of Joseph McGann's success, which is simply that he is so happy and engrossed in his work that he has no idea of retiring because, as he put it, "I wouldn't know what to do."

I wish every Member of Congress could have had the opportunity and the privilege of knowing this man as I have because I can testify that his friendship is an inspiration to every good American. Mary McGrory's story follows:

JOSEPH H. MCGANN KNEW CONGRESS WHEN

(By Mary McGrory)

Last week, for the fourth time since 1941, hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway opened before the House Public Works Committee. As usual, the proceedings were stage-managed by Joseph H. McGann, clerk of the committee and its faithful servant for 49 years. Once all the relevant documents were on each Member's desk and all the witnesses and spectators herded in, he sat down at his desk in front of the chairman and began to take a few selective notes in the Pitman shorthand he learned so long ago in his native town of Cleveland, Ohio.

Man and boy, Mr. McGann has been listening to the pros and cons of the St. Lawrence scheme, and could probably pinch-hit for any of the witnesses on either side. An inland-waterways man from way back, he's been wondering about it since the days he worked for the Great Lakes Steamers in Cleveland.

It was during the 8 weeks' off-season in the office, when the Lakes were frozen over, that Mr. McGann, then 29, was prevailed upon by Representative Burton, Republican, of Ohio, to come down to Washington and give him a hand temporarily with the work of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which Mr. Burton was then chairman. Mr. McGann was reluctant, but he finally agreed. Like almost everyone else who ever came to Washington temporarily, he stayed on. Now, at 79, he has rolled up the longest record of uninterrupted service in congressional annals.

A spry, neat, dry little man, Mr. McGann looks back over a lifetime of hard work and considerable change in the congressional world he knows like the palm of his hand. One of those dedicated, anonymous Government workers whose job has become his life, he is better at figures than at names. But he can reel off the nine committee chairmen he has served without a moment's hesitation.

His memory goes back to a more inconvenient, informal era in Congress, when the House had only 357 Members, and only Members lucky enough to be committee chairmen had offices in the Capitol.

He can recall, for instance, when the House had its own mail delivery system, and horse-drawn wagons made the rounds eight times a day to Members' boarding houses or apartments. Most of the legislators had to conduct their business at home.

In November of 1902, when Mr. McGann brought his bride back from Cleveland to a boarding house on North Capitol Street, the congressional secretaries who lived above and below them used to be clacking away at their typewriters far into the night. It was the only time and place they could do their correspondence.

Looking forward to their golden wedding anniversary, the McGanns now live at 1845 Park Road NW.

One of the big considerations in a Congressman's life, in those old days, was seeds—vegetable and flower seeds, five varieties of each, sent on request to constituents. Congress voted $50,000 a year for the purpose.

The seeds, packed in envelopes and gathered into huge mail sacks, used to be delivered to the congressional secretaries for mailing at the boarding houses.

"Some nights I'd come home and the sacks would be piled so high around the door I couldn't get in," says Mr. McGann. "Then we'd leave them lying around the office at the Capitol, and the mice would get into them. Oh, we'd have an awful time."

The first bill the young McGann worked on was the rivers and harbors bill of 1902, which carried an appropriation of $63,000,000. This year, the President asked for $620,000,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control.

Another change Mr. McGann has observed is that they don't have the orators they used to. He can remember when Representative Burton would call them up to hurry over whenever one of the House's real spellbinders got to his feet. Mr. McGann's favorite was John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, Democratic floor leader from 1903 to 1907, "the best rough-and-tumble debater in the House." E. Bourke Cochran, a Democratic Member from New York, was another one who could make the rafters ring. Now, of course, under the 5-minute rule in the House, a man can scarcely clear his throat, much less work up to the classical references.

Hearings were a much more perilous business. Everybody jammed into the one-room committee office, and the air got so foul that on several occasions Congressmen collapsed. They had some sort of ventilation gadget, but it poured cold air down the nearest legislator's neck, so they couldn't use it.

The work isn't as hard as it used to be in the old days when they worked 14 hours a day getting bills ready. But it still absorbs Mr. McGann. And he is not looking forward to retirement.

"I wouldn't know what to do," he says.

The Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Grabbing the Peace Ball," writ-

ten by Malvina Lindsay and published in the Washington Post of March 1, 1951.

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

GRABBING THE PEACE BALL

(By Malvina Lindsay)

TREND FROM NEGATIVISM

There are some faint signs that at last Americans are doing a little more to grab the peace offensive from the Kremlin—and this despite the current louder noise made by the war-is-here, drop-the-bomb crowd.

A movement is growing here to differentiate between the Russian people and their rulers. There is also increasing popular demand that the Nation announce and reiterate its ultimate peace aims. The constructive idea of war prevention back of point 4 is beginning to take stronger hold of the imagination of grass-roots leaders, and the American prayer movement for peace—recently given momentum by the United Laymen's noon prayer practice instituted on Washington's Birthday—is snowballing.

One handicap to peace strategy here has been that the Soviet, having appropriated the word "democracy," then took over the word "peace"—lock, stock, and barrel. Many of the peace movements in this country and elsewhere have been Communist-inspired.

Many timid, expedient, and even normally self-protective Americans have been so frightened by such things and by the general jitters over communism that the Soviet has been left alone with the peace ball to make a big play to the grandstand.

But now there is some clamor that this country, and the western democracies as well, stop being outmaneuvered on the peace front. One of the first steps in doing this, many authorities on the Soviet Union believe, is for both citizens and leaders alike to try more of Stalin's technique in their public utterances. The fact that Soviet leaders have been careful to direct their vituperation to American imperialists, Wall Streeters, governmental warmongers, and not to the American people shows Kremlin respect for such strategy.

Yet loose talk about the evil Russians—rather than their tyrants—continues to be heard in Congress and on every streetcar. A pledge on the part of every American to substitute Soviet, Kremlin, Politburo for Russian in speaking of Soviet aggression might be one simple step in peace strategy.

Experts on the Russian situation constantly advise that the West's best hope of stabilizing the world lies in not alienating the great masses of Russian people because they may ultimately be its best help in removing history's latest upsurge of tyranny. The newly organized Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom are working along this line.

David J. Dallin, a leading authority on the Soviet Union, emphasizes in his just published book, The New Soviet Empire, that the Russian revolution has lost the devotion of the Russian people, though it still retains a large measure of their loyalty.

Several moves in peace strategy have recently been made in Congress. Senator BRIEN MCMAHON and 22 other Senators introduced a resolution expressing friendship for the Russian people. Americans discontented over their country's negativism in the cold war should see that this resolution is adopted with all the attendant publicity possible.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS recently called for more disarmament proposals. These at least would provide peace propaganda for the Voice of America and other information agencies to hurl at peoples behind the iron curtain and around the world. As Pastor Martin Niemoeller, of Germany, recently pointed out, one of the major problems confronting Germany today is how to combat, in non-Communist terms, the peace offensive with which it is daily battered by Communists. He emphasized that proposals had to be made in order that counterpropaganda could answer the Cominform.

The most vigorous, spontaneous expression of the American search for a peace formula is the prayer movement. This is becoming something more than a vague supplication for the millennium. Many of the manifold prayer groups now operating—one started by a State Department employee as a personal project has enlisted 1,700 organizations—are engaged in meditation, study, self-searching.

The United Laymen, a group of business and professional men which is trying to coordinate the Nation's prayer force, is especially seeking concrete action. Its prayer formula is that each individual ask guidance about what he personally can do to further peace in the world—and naturally in his own environment and in himself. Quiet though all these efforts have been, they possess a vitality that holds promise of reviving in the Nation its old positive spirit of leadership that it has manifested in the highest moments of its history.

Address by Former Senator John A. Danaher at the Banquet of the National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, extracts from remarks of former United States Senator John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, on the occasion of the annual banquet of the National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, held in Washington on February 20, 1951.

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

Madam president, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, one may sometimes wonder why Americans willingly become the most talked-at people in this world. The simple answer is that we like to be confirmed in our beliefs. It is part of our nature. There is little I can say tonight that you cannot say or that has not been said before—and said better. Even so, the observations of another speaker may suggest a fresh point of view, and the sum total of my presentation may prove helpful. If I at least did not hope so, I could not justify my acceptance of your gracious invitation to address you. As the Ladies Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, you are entitled to our salute if for no other reason than that you are ladies and affiliates of a great organization whose ideals you share. Last week our Nation celebrated the birthday of the Great Emancipator just as this week, we celebrate the birthday of the Father of our Country. Ninety years ago this very week at Independence Hall in Philadelphia Abraham Lincoln said: "I have never had a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence." What did he mean?

A partial answer, at least, can be found in a resolution adopted by the Jewish War Veterans at its last national convention, a portion of which describes the Jewish War Veterans as "an organization composed of men who served the Republic in time of war, devoted to the principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States and the American way of life, which principles stem from the basic tenets of Judaism, and have their origin in the concept that God created men in his own image, endowed with an inalienable individual right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness * * * irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin."

This magnificent statement reflects the principles underlying the Declaration of 1776. The founding fathers then insisted that the American people are entitled to that station "to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them." Not the law of the king. Not the law of some parliament.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," they said. Truths? A truth is something that is verity; it is immutable; it is persistent; it is living and vibrant. "That all men are created," the founders continued. Created?—not like animals but by a Creator, and we reach back thousands of years to the writings of the earliest prophets of Judaism for the assertion of that truth.

As Lincoln pondered the philosophy of the Declaration it is small wonder that he found in it an outline of the basic faith of all Americans, people endowed with rights, possessed by virtue of law higher than can come from any government.

Why are there Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America? Why are there any war veterans? Because we know that if we are to maintain our inalienable rights, we must have government, a Government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. We will fight, as we have always fought, to make our Government secure. We Americans preserve our own form of self-government in the sure knowledge that unless we govern ourselves, we will be governed by others. No other peoples in all history's pages have governed themselves so long or so well as we Americans.

Let us then pause to inquire into some of the characteristics of Americans.

It is of the essence of the American scheme that our Creator had invested us with individual sovereignty, a part of which we yielded up when we entered into the compact to form our Government. Hence it is that the authority of the United States of America derives from the people in that through the organic act called the Constitution we have consented to be governed. Thus we choose from among our number those representatives who will stand in our places and who will decide for us, as surely as though we were personally present, just what laws shall be enacted and how they shall be executed. Thus simply stated we have an outline of the principle of self-government in which—characteristically—Americans believe, and which, patriotically, we have sworn to support and maintain.

The first characteristic accordingly is that of our adherence to the principle of self-government.

If self-government is the largest common denominator, characteristic of the American people, have we achieved some degree of eminence because we are all of one race? Clearly not. From one mother country? Clearly not. Our people are made up of emigrants of various races, from all sections, from every nationality.

The one thing that all had in common was a desire to come to America. No matter what the risks, they came. No matter the heartaches at leaving home and loved ones, they came. They could have remained in the countries of their origin, and they could have accepted the status of the government in each of such countries, but they

came. They sought opportunity here. They sought to live under the beneficent rule of the very people among whom they would live, and with whom they would share the tasks, the obligations, the duties as well as the rights and privileges afforded by the United States. Thus, a second characteristic of the American people might be said to be their love of opportunity.

Those from other shores and their children, become Americans, found yet another characteristic of our people, that of self-determination. This meant not only freedom in the governmental sense but the exercise of a personal choice to do or to attempt to do, those things which the individual feels will be to his greatest advantage in life. It means that the American people believe that if they risk much, they are entitled to profit commensurately. Whether they be prospector or shipmaster, whether in the factory or on the farm, Americans seeking to satisfy their own wants and desires, found they must equally satisfy the wants and desires of others. They established the interdependence of all Americans, upon one another and upon the goods and services of each. Hence in the creation of a successful economy, self-determination urged on by ambition is disclosed as another American characteristic.

These elements so peculiarly admixed in Americans have combined to invest our people with a psychological attitude, unique in itself. It has pressed us on to what some will say is the greatest development among all peoples. Other nations are expansive, other nations contain larger populations. Some of them possess larger and more extensive natural resources. Americans however have not only developed their own sources of raw materials but have actively promoted the development of those owned abroad. The impelling desire, so generally prevalent is for an expansion of opportunity for ourselves and our families. More, this attitude has led the American people to a willingness to share both at home and abroad. Twice in 25 years we went to war against those nations which had reduced their people to puppets and which would destroy the dignity of the individual. In the aftermath of war we have willingly poured forth our billions to alleviate the suffering and reduce human misery. None can justly charge at the bar of world opinion that our Nation has sought material gain for itself in any single respect. Thus, magnanimity is a characteristic of the American people which ranks itself with the most noble impulses of mankind.

Clearly the evolution of these characteristics of Americans stems from our exercise of our inalienable rights which long anteceded the formation of our Government. Obviously, if we were to admit that an individual derives his rights from government we would equally be bound to concede that government could take those rights away. No constitution controls, the basic principles which underlie our very lives, do. It is of the utmost importance that we realize this fact. When Hitler assumed control in Germany, he purported to act legally under the Weimar Constitution. Who controlled Germany thereafter? The Weimar Constitution or Hitler? Let us analyze a little further the point now involved, for all too often we find Americans taking our natural heritage for granted. Yet our concept of life is under assault, and it sometimes may seem that the background of American life is not being properly defended. We assume that freedom, like sunlight or fresh air, belongs to us and need not be defended. We make too little effort to ascertain the forces against which we must contend.

We say we can out-produce any country that has ever existed. We have more automobiles than all the rest of the world put together. We have more telephones, more bathtubs. Are we to assume that our strength derives from these material aspects of our life? Did the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America send thousands of young men into battle on that account? I venture to say that our spiritual strength is our true bulwark.

And now we find the America we have made, the America we have lived in, under gravest assault. There are forces abroad which would challenge our very being and which would destroy us if they could. Some of the same forces threaten within our very midst. We have seen whole peoples elsewhere become the ready prey to the fanaticism of scheming dictators. Some of them yielded up their rights as individuals, fondly hoping that they might achieve security. Others, through outright persecution and mass murder, have been abjectly forced into a life of despair which knows no measurable depth.

The challenge to the American way of life is vast. It is cunningly contrived. It is mercilessly directed. The state which now seeks to impose its will upon the world is one which has completely repudiated the basic, fundamental, spiritual essence of mankind. The materialistic state admits no power superior to itself. It asserts the authority to plan and direct the life of every person, at all times, and in every field of activity. It sets itself up to men as their highest good—to be served without question and without reservation.

If I have set before you understandably two wholly different concepts of government and its functions I will feel rewarded. Go out knowing that freedom transcends every other phase of our societal life. With freedom comes incentive, with incentive comes work, with work comes production, with production come the means to satisfy our wants. Thus do we achieve that standard of living we discussed, a state of national well-being, and the maintenance of life, liberty, and the pursuits of happiness. Those are the ends for which our Government was formed—for these things have we fought.

Our fight is not over. It must go forward—and you are part of it. Only eternal vigilance can sustain us. That same great Abraham Lincoln once asked: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its people or too weak to maintain its own existence?" Our Government at this very moment is seeking the answer to this question. The National Ladies Auxiliary can enlist with us in a great cause—the American cause.

You may erect mammoth marble halls to house the Supreme Court—and surround it with the appearance of dignity and the trappings of the state. Its sessions will be in vain if it will not uphold the moral and constitutional rights of mankind.

You may insist upon majority rule according to the American process, but you will be bound by the tyranny of your own Government if you choose as your rulers those who would sabotage the institutions of liberty and abrogate the freedoms inherent in man.

You may install the Declaration of Independence upon a pedestal, you may put a gold frame around it, you may set soldiers to guard it by day and by night. It will be but "the faded memento of mankind's bravest dream if you will not defend the proposition that God has endowed each one of His children with definite rights."

Our form of government will be preserved—by the patriotism of our people. Our freedom will be guaranteed—by our vigorous and constant defense against all assaults upon it. Our institutions will thrive—not on musty parchment nor on the yellowed page. You cannot save them merely locked behind bars of steel. They will live—if they are to live—in the hearts of men.

Endorsements of the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have called the attention of the Congress on many occasions to the many expressions from all sections of the country, in newspapers and in other media, pointing up the tremendous importance of the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. I have pointed out that never before has there been a clearer recognition on the part of our people of the absolute importance of this project.

I have indicated that there are some few persons who feel that now may not be the right time for the completion of the work on the project. It is my personal feeling, however, that now is a splendid time and it is far better than 1 day from now or 1 week or a year from now. Of course, this project should have been acted on years ago, but there is no reason for any further delay.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following items:

First. The text of an excellent article by the associate editor of the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer-Press, Mr. Alfred Stedman.

Second. The text of a resolution adopted by the Sheboygan, Wis., Common Council.

Third. The text of an editorial in the Great Lakes Harbors' Outlook.

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

[From the St. Paul Pioneer-Press]

OURS VERSUS RUSS SEAWAY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Russia has stolen from us and is busily shaping to her aims the basic principle of our own long delayed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. That is the principle of opening a deep waterway from the ocean to inland lakes or seas, and of developing vast hydroelectric energy from its dams and reservoirs.

Right now while the United States of America is still arguing the strategic value of our seaway, the U. S. S. R. is building her version for herself. Next year she will partially open and in 1957 fully open her deep channel linking the Black Sea and the Caspian with the Baltic Sea and the Arctic Ocean. The map shows her route. Russia expects to gain tremendous military advantages: (1) From water transportation of strategic materials, (2) from stepped-up war production with electric power, and (3) from ability to move naval ships inland from sea to sea. Russia's steal of our seaway idea was for a long time one of her guarded military secrets. Back of the iron curtain, war prisoners and other forced labor rushed the work. And now the key link, a dam on the Don and a deep canal connecting the Don with the Volga, is headed for completion in 1952. Two more dams, further deepening the Volga, are

to be finished in 1957. Existing northern canals in the network are being improved. At last the Russian censors are allowing or ordering their press to tell their story. Recently details of the Russian project have been printed in the United States by the New York Times.

So what are we going to do now about building our seaway? We can't safely dodge the question any longer. Russia's completion date of 1957 is about when we can get our seaway built. Not that ours and Russia's waterway problems are identical; far from it. But her hard-headed militarists now show, not by their words but by their acts in sparing nothing to rush her seaway, the high military valuation they place upon it. Thus our seaway question is brought to a head by one of the greatest forces that can be felt by any nation—which is the leverage of seeing a military advantage slipping away to a competing and warlike power.

Our great question is whether the St. Lawrence seaway would or would not be a real military asset to Canada and the United States of America. Until now, the dispute has been running to extremes. A pamphlet called the project iceway. A college professor wrote flatly that it lacks any economic or military merit. A publicist for the seaport-rail-power lobby called it a laugh and a scream. A Texas newspaper dismisses its defense claims as "sleazy" patriotism, the last refuge of the damned scoundrel. But now the bloom is off this type of argument. In the light of this country's danger, Congress has got to get down to the facts and the sober judgment of authorities responsible for this Nation's safety.

Here are answers, straight from such sources, to real questions about our seaway:

As to bombing. The chance exists that a lucky bomb hit might disable the seaway for a considerable time. But the seaway's benefits fully justify any such danger. And the strategic risk can be minimized to a large extent by the taking of reasonable precautionary and defensive measures. Russia's much greater risks due to our superior air power and atom bomb power are not stopping her from rebuilding the great Dnepropetrovsk Dam on the Dnieper or the three big shipway dams on the Don and the Volga.

As to strategic materials. Steel requirements in construction should not be a serious deterrent. And the seaway's purpose to give access to great alternative supplies of iron ore in Labrador would obviously benefit national defense. Great Lakes shipbuilding would be of distinct advantage.

As to ice. On the average, Lake Superior is closed 4½ months and other lakes 3½ months a year by ice. Russia's shipway, especially the north end giving its only direct access to the ocean itself, would be closed much longer, but she still considers her seaway of great strategic value.

As to channels. The increase now proposed from 27 feet to 30 feet depth would accommodate a majority of merchant vessels at an added cost of $250,000,000. A 35-foot depth to Lake Ontario would admit to that lake at moderate added cost all freighters and all naval ships except capital ships. If the 35-foot depth later were extended to Duluth, the total seaway cost would be increased from $966,000,000 to $1,920,000,000.

As to electric power. The United States would get an average output of 6,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. From a national defense viewpoint, there would be great advantage in having available this large source of cheap, dependable power.

As to the railroads: These would no doubt do another heroic job as defense transportation mainstay. But in event of war, they would be laboring under intense strain that the seaway could, to some extent, relieve.

As to coastal ports and terminals. It is up to Congress to find out whether these main foes of the seaway are not themselves among the most vulnerable atom targets, and whether reducing the risks of snarled traffic in them isn't a militarily sound reason for building the seaway.

One place to turn for counsel on our seaway's value is to the recommendations of the Permanent Board on Defense for the United States and Canada. Another is to the words of the late Secretary James Forrestal, who literally gave his life in devotion to defense.

The joint defense board unanimously found that our seaway would be of great economic and defense value, found its defense benefits so great as fully to warrant any risks of attack, and urged that the seaway be built as a joint power and navigation project. Forrestal told Congress that "from the viewpoint of national defense, the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway and power projects would be clearly advantageous."

In a country like ours, the opposition always has a right to its say. But, ultimately, perhaps democracy must make decisions if it is to survive. Our time of decision on the seaway seems to have arrived.

Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway has been endorsed by all major political parties as essential to the continuing strength and commercial betterment of this Nation; and

Whereas this municipality as well as the surrounding area would participate in and benefit directly from such project; and

Whereas despite obvious economic justification, a minority opposition has been able to forestall creation of the proposed waterway to the detriment of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and common council of the City of Sheboygan, Wis., That by and through the adoption of this resolution that the common council reiterates the hope of this community that the St. Lawrence waterway may be realized in fact and that necessary legislation and treaties be consummated on the Federal level in the near future, and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to forward certified copies hereof to the President and Vice President of the United States and to our representatives in the Congress of the United States.

LESTER SCHILD.

[From the Great Lakes Outlook of January 1951]

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-ONE MAY WELL BE THE YEAR OF DECISION FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

In his annual economic message to Congress on January 12, President Truman called for a national increase in electric generating capacity of more than 20,000,000 kilowatts during the next 3 years, to increase national defense production and to expand power resources. Again vigorously recommending the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to the Congress, the President said that the country "should start at once on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project so that imported iron ore can be shipped efficiently by water to the great steel-producing centers of the Middle West." He said that the project was vital for the preservation of the steel industry and when developed will furnish a major part of the country's new power needs.

Thus, the issue of the St. Lawrence seaway project is again before a new Congress. Time may be running out on the American people and on western civilization, but in the time remaining much could be done to assure our future national security by adding the St. Lawrence project to the transportation and power resources of the United States and Canada.

The patience of our good friends and allies in Canada is wearing thin. Another clarion call for the St. Lawrence project was recently sounded by the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, Canadian Minister of Transport, who warned bluntly that unless the United States resolves its differences and undertakes the St. Lawrence seaway project as called for by the 1941 agreement between the two nations, Canada will do the job alone. A similar frank statement of Canadian position has been made publicly by Prime Minister St. Laurent on more than one occasion during the last year.

In this hour of decision, we see the North American Continent in peril, with a great demand and need for quick expansion of national production and transportation. Simultaneously, we see the spectacle of selfish and sectional interests working unceasingly to throw roadblocks in front of a project which will accomplish two of our most vital objectives—expansion of power for national defense production and increased transportation to move the goods.

The well organized and financed opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project probably does not appreciate the responsibility which history may attach to them. Dr. N. R. Danielian, seaway authority, pointed to the responsibility which these men have assumed, when he said in a recent address:

"I do not believe these railroad and power officials would join with Stalin in bombing Grand Coulee out of existence and yet they achieve the equivalent of that when they prevent the St. Lawrence power project from being built.

"I do not believe these men desire to increase the cost of steel by several hundred million dollars a year, or to endanger the life of our youth on the high seas in time of emergency, and yet that is the result of their obstruction of the seaway.

"I do not believe they wish to treat Canada, our best customer and our last line of defense, as a second class cousin, and yet that is the result of 30 years 'kidding' we have administered to our most patient and loyal friends by dallying with their most cherished project."

There is still manpower, material, and money sufficient on both sides of the international boundary between the United States and Canada to start the seaway rolling. The manpower and the material may not be available several years hence. It is no longer a question of whether the United States and Canada want the project, or whether certain influential interests do not want it—we simply cannot be without it for the critical years ahead and the critical decades ahead.

Freeman Lincoln predicted that the 50-year fight for the St. Lawrence project is approaching its final phase, and said in the December issue of Fortune magazine, "Whether the unsophisticated citizen bases his judgment on no more evidence than a map of North America or whether he carefully studies the volumes of testimony for or against, he can scarcely escape the conclusion that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project should be built because it is inevitable and essentially right. There is always the pious thought, however, that the things that should be done in the world eventually seem to get done. The seaway must be such a thing."

Export Losses of Gold Soar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Export Losses of Gold Soar," published in the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash., December 29, 1950.

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

EXPORT LOSSES OF GOLD SOAR—DEVALUATION BLAMED FOR RAISING METAL'S VALUE ABROAD

The United States may have to resort to raising the price of gold or revalue the currency to stop the loss of gold by export, Frank Lilly, Spokane mining man and head of the Mines Research Bureau, said yesterday.

Citing the largest value of gold exports in history during 1950, he declared that it was "comparatively small losses that led to the Government placing an embargo on gold exports in 1933 and to its increasing the price of gold."

According to figures tabulated by his organization, the United States Treasury lost $1,722,000,000 during 1950 up to last week and estimated the total for the year will come about $1,800,000,000. This, he said, compares with the loss of only $446,000,000 in 1932 and $173,000,000 in 1933.

UNITED STATES HOLDINGS SHRINK

He said that in September 1949, when Great Britain and its affiliated countries in the sterling bloc devalued their currencies, the United States Treasury's gold holdings totaled $24,691,000,000. At the beginning of last week United States holdings had shrunk to $22,795,000,000.

"The why of our loss of gold is inevitably linked up with devaluation," he continued. "In other words, devaluation had the effect of increasing gold's measure of value in over 30 foreign countries. For example, the London price of gold is now, and has been since devaluation, equivalent to $102.17 an ounce on the basis of legal monetary parity.

"This fact gives Great Britain a tremendous advantage in trading with us. As a result, our imports have been exceeding our exports, after elimination of gift exports under the Marshall plan, every month since Great Britain's devaluation. International trade operates on a gold standard; therefore we must pay trade balances in gold—hence our loss of gold.

"Since we in this country are so accustomed to think in terms of billions, the loss of one or two billions of gold may not, on the surface, seem a serious matter. However, when we consider the fact that each billion dollars' worth of gold lost means the loss of the required legal backing for four times as much in Federal Reserve notes we begin to realize something of the danger involved in the decrease of our gold reserve, because these notes constitute the bulk of our folding money."

RUSSIAN DOLLAR VALUE SECRET

"True enough, we still have more gold than any other nation, but our debt and responsibilities are also far greater than those of all other nations combined. The fact that Russia revalued its currency in gold last March has given Russia an advantage in trade, not only with countries behind the iron curtain, but also with some countries of the sterling block which still trade with Russia.

"The equivalent dollar value of gold in the Russian economy is not definitely known but that it is very high may be judged from reports that a good dinner for three costs as much as $125 in United States currency; and from the fact that Poland has recently revalued its zloty in gold on the basis of 100 to 1 or, in other words, has raised the price of gold 100 times.

"President Roosevelt raised the price of gold only after Great Britain had increased her price for it, and this move stopped the flow of gold from the United States, except for short periods, until September of 1949 when Great Britain, by devaluation, again increased gold's measure of value in the sterling bloc.

"This country may be forced again to raise the price of gold as Great Britain has done, or revalue its currency in gold as Russia has done because the economy of nearly 2,000,000,000 of the world population functions in one or the other of these two blocs. Without such a move, we will inevitably lose all of our gold and our economy along with it."

Military Housing in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of articles now appearing in the Scripps-Howard newspapers by Mr. Andrew Tully. Mr. Tully, now in Alaska, is viewing at first-hand the situation with respect to the housing of our troops in the Territory.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, Alaska, February 22.—Corliss Ann Hamilton, a pretty little girl of 3 years, is dead today because her soldier father—sent here to help defend America—couldn't find a decent place for his family to live.

Corliss Ann burned to death the other night in a fire that destroyed her home, a home-made two-room cabin. Apparently an oil lamp, the cabin's only illumination, turned over. It was all over in about 10 minutes.

They say there was a smile on Corliss Ann's face when they dug her blackened body out of the smoking ruins. That's possible because she had been asleep and little girls dream the pleasantest of dreams.

But Corp. Thomas Hamilton, her father, wasn't smiling. The neighbors had to pull him away, screaming, when he tried to run into the flames to get Corliss Ann. He already had carried 2-year-old Johnny out of the inferno, but no man could have gone into that cabin again and lived.

Mrs. Hamilton wasn't smiling either. She hasn't smiled since. For Johnny is in a hospital with burns over three-quarters of his chubby body and he may not live. And everything the Hamiltons had in worldly possessions is gone.

Corp. Tom Hamilton had been a pretty proud man, too. He came to Alaska 10 months ago, leaving word with his wife that she and the kids could follow as soon as he found a place for them to live.

He took a look at the one-room shacks without plumbing where the local landlords get $85 a month and up and decided to take matters into his own hands. He bought a little plot of land and built his own home.

What he built wasn't much. It wasn't as good, for that matter, as the shacks he had turned down. They at least had electricity, but there was no line on Muldoon Road so Corporal Hamilton had to be satisfied with oil lamps.

But he had his own well, and a pretty comfortable privy, with a couple of little seats for kids. And he partitioned the 10-by-18 cabin into two rooms so the kids could get to bed early and not be kept awake by lights and the parents' small talk in the evenings.

The Missus and the two children came to Alaska last September. The cabin wasn't what Mrs. Hamilton had dreamed of but it was home and it was where Tommy, her husband, was. That was important. That made up for no sink.

That made up for heating water for hours on the stove for laundry, and for midnight trips to the privy, and for the hard times they had getting doctors to come when one of the kids was sick.

And, after all, several hundred servicemen were living in houses just as bad—and paying outlandish prices to private landlords for the privilege. This was the Hamiltons' own home, and the back of the hand to all landlords.

Now, today, Mrs. Hamilton isn't so sure she wants to make the effort of living in Alaska so her husband can be content while he helps defend America. She is thinking of going back home to Victoria, Tex. It seems almost too much to take, just as it seemed too much to take for Mrs. Virgil Miller, wife of one of those dashing jet pilots you hear so much about.

Mrs. Miller left today for home in Nebraska—just her and the two kids, Kit, 3½, and Johnny, 2½. Lt. Virgil Miller couldn't go with them, because he was dead.

Lieutenant Miller was dead because he was serving his country when his jet cracked up in the weather. This was not considered unusual because a jet pilot realizes he is risking his neck daily in this Alaska weather and these Alaska mountains and you are not supposed to be corny and talk about it or else somebody will think you think you are a hero or something.

So they buried Lt. Virgil Miller, the boy from Nebraska, with full military honors, which was nice for those who can see them. And the officers' wives came to see Mrs. Miller and were sorry because officers' wives in the Air Force know how it is. Their husbands fly, too.

Then, today, after everybody said what little could be said, Mrs. Miller left.

She didn't leave much. For Lt. Virgil Miller, crack jet pilot, lived with his family in a trailer.

It's a funny thing. Back in Washington people wouldn't spend one night in the Millers' trailer for fear they'd catch cold. But the Millers, living in a country where the mercury drops to 25° or 30° below zero, thought they had quite a good deal.

That's because, unlike most servicemen around here—or anywhere in Alaska—they had running water. They also had a little lean-to attached to the trailer which they had fixed up as a bedroom for the kids. They had an electric refrigerator, which sometimes worked for as long as a week at a time. They also had an inside toilet, but this was just for show. The water was always freezing, so they used the community outhouse up the rubbish-littered alley.

It is nice to know that the Millers and Hamiltons put up with all this, that they are willing to live like they did because America needed them. But it makes you kind of

ashamed of yourself. And because you saw Corliss Ann Hamilton's body a few hours ago, it makes you pretty mad at the people who run things back in Washington.

The Millers and Hamiltons stood for all these hardships because they had hope. Things were going to be better, everybody said. But things are almost as bad here today as they were 2 years ago. Washington seems to have forgotten there are people named Miller and Hamilton up here defending their country.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, February 23.—Servicemen in Alaska get $60 a month as a cost-of-living allowance. In addition, enlisted men draw overseas pay of $8 to $22.50 a month.

But this extra dough doesn't mean much in a country where the necessities of life cost roughly twice as much as in the United States and where rent control is a farce.

It isn't so bad for those family men who can live on the base. They get rent free in place of their rental allowance. They are close to the commissary where food and other things can be bought for the same prices they bring in the States.

But since only about one-fourth of our military personnel in Alaska can be accommodated on bases, the lucky ones are the exception rather than the rule.

The rest have to shift for themselves among the money-hungry civilian landlords. They usually end up in one of Mountain View's one-room cabins with no inside plumbing, for which they pay from $85 to $100 a month, plus about $50 a month for heat.

This is real rough on the private, who draws $224.50 per month, less insurance and income-tax deductions. It is almost as rough on corporals, who draw $241.05, and on staff sergeants, who draw $319.60. It is not considered exactly easy on first lieutenants who draw $433.88.

All of these men, of course, are entitled to buy food and other supplies at the commissary. But if they don't live on the base, this if often impracticable. You just don't walk 2 or 3 miles every time you run out of bread, so you pay the civilian grocer 40 cents a loaf. You pay 20 cents a gallon for fuel oil. And you pay 40 cents a quart for fresh milk. Not at the end of the month, though, when you're running low on money. Then you pay 23 cents a quart for "recombined" milk, which is powdered milk with water and vitamins added. Or you buy frozen milk from Seattle at 19 cents a quart.

If you feel like a couple of beers, that's 1 buck, brother—50 cents a bottle. If you don't have a car, it costs you a minimum of $1 for a cab ride, or 2 bucks if you live outside the city limits, which don't extend more than a mile or two in any direction.

The big bite, of course, is your rent. That, also, is where you find the big gimmick.

Technically, Anchorage is under rent control. But since most of the shacks available to military personnel were built after August 1947 they don't come under the regulations. Thus the landlords can charge whatever they can get.

Even if you find a shack where the rent is controlled, however, that doesn't mean much. The landlord can get $20 more a month under the table from somebody else if you don't want the place. That's what you're going to pay. Or else he has put in improvements. This usually consists of a new shelf or a storm door or a flimsy partition. But it means he can jack up prices.

Most landlords have the same story when you talk to them. They pay the same high prices everybody else does, except more so. They point out that a house which costs $5,000 to build in the States costs $15,000 here.

This is not too convincing when you've just been inside one of those one-room cabins in Mountain View, but you can't argue with shrugged shoulders.

One character, though, was brutally frank.

"Sure," he said, "I'm getting away with murder. But why not? Maybe next year there won't be any Army here at all. You never can tell when those people down in Washington are going to put on another economy drive. So I figure I better get mine while the getting's good. When I get enough, I'm getting the hell back to civilization."

There are a lot of fly-by-nighters like this guy. And there doesn't seem to be much that can be done about them. Half the time they can't find anybody to run the local rent-control office. The director now, Miss Jean Camon, has only been here since last August and before that the office was closed for several months.

But it seems, putting it mildly, rather bad taste for the richest country in the world to let an American soldier with a wife and four kids live in a one-room cabin. Especially when that soldier would not be here if his country had not sent him.

(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, February 24.—Less than one-fourth of the servicemen entitled to live on the base are now being accommodated on Alaska's three major military installations.

And of that number, almost one-half, most of them with children, are living in substandard quarters which would be uncomfortable in a New York winter.

Yet these people are considered well off here. Most of the rest, including lower grade enlisted men not entitled to live on the base, are living in one-room cabins with no plumbing or toilet facilities and paying a civilian landlord $135 a month, including heat, for that dubious privilege.

If you want to extend callousness to the *n*th degree, you can wash your hands of these lower-grade enlisted men. Technically, they are not supposed to have families here. They are not even supposed to be married.

But all the rest is strictly Uncle Sam's responsibility. Under military regulations, the Government is required to provide housing on the base for all officers and the first three grades of noncommissioned officers.

Those regulations are a tragic joke in Alaska.

At Elmendorf Air Force Base and nearby Fort Richardson in Anchorage, a total of 4,167 family units are required to house those entitled to base housing. Only 1,332 families are now being taken care of and 517 of those are living in tarpaper shacks, converted latrines, and "temporary" Quonset huts which the military deems substandard.

The story is the same—or worse—at Ladd and at Eielson Air Force bases, both in the Fairbanks area. Ladd needs 1,906 family units. It's got 457, of which 171 are substandard. Eielson needs 1,014. It's got 208, every one of which has been ruled unfit for occupancy. It was 40 degrees below zero in Fairbanks the other day.

In most of these glorified chicken houses occupied by officers with children there are three or four rooms—each about the size of a large bathroom back in the States. But there are plenty of children living in two-room shacks designed for childless couples.

They all have inside toilets and running water. But they are heated with inadequate oil stoves which aren't much help against arctic winds that seep through the tattered tar-paper exteriors. The only time they're really warm is just after there's been a heavy snow. Then the man of the house banks snow high around his dream castle to keep out drafts.

"What's being done to improve the situation?" The answer is not much. Elmendorf and Fort Richardson need a total of 3,352 additional housing units, and only 672 are either under construction or will be started during the next building season. Only a small percentage will be ready for occupancy by next winter. Another 424 units have been approved and money is available to build them. But nobody knows when they'll be built.

Ladd Field, at Fairbanks, needs 1,620 additional units. None are being built now and only 555 are planned for the future. Eielson needs 1,014 units; 112 are under construction and 873 have been approved for future construction.

Only here in Anchorage is there any immediate hope of the military getting a new slice of civilian housing. The Pacific Alaska Building Corp., with FHA funds, is building a new apartment project. Because it's Government property, the Government has earmarked 464 of these units for use by either the military or civilians employed by the military.

Units—one- and two-bedroom size—will rent for $100 to $125 a month, including all utilities and garages.

These apartments will be heaven for those lucky enough to get them. But for a long time to come, there won't be enough heaven to go around in Alaska. For a long time to come, most servicemen will continue to exist in what is a rough approximation of hell.

International Japanese Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the growth of good will between Japan and the United States, Seattle, Wash., is undertaking the first International Japanese Trade Fair, scheduled for June 17 to July 3, 1951.

This worthy project will reflect the growth of business and trade between the Pacific Northwest and Japan. Those responsible for the program are to be commended. The following is a résumé of plans and accomplishments:

JAPANESE TRADE FAIR TO BE STAGED IN SEATTLE, WASH., JUNE 17–JULY 3, 1951—FULL SCOPE OF MODERNIZED JAPANESE INDUSTRIES TO BE SHOWN UNITED STATES BUYERS

Inquiries regarding the first Seattle-State of Washington international Japanese Trade Fair, which will be staged June 17 to July 3, 1951, in Seattle, Wash., have been arriving in quantity since the fair was first announced, Herbert S. Little, chairman of the fair, has stated in Seattle.

Honors for the first Japanese space reservation went to the city of Osaka, whose Foreign Trade Association cabled the fair committee to hold a large exhibition area open for a full showing of Osaka's products and cultures. The second Japanese reservation came from Mie Prefecture, which requested that substantial space be set aside for the showing of cultured pearls, fishing equipment, and porcelain ware. Between 300 and 500 of the latter manufactures will be shown, Little was informed by the Mie group.

Since the first two Japanese space reservations were made, Little stated, a number of other Japanese areas and individual manufacturers have sent in their space reservations, and every mail is bringing more.

The first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair will be one

of the most colorful and unique to be staged in the world during 1951. The fair's staging is being financed by the people of Seattle and the State of Washington as a good-will gesture toward the people of Japan. No fees or charges for exhibition are being asked of the Japanese who send displays. They are only required to ship their displays to Seattle, Little said. The rest is free; financed by the paid-display space being purchased by American exhibitors, and by donations being made to the production budget by Seattle and State of Washington business firms, commercial associations, and private individuals.

First donation to the $100,000 production and promotion budget was a contribution totaling $8,000, presented to Little by E. H. Savage, president of the Port of Seattle Commission. The port of Seattle's contribution includes the services, at the request of the fair committee, of John M. Haydon, port director of public relations. Haydon is serving as director of the fair.

Site of the fair is the University of Washington's famed Edmundson Pavilion. More than 60,000 square feet of display space will be devoted exclusively to Japanese merchandise, trade goods, products of both light and heavy industry, processed material, food products, textiles, china, and other retail merchandise items from every classification, plus cultural, educational, recreational, and entertainment displays. Use of the pavilion was donated by the University of Washington. It is Seattle's largest and finest public building.

Foreign traders have described the first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair as a prime opportunity for retailers, wholesalers, buyers, suppliers, contractors, manufacturers, and others from the fields of export and import, transportation, industry, and commerce to study at first hand the improved quality, craftsmanship, and originality of goods and materials now being produced by a revitalized Japanese industry for consumption in America and abroad.

Fair officials said that the dates, June 17 to July 3, 1951, were chosen for two reasons. First, so that buyers placing orders would be allowed ample time for seasonal delivery, and second, so that those attending the fair, which will be held at the best part of the State of Washington's cool and green summer season, will be able to bring their entire family for a vacation in Washington. "Many will take advantage of the opportunity to fly on to the Orient over Seattle's shorter, Great Circle routes," Little said, "and others will wish to visit the Old World atmospheres of nearby British Columbia, or to journey throughout the State to such scenic wonders as Grand Coulee Dam, the last frontier stretches of our rugged Olympic Peninsula, the romantically lonely beaches along the sandy Washington-Pacific Ocean coast line, the forest and river areas encircling Washington's snow-capped mountains, and by sea and air, to the grandeur of Alaska." Little stated that many buyers would find the cost of their vacations paid for by the commercial relationships established at the fair. Many entertainment features have been planned to take place in Seattle during the fair's presentation dates, and visitors will be given a royal welcome by the city of Seattle, which is just entering its centennial year.

The first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair is under the sponsorship of International Trade Fairs, Inc., a nonprofit organization which includes officials of the city of Seattle, port of Seattle, State of Washington, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Washington State Foreign Trade Council, Pacific Northwest Trade Association, Greater Seattle, Inc., World Trade Club of Seattle, Propeller Club, port of Seattle, and many other groups and organizations from all levels of Seattle and State of Washington culture, industry, commerce, labor, recreation, transportation and other fields.

Commenting on the fair, Seattle's mayor, William F. Devin, said, "Not only will this Japanese trade fair strengthen trade patterns with Japan, but it will help carry out America's political, economic, and social philosophies abroad, and at home. Not only will it assist the Japanese, but it will spread to the world a picture of how the strength of free nations depends upon their ability to expand their trade with each other and to outproduce their aggressors."

Mayor Devin toured Japan last year with a Seattle Chamber of Commerce good-will tour to the Orient, and he returned home convinced that the nations he had seen had to be helped in every way back to high levels of production, and to a state of self-reliance, so that they could take their place with other strong and peaceful nations. While in Japan, Devin, along with other members of the tour party, discussed the possibilities of holding a Japanese trade fair in Seattle with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and with other high SCAP and Japanese Government officials. All expressed enthusiasm and the fair is a natural outgrowth of those talks.

RADM Gordon Rowe, commissioner of the port of Seattle and also a member of the tour party to Japan, describes the forthcoming fair as a real example of democracy at work. Instead of merely giving gifts, we are going to provide the Japanese with a working opportunity to do and build for themselves. Obviously, if Japan is to be built as an ally of America and the other free nations, she must be helped toward a self-supporting economy. This fair will be a major step in that direction.

Formation of the committee to stage the fair came following approval and endorsement of the project recently by the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, which directed Robert C. Story, manager of the chamber's world trade division, to carry out the initial work under the direction of the division's membership and its chairman, Maurice C. Rattray.

Another member of the party which toured the Orient was Sol G. Levy, now serving as vice chairman of the fair committee. "Japan is beginning to get back on her feet industrially and culturally," Levy said. "This International Japanese Trade Fair will make Seattle a giant showcase for Japan's products, and a living textbook of ways and means and rules and regulations for traders and businessmen who are looking for new, profitable lines and ways in which to expand their trade with Japan and the rest of the world."

Committee appointments made include fair chairman, Herbert S. Little, Little, LeSourd, Palmer & Scott; vice chairman, Sol G. Levy, senior partner, the Commission Co.; site and dates, Fred W. Geibel, publisher of the Marine Digest; ways and means, Sol G. Levy; products and exhibits, Douglas Egan, United States Department of Commerce; and promotion and advertising, John M. Haydon, director of public relations for the port of Seattle.

Chairman Little has described the fair as a chance for Seattle to take a solidly constructive step toward strengthening her position in international trade, and further improving her place as closest American port to the Orient and the natural gateway to Japan and the other countries of the Far East.

Following announcement that the fair was going to be held, a letter received from Maj. Gen. William F. Marquat, Chief, Economic and Scientific Section, SCAP in Tokyo stated, "This will be an outstanding event for both Japan and Seattle. We will do everything necessary from this end to make it a real success."

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON of Washington stated in the Nation's Capital, "I wish to congratulate those who are working to put on the first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair. It will be of tremendous value, not only to Japan, Seattle, and the Pacific Northwest, but to the Nation as a whole."

Robert O. Edwards, manager of the port of Seattle foreign trade zone, wired from Chicago where he was talking with Midwest importers and shippers, "Announcement of Japanese trade fair received with wide interest here. This will mean much, not only to Japan, but to State and city as the country's major gateway to the Orient."

State of Washington Governor Arthur B. Langlie declared that the State was fully behind the venture, and described it as a major step forward in the economic, cultural and promotional progress of the area. Governor Langlie said that he would extend a personal invitation to Japan's Premier Sigeru Yoshida to be his guest at the opening of the fair.

Official offices for the fair have been set up on the second floor of the Central Building, Seattle, Wash., adjacent to the offices of Toshio Urabe, chief, Japanese Overseas Agency. Fair Director Haydon stated that many cultural, educational, and entertainment features and displays would be produced for the fair to add color and excitement to its business attractions and to interest attendance on the part of the general public. He said that the first week of the fair would be restricted to buyers and businessmen, and that a premier opening would start off the second week of the fair, which would then be open to the general public, with certain hours set aside for late-arriving buyers. Telephone number at the Japanese trade fair office is Elliot 2010.

In Japan, up-to-the-minute information about the fair, preparation of exhibits, shipping information, and other data is available to Japanese exhibitors at the Promotion Bureau, Promotion Section, Ministry of International Trade and Industry, Tokyo, and from the chambers of commerce and industrial associations in individual cities.

Japanese exhibitors are asked to construct display surfaces, shelving, and tables, in addition to providing themselves with booth decorations, draping, table coverings, background material, and other such individual design material which will carry out the theme of their display and portray the cultural, social, and economic background of the goods displayed and the life of the workers who produced them. The fair committee will provide the basic booths, internal decorations and lighting, and will make additional decorative materials available.

Products and Exhibits Chairman Douglas Egan stated that space reservations from United States firms and organizations are now being accepted on a first come, first served basis, since space was limited. Egan said that firms handling Japanese products for sale to retail or wholesale markets were invited to exhibit, and that it was not necessary for such firms to be located in the State of Washington. On the same basis, Egan said, exhibits are being accepted from service, social, and cultural organizations, regardless of geographic location, and from business firms anywhere that handle associated products which would not detract from the over-all Japanese theme of the fair. Egan stated that firms which were uncertain as to the eligibility of their proposed exhibits should immediately contact the Japanese Trade Fair office for a ruling. Egan also warned that space was going fast because rates were being kept as low as possible. He stated that no merchandising schemes of high pressure or gimmick nature would be allowed. Space contracts will be distributed as fast as inquiries are received, Egan said.

In summing up the purposes of the first Seattle-State of Washington International Japanese Trade Fair, Chairman Herbert S. Little said, "This is, first of all, a good will gesture toward the people of Japan. Secondly, it is an opportunity for Seattle once again to emphasize dramatically the advantages of her port and her Great Circle routes to the Orient. We intend that this fair will do as much as it possibly can to reestablish friendly trade relations and permanent cultural and social ties with Japan and her people. We believe that this is in keeping with America's current international efforts to promote world peace."

Let's Get an Effective Stabilization Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the Nation has full cause for real concern over the recent developments in the Office of Defense Mobilization. The action of the labor members in withdrawing from the Stabilization Board can easily lead to an eventual complete breakdown of our economy stabilization unless our own Government takes immediate and positive action to correct the conditions which threaten to bring about the breakdown.

Let us fairly analyze the facts which led to the situation as it exists today.

We have thus far failed to effectively stabilize our economy. Our first steps toward stabilization were weak and gave not enough hope for eventual success because they were haphazard, half-hearted, and in many instances inequitable. Though we might excuse some of their deficiencies because of the haste in which they were put into effect, this should not deter us from constructive criticism to help bring about the results which all of us seek.

I am confident that free American labor, which so gloriously proved itself in World War II, is ready and willing again today to do its share in the serious war for survival with which we are faced today.

But Congress and the mobilization agencies must also furnish their share of responsibility for a fair and equitable stabilization and mobilization policy which should take into consideration the welfare of the majority of the people.

Such a policy must be premised on equality of sacrifice by all groups of the civilian population, based on their ability to pay. It must include all areas of the economy and provide an over-all system of anti-inflation controls.

Because the present program fails fundamentally to include these considerations, the present crisis in our program was brought about. It still can, and must, be corrected, but only by insisting on more fair and equitable controls.

As I have previously pointed out in this House on February 12, the price order of the Economic Stabilization Agency of January 26, 1951, was unfair because it completely failed to roll back prices and gave legal sanction to the post-Korean highest price level in our history as the base from which future price stabilization action was to be taken. It gave comfort to those who had engaged in speculative manipulations in the commodity market and who engaged in an orgy of profiteering, all at the expense of the American housewife and the laborer.

No effective provision was made to hold down retail food prices, the major item in the cost of living. And nothing has yet been done to extend the control over rents.

The only field in which a rigid control is provided is in the control of wages. The inequity of this condition should be readily apparent to all of us, as it is to the workers who are compelled to live on frozen earnings without any over-all stabilization policy, thus cutting deeply into their living standards.

As far as they are concerned, there is no stabilization program in effect, except as to wages. Stabilization cannot be effected piecemeal, nor by controlling one group of the population. It should not place an undue share of the burden on those who can least afford it carry it. Reduced living standard of the workers is not the effective or proper antidote for business profiteering and speculation.

Our stabilization program must permit flexible wage adjustments based on increased living costs. Lower- and middle-income families should not be called upon to assume the burden of taxation. That burden should bear heaviest on individuals with high incomes and on corporations with large profits. It is unthinkable to compel low- and middle-income families to pay taxes high enough to cut too deeply into their basic living standards.

Let us hope that those responsible for our stabilization and mobilization program will strive to remedy the present inequities and thus avert the calamity which must follow if labor finds itself unable to participate in the program. And this Congress must also bear these same considerations in enacting its tax program for the ensuing year.

The Blood of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, orders were issued last Saturday for the Forty-fifth Division to be sent to Japan for training and duty. Since this division is the Oklahoma National Guard, and since it contains more than 11,000 officers and men who are Oklahomans, these orders naturally created a great deal of interest throughout my great State.

For many months I have been seeking unsuccessfully to find a way to stop the unequal drain on Oklahoma manpower for the Armed Forces. My intense feeling in regard to this unfairness shall cause me to continue my efforts and I shall propose amendments to the forthcoming manpower bill to prevent by law a recurrence of such a situation in the future.

These editorials included herewith give dramatic evidence of the way Oklahomans feel about this situation. Oklahoma, always in the front ranks in voluntary participation in all of America's defense efforts, is justly proud of her contributions now. We are proud of this division of troops. Surely, my colleagues, this is sufficient evidence to persuade all of you that our plea for a more equitable distribution of the manpower burden is due these patriotic citizens of my State.

These editorials, one titled "Oklahoma's Own," is from the Daily Oklahoman, of Oklahoma City, and the other, titled "Oklahoma in the Orient," is from the Daily World, Tulsa, Okla. They follow:

[From the Daily Oklahoman]

OKLAHOMA'S OWN

Oklahomans generally regret the necessity for sending the Forty-fifth Division to the Orient. It is a sad thing to see men going out on the grim adventure from which many never return. We who escape the call because of age or lack of training cannot fail to look upon any mobilization with a feeling of deep regret.

But according to those who are governing the Republic the necessity is there. Trained men are needed beyond the Pacific, in the opinion of those who are supposed to know. And the Forty-fifth is a trained division. It happens to be one of the few National Guard divisions of the entire country that is anywhere near the required standard, so the call comes to these young soldiers to prepare for their departure for the other side of the world.

All Oklahomans have reason for pride in the fact that Oklahoma is one of the handful of States whose organized militia was ready for activation when the first call to the Colors came. The guards of far more populous States have not yet received the initial call. And of all the National Guard units of America only those of Oklahoma and California have been called for service overseas. This is a great tribute indeed to the patriotism and fighting spirit of the lads of Oklahoma.

While it is a sad thing to see these boys in uniform called to action, it is a proud thing to live in a State where so many thousands are willing to go, and as the event proves, ready to go. Never in the State's trying history has Oklahoma failed to do her part in a crisis. Just now it cannot be denied that Oklahoma is doing more than her part. Eventually perhaps the sacrifices of all the States may be equal, but just now Oklahoma is carrying a double load.

As these thousands of spirited, young Oklahomans go forth to meet whatever fate may have in store for them, they will not be unmindful of the name they bear. There is illustrious blood in their military ancestry. On the battle flag of the Forty-fifth there are many shining names. There are inscribed the names of Sicily and Anzio and Salerno and the invasion of France and the dash across France and the bloody bayonet thrust into the heart of Bavaria. It is a proud record, and they who bear the flag of the Forty-fifth in 1951 will add to the

luster of that record, if they are given the opportunity.

If any ineptitude or blundering has helped to create the crisis that is calling these Oklahomans across 2,000 leagues of ocean, these boys are in no sense responsible. It is not theirs to create a crisis or to formulate a policy. It is their duty to go wherever the bugle calls and to support the policy that has been formulated. No doubt some of them will recall the words written by an Oklahoma soldier who fell at St. Etienne:

"Statesmen may fume and brag and lie
Winning the fame they seek,
But when we are weary of liars and lies,
Then the guns, it is theirs to speak."

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World]

OKLAHOMA IN THE ORIENT

Ordering of the Forty-fifth Division to Japan has, for Oklahomans, two principal phases—the intimation that the command is to be active in the Orient and that it is largely Oklahoman in personnel. The State is proud of the Forty-fifth; it won many honors in World War II and was in some of the worst fighting of that war. Its members brought home medals for valor and composite distinctions.

Tulsa has five units in the division. Our interest, then, is great, personal, direct. The Thunderbirds are a valiant force, and it is evident they are to have a large place in American military history and world developments. There is both pride and partial resentment in the public feeling of Oklahoma. The Forty-fifth is a National Guard command, one of the two of its type ordered to Japan. There is an underlying feeling that Oklahoma is being penalized to some extent for proficiency. Whatever familiar or personal feelings there may be, we all realize now far more than we did last week, that the world situation is full of meaning to this area and that we are to take a real part in whatever far-away activities there may be.

Two ideas quickly arose when the two National Guard divisions were singled out for duty in Japan. One was that the real destination would be Korea, and Washington was quick to deny that they would be used as replacements. The second, which came to general notice Monday, was that there may be a struggle in and over Japan. It seems to be expected that China and Russia will try to crowd into Japan or hem it in; that was undoubtedly on the Russian agenda when the Kremlin prompted the Korean war. There is pending a treaty with Japan, and apparently this country and Japan are to be in a military pact. We will probably exact bases and will necessarily have considerable forces there. European service, which the Forty-fifth had come to expect, may still be an eventuality.

The situation in Korea is actually much larger than our people had surmised. The war in Korea now engages 250,000 Americans, according to figures from Gen. Omar Bradley. The struggle is considerably of the seesaw variety; the Americans are alternately successful and unsuccessful; apparently they are heading into a big test of strength well up toward the thirty-eighth parallel.

The involvement of Japan in whatever may develop in Asia is acute. Formosa and Korea are just starting points for trouble. Thus, when the United States sets up a force and training grounds in Japan it is preparing for a real struggle with the whole Orient, which has been staked out for Communist domination.

In all this, Oklahoma has poignant interest. The commitment of the Forty-fifth Division to the Orient links us closely with far-flung and partly unseen events.

The Obligation of Americans to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address entitled "The Obligation of Americans to America," delivered by the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, at the annual meeting in honor of George Washington, held under the auspices of the Sons of the American Revolution and the Daughters of the American Revolution on February 18, 1951, at the First Congregational Church in Montclair, N. J.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the address will occupy two and one-half pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

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

THE OBLIGATION OF AMERICANS TO AMERICA

Let me say, no man living knows the answer to the thousands of distressing problems which have been created for the people of this country and the people of the world, by large groups of self-seeking politicians and dictators whose interest seems to be personal power first and the people's welfare second, if there is any welfare left. It is too late for any of us to lose our patience and temper or to cease striving for a sense of humility. No one can hope to be all right or to find the other fellow all wrong in the situation of mad confusion which faces the people, due to the concentration of power in a centralized government, which power has either been unwisely voted or improperly seized by those in authority. Mass confusion, in the minds of the people, has always preceded the downfall of any great government or organized effort of man.

In attempting to appraise our commitments of every kind, made to foreign governments or groups of governments, and their commitments to us, and in trying to ascertain the billions of dollars we have given away in the two World Wars, and since the cessation of actual fighting in 1945, up to the time of the Korean event plus the billions of dollars we are yet obligated to put into the foreign situation—I am unable to find a man in Washington, or elsewhere, who would even attempt to evaluate the situation. Practically all who are in a position to know considerable about the situation, recognize and admit that the loans or gifts, whichever you wish to call them, will eventually be charged off to profit and loss.

I think we should stop making any further commitments abroad and first appoint a committee of the ablest lawyers, statesmen, economists, accountants, and financial minds of the country to take an honest nonpolitical, nonpartisan inventory of our present economic and defense equipment and abilities; second, this committee should list all of our commitments and show all the gifts and loans, with their total sum, since World War I. Then we should determine whether it lies within our power to fulfill all the commitments made or promised in good faith and whether the nations to whom the promises were made can fulfill their part of the commitments and if they have acted in complete good faith.

The majority of this suggested committee should not be men or women who have already been instrumental in leading us along the path we are now following, but rather the majority should be other fine American men and women seeking only to fulfill the obligation of Americans to America. From the report of such committee, perhaps we can formulate a foreign policy clear enough and definite enough so that the American people themselves and the men on the firing line can understand it and know for what they are asked to sacrifice their lives.

Then we should try to find out whether the mothers and fathers of the United States are in favor of having their boys sent all over the world to fight battles in which I, personally, believe there is no way to do more than win a physical victory here and there without any of the fruits of peace and good will to follow the physical victory.

Americans forget too soon and forgive too often. Woodrow Wilson, a great and distinguished American, who took us into World War I, was elected for his second term, in which we became embroiled in foreign alliances, by this slogan, "He kept us out of war." I remember the posters all over the United States of a mother standing with her hand on her son's shoulder, saying "My son, vote for Woodrow Wilson; he kept you out of war." I will not analyze the right or wrong, but just take this look at the facts.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to his third term, principally through a campaign speech he made in Boston, when he said to the mothers and fathers in the United States the following: "I say to you again and again and again, that your sons will not be sent to fight on foreign soil." It is quite reliably reported by those who heard the speech and I was one of them—that the words which were later found inserted in the manuscript "unless we are attacked" were not used in the speech when it went to the ears of millions of Americans. My only purpose in reemphasizing this fact, is that it convinces me that our American people never wished to be drawn into the wars of foreign nations, which have been going on for centuries.

Both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt will probably occupy a distinguished position in history, and were beloved by millions of our citizens. That does not change the fact that the people did not want their sons sent to foreign soils and did not want to become involved in foreign entangled alliances.

Certainly, it is true that none of us know what George Washington might say today to the American people in a farewell address, but I want to ask every American to think carefully as to whether the morals, the character, and the spiritual development of a vast part of the world justified or justifies us in changing our position of living under our American way of life and contributing all within our power to help others to find the way of improving their lives and freedom.

As one American, to those who are willing to listen to what I say in good faith, my answer is that we have entered into partnership and alliances with political powers, leaders, and dictators whom no intelligent American citizen would choose as a partner in his life's work.

Let us always keep in mind two of the cardinal rules of equity which are fundamental in all human relationship:

1. He who asks equity must do equity.

2. He who comes into equity must do so with clean hands.

Perhaps we are moving too fast. Perhaps we are forgetting how the tide of good has come in over the last 2,000 years, only to recede to points further away from our objective than they have frequently occupied over the centuries gone by.

I ask you if anyone in this room feels that this world is better after World Wars I and

II than it was before World War I, when the Constitution of the United States was supreme with us and the American flag occupied first place in our hearts, minds, and souls?

A relatively small percentage of our people appreciate that a treaty made, executed, and ratified with a foreign power takes precedence over our Constitution and the law of the land.

A still smaller percentage of our people realize that our commitments to the United Nations and the new treaty-making processes evolved during the last 10 years are apparently circumventing our Federal Constitution, amending it without the process established for its amendment, and some say we have already abrogated vital constitutional provisions and guaranties as is evidenced by the recent decision of the California Supreme Court.

Only a few of our people have made the understanding of government important enough for them to realize that when we go into a world government, that we have lost control of our own affairs and have become just a part of a muddled, confused world. A world whose selfish motives and objectives dictate their vote.

If socialism and communism are predominant, then we have thrown our fine system and way of life into a kettle of international dictatorship, there to become part and parcel of the conglomerate whole, where the state is master and man its puppet or serf.

Then there will be no leader of freemen left to hold the light of liberty and opportunity aloft, to lead others out of the darkness and despair brought about by rulers who have all the iniquitous qualities of the worst kings and emperors of the past, regardless of the name by which you call them.

Perhaps power-seeking politicians and leaders are trying to change the quality and character of humanity faster than it can be changed.

Perhaps they are hoping to accomplish by force and subsidy those things which can only be accomplished by spiritual development and decency of purpose on a voluntary basis in keeping with the spirit of the Golden Rule.

Perhaps they are trying to change humanity by force faster than God ordained it should be changed.

A human life is but the wink of an eye or the break of a wave as compared to the known time of the past. I am not saying that some day the world may not be right for world government, but I am saying if we try to force it on the people of the United States in view of the conditions confronting us, and considering the character of the people of the world now, we will destroy the greatest accomplishment of mankind in the history of the world. I refer to the American form of government and way of life.

Regardless of what anyone may say or how much it may hurt the feelings of some people in the world, I claim that the United States of America has been the greatest charitable organization ever known in the history of the world in its attempts to do good for others without seeking anything material in return. I also claim that, in our great zeal to do good, we have overpromised ourselves, or agreed to things which, if pursued, will wreck this greatest charitable organization in the world.

If any great charitable institution within our borders were to become emotional or overzealous in promising to do things which its board of directors and contributors found could not be done without destroying the institution, then, it is my opinion, that board of directors would be forced to take inventory and reappraise its powers and the relative importance of the things it would like to do. Then the members of the board would be forced to say, "We have undertaken to do more than is possible with our manpower and material wealth without jeopardizing and destroying our whole effort in charity." I think they would be courageous enough to say we have overestimated our power to do good, and they would be compelled to adjust themselves to the doing of things within the limits of their known, or at least their probable, income and manpower. Thus they would preserve their great charitable institution to do good within the scope of its ability.

No decent American ever wishes to defy the law of his country. No decent American ever wishes to evade military service required to protect and preserve our great country. But if we are a free people, every American should have the right without smears or reprisals to say openly how he feels our welfare and purpose in life are to be best served and accomplished. If, because we are in a great emergency; if, because we are involved in some kind of a war that our leaders do not call war; if, because we are on the brink of a great war, possibly engulfing the world, we stop the citizen from expressing his honest, patriotic views, then, indeed, have we become a dictatorship where those in power in the Government are the masters and the people its puppets.

Right now I would not attempt to appraise who is responsible for the dilemma in which we find ourselves. Nor would I urge others to do so. Two great World Wars fought to victory by the men in the field; two great opportunities for the establishment of peace or ways to peace forfeited or bungled away by the political leaders because selfishness could not be made into intelligent self-interest, and our leaders compromised principle. They let idealism blot out realism almost completely. Theodore Roosevelt said, "A pure idealist is often one of the most dangerous men in the world, because frequently he is very sincere and convincing, but he has no foundation in the realism of life."

I often think of the admonition I gave to our political leaders and the leaders of the world, in the speech I made before the GI Forum in Rome, in June 1945, less than 8 weeks after VE-day. I had had conferences with the Honorable Winston Churchill and a delightful visit with His Holiness, the Pope—four other Senators being present. The substance of what I said was this. We have spent probably $200,000,000,000 to get an Army of 3,400,000 of the best trained and equipped American soldiers on the European Continent, and to assist our ally, Britain, in getting 785,000 of the best trained and equipped British soldiers on continental Europe. Then I asked the question why shouldn't we announce to the world in simple unambiguous language, the objectives for which we fought the war, and our objective in securing peace, before we take this great Army back home, and ship the equipment to other parts of the world. All I wanted to do was what any plain, ordinary, American citizen should have wanted to do, viz: that is help make peace possible while power was present.

For making that statement I was blasted by the socialistic, communistic, New-Dealish sympathizers, as a warmonger. Now I am receiving letters from the most distinguished men in the country, saying that I was one of the few people who saw the picture clearly and expressing great sorrow that no heed was taken of that speech except by the smear artists and character assassins. The only object I have in referring to this—which is water over the dam—is to prove that all we have thus far done is to win physical victories and bungle away the peace. Why should we expect the political leaders now in power in the world, to do a better job if we win another physical victory, after the loss of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of our fine young manhood.

No, I reiterate, they in Europe, should call to arms, all of their available manpower, to defend themselves, before we take another step with land forces into the foreign arena. I do not mean we should fail to support our boys in Korea or in Europe. But we should think well about maintaining land forces, for our own soil, and the return of our men from Korea, in an orderly way. I would adopt some sane program for pretraining our youth for armed service in case of necessity and not call upon them to fight wars without training. I would build and equip an army for the defense of our country, and it seems to me that Senator TAFT's figure of a million and a half men, over-all, with a backlog of trainees, should be our first step.

Then an appraisal and inventory of our resources, manpower and abilities to do things, should be made available to guide the American people and their representatives in Congress as to how far we can go with any degree of safety in the future. Nothing is more vital than that Congress and not any one man, or group of men, should have the power to say whether our young manhood shall be sent to fight on foreign soil.

I firmly believe that the duty of every American is to make the saving of the United States his No. 1 job. I do not believe in the slogan, we must save the world, if we would save ourselves. That slogan has already led us into the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, the crippling of hundreds of thousands more of our citizens, and has put us well on the way to national bankruptcy. National bankruptcy of our country can accomplish all of the wicked objectives of the Communists and destroy the cause of freemen throughout the world for centuries. I would change that slogan to read, "We cannot save the world unless we save ourselves."

I would ask those in authority to truly appraise the atomic bomb and not distress and terrify the people with imaginary things that may never happen, neither would I overemphasize the importance of dangerous things that may happen. Certainly, what General Bradley said is true, "We may be bombed." But I would like to ask you, fellow Americans, whether we are any less likely to be bombed if we send more troops abroad and thus weaken our defense at home? We will never be overcome, as a Nation of freemen, except by great land forces, landing on our own shores, and greater than we can combat. Hitler had one of the greatest armies in the world, and he got to the shores of the English Channel. England was on her knees, crippled from tensions and ruthless attacks from the air. Hitler did not dare attempt to cross the Channel, 22 miles. Russia would have to bring a man force of tremendous magnitude some 4,000 miles, if she started from home, and some 3,000 miles if she started from the shores of our former allies in Europe. It is inconceivable that she could transport a large land force either across the Atlantic Ocean or across Siberia down through Alaska. We can likewise bomb, providing we spend all that is necessary to be supreme in the air and maintain supremacy on the sea.

I said on the Senate floor almost 5 years ago that Russia would never need to precipitate an open war with us in order to accomplish her objective of destroying our way of life. I made this statement on the basis that we were and are spending ourselves into national bankruptcy, and national bankruptcy would sound the death knell of the free-enterprise system. I agree with what Abraham Lincoln said when he was 29 years old: "No power on earth can ever land a force in this country to overcome us. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide." Tolerance, patience, equity, and justice in our dealings amongst ourselves are the things required

to build national unity. If we can build real unity, no one can overcome us. Then we will set an example to the world which freemen can follow if they are willing to pay the price of liberty.

Our people favor air and naval supremacy, but they are opposed to our sending millions of men to fight on foreign soil side by side with people whose political philosophy and economic objectives are certainly not stabilized and unified any more than all of their morals and character are stabilized and unified.

What if these countries who are leaning strongly to socialism, should change their course, while a vast army from here is on foreign soil?

Yes, I would take an inventory right now regardless of what the world might think of us. The better people of the world would thank us later for having done it.

When I was on the Air Policy Board of the Congress, I told the committee and the high command of the various branches of the armed services that I would vote for any amount of money necessary to make us supreme in the air and on the sea as fast as we could lawfully and intelligently spend the money.

I would not say now what we should do to help other nations who believe sincerely and are on record as being in favor of the freedom of the individual. I would let them know their Uncle Sam cannot do their job for them, no matter how kind his heart is. The best work of all men in the world has been done when mother necessity stood back of them with a broomstick, and, particularly, when freedom and self-preservation were their objectives.

I hear Americans say, "Wouldn't you send even 10 divisions to Europe or to Asia, just to show good will?" My answer is: If you send 10 divisions anywhere and the vast hordes of any nation, which is our enemy, is putting them and our supposed full-fledged allies to rout, then, in the name of decency and honesty, we will have to send as many hundreds of thousands or millions more as is necessary to support them, protect them, and save them. We can't just send our boys around the world and, if they fail, let them be massacred.

No war can be conducted under the direction of the United Nations, which takes 2 or 3 months to give a go-ahead signal in every case, except when they voted to resist the Communist advance from North Korea, and we furnished 90 to 95 percent of all the aid given to the South Koreans.

Can anyone doubt the ultimate failure of our arms on foreign soil when they see how General MacArthur's men of the so-called United Nations forces in Korea have been handicapped by the indecision of the United Nations. Just this week the Prime Minister of Great Britain has suggested the United Nations forces should not go north of the thirty-eighth parallel. General MacArthur had the communistic forces on the run last fall, when he was ordered not to proceed further. The Communists reorganized, rearmed, and reinforced their ranks and drove our Armed Forces almost to the sea. About 10 days ago, our Army started to make heavy gains and drove the Communists back again. Now, there is talk of stopping MacArthur again. If that happens, the Communists' forces from a population of nearly a billion people, will reinforce, rearm, and again take the offensive. Meanwhile thousands of American boys are making the supreme sacrifice, and I suggest you ask yourself, "Where will this all end?" and further ask yourself the question, "What will we really accomplish if our forces overcome the Communists in Korea?" My opinion is, the communistic designs to destroy the cause of freemen will break out in other parts of the world thousands of miles from our shore. I am convinced that the manhood of 150,000,000 people in the United States cannot supply land forces to fight a billion people throughout the world without bringing disaster to themselves.

Some of our top politicians are saying we can't refuse to send armies abroad without forsaking our allies. I suggest they begin to think a little about forsaking ourselves and begin to recognize that the opposing forces of communism versus the cause of freemen are in a death grapple which will not be settled in any one part of the world so long as hundreds of millions of people are wavering in their minds as to which cause they will support. The nationalization of industry in Great Britain and the three defeats administered to the Honorable Winston Churchill within the last month should make all freemen who believe in free competitive enterprise stop and think.

I voted for the United Nations and it may yet serve a purpose, but when our fine ally, Great Britain, is holding Red China by one hand, while with the other she is patting us on the back and asking for more help and more favors, and took several months to vote Red China the aggressor, it does not seem to me to justify the sending of our fine boys to all quarters of the earth to fight battles for what we believe in, but apparently not the things in which the present British Government and some others believe in.

Let us not forget that those in authority in England have not yet shown her colors in regard to Red China becoming a member of the United Nations, and thereby further contaminating it with communism.

Of course, every decent American would help feed those in need and deserving, even if it means sacrifice at home.

Of course, every decent American wants to keep his promises within the limits of his ability, but the bankruptcy law, which helps individuals who have overreached themselves and failed, does not help nations who do the same thing. Of course, every decent American is interested in lending aid and help to nations who truly believe in the cause of freemen and who themselves are willing to pay the price to fight to the limit of their ability for that cause; therefore, I would be in favor of giving all possible help in the air and at sea to such nations, so long as that does not jeopardize the life and the preservation of our American people and their system of freemen.

Ex-President Hoover did the people of the United States and all the decent people of the earth a great service when he made his radio address on December 20, 1950. The gist of his speech meant to me this—we cannot save the world unless it first does everything in its power to safe itself.

We must stop where we are, take an inventory of our assets and liabilities in this world mess, then if not too late, make certain we save ourselves, otherwise all will be lost.

Why not consider Spain as an ally, in our great need to protect the lives, liberty, and property of the American people? Spain protected by the Pyrenees Mountains with 400,000 men now in arms, ready to fight Communist aggression and probably 1,000,000 more men who soon could be in arms, should have our consideration as an ally, and a protected base for our Air Force and Navy. Think carefully of some of the allies we now have in and out of the United Nations, before we ignore this available ally.

I am urging the people to demand of their Representatives in Congress that without delay an inventory be prepared of what we have left, after where we have been, what we have done, and what we have promised, or agreed to; so by that light, then and only then can our people know what we yet have to do with, and urge their representatives to use our remaining strength in the most effective way to save the United States, so that we can help others to save themselves.

I ask you, is that not sound as against plunging headlong and recklessly into war all over the world only to lose ourselves and gain nothing for anyone?

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has been almost a lost voice in the wilderness, wisely urging the curtailment and elimination of nonessential expenditures, so that we may pay for the essential things and not neglect self-defense, and avoid habits that lead to national bankruptcy and suicide. I have always agreed with him, that we should pay as we go and not deprive our air and sea defense of anything necessary to prevent an attack upon our shores. We should make an honest, earnest appeal to all of our people to stop demanding extravagant, nonessential expenditures, and to tighten their belts and do their full citizen's duty to defend this Nation against whatever may be ahead of us. Then, as our forefathers did, we should ask God's guidance and help in keeping our cause righteous and making it successful. Let us not forget the Declaration of Independence, and the constitutions of 46 out of the 48 States make a direct appeal to God Almighty for His help and guidance.

In closing, I think every American mother and father should make it their duty to notify their representatives in Congress and in the executive branch of Government how they feel and what they expect of their elected and appointed representatives. It is not a question of right to speak, but duty to speak. I would urge that it be done now, so that these representatives may understand, and be encouraged by the wish and will of the people. I would urge the people to carry that wish and will through to the next election, for if the people sit idly by and watch their rights destroyed one by one, and, later, try to arise to action, they may find they have lost the power of action.

If the people are masters in this country of ours, they must act like masters, because when the people abdicate to the government, their servant, they are no longer the master, and the dove of peace and the flower of liberty will have vanished and faded away.

"With malice toward none and charity for all" let us build unity and strength in the land of the free, and thus create an example for the world to follow. An example that may spell peace on earth under God.

Placing Figures of Great Americans on the Walls of This Chamber

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a day or two ago, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] took me to task for not mentioning certain Indians when I was naming great Americans whose figures should be placed on these walls to take the place of those caricatures of ancient aliens and enemies of America you see there now.

He named Tecumseh, a Shawnee Indian chief, as a red-blooded 100-percent American whom he said I had overlooked.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] ought to read American history. Then he would not attempt to

put Tecumseh on a parity with glorious old Benjamin Franklin, and other great Americans I have suggested for these places.

Tecumseh was a traitor to the United States in the War of 1812. He went down into Mississippi and tried to induce the Chickasaws and Choctaws to join the British in their war against the United States. Pushmataha, a Choctaw chief of Chickasaw descent, who was perhaps the greatest Indian America ever produced, answered him. I am going to put an account of their debate in the RECORD for all of you to read.

In 1921, Hon. Charles D. Carter, a Member of Congress from Oklahoma, who was part Indian himself and knew more about the history of the Chickasaws and Choctaws than any other man I have ever known, made a speech at the tomb of Pushmataha, out here in the Congressional Cemetery, in which he said:

The War of 1812 was impending and the British authorities were doing all in their power to stir up antagonism between the Indians and the Americans. The astute Shawnee chief, Tecumseh, was sent on a tour by British agents to organize all Indians west of the Alleghenies with the purpose to expel the white American beyond the mountains. One of the first tribes he visited was the Choctaw. After his mission had been explained to Pushmataha, the wise old chief advised Tecumseh that he was only one of the three chiefs of the Choctaw Nation; that the Choctaws could only take part in any war upon the decision of the general council of the tribe; and that before this was done they would probably desire to consult their kindred tribe and ally, the Chickasaws. Tecumseh then requested that both tribes be called together in order that he might lay his plan before the council. After a consultation with the other two Choctaw chiefs, Masholatubby and Apuckshinubby, and the principal chief of the Chickasaws, a general council of the two tribes was called.

Tecumseh was classed by many of his contemporaries as the most powerful debater of his generation, and this was saying much, for it was during the day of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. Realizing the full power of his oratory, Tecumseh surmised if he could get to speak to the Choctaw people in general council they would not be able to resist his magnetic logic and eloquence. The council was assembled, and Tecumseh, with his suite of 30 warriors bedecked in panoply of paint and feathers, filed in before the council fire to deliver his address. We must bear in mind that the Shawnees spoke an entirely different language from the Choctaws and Chickasaws, the Shawnees belonging to the Algonquin stock and speaking their dialect, while the Choctaws and Chickasaws are of the Appalachian stock and spoke the Muskogeon dialect. Therefore it was necessary for each speech to be translated by an interpreter so all might understand.

The great Shawnee chief was thoroughly familiar with past relations between all Indian tribes and the whites, and he began by recounting all the wrongs perpetrated on the Indians by the palefaces since the landing of Columbus. He related how the white man had beguiled the Indians along the Atlantic coast to part with their lands for a few trifling beads, and a little fire water, leaving them beggars, vagabonds, peons, and strangers in their own land, to be scorned and despised by their paleface neighbors. He told how the Shawnees and other northern tribes were being stripped of their patrimony. He laid down the principle that the Great Spirit had given the Western Hemisphere to all red people in common and that no particular tribe had anything more than the right of possession to any lands, and therefore asserted any relinquishment of title by one tribe to be null and void, because many of the owners had not joined in the transfer. These wrongs discussed, he declared, had been made possible by the ingenuity of the whites in attacking only one tribe at a time, but if all Indians would join and combine their forces in one attack at one time, the white man could be driven back over the mountains whence he came; that the golden opportunity was now at hand to join hands with the British and scourge from their revered hunting grounds eternally the hated paleface. He closed his eloquent address with a stirring appeal to the patriotism of the Choctaws and Chickasaws, asking if they would await complete submission or would they now join hands and fight beside the Shawnees and other tribes rather than submit?

Evidently Tecumseh's purpose had been fully accomplished. His magnetic words seemed to arouse every vindictive sentiment within the souls of the Choctaw and Chickasaw warriors; their savage enthusiasm had been stirred to white heat when Pushmataha calmly strode before the council fire and began his wonderful reply to Tecumseh's speech. What a pity that no accurate account of this wonderful debate between these two giant primitive orators was at that time preserved. Lincecum, Pickett, Randall, and other historians have left us brief excerpts; Cushman undertakes to give Pushmataha's speech in full, but his recital does not even do faint justice to the original and in no measure conforms to the Choctaws' account of it. For many years it was handed down from generation to generation by tradition to the Choctaws and Chickasaws, but it can be easily understood how that method might fail to preserve all the virile force and eloquence of this wonderful address. I will undertake to give it to you in part as nearly as I remember hearing it told by some of the old Indians many years ago. Pushmataha began his address as follows:

PUSHMATAHA'S REPLY TO TECUMSEH

"Omiske, tushkahoma ho chukma hashche yumma. Anumpa tilofasih ish hukio."

("Attention, my good red warriors. Hear ye my brief remarks.")

"The great Shawnee orator has portrayed in vivid picture the wrongs inflicted on his and other tribes by the ravages of the paleface. The candor and fervor of his eloquent appeal breathe the conviction of truth and sincerity, and, as kindred tribes, naturally we sympathize with the misfortunes of his people. I do not come before you in any disputation either for or against these charges. It is not my purpose to contradict any of these allegations against the white man, but neither am I here to indulge in any indiscreet denunciation of him which might bring down upon my people unnecessary difficulty and embarrassment.

"The distinguished Shawnee sums up his eloquent appeal to us with this direct question:

"'Will you sit idly by, supinely awaiting complete and abject submission, or will you die fighting beside your brethren, the Shawnees, rather than submit to such ignominy?'

"These are plain words and it is well they have been spoken, for they bring the issue squarely before us. Mistake not, this language means war; and with whom, pray? War with some band of marauders who have committed these depredations against the Shawnees? War with some alien host seeking the destruction of the Choctaws and Chickasaws? Nay, my fellow tribesmen. None of these are the enemy we will be called on to meet. If we take up arms against the Americans, we must of necessity meet in deadly combat our daily neighbors and associates in this part of the country near our homes.

"If Tecumseh's words be true, and we doubt them not, then the Shawnees' experience with the whites has not been the same as that of the Choctaws. These white Americans buy our skins, our corn, our cotton, our surplus game, our baskets, and other wares, and they give us in fair exchange their cloth, their guns, their tools, implements, and other things which the Choctaws need but do not make. It is true we have befriended them, but who will deny that these acts of friendship have been abundantly reciprocated? They have given us cotton gins, which simplify the spinning and sale of our cotton; they have encouraged and helped us in the production of our crops; they have taken many of our wives into their homes to teach them useful things, and pay them for their work while learning; they are teaching our children to read and write from their books. You all remember well the dreadful epidemic visited upon us last winter. During its darkest hours these neighbors whom we are now urged to attack responded generously to our needs. They doctored our sick; they clothed our suffering; they fed our hungry; and where is the Choctaw or Chickasaw delegation who has ever gone to St. Stephens with a worthy cause and been sent away empty handed? So in marked contrast with the experience of the Shawnees, it will be seen that the whites and Indians in this section are living on friendly and mutually beneficial terms.

"Forget not, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, that we are bound in peace to the Great White Father at Washington by a sacred treaty and the Great Spirit will punish those who break their word. The Great White Father has never violated that treaty and the Choctaws have never yet been driven to the necessity of taking up the tomahawk against him or his children. Therefore the question before us tonight is not the avenging of any wrongs perpetrated against us by the whites, for the Choctaws and Chickasaws have no such cause, either real or imaginary, but rather it is a question of carrying on that record of fidelity and justice for which our forefathers ever proudly stood, and doing that which is best calculated to promote the welfare of our own people. Yea, my fellow tribesmen, we are a just people. We do not take up the warpath without a just cause and honest purpose. Have we that just cause against our white neighbors who have taken nothing from us except by fair bargain and exchange? Is this a just recompense for their assistance to us in our agricultural and other pursuits? Is this to be their gracious reward for teaching our children from their books? Shall this be considered the Choctaws' compensation for feeding our hungry, clothing our needy, and administering to our sick? Have we, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, descended to the low estate of ruthlessly breaking the faith of a sacred treaty? Shall our forefathers look back from the happy hunting grounds only to see their unbroken record for justice, gratitude, and fidelity thus rudely repudiated and abruptly abandoned by an unworthy offspring?

"We Choctaws and Chickasaws are a peaceful people, making our subsistence by honest toil; but mistake not, my Shawnee brethren, we are not afraid of war. Neither are we strangers to war, as those who have undertaken to encroach upon our rights in the past may abundantly testify. We are thoroughly familiar with war in all its details, and we know full well all its horrible consequences. It is unnecessary for me to remind you, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, veteran braves of many fierce conflicts in the past, that war is an awful thing. If we go into this war against the Americans we must be prepared to accept its inevitable results. Not only will it foretoken deadly conflict with neighbors

and death to warriors, but it will mean suffering for our women, hunger and starvation for our children, grief for our loved ones, and devastation of our beloved homes. Notwithstanding these difficulties, if the cause be just, we should not hesitate to defend our rights to the last man, but before that fatal step is irrevocably taken it is well that we fully understand and seriously consider the full portent and consequences of the act.

"Hear me, O Choctaws and Chickasaws, for I speak truly for your welfare. It is not the province of your chiefs to settle these important questions. As a people, it is your prerogative to have either peace or war, and as one of your chiefs it is mine simply to counsel and advise. Therefore, let me admonish you that this critical period is no time to cast aside your wits and let blind impulse sway; be not driven like dumb brutes by the frenzied harangue of this wonderful Shawnee or..tor; let your good judgment rule and ponder seriously before breaking bonds that have served you well and ere you change conditions which have brought peace and happiness to your wives, your sisters, and your children. I would not undertake to dictate the course of one single Choctaw warrior. Permit me to speak for the moment, not as your chief but as a Choctaw warrior, weighing this question beside you. As such I shall exercise my calm, deliberate judgment in behalf of those most dear to me and dependent on me, and I shall not suffer my reason to be swept away by this eloquent recital of alleged wrongs which I know naught of. I deplore this war, I earnestly hope it may be averted, but if it be forced upon us I shall take my stand with those who have stood by my people in the past and will be found fighting beside our good friends of St. Stephens and surrounding country. I have finished. I call on all Choctaws and Chickasaws endorsing my sentiments to cast their tomahawks on this side of the council fire with me."

The air resounded with the clash of tomahawks cast on the side of the Choctaw chief and only a few warriors seemed still undecided. Tecumseh seeing the purpose of his mission thwarted and thinking Pushmataha could not understand the Shawnee language, spoke to his warriors in his native tongue, saying: "Pushmataha is a coward and the Choctaw and Chickasaw braves are squaws," but Pushmataha had traveled much and knew a smattering of many Indian dialects. He understood Tecumseh and turning upon the Shawnee with all the fire of his eloquence, he clinched the argument and settled the decision of the few wavering Choctaw braves by saying:

"Halt, Tecumseh. Listen to me. You have come here, as you have often gone elsewhere, with a purpose to involve peaceful people in unnecessary trouble with their neighbors. Our people have had no undue friction with the whites. Why? Because we have had no leaders stirring up strife to serve their selfish, personal ambitions. You heard me say that our people are a peaceful people. They make their way, not by ravages upon their neighbors but by honest toil. In that regard they have nothing in common with you. I know your history well. You are a disturber. You have ever been a troublemaker. When you have found yourself unable to pick a quarrel with the white man, you have stirred up strife between different tribes of your own race. Not only that, you are a monarch and unyielding tyrant within your own domain; every Shawnee man, woman, and child must bow in humble submission to your imperious will. The Choctaws and Chickasaws have no monarchs. Their chieftains do not undertake the mastery of their people, but rather are they the people's servants, elected to serve the will of the majority. The majority has spoken on this question and it has spoken against your contention. Their decision has therefore become the law of the Choctaws and Chickasaws, and Pushmataha will see that the will of the majority so recently expressed is rigidly carried out to the letter. If, after this decision, any Choctaw should be so foolish as to follow your imprudent advice and enlist to fight against the Americans, thereby abandoning his own people and turning against the decision of his own council, Pushmataha will see that proper punishment is meted out to him, which is death. You have made your choice; you have elected to fight with the British. The Americans have been our friends and we shall stand by them. We will furnish you safe conduct to the boundaries of this Nation as properly befits the dignity of your office. Farewell, Tecumseh. You will see Pushmataha no more until we meet on the fateful warpath."

As I said, Pushmataha was a great American, a brave and heroic patriot. He was never a Member of Congress, but I would not object to seeing his figure placed on these walls, or a monument erected to him in a prominent place here in the Nation's Capital, because of the great services he rendered to his country.

He fought with Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans, and when he finally died, here in Washington, where he came to confer with President Jackson about matters concerning the members of his tribe, he was buried with military honors out here in the Congressional Cemetery, at the end of East Capitol Street.

If he could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where he has taken his place in the silent halls of death, look down the century that has passed since his exit from this world, and see his likeness being placed by the side of that of Tecumseh, or even by that of Hammurabi, or any of those other ancient aliens, he would probably arise and shout: "Ex sho! Ex sho!" in righteous protest against such humiliation.

What Are We Fighting for in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column by Mr. W. H. "Hi Waters" McWilliams, published in the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times-Leader. It gives in clear language the answer to the question, "What are we fighting for in Korea?"

The column follows:

RIGHT AROUND HOME

A lot of letters have come to me recently. They say, "What are we fighting for in Korea?"

As near as I can say, it's this: It seems a lot better to stop communism on the slopes of cold Korea than on the sunny streets of Adena, Ohio.

Communism is a little like cancer of the big toe—unless you stop it below the ankle it will kill you above the shoulders later.

We're hacking off the short weeds in the garden of humanity now in Korea so we won't reap a full crop in our backyards in the fall.

It's the old story of the rotten apple in the barrel. We're removing it from the top today so we won't have to throw out everything from the bottom up tomorrow. The boys who slave and die by regiments to stop communism in the East are doing it so that we won't slave and die in the West—by millions.

Because as sure as the daylight in August, if communism gathers strong in the Land of the Rising Sun it will mean a hurricane over the plains across the world at eventide.

We are pinching off the bean stock as it peeps through the ground in distant Korea so that it won't harbor a giant when it grows big and entwines over the Statue of Liberty here.

That, in brief, is why we are now fighting a hard war on the other side of the world and must fight it to a finish—it's self-protection by remote control.

Our Communists Can Cripple Our Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend for your reading an editorial which recently appeared in one of my district's leading daily newspapers, the Escanaba Press, titled "Our Communists Can Cripple Our Industry:"

OUR COMMUNISTS CAN CRIPPLE OUR INDUSTRY

Half a million native-born fanatics, loyal to Moscow and entrenched in key American industrial areas, are ready to strike from within if Russia attacks from without, says Changing Times magazine in its February issue. The Communists will try to sabotage factories, break down transportation, disrupt communications, create panic in the cities and crush our morale says the magazine.

Will such attempts succeed? It all depends, says Changing Times, on how well loyal Americans are prepared to meet the Communists' attacks.

If the Russians make a surprise attack, as the Japs did at Pearl Harbor, it is likely that top Communists here will try to organize a simultaneous blow from within. Then it will be a split-second race between the Communists and the FBI. A few hours, or even minutes, might make the difference as to whether the FBI nabs the leaders before serious damage is done.

Be suspicious of anyone who asks a lot of questions about local conditions, especially questions having to do with manufacturing, electric power, transportation, or communications. Report it if you notice trespassers in defense plants, power plants, transformer plants, or railroad yards. Suspect anyone who tells you Communist-line stories that reflect on your country, its leaders, or its war aims.

Be security conscious especially if you work in a defense plant. Remember that red tape such as fingerprinting and filling out of forms is only a means of preventing sabotage and espionage. Be careful about joining a strike movement in a defense plant unless you are sure you have a legitimate grievance that outweighs any slow-down you may cause in the armament program. Inspired strikes are one of the Communists' chief weapons.

Don't sign petitions unless you know what you are doing. The Communists would love to get millions of mothers to sign a petition demanding repeal of the draft law. Perhaps a mother might conclude that the draft law was a bad thing but before she signs a petition she should be sure she is speaking her own mind and not being a dupe.

Don't join groups unless you have first investigated them. The Communists are continually forming shadowy organizations for propaganda purposes. If you can't find out just what the specific purpose of the organization is, or exactly who is behind it, give the whole thing a miss.

Be ready for an attempt to terrorize yourself and your family if war should come suddenly. What do you do? Be calm and sit tight. If you have taken the proper precautions in advance you will have right in your own home light, food, water, heat, medical supplies and means of getting correct information on what is going on.

If war comes, says Changing Times, it may bring with it an all-out terrorizing attack on industry and civilians. The two qualities that will stand the country in best stead are coolness and old-fashioned courage.

Unified Atlantic Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following letter addressed to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower by 22 prominent American businessmen concerning the necessity of a unified Atlantic defense program:

We, the undersigned members of the National Council of the Atlantic Union Committee, carry responsibility for the administration of a wide variety of American business enterprises.

Our experience in attempting to encourage the growth of national and international commerce, and to broaden the horizons of economic opportunity for all men, has given us opportunity to gain wide perspective on the organization of free society.

It is our view that there is among free nations an urgent and immediate need for a common democratic authority.

We therefore noted with deep interest your statement on your departure for Atlantic capitals: "There is power in union," and your statement on your return urging that "first priority" be given to achieving "the unity of freemen."

We wish respectfully to extend to you our sincere appreciation of the dedicated spirit with which you have accepted the supreme responsibility of commanding the forces of the free world. We are encouraged by the directness with which you have surveyed and reported on the transatlantic resources that must be pooled to preserve freedom.

We are not among those who misinterpret as defeatism the reluctance of European nations to put all their eggs in the United States basket. If we expect Europe to take this risk, it seems obvious that we should provide the strongest possible basket. Instead we have provided a committee structure, from which any nation can withdraw at any time and which has authority only to recommend and not to act. Russia is now actively engaged in publicizing and exploiting the divisions among the North Atlantic allies.

Even without the injection of Russian propaganda, the uncertainties of American foreign policy, and the contradictory statements of some American statesmen must themselves give rise to doubt around the world as to how far the United States intends actually to pursue the goal of total defense against the forces of tyranny.

We believe, with you, that the speedy construction of an adequate joint military defense in Western Europe, including American and Canadian troops, is the best medicine for the fears—both real and imagined—of the allies on whom we must depend. We believe that the Atlantic democracies should agree to an unqualified pooling of all defense resources, in order to turn blueprints into troops and build an Atlantic Army capable of deterring, or if necessary, rebuking Communist aggression in Western Europe.

The Atlantic Union Resolution, introduced last month in the Eighty-second Congress, provides the best opportunity for such agreement.

It requests President Truman to call a convention of the democracies that sponsored the Atlantic Pact to see how far they can apply among them the principles of the union to which you have referred. The full text of that resolution is enclosed and we should appreciate your comment.

It is our belief that a single Atlantic policy of defense and foreign affairs—instead of the present welve—is vital to prevent repetition in Western Europe of the Korean misadventure.

It is our hope that the effort to create a single policy will help the United States to meet peril with characteristic American boldness and decision, and thus aid you and your associates in expediting the defense timetable for the free world.

Albert C. Agnew, Attorney at Law, San Francisco, Calif.; Percival F. Brundage, Price Waterhouse & Co., New York, N. Y.; Harry A. Bullis, Chairman of the Board, General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.; W. R. Burwell, Chairman of the Board, General Mills, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; Will L. Clayton, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.; Gardner Cowles, President, Cowles Magazine, New York, N. Y.; W. B. Harrison, former officer, Union National Bank, Wichita, Kans.; Leland Hazard, Vice President, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Ernest M. Hopkins, Chairman of the Board, National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier, Vt.; P. W. Litchfield, Chairman of the Board, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio; Hugh Moore, Chairman of the Board, Dixie Cup Corp., Easton, Pa.; Edmund Orgill, President, Orgill Bros. & Co., Memphis, Tenn.; H. W. Prentis, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.; Gwilyn A. Price, President, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Alexander P. Reed, President, Fidelity Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harry Scherman, President, Book-of-the-Month Club, New York, N. Y.; Walter W. Schroeder, Vice President, National Bank of Commerce, New Orleans, La.; William Stern, President, Dakota National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak.; L. A. Tobie, President, Meriden Savings Bank, Meriden, Conn.; H. F. Willkie, President, Kingan & Co., Indianapolis, Ind.; W. T. Wynn, Director, National Cotton Council of America, Greenville, Miss.; Darryl F. Zanuck, Vice President, Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif.

A Parable About the Pilot Fish Points Up Dangers of Red Hunting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, let us stop, and look, and listen. Here is a warning given to us by Ernest Lindley in his column which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of February 25.

His article is as follows:

A PARABLE ABOUT THE PILOT FISH POINTS UP DANGERS OF RED HUNTING

(By Ernest Lindley)

Among the interesting people to be found in Washington—and elsewhere—are the pilot fishermen. The pilot fish are the fish which swim in front of the shark to guide him to hi prey. The pilot fishermen are, of course, the men who fish for the pilot fish. We have had active pilot fishermen in Washington for at least 15 years. In recent years, the sport has become quite popular. A number of the pilot fishermen have become well known and have a gallery of admirers.

It would be generally admitted, of course, that the pilot fish is a very undesirable variety of fish. We certainly don't want the pilot fish nosing around in sensitive places. Many of us would like to exterminate them.

Undoubtedly, some people were very slow to recognize that there is such a thing as a pilot fish and even slower to realize how diligently and faithfully he works for the shark. Many others who knew of the pilot fish did not realize for a long time that the pilot fish is often very skillful in concealing his stripes.

When the net is cast for the pilot fish, it is likely to bring up a lot of other fish. Some of them may look suspiciously odd and may not be very desirable even though they are not pilot fish. Many of them are quite innocent creatures—indeed so innocent that they probably didn't even know that there were any disguised pilot fish in their vicinity.

It takes experts to distinguish a well-camouflaged pilot fish from harmless and altogether respectable varieties of fish. Among the amateur pilot fishermen in Congress and elsewhere, there are not many such experts. Being unable to distinguish camouflaged pilot fish from harmless and respectable fish, some of them conclude that every fish they bring up with their nets is a disguised pilot fish. Also, like other zealous fishermen, the amateur pilot fishermen like to boast about their catches. They are not above describing a 6-inch minnow as a leader of the pilot fish. Nor are they above spinning tales about the big ones they saw but which got away.

Some of the pilot fishermen have become fanciers of pilot fish—of reformed pilot fish, that is. They keep them around as pets and seem to regard them as the finest species of marine life. A reformed and repentant pilot fish undoubtedly is much to be preferred to an unregenerate one. But it is not easy for objective observers to comprehend why a reformed and repentant pilot fish should be regarded as nobler than all the millions of fish which had the ordinary common sense—and patriotism—never to work for the shark.

Another curious characteristic of some of the pilot fishermen is that they evince so little interest in the shark. Some of them have been opposed to buying a supply of

harpoons to kill the shark and even to dropping a net around the beach to keep him away. They have protested at the expense or scoffed at the idea that the shark would really bite. (Perhaps they fear that if the shark were killed or cornered, there would be no more pilot fish for them to have the fun of catching.) Some of them wouldn't even toss a life line to a man overboard. They seem to regard the pilot fish as more dangerous than the shark.

Let Peace Not Die of Neglect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George F. Kennan in the magazine section of the New York Times:

LET PEACE NOT DIE OF NEGLECT
(By George F. Kennan)

The air vibrates with controversy about America's proper course with respect to Russia. Much of it, it seems to me, is shallow or prejudiced or ill-conceived. It is hard to imagine that ever at any time in history has more error ever been poured out upon a single subject. And one enters with misgivings into this disorder. Where so much confusion lies about, what can we do in a few brief moments to disentangle the snarled skeins, to assemble and sort out and put together again the broken pieces of thought, to bring order out of the chaos—even assuming, which is not proven—that we might have some greater clarity in our own minds? How can we avoid adding to the bedlam, heaping confusion upon confusion?

The only hope I can see of avoiding these pitfalls lies in attempting to rethink our problem, but with a little greater depth in time than we are accustomed to give to it these days.

Thirty-three years ago—not two or three, mark you—thirty-three—there was a revolution in Russia. That revolution brought into power a political movement already committed and long and deeply committed, to an attitude of hostility toward our own social and political system and to many other things elsewhere which we believe to be essential to world stability.

It is important to recognize that we did not create that attitude, nor was there really much we could do to prevent its rise or to alter it after it appeared. It arose out of ideology and preconception, out of things which were not our doing. To say that it stemmed only from the Allied intervention in 1919, or from the way we Westerners treated the Soviet regime generally in the early years of its power, reflects a very superficial view of the origins of the Bolshevik movement.

Lenin and his associates, I am sure, would not have been grateful for the implication that their views about the capitalist world were so shallowly rooted that they could be basically altered by subjective reactions on their part to the actions of capitalist governments in the period immediately following the revolution. They would have rejected with resentment and contempt the implication that they could have been glad-handed into the abandonment of ideological principles to which they had devoted their lives.

This new political power, while not entirely a Russian phenomenon, did succeed in establishing itself in Russia and in bringing under a form of effective and stable control the energies of the peoples and the natural resources of that area. This fact—namely, that those energies and resources should have fallen under the control of a power hostile to western civilization—was a serious and disturbing thing. It presented a major complication in the progress of the west. Those of us who were professionally occupied with Russian affairs in the twenties and thirties were very much aware of that fact. Perhaps that is why we are somewhat less than impressed when we are told today, by agitated and vociferous people, that this is the fact and that we ought to be much more excited about it than we are.

The Bolshevik leaders, in accordance with their ideology, did their best, in the years that ensued after the revolution to achieve the breakdown of non-Communist power in Western Europe, in this country, and elsewhere. They operated Communist fifth-column organizations in practically every area in the world. They unleashed civil wars and revolutions wherever they saw a chance. They sowed confusion and suspicion.

They peddled bitterness and bewilderment and despair. They earned a great deal of resentment in return, and no doubt a certain amount of subversive activity directed against themselves and their system, though nothing near what they claimed. They were a nuisance and a danger to everyone else. In these circumstances everyone else—inevitably and unavoidably—was a nuisance and a danger to them. Their relations with other countries faithfully reflected that fact.

Yet for over two decades nothing frightfully crucial happened in these relations. The Bolsheviks didn't succeed in destroying anybody; nobody succeeded in destroying them. Life was awkward—unnecessarily so—but not impossiole. The impact of this Bolshevik hostility and dissatisfaction upon the mellow old democracies of the west led to many remarkable and usually unpleasant things; but it did not lead to war. It was not until another violent and neurotic political movement had raised its head in a neighboring country, Germany—a movement as hostile to Soviet Russia by preconception as Soviet Russia had been hostile to the capitalist west—that major war ensued.

But then, it was not a war between Russia and the western democracies. The blow struck both Russia and the western democracies together—like a bolt of lightning, like a reminder to them, from some disgusted deity, of the tragedy and unhappiness of their division.

The war that ensued had two main consequences which we ought to note here. First, by eliminating the armed power of Germany and Japan from certain very important areas of human habitation it opened up new and delicate sources of difference and controversy between the Soviet leaders and the west. These geographic areas, which had been placed by the outcome of hostilities in what might be called a power vacuum, included certain of the world's most sensitive spots, from the straegic and political standpoint. There was no reason to suppose that agreement about their future disposition, as between Russia and the west, would be easy to achieve. There was particularly no reason to assume this, because in a totalitarian regime like that of the U. S. S. R. defensive and offensive motives are always inextricably intertwined, and the anxieties of such a regime for the safety of its own internal power prevent it from reacting normally, or even from speaking frankly, in problems of this kind. All that was known long before the war.

So there these new problems were; and they proved, indeed, to be anything but easy; and because of them it even turned out to be impossible, in the immediate post-war years, to negotiate peace treaties at all. And meanwhile the disputed territories lay there, completely vulnerable in each case, as it happened, to the armed strength of the U. S. S. R., which wholly overshadowed that of the western powers in the immediate vicinity. And there were many foreign ministers' meetings, many disputes, many disappointments, and much tension—but there was no major war.

The second consequence of World War II that I wish to mention is the establishment of the United Nations. We Americans took a leading part in this. The Russians reacted to proposals from us. You will recall that they were quite emphatic in their insistence on the veto power in the Security Council. This meant an insistence that the UN should not be used to settle security problems except where the great powers were in agreement. This applied particularly to precisely the problems we have just noted—the ones arising from the immediate dislocations of the recent war; and this was given indirect recognition in the Charter of the UN itself.

Now some of us liked these veto provisions and others didn't; but no one can say that the Soviet Government was not frank in stating its position at the time, or that we were not warned that there might be categories of problems which would be less susceptible than others of treatment in the UN forum.

Finally, we should note that when we established the UN we placed no barriers to the membership in it of Communist governments. We raised no objection to the Soviet Government's belonging to it, even though we knew it was a Communist government. We didn't ask how it had come by its power—whether by fair means or foul. We didn't ask it to disavow its ideology. We didn't even object to the admission of some of its satellites. It was clearly our view at that time that the UN was to consist of both Communist and non-Communist powers.

And we were plainly warned, I repeat, of what logic should have told us anyway: that there were distinct limitations on what such a universal organization, embracing both Communist and non-Communist governments, could be expected to achieve in this immediate post-hostilities period, and that among the things it could not be expected to do would be to serve as an invariably successful forum for the settlement of the problems arising out of the war, or for the resolution of the ideological differences between communism and all opposed to it.

Now we have on our hands today a situation the seriousness of which no one would deny. We find ourselves involved in a local military conflict, replete with the most grievous implications, over the problem of disposal of one of those disputed areas from which we required that the power of our recent adversaries be withdrawn. We are indignant over the refusal of Communist China, which is not a member of the UN, to recognize the authority of that body in the dispute, and over its action in opposing that authority by force of arms It is worth noting that, whereas we introduced our forces into the conflict, and I think properly and wisely so, the Soviet Government did not. It has preferred to operate, to date, with the forces of its puppets.

Meanwhile, we have come to the conclusion that the general world situation is one which requires a major effort of rearmament on our part and on the part of other Western nations. With this, again, I have no quarrel. I have long believed in the necessity for such rearmament. I think it should have come, to some extent, much earlier. But what I

want to get at is not the fact of rearmament, it is the rationale of it.

We know many people in this country are coming to believe that war is not only unavoidable but imminent, and that the reasons for rearmament lie not even possibly in the long-term requirements of a relationship with Communist power short of major war, but in some new and recent developments, some new elements of menace in the Soviet attitude, which entitle us to despair altogether of avoiding major war for any considerable further period.

Now this is a very difficult thing to put forth, because anyone who tries to urge caution and sobriety in the judgment of these matters is apt to be accused of having said that war is definitely not coming, that we are not going to be attacked, that our fears are baseless, that we can relax and go home.

Let me make it plain. I am saying none of these things. Of course war is possible. Of course no one can say that we will not be attacked or that major war will not develop from the impetus and the cumulative complications of this situation. Who can say for sure what is in the minds of the Soviet leaders? Who can guarantee their behavior? Who can assure that they, peering out at the world through the muddied and myopic lenses of their bitter and fear-ridden ideology, have not come to the conclusion themselves that war is unavoidable? From such a conclusion anything could flow.

My purpose is not to make a plea for any certainty of a continued absence of major war. It is to make a plea against the assumption of any certainty that war cannot be avoided. It is to plead that before we assume that the world situation has turned basically and irrevocably against the chances of peace we make absolutely sure that we know what we're doing—that we test our views and retest them, putting aside all emotion and irritation and everything subjective—that we take care to see that we are not being carried away here by false assumptions or short memories or emotion.

Let us look carefully at these things which are often cited as the sources of despair.

It is true that the Kremlin is hostile and secretive, and a constant source of worry, danger, and annoyance to us all; it has been that way for 33 years.

It is true that Western Europe is overshadowed by Soviet armed strength; it has been that way since 1945, and to some extent even earlier.

It is true that Russia has the atomic bomb. Did we then lack warning of this development? Does anybody suppose that we were in a position to assume, let us say 3 years ago, that they would not have it; that they would refrain from developing it out of some delicate regard for our feelings? I am not saying that these things are pleasant. I am asking whether they are new or unexpected.

It is true that the Kremlin unleashed its Korean puppets against the South Korean Republic. But there is nothing in this fact which is out of accord with the pattern of Soviet behavior we have known for three decades. At no time has there been any reason to suppose that they would not do this sort of thing, if circumstances seemed propitious. The assertion was made in a magazine article 3 years ago that the main concern of the Kremlin was to make sure that it has filled every nook and cranny available to it in the basin of world power. There was no objective reason to assume that the Soviet leaders would leave the Korean nook unfilled if they thought they had a chance of filling it at relatively minor risk to themselves and saw time running out on them. I am not trying to justify their action. I am challenging our right to be surprised about it or to call it a manifestation of some new aggressiveness on the part of the Soviet Union.

Finally, it is true that Communist China has defied the United Nations. It is true that Communist China has committed acts in Korea which no one can condone and for which its leaders bear the gravest responsibility. If anyone needed proof that these Chinese Communist leaders are behaving hysterically and violently, with a distorted concept of the interests of their own people, and with no understanding at all for the nature and ideals of the non-Communist world, they have it, of course, in these events in Korea.

But the question at issue here is not, and has never been, whether the Chinese Communists were nice people. The question lies in the amount of damage they are capable of doing, and are apt to do, to world stability. The question lies, for us, in the extent of the threat: in the measure of what we might call the intrinsic tolerances of the far eastern area against the effects of these tortured and neurotic attitudes we see in Peiping, and of what then remains to be done, and can only be done, by outside forces, and how much of that is within our capabilities.

Are we sure we have this so carefully figured out? Are we sure we have calculated correctly all the factors involved? China is a strange entity. She is called a world power, and doubtless deserves that designation from the standpoint of cultural and spiritual resources in her people. Actually she is the only country so considered which does not have the wherewithal to manufacture the sinews of her own military strength on a great-power scale. She has to get her major weapons from outside. I dare say that to date a considerable portion has come from us. Must that always be? It is true that China's resources as of today, while limited, are not negligible, and that they are in the hands of people who are foolish and excited and irresponsible. That is a dangerous and worrisome fact. But let us measure realistically the actual extent of this danger; let us be guided by that alone, and not by irritation over the fact that they are foolish and excited and irresponsible. They are not the first people that we have known that were that way, and they will not be the last; and we are not the keepers of their souls.

Now all of this might conceivably add up to the necessity for another world war; but before we decide that it does, let us be terribly, terribly sure we are right. In the old carpenter guilds there was a principle that you should measure seven times before you cut once. Are we sure we have measured here for the seventh time, or even for the third or the second? This is no time to make a false incision. The material will bear no more than one mistake.

A major American weekly recently devoted an article to combating the theory that coexistence with the present Soviet system may be possible. It attacked the Secretary of State for adhering to what it called "this pernicious fallacy." It called upon the President to drive from his councils at long last "all who have sold and fed him on the pap of coexistence with Soviet communism."

Now these are tricky words, and no one can ever be entirely sure what they mean. But if they mean what I take them to mean, I would range myself squarely and emphatically with the culprits: with the objects of these attacks and criticisms. What is the phenomenon of extremism and despair with which we are confronted?

Can this be realism, or is it a shrinking away from the first harsh implications of world leadership? Whoever said that world leadership would be easy or comfortable? Coextensive with Soviet communism, as we have seen above, has been possible for 33 years. I do not know whether it will continue to be possible for a long time to come. But I would submit that these people who wrote this article do not know for sure that it won't; and in attempting to persuade the public that it won't they have taken upon their shoulders a grievous responsibility and one which I should never wish to have on mine.

They should not try to comfort themselves and their readers with the flimsy pretense that this counsel of despair does not mean war. It does; and if this is the view they are going to take, let them have the forthrightness with themselves and with others to come out and say that what they are talking about is war and tell us how and to what ends and with what resources they propose we conduct that war, and how we are to assure the agreement of the members of a great coalition to a course founded on preconceptions which they do not share, and how a better world is supposed to emerge from the other end of this entire process.

But better still, for them and for all of us, would be not to take this view at all; to admit that the dimness of our vision gives us the right neither to a total optimism nor to a total pessimism, and that our duty to ourselves and to the hopes of mankind lies in avoiding, like the soul of evil itself, that final bit of impatience which tells us to yield the last positions of hope before we have been pressed from them by unanswerable force.

As long as there is a one-thousandth chance that a major world conflict can be avoided—and I hold the chance far greater than that—let us guard that chance like the apple of our eye—let us remain considerate of the hopeful possibilities as well as the discouraging ones—let it not be said of us that we allowed any hope for the avoidance of war to die, like an unwanted and unappreciated child, by abandonment and neglect.

I know that this is the view which has been held by my former associates in the Department of State, and that they will continue, despite all discouragements and opposition, to act on this. If these efforts succeed, the world will have been spared a great catastrophe. If they fail, there will always be time for the other things, the unhappy things, later.

Resolution of Society of Old Brooklynites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Society of Old Brooklynites, which I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues.

I heartily endorse this resolution.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OFFICE MUST BE MAINTAINED IN BROOKLYN

Whereas it has been stated on reliable authority that the Veterans' Administration in Washington plans to remove the Brooklyn regional office of the Veterans' Administration from Brooklyn; and

Whereas the present Brooklyn regional office is located at 33 Ryerson Street, in a building which may have to be taken over by the Mergenthaler Linotype Co. for war work; and

Whereas nothing should interfere with speedy mobilization measures, and no objection is interposed, so long as the Brooklyn regional office remains in Brooklyn: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Society of Old Brooklynites, in meeting assembled, Wednesday evening, February 7, 1951, goes on record as objecting to the removal of the Veterans' Administration regional office from Brooklyn.

Labor Leaders Balk Efforts To Halt Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the eminently fair, if not dangerously soft, wage control formula determined by Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston, the AFL-CIO United Labor Policy Committee continues to balk at any participation whatsoever in efforts to halt inflation and get the Nation on an adequate war basis.

The United Labor Policy Committee has taken this attitude obviously because labor leaders in the United States intend to dictate, if they can, the whole wartime economic policy of the Federal Government.

What other interpretation can be put upon their action, when it is universally conceded that in a free Nation like ours, no really effective attempt can be made to create a wartime economy, without the consent and loyal support of labor, as well as of business and industry? We are either a Nation united, or a Nation disunited. There can be nothing halfway about it.

The vote to continue and make complete the labor boycott of participation in the war effort—for that is what the vote amounted to—was taken by the AFL-CIO United Labor Policy Committee. It was not taken by the vast membership of organized labor. I do not think for an instant that the action of the committee represented the attitudes or opinions of labor's rank and file.

If the United Labor Policy Committee persists in its present attitude of sabotaging the effort to create an effective national defense, and thus to preserve the Union, I believe its members soon will feel the wrath of labor unionists throughout the country.

Especially will this be true if the United Labor Policy Committee passes the word to union officials everywhere that now is the time to call a strike, and help to assert the complete political ascendancy of labor unions in the United States.

Ballot results in last fall's election proved beyond any doubt that American labor unionists consider themselves Americans first, and unionists afterward. Labor leader members of the AFL-CIO United Labor Policy Committee would show good judgment, if they should refer this question of policy back to the membership of all union locals.

It is my conviction that the answer they would get would cause them to reverse themselves in a hurry. The rank and file of labor would tell them to get back in there and pitch. At the same time, no doubt, they would be instructed to keep up the pressure, by legitimate means, for greater labor participation in the councils of Government boards and agencies responsible for mobilization and the economic controls of temporary value in making that mobilization possible.

Stalin and his Politburo must be watching with broad grins this evidence that American labor leaders are thinking first of political power, and last of all the welfare of their country. If this attitude is continued for long, the American people may begin to doubt the protestations of labor leaders that the unions have been purged of communism.

The American people are likely to doubt, because they know that Eric Johnston has provided in his formula for cost-of-living escalator wage contracts, for fringe benefits in the way of health, welfare, and pension plans, and for adjustment of hardships and inequities on a case-by-case basis.

These concessions are greater than those being granted to any other segment of the American public. What more can the labor leaders ask?

A Prayer of Thanksgiving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "A Prayer of Thanksgiving," which was composed by Irvin E. Perigo, Indiana's poet-pianist, and read on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, 1951, at Lincoln City Park, Ind.

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

A PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING

Where our flag of freedom flies,
'Neath the soft blue Hoosier skies;
Where the birds sing songs of cheer,
O'er the grave we hold so dear,
We would look to God to pray
In our own true Hoosier way:

"God of heaven and of earth,
Thanks! to Thee for Lincoln's birth;
Thanks! to Thee for holy love
Sent this mother, from above;
Guilding Abe in childhood days;
Keeping him in wholesome ways,
That he might fulfill each task;
Do whatever Thou might ask.

"God of heaven and of earth,
Thanks! to Thee for Lincoln's birth."

So, we bring our flowers today,
O'er this mother's grave to lay;
As we look through grateful tears,
Back through all those stirring years;
Back to Lincoln's humble birth—
Love's gift to a needy earth.

So, our joys and tears today,
Bind us, as we humbly pray:

"God of heaven and of earth,
Thanks! to Thee for Lincoln's birth.
Amen."

—IRVIN E. PERIGO,
Indiana's Poet-Pianist.

Modern American Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many stories of bravery have come out of Korea during the past 8 months. Since these acts of heroism on the part of our boys occur in our own days and under the tension of world events, it is perhaps a little difficult for us to evaluate them fully and to realize how each of these heroic deeds contribute to the safeguarding of our freedom. Many nations are fighting side by side in Korea against a common and ruthless enemy. Men of different religious beliefs and different races have joined in the struggle for a free world. This, in itself, should be encouraging to all of us.

A story depicting the experiences in Korea of an American marine of the Jewish faith was recently written by Billy Rose in one of his famous columns Pitching Horseshoes. I think it is one of the great stories of bravery to come out of Korea, a story of sacrifice involving a Jewish corporal and his Irish captain. It is also a story of faith. I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading this brief but very human and characteristically American story of present-day heroism. It is as follows:

YOM KIPPUR IN KOREA
(By Billy Rose)

When Eleanor and I were in Tokyo a little over a year ago, we got to know Col. Anthony Story, General MacArthur's pilot. This morning I got a letter from Tony with a Korea date line and it contained a story which I think is worth passing along.

In one of the Marine Corps regiments which recently slugged into Inchon there was a corporal named Abraham Geller who had been brought up a nickel phone call away from Delancey Street. Abe is the son of a rabbi, and even at the front where sleep is the most important thing in the world, he never failed to wake a half hour before his buddies and go through the ritual of the orthodox morning prayers.

On September 20, Abe's regiment crossed the Han and cut the Seoul-Kaesong road and, what with snipers in every rice paddy, by dusk the men were glad to dig in and catch a few hours of clammy sleep—especially since they knew that the drive for the Korean capital itself was scheduled for sunup.

An hour before dawn, aside from the sentries, only two men in the company were awake: Corporal Geller, bent over his prayer book, and Capt. George O'Connor, surveying the terrain and figuring out how best to deploy his troops in the coming action.

When Abe was finished, the captain said, "Go back to the chow truck and get yourself a cup of coffee."

"Thanks, Captain," said Geller, "but today's Yom Kippur, and I'm not supposed to eat until sundown."

"You mean to say you're going to fast the day we bust into Seoul?" said the captain.

The East Sider grinned. "I figure I've got enough calories packed away for 24 hours," he said.

Well, as the papers have told you, the marines ran into plenty of trouble the first day of the drive, and along about sundown Captain O'Connor's men were inching their way across a field littered with dead North Koreans. One of the Commies, however, though badly wounded, was only playing dead, and as the officer came within range he rolled over on his side and aimed his pistol.

Abe, who was only a few feet from his commanding officer, saw the body move. He jerked his bayonet out of his belt and made a dive for the enemy soldier, but in finishing him off he got the three bullets which had been intended for O'Connor.

The captain did the best he could for Abe, but at this stage the situation was what military commentators called "fluid," and it was almost 3 hours before the corporal got a shot of penicillin and was carried to a hospital tent.

The operation lasted over an hour, and when the surgeon finally came out Captain O'Connor was waiting for him.

"How does it look?" he asked.

"The kid's doing fine," said the surgeon.

"I figured he was done for," said O'Connor.

"So did I," said the surgeon. "The bullets went through his abdomen and several loops of intestine and wounds like that are generally fatal if penicillin isn't administered pretty fast. The spillage almost always causes peritonitis."

"I don't get all the words," said the captain, "but his pulling through seems like something of a miracle."

"In a manner of speaking it is," said the surgeon. "Geller owes his life to the fact that when he was shot there was hardly any food in his stomach."

Resolution of the New York Young Democratic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution, adopted on January 31, 1951, at a regular meeting of the New York Young Democratic Club.

I heartily endorse the views expressed therein.

The resolution reads as follows:

The New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., resolves, That the United States should give to the people of India the 2,000,000 tons of wheat it needs to prevent famine. This food should be sent at once and with no political strings attached.

Regardless of any differences we have with India over China or otherwise, let us not defame ourselves by giving even a shred of justification to the charge that we could let people die of hunger because their government did not vote as we would like it to vote.

Let us not as a government do what no decent American would do himself if it were his personal responsibility to give or withhold out of his surplus food for men, women, and children dying of hunger.

Let us rather hereby reaffirm our belief in the dignity of the individual man.

Proposed Amendments to Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act.

These include editorials from the Washington Star, Indianapolis News, New Orleans Item, Christian Science Monitor, and Newark News.

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

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of January 19, 1951]

WE MIGHT NEED THEM TO SURVIVE

The Department of Defense has gone about as far as it reasonably could be expected to go in the direction of sparing 18-year-olds from combat service. The bill which Defense Secretary Marshall has proposed would guarantee that no draftee under 19 would be sent into combat without adequate training. This provision, General Marshall assured Congress, "would virtually wipe out, except in time of dire emergency, the probability that any young man brought into the service in the early days of this program would go into combat before he was 19." Presumably the Department's policy will be to give every draftee considerably more than the minimum 4 months of basic training before he becomes eligible to be sent overseas.

This is a sensible modification of the Department's original plan for induction of 18-year-olds for training and service. The program combines universal training with selective service in such a way as to provide not only the men needed to build up our present forces to required strength, but to provide a permanent pool of trained citizen-soldiers in reserve. Strong reaction had developed in Congress, however, against lowering the draft age without a statutory restriction against sending the younger men into combat. The congressional reaction reflected an understandable reluctance of parents to having youths of 18 thrust into the midst of war's horrors.

Conditions being as they are today, however, the time conceivably might come when we would need the services in combat of every able-bodied citizen, regardless of age. Secretary Marshall was not stating an empty fear when he warned that a legislative prohibition against use of men under 19 could "cripple the services in meeting a sudden, ruthless, and violent action by our possible enemy." If such an extreme emergency should develop, the Army's hands should not be tied by well-meant but risky limitations on use of younger men.

[From the Indianapolis News of January 12, 1951]

THE BEST AGE FOR SERVICE

Building projected Army Ground Forces of 8,500,000 men will require drastic expansion of the present exemption-hedged Selective Service Act. A Senate Armed Services subcommittee now is being acquainted with the hard fact that unless 18-year-olds are made eligible for service young married men and veterans of World War II, up to 35, will have to be called.

In the interests of equity, of physical and mental capacity, and of obtaining the maximum amount of service at an age which would cause the minimum of disruption to individual lives and to the national economy, the Defense Department's proposal to build up the Armed Forces with 18-year-olds is inescapably logical. The proposal, as outlined by Secretary of Defense George Marshall and Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, properly would not only fill present emergency requirements but also would create a long-needed, permanent reserve of trained manpower.

Secretary Marshall told the Senators that a system of "universal military service and training represents what I believe is the best way to meet our immediate need for enlarged combat forces and at the same time to provide an enduring base for our military strength." In other words, the combination of immediate draft authority and universal youth training on a reserve basis would end the dangerous cycles of complete demobilization of strength which have so weakened the Nation in the last generation.

Since 1945 this newspaper has been a consistent advocate of universal military training for the Nation's youth. It probably is not too much to say that had an adequate system of this kind been in operation, giving the United States a ready reserve of trained men, the Reds would not have dared to attack in Korea. Instead, our weakness invited attack and our reverses can be traced to our own blindness and unpreparedness.

With or without total war, the next decade will be for our country one of constant threat and alarm, in which we can afford no longer not to be prepared for the worst. It is with common prudence, therefore, that the Defense Department is urging on Congress manpower-skill training legislation broad enough to take care of the future, as well as the urgent necessities of the moment. The resultant law should not be of the piecemeal character of past efforts. Too long the United States has suffered from short-term military policies, expedients, and improvisations. Universal service, at the age when it can most easily be borne, is the best answer.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item of January 17, 1951]

NEW DRAFT REQUEST—FOR BOYS OF 18: A UNIFORM

The immediacy of the danger we face is driven home again by Secretary Marshall's urgent request for the drafting of 18-year-olds.

The simple fact is that the Armed Forces are working for a goal of 3,500,000 men in uniform within the next 6 months. And the present draft law can't supply that many.

A substantial proportion of the 9,000,000 men registered in the 19-through-25 bracket are subject to deferment. This group includes veterans, reservists, those who hold essential jobs in industry, those responsible for the support of dependents, and those who fail short physically or mentally.

The deferment policy can be tightened, and the length of service for draftees, now 20 months, can be extended. Still the current reservoir will not supply the necessary manpower.

For this reason the Defense Department is requesting immediate military service for 18-year-olds, starting with a draft of 450,000. (More than a million youths reach 18 annually, but present standards would permit calling only 700,000.)

Secretary Marshall says "Universal military service and training represents what I believe is the best way to meet our immediate needs for enlarged combat forces and at the same time to provide an enduring base for our military strength."

Marshall is speaking of permanent legislation designed to provide the greatest long-term security with the lowest cost in men and money.

The general's proposal is not pleasant news. But we are facing a fight for survival—a fight that calls for both immediate and long-range strength.

It is clear, as the nonpartisan Committee on the Present Danger recently declared, "the time has come for a new concept that universal service in defense of our freedom is a privilege and an obligation of our young men."

Marshall's plan is designed to further this concept and yet create the least possible interference with family life and with the Nation's ability to produce for defense.

There would be hardships, of course, particularly in education, although the plan includes these provisions:

For the first 3 years, 75,000 youths a year would be deferred—after basic training—to study medicine, the sciences and other needed specialties. Others already studying in these fields would be deferred upon graduation in sufficient numbers to meet civilian requirements.

The Navy's officer training program in civilian colleges would be expanded to cover the other services.

The services would send another 50,000 to colleges for training that would help the military.

Many of those drafted would probably go to college after their tour of duty; others would not resume their education.

Any way you look at it, colleges would be hard hit, and some might be forced to close their doors.

But, in a sense, that is only another side to the sacrifices that must be made by the hundreds of thousands of individual boys who normally would be thronging the classrooms.

We must face up to the fact that preserving the peace or winning the war, if it comes, will require many harsh programs. Freedom does not come cheap or easy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of January 23, 1951]

SOMEBODY HAS TO SERVE

These are times when the human mind finds few painless answers to the challenges and all of the answers call for courage. These are times, also, of decision. And the necessity of decision brings all the contradictions of wishful thinking out in the open. It is not a happy season for Congress.

Congress knows it dare not fail to provide the Nation with military manpower sufficient to meet today's crisis and the probability of continuing crises over an unknown number of years. Yet it is being bombarded by constituents who urge earnestly that 18-year-olds are too young for actual military service, by others who demand that neither veterans nor fathers shall be drafted, and by colleges which, fearing an unbridgeable period devoid of male students, plead for broad deferments.

Secretary Marshall's order permitting students to enlist in the service of their choice even after being called for preinduction examination should end the current wave of panic enlistments. But the long-term outlook for the colleges is still undecided, and the struggle between the champions of the 18-year-olds and of the veterans and fathers still goes on.

For the immediate build-up it is hard to defend further exemption of young veterans of brief noncombat service who have not acquired family responsibilities. Perhaps their inclusion in the draft might permit assuring 6 months' training to 18-year-olds before they are sent outside the country.

As for the needs of the long haul: We have yet to hear of any system other than near-universal service for at least 2 years and beginning at age 18 which would maintain the Armed Forces' ranks in a ready condition and build the pool of trained reserves against an all-out war, and do both jobs with so little disruption of the Nation's social and economic structure.

One thing is certain: Any answer to the military services problem will demand sacrifices of many. We think the American people are readier to make them than Congressmen's mail may indicate.

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of January 13, 1951]

UMST AND THE COLLEGES

On the same day that Secretary of Defense Marshall introduced before the Senate subcommittee on preparedness the plan for compulsory universal military service and training, the Association of American Colleges in Atlantic City was drawing up a "declaration on manpower." The Defense Department's plan was for 27 months of training and service by all able-bodied youths from the time they reached the age of 18. The colleges, representing 650 institutions, were for keeping the induction age of 19, and for keeping the draft out of certain professional schools.

The Department of Defense in its UMST plan has taken cognizance of the need to "keep the educational pipeline from drying up." As the plan was discussed before the same subcommittee by Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, it does not meet the wish of the colleges to keep the induction age at 19. But it does provide that in each of the first 3 years, after 4 months of preliminary training, the President may suspend temporarily the rest of their service to 75,000 youths to permit them to complete college courses, at the conclusion of which they would have to put in their remaining military service. Further, there is the implication that the colleges may get as many as 50,000 military personnel not connected with UMST, to pursue "specialties of value to the military."

Admitting that national welfare must come first, the colleges express the view that there should be deferment for students in professional schools of theology, medicine, dentistry and related health fields, and in the graduate schools in mathematics, engineering, and physical and biological sciences. They urge also that youth, generally, after basic training, be furloughed to the colleges of their choices for further training.

It is obvious that as this proposal by General Marshall is crystallized into legislation, the colleges cannot get all they want. But it is plain that the attitude of the Government toward them is sympathetic, and that some way may be found whereby weaker private institutions will not be driven to the wall by depletion of their student bodies. The very emergency that projects universal military training cannot be adequately met at the price of a partial educational collapse.

The Marshall-Rosenberg program represents a real advance, from the point of view of the colleges. Once in effective operation, it would be far better than the present inchoate mixture of draft, enlistment, Reserves, and National Guard. But college administrators and trustees will, for the visible future, face enormous difficulties.

Delaware Senator, Foe of Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article concerning the very distinguished and able senior United States Senator from the State of Delaware, the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

This article was written by the very able columnist, Herman A. Lowe, and appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 24, 1951:

DELAWARE SENATOR, FOE OF WASTE, SHOWS UP COSTLY CHEESE NONSENSE

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, February 24.—They pay considerable attention in the Senate when JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the thin man from Delaware, begins to speak. This grain dealer-solon from the second smallest State in the United States of America, talks in a dry, slightly harsh voice and with hardly more oratorical gesture than a cigar store Indian.

What counts is not how he says it, but what he has to say. For he's a quiet Galahad on behalf of the taxpayer's buck. He tilts endlessly against waste and extravagance and, unlike some of his colleagues, votes the way he talks.

He was up again, briefly, this past week with a typically WILLIAMS piece of information. He had learned that the 50,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese which this Government sold at a price of 15 cents per pound although our Government had purchased it as surplus for about 31 cents a pound.

But it was the second part of what he said which was the snapper.

At the same time our Government was holding this cheese off the American market to keep up prices to the American housewife, and selling at half cost to a foreign nation, American food firms were forced to import about 13,000,000 pounds of the very same kind of cheese.

They got it from the British Commonwealth units of Canada and New Zealand at prices ranging from 21 to 37 cents per pound, as contrasted with the price at which we were selling it to Britain.

It was similar to the instance brought up recently by another Senator that we were exporting surplus butter at 17 cents a pound while American housewives paid up to 80 cents.

WILLIAMS first teed off, a couple of years back, against the Federal pension system which was then—and probably is yet—shot full of inequities.

He brought out such examples as the substitute mail carrier who contributed $116.11 to the fund. On the basis of his normal life expectancy, WILLIAMS pointed out, he would get a total of $17,850 from the fund. Another employee, who had contributed a total of $72.86 to the fund, was drawing an annual pension of $951.64.

A year later WILLIAMS disclosed that the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation showed a discrepancy of more than $366,000,000. A lot of it subsequently proved due to the world's worst bookkeeping system, but considerable money was collected from private debtors and accounts were straightened out with other Federal departments and agencies which owed CCC.

By mid-1950, unaccounted-for items were down to $96,440,497; the administration felt it ought to just write this off so as to get the books back into balance. WILLIAMS raised the roof and the work of trying to clear up the accounts goes on.

WILLIAMS has attacked the Maritime Commission, whose records rival those of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thanks to his goading, the Commission collected for the taxpayers several million dollars owed by private business firms.

Although a dealer in grain and from a State with considerable agriculture, WILLIAMS has fearlessly attacked what he regards as wasteful farm subsidies.

He's quite a guy.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of New York Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of February 17, 1951:

MIGHTIEST FLEET HAILS NAVY YARD, 150 YEARS OLD—ITS FIRST WARSHIP, FRIGATE, HAD 74 GUNS, AND NOW IT CONVERTS HUGE CARRIERS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

A workman in a yellow helmet surveyed the teeming, 288-acre New York Naval Shipyard today, threw out his chest, and observed:

"Next Friday we're goin' to be bustin' out all over. Team work—that's the answer."

Across the network of streets, ways, and drydocks which punch their way into the brine of Wallabout Bay, Rear Adm. Paul B. Nibecker, commander of the world's largest shipyard, agreed.

"Yes, because of excellent teamwork through the years, we'll proudly commemorate this yard's one hundred and fiftieth anniversary February 23, and at the same time try to dispel the element of mystery inside our gates.

"There's a lot of big stuff going on in here, but we don't use any mirrors."

CARRIERS STRESSED

The admiral—an expert naval architect—conceded that a lot has happened to the seagoing silhouette since Robert Fulton's 2,000-ton "floating teakettle" first slipped down the Brooklyn yard ways in 1815.

"The emphasis," he said, "is on carriers, which have more than demonstrated their value in Korea. And this is the Nation's lead design yard for carriers. We've modernized one, two other similar jobs are under way—*Wasp* and *Bennington*—and we have information that we'll take care of others.

"It's a 3-year converting program and each modernization costs around $38,000,000. We're removing gun turrets to equip the flat-tops with escalators, installing stronger catapults, arresting gear, and flight decks to handle bigger planes.

"And * * * one of these days we're going to put a new slogan on our letterhead. We'll call this the Can Do Yard.

SLOGAN JUSTIFIED

Glorious tradition, accompanying America's rise in sea supremacy, more than justifies use of the slogan at the New York base, established in 1801 on a 42-acre plot of land purchased from John Jackson, a shipbuilder.

Three years before, Jackson built a small frigate (the *Adams*) for the Government in the tiny yard made up of swamps and mud flats. The yard didn't mature until 1812, when the Nation's second vital conflict thrust the construction of more than 100 vessels upon its limited facilities.

The challenge was met and conquered by ingenuity, improvisations and sweat. And in 1817 the yard began work on its first naval vessel—the 74-gun frigate *Ohio*, largest ship built in this country up to that time.

In the ensuing years of peace the navy yard flexed its muscles with new shops and a $2,000,000 drydock (completed in 1851). Then came the Civil War's unprecedented demands for 16 new fighting craft and 416 conversions of merchant ships. Again the New York yard, employing 5,500 trained workers, spewed forth fighting craft.

With the ebb and flow of peace and war, the New York shipyard responded with appropriate facilities and personnel. Lawns and trophy halls which delighted sightseers gave way to larger shops, railroad tracks, and piers. Fast building ways blossomed and gargantuan drydocks, which overcame substrata quicksand, dotted the cavernous water front.

When the rumble of war swept the Continent in 1917, the yard was one of America's top naval workshops. Employment jumped to 18,000. One herculean task was construction of 40 submarine chasers to meet the U-boat threat.

And as American sea power grew, so did the keels of powerful dreadnaughts. Up to this time, the yard had launched 50 vessels of varying tonnage and armor, starting with the line ship *Ohio*. They included sloops, cutters, paddle-wheel steamers, torpedo boats, cruisers, and the venerable but deadly battleship *New York* (1912).

BIG BATTLE WAGONS

From 1915 to 1922, eyes of the naval world focused on activities in the Brooklyn yard, where five first-class battleships with tremendous fire power were taking shape. They were the *Arizona, New Mexico, Tennessee, South Dakota*, and *Indiana*.

Then came the disarmament conference which halted work on the last two vessels, February 8, 1922. They were one-third finished.

As air power became more potent in the late 1930's, the New York shipyard kept abreast.

From December 7, 1941, to 1945, the yard repaired more than 5,000 ships, converted 250 others and turned out these battlewagons—*North Carolina, Iowa*, and *"Mighty Mo,"* on whose deck the Japs signed their unconditional surrender.

PARADE OF CARRIERS

The carrier parade picked up immediately. Three were of the Essex class (*Bennington, Bon Homme Richard*, and *Kearsarge*). The *Franklin D. Roosevelt* followed, and the last, the *Oriskany*, has just undergone complete modernization.

At the peak of the yard's World War II production, 69,000 workers manned the maze of building ways, drydocks, and foundries.

Next week, national, State and city officials will pay tribute to the rich traditions of the New York yard which has contributed so much to America's safety and strength.

AS A WORKER PUTS IT

Gazing at one of the grayish hulks in drydock, Robert E. Hanlon, 69, of 1517 East Twenty-ninth Street, Brooklyn, put it another way:

"I came to work here 46 years ago and I've watched all kinds of ships slide down the ways. They've been awfully good to me—the Navy personnel. And we've always tried to do the job well.

"I'll never forget working on the first oil engines for the battlewagon *Arizona*. We built 'em under the supervision of Adm. Chester Nimitz. And when I read about him in the last war, I wasn't surprised. He's brilliant and has a fine personality."

"You know," the public works foreman added softly, "I get just as big a thrill at seeing a modern craft launched as I did the older type vessels. You get sort of a patriotic chill that runs up and down your spine."

History of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the story of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R. I., has been told many times. It is appropriate, however, that we repeat it today.

I am therefore placing in the RECORD the story as told in the Metropolitan Star of February 1951.

UNCLE SAM GOES TO SYNAGOGUE: HISTORY OF A NEWPORT SHRINE

(We celebrate Washington's Birthday this week. The Touro Synagogue in Newport is now a national shrine. Its worshipers played important parts in our revolutionary cause and in 1790 Washington visited the synagogue. It was in a letter to this synagogue that he quoted his never-forgotten words: "For, happily, the Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanctions." It is fitting therefore, that we review the history of this national shrine in Newport during the week of Washington's Birthday.)

One hundred and eighty-eight years ago a small group of Jews gathered for their first service in their new synagogue in Newport, R. I. This was their first temple in their new land. Most of their fathers and mothers and some of them had fled religious persecution in the Old World and had found respite and a new home in this newest of lands—America. For over a hundred years now they had lived in freedom and tolerance in this land and had worshiped God in their own fashion—in the same manner as had Abraham and all his seed.

But previously the worship of God had been carried on in one or another private home. The members of the congregation had prospered in the new land, and now they decided to build a new temple to praise the Almighty. One of the finest architects of the day, Peter Harrison, was called in to design the synagogue.

This first house of worship of the Sephardic Jewish colony in Newport weathered many of the storms breaking over the handful of colonies, which later became a federation of States, and today stands out as one of the spiritual, moral, and physical leaders of the world. Recently the Government of the United States, recognizing the fact that the temple had lived the history of this country and survived as the oldest synagogue in America, designated the Touro Synagogue a national historic site.

TOURO FIRST RABBI

After the founding of the synagogue, in 1763, the congregation asked Isaac Touro, an immigrant from Holland, to act as its first rabbi. He led the congregation until

1780, when the Revolutionary War caused the temporary closing of the temple. Touro left Newport and went to New York to act as rabbi for the Shearith Israel congregation. Later he migrated to Kingston, on the West Indian island of Jamaica, where he died.

Many members of the congregation took part in our Nation's early struggle for liberty. They included soldiers, businessmen, and financiers. Aaron Lopez, one of the latter, sacrificed his entire personal fortune to further the American cause.

In 1790, George Washington visited the synagogue and later wrote its congregation an expression of religious liberty, which is as valid today as it was on the day Washington wrote it. It reads:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship.

"It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights."

NO SANCTION TO BIGOTRY

"For, happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Although Touro had left the country, his family remained associated with the temple. Both sons became leading citizens of the country as well as of the Jewish community. After Isaac Touro's death, his wife, Reyna, and his sons, Judah and Abraham, returned to Boston. The youngest brother remained in the East, but Judah, after one business voyage for his uncle, decided to set up in business for himself and went off to New Orleans. Here, despite the fact that Jews were theoretically barred from the city, under an old colonial law, Judah became a successful businessman and a prominent civic leader. In the defense of the city against the British during the War of 1812, he was one of the 13 men wounded among the American forces.

During his convalescence, Judah, who had by this time become a wealthy man, decided to use his wealth for philanthropic purposes. His first act was to purchase the land and building of the local Unitarian Church, whose minister was his friend. After the sale, which was forced by the church's indebtedness, he turned it back to the Unitarian congregation. Some years later after a fire had destroyed the building, he supplied the Christian congregation with another house of worship.

His donation of $10,000 toward the completion of the Bunker Hill Monument received great publicity—so great, in fact, that Touro told his old friend, the Unitarian minister, that he would like to take back the money because he had been promised anonymity, and the publicity disturbed him.

HELPED ALL FAITHS

Under Touro's inspiration, New Orleans established, in 1853, a Hebrew Foreign Mission Society to help Jews abroad. A year earlier, he had bought a large estate and built a hospital there, which he left to the city upon his death. During the last years of his life, he donated a considerable sum to Mount Sinai Hospital in New York. His will provided for over $200,000 for Jewish purposes and another $150,000 for various Christian and nonsectarian charities.

Both Judah and his brother donated funds for the upkeep of the Touro Synagogue, which was named for their father. In his will Judah left $75,000 to the congregation for the cemetery and the salary of the rabbi of the synagogue, while Abraham left $10,000 to the State of Rhode Island to maintain the building and another $5,000 for the city of Newport to repair the street leading to it.

The building itself is considered one of the finest examples of colonial architecture. Its designer had previously built King's Chapel in Boston and Christ Church in Cambridge. The woodwork in the synagogue is all hand carved and the masonic structure of the building follows the Temple of Jerusalem. Twelve columns, each a solid tree trunk, represent the 12 tribes of Israel. The central candelabrum is wrought of silver and is a beautiful example of contemporary art. No metal was used in the building, every unit was dovetailed and joined by dowel.

Although the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior will aid in caring for the synagogue, the ownership of the building will remain with the congregation and it will continue to be used as a place of worship.

Bled White by Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Michigan Tradesman, a widely read semimonthly business publication which well expresses opinions of business and professional people of my State. This editorial, "Are We Being Bled White by New Taxes To Protect a Europe That Won't Defend Itself?" should be read by every Member of Congress. The editorial follows:

ARE WE BEING BLED WHITE BY NEW TAXES TO PROTECT A EUROPE THAT WON'T DEFEND ITSELF?

Once upon a time we had a President who told us "all we have to fear is fear itself." Through the years this advice has given the people of the United States a kind of false courage to undertake and do things beyond their capacity and beyond the bounds of common sense. Wishful thinking by the man who thought up the nifty saying and on the part of others whom he influenced, has helped to get the country into its present nightmare of confusion.

At this time the people of the United States crave leadership in which they can have confidence. If ever a big man were needed, he is needed today—a man of clear thinking, sound common sense, acquainted with history, with knowledge of economics, business, finance, domestic and foreign commerce, the science of government, fundamentals of law. This man should not be so self-confident and willful that he will not seek and accept good advice.

We have been through an era of dreams. We have followed leaders, who, doubtless with good intentions, led us into uncharted courses fraught with unseen dangers. They started with the faulty notion that other peoples are like Americans and that they will react to certain conditions as our own people do. They thought all peoples loved peace so greatly that they would take any kind of sensible action to attain and preserve peace, when all history teaches us that mankind seldom is without wars.

And so, today we have a United Nations organization which is supposed to represent all nations but doesn't, because Communists cannot join in any endeavor with non-Communists. And worse, those who formed the United Nations gave the Russians a veto on its decisions.

Even while long-winded orators speak nonsense at meetings of the members of the United Nations, an army supposed to represent the world organization but really is about 80 percent American, is at war with Communists of Korea and China, while Communist Russia decries the United States and encourages the armies opposing Yankees in Korea.

BLED WHITE BY TAXATION

The United States Government is bleeding its own people white through taxation to finance an unprecedented program of preparedness against war. The Government has tried to persuade us that to protect ourselves from Russian aggression we must go to meet the Communists inside the continent of Europe. Our frontier has been placed even beyond the Rhine—on the Elbe.

Our President claims he has the right to send American fighting men wherever he thinks they should be sent. It was he—and he alone—who sent American boys to fight in Korea, where we already have had a casualty list of around 50,000. The thought must occur to every good American: "Why would any man crave the authority to send American soldiers to their destruction?" It seems that every good American would shudder to have and to exercise such fearful authority.

In conditions as they are and our Federal Government demanding such shocking sums as $70,000,000,000 for defense purposes, our domestic situation becomes confused. The Government wants ever more control of the people, and especially of their purse. It seeks control of prices, of metals, foods, imports, exports, distribution, manufacture, wages, hours, living conditions. And it plasters a tax on everything we make, handle, use, consume. Rarely, and probably never in history, has any country struggled under such crushing taxation as the United States of today.

GIVE US OUR DAILY SCARE

How can any people be at ease when forced to go through the scares as daily come to us via our newspapers or are thundered at us over the radio? We read that "the family food bill is going up again, perhaps March 1." At breakfast we read that another big strike is looming in the automobile industry. Again we are told wool manufacturers will be forced to boost men's wearing apparel 30 to 50 percent by the spring of 1952, or that carpet manufacturers have stopped taking orders because they can't survive under controlled selling prices but no control over prices of imported wool they have to buy and use in manufacturing processes.

In Government positions of importance are blundering jobholders who drive the public into scare buying because they predict a shortage of production in automobiles, television sets, textiles, plastics, wearing apparel, shoes, etc., etc. They place more stringent controls on credit to hold down purchasing. They express their fears of inflation, which only add to the fear the public already has of the shrinking value of the dollar.

INFLATION IS A REAL THREAT

As a matter of fact, inflation really is the greatest of the threats that stultify progress in this country right now. How to stop it claims the attention of good business and sane men in public offices.

Most men who are trying to think and act straight are of opinion that deficit financing

by the Federal Government lies at the base of inflation. They are of opinion also that to best fight inflation the Government must formulate and stick to a "pay-as-we-go" program. They say we can pay as we go, no matter how high the price of preparedness against war may be. Some of these men are advising resort to the sales tax. Unfortunately, the sales tax itself suggests unrest and leads to a new kind of fear. However, a sales tax hits everybody—even those who foolishly think "a little inflation is a good thing."

Some people in Washington suddenly have been struck with the thought that it might be a good thing if the Federal Government itself exercised a little economy, although our Kansas City President challenges anybody to cut his latest proposed $71,000,000,000-plus budget. A great many other people have been suddenly struck with the thought that possibly all this present war scare may have been just imagined and that we, the people, ought to have a little more information on the whole big problem confronting the public.

HAVE ANOTHER EMERGENCY

Somehow, some of the people holding big jobs in Washington manage to build up an "emergency" at just the time when they need one to carry out their own programs. This country was going along at a fairly even pace before our President, on all but a sudden impulse sent our fighting men into Korea. If there hadn't been an "emergency" before that time, there certainly has been one since then.

The sad fact is that the mutual calling of names by the United States and Soviet Russia cannot go on forever without ending in a hot instead of a cold war between the two nations. The Secretary of State informed the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that the Federal Administration intends to send 100,000 additional American Army troops to Europe as part of a combined defense force against Communist aggression. Defense Secretary Marshall disclosed plans to double 100,000 of American ground troops in Europe this year.

MINORITY REPUBLICANS ALERT

There is definite indication that the Republican party opposition to the Democratic Administration's policy is getting stronger. Recently 118 of 199 Republican members of the House of Representatives, signed a declaration of foreign policy which asks for a reexamination and a revision of the so-called bi-partisan policy which has clamped a silencer on much needed criticism of our foreign policy as fixed by Roosevelt, Truman, et al.

These Republicans believe that American foreign policy should be based on protecting the safety and welfare of the American people at home, more than on protecting foreign peoples. Ten of Michigan's 12 Republican Congressman have signed this declaration, which says that our foreign policy has been "in large part a costly failure." The declaration makes the following as a suggestive basis for our foreign policy:

"1. Whatever our future military policy is to be, it must be determined with full participation and approval of the Congress.

"2. Make this country impregnable to attack.

"3. Reduce nonessential civilian expenditures.

"4. Build a strong defense system in the Western Hemisphere.

"5. Build a strong defense line in the Atlantic and Pacific. Refuse further aid of any kind to western Europe unless persuaded that western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. In any case, invite Britain and the British Government to participate fully in this program.

"6. Conclude peace treaties with Germany, Japan, and Austria."

A reexamination of the whole situation in Europe might reveal that the people over there are more or less reconciled to a Russian invasion and are not eager to rearm and fight the Communists, because they dread most of all another bombing in which both friend and enemy might engage in case world war III is fought. We must not be misled into committing ourselves to fight in a Europe laboring under this impression or delusion.

BIPARTISANSHIP A FAILURE

We need, and must have, an alert, energetic, determined opposition party. We have had entirely too much of the so-called bipartisanship that proved to be so ineffective. The party in power commits the Government to a policy and sets a course that cannot be altered, then asks the opposition's approval. Only "me-too-ism" can result from that kind of bipartisanship.

Note: Members of the Michigan Republican delegation in Congress who signed the foreign-policy declaration referred to in the above editorial are: PAUL W. SHAFER, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, JESSE P. WOLCOTT, FRED L. CRAWFORD, RUTH THOMPSON, CHARLES E. POTTER, JOHN B. BENNETT, GEORGE A. DONDERO, and ROY O. WOODRUFF.

Leave Voice of America in State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 22, 1951.

This editorial, entitled "No Need to Change a System When It Is Working Well," sets forth clearly some of the cogent and compelling reasons for keeping our overseas information program in the Department of State where it can maintain close working relationship with the policy-forming branch of the Government on foreign policy.

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

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 22, 1951]

NO NEED TO CHANGE A SYSTEM WHEN IT IS WORKING WELL

When Senator WILLIAM BENTON first proposed, 2 or 3 years ago, that the Voice of America and other media of our official information program be taken out of the State Department, the Courier-Journal was attracted to the idea. It seemed to offer something along the line of the British Council, a semiofficial agency which does a major part of the British Government's cultural and propaganda work abroad.

Although he has offered no concrete plan in connection with his recent advocacy of his idea in the Senate, what the Senator had previously proposed, and it may be assumed what he will propose in a bill, was that a public-private corporation, be set up, composed of about 15 leading citizens of the country and a representative of the State Department. The Senator's idea is that, although the State Department must always be responsible for foreign policy, it would be easier for a distinguished group of public citizens to draw support from high-powered propagandists than it would be for an Assistant Secretary of State to command such talent.

That is perhaps a valid argument, but it does not seem to us to be the overriding consideration. The President's Advisory Commission on Information, set up under the Smith-Mundt Act, studied the operations of the old OWI and came to the conclusion that there should be a much closer liaison between policy making and policy exposition than ever existed between OWI and the State Department. As a matter of fact, OWI got most of its policy lines from the White House and not the State Department.

The Advisory Commission has consistently contended that representatives of the Public Affairs Branch of the State Department, which controls the information program, should sit on the major policy-planning group, participate in all meetings at which policies are considered, have access to all materials concerning policy, top secret included, if it was to be an intelligent voice of the American Government. Over the protest of some of the traditionally minded Foreign Service officers, the Commission won its point and there exists now the very closest relationship between all policy officers of the Department and the information specialists.

It works well, too. Foreign Service officers who never had any understanding of public reaction and consequently made policies in a vacuum, now take into consideration what that reaction will be, what the proper timing of a statement might be, and other matters that go into influencing people to think our way. There is no need to change the system and there is no apparent benefit to be gained from changing.

Soil Conservation Challenges the Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding speeches on soil conservation that I have ever heard was delivered by Rev. John Fred Streng, pastor of St. John American Lutheran Church, of Beatrice, Nebr. This address was delivered before the Nebraska Town and Country Church Conference held last month on the campus of the College of Agriculture at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

I wish to extend my remarks to include this fine address:

SOIL CONSERVATION CHALLENGES THE CHURCH

The struggle for survival tops the world's 1951 agenda. Victory will come to that side which can best answer the question: "When do we eat?" Here lies the difference between Europe and America, between poverty and prosperity. And that's a matter of life and death. It involves both church and state. So both had better get down to earth, coordinate their marvelous resources, and then look from clod and sod to recognize Almighty God. Bringing Jesus Christ to

rural Nebraska is the theme of this conference. That clearly defines our subject matter. Where Christ goes, His method and message inevitably intervene. In His program and prayers we note an enduring emphasis upon man's stewardship of the soil. He asks us to pray: "Give us this day our daily bread." God's answer to that petition is seen today in the miracle of modern crop surpluses and world consumption.

The church's people—priority—and prosperity depend directly upon soul and soil conservation. Notice the "u" and "i" relationship in soul and soil. So the church's basic institution for teaching understanding and appreciation of the soil, its meaning, capacity, and limitation, is the Christian home. Parents and children must learn to love the soil. Children are the most important bumper crop; they love to learn. We adults won't change our minds.

When little Ruthie dusts window sills and furniture, and exclaims: "Mother, I hate this old filthy dust," it's time for mother to begin a 3-minute rest period, and utilize it for a capsuled course in soil conservation. Says mother: "Look, honey, that isn't really filth. God made the dust; it's part of our soil. It's our bread and butter. We belong to the land. If we take good care of it, it will take care of us."

Here is the heart of soil conservation, and the church's future depends on what her God-fearing members do to, and with, God's good earth in time. For, soul and soil erosion are twins. Man and soil are of the dust of the earth. To it we shall return when our work is done. "The earth is the Lord's"—that's what God said. It does not belong to us; we are but God's farm managers, His stewards. Whether we disk, one-way, cultivate, plow, or duckfoot the land, we either bequeath a garden spot or a mixture of gumbo and gullies to the next generation.

How must soil conservation challenge the church. Ninety-five percent of Nebraska churches are rural. And since main street is but the business end of a country road, we may say that all churches in the Cornhusker State are directly affected by changes in agriculture. Roughly, Nebraska has 1,325,000 citizens. Only 2 cities are above 25,000; only 8 others above 10,000. Shifting populations in 20 countries chosen at random, and recently published in the Nebraska State Journal, show one-half gained, one-half lost.

Only 16 percent is engaged in farming; the remainder are country ladies and gentlemen living in town. With this minority, agriculture as a means of prosperity takes on a different angle. Strangely, the canning industry and truck gardening are rising leviathans. Overmechanization of farm equipment has led to excess borrowing. We demand a higher standard of living than our income can maintain. If time saved by machinery can develop other farm operations, they will pay out. But equipment that can be used only 1 or 2 weeks out of the year, may not be very profitable, especially if purchased on time payments.

Other factors complicate this modern puzzle even more. (1) The church, like other agencies, has wrongly emphasized production more than distribution. (2) The poor farmers are not poor because they are exploited, but because they are unproductive. Some are just plain lazy; they don't care how they farm. (3) In 1945 almost 10,000,000 people in the U. S. A. were over 65 years old; in 1970 we expect over 16,000,000. This vast army of silver-haired pioneers can no longer help conserve, but must be conserved. (4) In recent years we've heard much about specialized farming. The church must emphasize that prosperity is not so much farm culture, as common sense and reverence for and knowledge of the soil. The earthworm knows more about keeping soil clean and soft than a one-way. (5) The modern four horsemen threatening to plow under the rural church, farm, and family, include: Corporation farming, the canning industry, the giant truck-garden syndicates, and soilless farming. One inch of topsoil, valued at $1 per ton, when once lost through erosion, costs the owner $15,000 to replace per acre. No wonder some farmers are poor. Six out of every 10 people in the U. S. A. live in cities; they are consumers, not producers. They do long-distance farming which ofttimes does not help the rural church. The clean property around the little white church used to be the pride and joy of father and son; today much of it is owned by someone living thousands of miles distant, who has no interest whatever in the church. The farmer has a strategic position in this immense hierarchy of country community welfare. The church must encourage the Christian farmer to recapture the security of his God-given status as steward In the proportion that man loses sight of the idea that the world is here for his profit and pleasure by divine right, the more greedy, arrogant, and destructive he becomes in working with natural resources.

The church's duty is to inform man of his divine prerogative as ruler over the animal world. Thus man must seek to conserve the earth as a medium of happiness for both. The church is built on the land; lives off the land, and cannot prosper without good farmers. No magic or mineral will save precious top soil; just common sense mixed with the fear of God will work wonders. If we keep it fresh, clean, and productive, our children will not be paupers Man is just beginning to use science to help him study the effect of soil and its products on the human body, on industry, on national and international relations. Behind it all he will find the guiding hand of God. A thousand and one things depend upon common sense grass-roots democracy, and appreciation of God's miracle of life.

Every church denomination might well establish soil conservation districts, alert and active to preserve high Christian standards. Every clergyman should subscribe to a good farm magazine, attend county soil meetings, and insist that the congregation choose a committee on agriculture. The Lutheran church, among others, operates an efficient church-wide placement bureau which directs Nation-wide activities within its denomination. There is no limit to constructive surveys and service of a church council or board of elders, as pertains to rehabilitation of souls and soil. Landowners and tenants joining hands and hearts in church on Sunday morning will boost more peaceful relations during the week. The whole congregation must mobilize against its common enemies: erosion and depletion. Farm owners best know their land troubles; these might profitably be discussed by church societies from the standpoint of the Christian steward. Ailing humans call a doctor; ailing land needs the careful diagnosis of a conservation specialist.

The church should be deeply interested in how drainage ditches, county, State, and Federal highway construction, irrigation canal designs, railroad tracks, and other devices cutting through church territory, will affect the future of the congregation. There are only two ways to make conservation work: passing laws, or voluntary practice of the Golden Rule. Putting such a plan and program into effect cannot be accomplished in one day. The church is a long-range spiritual adviser. Her members come and go, at last to sleep beneath the sacred soil of God's acre. But the church teaches one generation after another that when land is treated as God's property on a share-and-share-alike basis, financial drives will not be necessary.

No government can subsidize God's land into prosperity. Only the family that owns and honors the land will demonstrate by its progressive methods that church and community are priceless. The owner-operator must realize that rain, sunshine, and good crops are not his doing alone. And the tenant must remember that he owes the boss and God an account of how he treats rent ground. Let the church's voice be heard in these days of high prices, greed, and selfishness, that cause overproduction and ruination of the land. No land can bear more than its share; therefore intensive cropping without rotation is dangerous. When huge corporations and foreign financial interests destroy family size farms, they annihilate church, public school, and community. And where there is no community life, people cannot live, love, or labor together. The church must stress the meaning of custodianship and trusteeship as a matter of self-respect.

Each farm has its problems; it may be the soil, or water management, or mineral deficiency, or topsoil contour. Anyone can ruin a farm, but only a good steward can improve it. Experiments and experience show that the so-called 10-year farm improvement and development plan works best in most cases. This plan is geared so that an average farm improvement will pay for itself, when financed as follows: 59 percent for minerals; 23 percent for erosion control; 10 percent for fences; 5 percent for building repairs; 3 percent for pond and shelter. Somewhere in this program, proportionate giving to the Lord must be added. Detailed costs and increased returns are necessary for the land and the good Lord in successful farming. As stewardship in the church is a slow program, so is soil conservation. Tithing for the land and careful conservation of soil are on the same side of the fence.

As the human body is able to do twice the work after a good night's rest, so soil needs a Sabbath, too. What summer vacation is to the human body, summer fallow is to exhausted soil. Balanced farming means sharing with the Lord. He makes soil productive; we work it, and live like kings from it.

The economic impact of 10 to 20 farmers practicing soil conservation in a group is tremendously important; like, when 10 to 20 church members begin using Lord's treasury boxes to introduce proportionate giving. That means all church debts liquidated, decent living for pastor and parish, well-kept church premises, including care of the silent acre of God's permanently retired saints. Why enthuse farmers of America when their elders ruin the home place because they look for the dollar sign on every fence post? If one-third of the productive soil in the country is conserved, new production increases by a million dollars. The way to make money is to take God in as partner. He who would prosper cannot park on Main Street all day. It's simple to raise corn and hogs; it takes a lifetime, however, to train intelligent Christian farmers who remember that they are tilling holy ground that belongs to God.

The more a government pushes parity, the less it relies on God. Church people need to ponder our strange modern mode of living. A soil expert recently made the statement that here once virgin soil produced 150 bushels without fertilizer, only 55 bushels now grow aided by artificial respiration. Worn-out soil results in higher prices, sky-high taxes, increased relief rolls. Depleted land produces mineral-deficient crops, malnutrtioned livestock, resulting in low-quality milk, butter, cream, and eggs. Healthy citizens do not thrive on eroded soil; aggressive Christians need vigorous stewardship to bring forth good fruits.

It's a tragedy that our Middle West has done so little to conserve its heritage. Only 1 inch of topsoil is left in some counties in Nebraska according to statistics; some prairie areas suffer from sheet erosion. Silt-laden rivers tell the story against which there is no argument. River beds full of black soil reflect greed. All the black soil in the field

dam has lost its value; dams are not the answer to soil erosion. Every ruined farm anywhere in the U. S. A. costs us all money. Conservation means to live happily and usefully. It's a way of life. God gave us earth, water, air; these three. We must live in harmony with them or lose our birthright. Even the climate becomes a pattern factor in the use of the land. When, for instance, civilization makes a mistake about a raindrop, history records the eviction of man from the landscape. Historians draw maps of lost countries. That wasteland began with an army of innocent raindrops that splashed to the ground. One thousand five hundred cubic miles of raindrops fall on the U. S. A. per year. One-half evaporates, one-fourth flows off in surface streams; the remainder works its way into the earth crust and staves off starvation. The raindrop is either man's terrible enemy, or friend; depends on where and how it falls. If we would harness the raindrop we wouldn't need expensive dams. Terraces, contour plowing, strip cropping, and similar methods, make the raindrop walk instead of run away. The mudsplash of the raindrop is a blasting force. The soil becomes puddled and floats away; only sterile ground remains. So the raindrop must be intercepted before it strikes home.

Since Nebraska slopes from west to east, lowlands in southeastern Nebraska should be seriously interested in flood-control measures. Development of the North and South Platte River beds, the Missouri River Basin, the Republican River watersheds, are of prime importance. Citizens of Lincoln and Beatrice should be alert about what goes up Salt Creek or down the Blue River. Underground water moves in an easterly direction also. Floods have gone far beyond the occasional stage. Dams completed in western Nebraska will be a great blessing, but smaller water courses must be controlled also if we are to escape serious damage. In passing, let me use this illustration just to show that we are our brother's keeper. The life of a New Orleans citizen depends upon the change of a water stream hundreds of miles away, namely, whether a sheepherder in Montana overgrazes bottomland, or a lumbermill in Minnesota overcuts its quota, or some farmer in Illinois overplows his land, which mistake in either case permits water to escape and converge on helpless, innocent inhabitants down Mississippi River way, flooding them out of their homes.

The church must preach vigorously against soil erosion. Every clergyman ought to make an inspection tour of the farm land in his parish. Soil erosion has evicted nations with more finality than any invading army. We are told we lose the equivalent of 10,000 100-acre farms each year from water erosion alone. A thimblefull of topsoil contains well over 2,000,000 particles necessary to keep soil sweet and fresh. If a certain soil can produce only 30 bushels, it must not be overfarmed. A good deal of what is called agriculture is really mining, just plain exploitation for quick profits. That is contrary to God's law. Human erosion is just as bad. God intends for man to live with dignity in accord with his high calling and destiny. The gully on the neighbor's place is a danger signal that ought to be discussed in a Christian manner, before it crawls under the fence and across the township line. The rape of the land has been horrible; 100,000,000 acres lost; 100,000,000 acres depleted seriously; 560,000,000 to be conserved. With huge areas across the world today totally arid, conservation is the only answer to starvation of increased world population. Shifting populations and civilizations move only because of ruined land.

The marvels of the eighties here in the Middle West include the rise of teeming cities. With them came new agriculture, farming ideas, and the institutional church. The pioneer broke up the tough prairie sod, hardened by cowboy horse hoof, Indian stampede, wagon wheels, and thundering herds. Today the church must remind her people of the hardships, and the return to homesteading unless we learn to appreciate what God gave us.

Christ in His parable recognized that soil is not all alike; neither are people. But the sense of the responsibility remains the same. Twenty-seven million of 53,000,000 rural people are unchurched. Only 53 percent of the people in the United States of America attend church; 39 percent of the rural population, and 48 percent of city people in Nebraska are church members. Most unchurched people live in the rapidly expanding suburban areas. The rural parish must not die. It is of basic fiber to American life and living. Though some rural areas never will be self-supporting, the church should persuade more fortunate communities to subsidize the less fortunate and lend a helping hand. This is God-pleasing to both.

Christian countries have always been the most destructive of soil. Records show that civilization has nearly always raped the land and treated it inhumanly. So-called heathen countries do not seem to have much trouble with depression or starvation, except where the white man has come, not to bring the Gospel, but to tap virgin resources in order to get rich quick at the expense of primitive people.

Surely the farmer knows nature and life better than anyone because he lives so close to the soil. He should live closer to God also because his living and livelihood are so closely related to God's handiwork. The church cannot live without her rural constituency. From the country parishes have come most of our church leaders in pulpit and pew. Country congregations have better records for benevolences because they are not slaves to budgets and salaries and wage control. Cities maintain themselves only because farmers retire. No city ever thrives of itself or its industry without farm support. But when we remember that 65 percent of the people in the United States of America are unchurched, then what about Christian leadership in the future? If our rural churches are permitted to close their doors, where shall the lifeblood of the church at large come from in the next decade?

Nor will the rural church be saved through co-ops, which seem to become necessary to maintain our modern standard of living. Restricted membership make it an isolated institution to which not all members of the church may belong, thus creating differences. The most successful co-op is the one which gradually absorbs all competitors. Thereby it becomes a monopoly and defeats its purpose. Soil conservation teaches us, oddly enough, that man does not live by bread alone. A better understanding between owner and operator is the churches' duty; that's where brotherhood begins. There is a definite connection between empty pews and sour soil. A golden era of agriculture lies ahead for the Middle West according to soil and watershed experts.

The church should speak more of soil building than soil conserving, because so much of our Midwest land is torn by deep ditches. Many a gully was once an innocent wagon track or cow path that someone left unguarded. Good farms, beautiful yards, painted buildings, adequate machine sheds, usually point to a well-kept church. It's a good sign of faith in God and the good earth. In the wake of continued demolition of the farm home follows the little white schoolhouse in many areas. Mechanization of the farm eliminates much human labor; chain farming and land barons ignore the God-intended owner idea. We must preserve the family-size farm. When the church is the hub of community life, all are happy. Therefore farms must ever remain in the hands of worthy people. The great majority of bad farmers hate farming and livestock, and their neighbor. In the years gone by a thrifty, farsighted farmer bought six quarters for his six sons; thus six new members joined the church later on. Today the picture has changed. Deserts and dust dunes do not feed hungry people, for lost soil always means thinning of population. Too many farm boys are employed in factories to be healthy for the future of the country church.

History shows that Babylon, Greece, Persia, China, and other nations were once world powers. Today they are international corpses due to land hunger. Doping and drugging the soil with all types of stimulating fertilizer will never keep alive the earth that breathes. Each square inch is a miniature beehive. Millions of tiny bacteria live there; this is their home and grave, and they give back to Mother Earth their life and enrich her. The unaffected soils of the tropics or prairie or forest primeval all have a harmonious communion of life. Nowhere, at no time, are deserts a natural phenomenon. Nature knows no waste places. Today's arid areas are monuments to man's mighty blunders. Beneath their sands sleep once thriving civilizations. Where soil changes, climate changes, people change. In the smallest clod of earth is more live and creative activity, than in the highest skyscraper.

The Christian farmer cannot approve of unsound, deliberate ruination of soil. He improves his farm so that others may admire his industry and integrity. He makes home, church, and school the very center of his family life. He is active in all of them, and thus undergirds the spiritual life of the community. He knows that it is more blessed to give than to receive. His cows may not know it's Sunday, but he and his family do, and they aim to keep the Sabbath day holy.

Country-church worship might well take into consideration the work schedule of the farmer. He becomes an irregular attender, not for lack of desire but because there are no short cuts to good choring even on Sundays. There is need for study toward a convenient timetable especially during winter.

The Christian farmer should be affiliated with progressive farm organizations and marketing groups, not as a pressure union but to develop and promote general welfare. He ought to make his voice heard against unfair practices, unsanitary methods, and unwise regulation. The Christian farmer elects to office such men and women as serve the community best without bribe or pressure. All this is a part of soil conservation.

Volumes have been written on the scientific angle of soil conservation. The church must speak out in simple terms about God's glorious earth and His divine laws which govern summer and winter, sowing and harvest, rain and sunshine, day and night. God wants man to exercise dominion over the earth. And that's a mighty big responsibility. It's a high calling to preside over the mystery of growth in nature.

In less than 300 years, under God's providence, America has grown from a tiny settlement to world leadership. Happiness and welfare of today's world depend so much upon Christian principles and attitudes. Successful churches are not only those polled and publicized; others have made just as enduring an impact upon community and national life. A successful church cannot be gauged by size; it's the spiritual life that counts. There are features that tend and trend to keep rural churches from experiencing that growth which progressive city churches normally expect because of citizen influx. Too many young men cannot rent a small farm because some rich man has bought up everything and mechanized it. So many farmers already belong to city

churches. The rural church and community are the very backbone of the American way of life, the one everybody hopes will remain for centuries to come.

By 1976 there will be 7,000,000 more children in American elementary and, we hope, Sunday church schools, than today. They must be taught about soul and soil conservation as a means of survival. A careful analysis of soil, self, and soul, are important to keep America spiritually sweet and clean. That's our job, and it's a mighty serious one in which church and State must work together, or hang separately.

There isn't a more wonderful place on earth, none closer to paradise, than a well-kept, peaceful countryside. On such farms the day is never long enough to complete all the tasks that demand attention. But that's where people really live. And when near that farm stands the sturdy country church, rearing its tall white spire unto God, calling its members together for prayer, praise, and parting, surely this is a bit of heaven on earth. Of such is the kingdom of God, of such faith and fiber is the stock of Christian citizenship in America. May God graciously protect and prosper it.

"O look upon Thy garden, Lord, the one
which Thou hast planted,
According to Thy promised word, on plain
and hillside slanted.
Enrich the soil, Thy light bestow, and soften
it with rain;
Let everything that ill winds blow result
in strength and gain!"

Appeasement and Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of our foreign policy, the American people are entitled to know the truth. It is our duty to give it to them. What is happening in Asia today vitally affects the freedom and security of our Nation. It is for this reason that under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement made by our former colleague in this House, the former President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, when last January before the political committee in Lake Success, he fought the passage of a resolution on Korea that to him, as to most of us, seemed to be both craven appeasement and blackmail.

The position taken by General Romulo has elicited the admiration of the American people, and it has shown once more that we have in him a true and loyal friend. General Romulo's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE PHILIPPINES, IN THE POLITICAL AND SECURITY COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS ON THE KOREAN CEASE-FIRE PLAN, JANUARY 13, 1951

Mr. Chairman, last December the Philippines joined the appeal of the Asian and Arab states asking the Peiping regime not to allow its troops in North Korea to cross the thirty-eighth parallel and suggesting that, in the meantime, measures might be explored for the peaceful settlement of the problem of Korea. Subsequently, the Philippines also sponsored jointly with the same states a resolution creating a committee of three to formulate the basis for a possible cease fire in Korea. Both the 13-nation appeal and the proposals of the committee of three have been rejected outright by the Peiping regime.

We supported these efforts in good faith in the context of the circumstances obtaining at that time—circumstances which gave some hope that the stabilization of a line somewhere along the thirty-eighth parallel would have permitted a just and honorable settlement of the Korean problem. However, the Peiping regime has ignored our repeated entreaties and its soldiers have pressed their assault against the armed forces of the United Nations. The political and moral basis for a cease fire has thus been altered by Peiping's rebuff of our proposals and by its continued hostility toward our troops and aggression against the Republic of Korea.

Though the time for a just and honorable settlement of the Korean problem is not past, we must clearly recognize that the margin of success has become pitifully small. However, believing that this narrow margin still exists, the Philippines continues to support the principle of unconditional cease fire—a cease-fire aiming at subsequent negotiations but not extorted at the point of a gun.

We submit, Mr. Chairman, that the principles set forth in the supplementary report of the committee of three and now embodied in the draft resolution submitted yesterday by the delegation of Israel do not envisage this kind of a cease fire. The report, in its paragraph 5, represents a retreat from the position taken by the Security Council on June 27, a retreat from the position taken by the General Assembly on October 14, and yet a further retreat from the position established in our resolution of December 14.

How far, sir, can the United Nations keep retreating from established sound moral positions without courting final disaster?

A retreat in the course of battle is understandable and sometimes inevitable, but a retreat from right principles while a battle is being waged for those very principles cannot be justified on any ground whatever.

Paragraph 5 represents, in our opinion, a surrender to intimidation and blackmail. The Peiping regime has made it utterly plain that it would not stop fighting the United Nations until we have agreed to hand over Formosa to it and allowed it to sit in the United Nations. Peiping has had the temerity to demand these conditions even while it continues to ignore our entreaties and proposals and while it continues to soak its hands in the blood of our soldiers.

My country, sir, knows the nameless terror and agony of war as few countries around this table do. Therefore, we understand the anxious desire of many delegations to exhaust every possibility of avoiding a general war. But we also know that there is at least one thing that is worse than war itself, and that is the degrading enslavement that would surely follow an abject surrender before the threats of a fanatic and implacable aggressor.

We hold that paragraph 5 constitutes just this kind of abject surrender. Having turned our right cheek to Peiping, and the left cheek also, we now say to Peiping in paragraph 5: "You may stop hitting me now and killing my boys so that we can discuss how to reward you with the gift of Formosa and a seat in the United Nations."

I beg the honorable delegates who have drafted or supported this paragraph to correct me if I am wrong in thinking that this is the essential impression that lingers in the mind after a careful perusal of this paragraph.

Paragraph 5 attempts to purchase peace at the price of appeasing and encouraging a power that may be expected to take the fullest advantage of any sign of weakness that we show. The history of totalitarian aggression teaches us that this is the road to disaster. The march of Communist aggression cannot be arrested by a policy of moral retreat and surrender. Every such retreat from a position of moral strength and every such surrender of basic principle but serve to whet the appetite of the aggressor and to egg him on to further adventures.

The goal of international communism is the domination of the world, and no show of weakness or attempt at appeasement like that which is evident in paragraph 5 will deter its leaders from that ultimate goal. Communists may change their tactics and modify their methods, but their final goal of world domination stands unaltered through all such cunning wiles and opportunistic stratagems. They will, as they did in the last war, accept very eagerly the benefits of lend-lease and the benefits of UNRRA, and they will even abolish the Comintern in order to mollify their allies and set their suspicions and fears at rest. But as soon as the crisis is over and the free world is completely disarmed, the Communists take off the mask of peaceful coexistence and resume their relentless march toward their goal.

This, sir, is the kind of force we are contending with, and Peiping merely happens to be the latest and most formidable instrument of that implacable force.

A show of weakness and the surrender of principle will encourage, not deter, the aggressive designs of Peiping and its allies. The only thing that can deter them is a convincing demonstration of the firmness and solidarity of the free world.

Munich showed the way to appeasement and disaster. But the United Nations has since blazed a new road of nonappeasement that runs through Iran, Greece, and Berlin. Because we stuck firmly to this road, the line against aggression was held.

Today the road of nonappeasement has been extended to the valleys and jungles of Korea. Upon this road the United Nations stands today. If it abandons this path and out of misconceived prudence takes the tragic road back to Munich, it accepts defeat and loses its reason for being.

We have heard moving appeals to the free nations of the world to close ranks. Such appeals to solidarity cannot be met on the basis of an admission of weakness and abject surrender to the aggressor. Our solidarity must rest on strength and firmness, on readiness to resist aggression, to identify it as such, and to name its perpetrators. There is no other basis for the common faith and common action of the free nations of the world.

The only just and proper demonstration of solidarity which, in our judgment, the free world ought to make at this crucial hour is to approve a resolution containing paragraphs 1 to 4 of the supplementary report of the Committee of Three. If this is rejected by Peiping, we must then approve forthwith a resolution pinning the label of aggressor on the Peiping regime and providing for further collective measures as may be required to check the aggression.

However, having made sure that this is the plane of principle on which the Philippine delegation stands, and having regard for the views expressed by many delegations, we shall not stand in the way of this resolution. Accordingly, we shall abstain on paragraph 5, and if this is adopted, we shall abstain on the whole.

Our attitude is not in any way influenced by the anticipation of Peiping's possible acceptance or rejection of these principles. It may well be that Peiping would accept paragraph 5 and reject the rest. Surely, what some consider to be principles acceptable to the aggressor cannot be regarded as the proper measure for the action of the United Nations. The only proper measures for our action are the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Krupp: What Price Expediency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD an article entitled "Krupp: What Price Expediency?" written by Joseph W. Kaufman, and which appeared in the February 26, 1951, edition of the New Republic.

Mr. Kaufman is a New York lawyer who was formerly deputy chief counsel for war crimes at Nuremberg, and chief United States prosecutor in the Krupp case. During World War II he served as general counsel of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and in 1949 and 1950 was chief counsel of the House Small Business Committee.

The article follows:

KRUPP: WHAT PRICE EXPEDIENCY?

(By Joseph W. Kaufman)

(Joseph W. Kaufman is a New York lawyer who was formerly deputy chief counsel for war crimes at Nuremberg and chief United States prosecutor in the Krupp case. During World War II, he served as general counsel of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and in 1949 and 1950 was chief counsel of the House Small Business Committee.)

The recent freeing of the Krupp defendants by United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy in Germany and the restoration of the Krupp industrial properties to Herr Krupp have come as a real shock to the American people. Americans who remember World War I still have not forgotten the stories of "Big Bertha," the monster gun named after Bertha Krupp, defendant Krupp's mother. And Americans of World War II cannot forget the awesome reality of the main Krupp works at Essen until the pinpoint demolition of these plants; nor can they forget the other formidable mining and industrial properties of the far-flung Krupp empire. When the Krupps are not only set free but restored to their largess, apparently rehabilitated with ECA funds, ordinary American folks throughout the country intuitively feel that the whole thing must be wrong. Perhaps they vaguely remember that it was from the same Landsberg prison that Hitler and Hess were freed under the German Republic.

The wholesale clemency now being practised toward war-crime defendants cannot be justified even as expediency. The Krupp action, on the contrary, supplies the Russian Communists with new propaganda material to the effect that we are now playing ball with the group which led the German industrialists in putting Hitler into power and in subjecting to Nazi control not only the labor unions but also the rest of German industry. Still worse, if we have freed the Krupps in order to be assured of their support against the Communists, the Russians may actually be laughing up their sleeves.

As proved in the war-crimes trial, the Krupps freely and actively collaborated with the Russian Communists. For about 3 years prior to Hitler's rise to power they were able to develop and perfect their blitzkrieg tanks secretly from the rest of the world only because Russia permitted them to do so in Russia. In return, Krupp experts, wearing Russian officer uniforms, taught and instructed Russian cadets as well as German personnel. Finally, in 1939, when Hitler signed up with the Russian Communists he had lambasted, and commenced World War II, the Krupps, unlike Fritz Thyssen, did not leave Germany and forfeit their properties, but found it congenial to be on the side of the Communists.

The prosecution and trial of the Krupps was no mean undertaking to be set aside lightly by the stroke of a pen. The trial lasted over 6 months. There were 250 witnesses called by one side or the other, and 4,500 documents were introduced into evidence. Each of the 12 defendants was permitted two German lawyers, and Krupp had an American lawyer also. Three judges from American courts presided. Significantly, if only in connection with the sweeping clemency now accorded the defendants, no Krupp defendant ever took the stand to defend himself or to submit himself to cross-examination on the charges.

Eleven of the twelve Krupp defendants were convicted, and all received jail sentences. They were convicted on the basis of personal guilt, not guilt by association, and they were convicted by proof beyond a reasonable doubt as required by the best American standards. The 11 defendants, including Krupp, were convicted of the infamous crime of using and abusing slave labor. Six of them, again including Krupp, were convicted of spoliation and plundering—of using the German war to enlarge and extend the Krupp industrial and economic empire.

None of the defendants was convicted on the aggressive-war count, charging the actual planning of aggressive war. However, the Krupp indictment charged the agressive-war allegations not only as a separate war-crime count by itself but also as part and parcel of the slave labor and the spoliation counts. This was for the purpose of showing that the Krupps, by indulging in their slave labor and spoliation activities, were not in the category of patriotic citizens obeying orders in time of war or acting under Hitler's duress; that, in view of the Krupp part in secretly planning for war before Hitler and then boosting Hitler into power, the Krupps committed their war excesses with malice aforethought and criminal intent; and, most important of all, that in view of this past history they were not entitled to any mitigation of punishment on a plea that they acted under higher orders. The judges were entitled to give weight to the aggressive-war proof for this limited purpose, and perhaps this helps explain why the sweeping property-confiscation decree was added to the prison sentences.

Judge William J. Wilkins wrote a concurring opinion stressing the point that the prosecution's aggressive-war proof was so convincing and so compelling that there was "built up a strong prima facie case, as far as the implication of Gustav Krupp and the Krupp firm is concerned." Gustav was defendant Alfred Krupp's father and could not be tried because of his senility. Judge Wilkins also stated that he concurred in dismissing the aggressive-war count against the defendants only by giving them "the benefit of what may be called a very slight doubt, and although the evidence with respect to some of them was extraordinarily strong."

The judge summarized the high lights of this uncontroverted proof—the Krupp firm's clandestine development of armament, tanks, and submarines in violation of the Versailles Treaty; its actual war plans and preparations, even before Hitler came into power, "in order that Germany may rise to fight again," as stated and fully described in the firm's own files; and Gustav Krupp's leadership of the industrialists' financial fund, which played such a vital part in boosting the then tottering Hitler into power. Defendant Alfred Krupp started with the firm in 1925, was a deputy board member in 1936, and a full board member in 1938. He certainly had knowledge of this background, and as a board member he participated. Moreover, as an early member of the Nazi Party and a colonel in the Nazi flying corps, he could not have been unsympathetic. He could hardly claim that he perpetrated his slave labor and spoliation crimes only because of Hitler and was, therefore, entitled to mitigation of punishment.

The prosecution also proved that defendant Alfred Krupp received a very handsome reward from Hitler for his continued participation in international criminality. This reward was the Krupp industrial properties. They had never belonged to Gustav, his father, who was not really a Krupp but had married Bertha, the Krupp heiress, and had adopted the Krupp name. And it was not preordained under Krupp tradition or by the firm's set-up that Alfred would take over the properties even on his mother's death. Hitler, however, issued a special decree in 1943, the Lex Krupp, which placed the properties in Krupp family ownership in perpetuity, much like a kingdom of its own, and stated that this was done in recognition of Krupp's incomparable efforts to boost the military potential of Germany. With Nazi approval Alfred took over.

The proof against the Krupps, including defendant Alfred Krupp, on the slave labor count in the trial was devastating. It was shown that the Krupps employed 75,000 foreign workers, 25,000 prisoners of war and 5,000 concentration-camp workers. Their crimes against foreign workers were not only against Russians and Poles, whom the Germans frankly treated as slaves and "subhumans," but extended to western workers—Dutch, Belgian, and French. Many of these workers were picked up in their own countries in manhunts, sometimes right off the streets, and required to go to Germany to work for Krupp. Those who attempted to escape would find themselves in one of the Krupp "penal camps." A Catholic priest was an inmate—and prosecution witness. Other recalcitrants would be sent to the Gestapo. All the pertinent provisions of the Geneva Convention for prisoners of war were violated, and Alfred personally participated in instigating violations.

Defendant Alfred Krupp approved and signed an appropriation of 2,000,000 marks for constructing a Krupp plant at Auschwitz, where concentration-camp workers would be freely available. At Essen, where he and his colleagues in crime could be eye-witnesses, 520 "Hungarian Jewesses," imported from concentration camps, were forced to engage in cruelly heavy labor outdoors and indoors. The girls, shorn of their hair and almost all clothing, lived a life of horror—with a bare cellar or worse for lodging, an open trench for air-raid shelter and filthy starvation rations for food.

On this record—and on a record of spoliation and plundering activities of gigantic dimensions and ruthless scope which will not be described here—defendant Alfred Krupp received a sentence of 12 years in jail, which does not seem excessive; and all his property was ordered confiscated. Great pressure was brought on Gen. Lucius D. Clay to disaffirm all the Krupp sentences, particularly the confiscation. But after protracted study by his legal department and careful consideration, he affirmed; the property, however, "to be subject to" confiscation.

During the administration of John McCloy, who, as high commissioner, succeeded Clay, nothing was ever done to put the confiscation into effect. In now annulling the confiscation, McCloy asserts that confiscation was not decreed in any other Nuremberg case, that nothing special was proved against defendant Krupp to warrant such discrimination against him, and that American tradition does not favor confiscation. He forgets that the proof against Krupp was very special—that Krupp obtained the industrial

properties with Hitler's aid as a reward for criminality, that he used them as the instrumentality for perpetrating his slave-labor crimes, and that he enriched them by criminal spoliation and plundering.

What price expediency? Krupp has been welcomed back by the Germans as a war hero, instead of a war criminal. The English, including conservative newspapers, have expressed bitter indignation, and so have the French. The Russians have been arming themselves with this new propaganda material, perhaps while wondering if they can make another deal with the Krupps. We, who criticize the UN on China, have created a new kind of international crime—crime without punishment.

H. R. 1, Veterans' Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me several days ago to extend my remarks, I am inserting a joint letter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and AMVETS to each Member of the United States Senate, which makes quite clear the views of these veterans' organizations on the amendment of H. R. 1, the veterans' insurance bill, which passed the House on January 24, 1951, by a vote of 390 to 0. The letter referred to follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, are concerned and confused by the announcement made on the Senate floor on February 22 that a motion is to be made by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, probably on Monday, February 26, to substitute the bill S. 84 for the twice House-passed H. R. 1 which was also unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

It is our opinion that S. 84 is merely stopgap legislation and highly discriminatory against the service-connected disabled exserviceman. We concede that S. 84 will take care of the able-bodied veteran.

We are convinced that H. R. 1 is good and meritorious legislation. It provides (1) universal, automatic, gratuitous protection for all persons entering into the Armed Forces after June 27, 1950, in the amount of $10,000, (2) it provides protection for those individuals who are disabled by reason of service-connection disability by granting them the right to procure insurance at standard Government rates after discharge, (3) the bill will result in substantial savings to the United States Government of an estimated $60,000,000 per year and will, in the final analysis, remove the Government from the insurance business, (4) the bill would eliminate the need for excessive civilian and military manpower in administering an insurance program in time of national emergency. The Assistant Administrator for Insurance of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Harold Breining, has stated that we should not repeat the experience of the last war where manpower was not available to adequately administer this program.

The principles outlined in H. R. 1 have been advocated by the President in his budget message for 1951. They have been endorsed by the Hook Commission, which was specifically established to study ways and means of improving the efficiency of the military service. They were also proposed by the Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, after 9 months' extensive investigation. H. R. 1 is endorsed by the undersigned three major veterans' organizations who have specific mandates from their membership urging the passage of the bill. H. R. 1 is endorsed by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget as well.

Finally, H. R. 1 received extensive consideration over a period of about 8 months in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, which on two occasions unanimously reported a bill carrying out the general provisions of a gratuitous indemnity approach. As a result of their recommendations on two occasions, the House of Representatives has approved the proposal unanimously.

It is inconceivable to us, in view of all the endorsements which H. R. 1 has received, that we could be very wrong in urging its passage. We therefore urge your serious consideration in opposing S. 84 which is to be offered.

Should S. 84 be adopted by the Senate in lieu of H. R. 1, it is our considered judgment that the House conferees will not accept this proposal and thus kill all chances of vitally necessary insurance legislation in this Congress. The adoption of S. 84 in lieu of H. R. 1 would be a method of killing with kindness a progressive and meritorious piece of veterans' legislation.

In the firm belief that the primary responsibility of the Federal Government insofar as subsidized insurance is concerne is to the service-connected disabled and does not extend to the able-bodied veteran, we urge that H. R. 1 be passed by the Senate as reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Legislative Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans.
RUFUS H. WILSON,
Acting Legislative Director, AMVETS.

American Taxpayers Reduce National Debts for European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio talk broadcast over Michigan stations this week:

My fellow Americans, only once in the past 19 years has our Federal Government made a payment on the national debt of the United States.

That was done by the Republican Eightieth Congress, which reduced the national debt by $6,000,000,000. It was done over the protests of the Truman administration, and was one of the reasons the President so vigorously denounced that Congress.

In view of this record, it is a startling thing to learn that, in the past 2½ years, American tax money has gone to reduce the national debt of five European countries to the tune of $1,200,000,000.

You who are taxpayers in the Third Congressional District of Michigan have a share in this amazing bit of administration generosity to foreign countries—even though it was done without your consent and, very likely, without your knowledge. Your share in this unauthorized gift, figured conservatively on a per capita basis, was nearly $3,000,000.

Today I want to tell you how it has happened that the administration's only debt-reduction program has been one for the exclusive benefit of foreign countries and foreign taxpayers—at your expense.

In order to make clear just what I am talking about, let me ask you to suppose that you had given a friend or relative a certain amount of money with which to start in business. Understand that you gave him the money—not merely loaned it to him. And your purpose in giving him the money to start the business was to enable him to be independent and earn his own way thereafter. Then suppose that you found that, instead of using the money to start in business, he had used all, or a large part, of that money to pay off old debts. I do not need to put your reaction to that into words.

That, in simplest terms, is exactly what has been happening under the so-called Marshall plan. Since 1948, the United States has given the countries of Western Europe some $10,000,000,000. These gifts were intended, primarily, to help these countries restore their productive capacity and so earn their own way. Instead, five European countries have used part or virtually all of the money to pay old debts.

The story of what has happened is disclosed in the latest report of the Economic Cooperation Administration. As you know, ECA is the Federal agency responsible for carrying out the Marshall plan.

Here's the record of the payments made in this manner on the national debt of these five foreign countries:

Norway has paid off $73,500,000 of its national debt: Denmark, $88,300,000.

Austria, who was our enemy in both world wars, had paid $55,000,000 on its national debt. France has paid $171,400,000.

Britain's socialist government has cut its national debt in this manner a total of $784,100,000, or more than three-quarters of a billion dollars.

That's a grand total of foreign debt reduction of $1,202,300,000. All by courtesy of the American taxpayer.

And this has been done with the approval of ECA—the Federal agency created by the Congress to supervise the Marshall plan and direct expenditures made under that plan.

Perhaps you will be interested in knowing just how this has been worked.

Under the Marshall plan, ECA makes available from funds voted by the Congress—that is, from American tax moneys or from money borrowed by your Government—specific amounts to the countries participating in the plan.

These foreign governments, in turn, use this money to buy specific items of machinery, raw materials, and other goods. The governments then sell these materials to the individual citizens or business concerns of their respective countries. These individual purchasers pay their government for these materials in the currency of their country.

This currency is deposited in a special fund, called a counterpart fund. Five percent of this counterpart fund is set aside for the United States, to pay the ECA administrative expense and to buy strategic materials which our country needs. Incidentally, the United States has found it very difficult to get the countries we are helping to sell us the strategic materials we need. But that is another sorry story.

The remaining 95 percent of the moneys deposited in the counterpart fund is given to the government of the particular country, to be used for purposes approved by ECA. It has the intent of the Congress that this money should be used primarily for pro-

ductive purposes—that is for investment in industry and business which would help stimulate economic recovery and put the European countries back on their feet.

That sounds fine, doesn't it?

Yet a former ECA official admits that in certain countries almost the entire amount of counterpart funds has been used for the retirement of debt—that is, for paying off the national debt of those countries.

The latest ECA report bears out this statement. It shows that of the total counterpart funds which had been approved by ECA for use by foreign countries as of November 30, 1950, 23 percent—nearly one-fourth—was used to reduce the national debt of those governments.

The excuse offered for ECA approval of this use of Marshall plan funds is that it would have increased inflation in these countries to use the money to build up productive enterprises. Apparently it never occurred to the planners in Washington that this money could have been paid back to the United Statec and used to reduce our national debt of $256,000,000,000. Moreover, these very countries, whose national debt has been reduced by American taxpayers' money, are now looking to the same hard-pressed American taxpayers for many more billions to help finance their military defense program.

It's interesting to note, in this connection, that the per capita national debt of every one of these five European countries was already lower, in 1948, than the present per capita national debt of the United States. In fact, our country's national debt, per capita, is 22 times that of Denmark's—one of the beneficiaries of the administration's generosity.

The administration always has one stock answer, one threadbare plea, whenever it is proposed to cut ECA appropriations, or whenever objection is raised to Marshall plan nations diverting products to iron curtain countries, or whenever any other criticism of the Marshall plan is offered in Congress.

We must not, we are told, "do anything to cause the people of Europe to feel that the United States no longer cares for their well-being," or that "we are no longer standing in their corner in the fight against communism."

They offer this plea, despite the fact that admittedly the people of Europe either are largely unaware of the $10,000,000,000 thus far spent under the Marshall plan or are resentful of American "charity."

There are some of us in Washington (in Congress and not in the executive branch of the Government, I can assure you) who have felt for a long time that some of this tender concern for people's feelings should be directed to the American taxpayer. Isn't it just possible that he sometimes wonders whether anyone cares for his well-being?

I believe that more and more American people are feeling that way. I believe that their mounting concern and anger arises not primarily from hurt sensitivities but from grave alarm over the threat which this and myriad other forms of the administration's wastefulness hold for the solvency and security of the Nation. It was that very concern which prompted me, among other reasons, to vote against the Marshall plan in the first place.

It was just because of this urgent need for concern for the American taxpayer—and the American economy—that I introduced a joint resolution in the House this week, calling for revival and permanent establishment of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Department. I believe the Nation, and the Congress, are in desperate need of the continuing counsel and aid of this highly competent national "citizen's committee." That need is underscored by the President's grandiose 1952 budget proposals.

Yes; concern for the American taxpayer and his burden of national debt is long overdue. At stake are all of the things we cherish; at stake are our economic stability, our freedom, our military security, the preservation of our republic form of government—and even our cherished, and ofttimes misguided, desire to be a good samaritan to the rest of the world.

Appeal for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the following petition received by me from the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, together with the supporting statement signed by its directors:

APPEAL FOR UNITY

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 11, 1951.

There is such disunity and cross purpose in our country today that it is the duty of organizations such as ours to express their views to those who hold in their hands the destiny of our country and the peace and welfare of the world.

We believe that both in and out of Congress free expression of views should be encouraged, and that those who state their opinion should not be subjected to personal attack or intimidation.

Bitter personal attacks upon our President and Secretary of State have seriously undermined the influence of this great Nation, particularly in carrying out its foreign policy. Our billions and the young men we are calling to the colors at great sacrifice will lose much of their effectiveness if these attacks continue.

The attacks against Woodrow Wilson began much as those on the President and Secretary Acheson. They grew out of honest differences of opinion, but soon developed into a shameful orgy of misrepresentation and villification. In the end the peace was lost, the League was hopelessly crippled, and a Second World War was in the making.

It would be a catastrophe if the United States should for the second time within the memory of living men forfeit the leadership of the world. This could easily come about. Other nations are not unmindful of our historic about-face following World War I, when the policies of Woodrow Wilson, which had won almost universal support and had literally become the hope of the world, were repudiated.

We doubt if democracy, as we have known it, could survice another and more terrible world war. This appeal is addressed to Congress in the hope that the representatives of the people will stand firm for those fundamental policies which have the approval of a vast majority of Americans and represent our best hope for avoiding another world war.

LOUIS H. PINK,
Chairman,
CLEVELAND RODGERS,
Vice Chairman,
ERNEST L. BOGART,
Treasurer,
LENORE TURNER,
Secretary,
Citizens Conference on International Economic Union.

NONPARTISAN SUPPORT OF ENLIGHTENED FOREIGN POLICY

United States: We have asked the nations to put their faith in us but we do not trust each other. The personal attacks which have been made upon our Government, and our Secretary of State, in carrying out the mandate received from the Congress and the President, have weakened the confidence of the world in our leadership and our ability to carry on consistently and courageously a guided, desire to be a good samaritan to the democratic nations.

United Nations: When the United Nations was born at San Francisco we believed that world unity had been achieved; that peoples would plan together and work out their problems; that there would be an end to major wars.

Despite the many advances made through the United Nations and the great hope which still clings to the possibilities of that body there is far less unity and understanding today than at San Francisco in 1945. Not only are the nations further divided—they are compelled to choose between two bitterly hostile blocks. But we must not lose faith in the United Nations. It is still our best hope for peace.

Korea and China: While our main problem lies with Russia and Europe, the Korean situation causes grave disunion in Congress and among our allies; it affects the sound development of all fundamental policies. We should have done a better job in rehabilitating South Korea, as the Citizens Conference pointed out over 3 years before the attack by the North Koreans. If the United States had built up a stronger South Korea and had made it clear when we removed our Armed Forces that we would return to defend the Republic against military aggression, there might have been no attack.

Mistakes have doubtless been made in appraising the strength and will of Communist China. If we had admitted the Peiping government to the United Nations as our allies wanted us to do, and had not backed a regime which no longer governs China, events might have been different. If our forces had stopped at the thirty-eighth parallel, or with the taking of the northern capital, the Chinese might not have attacked. But despite errors of judgment, the United Nations and the United States made no mistake in going into Korea to repel the aggressor and succor the Korean Republic which we had jointly created. Had we not done so, we would have sacrificed almost at its birth the power of the United Nations and its future usefulness. Had we failed to take the risk, small nations everywhere would have given up hope and made the best deal they could with the great powers.

The strength and influence of the League of Nations was sapped when it allowed Italy to attack Abyssinia and Japan to take over Manchuria. Then and there the hope for the League as a world order which would protect small peoples against aggressive war ended.

In principle we did the right thing in Korea, though we have not yet succeeded in this difficult humanitarian adventure. We must see it through, but in doing so we must realize that China is not a natural enemy of the United Nations or the United States. We should not appease. Neither should we sacrifice civilization in North and South Korea and the lives of our own youth and of our allies to save the face of any individual, or the United Nations, or the United States.

The solution of Korea must be evolved at the council table. Shall it be now or after more blood has been spilled? Obviously we cannot admit China to the United Nations so long as it is at war with the body it seeks to join. But to shed more blood to uphold procedure will not be tolerated by our people or our allies. All vital matters affecting Korea and Asia can and should be discussed

over the table. The discussion should include the future admission of the Chinese Government, when it is no longer at war, and has agreed to a program approved by the United Nations.

Aggressive communism: The aid we are giving to Yugoslavia has had a sobering effect upon that opinion in the United States which sought to combat communism as an anti-religious force. Can we not now say that as a matter of national policy it is not communism as such we are arming to combat, but revolutionary, expansionist communism which seeks to spread its doctrines not by legitimate example, but by terror and force. A religious war against communism as such would be as futile as the religious wars of Europe which ravaged the Continent, brought hunger and misery, set back civilization, and promoted neither Catholicism nor Protestantism.

For the North Atlantic Defense Treaty: Mr. Hoover's appeal, which has received consideration because he speaks above political partisanship, offers an easy but unthinkable retreat from the responsibilities we have assumed. The United States must go through with the obligations which it has pledged to Europe. We have covenanted not only support to the UN, which we must continue in all honor, but (with the almost unanimous ratification of the Senate) to carry out the North Atlantic Defense Treaty, along with Canada and 10 European countries. The treaty has been implemented at Brussels by the appointment of General Eisenhower as Supreme Commander. General Eisenhower cannot succeed unless he is backed by a large majority of Congress.

Such arms and aid as these nations need we must help to supply. Our allies must be assured that they can rely upon the United States to carry out its obligations in good faith and full measure. If there is any doubt of our commitment and our intention, Russia may consider our weakness an invitation to aggression, as happened in Korea.

Rearming of Germany: There is great perplexity in the public mind regarding the rearming of Western Germany, not only in the United States but in the United Nations and among our allies. We must not forget that we fought the biggest war in history, at untold cost in human life and money, to disarm Germany and Japan and bring them as partners into a society of self-governing nations devoted to peace and international cooperation. Neither can we overlook the fact that the rearming of Germany will be a direct challenge to Russia which may help to promote a shooting war. More than military strategy is at stake. The decision so far as Germany is concerned should be made primarily by the European nations close to both Germany and Russia, and by the Germans themselves.

Point 4: The development of technical assistance for backward areas known as point 4 and carried on in cooperation with the United Nations is one of the most necessary and hopeful activities in which we are engaged. Revolutionary communism is the product of hunger and misery more than of Marxian doctrine. To secure peace we must tackle the fundamental causes of war and follow up technical assistance with capital. European recovery under the Marshall plan is a tangible example of what may be accomplished under point 4 on a more adequate scale.

Support for President and State Department: If our President and Secretary of State are strengthened by support at home and we provide sound leadership we can build up the defense forces of the free nations to effective strength and jointly provide for the common defense of our homes and those human rights without which life is not worth living.

We canot succeed in this great undertaking if the carping personal attacks upon our Secretary of State are continued in rancor and to serve party purposes. All peoples pray against resort to war. Only a strong and unified United States, in full cooperation with the United Nations, can preserve the peace.

Signed by the following directors of the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, 60 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.: Louis H. Pink, chairman of the board, Associated Hospital Service of New York; Cleveland Rodgers, member, City Planning Commission, New York City; Ernest L. Bogart, professor of economics emeritus, University of Illinois; Arthur E. Albrecht, chairman, Department of Business Administration, CCNY; Harry Best, professor of economics, University of Kentucky; George Boas, professor of philosophy, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Gladys Boone, chairman, division of social studies, Sweetbriar College, Va.; Louis E. Fine, lecturer and lawyer, New York City; Rt. Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, suffragan bishop, Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York; Karl W. H. Scholz, professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.; Lenore Turner, secretary, Citizens Conference, New York City.

Tribute to Thomas A. Edison by George E. Stringfellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gratefully We Honor Thomas A. Edison," published in the Call, of Paterson, N. J., on February 10. The editorial makes reference to the tribute paid to Mr. Edison by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N. J.

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

GRATEFULLY WE HONOR THOMAS A. EDISON

Tomorrow is the birthday anniversary of New Jersey's illustrious inventor, who is still in the forefront of the great inventive geniuses of America and the world. Thomas Alva Edison first saw the light of day 104 years ago, and while still in his teens began his phenomenal inventive career that was to bless humanity with the marvels of electric light, power, and heat, and with hundreds of other inventions that brought us such universal joys as the phonograph, the talking motion picture, and the improved telephone.

Paterson Rotary, which believes with the Call that Edison's birthday should be honored and commemorated by every American, especially here in his home State of New Jersey where these modern miracles flowed from his inspired brain, practiced what it preached at Thursday's meeting by devoting the program hour to pay homage to this truly heroic American. And no more appropriate way could this outstanding Rotary Club find to high-light the occasion than to have as the orator of the day, George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Edison Industries, who worked side by side with the wizard of Menlo Park with tireless devotion to produce and make available the products of Edison's genius to every home and to every nation in the world.

Stringfellow inspiringly recounted the obstacles and handicaps, which would have made most men give up in despair, but which Edison with his never-give-up philosophy turned into stepping stones of success. One of these misfortunes was his deafness, caused by a conductor who picked him up by the ears at the age of 12, an affliction which instead of crushing his optimistic spirit goaded him on to the discovery of the phonograph and an improved telephone transmitter that first made the telephone commercially practical, because Bell's magneto receiver was too weak for long distances.

The spirit of Thomas A. Edison, the eternal optimist and champion of free American enterprise, is needed today as never before to lighten our way and lift us through the world's encircling gloom victorious. Through his inventions and scientific discoveries, this beloved genius and benefactor of mankind has placed in our hands unlimited possibilities, which if rightly utilized by an appreciative citizenry, all working together, in a spirit o. patriotism to step up production instead of pulling apart and laying down our tools in a spirit of selfishness to cripple it, will once again bring us safely through the shadows and dispel tyranny's latest threat in the guise of godless communism.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway, made by Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, before the House Committee on Public Works.

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

STATEMENT BY CHARLES E. WILSON BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

I am here this morning to support legislation that will enable construction to begin as soon as possible on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as one that is both vital to our national economic strength and urgent in terms of our mobilization requirements.

My remarks this morning will be brief, the details concerning this project being supplied by other witnesses who will appear before you or have already done so. I wish to limit myself to the central facts of the matter as I see them as Director of Defense Mobilization.

In approaching this matter I have, of course, availed myself of the studies that have been made by other agencies of the Government, including those of the National Security Resources Board. I understand that the Board's report of last spring, together with the recent supplement bringing it up to date, has already been placed before you and incorporated in the record. I have

examined these studies and concur entirely in their conclusions and recommendations.

The mobilization problems we face today have been set forth very clearly and succinctly by the President. In his recent Economic Report, he said: "In the first place, we must achieve a large and very rapid increase in our armed strength, while helping to strengthen our allies. This means more trained men in uniform, more planes, tanks, ships, and other military supplies. Second, we must achieve, as rapidly as possible, an expansion of our capacity for producing military supplies. This * * * must be large enough to enable us to swing rapidly into full-scale war production if necessity should require. And third, we must maintain and expand our basic economic strength * * * so that we can continue to grow stronger rather than weaker if it should prove necessary to continue a defense effort of great size for a number of years."

I need not elaborate on the central and critical importance which steel has in a program to step up our military strength, expand our industrial capacity, and strengthen our industrial base generally. At all times—in peace, in war, and in every stage of preparedness for war—steel is fundamental. Our entire industrial economy is based upon it. Steel is required for producing munitions and military supplies of almost every character and it is required for the expansion of our capacity to produce these vital items. Moreover, during periods of emergency many of our most critical shortages are traceable to the fact that large quantities of steel must be diverted to the defense effort. With respect to problems resulting from the steel shortage during World War II, the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, said:

"Steel, always the backbone of America's economy, is the keystone of our war production. But it has come very close to being the stumbling block. Almost all of our strategic material shortages today could be relieved sooner if we had steel. The aviation gasoline program, the synthetic rubber program, the shipping program, the aircraft program, all have suffered for lack of steel. We have been short of both gross tonnage and the specialized types of steel. Our fuel oil and gasoline shortages, our farm machinery shortage, our railroad problems, our housing difficulties, could be relieved if sufficient steel were available."

With this recent experience in mind, the expansion of steel capacity and related facilities is being pushed to the fullest extent possible. As this expansion proceeds, we face a steadily growing problem of securing a supply of iron ore that is adequate for the expanded steel-making capacity. Without a matching increase in the supply of iron ore, an increase of capacity, whatever its size, can do us no good.

At this critical juncture we must face the fact that the reserves of high-grade ore which have been the mainstay of the steel industry for 50 years are running out. Whether their practical exhaustion is only a decade away or will not overtake us for two or three decades more, we face the hard fact that the annual supply which they yield is dwindling year by year. Meantime our requirements of ore are moving up sharply. This means that our dependence on foreign ore will increase year by year. It means that because of this growing dependence we must be concerned with the development of foreign sources and with means of insuring that supply from these sources actually reaches American steel mills.

The dimensions of this problem can be quickly stated. The ingot capacity of the American steel industry is now being expanded to an expected total of 115,000,000 tons by the end of 1952. It is believed that further expansion at a rate of about 2,000,000 tons a year is feasible thereafter, provided the necessary ore can be brought in. Our thinking, therefore, must be in terms of a capacity of 130,000,000 ingot tons by 1960.

The NSRB report before you sets forth the compelling reasons to believe that to operate a 130,000,000-ton steel industry in 1960 might require as much as 160,000,000 gross tons of ore. Furthermore, if the ore requirements run that high, we would be forced to look to sources outside the United States for more than 40,000,000 tons of ore a year. Unless we plan now to assure a supply of this size in 1960 we may find ourselves unable to utilize the steel industry we can have by then, vital as it is sure to be to our economic strength and military security.

We are using 1960 as a goal simply because this represents about the longest look ahead that we can reasonably take in staking out our plans for the longer pull. It should be emphasized, however, that the task of obtaining sufficient ore in 1960 is but a prolongation of the task of obtaining sufficient ore during the intervening years. It is widely felt in the industry that as early as 1955 we shall begin really to feel the pinch of our dwindling domestic supply.

Other witnesses will testify to the efforts that have been made by a number of our steel companies to discover new reserves of iron ore. One such reserve—very large and very promising—is now in process of development in South America to meet the growing needs of American steel mills. Another important and promising reserve has been discovered on this continent in Labrador.

These iron ore reserves lie close to the surface, which makes them of particular importance in a situation where other sources may be cut off either partially or entirely. Once active production is under way, it can be rapidly expanded by the simple device of putting additional scoop shovels to work. This is a characteristic possessed in the past by much of the Lake Superior reserves, where open-pit mining continues to be the predominant method. As the operation proceeds, however, less and less of the remaining reserves is capable of being immediately opened up. That is why our annual supply of iron ore from these reserves is dwindling and why we must look elsewhere for the readily expansible supply that we must have in time of emergency.

These are the fundamental considerations that have brought me to the conclusion that the St. Lawrence seaway—in addition to its undoubted general contribution to our transportation system—is essential if we are to put our steel production, which is to say our entire mobilization effort, on a solid and secure foundation. Without the seaway we shall become steadily more vulnerable in this most strategic of all strategic industries. We must not permit that to happen.

This is a dual-purpose project, however, and the seaway is only one of its purposes. In my own thinking this phase alone provides the overwhelming case for approving the project and rushing its construction. But electric power is also essential to defense production.

At the outset of World War II the private and public power systems of the Nation had substantial reserves of electric generating capacity. By contrast, however, recent estimates indicate that in many regions margins of reserve capacity are now relatively small and in certain areas there will continue to be shortages for several years in spite of major capacity expansion programs.

Moreover, experience in 2 years has demonstrated that although capacity may be adequate to meet civilian loads, the impact of mobilization requirements must be expected to make an additional cheap power supply essential. Increased production of the aluminum, ferro-alloys, and other electrometallurgical and electrochemical products which mobilization requires can be achieved only by increased use of electric power. That is why electric power projects throughout the country are being pressed to early completion and new ones are being planned. None of these is more important than the St. Lawrence project which will furnish large quantities of additional power to important industrial areas where critical shortages were felt in both wars. We need the seaway and we need the power too, both for the special needs of defense and for our economic strength over the longer pull.

In all this our Canadian neighbors have a joint interest. We all realize that the national security of our two countries is closely linked. Our defense plans have to a significant degree been worked out jointly and it is the joint operation of our free economies that gives this continental defense effort its essential industrial base. The new transportation route and the additional power supply that the St. Lawrence dual-purpose project will make available will contribute to the development of Canada's huge resources and to making her an even stronger partner of the United States, whether in peace or in war.

As Director of Defense Mobilization, I have had to weigh the advantages I have discussed against the cost, in terms of manpower and materials, which the construction of this project would impose. My support of the project, therefore, takes into account this important consideration.

To explain my judgment on this let me point out that none of the materials requirements set forth in the NSRB report constitutes as much as one-half of 1 percent of our annual supply. For example, the 30,000 tons of steel a year required for the project is something less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of our current ingot production. The copper requirements of 500 tons a year amounts to one-twentieth of 1 percent of the annual supply from domestic ores alone. Even in the case of cement, where the fraction is largest, 750,000 barrels a year is approximately three-tenths of 1 percent of the annual supply that can be counted on during the 5-year period of construction. In each instance, therefore, the amount of materials required is so small as to be negligible in the total mobilization framework.

The same is true in the case of manpower. In addition to the manpower engaged in producing and moving the materials needed for the project, its construction will require 7,000 American workers on the site. This is equivalent to hardly more than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the civilian labor force.

It is with these insignificant fractions of our available supply of materials and manpower that we can purchase, if we act wisely and promptly, the vital and strategic advantages that construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project can confer. It is my hope that promptly upon conclusion of these hearings the committee will overwhelmingly approve this legislation and send it to the floor of the House for early action.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday I had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, before a

House committee, in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway. I neglected to ask consent to have printed in that connection General Marshall's introductory statement, which should have been printed preceding the printing of the testimony of Mr. Small. I now ask unanimous consent to have General Marshall's introductory statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The testimony of Mr. Small, to which General Marshall referred, was printed in yesterday's RECORD.

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

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

(Statement of Secretary of Defense General Marshall before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, Wednesday, February 21, 1951)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, the Department of Defense, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, supports the House joint resolution now before your committee which would permit implementation of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and recommends its adoption by the Congress.

Our support is based on the advantages to national defense that this project offers.

First, the seaway, when completed, will increase the flow of high-grade iron ore for the production of steel for munitions and other purposes from the Labrador-Quebec area, which is now being developed. Unless the seaway is built, obtaining ore from this new source will present serious problems of transportation, including the hazards of wartime sea transportation. On the other hand, the accessibility of the Labrador-Quebec area made possible by the seaway would supplement our present supply and would furnish a substantial additional source if our present primary source should be seriously reduced. Freedom from submarine attack does not, of course, mean full security. The risk of interruption of the new seaway by enemy sabotage must be faced. The danger of sabotage, however, is already of critical importance at the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, through which our Lake Superior ores are brought in such vast quantity. Until the seaway is built, almost the whole of our iron-ore supply is subject to interruptions by a single act of sabotage there.

Second, the power project in connection with the seaway will provide additional sources of cheap and independent power so necessary, especially in the case of an all-out mobilization.

Third, the seaway will facilitate the transportation of munitions to overseas bases. Moreover, in case of atomic attack, transportation could be diverted from one city to another. It is realized that the seaway will be closed for months every year because of ice conditions, but that is equally true of the present Great Lakes transportation route from the Mesabi Range to which all interested parties have successfully adjusted their operations.

Fourth, the seaway will afford access to additional shipbuilding and repairing facilities always very necessary in time of war to the maintenance of our supremacy on the high seas.

Finally, it should increase the capabilities of mutual defense between Canada and the United States.

I have brought with me Mr. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, who can explain in some detail the industrial mobilization aspects of the project.

For the record, I want to add that the project has had the approval of the Department of Defense in the past and that I supported it before a committee of Congress as Secretary of State.

We are still in the fortunate position of being able to buy time, insofar as this project is concerned. We have not yet run short of iron ore in continental United States. Our annual supply from the Lake Superior region is declining, however, in a period when our requirements are mounting rapidly. We must have other sources readily available. It is urgent that this project be begun promptly, so that by the time we must depend heavily on foreign sources of ore supply it will be ready.

Negro GI Record in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging military developments in our history has been the participation of colored Americans in the fighting in Korea. My own experience both with the American and the French Armies, long ago impelled me to urge that colored and white soldiers be integrated as much as possible. In this connection, the dispatch by Mr. Robert R. Brunn in the Christian Science Monitor, which has been called to my attention by Mr. Clifford C. Douglass, of Boston, is of particular interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

NEGRO GI RECORD IN KOREA COMBATS FOE'S "BIAS" TUNE

(By Robert R. Brunn)

SAN FRANCISCO.—The record of American Negro troops in Korea has been of tremendous value in combating Communist racial discrimination propaganda against the United States in Asia, reports Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Marshall had just returned to the United States after more than a month in Korea and Japan where he completed the first nongovernmental investigation of treatment of American Negro soldiers at the front ever made.

OUTSTANDING RECORD

Negro troops have established a record that defies comparison with whites, Mr. Marshall believes, despite segregation in Korea which he claims has led to hurried, unfair courts martial and heavy sentences which have amounted to discrimination.

Through the NAACP, Mr. Marshall will continue to press for the reversal of all but 3 of 50 court-martial convictions of Negroes to date. This follows front-line talks with troops involved, the men themselves, and examination of court records. Mr. Marshall received the fullest cooperation from General MacArthur on down.

He makes a plea for the complete integration of Negroes into Army units, defining this as fitted in as to merit, wherever a man is needed. At present, he said, Negroes in American forces are usually not integrated below a battalion level. That is, the smallest mixed unit is a battalion with all-Negro and all-white companies.

LONG BATTLE SERVICE

He reports that the all-Negro Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, with predominantly Caucasian officers, has been fighting at the apex in its United Nations sector almost always since entering battle in July last year.

It is his conviction that an equally trained and educated Negro soldier will run no faster and no slower than any other man in battle. He told of Negro bravery, devotion to duty, and staggering casualties.

As for the courts martial of 50 Negroes, 32 of them for misbehavior in the presence of the enemy, he believes this an unrealistic figure. This figure is for the Twenty-fifth Division, of which the Twenty-fourth Infantry is a part. In this division the ratio is one Negro to between every three and four whites. Yet, he says, only 2 white soldiers were convicted compared with the 32 Negroes.

UNEQUAL PENALTIES CHARGED

He gave parallel cases which, he said, were typical. One was that of a white soldier at a forward position who disappeared and later was found way behind the lines. He was given a 5-year sentence, later lowered to 1 year by the division commander.

J. P. Morgan, a Negro, was charged with being absent from his outfit and sentenced to life imprisonment. He had shown he was hospitalized at the time, during a period of manpower shortage when only great need would have allowed hospitalization. On NAACP protest, this sentence was commuted to 5 years and suspended by the Army review board in Washington.

WANTS MASS TRIALS ENDED

Mr. Marshall told of many other cases of court martial in the heat of battle where he feels discrimination, which he traces to segregation of Negroes in the Army, operated to bring a finding of guilt and unusually long sentences that were not justified.

In his report to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Mr. Marshall asks that what he calls mass trials be ended—that is, a practice which he describes as running them through one after another. He asked more time for the preparation of defense cases, and trial in an atmosphere where justice is more possible.

He told of several trials which lasted less than 50 minutes, including all arguments, statements, and formalities. Most of these brought life sentences.

NEGRO COURT AIDES

Without waiting for a complete report from Mr. Marshall, the NAACP has represented 21 Negro servicemen before the review board in Washington. Four men who received 10 years each were exonerated. Six others had life sentences commuted to 20 years, another to 15, another to 10, four sentenced to 20 years were reduced to 5 years each. There were other reductions.

In Korea, he said, the men have had the right to ask for enlisted men on the court, and Negro enlisted men have sat. One defense counsel was a Negro officer. Some of the charges have been preferred by Negro officers.

He said that both the Navy and the Air Force in Japan have racial integration, and, to the best of his knowledge, the Air Force is the most complete of all. This integration includes officers.

But, from his observation, the Army in Japan has absolutely no integration. He said there was not a single Negro among the hundreds of soldiers and officers in the Supreme Command, Allied Powers headquarters in the Daichi Building. He also remarked the absence of Negroes in the elite military police force which guards General MacArthur.

An independent investigation of court-martial conditions, down to the smallest detail, is being made by the Judge Advocate General's office in Tokyo.

Opening of Meetings of United Nations With Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Altoona Mirror, sent to me by Hon. J. Banks Curtis, a former distinguished Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, who suggests that it is fine reading. I have gone over the editorial myself, and it is a magnificent one, suggesting to the American people the religious side of life during the critical period in which we are living.

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

OUR FATHER'S LAND

This is our father's land. The argument advanced in some places that the sessions of the United Nations cannot be opened with prayer for fear of offending some of the member nations which do not profess Christianity should be judged against that fact. Our father's land has been bought with the blood of many generations, consecrated by the lives of devout men and women, blessed for many generations with an abundance that is not and has not been equaled in the realm of recorded history.

Why should we hesitate to give unto God the praise and credit for the many blessings that have been bestowed upon us? Have we also supinely surrendered to the UN our constitutional right of freedom to worship? Many guests from many lands have been entertained throughout the years in your homes and in mine and at least the right to give thanks at mealtime has never been suspended out of deference to the tender feelings of any guest or friend. I do not believe that any Christian American takes offense when traveling abroad when the hour of prayer comes and the inhabitants of that land turn their faces to Mecca or to some other shrine.

The nationals of other lands love their fatherlands, but Americans have more than a fatherland to love and revere. They share with but one other nation the certain knowledge that here is a land that is dedicated to the Almighty. There was no doubt about this in the minds of the founding fathers. There was no doubt in the minds of the framers of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution. There was no doubt about it in Abraham Lincoln's mind when he breathed life into immortal words at Gettysburg. There is no doubt about it in the minds and hearts of millions of Americans of February 1951 vintage.

If our shores are to give shelter to the United Nations and our tax money erect the buildings which will house the representatives thereof, we have the right to insist that those who believe in Almighty God have the right to call upon His name and seek His guidance. It would be better for us to withdraw now from any alliance that denies us this right.

Americans have the right to know, and to know now, just what other American liberties are being infringed upon or given away on the pretext of uniting the world. Our liberties are sacred to us and it is beyond the power of either Congress or the executive branch of the Government to dispense with them.

Four score and seven years ago last summer 53,000 brave Americans were casualties in a 3-day battle that stands out in history as one of the costliest military engagements of all times. In the blazing heat of midsummer, wave after wave of brave men charged up the rugged hills and across the crested wheat fields of a Pennsylvania farming community, to be met time and time again by resolute men who threw them back with minnie ball and rifle bullet, with bayonet and clubbed rifle, and finally in desperate hand-to-hand encounter with Bowie knives and other odds and ends of equipment.

That battle and that baptism of blood was the turning point in a great struggle between brothers to decide for all time whether this Nation could exist half slave and half free. Is that dearly bought treasure of human liberty to be offered also on a pagan altar of appeasement? America has paid the price for liberty. She has paid her price for internal unity; but the bloody sacrifices at Gettysburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and innumerable other spots were not made to lower the sum total of individual liberty and human dignity.

The battle of the States was won and the peace that followed that war preserved because men on both sides were the descendants of men who believed in the essential dignity of man and acknowledged the presence and guiding power of a Supreme Being.

Grim men marching south to the martial music of tattered bands in blue, singing under the stars and in the blistering heat of midday "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord," winding up the affairs of a Union of the States until at Appomattox an honorable surrender was arranged and a lasting peace conceived. Tattered, war-weary men in gray and blue wending westward for years after that war seeking new homes, building sod houses, conquering hostiles and adding breadth and dignity to a growing Nation. Glowing campfires, bleached bones along the trails, a period of lawlessness and then inevitably the church and law and order and a new State with a Constitution acknowledging the supremacy of God and guaranteeing the freedom of the individual.

Are all these also to be added to the sacrificial loot on the pagan altar of appeasement? What gods shall we appease, what manner of men are these that the descendants of the Pilgrims, the men in tattered colonial uniform, the men in blue and the men in gray and the men in khaki should bow the knee to them?

We have fought six major wars for that pearl above price—human freedom. We won all of them on the battlefields and will win the one in which we now are engaged on the battlefield. After our first major war for freedom, the American Revolution, we won the peace also because we entrusted that freedom to the consecrated men and women who had won the war. We won the War of 1812 to reaffirm our right to that freedom and once again we won the peace that followed because it was entrusted to the mass of people, those who had won the battles.

We came through the great cauldron of the Civil War and won a setting for the pearl of freedom that encased it with the fine gold which was purified on the altars of a thousand battlefields so that another race of men who dwelt with us might be free. That peace was preserved for us also because it was subjected to the great debates of freemen, openly arrived at decisions and mutual understanding.

In 1898 our men rallied to the banner of freedom from oppression for a neighbor and Cuba was liberated.

Then in 1917 our boys fought again, this time to "save the world for democracy." The boys won the battles, but the peace was lost. We should have learned then and there that individual liberty and national freedom can be preserved only by those who really believe in the sacredness of the individual and in government, by the people, for the people.

Once again in 1941 we rushed in to battle to preserve the free way of life. It is a little too early to say that that peace has been entirely lost. In one nation at least there seems to be hope for the future and that nation oddly enough has entrusted its freedom to a great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Has he ever been afraid to call upon his God for aid and guidance? Has he ever failed to give testimony to the source of his power? Would he be silenced in the halls of the United Nations or anywhere else when it came time to ask for the aid that cometh only from on high?

The battle is joined in Korea. For eight torturous months men have fought against overwhelming odds and in their moments of agony have called upon the God of their fathers to ease their pain, to give to them the victory.

Is that God now to be denied in the halls of the United Nations? "What shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul?"

Statement by Hon. John Marshall Butler, of Maryland, to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections on February 20, 1951.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of personal privilege. Before this committee begins its deliberations, I wish to raise the question as to the type of jurisdiction that the committee proposes to exercise and as to the nature of these proceedings. I shall confine myself to these questions in a brief statement, which I trust the committee will permit me to make, therefore, without interruption.

I am not here in response to any invitation to testify, but solely for the purpose stated. I have been informed that at this hearing witnesses are to be publicly heard whose testimony may involve criticism of me personally, my qualifications, and my conduct of my campaign. I, therefore, earnestly insist that before the hearing of any testimony it is essential for the committee to determine the character of the hearing.

There are only two constitutional powers under which this committee may be acting. Under article I, section 5, clause (1) of our Constitution, the Senate is the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members. Under its legislative powers, it has the authority to make investigations. Since the procedure is totally different and wholly different considerations govern, I submit at the outset it is necessary to determine which kind of hearing is to be conducted. While I have requested information, I have received none, nor have I been given notice

as to any specific charges that the committee's 8 months' investigation may have disclosed which would warrant any contest as to my election, the returns, or as to my qualifications.

First, it must be conceded that I have been duly returned as elected to the United States Senate by the proper Maryland authorities. There is therefore no occasion for the exercise by the Senate of its powers with respect to "elections or returns." The official vote was 326,291 for me and 283,180 for my opponent, showing a majority of 43,111.

Secondly, no question has been raised in Maryland as to my own complete compliance with the Maryland State Corrupt Practices Act. All reports were filed as required by me and my duly registered political agent, Mr. Mundy. Under the Maryland Corrupt Practices Act (Md. Ann. Code, 1939, art. 33, sec. 226), my opponent—or, indeed, any 10 duly qualified voters—could within 30 days after the election have had a complete and speedy investigation by a Maryland court and jury into any alleged violation of the statute. The result of any such judicial investigation would have been under Maryland law made available to this committee and the United States Senate.

Our Maryland law has provided adequate, impartial, judicial means of determining whether Maryland law has been violated. No petition was ever filed in any Maryland court, either within the statutory time or at any time, by my opponent or by any 10 voters, alleging any violation of the Maryland statute.

Does this committee, then, intend to disregard the fact that the Maryland authorities have found no reason to proceed or to take action on any alleged violations? Neither my opponent nor any 10 voters has dared submit such a question to a Maryland court and jury as provided by Maryland law.

Next, I have no personal knowledge of any violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. I filed—and my treasurer has filed—complete statements which I believe were a full compliance with that statute. I have never run for an elective office before, and I do not claim to be an expert in political procedures. In my campaign there were many citizens who volunteered to assist me—a large number of whom had had no prior experience in politics. Since my victory, I have learned that many people unknown to me at the time of the campaign were working independently to assist me.

It is thus impossible for me to state that the investigators of this committee may not have found some technical violations, as, indeed, I suspect could be found in a 3-month investigation of any political campaign. But I can state wholeheartedly and without any qualification whatsoever that I never knowingly have violated a single provision of any statute, and that if any of my supporters have done so, any such violations were technical in character and relatively trivial, and due to inexperience and not to intention.

There is no suggestion that the total amount of my expenditures was excessive compared to expenditures in other senatorial campaigns. It will also be found they were well within the limits of either State or Federal statutes.

As I understand it, during the past 8 months, this committee has been performing a function analogous to that of a grand jury, which is to determine whether there is any probable cause for further action, and to do so in a manner which will protect citizens against frivolous and unfounded public charges.

When it comes to a question of a public hearing, then I submit that before any such public hearing, in a similar manner, this committee should find that there is probable cause therefor. If it found that there was any such probable cause, then may I respectfully remind the committee that the Supreme Court has held (*Barry* v. *Cunningham* (279 U. S. 597, 615)) that in that event this committee acts in its judicial capacity in exercising the power to judge the qualifications of its members. It inevitably follows therefore that if the purpose of this hearing is to inquire into my qualifications or to reflect on me, I am entitled to notice of the charges made, an opportunity to prepare my answer, to assemble my evidence, and an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, as required in every judicial trial. As the Supreme Court said in *In re Oliver* (333 U. S. 257, 273):

"A person's right to reasonable notice of a charge against him, and an opportunity to be heard in his defense—a right to his day in court—are basic in our system of jurisprudence; and these rights include, as a minimum, a right to examine the witnesses against him, to offer testimony, and to be represented by counsel."

I have no information whether any charges have been made against me. There is not and cannot be any suggestion that any technical or trivial irregularities that the investigators may have found in this case are comparable to the wholesale fraud, bribery, or tremendous expenditures which have served as a basis for unseating an elected Senator. No Senator has ever been unseated because of mere irregularities in procedure. In all cases where Senators have been unseated there has been proof of widespread fraud, bribery, or such large expenditures as to suggest wholesale vote buying and that the election was not a true expression of the voters' will. The Supreme Court has said in *Barry* v. *Cunningham*, *supra*, the obvious purpose of the provision in the Constitution empowering the Senate to determine the qualifications of its own Members "was to vest the Senate with authority to exclude persons asserting membership who either had not been elected or, what amounts to the same thing, had been elected by resort to fraud, bribery, corruption, or other sinister methods having the effect of vitiating the elections." I feel certain that the committee, in its 8 months' investigation, found no evidence that would meet this test. Therefore, its purpose must be to conduct an investigation preliminary to possible legislation and not in regard to my qualifications. Such an investigation involves completely and widely different considerations, and I shall be most ready and eager to be of assistance.

The considerations to which I refer are:

First, the question before the committee should not be the Maryland campaign alone, but the campaigns in all 48 States. There is no reason for singling out the State of Maryland.

It is, of course, true that in many States there are political machines and charges of wholesale vote frauds, as the Senators know. I do not need to name the States.

There is no Republican machine in Maryland, which has ever been charged with vote frauds or scandals of that kind. There was no Republican machine in Maryland at the time of my election. Indeed, there had been no Republican governor elected in Maryland since 1934, and only three since the Civil War. There had been no Republican Senator elected in Maryland since 1928. In view of the national publicity as to vote frauds and machine politics in many cities and States of this country, it would seem a little strange for this committee to single out Maryland as a State to be first investigated.

Second, in any investigation as to possible legislation, where it involves the inquiring into a campaign in any State, it may also reflect upon the conduct of the Senator from that State.

Therefore, if ultimately this committee investigates election practices in any State, in all fairness the Senators from that State should have the opportunity to know what witnesses are to be examined, the nature of the testimony proposed to be offered, and an opportunity to produce testimony and cross-examine witnesses.

The Senators know only too well that campaign gossip may be distorted without warrant into charges reflecting on a Senator's honor and integrity. Even if accorded a later opportunity to testify, the truth would never catch up with such charges. If, in an election which I won by the largest majority that has ever been given a Republican senatorial candidate in the history of my State, this committee is going to permit my opponent to use the investigative process as a rostrum to repeat his campaign arguments or to explain away his defeat, then surely this committee is establishing a precedent under which every defeated candidate, especially in close elections, will attempt to do the same thing.

I earnestly suggest to the committee that there would be great danger that hearings conducted to permit defeated candidates to rehash political arguments of a campaign will degenerate into smear attacks on the reputation of Senators under the guise of investigation as to legislation. Moreover, examination of witnesses at public hearings where no bill of particulars has been given as to any complaints inevitably means a fishing expedition which will give wide publicity to vicious campaign gossip.

To restate concisely the question of personal privileges which I have raised about procedure, I submit that the following courses are open to the committee:

1. If it should determine that its preliminary investigation discloses probable cause for my disqualification, I should be given notice of the charges, a list of witnesses, an opportunity to prepare for my defense, and the usual rights accorded in a judicial hearing.

2. If the committee should, as I confidently expect it will, determine that there has been no sufficient evidence produced at its preliminary investigation to warrant an election contest, then it should so report to the Senate. To do otherwise would be manifestly unjust, as it would amount to a prosecution of an elected Senator under the guise of preliminary studies for legislation, without giving him the constitutional rights of a judicial hearing.

Finally, I deeply resent the fact that ex-Senator Millard Tydings emphatically repudiated by the voters of the great State of Maryland, be allowed to blacken the name and reputation of Maryland.

I speak for the Democrats, a large majority of whom voted for me, as well as the Republicans in my State when I charge that my recent opponent, by his reckless and unjustified attacks upon me, is in reality attacking the intelligence and honesty of the voters of Maryland, who have supported me by an unprecedented majority. Despite the fact that on November 7, with a majority of 43,100, the voters of Maryland decreed that ex-Senator Tydings should no longer represent them in the Halls of the United States Congress, he is attempting to go behind their backs and get this committee to overrule their decision.

Do As I Say, Not As I Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, just before he recently left for his European tour and study of conditions abroad,

Drew Pearson penned a column in which he set out the goals and obligations of columnists and commentators. Ostensibly intended as instructions for his staff, his ideas and observations might well serve as a bible of conduct for the fourth estate.

Drew Pearson's column, which appeared in the Washington Post on February 28, 1951, follows:

[From the Washington Post of Wednesday, February 28, 1951]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

NEWSMAN'S OBLIGATIONS CITED

Drew Pearson, departing for a news survey of gathering European war clouds, left the following instructions for his staff:

To the staff: I shall be traveling in Europe and countries adjacent to the iron curtain for the next 2 or 3 weeks. During that time you may have to write an occasional emergency column in case I get too far away from a cable office or the going gets tough.

In writing such columns please bear in mind the following:

Don't hesitate to admit an error. Double and triple check in order to avoid errors, but if you find you are wrong, say so. It is only fair to the man you have wronged, in addition to which the public will respect you for being fair.

If you are sure you are right, however, stick to your guns and if necessary we will battle it out.

Never bear grudges. If a President or a Senator calls you a name, don't call one back. Because he is puerile or small is no reason for you to sink to his level. Write facts; don't go in for name-calling. Any scrivener can fill a column with abuse. Epithets can be culled from any dollar dictionary, but it takes good journalism to ferret out graft or the backstage doings of diplomats or the income-tax cheaters—and then make what you say stand up in court.

SMOKE-FILLED ROOMS

Remember that it is part of your job to right some of the news wrongs of the Capital. The big newspaper chains can be ruthless, their newsmen in a hurry. It is your job to probe deeper than the hand-out or the official statement. You are to pick up where the spot-news men rushing for the telephone or grabbing for the headline, leave off. Frequently the best part of the story is after the spot-news cream has been skimmed.

Remember also that ever since politicians became politicians, the thing the public was not supposed to know has taken place in the private lobbies and the smoke-filled rooms. Yet what is hidden from the public is usually what the public is most entitled to know about, and the job of a good newspaperman to report.

Remember that in our system of government by checks and balances, it is your job to help in the checking. Government is so intricate and detailed today that Congress no longer can do all the checking. Furthermore, Congressmen themselves have to be checked. Most Congressmen are honest and reasonably conscientious, but it is your job to smoke out the Parnell Thomases, the Andy Mays, and the "Doc" Brehms, and report the facts about them—even if it means a tough battle.

FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

However, it is also important to remember that the Government is neither all good nor all bad. There are bureaucrats who are woefully inefficient, and bureaucrats who are a credit to mankind. It is your job to discriminate.

Government is only as good as the men in it. And since men are human, they are subject to all the frailties that make up mankind—laziness, inefficiency, greed, graft, temptation.

But they are also subject to great effort, sacrifice, inspiration.

It is your job as a newspaperman to spur the lazy, watch the weak, expose the corrupt. You must be the eyes, ears, and nose of the American people. Yes, the nose, too, is important. For no matter how much stench you may be exposed to, never lose your sense of smell.

But likewise remember that there are scores of underpaid Government servants dedicated to the cause of good government whom the public never hears of. It is your job to encourage them. It is also your job to let the public know that these men are working for them.

For the public must never lose confidence in its Government. Should it ever take seriously the scoldings of some of my competitors and lose confidence in our form of government, then the principle we are fighting for would be no more.

DEFEND LITTLE FELLOW

Remember also that it's the little fellow who usually gets kicked around. It's the little-business man, the GI, the guy in the lower-bracketed incomes who needs a friend. He has few friends in high places, no big politicians to pull wires, no one to speak for him on interlocking boards of directors. He has only the American public's strong sense of right and wrong to back him—and it's your job to spell out those rights and wrongs so the public can know what cooks.

This applies to minority groups as well as little people. Sometimes these groups, such as the Negroes or a minority religion, need a little more encouragement than the folks who are doing all right anyway.

Finally, remember that though the world moves slowly toward its two great goals—peace and the brotherhood of man—it is your job, when possible, to help accelerate the pace.

Sometimes it is better not to report a delicate diplomatic negotiation. Sometimes the cause of peace is best served by sacrificing a news story until a difficult diplomatic hurdle is over.

But if the diplomats fumble, if they betray their trust, then it is your job to be ruthless in exposing that betrayal. You must be their watchdog. You must let them know what the publicity penalty is—if they fail.

Finally, when you write anything, remember that the fewer words you say it in, the better.

These are the goals of the Washington merry-go-round which I have not lived up to. Perhaps you can.

Truman's Budget Carries His Socialistic Platform and Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an article from the A. F. of L. Weekly News Service:

TRUMAN BUDGET ASKS FUNDS TO HELP DEFENSE WORKERS, EXPAND BENEFITS

WASHINGTON.—President Truman's record-breaking peacetime defense budget submitted to Congress on January 15 outlines a broad program to help workers in defense industries and to expand benefits for all workers.

Mr. Truman asked for $71,594,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. He estimated receipts at more than $55,000,000,000 with the remaining $16,000,000,000 to be raised by new taxes.

He said 69 percent of the total, or $48,900,000,000, would go for military purposes and building up our Armed Forces to resist Soviet Communist aggression.

The President noted that the budget also contained expenditures for programs which will maintain and develop our national strength over the long run, keeping in mind that the present emergency may be of long duration and we must, therefore, be prepared for crises in the more distant as well as in the immediate future.

He thus keyed to the defense program a number of previously recommended Fair Deal measures and reiterated his requests for enactment of legislation necessary to carry them out.

They included health insurance, aid to education, a Fair Employment Practice Act, expansion of social security, and a farm program along lines proposed by Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture.

The President also recommended anew and budgeted funds for a dozen other items requiring legislation, including authority to construct defense plants, higher postal rates, a St. Lawrence seaway and power project, loans for Indians, defense housing incentives and extension of authority to control exports, rents, prices, wages, and the distribution of materials.

Changing Age Distribution of the American Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of an article on the first national conference on aging, which appeared in the January 1951 issue of the Industrial and Labor Relations Review, published by the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. The article, written by the Assistant Federal Security Administrator, Mr. John L. Thurston, tells how this important conference on this all-important subject came into being and was conducted.

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

FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AGING: A PREVIEW OF MATURITY

(By John L. Thurston)

The first national conference on aging was held in Washington August 13-15, 1950. On that occasion 816 delegates from all parts of the country met to consider the total range of problems presented by the changing age distribution of the American population.

The conference was organized around 11 broad subject-matter fields. Non-Government planning committees did the preparatory work on content, conducted the conference work sessions, and are now preparing

reports of the work of the delegates in their sections. The comprehensive volume is expected to constitute a bench mark in the effort of American society to adjust to this major social change.

The total conference is seen as having three phases. The first consisted of the preliminary determination of subject matter to be covered, identification of individuals and interest groups concerned with aging problems, and the selection of delegates. The second phase was that in which the delegates met in Washington to get acquainted with one another, to share their experiences and knowledge in the aging field, and to develop principles and lines of action for the guidance of the many individuals, groups, agencies, and organizations concerned. The third phase is that of disseminating the findings of the delegates through all available media for their stimulus value and for the direction they may afford persons throughout the United States who wish to initiate programs. It is anticipated that this phase will be accomplished by numerous public and private agencies through the printed word, the radio, local conferences, small meetings, discussion groups, and formal courses and lectures.

ORIGIN OF THE CONFERENCE

The conference on aging had its origin in the felt need and requests for help from a varied and growing number of persons and groups who were confronting problems that were not being solved through ordinary techniques, programs, and services.

Medical practitioners and researchers were becoming aware of multiplying numbers of older people with chronic illness and infirmities of aging. Management, labor, and employment offices were becoming concerned over longer-lived workers who wished to remain in gainful employment. Welfare workers were meeting more and more demands for living arrangements for older people. Legislators were continually beset by demands for financial assistance. Here and there communities were finding demands for recognition of older persons in educational, recreational, counseling, and home-service programs. Homes for the aged and mental hospitals were taxed to capacity. Slowly, American society was becoming aware that there was something new and that it required attention.

The problem of aging came to the fore during the 1920's and 1930's in the form of a large surplus of older, unemployed workers, and provided the final impetus for the passage in 1935 of the Social Security Act with the old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance programs. During World War II, it was noted that older workers were making effective contributions in most employment fields. The suspicion arose that there were errors in our notion of the unemployability of older workers and in our assumption that financial need represented the only problem of older people.

In the spring of 1948 the National Health Assembly pointed out that there was a complex of aging problems somewhat related to, but actually quite apart from, the problem of chronic illness. Following a recommendation of the assembly, the Federal Security Agency set up a working committee on aging, composed of representatives of the constituent units. After surveying the field through the literature and with the aid of their colleagues and of competent outside persons, this committee issued a progress report which was sent to several hundred informed people for comment.

In the meantime various groups who had been developing trial programs in their own establishments and communities began to recognize that some aspects of the aging problem were national in scope and would need to be handled accordingly. These groups took the initiative also in asking the Federal Security Agency for a facility through which they could become acquainted with other workers in the field and could check their programs against those being conducted elsewhere.

Late in the spring the President of the United States felt the time had come to make an assessment of the total situation and requested the Federal Security Administrator to do so.

The conference on aging, on a national scale, was called by the Federal Security Administrator in response to this evident mounting interest—the s imuli from outside sources, the immediate and provocative response to the Agency's working committee report, and the desire of the President.

AN EXPLORATORY FORUM

The first decision made was that the conference should be an exploratory forum to be held as soon as it could be organized. It was recognized that, while many people were interested in various aspects of the problem, there was little systematic knowledge on which to organize a definitive program.

The second decision was that the conference should be broad in scope. The studies of the Agency committee had shown that the problems of individual and social adjustment to aging are as broad as life itself. The breadth of subject matter covered is shown in the following 10-section outline around which the conference was organized:

I. (a) Aging research—biological, medical, psychological, sociological aspects.

I. (b) Population changes and economic implications.

II. Employment, employability, rehabilitation.

III. Income maintenance.

IV. Health maintenance and rehabilitiation.

V. Education for an aging population.

VI. Family life, living arrangements, and housing.

VII. Creative and recreational activities.

VIII. Religious programs and services.

IX. Community organization.

X. Professional personnel.

The next decision was that the conference should be essentially a conference by, of, and for persons outside the Federal service. In the end and at the request of the planning committee about 40 Government employees were invited as full-fledged delegates, representing themselves, however, rather than the organizations in which they work.

The decision as to nongovernmental responsibility and participation grew out of the twofold recognition: (1) That, whereas Government workers have expertness in some phases of the financial and health aspects of aging, the broad and varied experience needed in a comprehensive conference could come only by involving persons with a great variety of situations and interest fields and (2) that, since most of the work with the aging will always be done by varied groups at local and State levels, persons from those levels should from the start work out the solutions and actions to be employed.

The final major preconference determination was that the group process of discussion and decision making should be employed throughout. This decision was consistent with the state of knowledge in the field and with the nature of the conference. It has the further and compelling merit of making active participants of all who are involved.

OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of the conference were stated as follows:

I. To provide a forum for persons concerned with aging.

II. To revaluate the potentialities of older people toward insuring their useful and satisfying participation in the life of the community.

III. To stimulate the exchange of ideas among persons of varied experience, with a view to solving problems of the aging through voluntary and public organizations in each State, city, and community.

IV. To define the nature and extent of these problems as they affect the individual, his family, and his community.

V. To promote research on aging in such fields as employment, health, education, recreation, rehabilitation, and social and psychological adjustment.

VI. To transmit the findings of this conference to interested groups, including the Federal Government, as guidelines for developing policies with regard to our older people.

CONFERENCE DEVELOPMENT

The conference began to move in May when an advisory committee of outstanding persons and experts from many fields was appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. The individual committee members rendered invaluable service in reviewing the plans for the conference, nominating delegates, and affording guidance on several questions of policy. Later in the same month a small central office staff was set up, and a secretariat or committee of from five to a dozen Government staff members was created for each of the subject-matter areas or conference sections. Most of these committee members were from the Federal Security Agency, but representatives of seven other Government agencies were drawn in at appropriate points. There was representation from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor, and from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Library of Congress, and the Veterans' Administration.

The first task of the secretariats was the development of a preliminary outline for each section, detailed enough to determine the interest fields that should be involved, and, hence, to nominate appropriate persons from outside the Federal service to serve as members of the planning committees. The planning committees, in turn, were to assume responsibility for the subject matter content of the sections.

Planning committees consisted of from 9 to 13 persons, invited to serve by the Federal Security Administrator. Each committee held a 1- or 2-day exploratory meeting in June. Most met again during July, and all held meetings on the day preceding the conference.

It is a tribute to these committees and to American democracy that in every instance the planning committees accepted the invitation extended to them, made a preliminary outline for the section, nominated persons to be invited as delegates, and developed plans for conducting the August work sessions. With the help of the secretariats the committees cast the outlines in the form of questions which were mailed, together with background data, to the delegates in order to start their thinking prior to arrival in Washington.

Between planning committee meetings the secretariats worked on the delegate invitation lists, striving to achieve a balanced representation in each section. The committees had decided to seek broad interest representation within each section to insure expression of diverse points of view and to avoid narrow conclusions.

One of the first results achieved by the conference was the creation of a file of names of more than 2,000 people known to be concerned with some facet of the aging problem. The 816 delegates were selected from these names.

All delegates were invited as individuals representative of a field of interest and because of reported activity in that field. The conclusion was reached early in the group planning meetings that this procedure would yield a more informed group of delegates than would the procedure of inviting organizations to send official representatives.

The final step of this phase was an orientation meeting held the day before the con-

ference opened for secretariats, planning committees, discussion leaders and recorders, reporters, and all other persons with specific responsibility for some aspect of the conduct of the meetings.

THE CONFERENCE

The conference on aging convened on Sunday morning, August 13, 1950. Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing addressed the entire delegate body on the origin of the meeting and the significance of the subject. Dwight Cooke, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, then conducted his weekly panel discussion program, People's Platform, from the head table, with three conference delegates participating. The assistant administrator for program of the Federal Security Agency, in general charge of the conference, explained the role of the agency as the servicing unit of the conference, charged the delegates with their responsibility, and turned the conference over to them. Before the first work sessions convened, the University of Chicago Round Table program, also with three delegates comprising the discussion panel, was broadcast from the conference rooms.

The creative work of the conference went forward in work sessions held on Sunday afternoon, Monday forenoon and afternoon, and Tuesday forenoon, and in numerous unscheduled meetings of small groups whenever time was available. According to prearrangement, most of the sections broke down into subsections for the major portion of the work period. Usually 33 group meetings were in progress simultaneously. Planning committee members and discussion leaders kept the groups organized and moving.

Besides the opening meeting, there were two general meetings. A dinner meeting on Monday was addressed by Prof. Edmund V. Cowdry, Dr. Alvin Johnson, and Miss Frances Perkins. Mr. Ewing took this occasion to award a citation to Miss Ollie A. Randall, of New York, for her pioneering work with the aging. The final conference session was a luncheon meeting. The program consisted of a fast-moving summary of conclusions and unanswered questions presented by Dwight Cooke, CBS commentator, as conference rapporteur, with the assistance of the section chairmen.

It is worthy of note that the desire for a forum type of exploratory conference carried through to the very end; not one action was proposed or taken by the delegate body as a whole.

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

It is too early, at this writing, to state many of the conclusions reached in the conference. The several section committees are now engaged in preparing their final statements. What can be done here is mainly to report on the principal topics that came up for discussion. There was general agreement that the situation is already so critical as to require the immediate attention of all appropriate groups and interest in society.

Older people constitute the most rapidly growing segment of our population. There will be some 20,000 persons 65 years of age by 1975. The principal factor in their percentage increase has been the declining birth rate over the past century. Improvements in health have been a secondary factor but may become more important as a result of research and improved medical care.

Largely by reason of aging of the population, the average number of older dependents per worker has increased by 50 percent since 1900. Another set of factors contributing to this increase includes technological changes, shifts in the demands for labor in different occupations, shrinkage of opportunity in self-employment, changing employment practices, and compulsory retirement programs. Only 45 percent of men over 65 are in the labor force now compared with 68 percent in 1890.

These changes have a good many implications for the American economy. The delegates appeared to be in agreement that older people need to receive financial support sufficient to sustain at least their primary needs. Some income needs appear to decline with age but others, as for medical services, increase.

In two or three sections, much of the discussion was devoted to consideration of how financial support is to be maintained. The old-age and survivors insurance program, together with old-age assistance, is expected to continue to provide the core of income for many of those (and their dependents) not gainfully employed, but it was suggested that the breadth and amount of coverage need further consideration. The role of private pension systems and their ability to meet the needs of the individual and of society were discussed.

Many delegates saw the solution to the problem of adequate financial support for older people in continuing employment. This solution has the added advantage of contributing to the production of goods and services to supply the needs of the total population—a point that assumes particular significance during the present national emergency.

Separating continuing employment from chronological age, and relating it to capacities and desires of individual workers instead, appeared to present one of the knottiest problems raised by the delegates. The prospect of growing numbers of years in retirement was impressive, as was the consequential need for increasing support. There were conflicting beliefs regarding the interests of workers themselves in the matter.

Raising the retirement age would constitute reversal of the long-time trend which would be difficult in view of growing output per man-hour and other factors already mentioned. It was pointed out, also, that raising age limits would be contrary to habits of thinking regarding employability of older workers, habits that resulted in the general establishment of compulsory retirement ages. Reversal of this thinking would require wholesale change of attitudes.

While many delegates argued for flexibility in withdrawal from the labor force, they recognized that there are difficult problems of administration. It was pointed out that the worker's desires in the matter are conditioned by his financial situation and by his need for status within his family and among his fellows, and that we lack objective criteria for determining employability. In addition, there is a complicated two-way relationship between retirement policies and pension systems, which might be further complicated by introducing flexibility into retirement systems. Other delegates indicated that continuing employment of many older workers would necessitate job shifts as the effects of aging appear, and would necessitate counseling, special placement, retraining, and, perhaps, modification of jobs and adjustment in rates of payment.

The point on which there appears to have been almost total agreement is that we lack sufficient data to answer any of the questions raised in this connection. Over and over again, the delegates pointed out that the field for research is large and that the problems are numerous and varied. There is no question about their importance.

In addition to considering the implications of aging for the economy as a whole, all conference sections appeared to start with certain fundamental assumptions regarding older people as individuals. Briefly stated, these are: (1) Older people exhibit all of the fundamental needs or desires found among people at any age; (2) satisfaction of needs continues, as in all adult life, to be primarily a matter of individual effort; and (3) older people can find satisfaction only in a favorable environment. The sections recognized, further, that aging affects not only the individual but also his family, the community in which he lives, and the whole of society. Much of the discussion, therefore, concerned factors in individual adjustment, and adaptation of knowledge and social institutions to aging.

POSTCONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

Since the close of the conference many letters have been received regarding the significance of the conference and the impetus it may have given to the thinking and planning for our aging population. Some of the delegates have indicated that they expect to see things move ahead in their home communities, while others state that they have already gotten things underway.

It is reported that one State may set up a commission on aging and that another State is calling a meeting of all delegates to the conference to determine what the next steps should be. A third State and several communities have asked for all of the information available from the conference for the use of commissions or committees already established. One large city has indicated that it will request its mayor to set up a commission to deal with the entire range of problems in that community. Another large city is setting up a demonstration research project to observe the effects of introducing an activity program into homes for the aged.

A number of professional organizations are bringing the conference results to the attention of their memberships through articles in their journals or through addresses at meetings. One such organization has prepared a symposium on education for aging. Already there have been several requests for consultation on proposed educato sink very slowly.

To the extent that such interest is maintained and activities are developed, the conference on aging will have been successful.

A Visit to a Korean Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an article by United Press staff correspondent H. D. Quigg, describing a visit to a hospital in Korea:

HARD TO TELL LIVE FROM DEAD, FRONT HOSPITAL—WOUNDED LIE ON CANVAS LITTERS, DUST-CAKED AND BLOODY

(By H. D. Quigg)

A HOSPITAL IN KOREA, February 21.—The receiving room is large and high-ceilinged and filled with the chugging of the motor of a blower which sends hot air into the room through two big canvas tubes lying on the floor.

The ambulances back up to the receiving-room door, and the wounded come out on canvas litters, covered with olive-drab blankets, their faces showing dust-beards, their arms lying limp. It's hard to tell whether some of them are alive or dead.

Ten soldiers lie on litters on the receiving room floor. Some smoke and gaze at the lights glowing dimly on the high ceiling. Some just lie, their eyes closed, faces sick and gray. They're waiting to be checked in,

screened, and treated. Many still wear their green field caps. Dried blood mottles their stiffened clothing. Here and there a first-aid splint shows on an arm or leg.

Other wounded, starting to get treatment, are on a row of Army cots. An attendant with knife and scissors cuts off their clothing. Two or three are getting whole blood from pint bottles hung above them on iron frames. If you watch, you can see the pink blush of life coming back to their faces.

An Army nurse with fluffy blonde hair crooks her finger at me as I sit on a bench at the side of the room. As I approach she hurriedly hands me a pinched-shut portion of rubber tube hanging from a blood bottle.

"Hold this, will you?" she says, and I choke off the flow of blood in the tube while she begins probing in a soldier's arm with the large hollow needle at the end of the tube. The soldier below us on the cot is in a state of deep shock, which has caused his veins to contract.

The Nurse, Lt. Margaret Feil, of San Francisco, can't get the needle in a vein. She probes and probes, and the wounded man jumps and rolls his head at each probe. A medic pulls off one of the soldier's boots and he writhes in pain, for he has a mortar wound in the leg.

A doctor takes the blood-giving needle from the nurse and tries to get it in a vein lower in the arm, but it's no use. They have been working on the soldier's left arm. His right arm is a stump, blown off below the elbow. It is wrapped in a huge rolled white bandage, soaked with blood.

The head surgeon, a major, comes over and takes a syringe needle and begins probing deep in the man's thigh for a blood vessel. The guy is conscious and the surgeon says, "How do you feel now?"

"I don't feel bad at all," the guy says. He takes a cigarette.

A medic approaches and looks at the record card tied to the soldier's clothes and goes away, shaking his head. The case is critical. The important thing is to get blood into him. The surgeon has given up probing and is cutting into one of the big veins at the ankle. No blood comes out as he cuts. He thrusts a hollow metal tube through the incision and into the vein and attaches the bottle tube to it. The blood level of the bottle begins to sink very slowly.

The soldier has lost consciousness. As I leave he is lying still, his head fallen to one side, the arm stump hanging down over the cot edge. He probably will live, because someone has given the blood to keep him alive.

Gray's Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gray's Elegy," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1951.

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

GRAY'S ELEGY

England just now is celebrating the bicentennial of Thomas Gray's famous Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard. The poem was published by Robert Dodsley in quarto in February 1751, and it was "greatly successful from the very first." Composed by "the slowest of bards," it represented 7 years of consideration on his part. He was 35 when it finally was issued and had only two decades of life before him—and nothing much worth doing with the time. Richard Garnett and Edmund Gosse, in their History of English Literature, refer to him as being "altogether too delicate for the rough age he lived in." It served him to little effect that he was "perhaps the most learned man in Europe." Loneliness and gout afflicted him. He was constitutionally too fat, too shy, and too weak of body and spirit. Yet he could and did write lines as simple, as graceful, and as richly beautiful as:

"The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
The lowing herd wind slowly o'er the lea,
The plowman homeward plods his weary way,
And leaves the world to darkness and to me."

Nothing more compelling of its kind exists in English letters than the whole picture painted in the elegy. Each single word of it obviously has been chosen with meticulous discrimination. The poem is a tour de force of taste. If proof of its power be wanted, it may be found in this stanza, often quoted even now after two centuries:

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

Gray's mood throughout is melancholic. He faces the universe as a philosopher and as an artist, too, but he is sad and sorrowful—there is no exuberant joy in his work. The youth "to fortune and to fame unknown" is himself, and he mourns his frustrations, his disappointments, his pathetic griefs. At the last of the lament he affirms that heaven has granted him the friend who was "all he wished," but the elegist's history contradicts the claim. His immortal poem stands today as an appeal for a type of human fellowship—an authentic mutuality—which rarely, if ever, develops anywhere on earth. It is a cry for mercy which many great souls have helped to raise, all too often in vain.

Coming His Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is included herewith an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

Some of the professional—being for hire—New Deal, left-wing smear propagandists are having it handed out to them. Naturally they resent it, for they have proceeded on the theory that no one dare criticize any of their output.

The editorial from the Chicago Tribune—and there was one like it in the Washington Times-Herald — indicates that this little "holier than thou" group will have to expect an exposure of their motives—the falsity of their conclusions.

The editorial is as follows:

ONE WINDBAG WHO'S IN NO DANGER

Quentin Reynolds [chatter and opinions for hire] was heard the other day on a program sponsored by a television manufacturer. Reynolds is the New York night-club warrior who appeared before the Democratic National Convention in 1944 to plug for the fourth term, asserting that he spoke for the boys in the front lines.

He had no commission from them to back up this contention, but it is plain that he did walk away with a check for $2,000 from the Garsson boys when they threw a party to celebate their receipt of an "E" award from the Government for their glorious contribution to the "wah effoht." Later they were sent to the penitentiary with the New Deal statesman, Representative Andy May.

Reynolds can always be counted upon to bleed at every one of his copious pores out of reverence for the New Deal, but sometimes he changes his pace and loses himself in rhapsodies dedicated to the Soviet Union. He was 1 of 16 alleged writers who contributed to an extraordinary smear campaign in 1945 intended to damn W. L. White's critical Report on the Russians as "the book the Nazis like." Reynolds therein confessed his "love" for the Red soldiers who now form the basis of Mr. Truman's "tizzy."

The latest Reynolds offering starts off as follows: "The headstone over the grave on the grassy slope at Arlington Cemetery is a simple one with a simple inscription. It merely says, 'James Forrestal, 1892–1949, lieutenant, United States Navy.' Another line should be added. That one should read: 'Murdered by the American people.' "

Reynolds develops this astonishing theme by citing the fact that "we," meaning the people, put overwhelming burdens on "our public servants" until finally "some of them crack under the strain." He professes to see this happening again, although he concedes that Truman is fit, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder puts in 8 hours in bed, and the rest of the crowd are not complaining. The principal manifestations that something is wrong with Truman have been provided by that gentleman himself, in various quixotic letters and statements.

"As the tension mounts, as the responsibilities increase," Reynolds intoned, "we can expect more tragedies. We not only give our public servants impossible jobs to do; we snipe at them carelessly, criticize them unmercifully if their conception of the job does not conform to ours. Today there are a great many men in key defense posts in Washington whom we, the American people, have virtually sentenced to death—Harry Truman, Charles E. Wilson, General Marshall, Averell Harriman, Cyrus Ching, Frank Pace, Stuart Symington, General Bradley, Eric Johnston, General Collins, just to mention 10 men."

It may be asked why these people are exposing themselves if they don't like the work. Truman nearly broke his neck 2½ years ago to make sure that his job did not get away from him. The rest of the crowd can resign any time they want to. Many of them are politicians who are in the business for the power and perquisites, and the generals have been rewarded with their present station for playing ball.

With the exception of Mr. Truman, who got elected, but wouldn't stand a chance of repeating in the light of current sentiment, these public servants that we are supposed to have put in authority hold no mandate from the people to do 2 percent of the silly things that they have taken on themselves in their current zeal to latch onto wars and wreck the country generally.

Reynolds is at the same old confidence game of saying that nobody must criticize a New Dealer. If his examples are going to crack up, it would be convenient if they did so before they see that the country does. As to the crack-up, other reasons have been advanced, one of them being that members of an administration who invariably put foreign interests ahead of their own country's

inevitably become victims of psychological conflict, remorse, and loss of control.

To accuse the American people of murdering men who won't let go of power if they have anything to say about it is as shameless a libel as could be advanced. As long as the honorarium comes in from the sponsor, Reynolds himself is in no danger of sacrificing himself. As long as chumps can be found to pay money for windy vacuity, this perambulating tub will, unfortunately, be with us.

Statement of E. C. Hallbeck Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, legislative representative, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Monday, February 26, 1951. He testified before the subcommittee on behalf of Senate bill 355 and related measures. His testimony, the result of much study, was so outstanding that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with appendix A and appendix B.

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

STATEMENT OF E. C. HALLBECK, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, ON S. 355 AND RELATED MEASURES, BEGINNING ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1951

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name, for purpose of the record, is E. C. Hallbeck, and I am the legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, with offices at 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Ours is a voluntary organization and is composed entirely of post office clerks in more than 5,000 post offices of the first, second, and third class, located in every State and in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

It is my understanding that you are today considering four bills, S. 355, S. 376, S. 414, and S. 415, all of which relate to the pay or compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. If it be satisfactory to this committee, I shall comment on each bill in turn, placing by far the greater emphasis on the bill S. 355 which, to the people I represent, is certainly the most important and for which there is a very pressing immediate need.

Prior to July 1, 1945, the Postal Classification Act provided five automatic grades for post-office clerks with salaries ranging from $1,700 to $2,100 per annum. There were in addition two grades known as special clerk grades at $2,200 and $2,300 per annum respectively. These latter grades were limited entirely to first-class post offices and were created as an incentive to industry, efficiency, and the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of the postal service and its requirements. Needless to say, promotion to such grades was extremely rare except in some of our largest post offices. For all practical purposes it is correct to say that only five salary grades existed insofar as most offices were concerned.

With the enactment of Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress the number of automatic grades was increased from 5 to 11 with a spread of $1,000 between grades 1 and 11, the salary range being from $1,700 to $2,700 per annum. The same number of grades with equivalent hourly rates were provided for substitute employees.

Both Senator CARLSON and yourself were Members of the House of Representatives during the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure both of you will recall the circumstances that led to the enactment of that legislation. You will recall, I am sure, that President Roosevelt had set a figure of $150,000,000 as the maximum cost of such a measure, and that the then Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House, under the leadership of Chairman Burch, was more or less required to work out a satisfactory formula within that limitation. Chairman Burch and his committee had the advice and technical assistance of three extremely capable postal officials, the late Smith W. Purdum, then Second Assistant Postmaster General; the late Mr. Joseph F. Gartland, Director of Budget and Administrative Planning, and Mr. Archie A. Imus, the then Commissioner of Administrative Planning. While it is true that the representatives of the employees were consulted at practically every step, it is also true that the law as finally enacted was to a very considerable degree the brainchild of Mr. Gartland and Mr. Imus. It was they who developed the formula by which additional grades were superimposed on the existing five-grade structure, leaving the first five grades at the same rate as that originally provided in 1925, in order to keep down the cost estimate of the bill.

There was a feeling, and, I think, with good reason, that since no one knew when permanent classified appointments would again be made (we were still at war when the legislation was being considered), entrance salary grades presented a purely academic question that could easily be solved whenever permanent appointments were again authorized. Unfortunately, things did not work out that way. The end of the war and demobilization were almost coincident with the enactment of the 11-grade structure and the Post Office Department in 1945–46 was offering 1925 entrance wages to the returning veterans anxious to rehabilitate themselves in a peaceful society. Every man appointed since is still trying to catch up and is at least four grades or $400 behind on the economic merry-go-round.

While there is justification for a spread in grades based on the relative worth of a new man and an experienced and trained man to the postal service, there is no justification for the present 11-grade spread. In the branch of the service which I represent, and it is by far the largest branch of the field service, the vast bulk of the employees are engaged in the distribution of mail which requires a specialized knowledge that can only be acquired by experience. Mail is distributed, or sorted, by means of what we call schemes which require a knowledge of schedules and routes of each railroad and the time of arrival in each city and the time and places where those railroads intersect other railroads or star routes in a given State or group of States. Some of those schemes are extremely involved and many of them require 3 or 4 years of constant application before an employee completes his entire assignment and is a qualified competent workman. Obviously his value to the postal service is not as great in his first year as it is in his fourth or fifth year, but if he isn't a qualified journeyman at his position after his fifth year, he never will be. If he is thus qualified then he should be paid at the rate paid to other competent workmen and not required to work another 6 years at an inferior rate of pay, before receiving the same pay as others doing similar work.

We feel that the change from a 5-grade to an 11-grade salary structure was a mistake and believe that section 1 of the bill S. 355 is the best way to correct the existing condition.

Section 2 of the bill S. 355 requires no extended explanation. It would increase all field postal service salaries by 17 percent of the first $5,000 of such salaries. We realize that it will be necessary for us to justify the figure of 17 percent, and we are prepared to do so.

First of all, let me say that the 17-percent figure is not something picked out of the air, nor arrived at in any haphazard fashion. The best possible illustration of this lies in the recent report to this committee submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. According to that report, the cost of living advanced 76.1 percent from 1939 to November of last year. During that same period of time the average wage of a post office clerk advanced from $2,165 per annum to approximately $3,500 per annum, an increase of only some 61.8 percent, or a net loss of 16.3 percent. It should be borne in mind that the figures used were for November of last year, and that the index has risen something like 3 or 4 points during the interval between the date of the report and the present time.

To cite a specific example, using the formulas of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the group I represent has suffered a minimum loss of $6.84 per week in net spendable earnings, an amount which in terms of current dollars is equal to $12.27 per week, or $638.04 per annum, which would justify an increase of more than 18 percent based on current prices and earnings. We all know from bitter personal experience that prices are still going up despite price controls, and I think it would be perfectly safe to say that a 20-percent increase could easily be justified by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

In the past 10 years the postal wage has continually lagged behind the cost of living, and, as a result, postal employees have been going deeper and deeper into debt with each passing year. It has become necessary for an ever-increasing number of employees to seek additional part-time employment, and an even larger number of employees have their wives and children gainfully employed in order to supplement their postal income. This is not a healthy situation. It is disruptive of home and family life and could well be a contributing factor to the current increase in juvenile delinquency.

We feel that early enactment of S. 355 is desirable not only from the personal standpoint of the employee but because it will be reflected in improved morale and efficiency within the postal service as well.

With respect to the bill S. 415, "To provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices," I had an opportunity to go into that briefly at the initial meeting of this subcommittee on February 2. I am attaching as appendix B a reprint from the Postal Bulletin, the next to the last paragraph of which deals with this subject in the fewest possible number of words.

Theoretically at least, a regular clerk in an office of the third class is on duty 8 hours per day, 7 days per week. Unlike all other classified regular employees, all services of 8 hours or less performed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays is performed gratis, and without compensation either in time or money. In our view, this is an entirely unwarranted and unjust discrimination. Surely a Government that requires private employers to pay premium rates for hours in excess of 40 per week should at least grant compensatory time during the following week

to the employees of that Government who are required to work more than 40 hours per week.

We believe that the bill S. 415 by Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, will correct this unfortunate condition and urge its early enactment.

Another bill before this subcommittee, S. 414, deals with the same subject and would amend the present law so as to give the employee an option of accepting either the compensatory time now provided or additional pay at the overtime rate for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays.

Obviously, it would be difficult for the representative of any group of employees to oppose legislation which gives employees a choice of benefits. Certainly the principle of a premium pay for such service is pretty well established in private industry. However, we must also recognize that the task of moving the mail is a 24-hour-per-day, 7-days-per-week job and that unlike a manufacturing or mercantile establishment it is not practical to close the doors on Friday or Saturday evening and keep them closed until the following Monday morning. We also recognize the fact that a considerable amount of the work of substitute employees results from the compensatory time given to regular employees. If regular employees generally were to accept overtime pay rather than compensatory time, the work opportunities presently provided for substitutes would be drastically reduced.

Giving due consideration to these facts, our executive committee approved a resolution referred to it by our national convention which in substance provided that employees who perform service on Saturdays should be given 90 minutes of compensatory time for each hour of Saturday service, and 2 hours of compensatory time for each hour of service on a Sunday or holiday. We feel that this is a better approach to the problem. It would first of all, by administrative means, reduce Saturday, Sunday, and holiday work to the essential minimum. Secondly, it would provide a premium rate for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday service, in common with private industry, without adversely affecting substitute employees.

While it is true that the bill as introduced would perhaps augment present inadequate salaries, we do not believe that overtime work, even at a premium rate of pay, is a cure for that evil. We, therefore, recommend that the bill S. 415 be amended to provide that employees who are required to perform service on Saturdays shall be given 90 minutes of compensatory time for each hour of such service and employees who are required to perform service on Sundays and holidays shall be given 2 hours of compensatory time for each hour of such service, and that the bill as thus amended be enacted.

The fourth and last bill under consideration at this time is S. 376. This bill would provide a salary reclassification for postmasters and supervisors and would not directly affect members of the organization I represent. While recognizing that there are inequities in the present set-up, I do not consider myself competent to discuss this legislation at length. However, I do feel that there is considerable controversy in connection with this legislation and believe it should be considered on its own merits and not made a part of a general bill dealing with wage adjustments such as those contemplated in S. 355.

We sincerely appreciate the time and attention being given to this subject by the members of this subcommittee and hope that as a result of your deliberations the Congress will be prevailed upon to take necessary corrective action at an early date. We especially hope for an early favorable report on S. 355 as introduced by Chairman JOHNSTON of the committee.

Thank you.

APPENDIX A

NET SPENDABLE WEEKLY EARNINGS

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, the average weekly salary multiplied by 0.819 plus $7.31 equals the net spendable weekly earnings after allowance for income and social-security taxes for a family of four.

To adjust weekly earnings with the same earnings expressed in 1939 dollars, the current Consumers Price Index is divided by the 1939 index. The net spendable weekly earnings divided by the quotient thus obtained equals the current wage expressed in 1939 dollars.

Present approximate annual wage of $3,500 equals $67.30 per week; $67.30 multiplied by 0.819 plus $7.31 equals $62.42; $62.42 divided by 179.4 equals $34.79.

1939 annual wage of $2,165.21 equals $41.63 per week:

1939 wage	$41.63
Present wage in 1939 dollars	34.79
Deficiency in 1939 dollars	6.84

$6.84 in 1939 dollars equals $12.27 in December 1950 dollars; $6.84 multiplied by 179.4 equals $12.27.

(Source: Handbook of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor.)

APPENDIX B

[Reprint of notice which appeared in the Postal Bulletin of October 12, 1948]

INSTRUCTION OF FIRST AND FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS GENERAL

OVERTIME AND COMPENSATORY TIME FOR THE DECEMBER 1948 QUARTER

The attention of postmasters is directed to the necessity for the exercising of the utmost care in the use of overtime during the December 1948 quarter, and it is the duty of each postmaster to give this important matter detailed and personal attention and not to handle it in a routine manner.

* * * * *

Attention is called to the fact that clerks at offices of the third class are not subject to the provisions of the 40-hour workweek law, and may not be paid overtime, nor granted compensatory time, for the first 8 hours of service performed on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays.

The matter of the judicious use of overtime, for regular employees as well as supervisors, is one of great importance, and postmasters will be held personally accountable for the use of funds in that respect. It is imperative that overtime in all instances be restricted to emergency needs only, and postmasters must see that these instructions are given strict attention and full compliance.

Proposed Amendments to the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act. These include editorials from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union, the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the Dallas News.

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

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of January 12, 1951]

UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Defense Secretary Marshall presented to Congress Wednesday a balanced program of universal military service beginning at the age of 18 and continuing for 27 months in active service. The bill begins service a year younger than the present law and continues it longer than formerly contemplated in universal military training proposals. The more emotional opposition will be centered upon the first point.

No age is a convenient age to take 27 months out of one's plans for the future. But when the first emotional reaction is spent we believe that most boys and most parents will conclude that starting required service at 18 is an over-all time saver.

Deferments will be granted to permit finishing high school and for completing a college year if started before a youth's eighteenth birthday.

Normally an 18-year-old has completed high school at that age. A delay of a year for most boys would be a wasted year. The only jobs open to him would be restricted by his liability to service after a few months of work.

Starting early and getting it over with without loss of time in their main plans for life will be accepted by most young men.

What appears to be ample allowance for higher training of qualified candidates is included in the Defense Department plan. The Nation cannot afford to permit a gap in the training of doctors, scientists, leaders, and technicians.

If the provisions of this bill are linked in all the States with an accelerated educational program such as is being studied by the board of regents of New York, all the 27 months of service need not be reckoned as "lost" time.

Our men will be just as well educated, if not better, and have the added personal satisfaction of having done their duty to their country.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of January 15, 1951]

ARBITRARY AGE LIMITS

Letters to Congressmen protesting the drafting of 18-year-olds and proposals that 18-year-olds who are old enough to fight are old enough to vote both emphasize the fact that there really are no pat and perfect ages for beginning or ending anything.

Something of the same sort applies to retirement ages firmly fixed in the rules of some organizations and agencies, pension plans, and the like. There is no clear set age at which every boy reaches readiness to vote or fight and no age at which it can clearly be said that a man is finished and ought to get out of the job and out of the way.

Some boys certainly seem babies who ought to be protected at 18 from the harsh realities and dangers of military service. Some men at 65 or even 70 are at the prime of their usefulness and ability in their jobs.

The unfortunate fact is that in dealing with large numbers of people some arbitrary ages must be set. That was done long ago when we settled quite arbitrarily upon 21 as the age of maturity in citizenship. Clearly, however, some people are much more qualified for the exercise of the suffrage at 16 than some others seems at 65.

Every age can be wrong. Some very immature boys will be subject to selective service at 19 and even at 20. Some able, useful, and experienced men are summarily sepa-

rated from their jobs by retirement rules long before they should be. And some at 40 and 45 are already worn out as far as usefulness in their jobs is concerned. There will be much debate on this 18-year-old draft proposal as about other age limit rules. Everybody has a right to be heard with regard to it. The one certain thing, however, is that wherever the draft age is fixed it will not fit every boy neatly. Somewhere, however, an age must be fixed and the best place to fix it will be where it best serves the present and the future security of the Republic. And there will be no unanimity of opinion about that.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 19, 1951]

MARSHALL'S DRAFT PLAN

Sentiment has been making itself felt in Congress against the Defense Department's desire to lower the draft age from 19 to 18. Twelve months make a great difference in a teen-ager's mental and physical development, but it is questionable whether the difference between 18 and 19 is as great as some have pictured it.

In shifting manpower as well as industry to military purposes, the ideal is to achieve the desired end with the least possible dislocations. This is General Marshall's most telling argument in favor of lowering the draft age. He could get the needed manpower i the 19 to 26 age group, but he would have to take husbands and fathers, and this would mean a greater social damage than the drafting of 18-year-olds.

Drafting of young men at completion of high school would mean fewer family hardships. Also, as it now stands, a young man has a time finding a job between high school and being drafted at 19; or if he goes on to college, generally speaking, it means breaking off after 1 year.

Right now these youths are perplexed, not knowing which way to turn. All uncertainty never will be eliminated, but General Marshall's plan is aimed at doing away with some of it, at the expense of heartbreak to parents.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 26, 1951]

BUT IV-F'S CAN'T FILL ALL DRAFT NEEDS

Relaxation of the mental and physical standards for draft inductions is a necessary prerequisite to the drafting of 18-year-old boys, but it can hardly be regarded as a substitute for a thorough program of training and service for the Nation's younger men.

Assistant Defense Secretary Anna Rosenberg's disclosure that the qualifications for military service will be lowered is welcome for one big reason: it contains hopeful assurance that large numbers of older men will not be allowed to avoid some form of defense service while their younger brothers are being drafted.

The policy of excessively high physical and mental standards combined with wholesale deferments for other causes had just that effect during the last war. It meant that men with minor disqualifications not only avoided combat service; they didn't even serve in behind-the-lines jobs where their defects couldn't possibly have interfered with performance of duty.

It is not only that many men in the public eye were excused from service, although the classification of apparently hale and hearty athletes and movie actors as IV-F understandably aroused public disapproval. Large numbers of men were deferred—and they are still being deferred under present draft regulation—who were fit to carry out all but the most arduous front-line duties.

For every dubious IV-F who was exempted, a man who could meet all the requirements had to be drafted. That is unfair in any event; it will be doubly unfair if additional 18-year-olds have to be called because some older men are kept from the services without good reason.

Unquestionably some of the reasons for the needlessly high physical and mental standards goes back to the individual military services. There is as yet no uniformity on qualifications among the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and this applies to men who serve in noncombat positions as well as those who do the actual fighting.

Mrs. Rosenberg's statement that qualifications will be lowered indicates that some of the services will have to make use of men they have previously rejected, and it is about time. There are scores of jobs in all the services which can be filled satisfactorily by men barred by present draft standards.

But it doesn't follow that all our military manpower needs can be met by lowering the standards. Mrs. Rosenberg estimates that 150,000 more men could be added under the present 19-to-26 draft by this move. If we are to build up our Armed Forces to 3,500,000 by June 30 of this year we'll need many more than that.

Objections to drafting 18-year-old boys are wholly understandable. Nobody likes to see boys of this age taken away from their families and schools or jobs.

The world situation, however, makes a build-up of military strength imperative. It demands not only an immediate increase in the size of our forces, but a system of training for all young men so that we will never again have to send green, untrained troops into battle, if war should come.

It is better for the 18-year-olds to receive basic training now than to run the risk of being called suddenly later and thrown into combat without proper preparation. Their own chances of survival would be better and so would the Nation's.

Certainly provision should be made that any draft of young men would not completely disrupt our educational system. Those who qualify for further education, especially in the fields of science and engineering which are vital to national security, should be allowed to continue schooling after basic training is completed.

But the important thing is that the Nation face the facts on its manpower needs. Those facts call for a swift build-up of the armed services, using all available manpower, and a system of training for the younger men to prepare them for the part they may have to play in safeguarding the Nation's security.

[From the Dallas News of January 20, 1951]

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD DRAFT

The verbal sparring in Washington over whether to draft 18-year-olds is largely pointless. If full-scale war comes, we will have to do it. We had to do it in 1917–19, we had to do it in 1941–45, and we will have to do it again whenever the enemy strikes, be it 1951 or at some future date, say, in the 1960's.

The only point is whether these youngsters shall be properly trained to defend themselves and our country. President Karl T. Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is on sure ground when he asks that the draft be lowered from 19 to 18 years. He couples it with a plea for universal military training for all men between the ages of 18 and 27.

Congress and the Nation erred in not heeding Dr. Compton's plea for universal training 5 years ago. He made it as head of a committee of distinguished Americans who studied our defense needs and came to this conclusion. We would not find ourselves in the box we do today if we had paid attention to him then.

Defense Secretary Marshall says it is not the intention of the Armed Forces to send 18-year-olds overseas. Nor do they want to use them in any possible combat before they have had at least 4 months' training. Such a policy is both wise and possible at the moment. But General Marshall refuses, rightly enough, to be bound by such restrictions under all circumstances. They could be disastrous in the event of sudden, all-out, and undeclared war. Such a policy would have to be chucked out the window the instant Russia or any other enemy cut loose on us.

Have We Any Friends?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Have We Any Friends?" from the February 1951 issue of Fortune magazine.

This is a remarkable piece on the ideological struggle throughout the world. In the midst of our debate about army divisions and production, Fortune argues our greatest enemy may well be a myth—the myth believed by millions throughout the world that America is a country without a soul.

Make no mistake—

Says Fortune—

if we do not destroy this myth, it will destroy us.

Fortune's editors believe the United States should spend $500,000,000 a year on the international information and educational exchange program, in order to replace this myth with a world-wide understanding of what Fortune calls the American proposition.

I am informed that the article is estimated by the Public Printer to make three and two-thirds pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $300.68.

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

HAVE WE ANY FRIENDS?—YES; BUT THEY ARE ESTRANGED BY A MYTH; AND A MYTH PARTLY OF OUR OWN MAKING

It might one day be written that the free world destroyed itself because of a myth. It would not be the big lie of the Russians; only the fools believed that. It would be something much more inexplicable; the myth that for all our bathtubs and our cars and our skyscrapers we are without moral purpose; that we are the new Carthage—all money, no spirit; that we are, in short, a country without a soul.

Make no mistake; if we do not destroy this myth, it will destroy us. Already it has sapped the will of our allies, made those who benefited from the ECA cynical of its purpose; and each month it grows more in virulence, ready to attack at each crisis. But even more terrible has been the effect on us. For when we hear it played back to us, we grow petulant and dismayed, and in our anger many of us can think of nothing but to pull down the pillars on a world that does not understand.

Yet the West is desperately eager to listen. That it tragically misunderstands us

is not easily explained by the accusations that come so readily to American minds. Nor is it simply a matter of slicker gimmicks or extra kilowatts or more pamphlets. The failure is not technical: it is national. We have sold the world many things—sold them so well half Europe would pack up and come over if it could. We have left unsold the ideas that would destroy the myth.

We talk of a campaign of truth. This, certainly, is in order. But what is the truth? Speeches? Statistics? A day in the life of a Wisconsin farmer? Our congenital dislike of abstract thought has at last come home to roost. We have failed to determine what it is we wish to communicate.

MYTH BY DEFAULT

Once we knew very well what we were and what we wanted to be, and we thought it out into some of the most contagious prose of all time. But we went on to become the great pragmatists, so eager to be on with the job, so impatient of theory and reflection, that we worked ourselves into a moral isolationism. Why analyze America? It worked, didn't it?

Curiously, by keeping our philosophy so tacit, we have managed to show ourselves to the world as little different from the Marxists—seeming, like them, to believe that material prosperity is an end that in itself will bring all the other qualities. Instinctively we know better, but we have never bothered to articulate for ourselves what we take for granted, much less convey it to others. And so we have talked of the manifestations of our success rather than the causes. Not for us wooly headed theories or impractical idealism; instead, down-to-earth, hard-rock facts; the miles of cement, the telephones, the cars laid end to end—all the things, in short, our friends have envied and our enemies have conceded.

But what made the telephones and the cars possible? When we have tried to explain, it has been in a lazy man's shorthand that has obscured our national character rather tha illuminated it. Thus have we prated of individualism, when we have achieved the most horizontal, cooperative of all societies; of competition and incentive economy, when we have achieved the kind of security that socialists everywhere hunger for. And we wonder why the audience is confused.

And not only have we failed to define what we are to say; we have failed to define why we want to say it. Of all the many aims of our propaganda, which is to be primary? Interestingly, almost every private organization that has thought of an overseas propaganda program of its own has stumbled on precisely this question. More to the point, so has the Government.

What is the aim? Friendship? To many Americans this is the end-all. And nothing has done us more grievous harm—for we are offended terribly when love is not forthcoming from others.

It's quite impossible anyway. We have only to look at India; since their departure, the British, who never gave a damn whether anyone liked them or not, have become increasingly popular, while we, who did our best to expedite that departure, are becoming increasingly unpopular. The fruits of leadership do not necessarily include love, and we would do well to take the fact in our stride.

To Americanize people? No one ever puts it quite this baldly, but there lurks deep in some American breasts the feeling that there is a mystically beneficent quality in certain of our folkways, and that if only they could be exported, the chasm in understanding would be bridged. Again, we have a failure to isolate the particulars from the principles. After all, what was so Japanese as baseball?

To refute Communist lies? Obviously, this is an important part of any propaganda program, but as the primary aim it is a defensive course that would foredoom us to a constant shellacking. They'll always be a lie ahead. Furthermore, we must recognize that anticommunism does not fill vacuums, nor is it necessarily pro-United States; indeed, our biggest problem lies in those people who think we are as bad as the Russians.

To enlist support for American foreign policy? This is generally considered the primary aim of our propaganda effort. Spelled out, it means stressing the mutuality of each country's interests with ours; thus have we pushed ECA, North Atlantic Pact aid, the idea of national freedom, survival of the west. Is is enough? These policies are so demonstrably in the common interest that by all standards of logic they should be galvanic. Yet they are not, and the very people the policies benefit view them with mistrust. Why do they? The fact that we must ask ourselves this question helps answer the other.

Clearly, something more dynamic is needed. It is too late for mere information. If we wish our proposition to survive, we must now not only describe the revolution we began; we must extend it; and it is the Europeans themselves, as we shall see, who make the point.

THE GLOSSARY OF MISUNDERSTANDING

The obstacles to success may seem appalling, for even when we have articulated our philosophy we have the task of projecting it over the tremendous gap in attitudes and environment that separates us from other people, and it is a gap, unfortunately, that we do not readily appreciate.

We have been so unaware of basic differences that we have persisted in talking to the Europeans in terms for which there is no foreign equivalent—participation, community relations, incentive, public relations, productivity, man in the street, public opinion; the very listing itself produces a syllabus of the American philosophy, and a glossary of misunderstanding.

Taking the evocative power of these words for granted, we have assumed that hard facts will do the job—and that, in a sort of question-and-answer fashion, we can use prepackaged nuggets of truth to beat down each fallacy we come across. It won't work. Like the hydra, the myth is proof against piecemeal attack. Americans are barbarians. The United States is a dehumanizing technocracy. Here are the two chief elements in the myth—yet both are so mutually supporting that to refuse either we must trace them back to their common source.

THE BARBARIANS

Europe today presents an odd paradox. While "neutralism" has been reduced politically—in the words of one observer—to a "hard core of jerks," emotionally it has never been more powerful. Its underpinnings go something like this: Since there is no spiritual base to the United States, it is as culturally barren as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; its people are barbarians, and any who must accept succor from them should hate themselves for it. It is, of course, put much better than this. Essayists have a whole new lexicon of psychiatric and anthropological terms for the job, and they have been using it with increasing frequency to demonstrate that the jukebox, the milk shake, or some such thing is the universal clue to America's "infantilism," "reverted uncle complex," "Kino-Wellschmerz," etc.

The frightening thing is that it is the top intellectuals—the cream of Europe's professional class—who have convinced themselves most deeply. The bulk hate and fear Russia, yet the myth has so distorted their vision that, as one Frenchman has pointed out, what non-Communists seem to be fighting most is anticommunism. And this attitude, unfortunately, cannot be shrugged off as the affectation of a small coterie. The intellectual in Europe still retains a much more commanding position in society than his American counterpart. And though he has abdicated many of the responsibilities of his leadership, every poll and survey indicates that, if nothing else, he has been saying what the majority of his countrymen feel.

Why do they think us barbarians? First, because we paint ourselves as such. Few nations have put their worst foot so far forward; by our asinine emphasis on the material goodies we have seemed, by implication, to deny the existence of anything else in American life worth bragging about. Even during the most desperate days of the war we got our message of hope so tangled up with refrigerators and cars that, as one OWI worker put it, we could have billed it as "The War That Refreshes." The commercial projection of America has gone a step further; while our information people spend millions trying to demonstrate that we are really cultural after all, the biggest information agency in the world, Hollywood, has been exporting films that seem to demonstrate the opposite—so persuasively, it might be noted, that in Austria the Russians have been saving their breath by letting several of our gangster films quietly circulate in their occupation zone.

In their own way our intellectuals have joined in the chorus. How is the world to believe that there is any spiritual content in American life, the European asks, when American higher literature is so full of despair? In part, of course, the indictment is a misreading: Certainly America's literature is a long way from Whitman's ideal to report all heroism from the American viewpoint. Yet it is not quite so far as Europeans think, for they lack the context to see much of it for what it is—a self-criticism, a searching for values that in itself indicates a good bit of spiritual vitality in American life.

An appalling amount of our higher criticism, however, is a vituperation almost psychopathic in its intensity. "The emptiness of our American life," "bourgeois industrialism," "the grand canyon of the big money," "the dull horror of our lives." So goes the familiar litany. In part it is merely verbal revenge on a social structure that does not pay obeisance to the intellectual, and the European can sense it as such. What he does not realize, however, is that many of the critics have remained so unaware of the profound changes that have taken place in our society that they are still addressing themselves to the twenties—occasionally the 1890's.

But influential as our own self-criticisms may be, it would be a mistake to assign them a preponderant share in the formation of the myth. The myth reflects quite as much about the audience as about the United States it is supposed to describe—and the fact, for example, that Rage de Vivre (originally, Really the Blues—all about marijuana, hot jazz, etc.) is currently a best-seller in Paris demonstrates nothing so much as the extraordinary affinity Europeans have developed for such stuff. Furthermore, their attitude has now attained such a high degree of what the psychologists would call structurization that if we didn't supply them with the material they would probably make it up themselves. As indeed they have; two Frenchmen, for example, have been making quite a good thing of turning out novels of Stateside sadism and perversion as translations from the American. The myth has become self-perpetuating.

Here we see the folly of assuming mere information to be the cure for misinformation. The myth satisfies. In it the intellectuals find the rationalization for their own spiritual vacuum. For bewail as they may Europe's entrapment between les deux colosses, they have been unable themselves to come up with a valid alternative. Why?

They look away from themselves to chewing gum, bathtubs, and Coca-Cola for the answer.

Esthetically, the impact of America's culture gives them a point—even the American must feel queasy when he sees a grand canal plastered with Coca-Cola signs. But this is not their point. "What the French criticize," says Le Monde, after a swack at Coca-Cola, "is not so much Coca-Cola, as its orchestration, less the drink itself than the civilization of which it is a mark and the symbol." Le Monde goes on to bemoan Buicks, Chryslers, nylon stockings, and chewing gum. "As soon as they appear these habits become an invasion. It is a question of the entire French moral landscape." Throughout Europe intellectuals throw up their hands in the same fashion; a culture based on such wealth, goes the theme, cannot help but be contaminating.

But is even this the nub—this question of whether material riches can be reconciled with spiritual force? No; Florence, Rome, and Athens answered this one in the affirmative long ago. There is something else, more subtle, in the intellectual's animus, and it runs deep in current essays on United States culture. Why, the question keeps obtruding, is it so contagious? As he writes his farewells to happier days—the days when taste was still undemocratized and peasant girls were plump and didn't shave their legs—he writes his answer. It is a popular culture.

For here lies the true contagion of American culture. Whatever its aesthetics, it is above all else a proclamation to the world of the cultural enfranchisement of the common man. It is his culture, his own version of the pursuit of happiness—and a raucous ultimatum to a society that never allowed him to trespass quite so far. But to a Europe that is still culturally an aristocracy the symbols of his enfranchisement are often vulgar and shoddy. Is it the vulgarity of these symbols or their implicit revolutionary promise that makes them so profoundly disturbing? It is the Europeans, let us remember, not ourselves, who are sessed by the bathtub.

THE TECHNOCRATS

Why is American culture barbarous? Europeans have an easy answer: it is the product of a business civilization. Thus we come to the second great element in the mythology. For the European does not see the rapidly changing, socially conscious capitalism of 1950: he sees Wall Street, Mammon—and he trembles aloud over all the false dilemmas it would imply for Europe.

Thus, it is written, America's technological triumphs pose for Europe nothing less than the issue of man versus machine. Again we are back to the old spiritual theme. True, Europe wants America's mass-production techniques—but it is haunted by the fear that in adopting them it is making a compact with the devil. To many, American technology means the dehumanization of man—Charlie Chaplin poised in the gears is still a vivid symbol—and a Europe still deep in the old craft tradition is only now beginning to grasp the compatibility of mass production with quality and humanity. Somehow we have failed badly to show that, far from being narcotized by the machine, we have been invigorated by it.

But this failure in turn stems from a greater one: our failure to demonstrate the tremendous difference between our capitalism and the capitalism of Europe. In this respect it is startling to listen to an American businessman just returned from Europe; almost invariably he will so revile its low-wage, high-mark-up, monopoly economics that he sounds much more the howling revolutionist than the European Socialists who so mistrust him. His philosophy, however, remains uncommunicated. Not only have European capitalists remained utterly unconvinced of its value; the European masses have remained ignorant of its existence.

This double failure has had a deep effect on our relations with Europe. Translated by unregenerate European capitalism, ECA productivity has too often meant few benefits for the worker, but such profits for management that in Italy alone it has been hazarded that per capita there are more $1,000,000-a-year men—paying less taxes—than there are in the United States. To a dangerous degree, our efforts have appeared to the European worker simply a collusion between reactionary blackguards; he still can conceive of American capitalism only in terms of his own—and he is sick of it. It is high time the American businessman realized that it is not European socialism but European capitalism that is the chief block to free enterprise. "The problem of Europe," as one observer puts it, "comes down to who is to liquidate the capitalists of Europe the Russians—or the Americans."

THE LESSONS

Well, there it is—myth piled on myth, all synchronizing on the one great theme of spiritual impoverishment. And only recently have we begun doing something about it. After virtually leaving the field to the Russians after the war, in 1948 we authorized the State Department to set up an information and educational exchange program, and within a year this was further supplemented when ECA's information program was organized. We remained pikers, however. And it wasn't until after Korea that Congress decided a campaign of truth was in order and voted the money to get it going. (Total United States propaganda budget for the year ending June 30 is about $190,000,000.)

Will we get our money's worth? In view of the recent rise in American unpopularity it is easy to assume that our propaganda dollars are going down the drain. But the feeling of futility is unwarranted—certainly if ECA had been a complete propaganda failure there would be no "neutralism" problem in Europe to worry about. We're fairly new to the game, but—as even the avuncular British concede—we have been learning fast. We are ready to turn pro.

What have we learned? First, that we need much more of a sharpshooting approach to our "target" groups. There is no "European mind," but scores of group attitudes compounded along all sorts of professional, economic, and geographic lines. And the best way to get at them is through people that talk the separate lingoes. We have had a hard time talking to European intellectuals, for example, yet so far we have used few intellectuals for the job. The work of our "labor diplomats," in the toughest sector of the fight, underlines the same moral. How do they go about it? "You talk to the brothers," says one of them. "You go around and you talk to the brothers."

Next, we have learned that one of the principal reasons for the disbelief in American culture is, simply, the high cost of it. Stroll along the Kaertnerstrasse in Vienna, for example, and you will have a hard time finding a bookstore with any decent assortment of moderately priced American books in German—that is, until you come to the Communist information center, which has quite an interesting selection. Because of the lack of financial guaranties, European publishers have been loath to publish translations of anything except our sure-fire sex-and-mayhem fiction. So with the theater; stiff royalties—payable in dollars—have inhibited widespread production of the United States plays, and while the American companies that have gone over have dispelled a lot of European delusions, they have been far too few to make a deep impression. Patently, if we wish to project American culture rather than talk about it, a much more vigorous subsidy program is in order.

More important, we must develop far better means of reaching the masses. Considerable ingenuity has been brought to this problem; our people have put documentary films into thousands of commercial theaters, taken them in trailers to rural villages, brought showboats to Mediterranean coastal towns, subsidized troubadours to sing our story in Sicily, floated message-bearing toy balloons all over Europe, distributed household pamphlets and comic books by the millions. But though it is difficult to think of a bet that has been overlooked, we have made only a dent.

Why don't we merely expand all this? The answer, unfortunately, is not that simple. Europe has had a bellyful of propaganda these last 10 years, and after a certain point—and it is a very arguable point—you run not only into diminishing returns but rapidly increasing resistance.

There is, however, a way out of the dilemma—the participation of foreign nations in the job. "Let me get the facts about Korea to one pro-United States union man over here," says a United States propagandist, "and he'll be worth a thousand posters." There are many ways to invoke this aid. But there is one so effective, so destructive of the myth, that it has come to be the most promising weapon in our whole armory.

THE DISCIPLES

It was in Paris in the summer of 1948; Sir Stafford Cripps and ECA Boss Paul Hoffman were talking about productivity. How, Cripps asked, did the Americans do it? It was a question to delight a salesman's heart. "Let's bring your people over," Hoffman answered, "and we'll show them how."

So, with great vigor, we proceeded to do. Before long United States firms, labor unions, and professional groups were playing host to scores of European "productivity teams"; by the end of last year over 2,750 had made the trip and returned home—somewhat numbed, but enthusiastic—to tell what they had learned. The result, in increased productivity, is now a well-known story—and a good story it is. But there is another story that is not so well known.

What was conceived of as a technical measure turned out to be one of the most effective propaganda tools ever handed us. What was it the Yanks had over there? Was it, as people had said, the number of gadgets and gimmicks we had? Fortuitous national resources? Ruthlessness and overwork? Or was it something more profound? We gave Europeans a chance to come over and discover for themselves. And gained ourselves disciples.

Here—in excerpts from productivity-team reports—are some of the things they had to say to their countrymen:

"A visit to the United States gives one greater confidence in the ability of democracy to solve its problems. * * * The country is still * * * moving forward both culturally, socially, and economically." (Norwegian trade-unionists.)

"American unions' attitude to company profits is typical of their acceptance of a capitalist economy. However high, profits, at least in competitive industry, are not regarded as immoral or a social evil; indeed, they give proof of solvency and assured employment * * * the main concern of unions is to obtain a fair share of them." (British trade-union officials.)

"Contrary to the impression gained from many American films only a small percentage of American workers and their families live in tenements." (British trade-union officials.)

"There appeared to be a most friendly and genuine attitude of cooperation between management and labor and suggestions made by one side appeared to receive careful consideration, and in most cases support, from the other." (British rayon-weaving team.)

"The relations between management and labor in the great majority of mills which

we visited were excellent. There was often a sense of camaraderie based on mutual respect." (British cotton-spinning team.)

"Sometimes we had to ask ourselves whether it was manufacturer or union member speaking to us." (Danish ready-made-clothing team.)

"The big surprise to me was the importance American bosses give to human-relations problems. The American employer seems to be a psychologist aware that his prosperity is tied directly with that of the workers." (French unionist.)

"Both management and labor have taken steps to give greater efficiency in production and more understanding in relationships. When we return to Belgium I intend to recommend better management-labor relationships be created in our mines. I will see that this is done at Charbonnages de Houthalen, the mine I am managing." (Belgian coal-mining team.)

"If members of the team had learned nothing else from their travels in America and Britain, they would have learned one valuable thing, namely, the remarkable amount of good will which exists between people in the Western Hemisphere." (British gray iron-founding team.)

It is difficult for an American to appreciate what revolutionary documents these are. The British trade-union officials' report, for example, became a front-page story and gave British labor a resounding intellectual jolt. The Norwegian report, coupled with the report of a similar team that went to Russia, opened the eyes of left-wingers in a way that all the money in the world would not buy us. Throughout Europe, on a small but appreciable scale, doctrinaires of one kind or another are being provoked to rethink long and dearly held conceptions.

What gives the reports their impact? In an indirect way, the answer is to be found in the very criticisms they make. The teams make it plain that there are a good many aspects of the American way of life that they believe are either undesirable—the pace, for example—or inapplicable. But this leads them to a more important observation. These are only particulars, they say to their countrymen, they are not organic, and the essentials of the American success can be had without them. Which is what this issue is all about.

The technical-assistance teams are only one of the ways we have to go about the proselyting job. Thanks to the machinery set up in 1946 and 1948 by the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, and to special programs for Germany, Austria, Finland, China, and Iran, State is bringing over students, teachers, professional people, specialists, and leaders. The Defense Department is doing the same with Japan. Both State and ECA are placing foreign trainees in United States industry, farms, and Government agencies. Altogether, the Government is now bringing over about 13,000 people a year for observation, study, teaching, training, and indoctrination. Cost: about $45,000,000.

But by far the biggest contribution of all has been made by private organizations. This year they will have arranged roughly 40,000 exchanges of their own, and in addition will have footed a large share of the local expenses of many of the people brought over by the State Department. The 4-H Clubs have been exchanging young farmers; the Rotary Clubs have been bringing over students; the Girl Scouts, youth leaders—the list encompasses almost every kind of organization in American community life.

Measured against the need, however, our over-all exchange effort has been piddling.[1] There is a sort of geometric progression to exchange; since the clue to its success is applying the proposition, it follows that the more people engaged in it, the more effective each individual's work becomes. It has been very frustrating for many middle-management people, for example, to return to Europe all steamed up about, say, labor-management councils, only to realize that no one else in the outfit has got the word. Like plasma, exchange is best in massive doses.

We have a tremendous opportunity before us. We should seize it by expanding our total propaganda budget to at least $500,000,000 a year—and of this devote at least $180,000,000 to exchange. We could not legislate a bigger bargain for ourselves. For every Government dollar we put in the exchange kitty, we stimulate at least two matching dollars from private groups here and organizations and governments on the other side. As a result, by priming the pump with $180,000,000, we could step up the exchange to roughly 50,000 people a year to the United States; at least 10,000 in the other direction.

Mere expansion, of course, is not enough. Much more follow-up is needed abroad; equally important, much more preparation on this side. Exposure to America, as we have learned, does not itself produce understanding. The mayor of Graz is a case in point; when he got back he wrote the State Department that the Communist claim of imminent American bankruptcy might be correct; he had noticed that almost everyone in America seemed to be buying on the installment plan.

To do the job properly we should greatly extend our present system of orientation centers, and develop more provisions for working the stranger into community life. Here again, we have a tremendous asset in our private organizations. Already they are doing a tremendous job in welcoming and shepherding strangers, taking them on historical tours, plant trips, to PTA meetings, town meetings, and, in general, making them feel at home. And it is this, it might be added, that visitors talk about most often when they get home.

What has impressed the visitor points a moral for us as well. For when we assess our whole communication effort we find that, as in industry's communication effort, participation lies at the heart of our successes. It is not merely a question of manufacturing propaganda. Nor it it merely a Government matter. The problem encompasses all of us—for it is only as the diverse groups that make up our society, get involved in the job that our words carry real dynamism. And the potential is tremendous.

United States business, for example, has already contributed to our communication effort, but there is still more to be done. For the one area that remains virtually untouched is the one area for which United States business is the best-qualified group in all the world: getting the American idea across to European top management. It is hardly necessary to suggest the means; there could be seminars and international conventions—organizations such as the International Chamber of Commerce are ready-made for this—trips and private exchange of all sorts, and, as the success of the sales troupe "Red" Motley took to England suggests, some good old-fashioned barnstorming as well.

The more fields one thinks of, the more opportunities become evident. Labor, for example, is fairly bursting its seams to do more missionary work in Europe—and the more this is encouraged, the quicker will we reach European labor. So with all of our groups. The success of our communication efforts will depend ultimately on their initiative. And this is the way it must be. The American revolution is a challenge, not to states, but to free men, whose never-ending task is to seize their opportunities.

[1] NOTE.—Koreans brought to Moscow between 1946 and 1949: 2,600. Brought to United States in same period: 65.

WHY THEY DON'T LIKE US—EUROPEAN NON-COMMUNIST INTELLECTUALS ON THE UNITED STATES

"It is not what separates the United States and the Soviet Union that should frighten us, but what they have in common. * * * Those two technocracies that think themselves antagonists are dragging humanity in the same direction of dehumanization * * * man is treated as a means and no longer as an end—this is the indispensable condition of the two cultures that face each other." (Francois Mauriac, Catholic anti-Communist, in Le Figaro.)

"Americans appear the true successor of the Germans. America differs from Europe and resembles Russia, adorer of the technical." (Andre Siegfried, Protestant anti-Communist, in Le Figaro.)

"In all the homilies to which I listened, the word 'God' did not reverberate more often than the word 'money.' * * * It is perhaps because too often they have emptied European religions of their intellectual content that they have no choice except between music and convulsions." (Georges Fradier, in Esprit.)

"Of even the beginnings of the minutest embryo of a homogeneous culture there was no sign. * * * A general preoccupation with trivia—I mean coke machines, launderettes, laxatives, and baseball—I construed as the American attempt to exclude the bigger reality." (Robert Robinson, in the Isis (Oxford University).)

"Why they should not be originally creative is puzzling. It is possible that the lack of the organic sense, the conviction that man is a machine * * * turns them into technicians and cuts them off from the chaos, the accidents and intuitions of the creative process." (V. S. Pritchett; the New Statesman and Nation.)

"They come here, these barbarians, to teach us architecture—we, who are the sons of Michelangelo." (Italian educator.)

"The Russians used to rape 80-year-old women. * * * And after that, instead of being sick they simply drank vodka. You [Americans] wouldn't do that, I'm sure. You give them chocolates and contraceptives when you make love to them. * * * Every people has its own customs. But don't worry. You'll never feel sick, whatever you do." (From Virgil Gheorghiu's The Twenty-fifth Hour—Europe's No. 1 fiction best seller.)

"American influence has been harmful, for it has already begun the scaling down of aesthetic values so as to be within the intellectual grasp of the average city dweller * * * [it] will end, not with the debasement of taste, but with the disappearance of the word from our vocabulary." (Martin Cooper; BBC broadcast.)

"Thus, if France allows itself to be influenced by the whole of American culture, a living and liveable situation there will come here and completely shatter our cultural traditions * * *." (Jean-Paul Sartre; A European Declaration of Independence.)

"Jazz is their music, comic strips their most admired pictures, magazine stories their literature, Hollywood films their most popular entertainment, skyscrapers their architecture and their newest ball-point pens can write under water. * * * We know, too, that God could make America a wonderful country if he only had the money." (George Mikes in How To Scrape Skies.)

"America—the only country that's gone from barbarism to decadence without being civilized in the meantime." (Anonymous.)

War Casualties of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith, Michigan war casualties:

TWENTY MICHIGAN WAR CASUALTIES

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Twenty Michigan men were listed in the Korean casualty report issued today by the Defense Department.

Three were killed in action, 12 were wounded, 3 were injured, 1 was missing in action, and 1 was returned to duty.

KILLED IN ACTION

Army: Corp. Leonard J. Boger, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Boger, of Detroit.

Pfc. Lawrence J. Bouchard, son of Mrs. Mary Ann Bouchard, River Rouge.

Pvt. Herman L. Rembert, son of Mrs. Ruby Rembert, Detroit.

WOUNDED

Army: Pfc. Max E. Depoy, son of Mr. and Mrs. William E. Depoy, Niles.

Pvt. Richard C. Fockler, son of Mr. and Mrs. Vernon B. Fockler, Lapeer.

Pfc. George H. Guenther, husband of Mrs. Constance Guenther, Birmingham.

Cpl. Richard Idzior, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Idzior, Detroit.

Sgt. Arthur G. Proper, son of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Proper, Tawas City.

Cpl. Arthur F. Seitler, brother of Mrs. Jackie L. Seitler, Battle Creek.

Sgt. Thomas C. Harris, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas C. Harris, Sr., Detroit.

Sgt. 1/c Odvin Martinson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Martin J. Martinson, Iron River.

Cpl. Louis M. Quinn, husband of Mrs. Ruth J. Quinn, Lansing.

Cpl. Dale W. Siebenmark, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred W. Siebenmark, New Buffalo.

Cpl. Richard M. Zoltowski, son of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Zoltowski, Detroit.

Marine Corps: Tech. Sgt. Elmer J. Pappert, husband of Mrs. Elmer J. Pappert, Detroit.

MISSING IN ACTION

Marine Corps: Pfc Roy L. West, son of Olin V. West, Dansville.

INJURED

Army: Pfc Vermont S. Johnson, husband of Mrs. Alice Johnson, Flint.

Cpl. Howard R. Mann, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold R. Mann, Detroit.

Cpl. Maurice C. Roberts, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jammie L. Williams, Pontiac.

RETURNED TO DUTY

Army: Pfc Paul B. Haynes, son of Mrs. Lena Haynes, Benton Harbor.

Address by Governor Battle, of Virginia, to University of Virginia Alumni

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a copy of the most worth-while address by Gov. John S. Battle, of Virginia, before the Washington Chapter of the University of Virginia Alumni on February 8. As an alumnus of that great university, I naturally found this address of special interest, but its appeal and significance are not limited to those who have spent their college days on the campus at Charlottesville. For there are expressed here some fundamental ideas with regard to education which I believe to be of the greatest importance. Never before in the history of this country has there been a more urgent need for the truth clearly told and clearly understood. Every citizen has an unfailing responsibility to see to it that our educational processes are eternally dedicated to the attainment of that fundamental end. I consider it a privilege to commend to the attention of the Senate this worthy and thought-provoking address by Governor Battle.

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

As alumni of the University of Virginia, we are interested in the program afforded by our alma mater, the physical improvements that are now under way, and the contribution the university is making to the educational and cultural life of the Nation.

I wish I could take the time to outline in some detail the progress being made in all phases of the university's activities. I shall not undertake such a discourse, but I do want those of you who have not had the opportunity of maintaining close contacts with Charlottesville to know that the university is doing a magnificent job under the leadership of President Colgate W. Darden, Jr.

Mr. Darden, from the very outset of his administration, set his course so as to not only carry forward the fine work of his predecessor, President Newcomb, but also to strengthen and bulwark the position of the university, as originally conceived by Mr. Jefferson, as the capstone of the Virginia system of education. The noteworthy accomplishments in this direction are a high tribute to the President and the faculty as well as to all those loyal alumni who have so generously and wholeheartedly given their support.

We have given a great deal of thought to our entire program of education in Virginia and particularly to our free public schools, which provide the foundations of education for the great bulk of our citizenship.

For some time prior to my entering upon the duties of Governor, I had the very definite impression that there was room for substantial improvement in the character and caliber of instruction offered in the public schools. This impression was buttressed by further acquaintance in offices and in business with some of our high-school graduates, and also by the results of a study undertaken by a Virginia legislative commission of the teaching of history and government in these schools. It became evident that many high-school graduates not only were not well versed in history and government but that they were far from well grounded in grammar, reading, and elementary mathematics.

I set as one of the prime goals of my term of office the improvement of this situation. I am glad to say that all concerned in our State are working earnestly toward removing the causes of such deficiencies. The General Assembly of Virginia has increased appropriations for teacher pay, liberalized retirement benefits, and enlarged scholarship aid for teacher training in order to help attract and keep well-qualified teachers—and they, of course, are the key to the success of any program of education. I know that our teachers, as a group, are intensely interested in doing well the job that is entrusted to them. Our school administrators, together with the teachers and patrons, are joining efforts to reevaluate the teaching program in order to make sure that the public-school graduates are firmly grounded in the fundamentals of learning.

It is my considered judgment that the fundamentals—the three R's and history and government—cannot be overemphasized. It is upon these that all other learning rests.

We are determined that our children shall have full opportunity to develop the mental and moral capacities that are essential to the preservation of our civilization as we know it today. We cannot escape the realization that this generation, perhaps more than any other in history, is confronted with a maze of ideologies which requires the utmost discernment for the selection of that which is based upon truth, right, and justice.

In this conflict of ideologies, we see every day the emission of great streams of propaganda from those who have utter disregard for the truth; we see the truth distorted, twisted, and colored, and misrepresented to suit the tastes of tyrannical governments whose sole purpose is to confuse, undermine, and weaken those of us who still enjoy the greatest blessing known to mankind, the blessing of living in a free land where we can think, and speak, and worship as we please.

Only by an intimate acquaintance with the history of these liberties and some knowledge of the sacrifices on the part of those who so fearlessly and valiantly safeguarded them can the young men and women of today develop an appreciation of their meaning. With such an appreciation, the individual then is able to distinguish the false from the true; he can recognize propaganda for what it is and fact as fact; he can understand and espouse the principles and motives of democratic peoples, well aware that by them alone can he hope to enjoy and transmit to his children the opportunity to live, work, and play in the bracing atmosphere of freedom.

Can we afford not to exert ourselves in the schools, in the homes, and in the churches toward better informing our boys and girls on these matters? I say we cannot and that it is our duty to teach and to instill these truths indelibly in the minds of the youth.

It is one thing to read the Virginia Bill of Rights without any background knowledge of the struggle, the debate, and the study that led to its adoption. It is entirely a different thing to restudy this outline of our fundamental freedoms in the light of an acquaintence with George Mason and a clear insight into the era that produced this great document.

Built on the firm foundation of historical truths, and grounded in the basic skills of reading and writing and, at least, rudimentary figuring, our system of education then will have the means by which it will produce not automatons nor machinelike specimens of uniform but doubtful texture and resiliency—no, not such as these at all; rather, it will produce men or women of individual abilities with the capacity to think and act for themselves and with the determination to defend and strengthen the society in which they live.

I have mentioned these aspects of what we are striving for in Virginia because I believe that the same tenets are applicable to the Nation; certainly we all have the same goal, which is the preservation of those inherent rights of the enjoyment of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness and safety.

With sound public-school training, the great numbers of our young people who never reach college will be more adequately equipped to take their places in life as independent, self-reliant citizens. Our colleges

and universities, in carrying out their important functions, must build upon the base provided by the public schools for those schools are the first training ground of the majority of our college students. The better the public-school program, the better opportunity the higher institutions of learning will have to develop the technical skills and specialized abilities of their students.

I am happy this evening to say to you that the University of Virginia is fully and faithfully carrying out its high duty of training men and women in the way they should go; that Virginia men and women still seek to carry out the admonition of the ancient Greek philosopher so appropriately inscribed over the facade of Cabell Hall, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free" and as they go forth from the university, they carry with them something of the spirit of that place; and although the words of the inscriptions over the main gate may fade from their memories as the years pass, they do not forget that they have entered that gateway where they have sought "the way of honor, the light of truth, and the will to work for man."

In times such as these, we necessarily evaluate all our governmental enterprises on the basis of what they can contribute to the national defense and what are essential to the safety, health, and welfare of the people. In Virginia, we are, of course, giving first attention to the national and civilian defense. If some of the normal services must be curtailed, by reason of personnel or materials or other causes, it will be done. I think I should add that it will be done readily and without complaint, because without national security there can be no normal activities.

I am proud to serve in the government of our Commonwealth, because Virginia has conscientiously labored through the years to maintain the type of administration which does credit to the democratic system. We have succeeded in living within our means; in fact, our State constitution wisely makes this mandatory. We have restricted our governmental programs to those deemed to be essential and have striven steadfastly to return to the taxpayers a full dollar in services for each dollar contributed to the treasury. We have been fortunate to attract and retain capable, loyal, and civic-minded employees whose desire to do a good job and perform a real service provides the impetus for ever greater accomplishment.

This spirit and will for meritorious achievement is reflected in not only our improved school system but also in our good roads—unsurpassed in the Nation—in health, medical and welfare services, and in many other phases of the operation that constitutes the State government. I say this not in boasting but in all humility, because I feel sincerely that the principles followed so consistently in our Commonwealth could be applied with equally favorable results in some other echelons of government.

I purposely have avoided in these comments tonight any discussion of the issues uppermost in the minds of all of us at this time, the issues relating to our foreign policy and the strategy that might best be followed in the interest of national defense. These questions do not come within my purview as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and I claim no special qualifications to pass upon such grave national matters. Had I those qualifications, I still would hesitate to express my opinion, because it would remain only a personal opinion; but I do want to say that Virginia insofar as I can legally and properly guide its efforts will do its part, and more, to keep this Nation strong and secure against the tide of tyranny that already has encompassed such a large sector of the globe.

If more of the people of the world had the benefit of the knowledge and teachings of Thomas Jefferson, we might look to the future with greater confidence and hope. Would that all could adopt and adhere to his philosophy that "the care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

Address by Hon. Herbert A. Lehman, of New York, at Conference of Civil Liberties Clearing House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an excellent speech on the subject of the relation between our civil liberties and our foreign policy, which was delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] at the National Conference of the Civil Liberties Clearing House in Washington, D. C., on March 1, 1951.

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

The common purpose for which you meet and which you pursue through your individual organizations has become increasingly significant and meaningful in the light of developments in this country and throughout the world. Communism has advanced in large areas of the world, in some by subversive stealth and in some by naked force. Its advance has been marked by a brutal violation of the basic rights of man. To stem this advance the United States has sought to help strengthen internal democratic forces in many parts of the world. In this country we, too, have been confronted with the threat of Communist infiltration and corruption.

The problem of preserving our civil liberties at home while bearing the responsibilities which rest on us because of our position of world leadership constitutes a critical challenge.

Interdependence of civil liberties and world leadership is inescapable. There is a vast difference between being a world power and being a world leader. Leadership implies a degree of social and moral responsibility which cannot be identified with any nation which attains power by force alone. If the United States should ever lose its leadership, it would be because we had abandoned morals and principles in a naked struggle to survive in a slave world where survival alone would not be worth much.

The determination as to whether our power carries with it the indispensable elements of moral and social influence rests to a very large degree on our own behavior at home. Nations, like individuals, cannot have two sets of manners and morals.

Nazi Germany was unquestionably a dominant world power a decade ago and for a breathless moment in history it seemed that her power might prevail and the whole free world would go under. It took the determinated might of the entire free world to shatter the power of the Axis. But it could not have been accomplished had we not been fighting for a great moral principle.

And what was our position when the Second World War was finally over? We had certainly suffered the least of any nation involved in that war. And our power had increased enormously. We were in a position where we thought we could relax in the belief that the world at last was free again. How mistaken we were. We have had a rude awakening.

Thank God we have awakened. We have taken affirmative action, because we have recognized that military victory did not automatically insure freedom and security in Europe or even here in the United States.

The original concept of aid to Greece and Turkey and the later and broader concept of a vast cooperative European aid program restored economic security to Western Europe and marked an historic turning point in international relations.

The Communists did everything in their power to move into the vacuum that existed in Europe following the war. The people of Europe were physically exhausted and spiritually depleted. They faced the almost hopeless task of rebuilding their economic and their productive machinery.

Under these circumstances no wonder that the Communist appeal was almost irresistible. Unlike fascism, communism was arrayed in all the false trappings of peace and plenty. It boasted that it possessed the only formula for achieving economic restoration and social justice.

I do not think that there is any serious doubt in the mind of any man that the European aid program has been almost wholly responsible for the fact that the nations of Western Europe today are relatively vital and remain democratic. Of equal importance is the fact that they have regained their economic and military vigor.

The problem in Europe is, of course, quite different from the challenge that confronts us today in Asia. Most European countries have enjoyed some form of democratic experience. They have been constantly exposed to Western culture and politics. Tragically, some central European countries succumbed to overwhelming military force and did slip into the Soviet-Communist orbit. But we knew that Europe, or at least Western Europe, could be stimulated to take the democratic initiative if we could administer the necessary economic and moral aid.

It is clear that the allied victory over the Nazi empire, while it made us a tremendous power—as it did Russia—did not in itself insure for the United States a position of world leadership.

It was because we took a realistic approach to our moral and social responsibilities that we gained this position of leadership it was presaged in the formation of UNRRA, to which we contributed great sums to save millions of lives and to rehabilitate whole nations. And the broad economic aid programs which came later again reflected a moral and humane conscience as well as enlightened self-interest.

I dare not think what the world situation might be today if we had refused to heed our conscience and had ignored the political potentials in Europe.

Today the continuing threat of Soviet or satellite aggression is frighteningly real in Europe, as it is elsewhere. The tensions and anxieties have correspondingly increased. But the miracle is that Western Europe has achieved not only the capacity to care, but the will to resist.

We can expect to encounter fierce and ruthless pressures from the Soviet-dominated Communists everywhere. We have so far been safe in our assumption that Soviet Russia would prefer to entrap the world through a political and economic rather than by a military offensive. But the current situation may change at any time. Accordingly military strategy and preparedness cannot and must not be neglected. We must take every possible measure to be ready to meet aggression in all vital areas. But we must at the same time make it clear to the world that our purpose is to maintain peace, not to wage war.

Meanwhile the Eisenhower report has averted the threatened deterioration of our European partnership. Our objectives are substantially clearer than they were 2 months ago. But this apparent respite offers no reason for complacency. Our joint efforts with the free world to build an impregnable defense must go forward unhesitatingly and with all possible speed. Any sign of neglect of our obligations in Europe would be disastrous. I hope that Congress will act speedily and affirmatively to reject any suggestion to limit the Presidential power to commit troops to Europe as proposed by Senator TAFT, Senator WHERRY, and others.

I strongly suspect that many who are engaged in a dispute about how many troops should be sent and when they should be sent and whether the President has the power to send them at all are actually in favor of sending no troops at all. The dangers to our own security that would result from such policies are palpably clear, but it will take coherent leadership to discredit the arguments of this powerful group of latter-day isolationists. Acceptance of the fantastic Hoover plan would mean the abject surrender of all of Western Europe, all of Middle Asia, and much of Africa. It would mean that most of the free nations of the world would sink into the abyss of slavery. It would mean that the United States, isolated from the rest of the world would, I believe, ultimately collapse either by attack from without or deterioration from within.

But our policy in Western Europe is only one part of our total world problem. It appears now that a major test of our world leadership may come in our policy toward Asia.

The Korean war is, of course, a major factor. It has sharpened our national awareness of the possibility of an all-out military conflict. It has intensified our emotions and heightened our anxieties.

I shall not attempt to judge the merits or the fallacies of American postwar policy in the Far East. I do not know whether under any circumstances, western democracy could at that time have captured the imagination and loyalties of the Communist-led revolutionists in China. In any event, we gave our support to the regime of Chiang Kai-shek and that regime collapsed. Its collapse was followed by an organized and concerted attack on our State Department as being somehow responsible for the tragic events in China. The charge was made that Communist sympathizers controlled or influenced our foreign policy. This, in turn, loosed a flood of prejudice and intolerance that has resulted in irreparable injury to the careers and reputations of a great many innocent people. At the same time, these loose charges undermined confidence in our Government and persuaded free peoples abroad that we were a house divided against itself. These attacks inevitably came to permeate the whole fabric of our thinking.

If it is true that moral and social responsibility must be a constituent part of our foreign policy, then it is possible that we have lost some authority in the world because we have endured and accepted these unwarranted, unjustified assaults on our Government and on our fellow citizens.

It is only a few years since American foreign policy reached a noble peak in implementing our world responsibilities in peacetime. Our own best instincts as a people made effective a policy based on the great American tradition that we must do everything in our power to assist in extending freedom and security to all people everywhere.

But somehow we slipped from the peak. The descent was not sharp. But our objectives and our world relations and our methods of achieving them become momentarily clouded. There is some evidence that foreign policy has been at least partially responsive to these violent pressures here at home. As our foreign policy reacted to these pressures history will undoubtedly record the fact that there was also a notable decline in the state of our civil liberties.

Obviously we must not underestimate the real dangers of Communist subversion in our midst. I realize, of course, that some practical curbs must inevitably be placed on individual freedom of action when it becomes a tool in the hands of the Communists or others whose real objective is to destroy freedom.

We have good reason to fear communism. Its subtle and devious approach is beguiling. The Communists have searched out every chink and weakness of our armor of faith in freedom. But if we drop that armor, we stand stark in utter fear and futility.

There is no historic justification for fearing that we cannot detect and contend with our internal enemies if we act firmly and justly within the framework of our democratic institutions. If, however, we deny that the very strength and dynamism of democracy is rooted in the right of criticism and opposition to the status quo—then at least part of the meaning of freedom has escaped us and added confusion will be projected into our relations with the rest of the world. Such confusion is a manifestation of weakness and of fear—fear of economic, political, or social change.

This concept of democracy certainly cannot be expected to have any great appeal in Asia. We may not ignore the fact that there exists in Asia a genuine revolutionary spirit among vast numbers of peoples who have lived for centuries in misery and poverty. To ignore this would be to blind ourselves to one of the most compelling facts of contemporary history. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that today in great backward areas of the world the common people are on the march and they will not be stayed.

The main international challenge that confronts us in Asia now is to make certain that there will be no repetition of the Chinese experience elsewhere in the Far East. The problem is far greater than the one in postwar Europe. Programs such as point 4 and economic aid constitute the first step. The food-aid proposal to help India is a concrete and practical demonstration of our intentions and I most earnestly hope that this proposal will meet with speedy approval in Congress. These programs are of vital importance.

There will, of course, be inevitable disappointments and disillusionments even in this area of our endeavors. Many of the complexities will arise from the sheer vastness of the territory of Asia and from social, political, and economic diversities. But the demand for social reform is as great a compulson in Asia as the deep urge for economic betterment. Our whole program must be oriented in the direction of encouraging these reforms.

The millions of people in Asia, unlike the Europeans, have had little democratic experience. The word "Democracy" means many things to many people. In some areas it is just a slogan. It is therefore imperative to demonstrate by our own acts and our own record rather than by mere words that democracy offers a better hope than communism for equality and freedom as well as for economic security.

Military effort and a sincere and honest determination to merit the confidence of the free world are inextricably interwoven—neither will be enough by itself to assure either security or lasting peace. We must not sacrifice the latter to our preoccupation with the former.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche said only a few days ago, "Security today is a universal problem and a matter of friends as well as guns and planes and ships. In the ideological struggle now going on it is people who in the end will count more than armaments." I am afraid that we are not yet making the effort required to convince the peoples of the world that we are the most sincere exponents of the democratic ideal. We still have not convinced the world, not even some of our own friends, that we reject all forms of imperialism and seek no ends save freedom and peace for all people.

During my long public life I have come to know quite intimately the strengths and weaknesses of the democratic processes. I have learned, too, that deliberations and even great debates do not automatically guarantee wise decisions.

But my faith in democracy is unshaken and I have learned that in faith there is no room for fear.

A few weeks ago I warned the Senate of the current dangers of public hysteria when I said, "There is fear, there is panic. There is fear on the part of people that if they raise their voices in any way in defense of the American tradition of equality, justice, and law they will be accused of being sympathetic to communism."

The panic of which I spoke was revealed in the passage of such repressive legislation as the so-called McCarran bill. It is demonstrated by increasing indifference in Congress to civil-rights legislation. It is demonstrated by irresponsible and unsupported charges which blacken the reputations and weaken the influence of patriotic, loyal Americans, even men of the stature of General Marshall, Secretary Acheson, Philip Jessup, and Cordell Hull. It is reflected in the reluctance of certain newspapers to give adequate coverage to those who dare to oppose the black evil of McCarthyism.

In our relations with each other we have manifested fear and suspicion that are entirely alien to our great traditions of tolerance and faith. That course is sinister and dangerous beyond description.

If we are to accomplish the almost overwhelming global tasks that confront us, we must do considerably more than we are now doing to prepare ourselves spiritually as well as militarily for our assignment. If we are to give the world a convincing example of democracy unafraid, we must show not only a militant insistence on liberty, equality, and justice and law for the world at large but a sustained insistence on these values in our daily lives. The greatest threat to democracy comes not so much from sudden or revolutionary change. Its greatest danger comes through lethargy, and through failure of the people to defend their fundamental rights against gradual and sometimes cleverly disguised encroachment.

Loyal and devoted citizens of our country, liberals and conservatives alike, regardless of political affiliation, must join hands in the fight against abridgement of civil liberty under the guise of military necessity. A determination to defend and protect our rights and liberties and those of others will give strength and cohesion to our foreign policy and help to assure our position of world leadership.

And the free world needs our leadership as greatly as it needs our dollars and our men.

Pray God we will be wise enough and strong enough in hand and heart to make our leadership a blessing to all the world.

Statement of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding American participation in the defense of Europe, presented by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, to the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, on February 20.

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

In being given this privileged opportunity to testify before you gentlemen, at the very outset I can candidly state that by virtue of my organizational associations much of this testimony is fairly representative of the thoughts of several millions of Americans of Central and East European background whose knowledge of the Soviet peril is intimate, broad, and keen. Uppermost in the minds of these citizens, including those whom I directly represent, are these three cardinal factors of orientation toward the issue at hand: (1) The secure defense of Western Europe, and therefore of the United States, against threatening Soviet aggression, (2) the consequent, hoped-for preclusion of world war III, and (3) if this proves unrealizable due to disastrous Soviet miscalculation, a full vantaged preparedness insuring the best possible chance for military and political victory over Russian Communist imperialism. Geared to these fundamental points of interest, a reasoned analysis of the problem confronting us can only lead to the conclusion that the Senate should reassuringly resolve not to predicate executive assignment of more ground forces in Europe on any congressional adoption of a policy on the subject.

UNSTATED PRECONCEPTIONS OF THE WHERRY RESOLUTION

This recommended determination of the resolution is founded not only on certain guiding pragmatic principles posited in a dimension of thought scarcely considered in discussions on this issue, but also on a necessary assessment of the underlying preconceptions and the spirit animating the resolution, this despite its neutral verbal formulation. For (1) the suggestive note of conditioning executive troop assignment to Europe by a congressional policy beyond the determining principle of common defense that Congress has already adopted strongly implies a defeatist skepticism of that very principle in the measure of underrating the ability of free Europe to contribute materially to the common defense of Western democracy; (2) the animus of this resolution engenders a groundless doubt in the competency of our executive agencies to execute and properly implement the crucial policy principle already embraced by Congress in its acceptance of the North Atlantic Pact; (3) it nurtures the ugly possibilities of hampered military planning and the hazardous encumbrances recently displayed in the relations between the United Nations and the UN command in Korea; and (4) its spirit is permeated with an indiscriminate fear of mass Soviet power which, if affirmed, would constitute an open invitation to the Soviets into Western Europe and deprive us, in this unhappy event, of certain military advantages both outside and inside of the Iron Curtain. In brief, this resolution was conceived in cringing timidity, not strength, and the affirmation of its intent would only underwrite the former.

CERTAIN GUIDES OF ACTION IN A BROADER DIMENSION

Affixed to our original cardinal factors of general objective and in concise refutation of the preconceptions noted, the following pragmatic principles may be advanced for your able consideration in making possible the realization of our stated objectives and thus responding to this resolution in the negative:

(1) An observed distinction between the principle of common defense and its content. The principle revolves simply on the basic question of whether to support or to abandon free Europe against possible Soviet aggression. In effect, this has already been resolved in the form of the North Atlantic Pact, and this all-determining principle reflects adequately the policy of Congress. If it is admitted that to all intents and purposes this principle of mutual support is unalterable, then it follows for competent authorities to determine the content of this principle, which involves the flexible determination of the magnitude of troops in Europe as expertly evaluated by them in terms of adequation of means to the end imbedded in the policy already established by Congress. Logically, in order not to inhibit adjustments necessitated by conceivable changed circumstances, it would follow further that the rigidity of any mathematical ratio be avoided. Yet, without any mark of contradiction, Congress should continually demand that every practicable means be explored to bolster and equip our anti-Communist allies, not only in Western Europe but anywhere they can be found. The certainty of our integrated participation in European defense has inspired overflowing vigor and rejuvenation in West European rearmament, apparently sufficient to calm the fears of many. But also, let me emphasize, it has symbolized in another dimension American strength of leadership for the millions in Central and Eastern Europe upon whom we might crucially have to depend in the event of war.

(2) An appreciative recognition of the interdependent relationship between American power in Europe and Central and East European anti-Communist resistance. No one here will deny the vital importance of underground resistance behind the Iron Curtain for our paramount concern in the defense of Western democracy. To the extent that the existing underground network, operated by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the Slovak, Lithuanian, and Polish resistance movements, persists in its sabotage, sporadic skirmishes with Communist security troops, anti-Communist propaganda, and steady infiltration of the Red armies, to that extent it clearly conduces to our defense objective. For any plan of Soviet aggression on Western Europe would have to consider this deep-rooted internal weakness twice, especially if it must account also for stern Western military resistance. Today, for example, Soviet propaganda is exerting every effort to overcome this critical weakness in the Ukraine by pointing to the contemplated remilitarization of Western Germany in the hope of recalling Nazi ravages in the minds of the undependable Ukrainians. Reciprocally, to the degree that we ably defend ourselves in Western Europe, obstruct any Soviet conquest of its mighty industrial capacity, and show promise of maintaining ourselves there in case of war, to that degree, by sheer causal impact, we lend every encouragement to essential resistance activity behind the Iron Curtain.

(3) A forthright repudiation of the myth of Russian invincibility in land warfare. A logical examination of the arguments of the few who seek to withdraw or sharply restrict American ground troops in Europe discloses as their overplayed major premise the myth that "we can't beat the Russians in land warfare." This concoction, which unfortunately has been left unchallenged in recent debate, represents the acme of gullible absorption of Soviet propaganda bluff. The unthinking propagators of this psychologically destructive myth flagrantly ignore the fact that the "if," or real possibility, in history is just as real as the actual. To adduce the Hitler debacle in support of their fallacious contention, they betray a profound ignorance of the events in Eastern Europe during World War II. As is generally known in circles dealing with the subject, in the first six months of the Soviet-German conflict over 2,000,000 non-Russians, and even Russians, of the multinational Red army willingly surrendered in the fervent hope of taking arms against the Kremlin to realize the freedom of their respective peoples. But for incredible Nazi stupidity, had this and more come to pass, the Soviet power would certainly have collapsed. As underground operators well know, mere quantity does not reveal the true story about the flaunted Red armies.

(4) Serious consideration of an American foreign legion in a buttressed defense of Western Europe. Because of the immensely strategic importance of free Europe in the defense of Western democracy, there is no reason why this defense cannot be further solidified by the rapid formation and presence of an American foreign legion in Western Europe, such as Senator LODGE has long advocated. Consisting mainly of Central and Eastern Europeans drawn from all parts of the world, indeed even from inside the Iron Curtain, such a legion, by its very existence, would complicate additionally any prospective Soviet plans of aggression into Western Europe. For in Soviet Communist eyes there is a no more contaminating influence than contact between a free and an enslaved brother speaking the same language and with a common heritage.

For these coordinate reasons and on the basis of an abiding trust in the specialized competence of our military authorities, I earnestly urge that your unanimous report on this resolution be in the negative. However, to lend positive affirmation to your overwhelming reasons, a substitute resolution should be conceived for joint passage with the House of Representatives, in which a resounding approval of executive dispatch of more ground troops to Europe be boldly registered, in which a strong urging for practical aid to all anti-Communist allies, including those behind the Iron Curtain, be fearlessly made, in which on these basic issues the full unity of America be clearly reflected for all the world to witness.

How To Win the War of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on the night of February 27, at the Uphams Corner Market Restaurant, before members of the Dorchester Kiwanis Club, the Honorable Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the Suffolk Superior Civil Court, delivered an extremely interesting address on the way in which university students could help to win the war of ideas. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

It is an amazing fact that during the past 5 years, Stalin's empire has grown from 190,000,000 people to more than 900,000,000. Thirty-seven out of every hundred people in the world today are under the domination of the Communists because of the deceptive ideas given to the workers of the world. It is still more amazing that all the land and peoples taken over by the Com-

munists were acquired through propaganda and infiltration by the fifth columns within those countries.

Americans are considered experts in the mechanical know-how, but when it comes to propaganda we are babes in the woods compared to Stalin and company. The basic policy of Stalin and company is to achieve world conquest by force, violence, trickery, fraud, and the big lie. If we can draft boys to carry a gun, why not draft them to carry the principles of American democracy, based on justice and truth, to all the nations of the world?

The biggest lie of all that has been sold to the workers of the world is the part of the Communistic Manifesto, which reads, "Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains." Instead of the workers losing their chains, the Commies have put a lock and key on them all over the world. However, it is not enough to abuse Russian communism and to publish the horrors of its physical application and it will not be enough to defeat it physically. We must defeat it by a stronger idea, and we have that idea here in America—the Constitution of the United States. We should sell it to the world, not by lend-lease, gifts, or loans, but by training our bright young men in our colleges and universities and sending them to every country in the world as ambassadors of good will to spread the principles of American democracy. We could draft many of our best students in our colleges, being sure that they possess not only ability, character, and integrity but, most important, loyalty to the American way of life.

We must get rid of the fifth column of Russian conspirators in this country; we have tolerated them far too long. The Kremlin conspirators train their students to destroy the true way of life such as freedom, liberty, and religion. We should see to it that the students in our colleges are trained to sell our way of life, which is based on truth and justice for all, to the nations of the world. This would be in keeping with the wishes of the founding fathers who commanded the preceptors of our colleges "to go forward and teach the youth ideals of love of country, chastity, obedience, and all those virtues which are the ornament of human society and upon which our Constitution was founded."

Our Lord sent His apostles out to the highways and the byways to sell the common people the true way of life. Can you imagine the force of 12,000 or 20,000 students imbued with knowledge of our Constitution and our way of life going forth to the nations all over the earth—a sixth column for justice and truth? In World War I and World War II we won the war but lost the peace. You cannot win peace by guns alone, it must be accomplished by truthful propaganda. That is the only way to destroy for all time the big lies which have been planted in the minds of the workers of the world by tyrannical dictators.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stop Stoking Inflation," from the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, February 12, 1951.

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

STOP STOKING INFLATION

The controversy between the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board may sound like a high-flown, theoretical matter, but it has a lot to do with the price of hamburger. And of socks, suits, carpets, carfare, frying pans, coal, milk, bread, bobby pins, and everything else that money buys.

Because it has most to do with the value of money itself. The rate of interest on new issues of Government bonds is the price the Government pays for borrowing. There is a point at which, even for the Government, borrowing ought to begin to become expensive.

President Truman has supported the Treasury in simply setting its own interest rate, around 2½ percent, and expecting the Federal Reserve system to buy enough bonds to keep them up to par in the market. This puts more bonds and money into the banks of the country, where they become the basis for more and more loans to increase business or finance holding of stockpiles and inventories.

The result is that prices go up. Prices of virtually everything. Because money, or credit, has become more plentiful, while the supplies of goods are reduced by defense production.

Ordinarily it would be a matter for apprehension to see Government bonds, of the older, lower-rate issues, go below par. But while uncomfortable for the holders, such a development at present would be salutary to the extent that it reduced the base for lending, and there is little danger that it would go far.

New York's Federal Reserve bank last week reported credit expansion at a pace more than double the preceding week. For the country at large, the week ended February 7 saw an increase of $80,000,000 in money in circulation and of $209,000,000 in reserve bank credit.

Behind that lies the fact that the 12 Federal Reserve banks combined now hold more than $22,000,000,000 of United States Government securities compared to less than $18,000,000,000 a year ago. The Treasury should find a market for its additional bonds outside the banks, and should pay enough interest to attract investment by individuals and nonlending institutions.

To be sure, this will increase the cost of "service" or interest on the public debt, which everybody has to help pay. But the way matters are, the country is paying a great deal more in inflated prices for almost everything it buys, including even defense equipment, than the $1,250,000 it would pay in an additional one-half percent on the public debt.

Meanwhile, the Government, responding to public indignation, goes through frenzied motions of trying to establish workable price and wage controls. By resisting credit control, the full costs of national debt are kept from showing up on the Treasury budget but they show up in everybody's grocery bill, clothing bill, and tax bill for munitions.

Instead of letting the Federal Reserve Board regulate the engine to keep it at a steady working pressure, the White House has the Economic Stabilization Agency hang weights on the safety valve while the Treasury continues to shovel coal on the fires of inflation. That way lies an explosion.

Such a contradiction in policies is not good finance, sound economics, nor intelligent management. If the American people come to understand clearly what is being done to them by this process, it will not even be good politics.

Tribute to Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Indomitable Spirit," published in the Lake Land (N. J.) News of February 5, 1951. The editorial is in tribute to Thomas A. Edison.

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

AN INDOMITABLE SPIRIT

The one hundred and fourth anniversary of a distinguished American who spent most of his life within a few miles of Morris County will be observed Sunday. He is Thomas Alva Edison, who has been hailed by some as the greatest inventor of all times and definitely is one of the great ones if not the greatest. He carried on his experiments in Newark, then for a longer period in Menlo Park, near Metuchen, and for more than half of his life in West Orange.

Edison is generally known for some of his more spectacular inventions such as the incandescent light, motion pictures, and phonograph. An even greater insight as to the source of his genius might be found in listing, instead of his successes, some of the handicaps and misfortunes he overcame. He, himself, actually counted them as benefits and as having made a direct contribution to some of his best-known inventions.

When he first started school his teacher sent him back home as not being bright enough to continue, suggesting that he be sent to a State school for subnormals. When he was 12 years old and earning his own living as a butcher boy on a train, a conductor lifted him up by his ears and caused the start of a deafness that grew progressively worse. Yet he felt no bitterness and said that it was a help rather than hindrance, probably drove him to reading. He attributed at least two important developments to the necessity of adapting his experiments to his affliction—the telephone as we know it today and the phonograph.

"In experimenting on the telephone," Edison explained, "I had to improve the transmitter so I could hear it. This made the telephone commercially practical as Bell's magneto telephone receiver was too weak to be used as a transmitter commercially. It was the same with the phonograph. The great defect of that instrument was the rendering of the overtones in the music and the hissing consonants in speech. I worked over a year, 20 hours a day, Sundays and all, to get the word 'specie' perfectly recorded. When this was done I knew that everything else could be recorded."

Edison was always happy to recall that a dozen men and himself formed a $300,000 corporation whose chief asset was his 31-year-old brain. He invented the incandescent lamp 361 days later and then perfected his great power system that spread electricity across the Nation. Yet for another group he used up $3,000,000 in perfecting a process for mining and milling low-grade iron ore only to have all the time and money wasted because deposits of cheap ore were discovered elsewhere.

Later he invented a new kind of battery and put it into manufacture with a complete plant. However, when he discovered

that the product was not as good as he demanded, he closed the plant down and started experimenting all over again, finally succeeding in getting the battery he sought, now the most profitable product of the Edison Industries. At another time, almost his entire West Orange plant was destroyed by fire. But as he watched from a nearby vantage point he started sketching plans for the new plant that would take its place.

Such indomitable spirit could overcome virtually any handicap.

Herbert Hoover: A Prophet With Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call attention to a challenging editorial on American foreign policy and a most revealing summary of some of the remarkable prophecies and predictions made through the years by that great American statesman, Herbert Hoover. In the extremely difficult task of forecasting ahead of time the results of public policies, Herbert Hoover clearly stands without parallel or equal among his contemporaries of the past two decades.

The Huron Daily Plainsman is one of the great daily newspapers of South Dakota. Its editorials are the careful product of two well-informed and able men—Robert D. Lusk, publisher of the paper, and Bruce Campbell, the editor. From extensive reading, from studious research, from frequent travels, and from numerous contacts with American leaders, these two South Dakotans join in producing a most informative and illuminating editorial page which is read by large numbers of citizens in the upper Midwest area of this country. The editorial merits the careful reading of all Americans as we face up to the difficult decisions which are ahead. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

A PROPHET WITHOUT PROPER CREDIT

One of the most arrogant things which the ardent supporters, in Congress and outside of it, of the troops-to-Europe plan have done in the course of arguing for it is to try and write off Herbert Hoover as a man with no sense of history and no grasp of the foreign situation. They even have employed the meaningless but scornful word "isolationist."

They have done this thing after Hoover gave his famous speech of December 20, 1950, to the Nation, in which he suggested that the United States preserve the Western Hemisphere by building air and sea power to hold one frontier in Britain and one in Japan and by keeping economically sound, and by demanding proof that Western Europe even is willing to fight Russia before sending any troops to Europe.

What are the facts?

The facts are that Hoover's observations on foreign policy the past 10 years have proved remarkably accurate and that his speech of December 20, 1950, was part of a pattern of foreign policy speeches he has given the past few years.

JUNE 29, 1941

Perhaps the reason so many administration spokesmen have attacked Hoover is that time has proved him so uncomfortably correct in a notable speech of June 29, 1941, a week after Hitler attacked Russia.

At that time Hoover urged that the United States make no pact whatsoever with Russia because it would advance communism and "make the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the four freedoms to mankind a gargantuan jest."

He pointed out that in 1940 the Dies committee reported unanimously and specifically that the Communist Party in the United States and anywhere was a Moscow-directed conspiracy and worked against the United States Government people. This violated the agreement made in 1933 when the United States recognized the Soviet officially. Russia had agreed to refrain from any propaganda or any move to injure the United States in any way in any part of the United States.

Hoover pointed out how Stalin had conquered and enslaved the nations the United States had helped create at Versailles after World War I—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and how it helped Hitler rape Poland.

"If we go further and join the war and we win," he said, and remember that this is Herbert Hoover speaking on June 29, 1941, 6 months before Pearl Harbor, "then we have won for Stalin the grip of communism on Russia, the enslavement of nations, and more opportunity for it to extend in the world. We should at least cease to tell our sons that they would be giving their lives to restore democracy and freedom to the world. * * * War alongside Stalin to impose freedom is more than a travesty. It is a tragedy. * * * As great a violation of everything American as to aline ourselves with Hitler."

He said then the United States should "arm to the teeth for defense of the Western Hemisphere" and wait the moment after Russia and Germany had knocked each other out to step in and "promote a just and permanent peace."

During the war, naturally, Hoover as a patriotic citizen did all he could to help win the war.

APRIL 1950

In April 1950, he again appraised the world situation in a speech in New York. He grimly recalled his talk of June 21, 1941. His chief theme at that time was that the United Nations was the hope of the world but was being stymied by the Russians and should therefore be reorganized without Communists in it and that "if that is impractical, then a definite new united front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion and who love freedom."

JULY 11, 1950

On July 11, 1950, after the Korean war started, Hoover spoke in Emporia, Kans. He pointed out that the only justification for war is as an instrument for a specific consequence and that for America that consequence was peace, but that we had strayed from that objective in fighting World War II, as well as World War I. The United States concentrated on winning battles and it had no well-defined political objective by which to chart military action.

He urged at that time a regeneration of spirit in the United Nations and a clarification of thinking and determination of purpose in the United States and UN. "Military strength is no substitute for sound policy," he reminded, and World War II furnished him with a perfect sample.

OCTOBER 19, 1950

On October 19, 1950, he spoke out again. He challenged the will of Europe to fight and the ability of the United States to finance and send abroad large bodies of troops. He agreed that "the greatest danger point to all western civilization is Western Europe. It is obvious, with the threats in Asia, that the United States can supply only a minor part of this huge European deficiency even with our present program."

And he said then that: "We should say, and at once, that we shall provide no more money until a definitely unified and sufficient European army is in sight. And further that 10 American divisions will not be landed until then."

He urged getting down to brass tacks with other nations, after having sent $20,000,000,000 to Europe in 5 years with no results and said: "If we do not find real military action of powerful strength in Western Europe; if there is no definite and effective mobilization of the other members of the UN so as to take up the major burden of their own defenses, then we had better reconsider our whole relation to the problem. In that event we had better quit talking and paying and consider holding the Atlantic Ocean with Britain, if they wish, as one frontier and the Pacific Ocean with an armed Japan and other islands as the other frontier."

DECEMBER 29, 1950

Then on December 29, 1950, he made his forceful radio address which drew so much criticism. It was really no departure from his previous warnings. It went a little further in that he cited the fact that the United States had to furnish more than 90 percent of the foreign forces in Korea and suffer over 90 percent of the dead and injured in a supposed United Nations fight. He cited the land power of Russia and compared the vast advantage it has in manpower and he cited the strong points of the United States.

And he called for a policy to "preserve the Western Hemisphere." His critics immediately twisted that to say that he advocated "retreating" to America. He did not say so. He said "to preserve the Western Hemisphere" by holding the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with large sea and naval power and land forces where needed in Britain and Japan and the Philippines. He called also for a sound economy at home and that probably is what made so many administration spokesmen attack him.

The course of current events has seemed to vindicate Herbert Hoover's public utterances and policies. They deserved a much greater exploration and hearing than the administration has given.

But the public can remember, and must.

Postal Aide, Trolley Line Plan New Road Hazards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, owing to the discussion which is presently being had relative to the carrying of mail by the different common carriers, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Postal Aide, Trolley Line Plan New Road Hazards," written by Ivan H.

Peterman, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, February 21, 1951.

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

POSTAL AIDE, TROLLEY LINE PLAN NEW ROAD HAZARDS

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

For those of you who risk life and limb daily on our crowded highways, two items of special interest appeared in yesterday's news:

1. The Post Office Department plans a major shift of short-haul mail from railways to contract truckers.

2. The Liberty Bell Line, for 50 years a speedy, picturesque, carbon-monoxide-free rail route through the Lehigh Valley, wants to give up, and add more busses to traffic.

Almost any motorist, having completed a run from anywhere to Philadelphia, would veto both proposals without a second reading.

Certainly any car commuter, negotiating the city's drives, or completing the ordeal by Chestnut Street into town, any morning except Sunday, will agree we have neared the saturation point. He will say: "Let's abandon no railways for more busses, and for the love of Allah, keep the mail on the rails. We have enough careening mail trucks now."

Nevertheless the Public Service Commission has heard application for a fleet of new, scheduled busses that will further congest the north and west approaches to this bottlenecked city. Why? Because the company doesn't wish to repair its roadway. The inference, of course, is that the motorist, paying his annual fee, can better afford to restore the highways.

As to the United States mails further cluttering the roads, that bright suggestion comes from our old pal, Jack Redding, formerly chief propagandist for the Truman Fair Deal, but lately switched to Assistant Postmaster General. Mr. Redding was voted "least likely to succeed" by every war correspondent after he completely botched the Army's handling of the liberation of Paris story.

On the memorable Paris occasion (August 25, 1944) the then Lt. Col. John M. Redding superseded our adequate and practical First United States Army press arrangements, with what we lightly dubbed "Task Force Redding." This organization was to enter Paris with the French armor or United States Fourth Infantry Division, Redding at the head. Shepherding the correspondents, Redding decided on aircraft to fly our reports back to London, Normandy, Algiers, or Capetown—anywhere but the places to which our reliable jeep drivers had been ferrying them, and from where each night they were transmitted by press-wireless. Everything was to be practically foolproof.

But alack and alas, "Task Force Redding" got involved in the joys of liberation, the sporadic shooting caused delays, the aircraft flew to wrong fields, or refused to fly at all when came the dusk. Those that finally took our stories shuttled them back and forth across the English Channel for three dreary days. There was no relay from the airfields. The only ones who got the story of Paris to your ears were four tough scribes who violated censorship, went on the liberated radio, and broadcast the wild doings to the world. Redding suspended all four, sent them home.

We didn't hear of Colonel Redding for months after that prize snafu. And then it was to learn he had won the Bronze Star for his meritorious press handling of the Paris story.

So you may see why this taxpayer hesitates to applaud Redding's diversion of the United States mails. I'd like to get my letters this year, not next. And if we must be run down by truck, let it not be United States mail truck, from which it's hard to collect damages.

According to the new Assistant Postmaster General, a 95-percent increase in mail-pay rates over 1947 caused the decision to shift $100,000,000 worth of business from the railroads to public highways. Naturally this loss won't help the railways, without which the country cannot operate. Certainly not in wartime. So, no doubt, the Government will eventually subsidize this loss, while a host of additional trucks wear out the pavement.

Surveys have been made around several large cities, including Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Harrisburg. Hauls of 200 miles or less will be involved. "Through rain and sleet, by day and night * * *." Toot your horn, friend. Here they come, on the open roads.

This observer may be a laggard, but remembering the last sudden clampdown on gasoline, rubber, vehicular traffic in general, this year, with Joe Stalin stoking up his tanks and puppets more suggestively each day, seems hardly the time to abandon rail routes in order to clog the roads with more busses and trucks. As one who has inhaled more than his share of fumes, this gear-shifter objects.

I don't know if the Lehigh Valley commuters want busses to replace the comfortable, fast line they have. I don't know if the Hoover report suggested mail trucks to replace the mail cars already in use. But both busses and trucks wear out, the change-over costs plenty, the roads are overcrowded, and, anyway, why not let the customers have a voice in these things, for once?

Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have long had very strong personal convictions on the importance of books in our cultural life, in education and in that broad public discussion of national and international issues which is so fundamental to the democratic process. For this reason I was very pleased to see the discussion of the problem of book distribution in the President's message of February 27 on postal rates. In dealing with the inequalities in postal rates which now exist as between magazines and newspapers on the one hand, and books on the other, the President said:

These excessive subsidies for newspapers and magazines are not only wrong, they are seriously inequitable. Books, which are surely as important as newspapers and magazines in disseminating information, and mail-order catalogs, which carry advertising generally similar to that in newspapers and magazines, are classified as fourth-class mail. Under the recommended rates, there will be little, if any, subsidy in carrying these publications—a startling discrimination in comparison to the situation on second-class mail.

The current issue of the Saturday Review of Literature contains a very enlightening editorial on this problem and the President's reference to it, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

DISCRIMINATION

For some time the threat of higher postal rates on books has been giving anxious days and nights to publishers, already harassed by the almost prohibitive costs of printing and paper. It was a cause for jubilation when President Truman in his message to Congress on February 27 attacked the discriminatory clauses in the postal rate bill and said: "These excessive subsidies for newspapers and magazines are not only wrong, they are seriously inequitable. Books, which are surely as important as newspapers and magazines in disseminating information * * * are classified as fourth-class mail. Under the recommended rates there will be little, if any, subsidy in carrying these publications—a startling discrimination in comparison to * * * second-class mail."

There is a long history of injustice in this latest attempt to blackjack the three hundred or so publishers of hard-cover books in the United States into paying still higher postage rates. In 1938 postage on books was on a level with the reading matter in magazines. At that time President Roosevelt, who must have been aware that the United States was almost alone in this postal-rate discrimination against books, stated that "the interests of the public in the promotion of the cultural growth, education, and development of the American people" required the rate that was then established on a parity with magazines at one and a half cents a pound. Nevertheless, in 1943 the book rate was 3 cents a pound, and a surcharge of 1 to 6 cents was added, amounting to 4 cents for the first pound and 3 cents for each additional pound. In 1949 the rate was again increased to the present 8 cents for the first pound and 4 cents for each additional pound. During this period postage on magazines has remained the same. If the latest proposals of the Post Office Department are approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, book publishers will be confronted with a flat rate of 10 cents for the first pound and five for each succeeding pound. Furthermore, this will apply only to book packages up to 10 pounds as compared with 70 at present. The vast number of packages over 10 pounds will then be charged at full parcel-post rates applicable to general merchandise.

Few people outside of the publishing business, bookstores, libraries, and educational, technical, and religious institutions are aware of the vital role of the postal system in the distribution of "hard-cover" books. After the substantial orders for new books and reprints have been sent by railway express or motor trucks the post office takes charge of the distribution of all small purchases and reorders mailed in packages which it would be uneconomic to send in any other way. Over 10,000 new titles are published each year in this country, and at least a hundred thousand titles are kept in print. It is the duty of the Nation's bookstores and the larger libraries to have in stock a fair representation of this mass of literature of every type. A large volume of books is also sold by mail direct to the purchaser, especially in rural areas and smaller cities and towns in which there are no bookstores. Millions of books are sent out in this way every year by great or small book clubs. It is obvious that a large part of the distribution of books throughout the country is dependent on the post office and that higher postal rates will have to be paid by the consumer, in addition to the steadily increasing retail prices that publishers are forced to charge for their merchandise to meet their expenses.

For the coming year the post office is faced with a deficit of over half a billion dollars. For many years the mailing costs of magazines and newspapers have been heavily subsidized. In his message to Congress President Truman said that the present rates applicable to them were close to the level of 70 years ago. He also protested against asking the taxpayers to continue generously subsidizing the advertisers and others who use the mails for business.

There is little question that the post office will continue subsidies for magazines and to a lesser extent for books. The argument that it is in the public interest to have informative and cultural literature distributed as widely as possible is too powerful to be dismissed. Nevertheless, there are inequities in the present system that should be remedied. It is absurd, as Mr. Truman said, that the post office should be asked to distribute the digest-type magazines at the rate of 1½ cents a pound. Based on simple arithmetic three copies of the average digest magazine weigh 1 pound, so that a single copy can be transported anywhere in the United States for half a cent, while it costs more to handle a copy than it does an ordinary letter, for which the writer pays six times as much postage. Newspapers and magazines now are carried at a cost of $242,000,000 a year, though the postage paid amounts to only $42,000,000. For the year 1952 it is estimated that some 6,000,000,000 of individually addressed periodicals and newspapers will be carried through the mails. The larger mass-circulation magazines carrying a great number of pages of advertising pay only a small percentage of what it costs the post office to deliver them, so that the taxpayer is paying for advertising that goes into American homes at less than cost. "Surely," the President added, "advertising was not a part of the public information and education which Congress intended to subsidize 70 years ago when it established second-class mail."

In view of the huge deficit faced by the post office for the coming year book publishers can hardly expect to have the present rates reduced. But they may hope that common sense will dictate that the absurd discrimination against books will not be continued by increasing the postal rate on them until there will be little if any subsidy for books, while magazines and newspapers continue to cost the taxpayer four or five hundred millions a year. Our cultural past and the knowledge and wisdom in the future will be enshrined, as it has always been, in books—not in magazines designed for entertainment and for carrying vast quantities of advertising. We believe that magazines of this nature should pay a higher postage rate than the weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals which are cultural and educational and which cannot hope to obtain either large advertising revenues or a great number of subscribers. By their nature these magazines are limited in appeal to tens of thousands of readers rather than millions, but they are nevertheless a vital link in the immense process of educating, informing, and entertaining the public.

H. S.

Kenneth C. Vipond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in last Thursday's issue of the Evening Star of this city, which pays a deserved tribute to Kenneth C. Vipond, who is retiring an Assistant Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission, after a service of 47 years with that body.

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

KENNETH C. VIPOND

A notable career in the Civil Service Commission has come to end with the retirement of Kenneth C. Vipond, Assistant Executive Director, who steps out after 47 years.

When the young Vipond, Canadian-born, came into the Government back in 1904, the Commission itself was only a tiny agency, and the entire Federal Establishment was giving no hint of the tremendous proportions to which it would burgeon. As Government grew and Commission work increased, so also did Mr. Vipond's responsibilities. He developed into a recognized authority on procedure and policies, and his counsel for years has been solicited from one end of the Government to the other, whenever changes were in prospect. "Ask Vipond," became as much a part of the scene as payday.

As was natural, Mr. Vipond's name often figured in speculation when an appointment as Commissioner was in the offing, but he was happier in other fields. Some years ago he declined—with thanks—a special assignment tendered by the White House.

Despite his always-crowded hours, Mr. Vipond never succumbed to the in conference virus which has afflicted so much of the Government brass. Any caller was always certain of an audience, even though it might be delayed.

His retirement is a loss to the Federal service.

Mineral Engineering School Enrollment, United States and Canada, 1950–51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report by William B. Plank and Henry J. Petrie:

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON MINERAL ENGINEERING SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, UNITED STATES AND CANADA, 1950–51 [1]

(By William B. Plank and Henry J. Petrie [2])

The following preliminary summary of the tenth biennial survey of the mineral engineering schools of the United States and Canada, made by the writers under the auspices of the mineral industries education division of the AIME, indicates that there are 12,624 students enrolled in these schools in the current academic year 1950–51. Fifty-nine out of the sixty-four schools in the United States and all of the eight schools in Canada are covered by this preliminary report. The former complete survey was made in 1948–49 and was published in the journals of the institute in August 1949.

This enrollment of 12,624 mineral engineers in both countries is 16 percent smaller than the enrollment of 15,028 in 1948–49, the peak year, and is about the same size as it was in 1946–47. The decrease since 1948–49 was 15 percent in the United States schools and 28 percent in the Canadian schools. The data for these comparisons are shown in table III. In the United States 37 percent of the mineral engineering students are veterans as compared with 67 percent of the group in 1948–49. Thirteen women are studying to be mineral engineers in the United States but none in Canada.

Since the enrollments of engineering schools being gathered by the ASEE and the United States Office of Education are not yet published, no exact figures on these can be presented here. It has been estimated by Dean S. C. Hollister, of Cornell University, however, that the present number of undergraduate engineering students in the United States is 130,000, or 48 percent less than in 1948 and 28 percent less than in 1949.[3] By comparing these figures with those given above, it is seen that the mineral engineering enrollment has fallen off only about one-third as rapidly as the whole engineering group.

Considerable concern is being shown by engineering educators and industries over the engineering manpower shortage that is predicted as a result of the increasing demand for trained engineers not only by industry but by the armed services. This is in the face of a decreasing supply, as is shown by this and other studies. Not only has the number of entering freshmen been decreasing since 1947, because of a decrease in the number of high-school graduates entering engineering, but the total number of high-school graduates will continue to decrease until 1958 because of the lowered birth rate during the depression years.[3]

Table V shows that next June there will be approximately 35,000 engineering graduates, and in June 1952, there will be 25,000. These figures are from a paper by Henry H. Armsby, Associate Chief for Engineering Education of United States Office of Education presented at the ASEE in Seattle, June 22, 1950. In addition the estimated 51,000 men who received their first degrees in engineering last June have been absorbed by industry, and all branches of engineering have been listed as critical by the Secretary of Labor. In the light of these facts, it is easy to foresee the shortage in the supply of engineers that is alarming Government and industrial officials.

Not only are engineers vitally needed by industry, but in this present national emergency, begun when the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel on June 25, 1950, all branches of the armed services have been taking their toll of engineers through the Selective Service, by enlistments and by the recall of reservists. As has been pointed out by a number of educators and representatives of industry in the congressional hearings on the pending universal military training bill, it seems plain that to maintain our national defense, both in industry and in the Armed Services, there should be a continuing supply of college-trained engineers.

It will be to our national interest to make it possible for more 18-year olds to enter engineering colleges rather than to induct them into the armed services. If we are to graduate 50,000 engineers annually we must have at least 100,000 freshmen entering the engineering schools instead of the 30,000 men now in the freshman class. The 75,000 18-year olds proposed to be allotted to the colleges for scientific and technical education would supply only about 37,000 graduates in all branches of science and engineering.

[1] A paper read before the Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1951; to be revised.

[2] Head of department of mining and metallurgical engineering and instructor in mining, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; member and junior member, AIME, respectively.

[3] News release of the ASEE manpower committee, October 11, 1950, George D. Lobinger, chairman.

The number of freshmen to be sent to college should be at least twice that contemplated in the pending bill. The proposal of Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, Chairman of the Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board, as reported by Dr. Howard A. Rusk in the New York Times, of February 11, 1951, for a Reserved Specialist Training Corps of 75,000 men in addition to a Reserved Officers Training Corps of 75,000 men in our colleges has great merit as a possible solution of the scientific, engineering, medical, and military needs for the national defense and industry.

As to a prediction of the supply of mineral engineers it is seen that the number of men receiving their first degrees in that field has increased 12.5 percent in 2 years as compared to a decrease of 25 percent in the whole engineering group in the same period. Next June it is expected that 3,240 men will receive their first or bachelor degrees in mineral engineering but in the succeeding 4 years this supply will sharply decline unless something is done to stimulate enrollment in the field.

Apropos of this, it is encouraging to note the increased efforts in this direction. Especially commendatory and worthy of support is the proposal to be presented by the Minnesota section of the AIME at the annual meeting at St. Louis "to study the means of encouraging youth to study in the mineral engineering field."

Of the 2,948 mineral engineers to receive their first degrees next June in the United States schools, 452 will be in mining, 735 in metallurgy, 855 in petroleum and natural gas, 274 in ceramics, 618 in geology, and 14 in fuels. The industrial placement officers have been on the college campuses offering jobs since before the first of the year and a government agency is actively seeking mining engineers. One large industry announced several months ago that it would hire all engineers that would apply. There is an encouraging increase in the number of graduate fellowships available, especially to metallurgical engineers. What are needed now, however, are more undergraduate scholarships such as those available through the Coal Division of the AIME, the National Coal Association, and several other industrial organizations.

TABLE I.—*Mineral engineering student enrollment by courses, 1950–51, United States, 59 out of 64 schools* [1]

Course	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Total undergraduates	Graduate students	Grand total	Canadian B. S. degrees
Mining	365	382	448	485	1,680	113	1,793	452
Metallurgical	512	581	636	727	2,456	607	3,063	735
Petroleum and natural gas	655	667	782	1,030	3,034	143	3,177	855
Ceramic	158	171	222	280	831	123	954	274
Geology	442	447	605	658	2,152	418	2,570	618
Fuels	7	12	9	14	42	25	67	14
Specials					101		101	
Total	2,140	2,260	2,702	3,093	10,296	1,429	11,725	2,948

[1] In the 5 missing schools there are 2 mining, 3 metallurgical, and 1 petroleum curricula. Data from tenth biennial survey by Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, Nov. 15, 1950

TABLE II.—*Mineral engineering student enrollment by courses, 1950–51, Canada, 8 schools* [1]

Course	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Total undergraduates	Graduate students	Grand total	Canadian B. S. degrees
Mining	62	55	65	100	282	1	283	103
Metallurgical	41	34	40	73	197	25	222	73
Petroleum and natural gas	8	18	27	26	79	0	79	26
Ceramic	1	1	6	10	18	0	18	10
Geological	47	41	53	78	219	78	297	80
Total	159	149	200	287	795	104	899	292

[1] Data from 10th biennial survey by Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, Nov. 15, 1950.

TABLE III.—*Engineering student enrollment, 1940–41 to 1950–51, undergraduates and graduates, United States and Canada*

	1940–41 [1]	1944–45 [1]	1947–48 [1]	1948–49 [1 2]	1949–50 [3]	1950–51 [4]
Mining	1,978	224	2,459	2,632	2,223	2,070
Metallurgical	2,460	472	4,121	4,158	3,887	3,285
Petroleum and natural gas	2,877	376	4,665	4,147	4,175	3,250
Ceramic	843	190	1,108	1,214	998	972
Geological	792	(?)	(?)	2,777	(?)	2,867
Fuels	44	(?)	(?)	47	(?)	67
Specials	149	(?)	(?)	53	(?)	101
Total mineral engineers:						
United States	9,133			13,769	11,283	11,725
Canada				1,259		899
United States and Canada		1,262	12,353	15,028		12,624
Chemical		5,082	20,972	23,619	19,976	
Civil		3,537	31,849	33,861	29,109	
Mechanical		6,965	50,551	53,642	45,632	
Electrical		5,934	56,408	53,774	45,711	
Others		18,852	68,117	72,969	46,555	
Total engineers	114,116	41,632	252,250	249,915	[4] 226,533	

[1] Mining Engineering, May 1950.
[2] Mining Engineering, May 1950; data on mineral engineers from Mineral Education Division study; other engineers and total from Journal of Engineering Education, February 1949.
[3] From Journal of Engineering Education, February 1950.
[4] Study of Mineral Education Division, AIME, Nov. 15, 1950.
[5] Includes 21,460 United States engineers from non-ECPD schools and 6,821 Canadian engineers, unclassified.

TABLE IV.—*Graduate students in mineral engineering, United States, 1933–34 to 1950–51* [1]

	1933–34	1934–35	1936–37	1938–39	1940–41	1942–43	1946–47	1948–49	1950–51
Mining	40	55	49	44	44	20	70	82	113
Metallurgical	116	93	131	172	215	137	479	552	607
Petroleum and natural gas	18	29	58	43	78	27	187	91	143
Ceramic	19	36	48	64	50	19	138	164	123
Geological	46	62	34	86	127	9	127	197	418
Fuels	4	10	18	6	9	10	16	16	25
Total	243	285	338	415	520	222	1,008	1,102	1,429

[1] Data from Mineral Industry Education Division, AIME, studies.

TABLE V.—*First engineering degrees, United States and Canada*

Year	All engineers [1]	Mineral engineers [2]
1942–43	14,714	
1943–44	11,155	
1944–45	4,724	
1945–46	8,219	
1946–47	19,272	
1947–48	30,018	
1948–49	46,934	[3] 2,881
1949–50	[3] 51,000	3,189
1950–51	[3] 35,000	[4] 3,240
1951–52	[4] 25,000	

[1] Data from Journal of Engineering Education.
[2] Data from AIME, Education Division studies.
[3] Estimated.

TABLE VI.—*Teachers in mineral engineering schools, United States, 1950–51*

	Professors	Associate professors	Assistant professors	Instructors	Assistants	Others	Number of schools
Mining, min. dress	43	20	22	12	13	3	33
Metallurgical	78	51	45	56	69	31	45
Petroleum and natural gas	22	13	19	13	32	4	19
Ceramic	31	14	20	11	17	0	14
Geological	55	35	41	36	56	8	31
Fuels	0	3	1	1	0	0	3
Total	229	136	148	129	187	46	145

TABLE VII.—*Teachers in mineral engineering schools, Canada, 1950–51*

	Professors	Associate Professors	Assistant professors	Instructors	Assistants	Others	Number of schools
Mining	11	5	4	3	3	7	8
Metallurgical	11	4	1	2	4	13	6
Petroleum and natural gas	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
Ceramic	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Geological	18	5	13	4	22	15	7
Total	41	14	19	10	30	36	23

Fifty-four Fatherless Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Maine Coast Fisherman of March 1951:

FIFTY-FOUR FATHERLESS CHILDREN

Owners of fishing vessels must recognize that the unusual loss of life in the numerous

sinkings during the past 6 months is a matter of growing public concern. The most recent tragedy—the disappearance of the 17 men on the *Gudrun*—has left 54 children without fathers. Certainly fishermen and their families—and the public—are justified in demanding that every possible precaution be taken to make these boats seaworthy.

In the past, similar tragedies and similar demands have brought about the required Government inspection of even the lowliest public excursion boat. Yet the larger fishing vessels—all carrying crews of from 8 to 18 men—are not inspected for seaworthiness by any authority. Navigational equipment carried is whatever the owner desires. And after sinkings have occurred, the occasional investigations can only be guesses at what might have happened in the reaches of the sea. Even when inquiry boards decide on preventive measures, there is no one to enforce them.

One thing the owners can and should do is paint all boats and rafts international orange. The Coast Guard recommends this as a result of the inquiry into the loss of the *Theresa A.* International orange is the most visible of all colors and will help searchers spot anything drifting on the water.

Fishermen themselves can take a step for their own safety and the future of their families by getting support for the Nicholson bill which was recently submitted to the House of Representatives by Congressman NICHOLSON, of New Bedford. This bill (H. R. 1762) will require the Coast Guard to make an annual inspection of every fishing vessel over 15 gross tons. It specifies the type of equipment to be carried, and owners will be required by law to have hulls checked by drydocking and hauling at least once a year.

The Nicholson bill deserves your strong support. Write to your Congressman today urging its passage. Required annual inspections will help reduce the recurring deaths at sea and hold the ever-present risks of fishing to a minimum.

The Cumberland and the Tennessee: Two Great Rivers as One—Report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has recently issued a report of Ten Rivers in America's Future—a voluminous report reflecting an exhaustive study, and particularly important at this time when power development for both domestic use and for purposes of national defense are of major concern.

This is the type of report which is of great interest to those who are concerned with and interested in the development and improvement of our country and the proper use and conservation of all of its vast resources. The report contains flattering, though factual, references to the accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority and make further recommendations with respect to the development of the Tennessee River—one of the mentioned 10 great rivers in the country. It also takes cognizance of the development of the Cumberland River by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army—the development to date and its future development and the integration of the Cumberland River program with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The integration of the Cumberland River with the TVA has long been one of the aspirations of the people of middle Tennessee. The study and report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission should hasten this dream into a reality.

I commend this report to the Members of Congress, and also the reading of an editorial in this connection from the February 27, 1951, edition of the Nashville Tennessean, which under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks.

The editorial, entitled "Two Great Rivers as One," is as follows:

TWO GREAT RIVERS AS ONE

A powerful and perhaps decisive voice has been added to those which have long urged full development of the vast resources of the Cumberland River.

It is the voice of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, which has called for the integrated management of the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers as part of a far-reaching development program for 10 major river basins scattered over the country.

In recommending that the entire program be carried out along the Tennessee Valley Authority pattern, the Commission gave flattering but altogether natural recognition to the TVA for the sweeping transformation it has wrought in our own region. As those of us in the Tennessee Valley know so well, the TVA experiment has proved to be an astounding success, and there is every reason for duplicating it in other regions so its political, social, and economic benefits may be even more widely felt.

Of especial significance to our region, however, is the fact that one of the basins the Commission believes particularly adaptable to a TVA-like development also lies in our own midst.

"In the Cumberland River below Nashville," said the Commission's exhaustive report, "there is a series of low navigation dams, inadequate for modern navigation and providing no flood protection. Accordingly the most pressing current issue relates to the method of future development of the lower portion of the river."

As for this method itself, the Commission gives strong support to a high dam like that proposed by the Army engineers for construction near Grand Rivers, Ky.

"A dam on the Cumberland near Kentucky Dam on the Tennessee and near the mouths of these two rivers," says the report, "affords definite possibilities of advantage in terms of the coordinated hydraulic development of the two rivers."

Carrying this idea of coordination even further, the Commission reports that "by interconnecting the two reservoirs by a canal it would be possible to use water from both rivers to greater advantage through the two powerhouses than would be possible if the rivers were treated as separate and distinct."

Nor would the advantage of such integration be limited to power production alone, the report continues. Navigation would be enhanced by shorter routes and lower costs for navigation structures, and "benefits for flood control" would be derived.

In substance, this recommendation for integrated development of the two rivers and for connecting their reservoirs with a canal closely parallels the course of action recently urged by the TVA in a study made for the President. Far from relying on the TVA's position, however, the Water Resources Policy Commission submitted some strong arguments of its own for tieing the two powerful rivers together. Said the report:

"The close cultural, economic, and political connections between the communities of the Cumberland Basin and the communities of the Tennessee Basin present advantages for managing the two basins in an integrated manner. The fact that both the Tennessee and the Cumberland are part of a single electric power marketing area, the similarity in agricultural problems, and the presence of both basins in the same two States favor a closely coordinated operation of the two."

Finally, the report takes note of the "great need for power in the TVA power marketing area at the present time," a factor which it says weighs heavily in favor of "rapid development of the Cumberland."

A similar observation, it will be recalled, was contained in the TVA's recent study, which noted that the need for power is so great that it overshadows the question of what Government agency shall undertake the development necessary to produce the power.

Apparently sharing this view, the Water Resources Policy Commission made no recommendation as to who should develop and manage the Cumberland. Its emphasis rather was on getting the job done and on coordinating the resources of the river with those of the Tennessee.

In effect, this leaves the door open for speedy congressional authorization of development of the Cumberland by the Army Engineers, who already have undertaken preliminary work on the Grand Rivers high dam.

Similarly, it paves the way for cooperation between the engineers and the TVA in bringing about the integration of the two great rivers which together can lift our already rising region to even greater heights and serve the Nation well in both war and peace.

Threat to Schuman Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 28 I called attention of the House to the threatened collapse of the Schuman plan. At that time I expressed my concern occasioned by the activities of American lawyers who were intervening with our own representative in Germany on behalf of the German monopolists. This morning Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his always carefully considered and lucid column, refers to the same situation. The Washington Post also carried an explanation by Mr. Robert P. Patterson of his own activities as an attorney in connection with the Schuman plan. The only comment the explanation calls for is that the statement of the Senator from Arkansas relative to the moral level of our Government should be broadened

somewhat to cover the activities of those who have gained great prestige by virtue of high Government position. I am asking that both the Lippmann column and the newspaper account of Mr. Patterson's explanation be included in our RECORD:

[From the Washington Post]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A BAD SET-BACK

The position of the Western Powers has been seriously undermined in Germany as the new discussions with the Soviet Union are about to begin. It is possible that the Ruhr industrialists, the masters of the coal and steel combines and cartels, have succeeded in frustrating the Schuman plan. If they have done that, these great private monopolists who have so long dominated the industrial life of Europe will be able to play a principal part in any German settlement.

The history of German-Russian relations for 150 years under the emperors, the Communists, and the Nazis, shows that while Germany is a difficult country to Russify or to Sovietize, there is always a good chance that Russia can come to terms with a reactionary Germany. This breakdown of the Schuman plan, which can be averted only by heroic measures, would mean that behind the facade of western German democracy the effective power to negotiate arrangements would lie in those powerful, quite unscrupulous monopolies which have no reason to like or to be loyal to the western democratic society.

The Schuman plan bears the name of the French Foreign Minister, Robert Schuman, who proposed it last spring. The negotiations to draft a treaty to carry out the plan have been carried on since last May by delegates of the six governments—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg. The principal negotiators have been M. Jean Monnet for France and Mr. Walter Hallstein for West Germany.

The object of the Schuman plan is to create in these six countries a single free and competitive market for coal and steel—a market, as M. Monnet has described it, where all consumers can have access to coal and steel on equal terms, without monopolistic discrimination and subject only to differentials in the cost of transportation. This proposal has had the enthusiastic, indeed the passionate, support of disinterested and informed men here and abroad. They believe it holds the first convincing promise of a Franco-German reconciliation and with that the promise that the dead hand of monopoly and restriction will begin to be lifted from the industrial practices of Western Europe.

By January of this year the draft of the treaty had been completed and agreed to except for the two articles which we shall come to in a moment. The treaty as it stands now deals substantially with the complex political, legal, and technical questions that arise in this new and unprecedented project of a single free open market for steel and coal in Western Europe.

The two articles which have not been completed have to do with the problem of monopoly. On these two articles the Schuman plan may founder. For without them there would come only a giant monopoly instead of free and competitive enterprise within the wider European market. One of these articles is designed to prevent cartelization. The other is designed to prevent the formation of the vertical and horizontal combines which have been so characteristic of the Ruhr industries.

It stands to reason that if there is to be a single free market in the six countries, then the German monopolies of the Ruhr must be broken up—in the language of the occupation statute they must be deconcentrated. Otherwise, the free market will simply mean the complete and the unopposed domination of that market by the German monopolies.

The occupation statute calls for the deconcentration of the German monopolies. As a matter of law, the three occupying powers could impose the deconcentration on the Ruhr monopolies. But such an imposed solution is no longer possible or desirable. The Germans would resent it and in their resentment they would certainly refuse to vote for the Schuman plan, which cannot come into existence except by their free and equal consent. For these reasons the fulfillment of the deconcentration policy of the occupation statute has not been imposed but has been made a matter of negotiation at Duesseldorf—actually between Mr. McCloy and the Germans.

The authors of the treaty for the Schuman plan have acted on the hope that the Duesseldorf negotiations would succeed, that the Germans would be induced to agree voluntarily to a plan of deconcentration, and that then the Schuman treaty would perpetuate as the general law of European industry the principles of a free market.

What has happened is that the German industrialists have felt themselves strong enough to reject deconcentration and the creation of an open market. It may not be a mere coincidence that they have precipitated the showdown on the eve of the meeting of the four powers. In any event they have waged a violent, elaborate, and expensive campaign against the basic conception of the Schuman plan. They have won the support in other countries of those vested interests, of those collectivists who are so habituated to restrictive practices and monopolistic purposes that the very idea of a free economy seems to them intolerable. They have set in motion a wave of reaction against the kind of progressive and competitive economy which the Schuman plan envisages.

This rebellion of the reactionary monopolists in Germany has been aided and abetted from this country. Indirectly, and no doubt unwittingly, this has been done in the first instance by the naive military men who have so foolishly believed, and so curiously persuaded Mr. Acheson to believe, that German divisions could be raised before Germany had recovered her sovereignty—that West Germany could be at one and the same time a military satellite of the United States and also a loyal and willing ally.

The rebellion of the Ruhr industrialists has been openly aided and abetted by a bevy of American lawyers, headed by the former Secretary of War, who—believe it or not—has actually gone to Germany to argue their case before his own former subordinate in the War Department, the present United States High Commissioner, Mr. McCloy. The monumental impropriety of this performance has cast the utmost doubt on the good faith of American policy in Germany—on the declared policy of full and enthusiastic support of the Schuman plan.

For how—without a renewed and unequivocal restatement of our policy—are we now to persuade the people of Europe that the former Secretary of War—under whom the occupation of Germany was instituted—is now so private a person that he can appear in Germany at this critical moment and that his appearance has no significance?

[From the Washington Post]

PATTERSON EXPLAINS HIS TRIP

Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, who returned recently from a visit to Germany in the interests of clients, the Association for the Protection of German Stockholders in Steel and Coal Industries, made a statement yesterday explaining his trip. He advised his clients, he said, that the formula of John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner, on coal holdings should be accepted. His statement follows in part:

"Some months ago an association of shareholders in German steel and coal companies * * * requested my legal opinion in regard to a decartelization law relating to those industries. That law was enacted in 1950, 3 years after my resignation as Secretary of War. In the legal opinion which I submitted I made it plain that I would have no share in any effort to challenge or thwart the basic policy of decartelization. * * * I pointed out, however, that in my view the law omitted safeguards against arbitary action. * * *

"I went to Germany for further discussion with my clients. * * * The outstanding matter on which agreement had not been arrived at was the percentages of coal requirements the steel mills might retain. With other American lawyers I conferred with Mr. McCloy on this subject. The importance of an agreement in promoting adoption of the Schuman plan was thoroughly discussed.

"As a result of these conferences I advised my clients that in my opinion the formula on coal holdings proposed by Mr. McCloy before my arrival in Germany should be accepted. * * * They have told me that it was my recommendation that broke the deadlock on this point.

"I wish to point out that I went to Germany simply as a lawyer representing investors who were entitled to have their viewpoint presented. I had been out of public office for 3 years. There were no reasonable grounds for anyone to assume that I still spoke for the United States Government."

Our Commitment in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, many conflicting statements are being made today by so-called authoritative personalities either interpreting this Government's foreign policy or advocating a foreign policy of their own for adoption by the United States. These views are so conflicting in nature so that to say that the people are confused would be minimizing the entire matter. This confusion is evident from some of the mail I am receiving from a portion of my constituency with particular reference to the Korean situation.

Although I am not a member of either the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee of the House, as a Member of the Congress, I am called upon to vote either by way of legislation implementing our foreign policy or by appropriations to effectuate that policy. In view thereof, I am, of course, obliged before voting to study and fully understand to the best of my ability our Government's policy in joining with the United Nations in resisting Communist aggression in Korea, and in the determination of the United Nations to remain in Korea until such time as the

aggressors are defeated or until our military position becomes so untenable as to justify the withdrawal of United Nations troops from that area.

I feel it necessary, therefore, to state for the record my understanding why the United Nations intervened in Korea with the full support of the United States Government and why we are determined to see the matter through in the interest of our own safety and welfare as well as world peace.

In June 1950 world communism decided its usual methods of subversion and penetration were not meeting with success in Korea. The unprovoked and sudden attack on the Republic of Korea that followed this decision represented a new phase in Communist tactics—a resort to open aggression. This was the first occasion of open aggression since the formation of the United Nations. If left unchallenged, it would have destroyed the security and way of life of the free world by embarking us on the same dismal road which led from Manchuria to Ethiopia, to Poland, and to Pearl Harbor.

The United Nations acted quickly and courageously in undertaking to oppose Communist aggression in Korea with force, if necessary. In carrying out this decision the United States has taken the leading part. The decision was taken in order to dispel immediately any Kremlin hope that aggression would pay big rewards and go unchecked from one success to another, thus chewing up the free world piecemeal. When the United Nations forces were on the point of accomplishing their objectives and preparing the way for a unified and independent Korea under United Nations auspices, the Chinese Communists compounded the aggression by open intervention in Korea.

The Chinese Communists, by their actions, defied the authority of the United Nations and the world's deep-rooted demand for peace. Repeated efforts by the United Nations to bring about a peaceful settlement in Korea have failed. The Communist dictators have thus far refused to take steps to end the fighting and bring about a peaceful settlement in accordance with the United Nations objective. On February 1 the General Assembly found the Chinese Communist regime guilty of aggression and expressed the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression.

The United Nations and the United States cannot abandon their moral commitments against aggression as manifested in Korea. Korea is a symbol of the free world's resistance to the forces that would make a mockery of international law and order and of the world's hope for peace.

By standing and fighting in Korea we are, in effect, defending our own land and people from the disastrous results which would surely follow upon any belief in the Kremlin that the world is too weak or uninterested in its liberty to resist this latest effort to impose tyranny upon us all.

We are staying in Korea because we and the other free nations of the world, united under the United Nations banner, must make aggression too costly a policy for any regime. The world Communist command must not be allowed to conclude that aggression is easy and that it pays dividends.

We are staying in Korea because our presence there serves as a deterrent to aggression in other places. If the Communists are plotting other acts of aggression in Asia or elsewhere in the world, they must not be given the idea that they will meet with no resistance and that they can act with impunity where and when they wish. Such an idea could only lead to greater disasters which a continuation of our present resolute action might prevent.

The aggressor forces in Korea are meeting with effective resistance from the United Nations forces and are receiving such heavy punishment that the Communist aggressor must face the fact that his crime will not pay. At the same time our actions in Korea are pinning down major Communist forces and may force the Kremlin to change its plans of aggression.

We are staying in Korea because withdrawal from Korea would have a serious effect upon many of our friends. A withdrawal now might undermine the resistance and confidence of countries living in the shadow of militant Communist imperialism and result in their capitulation to the threats of the Kremlin. Their freedom and independence and our united determination to cooperate in maintaining their freedom and independence are of great importance to the free world and to the United States.

We are staying in Korea because we must defend a small country to which the United Nations, under our leadership, has made a serious commitment. The Koreans have fought valiantly in their own defense. To abandon the Korean people now would indicate that our friendship means little in the face of adversity. If we did abandon them we could not hope to provide a rallying point around which the spirits and energies of the free world can be mobilized to meet the world-wide threat which the Kremlin now poses to the free world.

The initial United Nations action last June in support of the principle of collective security to resist aggression was widely acclaimed by a large majority of the American press and public. The entry of the Chinese Communists into the fighting does not alter the fact of aggression nor does it change the basic aims and objectives of the United Nations. It is not a question of wanting war with the Chinese people. Our traditional friendship for the Chinese people is a matter of record. It is a question of whether unprovoked Communist aggression shall be allowed to defy the principles of the United Nations and threaten the security of the entire free world.

It is easy to understand why many Americans, not in a position to realize the enormous importance to our future of the degree of determination and perseverance which the United States and the United Nations showed in Korea, should urge that we withdraw. There are sound reasons for such determination on the part of the United States and the United Nations. The issue in Korea is how the free world will react to aggression. We can face it or we can run away from it. The old League of Nations ran away from it in China and Ethiopia and made World War II inevitable. If we face aggression now and put it down, keeping our courage and our determination even when the going is very hard, we can have some hope that we shall not have to suffer the untold death and destruction of a world war III. If we give up now we will make clear that the wages of aggression is victory—and another world war will be unavoidable except by total surrender.

These, I think, are the primary reasons why we went into Korea and why we are staying there.

Pay Inequity Between White- and Blue-Collar Workers Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Jerry Kluttz, whose column, the Federal Diary, appears daily in the Washington Post, recently had this to say about Congressman CLINTON MCKINNON, of California:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

PAY INEQUITY BETWEEN WHITE- AND BLUE-COLLAR WORKERS CRITICIZED

Representative MCKINNON (Democrat, California), has put his finger on the real sore spot in the Federal salary picture—the growing inequity between the pay of white-collar and blue-collar employees.

He told the House that the blue-collar employee had been given a substantially larger increase in salary than his white-collar colleague since 1940. He then said:

"In watching its (inequity) effect on the caliber of employees initially recruited over the past 10 years it is clearly indicated that there has been a gradual decline in the desire of young people to make a career of Government clerical and administrative work as compared with the blue-collar work."

MCKINNON then produced an eye opening chart which compared white-collar with blue-collar salaries paid by the Navy in San Diego, a city he represents. In general, the startling results would have been the same no matter what area was studied.

On November 19, 1940, for example, a GS-2 clerk was paid $1,440 compared to $1,248 for a laborer. As of today the clerk gets $2,450, the laborer, $2,630. The clerk had received a 70-percent raise; the laborer 110 percent. MCKINNON suggested a 49-percent pay boost for the clerk to place his salary on an equal basis with that of the laborer.

He next compared a grade 4 clerk with a helper. In 1940, the clerk was paid $1,800 compared with the helper's $1,331. Today the clerk gets $2,875, the helper $2,691. The

clerk has been given a 60-percent boost; the helper has received 117 percent.

McKINNON then explains that a grade 6 employee and a machinist had comparable salaries in 1940. But since that time, the machinist has been given an increase of 82 percent, the grade 6 employee only 50 percent.

A grade 12 employee was paid $4,600 in 1940, compared with $2,808 for a blue-collar foreman. Today the grade 12 gets $6,400, a 39-percent increase; the foreman is paid $6,245, a 122-percent boost.

The California Congressman wasn't critical of the wage increases given blue-collar workers. He insists, however, that salaries paid white-collar people must be increased to provide a proper differential between the two groups of workers.

But what it all boils down to is this—Congress fixes the salaries paid the 1,500,000 classified and postal employees, the agencies themselves set salaries for the 600,000 blue-collar people. The agencies are required to pay their laborers, mechanics, and the like prevailing wages of private industry. Wages of per diem, or blue-collar workers have been adjusted frequently since 1940, as they should have been, to keep pace with higher living costs.

But the high cost of living has hit the classified and postal worker, too, and all he can do about it is to go through the long and painful process of urging members of Congress to do something about it and then retire to pray and hope.

It has reached the point now where employee leaders are seriously considering some plan to have salaries of postal and classified employees set by local wage boards, based on living costs and salaries paid private employees in similar jobs. They believe such boards would be more alert to the pay problem of these 1,500,000 postal and classified people. A look at the salary adjustments given blue-collar people proves that point.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Kluttz is one of the outstanding authorities on Federal personnel matters. He recognizes in Congressman McKINNON one who has the intelligence and the courage to tackle one of the most complicated and complex problems in Government.

There Is Great Need for Reasonable Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and There Is Ample Cash Funds on Deposit To Justify Increased Payments at This Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have in my district in Kentucky a large group of very fine American and Kentucky citizens whose life work is and has been that of railroading These men and women constitute one of the most respected, honorable, and dependable groups of citizens that could be found anywhere. A large percentage of them own modest homes, they have lived in their same communities mostly for many years, they are and have been a part of the community and civic life of their respective towns and counties and are, in fact, everything that could be expected of good law-abiding dependable citizens

These men and women, as a class, for many years, have been contributing each month out of their earnings a relatively large percent of their salaries in order to build up and accumulate an adequate and sufficient retirement fund for themselves and their wives and children

Practically every other Member of the Congress of the United States has in his home district a like and similar group of fine dependable citizens who are in the employment of some railroad company.

These railroad men and women have for many years been paying a relatively high percentage of their salaries each month into a joint fund so as to guarantee for themselves adequate and sufficient retirement funds so that they and their dependents may have this security in their old age or in case of their passing away and leaving dependents.

Under the present rate of payments to retired railroad annuitants and their widows and children, these payments are so small that the very purpose of the Railroad Retirement Act is being defeated. Those railroad employees who have retired do not have anything like an adequate sum paid to them upon which to live and those who are looking forward to retirement cannot under the present rates of payment expect anything like enough to support themselves upon or have enough for their widows and children to live on in case of their death.

This condition has caused great unrest and dissatisfaction among the railroad employees generally and they are looking to the Members of Congress to remedy this condition. To begin with, in order to increase the payments under the Railroad Retirement Act to the men and women who have built up this fund and who have retired and will retire in the future, it is not necessary to cost the taxpayers of America anything.

The funds that are paid out were accumulated under the laws of the United States over the past several years by each railroad employee paying a percentage of his salary into this fund each month and his employer, the railroad companies, paying a similar sum and the moneys which are being and will be paid out come from this fund and they do not cost the taxpayers of this country anything.

At the present time this railroad retirement fund is possibly the largest and strongest retirement fund ever accumulated in the history of the United States by any group of employees in any one industry. I have obtained the figures which show the amount collected into this fund each year and the amount paid out, as well as the amount remaining in the fund from the beginning of the Railroad Retirement Act up to and including the first day of January 1951.

For the benefit of the Members of Congress who are vitally interested in amending and improving the Railroad Retirement Act for the benfit of the railroad men and women who are their constituents and live in their districts, I am setting down this table showing the tremendous growth and present condition of this fund:

Fiscal year	Tax collections	Benefit payments
Total through June 1938	$180, 477, 270	$67, 102, 151
1938-39	100, 256, 540	107, 181, 438
1939-40	120, 966, 719	114, 025, 141
1940-41	136, 942, 076	121, 799, 903
1941-42	170, 011, 691	126, 656, 781
1942-43	208, 794, 892	130, 863, 977
1943-44	267, 064, 593	135, 215, 326
1944-45	285, 037, 862	142, 527, 642
1945-46	282, 610, 497	153, 815, 252
1946-47	380, 057, 125	173, 101, 153
1947-48	557, 000, 782	224, 871, 297
1948-49	563, 832, 734	283, 052, 033
1949-50	550, 172, 200	301, 542, 273

It is very impressive to know that this great accumulated fund now contains in it a balance as of January 1, 1951, of $2,369,008,240. If these figures will be studied by the Members of Congress, it will at once become apparent that the excess each year of the amounts paid in by these men and their employers over the amounts being paid out is from 150 million to 200 million dollars per year.

There has been no increase in the percentages of the benefits that are being paid out to the railroad men and women from this fund for the past few years, yet on the other hand during the past few years there has been a greater increase in the cost of living to these men and women than at any time in the recent history of the United States.

Recently our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing the tremendous increases in the cost of living in recent years. From these figures we find that in the past 10 or 12 years the ordinary family in buying the absolute necessities had to pay 99 percent more for food, 92 percent more for clothing, 16 percent more for rent, 33 percent more for fuel, electricity and refrigeration, 87 percent more for household furnishings, and 48 percent more for a great many miscellaneous items, making an average increase of 71 percent in the cost of living and these figures only bring us up to November, 1950. Since November 1950, there has been a considerable increase in the cost of living.

While it now costs the average railroad man and his family about 75 percent more to live during all these years, this railroad retirement fund has only been increased a very small amount, the last increase several years ago being 20 percent.

In view of the change in our times and the tremendous increase in the cost of living, and in view of the universal demand on the part of the railroad employees and taking into consideration the huge sum that has accumulated in this fund, I have introduced a reformed and amended Railroad Retirement Act in the Eighty-second Congress. My bill is H. R. 2533. Briefly, my bill increases the payment of retirement benefits to these employees who have already retired by 25 percent, it increases the benefits by 25 percent to those who will retire in the future, and it provides that when a railroad employee passes away that his

widow, so long as she does not remarry, shall immediately, without regard to her age, receive 75 percent of the amount that her husband would have been entitled to had he lived and retired.

It provides full annuities to railroad employees, both male and female, after 30 years of service regardless of age, but it does not require any compulsory retirement before the age of 70. There are other very beneficial improvements provided in this bill.

I most sincerely invite the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues and especially the members of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the facts and figures I have cited and recited above. I do hope that this great committee will give us a hearing on this effort to improve the Railroad Retirement Act and that all Members of Congress who wish to improve the lot of their railroad employees in their home districts will join me in presenting the case of the railroaders to this committee in the hope that we may get out and pass a good bill for them.

Furthermore, I sincerely hope that the great railroad brotherhoods of America and their officials and especially their legislative representatives will become very active in assisting Members of Congress who believe that this act should be amended in helping them to get up the facts and figures to present in evidence before the committee and will lend every constructive legitimate aid possible to the passage of this bill.

Exemption of Municipal Bonds From Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, Resolution 1700, adopted by the Common Council of the City of Kokomo, Ind., under date of February 26, 1951:

Resolution 1700

Whereas interest on municipal bonds heretofore issued by political divisions has been exempted from Federal income tax; and

Whereas it has been suggested that in the adoption of a new internal revenue code by the Congress of the United States, the interest from said bonds be no longer exempted from tax; and

Whereas in the opinion of the Common Council of the City of Kokomo, Ind., the taxing for Federal income-tax purposes of the interest on said bonds would greatly increase the amount of interest which said city will be compelled to pay on obligations to be sold by it and thus make it more difficult to finance its obligations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Kokomo petition the Congress of the United States to cause the interest of municipal bonds to be exempted in any new internal revenue code adopted.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Kokomo, Ind., this 26th day of February 1951.

JAMES H. McGUIRE,
Mayor, Presiding Officer.

Presented to me for approval, and approved by me this 26th day of February 1951.

JAMES H. McGUIRE,
Mayor, City of Kokomo.

Puerto Rican Regiment in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1951, Mr. FRANK T. BOW, the gentleman from Ohio, introduced for the consideration of the House of Representatives, House Concurrent Resolution 74 to commend the United States forces and units of the United Nations forces in Korea. I wish here to express my support to this deserving measure and to express my profound gratitude to the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks about the outstanding performance in Korea by the Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment, composed entirely of Puerto Ricans.

Puerto Rico is justly proud of these soldiers of the Sixty-fifth who ask no quarter and give none. They seem to confuse their Chinese opponents with their quasi-guerilla tactics and bold attacks, and they have been most effective in their contacts with the enemy. Oddly enough, although coming from the sun-bathed warmth of the Caribbean, they bear up well in the deep freeze of Korea.

Puerto Ricans serving with units other than the Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment also are attracting national attention for their heroism in Korea. One of them, Corporal Angel Gomez, is a triple amputee at Walter Reed Hospital. Gomez, who was attached to the Seventh Cavalry Regiment, has become, in Puerto Rico, the dual symbol of sacrifice and inspiration for total defense effort in this perilous period. In action against the Chinese Communists, "Andy," as they call Gomez at Walter Reed, sprayed 10,000 rounds of ammunition into the enemy before his steaming machine gun betrayed his position. He was hit by a mortar shell.

Puerto Ricans have proved themselves good soldiers under all conditions. But they seem to do especially well when fighting as a unit. Perhaps this is because of the heritage, customs, and language which they share together. These seem to make for effective teamwork, integrated, coordinated, and fluid to meet the changing conditions of battle.

Puerto Ricans have also proved themselves willing soldiers. Naturally, the selective-service laws apply equally in Puerto Rico as in the States, and there are Puerto Ricans in uniform who were drafted, as well as those who volunteered. But I should like to point out, as I have indicated on this floor before, that even without the selective-service laws, I believe an army of 75,000 Puerto Ricans could be raised merely by permitting them to volunteer. Such is their patriotism and their spirit.

No Congressman at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram and Times:

[From the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram and Times of February 27, 1951]

NO CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE

Michigan is entitled to another Representative in Congress on the basis of the 1950 population count. The State now has 17 congressional districts. It has grown big enough to have 18. Should the boundaries of all the present 17 districts be reshuffled to come up with 18, or is there an easier way? Any way that it is done, there probably will be an argument.

Two bills for increasing the State's congressional delegation have been introduced in the legislature. One by Senator Nichols, of Jackson, dodges the whole thorny issue of redistricting by proposing that the new Member of the House be elected from the State at large.

Senators Higgins, of Ferndale, and Reid, of Detroit, suggest that the new Eighteenth District be carved out of the present Seventeenth. Both vote in that district which now includes Oakland County plus Detroit's twenty-second ward and Northville, Plymouth, Livonia, and Redford townships of Wayne County. They would make Oakland County the new Eighteenth District, with the Seventeenth retaining the four Wayne County townships and Detroit's twenty-second ward.

This plan involves changing the boundaries and the constituencies of only one congressional district. The present seventeenth district which Senators Higgins and Reid propose to split up has had a remarkable population growth in the last 10 years. Oakland County had a 139,000 growth, by far the largest of any county in the State outside of Wayne. Macomb County was closest with a 76,000 increase. Wayne County grew by 404,000 with a very large part of that growth outside Detroit's city limits. Oakland County with 393,467 people has a population 13,000 more than the combined total of the four counties in the second congressional district. So there is definite merit to the Higgins-Reid proposal.

There is virtually none in the Nichols plan to elect the new congressman-at-large. The most that can be said for it is that it would assure for Michigan the added congressional representation to which the State is entitled. But the idea of electing the new Congressman-at-large is not a good one. No person so elected would be as apt to give the multitudinous, and often conflicting, interests of the entire State the careful attention he would give to the interests of a single district. Moreover, a Congressman thus elected would

have his responsibility spread very thin; he would be responsible to Michigan voters generally and to no geographical area of the State in particular. But the chief objection to the idea is that it runs counter to the constitutional concept of the House of Representatives.

Members of the House are supposed to be close to the people, to have ready contact with them at all times. They are the direct representatives of the people in the national legislature. The larger a State grows in population, the more Representatives it is entitled to in the House. For that reason the section of the Constitution setting up the House provided also that a national census be taken every 10 years. And that is why the term of office of Representatives is fixed at 2 years; the people can turn out an unsatisfactory Representative within 2 years.

Terms for Members of the Senate are 6 years. And the Constitution provides that the terms of only one-third of the Senate expire at any 2-year interval. The Senate is a continuing body. The House reorganizes every 2 years, the terms of its Members expiring simultaneously. Members of the House always have been elected by the people directly. For more than 100 years Members of the Senate were elected by their respective State legislatures.

A Representative at Large is a sort of Senator sitting in the House. A congressional district-at-large in a State with enough population to have more than one district denies that State's people the kind of representation to which it is entitled. Such arrangements are almost always the result of reactionary partisan political thinking. The party in power in a State fears that by creating a new congressional district the opposition party may be able to elect its candidate therein. So it creates a district-at-large, counting on the prevailing political sentiment of the State to elect a man from the party in power.

Michigan is entitled to a new Congressman. He should be elected from a specified district, whether that district be preponderantly Republican or Democratic. The political complexion of the district does not matter so much as that the greater number of people are better served by its creation. By all means let us avoid the dodge of electing a Congressman-at-Large. Let's keep our representative government truly representative.

Televised Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of March 2, on the subject of televised testimony.

Of course the matter has had no judicial determination and what the courts may finally decide is only conjecture. However, it raises many interesting questions. If witnesses may be forced to testify before congressional committees when the proceedings are being televised, who will do the forcing? By whom will the decision be made? Will it be by majority vote of the committee or will it be by the chairman? If the decision is to be made by majority vote of the committee, will an exception be made when the chairman is the only sitting member?

If television is to be made legal usage in such hearings, will the witness have the right to refuse to testify unless his testimony is televised? The witness may feel that he has some startling information that will contribute to the public weal; that should be given immediate and wide publicity. The manner in which he gives it might be most important. The facial expression, the tone of his voice, his enunciation and the emphasis of proper gesticulation might be lost to the world without the television.

If congressional investigations are to be televised, what about the courts? The arguments used in favor of televised criminal investigations are equally persuasive when applied to the trial of criminal cases; and perhaps more so. If a congressional committee investigating monopolies is to use television, then certainly the antitrust suits should be televised. Again we must know by whom the decision will be made. Will it be the judge or will it be the jury? Will it be the plaintiff or will it be the defendant? Supposing the A. & P. Co. decides it is being unjustly proceeded against. Judging from letters which I received last year, this is not an unreasonable assumption. Would the company have the right to demand that the trial be televised, so that its position would be better understood than it might be if the public had to rely on sketchy news articles? Senator KEFAUVER'S position is that one purpose of the investigations is to enlighten the people and that television is a medium of public information as are the press and radio. If this is correct and if the A. & P. feels that it is the innocent and injured party, should it not be entitled to make the decision rather than the trial court?

There is no doubt but that the Senate Crime Investigating Committee is doing much good in exposing crime and the tie-up between organized outlaws and some of our politicians. We cannot condone crime in any form. However, we should never let these investigations deteriorate into forums of entertainment nor should they be used to assassinate character.

The crime committee, in its report, has seen fit to make serious inferences against the attorney who appeared for the witness, James J. Carroll. These inferences had no basis in fact. Mr. Morris Shenker is a capable, an upright, and distinguished member of the Missouri bar. He has a large and lucrative law practice. He has never been cited for violation of legal ethics and no bar in the union is more alert toward proceeding against unscrupulous lawyers than is the bar of Missouri. Mr. Shenker was well within his rights in appearing for Mr. Carroll or any other witness and his conduct was in keeping with propriety. It is not to the credit of any congressional committee to take advantage of its position and seek to castigate or discredit an attorney when he is merely fulfilling his sworn duty to his client.

The witness, Carroll, offered to testify if the proceedings were not televised. When Senator KEFAUVER refused to hear his testimony, excepting under the terms dictated by the former, there arises the question of whether the Senator was most interested in getting the facts or in getting the fullest publicity.

As previously suggested, there is no more reason for televising crime investigations than there is in televising criminal trials. Of necessity, many of our criminal cases develop lurid and obscene testimony. Some of it is unfit to put in public print. Certainly it is unfit to go out over the air waves. Many witnesses would despair at the thought of testifying when they were being viewed by television. It is bad enough for a timid witness to face a small courtroom of spectators; but it would be far worse if that person knew that he or she was being spied upon by television addicts all over the Nation. Certainly it would not be conducive to clear thought or expression. I cannot feel that the courts will ever force witnesses to subject themselves to this needless procedure. To me the whole idea is inane and repulsive. It would bring the Congress to a new low level in public esteem. The dignity of the courtroom would become only a memory while its sacred portals became a testing ground for the future Faye Emersons and Jimmie Durantes.

I agree fully with the sentiments expressed in the following editorial:

TELEVISED TESTIMONY

Senator KEFAUVER'S attempt to compel James J. Carroll, a St. Louis betting commissioner, to testify while the proceedings of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee were being televised raises interesting questions of public policy as well as of law. Apparently the witness was willing to answer the committee's questions. But he objected to having his appearance televised on the ground that it would invade his privacy and subject him to ridicule. Senator KEFAUVER replied that the hearing was public, that television is a medium of public information no less than are the press and radio, that one purpose of the investigation is to enlighten the people, and that if the witness did not answer the questions, he would be cited for contempt.

Does the public interest in the exposure of crime demand that all witnesses before the committee, whether or not they are accused of crime, speak under the glare of television?

What the decision of the courts will be is open to wide speculation. If they follow precedent, they will be extremely reluctant to interfere with the conduct of congressional investigations. In any event, the larger question is whether it is sound policy to force testimony from witnesses under the distracting influence of television lights and microphones. We think it is not. In this instance Senator KEFAUVER may readily be absolved of headline hunting, but the regular use of television in committee investigations would certainly encourage the inquisitors to put on a show instead of calmly seeking information. Witnesses likewise would be tempted to resort to spectacular stunts and colorful charges. Fact-finding would almost inevitably degenerate into circus antics.

No doubt this is why Congressman CASE included in his code of fair procedure for congressional investigating committees, now under study by the House Rules Committee, a provision that "no photographs, moving pictures, television, or radio broadcasting of

the proceedings shall be permitted while any witness is testifying." The courts do not subject their witnesses testifying under oath to such impediments to candor. It is difficult to see why the fact-finding committees of Congress should.

Chicago's Forgotten Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the full text of an article entitled "Chicago's Forgotten Hero" which appears in the March issue of Coronet magazine.

This article describes the unrewarded heroism of Frank Bukovsky, of Chicago, who is believed to have saved the life of Theodore Roosevelt during an attempted assassination in the city of Milwaukee in 1912.

I have today introduced a bill proposing that the Congress take appropriate cognizance of this man's brave deed, even though almost 40 years have elapsed. I feel that the people of America owe this gallant immigrant belated appreciation and I trust the House will concur in my opinion.

The article from Coronet follows:

CHICAGO'S FORGOTTEN HERO
(By Milton Golin)

Frank Bukovsky got no medal for his courage in 1912, yet he feels amply rewarded.

Frank Bukovsky ran all the way up the three flights of stairs to his flat to show his wife the newspaper headline:

"Marie, look! It says, 'T. R. in Milwaukee Auditorium Tonight.'"

Marie had not yet learned to read English, so she could not tell what the headline meant.

"T. R.—that's Teddy Roosevelt," said Frank. He went to a rickety bureau and fished out a document. "See, the same name as on the paper I got 6 years ago when I came to America, 'President Theodore Roosevelt.' I must go to see him tonight. I'll eat when I come back."

Marie Bukovsky put the children to bed, wondering what it was like to stand near a great man like Theodore Roosevelt. Frank knew what it was like—nothing at all like in native Bohemia, where soldiers with rifles guarded the emperor in the passing coach. Here, on the evening of October 14, 1912, the great man with the mustache who had let Frank enter this country was walking through the Milwaukee crowd as if they were all his friends.

Frank was downtown early, outside the Gilpatrick Hotel. He could almost touch the car which was to take Teddy from the hotel to the auditorium a few blocks away, where several thousand people were waiting for him.

Now—he was coming out of the hotel. Frank cheered with the rest. The former President stepped into the car and stood in the back seat. He grinned and waved his wide-brimmed black slouch hat to the smiling crowd.

It was then that Frank Bukovsky noticed the wide-eyed man standing next to him. Suddenly the man reached inside of his coat and pulled a revolver. The next moment he was taking aim at Roosevelt's heart—a heart only 7 feet away. As the gun went off with a roar, Frank slammed his hand against the man's right arm. Then he knocked him to the ground so there would be no more shooting.

"Kill him! Kill him!" Frank shouted in English. Then he added in Bohemian: "Kill this crazy man! He shot our great Roosevelt."

The shocked crowd understood only the American words. They thought that Frank, the curly haired man with the foreign accent, was trying to kill Roosevelt. Some of them piled onto Frank and the gunman. A policeman swung his club on Frank's head. His clothes ripped, his hat smashed, Bukovsky tore himself away and ran home. Marie listened as he blurted out his amazing story.

Next morning he read the newspapers. His name was not mentioned. The paper said that Elbert Martin, Roosevelt's secretary, had saved the President's life by snatching the gun from the assassin, John Flammang Schrank. The paper also said a man in the crowd had hit Schrank's arm so that the bullet, instead of entering Roosevelt's heart, struck him in the right side of the chest, first passing through the 100 pages of his speech.

Roosevelt, shocked and bleeding, made the speech anyway. Later, at the hospital, he remarked:

"It takes more than one bullet to kill a Bull Moose."

Three weeks later Frank Bukovsky voted in his first presidential election—for Theodore Roosevelt, the Bull Moose candidate. He was not perturbed when Woodrow Wilson won. That was democracy.

Years went by, and Frank's family increased. He saved his money. His idol, Teddy Roosevelt, died. Together with his wife, his three daughters, and a son, Frank Bukovsky went to Chicago, where he bought a bakery on the southwest side. Here there were neighbors from old Bohemia.

Frank often chatted with a special neighbor—Anton J. Cermak, mayor of Chicago, and a lover of Frank's pastries. Until this time the story of Frank's role in the Roosevelt shooting had been told only in the Bukovsky family circle. But to Anton, the mayor, Frank told all. Cermak listened and smiled.

Frank never could tell whether the mayor believed him, but he used to say: "Well, I would do the same if the chance came."

One day in 1933 the news wires crackled with the story of how Cermak stopped with his body an assassin's bullet aimed at another Roosevelt—F. D. R., President-elect. Dying, Mayor Cermak muttered to Roosevelt: "I'm glad it was me instead of you."

The Bukovskys lost everything in the depression—the bakery, the home, the bank account—more than $40,000 saved over many years. They lost everything but their spirit and their faith in their adopted country.

"Our children must go to high school, and then to college maybe," Frank and Marie agreed. But for a long while Frank could not find steady employment. Marie helped out by working in restaurants, kitchens, hotels—wherever she could do a job and earn some money.

In 1943 Frank read in the newspapers that John Schrank had died in a Wisconcin asylum. And the story of the attempted assassination was revived. A newspaper revealed that Frank Bukovsky had been written up in an old history book as the man who really saved Theodore Roosevelt's life. The book mentioned half a dozen people who actually saw how Frank upset Schrank's aim. But the newspaper also said that Frank could not be found—that he was probably dead.

Frank Bukovsky turned the page. His white mustache shimmered as he mused. He was not seeking any notoriety.

Today, at 68, he still works nights in Zeman's bakery on West Twenty-sixth Street in Chicago. New friends listen to the story of what Frank did that October night 39 years ago. When he is through telling it, the friends ask:

"No medal, Frank? No reward?" No; no medal, no reward.

"Not even a letter—a note from somebody in the Roosevelt family?"

No; not even a letter; nothing.

Then Frank points to the pictures of his four children on the wall of his flat on South Avers Avenue:

"This is Frances," he says, "my youngest daughter. She graduated from a nurses' school, became a train stewardess, married a conductor, and went to live in Arizona.

"Here is my Marie. She went to college, the University of Illinois, graduated as a pharmacist, married, and went to live in California.

"This one is Elizabeth. She became a bookkeeper, married, and also made her home in Arizona.

"And here is my boy, Joseph. He went to college, married, went to war, and stayed overseas 3 years. He came back a major.

"Reward, did you say? Do I need any greater reward than my four children—all of them educated, successful, happy? Me, a poor immigrant from Bohemia?"

Frugality in Government Advocated by Bartlesville (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most carefully worded resolutions I have seen in recent years, and one that certainly goes straight to the heart of a situation that seriously confronts the American people today, is the following resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Bartlesville, Okla., some 2 weeks ago.

This resolution humbly and emphatically requests the President and Congress, servants of the people of this great Nation, under their oaths, not to levy heavy taxes upon the people while at the same time the President and Congress are squandering the substance of the people. Frugality in government is advocated by the Bartlesville (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce in this resolution, which I now quote:

Whereas the Government of the United States of America is a government of the people and owes all of its just powers to the consent of the people; and

Whereas there has been a growing tendency on the part of those in Government offices of trust and profit to lose sight of the fundamental truth that our Government was instituted for the benefit of the people; and

Whereas there is evidence that at least some of the servants of the people seem to think that our people exist for the benefit of the Government; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the people to observe scrupulous frugality in the conduct of their private lives and to forego luxury for their common good; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the people to sacrifice their lives and fortunes for the common good; and

Whereas the President has called upon the Congress to balance its disbursements by the levy of taxes upon the people; and

Whereas the President has a right to and is bound by his solemn duty to call upon the people and its Congress as he has; and

Whereas the President and Congress as servants of the people of this Nation have no right, either in morals or in law under their solemn oaths of office, to levy heavy taxes upon the people while at the same time this Government is squandering the substance of the people; and

Whereas the example set by public servants in spending in the coming months will inspire the people to great sacrifice if that example is one of frugality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of Bartlesville, Okla., in regular meeting assembled, That the Congress of the United States, as the direct representatives of the people be and they are hereby requested to eliminate all nonessential spending in government to the end that frugality in government will inspire the people to gladly and willingly sacrifice in this time of national peril; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congressman from this district and to each of the Senators from Oklahoma.

[SEAL] BARTLESVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
K. S. ADAMS, *President.*

Attest:
R. S. BEDFORD, *Secretary.*

An American Political Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January issue of the magazine Here in Ohio:

[From Here in Ohio magazine of January 1950]

AN AMERICAN POLITICAL TRAGEDY

For the past decade a stark tragedy has been enacted on the American political stage—a tragedy which, ironically, stands illumined by the spotlight on Republican victories in the election of November 7, 1950, throughout the country—but most notably in Ohio.

A tragedy—because of the failure of the Republican Party to offer to the people, in sufficient quality and quantity, candidates for national office who represented a clear-cut, forthright, unapologetic alternative to the party of increasing socialization, of bureaucracy, of concentration of power in the National Government.

A tragedy—because through three presidential elections, through too many senatorial and congressional district elections in too many places, the Republican Party cowered timidly, bankrupt in courage and intellectual honesty, afraid to offer clean alternatives to candidates of the hand-out state sworn to do the bidding of special economic groups instead of standing guard over the public welfare.

A tragedy—because the Republican Party became the party of cowardice, since it was afraid it would be defeated if it said frankly that it would yank away special privileges, instill order and economy into Government, and restore a reasonable balance of power among the dominant economic groups—industry, agriculture, and labor.

And what was the result?

Defeats, ignominious defeats, one after another; a weakening of the two-party system to the point where many thoughtful men feared for the very existence of this bulwark of the American form of government; bungled foreign policy, and inflation that expunged the apparent financial and social gains of a large part of the population.

The Republican Party sacrificed character, principle, and courage for political expediency, in a vain effort to entice the voters with gangbuster personalities, glamor boys from the public utilities and slick-paper magazines, and with me-tooism—with political sex appeal instead of political fortitude and candidates with the guts to stand up and say:

"I will not permit objectives that may be, in themselves, laudable, to be used as cover for the acquisition of power by those who think they possess some godlike capacity to shape the people's destiny. I will not permit government of the people to be become ruinously costly, sloppy, and inefficient, and bloated with power in the hands of a few who scheme for more power."

The Republican Party, by and large, thought only of: "How can we win without saying plainly to the recipients of Government favors we will not be as generous as the New Deal and the Fair Deal?" And, of course, it didn't win; it just kept soaking up one beating after another.

Then came 1950 and ROBERT A. TAFT, who had in 1944—when Dewey took licking No. 1—won without compromising his principles. Against what has rightly been called the most formidable opposition that ever confronted a candidate for the United States Senate, TAFT won, the man whom Republicans nationally recognized as their foremost exponent of statecraft, but who they said couldn't win because he was too honest and frank and he lacked political "it."

Well, TAFT won, not because he mesmerized the voters with his voice or drenched them in glamour. He won because he stirred the hearts and the minds of tens of thousands of every economic and social class by his earnestness, his industry, his intelligence; the deep-seated quality of his sincerity that emanated right across the platform and out of the radio speaker; his willingness to tell the people just where he stood on every important issue; his impress upon the voters of a conviction that, even when he didn't promise what some of them wanted, TAFT would endeavor to the utmost to fulfill the commitments he did make and not employ them, cynically as Harry Truman does, as continuing issues as the basis for the next campaign.

TAFT set splendid precedent in the 1950 senatorial campaign in Ohio. He demonstrated so clearly, so vigorously, that a man who doesn't use honeyed words to gloss over hollowness of thought can literally captivate the people. He showed that a man of brains and courage and proven statesmanship can get people who never before exhibited anything but indifference or disdain toward political affairs not only to vote for him but also to get out and do conscientious, fruitful work for him.

The people of Ohio, no different from the people of any other State, showed that they want a man who stands on a high moral and intellectual plane. Given the alternative of a statesman or a hack politician, they choose unerringly and unequivocally.

The man who couldn't win, WON—TAFT, who is at once a man of great independence of thought and yet of deep understanding of the people's problems and their welfare; who is a leader without having a leader complex.

The man who couldn't win, won—TAFT, whose almost belligerent penchant for coldly, analytically discussing the issues and criticizing who he thought needed criticizing, masks an innate shyness and a gracious personality in ordinary social intercourse.

Not within memory of most of us have the people given such a convincing demonstration of their thinking and their ability to distinguish between the real and the sham, as they did in Ohio on November 7, 1950.

Here was TAFT, the target of concentrated opposition by powerful forces—the New Dealers and Fair Dealers, the labor barons and their political and propaganda arms, radical "liberals," and wild-eyed internationalists. The CIO and A. F. of L. leaders themselves laid down the gauge of battle; they themselves designated ROBERT A. TAFT as their special and principal target. Even the proprietors of syndicated columns, as well as national radio commentators, with a Fair Deal slant, joined in the fight.

And the man who couldn't win—the man of competence in statecraft who, they said, couldn't attract the voters—carried 64 of Ohio's 88 counties, including every industrial county in the State.

The GOP would do well to ponder long and thoroughly some of the really significant issues the people of Ohio decided at the November 7 outpouring. For in the action of the Ohio electorate there's a clear invitation to the Republican Party to get the lead out of its knapsack, to forget the promotion of glamor boys and men who have nothing to recommend them but cold, calculating, self-advancing qualities in administration of public affairs.

Let the Republican Party remain humbly conscious of the tragedy that beset it in three presidential elections.

Let the party remember the disastrous, enervating consequences of its action in 1940, when it went outside its own political realm to come up with the late Wendell Willkie, GOP Presidential nominee by virtue of the activities of the internationalists and the high-powered promotion boys of the advertising agencies.

Let the party remember that it saw a candidate for whom no genuine enthusiasm could be developed, go down to defeat once—and then shattered precedent by choosing him again.

Let the party, and the people, not be beguiled by the presumably "new" personality in Albany, who, though he is the first major politician effectively to use television, and who, though he apparently won votes by kissing his wife over that medium, is still Tom Dewey—the twice defeated.

Let the party remember that while Dewey was entertaining the New York electorate (or a television-set-owning segment of it in the boroughs of New York), ROBERT TAFT was out in the hustings telling people just where he stood, just what he intended to do. Let the party remember that TAFT won an historic election, even though he rebuffed the sobsisters who would have written sympathetically of the Senator's loss, through his recent campaign, of his right bower, his wife, because of the state of her health. BOB TAFT simply didn't want sympathy to influence the voters.

Let the Republican Party follow TAFT in throwing off the tag of "reactionary." Let the party come to stand, as he does, for the common welfare as against special interest. Let it understand, as TAFT does, that the clock can't be turned back, that all which the Government does is not socialistic, and that the Federal Government can help in housing and education and medical care without unduly extending Government influence in State and local affairs.

The experience of November 7, 1950, in Ohio particularly, shows that the public will choose wisely if it is given a choice of sanity, integrity, and courage in public affairs, on the one hand, and incompetence and unwholesome commitment to one economic group on the other.

The people have lost confidence in the present administration for its incompetence in domestic and world affairs, and for the ward-heeler character of political thinking that characterizes the administration. They want—and deserve—something better. The people still cherish the old tried and true foundation of freedom to work, live, worship, and vote as they please.

Unless the Republican Party comes forward with a man who champions these causes, it will again go down to defeat in 1952 at the hands of a minority, because the majority will not vote if they are deprived of the clear alternative they were so long denied.

Ohio has such a man. It commends him to the Nation and it urges that men of good will, of high principle, in the Republican Party start now to smother any efforts by the adherents of lesser men to win control of the party by the time of the GOP National Convention in 1952.

Five Hundred Million American Gift Dollars Used To Buy Critical and Strategic Metals for Marshall Plan Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the period from April 3, 1948, through September 30, 1950, more than $500,000,000 picked from the pockets of the American taxpayers has been spent by the European Cooperation Administration to purchase for European countries critical and strategic nonferrous metals which now are under such stringent controls that the American consumers and businessmen who normally use these metals find that they will have to either do without or find substitutes for the most part.

Besides the shipments already made to September 30, 1950, additional millions of procurements have been authorized by the managers of our give away program under the Marshall plan.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the American consumers and the small businessmen of this country, I once again rise to protest against this continuing abuse of the American people, by this administration. Why, Mr. Speaker, must our people be taxed to provide things for the peoples of other countries, that they cannot buy for themselves?

As part of my remarks, under permission previously given, I offer a table from the Washington News Bulletin of March 1, 1951, showing the details of the transaction under which our taxpayers paid for these critical and strategic metals bought from other countries.

FIVE HUNDRED MILLION AMERICAN GIFT DOLLARS SPENT FOR CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC NONFERROUS METALS UNDER MARSHALL PLAN

(By Paul O. Peters)

In the period from April 3, 1948, through September 30, 1950, more than $500,000,000 American gift dollars went into shipments of copper, lead, zinc, nickel, brass and bronze, and aluminum to the European nations participating in the European Cooperation Administration's programs.

In Bulletin No. 43, the details of procurement of the nonferrous metals from United States sources of supply were shown. The total was over $100,000,000.

Besides the critical and strategic nonferrous metals purchased in the United States, an additional $293,098,000 was procured from Canada, Latin America, and the participating countries. This sum together with purchases of over $109,476,000 of aluminum places the total expenditures for shipments already made to well over $500,000,000. As usual, the United Kingdom was the principal beneficiary of American aid, as shown by the table following, which details the shipments by country and commodity:

Paid shipments of nonferrous metals to ECA countries from sources outside the United States for the period Apr. 3, 1948, through Sept. 30, 1950

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Copper	Lead	Zinc	Nickel	Brass, etc.	Total
Austria	589	155	468	278	1,091	2,581
Denmark	2,032	1,312	531			3,875
France	67,313	5,192	3,449	2,874	114	78,942
Germany	3,171		1,123	1,702		5,996
Greece	396					396
Italy	13,662			193		13,855
Netherlands	3,039	11,960	285	27	67	15,378
Norway	519	2,164				2,683
Trieste	75					75
United Kingdom	97,259	32,315	39,743			169,317
Total	188,055	53,098	45,599	5,074	1,272	293,098

The shipments of aluminum for this same period total $109,476,000 with $101,819,000 going to the United Kingdom and purchased with American gift dollars in Canada.

Verily the pockets of the American taxpayers are being legally and scientifically picked to continue these foreign-aid programs, including the purchase of critical and strategic materials which are now being denied to legitimate American consumers.

Tax Preferences Unpopular—They Are Un-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years certain preferences have been shown in matters of taxation, which have become very unpopular.

I refer primarily at this time to tax exemptions or preferences, in favor of the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and of the Members of Congress.

If there is anything that the American people believe in, it is fair play. Anything that smacks of unfairness, preferences or favoritism in a tax system designed to raise money for the support of our Government, causes resentment by the people.

It is not so much a matter of dollars and cents. The actual amount of taxes for a given individual or a group is more or less immaterial. It is the principle that is involved. The people simply do not want the President to have a part of his salary exempt from income taxes, while people who make the same amount of money from other sources do not have a like amount of their taxes exempt. Similarly, they protest against the exemption from income taxes of a part of the salary of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and every Member of Congress, while they do not enjoy such exemptions.

Especially is this resentment pronounced at this time, while the President is asking the people to tighten their belts and telling all of us that we must be willing to be taxed and pay taxes until it hurts. They are retorting in no uncertain language that they think the President, the Members of Congress, and other public officials who enjoy tax preferences should be the first to see that the preferences are abolished and that all be treated alike.

Therefore, I say tax preferences are unpopular — they are un-American. They are unpopular because they are un-American, because they are not in keeping with the spirit of American ideals. Discriminations and preferences are un-American, and wherever they exist they should be removed by appropriate legislation.

Let me give you a few facts. The President of the United States receives a salary of $100,000 annually. He is paid an additional $50,000 expense account, which is tax free. He is provided with a mansion in which to live. Incidentally, the improvements and repairs to the White House which are being made at this time will cost more than $5,000,000, and while these repairs are being made, the President is living across the street luxuriously in Blair House, which has been reserved for many years for dignitaries from other lands who may be visiting here. In addition, the President has a special yacht, the *Williamsburg*, a luxurious airplane, a battleship, a cruiser, and a special railroad train. All of these are furnished, maintained, manned, and operated, with a multitude of servants, at great expense to the taxpayers. Another $40,000 per year in ad-

dition to his $100,000 salary and $50,000 tax-exempt expense account above mentioned, is provided. The President, therefore, enjoys a tax preference of $33,744 annually, as compared with any other person in this country similarly situated who receives a salary of $150,000 per year.

I understand the Vice President and Speaker of the House of Representatives, each is paid a salary of $30,000 per year and in addition, is paid a $10,000 a year tax-free expense account. They are furnished high-priced sedans for their use, with chauffeurs at the expense of the taxpayers. This results in a tax preference in favor of each of the men holding these offices of $4,184 per year over an ordinary or private citizen with the same income.

Each Member of Congress receives a salary of $12,500 a year, and $2,500 for expenses which is tax exempt. I understand that the recent rulings of the Treasury Department are to the effect that the Members do not have to account for the $2,500 they receive as an expense account. I have always accounted for mine, and incidentally, I voted against the law which allows this $2,500 tax-exempt expense account. Members of Congress, Senators and Representatives, enjoy a preference in Federal income taxes of $597 over and above private citizens with an income of $15,000 a year.

People are saying that before the President and the Members of Congress raise taxes for private citizens to pay, we should be willing to forego our special preferences or preferences allowed by law and should pay taxes on our entire incomes. I realize that many citizens do not appreciate the fact that we, and the President, Vice President and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress are called upon to incur great expense that the average private citizen who makes a comparable salary or has the same income that we do, does not have to pay. I realize also that most people who are employed on a salary are allowed their salary net and are paid travel expenses and the expenses of lodging and meals and other incidentals while they are away from home, which are not furnished to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress as such, except as may be paid from these tax-exempt sums. It seems to me that we have gone at it the wrong way. If we had provided for the payment of expenses incurred by these officials in the conduct of their offices and work incident thereto, the same as traditionally has been provided for people engaged in private enterprise activities, the people would have had a better understanding of the situation. Then each item of expense would have been subject to scrutiny and would be allowed and paid whenever found to be legitimate and proper. But only such items as would meet the test would be paid out of public funds—which is exactly what happens in the conduct of private business, and is what the people are accustomed to and have grown to recognize as the proper method.

Therefore, I have introduced in the House of Representatives in Congress a bill which, if passed by Congress and approved by the President, as must be the case before any bill can become a law, the President's $50,000 per year tax-exempt expense item, the $10,000 per year tax-exempt item of the Vice President and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the $2,500 expense account for each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives of Congress, will immediately become subject to the payment of Federal income taxes. If these items are stricken from the favored or exempted list, by the enactment of my bill into law making them taxable, they will likewise become taxable for State income purposes for those States which have laws providing for the payment of income taxes by individuals.

Again I say that tax preferences are unpopular because they are un-American. They do not coincide with American traditions, American practices and American ideals. In the older countries where kings, czars, emperors and others of dictatorial authority ruled, and whose will became the law, regardless of the will of the people, tax preferences and tax exemptions were the order. But not so in America.

Therefore, historically, the matter of tax preferences and discriminations is un-American and the people of this country did not favor the enactment of the laws which granted these preferences. Now they bitterly resent being told that they must be willing to be taxed until it hurts or pains them, and becomes a genuine sacrifice, while their public officials, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress and every Member of Congress continues to enjoy tax preference in the amounts and in the order which I have outlined. Tax preferences are unpopular. They are un-American.

The RFC Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of February 27, 1951:

THE RFC MESS

More than enough evidence of the perversion of its original purpose has come to light in the Senate's Reconstruction Finance Corporation inquiry to justify not only a thoroughgoing investigation but a reshaping of the agency itself. In its present structure and personnel the RFC has forfeited public confidence and thus terminated its usefulness.

The RFC was originated by former President Herbert Hoover, who got Congress in 1932 to approve a Government lending agency to help banks, railroads, and large interstate businesses with Federal loans. It was a sound proposal for providing finances at a time when the regular sources for loans were incapable of lending money.

Under the New Deal RFC was altered radically. Its lending powers were broadened to permit loans to any business, to States, cities, and other governmental agencies. And with the war the RFC became the Federal bank for financing industrial changeover to war production, synthetic rubber, stockpiling, etc.

An RFC subsidiary, the Defense Plant Corporation, took over the local Republic Steel plant, refitted it for aluminum press forging and built Darinton Place.

In 1947 Congress attempted to regain some control over RFC, which it had not had under the long regime of Jesse Jones as chairman, by restricting its use of funds and designating public interest as a requirement fo eligibility for loans. This reform, it is the purpose of the Fulbright committee to show, has not been effective. And the committee is attempting to adduce evidence not only that White House influence plays a key part in the allotment of loans but that a fee system has been operated to offer that influence for sale.

These are grave charges. They brought an immediate reaction over the week end when RFC turned over to the White House a large file of letters intending to show that Members of Congress likewise applied their influence in getting loans for constituents. Some of these letters apparently were written by members of the Fulbright committee.

The use of Government funds for business loans is fraught with peril. It is a far cry from the original purpose of the RFC, which was to enable sound banks and interstate business to continue operating after all regular sources of financing were cut off by the depression.

In its operations since, RFC has lent taxpayers' money to help establish new auto plants, to finance wildcat petroleum exploration, and to build lush resort hotels in such places as Reno and Miami Beach. It poured more than $38,000,000 into a single prefabricated home corporation which failed.

On top of this the Fulbright committee apparently is convinced that the White House had a direct influence in obtaining RFC funds for favored applicants and that payments have been made to individuals for the exercise of influence in getting loans. That is why we say the investigation not only should be pursued to the limit but that Congress, with the facts thus adduced, should rewrite the charter of the RFC.

What a Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

More and more astounding facts are brought to light by the special Senate committee that is presently investigating and reviewing the record of the RFC. The admissions, flat contradictions, and improbable tales developed by the testimony definitely points to political manipulations and pretentions to influence

those in charge of RFC operations. The testimony developed by the committee replete with contradictions, incriminations, denials, and accusations, charges, and countercharges, are not only disgraceful but disgusting in the extreme. In fact, the charges are of such a nature and character as to shock the conscience of every honest and fair-minded citizen.

The committee is serving a twofold purpose. It is developing facts and performances in the RFC of which the public has heretofore been ignorant and kept in the dark. The exposé in connection with the investigation can lead to but one conclusion: There must be a moral realinement and awakening among public officials entrusted with a public duty and official responsibility. Nothing is so wholesome to bring that about as swift and sure justice meted out to all those who would sell their honor and trust for "30 pieces of silver."

What our country needs now is not a 5-cent cigar, we need more two-fisted militant and courageous United States district attorneys who are ready to work in conjunction with persevering and high-minded juries. It is apparent that nothing can be so effective in Washington in cleaning up the immoral and despicable mess floundering around and about the RFC as a goodly number of indictments, followed by speedy trials and vigorous prosecutions.

The shades of the Teapot Dome scandal are falling fast—or would it be more appropriate to quote Goldsmith's lines: "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey, where wealth accumulates and men decay."

The editorial in the Chicago Daily News as of February 26, which follows, expresses in clear and concise terms the resentment that is taking form throughout the Nation about continuing a bureaucracy that has become famous largely through promiscuity in disbursing tax funds to political favorites:

THE RFC MESS

President Truman's "counteroffensive" against Senators who are investigating the RFC proves nothing except that seats at the pie counter are not reserved exclusively for the administrative branch of the Government. Nobody supposed that they were.

The RFC files yielded hundreds of letters from Congressmen urging favorable action on loan applications. The probability is that these represented the ready response to the appeal of an influential constituent, such as Senator DOUGLAS' plea for the Waltham Watch Co. A union official wanted it, to keep men at work.

Mr. Truman must have been taken aback by the reaction of the investigating Senators. Far from being intimidated, they confessed their own indiscretions, and vowed to dig deeper into the use of official influence in allocating RFC loans.

A sufficiently scandalous situation has already been revealed to prove that politicians should not be trusted to play banker with public funds. Loans that require the intercession of the "right people" are not likely to be in the interest of the taxpayers who provide the money.

A favorite RFC maneuver was for the examiner investigating the merits of a loan application to recommend that it be granted and then accept a fat-salaried job from the successful applicant. The temptation in this procedure is so raw that a responsible banker would have sought some means to cancel the loan arrangement, on principle, if not on evidence.

Even loans which had the appearance of having a sound business basis were tinged with political considerations. The $37,000,000 poured into the floundering Lustron prefabricated housing venture is an example.

Many shrewd, energetic, and well financed corporations have tackled the prefabricated housing field. Problems of manufacture, distribution, and erection always appeared to keep the prefabs from being a complete answer to the low-cost housing need.

Nevertheless, the pressure to show up the real-estate lobby and the backward construction industry was strong and persistent from the New Deal-minded who believe that the Government can do anything better. The result was a monumental failure at taxpayers' expense. They are still eager to pour more millions into it.

The Senate investigation has at least succeeded in tumbling Mr. Truman from one of his more arrogant gestures of defiance. In the face of Senate criticisms, and a recommendation that abuses could be lessened by placing the agency under a single head, the President reappointed the five RFC directors.

The storm of resentment that followed was too much even for Mr. Truman's calloused hide, and he has concurred in the Senator's recommendation.

As with so many other governmental follies, the defense emergency is now advanced as a reason for perpetuating what in normal times would have become unendurable. It is argued that only the RFC can finance the plant expansion necessary to handle our production needs.

This may be true. War and the preparation for it call for speed and a disregard of possible waste that override ordinary prudence. But if RFC is to continue, the best course would be to make it an arm of the mobilization office, with its activities limited strictly to defense requirements.

With this limitation, under a responsible head, and with the salutary effect of the present disclosures, the agency might be useful. But Congress should have learned enough by now never again to let it linger on as a political grab bag after its specific purpose has been served.

United States To Pay for Hoosier Boy's Eyesight Damage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gene Dawson, able Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis (Ind.) News:

UNITED STATES TO PAY FOR HOOSIER BOY'S EYESIGHT DAMAGE

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The last election may have been pretty important to Jimmy Shellberger, Jr.

Jimmy is a little over 4 years old. His father is a Mishawaka veterinarian who formerly was an Army captain.

Jimmy was born January 6, 1947, at the Sixty-first Station Hospital at Leghorn, Italy, during his dad's military service.

At the hospital somebody made a bad mistake. They were supposed to put the normal silver nitrate solution in his eyes.

Instead the Senate Judiciary Committee decided yesterday, the solution they used was either some other chemical or a silver nitrate solution much too strong.

Whatever it was, the solution robbed Jimmy of the sight of his left eye (it may have to be removed) and left him only 50 percent vision in his right optic.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART went to bat for Jimmy in the last session of Congress. The bill he introduced to give Jimmy $50,000 damages was pushed through the Senate last December, but got bogged down in the House Judiciary Committee.

Yesterday, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER again shoved it through the Senate committee, of which he is a member, and reported it personally to the Senate.

Jimmy's Congressman was changed last November and the new one, Representative SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, JR., just happens to be a lawyer.

He also happens to be a member of the House Judiciary Committee, and that's what it takes, sometimes, to get things done for the Jimmy Shellbergers.

Incredible Irresponsibility Shown in Truman Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Syracuse Post Standard of March 1, 1951, dealing with the fiscal policies of the Truman administration. The tax burdens facing the American people are appalling. Before any further tax is imposed upon us, I think it is imperative that we have full and exact information as to what the expenditures—save for an all-out conflict—will be for the fiscal year 1952. Every nonessential program must be eliminated until the emergency is over. The American people are willing to accept their responsibility if they find the Government doing its part in an honest effort to institute sound business management in its programs. Government waste of the taxpayers' money, as outlined in the following editorial, does not lend to the public having confidence in the present administration's ability or interest to effect such policies. As the editorial points out, this is probably one of hundreds of such examples of gross extravagance and the lack of wisdom in the management of affairs by the administration.

The editorial follows:

INCREDIBLE IRRESPONSIBILITY SHOWN IN TRUMAN FINANCING

The incredible irresponsibility of the Truman administration is nowhere more clearly shown than right here in up-State New York.

The Sampson air base, formerly a naval base, has been permitted to go to wreck and ruin, with no effort of any kind made either to protect Government property or to salvage sound and expensive equipment.

The picture is one of unbelievable waste and carelessness. It is clear that the administration did not even care.

The story gathered by news reporters is one of valuable property such as boilers and stoves being carried off without let or hindrance, of buildings allowed to fall to pieces, with the help of vandals, of an investment of millions given not the slightest protection and, in fact, completely ignored.

When the Air Force decided to take the base over in its expansion program, it was estimated that it could be put back in shape again for from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000. Now the estimate has been raised to $12,000,000 and some are convinced that from $18,000,000 to $20,000,000 will have been spent before it is once more in shape.

Twelve million dollars, even $20,000,000, may be considered peanuts by an administration that is spending $70,000,000,000 a year. But if this waste and irresponsibility is permitted here, in just one instance, imagine what the total must be for the whole country.

It is well known, although an investigation has never been permitted, that materials worth hundreds of millions were stolen from Government depots in the Philippines, that equipment for 60 divisions was abandoned in Europe, that the disposition of war surplus has been a scandal whose stench rose to high heaven.

Now, with this record, we come to the present time, when the American people are giving the Government $50,000,000,000 a year to spend and going into debt for $20,000,000,000 more.

The people, contributing so mightily for the good of their Nation, have the right to ask whether this awful carelessness, this utter disregard for fundamental supervision of activities, is to continue.

Is the squandering of money and property to continue?

Or are Army, Navy, and Air Force procurement and maintenance to be placed on a sound, incorruptible, and lawful basis?

Are the rights of the people to be safeguarded, so that inflation is halted with Government financing on a responsible basis a factor in it?

Is nonessential spending to be cut out, adding still more strength to a Government budget that needs strength?

If the people of this country do not insist upon answers to these questions—and satisfactory answers—they will pay heavily for it. The burdens upon us are so great that the welfare of all depends upon an end to the reckless policies of the administration during the last 5 years.

President Truman has called upon the people of the country to pay additional taxes of $16,500,000,000 this year, asking that an immediate imposition of $10,000,000,000 and a later law providing the additional $6,500,000,000. The second package can be eliminated entirely and it is probable that a large slice could be cut out of the first total.

For instance, nonessential spending has been increased by $6,000,000,000 in the last 3 years. It certainly can be dispensed with; the kind of extravagance of which Sampson is an example, plus more orderly military procurement would reduce the cost by at least $2,000,000,000 more.

There is no least question that the proposed tax bill could be reduced substantially and the budget balanced, halting dangerous inflation, by sound financial and administrative methods.

We cannot afford to make the mistake of underrating the importance of drastic improvement of national financial methods. The Nation must be strong internally as well as against external foes.

An Obvious Rebuke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in all of the comment, in the press and elsewhere, which followed final ratification last week of the proposed constitutional amendment limiting the length of time any one man can be President of the United States, one fact apparently has escaped notice.

I refer to the significant point that, by voting to ratify the proposed amendment, the legislatures of nine States reversed the position taken by their respective delegations in the National House of Representatives when the House approved submission of the proposed amendment to the States on February 6, 1947.

Although House Joint Resolution 27 passed the House by a vote of 285 to 121—well over the required two-thirds majority—a majority vote in support of the resolution was cast by the House delegations of only 33 States. The vote was a tie in 3 State delegations, while the delegations from 12 other States cast a majority vote against the proposal.

Something apparently has happened since 1947 to prompt the legislatures of 9 to these 12 States to reverse the stand taken by the majority of their Representatives in the National House.

It is interesting to note the list of these States and the vote of their house delegations in 1947 on submission of the proposal to the States. Here's the record:

Arkansas—2 to 0 against.
Mississippi—5 to 2 against.
New Mexico—2 to 0 against.
North Carolina—6 to 4 against, two Members not voting.
Tennessee—6 to 3 against, with one Member not voting. Two of the three votes for submission were cast by the Republican Members.
Texas—13 to 8 against.
Virginia—5 to 3 against, with one Member not voting.

The vote of the Montana and Utah delegations was, in each case, a 1 to 1 tie, with the Republican member voting for the proposal in each delegation and the Democratic member voting against it.

Since that time, the legislatures of all nine States have voted to ratify the proposed constitutional amendment. Seven of these 9 States were among the 12 States which voted ratification since the first of this year.

I believe that there is a very definite reason for this grass roots evidence of a reversal of sentiment.

It is obviously a rebuke, amounting to a "no confidence" vote, directed at the present administration in the wake of Korea, the demands for unprecedented tax increases, and claims to more and more executive powers. I believe it was so intended even though the present occupant of the White House is technically exempted from the limitation imposed by the twenty-second amendment.

Moreover, I believe this is also a grass roots repudiation of the "indispensable man" theory, an un-American theory which is completely discredited now that some of the tragic fruits of the Nation's departure from the two-term tradition have become more fully manifest.

The Real Forgotten Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published in the Sun-Tattler, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers of Florida, published at Hollywood, Fla., in my district.

I think this editorial has so much merit that it should have a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

THE REAL FORGOTTEN MEN

Under the current Army pay system, the real heroes in the Korean War are drawing the least pay. They don't even get a fair share of the glory when the publicity and medals are dished out.

These unsung heroes are the infantrymen, who form the Army's battering ram, but who are not paid as much as the technical men and the pencil pushers behind the lines. The average monthly pay of a member of a rifle company is $135, as compared with $226 for an Air Force combat crewman and $172 for a submariner. Combat infantrymen once got $10 a month bonus, but this is no longer given.

Moreover, infantrymen are actually the poorest paid of all the troops in the Army. Ordnance, signal corps, armored force, quartermaster, artillery, and everyone else does better financially. And the ironical part of it is that all the other troops are, basically, simply the infantry's support. They exist for the sole purpose of aiding the infantry in its grim task of closing with and capturing or destroying the enemy. If the infantry fails to do that, the cause is always doomed.

Relatively little stress was placed on the infantry in the so-called "new army" we heard so much about a year or so ago. This was to be pretty much the mechanized army, the push button army, in which almost everyone would be a technician of some kind. The Korean war changed that concept, and with a vengeance. It was infantry, the poor, bloody infantry of legend, that fought the delaying actions in the dreadful early weeks. At times the situation became so desperate that service troops had to be given rifles, canteens, and bandoliers of ammunition, and sent into the line as infantrymen. And, finally, it was infantry, Army and Marine, which accomplished the brilliant later successes.

Infantry takes the beating in war. It suffered 70 percent of the casualties in World War II, perhaps a higher percentage in Korea. Yet, in World War II it got only 11.6 percent of the medals. And, as noted before, it is way down the line at the pay table.

It can be argued that mere money is a small recompense for asking a man to risk his life in war and, at best, live miserably. But it is the only recompense possible, no way exists to make the infantryman's lot an easy, pleasant one. It is certainly a reasonable assumption that the footslogger with a rifle in his hands deserves a better break than he's now getting.

Charles Broughton Day Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February we honor the memory of many great American statesmen and many times overlook those who are still with us. In the Sixth Wisconsin Congressional District there are many who have served their country and fellowmen in many outstanding ways. Included in that group of distinguished citizens is one we all know as Charlie Broughton, president and editor of the Sheboygan Press, an outstanding Wisconsin daily newspaper. Politically Charlie and I are not always in agreement, but aside from that we have many, many areas of agreement. So, because of his outstanding record in community activities as well as the State and the Nation, I want to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a speech made by Attorney Gerard M. Ungaro, legal counsel for the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, on February 22, 1951, in presenting a plaque to Charles E. Broughton, who served on the board of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago for 15 years and 12 years as the board chairman.

The excerpts follow:

Dear friends, with all due respect to George Washington, whose birthday we honor on this date, it is fitting and proper that this meeting of the Federal Home Loan bank has been set aside in honor of our good friend, Charlie Broughton.

I am certain that all of us deeply regret his announced retirement from the bank and as its chairman.

You know, no matter where he goes, he is always referred to as just Charlie. I believe the only time that he was ever called Mr. Broughton was at his very first meeting and even then, before the session was over he was called Charlie.

Seriously, Charlie is an outstanding man and truly it can be said of him, he was a public interest member of the Chicago bank. He was willing to give of his time and energies and efforts in attacking and solving problems not having direct relationship to his own business. He personally had nothing to gain.

He became a member of the board of directors some 15 years ago and was chairman for almost as long a period of time. His nature and his character are indicative of the many facets of community life, local, State, and national, in which he has participated over the span of years.

AN ACTIVE MAN

Charlie is an active man and although his many activities belie the number of years that he has been around, I'll let you in on a secret. Not too long ago he celebrated his sixty-fifth year in the printing office. We here in this association are privileged and we think that Sheboyan can be most proud of Charles E. Broughton.

He is an outstanding man among the Elks and served as the grand exalted ruler.

His main interest here was in the Federal home-loan bank. He has been an ideal chairman and could always be counted upon to exhaust every phase of any topic or problem placed before the board of directors, and whenever he believed that a discussion had gone long enough or became too involved, he would always manage to steer to a vote or go around it.

Since it becomes his choice to retire after long and faithful service, it is, I believe, fitting and proper that he does it at the same moment when the Chicago Federal Home Loan Bank returns from public to private ownership.

I would like to quote a bit of an editorial which appeare in his newspaper in the year 1916. At that time he had well indicated that he was fearless in policy and strong in adherence to the system of fair play. His editorial went something like this:

"Friends, you cannot compromise while there is an issue involving the welfare of your city, State, or country, but this does not mean you cannot be fair. You can fight on a high plane or you can surrender. If right is on your side, there can be no surrender.

"The writer would rather go down waging a fight than win financial gain by compromising with wrong."

VALIANT FIGHTER

I think that his life's work can be marked by his editorial which in effect said that you cannot surrender. I believe there is a great analogy between Charlie and the president of our bank, A. R. Gardner. Both are valiant fighters and they always have fought fairly in your behalf.

Charlie, you have served us well and have earned a rest. In all sincerity and as one who cherishes your friendship, it give me great pleasure and privilege to present this plaque as our expression of the esteem in which you are held.

Overloaded Trucks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sacramento Union, Sacramento, Calif., of February 6, 1951:

OVERLOADED TRUCKS

Highway truckers are not treating California highways lightly.

In 1941, a total of 118 individual trucking companies or operators were arrested 20 or more times for overloading in California. Of these, 95 were licensed as for-hire truck operators, the remaining being people who carried their own goods in their own trucks. Of this group of 118, 1 operator was arrested 239 times, and 9 others more than 100 times each. Some of the largest trucking companies are right up there high on the list of offenders.

They come from everywhere. Of the 18,118 overloaders arrested in California in 1949, out-of-state licenses were borne by 1,759, nearly 10 percent of the arrests. There were 440 registered from Texas, 38 from Florida, 32 from Kansas, 22 from Minnesota. Violators came from 31 different States and from British Columbia.

These overloaders carried nearly everything. There were 168 illegal truckloads of beer, 352 of cement, 362 of gasoline, 501 of crude oil, 1,714 of logs, 1,543 of lumber, 254 of meat, 263 of potatoes, 72 of wine.

One truckload of beans with a Texas registry was 16,900 pounds overweight. Butter, in an Idaho truck was 14,400 pounds overweight; liquor in a Texas truck weighed 14,370 pounds too much; potatoes, in an Arkansas truck, 19,900 pounds overweight; shrimps on a Texas truck 16,450 pounds overweight, and so on.

An overloaded truck is not a safe truck. Brakes are not designed to handle the burden imposed on them by overloads. Your safety as a motorist is jeopardized when an emergency stop is forced on an overloaded vehicle.

The American Automobile Association has reported: "Billions of dollars' worth of the Nation's finest highways are being pounded to pieces by overweight and overloaded commercial vehicles."

Representative John Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, John Sullivan, that distinguished son of Missouri, that superb gentleman of St. Louis, has passed from among us, and our sorrow is real. Our colleague's friendship was to be prized. He was an innately friendly man. He was, too, a man of genuine dignity—one whose respect for the trust placed in him by the good people of the Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri served as a bright example to all of us.

It was my privilege and pleasure to serve with John Sullivan on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He made a major contribution to the deliberations of the committee, and his conscientious attention to the problems at hand was an inspiration in the consideration of legislation which often had highly technical aspects.

Mr. Sullivan took a broad view of every legislative decision. He strove always to shape his determination of the issues in the interest of the Nation as a whole. In the process, however, he remembered always the particular applicability of each proposal to his beloved State of Missouri and the city of St. Louis. His district and his State received painstaking representation from him, and the entire United States share in the results of his careful study of all measures entrusted to the committee.

We have heard today of John Sullivan's devotion to his God. He was reverent. He accepted willingly the responsibilities of his faith. All who shared

in his bountiful store of friendship knew from the first stages of their pleasant and rewarding association that the Master had been welcomed to his rightful place in the life of this humble man. Quietly, but with uncommon diligence, he served his church. With this spirit of religious service, he combined a true tolerance. I am certain that no Member of this House—or, indeed, anyone privileged to share John Sullivan's friendship—ever heard him utter a syllable of disparagement toward any other creed, race, or nationality. He represented all classes of humanity, and no class had a priority on his attention, or on his high competence.

We shall miss John Sullivan deeply in this House. On many days, we shall stand in dire need of his strength, his encouraging example.

As we mourn him today, our thoughts must turn to Mrs. Sullivan, the active partner in his public service through the years. We can only hope that her pain will be eased by the realization of the esteem in which he was held by all who knew him—and by the knowledge that he passed to his reward as he certainly would have wished—while in the discharge of the public trust he so truly respected.

World War II Amputees Show Ways of Life to Korea Wounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Wallace E. Clayton from the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1951:

WORLD WAR II AMPUTEES SHOW WAYS OF LIFE TO KOREA WOUNDED

(By Wallace E. Clayton)

Twenty-five successful World War II veterans went out to Walter Reed Hospital yesterday to talk about a subject on which they are experts.

It wasn't job advice they gave the Korean War veterans they visited. They offered no generalities about making a better world when the war was over. Their discussions added up to one thing; practical application of the "keep-your-chin-up" theory.

The visitors were men who lost limbs in the last war, and overcame their handicaps to get jobs, start businesses, get married, have families. They spent most of the day chatting with patients in the hospital's amputee ward.

"You've got to take it in your stride or you're lost," Stanley Zybort, 31, a teacher, of Maplewood, N. J., told Sgt. Raymond Duffy, 24, of West Warwick, R. I. Mr. Zybort, who lost his left leg in a German prison camp, added that "if you're self-conscious, you have two strikes against you."

Mr. Zybort, typical of the delegation from the New Jersey Amputation Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, told of an incident in a streetcar.

"A lady stepped on my foot—the artificial one," he said. "She apologized, but I assured her I couldn't feel it. When she found out I had lost the leg, she was much more embarrassed than I was.

"You'll find you won't mind about things like that," he said.

Henry Preckajlo, 29, of Newark, N. J., boosted himself up on the bed of Pfc Lawrence Jantz, 20, of Shutesbury, Mass. He lost both his legs after being wounded in the China-Burma-India theater.

"You just have to recognize your limitations," he told Pfc. Jantz, who lost his left leg in fighting near Hamhung, Korea. "After you get used to your artificial leg, you've just got to realize there are some things you can't do anymore. Once you've made your mind up to that, you'll be O. K.

"Some things you can do better" said Mr. Preckajlo. "I'm a better swimmer now than I was before. And I never could float. You should see me now."

Mr. Preckajlo is a dispatcher at a garage. "Must be doing pretty good, too," he said. "I've had two raises in a year."

Of being confined to a wheelchair, he told Pfc Jantz: "I figure you can chase a woman faster in it than running."

Pfc. Harry Carter, 21, of Bridgeton, N. J., who Friday underwent an operation on the stump of his left arm, said he would be satisfied if he could get a job selling insurance when he got home. He was reassured by Moe Goldberg, 35, of Hillside, N. J.

"Look at me," Mr. Goldberg said. "A truck driver before the war. Then I lost this arm. I had a long time to think it over, and decided I wanted to do more than drive a truck, anyway.

"Some people—good Samaritan types—offered me sympathy jobs. Not for me. I didn't want to go into the Government, either. They don't even want you to go out for coffee.

"So I knocked on office doors till I found what I wanted. Now I'm a food broker. I'm doing all right.

"And if I can, so can you, kid."

Sam Masor, 33, an accountant of Hillside, N. J., a triple amputee, summed up the thoughts of the visitors.

"These boys here will be o.k.," he said. "Maybe our visit cheered them up a bit, and showed them what they can do—showed them they aren't cripples at all. But with the spirit they have, there's nothing to worry about."

Let Us Alone Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Joplin Globe of March 3, 1951:

LET US ALONE CLUB

Down in Mississippi they have recently announced the organization of a new club. Membership, it is stated, is "small, exclusive, and anonymous." There are no dues and no officers. At the first meeting a statement of principles was drawn up, as follows:

"We don't want no pensions.

"We don't want no minimum wages.

"We don't want no Government houses to live in.

"We don't want no Government loans.

"We don't want no subsidies.

"We don't want no bureaucrats telling us how to make a living.

"We don't want no socialized medicine or no socialized nothing.

"We don't want to have to pay no poll tax, but as long as we do have to, we don't want nobody paying it for us.

"We just want to be left alone to make our own way as best we can and as long as we can."

At last accounts the membership was undecided as to a name for their organization. Some stood out for "Let Us Alone," but some others thought "We Don't Want Nothin'" would be better. Anyway, the name isn't important with an organization which has such refreshing objectives.

The Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of boxcars is creating a hardship throughout the agricultural Middle West. This is especially so in my own State of Nebraska. It is reported that there are 1,600 blocked elevators in our grain-producing areas. This is an unusual and bad situation, especially for this time of the year.

It has been pointed out by the senior Senator from Nebraska, the honorable HUGH BUTLER that the beginning of 1949 the number of boxcars suitable for transporting grain was 729,637 and that at the beginning of 1951 it was only 710,350.

We need more boxcars. The cut-back by the National Production Authority in the boxcar production was ill-advised and a mistake. We also need to investigate the use and distribution of the cars that we have. Recently the secretary of the Nebraska Grain and Feed Dealers Association wrote me as follows:

You are undoubtedly familiar with Nebraska's problem of moving grain during the current boxcar shortage. The situation is now very critical, and Nebraska producers of corn and wheat are in danger of taking a terrific loss. The only answer to the problem of moving grain is boxcars; never in recent years has the situation been so acute. We have in the State of Nebraska millions of bushels of grain that is and will go out of condition unless it is handled immediately. Much corn is still on the ground and much that is in the cribs carries from 17 to 22 percent moisture. This will spoil as soon as warm weather arrives.

The car shortage is now preposterous. Former claims of the railroads that they could not be expected to move a whole crop in a few weeks is entirely meaningless. Many, many of our elevators are blocked and have been so since the first part of November. They will soon receive shipping orders from CCC which will complicate the problem. Failure to supply this area with sufficient numbers of cars will mean a great loss to this country both industrially and agriculturally. We need immediate alleviation of the shortage and then a definite program to provide the railroads with an adequate boxcar building program.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution which is a companion to the resolution introduced in the Senate by the Nebraska senior Senator calling for an investigation. That resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to insuring an adequate supply of materials necessary for the production of 120,000 railroad cars during the calendar year 1951.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the House at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable for the purpose of securing such production.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that speedy action can be had on this resolution.

Resolution of Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma City, Okla., retail grocers have resolved and, in so doing, have expressed themselves vividly on the subjects of price controls and rationing, war-emergency sales taxes, and inflation.

Copies of their resolutions have been sent to me. Their sentiments are expressed in the following resolutions, which I quote:

Resolution on price controls and rationing

Whereas price controls have been enacted by the Government of the United States as a measure to curb further inflation and to prevent war-time profiteering and inequitable distribution; and

Whereas foods constitute a major item in controls; and

Whereas a hardship may be imposed on the retailer unless controls include controls at all levels; Be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association here assembled on this sixth day of February 1951, endorses the code of rules submitted to the ESA by the board of directors of the National Association of Retail Grocers;

1. That the Government eliminate all nonessential spending and waste of food and other materials;

2. That price controls and rationing be used only to meet the existing state of emergency;

3. That price controls be established from production through distribution;

4. That fair and equitable price controls must include controls on raw products, transportation, supplies, wages, and all costs that go into the product;

5. That special provisions be made for services such as credit and delivery or other services and functions performed by the retailer;

6. That rationing not be considered on any item except as the supply indicates necessity for rationing to equitably distribute the basic or important food;

7. That penalties be invoked only against persistent and flagrant violators; and

8. That the Government remove these controls as soon as they have served their purpose.

Resolution on war emergency sales taxes

Whereas the Congress of the United States has been asked to increase taxes materially for defense purposes; and

Whereas a luxury tax, national sales tax, and other taxes are likely to be imposed which affect the small merchants; and

Whereas the collection of such taxes would requires a lot of time in making collections, keeping records, etc.; and

Whereas thousands of merchants would be affected by it: Be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association here assembled on February 6, 1951, go on record as recommending that such taxes be imposed at the manufacturing source, thus confining the collecting and record keeping to a minimum number, relieving the thousands of small merchants of these burdens and at the same time alleviating the work required by the Revenue Bureau; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the Oklahoma Members of Congress in Washington, D. C.

Resolution on inflation

Whereas inflation is an acknowledged and deadly enemy of any free enterprise system and to our economic American way of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma City Retail Grocers Association here assembled on this the 6th day of February 1951, pledge their full support to the officials in charge with the duty of preventing inflation in the United States of America.

To the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, each year representatives of my home city place a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier as a tribute to the war dead and the ceremony is known as Corpus Christi Day in Arlington Cemetery. This year, Miss Mary Toomey Tompkins, a member of the By-Liners Club, has written a poem in commemoration of that occasion and under leave to extend my remarks I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

To you, sleeping in this hallowed tomb as symbol of our soldier-dead,
We bring our wreath of remembrance.
We offer it in special tribute to our courageous buddies
Who perished on the icy battlefields of Korea.
They met a double foe—not only the human enemy but bitter, relentless cold.
Humbly we gather at this national shrine to honor them and do homage to their valor.
And, in this memorial place sanctified by the blood of heroes,
We bow with reverence and appreciation.
Gold Star mothers, holding precious memories in each tear-stained heart,
Have sent the star of flowers.
Our flag, there, symbolizes the peace-loving Union of free people
Who believe in liberty and justice for all.
In defense of these noble ideals brave men have sacrificed their lives throughout the years.
This let us never forget. As long as we remember, they are with us yet—
For "they are not dead who live in the hearts they leave behind."

—*Mary Toomey Tompkins.*

FEBRUARY 22, 1951.

Shipment of Strategic Materials to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered what became of our stockpiling of strategic materials. Three times have we voted hundreds of millions for that purpose. Perhaps this news item from the Sunday, March 4, Chicago Tribune gives us a key to the mystery:

SEVEN BRITISH PORTS PILED HIGH WITH UNITED STATES GIFT METALS—BIGGEST HAND-OUTS ARRIVE AS ECA EXPIRES

(By Arthur Veysey)

LONDON, March 3.—The biggest gift shipments of metals in many weeks are being unloaded in British ports, the Marshall-plan office announced.

At seven ports, ships are discharging 4,857 tons of aluminum, 1,440 tons of copper, 1,416 tons of steel, 900 tons of zinc, and 600 tons of lead. Other shipments, paid for by the American taxpayer and sent to Britain as a gift, include 13 tons of carbon black for tires and 4,285 tons of milo starch.

The Marshall-plan office said that although its hand-out program is officially over as far as Britain is concerned, gift cargoes will continue to arrive here for several months. Metals shipped to Britain under the Marshall-aid program already have cost $311,000,000, and Marshall-plan officers estimate gifts costing another $100,000,000, most of it in metals or machinery, are still to come.

INCREASE METAL GIFTS

Gift metal shipments to Britain have increased in recent months as the metals have become scarce and as metal prices have multiplied.

At British ports, the metals are turned over to the British Government which sells them to British industrial users. Much of the copper goes to electrical manufacturers who are turning out generators and other goods which the British Government uses as barter with Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

The money the British Government receives from British manufacturers for the gift metals is used to pay off the British debt. During the Marshall plan program, the British debt has gone down at the fastest rate in British history. At the same time the American Government's debt has gone up.

EYES UNITED STATES STOCKPILE

EASTBOURNE, ENGLAND, March 3.—High Gaitskell, Britain's economic chief, has em-

phasized Britain's need for some of the raw materials the United States is stockpiling. They are needed, he said, to stave off an economic crisis in this country.

Without these critical raw materials, said the chancellor of the exchequer, Britain's export drive, the key support in her own defense program, would collapse.

Speaking to a convention of more than 500 of Britain's dollar export manufacturers, he said the Government attaches "enormous importance" to the satisfactory outcome of discussions now under way in Washington by international commodity committees. These groups are studying ways of reallocating raw materials.

ILLUSORY ASSET

Gaitskell said: "We really must remember that we are rearming in peace time, and that if peaceful trade and economic stability were gravely weakened for lack of raw materials, then the heaping up of unused materials in stockpiles would, even in a military sense, be an illusory asset."

He estimated that Britain's increase in production this year would be 4 percent over 1950. Then he added:

"But if the 4 percent increase were not achieved—and it certainly could not be if raw material supplies fell seriously short of requirements—then the economic outlook would, of course, be far worse."

Security Secrets Cloak Bungling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1 issue of the Holland Sentinel, the daily newspaper in Holland, Mich., a challenging article appeared by one of Washington's most reliable and astute correspondents, Junius B. Wood.

The fundamental question raised by Mr. Wood must be answered if the citizens of this Nation are to make the necessary effort in this critical period. I join him in urging that some of the plans and programs be revealed, at least the blueprints for the future, so that America will know the long-range benefits to be derived from the proposed burdens of nearly overwhelming magnitude.

Mr. Wood's remarks follow:

SECURITY SECRETS CLOAK BUNGLING

(By Junius B. Wood)

"Our Nation has won two wars and twice lost the peace," the Senator said. He was from an Eastern State. It was one of those off-the-record talks so popular in the National Capital, where an official edifies a small audience with startling statements but does not accept responsibility for any of them.

The Senator explained that the peace was lost on each occasion for lack of planning. "Win the war and forget it," Washington had said, "Why bother planning for the future. The future will take care of itself," was the brush-off.

With two such costly lessons and a third war rising over the horizon, the natural question was: "What are our plans if and when we win the next one?" Nobody answers. Washington's plan, if it has any, are security secrets. A glassy-eyed owl may be wise or it may have nothing in its head. Official Washington is the same. The Senator talked freely on party policies. Joked about other officials and touched on passing sensations but did not express an opinion on the vital question—the future of our Nation.

That is typical of Washington. Anyone who reads knows the National Capital is a bedlam of talk. He sees a modern version of the Biblical tower of Babel—warring political parties, officials scrambling like ants, one idea today and a new one tomorrow, fighting for the spotlight, grinding out statements, sounding off for the public and, more appalling, each one competing with all the others. From a President and Cabinet with other cabinets pyramided on top, down to hundreds of Congressmen and lesser officials, each has his own act. The man on the flying trapese stays up in the air as long as he attracts attention and applause from the juggling act in another ring. The public doesn't know where the country is going or why but it is on the way.

The citizen whose part in public affairs is limited to a vote on election day and paying taxes every day wants to know. That is his right in a democracy, but he waits in vain for Washington to let him in on the secret. Instead, his attention is diverted—investigations of elections, of city crime, of missing millions and of loyalty, new projects and new proposals, debates over wages and prices, feuding between President and Congress, arguments, personalities, and wisecracks—whipping up emergencies but never a promise of what our world will be when the next emergency ends.

Official confusion spreads across the country. Business does not know what is ahead and humble households are helpless. They deserve more than the owlish alibi security secret. They answer the country's call in lives and taxes. The young and the aged, the city workers and farmers, the businessman and every other taxpayer can ask: "And what are we to have after the fighting ends?

"Another war may be in the making. Why not tell the people now what we will get out of it?" was the big question which the Senator did not answer. Stalin was looking ahead in the last war as we've found out. But the world's troubles today are due to the lack of planning by others who sat in those big conferences. Their slogans were good. The new ones are today. Slogans disappear like paper posters after an election.

In wars, a few get profitable contracts. Federal funds are spread in favored districts and colonels become generals, the dollars of others melt faster than they are earned, and thousands of our young people never return. Everybody knows that. Washington, now sounding a third call to war, might tell the people what they can expect after paying such a terrific price.

Merlin Casterlin, Political Leader of Sincerity and Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to praise the New York State leader of the Townsend movement, Mr. Merlin Casterlin, for his years of forthright espousal to the cause of America.

Ever since I have served the people of my district in Congress, I have been the target of some of the most unprincipled attacks in local political history. At all times, I have been supported by Mr. Casterlin's never failing words ringing true in my defense.

At times, the gunfire from the mouths of enemy cannon has been so terrific, that men less courageous have been silenced or subdued. Mr. Casterlin has never hesitated to spring to my aid, when the lions became so out of hand, I could not handle them alone.

I appreciate friendship of this kind. It is easy, when the smoke of the conflict has cleared, and one emerges the victor to receive the accolades of praise from fair-weather sailors.

But when the chips are down, it is a simple thing for us to cross over to the other side of the street to conveniently avoid having to take up the cudgel for a friend in need.

Down through the years, Merlin Casterlin's defense of your Congressman on the home front has, on many occasions, held back the hosts of demons who would destroy him.

I am grateful to my friends and, as one of the foremost among them I am grateful to this unselfish, civic minded, public-spirited friend, not only of the old folks, but to all the people.

That man is Merlin Casterlin and with a hundred stout-hearted men like him we could go on to the White House within the next few years.

Platform of Thirty-second Annual Convention of the Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform adopted at the thirty-second annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 13, 1951:

1951 PLATFORM

The Mississippi Valley Association is dedicated to the full use for beneficial purposes of the controlled waters of the Mississippi Basin through the development of navigation, irrigation, flood control, power development, soil conservation, wildlife conservation, reforestation, and recreation. This region, which comprises a major part of 22 States, is the section to which the Nation must look if it is to continue to grow and prosper. We dedicate ourselves anew and pledge our continued support and effort to the achievement of these objectives.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES

Because of the magnitude of the public debt, we recommend that Congress confine Federal appropriations as far as possible to the construction of projects which will contribute to the national defense, and which will create new and additional economic opportunities for the people.

INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEMS

We consider the development of the authorized inland waterway system of the United States to the point where it can carry tonnages required for a national war effort to be of immediate urgency. We call specific attention to the need for improvements of the connections of this inland waterway system to the Gulf of Mexico and to the Great Lakes; and for the earliest possible completion of the Missouri River channel and the great reservoirs required to maintain channel depths through periods of low stream flow.

Specifically, we recommend that work be expedited on the Garrison, Oahe, and Fort Randall Reservoirs, and that work be started at once on the Gavins Point Reservoir, which is required for the regulation of channel depths below Fort Randall. We recommend that Congress authorize and appropriate for construction of projects embraced in the Kansas River report of the Corps of Engineers. We recommend that work on the authorized stabilization works to Sioux City, Iowa, be prosecuted vigorously.

MERCHANT MARINE

The grave international situation, our increased mobilization, and our participation in the Korean conflict reemphasize the necessity for keeping strong and well-balanced our fourth arm of national defense, the American merchant marine.

The United States faces a deficiency of fast passenger vessels speedily convertible to troop transports. Also needed is a more specific national maritime policy. To remedy these deficiencies we urge and recommend that a long-range legislative program be enacted immediately to—

(a) Encourage private enterprise to build, operate, and maintain fast passenger-carrying vessels for both our commercial and defense needs;

(b) Guarantee an orderly replacement program for all types of American merchant vessels by adequate trade-in and building provisions; and

(c) Clarify the 1936 Merchant Marine Act so that Government agencies mandated by the Congress to promote and encourage an adequate privately owned and operated merchant marine will be able to speedily and efficiently administer the law.

That in the light of world conditions our reliance not be placed solely upon foreign shipping for our national security, but upon the American merchant marine, and that to encourage such a fleet the Armed Forces make the fullest use of American shipping services.

That we support the policy of our Government in granting financial aid for the operation and maintenance of regularly established United States-flag liner cargo and passenger service. To carry out this policy there should be no restrictive or limiting provisions in appropriation bills, other than the actual amount of money made available for such purposes.

That in event of total mobilization the merchant marine be placed under jurisdiction of a National Shipping Authority and that officials of United States steamship lines, with their experience and knowledge, participate in the operation of such an authority. Further, that priorities for ship repairs and maintenance and deferments from military service for personnel in critical martime occupations be provided through such an authority.

That policies expressed in any peace treaties with Japan and Germany which bear upon their merchant shipping should be based upon policies governing the American merchant marine.

We pledge our active support to the promotion and maintenance of a strong, well-balanced, privately owned and operated United States merchant marine to provide the shipping services essential to our business and agriculture, and thereby be immediately available for our national security.

FLOOD CONTROL

We consider protection of the lives and property of the people of our valley against the hazards of floods and droughts to be part of the national-defense effort. To that end we recommend that flood-control projects be prosecuted to completion as vigorously as possible with particular efforts to expedite those projects which not only will provide protection from floods and droughts, but will contribute to the development of navigation, the security of municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, and the incidental generation of hydroelectric power. We believe the solution of our water-control and utilization problems will be found in the 1936 Flood Control Act and continuing directives of the Congress, addressed to the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

We further recommend the continuance of congressional policies of appropriating flood-control funds usable any place over the United States, not exceeding $100,000 annually, for any one small stream watershed not sufficient in size for an individual flood-control program. We also recommend the continuance of congressional policies of making adequate appropriations for emergency repairs to all flood-control structures.

SOIL CONSERVATION

One of the great needs in the United States is a sound land-use policy. This policy should—

1. Provide for the permanent conservation, improvement, and development of the Nation's agricultural land and water resources.

2. Recognize that research, education, on-site technical assistance, together with material and financial aid are obligations of the Federal Government in cooperation with subdivisions of Government and other local agencies and individuals.

3. Consolidate all activities of the Federal Government in the field of soil and upland water conservation and land management into one Federal agency within the Department of Agriculture. This agency should have no other duties than those pertaining to the administration of the soil and upland water conservation program, and should coordinate its activities with the program for flood control and for irrigation in charge of the United States Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation.

4. Place in the hands of the Federal and State agricultural extension services the authority and the responsibility for the necessary educational programs.

5. Make technical assistance available to all soil-conservation districts organized under State laws and to all other organized groups recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture as capable of efficiently using technical assistance.

6. Greatly expand the program of research, and in cooperation with the States, speed up the mapping of the physical land resources, and determine accurately the location, extent, and quality of the Nation's productive lands and their capability for use.

7. Completely separate any economic stabilization program from soil and water conservation programs.

REGIONAL VALLEY AUTHORITIES AND ADMINISTRATIONS

There is a continuing effort on the part of certain elements in Government to extend regional valley authority plans for the development and control of the valleys of the United States. These authorities and administrations become superstates very quickly. The powers of existing authorities and administrations have to a certain extent been delegated to them by the Congress. To a much greater extent, however, they have been assumed by the authority or administration itself, or have been obtained through a bureaucratic directive issued without congressional approval. These authorities now transcend State and local governments, and ordinarily are not even subject to further control of the Congress or proper regulatory and auditing branches of the Federal Government.

We strongly oppose the expansion of the regional valley authority or administration plan of valley control. We urge upon the Congress that necessary legislation be passed providing for valley control and development by existing agencies of the Government, such as the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and others, which are fully equipped to design and construct necessary flood control, navigation, and reclamation projects, and to operate and coordinate them upon their completion. Such a plan will result in more efficient operation of projects, the saving of millions upon millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money, and the protection of our private enterprise system against encroachment by subsidized Government-in-business operations.

We further urge that Congress amend or strengthen existing laws to prevent authorities or administrations from circumventing the will and intent of the Congress in order to achieve their bureaucratic aims and plans.

It is our sincere conviction based on the outstanding progress being made in the Missouri Basin, that all legitimate objectives of land and water conservation and use can be achieved faster and more efficiently under the coordinated direction of existing Federal agencies without the threat of state socialism inherent in the regional authority program, no matter under what guise it is offered.

FORESTRY

We recommend a systematic and scientific program of reforestation, forest conservation, and forest-fire prevention.

We specifically urge that the Congress expedite the Nation-wide forest survey, conducted by the United States Forest Service, as authorized in 1930 by the McNary-McSweeny Act.

We recommend cooperation between the States and Federal Governments to stop needless forest destruction and to keep forest lands, both publicly and privately owned, in a state of productivity.

We favor adequate appropriations for (a) Federal-State cooperation in forest-fire protection on State and private forest land; (b) production and distribution of forest planting stock to private land owners; (c) farm forestry extension work; and (d) technical services and assistance to private forest land owners and to processors of primary forest products.

We also recommend that the various State governments, through their forest service departments, cooperate to hasten the potential development of a comprehensive reforestation program throughout the United States.

WATER RESOURCES

We recommend continuing studies of all matters affecting our water resources, such as drainage, precipitation, evaporation, infiltration, surface runoff, underground movement, quality of water and water tables, together with the protection of underground and surface waters from pollution and waste. We particularly endorse the work along these lines being carried on by the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, in cooperation with States and other agencies, and recommend to the Congress and State legislatures adequate appropriations for the carrying on of these activities.

Continuing development of our water resources for flood control, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and other possible benefits is of prime importance.

We realize that water is a vital natural resource, essential to our expanding economy, and we believe that every measure should be employed to safeguard the supply and promote the beneficial use of water. We know that the public receives many intangible benefits from water conservation projects, such as, the storage of water for future use, recreation, pollution abatement, and kindred uses, and that none of said uses can readily be evaluated in monetary terms. The results of said uses are all essential to our economic well being.

It is therefore the sense of this association that the Public Works Committee of the Congress establish a formula for use by the Corps of Army Engineers and other agencies which will operate to give an economic valuation basis to all beneficial uses and that credit be included in computing the cost benefit ratio in all projects involving water conservation.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

It is recognized that in a comprehensive plan for the development of our valleys to provide for flood control, navigation, and irrigation, in many localities dams can be constructed of the so-called multiple-purpose type without serious impairment of the primary purposes for which the dams are constructed. It is urged that, wherever such conditions exist and multiple-purpose dams can be economically justified, Congress proceed as quickly as possible with the authorization and appropriation of the construction of such multiple-purpose dams.

Due to the nature of the stream flow in the Mississippi Valley area, power and energy generated from any such multiple-purpose dams in the area will vary materially with rainfall. Therefore the production of power must be purely incidental to the primary purposes for which the dams are designed. For this reason, and in order to protect the pimary purposes of the dams, it is urged—

1. That the incidental power and energy produced at such multiple-purpose dams be sold at the bus bar or from high voltage lines constructed by government agencies to existing agencies, both public and private, engaged in production and distribution of electric power and energy in the contiguous areas, for resale by them to their customers without discrimination or preference;

2. That wholesale rates for such sales be set by the Federal Power Commission;

3. That sale and accounting for such incidental power and energy should be made and carried on by the existing agencies of the Federal Government designing and building and operating such multiple-purpose dams, i. e., the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Reclamation;

4. Purchasers of wholesale power should pay to the Government as a minimum the actual cost thereof including, in addition to ordinary operating expenses, interest at average rate on governmental borrowings and amortization of the cost of the project allocated to the power production over not to exceed a 50-year period; and

5. Any and all savings or profits accruing to the purchaser at wholesale rates under what similar quantities of electrical power and energy would have cost the purchaser to produce by the best and cheapest alternative method should be passed on to its retail customers in the area, in the amounts and in the manner prescribed by proper regulatory authorities.

FEDERAL STEAM PLANTS

We believe that controlling floods, providing and improving navigation, reclaiming arid lands, protection of soil against erosion, and the generation of hydroelectric power incidental to these functions are proper activities of the Federal Government.

The construction of steam plants for generation of power for commercial resale puts the Federal Government into the power business in direct competition with its citizens and is not a function of government.

We particularly oppose the use of money from continuing funds by the Department of Interior for the purpose of inducing rural electrification cooperatives to build steam plants and high-voltage transmission lines for direct sale or lease to the Department of Interior. Such loans avoid the clearly expressed intent of Congress to control the operations of these two departments of government through annual appropriation bills.

We emphatically oppose the Federal Government, its authorities, administrations or agencies, constructing steam-generating plants for the production of power for resale.

USE OF EXISTING AGENCIES

The Mississippi Valley Association endorses the excellent work of the existing Federal agencies responsible for the development of land and water resources of the Mississippi River Basin. These agencies include the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; the Federal Power Commission; and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey, Department of Interior. We oppose the creation of any public works department of Government for consolidating the work and duties of these agencies long expert in their respective fields, or for any other purpose that would interfere with, or interrupt, the progress now being effected by these agencies.

We specifically insist that no organization plan of the Congress shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan should take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this statement. The elimination of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers would destroy one of the most valuable and efficient operating agencies in the Federal Government. With virtually the stroke of a pen such a recommendation, if not disapproved by the Congress, would eliminate all the experience gained by this single agency over the last 100 years, would scatter its trained personnel, and would destroy the esprit de corps that has made its work outstanding throughout the world. To transfer this function from the Department of the Army to a civilian agency would take away from the Army a valuable peacetime training activity, which has proved its worth on the battlefields of the world, where our troops have fought and now fight for freedom of all mankind.

RECLAMATION

Next to the consumptive use of water for municipal and domestic purposes, we consider the development of arid and semiarid lands by irrigation as the highest beneficial use of water in the 17 Western States. We therefore endorse the construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation and ask Congress to provide adequate construction funds to complete the reclamation program.

Reclamation by controlled drainage could add many millions of acres of highly productive lands to the agricultural assets of the country. We recommend that the Federal Government make adequate investigations of this most important matter.

SNAGGING AND CHANNEL CLEARING

There is now allocated to the chief of engineers $1,000,000 annually for cleaning out and straightening the channels of small streams. We recommend and urge that this amount be increased to $5,000,000. It is reported that in certain States $1,000,000 annually for this channel snagging and cleaning could be properly expended in 1 year.

We recommend that Public Law 526—Seventy-ninth Congress—be amended so that "Cleaning and grubbing" may be interpreted to allow complete and full removal of stumps and trees in interior drainage work.

We recommend and urge that drainage districts, in which the previously dug ditches have filled and grown up to a point that drainage is totally inadequate be included in the scope of streams participating in this fund—(notably such drainage districts where the Commissioners have not levied any taxes in 8 years or more, having practically "gone out of business"). We urge the importance of including those abandoned drainage districts.

FEDERAL BARGE LINES

We endorse the action of the board of directors in its approval of the recommendations of the special committee made in February of 1949 concerning the future of the Federal barge lines. We request the board of directors to continue this committee to advise with and keep the board of directors informed as to proposals for the disposition of the Federal barge lines.

WORK STOPPAGE

We believe work stoppages in industry jeopardize the health, safety, and economy of this Nation. We believe that the right to strike must be curtailed short of the right to injure the public welfare. To this end we urge Congress to amend the antitrust laws in a manner that will make them applicable to labor organizations to the extent necessary to restrain, and make illegal, monopolistic practices.

WORLD TRADE

One of the primary objectives and aims of the Mississippi Valley Association is to further and increase the world trade of the Mississippi Valley area of the United States.

It is recognized that imports play a vital part in the maintenance and increase of such trade, and certain other organizations have signified their intention to embark on a coordinated program to stimulate imports into the United States.

We hereby signify our desire and intention of participating in this movement and joining with the International House of New Orleans, New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, Memphis International Center, National Cotton Council, Mid-Continent World Trade Council, and other organizations in this activity.

We authorize our president or duly authorized officers to take such steps as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

Our international air transport, like our merchant marine, is a vital link in the Nation's transport system. Efficient air transport services overseas, operating on dependable schedules, and backed by a sound aircraft construction industry at home, are vital to our national defense. The association urges that all necessary measures be taken to assure proper place for United States flag services on the world's air routes.

SUBMERGED LANDS AND WATER RIGHTS

Whereas the United States, under recent court decisions, may raise the claim to the ports and the beds of the navigable streams as well as to other submerged lands; and

Whereas the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have asserted in Federal courts that there can be no private rights in the waters of a navigable stream: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association urge that the Congress promptly adopt legislation recognizing or vesting in the several States, and those who hold title from said States, the absolute title to the submerged lands within the respective State boundaries. We reaffirm our policy to recognize all water rights vested under State law.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

We again disapprove the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway for these reasons:

1. There never has been an economic survey made of the project by the Corps of Army Engineers.

2. The charging of tolls would probably result in the imposition of tolls on all the navigable channels in the United States, thus ending the free use of them.

3. The seaway would further handicap the American merchant marine.

Son John Now a Leading Candidate in His Own Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great frustrations I have with the deliberate stalling on congressional reapportionment in New York State is being uncertain whether or not that mighty and patriotic American county of Madison is to leave my district.

Suffice it to say, some of the finest friends I ever knew sprang to my defense in Madison last year when I was challenged by the ghastly crew.

Brave citizens took up the cry for freedom against the anti-Hall gang and rallied a powerful opposition to the punk powers that be up there.

For a moment, I am stymied for obvious reasons, but Madison's leading smear sheet, the Oneida Daily Dispatch, has already started to beat the drums of war.

Time was when the policy of the Dispatch was dictated by a worthy father of the unworthy son, now in command. Unfortunately, the "Young Turk" element has taken over. God help the Dispatch.

The Dispatch editorial, probably written by "my son John," smears your Congressman as usual but goes further in exhorting those "who voted against HALL should be giving some thought to replacing him with a good man." As though just about all the boys were not.

What John really means is that he considers himself congressional timber and is itching for his friends to start slapping him on the back and start telling him he is the man.

While I was campaigning in Madison last summer, I made special inquiries among those who know what goes on behind the scenes up there.

One man spilled a lot to me. In answer to my question about what had made the Dispatch go so haywire, he replied:

"Public relations were grand until the young fella come home and took over. Then he made everybody there goose step and tried to do the same thing in Oneida.

"For a long time young Tuthill has hankered to run for Congress but hasn't got up nerve. That's the reason he hates you so, because you stand in his way."

Well, I certainly would not stand in John's way. I think it is about time he tried his wings. He has been so anxious to smear me from his ivory tower. Let him come forth now and do battle like a man.

Let the rank and file of our people, whose Representative he derides and taunts, get a good look at the bounder.

Most Courageous Comeback in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the Eightieth Congress, many wise measures were taken in the field of foreign affairs. In particular, the aid which was extended Greece and Turkey has paid rich dividends in terms of national security and the performance of the Greek and Turkish troops in Korea has been an inspiration. But, certainly, none of the many wise and far-seeing measures which were enacted during the Eightieth Congress have paid richer dividends than the Marshall plan. Without it, most of the western world would have been seriously, if not fatally, weakened by communism. Thanks to it, all these nations are now in a position to develop some real strength for human freedom so that we will not need to carry the whole burden alone. I am particularly proud of the part which members of my own party took in the development of that legislation. I am also proud of the extraordinarily able administration of the Marshall plan by Paul Hoffman without which this success would not have been so great.

We are now entering a new phase in Europe in which the Marshall plan will be modified so as to fit the needs of an increased emphasis on building military power, which, as I just said to the Senator from Utah, should have come much sooner. It seems, therefore, that this is a fitting time for Senators to sum up in their own minds what the Marshall plan accomplished. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in a recent issue of Life magazine by Paul Hoffman which is a summation of what has been accomplished.

I have asked the Public Printer to estimate the length of the speech if printed in the RECORD. He says it will cover 3⅔ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $300.68. I ask unanimous consent that although the printing of the article will take up more than the usual length of such speeches, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MOST COURAGEOUS COMEBACK IN HISTORY—THIS YEAR EUROPE'S FARMS AND FACTORIES ARE PRODUCING MORE THAN BEFORE THE WAR—ECA'S FORMER DIRECTOR ASSESSES THE GREAT RESURGENCE AND ITS LESSONS FOR FUTURE

(By Paul Hoffman)

(In April 1948 Paul Hoffman took over the unprecedented job of directing the Marshall plan program to bring Europe back from the verge of collapse. Four months ago he resigned after an unprecedented success to which the figures on page 107 attest. As a result, even if war should come in Europe, the West is, economically at least, strong and healthy. Mr. Hoffman has written a book which reports on the first years of ECA and makes recommendations for the future. From the book, which Doubleday will publish April 19, under the title Waging the Peace, comes the article which follows.)

In one very real sense the contest between freedom and despotism is a contest between the American assembly line and the Communist Party line. In this arena the Economic Cooperation Administration is America's boldest experiment in waging the peace. In order to support its activities, the American people, through their Congress, have already appropriated more than $12,000,000,000 for European recovery, $556,000,000 for Korea, and $275,000,000 for other Asiatic countries.

ECA is also the story of the most meaningful 2½ years in my own life. The story began on a bright April day in 1948 when we started operations in room W-900 in Washington's Statler Hotel.

The year 1948 was a fateful one for Western Europe, menaced by Kremlin conspiracies. No less an authority than British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin had said that Western Europe was on the verge of collapse. There was ample ground for this pessimism. Already the Red wave had moved west from its own frontiers. It had swept over the once-independent states of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. Fifth columnists were hard at work in France, Italy, and Germany. In all these countries the Communists were busy exploiting the hunger and the hopelessness and the lack of of jobs among tens of millions of people. Broken factories were operating only fitfully. Farmers raised little more than enough to feed themselves. The transport system was in too sad a state of disrepair to carry even the slight food surpluses to undernourished city dwellers. To compound all these troubles, Western Europe found itself host to millions of refugees and displaced persons who had fled the Kremlin's terror in Eastern Europe.

Facing all these problems, the nations of Western Europe were shackled by their own destructive economic practices. When I made my first visit to Europe as ECA administrator back in July 1948, I saw that Western Europe's economy then was like a crazy quilt whose varicolored squares had been cut out but not sewn together. For 50 years, indeed, Western Europe had been moving in the direction of economic nationalism. Countries competed with each other in intensifying trade restrictions, in raising tariffs and in imposing import quotas and exchange controls to "protect" home industries.

The harm done by trade barriers among the European nations is best illustrated by comparative production figures between Europe and the United States. In 1900 the per capita output of the European worker and the United States worker was virtually the same. Both lived on about the same scale. Yet in 1950 the United States, with a population of 151,000,000, turned out a gross national product of $289,000,000,000 in contrast to Western Europe which, with 274,000,000 people, turned out a gross national

product of only $170,000,000,000. If, however, European per capita output had been on a par with ours, its gross national product would have been around $507,000,000,000. Of course Europe lacks both the raw materials and the horsepower for this rate of production, and its progress was badly set back by a war that increased our output. Its application of the industrial arts will lag behind ours for an indefinite time. Yet a free-trading European market, unhampered by tariffs and controls, might well have given Western Europe $100,000,000,000 more production. That extra $100,000,000,000 would have made it far easier for Europe to move both toward higher prosperity and faster rearmament.

Such was life in Western Europe in 1948.

It is enough to say that today—2½ years later—Western Europe's industrial production has been lifted, not merely to prewar levels, but 27 percent above them. The output of crude steel has been increased 24 percent, motor vehicles about 90 percent, and textile yarns about 25 percent. Farmers in 1950 had bumper crops, and production of livestock products reached the prewar standard. Production of electric power has gone up more than 80 percent. Currencies are stabilized. People are eating regularly and working hard; let no one tell you that they are not. And, in the broadest sense, the vices of economic nationalism, though not wholly erased, have in part been removed; the wiser temper of the new times reflects itself in schemes like the Schuman plan for pooling the coal and iron resources of Western Europe. This change—this comeback—has been called "the most courageous in history." I support that verdict.

From the record of this comeback I wish to draw some important lessons that must become the signposts of the future. The first of these is the principle: We can help only those who help themselves.

Even during those rushed early days of planning and in the difficult months of putting the program across, we at ECA never had the slightest disagreement on one vital matter—the basic concept of the job itself. General Marshall had said at Harvard: "The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so." These words, then, became our text: Only the Europeans themselves can save Europe. ECA has never departed from that idea.

In putting that idea into action we were immensely aided by the remarkable "counterpart" clause that Congress had written into ECA legislation. I can say, flatly, that it made the difference between success and failure for the Marshall plan in every nation that had a shaky government, and it helped mightily with those that had strong ones.

DOUBLE-DUTY DOLLARS

In briefest outline the counterpart arrangement requires all governments receiving outright grants to match every dollar with its equivalent in their own currency—in francs, pounds, lire, or whatever. Of this foreign currency 5 percent is turned over to the United States Government. It is used for such purposes as running ECA missions to individual countries and the purchase and stock-piling of strategic materials. The remaining 95 percent is then put into a fund available to the Marshall-plan governments for recovery projects approved by ECA. Thus America's dollars do double duty. They provide the Marshall-plan nations with foreign exchange for vital commodities, and they encourage the governments of those nations to use the counterpart—which is currency actually acquired by the sale of those commodities—for building up their economies.

If this sounds like fiscal fantasy, let's look at the process in action. The French had made a valiant comeback in their cotton industry, restoring some 80 percent of prewar capacity. Raw materials ran out. The mill owners had plenty of francs, but the American cotton grower couldn't use them. Then the Marshall plan came along. The mill owners took their francs to the French exchange control, traded them for dollars (after their requests were approved by French officials and ECA), bought the needed cotton with the dollars and kept their mills going. What about the mill owners' francs? They went into the recovery fund and became counterpart—to be used for some such worthwhile project as building a highway or creating new farm land by draining a swamp. Thus the same dollars that kept the French mills active and thousands of French workers at their jobs also provided the French Government with a sackful of francs for recovery projects.

In thus helping those who help themselves we learned in ECA a second imperative principle: We must guide our dollars.

The ECA legislation itself was based upon some of the most protracted hearings in congressional history—the testimony filled five volumes and contained 6,584 pages. When the law finally emerged from these hundreds of necessary but wearisome hearings and conferences, it included among its provisions a directive that the European nations (1) submit a detailed program of their needs, (2) discuss with the ECA administration the trade and fiscal policies they would follow, and (3) allow ECA to make end-use checks to determine that American aid was spent as agreed. These provisions are actually nothing more than the realistic lending policies of your local banker transferred to the international stage.

A short case history of Italian recovery offers a prime example of the "guided dollar" principle.

At war's end Italy was struggling under more burdens than John Bunyan's famous hero. Fortunately an interim program of United States aid had been made available, and it did much to save Italy from going Communist in the elections held in April 1948. When ECA's James Zellerbach and his special mission to Italy arrived that summer, they required no long series of conferences to verify the continuing urgency of Italy's need for help. For two decades the nation had exhausted itself in efforts to fulfill Mussolini's mad ambition to be the first of the new Roman emperors. The results were plain on the gaunt faces of the Italians—in their exhaustion and in their cold homes and apartments.

They needed food and warmth. We shipped wheat and coal. They needed raw materials for the factories that still stood. We shipped cotton and steel and copper. At the same time work was begun on the more far-reaching plans to revive and rebuild the Nation. After exhaustive study ECA and the Italian Government agreed upon an over-all recovery program that emphasized (1) machines for gutted factories, (2) power to run the machines, and (3) more land and improved land cultivation.

UNDERGROUND BOILERS

A good example of the first was the Fiat plant at Turin, which had been 75 percent destroyed during the war. But Fiat obtained a $23,000,000 loan and new American equipment. Now Fiat is producing more than 100,000 passenger cars a year, in addition to a long list of buses and trucks, and has again become one of the automotive leaders of Europe.

Rebuilding Italy's power output was a problem, not only of engineering but of finance. Italy's coal deposits are poor; to import coal would be to lose foreign exchange. One answer was to harness more of the water that fell through the Alpine gorges of the north. This made good sense and new generating equipment was ordered. But even the Alps have occasional years of light snows, and the Italians wanted a hedge against that kind of failure. Accordingly the Italian investment and import programs have placed heavy emphasis on projects for thermal-generating plants to insure and to safeguard production against threat of electricity shortages. In a remote section of Tuscany, about 40 miles south of Florence, they found their insurance: "geothermic power." There, for years, huge jets of steam, the product of water seeping through semiporous rock to deep-lying lava beds, had erupted into the air. Even before the war Italian engineers had drilled through those underground boilers and harnessed the pent-up steam pressure to produce electricity. Then the retreating Germans had blasted their work to rubble. By the time ECA arrived on the scene Italian engineers were hard at work rebuilding but in desperate need of new piping and turbines. ECA not only provided these but encouraged the Italians to enlarge greatly their geothermic power plants by drilling new wells. By the end of 1951 the plants will be producing 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, accounting for one-twelfth of Italy's total power production.

The land problem is more complex. ECA has helped raise soil yields. Farm mechanization has been encouraged, modern fertilizers introduced and experts sent to show Italian farmers how to control pests and parasites. But land is a social, political, and mathematical conundrum. Along with the question of absentee landlords is the problem of tens of thousands of small farmers who are trying to eke out a living on two or three acres, or even tinier parcels. Italy has faced the needs not only of breaking up large estates but also of consolidating small ones. At the same time steps must be taken to see that the land acquired by the peasants—often neglected or unfarmed over many years by its previous owners—is developed to the point that it can be productively tilled. This requires large-scale public works in irrigation, drainage, reclamation, and roads, as well as making available to new owners the tools and credit to improve their own plots.

To meet this double challenge of land improvement and land reform, ECA is using one of the most potent weapons in its economic arsenal—its influence over counterpart funds—and now has more than 200 projects in the works. These extend from Sardinia (where a cooperative ECA-Rockefeller Foundation program is ridding the island of its centuries-old scourge of malaria) to the fertile plains of the Po to the rocky toe of Calabria. It was here, in the Sila area of Calabria, that the ceremonies marking Italy's first land division took place in the fall of 1950. Four hundred peasants, whose names had been drawn by lot from a box, took possession of 9-acre plots—the first bit of land most of them had ever owned. With tears in his eyes, their leader voiced their thanks: "Since the world began, we never thought to see so luminous a day."

From all this it is easy to see how quickly the economic functions of ECA mesh with political and social issues—and how widely and deeply they affect the life of any nation receiving American aid. Here, I believe, is the supreme political significance of the ECA: It has developed techniques of collaboration under which a powerful nation like the United States could establish an effective working partnership with a less powerful nation, without exacting from the latter any surrender of the right to rule itself. The ECA is, therefore, the first major experiment in the history of world politics where a strong power, while participating in the internal affairs of a weaker one, has not only refused to infringe upon freedom of

choice, but rather invoked every means to conserve that freedom.

A FEW MANUFACTURING SECRETS

I come now to a third lesson of ECA: We must export our skills—our know how—as well as our dollars. This is, in fact, the basis of the technical assistance (TA) program at ECA. I have always been convinced that the adoption of American labor and management practices would be a great boon to European labor, European management, and the European consumers. My chance to do something about it came one warm summer day in Paris in 1948. Sir Stafford Cripps, then Britain's ascetic Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I were talking over the economic recovery obstacles that lay ahead. "If we are to raise the standard of living in Great Britain," he said, "we must have greater productivity." My heart quickened; this was the kind of talk I wanted to hear from a European. Then he continued. "Great Britain has much to learn about that from the United States and," he paused, "I think we have a few manufacturing secrets we've been concealing for a generation or so that you might like to learn. Why don't we interchange this information?"

Naturally I jumped at the idea. "We'll set up a system of trans-Atlantic visits," I replied, "taking British management and labor on tours of American factories and shipping Americans to Britain for a look at your shops." Sir Stafford made the deal right there and within weeks he had thrown his amazing vegeterian energy into the creation of an Anglo-American Council of Productivity. Top figures like Philip Reed, of General Electric, and Victor Reuther, of the CIO, were enlisted to represent American management and labor. The late Sir Frederick Bain, deputy chairman of the Board of Imperial Chemical Industries, and Lincoln Evans, general secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, were brought in for the British. The first British team to arrive in the United States represented labor and management in the steel industry. This group spent 6 weeks over here, exploring our factories, taking notes by day and chewing over them in the evenings. These were no junketeers; they came with determination to learn. When they returned to England they sat down and wrote a report so much of an eye-opener that it sold 25,000 copies in a fortnight and went into three extra printings. Its gist: productivity per man in American foundries was from 50 percent to 90 percent higher than in British foundries; the latter must mechanize and raise output or workers' living standards would fall even lower.

At the same time that we were trying to help increase productivity in Europe with our large-scale technical assistance program, we were also experimenting with another sort of technical aid in China. The China Aid Act of 1948 provided for the formation of the five-member Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction and sponsored a novel attack on conditions behind the growing unrest in rural areas—conditions which had made China (and southeast Asia) especially vulnerable to Communist agitation.

Chinese and American agricultural survey teams had, in 1946, pin-pointed areas in which rural reform was needed. In some places rents were as high as 50 percent of the farmer's crop. Tenancy contracts were a mockery. They could be altered or abolished at the whim of the landlords. Middlemen profits cut the farmer's earnings, and excessive tax rates bit deep into the meager remainder. Nearly 80 percent of Asia's one and one-quarter billion are farmers, so they were susceptible alike to the growing demand for rural reforms and to the propaganda of Communist agents who quickly assumed the guise of agrarian reformers in matters of political importance.

PRODUCTION UP, COMMUNISM DOWN

The JCRR was designed to fight on this front and to gain three major objectives simultaneously. It began a social justice program to improve health, to insure fair rentals and increase production. Unlike missions, whose members spend their time at their desks, the JCRR went out into the hills and worked with the people. There they lived and talked with the peasants. I do not hesitate to say that not since Lawrence's days in Arabia has a more sensitive or successful venture been carried out by any westerners in the Near or Far East. It was in the very provinces that the JCRR program had got underway—in Szechwan, Kwangsi, and Fukien—that the Communist invaders found some of the most stubborn grass-roots resistance to their drive. What a different story might have been told in China if this alternative to Communist strategy had been started a few years earlier.

The work of the ECA has everywhere proved, whether in Asia of Europe, the validity of its basic assumptions; physical well-being, or the promise of it, provides the hope and the faith which permit free people to make rational judgments.

The correlation between material benefits and election results backs up the point. There were, of course, other influences—the revival of prodemocratic political forces, the church's crusade against communism, the increasing awareness among all groups of the difference between its rosy propaganda and its ruthless barbarism. Even when all these are taken into account, however, there remains a very definite connection between economic recovery and anti-Communist votes, as the balloting before the Marshall plan and afterward attests. In Belgium, for instance, industrial production has gone up 12 percent since the advent of the Marshall plan. At the same time, Communist strength in the Parliament dropped from 17 seats to 10. In Norway production is up 23 percent and Communist seats in Parliament have fallen off to zero. In the Netherlands, where industrial output is up 51 percent, Communist seats in the provincial assemblies have declined from 10 percent in 1946 to 5 percent in 1950. In Denmark output is up 31 percent and the Communist showing is down from 12 percent of the popular vote (in the 1945 elections) to 4 percent (in the 1950 elections). In Austria production has risen 140 percent; Communist mayors in 30 cities were all out of their jobs by 1950. In Britain, as in Switzerland, communism has never been a serious problem; the Communist Party as such is outlawed in Greece, Turkey, and Portgual. In Italy the very announcement of ECA aid did help to decrease Communist representation in the National Assembly, and the 27 percent hike in industrial output since then has been a hard blow at Communist strength within the labor forces. In France the advent of the Marshall plan prevented, in all probability, a Communist take-over.

With these proved lessons behind us, where do we go from here?

First, I have one urgent legislative measure to propose on the basis of our experience: to get maximum efficiency out of the dollars we spend abroad, whether they go for recovery, for development of retarded economies, or for building up military defenses, one Government agency must have the primary responsibility for allocating all funds. Only by concentrating control over our economic activities abroad in the hands of a single agency can we—

1. Properly apportion aid among countries (several agencies working separately often tend to give one nation too much help, another too little);

2. Avoid waste of dollars with a country (two or more agencies often duplicate functions); and

3. Control the impact of our dollars upon the economy of a recipient country (too great a pressure for rearming on a nation of full employment, like Britain, could unduly drive down the standard of living; the same dollars applied to rearming in a nation of unemployment, like Germany, would raise the standard of living).

To tackle all this, we urgently need an overseas economic administration—of Cabinet status—to take over the present set-up of ECA, absorb the point 4 program now administered by the State Department, supervise at least the economic side of all sums to be spent on European rearmament under the mutual-defense-assistance program, and give policy direction to American representation in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

If this new agency is to wage the fight for peace effectively, there is something else the United States must do which may seem a good deal more painful than creating a new Government office: it must revise its whole attitude toward foreign trade. The great giver of peace, Great Britain, in the nineteenth century advanced international stability and amity by means of a world trade that benefited everybody. The United States must build to the same end. For a century we have hidden behind our tariff walls, protecting our infant industries, bulwarked by the self-sufficiency of our immense resources. We have sold to the world but have been reluctant to buy from it, and world trade has been thrown badly out of balance. The real volume of goods imported into this country between 1929 and 1948–49 increased about 5 percent at the same time that the real domestic output (our national farm and factory production) increased 60 percent. Under such circumstances other nations could not afford to continue buying from us unless we gave them money. And that is, of course, exactly what we have had to do through a dozen loan and grant schemes, starting from after World War I right down to our present ECA. American aid to Western Europe during the last 35 years has amounted to $22,000,000,000 exclusive of direct war outlays. This was—apart from genuine philanthropic motives—a way of subsidizing our exports; for practically all the American money that went abroad never stayed there; it always returned to buy American goods.

All this means that we should take a hard look at both our tariffs and our customs regulations. Despite some progress since 1934, we still charge duties of up to 110 percent on some items. Moreover the entire procedure for determining them is antiquated and obstructive. Our tariff act has several thousand classifications, many of them capricious and arbitrary. Some imported cotton carpets, for instance, are subject to a 10-percent duty, but if they have fringe at the ends they may be subject to four times as much duty. Clearly, Congress should immediately pass the Customs Simplification Act that it now has before it. It should also, I believe, give the President wide discretionary powers to modify customs procedures to cope with special situations.

WORLD'S LARGEST PRICE UMBRELLA

Perhaps the Achilles heel of our foreign trade is our domestic agricultural policy. Like Topsy, it has been allowed just to grow. Over the past 3 decades little thought has been given to its impact on the rest of the world. The nub of the present policy is the guaranteed minimum price to the farmer for his produce. The guaranteed minimum price was originally designed to protect farmers against loss from a few key crops such as cotton and wheat. But its coverage has been

persistently extended until today more than half of farm commodities have been placed under this largest price umbrella in the world.

This excessive bolstering of farm prices tends to restrict markets both at home and abroad. Consumers cannot afford to buy the entire available supply. Surpluses pile up in warehouses and in caves. And, since American prices are so unrealistically high, overseas farmers are pushed into uneconomic planting of such crops as cotton and wheat, thus reducing United States export of these items. This shrinkage should cause everybody genuine concern, since agricultural products have comprised 24.5 percent of all United States foreign trade. Moreover entire areas in the southwestern cotton belt, for example, largely depend upon foreign customers. What applies to Texas and Oklahoma in cotton applies to various wheat States, such as Kansas and Washington. As one who believes that the mainspring of free enterprise is to expand production by means of high volume output at lower unit cost, I cannot help but be troubled by the deadening effect on American agriculture which comes from reversing this process. Present fixed and rigid prices not only violate the supply and demand equation, but also foster an ever-greater amount of Government regulation, intervention, and control. By mid-1950 the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the Department of Agriculture's price-support agency, owned or had loans on $4,500,000,000 worth of surplus grains, eggs, butter, soybeans, and a long list of other farm products. To try to dispose of such surpluses, the Department has been compelled to resort to what amounts to "dumping" overseas, a procedure which induces anger on the part of foreign farmers and retaliation on the part of their governments. I am not a farm economist, but on a commonsense business basis it seems to me that the solution is to be found in the area of more sensitive and flexible price supports. Farm spokesmen for the countries of the free world should be able to sit around the conference table and reach agreement on how continuously to modify internal agricultural programs, bringing them in harmony with today's need for expanding world trade. We must seek and achieve a denationalizing of agricultural programs inside the countries of the free world.

From all that I have said it must be plain that I, like most Americans, am convinced that two world wars offer at least circumstantial evidence that the United States cannot stand aside, and alone, if chaos and destruction swirl about us. And some circumstantial evidence is very strong. If you are sitting on a fence and a bullet whizzes by, perhaps no conclusion can be drawn; if a second bullet takes a similar course, you are warranted in entertaining a suspicion that all is not well. However, if a third bullet puts a hole in your hat and parts your hair, you are justified in concluding that someone is out to get you.

World politics today shape our lives more tellingly than ward politics. A coffee blight in Brazil, a famine in India, devaluation in Britain, the almost perpetual cabinet crisis in France, the discovery of uranium ore in Africa, a political assassination in Lebanon, all have an increasingly direct and pervasive influence upon decisions which determine our destiny as individuals and as a people.

THE "AMERICAN ISLANDERS"

There are, of course, a few people who, despite two world wars and much other "circumstantial" evidence, still hold that we can abandon Europe and Asia and do business as usual on our great island continent. They insist that we should keep all dollars at home and devote them to throwing up bastions that stop at our own borders.

The simplest facts of economic life argue against these "American islanders." Let us look at the comparative resources of ourselves, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union.

In many important items we outstrip both the Kremlin and its satellites. The United States will have in 1951 the physical capacity to produce 95,000,000 metric tons of crude steel per year, and Western Europe 55,000,000. The Soviet sphere will probably be able to produce only 33,000,000 metric tons. The United States can produce if necessary between six hundred and seven hundred million metric tons of coal as against Western Europe's four hundred and fifty te five hundred million, and an annual output in the Soviet and its satellies of less than 400,000,000. The United States can produce about 2,300,000,000 barrels of oil, and Western Europe about 25,000,000. In addition the remainder of the free world, in South America, the Near East, and the Far East, can produce an additional 2,000,000,000 barrels. The Soviet Union and its satellites will probably produce in 1951 about 350,000,000 barrels. The United States will probably turn out 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity in 1951, and Western Europe 250,000,000,000, as contrasted with some 140,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellites.

No one who reads these figures can fail to note what a vital proportion of our production potential is provided by Western Europe. Let those "realists" who would abandon Western Europe to its fate remember that if Western Europe were taken over intact by the Kremlin, and its resources added to those of the Soviet sphere, the net result would be that the resources controlled oy the Kremlin would in many essentials equal those of the United States. I think this is proof positive that we cannot wage the peace by ourselves.

Waging the peace is about the opposite of preventive war. I do not believe that we are faced by a dilemma so direful that we have no choice but to cast mankind into the darkness of global war. I believe that an attempt to crush communism with atomic bombs would be to miss the objective, like the bull that charges the cape instead of the matador. To wage a preventive war against the Kremlin would be to substitute emotion for intelligence, panic, or resourcefulness, You do not prevent a war by starting one.

We can prevent war—and wage effective peace—only by a positive program that goes beyond mere containment. It calls for wresting the initiative from the U. S. S. R. not only by anticipating its moves, and thus thwarting them, but even more importantly by eradiciting the social and political and economic conditions on which communism thrives. In this respect the Marshall plan has been and remains the pilot plant and proving ground for an American foreign policy that is firm, constructive, and far-reaching. For the first time the Soviet Union's boring-from-within strategy has been halted and hurled back as the Marshall plan's hydroelectric power plants and housing developments and tractors and seed have been set against Marxist dialectic; as the Marshall plan's bread and butter are set in contrast to the hollow cake of the big lie.

One of the prime necessities in such a program is to assure our military defense in ways that make economic sense. Our military leaders report that we must spend some $50,000,000,000 annually for defense. Of this sum, some $15,000,000,000 will go for the new equipment required by our own enlarged Armed Forces. Fortunately, much of this new equipment will represent what business calls capital outlay, such things as materials, factories and plants that do not become obsolete and so require only infrequent replacement. Thus, after the third year, and when our Armed Forces have been built up to a posture of defense, we should be able to prune our spending to some $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 a year, until the world reaches a durable peace. This estimate is based on the assumption that the present small war doesn't erupt into the big war; if it should, we would of course have to scrap such figures and return to deficit spending.

ECA IN ASIA

The relationship between what we spend on defense and our gross national product ($279,000,000,000 in 1950) is a very sensitive one. I think that if we can hold our defense spending to the levels I have suggested, and can sharply reduce them after the third year, we will not seriously endanger our economy. But to do this we must change some of our ideas of soldiering. Right now the average American private is paid about $3 a day plus allowances. He needs it—for many of our boys in uniform are the sole means of support of young wives and children. But we simply can't pay three million or more soldiers in uniform $3 a day in peacetime and stay within that 20 to 25 billion dollars a year bracket that the country is able to carry over the long term. The answer, to my mind, is universal military training—taking all male Americans at about 18, before they have assumed family obligations, and paying them perhaps $1 a day. (A Turkish soldier gets $1 a month in cash.) When they are released at 20, they can return to their jobs or continue their schooling. Both militarily and economically this is the only program that seems to me to make sense.

What, meanwhile, will it cost us to wage the peace abroad? No one can forecast too accurately, but I am willing to make an estimate and put it on the record. Before doing so I would like to repeat that no one in his right senses is thinking of an all-embracing Marshall Plan for the world. However, many men of good sense in many countries are thinking in terms of strengthening those areas vital to the security of the free world. Here is my estimate:

Economic aid to those countries in whose development is important to the security of the United States and the free world	$2,000,000,000
Political activities	350,000,000
Informational activities and propaganda	300,000,000
Total	2,650,000,000

These figures for economic aid may seem low in view of what has been spent on the Marshall Plan alone. The explanation, however, is quite simple. Out of the nearly $11,000,000,000 that the Marshall plan has cost so far, an estimated $7,500,000,000 was for relief and rehabilitation stemming directly from the war itself—some of it for emergency food supplies for the undernourished; more of it to rebuild and re-equip bomb-damaged plants. In other words, not more than one third of our ECA expenditures covered the normal postwar needs for economic expension.

Another reason why economic aid can be held within the figures I have cited is that ECA operations are now expanding only in southeast Asia. There are good reasons—aside from better earnings from exports such as rubber and tin—why this first year's program in southeast Asia requires the relatively small sum of $84,000,000. Southeast Asia is a largely agricultural community and will remain so for many years. The emphasis, therefore, is on agricultural development; on shifting from wooden to steel plows; on better seed and irrigation and soil care. In some areas we will use the techniques we

found so effective with the rural rehabilitation program in China. In other areas, however, we must first fight debilitating diseases before we can even begin to help modernize agricultural methods. In Viet Nam (one of the three associated states of Indochina), for instance, the great problem is malaria. Thus our top-priority project there falls into the health and sanitation field.

To wage the peace and win it is an aim that so transcends any other reasons for investment in the recovery of other nations that only with some hesitation do I suggest it is to our commercial as well as to our political advantage to strengthen the free world. Every businessman knows how difficult it is to build a profitable business in a community that is broke. Every successful businessman also knows that he must invest a certain amount of his company's annual income to develop markets. Usually that amount ranges from 2 to 5 percent, depending on how much of his advertising program goes into building future, as against current, sales. The sum I propose is less than 1 percent of our total gross income. Perhaps even from a practical business standpoint that is not too much for a prosperous America to invest in developing world prosperity. If these expenditures help to bring about successful resistance to the Kremlin's internal aggression, they must be regarded as one of the best-paying investments ever made by any people, any time, anywhere.

A third world war would not only necessitate genuine sacrifice, but would also bring individual tragedy and perhaps even national disaster. How disastrous a third world war would be can best be shown by taking a backward look at World War I and World War II. The only cost of war that can be stated in figures is the dollar cost. The out-of-pocket cost, or the shooting expense for World War I, was approximately $22,000,000,000; for World War II, approximately $340,000,000,000. However, Gordon Gray, ex-Secretary of the Army, reckons that the ultimate cost of World War II, before the last pension is paid, will be approximately $1,300,000,000,000. When I look at that figure, when I note the great increase in the loss of lives in World War II over World War I, when I think of the atom bomb, guided missiles, bacteriological and gas warfare, I find myself overwhelmed by the nightmare of what world war III would do to us and everybody else.

The prospects of any such catastrophe, if nothing else, should goad us into getting on with waging the peace on all fronts and keeping at it until it is won.

Divided Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the clip sheet:

DIVIDED RESPONSIBILITY

Divided responsibility is at the very heart of democracy.

The country fully realizes the critical nature of the emergency which faces the United States and the entire free world.

It also realizes the necessity of dealing with this emergency efficiently but without developing totalitarianism, against which we arm.

There is no more corrupting influence than the development of ever-swelling power.

For this reason, and with entire sympathy for the Armed Forces in every legitimate and reasonable demand upon Congress and the American people, we suggest the high importance that Congress shall not forget its own responsibility. For the elected representatives of the people to put the stamp of approval upon every request of the Armed Forces even when those requests are within the area of congressional responsibility and run counter to the considered opinions of the legislators, would be an abdication which the people would regard with profound unease. Have we not been warned that we cannot defend ourselves without losing everything we want to defend? We do not believe this to be true; it is ours to see to it that it is not allowed to become true.

There was reason in Representative MUNDT'S suggestion that even the contemplated expenditures for defense should be subjected to close scrutiny for possible savings.

These thoughts are prompted by the failure of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in the bill it is reporting, to provide for protection of the men in the Armed Forces against systematic exploitation by the liquor traffic. Many of these men will be very young and many of them—we believe on the average, the best of them—will come from homes where they are encouraged to abstain from liquors. Indeed, the majority of them will have been taught in their schools and in their churches that abstinence is the better and safer way of life.

The American Legion, in a bill it proposed to the committee, made very clear its attitude that such protection should be offered in any system of military training or service. Members of the Senate committee considering this legislation, men of great experience and prestige, believe that such provisions should be made. So far, they have not been made, and this failure seems to be due to an uneasy deference on the part of the legislators to all suggestions from the Pentagon. Too great a deference may lead to a customary bypassing of the elected Representatives of the people, to reach an autocratic group holding all power of decision.

There are men high in the Armed Forces who are evidently disturbed by the number of alcoholics among veterans. When an abstainer becomes a drinker he incurs a certain liability to alcoholism, a greater liability to ordinary addiction, and a very formidable liability to involvement in alcoholic misfortunes which are almost infinite in variety.

For this reason we suggest that the matter should receive adequate consideration in general debate. Why are not the provisions of existing law carried out? Why are there persisting rumors, and more than rumors, of unsatisfactory conditions in the occupation area in Germany? Why these humiliating stories of misconduct, so damaging to the prestige of the United States? Is it because examples set the men are bad? Is it because no standard is raised, no high ideal of morality is set before the men in regard to alcoholic indulgence?

We believe that others in places of responsibility should share the evident concern of General Eisenhower in this matter. Too much is at stake for them to fail to do so.

In the meanwhile, the responsibility primarily rests upon Congress. There should be no rubber stamping.

GENERAL EISENHOWER AND BEER IN THE ARMY

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate, February 2, 1951, made the following significant statement:

"I will tell you this about the American soldiers. When I finally got enough shipping to send home for something of that kind for our soldiers after the first landing in Africa, I conducted a Gallup poll and found that instead of beer, they wanted Coca-Cola, which was easy because you can bring over the sirup and make it there."

The statement appears on page 1194 of the hearings, Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951.

NOTE.—This statement was in reply to a question by Senator SALTONSTALL: "He also buys Coca-Cola, does he not?"

Opposition to Taxation of State and Municipal Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, local governments everywhere, including both municipal and school districts, are alarmed over the proposal by the Secretary of the Treasury to abolish the tax-exempt status of future issues of State and municipal bonds. The Federal Government has today entered every field of taxation except real estate, so that localities are hard pressed to find sufficient tax resources to finance essential services. If now the Federal Government removes the tax-exempt status of State and munipical bonds, the localities may well find it impossible to finance current operations and long-range capital improvements.

Many local officials, groups, and agencies have written me urging that this proposal be dropped. Among them are the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin; the Village Board of Warsaw, N. Y.; John J. Hickey, the president of the Board of Education of Letchworth Central School, Gainesville, N. Y.; Mark Heath, county attorney of the county of Orleans; Joseph B. Boyle, legal adviser to the county of Monroe, speaking for the Board of Supervisors of Monroe County; Edward F. N. Uthe, executive secretary of the Association of Towns of New York State; the County Officers Association of the State of New York; Mayor Elbert H. Carver, of the village of Scottsville, N. Y.; and the council of the city of Rochester.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a duly attested resolution adopted by the council of the city of Rochester on February 27, 1951, petitioning the Congress of the United States not to enact this proposed legislation.

The resolution follows:

Resolution 51-19

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the council of the city of Rochester, that the Treasury Department of the United States has again renewed its efforts to obtain congressional legislation imposing taxes on income derived from State and municipal securities, in spite of the fact that such proposal has been several times rejected in the past by the Congress; and

Whereas this council is advised that such proposal is now pending in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the council is of the firm opinion and has been advised that such proposal is both economically unsound and unconstitutional; and

Whereas such a tax would be reflected in substantially higher interest rates upon bonds and other securities issued by the States and their municipalities, which increases would result in substantially increasing the tax burdens of citizens of the States and the municipalities issuing bonds and particularly the tax burden on real estate; and

Whereas such legislation would, in the opinion of the council, do violence to the fundamental concepts upon which our constitutional Government is based, in that it would tend to destroy the dual sovereignty of the Federal and States' Governments and tend to make the States and their municipalities in all things subordinate to a central government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council does respectfully petition the Congress of the United States not to enact such proposals; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested, be forwarded to the Congressman representing any part of the city of Rochester, N. Y., and to each member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

Two Thousand Two Hundred and Twenty Dollars Per Acre Cost of Central Arizona Project, President's Water Policy Commission Finds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, California has always contended that putting water on the land under the central Arizona project would cost close to $2,000 per acre in capital investment. But Arizona has always pooh-poohed those charges. Now we have it on high authority: The President's Water Resources Commission. The commission puts the capital cost of a full supply of water for the land under the central Arizona project at $2,200 per acre on 1948 price levels. Moreover, the commission points out that for the lands under the project which will receive only a supplemental supply of water, the cost will be $620 per acre. A supplemental supply is added water to make up a full supply for lands which do not have sufficient, but have some water. These figures fully verify the charges made by California against this fantastic project, and the verification comes from experts of high authority and unquestionable impartiality. The statement of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission appears in volume II of their report at page 384, and reads as follows:

In many places the acreage of lands needing supplemental water is much greater than new irrigation lands. Among these the central Arizona project is an important one. Tentative allocations indicate that the capital costs per acre of irrigated land on this project would be approximately $620. This per acre cost is under the assumption that 640,000 acres of land will be benefited with supplemental water supply by the project.

However, it has been estimated that approximately 467,000 acres of these 640,000 could be irrigated with the present water supply in the area to be benefited. The additional equivalent acreage which would receive full water supply through the central Arizona project, therefore, is about 173,000. Calculated on this basis, the costs of irrigation are about $2,200 per acre benefited. (Basis of estimate: Allocation to irrigation of $397,693,000, as given in H. Doc. No. 136, central Arizona project, Washington, 1949, p. 208. A 1948 price level is assumed.) Costs of other supplemental water supplies on other projects generally are less, some being as low as $200 per acre on the basis of price levels in several different years between 1946 and 1949.

The Tragedy of George Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Tragedy of George Marshall," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the American Mercury for March 1951.

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

THE TRAGEDY OF GEORGE MARSHALL
(By Walter Trohan)

At a corner of one of the vast avenues in the Pentagon, erect in a high-backed chair, sits a tragic old man. He is George Catlett Marshall, General of the Armies, Secretary of Defense, former Secretary of State, adviser to Presidents, and, in the eyes of Harry Truman, the "greatest living American." He is the devoted old warrior—patriotic, loyal, courageous; yet his life is a tragedy, both for himself and for the cause of mankind, because his unsound judgment has helped to lead his country from one disaster to another.

On March 12, 1950, General Marshall announced that he would not write his memoirs for these remarkable reasons:

"To be of any historic importance they have got to be accurate; that is, one musn't omit and make it pleasant reading. Now, if you do put it all in, you may do irreparable harm. You almost ruin a man, but if you don't mention that, it is not history."

From the lips of a leader of freemen these are disillusioning words. They say, in despair, that freemen must not be told the truth; they indicate that the speaker is in a mental purgatory for hidden sins which he has either observed or committed, and they emphasize the graver tragedy: that an old man who must conceal past errors from his countrymen is still exercising powers of decision.

Can freemen trust a leader who will not trust them with the truth? By what right does a public servant say to freemen: "You trusted me with leadership, but I will not give a true accounting because the truth might do irreparable harm"?

This is the same General Marshall who, in December 1939, said to the American Historical Association: "I believe that much of the colossal waste, much of the tragedy of warfare, is due to the ineffective manner in which history is written and taught." Yet he now seals his lips on historical truth.

The tragedy of George Marshall is that his vision has never matched his courage. As a young man at military school he was accidentally transfixed by a bayonet and endured his wound, not unlike the Spartan lad with the gnawing fox, without identifying the man at fault. He is self-disciplined and loyal. In a quiet way he possesses charm. But, strangely, while refusing to trust the American people with the truth, he has always been quick to blame the people for mistakes. On November 30, 1950, alibiing for the war in Korea, he said: "The basic error has always been with the American people."

If the general only trusted the people, he might make some valuable additions to our history, for he has been present when most of the critical decisions were made since 1939. And, according to President Truman, he has a phenomenal memory. Truman once told two Congressmen: "I've got a mighty great man working for me now." Why, do you know he has an absolutely phenomenal memory? He can even tell the day and hour, and exactly what was talked about, without any notes."

But here are some examples of the general's memory:

Before the Senate Armed Services Committee on September 19, 1950, he disclaimed any personal responsibility for the disastrous China policy which he had implemented in his 1946 mission to China. He said "the policy of the United States was * * * issued while I was on the ocean, going over there."

But in the authorized biography of President Truman by Jonathan Daniels, Admiral William D. Leahy is quoted as saying: "I was present when Marshall was going to China. He said he was going to tell Chiang that he had to get on with the Communists, or without help from us. He said the same thing when he got back."

Former Secretary of State Byrnes, in his memoirs Speaking Frankly, says:

"As soon as President Truman appointed General Marshall his personal representative in China, I asked the general to study the draft (of policy) so that he could help prepare the final statement for presentation to the President. The Sunday before I left for Moscow, Under Secretary Acheson, General Marshall, and members of his staff met in my office. By the end of the morning's discussion, we had agreed upon the statement of policy. Thereafter the President made no change in that policy except upon the recommendation of General Marshall or with his approval."

When General Marshall left for China he carried with him, not only the documents setting forth the policy of enforced coalition, but a letter from the President which said: "I understand that these documents have been shown to you and received your approval."

In June 1950 General Marshall wrote a letter to Senator Millard Tydings saying that so far as he could recall, "I never met Mr. Owen Lattimore." Yet, during a State Department seminar in October 1949, for 3 days Lattimore sat within five feet of Marshall and obtained permission to express his views at least 15 times. And several times Marshall was observed greeting Lattimore warmly.

The general has had difficulty remembering the names of his closest associates. During the Second War he referred to General Eisenhower as the "red-headed fellow down the hall," and to Gen. Bedell Smith as "the fellow with the red eyes." In January 1951 he told a Senate committee that he couldn't remember the strength of a Second War division, but he could recall the strength of a First War division.

The most notorious lapse in the phenomenal memory, of course, is the general's inability to remember what he was doing on

the eve of Pearl Harbor, the most important night of his life.

In testimony before a congressional committee General Marshall admitted that he knew, following a meeting at the White House on November 25, 1941, that the United States was likely to be attacked by December 1 and that the attack was likely to come without warning. He further admitted that he knew on December 1 that Hawaii was alerted only against sabotage. Then came the fateful moment at 9:30 p. m. on December 6 when President Roosevelt, on being handed the decoded Japanese ultimatum, exclaimed: "This means war."

Few knowledgeable persons in Washington believe that Roosevelt went to bed on December 6 without communicating this fateful news to Marshall. But Marshall has sworn before Congress that he can't remember where he was, that he has no recollection of the night of December 6, and that he didn't get the message until he had returned from a horseback ride at 11 a. m. on December 7.

Marshall still had 2 hours to save lives at Pearl Harbor, but he disdained the scrambler telephone on his desk, declined Admiral Stark's offer of Navy radio, and sent his message to General Short by commercial cable without even marking it "Urgent." By the time the message was decoded in Hawaii, 2,326 Americans were dead.

This is the essence of the tragedy of George Marshall. Wherever the American people have depended on him in the clutch, he has come up with advice or decisions which have led to disaster.

General Marshall was born in Uniontown, Pa., on December 31, 1880, the son of a Kentucky coal and wool dealer who had moved north after the Civil War. Because his father, a solitary Democrat in a Republican community, could not wangle him a West Point appointment, he went to Virginia Military Institute. Although just above the middle of the 1901 class scholastically, he was first captain of the cadet corps and an all-southern tackle at 165 pounds. His first Army assignment was map making in the Big Bend country in Texas. His career followed the regular Army pattern of waiting and serving. In 1907 he was made a first lieutenant and sent to the Army Staff College, where he graduated at the head of his class. He became known as a "staff man" rather than a command officer among his superiors. In 1916 he was made a captain.

Upon America's entry in the first war Marshall was sent to France to serve on the staff of the First Division, and was promoted by General Pershing to operations officer of the First Army. After the war Pershing made Marshall his aide-de-camp while Pershing was Chief of Staff.

Up to the early thirties Marshall's career was one of slow but steady progress. He had a deep personal loss in 1927 in the death of his first wife, but was remarried happily in 1930 to Mrs. Katherine Boyce Tupper Brown, of Baltimore. With 14 years to go to the mandatory retirement age of 64, his future appeared serene, if undistiguished, especially since Pershing, a retired but influential old dog of war, had promised to have him made a brigadier general. But here Marshall met his first failure.

True to his promise, Pershing called upon Douglas MacArthur, then Chief of Staff, and asked that his protégé be made a general. MacArthur was ready to oblige, but insisted that the promotion go through regular channels. Pershing agreed, confident Marshall could clear the hurdles. Friendly examination of the Marshall record showed what his superiors regarded as insufficient time with troops. MacArthur proposed to remedy this by giving him command of the Eighth Regiment at Fort Screven, Ga., one of the finest regiments in the Army.

Marshall was moved up from lieutenant colonel to colonel, but his way to a general's stars appeared to be blocked forever when the inspector general reported that under 1 year of Marshall's command the Eighth Regiment had dropped from one of the best regiments in the Army to one of the worst. MacArthur regretfully informed Pershing that the report made promotion impossible. To this day Marshall is uneasy in the presence of MacArthur.

In 1936, after MacArthur had been succeeded by Gen. Malin Craig, Pershing tried again. But this time, knowing that the Army would never make Marshall a general, Pershing went directly to the White House. He persuaded Roosevelt to promote Marshall; and 3 years later when Roosevelt was looking for an agreeable Chief of Staff, he chose Marshall over 20 senior major generals and 14 senior brigadiers.

Marshall is, therefore, a "political" general—a general by virtue of Presidential favor. It is unlikely that he would ever have become a general on his Army record.

Early in the Second War Roosevelt told Pershing that he expected to make Marshall "the Pershing of the Second War"; and there are conflicting theories as to why Marshall never assumed field command. One theory is that Churchill acquired an intense dislike for Marshall at Tehran when Marshall advocated the cross-Channel invasion in support of Stalin and opposed the Balkan invasion which Churchill preferred.

The more likely theory is that Marshall himself, remembernig his failure with an Army regiment, chose to remain in a staff position. Admiral Leahy writes that Marshall and Sir John Dill, British member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, were "as close as the proverbial peas in the pod"; and Dill could probably have persuaded Churchill to accept Marshall. Instead, Dill used his influence to keep Marshall in Washington—but this could have been on instructions from Churchill. At any rate Marshall repaid his friend Dill by burying him on the best acre of ground at Arlington National Cemetery, and by having Truman dedicate an equestrian memorial over Dill's grave. Dill has more ground and a larger monument than any American hero, not even Pershing or Dewey or Sheridan has a monument to match Dill's.

The dispute at Tehran illustrates how Marshall's feeble judgment has led to tragedy. There were two proper concerns for the representatives of free men at Tehran in 1943. The first concern was who would hold what when the German Army was defeated; the second concern was the defeat of the German Army. Churchill, at least at the outset, seemed to have these two concerns in their proper order: He was primarily concerned with keeping Russia out of Europe. But poor Marshall—at a tragic cost to all of us—had the two concerns reversed: He was primarily interested in the destruction of the German Army, and he evidenced no concern over how far Russia advanced into Europe.

This is the essential tragedy of American leadership during the last decade. Our leaders have evidenced no broad vision or deep wisdom; they have made decisions on the emotions of the moment. And the failures have not been failures of the people—as General Marshall would have it; our failures have been the failures of trusted leaders like Marshall.

George Marshall was the willing instrument of the tragic policy which held that Russia was an ally to be trusted, that Joe was "good old Joe," that the way to peace and serenity was to destroy Russia's enemies and let communism work its will in both Europe and Asia. Marshall was the willing instrument of the Hisses and the Achesons, the Lattimores and the Jessups, the misguided men who let American boys die to make Eurasia safe for communism.

If Marshall is the greatest living American, why didn't he stand up at Tehran and prove his greatness? Why didn't he raise his voice against the sell-out of Poland and Czechoslovakia? Against the marooning of Berlin in a Russia sea? Against the whole traitorous process by which the Reds were invited to sack western civilization?

Numerous associates of Marshall have reported that in 1943 he seemed much more interested in furnishing arms to Russia than in equipping our own forces. He answered all criticism with this remark: "The fastest way to kill Germans is to send tanks to Russia." The thought of what would happen when an all-powerful Russian Army stood astride Europe—apparently no such thought ever crossed his great mind.

At the Yalta Conference in February 1945, General Marshall helped to deliver Asia to Russia just as he had helped to deliver Europe at Tehran. Japan was beaten and would have surrendered to us within 6 months, but Marshall was so anxious to cooperate with Russia that he approved the granting to Russia of Port Arthur, Dairen, preeminent rights in Manchuria, the Kurile Islands, the southern part of Sakhalin—everything that would enable Russia to dominate Asia.

The man who sat next to Marshall at Yalta was Alger Hiss, and Hiss was the exponent of the Acheson-Jessup policies in the State Department, the men who believed the destiny of China lies with the Communists." On no point at Yalta did Marshall disagree with Hiss.

After the war the Hiss-Acheson-Jessup group squeezed the last drop of usefulness out of the greatest living American. They sent him to China to compel the Chinese Nationalists to quit fighting and come to terms with the Communists. It was Marshall who embargoed arms shipments to Chiang Kai-shek, and it was Marshall's personal order which allowed the first Chinese Communist armies to enter Manchuria.

One of the Americans who patiently briefed General Marshall on the Chinese situation was Col. Ivan D. Yeaton, who had been assigned to Yenan, headquarters of the Chinese Communists. Colonel Yeaton warned Marshall of Mao's close ties with the Kremlin. But Marshall completely disregarded this advice; he listened instead to the pro-Communists in the State Department; and when he forced Chiang to cut his army down to 50 divisions, he forced numbers of Chinese Nationalist troops to join the Red Army so that they could get food and pay.

When Marshall returned from China, which he had helped deliver to the Communists, and was made Secretary of State, his first action was to name Acheson his chief of staff with "complete authority to cleanse the Department."

In 1947 Marshall sent Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer to China. When Wedemeyer's report did not ratify Marshall's findings—when it urged instead that we erect a bulwark against communism in China—Marshall angrily suppressed the report and banished Wedemeyer to an obscure post. Marshall, on his record, is a man who believes in suppressing reports; he doesn't believe that the people should have the truth; he blames the people for disasters.

Before he left his post of Secretary of State because of ill health, Marshall gave his name to the European-aid plan. Actually the plan was first proposed by Dean Acheson, speaking for Truman, in the little town of Cleveland, Miss., May 8, 1947. Truman called it the Marshall plan, but a few weeks after the plan's promulgation Marshall was unable to say under questioning whether or not Eire was included in his own plan.

In 1949 Marshall retired. In retirement he was given the post of head of the American Red Cross. His retirement pay as a five-star general was, with living allowances, $18,761 a year, but he accepted from the Red Cross an additional $22,500 a year as salary and $6,000 a year as expenses. His

predecessor, Basil O'Connor, had served the Red Cross without pay.

When Truman was considering whether or not to send ground troops into Korea, he sought the advice of his "greatest living American." Marshall advised him to send in the troops—and this is now conceded to have been one of the most foolish and disastrous decisions ever made by an American Government. After suffering 90,000 casualties we are now struggling to get out of Korea so that we can exploit the advantageous position which we were in before Truman, Marshall, and Acheson committed our ground troops.

As Secretary of Defense, Marshall's war planning is now gravely distrusted by the ablest officers in the Armed Forces. He and his manpower assistant, Anna M. Rosenberg, want a vast land army with 18-year-olds as the core. On December 15, 1950, he was called in to confer with Truman and the leaders of Congress. Three times Marshall spoke up during lulls to say: "I'm going to build a big new army." This was his only contribution to the discussion, and each time he made the pronouncement he smiled proudly. Members of Congress left the conference shaking their heads.

Marshall planned the second war with airplanes having the lowest priority of all armaments. He conferred weekly with the eighty-odd-year-old Pershing, and Pershing detested airplanes—he told Congress that "no airplane had ever affected the course of a battle."

Today it is feared that Marshall is planning to fight the Russian and Chinese hordes with manpower. When the Air Force sends suggestions to him, he merely draws a line through the pages and sends them back.

In January 1951, Marshall made another remarkable appearance before a Senate subcommittee. Talking about his 18-year-olds and his big new army, he said, "I sometimes think that our standards are too luxurious. I think sometimes we provide more than is advisable. When I was in the Army, we didn't have turkey and chicken. This is off the record, of course, I wouldn't want the troops to hear it."

In the room where Marshall was speaking thus off the record were at least 900 persons, including representatives of Tass, the Soviet news agency.

Perhaps Truman is correct. Perhaps Marshall is, indeed, the greatest living American. But the free world will certainly have to be strong if we are to survive much more of his advice.

California's Democratic Attorney General Denounces Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from Edmund (Pat) G. Brown, attorney general of California, regarding the proposed central Arizona project—S. 75 and H. R. 1500—now before both Houses of Congress.

Speaking as the chief law officer of California, Mr. Brown states that the first objective must be the decisive defeat of this legislation, and he reiterates his intention to support fully the members of the California congressional delegation in their effort to win that objective.

Mr. Brown points out that the present central Arizona bill gives only lip service to California's repeated efforts to take the Colorado River controversy before the Supreme Court for final adjudication. He expresses his disapproval of the present bill's subsidiary provision for Supreme Court review, which, he declares, has been tied as a tail to the central Arizona kite, and binds litigation to prior congressional approval of the fantastic project.

Terming the central Arizona bill a "serious threat to the national economy," Mr. Brown states that it entails staggering subsidies amounting to billions of dollars, which would be an additional burden on the Nation's taxpayers.

The complete text of Mr. Brown's communication follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ENGLE: Since assuming the office of attorney general of California and surveying the problems that confront the State in which the attorney general has an official interest and responsibility, I have become convinced that none of these is of more immediate and far-reaching concern than the proposed central Arizona project.

A review of the record in the current and earlier Congresses convince me that our California delegation in both House and Senate has been vigilant, courageous, and vigorous in opposition to what is obviously a serious threat, not only to the national economy, but to California's right and need to the use of the waters of the Colorado, confirmed to various California public agencies under Federal contract. It is gratifying to me personally that you and your colleagues have made such a splendid record and have held the line so well. As the chief law officer of the State I propose to support fully the work you and they have done and are doing. You may be assured of my earnest and complete support also in the handling of the many legal problems involved in which my office may be of service to you.

The first objective must be to defeat decisively the pending bills on the central Arizona project. It is unsound and infeasible. Power which could better be used for the needs of industry in the Southwest must not be dedicated to the relatively uneconomic pumping of water for irrigation of ordinary field crops. The project would entail hidden subsidies in a staggering total amount by diverting the interest component in power rates to repayment of the capital cost of irrigation works. The proposed financial scheme provides no revenues to pay the interest on the national debt which would necessarily be incurred to construct the works; and it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation over $2,000,000,000 in interest over the 75-year financing period. The cost of the works themselves is wholly disproportionate to the value of the lands involved.

After the defeat of the central Arizona project, which I trust will be the result of your efforts directed against the bills, there will remain a serious controversy between California and Arizona over the rights of each to the use of the waters of the Colorado. This dispute must be settled, in the interest of interstate harmony and in fairness to the great economic considerations at stake. If negotiation fails, then the issues should be submitted to the only tribunal authorized to determine them—the United States Supreme Court. I am in accord with the efforts that have been made by California's Representatives in Congress to bring about the necessary waiver of Federal immunity as a foundation for such litigation. I cannot approve the subsidiary provision for Supreme Court review that has been tied as a tail to the central Arizona project kite, because it gives only lip service to a solution through the Supreme Court and binds this to prior congressional approval of the proposed fantastic irrigation venture. Certainly the availability of the needed water should be decided before the costly Arizona proposal is given congressional approval, contingent or otherwise.

We in California are confident, morally and legally, of the soundness of our position founded upon the water rights we hold. We have been and are willing to submit the points at issue to the Supreme Court, and to do this without any $2,000,000,000 string attached. The efforts of you and your colleagues will surely bring this reasonable course to realization.

Railroads: A Vital National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered at a meeting of the Missouri Pacific Club of St. Louis, Mo., on February 15, 1951, by former Congressman Leonidas C. Dyer, of St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Dyer served as a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the Sixty-second to the Seventy-second Congresses, inclusive.

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

RAILROADS: A VITAL NATIONAL ASSET

(By Leonidas C. Dyer)

I wish to speak to you about the Nation's transportation facilities, with special reference to the railroad system.

I need not emphasize the vital importance of adequate transportation to our economy and national security. Without a high degree of mobility, economic activity would revert to a primitive state, and our means of defense against aggression would be crippled. Movement is an essential adjunct to extraction and utilization of raw materials, manufacture, distribution of commodities, and countless other operations embodied in our complex and highly developed economy. Transportation provides valuable social advantages, and makes possible the economic and political unity of a country whose territory stretches from coast to coast. In times of national emergency, such as war, our armies would be helpless without transport, and we should be able to move neither men nor equipment. The urgent military requirement of "getting the mostest there the fastest" would be an impossibility.

The United States has transportation facilities superior to, and more abundant than, those of any other nation in the world. Our country comprises about 6 percent of the land area of the world; we have about 7 percent of the world's population, but our means of transport represent a much greater proportion of world totals. For example, we possess 33 percent of the world's railroad mileage, about 70 percent of the world's motor vehicles, and a large percentage of the world's improved highway mileage.

It is my firm conviction that certain transportation problems exist which, if not

solved, will eventually cause serious deterioration in our national transport system. I shall try to point out, briefly, some of the developments now taking place which are definite danger signals.

Let me review briefly the development of transportation in this country. First, of course, there was the post road and the canal. By 1830, rail service made its appearance. During the next 100 years, railroads made one of the most remarkable growths of any mode of transportation in all history. The railway network increased from 23 miles in 1830 to 193,000 miles in 1900, and further expanded to a peak of 254,000 miles just prior to the First World War. Rail transport service, during that time, became available from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico. Since then, railroad efforts have been devoted chiefly to intensive improvement of existing facilities rather than to further expansion of the network.

Following the First World War, came the rise of motor transport. Today, a total of 36,300,000 passenger cars, 7,698,000 trucks, and about 135,000 buses are in operation on the Nation's streets and highways.

In the decade following the First World War, air transport emerged from its experimental state and became an accepted means of commercial transport for passengers, mail, and express. In 1949, domestic scheduled air carrier operations included movement of 15,120,015 revenue passengers, and transport of 41,418,156 ton-miles of mail and 123,001,652 ton-miles of express and freight. These totals are rising sharply.

The last three decades have witnessed a renaissance of inland waterway transportation, due chiefly to large expenditures by the Federal Government for improvement of inland waterways, such as rivers and channels. In the first 90 years of Federal Government, expenditures on waterways (including seacoast harbors) totaled less than $90,000,000. In the decade following the First World War, they aggregated $492,000,000; in the decade of the thirties expenditures rose to $1,206,000,000; and in the decade of the forties despite postponement of work because of war, the total exceeded $933,000,000. In fact, during the past 20 years the Government has spent almost twice as much on rivers and harbors as had been spent in all our national history, prior to 1930.

As a result of these large expenditures by Government, the volume of traffic moving over our inland waterways showed a marked increase. Roughly, the tonnage of waterborne commerce moving over rivers, canals, and connecting channels increased threefold between 1922 and the beginning of the Second World War in 1939. Since that time there have been further increases.

Despite all this recent development and expansion of other forms of transport, the basic element in our national transportation is still the railway. Now almost a century and a quarter old, the railroads, as the Interstate Commerce Commission once pointed out (178 ICC 580), "now furnish the backbone and most of the other vital bones of the transportation system of the country, and we believe this will be the situation for a long time to come."

The railroads, virtually the sole means of common carrier transport available to shippers and travelers for many years, now find themselves faced with a mounting tide of competition, which has developed largely since the close of the First World War. The conditions under which this competition is permitted to operate, constitute a serious and growing threat to the continued welfare of the rail industry. Unless steps are taken to relieve this situation, we shall be guilty of permitting the essential railroads, the very foundation of our national transportation system, to deteriorate to a point where they cannot provide the volume and quality of services so vital to our economic welfare, and to our national security. This danger becomes particularly significant in times like these, when the international situation is fraught with uncertainty and peril.

I am not taking a position inimical to the new modes of transport which have come into being during the past 30 years. I believe there is a distinctive place in our national transportation system for motor transport, for water-borne facilities, and for air transport. Insofar as they provide services characterized by advantages which are inherent in these new means of moving property and people, they should receive every legitimate encouragement, both by Government and shipping and traveling patrons.

The railroads only object to discrimination. What are the inquities in competition of which the railroads complain? They may be grouped under three general heads: subsidies, inequality in regulation, and the varying degree to which the several modes of transportation are subjected to taxation. The effect of such inequities is, of course, loss of rail traffic and revenues, increased costs of operation, and consequent inadequate net earnings which make it difficult for the railroads to obtain capital funds for essential improvements at moderate cost.

Motor transport, water carriers operating on our inland waterways, and domestic air transport operate with extensive facilities provided at public expense. In some instances, as in the case of air mail, outright subsidies are paid to carriers competing with the railroads. In most cases, no user charges are assessed against those carriers making use of the publicly provided ways over which they operate, or for various other facilities such as navigation aids for water and air carriers, airway markers, air-traffic control, and the like. Commercial motor carriers using the highways usually pay less than maintenance cost and interest on the investment involved.

The result is that rates quoted by the carriers which use such public facilities do not represent the full cost of the services they render the public. Railroads, on the other hand, which provide and finance all their own facilities are forced to compete on a rate basis with carriers whose sole investment is that required for procurement of equipment.

The result has been to build up additional competition for the railroads, with little thought for the welfare of the railroads, or for integration of the various facilities into a sound national system, in which each mode of transport would, if unsubsidized, serve the purpose for which best fitted.

It is hardly necessary, I think, to enlarge this picture of a transportation situation with which you all are familiar. What I would emphasize is the detrimental effect, of course, to divert important elements of traffic from rail carriers. Not only is the volume of such diversion increasing, under present governmental policy, or lack of policy, but traffic thus weaned away from the rails is, in most instances, higher-rated types, the loss of which bears heavily on railroad revenues. Unlike the railroads, which constitute the only 100-percent common-carrier mode of transport, competing carriers are permitted to pick and choose what they will carry. Naturally they select the better-paying types of traffic. Railroads, on the other hand, must and do carry every type of shipment offered. The monetary disadvantage such a situation creates is exemplified by the fact that the average ton-mile revenue received by highway carriers, common and contract, which report such figures to the Interstate Commerce Commission, is about four times the average ton-mile revenue of the railroads. This indicates the extent to which highway freight carriers select the traffic they wish to haul.

I have mentioned certain inequalities in regulation. Let us consider some of these inequalities and their effect on railroads. A few examples will serve. Although the Transportation Act of 1940 brought water carriers under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, that law provided for so many exemptions that a large proportion of inland waterway movement, which is directly competitive with the railroads, is permitted to operate without any economic regulation whatever. These unregulated carriers move a large percentage—probably as much as 70 or 75 percent—of all inland waterway traffic. Thus, the highway regulated railroads are forced to compete for a large part of inland waterway traffic with carriers over which the Government exercises no control, as far as economic regulation is concerned.

Similarly, the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, exempts certain important classes of truckers from regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. One of the escape provisions of that act relieves from the usual regulations motor vehicles used in carrying agricultural products, livestock, and fish. These exempt truckers are estimated by the Commission to number approximately 40,000 which is twice as many as the 20,000 regulated motor carriers of property. Virtually half the fruit and vegetable crops of Florida, for example, are moved by truck which, with very limited exceptions, are exempt from any economic regulation. Such traffic is highly desirable from the standpoint of the railroads, but they must compete for it against motor trucks which are subject to no restraint as to rates or other restrictions under which the railroads operate.

Railroads operate under a heavy burden of taxation. Like any other self-supporting business, railroads provide and maintain all of their facilities and pay taxes on them. These include cars and locomotives, shops in which such equipment is repaired, office buildings, and other structures, as well as roadways, tracks, signal systems, and numerous other properties.

These facilities are distributed throughout the United States and are therefore subject to taxation by the several States and their various subdivisions. In addition to such taxes, railroads also pay Federal income and other taxes, besides being taxed heavily to support the retirement and unemployment insurance systems administered by the Railroad Retirement Board. Taxes constitute a heavy drain on rail revenues, and currently take about 10 cents out of every dollar of operating revenue.

In contrast to the railroad tax situation, such carrier groups as motor carriers, water carriers, and air transport, are relieved in large measure of tax burdens.

In measuring the economic value of the railroad industry as a national asset, we should recognize that in addition to providing a facilitating service—low cost, mass transportation—so necessary to the smooth working of our economy and so vital to our national security, the railroads contribute heavily to the welfare of the country as purchasers, as employers, and as taxpayers.

In normal years, railroads purchase about 28 percent of our bituminous coal production, about 19 percent of the fuel oil output, approximately 16 percent of the timber cut, and about 17 percent of the iron and steel output. In 1949, railroads of class I spent $1,641,000,000 in direct purchases of material and supplies. Of that total, fuel purchases aggregated $564,000,000; expenditures for forest products totaled $142,000,000; outlays for iron and steel products amounted to $454,000,000; miscellaneous purchases amounted to $181,000,000.

The railroads also, in 1949, spent $1,212,200,000 for additions and betterments to their properties; employed on the average

1,191,000 employees, and disbursed over $4,278,000,000 in wages and salaries. The tax bill of the railroads in 1949 aggregated about $833,000,000, or more than $2,200,000 a day. Incidentally, railway taxes took 9.7 cents out of every rail operating revenue dollar, a fact to which I have already referred.

In closing, I would reemphasize our critical need of railroads in times of national emergency. In the supreme test which this country faced in the last war, the railroads carried nearly three-fourths of all the Nation's freight traffic, more than 90 percent of war freight and more than 97 percent of organized military travel. In view of the present disturbed condition of our international relations, the need for seeing that our railroads are kept in sound physical condition, is more pressing than ever before. This can be accomplished only by giving the railroads opportunity to earn enough to meet the capital outlays which the industry must make in order to provide a vitally needed transportation service.

Railroads cannot continue indefinitely to provide the high class of service they do provide, and to which the public is entitled, on the meager returns of recent years. Unless relief is afforded, our basic agency of transport will deteriorate. We should not and cannot let this happen.

UNESCO and the Cultivation of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Dr. Richard H. Heindel, Deputy Director, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State, before the 1951 Convention of the American Association of School Administrators meeting at Atlantic City on February 22. Dr. Heindel until a year or two ago served on the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; prior to that as a valued associate of mine in the Department of State. I have long argued that UNESCO cannot stand apart from the ideological struggle that is rending the world; that it must become a vigorous champion of freedom. Herein lies its great immediate opportunity. Thus I am glad to see Dr. Heindel arguing that "when confronted by the poisoning of minds, the stifling of the sciences, the imposition of canons of taste in art, and the subversive attacks on the cultural values of peoples and on the orderly improvement of disadvantaged countries," UNESCO must work to "protect the integrity of education, science, and culture against the inroads of tyranny, totalitarianism, and—darkness."

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

UNESCO AND THE CULTIVATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(By Richard H. Heindel)

UNESCO can be viewed as a revolution. If the title of this session—"UNESCO as a World Force in the Establishment of Human Rights"—is taken seriously, UNESCO is certainly much more than an academy.

No one declaration, no one program, no one agency can comprehend the establishment of human rights and the staggering responsibilities which always accompany such rights. But I like to think that everything UNESCO touches, and everything that men and women of talents and good will do for it, alone or collectively, in any part of the world, advances the cause of human rights.

Examine a few of the related, major UNESCO activities which are "directed toward the peace and prosperity of mankind" at a time when "human solidarity is under trial and when human rights are in peril." You may conclude that UNESCO can be interpreted as an agent of brain-power and leadership—to guide the present revolutions against oppression and poverty into more democratic channels, and to inject a leaven of universalism into the stirring nationalism of many areas of the world.

I am certain that UNESCO's dyanmic role does not frighten us. Even Karl Marx once said, "In the eighteenth century, the American War of Independence sounded the tocsin for the European middle class * * * in the nineteenth century the American Civil War sounded it for the European working class." Recently, Justice William O. Douglas suggested that the United States "direct the revolutions of the world into democratic channels;" if we do, he adds, "We will at once enlist the support and enthusiasm of the peoples."

Time and time again, American scholars, educators, and intellectuals have tried to do something about the situation described by the Director General of UNESCO when he spoke in Cleveland, April 1949—"The most dangerous division in the world is the one between education and ignorance, between the culturally privileged and the culturally underprivileged, between the intellectual 'haves' and the intellectual 'have-nots'."

I am saying these things because I believe the fundamental objectives and priority directions of UNESCO coincide with United States foreign policies generally, and with the basic motivations of American scholarly and creative workers. I am saying this, too, because forces hostile to UNESCO and to us have been debauching the integrity of education, science, and culture, they have stolen and perverted our most cherished words and values, and they have generally fouled international semantics and the channels of communication.

In my reading of American history, of American education, I find a democratic, dynamic political and social heritage; a population of many nationalities, creeds, and races; the willingness to share ideas and experience through education and by mass media; a concern for civic responsibility and individual dignity; technological skills for a world that is being rapidly changed by the impact of science; and broad as well as specialized accomplishments in many fields of knowledge and creation. I do not find, in sum, a dreary record of reaction, war mongering, incurious provincialism, obscurantism, dilettantism, or cultural imperialism.

I believe this analysis explains in part why the United States takes, and ought to take, such a deep interest in helping UNESCO find its vital role in the present world situation. Besides, there are many advantages, for ourselves and for the rest of the world, in testing and sharing American strengths and ideas through a multilateral agency of many nations and cultures.

1. In waging peace, in establishing the bedrock of human rights, the widest of the central themes running through the UNESCO program, UNESCO has begun to concentrate some of its efforts on fundamental education, within its regular program and possibly in a special project which would apply $20,000,000 over a period of 12 years for various areas such as equatorial Africa, Latin America, the Far East, India, and the Middle East.

The masses want education and give it a higher priority that we might imagine under the present circumstances. Projects aimed at preparing the illiterate, the unfranchised, and the young for useful national and international participation require zeal, patience, diplomacy, and skills. Here is a task which may very well involve the competences and contributions of all the scholarly and creative fields presently identified with UNESCO. Of course, this is a long-term process. But immediate, vigorous, and proper execution now will yield immediate values and results which are urgently needed.

I am confident that American education has much to contribute in know-how, personnel, and spirit to this priority, to this revolution if you like. And you can work on it at home or in the foreign fields.

2. Economic well-being is an aspiration for all people throughout the world. UNESCO has got under way its share of the world's work in technical assistance and has agreements with 13 countries. Basically, this also includes the encouragement of improved training for tomorrow's leaders in education and science. Possibly, if one looks at the time tables, at the urgencies, secondary education may need as much invigoration as a program for universal literacy.

Here again all the disciplines and specialties can participate, perhaps not so much to elaborate as to share the world's store of knowledge. Yes, UNESCO is as revolutionary as the spirit behind our great elementary and secondary school system, and behind the act of our land-grant colleges and universities.

But this is not enough. And, fortunately, UNESCO does not think so either.

3. It is heartening to hear the Director General of UNESCO declare that: "UNESCO is first and foremost an organ of education for peace under the law." This must certainly mean a vigorous and effective support for the United Nations' system, human rights, collective security, and the development of a sense of loyalty to international cooperation.

The programs of "education for international understanding" and of "teaching about the United Nations and the specialized agencies," one may surmise, will enable influential leaders and major public opinion groups to play a more effective, intelligent part in influencing the course of international affairs toward peace and security. A positive educational program in support of the kind of international life the UN stands for is necessary on a world-wide basis. This seems to me political education of the highest order—political literacy is added to literacy. A thinking citizenry cannot but be an appropriate concept for UNESCO.

It appears to me, to adapt the words of the executive board's resolution about Korea last August, that these programs will help to reinforce "in the minds of men the intellectual and moral defences of peace through law." This is important, even though we must admit that only free minds have alternatives from which to choose.

This work will help to correlate intellectual enlightenment and the maintenance of peace and justice. Once more, this activity helps us to achieve a synoptic view—it is not just what UNESCO can do for particular educational, scientific, or cultural activities, it is also what education, science, and culture can do for UNESCO.

So much for these three priorities.

There are other projects and intrumentalities which are related to today's theme, and also to what you are doing and can do in your own community.

You are a contributor to and beneficiary of whatever helps to carry out the demonstration of world cultural interdependence.

Certain of you, for example, have been trying hard to broaden and deepen foreign area studies in your school systems. A sincere recognition of the achievements of other cultures helps to promote solidarity among diverse peoples. UNESCO, through activities in the field of book and gift coupons, translations, the interchange of persons, and the removal of barriers, has aimed at widening and improving the sharing and interchange of essential scholarly and cultural data.

There is little doubt that UNESCO has to solve a communication problem in the relatively new field of intercultural relations and cultural diplomacy. This is not easy because in many countries the intellectuals have not solved communication among themselves or with the masses of their own country. The way is wide open for social inventions, workable devices, and the testing of traditional methods in the field of international cultural relations. UNESCO has also to recognize and digest the growing knowledge about social action and the roots of social behavior. It will have to identify basic predispositions and motivations, and it will have to find the best ways for UNESCO to influence and modify attitudes and behavior.

UNESCO cannot be designed merely as an arena for genteel discussion on seemingly irrelevant topics, or for neutral aloofness when confronted by the poisoning of minds, the stifling of the sciences, the imposition of canons of taste in art, and the subversive attacks on the cultural values of peoples and on the orderly improvement of disadvantaged countries. UNESCO and its national commissions can and should develop the prestige which would help to achieve balance and perspective in a troubled world, and which would help to maintain the unity and morale of the UNESCO world. UNESCO, as many of us here may view it, has a particular responsibility to protect the integrity of education, science, and culture against the inroads of tyranny, totalitarianism, and—darkness.

Yes, the cultivation of human rights is a plodding, searching, arduous task which is only occasionally lighted with drama. It is good that UNESCO is an ally in that task.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fourth Class Service," which appeared in the Chicago Daily News recently.

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

FOURTH CLASS SERVICE

A Daily News staff member who has lived in many parts of the world, and who is now in New York City, has been keeping tabs on the mail service between Chicago and New York. He says that ordinary mail from here to his home in Queens takes 4 days—about the same time as air mail from Chicago to Rome.

His conclusion is that the United States now has about the same letter service as a second-rate Latin American country. It's better in Brazil and in many European countries whose governments we subsidize.

If the time ever comes when our Government finds a decreased need for raising living standards all over the world, perhaps some of the savings could be devoted to improving the mail service in the United States.

Beloit (Wis.) Buccaneers Basketball Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article which has been prepared by Mr. Jud Allen, publicity man for Beloit College, on his favorite subject of the Beloit College basketball team. I am submitting his statement which brings worthy recognition to a small Midwestern College which has only 400 eligible men for varsity athletics yet is in big-time basketball in this country. I am proud to present the article in question:

Beloit College's basketball team has often been referred to as "the smallest school in the big time."

The 104-year-old liberal arts college located on the southern boundary of Wisconsin has slightly less than a thousand students, with only 400 men eligible for varsity athletics. While it has made an impressive basketball record since the arrival of Coach Dolphe Stanley following the war, like any small school, it must defeat an army of sports skeptics before gaining any recognition in athletics.

The unheralded Buccaneers made their debut in the big time several weeks ago when they met a strong DePaul University team at the Chicago Stadium. What resulted was one of the most surprising exhibitions of basketball ever seen in any arena this or any season.

Before the largest crowd of stadium season (more than 13,000) Beloit defeated DePaul 94 to 60, to set a new stadium scoring record, previously held by Kentucky and the University of Illinois (86 points). It was DePaul's only decisive defeat of the season, having lost by three points to Kentucky, the Nation's number one team, and in a double overtime to Oklahoma A & M. DePaul also listed the University of Illinois as one of its victims. Illinois is currently leading the Big Ten.

Here were some of the comments by the Chicago scribes following the game:

"Beloit gave the most amazing exhibition of speed and ball-handling I've ever witnessed," said sportscaster Joe Wilson.

"Beloit easily belongs among the Nation's top 10. It is the most beautifully conditioned club I've ever seen," said Bob Russell of the Chicago Daily News.

"I was tired just watching them. Nobody can run that much," commented Dutch Lonborg, athletic director of Kansas University.

"I'd rank the Buccaneers among the first 10," said Ed Sainsburg of the United Press.

"Beloit is the runningest and best passing team I've ever seen in my coaching career. After Kentucky and Oklahoma A & M, they are as good as any team in the country," said Ray Meyer, coach of DePaul.

"Isn't it wonderful that a little school like Beloit can have a team like that. Amazing," said Tug Wilson, Big Ten Athletic Commissioner.

These were just a few of the comments made by a completely surprised crowd of basketball fans.

Coach Stanley had this to say after the game:

"I only hope that this game will help the cause of all small colleges who may have everything but the recognition they deserve. So many people seem to forget that excellence has always been based on quality, not size."

Lebanon, Conn.: Example in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, under the page 1 heading "Booklet on Connecticut village going to Russia to answer lies."

Mr. Speaker, this refers to Lebanon, a town in New London County in my district, and I would like to say that I share with every citizen of Lebanon the feeling of pride that this town has been selected as one of the typical communities in the United States, to demonstrate to the people of other lands, the kind of lives we lead and the type of folks that we are.

I would like to say, also, Mr. Speaker, that I commend the State Department for its judgment in the selection of Lebanon as an exemplary community. It is one of our historic towns, having been settled in the closing years of the seventeenth century, named in 1697 for Lebanon in the Near East, and incorporated in 1700. It was the home of Gov. Jonathan Trumbull, the celebrated War Secretary referred to by George Washington as "Brother Jonathan," and it was from the War Office in Lebanon that much of the business of organizing and equipping and supplying Washington's armies was transacted.

That is not its only claim to fame, by any means. It is a beautiful and peaceful community whose citizens are regular, freedom-loving Americans, with reverence for the great past of our country, and concern about its future, and about the peace of the world.

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

BOOKLET ON CONNECTICUT VILLAGE GOING TO RUSSIA TO ANSWER LIES—STATE DEPARTMENT PRINTING 500,000 SHOWING DEMOCRACY IN LEBANON—DISTRIBUTION PLAN IS SECRET

(By Bernard Peyton, Jr.)

The State Department announced yesterday in New York and Washington that it has prepared a 24-page pamphlet about an American village and will print 500,000 copies, many of them for distribution behind the

iron curtain, to combat lies about this country there.

The Department picked out Lebanon, Conn., a rural and unsophisticated dairy town of 1,400 population, 25 miles southeast of Hartford, as best exemplifying the democratic process in action. This town, which was founded 251 years ago, and has never yielded very far to big city attractions or pressures, should appeal to peoples all over the world, the Department indicated.

The pamphlet, filled with photographs of village activities, will be printed in 18 languages including Russian. Michael J. McDermott, press officer of the State Department, declined to state how it would be distributed within Soviet-controlled areas.

"If I told you, maybe we couldn't distribute it," he said.

The cover of the pamphlet bears a picture of children in front of a library, and the story opens with an aerial view of the rolling countryside in which Lebanon is situated. The commentary begins:

"Beset by anxiety, a tiny farming village has an air of unreal tranquillity. To the casual eye such would be the first impression of Lebanon—a little cluster of buildings some 50 miles from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean in the northeastern United States. Each rocky field is bounded by waist-high fences of stone, culled from the earth through the 200 years the fields have been cultivated. Little traffic passes by."

The narrative carries the reader through town meetings, social get-togethers at homes, and the various occupations of the residents. A theme links the successive lay-outs: The young couples in town feel the need for a kindergarten, but are opposed by the elders, who feel the need is not too drastic.

The young members work up interest in their project, and ultimately, through a process indigenous to democracy, put it over. This situation, the Department said, closely reflects its actual prototype in Lebanon.

Lebanon's historical importance, proclaimed by its own residents and by State chapters of patriotic societies, which hold their annual conventions on the village green, did not influence the selection of the town for the pamphlet, according to the Department.

Nevertheless, it conceded that the homebred background of the village's residents—many of whom are descendants of the original settlers—has been responsible for maintaining the village heritage. Headstones in the town cemetery are inscribed with the names of Revolutionary War soldiers, and the famous village green, a mile long and 500 feet wide, was a camping site for Lafayette and a French detachment for 8 months during the war.

HAS HISTORIC CHURCH

At the south end of the green, known as Lebanon Common, stands the Lebanon Congregational Church, founded the year the village was started. John Trumbull, the painter, designed the present replacement for the original structure. His father, Jonathan Trumbull, was the only governor elected by the people and not an appointee of George III, and inspired the people of the State to help General Washington in his bleakest hour. Governor Trumbull, a resident of Lebanon, delivered 300 cattle to the American forces at Valley Forge when their provisions were almost exhausted.

The town in those days was the fifth largest in the State, with a population of 4,000. Its residents employed themselves much as they do now—in farming. Today dairy herds graze over many hillsides nearby, with chickens and vegetables adding to the farmer's fare. There are no industrial plants, and most of what is grown is consumed locally.

The disinterest in an export economy is typical of the residents. The town was once a stagecoach stop on the New York–Boston road. When the railroad pushed through, the citizens vigorously opposed it, and today the Willimantic branch of the New Haven bypasses the town to its junction 5 miles north.

TOWN HAS FOUR CHURCHES

Lebanon, besides its kindergarten, boasts an elementary school and the Tisdale High School. Although the Congregational Church is most prominent, with its command of the green, the residents attend a Baptist, a Roman Catholic, and a Methodist Church, with pride in the influence these churches have had on community development.

"Lebanon people do not ask anyone else to accept their ideas," the pamphlet states, "but they do have some beliefs which are perhaps larger in scope than this one small village:

"They believe: The needs of the individual are the concern of the community; the community can act successfully to meet those needs; the goals of stability and progress can be attained within the framework of a free society.

Foreign Policy Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me by the House, I include a draft of a letter and a form of foreign policy questionnaire, which I propose to send to people in my district. I shall later report the results with the hope that we may obtain some help from a cross-section opinion of my area.

The letter and questionnaire follow:

MY DEAR FRIEND: Most problems now facing the people have their root in one thing: The foreign and military policy of the United States. For example:

1. Upon the nature of our policy depends the severity and duration of the draft of our young men. Their very lives depend upon decisions in the immediate future.

2. The President's budget calls for $71,000,000,000 cash, a Federal tax increase of approximately sixteen billion. New Jersey's share is calculated at nearly two and a half billion or about $2,000 for the year from the average head of a family of four. A large percentage of this money is allocated to the support of a possible global war. Taxes are high and will be very much higher. Very few begrudge any sacrifice necessary for America's defense, but millions object to preparing for a vast land war in Asia.

3. Prices are high, and despite controls, will be higher. Goods of all kinds will be scarcer; restricted. Black markets will be back; possibly rationing. These are incident to a war economy, which in turn depends on the wisdom or the folly of the foreign policy.

Illustrations could be multiplied. You can be sure that the subject of paramount importance in the whole world today is the foreign policy of the United States.

Therefore, I am issuing a short special questionnaire, devoted to this single subject. Many of you know my views. I want to know more about yours.

That's the way a representative government works the best.

Your prompt answers will help me to decide issues now before us, and you will be participating in what is called the Great Debate.

Sincerely,

MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress.

Return to me at 1504 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

QUESTIONNAIRE

"The great debate" now proceeding in the country and in the Congress, concerns itself with a fundamental question of whether the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, may, by his own action, send them into war in Korea, or send them, as he now proposes, to occupy Europe, or whether Congress, having the sole right to make war, must approve basic policies which involve war or the possibility of war. What do you think?

1. Committing ground troops to Europe, or elsewhere outside of the continental United States:

☐ A. May be done by the President alone.

☐ B. Must be done only with the consent of Congress.

☐ C. Should not be done at all.

2. Dealing with question No. 1 a little further, Senator TAFT argues that if Russia intends to attack Western Europe, it will do so now, and certainly not wait the two or more years it will take to prepare defenses there; moreover that no land army can be built sufficiently large to resist the huge numbers that Russia can bring to the attack. Eisenhower feels that Europe has the will to resist, and if encouraged by our leadership and divisions, will build up a strength that will deter war:

Which is closest to your position?

(a) ☐ Give Europe all the aid necessary in an attempt to build strong defenses there.

(b) ☐ Send the four divisions now proposed, but no more.

(c) ☐ Send no men, but supply Europe with equipment.

(d) ☐ Send no equipment or aid, unless Europe raises its own adequate army.

(e) ☐ Keep out of Europe entirely.

3. If Russia attacked Western Europe tomorrow, should we:

(a) ☐ Continue to mobilize a large land army to fight Russia in Europe, Asia, or both.

(b) ☐ Concentrate our Air Force in England, or at any other available point, and attack and harass the Russian Army in Europe.

(c) ☐ Attack Russia itself by air.

(d) ☐ Let Europe protect itself and concern ourselves exclusively with the defense of this hemisphere.

4. On June 25, 1950, the North Koreans launched an attack on South Korea. Following the Truman doctrine, which assumes it to be our duty to help any free people anywhere resist aggression, the President ordered the Navy, Air Force, and most of our Army and Marine Corps into action.

What was originally described as a police action has resulted in 50,000 American casualties. Was the action justified? What should we have done, or now do?

(a) ☐ Send the Navy and Air Force to harass the North Koreans, but kept away from a land engagement.

(b) ☐ Done nothing on the assumption that our vital interests were not affected.

(c) ☐ Waited to see if the United Nations were willing to do their full share.

(d) ☐ Gone ahead as we did to uphold the principle of collective security.

(e) ☐ Now that we're in it, fight it out.

(f) ☐ Withdraw from Korea.

5. Nearly all Americans agree that the freedom of the United States must be defended at any cost. The question is where and how? Leading Americans have recently declared a variety of views. They are summed up here very briefly. Mark the one closest to your opinion:

(a) ☐ Truman administration: Support free people everywhere in resisting aggression. "Contain" communism wherever it seeks to dominate. For example, fight in Korea, assist and perhaps fight in Indochina, Iran, India; lend our men and arms to Europe. In short, fight wherever Russia, or those influenced by Russia, fight.

(b) ☐ Kennedy: Give up Asia as a bad job, and leave Europe to protect itself. Withdraw to the Western Hemisphere, and build strongest possible defense for North and South America. Russia will bite off more than it can chew, and will be unable to maintain its dominant position.

(c) ☐ Hoover: Concentrate on defenses of Western Hemisphere, but maintain our surrounding positions as in Japan, the Philippines, etc. Aid Europe only after it proves its willingness to help itself.

(d) ☐ Taft: Much like Hoover. Is willing to send a limited number of divisions to Europe, but insists that Congress must approve, not just the President.

(e) ☐ Dewey: The administration position, except that he favors all-out mobilization, including at least 100 divisions.

6. A group of 123 Republican Representatives recently filed a six-point Declaration of Policy, under which they propose to change the course of the administration's foreign policy. How do you feel about each point?

Yes ☐ No ☐ 1. Whatever our future military or political policy is to be, it must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 2. Make this country impregnable to attack.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 3. Reduce nonessential civilian expenditures.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 4. Build a strong defense system in the Western Hemisphere.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 5. Establish a strong defense line in the Atlantic and Pacific. Refuse further aid of any kind to Western Europe unless persuaded that Western Europe is carrying its full share of the burden. In any case invite Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations to participate fully in this program.

Yes ☐ No ☐ 6. Conclude peace treaties with Germany, Japan, and Austria.

7. Do you favor—

Yes ☐ No ☐ Draft of 18-year-olds.

Yes ☐ No ☐ Draft of married men between 19 and 26.

Yes ☐ No ☐ Draft of veterans.

8. Of the principal branches of the armed services, which does the strategy of this country require to be at top strength?

(a) ☐ Army.
(b) ☐ Navy.
(c) ☐ Air Force.

Sign only if you choose.

Name _____
Address _____

Free Wheat to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Elkhorn Independent on Thursday, February 22, entitled "Free Wheat to India." The editor raises this important question in connection with the current legislation: "Shall the American taxpayer alone pay the bill for free wheat to India?" What about the United Nations helping out? The editorial follows:

FREE WHEAT TO INDIA

India appealed to the United States for millions of bushels of wheat to avert a famine and there are indications that the wheat will be given without charge.

That is typical of American generosity, and the urge to take care of unfortunate people who are starving is traditionally American. We hope that wheat is furnished immediately.

But why didn't India ask the United Nations instead of the United States? Dozens of countries in the UN raise wheat. Of course, the answer is obvious. America doesn't sell anything to people in trouble; it is all free, and the American taxpayer foots the bill.

We'd like to ask whether wheat that is paid for wouldn't alleviate a famine as quickly as free wheat? Some of the richest people in the world live in India.

Ten Billion Dollars Budget Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Federal Tax Policy has just proposed a comprehensive plan to reduce the $71,600,000,000 Federal budget by $10,000,000,000. I am in hearty accord with the objective of many of our leading citizens and leading organizations to cut nonmilitary spending. I believe that many billions of dollars can be saved the taxpayers of this country by a broad program of fiscal retrenchment.

The plan proposed by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy is a step in the right direction. Some conclusions by the committee I cannot completely agree with. But I do think that this exhaustive study is timely and the plan merits the thorough consideration of the Congress and the people.

The proposal of the committee follows:

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Immediate suspension of all nonmilitary Federal spending programs for the fiscal year 1952 was proposed today as the first step in a plan to cut $10,000,000,000 from the projected $71.6 billion Federal budget.

The plan, which was accompanied by a breakdown showing areas where savings could be made, was proposed by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, composed of five leading fiscal authorities.

Following suspension of "the operation of every provision of the law now in force requiring expenditures or appropriations," these further steps would effect the saving:

1. Congress, with the cooperation of the President, would ask the Budget Bureau to prepare a new budget on a clean-slate basis, with no commitments to any program or group, the total being $10,000,000,000 below the present $71.6 billion.

2. Congress would then consider the revised proposals on a clean-slate basis and would permit no additional expenditures not proposed by the Budget Bureau, unless a corresponding amount were cut from other Budget Bureau proposals.

There should be no exceptions in the suspension of spending "except for direct (not indirect) military expenditures or international aid," said the committee, pointing out that no detail is shown for these two categories in the President's new budget for fiscal 1952. Laws relating to interest on the public debt would be left undisturbed.

The recommendations were contained in a 32-page study made public by Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, who is chairman of the committee. Other members are Fred W. Fairchild, Knox professor emeritus of economics, Yale University; Rowland R. Hughes, comptroller of the National City Bank of New York; Walter A. Cooper, well-known accountant and former chairman of the Committee on Federal Taxation of the American Institute of Accountants; and Thomas N. Tarleau, former tax legislative counsel of the United States Treasury.

"We are recommending this clean-slate approach to Federal spending as a sheer necessity at this time," said Mr. Magill. "Few people seem to realize that some $35,000,000,000 in the proposed budget comes from previous authorizations and commitments, making it virtually impossible for the present Congress to effect needed reductions in these areas. To avoid an intolerable tax burden, Congress must act firmly.

"The drastic demands of the present situation require drastic action. Budget paring is essential. But no one believes that paring will do the whole job. The need is to start with a clean slate, so that only expenditures that can be proved necessary under today's conditions will be authorized. With teamwork between the executive and legislative branches of the Government and the understanding and alert support of the public, this can be done."

The committee said that a clean-slate policy will have the additional advantage of strengthening the appropriations procedure by giving Congress better annual control over expenditures. For some years, it was contended, the appropriations and expenditures have been getting further apart. By June 30, 1952, unspent appropriations under the budget will have accumulated to $81,300,000,000.

Most of the study, entitled "Financing Defense: Can Expenditures Be Reduced?", is devoted to a detailed discussion of nonmilitary Federal expenditures. Instead of the customary functional breakdown of expenditures, the committee rearranged the budget into new groupings: Loans, $2,100,000,000; public works, commodity inventories and equipment, $3,700,000,000; aids and special services for programs of State and local governments and others, $9,600,000,000 (domestic) and $7,000,000,000 (international); and other current operating expenditures, $2,400,000,000.

This total, which the committee designated the reducible areas, comes to $24,800,000,000.

"Not every item in the nondefense area of expenditure can be eliminated," said the study. "However, under present-day conditions and necessities, the burden of proof is not upon the citizen to demonstrate where reduction can be made. Rather, the burden of proof falls on the Government and its departments. Each item should be justified for retention only after a thorough review of its purposes without regard either to any previous approval of its programs or to legislation on the statute books."

The committee's review of reducible areas includes the following recommendations to reach reduction goals:

1. A prompt withdrawal of the Federal Government from the lending field, and a limitation of its future operations to servicing and collecting outstanding loans, with an estimated saving in fiscal 1952 of $1,500,000,000.

2. A deep cut in the public-works program and a suspension of all projects not contributing directly to some essential defense

purpose, with a resultant saving in fiscal 1952 of $750,000,000.

3. Drastic curtailment of Federal aid, grants, subsidy, and special services programs, largely by making the States responsible for various services now supported by the Federal Government, with an estimated saving of $3,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952.

4. Immediate application of remaining reforms outlined by the Hoover Commission and a general tightening up of Federal management to eliminate waste, with a saving of $1,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952.

Adding another $2,000,000,000 in savings resulting from sale of loans, mortgages, and commodities, the committee arrived at a nondefense reduction goal of $8,250,000,000. It warned, however, that "the precise amounts in the budget total that can be eliminated by applying standards of prudent judgment will have to be carefully worked out by the Congress, with the aid of the administration and the alert and continuous active support of the public."

With respect to defense expenditures, the committee noted that no attempt was made to determine how much could be saved from the $7,000,000,000 included in the 1952 budget for international aid, or in the $41,000,000,000 listed for the military. It also suggested further savings by more exhaustive inspection of civilian expenditures.

"Giving recognition to the very many additional opportunities for saving, it is conservative to conclude that a reduction of at least $10,000,000,000 is possible, while still leaving intact all the government that a free nation requires."

The committee based its recommendations on the fact that "we must look forward to an extended period, possibly 10 years or more, of tensions abroad and huge budget demands at home."

Pointing out that there is little prospect of a large budget deficit in fiscal 1951, ending June 30, the committee added that there are just three ways to make up the gap of $16,500,000,000 expected between revenues and expenditures for fiscal 1952: reduce expenditures, increase taxes, borrow.

In supporting the principle of pay-as-we-go, the committee explained:

"To increase our present peak tax bill of $55,100,000,000 enough to cover expenditures of $71,600,000,000 is to strain our economy and heavily burden our whole people. To borrow the money to meet such a budget is to fan the flames of inflation. On the other hand, even if budget expenditures are cut substantially, very generous provision will still be made not only for all defense requirements but for essential and reasonable nondefense activities. We can then tax ourselves enough to meet the total bill. * * * Our citizens must tighten their belts. They can fairly require the Government to show similar prudence in spending."

India Wants To Pay for Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of misinformation about the so-called gift of grain to India which is supposed to take care of starving people in that unfortunate land. As a matter of fact the Indian Government did not ask for a gift of wheat for this purpose but it suggested to our Government that it would be willing to pay for any grain that we sold them on a long-term credit basis. Why then should the American taxpayer be asked to foot the bill for this grain when the Indian Government is willing to pay for it? The answer to that question can only be secured from the planners in the State Department and those who advance the threadbare argument that a gift of this grain will stop communism in India.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by that well-known newsman, Mr. Henry Hazlett, who has an article in the current issue of Newsweek entitled "How To Cause a Famine." I commend this article to all Members of this House:

HOW TO CAUSE A FAMINE
(By Henry Hazlitt)

"This program," said President Truman, in asking Congress to give the Indian Government 75,000,000 bushels of grain, "does not constitute a precedent for continuing to provide food to India on a grant basis or for providing similar aid for other countries." But it does, of course, constitute precisely such a precedent. We cannot do less in future for India or any other country without being accused of less generosity or plain discrimination.

Famine and starvation should, of course, always be prevented or relieved when humanly possible. But we must also ask what caused it, whose duty it is to relieve it, and what steps are essential to prevent its recurrence.

It has gradually, precedent by precedent, become the assumption of most foreigners and most American Fair Dealers that when any real or imagined deficiency of anything whatever exists anywhere on earth, it must be made good primarily, if not solely, at the expense of the American taxpayer. Yet even the Indian Government did not ask us for more than a long-term loan to enable it to buy this grain. Given reasonable prudence, it could easily have repaid such a loan. Why did Mr. Truman recommend a gift?

The process will be this. America will give the grain. But the average Indian (nearly 85 percent of the Indian people are illiterate) will probably never know this. For the gift will be to the Nehru government, and the Nehru government will sell the grain to India's hungry. Moreover, the Nehru government will be allowed to keep for statist schemes even the counterpart funds it gets for selling what we give.

Just as Mr. Truman ascribed the Yugoslavian food shortage solely to the drought, so he now ascribes the Indian famine solely to natural disasters—earthquakes, floods, droughts, and plagues of locusts. Yet the famine has at least been intensified, if not principally caused, by the economic policies of the Nehru government.

1. The Nehru government is a planning government, a Socialist government. Like all such governments it has embarked on a grandiose industrialization program. This means that it has diverted land, labor, and capital from agricultural to industrial production. This has directly reduced India's production of food. Mr. Truman apparently approves of this compulsory diversion. For he wants to compel American taxpayers to subsidize it. It is explicitly because he wishes the Nehru government to have funds to continue this long-range economic development program that he thinks American and not Indian taxpayers should be asked to pay for the present Indian food deficiency.

2. Specifically, the Nehru government intensified India's food shortage by its isolationist efforts to become independent of Pakistan (or anywhere else) for cotton and jute. It ordered a reduction in grain-growing acreage to increase cotton and jute acreage.

3. The Nehru government has not permitted free markets in agriculture. It has put price ceilings on grain. These have, as always, discouraged and reduced the production and sale of grain. The government has resorted to forced government procurement of grain from peasant growers. Our Government is asking American taxpayers to suffer from those policies and is not suggesting any change in them. Therefore the food shortage is likely to recur.

The argument that India cannot pay $190,000,000 for grain because it has only limited foreign exchange reserves and an unfavorable balance of payments is economic nonsense. These conditions are the result of the Nehru government's own exchange-control measures. It has made dollars scarce in the same way as it has made foodstuffs scarce—by putting artificial price ceilings on them.

In this grain discussion the whole emphasis has been on distribution. But in the long run nothing can save India or the world from poverty and famine but greater production. And there is willful blindness to the fact that governing planning, price-fixing, and socialism inevitably discourage, reduce, and disrupt production.

The Sampson Exposé As Told by George O'Connor, Newshawk De Luxe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my good friend, George O'Connor, Binghamton City councilman, reporter, and radio commentator, made some startling revelations in the Binghamton Sun through his daily column, City Desk.

Mr. O'Connor spent several days at Sampson, near Geneva, N. Y., which was used as a training station by the Navy in World War II, and recently has been taken over by the Air Force.

Mr. O'Connor's investigation is an eye-opener, to say the least. I feel sure his disclosures, which follow in part, will be of deep interest to all the countless readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. O'Connor's report on Sampson herewith:

[Station WINR, City Desk Broadcast, February 28, 7 p. m.]

Our operation Sampson started officially as we walked up to the main gate of the sprawling former Naval station.

Blue-clad Air Force guards with guns stood at the gates to stop visitors. It looked as if we might have a tough time getting in without explaining what we were there for—to have a look at what makes the place tick.

We walked into a small building near the gate—a place bearing a sign reading "Security Office."

A sergeant behind the desk looked up, asked what we wanted. We said we would like to go into the base.

"O. K.", he replied cheerfully, "do you want a temporary or a permanent pass." Not one question as to who we were, what we wanted or what we planned to do inside

We said we just wanted to go in and he told us to drive right in. For all the guards knew, we might have had the back end of the car filled with bombs, poison, or both. But we said nothing about the lack of security, and drove inside.

Here was an important military installation, where thousands of Air Force boys are to be trained, and anyone, Russian or anybody else, can drive in and out without asking any questions.

Of course, we're not at war, but there certainly should be a little security where human lives and military installations are concerned.

Inside the base it's hard to believe what you see. The once shipshape buildings are sprawling in disrepair in a sea of dirty, waist-high weeds. The sleeping giant that once was potent, vigorous Sampson, is a down-at-the-heels military wreck. Stark brown buildings, with paint peeled off, are pitted with thousands of broken windows and cracks. Doors creak on sagging hinges, porches sag, and wind whistles through the broken windows and doors. The plumbing that wasn't stolen by looters, is almost useless.

Crews of workers—some making up to $360 a week—are trying to put the place back in shape. But it's a big job. When the Navy left Sampson in 1946, it left in a hurry. Workmen told us of finding molding food in the big electric ovens in the mess halls. The plumbing was split and cracked, and many boilers were flooded because of someone's neglect. Expensive electrical equipment had been ripped from the walls and must be replaced.

From the time the Navy left, Sampson was at the mercy of the looters. They didn't miss much, including just about everything that could be carried away. Squatters lived in the furnished buildings for months after the sailors moved out, and apparently no one paid much attention to poor old Sampson.

Sampson was built in 1942, at a cost of $52,000,000. The rebuilding job may run almost that much. The first contractor got the contract on a bid of $2,877,721, but that was only the beginning. Last Friday, when the contract was terminated, the contractor said he had spent almost $5,000,000.

Now there's a new contract. This one calls for repair work to the tune of about $18,000,000, and new construction amounting to $12,000,000. This is going to be a cost-plus proposition. Meanwhile, the Air Force is going ahead with its job of training recruits—and doing a good job despite the big handicaps at the rundown base.

We'll tell you more about that tomorrow.

[Station WINR, City Desk broadcast, March 1, 7 p. m.]

For the last couple of days we have talked about the run-down, dilapidated physical plant at Sampson, or what was left of it when the Air Force moved in to set up shop.

Then the contractor took over and started putting the place back together.

This was a tremendous handicap to the Air Force, which had to wait, before occupying buildings, until repairs had been made by the civilian workers.

As of last week, there were 4,700 trainees on the base, occupying only a small part of the rambling installation.

Two mess halls had been repaired to the point where they were usable, and enough barracks were fixed up for the airmen to move in and clean up.

The Air Force cut off the flow of recruits into Sampson on February 16, because of shortages of uniforms and equipment.

Now recruits will start arriving at the rate of about 80 a day beginning on March 6.

As it is, the Air Force is operating under tremendous handicaps—handicaps that might not exist if the base had not been permitted to fall apart at the seams through sheer waste and neglect.

Much of the millions of dollars in repair work now in progress could have been avoided, if just a small working force had stayed on the base after the Navy left in 1946, to keep the place in shape.

Unfortunately, that's now water over the dam, and the blame will probably never be placed where it belongs.

Uncle Sucker, or rather the millions of taxpayers, are paying and will be paying in withholding taxes, for a colossal case of neglect and short-sightedness.

When the first batches of trainees arrived, there was a shortage of mattresses.

The Air Force had to use mattress covers stuffed with pillows and blankets so some of the youngsters would have a comfortable place to sleep.

Now, despite the confusion at the base, the Air Force is doing its best—and doing a pretty commendable job—of running a training operation.

We had lunch in one of the mess halls—only the Air Force doesn't refer to mess—but as breakfast, luncheon, and dinner.

We went through the line with the base public information officer, Bob Merritt, who is doing a good job of trying to keep the public and the parents of the trainees informed as to what's going on.

Luncheon consisted of some vegetable soup, hot dogs and sauerkraut, a slab of American cheese, some plums—which we skipped, bread and butter, and coffee, plus a green salad.

It was good, nourishing chow, not perhaps served in Waldorf Astoria style, but nevertheless pretty solid stuff for hungry airmen.

Most of the equipment in the mess halls is brand new, installed for the Air Force. Just what happened to the Navy stuff, no one seemed to know quite clearly.

At this point, there isn't much the Air Force can do in the way of furnishing leisure-time recreation for the trainees.

There were bowling alleys in the ship store buildings, but some of them have disappeared. We tried to find out where they went but no one seemed to know.

They're working on the theater buildings and drill halls, which also have swimming pools, to get them in shape for use—but it will be a long time before they're back in class-A shape.

By spring, perhaps the base will start functioning the way it should.

But it's going to cost John Q. Taxpayer a barrel of dough.

The contractors' men—plumbers, electricians, steamfitters, etc.—draw big money especially when they work overtime. We saw check stubs that ran up to $900 a week's work.

But the place wasn't usable the way the Air Force found it, and there was nothing else to do but start spending.

The base cost $52,000,000 to build back in 1942.

And before it's back in shape, with repair work and new construction, the bill might well run almost as much as it cost to build the base in the first place.

It's been a pretty sad and expensive lesson and the taxpayers are learning it the hard way.

But maybe it will smarten up the people who let the place go to the dogs after World War II.

Perhaps next time—if there is a next time—someone will figure out that it's worth spending a little money to protect a $52,000,000 investment—on the long chance that the place might be needed again.

Restore the Constitutional Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a radio speech delivered by my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], over radio station WOL on Sunday, March 4. Mr. HAND clearly states the position of the great weight of authority of those who believe that the President has the right to dispatch military forces abroad only with the consent of Congress. I am including his speech at this point in the RECORD. It is a remarkably clear statement and I commend it to all Members:

RESTORE THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF CONGRESS

(By Hon. T. MILLET HAND)

A few weeks ago a respected newspaper of this city said, in part:

"There can be little doubt that the Constitution invests in the President the right, the duty, the authority, and the power to order, without prior consent of Congress, the dispatch of American military forces to foreign areas when and if he finds that such action is necessary to safeguard the interests and security of the United States. This principle—a principle put into action by several of our past Chief Executives—is so deeply rooted in our history and system of government that it now seems to be far beyond the reach of any effective legal challenge."

This is a clear expression of the administration's view. I flatly challenge it. I challenge the dangerous theory that by the device of labeling a war as a "police action," one may decree that we engage in battle with the North Koreans, with the Chinese, in Indochina, Iran, Tibet; in fact with anyone anywhere, if he and he alone sees fit. So holding is to ignore not only the plain words of the Constitution, but the essential meaning of our representative form of government.

The Commander in Chief has the power to direct the movement of the Armed Forces, but only after the war-making powers of Congress has been exercised. "He has no more power to make war, than one of his inferior officers," says General Eisenhower.

Article 1, section 8, dealing with legislative powers, provides, in part, that "Congress shall have the power—to declare war—to make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies—to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

I have referred to these powers in detail to indicate the painstaking care used by

the Constitutional Convention to make sure that the high responsibility of raising and regulating the use of armies was exclusively vested in the Congress, hence, by representation, in the people.

In addition, Congress has complete control of our money, without which no troops can be sent anywhere.

In contradistinction to those broad and detailed powers, article II, section 2, briefly provides that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States; * * *"

This is the only reference to such powers. Can we infer from this a power to start and maintain a major war, as in Asia?

Those who support the President's powers rather glibly refer to a large number of precedents and Supreme Court opinions. They don't bear careful analysis. It is of course true that from 1798 on, marines and limited forces have been dispatched to protect American lives or property, usually as a result of a civil war or internal disturbance which could not be controlled by the local government. Such temporary emergencies are hardly to be compared with a permanent policy of occupying Europe with large numbers, for long years; or with fighting in Korea the fourth worst war in our history, with 250,000 troops, 50,000 casualties, and 15,000 monthly replacements, a war in its ninth month, now involving us with the most numerous nation on earth; a tragic war in which the end is not in sight.

While I am satisfied, as a lawyer, that the President is without constitutional right to fight all over Asia, or to occupy Europe, without congressional sanction, it is even more important that he should not attempt to involve the Nation in such vast projects without an assurance of the Nation's will, and the backing of its representatives. Obviously he must come to Congress to implement his actions. How much wiser to obtain their approval in advance.

You don't avoid war by omitting a formal declaration of war. We are presently engaged in a major war which may suddenly or by degrees become a world war. To suggest that such a course may be pursued without action by Congress is to reduce its authority, and hence the authority of the people, to a debating society, with some limited function of approving the appropriation of money demanded by the President. To so limit the Congress and exalt the Presidency, is, of course, to abandon democracy and surrender to a dictatorship.

On January 15, Senator TAFT said:

"The basic liberties of the people * * * are imperiled unless we can retain in Congress the right to pass on policies affecting [their] very life and being. * * *"

I agree. I am not prepared to surrender in whole or in part the power of the people exercised by their elective representatives.

Neither am I prepared to deliver the fate of this country solely into the hands of President Truman.

Are you?

Why All Three Services Are Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview with Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, appearing in the February 23, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report:

WHY ALL THREE SERVICES ARE NEEDED

Question. Admiral Sherman, do you think you can draw a line of demarcation today between sea power and land power and air power, and treat them as three separate, autonomous factors in war?

Answer. I don't see how you can draw any sharp line between sea power and air power. I have spent nearly 30 years working in both at the same time. I don't see how you can separate what you might call land power from air power. Certainly one gets nowhere without the other. I don't see how you can separate land power from sea power unless you're going to defend yourself on your own continent. I think we have to talk about the military power of the United States, and get away from being too compartmented.

Naval strategy, in its broader sense, has always involved the use of troops as well as ships, military positions on shore as well as fleets deployed at sea, and the coordination of naval action with military and political action as well. It seems to me that the time has come to talk in terms of national strategy involving all elements of our national strength, rather than in terms of power in only one or two elements.

Question. When you speak of air power being tied in to land power, do you mean in the support that bases and overseas stations have to give to land power?

Answer. I think it has been demonstrated that an army in the field cannot achieve the best results unless it is aided and supported by air. Certainly air cannot be maintained without antiaircraft artillery to defend its bases, without ground troops to defend its bases, or, if the air power is overseas, without sea power to project the air bases overseas and sustain them there.

Question. Isn't the impression that air power can act independently based upon the belief that there are bombers now that can fly from our continent to another continent and back?

Answer. If you try to survive with nothing but the resources of North America against the combined resources of the rest of the world—that's what you would be coming to if you go to the thesis of nothing but intercontinental air warfare—I believe that in the long term you would be doomed to defeat.

Question. Suppose you had sea and air combined—that seems to be the new conception——

Answer. I doubt that we can sustain the allies that we must have, unless we are prepared to exert a balanced effort. I refer, of course, to collective balance. To the degree that your allies can contribute locally any of the components in the required over-all military effort, we can concentrate on the other components, but in the long run, if we are going to have allies and other nations friendly to us, those nations will have to be defended by the combined efforts of regional organizations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Inter-American Defense Organization, and their defense will have to be accomplished by the required combination of military effort in all three spheres.

Question. We would have to supply troops as well as airplanes and pilots?

Answer. Each situation will have its own requirements.

Question. Should our air power be possibly considered in two phases—the initial phase of a war, where the long-range intercontinental bombers inflict immediate reprisals, and then the second phase, which would be conducted from shorter ranges and overseas bases—is that part of the general concept?

Answer. Well, viewing the world's strategic situation broadly, it would seem to me that our national security must involve several concepts. Being surrounded by great oceans we must control those oceans, make sure that we can use the sea and make sure that war cannot be brought to us by sea. Then certainly we must have an adequate air defense of the United States and we should have the capability of prompt and severe retaliation by air in case of attack. But ability only to retaliate is not enough. If we concede that we need the support of allies with whom we have entered into a regional pact and to whom we have made commitments, then it seems clear that we must stand ready to assist them in a way which gives them a chance of survival. Pounding an aggressor at long range cannot be the whole answer.

Question. There is some talk now of our being strong at home and probably maintaining Britain, Spain, and north Africa, and forgetting Europe. Would that concept—that is, drawing back from Europe presumably because we couldn't defend it anyway—be logical from the point of view of sea power?

Answer. I think the British have long believed that the survival of the United Kingdom required that no unfriendly nation be on the opposite shore of the English Channel.

UNITED STATES INTEREST IN WESTERN EUROPE

Question. Haven't we as a Nation always felt the same way about Western Europe, too? That is, that we shouldn't have an unfriendly power controlling all of Europe opposite us?

Answer. We should remember the days of 1940 when the total strength of the Axis navies was greater than the strength of our Navy, and the total ability of the shipyards of Western Europe to produce ships was greater than the ability of our shipyards to produce ships, and we felt that if all of Western Europe were overrun, and if the British Fleet were removed from the balance of power we would then be on the weaker side, even in terms of sea power alone, and the Axis powers with control of all Western Europe in time might outbuild us, and achieve control of the Atlantic.

Question. But isn't one theory now that air power could keep their factories reduced over there so that they couldn't use them to build up their armament?

Answer. The difficulty with that theory is that the distance is the same westbound as it is eastbound.

Question. You mean they have planes, too, and they could hurt our industry as well as we could hurt them?

Answer. It seems to me that the security of the United States lies in keeping war as far as possible from home.

Question. Does that require occupation of territory or having friendly armies to keep back potential enemies?

Answer. It certainly requires the ability to project our military power overseas into the areas that are selected by us, and in the form that is required by the particular situation.

Question. Well, in Europe, would that include land troops?

Answer. At the present time purely military reasons require that it include a certain proportion of troops. Psychological reasons also require that it include troops.

NEED FOR SUPPORT OF ALLIES

Question. So that we probably wouldn't be wise to depend upon just our Navy and Air Force?

Answer. We might depend on the Navy and Air Force in the short term, but in the long term our security requires the maintenance

of a free world, which includes countries on the other side of the Atlantic.

Question. Do we need allies?

Answer. I believe so. And if we want them we must prepare to support them resolutely.

Question. And we need an army, then—a big one?

Answer. Yes; of course we need an army—a much larger peacetime army than we have maintained in recent years.

Question. In other words, we couldn't get along with air power and sea power alone?

Answer. We need a balanced force, with the proper proportion of air, sea and ground elements.

Question. As a matter of fact, in the pursuit of your enemy in modern warfare, can you actually achieve success with any two components, or would it require all three?

Answer. It is very dangerous to rely on an unbalanced force. Curiously enough, when you have an unbalanced force, it's usually the soldier who gets hurt. During my service command in the Mediterranean recently I made a very thorough study of the Battle of Crete, in which the Germans had an army, and an air force, but no significant naval force, while the British had ground troops and a fleet but practically no air. The net result was that the German soldiers were slaughtered in great numbers by the British ships as they attempted to cross from Greece to Crete. On the British side, the British soldiers received heavy casualties because of a lack of air cover. The lesson seems to be that, when you have unbalance, the doughboy is more apt to be hurt than anyone else.

Question. But, from the point of view of winning victory, there is no way, realistically, whereby an air force can occupy a country or a navy can occupy a country, is there? Haven't you got to have sufficient troops to occupy and to defeat the enemy on the ground?

Answer. I think that our own history will prove that. You will recall that after the battle of Manila Bay our Asiatic Fleet had to remain at anchor and wait for an army to arrive before operations could be initiated.

Question. And then in World War II in the Pacific, you had to have troops to take these islands, didn't you?

Answer. In the Pacific war we found that every operation called for a combination of land, sea and air forces to achieve victory.

Question. You were Chief of Staff to Admiral Nimitz during what period?

Answer. I was Admiral Nimitz' Deputy Chief of Staff from November 1943 until the war was finished.

Question. So that you were in on the planning?

Answer. Under Admiral Nimitz I was responsible for the planning of the Central Pacific campaign.

Question. That included all the island campaigns and the later campaign in Okinawa, and you would have been a part of the planning of the invasion of Japan if that had been consummated?

Answer. I worked very hard on the plans for the invasion of Japan.

Question. Did you contemplate in that invasion that we could do it with sea and air power alone?

Answer. No.

Question. Has it ever been recorded how big an army we thought we might need for that invasion, roughly?

Answer. It involved all the troops that General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz had been using, plus a redeployment of troops from the European theater.

Question. Approximately how many ground troops do you think that would have involved?

Answer. Over a million.

DID THE ATOM BOMB DEFEAT JAPAN?

Question. Would you say that the atom bomb dropped from the air won the final victory, or would you say that a serious weakening of Japan was accomplished by sea, land, and air, preceding that?

Answer. I think that the end of the Japanese war was brought about by the destruction of the Japanese fleet, destruction of sea communications—in which our submarines figured very importantly and also our air—the complete isolation of Japan so far as sea communications went, the damage that was done to Japan by air, and the threat of an invasion. After the fall of Saipan and the fall of Okinawa, it was certainly obvious that the tide of war was headed for the main Japanese islands.

Question. In other words, here was an island empire with lots of islands and you conquered the islands with ground troops, and forced them into a corner in their own homeland, and then sea power blockaded and starved them?

Answer. They were cut off by sea power—or rather by the action of ships and aircraft—aircraft figured very importantly in the destruction of Japanese shipping.

Question. Applying the same reasoning to Europe, we had there not an island enemy but an enemy with a large land mass like Germany, and we had to land and use, in the Normandy invasion, large numbers of ground troops, plus air, plus the sea blockades. That was the pattern of the last war. Now bearing in mind that pattern, would you say the situation has changed, in any particular, so far as Europe is concerned?

Answer. Well, it has changed in detail, but not in principle. In principle you still require the combination of land and sea and air action.

WHAT NAVY COULD DO TO EUROPE

Question. But an enemy which controls the whole land mass of Europe couldn't very well be blockaded as Japan was blockaded, could it?

Answer. Not if one power controlled the whole Eurasian land mass, no. On the other hand, there are certain coastal communications that are quite vulnerable to action from the sea.

Question. Even in the case of the largest power?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is the Mediterranean an important defense perimeter, from the Russian standpoint—is it a vulnerable point for them?

Answer. Russia is not in the Mediterranean now. The importance of the Mediterranean is that it is an avenue by which naval, air, and ground forces can be projected deep into the heart of the great land mass of Europe, Asia, and Africa. It is important because it offers a means of exerting our military power readily in any of the Mediterranean countries where we choose to exert it. It is also important as an essential line of east-west communications with the Middle East and because it covers the southern flank of the European peninsula.

Question. Isn't it being assumed pretty generally that the need for land armies has only to do with the march across the main continent, from Russia across to France? Wouldn't land armies also be able to deploy or operate from the Mediterranean countries?

Answer. The importance of being a very strong sea and air power is that we can take relatively small numbers of troops and we can deploy them in areas of our own choosing, where, in their relatively smaller numbers, they can be most effective. The selection of such area calls for a great deal of judgment. I think if you examine the history of the wars between France and England you will find that England as a sea power used at will small numbers of troops very effectively in many areas where they could be moved, landed and supported by sea, even though in the continent there was an overwhelmingly strong land power. The introduction of air has complicated the problem, but it hasn't changed the underlying principles.

Q. You spoke a moment ago of using the Mediterranean to project air, land, and sea power into two continents. Does that mean long-range Navy bombing?

Answer. No. I had in mind that because it is a sea area, you can move troops, including ground components of the air forces—these can be moved to the Mediterranean littoral, as well as to the Atlantic coast of Europe.

Question. Isn't there a good deal more emphasis being given today to the possibility of land operations being confined to the area of Germany and France with much less thought being given to the possibility of land operations coming up through what is called the underbelly of Europe?

Answer. I think that the possibility of fighting in Central Europe is more apparent. The history of these matters is that wars tend to spread and become global in character. I think it would be a mistake to assume that a war which started in one area would end in the same area. The Seven Years' War of the eighteenth century, for example, started between the British and French in the vicinity of what is now Pittsburgh. It spread to Canada and the West Indies and then pretty well around the world. There was fighting in Europe, on the West Coast of Africa, in India, and in the Philippines.

Question. In any planning of military operations for the security of this country and its allies, would you say that we've got to be thinking flexibly in terms of land armies as an essential part of our operations—is that the sum-up of your view?

Answer. Yes. The security of the United States requires that we have a good army and that our forces be so proportioned that we can operate a balanced force wherever it is required.

Question. By balanced force you mean a combined force, do you not?

Answer. I mean a force of all arms.

REGIONAL DEFENSE OF NORTH ATLANTIC

Question. Is it better to have a force in Europe while you hold Europe, or while you have friendly nations there, or to let Europe be overrun and then try to retake the area later?

Answer. It would be much better to defend Western Europe than to let it go and to have to recapture it—better for us and exceedingly much better for Western Europe.

Question. Well, from a strictly military point of view, given the defense of Europe and given the defense of the United States, is it your view that the two things are interrelated?

Answer. I think that they can definitely be combined into a problem called the defense of the North Atlantic region.

Question. And all our thinking is in terms of the North Atlantic region, up to now at least, rather than just the defense of the United States?

Answer. Certainly we have devoted a good deal of thought to the defense of the North Atlantic region because of a doubt that we could make the United States secure without making the whole region secure. Of course, we have a similar problem in the Pacific, but less acute, because of greater distances.

Question. Speaking of attack on the United States from other countries, would you say that the territory of the United States is definitely subject to attack by air and by sea by planes and guided missiles from submarines?

Answer. In theory, yes. But in practice there is the question of scale of attack.

Question. But definitely the military man conceives of the United States as being subject to attack by air—there is no question about that, is there?

Answer. The possibility of an attack on the United States by air is great enough now to necessitate the creation of an adequate air defense, and the prospect is that the exposure of the United States to air attack will increase as the performance of airplanes increases.

Question. So that while there is no threat to us from an army coming 3,000 miles, airplanes can easily come 3,000 miles; is that the essential difference between this and the situation we faced in World War II?

Answer. Yes.

DIFFICULTIES WITH ENEMY BASES

Question. If that's the case, is there any defense concept better than trying to get at the operating bases from which the enemy planes come?

Answer. Certainly we should keep those bases as far away from us as possible. Similarly, we should keep submarine bases as far away as possible. The most difficult times we had with submarines in the Atlantic in World War II were in the period when there were enemy submarines in the Bay of Biscay on the Atlantic coast of France. It is very necessary to keep enemy air bases and submarine bases as far away as possible.

In that connection, the air-defense problem, and the antisubmarine problem have certain points of similarity. The worst place to protect a ship is where the ship is. The worst place to protect a convoy is at the convoy. The worst place to protect a city from air attack is at the city. The best place is at the bases from which the airplane or submarine comes. The next best place is en route—the worst place is at the target.

Question. To get at those bases you've got to capture them or intercept at the bases?

Answer. We should prevent our enemies from getting bases nearer to us.

Question. In getting at the enemy's bases, then, you have to use sea power, air power, and possibly land power?

Answer. To accomplish the desired result calls for a combination of all three elements.

Question. In the Korean War, we use all three, but for a brief time there was an impression that we could use two, and the first few days we did use sea and air and then supplemented our action with land troops. Now, why was it not possible for sea and air to win the Korean War alone?

Answer. Air attack and naval gunfire alone will not drive determined soldiers out of an area. When they're properly dug in and properly dispersed, they can stay and fight. Certainly that was our experience in the Pacific war, where we poured into small islands terrific quantities of naval gunfire and terrific quantities of preliminary bombing, and yet when the assault troops hit the beach they always found important fighting to do.

All the way across the Pacific we demonstrated that naval gunfire and bombing and strafing can do great damage to troops that are dug in on shore, but still not destroy them completely.

ENOUGH TROOPS TO DO THE JOB

Question. I think in the popular argument it is agreed that there should be land fighting, but the argument rather turns on whether we as a nation can minimize participation in land fighting abroad. The argument is that Great Britain, with control of the seas and a few soldiers, dominated much of the world for a long time. An analogy is drawn that we can do the same. Is there a difference between our position and that of Britain?

Answer. No; I don't think there is, in principle. For instance, in the Napoleonic wars the British carried on a rather protracted campaign in Spain.

Question. Did they use many troops?

Answer. Yes.

Question. The theory is that Britain got along without a large army, and that we therefore can get along without a large army——

Answer. But Wellington had a large army under his command in the Battle of Waterloo.

Question. They weren't all English——

Answer. There were enough British troops at Waterloo both to inspire their allies to fight and to take their own part.

GROWING IMPORTANCE OF CARRIERS

Question. Is there any shift in emphasis in the Navy itself, for instance, away from battleships and toward carriers, as a result of the way things are going now?

Answer. I can answer that best with some statistics as to where we were in 1940 and where we are now. In 1940 we had in commission 15 battleships and 6 carriers of various size. The program we are now engaged in calls for building up to 27 carriers of various sizes and only 3 battleships.

Question. We are pulling battleships out of moth balls, apparently. Is there still a place for them in the fleet?

Answer. Yes; but they are used for rather specialized purposes now. It is now pretty generally accepted that the aircraft carrier is the ship of the line and the core of naval offensive power, which is the place that was held by the battleship in World War I but which passed to the aircraft carrier during World War II.

Question. General Collins has spoken several times about the possibility of developing atomic artillery. Is there any prospect that the Navy could use atomic artillery—turn the 16-inch guns into guns that will shoot atom shells?

Answer. There are very definite prospects of the Navy using atomic weapons for naval purposes.

Question. Are you speaking of missiles or conventional weapons?

Answer. Missiles.

Question. The Navy has planes now big enough to carry atomic bombs—the old-style atomic bombs—and it also has carriers that could handle those planes, doesn't it? So that in the event of war, the Navy as well as the Air Force would be able to deliver the atomic bombs within a certain range?

Answer. We will be able to deliver atomic bombs, if required to.

Question. So atomic energy is now diffused in all three services, in the use of weapons?

Answer. It definitely has become possible to develop tactical applications of atomic weapons. I think that in the future you will find all the services prepared to use those applications.

HOW NAVY WOULD USE A-WEAPONS

Question. What would tactical application be so far as the Navy is concerned?

Answer. Destruction of a submarine base might be an example.

Question. You could cover the landing of troops, too, tactically?

Answer. Yes.

Question. And you could use the power of the atom to run submarines or ships, couldn't you?

Answer. We're making good progress in that direction.

Question. It's pretty generally recognized that Russia since the war has been concentrating her naval effort in the development of a large fleet of submarines. What would you say about the progress that we have made with antisubmarine measures?

Answer. We have made great progress in our development of countermeasures against submarines; the equipment that we use, the weapons we use, are much better than they were. New equipment has been developed which we are putting into our destroyers. On the whole, our ability to cope with submarines is improving. On the other hand, there is always the other side of the shield, which is the rate at which the capabilities of the submarines develop.

Question. Are there new methods that have been developed, or is it a matter of getting the teamwork?

Answer. We've developed new equipment over the past 5 years. Also we have learned to use it.

Question. Last year, wasn't the whole fleet "sunk" in maneuvers by theoretical submarines in spite of the best equipment developed?

Answer. No. However, if a submariner didn't believe that submarines were capable of sinking a whole enemy fleet, he would not be as enthusiastic as he should be. On the other hand, if the people who operate the surface ships don't feel that they can accomplish their mission in spite of submarines, they're not as enthusiastic as they should be. It is a mistake to accept zeal and enthusiasm as completely factual.

PROGRESS IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Question. What would you say about the progress we're making in all three services in the field of invention in military science?

Answer. I think we've made great strides. We've had a quite well coordinated program. We have converted some of our development projects into hardware and into useful supplies of weapons, and others are still in the development stage. I consider that the money we have invested in research and development has been well spent, and we're better equipped as a result of it.

Question. Are we too gadget minded?

Answer. I think not. As far as I know, the responsible senior officers in the services are thoroughly aware of the ultimate importance of personnel, that gadgets do not replace personnel. I've recently been asked a great many times how long it takes to take a carrier out of "moth balls" and get it operating. The real answer to that is the length of time it takes to assemble the crew and to train the crew to operate the ship. Personnel is the governing consideration in making divisions and armies, in making ships and fleets, and also in making air squadrons.

Question. During World War I, when the country was frightened by the submarine menace, scientists and inventors went to work to try to find something to detect the submarine—detection was the great objective. Is it possible to describe some of the objectives today—is science seeking a way to intercept the plane that is coming to attack us?

Answer. The development both against aircraft and against submarines falls into two fields. One is the location and the other is the destruction.

IMPROVING THE PROXIMITY FUZE

Question. The proximity fuze, which was used widely in World War II, has often been discussed as one of the inventions that revolutionized World War II's operations. Would you say that the proximity fuze still has great value?

Answer. It's an essential device.

Question. Can it be said that it has been developed for greater usage—that there have been improvements made in it?

Answer. It has been improved.

Question. Do you think that guided-missile ships may replace the aircraft carrier as the main "ship of the line" within the next 5 or 10 years?

Answer. Probably not within the next 5 or 10 years. It may eventually, but that's getting pretty far into the realm of speculation. I think that the use of guided missiles in naval warfare will increase steadily.

Question. Can you visualize the type of warfare in which a guided missile could be useful if we had war, say, in the immediate future? What part would the guided missile play in the general strategy—helping to interdict, helping to reduce bases?

Answer. Guided missiles, of course, fall into a great many categories—for example, air defense missiles, missiles to be used from

one airplane against another, and longer-range missiles which in effect are long-range artillery. The time may come when long-range missiles of considerable size will begin to replace bombers.

Question. Is it possible that guided missiles are so far along in their development that the Navy will be unable to operate within a range of, say, 100 to 150 miles of enemy land bases on account of guided missiles—can they be made that accurate within the next few years?

Answer. No.

Question. Are they active enough to be a menace to navies—those missiles in the hands of the enemy?

Answer. Well, guided missiles are just another type of weapon that we will have to resist. The more they develop the more of a problem they will be, but I do not think they will be a controlling weapon at any time in the near future, insofar as the operations of ships are concerned.

TACTICAL ANSWERS TO ATOM BOMB

Question. How vulnerable would the fleet be to an atom-bomb attack in an amphibious landing such as the Normandy landing in the last war?

Answer. The enemy's possession of atomic weapons forces the necessity for a greater degree of dispersal.

Question. Would that dispersion have to be of such an extent that it might jeopardize the success of landings?

Answer. I think not. The tactics of amphibious operations have usually been able to respond to the character of the weapons that confronted them. I think that will continue. It is inevitable that tactics will conform to the situation and take into account the weapons that the enemy has.

Question. Won't it be necessary, if the enemy possesses guided-missile bases, to capture those bases by a combination of sea power, air power, and land power—to get at them if guided-missile bases are very extensive?

Answer. We had an example of that in World War II, when the existence of bases for V-1s and V-2s had a pronounced influence on the requirements for land operations on the Continent.

Question. In other words, air power was not able to reduce those, apparently?

Answer. It accomplished a lot but couldn't deliver 100-percent results. To get 100-percent results on the ground usually requires action on the ground.

Question. How soon will we get the big new carrier?

Answer. I would estimate that as a 3½-year job.

Question. In the meantime we will be dependent on World War II carriers, largely, won't we?

Answer. We will be dependent on World War II carriers, so the program of modernizing the World War II carriers is of primary importance.

Question. For this new carrier, can the keel of the United States be used?

Answer. Nothing from the United States is useful in the new carrier, except certain design features.

Question. Would you say that, in the interval that has elapsed, you have learned some new things that will make this a better carrier than the other would have been?

Answer. I think so.

Question. Has the idea of a flush deck been abandoned?

Answer. There is a great difference of opinion in the Navy about the desirability of a small island versus the desirability of a flush deck.

Question. Now that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have carried on in the postwar period for at least 5 years, can you say that the coordination or the joint planning has undergone great changes from what it was in World War II?

Answer. Yes, I think since World War II the work of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff has improved greatly. There are more and more officers who understand the problems of all the armed services. At the top level I think there is a greater understanding of the problems of the other services. I can assure you that even during the short period of time that I've been here there has been a steady improvement in the functioning of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff.

HOW JOINT COMMAND WORKS

Question. Would you say the Joint Chiefs of Staff function now to some extent as an operating agency?

Answer. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were never an operating agency in the accepted sense of the term. Our duties are laid down by law and have to do with military advice to the President and the National Security Council, with strategic direction of operating forces, preparation of plans, and the allocation of forces to the various field commanders.

Question. So that the joint operations today are theater-of-command operations, and the Joint Chiefs are concerned with strategic planning rather than operations?

Answer. Strategic planning and strategic direction.

Question. So that in the far eastern theater there exists at the moment the only joint operations we have?

Answer. The only joint operations in combat—but of course we have a series of unified commands. Admiral Radford has a very important one in the Pacific Command which, among other duties, has to support the Far East Command. We have a unified command in Germany, one in the Atlantic, a unified command in the Canal Zone, a unified command in Alaska, and several other unified commands under the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Question. And the designated commander, whether he be an admiral or general, is the representative of the Joint Chiefs?

Answer. He exercises command under the Joint Chiefs of Staff and commands elements of all three services.

Question. Is it regarded as important that Formosa be kept out of the hands of unfriendly nations?

Answer. I consider it important.

DEFENSE LINE IN FAR EAST

Question. Would you say that the defense line of this country extends to far-eastern waters, so far as the security of the United States is concerned?

Answer. I think the security of the United States requires that we be able to control the Pacific and prevent any action in the Pacific, by any unfriendly power, which would impair our security.

Question. Particularly from overseas territories that might be occupied by an enemy? In other words, the absence of an enemy fleet in the Pacific doesn't diminish your task, does it?

Answer. The Pacific Fleet has been kept pretty busy right in the Far East even though there has been very little hostile naval action.

Question. What about the impression that the Navy wouldn't have been able to accomplish the landings at Inchon or the operations on the east coast of Korea had there been present a hostile air force or a hostile navy?

Answer. We would have accomplished them, but with more difficulty than we actually experienced.

Question. Do you make that statement on the basis of any particular incident in World War II, where we had the hostile navy and the hostile air force present?

Answer. We had a hostile navy and hostile air forces all the way.

Question. At Okinawa?

Answer. At Okinawa, at Iwo Jima, in the Philippines, we had them both.

Question. But you don't consider that the presence of a hostile air force or a hostile navy necessarily prevents us from landing troops and carrying on land, sea, and air combination operations?

Answer. It makes it more difficult, but it certainly doesn't make it impossible.

Question. At what distance inland would you say that the Navy's operations have made land operations hazardous for the enemy in Korea?

Answer. All the way across the country. We've been bombing west coast ports from carriers in the Sea of Japan and we've bombed the east coast ports from carriers in the Yellow Sea.

Question. Well, I meant for land operations along the seacoast—how about bombardment of coastal points?

Answer. Well, right up to the limit of naval gunfire.

Question. You can protect and destroy coastal communications at least 15 miles inland and the carriers can destroy communications farther inland?

Answer. Yes, carrier aircraft have ranged all the way across Korea.

Question. But your naval gunfire has made it difficult for the enemy to keep the troops on the coasts of Korea and forced the fighting into the center?

Answer. It covers the whole coast.

Question. You've never had any question about blockading the northern area of Korea?

Answer. We blockaded it in June and it's been under blockade continuously.

Question. How far up do you go?

Answer. The whole coast is under blockade.

Question. Up to the Yalu River?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is there any Russian navy around Korean waters?

Answer. The blockade is a United Nations operation but there are no Russians participating in it.

Question. Is it possible that a lot of the recent gossip about the Army's not doing well in Korea might have been based on initial operations with raw troops?

Answer. At the beginning of the fighting in Korea we had occupation divisions at half strength and had to send them into action. They're still in there. They're still fighting and they seem to be doing pretty well. Their morale and conduct and training and discipline have improved steadily.

I believe that, when adequately trained, our soldiers are superior to any soldiers anywhere. However, they cannot be made ready without training. The United States Army is entitled to the full support and full confidence of the country for which it fights. The morale of an army normally reflects the morale of the country.

OPTIMISM OVER KOREA

Question. How do you feel about the long-range view of the Korean operations—in a tactical or a strategic sense?

Answer. Our Army is giving a good account of itself and will continue to give a better account of itself, and I think the Chinese are being punished terribly. Whatever the next move the Chinese make, I think it will be the result of their feeling that this is a bad show, that they've got to do something different, do something to change the unhappy situation they find themselves in.

Question. Has the napalm bomb been a very important factor in our advance, recently?

Answer. It's been a very effective weapon in Korea.

Question. Does the Navy use it, too, or only the Army Air Force?

Answer. The Navy and Marine Corps used it very extensively in World War II, and more recently in Korea.

Question. With respect to Korea, would you say as a military man that Korea is of vital importance to Russia and Communist China, the Communist world—that it is important to them strategically to hold Korea?

Answer. I don't think that Korea in the hands of only the Koreans is very much of a threat to the Russians or the Chinese. I don't think Korea in the hands of only the Koreans would be much of a threat against Japan or against ourselves.

Question. But, conversely, the possession and occupation of Korea by a power unfriendly to us would be a menace to us?

Answer. Occupation of Korea by forces unfriendly to Japan would be a menace to Japan or to anyone charged with the defense of Japan.

EFFECTIVENESS OF BLOCKADE

Question. Hase there been any naval interdiction of enemy supply lines to Korea?

Answer. A naval blockade of Korea was established in June. It has been almost completely effective and has been respected not only by the nations who have been fighting in Korea, but also by the Russians. It's a United Nations blockade, and as far as I know it has been respected by all the members of the United Nations.

Question. Admiral, we have talked about land forces, air forces, and sea forces. There is one force often described as a mobile force. Do you see in the future picture of our strategy a more important place for such a mobile force—the Marine Corps—than it has had before?

Answer. It is pretty generally believed that the Marines are an indispensable part of the naval service. I certainly believe, in connection with my own responsibilities, that we must have a strong fleet marine force in each fleet. It must include not only its ground elements but also its own air elements. I think the effectiveness of such force has been demonstrated once more in Korea, as it has many times before in the existence of the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps is a necessary part of the naval service.

Question. The President has said we have now in the armed services about 2,500,000 men, and the goal is 3,500,000. What is the Navy's share in that figure?

Answer. The present program involves something over 800,000 officers and men in the Navy and around 200,000 officers and men in the Marine Corps.

Question. Can you tell us, Admiral, very briefly, what the Navy's Reserve policy is now?

Answer. Our program is to call only those we need and to try to let them know well in advance when they are to be called up. However, our program is only as good as the assumption on which it is based. It is based on carrying out the planned program of expansion and not having an increased emergency during that time.

Voluntary Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Pasadena Property Owners Committee, a nonprofit California corporation, is endeavoring to create a plan of selfcontrol of rents through the cooperation of business and civic groups, tenants, and property owners. The following I present for the RECORD: a letter addressed to me by Robert H. Aarons, general counsel; a typical letter soliciting the cooperation of a chamber of commerce; and also a letter addressed by the president of the Property Owners Committee to the President of the United States. In this connection I present also the following newspaper items referring to this subject.

PASADENA PROPERTY
OWNERS COMMITTEE,
Pasadena, Calif, January 29, 1951.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Twentieth District, California,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. HINSHAW: On January 4, 1951, a copy of letter addressed to the President of the United States, together with copies of news items appearing in the Los Angeles, Pasadena, and surrounding areas press, were sent you. There was also copies of the enclosures sent to Allen Valentine, economics stabilizer, and other Government officials in charge of economic controls. No replies to these letters have been received.

There is enclosed herewith a copy of letter sent to 170 chambers of commerce in the Los Angeles defense area. The replies have been gratifying, and there is manifested everywhere a spirit of cooperation.

There is going forward an invitation to all of the realty boards in the Los Angeles defense area to join in the participation of this program.

Most of the people whom we have contacted on the subject appear to be pleased with the program, and are happy to aid in an endeavor that it may be successful in avoiding distasteful Government controls. It also appears that their experience with Government controls have left them in no mood for its reimposition. However, as above stated, the President and his appointees have not shown any interest in the matter, and by such lack of response, it is indicated that they have no confidence in the people.

It is our opinion here that Congress should be informed of our efforts, and citizens and groups throughout the country likewise informed, and perhaps by such publicity something worth while can be accomplished.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT H. AARONS.

THE PASADENA PROPERTY
OWNERS' COMMITTEE,
Pasadena, Calif., January 5, 1951.

SIERRA MADRE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

GENTLEMEN: We enlist your cooperation and support in connection with our endeavor to carry out a plan for self-control and self-discipline on the part of residential income property owners of housing accommodations which have been released from rent control since April 19, 1949.

We are confident that our purpose can be accomplished if the plan is properly publicized and cooperation from substantial and reputable organizations of your type is obtained. We believe that your organization stands for the preservation of the way of life, which has made our country the inherently wonderful nation that it is. These are not mere words and to many of us, as it must be to you, they have a profound meaning.

With more and more economic controls followed by regimentation, the free enterprise system, must necessarily be stifled. It is therefore highly advisable to curb and prevent such inequities unless the country is in such actual danger, that the imposition of all such controls is unavoidable and our war effort or preparedness program would be endangered or placed in jeopardy. However, lest there be any misunderstanding, we emphasize that we are for all proper methods so that patriotic duty in all respects may be discharged.

We have no politics to play and have not the slightest or most remote motive in that direction, therefore let us find out if we cannot employ methods of public meetings and the like to bring about fair and harmonious dealings with landlords and tenants. However, we don't concede that thus far there has been anything unfair. But, the precipitant action of some few irate landlords may furnish the persons seeking rent controls for political purposes, a claimed cause for reimposition of such rent controls.

With the above end in view, will you therefore, join in our program? You are hereby requested to nominate either yourself or some other person of your organization and one or two public-spirited income property owners, preferably in your vicinity to attend a meeting of many such persons to map out and execute plans to attain the aims above described. May we hear from you with your nominations at the earliest possible moment.

Thanking you for your cooperation, we are,

Yours truly,

PASADENA PROPERTY OWNERS' COMMITTEE,
WILLIAM CHRISTEN, *President.*

DECEMBER 27, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Enclosed please find some news items in reference to the efforts being made by owners of residential rental property, in southern California, to prevent unreasonable rent increases.

We believe that cases of undue rent hikes are in the small minority. However, we do know that it is the example of the few unwise landlords, that may make out a case for new rent control. We would like for you to believe that our effort to moderate the actions of those few unreasonable landlords is not only for the purpose of alleviating the situation and making new rent control unnecessary, but also, it stems from a patriotic duty and feeling so that the war effort would not be impeded. We firmly believe that given a chance, the vast majority of Americans, yes, even landlords, are good citizens and sincerely desire to aid the war effort in every way by the exercise of self-restraint on the part of such landlords, and the desired ends could be accomplished without the necessity of rent controls.

This is particularly so, since so many of the owners of property are small people, and in the light of the past, they really would appreciate an opportunity of proving their loyalty to their country and practice of justice to their fellow man.

We know that you are a busy and harrassed man, and we know that you have suggested rent control to the Congress, but we feel that inherently you do have faith in the millions of Americans who happened to have placed their life savings and other small meager funds in investments in residential income property.

Will you help us give our plan a fair trial?

Respectively yours,

WILLIAM CHRISTEN,
President.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News of December 21, 1950]

PROPERTY OWNERS PLAN SELF-CONTROL RENT BOARD

A resolution authorizing the formation of a rent control board to help stabilize economy and aid the war effort was adopted by the board of directors of the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee at a meeting last night.

The board will be formed with the purpose of creating a plan of self-control of rents and will be composed of a group of rental property owners, representatives of

business and civil groups, and tenants, the resolution said.

TO ADOPT SCHEDULES

Under the plan, the board will set up schedules and rules for the conduct of the board and of owners of residential property in connection with rents and rental conditions.

In the resolution, owners of rental units were urged to exercise self-restraint in fixing rents and to cooperate with the Property owners' Committee on plans to prevent any unreasonable increases in rents.

Through such cooperation, landlords not only will be cooperating with the Government's request for voluntary price freezes but also will eliminate the need of any reimposition of rent controls during future emergencies, Robert H. Aarons, Pasadena attorney, told the committee directors at the meeting.

SUPPORT URGED

Directors expressed the hope that other areas throughout the Nation which have campaigned successfully for rent decontrol would take similar steps in forming self-control organizations.

The present rent-control law, which expires December 31, recently was extended by the Government for 90 days and applies to all areas which did not take the initiative to decontrol rents before the December 31 expiration date.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Independent of December 22, 1950]

PROPERTY OWNERS URGE VOLUNTARY RENTAL FREEZE

Members of the board of directors of the Pasadena Property Owners Committee yesterday adopted a resolution to voluntarily stabilize rents and urged other organizations throughout the country to follow suit to forestall the return of rent controls.

The resolution suggests that landlords exercise restraint in fixing rents so that the Economic Stabilization Authority in Washington will include rent control in its contemplated voluntary price-wage freeze plan.

Creation of a board to draw up a self-control rental plan was called for in the resolution which ordered inclusion of representatives of business, tenants, and property owners on the board.

At the directors meeting, Attorney Robert Aarons discussed Effects and Advantages and a Voluntary Price-Wage Freeze.

He said that if landlords could restrain themselves from making abnormal increases in rents, possibly there need not be recontrol of previously decontrolled areas.

The resolutions adopted by the board reads:

"Whereas the existence of a national emergency has been declared by the President of the United States under congressional authority given last spring; and whereas the Government, through the agencies set up by the President, have requested the people of the country to set up a self-controlled and voluntary system to the end that inflation be halted and that prices be stabilized so that the war effort would be aided; and whereas controls and regulations are generally abhorent and obnoxious to the American people, except only in the case of real necessity; and whereas the residential income property owners, as well as other real estate owners, desire that there be stability in the American economy and desire to aid the war effort, and desire further to cooperate and heed the request of the Government with the end that there be no reimposition of rent controls; and whereas heretofore, the unexplained cases of a few landlords who sought large increases have been unjustly used for the imposition of controls on the large majority of property owners who have been fair in their dealings, and such action has been found to be intolerable: Be it

"*Resolved as follows:* That the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee pledges its support of a plan for the stabilization of the economy of the Nation on a fair and equitable basis; and to that end, be it further

"*Resolved,* That a voluntary board be, and is hereby, established for creation of a plan for self-control of rents, and rental and kindred conditions for dwellings commensurate with price index and wages: be it further

"*Resolved,* That the board shall be composed of rental property owners, representatives of business, tenants, and public-spirited persons: be it further

"*Resolved,* That the board set up schedules and rules for the conduct of the board and conduct of owners of residential property in connection with rents and rental conditions. Be it further

"*Resolved,* That owners of rental units, associations of owners of property or individual owners, be requested and admonished to adhere to the suggestions contained in the foregoing and to exercise self-restraint in the fixation of rents and by so doing and joining, with representatives of the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee or its representatives, to work out and follow through on plans in order to prevent any unreasonable increases in rents, and to hold the line on all prices and living cost; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the boards which may be set-up in cities throughout the Nation will, by fair and impartial and patriotic conduct, obviate any alleged reasons which may be interposed for the reimposition of controls."

Resolution adopted December 19, 1950, Pasadena, Calif.

PASADENA PROPERTY OWNERS' COMMITTEE.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of December 23, 1950]

LANDLORDS OFFER VOLUNTARY CONTROL—PASADENA PROPERTY OWNERS SUGGEST PLAN TO SETTLE RENTAL PROBLEM

Now comes the suggestion of a voluntary rent control set-up by landlords. The idea originated and is being promoted by the Pasadena Property Owners' Committee. The committee made its suggestion in the form of a resolution which it adopted at a meeting Thursday night.

Directors of the Pasadena group called upon similar organizations throughout the Nation to follow their plan as a means of heading off possible new control of rents and "for the stabilization of the Nation's economy."

They proposed a Federal board composed of representatives of business, property owners and tenants to draw up a self-control rent plan.

COPY TO TRUMAN

Copies of the Pasadena committee's resolution were sent to President Truman, Congressmen, Price Administrator Allen S. Valentine, and Housing Expediter Tighe Woods.

Meanwhile, decontrol of rents in Los Angeles still failed to create the big splash many expected.

Typical landlord operation was that of the owner of a building containing furnished apartments and which is located near the Ambassador.

The owner of the apartments reported that 60 percent of his tenants will get no rent raise. The other 40 percent will be raised from 5 percent to 25 percent, the average being about 15 percent. These increases are not for eviction purposes, the owner said, but to bring those units in line with the other 60 percent.

For the moment, the increases will range from $2 to $13.50 a month.

ONLY TWO DISSATISFIED

The landlord reported that, of his 60 tenants, only 2 have signified a tentative desire to move. So he hung out the vacancy sign. And, although price of the apartments was not indicated, he had no takers.

Patrick J. O'Donovan, secretary-manager of the Apartment Association of Los Angeles County, reported yesterday that a preliminary survey of 7,500 apartments in Los Angeles revealed that the over-all rent increase after ceilings were lifted here has averaged 11½ percent.

Meanwhile, the Apartment, Hotel, and Motel Association of California called for investigations by the county and Federal grand juries of reports that certain persons were advising tenants to disregard rent increase and eviction notices.

Too Much Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in Barrons on February 19, 1951. The writer of this article points out that our economic system is being expanded way out of proportion and this has been done because of practices initiated by Leon Keyserling, the President's No. 1 economic adviser. Mr. Truman is leading this country to economic disaster. I am including the article in question:

TOO MUCH EXPANSION—IS THE UNITED STATES BUYING MR. KEYSERLING IN UNIFORM?

The latest plan to come out of Washington, and certainly the most important for United States business, is what for want of a better name, but at the risk of some injustice, may be called the Charles E. Wilson plan for the expansion of the American economy.

The essence of this plan, as often reported in the press, is that by making capital expenditures today at the expense of the consumer, the United States by the end of 1952 can achieve a new plateau of prosperity. On that plateau it can afford military expenditures of $50,000,000,000 (as against $20,000,000,000 today) and at the same time restore the lush civilian economy of mid-1950.

So stated, the plan is extremely enticing, yielding the American people some definite goals and providing the administration with what the London Economist in a happy turn of phrase once called the Carrot and the Stick. Today, the stick of controls, exhortation to sacrifice, and appeals to patriotism But ahead, the carrot, the glistening goal of heavy tanks rolling off, or capable of being rolled off, the production line at the new tank arsenal building in North Carolina, as well as Dynaflow Buicks and Cadillacs coming off the production lines of Detroit.

Nevertheless, despite its enticement, and its boldness, we believe that this plan deserves the utmost scrutiny. That scrutiny should begin with asking just how much investment the administration contemplates this year and next in order to make the miracle of late 1952 possible. It may be conceded that the military do need a new tank arsenal, since 50-ton tanks cannot be made with present facilities. The same may well be true of new weapons of various kinds.

But this is by no means the only kind of expansion contemplated. Through the issue of over $2,000,000,000 worth of 5-year depreciation certificates, the production authorities are speeding a big increase in steel and aluminum capacities as well as an increase in copper output, the theory being that these raw material bottlenecks must be

broken. Moreover, and this is the critical point, the expansion of these so-called basic industries is apparently going hand in hand with other types of capital expenditures.

There is a special program for petroleum, freight cars, locomotives, merchant ships, and farm machinery to mention but a few. As the Wilson plan is working out (whatever its theory), one type of capital growth is not displacing another, but rather there is already an over-all upsurge in private plant and equipment expenditures. In 1951 these may well reach an all-time peak of over $25,000,000,000. While there will be a reduction in housing, a vast investment boom is in the making.

Once this point is grasped, the plan to hoist America by its bootstraps to a new production plateau looks a lot less attractive. Its immediate cost is a tremendous increase in inflationary pressures. It is a truism to say that it takes steel to make steel, so that each ton of new capacity built temporarily increases the steel shortage. But it is also true that where total investment pushes ahead of real savings the result is an upward price pressure on the whole system. Since the Korean War began inventories have leaped up by $7,000,000,000, financed not by savings but largely by bank credit, e. g., new money. Now plant expansion is taking the place of this inventory spree.

The immediately inflationary implications of overinvestment are, of course, recognized by the planners. Hence the need today for price controls which are, however, to drop off in the benign year of 1953. But will they? And with what result? Politically, controls once invoked are difficult to get rid of (witness rents). Moreover, as the American postwar experience shows, price controls, if effective at all, do not eliminate inflationary pressures; they simply bury them. During World War II the Government created a vast amount of new money through deficit spending just as now new money is being created by overinvestment. In the end this new money, as it always must, burst the bounds of controls and the American price level openly moved up to accommodate it. Such is bound to happen in 1953 when and as controls are taken off, so that the promise of avoiding inflation through increased production is really a phony one.

This suggests one further comment on the so-called Wilson plan. By a process of legerdemain and juggling with inflated gross national product figures it is always possible to prove that by doing this or that, total American output can be vastly increased. That perpetual optimist, Mr. Leon Keyserling, is forever citing wartime statistics to this end. Alas, for Mr. Keyserling. Debunked for inflation, and the deterioration of the dollar, the Department of Commerce has shown that between 1941 and 1949, for instance, gross production in real terms moved up very slowly by only 2 to 3 percent per year—its normal increase over the decades. Washington planners, according to our calculations, are counting on a substantially bigger increase between now and 1953. We doubt if they will get it, especially as much of the new plant they are bringing into production is essentially high cost and hence inefficient.

To sum up, the Wilson plan, as it is unfolding, is not only inflationary now, but its longer term premises are at best dubious. This is not to say that Mr. Wilson's heroic efforts to emphasize production are misplaced. It is to say that his press agents may be doing him a bad turn by holding out promises that cannot be honored. The immediate task is not to push the country into a general investment splurge, but to expand plant where it clearly must be expanded, and for the rest, put on the dampers. It is not to make business borrowing easy, but to make it hard. Above all, it is to keep our eyes fixed on the present rather than on a gilded future. The United States, in this year of decision in Asia and Europe, needs arms now, not 2 years from now. For this the people will make real sacrifices. What they will not sacrifice for, and should not be asked to sacrifice for, is a newfangled Keyserling plan which is no less suspect because it happens to have put on a military uniform.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by William Henry Chamberlin, of Cambridge, Mass., as one of a series entitled "Justice for Poland" over WSPR in Springfield, Mass. These programs are under the sponsorship of the Polish American Congress, western Massachusetts branch.

Mr. Chamberlin was for 18 years foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor. He is editorial writer of the Wall Street Journal and a contributing editor of the New Leader. He has been the author of eight books, including European Cockpit and Russian Enigma.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

There is a relentless unbroken line of connection between the appeasement of Stalin, which was a cardinal policy of the Roosevelt administration, and the fact that American soldiers are dying today in the snow-struck fields of Korea.

The most glaring example of this appeasement was Anglo-American acquiescence in the destruction of Poland's independence and territorial integrity at the Tehran and Yalta Conferences in 1945 and in the many intermediate diplomatic steps which made Tehran and Yalta possible. Now, as the eleventh anniversary of the beginning of World War II approaches, we should remember that the global conflict started with the German-Russian invasion of Poland.

One wonders what would have happened if the British Government, when it offered its guaranty against aggression to Poland in the spring of 1939 had added this warning:

"You must understand that this guaranty is valid only against Germany. If the Soviet Government proposes to take almost half of your territory and to impose a Communist-dominated government on what is left of Poland you cannot count on our help. On the contrary, we will make no serious effort to prevent the Soviet Government from accomplishing these designs and will even support its case against yours."

One may also wonder as to how the Yugoslav Government of 1941, pushed and prodded by the Roosevelt administration into entering an unequal struggle against Germany, would have reacted if some candid and farsighted American diplomat had said:

"Your country will experience all the sufferings of foreign occupation. More than that, there will be a savage civil war. In this war the Moscow-trained Communist, Josip Broz Tito, will win the support of America and Great Britain. You and other Yugoslav non-Communist patriots will be lucky if you save your lives in exile or in obscurity at home."

And it would be interesting to know how the American people would have felt if some correct prophet would have said:

"Our policy of inflexible support for Chiang Kai-shek's regime in China will almost certainly lead to war with Japan. This war will be prosecuted to the ruin of Japan and its destruction as a great power. But we will not worry about Soviet and Communist aggression against China. In fact, we will bribe Stalin, at China's expense, to join in our crusade against Japan. As late as 1945 high State Department officials will be giving Communist sympathizers access to confidential information. The upshot of all this will be that China will fall under the domination of Communists, disciples of Moscow, who will show the bitterest hostility to this country."

Such things were not said by people in positions of influence in the years of decision about America's entrance into the war. But they are a faithful preview of what has happened, of what a reasonably intelligent student of foreign affairs might have expected to happen.

The betrayal of Poland was the greatest and most flagrant of the three, because the Second World War began ostensibly over the issue of Poland's independence and territorial integrity.

The Soviet Government, in fullest agreement and complicity with the Nazi dictatorship, set out to blot Poland forever from the map of Europe. The record on this point is unmistakably clear. The Soviet-German so-called nonaggression pact of August 1939 was really a pact of mutual aggression against Poland. Its secret clauses, providing for a partition of Poland and for the inclusion of the Baltic Republics in the Soviet share of the spoils, are now well known.

Molotov made the Soviet attitude plain when he declared at a session of the Soviet parliament on October 31, 1939: "Two swift blows to Poland, one from the German Army, the other from the Red army, and nothing remained of the ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."

Annexing and incorporating into the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics almost half of Poland's territory, inhabited by about one-third of the Polish population, the Soviet Government tried to insure its position by the usual brutal totalitarian methods. About a million and a quarter people were deported to the Soviet Union, the majority being sent to slave-labor camps. When the Polish Government was able to investigate what had happened to these deportees, during the period of Soviet-Polish rapproachement which followed Hitler's invasion of Russia, it reached the conclusion that about 300,000 human beings had perished of hunger and maltreatment.

Especially sinister was the mysterious disappearance of some 10,000 Polish officer war prisoners. Letters from these men stopped abruptly in the spring of 1940. For almost 2 years Polish diplomatic representatives in Russia, furnished with detailed lists of names, sought vainly for information about what had become of these prisoners.

The case was repeatedly taken up with the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and was brought to the attention of Stalin himself. This matter came to a head when the German radio announced that thousands of bodies of Polish officers had been discovered in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, in western Russia. The Polish request that the matter be investigated by the International Red Cross was seized on by the Soviet Government as an excuse for breaking off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government. The virtual certainty that the Soviet authorities were responsible for this massacre of war prisoners was confirmed when the International Tribunal at Nuremberg, certainly not lenient in its attitude toward the accused German war criminals,

did not find Germans guilty of this atrocity. These points of circumstantial evidence about the responsibility for the Katyn massacre would seem to be decisive. First, all letters from the imprisoned officers to their families ceased not in 1941 when the Germans invaded Russia but in the spring of 1940. Second, never, until the bodies were discovered, did the Soviet authorities place the responsibility on the Germans by saying the prison camp had been abandoned. Third, neither the Soviet Government nor the Communist-dominated regime in Poland after the war made any attempt to investigate the details of the Katyn Massacre. Fourth, it is unthinkable that thousands of Polish officers would have waited passively to be captured by the Germans if the camp had been abandoned. In this case there certainly would have been some survivors. The completeness of the extermination suggests that there was no confusion and no opportunity for any of the victims to escape. With characteristic cynicism the Soviet Government used the discovery of its own crime as an excuse for breaking off relations with the generally recognized Polish Government-in-exile in London. This was in the spring of 1943. The Kremlin stepped up its pursuit of its two main objectives in Poland. The first was to retain almost all the Polish territory which had been acquired as a result of Stalin's deal with Hitler. The second was to prepare for the new Poland, mutilated in the East, artificially enlarged in the West, a made-in-Moscow government.

Both objectives were achieved with the acquiescence or, at most, the very weak opposition of Washington and London. When Anthony Eden, as British Foreign Minister, went to Moscow in December 1941, he found Stalin inclined to demand the recognition of the annexation of eastern Poland as the price of signing an Anglo-Soviet treaty alliance. A firmly negative attitude on the part of the American State Department blocked acceptance of this demand at that time.

But the American attitude weakened, curiously enough, as the American military position grew stronger. Less is known about the Tehran Conference, held at the end of November 1943, than about Yalta. But the comment of a Polish diplomat of long experience in the United States holds true: "Our territorial integrity was sacrificed at Tehran, our national independence at Yalta."

Certainly Churchill launched a vigorous campaign, in parliamentary speeches and in private communications to the Polish Government-in-exile, upholding Stalin's claim to the so-called Curzon Line frontier. The factually absurd argument was used that Russia had twice been invaded by Germany through Poland and was therefore entitled to security. This overlooked the historical truth that at the time of the First World War most of Poland was part of the Russian Empire, while at the time of the Second World War, Poland's territory had been partitioned between Stalin and Hitler. In neither case was Poland in the slightest degree a partner in the German invasion of Russia.

The Yalta Conference, held in February 1945, placed the final seal on the betrayal of Poland. No representative of Poland was present at this meeting. The Polish Government-in-exile, the successor of the regime with which Great Britain had concluded a treaty of alliance, was treated as nonexistent.

Stalin's territorial demands were accepted after one or two faint and unavailing pleas from Roosevelt and Churchill that the city of Lwow, culturally and ethnically Polish, and the oil wells of East Galicia should be left to Poland. The face-saving verbal assurances about free unfettered elections and about reorganization of the Communist-dominated puppet government which entered Poland in the baggage trains of the Red army were proved empty frauds by the subsequent course of events, which led to the steady clamping down of a routine Communist dictatorship in Poland.

Apologists for the policy of appeasing Stalin which reached its climax at Yalta adopt two lines of argument. Some contend, like the late Edward Stettinius, that Yalta was really a great victory for the West because Stalin made a number of promises which he broke almost before the ink on the Yalta documents was dry. This is about as convincing as suggesting that a man achieved a great financial triumph by accepting a large sum of worthless checks.

There is also the argument that America and Britain needed Soviet military aid and could not effectively restrain Stalin's moves in Eastern Europe. This line of reasoning, however, overlooks the fact that the Soviet Union was more dependent for its own security on maintaining the coalition than was the United States. There was certainly no valid moral or political reason why the United States and Great Britain should have actively cooperated in the territorial mutilation of Poland and in recognizing a government that was a complete negation of the Atlantic Charter principles and violently hostile to the West.

Today's headlines from Korea furnish eloquent, decisive proof that the wartime appeasement of Stalin was a practical failure as well as a confession of moral bankruptcy. Let us now repudiate the sordid deal at Yalta. Any validity this disgraceful agreement may have ever possessed has been lost because the Soviet Government systematically violated all the engagements which it undertook at Yalta. Lets come out with all the weight of the official authority with the whole terrible truth about Katyn. Only by such action can we show that we turned our backs once for all on the policy of appeasement which has borne such bitter fruits for our dead and wounded in Korea.

Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an advance editorial which appears in the March issue of the International Chemical Worker entitled "Wage Controls Now Are a Product of Stupidity and Greed," written by Mr. H. A. Bradley, president of the International Chemical Workers Union:

WAGE CONTROLS NOW ARE A PRODUCT OF STUPIDITY AND GREED
(By H. A. Bradley)

The antics of big business have ceased to be funny as far as their attempts to dictate the wage policies of this Nation are concerned. We have waited a long time for a proper and fair wage control order. As this is written, they are still trying to force labor to accept a few crumbs while industry gets the loaf.

The information at press time is that an order will be approved allowing 10 percent wage increases over January 1, 1950 and that escalator clauses and pension plans, negotiated prior to June 1, 1950, will be permitted to stand but any such plans negotiated since June 1 would be taken into account in the 10 percent formula. If anyone on the present board, or within the administration, has the idea that such a formula is conducive to industrial peace, he should have a psychiatrist test his mental capacity.

In the period between January and June of 1950 there was no spectacular rise in the cost of living or in wages. When the Korean situation broke in June, however, almost every item of food began to rise in cost by leaps and bounds. This phase was followed by unreasonable and unnecessary price increases in almost every other item. No economist in the world can truthfully claim that labor costs had anything to do with these rising prices because labor did not try to get any unusual wage increases until it was actually faced with the inflationary rise in the cost of living. The formula, as it is now being discussed, can only penalize those workers who renewed their contracts in the normal course of events, and in the normal manner, prior to June 1, 1950. It would also increase inequities throughout all industries that would, beyond question of a doubt, create industrial strife such as this country has never known.

There has been entirely too much pointing of the finger at the wage earner. The cost of living must be controlled before any fair wage formula can be effective. This means that someone is going to have to have the courage to talk to, and to talk about, the farmer, the wholesaler, and people in like positions over whom there is no control whatsoever at the present time. Wage controls have no value whatever if they are unworkable, unfair, and not conducive to industrial peace. For those gentlemen in Congress who frame our laws, the members of the various boards who have the responsibility of formulating orders and those of the executive branch of Government who have the authority to sign orders affecting the welfare of the wage earner, I recommend that they do not lose sight of the fact that a wage restriction imposed upon a wage earner is paid by the wage earner himself and that the wage ceiling or so-called parity prices given to the farmer is paid by the taxpayers which includes all wage earners. I recommend that these people do not overlook the fact that almost every wage earner has to pay in hard cash for everything he uses and every necessity of life, even to the most fundamental things. I remind them that the wage earner must buy even the water and the paper for his necessary toilet while the Lord above supplies the water to the farmer and Sear, Roebuck still furnishes the paper.

If these gentlemen in authority insist on imposing unworkable and unfair restrictions upon the wage earner, it will be they, and they alone, who must shoulder the responsibility for any failure in our industrial plans or our stabilization effort, both of which are so vital at the present time. Stupidity in these times is a luxury and not a necessity.

Address of Charles H. Silver at Beth Israel Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address by Charles H. Silver, president of the Beth Israel Hospital in New York City, delivered by him at the graduation exercises of the nursing

school of the hospital on February 28, 1951:

As president of Beth Israel Hospital one of my very pleasant privileges is to attend the annual graduation exercises of our school of nursing. It is an experience that I have enjoyed for many years, yet each time I come away stimulated and inspired by what I have seen and heard. For it seems to me that when these young women in white are now ready to take their place as trained experts in the world of medicine, in a sphere where tender care, sympathy, and understanding play such a great part, we are witnessing a phase of human existence that is indeed very noble and beautiful.

These young women are the ambassadors of good will of the hospital; they are constantly at the side of the patients, they are with them at all times and they reflect the relationship between the hospital and those who have come to it for solace and healing.

They must be cheerful without being patronizing, stern without being too forceful, sympathetic without being maudlin, and reassuring without being deceitful. That is a very difficult job, my friends, and these young women who have finished their training at the nursing school of Beth Israel have all these qualities, I am sure, for they have been trained under the direction of one of the ablest women in the nursing profession.

I am referring to Miss Clare M. Casey, the head of our nursing school, whose abilities are recognized not only among those in her own profession but by medical men and hospital administrators. Those who work with her have the highest respect and admiration for her as a nurse and as a human being. She is capably assisted by her two aids, Miss Rose Muscatine and Miss Gladys Scott, and they make a very effective team under whose guidance the nursing affairs of Beth Israel are being carried on. I am sure I reflect the feeling of my associates on the board of trustees when I say we are all very proud of them.

I want to take this occasion also to say a word about our executive director, Dr. Maxwell S. Frank, with whom I have had occasion to work very closely. He is recognized as an able hospital administrator and I am sure that I reflect the sentiments of his staff, the members of the medical staff, and our board of trustees when I say that he has rendered highly skillful service to Beth Israel.

Our graduation exercises this year have an unusual significance. For we are honored by the presence of the chief executive of our great city, Mayor Impellitteri, who has shown such a deep interest in the hospital activities of New York City.

Mayor Impellitteri understands hospital problems. I have heard him discuss them in public and it is gratifying to us as hospital workers to know that we can count on him for encouragement in carrying out broad hospital programs so that the people of our city may be served more efficiently than ever.

And speaking of hospital programs, I am sure, Mr. Mayor, that you are familiar with our own expansion plans. We have acquired the adjacent property to our present structure; the plans for new buildings have been approved by the building department but we still face the problem of demolishing some of the buildings which are occupied because the tenants have been unable to find other quarters. We are, of course, reluctant to do anything that would cause them inconvenience or hardship.

But we hope, Mr. Mayor, to begin some of the work this spring. We plan to break ground on the plot immediately adjoining the hospital upon which will be erected a structure to handle out-patients.

The pressure of the present facilities of the out-patient department is so great that it is essential that additional quarters be constructed inasmuch as this department handles ambulatory cases. The hospital will be in a position to take care of a greater number of patients. I say this with a full understanding by my associates and myself of the imperative need to carry on this program to a successful conclusion. We serve one of the most thickly populated sections of our city.

I think it is a typically American community for here you can find more than a dozen nationalities living in harmony and friendship side by side and it is this spirit that makes our country so great. As mayor of the city of New York, Mayor Impellitteri presides over the lives and health and welfare of 8,000,000 men and women and children. He holds a public office which is only second in importance to that of the President of the United States. May I express the fervent hope that he will have the vigor and health to carry on for we now know that he is doing a mighty good job.

We have been reading and hearing about the plans for civil defense which the mayor has inaugurated. Not a single loyal American will fail to cooperate with those who are carrying out the mayor's plans, but there is also need for hard practical work so that the civil-defense organizations of ours will stand on a solid foundation. The stakes are too high to permit mistakes. We must be sure of our ground.

In this defense set-up of New York the hospitals must of necessity play a very vital part. Beth Israel has already answered the call and under the direction of the hospital administrators we are working on civil-defense plans that will harmonize with those that are being developed by the city.

And while I stand here, Mr. Mayor, to greet you at our nurses' graduation, I want to pledge to you and your entire administration the full and unstinted cooperation of Beth Israel Hospital in solidifying the civil-defense program. I want to pledge to you the willingness, capacity and experience not only of the administrative staff but of the doctors, the nurses, technicians, and general hospital workers.

All of us at Beth Israel hospital will follow through and we stand alert and ready to give the best in us

May I close by saying how happy I am as president of Beth Israel Hospital to be with you this evening and greet you in behalf of the board of trustees. A very interesting program has been planned and I am sure you will have a very pleasant evening.

None of us knows what is ahead of us in these very critical days. We are a peaceful people and, of course, we shall hope and pray that we will come through these troubled times without heartbreak and misery.

But as much as we all desire peace and friendship among the peoples of the earth, we shall not sacrifice our heritage of human dignity and individual freedom by yielding to the ideology and practices of a slave state. I say again that we work and pray for a peaceful solution, but if our way of life is threatened we shall be ready to defend it and by that I mean not only those of us at Beth Israel Hospital but all institutions in every field of human activity will be prepared and alert to uphold our democracy. Thank you.

This Nation Founded To Make Men Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Times of February 20, 1951:

THIS NATION FOUNDED TO MAKE MEN FREE

For the first time since the American Revolution, with the exception of the War Between the States, the people of our country are faced with a stark test of faith. The conflict with world communism now is not to save the world for democracy, but to repel an enemy who is determined to destroy in our own land the Christian ideal of human dignity and individual liberty and the political system which upholds that ideal. Our faith and our strength is this ideal.

As a Nation, we came through World War II with little discomfort. Living standards have risen to record levels. So has the public debt which is exacting its toll in depreciating money. However, it is evident that devalued dollars have not yet cramped our style. Last year, according to the Commerce Department, United States citizens spent a staggering $178,832,000,000. The fabulous "American way" is well illustrated in a current joke which defines a pedestrian as a motorist who has found a place to park his car. The list of American "haves" could go on indefinitely. Already there are 8,000,000 television sets in our homes—homes which are equipped with tens of millions of deep freezes, refrigerators, electric stoves, radios, washing machines, ad infinitum.

In retrospect, after nearly two centuries of freedom and the boundless progress that only freedom could have achieved, it would be a wonder if we were not confused when suddenly confronted with prospect of a fight for actual survival. But the time when we can afford confusion has nearly run out. These words of Lenin, uttered 30 years ago, ring with new significance: "As long as capitalism and socialism remain we cannot live in peace. In the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism. * * * We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

This is the ruthless concept, backed by vast military force, which is confronting America and the world. To meet it we will need more than arms and men. We will have to lay our sights on primary objectives and keep them there. We must forget the adolescent notion that material security is an unqualified right. The rights embodied in the American ideal are few and elemental. They include equality of opportunity, freedom of speech and religion, and the protection of private property. They are the tools with which the individual may achieve life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

In a word, it is time we again understood what this country really stands for. John Dos Passos, the distinguished American author, has said, "this country was not founded to furnish glamorous offices for politicians, or to produce goods and services, or hand-outs of easy money. This country was founded to make men free." In the wealth of material comfort we have enjoyed so long, we have tended to forget that great truth. Now we must return to the simple fundamental—"This country was founded to make men free."

We face a two-faceted task. We must fight with all we have against our enemies outside. And, while we are undergoing all the sacrifices and trials that may involve, we must keep our people free. One of the greatest dangers is that we may grant so much unlimited authority to the Government that the system of checks and balances which stands between us and tyranny will be permanently destroyed. The problem of economic controls is a perfect example here. They should be imposed only if they are clearly necessary to implement the war effort. Otherwise, we will have control for control's sake—which is the essence of dictatorship.

Then our productive capacity will be crippled and, far more important, we will no longer be a free people—we will have lost the battle.

We Americans have come to a climactic phase in the history of the good life. It is our duty to hold together for future generations the framework of freedom which made that good life possible.

Labor's View on Defense Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the March 1, 1951, issue of the Machinist, the official weekly newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, on labor's view on defense mobilization:

LABOR'S VIEW ON DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Organized labor, speaking through the United Labor Policy Committee, has been criticizing the way defense mobilization is shaping up. To help IAM members understand what has been going on in Washington, the Machinist here answers some of the questions being asked by thoughtful union men and women.

Is big business really in control of defense mobilization?

It has been up to now. Last December, President Truman granted full authority to Charles E. Wilson, former president of General Electric Corp., to get defense production going and to control inflation. Wilson is Director of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. Wilson has had two principal acsistants, Gen. Lucius Clay, chairman of the board of Continental Can Co., and Sidney Weinberg, senior partner of Goldman, Sachs & Co., Wall Street bankers. Under Wilson are Eric Johnston, Director of Economic Stabilization, and William H. Harrison, Defense Production Administrator. Johnston is president of the Motion Picture Producers Association and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Harrison is president of International Telephone & Telegraph Co. Most of these men are drawing their salaries from their companies—not from the Government. Only Eric Johnston, up to now, has made any real effort to bring labor in to help run his organization. Since labor's protest, however, Mr. Wilson has offered to appoint a labor man as his third assistant.

What's wrong with business executives doing the defense job? Don't they know the most about production?

There is nothing wrong with production men doing a production job. Certainly, businessmen can be just as patriotic and self-sacrificing as any other group of Americans. However, production is only one of the Government's mobilization problems. In most cases, big corporation executives have had little experience in running an organization in which the plain people have a voice and a vote. A Government, such as ours, can operate only with the consent of the governed. Therefore, the first job in defense mobilization is to establish a policy and a program that will win and hold the enthusiastic support of all Americans. No one group in our country should have the power to use the Government to impose a set of arbitrary controls on other groups.

Won't more business efficiency be a good thing in Government?

Normal business methods may not prove efficient when they are used to govern a democratic people. The job of governing is as different from the job of making a profit as day from night. For example, big businessmen naturally feel that big producers are more efficient than small producers. So far, mobilization plans have failed to recruit the useful production facilities of small business. That is the opposite of efficiency. It is a waste of an important part of our productive capacity. This is one example of how big business thinking can be wasteful when it is applied to Government. In broader terms, the dollar is what counts in business; human welfare is what counts in government—human welfare in the home, on the job and on the battlefield.

Isn't the attempt to stop inflation a good thing, even though it seems to be unpopular?

Labor was one of the first groups to ask for a stabilization program to fight inflation. Controls are never popular with the group being controlled. But everyone, including those who complain, benefit from stabilization if the controls are fair and equitable. The present anti-inflation program is based on the idea that the economy can only be stabilized by reducing the purchasing power of the great majority of the people. That theory is the basis of the proposed tax program. In addition, industry and public members of the Wage Stabilization Board have voted for a rigid, inflexible wage order. At the same time, the Office of Price Stabilization is allowing prices to continue to rise. Even the price stabilizer admits that prices are going to go up an average of 6 percent in the next few months. This is almost as big an increase as took place from March 15 to December 15, last year, before the freeze. And that doesn't include what may happen to rents.

Is all the shouting just for an extra 2 percent more on wage rates—the difference between the 10 percent voted by industry and public members and the 12 percent asked by labor?

It is much more than that. The 2 percent is important. It would mean an average of almost 4 cents an hour to IAM members. But even more important are a half-dozen other sections of the proposed wage order. As it was originally voted, the freeze order would virtually end collective bargaining for millions of union members for the duration. It would prevent the correction of injustices and inequities. Anyone who has had a raise of 10 percent or more since January 1950, would get no more raises. Furthermore, the order cancels raises provided in union contracts agreed to months ago—long before the freeze. Under the original order, employees who do not already have pension plans and health and welfare benefits, couldn't even hope for them until the emergency is over. Pensions are not inflationary. Neither are sound health and welfare plans. Yet, the wage board voted to prohibit all future pension plans and health and welfare benefits unless they are charged off against the 10 percent raise allowed over the rates of January, 1950. In the same fashion, anyone who doesn't now have a paid vacation, paid holidays or other standard non-wage benefits would be denied them.

How is the wage order going to be enforced?

The law makes it illegal for any employer to raise wages beyond what the Wage Board allows. If he does, then he cannot charge off the raise as a business expense on his income tax. That is enforcement enough to make any wage regulation stick tight.

Suppose the man become dissatisfied and strike?

There is no law against strikes, providing due notice is given under the Taft-Hartley Act. A no-strike pledge has not even been asked from labor so far. However, if the President declares that a dispute threatens the national safety he can invoke the emergency provision of Taft-Hartley and appoint a board of inquiry. Those factfinders cannot even recommend a settlement. After 80 days the men can strike. However, the President has authority to seize the plant and order the men back to work as Government employees. The company would continue to draw its profits.

What if the men get stubborn and won't go back?

Then they face the possibility under Taft-Hartley of loss of their seniority and of discharge.

And, if they still won't report back to work?

Then presumably Congress could act to give the President the police power to break up their union.

Is this the way wage stabilization worked in World War II?

No. The old War Labor Board, for all of its shortcomings, was, flexible and allowed room for bargaining on fringe issues and for correcting inequities and injustices. Organized labor while far from satisfied was able to accept the formula and support the stabilization program. When trouble came, labor helped work things out without use of troops or police.

Will the use of police power protect production?

Labor doesn't think so. Labor believes that the order proposed by industry and public members of the Wage Board will hurt production. That is why labor has been trying to persuade the Government to adopt a flexible formula that will allow room for settling grievances and hardship cases and give some consideration to the men and women who work in the plants and shops.

Is there any danger that a man will be frozen to his job or ordered to take a job he doesn't want?

Not at this time. In some industries, the immediate problem for many families is the prospect of a long lay-off. Some manufacturers are being forced to shut down civilian production lines even though no defense orders are ready for them.

Suppose the Russians attack, will job control come then?

It may. That is the door Mr. Wilson and General Clay are leaving wide open. General Clay favored drafting men for jobs in defense plants during World War II. Then, however, labor had a direct voice and a vote on the old War Manpower Commission. Both labor and management representatives on that Commission voted against General Clay's proposal. The manpower problems of World War II—and there were serious problems—were all solved by voluntary methods, not by force. This time, Mr. Wilson has set up a manpower committee made up entirely of Government officials to fix manpower policy.

Didn't the country accept controls during World War II and come out all right?

The country accepted controls voluntarily during World War II. Labor and management had an equal voice in the making of policy from the beginning—William S. Knudsen for industry, Sidney Hillman for labor. True, no group liked the controls over its activities, but in every case controls were made acceptable to the interested groups before they were imposed. No group was asked to make a greater sacrifice than any other. This is the way a democracy meets a crisis—through the voluntary acceptance of controls during an emergency. So far, it has looked as though Mr. Wilson intends to impose controls by force this time without regard for any group except business.

Is labor trying to get an advantage for its own members?

No. It is not. Organized labor has not asked for a single advantage for wage earners over any other group. On the contrary, labor's entire struggle is to establish a policy based on equality of sacrifice. On the other hand, union officers are unable and unwilling to help impose upon their members a defense policy which they are convinced is unfair and unworkable. Labor believes that the present policies will hinder rearmament, that the only policies which can succeed are those which will convince every American that he is getting the fairest possible break under the circumstances. That has to mean lowering the standards of luxury before lowering the standard of living.

The Project Is Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by the Honorable Charles Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, which appears in the February-March issue of the *Democratic Digest*. In this article the able Secretary gives details on the importance of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. His words will be of special interest to all Members of Congress at this time when we are once again considering the seaway. The article follows:

THE PROJECT IS VITAL

(By Charles Sawyer)

(In President Truman's Economic Message to Congress on February 12, he said: "Iron ore constitutes one of our most serious potential shortages. * * * We should start at once on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project so that imported iron ore can be shipped efficiently by water to the great steel-producing centers of the Middle West. The St. Lawrence project is vital also to bring in a new source of power for industry in the Northeast."

(The article herein, by Secretary Sawyer, gives details on the importance of the project. Legislation on the St. Lawrence seaway was introduced early in the present session of Congress, and hearings are scheduled for late February and early March.)

The essential facts about the St. Lawrence seaway and power project may be summarized quite briefly.

It is an international dual-purpose project to provide a channel for ocean-going vessels between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic and to harness the tremendous hydroelectric power now running to waste in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. Both the electric power and the transportation are badly needed to serve our steadily growing industrial economy and to assure that our defense requirements are fully covered. These are considerations that apply to Canada, our partner in this development, quite as much as to the United States. This is a North American resource which requires development for the industrial and military strength of the Continent.

The project will add a fourth coastline, 4,000 miles in length, to the United States, and add 700,000 kilowatts of dependable generating capacity to our power supply. The cost to the United States is estimated to be about $600,000,000 at 1948 cost levels. It can, moreover, be made fully self-liquidating. The power phase will constitute, after Grand Coulee, the largest single-dam project in the country, but a market is already in prospect for much more power than even this huge project can produce. Conservative estimates of traffic on the seaway make clear that it, too, could be made to pay its way through tolls.

The project has been under active discussion for many years and the present plan is based upon an agreement between the Government of the United States and Canada reached in 1941. The war caused suspension of the project's consideration, but since 1945 a joint resolution to approve the international agreement has been offered in every Congress. The President has again recommended approval of the agreement; legislation to approve it was introduced promptly after the convening of the new Congress, and hearings before the House Public Works Committee are scheduled to begin late in February. It is to be hoped that realistic appraisal of the urgent need for the dual-purpose project will lead to its final approval before summer.

PRESENT URGENCY

The urgency of the matter was made clear last spring in the course of hearings before the House Committee on Public Works and has been underscored by developments in Korea since that time. The project is of basic importance to the industrial strength of the country and is thus also basically important to our military strength. More than this, it has great strategic importance because of the growing dependence of our steel industry upon foreign sources of iron ore.

The outlook for iron ore, as summarized by the National Security Resources Board last April, assumed that by 1960 our steel industry's probable ingot capacity would be 110,000,000 tons. Operation at this level would call for about 125,000,000 tons of ore a year. Taking into account the maximum output to be expected of Lake Superior sources, of other ore-producing regions, and of taconite development, a deficit of about 25,000,000 tons a year—to be supplied by imports—was expected to develop by 1960.

Under present and prospective conditions, this outlook is greatly changed. Ingot capacity of 110,000,000 tons is now expected to be reached, not in 1960, but by the end of this year. By 1960 we may need as much as 160,000,000 tons of ore and of such a total more than 40,000,000 tons would have to be imported.

This means that over the next 10 years we must plan to meet a developing dependence on imported iron ore which at the end of that time will amount to about one-quarter of our total requirements. Unless this large fraction of our iron ore can be assured—and the only safe and efficient route of import is from Labrador via the St. Lawrence—we shall, in time of war, when we need it most, be under the constant threat of having to close down as much as one-quarter of our steel-making capacity. That is a grim prospect to invite through neglect of the opportunity now before us.

As for power, the Federal Power Commission estimated last spring, prior to Korea, that, in addition to the expansion of steam-generating capacity already planned, there would be required by 1960 about 2,700,000 kilowatts of dependable generating capacity in the region of the St. Lawrence. This is nearly four times as much as can be supplied by the project on the St. Lawrence.

Mobilization to meet military needs will require increased production of aluminum, magnesium, ferroalloys, explosives, chemicals and other products which require large quantities of electric power. Accordingly, it is essential to accelerate programs for increasing power-generating capacity. This applies to the steam plants of the private companies and it applies to the hydroelectric plants which Federal and State Governments are constructing on our great rivers. It applies, in particular, to the St. Lawrence project, for here lies the largest single unit of undeveloped hydroelectric power in the entire country, one, moreover, that has so uniform a flow of water as to be termed an engineer's dream. Here is a power resource uniquely associated with a key transportation route, making its complete and integrated development an incomparably valuable achievement.

IN THE LONG RUN

Important as it is that we move promptly, through construction of the seaway, to provide a sheltered route for the secure importation of vitally needed iron ore from sources on this continent, we must not overlook the broader requirements of transportation which the dual-purpose project on the St. Lawrence would enable us to meet. The volume of traffic that must be carried by our transportation system, by the railroads, and over the highways, by air and by water, is steadily growing and under the demands of mobilizing will grow even more rapidly than we have planned for. We dare neglect none of these means of transportation and particularly we must not neglect the provisions of a deep-water channel that will enable full use to be made of water transport between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic.

This is not a question of traffic being taken away from anyone. The railroads today are requesting enormous quantities of steel for freight cars to increase their carrying capacity. Substantial freight-car-construction programs have been approved. At the same time, however, we must also increase the capacity of this other vital element of our transportation system. We must enable this great arm of water transport to expand side by side with rail transport, so that our national transportation system may have the capacity, the flexibility, the efficiency that our growing and dynamic industrial economy requires.

EVERYBODY BENEFITS

In viewing the traffic prospects for the seaway, it is important to bear in mind not only that our requirements for total transportation are steadily growing, but that, of the traffic to be expected on the seaway, a very large proportion will be new traffic, which will not involve tonnage now moving by other forms of transport. The economic development encouraged by this opportunity to ship at low cost will tend, in turn, to increase the volume of goods transported by other carriers. In this connection we must bear in mind how greatly the railroads have benefited from development along the Pacific Coast, development that would not have reached its present stage except for the opening of the Panama Canal in competition with them. This benefit from competition is paradoxical, but genuine, and will, I am confident, prove equally genuine in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway.

One feature of the seaway has given concern to some. During 4 or 5 months of the year shipping on the Great Lakes is impossible because they freeze over. This will also be true of the seaway. Shipping on the Great Lakes during the open months is nonetheless tremendous in volume and the traffic estimates for the seaway that have been made by the Department of Commerce make full allowance for the closed season.

Because the 7 or 8 months of the open season extend into the peak weeks of railroad traffic, there is some tendency for Great Lakes shipping to aid the railroads by lowering the traffic peak for which the latter must have equipment ready. This is a minor factor because, for the most part, this seasonal problem is met—and on the seaway would be met in the same fashion—through storage and stockpiles accumulated during the open

season to last through the closed months. To such extent, however, as the seaway would create new traffic which, during the months the Lakes are closed, might alternatively be carried by rail, this diversion of traffic would occur at just the right time to help the railroads maintain their traffic volume after the fall peak was past. The fact that during the winter months the seaway would be closed is, therefore, in no way damaging to the railroads; indeed, its effect would tend to be helpful.

OUR NATIONAL STAKE

From every viewpoint the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is one that we simply dare not neglect any longer. Much of the opposition has in the past arisen because of the conviction that both the power and the transportation facilities could be used only at the expense of existing power plants and existing means of transportation. The rapid growth of our need for electric power has quite effectively brought a correction of this view so far as power is concerned. It should be apparent by now that in transportation, too, our needs are steadily expanding, so that the effect of expanded Great Lakes shipping will be to afford greater balance and flexibility rather than reduce the existing traffic of competing carriers. Incidental local adjustments will undoubtedly be necessary in the short run, but they are so minor as to be wholly offset by the broader advantages that will be gained.

In dollar terms the project can be made to pay its own way, but under mobilization that is not necessarily enough. The advantages it would bring must not be bought at too high a cost in materials or manpower, both of which are tight and will grow tighter. Fortunately, this project, huge as it is, will during its construction take no more than one-third of 1 percent of our annual supply of any of the principal materials going into it and will take the labor of hardly more than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of our civilian labor force.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project goes to the very heart of our country's economic and military strength. That is why Americans in every section and every locality should seek to have its construction authorized and begun as promptly as possible.

Book Postage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent Congress a message on postal rates which was remarkable for balanced statesmanship and clarity of expression. In this message the President called attention to the long-standing discrimination against books which exists in the present postal-rate structure and which will be intensified if the Interstate Commerce Commission grants the application by the Postmaster General which is now pending and which the Postmaster General made in accordance with a directive which was included in the supplemental appropriation bill of 1951.

I have long felt that all users of the mail should more nearly pay the costs of carriage. At the same time, however, I welcome the President's evident desire to equate the rate for books and that for the reading matter portion of magazines.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried an excellent editorial on this subject, and I commend it to the attention of those of my colleagues who are concerned with the postal-rate problem, as well as to all Members who feel as I do that our free institutions depend in a great degree on the maximum use by the public of good books.

BOOK POSTAGE

In his message to Congress recommending increased postal rates, the President pointed out what he called "a startling discrimination" in the treatment accorded books as compared with newspapers and magazines. From the earliest days of the Republic, newspapers and magazines have been carried through the mail at a rate so low as to entail a generous subsidization on the theory that they would contribute to public education and enlightenment. Classified as second-class material, they are required to pay only 1½ cents a pound without regard to distance on the portion of them devoted to reading matter, plus a graduated rate for the advertising matter in them, rising from 1½ cents a pound, for distances up to 150 miles, to 7 cents a pound for distances over 1,800 miles.

Books, classed as fourth-class material, are charged 8 cents for the first pound, 4 cents for each succeeding pound. Moreover, the Post Office Department has asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to raise this rate to 10 cents for the first pound and 5 cents for each succeeding pound; and book packages over 10 pounds in weight would be required to pay the much higher regular zoned parcel post rates applicable to general merchandise. If these proposed rates are put into force, books—which, of course, carry no advertising matter—would be granted little, if any, subsidy.

There is a striking anomaly in this contrast. Books, as the President observed, "are surely as important as newspapers and magazines in disseminating information." As matters stand now, the postage charge on Winston Churchill's memoirs, for example, would be over six times as high in book form as it would be if the same material were published in a magazine. This is a form of discrimination which virtually no other country imposes on its book publishers—or, to put the situation more accurately, on its book readers. Books, used in schools, colleges, and libraries, are an essential element in education—apart from their high value as sources of information and entertainment in general circulation. As we said in commenting the other day on the postal rates for periodicals, we think they ought to pay their own way when they use the mails. But every consideration of common sense and fairness dictates that books be put on a parity with newspapers and magazines.

Speaker Rayburn 38 Years in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, no man in this Nation is held in higher esteem by the Washington press than the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. This is a singular honor to be so respected by these discerning men and women who represent our free press.

Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, wrote for his newspaper on February 11 an excellent article on the occasion of Mr. RAYBURN's attainment of the record in service as Speaker of the House.

Members of this body, and Americans everywhere, will want to read this story about a great American, by one of the Nation's outstanding newspapermen.

Therefore, by unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 11, 1951]

SPEAKER RAYBURN, 38 YEARS IN HOUSE, SAYS PEOPLE JUDGE RIGHT WHEN THEY HAVE FACTS—TEXAN WHO HAS WIELDED GAVEL FOR 3,057 DAYS, BEATING HENRY CLAY'S RECORD, ALSO DRAWS ANOTHER CONCLUSION: "YOU CANNOT LEAD PEOPLE BY TRYING TO DRIVE THEM"

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, made formal history when he recently broke the record of Henry Clay, of Kentucky, by serving as Speaker of the House of Representatives for 3,057 days. Clay's record stood for 125 years; RAYBURN, 69 years old and from a district which reelects him almost automatically, is likely to set a mark that will endure for another century and a quarter.

In an exclusive interview with the Post-Dispatch, RAYBURN outlined some of his outstanding experiences and accomplishments during his 38 years in the House, first as a freshman Representative at the beginning of the Wilson administration; as an opposition leader in the administration of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover; as chairman of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission; then as majority leader, and finally as Speaker during the war years of President Roosevelt and now as Speaker in the postwar years of President Truman.

Truman has called the Speakership "the second most powerful office in the Nation," and RAYBURN will go down in history as one of the great figures to hold this office which ranks statutorially after the Vice Presidency in succession to the Presidency. No other legislator has been more influential in shaping the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

TWO BASIC CONCLUSIONS

Seated in his small personal office next to the larger and usually crowded Speaker's room on the second floor of the Capitol, RAYBURN told the Post-Dispatch he had come to two basic conclusions during his Government service that began with his election as a member of the Texas House of Representatives when he was 24 years old.

"First," he said, "I believe in people and the soundness of their judgment when they have the facts. I know that 98 percent of the people have more good than bad in them and can be trusted to do the right thing.

"My experience with the Speakership has been that you cannot lead people by trying to drive them. Persuasion and reason are the only ways to lead them. In that way the Speaker has influence and power in the House.

"Second, I have seen a lot of politicians and officeholders in my day and there is no job so big that it should change a man's outlook and manners. When you see a man get stuffy or arrogant because he holds a big job, it means he was not big enough for the job

when he got it. There is no reason why a man should not be able to look you square in the eye and tell you what he will or will not do. I've found that people respect you if you tell them where you stand. If you shilly-shally and are afraid to say, 'No', you'll get into trouble, and there's no reason for any man to get 'uppity' in a Government job."

"What about the Presidency?" I asked.

"That is an exception," he replied. "Any man would be changed by the responsibilities and requirements of the White House."

RAYBURN, who was one of the President's closest friends when Truman was in the Senate, unwittingly illustrated this point later when he told how he had called at the White House after Truman had succeeded Roosevelt in 1945, Truman had been in RAYBURN'S office when he received word to come to the White House as quickly as possible that April day.

"The President and I discussed our long friendship," RAYBURN said, "and how he hoped it would continue. I told him, 'You are no longer Harry to me; from now on you are Mr. President.'"

AURA OF HISTORIC POSITION

As Speaker, RAYBURN is surrounded by the historical aura of the position. In his small office there are portraits of his early predecessors—Clay, who was an active candidate for the Presidency for a quarter of a century; James K. Polk, who became President, and Schuyler Colfax, who was Grant's first Vice President.

This office, with its red draperies and large gilt mirror that reflects an enormous crystal candelabra, also contains many personal mementos of his long service as well as the inevitable Texas souvenirs, such as a pipe with a carved steer's head for a bowl. A photograph of Chief Justice Vinson has a prominent place. It says: "Sam, I love you a lot. Fred."

The Speaker smoked several cigarettes during the interview, with bald head flushing when he laughed over some minor historical episode. He wore a well-fitting blue suit, enlivened by a dark red tie. He said he felt equal to the task ahead.

"My latest medical examination showed that I am in good physical shape," he said. "I weigh the same as I did 30 years ago and wear the same size clothes."

HE WALKS, RESTS, DOESN'T WORRY

Knowing that he did not go in for any sports, I asked him how he kept fit.

"I walk at least 2 miles every day," he replied. "I also stay in bed as long as I can. Although I don't sleep 9 hours a day, I know that when I am stretched out in bed, all my insides are relaxed. Also, I don't worry. When I leave Capitol Hill, I leave my work there."

RAYBURN likes to attend small parties in the evening, preferably where Texans are present. His greatest delight is to go to a friend's home where he can cook the meal. He will take a little "bourbon and branch water" before dinner but not after.

"Since I was majority leader," he disclosed, "I have not been in a cocktail room. It's not that I have any prejudice, it's just because I don't think a public official should be seen in such places. I remember going to cocktail parties during the war and seeing some high-ranking generals there who had arrived before I did. I wondered then why they weren't using the time to fight the war. Some people might have some such idea if they saw me in a cocktail lounge."

HE EXPECTS NO TROUBLE

As for the present session of Congress, RAYBURN thinks he will have little trouble in getting House approval of President Truman's defense program.

"We'll pass a reciprocal trade agreement extension and a good tax bill," he said. "And we'll give the President the appropriations for defense and foreign aid. The people are behind our security program and are willing to pay for it and make personal sacrifices in their daily lives. We should pay for this program as we go.

"A lot of people say they are afraid this will bankrupt the country. I don't think so. I remember back in 1932 our national income was only $39,000,000,000; last year it was up to $270,000,000,000. That means we can stand heavier taxes. But it also means we've got to keep our national income up."

"Do you think you will have opposition from the isolationists and the economisers?" he was asked.

"The best answer to that," he replied, "was the vote in the House the other day for the expenditure of $2,000,000,000 for fighting ships and naval aircraft. The roll call was 365 to 0. That's a pretty good index of congressional thinking."

PERSUADER, NO COMPROMISER

RAYBURN appeared to enjoy talking about the early years in which he gained experience to preside over a divided House. Henry Clay was known as the Great Compromiser, RAYBURN doesn't like, or fit, that description.

"I am not a compromiser," he asserted vehemently. "I'd rather be known as a persuader. I try to compromise by getting people to think my way. Of course, there are times when you haven't got the votes, then you have to make concessions. But in the main, you can get what you want by sticking to your guns.

"Champ Clark, of Missouri, was Speaker when I came to the House in March 1913. I was given a place on the Interstate Commerce Committee. One of my assignments from the Wilson administration was to get House approval of the first War Risk Insurance Act, which supplanted the old pension system. Later, on my own motion, I secured House passage of a bill requiring Government supervision of the issuance of railroad securities. I modeled this after the Texas 'blue sky' law and it was a forerunner of the Roosevelt securities and exchange legislation.

"Perhaps the most enjoyable period of service was when the Democrats were in the opposition from 1921 to 1931. The times seemed to be prosperous and under the leadership of John Garner we needled the Republicans. We had a great crowd in Bankhead and McDuffie, of Alabama, Rainey of Illinois and, of course, Hull of Tennessee."

MOST DIFFICULT PERIOD IN HOUSE

"What do you consider the most difficult period in the House?" the writer asked.

"Undoubtedly, it was the years before World War II, when the isolationists were trying to prevent legislation and appropriations for preparedness. The darkest hour was in September 1941—by that time I was Speaker—and the draft extension bill was passed by a single-vote majority."

RAYBURN won't publicly admit it, but many observers believed his greatest parliamentary stroke was his gaveling of that bill through the House before any legislator could change his mind. Had it failed of passage, this country's defense would have been terribly weak at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

During the period from 1931 to 1937, RAYBURN'S name was on much New Deal legislation, such as the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Rural Electrification Administration Act, the Communications Act and the Public Utilities Holding Company Act. Powerful lobbies worked against each of these bills and RAYBURN was able to get approval in the shape he and the White House wanted.

CORCORAN AND COHEN

RAYBURN'S helpers on much of this legislation were Thomas G. Corcoran and Benjamin V. Cohen, the brilliant team that worked out of the White House.

"Taken together," RAYBURN said, "these two fellows made the brightest man I ever saw. They never insisted on their own views. When I told them what I wanted, they started to work to put it into the legislation, and they wrote it in such a way as to make it stick.

"I know that a lot of people say that Tommy Corcoran has made a lot of money. But he is a real Democrat and we could use some young fellows like him now."

When RAYBURN was asked whom he considered the ablest man he had known in the House, he countered by saying that he had asked the same question of Speaker Clark many years ago and got a vague answer.

"Clark said that if he had to select one man, he would choose Joe Bailey, of Texas, who was a Representative before he went to the Senate," RAYBURN reported. "The other man whose intellect he greatly respected was the Socialist Meyer London, of New York City.

EACH ABLE IN DIFFERENT WAY

"I could not pick out a single man as the ablest because there are various kinds of ability. John Garner was a man of rare intelligence and great industry and he left his imprint as a great Speaker and Vice President. The man who impressed me most for breadth of view was Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama, who would have been President had he come from a Northern State. Another man of great ability was LaGuardia, of New York. For sheer intellectual ability, quite aside from his political views, it would be hard to find a more incisive mind than that of Marcantonio, of New York. As for men who got things done on the floor of the House, no one can ignore Fred Vinson, now Chief Justice of the United States, and Chief Justice Finis J. Garrett, of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals."

This writer, who has known all of the men mentioned by RAYBURN, will hazard a guess that if they could be polled about the men of ability they had known in the House, they would put RAYBURN among the top, if not at the top, of their contemporaries.

RAYBURN said he thought the Speakership had most of the power and as great prestige as it had in Uncle Joe Cannon's day.

HOUSE I. Q. HIGHER THAN EVER

"Times have changed," he observed, "and the House is a different body than it was when Cannon was the boss. The Norris "lame duck" amendment did away with the so-called short session of Congress from December to March 4. Under present conditions we couldn't afford to have a short session in which a Member defeated in November returned for almost 4 months, and the man who beat him did not take his seat until 13 months after the election. It was in the short session that the Republicans pulled off some of their most important legislation.

"Our Representatives today are better educated, better informed on issues, and work harder and longer than in the old days. When I first came here I sometimes got as many as 10 letters a day. Now a Congressman's daily mail runs into the hundreds and thousands of letters and telegrams. Generally speaking, I think the intelligence in the House is higher than I have ever known it before."

"What about the Senate?" he was asked.

"A Member of the House," he replied, "shouldn't comment on the other Chamber. It is something of an index, however, that Senator TAFT is the spokesman for a majority of the Republicans over there."

NO HIGHER AMBITION

RAYBURN said that what success he had had as majority leader and later as Speaker could be attributed to the fact that he had had no ambitions above the Speakership.

The writer reminded him that he had been discussed as a vice-presidential candidate in 1944, the year Senator Truman got that honor.

"Yes, I know there was talk about that but I told everybody that I wouldn't be selected. Frank Walker, who was then Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic committee, talked to me about it. So did his successor as chairman, Ed Flynn, and Ed Pauley, Ed Kelly, and Harry Truman. Before the convention, Truman asked me to come out to Missouri to make a speech for Representative Dick Duncan (now a Federal judge) who was having trouble. Truman said he wanted me to be there so he could say that I was his choice for Vice President. I told him that he had been mentioned for the place and he said he didn't want it.

"I knew I didn't have a chance. I came from the wrong State and I think Roosevelt remembered the trouble he had had with Garner. Roosevelt never spoke to me about it and I didn't take the other talk seriously. And I am glad I didn't get it."

ALWAYS A TEAM PLAYER

As Speaker and as majority leader, RAYBURN has regarded himself as a team player and not as an individual star. Although he sponsored and helped pass much New Deal and Fair Deal legislation, he does not classify himself as a New Dealer or Fair Dealer. Neither can he be called conservative or a middle-of-the-roader.

He was much impressed by Wilson's new freedom and he described the First World War President as the most detached person I have ever known.

"Wilson," he remarked, "was sheer intellect and he once told me that he knew he could never be loved by the people Yet he was working for their welfare all his life with the zeal of a covenanter.

"Roosevelt was the greatest humanitarian of these times and he held the devotion of the great masses. Although an aristocrat, he put through more social welfare legislation than any other President."

"Did you ever disagree with Roosevelt on his New Deal program?"

"Not publicly," RAYBURN replied, "I think his two greatest mistakes were his Supreme Court plan in 1937 and his attempted congressional purge in 1938. Officially, I had nothing to do with either.

IF OUTVOTED, HE GOES ALONG

"As I said, I am a team player and believe in working within the party organization. Even today, if we go to the White House and the President, the Vice President and the two majority leaders believe strongly one way and I believe the other way, I express my views as well as I can. If I am voted down, 4 to 1, I go along with the majority."

Most of the votes against Roosevelt and Truman measures have been determined by his Texas background. He voted with the southerners against antidiscrimination legislation, the Taft-Hartley Act and has been a principal figure behind the legislation to give the States the rich tideland oil reserves. He was also an active manipulator in securing congressional passage of the Kerr natural gas bill that Truman vetoed.

The writer also reminded him that in 1946 he had shown reluctance to run for reelection because he felt the Democrats would lose control of the House and he didn't want to step down from the Speaker rostrum to the minority leadership on the floor. He did run, however, and he did serve as minority leader while Republican JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, was Speaker.

HE ISN'T GOING TO QUIT

"I know I talk about it," RAYBURN agreed, "but I couldn't step out then because it would have been a public confession that I thought the Democrats would lose the Congress. I did want to go back to the farm and take it easy for a while. I felt a little that way in 1948, but then it would have been said that I was doing it because I thought Truman would be defeated. So I ran again. Those 2 years as minority leader had one compensation, however. See that silver plaque over there on the wall, the Collier's award for distinguished congressional service in 1948. Eric Johnston, who headed the award committee that year, told me I would never have won it as Speaker, so it was given me for my minority leadership."

"How about 1952?" the writer asked.

"It probably will be 1946 and 1948 all over and I'll have to run again. If I retired then, people might say I was doing so because I was afraid the Democrats would lose the elections."

Should the Democrats control the House after the 1952 elections, RAYBURN surely would be reelected Speaker and would set a record far beyond Clay's. Such a record would probably stand as long as the Republic retains the two-party system.

Tax-Free Expense Accounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Congress must pass tax-increase legislation at this session to support the Armed Forces and curb inflationary pressures.

Before asking the people to deny themselves and bear the heavy additional burdens of taxation which the President has asked in his recent message, the Members of Congress and other officials should set the pattern by removing the exemption on expense allowances which they enjoy. Those in authority in the executive and legislative branches of the Government should first repeal the provisions of the law calling for tax-free expense accounts. There is no reason that special privileges be enjoyed by any segment of the people. In this emergency all should bear his or her tax load on an equal basis.

In the Reorganization Act of 1946, Members of Congress, both Senate and House, were provided an expense account of $2,500 which could not be taxed. Under a special act of Congress in January 1949, just prior to the inauguration of President Truman, the President was given a tax-free expense allowance of $50,000 per year, the Speaker of the House a similar allowance in the amount of $10,000 per annum, and the Vice President an annual sum of $10,000 for expenses, which is tax exempt.

I am introducing a bill to repeal these tax-free expense accounts and provide that all such officials pay taxes on these sums, just as any other citizen would pay on his earnings. These public servants have always, and do now, pay taxes on their salaries. It is the allowances for expenses that carry the exemption from Federal tax that should be corrected. With the heavy preparedness program confronting the Nation, the budget for the new fiscal year July 1, 1951, will reach an astronomical figure.

In providing the necessary funds, tax increases will, of necessity, have to be made in individual incomes, corporations, and excises.

Taxes are high now. By increasing them as suggested, such heights are attained in many instances that there is little incentive for the individual to produce or earn more money. Too heavy a tax on individual incomes and corporation earnings may have the effect of reaching the point of diminishing returns.

There should be no objection on the part of the taxpayer to carry his individual burden in providing the funds that are needed to keep down aggression to defend the Nation from the threat of Communist totalitarianism. Every good citizen would want to participate and even make sacrifices in order that the precious heritage which we have inherited will be safeguarded and preserved. He wants to know, too—and he has the right to know—that the tax moneys he provides will be spent for the necessary preparedness effort or reasonable support of the departments of the Federal Government. He wants to know without equivocation that his tax dollars will not be squandered. He wants to know—and has a right to know—that all taxpayers are placed on the same basis and taxed accordingly. He wants to be assured emphatically that no person or group enjoy tax exemption when others in the same category engaged in the same business pay such tax.

All businesses for profit should pay the same tax as their competitors. It is a source of satisfaction to me that my bill to tax the untaxed businesses that operate for profit was introduced by me in 1948. It is believed that this bill was the first one on this question introduced in either House of Congress.

Perpetually in Favor of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by the Honorable Bruce Barton, entitled "Perpetually in Favor of War":

PERPETUALLY IN FAVOR OF WAR
(By Bruce Barton)

Abraham Lincoln liked to tell about a political friend of his in Illinois, a man named Butterfield, who was asked at the beginning of the Mexican War if he were not opposed to it.

"No," exclaimed Butterfield. "I opposed one war. That was enough for me. I am now perpetually in favor of war, pestilence, and famine."

That story deserves to be much better known. The good people of America, the backers of war, should cut it out and paste it in the top of their hats to remind them daily that, in their thinking about war and how to prevent it, they too often proceed on a fundamentality unsound assumption. They assume that everyone hates and opposes war. Whereas, all history shows that large and powerful sections of the population, while sincerely believing that they hate it, actually profit from war—politically, financially, or emotionally—and are therefore subconsciously divided in their opposition to it.

You can see our politicians already casting themselves in the brave role of war governors and war Senators. To them war comes as a divinity wind from heaven to blow away all discontent and criticism with their mismanagement of domestic affairs. There is no vote-getter so faithful as the old reliable "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream."

War means full employment, millions in dues for union leaders, and plenty of dough in the take-home envelope. It means big crops for farmers, at guaranteed high prices.

To all sorts of routine-bound business and professional people it means a tingling release into the wide world of adventure and irresponsibility.

Doctors and surgeons at the front have, in a few months, a variety of experience that would not come in years of ordinary practice, plus the tremendous satisfaction of giving relief where it is most bravely deserved and urgently needed. College professors have a wonderful chance to rush to Washington to be all sorts of important persons at much more money.

A young friend of mine, returning from the last war, told me he had decided to study law. "I talked with hundreds of men in the Army," he said. "The two groups that were most eager to get back to their work were lawyers and taxicab drivers."

"Which group was having the best time and hated most to go back?" I asked.

He answered unhesitatingly, "Teachers."

War is inflation, and a booming stock market. It is a black market from which the unrighteous garner billions. It can be a blessed escape for the man in the dreary job, for the husband with the nagging wife. Such men would be fools for turning their backs on their jobs and their homes in peacetime; in wartime they are heroes.

Like Lincoln's obscure and long forgotten friend, I, as an obscure Member of Congress, opposed one war. I am now doing my feeble best to oppose another.

But I have no delusions. I know how deep-seated and powerful are the hidden forces that, often with utmost sincerity and even in the name of peace, help to make bread and smooth the downward path.

Resolution by Juraj Onda District of the First Catholic Slovak Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution adopted by the Juraj Onda district of the First Catholic Slovak Union protesting the conviction of Rt. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev. Michael Buzalka, D. D.; and Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D., by the people's court at Bratislava on charges of collaboration with the western powers.

I wholeheartedly join with these people in their protest against the injustice to these clergymen. It is clearly a case of religious persecution, and I believe every effort of the State Department should be exerted to rectify it. The resolution follows:

Whereas the district officers and representatives of the Juraj Onda district of the First Catholic Slovak Union, comprising of 28 senior societies and 10 junior societies of Westmoreland County, Pa., assembled at their regular quarterly meeting at the Holy Trinity School Hall, in the city of Greensburgh, Pa., on February 25, 1951; and

Whereas the R.. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev. Michael Buzalka, D. D.; and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D., were tried by the people's court at Bratislava for allegedly collaborating with the western powers; and

Whereas the Kremlin dominated court found the aforesaid, Rt. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D.; and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Michael Buzalka, D. D., guilty on drummed up charges and were given 25-year sentence to life imprisonment.

We, the district officers of the Juraj Onda district of the First Catholic Slovak Union, numbering over 5,000 members in Westmoreland County, Pa., vigorously protest against the unfair, unjustifiable, and prejudicial trial of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Jan Vojtasak, D. D.; Rt. Rev Bishop Michael Buzalka, D. D.; and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Gojdich, D. D., as violative of the rules laid down by our own Justice Robert H. Jackson for the trial of war criminals and call upon the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to protest against the conviction based upon proceedings held by the People's Court of Czechoslovakia, and be it further:

Resolved, That this protest be spread upon the minutes of this our quarterly meeting, be disseminated through the various publications and copy thereof be forwarded to our United States Congressman, Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, at Washington, D. C., for the purpose of entering the protest in the UNITED STATES CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Adopted this 25th day of February A. D. 1951, Greensburg, Pa.

M. J. VARGOVICH,
National President.
FRANK MIHOVICH,
District President.
STEPHEN F. UNGVARSKY,
Secretary.

Mink-Coat Standards of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 2, 1951:

MINK-COAT STANDARDS OF HONOR

The Star does not know whether Donald Dawson, the President's aide on personnel matters, intends to appear voluntarily before the Fulbright committee and give his own version of the "influence" he is alleged to have exercised with the RFC Board. He may yet intend to do so. If he does, it will be a creditable act on his part.

If he does not do so, he ought to be fired. In the Star's opinion, a failure to demand an opportunity to testify and tell his own story, especially in the light of the ugly mess already being developed by the Fulbright committee, will render him unfit for service in the White House or anywhere else in Government. Furthermore, his continuation in White House service under such circumstances would be an affront to public morals.

Mr. Dawson has not been charged with any illegal act. But that is not the point. The point is that here is a man occupying a position as one of the President's intimate advisers on personnel who has been publicly charged by a responsible committee of the Senate with having "apparently exercised considerable influence over certain directors of the RFC" in its business of lending public funds.

According to certain moral standards of honor and public service, which are felt rather than defined by decent people, this unwritten code would compel Mr. Dawson to demand the right on his own initiative to testify under oath before the committee and to explain in complete detail the nature of his relationship, if any, with the RFC. The fact that he has not done so, and in the present atmosphere at the White House it does not seem likely that he will, raises the cynical thought that Mr. Dawson is not following the old code of public service but is guided by what seems to be a new code, of which there is much unusual evidence in public life today.

Under this code a woman assistant secretary at the White House can accept a $9,500 autumnal royal pastel mink coat from her husband who, according to his own story, must yet complete, is already in debt to a lawyer who has been active in business before the RFC, and who arranged for the purchase of the coat.

Under this code Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, military aide to the President, can continue to serve at the White House after being named by another investigating committee of the Senate as the man who made possible the "nefarious activities" of John Maragon, an "outright fixer," who subsequently has been convicted of perjury.

Under this code a woman alien from Australia can be brought to the United States and admitted to residence by a special act of Congress, approved by the President over the protest of the Department of Justice, which could not find in the records "any facts which would justify" the legislation. She turns up, too, at the White House, as the secretary of General Vaughan.

Under this code the President's press secretary, Joseph Short, can explain that the President "knows of no evidence of illegal influence on the RFC by any member of the executive branch or the legislative branch * * *" as if the "legality" of influence had anything to do with what is worrying the Senate committee—and the country.

Under this code it is the legality of conduct rather than integrity of conduct, which assumes importance. Loss of honor is accepted as perhaps the inevitable accompaniment of politics, which the public is being taught to believe is without honor. A double standard of morality for public office and private life is beginning to be cynically accepted as one of the facts of life.

If it becomes finally so accepted, the Russians and their masses of infantry are one of the least of the things we have to worry about.

The Late Honorable Delph E. Carpenter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has learned with sorrow of the passing of the Honorable Delph E. Carpenter, of Colorado; and

Whereas Mr. Carpenter was the commissioner for the State of Colorado in the negotiation and execution of the Colorado River Compact; and

Whereas Mr. Carpenter has been generally recognized as the father of the Colorado River Compact, both in the conception of this constitutional method of solving the interstate problems on the Colorado River, as well as in the negotiation of the compact itself; and

Whereas Mr. Carpenter was known and respected throughout the seven States of the Colorado River Basin, and held the deep affection of all those who knew him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives expresses its sorrow on the passing of Delph E. Carpenter, lawyer, statesman, father of the Colorado River Compact, and a leader of the West; and extends its sympathy and respect to the members of Mr. Carpenter's family.

Unanimously adopted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 1, 1951.

JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Chairman.

Attested to:

CLAUDE E. RAGAN,
Clerk, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

More Secure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic entitled "More Secure?" In this very concise and pointed argument, it is clearly shown that what we need is more unity and more faith in our professional military leaders:

MORE SECURE?

Whether in reaction to Russian Premier Stalin's recent "interview" in which he offered oily assurance that he doesn't want war; or because the fighting in Korea continues to show reverses for the Communists; or because General Eisenhower's report on conditions in Europe was more encouraging than had been expected; or because the mobilization of our industrial resources for defense purposes seems to be progressing satisfactorily; whatever the reason, or combination of reasons, the fact is evident that this country isn't so nervous about the international situation as it was a few weeks ago. At least there has been a resumption of "politics as usual" in discussing foreign policy, a free expression of criticism of the administration's methods and plans, and a general attitude that no considerations of national safety need interfere with our airing of our differences and disagreements.

Thus, arguments are continued as to the number of men we should send to Europe, and as to how definite should be the control of Congress over the Armed Forces, as if hard and fast answers could be established for these questions without putting invaluable information in the hands of our enemies, if war should break out; the opinions of such experienced military men as General Eisenhower and General Marshall—who happen to have had a leading part in winning the most terrific war in history—are denounced and belittled by individuals who certainly can't claim any military competence; abstract reasons why we should not have "peacetime" conscription and military training are put forward, as if the present days could properly be called "peacetime."

In a way, all of this is a tribute to the mobilization plans that have been undertaken; beyond doubt, they have already established a feeling that the danger of war is receding. But we ought to be more realistic than that; we ought to realize that security must rest on a firmer basis than plans, no matter how impressive. If we are to pass safely through this crisis we need far more concern for the common good, more submergence of prejudices and partisanship. We certainly cannot yet afford the luxury of disunity.

Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is now conducting hearings on depletion allowance. My friend and constituent, Mr. R. B. Anderson, of Vernon, Tex., made a most excellent statement before said Ways and Means Committee in their hearings this morning on this subject. This statement should be readily available to Members of Congress and others who wish to be informed in the premises. I am, therefore, inserting it herewith in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF R. B. ANDERSON, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 6, 1951

I am grateful for the privilege of again appearing before this committee. I do not remember a period in contemporary history when I believed that the problems of our Nation were more multitudinous or complex. The future is full of imponderables, and America is undoubtedly at a point where it must make some fundamental decisions.

This Congress must make every effort to provide for the security of the Nation. You have a tremendous responsibility in trying to provide the money which that security will cost. We all agree that, if possible, we must finance the defense effort from taxation in order to curb inflation.

National security requires that we have an ample supply of the critical materials of war. There are 71 materials in critical short supply or which are not procurable in the Western Hemisphere. For some of these items we are paying a high price.

The Armed Services Preparedness Committee in its last report points out that tin has increased in price from 77 cents per pound in May of last year to $1.82. Copper has increased from 19 cents to 25½ cents. Lead has increased from 11 cents to 17 cents. Zinc has increased from 12 cents to 17 cents. Antimony has increased from 22 cents to 42 cents. These are only a few items on the critical list. Without them, the whole war machinery slows down.

There is no more vital commodity in the world than petroleum and its products. Oil and gas provide more than half of the energy in the United States. They are indispensable to military preparedness.

You are concerned here with a suggestion that you tamper with the depletion provision under which for the last 25 years the oil industry of this country has provided the petroleum necessary for our domestic economy and for our war machines.

You could not be asked to tamper with this provision at a more dangerous or difficult time.

Secretary Forrestal 3 years ago testified before the House Armed Services Committee that in the event of another world emergency the requirements of petroleum would be nearly double the requirements of World War II.

At the same time, Harold Ickes said, "And I will say further that, in the event of another war, we cannot rely on imports, with the possible exception of Mexico. In other words, you will not be able to bring it in by tanker. The airplanes will be so efficient that they will blow every tanker off the surface of the ocean. You cannot depend on that."

The chiefs of the armed services in January of this year advised the National Petroleum Council that an additional productive capacity of 1,000,000 barrels of oil per day is necessary in order to form a minimum cushion for security.

Today we are importing 950,000 barrels of oil daily. One year ago we were importing 684,000 barrels. Today, our domestic production is 5,900,000 barrels daily as compared to 4,900,000 barrels a year ago.

For the last quarter of a century the petroleum industry has met every requirement in war or peace. You gentlemen of Congress and your colleagues who have preceded you made it possible through the wise provision of percentage depletion for us to meet each new responsibility. We can continue to meet those responsibilities if we are permitted to operate under the same wise provisions which this and preceding Congresses have approved as necessary for a sound petroleum industry.

If in these difficult and dangerous times, you destroy the incentive which stems from the current depletion recognition and slow down the exploration and discovery of oil, then it, too, may become the next of the critical items for national security.

Think of the increased cost alone if this eventuality should arise.

We are preparing now to send armies abroad to defend sources of supply for some critical materials that are not procurable at home. I hope the time never comes when it is necessary to send our sons abroad to defend our sources of a part of our supply of petroleum.

Apparently the principle of percentage depletion is not an issue; however, as certainly as you reduce the established rate which has made possible the discovery and development of new reserves, you will just as surely lessen the supply of petroleum and

will just as surely have added to national insecurity and to the critical character of petroleum and its products at the most difficult time in the history of the Nation.

Just a little more than a year ago a nation committed itself to 48 air groups. Today we have 94 air groups. A few days ago, General Spaatz testified before this Congress that it might be necessary for us to have 248 air groups. Such an Air Force without an adequat fuel supply would be a national tragedy.

In 1934 we had a military budget of about $480,000,000. In 1939 the military budget was $1,074,000,000. In fiscal 1952 we will have a budget of $41,500,000,000 for preparedness. No one knows how much higher it will go.

We are advised by the Armed Services Preparedness Committee that if at current prices we complete our stockpile objective of tin, it will cost the American taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars. During the past year, the cost of rubber has reached a high of 400 percent and today is 350 percent higher than 1 year ago.

If Congress had been as wise in the development of such critical materials as rubber which certainly can be grown in the Western Hemisphere as it was in the provision for depletion which made possible the development of petroleum, we might today have neither the fear of scarcity nor the high price in dollars to pay for national security.

It is unthinkable in these days of doubt and danger that serious consideration should be given to the tampering with the depletion provision which inevitably means a reducing of exploration and a reduction in the flow of oil. The record will demonstrate who is willing to take chances with the national security in these times of preparedness.

I know that this committee is of necessity concerned about raising more money. We of this industry agree that, as nearly as possible, we should finance preparedness from current taxes.

Every barrel of oil we produce adds to the gross national income and to increased taxation. That is as it should be, but surely let us not engage here in a program that will result in producing less barrels of oil which will mean less tax resources in the vain hope that we might secure additional revenue from a reduction in depletion that will surely mean less production, less taxable income, and less national security.

You will actually force into early retirement thousands of marginal wells. You will discourage wildcatting and development. You will have caused to be lost forever as a national resource billions of barrels of oil that can be produced only through the expensive methods of secondary recovery.

Oil is a vital necessity to our domestic economy in both peace and preparedness.

Let us not forget that the consumer has a stake in your decision. Passenger cars carrying millions of men and women to work, used last year an average of 626 gallons of gasoline per car or 24,600,000,000 gallons for a national total. In 1920 the average per capita consumption of petroleum was 4.2 barrels. Today the average consumption exceeds 15.2 barrels and by 1960 it is estimated that each American will require 18 barrels.

With all the increase in demand, gasoline sells at a lower figure today than when percentage depletion originated in 1926, yet it is a tremendously improved product.

While gasoline is only one product of petroleum, it is an American indispensable. Of the gasoline consumed in automobiles, 84 percent is consumed in carrying men to work, the housewife shopping, children to and from school, and in all of the other vital purposes of normal American life; only 16 percent is used for social or recreational purposes.

If you here cut down the flow of oil, you will have taken a step that inevitably will increase the price of gasoline, you will have added fuel to the fire of inflation, you will have placed a new burden on American preparedness, you will have ignored the American consumer.

The demand for petroleum for 1951 will be one and one-quarter million barrels per day above the daily average demands in 1949. Compare this with the average annual growth in demand for the period 1941-49 which was only about one-fourth of a million barrel increase in demand each year.

Reserves of liquid hydrocarbons at the end of 1950 were 29.5 billion barrels. At the end of 1949 they were 28.4 billion barrels. While we added over a billion barrels to our reserves the increase in demand was such that our potential supply in relation to demand was not improved.

We do not cite this situation to alarm you, because it is not alarming to us when we can be assured that we will be allowed to exercise every ingenuity and every freedom and maintain the incentive to replace oil as rapidly as it is being used. Even with all of the incentive furnished by percentage depletion, a review of these ratios during the past several years shows that the industry's discovery of new reserves has kept the ratio between reserves and production almost constant despite record-breaking demands for domestic and military purposes.

At the beginning of this year, we had only 27½ percent of the world's crude oil reserves, but during last year we produced 52 percent of the world's total. The barest sort of insurance for our domestic needs and our military defense demands the uninterrupted activity of all of the capital, all of the daring, and all of the ingenuity that can be brought to bear in this industry to increase American reserves and productive capacity.

If we are to secure the million barrels of daily productive capacity required for national security we must find billions of barrels of reserve. The industry must invest between 5 and 6 billion dollars of private capital. We will not ask you to furnish it from taxation or from subsidies. We do ask that you leave alone the established incentive that has traditionally brought capital to the industry and we will require risk capital from hundreds of thousands of people in America to find those indispensable reserves. The proven reserves, however, are not enough. We must drill and equip the thousands of wells that will make possible the additional daily production.

The east Texas field is the largest in the Nation. It has estimated reserves of 2.2 billions of barrels. East Texas is producing 272,000 barrels per day. If we are to have a productive capacity of an added million barrels per day, we need the equivalent of more than three additional east Texas fields, yet there has been only one east Texas field discovered in this country in the past 90 years of exploration.

While we are talking about the huge resources that are necessary to furnish the additional production we need for security, I should like to comment briefly on some of the specific publicity that has come to some elements of the oil industry through the investment of individuals whose names have a popular or dramatic appeal.

In every business I know there are persons who spend their lifetime operating in a single field of activity, and there are others who become prominent in one field and cross investment lines into others.

Actually, the small independent operator is seeking capital wherever he can find it. His efforts do not afford bankable collateral. He is looking for anyone who is willing to risk his money on the operator's judgment. It cannot be otherwise so long as the demand for increased petroleum reserves is great, and the independent operator is constantly seeking new avenues for capital.

Then there are those who cross investment lines and buy producing properties. It has been suggested that they are simply seeking a tax advantage.

As a matter of fact, although criticism has been directed against these investors, they are not utilizing percentage depletion, but are utilizing cost depletion, which is their privilege and which would be the same procedure they would utilize if they were investing in any other business enterprise.

In the midst of fears for our national security, we are fearful as well of our national economy endangered by inflation.

When the Korean situation developed, our productive machinery was operating close to full production with full employment. Then came dramatically increased material demands. It was obvious that with all of our productive capacity, we could not impose on our economy in a short time the increases that were required to meet the joint Government and private demand for goods and services. During the last 6 months, currency in circulation and demand deposits of banks have risen more than $8,000,000,000. Private loans have increased during the same period by $8,800,000,000. There was a wave of war-scare buying on a large scale. The wage spiral has already begun. Price increases both actual and anticipated are being passed on to the consumer.

For the first time in many years, we are witnessing the flight of the dollar into equities, lands, and other economic hedges. Savings bonds are being redeemed more rapidly than they are being bought. Even now we have not felt the full impact of defense spending.

These factors are accountable in part for the problems we have here today. Some of the revenue which this Congress is required to provide stems not entirely from increased domestic and military demands but from our failure to make those great decisions which might have restrained the inflationary predicament in which our country is now involved.

We must make some of the decisions to control inflation now or subject ourselves to even more momentous problems in the days to come.

We must honestly confess the known realities of our economy. Our money supply is too large. Its expansion continues unabated. American goods and services are, and will continue to be, in short supply.

There is only one real cure for inflation and that is to increase the productive output of the American economic machine to the point that it meets the combined military and domestic demands so far as is humanly possible. To me, each conclusion leading to an achievement of this objective is a fundamental decision which must be made by Congress.

We must work longer hours. We must be willing to lessen our standards of living. We must make full use of our industrial and agricultural potential. We must do everything that is necessary to increase American production.

If you tamper with percentage depletion, you will have reduced the flow of oil; you will have slowed down the productive capacity of the petroleum industry; you will have curtailed the operation of each industry dependent upon petroleum for its source of power; you will have laid another stone upon the already crippling burden of inflation.

In a time of national emergency, you surely cannot want to accept the responsibility of lessening production, endangering our national security, and increasing the inflationary problems of our country.

You are seeking to raise more revenue for two reasons: One reason is to finance preparedness, the other reason is to drain off excess purchasing power in a period of inflation.

During the past 6 months the index of prices of raw materials has increased more than 40 percent. During the past 3 years, the price of crude oil has not increased. If you lower the depletion provision you would not be draining off profits for purchasing power that stem from the national emergency because in this industry the price of crude oil has remained constant despite the rising costs to the industry. Surely it would be a mistake to impose taxes of such a character or of such an amount as to discourage or reduce the production of essential raw materials.

While high taxes are inevitable and desirable, they should be to the greatest extent possible the type of taxes that encourage production of essential materials and discourage consumption of goods in short supply.

As we seek to secure additional money to finance preparedness, let us do so by producing more barrels of oil that will yield more tax—not fewer barrels and less tax. I sincerely believe that a reduction in depletion will result in a net loss of Treasury revenues. Left alone, there will be a net Treasury gain.

This is an hour of decision. The struggle of the free world is to remain free. We are outnumbered. Critical materials are in short supply and their cost is stupendous. We are preparing to defend our source of supply of some materials with armed forces because of necessity.

Through the wise policy of this and preceding Congresses, we have had security in petroleum. We cannot now tamper with the depletion provision which has historically permitted the industry to furnish adequate petroleum supplies and reserves. Surely we would not want to place oil in the same category as rubber or tin or manganese or other critical materials. History will pass in judgment upon any man or any Congress who dares in this difficult hour to take a chance with our national security.

Certainly we must have more money to finance our efforts but let that money come from the normal channels of taxation in which we will willingly share and do our part, but let it not come by tampering with the provision that has secured this Nation through two wars and which must secure it in the days to come. When we levy a tax, let it not be one that will stifle production but rather one that will curb inflation as well as provide revenue.

If the oil industry is left to its own resources with the wise incentive that has made possible its development during the last 25 years, I have no hesitancy in assuring you that the petroleum reserves and capacity of this Nation will be adequate and secure.

It is far better to have and not need than to need and not have.

In this hour of decision, we have confidence in the judgment of this committee.

Joint Committee on Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to include an open letter and resolution to the members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production from the Employers' Association of Chicago. The open letter and the resolution follow:

FEBRUARY 26, 1951.

GENTLEMEN: There is widespread feeling throughout the country, and particularly here in the Middle West, that the powers conferred upon the executive branch of the Government by the National Defense Production Act of 1950 will be employed by that branch to extend its control over the lives of the American people and perhaps beyond the limits intended by the Congress when it enacted the legislation.

The public is aware of the many attempts (some successful) that have been made in recent times by the executive branch to dominate the people, both economically and politically. The administrative agencies that have been created by it to effectuate the purposes of Congress have lent themselves well to the extension of executive influence and control.

Even now the Offices of Price and Wage Stabilization are being staffed, in the operative or control sense, by people of political sympathies in keeping with those of the executive and with little apparent regard for ability. This, despite the fact that the operation of these offices will affect the lives of all of the people for an indefinite period of time—perhaps for many years.

The Congress did well when it provided for the creation of a Joint Committee on Defense Production in enacting the National Defense Production Act of 1950. Many of us would be less fearful of the possible consequences to the fundamental liberties of all of us if we could be assured that the Joint Committee on Defense Production, of which you are a member, is functioning and to the end that the intent of Congress may be served rather than the ends of political advantage.

The attached resolution deals with the foregoing subject and is respectfully commended to your notice.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON L. HOSTETTER,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the National Defense Production Act of 1950 confers upon the President extraordinary functions and powers; and

Whereas an unreasonable or arbitrary exercise of such powers may result in injury to the general welfare of the people of the United States; and

Whereas Congress, in the enactment of said act, has provided against such possibility and to that end has provided for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Defense Production; and

Whereas it is the function of said committee to make a continuous study of the programs authorized by said act and to report to the Congress the results of its studies (including any defects which may develop in said act) and to make recommendations with respect to the same to the Congress; and

Whereas we believe it to be the function of this committee to guard the people of the United States against an unreasonable or arbitrary exercise of power by the President under the authority given him by this act; and to guard the people against any defects which may develop in said act or in its administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Employers' Association of Chicago urge that the Joint Committee on Defense Production convene regularly and scrutinize closely the operation of said act and all programs proposed or initiated under the authority thereof to the end that said act may be administered equitably and reasonably and any defects in said act be speedily rectified.

FEBRUARY 26, 1951.

Letter From a Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter written by a veteran, W. C. Carter, of Delaware, Ohio.

Although I do not entirely agree with all that is in this open letter, I firmly believe that all views on the question covered by Mr. Carter should be explained. The letter follows:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: LENIN'S PROPHECY RECALLED BY WRITER

EDITOR GAZETTE: "The United States will spend itself into destruction"—so predicted Lenin, the high priest of communism—a prophecy that is being rapidly fulfilled. He should have added "and extend" to his prediction to have better envisioned our ruin, for we are both overspending and overextending our limited resources in manpower and wealth.

The tragic Korean debacle has already sacrificed 10,000 brave young Americans, national prestige, and vast military supplies, and is but a prelude to the grim outlook ahead. What should have been the responsibility of the United Nations was ineptly assumed by the United States, with disastrous results. That the United Nations has so far proven to be only a wrangling debating society and a propagator of Russian propaganda and appeasement is the fault of our State Department and the UN Secretary General, Trygve Lie.

Since the United States is host to the UN and we are carrying about half of its expenses—compared to Russia's 5-percent contribution—we have the right to expect that its proclaimed objectives will be advanced, our rights and dignity respected. Instead, confusion reigned, valuable time was wasted, and we were compelled to listen to the long-winded Russian insults, lies, and obstructions. Moral courage was lacking to call the Russian bluff, to place the blame for the Korean aggression squarely where it belongs.

If the United Nations is ever to achieve its purpose, recent events show that it must have, not a police force, but a complete military establishment, trained and ready to strike wherever aggression threatens. Considering the reluctance and puny efforts of the leading member nations to aid in Korea or to cooperate in the Atlantic Pact for their own protection, the building of such a military force would no doubt depend on the United States. The notable exception was Chiang Kai-shek's offer of 300,000 trained China National troops, declined by the Truman-Acheson regime and the UN, evidently fearful of offending Russia and Red China. After 5 years of fruitless palaver and frustration, and in the face of continued Russian threats and aggression, not even a police force was organized. When the Korean crisis came last June it was the United States Army, practically alone, that opposed the invading Communist hordes.

There are millions of disillusioned, able-bodied men of many nationalities who have

suffered under communism, who would gladly join an international military force to fight this monstrous evil. Such a needed force would also provide a haven for thousands of homeless refugees whose welfare is a serious problem. All they need is the invitation and pledge of protection and security to assure their loyalty to the United Nations. For many years France has had such a voluntary military force, the Foreign Legion, which has rendered loyal service, although made up from many different nationalities.

Instead of pouring more billions in credits and material into Europe to bolster up our uncertain friends, the United States should organize and equip an international military force whose services would be available to the United Nations. A logical recruiting ground would be in Germany—it might even attract a good part of the Russian Army. Such an organization could weaken and even eventually destroy communism, because it would be largely made up from the millions who had suffered most under Red tyranny.

W. C. CARTER.

Domestic Tin Smelting Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the attached article from yesterday's Washington Post brings vividly back to my mind the struggle we had last summer to pass the so-called tin-smelter bill. The United States has only one tin smelter which adequately refines the types of ore on which the Nation must depend for its tin supply.

The smelter, which is located in my home county at Texas City, Tex., is a Reconstruction Finance Corporation project. Its operation has been efficient and capable. The contract between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the operating company was to expire at the end of the current fiscal year. New legislation during the last session of Congress was necessary to extend the life of the present contracts.

I mention the matter now only to remind the Congress that the extension of the life of that smelter operation was very vigorously fought by an organization which frankly stated that their desire was only to close the smelter down. They adhered to this position throughout the hearings and the debate even when every defense agency cautioned them that tin was an essential commodity and one in short supply.

Fortunately, the sounder and more thoughtful Members of Congress prevailed and the life of the smelter was extended for 5 years. I trust that the Congress will never forget how essential it is to maintain a domestic tin-smelting industry.

Attention is invited to the article from the Washington Post which follows:

GOUGING ON TIN PRICE HIT BY SENATE GROUP

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee yesterday proposed that the United States stop buying tin abroad until some of our own allies cease their price gouging.

"We are no longer in a position where we must buy tin at any price," the subcommittee declared in a report, adding there is more tin in the United States now than at the time of Pearl Harbor.

The subcommittee noted that control of most of the world's tin is held by "a relatively few British, Dutch, Belgian, and Bolivian corporations, with interlocking connections across national boundaries."

For 30 years, the report said, those producers have joined in restricting production so as to guarantee a satisfactory price. Frantic speculation has driven the tin price to nearly $2 a pound from 75 cents just before the Korean war.

CONSERVATION URGED

The subcommittee called on the State Department to get the non-Communist world to allocate tin supplies and fix prices "so that we are not gouged by the mine owners and speculators for the privilege of defending them."

The report said the National Production Authority must set up industrial rationing and a stringent conservation program to make our current supplies go further.

DEVOID OF MORALITY

Chairman LYNDON B. JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) echoed his subcommittee's report. He said: "The tin price gouging by some of our oldest international friends is entirely devoid of morality. The United States needs tin, but we don't need it so badly that we must bankrupt ourselves by paying anything and everything other nations try to charge."

The report declared world production of tin in 1941 was 50 percent higher than it is today.

The subcommittee said the United States is willing to help producer nations expand and even pay premium for tin in excess of current production.

Legislative Program of the Regular Veterans' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the legislative program adopted by the Regular Veterans' Association of the United States at their national convention, September 23, 1950:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ADOPTED BY ITS 1950 NATIONAL CONVENTION

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. The immediate enactment of a universal military training law.

2. Mobilization of all material resources for war.

3. Legislation to effectively curb war inflation during the present emergency.

4. An effective national organization for civilian defense.

5. Creation of a national committee for the conservation of natural resources.

6. Issuance by the United States of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.

7. Issuance by the United Nations of an appropriate medal for service in the present Korean campaign.

8. Appropriate United Nations rank for the present commandant of the United Nations forces in Korea.

9. Relentless war on Communist aggression.

10. Extension of all provisions of the GI bill of rights to all veterans of the Korean campaign.

11. Federal income-tax exemptions, the same as was extended to Armed Forces personnel during World War II, for all personnel engaged in the present Korean campaign—said exemptions to be retroactive to the beginning of hostilities and to continue for 1 year after they shall have ended.

12. Free postage for all service personnel during the present Korean campaign.

13. Immediate restoration of the World War II allotment system for the dependents of all service personnel.

14. Legislation prohibiting strikes or mass work stoppages in time of war or during military campaigns such as the Korean campaign.

15. Extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance coverage to all members of the Armed Forces, drafted for service, with the Federal Government paying the contributions.

16. All commissaries, exchanges, and ships' service stores to be operated strictly on a nonprofit basis and all merchandise sold in them to be exempt from Federal and State tax.

17. National Service Life Insurance to be supplanted with a flat $10,000 death gratuity.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. Continued support of the United Nations.

2. Vigorous fulfillment of our international commitments and agreements.

3. Restricted and screened immigration.

4. Continued cooperation with all nations for the promotion of international peace and the development of backward areas.

AMERICANISM

1. Legislation outlawing the Communist Party, and all other groups who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

2. Unequivocal denial of the right to vote and to hold public office, or to enjoy public employment, to those who are known to oppose our form of government.

3. A stronger Voice of America program and greater efforts to penetrate the iron curtain by educational means.

4. Deportation of all known alien and foreign-born Communists.

5. Praise and continued support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its effective war on communism and subversive groups.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

1. Parity in pensions and disability compensation for all persons who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States at any time and parity in all widows' pensions, and in all pension payments to the dependents of deceased disabled veterans (S. 727 and H. R. 308).

2. Service pensions for all veterans who were engaged in hostilities against the hostile natives in the Moro Province and in the islands of Leyte and Samar from July 4, 1902, to January 1, 1914 (S. 482 and H. R. 308).

3. Vocational rehabilitation for all honorably discharged disabled veterans of the Armed Forces regardless of when the service was performed.

4. Civil-service preference, United States Employment Service preference, and preference on relief projects—when they exist—for all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishment.

5. A uniform law, and uniform regulations, applicable to all disabled tubercular

veterans regardless of the date of service (H. R. 1096, 77th Cong.).

6. Legislation to reduce to 10 percent the disability requirement for entitlement to additional compensation for dependents of veterans.

7. Service pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II at age 55, in the amount of $55 a month with an increase of $2 a month for each year thereafter.

8. Legislation to increase pension-income limitation to $2,000 for veteran, or widow without dependents, and to $3,000 for veteran or widow with dependents.

9. Legislation to exclude commercial insurance payments from consideration as income in determining eligibility for non-service-connected death pensions.

10. Legislation, or an executive directive by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, requiring the Veterans' Administration to accept as evidence, for rating purposes, examinations made at any hospital approved by the American Hospital Association.

11. A substantial raise in pay to VA hospital attendants, especially to those in mental hospitals and contagious-disease wards in VA hospitals.

12. Opposing any plan to take from the Veterans' Administration, or its immediate jurisdiction and control, any function of Government having to do with veterans.

13. Continued hospitalization, in VA hospitals, for non-service-connected disabilities when facilities are available.

14. Out-patient treatment and medication for veterans receiving part III benefits at VA hospitals.

15. An identification card and lapel button to be furnished all service-connected disabled veterans by the Veterans' Administration.

16. Rescission of VA Circular 25, March 7, 1947, prohibiting VA employees from taking part in veterans' organizations.

17. Legislation requiring the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue explicit instructions that each and every decision of the VA in its agencies of original and appellate jurisdiction be supported by an adequately detailed recitation of the basis of finding of fact and to contain a statement that the policy of resolution of reasonable doubt has been considered.

18. A rating of permanent and total disability for all veterans who have a lung removed.

19. Amendment of R. and P. R. 2676 (b) 4 to permit acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria.

20. The establishment of a VA hospital in Franklin County, Va., for Negro veterans, the birthplace of Booker T. Washington.

21. A minimum of two prosthetic appliances a year to eligible veterans.

22 A national cemetery in each of the 48 States.

23. Adapted housing for helpless disabled veterans of the Regular Establishment.

24. Adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II, and the present Korean campaign, in the amount of $6 a day for foreign service and $3 a day for home service.

25. Legislation authorizing official representatives of veterans' organizations, accredited by the Veterans' Administration, to appear before any unit of the Federal Government on behalf of any veteran when properly empowered by the veteran to do so.

26. Maintenance of the United States soldiers' and naval homes in their present locations.

27. First priority for Philippine veterans and their dependents in the settlement of all World War II claims.

28. Compensation and pension for service-connected disabilities are rights and not gratuities. The Regular Veterans Association of the United States, therefore, urges the immediate enactment of legislation to subject all decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Federal court review.

FRANK E. MCCLERNAN,
National Commander.

State Sovereignty Threatened by Tidelands Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, hearings have been concluded in the other branch of Congress relative to Senate Joint Resolution 20, a so-called interim tidelands resolution introduced by the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The hearings on the resolutions have served to clarify the issue between the States on the one hand, and the Federal Government on the other. Many of the advocates of Federal ownership of the submerged coastal lands within the boundaries of the Coastal States have heretofore deliberately befogged the real issue by accusing those opposed to Federal control of being interested only in protecting the rights of oil companies. These companies obtained mineral leases of parts of the submerged lands from the States, who were at the time considered to have full ownership of such lands. This occurred before the Supreme Court decision in United States against California, which was handed down only a few years ago—1947.

Actually, the tidelands issue is and always has been squarely between the States and the Federal Government, with the oil companies being merely innocent third parties involved in the controversy only because they developed the submerged areas pursuant to State leases. They did this with the full knowledge and consent of the Federal Government, which unequivocally maintained, until a few years ago, that the States owned the coastal submerged lands within their borders, and that the Federal Government had no powers over them, except control of navigation and similar national powers which the States have never questioned, and which are not involved in the current controversy.

While some of the proponents of Federal ownership were attempting to becloud the issue by using the oil companies as "whipping boys," responsible Federal officials were, at the same time, assuring the oil companies that their rights under the State leases would be respected if the Federal Government was awarded a decision against the States in the Supreme Court. In fact, the Attorney General of the United States said in open court during the trial of the California case, that the President had authorized him to tell the Court that equities acquired by third parties, in reliance on State ownership, would be respected. This promise was made on other occasions and has never been revoked. Nevertheless, the loudest proponents of Federal ownership have consistently directed their propaganda attacks against the oil companies, not daring to openly direct their attacks against their real target, the sovereignty of the States. This is the very heart of the controversy.

Senate Joint Resolution 20 has, I repeat, served to clarify the issue because it is sponsored by proponents of Federal control; is supported by the administration; and by its terms it definitely validates the oil leases issued by the States to the oil companies before the decision in United States against California, and also those issued thereafter pursuant to a stipulation between California and the Federal Government. This validating provision has caused the oil companies holding State leases to support the resolution, but the States have refused to do so. Although all parties realize that some temporary compromise may eventually prove necessary, the States are presently unwilling to accept the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 20 as even a proper interim compromise. The fact that the oil company lessees are in favor of the proposed temporary compromise, while the States involved are opposed to it, does show that the issue goes far deeper than the Federal ownership people were willing to admit while they were pretending to be fighting oil companies but actually confiscating State property—property which the Federal Government conceded to be owned by the States from the founding of the Nation until the filing of the Federal Government's suit against California in 1945 and the decision of the Federal Government's Supreme Court in favor of the Federal Government in 1947. This unprecedented decision set a new pattern of conquest or confiscation—a pattern which, if followed to its ultimate conclusion, could mean the complete destruction of the sovereignty of the States. It could obviously be used to confiscate privately owned property as well.

The California case is still referred to as the Tidelands case. The submerged coastal lands within the States' boundaries have always been referred to as tidelands, and they still are. Only by a strained, restricted, technical definition of the word "tidelands" was the Federal Government able to avoid the effect of the numerous decisions of the Supreme Court squarely holding that the tidelands belonged to the States. By limiting the definition of this word to mean only the small area covered and uncovered by the ebb and flow of the tides, the Federal Government was able to get around the previous Supreme Court decisions which had unfortunately used the word "tidelands" in its broad and ordinarily accepted sense. In this insidiously clever manner, the Attorney General of the United States avoided many past precedents and laid claim to the coastal submerged lands, actually

contending that they were owned by the Federal Government because the Federal Government was charged with defending them in time of war, and that they might become involved in the conduct of foreign affairs. It asserted its claim by filing an action in the Supreme Court of the United States, the members of which are Federal officials appointed by the President. These Federal officials ruled in favor of the Federal Government, and the States' property was, by this device, confiscated. This device circumvented the Constitutional prohibition against the taking of property without paying just compensation therefor. If the decisions against California, Texas, and Louisiana are allowed to stand, the Federal Government has paved the way for confiscating any property in the United States by simply contending that it has always owned it and thereafter suing in its judicial branch and obtaining a decision in its favor. This is the stark, ominous meaning of these decisions which have aroused and frightened all thoughtful people who have taken the time to study and understand the really serious threat to State sovereignty and private rights contained in the tidelands decisions.

The first persons to suggest that the Federal Government owned the coastal submerged lands beneath navigable waters were persons who filed claims on the oil-bearing portions of these lands with the Secretary of the Interior, claiming at the time that these lands were Federal public lands which could be filed on pursuant to the Federal Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. These claim-jumpers instigated the whole sordid scheme. They now brazenly admit, as the testimony at the said hearings will show, that they expect to compel the Secretary of the Interior to void State leases and to issue Federal oil leases to them calling for a royalty to the Federal Government of 12½ percent; these Federal leases to cover the same areas where, pursuant to California leases, oil companies have developed oil structures and are paying the State about 35 percent. These claim-jumpers call themselves prospectors, but they want to prospect for oil where the shore line is thick with pumps producing oil. The Secretary of the Interior has ruled that the submerged coastal lands are not public lands which can be filed on pursuant to the Federal Mineral Leasing Act. If the Federal courts in pending cases decide otherwise, the States which made the leases, and the producing oil companies who took the risks, developed the deposits, and who pay high royalties, will see their properties turned over, not to the Federal Government, but to the so-called prospectors who fully expect to take over producing fields; to pay only a 12½ percent royalty to the Federal Government, and, of course, nothing to the States. These are the real facts underlying the controversy, and it is well that the hearings have made them crystal clear.

The so-called interim resolution does not purport to bring about a final determination of the controversy between the States and the Federal Government. It was introduced because legislation restoring or confirming the States' ownership was previously vetoed by the President after being passed by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress. Incidentally, legislation restoring title to the States has again been introduced by 34 Members of the other House. The authors of the interim resolution contend that this legislation restoring the States' rights will again be vetoed, if passed, and that therefore a temporary arrangement is necessary to permit oil development along the coast in the interest of national defense.

The interim legislation validates existing State leases, gives 37½ percent of the royalty payments derived therefrom to the States instead of 100 percent, and impounds the balance for future disposition. It substitutes the Secretary of the Interior as lessor in place of the States. It provides for issuance of future leases by the Secretary who would, of course, need to duplicate existing State agencies in order to carry out his functions under the resolution.

The resolution provides that the Secretary may suspend or terminate any lease by making payment to the lessee in an amount determined by due process of law. This could mean many things and might mean almost anything if a controversy arose which would be settled by the Federal Government's Supreme Court.

Although the States would like to get the whole controversy settled, they prefer to leave it where it is rather than to complicate it by temporary expedients which they fear might compound the confusion that already exists. They contend that the interim arrangement might endure indefinitely and diminish their chances of forcing a clear-cut decision on the principal issue involved, which is nothing less than the maintenance of the identity of the States as sovereign units of a federation in which all powers constitutionally remain with the States which are not delegated to the Federal Government by the States.

Looking into the unforeseeable future, it seems clear that a dictatorship could be established over this Nation only if the States are so subservient to the Federal Government that seizure of the Federal Government would invest the tyrant with irresistible control over the whole Nation. So long as we have 48 or more strong, sovereign States, the establishment of a dictatorship will be virtually impossible. The decision in the tidelands case opens the door to a new method of centralization which has shocked the lawyers of the Nation and caused grave concern to all people who have studied its full portent.

The California case is still pending in the Supreme Court because the Federal Government is not, at this time, claiming ownership of lands underlying navigable inland waters as distinguished from lands underlying waters not considered inland. The Court has so far been unable to decide where inland waters stop and others begin. In the meantime, close to $30,000,000 in royalties from State leases is impounded.

The State used its oil royalties, for the most part, to carry out its beach development program, acquiring privately owned beaches for the benefit of the public, not only of California, but of the entire Nation. While this program has been suspended, the beaches have increased in value so that the whole undertaking is jeopardized by Federal lust for power. Other coastal States use income from oil royalties for support of their schools. All have strict conservation laws governing development of submerged lands.

Aside from the desire to expand Federal dominium at the expense of the States, what explanation is there for the Federal executive department's stubborn refusal to restore the coastal submerged lands to State ownership? Any State which thinks it does not have a vital interest in the controversy should study this new pattern of expansion with an eye to the future. Today it is oil-bearing submerged lands, but tomorrow?

Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, when necessary duties and functions that prompt organization of a public agency are fulfilled, private enterprise should then be given the opportunity to assume responsibilities of such functions.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, organized during a period of depression to meet the great financial demands of the public, seems to have filled the gap. Banks and other lending institutions in the field of private enterprise now appear adequately able to assume this burden.

In the opinion of a great segment of our people the RFC has fulfilled that purpose. Now many groups and particularly have I noticed where many newspapers have editorialized in favor of the liquidation of this function as unnecessary. The editorial which I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD is an example. We should take heed. Possibly this is an opportunity for the Congress to take action to eliminate a Washington bureau.

I personally would like to see our Government returned to local agencies, eliminating all unnecessary functions. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

[From the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat of February 16, 1951]

INDIFFERENCE TO RFC DISCLOSURES INDICATES DECLINE OF INTEGRITY

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a product of the Hoover administration to meet depression emergency need for loans to business. Nearly 20 years later, the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of

the Federal Government, recommended that it be abolished.

It has become a multimillion dollar lending agency largely for the benefit of those with enough influence or pressure on the five-man board to get loans often without regard to the financial stability of their enterprises. The Lustron Corp. fiasco is the most striking example. A Reno gambling establishment and the famous rattlesnake farm are others.

Since banks and other private lending agencies stand ready to loan money on all enterprises that stand up under investigation, it has naturally followed that many unsound projects which fail to qualify for private credit, turn to the RFC. It was this factor which prompted the Hoover Commission to recommend that the RFC be abolished.

Nothing has been done about it. Charges of favoritism, influence, and coercion are becoming so frequent in Washington that they no longer create enough public indignation to influence Congress.

But the recent report of Senator FULBRIGHT'S Senate Banking Committee on the rankest kind of RFC favoritism leading direct to a White House aide, has churned up more than the customary attention from Congressmen.

Taxpayers interested enough in the RFC investigation to send to the banking committee for a free copy of its report (No. 76) will find disclosures which would justify them in demanding that the RFC be not, "reformed," as some Congressmen suggest, but abolished.

They will have further reason to be concerned since President Truman characterized the report as "asinine" and immediately renominated three of the directors on whom the shadow of suspicion was cast.

The reader will find on page 14 of the report, a chart which shows more clearly than words, the "favoritism and influence" charged by Senator FULBRIGHT'S committee. The committee members made the chart for their own clearer understanding of who was related to whom in the maze of testimony.

It is made up of scattered boxes with criss-crossing lines. One box for instance, carries the name of Donald Dawson, an aide to President Truman and a former Director of Personnel in the RFC. A connecting line runs to the box labeled William Willette, a Democratic RFC Director.

Similar lines run to "expediter" Merl Young and Rex Jacobs, president of a Detroit company which borrowed $3,000,000 from RFC. Still another line shows Mrs. Donald Dawson as top supervisor of RFC files, and Lauretta Young, listed as secretary to President Truman's secretary, is the wife of Merl Young, the expediter.

Personal friendships in the Government are not subject to criticism until public funds are being dispensed to private firms and the evidence proves that these interrelationships result in favoritism and undue influence on the lending board.

To quote the Hoover Commission report: "Direct lending by the Government to persons or enterprises opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or enterprises. It invites political and private pressure and even corruption."

The RFC has been useful to Congressmen who like to do a favor for a businessman in their districts once in a while, and there is no apparent inclination to abolish it. The Senate committee thinks things might be better if a single Governor is substituted for the five-man Board. Their reasoning, that he would be less subject to pressure and less able to escape responsibility, is not realistic.

Reforms cannot kill favoritism and influence in a Government which has been too long in office, and operates on a political pressure basis for its perpetuation. There are jobs, votes, and big interests that hinge on RFC's continued operation. Besides, the administration has now put a defense tag on RFC to uphold its continuance.

Time was, in the memory of some of us with gray hair, when the Government maintained a semblance of integrity. The principle of fidelity to the public trust was upheld by the President even though it sometimes required closing his eyes to practices which did not bear the light of day. Exposures brought reforms or honest attempts at reforms were made.

The voters are reportedly writing thousands of letters a day protesting the failure of price controls to stop inflation. If they will give an equal amount of attention to the stench which is the RFC, perhaps Congress will give it the decent burial which is overdue.

BERNIECE BATTERTON.

Address by Hon. Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, at Annual Dinner of Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made an outstanding contribution on the subject of the danger of nondefense spending during the emergency in an address which he delivered before the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, held in Philadelphia, Pa., on February 27, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

In the coming years—and perhaps for generations—we will have two great burdens to carry:

On one hand we must make ourselves so militarily strong as to protect us from the aggression of communistic nations, and, on the other, we must preserve and fortify our free enterprise system, which, after all is said and done, is the real source of our strength and future security.

The free enterprise system is a greater deterrent to world conflict and a more dependable guardian of peace than a United Nations organization will ever be. It is the only force in the world today that Russia fears. It must be preserved.

Let us not be deluded: The emergency in which we now find ourselves will exist, in all probability, for many, many years. Today Russia has the timetable, and Russia has control of the initiative. She began the Korean War—costly to us in blood and treasure—but Russia has not lost a single soldier. We shall have to live for a long time in a period of crisis and must be on a war alert even though world war III does not materialize, and pray God it will not. In a democracy the threat of war over a long period can be nearly as destructive of our economic system as actual war.

If Russia determines on war, she can fix the hour and the place and the day of the conflict, or she can, for years to come, conduct against us a war of economic attrition, sapping our resources and weakening our system of government. This may be her sinister purpose—I am inclined to think perhaps it is—and in the past 5 years she has made great progress in this direction.

Then, too, if we should become involved in wars with Communistic China and Communistic Russia, it is not probable that a complete and clear-cut victory can be won against such adversaries—living on vast land areas with huge populations—such as was done with compact Germany and compact Japan.

Russia has succeeded in immobilizing practically all the well-trained troops of the three leading free nations—the United States in Korea; France in Indochina; England in her possessions in Asia.

For ourselves we have spent $60,000,000,000 for defense in the past 5 years and have only one well trained division at home, two in Europe and about 225,000 troops fighting in Korea. There we follow the flag of the United Nations but do so nearly alone. In Korea, exclusive of the South Koreans, 95 percent of the fighting is by Americans.

I am not an appeaser. Our future security demands a definite, as well as a very wise, foreign policy. Russia has such a policy—wise and practical from her standpoint—and has out-generaled us time and time again.

We jeopardize our future if we continue to pursue a vague policy of impractical altruism. It must be realistic. We serve neither ourselves nor the free peoples of the world when we undertake burdens beyond our ability to carry and make promises we cannot fulfill. We may be powerful but there is a limit beyond which we cannot go and survive. We cannot go over the world like Don Quixote tilting our lances at every windmill that may have a Communist behind it.

We cannot go over the world trying to make democrats of people who do not want to be democrats and who do not, in fact, comprehend what democracy means.

If first things are to come first, what we need above everything else is an impregnable defense at home. This may determine whether we will survive. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I pledge to you that I will do all in my power to provide an impregnable national defense. I am for compulsory military training. I am for a trained army within our borders. I am for an Air Force of 70 groups or more. I am for a radar screen around this country. These things I have been advocating and supporting for years. We do not have them now. We must do our level best to prod those responsible to get them quickly.

Will our economic system stand the great burdens we are assuming unless we first set our financial house in order?

On January 15 the President appeared before Congress and made this specific pledge:

"It (the Government) must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

Yet, a week later he submitted to Congress a budget which has actually increased nondefense spending to the highest level in the history of the Nation—whether in peace or in war.

Not only has he, in the time of our greatest crisis, failed to keep his pledge for a rigid reduction in domestic spending, but the President renews his advocacy of the socialistic measures known as the Fair Deal.

He asks citizens to make deep sacrifices in their daily living, yet he declines to make political sacrifices by the curtailment or

suspension of measures for the distribution of public funds for nonessential purposes.

In my experience of 18 years in the Senate, this message represents the very height of fiscal irresponsibility. Unity and the sacrifices necessary to save our country must be a two-way street. They must come from the Government as well as from the citizens. Fiscal preparedness is just as vital as military preparedness. I was greatly disappointed in the President's budget. I had hoped he would advocate an austerity budget; cut all nondefense expenditures to the bone; suspend for the duration all socialistic schemes. Instead he actually increased nondefense spending and renewed his support of his socialistic measures—the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, more socialized housing, expansion of Government-owned industrial production, increased Federal authority over unemployment State offices, Federal aid to education.

The estimated deficit under the President's budget is over $16,000,000,000. By saving $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000, new taxation of $9,000,000,000 would balance the budget. If we cut his total budget by 10 percent we can avoid 50 percent of the total of new taxes he requested.

In short, he proposes that the people who support the National Government practice rigid austerity for the preservation of democracy and free enterprise, but at the same time, he proposes a Federal budget under which the Government would spend lavishly and extravagantly, as if there were no clouds of grave danger on the horizon, not only for things we could do without but also for schemes which would socialize the food we eat, our health, and the roof over our heads.

In these perilous times we are confronted both with potential military aggression from abroad and potential fiscal collapse from within. We started World War I with a Federal debt of approximately $1,000,000,000. We started preparation for World War II with a Federal debt of a little over $40,000,000,000. We started the current preparedness program with a Federal debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars. Our only advantage over our potential enemies is in the productive capacity of the free-enterprise system. That cannot survive in either insolvency or an atmosphere of fiscal weakness.

Under these circumstances it becomes crystal clear that we must eliminate completely all nonessential expenditures. And not the least of these lie within our domestic-civilian programs, including the give-away schemes which have been developed in recent years. We must put Santa Claus in the cold freeze for the duration of the present emergency. I am willing to vote for taxes for national defense, but I do not like the idea of placing great additional burdens on an already overburdened people for wasteful political spending.

What we need is pay as you go by combined economies and, if necessary, new taxes which with economies can be much less than the President requests.

Eric Johnston and other leaders say deficit spending is one of the most inflationary factors.

Continued deficits encourage irresponsibility in appropriations and will end in disaster.

You can never go broke pay as you go.

"Byrds"-eye view of the budget as requested by the President: Expenditures, $71,000,000,000; income, $55,000,000,000; deficits, $16,000,000,000.

To pass another "quickie" tax bill of $10,000,000,000 to be followed by another, as requested by the President, would be a most unwise procedure.

Two so-called "quickie" tax bills have already been enacted in the past several months. Including these two tax bills, the Treasury estimates that the tax take will be increased from $37,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1950 to $55,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1952, even if no further tax increases are enacted. We have taken off the fat. Further huge tax increases will dig deeply into the lean meat and possibly into the very bone structure of our economy unless they are eased by elimination of nonessential expenditures.

General Eisenhower has warned that our war alert status may last 20 or 30 years. Our real strain may be economic attrition. We must husband our financial strength and tighten our belts for the long struggle ahead.

The country is entitled to a firm financial program from the administration instead of piecemeal "quickies." Our financial preparedness cannot be attained by piecemeal implementation such as the President proposes. I repeat—it is essential to pay as we go, but the people of the United States will not accept huge tax increases in good spirit unless they are accompanied by:

1. Closing of all loopholes in existing tax laws. The start should be made with the tax exemptions now given to the President, Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and Senators and Congressmen. The President receives $50,000 tax exemption, the Vice President $10,000, the Speaker of the House $10,000, and each Senator and Congressman $2,500. If legitimate expenses are incurred, allowance should be permitted from their income tax returns, but all income should be taxed on an equal basis. No one should enjoy special privileges in tax exemptions at any time, but especially not now, when the tax burden must be vastly increased. I voted against these tax exemptions when they were enacted, and I will vote for the Williams bill now pending to cancel these exemptions. Common sacrifice for national unity requires that these tax privileges be eliminated promptly.

2. Improved tax assessment and collection system to prevent tax evasion.

3. Elimination of every dollar of nonessential spending.

After these things are done Congress can then determine the extent that new taxation is necessary in order to balance the budget.

My budget is an austerity budget. It will hurt but not so much as huge new taxes.

The rich cannot pay it all. If we confiscate the income of all those having more than $100,000 net income, it will net only $500,000,000 in taxes.

The President has "dared" the Congress to reduce his budget. He has spoken in a belligerent tone. His dare should be accepted. The Constitution gives only to Congress the power to appropriate public funds. The President can only recommend. To coerce or intimidate Congress in the execution of this constitutional power is a step toward dictatorship as the "power of the purse" in the hands of Congress is a major bulwark in our free government.

I propose, and have submitted in detail, reductions in the President's budget to the total of about $9,000,000,000. As a Member of the Senate I will fight for this reduction as a measure necessary to avoid disastrous taxation and ultimate insolvency.

On request I will have printed and send at my own expense to those interested copies of the congressional reprints indicating where and how these reductions can be achieved without impairment of national defense or essential Federal functions. I will merely cite now a few comparisons to indicate that the Presidential "touch me not" budget should be reviewed by Congress for the elimination of unconscionable increases in spending by nondefense agencies. I compare his proposed figures with the 1940 expenditures. I do not argue that these should be cut back to the 1940 figures, but I emphasize the amazing expansion of governmental agencies exclusive of the armed services.

These figures cover actual expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and the President's budget for June 30, 1952.

	1940	1952
Department of Commerce	75, 116, 535	982, 092, 852
Department of Interior	71, 385, 280	603, 435, 344
Department of Labor	18, 576, 098	220, 043, 997
Department of Justice	50, 813, 162	153, 290, 804
Department of State	20, 829, 487	371, 226, 112
Independent Offices	3, 269, 254, 403	5, 033, 499, 925

The Federal Government is now adding 1,000 new employees each day, and I estimate that, unless checked by Congress, 400,000 to 500,000 new employees will be added to the public payrolls, on which there are more than 2,000,000 civilians at this time.

The President may want his budget to be a "sacred cow," but Congress will be derelict in its duty unless it explores every inch of it and trims off the fat which bulges out of its every part.

The people of America want nondefense spending cut to the bone. It remains to be seen whether an obstinate President, who has dared the Congress to reduce his budget, can defeat this overwhelming public sentiment.

The free-enterprise system operating in the fullest freedoms of democracy stimulates individual initiative to the development and production of more of what we need at a cost we can more easily afford from the earnings of our endeavor. I am for that. Among the cardinal characteristics of socialism are Government subsidies with controls, and Government dole with regimentation. I am against that. The welfare state is that state of twilight in which the glow of democratic freedoms is fading beyond the horizon, leaving us to be swallowed up in the abysmal blackness of socialism or worse.

Socialism will not come to this Nation as long as it is fiscally sound. People are always restless and unhappy in debt. Debt makes slaves of people. There can't possibly be either military security or civilian welfare under conditions which are bound to exist in a nation which is constantly increasing its debt from a postwar base of a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Remember this: People can't cash war bonds of an insolvent nation. Fully solvent nations don't go socialistic. As I have said, the Federal budget can be cut without impairment of our military security or the impairment of any essential Federal function. You can bring this about by the use of the media at your command—your business, your newspapers, your radio stations, your organizations, your family, your associates—to press home the facts. Tell the facts over and over again. How could we finance another war, if it should come, with a debt already at a quarter of a trillion dollars?

I do not believe the people of this country want to live under a socialistic government or something worse. If we like what we are seeing in England we are justified in sitting on our hands while others bring it about in the United States.

Balancing the Federal budget and keeping it in balance during times of peace with no domestic emergencies is the first vital requirement for the preservation of our security and the security of democracy throughout the world.

I do not concede that either democracy, or free enterprise, or any other American freedom, has run the course of its usefulness in the world. They have been worth fighting for and winning for in the past against

both economic and military challenge, and I do not concede that they were any dearer to those who have fought and won before than they are to us today. We shall win again, but not until we begin thinking straight through all the double talk that we hear to the hard core of the problems that confront us, until we recognize the sacrifices we must make, until we see clearly the course we must take, and until we act accordingly.

In all of these, leadership, characterized by unselfish and selfless patriotism is the first requirement. We have had it in the past. It is not too much to ask now.

I have been frequently criticized by some of the New Dealers and Fair Dealers for voting with Republicans in the Senate, but I tell you now, as I have said before, the test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, are determined by the test of what I believe in my conscience to be the best for my country. I say with all the sincerity of which I am capable that such must be the test to be applied to everything by everybody in this country—in public office or out—for a long time to come, if we are to restore the peace and freedom for which this Nation was founded, and to which it is dedicated.

Depletion Allowance on Oil

REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN REGAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, some 25 or more years ago this Congress decided that, in order to encourage the development of our mineral resources, it would take care of those engaged in that risky business by giving them a certain depletion allowance on their discoveries if and when anything was discovered. That has gone on now for more than 25 years in a very successful manner, and we have developed our oil resources to the point that this country has never gone for want of this vital commodity in time of war. We are now about to get into another conflict and have been preparing for one, and again it has been suggested that the depletion allowance that has long worked so well for the development of the mineral resources of our country be reduced. I do not know why it should come up every year. Time after time Congress has decided on the worthiness of this depletion allowance program.

The talk by General Thompson, of the Texas Railroad Commission, explaining in detail the working of this program before the Committee on Ways and Means today, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. ERNEST O. THOMPSON, TEXAS RAILROAD COMMISSION, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 6, 1951

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Ernest O. Thompson. I was before you last year on this subject of depletion allowance on oil. You may ask why am I back here? The oil-supply situation today in the United States is much more serious than it was a year ago. That is why I am here.

I have no financial interest in oil. I own no oil production, no royalty or oil stocks or interests of any sort or kind whatsoever. None of my kinfolks owns any oil interests that I know about, and I think I would know about it if they did. My sole interest is that of a citizen soldier and as a conservation official.

I am a member of the Texas Railroad Commission, the State oil-conservation body. I have been in daily contact with oil conservation for 18 years in this capacity.

We have 2,268 separate oil fields with 126,231 producing oil wells, and Texas produces two and one-half million barrels of oil daily. The Nation is producing 5,850,000 barrels per day at this time. We will soon be at capacity.

Demand for oil was never so strong as it is today.

With the uncertainties of the future to be faced, we must find an additional reserve cushion of oil for our defense. Our safety margin is too short.

The question of depletion allowance here under consideration is the keystone upon which this added production can be built. It is a proven incentive.

ARMY AND NAVY CONVERT TO OIL

Today we are in a state of national emergency. Our men are fighting in Korea. Our national security is in peril. We need more oil-producing ability today, far more than we did a year ago. We face a pressing need for at least 1,000,000 additional barrels per day of ready producing reserve. Every possible incentive must be offered to get this added oil.

In War I we converted our navies to oil from coal and our Allies floated to victory on a sea of oil. Motor vehicles were just beginning to displace the horse as motive power for our Army. Our artillery was still horse-drawn.

In 1941, when War II came upon us, we were consuming in the United States 4,000,000 barrels of oil per day. We had at that time the ability to produce 5,000,000 barrels per day from wells already drilled. This was a producing reserve of 25 percent, and, mind you, only producing reserves are of any value for war.

When experts estimated that we would need 5,000,000 barrels per day to win the war, their prediction, though it seemed fantastic, proved to be true, and even civilian rationing was necessary. Sixty percent of all overseas tonnage in War II was petroleum. Our defense machine moves on oil.

Oil reserve for war must be ready in wells already drilled and hooked up to pipelines and refineries of ample capacity to produce the products of proper quality. You can't fight a war on undrilled oil wells. The wells must be ready within our borders, able to produce an additional million barrels per day, if, as, and when needed. We cannot feel secure with less, dependent as we now are on so much foreign oil. We cannot depend on foreign oil for defense.

In 1946 the man who headed our War II petroleum problem, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, told the House Armed Services Committee:

"The prudent man, instead of regarding the figure of our military leaders as excessive, must conclude that the only safe policy would be to regard them as an underestimate."

Quoting Secretary Ickes further from the same hearing:

"And I will say further, that in the event of another war, we cannot rely on imports, with the possible exception of Mexico. In other words, you will not be able to bring it in by tanker. The airplanes will be so efficient that they will blow every tanker off the surface of the ocean. You cannot depend on that."

I concur absolutely with this statement and cannot emphasize too strongly that we must develop our own domestic oil production. May I say that the Congress has been doing that for more than 25 years by the depletion recognition allowance. It is a proven method.

We are told that we are short of some 71 critical commodities today. They have to be imported.

If the Congress had pursued the policy of encouraging production of these commodities here at home as you have so wisely done in oil, we might not be so short of these 71 items.

Had you cut out or reduced the depletion incentive in the past, as you have each time wisely refused to do, we might today be compelled to depend on foreign sources for our defense oil.

Our reserve of daily producing ability today is relatively much smaller percentagewise than it was in 1940. We are consuming in the nature of 6,000,000 barrels of oil per day in the United States, and our reserve daily producing ability is not in excess of 600,000 barrels. So the reserve today is only about 10 percent as against 25 percent in 1940.

The late Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, testifying before the House Armed Services Committee in 1948, said:

"The maximum military requirements of petroleum in the event of a war emergency are now estimated nearly double the requirements of World War II. In other words, instead of 1,375,000 barrels per day, it would be about 2,750,000 barrels, which would be roughly 70 percent of our daily production before we entered World War II."

We are importing about a million barrels of oil per day into the United States from other countries, and were it not for these imports rationing of civilian gasoline would be on us today. A year ago oil imports presented a domestic oil problem. That problem does not exist today. Imports should come in only to supplement and not ever supplant domestic oil. You cannot depend on foreign oil for defense. This, to me, presents a real problem in the supply of oil, come war. In fact, it even presents a real problem to find oil for our rapidly expanding peacetime economy even if war is avoided.

CONSUMPTION IS INCREASING

Gasoline consumption is up 20 percent over last year. Twenty-seven thousand new motor vehicles were added each day last year. The railroads have largely converted to Diesels, which require much oil.

We have in storage at this time above ground 133,134,000 barrels of gasoline; but when divided by the number of vehicles on the road using gasoline—that is, automobiles, trucks, and buses—that gives only 114 gallons per vehicle in storage today. This does not include farm tractors or stationary engines.

HOW WILL WE GET OIL FOR TOMORROW?

It is proper for us to ask this question, then. What are we going to do for oil, come war, or even for the constantly expanding economy of the United States?

During the last reported week, in January, there were completed in the United States 848 new wells compared with 817 in the same week of January 1950. Wildcat or new-discovery completions gained 30 wells over last year for the same week to a total of 172.

There are 2,284 rotary oil-drilling rigs operating in this country today.

It is the plan of the Petroleum Administration for Defense to try to obtain enough steel to drill 44,400 oil wells in the year 1951. This compares with 48,000 drilled in 1950. During the year 1950 we brought in enough new dis-

coveries to take care of the oil that we consumed, and added only around 1,000,000,000 barrels to our reserve. But the trouble with these reserve figures is that it takes a long time, a generation, to produce all of the oil in the known reserves. The early production, of course, is flush, but it takes a long time to bring the last part of the oil out of the ground. As fields get older they produce more slowly.

It should be borne in mind that in order to get an additional 1,000,000 barrels per day of ready oil reserve, there must be twice as many wells drilled as are even contemplated to be drilled in this year.

The method of calculation is easy. We drilled last year 42,000 wells, and with those additional wells we were able to only care for the normal growth in consumption of our constantly expanding peacetime economy and for the small additional requirements of the Korean War effort.

CRUDE STOCKS LOW

Oil stocks at the moment are dangerously low. Crude stocks above ground are 237,000,000 barrels. This is as low as stocks should be.

In 1940 at this time of the year we had 99,000,000 barrels of gasoline on hand, which averaged 134 gallons of gasoline per vehicle. In 1946 at this time of year we had 104,000,000 barrels of gasoline on hand, which was 120 gallons of gasoline on hand per registered motor vehicle in the United States. We now have the lowest inventory per vehicle on record. We are faced with our largest demand in history.

HOW CAN 20-BARREL WELLS COMPETE WITH 10,000-BARREL WELLS?

The average oil production per well in Texas today is about 20 barrels. The average for the United States is around 16 barrels per well per day. Some wells in foreign fields produce up to 10,000 barrels of oil per well per day. Our problem here in America is to find ways and means to permit our oil to compete in the world market with foreign oil. Our exports have been dropping. Our crude oil and products imports are increasing. This brings about, naturally, a question which faces the American people today, and that question is, How can 20-barrel wells compete with 10,000-barrel wells? We are going to have to spread our oil-well steel supply much thinner in order to get more barrels of oil per pound of steel expended in the effort. This inescapably means wider spacing of oil wells, more acres per string of pipe.

I ask you gentlemen again: "How can 20-barrel wells in America compete with 10,000-barrel wells in foreign fields?"

Certainly it is fair to assume that if the depletion allowance is reduced our oil supply will suffer. We are not now in any position to see our oil supply diminished. We cannot afford to let anything happen that would lessen the incentive to hunt for oil in the United States.

If we get into a general war, our tankers, unescorted, might be sunk and we would be denied the oil that we so badly need to keep our country going and at the same time fight even a defensive war. Many of our planes of tomorrow will be jet-propelled, and it is a well-known fact that jets consume vastly greater quantities of petroleum products per hour than do internal-combustion engines.

We are bringing out of moth balls two vessels per day for our Navy. Tanks are being ordered by the thousands. Our Army is properly being rebuilt. I say to you gentlemen that I do not believe that we should tamper in any way with the depletion allowance, which has been so successful in furnishing the incentive to hunt for new oil.

The depletion allowance does not guarantee to any oil operator that he will find oil. He is merely given the means from his own depleted capital to go and hunt for more oil. He just gets a hunting license to search for oil. This he almost invariably does. A great deal has been said about the independent oil man finding most of the oil. In all candor I must say that many of the independents who search for oil go to the majors for assistance in the form of bottom-hole money, dry-hole money, purchase of checkerboard leases, and other cooperative methods which help the independent to put down his wells. The oil searcher has to get capital wherever he can find it.

Inquiry has shown that the major companies have expended twice as much in search for and development of oil production as has been granted to them in the form of depletion recognition.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEPRECIATION AND DEPLETION

I think it well to distinguish between depreciation, which is the granting of an allowance to rebuild something that can be rebuilt, while depletion in oil is the recognition of diminution of oil in the reservoir. Only nature can make oil. Man can only search for these deposits of nature.

After all, it is the consumer who must be served and served he will be. The consumer's wishes will best be served in our keenly competitive system, in which every man strives to supply the demands made upon him.

Incidentally, gasoline prices, excluding taxes, are no higher than they were 20 years ago, and the present gasoline is a far superior product to the gasoline of 1930. Crude prices have not risen for over 3 years. They have been steady.

The current press items carry the news that the oil industry has been called upon to furnish figures on the cost of adding 1,000,000 barrels per day to present capacity. Surely when one division of our Government thinks we should build up 1,000,000 barrels per day additional oil capacity, producing, transporting, and refining, this is no time to be taking away incentives which would make that increase in capacity all the harder to attain.

The Department of Interior also is considering the matter of coal-hydrogenation plants to guard against possible liquid fuel shortages in an all-out emergency. This talk is that 15,000-barrels-per-day-capacity plants would cost in the neighborhood of 250 to 300 million dollars. I am not talking against the construction of coal-hydrogenation plants, but the very fact that our Interior Department is considering or discussing the advisability of spending 250 or 300 million dollars to build two plants that would make 15,000 barrels per day each, or only 30,000 barrels per day, certainly emphasizes the extreme need to preserve the depletion allowance which made it possible last year to bring in enough oil to supply our needs and still add to our known reserves by 1,000,000,000 barrels—reserves that will require years to get out.

I cannot pass this over without calling the attention of the committee to this point. Here you are considering 900 million dollars added revenue by changing the long-proven depletion-allowance incentive, revenue you, of course, won't get anyhow. The reason being that development would be hampered.

The Government is considering or discussing the setting up of two plants to convert coal into oil that will cost 600,000,000 dollars to produce 30,000 barrels of oil per day. This Nation needs an additional million barrels of proven production of oil daily. Modern wars are won by production or lost by lack of production. This surely applies to oil.

The cold facts are, gentlemen, that we are growing so fast in our consumption of petroleum and its products that we are going to be hard put to keep up with the advance in requirements for petroleum. And as an oil conservation official from a State that produces 2,500,000 barrels of oil per day, and as a citizen soldier who appreciates that oil is ammunition, I respectfully suggest and recommend to you that you do not change the present 27½-percent depletion allowance as now provided in the statute. It has worked well through World Wars I and II, and has brought us thus far along in war "II½," and I trust that it will be kept in effect so that we may build up a reserve supply of petroleum that will help us avoid war III, or to be more nearly ready come war. We can avoid it only by being amply prepared to defend ourselves, and we cannot be amply prepared to defend ourselves unless we have ample oil supplies. Ample oil supplies will not be obtained, in my opinion, if you tamper with the 27½-percent depletion.

Back in 1918, when the discovery value was recognized by this Congress, oil had not become really so vastly important to our economy.

In 1926 when oil was more important to us the Congress wisely set up the 27½-percent depletion allowance recognition.

The Congress reviewed the whole question in 1942 and found it to be a proper and sound incentive to discover new oil.

It has become the keystone of our oil-producing industry.

Now in 1951 when our very freedom is at stake why tamper with this time-tested and proven method. To do so would endanger our defense effort. It would impair our peacetime economy.

I am an elected public official just like you gentlemen are elected public officials. I have my problems just like you have yours. My problem is to try to increase oil production. Your problem is to raise revenue. The way to raise the revenue of this Nation is to increase production. If we increase oil production, your revenue will be increased.

I know you want ample oil for defense. The reduction of the depletion allowance will reduce oil production for defense and will reduce your needed revenues for our war effort.

I know you do not want to do anything that would reduce oil production and revenue at the same time. To tamper with the depletion would do both. I know you need to raise taxes. I am for it. But do it for all alike in the same manner.

Outside of water and bread there is no more important commodity than oil to our existence today in this forward-looking Nation. Realistically, you couldn't get the bread without the gasoline. We cannot risk any possible shortage of oil. The retention of the depletion allowance will keep going the constant search for more oil by big and little operators all over our land. I hope they find it.

Here we have one branch of our Government talking about spending $300,000,000 to make 30,000 barrels per day of synthetic oil. Another branch of our Government says we must have an added million barrels per day available oil production for our defense. Then still another branch of our Government comes along here and asks your committee to cut the discovery incentive by 45 percent. This would reduce the oil industry's financial ability to explore for oil. It just doesn't make good sense. It doesn't even make good nonsense.

It is not too much to say that petroleum protects freedom. Our tanks, our ships, our planes, and trucks all require petroleum in great quantities. If we are to remain free, we must be strong. Our Armed Forces move on oil. One day without oil would paralyze our economy. Petroleum propels the machines of defense. Yes, gentlemen; petroleum protects freedom. I thank you.

Cost of Government Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of four articles from the Detroit Free Press, written by Mr. Paul R. Leach, the distinguished chief of that newspaper's Washington bureau.

These articles expose the huge Government propaganda machine which annually consumes and wastes millions of taxpayers' dollars. As the series reveals, much of this so-called Federal information service is designed to promote bureaucrats' pet projects and policies. It is a timely and important series on a phase of Government activity which is too little known, and is the product of an intensive investigation by an outstanding reporter.

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

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 18, 1951]

UNITED STATES MACHINE FOR PROPAGANDA KEPT WELL OILED—45,000 PUBLICITY MEN ARE BOON TO BUREAUCRATS

(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON.—The American people are supporting more than 45,000 Federal employees who are engaged directly or indirectly, full or part time, in dispensing information, publicity, and propaganda.

A little-known report of the Hoover Reorganization Commission called much of this activity "thought control."

There have been congressional charges that there is great waste in the Government's publicity campaigns. A resumption of investigations into the whole picture is being sought by Republican critics of the Truman administration.

The 45,000 figure was supplied on congressional demand by the Budget Bureau more than 2 years ago. It is believed to be growing larger as emergency bureaus are formed.

Many of these 45,000 are said by congressional critics to be carried on the payrolls in capacities other than publicity venders. But they are used, part-time at least, to further administration ideas and aims, and to stir up pressure groups to influence legislation.

However correct that 45,000 is, there are more than 8,000—from stenographers to information officers—engaged directly in public-relations work.

Their annual pay runs from $3,000 to $10,300, with a few section chiefs getting $15,000.

The largest group, nearly 6,000, is employed by the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration at home and abroad.

The other 2,000 are scattered through domestic departments and bureaus in Washington and throughout the country.

Even the most severe critics of the Government information machinery admit that much of this work is legitimate and essential. These people inform the public, the press, and radio of the operations of a Government employing 2,100,000 persons and doing a $50,000,000,000 annual business.

They seek to spread the gospel of free America abroad as counter to Communist propaganda.

How much of it is legitimate and how much is waste only a full-dress congressional investigation can determine.

When Government publicity was last investigated by the Eightieth (Republican) Congress the total cost of direct and indirect publicity was estimated at $250,000,000.

The State Department employs 5,028 persons at a total salary cost of $14,015,670.

Of these 3,393 work overseas, 2,844 of them locally recruited from foreign sources. Only 549 are Americans.

The other 1,635 are employed in this country. This includes 148 in Washington who are directly concerned with supplying public information.

By far the largest portion of these State Department workers are connected with the Voice of America and the United States Information Office.

The USIS, mostly connected with our embassies abroad, dispenses American information in 82 countries.

The Economic Cooperation Administration has a total working budget for salaries, radio, publications, movies and still pictures of more than $17,000,000.

It employs 58 persons in Washington and 602 abroad in "selling" the Marshall plan as an antidote for communism.

Of those employed abroad 169 are Americans. An oddity of the ECA overseas cost total is that nearly $16,000,000 of it is paid out of counterpart funds.

Every country getting Marshall-plan grants from the United States must set aside the full equivalent in local currencies to be used internally for recovery. These are counterpart funds.

Five percent of this is collected by the United States Treasury for buying strategic raw materials and in meeting ECA expenses abroad.

The ECA information specialists abroad and some of the State Department's USIS people are irritating to other Americans overseas because they draw living expenses in addition to pay.

Thus, the top information man for ECA in Paris is paid $12,000 in salary and $3,000 for rent and servants.

Also, Foreign Service employees may have their personal automobiles shipped to them at Government cost.

Except for ambassadors in major capitals and two top ECA administrators in Paris, who are provided cars with chauffeurs, overseas employees get free transportation only from cars in Government-owned "pools."

Both USIS and ECA publicity offices are somewhat at sea now because of moves in the Senate to consolidate all overseas propaganda bureaus.

The ECA is to die legally June 30, 1952, but the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wants to carry its work beyond that time.

While there has been some criticism of the Voice of America in Congress, Senator BENTON (Democrat, of Connecticut), former Assistant Secretary of State in charge of all information activities, wants it greatly expanded.

The over-all cost of the Voice this year is $57,462,167. More than $40,000,000 is going into the building of new transmitters in America and in Europe.

Except for Joseph H. Short, White House information secretary, and Robert R. Mullen, head of all ECA, public relations, the Washington top for information men is around $10,000.

Short gets $17,000, and Mullen draws $15,000.

Employees in the United States do not get living allowances.

Here are high lights of other major Government offices:

The Department of Defense is second to the State Department in number of persons assigned to all forms of public relations. The total is approximately 1,800. The figure is hazy, because many officers handle two or more jobs including information.

The Department of Agriculture figures it has 400 people on information jobs, nearly half of whom give part time to it.

This figure does not include another 300 engaged in the research, writing, and editing of its many publications.

The Federal Security Agency employs 31 information specialists. It has 10 head offices, but in only one, Chicago, is an employee listed as doing public relations.

The Department of Labor has 30 persons in its public relations bureaus. The Veterans' Administration has 68 scattered over the country.

The Department of Commerce has 73 persons in its information and publications section.

The emergency agencies are just getting started. The price and wage offices have 10 men here and 50 in the field. The National Production Agency has 15 local men and 13 in the field.

So far Charles E. Wilson, "assistant President," in charge of defense mobilization, has only three information men on his staff.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 19, 1951]

CONGRESSMAN HITS UNITED STATES PROPAGANDA TO CONTROL THOUGHT—CLAIMS AGENCIES ATTEMPT TO GUIDE PEOPLE'S THINKING

(By Paul R. Leach)

(No. 2 of a series)

WASHINGTON.—"There can be no question that the greatest and most effective lobby in the country today is that conducted by the Federal administrative agencies," says Representative BOW (Republican, Ohio).

A freshman Member of the House, BOW was attorney and fact-finding chief of the Harness Committee of the Eightieth Congress which spent 15 months delving into propaganda to influence Congress by Government agencies.

He wants Congress again and more fully to go into the "location of and rooting out of the incipient dangers of Federal thought control." He charges that bureaucrats who are not a part of the legitimate Government information and public relations offices are promoting such activity.

He is especially interested in having Congress keep an eye on propaganda for the Brannan farm plan, prepaid health insurance, and activities of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

BOW explains "thought control" as "a system of Government propaganda which presumes to tell the people what they (the people) should think about certain grave issues, what kind of legislation they should demand." "This system builds up pressure groups to push administration bills," BOW claims.

The aim, he says is for more centralized Federal Government power, larger appropriations.

He recently charged that the Federal Security Agency is spending $2,000,000 a year on promoting "socialized medicine." President Truman again recommended this item in his 1952 budget message.

BOW recalled the row in Congress last year when Agriculture Secretary Charles P. Brannan summoned some 5,000 regional Agriculture Department employees to a meeting at St. Paul, Minn., at a cost of $200,-

000. The group heard a Brannan plan political speech.

This, Senator FERGUSON (Republican, Michigan), told the Senate at the time was a clear violation of the law.

In a recent House speech Representative LATHAM (Republican, New York), said that, although the St. Paul meeting was held 9 months ago, the Justice Department has done nothing about it.

"The administration has frankly begun to experiment with the mechanisms of official thought control," said LATHAM, "* * * at the direct expense of the American taxpayers."

The Hoover Reorganization Commission, in its unpublished report last year, devoted considerable space to another Department of Agriculture activity in 1948.

The House had made reductions in the soil conservation appropriation as recommended by President Truman. A telegram was sent from the Department in Washington to all State administrators of the program.

Regional meetings were held, the report recounted; letters were sent to county agents designed to stampede the Senate to restore some of the economies.

The Hoover Commission report pointed out "the potentialities of such a campaign looking to a telegraphic drive on Congress."

There are 3,029 county agricultural associations in the United States, it said. Each has its county offices. There are 9,087 county committeemen assisting the county agents.

"Under these county committeemen," the report went on, "are 97,529 community committeemen employed on a per diem basis. In addition there are 8,378 paid office personnel serving the county agents.

"All of these local information channels are brought together in each State under the State administrator, a full-time officer and staff, usually located in the capital city."

Among other inquiries which Bow recalled the Harness committee made, was one into Army propaganda for Universal Military Training. That was so unpopular at the time that Congress refused to consider it seriously.

Bow is now a member of the Public Lands Committee, which keeps an eye on the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

As attorney for the Harness Committee Bow wrote the report which charged the Reclamation Bureau with "evasion of the intent of Congress and wilful evasion of Federal Law."

That grew out of a long investigation into Reclamation Bureau lobbying for its projects, especially in the western States.

Echoing Representative LATHAM, Bow said that by its size alone the Federal domestic propaganda army of regular—not public relations—employees influences public thinking.

"The public is being conditioned by its own Government to demand more and more subsidies, guaranties and grants * * * and to defeat any Member of Congress who dares to raise his voice in protest."

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 20, 1951]

HOW MUCH WASTE?—UNITED STATES PRINTING SHOP LARGEST IN WORLD

(By Paul R. Leach)

(No. 2 of a series)

WASHINGTON.—The United States Government conducts the biggest printing and publishing business in the world, and it is growing much larger.

The Government Printing Office during the fiscal year ended last June spent $57,631,000. Its allowance from Congress for the 12 months ending next June went up to $69,284,000. A similar amount has been requested for the 1952 year.

Much of the Washington establishment's output, for Congress and all departments, and of smaller plants in a dozen cities, is necessary.

At the same time, that output furnishes publicity for administration-favored causes in countless ways.

How much waste is involved is a question Representative REES, Republican of Kansas, ranking minority member of the Civil Service Committee, wants Congress to delve into.

"The waste," he told the House recently, "is great but incalculable. The Government spent millions of dollars more than it should because of duplication and multiplication of effort.

"Furthermore, it prints a tremendous amount of material that is unnecessary."

REES pointed out that the printing-bill figures do not include the costs of writing, editing, and assembling countless publications, big and little. Those costs, he said, are three times that of the printing.

Senator BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, discovered a couple of years ago that more than 83,000 publications were issued by the Government Printing Office in 1 year.

He tried to make a complete survey but gave up after discovering that in 1949 the Superintendent of Documents issued 61,979,102 copies of Government publications.

Because we thought BRIDGES might have been exaggerating in that speech, we called a few days ago at the Office of the Superintendent of Documents.

In the reception room we picked up 52 catalogs, from 2 to 60 pages each, listing publications for sale. Prices for those thousands of pamphlets and books range from 5 cents to $5. They are carried free by the Post Office.

On top of the heap was a 10-page booklet listing 134 Government periodicals. These run from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (proceedings of Congress), which you can get for $1.50 a month, to the official monthly organ of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service. That costs $1 a year.

The monthly bulletin of the Social Security Agency, which has been accused in Congress of propagandizing for compulsory medical insurance, costs $2 a year.

The Rural Electrification News, bimonthly, can be had for 75 cents a year.

Most of these publications are sold at printing cost. This represents a loss to the Government because the preparation and editing is not figured in.

Here are high lights of just a few of the other catalog titles, each listing many separate publications:

Fish and wildlife: Nine pages. You can find out how to trap bobcats for 5 cents. For another nickel you can learn about the Turbellaria in the Philippine Islands.

Finance, banking, securities, loans: Seventeen pages. A nickel will get you the Bretton Woods agreement, but it will cost you 20 cents to learn how to select a store location.

Office of Education: 19 pages. The status of education in a dozen foreign countries will set you back from 10 cents (Austria) to $3.75 (The New Education of Japan).

Labor: 22 pages. Proceedings of the National Labor Relations Board run as high as $4.50 a volume. For a dime you can find out about paid vacations in the United States.

Occupations, professions, and job descriptions: 12 pages. What a rabbi, priest, or minister does, for 5 cents each.

Tariff and taxation: 19 pages. From Internal Revenue Bureau regulations, at 15 cents to $1.75 each, to regulations pertaining to liquor stills, at a dime.

The are many more of these catalogs covering the widest possible range of information, all prepared, printed, and mailed at Government expense.

Life is too short to count all the publications in those 52 catalogs. We're taking BRIDGES' word for it.

Undoubtedly many are valuable. Some of the cost is realized in sales.

But REES brought out the fact that "tons and tons of undistributed Government publications are sold as waste every year."

He found that some 5,000,000 back-number, nondemand copies are condemned each year.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 21, 1951]

AND PUBLIC PAYS—BUREAUCRATS BUILD POWER ON FAVORS

(By Paul R. Leach)

(No. 4 of a series)

WASHINGTON.—When you demand favors of your Congressman you may be helping Government bureaucrats influence the adoption of pet legislation and nonessential spending bills.

And, says Representative MEADER (Republican, Michigan), you weaken the ability of regular Senate and House committees to investigate impartially the far-flung activities of executive departments.

You also may become unwittingly a tool of the propaganda machine that seeks more power for individual bureau heads and the central Government and add to growing Treasury deficits.

"The country," says MEADER, "is dangerously close to something like state socialism because of an overgrown bureaucracy and weak congressional investigating powers."

To correct this tendency MEADER would have Congress do these two things in addition to doing more auditing of the executive departments:

1. Encourage the creation of special investigating committees. Their members would not have the close relations with any given executive department that standing-committee members have.

The congressional reorganization act discouraged special committees.

2. Greatly increase the professional staffs of regular and special committees.

Nearly 300 lawyers and trained investigators are now available for the tremendous job of seeing that the executive department does with its money and laws what Congress told it to do.

MEADER would double that staff. The added costs would create savings a thousandfold, he believes.

Although a freshman member of the House, MEADER is far from being a stranger to how Congress works.

He was head of the legal and investigating staff of the Senate's Special War Investigating Committee. It has been credited with saving the taxpayers billions of dollars during and after the last war by its watchdog labors.

He is a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee of the House Expenditures Committee.

His subgroup, headed by Representative HARDY (Democrat, Virginia) has authority to investigate any Government department's activities. Among the things MEADER wants it to look into is pressure by bureau heads for legislation.

How favors weaken a Congressman's influence was told by MEADER.

"A new Congressman comes to town," he said. "He draws assignment to a standing committee which deals with one or more Federal bureaus.

"Immediately, those bureau heads and their deputies start being nice to him.

"It's never so blatant as providing wine, women, and song. They do things for him that his voters ask for.

"Some constituent wants his civil-service rating upgraded for better pay. Another

wants his son transferred from one military assignment to another.

"A business man or manufacturer needs help in seeing the proper people for contracts.

"The back-home mayor or governor or chamber of commerce wants a public-works project planned.

"School kids and researchers want information that will take days to compile.

"All these things and many more which are constantly being requested of Congressmen require help from some Government bureau.

"The bureau head, not the bureau's public-relations man, sees personally to the job of taking care of them, as promptly and fully as possible.

"Over the years these favors mount up.

"When a member, especially if he's of the administration's majority party, achieves seniority and authority in his committee, he is valuable to the favor givers.

"And because of those favors it is often difficult for a member in committee work affecting bureaus with which he has had to take a detached, penetrating viewpoint."

The very existence of special committees, such as that for which MEADER was chief counsel and which Senator FERGUSON, Republican of Michigan, wants to revive, serves to make bureau heads more careful of how they operate, MEADER believes.

Address by Gov. John S. Fine, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Dinner of Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, held at Philadelphia, on February 27, 1951, the Honorable John S. Fine, Governor of Pennsylvania, delivered an able address, in which he pointed out the duties of government and business in the present crisis. I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF GOV. JOHN S. FINE AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Gentlemen, I am glad to have this opportunity of talking to an organization of men who exert a distinct influence on Pennsylvania's growing economy.

As you well know, we are living in an atomic age. That connotes many things—among them, sacrifices, fear of global war, preparedness in the hope of avoiding conflict, readiness if we cannot avoid it.

We have need of many readjustments to our normal ways of doing things. Those readjustments apply to our everyday way of life. They involve business and industry. They apply to the conduct of government. Little, if anything, is outside the scope of change in our Commonwealth and in our Nation.

We must be prepared for anything and everything. Once again in far too short a span of time we have to gear for war. And that, basically, is industry's job. The time for theorizing is past. The practical man's day has come—is here again.

There never has been too much theorizing in business and industry—but there has been in Government. And there still is. That fact is largely responsible for the trouble we are in. Weak and deteriorating international negotiations, masking under the misnomer of diplomacy, contributed to our difficulties. Ill-considered judgments, which tore down our strength even while conflict raged, did not help us to solve the problems which have led to the predicament we are in today. Industry was expanded; then dismantled at the first thoughts of peace. Demobilization was hastened. The uncertainties of a precarious peace were further enlarged. Our productivity, which astounded the world and paved the way to victory, was constantly assailed by economic planners only because of its bigness, its efficiency.

Now those who produce the sinews of war and of defense, again knuckle down to hurried and expanded production. You will do it. Of that I am certain. You never have failed, and you will not fail now. While there is much lost motion in the process of rebuilding, potential industry will accomplish the gargantuan job with efficiency and economy of operation. Men of industry, as all other good Americans, are tremendously interested in preserving the American way of life.

That is why I believe that the seriousness of the times makes it imperative that we bypass wishful thinking in favor of direct and practical approaches to our manifold problems—problems of industry and of government. We will have to speak out, sensibly and to the point. There is nothing to be accomplished by indirectness or by minimizing our problems.

All of you realize that you can't do business as usual. And I don't believe you will be able to again in the foreseeable future. Conditions have changed because of a war economy which conceivably can spread to alarming proportions at any moment. Our whole scheme of things has altered. So has our economy not only in Pennsylvania but in every State of the Union. Costs mount. Taxes rise. Pay rolls increase. As men and women take up military duties man-power problems increase. These are worries that are common to all of us. They are not yours alone. They are bothersome to every man and woman in every hamlet and town in our Commonwealth. And you must not forget, they are the worries of your Government too. Like everything else, cost of government has risen. And we who administer your Government, like you in industry and business, will have to take it in our stride.

There is nothing else for us to do. The tremendous upsurge costs have taken, compels it. When rising prices come little by little over a period of time, we are apt to lose the true picture. Let me combine these rises into one package for you. As the present State administration begins, the general cost of living is up nearly 75 percent over the cost in 1940, a mere 11 years ago. Building construction costs are up three times as high and still soaring. Wages are up too, in some instances 100 percent. Administration of State government has risen as high as 75 percent in many cases.

This changed economy of which I speak, and which all of us I am sure, have recognized, demands immediate expanded production on your part. It calls for more man power, greater harmony between Government and industry and between labor and industry. Already, you are mobilizing your productive ranks. That mobilization, and its utilization, is a major part of the preparedness program. This program contemplates expenditure by the Federal Government of some $130,000,000,000. But that is only a start. Actually, the program extends over unforeseeable years at annual expenditures of probably in excess of forty to fifty billions.

This means accelerated production. New vistas of expansion open up to industry in Pennsylvania, and to your advantage. Pennsylvania has always been in the vanguard in assuring national security. It has been no idle boast to say we have been the arsenal of America. Our natural resources, our industries, our man power, our hearts, our will, our initiative have combined to make this a fact. For anyone to say we will be laggard in this emergency would be a slander or libel which we would not countenance, even momentarily.

And this is where you gentlemen, and what you represent, come forcefully into the picture. You must assume a part of the leadership so vitally necessary to insure strengthening our economy. You must work hand in hand with Government—State and National—accepting restrictions which seem inevitable, enlarging sufficiently to support full-scale war. You face sacrifices, as do all of us. You may need, perhaps as your Government most assuredly needs, to take a rereading on organizational efficiency, productive capacity, alertness of management. If there is room for improvement, you must improve. You will have to cut your cloth to the needs of the times. And, for that matter, so will your Government. We propose to pursue such policies in Pennsylvania, but we shall not be parsimonious in civil defense, health, and education.

We are not going to run hog-wild in expenditures for State government in this Commonwealth. I have said that the cost of Government has risen. That is true. But I do not wish to pass on every cent of that rise if economies can be obtained here and there in the conduct of Government and if greater efficiencies of operation can lessen the burden.

Additional taxes will have to be collected. There is no way of escaping that. But we intend to keep them at a minimum. Prudent management of State affairs will assist in that aim to some extent.

Unfortunately, there are some people who would gleefully burden business with most, if not all, of the additional revenues needed to run the State's business. This belief is engendered, no doubt, by the ease with which some look to business and industry as limitless sources of ready tax moneys. There is that group who will only direct collectors' hands to industry because they believe industry has inexhaustible finances easily accessible for taxation purposes. And then there are those whose policies are supported by the punitive attitude. That philosophy may be part of national thinking. It is not this State administration's thinking. We all know you can go to the industrial well once too often if the trips are frequent enough. Business moneys can be exhausted, just as the resources of individuals may vanish if they are overtaxed. That is why we intend to spread whatever needed additional revenues may be found to be necessary—spread them so that they will be uniformly applied and not be overly burdensome to any group or groups.

That is why we are not going to penalize industry in Pennsylvania. Why should we, when Pennsylvania sincerely welcomes business to this State? We are trying to make that welcome inviting and true. The number of new industries coming here, and the expansion those already here are making, are indicative factors that the businessman knows a good thing when he sees it. There is no exaggeration in saying that business already here is growing from little to big, to bigger, far out of proportion to growth in other States.

Taxation is a big consideration to an industry seeking location of its business. But

it does not necessarily have to be the determining factor. Many times there are more important things than taxation to be considered. There are favorable labor conditions, and we have them. There is low local taxation to be considered; and in most of our industrial areas in Pennsylvania we offer more in that respect than do surrounding States. As the center of a great population area, we have rich markets at hand. We have the best transportation facilities in the country to make those markets easily and speedily available to our industry. We have an outstanding program of State health assistance to help keep your workers healthy and happy. We are cleaning our streams. That is a boon to industry. And with all this, when we consider taxes at all levels, from State level downward, our tax situation respecting industry is a favorable one.

One reason for this is that a large share of the burdens of local governments carried locally in other States, are assumed by the State government in our Commonwealth. That lowers local taxes on industry. For instance, the State carries the entire public assistance burden—thus relieving localities of this charge. The State carries a very high percentage of the cost of schools. The State government has taken over local burdens on highways which in many other States are paid for by the counties.

There is still another illustration where our counties are exempt from cost that normally is shared elsewhere. Here, the State provides for the care of mental patients.

These are some of the major ways in which the State relieves local governments. As a result, local taxes are comparatively low, either because of a low tax rate or because assessments are low, extremely, and oftentimes ridiculously low. That in itself is an invitation to industry not only to come into Pennsylvania, but to those here to expand. When you take our whole tax picture into consideration, State and local, we compare most favorably with the States around us. This favorable picture your administration will be most reluctant to alter.

We are, of course, still working on the State budget and upon the tax program. It is taking longer than ordinarily necessary to work these out because of certain imponderables which the emergency propounds. It was delayed, too, by family illness, which is daily being bettered

We do not yet know what our civil defense program is going to cost. We will take every step necessary to properly and adequately protect our people against the possible ravages of war which might strike this Commonwealth. We are going to insure within our collective abilities that our industries are protected against sabotage and external attack. But we are not going to go overboard by providing unnecessary money for this protection. We are not going to throw money away. We are going to get back in protection the value of every dollar we put into it. Up to this moment we have pursued the policies and reorganization directives as drawn by that self-sacrificing American and outstanding Pennsylvanian, Gen. Richard K. Mellon.

Yet, with civilian defense as one of several imponderables before us, I can say to you now that the budget for State government for this biennium, outside of obligations for meeting the soldiers' bonus, mandated salaries for teachers, State authority rentals, and education appropriations required under existing law, will not be more than 3 percent over what was needed for the last biennium. This will be true despite increases in costs of State government, in salaries, wages, State purchases, and the like. We will see to this by paring the budget wherever it is possible to economize without losing efficiency. We have started the pruning, and we are still continuing the process of pruning.

While I have not yet made my final recommendations for additional revenue, I feel confident that the share that industry will be called upon to bear will not be larger proportionately than at present. True, we may find it necessary to defray a part of needed additional revenues by slightly increasing the corporate tax. If we can avoid the imposition of further taxes on industry, we will do so. If not, you may rest assured the increase will be light. I think we have gone as far as we can safely go at this time in imposing taxes on industry in Pennsylvania, particularly in relation to taxes levied by surrounding States. Nevertheless, we must recognize that the time is fast approaching, in fact not far distant, when the tax base in Pennsylvania will have to be broadened.

Our present attitude on taxes places responsibilities upon both of us. I have to see to it that industry in Pennsylvania—indeed Pennsylvania itself—is not hampered in its productive potential by excessive taxation. You have the responsibility of adjusting yourselves and your business to quickly expanded production.

Next to our spiritual strength, our productive capacity makes us a great Nation. The men who first came to our shores came here looking for God—not for gold. Their spiritual blessings were woven into the fabric of our Government. That is why we are willing to fight, if need be, to preserve freemen from subjugation by the Godless. But we have to implement that faith and that willingness to fight with weapons to translate our ideals into realism. That is where you come in with your productive capacity. There are those Godless people who cannot evaluate spiritual and moral values but who are fearful of our ability to produce everything we need. Our production is our bigness. You and I recognize that. It is this production which may thwart evil men, destroy the Godless, and save religion itself. Yet, we have in this country high-placed officials who in peacetimes condemn as evil, industry because it is big. There is no inherent wrong in bigness itself any more than there is virtue in smallness. Business, big or small, depends on how honestly and how morally it is conducted.

We need to be big to produce big, to accomplish big things. The prospect on conflict to save mankind, in which we would have to lead, dictates bigness not only in our production of materials to wage that prospective conflict, but in our viewpoint of how, why, what, and under what conditions we produce.

Our preparations to meet the challenge must be all-out preparations.

Upon the industrialists of the country may largely rest decision whether we have war or peace. Meet the crisis with the production of which American industry is capable; provide the tools and implements to fashion the style of peace, and Americans everywhere, fortified with a crusading spirit born of moral and spiritual values, will be fully prepared for peace without war, or a war for peace.

Reforms in Federal Communications Commission Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Plotkin Thickens," from Broadcasting magazine of March 5. It deals with the McFarland FCC procedural bill. Undoubtedly this very vital bill will shortly be worked out between the Senate and House.

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

THE PLOTKIN THICKENS

It's happening again. The FCC majority, still hypnotized by its brain-trust lawyers, has authorized action that would sabotage the McFarland bill (S. 658) to institute desperately needed reforms in FCC procedures. The bill has been approved by the Senate for the third time—with no open FCC opposition.

It is in the House that the FCC legal cabal is at work. It is using practically the same script as a year ago, but with a defense twist.

The FCC lawyers want no new legislation that will wrest the control they hold over all FCC policies—engineering and economic, as well as legal. The McFarland bill would halt ex parte maneuvering, and place responsibility where it belongs—with the Presidentially picked and Senate-confirmed Commissioners.

In closed House hearings a fortnight ago, the FCC resubmitted its model bill. It saw no need for legislation along the lines of the McFarland bill. It wants merely three or four changes in the present act at this time. It blandly selected palatable parts and talked down changes in substantive provisions that would take away its gun (and the lawyers' powers).

As always, greatest secrecy surrounds the FCC's suggestions. The hearing was held behind closed doors—at the FCC's behest. But the model bill, which we reported in detail in our issue of January 30, 1950, is about as secret as yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Things have changed since the FCC lawyers did the machete job on the McFarland bill last year. Representative Sadowski, who introduced the FCC bill in January 1950, is now Mr. Sadowski, citizen. Senator MCFARLAND, who was a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last year, is now the majority leader—No. 1 party man in the upper Chamber.

House Committee Chairman CROSSER, who last year was told the McFarland bill was a radio version of the Taft-Hartley bill (he's a prolabor man) now knows the facts.

Of course, the Cottone-Plotkin-Goldman-Solomon quadrumvirate of FCC legal lights still has in its vest pocket the House communications expert, Mr. Kurt Borchardt. It was his collaboration last year that aided the FCC lawyers in thwarting remedial legislation, keeping inviolate the FCC's record of blocking any changes in the substantive law since 1934.

It is our guess, however, that the strategy won't work this time. The FCC wants, and perhaps needs, the authorization for new monitoring station facilities. It covets a radio-fraud law, similar to the postal-fraud law. It wants other sugar-coated provisions of the McFarland bill. Its device is to get them piecemeal, thereby kicking the bill in the teeth.

What will the Senate do? Communications bills automatically go to the Interstate Committee, headed by Senator BIG ED JOHNSON, and of which Mr. MCFARLAND remains the ranking majority member. While we do not have the confidence of these distinguished statesmen, we surmise they will see to it that these piecemeal amendments will be attached to the thrice-approved McFarland bill, and shunted back to the House. In fact, this happened Wednesday on the monitoring amendment.

Thus, if the FCC wants its monitoring money, or its sugar candy, it will have to

take them hand-cuffed to the lawyer wing-clipping provisions of the McFarland bill. They can play shuttle-cock that way all year.

How long this travesty will endure we do not know. It is our feeling, however, that a few well-timed speeches on the Senate and House floors, laying bare the artifices of the FCC's legal minions over the years, would yield the essential results.

Grain for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement issued by the social welfare committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace, supporting the program of grain for India which I have joined in sponsoring. The statement concludes with the recommendation that "the Congress pass legislation without delay granting to the Government of India the food grains required and that it take this action without attaching to it political conditions of any nature."

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

GRAIN FOR INDIA

The issue of food grains for India breaks down into three questions of fact: Does India actually face a serious grain shortage? Can the Indian Government obtain such grain imports as may be needed through commercial transactions, either in the Far East or elsewhere? Should the United States, in view of its current and prospective heavy demand for grain, make sizeable shipments for India from its reserves?

The Indian Government requests 2,000,000 tons of food grains from the United States as the minimum to continue the ration in 1951 at the level prevailing in 1950 to build back India's depleted grain reserves to a minimum safe level. The Indian Government bases this request for aid on the contention that summer floods, earthquakes, and fall droughts have critically reduced domestic grain supplies.

So far as can presently be ascertained, summer floods in some areas did wipe out grain reserves held by Indian farmers and destroyed seed stocks as well. Earthquakes did destroy some villages and otherwise hampered production.

But most importantly, in some of the principal rice-growing provinces, autumn rainfall was far below normal, with very serious effects upon rice production.

The evidence on these points appears to be conclusive. So, too, is the evidence that the people of India are faced with a dangerous grain shortage unless additional imports are provided—though there is lack of full agreement as to how bad the situation actually is. It would appear to be significant however, that the per capita daily grain ration has been reduced by 25 percent in Bombay and other ration areas.

Regarding the second question of fact, whether the Government of India can obtain the required imports commercially in the Far East or elsewhere, the Government alleges that it has already arranged to import all of the grain for which it can make financial arrangements. In the absence of reasonable evidence to the contrary, it would seem that this contention should be accepted.

With respect to the third question of fact, while United States reserve supplies of grain are not as large in relation to current and prospective demand as seemed to be the case a few months ago, nevertheless, the United States entered 1951 with about 998,000,000 bushels of wheat in all storage positions, a stock exceeded only twice before in our history. The Nation's carryover of corn, 860,000,000 bushels last October 1, was an all-time record.

There is little doubt, therefore, that this Nation can spare the quantity of grain required, under present estimates, to tide India over this emergency, particularly since any deficiency in wheat supplies available for shipment could probably be made up out of barley, corn, and grain sorghums.

We should undertake this humane act in the spirit of Christian charity. We shall not jeopardize ourselves in any way.

The Social Welfare Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace urges, therefore, that the Congress pass legislation without delay granting to the Government of India the food grains required and that it take this action without attaching to it political conditions of any nature.

Award to Lorenzo Lee Bean, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement issued by the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce with respect to the award made to Lorenzo Lee Bean, Jr., of Arlington County, as Virginia's outstanding young man of 1950.

This is a well-deserved honor, and I commend the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce for their custom of making a selection such as this each year.

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

WILLIAMSBURG.—Lorenzo Lee Bean, Jr., 34-year-old Arlington attorney, was named Virginia's outstanding young man of 1950 and presented the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award at a banquet here last night. Presentation was made by Dr. John E. Pomfret, president of the College of William and Mary.

The banquet was attended by Jaycees from throughout the State who are meeting this week end for a quarterly work conference. Also present were the four national winners of the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber, National Association of Broadcasters, and Radio Manufacturers Association.

Bean was awarded the honor for his many civic contributions and for donating his legal services to a number of public-spirited organizations.

Foremost among the Distinguished Service Award winner's civic accomplishments was his work in helping to establish Arlington's Anderson Orthopedic Hospital, which will be opened in April. The idea for the $400,000 hospital was originated by Dr. O. Anderson Engh, Arlington orthopedic surgeon, and Bean, who was a polio victim while in college.

Construction of the 40-bed hospital was adopted as a project by the Arlington Junior Chamber in the spring of 1949. The chapter was a year old at the time.

Under guidance of Bean, the site for the building was cleared by Arlington Jaycees. Land was donated by Dr. Engh. Nearly all labor and materials were contributed by several building unions and contractors associations, mainly the Northern Virginia Contractors Association.

The hospital project earned a first-place national award from the United States Junior Chamber.

Other civic contributions which the Young Man of the Year made in 1950 include service as: A board member of the Community Chest campaign, a director of the Arlington YMCA, legal adviser and trustee of the Anderson Hospital, a director of the Family Service of Northern Virginia, and president of the Arlington Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Bean was also during 1950 active in mission church work, member of the Legal Aid Bureau of the bar association, and executive director of the Democratic Council of Arlington.

He has taken the leadership among younger members of the bar in urging them to donate their legal services to welfare groups and to participate in community life.

After studying prelaw at Hampden Sydney College, Bean was graduated from the University of Virginia Law School in 1941. He passed the bar a year before graduation.

Accepting a position with the United States Department of Agriculture, he became Chief of the Litigation Section of the Rural Electrification Division. He has been in private practice since 1947.

Nominations for the distinguished award were open to the public. Any Virginia man between the ages of 21 and 35, inclusive, was eligible. Judges this year were Dr. Pomfret, William H. Trapnell, vice president and general manager of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., of Virginia, and Lynn W. Franklin, retired United States consul general.

Bean was nominated by Charles R. Fenwick, Arlington patent attorney.

Closing Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8900, the Revenue Revision Act of 1950, had a provision that closed a certain tax loophole then prevalent. It was a loophole indulged in by Charitable Trusts and Educational Institutions that engaged in unrelated business activities in competition with taxpaying business organizations. For example such as owning and operating macaroni factories, piston ring factories, and so forth. The net income received by these charitable trusts and educational institutions after January 1, 1950, from unrelated business activities is to be taxed under the provisions of the 1950 tax act on the same basis as corporations are taxed.

The following article, taken from the February 6, 1951, issue of a national magazine, the Reporter, and entitled "The

Financial Wizard of Omaha," is a graphic picture of the loophole in question that was closed. We hope the tax bill of 1951 will close other glaring tax loopholes, and put a stop to the taxdodging adventures of other tax exempts that are so prevalent today.

THE FINANCIAL WIZARD OF OMAHA

(By William S. Fairfield)

This is the story of an operator. His name is Gordon W. Diesing. That he is not better known may be just another tribute to his ability as an operator.

Diesing is an Omaha, Nebr., citizen who has never lived or worked on a farm. But until recent events slowed him down, he was well on his way to building a vast farm empire of which he would have had sole control by 1954. He started from scratch less than 3 years ago.

In 1948, Diesing was just another lawyer—a tall, easygoing bachelor whose receding but thick black hair and whose physique, only slightly gone to fat, belied his 42 years. Up to that time he had been practicing law for almost 20.

One day Diesing came across an article in Fortune magazine describing how many of our biggest charitable, religious, and educational foundations had bought and were operating private business tax free. Behind the practice, the article said, was a specific Internal Revenue Code exemption for such organizations.

Late in 1948 Diesing began to charter nonprofit foundations under Nebraska laws. Within a few months he had eight different foundations to his credit—some educational, some religious and charitable. They ranged in title from the Crusade for Freedom to the Sacra Coeur Foundation. In financial structure, they also varied from strictly nominal capitalization to no capitalization at all.

Diesing, faithful to the tradition of operators, didn't plan to spend much of his own money in any event. The largest amount at which any one foundation was capitalized was $10.

To be assured of complete control, Diesing appointed himself not only president of each foundation, but also treasurer, secretary, resident agent, general counsel, and chairman of the board of trustees. The charters stipulated that all activities should be managed and controlled exclusively by the president and the treasurer.

Diesing's next step was to put in a long-distance telephone call to Thomas D. Campbell, a man whose farm operations had earned him the title of "Wheat King of the World." Had Campbell, Diesing wanted to know, ever thought of selling his 65,000-acre farm in Montana? Campbell hadn't, but he was willing to start. A meeting was arranged.

Diesing arrived at the meeting armed with little more than photostatic proof of his tax exemption and a few cogent figures. To Campbell, it sounded then like the craziest deal in the world. It still does.

But Diesing's figures proved very persuasive. Campbell's farm probably averaged a profit of about $400,000 a year. But since the farm was incorporated, 38 percent of this amount, or $152,000, went to the Federal Government in corporation taxes. Out of the remaining $248,000 came State taxes and individual income taxes, the latter especially onerous for a man in Campbell's income bracket. After all these taxes, Campbell was left with possibly $50,000 out of his corporation's original profit.

If Campbell were to sell his farm to one of Diesing's tax-exempt foundations, however, the $152,000 in corporation taxes could be completely saved. Moreover, since the foundation had no stockholders clamoring for dividends, the entire $400,000 would remain intact. As for his foundation, Diesing would be satisfied with possibly 15 percent, or $60,000—thus leaving $340,000 to be returned to Campbell each year as an installment on the sale.

True, Campbell would lose ownership of the farm and with it $50,000 annually in take-home profits. Also, he would have to pay 25 percent of the sales price in capital-gains taxes.

But Diesing was prepared to compensate for these factors. He offered Campbell $2,000,000 for the farm, a figure Campbell has compared to the million and a quarter he'd have been lucky to get on the open market. The margin of $750,000 would cover not only the $500,000 in capital-gains taxes but also Campbell's $50,000 income for 5 years. And at $340,000 a year, the sale would be paid off in approximately the same amount of time. Also, Diesing offered to retain Campbell as manager of the farm at $12,000 a year until the sale was completed.

In the spring of 1949, Campbell signed the papers. Diesing had taken title to one of the Nation's biggest and best farms without paying a nickel down, according to Campbell.

"Diesing's exemption from corporation taxes is the key," Campbell has explained. "Without it, there would have been no deal." But conversion to a position to capital gain was also a prominent consideration. "Any financier will tell you that the only way to pile up large sums of money today is through capital gains." And Campbell wanted large sums, he has said, to expand another of his farm holdings, a 48,000-acre ranch in New Mexico.

A month after the Campbell transaction, another of Diesing's tax-exempt foundations bought a 30,000-acre cotton plantation in California for $4,078,000. The plantation had been owned by Russell Giffen and 12 other stockholders. As might be expected, the method of payment was much the same. Giffen did insist on a small down payment, the balance to come from the farm's net profits. Diesing's foundation was to receive 15 percent of these annual profits until the sale price was paid.

When the Campbell and Giffen purchases were made, Diesing made the mistake of bragging about his activities to friends. The news leaked out locally, and Diesing discovered the meaning of a bad press. He also learned a lesson; any more recent deals that may have been made through his eight foundations remain unknown. Diesing himself now claims that except for the Campbell and Giffen farms his foundations are all dormant.

What Diesing himself gets out of all this is difficult to discover. Officers of foundations generally receive an annual token fee for accepting the responsibility involved. Several independent foundations have quoted $1,000 as a quite modest token.

Nebraska law specifically forbids the payment of such a fee to only one class of foundation officers—the trustees. Implicitly, then, Diesing is left with a total of 40 positions—5 in each of 8 foundations—for which he legally could accept money. If he were to receive the above-suggested $1,000 for each position, Diesing would obviously be enjoying an annual "token" income of $40,000. On the other hand, Diesing may expect no earthly reward.

Soon after the Campbell and Giffen deals, Diesing's troubles began. First, it was his initial trustees: three female Benedictine and three male Trappist orders. Venerable Mother M. Dolorosa, primate-general of the Benedictine Sisters of Perpetual Adoration in this country wrote:

"We became trustees [in September 1948] in the first place only after much pressure had been brought to bear [by] Mr. Diesing, who had long been a friend of our community. * * *"

Whether or not Diesing himself later hinted at his real plans, the various trustees did get wind of them, even before the Campbell and Giffen purchases. On January 21, 1949, Mother M. Dolorosa resigned for the Benedictine Sisters. The Trappist groups all followed suit within the next few months. However, on April 25, Diesing wrote Mother M. Dolorosa, advising her of the Campbell deal and asking her to reconsider the Benedictine resignations.

According to Mother M. Dolorosa, Diesing's letter continued: "If you expect me to assist in paying your debts, I most certainly think the divine law of charity insists that * * * you consent to again be trustees. Your refusal will mean immense loss of financial assistance in future years to your convent."

On May 7, Mother M. Dolorosa replied, confirming the resignation as final. "Our bishop," she said, "highly disapproved of our being connected with any business enterprise which involves a tax exemption of this nature."

By June 8, all six former trustees had thus positively reaffirmed their resignations, but Diesing continued to use their names. Finally, all six were forced to take their cases to the office of the secretary of state at Lincoln, Nebr

The letter from Father M. Robert, abbot of the Trappist-Cistercian Abbey at Conyers, Ga., was typical: "I stipulate that neither my name nor the name of (my abbey) should be used in any further connection with * * * any foundation or any corporation of which Mr. Diesing might be named president or chairman of the board."

All during early 1949, Diesing had also referred to Francis P. Matthews, who is now Secretary of the Navy, as a trustee. But Matthews, a prominent Catholic and an old Omaha friend of Diesing's father, was not to become a trustee until summer.

"Gordon had told me something about what he was doing and had been after me a long time," Matthews recalls. "Finally, I agreed to do anything I could to help the Trappists."

Matthews became a trustee on July 21. What Diesing evidently had not told him was that the last Trappist group had "completely disassociated" itself from Diesing's help some 6 weeks before.

Matthews lasted less than 2 months. Then, on September 16, he too resigned. "I had understood that Gordon was forming a foundation to help Catholic orders invest their money," Matthews explains. "Then I found out they didn't have any money to invest."

Nebraska law requires every nonprofit foundation to have a minimum of three trustees. But at several points Diesing was down to one—himself. He finally solved this problem, after Matthews' resignation, by appointing two laymen—men he personally has described as "close friends."

Diesing's next trouble came from Noah M. Mason, Republican Congressman from Illinois. On the same day the last Trappist group gave Diesing its resignation Mason had introduced a bill one of the provisions of which called for taxation of the "business income" of all charitable, religious, and educational foundations. Such a measure, of course, would have completely sealed off Diesing's loopholes.

Less than 10 days after Mason's first speech on the bill the stubby Congressman received a letter from Diesing: "I read an article in the Chicago Tribune stating that you gave a splendid speech in the House attacking the tax exempt. * * * Kindly send me several copies of your excellent speech, and send me several copies of the bil. you introduced."

Mason complied. On July 9 Diesing wrote again, thanking him: "I would appreciate it very much if you would advise me as to the progress of your splendid bill through the [Ways and Means] committee and the House."

Mason complied again, saying he didn't expect to press for passage of his bill until the second session.

Diesing's next letter to Mason, a month later, reported "tremendous interest in the bar association" in Omaha. "Kindly send me all the detailed information you have on the matter as promptly as possible," Diesing wrote. Also, in connection with three organizations named in Mason's speech, Diesing wanted to "know in detail how they own and operate such a business and not pay any income tax."

Possibly because of the reference to the bar association, Mason considered this letter important enough to turn over to the National Associated Businessmen, which was solidly backing his bill. And on August 28, Mason received from Loring A. Schuler, head of the NAB, a two-page "suggested answer to Mr. Diesing." It may be assumed that this answer satisfied Diesing's purposes, for he wrote no more. However, he didn't have much more time to write, for a month later Mason discovered the true nature of Diesing's interest in the bill. On October 6, Mason notified his Nebraska correspondent of this discovery by exposing the 8-month-old Campbell deal to the House.

"I think it's the funniest thing I ever heard of," said Mason's secretary, Mrs. Evelyn Krupp. "He acts like he approves of the bill, then organizes everything he can lay his hands on." But "the boss doesn't think it's funny at all," according to Mrs. Krupp. In fact, she says, Mason blames her because it was her idea to answer nonconstituents' mail.

The Ways and Means Committee, after extensive hearings, shelved the Mason bill last summer, and Diesing was apparently in the clear. He had two trustees he could count on. He had letters of detailed information from a Congressman—letters that much more than offset any harm that same Congressman's dead bill could do him. And he had his own ability to cope with situations as they arose. Perhaps his career had only begun. Campbell had said: "If I had a deal like that, I'd buy up the whole world."

But when I visited Diesing in Omaha last fall he looked and acted like a tired businessman. His manner of speaking was considered almost phlegmatic—though his chain smoking hinted at an inner tension. His answers were as evasive as I had anticipated, if not as skillful. When cornered, however, he had a perfect comeback: "It would only be personal vanity for me to talk about it." The interview was singularly uninformative.

If Diesing appeared more worn than usual during this period he had good reason. He had just returned from two disheartening weeks in Washington. It looked as if the legislators, in one game at least, were finally catching up with the operators.

With the Korean situation had come a demand for more money. Congress started all over on a tax law. And although the Mason bill itself wasn't dragged off the shelf, one of its segments was. Included in the final draft of the new bill was the exact provision Diesing dreaded, a provision specifically denying nonprofit foundations tax exemption on any income from business enterprises unrelated to the exempt purposes of the organizations.

Diesing's loophole was gone. His foundations no longer enjoyed any tax exemption.

His immediate goal was to salvage what he could. Both Campbell and Giffen had considered the loophole wrong from the beginning. And, expecting a change in the law, they had demanded escape clauses in their contracts. Diesing, of course, marshaled all his arguments to prevent these clauses from being invoked. "We spent a lot of time on the phone those days," Campbell recalled recently.

The details of these long-distance conferences must be filled in from peripheral information; but the results indicate that Diesing had some persuasive reasons for continuing the transaction, even without his tax exemption.

In the first place, as Campbell was no doubt reminded, the new tax law had not altered the capital-gains aspect of the deal. In fact, by increasing corporation taxes 15 percent and high-income individual rates as much as 13 percent, the new act actually strengthened this particular phase. Because of these increases, Campbell would now be enjoying only about $25,000 out of his farm's $400,000 income—as opposed to the $50,000 he got previously. And on the horizon was an excess-profits tax that might cut his take even further.

Then, too, Diesing had already paid one $340,000 installment, and would be able to pay a second before the new tax law took effect. Roughly, a third of the sales price, perhaps more, would be paid under the original agreement.

And finally, the installment payments could be continued, though the loss of tax exemption would necessitate a lower rate. Even under the original deal, the payments were to come out of the farm's profits. But Diesing's foundation could pay the new, much higher corporation tax on those profits and still have nearly $200,000 a year left to turn back to Campbell. And with about $700,000 of the $2,000,000 already down, it still would take Diesing only 9 years to pay off.

Campbell's only alternative was to go through the legal entanglements of repossessing his farm. Such a process would not only be messy but also, in the case of so sizable a piece of property, very expensive.

Campbell decided to play it Diesing's way. "The deal is still on," he says. "Now that it's gone this far, it's better to go the rest of the way." But, as Campbell had previously said, "It would never have started without the tax exemption."

Giffen evidently made the same decision. His lawyer wrote: "I wish to state that no change whatsoever has been made in the original transaction, and that the * * * stockholders expect the organization which Mr. Diesing represents to perform its agreement in accordance with the terms thereof."

The "terms thereof," however, call for "a minimum payment that must be met each year." Campbell's contract no doubt contains a similar stipulation. And it is possible that without his tax exemption, Diesing has trouble meeting these minimum payments. Thus, he may be paying off debts for a considerably longer period than 9 years.

Obviously, the new tax law has ended Diesing's dreams of expanding. He has his hands full.

In Diesing's particular game, the legislators have come from behind to tie the score. But other games are already in progress, in the oil fields and in the commodity exchanges, to name but two places. And where there are loopholes, such as depletion allowances and speculative freedom, there will be found the Gordon W. Diesings.

The Army's Contradictory Manpower Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in Vivian's Caddo Citizen, of Vivian, La., on February 22, 1951.

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

The Army is doing a bang-up job of confusing us poor civilians. Statements issued by the Pentagon are continuing to be contradictory and making the men who are in the Armed Reserves tear their hair out by the roots.

A few months ago, the Army called for mobilization of all Air Force Reserves, and they emphasized that the need for manpower was so great that they felt the drafting of all 18-year-olds was imperative if the Nation hoped to survive an imminent war with the Russians. A few weeks later they decided that the Reserves were not needed. A few weeks ago the same thing repeated itself, this time actual orders went out to practically the entire Reserve Corps, telling them that they had 30 days in which to straighten out their affairs before reporting for duty. This time they said they weren't fooling.

So what happens, these men who received these orders started preparing to become Army men again. In a few cases which we actually know, they sold their homes, quit their jobs, or in one case a man who was in business, after trying to sell and failing, hired a man to run his establishment.

Now they say once again, "We are just fooling, we don't need you." They are even planning to discharge some of the men who are already in service. The same thing happened with the National Guard. Men high in guard circles definitely stated that everything pointed to practically all guard units being called to active duty by the middle of January. Now they say, they won't call any more National Guard units and plan to discharge the ones already in service at the end of 21 months.

Now, if they have no use for the men they already have in service and are not interested in the men who are already in the Reserves, why in the name of heaven do they want to draft the 18-year-olds? Why can't they wait until they reach the age of 19, and then induct them into the armed services? Personally, we can't figure this all out, and we are sure a great number of you are a little amazed at the shenanigans going on at the Pentagon. We have almost made up our minds that men in the Pentagon themselves don't know what is going on. We hope they don't fight battles the same way.

Proposed Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution to liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation effective June 30, 1951. I am convinced a mere reorganization will not provide a cure for the political paralysis which has RFC in its grip.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in today's

New York Times entitled "Reorganization—Or Burial?"

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

REORGANIZATION—OR BURIAL?

While Senators dredging in the records of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation yesterday were bringing new evidence to the surface of the intimate tie-up between finance and politics in its affairs, a Member of the Senate was demanding the outright abolition of the agency. He is JAMES P. KEM, Republican, of Missouri. Proposals to reorganize the RFC, said the Missouri Senator, didn't go to the heart of the problem. The Government lending agency, he declared, has become a "political grab-bag of White House favorites." Even Congress, he added, "can't legislate honesty or good management."

Whatever their views may have been previous to the present hearings, many persons, we believe, will go a good deal of the way, at least, with Senator KEM. For our part, our mind is not closed to arguments for keeping the RFC alive temporarily as a strictly emergency instrumentality, with all nonemergency activities to be liquidated without any unnecessary delay. But in the light of recent revelations, the burden of proof even for this limited continuance of its activities has been shifted to the shoulders of its friends. As to reorganization, that has become a matter for discussion only after the more basic question has been decided.

The RFC was originally created in February 1932 as a temporary organization (with a life of 1 year) to help shore up distressed banks and other financial institutions, to keep the Nation's railroads out of receivership and to provide agricultural credit. In the conduct of its affairs in those days no such scandals developed as those whose details fill the news columns today. Was this a matter of personnel and organization? No doubt it was, in some measure. Certainly the country was fortunate to have as the directing heads in those early years such able financiers and administrators as Eugene Meyer and Jesse Jones. But a more basic consideration, we suggest, was the fact that the RFC, in those days was functioning in an economy which was at the outset in a state of shock and in the later years still convalescing. The Corporation's job, basically, was that of a stand-in for other institutions whose functions had been partly paralyzed by the crash of 1929 and the depression which followed.

Contrast that with the peacetime octopus into which the agency had grown in the early postwar years—a gigantic Government holding company with a string of subsidiaries that put to shame in number and variety the corporate offshoots of our most far-flung public-utility giants before the dissolution of these monsters. But worst of all, the RFC had now become a great lending institution, with no emergency to justify its lending. And what is more natural than that such an agency, with no basic economic justification for its banking activities, should find its particular justification in politics? By this we don't mean the acts of political collusion which are now coming to the surface; we are thinking rather in terms of the numerous lending fields into which the natural process of bureaucratic proliferation had drawn it. As Jesse Jones said a year ago in recommending "a decent burial" for the Corporation (a recommendation seconded by the task force of the Hoover Commission), "Government lending in competition with private business is not a proper function under our private enterprise system."

Statement of George J. Burger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1951, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and made a very interesting statement. Mr. Burger expressed a definite fear that with increasing taxes and the tendency to give war contracts to the larger firms would result in closing up and probably bankrupting many of the small business operators throughout the Nation. Mr. Burger quoted from letters his organization had received from many small independent manufacturing firms throughout the country, each stating the fact that they were afraid of the impact on their firm if careful consideration was not given not only on taxes but in the letting of contracts and the supplying of raw materials to them during the war effort. I am sure you will find this statement well worth reading and I commend it for your serious consideration. It follows:

In his Economic Report to Congress this year, President Truman said: "In a defense emergency, all those on the home front should serve, to the limit of their ability, in the kind of work for which they are best fitted."

The 98 percent of all our businessmen who own and operate small and independent firms are ready and eager for this service.

In World War II, when they were permitted to use only a fraction of their potential, they provided almost 27 percent of the value of all war production. Today they are accounting for 24 percent of a much smaller defense production total.

As our Nation goes further into the defense program, more and more of these small and independent businessmen will be called on. Many of them will be required to expand their facilities. Their service, and constant readiness to serve, will provide our Nation with a great safety factor, as England learned in World War II after its centers of concentrated, giant production had been bombed out, and that nation forced to turn to its thousands of small and independent factors for needed defense production.

But, as matters stand today, many of these small and independent businessmen may be unavailable when the need for them arises. Their decentralized plant may be in disrepair, their pool of skilled labor dispersed, their magnificent productive potential completely lost.

For today literally thousands of these independents—some of them likely right in your own congressional districts—are rushing down the road to ruin. Not because of their own ineptness or mistakes. Rather because they are being squeezed to death between operation cut-backs caused by materials shortages and rapidly increasing costs, of which mounting taxes are part cause.

Let us illustrate by quotes from four of the hundreds of letters received from small and independent members of our federation within the past 30 days. Hear what these businessmen have to say:

A mail and independent plumbing manufacturer writes: "The owners of this company contribute substantially to the United States Treasury in the payment of taxes. However, due to its inability to obtain steel, copper, lead, and zinc, this contribution is about to cease unless materials for essential products are made available. We are holding urgent orders from jobbers requiring more than 40 tons of metals, which we cannot obtain. Military orders are being held, due to refusal of extendible ratings."

A small and independent plastics manufacturer writes: "We have a new plastics factory * * * completed late in 1948. It is equipped with one of the largest injection presses in the Middle West. We have floor space and modern, up-to-date equipment and could handle a prime contract for the mobilization program. Our inability to secure plastic molding materials is very perturbing to us as we have thousands of dollars in molds and other materials, and unless we can secure Government work or get materials for our items for the civilian market, we will have to close our $150,000 plant."

A small and independent farm-implement manufacturer writes: "The usual sources of steel supply for the small manufacturer completely dried up by middle September, and the gray market operators moved in to market the available supply—at a price. By late December, this price had risen to 20 cents per pound for certain steel items such as sheets, effectively closing the door on this, our last source of supply for sheet and strip steel. We could not hope to meet this price level. Our products simply would not sell for that kind of money. It is obvious that we cannot long remain in our present static position and simply mark time. If we are not soon able to obtain sufficient materials to maintain our manufacture the only alternative is complete and permanent closure of our plant."

A small and independent tire retreader writes: "We have been under the impression from news releases and bulletins that the rubber manufacturers have been instructed by our Government to channel a greater portion of their production to camelback. From the manner in which orders are being received in tread plants it appears that there has been a considerable reduction rather than an increase. We have been unable to secure any camelback whatsoever for 30 days. No operator can keep open and save valuable tires on such a basis."

Some of these businessmen are individual proprietors or partnerships, others are incorporated. Consider that the unincorporated businessmen were the last to receive tax relief after World War II, that they have already taken one tax increase, and are facing a second in the President's proposed tax program. At the same time, the incorporated firms who were, 1 year ago, paying 21 percent on the first $5,000, 23 percent on the next $15,000, and 25 percent on the next $5,000 are all paying 25 percent today, and are being asked to pay 33 percent in the President's proposed tax program. More than this, the so-called tax speed-up adopted in the last Congress is causing them to pay, temporarily, relatively greater amounts of taxes in relatively shorter periods of time.

What, we ask, would your outlook be as a businessman in the face of these increasing taxes and mounting materials shortages? Undoubtedly many of you, just as many of these businessmen, would be facing extinction.

In addition, for many years difficulty in securing financing has been a serious deterrent to the formation of new small and independent business enterprises and to the continuation and expansion of these enterprises, once founded. Our sales representatives contacting thousands of small independents at their places of business daily see evidence of this problem. The files of the House and

Senate Small Business Committees, and of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, contain much evidence of the problem. All three committees have held extensive investigations into the problem.

The reason for this difficulty is easily determined. Even in normal times the returns available are not sufficiently attractive for individual investors. The costs of stock flotation are prohibitive. Inability to build sufficient reserves prevents internal financing.

Now, even before any further increase in taxes, all of these stumbling blocks to continued small and independent business are greatly magnified. Where, then, if anywhere, are these small and independent businessmen to turn for a solution to their pressing financing problems? How are they to continue in existence?

Congress could, if it will—and as we hope it will, help smooth the extremely rough path these independents must travel if it will do any one or more of the following:

1. Refuse to raise taxes on small and independent business or to raise them to the confiscatory levels suggested so far; or,

2. While raising the tax level, either—

(a) Permit tax deductions for plant expansions or improvement, or

(b) Permit greater retention of earnings for reserves, or

(c) Eliminate double taxation of dividends, perhaps with some ceiling attached.

We recognize that any one of these suggestions will lessen the total revenue taken in by Government. Against this we are sure you recognize that if something is not done many of these businesses will no longer be a source of tax revenue; their payments to the Treasury will stop once and for all. More than this, we are sure you recognize that the easier Congress makes it for small and independent firms to secure private financing and to finance themselves, the smaller will be the demand for Government assistance, and the smaller will be the total tax bill Government will have to present to the people.

In this last we are not suggesting that private financing is now, or will be in the foreseeable future, an adequate source for small and independent enterprise. Much as the federation would like it to be, it just has not been so, and on the basis of all portents it is not likely to be so. But we are suggesting that Government can act now, by giving up a little at the present in order to gain more in the future in the way both of taxpaying competitive enterprise and national security.

Beyond all this, the loss caused by enactment of any one or more of these suggestions could be overcome, in great measure, by complete elimination of nonessential Government spending in both the defense and nondefense fields, and by closing the loopholes in present tax law.

Last month we recommended just this to the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report. We told the committee that economies can be achieved in the defense program by (1) extension of the competitive advertised bid system of procurement, which will permit greater small and independent business service to the Nation; (2) greater defense agency use of small and independent business facilities, which will reduce the need for direct and indirect Government financing of additional new plant and reduce product cost by eliminating the build-up of wasteful backlogs and the incomplete use of the labor potential; and (3) more willingness on the part of defense agencies to heed constructive suggestions, from small and independent businessmen, designed to cut armament costs. We pointed out also that savings can be affected in nondefense programs by holding up extensions or all social-welfare programs and creation of new programs of this type, and by eliminating all subsidies to business and agriculture, so far as is possible. We told the committee that in a period such as this of great business activity and high income, promoted largely by Government spending for defense, curtailment and elimination of these programs can be made without endangering the Nation.

On the other hand, as we recommended also to the joint committee, Government tax revenues can be increased by fair taxation of presently tax exempt organizations which compete daily with independently owned and operated unincorporated and corporate businesses. We refer here specifically to the so-called cooperatives, which should be taxed in the same manner as their independently owned and operated competitors. In this connection you will recall that apparently reliable witnesses before your committee last year estimated that during the years of World War II, cooperatives escaped payment of some $655,000,000 in Federal taxes. Since that time, the volume of business done by cooperatives has increased tremendously. So, obviously, has their tax advantage.

We need not remind you that a question greater than that of raising additional revenue—vital as that is—is here involved. President Truman put it well when he told the Congress, January 12: "Sacrifices must be shared fairly." Small- and independent-business men urge that Congress consider this principle when working on the problem of taxing cooperatives. All other considerations aside, it simply is not fair when co-ops do not have to pay the same taxes as their unincorporated- and corporate-business competitors. As a matter of fact, it might be said that the unincorporated- and corporate-business men are being coerced into paying the freight for their competitors.

Before we close, gentlemen, let us make one point very clear; as we told the Senate Finance Committee, December 8, 1950, small- and independent-business men are quite willing to assume their full tax burden. They do not desire to have anyone carry the load for them. They have never asked for any unfair shift of the burden from themselves to any other class of taxpayer.

But they realize as well as you that ruined businesses neither pay taxes nor contribute otherwise to national security. They know, too, that any expansions to fill the gap caused by their elimination will not provide Government with the same amount of revenues as it is now receiving.

Remember, many of these enterprises—as you have seen by their own testimony—are now close to ruin. Further tax increases, at least to the levels suggested in the President's suggested program, may push them over the brink to complete disaster.

Donaldson's Shocking Antilabor Tactics Cause Employees and the Public To Suffer

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial which appeared February 23, 1951, in the Detroit Labor News, which is the official spokesman for the American Federation of Labor unions in Detroit and Wayne County, Mich.:

IT'S TIME TO GET A NEW POSTMASTER GENERAL—DONALDSON'S SHOCKING ANTILABOR TACTICS CAUSE EMPLOYEES AND THE PUBLIC TO SUFFER

(By Frank X. Martel, president, Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor)

Never in the history of the Post Office Department has any Postmaster General put into effect as many administrative policies that adversely affected the welfare of the employees as has the present head of the Post Office Department. Since his permanent appointment he has made no recommendations that would improve the lot of the employees. Despite his high-handed actions toward the rank and file, the Postmaster General has been most generous in recommending increases for ranking departmental officials of the Post Office Department, and extremely generous in recommending increases for the American railroads. He vigorously fought a sorely needed slight wage increase for World War II veterans. His record toward the employees has been a shocking one. A recital of a few of the many actions taken by the Postmaster General lowering employees' standards follows:

1. The Congress by law provided for the payment of 90 cents an hour or 7 cents a mile to special delivery messengers for the use of their automobiles. On the strength of this legislation, many messengers went into debt to purchase new cars. The Post Office Department, under General Donaldson, disregarding the intention of Congress, has leased automobiles from private contractors in many of the large cities, leaving the special delivery messengers holding the sack.

2. On October 27, 1949, the Postmaster General issued a down-grading order. He assigned a number of the duties that had been performed by skilled clerks in the post offices and by postal transportation clerks to mail handlers, at a lower rate of pay. This order also provided that all extra clerical and carrier work during the Christmas rush would be performed by temporary mail handlers. This action is comparable to using a laborer to do the work of a skilled journeyman.

3. With the advent of streamlined trains, the Post Office Department agreed to give a time differential to all postal transport clerks serving on speed trains, similar to the differential granted to railroad employees. This speed differential remained in effect from 1936 until June 30, 1950, when Postmaster General Donaldson abolished it.

4. The postal classification law provides two classes of postal transport employees—class A and class B. Class A employees are clerks on the minor branch lines. Main-line employees and those on the heavier branch lines are in class B. Based on the volume of work, clerks in class B are given $200 a year more than those in class A. Many years ago the Post Office Department established as a basis of distinguishing between class A and B the qualification of 450 units of work. This has been the qualification ever since, until the "great, career" Postmaster General increased the requirement from 450 to 600 units of work.

5. On April 17, 1950, Donaldson issued orders that have practically ruined the postal service. He made the job of letter carrier an intolerable one. Ironically, Jesse Donaldson himself was a letter carrier for a very short period of time 40 years ago. With the reduction of deliveries, carriers are required to remain on the street for 6½ hours and more without restroom facilities and without proper places to eat. Everyone is aware of the many inconveniences and the cost to the public resulting from the April orders, but this article is concerned principally with the hardships that it has caused the employees. Despite the misleading statements issued by

the Postmaster General, letter carriers are compelled to carry much heavier loads. They have longer routes—with perhaps several hundred additional patrons to serve. Their routes are so heavy they seldom see their job completed. They must listen to patrons' endless stream of complaints without being able to solve them.

6. Congress made Armistice Day a national holiday. In the past, it has been the practice to permit postmasters to give service on holidays in cases where service may be necessary. However, when Armistice Day 1950 came around, the Post Office Department issued a flat order to deliver on Armistice Day. There was no latitude given to the postmasters. The order was absolute. The employees who worked on Armistice Day were not given double time for holiday service; they were not given time and one-half—they were given time off on a straight-time basis within the next 5 days. The holiday was taken from the men largely because mail was piling up and the Postmaster General was vainly trying to keep the real facts from the public.

IT'S TIME FOR A NEW POSTMASTER GENERAL

All in all, the actions listed above have resulted in little or no saving to the American taxpayers. They have, however, made the Post Office Department—once the pride of the Government—the despair of the public and the postal employees. It is ironic that the employees of an agency of Government in an administration that prides itself on its liberal attitudes should have to put up with the whims of an administrator whose sole response to the challenge of managing a big department is to issue orders ruining the service and wrecking the morale of the employees. The President of the United States should immediately seek a competent administrator to head the Post Office Department. The longer the change is delayed, the more difficult it will be for a competent man to bring order out of the present chaos. The President should find a man who understands morale, administration, and public welfare—one who is sympathetic to the employees. The bleating explanation by Donaldson that economy drove him to it is rather hollow in view of the recent agreement by the Post Office to pay the railroads an additional $312,000,000 for transporting the mails for the period February 19, 1947, through December 31, 1950.

It is unfortunate that the Post Office Department, in an administration that boasts of its friendship to labor, is now headed by a man who knows hostility to the labor principles insisted upon by President Truman. In October 1950, the National Postmaster General Donaldson attended the convention. The Postmasters' Association is presumably an independent organization. Dan L. Gibson of Albany, Ga., was a candidate for president and was the almost unanimous choice of all the postmasters for the position. When the postmasters arrived in St. Louis, they were informed that Donaldson insisted on Barney Dickmann of St. Louis for the position. Departmental officials put the pressure on postmaster delegates. At least one acting postmaster was informed that failure to support Donaldson's choice would result in failure to secure a permanent appointment. The newspapers told the story—the disappointed defeated candidate complained publicly. He stated that he knew he was defeated—he had it "from the horse's mouth."

Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES of Pennsylvania, introduced in the Eighty-first Congress a bill to firmly establish labor regulations in the postal service. Donaldson would have none of it. Company union procedures were more to his liking. In a letter to Congressman TOM MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, dated July 19, 1949, he declared:

DONALDSON OPPOSES ORGANIZED EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION

"This measure would provide for representation of members of employee organizations only, and might possibly force all employees to join an organization in order to obtain the same consideration and treatment in dealings with administrative officials. * * *

"The present law recognizes the right of employees to become members of employee organizations and provides necessary protection to such employees incident to legitimate activities therein. During the many years this law has been in operation the Department's relationship with employee organizations has on the whole been amicable. The Department and its representatives are always willing to discuss problems in which responsible employee organizations have an interest at any time the representatives request such a discussion. Because of this it is in my opinion that H. R. 3702 is superfluous and its enactment would serve no useful purpose. * * *

"Legislation of this nature will so encroach upon the administrative functions and responsibility of the Department, postmasters, and others charged with the administration of the postal service, that it would very seriously hamper the economic administration of this service.

"In view of the foregoing, this Department is strongly opposed to the enactment of this measure."

The Department recognizes unions on its terms only. The action of the "Career Postmaster General" at St. Louis indicates the nature of those terms. Discussion when the Postmaster General wants it, and numerous weak voices rather than a few strong ones, are much preferred by the present head of the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General when it served their purposes have refused to see representatives of the employees. The General is busy with the budget is the favorable excuse.

Recently, in an examination for the position of Post Office Inspector, an applicant was interrogated at length on his union activities and his attitude toward the curtailment order. In the Post Office Department these days, there is much talk about loyalty to the Postmaster General—loyalty not to the postal service, but to its temporary head. What Mr. Donaldson demands, however, is not loyalty, but subservience. Men, even in high position, who give loyal, intelligent—but unwelcome—advice, are quickly shunted from authority. Servile submission—not loyalty—is the demand of Postmaster General Donaldson.

Statement of Belt-Wide Cotton Producers Committee on Price Control for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by the Belt-Wide Cotton Producers Committee on price control for cotton:

It is obvious that only increased production can correct the world-wide scarcity of cotton. The world price at 70 to 75 cents a pound is almost 30 cents a pound above the United States price with present governmental proposals for ceilings. Export controls eliminating possibly 2,000,000 bales of the potential market for the American cotton grower are the reason for most of the difference.

In spite of the effort for price adjustments through export controls, the very high military and domestic demand is such that many people are advocating ceilings on raw cotton.

Unfortunately ceilings would not work at any price level. There are approximately 368 different staples and qualities in addition to weight considerations involved. The operating spot and futures markets have proven themselves to be the most efficient check and balance system for marketing the most complex commodity the farmers have to offer.

Ceilings would inevitably mean black-market operations in qualities and weights and would mean the substitution of a new and wasteful distribution system at a time when we cannot afford to waste manpower and resources.

Furthermore it is inconceivable that prices paid the grower could be closer than 8 cents a pound to the ceiling during the height of the season, October, November, and December. This fact would come from a situation in which cotton buyers meeting mill and export needs would discontinue their normal practice of buying large supplies during the height of the farmers' marketing, realizing full well that the market could not go up much and they could buy their requirements on a week-to-week basis through the year and the grower and his banker would be left to finance the crop.

It must be recognized that the congressional mandate given to the Economic Stabilization Administration is to protect the consumer against run-away prices. Therefore the American cotton growers recommend a ceiling on cotton textiles, with the removal of ceilings on raw cotton.

This would make it possible to reopen both the spot and futures cotton markets under the guidance of a market administrator to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. With the appropriate use of many influences affecting prices, the average cost of Middling 15/16 cotton to the United States textile mills during the calendar year of 1951 would not exceed an average price of 45 cents a pound, unless a crop failure occurred.

Several steps, which the market administrator could take to avoid skyrocketing prices would include the following:

1. Announcement by CCC of the sale of its remaining stocks as soon as the market reopens.

2. Announcement by the USDA that no further cotton export allocations would be made in the immediate future.

3. Announcement should be made by the ECA that no further cotton procurement authorizations will be issued in the immediate future and that authorizations which expire March 31 will be extended to permit shipment after that date if necessary.

4. Export licenses for the time being should be limited to those requested which were available at the Department of Commerce when ceilings were invoked.

5. Urge cotton exchanges to agree to raise margin requirements on all new speculative accounts in March, May, and July positions to a minimum of 50 percent of market value. If this is not sufficient to control excessive speculation then this margin requirement can be progressively raised to 100 percent.

6. Require the exchanges to reexamine all hedge letters so as to provide that no holder of a hedge letter could be actually net long the market in March, May, and July 1951, positions. All brokerage houses should be requested to notify their customers that within a 30-day period all existing open credit

for hedge accounts will be canceled and satisfactory margins not to be effective before May 15 and to end July 31, 1951, will be required on all contracts.

7. Prohibit any speculative purchases of cotton futures in the old crop months except in liquidation and prohibit purchases of March, May, or July against sale of later deliveries as a speculative straddle except in liquidation.

8. Limit daily fluctuations on cotton futures exchanges on the spot month to the same limit applicable to other months.

9. Request military to withhold purchases not deemed absolutely necessary until after September 1, 1951, and to make such purchases on (on call basis) until after such date.

10. In order to prevent a disastrous break in the cotton market which would prevent the production of 16,000,000 bales so badly needed, it is recommended that all of the above requirements be automatically lifted if and when the price of middling 15-16 inch goes below the price at which it was selling when the exchanges were closed on Friday, January 26.

11. If lifting of above requirements does not stop decline, issue announcement increasing export allocations.

12. Announce the intention of USDA to stockpile cotton through open-market purchases in normal trade channels whenever the anticipated domestic demand plus anticipated exports plus reasonable carry-over is exceeded by the anticipated supply.

The American cotton farmer is ready to make his decision as to the size of his acreage for 1951. He cannot have confidence in a market structure which will reflect arbitrary price ceilings. He must have the opportunity to receive prices for his product reflecting the supply he produces in relation to the available demand.

It would be disastrous for growers to pitch a 16,000,000-bale crop, then encounter poor growing conditions on top of high costs and have only 13,900,000 bales to market at the price level he would have gotten for a 16,000,000-bale crop.

Resolutions of New York State Civil Defense Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to three resolutions which have been adopted by the New York State Civil Defense Commission. In accordance with the suggestion contained in the second of these three resolutions, I am preparing and will introduce a bill to reactivate the insurance provisions of World War II to cover civil-defense volunteers.

The resolutions follow:

Resolution 1

Whereas the volume of correspondence and informational material to be distributed by the States and their political subdivisions, and by the Territories and the District of Columbia, in the execution of the national civil-defense program, has become a substantial burden upon the finances of the States; and

Whereas the present mailing procedure for civil-defense materials is definitely impeding the civil defense informational and educational programs due to the time element and manpower requirements involved in stamping, weighing, counting, and otherwise complying with postal requirements; and

Whereas the success of the national civil-defense program requires the fullest possible dissemination of instructions and informational material throughout the several States, Territories, and District of Columbia: Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the extension of the Federal franking privilege to all States and local offices of civil defense and to the offices of civil defense in the Territories and the District of Columbia for their official correspondence and the mailing of informational material, and to further recommend that a Federal appropriation be made available to the Post Office Department to cover the additional operating expenditures which this extension of the franking privilege would entail.

Resolution 2

Whereas the recruiting of civil-defense volunteers is being hampered in many States by the reluctance of citizens to expose themselves to danger without adequate insurance protection against injury or death sustained in civil-defense training and operations; and

Whereas the burden of such insurance protection is great; and

Whereas the overcoming of the effects both material and financial, of enemy attack and the preparation of civil-defense forces to minimize such effects is a matter of national and not merely local concern: Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the enactment of suitable legislation to provide adequate insurance protection to officially enrolled civil-defense volunteers throughout the Nation against injury or death sustained in active civil-defense training or in operations.

Resolution 3

Whereas the laws of the Federal Government and of the various States require the prompt establishment of an effective civil defense organization in the individual States; and

Whereas the Federal and the State plans recognize the necessity for procuring certain essential items of organizational equipment (including communication and air-raid-warning equipment) as promptly as possible; and

Whereas the Federal Civil Defense Administration will recommend to the Congress that Federal appropriations be made available to defray half the cost of such items; and

Whereas it is desirable that actual procurement not be delayed until the Federal appropriations are available; and

Whereas it is felt that the States who have shown initiative and foresight in procuring such equipment prior to the availability of Federal funds for such purpose should not be penalized for their forehandedness: Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to include in this request to the Congress for appropriations a recommendation that the Congress authorize the Administration to utilize any such appropriation to pay half the cost of any items approved by the Administrator which may have been purchased by the States or their political subdivisions or by the Territories and the District of Columbia on or after the enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 on January 12, 1951.

Outraged Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if a Republican uses the milder forms of a Democratic candidate's procedure at election time, the loser screams to high heaven. Under permission granted there is inserted herewith, as an illustration of what is meant, a discussion by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in his Washington Report of March 5, wherein he states:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Since his 43,000-vote defeat at the polls in Maryland, ex-Senator Millard Tydings has discovered that one of his constituents (who did not vote for him, by the way) was taken for an unmerry midnight ride in an argument over a letter.

Not satisfied with telling this story before a Senate subcommittee 4 months after he had been licked at the polls, ex-Senator Tydings is franking copies of his hysterical description of the alleged midnight ride at taxpayers' expense to Maryland voters.

A defeated Senator has the privilege of mailing at Government expense any words of wisdom he cares to put down on paper explaining his defeat, or on other subjects, for a period of 6 months after he is dumped by the voters.

To us taxpayers this may seem like unnecessary kindness for a defeated politician, but in Tyding's case it has its value. Each turn of the mimeograph tells us more about what manner of man this Tydings is.

For instance, William H. Fedder is the Baltimore printer who picked up $18,000 worth of business from Senator JOHN BUTLER's campaign headquarters and then ran to Tydings with a story that he had been mistreated. He has a next-door neighbor named Louis Fried.

Fried and Fedder got together, then called on Tydings and told a wild-eyed story of Fedder being taken for a ride. In a gesture of good will, Tydings didn't stand in the way of getting Fried a job on the very same Senate subcommittee which is investigating the Maryland election campaign.

Mr. Fried's presence in the story is somewhat curious in itself. Other than being a neighbor of Fedder's and having brought him to Tydings, there is nothing on the record explaining the subcommittee's need for his services as an investigator. Nor can much be learned about his investigative background, if any. He runs a garage and parking lot in Baltimore, next door to Fedder's printing shop.

For a spell, Tydings had members of my own staff involved in the kidnaping episode, which now turns out to have been a ride around Baltimore collecting Butler-for-Senator post cards so they could be mailed before the campaign was over.

Nobody in my shop was involved, and Tydings finally had to admit it, with a sort of offhand apology.

The campaign spending that the subcommittee sniffers are after is for post cards and a tabloid newspaper which showed Tydings and Earl Browder, the ex-Communist Party leader, with their heads together.

This cost BUTLER's headquarters a total of $18,000. A letter from BUTLER, which the committee has, guarantees payment of $12,000 of this sum. It was given to Fedder

when he was squawking about not being paid for helping to distribute the cards and tabloids.

Fedder later was paid by BUTLER'S campaign finance director, so this leaves the subcommittee about where United States Code, title 2, paragraph 248, comes in. It says:

"Money expended by a candidate to meet and discharge any assessment, fee, or charge made or levied upon candidates by the laws of the State in which he resides or expended for stationery, postage, writings, letters, printing (other than for use in billboards or in newspapers) or for distribution of letters, circulars, or posters shall not be included in determining whether his expenses have exceeded the sums in paragraph 1 or 2."

For your information, paragraphs 1 and 2 set forth an outright election spending limit for the candidate of $10,000, or a sum of 3 cents for each registered voter, not to exceed $25,000.

As to the picture Tydings is fuming about, it might be better for him to relax. Republicans on the subcommittee have quite a collection of pictures taken the day Browder testified before the Tydings subcommittee that whitewashed the Communist-in-Government charges made by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

They will be exhibited in connection with the question of just how close Tydings and Browder did get their heads together.

Actually, what the shooting is all aimed at is to embarrass Senator MCCARTHY. He hurt the Democrats as they've never been hurt before, and the Democratic National Committee knows it.

So the big pitch is to fix it so MCCARTHY won't be useful to any other Republican candidate for a Senate seat, or to the GOP Presidential nominee, in 1952.

MCCARTHY, in the Butler-Tydings campaign, rigged up the postcard idea and helped with the tabloid. The Democrats and Tydings know it only too well.

But not in all sections and branches of the Democratic Party are the standards of fair dealing, as is indicated by an editorial from the Washington Star of last week, which reads as follows:

MINK-COAT STANDARDS OF HONOR

The Star does not know whether Donald Dawson, the President's aide on personnel matters, intends to appear voluntarily before the Fulbright committee and give his own version of the influence he is alleged to have exercised with the RFC Board. He may yet intend to do so. If he does, it will be a creditable act on his part.

If he does not do so he ought to be fired. In the Star's opinion a failure to demand an opportunity to testify and tell his own story, especially in the light of the ugly mess already being developed by the Fulbright committee, will render him unfit for service in the White House or anywhere else in Government. Furthermore, his continuation in White House service under such circumstances would be an affront to public morals.

Mr. Dawson has not been charged with any illegal act. But that is not the point. The point is that here is a man, occupying a position as one of the President's intimate advisers on personnel, who has been publicly charged by a responsible committee of the Senate with having apparently exercised considerable influence over certain directors of the RFC in its business of lending public funds.

According to certain moral standards of honor and public service, which are felt rather than defined by decent people, this unwritten code would compel Mr. Dawson to demand the right on his own initiative to testify under oath before the committee and to explain in complete detail the nature of his relationship, if any, with the RFC. The fact that he has not done so, and in the present atmosphere at the White House it does not seem likely that he will, raises the cynical thought that Mr. Dawson is not following the old code of public service but is guided by what seems to be a new code, of which there is much dismal evidence in public life today.

Under this code a woman assistant secretary at the White House can accept a $9,500 natural royal pastel mink coat from her husband who, according to his own story, not yet complete, is already in debt to a lawyer who has been active in business before the RFC, and who arranged for the purchase of the coat.

Under this code, Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, military aide to the President, can continue to serve at the White House after being named by another investigating committee of the Senate as the man who made possible the "nefarious activities" of John Maragon, an "outright fixer," who subsequently has been convicted of perjury.

Under this code a woman alien from Australia can be brought to the United States and admitted to residence by a special act of Congress, approved by the President over the protest of the Department of Justice, which could not find in the record "any facts which would justify" the legislation. She turns up, too, at the White House, as the secretary of General Vaughan.

Under this code the President's press secretary, Joseph Short, can explain that the President "knows of no evidence of illegal influence on the RFC by any member of the executive branch or the legislative branch * * *" as if the "legality" of influence had anything to do with what is worrying the Senate committee—and the country.

Under this code it is the legality of conduct, rather than integrity of conduct, which assumes importance. Loss of honor is accepted as perhaps the inevitable accompaniment of "politics," which the public is being taught to believe is without honor. A double standard of morality for public office and private life is beginning to be cynically accepted as one of the facts of life.

If it becomes finally so accepted, the Russians and their masses of infantry are one of the least of the things we have to worry about.

Rural Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Clarence J. McCormick, on rural-manpower situation, made before the House Agriculture Committee on Monday, February 26, 1951:

I appreciate this opportunity to talk with this committee about the more essential aspects of the farm-labor-supply situation in relation to the national manpower picture.

We all agree, I'm sure, that in order to safeguard our American way of life, the Nation has no choice but to make the best possible use of its available manpower.

Making the best possible use of our manpower involves, first, providing sufficient and qualified personnel for our Armed Forces. This is an obvious fact that needs no elaboration. Nor do I need to elaborate on another obvious fact, namely, that farm people want to make their full contribution to meeting this phase of the present emergency.

But, as President Truman pointed out in his memorandum of January 17 to the heads of executive departments and agencies, "the needs of mobilization also require a vigorous civilian economy. The manpower necessary to defense production, to civil defense, to agriculture, and to the production of essential civilian goods and services and to sustain our commitments of aid to other nations, must be considered as integral parts of a balanced mobilization program."

Confusion sometimes arises from the fact that when people talk about the manpower situation they aren't always talking about the same thing. The manpower situation in terms of all-out war is one thing. The manpower situation in terms of less than all-out war—in terms of mobilization for what may be a 10-year-long or a generation-long preparedness effort—is something else. As the President has pointed out, the manpower measures of the present situation should be consistent with and should contribute to the most advantageous use of our manpower should full mobilization become necessary. But the situation we now face is still something less than full mobilization.

In agriculture, we are gearing for a long-pull effort. The Nation needs increased farm production in 1951.

But it may need even greater production next year, the second year, the third, fourth, or tenth year.

We are not in a one-shot situation. We can't afford, therefore, to neglect the fertility of the land, nor the conservation of farm equipment, nor the preservation on farms of sufficient skilled workers.

Our agriculture has always been a vital part of our national strength. But during and after World War II, the Nation learned anew the importance of food as a national asset. We learned that food is as essential to victory as planes, tanks, ships, and guns. It is precious in the same way as oil and steel are precious. It determines in large part the effectiveness of the fighting man.

It largely determines also the productivity of the civilian worker. In periods of mobilization, American producers, whether in manufacturing, mining, transportation, or agriculture, work longer and harder. Consequently, they want more food, and they have the money to buy it. Demand for food rises rapidly. Price pressures increase. Abundant farm production is necessary to lessen the dangers of runaway inflation.

Besides these contributions to our national strength, the American farmer contributes as an indirect producer of ammunition, tanks, aircraft, parachutes, and battleships. From his soil come the fiber and oil-producing crops which are used in the production of some of our most important weapons of war.

Cotton is one of the best examples. Cotton linters are used in making smokeless powder, plastics, and photographic film. A 500-pound bale of cotton linters (chemical grade) will provide enough smokeless powder for 100,000 rounds of rifle ammunition, over 20,000 rounds of machine-gun ammunition, 2,700 antiaircraft shells, or 85 rounds of heavy tank ammunition.

Long-staple cotton is used to make light, strong, wind-resistant, and water-repellent fabrics, yarns, and thread. It goes into the making of airplane and balloon fabrics and parachute cloth.

Agricultural raw materials provide the basic fabrics in the fighting man's clothing. It was estimated during World War II that clothing a soldier for a year takes all the wool of 26 sheep.

I could go on to show you the importance to preparedness of such other agricultural crops as hemp, flax, peanuts, castor beans,

and soybeans. But for reasons of time I will simply point out that agricultural products are not only important but absolutely basic elements in our national defense effort.

We have recently proposed acreage guides for 1951 designed to bring about the biggest agricultural production in our entire history. That statement has much more than ordinary significance when it is recalled that our agriculture in 9 of the past 12 years has either set a new record for production or has equalled the record then existing.

In 1948 and 1949, total farm output ran about 40 percent above the 1935–39 average. In 1950 output dropped off somewhat but was still about 37 percent above prewar. This year we are shooting for production about 45 percent above the pre-World War II level.

The acreage guides call for a very large increase in cotton—approximately 53 percent above 1950. We need substantial increases in the total acreage devoted to corn, wheat, and rice. The target for corn is an increase of about 6,000,000 acres, for spring wheat about 3,000,000 acres, with a smaller increase suggested for rice.

The Department has also suggested increasing the acreage of vegetables for processing 22 percent above the total planted in 1950.

On the whole, these targets for 1951 farm production are encouraging—but there is a catch in them. A figure on paper, no matter how carefully it has been arrived at, is not fiber in the warehouse, nor is it food on the table.

As the members of this committee know, food and fiber are not produced by land alone. A great many elements besides land and water resources go into farm production—machinery and equipment, fuel, tires, and repair parts, fertilizer, livestock, buildings, and plenty of disease-resistant and weather-resistant seed. But above all, food and fiber produced by the skill, sweat, and planning of farm operators and farm workers. The millions of skilled people who work on farms are the Nation's most valuable agricultural resource.

In 1949, the Nation's agriculture produced about 40 percent more food and fiber than the 1935–39 average, using about 1,938,000,000 man-days of labor in the process. Last year, we produced about 37 percent more than the 1935–39 average, and used 1,829,000,000 man-days of labor to do the job.

This year, shooting for a production target about 45 percent above the prewar average, we estimate agriculture will need about 1,936,000,000 man-days of labor. In other words, to realize the hoped-for production we expect to need almost as many man-days of labor as were utilized in 1949—and nearly 6 percent more than were used last year.

We have deliberately based this comparison on man-days rather than on the number of farm workers involved, for the reason that in periods of national emergency requiring heavy farm output, farmers have already worked harder and longer than under normal conditions. You will note that the estimate for 1951 anticipates greater efficiency and larger output per man-hour than in 1949.

The fact remains, however, that farmers, this year, are being called upon to produce considerably more food and fiber with considerably less manpower. During 1950, the number of workers on farms decreased sharply and some of these farm workers were absorbed in nonfarm employment. The average cash farm wage in 1950 was about 56 cents an hour. While this was more than three times the average wage for the 1935–39 period, it was still only 38 percent of the average factory wage of $1.46 an hour prevailing last year. The fact that nonfarm employment opportunities are increasing with the present expansion in defense industries will operate not only against the return of these workers to agriculture, but will draw still more upon the remaining supply of farm workers.

While it is true that a growing number of tractors, milking machines, combines, corn pickers, and other machines together with greater use of electric power have enabled agriculture to increase production, despite the declining supply of farm labor, these same factors have brought about a situation in which skill and experience are more important in farming today than ever before. We are proud of the fact that farm output per man-hour is now approximately 50 percent above the 1935–39 average. But we are keenly aware also that the loss of one skilled operator today is equivalent to the loss of one and one-half skilled farm operators in the pre-World War II period.

There just isn't any substitute for experience and skill on the farm. If I may speak about this in terms of my own farming experience, I think I can show pretty plainly what I mean. Like a lot of other farmers in the Midwest I've spent a good bit of time in raising hogs. I think I can spot a sick hog a long ways off. There's something about the way an animal's ears droop or his tail hangs when he's sick that an experienced hog raiser can see at a glance. That's the kind of skill that just can't be picked up overnight.

It takes a lesser amount of skill—but nevertheless a good bit—to handle a tractor or a milker or any of the dozens of machines that you find on the average well-equipped farm today. These machines cost the farmer a lot of sweat and toil. He knows how to handle them. His sons know how to handle them. But when a fellow without know-how gets to fooling with this equipment he's not only taking a chance on ruining valuable property, he's often taking a chance on his own limbs and life. Because, as this committee knows, farming is a hazardous industry. All—or nearly all—farm machines have moving parts that are dangerous—knives or cutters, gears, chains, rotating shafts, flywheels, and so on. They're not safe to be around when a fellow's body is on the farm but his mind is in the city.

It is absolutely essential that agriculture retain enough key men to provide the skills needed for planning farming operations, operating farm machinery, and directing the work of inexperienced laborers.

It is necessary also to recruit additional workers into the agricultural labor force in order to meet seasonal needs. Inasmuch as a good many experienced seasonal agricultural workers either have already been—or will be—absorbed by industry and the Armed Forces, it will be necessary to obtain workers from new and additional sources in 1951 if production targets are to be hit.

Obviously it is of great importance to the Nation's agriculture that the local selective-service boards understand the particular problems involved in the agricultural manpower situation. Many farm workers in the lower age groups are, in the truest sense of the word, skilled or key men. They have learned by watching and doing throughout their years on the farm. Many of them have added to their farm skills by agricultural courses in high school or even in college.

The Department recognizes that many local selective-service boards have actually met this problem. We believe that farm workers, on the whole, have been treated very realistically. However, we have received some apparently well-founded complaints about the existence of great variations in the practices and standards adopted by various local boards.

Agriculture should contribute—and it will contribute—men to the armed services. The problem before the local boards—and before the Nation as well—is one of determining which are the truly irreplaceable farm men, and which are those who would perhaps try to use agricultural deferment as a way of avoiding their obligation of military service.

It is vital, too, that local boards take into consideration the large number of family-type farm units producing substantial quantities for market which are operated by one or two men, for example, a father and a son in his early twenties. The mobilization effort demands that we keep at least one able-bodied man on each of these family farms.

Are We Fulfilling Our Obligations Under the Displaced Persons Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution calling for the extension of provisions of section 3 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, until final action shall have been taken on all applications which may have been filed under the act by June 30, 1951.

The Displaced Persons Act, as amended last year, will expire on June 30 of this year. By then it will have been on our statute books for 3 years, during which time close to a quarter of a million DP's will have entered the United States under this act. In the troubled and hectic years which followed World War II, we proved to the whole world that the United States is still a great humanitarian country, notwithstanding the vicious propaganda attacks by our enemies who would make the rest of the world believe that we are blood-thirsty warmongers and money-mad imperialists.

Our example, set nearly 3 years ago by the enactment of legislation to admit several hundred thousand homeless European DP's, was followed by several other countries who admitted considerable numbers of them. Among these countries are Australia, Canada, Israel, several Latin American countries, and others.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that under the DP Act, as amended in 1950, a total of 341,000 DP's were to be admitted to the United States, not including the so-called ethnic German or Volksdeutsche which come under a different category. According to the latest available figures, obtained from the Displaced Persons Commission, a total of 220,000 DP's have entered this country since the act went into effect in 1948. How many more will arrive in the United States between now and the end of June when the law expires we have no way of knowing, but I would venture to guess that it will not exceed another 20,000.

It may interest the members of this House to know that on the basis of religious affiliation, the DP Commission has found that the 220,000 who have entered until now, consisted of 45 percent Catholic, 24 percent Protestant, 20 percent Jewish, and others, including

those whose religious affiliation is not known—1 percent.

From all indications, then, it appears that probably no more than 240,000 DP's—and possibly less than that—will have entered this country by the time the act expires at the end of June. This would leave approximately 100,000 visas, authorized by the act, as unused, voided, and totally lost. It would mean that the extra 100,000 DP visas, for which we fought so strenuously last year will not be used and despite our legislative victory of last year, the fight to gain admittance for a larger number of DP's will have been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I believe if we allow the law to lapse without taking the necessary precautions to admit the number of DP's as prescribed by the law, we will have committeed a grave injustice to those homeless people who have been waiting all these years for an opportunity to reach the United States. I believe that the folly of such an act will reverberate throughout Europe and cause untold injury to the prestige and the good name of our country. It will be said that the great democracy of the United States refuses to abide by its own laws and to fulfill the provisions prescribed therein.

In the resolution which I am introducing today I aim to forestall this injustice and to provide for the fulfillment of our promise and obligation to admit the number of DP's as prescribed by this Congress. My resolution provides that the issuance of immigration visas to DP's under the amended DP Act "shall remain in effect until final action shall have been taken on all applications which shall have been filed on or before June 30, 1951, and the applicants found admissible, as provided by law, have had a reasonable opportunity to enter the United States of America."

Instead of the law expiring on June 30, 1951, and all our responsibility and obligations ending on that date, my amendment provides that all eligible DP's who file for admission to the United States by that date and are subsequently found admissible under our immigration and security laws should be granted the long-awaited opportunity to come here. Thus we shall make it possible for most of the 100,000 DP visas to be used in accordance with the law. This is the least we should do. Only in this way will we be able to claim that we have faithfully fulfilled our obligations in helping to solve the DP problem.

Justice for Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable complaint arising from reservists with respect to the conditions under which they are recalled for service. In many instances they claim to be doing only ordinary service that could be well performed by young men who have had no training, and, who should have such training. Furthermore, it is claimed that no consideration is given to the fact that the reservists have already given service to their country in time of war, and since the war have become married and have children dependent upon them. These and many other complaints are being made. The following letter is an illustration of the numerous letters being received by Members of Congress at this time:

WESTMONT, N. J., *March 3, 1951.*

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress.

HONORABLE SIR: I am the mother of a World War II veteran who has been recalled to active service in the Navy through his continued service in the Naval Reserve. This has caused him to break up his home and to try to live in furnished rooms with his wife wherever it is possible to do so. He also had to leave a good position at home and, as is always the case, will probably find some younger man has stepped around him while he has been away.

Is this the American way of life? I know of many young men who are unmarried and with practically little or no responsibilities, who attend Naval Reserves drill each week and are trained as much as my son, who anxiously await a chance to get into the Navy but who are told there is no room for them at present at the receiving stations and the boot camps we now have opened are too full and insufficient to take care of them.

Couldn't something be done to give married war veterans a better deal than they are now receiving? With their broken-up homes and their married life damaged, couldn't they be replaced with the nonveteran Reserves who really are being held back. Their rates of pay are even greater than the nonveteran Reserves, thereby effecting a savings to the Government.

My son is a holder of the Purple Heart and the Good Conduct Ribbon from World War II proving he has stood his turn and would like to resume his interrupted married life. Surely it is only just that he be given this chance and I know he will serve just as faithfully in the inactive service of the Reserves by helping to train further the younger men who could replace him.

You would be better versed in the ways and means to rectify this unrest and unhappiness. Wouldn't you please take the necessary steps to correct this condition.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Mrs. ETHEL P. TURNER.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the Armed Services Commitee will give consideration to complaints such as the above to the end that a more equitable system of calling to service may be adopted.

The Truman-Snyder Inflationary Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for extension in the RECORD, I herewith submit copy of a radio address delivered to the good people who have given me the honor to represent them in the House of Representatives.

Perhaps the two greatest disturbances which daily aggravate you consists of: First, the declining buying power of your wages and your accumulated savings; and second, the contributions you have to make in the form of human flesh and blood and money to the war effort.

At the outset let me emphatically say that since 1933 the policy of the previous and present administrations has been directed toward a higher cost level, a higher wage level, and a higher selling price on the goods and services which you purchase.

This fact cannot be successfully denied by anyone.

In making these presentations it will be necessary occasionally to use a few figures, as much as we dislike to be burdened with them.

As citizens we cannot escape the fact that the sheer management—and here I am not referring to the payment—I repeat, the sheer management of the present Federal debt of $256,000,000,000 presents economic forces which, at times, literally guillotine your personal capital structures, and your buying power. At this very moment President Truman and Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, are pursuing an inflationary policy, with respect to managing and financing this devastating Federal debt.

This inflationary program, sponsored and administered by Messrs. Truman and Snyder, is so inflationary and highly destructive that you cannot rely for adequate relief on the other program of price controls, rationing, and allocations.

Price controls and rationing cannot possibly offset the damage of the inflationary program. I urge you not to be misled by political statements which so often come to you to the effect that price controls will make your economic pathway one easy to travel.

Too much of this Federal debt, to which I have referred, was sold by the Federal Treasury to the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks of the country.

Too much of this debt consists of short-term paper.

Too much of this debt consists of what is known as call paper. By this I mean to say that all of you who hold savings bonds can take those bonds to the banks and cash them any time during business hours. Thus you can call upon the Treasury to pay the savings bonds upon your option. Thus you determine the due date. You make the call on the Treasury. And the Treasury must stand ready to answer when you call.

The administration and the Treasury followed an unsound and dangerous fiscal policy in financing this debt in such a manner. Against this dangerous policy I have for years protested. I am here protesting again.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Truman and Mr. Snyder have, just recently, established a policy which literally converts the Federal Reserve Banking System and the commercial banks into an engine of inflation.

Therefore, the buying power of your savings declines daily.

This is a terrible fact which you now face. This is a fact you must understand. This is a fact you must help change, or we face financial disaster in this country such as other countries have suffered.

Not only do these constantly advancing prices reduce the buying power of your liquid savings and your current wages and salaries, but in addition the dollar value of your life-insurance policies are being destroyed.

Furthermore, here is another terrible fact: Everything the Federal Government purchases in connection with the defense program, or otherwise, carries a premium in price due to inflation which you, as taxpayers and bond buyers, must bear.

President Truman and Mr. Snyder excuse their action on the basis that they are holding down to a low level the interest rate on the Federal debt.

However, it would be much easier for the people of this country to pay $2,000,000,000 more per annum as interest on the Federal debt than it is for them to pay annually $25,000,000,000, or more, as a premium on what the citizens purchase and what the Government purchases for the defense program.

And, of course, you would much prefer to be burdened with a somewhat higher interest rate on the Federal debt than to have the value of your savings and insurance policies reduced more and more each month and year just as they have been reduced for the past several years.

These reductions have occurred by reason of the inflationary and unsound fiscal policies pursued by the administration in the form of deficit financing, easy money rates, too much Government lending and selling bonds to the banks and having the Federal Reserve banks guarantee the market price of the bonds.

Now, my fellow citizens, what I am saying to you today is not a clash of personalities, or a case of Crawford versus Truman and Snyder.

The one thing that is clearly at stake now, today, and which is of far greater importance to you than the position of any individual involved, is the buying power of your dollar.

Whether or not you have confidence in the American dollar at this moment is of supreme importance.

Do I need to tell you that the purchasing power of your dollar is rapidly shrinking right now. It has been shrinking for so long a time that we are faced with these makeshift proposals known as price controls, rationing, allocations, wage controls; and all with which the President is making so little progress.

Let this shrinkage continue and I assure you that public confidence in the American dollar will be destroyed. When that day arrives public credit will likewise be destroyed.

And when public credit is destroyed in this country, our individual enterprise system or capitalist society is done for. Then, you may rest assured, whether we like it or not, that we will move into some kind of a tightly regimented socialistic state.

This calendar year many billions of dollars of the Federal debt mature. The Treasury does not have on hand tax dollars with which to meet these maturing bonds. To get those dollars the Treasury must first sell more bonds which will mature at some future date. And to whom will the Treasury sell those bonds? To the Federal Reserve banks, or the commercial banks, or to the individual citizens?

If these refunding bonds are sold to the banks at a very low interest rate in conformity with the policy of the President and Secretary of the Treasury, you will witness more and more inflation, regardless of the price-control program.

But on the other hand, if the public—that means you—have little faith in the purchasing power of the dollar—its real measure of value—do you believe that the Secretary of the Treasury can sell to you and other private citizens forty or fifty or sixty billion dollars' worth of those bonds this year?

In no way do I mean to influence you against buying Federal bonds. Let me say that I, too, have some of these bonds—both marketable and savings. I have seen the "hound of inflation" eat up the buying power of my savings just as you have.

We should invest our savings in Government bonds to help finance what we believe is sound. But in turn, Mr. Truman and Mr. Snyder should have great respect for the rights of the citizens and be dead sure they advocate and support a sound fiscal policy of Government so that we will have faith in those bonds and so that our investment therein will not disappear through inflation.

Just why are you running away from the ownership of dollars into the ownership of goods? Simply because each day the dollar buys less. And for this good reason you hesitate in purchasing long-term Government bonds at a very low rate of interest because the experience of the past 10 years teaches you that your dollars buy less when your bond matures and you receive back your money, than it would buy when you bought the bond.

Thus the destructive hand of inflation writes on. President Truman and Secretary Snyder advocate a cheap money policy operating through the open market committee of the Federal Reserve banks and the member banks of that system.

The net results of such a policy allows for vast sums of speculative loans made by banks to individuals and corporations with which to go into the market place and bid up the prices on basic and raw materials, manufactured goods of all kinds, foodstuffs, fats, and fibers.

Thus, the whole banking system becomes an engine of inflation—and against this policy I protest.

Mr. Oscar Bledsoe, one of the leading cotton farmers of the South, the other day observed that—

> The strongest ally that communism has is inflation of the monetary system of this capitalistic Nation caused by the flagrant violation of the natural law of supply and demand, as if it did not apply to money. The Treasury Department is directly responsible by floating and supporting our tremendous Government bonded debt with our monetary system.

Mr. Bledsoe also said:

> The building of a price control dam down stream is no cure. * * * The morale of this Nation is the lowest in its history, with the loss of confidence in the dollar. The Treasury is now paying off its 10-year D savings bonds. The $75 investment is receiving $100 that will buy, as of date of investment, about $55 of goods, which is a loss of $20 of the original investment, plus the $25 interest.

The Washington Evening Star in commenting on this policy of Messrs. Truman and Snyder only a few days ago had this to say:

> It is interesting, however, that a group of economists from the University of Chicago have expressed the opinion that the price rise of the last 6 months could almost certainly have been largely or wholly avoided * * * if the Federal Reserve System had kept its holdings of Government securities unchanged instead of adding to them by $3,600,000,000.

In conclusion, let me remind you that years ago the Congress approved the Federal Reserve Act and brought forth the Federal Reserve banks designed to regulate the credit structure and to provide the necessary flexibility in our supply of money and credit to meet the economic needs of the people. Congress made this an independent agency and intended that the system be free of political domination. The system is charged by law with the duty of promoting commerce and industry, of conducting its operations with a view to the broad interests and needs of the national economy as a whole. This recent attempt of the President to dominate the system is the boldest attack yet presented by any Chief Executive since Congress approved the original law.

Let us hope that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury will immediately withdraw their demands and discontinue the policy which so many experts charge as being responsible for the destructive inflationary forces that now eat into your savings so disastrously.

Business Week in its editorial headed "Down the Inflation Road" had this to say:

> The Federal Reserve System is at a crisis point. Contrary to the intent of the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Reserve Board faces the loss of its independence to the executive branch. It has three courses open to it: (1) It can acquiesce; (2) it can resign in protest; (3) it can seek to get a public review of the issue.

My fellow citizens, I think the board should get the public—that means you—to review the issue. That is why I am presenting this case to you. I agree with Business Week when it says:

> What is at stake is no less than the preservation of our economy from the ravages of inflation.

Controls Hamper Government's Revenue Intake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by William C. Hope, legislative and market analyst of Robert Moore & Co., New York City:

CONTROLS HAMPER GOVERNMENT'S REVENUE INTAKE

(By William C. Hope)

A glaring example of how controls militate against one of the Government's major objectives at a time of international stress—that of increasing its revenue—is furnished by the cotton industry, an industry second only in importance to that of steel. Some 14,000,000 people are dependent upon cotton for a livelihood. Therefore, one can well imagine what will happen to an overwhelming majority of these people should the ESA adhere to its plan of placing a ceiling on raw cotton or should it fail to clarify its present freeze order on cotton—an order that has resulted in chaos and a complete stagnation of the cotton industry.

It is a recognized fact that the merchandising system applied to raw cotton is the most complex and intricate one in our economic structure. This is due primarily to the fact that hundreds of different grades and staples have to be dealt with. Therefore, any kind of control over this commodity—other than one at the mill level, accompanied by a liberal escalator clause—results in confusion and stagnation. Such stagnation prevails at present. Everyone in the industry—including grower, shipper, merchant, and futures broker—has remained bewildered and immobile since the promulgation of the ESA freeze order on January 26. The only sales reports received from the 10 southern spot markets since the institution of the freeze order show a total of merely 33,000 bales changing hands, compared with 776,000 bales changing hands in the month immediately preceding this order. (December 27, 1950–January 26, 1951.)

Furthermore, due to the hundreds of grades and staples concerned should a ceiling be placed on the raw commodity, we would be confronted with one of the most stupendous black markets ever witnessed in the annals of the United States. Thousands of taxpayers would be eliminated from the tax rolls while, at the same time, the United States Treasury would lose millions of dollars through these black-market operations.

As mentioned above, the cotton industry is so complex, it is doubtful that it could be successfully controlled, even after years of study on the part of the would-be controllers—be they men of the industry or be they politicians grasping for a higher rung on their own political ladder.

The present ESA freeze order reminds the writer of the sane advice given by Confucius when he stated:

"The men of old, when they wished their virtues to shine throughout the land, first had to govern their states well.

"To discipline themselves, they first had to set their minds in order.

"To set their minds in order, they first had to make their purpose sincere.

"To make their purpose sincere, they first had to extend their knowledge to the utmost.

"Since knowledge is acquired through a careful investigation of things.

"For, with things investigated, knowledge becomes complete.

"With knowledge complete, the purpose becomes sincere."

Examining the present situation in the light of the above rationalization, no reason is found to challenge the sincerity of the ESA freeze order on cotton, as it is fully realized that it was promulgated with the intent of placing a damper on inflation. However, there is ample reason why the method should be challenged. As long as the United States Treasury insists on a low interest rate of 2½ percent on Government bonds, the price of goods will be bid up to and above any line established by a wage-price freeze. There is also reason to question the knowledge upon which the ESA freeze order, insofar as it applies to cotton, was based. When the end product of such knowledge results in the complete stagnation of a major industry while, at the same time, posing a threat to ample production in that industry, it is time for the economic stabilizers to stop, look, and listen.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an excellent and thoughtful radio address recently delivered by Mr. Eugene Lyons, roving editor of the Reader's Digest, under the auspices of the Polish-American Congress for western Massachusetts.

This speech and this sponsorship offer striking proof of the unyielding determination of the advocates of the cause of a free Poland never to give up the fight for Polish freedom until justice has been done and Poland's freedom regained.

I shall continue to be in the vanguard of that fight.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, most of you, I'm sure, have heard of the strange new game called Russian roulette. In a pitch-black room, men shoot at one another—and sometimes someone is killed. They do it just for the fun of the thing, to titillate their nerves.

But let me tell you of another such game of chance, which we might call "Russian roulette for freedom." It is far more dangerous—and it is not played for fun. I refer to the grim game that has been going on since the end of the war in 1945—in which liberty-loving men and women stake their lives for the chance of winning freedom.

This tragic yet inspiring gamble goes on day after day along 2,000 miles of land and water frontiers that divide Stalin's part of Europe from the rest of that Continent. Every one of those miles is fortified and guarded, by border police, electrified barbed wire, police dogs, speedboats. But despite all barriers of danger, thousands of people—Poles and Germans, Hungarians and Rumanians, Baltic nationals, and even Soviet citizens—take the gamble of attempting to escape.

They know when they start that the odds against them are frightening. According to refugee officials who have watched the gruesome business, only 1 in 12 can expect to make it in the Balkan areas; only 1 in 6 in the Baltic areas. At best, in the German and Austrian occupation zones, where the attempt is easier, the chances of winning—that is to say, of getting safely through the iron curtain—are about 50–50. And the penalties for losing are concentration camp, torture, and most often death.

Nevertheless, there are no lack of players. The awful game that began 5 years ago is still under way. From two to three thousand escape every month from under the iron heel of Red despotism. This means that at least eight or nine thousand make the try—and fail. Singly or in groups of two or three, these men, women, and children—yes, even children—match their courage and ingenuity against the terrific might of Stalin's secret-police and frontier-guard forces.

To reach the world of freedom—the world which you and I accept as a matter of course—these refugees from communism have crawled through swamps and trudged through forests. They have cut a path through barbed wire and hovered between life and death for days on flimsy rafts or in rowboats.

It is for these heroes of our world in chaos that I am here to speak. In staking their lives for liberty, they have given proof of the grandeur of the human spirit. They have established a powerful claim on our conscience. In simple truth they are fighting not only their own but our battles in the world-wide struggle between human freedom and totalitarian slavery.

Every one who succeeded in escaping has behind him a nightmare journey across hundreds of miles bristling with machine guns, booby traps, police dogs, informers. But what do they find when they reach our side of the iron curtain?

The sad fact is that after surviving the Russian roulette for freedom, those people generally face another nightmare. They face the ordeal of finding themselves homeless, hungry, unwanted surplus humanity—part of the huge army of wretched victims of total war who have come to be called displaced persons.

For the hope of a new life in freedom they have thrown away their native land, their language, their career, their worldly possessions. They imagined that the democratic peoples would make them welcome and give them a helping hand. Now they discover, in despair, that they are not regarded as comrades in a common fight, but as a distressing nuisance. They find themselves interlopers in Germany or Austria or Italy—areas already suffering under a great load of refugees and DP's. Worst of all, the gates of democratic nations are almost entirely closed against them.

These thousands of escapees whom I have described are only part of the vast and suffering displaced population. They join the hundreds of thousands who have been in a similar plight for years. They join the hordes of victims of German concentration camps—the veterans of Hitler's gigantic slave-labor forces—the fugitives from a hated communism who followed the retreating Germans to avoid being overrun by Stalin's Red armies.

At the end of the war, literally millions of men and women who had been dragged into the German slave-labor battalions, or who languished in German prisoner-of-war camps, were liberated. Those from the west—from Belgium, Holland, France, the Scandinavian countries—returned home, eagerly and joyously.

But most of those from the east, alas, had no real home to return to. Their native

lands had been grabbed by the Communists and turned into satellites; or, as in the case of the Baltic republics and the eastern half of Poland, had been made part of the Soviet Union itself. For many of them going back would have meant jumping from the Nazi frying pan into the Communist fire.

And so immense numbers chose to take their chances as displaced persons in the free world rather than to don the chains of Soviet tyranny. They were Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Yugoslavs, and soon enough, as one nation after another was swallowed by Red imperialism, their numbers were swelled by Bulgarians, Rumanians, Hungarians, and finally Czechs and Slovaks.

Nor should we overlook the hundreds of thousands of Russians who form part of this uprooted humanity. They, too, had been in Nazi labor brigades, concentration camps, prisoner-of-war camps. The great majority had no choice but to return to their families in the Soviet homeland. Many others—to our eternal shame—were forced to go back at the point of American and British bayonets and machine guns, in accordance with an infamous secret covenant with Stalin made at Yalta. The rest, as we know, chose freedom. They did so knowing that they would be homeless and sometimes hunted vagrants in strange and not too hospitable lands.

A special group among the mass of displaced humanity deserves special notice. I have spoken of it before in this series of broadcasts. I refer to the Polish soldiers, sailors, and airmen who had fought gallantly side by side with American and British forces on every front of the war in Europe and Africa. For this "crime" they were labeled "enemies" by the new Communist masters of Poland. Most of them have found new homes, but thousands, with their families, still await resettlement, and their hopes, naturally, are focused on the United States of America.

The words "displaced persons" have a cold, technical ring. They have come to have vaguely annoying overtones, if only because they represent another "problem" to disturb our comfortable complacency. But under these words is the living reality of human beings who are being cruelly punished though they are innocent of any special sins. In the final analysis they are the victims of a historical struggle that is as much our concern as theirs.

We owe these people a great debt of conscience. We owe it to them as Americans, as freemen, as human beings, as a nation involved in a crucial showdown with godless communism. The displaced men and women and children have a first call on our compassion. But compassion, my friends, is not enough. What is needed urgently is immediate and practical help. That obligation does not rest on society in the abstract, nor even on governments. It rests on individual Americans.

A small but vital step was taken by the United States Congress 2 years ago, when it passed a law permitting the entry of 205,000 qualified DP's. This year the law was amended to make an additional 100,000 eligible to come to America, plus about 30,000 more in specific categories like the Polish war veterans.

In line with this congressional action, roughly 100,000 have already arrived. With few exceptions they have adjusted themselves readily to American life and are making valuable contributions by their labor. The agencies which have followed their fate here are all agreed that these newcomers will make first-rate Americans. A good many young men who only a few years ago were in DP camps in Germany or Austria are today fighting and dying for their adopted country on the battlefields of Korea—surely a dramatic symbol of our unity in the cause of freedom.

How many of the remaining 220,000 eligible to replant their lives in American soil will be allowed to do so depends on you. Yes, on you. In order to qualify for an American visa the would-be immigrants must be sponsored by American citizens. They must have what is technically called assurances of a job and a place to live when they get here. And you're the one who can provide them with those assurances.

Somewhere in a black DP barracks overseas there is a family waiting and hoping for you to act. Whether that family will be given a new lease on life, a chance to start fresh on some American farm, in some American industrial plant, or as a professional worker, depends on your willingness to sponsor that chance.

Two years ago, even a year ago, there was some justified fear of unemployment. Today that picture has changed, for the need of more and more working hands has become great and is growing more acute. Whatever the outcome in Korea, our country will assuredly continue the program of rearming on which it is launched. That's a good omen for the thousands seeking, and entitled under the law, to add their muscle power and their brain power to our common American pool. The last excuse for not sponsoring them has been removed.

But I do not want to rest this plea for your cooperation merely on economic self-interest. The challenge is to our every instinct of American decency and sportsmanship and Christian charity.

The necessary assurances are being collected by a great many religious and secular organizations—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—as well as ethnic organizations of American Poles, Lithuanians, Hungarians, and so on. If you, or your church group, or some fraternal society of which you are a member, want, for instance, to become sponsors for a few Polish displaced persons, write to the Polish-American Congress, in care of the station to which you are now listening. I repeat, the Polish-American Congress, care of this station. You will be told precisely how you can translate your feelings of human sympathy into concrete assistance.

We must keep faith with those who died that a better world might be born. One immediate way to do this is to open for some victims of the war a new horizon of life and hope in our blessed America. We shall indeed be unworthy of our blessings unless we show the will to share them.

Secretary Acheson Convinces a Marine That the United States Has To Fight in Korea

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. JONES of Missouri. *Mr. Speaker,* I was pleased to note the apparently wide publicity which was given over the week end by the press and by radio commentators to the recent letter written by Secretary Acheson to the father of the young marine in California who, in a letter to his father in New Jersey, described the state of confusion and frustration and expressed the doubts existing in his own mind, which I think is typical of that in the minds of thousands of people who are honestly and sincerely asking, "Why are we in Korea?"

I think it is significant that, upon reading the letter of Secretary of State Acheson, this young marine corporal, who had previously written that he and his friends can see "no cause to fight" in Korea, has been convinced that the United States has to fight in Korea. He is quoted as saying "His letter has convinced me, and I would like to get it across to all these people who do not think so."

It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that our leaders have not taken the initiative long before to explain in more detail, and more often to the people, the basis on which we are proceeding in formulating and implementing our foreign policy—to permit the people of this Nation, particularly the youth of our country, who are being called upon to make the supreme sacrifice, to realize that in the actions which we are taking, we have every reason to believe that only by following such a course do we have any hope of building the kind of world in which we all wish to live.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see these three letters, the one from the marine to his father, from the father to Mr. Acheson, and the Secretary's reply, a complete answer to the burning questions in the minds of many today, made available in a form which could be transmitted to all of our men in the services today in order that all doubts as to the necessity of our presence on the battlefields today might be removed. I think our Committee on Foreign Affairs might well consider the benefits to be derived from the publication of this series of letters.

Under the leave granted for the extension of my remarks, I am including herewith the correspondence between Secretary of State Acheson and Mr. Moulette, assistant to the mayor of Camden, N. J. Mr. Moulette had asked Secretary Acheson to help him reply to a letter he had received from his son, Corp. John B. Moulette, USMCR, Camp Pendleton, Calif. The following is the text of Secretary Acheson's letter, together with the letter from Mr. Moulette and Corporal Moulette:

FEBRUARY 28, 1951.

DEAR MR. MOULETTE: I have thought a great deal about the letter from your son, which you sent me, and your problem in answering it wisely and helpfully. It brought back many memories to me of 10 years ago when my own son was in college, before he went to the Pacific, and I used to sit with him and his friends and talk over their problems which loomed ahead of them—and all of us.

I thought then, and think now, that the real problem lies deeper than the questioning of particular decisions, even the important ones which distress your son. It lies in the fact, for which we may thank God, that these boys have been brought up in the fundamental decency and rightness of American life. They have found in communities where they have worshiped in faith the air truth and tolerance of others' interests, generosity, and good nature, found

work, honesty, and fairness. To all of them opened the opportunity for happy and constructive lives, their own homes and families, work to do, a part to play in the community in a hundred ways. They saw no problems, here at home, that would not yield to effort, ingenuity, and the give-and-take of people who believe in the same right values.

Now, just at the moment when they were about to enter fully as grown men in this world, its promise is dashed. In its place, they find hardship, loneliness, uncertainty, danger. They are separated from family and friends. Even worse, they are denied the natural development of their lives. The fact that this happens to them because some distant and shadowy figures in the Kremlin, controlling millions of people far from them, are setting out to make impossible such lives as they had every right and hope to have, does not help their frustration and bitterness.

This agony of spirit, so understandable and right, makes it hard to believe that so monstrous an evil can exist in a world based upon infinite mercy and justice.

But the fact is that it does exist. The fact is that it twists and tortures all our lives. And, I believe, to each of us in this case as in so many others, the great thing is not what happens to us but how we bear what happens to us.

For our country, and for most of us as individuals, the period which has passed since VE- and VJ-days has been one of cruel disappointment, slowly forming resolution, and, finally, great determination and effort. The high hopes, for which great sacrifices were made during the war, did not come to ready fruition. That did not mean that these hopes—for peace, and for a good life for all—were wrong, or that the principles of freedom and justice on which they were based were not worthy of these sacrifices.

What it did mean was that it was going to be a good deal harder to build the kind of world we wanted, than we thought it was going to be.

We started out, even before the war had ended, building the foundation of the structure of peace, of law and order in the world, in the United Nations. We hoped that all nations would work together in bringing this about.

We came very close to realizing this aspiration. An international organization has been started functioning, and in some cases, it has performed extremely successfully. The role of the United Nations in the disputes in Palestine and in Indonesia suggest that, far from being discouraged, we should be heartened by the progress that has been made.

However, as it became clear that the rulers of the Soviet Union not only were not interested in cooperating with us, but were challenging the survival of our free institutions, and the independence of all nations, we have been obliged to build up our strength again, all of us.

In some ways, this is an ancient problem. Our forebears on this continent had it cruelly impressed upon them that the liberty we enjoy is not won and preserved without unremitting effort, without sacrifice, without "eternal vigilance." But we had for so long enjoyed the blessings of freedom, that we had come to accept this condition as automatically assured. It has fallen to us—to your son's generation, and to ours—to take up again the defense of freedom against the challenge of tyranny.

In other words, this is a new problem. Our country, which has risen to a position of unprecedented power and eminence in the world, is seeking to use that power in such a way as to help bring about a peaceful international order. This means that we have to be doing two things at once: While we move ahead in our efforts to build the kind of a world in which we can all live together peacefully and in common helpfulnes, we are at the same time protecting ourselves from being overrun by the tyranny which is run from Moscow. I have sometimes compared this two-pronged effort as being like the way our ancestors had to have some men drilling and keeping watch from the blockhouses, while others went on, tilling the fields.

In a sense, we are standing with one foot in the world of our hopes for a future order among nations, and the other foot in the world of power. Both of these are part of the present reality. Unless we are strong enough—we and the other free nations—to prevent the Soviet rulers from extending their control over the entire world, then we shall never have the chance to help build the kind of a world we all want.

There are many terrible heartbreaks in this course of action, but there is no easier way to a peaceful world. Your son asks in his letter whether Korea proves anything. That he is heartsick over the loss of life and the destruction in Korea is right and good, and reflects what must be the instinctively humane feelings of good men everywhere. But I hope he will come to see that Korea proves—has already proved—a great deal. In Korea, the men and the nations who love freedom and who believe in the United Nations have made it clear that they are willing to fight for these things. By standing firm against aggression in Korea, we are doing our best to prevent the world from following the road which led us, twice in recent times, to world war. The heroic sacrifices which are now being made in Korea may enable the world to pass through this time of hostility and tension without the catastrophe, the greater destruction, and the immeasurably greater sacrifices of a world conflict.

I know that these thoughts I have written to you will not answer all the questions which you have touched on in your thoughtful letter, or which your son has mentioned. These are hard and complicated problems, for which there are no easy answers, and which a short letter could not deal with adequately. What I am concerned about is not that your son should feel that I, or the administration, or the Government is right on any particular issue. It is good that he should question whether the steps we are taking are right or are wrong. But what is important is that he feel, and that all our young people feel, a strong faith in the validity and the reality of the ideals on which this country was founded and on which it now endeavors to guide its actions. So long as our young people are steadfast in this faith, we can be assured of the vitality of our society, and its ability to go on meeting the challenges of the future.

Yours sincerely,

DEAN ACHESON.

CAMDEN CITY CIVIL DEFENSE COUNCIL,
Camden, N. J., January 19, 1951.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Enclosed, is a letter I received from my son this morning on my arrival at my office. I am sending it to you, since it is a letter which reflects the loose thinking on the part of many of our legislators and publishers—it is a letter filled with answerable questions, but questions which require much in knowledge, substantial qualifications which can and should be made understandable—since the American people as a whole are a provincial lot.

This lad of mine is 24 years old, a corporal in the Marine Corps at Camp Pendleton, Calif. He served with the First Division from 1944 to August 1946. Last September, he was hoping to enter Cornell University to take his course in hotel management. Instead, he went back in the Marine Corps, a Reserve. He was then, and I suspect now, bitter about it all. It so happens that in September 1949 I warned him not to put too much stock in his future, since I was positive we would be involved somewhere in the world before another year was out. He, my wife and many of my friends made life miserable for me, since they said I was warmongering, when I was only evaluating the news as it was brought to me by a world press.

This lad has been raised in the traditions which have been prevalent in this country since colonial days, his schooling is that of the average public-school pupil, and he has had the advantage of books, magazines, newspapers from all over the world; he has traveled widely for his age, working on tramp steamers and tankers, and the United States is as his backyard at home, he knows it from personal visits.

The tenor of his letter about "foreign policy" leaves me cold and my reply to him will be an explanation that foreign policy is always fluid, that it must be so and has been so since 1914 because of certain inescapable facts. I will explain that we are a gullible people, that we won (or helped win) two wars and lost both times the peace, because we regarded winning wars in the same manner we regard winning a football match. I will tell him something of the different mores of various people, of their hatreds, their jealousies. I will tell him that the broad policies of our foreign policy is laid down in the Constitution of the United States, in the convictions of our people, and their attitudes toward all peoples, all over the world.

I will send him a copy of an address of mine, which he said was too deep for him to understand when he read it in its formative stage. I will try to open his eyes to an understanding of the forces about him which are inimicable to the general good of our people, to the powers which can be wielded to destroy a man, no matter how sincere and true he has been. I will cite the case of Forrestal, of Hiss, of others who were earnest Americans of good understanding. I will indicate to him that the American people in their utter provincialism are tremendously jealous of their rights and prerogatives as free-born Americans, that they want the fruits thereof, but detest its responsibilities; that there are many men to advance their own interests against the interests of the whole people, take advantage of the situations brought about by the general misunderstanding which have been fostered by a press which is venal.

What I am going to tell him of foreign policy will be my experiences in most of the countries of the world, where I have seen my own countrymen reflect the worst of their natures, since they were of the opinion that they were a race apart. I will tell him something of the spread of the common law throughout the world by the British, whom he had been taught by a venal press to despise, and it has been hard to offset his distrust of the British even though he has close blood relatives in England, and more of them in Denmark and France.

Mr. Secretary, I have written you a long letter about a letter, but, what actually was also a motivation was a telephone call I received this morning from one of the principals of one of our high schools. He related to me that his teachers absolutely refused to take civil defense seriously, that it was a tempest in a teapot, and anyhow it was the figment of the administration's imagination that caused all the furore—that we would never be bombed or otherwise attacked, note the remarks of various Senators and Congressmen, and anyway, what was it you read in the press?

I have had members of my own party discount the sincere efforts of the President of the United States, simply because they wished in that way to resist the necessity of facing up to a world that is becoming increasingly more atavistic and reprehensible.

Mr. Secretary, I have lived on every continent, worked in most of the countries of the world, or visited them, and I have a working knowledge of 10 languages, none of them taught to me academically but which I have learned because I needed them. I see about me so many things which are left undone, which should be done, and I want more than anything else to wake my countrymen up to the necessity of realizing we are not living in a chocolate-coated world, but one that is armed to the teeth against us by and through actual armor or armed against us in propagating the belief that we have only a nickel under foot to motivate our activities.

I know of personal knowledge that most of the peoples of the world have a sneaking respect for us, that they like us fairly well for ourselves alone, that they fear us far more than we fear them, but all of whom could be turned against us simply because they are jealous of our way of life which we have earned for ourselves by hard work and ingenuity. I hope you will help me with this letter to my son.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE E. MOULLETTE,
Assistant to the Mayor.

JANUARY 16, 1951.

DEAR DAD: I just finished reading from the Los Angeles Examiner the impeachment resolution against Dean Acheson which was introduced into the California State Senate by State Senator Jack B. Tenney, Republican, from Los Angeles. I can't help but think that the American people, Democrat and Republican alike, are fed up with the administration and its foreign policy.

The way Truman is appropriating money is outrageous. It is my belief that he is taking anyone's word for it and spending money uselessly and needlessly. At present he is asking Congress for $71,500,000,000 which would cost each American $468.

Do you not think that our foreign policy is fouled up a bit? What right have we to refuse Red China entry into the United Nations? I think she (Red China) has a right to voice her opinions about what is to take place in the Far East. After all, is she not a country out there just as Venezuela or Brazil is in our hemisphere? I say, "Let Red China into the UN and let her voice her vote and her opinions on what is to take place in the Far East."

The needless waste of life in Korea, on both sides, is shameful to the human race. Fighting will not settle anything. The only thing that I can see is being proven in Korea is: "Might over what may be right," Red China being the might. The problem of Red China versus the world, or the best part of it, has to be settled at the round table and eventually it will be. Red China will be admitted to the UN. So the UN will have lost the first round. We did better in the Boxer Rebellion.

I thought that only Congress could declare war. Why doesn't Congress either declare war against Red China or stop Truman from sending American troops throughout the world? Why should we take the brunt of it all? If the other countries in the UN won't supply the needed men and money then we should pull out of Korea and if need be, out of the UN and adopt something similar to what Hoover suggests.

The morale of the fighting man is very low. Mainly because the American people aren't behind him. Here at Pendleton most of these men know what war is or what its after-effects are and will be. Just last night at the "slopshute" (beer-hall) the men, not one or two, but the majority, were complaining about the way we were tricked into this. Everyone seems to have nothing but disfavorable thoughts and remarks about the foreign policy. These men aren't afraid to fight, it's just that they have no cause to fight. If ordered to, we will but only because of the obligation we have to each other. I guess it's a form of "Brotherly Love."

Our only hope is that men our age throughout the world feel the same way and will state so to their leaders. By rebellion or other ways. After the loss of life, and property from the last war, everyone should want only peace. I believe that the people of our level want only peace but that the leaders (including Truman) are afraid to admit they are wrong and are ashamed to admit it for fear they will lose face. It looks that way, Dad!

I guess I've tired your eyes by now so I'll secure for now. Good luck in your defense job.

Love,

JOHNNIE.

P. S.—I may be a rebel but these are my own thoughts and convictions.

Northwest Power Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a radio broadcast entitled "Northwest Power Situation," delivered by Rudy Block over Station KOMO, Seattle, Wash., on Monday, February 19, 1951.

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

NORTHWEST POWER SITUATION

(Radio broadcast by Rudy Block)

So great has been the spontaneous and organized pressure against Congress voting to spend $6,000,000 next year to link the electric power grids of California with the Bonneville Power Administration grid in Oregon and Washington that it appears certain the money will not be voted.

Actually the only possibility of building the controversial tie-in would be if the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Force tell Congress that as a national defense safeguard the power connection between California and the Pacific Northwest is vital.

In the meantime Congress has been swamped with letters and telegrams opposing the tie-in. Beside the Grange and chambers of commerce throughout the Pacific Northwest, the public utility districts and private power companies are lined up against the tie-in.

Even in the Department of Interior itself there is a difference of opinion as to whether the tie-in should take place and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget where the project was screened before President Truman included it in the $71,000,000,000 budget stand out as the only proponents at this time.

When he was in our Nation's Capitol last week to appear before the House Appropriations Committee regarding next year's appropriations for Bonneville Power Administration, Dr. Paul Raver, the Bonneville Administrator, said he saw little hope for Congress to O. K. the tie-in item.

As in the case of all controversies between private and public power advocates the Bonneville Administrator in the case of the tie-in is trying to keep from taking sides.

"It seems to me that it is economically sound to have it possible for surplus California power to be sold in the Pacific Northwest and for surplus power in the Pacific Northwest to be sold in California," Dr. Raver said. "For example, if we have surplus Bonneville power and sold it in California it would help preserve oil for national defense."

At the same time the Bonneville chief said he appreciated the position of those on both the California and Pacific Northwest side of the proposed hook-up who fear the loss to their own industries which might arise if needed power were being sold to a far-away area.

The power situation continues to be a hot topic these days and besides the tie-in controversy the power fight is raging over the aluminum program and also over the Washington State squabble in connection with the proposed sale of the Washington Water Power Co. and public-utility districts.

This latter fight has centered at the State legislature but its Washington, D. C., angles include the decision last week by the Securities Exchange Commission that field hearings in the State would be held before the Commission acts on the proposed deal.

Another power controversy is the matter of where the Aluminum Co. of America will locate another aluminum production plant in the Pacific Northwest. Privately Alcoa is apparently hoping that it will set up its new plant near McNary Dam, but from recent conferences with Government power officials it became virtually certain that this plant will be located at Wenatchee. Until Alcoa signs its power contracts with Bonneville and the PUD, however, the deal is not set. In the meantime the town of Coulee Dam hopes it will get the Alcoa plant, but this appears to be a forlorn hope as Wenatchee has the inside track. Incidentally, once Wenatchee does get the Alcoa plant or any other new industry using Bonneville power, it will quiet a long-drawn complaint which see Wenatchee residents unhappy over the fact that their city is so near Grand Coulee Dam, but the big Bonneville transmission lines running through Wenatchee carry the dam's power to distant places.

The eastern newspapers have published little news about the important power situation, but last week Washington Representative HUGH MITCHELL attained widespread publicity when he made public his letter to Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman charging discrimination against the Pacific Northwest by the Defense Electric Power Administration.

Mr. Mitchell's blast was aimed at a reported memorandum issued by Defense Power Administrator Clifford B. McManus. Mr. McManus is a former Georgia Power Co. executive and his present attitude seems to favor halting new power projects in the Pacific Northwest. In place of this, Mr. McManus seems to feel, natural gas and coal in other parts of the Nation should be used.

For the last 2 weeks Senator MAGNUSON has been on top of this problem. In the hope of settling the issue without headlines, MAGNUSON talked to Secretary Chapman, to Dave Bell, the President's closest adviser on power matters, and to McManus himself. The gist of MAGNUSON's talks is: "We won't stand for discrimination against the Northwest in the allocation of defense industries."

Mr. Mitchell's letter actually puts Secretary Chapman on the spot to make public his position as to whether he favors the expan-

sion of the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest.

Looking at the situation impartially it appears from the testimony before the Celler committee investigating monopoly in the aluminum industry that new aluminum plants can be built quickly in areas where coal or natural gas are available. It is also a fact that such plants are cheaper than a power dam and that they can be built near centers of industrial production which are not as close to Soviet Russia as is the Pacific Northwest.

However, from a military standpoint, it is certain that in this age of aviation and guided missiles no part of the United States is out of reach of Russian air power, just as no part of Russia or Europe is out of reach of American air power.

And economically, while the first phase of a new aluminum plant might be cheaper if gas engines are used the maintenance cost and the ultimate increase in gas or coal due to depletion of resources, would make these plants costly to our national defense.

In other words the low cost of hydroelectric power makes this type of energy the most economical for aluminum production.

Alcoa, the giant of the aluminum industry, apparently realizes this or it easily could be planning its new plant in some other area of the Nation.

But the problem of Representative MITCHELL and other Pacific Northwest Members of Congress to sell their colleagues and Government agency heads on the fact that hydropower is the best power for aluminum production is not an easy one.

The South holds the key positions in the Eighty-second Congress and it is the Southwest and Texas where natural gas is plentiful. Eastern coal mine operators are also alert to the situation and see in the alumi um defense stockpiling a potential outlet for coal via steam plant.

Turning now to another phase of the power situation Congress is faced with the question of how much money to appropriate for new authorized dams. These dams, such as Ice Harbor Dam, would be added to the Bonneville grid and help meet the growing demand for power throughout the Pacific Northwest.

Secretary Chapman is also the head man when it comes to Interior Department requests for funds for new dams. His friends within the department are not too happy over his getting dragged into the controversy over whether the Federal Power Commission should issue a permit to the city of Tacoma for new dams on the Cowlitz River in the State of Washington.

The Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department opposes these dams as killers of fish while city of Tacoma boosters for the dams are not satisfied over Secretary Chapman's holding back on a strong appeal for the dams to be built.

Behind the scenes when the Cowlitz controversy was hot and heavy last year suggestion was made by some of Secretary Chapman's advisers that the Government should have approved the Cowlitz dams and then pass the controversy to the Washington State Legislature. The legislature, it was admitted would probably block the dams to protect the fishing industry, but at least the controversy would be away from Secretary Chapman and his Department.

C. Girard Davidson, the former Assistant Secretary of Interior, is a factor in the power controversy. This time it is not over Mr. Davidson's pet CVA project, but the overall power situation which involves the aluminum picture we have tried to describe.

As a consultant for the Interior Department Mr. Davidson has been working on a report to show the power potentialities of the Pacific Northwest—as they are today and as they will be next year, the year after and so on for the next decade.

His report is expected to offset the surveys which are the reported basis for the Defense Electric Power Administration attitude that the aluminum program in the Pacific Northwest should be halted. Incidentally, it will include a recommendation that three steam plants be built in scattered areas to help firm up the power pool.

Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement given this morning by Mr. S. Abbot Smith before a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee. This subcommittee, of which I am chairman, was set up by Chairman SPARKMAN to develop a report on the manpower problems of smaller independent business. I knew Mr. Smith during the war as a fellow member of the Committee on Small Business of the Committee for Economic Development and after the war as a fellow trustee of the Committee for Economic Development. He is past president of the Smaller Business Association of New England. Mr. Smith is an outstanding representative of independent business and I am sure my colleagues in Congress will agree that his statement of this morning shows he is not only well informed on problems arising from the current crisis but that he presents intelligent and constructive suggestions. I commend in particular the point illustrated by the two small companies in Connecticut which are troubled not so much by present ills as by the uncertainty which clouds their future. Businessmen operate largely on their guesses about the future. Obviously smaller independent businessmen cannot do an enterprising job when they live in daily fear they will be put out of business, their working capital will be lost, and their years of effort in building a business to a profitable point will be sacrificed.

Mr. Smith's leadership deserves the thanks, not only of the New England business community, but of businessmen everywhere.

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

STATEMENT OF S. ABBOT SMITH BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, UNITED STATES SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON MANPOWER

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is S. Abbot Smith. I am president of Thomas Strahan Co., a small concern manufacturing fine wallpaper in Chelsea, Mass., a past president and still a director of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

I wish to thank you, gentlemen, for the privilege of appearing before you today and at the same time tell you how glad we small-business men are that you are holding this hearing now in time to ascertain the facts and then we hope to devise manpower policies which will avoid the mistakes and unnecessary disruptions of the last war. As we all know too well, many skilled men were ruthlessly plucked from their businesses and put into uniform with dire results to their businesses and the economy, but with little advantage to the Army beyond adding another man because their special skills were so seldom fully utilized.

Our armed services must have men, but we also must maintain a strong and expanding economy for that is basically our most potent weapon against Russia. This period of tension may, probably will, go on for years. We cannot afford to stop expanding and growing now.

The strength of our economy lies in its being a system in which everyone can go into business or out at will. It is a system which automatically screens out the inefficient. The survivors go on and grow, some become big. It is a system which furnishes leaders for the country in all fields.

If all-out war comes, then we must have total mobilization of all resources, including manpower. But that time has not yet come.

Today it is more important to keep small companies going than just to get another man to swell the numbers in uniform and perhaps only to pound a typewriter at some base which in most cases could probably be done more efficiently by a WAC or a WAVE anyway. Yet in many cases the taking of just those one or two men if they are key men or specialists will wreck or seriously injure a small company.

That is what we must avoid until the emergency becomes really acute and there is no alternative.

Although this situation may and does occur in some of the larger "small companies," I am thinking now more particularly of the really smaller companies, those we'll say employing 100 or less which make up more than 90 percent of the businesses of the Nation.

Take the many cases where veterans of the last war have gone into business for themselves. They are the key men in those little businesses. Isn't it better for the country in the long run to let those men grow and expand, to prove their mettle, perhaps be amongst our top leaders 20 years hence rather than to pull them back into the Army and wreck the business they started with their savings, kept going with their sweat?

It takes years to train many of our specialists and skilled workers. They can't be replaced in 3 months or 6 months except by enticing a similar worker from some other employer. Where is the gain there? This brings up the whole question of labor pirating, a sore subject with many small companies, but with too many ramifications to take up now.

At this point let us consider for a moment how these key men are pulled out of their small companies. First there is the draft. So far the draft calls have not been heavy and draft boards have been lenient in granting deferments. From all indications, however, it appears it will be a different story by next fall as present deferments expire and the services need more men.

Secondly, there are the Reserves and the National Guard. Here we have to make a distinction it seems to me between the Volunteer Reserves and the officers of the Inactive Naval Reserve. Many officers signed up for the Volunteer and Organized Reserves seeing an opportunity to make some easy money. Thus you can say there is no reason why they should not be called when wanted no matter what they may be doing. They went into it with their eyes open and the employer who hired them did likewise. Nevertheless, I still say that we are being

"penny-wise and pound-foolish" if the calling of such men now means a small business must fold up.

In the case of naval officers there is a difference because they were not allowed to resign, but had to stay in the Reserves. There is therefore still more reason for not calling them at this time if they wish to continue in the small business where they are presently employed.

Many people will say we are creating a tempest in a teapot, that we are crying before we are hurt. In one sense that is true. Up to this moment not many key men have been called but I can tell you positively there are thousands of small concerns in New England who are scared to death as to what is going to happen to them a little later when present deferments expire, when draft boards needing more men become less lenient, when more and more of the Reserves are called back.

I know one small company started since the war which is just getting into its stride after tough sledding and now doing valuable military work. The business is entirely dependent on two young men both naval officers in the last war and still in the Reserves because they can't get out. Presumably the importance of the work they are doing will keep them where they are. But who knows? We saw queer things happen in the last war when highly skilled men were put in fields completely unrelated to their training.

I checked with a small company in Connecticut last week and tried to get one of the partners to come down here today, but they are tremendously busy and couldn't take the time off. One of their key executives is in the Naval Reserve, he was deferred but the case comes up again in May. Their foreman is in the Air Forces Reserve. They are terribly worried for fear they will lose these two men.

I know of another case in Massachusetts where the master mechanic, the "set-up" man in a small company, was in the Naval Reserve and was called last December. He got a deferment, but the appeal board has turned down a request for indefinite deferment and they don't know what they'll do.

There is another small company in New Haven, Conn., where the executives are tearing their hair because they and the superintendent are all in the Naval Reserve. They have had no calls yet but don't know when the lightning may strike.

That is another bad feature of this manpower situation—the uncertainty of it all, the lack of a clear policy which everyone can know and plan on. Any number of young men have come to our plant looking for a job. In spite of the need for men, no one will hire them for they are either of draft age or in the Reserves. Consequently, no one wants to hire them, spend time and money breaking them in, and then lose them just when they are becoming worth something in the job.

Over the radio the other morning I heard the announcement that Pratt & Whitney in Hartford is going to want 11,000 more workers this spring. That high lights another reason for letting the small companies keep their men—to avoid so far as possible the awful congestion we saw during the last war in the defense centers.

Surely it is ever so much better from every point of view to subcontract the work to the greatest extent possible to the small concerns in smaller towns where the workmen can live at home, where housing is already adequate and more housing does not have to be built, consuming additional critical labor and materials, where schools and public utilities are already available, rather than to close those small plants and force the men to move to already congested areas or at best spend unnecessary hours commuting long distances.

Some of you may have seen in the February issue of the American Machinist a report on the speech made January 31 in New York by Herbert F. Jahn, president of the National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, in which he said that the Nation's 3,000 contract shops are losing men to the armed services, and thus imperiling the rearmament effort through Selective Service Board failure to recognize that the supply of such craftsmen is short, about the same as 1941, and that it takes a long time to train them. This crisis has arisen in part, he said, because local draft board officials have sole power to decide if skilled workers shall be inducted. There is no single national office to which plants can appeal for release from further depletion of their vital manpower.

When discussing this subject of manpower we usually think of manufacturing, but to my mind key men of small wholesalers, retailers, or service industries are just as important. They serve a local need or they wouldn't exist. Even though the business in question is not listed amongst the essential industries I still think that until the emergency is more acute it is better for our economy in the long run to leave key men running those businesses, keeping our free-enterprise system alive and dynamic. Many will have to close anyway but insofar as possible we should avoid the wholesale closings which took place during the last war when hundreds of thousands of small businesses closed their doors, when the big became bigger and the small fewer.

Please do not misunderstand me, the national defense comes first, before every other consideration. Individuals and groups of individuals must be willing to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary for the good of our country as a whole. I firmly believe they are and will be willing to make those sacrifices if they are told clearly and concisely what must be done and why.

The armed services must have the number of men our experts decide is necessary. The only question is how can that number be obtained with the least damage to our overall economy. This means considering the individuals themselves and the occupations from which they are taken.

My personal feeling is that the draft should be lowered to 18. Those boys make good soldiers and after all they will be 19 before they get their full training. Having no established place in industry their drafting does less harm to their own future and to industry than does taking older men who have definitely started their careers, who in many cases have family obligations and who have already made a place for themselves in their businesses.

One of the major differences between large and small business is that large business has many men in each department and overlapping in their functions, while in small business there is usually only one man performing each function, if indeed the one man does not perform several functions. Take one or several men from the large business, there are others ready to cover up, but if one of these key men is taken from small business it leaves a hole which cannot be filled and frequently means the disintegration of the business.

To sum up, we need a clear national policy on manpower needs and the plans for filling those needs so that the individuals concerned both of draft age and in the Reserves and business know what to expect and can make definite plans accordingly.

There must be provisions specifying that skilled workers needed for defense work will not be taken for the armed services unless it is certain their skills will be of greater use to the country in the armed services than where now located and assuring that once inducted those skills are utilized to the full rather than not used at all as we saw happen all too often in the last war.

There should be a definite policy implemented by draft boards and the armed services that short of all-out war key men are not to be taken from small businesses whether listed as essential to defense or not. At this point they are essential to our overall economy and future growth.

Income-Tax Exemptions for Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the February 24 issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal. This publication, which has for so long dedicated itself to the interests of the Armed Forces of the Nation, makes some very cogent observations on S. 891, a bill which I and four other Senators introduced 2 weeks ago to grant special income-tax exemptions for all members of the Armed Forces.

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

ALL-SERVICE INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN (Democrat-Labor, New York), acting for himself and a group of both Republican and Democratic Senators, is sponsoring legislation to apply a special income-tax exemption for all service personnel to replace the present military deductions confined to those serving in the Korean combat zone. Senator LEHMAN would allow a special personal deduction of $600 a year to all commissioned and enlisted personnel with an additional $100 exemption for each dependent in addition to the spouse. This basic figure is only one-half of that allowed to service personnel during World War II and should be increased to at least that figure. However, the principle of special military exemptions is well founded and amply justified. Already the tax laws provide extra personal deductions for persons over 65 years of age and for blind persons, thus recognizing the need for special exemptions to cover special conditions. Certainly the unsettled life of service personnel justifies special income-tax relief. Families are uprooted and moved from time to time. Additional expenses are incurred in educating children. Uniforms and equipment cost more than civilian clothing. Ownership and operation of a private car is almost a necessity on most posts where distances from quarters to duty are great and where many live far from the post itself. The Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee should study this situation carefully. We feel that the facts not only will justify the principle advocated in Senator LEHMAN's bill but will show the need for a more substantial basic military deduction. Special compensation for the men actually in the fighting zones can be handled better through the establishment of a system of combat pay such as that recommended by the Department and

now awaiting consideration by the congressional committees. Both the over-all military income-tax deduction and the hazard pay for service in combat zones should be permanent legislation.

Communism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by William Fulton entitled "Capitalist Money Helps Reds Carry Out Socialist Schemes," published in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, March 4, 1951.

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

CAPITALIST MONEY HELPS REDS CARRY OUT SOCIALIST SCHEMES—HEIRS OF EARLY MILLIONAIRES PLAY ROLES AS ANGELS FOR MANY LEFT-WING GROUPS

(By William Fulton)

NEW YORK, March 3.—One of the strangest developments of the drive to saddle communism on the United States is the recruitment of millionaires whose fathers or grandfathers made their fortunes in a free, democratic, capitalist society.

Most of these hybrid offspring operate here in New York where the atmosphere of "foreignism" and "internationalism" suits them. Ever since the Bolshevik revolution, the Reds have cultivated idle men and women with money in this town.

FLATTERED BY PINKOS

Red organizers prey on the frustration these cafe society characters feel because they haven't achieved the fame of their ancestors. They have been made to feel important by flattering offices in Red-front organizations, by being hailed as "liberals," espousing causes of "social significance," or "freedom," or "democracy," by affixing names to petitions on behalf of Stalinoid characters and numerous other tricks through which the Communist underworld carries on its propaganda.

Pioneer patriarch of the Pinko flock is Corliss Lamont, son the late Thomas W. Lamont, multimillionaire partner in the John Pierpont Morgan banking firm. Corliss, former chairman of Friends of the Soviet Union, boasts 46 separate citations for affiliation with Red-front set-ups in Appendix 9 of the reports of the special House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The younger Lamont, after preparing at exclusive Exeter Academy and being indoctrinated at Harvard University, has been described as "the upper class near-intellectual driven perversely to assert himself by an extremist past."

DEFEATED KREMLIN

Lamont conducted affairs of Friends of the Soviet Union along the same policy line laid down by Moscow as avowed Communist leaders in this country. For example, when Prof. John Dewey and other significant figures in American education condemned the 1937 Moscow purge trials and "confessions," Lamont rose to defend the Kremlin.

Shortly before the outbreak of World War II, Lamont sponsored a letter supporting the Soviet Union on every count. This epistle, for which Lamont garnered 400 signatures, denied the "fantastic falsehood" that Russia could have anything in common with Germany and called those who spread such a report "Fascists and their allies" out "to prevent a united aggression front."

Then came the Hitler-Stalin nonaggression pact which opened the door for the invasion of Poland, Lamont allowed his Friends of the Soviet Union to disband without public announcement but he continued personally to hew strictly to the Moscow line.

REPRESENTS RED INTERESTS

Paralleling the Lamont career is that of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, millionaire representative of Red China interests in this country. He refused to answer questions of congressional committees investigating Communist activities and has been charged with contempt.

Field is the great-grandson of Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt, wealthiest financier and railroad magnate of his time. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. William Osgood Field, who are now dead, and grandson of Mr. and Mrs. William Douglas Sloane.

The great-grandson of the doughty commodore attended fashionable Hotchkiss Preparatory School and then went to Harvard. He also studied at the London School of Economics where he soaked up socialism at the feet of the late Prof. Harold Laski.

Field took out his Red card in the Socialist Party in 1928. Before the Second World War he bobbed into prominence as executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization. This Red-facade organization was consistently antiwar during the life of the Soviet-Nazi pact but switched over after Hitler attacked Russia.

Louis Budenz, ex-Communist editor, told the Senate that Field was a member of the American Communist politburo from 1936 on and was assigned to infiltrate the Institute of Pacific Relations. Field became chairman of the board and Owen Lattimore, also accused by Budenz as a Communist agent, was editor of the institute's magazine, Pacific Affairs.

Last fall Field registered as a foreign agent representing Red China financial interests.

MARSHALL FIELD FORTUNE USED

Another old fortune which has been poured into the left-wing propaganda stream in this country is that founded by Marshall Field, the Chicago department store king. His grandson, Marshall Field 3d, suddenly faced to the left in the 1930's and became a votary of the Roosevelt administration.

Educated at Eton and Cambridge in England, Field had gained prominence as an international playboy, racing stableman, grower of fancy flowers, and host at fashionable grouse shoots. For an unrevealed reason Field went to Dr. Gregory F. Zilboorg, a New York psychiatrist of Russian birth, for examination. From that time on Field sharply switched his course.

He started the alleged newspaper PM in New York, a happy feeding trough for left-wingers and Communists of all sorts. After sinking several millions in this venture he started the Sun in Chicago, it is said, at the behest of the late President Roosevelt. This paper also flopped and was merged with the Times.

Another piece of the old J. P. Morgan banking fortune is also finding its way into the New Republic, which is edited by the radical Michael Straight. The real angel is his mother, Mrs. Leonard Elmhirst of London, widow of the late Morgan partner, Willard Straight. Mrs. Elmhirst has bankrolled the pinkish New Republic to the tune of several million dollars.

Millions are also being funneled into Communist and left-wing drives via the big foundations. One of the most notorious is the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust and Foundation. Robert Marshall, son of Louis, a law partner of Samuel Untermeyer, left $1,594,000 in 1939 for the cause of trade-unionism, civil liberties, and preservation of wildlife.

DEFENDED REMINGTON

Recently the Marshall money went into the defense of William W. Remington, Commerce Department economist convicted of perjury in connection with spy-ring activities. Other Marshall money has been contributed toward the Rev. L. M. Birkhead's Friends of Democracy, well-known smear outfit of patriotic Americans and organizations.

Trustees of the Marshall Civil Liberties Trust include Roger Baldwin, who has been identified with organizations deemed subversive by the Government; Edwin S. Smith, former member of the National Labor Relations Board and later executive director of the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship; John F. Finerty, lawyer for numerous pinko causes; Gardner Jackson, Roosevelt intimate and once chairman of the Council for Pan-American Democratic Union which is on the Department of Justice list as subversive, and James Marshall, brother of the late Robert and member of the New York City Board of Education.

Ed Allen's Fireside Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 6 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ed Allen's Fireside Thoughts."

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

ED ALLEN'S FIRESIDE THOUGHTS

Within the past few weeks I have had occasion to travel from coast to coast, visiting with many people along the way. Everywhere I went, the people I talked to seemed to have one thing in common: fear. Of course, I do not say that my experience reveals a true cross-section of the American frame of mind, but never in the darkest days following Pearl Harbor was I as conscious of such a lack of confidence in our destiny as I find now.

These fears were expressed in many ways: fear for the lives and future of our sons and daughters; fear for the destruction of our economy; fear for a greater loss of our freedoms. In fact, fear for the loss of the American way of life, with all that it implies. It seems strange to me that I have found little concern of the atomic bomb or, in fact, of Communist aggression.

Since I have but little space, I have tried to boil my impressions down to my size and have come to the conclusion that these misgivings and fears have their origin in the failure of our Government in its dealings with other nations. There is widespread fear of what our Government will commit the American people to next.

It appears to me that people are afraid of Government, afraid of the world leaders

who have, in one way of another, come into the position of domination over the lives and the acts of the great majority of the people of the earth. Today, it would appear that any one of several world leaders can wake up on the wrong side of the bed and, with a single gesture, set millions of people at each others throats. Recall that but a few short days before the "police action" in Korea, the American people were assured that Korea was considered indefensible and not within our defense perimeter. What happened? Did someone get up on the wrong side of the bed? So far as I know, neither the American people nor Congress have been given any explanation for the change in attitude. Is it possible that we have so degenerated into statism that we are not entitled to know?

In one way or another, it's certain that we have been pushed, led, frightened and driven into a national emergency of unprecedented gravity, calling for the drafting of our 18-year-old children, controls of wages, production, and taxes until they hurt. Yet, strangely, there is no mention of vote-buying handouts here at home or the elimination of tax-free spending money of Government officials or, as a matter of fact, any real assurance that the new powers and money cannot be used so as to promote greater tragedies in the future.

As I see it, our greatest and brightest hope is that the new Congress will rise to unprecedented heights of statesmanship, that it will possess the foresight, the wisdom, the judgment, the unselfishness, and the courage to lead this Nation back to the principles upon which it was founded, to a position where its citizens may look forward to each tomorrow as we have in the past with dignity and confidence. It can be accomplished if the new Congress will lead the way.

In Fairness to Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of March 5, 1951, by Joseph Young.

Mr. Young, a staff member of the Washington Evening Star, is a recognized specialist on news concerning Government employees, and his column, the Federal Spotlight, is widely read.

It is pointed out by the columnist that the Civil Service Commission is planning a crackdown on inefficient and wasteful personnel practices. This action, Mr. Speaker, is one that is long overdue, not only because big government has become one of the most expensive items in the tax bills which bears so heavily upon everyone of us, but particularly because the faithful and diligent Government employee frequently has been placed at a disadvantage, and has had no alternative but to acquiesce silently in the continuance of job practices which would not be tolerated in private employment.

The article is as follows:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT
(By Joseph Young)

RAMSPECK PLANS TO CRACK DOWN ON WASTEFUL PERSONNEL POLICY

A crackdown on inefficient and wasteful personnel practices wherever they are found in Government is planned by the Civil Service Commission under the leadership of Robert Ramspeck.

Mr. Ramspeck, who is expected to be confirmed soon as Commission Chairman, feels very strongly about the necessity of the Commission taking the leadership in seeing to it that the Government utilizes its own manpower to its fullest ability.

Mr. Ramspeck tells friends that's one of the main reasons he resigned his $25,000 Air Transport Association job to take the $16,000-a-year Commission chairmanship. He feels that the full utilization of manpower is one of the Government's gravest problems and one particularly urgent right now in the national emergency.

For many years, the Commission has hesitated to tell agencies how to run their personnel operations, feeling that it did not have the necessary legislative or executive authority to do so.

However, Mr. Ramspeck and Budget Bureau officials feel that the Commission does have the authority and should take the lead in this field.

Consequently, Commission investigators will probe the personnel operations of the various agencies to see if wasteful and inefficient practices exist. Any such practices will be brought to the agencies' attention, with an order to get their house in order. If this is not done, the Commission will report the condition to the Budget Bureau for appropriate action, and also to the proper committees in Congress.

This marks a radical departure from past Government personnel policy and conceivably could lead to large economies and much greater efficiency in personnel operations.

Veterans Subjected to Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Veterans Subjected to Fraud," published in the Washington Post, and reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del., in the New York Times of January 31, 1951.

By pointing up an issue which is of such public importance as whether veterans are receiving adequate medical care in the veterans' hospitals, the International Latex Corp. is rendering a distinguished public service. In order to understand a controversy of this kind, it is important that the public be informed of the facts and of the different viewpoints about the controversy.

The editorial follows:

VETERANS SUBJECTED TO FRAUD

The only consoling thing about the departure of Dr. Paul B. Magnuson from his post as medical director of the Veterans' Administration is that the reasons have been frankly stated. Dr. Magnuson refused to enter into the usual interchange of sweet nothings; instead, he asserts that he was fired—and fired as the result of a long-continued squabble with Veterans' Administrator Gray over whether doctors or politically inspired meddlers were to run medical services for veterans. This candor from Dr. Magnuson at least gives the country a chance to see what is happening.

From our standpoint it is unmitigated tragedy, notwithstanding the amiability and good intentions of Dr. Magnuson's successor, Vice Adm. Joel T. Boone. More than any other man, Dr. Magnuson is responsible for building Veterans' Administration medical care from a fourth-rate, bureaucracy-ridden service to the best service available anywhere. He has done this by earning the respect, cooperation and active participation of the medical profession. He has insisted on locating hospitals near medical schools, thus enabling veterans to enjoy the services of the best civilian doctors. He has resisted every effort by Members of Congress and others to determine hospital sites by considerations of patronage.

A brilliant Chicago orthopedic surgeon and teacher, Dr. Magnuson has been singularly dedicated to the public service. A measure of this dedication is that he stuck to his job and refused point blank to resign despite a round of heckling, interference, and indignity that would have discouraged most men. When Gen. Omar N. Bradley and Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley in 1945 undertook the herculean task of modernizing the VA to serve 15,000,000 new veterans, Dr. Magnuson was especially chosen to enlist the interest of the medical profession. He had the full support of these two anchors of independence and succeeded to General Hawley's job as medical director when the latter left in 1948.

Even before General Bradley returned to the Army, however, he and his associates knew that they were fighting a losing battle. They had put too much faith in the loyalty of the top people they had inherited in the VA—people who quietly bided their time in order to sabotage reforms. It was this group that never accepted the apparently novel concept that medical men should be allowed to run hospitals.

The support which Dr. Magnuson enjoyed from Generals Bradley and Hawley has been conspicuously lacking from the present Administrator, Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr. Perhaps the most charitable thing that can be said about General Gray's performance is that he has tried to run the Veterans' Administration as he used to run the Chicago & North Western Railway. He has allowed himself to become the prisoner of the VA old guard, he has deferred ostentatiously to congressional whims, and he has declined to go to bat for the doctors against unwarranted cutbacks in the quality and extent of medical care.

Basically the trouble is that General Gray and the men around him never have understood the requirement for independence of medical direction. Dr. Magnuson has been further and further insulated from the top by an army of assistant directors, and General Gray has refused to make hospitals responsible to the medical director. The crowning blow was the appointment of a three-man board for the selection of hospital managers about which Dr. Magnuson was not even consulted. Concurrently, of course, political influence in the location of hospitals has been seeping in again.

This record makes the Gray explanation childish—that he acted on a previous resignation submitted by Dr. Magnuson. The fact is that Dr. Magnuson consistently refused to compromise the welfare of his patients and never ceased to fight the reinfiltration of red tape. For these reasons he

was ousted. The Administration and Members of Congress who have been justly proud of the VA medical record need to take a good look at the deterioration that has set in; perhaps a reawakening of interest will spare Admiral Boone the humiliation that Dr. Magnuson has undergone. Dr. Magnuson's indefatigable drive and salient personality will be a loss not only to official Washington but to the entire country. Most especially it will be a loss to the veterans. They have been outrageously defrauded. (Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.)

Address of Hon. Miles F. McDonald, District Attorney, Kings County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by the Honorable Miles F. McDonald, district attorney of Kings County, N. Y., made before the Notre Dame Law Association luncheon on January 26, 1951:

I am grateful to you for this opportunity of talking to you on a subject which I believe is of vital importance, not only to the individual safety of the citizens of our country but also to the very existence of our country as a nation.

Bills have already been introduced in the House of Representatives under H. R. 406 by Congressman WALTER and H. R. 479 by Congressman KEATING and H. R. 1947 by Congressman CELLER to accomplish the purpose which I suggest and I earnestly hope that you will give the matter your careful consideration and, if you believe these bills to be in the interest of your country, that you express your views to your Representatives in Congress.

Fifty percent of my professional life has been devoted to public prosecution: I have been an assistant district attorney in the second most populous county in the country; I have been United States attorney in charge of one of the busiest Federal districts in the country; and, for 5 years, I have been the district attorney of Kings County, which is more usually described as Brooklyn.

In these years I have watched the ever-increasing power of the criminal combination, the gangster and the racketeer.

I have seen the power of the subversive forces work against our country—and I have come face to face with the insidious propaganda machine that has been built up to foster legislation that will make it easier for these vicious forces to avoid just punishment for their crimes.

I have heard the cry of civil rights from lips of those who would destroy the very Constitution that guarantees these rights.

This great shield of personal liberty has become in large measure the velvet glove that masks the iron fist of the dictator.

While this insidious attack is made upon our people and our way of life, the honest men, the loyal Americans have stood silently by unable to fight because they knew not where to begin.

Today I want to show you a starting point. I want to encourage you to forge a weapon with which the law enforcement of the United States can arm themselves in your defense—a weapon that we are denying to ourselves at the cost of our own lives and liberties.

All of you have read in the public press of the arrest and trial and conviction of Judith Coplin.

Those who followed the trial carefully are aware of the various rulings made by the trial judge concerning evidence obtained by the interception of telephonic communications.

All of you must have been shocked that the appellate court found it necessary to reverse the conviction partially because the Government did not prove that its investigation had not secured leads by the interception of telephone conversations.

Despite the fact that the court held the defendant was clearly guilty of the crime charged, Judge Hand, in writing the opinion of the court, said:

"For all the foregoing reasons, the conviction must be reversed; but we will not dismiss the indictment, for the guilt is plain, and it is possible on another trial that there may be more evidence of the likelihood of an escape; that the prosecution may decide to divulge the contents of the 'taps'; and that the examination as to the confidential informant may go far enough to show that he was not a wire-tapper."

Some of you may be familiar with the work I have been doing in fighting organized gambling and police corruption in the city of New York.

If you are, you will know that our investigation was largely successful because the law of New York permitted us to tap wires and that, during our supervision of the wires, the various subterfuges used by the gamblers and police to hide their corrupt agreements came to light.

When you compare the relative importance of my field of work with the importance of the preservation of our country against its enemies from within, you will see why I am of the firm opinion that we Americans must wake up and protect ourselves if we are to survive.

Let me make my position on this subject quite clear.

I am not here to defend nor do I condone unlawful wire tapping by anyone and that includes public officials, both State and Federal.

I do not propose nor do I urge that any Government agency—State or Federal—or any law-enforcement office—police or District Attorney—should have unlimited power to intercept the telephonic communications of others.

I contend with the utmost sincerity—and I hope with equal logic and vigor—that the right to intercept telephone communications in certain cases is a vital necessity to law enforcement and that, without such a right, the forces of law and order would be at such a disadvantage in the war against crime, subversion, sabotage and treason, that the peace and security, the property and the lives of the individual citizens and the existence of our country as a free Nation, could not be insured.

My position on this question perhaps can be best stated in the words of former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, now a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, when he stated in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940:

"Wire tapping presents a problem of proper balance and nice adjustment as between rights of individuals on one hand and the needs and interest of society on the other."

I should like therefore to point out what I believe are the considerations to be taken into account in arriving at these balances and adjustments.

Let us go back through the years and try to determine the evils that the drafters of our constitution sought to combat by their prohibition against unlawful search and seizure.

In those days, when the Red Coats rapped their sabers on the doors of the sleeping villagers of Concord and Lexington, they sought to punish wrongs allegedly committed against the Crown itself, not crimes against the life or property of the citizens of the Commonwealth. Further, the crimes they alleged dealt with the proprietary interest of the Crown itself.

In this I believe will be found the historical basis for existence of the Federal rule.

The majority of Federal crimes are crimes against the proprietary interests of the Government itself, such as cases involving taxes and allied matters.

There are but few crimes under Federal law which directly affect the welfare of the individual citizen, or life of the Nation.

In the former class of cases—cases involving the proprietary interest of the Government, I will agree that wire tapping might well be prohibited or at least so carefully circumscribed as to make its use impractical except in the most serious cases, cases involving large criminal combinations and the purveyors of illicit drugs who, by their activities, imperil the health and life of their victims.

On the other hand, in cases where the safety of the citizens of the Nation is the prime concern, where the very life and existence of the Nation is at stake, the right to intercept telephone communications must exist.

To act otherwise is sheerest folly. I firmly believe that treason, sabotage, espionage, and seditious conspiracy are such crimes.

Remember, 99-9/10 percent of the people of the United States never engage in unlawful acts of this nature and need have no fear of any law that permits wire tapping for the purpose of securing evidence of crimes of that nature.

By the same token, the small percentage of people who seek to destroy our country are attempting to create a statutory protection for their nefarious acts as a means of destroying the Government behind whose laws they seek to hide.

The laws prohibiting unlawful search and seizure are based primarily upon the laws of fair play.

But we are not engaged in a game, the Communists and Russians and their satellites are not going to fight according to any rule.

They will take any dishonest advantage available to them.

To combat them without the privilege of wire tapping is like putting Joe Louis in the ring to fight Gargantua and insisting that Joe follow the Marquis of Queensbury rules.

Would you propose a statute that would provide that any person attacked by a rabid dog must not defend himself with any weapon stronger than a fly swatter?

Of course not, but that is what you seek to do when you tie the hands of the Department of Justice and the Army and Navy in cases of treason, sabotage, and espionage.

Of course, we want to defend the rights of the citizen against his Government but, to do that, we must defend the existence of this Government as a democracy or we will have no rights left to defend.

I am not aware of the provisions in the law in many of our States with regard to this matter but I can say that if you do not permit your law enforcement agencies to avail themselves of wire-tap evidence, you will never successfully overcome organized crime.

In cases arising within the sovereign States an even more liberal rule should be established for the vast majority of the crimes under State law are crimes against the individual citizens.

The prosecution is avenging not the State but the outrage perpetrated on the life and property of the law-abiding citizen of the community.

The rights of these law-abiding citizens cannot be left unprotected and the greatest deterrent to crime is the certainty of apprehension and punishment.

If you, by a foolish devotion to an abstract idea, so limit the agencies of law enforcement that the chances for apprehension and conviction become small, the criminal will continue to expand the circle of his depredations.

I agree with the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes that wire tapping is a dirty business but, if you were to ride with me through the streets of any large city in the early hours of the morning and view the bloody corpse of the victim of a gang murder or view the tortured body of a youthful narcotics user whose future has been destroyed to gratify the gangsters' greed for easy money; if you had seen, as I have seen, the poor and unfortunate victims of organized groups of confidence men who have lost their life savings; if you had been forced to cope with the revolting spectacle of a segment of the police department who had been corrupted by an unscrupulous gambler, you would agree that crime is an even dirtier business.

I have asked before and I ask again, What is so sacrosanct about a telephone that men can use it to plan murder or to steal the secrets of the atomic bomb, and the evidence cannot be used against them?

Is the right of privacy greater than a man's right to life?

Of course not.

Then, if you will prohibit wire tapping, why don't you disarm the police?

The reason is apparent; you trust in the policeman not to use that gun in an improper manner. The patrolman's revolver and club are your weapons, employed in your interest.

So is the wire tap.

This is the age of scientific progress. The criminal takes advantage of every known scientific aid to foster his nefarious acts.

Will you deny the benefits of technological progress to the agencies of law enforcement?

Mr. Justice Jackson, then Attorney General of the United States, writing to Representative Hatton Summers on March 19, 1941, said: "Criminals today have the free run of our communication systems but the law-enforcement officers are denied even a carefully restricted power to confront the criminal with his telephonic and telegraphic footprints."

For one, I cannot see the logic of the opponent of a measure to permit wire tapping under proper auspices and under reasonable restrictions.

To follow any such line of thought reduces us to the absurdity of taking the motorcycle away from the traffic cop and giving him back his bicycle.

Today a criminal can commit a crime in Massachusetts now and be in California in the morning. Should we be limited in our chase to a covered wagon or may we use a DC-6?

You may rightfully ask by what then will we protect ourselves against the inordinate and reckless use of this means of detection.

The answer is simple—by the same means you protect yourself from every other possibility of misgovernment—by the integrity of the officials in whom you place the right to exercise these powers.

If the government official violates this confidence, our democracy provides adequate means for you to turn the rascal out.

The minute a man becomes a prosecutor, policeman, or other public official, he does not lose all sense of decency and justice no more than a man becomes a criminal the minute he accepts a retainer as defense counsel in a criminal case.

There are a few erroneous ideas with respect to wire tapping I should like to correct.

First is the belief that law enforcement officials use wire tapping to a great extent.

I do not believe that this is correct.

In my first 4 years as district attorney, I have prosecuted more than 8,000 felony cases, approximately 30,000 misdemeanor cases, and have conducted many more investigations and yet, during that time, I have applied for orders to intercept telephone communications as follows:

1946	12
1947	6
1948	11
1949	1

a total of 30 applications, 14 of which dealt with homicides.

In addition, the cases in which we have used evidence resulting from orders obtained directly by the police does not exceed 25. The figures of 1950 were not yet available as I prepared this address.

The foes of wire tapping are attempting to guard the average citizen against an outrage to which he never will be subjected.

We might just as well adopt a statute making it unlawful for sea serpents to swim further north than the George Washington Bridge.

The whole subject cannot be better stated than in the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, to which I originally referred and which I should now like to quote in full:

"Wire tapping presents a problem of proper balance and nice adjustment as between rights of individuals on the one hand and the needs and interests of society on the other. Unrestrained and uncontrolled wire tapping, even on the part of law-enforcement officers, would constitute serious abuses.

"On the other hand, to prohibit law-enforcement officers from intercepting messages no matter what the circumstances may be, is to guarantee the safe use of the channels of wire and wireless communications to spies and criminals.

"One would not think of providing that a police officer shall not stop a suspect who is driving an automobile on the highway and yet today the criminal and the spy may use the highways of communication without restraint or even surveillance."

There is a fundamental principle that every right has its corresponding obligation and those who willfully refuse to accept the obligation cannot seek to protect themselves with the right.

The criminal, the spy, and the saboteur accept none of the obligations imposed by the laws of this country.

Surely you will not create for them a new and inviolable privacy to assist them in their attack on our way of life.

The recent statement of Mr. Justice Jackson to the effect that "There is a danger that, if the court does not temper its doctrinaire logic with a little practical wisdom, it will convert the Bill of Rights into a suicide pact" may well be applied with equal appropriateness to those who, in their sincere zeal to insure the blessings of the Bill of Rights to our citizens, impose restrictions on the agents of law enforcement which never were within the purview of that blessed document.

The so-called right of privacy, which is not guaranteed by either the State or Federal Constitution, should not be made to serve as a cloak of invisibility to Coplons, Hiss, Gold, and others of their ilk.

Let us no longer fool ourselves—we are at war with communism in Korea and in Russia and here in the United States.

The saboteurs are waiting to strike. The spies of the Kremlin are at every hand.

The telephone is more secret than the diplomatic dispatch case.

They avail themselves of it with impunity and with immunity.

Why must we forget the homely but sound advice that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

By intercepting and supervising the telephone conversations of Communist spies now, you may well prevent the sounding of the siren that will warn you that a jet bomber bearing a load of atomic bombs has pierced our radar screen—and that all that remains to be done is to cower in a cellar and pray.

Let us no longer behave like the monkeys that see, hear, and do no evil—but act like the minutemen who, in the days of our country's birth, used any weapon that came to hand, be it pitchfork or ax in their fight for freedom.

Is USAF Troop Support Adequate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following article by Ben S. Lee in Aviation Week of February 12, 1951, on the subject of the Army taking over tactical aviation from the Air Force:

IS USAF TROOP SUPPORT ADEQUATE?—CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION MAY POINT THE WAY TOWARD ARMY TAKING OVER CONTROL OF TACTICAL AVIATION

(By Ben S. Lee)

Steps to bring about a congressional investigation of the inadequacies of tactical air support provided by the USAF to the Army are being taken in Washington, Aviation Week has learned.

Figuring importantly in the over-all proposed inquiry is the specific question: Why has the Air Force failed to procure the Chase XC-123 assault transport, winner of a recent assault transport competition?

Natural channel for the investigation would be through the House Armed Services Committee. While some members of the committee favor such an inquiry, the final decision to project it will probably remain with its powerful chairman, Representative CARL VINSON.

FINE JOB, BUT—

While it is generally conceded that USAF has done a fine job in Korea despite obvious deficiencies in tactical air equipment available there, the deficiencies have pointed up the weakness in this phase of United States air power, a Congressman said last week.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur apparently shares this view, for acording to reports of his talks with President Truman in the Pacific last fall, he expressed dissatisfaction with tactical air support. The President promised that it would be bolstered immediately. "I have not noted that the situation has altered materially as yet," the Congressman said.

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, following a recent visit to the Far East, also issued a staff report expressing no little concern over the quality of aircraft assigned to Korean effort, tactically, and to the over-all inefficiency of tactical air support techniques, a Defense Department source declared.

ARMY PURCHASING LIMIT

Several months ago, Army asked for removal of an Army-USAF agreement restricting Army to the purchase of fixed-wing aircraft weighing less than 2,500 pounds and

helicopters weighing less than 4,000 pounds. The problem is still under consideration. Weight limitations virtually freeze Army to procurement of aircraft intended only for liaison.

"This situation," a high-ranking Army officer stated to Aviation Week, "would suffice, if Air Force cooperated with Army for its needs in heavier aircraft fields. Our needs in transport are totally ignored as are our concepts in fighter and fighter bombers in tactical support utilization.

"The Chase Aircraft Co.'s XC-123, for example," he said, "was built specifically to meet requirements of the Army in the medium transport field. It is what Army wants and what it needs to fight a war. After long, unnecessary delays, Air Force evaluated the plane with several others (Northrop C-125 and Fairchild C-82). The Chase plane won the evaluation virtually on every count, as we thought it would, but there is still no contract for its manufacture.

"If the present weight limitations were eased, we'd buy the C-123 ourselves," the spokesman said, "and it is my belief that a real scanda' exists in the fact that Air Force hasn't contracted for the plane in quantity."

The entire problem of the application of air power to tactical support problems of Army has been under the eyes of Congress for some time. Late last year an investigation of tactical aviation was promised by House Armed Services Committee Chairman CARL VINSON. It was sidetracked when Air Force let it be known it "would do something."

ARMY FIELD COMMAND

There is a growing feeling in military quarters that tactical aviation should be placed under control of Army. From a practical point of view, top officials of both Army and Air Force claim it would be unwise to actually transfer tactical to Army. There is some consideration being given instead to correcting existing command relations between services.

This means that tactical air forces in support of armies would be placed under Army command instead of being offered for "cooperation whenever the over-all air situation permits."

Army planners do envision, however, establishment of an Army air logistics support group. Army would like to provide for its own internal needs much in the same manner as Navy's fleet air logistics. It has no desire to infringe upon the strategic airlift mission of Military Air Transport Service, it was said.

Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, is a firm adherent to the cause of Army in tactical air support. He told Aviation Week that he believed that all tactical and transport aviation should be transferred from the Air Force to the Army. "I have urged my committee to conduct immediate hearings on the subject.

"Many in high command," said NORBLAD, "including General MacArthur and Gen. Omar Bradley, have recognized the need for coordination between air support and the ground troops.

"The Marine Corps, with its own aviation, has coordinated its Korean air and ground attack in an excellent manner and has been the leader in precise close support. On the other hand, when the Army needed bomber or fighter support for its troops, it was necessary to go through an involved chain of command from one service to the other with a resultant waste of time and without the coordination found in the one-command system of the Marines.

"During air-ground combat operations the air was under one command and the ground troops under another. It simply isn't logical.

"The Air Force should continue to command and develop long-range strategic bombing on distant targets, but all of the short-range bombers, fighters, and transports should be returned to the jurisdiction of the United States Army," the Congressman said.

"I do not mean to imply that I am against the present air-development program—to the contrary, I have urged for several years that it should be expanded—but I do feel that we will have a much more efficient and capable fighting machine if this transfer is made."

NORBLAD was a combat intelligence officer in the Eighth Air Force during World War II. He is a member of the four-man Tactical Aviation Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

The Best Defense Is the Bold Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has always advocated a strong national defense in times of peace as the best way to prevent war, it is with great pleasure that I place in the RECORD, this editorial by former United States Senator Wilton E. Hall, of South Carolina.

Senator Hall is now publisher of the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S. C., which is today one of the South's leading newspapers.

Senator Hall through the years has consistently backed us in this fight for adequate and overwhelming air power, a force which he believes will contribute immeasurably to the preservation of peace. He realizes that air power is the only force today that can bring destruction immediately to the heart and homeland of Russia following a general outbreak of war.

Senator Hall is in daily touch with the American people. No defense program can be successful without the united backing of the American people. They are the ones who will pay the bills; they are the one who will do the dying in case of war. They should be heeded in their demands for a great air force which would prevent further aggression by this atheistic, communistic dictatorship.

Senator Hall is looking ahead into the future with the preservation of this great country in mind. He is to be commended for his contribution to our thinking. The above-mentioned editorial follows:

THE BEST DEFENSE IS THE BOLD ATTACK

The defeat of the Spanish Armada, famed in song and story, was not what broke the back of the Spanish fleet.

The intrepid Francis Drake did that job by hunting down and destroying Spanish vessels inside Spanish harbors. He was an advocate of the bold attack.

Stonewall Jackson was another advocate of such strategy. It was likewise the military belief of Gen. Bedford Forrest not only to "git thar fustest with the mostest" but to hit first.

The Air Forces General Vandenberg is of the same mind.

He points out that the United States could build a ring of steel and radar around its border but still 70 percent of an enemy's bombers could get through.

If this be true, it also means that 70 percent of our bombers could get through the network of defense thrown up by an enemy.

What Vandenberg is driving at is that America's best defense is the maintenance of an air force powerful enough to pulverize our enemies within hours after trouble breaks.

For the United States to strike first at Soviet Russia would be diplomatic suicide, or so we are told. That rules out the surprise attack, the "preventive" war idea.

But the bold attack thereafter must be mountable if the United States is to defend itself in modern war.

That is why the advocates of air power make so much sense, and is excellent enough reason for a thorough-going revaluation of the Nation's over-all strategy in this half-hot war with the Communists.

Small Business and Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, last, Dr. Ernest L. Stockton, formerly president of Cumberland University, of Lebanon, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent, and now economic consultant for the House Small Business Committee, spoke before a gathering of the eastern North Carolina area of the North Carolina Association of Chambers of Commerce Executives. Dr. Stockton addressed these businessmen on the topic entitled "Small Business and Mobilization" drawing upon his full knowledge of conditions in this regard as he has observed them and as they have been revealed to him in the line of his duties with the Small Business Committee.

This address is thought-provoking and deserving of the attention of all the Members of the House who are concerned with the role which our small-business enterprises wish to play and should be permittted to play in our current-mobilization program. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Dr. Stockton be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS AND MOBILIZATION

It is a pleasure to meet with this fine group of businessmen representing the great Tidewater and Piedmont area of the Southeast. Naturally you had hoped that a Member of Congress could be with you and speak ex cathedra on the many vitally important questions relating to small business. The voice of authority is always better than the opinions of an interpreter. You may be assured, however, that the opinions and facts which I attempt to present are in agreement with those of the distinguished chairman of the House Small Business Committee and its members. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN is the pioneer founder of

this committe, and for many years has been the courageous champion of the cause of small business. He has been chairman since the Hous of Representatives first established the committee in December 1941 (77th Cong.), with the exception of the 2-year period of the Eightieth Congress. The members of this committee would wish me to convey to you their greetings and best wishes.

ORIGIN AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Select Committee on Small Business was created 8 days after Pearl Harbor to insure the survival of small business in a wartime economy. The need for the committee has been recognized by each succeeding Congress.

Studies of the American economy have revealed the fact that, in periods of high profits, merger and consolidations in industry have greatly increased. Four such periods are readily apparent in a survey of the history of our economy: the consolidation movement of 1897–1905, the post-World War I movement, the period of the late twenties, and the present time. The precarious position of the small independent business has increased the urgency of action to remedy small-business problems.

The committee feels that its objectives can be most effectively accomplished by activity in the legislative field, and by working to alleviate problems common to all smaller business enterprises, rather than by conducting prolonged, extensive investigations to underline existing facts concerning monopoly and monopoly problems.

SMALL BUSINESS—FOUNDATION OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

It seems evident at times that some of our leaders forget the small beginnings of all American enterprises. Every big business today was a small business yesterday. Recently an 80-year old businessman wrote a brochure entitled "Progress in America Which I Have Seen Since the 1880's," a colorful period in our history when most of our great inventions, great industries, and our entire modern economic structure were developed and expanded to their present huge proportions during one lifetime. In his early life this man saw no streetcars and automobiles, no electric power and lights, no telephones, no bathrooms, no steel bridges, no rubber tires. In a few years, however, he could see a hot air engine, bathrooms with gas heaters, electric lights, high pressure water-tube-boiler engines driving large ships overseas, gasoline engines driving a horseless carriage called an automobile at the speed of 5 miles per hour.

These simple inventions have become vast industries which produce and supply us with the major products used by 150,000,000 Americans. It is a story of how great oaks from little acorns grow. We must continue to manage our economy so that the opportunity to found and to develop small businesses shall not be lost. Freedom to go into business and to stay in business, on the basis of efficiency, is one of the basic freedoms of our democracy. The meaning of this chapter in the history of our economic progress is that small business is always the broad and deep and strong foundation of our whole economic structure. We must not permit this structure to become too top-heavy with highly concentrated big industries which might weaken the foundations.

THE EMERGENCY AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

It has already been demonstrated since the declaration of a national emergency on December 16, that the problems of small business multiply during an emergency. The solution of these problems is exacting and requires continuous study and investigation. Some of these problems now under constant study are:

1. Defense prime and subcontracts.
2. Essential civilian supplies.
3. Scarce materials.
4. Financial assistance.
5. Plant utilization.
6. Retail and wholesale distribution.
7. Effect of price controls and rationing.

During the Eighty-first Congress the committee conducted a continuous study of Government procurement. The committee was able through negotiation and by other means to bring about changes in procurement methods which have been of material assistance to small business—

1. Convincing procurement agencies to classify more accurately small-business concerns in contract awards.

2. Establishment of a Board of Contract Appeals in General Services Administration.

3. Lengthening the period between an invitation to bid and the closing of bids.

4. Standardizing specifications of common use items and equipment.

5. Prompt notification of the closing of contracts.

6. Wider publicity on invitations to bid.

7. Establishment of Offices of Small Business in procurement agencies.

PROMISES NOT ENOUGH

In spite of the provisions in the Defense Production Act providing for full information to small-business enterprises, for fair representation on advisory committees, for allocation of materials and loan guaranties, it is evident that the only power exercised today in behalf of small business is the power of persuasion. Since the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Defense Production Administration were established, there are even fewer guaranties that small business will receive an equitable share of materials and contracts. However efficient the top leadership of the Office of Defense Mobilization may be and however optimistic pronouncements sound, nothing can be done within the organization with its present policies and methods of operation to utilize fully and effectively the manpower and productive facilities of the thousands of small businesses of the Nation. So far small business has only had what Hamlet said to Polonius: "Words, words, words"—only promises. Every NPA order contains this assurance: "To reduce to a minimum disruption of normal distribution," but what does this mean to a businessman who wants materials to keep his plant in operation. Further, it is promised that contracts will be spread as widely as possible. This promise sounds good but it does not provide materials and contracts. The Department of Defense Executive Order No. 1538–50, issued December 18, 1950, to speed up procurement actions in connection with the second supplemental fund request, declared that it is essential that contracts be spread across industry in order to broaden the industrial base of the procurement program.

NEGOTIATION THE RULE

Again, this sounds good until we read further: "Broadening of the base will require wider use of negotiation." It is reported that at this time approximately 98 percent of all procurement actions are negotiated.

No loyal American would object to negotiation of contracts if adequate material to meet the threat of aggressive communism is the only way to protect our Nation and other free nations against Red China, Red Russia, or any Red satellite. If negotiation is the only way to get weapons and supplies for our fighting forces, then all of us would say "Negotiate the contracts."

But common sense dictates the present state of world affairs does not appear to justify such desperate speed in volume production, particularly to an extent that would eliminate almost entirely small business participation in procurement. Furthermore, the mobilization effort can be weakened by failure to recognize the abilities and productive capacities of small business. The Small Business Committee of the House insists that procurement agencies could utilize more fully and effectively the many small plants throughout the country to increase the volume of total production and at the same time help small manufacturers in their struggle to survive.

HOW DO YOU GET A DEFENSE CONTRACT—NOW?

If negotiation is the established procedure, and if you do not receive notices of intent to negotiate, how do you get contracts—now? It is hoped that present policies and procedures of procurement may be modified, but small manufacturers whose civilian production has been cut back cannot afford to wait too long.

Then what can you do? First of all, do not depend upon a 5-percenter or a professional contact man. Small-business men who have succeeded against great odds in getting contracts involving considerable amounts have told the committee that a contract seeker at this particular stage of mobilization must depend upon his own ingenuity, energy, and persistence. He must knock on doors and continue knocking on doors of procurement officials and prime contractors until he receives fair consideration of his abilities and facilities.

The following steps are recommended as the best procedure for a prospective contractor:

1. Prepare a plain brochure and statement, including bank connection, financial rating, and size of contract that could be handled.

2. Make calls on officials in various procurement agencies and leave adequate information for examination.

3. Get clearance—technical, plan capability, financial stability, products, and security.

4. Repeat calls on the same officials to check on the consideration of your application.

5. Follow through on bids to see if they are completed and check, step by step, the progress on these bids in various agencies.

If a small manufacturer is interested in a subcontract, it would be necessary to examine lists of prime contractors and make contacts with them in the hope of producing some component part of the prime contract. In the Munitions Board and other agencies are lists of large contracts which have been awarded to prime contractors. These lists may be found in 6,000 or more "informational outlets" established by the Department of Commerce, in cooperation with the Department of Defense and General Services Administration, in local chambers of commerce, banks, and other places. Weekly synopses of contract awards in excess of $25,000 are available at these outlets.

OFFICES OF SMALL BUSINESS

The House Small Business Committee convinced several agencies to establish offices of small business to maintain liaison with procurement officials. These offices in NPA, Munitions Board, RFC, and ECA have been sympathetic with our objectives. They have cooperated to the fullest in providing information and guidance and in making recommendations to the heads of various departments of the Government, but they do not sit in the councils of the policy makers where final decisions are made. They are kind friends, highly intelligent officials, and courageous pleaders, but they do not have authority to guarantee materials and contracts to small business.

The fine cooperation exemplified in their attendance and messages at many clinics in almost all States has proved beyond doubt

their sincere desire to be helpful. They have done their best to guide small-business men to the end of some rainbow where a potential supply of essential materials or an eagerly sought contract might be found. Whether or not the search could succeed, these officials of small-business offices have created in the public mind a keen awareness of the place of small business in the American economy, and they have pointed up more clearly to the necessity of further action to insure more equitable distribution of materials and contracts to small manufacturers.

DANGER IN DELAY

There is grave danger in prolonged delay in utilizing small-business potentialities. Decisive action should be taken at the earliest possible moment before the cream of prime contracts is negotiated, leaving only the skimmed milk for small business. If many small plants do not either obtain essential materials for civilian production or defense contracts, they will be compelled to cut back operations below cost of production or to close down. Such conditions would set in motion a chain reaction of successive shocks and irreparable losses to our economy—unemployment, migration of labor, loss of businesses in communities formerly dependent upon their own local industries, and not the least would be the great loss of revenue to our Federal and local governments. There are dangerous signs that these symptoms exist already. Many letters come to the House and Senate Small Business Committees from businessmen or their Representatives in Congress, with distress appeals like this: The limitations in NPA Order So-and-So were not intended to force anyone out of business, and some provision should be made to permit my company to obtain a sufficient quantity of material to continue operation. There are hundreds of thousands of small businesses all over the country in desperate need of a minimum of supplies with which to continue in business.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

The only thing that can save these many small businesses from famine or death is to provide some means by which they can secure needed materials or a fair share of defense contracts. This means is a legislative enactment by the Congress of the United States. Officials of the Department of Defense, the Office of Defense Mobilization, NPA, and other agencies may make eloquent commitments that materials and contracts will be scattered widely, but past records indicate that promises will not be translated into action unless Congress gives a mandate to officials requiring them to allocate a more generous proportion of contracts to small manufacturers.

It is a matter of record that each of the past two World Wars made a new crop of billionaires and millionaires. We are not opposed to billionaires and millionaires as such if their billions and millions are made and used in the public interest and for the national welfare with reasonable margins of profit, but there is reason to surmise that the profits they have received were not always in true balance with the public welfare.

Why not say that we know to be true in periods of national emergency and mobilization. Big industries are vital and indispensable, but they want too much of the lion's share of everything. The more they get, the more they want, and the more economic power they acquire. Well-earned power to produce the implements of peace and war may become entrenched power to control great concentrations of financial resources and productive facilities. If small business does not use some means of getting its deserved share, business will not be handed out to them without effort. Because of the recognized disadvantages of the weaker and smaller units in our business structure, some extraordinary measures must be adopted in crucial periods like this.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS CORPORATION

The Small Business Committees of the Senate and House believe that the best measure to protect and to preserve small business is the enactment of a bill (H. R. 1666; S. 553) to create the Small Defense Plants Corporation and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN and in the House by Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, January 17.

The committee has learned from experience the virtual impossibility of properly utilizing the strength of small business in the national defense and in providing essential civilian supplies through the agencies presently established under the Defense Production Act. Those charged with administering the entire mobilization program, even though they have the inclination, cannot give adequate attention to the unique problems of small business in a wartime atmosphere. Therefore, the Small Business Committee feels that it is duty-bound and has the high responsibility to the House of Representatives to shoulder the burden of this problem and to see it through to a final conclusion. The committee believes the only feasible remedy is the one it has proposed.

Essentially, the SDPC bill provides for positive means to aid small business—

1. To secure a fair share of Government contracts under the national defense program;

2. To secure a fair share of scarce materials for essential civilian production;

3. To be assured fair and equitable treatment when acting as subcontractors;

4. To obtain loans for expansion and conversion in the interests of the national defense program; and

5. To achieve full economic and industrial mobilization.

In order to accomplish these major objectives, provision is made for—

1. The integration of this legislation with the basic legislation: The Defense Production Act of 1950 (sec. 2 (a)).

2. A revolving fund in the Treasury for the purpose of making loans and acquiring property.

3. The appointment of a board of directors representing small business, labor, and agriculture.

4. Banking powers vested in the Corporation to enable it to adequately finance small-business concerns for defense and essential civilian production.

5. The Corporation's entry into contracts with the United States Government for the purpose of furnishing equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government and to arrange for the performance of such contracts through the letting of subcontracts to small-business concerns.

6. Full mobilization and integration of small business in the national defense program by empowering the Corporation to make or arrange for a complete inventory of all productive facilities of small-business concerns which can be used for defense and essential civilian production.

The broad view, as we see it, involves the community life of America. No matter how long the emergency may prevail or what the future may hold, the communities making up our cities, towns, villages, and farms must be preserved in the glorious tradition of our history. We can all agree that we do not want to see mass migration of our people seeking work in defense plants far from home and fireside. The slogan of our national defense may well be: "Take the plants to the people and not the people to the plants." In this way we preserve, insofar as is humanly possible, the traditional American community with its churches, its homes, its factories, its stores, its farms, and its civic life.

Irish Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent release by the Irish Government which I think would be most informative for Members of the House.

It bears out a view which I have held myself for a long time that Ireland has great strategic potentialities in connection with the defense of Western Europe and in some conceivable circumstances in connection with the defense of the United States.

Obviously, it is most essential that we should continue to enjoy cordial and pleasant relations with the Irish Government. It is also important that we should not permit England or any other ally, or so-called friendly nation, to take action or pursue policies regarding Ireland which are calculated to cause resentment and breed unrest, dissatisfaction, and possible conflict within that nation. The Irish are our natural allies. Let us keep them as friends and allies throughout this crisis and in time to come. They have proved their loyalty to the cause of liberty. They have fought and died for freedom with unexcelled valor. Let us strengthen and encourage the Irish Nation and assist it to secure that unity and autonomy which the Irish people so richly deserve. The above-mentioned follows:

The Irish Government learned with grave concern and deep regret of the invitation issued by the British Admiralty to the Netherlands to send a naval air squadron for training purposes to Derry, Ireland. The fact that this announcement was accompanied by a statement issued by the British Admiralty to the effect that "this will be the first occasion in time of peace for Netherlands aviators to receive training on British soil" had heightened the public concern which, in any event, would be aroused by such a proposal. The Irish Government had not been consulted either by the Netherlands Government or the British Government concerning the coming of a Netherlands air unit to Derry for training purposes. The people of Ireland have no feeling other than friendliness toward the people of the Netherlands and have no desire to do otherwise than maintain the friendly relations which have always existed with the Netherlands. It is, however, necessary to point out emphatically that Britain's exercise of sovereignty over a portion of our country is in defiance of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people and is repugnant to the national sentiment of our people. In the light of these circumstances, any invitation by Britain to another nation to send a contingent of its armed forces even for training purposes to our country and the acceptance of such an invitation can only cause deep resentment in Ireland. It would appear to me that the sending of military forces for occupation or training purposes by another state to territory which, to put it mildly, must be regarded as disputed territory is contrary to normal international usage. Such a step will no doubt be represented

rightly or wrongly as a taking of sides. It seemed particularly unfortunate that such an invitation should have been sent to the Netherlands at this particular stage in world history when democracy itself was on trial. The democratic system depended for its basis upon the right of the people of a nation to determine their own affairs freely and without outside interference. The partition of Ireland and the occupation of a portion of Ireland whether by British or other troops in defiance of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people constitute a clear infringement of the principles upon which democratic rule rests. We have at the moment in Korea a tragic example of the results that flow from the undemocratic and unnatural partition of a country. One would expect that at this time more than any other time democratic governments in Western Europe would appreciate the vital necessity and importance of giving effect in practice as well as in theory to the principles of democracy. For the government and the people of the Netherlands we have nothing but the highest esteem and affectionate regard. We do not, however, wish to see them drawn into a position wherein they would acquiesce in an infringement of the sovereignty of the Irish people and of the fundamental principles of democracy.

Diplomatic correspondents in Dublin report that Mr. MacBride, Minister for External Affairs, had an interview with the Netherlands Minister in Dublin, His Excellency Jonkheer J. W. M. Snouck Hurgronje, on December 30 and on a number of subsequent occasions in relation to the announcement of the proposed visit for training purposes of a Dutch naval air squadron to Derry. It is understood that further exchanges on the matter are still taking place.

The Relative Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD L. SITTLER, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brownsville (Pa.) Telegraph of February 20, 1951:

THE RELATIVE RIGHT

It is a common illusion of our time that what is "right" must inevitably triumph. This is proved to be an illusion, first, because it is impossible to determine precisely and absolutely what is right. Therefore it is impossible to know if "the right" ever does triumph, in any final and absolute sense. It may be the consensus of opinion that some idea is more right than some other idea, but no one can say, if this idea triumphs, that the outcome would have been worse if some other idea had prevailed.

But even if a society decides that a certain idea is more right than another, it does not follow that this idea, by virtue of its being more right, must inevitably triumph over opposing ideas. It is not inevitable, for instance, that the idea of American democracy will triumph over the idea of Stalinist communism, just because it is the consensus of American opinion—and perhaps of world opinion—that the former is more right than the latter.

It is occasionally necessary for us all to recall this hard fact in order that our efforts in behalf of our cherished ideas are not wrongly based. Quite a number of people, among those socially conscious enough to have faith in ideas, work and fight for right ideas in the fond belief that these ideas are automatically destined by providence to prevail. This is a dangerous illusion. Its result is that people come to judge the validity and worth of an idea according to its success in the world. Those who believe, for instance, that democracy must triumph because it is more right, must have suffered crushing disillusionment during this century, when the idea of democracy has lost out again and again. We may fervently want our right ideas to triumph in the world, but our belief in them is not soundly and firmly based when it depends on their success in terms of worldly achievement.

The only alternative to this fallacious kind of belief, and the only proper basis for a belief in an idea is the feeling that the idea should and can triumph. There is, admittedly, a very fine line between believing that something can triumph and believing that it will. But the distinction is fundamental to a sound faith. If we believe that something can win out—but may not—we are at once driven to valiant effort in its behalf and protected against the illusion of its inevitable victory. Such is the true faith of those who fight for ideas. They do not lean on the paper shield of inevitability. They ride the war horse of what-should-be.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Indianapolis News, Thursday, March 1, 1951:

THE ST. LAWRENCE

The Washington administration is trotting out again all the old arguments for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, but with louder national defense overtones. The expenditure of new tax billions to build a waterway that would be frozen a great part of the year, in order to transport iron ore from Labrador, may have some justification, but it should be far down the list of national priority. The Panama Canal, for instance, is in far graver need of improved facilities and defenses.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has nailed down the real motive for the administration's inordinate interest in the St. Lawrence project. In advocating New York-Ontario joint development of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, he told the New York Legislature that the Federal plan is to make the power facilities a "potential source of national revenue at the will of Congress for the indefinite future."

"This outrageous notion," said Governor Dewey, "is completely in the groove of thought of those Federal monopolists who would like to reduce the States to mere dependents upon the Federal Government and let their assets and authority be soaked up by ever-encroaching Federal power."

If the St. Lawrence is to be developed for shipping and electric power, it should be done by State-Province compacts, and not to set up a vast socialistic government monopoly with life and death power over State and private business interests.

Anything Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a House resolution which I have introduced today, and under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post commenting emphatically on the lack of moral and ethical standards of many public servants disclosed by recent congressional hearings. For the reason that it might be violative of the House rules, I have eliminated that part of the editorial which refers to alleged improper conduct by a Member of the other body. Nevertheless, there can be no double standard. Equally with the personnel of the executive branch, those chosen by the people to represent them in the Senate and House owe the duty to refrain meticulously from actions which might cause disrespect for government. The editorial from the Post follows:

ANYTHING GOES

"It is gone," said Edmund Burke in his Reflections on the Revolution in France, "that sensibility of principle that chastity of honor, which felt a stain like a wound." It appears to be, to say the very least, blunted among men in public life today. The appalling aspect of the disclosures—and one gets the impression that they are only a tithe of the sordid story—that have come out of the Fulbright committee's inquiry into the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is that the officials involved in them seem almost devoid of any sense of impropriety. Taxed with having accepted the hospitality of a Florida hotel for which he had been instrumental in obtaining an RFC loan, Hilton W. Robertson, an examiner in the agency, said: "I expect to pay the rate. They wouldn't take it. I did not know they were going to issue a courtesy card. Is there anything wrong about that?"

Well, Mr. Robertson, it all depends on your concept of right and wrong. It probably isn't a penal offense, if that's any comfort to you. The chances are no one will suppose you sold your influence for the paltry price of a free hotel room. But a man who holds a position of responsibility and trust in the United States Government can no more afford to accept favors than to grant them. Time was when this elementary point of honor seemed so clear that no one thought to question it. But in the blurred vision of today, anything goes, it seems, if you can get away with it.

It is somewhat harsh to point a finger at Mr. Robertson. Some of his bosses in the RFC saw nothing wrong, apparently, in taking a gratuity here and there from applicants for RFC loans. For that matter, Donald Dawson, White House aide in charge of personnel, did just what Mr. Robertson did. On three occasions, he was the nonpaying guest of the same hotel. If Mr. Dawson has any regard for his reputation, he will cease hiding behind his White House immunity and come before the subcommittee to explain his conduct. In the absence of an explanation, his unfitness for a post in the White House seems abundantly demonstrated.

Robert Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent article from the Clinton Daily Item containing two poems in reference to the immortal Robert Burns, the great and ever-to-be-remembered Scottish poet.

One of these contributions by Alexander C. Duncan bears particular significance because every year on January 25, in keeping with a long-established custom that fine gentlemen appropriately observes the birthday of the great Bard of Scotland. Time was in the town of Clinton, Mass., when this occasion was widely observed with festivities and celebrations arranged by old Scotch settlers and participated in by many people. Time itself has taken toll of many of those who arranged these annual celebrations and they are now but a sacred memory. Yet the spirit of Scotia and of Burns lives in the hearts of the loyal Scots and not a birthday of the great Burns passes without some reference to his memory and some tribute to his greatness.

It can truly be said of Robert Burns that he will live forever in the hearts of men. Some poets have written for kings and queens who were their patrons, some have sung their songs as poet laureates to the glory of great empires. But Robert Burns wrote his poems for the common people—for the poor, and the unheralded, and all the men and women of the rank and file who go to make up the fabric of every nation.

I cannot here give adequate utterance to the greatness of Robert Burns, nor can I recite his many contributions to human happiness. Others have sung paeans of praise to his name. The sparkle, gaiety, and brightness of his works will endure to the end of recorded time. The name of Robert Burns and what it stands for will never die. Men like Alex Duncan, loyal Scots, fine, proud Americans, will keep his memory warm and his beautiful poems and songs alive. All this for the sake of Auld Lang Syne. The poems follow:

ROBERT BURNS
(Born January 25, 1759)

"Our monarch's hindmost year but ane
Was five and twenty days begun
'Twas then a blast o' Janwar' win'
Blew hansel in on Robin."

Thus Robert Burns wrote as to the time and circumstances of his birth, and in the same song he ventured what probably seemed to him a rash prophecy when he said:

"He'll hae misfortunes great an' sma',
But ay a heart aboon them a'.
He'll be a credit till us a':
We'll a' be proud o' Robin!"

But rash as the prophecy was, it has been gloriously fulfilled, for not only are Scotchmen "a' proud of Robin" and getting "prouder" every day, but we are even "prouder" to see the warm place which Robert Burns has found in the hearts of people the world over. "When Scotland Forgets Burns Then History Will Forget Scotland."

ALEXANDER C. DUNCAN.

THE STAR OF ROBERT BURNS

There is a star, whose beaming ray
Is shed on every clime,
It shines by night
It shines by day,
And ne'er grows dim wi' time.
It grows upon the banks of Ayr,
It shone on Doon's clear stream,
A hundred years are gone and mair,
Yet brighter grows its beam.
Let kings and courtiers rise an' fa'
This world has mony turns
But brightly beams aboon them a'
The star o' Robbie Burns.
On Fames emblazoned page enshrined
His name is foremost, now.
And mony a costly wreaths been twined,
To grace his honest brow.
Auld Scotland's heart expands wi' joy,
When e'er the day returns
That gave the world—its peasant boy,
Immortal Robbie Burns.

Do We Want the RFC?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of March 2, 1951:

DO WE WANT THE RFC?

It's a perilous situation when politicians play banker with public funds. That is precisely what has been going on within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Money from taxpayers has been passed over the loan counter with its lending subject to political pressures, influence, and favoritism. Public confidence in the RFC was not great before the Senate committee's inquiry. Confidence has been shattered by the committee's disclosures.

Set up under the Hoover administration in 1932, the RFC served the public interest by keeping sound banks and large interstate businesses operating when they suddenly found themselves shut off from their normal sources of financial help. It was a depression agency designed to deal with the depression. It succeeded wonderfully in its original purpose. But over the years that original purpose has been perverted. RFC has become a tool for carrying out political goals of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. It has become a source of loans for the politically favored.

The RFC poured $38,000,000 into a prefabricated housing venture that went bankrupt. Other RFC millions enabled a new company to enter the automobile manufacturing field. Loans went into wildcat oil wells, into a plush resort hotel housing a gambling casino and into all sorts of other ventures, some successful, some not. About all the borrower had to show was that he could not obtain the money from private sources cheaply enough.

The stench of scandal hangs over the RFC. Examiners who passed on loan applications have been given fat salaried jobs by the loan applicants. A former lowly clerk in the RFC organization is shown to have bought stock in a company at $1 a share that quickly was worth $200 a share. He bought it by borrowing from an attorney representing a firm seeking an RFC loan. Meanwhile the wife acquires an $8,500 mink coat with the attorney footing the bill. The wife is a secretary at the White House. An RFC director testifies that he departed from the usual procedure as a personal favor in assigning an examiner to go over the loan application of a friend. That loan applicant subsequently became an RFC director himself.

After the Senate committee had reported that at least three of the five directors whom President Truman wanted reappointed to the RFC board had been subject to influence, the President first insisted on their reappointment and then relented. He was willing to have a single administrator with separate boards to determine loan policy and review loan applications. The trouble with that plan is that the RFC would continue as an executive agency subject to direct political influence. And the RFC record is proof enough that politics and banking are an unwholesome mixture.

The more the committee turns up in its public hearings the clearer it is a question whether the RFC should be continued at all. Does the country want and need it? The Hoover Commission in its report on Government reorganization declared that "the Government should not engage in direct lending where loans can be obtained from private sources on reasonable terms." That's a good principle to follow. Jesse Jones, long-time head of the RFC, recommended nearly a year ago that it be liquidated.

Matter of Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, March 2, 1951:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Stewart Alsop)

THE KEY

A nightmare is beginning to haunt those principally responsible for American foreign policy. For it is now about as certain as such things can be that the Kremlin will soon formally propose a German settlement based on the unity of a "neutralized" Germany, after the staged withdrawal of all occupation troops. And it is even possible that the Kremlin will add glittering window dressing, by ostensibly accepting the principle of a free, secret, unsupervised vote to elect a single all-German Government.

This prospect has initiated a crucial, agonized debate in the inner circles of the State Department and the Pentagon. For the objective of such an apparently reasonable Soviet offer would be to end Western rearmament, split the Western alliance, and thus knock the props right out from under American foreign policy.

The evidence is increasingly strong that the Soviets will produce some such proposal

at the forthcoming foreign ministers' conference. This evidence takes various forms, such as dispatches from Moscow, passed by the Soviet censors, reporting that the Soviets are now eager for a German settlement on generous terms. But the most convincing evidence is provided by the course of the campaign for "unity and neutrality" waged within Germany by the East German Communists.

At first, this campaign was based exclusively on the "Prague resolutions." The campaign made little headway, simply because the "Prague resolutions" are no more than a crude blueprint for the Communist capture of all Germany. But recently, East German Communist Chief Otto Grotewohl suddenly switched the line, more than hinting that the Communists would welcome free, secret elections throughout Germany as a basis for forming a united government.

Grotewohl acted, of course, on specific instructions from the Kremlin. And Grotewohl's line thus almost certainly foreshadows the Kremlin's line at the foreign ministers' meeting. Almost no informed official believes that a Soviet offer of a German settlement on such terms would be genuine. The reasons are obvious.

A genuine German settlement would also involve a genuine Austrian settlement. This would mean a Soviet guaranty to withdraw the Red army from all the satellites—and the satellites are more restive than ever before. It would mean the loss to Russia of the vital Erzebirge uranium mines in East Germany. A really secret vote would mean an overwhelming defeat of the East German Communist regime, and a deadly blow at Soviet world prestige. Finally, it would mean a pro-Western or at least strongly anti-Communist, all-German government, and however "neutralized" Germany might be, it is almost unimaginable that the Kremlin would accept such a risk.

For these reasons and others, it is believed that any Soviet proposal for a German settlement will be essentially a fake, a tempting trap for the unwary west. Yet even a fake proposal, cleverly camouflaged, could have disastrous consequences. American policy is now squarely based on the assumption that a true balance of power can only be achieved, and peace maintained, if Western Europe is rendered defensible.

The Pentagon is convinced that Western Europe can never be defended without German participation. A German settlement providing for withdrawal of all occupation troops and the permament demilitarization of Germany would, it is feared, cause the Western European defense effort, now just getting underway under General Eisenhower's leadership, to crumble into nothingness.

Yet even if the Kremlin only seemed ready to offer a reasonable settlement involving the withdrawal of the Red army to the Russian frontiers, the offer would be almost unbearably tempting to the Germans, the French, the British, and even to many Americans. It might throw the whole Western Alliance into an uproar of bitter, mutual recrimination, causing the alliance to fall apart.

This is why the internal debate now going on is so vitally important. One school of thought particularly in the Pentagon, believes any German settlement at this time, on any terms, disastrous. This school would attempt to forestall the Kremlin with a prior American proposal for a German settlement festooned with conditions which the Soviets would not conceivably accept. Yet any diplomatic device so obvious and so clumsy might itself split the Allies by convincing the Europeans that the United States was interested only in war.

Another, smaller school of thought believes that German rearmament should be used as a bargaining counter; that it is not wholly impossible that Soviet policy may actually have reached a turn in the zigzag course prescribed by Lenin; and that we should be prepared to recognize this change of course and to take maximum advantage of it. One thing is clear—and it is the reason why one of these reporters has now left for Germany: The world struggle is now moving into a new stage of crisis which will almost certainly center around the country which Lenin called "the key to Europe."

Meat Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my recently expressed views on the question of meat prices.

Present meat prices are outrageous and in the interest of the health and welfare of the American people they must be reduced. If Government control agencies fail to act, this Congress must grapple forthwith with this vital problem.

The rise in the cost of living since Korea has been most alarming. It has inflicted real hardship on the consumers, particularly our working classes. General price levels of essential commodities and necessities of life used in the homes and in the every-day lives of our people have substantially advanced. For some time past, I have been strongly urging OPS Director Michael V. DiSalle to move along a broad front to bring these prices into line. From the standpoint of economic law, such action involves considerable difficulty but, nevertheless, the problem must be tackled without further delay.

I think that the recent slaughter order, which is designed to prevent the diversion of meats from established distribution channels, should be helpful. But it will not be sufficient to bring essential and necessary adjustments in the prices of meats. Steps must be taken to control effectively the large packers as well as the small slaughterers. I hope it will not be necessary to impose rigid restrictions upon any part of American business which will shackle initiative and tend to create black markets. But the American people will not long tolerate the excessive prices which now prevail over meats and other necessities of life.

I am, therefore, urging once again that the Government act as soon as possible to stabilize conditions in the commodity markets with special reference to meat, but including all other necessities.

Meat is such a vital and important protein food which is used and so urgently needed in the ordinary American family that an adequate supply of meat at reasonable prices is most essential.

I hope that early action will be taken to bring down meat prices. Otherwise Congress must enact special legislation to relieve present intolerable prices.

Commutation of Sentences of German War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary on the commutation of sentences of German war criminals, together with a pertinent letter of representatives of several organizations, members of the National Community Relations Advisory Council to the Secretary of State:

COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES OF GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS

One hundred and one individual cases were reviewed by Mr. McCloy and General Handy. Mr. McCloy's determinations were based in part upon recommendations made to him by the Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, which he appointed in March 1950. Of the 101 cases which were reviewed, sentences were commuted in 89 cases and were reaffirmed in 12 cases. Twenty-eight of these 101 sentences were death sentences of which 21 were commuted, 15 to terms of life imprisonment, and 6 to varying terms of imprisonment. The types of criminals involved in both the commuted and reaffirmed sentences are indicated in the sections below dealing separately with the cases under Mr. McCloy's jurisdiction and those under General Handy's.

CASES REVIEWED BY GENERAL HANDY

The following data are taken from a press release of the headquarters, European Command, Public Information Division, January 31, 1951, marked EUCOM, release No. 51-91.

General Handy reviewed 13 cases, all involving death sentences. Of these 13 he reaffirmed 2 and commuted 11 to life imprisonment.

Of the 11 death sentences commuted to life imprisonment, 6 involved army noncommissioned officers and officers who were implicated in the Malmedy case.

Two of the 11 criminals whose death sentences were commuted to life imprisonment were SS sergeants who participated in concentration-camp brutalities; the remaining 3 were convicted of murdering Allied and United States airmen parachuting from disabled planes.

Reasons given for commutations: General Handy states that the commutations of the sentences of the six men involved in the Malmedy case were based upon the following considerations: The crimes were associated with a desperate combat action, were definitely distinguishable from the more deliberate killings in concentration camps, and were committed by men of comparatively low rank who did not initiate or advocate the orders leading to the crimes.

Regarding the two SS sergeants, it is said that they were in relatively subordinate positions and that "the records do not show that they went out of their way to add to the brutalities."

With regard to the three persons convicted of murdering Allied and United States airmen, mitigating circumstances are noted, such as excitement, the fact that the offenses were committed after severe bombings, and the fact that the crimes showed no special pattern.

CASES REVIEWED BY MR. M'CLOY

Mr. McCloy reviewed a total of 88 cases, of which he commuted 78 sentences, in gen-

eral following the recommendations of his Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals. Of the 88 cases reviewed, 15 involved death sentences, 19 sentences to life imprisonment, and 54 sentences to terms ranging from 6 to 25 years. Of the 15 death sentences, 5 were reaffirmed and 10 were commuted—4 to life imprisonment and the remaining 6 to terms ranging from 9 to 25 years. Of the 19 sentences to life imprisonment, 3 were reaffirmed and 16 were commuted, 15 of them to terms ranging from 10 to 20 years, and 1 convicted criminal was released on medical parole. Of the 54 sentences to terms ranging from 6 to 25 years, 2 were reaffirmed and 52 were commuted to sentences ranging from time already served to 15 years.

The 88 cases are divided into 10 groups. A summary of the results in each group follows:

(1) This group of 20 defendants were SS officers in charge of extermination squads responsible for the murder of an estimated 2,000,000 people. Of these 20 defendants, the sentences of 16 were commuted; the 4 sentences which were reaffirmed were all death sentences.

Nine additional death sentences were commuted, four to life imprisonment and the remaining five to prison terms ranging from 10 to 25 years.

Two sentences to life imprisonment were commuted to 10-year terms.

Three 20-year sentences were commuted, one to time already served, one to 10 years, and one to 15 years.

Two 10-year sentences were commuted, one to time served and one to 8 years.

Reasons given for commutations: Regarding the death sentences commuted to life imprisonment, it is said that in these cases the individuals were guilty on a "less imposing scale" than those whose death sentences were reaffirmed. It is added that new evidence on some of the other cases indicated subordinate responsibility, relative remoteness of connection with crimes and refusal of the convicted to continue the work of extermination as ordered.

(2) This group of 15 defendants were administrators of concentration camps or SS economic enterprises run with slave labor, and some were directly identified with genocide activities.

Of the 15 sentences, 14 were commuted. The one sentence which was reaffirmed was a death sentence. Another death sentence was commuted to 9 years.

Four sentences to life imprisonment were commuted, 2 to 20-year terms and 2 to 15-year terms.

Two 20-year sentences were commuted, one to 15 years and one to time already served.

One 15-year sentence and six 10-year sentences were all commuted to time served.

Reasons given for commutations: In the case of the death sentence commuted to 9 years, it was said that new evidence dissociates the criminal from offenses on which the original death sentence was based. New evidence is also mentioned as the reason for commuting several other sentences in this group.

(3) This group of 9 defendants were physicians and soldiers who carried out experiments on concentration camp inmates.

The sentences of all 9 were commuted.

Five sentences of life imprisonment were commuted to terms of 15 to 20 years.

Four sentences of varying terms were all reduced to 10-year terms, except one which was reduced to time already served.

Reasons given for commutation: The reasons given are "lack of primary responsibility, age, and limited participation."

(4) This group of 7 defendants were leading judges, public prosecutors and government officials who "perverted law to suit the arbitrary requirements of Nazi racial ideology."

All seven sentences were commuted.

Four sentences to life imprisonment were commuted, 3 to 20-year terms and one to a release on medical parole.

Three 10-year sentences were commuted to time already served.

Reasons given for commutations: The only reason given is limited responsibility.

(5) These six defendants were military men of high rank who were personally responsible for ordering the killing and mistreatment of prisoners of war, and fostering and participating in the program involving the deportation and abuse of civilians in occupied areas.

Of the six sentences, three were commuted.

Of 2 sentences to life imprisonment, 1 was reaffirmed and 1 commuted to 18 years.

Two 20-year sentences were commuted to 12 years each.

Two 15-year sentences were reaffirmed.

Reasons given for commutations: It is said that the persons whose sentences were commuted had remoter responsibility according to evidence brought out mainly since the trial. Extenuating circumstances are mentioned, such as the attempt to moderate or resist orders to commit excesses.

(6) These eight defendants were generals in southeastern Europe, convicted for criminal disregard of the laws of war in their treatment of hostages and civilians.

Of the eight sentences, six were commuted.

Two sentences of life imprisonment were reaffirmed.

Two 20-year sentences were commuted, 1 to 10 years and 1 to time already served.

One 15-year sentence was commuted to 10 years.

Three sentences, of 12, 10, and 7 years each, were all commuted to time already served.

Reasons given for commutation: Some of the persons whose sentences were commuted had lesser responsibilities or showed "evidence of humane considerations." The 2 individuals whose life sentences were reaffirmed will be physically examined to determine whether or not they should be released on medical parole.

(7) These 6 defendants were high government officials in agencies which were involved in genocide through kidnapping children, performing abortions, sterilization, forced evacuation, and forced Germanization.

All these sentences were commuted.

One 25-year sentence and one 20-year sentence were both commuted to 15 years.

Two 15-year sentences were commuted, one to 10 years and one to time already served.

Two 10-year sentences were commuted to time already served.

Reasons given are the "relatively restricted nature of the relationship of these defendants to the crimes, their relatively subordinate roles, and certain other extenuating circumstances."

(8) These nine defendants were all executives in the Krupp Industrial Enterprises, and were convicted of collaboration with the government in the use of slave labor and in spoliation.

All nine sentences were commuted.

One sentence of 12 years and confiscation of property (Alfred Krupp) was commuted to time served and no confiscation of property.

Eight other sentences ranging from 6 to 12 years were commuted to time served.

Reasons given for commutation: With regard to all the cases it is said that the sentences were commuted to conform to other sentences in similar cases and that "it is extremely difficult to allocate individual guilt."

As for the commutation of the confiscation sentence for Alfred Krupp, Mr. McCloy states that inasmuch as he is the only Nazi criminal whose property was confiscated by Nuremberg, it would constitute discrimination against him to reaffirm this sentence. Mr. McCloy points out that Justice Jackson opposed "such sentences in connection with the jurisdiction granted to the International Military Tribunal."

(9) These eight defendants were high officials who played an important part in the political and diplomatic preparation for the initiation of aggressive wars, the violation of treaties, spoliation, and the diplomatic implementation of genocide.

All eight sentences were commuted. One sentence of 25 years and two sentences of 20 years each were all commuted to 10 years.

Three sentences of 15 years each were commuted, respectively, to time already served, 10 years and 9 years.

Two 10-year sentences were commuted to time served.

Reasons given for commutation: It is said that the defendant whose sentence was reduced from 25 to 10 years had intervened to save Allied officers and men held for liquidation or as hostages.

(10) This single defendant is Field Marshal Erhard Milch, State Secretary in the Air Ministry, convicted for advocating and exploiting slave labor.

His sentence to life imprisonment was commuted to 15 years. No reason is given for this commutation, but it is mentioned that Milch claimed "instability of temperament due to severe strain, aggravated by a head injury."

FEBRUARY 20, 1951.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: The undersigned national organizations, which together with 27 Jewish community councils throughout the country comprise the National Community Relations Advisory Council are greatly disturbed by the American authorities' recent commutation of the sentences of 89 German Nazi war criminals convicted of the most heinous crimes against humanity and democratic society. Among the criminals, 21 of whom now escape the death sentence and 34 are now set free, are Nazis who committed atrocities in the Nazi concentration camps, industrialists who collaborated with nazism, Nazi officials who planned and carried out Hitler's genocide program, pillagers and slaughterers in the Nazi-occupied areas and Nazi diplomats.

Until now we have withheld public comment on the commutation of these sentences because adequate information was not available in this country. Having examined the official report by the Department of State, we now see the full extent of the mistaken policy which the United States authorities are following in this matter. The official record shows that of 101 cases reviewed by John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner for Germany, and Gen. Thomas T. Handy, commander in chief, European command, sentences were commuted in 89 and were reaffirmed in 12 cases.

As the official report indicates, the criminals whose sentences were commuted had been convicted at Nuremberg of crimes, the cruelty and depravity of which are scarcely imaginable in the civilized world. The Advisory Board on Clemency for War Criminals, in recommending the reduction of sentences, pointed out that they were not entitled to grant relief beyond that warranted by mitigating circumstances and fair consideration of individual situations. "Clemency," the Board further stated, "may be an encouraging example, but a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder would be a mockery. It would undo what Nuremberg has accomplished if in the end we were guided entirely by consideration of sympathy or generosity. Executive clemency does not exist to that end."

In our view these commutations are precisely a mistaken tenderness toward the perpetrators of mass murder and do constitute a mockery of what Nuremberg has accomplished.

These commutations are dangerous for four reasons, among others:

(1) The commutations tend to throw into doubt the entire basis, procedure, and judgments of the 12 trials conducted by 6 United States military tribunals at Nuremberg. It is gratifying to note that both McCloy and the members of his clemency board defend the standards and judgments of the Nuremberg trials and that they have rejected the arguments commonly made in defense of the criminals who were brought to judgment at those trials. In our view it would have been more appropriate, however, to honor the achievement of the Nuremberg trials by observing rather than by undoing their results. In setting forth the principles which governed the conduct of these trials, the United States was following a policy of high moral standard. In granting these commutations, however, expediency appears to have been a factor in seeking the approbation of those German elements whose devotion to democracy is justifiably suspect.

(2) At a time when it is contemplated to grant Germany greater independence, it is especially dangerous to reduce the sentences of the perpetrators of inhumanities in the concentration camps, many of whom are now able to return to public life. Such action can hardly be considered an encouragement of democratic elements in Germany. The immediate release of nine former executives of the Krupp enterprises is likewise unlikely to encourage German democratic elements, since the Krupp record as one of the leading industrial pillars of nazism is well known.

(3) The return of the Krupp industrialists to positions of power and the commutation of the sentences of Nazi war criminals implicated in the genocide program and in the pillage and slaughter in the concentration camps and in the Nazi-occupied countries of Europe cannot but alarm our allies among the democratic nations of Western Europe and among the partisans of democracy in the countries behind the iron curtain.

(4) These commutations, finally, were obviously intended to placate German opinion in the effort to make Western Germany a bulwark against the real threat of Soviet aggression. Such a policy of expediency, as years of experience shows, does not accomplish its purpose and usually leads to other evils. This case is no exception. Press reports already indicate that the Germans are not satisfied with the extent of the commutations. The United States and the West cannot safely copy the Soviet Union's technique of currying favor with former Nazi leaders. These criminals are totalitarians and hence are more reliable allies of the totalitarian East than of the democratic West.

We believe that a simple reading of Mr. McCloy's report will clearly show the extent of the error the United States has committed in reducing the sentences of these war criminals.

JACOB BLAUSTEIN,
President, American Jewish Committee.
Rabbi IRVING MILLER,
President, American Jewish Congress.
FRANK GOLDMAN,
President, B'nai B'rith.
ADOLPH HELD,
Chairman, Jewish Labor Committee.
HENRY ALBERT,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.
MAURICE N. EISENDRATH,
President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
IRVING KANE,
Chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Defense of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article on Alaska defense written by Andrew Tully, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers:

DEFENSE OF ALASKA
(By Andrew Tully)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, March 1.—On the theory there is no point in biting off more than you can chew, the military is prepared to defend only about one-quarter of Alaska if war should come with Russia.

Our officers may be reluctant to discuss it, but the defense line is there for all to see. It begins with the Navy's installation on Kodiak Island, just south of Anchorage, and runs north through Anchorage and up the Alaskan Railroad to end north of the Alaskan Range in Fairbanks—500 miles in all.

The rest is expendable—despite the fact that it is a lot of real estate. It includes the old-time frontier town of Nome, the entire northland which ends at Point Barrow, the Aleutian chain and the southeastern area including the capital city of Juneau and the important cities of Sitka and Skagway.

In this decision—arrived at in Washington—the military is being merely logical. Nearly all of Alaska's population of 126,000 persons lives in the so-called heartland embraced by the defense line. It includes the country's only railroad. And it is the only part of the country which meets the military's requirements for bases that are defensible and suppliable.

Nome has nothing the military wants—or, it believes, Russia wants. It is isolated except by air and by ships a few months of the year. The northland is a barren waste. Southeastern Alaska is too mountainous and glacier-ridden to furnish good bases. And the Aleutians would take too many men and too much money to defend.

You can say yes, but what if Russia establishes bases in these places? And the answer will be, so what? In the first place, it's only a couple of hours from Siberia to Anchorage by fast bomber, so there's no point other than psychological in seizing any of Alaska's outlying real estate. And in the second place, the military figures it could cut off, bomb, and generally harass any bases anybody would like to set up anywhere in Alaska.

What Lt. Gen. William E. Kepner, commander in chief of the Alaskan theater, obviously wants to avoid is the mistakes of World War II. Then, when we discovered Japanese troops on Kiska and Attu in the Aleutians, we rushed 150,000 troops to the Aleutians and sent tens of thousands more to back them up on the mainland. As a result, throughout the war, we had what amounted to 10 divisions tied up in a largely noncombat theater.

Today Alaska's role is that of a base from which fighter planes can intercept Russian bombers and, possibly, as a forward base for our own bombers. The primary job of the infantry here is to protect the airfields—like Elmendorf here in Anchorage, Ladd in Fairbanks, and Eielson base, 25 miles from Fairbanks, which has the world's longest runways—14,600 feet.

Military personnel in Alaska has increased since the start of the Korean War—but it still isn't even a small percentage of what Uncle Sam had up here during World War II. Air Force strength is greater if you count all the C-54 transport planes. Most planes, though, are F-80 and F-82 fighters. The F-82's are being replaced by all-weather F-94 jets, equipped with radar.

But if Uncle Sam has shortened his Alaskan defense line and pulled in his belt on troop strength, he has not done so casually. Life in the Alaskan theater is the nearest thing possible to being in a combat zone. General Kepner runs his show on the theory an attack could happen any time.

This means frequent week-end alerts—so frequent they are getting on GI nerves. During an alert, every man stays on his job around the clock. An alert usually lasts a couple of days. Troops grab their rifles and report to strategic spots along highways or commanding airfields—and eat there and sleep there until the alert is over.

Antiaircraft crews live with and sleep with their guns—home to them is a tarpaper shack 20 feet from battle position.

Every military man at Alaskan Command headquarters here—including General Kepner—must sleep out once a month. At Big Delta, near Fairbanks, selected groups of officers and men get specialized Arctic training, learning how to live and operate in temperatures of 40 and 50 below zero.

Alaska's radar net, on which work began last fall, won't be ready for another 2 years. Even then nobody claims the Territory will be safe from air attack—you couldn't build that kind of a radar screen without the United States going broke. It will make an attack more trouble for whoever tries it, force them to use more planes and fly more carefully.

But General Kepner wants no hand wringing about Alaska back in the States. He says he can hold his defense line, now, with the troops he has—and make it uncomfortable for the enemy to boot.

The way General Kepner sees it, "He who holds Alaska will have a lot to say about who is going to hold the world."

How Big?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 2, 1951:

HOW BIG?

We hope the Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will pardon us if we don't quite understand its expressed desire to avoid a "big quarrel with the White House."

That is the excuse the committee members give for not asking Donald Dawson, White House aide, to speak his piece before the committee about charges of political influence on the RFC from White House circles.

Dawson was mentioned in a committee report and the President called the references asinine.

Then the committee opened new hearings to prove the President was wrong when he belittled the committee's work.

Someone in the White House called for copies of letters from members of Congress to the RFC.

The Senators on the committee pounded their desks and said they refused to be intimidated.

How big can a quarrel get?

FTC at the Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include as a part thereof an article appearing in the December 1950 issue of the Michigan Bar Journal, entitled "FTC at the Gates," by James F. Hoge, of New York. The editor of this journal stated in the introduction:

There probably is no lawyer in the United States more qualified to write about the Federal Trade Commission than Jim Hoge, of New York. He has participated in numerous FTC matters, one of which required 10 years and resulted in 80,000 man-miles of travel for counsel representing the firms involved and the Commission. To the average practitioner this article will be enlightening.

Mr. Speaker, in offering this comprehensive statement on the functioning of the Federal Trade Commission, may I point out to the membership of the House that I have known Mr. Hoge since our undergraduate days in the Wake Forest Law School of North Carolina. He was admitted to the North Carolina bar in 1922, and later associated himself with an outstanding law firm in New York. He is a member of the American, New York State, and New York City Bar Associations. In addition to serving on numerous committees, Mr. Hoge is chairman of the National Trade-Mark Coordinating Committee, and a member of the Lawyer's Advisory Committee, of the United States Trade-Mark Association. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will find in this stimulating article much food for thought on the scope of the operations of the Federal Trade Commission:

FTC AT THE GATES

(By James F. Hoge)

The Federal Trade Commission is at the gates of business.[1] It was put there in 1914 by Woodrow Wilson, but it was put there to open the gates, not to close them. Mr. Wilson had a great deal to say about the Commission. It was a creation in which he took considerable pride. Here are a few, out of a great many, of his sayings:

"What we are proposing to do, therefore, is, happily, not to hamper or interfere with business * * * or in any sense to put it under the ban. The antagonism between business and Government is over." Alas; he said that in 1914.

"I have taken a long time, ladies and gentlemen, to select the Federal Trade Commission, because I wanted to choose men and be sure that I had chosen men who would be really serviceable to the businessmen of this country, great as well as small, the rank and the file.

"This country, above every country in the world, is meant to lift. * * * That is the reason the Federal Trade Commission was established, so that men would have some place where they could take counsel as to what the law was and what the law permitted, and also take counsel as to whether the law itself was right and advice had not better be taken as to its alteration." That one is of particular timeliness.

"The processes of counsel are only the processes of accommodation, not the processes of punishment. Punishment retards but it does not lift up. Punishment impedes but it does not improve. And so we ought to substitute for the harsh processes of the law, wherever we can, the milder and gentler and more helpful processes of counsel."

He also commented on the fact that this Commission had been endowed with greater powers than any other similar agency or commission, but he said that those powers were put upon it in order that it might the better inquire into the needs of business, that it might the better learn the whole business structure of the country.

INCREASED POWERS

These powers have been greatly enlarged since President Wilson spoke. From the concept, purposes, and explanations stated by him, the Commission gradually moved into a different field of operation, into one of policing, of enforcement, of punishment. In this field, prosecution is a necessary function and, where there is prosecution, adjudication is essential. There is an unfortunate and key circumstance in this, and that is that the Commission combines both the prosecuting and adjudicating functions. It investigates, it issues and serves the complaint, prosecutes and adjudicates.

The Federal Trade Commission Act was passed on September 26, 1914. Since those early days the act and the functions of the Commission have radically changed so that the scope of the Commission's adjudicating powers has been immeasurably extended and the effect of its orders made the more severe as they bare on the rights of respondents.

The Commission was empowered originally to prevent unfair methods of competition in commerce. In 1938 the Federal Trade Commission Act was amended in numerous important particulars. That was accomplished by the Wheeler-Lea Act. It gave the Commission enlarged and specific powers for regulating the advertisements of food, drugs, therapeutic devices and cosmetics, and made other significant amendments.

Section 5 was changed to include unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce, as well as unfair methods of competition. Before that amendment it was necessary to show that the act complained of was a method used in competition. That is not now necessary. There is no requirement to show that competition is involved at all. It is sufficient to allege that the act or practice is unfair or deceptive.

A provision was inserted in the act by which an order to cease and desist becomes final.[2] If a respondent against whom the order is directed does not appeal, or if having appealed, the required number of days have elapsed since the disposition of the appeal, the Commission's order then becomes final.

A provision was added whereby one who violates an order which has become final shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation. That worked a vast change in the effect of these orders. Formerly, an an order was unenforceable and of no practical effect unless and until the Commission itself applied to a circuit court of appeals to enforce it. And at that time the validity of the order was open to attack by the respondent. That is still true as to orders issued by the Commission under the Clayton Act.

The penalty provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were materially altered by the so-called Oleomargarine Act of 1950 (15 U. S. C. A. 45). Not only does this act add to the duties of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to regulating the sale of oleomargarine, but the penalty provision was amended to provide that each single day of a violation should constitute a separate violation on which the penalty of not more than $5,000 should apply. Thus was the sphere of the Commission's jurisdiction and the severity of the penalty for the violation of its orders increased.

FTC AND OTHER ACTS

Therefore, at this time—36 years since the passage of the Federal Trade Commission Act—the Commission has taken on quite a different complexion from that given it at the time of its establishment. The Clayton Act followed closely in time upon the Commission Act and authorized the Commission to enforce against the persons, partnerships, and corporations subject to its jurisdiction sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of the Clayton Act.

Section 2 dealt with discrimination in price, services, or facilities, and was greatly enlarged by the amendment in 1936 known as the Robinson-Patman Act. Section 3 prohibits tying of exclusive leases, sales, or contracts. Section 7 prohibits acquisition by one corporation of the capital stock of other corporations where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition between the corporation whose stock is so acquired and the company making the acquisition. Section 8 prohibits interlocking directorates under conditions specified therein.

The Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 was passed in 1940 (15 U. S. C. A. 68). It regulates the labeling of wool products. The enforcement of it was placed with the Commission and numerous powers were provided for the Commission's employment in the enforcement of it.

The manufacturers and distributors of food, drugs, therapeutic devices, and cosmetics have an immediate and direct concern with the Commission in that the administration of the Wheeler-Lea Act respecting advertising is entrusted there. Those who advertise drugs and devices directly to the public collide more frequently with the Commission in this field, but the act also applies to advertisements which are restricted to the profession—rather curiously worded, but it is there—and no drug or device manufacturer or distributor can ignore the Commission's powers in this field.

All manufacturers that are not specifically exempt, are subject to the Commission's powers under the other sections of its act and under the Robinson-Patman Act and other parts of the antitrust law. This has been brought home forcibly by the recent Supreme Court decisions in the Cement,[3] Morton Salt,[4] Steel Conduit,[5] and other cases.

Since 1947, the Commission has been empowered to institute cancellation proceedings in the United States Patent Office against trade-marks and collective and certification marks on numerous grounds.[6]

Another field of activity was opened to the Commission when the Supreme Court held for the first time, and over 50 years after the passage of the Sherman Act, that interstate insurance business is subject to the

[1] Under the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U. S. C. A. 41), the Commission has jurisdiction over persons, partnerships, or corporations except banks, common carriers subject to the acts to regulate commerce, air carriers, and foreign air carriers subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. A. 401), and persons, partnerships, or corporations subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 (7 U. S. C. A. 181) except as provided in sec. 406 (b) of said act.

[2] This provision applies to orders to cease and desist issued under the Federal Trade Commission Act. It does not apply to such orders issued by the Commission under the Clayton Act.

[3] *F. T. C. v. The Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 683).

[4] *F. T. C. v. Morton Salt Company* (334 U. S. 37).

[5] *Triangle Conduit & Cable Co. v. F. T. C.* (168 F. (2d) 175; aff'd 336 U. S. 956).

[6] U. S. Trade-Mark Act of 1946, 15 U. S. C. A. 1064.

antitrust laws.[7] Congress followed with the passage of the Insurance Anti-Trust Moratorium Act to provide specifically that the Federal Trade Commission Act as well as the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act is applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that it is not regulated by State law.[8]

COSTLY LITIGATION

A proceeding leading to a cease and desist order (or possibly a dismissal of the complaint) is a luxury that only the wealthy can afford. A small-business man or a small corporation cannot "stand the gaff" of one. The respondent must have unlimited resources in order to see one of them through. There is no means for peremptory termination of a case. One may make a motion before the Commission but if the Commission denies it, he has no appeal. And the courts will not entertain injunction or declaratory judgment actions.[9]

CASES ARE PREJUDGED

Under the provisions of section 5 of the act, the Commission to a large extent prejudges a case. If it has reason to believe that one has been using an unfair method of competition or an unfair or deceptive act or practice, it may file its complaint. In other words, the Commission does not file a complaint until it has reason to believe there is a violation. Thus, at that point and for that purpose, it has reached a conclusion as to a violation.

One of the former Commissioners explained this. In outlining the Commission procedure and practice for the George Washington Law Review, he noted that a complaint is issued only at the direction of the Commission and that motions with respect thereto are permitted, but that "as a practical matter, very few such motions are briefed and argued to the Commission, and a great majority of them are denied, without prejudice to the right of the respondent to renew them at the end of the proceeding. The Commission itself has passed upon the question of its jurisdiction in advance of ordering the issuance of a complaint and in most cases has fully considered the questions raised by the respondent in the motion." [10]

COMMISSION PROCEDURE

When a complaint is issued, an attorney on the Commission's staff is assigned to prosecute it and one of the Commission's trial examiners is assigned to take the evidence. The Commission first sees the evidence, if it sees it at all, when the trial is over. Under the rules of practice which became effective June 1, 1950, the trial examiner makes an initial decision which becomes the decision of the Commission unless an appeal is filed by any of the parties or unless the Commission upon its own initiative reviews the case. Such an appeal is presented in the form of a brief, designated "appeal brief," which sets forth the exceptions and grounds for appeal, and no matter not included in the brief may thereafter be presented to the Commission. Upon such an appeal, the Commission will consider only such parts of the record as are cited therein or which may be necessary to resolve the issues presented.

Under this procedure the Commission itself becomes an appellate tribunal. And, as with such tribunals, whether the Commission sees the evidence on appeal by the parties or on its own motion, it sees it in transcript. That may be a few hundred pages or, as in the Cement case, 50,000 pages, and 50,000 pages of exhibits.

In addition to the evidence, all the proceedings by way of motions and appeals from examiners' rulings must be reduced to writing and filed in multiple copies. It is humanly impossible for the Commission to read such a record, so it has to rely on assistants and advisers.

So here the ultimate authority, the Commission—the judge—does not see the witnesses; does not pass upon the qualifications before the evidence goes into the record; does not observe the demeanor of witnesses which in court is so important.

This is an assembly-line method of trying cases. It is a trial by organization. A respondent finds himself opposed to an organized mechanism where wheels within wheels grind out what has been called by one of the law writers "an institutional decision." [11]

Herein arises that "expertness" which the advocates of administrative law are prone to assert. The "expertness," if any, is not necessarily in the person of the Commissioners. Tenures of office may vary greatly in time and there may be periods of considerable turnover in the Commission's membership. Likewise, there is no reason for supposing that Commissioners become expert in the wide field of commodities and businesses affected by their act.

James M. Landis, who served a period as a Commissioner, put it this way: "To assume that any 5, 10, or 20 men have the ability to acquire, within their brief official lifetime, the expertness to comprehend the full range of our industrial problems, from aluminum to zinc, is once more to put our trust in supermen. In the business of governing a nation—to paraphrase Gerard Henderson again—we must take into account the fact that government will be operated by men of average talent and average ability and we must therefore devise our administrative processes with that in mind." [12]

What expertness exists in a commission is usually to be found in the staff. It frequently is related to the adjudicating process but anonymously and without responsibility for the decision.

The exercise of expertness and the doing of justice are not always synonymous. Frequently the contrary is the case. Sometimes there is more difficulty in arguing before alleged experts than before ordinary courts which must learn of the case from statements of counsel, from evidence, and from briefs. The expert, so often, has preconceived opinions.

APPEALS FROM COMMISSION

Finally, as to this process, on appeal from such institutional decisions, the law provides that the findings of the Commission as to the facts, "if supported by evidence,[13] shall be conclusive." That is about the same as saying there is no appeal. If there is a legal point, if capriciousness can be shown, if arbitrariness can be demonstrated, then the courts may interfere. But the courts accept this language of the act as forbidding them to review the record to determine where the weight of the evidence lies.

In the Steel Conduit case the circuit court of appeals said:

"In this state of the record it will be enough to say that Congress has left to the Commission the determination of the facts, *Federal Trade Commission* v. *A. E. Staley Mfg. Co.* (324 U. S. 746), * * * and the weight to be attributed to the facts proved and the inferences to be drawn from them" (p. 180).

In addition to this, the Supreme Court said in the Morton Salt case that it was enough to support the Commission's findings of injury to competition if there was a "reasonable possibility" that competition might be adversely affected.

Generally, in this state of the law, it would seem to be a waste of time to appeal. The Commission has, therefore, in effect become an administrative agency that can do about as it pleases in proceedings against business people without any real relief being available in the courts.

This situation represents a gradual development over the years since the Commission was created. It has come by statutory enactment, judicial interpretation and the burgeoning of administrative processes in Government. The fundamental evil is in the combination of the prosecuting and adjudicating functions. That is the root of the vine. It is axiomatic that one should not be judge in his own cause. That has been so stated for at least 2,000 years. As long ago as 300 years, Pascal put it in these words:

"It is not permitted to the most equitable of men to be a judge in his own cause."

Two approaches have been made toward tempering or overcoming this combination of prosecuting and adjudicating functions under the Federal Trade Commission Act. No move has been made with respect to the situation under the Clayton Act. The first was the Reece bill, H. R. 2390, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It proposed an amendment to the Commission Act whereby, on appeal, the appellate court might review the record to determine whether the findings of fact by the Commission were supported by the weight of the evidence.

THE O'HARA BILL

The other approach is the O'Hara bill, first introduced in the Eightieth Congress, H. R. 3871, and again in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 1819, reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1948. It proposes that the Federal Trade Commission file and try its cases in the courts according to the rules of civil procedure. It says simply that in cases under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act the Commission ought hereafter be the investigator, the complainant, and the prosecutor, and that the regularly constituted courts of the land should be the adjudicators.

For a conclusion recall some of the words of Wilson quoted at the outset to the effect that antagonism between business and Government should cease, and that "this country, above every country in the world, is meant to lift." That, remember, was the basic reason for the creation of the Commission—that business might be aided in making its full contribution toward enabling this Nation to "lift."

If that was the important and primary function for which the Commission was created in 1914, then its performance of that function is many times more important in 1951, for the Nation is engaged in a fierce struggle ("hot" and "cold") on a worldwide front, and the issue of the struggle is the Nation's ability to see it through.

PEOPLE ARE BUSINESS

Business, in the final analysis, is not a thing apart; it is the people. Industries are owned by the people. Every one of the 50,000,000 Americans who has a savings account, each of the 54,000,000 who has a life-insurance policy, and each of the 14,000,000 who has a share of stock or an industrial bond owns directly or indirectly a part of Ameri-

---

[7] *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Assn.* (322 U. S. 533 (1948)).

[8] 15 U. S. C. A. 1011–1015.

[9] *Miles Laboratories* v. *Federal Trade Commission* ((C. A. D. C.), 140 F. (2d), 683; cert. den. 322 U. S. 752).

[10] Federal Trade Commission Procedure and Practice, Robert E. Freer, the George Washington Law Review, January–February 1940, vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 316, 323.

[11] Institutional Administrative Decisions by Prof. Kenneth Culp Davis, Columbia Law Review, March 1948.

[12] Administrative Process, 1938, p. 87.

[13] The courts have construed this—and the Administrative Procedure Act has defined it—to mean "substantial evidence" but at best it means little more than that there be some evidence; that there be more than a scintilla.

can industry. And approximately 85 cents out of every dollar of sales by manufacturers go for salaries and wages. It will not do to separate big business and little business; little businesses become big and big businesses sometimes become little.

If the issue of the world struggle today is this Nation's ability to see it through, then the need is production—more business, not less; more invention, research, exploration, expansion, discovery and development of known and unknown resources here and in other parts of the world. And if the road is to be kept open for the achievement of those aims, it is now more than ever important that the Federal Trade Commission should be, and conceive itself to be, an agency really serviceable to the businessmen of this country, great as well as small, the rank and file.

It is unfortunate that through the years the processes of the Commission have become more and more the processes of policing and punishment, and less and less those of advice and counsel. It is true that this trend has been accelerated by successive legislative enactments conferring increased punitive powers. But the Commission still can, if it will, take stock of the purposes for which it was created and devote a greater portion of its energies toward their accomplishment. It can and should recognize that it can best serve businessmen and the Nation by smoothing the road of business and marking its boundaries rather than by setting up ›ad blocks in the form of expensive and long d awn out administrative proceedings; by erecting signposts which all can read and supplying directions to those seeking a safe course, instead of playing the role of traffic cop lying in wait for the unwary who may go astray while groping his way through the maze of statutory do's and don't's.

The gates of business are the gates of freemen, and the Federal Trade Commission is one of the principal keepers of those gates. The hope of mankind is that this Nation and those who guide its destinies remember now its own founding hopes and its traditions and its faiths, to the end that the dynamic energy of freemen, the greatest power in the world, may be released as never before, and its great gates be thrown wide.

One Big Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 4, 1951:

ONE BIG INVESTIGATION

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation mess says that the record may show the need for a "general investigation of the moral level of the Government."

We are glad to see an important Member of the Senate coming around to our way of thinking because he is in a position to do something about it.

We said in this column on Lincoln's Birthday that our Government has fallen far from the standards of integrity which prevailed in the days of Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, and the other great leaders of the past.

The "Washington fix," influence peddled for dollars or votes, the fast dollar, government by crony, officials on the open market for a price, are the standards now.

Let's have that one big investigation to see just how low the moral level of the Government has dropped.

How Europe Feels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1951:

HOW EUROPE FEELS

Paul-Henri Spaak, the distinguished Belgian statesman who heads the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, has effectively summed up the European reaction to our great debate on the issue of sending American troops overseas to become part of the Atlantic Pact Army under General Eisenhower. Wholly apart from the many things that can be said against the essentially defeatist do-it-by-air proposals of Senator TAFT, former President Hoover and others of like mind, Mr. Spaak's views—as expressed the other night in New York—deserve careful attention in this country as a measure of how our allies abroad feel in terms of what is vital to them as well as to us. His words on the subject are worth extensive quotation:

What is the great fear of Europe? That America might refuse to declare war if Europe is attacked by Russia? No. The great fear is that the United States will decide that to defend Europe on the ground is impossible, that the United States will accept the idea that Europe must inevitably fall to the Russian conquerors in the first phase of war, and eventually be delivered by the victorious Americans after 2 years, 3 years, 10 years of occupation.

But I ask you: "What would be left of Europe after years of Soviet occupation?"

What we hope in Europe is that the United States will reject this fatalistic conception and that, from the very beginning of a war, they will be with us, with all their strength and with the precise objective of preventing the conquest of Europe.

There is for Europe only one hypothesis on which the chance of victory is great: It is that aid from America is given from the very beginning and completely; that the United States will engage itself without limit.

Is it not now the time—now or never—to repeat the immortal sentence that you have placed in stone on one of the most beautiful of your monuments?

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end do our duty as we understand it."

Defeatism at this stage is surely as unwarranted as it was before Pearl Harbor. In fact, in some ways—especially in view of the actual and potential might of America and the rest of the free world—it seems far more unreasoning now than it was then. The future of Western Europe is of vast importance to our own future. We simply cannot afford to write it off—even temporarily. Mr. Spaak has spoken timely words on that score.

United States Suspends Tin Purchases for Stockpile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post this morning I read an interesting article on the subject of the tin stockpile. The article, which is to be inserted below, points out that because of the present reserves of tin it is possible to refuse to buy tin on the foreign market at the exorbitant prices now demanded.

In my remarks of yesterday, I reminded the Congress of the legislation which continued the operation of the Government's tin smelter for 5 years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1951. Had the opponents of that legislation been successful, the Government smelter would not be in the process of shutting down and going out of business and the United States would be at the mercy of foreign producers who are demonstrating their desire to gouge us.

Attention of all Members of Congress is invited to the article which follows:

UNITED STATES SUSPENDS TIN PURCHASE FOR STOCKPILE

The Government last night announced the sudden stop of tin purchases for the stockpile, implying that the present price of the imported metal was not at a "reasonable level."

The announcement, made by General Services Administrator Jess Larson, also declared that Government purchases of tin for industrial use would be held to the "barest minimum."

This policy will continue, he said, until tin prices reach reasonable figures.

Meantime, from other sources, there were intimations of "drastic changes" in the Government's thinking on the stockpiling of other nonferrous metals. Details were unknown, but it appeared that the trend was toward much reduced purchases for stockpiling of copper, lead, and zinc.

As in the tin situation, high prices of foreign exporters are believed to be a factor. But also an element, it is believed, is the problem of scarce supplies for the whole world, particularly Britain and other European countries beginning heavy, metal consuming rearmament programs.

The cessation of tin stockpiling followed swiftly the Senate Preparedness Committee's demand for such action on grounds this country's allies are gouging the United States on tin prices.

The committee said there is more tin in the United States than at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, and asserted that this country is no longer in a position where we must buy tin at any price.

A Bureau of Mines official said the slash in buying might put producers in a difficult position.

But he estimated that supplies now in the United States, apart from those in the reserve, would be enough to meet needs for 2 years if tin use is cut to rock bottom.

This appeared to indicate that drastic new Government controls on use of tin may be

forthcoming. The Government previously ordered a 20-percent cut in civilian use of tin in February and March. Use of new tin was forbidden where secondary tin could be used.

Communism's Threat Within the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at Greer, S. C., March 6, 1951, before the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Lions Club:

COMMUNISM'S THREAT WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Ladies and gentlemen of Greer, again I consider myself extremely fortunate in being thus permitted to speak on this significant occasion during these perilous times. It is my purpose to speak to you somewhat in detail on the aspects of the spread of communism within the borders of our own great country.

By way of introduction, may I call your attention to the fact that more than 30 years ago, the father of the Russian revolution, Lenin himself, warned of the very events which are now coming to pass. Said Lenin—

"We live not only in a state, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic next to a number of imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either the one or the other will have the better of it. Until that end comes, a series of most terrible conflicts between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

Those words can scarcely be misunderstood. The conflict predicted so positively by Lenin is inevitable not because of any refusal on our part to live and let live, but because communism cannot tolerate the existence of freemen anywhere; thus the Russian jail-keepers constantly seek the destruction of free nations everywhere. In recognizing the inevitability of conflict with Communist Russia we engage in no childish or neurotic flights into fear. Rather is our own purpose sharpened, our course of duty made clear.

I am not here to tell you that the Kremlin is working overtime to achieve our downfall. We all know that. I want rather to discuss with you the internal threat which communism poses—to our Christian morality, to our Constitution and liberty, to our national defense, and to our economic system.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO CHRISTIAN MORALITY

To begin with, communism repudiates everything we hold dear in Christian morality. At the outset, the Communist view of man is totally opposed to our own. They believe that everything in life is determined and shaped by economic arrangements—the means of production and the owners of those means. What this comes down to, is that the Communist seems to believe "man is what he eats." We know that the individual human being, while influenced by the material world around him, is not a slave to it; that every man, having within him a spiritual self, is free to live greatly or fall ignobly. To us, the individual is a gem worth saving; to the Communist, only a pawn to be used. Therein lies a basic conflict between communism and Christian society.

Communism asserts that it can solve all the troubles of mankind simply by eliminating economic sin or class exploitation. So it proposes to take us on a joy-ride through dictatorship and socialism to a classless society in the great beyond. But we are not fooled by either the diagnosis or the cure. As Paul told the Ephesians, we struggle as much against spiritual wickedness as against economic sin; and we know, furthermore, that you don't produce freemen by means of dictatorship. Did you ever hear of T-bone steaks coming out of a meat grinder?

As you might well expect, there is no place for a God in Communist materialism. It makes my Baptist blood boil when I read Lenin's repudiation of all God-given morality. "In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality?" this Communist big-leaguer asks. Hear his reply:

"In the sense that they were preached by the bourgeoisie, who declared that ethics were God's commandments. We, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests. Or, instead of deducing these ethics from the commandments of morality, from the commandments of God, they deduced them from idealistic or semi-idealistic phrases, which were always very similar to God's commandments. * * * We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat."

Note well the results of this so-called proletarian morality; the precept that the end justifies the means, the Hitler-Stalin pact, the illegal, secretive party programs, the false names, the special Communist language with double meanings (which the Communists themselves call "Aesopian").

We must make no mistake about it. Communism poses a direct threat to our whole fabric of Christian belief as to man, God, and right and wrong.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO OUR CONSTITUTION AND LIBERTY

The second target at which communism points a dagger is our Constitution and liberty. You know, the Communist is a lot like that little lizard which can change its colors; he may be a striker, an agitator, a spy, a traitor, a saboteur, a revolutionist, or very often, just a worm. You know how easily a couple of worms can spoil a few apples in the bottom of a barrel, which in turn spoil all the rest. That is just what happens when a handful of Communists succeed in taking over an organization—they are then able to control and spoil many other organizations and fronts.

That was the sort of thing J. Edgar Hoover had in mind a year ago when he said not to be fooled by the seemingly small 55,000 membership of the American Communist Party. Many of those 55,000 are strategically placed and devoted solely to the advancement of Communist aims. With them are 500,000 fellow travelers. Let us never forget that the Communists didn't have to throw bombs to take over Czechoslovakia; they did it by infiltrating strategic government offices—the police, the army and the courts.

I don't need to quote from the Un-American Activities Committee to tell you what the Communists are up to. Here is what the Manual of the Communist Party itself states:

"As the leader and organizer of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the United States of America leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a Socialist Soviet Republic in the United States, for the complete abolition of classes, for the establishment of socialism, the first stage of the classless Communist society."

And in case that isn't clear enough, the Manual at another place says, "We do not question the theory of the necessity for the forceful overthrow of capitalism."

In their own words, then, Communists are a threat to our Constitution. That great charter of liberty provides the means for peaceful change of government. Any organization which repudiates those means and advocates force and violence instead is an enemy of the Constitution and is not a political party. It is an insult to our great Republican and Democratic Parties to put them in the same class as the Communist. The Communist Party, as an advocate of force and violence, is a revolutionary faction having no claim to any rights in our system. In order to have the laws explicitly recognize this, I have introduced a bill to outlaw the Communist Party, the same being designated on the House Calendar as H. R. 1037.

We must inquire beyond the immediate plans of the Communists and into their ultimate intentions should they ever succeed in overthrowing our Government. First off, they would establish what they call the dictatorship of the proletariat—which in plainer terms means dictatorship by the Communist Party over everyone else, workers and businessmen and farmers. Stalin has admitted that the dictatorship cannot be a complete democracy, for it will be based on the limitation of the rights of the former capitalists and directed against these capitalists. It is rule unrestricted by law. That strikes me particularly hard, as a lawyer, for I think it is plain to everyone that laws are a guaranty of freedom. When you take away legal restraints on a ruler's powers you have a Hitler or a Stalin. And you can't get rid of him.

Let us take one example of what the Communists would do when in power. Their president, William Z. Foster, tells that under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties, "Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc., will be liquidated, the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses. Likewise will be dissolved all other organizations that are political props of the bourgeois rule, including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary Clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc."

Ladies and gentlemen, he's talking about us, you and me. I belong to several of the organizations that Foster says will be abolished. We know they are not kidding about these intentions, either. On the 7th of February it was reported that the Salvation Army had been liquidated by the Communist government in the Baltic States. These boys mean business—dirty business—the wiping out of all voluntary groups.

So without even going on to discuss the absence of freedom of speech and other freedoms under Communist rule, I think you can appreciate the dire threat which American Communists pose to our Constitution and liberty.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

That threat is primarily a future danger. Let us now turn for a moment to a Communist threat which is clear and present—the threat to our national defense. The parade of confessions, convictions, and exposés in the last 3 years tell as grim a tale of espionage, sabotage, and treason as any fiction writer could ever dream up. One chapter was related during the trial of the 11 Communist leaders before Judge Medina by one of the FBI "plants" in the Communist Party. In 1945, Mr. Al Lannon, director of the Communist Party in Maryland, said that "The party would have to adopt a policy of sabotage not only for war industries but for every other industry. This would demoralize the population to the extent that they could not adequately support a war." Another undercover agent reported a state-

ment by George Siskind, the party's education director. In December 1945 Siskind told members to get ready for the day when they would have to foment slow-down and strikes and throw bombs in machinery. Can there be any doubt that the Communist Party is a school for spies and saboteurs?

It is difficult to estimate how much damage has been done to our national defense by the invaluable information given to Russia by Communists in our atomic plants and Government offices. First there were the Canadian spies, then Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold, David Greenglass, Sidney Weinbaum, Brothman and Moskowitz, and now William Remington.

And beyond espionage there is the serious matter of loyalty in wartime. William Foster has publicly announced that in the event of a war with Russia, the American Communists would "cooperate with all democratic forces to defeat the predatory war aims of American imperialism and bring such a war to a speedy conclusion on the basis of a democratic peace." These are the seeds of treason.

I am certain we must steel ourselves to the realities of the future. If war with Soviet Russia breaks out, we will see a fifth column that had no equal in World War II, here or in any other country. And right now, today, espionage is a clear and present danger to our security.

COMMUNIST THREAT TO THE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

The fourth and perhaps the most obvious threat of communism is the threat to our economic system of private enterprise. While they try to hide many things, the Communists have never hidden their desire to socialize the economy of the United States. They said, in their 1945 postwar program:

"We shall aim to convince the broad masses that the eventual elimination of the profit system and the establishment of socialism in the United States will usher in a new and higher type of democracy and a free road to unlimited and stable social progress because it will end exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, through the establishment of a society without oppression and exploitation."

The Communists' favorite sport is to sell the workingman a bill of goods to the effect that he is exploited by predatory capitalists. The only difficulty is that the Commies have a tough time getting our workers to come away from their TV sets long enough to listen. Even when they do get someone to listen, convincing a man who owns an automatic washer, an automobile, a telephone and refrigerator that he is exploited is rather hard to do, to say the least. But sometimes they do succeed in getting people to swallow their poison. They hold the promise of bread in exchange for a man's freedom—and the joke about it is that bread is all they give in return. Those who have gone to Russia as admirers of communism have returned again, disgusted by the universal poverty of the working people, the inequalities, the suffering. They have bread all right—three times a day with thin soup. Yes, communism has enriched some, to be sure—the party bigshots. The poor were never poorer under the Czar.

Why do we want to preserve this economic system of ours, where the bulk of decisions are made by private persons rather than government boards? Because we know that American capitalism has produced the highest standards of living, with the widest distribution of benefits, of any economic system in the history of the world. And the Communists would scrap private enterprise capitalism for the dead hand of socialism. We will neither buy their bill of goods nor be oblivious to their threat. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us recognize communism for what it is—a cancer in our lives eating away at our vitals. It would corrode our moral foundation, overthrow the Constitution, and take away our liberty. It would substitute socialism for free enterprise. And today, right now, Communist spies, saboteurs, and traitors are selling us down the river by doing all in their power to weaken our defense efforts.

Two thousand years ago the Apostle Peter, in his second epistle, gave a warning that I think applies to Communists in our own day. He spoke of the ungodly.

"But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness and despise government. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities. * * * These, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption; and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day time. * * * While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.

"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."

I exhort you to recognize the menace of communism and to take action in the American way to preserve the American way.

One Hundred Years of Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundredth anniversary of the first real effort on the part of Congress to build a civil service. It was on March 7, 1851, that Congress passed a resolution requesting President Fillmore and his Cabinet to formulate some plan to classify Government employees, apportion their salaries according to their service, provide a fair and impartial examination for appointment, and to set classification standards for promotion purposes.

A report issued by the Cabinet was concurred in by all except Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, who wanted a higher standard set for his Department than for others. In March 1853, the Congress enacted legislation based on this report of the President and his Cabinet. This act, and a similar one passed in 1855, established a salary for four grades or classes of clerks in the executive department and set up a system of "pass" examinations. These "pass" examinations were the basis of the competitive examinations established in 1872. In practice they proved ineffectual in that the department heads preferred to make political rather than merit appointments.

President Lincoln recognized the faults of the spoils system and stated at one time that:

I feel like a man so busy letting rooms at one end of the house that he has no time left to put out the fire that is blazing and destroying at the other end.

He truly was so busy "putting out the fire" that he had little time to build the civil-service system in which he believed.

The next step in the history of our attaining a good permanent civil service was made by Representative Thomas Jenckes, of Rhode Island, who in 1868 made a report to the House of Representatives that was a remarkable piece of research containing testimony of many public officials and comparisons of the civil-service systems of other countries. This report served as the basis for much of the discussion on the matter in the following years, and, in fact, was responsible for much of what was contained in the Civil Service Act of 1883.

A rider attached to an appropriation bill in 1871 authorized President Grant to prescribe regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service. The President issued several rules and regulations and Executive orders covering the personnel of the executive service under this authorization. He established a seven-man Board in 1871, known as the Advisory Board of the Civil Service. The Board existed for only a few years because Congress failed to make any appropriations for it after 1874.

It is one of the ironies of our history that the assassination of a President was the final factor in causing the Congress to establish a permanent civil-service system. When a disappointed office seeker assassinated President Garfield, the country and the Congress became convinced of the needs of a permanent civil service. The Congress then enacted the Pendleton Act, the Civil Service Act of 1883. This is still the basic statute upon which our civil-service system rests. It has been supplemented by a set of civil-service rules and regulations, by Veterans' Preference Acts of 1919 and 1944, by the Classification Act of 1923 and 1949, by the Retirement Act of 1948, and by other important statutes, Executive orders, and reorganization plans.

This hundredth anniversary of the first congressional legislation on civil service is a historic occasion. That joint resolution was truly one of the basic laws of this Nation. Under it the civil service has grown and become more efficient. A faithful and loyal civil service has been established and maintained.

We should always remember the many loyal men and women throughout the country who under civil service have worked anonymously at their tasks to build the greatest Government in the world. They are the ones who have made it possible for the Nation to carry on and prosper. They are the ones who have put into action the laws which this Congress made. They are the ones who have made the policies of this country both on domestic and foreign issues respected.

We must not forget them nor ignore them. Too often they have been ridiculed by the press and the public as lazy and inefficient. But we should remember on this one hundredth anniversary that the greatest Government, serving the most productive Nation and the freest and happiest people in the world could not have been conducted by a civil service of second-rate people.

If we are to continue to maintain an efficient civil service and create a desire among young people to enter Government work we must treat them fairly. We must realize that they constitute the motive power of this Government. We must face our responsibility to them and bring the cost of living down to where they can live or their income up to where they can buy.

The first hundred years has seen the tremendous growth of civil service. As we enter the next hundred years world leadership has been thrust upon us. To discharge our great responsibility we of the Congress must rise to the responsibility of our part in maintaining and increasing the effectiveness of this loyal civil service.

Price and Wage Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the economic report submitted to the executive board of the Essex-West Hudson CIO Council by Mr. Joel R. Jacobson, executive secretary. At this time when the grave wage-price situation is of concern to all of us, I believe this statement is well worth reading and is deserving of careful consideration. From the information contained in this report it is readily apparent why the labor organization is concerned with the attempt to stabilize wages while prices and profits continue to zoom upward to new heights.

The report follows:

Perhaps one of the most important internal problems affecting the American people today is the question of stabilization. Government officials daily are wrestling with this issue and it must be admitted by all objective students that even the preliminary issue of the wisdom of over-all stabilization at this juncture is still an item to be questioned.

In particular, wage earners are specifically concerned with the persistent agitation to control their earnings at a time when living costs and corporation profits are establishing new records almost hourly. Wage earners have learned from bitter experience that stabilization all too often turns out to be wage stabilization and nothing else.

One thing is certain. There is no justice in any system of stabilization which freezes wages but permits price-gouging and profiteering to run rampant throughout our economy.

The words "price-gouging" and "profiteering," however, are not just propaganda bolts shot indiscriminately into the dark. To the contrary, much evidence is on the books to substantiate the CIO's charges that such conditions not only exist but, in fact, flourish right in our own back yard.

In order to high light this problem on a local level, the Essex-West Hudson CIO Council has prepared this report to compare the rates of profit and wage increases since the end of the war in 10 of the largest corporations in the Essex-West Hudson area, with whom CIO local unions have collective bargaining agreements. Before analyzing the figures, however, it is important to realize certain basic facts concerning the report.

The figures used for corporation profits are net profits, after taxes. The figures used for wages are gross wages, before taxes. Since economists have popularized usage of these figures on two different levels, we will comply for purposes of simplification. But it is obvious that the disparity between profits and wages is actually much greater than is depicted herein.

TABLE NO. 1.—*Since 1945—Percent increase in profits over wages*

Corporation	1945 profits	1949 profits	Percent increase in profits	Percent increase in wages since 1945
Ronson	$598,409	$5,417,173	822	41
Koppers	3,241,784	11,615,498	205	46
Swift	12,303,807	35,826,129	109	39
Lionel	193,070	[1] 1,650,322	730	48
General Motors	188,370,919	656,526,969	249	31
Westinghouse	26,800,767	67,288,585	150	48
Worthington Pump	2,274,317	5,387,054	135	38
Congoleum-Nairn	1,617,214	3,763,516	134	53
Celanese	7,613,490	20,640,826	171	44
United States Steel	58,015,050	165,908,829	185	53
Average increase			289	44

[1] 1950 figures available.

TABLE NO. 2.—*Since 1945—Percent increase in profits over sales*

Corporation	Percent increase in profits	1945 sales	1949 sales	Percent increase in sales since 1945
Ronson	822	$7,579,036	$32,126,076	337
Koppers	205	121,449,052	212,397,177	75
Swift	109	1,807,631,681	2,213,160,242	77
Lionel	730	6,424,409	15,280,777	137
General Motors	249	3,127,934,868	5,700,835,141	82
Westinghouse	150	684,730,060	945,690,382	38
Worthington Pump	135	93,994,066	88,848,553	−5
Congoleum-Nairn	134	82,319,003	43,062,762	38
Celanese	171	104,197,237	171,292,005	65
United States Steel	185	1,740,464,055	2,293,357,286	32
Average increase	289			87

TABLE NO. 3.—*Since 1945—Comparison of percent increase in profits, sales, and wages*

Corporation	Percent increase in profits	Percent increase in sales	Percent increase in wages
Ronson	822	337	41
Koppers	205	75	46
Swift	109	77	39
Lionel	730	137	48
General Motors	249	82	31
Westinghouse	150	38	48
Worthington Pump	135	−5	38
Congoleum-Nairn	134	33	53
Celanese	171	64	44
United States Steel	185	32	53
Average	289	87	44

All figures on profits and sales are taken from Moody's and Standard & Poor's financial manuals.

In summary, the report amply demonstrates the following:

1. Since the end of the war, net profits, after taxes, for 10 of the largest corporations in the Essex-West Hudson area with whom CIO local unions have collective-bargaining agreements have increased an average of 289 percent, while wages earned by the workers employed by these same corporations have risen only 44 percent.

2. While the profits for these 10 corporations, since the end of the war, have increased 289 percent their gross sales revenue has increased only 87 percent. In view of the fact that management has been universally deploring its increased costs of operation—citing such factors as increased material, labor, and tax costs—it is now obvious that the higher rate of profits is reflected only because these 10 corporations have indulged themselves in a not inconsiderable amount of price gouging and profiteering.

It is very difficult to understand, for instance, how the Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp. could sustain a 5-percent drop in gross sales revenue from 1945 to 1949 yet, simultaneously, enjoy a 135-percent increase in profits during the same period of time.

3. In its proper light, industry's rather persistent claim that labor is responsible for increased prices and the high cost of living now appears as ridiculous as it actually is. Management has continually increased prices far above the commensurate percentage increase in costs caused by the wage boost. Even if we assume that prices must be raised because of wage increases—a false assumption as this report obviously demonstrates—it is apparent that management has used every conceivable opportunity to blame its workers for industry's profiteering schemes.

4. Workers' wages have been left far behind by prices and profits in the current economic race. In terms of purchasing power, a worker today has made no gains whatsoever during the past 5 years.

5. The future prospects for wage earners are gloomy. While the cost of living continues to zoom upward, wages are being frozen and workers are being forced to accept a completely disproportionate burden in the current emergency.

6. The future prospects for corporations were never better. Profits earned and dividends paid by United States corporations in 1950 have broken every record in the financial history of the country. From every indication, 1951 will be still another record-breaking year.

While this report is confined to a local level, it is a reasonably safe estimate that the figures contained herein are typical of the national scene. The following conclusions, therefore, must be reached:

1. A continuation of the freeze on wages, until glaring inequities pointed out herein have been eliminated, is an undue hardship upon all wage earners and will cause a serious dislocation in our national economy.

2. Because price-gouging and profiteering have been standard operational procedures since the end of the OPA, rigid price controls and a stiff excess-profits tax must be levied immediately if we are to put an end to our inflationary spiral.

3. There will be no equality of sacrifice if workers alone are asked to tighten their belts and sacrifice, while corporations enjoy the luxury of profits and business as usual.

Moral Training of Our Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Latrobe (Pa.) Bulletin. This editorial is timely. One of the great problems confronting the Nation is the moral standards of its people. This editorial

gives an insight into what is needed in our education system—moral training of our children. It follows:

Citing the increase of mental maladjustment and increase in divorce, suicide, and crime rates, Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, head of New York State University, reaches the conclusion that American education and home training are failing. He calls for a reexamination of the Nation's entire school system.

This is an old and frequently enunciated theme—that the schools and the homes are responsible for moral decline in America. Some blame what they assert they see on the politicians, but that seems a trifle far fetched. After all, the politicians simply reflect the voters of America.

How is the moral regeneration of America to be effected through the schools and the homes? No one ever says exactly. The schools and the homes turn out a certain product, generation after generation.

In the early days of the Republic it was one kind of product. At the turn of the century, before all the gadgets were invented and the high standard of living captured the fancy as the first of all considerations, there was a slightly different product.

Now the homes and the schools are turning out a product that is described as the end result of years of subscription to materialism—or the high standard of living—and some observers don't like what they see.

The way to dilute materialism is to introduce cultural and spiritual factors, make them seem more desirable than a high standard of living alone, comfortable and inviting as that is.

Perhaps the teachers can start such a trend in the schools and homes will fall into line. But, as the teachers are themselves members of this materialistic generation, it is possible that they will grope in vain for the starter button. But it is important that we keep trying.

No More Third Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Bordentown Register of March 2, 1951, a weekly newspaper that is published in my district. I think the editorial provides excellent food for the thoughtful consideration of all Members of Congress.

NO MORE THIRD TERMS

So now there will be no more third-term Presidents in the United States. This may be a very wise move and it may be a very foolish one. It always seems foolish to us to tie our hands with laws, when none are needed.

Until Franklin D. Roosevelt became President no other Chief Executive was ever in danger of being elected for a third term. Most of the Republican Presidents in the last 50 years have been fortunate to survive one term let alone three. Considering the terrific strain of the Chief Executive's job, most Presidents are glad to surrender their chains at the end of 8 years, if death has not claimed them before that.

Until recently New Jersey had a law limiting the Governor's stay to one term. Many times we had good Governors who could have done excellent work for the people of New Jersey had they been allowed two or three terms to promote their programs. Under the new constitution that has been changed so that a Governor can serve at least two terms.

Strong men make good executives whether they serve one, two, three, or four terms. When a strong man is not permitted to serve in an executive position he will serve behind the scenes for an indefinite period of time. We prefer him where we can see him in action.

The same principle applies to the matter of a law requiring Congress to O. K. the sending of armed forces outside the country in peacetime. The world we live in is an ever-changing one. Where once the oceans were our bulwarks today they are no more than rivers. What happens in Korea, or Tibet, or even in Iran is of vital importance to America, because it foretells a trend of which we must take notice.

Prohibition was one of those laws which seemed reasonable, but was not so good. We never know just how these laws will work until after we get them in action. Afterward it takes a long time to get rid of them. At the present time the no-third-term seems innocent since we doubt if Harry Truman would want a third term, let alone get one. But will we regret it sometime hence?

Why I Voted To Liquidate the RFC Back in 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1947, Congress had before it a bill to extend the life of the RFC. At that time I opposed that extension.

Recent disclosures about the RFC constrain me to renew my efforts to liquidate this agency, which has long outlived its usefulness.

Members sincerely concerned about the RFC breakdown of integrity and its effect on public confidence may find my analysis 4 years ago helpful.

Here it is from volume 93, part 6, page 7623, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, the RFC was created in 1932 when private credit facilities of the country were close to temporary paralysis. Its operations served to bridge the gap caused by that paralysis and to help restore private credit agencies to normal operation. In that emergency period the RFC served a critical and useful economic function.

However, in the final analysis the true test of whether or not that experiment in Government credit was successful will be determined by the ability of Congress to eliminate this instrument of state capitalism at the appropriate time.

It is my conviction that the appropriate time for the withdrawal of the RFC from the lending field has arrived. Bank deposits and currency outstanding in America as of April 30, 1947, approximated $165,000,000,000. This is not far from the highest amount of cash and credit available in our history. This cash and credit should furnish an adequate reservoir of capital for all justifiable private credit purposes.

If that is so active, continuation of the RFC will almost certainly result in Government competition with private credit facilities for the loaning of funds.

The impression has been created that this bill represents a rigid contraction of RFC lending and investment activities. Compared with the unlimited grants of power given the RFC during the war, that statement is correct. Compared with the prewar peacetime operation of the RFC, the statement seems somewhat overdrawn.

On December 31, 1938, the year end following the crisis in industry and finance, the RFC had loans outstanding of $1,719,602,000. This bill provides the RFC with $2,000,000,000 of loaning power, or more than the RFC was using at the end of 1938, when we were still in the valley of depression.

So it is perhaps significant that 14 years after the paralysis period the RFC is being continued on a basis which provides loans and advances up to $2,000,000,000.

Furthermore, as a matter of record, the loans and advances of the RFC on March 31, 1947, only amounted to $1,716,000,000. On this basis the RFC continues its operations with lending power substantially in excess of that in use as of the end of the first quarter of 1947.

The rise in the number of employees of this bureau affords a side view of the scope of its activities. On June 30, 1939, the RFC had 4,090 employees. On April 30, 1947, it had 7,892 employees. For an agency supposedly diminishing, as we get further and further away from the credit paralysis of 1933, this is a strange contradiction in employment totals.

Some members of the committee were satisfied that the hearings gave us adequate information on the operation of this public-credit colossus. I did not share in that conclusion. The committee heard only one witness, the present Chairman of the RFC Board.

The importance of a comprehensive understanding of the activities of the RFC by the House was pointed out by the Comptroller General in House Document No. 316, Eightieth Congress, first session:

"The desirability of financing the activities of RFC through borrowings has not been questioned in this report, but it should be pointed out that the Congress could improve its control over the enterprise through the requirement that its capital be supplied through appropriation rather than through borrowings."

As a factual matter, the Congress will be by adoption of this bill in the position of authorizing, without specific appropriation or further congressional action, Federal lending and investment up to $2,000,000,000, based upon hearings during which only one man was heard and that was the Government official heading the agency. Letters from Jesse Jones and Herbert Hoover were read into the hearings, and this was the only other evidence the committee obtained.

Perhaps the committee had adequate information to give carte blanche approval to the operations of the RFC, but to me that approval consisted quite largely as an act of faith.

The Comptroller General in a letter to the RFC Board of Directors in June 1946, after 8 months of examination of RFC records, declared:

"Nor do these records afford an adequate basis for a satisfactory report of the discharge of important operating and fiscal responsibilities assumed by the companies or a satisfactory report of the discharge of the aggregate responsibility of the top management for any period."

On July 31, 1946, in House Document No. 674, the Comptroller General, reporting to Congress on the audit of the RFC then in progress by his Office, listed the following specific failures in the accounting functions of the RFC:

First. The Company does not control its $7,000,000,000 investment in property.

Second. The Company does not control its $800,000,000 investment in inventories of Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, and U. S. Commercial Company.

Third. The Company does not control its cash receipts.

Fourth. The Company does not control rentals earned on its properties.

Fifth. The Company does not control certain important liabilities.

Sixth. The Company does not control recoveries due it on plant extensions built for utility companies.

Seventh. The Company does not control its surplus property disposal activities.

Eighth. The Company has no control over the activities of its affiliate, U. S. Commercial Company.

I have inquired of the Comptroller General to find out whether in the ensuing period he has had any occasion to revise these findings, and I quote from his letter to me on June 4, 1947:

"The views of the General Accounting Office concerning accounting of the RFC and other matters, as expressed in House Document No. 674 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, remain unchanged."

To agree to the active continuation of the RFC now the House must subscribe to the belief that private credit in the United States cannot operate without a public credit crutch at a time when American business is in the biggest boom in its history. I am unable to accept that conclusion. Further, it appears somewhat strange that we should be, in official oratory, at least, opposing the nationalization of credit in foreign lands while continuing to countenance its growth in this country.

To pass this measure in its present form the House must subscribe to the belief that politically selected money lenders, using other people's savings, can loan money with more wisdom and competence than private individuals and groups using their own funds. It must subscribe to the belief that the Government has a right to use arbitrarily assessed tax funds for risk-capital purposes in private enterprise.

To continue the RFC the House must subscribe to the belief that either an emergency exists in the field of private credit or that the private credit facilities of the Nation are so defective or so puny that an instrument of state capitalism must permanently both umpire and play in the contest of supplying credit to private enterprise. I cannot agree to this conclusion.

In its present lending to business firms, the RFC is doing one of three things (1) making loans that private credit institutions find economically unsound; (2) competing unfairly with private capital; or (3) making political loans.

This is not a healthy situation even though there may be a great number of private banks in this country who currently welcome the credit-crutch facilities made available by the RFC.

In the competitive-enterprise system there should be enough competition among the banks to see that every reasonably sound loan is made. If present laws prevent such loans from being made for one reason or another, such as capital requirements of small-town banks, then changes should be made in our banking laws to permit private credit to become mobile enough to supply such needs.

When the RFC makes loans that private institutions will not make, it imposes a judgment that overrules the competitive operation of the natural economic laws. It interferes with the operation of financial institutions whose progress and profits depend upon their ability and willingness to make every reasonably sound loan.

Mr. Chairman, theoretically the House has four alternatives before it on the RFC.

One is to do as the other body did, extend it for 1 year without change. That procedure seems utterly indefensible in a Congress pledged to get the Government out of business, to eliminate unnecessary bureaus, and to bring about economy in Government.

A second alternative is to abolish the RFC entirely. I am not inclined to favor that course. However, there is a significant body of opinion in this country that believe that to be the sound procedure, based upon the fact that the RFC was set up to tide us over an emergency and the emergency is over. Rather than the continuance provided in this bill, I believe the RFC should be liquidated.

A third alternative is the one selected by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is to continue this agency more or less indefinitely, although the stated period of the bill is 2 years, and leave it possessed with tremendous powers although shorn of the utterly fantastic wartime grants of power.

A fourth alternative is to preserve the RFC as a skeleton organization, as an instrument of public credit that could be reactivated in the event of another emergency. This was the course that I had hoped the committee would take in its action on this bill.

By retaining this agency on a stand-by basis the House would be preserving its utility in the case of another emergency.

In this way the potential usefulness of the RFC could be continued, but the evils which it brings into the normal operation of our private credit facilities would be ended.

In closing I want to point out to the House that this bill continues in the hands of the RFC, a politically controlled credit agency, vast powers to influence the course of economic affairs in this Nation.

For some time we have been in the throes of inflation, yet the RFC with continued power can add fuel to inflation by financing enterprises which are unsound credit risks.

While the bill provides that the RFC will not provide financial assistance unless financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, this provision is open to many interpretations. For example, in its current operations the RFC loans money at 4 percent. This interest rate alone has operated as an inflationary factor in the economy. It has undoubtedly encouraged the establishment of businesses that would not otherwise come into being at the height of a war-created boom.

It seems probable that the lending operations of the RFC have helped to accentuate the length and intensity of the present business boom. As a consequence, the bust—when it comes—will be of greater proportions than without the peacetime operations of the RFC in the field of private credit.

If that conjecture proves correct, then the peacetime RFC will have gone a long way toward nullifying its emergency usefulness.

If the Congress means business when it orates about eliminations of unnecessary bureaus the RFC is a good place to start. The creeping socialization that this agency is facilitating has no place in a Nation that owes its greatness to a genuine system of privately operated enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that only three Republican Congressmen voted to end RFC at that time.

Rubber Stamp Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the Congress continues to permit the executive department to usurp its functions it will become a rubber-stamp Congress, a useless expensive branch of the Federal government.

That some folks in the South realize we are well on our way toward that end is evidenced by an address from the Southern Conservative, Fort Worth, Tex., of February, which reads as follows:

PROVISIONS IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES ON LIMITATION OF POWER REPEALED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER—USURPATION OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY BEGUN BY ROOSEVELT REACHES PEAK UNDER THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

Harry S. Truman, who frequently suffers with the delusion that he is a Roman Emperor rather than an elected president of a constitutional republic, has announced that while he is perfectly willing for Congress to discuss the matter, he alone will make the decision about whether or not American troops will be sent to Europe and in what numbers.

No ruler is bigger than the written constitution of the country over which he presides and when usurpation of power by an arrogant leader is tolerated, it marks the first step toward the crumbling and decay of a sovereign state.

In our case, limitation of power was the most serious concern of the founders of the Republic and they put this safeguard into the Constitution of the United States in order that no political bantam rooster might ever be able to mount the public rostrum and boast of his power over the purse and the people.

Accordingly, they set up the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of Government with the powers of each specifically defined, with no overlapping jurisdictions, and in no case was it intended that one branch would arrogate to itself the authority and power bestowed by the Constitution on another.

Because of wholesale violations of these provisions of the Constitution in recent years, Congress has been compelled to surrender its power not only to the Executive, but to the judicial department of Government which frequently stepped in to pinch hit for Congress by passing social legislation, through judicial decisions, when Congress had failed, or refused, to pass such measures.

The action of the judiciary, however, in usurping power belonging exclusively to Congress deals only with the destruction of the Constitution and of our form of government, and the breaking down of our American institutions.

But the usurpation of power by the Executive in which the President purposes to declare war and send troops around over the world according to his own sweet will, involves human lives and it is to this phase of the violation of constitutional provisions that the American people should first address themselves.

Handicapping any attempts at retrieving lost power now, however, is the shameful memory of how far another American President was allowed to go in the usurpation of power from a subservient and spineless Congress.

During the decade beginning in 1933 we witnessed the debasing spectacle of a majority of the Members of both Houses of our national law-making body trying to outcrawl each other in knuckling and kowtowing to Roosevelt's demands for must socialistic legislation instead of displaying the courageous manhood Americans are entitled to expect of their representatives, and throwing it back in his teeth.

It was during that time that the precedent was set for a President exercising power specifically delegated to Congress and transgressions along this line since then have been so steady and gradual that

a President today actually dares to rear up on his hind feet and defy Congress to do anything about it.

If we are able to read, the Constitution confers the authority to declare war, raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces solely on Congress and the President as Commander in Chief is empowered only to carry out the mandates of Congress.

Pending the time that the voters themselves get another whack at him, we think it high time that Congress rise up in its might and reclaim its surrendered powers, whittle the President down to his proper size and put him back in short pants.

An Invincible Air Force—The Key to Military Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if we are to survive as a Nation in the atomic age, we must recognize the fact that our military strength rests in an invincible Air Force. In support of this theory a brilliant speech was made to the membership of this House the other day by our distinguished colleague, Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, an able statesman and veteran of World War II. Mr. DORN's speech deserves the attention of every thinking American, and I am sure that Members who heard it in person, or were privileged to read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, were impressed with its logic and sound expressions of common sense. Mr. DORN's speech received wide coverage in the press of our country and was the subject of commentary by many distinguished newspaper and radio men, not the least among whom was Fulton Lewis, Jr. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith Mr. Lewis' comment, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of March 3, 1951:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

A Member of Congress believes our military leaders, with the exception of those in the Air Force, ought to be put out to pasture.

Admittedly a partisan of the fly boys, W. J. BRYAN DORN, South Carolina Democrat, says our Army and Navy brass are antiques. He pointed out that the three greatest military leaders in history, Napoleon Bonaparte, Alexander the Great, and Hannibal, all led armies before their mid-thirties.

The Congressman is convinced that only in the Air Force can an officer reach the rank of lieutenant general at the age of 27 years, which was Napoleon's (equivalent) rank and age when he overran Europe.

This backhand swipe at the paucity of youth in the top echelon of our military leaders is not the only irritating idea the Congressman passed along to the Pentagon.

DORN thinks a balanced military effort—with about equal expenditures on the Army, Air Force, and Navy—is a dangerous gamble with security. He wants Air Force prowess increased, with less emphasis on massive ground forces. He quotes some pretty fair experts to back up his opinion.

Lieutenant General Koller, of the German Air Force, who was on the receiving end of more bombing raids than he cares to remember, has this to say about air power:

"The nation that controls the air will control the sea lanes of the world, will control the continents of the world. It will be an interesting game to watch from the sidelines, the game of power politics. The nation that controls the air will control this world and dominate this world for the next hundred years."

For those military experts who scoff at too strong a dependence on air power, DORN recalls a few incidents in the past so we can judge the fallibility of the experts.

Prior to and during the last war military leaders at one time or another stepped up and opined that the United States Pacific Fleet was invincible; that Japan would collapse in 6 weeks; that Hitler would not last through the winter of 1939; that the French Maginot line was impregnable; that the Nazis would never reach Paris; and that American boys would never be sent to Europe.

There are others, including the passionate propagandists who promised that the United Nations would make peace secure; and that Uncle Joe Stalin was the kind of guy we could all get along with after the war.

The Congressman admits that it might be a little unfair pulling the record on the experts now, but he says he is a young man and wants to enjoy life for a few years.

DORN wants to build an Air Force of 5,000 heavy bombers. This can be done with $17,000,000,000, which is considerably less than what we will be spending in Europe on relief and military aid.

Once we get the bombers, DORN wants the President to notify Stalin that we're all set and one false move will bring on an avalanche of atom bombs.

Russia has concentrated on a large land army. DORN is convinced we can only match the threat with an overwhelming concentration on air power.

He points out that the two greatest eras of peace in history were created by the powerful Roman legions and by the British fleet. No one for 500 years dared take on the Romans, and for 400 years the British Navy kept the world in order. Now, in DORN's opinion, air power is not only peace power but economy as well.

In 1947 DORN stepped up and demanded the biggest Air Force the world had ever seen. He said then that the only way to halt Russia was from the air.

For his pains Vishinisky, Russian representative at the United Nations, put DORN's name at the top of a list of Americans the Kremlin considered the world's worst warmongers.

Nothing since has aroused the Russians so much as DORN's speech in 1947. They got almost as mad in 1950 when he proposed using Marshall plan funds for building up the Air Force.

Apparently what they fear most is a powerful United States Air Force, several times bigger than the one being planned today. The Russians, also, have talked to a few German generals and they know just how rough a United States bombing attack can be.

Address by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the following remarks by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri at graduation exercises, Beth Israel Hospital School of Nursing, Stuyvesant Square East at Sixteenth Street, New York City, on Wednesday, February 28, 1951:

Mr. Silver, Dr. Frank, Miss Casey, distintinguished guests, parents, friends, and graduates of the class of 1951, my presence here this evening as guest speaker at these graduation exercises—I must admit—is due largely as tribute to a great New Yorker and American, one of our city's outstanding business leaders, who will be remembered for generations to come by his grand deeds of philanthropy in helping the sick and the poor and the underprivileged.

No man in our town better symbolizes the sterling qualities that have made our city great than the man who for a quarter of a century has been closely associated with this hospital, whose growth and development in the last 62 years has so many parallels to the growth and development of New York City.

When Charles H. Silver, early in 1947, took over the greater responsibilities as president of Beth Israel on the passing to his eternal reward of the hospital's honored and beloved president, David L. Podell, he had already been closely identified with the work—the joys and the sorrows of Beth Israel Hospital—for more than a score of years.

Beth Israel Hospital has had a glorious history—since its founding back in 1890 by a small group of immigrants, joined together in the humanitarian venture that was to become this great voluntary institution which today treats many thousands of patients, regardless of race, creed, color, or ability to pay.

The growth of Beth Israel Hospital under the aegis of David Podell, Charles Silver, and their associates is truly an affirmative answer to the ancient Biblical query: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

The question that always mystifies us is how great men, how busy men, find time to do so much. Guiding the destinies of a busy enterprise such as this would seem to be occupation enough for one man, but not for Mr. Silver. For him to be his brother's keeper means not only to help those of his own religious persuasion, but he lends his talents and time to all. He is one of Cardinal Spellman's close friends and associates, and for years has been spearhead and a directing genius of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation, which has constructed a large addition over at St. Vincent's Hospital, not too far from here, in memory of the Happy Warrior of our city and State.

Only recently President Truman appointed Mr. Silver the New York State member of the Internal Security Commission, of which Admiral Chester Nimitz is the chairman and whose roster is a veritable "Who's Who" of American religious, professional, business, and governmental leaders.

I am sure that the nurse graduates of Beth Israel—the good doctors and nurses who brought them through their arduous studies, their able and illustrious Director of Nursing Clare M. Casey, their parents who anxiously are awaiting that their diplomas be conferred upon them, and the guests and friends here

tonight—will forgive the time I have consumed in paying tribute to Beth Israel's top administrator.

Let me make it clear that Mr. Silver is not looking for a Commissioner's job although his rare abilities would grace any administration. I have been looking for a chance to tell the world what a truly great public benefactor he is.

I have always rather liked the words of Thomas Paine, one of our founding fathers, and I should like to use them as my text this evening:

"I love the man that can smile in trouble," Tom Paine said, "that can gather strength in distress and grow brave by reflection. 'Tis the business of little minds to shrink, but he whose heart is firm, and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death."

Our busy, harried world with its swift strides in economic evolution and confusion, but with it all, social progress and particularly medical advancement sorely needs men and women who "can smile in trouble, gather strength from distress, and grow brave by reflection."

Around us everywhere there is need for abiding principles and ideals which we may pursue in our life's work, and unto death.

Graduation exercises too often are ponderous and dull, particularly where the guest speaker is concerned, and I hope that I shall not err too greatly on that score.

Nothing I shall say from here on is more important than a few words to the parents and families for whom this is the occasion they have eagerly awaited for 3 long years.

What worries and misgivings have been theirs. What sacrifices they have made. How proud they are tonight that one of their own is now and forevermore enrolled in one of man's nobler professions, for truly nursing is such a calling.

Helping a patient back to physical strength and well-being must give an inner satisfaction that is associated with few other types of work.

Nursing is a vocation as old as the history of man. It may rightfully be called an art, and as with the other arts, it has continued to develop, improve, and flourish until today it may be said that those who have mastered the craft of nursing are indeed professional artists in their own right.

In A History of Nursing by Sellew and Neusse, good nursing care is described as "a service which alleviates physical and mental suffering, shortens the period of illness, and increases the chance of recovery."

These are few words, indeed, with which to describe a life's work. Yet, it means that you graduates have selected a field wherein lies a golden range of opportunity for service to your fellow man.

Your American Journal of Nursing, the bible of your profession, has expressed a standard for nurses as follows:

"You should be strong, because people depend on you. You should be steady and self-reliant for you will many times be charged with heavy responsibilities. You should have a spirit of service and a sincere interest in human beings of all classes and kinds. Finally, you should be tactful, have a good sense of humor, be resourceful and always dependable."

So much has been written about your fascinating profession that one could go on ad infinitum and ad nauseum in quoting therefrom, but I should like to repeat just a few lines from Nursing in Modern Society by Mary Ella Chayer, former associate professor of nursing education at Teachers College, Columbia.

"The nursing profession," according to this authority, "is one of those human institutions that is more sensitive to its social environment than any other group, because its purpose and methods are close to the everyday problems and needs of the people."

You, the graduates of this fine school of nursing, have learned the truth of this statement from your own experiences in the classrooms and on the wards of this hospital and from the other hospitals with which you may have been affiliated.

The great Jewish philosopher, Maimonides, in a dissertation on the universe stated that the "ideal sets the sphere in motion." He was, of course, referring primarily to the universe, itself, but in the last analysis what he said applies most aptly to the sphere of nursing activity.

From the very beginnings of our present system of nurse education, it has been the high ideals of the leaders of your profession that have set in motion and widened the sphere of nursing progress.

While nursing care, or as more accurately stated, ministering to the sick, dates back to the very beginnings of man's endless struggle against pain, pestilence, disease, and death, nursing as a profession only today is assuming its rightful place in medical science.

Nursing education has come a long way since 1873 when the first three nurses' training schools in the United States, based on the Nightingale plan of training, were established. Incidentally, one of these three original schools was the one set up at nearby Bellevue Hospital.

Back in those days, a probationer or student nurse, with neither formal schooling nor much in the way of theoretical or practical experience in her one year's apprenticeship, was set to work in a hospital ward, usually without supervision.

Today's nurse's candidate, following her high-school graduation, must attend a school of nursing for three full years and following her graduation, must keep abreast of almost daily discoveries in medical procedures and nursing techniques. The highly technical duties performed by the modern "women in white" were not dreamed of by nurses 75 years ago.

And yet, despite these great advances, there has not been sufficient public awareness of the role played by the professional nurse in our far-advanced and rapidly expanding medical frontiers.

There still are sections of the country where nurses do not enjoy the shorter work-week and the salary levels that obtain in less skilled and nonprofessional categories.

In our own city, both the voluntary and municipal hospitals have done much in recent years to raise the economic level of nursing personnel commensurate with the essential and high service your profession renders.

The Beth Israel Hospital School of Nursing is one of the best in the country. Conducted under the able direction of Miss Casey, an outstanding nurse educator and administrator, it has kept apace in its curriculum with the most advanced studies in the profession. Your school of nursing is accredited by the State Education Department of New York and is fully approved by the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Hospital Association.

Before closing, I should like to thank Mr. Silver, his board of trustees, and his medical and nursing staffs for alerting all the resources of this great hospital and placing them at the call of the city of New York in its civil defense preparedness program.

Civil defense is something in which all of us must be joined. Although our national leaders are doing everything within their power to bring sense to the crazed war lords of Communist dictatorships, and though we pray to God that we be spared destruction by modern science's hellish weapons, civil defense preparedness is necessary and essential in these critical days.

Nurses, of course, are important in every phase of civil defense activity and they must take leadership in this vital undertaking.

Sir William Osler, great physician and spirit of our age, in addressing a nurse graduation exercise at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore in 1891 said to these sisters of yours of a few generations ago:

"Useful your lives shall be as you will care for those who cannot care for themselves, and who need about them in the day of tribulation, gentle hands, and tender hearts."

Some years later at a farewell dinner in our own city at the old Waldorf Hotel back in May 1905, Osler, in the memorable address in which he reviewed his philosophy of life, said in closing:

"I have made mistakes but they have been mistakes of the head and not of the heart. I can truly say, and I take upon myself to witness, that in my sojourn with you:

> "I have loved no darkness
> Sophisticated no truth
> Nursed no delusion
> Allowed no fear."

With this, the simple credo of a great mind, I salute the class of 1951 of the Beth Israel Hospital School of Nursing.

You are on the threshold of a great career of service to your fellow man.

May you in your life's work hold high the ideals of your profession.

And let me end this on the keynote of my opening remarks.

If you apply the education and the training obtained here at Beth Israel as selflessly as Mr. Silver and Mr. Podell before him—and emulate their high ideal of service to their fellow man—you truly will have been your brother's keeper.

To a higher trust none of us can aspire, because that is the command of the divine Ruler who rules us all.

Man in the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article written by Peter Edson for the Washington Daily News. This article is a personality sketch of W. Elmer, Chairman of the RFC Board of Directors, and my fellow townsman from Shawnee, Okla. In the light of everything else being said and printed these days about the RFC, I am sure my colleagues will be interested to know more about the man who now holds the heavy responsibility of carrying on this vital and important governmental agency.

The article follows:

MAN IN MIDDLE

(By Peter Edson)

Man caught in the middle of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT'S investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) is W. Elmer Harber, RFC Chairman since a couple of days after his appointment as a Director last October. All the stuff about $8,500 mink coats and alleged attempts at influence peddling through the White House happened before Mr. Harber arrived. He has tried to keep out of the whole mess. But his job now is to clean it up.

Ask him what's in those hundreds of letters from Congressmen which the White House requisitioned from RFC files, and Mr. Harber says: "I don't know. I never saw them and I don't want to see them."

As an afterthought he supposes that a lot of those letters should have been thrown in the wastebasket. That's how fresh and unspoiled his viewpoint is on Washington, where a letter from a Congressman has more weight than the tablets of stone handed Moses on Mount Sinai.

President Truman drafted Elmer Harber to try to straighten out some of RFC's troubles. This was shortly after Senator FULBRIGHT began kicking up a fuss on RFC's $37,500,000 loans to Lustron Corp., which later went bankrupt.

Mr. Harber had been Democratic national committeeman for Oklahoma. First thing he knew about the job was last July, when he found himself in the White House arguing with the President on why he shouldn't take it. He lost the argument. His draft is for 2 years.

Six months in Washington still haven't convinced him he wouldn't like to go back to Oklahoma. When an old friend came to see him recently, the parting was, "Don't let 'em get you in jail up here." Mr. Harber's reply was, "Sometimes I think jail would be more comfortable."

The thing that appealed to Mr. Truman in appointing Mr. Harber RFC Chairman was his practical banking background. He is little, medium sized, and big banker, all three.

Forty years ago he went to work as janitor in the First National Bank of Seminole, Okla. Ten years later he was president and today he owns controlling interest of it. It's a $5,000,000 bank with a $350,000 capital account. He is also president and controlling owner of American National Bank, Shawnee, a $12,000,000 bank. And he's a director of Liberty National Bank of Oklahoma City, a $100,000,000 institution.

It is Mr. Harber's experience as a small-town banker that he has drawn on in trying to steer the reorganization of RFC. "When you go into a small-town bank and ask for a loan, you get the answer right away. Some applications have been hanging around here 3, 4, and even 5 months. And it takes that long again to disburse the money," he says.

The RFC Board used to meet twice a week. It now meets first thing every morning. Then it may meet another half-dozen times a day whenever there is anything to decide. Fees and interest rates have been hiked. Personnel regulations have been tightened.

Also, RFC's staff has been cut way back—saving the Government an estimated $5,000,000 a year. Thirty-one branch offices have been reduced to 10. Employees have been cut from 3,600 to 2,600.

It is some of these discharged employees, Mr. Harber believes, who have been feeding scandal to the Fulbright committee. The Chairman doesn't particularly object to that. On the whole, he thinks the investigation and its disclosures have been a good thing. They have shown what has to be done to set the house in order.

Opposing Drafting of 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Advertiser, Boston, Mass., March 4, 1951, by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston:

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD DRAFT OPPOSED ON MORAL, RELIGIOUS GROUNDS

(By the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D.)

I wholeheartedly oppose the drafting of 18-year-olds into the Armed Forces on moral and religious grounds.

I oppose this conscription because many, many of these boys will go into the military or naval forces as good, honest, moral, religious young men—and many will come out immoral, dishonest, irreligious, heavy drinkers, gamblers, and plain "no good."

Everyone who knows anything about what happens to a green boy when he is plunged into unbridled life within the Armed Forces knows this to be true.

The temptations that come to a more mature man are great enough, but what these temptations accomplish among the immature are horrifying.

Please do not misunderstand. Many, many of our finest and greatest men are products of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Life in the Armed Forces can accomplish wonders for some men.

But what I am talking about is the green boy who lives next door or down the street, who has been brought up in a sheltered atmosphere and knows little or nothing about life.

Let us assume that he knows little about the temptations he will face when he is inducted. In most cases this is true.

Then let us assume further that he is drafted. Pretty soon he begins to rub elbows with a few of the human vultures who prey on the innocent.

Within a period of months he is a changed person. He becomes lax in his religious practices, be he Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish. He starts to gamble, to drink, to become immoral. He may enter into a hasty marriage.

All of these hazards do in fact exist in civilian life. But they are peculiarly more insistent and more insidious in military life, especially for those who are not fully mature.

To those who feel that the ordinary religious and moral instructions which our boys receive are adequate for the situations which they will confront in military life, I recommend a reading of the pamphlets distributed by the military authorities concerning some phases of morality of World War II.

These pamphlets can give moral shocks and create confusion in young minds that have been brought up on high ideals.

Unfortunately parents are not so well aware of these moral and religious hazards in military life as they are in civilian life.

So I am taking this opportunity to point out to them that unless positive methods can be taken to improve to a very considerable degree the moral climate of military life, the official pamphlets, posters, and movies that are issued will continue to do as much as they have been in the past.

I am firmly convinced that 18-year-olds will be drafted. They want them and they are going to get them.

In that case, I, for one, prefer to have these hazards brought to teen-age boys before induction into the service. In that way it would be possible to cushion somewhat that moral shock, to the extent of pointing out the insidious philosophy that underlies these visual aids and to show the important part that God and religion can play in strong motivation to clean living in or out of military life.

I have no complete program to suggest, merely some ideas and suggestions which I hope will enable religious leaders of all faiths to develop more clearly under discussion.

For example, I suggest an organized program in the schools as a good way to meet the problem.

At a time when young men are only a few months away from induction into military service they may be expected to be reasonably interested in all phases of this new and different life which they are soon to enter.

Why should they not be particularly receptive to religious and moral instructions which are directly pointed to that life?

In a way, it can be a preview of that life in its moral and religious phases at a time when they have not so many other distractions. Once they are inducted into service there are so many new things to learn and so many new duties to be fulfilled that whatever instruction a chaplain may be able to give is in danger of going in one ear and out the other.

Therefore, I suggest to Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders to consider this fact:

From the standpoint of timing and psychology, some preinduction religious and moral indoctrination would seem to have advantages over whatever the chaplains may be able to do after induction.

Conservation: United States Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Bertram on the subject of conservation as it applies to our United States parks. There is no doubt that attempts are being made to change our long-established policy on this subject. Congress should be alerted to this danger to which this article calls our attention. The article, from the New York Times of March 4, 1951, follows:

CONSERVATION: UNITED STATES PARKS—DEBATE OVER DINOSAUR MONUMENT RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT LONG-RANGE POLICY

(By John Bertram)

In the ousting of Newton B. Drury as Director of the National Park Service, the country loses (as of April 1) a valued public servant, and the Department of the Interior an effective conservationist. The circumstances surrounding Mr. Drury's impending departure have—rightly or wrongly—aroused grave apprehension over the future of the national park system. There are two major reasons why this is so, and the current battle over the Dinosaur National Monument illustrates both of them.

Originally a tiny tract set aside to preserve some prehistoric fossils (hence the name), the Monument was in 1938 enlarged to 190,000 acres for the express purpose of preserving from exploitation some of the most spectacular canyon wilderness left in the United States. But the Bureau of Reclamation has chosen two sites within the confines of the monument for the construction of tremendous dams which would still the rushing waters, deface the canyon sides, and alter forever the wild and untamed character of this rare bit of primeval America.

Qualified engineers have pointed out that the selection of certain alternate sites outside the monument might result in greater water storage and more power development at smaller cost. Mr. Drury vigorously opposed invasion of the monument for construction of these ill-advised dams; but Secretary Chapman overruled him, and the final decision is now in the hands of Congress. It is impossible to avoid seeing the larger implications of the Dinosaur affair.

SETTING A PRECEDENT

In the first place, the invasion of a national park (or monument) for extraneous purposes not only is contrary to the spirit of the laws which established the parks, but also sets a precedent under which incalculable harm can be done to other units of the system. Particularly amid the strains and stresses of a national emergency, terrific pressures are brought to bear against the resources locked up in our national parks; and only resolute determination to prevent their exploitation (except perhaps in case of the most desperate crisis) can protect them for future generations.

The ground work is already being laid for an assault on the timber resources of the national parks and forests in the name of defense. If Congress should approve construction of the Dinosaur dams, it will release the floodgates for renewed attacks on many national parks—Grand Canyon and Glacier, to name but two that have already been threatened in the same manner. In a speech recalling the damming nearly 40 years ago of the Hetch Hetchy Valley in California, an Assistant Secretary of the Interior recently said:

"If somebody made a proposal today that we put a large dam at the foot of the valley here to flood Yosemite, * * * the howl of protest from over the entire Nation would be so tremendous such a proposal would not even be considered. I think we must have that same kind of support in other areas so that any time we have another Hetch Hetchy * * * the people * * * will immediately conduct a strong campaign to stop such activities."

If "howls of protest" should rise with sufficient strength, Congress may yet prevent the Interior Department from commiting at Dinosaur the very folly against which its own spokesman has sounded so eloquent a warning.

RECREATION QUESTION

Fear that the "park principle" may be violated more easily and more frequently in the future is, then, one reason why many conservationists are worried over Mr. Drury's forced resignation. The other fundamental reason revolves about the word "recreation."

Recreation, when applied to national parks, can mean the development of large-scale facilities for popular use, such as bathing, boating, and similar activities. But it can also mean the quiet and peaceful enjoyment of scenic grandeur, the contemplation of a lonely wilderness, camping beside white water, gaining spiritual values from nature far from the organization and appurtenances of our machine-made civilization.

Both forms of recreation are valid. But mass recreation—the recreation that implies elaborate equipment and extensive development—can be had anywhere, on a thousand man-made lakes behind a thousand man-made dams, in scores of State parks and playgrounds, in innumerable areas near cities, towns, and villages throughout the land. Facilities for this sort of recreation are necessary and desirable; but surely a small part of America should be left unspoiled for future generations.

Dinosaur Monument is one such place; and yet a Salt Lake City newspaper can say, "The reservoirs the dams will create will make available to the run of the citizenry the very sort of recreational facilities which * * * (the opposition) said they would destroy." Mr. Drury's departure may forebode a new stress on the promotion of organized recreation in our parks and monuments, and a slackening of interest in the preservation of untouched areas of wild and natural beauty for themselves alone.

NOTES

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, at its recent annual meeting, has urged the Government to require watershed control to be closely integrated into all large-scale dam-building activity in the future * * * The second volume to be published by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission is called "Water Resources Law." The "central fact" revealed by the study "is the lack of a unified Federal policy respecting the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related uses of land."

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Friday, March 2, 1951:

SEAWAY WOULD HURT NEW ENGLAND

As far as the St. Lawrence seaway is concerned, it's every man for himself, apparently. It's quite evident that not much thinking is being done in terms of the greatest good for the greatest number. Not especially, anyway. Take the steel industry, for example. Not so long ago, before depletion of Mesabi iron deposits was in prospect, the steel industry saw no particular reason why the seaway should be developed; it pointed to the tremendous cost of the project, and argued that small advantage would accrue to the country as a whole. But the steel industry has now reversed itself because its special interests will be served—and very handsomely—if the seaway is constructed. Labrador ore is the reason for the switch. Obviously, it would be far less costly to transport that ore by water than by water and rail, as will have to be done if the seaway doesn't get congressional approval. So steel is in there championing the cause of the seaway.

On the other side of the fence is the combined opposition of the eastern seaboard, which has a tremendous stake in the outcome of the battle, as battle it is. The ports of Boston and New York and eastern railroads, generally, would suffer huge annual losses because of the ocean traffic which would be diverted to the seaway. There would be a direct water route to the Midwest, and it is not hard to see what this would mean to coastal cities which have big investments in port facilities. Mayor Impellitteri, of New York, a vigorous opponent of the project, calls it a visionary and madcap scheme, but it isn't that, exactly, because it would have a practical value from the standpoint of Big Steel and other industries now remote from the sea. It would be better if the mayor admitted his sectionalism, which is nothing to be ashamed of, and attacked the project in terms of what it would cost New York.

In the first place, New York would have to bear its proportionate share of the billion-dollar outlay which the seaway would involve. This would not be so bad in itself, but the fact that it would undoubtedly have economic repercussions which would work a grievous hurt upon New York and other cities is another thing entirely. Neither New York nor Boston nor Baltimore nor Philadelphia can be expected to be jubilant about a project which, demonstrably, would react to their disadvantage. It seems to us that it would be nonsensical to expect to find in the eastern commonwealths the large stores of sacrificial zeal they would have to draw upon in order to put the concerns of Big Steel and the Midwest above their own. The very fact that the seaway would hurt the East, and seriously, is an excellent reason why the East should raise a clamor against it. Any project which has implicit in it such a burden of localized harm cannot be represented as universally beneficial.

As far as the steel industry is concerned, it will be remembered that it evinced little or no interest in the location of an integrated steel plant in the New England area. Such a steel plant would, of course, be good for New England industry, because it would reduce freightage and would thus narrow the competitive differential which has been, and is, a handicap to consumers of metal in this area. The steel industry, now faced with the prospect of having its margin of profit reduced by freight costs, is actually seeking to have itself subsidized out of its dilemma, and partially at the expense of the New England which it has consistently snubbed. Any New Englander would have to do a lot of concentrated thinking before he gave endorsement to the seaway proposal. It shapes up as one more obstacle in the way of New England's economic revival.

Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt which appeared on March 2, 1951, in the Washington Daily News:

REPRESENTATIVE CELLER'S BILL RATES DEMOCRATIC AND GOP SUPPORT

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Thursday.—There has been a very important bill introduced in the House by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

The heading on the bill, H. R. 2648, reads: "To require the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territories in the election of Representatives and for other purposes."

Representative CELLER says that the simple question before the House is whether its Members should represent all the people fairly and equally, or allow the present inequalities and injustices to continue. He feels that each citizen through his Congressman is entitled to an effective and equal voice in his Government.

It is usually the State legislatures, rather than Congress, that fix the times, places, and manner for holding elections for Senators and Representatives. But Mr. CELLER maintains that the Constitution also provides, "That Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the place of choosing Senators." Then he cites a case in which the Supreme Court in 1948 "held that it is within the power of Congress to set up standards which the State must follow in enacting reapportionment legislation."

It would seem to me, therefore, that this bill will force the States into a position where they will have to remedy any inequalities that may exist within the State.

The bill provides that each State entitled to more than one Representative shall establish a congressional district for each Representative, instead of simply electing a Congressman at Large as has sometimes been

done. It also provides that the district shall be composed of compact areas. This, of course, is designed to prevent the curious patterns that have been established in some States for political purposes and to make it impossible to maneuver the voters for political ends. This practice has been known as gerrymandering.

There also is a provision to make as fair as possible these divisions as to numbers of people voting in the different districts.

It seems to me that it is high time that some such regulation was passed, and I hope both Republicans and Democrats will join together to make it possible.

Problems That Confront Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in 7 of the 8 years I have served the people of the Fourth District of Nebraska as their Representative in Congress I have sought their reactions to the problems that confront our country by sending out a questionnaire. I have always received a good response, and many took the trouble to write letters. These questionnaires, I believe, serve two purposes; they bring me the private views of a larger number of people, as contrasted with the views of organizations that purport to represent them, and they stimulate more people to think about the problems that confront the country. I have an abiding faith in the good judgment of the people who live away from the confusing propaganda and pressures that pervade the very air you breath here in Washington. They feel and understand the basic concept of the freedom of the individual which our Government was set up to protect. They cherish their rights as individuals, and they resent the gradual encroachment of their Government upon them.

During the month just passed I sent 70,000 post cards to my district, about evenly divided between urban and rural addresses. On them we asked the following questions:

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

1. Should there be complete mobilization, including price controls, rationing, and wage freezes?
2. Do you favor universal military training?
3. Should the draft law have exemptions for farm boys, students, and other groups? Should 18-year-old boys be drafted?
4. Should we raise taxes and attempt to pay for the war as we go?
5. Should we eliminate the 40-hour week and overtime at extra pay?
6. Do you favor Federal aid to schools? Socialized medicine? Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?
7. Should we limit farm price supports?

FOREIGN PROBLEMS

1. How do you feel about the United Nations?
2. Should we send ground troops to defend Europe and other parts of the world?
3. Should we withdraw our troops from Korea? Where would you suggest we take a stand?
4. How large an Air Force, Army, and Navy would you recommend?
5. Should Marshall plan aid and the point 4 program (aid to backward countries) be continued?
6. Should we recognize Red China?

Mr. Speaker, you will note that some of them were phrased in a way that they could not be easily answered by "Yes" or "No." I purposely did this to encourage the people to write letters. I also asked them to write me. The interest shown and the letters received far exceeded my expectations. There were a much larger percentage than from any previous poll I have taken. In addition to elaborating on their answers to my questions many expressed themselves on the general situation that confronts us. Throughout the letters ran a note of grave concern—what is all this preparedness program going to do to us and to future generations? Huge taxes, controls and regulations, universal military training, spreading our resources all over the world, and meddling in the affairs of other nations will make profound changes in our way of life. Many wonder whether or not we can continue down this road and preserve our liberties. There are honest differences of opinion just as there are among the various groups of leaders in both political parties. All the letters expressed the desire for a strong America with strong Christian leadership. They want an end to confusion, corruption, and communism. They crave peace, security, and freedom from unnecessary Government interference with their daily lives.

On domestic issues, opinion was about evenly divided on the questions concerning complete mobilization, price control, and wage freeze. Many of those who favored going all out on these did so as a temporary expedient, but expressed a lack of confidence in the Government's ability to administer them with even-handed justice. The spread was a little greater on rationing—56 percent opposed. On universal military training 56 percent approved, but only as a temporary expedient; 59 percent opposed exemptions from the draft for farm workers and students; 64 percent were against drafting 18-year-olds. Most people were bitter at the leadership for the way it has led us to the very brink of war by its appeasement policy toward Communist countries and its sudden reversal to armed conflict when we were ill-prepared and lacked the support of real allies, all of which made necessary a decision on these matters. The people have an ingrained fear of the military.

While the opinion was unanimous that the budget should be cut deeply and Government waste eliminated, 68 percent favored increased taxes to put the rearmament program on a pay-as-you-go basis. There was strong condemnation of the administration's failure to make deep cuts in the budget for nondefense spending and its attempt to put over its socialistic program in the guise of defense spending. On the elimination of the 40-hour week and straight time for overtime, 75 percent voted "yes." Socialized medicine and the repeal of Taft-Hartley were opposed by more than 90 percent, and Federal aid to education by 66 percent. On elimination of farm price supports, 73 percent voted "yes." Many felt that the big bureaucracy needed to administer the program should be dispensed with now that agricultural prices are good.

In the field of foreign problems, 56 percent expressed the feeling that the United Nations had failed in its mission and must be reorganized if it is to justify the heavy financial support we are giving it. On sending more troops to Europe, 60 percent voted "no." Strong support was given to the proposals of former President Hoover; 52 percent wanted our troops withdrawn from Korea; 59 percent opposed continuing Marshall-plan aid and the point 4 program. Most unanimous was the 92 percent registered against the recognition of Red China. Many expressed themselves bitterly on this subject. One put it this way: "Should I shake hands with the man who has given my children poisoned candy and call him a friend?" As a result of this questionnaire, Mr. Speaker, I have a splendid cross section of the thinking of the folks in the Fourth District of Nebraska.

Like the people of my State, Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the future of my country. I am concerned about the secret commitments made at Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and other places in the world. I am convinced that the administration has not told us of the secret commitments made under the Atlantic Charter, especially on the arming of Europe. Even so, if the administration has committed us to sending six divisions to Europe, I feel it must be fulfilled. I agree with former President Hoover that it would be impossible to protect Europe with a land army. I believe we should have an Air Force strong enough to strike every military and industrial target in Russia and to protect us at home, and a Navy that can control the sea. We should not be wasting our resources on nations that do not have the courage and willingness to defend themselves. I am also concerned that the strain of supporting an Army of 3,500,000 men, a 100-group air force, and an adequate Navy will break the back of the taxpayer. While I believe we should help other countries in the matter of public health, preventive medicine, and food within our ability to do so, we should not spread ourselves so thin that we will lose our economic balance at home.

On the domestic scene I am convinced that the attempt to control prices and ration scarce materials is doomed to fail. Rising prices at this time are due to Government spending, scare buying induced by the way the situation has been handled, and by the administration's cheap-money policy, championed by the Secretary of the Treasury but opposed by the Federal Reserve Board. There is no indication that the administration will abandon its spending policy, nor tighten up on cheap money. Trying to control prices without destroying the causes of

inflation is like sitting on the valve without drawing the fire from under the boiler.

Deep in the heart of our people is a natural resentment to Government control of our economy. To accept it they must have great confidence in the judgment, honesty, and fairness of the administration. The sudden reversal of policy that threw us into a full-scale war in Korea, with a casualty list of more than 50,000, and the fear of another and larger debacle in Europe has raised a big question as to its judgment. The revelations concerning the tie-up between goverment and crime, the disclosures of political influence in obtaining RFC loans, the staffing of control agencies by political patronage, and the sale of jobs in at least one Southern State has destroyed confidence in its honesty and fairness. If we are to avoid disaster, the administration must quickly restore the confidence of the people. It must stop playing politics and bring to its aid those whose judgment they will trust. It must cut nonessential spending to the bone and clean out the influence peddlers and machine hangers-on. It must get rid of those whose soft policy toward communism has gotten us into this critical situation. Only by taking such drastic measures can it do this.

Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an open letter to the Congress of the United States, placed in leading newspapers of the Nation Sunday, March 4, 1951, by the Isbrandtsen Co., 26 Broadway, New York. I commend this letter to all Members of Congress:

To the Congress of the United States:

So that you will know, and knowing, you will consider, carefully investigate, and clarify the deliberately created hysteria in the Capitol of the United States other than the subject of high appropriations.

You have built a Frankenstein monster. Politics contributed to laying the foundation and foreign influences completed the job—like the vampire bat it has sucked the lifeblood from the veins of our way of life.

Public indignation and your investigations have proved that in this new era crime and rackets have penetrated public, social, and political life—Hollywood has glorified the easy way to glamor—legal confusion has contributed to disintegration—you stand in the Hall of Congress apparently confused and often imposed upon by pressure groups, State, National, and international—many beat the drums of war to divert public attention from realities to a magnetic sop of unpredictable spending, stimulating the selfishness of man both home and abroad.

The Nation reflects strong emotions of despair in mind, home, and business—your campaign promises and duties are often overlooked for the sake of a political Napoleonic grandeur—this is not inspiring to the people and business who pay the bills, and leaves ambition and life itself questionable.

We stand confused in our all-out policy of a global war that promises only destruction—isolationism carries the scourge of leprosy—you leave the path of nationalism under the guidance of foreign hyphenated groups in the name of world peace.

Today we are still muddling and meddling in the Orient. East is East and West is West—the twain has met. Backward China in the early 1860's warned the Occidentals "You are all too anxious to wake us up and start us on a new road, and you will do it, for, once awakened and started, we shall go fast and far—farther than you think, much farther than you want."

China fought its way out of a drugged stupor forced on her by opium wars, and today stands in defiance of Occidental rule. They have erected an Asian-Arab bloc of 1,500,000,000 peoples in declaration against and resentment of political, economic, and religious interference—they will create their own doctrine and will retain their culture and philosophy. The vast world markets cannot be regained or conquered by war, ambition, or intrigue by any nation, or by military action to force economic or religious issues or beliefs which will only increase hate and the determination amongst them.

The Orientals, by weight of numbers, believe they have a justification to exert their influence in settling the Korean question. Korea is in their sphere of race, religion, and culture and in the orbit of Oriental rule.

The United Nations cannot force Occidental rule over the Orient. There is no explanation of our purpose in a costly war in Korea.

We have debated for a long time the pros and cons of Nationalist China and the Peoples Government of China—our only offered solution and action to date is the growing possibility of an all-out war—even that is without explanation as to its intent.

High military authorities point out the folly of a losing undertaking. But, somewhere there is an influence in this destructive plan which invites our ultimate disaster. Many in Congress know of what we speak.

A much-questioned program was launched to deplete our manhood and treasure. This action was born out of resentment of the other fellow's beliefs and views. We followed an academic crystal-gazing philosophy without intelligence or understanding. We made many enemies and few friends by interfering in political and religious issues fostered by minority groups.

Today we are challenged by racketeers, socialism, and a crack-up of the American way of life. Through the valor of ignorance and folly, dreaming of riches, we entered a spirit of carnival time—the wisecracks of parasites of pleasure have supplanted the warnings and utterances of statesmen. In orgies and revelry we celebrate the birthdays of the founding fathers. This week Washington's advices and preachments will again be eulogized and disavowed. A new era is born. Social life dissipates its inheritance in sensationalism and in a toast to the dance of demoralization.

The world knows all this and encourages our disintegration—many will cheer the fall of modern Babylon. Those nations participating in draining our wealth will then have to end their Roman holiday and reluctantly go back to work.

The efforts of business and the people pay all costs of government; destroy their efforts and you destroy government. Every person in public life is a servant and employee of the taxpayer—no one is immune to the voice, vote, or will of the people.

You should declare a moratorium during which we might get back to stability, factual bookkeeping, and common sense.

Sanctions and arrogance have supplanted realization and understanding of the issues we in this country have had a large part in creating. On the seas we replace the flag of commerce with the flag of ships of war—make enemies instead of friends. Already our flag of commerce is denied access to more than half the world. Already we are the highest-cost country in the world. Regulations and sanctions add to the almost impossible task of us taking an intelligent part in the competition for foreign commerce.

It is universally known that understanding between nations and peoples is fostered by the bonds of industry and commerce—the necessary flow of goods that keeps the wheels turning all over the world—is basic to peace, and that mutual sanctions do precisely the opposite.

What has been done may not be undone, but is there no solution that our statesmen have to offer—is there no end in sight? The answer to that question, gentlemen, rests in your hands. The time is here—people are tired, confused, and searching for courageous leadership.

ISBRANDTSEN.

Treaty of Peace With Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution which I have introduced, and which Senator WATKINS introduced in the Senate yesterday, if passed, will relieve Italy of liabilities which it is under at the present time, and which prevent it from taking an effective part in the defense of liberties of Western Europe.

Denunciation of the Italian Peace Treaty will open the way for Italy to build up her own defense against Communist aggression and effectively contribute to the defense of the whole of Western Europe. It should substantially reduce the number of ground troops which the United States may be required to send to Europe.

The Italian Peace Treaty levied severe economic and territorial tribute on Italy. It deprived Italy of its armed strength and gave it in most part to Russia and her friends, thus weakening Italy and strengthening the military potential of the forces of communism.

The Italian Peace Treaty deprived Italy of certain territory along its borders and placed the inhabitants of that territory under the sovereignty of other nations without consulting the will of the people concerned. This was a violation of the spirit of the Atlantic Charter.

The Italian Peace Treaty placed severe limitations on the number of men who may serve in Italy's armed forces.

I believe that Italy should be allowed to more adequately arm herself and more effectively contribute to the defense against Communist aggression. Therefore, I urge the passage of this joint resolution.

Point 4 Agreements With Israel, Lebanon, and Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the State Department made three important announcements which constitute significant steps in the direction of raising the standard of living in the Near East and improving the economic stability of the area. Agreements have been reached with the State of Israel, Lebanon, and Jordan to undertake development projects in those countries under the point 4 program.

The agreement between the United States and Israel, signed at Hakirya (Israel) on February 26, 1951, by Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett and United States Ambassador Monnett B. Davis sets forth the conditions of cooperation prescribed by the Act for International Development of 1950, under which the point 4 program was authorized. Under the agreement the United States will send American experts to aid Israel in the development of specific projects, and a number of trainees will be brought to this country from Israel for the purpose of acquiring wider knowledge and experience in the specialized fields.

The State of Israel is anxious to obtain the help of American experts in connection with road construction, railways, irrigation methods, public-health services, citrus-fruit production, and technical training. Trainees from Israel are interested in learning methods and acquiring experience in the United States in deep-sea fishing, railways, ship repairing, the ceramic industry, and others. All of this would be extremely beneficial in the fulfillment of the 4-year plan of economic development of Israel, which aims to develop the country's resources, improve working conditions, and raise the standard of living of its population.

Israel has been making tremendous economic progress since its establishment as an independent state nearly 3 years ago. The United States was the first to recognize the independence of Israel, and since then the relations between the two countries have been most cordial and friendly. The new agreement, just completed, is a further example of the friendly relations and the spirit of cooperation between Israel and the United States.

The agreement between the United States and Lebanon calls for a technical mission of 12 specialists from the United States Department of Interior's Bureau of Reclamation to aid in the development of the Litani River. Specifically, the mission will make a survey for the power and irrigation development of the Litani. It will be recalled that in 1949 a United Nations Economic Survey Mission, headed by Gordon Clapp, visited Lebanon and recommended the development of the Litani River as a means of increasing the country's industrial and agricultural production. Among the major projects intended to raise the standard of living in Lebanon are the development of hydroelectric power and irrigation.

The agreement with Jordan, signed at Amman, paves the way for cooperative action to develop that country's resources and improve the standard of living of its people. Jordan has requested assistance in establishing a laboratory to handle technological problems, health, and research in agricultural and industrial chemistry. The United States will also aid in cleaning, repairing and enlarging cisterns, which are vital to this arid country.

Lebanon is about the size of Connecticut with a population of 1,200,000; Israel is somewhat smaller than Massachusetts with a population of 1,300,000; Jordan is somewhat larger than Maine and has 1,200,000 people. All of them are primarily agricultural countries, with much of the land under cultivation devoted to raising fruits, citrus fruits and the like. All of them have a serious deficiency in the production of certain foodstuffs, making it necessary for them to import large quantities of their food requirements. The agreements provide for specific development projects in these countries which will help to increase their agricultural output and to make them self-sufficient in feeding their populations.

This great accomplishment redounds to the credit of the United States. It is another example to other countries of what can be accomplished through cooperation in good faith. With these agreements in the economic sphere as a start, the United States should continue to urge an early consummation of a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab countries in order to establish true economic cooperation and stability in the whole Near East.

Such an accomplishment would be a great boon to the free world. The United States ought to explore this possibility most seriously. It should be made clear to the peoples of the Near East—and also the Far East—that economic development and a higher standard of living will enhance the chances for true peace with freedom, justice, and dignity.

The Atomic Bomb and the Defense of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very pleased to place in the RECORD a copy of the radio address by Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, which he delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System network for the Committee on the Present Danger on last Sunday evening.

In this address, Dr. Bush has given a penetrating analysis of probably the most serious problem which confronts us today. The address follows:

THE ATOMIC BOMB AND THE DEFENSE OF THE FREE WORLD

(By Vannevar Bush)

My fellow citizens, the Committee on the Present Danger is beginning tonight a series of weekly broadcasts on the peril that faces the American people and how it can be met. The committee is a nonpartisan group of citizens who have organized to work together as the Nation prepares to safeguard freedom. I have never been a "joiner," as we call them on Cape Cod, but I believe so strongly in what this committee stands for that I am glad to be a member of it. We believe the Nation's preparation to meet the danger must be on the same scale as the danger itself. We believe balanced armed forces are the heart of such preparation. And we believe the utmost speed is essential. I have been asked to begin this series with a reckoning of the probabilities of the defense of the free world, and how the atomic bomb affects them.

There is no doubt of the desire of the American people—and of our friends. We wish to avoid war. We wish to preserve our freedom and the free way of life. In a world where aggressive dictators are still at large, there is but one way to achieve these ends. That way is: to be strong. I am confident that the American people realize this. But we need to study just how to build that needed strength.

The key to the matter, in my opinion, is the A-bomb. At the end of the war our allies were exhausted. We disarmed. We know what has happened. Russia moved in. Working by intrigue and by the subversive overthrow of governments, she took over enormous territory and millions of people. But Russia stopped. Russia stopped at the boundary where the Kremlin was sure there would be war with us if it proceeded further. We saw the matter tested out at the time of the air lift in Berlin, and we know when we confronted the Russians with true strength they did not force the issue.

The deterrent is nearly as powerful today as it was then. If Russia sent its armies rolling across the German plains tomorrow, we with our A-bomb and the planes to carry them would destroy Russia. We could do it without question as matters stand today. We could destroy not only the key centers from which her armies would be supplied, but also political centers and the communications of the armies on the march. Initially equipped with weapons and supplies, those armies might keep rolling for a time, but there would be no Russia behind them as we know it today. The answer to this is that the armies will not roll. No all-out war is in sight for the immediate future unless they or we make some very serious error indeed. If Russia knows that she cannot go beyond certain boundaries without provoking a war, she will not pass those bounds; no war will occur. This has been well shown in recent years. The only apparent exception is in Korea, and there we did not make our position clear.

The difficulty is that we cannot count indefinitely upon strategic bombing as the sole means of averting war. Today, it gives us a military stalemate. To maintain that stalemate is the real problem.

Defenses against strategic bombing have been mounting ever since the war. Jet pursuit ships controlled by ground radar

can be enormously effective in bringing down high-flying bombers. Russia with its vast distances can have extensive early warning radar networks to alert its defenses. She can have great fleets of jet pursuit ships for defense, accurately controlled from the ground night and day. She can also have about her key positions modern antiaircraft artillery and also perhaps ground-to-air guided missiles. Russia in time can thus protect her key points. Note that I say in time. She cannot do it now. She cannot at any time safeguard all the places in Russia we might wish to attack. But in time there is a strong probability that she can defend key points to the extent that we could not penetrate to them without prohibitive attrition. She is also building a stock of A-bombs of her own. The deterrent of our A-bombs is real. But we cannot count on its remaining fully effective forever. I trust we have time—time to prepare the defenses that will continue the balance and avert war. But we do not have time to waste.

These defenses center in an allied army in Europe capable of holding a defensive line, stopping the Russian hordes if they should ever start, and so dissuading them from starting. That army must be well trained and it must be supplied with the very best of weapons of every sort. It must be created before our present enormous atomic advantage is seriously lessened. Of course it needs to be combined with continued development of our striking Air Force and support of our Navy to keep the seas open, but there must be an army in being and on the spot capable of holding back the hordes of Russia. Such an army does not now exist.

This need by no means be a matter of opposing hordes by hordes. We have no idea whatever of invading Russia by land, nor should we develop any such idea. Ours should be a defensive line, a line to hold back the hordes while we strike by other means.

Many elements enter into this. In the first place, take the matter of tanks. Russia has 40,000 tanks of various sorts. All her military doctrine revolves about the use of tanks and artillery. But there have been developed in the last few years antiaircraft weapons of great power. Relatively small recoilless antitank guns mounted on a jeep or handled by four men can put a heavy tank out of business, with a high probability of doing it before the enemy can get off his first shot, even at ranges of 1,500 to 2,000 yards. These guns can be built in quantity by the hundreds for the cost of a single heavy tank. When the countryside is invested by stingers of this sort no tanks are going to roam that countryside long. There will still be a function for the light tank and for armored vehicles of various sorts. But the big tank has met its match, and, unless techniques change in a way that I do not now see, it will become a liability rather than an asset in due time. I do not say that the big tank is now obsolete; I do say we can make it obsolete if we put our minds to the job and build the things to counter it. With that problem settled, the defense of Europe is simpler.

There is another factor, moreover, which is of enormously great importance. Out in the Nevada desert there have recently been a number of explosions. Presumably they mean the testing of new types of A-bombs developed by the Atomic Energy Commission during the past 5 years. I will not speculate as to their nature, but we can certainly assume that we have not been idle and that we have more effective bombs today than we had 5 years ago. They may indeed be far more adaptable for a very important purpose.

We have thought of the A-bomb as a means for attacking great military production facilities or centers of political power. The A-bomb can also have important tactical uses. Suppose that a war were to break out 3 or 5 years from now and that the Russian hordes were held up by a much smaller number of well disciplined and well armed divisions. If the line were not too thinly held, if it were defended in depth with the land mines, antitank obstacles, artillery, and other weapons that we can have if we choose, how would the Russians break it? They could do so only by a huge concentration of armies, artillery, and tanks—the kind of thing the Nazis did in 1944 just before the Battle of the Bulge. But with A-bombs in existence this becomes a very different matter. An A-bomb delivered upon such a concentration by an airplane, or possibly by use of a gun or a guided missile, would be devastating. In its presence, concentration of this sort would not make sense. Tactical use of the A-bomb thus will help to make the defense of Europe with reasonable numbers of men a practicable matter.

Further, Europe is regaining courage and spirit. The mission of General Eisenhower and the evident determination of the American people are aiding greatly in that regard. We can join our strong and well trained troops with those of our allies in Europe—we must assemble them in such numbers that they can hold the line. When enough men are mustered, there are important technical innovations to enable them to hold such a line against vastly superior numbers. It is not a matter of meeting hordes with hordes. Yet with even the most subtle of modern weapons there must be men to maintain the line and men to wield the weapons if they are to be effective.

I trust therefore that in our provision of manpower we will look well to the future. There is no thought in my mind that the men we bring in for training now will have to fight soon. Rather I think they will be the beginning of a well trained, well organized reserve. We need not only an army in being on the spot, but also behind it masses of trained men who can be called, if it becomes necessary, without a long period of indoctrination. If total war ever comes again it will break suddenly. I believe that the way to accomplish this purpose is to induct 18-year-olds to have approximately 2 years training and service and thereafter to go into the reserve to build up the essential body of trained men.

We cannot build the forces we need without sacrifice. This sacrifice must come in many ways, in foregoing some of the pleasures we like to enjoy, in increased taxes and heavier burdens, and above all in the selflessness of our youth as they devote a part of their lives to training for the defense of decency and freedom. In my opinion we shall produce less interruption in the life of the youngster if we train him in the years of 18 and 19, after he has finished high school before he launches his permanent career. Moreover the earlier the training starts, the longer will men be available for the Reserve. It takes young men to fight a war.

As I said when I started this talk, the object of the free world is not to fight a war but to avoid the necessity of fighting. If we are wise I feel sure that we can avoid that necessity. We have today an able group of military leaders. We have a strength which Russia fears. The Kremlin will not strike unless it makes a mistake or unless we by the utmost foolishness cause it to make a false move in the belief that it can do so without bringing our retaliation upon it. We must keep such strength that we cannot be overwhelmed, such strength that to attack us would be suicidal. If we do, the attempt will not be made and we can live without a world war III. The sacrifices we shall make to that end, heavy though they may be, will be small, indeed, compared to the sacrifices we would make if through weakness or hesitancy we allowed a war to come upon us.

Nor does America stand up to Russia alone. Russia today faces the entire free world, of enormous production capacity and enormous numbers of men, a vigorous free world. The free world has no idea of making war on Russia. But it is determined to live in peace and to be strong in order to do so. We, of the United States, have great allies. They are temporarily in some distress, for they suffered grievously during the war. But their might is rising. France is rising with all of its great traditions of strength and independence. Britain is rising with its pride at having maintained the peace of Europe by its strength for many years. So are other allies as well. Their growing strength combined with ours can be made ample to stand off the present danger. If it is held in check that danger will in time fade. We will face the threat shoulder to shoulder, and facing it thus we will keep the peace.

One World—Two Giants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edgar Shook, of Kansas City, Mo., the president of the Kansas City Council on World Affairs, has called my attention to the following address given by Dr. Clarence R. Decker, president of the university of Kansas City. Dr. Decker's speech represents an important contribution to increased understanding of the international problems which confront every citizen today:

ONE WORLD—TWO GIANTS

(By Clarence R. Decker)

I

Always at the New Year I find myself burdened with dark memories of another New Year—a New Year now 18 years ago. I was spending the year in Europe, studying in Europe's famed universities, hiking, and traveling over Europe's countryside, from Norway in the northwest to Greece in the southeast, and to Turkey in Asia Minor. It had been a beautiful year. Nature was never more generous. But already, in the world of men, there were ominous rumblings of portentous events. Mussolini's voice was growing more strident. Hitler was grasping for power. Within a short while von Hindenburg—then old and ill—would sign the fatal piece of paper that would drive Germany into ruin and degradation. Spain's civil dissension cast its shadow before coming events. Pierre Laval—pictured that winter on Time Magazine's cover as the world's man-of-the-year—had risen from an obscure slacker in the First World War to a sinister international figure. Stalin was restive and furtive. Baldwin was committing England to the fatal policy of appeasement. Here in our own country we were too preoccupied with the depression and an ideology of isolationism to worry about the problems of the rest of the world.

In January of 1932 I found myself in Geneva, Switzerland. Late one afternoon the Council of the League was hastily summoned into emergency session. Japan had just delivered an ultimatum to China, threatening to attack Shanghai and Chapei

unless certain humiliating conditions were met within 22 hours. The attack was to begin at midnight, Geneva time. China, as a member of the League, had appealed to the Council.

All of us at Geneva were deeply disturbed. The situation itself was grave, but graver still were its implications. Ironically enough, the statesmen of 57 nations were at that moment assembling in Geneva for the ill-fated Disarmament Conference. The Sino-Japanese "incident," as it was called, came at a critical moment. Now, if ever, the League might justify its existence, might prove itself a powerful agent for world peace. Now, if ever, the signatories to the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war might prove their good faith. Now, if ever, wars made by men might be prevented by men.

As we gathered that afternoon we could see through the battery of windows the rays of the setting sun illuminating the snow-covered Alps rising majestically beyond the blue waters of Lake Geneva. It was a peaceful, sun-flooded world, almost theatrical in its perfection.

But inside the assembly hall there was neither peace nor light. Hundreds of persons milled about seeking seats in the already overcrowded room. On the slightly raised rostrum, in the shape of a horseshoe, 13 vacant chairs awaited their occupants, the official representatives of the Great Powers. Contrasting the peaceful world of nature outside and the confused world of men inside, one could not help recalling Wordsworth's lines:

"To her fair works did Nature link
The human soul that through me ran;
And much it grieved my heart to think
What man has made of man."

The Council members at last took their places. A nervous hush settled over the room. On the wall, at one end of the hall, the hands of the large clock moved steadily ahead, a kind of nemesis that at midnight would declare the beginning of another war.

M. Paul-Boncour presided. First he called upon Dr. Yen, Chinese Minister to the United States and special envoy to the League. In an eloquent, moving appeal, quietly spoken, Dr. Yen recalled the unprovoked attack on Manchuria in the fall, the brutal demands of a power-mad Japan on an unprepared and weak China. He called upon the League for protection under article XV of the Covenant. When he finished, the reporters and other members of the audience, in violation of the rules, burst into spontaneous applause. The chairman rapped for order. The hands of the clock had moved 1 hour closer to midnight.

Mr. Sato, the Japanese delegate spoke next. He too was eloquent—this we had to admit, even though our sympathies were almost unanimously with China. He recalled the humiliations of his own country at the hands of the great powers, including the United States. He argued that Japan was the victim of race discrimination, that in America we looked upon his people as the "yellow peril," that we had passed the Oriental Exclusion Act, that the great powers were seeking to strait-jacket a little island smaller than California but with a population of more than 70,000,000 people. He reminded us that Admiral Perry had forced the open door upon his country, that we too were guilty of exploiting China, that Japan's imperialism—if it was imperialism—was simply the problem of survival in an already imperialistic world. As he took his seat, the hands of the clock had moved ahead another hour toward midnight.

Then Paul-Boncour arose and made one of the most tragic talks I have ever heard. Here we are, he said in substance, a small group of men, the representatives of supposedly civilized nations. We are thousands of miles from the scene of imminent conflict. At midnight the troops will move. He reviewed all the circumstances. He pleaded for patience and good will, only to reach the conclusion that under existing circumstances there was little the League could do.

Silently we left the hall. As we made our way back through the cold midnight streets to our hotel, many of us were overwhelmed with the feeling that the world itself, not China alone, was at stake; that Paul-Boncour's confession of defeat was the world's confession of defeat; that we had witnessed the beginning of the Second World War.

The following morning we read in the papers of the smoking embers of Chapei, a charnel house in which thousands of humble people—men, women, and children—were blown to bits by Japanese bombers and infantrymen, while 200,000 other civilians barely escaped with their lives.

The fires of Chapei soon spread over the world. Almost 10 years later to the day, our own country found itself attacked at Pearl Harbor by the same ruthless and lawless aggressor. In Europe country after country had been invaded, cities and countrysides laid waste, minority groups brutally herded into concentration camps and all but exterminated by crematoriums, firing squads, starvation, and disease. And today, 18 years later, we find ourselves faced with events and decisions of similar, if far larger, import. It is as if the long arm of destiny had begun to not too clearly understood.

II

To understand a little better for ourselves, Mrs. Decker and I were happy to accept the invitation of the American Association for the United Nations to represent it on the 1949 'round-the-world seminar tour of the well-known radio network program, "Town Hall of the Air." Altogether 28 national organizations, whose memberships included some 30,000,000 Americans in all fields—commerce and industry, labor and agriculture, education and cultural affairs—were represented.

The purpose of this pioneering venture was to increase American understanding of world problems, to promote understanding of America around the world, and to advance through uncensored public discussion, the cause of freedom, peace, and well-being.

With such ambitious ends in view, we were naturally disappointed that our efforts to include meetings and broadcasts behind the iron curtain were unsuccessful. Yet, even without the hospitality of the Kremlin, we traveled 33,000 miles by air, visited 15 world capitals, held daily conferences with leaders in the countries we visited, inspected many of their most significant undertakings, and produced over 150 local broadcasts in addition to the 2 network series broadcast in the United States. The cost of the trip was approximately $200,000, financed entirely by private funds. While we enjoyed the active assistance of our State Department and the full cooperation of foreign governments, we had no official responsibility. We were likewise entirely free from official control. The whole undertaking was in the best tradition of American free enterprise.

The results were gratifying from many points of view. The leaders of the countries we visited appreciated the questioning interest we took in their problems. That we were seeking understanding rather than giving advice impressed them. They were also impressed by our frank method of discussion, especially by our typically American way of disagreeing uninhibitedly and good-naturedly among ourselves. In many countries our meetings were a revelation in the technique of democratic discussion.

Such a trip deepens one's conviction that we are living in times that offer magnificent opportunities for genuinely heroic and creative achievements, but that thus far our midtwentieth century, far from behaving either heroically or even as civilized, actually threatens to destroy itself. The critical problems we face center around three characteristics unique in the modern world: (1) The release of atomic energy; (2) the ideological nature of our political problems; and (3) the shift of the center of international political gravity from Western Europe to Asia.

III

Hiroshima and Nagasaki struck a profound fear into the hearts of men throughout the world. The feverish postwar race for the perfecting and stockpiling of the atomic bomb, and other even deadlier weapons of destruction, aggravates our global fear and hangs like the sword of Damocles over all the other fears of insecurity that beset the smallest villages in India no less than the greatest cities of the western world. It likewise affects political strategy on the highest levels. The colossal failure of statesmanship to placate this modern Nemesis must be accounted a major predicament of our century.

IV

The history of war has been the history of mankind, but even allowing for the holy wars of the past, the world has never before been more divided and endangered by conflicting points of view more completely ideological in character. The ideological struggle of our times has been brilliantly summarized in these words:

"There are at this time two great nations in existence which, proceeding from different points, appear to be advancing toward the same end. I mean the United States of America and Russia.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. * * *

"The American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the Russian centers all authority of society in a single arm. The principal authority of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude.

"Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

These observations were not written yesterday. They appeared in a book entitled "Democracy in America," written by the distinguished French traveler and philosopher, Alexis de Tocqueville, and published in 1835, 115 years ago and 14 years before the appearance of Karl Marx's Communist Manifesto. The ideological problem arose long before Karl Marx was born, and it will continue long after Joseph Stalin dies. It is the ancient and perennial question of two profoundly irreconcilable ways of life—freedom and servitude. Lenin, and later Stalin, imported Marxism from Germany and adapted it to their special purposes, but it is no longer even communism, as Marx conceived communism; it is rather what we should call Stalinism, an instrument of tyranny and suppression as cruel and as destructive as anything the Caesars, czars, or Nazis ever perpetrated.

But even as we contrast Stalinism and democracy, we Americans must remember that the ways of democracy in the United States are by no means always identical with the ways of democracy in the other non-Communist countries of the world. Nor can the fact that these other countries have far more government control than ours be charged solely against Socialists, planners, and other devotees of the so-called welfare state. Conservatives themselves are often responsible for "statism." In America, as Arthur Schlesinger in his recent book, The

American as Reformer, points out, many individuals at once wealthy and conservative have been in the vanguard of economic and social reform. In England the seeds of socialized medicine were sown in 1910 under a Conservative government. Lloyd George and Churchill supported its principle 20 years ago, and the Beveridge wartime report recommended its extension. Radio was nationalized under the Conservative Baldwin, land under Lloyd George. Radio, railroads, and utilities in many European governments were nationalized by conservative or middle-of-the-road governments. In Israel, supported largely by American money, the cooperatives and collectives account for one-half of the agricultural economy. In much of the Near East the tyranny of statism is actively promoted by reactionary feudal and other vested interests. It is true that 6 of the 15 countries we visited—all thus far on our side in the struggle against Stalinism—are less than 3 years old politically and each is struggling in its own way and with its own conditions to work out its democratic destiny. Their way may not seem to us the ideal way, but the moral remains that if we apply our own peculiarly American point of view too rigidly or too arbitrarily to other peoples, we shall not only fail to understand them, but we may easily drive them into the camp of our real enemy. The United States thus walks a tight-rope in its foreign relations.

Nonetheless, with this caution in mind, democracies the world over—as opposed to the Stalin ideology that ideas and ideals are not only impotent but evil unless embodied in matter and the might of force—do share to a greater or lesser extent the basic belief that free inquiry, open competition, and reasonable compromise, if undisturbed on the open market, offer the surest hope in the long run for the greatest good for the greatest number.

Of the two major ideologies, Stalinism presents, at least on the surface, a united front, while democracy—an evolutionary way of life derived from the liberal philosophy of Locke, Hume, Bentham, the French Encyclopedists, Jefferson, Hamilton, and others—is usually slow to form simple, clearly defined patterns of action. Stalinism consequently holds certain immediate strategic advantages in its quarrel with democracy. The post-war strategy of the democracies, I take it, has been to hold the line, to play for time while we clarified our thinking and mobilized our divergent energies, but except for a tactical success in Europe under the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Charter, there is no conclusive evidence that we have held even our own in most of the other critical centers in the world. There are signs now, however, that we are ready to unite on a crusade for freedom to forestall the threatened loss of the free world by default.

V

The struggle has thus far centered mainly in Europe, but the emergence of Asia as a dominant force adds a third unique factor to the modern world. As the world chooses up sides, or as specific countries have one or the other side thrust upon them, Asia, with half the population of the world, occupies an increasingly pivotal role. There—in terms of territory, numbers of people, and in immediate human appeal—communism has thus far made the more significant gains. We have lost China, largely because, in an effort to choose the lesser of two evils, the western democracies during the thirties and early forties supported a corrupt reactionary regime out of touch with the people; we have found no way to secure Korea; and we could easily lose Japan once the occupation is withdrawn; southeastern Asia is drifting; and India, Pakistan, and the Near East—troubled by their own special problems—have yet to make up their minds. With the balance of power and influence in Asia—and with our own destiny in Asia no less than in Europe—we have yet to impress western democracy in understandable terms on the Orient. We have yet to impress it on many parts of Europe, but there we have at least not appeared indifferent.

The ideological war of our century is all the more ominous when we recognize that the appallingly low level of human existence throughout the world, especially in Asia, precludes for most peoples any real freedom to choose wisely among the alternatives. The vast majority of the world's population lives in filth, disease, poverty, and ignorance—a subanimal existence as low as in any previous period of remembered history.

The degraded level of life in much of our so-called modern civilization is, of course, aggravated by what we all hope are temporary dislocations. The refugee problem, for example. Racial and religious intolerance has literally driven millions of people from their ancient homes and lands. We saw them herded together in camps or slums like so many cattle: Jews from Europe and Africa in Israel; Arabs from Palestine in Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, and Transjordan; Moslem Indians from India in Pakistan and Hindus from Pakistan in India. In this last religious war, in the home of Gandhi's "passive resistance," more people were killed than our entire casualties in the war against Japan. Whatever the complicated reasons for the modern barbarism that has displaced millions of people, the unhappy fact remains that their lives can never be wholly or even adequately rehabilitated.

But even beyond the refugee problem, the grim truth is that for the vast majority, human life on this planet has neither dignity nor importance. As we drove one day to the sacred spot on the Ganges where Gandhi's ashes were strewn, we passed through the dirty crowded streets of Calcutta where literally millions of people live and breed in a squatter's existence, amidst a vast confusion of sacred cows, carabao, camels, goats, cats, dogs, chickens, parrots, and monkeys. For safety's sake we asked our young Hindu chauffeur to drive cautiously. He shrugged his shoulders and commented, "What is the loss of one more? We have so many!"

There are times, while encircling this sorry globe, that one is almost convinced that man is not only indifferent to his present state, but that he is intent on race suicide. The older civilizations of the world have all but destroyed the good earth—the mother of us all. Through centuries of waste and neglect—in Italy, Greece, Egypt, and Asia—man has decimated his forests, laid waste his soil. Egypt, once the bread basket of a civilization sustaining millions of people, is today in large part a boundless and bare desert whose "lone and level sands stretch far away." The cedars of Lebanon, once responsible for a magnificent maritime fleet that carried trade and commerce to all the corners of the known world, are no more. The fertile fields and timber-covered mountains of Greece, once the support of one of the greatest civilizations the world has ever known, are today barren and sterile.

Throughout the United States, we have lost from one-third to one-half of our top soil in little more than a century. Many of our raw materials are already expended. The great iron-producing Mesabi Range of Minnesota is nearing its end. Great civilizations of the past have gone the way of all flesh. There is no reason to suppose that we in the United States are immune. Although the world still has great undeveloped areas, there is no reason to believe that the resources even of our planet are limitless.

As we deplete the good earth that sustains us, population is everywhere increasing more rapidly than our techniques and resources for supporting it. In Japan alone—a country, I repeat, slightly smaller than California—the population today is 85,000,000 (15,000,000 more, in spite of all war casualties, than in 1932), and recent studies indicate that this already overcrowded population will increase another 23,000,000 during the next two decades. Birth control, important and helpful, has been accepted as official policy in most of the non-Catholic countries of the world, but that alone cannot solve the problem. Only a highly developed and balanced world economy provides the intelligence and ability to correlate resources with subsistence. But today vast extremes in power, wealth, and culture plague us everywhere. Less than an air-hour from relatively intelligent farmers plowing with modern tractors, primitive peasants still till the soil with crude wooden plows. Their grain is still harvested with hand sickles, thrashed with wooden sleds, winnowed by tossing into the air against the wind. The grim fact is that mankind is caught in a back-to-the-wall struggle for survival in a world that is at least four-fifths slave and one-fifth free.

Under these conditions, we cannot wonder at the vast restlessness throughout the world. The climate is propitious for a bitter and suicidal war between the privileged and the underprivileged. The struggle is manifest in many ways—conflicts over color, race, and creed; the bitterness of 216,000,000 colonials toward imperialists; the historic antagonism of Asiatics toward westerners; the hatred of the poor toward the rich, the starving toward the well-fed. There is little or no formal education, but lack of education does not blind people to the fact that some have, but that most have not. Under these circumstances they will not—indeed, cannot—choose rationally between Stalinism and democracy. They stretch out desperate hands for the first crumbs that promise to satisfy their hungers.

VI

I have reported a grim picture of the state of man in this midtwentieth century. Candor compels me to do so. But what of the future? Is the world well lost?

I am not without hope, although I must confess that our planet seems to me in a bad way and quite capable of losing H. G. Wells' oft-quoted "race between education and catastrophe." The greatest hope for the future, it seems to me, is found in the heroic efforts of some men and women everywhere to give order and meaning to the chaos of our times. I speak of men and women, because people, far more than government, represent the creative forces of life. On the larger scale, I have seen what has happened to a country like Turkey in the past 30 years—a country transformed from feudalism into a partial democracy almost over night. I have seen the miracle of Palestine. On a smaller scale I have seen the building of hydroelectric plants, irrigation systems, universities, medical schools, hospitals, and health centers in Pakistan and India. I have met women, like the 70-year-old minister of health in Delhi, fighting hopefully against seemingly insuperable odds. Given the chance and tools adequate to the task, I am convinced that people want to help themselves.

Although we must rely ultimately on people themselves, government must open the way and facilitate their efforts. What is to be the role of the United States in the shaping of the world of the future?

I disregard the position of the isolationist. Although we still have isolationists among us, some in high office, I do not believe that any substantial group of Americans seriously believes that this country, with less than 7 percent of the population of the world, can live unto itself and survive. Less than 50 years ago the British Empire—then at the height of its power and influence—celebrated

in gorgeous pageantry the diamond jubilee of Queen Victoria.

"There were miles of warships gathered at Spithead; feudatory princes from India and representatives of free peoples ruling over territories such as has never before owed allegiance to a single flag were assembled to do homage to the aged sovereign. The newspapers whose 'frantic boast and foolish word' gave utterance to the feeling of the nation from which those newspapers took their spirit, were not without excuse. But suddenly, upon ears still ringing with the blare of trumpets and hearts still elate with the proofs of material power, there fell the arresting voice which proclaimed the insufficiency and evanescence of all such power:

" 'Far called, our navies melt away,
On dune and headland sinks the fire:
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!' " [1]

The British Empire, forgetting its larger responsibilities, even then was lost, but out of its revolution emerged the Commonwealth, which I hope will flourish because she is an essential and congenial partner in our common democratic cause. Yet the painful knowledge of the price the greatest and the most powerful Empire had to pay should give all Americans pause—"Lest we forget! Lest we forget!"

Just as I disregard the position of the isolationist, I assume in my own thinking that the United States, although it possesses half the manufacturing capacity of the world and the only highly mechanized agriculture, is not rich or strong or wise enough to underwrite the entire globe. But our possessions involve responsibilities. The task of our leadership is to give economic, technological, and financial help designed to open the way for friendly countries to get on their feet. The point 4 program of the United Nations, rather than the Marshall plan, indicates the road for our long-time policy. From our own selfish as well as altruistic point of view, an enlightened program would encourage foreign investments of private American capital on a competitive enterprise basis. Already we are investing some $16,000,000,000 outside the United States and approximately $11,000,000,000 from abroad is being spent here. A dynamic program of international trade and economic development would extend what ARAMCO is doing in the oil fields of the Middle East, Westinghouse and General Electric in the Far East, United Fruit in the Caribbean, Sears, Roebuck in Mexico and Brazil, and United States Steel in Venezuela, where the most far-flung and greatest of all ore searches has culminated in the discovery of La Parida, an area 11 miles long and 1 mile wide, containing the richest and greatest iron deposit in the history of the world. Like these larger industries, many smaller businesses are finding exciting opportunities throughout the world.

Such a program must be partnership-capitalism at its best, without colonialism, imperialism, or exploitation. It implies that we will negotiate treaties guaranteeing fair treatment for American private capital when it goes abroad, including an insurance program for these private investments. It means that we will provide technical assistance as rapidly as foreign countries can absorb it, especially through such missions as we have recently sent to Brazil and Iran to survey the over-all needs and resources of those countries. It includes government-to-government credit for undertakings outside the scope of private enterprise—the building of harbors, transportation, and communication facilities, sanitation and the like. It assumes that we will reduce tariffs, perhaps to a free trade level, for those countries who cooperate with us, in order that we may replace our own dwindling supplies of strategic materials—lead, zinc, copper, tin, manganese, uranium, and many others.

Never before has the United States held such a stake in world economy. Never before has the world held such a stake in American economy. The point 4 program—designed to bring food and electric power and health to the underprivileged—has so powerful an appeal that even Russia has not dared to oppose it.

But even as we extend our technological and economic way of life around the world, we need desperately to disseminate our spiritual way of life. It is essential to our own future that we win friends and influence people in the way we have never done before—in a way, I repeat, that is understandable abroad.

Even the most casual traveler around the world quickly senses a strange mixture of admiration, anxiety, and disdain toward us. My own general impression, contrary to that of some others, is that the people of the non-Communist world genuinely like most Americans, but that they hold certain strongly felt reservations, many of them psychological, about us. (1) We are the rich uncle and they often betray an understandable envy of the vast power, wealth, and world prominence we have acquired in a relatively short period of time. (2) They appreciate our economic help, but thoughtful Europeans know, as some Americans occasionally forget, that the Marshall plan was designed to save us as well as Europe. The Near and the Far East, on the other hand, wonder why we want only to save Europe. (3) They are inclined to feel that we are often excitable and inexperienced in our foreign policies, that we act first and reflect later, that we sometimes allow purely domestic considerations to influence international affairs, and that we are so far to the right that we cannot understand the peculiar nature of their social and political problems. Sometimes they suspect that we may try to force an imperialist capitalist democracy on all the rest of the world. They may admit that our democracy works reasonably well in the United States, but they object to the notion that it is invariably superior to their own or better adapted to their needs. (4) The Asiatics especially think we are hypocritical on matters of social justice. Our Negro problem, with the help of Communist propaganda, is played up everywhere. They may not actually be deeply concerned about our Negroes, but they see it in terms of the Oriental problem. (5) They are often offended by the naive insolence—the exhibitionist conduct and patronizing manners—of some occupation personnel and tourists. (6) They feel that while our culture produces high living standards with a large amount of personal freedom, it also produces high divorce rates, tawdry entertainment, and stomach ulcers. Our movies abroad, for example, convey an impression of immaturity, crime, speed without direction, materialism, and plushness. As Mayor Singh, of Delhi, phrased it in a talk before our group:

"When the West is purely materialistic in conception as well as in practice—and most of the ills of the modern world are due to this materialism—we feel there is much that the West can learn from us, as there is so much we in the East can learn from the West."

Unfortunately, Europe and, even more, Asia is convinced that what it can learn from us is purely technological. They do not believe that we have anything to teach them about a way of life.

Most Americans believe that these criticisms are either untrue or grossly exaggerated, but at this crucial moment in history the important fact is that they are widely believed. Our task, therefore, is to persuade the world in practical deeds that we are not a Frankenstein, not a technological monster and a crass materialist. Even as we send our bath tubs, tractors, turbines, and gadgets around the world, we must also share our nonmaterialistic culture—our education, our art, our philosophy of the good life. The most precious things we have to share are our Bill of Rights, our Government of law rather than of men, our dynamic and creative culture. And as we export these spiritual values, we must indicate our willingness to import the rich cultural resources of other peoples who can become our enemies or remain our friends.

Americans are famous for their salesmanship. No important business concern would fail to provide generously for its advertising and its public relations. Yet, until recently, our country has not really tried to sell its way of life to its friends. Stalinism understands the power of ideas and the value of propaganda in disseminating ideas. In a statement not long ago, Andrei Vishinsky made it clear that the Communists consider ideological weapons superior to tanks and bombs: "We shall conquer the world," he said, "not with atom bombs, but with something the Americans cannot produce—with our ideas, our brains, our doctrines." In this connection, I recall, among the many slogans scribbled on the walls of buildings, on sidewalks, on vacant spaces everywhere in the Russian sector of Berlin, this memorable bit: "Korea for the Koreans, Coca-Cola for the Americans."

In our stand against Stalinism, we are supporting the soldier munificantly, as we should. We are supporting the statesman generously, as we should. But ultimately life is not military and it is not political, it is moral. There is no defense—not even an Atlantic Charter, a Marshall plan, a hydrogen bomb, or an international army—against Soviet ideology, except a superior moral and intellectual courage. That is why we need so desperately to develop ambassadors of good will and mutual understanding, whether they come from high Government levels and such official agencies as the United States Information Service, or, more important, whether they be industrialists, businessmen, teachers, artists, students, or simply tourists. These need to be encouraged to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature—the gospel of trade in goods, in services, in ideas, and, not the least, in ideals.

VII

A few days before we left Tokyo, Mrs. Decker and I called on one of Japan's elder statesmen. He had had a long record in Japan's foreign service—a record of devotion to his country's best interests. He had held various posts, including 3 years as Ambassador to Russia. His life had been one of profund anticommunism and pro-Americanism. He had withdrawn from all public life in 1941 in silent protest against Pearl Harbor. Now, as Director of the United Nations Tokyo Committee, he invited us to his quarters to meet with his committee. As the thin, gray, little man with a quiet, professorial manner greeted us, our minds went spinning back to the meeting of the Council of the League of Nations in January of 1932. Our host was Dr. Naotake Sato, whom we had not seen for 17 years. As we shook hands, he said simply, "I had a poor cause to defend that day." Now he is devoting his remaining years to a beter cause, the cause of free men who would live in a free world. We can hope only for him, as for the millions of other men of good will throughout the world, that there is still time.

The day before we left Tokyo the city was shaken by earth tremors. A few hours later "Typhoon Kitty," the most virulent since the war, clawed the Tokyo-Yokohama

[1] Hugh Walker, the Literature of the Victorian Era (Cambridge, University Press, 1931), p. 1.

district with an 80-mile-an-hour fury, uprooting miles of trees along the boulevards, destroying thousands of homes and leaving homeless some 150,000 persons, killing and injuring hundreds, creating millions of dollars of damage.

As we later boarded our plane for the last lap of our 'round-the-world flying-inquiring seminar, this willfulness of nature somehow symbolized the perverse and uncertain world of our twentieth century. We can now fairly closely predict the time, place, and force of typhoons. We cannot yet control their causes or mitigate their havoc.

So also with the typhoons of our political and moral world. Yet, though we have no clear assurance for our future, the will to survive as free men is deep, heroism and faith are still the dynamic virtues, and people the world over—like the men, women, and children of Tokyo the morning after the typhoon—are busily clearing away the debris and rebuilding with eternal hope for a better world.

A Capital Levy Sneaks Up on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, in addition to inflation, home owners are finding the capital gains tax not only burdensome but a confiscation of home ownership. Americans are a moving population—especially in wartime. A home owner in New York who paid $12,000 for his home in 1939 is compelled to sell and move to the Central West. He receives $25,000 for his old house. He pays a 25-percent capital gains tax, that leaves him $21,750, but he cannot buy a new house like the one he has just sold for less than $25,000. So he is short $3,250 of the purchase price of a new home, due entirely to a thoroughly unjust and confiscatory system of taxation. This same thing is happening to the farmer and the manufacturer as shown by Fred H. Sexauer in a recent issue of Spotlight:

A CAPITAL LEVY SNEAKS UP ON US

Inflation and capital gains taxes are a new method by which the home owner, the small businessman, and the farmer are having part of their capital taxed away. There is talk of raising the capital-gains tax but little thought is given to its effect on the little man. May I illustrate?

John Jones 10 years ago bought a house. He paid $6,000 for it. Since that time inflation has cut the purchasing power of the dollar in two. If he were to buy that house today it would cost him $12,000. John Jones finds he must leave his job and go to a neighboring city; so he sells his house for $12,000. He has gained $6,000. That gain is taxable. Let us assume, just for the sake of argument, that it is taxable for 25 percent. That means he pays to the Government $1,500. John now moves to the new city. There he buys an identical house and he pays $12,000. But he only has $10,500 to pay for it. That is his net on an identical house which he sold for $12,000. Now John Jones has a $12,000 house and a $1,500 mortgage. The Government has taken 12½ percent of his capital.

Well, let's take a farmer. Ten years ago he started farming with 20 cows for which he paid $200 apiece. That is $4,000. His son has grown up and he decides he wants to expand and change the breed of cattle. He sells the 20 cows for $400 apiece. That is $8,000. He has a $4,000 profit. Let us assume this, too, is taxable at 25 percent. So he has $7,000. His son now buys 20 cows of a different breed, paying $400 apiece. Farmer Brown only has $7,000 to pay on these cows; the Government has taken not a cattle-gains tax but a capital levy.

Inflation and capital gains deprive every man who must sell his property and change his location of a part of his original capital. This can be repeated over and over again with small business, professional men, everyone who for whatever reason must relocate but continues in the same field of activity.

The capital tax is sneaking up on the American public behind the twin camouflage of inflation and capital-gains tax. What is now done by indirection, if continued long enough, undoubtedly will be looked upon as sound public policy—to confiscate and redistribute wealth by such a concealed capital levy.

A Song for Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial and a letter relative to a contest looking to the selection of an official song for Washington, D. C., with a brief statement commenting on them. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and letter, together with the statement, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SONG FOR WASHINGTON, D. C.

On March 5, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for himself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] offered a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) relative to the selection of an official song for Washington, D. C.

In this period of strain and crisis, it is not only proper but also a dictate of wisdom that such a resolution, which calls upon the Congress to recognize the need for songs and singing, should be introduced.

During the depths of the depression in the 1930's, when fear and uncertainty stalked millions of homes and our great financial institutions were tottering, gloom was driven out, hearts were lightened, and we were taught to laugh and sing again by the minstrels and entertainers of stage and screen. Men like the late Al Jolson and Eddie Cantor did not solve the depression, but through their songs the strain was eased and the problem made to appear smaller. With songs on their lips, the American people found that the problem was just the proper size for them to handle.

Surely no Member of the Senate can hear or sing the Star-Spangled Banner without feeling the same strong surge of pride and confidence that the composer, Francis Scott Key, felt as he watched the valiant defense of Fort McHenry.

This country has been made great through the rhythms of its songs, the singing spirit of its people.

The great cotton plantations of the South were created and tended to the accompaniment of some of the world's great folk music. This Nation stretched its sinews westward to the Pacific, built railroads, and created cities and garden valleys while singing the songs of Stephen Foster and other composers of the people.

I have learned that music is of great value as a tonic for the soul, as a cultural balance for the home and for the Nation.

In perilous times such as this, we need songs—not just militant marching songs, but also hymns of peace and strength, ballads of love and home, and songs of civic and national pride.

Perhaps it was a similar emotion which led the Honorable Andrew Fletcher to say in 1703:

"Give me the making of the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws."

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 17, 1951]

SINGING OF WASHINGTON

Mr. James H. Simon strikes a poignant note in his letter elsewhere on this page bemoaning the lack of a suitable song for the District of Columbia. There is no emotion more fundamental than the love of home, and there is nothing like a rousing song to stir State and community pride. But Washingtonians confronted with, say, a group of Iowans waxing forth with the Tall Corn Song can only mumble meekly, "We're from Washington—that's where we have no votes" or offer a subdued chorus of Somebody Loves Me, I Wonder Who? There are even some cynics who say that the District could appropriately take over the Missouri Waltz or start adapting Beautiful Ohio. No loyal Washingtonian, however, could agree to such intrusions.

Joking aside, the contest suggested by Mr. Simon is a constructive idea which, in addition to being a lot of fun, should serve to kindle community spirit. We congratulate Mr. Simon and the Motorola Co. on their enterprise. For whatever song is chosen should be a good one, sprightly and original, that captures the spirit of this beautiful Capital. Surely there are many embryo Francis Scott Keys along the Potomac of today who will want to try their hand at a composition which Washingtonians, both native and adopted, can sing with gusto.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 17, 1951]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A SONG FOR WASHINGTON

I am a native Washingtonian born and raised in good old Georgetown, and I am very proud of my home town.

I have occasion four or five times during the year to attend conventions which attract others from all sections of the country. These conventions usually end up with a big banquet. While dinner is being served, the orchestra will inevitably begin to play home town songs. As each home town or State song is played, the fellows at the table representing that section of the country will get up and cheer and join in the singing of their native song.

Time after time this has presented a most embarrassing situation for me, and it has reached a point now where I join in with the Maryland fellows singing "Maryland, My Maryland," or the Virginia contingent in helping them sing, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginny."

I have become quite used to taxation without representation, but I am getting quite

tired of posing as an adopted son and using Maryland or Virginia as my excuse for being born in Washington. Why don't we have a song representing the Nation's Capital? The only one all of us know is, "Mail to the Redskins," and, while it is a good song, it is certainly not representative of all of the great things that our city stands for.

The situation has become an obsession with me and in discussing it with my friend, Paul Galvin, the president of the Motorola Co., he said, "You have a great point there. Why don't we do something about it? Suppose Motorola puts up some prizes and invites people to write a song for the Nation's Capital. We will set up a bunch of judges to pick the best song, and I think you will get a tremendous number of songs submitted for the contest."

This, Mr. Editor, is our idea and our aim. With your help in obtaining the great public interest this deserves, we might end up with something as catchy as California, Here I Come or Deep in the Heart of Texas. And what about Harry Truman and his Missouri Waltz?

Will you help us?

JAMES H. SIMON,
President, Simon Distributing Corp.

If This Be Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, here is a message from Edward R. Eastman, editor of the American Agriculturist, the oldest agricultural paper in the United States. It occupies a position of leadership and speaks for the farmers in the Northeastern States. If everyone who reads this article—whether he is for or against the viewpoint expressed by Ed Eastman—would speak up to his representatives in Congress, it would give Members of Congress helpful guidance in appraising what their constituents want at this time.

The article follows:

IF THIS BE TREASON

At a time when every person in this Nation (whether he realizes it or not) is struggling under a burden of direct and indirect taxes more ruinous than at any other time in the history of the Nation, President Truman submits another tax budget far greater than any other President has ever called for either in wartime or peacetime. His budget asks for $71,894,800,000 for the coming fiscal year.

No human being has any way of realizing how much a billion of anything really is, to say nothing of seventy-one and a half billion. But anyone who does any thinking at all knows what such Government spending will do to the Nation and to every individual in it.

Some of that huge expenditure is necessary for national defense. I have no quarrel with that. But in common with millions of other taxpayers I resent bitterly Truman's insistence that the cost of socialistic schemes—which not only help to ruin us financially but are contrary to our American liberties—be added to an already ruinous budget. These schemes, as you know, include: the Brannan Farm Plan; socialized medicine; Federal aid to education; subsidization of agriculture, followed by iron controls; further nationalism of electric power; and the expansion of Government ownership and operation of business.

Even great leaders of the Democratic Party like Senator Byrd, of Virginia, say that at least $7,000,000,000 can be cut out of this all-time high budget by some economy in domestic policies and enterprises.

No bureaucrat need ask me as an editor to help raise money to pay Government expenses as long as the national budget provides for the gradual taking over of our American way of business and of life by the socialists and the rapid destruction of our liberties. In the words of Patrick Henry: "If that be treason, make the most of it!"

Importance of Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial entitled "Strategic Air Power: The Big Stick Holding Back Kremlin's Aggression," which appeared in the March 1 issue of the Anderson (S. C.) Independent. No one can question the extreme necessity of maintaining an adequate ground force to protect this country from the spread of the evil communism, but we must also realize the important role strategic air power is now playing and will continue to play in national defense. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

STRATEGIC AIR POWER: THE BIG STICK HOLDING BACK KREMLIN'S AGGRESSION

Not even the most ardent supporters of plans to send United States ground troops to Europe will say today that such a force would slow Soviet Russian advance into Western Europe.

The force is token. The four divisions contemplated at present for service in Western Europe would be there as indication of United States good faith in ability of the European nations to arm themselves.

It was as such that General Eisenhower recommended it, and it is as such that it should be approved.

The fact remains that fear of atomic bombing carried out by the Strategic Air Command is what is staying the aggressive hand of the Kremlin.

The Third District's Congressman BRYAN DORN made an effective plea recently for a defense policy based upon the Strategic Air Command.

It is DORN's belief that only top-heavy strength in bombers can continue to stay the Russian hand or, in case of attack, provide the best hope for eventual victory.

He charged that military thinking is in a strait-jacket and that younger men, brains uncluttered by outmoded traditions, should have more say-so in the Nation's defensive and offensive planning.

In that he is supported by Alexander de Seversky, aircraft designer, and military student of note, who told the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that a revised budget is needed with at least two of every three dollars going to the Air Force.

Like DORN, he contends that the present planning is dominated by men whose ideas are outmoded; that the Navy is utterly irrelevant as an offensive force in the present situation.

Obviously the United States is outmanned on the ground, and land war in Europe if pursued by large American armies would bleed the country white within a short time, and still with no guaranty of even stalemate or victory.

It is known that Soviet Russia fears attrition from the air. The Soviet productive machine, although increased enormously, is creaky and highly vulnerable to air blows.

Russia's armies could overrun better than half the world but, as DORN points out, they would find victory empty if their homeland was laid in ruins and millions of their loved ones sealed in the flashes of atomic or hydrogen bombs.

Strategic air power, recognized as the one force holding back all-out Red aggression, appears to us the best hope for maintaining a precarious peace. Likewise, should war come, it is the only hope of survival.

Congressman DORN is to be commended for forcefully bringing this to the attention of all Americans.

The Moscow-Peiping Plot Against Asia's Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call attention to an article in the February issue of the American Federationist.

Written by Richard Deverall, a representative of the American Federation of Labor in Asia, it is titled "The Moscow-Peiping Plot Against Asia's Freedom." It details the Communist intent in Asia in a superior manner.

The article follows:

THE MOSCOW-PEIPING PLOT AGAINST ASIA'S FREEDOM

(By Richard Deverall)

Many of us remember well the raving pages of Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf, with its blueprint for the conquest of the west. Some of us found in Mein Kampf a clear warning of Nazi intentions. Others regarded it as the work of a madman, a wild dog, a screwball. But, as we know today, Mein Kampf was a document that clearly outlined the tactics and strategy of the Nazis.

So, too, today many who have read the collected works of V. I. Lenin and such books as Joseph Stalin's Problems of Leninism have been plainly forewarned by the Soviet slave masters that their objective is world domination and nothing less, that they plan to achieve conquest of the world by first conquering Asia and then using the men and raw materials of Asia to destroy the remaining portions of the free world.

Thus in one of the last articles penned by Lenin, found on page 854 of volume II of his Selected Works (Moscow, 1947), we read:

"In the last analysis, the upshot of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And it is precisely this majority that, during the past few years, has been

drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism (Stalinism) is fully and absolutely assured."

There is no secret in all this. It is not Anglo-American or anti-Soviet propaganda. Following Lenin, Stalin has himself written on countless occasions of the intentions of the Soviet geopoliticians to conquer China first, then through China conquer Asia and, with control of the land mass of Eurasia, complete the conquest of the entire world. This follows the classic formulation of Lenin:

"The road to Paris is through Peiping."

Some persons profess to see in the Communist drive a "glorious and epic crusade" to free the world from imperialism and colonialism They view the literacy, electric power, and collective farming schemes of Communist Russia as achievements of the Soviet regime. Such persons overlook the tens of millions of Soviet citizens who languish in slave labor camps because they dare to assert their God-given humanity and their human rights. Such naive persons overlook a Yugoslavia which, if it is Communist, is not under the heel of Stalin and which therefore, in Stalin's view, must be destroyed by a Communist Russia whose concept of democracy is utter surrender to the will of the Kremlin

The Communist geopoliticians at Yalta in 1945 wrung from President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill amazing concessions which made straight the path for the advance of Soviet imperialism in Asia. Yalta guaranteed Russian control of Manchuria, guaranteed the encirclement of a disarmed and defeated Japan by Soviet military and naval power, and guaranteed the fall of democratic Korea under the weight of Soviet pressure.

When the war ended, the honest attempt made by the West to find the road to world peace was termited, as ever, by the Soviet butchers. They created the Cominform, pushed guerrilla activities through stooge Asian Communist parties, and most cynically used Japanese arms and the vacuum created by Japan's defeat to launch full-scale guerrilla warfare in China, in Indochina, and other Asian areas

It must never be forgotten that so-called British imperialism has drastically retreated in Asia British power has left India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and other areas The Dutch have been forced to relinquish political control of rich Indonesia. Throughout Asia the greatest phenomenon of the postwar era is the end of European power in Asia.

And in the Asian countries which have found freedom and national independence, indigenous regimes have struggled with the terrible social and economic problems which resulted from the brutal and wasteful occupations of the Japanese Army. These new regimes have struggled to emancipate their people and to resurrect and refurbish their century-old cultures and century-old civilizations Yet Moscow has attacked each and every national regime in Asia—except those subservient to Moscow—as bourgeois, antinational, rotten regimes.

In essence the Soviet aim in Asia since the end of the Pacific war has been to wreck the new-found national independence of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Indochina, Indonesia, Burma, Korea, and the Philippines. Stalin's actions clearly warn that Red China is the Asian base which the Kremlin is using to extend Communist domination across the map of ancient Asia. Where the British and Dutch and French have withdrawn, Moscow and its Asian stooges plan to march in. Nothing less than complete domination of Asia is the objective of the Kremlin and its Chinese Communist colony.

The Stalinist butchers use two tactics in the achievement of their aggressive strategy and warmongering.

One is the exploitation of overseas Chinese minorities in the Philippines, Indochina, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma to aid in the financing of Chinese Communist propaganda, penetration, and espionage. Anyone who listens to Radio Peiping broadcasts made daily to the overseas Chinese knows that the Chinese Communists are banking on use of overseas Chinese as a fifth-column in Free Asia

The second tactic is use of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its stooge unions to foment civil disorder, violence, sabotage, and juncture with Communist guerillas in the final all-out push to liquidate the governments of Indochina, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines

All this is a matter of the Communist record.

Early in September of 1949, Asian and Australasian Communist leaders and WFTU affiliates received invitations to attend a conference to be held in Peiping, capital of Communist China The invitation requested complete reports on the situation in your respective countries, progress of your organizations, your problems and the means of solving them, and the assistance you wish to obtain from the WFTU. The WFTU conference met in Peiping on the 16th of November 1949 with some 177 delegates on hand, representing 13 countries, including Communist Russia, Communist China, Communist Mongolia, North Korea, Indochina, India, Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Ceylon, Malaya, Iran, and the Philippines

The conference was formally opened by Liu Shao-chi, a vice president of the WFTU, trusted adviser to Mao Tse-tung and honorary president of the All-China Federation of Labor. With the geopolitical ambitions of world communism well in mind, Liu told the assembled delegates that over one-half of the world's population lives in the vast territories of Asia and Australasia; these territories have rich resources, industrious working peoples

As even a blind man can see by reading Liu's speech, this was no conference of bona fide trade-union leaders promoting free-trade unionism but rather a top policy conference of military men, guerrilla tacticians, and quasi-trade-unionists plotting the military destruction of the hemisphere of Asia not yet under Soviet domination. Thus Liu said:

"The path which led the Chinese people [that is, the Communists—Editor] to victory is expressed in the following formula:

"(1) The working class must unite to form a broad, Nation-wide united front.

"(2) This Nation-wide united front must be led by the Communist Party.

"(3) It is necessary to build up through patient struggle a Communist Party equipped with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

"(4) It is necessary to set up wherever and whenever possible a 'People's Liberation Army' led by the Communist Party, an army which is powerful and skillful in fighting enemies, as well as strong points for the operations of these armies, and also to coordinate the mass struggles in the enemy-controlled areas with the armed struggle Moreover, armed struggle is the main form of struggle in the national liberation struggle in many colonies and semicolonies."

And in case anyone doubted the intent of Liu, he added:

"This is the main path followed in China by the Chinese people (i. e., the Communists) in winning their victory. This path is the path of Mao Tse-tung. It can also become the main path of the peoples of other colonial and semicolonial countries for winning emancipation where similar conditions prevail."

On November 16 the executive board members of the WFTU were tendered a banquet by Chou En-lai, premier of the Chinese Communist regime. With Chou En-lai were General Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Soviet Red Army, and other top Chinese Communist and military officials. On November 21, Mao gave a huge banquet honoring the WFTU delegates.

And, as reported by the Indian Communist weekly, Crossroads:

"The delegates repeatedly toasted to the health of Stalin, leader of world working people, and Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Chinese working people."

As the smoke screen of public meetings, huge rallies, and banquets proceeded, super-secret military sessions were held by the top leaders with well-known Russian agents. These secret sessions pointed up the essentially military nature of the WFTU's Peiping conference. The Russian Communist warmongers, L Soloviev and S Rostovsky, were present at the secret meetings. The participants in the top-level meetings discussed the 1950-51 strategy of world communism, including the planned tactical struggle in Korea to secure that geopolitical bastion for the Kremlin.

The report of Louis Saillant, general secretary of the WFTU, clearly outlined the key role of the WFTU in undermining the freedom and national independence of the Asian nations Comrade Saillant listed the several Cominform stooge organizations which would work with the WFTU in overthrowing popular governments throughout Asia—the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and the International Committee of Intellectuals Saillant proclaimed the world aims of the Communist imperialist warmongers when he declared:

"We are forming the grand new coalition of peoples fighting for a new world, living in peace, making socialism a living reality, and laying the foundation of a new civilization on a world-wide scale "

Following Saillant, Comrade Soloviev of Russia warmly supported the recommendation of Saillant that an oriental bureau of the WFTU be set up in Peiping. He outlined the antinational and espionage role of this agency when he said it would be "responsible for the consolidation of contracts between the countries of Asia and the WFTU, for the provision of mutual exchange of information, implementation of the decisions of the leading bodies of the WFTU, for rendering assistance to national trade union centers of countries of Asia."

And, as Saillant noted in his closing speech, the WFTU described a three-tiered category of Asian countries:

Tier 1—China, Mongolia and North Korea.

Tier 2—South Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Tier 3—India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan.

Obviously the Tier 1 countries are those dominated by the Soviets and presently behind the Kremlin's oriental iron curtain. And if the Peiping conference considered the Tier 3 countries as still difficult, the implication is clear that Moscow's plan of aggression in Asia comprehends guerrilla warfare and the overthrow of democratic regimes in the Tier 2 countries—South Korea, Indo-China, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines.

Another proof of the tactics and strategy can be found in the speech of Li Li-san. He pointed out that the Chinese Communists had learned that they had to stir up agrarian unrest and promote revolutionary land-reform programs, that they had to unite with the bourgeoisie in the urban areas and thus build a united front. Second, Li Li-san said, guerrilla struggles over a period of years would form the base for the People's Liberation Armies. Third and most funda-

mental, the Chinese Communist movement has always been under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which has always accepted the theoretical guidance of Marxism-Leninism.

Clearly Li Li-san was hammering home the warmongering, death-to-liberty theme expounded at the conference by Comrade Liu.

Significantly, Ban Se-yang of South Korea, led off in presenting reports He noted that since October of 1946 the WFTU forces had led mounting guerrilla warfare against the Republic of Korea (South Korea). He called upon other Asian nations to boycott the United Nations. And after him came Choi Ho-min, of North Korea, who demanded that UN advisers in Korea and American troops in Japan leave at once Each speaker underlined the activities needed to pave the way for the coming Communist aggression against South Korea.

As Indochina is the next on Stalin's timetable in Asia, it was not surprising to find that Luu Doc Pho reported in turn. Representing the Vietnam trade-union movement, he emphasized guerrilla struggles and the war for emancipation. Luu Doc Pho said that such emancipation would be brought to a successful issue only if the working class of every country follows the example of China.

Next came the report of Vas Sunderachamara of Thailand, who reported on the progress of the labor movement in that country. After describing the wartime role of the Anti-Japanese Volunteer Corps (the Communist wartime front) and "their struggle against Japanese militarism and the Phibul Songgram clique," this Communist then told of the emergence of the Bangkok Federation of Labor, and pointed out how the wartime struggle brought "unification of Siamese, Chinese, and workers of other nationalities" After attacking the government of Thailand, Vas ended thus·

"Long live the new democratic republic of China Long live Mao Tse-tung. Long live Stalin."

The report of Lu Cheng, of Malaya, emphasized the role of the Communists in building guerrilla forces under the Japanese occupation. He told how after the war the Communists formed the Pan-Malayan Federation of Labor to launch revolutionary general strikes. Then he told the story of how after June of 1948 the Communists and their trade union allies went underground to mount the present civil war in British Malaya.

Comrade Ali Marjono reported for Indonesia. He told how the Communists formed the SOBSI in November of 1946, attacked Hatta as an imperialist tool, and described Premier Nehru, of India, as leader of the reactionaries in southeast Asia. This Indonesian Communist let the cat out of the bag when he declared:

"The great victory of the Chinese people and its working class, guided by the Chinese Communist Party and the leader, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, is a victory for our people"

Comrade Aun-Win reported for Burma. This Communist denounced the Thakin Nu government. The Communist-led unions of Burma, he said, would fight for "complete destruction of the Fascist system of the Thakin Nu government."

The report from India was unsigned, but it was given in the name of the Communist-led All-India Trade Union Congress. It denounced the "bourgeois Congress government." It denounced Prime Minister Nehru. It denounced both the Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the Indian National Trade Union Congress It also denounced the American Federation of Labor "who have spent many months (and dollars) in India training up their Indian prototypes." But for Stalin, Mao and the WFTU it had sweet words. Them it hailed as saviors of Gandhi's India.

The program of the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and its Russian and Chinese Communist backers is crystal clear. The record speaks plainly. There can be no doubt that the criminal Communist aggression against South Korea is but the first move in the conquest of the Tier two countries—Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya and the Philippines. And once they are conquered and transformed into Kremlin colonies, then will come India's turn and the turns of Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran and Japan.

No sane person can talk of neutrality in the face of this clear Communist-WFTU blueprint for the conquest of Asia, which has already given evidence of its authenticity through the brutal Communist aggression against Korea.

As the Communist record shows, the Communist Party in every country mentioned is committed to the service of Stalin in the subversion of the now independent and free nations of Asia.

And in Korea, Indochina, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Iran, and Japan, the WFTU-affiliated unions, by their own pronouncement, are traitorous, subversive agencies seeking to use armed guerrilla forces, pledged to serve as espionage agents for their Kremlin-Peiping masters and acting as the running dogs of world Communist imperialism—the highest stage of international Stalinist communism

In these countries the Communist Party is not a political party but the advance military base of Soviet imperialism and the coordinator of armed terror, arson, bloodshed and unremitting guerrilla warfare. The Communist Party in every country is not a political party but, by its own frank admissions, an armed military group So, too, the agents of the WFTU and their affiliated members throughout the world are not trade unionists but the running dogs of the Kremlin, the espionage agents for Soviet Russian imperialism, the paid puppet fomentors of bloody revolution, the precursors of totalitarian coups d'etat aimed at throwing into the ashcan of history the hard-won freedom and independence of the Asian countries which have struggled, in the face of all difficulties, to extend freedom and raise living standards throughout Asia.

The blueprint for Communist aggression against all Asia outlined at the Peiping conference of November-December, 1949, is proof positive of the vast plot now unfolding throughout Asia. Asia has been warned. Let him who has ears hear!

Asia has indeed been warned! Courageous action today may secure freedom, peace and national independence tomorrow

But action tomorrow or the day after tomorrow may be too late.

How to Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have groped helplessly for a solution to what seems hopeless involvement of America in world war III. I have seen attempt after attempt on the part of the United States to bring about peace go down to defeat and disappointment, especially at the United Nation's meetings.

Not long ago, a young Cornell man, David Repass, whose home is in Binghamton, visited my office. He told me he had made a special trip to Washington for the purpose of presenting me with a thesis he had written on how to fight communism.

As I perused this, I realized Mr. Repass has struck upon a unique and highly practical method. To be able to combat communism without shedding the blood of our boys, yet just as surely, seems to me to present about the happiest solution to life's No. 1 problem I have been lucky enough to learn about.

I was so impressed with Mr. Repass' essay that I feel he has made a real contribution to our ceaseless efforts toward peace. I am, therefore, taking the liberty to incorporate his words in the RECORD:

Is there going to be a third world war? If so, how can we prevent it? These are the questions that all Americans are asking themselves today, for a world war will have deep effects on the lives of all of us. These questions are not easy to answer, but if we face the facts and analyze these facts, we will be able to draw conclusions that will give us the answers.

WHAT WE ARE FIGHTING

The first fact we must face is that the third world war has already started. It started in 1917 when the Communists seized power in Russia. This is a bold statement to make, but if we regard, and we must regard, the present world war as a war against communism, it must have started with the first Communist revolution To make this point clearer, let us see what communism really is. After all, if we are fighting a war, we must know who and what we are fighting, a rather obvious fact; yet it is a fact that many people seem to have forgotten.

The original theories of Marx have been modified somewhat by Lenin and Stalin, but they are still followed by all Communists today. These theories are not too difficult to understand. Marx believed that class struggle between the rich, propertied (bourgeoise) class and the poor, propertyless (proletariat) class was the cause of all social, economic, and political conflict Since the bourgeoise own property (capital), they have control of the means of production and, therefore they have power over the proletariat who cannot live without the products of capital Thus, the capitalists can rule and exploit the propertyless. As a result of this unjust power that the few capitalists have over the great number of proletariat (workers), said Marx, capitalism is bound to disintegrate for the mass of workers will revolt against the capitalists and establish communism. According to the Communist Manifesto: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite" After these revolutions, Marxist formula called for socialization of the means of production by a dictatorship of the proletariat (a dictatorship to work for the benefit of the proletariat). As soon as this dictatorship established a uniform, classless society there would no longer be a need for state rule, or any form of government at all. Everyone would rule themselves since there no longer would be classes to cause conflict.

In 1917 Lenin and Stalin, guided by these principles, led the proletariat of Russia in a revolution which destroyed their existing government. At this time the Communist

leaders expected the workers of the rest of the world to revolt against their governments also, and thus establish communism throughout the world. This did not happen, so the leaders had to modify their plans In accordance with the Marxist theory, they established a dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, and waited for the proletariat in other countries to follow their example and revolt.

In a dictatorship, all opposition has to be eliminated Thus, the Communist leaders had to kill or ship to Siberia all people who acted or even spoke against their exact views. They had to establish a totalitarian police state in order to keep their Communist homeland free from enemies (those who oppose communism). Thus, the people of Russia found that they had lost their freedom to speak and act and were under the iron hand of a police state.

Communist leaders are at work in every country of the world preaching the ideals set forth by Marx, trying to stir up a revolt. People who are dissatisfied and who are living in chaos are very susceptible to Communist doctrine, for it offers them a way to overcome their dissatisfactions by destroying the society that causes them Thus, the Communist leaders, with the aid of propaganda from the Communist homeland (Russia), have won many thousands of people to their way of thinking These many thousands of people who have been converted to communism have revolted in almost every country. These revolutions have succeeded in winning Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Hungary, and all of China, to the Communist cause These revolutions take the form of guerrilla fighting in French Indochina and on the border of Greece These revolutions have taken the form of riots in France, Germany, Italy, and many South American countries. These revolutions are no different from the first revolution in which Russia was made communistic, and they are all part of the great plan for world revolution against all existing forms of government

We are fighting Communists We are fighting Communists no matter if they are in Russia, or France, or right here in the United States. We are fighting communism because it seeks to destroy our free, democratic way of life, and we have always fought to preserve democracy and freedom wherever it was in danger.

HOW TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

Now that we know that we are fighting Communists, and that they have been fighting us (and every other existing society) since 1917, we must learn how to fight them. It seems very late to start wondering how to fight them now that they have been at war with us for so long, but perhaps it is not too late

The most intense fighting has been in the last 5 years since the end of World War II. It has been referred to as the "cold war". The main Communist weapon during this war and throughout history has been words. They use words to preach the gospel of communism. By this preaching, they convert many thousands of people to their way of thinking, which is the way of world revolution (war) These many converts preach to make more converts, until there are enough Communists to revolt and take over the world, country by country. These words must be a very potent weapon, for the Communists now control over 800,000,000 people.

Every conference in the "cold war" has been a battlefield for the Communists. We have lost every battle, because we did not use the proper weapon—truthful words. Truthful words are a far more potent weapon than lying words. The only way to fight Communism is with the truth.

Instead of using words of truth to fight communism in Europe, we use money (Marshall plan). We do not even tell the people who receive this money why we are giving it to them, so the Communists tell them that we are imperialists trying to buy control of their countries. Thus, this money actually has a bad effect. The Communists use the UN as a soap box from which to preach their gospel to the world, and we sit by and let them do it, not even preaching our own ideas. We do not use the weapon (truthful words), the only weapon that can defeat communism. We only use money, and now armed might to fight words

We must start fighting back with words now. We must tell the world the truth about communism We must devote our defense efforts to telling the world the truth. We must build huge radio stations to broadcast the truth around the world We must bomb countries behind the iron curtain with pamphlets, magazines, and books so that they will know the truth. We must fight with strong, cutting words at every conference. We must fight this war of words and ideas with better words and ideas.

What should we say to the people of the world? What is the truth? The answer to this question is in the hearts of every freedom loving person. Marx forgot one important thing when he developed his theories. He forgot that men desire freedom as much as life itself. Yet in the period of dictatorship of the proletariat that is to follow the revolution, all freedom is taken away This, as has been pointed out before, is the situation in Russia today. It is the situation in all Communist dominated countries today—there is no freedom. People are much worse off than they were before they revolted. They revolted because they were dissatisfied, and now they are in misery with no freedom. Tell the people in the countries that have not yet fallen to the Communists what will happen if they support a Communist revolt. Tell them that if they follow the Communist preaching they will lose their freedom Tell them that we stand for the free rights of men and to follow us in preserving these rights. Tell the people behind the iron curtain about the United States, about its high standard of living, its free enterprise system of economy, and all about its freedom

If we drown out the Communist lies with our truths, communism will be defeated If we tear communism apart with words, people will no longer believe the Communists, and their weapon of words will be ineffective. People behind the iron curtain (800,000,000 of them) will fight the Communists to gain back their freedom, and thus, in time, communism will disintegrate.

Lessons From the Founding Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Modern Americans Can Learn Much From Founding Fathers," by Drew Pearson.

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

MODERN AMERICANS CAN LEARN MUCH FROM FOUNDING FATHERS

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON—When George Washington and the Founding Fathers first tried to make a go of this Nation against the British, not many of them knew much about Korea. Nor did they dream that some day their descendants would be fighting communism all the way from Indochina to Italy.

However, some of the ideas which the Founding Fathers hatched are directly applicable to Korea Indochina, and the rest of the world today.

Roy Norr, the publicist who made the American Tobacco Co cry uncle in the famous reach for a lucky instead of a sweet campaign, has been doing important research on this point and reminds me that, when the British imported Hessian troops to do their fighting, George Washington decided to undermine them with propaganda. Only Washington used more high-brow words than propaganda, namely exciting a spirit of disaffection and desertion.

Anyway, Washington appointed a committee of propaganda experts, including the three top men in the would-be Nation—Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin And they devised a plan whereby Congress offered every Hessian who would desert the British 50 acres of free land

In short, the Hessians were invited to quit fighting and make their home in the United States

In addition, Benjamin Franklin wrote a propaganda letter, which was pure fiction and which he signed "Count von Schaumberg," regretting that so few Hessians had been lost in the battle of Trenton Naturally, the letter didn't make the Hessians feel too kindly toward their British-German masters

On top of this Franklin wrote a series of propaganda leaflets which were wrapped around quids of tobacco and smuggled into Hessian hands

Net result of this propaganda was that, out of 30,000 Hessians, 6,000 deserted George Washington had 6,000 fewer mercenaries to fight

In contrast, here are some of the things we are not doing, and which the Communists are doing in different parts of the world.

Contrast No 1: Congress last week cut $20,000,000 from the State Department's propaganda budget The Senate originally voted all the money the State Department requested, but when House and Senate conferees got together, House Members chopped the appropriation by $20,000,000.

The Congressmen who ignored the example of George Washington, Ben Franklin, et al, were:

CANNON of Missouri, GORE, of Tennessee, WHITTEN, of Mississippi, ROONEY, of New York, GARY, of Virginia, RABAUT, of Michigan, Democrats, and TABER, of New York, WIGGLESWORTH of Massachusetts, and SIEFAN, of Nebraska, Republicans

Contrast No 2. First things the Korean Communists did when they advanced into South Korea was redistribute the land Dr. Syngman Rhee, president of South Korea, had long been talking about land reforms, but never did anything about it The Communists, taking a leaf from George Washington's book, beat him to it.

The same thing has happened in Communist-held French Indochina and in China. Free land to pinched peasants has had a greater effect than all the quinine, medicine, and technical advice we have flown in to help the Indochinese.

Contrast No. 3: Dan Bell, former undersecretary of the Treasury, has just returned from the Philippines with a similar report. Dan is no radical. He is president of the American Security and Trust Co., one of the biggest banks in Washington, and went to the Philippines as head of a commission to see what we could do to prevent the island from going Communist.

He reports that the land reforms long promised by President Quirino have never taken place. Quirino is a friend of the big

landowners, including Col. Andres Soreanos, a former aide to General MacArthur. So the big estates have not been broken up, and communism is spreading like wildfire among the peasants, many of whom operate under slave labor conditions.

Contrast No. 4: In Southern Italy the situation is somewhat similar. There the chief weapon of the Communists is the vast landed estates, held by a few, while several million peasants are landless. For some time, Premier de Gasperi has considered land reform, but has been advised by American ECA officials that this would create a bad impression in Congress. Senator TAFT, de Gasperi was warned, would feel toward Italy as he did toward the British labor party and its nationalization proposals. Thus, ECA money for Italy might be jeopardized.

Yet, if there isn't land reform in Southern Italy, it is fairly certain to suffer the same fate as Northern Italy, now dominated by the Communists.

I doubt if George Washington would have agreed with our ECA officials in Italy.

The Federal Trade Commission Reports on Interlocking Directorates of Major Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the impact of our mobilization program has focused attention strongly in recent months on certain weak aspects of our Federal statutes by which our business life is guided for the protection and strengthening of our small-business enterprises. I refer specifically to our antitrust laws such as the Clayton Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Robinson-Patman law, and others.

In this connection I wish to commend to every Member the reading of the 1950 report of the Federal Trade Commission, the agency of our Government charged with the enforcement of our antitrust laws and the protection of our economic life from the stifling effects of unfair methods of competition in business.

The 1950 report of the FTC, recently issued, unfolds to us the story of the so-called interlocks—a device by which big business is able to dominate and control our economic life through the means of interlocking directorships, and other tie-in relationships which make possible inflexible control in certain fields of business.

This story becomes all the more important in its relation to our current mobilization program and the increasing burden of proof that big business in our country continues to get the defense orders and that small business can get only the crumbs from the table of our preparedness program and its attendant procurement orders.

I acknowledge the fact that much of this situation is attributable to the fact that big business is geared to take care of large orders, but it does not alter the proof that, as a whole, small business is being left out or not given a fair and proportionate share of Government contracts.

The report of the FTC for 1950 makes some startling disclosures on the interlocking device in the operation of big business in this country—among the facts being pointed out is the interlocking relationship of 1,000 manufacturing corporations listed as largest by the Department of Commerce to many additional thousands of banks, investment trusts, insurance companies, railroads, public utilities, and distributive enterprises.

These relationships, Mr. Speaker, have been termed as "kissing kin" by a widely read Washington columnist which, the columnist declares with realism "makes it a cozy family affair" in our great economy—a family affair which has only one end result—the stifling of competition, the squeezing out of small business, the discouragement of new business, the creation of despair among management of small business enterprises—not to mention the maintenance of artificially high prices to consumers and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the fact that big business performed magnificently in the last war—albeit for a proper price for what they produced—I want to point out that big business, as we all know, emerged from the war bigger and stronger than ever, and with its interlocking devices intact and even strengthened. During this present emergency and conflict our Government should take steps to insure that big business not be permitted to become monopolistic giants by repressing small business and do this at the expense of the taxpayers, the consumers, and the public generally.

There is now pending before the House a bill to create a Smaller Defense Plants Corporation—to safeguard the interests of the smaller industrial plants and business of the Nation during this period of expanding production and war emergency. This measure deserves the attention of every Member interested in preserving the small-business enterprises of the Nation—and should be enacted into law.

I believe that the Members of the House will agree with the correctness of these statements if they will read and appraise the recent report of the Federal Trade Commission and particularly that portion dealing with the interlocking directorates of certain of the industrial concerns of the Nation. I should also like to point out that the same portions of the FTC report wisely could be borne in mind when the membership may be called upon to consider a pending measure to preclude by statute the operation of devices not now clearly defined as illegal and monopolistic—but which are, nonetheless, destructive of healthy competition in our economic life. I again refer to the problem and question of "interlocking" directorships in business and also to the proposal which has been made to amend and strengthen section 8 of the Clayton Antitrust Act in this connection.

In this regard, I wish to have included with my remarks the following significant excerpts from this worthwhile FTC report.

The excerpts are as follows:

[Excerpts from the Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, 1950]

INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES

The report on interlocking directorates summarizes the interlocking relationships among directors of the 1,000 manufacturing corporations which are listed as largest by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce, and also the interlocking directorates between these 1,000 corporations and a selected list of banks, investment trusts, insurance companies, railroads, public utilities, and distributive enterprises.

The report covers not only direct interlocks among these companies but also indirect interlocking relationships which are established through the presence of directors of two corporations on the board of a third corporation

The interlocking directorates that have been examined fall into six different patterns, which differ in their effect upon competition. These are:

1. Interlocking directorates between competitors, the tendency of which is to reduce or eliminate competition.

2 Interlocking directorates between companies in closely related lines of production, which are capable of forestalling the competition that might develop from the normal expansion of these companies.

3 Interlocking directorates between companies that face similar or closely related problems, the tendency of which is to consolidate comuunities of interest among these companies and to create a united front against enterprises that threaten the habitual relationships, ways of doing business, or established preeminence of members of the group

4. Interlocking directorates between companies and their suppliers or their customers, which may bring about preferential treatment in prices, in the distribution of materials that are in short supply or in access to market outlets.

5. Interlocking directorates between manufacturing corporations and financial institutions, which may give such manufacturers preferential access to credit or may constitute an obstacle to the access of competing enterprises to credit.

6 Interlocking directorates which express a desire to protect an underlying ownership interest.

In the survey of interlocking directorates, the Commission has not found it possible to examine closely each of the apparently significant relationships that were found. The potentialities of the various patterns have been analyzed, and interlocks have been classified in accord with these potentialities; but the report does not seek to determine whether or not the possible effects upon competition from various interlocking relationships have actually appeared

THE OUTSTANDING INTERLOCKS IN VARIOUS INDUSTRIES

The food industry exhibited an extensive array of interlocking directorships which appeared to be significant both for competition within the industry and for its relations with other industries. In the meat-packing branch of the industry, Armour & Co. was indirectly interlocked with the third and fourth largest packers; three of the largest meat packers had indirect ties with three of the largest bakers. Armour and Swift & Co. had direct interlocks with equipment manufacturers.

Three of the 10 largest dairies were directly or indirectly interlocked with each other; the 3 largest dairies were also indirectly interlocked with General Foods Corp., Standard Brands, and Best Foods The largest

of the dairy products companies was indirectly interlocked with 2 large baking companies, which were potential customers, and with a large manufacturer of metal and paper containers.

Four of the 12 largest canners had direct or indirect interlocks with companies producing competitive products The direct interlock between Libby, McNeil & Libby and Minnesota Valley Canning Co. is illustrative of the probable competition-reducing ties found in the industry.

Six of the 12 grain-mill-products companies had interlocking relations with competitors. General Mills, the largest, had a direct interlock with Best Foods and indirect interlocks with Pillsbury Mills. International Milling Co., and Russell-Miller Milling Co The three large milling companies also had one or more direct or indirect interlocks with bakers or distillers. Both General Mills and Pillsbury Mills were directly interlocked with a large manufacturer of kraft paper Pillsbury Mills was also interlocked directly with a food-container stock manufacturer

The producers of bakery products were also tied together through interlocking directors, 6 of the 10 companies being involved Purity Bakeries Corp. interlocked directly with American Bakeries Co. The two largest—National Biscuit Co. and Continental Baking Co—had indirect interlocks with each other and with a number of other baking companies National Biscuit was also directly interlocked with American Sugar Refining and had indirect ties with five other potential suppliers in the food industry, one of its most notable ties outside the food industry rested upon five directors in common with American Can United Biscuit, Ward Baking, and Interstate Bakeries also had direct interlocks with container stock or container manufacturers.

A highly concentrated pattern of interlocks occurred among the sugar companies. Sixteen of the 23 largest of these companies had direct or indirect ties with each other. Six Hawaiian sugar companies were both directly and indirectly interlocked with each other, while sugar companies outside Hawaii were equally intricately interlocked The sugar companies also had direct or indirect ties with the country's largest producers of dairy products, bakery products, and beverages American Sugar Refining alone had direct and indirect interlocks with 16 potential customers

Eight of the 23 largest beverage products companies were directly or indirectly interlocked with each other. Canada Dry Ginger Ale, for example, had a direct tie with National Distillers Products, both companies manufacture soft drinks as well as alcoholic beverages Ties between beverage manufacturers and potential customers or suppliers were varied and numerous. National Distillers Products, the third largest of the distilled-beverage manufacturers, for example, had indirect ties with the largest corn products and sugar-refining companies It also had a direct tie with the country's largest manufacturer of glass bottles

General Foods, Standard Brands, and Best Foods were interlocked with each other through a variety of third companies. General Foods also had direct ties with the country's two largest dairy companies, and indirect ties with the largest bakery company and the two largest grain-mill-products companies, all of which manufacture products with which General Foods' lines compete. General Foods also had a direct interlock with American Can and with the Mead Corp., which sells paperboard.

The interlocking relations within the primary iron and steel industry fell into four major categories. United States Steel maintained indirect interlocks with 11 other members of the industry—7 integrated steel companies, a nonintegrated strip-steel producer, a coke and chemical company, and 2 ferroalloy companies.

The second group of steel companies included Republic Steel Corp., Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Inland Steel, Wheeling Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin, and National Steel Corp. These companies were all interlocked through a group of important Cleveland companies, including four ore companies and two Cleveland banks. The interlocks consisted of both stock ownership and common directors.

The third group centered in the Mellon family and in a number of companies in the Mellon sphere of influence, including Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Koppers Co., Pullman, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., and Westinghouse Electric Co Through these corporations, interlocking relations were maintained among Lethlehem Steel Corp., Armco, Crucible Steel, A M Byers, Superior Steel, Granite City Steel Co., and Vanadium Corp of America In addition Jones & Laughlin provided a point of contact between the Mellon group and the Cleveland group, and United States Steel was linked to the group through Pullman

Finally, Pittsburgh Steel Co., Alan Wood Steel Co., Follansbee Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co were interlocked through ties among themselves and with the peoples First National Bank & Trust Co. (Pittsburgh). This group was interrelated with the Mellon group through Jones & Laughlin and with the Cleveland group through both Jones & Laughlin and National Steel

The nonferrous metals industry was characterized by multiple indirect interlocking relations among companies within the industry, principally through financial institutions but also through a number of leading industrial corporations The concerns thus interlocked were among the industry's most important Within the industry, American Metal Co interlocked with 10 companies, Kennecott Copper Corp and Phelps Dodge Corp with 8, Anaconda Copper Mining Co., St Joseph Lead Co., and American Smelting & Refining Co with 7, United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co with 6; Magma Copper Co. with 4, and National Lead Co., New Jersey Zinc Co., Mueller Brass Co., Doehler-Jarvis Corp., and Anaconda Wire & Cable Co with 3

Several of the integrated producers of primary metals are also fabricators and thus compete with their customers, actual or potential There were a relatively large number of interlocks between fabricated and primary metal producers Some of these vertical interlocks- for example, that between the Sharon Steel Corp and the Mullins Manufacturing Corp—appear to have been the equivalent of forward integration. Other interlocks—for example those between United States Steel, Babcock & Wilcox, and American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp—provided the basis for establishment of a community of interest among companies dominant in their respective fields. The interlocks of fabricated metal producers with users of their products consisted primarily in 36 interlocks with the machinery industry; 24 with the transportation equipment industry; and 19 with the electrical machinery industry.

Companies in the machinery industry were linked primarily with banks, primary metals producers, transportation-equipment companies, and electrical-machinery manufacturers. In every branch of the industry, competing producers were directly and indirectly interlocked. Among the farm-machinery manufacturers, International Harvester, Allis-Chalmers, and J. I. Case were indirectly interlocked with each other and with two of the other six largest producers; the Oliver Corp was indirectly interlocked with two other farm-machinery companies; and Deere & Co. and Minneapolis-Moline Power Implement Co. were interlocked indirectly with each other. Eighteen competing engine producers were directly or indirectly interlocked, five being classified as manufacturers of engines and turbines and the remainder being otherwise classified. Ten of the large machine-tool manufacturers were indirectly interlocked with one another, as were the seven largest manufacturers of office and business machines. Of the four largest producers of textile machinery, the two largest were directly, and all indirectly, interlocked with each other. They were also directly linked with four of the country's largest textile mills and indirectly with nine others Six of the major producers of pumping and drilling equipment had direct or indirect ties with one or more competitors The four leading manufacturers of road-building and earth-moving machinery were indirectly associated through multiple interlocks The machinery producers were also involved in direct vertical interlocks with primary-metals producers and with numerous potential customers

In the electrical-machinery industry, the big four manufacturers—General Electric, Westinghouse Electric, Western Electric Co., and Radio Corp of America—were indirectly interlocked on a multiple basis through six large commercial banks, two of the largest life-insurance companies, a public utility, a railroad, and an industrial company This industry also presented a pattern of interlocking relations extending backward to suppliers of metals, plastics, and the like, and forward to users of electrical equipment The interlocking directorates between General Electric and New York Central and between Westinghouse and the Pennsylvania and New Haven Railroads appear to be particularly noteworthy.

The transportation equipment industry presented a picture of extensive and complex interlocking relations. Significant interest groups centered around General Motors Corp., and the Victor Emanuel enterprises linked companies in all of the major subdivisions in the industry The railroad equipment companies appear to have established a close network of interlocks—12 of the 15 interlocked directly or indirectly with other railroad equipment companies. Two manufacturers of railway air-conditioning equipment—Safety Car Heating & Lighting Co and the Carrier Corp—were directly interlocked The only two manufacturers of railway air-brake equipment—Westinghouse Air Brake Co and New York Air Brake Co—had multiple indirect interlocking relations. Pullman, an important manufacturer of railway cars, was the nucleus of a far-reaching system of interlocking directorates Other indirect interlocking relations existed among manufacturers of locomotives, railway rolling stock, and other special types of railway equipment. In the aircraft group there was a direct interlock between Douglas Aircraft Co and Curtiss-Wright Corp., which, however, appears to have been discontinued The aircraft group also had a chain of indirect interlocking relations that linked not only aircraft manufacturers but also producers of specialized equipment

In the motor-vehicle field, direct interlocks between the large automotive manufacturers and the parts manufacturers appear to have been of principal importance. No significant interlocking relations were found in the ship- and boat-building field. As in other large and important industries, the pattern of interlocking relations between transportation equipment companies and finacial institutions was extensive.

Through directors and officers of leading New York banks, the chemical industry maintained many indirect interlocking relations; there were few direct interlocks. Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corp., Mathieson Alkali Works, Inc., American Enka Corp., North American Rayon, Davison Chemical Corp., and American Bem-

berg were indirectly interlocked through Chase National Bank. Union Carbide and Carbon, Commercial Solvents, North American Rayon, Sun Chemical, and American Bemberg were indirectly interlocked through Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co. American Cyanamid Co, American Home Product Corp, General Aniline & Film Corp., Sharp & Dohme, and the Lambert Co. were indirectly interlocked through Manufacturers Trust Co. (New York). The chemical industry also exhibited a significant array of vertical interlocks that related producers to sources of supply and to outlets for their products.

The leading petroleum companies—Standard of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Texas Co., Standard of California, Standard of Indiana, Gulf Oil Corp., and others—were closely tied together by indirect interlocking directorates or by joint ownership of affiliates. The most significant interlocking directorates were through Chase National Bank. On that board were directors of Standard of Indiana, Standard of California, Gulf, and Continental Oil. Texas, Shell Union Oil Corp, and Tide-Water Associated Oil were indirectly interlocked through Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.

None of the rubber manufacturers had any directors in common in 1946. Indirect interlocking relations existed among the large tire manufacturers, between the large tire companies and some of the smaller tire manufacturers, and between some of the other rubber companies The most significant of the interlocking relations were apparently those between United States Rubber and General Motors, resting on du Pont investments in both companies and the presence of du Pont directors on both boards. Three of the large tire manufacturers—Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., United States Rubber, and B F Goodrich Co.—had direct interlocking relations with chemical companies producing materials used in the manufacture of tires.

The textile industry had an extensive network of interlocks, with 39 of the 85 companies interlocked with one another. Although members of the same industry, these companies produced a diversified list of products. A large number of interlocks appeared to have been among companies that were currently producing competing products. Forward vertical interlocks appeared more significant than those reaching backward to sources of supply. Several of the textile mills had indirect interlocks, principally through financial institutions, with retail outlets, largely chain clothing and department stores.

In the apparel industry interlocking relations existed through banking interests and factors. The outstanding interlocks brought together on the board of Van Raalte Co., directors of Cluett, Peabody & Co., Manhattan Shirt Co, the Hat Corporation of America, and A. Stein & Co, thus creating a community of interest potentially significant for competition. Apparel manufacturers also interlocked with textile mills: Cluett, Peabody & Co. with Sidney Blumenthal & Co., Botany Worsted Mills, United States Finishing Co, and Cheney Bros.; Hat Corporation of America with Sidney Blumenthal. In turn, Cluett, Peabody & Co. had directors in common with National Department Stores and Sears, Roebuck & Co; Manhattan Shirt was also directly interlocked with the Hecht Co and Gimbel Bros.; A. Stein & Co. was represented on the boards of Sears, Roebuck, Bond Stores, Inc, W. T. Grant Co., and S H. Kress & Co; the Hat Corporation of America was interlocked directly with Bond Stores. The strong position of Van Raalte and its interlocking relations with apparel manufacturers reflected in part the presence of two Goldman, Sachs & Co. partners and a Lehman partner on the board of Van Raalte.

The paper and allied products industry had a chain-like network of interlocking directorates connecting 22 of the 31 large companies with one another. There was no one company from which these interlocking relations radiated; the ties were as characteristic of the smaller as of the larger companies.

The printing, publishing, and allied industries had no directly interlocked directorates and relatively few significant indirect interlocks.

The lumber and wool products industry and the furniture and fixtures industry had few significant interlocking directorates.

In the glass industry the direct and indirect interlocks between Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. and Owens-Illinois Glass Co. appear to have had significance in supporting a division of fields between the companies Several of the glass companies also had vertical interlocking relations with important outlets.

Interlocking directorates in the cement industry appeared to be important principally on the Pacific coast. Significance may have attached to the interlocks between refractories manufacturers and cement and steel companies. The gypsum manufacturers had their most important interlocks with financial institutions.

None of the larger companies classified in the leather products industry were directly interlocked. However, indirect interlocks existed between some of the important companies: Endicott Johnson Corp. with Florsheim Shoe Co., and the latter with George E. Keith Co

No significant interlocking relations were found among the companies classified in the tobacco products industry.

In the professional and scientific instrument industry the few insignificant interlocks were between companies the products of which were complementary or which might provide components for finished products

In the miscellaneous manufacturing industry the interlocks, direct and indirect, involved supplier-customer relations.

CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions that emerge from the Commission's analysis of interlocking directorates among the 1,000 largest manufacturing corporations and between these corporations and some 330 nonmanufacturing corporations follow:

1 Among the largest companies there was in 1946 a substantial and significant variety of interlocking directorates, which, by virtue of the character of the businesses of the companies, involved reasonable probabilities that competition would be reduced thereby.

2 Some of these interlocks appeared on their face to be violative of section 8 of the Clayton Act.[1] The majority of them, however, did not fall within the prohibition contained in that act.

3 Many of the interlocks which were capable of reducing competition were lawful under the provisions of section 8 of the Clayton Act because the interlocked concerns, though potentially competitors, had not been competitors in the past, or because the interlocked concerns were related to each other as actual or potential suppliers and customers rather than as competitors, or because the individuals through whom the interlocking relationships were maintained were officers or stockholders rather than directors, or because the companies involved, instead of having common directors, had directors who were jointly members of the boards of third companies.

4. In certain cases interlocking relationships involving several directors from the same company provided a broad base for the development of common policies and attitudes. In certain industries directors from various important companies sat together on particular boards which served as focal points of interlocking relationships. In certain other industries, though there were no focal points, there was such a multiplicity of interlocking relationships as to constitute a network in which it was evident that the effect of any one interlock was strengthened and supplemented by the existence of the others. The Clayton Act contains no recognition of the significance of multiple, focal, and network interlocks, as distinguished from single interlocks.

5. The most common interlocks were those that linked a seller of goods or services with a buyer thereof. In a substantial number of cases the importance of the seller, the buyer, or both was such that establishment of preferential or exclusive-dealing relations between them might be expected to have adverse effects upon the opportunities of their competitors. This was particularly true in the case of interlocks between industrial companies and financial institutions The problems raised by interlocks of the supplier-customer type appear to be similar to those which led the Congress to prohibit such interlocks in the case of common carriers except where steps are taken to assure arm's-length dealing. Nevertheless, there is no legal limitation upon this type of interlocking relationship among industrial and commercial companies.

[1] Section 8 of the Clayton Act provides in substance that no person may be director in two or more competing corporations, any one of which has capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than $1,000,000. (This provision is not applicable to banking institutions and common carriers, which are covered under other sections of the statute.)

Working Hours of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Farmers Said Now Working 70 Hours for 40 Hours' Pay," published in the Leader, of Bismarck, N. Dak.

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

FARMERS SAID NOW WORKING 70 HOURS FOR 40 HOURS' PAY

CROOKSTON, MINN.—Farmers today are putting forth 70 hours of hard work a week to match the earnings of 40-hour-per-week city workers, says John Brandt, of Minneapolis.

Pointing out that many farm prices are still below parity levels, Brandt, president of Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., said the present high cost of living was due principally to the high cost of getting products of the soil to consumers rather than to the prices farmers get.

"When the Nation as a whole puts forth the same hourly effort on a basis comparable with that of the farmer we will have true parity in price levels," Brandt Wednesday night told an audience at the Red River Valley midwinter shows here. "Then, and only then, will the cost of living start downward.

"We cannot and should not depend upon war as a means of maintaining a prosperous

agriculture, as war itself can bring only temporary booms."

Brandt said that livestock farming had always been a stable and reasonably safe pursuit, adding that "there is nothing on the horizon that points to a reversal of this situation."

The Record of 32 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, last Sunday, March 4, 1951 in the capital city of my State, Arthur Capper, a distinguished former Member of the Senate of the United States, made a radio address over Station WIBW.

What he had to say on that occasion, after 30 years of service in this legislative body, is most timely for us to consider. He points out the changes that have come over our Nation and where some of our present policies, if pursued, will lead us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CAPPER NOT SURE ALL CHANGES IN 32 YEARS ARE FOR BEST INTERESTS OF UNITED STATES AND WORLD

(Senator Capper discussed the things that have happened to the world and the United States in the past 32 years since he went to Washington as Senator, in his weekly radio talk over WIBW Sunday. He also was gratified over ratification of the anti-third-term amendment, and paid his respect to the would-be dictators in Government.)

Thirty-two years and 30 minutes ago, at noon on March 4, 1919, I became a United States Senator from the State of Kansas.

You Kansas people kept me in the Senate for almost 30 years after that.

Due to the adoption of the so-called "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution, terms of United States Senators and Representatives, starting in 1934, have begun their regular terms of serving on January 3 instead of on March 4 following the general election.

For that reason I did not serve a full 30 years. My fifth and last term ended January 2, 1949. The following day at noon my successor, former Gov. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, took office. My impression is that Andy is doing a good job.

I certainly enjoyed my nearly 30 years in the Senate, and appreciate more deeply than I can tell you the honor you people of Kansas accorded me by electing and reelecting me five times to that high office.

During those years I represented you to the best of my ability. I tried sincerely to follow this rule: On every piece of legislation I cast my vote as I believed the majority of the people of Kansas would have voted, if they had the same information and understanding of what was involved which I believed I had.

But all that is water over the dam. Only I just couldn't help reminding you that today is one of my anniversary days—and a very happy one for me, personally.

There have been a lot of changes in America, in the world in those 32 years. Not all of them have been for the better.

Actually, although few of us realized it at the time, the wheels of fate already had started whirling us into the era of the great change in America, the American way of life, the American form of government.

In 1919 we were just emerging from World War I which we thought we had won. We had defeated Germany, broken up the Austrian Empire, and, so we were told, had made the world safe for democracy.

As it has turned out since, there are grave doubts whether our American First Crusade promoted the interests of democracy, to say nothing of making the world safe for democracy

Instead, World War I just paved the way for World War II, which we also thought we had won, 5 years ago. We destroyed Germany and Japan—and apparently also have made Soviet Russia dominant in the Old World; also seem to have made Russia a threat to the New World So now we must build up Germany and Japan.

And also, judging from the plans we are making for the future, World War I and World War II just paved the way, combined, for world war III

Instead of bringing the four freedoms to the peoples of the world, we assisted in making Joseph Stalin the dictator over one-third the people in the world, gave Britain a Labor-Socialist government which will become a dictatorship if ever we quit pumping funds into Britain to keep the Labor-Socialist government in power

And there are some in our own country who believe we are headed toward a dictatorial form of government in the United States, as a result of our world crusades.

I think it is at least correct to say that to date our participation in three world wars—we are in the third one now, whether we are willing to admit it or not—has decreased rather than increased the freedoms of the individual, here and overseas.

When a government spends as much as one-third of the nation's income, taxes its people for one-third of their incomes; depreciates the value of its currency more than one-half in less than a generation, loads a bonded debt larger than the national income upon its people, and proposes universal service for all its citizens—

Where those conditions prevail and are in prospect indefinitely into the future, one cannot truthfully proclaim that such a people is a free people—at least not as we understood was the word "free" in those pre-World Wars days.

Briefly, those are some of the reasons I raise the point that all the changes in the 32 years—and 30 minutes—since I became a Member of the United States Senate, have not been changes for the better.

Not but that I believe the American people, the American way of life, and the United States Government will rally and survive the perils that obviously lie ahead. I do believe we will survive—but only if we have the will to survive, and to fight for survival.

By the way, I received another letter from Dwight Hauptman, of the Hauptman Family Farm, Brewster, Kans., the other day.

In this letter Mr. Hauptman said so much in so few words that I cannot resist repeating them to you. Mr. Hauptman wrote us this way:

"It seems to me the little Napoleons in the administrative branch of the Government are intent upon dissipating the accumulated wealth of past generations, the earnings of the present, and are wishing to mortgage the earnings of the future citizens of America.

"It was only a few years ago," our farmer friend from Brewster, Kans., continues, "we farmers had only to contend with drought, grasshoppers and hail. But today we look with apprehension toward Washington for some new flat or directive in keeping with the perpetual state of emergency or crisis in which we live—

"A crisis so admirably maintained by the ponderous and burdensome machinery of government."

Then Mr. Hauptman concludes with this call to duty, which I in turn pass on to you with the suggestion you take it unto yourselves to carry on—

"Please continue, Mr. Capper, the good fight in behalf of the individual, who, after all, is the strength of America," Mr. Hauptman, of Brewster, concludes.

One of the bright spots of last week was the action of the Nevada and Utah State legislatures in ratifying the twenty-second amendment to the constitution. The following day I believe Minnesota also did, but the Minnesota action in a way was superfluous.

When Nevada acted, following by a few minutes only the ratification by Utah, the amendment was ratified, 36 States having approved it.

The twenty-second amendment prohibits anyone—except President Truman himself—from being elected to serve a third term as President of the United States.

This action at least is an attempt to return to a form of government in which all powers are not centered in the executive branch of the Government.

But the Congress itself, as I see it, faces the job of asserting itself in the matter of war making. As I mentioned last week, I believe, the forefathers who wrote the Constitution did their best to vest war making powers in the Congress, rather than the President.

They had seen, some of them at first hand before coming to America, what evils were wrought in Europe through the war-making power being lodged in the hands of rulers.

So I say, Congress has a job to do I hope it does that job And more power to Senators Taft and Wherry and to Herbert Hoover and others who are making the good fight.

Some 10 days ago I had the pleasure, and the mental and spiritual profit, of hearing an address at the Hi Twelve Club by Dr. Eugene Frank, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Topeka.

It was an inspiring speech, and I would like to give you all of it. But I am going to give you just one or two ideas among the many that he gave to us.

Dr. Frank was speaking on "brotherhood"—week before last was Brotherhood Week, I believe.

He listed several basic assumptions, as he said it, that are necessary if the idea of brotherhood is to prevail.

In the first place, Dr. Frank said, only a free people can do anything about brotherhood. Free people must be free to think their own thoughts, speak their own minds, choose their own friends, and so on.

"You cannot crowd brotherhood down people's throats," said Dr Frank "You cannot get brotherhood at the gun point.

"Subservience is a barrier to brotherhood"

"For that reason," he continued, "militarism is the enemy of brotherhood."

"And when you have universal military training in America, same as under Hitler, Napoleon, Mussolini, Stalin—any dictator—then you have militarism, and that is the end of freedom of the individual.

"Without freedom you cannot attain the brotherhood of man," Dr. Frank explained further. "You cannot have freedom under militarism; therefore you cannot have brotherhood under universal military training. Military discipline supersedes democracy when we are at war.

"It also supersedes democracy when it is fastened on a people between wars. Universal military training means a subservient people, whose thinking is done by others, whose decisions are made by others, whose

actions are ordered by others. That is the end of democracy, the end of freedom, the end of hope for brotherhood."

He said something else which I wholly approve.

"Government subsidies," he declared, "are the enemy of freedom, the enemy of brotherhood. Subsidies set group against group for manna from government; subsidies bring about subservience, which destroys the freedom of the individual

"Socialism," said Dr Frank, "sounds to the uninformed like the brotherhood of man. But it is just the opposite, socialism is based on the idea that men cannot govern themselves."

I wish we had more men like Dr. Frank in the ministry, in business, in public life—and holding public office

Am looking forward to talking to you again next Sunday.

Navajo Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Aid Program Lags, Navajos Complain," published in the New York Times on February 25 last.

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

AID PROGRAM LAGS, NAVAJOS COMPLAIN—SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS, ROADS ARE BEING BUILT BUT INDIANS ARE LIVING IN SQUALOR

WINDOW ROCK, ARIZ., February 24.—Roads are being built, schools expanded, hospitals enlarged, and water facilities surveyed under the 10-year $88,500,000 rehabilitation program for Navajo Indians and their Hopi neighbors, authorized by Congress and begun last October. But accomplishments are too slow, according to Sam Ahkeah, chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council, which met here recently.

The tribal council is an elected tribunal looking after the interests of the Nation's largest Indian tribe. The reservation spreads over much of northwestern New Mexico, northeastern Arizona, and southeastern Utah and entirely surrounds the less populous Hopi pueblos in Arizona.

It is a desert land, where Navajos live in illiteracy and squalor. A year-long drought has added considerably to the burden. "Our people still need the aid of such men as Bert Pousma, of Gallup," says Mr. Ahkeah.

NAVAJOS LONG NEGLECTED

Mr. Pousma heads Navajo Assistance, Inc., a nonprofit organization set up to dispense direct relief to the Navajos and to promote causes beneficial to the tribe.

Eight decades of Government neglect have contributed to the present Navajo plight.

In 1868, the Government returned the Navajos to their traditional homeland after 5 years' exile at Fort Sumner, N. Mex. This has become known as the Bosque Redondo incident. There were only about 10,000 Navajos then, but now the population is over 61,000, and the parched land cannot support a third that number.

After the exile, a treaty was drawn up guaranteeing a school for every 30 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 16. Some schools were built, and through the years many Navajos have attended them, but the facilities have never been adequate. Today the illiteracy rate for this tribe is 80 percent—highest for any ethnic group in the Nation.

Residents of Cheechilgeetho and Thoreau, two Navajo communities near Gallup, N. Mex., petitioned in 1948 for the reopening of their schools, closed for several years because funds for maintenance were lacking. The long-range rehabilitation program provided for conversion of these facilities to boarding-school status, along with others at Hunter's Point and Kaibeto. Water has been proved in adequate amount for the Thoreau, Hunter's Point, and Kaibeto plants, and construction will begin as soon as the weather permits. Plans for the Cheechilgeetho school are awaiting a water survey.

SCHOOLS STILL INADEQUATE

But the situation continues bad, with 22,000 Navajo children of school age, and only 8,000 able to crowd the inadequate Government and mission facilities of the area. "On account of closing some schools, and using schoolrooms for sleeping purposes in others," Mr Pousma says, "the seating capacity on the reservation is 1,315 less now than it was 10 years ago."

Illness and death rates among the Navajos are out of all proportion to the country as a whole Tuberculosis is estimated as 10 times the national average Mobile X-ray units have discovered thousands of tubercular Navajos, but hospital facilities are so scanty that those with the most active cases must often return to insanitary hogans, where in many instances the disease is passed on to small children and others. About 6,000 die from tuberculosis on the reservation annually

A 700-bed hospital is planned for Fort Defiance, Ariz., as a part of the rehabilitation program, but even the funds for its blueprints won't be available in the current fiscal year.

Shortage in the Accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding a shortage in the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation, published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of February 28, 1951.

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

GOOD WORK, SENATOR

For nearly 2 years Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has been hammering away at a $336,000,000 shortage which he uncovered in the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senator's persistence has been producing some noteworthy results.

By last June the General Accounting Office reported that the deficit had been reduced to $96,440,000. It said this amount was uncollectible because no records had been kept of where it went.

Senator WILLIAMS refused to accept this explanation as final. It turns out he was right. The Delaware Senator was able to report to the Senate the other day that more than $15,000,000 more has been recovered. Some of it has been collected from private citizens, some from foreign governments, and the remainder from the Department of Defense.

This constant prodding has already saved the taxpayers millions, and that's no trifle even in a day when the Government is dealing mostly in billion-dollar chips. It ought to save additional millions by forcing Government agencies to tighten up bookkeeping practices so faulty that $336,000,000 can get lost.

Anybody, including Uncle Sam, can go broke quickly with that kind of hole in his pockets.

The Unconstitutionality of a Federal Tax Upon State and Municipal Bond Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following very excellent memorandum prepared by the distinguished Attorney General of the State of New York, the Honorable Nathaniel L. Goldstein.

Although it was prepared with specific reference to the pending tax bill, the underlying principles of the law are of the greatest importance to all legislators. The matter referred to follows:

MEMORANDUM PRESENTED TO CONGRESS IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSAL TO TAX STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST—THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF A FEDERAL TAX UPON STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST—THE CONSTITUTIONAL IMMUNITY OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL SECURITIES

STATEMENT

This memorandum, submitted in opposition to a proposal of the Secretary of the Treasury, to tax State and municipal bond interest, deals with the absence of power in the Federal Government, under the Constitution of the United States, to impose such a tax

The fiscal and economic effects of Federal taxation of interest upon bonds issued by the State and its local subdivisions are being presented by the Comptroller of the State of New York and the State superintendent of public works in oral testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and by written statements.

Such effects, they have shown, would be to add staggering amounts to the cost of State and municipal financing The additional cost would be so formidable a burden upon the people of the State that the certain, inevitable effect would be to put a halt to the provision of essentially necessary facilities for the people, by the State, its counties, cities, towns, villages, school districts, improvement districts, fire districts. Public housing, the elimination of water pollution, the building of State hospitals,

the State throughway, and other State highways could not go on. The local communities—some desperately requiring new facilities because of growth in population in recent years—could not provide the schools, hospitals, streets, transit, sewage, water supply, and fire-fighting facilities that they so urgently need. Not only could the increased cost not be absorbed but the tax-exempt feature gone, the municipals particularly and the State bonds as well, would lose their sales appeal, and the source of State and local funds by borrowing would be vastly and seriously limited.

Thus, it is indisputably clear that such a tax would place a burden, actual, substantial, direct and tangible, in nowise merely conjectural or uncertain, upon the State in the performance of the functions which in the very nature of our constitutional system of government are those of the State and local units of government. It is a judicially recognized fact that the imposition of such a tax which would cut off the ability of State and localities to provide these facilities for the people, both by making the cost burden one that cannot be met and by impeding the power to borrow, could spell the end of State and municipality as vital units of government.

Under the Constitution of the United States, such a tax may not be levied. The Supreme Court of the United States so holds.

Immunity has its source in basic constitutional provisions and principles

Proposals to tax State and municipal bond interest have been before the Congress recurringly during the last decade, but the Congress has either declined to consider such measures or rejected them after consideration.

The invalidity of such a tax is implicit in the basic framework of our Federal system of government. Our Government was formed of a union of States (Preamble to the Constitution; cf. Mr. Justice Frankfurter in *Graves* v. *New York ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. at p 488); Mr. Justice Douglas in *New York* v. *United States* (326 U. S. 594, 596–597)). It was not a central government in its origin, divided into units by a central power. It was the States through which the people spoke in ratifying the Constitution. The National Government is one of delegated powers. The people and the States which united to form that National Government retained all powers except those which they surrendered to the Federal Government (tenth amendment). Governmental power over internal affairs is, by the Constitution, distributed between the National Government and the several States (*United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S at p. 330)). Each is sovereign in its own sphere.

From this basic concept the courts have drawn and developed the principle that taxes may not be imposed by the Federal or State governments, the one upon the other, which would burden and obstruct the operations of either.

In order that this Federal system, to include the States, cities, and other units of government shall endure, in order to protect "the continued existence of the state" (*Helvering* v. *Gerhardt* (304 U. S. at p. 421)), no taxes by the Federal Government may be levied which would straiten them by depriving them of the means of performing those functions which it is their province to exercise for the people (Mr. Justice Douglas in *New York* v. *United States* (326 U. S. at p. 598)).

The immunity of the States from Federal taxation, which would hamper them from performing their essential functions, flows from the same basic principles as the Federal Government's immunity from State taxes which would have the same effect. The necessity of that immunity to the National Government as essential to permit it to function is one of which the Congress is acutely aware.

I. To preserve our dual system of government, Congress has the responsibility not to enact a law which would hamper and ultimately destroy the ability of the States to exercise the powers expressly and deliberately reserved to them in the Constitution (tenth amendment)

The responsibility of the Congress to preserve our dual system of government, particularly to preserve and maintain the integrity of the States and their governmental subdivisions, is profound. It is a responsibility which is primarily that of the Congress. Only if the Congress has not fulfilled that responsibility, is it the province of the courts to declare its action unconstitutional. The United States Supreme Court approaches the construction of statutes which present the issue of encroachment of the Federal Government upon the States, on the assumption that the representatives of the States in the Congress would decline to surrender the independence of the States. So in *Helvering* v. *Gerhardt* (304 U. S at p. 416), the Court said:

"The very fact that when they [representatives in Congress] are exercising it [the national taxing power] they are taxing themselves, serves to guard against its abuse through the possibility of resort to the usual processes of political action which provides a readier and more adaptable means than any which courts can afford, for securing accommodation of the competing demands for national revenue, on the one hand, and for reasonable scope for the independence of state action, on the other."

See also *New York* v. *United States* (326 U S at p. 582).

Thus, the courts point to the initial duty of the Congress to abide by the declaration of the Constitution (tenth amendment) that those powers not granted to the Government of the United States are reserved to the States and, abiding by that constitutional declaration, not to enact any law which would render that reservation meaningless by stripping the States of the wherewithal to exercise the powers which the people declined to surrender to the National Government and were deliberate in reserving to the States.

"The ultimate touchstone of constitutionality," said Mr Justice Frankfurter in the *O'Keefe case* (306 U. S at p. 491), is "the Constitution itself." It is the constitutional duty of the Members of Congress to refrain from the imposition of taxes which would render the States powerless to function by making the cost so excessive that it cannot be met, and by reducing dangerously the ability to raise money through sale of bonds. For so the existence of the States as free, independent units of government which the Constitution intended and provided, could end. The United States Supreme Court has said:

"It rests on the law of self-preservation, for any government, whose means employed in conducting its strictly governmental operations are subject to the control of another and distinct government, exists only at the mercy of the latter" (*Ambrosini* v. *United States* (187 U S. 1, 7)).

That is simple fact for the Congress to consider carefully and seriously.

II. The United States Supreme Court has never departed from the principle that the Congress may not enact a law which will obstruct the functioning of State government

The several opinions of the United States Supreme Court in *New York* v. *United States* (326 U. S. 572), decided in 1946, make it indisputably clear that the Court deems the States immune from Federal taxation where such taxation would impede or curtail them in the performance of their sovereign functions. Five of the eight Justices who sat in that case are members of the Court today.

In one of the prevailing opinions, Justices Reed and Burton concurring, the late Chief Justice Stone unmistakably forecast that the Court would disapprove any Federal tax which would—

"So affect the State, merely because it is a State that is being taxed, as to interfere unduly with the State's performance of its sovereign functions of government. The counterpart of such undue interference has been recognized since Marshall's day as the implied immunity of each of the dual sovereignties of our constitutional system from taxation by the other. *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316)."

The issue in that case was considered and determined by the Court on the premise that a tax is invalid which "unduly interferes with the performance of the State's functions of government" (p. 588), and declared it "plain" that a tax is invalid which "infringes" "in some manner" upon the State's performance "of its functions as a government which the Constitution recognizes as sovereign" (p. 588), continuing (pp. 589–590):

"The problem is not one to be solved by a formula, but we may look to the structure of the Constitution as our guide to decision * * * neither government may destroy the other * * * or * * * seriously * * * impair * * * the appropriate exercise of the functions of the government affected by it. *Metcalf & Eddy* v. *Mitchell* (supra, 523–524)."

Another opinion in that case said squarely (p 584):

"All agree that not all of the former immunity is gone."

The dissenting opinion in the case written by Mr. Justice Douglas in which Mr Justice Black concurred, was strong in its emphasis upon the sovereignty of the States in our scheme of government and upon immunity from Federal taxation as an essential concomitant of that sovereignty. He said (taking as granted that the Constitution gives to the States "immunity from a tax on the issuance of securities" (p. 591)):

"The sovereignty of the States * * * has been understood throughout our history" (p. 592).

"Woodrow Wilson stated the starting point for me when he said that 'the States of course possess every power that government has ever anywhere exercised, except only those powers which their own constitutions or the Constitution of the United States explicitly or by plain inference withhold They are the ordinary governments of the country; the Federal Government is its instrument only for particular purposes'" (p. 592).

"It is antagonistic to the very implications of our Federal system to say that the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes—article I, section 8—includes the power to tax any State activity or function so long as the tax does not discriminate against the States" (p. 592).

Going back to earlier decisions of the Court he quoted:

"As stated in *United States* v. *Railroad Co.* (17 Wal. 322, 327–328), 'The right of the States to administer their own affairs through their legislative, executive, and judicial departments, in their own manner, through their own agencies, is conceded by the uniform decisions of this Court and by the practice of the Federal Government from its organization. This carries with it an exemption of those agencies and instruments from the taxing power of the Federal Government. If they may be taxed lightly, they may be taxed heavily; if justly, oppressively. Their operation may be impeded and may be destroyed, if any interference is permitted'" (pp. 592–593).

Specifically, State and municipal securities were to him a fortiori constitutionally immune from Federal taxation:

"Can it be that a general Federal tax on the issuance of securities would be constitutional if applied to the issuance of munic-

ipal securities or of State bonds or of the securities of public-utility districts organized by the States" (p. 533)?

"As stated in *United States* v *California* (297 U. S 175, 184, 185), the immunity of State instrumentalities from Federal taxation 'is implied from the nature of our Federal system and the relationship within it of State and National Governments, and is equally a restriction on taxation by either of the instrumentalities of the other" (p. 592 footnote).

He cautioned:

"A tax is a powerful, regulatory instrument. Local government in this free land does not exist for itself. * * * Local government exists to provide for the welfare of its people, * * *. If the Federal Government can place the local governments on its tax collector's list, their capacity to serve the needs of their citizens is at once hampered or curtailed. The field of Federal excise taxation alone is practically without limits. Many State activities are in marginal enterprises where private capital refuses to venture. Add to the cost of these projects a Federal tax and the social program may be destroyed before it can be launched. In any case, the repercussions of such a fundamental change on the credit of the States and on their programs to take care of the needy and to build for the future would be considerable. * * * The power to tax lightly is the power to tax severely. The power to tax is indeed one of the most effective forms of regulation. And no more powerful instrument for centralization of government could be devised" (pp 593-594).

"The Constitution was designed to keep the balance between the States and the Nation outside the field of legislative controversy" (p 594).

He recalled:

"The immunity of the States from Federal taxation is no less clear because it is implied. The States on entering the Union surrendered some of their sovereignty. It was further curtailed as various amendments were adopted. But the tenth amendment provides that 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.' The Constitution is a compact between sovereigns. * * * If the power of the Federal Government to tax the States is conceded, the reserved power of the States guaranteed by the tenth amendment does not give them the independence which they have always been assumed to have. They are relegated to a more servile status. They become subject to interference and control both in the functions which they exercise and the methods which they employ. They must pay the Federal Government for the privilege of exercising the powers of sovereignty guaranteed them by the Constitution * * *" (pp. 594-595).

Worthy of particular note is his view that a tax which would curtail State activity in many fields would have an adverse effect on the Federal tax burden:

"There is no showing whatsoever that an expanding field of state activity even faintly promises to cripple the Federal Government in its search for needed revenues. If the truth were known, I suspect it would show that the activities of the States in the fields of housing, public power and the like have increased the level of income of the people and have raised the standards of marginal or submarginal groups. Such conditions affect favorably, not adversely, the tax potential of the Federal Government" (p. 598).

See also pages 594, 596-597.

Thus, the current United States Supreme Court writing in the contemporary scene maintains the sovereignty of the States and the attendant principle of immunity from Federal taxation as an indispensable essential of that sovereignty and, indeed, of their continued existence.

Between Chief Justice Marshall's statement of this unalterable truth as arising from the fact that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," and Mr. Justice Douglas' statement of the reason as that "the power to tax is indeed one of the most effective forms of regulation. And no more powerful instrument for centralization of government could be devised" (326 U S. 594), have been a long succession of decisions affirming and reaffirming the doctrine of immunity.

In considering the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, we are taking the most recent cases first, for the argument of those who urge a tax by the Federal or State Government upon the other is based on a mistaken or wishful theory that the Court in recent years has decimated the immunity doctrine to the point of extinction. It is not so New York against United States, from which we have quoted at length, supra, is the most recent case which discussed the principle extensively and showed that it is still very much alive.

In an even more recent case, one decided approximately a year ago—*Wilmette Park District* v. *Campbell* (338 U. S. 411 (December 1949))—the Court in an opinion by Mr. Justice Clark, affirmed the principle that a tax does not offend the principle of immunity only "when the burden on the State is so speculative and uncertain that if allowed it would restrict the Federal taxing power without affording any corresponding tangible protection to the State government" (p. 419). At page 420 he also indicated unmistakably that a tax which would cause "the volume of its [the State's] revenues" to suffer, would be unconstitutional.

In 1944, in *United States* v. *Allegheny Co.* (322 U. S. 174), Mr. Justice Jackson held distinctly that "the trend of recent decisions" was not in the direction of "impairing the immunity of the State or Nation itself" (p. 186; see also p. 194).

In *Alabama* v *King & Boozer* (314 U. S. 1), in an opinion in which, of the present Court, Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, and Douglas concurred, Mr. Justice Stone made clear his acceptance of the doctrine that a tax would be invalid where "the economic burden" thereof would fall upon the Government (p. 12) or where it was "an infringement of the Government immunity" (p. 14).

Going back to 1938 and 1939, to *Helvering* v. *Gerhardt* (304 U S 405), and *Graves* v. *N. Y. ex rel. O'Keefe* (306 U. S. 466), the cases which held that the salaries of State employees are taxable by the Federal Government and the salaries of Federal employees are taxable by the States, the opinions in those cases leave unimpaired the immunity of the States from a Federal tax, where the burden upon the State function is "actual and substantial" (*Helvering* v. *Gerhardt* (304 U. S 421)). The Court in the Gerhardt case recognized that "the basis upon which constitutional tax immunity of a State has been supported is the protection which it affords to the continued existence of the State," and that a tax is invalid which "precludes or threatens unreasonably to obstruct any function essential to the continued existence of the State government" (304 U. S. at pp. 421, 422; see also p. 424).

In the O'Keefe case, the Court was again explicit in expressing its continued acceptance of the doctrine of immunity. At pages 477-478 it said:

"The theory of the tax immunity of either government, State or National, and its instrumentalities, from taxation by the other, has been rested upon an implied limitation on the taxing power of each, such as to forestall undue interference, through the exercise of that power, with the governmental activities of the other."

See also page 480 where the Court recognized "the purpose" of the immunity as one "to avoid interference with the functions of the taxed government," and page 481 where the Court pointed out that the argument for constitutional immunity would be "that the economic burden of the tax is in some way passed on so as to impose a burden" "tantamount to an interference by one government with the other in the performance of its functions." At pages 483-484 the Court again said that the "purpose of the immunity" is "to prevent undue interference with the one government by imposing on it the tax burdens of the other" Finally, at page 486, the Court accepted the principle of immunity where the effect of the tax is that a "tangible or certain economic burden is imposed on the government concerned." Justices Black and Reed of the present Court concurred in the majority opinion in this case.

In a concurring opinion Mr. Justice Frankfurter declared (p. 488) that—

"Neither [the State nor Federal Government] through its power to tax can be allowed to cripple the operations of the other. Therefore, State and Federal Governments must avoid exactions which discriminate against each other or obviously interfere with one another's operation"

Shortly before the decision in the Gerhardt case, the Court in *Helvering* v *Mountain Producers Corp.* (303 U S. 376 (1938)) tested the validity of a tax by whether it was "a direct and substantial interference" with State government (303 U. S at pp. 384, 387). See also, *Helvering* v. *Therrell* (303 U S 218, 233).

Thus, it is abundantly clear that in the last dozen or more years, through depression years, defense years, war years, and the uneasy postwar years, on examination and reexamination of the theory underlying immunity (*Graves* v. *New York ex rel O'Keefe* (306 U S at p 483)) by a Supreme Court of changed personnel, there has remained the basic doctrine of immunity of the States from taxation by the Federal Government, where that taxation will interfere with the performance by the States of their functions There has remained the appreciation by the Supreme Court that such interference would endanger the very existence of the States as such. There has remained the cognizance by the Court that the Constitution designed a role for State government as well as for the National Government There has remained the respect by the Court for the role of the States in our constitutional scheme of government

No serious question exists in any mind as to the strength of the doctrine of immunity prior to 1938. Therefore to keep this memorandum within temperate bounds, we merely list without discussion or quotation some of the numerous cases, never overruled, that have sustained it:

Trinityfarm Co. v. *Grosjean* (291 U. S 466). See especially page 471.

Indian Motorcycle Co. v *United States* (283 U. S. 570). See especially page 475.

Willcuts v. *Bunn* (282 U. S. 216). See especially pages 224-225.

Metcalf & Eddy v. *Mitchell* (269 U. S. 514). See especially pages 521, 522, 523

Ambrosini v. *United States* (187 U. S. 1). See especially page 7.

McCulloch v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat 316). See especially pages 429-430, 431.

Brush v. *Commissioner* (300 U S. 352). See especially page 354.

South Carolina v. *United States* (199 U. S. 437). See especially page 452

Pollock v. *Farmers' Loan and Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 429). See especially pages 583-584, 603.

United States v *Railroad Co.* (17 Wall. 322). See especially page 327.

See also the decisions cited in point III, infra.

III. A Federal tax on State and municipal bond interest is, under express decisions of the United States Supreme Court, an unconstitutional direct burden on the States

The United States Supreme Court has consistently held, from its earliest decisions on the subject to the present day, that to tax the interest on Government bonds—Federal, State, and municipal—would be to disastrously affect the borrowing power of these governments, and thus under the Constitution to be mutually prohibited.

The power to borrow money is so indispensable to government that it is expressly provided for the Federal Government in the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8) and like provision is made in State constitutions. It is that power which a tax upon State and municipal bond interest would endanger

In December 1944, in *Smith* v. *Davis* (323 U. S 111), the late Mr. Justice Murphy in a unanimous opinion of the Court, noted that interest-bearing securities of the Government are tax exempt and this for the reason that they would "diminish" "the market value or the investment attractiveness" of the obligations issued to "secure necessary credit" (p. 117). Justice Murphy cited cases reaching back to early decisions of the Court sustaining such tax immunity (p. 115). See also Mr. Justice Douglas' opinion in *New York* v. *United States* (326 U. S at pp. 591, 593).

Smith v *Davis* was in turn cited only a year ago in *N J. Ins. Co* v *Div. of Tax Appeals* (338 U S 665 at p. 675).

Decisions by the United States Supreme Court holding Government bond interest tax exempt because of the deleterious effect on Governments' borrowing power are legion.

An opinion of not long ago (December 1937) which enjoys high prestige with the Court today, *James* v. *Dravo Contracting Co.* (302 U. S. 134) held (p. 153, Chief Justice Hughes):

"That doctrine recognizes the direct effect of a tax which 'would operate on the power to borrow before it is exercised' (*Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co*, supra), and which would directly affect the Government's obligation as a continuing security. Vital consideration are there involved respecting the permanent relations of the Government to investors in its securities and its ability to maintain its credit. * * *."

A few months later (March 1938) in *Helvering* v. *Mountain Producers Corporation*, the Court pointed out (303 U. S), at page 386

"The interest payable on State and municipal bonds has been held to be invalid as a tax bearing directly upon the exercise of the borrowing power of the Government (*Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468, 469); *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U S. 429, 586))."

In prior cases, whose authority, as we have seen, is undiminished, the United States Supreme Court has repeatedly voiced this view We quote from just a few of the very many cases that are in accord: *Indian Motorcycle Co.* v *United States* (283 U. S. 570), at pages 576-577:

"It has been adjusted that bonds of the United States issued to raise money for governmental purposes, and the interest thereon, are immune from State taxation, because such a tax, even though inconsiderable in amount and imposed only on holders of the bonds, would burden the exercise by the United States of its power to borrow money *Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468); *The Banks* v. *The Mayor* (7 Wall. 16); *Home Savings Bank* v. *Des Moines* (205 U. S. 503, 513); *Northwestern Ins. Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (275 U. S 136, 140). * * * It also has been adjudged that bonds of municipal corporations in the several States issued to raise money for public municipal purposes, and the interest thereon, are immune from Federal taxation, and this on the ground that * * * under the implications of the Constitution the governmental agencies and operations of the States have the same immunity from Federal taxation that like agencies and operations of the United States have from taxation by the States. *Pollock* v *Farmers Loan & Trust Co* (157 U. S. 429, 584–586, 601, 652, 653; s. c. 158 U S. 601, 618, 693)."

Willcuts v *Bunn* (282 U. S 216), at pages 225, 226–227:

"A tax upon the obligations of a State or of its political subdivisions falls within the constitutional prohibition as a tax upon the exercise of the borrowing power of the State. *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Company* (157 U. S 429, 581-586; id., 158 U S 601, 618); *National Life Insurance Company* v. *United States* (277 U. S 508, 521).

* * * * *

"In the case of the obligations of a State or of its political subdivisions, the subject held to be exempt from Federal taxation is the principal and interest of the obligations. *Pollock* v *Farmers' Loan & Trust Company*, supra These obligations constitute the contract made by the State, or by its political agency pursuant to its authority, and a tax upon the amounts payable by the terms of the contract has therefore been regarded as bearing directly upon the exercise of the borrowing power of the Government In *Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468, 469), where the tax, laid under an ordinance of the city council upon United States stock which has been issued for loans made to the United States, was held invalid, the principle was thus stated by Chief Justice Marshall 'The right to tax the contract to any extent, when made, must operate upon the power to borrow, before it is exercised, and have a sensible influence on the contract. The extent of this influence depends on the will of a distinct government To any extent, however inconsiderable, it is a burden on the operations of government. * * * The tax on Government stock is thought by this Court to be a tax on the contract, a tax on the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and consequently, to be repugnant to the Constitution.' This language was applied by the Court in *Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Company*, supra (157 U S at p 586) in holding invalid Federal taxation 'on the interest' from municipal securities"

Missouri v *Gehner et al.* (281 U S 313), at pages 320-321:

"It is elementary that the bonds or other securities of the United States may not be taxed by State authority * * * The power of Congress to borrow money on the credit of the United States would be burdened and might be destroyed by State taxation of the means employed for that purpose. As the tax-exempt feature tends to increase and is reflected in the market prices of such securities, a State tax burden thereon would adversely affect the terms upon which money may be borrowed to execute the purposes of the general government"

The Macallen Company v *Massachusetts* (279 U S 629), at pages 624, 629:

"Of course, in respect of United States securities, the statutory exemption is superfluous. A State tax, however small, upon such securities or interest derived therefrom, interferes or tends to interfere with the constitutional power of the general government to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and constitutes a burden upon the operations of government, and carried far enough would prove destructive. The principle set forth a century ago in *Weston* v. *Charleston* (2 Pet. 449, 468), has never since been departed from by this Court:

" 'The right to tax the contract to any extent, when made, must operate upon the power to borrow before it is exercised, and have a sensible influence on the contract. The extent of this influence depends on the will of a distinct government, to any extent, however inconsiderable, it is a burden on the operations of government. It may be carried to an extent which shall arrest them *entirely*' (*Home Savings Bank* v. *Des Moines* (205 U. S. 503, 513).)

* * * * *

"In the consideration of such legislation, the controlling principle, constantly to be borne in mind, is that the State cannot tax the instrumentalities or bonds of the United States, or, what is the same thing, the income derived therefrom, directly or indirectly—that is to say, it cannot tax them in any form."

National Life Insurance Company v. *United States* (277 U S 508) at page 521:

"It is settled doctrine that directly to tax the income from securities amounts to taxation of the securities themselves. *Northwestern Mutual Life Ins Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (275 U. S 136). Also that the United States may not tax State or municipal obligations. *Metcalf & Eddy* v *Mitchell* (269 U. S. 514, 521)."

Farmers Bank v. *Minnesota* (232 U. S. 516) at pages 526-527.

"But we deem it entirely clear that a tax upon the exercise of the function of issuing municipal bonds is a tax upon the operations of the Government, * * *. And to tax the bonds as property in the hands of the holders is, in the last analysis, to impose a tax upon the right of the municipality to issue them (Quoting from *Weston* v *City Council of Charleston* (2 Pet 449, 466, 469), *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat 316))

* * * * *

"It is on this ground that United States bonds have always been held exempt from taxation under authority of the States By like reasoning it has come to be recognized that bonds issued by the States are not taxable by the Federal Government, and it was upon this ground that this court held in *Pollock* v *Farmers Loan & Trust Co* (157 U. S 429, 584), that the income tax provisions of the act of August 15, 1894, were unconstitutional in that they imposed a tax upon the income derived from municipal bonds issued under the authority of the States."

Hibernia Savings & Loan Society v. *San Francisco* (200 U. S 310) at page 313:

"The efficiency of the Government service cannot be impaired by a taxation of the agencies which it employs for such service, and, as one of the most valuable and best known of these agencies is the borrowing of money, a tax which diminishes the slightest degree the value of the obligations issued by the Government for that purpose impairs pro tanto their market value."

It is unnecessary to quote from the pioneer cases holding that Government bond interest may not be taxed because of its burden and inevitable effect upon the power to borrow the necessary funds for the operation of Government, even to the point where it could arrest them entirely (*Pollock* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U S 429, 586). See also pp. 585, 601, 652, 653, s. c., 158 U. S 601, 618, 693). Their frequent citation in the later cases has made them and the well-known subsequent cases familiar, e g., *Weston* v. *City of Charleston* (2 Pet. 449); *Bank of Commerce* v. *New York City* (2 Black 620); *The Banks* v. *Mayor* (7 Wall. 16); *United States* v *Railroad* (17 Wall 322), Pollock cases, supra; *Home Insurance Co* v. *New York* (134 U S 598); *Home Savings Bank* v *Des Moines* (205 U S. 503), *Smith* v *Kansas City Title Co* (255 U. S. 180, 213); *Metcalf & Eddy* v. *Mitchell* (269 U. S 514, 522); *Northwestern Ins Co* v *Wisconsin* (275 U S. 136, 140); *Hale* v. *State Board*, (302 U S. 95, 107).

It is thus clear beyond doubt that the United States Supreme Court has held and holds that to tax the interest on Government bonds is to tax the means (*James v. Dravo Contracting Co* (302 U. S. at p. 153)) by which Government raises the money without which it cannot function, because such tax would not only increase the cost of Government but would inevitably curtail the market for the bonds. The disaster that would be the product of such tax is one that the National Government may not constitutionally visit upon the States and their subdivisions—the partners in our governmental system as created by the Constitution.

CONCLUSION

This memorandum is but a summary of the principles under which a Federal tax upon State and municipal bond interest is unequivocally unconstitutional An extended study developing these principles and citing other principles supporting the conclusion f unconstitutionality would but be laboring the point, and we have therefore confined the length of our discussion.

There is not a Member of the Congress who would forfeit the existence of his State, his county, his city, town or village. If he were to impose the proposed tax he is on the way of doing just that. He is imperiling the highways, schools, hospitals in his home State and community, the needed fire fighting facilities, the public housing development—all the essential and enterprising activities of his home State, his home city or village. He is stopping their progress and growth on the day he votes for this tax. For by imposing costs that he knows full well his State and community cannot meet; by taking away the ability of his State, his county, his school district to market their bonds holding out the attraction of freedom from Federal tax on the very modest interest rate which the purchaser receives, he is drying up the funds of his home State and community without which they cannot continue to progress.

The framers of the Constitution recognized that such is the danger in surrender of State power to the National Government, and reserved therein the powers of the States. The courts translated that principle into immunity of the States from National taxation which actually and substantially places a burden on the States' functions. Holding that immunity essential to the independence of the States—and the independence of the States the essence of our form of government—the courts have to this day held a Federal tax constitutional only when its impact upon the States is merely conjectural and uncertain. They have held it invalid and unconstitutional when the impact upon the States would be to hamper them in the exercise of their powers as the vital units in our system of government that they are.

"The very nature of our constitutional system of dual sovereign governments is such as impliedly to prohibit the Federal Government from taxing the instrumentalities of a State government, and in a similar manner to limit the power of the States to tax the instrumentalities of the Federal Government.

* * * * *

"* * * recourse may be had to the reason upon which the rule rests, * * *. * * * it rests on the conviction that each government, in order that it may administer its affairs within its own sphere, must be left free from undue interference by the other. * * * neither government must destroy the other nor curtail in any substantial manner the exercise of its powers." (*Metcalf & Eddy v. Mitchell* (269 U. S 514, 521, 523).)

Dated: March 1, 1951.

Respectfully submitted,

NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN,
Attorney General of the State of New York.
Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

Galeton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article by Ann Fields from Coronet for June 1950:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 1, 1951.*
Hon DANIEL J. FLOOD.
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN. Pursuant to our discussion several days ago relative to the possibility of a military or naval installation securing the property of the Galeton Foundry Co

May I suggest that you use your good offices in influencing the authorities in either leasing or purchasing this property. During the last war the Department of the Army used the Lyman Run CCC camp which is 17 miles from Galeton as a prisoner-of-war camp and the prisoners cut chemical wood for the Susquehanna Chemical Co at Roulette, Potter County Potter County has the largest acreage of State forest lands in Pennsylvania

The General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recently completed the construction of a million dollar recreational lake near the old Lyman Run Civilian Conservation Corps camp which buildings are still in good condition During the depression we had eight CCC camps in Potter County. It appears to me that the Galeton area would be a fine location for an Army installation or convalescent camp as we have land, pure mountain air and water, finest hunting and fishing in the eastern part of the United States. We also have a need for these facilities as our foundry closed in October 1949, laying off 150 male employees, and some are on the relief rolls and others are drawing unemployment compensation. This would give employment and purchasing power in an area which is certainly in need of consideration at the earliest date possible.

I refer you to the June, 1950 edition of the Coronet magazine which clearly indicates what the people of "Galeton, the Friendly Town" have gone through and what they have accomplished, and that they are still determined to go forward

I feel confident that Potter County can contribute a great deal toward the defense effort, and may I also suggest that the proper authorities investigate the possibilities of developing this area as it has a great deal to offer.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE CROSETTO,
Owner and Publisher, the Leader-Dispatch, Galeton, Pa.

FORTUNE SMILES ON "FRIENDLY TOWN"

(By Ann Fields)

As the little one-coach train puffed along the lonesome wishbone of track skirting the Allegheny Mountains, a happy chorus of children sang: "Back to Galeton—we're going back to Galeton."

The children were from the sweltering streets of New York City's lower East Side, which they were leaving behind to become the summer guests of strange mothers and fathers in the heroic little town of Galeton, Pa.

When the train came to a halt in the heart of Galeton, half the population was on hand to meet the children. There were hugs and gay shouts as each youngster hunted the mother whose name was written on the card pinned to shirt or blouse. And anxious Galeton mothers, taking a child for the first time, eagerly read tags to find the boy or girl assigned to them.

The children were representative of the great metropolitan melting pot—Protestant, Catholic, Jew—of French, Spanish, German, and Italian descent—for the mothers of Galeton play no favorites. They simply say: "Send me a child." And now here were the children, happy, carefree—thinking only of the sunlight and the fishing, the green yards and miles of forests.

They could not know, nor would they know, that their coming meant genuine sacrifice on the part of the little town. For the people of Galeton have been hit by almost every possible disaster Destroyed three times by fire, washed out by floods, their giant lumber and tanning industries closed, they have watched their population shrink from 4,100 to a mere 1,800. And yet, they have refused to admit defeat

Schooled by hardship and solitude, the people of the near ghost town have learned a philosophy of living that is unique in our time. It has become a kind of folk-religion with them to think of others No one can be a stranger in Galeton, and the atmosphere of friendly peace and happy living has made it a second spiritual home for the so-called tenement kids.

The children are guests of the fresh-air fund, a program sponsored by the New York Herald Tribune to give vacations to city children who can't afford them The fund pays train fare, and the homes into which they go take care of their meals and recreation

Speaking of the town and its people, one of the executives of the fund summed it up: "You might say the people of Galeton are sharing what they have with magnificent pride—God bless them."

To the children assigned to Galeton, it is a dream town Tucked in a green valley of eastern Potter County, it is hemmed in by two chains of the Alleghenies. Fickle Pine Creek, sometimes rambling, sometimes boisterously rushing, divides the town in two. Deer roam in herds, fox and porcupine scurry through the brush, and streams are abundant with fish.

Into this paradise come the children from Manhattan, many of whom have never even seen a live cow or chicken. Wonderful things happen to them, and to their summer parents as well.

For example, little Ann, an Italian child, was taken into the home of Danny del Grasso. Danny, survivor of a wartime torpedoing, had had 5 years of military service when, with his wife and a pension, he came back to the quiet and peace of his mountain town.

The Del Grassos fell in love with little Ann, kept her all summer, and visited her later in New York Next year they brought her back, along with her brother, and had the mother and father and one other child as visitors for a week.

Little Marilyn, age 11, almost didn't make it to Galeton, which she now considers would have been high tragedy. Mr. and Mrs. Nick Hitzell live in the factory section where houses are old and many unpainted Nick Hitzell works in a small factory that makes powdered milk. They have two children of their own, and their worry was that a city child might be disappointed with their simple way of living.

There was no need to worry Little Marilyn took one look at the spreading lawn, the huge trees and the stream running by the door, and gave a delighted, whoops!

The man who started Galeton on its happy career is the Rev Robert S Cocks, minister

of the Presbyterian Church. The Rev. Mr. Cocks had been active in the work of the fresh air fund during a pastorate in New York, and when he came to Galeton he invited his congregation and other churches to participate. He was astounded at the wholehearted response Eight churches (including three from nearby communities) came in, as well as all civic organizations.

The minister himself took four robust boys ranging in age from 8 to 11. He cooked for them, took them hunting, fishing, and swimming, and trained them to help him with bachelor housekeeping.

"They ate me out of house and home," he says, "putting on weight even with my cooking. I don't know which of us loved it most"

Since one of the boys was a Catholic, the Reverend Mr. Cocks took him to mass on Sunday morning. Then the lad looked after the house while the minister preached his own 11 o'clock sermon.

The Galeton hosts are all plain working people, but there is no lack of entertainment for the children. Every day is full of magic for them. Everybody wants to entertain them—and does. And they give the children the time of their lives.

The favorite treat is what is called "putting the deer to bed" Each night, cars loaded with children drive out of town and, as the caravan creeps along, spotlights play on fields and hillsides where hundreds of deer graze unconcernedly, ignoring the procession

Unintentionally, the youngsters have been a means of focusing attention on the plucky town and its hard-luck history. Back in 1885, the Galeton section was the largest hemlock and pine empire in the world. Into this timber bonanza moved the Goodyear brothers, Frank and Charles, buying an 80,000-acre tract. Then the combine ripped through the hills, cutting 50,000,000 feet of timber annually, tearing the bark from the great trees to feed the tanneries and leaving the trunks to rot on the ground.

More and more men were needed as faster and faster went the saws Giant tanneries sprang up. A horde of itinerant workers moved in The railroad yards alone had a crew of 700 men, with up to 10 trains a day pulling out, loaded with Galeton's lumber gold

More homes were needed and built A raucous, rowdy, robust town replaced a placid village Liquor flowed, guns barked, gambling houses ran round the clock

Then, through the ghost of the once-green forest, swept a fire which blotted out almost the entire business section and hundreds of homes. Patiently, Galeton set about rebuilding But the fire came again in 1899, and still a third time in 1916, and destroyed all of Main Street

Then, one day in 1920, the boom was over. The raped hills were barren areas, and the timber barons and the floating population moved on In the years that followed, little Galeton really knew hard times. There were no jobs, no industries. But the faithful people stuck it out.

In 1942, nature struck the hapless town again. This time a raging flood tore through Pine Creek Railroad tracks were ripped apart, homes were uprooted, farms destroyed, and the people fled to the hills for their lives.

A second flood came in 1946. When it was all over Galeton was shut off, isolated from the world No railroad remained to take them out or bring the world in. The once-teeming car barns and sheds were empty. No one cared whether a train ran to Galeton or not.

But the people cared. A meeting was called of local businessmen, for in the heart of the town were several large railroad buildings, now unused, which could be turned into a foundry. A committee was appointed to contact the Lennox Furnace Co, which needed additional foundry capacity, and persuade them to open a branch in Galeton. Finally, the manager agreed, provided the people of Galeton would put up $15,000 to help get the buildings back in order and show good faith in the new industry The hard-pressed little town subscribed not $15,000, but $20,000, and the Lennox foundry has been a lifesaver, employing 150 men

The people of Galeton now hope that United States Highway No 6, which was once an impersonal "hurry road" through their town, will soon be clogged with vacationers from Washington, New York, and Philadelphia, who seek peace in the woods and hills. Meanwhile, the local streets are filled with smeared jerseys and sun-tanned legs as 44 laughing, happy children mingle with Galeton's own

The struggles of the people along the creek and their wholehearted sharing among themselves and with others have become a part of everyday living Their reward, they feel, came in the words of a little girl who had spent two summers with them As she tearfully boarded the train for New York, she said

"If I can't come back here, I don't ever want to go any place"

Shipment of Rubber to Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in which he stated he had just received an article from a paper published in Hong Kong, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum nearly 1 week before the Senator's remarks yesterday. The article is entitled "The British Attitude Hard to Understand"

I also ask to have printed an article entitled "United States Slaps New Ban on Use of Rubber," which appeared recently in the press.

I call attention to the fact that the article in the Forum states that "10,000 tons of rubber are on the high seas en route to Communist China from British Singapore." It is also stated that "British woolen goods exports to Red China shot up from $2,000 in December 1949, to $300,000 in December 1950."

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

[From the Fargo (N Dak) Forum]

THE BRITISH ATTITUDE HARD TO UNDERSTAND

It is difficult to understand the British Government's policy in respect to shipments of goods and materials to Red China.

Here is a story from the London bureau of the Baltimore Sun:

"Ten thousand tons of rubber are on the high seas en route to Communist China from British Singapore, and the British Government says it has at present no intention of stopping the shipment.

"The rubber valued at more than $9,800,000—is being carried in two ships"

Then we read this from another source: "British woolen goods exports to Red China shot up from $2,000 in December 1949, to $300,000 in December 1950 And in the same related periods, British shipments of assorted machinery, also vehicles of various kinds, rose from a few thousand dollars to hundreds of thousands"

UNITED STATES SLAPS NEW BAN ON USE OF RUBBER

WASHINGTON, D. C—The Government Monday banned or limited use of natural rubber in more than 40,000 civilian products, ranging from inner tubes to falsies.

The order is to be effective March 1.

The order, which will be issued formally by the national production authority (NPA) in a day or two, bans use of natural rubber in some items and limits it severely in others. Sporting goods are hard hit.

Officials said the order will not mean any cut in over-all production of rubber goods since synthetic rubber may be used wherever the use of natural rubber is banned.

An average of only 15 percent natural rubber was allowed for the production of most small and medium-sized automobile tires, but those over 7 10 inches can be made with 22 percent.

Natural rubber use in heavy duty truck tires ranged up to 92 percent and to 100 percent in airplane tires. No natural rubber will be permitted in passenger car and light truck tire tubes.

Smaller auto tires now are being made with 25 percent natural rubber, while larger passenger car tires are manufactured with 35 percent Present limitations on the tire industry permit auto tires with 35 percent natural rubber.

NPA said none of the restrictions will affect the appearance, performance or safety of the rubber items, adding that about 300 rubber industry officials helped draft the order

NPA said the order is aimed at holding civilian consumption of natural rubber to 25,000 tons a month. It averaged slightly higher than that this month and last.

There was speculation that the action might be followed by an order cutting auto tire prices because of the mandatory reduction in the use of more expensive natural rubber.

The Federal Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bewildering Tax Structure Needs an Overhauling," which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on March 4 last.

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

BEWILDERING TAX STRUCTURE NEEDS AN OVERHAULING

Next to military defenses and safeguards against inflation, this country badly needs simplification of its entire hodgepodge tax structure, Federal, State and local.

Not only are taxes reaching staggering proportions, they are so many and so com-

plex that we doubt Dr. Einstein, even with the aid of a mechanical brain, could keep track of them.

Everybody knows that, in addition to income taxes, corporation taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, school taxes, and so on, there are hundreds of hidden taxes on practically everything we eat, wear, and use.

But that's not all. According to a study by the Tax Foundation, New York, and printed in its magazine, Tax Outlook, many States, searching high and low for new revenue, have taxes based on trades, occupations, foods, and manufactures For instance, Virginia has an apple excise tax; Colorado, a tax on bedding manufactures; Idaho, a beans excise; Maine, a blueberry tax, Texas and Maine, a tax on bank-night awards; and Florida and Vermont, a tax on copyrighted music.

In addition Massachusetts taxes entertainment on Lord's day; Delaware has a feed dealers' tax; Indiana, a tax on fertilizer inspection; Oregon, a hop inspection tax; Georgia, a tax on mattress inspection; Kansas, a quail tax; and California, a tax on upholstered furniture.

These are only a few samples And the United States Government, the State, and the municipalities are always on the alert for something else to tax With Federal taxes soaring, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia, among other States and cities, are on the hunt for new taxable items.

Congress and State and local governments should make a vigorous attempt, not only to cut out extravagance, but to revise and simplify their taxes to take a little of the present worry off confused and weary taxpayers. Certainly not only the total cost but the bewildering multiplicity of seen and unseen taxes is a rank injustice to the millions of Americans who want to be good citizens but are being driven crazy by complex, often overlapping, tax demands on their hard-earned pay.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Wisconsin Builders' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, March 5, it was my pleasure to address a joint conference of the Wisconsin Builders' Association and the Madison Builders' Association on the theme Building America's Values. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my address.

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

BUILDING AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, before Wisconsin Builders' Association, Madison, Wis., Monday, March 5, 1951)

It is a great privilege to be back in the capital of our State to address this important gathering of leaders in the field of construction.

Certainly there are few more inspiring themes than that of "building" Yes, I know that you gentlemen who have put on the landscape thousands and thousands of splendid structures—that you get a tremendous sense of satisfaction when you look about your community and see the buildings which you have developed from the drafting board to the foundation. Today, our entire country is building in a new way—building the bulwarks not only of our own defense, but of the defense of western civilization.

BUILDING AMERICA'S VALUES

Speaking to you, therefore, as builders, may I say that what we need is more men with the building concept and less with the "tearing down" idea In other words, what we need to do is build up the great values which have characterized the American scene

Of course, you and I know that there are times when the only way to put up a new structure is to tear down an obsolete old one. But you have to be mighty sure that you are not tearing down something far more beneficial than what you are building up

During the 1930's this country spawned a great number of fuzzy-minded people—some supposedly well-educated—who wanted to tear down the structure of American society, to tear down the free-enterprise system, to tear down the constitutional system They wanted to replace it with some such structure as that of the Soviet Union, a structure which is nothing but a new disguise for the old idea of human slavery, a structure based on the fanatic idea that man is a materialistic brute who must be controlled and who must be dictated to in every single essential of his life.

THE TEARERS-DOWN INSIDE GOVERNMENT

The result of this spawning of the "tearer-downers" is shown in the headlines of 1951. More and more instances are coming to light where these wrong-minded individuals got key positions in the Government and proceeded to tear down from within

Today, a subcommittee of our Senate Judiciary Committee is making a complete investigation of these tearer-downers and the extent to which the Department of Justice has interpreted or misinterpreted the anti-subversive law which we in the Congress enacted.

HOW AMERICA CAN BE TORN DOWN

You and I know that there are many ways by which an individual can tear down. He can tear down by spreading hatred among his friends, neighbors, business associates, and acquaintances—hatred between classes, religions, races, regions. He can tear down by constantly expressing a philosophy of gloom, fear, pessimism, and anxiety. He can tear down by actively becoming a seditionist.

The only ways to combat such an individual is by the public light of exposure and by the healing forces of truth.

THE ONE BASIC ISSUE OF OUR TIME

And, speaking of public light, let us remember that we in Washington have been working on bringing before the public attention the crucial issues involved in the shaping of America's future foreign policy. I believe that the discussion which has been held on the Wherry resolution has been tremendously constructive to the future of our Nation.

Now, my friends, there are many aspects of your own building situation that you and I could discuss—for example, the newly required licensing of commercial construction, the tightening of building credit restrictions, and a great number of other regulations which have recently been enacted by Washington officialdom. All are worthy of your study and mine. And, yet you and I know that there is only one real crucial issue in our time, and that is this issue of war or peace, survival or destruction, freedom or slavery. And so with your kind permission, I should like to devote these thoughts to this great issue.

USING BEST POINTS OF EACH VIEWPOINT

I am not one of those who feels that there is a monopoly of truth on any side of this great discussion. I believe that each of the differing viewpoints which has been expressed most prominently by former President Hoover, by Senator TAFT, by Senator WHERRY, by Senator CONNALLY, etc—that each of these viewpoints has some element of truth and justice, and that what we ought to do is distill from all of these various ideas a basic policy statement which will clarify the issue and serve to unite—not divide—the American people

POINTS OF AGREEMENT ON FOREIGN POLICY

There is a tremendous amount of agreement among these various approaches, just as there is considerable disagreement. Let us not forget therefore, these points on which practically every one is agreed:

1 Russian communism does present a menace to the American way of life The world is so contracted that every nation is in every other nation's backyard.

2 America has no alternative but to build up her defenses so that she is second to none in the world, particularly in air force and naval power.

3 America cannot hope to match the mass land armies of the Soviet Union.

4 America must not allow herself to be sucked into another Korea-like trap in which we are bled in a costly venture which cannot possibly achieve complete success

5. The only way that unity can be attained is by having the President consult with the Congress as a full partner.

PRESIDENT DOES HAVE WIDE INHERENT POWERS

6 The President already has sufficient authority to station occupation forces abroad, and as a matter of fact over 100,000 Americans are now located in Germany and Austria

7 The President already, moreover, has sufficient authority to deploy United States Naval and Air Forces abroad in order to maintain an outlying ring of bases for the defense of our country, and, yes, if need be, for possible offensive operations and he has done so and is so doing.

What, then, is in dispute if practically all of these points are in complete unanimity?

IT IS CONGRESS WHICH SHOULD IMPLEMENT PACT

Well, for one thing there is a dispute as to whether or not the President has inherent power to decide independently to contribute American troops to an international land army

Involved in this question is whether or not the North Atlantic Pact is self-executing or whether it requires congressional act for implementation I personally feel that there is a moral obligation that Congress should determine the policy in relation to implementing the Atlantic Pact with ground troops

My basic conviction on the matter is that the Congress and the President must try to come to agreement on the basic essentials of defense of Western Europe This makes it absolutely necessary that the President consult with the Congress in the actual formulation of policy. By consultation I do not mean merely reporting to the Congress after a decision has been made. Congress represents the people. It must never and will, I trust, never become a mere rubber stamp of the Chief Executive.

UNITED STATES' OWN DEFENSE IS PARAMOUNT

Now, my friends, practically no one has urged that America send an unlimited number of troops abroad. I for one, of course, have completely rejected any such proposal. Obviously we cannot send so many troops abroad as to:

(a) Strip our own continental defenses of essential manpower.

(b) Give Europe the notion that Uncle Sam all by himself is going to defend it, and

the European countries need do little, if anything, in their own behalf.

AMERICA MUST PROVIDE WORLD LEADERSHIP

But I have said it before, my friends, and I think that it is urgent that I repeat it, that there can be no retreating from history. Whether we like it or not, there is simply one country in the remaining free world which is the hope of mankind, and that country is, of course, the United States.

We cannot and will not retreat from our military, political, and spiritual obligations. When a tremendous fire is blazing in your town or mine it is up to the fire chief to lead his men in putting out that fire This does not mean that the fire chief should try to do the job all alone, or, for that matter, that he should sit back in the fire house to see if his men can do the job all by themselves.

It should be the role of the leader to be right on the scene, to coordinate, to encourage and to give the benefit of his experience and know-how. But yes, if necessary, he must be ready to man a hose himself. However, the whole fire department has to work together as a team. The members of the fire-fighting forces cannot start to argue who has the right to use the hose in putting out the fire.

In other words, my friends, I do not think that it is time for the Congress or the President to knock each other out in a dispute as to who has the power to do what. Teamwork is essential regardless of who has the power.

PEOPLE HAVE LOST CONFIDENCE IN ADMINISTRATION

Now I personally feel that much of the present foreign-policy dispute would have been avoided if there had been justified a greater confidence on the part of the American people in the present administration I feel that this administration has lost much of the confidence of the people, largely due to its own mistakes. It made an agreement as to occupied Berlin, for example, but failed to even provide a cow path to it. It naively gave Joseph Stalin pretty much what he wanted in Europe and Asia, and never sought a concession in return. It negotiated with him in a series of secret agreements on the silly idea that Stalin was a right-good fellow who would keep his bargain. And the administration committed a great number of other blunders. I say that wholly aside from partisan differences

It is small wonder, therefore, that the American people are so disturbed and concerned about their future. Naturally, too, when with each day's newspapers, we read more and more reports of casualties of our boys in Korea, there isn't any American who does not wince at the thought of these young smiling faces, fallen in combat on the frozen battlefields of that far-off peninsula. There isn't any single American who does not seek in his inward heart for a way that will prevent the further spilling of blood.

ALLIED WEAKNESS INVITES WAR

But, my friends, in this present period, weakness and timidity will definitely not prevent a further spilling of blood. On the contrary, strength and strength alone—moral strength and physical strength—are necessary for this present critical hour. When there is a pyromania—a fire maniac (like a fanatic Communist) free in town, the only thing that will deter him is the presence of a lot of cops on the beat. If he doesn't see any cops on the scene while he is roaming the streets, there is more likelihood that he will proceed to set fires.

If, however, he sees practically every corner patrolled by a well-armed policeman and backed by an alert and intelligent citizenry, that fire maniac will think twice before he sets fires.

PRESENCE OF UNITED STATES TROOPS WILL HELP PREVENT WAR

So the basic question over this European troop resolution boils down to whether or not the cops should go on the beat before the fire has started or whether they should go after the fire has started. It is my personal feeling that the presence of a small number of American troops will prevent the fire from breaking out in the first place.

We cannot and should not contribute a completely disproportionate number of United States troops as we have in Korea. It is only stating a fact that I point out to you that it is American boys by and large who have one the bleeding and dying on that battle front. This lopsided situation must not happen again. We are willing to carry our fair share of the load, but we are not willing to carry the entire brunt all by ourselves.

YOUR LETTERS ARE WELCOME

I receive a tremendous amount of mail from Wisconsin on both sides of this problem. I welcome all expressions which come to me, whether or not they agree with my own views. I earnestly consider the views of my constituents. All I ask of them is that they, in turn, consider the fact that by colleagues and I are trying to arrive at an honest, sound decision which will accord with the best interests of our own American people first and foremost.

We recognize that any policy which is harmful to America is in the long run harmful to the world. We recognize that any policy which strengthens America strengthens the foundation of freedom in the world.

PREVENTING RUINING OF A DOLLAR

In the final few moments, I should like to turn to the subject of economic strength and leadership just as I have already spoken of military and political leadership

We recognize that a solvent America is absolutely necessary if she is to meet her challenges. That is why I have repeatedly suggested on the Senate floor, and it is why I will continue to suggest certain actions designed to save the taxpayers' money and prevent further inflation.

I know that there isn't a man or woman in this audience tonight who is not concerned about the continued ruinous depreciation of the dollar. We all realize that the 100-cent dollar has become a 40-cent dollar. Why? Well, in part, due to spendthrift policies of Government which have resulted in more and more cheap printing-press money. Now what are we going to do about it?

I have made four suggestions:

1. The armed services procurement program must be tightened so that every single dollar provided to our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, gets 100-cents in value. There must be greater coordination among the procurement agencies, and our military services must recognize that while we will eagerly give them every penny that is necessary, this is not an excuse for extravagance or wastefulness on their part.

2. A second way of securing economy is by postponement of all proposed projects not absolutely essential right now to the national defense. You know, my friends, when a country is in a crisis, it is no time to be indulging in luxury pursuits.

WE NEED EFFICIENCY EXPERTS IN AGENCIES

3 A third suggestion that I have made is that Congress set up efficiency committees which will actually check into every Government agency on excess manpower, excess functions, etc. We know that Senator BYRD'S Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures has done a fine job; but what we need is an actual pool of trained efficiency experts—men such as those whom you would hire to look into your own company to learn how to save money in very specific ways.

I shall follow through on this matter of setting up such efficiency committees in order to put the agencies on their notice that the Congress is ready, willing, and able to cut down on unnecessary appropriations.

4. Still another approach for saving money is by utilization of the latest technical weapons which will make unnecessary any attempt at having, for example, a hundred divisions or any such unsound total. In other words, if we can tap the technical genius of American industry by turning out superplanes and other essential new weapons, guided missiles, etc.—if we can do that—we will help assure defense without attempting to match Russia's mass land power.

Now, my friends, these are but four ways by which we can achieve this great economy objective. The sum and substance of what we are aiming at is that we balance the budget by pay-as-you-go financing and by cutting out all unessential items. The net effect to you and to me and to the man in the street is that we will protect the value of the dollar, which means the purchasing power that is available to every American family.

CONTINUED RELIANCE ON DIVINE PROVIDENCE

May I conclude now on a note which I believe is appropriate to this solemn hour in American history On another occasion, at the establishment of this Republic, the founding fathers of this great Nation expressed in no fewer than four specific references in the Declaration of Independence our universal dependence on God. May I, therefore, recall to you these references which I think can guide us today as they guided the patriots of 1776:

1. In the first sentence, the authors of this great charter of our freedom wrote: "To which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

2. Then in the second sentence, they wrote: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

3 Then in the next to the last sentence: "Appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world."

4. Then finally, my friends, the authors of the Declaration of Independence wrote in the final sentence: "With a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

With that same firm reliance today, with that same faith which we are told moves mountains, I know that America will be adequate to the challenges of this challenging hour. Thank you.

The Key to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article signed by a clergyman dealing with a book entitled "The Key to Peace." The article is entitled "Superficial Book," and appeared in the Washington Daily News.

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

SUPERFICIAL BOOK

(Under the above title, the National Catholic Welfare Council here has released the following review of a book called Key to Peace, by Clarence Manion, Notre Dame's law dean. The assistant director of the social action department of NCWC says the book may insult our allies and "is likely to do a lot of harm." The book is currently being serialized by the Times-Herald.)

(By Rev. George C Higgins, assistant director, social action department, NCWC)

Clarence Manion, dean of the law school at the University of Notre Dame, recently published a book entitled "The Key to Peace," which has aroused a degree of public interest out of all proportion to its length and importance.

One reviewer—Walter Trohan, well known correspondent for the Chicago Tribune – refers to it unqualifiedly as "the finest politico-spiritual study of America I know"

"I read it twice in one night," he says, "have returned to it many times, and expect to do so as far in the future as my road may go" Others have praised it just as highly.

LIKELY TO DO HARM

Under the circumstances, therefore, it is more than a little embarrassing for the present writer to be among the first to sound a sour note and suggest that The Key to Peace is a very superficial book

Our discomfiture is all the greater in view of the fact that the book is obviously well-intentioned and so deeply spiritual and religious in tone Nevertheless, we cannot help but think that it's likely to do a lot of harm, particularly if it falls into the hands of our beleaguered allies in the struggle for international peace The free nations of the world are likely to be insulted—as they have a right to be—by its exaggerated "Americanism" and its all too conspicuous contempt for "Europeanism," whatever that may be.

IMPLIED INDICTMENT

Inasmuch as Manion is a Celtic name, the present writer—a fellow immigrant, two generations removed—is particularly bewildered by the author's implicit indictment of the Republic of Ireland

Dr Manion says, by obvious implication if not in so many words, that the Government of the Republic of Ireland (and of all other nations on God's green earth, with the sole exception of the United States of America) holds to "the proposition that Government once installed is unlimited in its power over its subjects"

His thesis is that "Americanism offers the only valid formula for the ultimate achievement" of the ideal of human brotherhood The "genuine and really precious diamonds of human civilization," he says, are to be found "only in this—the United States of America" It is unfortunate, he adds, that "every political system in the un-American world officially and categorically denies the sacredness of human personality"

If this means anything at all, it means that Ireland (among other countries) is either actually or potentially a totalitarian dictatorship

Dr. Manion's definition of "Americanism" is a mixture of fact and personal opinion I, for one, couldn't possibly accept it as it stands, any more than I could possibly go along with the following generalization from an address he delivered on February 9 before the First Friday Club of Detroit.

"For a quarter of a century many influential people in America have flirted coyly with Socialist-Communist economics, Socialist-Communist sociology and Socialist-Communist materialism in general. The flirtation becomes an outright scandalous association in many, if not most, of our schools and colleges, and from them it invaded our politics * * *"

"Most of our schools and colleges," in other words, are teaching Socialist-Communist economics and Socialist-Communist sociology.

We simply don't believe it And we don't think Dr Manion can prove it Or as the Latin motto puts it very bluntly: "What is freely asserted can be just as freely denied"

But Dr Manion's definition of "Americanism" is beside the point So is mine Americans can agree to disagree, amicably and sincerely, about this and similar issues—such as the extent of Socialist-Communist teaching in our schools and colleges—as long as the argument is kept within the family.

On the other hand, however—unless we have completely misunderstood the meaning of this morning's headlines—Americans can ill afford to go around insulting the honor of all the other free nations of the world by condemning the whole kaboodle of them (including Ireland, I insist) as totalitarian dictatorships The United States of America is a wonderful place in which to live, but it's probably not as good as Manion says it is, nor are the other free nations of the world (including Ireland) quite as bad.

BRITISH SOCIALISM

Take the case of British socialism as an example Dr Manion writes it off in sweeping generalizations as a "totalitarian" system of government—communism on a slow train The professor is entitled to his own opinion, of course, and is unquestionably on solid ground in his opposition to unnecessary governmental intervention in the field of economics

Let us not forget, however, that there is another side to the picture of British socialism,

Our information is that approximately 75 percent of British Catholics voluntarily vote the Labor ticket and that the bishops of England have publicly and officially ruled that Catholics are free to belong to the Labor Party if they so desire I myself happen to know a lot of British priests who belong to it

That doesn't mean, of course, that British socialism is better than Americanism, nor does it mean that the bishops and the Catholic clergy and laity of England are completely satisfied with the program of the Labor Party It does seem to mean, however, that the bishops of England—unlike Dr. Manion—have not yet decided that the program of the British Labor Party is totalitarian.

I think the rest of us can afford to be as tolerant as the bishops.

Break the Inflation Stalemate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr HUMPHREY. Mr President, in the February 28, 1951, issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appeared an editorial which merits consideration by Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

BREAK THE INFLATION STALEMATE

Few fires would be put out if firemen stopped to argue who should make the first move or take the greater risks in tackling a blaze But isn't that about what America's anti-inflation firemen are doing today?

Everybody is against inflation, but virtually every economic and political group is holding back, insisting that somebody else make the first move to halt it. The stalemate between those who seek price rises and those who press for wage increases is bad enough. But on the governmental front the deadlock between the economy-first advocates and the taxes-first school is even more harmful. For it is delaying teamwork between the executive and legislative branches on the essential steps to deal with the causes rather than the symptoms of inflation.

The basic hope is for measures to siphon off the pressure of excess buying power. Three principal steps hold promise. Higher taxes, curbs on credit, and measures to encourage saving. Congress is directly responsible for the delay in taxes. The people should make it clear that they prefer to pay fair taxes rather than tribute to the cruel caprices of inflation.

Congress finds an excuse if not a reason for delay on taxes in the failure of the executive branch to move more resolutely against inflation. Many Congressmen have declared that they will not vote taxes until assured that nondefense spending will be cut. They were outraged by the President's inclusion of costly social welfare projects in the budget.

There must be economy. If the Government is going to ask citizens to tighten their belts, it must show a willingness to do some reducing itself Those shiny new social experiments should be laid on the shelf; savings that will not destroy efficiency can and should be squeezed from all Government costs—including those for defense. This is not wholly up to the President. Congress can cut the budget. It can revise legislation in which it has given expensive favors to special-interest groups. It can move to tighten credit.

But President Truman might well take the lead He could offer to drop the fancy nondefense spending from the budget. He could more urgently drive for economies in the executive departments He has now appointed a committee to study additional ways to curb credit through the Federal Reserve Board He could give more positive support to such measures even at the risk of some damage to the Government's market for bonds He could more resolutely back price and wage controls—even where they pinch politically powerful groups.

Such leadership would leave Congress with no shadow of excuse for slacking in the fight against inflation It could not long hold back and dodge the voting of higher taxes. Mr Truman has chosen able men for the Office of Defense Mobilization We expect a good job on the production and controls ends of the problem But their efforts can be largely nullified unless the President and Congress act vigorously to take off the inflation pressures through taxes, credit curbs, and the promotion of saving.

Unless the Government soon shows real determination to take these basic measures against inflation the public will continue to try to buy ahead of rising prices—and thereby push them up another notch But once the executive and legislative branches display even a firm intention of stopping inflation much of this pressure will subside. Let the fire chief lead the way, and the firemen will have to stop arguing about whether economy should go before taxes or taxes before economy Tackling the fire as a team, they can put it out.

Grain and Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter I have received from Peter Weinhardt, of Glen Ullin, N. Dak., dealing with the subject of grain and food prices.

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

GLEN ULLIN, N DAK, *March 3, 1951.*

Hon WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SIR We read so much about a set price on wheat in parity of other goods

You know that wheat is selling for $2 13 today. How can we pay all the taxes forced upon us, and for the high-priced machinery. One three-bottom plow costs $390, a 10-foot drill between $800 and $900, a 10-foot self-propelled combine $5,000, and every other item is out of line with our commodities

In 1943 I purchased a 9-4-foot press drill for $316. Wheat sold around $1.54; now wheat is a little over $2 and the drill $800. Why do we have to go broke under a monopolized system; under a free people Constitution? We have no free bargaining; the prices are all the same wherever we go

What about the antitrust law passed in 1914, I believe? The larger a company or owner gets, the worse we common people are off, because they control the prices by money power.

I want to let you know honestly that we farmers cannot exist under this tax and profiteering system One crop failure, and the farmer has to mortgage some property or land.

I break even and farm 480 acres. Now I need a barn bad, but I don't know whether enough money can be made to pay for it. This little barn will cost me more than I can sell cattle for in 4 years.

Mr. LANGER, we know and see that the odds are against us but we as free people cannot, nor dare not, do or say something. If we do we are called Communists. There are taxes imposed upon us that are unconstitutional, but we are at war, we are told But I think we are only at war to impose those unjust and destructive taxes.

Mr. LANGER, the only thing that is free is, we can work 24 hours a day. And if we want to be loved or admired by some, then give everything away, then you are a patriot

I don't expect you, Mr. LANGER, to try and change this situation alone. I don't believe that some of our leaders know what is going on, and I also don't believe some of them care about the common people, because a human being is the cheapest weapon, and want to destroy some of them anyway.

Yours truly,

PETER WEINHARDT.

Minority Opinion on the Proposed Merger of Colorado Interstate Gas Co. and Canadian River Gas Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 7 (legislative day of Monday, January 29), 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, today Commissioner Buchanan, of the Federal Power Commission, rendered a minority opinion in the matter of the proposed merger of the Colorado Interstate Gas Co. and the Canadian River Gas Co.

Denver, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Cheyenne, and other cities in the Rocky Mountain area being served with natural gas by these companies are growing so rapidly that new supplies of natural gas must be obtained. If the proposed merger is approved, I am assured that a pipeline will be built promptly; the Canadian River Gas Co. reserves will be protected from the encroachment of competing gas producers; and an adequate supply of gas for these communities will be forthcoming. I urged the Federal Power Commission to look with favor on the proposed merger, provided, of course, that the terms of the merger are reasonable and in the public interest.

I have read Mr. Buchanan's minority report with surprise. I disagree completely with respect to his pessimistic conclusions. All of the points which he raises were before the Commission when the case was heard and they were rejected on their merits.

The important point, which Mr. Buchanan apparently has failed to grasp, is that an adequate supply of gas for Colorado consumers, and not the price of gas, is the issue in this particular matter. Denver now enjoys, and will continue to enjoy under the merger, lower natural-gas rates than many other cities. For example, in 1949, the Denver home owner who heated his house with gas and who used 20,000 cubic feet of gas monthly—a typical bill—paid 43.8 cents per thousand cubic feet, or a total of $8.87. This is in startling contrast to the Fort Worth, Tex., family, deep in the heart of the gas and oil country, who paid 59.8 cents per thousand cubic feet, or $11.96 for 20,000 cubic feet. Colorado Interstate's wholesale rate at the Denver City gate at 17 1 cents per thousand cubic feet is one of the lowest rates in the entire country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of my letter to Chairman Wallgren, of the Federal Power Commission, a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Denver Post of March 3, 1951, and a copy of Commissioner Buchanan's press release of March 7, 1951, regarding his minority opinion, which I have just referred to.

There being no objection, the copy of the letter, the editorial, and the press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1951.

Hon MON C. WALLGREN,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MON. I am much interested in the proceeding now pending before the Federal Power Commission, in which Colorado Interstate Gas Co. seeks authority to acquire the natural gas leases, gas wells, and pipeline facilities of Canadian River Gas Co. For 20 years Colorado Interstate has been supplying natural gas for distribution in all the principal communities in my State, and has performed an outstanding job. The citizens of Colorado have benefited greatly from the sound business practices of the company.

Regulation by the Federal Power Commission has been beneficial, too. A substantial rate reduction was made in 1942. In 1947 the Commission authorized the building of a pipeline to Kansas to obtain additional gas from the Hugoton field. The proposal now before the Commission strengthens the gas supply for Colorado and provides for an additional delivery of badly needed gas.

I understand that the proposal now under consideration would put in Colorado Interstate the ownership of large gas reserves in the Panhandle field now owned by Canadian River. By reason of the ownership Colorado citizens would be assured of a gas supply for many years at a very low rate A contract between the two companies, under which gas from the Canadian company's reserves is available to Colorado Interstate, has been before you a long time, but I am advised that you object to certain features of that contract, and that is holding up the building of a second pipeline from Colorado to Texas.

I realize that the Federal Power Commission will protect the public interest and approve the terms of the proposed merger only if reasonable and in the public interest. I have no knowledge as to that matter, but I do urge upon you the importance of an assured gas supply for the citizens of Colorado. There are no complaints about the present rates and no agitation for lower rates. The only worry is with respect to delivery of a sufficient supply. In view of the constant increase in the prices of coal, oil, and other necessities of life our citizens are not likely to complain about rates for gas which were fixed on the basis of 1940 costs

It is my understanding that no increase in rates will result because of the merger; and unless other costs increase beyond the present levels, there will not be any request for higher rates in the near future.

I repeat, the most important consideration is an adequate supply of gas Unless the terms upon which Colorado Interstate would acquire this fine gas reserve are clearly unreasonable, I am convinced that the welfare of the people of Colorado will be served by the Commission's approval of those terms at a very early date.

I hope that an early decision will be forthcoming so that the proposed second line to Texas can be constructed. It takes time to build such a line; and unless action is speeded up, the allocation of pipe already arranged for this job may be withdrawn.

Sincerely,

EDWIN C. JOHNSON.

[From the Denver Post of March 3, 1951]

Approval by the Federal Power Commission of the proposed merger of the Colorado Interstate Gas and Canadian River Gas Cos. is welcome news to Denver. It insures an additional supply of natural gas for this city before next winter. And assurance is given that the merger will not increase gas rates.

Merger of the two companies is necessary to increase the borrowing capacity of Colorado Interstate so it can finance an $18,000,000 expansion of its pipeline system. This includes construction of a 215-mile line from the Amarillo, Tex., gas field to Kit Carson, Colo., where it will connect with the line running into Denver from the Hugoton, Kans., field. That will take care of increasing gas demands in Colorado and Wyoming and leave a comfortable surplus Senator JOHNSON, of Colorado, and Congressman ROGERS, of Denver, merit commendation for their efforts to speed up FPC action.

[Federal Power Commission press release]

COMMISSIONER BUCHANAN FILES STATEMENT DISSENTING FROM FPC ACTION IN APPROVING COLORADO INTERSTATE GAS CO.-CANADIAN RIVER GAS CO. MERGER

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 7, 1951.—Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan has filed a statement dissenting from the February 28 decision of the Federal Power Commission authorizing Colorado Interstate Gas Co. to acquire and operate the facilities of Canadian River Gas Co.

Mr. Buchanan said he was dissenting "because (1) in my opinion the decision unjustifiably deprives the gas consumers of Denver, Cheyenne, and the Rocky Mountain area of a saving in gas rates of approximately $800,000 on an annual basis; and (2) the decision is completely at odds with fundamental principles of regulation vigorously espoused by this Commission and approved by the United States Supreme Court."

In his 20-page dissent, Mr. Buchanan reviewed in detail the history of the two companies and the merger plan, under which Colorado is acquiring Canadian from Southwestern Development Co. through a plan which will, among other things, give Southwestern title to all liquid hydrocarbons associated with the natural gas underlying Canadian's acreage.

Mr. Buchanan asserted that the merger is entirely one of increased gains for the stockholders. He said that Southwestern will receive more than $20,000,000 from natural gasoline revenues while the value of its stock holdings, which cost it nothing in the first instance, will be increased by several million dollars.

Commissioner Buchanan said that "I am not objecting to Colorado's stockholders making a profit from the sale of their stock holdings. That is one of the privileges of our free enterprise system. But where free enterprise and the public interest come into conflict through a public utility which Congress has expressly made subject to regulation, the situation is different and the congressional policies must prevail without choice."

Discussing the effect on the rate payers, Mr. Buchanan said that through the merger, the gas consumers and not Colorado's stockholders pay Colorado's cost of acquiring Canadian's stock which, he said, has already been paid for by Colorado.

"This is the first instance, to my knowledge," Mr. Buchanan continued, "where a regulatory agency has sanctioned the diversion of operating revenues to pay for the stock of another utility corporation. Colorado's customers will continue to pay a fair return and depreciation on Canadian's net investment of approximately $9,000,000, but in addition, will have to pay Colorado's cost of acquiring Canadian's stock amounting to more than $20,000,000. In my opinion this is an unreasonable and unconscionable burden on the gas consumers of Denver, Cheyenne, and the Rocky Mountain area."

Concluding, Mr. Buchanan stated: "My dissent does not mean that I am opposed to a merger if the public interest were fully protected. Quite the contrary. A merger in the customary or orthodox sense, without the diversion of Colorado's operating revenues to Southwestern as payment for Canadian's stock, would have been in the public interest. No such proposal, however, is before us."

Near East—New Center of Infection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including, as part of my remarks, an article that appeared in the Evening Star on March 7 by that well-known commentator Mr. Constantine Brown, who clearly points out the danger that exists in the Near East today as it affects the Moslem world. I commend this article to all Members who are interested in the subject of peace in this vital area of the world:

NEW CENTER OF INFECTION—MOSLEMS FROM INDIAN OCEAN TO ATLANTIC IN STATE OF FERMENT DUE TO RED PROPAGANDA

(By Constantine Brown)

Regardless of whether the news from Egypt about the rebellion in Morocco and repressions by French troops is exaggerated or not, the Moslem peoples from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic are in a state of ferment today.

Popular meetings have been held from Karachi to Cairo protesting alleged drastic French methods of reprisal and demanding freedom for the Moroccans.

Normally this would be a symptom of a minor condition which could be cured with tact and patience. Unfortunately, in the present world tension the addition of another potential center of infection could have serious repercussions on western preparations against aggression.

The Muscovites are playing a cagey game. They do not attempt to propagate communism among the millions of Arabs. They represent themselves as the torchbearers of nationalism, freedom and equality among peoples. The Arabs have not had the same chance as the peoples of Europe to see the Soviet brand of freedom. They resent the French and British, whom they accuse of continuing a policy of colonialism, which has been abandoned in other parts of the world, particularly the Far East.

Russian propaganda shows that the Mohammedans of Indonesia, for instance, have their own national government, without interference of any kind on the part of their former masters, the Government of the Netherlands. They also are reminded that another overwhelmingly Mohammedan country, Pakistan, is as free and independent as the free western nations.

The rulers and leaders of the Arab kingdoms can see easily through the Soviet game. But the people themselves—and particularly the young intelligensia—are so anxious to emulate their brethren who have obtained complete independence that they are inclined to speed up the move for complete political and economic liberty, even at the price of a physical struggle. This is bad news for our military men in the present crisis.

Military forces of the European nations are dependent on the oil resources of Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq. In the event of a conflict with the U. S. S. R. in Europe, it will be almost impossible for us to provide the Allied air forces, navies, and mechanized units with needed gasoline and oil from the United States. This not only would be difficult physically, but Western Hemisphere supplies would not be sufficient for the enormous requirements of a military campaign in which gasoline and oil will play a preponderant role.

Moreover, although this matter is seldom discussed in public, the top military strategists believe that if Russia starts an aggression much earlier than is expected, North Africa will play a far more important role than any other part of Europe.

France, Belgium, and the rest of the continental Western European nations may be overrun. This happened in 1940. But the aggressors would have as hard a time as the Nazis had in World War II to establish themselves solidly on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, so long as the native inhabitants continue to be friendly to the west.

The fact that the Arabs in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia remained faithful to France in its direst hours and were friendly to the American and British forces in November 1942 when the invasion was made, was of great help to the American commander, General Eisenhower.

If they had been in the ugly mood they are reported to be in today, there is no question that things would not have run as smoothly as they did. In addition to these international considerations, which can affect the free world's war effort, the reported restlessness of the Arabs in North Africa can impair greatly France's own military preparedness.

Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolutions protesting the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Whereas the present political division of Ireland, whereby a part thereof is subject to British rule, is not in keeping with the principles of self-determination and is not based on the racial, economic, or historical background of the people of Ireland: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts recommends that the Congress of the United States be urged to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in that country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted February 21, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 28, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that Europe is the only vital area to our national security. Mr. Constantine Brown, the outstanding columnist, writing in the February 25 issue of the Sunday Washington Star, indicates that the Far and Middle East are just as important.

Under unanimous consent, I am including the article as part of my remarks:

EUROPE ISN'T THE ONLY AREA VITAL TO OUR SECURITY—FAR AND MIDDLE EAST ARE TERMED JUST AS IMPORTANT

(By Constantine Brown)

Those who listened to the testimony and colloquy between Pentagon representatives and members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees last week are puzzled over interpretations put on those hearings, to the effect that there are important differences between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The Senators and the spokesmen for the Armed Forces agreed that the four American divisions, which it is intended to send to Europe this year, are more of a morale booster for our allies than a force which is able to defeat the Russians if they attack in the next 12 months

The witnesses and the members of the two committees also agreed that congressional approval would be very important, since it would show the world that the American people are united in their decision to resist communism at home and abroad

Finally, Secretary of State Acheson and the representatives of the Military Establishment concurred with the views of the Senators that we must utilize to the fullest extent all other military forces outside the Atlantic Pact which are willing to join in the defense of Europe. They want the 81 available combat divisions of Spain, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey to join with the Atlantic forces as soon as possible.

Nobody seems opposed to the plan that an American force—limited, according to Secretary Marshall, at first to only four additional divisions—is essential to bolster the fighting willingness of our allies. None of the military men expressed the belief that such a force could by itself stop the Reds in their tracks.

BROADER PICTURE

They all agreed that all other non-Communist forces should be permitted to join in the defense set-up. They all agreed that American air and naval power can be only an adjunct of the general defense plans of free Europe. Nobody vaguely suggested that we abandon Europe.

Meanwhile, it has become obvious to all but the politically blind that our own present task is not confined to "saving" Western Europe alone In the present conflict with the U. S. S R and her satellites there are two other immediately critical areas: The Far East and the Middle East. They are as vital to our national security as Europe is.

A good deal of emphasis is placed on Europe's raw materials and manpower, which totals 200,000,000. But the Far and Middle East, with a population four times as large as Europe's and with vast resources of basic raw materials, are mentioned only casually by advocates of Europe first.

The point of view of some of our legislators, that our responsibility for the security of our continent extends equally to the Asiatic Continent, is seldom heard or fully appreciated. And yet, it is fully appreciated by the military men, who cannot insist on its importance because the politicians in the executive branch of the Government do not want it emphasized at this time.

These are the same political considerations which have prevented us from fully enlisting the support of the large available forces of the Mediterranean countries. Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, and Vandenberg, as well as Admiral Sherman, have urged for some time that we bring the Mediterranean states into the defense set-up. These nations have a military potential which is believed to have slowed down Soviet aggressive aims in Europe.

CONDITIONS FAVOR REDS

While the West is capable, with the support of the Spanish armies, of fighting a delaying action against the Red forces in the west, the threat of a military operation on the highly sensitive Soviet underbelly—Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, all of which are hankering for liberation—could cause definite collapse of any Red aggression against the West. Thus, the European picture appears less glowing to some professional strategists than it is generally painted.

The situation is far less favorable in Asia, where Russian aggression is now in full swing.

In the Far East we are fighting a seesaw battle with the Chinese Communists in Korea They have poured about 60 of their best divisions against the numerically inferior United Nations forces These have been checked. But so long as no diversions are created on other fronts in the Far East, the Chinese commander in chief, Gen. Chu Teh, will be able to use fresh troops out of the pool of 400 divisions he now has available.

So long as we refuse the proferred help of the Chinese Nationalist armies in Formosa we risk a continuation of the futile loss of life in Korea and cannot put the brake on Communist plans in Indochina, Malaya, Burma, and Indonesia. Chu Teh knows that as long as the United Nations are not relieved by the creation of a second front, he can hold us in North Korea while his reserves operate freely in the south against the French, the British, and the newly created Asiatic independent states.

He is firmly convinced that we will not bomb the lines of supply and the industrial centers which are providing his armies with arms and ammunition from Manchuria. And whenever he is ordered by Moscow he can use his vast reserves in theaters of operations which may be far more important to Russia's plans this summer than Korea. He can hold us at the thirty-eighth parallel, while the rest of his forces are performing bigger and better deeds for the Kremlin.

The situation in the Middle East is equally alarming. With the exception of Turkey there is not a single military power in that area Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Iran, are the most vital spots which concern the western defense planners, since they contain vast resources of oil.

Russia cannot hope to fight a successful war against the West without adequate oil supplies. She has important oil resources in the Baku area, at Grozny in the Caucasus, in the Ploesti region of Romania, and some additional supplies along the Volga, in Poland, and in Austria. But considering the great requirements of modern weapons, tanks, trucks, planes, and ships, the available quantities are nowhere near large enough to wage a long war. Hence, the U. S. S R. must obtain the oil resources of the Middle East.

The extremely mild and courteous attitude of Stalin himself toward Iran, coupled with our own indifferent attitude toward that country, appears to give the Russians the advantage in that oil-rich area. Nobody in Washington or in London will be surprised to hear that the Teheran Government has decided to nationalize the oil fields by paying off the stockholders of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co., and later to hear that the new commercial agreement between Russia and Iran gives the U. S. S. R. practical control over that important source of strategic materials.

This has not been accomplished yet, but appears to be in the making. And the more we give the world the impression that we are confining our efforts mainly to Western Europe and the more we say that America's security will be in a desperate plight if we do not put all our eggs in the Western European basket, the more the Middle East will lean toward full cooperation with the U. S. S. R.

The Arab countries, which have even larger quantities of oil—Saudi Arabia and Iraq—are instinctively friendly to us. But they are completely powerless to meet a Russian aggression, once the U. S. S. R. has established itself by a friendly agreement in Iran. Both of these oil-rich countries have armies which can be described best as military police. They are even less prepared to cope with a Communist aggression than the South Koreans were last summer.

RICH PRIZES

But neither we nor the British have the necessary strength at this time to help them effectively. Our limited available ground forces are ear-marked for Western Europe. The British are no better off. Air and naval power cannot stop the Russians in the Middle East.

We may be able to pinprick the Russians with our Air Force from land bases in Africa or from carriers But on the admission of Admiral Sherman, the Chief of Naval Operations, and General Vandenberg, the Air Force Chief of Staff, naval and air power alone cannot succeed against an aggression by land forces, supported by an air umbrella.

Arabia and Iran are, in the opinion of most military men, far richer prizes for the Russians at this time than Western Europe, because of their unlimited oil resources Much emphasis has been placed on the danger to us if Russia were to take over the Western European industries and its skilled workers. But these, in a moment of tragic necessity, could be reduced to impotence by the Air Force.

This is not the case with the oil supplies. Oil wells can be destroyed by air bombardment, but this would be only a temporary condition, since they can be drilled in other parts of the vast oil fields.

The defense of that area, say our military in off-the-record conversations, can be assured by the acceptance of all Mediterranean nations into the coalition as full partners.

But whatever means for the protection of the oil nations may be, it is essential that we not overlook the fact that Russia has a keen eye on the Middle East, where it can find the oil for a long war and also can deny us the same advantage with little effort at this time.

Exchange Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, unless we of the free world win the war for the minds of men against the totalitarians, we cannot place final reliance upon success on the battlefield. We must sell the American system, our ideals of freedom and democracy, to the young men and women who will be the leaders of the other countries of the world tomorrow.

The various programs for exchange students are the best example of fruitful work in this field. Under unanimous consent, I submit an article from the Sunflower Tocsin, published at Indianola,

Miss., describing the experiences of an exchange student in Mississippi:

GOVERNMENT PROGRAM MAKES GERMAN BOY HAPPY AT BLAINE

Twenty-year-old blond William Wufka has rosy cheeks, twinkling blue eyes, and a graphic conception of democracy in action.

Wilhelm, or William, as we call him in America, is a bright-faced German youth who is studying Mississippi agriculture and American democracy on the 240-acre Delta farm of Mr. and Mrs C. K. Fisackerly, 5 miles northeast of Sunflower.

Jointly sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation and a division of the United States Department of State, William's entry to the United States was arranged under the direction of the Mississippi Farm Bureau and many families of warm-hearted Americans He arrived in Mississippi last July 1 and will return to Germany this July to take first-hand observations of American life back to his native Germany.

Last week this writer spent a day with William, and observed a remarkable adjustment in a boy with an eagerness to do a good job in his mission to America

When this writer arrived at the Fisackerly farm William was busily sloshing through thawing ice to dump sweet-smelling bales of lespedeza hay into racks for the varied livestock on the farm. He placed the cured hay before some 197 head of feeder sheep. Then he shucked ears of corn for Duroc Jersey brood sows, and he leaped over a stall door to sift mixed feed in troughs for 10-month-old Aberdeen Angus heifers

Less than an hour earlier William, dressed in a maroon corduroy sport coat and comfortable American slacks and shoes, waved farewell to school chums on a Sunflower County school bus and entered the large white house of the Fisackerly's. William is a freshman student at Sunflower Junior College He divides his time between class work, home work, farm chores, and a normal social life with boys and girls in the neighborhood.

The life, William will tell you, is vastly different from that of the 10 previous years of his life

In a little stone house at No. 94 in the village of Mallersdorf, Bavaria, there's a comely brown-eyed brunette 24 years old, named Herta. She is 50 percent of William's remaining immediate family—his only sister. She wonders how William is making out in English-speaking America. She is anxious for July 1951, when William comes home

Herta and William, teamed up by fate to overcome many humanly depressing obstacles, remember well, when as children, they lived in a castle at Karlsbad, in Czechoslovakia, where their father was overseer of some 500 acres of land. He was mayor of the village.

Then came war. William's two brothers, Walter and Erich, entered the German Army. His mother contracted a disease and died in 1943. In 1944 Brother Erich was reported missing in action against the Russians in the vicinity of Illman Sea.

VE-day, May 8, 1945, William was 16 years old. The American and Russian armies met head-on in their east-west slash across Germany. Russian soldiers occupied Karlsbad and took Father Wufka away. Walter was placed in a concentration camp and later released. Father Wufka was unheard of again.

German subjects were asked to move into Germany proper, so William and Herta left their destroyed castle and boarded a train with thousands of Germans and headed back into Germany. William was now 16. Herta was 20.

At Mallersdorf, Bavaria (a part of Germany), the pair rented a part of a house and set up housekeeping with the 280 pounds of luggage and housewares which they brought with them.

Herta obtained employment as a secretary in August 1947, 14 days after their arrival. Her salary provided for their most critical needs—and in March 1948, William enrolled in a German farm school, or landwirtschaftschule.

Under this school plan William and other German youths worked on farms during crop months and attended classes from November through March

During his second year an announcement was made in the school that a scholarship was being offered to top German students, providing for a year's study of agriculture and democracy in America

William applied for the scholarship and following an intensive screening, was selected over seven other boys in Mallersdorf. Next he was interviewed in Niederbayern or Regensburg. William was accepted as one of 138 boys and 36 girls to come to America for the democratic and agricultural study.

On June 14, 1950, a troopship steamed from Bremerhaven Harbor Nine days later eager German youths lined the ship's rails to snap pictures of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

Unity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following letter by Mr. J. Webb Saffold to the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which appeared in that paper on Sunday, January 28, 1951:

WRITER TO EDITOR SAYS UNITY IS ESSENTIAL TO SURVIVAL; SEEKS BASIS FOR IT

UNITY?

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER.

SIR Unity is now the basic essential to a wholehearted national effort to meet the crisis of the Russian menace to world peace and our American way of life. Stirring appeals for unity are being made hourly by prominent people and it is obvious that unless we first have real national unity at home we cannot save the nations abroad.

But it takes more than stirring pleas and promises to gain real unity from the American people They must have a solid and adequate basis for unity, a sufficient confidence in their leaders to enable them to rally round those leaders and give them wholehearted support without hesitation or mental reservations. Such confidence the American people do not have in their present leaders who are the Truman-Acheson-Marshall group. Why? "Look at the record" as a great genuine Democrat used to say. Former President Franklin Roosevelt prided himself upon being "left of center," but the Truman administration has prided itself upon being centered in the left. From the very start it has pursued a policy that has led this Nation rapidly down the road to socialism and done it in the name of democracy.

That policy has done much to build Russia up from a second-class power into the colossal threat of the most powerful totalitarian nation on earth today and the American people know this to their sorrow financially and in every other way. We are now reaping the whirlwind from the wind that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations have sown and we are literally and morally "in the red." Now this same administration is faced with a war of survival against that Red Russia which it has helped so much to build up, especially in China, and it is the mad scramble of the Snare Deal to get over on the American side of the fence in time to save itself and this nation that is causing the furious maelstrom of confusion in Washington today.

The men who have led us into this tragic mess are not the men to lead us out of it. They are in power, they are the government and the law so they can take our sons and fathers from us and send them to die on frozen foreign battlefields. They can tax us beyond our capacity to pay and so destroy our ability to support the national effort, and they will smear any man as an isolationist who does not agree with them and can put any man in jail who refuses to hand out his very living to support policies which he opposes But they cannot force any man to give them wholehearted loyalty in support of men and policies which he feels in his heart are wrong, and which are simply more of the same thing which this Nation has suffered continuously for the past 15 years. That record is only too well known to the people of America; just a brief résumé of it is sickening to any real American, especially those mothers who have lost a son in Korea. That record is what begets the firm conviction that this beloved land of ours has been sold down the Volga River, and a surprising number of citizens have said just that to me in recent weeks.

It is impossible to heal a wound until you get all of the infection out of it, no matter how many fancy bandages you put on it. I refuse to "unify" around the men and policies that have led us into this apparently bottomless morass, but I will gladly give my full support to men who are rooted and grounded in basic American principles as stated in our Constitution which is the rock on which this Republic (not democracy) was built. It is because politicians (not statesmen) have departed from these principles that we find ourselves in this predicament today and unless we have real leaders who will return to those principles we do not have a Chinaman's chance to survive in this great crisis regardless of how many billions of our inflated money we hand out, how much production we achieve, or how many millions of the flower of our young manhood pour out their American blood on foreign battlefields.

Unity is given, it cannot be enacted nor extracted and it will only be given if and when it is deserved

J. WEBB SAFFOLD.

CLEVELAND.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], is one of the United States representatives in the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the Birmingham News of February 21, 1951, there appears a most timely and interesting article by Mr. McClellan Van der Veer, the distinguished editor of the News, entitled

"JOHN SPARKMAN'S Hope of Peace." I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

JOHN SPARKMAN'S HOPE OF PEACE

(By McClellan Van der Veer)

Back home in Alabama JOHN SPARKMAN Monday talked about his hopes for peace and national security. He gave a remarkable extemporaneous exposition of American foreign policy in an address at Jacksonville State College. He pursued the subject in extended personal conversations. He was, as usual, lucid, frank, sincere. Much of encouragement and reassurance must have been obtained by many who heard him, although JOHN SPARKMAN is not one to minimize the continuing gravity of the world situation, the frightful costs it is now exacting, the persisting danger of far greater conflict.

Our junior United States Senator, however, is a strong supporter of our Government's foreign policy. He believes that it has gotten substantial results and may produce still greater achievements, though he would not claim it has been perfect or guided by unerring foresight. It is easy, he says, to criticize one phase or decision in a many-sided foreign policy, and on that basis condemn a whole program. But that is not a fair or intelligent approach to the matter.

As a very able and highly respected Member of the Senate, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, as one of the delegates to the General Assembly of the United Nations, JOHN SPARKMAN is exceptionally qualified to appraise the international crisis. He flatly disavows ability to foretell with assurance what is coming. He is no superficial optimist. But he has clear ideas as to the general lines along which he believes this Nation should work, he is himself working vigorously along those lines, he believes progress has been made in some particulars, he does have hope for the future.

So confused and uncertain does the situation appear to many Americans at times that they are not infrequently tempted to feelings of bewilderment, discouragement, and helplessness. It is good, and inspiriting, to obtain a clear conception of what so competent, highly placed and sincere a student of the Nation's present position is thinking. This is an attempt to grasp and pass on the outlines, at least, of that conception.

WAR NOT INEVITABLE

JOHN SPARKMAN does not believe that general war is inevitable. On that he is emphatic. What are the bases of his hope in that respect?

A demonstration of the will and the ability to withstand aggression, he thinks, may lead to a decision by the Kremlin to enter into negotiations that may produce a real settlement.

It is to be remembered that no perfect peace has ever been made, that governments are naturally influenced to a great extent by national interests, by expediency, by many other factors in reaching agreements. When agreements can be reached that are in the interest of all concerned, they have a good chance of enduring.

If Stalin and his associates are convinced that they have no favorable prospect of serving their own ends by a continuation of their recent tactics, including the maintenance of a vast military establishment, they may clear the way for a settlement.

But can any reliance be placed in any agreement with Moscow?

JOHN SPARKMAN points out that an individual leader's own reliability, or lack of it, would not be the only factor in any such settlement. Stalin or any other dictator may take arbitrary action, making for war or peace, but even dictators must function within a set of conditions which may greatly curb their tendencies to excess.

The Russian leaders are generally considered to be very calculating as to their moves. They may make many mistakes. They may at times be governed by impulse and misconception. But it can at least be hoped that the Russian leaders can be constructively influenced by an over-all situation making both aggression and noncooperation for peace very uninviting and unprofitable. And thus conceivably they might be brought not only to an agreement but to a continuing aherence to that agreement.

At least, in JOHN SPARKMAN'S view, that is the objective toward which we should indomitably persist, as long as possible.

President Truman and Secretary Acheson have repeatedly emphasized unity and strength among the free nations as the possible basis for a settlement with Russia. One of the criticisms of the administration—not without point and force—has been that along with the emphasis on force there has not been an adequate continuing persistence in quest of effective negotiations. Now the administration, with its emphasis on our persisting desire for an acceptable settlement in Korea and its proposals for a general peace discussion by the four-power Council of Foreign Ministers, seems to be making more positive moves in that direction.

But it is to be remembered that it is extremely difficult to carry on such a program while intensive efforts are under way to arouse peoples to a tremendous defense effort involving great sacrifice. The dangers calling for such sacrifice must be seen if such an effort is to be of maximum effectiveness. If dangers are seen, distrust, fear, and animosity are bound to be intensely evoked. Such trends do not make for the most favorable conditions for peace talks.

Even so, as Senator SPARKMAN sees the record, our Government has steadfastly put peace as its fundamental objective—and still does.

At what point of the upbuilding of western strength might it be hoped that effective negotiations could go forward? Who knows just where that point is? And who, aware of the perils of an arms race, particularly in this atomic age of heightened fear, can fail to realize that the nations suddenly may be precipitated into illimitable conflict?

But in every course there are dangers. And in a dual policy of firm strength and calm, peaceful intent, Senator SPARKMAN sees the best hope of preventing another world war and moving onward in the establishment of international cooperation for true peace. This is a high and supremely difficult objective. But the Alabamian does not by any means consider it absolutely unattainable.

As for negotiations, he believes that we should constantly make it clear that we are ready to discuss differences. He, like General Marshall, believes that we should be first to respond and act in behalf of any chance to advance real peace.

JOHN SPARKMAN is not inclined to estimate the odds as to another world war. We can't know what the men in the Kremlin will do, he says. If they want war, they can quickly produce it. If they really want peace, they can clear the way for it. But as to just what they will do, we can only speculate and hope. And trust in strength and a resolute, active will to peace.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Senator SPARKMAN believes United Nations forces should remain in Korea, at least for the time being, under present military conditions, in pursuit of the goal of frustrating aggression and establishing a unified, free nation. But he admits that we might be confronted by a situation which would make it wise to withdraw.

He is impressed, on the other hand, by the confidence expressed by our military leaders that our forces cannot be decisively defeated.

He hopes that the Chinese Communists may come to the conclusion that their whole adventure is costing too much and failing to show any promise of attaining its end, and therefore may be disposed to an acceptable settlement.

That seems to summarize Mr. SPARKMAN'S conception of the Korean struggle now. But he does add that abandonment of Korea now would open a vast far eastern area to much more effective Communist infiltration.

Many other able students are not as hopeful as Senator SPARKMAN seems to be that a satisfactory conclusion of the struggle in Korea can be wrought. It is not easy to have confidence that the Chinese Communists, with their low regard for human lives, will be shot and blasted into a willingness to accept a really free Korea. But it can be hoped that the new Good Offices Committee of the UN Assembly, which this week is renewing peace efforts will be able to find a way of progress.

PROGRESS SEEN IN EUROPE

Senator SPARKMAN sees very concrete and heartening results from our efforts to check Communist expansionism in Europe. He points to our aid to Greece and Turkey as having been notably effective. We turned to such steps, he said, only after persistent efforts to work with the Russians had failed.

Mr. Acheson, the Senator said, first suggested the underlying idea of the Marshall plan in Mississippi, and then General Marshall further developed it at Harvard. It has been a wonderful success in SPARKMAN'S estimation, having stopped the advance of the Communists in Western Europe, particularly in Italy and France.

Then came the North Atlantic Defense Pact. Our own human and material resources, together with those of Western Europe, give us a great security potential. The defense program now under way in the west aims at swift and adequate translation of that potential into reality. If Western Europe were lost, the balance would swing dangerously the other way.

In our Senate's ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, the area it covers has become our own defense area in which SPARKMAN maintains the President has clear power to deploy our troops—just as he has power to deploy them in Alaska or other parts of our own territory. The Senator emphasizes the Senate approval of this defense program in its ratification of the treaty. The issue here is no longer political, but military, he contends.

It is in this great united endeavor that he sees a major hope of demonstrating a "will and ability to withstand aggression" that will keep the Russians from plunging the world into all-out conflict.

But the junior Senator from Alabama would not raise any false hopes. He feels that already enough has been done to make the prospect of peace much better. He works and has the faith that that prospect may be improved in the months ahead. Thus, he is a man of restrained and realistic hopefulness.

The carefully reasoned, orderly basis for his views is impressive. Even those who do not see things just as he does can find much in what he says to lift their own spirit.

STILL STRONG FOR UN

Beyond a possible resolution of the present crisis without general war, Senator SPARKMAN sees the possible opportunity for great new strides in behalf of a stable world order through further development of the United Nations. That organization, for all its weaknesses, has gone further to serve its purpose, he says, than any other organization in history. It can, he believes, go further still. He calls upon all Americans to stand by it in faith and devotion. This realistic, analytical man still finds in it a vision of a far happier day for all mankind.

The Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge," delivered by me at the thirty-first anniversary dinner of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, at Norfolk, Va., on March 8, 1951.

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

In Locksley Hall Lord Tennyson told the British that they were the heirs of all the ages. Nineteen centuries of the Christian era, during which mankind was constantly struggling for personal freedom, for a higher standard of living, and for a type of government that would make both possible, was the foundation upon which civilization made its most remarkable strides in the first half of the twentieth century. But, ironically enough, man's progress in the social sciences in the twentieth century did not keep pace with his progress in the physical sciences, with the result that future historians may record the twentieth century as the century of fear—fear based upon the belief that engines of destruction developed by man's ingenuity may ultimately destroy him or leave him cowering behind a windbreak or in the disease-soaked ruins of a slum.

The first half of the current century has seen the death of the horse-and-buggy days and the birth of motor transport, of the airplane that wipes out space, the radio that has taken the wings of the morning, and, last but not least, the production of the atomic bomb, the reckless and indiscriminate use of which may result in international suicide. In the confusion that surrounds us, in the loss of faith in ourselves, in our fellow man, and to no small extent in God, many today share the pessimism of the English writer, Matthew Arnold, who said that we were "wandering between two worlds - one dead and the other powerless to be born."

I grant that the old order is rapidly passing away, I grant that many ancient landmarks both here and abroad have been moved in violation of the injunction to be found in the Book of Proverbs: "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set." But the theme that I covet to present to you tonight is that if America has the wisdom and the courage to assume in these troublesome times the role of world leadership which is its manifest destiny and can find a way to complement its unparalleled wealth and physical strength with unparalleled moral strength the new world that will emerge from the ideological conflicts of the first half of the twentieth century may well be the best world that civilization has ever known.

I never visit this historic and second oldest city in Virginia without recalling that Thoreau once said: "To him whose vigorous and elastic mind keeps pace with the sun, the day is a perpetual morning." I love Virginia and I am proud of the high privilege of being a Member of the United States Senate from Virginia. There is no section of the Old Dominion that has not made remarkable progress during the past half century and no section of which I am not proud. But I never visit Norfolk and the ports of Hampton Roads without a thrill of pride as I recall the remarkable changes that have occurred in this area during the intervening 45 years since, as a college boy, I visited Norfolk to see the annual Thanksgiving game between Virginia and Carolina. At that time Norfolk had a population of about 47,000, Portsmouth about 17,500 and Newport News about 20,000, the shipyard there having been largely responsible for a jump from 4,449 in 1890 to the larger figure in 1900.

Considerable progress, of course, had been made in the development of the ports of Hampton Roads prior to World War I but it was that war which impressed upon military leaders a fact that we in Virginia had always known—Hampton Roads is the greatest harbor in the world and of necessity must play a vital part in any war effort. Today, Hampton Roads has the country's heaviest export tonnage and biggest naval installation in the world. It's 300 wharves, providing more than 30 miles of berthing space and connecting with 150,000 acres of warehouse and transit shed areas can accommodate any type of shipping expansion which a national emergency may require. More coal is transshipped at Norfolk than at any other seaport in the United States and the loading docks here supply a proportional amount of bunker coal to vessels of all classes.

In 1949, and figures for last year are not yet available, Hampton Roads accounted for 55 percent of overseas coal exports from the United States and 50 percent of all bunker coal supplied to both foreign and domestic vessels along the Atlantic seaboard and that was the third successive year in which Hampton Roads exceeded all Atlantic coast ports in movement of outbound cargo.

This export trade is made possible by such modern facilities as the Norfolk & Western's new $6,000,000 pier, which can handle four of the largest ocean-going vessels at the same time, the same railroad's public grain elevator, which can berth three vessels and load at the rate of 75,000 bushels an hour, the Army base at Sewall Point, with berthing space for 8 to 12 ships at a time, and the storage and handling facilities which include 37 public warehouses and 50 acres of open storage space for public use. The ports of Hampton Roads not only can accommodate great fleets of warships and merchant marine but they also can build any type of ship afloat and repair any type. Norfolk, for instance, has three floating drydocks, 24 marine railways, and 47 piers, wharves, and docks operated in connection with shipbuilding. The Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., which built 18 standard and special type of merchant cargo and combination cargo-passenger ships, totaling 213,000 deadweight tons between 1939 and 1945, is now at work on the 48,000-ton superliner which will be a sister ship to the *America*, has a backlog of nearly $100,000,000 of major contracts and the prospect of being awarded a contract for the construction of the largest airplane carrier the world has ever known.

The Welding Shipyards at Norfolk built 13 large tankers during the World War II period and since 1945 has built some of the largest new tankers, one of which I saw launched in the fall of 1948. And across the river at Portsmouth is not the largest but the most efficient shipbuilding yard which the Government owns and operates. With respect to the future operations of that shipyard, I was recently advised by Admiral Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, that at the outbreak of hostilities in Korea the level of employment at the Norfolk naval shipyard totaled about 9,700. To meet the ever-increasing demands of our current emergency and to increase the material readiness of the fleet, employment at the Norfolk naval shipyard has been raised to approximately 12,700, while the prospective workload for that shipyard is expected to rise to approximately 15,000 by the last of the year. The Navy also has plans, as previously indicated, for awarding new contracts to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., which will measurably increase the employment at that fine plant. "With its long and creditable record of Navy ship construction," said Admiral Sherman, "Newport News can expect to receive a proportionate share of the shipbuilding and conversion contemplated in the program." Admiral Sherman also informed me that in the Navy's program for fiscal year 1951 are numerous projects for the development of the activities of the Norfolk area. In general these projects are for provision of additional facilities at established activities in the following categories:

(a) Development of permanent facilities at Little Creek.

(b) Development of additional aviation facilities at Norfolk and Oceana.

(c) Construction of additional covered storage.

(d) Construction of additional aviation-gasoline and jet-fuel bulk storage.

(e) Dredging in the harbor area to provide an increased anchorage area.

(f) Rehabilitation and alteration of present facilities.

(g) Additional communication facilities.

I once heard of a white man who congratulated his colored friend upon the improvements he had made in what had previously been a rather poor and rough piece of land, saying: "John, you and the Lord have certainly done a fine job in improving this farm." "Yes," said John, "but you should have seen this farm when the Lord was handling it alone." Of course, we are proud of the kind of natural harbor that God gave us in Hampton Roads but this Maritime Association can take pardonable pride in the fact that through active and intelligent participation on its part a better job has been done.

In 1870 the Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to commence work on the improvement of the James River channel. Every student of history is intrigued by the part that great rivers have played in the course of civilization. On the broad bosom of mighty rivers was floating man's first venture in commerce and on their banks man has built his centers of commerce and citadels of defense. When I went to Europe 2 years ago with a congressional party there were two rivers I was especially anxious to see—the Danube, famed in song and poetry, and the Tiber, famed as a natural moat defending the inner city of Rome—the river bravely defended by Horatio, inspiring Macaulay to say: "And how can man die better than in facing fearful odds for the ashes of his fathers and the temples of his gods."

I shall frankly admit that I was disappointed in both of them but I shall never be disappointed in our river named for King James, the site of the first permanent English colony in America and the river of which Daniel Webster said "We are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of their labors and sufferings can never be without interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it; nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment, till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the Nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended." It was at the mouth of the great and historic James that early Virginia settlers decided to start a settlement which is now the thriving city of Norfolk.

During the intervening years since 1870 the deep-channel security of anchorage, capacity, and freedom from ice in Hampton

Roads; the ease with which vessels can enter and leave, the location near the center of the Atlantic coast, the many miles of interior tributary waterways, and the service afforded by the lines of nine railroads radiating to the North, South, and West have made this an important center not only for shipping but for constructing and repairing vessels.

Because of the importance of the ports of Hampton Roads not only to our commerce and industry, but also to our national defense, I have been able to give full support to the activities of the Corps of Engineers in this area without in any way altering my position with respect to the need for economy in Federal spending and the importance of postponing or abandoning public-works projects which are not necessary in this time of crisis.

I challenge anyone who attempts to put the "pork barrel" label on the completed deep-water channels of Hampton Roads which proved their usefulness during World War II and the more recently completed improvements, such as the 12-foot channel into Hampton Creek and Herbert Creek, the 12-foot channel through the municipal harbor in Newport News Creek and the 25-foot navigation channel from the mouth of James River to the terminal at Richmond.

I also am convinced that the ratio of benefits to costs will amply justify the expenditure of funds needed to deepen the York Spit Channel and the branches of the Elizabeth River in Norfolk Harbor.

I assure you, too, that I shall continue to give close attention to the various studies being made by the engineers of additional projects, including more anchorage areas, channel dimensions to meet the needs of the new, deeper-draft vessels, and improvement of Chuckatuck and Hampton Creeks, James River, Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay, and Norfolk Harbor. If a case can be made for these on sound economic grounds and they are shown to be necessary to our defense effort, they will have my support. If an adequate case cannot be made for any of them, I am confident you who live in this area will agree with me that they should not be undertaken.

The kind of project which I am most happy to endorse is illustrated by the $50,000 which I had the Senate include in the 1948 appropriation bill for dealing with oil pollution in Norfolk Harbor. I know that illegally discharged oil was seriously damaging the oyster and fishing industries of Hampton Roads, which represent a $10,000,000 annual return, and that it was injurious to the $40,000,000 resort industry. I also was interested, as a lover of wildlife, in stopping the destruction of migratory birds by the oil-polluted water.

But what appealed to me the most about this item was that, instead of having the Federal Government take on a job and continue to do it for all time, the proposal was for Federal-State cooperative demonstration that would pave the way for private handling of this problem at no public expense.

As many of you know, a Federal-State oil collection service provided at a low cost to shipowners was started in July 1949, with the help of the appropriation which your able Representative [Mr HARDY] and I were able to obtain. In December 1949, the operation was discontinued because by that time the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Corp. had started a commercial collection service on the same cost basis.

This oil collection program, combined with educational efforts and more rigid law enforcement resulted in only two cases of oil pollution being reported in the calendar year of 1950, as compared with 47 cases investigated and 16 convictions obtained during the 18-month period before the collection service was started.

Thus, in brief summary, I have given you some of the reasons for my pride in the ports of Hampton Roads and some of my reasons for believing that our future is not as dark as certain pessimists in the country would have us believe.

But my major source of pride not only in the Hampton Roads area but throughout the entire State is the character of our citizenry, the contribution made by colonial Virginia to the birth of a nation and the determination I know to be latent in the heart of every Virginian to pass on to generations yet unborn those precious principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased by the blood of our founding fathers. However, if Virginia—the mother of States and of Presidents—is to furnish leadership in this crisis to save the institutions she did so much to establish, we must have a clear conception of the difficulties confronting us and a willingness to sacrifice, as our ancestors did, in overcoming them.

It is as true today as when Patrick Henry made his memorable speech in old St. John's Church that life is not so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. It is as true today as when the victor at Yorktown told the First Congress of the new Nation: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

I recognize the difficulty of some Christian men and women in trying to reconcile the Sermon on the Mount with war or preparations for war. It is my belief that the fundamental principle of self-defense includes the defense of our Nation and all other freedom-loving nations who subscribe to our belief in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We must recognize the fact that we face tyrannical and barbarous leaders of perhaps 800,000,000 willing or unwilling Communist followers and that a program of pacification or of unpreparedness on our part will not change their hearts or their plans for world domination. And if we believe, and I think we do, in the principle of self-defense and that the Bible condemns the suicide of an individual, we must of necessity believe that the Bible justifies us in preventing the suicide of Christian nations by permitting barbarians to become the exclusive possessors of modern instrumentalities of human destruction.

In 1802 Thomas Jefferson, whose principles of democracy I endeavor to understand and strive to follow, wrote Dr Priestley: "We feel that we are acting under obligations not confined to the limits of our own society. It is impossible not to be sensible, that we are acting for all mankind; that circumstances denied to others, but indulged to us, have imposed on us the duty of proving what is the degree of freedom and self-government in which a society may venture to leave its individual members."

With all the sincerity of which I am capable I tell you that I prefer peace to war and it is only because at the moment I feel that the best means of preventing war is to be prepared that I am willing to endorse universal military training, a tax program that will hurt, controls over credit and production that will involve inconveniences and personal sacrifice, drastic economy in public spending at the expense of many worth while domestic projects, and price and wage controls that seriously impinge upon that type of freedom of action in a system of private and competitive enterprise to which in the past we have been accustomed.

I have but two sons, both of whom are of military age, one of whom is a second lieutenant in the Marines now serving in Japan and the other a Reserve officer in the Navy not yet called to active duty. And over and above that, I have on my heart the plea made to me by my mother on her ninetieth birthday to keep us out of another war, saying that she had lived through four wars and that was enough war for one lifetime. She saw her father and nine of his brothers go into the Confederate Army in which five lost their lives. She saw three sons go into military service in World War I and two grandsons in World War II, one with the first bomber squadron that landed in Africa and the other in the bloody fighting in Italy and finally through the torture of the Battle of the Bulge. But my mother was not a pacifist but rather a militant Christian leader who believed that neither our Nation nor the other Christian nations of the world had ever adequately employed moral force for the preservation of peace. Her big and sympathetic heart knew only too well that it is the mothers of men who suffer the most when statesmanship fails and nations resort to the arbitrament of war in the settlement of their differences.

"Mothers of men!
The sea is not so wide nor the war so long,
The dead so many, nor human misery grown so old
That we forget the words you did not speak
When your sons went off to war.

"You did not speak! And yet
We heard you say more noble things and brave
Than any man or woman has said aloud,
We heard you speak of dear-remembered days,
Of chubby, tiny fists that clasped your fingers tight.
You said this, more than all your life, you'd give your son.
And yet you did not speak!"

In raising vast armies and providing vast war equipment for what now appears essential for our survival in a hostile world, it is my prayer that the Congress and that the American people will realize that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of spiritual force.

Conservation of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday, March 3, it was my privilege to address the fifteenth annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation, including outstanding conservationists from all over America. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address I delivered on that occasion.

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

SELLING CONSERVATION TO CONGRESS

(Text of address delivered by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY to National Wildlife Federation Conference, Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., Saturday, March 3, 1951)

I am profoundly delighted to address this outstanding gathering of conservation leaders of the Nation. You leaders are not only conservation-minded but conservative-minded, I dare say, except when you may be describing that fish that got away.

The fifteenth annual meeting of your federation is another important occasion in the history of the conservation movement of our country. We of Wisconsin are proud that you have honored us by your presence here in Milwaukee.

We feel there is sound logic in your choice because it is a fact that Wisconsin has pioneered in so many of the great conservation

advances of America. Today, the Badger State is more keenly interested in the preservation of our great outdoor heritage than ever before in our almost 103 years of history. The Wisconsin Conservation Congress in particular with its representation from every one of the 71 counties of our State has shown the tremendous grass-roots interest of the rank and file citizens of this State in preserving outdoor values.

MORE AND MORE AMERICANS ENJOY OUTDOOR SPORTS

As I speak to you this afternoon, the guns are firing, but they are not being fired in outdoor recreation alone Rather, they are booming in a life and death struggle against the forces of international communism in far-off Korea. Brave Americans are sacrificing their all that this land and its values might endure.

It is characteristic of our national defense that American marksmanship has attained legendary excellence Why? Because of the fact that so many millions of Americans have enjoyed the experience of hunting. Fifteen and one-half million fishing licenses and 12,500,000 hunting licenses—there is a record of which we can all be proud And with an ever higher standard of living to be enjoyed by the American people, we know that there will be a constantly larger increase in the number of Americans enjoying these outdoor pursuits.

CONSERVATION HAS AIDED AMERICA IN MANY WAYS

I need not point out to you, my friends, the many ways in which the conservation movement has contributed to this country's development wholly aside from enjoyment, relaxation, and recreation

You are all familiar with the importance of the fur industry in giving our Armed Forces clothing for protection against cold temperatures You know how important our commercial fisheries are to the feeding of our people You know that during the early part of World War II a tremendous amount of rifles, revolvers, and other firearms were voluntarily collected for our defense and the defense of our Allies.

AMERICANS AND CANADIANS ALONE FREE TO POSSESS ARMS

It is a fact of which we may all be proud that America virtually alone in the world (with the exception of Canada) is about the only place where a man can possess firearms in his home without fear that a government storm-trooper will march in, confiscate his gun, and send him off to prison for planning a revolution. In other words, the American Government has confidence in the hunters of America It knows that the American people can be trusted to exercise judgment and discretion in their possession of weapons

Soon we will be confronted with a tremendous civilian defense program throughout our country, and we know that the conservation leaders will be among the leaders in that movement.

CONSERVING AMERICA'S VALUES

On the subject of conservation, itself, it seems to me that there are few more important themes in all this world than that of conserving values. As you know, my friends, I have just been participating for the last 2 weeks in hearings conducted before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee on the highly controversial question of assignment of troops abroad

I will not take this occasion to go into this question, although I know it is of deep interest to all my listeners. Let me, however, mention that in my approach to this problem and to other problems, I try to find a path which will conserve the great constitutional system of which you and I are heirs. In other words, my friends, under the United States Constitution, there is a four-fold separation of powers, among: (1) the legislative branch, (2) the executive branch; (3) the judicial branch; and finally, (4) there is a great residue of powers vested in the States and in the people.

FIDELITY TO LETTER AND SPIRIT OF CONSTITUTION

When we approach a question like this matter of American foreign policy, or for that matter, any other problem, we must never forget that whatever decision we come to, we must be in full accordance with firm constitutional principles I am not one of those who believes that the Constitution—with its basic theme of separation of powers—can be forgotten when it does not accord with our own personal views. Rather, I feel that we must interpret the Constitution faithfully according to its letter and spirit, and in so doing, we will conserve one of the great landmarks of western civilization.

AMERICA AS A LIGHTHOUSE

Before I leave this theme of conserving values, may I mention that you and I, my friends, are in effect lighthouse-keepers amidst the long night in which the world now finds itself. We must keep on our guard so that the light of our lighthouse continues to shine forth as a great beacon to all the world. Darkness covers a great mass of the globe, including 800,000,000 people. The military forces of darkness have never been stronger- 175 divisions in Russia alone. The revolutionary allies of those forces have never been stronger. Let us therefore preserve on this continent the one great remaining lighthouse, a lighthouse of civil liberties, a lighthouse of faith in the dignity of man and in the fatherhood of God, a lighthouse of fraternity between men and all races, all creeds all colors This is the challenge to you and to me as American citizens.

PROBLEM OF CONTACTING CONGRESS

The theme of your conference is selling conservation to Congress. In many respects, that is not too difficult an objective, because among the 531 Members of the Senate and House, there are a great many men and women who enjoy as I do the thrill of outdoor sports whenever they can get the rare opportunity to do so

On the other hand, the objective is not an easy one, because as you know, over 15,000 bills are introduced in the average Congress and conservation bills may tend to get lost in the shuffle This can happen unless you, the conservationists of our country, exercise sound, farsighted contact with your Congress And so, let me mention to you just a few instances in which conservation can possibly suffer unless you are in close contact with your legislative officials.

FUNDS NEEDED FOR CONSERVATION AGENCIES

In the first place, there may not be sufficient funds provided for the United States Forest Service, for the Fish and Wildlife Service, for the Soil Conservation Service, and for other essential Government conservation activities

We all know that the budget of our country is tremendously strained, and naturally Congress is finding it increasingly difficult to provide appropriations for peacetime services Therefore, it is essential that care be exercised so that these vital conservation agencies are not forgotten when funds are allocated

TAXES THE OUTDOORSMAN PAYS

Let's never forget that the hunter and fisherman in considerable part pays his own way. Let's just take a look at his tax problem.

The sportsman pays directly for the administration of the wildlife which he is permitted to capture and reduce to the bag. He buys his hunting and fishing license, and this fund is set up within the State for the administration of the resource.

He pays 11 percent excise tax on every box of shells; every new gun, whether it is a rifle or a shotgun, on every box of cartridges which he purchases, and this goes into an earmarked fund provided for in the Pittman-Robertson Act of 1937.

This money, which is collected by the United States Treasury from the manufacturers of sporting arms and ammunition, is set aside in a special fund called the Federal aid to State wildlife restoration projects. Up to date about $70,000,000 has been earmarked into this fund. All but $13,500,000 of it has been allocated to the States for wildlife rehabilitation and restoration.

The man who shoots ducks and other migratory waterfowl has to buy what is known as the Duck Stamp which, until 1949, cost $1 The Congress increased the cost of this to $2 that year Well over $20,000,000 has been paid into this migratory bird conservation fund through the sale of these stamps since the act became effective in 1934.

This money has been used for the purchase of refuges and their operation, maintenance, and protection.

Last year the Congress passed what is known as the Dingell-Johnson bill (a previous version of which has been vetoed by the President). This new law earmarks the 10 percent excise tax on sport fishing tackle to be allocated to the States for fishery restoration projects. This will produce about $3,000,000 a year All three of these funds—the Pittman-Robertson fund, the duck-stamp fund, and the Dingell-Johnson fund—are administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

So, let it not be said that the outdoorsman has not been willing to carry his part of the tax burden.

ANTIPOLLUTION FIGHT

Now, having looked at the appropriation question, let us move on to the antipollution program of our country. Obviously, it still has a long way to go I need not repeat to you the grim facts of the befouling of our streams and the fact that actual work under the Taft-Barkley Pollution Water Control Act of 1948 has barely gotten underway It is a fortunate circumstance for this Nation that the conservation director of your distinguished organization, Mr Carl Schoemaker, is a member of the advisory board pursuant to that act. If we had more selfless men like Carl Schoemaker, men with outstanding experience in the field of conservation work, we would be further along in this problem's solution. The pollution challenge is a tremendous one, and action against it must be stepped up in full cooperation between the Federal Government, States, and localities and promote industry and farming.

NATIONAL PARKS MUST NOT BE DESTROYED

Now a third vital front on which conservation can suffer would be the continued despoiling of our great national park system. You and I know that these parks must be preserved as inviolate sanctuaries. No hunter is permitted in them, but fishing is one of the great activities there, under careful regulation. Fishing, the very mention of the word, makes a man's heart thrill, even though one fellow once said: "There are two kinds of fishermen, those that fish for sport and those that actually catch fish"

More than 30,000,000 people visited the national parks last year, and around a similar number visited the national forests in one way or another And yet there are those inside and outside of Government who would initiate policies which would destroy these national parks and national forests, and as a result future generations would not know the glories of outdoor scenes such as we of this generation have enjoyed. Why do we enjoy them? Because previous farsighted Americans preserved them for us.

Thus we see a third vital front on which conservationists must maintain contact with Congress.

TECHNIQUES OF CONTACTING CONGRESS

Well, my friends, granted that we are agreed that conservation is a vital front for the Congress to be contacted on, just how can you go about it There are several specific ways, and I would like to mention them briefly now.

In the first place, constructive correspondence is a tremendously important means of contacting your legislator. When you hear in your club, read in the newspapers, in conservation magazines, when you listen over the radio, or see on the television screen, that matters affecting conservation will be coming up in the Congress, do not hesitate to write to your legislator, to both your Senators and to your elected Representative.

First, however, inform yourself as fully as possible exactly what you want to write about. Is a bill good or bad, in whole or in part? Find out the bill's number, if you can, the name of the sponsor, the current status; then phrase exactly what you respectfully feel your legislator should do. Do you want him to vote for some particular amendment to it, for example? Do you want him to vote for it in its original form? Do you want him to contact the Department of Interior about it in some way, etc? Do you want him to speed the hearings or to speed the report on the work of the conference committee?

GIVE REASONS FOR YOUR VIEWS

When you have these facts, when you have clearly decided what you want in your own mind, put your thoughts on paper. Try to keep your message as brief, as clear, and as much to the point as possible Present the actual reasons why you feel the policy should be supported. Your legislator will be happy to get your judgment He will be pleased to analyze the logic of your argument. He may not, however, be able to respond in as great detail as he would like. For example, I receive over 300 letters per day, and it is almost inevitable that my replies must necessarily be brief and in fact, it is almost inevitable too that some of my responses must be form letters.

In addition, since I am not a member of any of the Senate committees which directly handle conservation affairs, I must necessarily first contact those committees and defer my personal conclusions until I can get the committee's expert judgment, rather than simply come to an off-the-cuff personal decision without previous study.

These are some of the facts which you must bear in mind. In addition, of course, you will want to remember that each legislator will be attending primarily to committee work within his own jurisdiction. My own field of endeavor is the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Senate Crime Investigating Committee. These three groups alone could take 24 hours of work a day And so it is necessary that the amount of time available for other work must be rather thriftily scheduled.

I present these facts to you, my friends, because I think that they will help contribute to your understanding of the problems that almost any legislator faces Because what I have said in describing my own work could be duplicated in the case of virtually any other legislator.

SEEING LEGISLATOR AT FIRST HAND

Now, my friends, if it is at all possible, there is nothing superior to face-to-face contact with your legislator. If you get the chance to come to Washington, don't hesitate to write to your Senator and/or Representative in advance and they will undoubtedly be happy to try to arrange for an appointment with you. Moreover, when Congress recesses, try to contact your legislator when he or she is at home, and present facts to him on the conservation situation as you see it.

He is particularly interested in the local phase of conservation on which you, in particular, are most expert. In other words, he can get the national picture through national magazines and national organizations. But what he wants and needs to secure most of all is your concise report on the conservation problems affecting you and affecting his particular congressional district or State. Naturally, however, he is happy to get supplementary information on the over-all problem.

USING YOUR ORGANIZATION

Another way by which you can contact your legislator is, of course, through your organization by resolutions which you adopt in your Rod and Gun Club, or by resolutions of the National Wildlife Federation, or by contacts made by executive secretaries of your organizations. In this way you and your friends can simultaneously contact your legislator and get the full benefit of mass support of your position, rather than merely doing so as an individual.

The more you acquaint your legislator with what your fish and wildlife club is doing, the better are the chances of sound representation of your interests. Send him news reports of your club's activity Invite him to your meetings. Ask him to speak before you or to serve on a panel He may not always be able to accept, but he will be happy to be in contact with your group.

CONCLUSION

Now these are but a few of the ways by which you can sell conservation to Congress. Of course, you will want to be active in contacting your State Conservation Commission too As a rule, there are a wide variety of other State and local officers who work on the problems affecting conservation. You and I know that there are many problems which can only be handled by Uncle Sam, but there are a great variety of problems which can be met effectively on the State and local level.

I want to thank you for the kind attention to this address. I hope that it will be but the opening gun in a long series of other contacts which you and I will have together and which you will have with your own legislators.

Good luck to you. Good fishing, good hunting, and good conservation.

Congressman Doyle Explains Congressional Committees for Information of Constituents

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, many inquiries I have received from residents of the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I am now representng for a third time, request information about the various standing committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Inspired by these inquiries is my own realization that only an informed electorate can act intelligently, and only an informed democracy can endure.

These realizations have caused me to go to the personal expense of having an informative outline set up and following this the further personal expense has been undertaken of causing this compilation of interesting and highly informative matter to be published and sent out to the very many persons who are interested, so that they may add to their enlightenment about the congressional committees; and, for their interest and guidance in having pointed out to them the names of the committees and the representatives on the committees, to whom these interested citizens may wish to forward opinions or ideas; or from whom these interested citizens may desire to obtain information about national affairs.

The presentation of information of which I speak promises to be of use to the thousands of residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California who share a very active American desire to be more fully informed—and thus able to act intelligently—as they fulfill their needs to know these things.

Also, Mr. Speaker, since I receive many requests asking me for information as to what congressional committees I am myself a member of, and requests for an explanation of the jurisdiction of these committees in this session of Congress, I have mentioned the two committees on which I serve—the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Un-American Activities—and in addition to this, I have itemized the jurisdiction and responsibilities of these two committees, as is set forth officially in the text of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 753, second session.

As all of the text which follows is verbatim from Public Law 601, entitled "An act to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government," I am hopeful that in its being cited in this connection, and thus made available for the quick information of the public, that my compilation of this information may prove of value to many students and scholars in their studies in schools and colleges, and other groups, as well as of additional important service to older citizens, whose interest in Government at the national level may be thus facilitated and made to become more alert and vigorous.

Standing committees of the United States Senate

	Number of members
Agriculture and Forestry	13
Appropriations	21
Armed Services	13
Banking and Currency	13
Civil Service	13
District of Columbia	13
Expenditures in the Executive Departments	13
Finance	13
Foreign Relations	13
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	13
Judiciary	13
Labor and Public Welfare	13
Public Lands	13
Public Works	13
Rules and Administration	13

Standing committees of the House of Representatives

	Number of members
Agriculture	27
Appropriations	43
Armed Services	33
Banking and Currency	27
Post Office and Civil Service	25
District of Columbia	25
Education and Labor	25
Expenditures in the Executive Departments	25
Foreign Affairs	25
House Administration	25
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	27
Judiciary	27
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	25
Public Lands	25
Public Works	27
Rules	12
Un-American Activities	9
Veterans' Affairs	27
Ways and Means	25

(b) (1) The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time.

(2) At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman, the Member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman; and in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

(3) All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

* * * * *

(2) Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

(3) Each standing committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more: except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am serving on the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities, the jurisdiction of which is set forth in Public Law 601, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any members designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

1 Common defense generally

2 The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.

3 The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.

4 Soldiers' and sailors' homes

5 Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces

6 Selective service.

7 Size and composition of the Army and Navy.

8 Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.

9 Ammunition depots.

10 Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

11 Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

12 Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

CONFERENCE RULES ON AMENDMENTS IN NATURE OF SUBSTITUTE

SEC. 135 (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC 136 To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

PRESERVATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 141. The Librarian of the Library of Congress is authorized and directed to have bound at the end of each session of Congress the printed hearings of testimony taken by each committee of the Congress at the preceding session.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

SEC. 203. (a) The Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to establish in the Library of Congress a separate department to be known as the Legislative Reference Service. It shall be the duty of the Legislative Reference Service—

(1) Upon request, to advise and assist any committee of either House or any joint committee in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals pending before it, or of recommendations submitted to Congress, by the President or any executive agency, and otherwise to assist in furnishing a basis for the proper determination of measures before the committee;

(2) Upon request, or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, to gather, classify, analyze, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations, and bulletins, and otherwise, data for a bearing upon legislation, and to render such data serviceable to Congress, and committees and Members thereof, without partisan bias in selection or presentation;

(3) To prepare summaries and digests of public hearings before committees of the Congress, and of bills and resolutions of a public general nature introduced in either House.

IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 221. The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to provide for printing in the daily RECORD the legislative program for the day, together with a list of congressional committee meetings and hearings, and the place of meeting and subject matter; and to cause a brief résumé of congressional activities for the previous day to be incorporated in the RECORD, together with an index of its contents. Such data shall be prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, respectively.

SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

SEC. 243 (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, are authorized and directed to enter into an arrangement with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the education of congressional pages and pages of the Supreme Court in the public school system of the District. Such arrangement shall include provision for reimbursement to the District of Columbia for any additional expenses incurred by the public school system of the District in carrying out such arrangement.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the District of Columbia in accordance with the arrangement referred to in subsection (a).

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, said page or pages may elect to attend a private or parochial school of their own choice: *Provided, however,* That such private or parochial school shall be reimbursed by the Senate and House of Representatives only in the same amount as would be paid if the page or pages were attending a public school under the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

Citizens desiring to communicate with any committee of Congress should address their letters as follows—to illustrate: Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; or, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

To communicate with me, as representing the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, address letter to: Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress, 1030 House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Need for Approval of Eagle Gorge Flood-Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by John L. Fournier, editor of the Kent (Wash.) News-Journal.

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

NOTES FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK
(By John L. Fournier)
EMPHASIZING THE NEED

Nothing could emphasize the need for approval of the Eagle Gorge flood-control project more than the near-disastrous flood of the past week end Once again the Green River has risen to flood stage and caused extensive damage throughout the length and breadth of its watershed Beyond the actual damage there is the secondary and potential damage that is caused by the ever-recurring threat of flood-borne disaster.

There is no question in the minds of the people of this community as to the real and growing need for the Eagle Gorge flood-control dam. There is also the recognition of the fact that it will be difficult to obtain flood-control appropriations during a period of national emergency. But for those who are willing to examine the situation here, there is the apparent immediate need for flood control and protection of vital defense areas here in the valley. That need, if properly evaluated, should bring action at this session of Congress for approval of the Green River flood-control project. For those who live here there is no more urgent or necessary project Those who face the flood threats from year to year recognize the manifold benefits that will be derived from flood control on the Green.

Investigation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Probe of RFC Mess Must Be Pushed," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 4, 1951.

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

PROBE OF RFC MESS MUST BE PUSHED

In view of the sensational testimony concerning peculiar activities in and around the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the public will find it difficult to understand the desire now voiced by members of the investigating Senate subcommittee to wind up its inquiry as quickly as possible.

An early end to this probe might make it easier for all concerned. It might relieve the perplexed members of the investigating group from the duty of trying to find the truth in what Chairman FULBRIGHT has denounced as "lying" testimony

But it wouldn't restore public confidence in a Government loan agency so tangled up in tales of mink coats, influence, and the "Washington fix" Nor would it furnish the vitally necessary assurance that the general moral level of all Government agencies is what it ought to be.

Senator FULBRIGHT has overwhelming backing for his contention that the subcommittee report charging improprieties in the RFC is anything but asinine, as President Truman characterized it. Every day of open hearings before the Senators demonstrates that their report fell short in only one respect—it didn't go far enough.

The probe still hasn't gone far enough. Whether the Senators are satisfied or not, the public has a right to know the answers to dozens of questions raised by testimony taken under oath before the subcommittee. And in the numerous cases where this sworn testimony is palpably conflicting, those proven to have perjured themselves ought to be punished

What about the charge hurled by a Detroit industrialist that a Washington lawyer claimed to have two RFC directors in his hip pocket? Are such serious charges to be let go with a simple accusation and denial, or will the committee dig into the whole matter to find out the truth?

What about the serious statement made by Carl G Strandlund, head of the Lustron prefabricated housing enterprise, that one RFC director headed a clique that tried to wrest control of Lustron from him? Lustron had borrowed $37,000,000 from the RFC, and ultimately the loan was foreclosed.

There are other matters hanging fire as a result of disclosures before the committee, and not the least of them is the curious role of E. Merl Young, one-time RFC examiner whose wife got the $8,540 mink coat charged to a Washington attorney alleged to be influential with the RFC. Young also jumped from his modest RFC position to two jobs, at salaries totaling $28,000 a year, with two separate RFC borrowers, and FULBRIGHT says he is still trying to find out what Young did to earn these salaries.

So is the public More importantly, the public is trying to find out why the services—and proposed $100,000 fee—of a lawyer were rejected because it looked like "the Washington fix." Is the "fix" such a common operation in Washington that it can be readily spotted?

President Truman has moved belatedly in this situation by offering a plan to reorganize the RFC. But he could and should go much further. He ought to demand, on the basis of the disclosures up to now, that the whole mess be thoroughly investigated until all the charges are explored.

Whatever the President does, FULBRIGHT and the other subcommittee members should not let the investigation die. Yet FULBRIGHT has announced that he wants to wind up this week the hearings on what he terms "this cockeyed thing"

It's cockeyed, all right, but it's much more than that. It raises grave doubts whether the RFC has been run for the benefit of the country or on the basis of influence and favors. It casts reflections on various Washington characters whose stock in trade seems to be knowing Government officials.

The RFC mess carries grave implications about the conduct of the Government. It must not be half exposed and then brushed aside and forgotten.

Commemoration of the Christianization of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, an occasion of outstanding interest to the many persons of Lithuanian birth and descent in Maryland was held this past Sunday at St. Alphonsus Church, Baltimore, Md., to mark the seven hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Christianization of Lithuania.

Present at the services at which his excellency, the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough, presided, were 500 displaced Lithuanians who have arrived in Maryland in the past 18 months, to give thanks for the freedom they now enjoy. The Reverend Louis J. Mendeles is pastor of this large congregation of splendid Maryland citizens.

Because of its pertinence to conditions throughout the world today, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the sermon delivered on this occasion by the Reverend John J Duggan be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

It is singularly appropriate that at the gracious invitation of your reverend pastor, we should gather today at this solemn mass presided over by our most reverend archbishop, to commemorate the Catholic baptism of Lithuania over seven centuries ago, and at the same time to join with you exiles of that martyred daughter of the church in hymns and prayers of thanksgiving for the favors which God has bestowed upon you, not the least of which is the haven of hospitality enjoyed by you in this State of Maryland and city of Baltimore. It is Laetare Sunday when the church bids her children who have been so far engaged in penitent works, to look up and beyond Calvary and see in the first rays of the Easter sun the risen Christ who brings them redemption, and to rejoice.

We live in one of those interludes of history that come upon us once every few hundred years. A twilight zone when darkness seems so real and the light seems so far away. The whole world is on tenterhooks, possessed of a sense of impending catastrophe when war, defeat, persecution of religion, frustration of hearts, enthronement of violence, and a gnawing fear would turn us into prophets of despair. We who believe in God cannot share the pessimism and despair which speaks of the return to barbarism.

There are three notes of hope today for us who believe in God which keep us from sharing the pessimism, hopelessness, and defeatism of those who have forgotten their God.

The first lesson is this: A great calamity is often the eve of a great spiritual awakening. In such moments of defeat man's pride is most humbled and his soul thus prepared for the help of God.

The second reason for hope is that in the lifetime of all of us the church has been more and more emerging into the world from which she was exiled 400 years ago. Nothing better symbolizes this progressive

influence than the manner in which the last two Popes have been crowned as successors of St Peter. Both pontiffs were crowned on the portico in the piazza of St. Peter.

The third and final reason for hope is that the strength of material opposition has no relation to the possibilities of spiritual victory. That is why we who believe in God and Christ's victory over the powers of darkness and the victory of spirit over matter will not be without hope for America, so long as it trusts in God

May you who have come from the old country, a Lithuania that was baptized in the faith 700 years ago, now help us to continue our trust in God. You have been the recipients of the magnificent care and generosity of the Resettlement Committee of the National Catholic Welfare Conference under the energetic and most gracious leadership of our most reverend archbishop. You who are most anxious to show your gratitude can do so in no better way than by living catholic lives. Good example from you at work and in your homes will surely bring back God into main stream of American life. Your attendance at Sunday mass and frequent reception of the sacraments as witnessed by us this morning will be the best compensation for the hospitality of our country. You who have witnessed disloyalty of your own in face of tempting promises from without help us so that the epidemic of Benedict Arnolds in this country may be stopped completely. You who have seen faithful souls apostatize in face of adversity and of tempting promises of fool's gold, worldly prestige, and impossible utopias please help us to be self-disciplined and faithful under our present trials and penance. We are your debtors because you are the servants of the suffering Christ who have given us the precious opportunity of being another Veronica and Simon of Cyrene as you tread your sorrowful journey carrying so courageously and hopefully your burden of the cross.

Life Insurance for GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the Washington Post of yesterday in regard to the bill now in conference providing life insurance for GI's.

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

FREE INSURANCE

Of the two bills to provide free life insurance for GI's, the Senate version is much to be preferred. This bill, which would furnish free insurance to men on active duty, also would permit them to continue it after discharge by paying the premiums themselves The House bill, on the other hand, would require that the insurance privilege end upon discharge from the service, with no provision for continuance.

There can be little question that automatic insurance is desirable for men on active duty. It is a form of protection for families which is obviously necessary, for no matter what the inducements to take out insurance on a voluntary basis, the casualty records always include some men who for one reason or another do not have a policy. Whether the insurance is given free or is made mandatory by pay deductions is not important; the need is to see that everyone has it. Actually, free insurance may prove to be cheaper to the Government than the present system through elimination of an inordinate amount of paper work.

With respect to veterans, however, the House bill would take away a privilege which has been accorded veterans of two World Wars. Even though it would not affect existing policies, it would deny new veterans the right to keep their insurance in force. This right to continue Government life insurance is, to be sure, a form of subsidy in that the Government assumes the cost of overhead and the premiums are cheaper than on comparable civilian policies. It is a subsidy, however, for a worth-while purpose, and one that means far more to veterans than most of the other benefits that generous legislators conjure up Undoubtedly the administration of Government life insurance could be simplified, but we hope that Senate conferees will stick to their guns in continuing the privilege for men who have earned it.

Abolition of Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which urges the abolition of discrimination, separation, segregation, and inequalities applying to certain minority groups living in the United States. The resolution is from the Reveille Club, of New York, whose membership is composed of distinguished citizens of my own State. The position taken by this group is that inequalities based on race, color, or creed, are contrary to our principles of democracy, hamper our mobilization effort, and should be eliminated. In this position I wholeheartedly agree.

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

REVEILLE CLUB OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y.

"Resolution advocating the abolishment of discrimination, separation, segregation, and inequalities to certain minority groups living in the United States

"Whereas the President of the United States declared a national emergency, requesting of the Congress extraordinary powers, and

"Whereas it appears that a third world war involving Russia and other communistic countries against the United States and other free nations appears inevitable, and

"Whereas such a world war would be catastrophic and more devastating to the free nations and western civilization than all the other wars in history; and

"Whereas the United States is known as a democratic country but in reality numerous groups of its citizenry suffer from diverse discriminations and inequalities despite advances made with regards thereto toward the broadening of the democratic base during World War II; and

"Whereas discrimination, segregation, or separation in any form, to any group because of race, color, or national origin is contrary to the concept of our democratic principles; and

"Whereas the communistic enemies of the free nations are successfully using these facts to undermine the prestige of the United States throughout the world, to increase her enemies and dispel trust in the free nations' advocacy of democracy; and

"Whereas the colored peoples of the world have long resented the many slights and inequalities meted out to them, and this is particularly true of the Negro minority as well as other minorities in the United States; and

"Whereas they, with the other colored peoples of the world, look forward to and demand equal treatment for equal abilities since they, as American citizens, are to take a part in a war against communistic aggression; and

"Whereas the United States and the free nations of the world can only meet the aggression of communistic countries by being totally unified: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to exercise the full power and authority vested in him as President and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, by Executive orders or otherwise, to the end that discrimination and inequality against any groups of persons because of race, color, or national origin throughout the United States, and particularly in the so-called Southern States, shall be eliminated immediately, and that all laws, customs, and practices contrary thereto shall be abrogated, and that the Congress in such instances as may be necessary implement such Executive orders by law."

The above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Reveille Club of New York at a meeting held the 13th day of January 1951.

IRA L. ALDRIDGE,
Secretary.

Five Basic and Explosive Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable article from the New York Times Sunday magazine section written by Lester Markel, the Times' Sunday editor. The article is headed "Five basic and explosive fallacies" and is based on a series of recent interviews by Mr. Markel with Government officials in Washington.

Mr. President, these five fallacies underlie much too much of the thinking and the debating now going on in Washington. I hope this article may be widely read by Members of the Congress. I particularly commend Mr. Markel's prescription, his recommendation to carry on the work in each of the four great areas where public opinion is made.

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

FIVE BASIC AND EXPLOSIVE FALLACIES—AMERICAN POLICY IS INFLUENCED BY MISCONCEPTIONS TI AT REVEAL THE NEED OF A BETTER INFORMED PUBLIC

(By Lester Markel)

Washington at all times strives to be many things to many men—an international as well as a national capital, a monitor for the world and a sounding board for the Nation.

Now it strives especially to be the last. The White House keeps its collective ear as close to the ground as physics permits. The Congress tries almost desperately to discover the wishes of the country. Increasing attention is paid to the mails and the polls; politics makes uneasy as well as strange bedfellows. What is thought on Main Street—or rather what Washington thinks Main Street is thinking—has a profound effect on the Capitol.

Washington today is overhung with uncertainties, abnormal fogs added to the normal mists of the capital—the political and ideological miasmas and the clouds of gossip that are wafted from the cocktail lounges into the innermost sanctums of government.

To the degree that the Nation is confused and uncertain, so is the Capital. If many among us are uninformed or misinformed, then we are likely to move by emotion rather than reason. Unless public opinion is steady and sane we shall not fulfill our role in the world and thus we shall invite incalculable danger.

There is convincing evidence that we are not as informed as we need to be informed to meet the present peril Specifically, there are five prime fallacies that have wide currency in the Nation. Even though, as is undoubtedly true, these views are not held by a majority of the people, they are held broadly enough to exert a compelling influence on national policy.

What follows is a statement of these five fallacies and a report on their effects, as the visitor to Washington observes them.

I. THE ATOMIC BOMB

The belief: This is a twofold conviction: First, that in the atomic bomb we have the decisive weapon, second, that we should proceed now, if not with the atomic bomb, at least with atomic speed, to shoot the works, to move with everything we possess, so that we can have it over with and return to normalcy as quickly as possible.

The fallacy. The atomic bomb, it is true, is a most potent arm and a mighty deterrent to Soviet Russia. But it cannot be conclusive in a war with Russia. As for a program for shooting the works, in that direction may lie an economic defeat more overwhelming than a military one.

In Washington the atomic fallacy results in a spurious reliance on the bomb—and in some instances, fortunately rare, in a demand for a preventive war. Those who advocate this kind of program do not carry it beyond the first blasts. You ask, for example, what do we do if, immediately the war is on, the Russians move into Europe, our critical bastion? The only answer you get is that we shall then destroy Europe's factories. What an impression that formula must make on countries such as France, still struggling with the wreckage of the last war and still dazed from the occupation.

A second important effect of the atomic fallacy is the call for full mobilization—for many more troops, for complete controls, for arms in vast quantity—now. The pressures are fully evident in the White House, on Capitol Hill, and especially in the echoing halls of the Pentagon.

The men in charge of the mobilization deplore these pressures. If we yield to them the Kremlin might stampede us into economic disaster. General Marshall is emphatic on the point. "We must," he says, "build up our productive capacity; the stockpiles will come later" As he sees it, the job is not one of day-by-day improvisation, but the development of a 10-year plan. If the effort is concentrated in a single year and the war continues cold instead of hot, then the let-down will be tremendous and the future will be in grave jeopardy.

For this is not a reckless foe we face; this is a cool, calculating enemy. Averell Harriman tells of a conversation he had with Stalin 3 years ago about Hitler's course. Hitler's mistake, Stalin said, was that he became impatient, he tried to force matters, he failed in his timing and so he was defeated.

We can be sure of little about the Kremlin except that it will not act until it believes the time is ripe—and this regardless of what we do, either by way of firmness or appeasement. To those who, like Mr. Harriman, have had experience with the men that walk and act like bears our course is clear. We must build up our strength steadily and surely and calmly, unswayed either by Russian threats or by Russian promises.

II. THE GEOGRAPHIC FALLACY

The belief: This takes three forms: First, the conviction that, if we choose, we can withdraw to a western Gibraltar and from there defy the Russians and all the forces of ideology and economics; second, closely allied with this, the theory that we can achieve sea and air control and so utterly safeguard our shores; third, that what we face is exclusively a military problem.

The fallacy: There is no Gibraltar, no fortress, that can be made surely safe against atomic attack. Second, sea and air control implies bases and bases imply allies Finally, this is not fundamentally a military problem or even a geographic one, it is one to be solved, ultimately, not with arms, but with doctrine.

The geographic fallacy is highly potent in Washington. It expresses itself in a demand that we do something—exactly what is never clearly defined—about Asia and that we tell Europe where she gets off.

The answer from the White House and Pentagon is this: As for Asia, the problem is one that dates back deep into history and requires time, patience, and fortitude; as for Europe, where she gets off is almost precisely the place where we must get off.

The talk of a Gibraltar of the west is likened to the talk 10 years ago of an invincible Maginot line. To those who minimize and criticize Europe the Pentagon leaders answer that the Continent is vital to us, first, as a production area, and, second, as a citadel. In the hands of the enemy the European workshops might well tip the scales against us. Even Mr. Hoover's plans call for the holding of the British Isles, but without Europe, the military leaders say, it will be very difficult to hold the British Isles; and without the British Isles a crucial base will be lost.

That is why, it is argued, we must send troops to invigorate the European defense. Even though the forces may not be sufficient to hold the continent indefinitely against a Russian onslaught, they can at least check the attack, so that a breathing spell will be provided during which our air arm can go into action.

But the main defect in this kind of thinking, as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS puts it, is that most so-called geographic problems are not military and not even geographic. We must surely build up our strength so that Russia will not dare to move; then will come a period of armed truce during which the two systems will be tested. But no ultimate victory is possible unless psychology and economics are on our side.

"That means a double effort; we must make our own system stronger and we must help others to achieve like security." There are no doubts about the outcome if we make this effort, for then the moral and industrial potentials of the free states are certain to prevail against those of the slave nations.

III. THE M'CARTHY FALLACY

The belief: This is the suspicion that the Government is riddled with Communists or soft sympathizers with communism; that few in these parlous days are to be trusted; that those farthest right are likely to be nearest right.

The fallacy: First, even though constant screenings of Government ranks are necessary, the large majority of Government workers are loyal and faithful. Second, it is surely a blazing non sequitur to conclude that any argument advanced as an anti-Communist argument is per se a good argument.

The shadow of the McCarthy fallacy lies heavy over Washington. The Republicans are very conscious of the fact that the issue made by the Wisconsin Senator helped them win important victories in the 1950 elections and they look to it hopefully for 1952. Foreign policy, says Mr. TAFT, will be the issue next year. He defines that issue as the "ousting of communism from Government." And the administration is, of course, acutely conscious of the challenge.

Over the State Department the cloud hangs blackest. The charges have made State officials very cautious, even timid, and this is reflected in our policy. So deeply has the doubt penetrated that there are officers abroad who are reluctant to make true appraisals of the Russian situation for fear that sometime someone will come upon their reports in the Department files and accuse them of subversion.

A current of dank anxiety runs through the departments of Government; and many good men will not take Washington jobs because they are unwilling to submit themselves to the kind of ordeal by adjective and by fire to which others have been subjected.

The Nimitz Commission—appointed to examine the twin problems of security and individual rights—may take some of the heat off. But basically what is needed is a sterner resistance, by both the public and the Congress, to the trend toward suspicion and witch hunting.

IV. THE RIGHTEOUSNESS FALLACY

The belief: This is the conviction that, because our idealism is strong and our cause just, the world should recognize them as such; that the American way—our economic and social system—is the only way; and that socialism is something as evil as communism.

The fallacy: It is undoubtedly true that we rate high in idealism and altruism. But the fact is that a large segment of the world does not acknowledge this; the huge lies of the Communist propaganda machine have had their effect. Moreover, much of the world believes in the Socialist creed and has an inherent distrust of capitalism. This suspicion is fostered by our unconcealed antagonism toward socialism—which puzzles and angers the Socialists inasmuch as they are among the most dedicated of communism's enemies.

The righteousness fallacy is reflected sharply in both thinking and action in Washington.

Our opposition to socialism leads us into such blind and dangerous alleys as distrust of laborite Britain, even though Britain is inevitably the first of our allies; reliance on the old rightist elements in such places as Germany; acid debates with those who disagree with us about the Far East.

Mr. Harriman, who saw the problem closely as head of the ECA operations abroad, puts it this way: "I do not believe in socialism. But the only test we should apply in our judgment of any nation is whether the basic freedoms are being preserved."

The fallacy has large effects also on our propaganda operations. The Voice of America is likely to put the emphasis on such themes as the high standard of living in the United States; the importance of democracy (difficult to convey because of the confusions the Russians have injected into the dictionary); the worth of free enterprise, and the like.

But peoples who have been subjected to a propaganda barrage for all these years do not easily recognize truth and are not interested in facts or words without acts. The two great themes of the Kremlin's propaganda machine are capitalism and warmongering. Paul Hoffman, who has studied the public opinion operation intensively, insists that these must be met head-on.

We must make clear, he says, that our kind of capitalism is not the European kind. Capitalism in Europe and in Asia connotes monopoly and the sweating of labor and unconscionable profits: capitalism here means mass production, a high standard of living, and social welfare.

The charge of warmongering—its effectiveness for the Russians can be measured by the success of the Stockholm peace appeal—can be met only by demonstrating that we do not need and do not want war. But the best propaganda is acts.

"When men are starving and you offer them the choice of the four freedoms or four sandwiches," Senator DOUGLAS points out, "they are likely to take the four sandwiches" Until, in brief, their economic problems are solved, men do not consider their political problems, even though the solution of the first depends on the second.

V. THE LEADERSHIP FALLACY

The belief: There is a profound conviction that a strong man in Washington can solve all our problems for us, showing us where to go and how to get there (without too much discomfort)—a Moses who can reveal the way through the "red sea" of communism.

The fallacy: No leader can do the job by himself. Leaders' ip arises primarily from the people, from the main streets of the Nation rather than from Pennsylvania Avenue. Unless the average citizen performs his duties as a citizen, dealing responsibly with the great issues of the day, leadership will fail.

The leadership fallacy serves as a mannalike alibi for the hungry habitants of Capitol Hill. Because the Nation's attention is focused on the White House, many in the Congress dodge decisions and bestride the fences; they seem to forget that representative government requires the exercise of judgment, that it is not a rubber-stamp or carbon-copy process.

Nevertheless the feeling is strong in Washington, among adherents of both parties, that there should be a firmer assertion of leadership at the top; that the issues should be made clearer to the people, especially by the President (whose voice cannot avoid being the only real voice of America) and the Secretary of State.

Take, as an outstanding example, the case of Korea. There is, as Mr. Acheson says, a great moral issue involved. When we went into Korea to counter the aggression, the Nation as well as the world applauded; while we were winning, the applause continued; but when the Chinese threw us back, it began to be said that we should never have gone in. As Mr. Acheson points out, the fact of defeat does not change the principle involved; it was right to go in and even though we may still be forced out, not to have gone in would have been a moral surrender of untold consequence.

But this has not been put in this way to the people and so the fundamental issue is not clear to them. The top officials will agree about the need of such explanations, but they add that there are so many other pressing things to be done, so many immediate problems. They do not recognize that none of these other problems can be solved unless the basic problem is met—the problem of informing the people.

OUR BASIC STRENGTH

There is much evidence that we do not have the knowledge of world affairs and the interest in them that are vital for our future.

There are those who contend that we are better informed than most other nations; that there is manifest in many quarters a desire to know, and that history reveals, clearly and convincingly, that the American people have a basic common sense which eventually asserts itself.

All this is true, but the overriding fact is that we are not sufficiently informed to meet the present dangers. Somewhere there is a failure of the supply of information and a failure of the absorption of information.

To correct these failures requires a major effort in many directions. In each of the four great areas in which public opinion is made the work must be carried on: (1) The mass media must do a better job—the free press must be also a fully responsible press; (2) education must educate for good citizenship and link the schoolroom and campus more closely to the outside world; (3) the beacons of adult education must reach further into the darkness; (4) Government—and this includes Congress as well as the President—must do much more to inform and to lead.

Leadership is required; there must be no doubt on that score—leaders who lead rather than follow or are pushed on from behind; leaders who decide upon the right course and follow that course, the polls and the commentators notwithstanding. And leaders with courage. "A leader," says General Marshall, "is one who continues to fight even though the odds are 10 to 1 against him."

But more inspired leadership and broader education and better information cannot do the job unless the individual citizen does his part too. He must do his best to insure that the right men are elected to office, that the great issues are debated fully and fairly, and that those on whom he depends for guidance are doing their jobs competently and responsibly. Above all, he must cultivate tolerance and a decent measure of humility

Then there will emerge the basic strength and the basic unity of the country. Then, through leadership and the response to leadership, we shall develop the white faith that alone can turn back the black challenge that confronts us.

Alaska Girds To Preserve Its Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, after careful research and 6,000 miles of travel in Alaska, Mr. Louis R. Huber, of Seattle, has written and the Christian Science Monitor has printed several articles under the general heading of "Alaska girds to preserve its wildlife."

Because of the national importance of this problem, I include the articles in the RECORD for the information of Members of Congress:

ALASKA GIRDS TO PRESERVE ITS WILDLIFE—FIRE AND HUNTING SLASH BIG GAME AND FISH TOTAL

(By Louis R. Huber)

SEATTLE.—Can Alaska's magnificent wildlife be saved?

Many Alaskans are asking this question because, in their spacious land (586,000 square miles), which is as yet only sparsely populated (128,000 people, about 1 for every 5 square miles), wildlife is decreasing.

The northland is supposed to be capable of supporting a population of 12,000,000, eventually. As they come, will the wildlife have to go?

Alaskans hope not—and they are studying ways to insure the permanency of their wildlife neighbors.

"Most of the land in Alaska is of greatest value for producing wildlife, but great changes have been made in the numbers of our big game and fish," says Neil W Hosley, head of the cooperative wildlife research unit at the University of Alaska, near Fairbanks.

FIRE TAKES TOLL

"To use only one illustration, the herds of caribou, which 25 years ago were estimated in the millions, are now down to about 160,000. Fires which have burned a large part of the Alaska interior have often destroyed the lichens on which the caribou depend, and it takes decades for this growth to develop again.

"Along with this has come a big increase in hunting Nonresident hunting and fishing licenses issued in the Territory have increased sixtyfold since the late 1920's. At the same time, resident hunting and fishing licenses have increased seven times since 1936," says Mr. Hosley.

In brief, the balance of nature has already been rudely upset by man in Alaska, with grim consequences for the wildlife. Unless swift and adequate steps are taken, the scales may tip over—with important members of the wildlife family lost to the northland.

SPORT HUNTER EYED

"There are important differences and many similarities between Alaskan and State-side wildlife problems," says Winston A. Elkins, wildlife management supervisor of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service office here. He adds

"The term 'meat hunter' would be generally regarded as having a stigma in the States, but Alaskans would consider it praiseworthy and, indeed, would look askance at the sport hunter.

"Wildlife in Alaska is a resource that means food and clothing to many people. The resident hunter in Alaska is interested in a permanent wildlife population, with fish in the streams and lakes for all time to come.

"But the transient hunter and fisherman are too often motivated by the souvenir instinct The fisherman is too intent on getting whoppers to take home for mounting and neglects to throw back the fish he doesn't intend to keep

WOLVES AND COYOTES

"The hunter must have a brown-bear rug, a set of caribou antlers, or a goat head to show the folks back home. What if he shoots three bears before getting one in the trophy class, or if his first two goats are crippled and fall down the cliff?" asks Mr. Elkins

At the same time, due to various factors associated with the overturned balance of nature, the number of wolves and coyotes throughout all Alaska has increased alarmingly in recent years Predators of the worst kind, wolves have killed thousands of deer,

moose, caribou, mountain sheep, and mountain goats.

The Alaska Legislature meeting here in 1949 set the bounties on wolves at $50 and on coyotes at $30—a move which has resulted in destruction of more of these wanton killers than was the case when smaller bounties were in effect.

The Fish and Wildlife Service at the same time has carried on a poison-setting program which is declared to be a success. The poison used is said to be selective—attractive to wolves only and not eaten by other fur-bearing animals.

In McKinley National Park during recent years the wolves increased to such numbers that the famous big-horn Dall mountain sheep living there were threatened Then permission was given park rangers to shoot wolves, even though shooting in the national park otherwise is forbidden.

From a low of 300 sheep that remained after long-unmolested depredations by the wolves, an increase to 1,000 sheep—with prospects for further increases if the shooting war against wolves is continued—has occurred, says Grant Pearson, park superintendent.

Paradoxically, the Fish and Wildlife Service says that destruction of caribou in the Arctic portions of Alaska is caused chiefly by the people who depend on them for food and clothing—the Eskimos.

CURB ON ESKIMOS

Early last March a caribou herd passed near the Eskimo village of Noatak, 225 miles north of Nome, and 37 Eskimos shot 280 of the animals, according to Wildlife agents who investigated the affair.

For centuries the Eskimos have killed caribou as they pleased, but now, with these animals disappearing, the Federal Agency declares firmly that Eskimos must sharply curb their traditional slaughter A limit of one caribou and two polar bears apiece annually has been set.

In the Noatak case—not the only one to occur recently—the guns of 7 of the 37 hunters were confiscated, for those 7 had killed a total of 107 caribou

The story does not end there, for the Eskimos strongly resent the taking of their guns and they dislike the Wildlife agents. Lt. Col. Marvin R. Marston, chief organizer of the Eskimos into the Alaska National Guard as "human-radar" watchers against the possibility of enemy invasion, thinks he may have a solution.

WHALES SUGGESTED

"The Eskimos can hunt whales, if they are given the right equipment; and they can use some of the half-wild reindeer that are still found in the Arctic," he suggests.

In any case, the difficulty between Uncle Sam and his Eskimo citizens is a matter worthy of prompt and careful attention. It will call for greater understanding on both sides, and for a high degree of tactfulness on the part of Wildlife agents.

Members of the Armed Forces, too, have been accused of much of the unwarranted slaughter of wild animals in Alaska—as have the thousands of construction workers who go north for varying periods to help build military installations.

This writer talked to one Wildlife agent, Jim Wood of Naknek, who reported notable cooperation after he made a candid appeal to civilians and military men in his area. His direct, trusting approach has paid off, he says, in sensible, law-abiding hunting and fishing.

Larger Appropriation Urged for Preservation Program

Saving the wildlife of Alaska is a costly job—and growing more costly as the northland population grows.

"It's a field of great concern to all Alaskans, but entirely outside their jurisdiction for action," says the Anchorage Daily Times.

"For years, Alaskans have hammered the Fish and Wildlife Service to do a better job * * * but each year little or nothing is done. The service continues its operations with one agent trying to do the work of ten "

The Anchorage newspaper goes on to explain that the fault in Alaska wildlife management is due almost entirely to niggardly appropriations Last fiscal year the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska operated on a budget of $2,150,000.

BUDGET BUREAU HIT

The Times accused the Bureau of the Budget for this low figure, insufficient, it said, for an area one-fifth the size of the United States. In an editorial it quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, giving the colloquy between Albert Day, head of the Federal agency, and Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio.

This revealed the over-all Fish and Wildlife Service budget for the 1951 fiscal year to be $14,350,500, which is less than $2,000,000 more than for 1950.

Mr. Day said before a congressional subcommittee that his agency did not have enough to carry out an effective wildlife program, and he added, "We can only ask Congress to appropriate what the Bureau of the Budget has approved."

This year, Alaska received some additional help from funds distributed under the Pittman-Robertson Act for the restoration of wildlife. A total of $75,000 was given to Alaska. This was $50,000 more than was available last year.

WALTON LEAGUE BUSY

The Izaak Walton League has taken an active interest in securing greater help for Alaska wildlife. Last year it tried to get Congress to plow back into Alaska the Government's profit from the annual fur-seal harvest on the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea.

"But the congressional committee to which we presented this plan asked for more time to study it—and that was the last we heard of it," said Burton H. Atwoord, a national director of the league

The Wildlife Management Institute of Washington, D. C, also has taken a lively interest in Alaska wildlife Two high officials of the institute, which is financed by donations from business firms and private individuals, visited the northland last summer.

RESEARCH UNIT SET

They were Ira N. Gabrielson, formerly head of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Territory, and Clinton R. Gutermuth, institute vice president.

While in Alaska they formally installed one of their organization's cooperative wildlife research units at the University of Alaska, near Fairbanks. About 18 similar units already are operating in land-grant colleges in the United States under the aegis of the institute.

Bison Herd Thinned Out

The only buffalo (bison, that is) on the open range under the American flag today probably are those in Alaska.

Twenty-three of the big, shaggy animals were brought here from the Plains States in 1928. Now they number 350. They are the first bison to live in the northland, the species not being native here.

Elk, likewise not native to the territory, were brought to Alaska in 1929. Eight of the animals were placed on Afognak Island, adjacent to Kodiak Island. They now number more than 200.

Both the elk and the bison were judged in need of "thinning" for the good of their herds by United States Fish and Wildlife Service biologists last year, so a restricted "open season" was arranged for 50 elk and 25 bison.

The bison forage by themselves and are among the few large wild animals that can hold their own against wolves.

BISON REPEL ATTACK

"When a wolf pack closes in on a herd of buffalo, the big animals don't run as moose and caribou do," says Edward F. Chatelain, biologist of the Fish and Wildlife Service. "The bison stand their ground, their shaggy heads lowered and their horns ready for action "

The task of catching and transporting the 32 young bison to the new Copper River range was a "wild-north" epic calling for new techniques.

A corral was built and the bison were enticed into and made used to it by salt-lick blocks and alfalfa. When the "roundup" began, the corral gate was dropped—and the fun began.

The top bull in the herd had been locked out—but that didn't last long. While the "cowboys" watched in apprehension, the big bull battered down the rail fence, leaped a 6-foot barrier and joined his range mates.

LURED INTO CRATES

After the animals stopped milling around, the wildlife men opened a chute in one side of the corral and waited for a buffalo to wander into it.

When the chute contained one of the desired young animals, they closed the chute entrance and prodded the buffalo into a heavy crate, which was then hoisted onto a truck.

But the buffalo wouldn't stand quietly in the crates—until Mr Chatelain suggested shrouding each one with canvas. Thus sequestered, the animals became quiet.

Latest reports are that the transplanted bison are doing well after their highway journey of more than 100 miles, in future years, wildlife agents say, more buffalo will be taken to other suitable range areas in Alaska.

Keep the Right Animals

"People back in the States are always getting excited about the wrong things in Alaska " This was a statement by an Alaska guide at Kodiak, who makes his living by escorting hunters into the haunts of the huge Alaska brown bear, largest carnivore on earth, and other wild animals of the northland.

He was referring to recurrent efforts to preserve the bald eagle and the Alaska brown bear.

"The bald eagle thrives in Alaska We've had a bounty on that bird for most of 33 years, even if it is our national symbol by act of the Continental Congress in 1782 If the bounty is taken off, there will be too many bald eagles, and they'll destroy too much other wildlife," he said.

As for the brown bears, they are scorchingly criticized by farmers of Kodiak Island and other localities, who find it impossible to raise beef cattle on account of them. The bears delight in killing the beef cattle, and the game laws prevent the farmer from taking retaliatory measures.

"Those bears are far too numerous. There should be open season on them all the time. Don't worry; they'll take care of themselves. Besides, there are plenty of refuges for them, totaling nearly 2,000,000 acres on Kodiak and Uganik Islands," said one Kodiak Island farmer.

"On the other hand," reflected the guide, "people in the States seldom get worked up about the plight of caribou, mountain sheep, mountain goats, and, to some extent, moose. These animals really need some help.

"People in the States forget, or don't realize, that wolves and coyotes are the greatest enemies of wildlife up here. So are the forest fires, against which Alaska has almost no protection."

How To Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, each session every one of us is buried under an avalanche of mail. Few of us dare talk back to our correspondents. Most of them are well-meaning. Some are merely misinformed.

The following guide will ease our burden, if our constituents would only heed its excellent advice. It appeared in the January 1949 edition of Kiplinger magazine. It is worthy of reprinting now:

HOW TO WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN—PUT ASIDE THAT PEN AND PAPER UNTIL YOU HAVE READ THIS LIST OF DO'S AND DONT'S

You may have strong ideas about what the new Congress should do. So perhaps you will write a letter to your Congressman. But you will waste your time unless you know how to write him.

If your letter is a gripe or a whine, it will be brushed off. If it is a long-winded essay, it may never get read If it can't make a definite point, it will invite a similar reply.

The basic rule is to write a simple, concise statement of your position, plus your reasons for that position. Your Congressman will read such a letter carefully

To make your letters most effective, follow these suggestions. They come from Congressmen themselves.

Do make your letter short and to the point. If your letter runs less than a page, all the better.

Try to base your views on local observations or experience. Congressmen want to know the effect of their action on their home district.

When writing about a specific bill, try to use the bill's number or its popular name. Thousands of bills pass a Congressman's desk each year and it helps to know which particular one you are talking about.

When writing about something on which you have a special knowledge, state your experience in the field. A Congressman doesn't know about everything, and a specialist's views will help him make up his mind.

Time your letter to reach your Congressman when the subject you are discussing is alive. A letter on a bill months before it comes up is almost as useless as one on a bill months after its disposition.

Write your Congressman when you think he has done something good. He likes praise as much as anyone.

Don't write letters which threaten him with defeat at the next election if he doesn't vote your way. Reasons are more effective than threats.

Don't tell your Congressman how influential you are in his district. If you are, he probably knows it; if you're not, he'll resent your letter's implication that you can bring pressure to bear.

Don't merely "demand" or "insist." He doesn't know whether your reasons are good unless you tell him what they are.

Don't get caught in a pressure letter or telegram campaign. A batch of identical letters, obviously inspired by a pressure group, gets very little attention. If you agree with a group's position, use your own words, not the group's.

Don't swamp your Congressman with letters on the same subject. When you've expressed yourself once, you've made your impression. One good letter is worth 10 bad ones.

Don't write Congressmen from other than your home district, unless it is to the chairman of the committee discussing a specific bill. Congressmen aren't swayed much by outsiders.

On Working Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Working Together," published in the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., of February 28, 1951.

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

ON WORKING TOGETHER

Hard-shelled, dyed-in-the-wool Democrats, who think that every Republican is equipped with a pair of horns, and Republicans who feel the same way about members of the opposition party, should take a cue from the working relations of Senator BURNET R MAYBANK'S Banking and Currency Committee.

While in this locality yesterday to study community service needs in the atomic-energy-plant area, the members of the Senate committee showed every evidence of being a great working team.

Of the four committeemen here, two were Democrats—MAYBANK, of South Carolina, and FREAR, of Delaware—and two were Republicans—CAPEHART, of Indiana, and BENNETT, of Utah

There was no partisanship evident. There was no bickering, no unfriendliess There was, indeed, a noticeable spirit of camaraderie, and genuine evidence of mutual respect. Obviously, they were intent only on doing a good job—working together, Democrats and Republicans

And that is as it should be. After all, they are all Americans, and party labels shouldn't count for too much when the welfare of the Nation is at stake.

What You Can Do Personally To Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1951

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following interesting and concrete idea which appeared in Woman's Home Companion of December 1950.

Let us get together and stop communism by being for Americanism.

WHAT YOU CAN DO PERSONALLY TO STOP COMMUNISM

(By Howard Whitman)

You, all by yourself, can strike repeated blows—day in and day out—to stop communism. Does that seem fantastic? Has it seemed that stopping communism is a job which only the President or the Army and Navy or the FBI can do? Have you wished you actually could do something?

You can.

You will not get a medal for it nor will you see your picture on page 1. But deep inside you there'll be a warm glow. For in your daily private life you will personally be contributing to the preservation of freedom and turning back the dark shrouds of Communist repression. You will be defeating totalitarianism with the sole weapon which is capable of defeating it: individualism.

As you read the specific suggestions below, bear in mind the oft-told tale of the Reverend James Keller, founder of the Christophers. Father Keller was speaking at the Los Angeles Coliseum, expounding the Christophers' thesis that individual people, by their simple, everyday acts, can change the world. In this huge arena, under a starless sky, Father Keller said, "Don't be afraid. All the lights are going out."

Then he struck a match. It was a tiny pin point of light. The area was still shrouded in gloom.

"But suppose every one of us strikes a light," Father Keller went on. And at his signal, men and women in the audience—a hundred thousand—each struck a match. Now, instead of a pin point, the entire arena was bathed in light. The darkness was gone. Father Keller had driven home his point.

One soldier cannot take a beachhead, but without the acts of individual soldiers no beachhead can be taken. The fight against communism cannot be won by machines, by weapons, by congressional committees, by laws, decrees, or speeches. Nor can it be won by you alone. It can only be won by all of us, each acting alone; and yet, in a larger sense, all acting together as holders of the tiny pin points of light, which, combined, dispel the darkness.

What have you done lately to make our free-enterprise system free and enterprising? Perhaps you never have thought of yourself as an economic unit, but you are If you hire a maid in your house you are very much a part of the free-enterprise system. Perhaps she already has fair working hours, prescribed in advance, and a regular vacation But when she does extra-good work do you give her a bonus? Not a hand-out or a tip, but a bonus—something she has earned After all, reward for individual initiative is the very heartbeat of free enterprise.

Or if you work in an office and one of your subordinates is long overdue for a promotion, do you go to bat for her? Do you stand up—even at some risk to yourself—for her right to share in a system which thrives on each individual's hope to climb up the ladder?

There are a thousand and one little things you can do.

When a new grocer or radio repairman or dry cleaner opens a store in your neighborhood you can give him a chance at your trade. Ours is the competitive system If he is a better grocer, repairman, or cleaner he deserves it. And don't be afraid to tell him, "I like dealing here. It's a fair well-run establishment." Give him a free-enterprise pat on the back.

When you go into a big department store don't treat the salesgirl as if she were a robot. Speak to her as though it were her store, her merchandise. Indeed it is, in the sense that her daily labor is invested in every bit of it.

Opportunity for youth is another bulwark of our system. Have you supported it lately—personally?

I tried an experiment I think is working well. My car needed waxing. I got a teen-aged boy named Tommy to do it. Tommy did such a fine job that I told him he could

consider me a regular customer. Then, a few months later, we had a new shingle roof put on our house. The old shingles needed to be carted to the back lot and burned. Why not give another boy a job? This time I got Donald. His eyes shone like light bulbs when I handed him his pay. He had savored the good feeling of earning his own money for his own work.

Perhaps you are in a position to do much more than that. You may be able to hire a teen-aged boy or girl for part-time work after school or on Saturdays. You may even be in a position to give a young high-school graduate a job with your company—or get your husband to do it—and thus afford that youngster a chance to start at the bottom and work up—just as far up as he can work.

One of the most vulnerable chinks in our national armor is the race problem. There is no sense pretending it isn't there. We have a race problem. The Communists smash at it incessantly; they try to turn the many-colored peoples of the world against us by portraying us as Negro haters.

What can you personally do about that?

A friend of mine, Arthur Gordon (a native of the deep South, by the way), wrote an enlightened novel against race prejudice.

We can't all write novels

A woman I met in New Haven, Conn., Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day, got a taste of prejudice (not against Negroes but against a migratory mother with three children, to whom nobody wanted to rent a house) when she followed her Army-doctor husband around the country during World War II. She came back and founded the New Haven Neighborhood Project, dedicated to combating every prejudice.

We can't all start neighborhood projects.

But we all can do little things. Little things which when multiplied by millions become the most invincible forces on earth.

A woman I know heard the barker at a country fair repeatedly refer to a small Negro boy as "snowball" and "chocolate drop." She went up to the barker and said quietly: "The boy's name is Edward. Wouldn't it be far more American to call him that?"

An alumnus of a middle western college received a questionnaire from his alma mater. Among its dozens of blanks was one which recalled to his mind old campus battles on discrimination in education. It said, "Race ———." He simply filled in "Human."

Communists sneer at our belief in human dignity and the supreme worth of the individual. They say it is hypocritical. Can you prove them wrong?

Harry E. Humphreys, Jr., president of the United States Rubber Co., once said: "Any person in a managerial position, from supervisor to president, who feels that his employee is basically not as good as he is * * * lacks the necessary qualities for human leadership—to say nothing of human friendship."

If the head of a huge corporation can take that attitude, can't you and I? Try it. Try regarding the rubbish collector, the waitress in the restaurant, the elevator man, the bootblack, the salesgirl as, in the eyes of God and in the heart of democracy, fully as good as President Truman, King George, or the Shah of Iran.

Set yourself a private little job: get to know just one of the people you might have written off before as, well, a bit inferior. See if you don't begin to see the light of human dignity shine through.

I tried it with a garbageman (that had always seemed to me, since childhood, a "low" profession). I broke the ice by discussing politics with him. What a grasp he had. I started by talking down to him, ended by looking up to him. We discussed our families and our problems with our kids—and we still do, every time I see him.

The Communists would love to see us bickering among ourselves. "Divide and conquer" is their watchword.

What can you do about that?

You can cultivate the "we" feeling. An English friend of mine says he can always tell Americans from Englishmen by the way they use their pronouns. An American, complaining that the streets in his city are littered, says, "Why don't they keep their streets clean?" An Englishman with a similar complaint says, "Why don't we keep our streets clean?"

The "we" feeling isn't difficult to cultivate. Next time you talk about "the Government," try saying "our Government." Not "those people in Washington" but "our people in Washington." Try saying, "Our corporations, our labor unions, our schools, our farms, our factories."

The "we" feeling not only spikes the Communists' divide-and-conquer technique. It also has a personal dividend for you: a healthy sense of belonging, of participation, of shared experience. Psychiatrists tell us that's the basis of this thing we call security.

Another club the Communists hit us with is perfectionism. "If we're not perfect, we're no good"—that's what the Communists would like us to believe. They bury their own imperfections under a blanket of lies and tempt us to do the same thing; for they know that lies smother freedom, our life breath.

I visited Yale University recently to inquire into a course in the "American way" being given to students from foreign lands. I wanted to see how we turn the mirror on ourselves. I was proud of what I saw. Assistant Dean Harold B. Whiteman, Jr., in charge of the course, acquainted the students from 16 foreign countries with the real America we love—no image of perfection, but an image of human striving with plenty of failures and shortcomings, but an everlasting bent toward progress.

These students became acquainted both with our healthy democratic processes and with unhealthy machine politics; they visited East Harlem slums in New York and spent week ends with families in Westport and Stamford, Conn.; they saw movies ranging from the saga of migrant workers, Grapes of Wrath, to a General Motors production film, their guest speakers included a CIO organizer and a chamber of commerce executive.

"We want to show them our good side, our bad side, our hopes, our progress, our plans, and our aspirations," Whiteman said.

A little later I sat in Vanderbilt Hall with one of Whiteman's boys, a scholarship student, George Chranewycz, Ukrainian. His family had been driven out of the Ukraine by the Communists, out of Poland by the Nazis—and finally to a DP camp. When I asked, "Well, what do you think of America?" George answered, "In Europe I was in a DP camp. Here I am at Yale."

His was an eloquent answer.

Sure, let's face up to our shortcomings. Let's admit our failures. We are not a finished product and we never will be, so long as we are free to grow. Nazi Germany thought it was a finished product, and it was—finished.

When alleged Communist perfectionism is hurled your way, reply as Whiteman does at Yale. "We have many imperfections—but we're working on them."

There is a positive side, too, to this war of ideas. It is not enough to be against communism. What are we for? The Americans who fought in 1776 knew very definitely what they were fighting for. They were afire with bright new ideas—freedom, equality, the inalienable rights of man.

That was their religion. What's ours today? If you ask the first person you meet on the street, you may get a reply such as this: "We've got to keep communism from spreading. We can't let it engulf the world."

Entirely negative.

A New England woman, Mrs. John L. Senior, recently endowed a new professorship at Cornell University. It is a chair in "American values." I went to see her, questing for our positive position in the war of ideas.

'Just what are the American values?" I asked. This woman, a widow, of Lenox, Miss., listed six of them: "The supreme worth of the individual; the soundness and basic rightness of the great mass of the people; every individual's right to think, feel, and speak as he likes; freedom of the individual to achieve what he can, on his own, without interference, individual initiative and responsibility; and, finally, freedom—the touchstone of them all."

Can you, for your own part, make a similarly positive declaration? Do you know what you are for? Just think of the moral force which would be turned loose in the world if 150,000,000 Americans firmly knew—and believed in—the ideas they were fighting for, not just fighting against.

That moral force starts with you. Think about it. Set down in your mind—and on paper, if you wish—your own personal list of American values.

Finally, beliefs must be lived, not simply believed. Action is the key.

Action begins at the grass roots—in your community, your circle of friends, your home.

You can live your belief in Americanism by being active in your local parent-teachers association You can live it by doing voluntary work for the Red Cross, by serving on the library board, by being a leader of Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts, by supporting civic betterment movements, by working for civilian defense, by volunteer social work or child welfare work On one afternoon a week you might give your time to a mother who cannot afford to have a baby-sitter. Or even offer your yard, if you have one, to neighborhood children where playgrounds are scarce There are a thousand and one things you can do.

Never mind the thousand. Try at least one.

Mrs Ralph B. Morris, president of the New York City League of Women Voters, holds out another line of individual action. "A person is living his beliefs in Americanism when he takes his voting responsibilities seriously, when he votes at all elections and primaries, and finds out as much as he can about the candidates and the issues," she says.

And beyond that, she continues, "He takes his other citizenship responsibilities seriously. He doesn't get out of jury duty just to get out of it. He doesn't tip a traffic cop to avoid a ticket—and then complain about police corruption. He doesn't try to get favors from political friends—and then rail against the 5 percenters."

Individual action, in its purest form, may actually be the quiet little acts you hardly think twice about. They are the little things of beauty, the gems A man picks up a piece of waste paper from the street and carries it to a trash bin. A woman helps a cripple across the street. A motorist stops to patronize a children's vegetable stand. A bus driver waits for a man who is running to the bus stop. The man says, "Thanks" A woman shopper helps another shopper with her packages.

This is the blood in the veins of democracy. It is the people living together for the common good.

What quiet little act can you perform—today?

Price Regulation Ceiling on Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have written to Mr Michael V. DiSalle, Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, relative to the need for a change in the present interpretation of the recent margin freeze order on agricultural commodities, in order that both the farmers and consumers may be better protected

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

MARCH 6, 1951.

Mr. MICHAEL V DISALLE,
Director, Office of Price Stabilization, Washington, D. C

DEAR MR DISALLE: This refers to the series of conversations which I had with Mr J. Howard Houk and Mr Allan Rubin, of your Office, last week relative to the interpretation which has been placed upon section 11 (e) of the price regulation order of January 26, 1951, with particular reference to the ceiling on poultry I was very much concerned to find that an interpretation had been placed upon this regulation to the effect that while margins of profit would be sealed as farm prices were in a continuous advance, such margins of profit for the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer of poultry products would not be frozen in a declining market; that is, as it was pointed out to me, as farm prices advanced each 1 cent or fraction thereof, all prices could be advanced automatically up the line with the increased cost being passed on to the consumer, however, once new ceiling prices had been established at some projected level, I found that a decline of even any insignificant fraction would unlock all margin freezes, thereby making it possible for poultry prices at the farm level to decline substantially while at the same time retail prices to the wholesaler and the consumer could be maintained at near-ceiling level.

The excuse offered was that it was hard to arrive at a fair or normal margin of profit to an industry and that permanent ceilings on margins during a price freeze would not be administratively feasible. I cannot follow that line of reasoning, since surely, if profit margins can be established and enforced as prices advance, why can they not be in operation in reverse?

The present interpretation is affording a golden opportunity to wartime profiteers to extend their margin far beyond that which is normal to the industry and at the same time cloak their profiteering as legal under the Defense Production Act.

That this opportunity is not being overlooked is evidenced by the market conditions of live poultry on the farms in Delaware and on the Delmarva Peninsula generally as shown by the retail prices which are reported and filed by the Marketing and Facilities Research Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture.

I am seriously concerned with this interpretation and the effect which it will have not only upon the cost of living but also upon the poultry growers on the Delmarva Peninsula. Other Senators who are also seriously concerned have joined me in introducing Senate Resolution 93 to correct this interpretation. A copy of this resolution is enclosed herewith.

I express the sincere hope that it will not be necessary for the Senate to be compelled to amend the legislation when the intent of Congress in this matter is clear and that you will accordingly correct this interpretation immediately, thus removing the necessity for action by the Senate. However, in the event such correction is not made, I shall feel compelled in the interest of the consumers and the farmers on the Delmarva Peninsula to insist upon action by the Senate.

An extra cent spread in the margin of handling poultry that moves from the Delmarva Peninsula in 1 week means about $80,000 to the Delmarva farmers. A 3- to 4-cent extra spread in the margins between the New York wholesale market and the farm price as it now exists means a loss to our farmers and an extra profit to the middleman of about a quarter of a million dollars each week.

If this same interpretation prevails in relation to all other agricultural commodities, I can visualize where the farmers and the consumers could be robbed of millions.

I think in the light of these figures you will agree with me that we must have immediate action.

Will you please advise me promptly your reaction to this request and what steps you intend to take in the matter?

Yours respectfully,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Curtailment of Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 9, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Stephen L. DeBalta which appeared in the Hagerstown Morning Herald on Thursday, March 1. The article deals with the service rendered by the Post Office Department.

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

MARYLANDERS IN WASHINGTON

(By Stephen L. DeBalta)

In every community of our land, big and small, tearful mothers, wives, sweethearts, sisters are impatiently waiting every day for news from Korea, Japan, Germany, the Near East, wherever members of our dispersed Armed Forces may be. But the letters are slow in coming when they do come at last. It seems that some cruel hand is holding up the delivery of the anxiously awaited messages from the beloved ones. This hand is the clenched fist of a willful man who, with the amazing defiance of the very people who employ him, imposes upon a whole nation his arbitrary will. Last April Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson decreed a drastic curtailment of the postal service throughout the country. Post offices were ordered to adopt a banking-hours' schedule, to deliver mail only once a day, to make fewer collections, and to call it a day at sunset. This wanton destruction of a long-established public service brought in its trail idleness and distress to many employees, particularly in the lower-wage brackets, and aroused the violent protests of the National Association of Letter Carriers. Vainly, Senators, Congressmen, chambers of commerce, civic organizations remonstrated with the former Shelbyville mailman, but of no avail. The spiteful potentate thus got even with Congress after having been refused the credits he had asked, adopting the proverbial motto of the Chinese laundryman: "No tickee, no washee."

One would expect such dictatorial attitude from one on a higher administrative level but not from a minor member of the Cabinet, intent upon settling a personal peeve regardless of the hardship it brings to the whole Nation. In a great metropolis like New York, for instance, a letter mailed after 6 p m. to a next door neighbor is delivered not the next morning but the day after. On Saturdays and Sundays, when the average citizen can indulge in catching up with his correspondence the post offices are closed and stamps are hard or impossible to procure. The entire postal service is disorganized and demoralized and causing, as usual, more inconvenience to the individual taxpayer than to the large business concerns.

James J Doran a former colleague of Postmaster Donaldson, who held a top position in the Post Office Department until he voluntarily resigned 4 months ago, finally had the courage to come out with a vigorous denunciation of the reckless sabotage of our postal service. In an article to be published in the March issue of the Postal Record, official organ of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. Doran expressed opposition to the mail curtailment in effect since last April and quoted the Department's own figures to show how savings could be effected without mangling the service or raising rates. The real cause of the huge deficit is seemingly to be found in the reckless operation of the 20 largest post offices in the country. It is there, according to Doran, that savings should and could be effectuated, and in the 39,000 small post offices of the second, third, and fourth class, which could never operate nor should be expected to operate without a postal subsidy. The former chief inspector concludes in stating that Congress can never be expected to hike postal rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit of the small district offices and should not even attempt to do so.

The sooner Postmaster Donaldson will concur in Doran's sane views and will bring to an end his personal feud with Congress, the happier the country will be.

Death of Maj. Gen. Bryant E. Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in tribute to the late Maj Gen. Bryant E. Moore, of Maine, written by me, and published in the Bangor (Maine) Evening Commercial of March 5, 1951.

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

THE NATION'S CAPITOL

(By Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The Nation has lost a leader in the death of Maj. Gen Bryant E. Moore. My State has lost one of its most illustrious sons, as General Moore came from Ellsworth I have lost a friend.

It was not until the fall of 1947 that I really got to know General Moore. At that time I was a member of a House Armed Services Subcommittee that made an inspection trip of our military bases in Europe and the Middle East. General Moore was the commanding officer of the United States troops in the Free Territory of Trieste.

At that time Yugoslavia had designs on Trieste and was on the side of Russia. There was the constant threat of a Yugoslav invasion, which would have meant war.

The Yugoslavs were constantly creating incidents and disorders that tested the fortitude, patience, judgment and diplomacy of General Moore. In fact, Trieste was the powder keg of the world at that time.

SUPERB PERFORMANCE

General Moore's assignment was to hold the so-called Morgan line in Venezia Giula. When disposition of this territory was made, General Moore then had the job of protecting the American part of the Free Territory of Trieste His performance was superb, had it been anything less, Russia might have made war on us in 1947.

The importance of General Moore's performance becomes all the more apparent when a review is made of our relations with Yugoslavia and their effect upon the strength of Russia

Tito's Yugoslavia was originally in the Soviet camp and was shooting down our aircraft and murdering our airmen. Yugoslavia was a source of terrific leverage for Russia in the Balkans in threatening war and exercising dominating influence over that area.

YUGOSLAV SWITCH

But now Tito and Yugoslavia have broken with Stalin and shown complete independence and defiance of Russia. The slave has thumbed his nose at the master

He has switched sides And his action has given courage to other slave nations in the Balkans to break with Russia—and to the free nations to remain independent of Russia The whole switch and its significance is summed up in the word "Titoism"

Had it not been for General Moore this encouraging development would not have been possible.

SOLDIER AND DIPLOMAT

There were two people who stood out in my mind on that trip One was General Moore. The other was George V. Allen, our Ambassador in Iran, who did such a wonderful job in keeping Iran and her oil away from Russia.

Interestingly enough, George Allen is now Ambassador to Yugoslavia Between General Moore and Ambassador Allen, our country has been most effectively represented in relations with Yugoslavia and the results have been gratifying.

Being a military leader and a successful diplomat is rare. Gen. Bryant Moore was that rare combination, just as General Eisenhower is.

Statement by George J. Burger Before Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. TAFT Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 20, 1951.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it must be understood that the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California is a nonpolitical organization.

The principal and main objective of this organization is to protect the free enterprise system and secondly, the people we represent, independent business and professional men

The record will show that the federation has the largest individual membership of independent business and professional men of any business organization in the Nation.

It must also be understood for the record that whatever position the federation takes is taken only after a poll has been made through its official publication the mandate, of the entire Nation-wide federation membership The mandate ballot is voted by the individual member and turned over by him to a district chairman who in turn mails the individual ballots from that district to the respective Member of Congress. In this way, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the majority opinion rules in setting the policy to be followed by the executive officers of the federation. In other words, no executive officer can speak for the federation until the entire membership has expressed its opinion one way or the other Of course, the question before the Nation of sending troops abroad during an emergency period outside of an actual true state of war is of considerable interest to independent business and professional men and their dependents. In our opinion it is a most major question and it can be said for the record that in an actual state of war we believe there would be no question in the minds of anyone that the President as Commander in Chief, would have the power to send troops wherever it was necessary in the best interest of protecting the Nation's welfare.

The subject matter, Senate Resolution 8, was presented to the Federation members in the following manner:

Pro: The President has exceeded his powers by sending and promising to send soldiers to Europe without first securing congressional approval More than this, he has dangerously undermined our own national security by so doing. First, troops sent and promised may just be going into a bottomless hole, for our so-called allies have shown no great progress in strengthening their own defenses. Second, the President may be maneuvering us into a position where we will be forced into disastrous large-scale land war with the Communists. It is not logical to think that Russia will remain idle while we garrison Europe Likely she will strike first. And without the needed moral and physical support of the people we are defending, we are more than likely to lose our troops and all. This is a most serious question, one which—since we are not formally at war with Russia—only the whole American people, through their Congress, should be permitted to decide.

Con: This bill is founded in defeatism and is dedicated to the selfish proposition that the United States should assume no risks to preserve and extend the ideals of freedom it preaches. It can serve only to delay our aid to Europe, thereby wreck the great efforts made thus far to build a world-wide defense among free nations against communism—without which Russia cannot be checked. It can, therefore, result only in Russian domination of, first, Europe and Asia, then the entir world. In assessing this question there are some things we must decide in all humility. First, our European allies are "going slow" because devastating war was fought actually over their own countries recently—something we very fortunately escaped. Second, because they fear, with good reason, that we may leave them in the lurch. They need the encouragement the presence of additional United States troops already promised can give them. We need their assistance—or our own safety will be out the window.

The result of the poll of the Nation-wide membership is as follows: 75 percent of these Federation members voted for Senate Resolution 8, 22 percent voted against the bill; and 3 percent gave no opinion at all

I would like to ask at this time that the copy of the mandate in which this poll was made as well as the copy of the press release which shows the results of the poll appear as a permanent part of the record of this hearing

Independent small business and professional men of this Nation who have a vital interest in this tremendous undertaking as a result of the serious difficulties they are now facing in carrying on their individual businesses have expressed their majority opinion from the grass roots of the Nation, and as the accredited spokesman for independent business of this Nation we urgently request that the deepest consideration be given by this commitee as we believe this is the voice of America.

Thank you.

An Intangible Weapon for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered by Mr. J. S. Kroh at several places in Nebraska. Mr. Kroh was formerly the publisher of a newspaper and is one of our most civic-minded citizens. His address, I am sure, will interest the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I consider it a real contribution to the study of many of the serious problems facing our Nation.

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

AN INTANGIBLE WEAPON FOR DEFENSE

(By J. S. (Jack) Kroh)

This is the fifty-first year of the twentieth century A D.—the beginning of an era of grave problems and consequences for the United States.

It is a gloomy moment in our history.

Our people live in fear of the trend of creeping socialism for they know socialism is but one short step to communism.

They are being taxed beyond reason because for the past 17 years our policy has been to tax, and spend, and spend.

They note the ballooning of our national debt because of the increase in the Government payroll with its rapidly increasing number of bureaucrats and bureaus.

They note with growing fear that politicians in high offices would burden us still further with socialized medicine, the Bran-

non plan, etc., while we are spending billions of dollars for war.

They fear our country will soon become bankrupt, Stalin's greatest hope.

Our people have a feeling that we have been forced into this, the third world war by bungling and appeasement because of the presence of termites which are gnawing away at the American structure.

Yes, our people are bewildered because the United States lacks leadership.

It is true that there are those among us who have not forgotten our purpose, but in this new world of United Nations alliances the chain of the cooperation is only as strong as the weakest link

Will we have allies in Europe and Asia or will we stand alone?

We have been hoping that the 60 or more member nations of the UN offered the best opportunity to work for peace in the world.

But these nations have not yet used their full power, nor have they shown the moral courage to take a firm stand against those who are continuing to make war.

The United Nations have bowed to big aggressors to date and unless it shows results now it will go the way of the League of Nations. It will be washed up and there will be no neeed to continue it as an organization.

On the other hand the American people have been admonished to seek help in the only place where mankind has an abiding faith—in the leadership of God.

But prayer to Almighty God will not avail, however, if we are not ready to face truth within ourselves.

Prayer is a two-way line of communication, we, meaning the administration, the Supreme Court, Congress, and all individual citizens, must surrender selfishness to intelligent and spiritual service if we expect guidance in return.

When we are willing to enlighten ourselves and clean house at home we will be strengthened to resist evil abroad.

Therefore I have chosen for this address just one idea not advanced or considered for the past century for our defense, and victory.

AN INTANGIBLE WEAPON FOR DEFENSE

Five years and 4 months after the Japanese surrender, we find ourselves engaged in a real shooting war, and this marks our active participation in three big wars in 34 years.

Once more we are forced to take stock of our preparedness, and the picture is not a reassuring one. Nearly $50,000,000,000 have been spent on defense in 5 years, and if we are correctly informed, only one billion was spent for the defense of our own Nation. The balance, or $49,000,000,000 in money and substance was given to other nations of the world in the pretext that it was for national defense.

And so, today, we find we are far from prepared for protection to our homeland.

I fear that in part our unpreparedness is the result of the wishful belief, that our scientists, if given a little encouragement and much money, could produce some miraculous form of weapon which, by pressing a button, would give us immediate victory anywhere in the world.

In the frantic haste of rearming there is always the danger that we may overlook weapons which are available, particularly if they are intangible. It is concerning one of these weapons that I would like to talk with you today.

It is not a secret weapon, nor is it new, but it is essential.

Let me introduce it by telling you of a conversation in Paris last summer between Professor Morris, of Tulane University, and a Polish ex-patriot. This Pole, who was an outspoken anti-Communist, an educated man, trained as a lawyer, and a colonel in World War II, was asked how it was possible that a country as fiercely patriotic and nationalistic as Poland, a country which prospered under the capitalistic system, fell so easily for the delusion of communism.

The Pole told how his country suffered unparalleled loss of life and the destruction of cities, railroads, and other national assets.

But the major cause of the tragedy he said was this: For 6 years all the schools and colleges were closed, the educated Poles were killed, and the young people uneducated. The result was that they unwittingly accepted the glowing promises of communism.

Note that he gave this as the most important single cause of the collapse of a free government in Poland.

This is the intangible weapon about which I wish to speak today—learning and education—a weapon which kills no one but without which our Nation 's not secure.

More particularly I refer to what is known as the liberal education in contrast to the practical and professional education—or, if you will, I refer to the type of education which many people consider to be a sheer waste of time.

There is no necessity of making a case for the need of practical education, because our economic life is firmly based on technical skill, and the lessons of the last war are still fresh

Our country will long remember its dependence during the last war on our scientists and engineers in so many fields—not only the atomic bomb which served only to terminate a war already won, but equally in many fields where we were hard pressed indeed

We remember how one of our scientists and his associates devised ways to check the submarine when this was sinking our shipping; how another scientist tracked down the operations of the U-boats—one of the most thrilling detective stories of all time, how another German menace, the airplane, was checked with the development of radar; nor does any one need to be reminded how our engineering skills in oil refining, in making steel, in production-line methods of manufacturing furnished many tools and materials of war.

But I wish to emphasize the need to continue and to reemphasize the so-called liberal arts, not only as adjuncts to gracious living, but as valuable weapons of defense against not only external enemies, but against those within who either from ignorance or maliciousness would tear down our heritage

A good case could be made for many of the liberal disciplines, but let us choose ancient history as an example, particularly that of Rome and Greece.

From the beginning of our Republic and up to a century ago this formed the core of all formal education, but today the vast majority of high school and college students complete their education with only the haziest notions of the ancient world—its study having been pushed out by including subjects of more practical value.

The claim was made that while it might be interesting it certainly was not important, and if one must study history, at least it should be something of some value—American history or Nebraska history.

While I have no quarrel with these, and, in fact would like to see more American history taught, such subjects do not by any means replace the broad view gained from the over-all study of the rise and fall of these ancient civilizations. But what, some of you may ask, has the knowledge of these long dead civilizations to do with our Government and what has a knowledge of such subjects to do with defense, or the preservation of our Republic? I think a great deal and I ask you to bear with me while we consider this point.

Let us go back to the beginning of our Government, to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The men who formed this Government did not by some sudden flash of inspiration conceive the form of Government which for at least 160 years proved so successful. Quite the contrary: these men—Jefferson, Adams, Witherspoon, Livingston, and others—were steeped in the learning of the past They planned the new Government based upon the wealth of experience over the ages.

They knew the dangers of a too centralized Government, the hazards of a Government too easily swayed by momentary popular whims and passions, the need of separate legislative and executive departments, the necessity of an independent judiciary, the need to avoid all possibility of the military assuming control of the Government—all this they knew because liberal education stressed the study of ancient culture.

Such matters as I have just listed were "old stuff" to them and with this background they proceeded to build a form of Government which has justified the confidence they felt How do we know that these men were influenced by their liberal training? Well for many reasons. In the first place we are familiar with their education; secondly, we have the record of their discussions during the period when these documents were drawn up; and lastly, we have the internal evidence of the documents themselves.

Have you ever thought how the Declaration of Independence opens? After an opening sentence which merely states that "When in the course of human events" it became necessary to revolt, the decent thing to do is to state clearly to the world your reason for doing so.

The Declaration proper begins: "We hold these truths to be self-evident." This has a familiar ring It is the identical phrase with which Euclid begins his monumental text on plane geometry. In the latter case—in the only school text which has secured world-wide adoption for over 2,200 years—Euclid proceeds with his axioms, the self-evident truths, from which he deduces step by step the laws of geometry.

In the former are listed the basic concepts of government—"that men are created equal" and so forth. It is no coincidence that the framers of our Government drafted this Declaration in the form and words of Greek philosophy.

These men were as familiar through their liberal education with past political thought and experience as our great generals of the Civil War were with past military tactics and campaigns.

Every one of us who appreciate the privilege of living under our Government owes a debt of gratitude to these men and should be thankful for the fact that they possessed the liberal learning that gave them the vision and judgment required.

Under our present educational system it would be hard to find a group with such a background. With few exceptions our so-called statesmen today lack even a pretense of such a background. Yet these men have no hesitation in proposing to modify our social, economical, and political set-up

If the people listening to the political speeches which are all too common in our country could realize that all the tricks used are old stuff, perhaps they would not fall such easy prey to glib promises. Note the general advice given on political speech-making by old Aristotle 2,300 years ago.

Here is how Will Durant summarizes Aristole's comments:

"Success is the only measure of a telling speech, and the appeal is primarily to the emotions rather than to the reason.

"Indeed the test of a good orator is his ability to arouse the prejudices of his audience and to enlist them on his side. In accomplishing this, sentimentalities and moral aversions and convictions of his hearers are the orator's best friends, and by carefully stringing together platitudes and maxims that reflect their outlook on life

he can win for himself the reputation of being a man of sound moral character, and a clear thinker, and give to his discourse a counterfeit logic.

"According to Aristotle, the assumption of a high moral tone suggests that the speaker has a noble nature—a suggestion that carries all the more weight the less intelligent the audience is."

The above, gentlemen, is from Aristotle's Politics written 2,300 years ago.

Who, familiar with the fact that these hints are well over 2,000 years old, will let himself be fooled by them? On the other hand, as we know all too well, these tricks work today as well as ever—and seduce even those with formal education. I submit to you that the plausible-sounding, pious-speaking, self-seeking politicians would find it more difficult if their hearers knew how old this sort of guff really is, and I suggest that the study of the life of Rome and Greece would have taught this.

And if knowledge of the past may save us from falling headlong for the wiles of the politician, may it not also save us from swallowing hook, line, and sinker some of the cure-alls offered today?

Again and again (and again) we have presented to us new ideas, those which are hoary with age All too often these ideas are snapped up by the populace under the impression that they are original with the advocate.

In many cases knowledge of history would show that these ideas have been advanced often before and have a long history of failure.

Examples of such ideas which have been swallowed whole under the impression that they were original brain children of their advocates are numerous—too numerous to mention more than a few.

Almost every country has recently devalued its currency. We did it in 1933 and called it "revaluing the price of gold," thereby making it seem as if it affected only a few wealthy persons, no mention was made that it would inevitably raise all costs so that it partially confiscated all savings, life insurance, etc.

Is this a new idea? Far from it. About 600 years before Christ, Solon devalued the Athenian drachma by almost exactly the same percent as Britain recently devalued the pound, and if the British do not have happier results than the Athenians did they are going to be very much disappointed.

Devaluation was resorted to over and over again in Rome during the Republic, again under Nero, again under Aurelius, again under Commodus and again under Severus. Always more and more inflation, and each time followed by sky-rocketing prices until finally Diocletian attempted in A D. 301 to stabilize the currency but it was too late.

In Britain today, we find a war-weary nation, victorious in war but economically crushed, placing its hope in the nationalization of industry, many naively believing that this is an original thought of the labor government now in power. Is it new? Let me quote from Will Durant's interesting history of Rome entitled "Caesar and Christ." I think you will agree it has a modern ring. He is speaking of the time of Diocletian about A. D. 300:

"Diocletian, in his new deal, brought many branches of industry under complete state control beginning with the import of grain; he persuaded the shipowners, merchants, and crew engaged in this trade to accept such control in return for government guaranties of security in employment and returns.

"The state had long since owned most of the quarries, salt deposits, and mines. It went on to control establishments producing for the army, the bureaucracy, or the court. In munition factories, textile mills, and bakeries the government required a minimum product, bought this at its own price and made the associations of manufacturers responsible for carrying out orders and specifications. If this procedure proved inadequate it completely nationalized these factories. Gradually the majority of industrial establishments were brought under the control of the corporate state.

"Such a system could not work without price control. In 301 Diocletian and his colleagues issued an edict fixing prices and wages.

"He fixed the price at which 700 or more articles could be sold and he fixed the wages of many different kinds of labor including the carpenter, the painter, the writer, the teacher, the advocate or counsel for presenting a case, and he even fixed the price to be paid to baby-sitters

"The weakness of this managed economy lay in its administrative cost. To support the bureaucracy, the court, the army, the building program, and the dole, taxation rose to unprecedented heights"

But why go on except to say that the whole effort ended in miserable failure so that Rome collapsed under Diocletian's successor. The voters of Britain might think twice before going further in this direction if they realized that nationalization is no bright new idea.

Example after example of old notions now pulled out of the hat in this country and offered as new could be given, so let us take but one more—one which today is the matter of extreme concern to us communism

It is foolish merely to denounce communism with such expressions as "I don't see how anyone can be a Communist," or to imagine that all Communists are sodden, bushy-haired clouts or ape men.

Unfortunately it appeals to hundreds of millions of people, even including a surprising number in our own country. The vast majority of these are sincere idealists. Make no mistake.

Its leaders may be in it for personal power and wealth but it must be supported by followers who believe in it.

To many of these communism is offered as a new solution (at least no older than Marx) and this claim is accepted at face value. But this is far from true. Its general principles were considered long ago and even old Aristophanes poked fun at them 2,300 years ago in his hit play Ecclesiazusae. In this play a lady Communist says:

"I want all to have a share of everything and all property to be common; there will no longer will be either rich or poor, no longer shall we see one man harvesting vast tracts of land while another has not ground to be buried in, I intend that there shall be only one and the same condition of life for all. I shall begin by making land, money, everything that is private property common to all.

"But who shall do all the work?" asks Blepyrus, another character in the play.

"Oh," says Praxagora, "we shall have to have slaves."

Twenty-three hundred years ago this was written; so you see our student of Greek culture will not be taken in by any illusion that communism is something that has just been pulled out of the hat.

Time and patience limit me from giving example after example of how training in the so-called "useless" field of classic history would make our students sophisticated in the good sense of the word. I suggest that such learning would give our children the opportunity of leaving school with the vigor of youth and the vicarious experience of the ages, whereas most of our present training tends to turn them out with competence in a trade but with the innocence of babes. And why shouldn't they be innocent? All their lives have been spent in learning plastics or electronics or air-conditioning or salesmanship, or what not, and if perchance they have been given a year or so in English it is carefully explained that this will enable them to make a sales talk or write a letter to a customer.

I have recently been informed that there are 1,726 of the 2,500 high schools and many colleges and universities in the United States who are using textbooks infiltrated with un-American propaganda, presumably written by Socialists or Communists for the purpose of indoctrinating millions upon millions of our young people in socialism and communism, another one of many tricks of the Russians to destroy the American way of life.

This should alarm us to another need for a greater study of ancient history, and I suggest that professors, teachers, school board members, and parents make every effort to protect our young people.

The defense of our country demands that our citizens have more than competence in a trade in order that they and their leaders make wise decisions on the problems now before us We have paid and are paying heavily for this lack of capable leadership.

If ever we needed an informed citizenry and leadership, it is today. It is a trite remark that the United States has a way of winning wars but losing the peace. If we are to play a prominent role as a world power, the only strong power adhering to a democracy, we desperately need to be prepared to understand not only ourselves but other people as well.

We can no longer afford the luxury of unsophisticated leadership and an unenlightened citizenry, and I believe the best way to secure this is through liberalizing our education by the study of ancient history.

Do not mistake me. I certainly do not mean that training in engineering, law or medicine have no technical content, but I do contend that space should be found for the liberal subjects which alone can make a man at home in all places and in all ages

I believe the man with a mind trained and familiar with all the foreign ideologies and isms, including communism, will for that very reason the more firmly hold to our system, and moreover, have a reason for the faith that is in him. In fact, I think this is far more effective, at least at the college level, than all the special courses in why I am an American, which are so often proposed.

These all too often amount to nothing more than the shameless boasting of our material wealth.

We need to emphasize the things that make people great instead of the things that make them merely comfortable.

And now in closing.

May I remind you that few, if any, civilizations have fallen from outside attack. The downfall of nations, particularly the Roman Republic, was the fact that they changed from a frugal, efficient government to an inefficient and lavish government with subsidies, doles, and other socialistic plans, thus creating bureaucracies and dictatorships with resulting confiscatory taxations.

America today is facing difficult times, because there is the possible danger that we, too, might join the long list of fallen nations Only Americans can save America. And we cannot stop the trend without vision.

We have already discovered that we do not receive vision by inspiration. But it is not too late to discover that vision is the product of information and thought, and make no mistake, we must have vision. For it is as true today as when Solomon said it.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." Thank you. And God save America.

The RFC Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from yesterday's Washington Star entitled "The Dollars Would Pour In." It relates to the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation being conducted by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is the chairman.

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

THE DOLLARS WOULD POUR IN

The RFC investigation by Senator FULBRIGHT's committee is now scheduled to end on April 30. But there is only one date on which this investigation properly can be brought to a close. And that is the date on which the committee finds there are no more stones left unturned

The committee began its work in February of 1950. Its investigation has been conducted with a relatively small staff It received an original authorization from the Senate to spend up to $50,000 Last summer it received $35,000 more Last January Senator FULBRIGHT requested a final $20,000. Senator MCKELLAR was doubtful. Senator FULBRIGHT explained: "We ask only for an extension to April 30. I can absolutely assure the Senator that I will not ask for any further extension of money beyond that date." Senator MCKELLAR replied: "With that assurance I withdraw my objection."

Senator FULBRIGHT, therefore, may be foreclosed from making another request for funds from the Senate He might, it is true, apply to the RFC In the circumstances that might be of doubtful propriety. But if he needs any more money, the Star suggests that he appeal to the American people to supply it by voluntary gifts.

The results of such an appeal would be overwhelming. The money would roll in from citizens of high and low degree. For this investigation has revealed a condition in Washington that reflects on the integrity of our Government. And one of the most important things that this or any other congressional committee can do is to keep probing without let-up until every sinister area thus exposed has been explored to its roots. If there is the slightest suggestion that the committee is ending its work before the task it undertook has been completed, the people will resent it.

We talk a great deal in this country about our high moral principles. But when we compare these lofty ideals, that we are spending the lives of young men and our substance to preserve, with the sleazy moral standards of people in high places in Washington, the disillusionment of the people is bitter and their loss of confidence can be dangerous. A good many people are bewailing this loss of confidence now.

But one looks in vain for any sign of righteous indignation by the President, ordinarily associated with high standards of public morality, any expression of which from him would go far to restore confidence. All they find there is loyalty to his friends. The President, it is true, does not turn his back on them. But he seems to have come very close to turning his back on the rest of us.

If Senator FULBRIGHT's committee needs more money, all he has to do is to ask for it.

How Sick Was President Roosevelt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Vice Admiral (retired) Ross T McIntire, addressed to the Washington Evening Star, and printed in the last Saturday edition of that newspaper under the headline "How sick was President Roosevelt?"

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

HOW SICK WAS PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT?

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The leading editorial in the Star of March 6 gives me cause for considerable concern. The statement that President Roosevelt was a dying man in the summer of 1944 is not new to me, as it has been made time and again by certain columnists and writers seeking the sensational. To have this charge appear in the Star is something else. I have ignored the attacks and statements that have been made by irresponsible people. But when a publication as responsible as yours makes the statements that I find in your editorial, I feel that I must, in justice to the excellent doctors who worked with me and whose reputations cannot be challenged, bring to your attention a few facts surrounding my statements that appeared in the press throughout the year 1944.

The statements that were given were the result of careful examinations and evaluation of the findings made by the doctors who worked with me. As far as President Roosevelt himself was concerned, he had a clear understanding of his own physical condition at all times. To say that he deliberately practiced calculated deception in this regard is completely false. If this is an accusation against me, then I take it as one against all the doctors who worked with me. I do not believe that the Star cares to make such a statement.

As far as the year 1944 is concerned, we had a very difficult 2 months in February and March. April saw great improvement, and by early summer all signs of the President's recent illness had completely cleared. Anyone who was with us on the Pacific cruise, and had the opportunity to see the tremendous activity carried out by President Roosevelt in Hawaii, would bear me out in my statement. During our 8-day stay in Honolulu the President covered all military installations, including the military and naval hospitals. He spent hours going through the wards, visiting thousands of wounded in these hospitals. He carried out long and exhaustive conferences with General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz. His stay in the Aleutians was equally strenuous.

One comment on his campaign trips: It is noted in your editorial that the New York trip was used as an argument that the President's health was excellent. I did not consider this trip in the rain of any great significance, as the President was accustomed to exposure in all sorts of weather and climate. The fact that he took it in his stride was no more than I expected. The entire campaign was strenuous and demonstrated his return to good physical performance. It should be remembered that he took part in the Quebec conference in October with Mr. Churchill, working on a schedule that carried them through the day and far into every night.

I am sorry Mr. Farley felt that he must write as he did in his letter to the New York Times. It could not have been his personal observation that the President was a dying man. Mr. Farley and the President saw nothing of each other for a period of several years, for reasons well known to all.

The consensus of the doctors regarding President Roosevelt's condition and his future was that if he would live within his physical reserve, it was believed he could carry on the strenuous and exacting work of the Presidency.

During the summer and fall of 1944, I had very little complaint to make regarding his daily conduct While he did a tremendous amount of work, he was able to take moderate exercise and secure the needed rest

Following the election, with the rapidly approaching victorious end of the war, and the United Nations project always before him, the President labored strenuously and partially neglected his own well-being. By inauguration time, fatigue was again becoming a real problem The period around inauguration demanded a great deal of him, due to certain social obligations as well as the framing of his inaugural address.

He left immediately for the Yalta Conference; the long sea trip to the island of Malta did much to provide the rest he needed. But the Yalta Conference called for a great output of energy over a period of 8 days, during which he was constantly in conferences with Mr. Churchill and Premier Stalin. This conference, too, involved day and night sessions, together with the needed work with his own staff. Even so, at the end of these talks he was able to fly to Egypt where he received the King of Egypt, the King of Abyssinia, and the King of Saudi Arabia. In all the days I saw President Roosevelt in action, I cannot remember one where he was more alert than during the days of these conferences.

The long trip home was marred by the death of General Watson, his military aide, which saddened him greatly. He continued to work on the Yalta report to be presented to the Congress. Following his return he went through strenuous days picking up the events that were necessary for his congressional report, at the same time putting the finishing touches on preparations for the United Nations Assembly to be held on April 21.

In this period the President was unfortunate enough to pick up a virus infection which destroyed his appetite and lowered his physical condition. It was because of this that he went to Warm Springs to regain his strength, so that he might carry out his plans to address the United Nations Assembly.

At the same time, Admiral Wilson Brown and I were working out a schedule for his trip to the Far East, where he planned to visit General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz again, and review plans for the closing phases of the war. In addition to this, plans were being made for him to visit England in June. It is apparent that at the time of his death the President was planning for the future, with no thought of impending disaster.

I hope this letter will clarify again for your readers the true facts in this unfortunate controversy.

ROSS T MCINTIRE,
Vice Admiral (M. C.) United States Navy, Retired.

Western World Is Pacifist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson on the theme that the western world is pacifist. I hope most earnestly that our diplomats, statesmen, politicians, military leaders, and citizens generally will give heed to what Miss Thompson has said, lest we aspire to be the leader of the leaderless. Military strategy not supported by the people must end in disaster to everyone.

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

WESTERN WORLD IS PACIFIST—PROFOUND DISTRUST OF FOREIGN POLICY SHOWN BY PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES AND EUROPE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The governments of the United States and Europe need to be more aware than they apparently are that the present foreign polity has very little popular support, and that without popular support no defense effort on the scale envisioned can be successfully maintained. This hiatus between government policy and the instinct of the people is at present more dangerous to democracy than communism.

Every Gallup poll thus far shows that an overwhelming majority of the American people believe that the Korean War was a mistake, that the UN forces never should have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, and that we should try for a truce at that line. Five to one oppose a war with China, believing such a war would only serve Russia's interests, and a majority believe we should try harder than we have done to reach an agreement with China.

What has been called "the science of engineering consent"—and the practice of this science is by no means confined to totalitarian states—is not functioning, according to plan, in either the United States or Western Europe. Communism is on the wane in all countries, but the decline is not accompanied by a rise of confidence in existing anti-Communist governments.

With very few exceptions, not a European government can claim more than a precarious margin of popular support. Nor, in my opinion, can our own. There is no Churchill, or Roosevelt, to rally the British or American people into enthusiastic unity and trustfulness. And this is not merely due, I think, to the absence of dynamic personalities. Neither Roosevelt nor Churchill, or other personalities as dynamic, could, I believe, do it again—and I seriously doubt whether Stalin could.

The western world, at least, as a result of World War II, is profoundly and instinctively pacifist. And the people of this world are not convinced that the American policy of peace by the threat of overwhelming force, and postponement of serious attempts at a settlement until such force exists, is the road to peace. Although an immense selling campaign has been put on for this policy, it has not been sold.

I recently had an opportunity to test this. The Town Hall of the Air staged a debate on the issue Roads to Peace in 1951. Of the three participating speakers, this columnist alone strongly criticized the Government's peace theories. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo naturally (and ably) upheld the United Nations' view; William C. Foster, an official of the ECA, naturally (and ably) defended our Government's policy. But the mail that has come in to the Town Hall has been almost unanimously in favor of the viewpoint I expressed—that our Government is not sincerely, intelligently, and energetically trying to reach a settlement which would protect all alike, but is making political action subservient to military strategy, and that this is highly dangerous to peace

Now, I do not believe that radio audiences are converted to a viewpoint by any speaker, and especially not in a program of compact brevity, but only react favorably to the articulation of views they already hold or against views they have already rejected. And I do not believe that the profound distrust of present policy, both here and in Europe, can be overcome by any amount of exhortative propaganda. In propaganda a law of diminishing returns also operates.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a telegram from Mr. Curtis Hatch, president of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, and the text of an editorial from the Spooner (Wis.) Advocate as reprinted from the Eau Claire (Wis.) Leader, both of which heartily endorse prompt action on Great Lakes waterway legislation. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MADISON, WIS., *February 23, 1951.*
Hon ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator:

The Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation is very keenly interested in the proposed plan for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway. Our policy of long standing has been in support of this project for its great potential benefits to midwestern agriculture and industry, its value from a defense standpoint makes it doubly important at the present time.

CURTIS HATCH,
President, Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation.

[From the Spooner (Wis.) Advocate of February 22, 1951]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who for many years has been an ardent advocate of a St. Lawrence waterway to open the Great Lakes to ocean shipping, is still carrying on a determined fight. This time he may succeed.

Senator WILEY has introduced a resolution authorizing immediate start on construction. The resolution has 23 co-sponsors, Republican and Democrat.

Chances for congressional approval are brightest in the project's long history.

President Truman has given the proposed seaway strong endorsement as a defense project. Sponsors say it would assure the United States of an adequate iron ore supply during the national emergency and provide additional electric power for defense. Senator TAFT has given strong endorsement.

The plan provides for tolls to pay off the original cost, estimated at $800,000,000 in 50 years.

It is about time Congress recognized the needs of the midwest and the benefits to accrue to the Nation through opening up a channel for ocean ships into the Great Lakes. Opposition in the past has centered in transportation groups and eastern and southern port authorities who fear a loss in revenue. Such opposition should not be permitted to block a move in the public interest.—Eau Claire Leader.

Price Control Is Not Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the price-control program cannot be made to work so long as farm products are exempted from control until they increase in price to a point above the minimum fixed in the Defense Production Act of 1950. Wage earners whose salaries are less than is needed to purchase a reasonable amount of food do not have their wages exempted from wage controls, although they certainly have as much right to an exemption as have producers of food. Naturally, our labor leaders are disgusted and worried. How can they support a wage freeze when the most important item in the family budget is exempt from control? The whole price-control program is becoming a ghastly and cynical farce. It is a danger to the economy of this Nation. Even authority to greatly increase bank reserves was left out of the 1950 act, and this fact is partly responsible for the controversy raging over the need to prevent further monetization of the public debt.

Under the circumstances, it is heartening to see some groups voluntarily offer to forsake their special privileges. The powerful farm organizations which have obtained Government subsidies are apparently beginning to question the value of subsidies which inevitably are accompanied by Government controls. Important food merchants are beginning to question the wisdom of the present exemption of food from price controls. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an interesting newspaper article by Joseph Alvarez and also a copy of a telegram to the President from the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.:

BUTTER-AND-EGG MAN URGES PRICE CEILINGS ON EVERY FOOD PRODUCT

(By Joseph Alvarez)

Alfred Rich, business manager of the Butter and Egg Merchants Association, today called upon President Truman to demand a revision of the Defense Production Act to permit the imposition of ceilings on farm commodities now selling below parity.

The change, said Mr. Rich, would stretch price controls to every food and farm product.

The request was made in a telegram and incorporated into a special bulletin sent to the association's 250 wholesale food dealers.

SEVENTY ITEMS EXEMPT

Under the present law, which Mr. Rich charged, "is written solely to fatten the bank accounts of farmers," about 70 important food items are exempt from controls. Among these foods are eggs, butter, milk, wheat, corn, and potatoes

"This is a wedge that ultimately will destroy all effective price ceilings since each unregulated commodity must necessarily unbalance the entire economic stabilization program," Mr. Rich asserted.

"Labor will not stand for a wage freeze when it sees that food, which constitutes about 35 percent of the cost of living, keeps right on climbing."

CITES OVERPRODUCTION

Expressing great disappointment with the Government's freeze order, Mr Rich declared that President Truman should not have permitted the imposition of controls under the inequitable Defense Act.

"He should have recommended a change in the law to bring farm prices selling below parity under control.

"During the past several years," Mr. Rich continued, "the powerful farm bloc succeeded in obtaining support on all basic farm products at 90 percent of parity and nonbasic commodities at 60 to 90 percent of parity.

"Production was tremendous at these support levels, resulting in large surpluses. So great were these surpluses that it became necessary to curtail production through acreage allotments. Price supports on potatoes, poultry, and eggs, at 60 to 75 percent of parity were discontinued this year due to overproduction "

FARMER PROFITED

Mr Rich added: "It is reasonable to assume that the support levels were high enough to return a good profit to the farmer, otherwise they would not have overproduced.

"This," he said, "is one reason why controls on farm products should be imposed below parity"

Mr. Rich asserted the farm bloc was instrumental in changes in the method of figuring parity that jumped butterfat from 63 1 cents a pound to 69 cents; cattle from $13 a hundredweight to $16.90; wool from 43 9 cents a pound to 50 cents a pound; and milk from $3 84 a hundredweight to $4.31. In a quart price to the milk consumer, this is a jump of 1 cent.

Mr. Rich, an economist and market analyst, blasted parity as the bunk (Parity is the formula that expresses a relationship between what farmers must pay for commodities and what they are paid for their crops)

"A most important factor has been omitted in computing parity, which if included would adversely affect the farmer. It is the element that has enriched the farmer at the expense of consumer," said Mr. Rich.

"We refer to the incredible rise in the rate of production.

"For example," he said, "the yield per acre of potatoes increased from 107.8 bushels in 1914 to 237 9 in 1950. Egg production per hen per year increased from 135 in 1940 to 163 in 1948. Pounds of milk per cow per year went up from 5,780 in 1940 to 6,450 in 1949.

"These production boosts greatly lower the unit cost of production, yet this factor is completely ignored in the parity index," Mr. Rich said.

"In view of the present emergency which entails large expenditures of public funds, heavy taxes, and sacrifices on everyone's part, no favoritism should be shown."

MARCH 6, 1951.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Key West, Fla.:

Today, an awakened public opinion among men and women in all walks of life gives you the opportunity and support needed to carry through a program that will stop inflation, keep down costs, enormously strengthen our defense efforts, and give us for the future a dollar of constant value and a stable level of average prices, thereby strengthening economic freedom.

Congressman JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in the Eightieth Congress and now ranking minority member, in a recent spotlight statement points out that, through the Bretton Woods Agreement, the currencies of all major countries except Russia are tied to the American dollar, and that, therefore, further shrinkage in the value of our dollar must immediately reflect itself in the value of currencies throughout the world.

Experience shows that no stabilization formula can be found that will do justice to all groups if we allow inflation to proceed and living costs to rise. But the response of hundreds of thousands to our committee's direct-mail inquiry demonstrates that citizens in all walks of life can be rallied to support and keep permanently in effect a policy of pay-as-we-go, a balanced budget, and price stabilization.

In 1933, when President Roosevelt lifted the United States out of the depression, New York State agricultural leaders gave major guidance to the organized agriculture of the entire Nation. Now they are moving again to give organized and highly effective support to our Government in stopping inflation. The Northeast Farm Foundation, comprising 11 major State-wide farm organizations and cooperatives in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, now patriotically offer to give up all subsidies and special interest favors. Its March bulletin says:

"The New York State Farm Bureau Federation has wisely and courageously called for an end of Federal hand-outs to farmers, even of such things as lime, fertilizer, etc. These aid programs were put into effect when farming was in a severe depression Now, however, the farmers of New York State feel that their enterprise can and should stand on its own feet. They believe that it is time to balance the national budget and gird the national economy for whatever may come. They believe that all groups should now put country ahead of self-interest, and they are prepared to back up this sentiment by example

"Moreover, the farmers of this State, by and large, are firmly opposed to the controls which are the inevitable price of subsidies. The State Grange, the Dairymen's League, and other farm organizations have condemned subsidies and the Government controls that go with them.

"The State Conference Board of Farm Organizations, representing eight major State-wide organizations, has time and again expressed its firm stand against socialistic schemes and for free institutions, including free markets, free enterprise, and those basic individual freedoms which have made American farms and American life the best and most fruitful on this earth.

"Never have the farmers and their leaders been more solidly alined, shoulder to shoulder, on the major economic and social issues of the time than they are today in New York State.

"As we interpret this united voice, it stands for the very fundamentals that our forefathers stood for and fought for when they built this Nation. It is, in one word, the voice of freedom. It is the voice of patriotism.

"We think that the community at large will not underestimate the position of a united agriculture; not merely because it represents the stand of that important group who grow our food, but because, now, as in times gone by, it is the resolute core of resistance to socialism, despotism, and all other isms that menace the American way of life."

Only the 15 percent of our people included in pressure groups receiving direct payments from the Treasury or placed on islands of special privilege have any chance of profiting from inflation; and many of these 15 percent groups will also suffer serious losses if inflation occurs.

But 85 out of every 100 persons entitled to vote stand to lose heavily if their dollar, worth 100 cents in 1941 and 50 cents now, shrinks during the years ahead to a 25-cent value. In the Nation, there are 78,000,000 life-insurance policyholders and more than 10,000,000 bank depositors. As our dollar becomes cheaper, the stored savings of these thrifty citizens fade. Most life-insurance beneficiaries are women. If they realize that inflation, rotting their money, destroys the protection their husbands have worked hard to provide, they will support sound money policies.

The millions owning Government bonds and the forty to fifty million citizens who have an investment in social security will, if made aware of the damage inflation does to their interests, give wholehearted support to whatever measures are needed to protect the value of our dollar.

John L. Lewis and other labor leaders have invested years of effort in building up insurance protection for members of their organizations. Inflation undermines these savings Moreover, without a stable dollar, the rising cost of living will constantly encroach upon the workers' wage rates

Insurance companies, financial institutions and other corporations having tens of billions in bank deposits, all stand to lose—all have vital interests in maintaining a stable price level. If leadership is given, they will stand ready to give whatever support is needed to stop inflation now.

If farmers can be assured that the dollar will have the same purchasing power a generation hence as today, the example and leadership of the Northeast Farm Foundation and the American Farm Bureau will spread throughout organized agriculture, for the farmer will know that he will be protected against such disastrous deflation as occurred between 1929 and 1932 This patriotic stand of farm groups willing to abandon Federal handouts will save the Treasury large amounts and set a pattern for reducing nonessential Federal expenditures, saving possibly seven billions annually and making it easier to balance the budget.

Past experience has demonstrated the futility of trying to hold the price line if monetary and fiscal policies are allowed to create continuing inflation. Today there is better understanding than ever before of the dangers of inflation and just what steps are necessary to prevent it. Government and citizens alike have now the best chance in decades to establish permanently a sound fiscal policy. But top-level leadership in Washington, and a Nation-wide campaign of education are needed to establish in public opinion once for all, such an understanding of the problem that 85 percent of the citizens in every district will support their representatives in doing whatever is necessary to stabilize the dollar's purchasing power.

Our Constitution gave freedom and released the creative powers of men as never before in any society It provided that Congress should establish units of measurement—the pound, the yard, the gallon, and "coin money and regulate the value thereof." It also permitted man freely to make voluntary contracts in terms of these units, and the Government itself undertook the task of enforcing such contracts.

What would happen if, without rhyme or reason, the foot were to shrink to 6 inches; the gallon from 4 to 2 quarts; and the yard from 36 to 18 inches—just what happened to the value of our dollar during the last decade?

Lenin and the Communist revolutionaries well knew that inflation, disrupting the monetary mechanism for the exchange of goods and services, prepares the ground to break down the free enterprise system and to open the way for collectivism. He said, in substance: "We will print so much money and so many bonds that the capitalists will choke on them."

In the interest of the defense effort, of maximum production, and of the preservation of our system of free enterprise, we must stop inflation here and now, and establish for the future a dollar of constant purchasing power.

Our committee has carefully explored this problem Our chairman, Dr. Willford I. King, has on record with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, statements setting forth the mechanism for attaining price stability Various organizations and many other outstanding leaders in economic thinking and public policy have discussed the same problem

If, in this emergency, our Washington leaders will move immediately and with determination to stop inflation at once and to give us a stable dollar for the future, many of the serious problems besetting us will disappear, and the overwhelming majority of our citizens will rally to their support.

To establish a dollar of stable purchasing power will, historically, be a contribution comparable in importance to that of Julius Caesar and Pope Gregory the Great, when they standardized the calendar.

The foregoing program, if adopted, will strengthen the defense effort and unite our people. Our Committee pledges its utmost effort to carry across the Nation understanding of this program and to rally all groups in its support.

SUMNER GERARD,
Trustee, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Administration Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of March 12, 1951:

ADMINISTRATION MORALS

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, who once openly called for President Truman to resign, now is convinced that Congress should undertake an investigation of the general moral level of the Truman administration. He is led to that conviction as a result of the evidence of influence and favoritism disclosed in his own inquiry into the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"I have never heard so much lying in my life," the Senator asserted, in calling on the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to launch a full-scale inquiry into moral corruption. He plans to finish up his own subcommittee's RFC study this week because he doesn't want to spend the rest of my life on this cockeyed thing.

The RFC disclosures to date provide a startling parallel with the revelations of another Senate committee last year which delved into the 5 percenters. That was the inquiry which brought to light White House intimate John Maragon's smelly bottle of perfume and White House aide Gen. Harry H Vaughan's freewheeling deep freezers. In the present instance it is Donald Dawson, the White House patronage aide, who is involved in accusations of influencing RFC loans, some of which had juicy fees for the arrangers.

Similarly, the Fulbright committee has blazed a trail to the White House which somewhat parallels that blazed by the Kefauver committee in disclosures of racketeering and gambling on a national scale. Close alliances between the racketeers and some of the State and city political machines on which the White House depends for support have at least been indicated in the Kefauver public hearings.

More pertinent, perhaps, have been the revelations by both committees that the United States Treasury Department, under White House domination, has exhibited a peculiarly tender attitude toward the income tax returns of persons involved in both the RFC mess and the gambling syndicates.

All of these inquiries, going back to Senator CLYDE R. HOEY'S 5 percenter investigation, have been in the hands of Democratic Senators, it is interesting to note How much further they would have been pursued under Republican leadership it is only possible to conjecture.

But Senator FULBRIGHT at least is convinced that something definitely is wrong with an administration that permitted the mess in the RFC to get out of hand. On the basis of this single segment of administrative ineptitude he now calls for a thoroughgoing inquiry into the moral structure of the executive branch. It remains to be seen whether his Democratic colleagues will take up the challenge in an effort to get to the bottom of the unsavory situation.

The Need of National Representation for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for Mr. Jesse C. Suter, a newspaperman with the Washington Star, who, I believe, knows more about the District of Columbia than any other living man. He has made such a thorough study of all matters concerning the District of Columbia and has such a sincere desire to be of service to his fellow man here that I think his views on the so-called home-rule bill should be given very careful and serious consideration.

If the citizens of the District of Columbia want to really have a say in their government, national representation will afford them this opportunity, whereas the so-called home-rule bills utterly fail in this respect.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include several items beginning with Mr. Suter's column of February 18 entitled "Need United Effort To Americanize Washingtonians." I also wish to include editorials and additional articles which have the following titles: "Mr. West and Home Rule"; "Senator MONRONEY'S Fish Story"; "How May Uncle Sam's Face Be Saved?"; and "S. 656 Criticized Constructively":

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 18, 1951]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—A COMMON GROUND FOR UNITED ACTION

(By Jesse C. Suter)

NEED UNITED EFFORT TO AMERICANIZE WASHINGTONIANS

In the long fight by the voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District of Columbia for an enabling amendment to the Constitution of the United States under which the Congress would be empowered to grant these people voting representation in the House, Senate, and electoral college, there have on a number of occasions cropped out legislative proposals for an elective local government. These proposals have been due in a large measure to impatient ones who seek a short cut for obtaining some kind of suffrage in the District.

Invariably the supporters of such proposals declare their belief in and their support of proposed constitutional amendments for national representation, but insist that the process of obtaining amendments requires too much time.

That the greater number of the citizens of the District of Columbia, either as individuals or as members of organizations, favor national representation has been demonstrated clearly on a number of occasions. Analyses of the situation show that there are organizations and many individuals who support the proposal to give District of Columbia people an effective participation in the National Government but at the same time are very much opposed to the setting up of an elective local government.

There are others who are ardent advocates of national representation who would favor the creation of an elective local government after the acquisition of American citizenship on the national level. Some unqualifiedly favor both national representation and suffrage for local offices. Some of these insist that a vote in local affairs should be acquired first, leaving national representation for a later period.

And then there are encountered those who declare their opposition to the granting of any kind of a vote to the people of the District. It has been found in the unofficial referenda that the opposition to the election of local officers is far greater in numbers than to the election of Senators, Representatives, and Presidential electors. Of course, this analysis does not include people who seem utterly indifferent as to participation in government, local or national.

It has been repeatedly charged by workers for local suffrage, miscalled home rule, that those who advocate only national representation are insincere and support the national only as a means of defeating the local. A most interesting development of this idea was included in a very able statement of the late Henry H. Glassie, a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, in the course of the hearing on House Joint Resolution 18 for national representation, before the House Committee on the Judiciary, in the first session of the Seventieth Congress, in 1928. The following is quoted from Mr. Glassie's statement as reported on page 72 of that hearing:

"One principal ground or suggestion in the way of opposition is that we are not quite open, and that we stultify these American principles by not claiming the right of local self-government; that we come into court, so to speak, weakened by not claiming that right.

"Now, if the gentlemen of the committee please, coming from words to facts, what was the claim of the Americans to full participa-

tion in the Government before the Revolution? Participation in local government? Not at all. They had that. It was participation in that sovereign imperial parliament which made the law.

"We have been reproached with the idea that we do not want local government and therefore do not want self-government. But mark the distinction. Local government may be a mere matter of municipal administration. But what self-government means is that the people who are to obey the laws shall have a share in the making of the laws. You (the Congress) make the law. Under the constitutional provision you will always make the law. Under the principle that the Federal Government shall be supreme, you must continue to make the law.

"Therefore, when we come to you humbly, and say, 'Admit us to participation; admit us to your councils in the making of this law,' we are asking for local self-government.

"True it is that we do not ask that we shall appoint the dog catcher. True it is that we do not ask that we shall elect the school board. True it is that we do not ask at this time, coming as a united body, for any of those usual municipal functions as to which it is still a question, after 100 years of self-government, whether they are better done by a vote or by a city manager or by a commission.

"So I say to you gentlemen, with profound deference, that these things, first from one side and then from the other, which are continually thrown against us, will hardly bear scrutiny. We do want self-government, and the essence of self-government is the right to send a man from your community into your legislative representative body which can send you to war, tax your property, do what it pleases with your will, control your domestic relations, your relations to your family, your wife and children, and do all those things which make a government, a government touching intimately the life, as the learned gentleman suggested—and I thank him for the suggestion—which touch intimately the life of the community. Those are the things that are dearest to you, and those are the things which, in your respective States, you insist upon having, and which you will never surrender."

American citizenship as possessed by the citizens of the States of the Union is shown by Mr. Glassie to touch far more intimately the life of the citizen than the mere participation in a local municipal government.

The numerous attempts to acquire elective participation in the government of the District of Columbia, though sought as legislative short cuts, have all failed. At the same time, the mounting obligations imposed upon all American citizens by the National Government have increased to such an alarming extent that the need for participation in the Government of the United States has increased materially.

The community is confronted by a problem of highest importance, and that is to bring about a practical union of the forces for obtaining the amendment to the Constitution for national representation. It must be conceded that many improvements may be desirable in the form and operation of the local government. Surely, with our own representation in the two branches of Congress and the possession of the right to vote for the President of the United States, the people of the District of Columbia would find themselves in a far better position to gain any improvements in the local government they desire.

A combined effort applied intelligently and persistently by all of those who favor the Americanization of the people of the District of Columbia would prove to be an irresistible force for putting through the proposed amendment to the Constitution and its ratification by the States.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 22, 1951]

MR. WEST AND HOME RULE

In the current hearings on home rule Corporation Counsel Vernon E. West, testifying for the Commissioners, has rendered a valuable service to the people of Washington, and, one would think, for Senator NEELY and the members of his subcommittee.

But Mr. West got rapped over the knuckles by Mr NEELY for his pains. He was accused of trying to defeat the bill. And how was he trying to defeat the bill? By examining its provisions in detail and suggesting that somebody ought to take a second look at some of them; by pointing out contradictions, inconsistencies and one or two passages of gobbledygook that even a lawyer cannot understand. He also expressed warranted skepticism as to whether the people of the District, at least the owners of property, were not being sold down the river in such important fields as zoning regulation.

Had Mr West taken a leaf from the productive political experience of his soon-to-be-boss, F Joseph Donohue, he would not have used this approach. He would have given three cheers for home, mother, and the American flag, endorsed home rule by uttering irrelevant generalities concerning the right to vote and acknowledged the plaudits of Senator NEELY and assembled guests.

But Mr. West happens to belong to a possibly vanishing school of public servants who believe that their official testimony on pending legislation should be directed to perfecting it, and who are willing to leave the policy of enactment to the legislators. That is what he did, and he did it very well.

The Star happens to agree with Mr West that the bill raises a serious question of constitutionality which may not be answered finally for many years, and that in the meantime such routine transactions as the execution of real-estate deeds, should this bill be enacted as it is, would be thrown into confusion The Star also agrees with Mr West that the powers of a city council to put the city in debt for as much as $83,000,000, while placing the burden of debt repayment only on real estate and tangible personal property, is a threat to everybody who owns Washington property. And when this situation is coupled with voting rights for everybody who lives in Washington for a year, without affecting his voting status as a resident of a State, the hazards of the local property owner, who claims only Washington as his place of residence, are even more manifest.

There are many other criticisms of the bill with which anybody who reads Mr. West's careful analysis should agree. For there is nothing frivolous or picayunish in what he had to say. But this is the identical bill that passed the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress, without discussion on the floor, and the same procedure may be followed this term. When Mr. Donohue is confirmed and sworn in, he may want to read the bill. It would be part of his job as Commissioner to read it. If he then suggests that it be changed, he will be criticized for trying to save his job by working to defeat home rule. Perhaps he can take that sort of buncombe without batting an eye. If he wants to be a Commissioner, he should learn to take it now.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 24, 1951]

SENATOR MONRONEY'S FISH STORY

One argument for home rule is based on the theory that Congress devotes too much time to the trivia of local legislation. This may be true. There are practical and unutilized methods of reducing the time thus spent which have nothing to do with home rule.

But when such an outstanding Member of Congress as Senator MONRONEY libels the succulent rockfish of our own Potomac River as a waster of golden congressional hours, the time has come to protest. A number of fish stories about home rule have been told to Senator NEELY in the past few days, but here is the specific whopper that Mr. MONRONEY told:

"One of the examples that I think points this up most clearly was 2 or 3 years ago when we had the question of the British loan. Some billions of dollars was involved therein, and high international policy We had to quit in the middle of that loan so that we could spend a whole afternoon discussing whether rockfish of 10 or 12 inches long could be sold in the District, and we spent the whole afternoon on the subject of rockfish."

NOW, Mr. MONRONEY. The rockfish bill, amending a statute of 1901, and changing from 10 to 11 inches the minimum length of rockfish legally sold in Washington, was passed by the House on Monday, September 24, 1945. That was a District day. There are two such days set aside each month for the disposal of local legislation, if there is any, and if nothing else of importance is pending.

Jennings Randolph, then chairman of the House District Committee, looking around at the empty seats which are a distinguishing feature of District day, announced that there was some local legislation but that two distinguished Members wished to speak on matters of national importance So, he said, he would yield part of his time to them in the hope that more Members would stick around and listen

He brought up the rockfish bill and immediately yielded to Mr. May, of Kentucky, who made a speech about demobilization centers. He then yielded to Delegate Romulo, who made a speech on Philippine-American trade relations. Mr. Randolph then answered two questions about the rockfish bill. It was passed without debate and without dissent. The whole business took less space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than the Chaplain had taken that morning in asking divine guidance for the House. From the House the fish bill went to the Senate, where it was passed without objection, and sent to the President, who signed it without recorded comment

That same day the House disposed of a few more routine local bills without spending more than a few minutes on any of them. Most of the time was given over to debating a health program for Federal employees, which was not local legislation. As for the British loan, Mr MONRONEY is possibly confused—but aren't we all? We do not lend money to the British or anybody else. We give it away.

Senator MCCARRAN, incidentally, has been trying for a year or more to get another rockfish bill enacted. That may be bad news for Mr. MONRONEY. It would prohibit the sale of oversize rockfish—laden with roe—in the District of Columbia, such sales now being prohibited in Maryland and Virginia. The commercial fishermen, who dump these forbidden fish on the District market, may object through their Representatives in Congress. But it is an important conservation measure and should be passed. The rockfish may be all gone by that time, however, like the sturgeon that once swam in the Potomac.

But the rockfish are not to be blamed. They did not hold up the British loan. Nor would home rule change the situation one way or another.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 25, 1951]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—HOW MAY UNCLE SAM'S FACE BE SAVED?—S. 656 CRITICIZED CONSTRUCTIVELY

(By Jesse C Suter)

EMBARRASSED BY OUR UN-AMERICANIZED CAPITAL

The complete and inconsistent lack of political status by citizens of the District of

Columbia is a frequent source of embarrassment to our legislators and diplomats. The United States, being committed to the fundamental doctrines of the United Nations Charter, is in a difficult position when the wide variation between our preaching and practice is noted. The Charter abounds in solicitude and promise of participation by all peoples in the governments of their respective countries. If they have not yet attained a condition for such participation, the promise is to prepare them for the ultimate enjoyment of such rights and privileges. The voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District see in such promises a bright ray of hope. Our country is now definitely committed to putting these high ideals into practice for all peoples.

Under such conditions, how can one explain why a large community of American citizens, exceeding in population each of 13 States and the combined population of 3 States, is denied the least vestige of participation in the government of their country? In dealing with other affiliated nations, there can be conceived no satisfactory explanation which would save Uncle Sam from a charge of gross inconsistency.

Some legislators would grant these people a limited participation in their local government and call it home rule. But such rule would continue to be under the autocratic control of the Congress, in which these people are without representation.

Such a grant of limited participation would fall far short of purging the Nation of gross inconsistency at its heart The only way to save the face of Uncle Sam would be through a grant of national representation, which would involve the election of Senators and Representatives and Presidential electors from the District.

HOME-RULE BILL CRITICISMS AND CHANGES ARE DUE NOW

The Senate District Committee began hearings on the Kefauver District of Columbia home-rule bill, S. 656, on Tuesday morning. The bill is identical with S. 1527 of the Eighty-first Congress, which was passed by the Senate in 1949 but tabled in the House District Committee. The first session of the hearing was somewhat of a field day for advocates of the bill, some of whom indorsed it only in principle but did not say they had read it.

A discordant note was sounded in the views expressed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, presented by the corporation counsel. The Commissioners declared their belief in the principle of home rule for the District, but pointed out what they considered some defects in the proposed legislation

Many ardent supporters in private conversation admit that there are numerous features of the bill which they do not approve. However, they insist that after the enactment of the bill, corrections may be made by subsequent legislation. Some of the more conservative regard this as a very uncertain method.

True home rule for the District of Columbia would of necessity include national representation Hatton W Sumners, then chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in the course of explaining his proposed amendment to the Constitution for District national representation, in 1945, among other things, said:

"Thus far, I have discussed this matter solely from the standpoint of local government, because the Congress is the local government. * * * The Congress and the President are a part of the local government for the District of Columbia. Why these people should be denied the right thus to participate in the selection of these agents, if such participation on their part would not conflict with the Federal interests, and it would not, it is very difficult to understand.

"Looking to this matter from a national standpoint, these people are a part of the Nation's citizenship."

It is believed that the pending bill would provide only a very limited gesture toward home rule, which could be obtained only through the acquisition by the people of the District of the political status of American citizens through national representation.

SOME PERTINENT CRITICISMS

The chief criticisms which have been heard regarding the Kefauver bill are as follows:

1. That the qualifications for holding office as a member of the council lack requirement of District residence equivalent to that now required by law for civilian members of the Board of District Commissioners.

2. That the rate of compensation and expense account for the council are too high.

3. That the two appointed members of the council to represent the interests of the United States are unnecessary for the reason that the overriding authority of the Congress is a sufficient guaranty that the interests of the Nation will be amply guarded.

4 That the proposal to abolish the Board of Library Trustees, transferring its functions to an executive department under the District manager, is contrary to the best recognized library experience and practice.

5. That the qualifications for holding office as a member of the Board of Education do not require the selection of persons of long enough residence in the District to be proper representatives of the local community in directing the operations of the public-school system.

6. Serious criticism is raised against the qualifications of electors as provided in the bill, which would permit voters in the States to qualify as electors in the District. Such dual voters would thus possess the right of suffrage not only in their local, State, and National elections in their home States, but also in the local elections in the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED

The above criticisms could be overcome mostly by suitable amendments, as follows:

1. To provide in section 302 of the Kefauver bill the requirement that a candidate for membership on the council at the time of nomination shall have been an actual resident of the District of Columbia for 3 years next before such nomination, and have, during that period, claimed residence nowhere else. Such an amendment is needed as a substitute for clause (2) of the section. The qualification thus suggested follows existing law as to the two civilian Commissioners (District Organic Act of 1878).

2. As membership on the District council is not supposed to be a full-time job, it has been suggested that the compensation for members be reduced from $5,000, as carried in the bill, to $2,500, and that of the chairman to $5,000 instead of $7,500, and that the chairman's general expense account be reduced from $3,000 to $2,000 per annum. This would be a saving of $23,500 per year (based on a council of nine elected members).

3. The theory of two appointed Federal members of the District council to safeguard the interests of the United States is entirely erroneous and out of place in legislation purporting to establish even a limited form of home rule in a community which by the Constitution is completely under the control and domination of the Congress representing the Nation. Elimination of the salaries of the appointed members would make a further annual saving of $10,000 at the rate carried by the bill, or $5,000 at the suggested reduced rate.

4. To overcome the fourth criticism, it would be necessary to amend section 901 (a) by striking out the "Department of Libraries" from the list of executive departments named therein and in section 909 to strike out the "Department of Libraries" and transfer the entire section 909, with further amendments, to a new title XII—Board of Library Trustees, renumbering the section as 1201. The section now numbered 909, on page 57 of the bill, would be further amended by striking out the provision transferring to the proposed Director of the Department of Libraries the functions of the Board, also striking out the proposed abolishment of the office of the librarian In place of the matter struck out, language should be inserted providing that the functions of the Board of Library Trustees and the librarian are hereby "continued, together with all powers and duties as provided under existing law."

A further amendment suggests a new subsection providing for the qualifications and appointment of members of the Board of Library Trustees. It should provide that such persons shall have been actual residents of the District of Columbia for not less than 3 years next before their nomination and have, during that period, claimed residence nowhere else. The trustees shall be nominated by the chairman of the council and be confirmed by majority vote of that body.

5. The qualifications for members of the Board of Education would be amended so as to require 5 years' residence in the District of Columbia immediately preceding their nomination for office. (Required under existing law)

6 To rid the pending bill of the so-called dual voting provision, which proposes to qualify as electors persons possessing voting rights in other jurisdictions, two amendments appear to be necessary. Section 1206 (a) should be amended to read as follows:

"To be qualified to vote in the District, a person must be an actual resident of said District without voting rights in another jurisdiction" Strike out the last sentence of section 1206 from lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 82 of the bill, reading as follows: "A person who is otherwise qualified shall not be disqualified by being entitled to vote in another jurisdiction"

Other fair criticisms were in the Star editorial of February 22

The only reasonable insurance of a fair and stable local government for the District of Columbia is to be found in the possession by the District people of their own elected Senators, Representatives, and electors of President and Vice President The American Government rests upon this well-tested and proven foundation.

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 25, 1951]

RIGHT TO VOTE FOR WHAT?

There has been a great hullabaloo about this Taft-Kefauver bill. There was a distinguished list of men and women testifying for home rule at the NEELY hearings. One can't help wondering how many of them had read the bill and realized how little was to be the reward for such effort.

The new commissioner, Mr. Donohue, is in favor of it "Our American heritage," he says, "depends upon the privilege and exercise of the right to vote" To vote for nine councilmen and a seven-member board of education?

Mr. Donohue says he was in a bombardment group in England during the 1944 election. It was his responsibility to distribute absentee ballots to some 1,600 men under his command. He says he was impressed at that time that he, "as a soldier, was denied the right to vote." Does Mr. Donohue think that this home-rule bill would give him the right to vote in the 1952 election as a soldier or any other way? Pressed by Senator CASE, Mr Donohue conceded he had not given detailed study to the bills.

That grand person, Mrs. J Borden Harriman, Democratic National Committeewoman for the District, says: "All I have to say is that, of course, I'm for home rule. It's horribly embarrassing that the Capital City is so uncivilized and its citizens are not allowed to vote."

What connection does Mrs Harriman have in her mind between home rule and the civilized American right to the ballot? Can she put such a high value on the purely municipal right to vote for a council and a board of education? After all, many of us vote for presidents of social and civil charitable organizations now.

Of course, it is humiliating that the people of the District are disfranchised and un-American. It is cruel and unjust that soldiers from the District cannot vote like soldiers from neighboring States But the Taft-Kefauver bill will do nothing to remedy this injustice. Only District representation in Congress can do that.

The object of the home-rule bill would seem to be to divert the minds of the 500,000 potential voters of the District by offering them a shuffling of the local set-up All decisions, of course, would remain subject to congressional approval. Washington taxpayers—men and women in Government and the military services- should read the bill—all 119 pages of it They should not be satisfied to be made one-half a citizen

NATIVE WASHINGTONIAN.

Cost of Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Interior Oscar L. Chapman has estimated the proposed central Arizona project, now before Congress, will cost the taxpayers of the Nation $2,075,729,000 in lost interest alone.

I believe Members of Congress will be interested to see how much of this tremendous additional tax burden the taxpayers of their own respective States must bear, should this legislation be passed.

A State-by-State tabulation follows:

State	State's percent of total [1]	Cost to taxpayers [2]
Alabama	1 17	$24, 286, 000
Arizona	.37	7, 680, 000
Arkansas	.72	14, 945, 000
California	8 32	172, 701, 000
Colorado	.80	16, 606, 000
Connecticut	1 67	34, 605, 000
Delaware	.40	8, 303, 000
Florida	1 29	26, 777, 000
Georgia	1 40	29, 060, 000
Idaho	.32	6, 642, 000
Illinois	7. 59	157, 548, 000
Indiana	2. 29	47, 534, 000
Iowa	1 58	$32, 797, 000
Kansas	1. 15	23, 871, 000
Kentucky	1. 20	24, 900, 000
Louisiana	1 22	25, 324, 000
Maine	44	9, 133, 000
Maryland	1. 68	34, 872, 000
Massachusetts	3 40	70, 575, 000
Michigan	4. 71	97, 767, 000
Minnesota	1. 86	38, 609 000
Mississippi	71	14, 738, 000
Missouri	2. 53	52, 516, 000
Montana	.35	7, 265, 000
Nebraska	.86	17 851, 000
Nevada	.13	2, 698 000
New Hampshire	.29	6, 020, 000
New Jersey	3. 20	66, 291, 000
New Mexico	28	5, 812, 000
New York	11 67	301, 509, 000
North Carolina	1. 59	33, 001, 000
North Dakota	.34	7, 057, 000
Ohio	5 78	119, 977, 000
Oklahoma	1 17	24, 286, 000
Oregon	1 04	21, 588, 000
Pennsylvania	7 62	158, 171, 000
Rhode Island	.56	11, 624, 000
South Carolina	.76	15, 776, 000
South Dakota	.36	7, 474, 000
Tennessee	1 37	28, 438, 000
Texas	4 38	90, 917, 000
Utah	.34	7, 056, 000
Vermont	.18	3, 736, 000
Virginia	1 49	30, 928, 000
Washington	1 65	34, 250, 000
West Virginia	92	19, 097, 000
Wisconsin	2 10	43, 590, 000
Wyoming	.18	3, 736, 000
District of Columbia, Hawaii and Alaska	1 48	30, 721, 000
United States total	100 00	2, 075, 729, 000

[1] Percentages of total tax burden that each State will bear were computed by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

[2] Cost to the Nation's taxpayers of $2,075,729,000 is an official estimate of Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior It is based on the provisions of S. 75 (central Arizona project bill) and the following specified conditions construction cost estimate of $708,780,000 made by the Bureau of Reclamation (S. Rept. No 832, 81st Cong., 1st sess.); an interest rate of 2½ percent, an 8-year construction period, and a 75-year financing period. The Secretary's statement appears in his letter dated June 28, 1950, to J. Hardin Peterson, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee. The statement was approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

These figures prove that the central Arizona project will not be self-supporting, as claimed by its promoters Actually, it will cost taxpayers of all the States billions Spending this huge sum will not help the current national defense effort in any way. Instead, it would divert and use up manpower and large supplies of steel, cement, copper, and other critical materials.

Joint Statement of Gov. Allan Shivers, Attorney General Price Daniel, and Commissioner of the General Land Office Bascom Giles Concerning Senate Joint Resolution 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are anxious to see that the production of oil and gas and the additional exploration for this oil and gas and other minerals will be continued, especially during this national emergency until permanent legislation as to ownership of the so-called tidelands is firmly established.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the joint statement made by Gov. Allan Shivers, Attorney General Price Daniel, and Commissioner of the General Land Office Bascom Giles, regarding pending legislation on the subject of tidelands:

The undersigned officials of the State of Texas, in addition to their capacities as Governor, Attorney General, and Commissioner of the General Land Office, constitute the School Land Board of Texas, which has charge of the leasing of public-school lands for oil and gas development in this State.

In view of the short time allotted for the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 20, and since our views as to permanent legislation and interim legislation have been expressed previously to this committee, we submit this joint statement for the purpose of summarizing our previous testimony and present views concerning Senate Joint Resolution 20.

We favor the general purpose of interim legislation as expressed in Senate Joint Resolution 20 We recognize that continued production and additional exploration for oil, gas, and other minerals are essential to the welfare of our people in this time of emergency Pending permanent legislation on the subject, we will support any reasonable interim bill which would permit exploration, development, and production of essential natural resources to be continued on this property, provided the interim legislation does not contain anything which would prejudice our State in its effort to obtain permanent legislation restoring the ownership which it claimed and enjoyed prior to June 5, 1950.

The present emergency and the need for interim legislation should not be used by either party to gain a point which may weigh in its favor or against the other party when permanent legislation is reached for consideration.

We believe that Senate Joint Resolution 20 can be amended by your committee so as to accomplish the desired purposes of interim legislation without giving either the States or the Federal Government any undue advantage with reference to permanent legislation In this connection, we present the following objections and suggested amendments for the consideration of the committee

1 The first sentence in the preamble recites that the resolution is to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States. It would seem only fair that protection of any equities which the States may have should be added to the purpose clause by the insertion of such words therein. These words should also be inserted in the last paragraph of the preamble.

2 Section 4 (a) provides for leasing of the entire Continental Shelf by the Secretary of the Interior during the interim, making no distinction between that part of the shelf lying within the original boundaries of the States and that part lying seaward of the original boundaries Since the coastal States have claimed and enjoyed ownership and management of that part of the shelf within their original seaward boundaries continuously for more than 100 years and now have the machinery, personnel, and experience necessary to continue managing the area without additional expense and without employing additional manpower, and since a majority of the House and Senate on several occasions have indicated that this land should be restored ultimately to the States in permanent legislation, we believe that an interim bill should not give the Secretary of the Interior exclusive management and leasing powers within these traditional boundaries Adoption of this feature of the bill might be used as a precedent which would prejudice the States when permanent legislation is reached for consideration. For the reasons heretofore stated in our previous testimony, we believe that more production will be obtained and more revenues received during the interim if State operations are continued within the traditional boundaries. However, if the committee believes that such arrangement would give the States an undue advantage with reference to future permanent legislation, it would seem that a plan for joint action could be devised and written into section 4 (a) along the lines of the present stipulations between the United

States and the State of California. At least, some amendment with reference to lands within the traditional seaward boundaries should be made so as to render the present bill fair to both the States and the Federal Government insofar as this point may bear hereafter upon consideration of permanent legislation.

3. We believe section 5 (a) (1) should be amended so as to authorize payment to the States of at least 37½ percent of the revenues received from the entire Continental Shelf. Payment of 37½ percent of the revenues to the States during the interim is limited by section 5 (a) (1), as now written, to those revenues received from lands lying within 3 miles of shore. Both the States of Texas and Louisiana extended their boundaries beyond their original limits to a distance of 27 miles prior to President Truman's Continental Shelf Proclamation. The States have already contributed and will continue to contribute to the claim of the United States (and its political subdivisions) as against other nations to jurisdiction over that part of the Continental Shelf lying beyond traditional State boundaries. This was recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in its opinion in *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699, 706 (1950)), in which the Court said: "Louisiana's enlargement of her boundary emphasizes the strength of the claim of the United States to this part of the ocean and the resources of the soil under that area."

4. The term "seaward boundary of a State" is defined in section 9 (b) as "a line 3 miles distant from the points at which the paramount rights of the Federal Government * * * begin" This is less than some of the coastal States have claimed, with approval of Congress, for many years. In the case of Texas, the seaward boundary was fixed at 3 leagues (9 marine miles) from shore in 1836, and this boundary has been recognized continuously by the United States and other nations of the world. It was so recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent case of *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)). Therefore, it is submitted that this definition of "seaward boundary of a State" should be amended to provide that the term means "a line 3 miles seaward from the coast, or such further distance as the seaward boundary of any State existed at the time such State became a member of the Union."

It is our sincere hope that the committee will adopt the suggestions herein offered in order that our full support may be given to this legislation.

ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor of Texas.
BASCOM GILES,
Commissioner of the General Land Office.
PRICE DANIEL,
Attorney General of Texas.

The Atlanta Journal Lauds the Honorable Henderson Lanham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in one of the South's leading newspapers, the Atlanta Journal, a tribute to our able and respected colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]. This deserved tribute calls attention to his spirit of independence, his courage, and his devotion to the public interest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN LANHAM SPEAKS OUT AGAIN

HENDERSON LANHAM attained something like Nation-wide attention when on Tuesday he expressed emphatic disapproval of the cease fire proposal to Communist China. He moved in the forthright manner that seems characteristic He put his views directly and in plain words to Secretary Acheson and our delegate to the UN, Senator Austin.

Mr. LANHAM held that the proposal was a betrayal of our men who have died in Korea or are still fighting in that attempt of civilization to resist and punish aggression

Many saw it as did Mr LANHAM, many disagreed So, also, many Americans favor recall of our forces from that desolate and tragic battlefield, while others believe we should keep them there so long as we can hold out. From divided counsel, from indecision, must come decision and unity. As to the wisdom of the course that is taken, history alone can determine from the perspective given by time

But we find ourselves interested in the boldness of Mr LANHAM's action. He takes a stand A politician would say he goes out on a limb, and that, of course, is a hazardous thing for an officeholder to do It might be sawed off, and that would cost votes. It might alienate friends, and that would be expensive, too

But Mr LANHAM has been taking stands and going out on the limb pretty regularly since he entered Congress as Representative of the Seventh Georgia District in January 1947.

He is counted and listed in all roll calls. He dodges no issues. He weasels no words. He was elected as a Democrat and as a liberal. He campaigned as a believer in unionism. He remains a Democrat but he does not follow the party's line when it divagates from his conviction as to principle. He was the one Member of the Georgia delegation who voted a few weeks ago against the restoration of autocratic, undemocratic power to the House Rules Committee. He remains a liberal in his voting as well as in his profession of faith, but he seems to have both feet on the ground and to look at questions with clear and not starry-eyed gaze. Still a believer in unionism, he has not hesitated to speak bluntly about abuses of power that labor has been led into by some of its more ambitious and less wise satraps.

This newspaper would not stultify itself, nor do Mr. LANHAM a disservice, by imputing to him all wisdom. It is not unlikely that there are errors of omission or commission on the tally sheet.

But we do suggest that Georgians keep score on his actions in the House. There are all too few Members whose vision encompasses more than their home fences. Those who grow to statesmanly stature should be given recognition and intelligent support, without which their efforts cannot have maximum success.

Labor's Walk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently certain labor officials walked out on the organization headed by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, which was created to best utilize our production machinery.

The walk-out, if my reading is correct, was because of Wilson's refusal to take into the organization the official representatives of organized labor.

There is no question but that Mr. Wilson's program cannot succeed without the cooperation not only of labor, but of industry, farmers, and practically everyone. So far as I have been able to remember no other group has fought coordination of the war effort by insisting that its authorized representative, speaking for it, shall be made a member thereof.

Again, if information is correct, Mr. Wilson before he accepted this position severed his connections with industry. He does not speak for the National Chamber of Commerce, nor any other group representing industry.

As a result of the action of these officers of organized labor, it is my understanding that farm groups will demand recognition.

When, if ever, will the representatives of organized groups forget, as they should, that when we are at war they are not spokesmen for certain groups or interests, and act in behalf of all the people?

A Congressman must represent all the people of his district, not just that particular group which is the most vociferous, claiming to have, or has, the greater number of members.

But the people as a whole believe that all rather than this or that or the other organization should be represented not only by those elected to Congress, but those appointed, as is Mr. Wilson, to carry on a program. The thought is indicated in an editorial in the Chicago Tribune of March 9, as follows:

MR CAREY'S BELATED BOLT

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, announced in a spacious way recently that organized labor may bolt the New Deal as a consequence of disgruntlement over the mobilization program Mr Carey may regard this as a formidable threat which Mr. Truman will take to heart, but we cannot see that he is speaking for anyone except himself.

The fact is that, although people like Carey and Philip Murray in the CIO, and William Green and the bosses of the AFL, think that they have an organized voting bloc which they can deliver by imperial command, the election of 1950 showed that they were very wrong. They marked up an extensive list of Republican Congressmen who were to be defeated, and, with few exceptions, all of the men they opposed rode triumphantly into office.

Their particular efforts were leveled against Senator Taft in Ohio, who trimmed them by more than 400,000 votes and carried every industrial county in the State—a feat which he could not have accomplished without very extensive support from rank and file union members.

When Mr. Carey indulges the pretense that he can lead citizens who happen to be union members in whatever direction he pleases, he is talking through his hat. His supposed followers traveled in the opposite direction in Ohio and many other States. If he makes good his threat to bolt Mr. Truman and the New Deal, he will find that he is a one man rear guard far outdistanced by a multitude of union members who arrived at that decision long before he did.

Additional Strength for Our Navy and the Merchant Marine—Revival of Shipbuilding Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted, I am inserting as part of my remarks two editorials of the Courier-Post newspaper, published at Camden, N. J. These editorials clearly and forcibly state the case for additional strength for our Navy and the Merchant Marine, and, the resultant revival of the shipbuilding industry of our country.

It is extremely gratifying to me to realize that the importance of building an adequate and up-to-date Navy and Merchant Marine is now recognized by the Congress. The recent action of Congress is a long step forward in meeting the deficiency that now exists Not only will it bring strength to these two important branches of our national defense, but, it will also revive our languishing shipbuilding industry. All of this means much to our future security as a nation.

The editorials to which I refer are as follows:

NEW NAVY BUILDING PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY

First of the administration bills introduced in Congress to build up the Armed Forces, in keeping with President Truman's plans as announced in his state of the Union message, is a $2,000,000,000 shipbuilding program for the Navy.

Sponsored in the House by Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the bill has the indorsement of both the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The latter has often curtailed or completely blocked naval and other military expansion in the past

The new bill calls for construction of more than 173 ships and the modernization and conversion of 291 others The new ships will include 52 mine-sweepers, seven snorkel submarines, two rocket launchers, and a super-aircraft carrier.

The carrier, of flush-deck type, will be 5,000 tons lighter than the one which was started and then cancelled under the economy program of former Defense Secretary Johnson after its keel had been laid down, and after a long and bitter controversy at Washington.

The decision to go ahead with the new carrier thus is a palpable policy reversal and a victory for the air-minded Navy officials who were overruled on constuction of its predecessor.

Construction of the carrier is expected to take 3½ years, according to VINSON, and it now is clearly unfortunate that the earlier ship was scrapped. Not only has precious time been lost in building it, but due to inflation, the cost of the new carrier now is estimated at $235,000,000, whereas the other ship would have cost only $189,000,000. The remainder of the Vinson bill program can be completed in 2 years, it is said.

The new Navy program will be a needed stimulus to shipbuilding in this country. Over and above that, it will furnish necessary additions to the naval arm of our military forces, which has shown in Korea that it is anything but obsolete, and remains an integral and major element of our defense establishment, and whose brilliant work in support of our land forces, in supplying and transporting them and in participating heavily in actual combat, is one of the bright spots in the whole Korean War.

The House committee has acted with commendable speed by reporting the bill at once to the floor for consideration That's the kind of action we need at Washington in remobilizing--and get little of.

The program should have full right of way and early passage in Congress.

CONGRESS VOTES BUILDING OF 50 FAST CARGO SHIPS

With final passage of the $20,000,000,000 supplemental appropriation bill, Congress has at length taken a major step toward strengthening our merchant marine and reviving our shipbuilding industry

Included in the bill is a $350,000,000 appropriation authorizing the Maritime Administration to go ahead with its program for construction of 50 fast new cargo ships.

The fund was stricken out of the bill last month by the House, although the House Appropriations Committee had approved it. It was restored by the Senate, and in the final hours of the Eighty-first Congress the House also voted to replace it in the bill as it went to the President.

Vice Adm Edward L Cochrane, Maritime Administrator, and shipping exports have been fighting for the appropriation for many months as vital to our national defenses. Plans for the ships have been in preparation and actual work on them can begin as soon as bids and contracts are negotiated.

The ships to be built under this program can be used as troop carriers if necessary, but are primarily modern, speedy cargo vessels of a type almost nonexistent in our merchant marine. They will have a top speed of 22 knots, far faster than the obsolete World War II vessels. They will carry their own torpedoes, guns, and helicopters which, combined with their high speed, will enable them to travel alone instead of in convoy and yet be adequately defended against submarine attack.

At present the United States has only 15 passenger and cargo ships that can do better than 20 knots

The new ships are to be about 525 feet long, of more than 12,000 deadweight tons, and will have interchangeable parts.

Washington officials say that the first of the 50 ships can be in service within 18 months from now, if an accelerated building program is adopted, and the Maritime Administration, fortunately, is committed to getting them on the ways as soon as possible.

These ships are badly needed now to meet competition of other maritime nations for peacetime trade, and in a full-scale war they would be absolutely essential—in fact, we would want many more like them.

Their construction should be the biggest stimulus the shipbuilding industry has had in many years and provide employment for large forces of skilled shipworkers who otherwise might have drifted away and been lost to the industry forever.

Camden's New York Shipbuilding Corp. expects the Government to invite bids on the ships shortly, possibly calling for formal submission of bids about January 24. New York Ship, which has received copies of the design and is equipped to construct vessels of the new type, hopes to be able to submit bids and receive some of the work.

Congress has done the right thing in furnishing the money for the building program. Now it is up to the Maritime Administration and the builders to push construction along at top speed.

In the Interest of Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

NEW YORK STATE
CIVIL DEFENSE COMMISSION,
New York, N. Y., March 6, 1951.

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: On February 12 the civil defense directors of the 48 States were called to Washington for a conference with the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to discuss current problems, policies, finances, and impending legislation The following day the directors met by themselves, as the National Conference of State Civil Defense Directors, and after discussion of the information given them by the Federal Administrator adopted the enclosed resolutions, which I believe speak for themselves.

I can certify that in the operations of this commission the volume of mail and informational material originating at Federal, State, and local levels constitutes a very heavy burden on our budgets, and the extension of the Federal franking privilege to this mail would undoubtedly increase the coverage and therefore the education of our population through authoritative civil defense publications

The question of insurance protection for civil defense volunteers has arisen in every one of our 104 local offices of civil defense, and the lack of proper coverage has definitely impeded our efforts to build up a strong civil defense volunteer force. It is my understanding that the McKinnon bill, now pending before the House of Representatives, is intended to provide Federal assistance in making appropriate insurance protection available.

The last resolution regarding the reimbursement of States and their political subdivisions for the forehanded procurement of civil defense items, approved by the Administrator, is vital in the State of New York. We are informed that it is the intention of the Federal Administration to participate in the cost of a number of communications and public-warning items of equipment, but under our State law, and with the very real sense of urgency which prevails in our great target cities, neither this commission nor the cities have felt justified in refusing to set up adequate alerting systems pending availability of Federal funds. This action is entirely in keeping with the policy and statements of the Federal Civil Administration, which has emphasized the fact that attack may come at any time and that a city properly warned can hope to reduce its casualties by as much as 50 percent. It does not seem equitable nor in the public interest to penalize those communities which have acted promptly in accordance with these official assumptions and policies in favor of other communities which have been content to do nothing until Federal funds were given them.

It is recognized that the retroactive features of the resolution would not normally recommend themselves to the Congress, but it is urged by all State directors that the special circumstances surrounding the inauguration of the Nation-wide civil-defense program be taken into account and

that the Federal funds, when appropriated, be made applicable to federally approved items of equipment purchased after enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

I believe you are aware that in the State of New York we have not been holding back on our civil-defense program and waiting for the Federal Government to pay all our bills and instruct us in every last detail of our job. Nevertheless, we do feel that Federal assistance in the fields covered by the enclosed resolutions is essential, and since we have been joined in this conclusion by the directors of the other States, we feel justified in urging that you as the State's representative in the Congress introduce or support bills accomplishing the purposes set forth in the resolutions.

I sincerely hope that you will be willing to give this added boost to the vital civil defense program.

A further matter which was not considered by the National Conference of Civil Defense Directors, but which is of very real and immediate significance in New York State is the question of the loyalty oath to be taken by all civil defense volunteers. In Niagara Falls and other border communities, there are a large number of resident Canadian citizens who have been taking an active part in our civil defense organizations and are exactly the kind of people that we want as volunteers. Under the terms of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as interpreted by counsel for this Commission, and for the Federal Civil Defense Administration, we cannot enroll these Canadian volunteers unless they take the loyalty oath provided by the act, if they do take the oath, they imperil or lose their Canadian citizenship.

You will note that the act specifically permits the Federal Civil Defense Administration to enroll a limited number of British or Canadian citizens without taking the loyalty oath, but this exemption is not extended to State civil defense organizations. I urge that an amendment to the act be introduced permitting the enrollment of Canadian citizens, otherwise meeting the qualifications required from civil defense volunteers, without taking that portion of the oath which reads, "I, ———, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

If there are any aspects of the above proposals which are not entirely clear or on which you wish further information, I would be honored to hear from you.

Respectfully yours,

L. WILKINSON,
Acting Chairman.

Resolution 1

Whereas the volume of correspondence and informational material to be distributed by the States and their political subdivisions, and by the Territories and the District of Columbia, in the execution of the national civil-defense program, has become a substantial burden upon the finances of the States; and

Whereas the present mailing procedure for civil-defense materials is definitely impeding the civil defense informational and educational programs due to the time element and manpower requirements involved in stamping, weighing, counting, and otherwise complying with postal requirements; and

Whereas the success of the national civil defense program requires the fullest possible dissemination of instructions and informational material throughout the several States, Territories, and District of Columbia: Be it

Resolved, That this conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the extension of the Federal franking privilege to all States and local offices of civil defense and to the offices of civil defense in the Territories and the District of Columbia for their official correspondence and the mailing of informational material, and to further recommend that a Federal appropriation be made available to the Post Office Department to cover the additional operating expenditures which this extension of the franking privilege would entail.

Resolution 2

Whereas the recruiting of civil-defense volunteers is being hampered in many States by the reluctance of citizens to expose themselves to danger without adequate insurance protection against injury or death sustained in civil-defense training and operation; and

Whereas the burden of such insurance protection is great; and

Whereas the overcoming of the effects, both material and financial, of enemy attack and the preparation of civil-defense forces to minimize such effects is a matter of national and not merely local concern: Be it

Resolved, That this conference request the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to recommend to the Congress the enactment of suitable legislation to provide adequate insurance protection to officially enrolled civil-defense volunteers, throughout the Nation against injury or death sustained in active civil-defense training, or in operations

---

Resolution 3

Whereas the laws of the Federal Government and of the various States require the prompt establishment of an effective civil-defense organization in the individual States; and

Whereas the Federal and the State plans recognize the necessity for procuring certain essential items of organizational equipment (including communication and air raid warning equipment) as promptly as possible; and

Whereas the Federal Civil Defense Administration will recommend to the Congress that Federal appropriations be made available to defray half the cost of such items; and

Whereas it is desirable that actual procurement not be delayed until the Federal appropriations are available, and

Whereas it is felt that the States who have shown initiative and foresight in procuring such equipment prior to the availability of Federal funds for such purpose should not be penalized for their forehandedness: Be it

Resolved, That this Conference requests the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to include in his request to the Congress for appropriations a recommendation that the Congress authorize the administration to utilize any such appropriation to pay half the cost of any items approved by the Administrator which may have been purchased by the States or their political subdivisions or by the Territories and the District of Columbia on or after the enactment of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 on 12 January 1951.

Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, letters from mothers are pouring in from the district which I have the honor to represent protesting against the drafting of 18-year-old boys. The overwhelming number of letters are opposed to sending our boys to Germany. Moreover, the majority of those who write to me on the subject see in the proposed universal military training program nothing but an attempt on the part of the Army to Prussianize our country. They see in the military proposals the first step toward military domination of civilian life, and ultimately a military dictatorship.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a letter written by a mother of eight boys, of whom five are now in the Army, and three more soon to go into the service:

We can no longer boast of a free democratic country. Just think how we talked about Hitler and Stalin. What's the difference? Now when a boy is out of high school he is forced to go into the Army just the same as Hitler's and Stalin's

I have had five boys in the Army and it isn't a very pleasant thought to know that when my other three finish school they will be forced to go, even in peacetime. What has a parent to look forward to? Educate their children, then turn them over to the Government? And if the Congress and Senate think they have helped the morale of our boys they are mistaken. I know boys, not my own, who say, "What's the use—we have to go in the Army anyway" After they once leave home they never return the same any more.

They will spend all that money training 18-year-olds instead of putting it in the Air Force and building more planes, which, if they would use more of, instead of so many troops in Korea, we would be better off.

Here we've sent all those boys to Korea just to be slaughtered. We can't win there in this long time and they expect to defend Europe with less. I don't know how stupid we can be. If Russia wants to fight she could wipe those out any time, and if she doesn't want to fight, why send our troops over there?

I still think it is foolish to think our boys can defend every country that causes a disturbance That's all Russia wants anyway is to get our boys scattered all over the world She will be able to take over without her country being touched. Who is going to guard our country?

I say if Russia won't have peace, why fight in all these other countries, tear up other peoples' homes, and destroy everything, like we are doing in Korea. Why not start at the source of the trouble, in Russia, and not with our troops, either. What did we spend so much money on bombs for, and if we use them put them in the right place.

We should do everything in our power to have peace first, but this constantly talking of war and planning for war—compulsory training, sending troops to Europe, getting ready for all-out war, will never bring peace. All anyone hears is preparing for war; why not talk more of peace?

Are we going to leave our boys in Korea till they are all slaughtered? Are we going to send more over to feed the machine guns of the Communists? That could go on for years as long as we keep sending troops over. The only thing that will stop it, unless they come to a peace agreement soon, is to furnish enough airplanes and give someone power to bomb the Chinese supply line.

Compulsory training will never bring peace—it has never brought peace to the countries that have had it before us. All it is good for is to upset every home in the United States, take boys away from their homes before they are ready, and put them

with all kinds, where they learn everything they shouldn't learn

We've passed the first step against freedom.

Do we have enough planes to protect our country? We will spend all that money on training 18-year-olds—then they won't have any protection.

Pipeline Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of H. R. 88 which I have filed and which would provide for certain jurisdiction in the Federal Power Commission with reference to safety requirements for the operation of natural-gas pipelines, I wish to include a recent editorial from the Boston Herald. It is as follows:

NATURAL GAS DANGERS

Natural gas is on its way to New England, and that is good, but we should not assume that it is all unalloyed bliss. There are troubles connected with it. One is explosions and fires in the big pipelines Another is shortages during peak loads A third is failure to odorize the gas sufficiently. A fourth is politics

None of these are unavoidable dangers, but they are dangers we need to watch

Pipeline explosions are not frequent. Considering that there is a greater mileage of pipelines now than of railroads, the frequency of such accidents is small. But a series of blasts around St. Louis, including one that formed a blowtorch with flames 40 feet high, is being investigated by a grand jury The gas is carried through the lines at a pressure around 750 pounds a square inch, rather more than the pressure of two-tenths of a pound at the gas stove in the home. It can make a nice little blaze.

In Massachusetts the State department of public works is supposed to check where pipes go under State highways, and the department of public utilities under local roads. The Federal Power Commission ought to have general responsibility, and Congressman HESELTON has a bill to make it definite

Possible shortages are just one of those things. To build a pipeline from Texas to Boston to take care of the highest peak load on the busiest and coldest winter day would be uneconomic. The line would be almost empty on summer Sundays. It is possible to do two things. One is to store a supply of gas in old exhausted gas wells in central Pennsylvania, which mitigates the problem a little. The other is the use of stand-by manufactured gas facilities.

This last will be done in Boston, where some manufactured gas will be mixed at all times with the natural gas, but more during peak load periods. The danger here is not so much that the companies concerned will fail in their responsibility to maintain pressure, but that political demands in the department of public utilities or the legislature will bring unsound restrictions.

Finally the odor. Manufactured gas has a smell that gets there in manufacture. It doesn't have to be added, so there is no human fallibility involved. But natural gas is odorless, and if enough smell isn't added, a leak may go unnoticed.

The smell ought to be added before the gas goes into the pipeline at the source so, that anywhere along the way a leak may be detected. Some transmission companies do this voluntarily; it should be required.

These are not in the least arguments against natural gas. Indeed, there is no worth while advance unattended by some new dangers. The automobile is welcome despite the hazards of the highway. But it does mean that we should make certain that the dangers are minimized.

Hell of a Way To Run a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 9, 1951, speaks for itself:

HELL OF A WAY TO RUN A WAR

Never in history has an army commander fought a war under more frustrating circumstances and conditions than handicap General MacArthur in Korea

A powerful foe is throwing all it has at him—and General MacArthur can't throw all he has back It's true the Chinese Reds have little more than massive manpower, but this is particularly effective for two reasons: Allied manpower in Korea is limited. And the Chinese Reds are drawing on an inexhaustible source in an area we can't touch.

General MacArthur has overwhelming airpower, but can't use it to destroy Communist bases just across the border in Manchuria. Why? Because he is taking his orders from the United Nations

And the United Nations, so far as the Korean War is concerned, has deteriorated into little more than a debating society—which isn't even debating these days

How can effective orders or decisions come from a discussion group which is split four ways—the Russian bloc openly helping and encouraging the Chinese Communists; the nations, bellwethered by Britain, which have recognized the Peiping regime and want to do business with it, even admit it to the UN, a sizable group apparently uninterested; and a United States delegation trying to play Happy Hooligan to all sides?

No wonder General MacArthur bitterly concludes that under existing conditions the allied forces in Korea have absolutely no chance of winning the war from a military standpoint.

His hands are tied. He can't do a thing but hold on with all he has and trade punches indefinitely with the growing Chinese armies.

Never before has a military commander had a narrower field for individual judgment and decision. Every move he makes he must submit beforehand to an inert UN.

When General MacArthur confesses he is at the end of his tether, that he can do no more until vital decisions are made, what happens?

At Lake Success: United States Delegate Ernest A. Gross says it is only an analysis that General MacArthur cannot make any recommendations. Moreover, the United States delegation has had no instructions from Washington to ask the UN to let General MacArthur blast Red bases now immune. Within a few days, the United States may present some ideas for steps to be taken against Peiping, but they'll be in the nature of trade restrictions.

In Washington: With President Truman in Florida, and Secretary of State Acheson in Bermuda, Assistant Secretary Webb declines positive comment, except to say that General MacArthur's appeal is under study.

So, the big run-around goes on.

Meanwhile, American casualties have reached 52,448 We're sending in more troops, but no other members of the UN have moved to increase their token forces in Korea. Nor is anyone pressing them to do so.

It's a hell of a way to run a war.

Resolution of the Senate of the Sixty-Seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the conflict of interests between an expanded bureaucracy and the proper functions of the sovereign states is well illustrated in a situation called to the attention of the Congress in Resolution No. 24, adopted by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois. Because it is a matter of grave concern to all the States, I am including the text of the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission granted by the House.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Congress of United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public-assistance programs operated by the various States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of these programs, and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern, and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public-welfare program in many communities of the State, and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the Public Assistance Code of Illinois, which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public-assistance purposes; and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $3,340,000,000 during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public-assistance recipients and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of March 8, 1951:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

The Kefauver committee reports: "It was no secret in the State of Missouri * * * that the State government and its administration had narrowly escaped falling under the control of gangsters with criminal affiliations in the election of 1948."

This does not make pleasant reading about any State or city, but this is what that same report says about St. Louis.

"* * * in St. Louis, Morris Shenker appeared to have a substantial portion of the legal trade involving bookmakers who had fallen into the clutches of the law. It is noteworthy that Shenker appeared before the committee as counsel for William Molasky, one of the owners of Pioneer News Service, the racing wire news distributor in that city.

"He also appeared as counsel for Joe Uvanni, race-track come-back money agent for John Mooney, of St. Louis. According to testimony before the committee, Molasky contributed $2,000 to the gubernatorial campaign fund of Forrest Smith on condition that Smith would name Shenker to the police board (of control) of St. Louis if elected."

Again, the report states:

"There is considerable evidence in the minutes of the testimony concerning contributions to political campaigns by gamblers and gangsters."

So, we come to the curious election which is to take place in St. Louis next Friday. Congressman John Sullivan, Democrat, representing the Eleventh District, having died, March 9 was set for a special election.

His widow, who had been the Congressman's secretary, expected to be the candidate. She was rejected by the aforesaid Morris Shenker, who controls what is roughly called the democracy. Shenker thereupon nominated Harry Schendel, sales manager of an automobile agency, as his candidate. The Republicans nominated Claude I. Bakewell, a former Congressman.

The real issue in this contest is the power and authority of Morris Shenker, the mouthpiece. He is said to be unusually able. His own view is that he can separate his law practice from his political activities, which would be an interesting feat, if accomplishable.

In a telegram to Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, he wrote:

"I have never permitted my political activities to interfere with my practice of law, nor have I attempted to associate the two. I have never solicited or accepted a political contribution from any of my clients."

Shenker is the lawyer who raised the question of the use of television in public hearings. One of the most valid purposes of congressional hearings is that they give the people an opportunity to know of corruptions, distortions, and treasonable conduct of individuals. The newspapers, radio, and, now, television bring these hearings close to the people. In the case of James J. Carroll, who calls himself a betting commissioner, Shenker said:

"Forcing a man to give testimony before television is an invasion of his privacy. A person cannot be put in such a position that he is exposed to public ridicule. While the hearing was public, it was not contemplated that the person of the witness should be televized for everyone to see within a 75-mile radius of St. Louis."

The Kefauver report on St. Louis makes very ugly reading, particularly the tie-up between gambling, crime, and politics. And it is obvious that even in this special election for a Member of Congress the power of the gamblers and the criminal elements is an important consideration.

What goes on in St. Louis, it is true, goes on in many American cities where the Mafia has gained an unbelievable power due to the apathy of Americans who have permitted these specialists to take over the political machinery.

The real trouble is that our people are not ashamed of the degeneration of public morals. In other periods of our history, such exposures as those of the Kefauver and Fulbright committees aroused public opinion to action.

Today, we witness an appalling apathy. The word "Missouri" has become in Washington a synonym for corruption.

It is for this reason that this special election is of national importance. Will Missouri use it to protest against the libel on that State?

Destroying Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there appeared in the press a dispatch from Presque Isle, Maine, containing a report that the Federal Government has ordered the dumping of about 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes in Maine.

The report follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 11, 1951]

FIFTEEN MILLION BUSHELS OF SPUDS ORDERED DUMPED IN MAINE

PRESQUE ISLE, Maine, March 10.—The Federal Government has ordered the dumping of about 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes in Maine, the retiring executive secretary of the Maine Potato Industry Council said today.

Herbert W. Moore charged "there is no reason for dumping" the potatoes, valued at about $9,000,000.

Moore said the potatoes would make about 9,000,000 gallons of commercial alcohol, needed in the defense effort.

Moore said the Government will purchase 25,000,000 bushels of spuds in Maine this year, from a 1950 crop of about 62,000,000 bushels. Of the total Government purchase, he said, about 15,000,000 bushels will be dumped.

Lawrence Chatto, State head of the Production and Marketing Administration, said the Government has found the conversion of potatoes into commercial alcohol too expensive to be practical.

Mr. Speaker, this is most disturbing in terms of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the first 7 months of this fiscal year. The report for January 31, issued last Friday, shows that on June 30, 1950, there were no potatoes on hand, but that through January 31, the Department of Agriculture purchased 2,519,363,500 pounds for $25,683,046.94; that it paid for carrying charges $357,249.01; that it disposed of 169,370,100 pounds as donations; that it sold 2,347,450,400 pounds; that it received on sales only $1,490,295.07 and that there was a net loss of $24,548,255.28.

If these additional 15,000,000 bushels are destroyed, the loss in this fiscal year could well approximate the loss in 1950, which was $75,090,315.

Let's Have the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of March 7, 1951:

LET'S HAVE THE FACTS

The Senate committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is wrong when it refuses to press an investigation into the matter of Senators who might have been nonpaying guests at the Saxony Hotel at Miami Beach.

We understand that the Senate has some very nice rules of conduct and that it regards itself as the "most exclusive club in the world." The rules of the club prevent the members from casting reflections on each other or questioning their honesty. It's a dignified way to run a legislative body and holds the name-calling to a minimum.

But the public isn't going to be a bit satisfied with rules which permit muckraking in the executive branch of the Government and call for putting the rake away when it comes near a Senator's coattails.

If Senators did have a free ride on the easy hospitality of the Saxony Hotel, one of the many centers of the committee's searching inquiry, let's go into the matter and find out who got just how much.

We have defended the writing of letters to the RFC by Senators and Representatives. That is within the scope of their normal duties. We believe that the White House was preparing to do a little unjustified mudslinging when it called for those letters. A Member of Congress should not be smeared because he attempted to run an innocent errand for a constituent.

But, if a Congressman wrote a letter and was rewarded in any way, either through a free vacation at a hotel or any other means, then he becomes a subject for investigation.

Any influence which he uses in return for favors is "improper." And, as we have said before, the purpose of the inquiry is to reveal instances of use of improper influence.

We can't agree with Senator Fulbright that the matter is "outside the scope of the inquiry."

The committee has made quite an issue of the manner in which the RFC loan to the hotel was made. Surely any favors granted by the hotel management to anyone in either the executive or legislative branch of the Government are pertinent to the inquiry.

The Fulbright committee has done a good job. It has proceeded with a certain dignity and has shown a tendency to root out the facts and follow leads wherever they go

The work of the committee should not be discredited by a maneuver which the public might interpret as a move to cover up for Members of the Senate.

Thirty-Third Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, in Philadelphia recently, Americans of Lithuanian origin met—more than a thousand strong—at the Lithuanian Music Hall, and in an inspiring session, adopted unanimously a resolution, which it is my high privilege to call to your attention. I urge all Members to support its proposals and to make their views known to the State Department, through which Department alone action can be taken.

The resolution follows:

Know all men by these presents that the Lithuanian-American citizenry of the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, and its environs, meeting in solemn session on Sunday, February 18, 1950, at the Lithuanian Music Hall, Tilton Street and Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, on the occasion of commemoration of the thirty-third anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, solemnly and unanimously proclaim the following:

"Whereas the unlawful and predatory occupation of the land of Lithuania by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic continues with unabated terrorism, having for its obvious objective the extermination of the Lithuanian people, and

"Whereas it has been established that more than 1,000,000 citizens of Lithuania have surrendered their lives or liberty, directly as a result of Soviet brutality and efforts to provincialize the population of Lithuania; and,

"Whereas it has further been demonstrated that Lithuania's churches have been abolished and her schools appropriated solely to propagate materialism; and

"Whereas the citizens of Lithuania, in their own country, are deprived of all four freedoms, solemnly declared in the Atlantic Charter as inalienable rights of all nations, large or small: Now, therefore, it is here highly

"*Resolved*—

"First. That the United States Government through our President, Secretary of State, and the Congress, be urged to take immediate and effective steps, without further delay, to halt the Soviet program of furthering the genocide of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian peoples; and

"Second. That the United States Government through its representatives propose that the Council of the United Nations adopt a resolution placing upon the UN agenda the question of the right to sovereign status of the Baltic lands; and

"Third. That the Council of the United Nations without delay insist upon immediate measures to permit its own representatives to visit the Baltic lands and conduct an investigation involving aforesaid accusations of Soviet brutality and terrorism; and

"Fourth. That the United States Government through its Department of State officially again issue proclamation to all nations and particularly Soviet Russia that this Nation does not recognize the Soviet occupation of the Baltic countries, and that no permanent peace can be concluded without the restoration of democratic self-government within those countries; and

"Fifth. That this Nation's most illustrious men, distinguished by their noble efforts in the fight for freedom for all nations, large or small, continuously employ their abilities and influence for the purpose of preventing further extermination of people and of restoration of independence in Lithuania and of all the other lands enslaved by the Soviets; and that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State."

Poll on Foreign and Domestic Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on January 25, 1951, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of a poll on our foreign and domestic policies conducted by an outstanding Missouri newspaper, the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News.

The results of similar polls by several other newspapers over the country have now been announced. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Edward W. Sowers, publisher of the Rolla Daily News, summarizing the results of this poll of more than 10,000 Americans. I commend it to the attention of Senators who may have more than a passing interest in what the people back home are thinking.

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

TEN THOUSAND AMERICANS VOTE TO WITHDRAW FROM KOREA, TO QUIT MEDDLING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, AND TO CUT SPENDING — BALLOTS FROM CHICAGO, DETROIT, CLEVELAND, AND ROLLA SHOW UNITED STATES THOUGHT

(By Edward W. Sowers)

Over 10,000 thinking Americans have voted for drastic changes in United States policies, including withdrawal from Korea, less meddling in foreign countries, and drastic cuts in Government spending.

The trend of opinion on those and other issues has been brought before Congress by a public-opinion survey by the Rolla Daily News on January 12 and copied by metropolitan newspapers in Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, and other smaller cities.

Tabulation of ballots, printed in the several newspapers and voted by an estimated 10,150 citizens, gives strong majorities for early withdrawal from Korea, against drafting of 18-year-olds, against sending troops to Europe, against continued aid to foreign countries, for drastic cuts in nondefense spending, against use of the A-bomb now, but for retention of it as a weapon of war.

The survey disclosed an even stronger trend toward so-called isolationism in the big cities than in smaller rural centers like Rolla, where conservatism was once supposed to predominate. Instead of isolationism, we would prefer to call it Americanism, as it is nothing more than a policy of America first.

A nearly complete count of ballots received by this newspaper and the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, and the Cleveland (Ohio) Daily News gives the following results:

Should we withdraw from Korea as quickly as possible? Yes, 6,321; no, 2,902.

Should we stay until we can give Korea a government chosen by its people? Yes, 2,726; no, 5,614.

Should we drop the A-bomb now and take chances on reprisal? Yes, 1,831; no, 6,754.

Should we reject the A-bomb as a weapon of war? Yes, 2,168; no, 6,476.

Should we continue to send substantial aid to foreign countries? Yes, 3,831; no, 5,078.

Should we draft 18-year-olds? Yes, 3,791; no, 5,381.

Should we send American troops to Europe? Yes, 3,007; no, 6,003.

Should we expect foreign nations to supply the bulk of UN armies? Yes, 7,654; no, 1,262

Should we simply defend outlying bases with air and sea power and keep our armies at home? Yes, 5,961; no, 3,090.

Should nondefense spending be cut drastically? Yes, 7,565; no, 1,611.

Should we have stiff price and wage controls? Yes, 7,073; no, 2,029

Many of the ballots received by the newspapers were accompanied by caustic comments, critical of present United States policies. They consistently condemn United States meddling in foreign countries, particularly foreign wars.

It has been our outspoken opinion for some time that this is the way the majority of Americans feel. Now, with so many other Americans joining us in this way of thinking, and saying so on the thousands of ballots in widely separated sections of the Nation, it would seem to further justify such a policy of Americanism rather than foreignphobia.

Continuing Losses in Government's Purchases of Food Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture's report on its food purchase and sale program for January was published last Friday.

This 37-day delay in making the report is undoubtedly one of the prime reasons

for the fact that this program is beyond salvage.

In January alone this Department ran up its losses by $28,719,240.92 on butter, dried milk, cheese, and dried eggs. The total losses on these four commodities for 7 months ending January 31, including the cost of storage, was $112,670,971.37. This is dismal news for the overburdened taxpayer now sacrificing to pay to the Federal Government hard-earned or saved money so that it can continue such extravagant and useless activities. It is equally bad news for everyone who has been trying to find enough money to buy these or other foods.

But that is not the end. On January 31 the Department had on hand 419,326,976 pounds of those four commodities. The losses incurred were in the disposition of 375,005,811 pounds. Consequently we can expect at least an additional loss of $115,000,000. And there is no indication that the Department has any intention of stopping this indefensible program of buying, hoarding, and then selling at further losses.

This offers part of the reasons why the entire program of purchasing food commodities which cannot be stored indefinitely should be reexamined immediately. The Department should not be permitted to continue it unless clear and convincing reasons can be given for such continuation. Its operations at a time like this may well bring about an aroused demand for the elimination of the entire program.

Immorality in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 6, 1951:

IMMORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

Senator FULBRIGHT took a look at the stench uncorked by his committee's RFC investigation and suggested it indicates a need for a general investigation of the moral level of our Government. The only thing wrong with that remark is it is too far behind public sentiment. For months the sidewalk citizens of this country have stood aghast at the evidence of nonchalant immorality in the highest places, and the devastating effect it is having on the Nation's whole code of political ethics.

Claude I. Bakewell, Republican candidate for Congress from the Eleventh District in the election to be held next Friday, is making Government and party morality the dominant issue in his campaign. "The chief enemy of America," he says, "is not the Russians, the North Koreans, nor the Chinese Reds. It is not inflation, although that is bad enough. It is something much more deadly—cynicism."

And this cynicism has its origin in the miasma of corruption in high places, among those to whom the public should look for honest leadership at Federal, State, and local levels. But coupled with cynicism is an appalling apathy among decent American voters which has permitted the control of Government to slip by default into the hands of gangsters, hoodlums, and corruptionists.

Mr. Bakewell's plea is for the voters to be not only aghast at what is happening in America but to do something about it—elect men to office who will be no part of the plunder bund and employ courage and intelligence and native honesty to the effort of cleaning the Augean stables.

Let us look at the recent record:

The multi-billion-dollar RFC all but convicted of requiring only that loan applications be made through the right people, who in turn collected handsome fees and saw to it that persons close to the White House received suitable gratuities.

The Fulbright committee's corrective efforts ridiculed as asinine by President Truman, a reckless brush-off of evil in government only slightly less inept than his branding of the Communist investigation as a "red herring."

Gen. Harry Vaughan, long-time, loose-tongue crony of the President, associated with gifts of deep-freeze units made to win government favor—and with never a rebuke from the White House, much less a dismissal.

Another Truman pal, John Maragon, using White House friendship for personal profit. Maragon is unique among favor-peddlers in that he was convicted. But only of perjury, a technical appeal from which now has a Washington court of appeals tied in knots.

The Kefauver crime inquiry, which has begun to reveal government at local levels rotten with the bribery and corruption of organized gambling.

The Tydings campaign investigation in Maryland, and its evidence of politics at an unbelievable level of degradation. And in Mississippi, where Federal jobs were frankly and openly sold to the highest bidder. Would this have happened had Washington not offered the cue in ethics? And earlier, the Taft election battle in Ohio, where anti-Taft campaign tactics reached an all-time high in viciousness.

Along a slightly different line, we have Price Controller DiSalle demonstrating the reckless attitude of officialdom in spending $17,000 of the people's money to telegraph lengthy instructions to local price chiefs instead of writing them at a fraction of the cost.

And what are the effects?

In New York a group of miscreant teenagers listened to a lecture from the judge on respect for the law, then inquired casually why they should have respect for Government when their seniors, among them Government's own officials, show scant respect for it. Surely such stunning truth from the generation next to have charge of this Nation's future should wake us up.

And to go on up the age scale: College youths succumbing to the lure of easy money through fixed basketball games; a rash of income-tax evasions by upper-bracket persons—all demonstrating that too many people feel themselves above the law. How can our democracy hope to survive amid this ruinous psychology of "anything goes that you can get by with?" How can it be stopped?

Senator FULBRIGHT'S suggestion implied a morals investigation by congressional committee. But is the hour too late for that?

One cannot forget that President Truman's neat trick of getting copies of all Congressmen's letters to RFC produced an instant committee disinterest in pursuing the RFC inquiry much farther. It is to end this week. So there follows an inevitable suspicion that congressional hands as a whole are so soiled their owners prefer a charge of whitewash to an appearance in the court of public opinion Certainly Congressmen have a duty to introduce constituents around Washington. If their introduction letters were no more than that, why are they so apprehensive of embarrassment?

So arises the dismaying question: Has Government immorality now gone so far—become so all-inclusive—that it cannot now be trusted to find the truth and remedy it?

It seems to us nothing will suffice now but an outraged revolt by the people themselves; a revolt which will force upon Government, despite all political resistance and organized entrenchment, a tidal wave of simple, old-fashioned religion.

Morals in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of March 7, 1951.

MORALS IN GOVERNMENT

Scarcely had the country had time to consider the comments of one Senate committee on how menacingly powerful has organized crime become in the United States before another Senate committee suggested the need for a congressional investigation of "the general moral level" of the Federal Government's executive branch.

In the first instance the Kefauver crime commission was reporting that its investigation showed the existence of a crime syndicate so powerful and so widespread in its operations that it could easily be switched into an underground movement capable of taking over the Government itself In the second instance Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of a committee that has been investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, points to "a double standard of morality for public office and private life." His committee has been looking into the use of influence, pressure, and favoritism in obtaining loans from the banking agency.

Both investigations and their resulting reports deal with the morals of Government. A crime syndicate of the proportions described by the Kefauver committee cannot exist without the knowledge, and even consent, of officials at various levels of government. And the committee has heard convincing evidence of official knowledge and noninterference. As for the Fulbright committee's investigation of the RFC, it is a sordid account of official pressure, influence, and favoritism exerted to get big loans of public funds for business ventures of dubious worth, some so shaky that the enterprises failed despite the millions poured into them.

Nothing actually forbidden by law and therefore punishable by the courts has been produced by the FULBRIGHT investigation. Nothing has been shown to have been illegal about RFC loan policies. But things may be legal and still be wrong and improper. That's a distinction not to be ignored. For as Senator FULBRIGHT points out, "Too many people seem to think that just because an action by a Government official is legal, it is therefore right."

Neither the Kefauver nor the Fulbright committees' finding can be said to be biased or prejudiced by partisan political considerations. The chairmanships and the majority of committee posts are held by Senators belonging to the same political party as that of the administration. But political

parties have little to do with American Government these days, for our Government for the last 18 years has been one of personalities rather than parties

Upon his election in 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt began working for his reelection 4 years in the future. But he did not do it by trying to bring together dissident factions within the Democratic party which had nominated him in Chicago. He began building his own party. He appealed to various income groups with promises of what his administration would do for them. He depended upon the gratefulness of those groups and the influence of powerful political machines in the biggest cities to perpetuate himself in power. And these machines were gangster-ridden.

Harry S Truman depended even more than did Roosevelt upon promises of special favors and a record of performance of favors to win in 1948. To labor leaders he promised repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and to farm groups he declared they should vote for him out of a sense of gratefulness for the benefits they got from price-support laws and other farm legislation. And even more than his predecessor at the White House, he relied upon the machines in the big cities to deliver the vote. Meanwhile he ran a government by crony, passing out fat appointments to close friends and acquaintances, preferably to men from his home State of Missouri.

It is small wonder that moral standards in government have fallen to a new low Small wonder that the "Washington fix" has become commonplace, that influence and favorable treatment from officialdom is peddled for money or for votes

Morals in government will be exactly of the standard that the people insist that they be Higher standards can be had when the public decides that politics is something from which it dares not stand aloof, when it realizes that politics is something in which it must take an active and continuous part Far too many of our people these days have a patronizing attitude toward politics and holding public office. They "don't care to mix politics" They will have to "mix in politics" if ever there is reform

Post Office Department Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the deficiency in the Post Office Department of over $500,000,000 is the subject again before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Postmaster General reports that $160,000,000 of this deficit is due to penalty and frank mail, that is Department and Congressional mail. That amount cannot be charged as a part of the Post Office expense and is not carried that way on the books, but this amount does show up in the general deficiency. There is no good reason why the cash users of mail should have to pay more postage in order to allow this penalty and frank mail to be handled. The Government should make a direct appropriation for this the same as any other department expense.

We therefore deduct this $160,000,000 from the deficit and that leaves $340,000,000, the amount that the expenditures of the Post Office exceeds the income.

There is another item that should be determined by Congress and that is how much annually should the Post Office Department be subsidized for the educational value of the service to the people. Various amounts have been suggested, but I think $100,000,000 annually could be well spent in this country in order to disseminate information. The newspapers do a lot of printing for which they derive no revenue. For example, newspapers carry, or most of them do, news from Washington, telling all about what is going on here in Congress. That informs the people—not only those who take a newspaper but everyone who reads them. That is a definite service which all the people—the taxpayers—receive and I do not believe any taxpayer would object to allowing newspapers some reasonable low rates to compensate them for free printing.

Now, deducting this $100,000,000 from the $340,000,000 would leave $240,000,000 that will have to be made up with increased postage. When the Government sells postal cards for 1 cent each, it loses a quarter of a cent on each card. This is not justified and the people will not object to paying more for this postal-card privilege. It is found that 90 percent of postal cards are for advertising purposes and advertising cannot be obtained anywhere for less than cost, except the Government.

Magazines that carry 50 percent advertising or more are receiving a ridiculously low rate for the distribution of their advertising. No such advertising can be obtained from any place else, and where the advertising is presumed or intended to increase sales and make profits, the users ought to be willing to pay a higher rate. This second-class mail shows an annual loss of $200,000,000.

The correction of these two items alone, postal cards and advertising would balance the loss in the Post Office Department, without interfering with present rates on nonprofit mail such as the distribution of religious, educational, and paternal literature. Newspapers—the small newspapers—would not be materially affected and the larger dailies, with page after page of advertising, should be willing to pay more for that part of their publications carrying advertising.

Fourth-class mail, or parcel post, is another item of heavy annual loss. We have been running the parcel-post system with an annual loss of $105,000,000. The law providing the set-up for parcel post said specifically that this department must pay its own way. The Congress will not have to act on this matter, however, as under the law the Postmaster General can apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to raise the rates. This the Postmaster General has done and the case is now pending.

It looks now as though the great deficit in the Post Office Department can be wiped out, at least down to the $100,000,000 which Congress can earmark as an educational or subsidy fund for the dissemination of information, which the people will never have access to unless this subsidy is provided. There never was a time in the history of this country when the people needed more information than they do now. Newspapers and magazines, which now carry important information for which they are not directly paid, should have some encouragement to continue by participating in a favorable postage rate.

In order to keep this deficit down and obey the commands of Congress, the Postmaster General has reduced the service. This was a mistake, as there is no reason why the people cannot have good service. The fault, though, in curtailing this service, was the responsibility of Congress and not the fault of the Postmaster General. The service can be reestablished, salaries to postal workers can be raised so that they may exist under a decent standard of living, and still the deficit can be kept down to $100,000,000—the subsidy fund—if postal cards, second-class mail, and parcel-post rates are increased.

This parcel-post venture has had a disastrous effect on the express companies. They cannot carry material at a rate to meet the rates of parcel post—the Government cannot do it either, as now they are running behind $105,000,000 annually. These present Government rates have injured the express business to the extent that 40,000 express employees were laid off last year. Not only is the Government losing on this venture, but, at the same time, it is taking jobs away from men and women in private industry, and if kept up will finally put every express company out of business.

The users of parcel post are willing to pay higher rates, and when the rates of parcel post and express are in proximation the business will go back to the express companies, at least there will be no great money incentive to send parcels by parcel post, because it is so much cheaper than express rates.

Dr. Jay McLean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent newspaper article from the Savannah Press paying tribute to a Georgian who has achieved a high degree of success in the field of medicine. I join with Americans everywhere in paying tribute to Dr. Jay McLean, who has contributed so much toward saving lives of our fighting forces in the armed services.

The article follows:

SAVANNAH DOCTOR HELPS SAVE LIMBS OF FIGHTING MEN—HEPARIN, DISCOVERED BY DR. MCLEAN, BEING USED IN KOREA

Heparin, an anticoagulant currently credited with saving the frostbitten limbs of hundreds of Americans fighting in Korea,

was discovered by a Savannahian, Dr. Jay McLean.

Dr. McLean, who has for the past couple of years been connected with the Savannah Tumor Clinic, discovered heparin in 1916 while doing research work at Johns Hopkins.

The current issue of Life magazine carries a feature article headed "New treatments for frostbite—they save limbs of Korean casualties," in which it describes treatments given fighting men in Korea suffering from frostbite. The article explains that these injured men, unless otherwise wounded, are given shots of heparin to prevent the clotting of blood in the injured parts.

An article appearing in the Evening Press of January 11, 1950, told of Mr McLean being included in the eighth edition of American Men of Science, which had just been published at that time, and stated that "Dr. McLean is known internationally for his discovery of heparin, the substance of the body which keeps the blood from clotting."

Dr. McLean holds a decree of bachelor of science from the University of California, a master of science degree from the University of Pennsylvania, and received his doctor of medicine degree from Johns Hopkins where he served as assistant resident surgeon for a number of years prior to 1923 when he was awarded a National Research Council fellowship and went to Europe for postgraduate studies at the universities at Berlin, Leipzig, Heidelberg, and Paris.

Why I Want To Grow Up in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HOWELL. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call to the attention of all Members of Congress the remarks of a 15-year-old constituent of mine who has recently won a $2,500 scholarship for his statement Why I Want To Grow Up in America. The boy's name is Richard Henderson, of Mount Holly, N. J. When Dick Henderson heard of the national letter writing contest sponsored by an anonymous Californian, he sat down and wrote the following letter in a few minutes. This letter, the one to be judged the winner of 9,582 letters, is being broadcast by the Voice of America to all the peoples of the world. It speaks for itself:

WHY I WANT TO GROW UP IN AMERICA

(By Richard Henderson, Mount Holly, N. J.)

DEAR FRIENDS ACROSS THE SEA: From the heart of a small town of friendly people, I want to tell you why I love America and why I want to grow up here.

In our school we have almost every nationality, color and creed and we get along together, too. My best pal is an Italian boy. When a new student comes to our school from another land, we try to make him feel at home, simply because we like him.

If you should move next door tomorrow, I'll wager the neighbors would soon let you know that they would be hurt if you needed anything and didn't ask for it. The majority of Americans are like that and don't let anyone tell you different.

The great heart that is America is not rotten as dictators would have you believe, but it is good, strong and steeped in the idea that all men deserve their individual freedom.

We have fought to preserve it for ourselves and for the world and the biggest tribute to that fight are the peoples of the world, who come to our shores and remain to love and cherish our way of life.

Some day I pray that we may walk in any country in the world, as all may walk in ours now, not to kill or enforce our government or our laws upon you, but simply to say, "I come here as your friend."

God bless you all.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of RECORD the first of a series of 22 articles which have been written by Mr. Selig Greenberg and which appeared in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, a newspaper published in the city of Providence, State of Rhode Island, entitled "Medicine in Crisis." These articles present a very impartial and objective discussion of the conditions faced by our medical schools and the medical profession in general.

I feel that the Members of the Senate would be very much interested in reading these articles in connection with their consideration of S. 337, which is a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

I am asking that the articles be inserted in a piecemeal fashion because the entire series has not yet been published and will be made available some time after April 1, which might well be after S. 337 has been acted upon. However, I feel that the articles which have appeared thus far will be most helpful and assure the Senate that from time to time I shall request to have the remaining articles inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—MEDICAL EDUCATION FACING PROFOUND FINANCIAL CRISIS—AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ALSO HAVE SERIOUS INTERNAL PROBLEM OVER SCOPE OF TEACHING; OFTEN AT ODDS WITH ORGANIZED LEADERSHIP IN PROFESSION

(By Selig Greenberg)

American medical education—the keystone of what has long been represented as the finest system of health care in the world—is confronted with a profound crisis.

The crisis is twofold.

First of all, the Nation's medical schools are faced with the most critical financial emergency in their history.

Secondly, the institutions training the doctors of tomorrow are going through a serious internal crisis. In this crisis of function, of determining what they should teach to keep up with the constantly expanding frontiers of medical knowledge and of how they can teach it most effectively, they frequently find themselves at loggerheads with the conservative leadership of the organized medical profession.

Both aspects of the crisis are of far more than academic significance. Indeed, they affect vitally all of us.

Our medical schools are by all odds our most important asset in the health field. They are the tools with which this country has wrested world leadership in medicine from the great European universities. Many of the spectacular advances in medical science, which to an unparalleled degree have warded off death and made life longer, easier, and safer, have been achieved in their laboratories and teaching hospitals.

Because of the high quality of their training in the diagnosis and treatment of disease, you feel secure when you call a doctor for a sick member of your family. It is futile even to talk about various proposals for improving the distribution of medical care in the United States unless there is assurance that our medical colleges can continue turning out competent physicians and can train them in adequate numbers.

There is no such full assurance today.

The desperate financial plight of the medical schools, the reason for which will be discussed in subsequent articles of this series, holds the direct sort of threat to both the quality and quantity of medical education.

MIGHT LOSE MOMENTUM

Many of the schools already have been forced to curtail their activities or to defer essential expansion of the scope of their teaching, thereby impairing its quality. Unless some way can be found to ease their financial difficulties, all of them will have to lower their standards or reduce the number of students they can train. Some may have to do both.

Such a development would be tragic. For we might actually lose the momentum of medical progress The kind of medicine we get depends fundamentally on the kind of medical education we have. The quality of medical care and research we can expect in the years to come will be determined primarily by the adequacy of our facilities for the training of good doctors.

Dr. Alan Gregg, director of the medical sciences division of the Rockefeller Foundation for the past 20 years and one of America's most distinguished authorities on medical education, recently summed up the situation succinctly when he said that support of medical schools of the highest quality was "the only way in which older people can look after their children after they are gone."

SCHOOLS BEING "STARVED"

"If we let medical education in this country slip," Dr. Gregg warned, "then it is our children and our grandchildren who will be paying for the inadequate training of men to use medicine as best it can be used."

Dr. George Packer Berry, dean of Harvard Medical School, feels just as strongly that the maintenance of top-grade medical education is our paramount task in the health field. In one of two interviews I had with him he pointed out that while millions of dollars were being spent for research into the causes of specific disease, the medical schools were being "starved for bread-and-butter money." This, he thinks, puts the emphasis in the wrong place.

"We must focus our attention," Dr. Berry said, "on the goose that lays the golden eggs—the training of people who can furnish the medical care we are now capable of giving and who can do the research to improve that care still further. Or to put it in another way, we must never forget that the

main stem of medicine is the production of doctors of the highest quality. There isn't much sense in concentrating on the branches while neglecting the main trunk."

WILL WIDEN EXISTING GAP

The threat of cutbacks in medical education comes at a time of expanding demands for medical service and of an anticipated sharp rise in such demand because of the national emergency and the threat of a new world war. Men in uniform require a great deal more medical personnel than civilians do. Even without all-out war, the armed services are certain to dip deeply into our reservoir of medical manpower within the next few years. This will widen still further the gap which many authorities believe already exists between the available number of physicians and our needs for health care.

The progress in medical science during the past 50 years has been described as greater than the advance made in the 2,400 years between the time of Hippocrates and the dawn of the twentieth century. But along with the triumphs of medical knowledge have come growing complexities. These have made medical education the longest, most arduous, and most expensive form of training we have. They also have set in motion forces which are gradually revolutionizing the day-to-day practice of medicine.

Medical education has set the pace for the far-reaching changes in medical practice and has at the same time had to adapt itself to these changes as they came along. This has not only led to a steady increase in the cost of training doctors but has embroiled the medical schools in the crisis of function with which they are now struggling.

SEEDS OF INTERNAL CRISIS

It is relatively easy to put your finger on the aspect of the emergency involving the dollars and cents of mounting operating deficits. But though it is much less tangible and most laymen have never even heard of it, the second aspect is just as compelling. While not quite so immediately threatening as the money troubles, the friction with powerful segments of organized medicine caused by the reappraisal of medical school functions holds serious possibilities.

The internal crisis stems, briefly, from the growing conviction of many medical educators that—

1. The job of the medical colleges extends beyond the education of new physicians, the advancement of knowledge through research and the care of patients in teaching hospitals and clinics. It is also their function to furnish continuing education to established doctors to help them keep abreast of rapidly developing new knowledge and methods.

2. The medical schools have to provide a constantly widening range of community medical services through the hospitals and clinics which they use for teaching. They have to do this if they are to give the kind of training which will be both adequate scientifically and in touch with the environment where the medicine they teach will eventually be practiced.

3. Medicine cannot be taught in a vacuum. It is a social as well as biological science, and its teaching cannot be divorced from the problem of the economics of medical care. It cannot be disassociated from the challenging issue of how the benefits of modern medicine can be made available to all, regardless of economic circumstances; of how we can bridge the chasm between the knowledge of the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of disease and its application to the needs of individuals and the community, between what medicine can do and what it actually does for a large proportion of the population. It is the duty of the medical colleges to instill within their students a wider awareness of the social and economic factors in the practice of medicine. It is furthermore, part of their responsibility to join with others in providing the leadership for a frontal attack on the still unsolved problems of the most effective organization and distribution of medical care.

This conception of the responsibilities of medical schools has brought them into conflict with the American Medical Association and some of its component societies. In trying to serve as a stimulus and corrective for the medical profession, the schools have also become an irritant.

CLEAVAGE HAS DEVELOPED

While there is some reluctance on both sides to discuss the matter, there is little doubt that a cleavage has developed between the leadership of the organized medical profession and many of the men who are training the new generation of doctors. This split obviously has far-reaching implications, which will be gone into in later articles.

All that need be said here is that it is a disagreement on both theory and practice. The theory pertains to the role and responsibility of the medical profession in providing the American people with more adequate medical care. The practical questions have to do with the degree to which medical training—which to a striking extent is learning by doing and thus frequently constitutes actual medical service—tends to touch the economic interests of private practitioners.

The medical colleges are now going through a significant and extremely interesting process of intellectual turmoil and reassessment. This reporter ran quickly into this undercurrent of soul searching and inner ferment.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS SOUGHT

I started out about 3 months ago looking for answers to what appeared to be these relatively uncomplicated questions:

a. Are there enough doctors in the United States?

b. If there is a shortage, what are some of the reasons for it?

c. Just how serious is the financial problem of the medical schools and what are some of the possible remedies for it?

d. What are the medical colleges doing or considering by way of curricular changes to turn out doctors who are not only competent but also have a better understanding of the social and economic scene in which their patients live and which directly affects the patients' physical and mental health?

But I no sooner started to ask these questions than I found that they were closely intertwined with the broader problems of the future of medical practice and medical care in this country.

ADEQUATE FOR WHAT?

When I asked, for instance, whether we had an adequate supply of doctors, men on the faculties of some of our best medical schools came back with these questions:

Adequate for what? Why don't you define, first of all, what you want the physicians to do and how they are going to do it? Are you talking about a set-up under which, as is now largely the case, the amount of medical care given is substantially determined by ability to pay for it? Or do you have in mind some broader system we may be able to devise under either voluntary or Government auspices which would make it possible to meet to a greater extent the needs for medical services? And what sort of practice are you talking about—the present system of individual practice or wider adoption of group practice which would permit doctors to pool their skills, equipment, and auxiliary personnel much more effectively than they do now?

I found the same thread of the over-all issues of medical care and practice running through the other questions I set out to ask.

We will inevitably encounter these issues throughout this series, which will include a discussion of such questions as the adequacy of our present number of doctors and medical training facilities; the factors which have limited medical-school expansion; the terrific competition for admission to medical schools; the financial crisis of medical education and the controversy over the proposal to help solve it through Federal subsidies; the extent and meaning of the cleavage between the medical faculties and some of the private practitioners; the role of medical education in the friction between doctors and hospitals; the problem of specialization versus general practice; the light shed by the income of physicians on the operation of the law of supply and demand in the medical profession; the pressure exerted by medical educators to streamline medical practice and thereby help reduce the spiraling costs of medical care, and some of the new ideas on the scope and methods of medical teaching which are hailed by authorities as a turning point in medicine.

MOST QUITE CONTROVERSIAL

All of these questions, as you can readily see, are important and complicated. Most of them are quite controversial. They can easily trap the unwary layman into unjustified assumptions and conclusions.

For this reason great care was taken to consult some of the leading authorities in the fields of medical education, care, and economics in the United States. As you can see from the list of those interviewed, which is published in an adjoining column, various views were represented among the men with whom I talked in New York, Chicago, Washington, Boston, and New Haven.

Because of space limitations and the technical nature of the material, some of the documentation will have to be omitted. Nor will it be possible to quote directly some of the men interviewed who would consent to talk freely only on an anonymous basis. But throughout this series every effort will be made to discuss the issues carefully and with full realization that they are not only technically complex but have an immediate bearing upon the health and welfare of the Nation as part of what Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, has described as America's most essential industry.

Friends of United States of Latin America—FUSLA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1951

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to call to the attention of the Congress a most important project which a group of private citizens has undertaken to carry out in Latin America. For a little more than 3 years a small organization composed of public-spirited citizens of the United States and of several Latin-American nations has been quietly building the basis for an improvement program in Central America which may have the most profound effect in developing inter-American friendship. The organization to which I refer is known as the Friends of the United States of Latin America. It is headed by Stanley I. Posner, prominent Washington attorney and senior partner in the firm of Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent. Mr. Posner has voluntarily taken time away from his professional

life, in order to devote a substantial part of his efforts to launching this public-spirited undertaking which is already showing by tangible results what can be done to promote the sound economic and political development of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Though sometimes we should like to forget it, we of the United States have a lot to live down in our relations with the governments and peoples south of the border. A lot must be done to erase past impressions which still remain from older policies pursued by this Government some 50 or 60 years ago. We sometimes forget, for example, that it was not until January 1933 that the last American Marine was pulled out of Nicaragua. The United States formerly was opposed to any efforts by the Central American and other Latin-American countries to unite politically or economically on any common purposes which might tend to permit the growth of a strong nation or group of nations to the south of us For years the idea of pan-Americanism was a stepchild. For a time there was fear in business circles that any strong union of Latin-American countries might lead to repudiation of debts. During a long period our pan-American policy, if it could be called that, was in the hands not of our Government but of some five or six private business corporations. It was a privately managed policy, alleviating a little distress here, winning the support of a few important men there, as business conditions dictated. Then, after the construction of the Panama Canal, it was feared that any regrouping which strengthened these nations might constitute a threat to the Canal. In net effect the whole policy was one of "divide and rule" rather than one of encouraging the growth of a united Latin-American neighborhood on a solid foundation. All of these things which we would like to forget are still matters vivid in the memories of our neighbors to the south.

Today none of these impressions is an accurate reflection of the true official policies of the United States Government. If any of the reasons for our former policy of restriction and frustration were ever valid—and this is a matter on which there could be some dispute—certainly they do not apply today. Among all our present worries it is not from a strong and unified nation or group of nations in Latin America that the United States needs to fear trouble. In any of the tropical and semi-tropical areas near the Panama Canal, far greater trouble would come from a low level of nutrition or from disease, unrest, dissatisfaction, and the general unhappiness which a low standard of living brings, than from any amount of political union and economic development. A sound, healthy economy supported by a happy, healthy, and industrious people would be no threat to any one.

Mr. Speaker, I want to describe what this organization, the Friends of the United States of Latin America, has been doing to further the sound economic and political development of the important region comprising the five traditional Central American republics and the Republic of Panama. It is a fascinating and inspiring story of private initiative devoted to a good cause and on a non-profit basis. In this case a private organization is doing something which it is doubtful that government alone could do. By person-to-person contact with citizens and civic organizations in Central America, it has been quietly cutting through many of the barriers of skepticism which the unfortunate policies of earlier years had planted in the minds of our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the hopes of these neighboring peoples have been maturing for a long time. Over a hundred and thirty years ago the Latin American countries achieved their independence from Spain and began their tortuous struggle for economic independence to match their newly won political freedom. The great liberator, Simon Bolivar, always dreamed that one day the countries of Latin America would be united into a federation which could become a United States of Latin America. The dream was never realized in Bolivar's lifetime, nor has it been at any other time up to the present.

It is true that in 1821 the five states of Central America—Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, which together had constituted the vice royalty of Guatemala under Spanish rule—formed themselves into a Federated Republic of Central America. However, they could not even agree on a constitution until 1825, and the union stumbled on unhappily for some 15 years until it finally was dissolved in 1840. From 1840 until we built the Panama Canal, sporadic attempts were made to recreate the Federated Republic of Central America. At least a dozen times the matter was taken up, each time with no result.

The immediate cause for failure was always some residue of interstate jealousy left over from the Spanish period. But fundamentally behind all the failures was the shadow of the Central American jungle and the difficulty of maintaining an interconnected working economy among all the participating countries. To this day it has been practically impossible to maintain any kind of all-weather road system connecting the principal cities of these Central American republics. Swamps and mountains, and jungles which grow almost overnight, have always been more than a match for people armed only with hand implements. Without roads to get products to market, the agriculture of the territory has been limited largely to bananas and coffee. Without modern equipment and the knowledge of how to use it, this area—peopled though it is by human beings of marvelous culture and great potentialities—has seemed destined to be nothing but a balkanized area of banana republics, living in a constant state of threatened revolution.

Mr. Speaker, here is something to challenge the imagination of anyone who will take the time to think of the changes that some unselfish, friendly help might make in this troubled area which borders on our Caribbean lifeline.

The idea of fostering political unification of the Central American republics by making possible, first, the growth of their economic interdependence, had its beginning in 1947 when Stanley I. Posner represented the District of Columbia Bar Association in the Annual Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in Lima, Peru. At that time a wave of revolutions had been sweeping through Latin America. There had been nine since July 1946. It would have been hard to avoid contrasting the realities of Latin American politics at that time with the history, at least in Central America, of constant though unsuccessful efforts to reunite the areas which at one time had been a federation in fact. It was at this conference in December 1947 that Dr. Humberto Ugolotti Dansay, an outstanding expert in Latin-American affairs, proposed that the Inter-American Bar Association throw its support behind a program which could lead to a political union of South and Central America. He pointed out that the constitutions of El Salvador and Guatemala, among others, already contained provisions looking forward to membership in a Latin-American confederation, and that many people throughout Latin America could be counted upon to help crystallize the idea.

Though Dr. Ugolotti's sweeping proposal was not immediately adopted by the Inter-American Bar Association, it was enough to lead Mr. Posner to incorporate the Friends of the United States of Latin America with the purpose of encouraging efforts toward political and economic union in Latin America. The Friends of the United States of Latin America, also known as FUSLA, was formed on May 26, 1948, as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the District of Columbia. The purposes of the organization as set out in the charter are:

First. To promote and encourage the study of the economic and other advantages of the political union of all the Latin-American Republics, or any two of them.

Second. To provide scholarships to graduate or advanced students of any country in the Western Hemisphere for research or graduate study connected with a proposed political union of any of the Latin-American Republics.

Third. To undertake research activities and issue publications related to a proposed political union of any of the Latin-American Republics.

Fourth. To sponsor the interchange of cultural, economic, and social information concerning proposed political union of Latin-American Republics—provided, of course, that all the activities of the association must be of a character permitted by the laws of the United States and of the Latin-American Republics concerned.

At the time FUSLA was incorporated, in 1948, a strong sentiment for federation already existed among groups of citizens in the five Central-American Republics and the Republic of Panama. What these Central Americans needed was coordination, the asssurance of friendly understanding from their neighbors up here in the United States, and some immediate help in the form

of technical education. They also needed some prospect of future help in procuring materials and equipment for public works like road building and sanitation.

As a step toward its over-all objective, the FUSLA organization decided to concentrate its first efforts into helping nonpartisan citizens' groups in the six countries just mentioned. The officers and advisory board of the FUSLA group have four reasons for believing that they might succeed where others during the past century have failed. They have a definitive program, they have an organization, they have the enthusiasm of a great moral crusade; and last, but not least, they have the knowledge that the economic means are now at hand—provided they can be mobilized—to overcome the obstacles which have proven insuperable in earlier times.

Not only are the economic means within the realm of possibility, but considerable spadework has already been done on particular economic problems in various localities of Latin America. When the FUSLA organization was formed there were already some 82 private international organizations and associations devoted to the promotion of inter-American cooperation. Also there were a number of Latin American schools and other institutions working toward economic improvement of specific areas. For example, there are agricultural experiment stations in all six Central American countries. At Turrialba in Costa Rica is the Inter-American Institute of Agriculture, which is backed by the Organization of American States, where great strides are being made in conquering tropical plant diseases. All of these private efforts have added to the totality of knowledge and experience which now make the time ripe for a unifying idea. This unifying idea is being supplied by the Friends of the United States of Latin America, which has frankly dedicated its first efforts to the proposition that there should be a political union of all the Central American Republics, based on a sound economic and social development of a region which can function as an economic unit once the physical limitation of jungles and swamps can be mastered.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that our Government has officially adopted a long-range policy which is friendly toward the technical and economic progress of other lands. In the now famous fourth point of his inaugural address in 1949 President Truman called for the adoption of a bold new program of technical assistance for the underdeveloped areas of the world. The Congress started this idea on its way toward practical realization in the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950. But Government can only go so far and so fast. Latin-American nations are already showing signs of impatience over the time it is taking to complete officially sponsored plans for a program of economic development. There is, furthermore, the danger that in the shuffle of our own rearmament program we may again let out official devotion to the "good neighbor" idea slide downhill as we did a few years ago, at the end of World War II.

The Friends of the United States of Latin America is still ahead of us in pointing the way to the kind of political stability which economic progress makes possible. This effort has already started producing concrete results without waiting for someone to draw a blueprint of the entire operation by which economic and political union of the states of Central America can be achieved.

At first an arrangement was begun for the exchange of university students at the graduate level between universities in the United States and Central America. It was hoped that the idea might take hold over the years on a large enough scale to provide a reserve of knowledge and understanding cutting across national boundaries. Meanwhile another plan was started, looking toward the vocational training of mechanics and craftsmen to maintain and repair mechanical equipment.

The most recent evidence of the work of the FUSLA organization is a project now being carried out in Nashville, Tennessee, by a group of educators and civic leaders who have found themselves drawn into an experiment in international cooperation by the sheer logic of an idea. A few weeks ago a group of 18 Latin-American students arrived in Nashville, 3 from each of the six Central American Republics. Two others from Mexico also joined the group. These young men arrived to start a course of training in the maintenance and repair of agricultural and road-building machinery, including gasoline and diesel engines, welding, and the other basic techniques on which the economic development of their countries must ultimately rest. This training is being provided at the level needed for real help to the countries from which these students come. When they complete their training and return home to teach others what they have learned, the members of this nuclear group, and their successors over the years, may ultimately spark an industrial revolution that will make constant political revolution a thing of the past. The trainees have the opportunity to learn about the United States at first-hand, without the intervention of Government agencies, and without any attempt at indoctrination. Here is a privately operated venture which may well point the way to an effective Point 4 program for Central America, starting literally from the grass roots.

The Nashville project has been undertaken by H. O. Balls, president of the Nashville Auto-Diesel School, who offered to provide free scholarships and financial assistance almost immediately after he caught the spirit of the FUSLA idea. A citizens' committee has taken hold both to see that the students are provided with opportunities to learn about the community around them and also to see that they are protected from overentertainment or lionizing. This committee is headed by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancelor of Vanderbilt University, and includes outstanding civic and business leaders of Nashville.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to the story, but what I have already covered is enough to indicate the importance of this work. The men who formed the Friends of the United States of Latin America are not unaware of the obstacles which might make it difficult to achieve their objective. They realize that among the 20 republics which make up Latin America are both large and small states, industrialized and backward countries. They know that there are racial problems, age-long disputes, and prejudices, economic rivalries, and even in some cases simple obstinacy based on the history of past wars and inter-American plundering. However, the advisory council which Mr. Posner has managed to assemble includes men with enough vision to see beyond the obstacles of the moment. This group consists of Capt. Colón Eloy Alfaro, for many years Ambassador of Ecuador to the United States and almost every other country of the Western Hemisphere; Prof. Richard Behrendt, director of the inter-American studies at Colgate University; Honorable Carlos Dávila, former President of Chile and distinguished author; Prof. Harold E. Davis, director of the division of inter-American studies at the American University; Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of the American University; Prof. A. L. Gitlow, professor of economics at New York University; Philip Leonard Green, outstanding writer and authority on Latin American affairs; and Lt. Comdr. Alvin E. Moore, retired, exponent of a plan for world government.

The idea of these men is not to meet the obstacles head on, by becoming embroiled in all of the historical tag ends left from a century and more of frustrations and mismanagement, but to try instead the cultivation of the Central American garden. They started first arranging exchanges of graduate students. They have now moved to a more immediately practical stage of technical training for economic development work. They are encouraging the development of regional schools of vocational training throughout Central America for the furtherance of economic and social integration, along with road building, and other integrating public works. All of this is to be done on a voluntary basis so that it need not be accepted by any government or individual in Latin America who does not agree. But so far no one has disagreed. It is one of the heartening things about a great idea that so few people disagree with it.

Mr. Speaker, efforts in this field are all too few; and particularly, efforts which try to point beyond the immediate details of health centers, experiment stations, schools, and the like, to a unifying idea such as this one for regional integration both economic and political. We have heard of many inspiring projects for human betterment and international cooperation, but up to this time I have heard of no other similar attempt to get to the roots of the problems of Latin American unity.

Our Government should welcome and encourage such activities on the part of public-spirited private groups, and we should hope that more people will join in contributing services and funds to support an organization like the Friends of the United States of Latin America.

India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the gift of grain for India was proposed, our office sent for any available information on Indian famines from the Library of Congress. The legislative reference service of the Library of Congress sent us the History and Economics of Indian Famines, by A. Loveday, B. A., late scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge. The same was published in London by G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., in 1914. Besides the introduction it contains a chapter on famines previous to the English predominance, that is previous to 1770. Chapter II is on famines and the East Indian Company. Chapter III contains famines from the abolition of the East India Company to the present day, namely, 1907, and their summaries. Chapter IV contains relief organization. Chapter V contains protective measures and wider economic problems. "Appendix A" of this interesting book contains the date of the famine or flood, the locality, the state, the reference and the remarks. The first reference to any famine in this appendix which was merely a legend, carries the date of 297 circa. The next one was 445 circa with the date not definitely known.

Starting with the year 917, I have separately attached a sheet as outlined under appendix A. This sheet contains from the year 917 to 1907, approximately 102 famines or floods. The years involved total 990. This shows an average major flood or drought every 9 years for almost 1,000 years.

Having always heard of droughts, floods and locust swarms in India, I wondered who supplied them grain prior to the request that the United States supply it to the extent of $190,000,000 or 9,000,000 long tons or 336,000,000 bushels. To maintain the rationing system, even at a level below last year's the Government of India finds that it will have to import close to 6,000,000 tons in 1951. India is procuring almost 4,000,000 tons of this total through the use of its own foreign-exchange resources, and the $190,000,000 worth or the remaining 2,000,000 tons, about 75,000,000 bushels, would have to come in a large measure if not entirely from the United States.

I was also curious to know just how a foreign government requested such help or assistance as was asked of the United States. I found that M. K. Kirpalani, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Embassy of India in Washington, on February 8, 1951, transmitted a letter to Mr. Acheson, the Secretary of State. Mr. Kirpalani in his letter explained under instructions from the Government of India—

I have the honor to communicate to you the following:

* * * * *

2. On account of a succession of natural calamities cereal production in India in 1951 is expected to fall short by at least 5,500,000 tons as compared with 1950. Although vigorous attempts have been made and are being made to increase production, floods made worse by earthquake and subsequent drought have seriously handicapped efforts.

3. In 1950, 3,000,000 tons of cereals—2,100,000 tons from imports and 900,000 tons from government stocks—were distributed in addition to the grain available within the country. In spite of this, rationing broke down in many parts of India and the ration had to be reduced to below 12 ounces in most states for a long period. Now the ration has had to be temporarily reduced to nine ounces all over the country.

4. Cereals form the principal part of the diet of the people and 12 ounces provides only 1,200 calories. It is estimated that about 9,900,000 tons of grain will be necessary to enable government to meet its ration obligations in 1951. Out of this quantity approximately 3,500,000 tons is likely to be procured within the country. Government of India is arranging to import 4,000,000 tons of grain in 1951, which is all that can be paid for with available funds. This leaves a requirement of 2,400,000 tons uncovered.

5. Government of India is facing an exceedingly difficult food situation. Semi-famine conditions prevail in many areas and it is apprehended that unless a major part of the deficit is made good by large imports, acute famine conditions are likely to develop later in the year and the situation may well get out of hand.

6. In accordance with the representations that have already been made to you by the Ambassador on December 16, 1950, the Government of India requests the United States Government to give them ad hoc assistance during 1951 to obtain 2,000,000 tons of food grains and would greatly appreciate if the grain be supplied on special and easy terms. I avail myself of the opportunity to convey to you, Mr. Secretary, the assurances of my highest consideration

M. K. KIRPALANI,
Chargé d'Affaires Ad Interim.

Please note in the second paragraph, Mr. Kirpalani stated that on account of a succession of natural calamities cereal production in India in 1951 is expected to fall short by at least 5,500,000 tons as compared with 1950. Please note he states that it is expected to fall short. He did not say that it has.

In the introduction of Indian Famines, the book which I mentioned previously, on page 4, it states:

The frequency and extent of famines in India should be no cause for surprise. That they are not more extended in area and more tragic in their effects is due on the one hand to the size, and on the other to the varying elevations of that country.

It further states:

History gives no example of a drought extending over the whole of India; and meteorologists declare such an event impossible.

While this book was published in 1914, the elevations in India, no doubt, except for erosion, are the same. I believe the climatic conditions remain the same, also.

Paragraph 4 of Mr. Kirpalani's letter states that cereals form the principal part of the diet of the people and 12 ounces provides only 1,200 calories. Naturally, 1,200 calories is not very much. The same paragraph estimates that about 9,900,000 tons of grain will be necessary to enable the Government to meet its ration obligations in 1951, and out of this quantity approximately 3,500,000 tons is likely to be procured within the country and that the Indian Government is arranging to import 4,000,000 tons of grain in 1951, which is all that can be paid for with available funds. This leaves a requirement of 2,400,000 tons uncovered.

Paragraph 5 states that India is facing an exceedingly difficult food situation. Presumably this is another of their every-9-year famines for approximately the last 1,000 years. The paragraph further states that semifamine conditions prevail in many areas, and unless the deficit is made up by imports that acute famine conditions are likely to develop later in the year, and the situation may get out of hand. The droughts and sand storms in the United States in the thirties got out of hand, but we survived. Please note that in paragraph 5, Mr. Kirpalani states that the situation may get out of hand.

In paragraph 6, Mr. Kirpalani states that the Government of India requests the United States Government to give them ad hoc assistance during 1951 to obtain 2,000,000 tons of food grains and would greatly appreciate it if the grain could be supplied on special and easy terms. He did not request a gift.

Next, I was curious to know or to read the message asking the Congress to provide assistance to India to meet the request as outlined in Mr. Kirpalani's letter. It is contained in House Document No. 56, Eighty-second Congress, first session. The recommendation was made by the executive department to comply with the request of the Indian Government. The request of the Congress was not made on a basis of special and easy terms. It was made on what is called a grant which actually means a gift, and remember Mr. Kirpalani's letter asked for easy terms. The recommendation to the Congress by the executive department was, in part:

We would also expect the Government of India to do all it can to expand supplies and otherwise to lessen the danger from crop shortages in the future.

I wish to remind you that under the Indian Famines book from the Library of Congress, the record shows that they have had a famine every 9 years for 1,000 years.

The message further stated that—

Shipments must begin by April.

Mr. Kirpalani's letter stated that the 1951 crop is expected to fall short, and the Indian famines authority from which I have quoted, states that it is possible to raise three crops a year in India.

How proud of the United States American citizens should be, supporting a Republic such as ours, a nation of 150,000,000 people made up of immigrants from all countries of the world, 175 years old, being able under the two-party system to be in such a position that a nation of 350,000,000 souls and over 1,000 years old would request help even on a pay-back basis as outlined by Mr. Kirpalani.

Again referring to paragraph 6 of Mr. Kirpalani's letter wherein he asks that

the grain be supplied on special and easy terms, it seems to me that we are not even complying or attempting to comply with the request. A Christian gift of $190,000,000 worth of grain to a starving nation is one thing; but we are not doing that as evidenced by the executive communication and Secretary Acheson's statement before the Foreign Affairs Committee. The grain is proposed to be given to the Government of India to be put in with that part of their shortage which they have purchased and are paying for from Communist China, Canada, and Australia. These countries have sold them their part while our part was asked for on easy terms. Again, our part of the grain is not to be given to starving people of India but to be placed in the hands of the Indian Government again with that part that they are agreeing to pay for and then sold by the Indian Government to their own starving people.

It is proposed by the executive department of the United States Government that the funds derived from the grain from the United States be used to further the economy of the Indian Government which, with Pakistan, was given its freedom by England in 1947.

If it is to be done on a humane basis to save the lives of starving people on their every 9-year famine average, why should it be sold to them. Our office is reliably informed that last year India produced $349,000,000 worth of manganese, mica, jute, cyamite, and monazite sands used industrially and that the United States purchased $101,000,000 worth, not quite one-third of the total.

The only conclusion I can reach after reasonably studying the matter is that India wants food grains from the United States as part of a total on easy terms and that the executive department has asked the Congress to authorize it on a gift basis. The Indian Government in turn is to sell it to her people should the 1951 crop condition prove a failure or a partial failure. There is no proposal of any strategic material which we can use to be taken in exchange either now or at a future date for stockpiling.

The Pakistan League of America, Inc., mailed to all Members of the Eighty-second Congress a very interesting four-page pamphlet. The religion of Pakistan is Mohammedanism and that of India, Hinduism. In 1947 when the two nations were formed, millions of Mohammedans migrated from India to Pakistan and millions of Hindus in Pakistan migrated to India. The testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee was to the effect that they left their crops standing in the fields, their religious immigration being made in such haste. The Pakistan memo states:

1. It (India) refused to buy 600,000 tons of food grains which Pakistan offered to sell below world prices.

2 It reduced its purchases of food grains from the United States from $63,000,000 in 1948 to $24,400,000 in 1950.

It further states that on the other hand it stepped up its purchases of raw cotton from the United States from $4,000,000 in 1948 to $68,000,000 in 1950, and that this was because India was refusing to buy Pakistan cotton in an attempt to cripple Pakistan's economy.

The Pakistan pamphlet further states that India declined to buy its normal offtake of raw jute from Pakistan, thus losing in terms of manufactured jute goods approximately $100,000,000 in dollar exchange which it could have applied to food purchases in the United States. If this had been done, this would have made India's request for easier terms easier.

The pamphlet continues as follows:

It there is famine in India today, it has not been brought about by natural calamities It is the direct and inevitable result of the Government of India's plans to break Pakistan's economy. India has been waging economic war against Pakistan since September 1949. In an attempt to force Pakistan to devalue her currency, India stopped all trade with Pakistan from that date.

Again remember that these two nations were established in 1947 when England gave India its freedom.

Why should the United States get involved in foreign, religious controversies?

Will India's request for $190,000,000 worth of grain on easy terms stop famines, floods, pestilence, and locust swarms which have occurred every 9 years for 1,000 years? If I believed it would, the $190,000,000 worth of grain should be given them as a gift. I do not believe it will stop it for 1 minute.

The Indian peninsula stretching as it does from the eighth to the thirty-eighth degree of latitude having innumerable variations in climate, political, social, and racial conditions, is not going to change in 1951 from what has been taking place for the last 1,000 years. Monsoon storms beyond control occur in India. With a 6-month rainy season and a six-month dry season, either floods or droughts can cause the trouble. The autumn crops in India are reaped in September and December, and the dry crops reaped in March and April.

The $190,000,000 worth of grain for India according to Secretary Acheson is not included in the seventy-one billion-dollar-plus budget—1951-52—of the United States.

How far can the United States go with its resources on such a budget and such an additional request of $190,000,000 which is gone forever?

Our office receives daily many letters protesting unnecessary Federal spending. This legislation as proposed in the form of a gift is just that. If this proposal were changed whereby the United States might obtain some strategic material in exchange for grain, I might have a different viewpoint.

I do not believe this country can afford this authorization on a gift basis. I do not believe it should, as India has not asked for it under such conditions. For my part I will not support it.

Everyone knows what a farce and loss the China programs proved to be and which, as one Member of Congress, I had no part of. I will not be a party to a repetition of it in India.

Date	Locality	State	Reference	Remarks
97 circa	Magadha	N	Duff, Hist., vol. ii, p. 317	This is merely a legend
45 circa	Kashmir	N	Ibid., vol. iii, p. 57	The date is not definitely known.
17 18	do	N	Stein's Rajat, bk. v., VV 271 7	Great mortality, no apparent steps taken to mitigate distress.
1033	Hindustan	N	Dow, vol. i., p 85; Briggs, vol. i, p. 103	In many parts of the world; accompanied by foodly plague.
1116 19	Deccan and Burhanpur	N	Elliot, vol viii, p 36	
1200	Bombay	N	Eth., p 88	Legend that it lasted 12 years.
1250	do	N	Imp. Gaz Ind., vol i	
1291	Delhi and Siwalik district	N	Elliot, vol. iii, p 140, vol vi, p. 47	"Next year such rain fell as but few people could remember."
Between 1296 and 1317	Delhi country	N	Briggs, vol. i, p. 556, cf. Elphinstone, 399	The exact date of this famine is not ascertainable, probably circa 1305
1343 45	do	N	Briggs, vol i, p 428, Elliot, vol. iii, pp. 238 seq., 612, 620	People migrated to Bengal, also plague.
Between 1351 and 1363	Kashmir	N	Brigg's, vol iv, p 457	
1396	Deccan	N	Eth., p 99. Scott, vol i, p. 56	Reported to have lasted 12 years.
1423	do	N	Briggs, vol. ii, p. 405, Scott, vol. i., p. 102	The Sultan prayed (in 1424), and rain came.
1471-72	Bijapur district, All Bahmani kingdom and Bombay	N	Briggs, vol. i, pp. 493-4	No grain sown for 2 years.
1494	Delhi country	N	Elliot, vol vi, p. 187	
1500		N	Baber's Mem. Talbot, p. 61	All relief prevented by wars
1520	Bombay	N	Eth., p. 100	Caused partly by war, no relief.
1527	Sind	N	Eth., p. 16	Lasted 6 months, caused by crop burning.
1540-43	do	N	Eth., p. 17	Same cause then 2 years' drought.
1540	Coromandel Coast	N	Investiga. Portug., vol. xvi, p. 279	Spread over the east coast of the Red Sea.
1554 55	Delhi, Agra, and Bajana districts	N	Elliot, vol. v, p. 490	People fed on acacia seeds and hides of cattle.
1556	Hindustan	N	Elliot, vol. vi, p. 21	People fed on each other.
1576	Delhi country	N	Elliot, vol vi, p. 297	No relief.
1577	Kutch	N	Eth., p 25	Liberal relief and cooked food.
1592 circa	Sholapur district	N	Scott, vol i, pp 314 and 360	Also a pestilence.
1594-98	Central India, Hindustan	N	Elliot, vol. vi, pp. 94, 193	Reported all over Asia; also apparently plague, lasted 3 or 4 years.
1613-15	Punjab	N	Elliot, vol vi, p. 346	Afterwards plague
1623	Gujarat, Ahmedabad	N	Eth., p. 40	Not severe, and stores proved sufficient.

Date	Locality	State	Reference	Remarks
1628-29	Hoozoor	N	Eth., p. 63	Dogs and men eaten.
1629-30	Deccan	N	Dow, vol iii, pp. 128-9, 341; Elliot, vol. vii, pp 24-5, 263, 246-7, etc., vide text.	Also pestilence, spread over nearly the whole of Shah Johan's dominions, extensive relief and more extensive mortality.
1650	Ahmedabad	N	Eth., pp 37 seq	Lasted several years, grain imported; also plague of locusts and cattle disease
1660	Aurangab's	N	Elliot, vol. vii, pp. 246-8, 263, Dow, vol. iii, pp 310, 341, Scott, vol. ii, p. 47; Eth., vide text	Evidence only shows Bengal and Bombay as definitely immune.
1676-77	Hyderabad, especially Culburga district	N	Mackenzie MSS., vol. vi, pp. 33-35, Scott, vol. ii, p. 47	Apparently caused in the first place by excessive rains.
1685	Deccan and Hyderabad	N	Elliot, vol vii, p 328	War prevented any relief.
1702-04	Bombay and Deccan	N	Scott, vol ii, pp. 112-114	
1709	Bombay district	N	Der Neue Welt Bott, pt vi, p. 67	Prices rose to 32 times the normal.
1718	do	N	Eth, p 40	The extent of this famine is not known.
1737	do	N	Baird Smith	
1739	do	N	Scott, vol. ii, pp 210-211	Also pestilence.
1746-47	Bombay district, Kutch	N	Eth., pp 26, 40, 60	Cooked food given in Kutch.
1759	Bombay district	N	Eth, pp 17, 19	Caused by war mainly, short; but also general over other parts.
1770	Bengal	N B.	Orissa Report, passim. Hunter, Rural Bengal, etc	Vide text.
1781	Madras	N. B.	Madras Manual of Admin, vol. i, p 298	Caused partly by Hyder Ali's devastations.
1782	Bombay and Madras districts Hyder Ali's country.	N B.	Eth, p. 17	2½ years, caused partly by burning of crops.
1783	Bengal, Bellary, U P., Kashmir, and Rajputana	N B.	Orissa Report, passim	E I. Co show greater energy.
1787	South Mahratta country	N	Eth, p 103	Caused largely by locusts
1790-92	Bombay and in Hyderabad, Gujarat, N Madras, Kutch, Orissa	N. B	Eth, pp. 22, 50, 55, 105 etc	In Dharwar women and children sold Corn imported from Bengal
1799 1801 to 1802-4	N. W. Province, Bombay district, Central India, and Rajputana	N. B.	Vide text, numerous	Vide text
1806-7	Widespread, especially Carnatic	N. B.	Madras Manual of Admin., vol. i, p. 298, Eth, p 12	
1812	Bombay, Agra, and Madras districts	N B	Eth, pp 33, 78, 126, etc., vide text	Locusts in Bombay, pestilence in Ahmedabad, vide text.
1819-20	N. W. P., Rajputana, Deccan, Broach	N. B	Eth., p. 79, Baird Smith, etc	In Broach for 2 years excessive rainfall, panic occurs; migration.
1820 and 1822	Upper Sind	N	Eth., p 18	Ameers throws open Government granaries
1824-25	Deccan and Bombay, Madras	N. B.	Eth., pp. 70, 95, 134 137. Madras Manual Admin, op cit.	British Government appoints a committee of wells and tanks also relief. It was not acute in Madras.
1832-33	Sholapur, N Madras	N B	Eth, p 101, B Smith, various Comms, etc.	Vide text.
1833-34	Cujarat, Kandish, N. Deccan, and parts N W. P.	N. B.	Eth, p 79, various Comms, etc	Vide text In Cujarat partly due to locusts. Nowhere very severe
1853-55	Bellary, and S Madras and Deccan, Rajputana, part of Bombay district	N B.	B. Smith; Eth., p. 80, various Comms., etc.	In Thana and Kolaba, followed by excessive rains in 1854, culminating in a hurricane.
1860-61	Parts of N. W. P, Punjab and Rajputana and Kutch.	N B.	B Smith, etc	Vide text. First famine after abolition of E. I. C.
1862	Deccan	N. B	Eth., p 80	Not very intense,
1866-67	Orissa, Behar, Ganjam, Bellary, Hyderabad, S Mysore	N B.	Orissa Report, etc	Vide text. Failure in Orissa in relief organization
1868-70	S. N W P, Punjab, Gujarat, parts of Central Prov., N Deccan, Rajputana.	N. B.	1880 Comm, etc	Vide text Terrible mortality in Rajputana. British relief better organized, but financial strain
1873-74	Behar, Bundelkhand, S. W Prov	B	1880 Comm, etc	The "Panic Famine"
1876-78	Madras, Bombay, Mysore, and Hyderabad	N B	do	Vide text.
1877-78	U P, Kashmir	N B.	do	Do
1888-89	Ganjam, Native Orissa States	N B	1898, etc	Relief too late.
1896-97	N W Provinces, Bengal, Bombay, C Province, Berar, Madras, Delhi district, Parts S India, Hyderabad, N. W. Rajputana	N B.	do	Vide text.
1899-1900	C Province, Hissar dist, Bombay, Berar, Hyderabad, Rajputana (and Ajmere), Central India.		1900, etc	Vide text The greatest famine history records
1899-1900	Baroda, Kutch, Kathiswar, Native states of C. Province, S Punjab.	N. B	do	The drought affected also, less severely, Bengal, Agra, S. Madras, Delhi district.
1900	Cujarat	B	Report on relief	
1906-7	Darbhanga district	B	do	Extensive floods.
1907	United Provinces	B	do	Extraordinary success in decentralized relief.

Immediate Hearings on Railroad Retirement Legislation Are Necessary To Relieve the Plight of Retired Railroaders or Their Survivors

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, early in January I introduced three bills all of them designed to liberalize provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase present benefits. These measures and scores of similar bills were pending in the Eighty-first Congress, being introduced by Members of Congress like myself who represent heavily populated railroad districts where retired railroaders and their dependents are near starvation levels because of the inadequate benefits received under the Railroad Retirement Act.

On January 22, 1951, I wrote to Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and renewed my pleas that I made to him over a period of the last 2 years that action be scheduled on railroad retirement legislation. My letter to Chairman CROSSER was as follows:

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CROSSER: As you know, I represent a heavily populated railroad district in Pennsylvania and for the past 2 years I have made a sincere effort to get action on amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act that were pending before your committee.

With the convening of the Eighty-second Congress and with the cost of living still skyrocketing, I have introduced H. R. 1404, 1405, and 1406, designed to liberalize the provisions of existing law and to increase benefits to not only annuitants and pensioners, but also to widows and other survivors.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, the average age of the disabled and retired annuitant is 70 2 years and the pensioner 81 9 years; while the average age of the widow is 72 8 years The average monthly benefit received by the annuitant is $82 81 monthly, the pensioner $70.80 monthly, and the widow $29.59 monthly.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, the cost of living as of November 15, 1950, has increased 71 percent over the cost of living in 1937. For an illustration, food has increased 99 percent; wearing apparel 89.7 percent; rent 24.3 percent; fuel, electricity, and so forth 43.4 percent; house-furnishings 94 percent and miscellaneous 58.9 percent. While these increases have taken place since

1937, the only percentage of increase in retirement benefits was 20 percent granted by the Eightieth Congress.

I am fully familiar with the actuarial studies made from time to time and while the retirement fund was said to be unable to stand an increase in benefits the past 2 years, it is my opinion that the fund is capable of such an increase when you take into consideration the increased income of the fund resulting from increased wages and high employment in the railroad industry.

You may not agree with me when I say that I have retired employees and survivors of deceased employees in my Congressional District that are actually hungry and living under conditions that you and I would find repugnant to the American way of life. These people are the victims of a frozen income over which they have no control. Congress, as custodian of the retirement fund, is obligated to provide relief to these people by immediately considering legislation that will remedy their plight.

There is general sentiment in railroad circles that the fund will stand an increase in benefits and we are guilty of gross neglect if we do not do something immediately to relieve the distress of annuitants, pensioners, and survivors under the Railroad Retirement Act.

I sincerely hope that you will give serious and favorable consideration to my plea for early action on pending amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

JANUARY 22, 1951.

On February 26, Chairman CROSSER replied to my letter by advising "careful studies are now being made and I expect a report thereon very shortly."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is the same old story that studies are being made despite the fact that we were given the same excuse in 1949 and 1950. While these so-called studies are under way the cost of living has skyrocketed to an all-time high and the letters I am receiving from recipients of railroad retirement benefits reveal the widespread misery caused by the refusal for over 2 years in scheduling action on amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. I have talked with other Members of Congress from railroad districts, and they inform me that they too are receiving pathetic letters urging action on railroad retirement legislation.

How would any of us feel if forced to live on one meal a day? Well, that is the situation with thousands of retired railroaders and their dependents who are trying to exist on the present scale of retirement benefits.

There is something radically wrong either with the Railroad Retirement Act or the administration of it. Instead of the age-old excuse that studies are being made, let Congress get busy with hearings on the subject. We are the representatives of the people and they have a right to expect action from us.

I want to be fair in my request that prompt action be taken and that hearings be held on railroad-retirement legislation, yet I do not propose to be charged with evading my responsibility to the retired railroaders or their survivors.

The Stars and Stripes Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been evidence of a growing movement in this country to relegate the flag of the United States to a secondary position, and to implant the flag of the United Nations in its stead. Certain groups have been active in obtaining special recognition for the United Nations flag, and near riots occurred in some localities where patriotic citizens vigorously protested the display of the United Nations flag unaccompanied by the flag of the United States.

It is high time that appropriate action is taken by the Congress to protect the flag of the United States of America and to prevent the use of any other flag in its place. For this purpose I have introduced House Joint Resolution 167 which would establish a rule that no foreign national or supranational flag shall be publicly displayed unless it is accompanied by the flag of the United States.

And to stimulate greater interest in the proper and frequent display of our Stars and Stripes, I have also introduced House Resolution 64 to encourage all citizens to display our flag whenever possible.

In the United States today there is a growing need for the spirit of patriotism, devotion to country, and willingness to sacrifice for those ideals which were the flaming torch that lighted the way of our valiant ancestors who bore arms at Bunker Hill and stood steadfast with Washington at Valley Forge.

Though outnumbered many times, without provisions, without money, and without adequate arms, those patriots of the Revolution were willing to die for the freedom they cherished, and fought the might of Britain to win the blessings of liberty which have been the birthright of Americans for more than 160 years.

Today we do not have the dedication to purpose and ideals which the founders of our Nation possessed. And today our beloved Nation is in danger. Let us make no mistake about that. The Communist threat throughout the world continues unabated, changing direction continually and moving constantly from a position of threatening belligerence to one of soft-spoken pleas for peace. But whatever front is presented to the world at large, the fixed purpose of the Communists to undermine the United States of America, divide the western alliance, and destroy our Nation through internal collapse or through open aggression, remains.

KEEP STRONG YOUR FAITH IN THE UNITED STATES

We need today in the United States a rebirth of the patriotic spirit of 1776 which is symbolized by the American flag. We need the faith in God and in right that brought liberty and established a free nation on our shores. We need a rededication of every American citizen to the purposes and ideals upon which this Nation was founded, and we must uproot and destroy treason and communism wherever it is found.

During recent years a move has appeared in our land to convince Americans that patriotic pride in America is isolationist, that it is wrong to believe the United States the greatest and finest country in the world, the only land Americans are willing to fight for and die for.

How long must this internationalist policy which is so dear to the administration continue before we awake to our danger, and call for a return to good old-fashioned American patriotism. It is true we are no longer in the horse and buggy days, but honest patriotism taught by parents and teachers to the youth of our Nation, the flying of the Red, White, and Blue, and the celebration of the Fourth of July in the town squares throughout the land brought forth Jackson, Grant, and Lincoln, not Coplon, Remington, and Alger Hiss.

We Americans should wake up to the fact that we must look out for the interests of our Nation and our people while we pour out our resources to save the rest of the world and risk the loss of our own freedoms and our own system of free enterprise. We can in the spirit of brotherhood and cooperation, and with the honest desire to follow the Christian principle of helping our neighbors, do what we can to help them to raise their standards of living and strengthen their defenses against the common enemy.

But we cannot look out for the interests of all the rest of the world at the expense of our own Nation and our own people. We cannot risk economic collapse and the loss of our own freedom. We cannot adopt a policy of America last while no other Nation in the world has evidenced any willingness to relinquish its own self-interests in behalf of the United States.

The recent campaign sponsored by the administration through the Department of Agriculture to fly the flag of the United Nations in every city, town and village in the country, was an example of the campaign to undermine and destroy American patriotism.

KEEP OUR GLORIOUS FLAG FLYING

The proud Stars and Stripes which was adopted as our national flag on June 14, 1777, has become a symbol of liberty and freedom throughout the world. And our flag is the only flag in the world that is never dipped to any individual, not even to the President.

Americans have loved and respected our flag since it first unfurled in the breeze. It has moved westward across the Nation with our pioneers. It has accompanied our troops into battle on land and on sea. It is far more to a loyal American than bits of bunting stitched into a design, it is a hallowed emblem of the spirit of America.

I have long recognized the need for a revival of honest American patriotism in our land as the best answer to those enemies of democracy who would spread the insidious lies of communism. And I believe one of the best ways we can foster a resurge of American spirit throughout the United States is through greater display of Old Glory and assurance that no other flag shall usurp the place of honor which should be accorded in this Nation to our own flag.

For this purpose I have introduced House Resolution 64 and House Joint Resolution 167, and these resolutions, if adopted by Congress, would spark a campaign to keep the flag flying on high from every flagpole in the land, a banner of hope and freedom, a symbol of national unity and faith in the future of the United States of America.

As forcefully expressed by the American poet, Henry Holcomb Bennett:

The colors before us fly;
But more than the flag is passing by.

Sea fights and land fights, grim and great,
Fought to make and to save the state;
Weary marches and sinking ships,
Cheers of victory on dying lips.

Days of plenty and days of peace;
March of a strong land's swift increase,
Equal justice, right and law,
Stately honor and reverend awe.

Sign of a nation, great and strong,
To ward her people from foreign wrong,
Pride and glory and honor--all
Live in the colors to stand or fall.

Congressional Committee Doubts Reliability of CASBO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1951 issue of the Nation's Schools:

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE DOUBTS RELIABILITY OF CASBO

"The lady doth protest too much, methinks." Shakespeare put these words in the mouth of the Queen replying to Hamlet, but the same good counsel might appropriately be addressed to the organization that identifies itself as the Conference of American Small Business Organizations (CASBO).

This group is one of the 10 identified by the field secretary of the NEA Defense Commission as agencies whose good intentions toward public education are doubted. It campaigns for permission to "evaluate" textbooks and supplementary material used in public schools, especially those dealing with American history and social sciences It publishes the Educational Reviewer, which it describes as "a quarterly review of educational materials."

Since CASBO presumes to take over a function that legally belongs to school boards—namely, the evaluation of instructional materials—it is important for school administrators to know that this organization has been the subject of a special study and report by the House of Representatives through its select committee on lobbying activities, under the chairmanship of FRANK BUCHANAN of Pennsylvania. This House Report No. 3232 was ordered printed on December 26, 1950, and can now be obtained from the United States Government Printing Office.

Inasmuch as the Educational Reviewer has been plugged recently by Radio Commentator Fulton Lewis and has been wholeheartedly endorsed in an editorial (January 29, 1950) in the Chicago Daily Tribune, friends of education really should read the full 73 page report. The Tribune maintains that "Every school trustee in this country and every school administrator ought to subscribe to the Educational Reviewer." It asserts that "the reviewers whose work appears in the periodical are chiefly concerned with discovering the bias of textbook authors and exposing any propaganda which results from it," and declares that "the learned reviewers are liberals in the old and respectable sense of the word"

A much different conclusion was reached by the congressional committee after its extended and thorough investigation. The report reads:

"CASBO makes a more ingenious contribution to the encyclopedia of pressure tactics with the Educational Reviewer, 'a quarterly review of educational materials' published for CASBO's committee on education. The Reviewer's avowed function is to examine textbooks from the point of view of their attachment to the principles of 'personal liberty and economic liberty,' and their freedom from 'concealed theories of collectivism' The Reviewer's consulting staff consists of William Starr Myers, professor emeritus of politics at Princeton University, Lewis H. Haney, journalist and professor of economics at New York University, and O. Glenn Saxon, professor of business administration at Yale University.

"The general tone and viewpoint of the textbook reviews found in the Educational Reviewer are difficult to describe briefly," the congressional committee report continues. "A few samples are set forth in the appendix to this report. * * * What matters, of course, is not that CASBO's viewpoint is either broad or narrow but that it has gone to such lengths to put it into operation The long-run aim of this program is obvious, and this is nothing less than the establishment of CASBO's philosophy as the standard of educational orthodoxy in the schools of the Nation.

"We all agree, of course, that our textbooks should be American, that they should not be the vehicle for the propagation of obnoxious doctrines. Yet the review of textbooks by self-appointed experts, especially when undertaken under the aegis of an organization having a distinct legislative ax to grind, smacks too much of the book-burning orgies of Nuremberg to be accepted by thoughtful Americans without foreboding and alarm. It suggests, too, that the reviewers profoundly distrust the integrity, good faith, and plain common sense of the school boards and teachers of the country. If these educators are so utterly naive and untrained as to need help from a lobbying organization in selecting proper classroom materials, then our educational system has decayed beyond all help. This proposition we cannot accept.

"For good or ill, CASBO is doing essentially what many other pressure groups are trying to do. These groups have long since recognized that lobbying of the traditional variety is not enough to insure lasting legislative success. As a consequence, they have entered upon a far-reaching and infinitely ambitious struggle to control public opinion. The effort to reach this opinion in the bud through dictation of educational materials is only one aspect of this struggle. Wherever opinion is made there can the resourceful pressure group be found. The implications of this heavy and relentless assault on the Nation's mind—by all the CASBO's, big and little, liberal and conservative—have yet to be fully realized."

Through its editor, the Educational Reviewer has demanded apology for certain references to it that were included in our January article, They Sow Distrust, by Robert A. Skaife, field secretary for the National Educational Association Defense Commission.

The Nation's schools does not question the right of any group to organize for lobbying or propaganda purposes, nor do we defend all that appears in textbooks. We agree that every citizen has the right to criticize the curriculum. It is not, however, the function of any self-appointed interest group to decide what shall or shall not be taught in the schools. It would be just as logical for a group of restaurant owners to decide what shall be taught in home economics courses, or for the amalgamation of ash haulers to determine the qualifications of the school custodian Such decisions are the responsibility of the school board or the State legislature, legally representing the interests of all the people

Normally, the school board operates through its administrative and teaching staff. If the board feels the need of additional or other expert advice, it is obligated to seek impartial and unprejudiced assistance.

Whether the Educational Reviewer meets such qualifications must be answered in the light of other significant findings of the House select committee, such as:

"We have already indicated how CASBO both creates and then assesses the 'deliberated opinion' of its membership" (p 6 of H Rept No 3232).

"Both the language and the lay-out of these materials (CASBO letterheads) might give the impression that CASBO and its committees are working under direct congressional sanction. The suggestion that CASBO is an adjunct of the United States Government is preposterous but is nevertheless put to frequent use in recruiting members and soliciting money" (p 7).

"A closely related technique and one used frequently by CASBO is to disparage the honesty and effectiveness of competing small-business organizations" (p. 8).

"Neither the Congress nor the public nor the small-business men of America can rely on CASBO's reports under the Lobbying Act as a full and accurate disclosure of its sources of financial support. For all its posturing as the spokesman for small business, CASBO has made devious and sometimes successful efforts to secure big-business support for its activities" (p. 11).

The final judgment of the House select committee as to whether CASBO represents what it professes to be is repeated here It comprises the last two paragraphs of the committee's report:

"As for CASBO's claim that it voices the 'deliberated opinion' of small business, its methods of ascertaining and formulating such opinion, sometimes through loaded questionnaires, prepared resolutions, and otherwise should make the Congress wary of any figures which CASBO offers as a measure of small-business opinion.

"We repeat our conviction that it is proper and desirable that small business be represented before Congress; but if such representation is by persons or groups whose single-minded attachment to the special interests of small business is open to question, the Congress cannot rely on their expressions as to the true needs and interests of small business. Such a situation can only work to the detriment of Congress, the public, and small business itself" (p. 23).

It seems evident that Congress cannot rely upon CASBO as actually representing small business. Neither can the public schools rely upon it for unbiased evaluation of textbooks.

Gifford Pinchot National Forest, American Shangri-La

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the March issue of the magazine Eagle appears an article by Richard L. Neuberger, an Oregon writer and member of the Oregon State Senate, entitled "American Shangri-La."

This article is about one of our most picturesque national forests extending northward from the Columbia River into the State of Washington. Mr. Neuberger's article is both interesting and factual and worthy of wide reading. I am including it here as a part of my remarks:

AMERICAN SHANGRI-LA

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

In the fast-changing Pacific Northwest, the Gifford Pinchot National Forest stands as a monument to a great conservationist and the glory of nature. America's greatest missing-link scare occurred some years ago when a party of frightened prospectors staggered down to the Washington State city of Kelso with fearful tales of apes swinging from rope ladders in Mile-Deep Canyon below the glaciers of Mount St. Helens.

This picturesque Columbia River community, the site of Eagle Aerie No. 1555, was stirred by the episode. Soon the news hit the front pages of papers all over the Nation. Reporters arrived from almost everywhere. The far-off New York Times had a correspondent at the scene. Into the timbered wilderness the journalists trekked.

They clambered over the threshold of forbidding chasms, they gazed at heights of eternal snow and ice, and they struggled across strange deserts of pumice stone which would float in a bowl of soup. No gorilla or Neanderthal man did they see. Not even a Tarzan in leopard skin leaped among the fir trees.

Yet, when the fruitless search for the missing link ended, the reporters were unanimously agreed that the mission had been far from unsuccessful. How could it be considered a failure when they had looked on the grandest outdoor vistas any of them ever had experienced?

This American Shangri-La then was known as the Columbia National Forest, 1,450,000 acres of wooded uplands and carpet-like meadows in the southwestern corner of the State of Washington. Today, this realm of natural grandeur has a brand new name, and thereby hangs a tale.

The United States Forest Service wanted to honor the quiet man with handlebar mustaches who had been its founder and first chief. Biographies of all the 152 national forests under the American flag were sent to the family of Gifford Pinchot, father of the conservation movement in this country. Forests in Pennsylvania, where Pinchot had served as Governor, instantly attracted the forester's redheaded widow.

"Yes," explains Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, "almost against my will, I found myself curiously drawn to another forest 3,000 miles away."

It finally was the solid choice of the Pinchot clan that the Columbia National Forest, where the white cones of dead volcanos are rimmed with green hills and blue lakes, was more qualified than any other to pay tribute to the memory of the man who originally protected this wilderness from ax and saw and fire. By proclamation of Harry S. Truman, the Gifford Pinchot National Forest now stretches northward from the Columbia River to the ramparts of Mount Rainier.

Mention an outdoor pastime common to the temperate zone, and the Gifford Pinchot National Forest has it

Sheep and cattle forage on the steep slopes that join the sagebrush of the Inland Empire. Elk and deer compete with domestic stock for grass. Cougars lope along the rim rock, and bears inhabit the windfalls. Steelhead and rainbows lurk in a thousand murmuring creeks. And the full-throated rivers are host in the spring and autumn to innumerable thrashing king salmon, up from the salty Pacific to lay their eggs and die. More than 15,000 fishermen and at least 7,000 hunters plod through the dense reaches of the forest every year. Another 12,000 adventurers seek handholds on the precipitous peaks. A substantial number of these backwoods visitors are eagle brothers, for eagle cities surround the mountain citadel like a stockade

Vancouver, Stevenson, and Goldendale guard the approaches to the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in the south. Kelso, Centralia, and Chehalis greet its rangers and hikers in the west. Below the meadows which fringe the forest on the east, sprawls bustling Yakima, orchard capital of the Northwest and headquarters of Aerie No. 289. Undoubtedly there would be eagle communities along the northern boundary of the forest, too, if it did not bump directly into the icefields of Rainier National Park.

Even eagle brothers with empty creels and no deer for the larder come back to civilization in a pleasant mood. The grassy rugs of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest—rugs decorated with borders of firewood and Indian paintbrush—offer unparalleled camp grounds.

The forage brushes against a horse's cinch strap. Cold springs dot the meadows. Alpine fir grows in convenient clusters. A lake for a quick dip is invariably at hand. Steelhead soon sizzle in the pan, flavored with strips of bacon and garnished with a mound of hash-browns. The fish was flipped from water to skillet with one quick twist of the wrist.

Overhead towers the symmetrical mound of St. Helens or the rugged dome of Adams. Rainier may be visible in the distance. The great snowcaps are like hooded goblins at a council fire—silent, majestic, and ominous. All who come to the forest feel their brooding presence.

Once each of these mighty craters belched rock and fire. Lava chunks the size of five-room cottages were thrown higher in the sky than frail man yet has flown. Air holes were blown in boulders, and this weird symbol of bygone ages still blankets the moraines at the foot of Mount St. Helens. It is called pumice.

The rock is pocked with tiny cavities, put there by the terrible unseen forces which lurk at the earth's core. Small boys who visit the forest throw the pumice on the surface of a lake. Miraculously, it floats, and they have had an outdoor lesson in volcanic power and fury.

St. Helens, Adams, and Rainier last were violently active in prehistoric times. No man or beast could have survived the baleful fire which they spread across the land, flame throwers on a cosmic scale. Yet as late as 1841, St. Helens smoked forebodingly. Steam issued from fissures on its flanks and from the crater at its crest. Frontier families in the Northwest wondered if some grim Pompeii-like doom was to be their fate.

But St. Helens smoked no more, and jittery settlers returned to their cabins. Yet an ascent of the mountain today, over a century later, still is tinged with awareness that this was the last true lava volcano in continental United States to signal its fiery origins.

The Pacific Northwest abounds in magnificent vistas, but one particularly appears on more calendars than any others Spirit Lake stretches placidly at the base of Mount St. Helens, a tureen of blue nectar below a vanilla ice-cream cone of universal dimensions. Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois called it a landscape to excel anything he had seen on tramps through the Swiss Alps. Spacious lake, comfortable foothills, and fragile yet sinister mountain are blended into a classic painting by the Master Hand of creation.

This is a family forest, with attractions for all ages Grandparents can idle on the veranda of Harmony Falls Lodge and watch a younger generation leap and frolic in the cold water of Spirit Lake. Yet perhaps grandma and grandpa can reach the formidable summit of St. Helens. It has been done by those in the sunset of life, under the expert guidance of the region's most famous mountain-climbing club from Portland, 99 miles away. "Mazama" means mountain goat, and the human Mazamas display this agility as they get old-age pensioners, legless newsboys, and all others with courage and determination to the top of the dizzy peak.

The Gifford Pinchot National Forest is predominantly a domain for recreation and inspiration. Yet it is something more.

With the country again desperately needing lumber for barracks and military projects, Douglas fir timber is felled on the Iron Creek drainage in tremendous quantities. Yet rangers supervise the cutting. Only ripe, mature trees can be brought to the ground. Blocks of timber must be spared to reseed the area Lookouts vigilantly watch for fire from logging operations. One stately, blonde lookout even married the head ranger of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest a few years ago, so romance, too, is here.

Lumbering is carried on carefully for more reasons than one. At least a dozen important rivers foam off the slopes of the forest. These provide drinking water for all the Eagle cities along the perimeter of the mountain domain. They also irrigate the plaided acres of orchards which have made Yakima famous for apples.

Not many profound changes have disturbed this United States version of Shangri-La. Behind its protecting buttress of foothills and canyons, the Gifford Pinchot Forest still is a haven for the old-time prospector and lumberjack who carries his sourdough jar with him to get the biscuits and hot cakes started at the next camp. Many of these men sleep with the jug in their bed rolls to keep it from freezing on frosty nights. Occasionally a red-hot argument starts when some interloper insists that the right kind of syrup is more important to a stack of "hots" than the fermenting bacteria in that yeasty jar.

Twenty-second Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the

following statement by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, on the passage of the twenty-second constitutional amendment:

The passage of the twenty-second constitutional amendment by 36 States limiting Presidents to two full terms, thus making it the law of the land, represents the sentiment of millions of people in this country and gives unmistakable approval to the position of those who have long maintained that no man elected to this office should serve more than two terms.

It is only natural that I should be gratified by the action of the 36 State legislatures because I was the center of considerable controversy, and I might even say the object of rather harsh criticism, when I took the unqualified position in the 1940 Democratic Convention in Chicago that I was opposed to a third term.

I held this view because it was my inner conviction that the presidency should be limited to two terms and that it was so intended by the founding fathers, although they did not put it into law

Many of my close friends and associates from all over the country did not think that I should declare myself on this subject, but to have held back and said nothing would have meant that I was not faithful to the principles which governed my public life—namely, that it was my duty to give my honest opinion on matters of public interest, regardless of how it would affect me personally

It is not my purpose now to speak in a spirit of vindication or to proclaim that I was right. But I do feel that the legislatures of the 36 States, which are the voice of the people, have indicated that they shared my viewpoint because they believed that the two-term law was in the best interests of our country.

Fair Play and the Mobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by CIO president Philip Murray delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. network, March 5, 1951:

Good evening. I want to talk to you tonight about the tremendous and complex problems that we, the American people, face at home and abroad. Our America is caught in the web of a great international crisis—a crisis resulting directly from Communist aggression. Tonight, as we sit in our homes, boys from our factories and farms and schools are fighting for freedom's cause in the snow and mud of Korea. Throughout the entire world, men and women who believe in freedom and human dignity are taking more effective steps to resist totalitarian dictatorship.

Here, in the United States, we have long since made our great decision. Together with the other peoples represented in the United Nations, we are resolved to mobilize our resources in defense of the democracy we love and cherish.

Our skills, our resources, and our spirit have given us the leadership of all the democratic world In that role of leadership, we must show intelligence and imagination, courage, and boldness. Those are the qualities expected of leaders. And the American people have those qualities.

On the field of battle against Communist aggressors, the men and boys from our cities and hamlets are showing intelligence and courage But, on the home front, there is confusion.

Malignant inflation is feeding on the vitals of economic life. It affects each and every family; nobody ever escapes the effects of inflation

You know that Every salary and wage earner knows it. Every housewife meets the byproducts of inflation on her trip to the grocer or the butcher Prices have gone up too high. They are continuing to rise too fast, right now. And there is no adequate mechanism at work to halt that terrible inflation, which steals food from the tables of our families and bullets from the arsenals of our Armed Forces.

Inflation must be stopped. Inflation can be stopped—if we meet this major problem of the home front with the same boldness, intelligence, and courage that our Armed Forces are showing in Korea. Thus far, Congress and our mobilization officials have not met this problem head-on

As president of the CIO, and a cochairman of the united labor policy committee, I can state with conviction that Americans are determined to halt the steady upward march of the cost of living. Certainly, the men and women of our labor unions have repeatedly shown their desire to stabilize our national economy.

Last summer when the outbreak of war in Korea first began to place its burden on the American economy, organized labor called for prompt and vigorous Goverment action to curb inflation. We said then and we say now, let us defend ourselves against the economic fifth column that will destroy our standards of living. We said then and we say now, let us meet this challenge of world conflict by the democratic principle of equality of sacrifice, let there be a sharing by every group in the land of the burdens and responsibilities which we as free men must assume.

This demand for equal sharing of our common burdens and responsibilities has been voiced by many segments of the population. Americans know instinctively that our defense mobilization program must play fair with all the people—with labor and with management, with the farmer and the consumer.

However, our mobilization program is not now being conducted with equity and justice for all. It is not drawing fully on the abilities and skills of all the people. Now, while there is time, it is essential that these basic defects be corrected

The United Labor Policy Committee, representing 15,000,000 workers, has made protest about this serious situation. We have done so not to impair the defense mobilization program but to improve it. And it urgently needs improvement.

Our criticisms are not those of labor alone but of millions of Americans in every walk of life.

It is not just a labor problem when consumer prices go up, or an inequitable share of the taxes are imposed on the lower income groups. It is not just a labor problem when the future of rent control is in danger. Unions are not the only groups concerned when wages and salaries are threatened with a straitjacket, while the dollar loses value.

We are supposed, for example, to have price controls. Yet, the consumers price index just published is at the highest point in our history—and our price administrators tell that prices will continue to rise still higher.

The Consumers Price Index, published by the Government, provides ample proof that present price-fixing policies are simply a hoax. The hypocrisy of this present system of alleged price control demonstrates an utter lack of morality—for it provides bonuses to profiteers at the very moment it works new hardships, of a discriminatory nature, upon the working men and women of America.

Moreover, the latest so-called price regulation does not establish firm ceiling prices. Neither you nor any other consumer is protected by this order, which cannot—by its very nature—be effectively enforced.

This is not real price control with teeth in it. This is a license to charge whatever the traffic will bear. A change is needed—or the national welfare will suffer.

The tax program is the second example of unequal burdens. Your Representatives and Senators are considering tax proposals that will favor the high incomes and bear down on lower incomes. Under this tax program, if you are earning $3,000 or $4,000 a year, you will have to pay the same amount of income tax you paid at the height of World War II. But if your income is $500,000 a year, you will be permitted to pay $40,000 less than in 1944—and you'll have additional loopholes to save you still more tax money There's no equality of sacrifice in this type of tax program.

Another case in point is rent control. Under our present weak law, millions of families have been forced to pay much higher rents. Yet, no rent-control law, with really effective provisions, is anywhere near passage in the Congress. If nothing is done by March 31, tenants in every part of the Nation will be confronted with the specter of rent increases of 10 or 20, or even 40 percent.

On prices, on taxes, on rents—you, the ultimate consumer, are being asked to bear the heaviest share of this increasing burden.

On the other hand, corporation profits have reached an astounding all-time high. Nothing effective is being done to make those superprofits bear their fair share of our national burden. At the same time, while you are carrying the extraordinary burden, a new unfair wage and salary formula has been promulgated by the Government. The net effect of this Government order is to keep wages and salaries down. This combination of heavier expenses and restricted income will cause real hardship among millions of moderate income families.

Our complaint against the stabilization program is that it is not geared to curb inflation. Rather, in the name of fighting inflation, the program will lower living standards while safeguarding swollen profits.

On the one hand, flabby treatment of the wealthy and gingerly treatment of profiteers; on the other, severe controls over people in the lower and middle income levels.

That is the reverse of fair play.

Who is to blame for this lop-sided approach to our inflation problems?

First, the conservative coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats who dominate our Congress. They have given us a law that cannot effectively keep prices down and thus far, they have failed to improve the law to make it workable.

Second, an equally conservative coalition of big-business-minded officials who direct our defense mobilization program.

No one can object to the desire of businessmen—big or small—to serve their country. But we can and should object when representatives of big business monopolize the top levels of our defense mobilization program. That program is supposed to serve all the American people. Representatives of labor, of agriculture, and of small business thus are entitled to a significant place—in the policy and operating levels of our mobilization agencies. These spokesmen for major groups in the American public would not serve narrow interests—they would contribute their skill and their viewpoints to building a defense program thoroughly attuned to the needs and the problems of every citizen.

This would help to insure a fair deal for every American citizen—rich or poor, city worker, or rural farmer, housewife or school teacher, people at work and people who have been retired on meager pensions.

Americans want a defense program that will give our Armed Forces the supplies they need—when they need them and in abundant quantity.

Americans want equitable treatment for the millions of the civilian population. That means: price controls that work, and an equitable wage and salary policy.

Americans want rent controls extended. They want a tax program that will not permit any section of the public to avoid its share of the revenue burden. They want corporations to make reasonable profits—but not a license to profiteer at the expense of the people during an emergency.

The American people have shown time and again that they insist upon fair play.

Let us start now to get fair play in the mobilization program. Let us halt inflation and promote equality of sacrifice throughout the length and breadth of America.

That is labor's program. That is the American people's program.

Let us all work together to attain it.

We of labor stand ready to do everything in our power to achieve the equality of sacrifice needed in this time or crisis.

Textiles for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I attach hereto an editorial from the Observer, a splendid weekly newspaper printed in my home town of Greenville, S. C. In view of the importance of textiles in the defense effort, this editorial is most encouraging. It follows:

TEXTILES FOR DEFENSE

In these days, when so much confusion is evident in both official and unofficial circles, it is encouraging to note that a major industry has voluntarily initiated a program designed to make the most of its vast resources. Such a move by the far-flung American cotton textile industry promises to be of tremendous help to the country's defense activities.

Few persons realize the complexity of this industry. More than 500,000 workers in one-thousand-two-hundred-odd separate mills produce a bewildering variety of goods. These mills annually pour out billions of yards of yarn and fabrics, ranging from surgical bandages to heavy duck cloths. In 1950, the combined value of these products was approximately seven and one-half billion dollars.

No industry is more basic or important to the security of the Nation than textiles. Its consumption of cotton provides livelihoods for millions of farmers, processors, and handlers. Its finished products go into countless items, like garments, conveyor belts, or tire fabrics.

Yet, its very size and diversity present a peculiar problem in times of emergency. Immediately following Pearl Harbor, for instance, grave confusion resulted from overhasty plans attempting to coordinate the production of hundreds of cotton mills, large and small, in various sections of the country. It was months before red tape was eliminated and Government planners were able to utilize more fully the knowledge and advice of experienced textile men.

The cotton textile industry is taking steps to forestall similar difficulties in the current emergency, no matter how severe are the demands made upon it. All the various segments of the industry have been organized so that they can offer their services to military and civilian planners. Systematic planning will permit the industry to realize its full potentialities. It will prevent, for example, one mill from being overtaxed in turning out an important type of fabric in a limited time when some facilities of another mill might be easily shifted from less essential goods to speed production.

Textile leaders point out that physically the industry is in its best shape in history. More than a billion dollars has been spent for modernization since World War II. Its plant facilities, plus such intangibles as "know-how" gained in the war, equip it to handle almost any demands for military and civilian production

With its voluntary program well under way, the cotton textile industry has in effect said to the Government, "We stand ready for any task. Let us know what you want. Give us the raw materials and we have the loyal workers, managerial ability, and plant equipment to produce as needed."

Interlocking Directorates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement entitled "Interlocking Directorates" by James M. Mead, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, March 7, 1951:

It gives me great pleasure to present to this committee the report of the Federal Trade Commission on interlocking directorates.

For a number of years the Commission has been endeavoring through its economic reports to help the Congress and the public discover the extent of the concentration of economic power, the means by which concentration is achieved, and the results that are to be expected therefrom. In 1948 the Commission submitted a report on the merger movement which showed that in 8 years about 5 percent of the assets of all American manufacturing corporations had been absorbed through mergers and that many of these mergers had been of a kind tending to reduce competition. Partly on the basis of this report your committee sponsored a bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act, which became law last December. In 1949 the Commission made a report showing the concentration of control over productive facilities which prevailed in 26 manufacturing industries in 1947. In 1950 the Commission published a report showing the exent to which the concentration of production in large companies was due to the use of large plants and the extent to which it was due to other factors. Your committee held hearings on both of these reports and thus brought them to the attention of the Congress and of the public and made their significance clearer.

The report on interlocking directorates is a study of the way in which the largest manufacturing corporations are bound together through the presence of the same persons on their various boards of directors. Thus it presents some of the information that is needed to determine whether these companies may be expected to compete with each other or to act together in ways capable of reducing competition. It also provides some of the information that is needed to determine whether or not Section 8 of the Clayton Act, through which the Congress sought to prevent interlocking directorates that injure competition, is fulfilling its intended purpose.

The Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act were developed on a bipartisan basis after the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in 1912 had emphasized the importance of strengthening the antitrust laws. The provision about interlocking directorates was included in the Clayton Act in response to a specific request in President Wilson's message to Congress in 1914. He asked for a law "which will effectively prohibit and prevent such interlockings of the personnel of the directorates of great corporations—banks and railroads, industrial, commercial and public-service bodies—as in effect result in making those who borrow and those who lend practically one and the same, those who sell and those who buy but the same persons trading with one another under different names and in different combinations and those who affect to compete in fact partners and masters of some whole field of business." The committee report on the Clayton Act emphasized the same point, saying "The truth is that the only real service the director in a great number of corporations renders is in maintaining uniform policies throughout the entire system for which he acts, which usually results to the advantage of the greater corporations and to the disadvantage of the smaller corporations which he dominates by reason of his prestige as a director and to the detriment of the public generally." In the debates on the bill the sponsors of the provisions about interlocking directorates emphasized the fundamental principle that no man can serve two masters.

The Clayton Act contains three different types of prohibitions applicable to interlocking directorates. One of these in section 10 of the act applies to common carriers. Another in section 8 of the act applies to banks, and a third, also in section 8, applies generally to other types of corporations, although by later legislation air carriers and communications companies have been made subject to special statutes. The provision about common carriers is designed primarily to prevent these concerns from being interlocked with enterprises which deal in their securities or furnish them with supplies. It provides that if the board of directors of a common carrier includes any person who is at the same time a director or manager or purchasing or selling officer of an enterprise that has such dealings with the carrier or if any such person is the carrier's president or manager, or purchasing or selling officer, all the carrier's transactions with that enterprise must be by competitive bidding followed by an award to the lowest bidder under regulations prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This effort to assure arms-length dealing and competition among those who deal with a carrier has been supplemented in the Interstate Commerce Act by a provision that no person may be an officer or director of more than one carrier unless his dual role is authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission after a finding that neither public nor private interests will be adversely affected. Thus the present law applicable to common carriers

contains broad precautions against interlocking relations either on a horizontal basis among the carriers themselves or on a vertical basis between the carriers and those with whom they deal. It seeks to prevent those linkages not only where they consist of having directors in common, but also where they are brought about through the officers of the various enterprises.

The rule applied to banks in the Clayton Act prohibits interlocking directors, officers, or employees unless the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System explicitly permits a particular type of interlock by regulation. This rule is subject to certain exceptions, the most important of which exempt banks which are engaged in different classes of business and operate in noncontiguous territory. This rule is generally designed to prevent interlocks between banking corporations that are or may be in competition with each other. It does not, however, attempt to prevent interlocks between banks and their customers. Like the rule about common carriers, it applies not only to directors but to officials as well.

The rule generally applicable to industrial and commercial companies is much more limited than those which govern common carriers and banks. It prohibits the holding of directorships in two or more corporations if any of the corporations has capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than a million dollars, and if the corporations have been competitors so that elimination of competition between them by agreement would violate the antitrust laws. Unlike the law applicable to banks and common carriers, this provision exempts all noncorporate business and the smaller corporations. It is limited strictly to the maintenance of competition between competing corporations and does not touch the vertical relationship between a corporation and its suppliers and customers. Moreover, the rule applies only to interlocking directors and has no bearing upon interlocks that may be accomplished through officials other than directors.

The Commission's report has not attempted to ascertain the situation as to interlocking relationships among banks or among common carriers. It is limited strictly to the interlocking relationships among the larger manufacturing corporations and between these corporations and a selected sample of other large corporations. However, it has taken account of the principles that had been applied by the Congress to interlocks by banks and by common carriers for the sake of ascertaining whether or not similar problems may arise in the manufacturing field.

On the basis of the facts disclosed, the Commission has concluded that Section 8 of the Clayton Act does not adequately cope with the competition-reducing effects of interlocking directorates in ordinary manufacture and commerce.

The principal weaknesses of the present law are these:

First, it can be so easily evaded as to be scarcely worth enforcing. This law is violated if a director of one large concern is also a director of its large competitor. However, there is no violation of the law if one concern's president is director of the other, or if the president of one company is sales manager of the other. The result is that when an interlocking directorate is questioned, a mere change of form without change of substance is sufficient to bring about technical compliance with the law. For example, several years ago the board of directors of General Steel Castings contained the president and two vice presidents of American Steel Foundries, all of whom were also directors of the latter company and also contained the chairman of the board and the president of Baldwin Locomotive, both of whom were also directors of that company. When the Department of Justice questioned these interlocking directorates, the directors from American Steel Foundries and Baldwin withdrew from the General Steel Castings board. Their place was taken by two vice presidents and the comptroller of American Steel Foundries and two vice presidents of Baldwin Locomotive. But since none of these officials was a director in any company but General Steel Castings, the new arrangement satisfied the requirements of section 8 of the Clayton Act. There is no reason to believe that the closeness of the executive and policy-making ties between the three companies was in any way reduced by the changes.

Second, the present law is applicable only to direct interlocks as distinguished from indirect interlocks. The indirect interlock is by far the most common type of interlocking relationship among competitors. Such an indirect relationship is established when two or more competitors have directors who sit jointly on the board of directors of a third company. For example, Standard Oil Co of Indiana, Standard Oil Co. of California, Gulf Oil Corp., and Continental Oil Co. all had directors on the board of the Chase National Bank. Similarly, the Texas Co., Shell Union Oil Co. and Tidewater Associated Oil Co. all had directors on the board of Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co. of Chicago, and Standard Oil Co. of Indiana and the Texas Co each was represented on the board of Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Co of Chicago. The significance of such indirect interlocking relationships differs from case to case. It tends to increase when more competitors are represented on the same board, when each competitor has more than one representative on the board, and when the same competitors are represented together on the boards of more than one company. It also tends to increase when the company on whose board the various competitors are represented has a business interest in the terms of the competition between the represented companies. When several competitors are represented on the board of a bank which finances them all, or of a large buyer of their products, or of a large supplier of their raw materials, there is a strong probability that the indirect relationship will impair competition. Indeed, it is hard to see how the directors from the various competing companies could perform their duties as directors except by working together to keep the competition of their companies within limits that would not adversely affect any of the companies involved Decision of major policies of purchase and sale by the directors of the company in whose board the interlock takes place can scarcely fail to produce a working understanding as to the respective shares of that company's business to be enjoyed by the competing customers or suppliers from which the directors come.

Third, the present law makes no attempt to prevent injuries to competition that may be produced through interlocking relationships between suppliers and customers. Interlocking directorates which connect a supplier with his customer are common. Their typical purpose appears to be to create a two-way preferential relationship which gives the customer assurance of supplies on favorable terms and gives the supplier assurance of an outlet for his products In other words, such an interlock has a purpose similar to that of vertical integration. Like vertical integration, it may be sometimes harmless and sometimes seriously harmful. So long as neither the supplier nor the customers has an important part of the total market, it is probable that the vertical relation between them will not jeopardize the opportunity for other concerns to sell or obtain goods. However, if the supplier is an important concern the loss of equal access to his products may be harmful to competition among the customers, and if the customer is an important concern the loss of the sales outlets which he controls may be harmful to competition among the suppliers. If a large supplier and a large customer work out a preferential trading relationship, there is a strong likelihood that other large suppliers and large customers will find it expedient to do the same thing in self-protection; and when such dancing-partner arrangements become general the effect is not only to give each of the dancing partners a good deal of relief from competitive pressure but also to make it difficult for small companies that have not been able to find dancing partners to have any share in the party.

Vertical interlocks are particularly serious when one of the interlocked companies is a public utility that has a duty to serve all customers without discrimination. The establishment of preferential relationships with such a utility defeats one of the basic purposes of public utility regulation.

The interlocking directorate report shows the prevalence of indirect interlocks between competitors and of interlocks both direct and indirect between suppliers and customers. On the basis of this report I am convinced that section 8 of the Clayton Act as now written would cover only a small part of the problem of interlocking directorates even if it were effective in preventing direct interlocks between competitors.

Section 8 should be amended to take care of the inadequacies which have come to light. The amendment should tighten the law against evasion so that where a directorate may not be held by the director of another company it may also not be held by an officer, employee, agent, or substantial stockholder of that other company. The amendment should broaden the law to cover the kinds of indirect interlocks between competitors in which a substantial lessening of competition is reasonably probable. It should also broaden the law to cover the kinds of vertical interlocks between suppliers and customers in which there is a reasonable probability that competition will be reduced. The Commission is now preparing draft legislation designed to accomplish these purposes.

Legislation Desired by Federal Trade Commission as Presented by Hon. James M. Mead, Chairman

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1951

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there are few of us here without a personal acquaintance with former Senator James M. Mead, of New York, who is now continuing his able public service as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission—certainly none to whom his name is unknown.

When the Chairman appeared as a witness before my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by invitation of our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], to present a formal statement outlining legislation which the Federal Trade Commission deems desirable in the Eighty-second Congress, his statement aroused so much interest I am taking

the liberty of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it will be more readily available to all Members and to thousands of interested citizens.

The statement follows:

I deeply appreciate this opportunity which you have afforded me to discuss with the committee legislation that may be needed in the emergency. I regard it a matter of real importance with highly constructive possibilities toward advancing the cause of good government for agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission to be able to consult closely with appropriate committees of Congress and to discuss questions of mutual concern. It is for such purpose, I understand, that the members of the committee have taken the time to assemble this morning to hear agency representatives.

With your permission, and by way of background, I shall refer briefly to the relationship of the work to the Federal Trade Commission to that of your committee, and shall then detail certain items of possible new legislation which are of concern to the Commission, either from the standpoint of the present emergency or as important to the public interest from the long-range viewpoint.

We in the Commission feel very close to this committee The original legislation under which the Federal Trade Commission was created, when passed in 1914, was in charge of this committee That statute introduced into our Federal law the principle that unfair methods of competition in commerce are unlawful, and the Commission was established as the agency to uncover such methods and upon proof and hearing to issue cease-and-desist orders against the offending parties That act has become a landmark in our laws designed to maintain and protect our system of free competitive enterprise Much subsequent legislation with which the Federal Trade Commission is concerned has likewise come through this committee, such as the Wheeler Lea Act of 1938 and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 The statutes mentioned together with the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act amendments, and other legislation, materially enlarged the duties of the Commission, which is an agency established directly by act of Congress. Our principal functions and responsibilities as specified by law may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. To promote free and fair competition in interstate commerce in the interest of the public through prevention of price-fixing agreements, boycotts, combinations in restraint of trade, other unfair methods of competition, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices (Federal Trade Commission Act, sec. 5).

2. To safeguard the consuming public by preventing the dissemination of false or deceptive advertisements of food, drugs, cosmetics, and devices (Federal Trade Commission Act, secs. 12 through 15).

3. To prevent unlawful discriminations in price and other discriminations; exclusive-dealing and tying contracts and arrangements; mergers of competitors through acquisitions of capital stock or assets; and certain interlocking directorates between competitors (Clayton Act, secs. 2, 3, 7, and 8).

4 To protect producers, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of substitutes and mixtures in manufactured wool products by requiring content labeling (Wool Products Labeling Act).

5. To supervise the registration and operation of associations of American exporters engaged solely in export trade (Export Trade Act).

6. To petition for the cancellation of the registrations of trade-marks which were illegally registered or which have been used for purposes contrary to the intent of the Trade-Mark Act of 1946 (Latham Trade-Mark Act).

7. To gather and make available to the Congress, the President, and the public, factual data concerning economic and business conditions as a basis for remedial legislation where needed, and for the guidance and protection of the public (Federal Trade Commission Act, sec 6).

8 Under the Defense Production Act of 1950, the President is authorized to enter into voluntary agreements and programs to further the objectives of the act and to request industry to conform to such agreements and programs Persons complying with such request are to be accorded exemption from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act, upon clearance of the program through consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General and approval by the Attorney General. Under these provisions the Chairman of the Commission as well as the Attorney General has the duty of examining into such agreements and programs and according them appropriate clearance pursuant to law.

ITEMS FOR POSSIBLE NEW LEGISLATION

While the Federal Trade Commission's duties are numerous, they are all in line with the objective of protecting industry, trade, and the buying public from the use of practices or methods in commerce which are unfair or contrary to the public interest as destructive of the freedom of competition. Many competitive problems which vitally affect our economy have been studied and reported upon by the Commission during the period of its operations. Many of these reports have formed the basis of new legislation. Our experience currently points up the need for additional legislation on several matters which I believe will be of interest to the representatives on the committee.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 11, CLAYTON ACT

When your committee processed the legislation which resulted in enactment of the Wheeler-Lea Act of 1938, provision was thereby made to the effect that orders to cease and desist of the Federal Trade Commission shall become final if appeal is not taken to the court of appeals within 60 days. It was further provided that violation of such an order after it became final shall be subject to civil penalties up to $5,000, which the United States district courts are authorized to assess in a suit brought by the United States. These measures for enforcement of cease and desist orders under the Federal Trade Commission Act proved highly beneficial. In the absence of such provisions Commission cease and desist orders never became final and appeals were possible at any time, even many years after the trial had been concluded and the decision of the Commission had been made Further, the civil penalty provisions put teeth into Commission orders after they had become final, and the Commission through the courts was thereby enabled to apply a more effective measure of compliance than was possible under the old method of contempt proceeding which theretofore was the only means available for enforcement of orders.

We recommend legislation whereby the same type of provisions be applied to Commission cease and desist orders under the Clayton Act, including the Robinson-Patman Act, as has been applied by the Wheeler-Lea Act to Commission cease and desist orders under the Federal Trade Commission Act. This would require amendment of section 11 of the Clayton Act, the procedural section, to introduce into the Clayton Act the Wheeler-Lea Act type of provisions respecting finality of orders and civil penalties for violation.

The original Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, both passed in 1914, as you may recall, were closely related bills. Both were under consideration in the Congress at the same time and both were aimed at curbing various unfair and restrictive practices in competition. The procedures in the two bills which provided for enforcement by the Commission through issuance of cease-and-desist orders were in practically identical terms, and the same considerations apply to Clayton Act orders as those which led to the amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Commission considers such amendment of section 11 of the Clayton Act as a highly important need by way of new legislation.

The Commission recommends this legislation to make its orders more effective against price discrimination, illegal tying contracts, acquisition of competitors, and the like

Since these orders of the Commission under the Clayton Act are designed to preserve competition and prevent the growth of entrenched monopoly, the public interest requires that they become effective and enforceable without delay, whereas at present the proceeding may be prolonged almost indefinitely by the offending party, and the Government put to the necessity of proving him guilty of violation of law three successive times before reaching the point where the court may apply sanctions which must be by way of contempt action.

We have prepared draft of a bill for the purpose mentioned which will be made available for congressional consideration

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Section 8 of the Clayton Act prohibits interlocking directorates between competing corporations of a certain size. The section has proved to be weak and inadequate to accomplish its purpose of preventing intercorporate relationships which are destructive of competition and lead to undue concentration of economic power We believe that such section 8 on interlocking directorates should be amended to take care of the inadequacies which have come to light. This proposal is based upon a Commission report on interlocking directorates which is now being printed. The relationships among large companies, as disclosed by this report, supply striking evidence of the inadequacy of the portion of the section directed against interlocking directorates among competing corporations other than banks and common carriers The Commission makes no recommendation for amendment of the part of section 8 of the Clayton Act which applies to interlocking directorates among banking corporations nor for amendment of section 10 of the act, which applies to interlocking directorates among common carriers.

The defect of the present law, as applied to manufacture and commerce, is twofold: First, the offense is so narrowly defined that the law is easily evaded; and second, various types of interlocking relationship which impair competition are not covered by the statute.

Evasion of the intent of the present law is possible by placing an officer, employee, agent, or substantial stockholder of one corporation upon the board of directors of another corporation where it would be unlawful for the same person to be a member of the boards of directors of both corporations. For practical purposes, there is little difference between an interlock of corporations through common directors and an interlock through a director of one corporation who is an official or substantial owner in another corporation. This point has been recognized in the present statute in the case of common carriers and banks. The proposed amendment would apply the same principle to manufacture and commerce.

The most common type of interlocking relationship which impairs competition but is not covered by the present statute is that in which competing corporations are indirectly

interlocked through the fact that officers or directors of each of them are members of the board of directors of one or more concerns which supply them with goods and services or which buy their products. In this type of situation, decision of major policies of purchase and sale by the directors of the company in whose board the interlock takes place produces necessarily a working understanding as to the respective shares of that company's business to be enjoyed by the competing customers or suppliers from which the directors come

Another type of relationship which endangers competition is that in which one of a group of competitors is represented on a board of a public utility company that is so affected by a public interest that it is required by law to serve all customers without discrimination. Preferential relationships between this competitor and the public utility company are to be expected in such a situation

A third type of problem is created by the direct vertical interlock of a buyer with a seller in cases in which either concern has such power in the market that if the other is given preferential treatment the other's competitors will find it difficult to compete with the preferred concern

The Commission is now preparing draft legislation to amend section 8 so that it will no longer ignore important interlocking relationships which impair competition in manufacture and commerce.

This legislation, in our opinion, is urgently needed not only during the present emergency but also from the long-range view of strengthening our antimonopoly laws.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

The concentration of economic power in the hands of the few and the consequent suppression of small independent business constitute perhaps the greatest present-day threat to the competitive system Bear in mind we are not against bigness as such but we are concerned over the future of small business. Over the past year or more the Commission has sent to Congress a number of reports revealing data touching this subject There are reports of the Federal Trade Commission with the following titles: "Concentration of Productive Facilities, 1947," 96 pages; "The Divergence Between Plant and Company Concentration, 1947," 163 pages, "The Merger Movement—a Summary Report," 134 pages, "International Cartels in the Alkali Industry," 96 pages; "International Steel Cartels," 115 pages; "International Electrical Equipment Cartels," 106 pages, "Manufacture and Distribution of Farm Implements," 160 pages, "The Fertilizer Industry," 176 pages.

During the Eighty-first Congress a number of bills had been introduced to deal with certain aspects of the problem Among these are bills proposing to strengthen the antitrust laws by increasing the penalties for violation One of the bills, H R. 7827, passed the House on June 5, 1950, and provided for increasing the criminal penalties for violation of the Sherman antitrust law from $5,000 maximum to $50,000 for each count

Quite obviously the penalties for violation of the antimonopoly law have been too light to provide an adequate deterrent. In my opinion steps to sharpen the teeth of the antitrust laws are needed and should be taken. Dangers due to the accelerated tendency of mobilization toward concentration and the submergence of small independent business are such as to warrant classification of legislation of this type as an emergency measure.

LABELING LEGISLATION

The wholesome functioning of competitive business for serving the needs of the public depends in no little measure upon truthful and informative labeling under which merchandise reaches the ultimate purchasing consumer. Such honest informative labeling is often of greater importance in times of emergency than otherwise because scarcities of tried and proven materials bring about extensive use of substitutes which, unless scrupulously disclosed by proper labeling, tend to deceive and defraud the public. Moreover, the stress imposed upon the people by high prices and the necessity to stretch the consumer's dollar to the limit are more keenly felt in times of emergency. These require that greater attention be given to the type of consumer legislation which is directed toward assuring that the things the consumer must buy for himself and his family are properly labeled to enable him to buy intelligently and without being misled by deceptive appearances or representations.

Legislation of this character, which has proved to be such a boon to the consuming public as well as a matter of major protection to honest and scrupulous manufacturers and merchants, is the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 which was handled in its legislative journey by your committee. In the Eighty-first Congress your committee also produced the Fur Products Labeling bill (H R. 5187) which was passed by the House on July 14, 1949, but failed of being reached on the Senate calendar before the end of that Congress I am gratified to note that fur labeling legislation has again been introduced, known as the O'Hara bills, also that in the Senate fur labeling legislation has already been reported out of committee. Since the entire subject was fully developed in extensive hearings under the jurisdiction of this committee both in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, I need not undertake to speak of the great need for this legislation to afford adequate protection to the consumer and the scrupulous manufacturers and merchants against deception and fraudulent practices in the fur business

I regard the passage of the fur-labeling legislation as a measure of real importance in the emergency as well as in the long-range viewpoint. It is legislation which is necessary not only to protect the consumer from deception and misnaming of furs, but also to protect our infant fur-farming industry and honest business from the harmful and destructive tendencies that flourish when the market place is beclouded by dishonesty, confusion, and deception which have been altogether too prevalent in the marketing of fur products.

LABELING OF MANUFACTURED TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS

Another area in which informative labeling is a matter of special significance is that of the labeling of products made in whole or in part of manufactured textile fiber In the past few years the chemical laboratory has brought to us many synthetic textile fibers with different properties and characteristics These have found extensive use throughout the textile industries in clothing, household fabrics, and other textile uses. They are woven separately and in blends of one with another, or with the fibers produced by nature, into fabrics of such close simulation to products made of the natural textile materials, such as wool, linen, silk, etc., as to be indistinguishable by the ordinary purchaser.

During the Eighty-first Congress a manufactured fiber-products bill had been introduced in the Senate, known as the Green bill, S. 263 Although no hearings were held on the bill and it had not yet gone through the refining processes which committee scrutiny would bring about, the synthetic textile situation is such that labeling legislation of this general character is needed. The legislation should provide appropriate procedures for determining proper nomenclature for the respective new fibers, in collaboration with the industries and trades concerned, and for nondeceptive informative labeling to bring the adequate content disclosure to the ultimate consumer.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION FOR SMALL BUSINESS

As previously indicated, one of our major problems in the mobilization is to provide ways and means of affording necessary protection to small business to the end that it may come through the emergency in a strong and healthy condition, able to offer vigorous competition with larger business. This is essential to the future of competitive enterprise.

There are a number of steps which I believe can and should be taken in the emergency to effect the needed protection to small business.

We should make, and bring up to date from time to time, a study of the idle capacity available in the United States, particularly that in the hands of small business. We should also study the idle manpower that is available, particularly in the smaller communities. In the light of these studies, we should review the distribution of Government procurement, of industrial subcontracts, and of order backlogs for the sake of shifting orders from the overused to the underused facilities, and from localities where labor is short to localities in which it is more plentiful. We should examine the size of inventories and review allocations of scarce materials to avoid tying up such materials in congested establishments where their turn-over will be slow. We should avoid withholding such materials from plants which could use idle facilities and idle labor in the defense effort.

We should set up special machinery for placing Government contracts directly with small enterprises We should use that machinery also to assure so far as possible that subcontracts placed by large concerns shall go to small enterprises

We should encourage expansion by small enterprises as well as by large ones We should take steps to make available to small concerns loans and tax amortization privileges comparable to those that are extended to large companies that undertake strategically desirable expansion Wherever practical we should encourage expansion in dispersed small units capable of being built and operated by small companies rather than in large concentrated units which, aside from promoting concentration of economic power, are more vulnerable to attack in this atomic age

We should make production methods and techniques available to small companies as fully as possible We should consider a policy of making research grants to small companies that have appropriate research facilities We should consider requiring that technology which has strategic value and has been financed by the Government be made available on reasonable terms without undue restrictions to concerns that will use it for mobilization purposes.

Legislation has been introduced in both Houses of Congress for establishment of a Small Defense Plants Corp. I refer to H. R 1600 through H R 1604, and the companion bill in the Senate, S 533 This type of legislation, I feel, is in the right direction and should materially assist us in coming through this period of emergency mobilization without undue impairment of our free-enterprise system.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AS AN ARM OF CONGRESS

When Congress passed the original Federal Trade Commission Act, it wisely lodged authority in the Federal Trade Commission whereby Congress may utilize the Commission to make studies and reports to it of antitrust problems and practices affecting our economy or the operation of industry and trade. (See sec 6, FTC Act.) On numerous occasions this authority, which may be brought into operation by joint

resolution of Congress, was availed of for studies and inquiries to aid Congress in its legislative work. These inquiries have brought together the data and the facts upon which Congress has seen fit to legislate in many important respects.

For example, at the direction of Congress the Commission made the public-utilities study which entered so largely in passage of such statutes as the Public Utility Holding Company Act, Federal Power Act, and the Natural Gas Act of 1938 Other instances could be cited. Likewise the Packers and Stockyards Act followed upon investigation and studies made of that industry by the Commission. The chain-store inquiry of the Commission preceded passage of the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act.

I feel that the machinery which Congress, through this committee, has made available in the Federal Trade Commission for conducting large inquiries can fruitfully be utilized in the present emergency to develop facts needed by the congressional committees in their consideration of legislation affecting our economy, whether of the emergency type or of permanent character.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I wish also to say the Commission has alined its work to furnish the fullest measure of assistance possible to the Government in the emergency. We wish to be of every assistance to this committee and to the Congress, and we shall be happy to respond to any suggestions which you may have in this respect.

Why Are We in Danger of Losing the Ideological War With World Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Washington's birthday, Thursday, February 22, at Princeton University there was held in connection with the Washington's Birthday celebration a discussion panel on the subject, Why Are We in Danger of Losing the Ideological War With World Communism?

Those who participated in this panel, while all Princeton graduates, were at the same time individuals prominent in public life. They were: Arthur Krock, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, and moderator of the panel discussion; Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; Allen W. Dulles, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; William E. Eddy, former Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Saudi Arabia and former special assistant to the Secretary of State in charge of research and intelligence; Charles D. Jackson, president of the National Committee on Free Europe; H. Alexander Smith, senior Senator from New Jersey.

The subject under discussion is of such current interest and has such an important part in the pending consideration of our foreign policy that I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the discussion as it appeared in the March 9 number of the Princeton Alumni Weekly be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have received from the Public Printer an estimated cost of printing the manuscript which indicates that printing the transcript will take one page more than the two pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $246.

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

WHY ARE WE IN DANGER OF LOSING THE IDEOLOGICAL WAR WITH WORLD COMMUNISM?

Mr. BARRETT. The question seems to be: "Why are we in danger of losing the ideological war?" My answer to that is that, if we are, it is in large part because we fear we may be losing it. Our greatest risk today is, I think, our own unjustified self-doubt in the people.

It is high time that we Americans stopped being so defeatist about military matters and about psychological matters Who says that we are losing the ideological war? The Kremlin certainly doesn't say it today in Western Europe. They are in effect crediting us with such success that they are urging the people of Western Europe to believe that their own governments have sold out to us. Don't misinterpret me. I don't think we ought to be complacent. I think we have a whale of a long way to go. And we will discuss later a great many things which need to be done. But the record shows the very opposite of what the apostles of self-doubt and despair are preaching.

Let's look back a little bit. In 1947 Europe was in very bad shape as far as public morale was concerned Communist forces could call a political strike in any country they wanted to and tie up industry and the entire economy of the country for an indefinite period. That situation does not exist today.

In France today, the Communists haven't been able to pull a major strike in 2 years. They failed in their efforts to block the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to block the military-aid program. They flopped badly in their efforts to stage a great demonstration against General Eisenhower. They failed in their efforts to block the unloading of ships with supplies. In France today the Communist-dominated federation in the labor field has lost two-thirds of its members The chief Communist publication has gone down from 500,000 to 200,000 circulation.

Much the same sort of thing can be found in other countries in Western Europe. In country after country the Communist vote has decreased very substantially. Even Austria, which is still one-third under the heel of the Soviet army, voted to kick out Communist officials The defections of key Communist leaders in Italy are significant.

Even in the satellite areas, which have been under Soviet control and domination for 5 years, they have not been able to win over the people despite the most intensive propaganda campaign. Today it is clear that 60 to 80 percent of the satellite peoples are anti-Kremlin.

In the Far East the picture is not so rosy. But even there, for complicated reasons which we can go into later, I feel that the tide, after reaching a very low point, has turned and that there is definite improvement in the area. In the Middle East and Africa we have a great deal to do, but the situation is clearly better than it was a year ago.

We have a great deal yet to do in all of these fields. We have to get more spiritual lift into the psychological fight of the free world cause. We have to persuade other governments and other peoples to take a much greater part in this ideological war. We have to step up our own campaign of truth.

But I say in all seriousness that I am convinced that the tide has turned and turned very definitely in the so-called battle for men's minds There is one ingredient that is particularly needed in this battle today—the ingredient of American confidence and faith in ourselves and the future Whenever we show self-doubt, whenever we begin to waver, that fact is reflected around the world and throughout the free world The world is watching us, and we have got to show the courage, the spunk, the moral strength, the confidence, and the faith that we have a right to show.

Mr DULLES Mr. Barrett has very largely stolen my speech from me. I maintain too that we are not now losing the ideological war with communism In fact, I believe that the tide has turned, that it turned about a year ago, and that we are beginning now to see the way it is running

Stalin and his Cominform have produced no new ideas during the past year, and there has not been a single Communist conquest in this last year—the only year in which one can say that since 1945. Bolshevism is checked in Europe It is blocked in Yugoslavia, which is now a thorn in the side of Moscow The defections of the Communists in Italy, where a split exists in the Communist Party, is one of the most significant events of recent years Every single free election that has been held in Europe in the last 5 years has shown a gradual lessening of Communist strength. And every single controlled election that the Communists have held in their areas has been a greater and greater farce (the election they held recently in the eastern zone was the greatest electoral farce that has ever been staged). One of the most interesting developments is that those people who are nearest to the danger point in Berlin and Vienna are the ones who are stoutest in their determined opposition to communism

The reason that some of us feel that we may be losing the ideological war is that we don't realize the handicap under which we started. It took us too long to realize from 1945 on what we were up against. Like a runner in a race, we had hundreds of yards to make up I say that in the last year, particularly in the last 6 months, we have made that up and now we are going ahead.

What do we need now to insure victory in that area? I think we need the same type of united action of peoples in this field of ideological warfare that we are now seeing in the field of defense America cannot do it alone We must do it with our allies. We have an Atlantic Pact in the field of defense. What we need is an Atlantic Pact to bring all the free peoples together in this warfare of ideas and ideals.

Great movements in this field, as history shows, have again and again centered around a man Now we have a great leader in Europe who takes over the united command of the forces of the free world in Europe I believe that that same man can help support the united front of the free peoples in the war of ideas.

(Because of a temporary breakdown in the public address system, a complete transcription of Mr. Eddy's opening ramarks is not available.—Editor)

Mr. EDDY. My remarks will be based largely on my observations in the Arab world * * * the only part of the world * * * that is still not definitely in anybody's pocket.

It is safe to say, with some pride, that what work we have done in this field is being done largely by Princeton men Not only our * * * and diplomats but also missionaries, educators, and doctors have been Princeton men and we can be proud of them.

Unfortunately there is a tendency to belittle the Near East as a vacuum. * * * They forget that a vacuum has a terrific

suction power and the wind is blowing over there with some velocity.

I don't like to be a Cassandra in this war of ideas. We have a 100-year record of American philanthropy, education, and medical work and friendship of the Government. It is a clear record, but still we are in danger of losing the war there for other reasons.

First is our failure to define the proper target. It is communism or Russian aggression? The same front page of the paper acclaims Senator McCARTHY's attacks on communism and acclaims * * * Tito. We have to appeal to the bulk of the people of Asia and inform them of our liberties. * * * We must invite to our camp meetings all the angels and devils who are willing to fight against Russian aggression.

Secondly I think we would do well to stop serving the middlemen—and speak with our own voice of our own business. Too frequently we have served the interests of colonizing powers and have regarded their actions as an extension and ratification of our policy. This is not appreciated by the people who live in those countries They would like to feel that what is happening in Korea is happening for Koreans as well as for the world.

There was consternation in imperial circles when FDR met Ibn Saud exactly 6 years ago this week. * * * Frantic measures were taken by Churchill and the Foreign Office to cancel the effect of this interference with the British preserve One of the great items of loss in the death of FDR may prove to be that he did not live to establish the natural precedent of direct dealings with these people of the Near East.

Third, I think we should talk of joint defense and not in terms of occupation of our own forces. We should offer to help Asiatic peoples to defend their own lands. * * * Let us not talk about aid and hand-outs and taxes. We are doing these things for our own defense. * * *

It is appropriate to say on Washington's Birthday that Lafayette was welcome in this country and is pleasantly remembered because he came to help George Washington save this country Lafayette did not come to demand in perpetuity a French base on United States soil

Finally, if we are going to win this war, I think we would do well to engage in personal warfare as well as modern arms Victories on the Korean battlefield have less significance on the Korean than on us I should not like to see a plebiscite in Korea taken today.

Twenty million friendly Egyptians would make the Suez Canal much more secure than 20,000 Egyptian soldiers there against the will of the Egyptians Singapore fell in a very few hours when it was isolated because across the water natives were no longer friendly So will Hong Kong and Japan fall tomorrow. * * *

The significance of using Darlan in the North African landing was not only to make the landing less costly in lives but the fact that Darlan ordered them to lay down their arms and made it unnecessary for us to police and occupy all of North Africa. We could turn ourselves directly against a common enemy.

The West cannot hold down these millions of Asians by planting a few soldiers and forts every thousand miles as the British have done for 300 years and still think can be done today. The alinement of these Asians in the war will be determined by the people of Asia and by nothing else. Unless they hate Russian domination, our cause is lost.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe that Messrs. Barrett and Dulles were gratifyingly hopeful, but I am afraid that they may have been just a trifle misleadingly hopeful about the way things stand right now. The last part of Colonel Eddy's talk, I believe, put very forcefully some of the real dangers that still face us in the world. We still could lose this ideological war The most that we can be happy about today is that possibly we have fought this battle of psychological warfare back to the thirty-eighth parallel. We certainly haven't crossed it, and unless we do, we just aren't going to win it.

The ingredient that is going to make us win it is fanaticism. The outstanding characteristic of the enemy, the world enemy, both in his own country and wherever he is operating, including this country, is his fanaticism. We have got to have our own fanaticism for our own cause, but more important and even more difficult, we have got to instill fanaticism for our cause in a lot of doubtful friends and even more doubtful on-the-fencers. It doesn't do us any good in this country to work ourselves into a feverish lather unless some of that lather can be communicated to the Frenchman, Italian, Korean, Chinese, and others all over the world. Their fanaticism has got to be part of our struggle.

Psychological warfare is a very peculiar animal. To oversimplify it greatly perhaps, may I point out a reason why we are having such difficulty with it, the fact that it is all so new to this country. Prior to the fall of France in 1940, this country just simply did not know that it had to be in the psychological-warfare business. We sat in the movie theaters and giggled at the Goebbels, the Mussolinis, and the Hitlers. It just wasn't our kind of stuff and they were not our kind of folks Gradually we began to realize that we had to get into what we then called the information business.

Another odd thing about this psychological-warfare business is that we visualize and think of Russia as a monolithic, solid, ponderous bureaucratic outfit, where there is no maneuverability at all. Everything finally has to go back to Joe Stalin for decision, and then it goes out into the world, into the various tentacles of the system. Interestingly enough, the Russians seem to have all the maneuverability and we have much less maneuverability. We are really so self-conscious about this new "dirty tricks world" that we are always looking around to some secretary or other or to some boss or other to see if it is O. K to do something And all of us in this game are trying to do exactly the same thing at the same time to everybody everywhere. And that isn't the way the war is going to be won We have to have flexibility and maneuverability; and if a message or idea of psychological warfare is applicable to the French, that does not mean that exactly the same thing has to be applicable to the Yugoslavs.

The three big ingredients of psychological warfare are (1) money, (2) no holds barred, and (3) no questions asked I look to my great pal and colleague, now Assistant Secretary of State, Edward Ware Barrett, and ask him if he feels quite free on the no holds barred and no questions asked. The poor guy is just in a terrible swivet all the time. Yet of all the incumbents who have held that post, with the strait-jacket factory in the next block, I think he has done the most absolutely extraordinary job. When you see anything adverse about the Voice of America or Ed in the press, take it from me "it ain't so" He is doing a terrific job under conditions which are absolutely insupportable.

There is an important job to be done, and no one way of doing it. In this labyrinth that we are in, there is just one thing that is absolutely sure: that if world war III is to be avoided without appeasement, psychological warfare ranks on a par with dynamic diplomacy and the defense effort as an outstanding weapon.

Senator SMITH. Are we in danger of losing the psychological war? I think we should accept the fact that we are in danger of losing it. Although in saying that I want to pay the same high tribute to my friend Ed Barrett that C. D Jackson has just paid him. He has done a magnificent job, but I believe that he has an enormous job ahead of him still to do.

As I have studied this problem and, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I have been dealing with the war side as well as the psychological side of military defense. I agree with Mr. Jackson that ideological warfare, this battle for the minds of men, is just as important if not more important than military preparedness. Unless we can win the battle for the minds of men, the other war might well be lost

The reason we are in this difficulty, as I see it, is that the Russians, by their very astute propaganda, have tended to isolate the United States from the rest of the world because of their particular hatred of us. They have tried to present a picture to the world of a conflict between, on the one hand, Russian communism which is aimed at helping the poor downtrodden peoples to be liberated, as against what they call capitalistic, imperialistic, wealthy America. The issue is totally wrong and we all know it But they have been very successful in convincing an area of the world that is not as familiar with us as possibly some of the western part of Europe is.

May I illustrate this point by telling about a session that I attended in Dublin just this last fall at the Interparliamentary Congress, where we had representatives from 40 nations Part of the program called for each nation to state his case before the rest of us That show was stolen by the representatives of the Far East, who said to us: You western powers are missing this picture, because we don't understand practically anything that you are talking about. You have to tell us what you mean more effectively, more practically. We can't understand why you are throwing surplus away when people are starving in other overpopulated areas of the world We don't want to become tools of the Russian Communists, but we are in danger of having our people pull us there, because of the great promises which these people are making And you're not meeting that issue.

I was shocked I felt that I shouldn't resent their statements I knew it wasn't true, but I realized that we hadn't sold them the big issue before the world, and that we had to do it almost immediately. That issue is simply this. That we who have inherited the traditions of human freedom from our ancestors who came over here—freedom of the press, of religion, of free speech— have not made it clear that that is the big issue of the world, as opposed to totalitarian strength. An atheistic Marxism as opposed to the western traditions of freedom under Almighty God. That is the job we have to do If we can once get to the world that this is the issue they'll take it I haven't the slightest doubt that they'll take it. The question is how?

May I suggest that the way to get at it is the way that Colonel Eddy suggested a minute ago We have to spearhead a missionary crusade of people who are willing to go to these countries and do what the Russians have done The Russians sent their scouts into these countries before they tried to do anything else to find out the cause of unrest and dissatisfaction, and to show how they, with their communism, would meet those needs of unrest and dissatisfaction We have got to do exactly the same thing We have got to go into those countries with a crusade and understand what the people's problems are on the ground—to find out what they are, and then indicate, by the proper method of

missionaries, educators, and other people, that we are prepared to sell our traditions of freedom on that basis. I haven't the slightest doubt that if we can make that approach we can win this war.

We mustn't be isolated as the one champion of freedom, whatever that might be, to people who don't understand it. They are weighing whether it would be wiser to get under the iron curtain or take the American side in this contest, and some are saying that they think it might be better to be neutral. How can anybody be neutral when the issue is freedom against slavery? That is the thing we have got to get across.

I think we are doing it; I think Ed Barrett is moving into that area But I can't emphasize too strongly the need for this living missionary crusade to tell the people of the world the kind of freedom that our ancestors gave us. They fought, bled, and died so that we would have what we have in this country, and what the western nations have. We mustn't be left isolated. We must be willing to say that this freedom is the freedom of the western nations.

I have said to Ed that I wish we could change the Voice of America, much as I honor that, to the Voice of Freedom, to the Voice of the Free Peoples of Asia, of Europe, of Scandinavian countries, of Switzerland, of any area of the world that is free, and keep that voice going, going, going until the issue is clearly stated and understood.

Mr KROCK Mr Barrett, in connection with defeatism as a danger, do you think that a tendency to emphasize the faults in our system to the young rather than to emphasize a feeling of pride in our achievements, an attraction to professions of idealism under other systems, had something to do with the creation of this symptom?

Mr. BARRETT. I suspect so. I think domestically that the tendency to examine our own faults is as healthy as it can be. Over the long pull it is one of the things that make us strong. But I think that in times of national danger like this we had better stand off and look at the country and realize how well we have done I think that we should look more at the plus side, less at the negative side, and realize that we as a Nation have made tremendous progress internationally as well as nationally We only got to our present role in world affairs at the time of the start of lend-lease and through the last war. Since then has come the Marshall plan with all that it did to bolster morale of Europe.

We don't realize how much progress we have made and how much ground we have for a feeling of confidence, pride, and determination. We should show more of this side to the world, and less of the side of self-criticism and squabbling among ourselves.

Truth is an extremely powerful weapon. We are now beginning to reap the dividends from the fact that we are believed, because we have stuck to the truth in our official propaganda output, whereas other powers are not believed. That has become particularly apparent in the last 6 months. The Soviets put on an enormously intensive campaign to try to prove that we were the aggressors in Korea. That campaign has failed dismally in most of the world, and it backfired badly because it proved to millions of once-credulous people that the Kremlin group was a group of incredible liars. The fact that we had built up credibility for the Voice of America and other official channels of the United States has paid off, is paying off, and will pay off. The truth can be used to build up confidence, "spunk," and determination in the free world. The truth can be used to enlist a really enthusiastic desire for cooperation with us in the cause of the free world. The truth can be used to undermine and disprove the Soviet lies in other free nations. The truth can be used to erect barriers against further Communist aggression on both sides of the iron curtain. The truth can be used to build up a spirit of resistance.

On the strait-jacket point, I admit that it is difficult to carry on an information service within the structure of the United States Government, bound by all United States Government policies. But as far as the official Voice of America is concerned, I don't know how it could be otherwise. The Voice is going to be interpreted as the official voice of America regardless of where it is located in Washington, and what it says is going to be interpreted as a commitment of this Government wherever it is located.

There has been a healthy recognition of possible limitations of this situation in the organization of a committee for free Europe by a group of private citizens, which is not an official voice of the Government. One of the great things that has happened in that field is that a number of individuals have put the heat on C. D. Jackson to persuade him to take over that very difficult job. There is nothing more healthy in the entire psychological-warfare field than his appointment.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Barrett, there is another part of your work—the exchange of students between countries—that I have been interested in for many years. It furthers the idea of giving others personal contact with our own people here. Could you tell us how that is developing? I am sure this audience at Princeton would be glad to know more about it.

Mr BARRETT. There has been no more outstanding champion in the entire field of exchanging persons than Senator SMITH He has been a pioneer in the field and a consistent supporter.

I am convinced, after some skepticism, that it does pay off, and in a big way. We are seeing proof of it right now in many parts of Latin America. Students brought here 10 or 15 years ago are now emerging in positions of leadership. We have seen how Latin American countries have placed their confidence in this country, are all working together in the UN, and so on.

That program is moving along at a rapid rate. There will be about 8,000 persons exchanged between this country and others within the next year. There is one shift in emphasis within the program. It is a shift to leadership groups, including student leaders, to people who are in touch with a great many individuals—editors, labor leaders, and so on. That shift was made because we obviously reap quicker dividends from that kind of group than from concentration on the others There are those who say that this kind of program is only long-term in its effect. I deny that.

One quick illustration. There is today in Germany a young labor leader, who made a trip here 8 months ago. He addresses audiences throughout Germany and starts each speech with these words: "When I sailed into New York harbor, I sneered at the Statue of Liberty as an empty symbol; when I sailed out 3 months later, I bowed to the old lady because I found she really stood for something fine and decent and strong" That is the reason for my enthusiasm for that part of the program.

Mr. JACKSON. The student exchange program is absolutely right. One of the basic criticisms that can be leveled at American propaganda is that it is frequently not on the human level. There are geographical reasons for that; it is very difficult to be human via a microphone and a radio wave. But whenever we can get on the human level—an American to another human being—we score 100 points just automatically. The more of it that can be done the better. If the Fulbright funds are ever in danger of being extinguished, I hope that Senator SMITH sees to it that they are replenished mighty quick. All of that activity is splendid, because it is human.

Mr. EDDY. We have got to get more people telling the truth on our side, all the dope fiends and all the peddlers and all the cutthroats who hate Russian domination. We need Franco and Tito and Mao and all of them, and we can't tell them apart by the color of their eyes.

Mr. DULLES. We are not really novices in this field. I go back quite a long way, to World War I, when a great Princeton president, then President of the United States, was a master in this field. I happened to be at the other end of the line in Berne, Switzerland, during the build-up of psychological warfare when truth and tricks were mixed together. Wilson, in a masterful way, was able to divide the Kaiser and his military leaders from the German people. Before the radio and all the modern gadgets of intercommunication with peoples, he was able, by the use of this weapon of psychological warfare, to bring the First World War to a close when the German armies were still intact on French soil.

How did he do it? He did it because he was able to divide and conquer, to show the German people that they had nothing more to fight for, and they gave up their support of the armed forces in the field. The 14 points and his negotiations brought the war to a close when the fighting forces were still intact. I think that is certainly the most masterful achievement in the field of psychological warfare in this century.

We can use the same tactics today. Those 12 men in the Kremlin can be divided from the Russian people, and they can be divided from the satellites, from the people of the satellite countries. One of the most able moves in the field of psychological warfare came the other day from Yugoslavia (and revealed that maybe our Communist friends will be able to help us, too) when Tito pointed out that Stalin was a retrograde, that Stalin was no longer the one that had a right to speak even for communism There we have a wedge driven. We have many other ways in which we can drive a wedge between the rulers and the satellites and the people whom they oppress. We can go back to Woodrow Wilson to help us do it.

Mr. JACKSON. In line with this extraordinary kaleidoscope of truths, half-truths, and untruths, if anyone in this audience were suddenly asked to step up to one of Ed Barrett's microphones (or one of the Radio Free Europe microphones) and speak to all of these countries, how would you describe the enemy? You would have a perfectly terrible time. Would you say it is the Kremlin, the Politburo, communism, Stalinism, Marxist-Leninism, totalitarianism, etc.? What the people in this racket have got to realize, and what you have to realize, is that we must be terribly smart. We have to be smarter than we have sometimes been in the past. If you decide for instance to attack Stalin's Russian imperial tyranny, that goes for Yugoslavia, but if you start opening your mouth shouting just communism at the enemy, you can't say that to the Yugoslavs We expect those Communists possibly to die for us this summer. You cannot, out of one corner of your mouth, say, "Get in there and fight, boys," and out of the other corner of your mouth try to destroy communism to the Yugoslavs. It's a terribly complicated business.

Mr. KROCK In this morning's newspaper (the name of which I shall not mention) was a dispatch from a British correspondent in India who had just been in China. He describes Mao Tse-tung as follows: Though he takes long views, he is nonetheless a firm believer in what he calls Marxist-Leninism. He will accept coalitions, he regards some of Chang's capitalists as his present friends, he

wants to encourage private enterprise, he recognizes the bourgeoisie as a permanent element in society, he does not contemplate rural collectivism, etc. What of that, Colonel Eddy?

Mr. EDDY. It doesn't mean anything at all to me. It seems to me that there is only one thing we can be sure of—that in each nation of the world these people want to be free from domination, free to misgovern themselves, to ruin themselves, to damn themselves, to be Democrats or Populists. We must appeal to them and say that if they want to stay free we will help them.

Senator SMITH. I was in the Far East a year ago and went through a number of the areas out there and talked to many of the people. I was in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Korea, and Hong Kong. The only thing that people were talking about there was to be free to express their own individualities, and not to be exploited by any greater power. They were critical of what they called imperialism and colonialism; they were critical of the United States because they said we had been the partners of those who had been guilty of these things in the Far East. What they wanted was to be free for self-expression and all they wanted from us was assistance in getting that freedom.

I agree with what Mr. Eddy said. I think that what comes from Mao is simply coming from Moscow. We know that China was conquered by Moscow We know that there must be millions of people in China today who are yearning to be free just as much as those in these other countries. The question in my mind is whether we are going to win the confidence of the people in Asia who want to be free. There's where our danger is—the great masses of people in the Far East who don't understand us adequately. As I said earlier, we need a real crusade to tell them what it is all about and give them what they are yearning for.

I have been in contact with Mr. Dulles' brother, John Foster Dulles '08, very closely in the last few months. The wonderful job that he has done in Japan is worthy of our consideration all through here in his efforts to convey to the Japanese people our eagerness to give them the kind of freedom they want. To work out a peace treaty and yet give them the protection they need to prevent their being overrun by this Russian menace

I think Mr. Barrett will agree with me that it is different from the problem in Western Europe.

It is something we have got to face with courage, realizing this yearning for freedom and the necessity of the United States properly interpreting that freedom to them. We must understand their problems and not sit in an ivory tower here and say that because we are free, therefore you ought to be free. It can't be done that way. It has to be done by personal contact, personal understanding and the man-to-man approach.

Do Corporation Lobbyists Swarm Over Capitol Hill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 1951 issue of Sales Management, the magazine of marketing:

DO CORPORATION LOBBYISTS SWARM OVER CAPITOL HILL?

(By Jerome Shoenfeld)

(The results of a congressional inquiry may disappoint the public and perhaps amaze most businessmen Here's a report on how much corporations have spent and for what.)

From much that's being written, you get the impression that the head of a company spends most of his time, not to mention his company's money, crusading His crusades—at best indirectly, often remotely and sometimes not at all- sell his company's products or reduce its costs, their connection with the earnings statement can be perceived only by the elite policy makers, not by mere operating men. He crusades because he's scared, scared of socialism, of government extravagance, of labor, of regulation. In command of a great company, he finds ever so much money to indulge his personal neuroses by mailing books all over the county, blanketing the press with institutional ads As for himself, has he anything else, really, to do?

The caricature gets a suggestion of accuracy, perhaps, from the literature circulated by the publicity staffs of associations to which most of the big companies contribute. There were the irate and, so to speak, redfaced ads exploding that free enterprise is breaking down, there are the more recent patronizing ads featuring two men, one in a business suit and the other in overalls, in which the terms "profits," "free enterprise," "sales costs," "high productivity," etc, are explained or defended. Whether it's the business suit or the overalls that's talking, is sometimes made clear by the presence or absence of grammar There are also the booklets on all sorts of things—taxes, labor law, etc, and the books, among which, in the past year, John Flynn's the Road Ahead, has taken the lead.

Rarely does the picture fit anybody you meet, even though he happens to be the chairman of some board He doesn't sound or look like a canned institutional ad, even when the conversation shifts to the institutional subject matter; he's more likely to have some angle, which, plausible or silly, is his own and interesting And, despite the great war of books, booklets and ads, by now it's probably a rare company chief who isn't in some way working with the Government or who hadn't been during the war.

GROUP INFLUENCE

"Our investigation," declares the report of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities issued on January 1, "has convinced us that the business of influencing legislation is dominated by group effort, and that individual activities by persons known as lobbyists are subordinate. Much of the money expended to influence legislation is spent on pamphleteering or advertising to obtain legislative aims."

Previously, the House committee had published a booklet, Expenditures by Corporations To Influence Legislation, in which major companies tell what propaganda they've circulated, what propaganda ads they've published, etc. Company by company, you get the answers to a long series of questions. Going through about 500 pages of tables, you come out with the impression that most of the big companies most of the time mind their own business. Their crusades are usually close to home: power companies against public power, railroads against some twist in the regulations, ordinary vendors against a sales tax, liquor companies against the WCTU.

The questions by the committee covered: (1) trips to Washington; (2) maintenance of District of Columbia offices; (3) distribution of literature dealing with legislative matters, (4) institutional ads of the same kind; (5) contributions to various propaganda agencies, (6) lobbying expenditures not covered otherwise.

Take the expenditures for institutional ads Detroit Edison from 1947 through 1949 spent more than $200,000, but didn't report where or why. Late in 1948 Ford placed displays in each Washington, D C, newspaper, repeating the testimony of one of its executives before a congressional committee. General Electric didn't report to the Lobbying Committee, General Motors, which circulates pamphlets, didn't advertise; Georgia Power reported upward of $100,000 spent as "its share of the electric companies' advertising program" (presumably run by N. W. Ayer & Sons, Inc, over CBS). Gulf Oil placed seven ads in 1940, spending $150 on the average, "favoring business profits" International Latex merely cites five editorials that it republished, not listing the papers that were favored nor telling how much it spent.

LISTS ADVERTISING COSTS

Ohio Edison's tabulation covers nine and one-half pages The business goes to dailies and weeklies within its territories. Its subject matter has two themes: public power and creeping socialism. In addition to its own advertisements, the company through the last 4 years spent around $70,000 explained thus "payments to N W. Ayers & Sons, Inc., Washington Square, Philadelphia, Pa., the advertising agency that is conducting the electric companies' advertising program in various magazines having national circulation and radio broadcasts over CBS network"

Early in 1948 Schenley spent $279,370 on one ad: An ad that appeared in "daily newspapers throughout the country, in licensed beverage business papers and magazines, financial newspapers and magazines, news and press magazines, and similar publications." It dealt with the Luckman Committee, which was tying up the grain supply. This spring it spent $14,000 in business papers to urge liquor dealers to fight the excise tax.

These are some of the big ones. Most concerns do little or no advertising, the committee's tabulation indicates. If the reports are accurate and representative, companies don't stray far from business The greatest spenders are the utilities, which are the rarest among product advertisers.

Several companies spend a lot of money for books and pamphlets, chiefly about socialism, published by such organizations as American Enterprise Association, America's Future, Committee for Constitutional Government, Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, Economists National Committee for Economic Policy, Foundation for Economic Education, Public Affairs Institute, etc. Copies go to dealers, to employees, to executives, sometimes to customers. Hearings brought out that the organizations try hard to sell bulk subscriptions. One gets the impression that, with a few exceptions, company chiefs are prompted not so much by their own crusading zeal as that of the energetic publishers. Among companies that reported the distribution of this literature were:

Allied Chemical, to supervisors; American Gas, "office use"; A T. & T., evidently for the company library, judging by the small amount spent; Armco Steel, employees, supervisors, executives; Carolina Power, personnel, stockholders, "other friends"; Central Power & Light, employees; Champion Spark Plug, to people who request; Chrysler, not reporting recipients; Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric, employees, stockholders, and visitors in company lobby.

Literature circulated by companies consists mostly of stuff written by their own

staffs or ad agencies and deals with things they're directly interested in. Here are some examples of big spenders:

A. T. & T.: Its officials have repeatedly testified before various committees and commissions. The company circulated their testimony, chiefly to the press. This is simply a service to the reporters. Testimony also goes to people within the organization directly interested and to interested Government officials.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe: Its officials make speeches, which are circulated, among others, to newspapers—again a service

Detroit Edison: Literature from just about everywhere, mostly for the help and the customers.

Erie Railroad: All sorts of literature, distributed almost everywhere—employees, civic associations, papers, etc.

Ford: Dealers get testimony before Congress.

General Motors: For dealers, the testimony of C. E. Wilson; company booklets reprinting radio speeches to a list of 30,000; company official speeches to dealers, Congressmen, employees, papers, etc. One of the greatest spenders.

RCA: Company testimony goes to the press, licensed stations, distributors, etc.—distinctly a service.

Schenley: Press releases prepared by Carl Byoir distributed nationally; literature on excises, grain allocations, etc., sent to distributors. Some press releases get special distribution, for instance to the labor or the medical press.

Most of the money consists of contributions. The average big company joins chambers of commerce and trade associations all over the place. From the tables, you can see that there are thousands of them.

What corporations spent on lobby ads

Name of corporation and total expenditures reported under Federal Lobbying Act (Jan. 1, 1947-June 30, 1950):	
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	$15,255.00
Aluminum Co. of America	
American Automobile Insurance Co	
American Can Co	
American & Foreign Power Co, Inc	
American Gas & Electric Corp	
American Gas & Electric Service Corp	
American Power & Light Co	
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	103,632.01
American Tobacco Co	42,104.48
American Viscose Corp	
Anaconda Copper Mining Co	
Armco Steel Corp	
Armour & Co	
Armstrong Cork Co	
Association of Casualty & Surety Companies	29,882.56
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co	63,732.02
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co	
Beech Aircraft Corp	
Belden Manufacturing Co	
Bethlehem Steel Corp	256.75
Borden Co	
Burroughs Adding Machine	
Carolina Power & Light Co. (North Carolina)	
Celanese Corp. of America	
Central Power & Light Co. (Texas)	
Champion Spark Plug Co	
Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co	2,199.97
Chrysler Corp	
Cities Service Co	
Coca-Cola Co	
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co	
Commonwealth Edison Co	
Commonwealth & Southern Corp	
Connecticut Light & Power Co	
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc	
Consolidated Vultee Corp	
Consumer Power Co. (Michigan)	
Continental Can Co., Inc	
Curtiss-Wright Corp	
Deere & Co	
Delaware Power & Light Co	$7,719.05
Detroit Edison Co. (Michigan)	
Distillers Corp.-Seagrams, Ltd	
Du Pont, E. I. de Nemours	51.16
Eastman Kodak Co	
Electric Power & Light Corp	
Empire Gas & Fuel Co, Ltd	
Empire State, Inc	
Erie R. R Co	
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	4,504.50
Florida Power & Light Co	
Ford Motor Co	
Fruehauf Trailer Co	4,500.00
General Electric Co [1]	48,427.33
General Motors Corp	135,165.06
Georgia Power Co	6,385.03
Goodrich, B F., Co	18,254.75
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	
Great Northern Ry. Co	3,784.69
Gulf Oil Corp	
Harnischfeger Corp	3,576.72
Humble Oil & Refining Co	19,440.86
Illinois Central R R. Co	
Indianapolis Power & Light Co	
Inland Steel Co	10,900.00
International Elevator Co	
International Harvester Co	
International Hydro-Electric System	
International Latex Corp	
International Nickel Co., Inc	
International Paper Co	
International Telephone & Telegraph Co	
Jersey Central Power & Light Co	
Johns-Manville	12,749.31
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp	
Kaiser-Frazer Corp	
Kaiser Industries, Inc	
Kaiser Steel Corp	
Kresge, S. S	
Liggett & Meyers Tobacco Co	
Lilly & Co., Eli	
Lone Star Gas Co	
Mellon National Bank & Trust Co	
Middle West Corp	
Monongahela Power Co	
Monsanto Chemical Co	
Montana Power Co	
Montgomery Ward Co	
Mountain States Power Co	
Nash-Kelvinator Corp	
National Dairy Products Corp	
National Distillers Products Corp	
National Power & Light Co	
National Steel Corp	
New York Airbrake Co	
New York Central R R. Co	
Niagara Hudson Power Corp	
Norfolk & Western Ry. Co	$1,881.90
North American Co	
Northern Indiana Public Service Co	
Northern Pacific Ry. Co	2,503.99
Owens Illinois Glass Co	
Pacific Gas & Electric Co	89,912.22
Pacific Power & Light Co	
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co	
Pennsylvania Electric Co	
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	
Pennsylvania R R. Co	98,471.82
Petrol Corp	8,976.66
Philadelphia Electric Co	
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co	
Potomac Electric Power Co	
Procter & Gamble Co	
Public Service Co. of Colorado	
Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc	
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	
Public Service Corp. of New Jersey (Public Service Electric & Gas Co)	
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	7,389.85
Public Service Electric & Gas Co	
Puget Sound Power & Light Co	
Pullman, Inc	
Radio Corp. of America	
Reading Co., The	
Republic Steel Corp	6,849.00
Reynolds, R. J., Tobacco Co	57,375.28
Schenley Distillers Corp	168,957.22
Seagram & Sons, Inc	
Sears, Roebuck Co	5,721.84
Shell Oil Corp	
Singer Manufacturing Co	
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co, Inc	36,020.13
Southern California Edison Co, Ltd	
Southern Pacific Co	14,669.01
Southern Railway Co	122.78
Southwestern Gas & Electric Co	12,728.95
Standard Oil Co. of California	
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	2,000.00
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	
Sun Oil Co	
Swift & Co	
Texas Co., The	
Texas Electric Service Co	
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	
Union Electric Co of Missouri	
Union Pacific R. R Co	547.31
United Gas Improvement Co	
United States Gypsum Co	
United States Rubber Co	
United States Steel Corp	
Utah Power & Light Co	3,014.82
Virginia Electric & Power Co	
Washington Water Power Co., The	
Western Electric Co., Inc	
Westinghouse Electric Corp	
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co	18,375.67
Total	776,466.02

[1] $61,309.58 expended by General Electric Co. for distribution of a questionnaire "How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws?" not included in this total. The fact that the expenditure had been made was announced in a "Schedule B" filed at the same time as the quarterly lobby report in April 1949, but GE did not include the amount on the form as an expenditure stating: "The company does not believe that such publication comes within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act since no opinion was expressed and no position taken or advocated one way or the other on the question listed."

Source: "Expenditures by Corporations to Influence Legislation," by House Lobbying Committee.

Totals reported in response to questionnaire

	Corporations reporting expenditures	Amount
Subdivision (a)	66	$227,256 62
Subdivision (b)	7	346,807 65
Subdivision (c)	65	{ 1,811,850 24 377,301 31
Subdivision (d)	31	2,013,369 72
Subdivision (e)	125	26,041,452 57
Subdivision (f)	37	406,787 27
Grand total		32,124,835 38

The Bankers' Observation of the Value of Soil Conservation District Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech made by Mr. E. F. Vickers on November 20, 1950, before the Georgia Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors. Mr. Vickers is president of the Citizens Bank & Trust Co., of Bainbridge, Ga., and former president of the Georgia Bankers Association.

The speech follows:

They say that an honest confession is good for the soul. Most of the progress I have ever made has been forced upon me. I say that, not with pride, but with shame and regret.

Three years ago I was elected vice president of the Georgia Bankers Association. That meant that at the next convention I would be elected president. Shortly thereafter I was requested to attend a soil-conservation district award meeting, make a speech on soil conservation, and deliver the awards. If I had been asked to make a speech on astronomy, or the fourth dimension, or the *n*th degree, I would not have been any more at sea. There I was, running a bank with resources of $3,500,000, with half of my loans to farmers, and utterly ignorant of the fact that our country, our State, and our Nation are suffering untold damages from soil erosion, exhaustion, and depletion, and likewise ignorant of the fact that a remedy is at hand. Do not misunderstand me—I do not think that my feeble efforts since that time have corrected the situation or made any great contribution toward its correction. I do say that I have become alive to the importance and implications of the subject and am doing my best to make up for lost time.

My subject is entitled "The Bankers' Observation of the Value of Soil Conservation District Work."

I may have approached this subject from the wrong angle—I took it to mean that I am to appraise the appreciation of the banking fraternity of the value of soil-conservation district work, and my remarks will be predicated accordingly.

Before I conclude I hope that I shall convince myself and you that the average banker does have an appreciation of the value of soil-conservation district work, even though there is much room for improvement.

The first genuine broad public interest in the conservation of natural resources was stimulated by Theodore Roosevelt during his Presidency. Attention was given, however, principally to plans for conserving mineral, forest, and water resources, and no official attention was directed to the conservation of the soil until 1929.

In that year the Department of Agriculture began setting up erosion-control experiment stations and an intensive study of soil erosion was commenced. In 1933, when the depression was adding to the farmer's difficulties, the Soil Erosion Service was set up in the Department of the Interior, and it began operation of erosion-control demonstrations in problem areas.

In 1935, this service was transferred by act of Congress to the Department of Agriculture, and its name changed to Soil Conservation Service. This Service is purely a technical agency, staffed by soil scientists, engineers, biologists, chemists, hydrologists, agronomists, and other specialists, whose services are available to other Federal, State, and local agencies, which are engaged in promoting the soil-conservation movement. Through its research, educational activities, and on-the-job cooperation it has provided the basic leadership for the whole movement.

Today, under this national program, 48 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, and Alaska have passed enabling acts for the establishment of soil-conservation districts. Nearly 2,300 local districts are in operation embracing approximately 1,205,000,000 acres and 4,661,000 farms. Approximately 240,000,000 acres of the farm land included in the local districts have been covered by individual farm-conservation plans totaling approximately 873,000. A conservation plan, based on the needs and capacities of the land, and the means of the farmer, has been made for each farm. The practices called for by the plans have been put into effect on nearly 121,000,000 acres of this land.

The soil-conservation law of Georgia is found in Georgia laws of 1937, pages 377 to 404, as amended Georgia laws 1945, pages 190 and 191, and Georgia laws 1949, pages 584 to 587. These laws deal largely with the creation of the State committee, define its functions and powers, with the creation of the districts, and the appointment and election of supervisors Throughout it all is the feeling of utter democracy that inheres in all of it

Now as to the banker's role in all this vast movement.

The American Bankers Association, through its agricultural commission, has given a great deal of time and study to soil conservation, and has prepared and distributed a considerable amount of valuable literature on the subject to its members Its 1946 program for country banks, issued January 7, 1946, lists soil conservation as item No. 1, and states, with respect thereto, that the support of soil conservation should be a Nation-wide effort of organized banking.

The then chairman of this commission, C. W. Bailey, president, First National Bank, Clarksville, Tenn., is one of the earliest and most ardent supporters of conservation. As proof of the fact that he practices what he preaches, it can be said that his bank has pioneered in soil conservation loans, and is actively and aggressively encouraging farmers to adopt better farming practices. In this connection his bank distributed in September 1945, to the farmers in the community a very fine 4-page pamphlet captioned, "Take Care of the Soil—It Will Take Care of You," which explains in simple language the need for soil conservation, the procedure to be followed by the farmer for having his farm surveyed, and the benefits of soil conservation. The pamphlet also urges the farmer to discuss with the bank any financing that might be needed in the program, and in this connection the following statement is included: "The men who manage this bank think that there is nothing more important in farming than building up the soils * * * and keeping them productive" It is interesting to reflect that Mr. Bailey has served with distinction as president of the American Bankers Association and is now much in demand as a speaker on agricultural subjects.

The agricultural commission of the American Bankers Association has recently issued a booklet outlining the entire soil problem from the point of view of what the bankers can, and should, do about it, and how they should proceed in fulfilling their obligations in this respect. This booket, entitled "What Bankers Can Do About Soil Conservation," is highly recommended as a "must" in the files of all banks.

The contributions of two of the Federal Reserve banks to the soil conservation program have been outstanding, and the probabilities are that, as a result, the bankers in their respective districts have a much clearer realization of the importance of conservation, and their responsibility in the program. These banks are the Federal Reserve Banks of Cleveland and St. Louis. Both of these banks have on their staffs agricultural economists who are intimately familiar with the soils and soil problems of their respective districts, and who devote their full time to the development of programs to acquaint the bankers of the need for soil conservation and improvement.

I would be doing my friends over at the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta a great injustice if I should not say that it, too, has for several years been an earnest advocate of soil conservation. It has two agricultural economists who are very capable and well informed nd are always available when they can be of service in the cause. Their Bankers Farm Bulletin, which is published monthly, constantly exerts in favor of soil conservation.

Many State bankers associations have taken an active part in furthering the banker's participation in soil conservation As evidence of this is the fact that the Kentucky Bankers Association recently decided to spend $10,000 a year for three years to promote good farming practices in Kentucky. Further, the New York State Bankers Association has been very active in urging bankers to attend a special five-day course in agronomy and farm management designed especially for them, which is being offered by the Agricultural College of Cornell University. Numerous other State bankers associations have also taken positive action on the subject.

Clearing house associations in many communities are taking a realistic view of the problem, as is shown by the decision made in April 1945, by the St. Joseph, Mo., association, to earmark for soil conservation loans $500,000 of its $7,500,000 postwar credit pool.

There is no question that perhaps thousands of individual banks have management that is alert to the opportunities and obligations presented to the banks in the soil conservation movement. We know in countless communities scattered throughout the land, the banker is among the leaders of, and very active in soil conservation work. A great many banks have farm specialists on their staffs, and are therefore in a good position to embark on this comparatively new type of lending. However, the average country banker has been accustomed to making the conventional type of farm loans, such as feed, seed, and crop loans, which are usually short term. He does, of course, make

some long-term mortgage loans, but these are generally on the best farms and to the best credit risks. Soil conservation loans will fall in between the conventional short-term loan and the long-term mortgage loan, as they will generally require three to ten year maturities. They will also require a knowledge and understanding of the conservation program of the farmer, and of the loan repayment possibilities of the program. In other words, the country banker will have to acquire the know-how to make a type of loan he is probably not familiar with. The great danger in this situation is that too many bankers may feel it is too much trouble and effort to take on these loans on the theory that some other lender will take care of the prospective borrower. The banking profession should never permit this to happen, as the inevitable result will probably be the familiar cry that the banks are not doing their job. In this event the Government would probably feel it must take over the soil conservation financing job, and private banking would receive another set-back. Therefore, in the final analysis, the job of the banker in the soil conservation program must be done by the individual banks

For many of the statistics used, many of the thoughts expressed, and much of the language employed in the foregoing, I am indebted to a book, Soil Conservation and the Banker, by George H Emde, of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. To the author of this book I express my apologies for any liberties I took and my thanks for the pleasure I had in reading it.

Frankly, I think that the Georgia Bankers Association was among the first of the State associations to acquire an adequate appreciation of the importance of the whole matter—the loss or exhaustion of soil and the importance of preventive measures. It started its system of awards to soil conservation district cooperators in 1943 and since that time it has held 26 meetings and has given 2,007 awards to farmers who have made the necessary 90 points out of a possible 100 and have achieved some proficiency in each of the listed practices.

During the last 2 years, under the leadership of George Bazemore, as chairman of the agricultural committee, the Georgia Bankers Association has devoted more time, effort, and money to the encouragement of soil conservation than it has to any other subject. This has been done through and by working with the State committee, districts, Soil Conservation Service conservationists, technicians, and county agents.

And yet I fear that a great percentage, I would not say a majority, of individual bankers are not using the district and technicians to the extent that they could. Perhaps I should not head the list. But it is not the fault of the organizations, the supervisors, or the technicians. I have never found them too busy to talk to me or to go to any farm and help the farmer if I could assure them they would be welcome.

So it is refreshing to get a letter like this one, which I received from a banker friend in a neighboring county:

"My observation is the banks and the farmers are missing a good bet in not using the soil-conservation program more extensively. Some years ago we had a good farmer with a large family who was barely meeting his interest payments each year. All of his children worked and often had to say out of school to help with the farm. Much of his land was low and wet and his row crops frequently were drowned out. I called him in my office one day and had a long talk with him, the net result of which was he agreed to let me bring a soil-conservation man out there to study his problem.

"——— was our soil conservationist at the time and he did an excellent job. The first thing he did was to back off from the proposition and call in help to get a proper analysis of the soil So many weeks passed that I thought the matter was going by default.

"One day ———, another soil man, and the farmer came in my office. They had a complete new file, new aerial photographs of the farm, and a complete program outlined. I was amazed at the work and the careful attention which had been given to this man's program Their recommendations boiled down to a change in the system of terracing and drainage, abandoning row crops on some of the land and substituting pastures and livestock It all looked good to me and I turned to the farmer and asked him if he was willing to try. He said, 'Mr. ———, I am desperate I'll do anything these men say that you approve.'

"I told them all right. I had stuck my neck out and would finance him and asked what the cost would be. They said, 'We don't want any loan. The man is in debt. We don't want him to get any deeper in debt. He may have to borrow $125 for wire to construct one cross fence. Otherwise, we want him to do it on his own resources.'

"Last spring I stopped by this man's home. He was sitting on his front porch. When I drove up he walked barefoot out to my car and crawled up in the front seat with me. He said, 'I was just thinking about you a few minutes ago and my wife and I were talking about what a wonderful thing you did for us.'

"I explained to him that I had done nothing, that he himself had done it with the help of the soil conservation program I had merely directed him to the right parties.

"This man has had the money for 2 years without borrowing. He is ahead of the payments on his insurance mortgage on the land. His children are in school, they are well fed and well dressed and the whole family are happy This is a true story exactly as it happened.

"Since that time I have steered other customers to the soil conservationists in our county. They have been most cooperative and they are doing a good work in ——— County"

So you can see that the conservation movement and the State committee and districts and technicians are not without friends. Progress may be slow but I can assure you that bankers everywhere are becoming more and more appreciative of your efforts.

Time does not permit, nor do I need to talk to you about soil conservation. You are its apostles. But I wish indeed that somebody could speak with a voice as loud and impressive as the thunders that came down from Mount Sinai and say: Our institutions are in danger—our homes, our businesses, our schools, our banks—indeed everything. Our population is increasing fast—our cultivatable land is decreasing, not as fast as it was, but fast nevertheless. Under the impetus of price supports we are working our land for all its worth, and under our benevolent attitude toward other lands and peoples we are sending away the strength of our lands to foreign countries, whence it never returns. Can a crisis be long deferred? Not unless everybody—not alone the banks—becomes interested in soil conservation.

The absolute necessity, the "without which not," of soil conservation is the soil-conservation district. Through it work the State committee, the supervisors, and technicians and without them the whole effort would lack system, form, and body.

That, my friends, is the way one banker feels about the matter you assigned me. And I thank you sincerely for the honor you conferred on me—and the banking fraternity, in inviting me here.

Ishpeming GI Tells of Low Troop Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, an army is as good as its morale. I have contended that revision of the policy covering our reservists is of immediate importance. Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to commend for your reading the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Mining Journal, Marquette, Mich., which quotes a letter from one of our soldiers:

ISHPEMING GI TELLS OF LOW TROOP MORALE

ISHPEMING, March 3—"I've never seen the morale of troops so low before."

So writes Pvt. Charles Cowpland in a letter to the Mining Journal from Pusan, Korea. The soldier, formerly of Ishpeming, is the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Elliott Cowpland and the grandson of Mrs. C. C. Cowpland.

His letter, sounding a heavily pessimistic tone, is based on a series of searching questions. Reprinted in its entirety, the letter reads as follows:

"DEAR SIR: Myself and a few thousand other GI's would like to know the answers to several questions. The biggest question at the present is, Just why are we over here? The Army has tried to answer that for some time now, but I've yet to hear anyone say he's convinced we ought to be fighting. The Korean people certainly aren't glad to have us. I've seen that with my own eyes. You'll notice I said the people, and not the politicians. After all, it is the people of this world whom we are trying to satisfy, even though the scales show otherwise.

WHERE WILL IT END?

"Another good question is where will it all end, and to what advantage? Also, do the people back home realize how disgusted the reservists are at the quick shuffle they've gotten? I've never seen the morale of troops so low before.

"It just about all boils down to this: How is a man going to fight or give his all when he can't see anything worth while behind it? No one has satisfied us yet, so think twice before you try."

QUESTION OF RESERVISTS

"Another question which all reservists would like answered: When we signed up after the last war we were led to believe we wouldn't be called until a national emergency existed. Most of us were called before the emergency was declared. To us it was kind of a low blow dealt from what we once called a democratic nation. It's rough to be lied to, by our own Government, at that. This may sound harsh, but it's not half as harsh as all of us feel.

"Why is it that our PX (post exchange) shelves are bare when the black market thrives to such an extent that the streets are lined with shops selling American cigarettes, candy, toilet articles, stationery, and every item of GI clothing—not used (but) brand new?

BRITISH IN AMERICAN GARB

"Why is it that our engineer battalions have to drive trucks and equipment made in Japan, when the Koreans use United States equipment and tear it up within a month?

"Why was it that the reservists, the majority of whom were more than qualified, weren't held in (the) States to train draftees instead of being sent overseas?

"Why is it that British soldiers, from the nation which claims to have the best tailors in the world, are seen wearing GI field coats and carrying M-1 rifles as they stroll through the PX buying up our 'scarce' items? Why, too, are Korean police, civilians, and soldiers wearing our GI uniform? How is an American soldiers supposed to respect his uniform when it's being worn by everyone in the world?

IMPOSING EDIFICES

"Why is it that the British, Dutch, and other European legations are housed in imposing edifices when that Nation that foots the bill for the whole show is in a dump by comparison?

"You try to answer these questions. We, the expendable GI's, can't!

"CHARLES C. COWPLAND."

Anyone who feels he can answer some of Private Cowpland's questions can reach him by addressing the envelope to Pfc Charles Cowpland, ER 46044518, 378th Engr. Util. Det., APO 59, care Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.

Operations in the Chosin Reservoir Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

OPERATIONS IN THE CHOSIN RESERVOIR AREA

1 Early in November the First Marine Division launched a drive from Hamhung toward the Chosin Reservoir The Seventh Marines, in the lead, advanced north steadily and by aggressive and determined fighting finally decimated the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth CCF Division in the vicinity of Chinhung-ni The advance continued to a point west of Yudam-ni, when, on November 29, due to the deteriorating situation on the Eighth Army front and the appearance of several fresh Chinese divisions in the Chosin Reservoir area, orders were received to withdraw toward Hamhung This withdrawal, which was concluded when the last elements of the division closed the Hamhung area on December 11 will become an epic in the annals of the Marine Corps. Seldom, if ever, have marines been forced to battle against comparable odds The enemy in overwhelming force was on all sides, necessitating determined attacks to the front to clear the way, resolute rear guard actions to keep the enemy from closing in, and flank protection to guard the trains and the wounded in the center of the column Step by step the division fought its way for a distance of 35 miles, always against unremitting pressure from the enemy. First the Fifth and Seventh Marines, with attached units, fought their way out of Yudam-ni, over a 4,000-foot mountain pass and into Hagaru-ri. The losses were heavy but the column was strengthened by the garrison at Hagaru-ri, the Third Battalion, First Marines, the Forty-first Royal Marine Commandos, and headquarters and service units. Then the column fought its way from Hagaru-ri to Koto-ri. Again losses were heavy but the column was strengthened by the addition of the headquarters of the First Marines, the Second Battalion, First Marines, and attached units then in garrison at Koto-ri. For the final drive from Koto-ri to the relative security of Chinhung-ni at the southern end of the tortuous mountain road below Koto-ri the entire division participated. While the bulk of the division fought down the mountain, the First Battalion, First Marines, fought up the mountain to a juncture, thus permitting the trains to descend the mountain with reasonable safety. Much of the road over which this withdrawal was conducted was tortuous, narrow, and snow- and ice-coated. Temperatures ranged from 8° to 20° Fahrenheit imposing extreme hardship on men and causing considerable difficulty with motor vehicles There were road blocks, blown bridges, and cratered roads. Yet in spite of determined enemy resistance, hazardous roads, and bitter weather the division emerged from its ordeal a fighting division and inflicted heavy casualties on the six enemy divisions encountered. All wounded were evacuated, there were no stragglers, and usable equipment was not destroyed except by enemy action.

2 The performance of officers and men in this operation was magnificent Rarely have all hands in a division participated so intimately in the combat phases of an operation Every marine can be justly proud of his participation. In Korea, Tokyo, and Washington, there is full appreciation of the remarkable feat of the division With the knowledge of the determination, professional competence, heroism, devotion to duty, and self-sacrifice displayed by officers and men of this division, my feeling is one of humble pride No division commander has ever been privileged to command a finer body of men.

OLIVER P SMITH,
Major General, USMC, Commanding General First Marine Division.

Confusion's Ultimate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from a recent edition of the Commercial Appeal, which is as follows:

CONFUSION'S ULTIMATE

There are limits to everything, even confusion.

Price Stabilizer DiSalle achieved the ultimate Saturday when he released the cotton trade from the handcuffs of his first price ceiling order of January 26 and replaced them with a strait-jacket and leg irons.

The chaotic conditions of the cotton trade, which has persisted for five long weeks, thus has been made most confusing.

Contrary to the claims of Mr. DiSalle and his propagandists, the cotton trade is not asking for higher prices for cotton, even though it is asking that no ceilings be imposed.

It is fighting for its existence as a business and a marketing system, and has agreed to rigid and severe regulations to prevent any rise in prices if only the market is left intact.

The futures and the spot markets, as now constituted, are essential for the marketing of the cotton in an orderly manner. Without one, the other cannot function efficiently and effectively. If the buyer of cotton has no hedge in the futures market, he cannot afford to buy the farmer's cotton in the fall If the merchant cannot buy the cotton, the problem of holding the cotton until there is a market reverts to the farmer and his banker, neither of whom is fitted to carry the burden.

The cotton trade—producers and merchants—have been fighting alone to prevent the end of their marketing system, while the public and other industries stand by with little show of interest in the outcome. They are carrying the fight to Congress in the hope that the decisions of Price Stabilizer DiSalle and his staff of entrenched bureaucrats can be reversed.

They point out that the communistic tactic when it desires to take over an industry is to make rules which hamper operation, then rules which stifle business. Then they say, "You have been unable to operate, so we must take over."

They point out that the British cotton industry was nationalized by the same plan and the same procedure.

They know that if they are unable to function as a market the Government will use that as an excuse to take over the buying and selling of cotton. They know they cannot function under the price-control program outlined by Mr. DiSalle

They know that they must win this battle or become the first major industry to be socialized in America. They do not know which will be next, whether coal, railroads, transportation, including railroads and truck lines, textile mills, automobile factories, insurance companies, or doctors But they are certain that if one industry is socialized, it will be easier to nationalize the second, and the third.

This is not cotton's fight alone It is a fight in which everyone has a stake and in which every believer in free enterprise should join

Why We Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. CLEVENGER Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Bruce Barton, from the Washington Sunday Star of March 11, 1951:

WHY WE FIGHT

(By Bruce Barton)

I was interested in a news dispatch which read, "Officers representing the Secretary of Defense and the Armed Forces began yesterday a revamping of orientation programs, to help service men and women understand why they are being asked to risk their lives in the defense of democracy" This comes after a long series of dispatches reporting that GI's in Korea do not understand why they are there.

As a student of history and a patriotic American, I am impressed by the fact that the wars of our country divide sharply into two categories—those that every soldier understood, and those that many, if not a majority, did not understand.

There was no need for an orientation in 1775. The embattled farmers at Concord were fighting for their independence and for that they were willing to die.

With our Spanish-American War our perplexities began We just couldn't quite

make up our national mind whether we were fighting for the freedom of the Cubans and the Filipinos, or whether, as Senator Beveridge blurted out: "American factories are making more than the American can use; American soil is producing more than he can consume. Fate has written our policy for us; the trade of the world must be ours."

In World War I—the war to end all wars—we set up only a relatively small orientation establishment. In World War II, a host of "orientationers" was required—press agents, broadcasters, lecturers, mimeograph operators, makers of documentary films.

Now in world war III we must have uncounted hordes of explainers

In the same week I read two statements by Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, commander of the forces in Korea. The first, presumably the work of one of the orientation boys, was a very exalted message to the troops: "The real issues are whether the power of Western civilization as God has permitted it to flower in our own beloved lands shall defy and defeat communism"

The second declamation came a few days later. God had been dropped from the ranks along with the high-flown talk: "Lt Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway said today that his 13-day-old offensive was aiming at killing the most Communists at the least cost, and had no geographical objective."

A long, long road we have traveled since 1775. From "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * * that all men are created equal," all the way down to "killing the most Communists at the least cost."

Ceiling on Raw Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, chairman, March 9, 1951:

Mr. Chairman, it is always an honor and a pleasure to appear before your distinguished comimttees, but especially am I honored today in thus addressing my own senior Senator's committee. Assuming that my colleagues and those present are not as familiar with Senator MAYBANK'S background as we are, I would remind you that the Senator's entire background is wrapped up in the growing, marketing, and processing of cotton In our State, the names "Maybank" and "cotton" are synonymous. There are few men in the country and none in the Senate, in my judgment, who know quite so much about cotton as does the chairman of this distinguished committee. You will pardon me for a brief personal reference to my own background when I tell you that I too might be thought of as a product of the cotton industry. I grew up with cotton and now have the privilege of speaking for more textiles than any other Congressman in the world.

As evidence of the seriousness of the proposal to put ceilings on raw cotton, I quote below a series of telegrams which I have just received and my reply thereto:

"On behalf of membership we urge your support removal ceilings raw cotton and support of industry plan adopted by Department of Agriculture for control raw cotton prices.

"J. F. MCLAURIN,
"President, Carolina Ginners Association."

"Textile industry our State supports position of National Cotton Council on maintaining open market on cotton We hope you agree and will work in this direction.

"JOHN K. CAUTHEN,
Executive Vice President, S C. Cotton Manufacturers Association."

"Request you attend Maybank meeting tomorrow urge rescinding of cotton ceiling and adoption of industry plan endorsed by Department of Agriculture.

"FRANK A. JONES, Jr.,
"Greenville, S. C."

"I strongly recommend that you join with Senator MAYBANK in presenting the united front in testifying to the unworkability of the recent ceilings on raw cotton. I believe it to be imperative that Congress back up the Agriculture Department's plan of stabilizing prices on cotton which would prevent runaway prices without resorting to price ceilings. This program is workable and would have the full endorsement of the farmer as well as cotton merchants resulting in harmony which is so necessary at this time to get out the very large quantity of cotton in this growing year to supply our vital textile industry.

"WALTER REGNERY,
"Joanna Cotton Mills Co., Joanna, S. C."

"Senator MAYBANK has called meeting of congressional "watchdog" committee for tomorrow to hear United States Department of Agriculture present its view on cotton price ceiling controversy. Secretary Brannan's testimony will also represent cotton industry's position. Since this whole matter of such paramount importance would appreciate your attending hearing and obtain details of plan suggested by cotton people to stabilize cotton prices without resort to price ceilings. Regards.

"ROBERT R. COKER,
"Hartsville, S. C."

"Urge you protest ceiling on cotton at joint committee meeting on defense production to be held March 8 and suggest the adoption of the industry plan as indorsed by Department of Agriculture.

"REMSON BAUGHRIGHT,
"Vice President.
"D W. ANDERSON,
"Assistant Vice President.
"J. LAKE WILLIAMS,
"Secretary, Alice Manufacturing Co."

My answer to the above telegrams was as follows:

"Have vigorously protested cotton ceilings. Shall follow through.

"JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
"Member of Congress."

Of all the features of the many controls imposed during the last war, those relating to cotton and textiles worked most satisfactorily. It will be recalled that no effort was made to put ceilings on raw cotton then. The controls were placed upon the finished products Why past experiences were so suddenly and completely disregarded and this new unworkable plan instituted is beyond my understanding. In law, we follow the rule of "stare decisis"—stand by a decision. In this instance, no effort is being made to stand by a decision which was workable. I do not know Price Director DiSalle, but I am informed that he has had no experience whatsoever in dealing with cotton in any of its phases. I fear that he has not conferred with those best qualified to advise him on this intricate and involved subject. In this connection, I am reminded of a story about some government agent who came into our fair country years ago for the purpose of ascertaining the cause of hookworm. After spending much time and money, this agent filed a report stating that the presence of hookworm in the South was attributable to the excessive use of a drink peculiar to our country called cotton gin. This report stated that the natives went in for the manufacture of this drink on a large scale for at the principal crossroads would be seen sizable plants bearing large signs reading "Cotton gin." The conclusion was reached that hookworms were caused by drinking "cotton gin." This story illustrates the fact that there are those who know very little about cotton.

It is inconceivable that controls could be imposed on raw cotton since there are more than 400 different varieties and staples of cotton At best, controls are objectionable but right thinking people are reconciled to the fact that controls are necessary during emergencies such as the present. Unless we approach this difficult problem in the right attitude, greater confusion than we have ever known will ensue. I respectfully urge that the present theory or plan of controls be reconsidered and that further study be given to the system used in the last war.

Livestock Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following statement adopted by the board of directors of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., in regular session on March 8, 1951, on livestock ceiling prices:

Indiana farmers have heavy investments now in abundant production. Latest national figures indicate 6 percent increase in spring pig crop, with 4,000,000 more hogs for slaughter expected this year compared with last year. Cattle in Nation's feed lots 5 percent more now than a year ago. This extra meat production, as encouraged by free-market price conditions, can prevent rationing, while a discouraging, risky controlled-market-price situation would eliminate the emphasis on full meat production and thus hasten the day for meat rationing and resulting food subsidies.

Indiana farmers would far rather take the financial risks of livestock production in a free market than gamble with a Government-controlled market price where supply and demand are shoved aside for governmental considerations and decisions that no one can anticipate in long-range livestock planning.

Our livestockmen have now filled their feed lots with purchases from free markets and if the rules are changed, these farmers with heavy investments could be facing known losses by having to sell in a set, controlled market. As the swelling flood of increasing costs chokes off livestock production under conditions of price fixing, confusing meat rationing, and costly food subsidies will follow directly, as ample World War II evidence shows. Despicable black markets, waste of valuable animal byproducts, and

disruption of normal channels of trade also go along with Government fixing of livestock prices. World War II experience displays.

In short, Indiana farmers are strongly opposed to Government tampering or fixing of prices for live hogs and cattle or other farm animals. Price ceilings on livestock are taking production down the wrong road and hazards the Nation's food supply and strength now when we are mobilizing our might for the defense of freedom.

Hassil E. Schenck, Lebanon, President; Larry Brandon, Auburn, First Vice President; Mrs. Russell Cushman, Fortville, Second Vice President; Emil Bannwart, Michigan City; Elmer Kolmerten, Fort Wayne; Arthur E Arnott, Rensselaer; C. E. Moseley, Peru; J. Walter Thompson, Crawfordsville; Wayne Mann, Orleans; Ernest Freeman, Muncie; George Doup, Columbus; Lowell Taylor, Owensville, George W Elliott, Rising Sun.

Food-Price Spiral and Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter, as signed by Mr. Roy Stokes, president, and Mr. Joseph Stempnik, legislative chairman, Local No. 295, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Detroit, Mich., and also a clipping from the Detroit Free Press of January 11, 1951, entitled: "Detroit Food-Price Spiral Continues Unabated."

Spiraling living costs, as they affect the post office employees, are a direct concern of this Congress and I willingly call it to the attention of my colleagues.

There is proposed legislation pending in Congress to increase the salaries of our faithful postal employees and it is hoped by many Members of Congress that early action will be taken.

The letter and article follow:

DETROIT FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Detroit, Mich.

HON. LOUIS RABAUT,
House Office Building, Washington, D C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: Enclosed is a clipping from the Detroit Free Press dated January 11 which clearly illustrates how the price of food has increased from 10 to 15 percent over the prices shown for the same commodities as of last June The cost of living index as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics has risen to new heights making the salaries of post office clerks and Federal employees totally inadequate to maintain a respectable standard of living.

Private industry and local and State governments have granted wage increases in the past few months to their employees to offset the excessive rise in the cost of living, while Government employees must await favorable salary legislation by the Eighty-second Congress.

The postal deficit, the size of the national budget for the 1952 fiscal year nor a price and wage freeze law should be used by Congress to deny Government employees equitable salary legislation.

The postal deficit is not due to inefficiency on the part of the postal employees, but due to the high cost of operation, large subsidies paid to the transporters of the mails plus congressional reluctance to increase outmoded postal rates.

The $71,000,000,000 national budget for fiscal year 1952 is due to heavy military expenditures while allowing only a small increase over the amount granted in the fiscal year 1951 budget for nondefense items

Wage-freeze laws in the past have always provided exceptions to cover wage contracts being negotiated at the time the wage-freeze law went into effect, also permitted annual automatic raises and allowed wage increases after prior approval of a wage board or designated agency.

S 355 and H. R 244, H. R. 340, H R. 437, H. R. 452, and H. R 1546 have been introduced by either the chairman or members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in order to alleviate the economic distress of Federal and postal employees caused by their low wages and the high cost of living

The membership of Local No. 295, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, appeals to you to urge the chairman and members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to schedule early hearings on remedial salary legislation.

We thank you for your past interest in the welfare of all Government employees.

Respectfully yours,
ROY STOKES,
President, Local No. 295, NFPOC, Detroit, Mich.
JOSEPH STEMPNIK,
Legislative Chairman, Local No. 295, NFPOC, Detroit, Mich.

[From the Detroit Free Press of January 11, 1951]

DETROIT FOOD-PRICE SPIRAL CONTINUES UNABATED

(By John Griffith)

Detroit food prices continued their steady advance Wednesday except in pork where prices were steady to slightly lower.

A spokesman for a major independent supermarket chain said: "Prices are going up every day; they are not firm in anything. Nothing is stable"

Meantime, Windsor food prices also edged higher but on a lesser scale

Canadian price increases were smaller and there were numerous reductions from 6 months ago.

Detroit meat prices Wednesday generally averaged about 10 to 15 percent higher than in June, a survey revealed In that time, the cost of living index has risen 5 4 points to 175.6

Detroit dairies, meanwhile, announced that the price of home-delivered milk would be raised to 21½ cents a quart within a few days, the second increase in 30 days.

Alex Bell, Detroit retailer, and spokesman for the Associated Food Merchants of Greater Detroit, listed prices in effect Wednesday for top grades of meat

Round steak was 98 cents to $1.05; porterhouse, $1 15 to $1 20; rib roast, 90 cents; pot roast, 75 cents; pork chops, 80 cents; hamburger, 65 cents, and lunch meat 7 percent above 6 months ago.

At that time, he said, round steak was 90 cents; porterhouse, 98 cents; rib roast, 80 cents; pot roast, 65 cents; pork chops, 85 cents (the only price drop); and hamburger, 55 cents.

In dry groceries, a 5-pound bag of flour was 49 cents to 51 cents, due to a recent 2-cent increase. Tomatoes were two cans for 35 cents in contrast to 6 months ago when the charge was two cans for 27 cents

Powdered soaps, 32 cents a box, against 25 cents; shortening, 3 pounds $1.07 now and 91 cents in June; coffee, 89 cents and 77 cents 6 months ago.

Peaches now 47 cents a can against 36 cents; sliced pineapple, 39 and 35 cents.

The supermarket spokesman, who supplied the grocery figures, outlined some of the reasons for food cost increases.

"There is a general tendency on the part of manufacturers to edge prices upward, sometimes only 15 cents a case," he said.

"Retailers can absorb only so many of these boosts and then we must pass them along to the customer.

"Cost of paper bags and butcher paper have gone out of sight," he said. "Containers of all kinds, cardboard, glass and tin cans are all more expensive."

In Windsor, meanwhile meat prices were as much as 33 percent lower for similar meat cuts and grades than in Detroit butcher shops.

Ralph Polsky, operator of an independent supermarket at East Chatham and Macdougall, quoted the following prices:

Round steak, 75 cents; porterhouse, 85 cents; rib roast, boned and rolled, 72 cents, pork chops, 59 cents; hamburger, 57 cents; pot roast, 63 cents, leg of veal, 59 cents; sliced bacon, 55 cents; and smoked hams, 59 cents.

Polsky, who said his prices were representative of Windsor supermarket operation, said his prices in June were:

Round steak, 77 cents; porterhouse, 79 cents; rib roast, 59 cents; pork chops, 57 cents; hamburger, 39 cents; pot roast, 54 cents; leg of veal, 51 cents; sliced bacon, 55 cents, and smoked hams, 59 cents.

His vegetable prices were higher, however, than those in Detroit, he said. Canned tomatoes were quoted two of the 34-ounce cans for 33 cents, against two cans for 35 cents in June

Milk sold generally in Windsor at 20 cents for the large Canadian quart, five of which would make six American quarts. This was 1 cent higher than in June

Bread was 17 cents, coffee $1 05, lunch meats were 49 and 59 cents, while canned milk was sold at two for 29 cent

Letter of Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1951

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter written by Mr. William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, which was sent to Life magazine in answer to that magazine's editorial on January 15 entitled "This Way to Suicide":

JANUARY 20, 1951.

The EDITORS, LIFE,
New York City.

GENTLEMEN Because it calls exactly for the fatal step that will destroy our free society, and reduce the world to chaos where communism can thrive, I rise to protest your editorial of this week, "This Way to Suicide."

When you denounce the President and Mr Acheson for believing in the possible coexistence of communism and Americanism; when, in addition, you demand the destruction of "Soviet communism," its ambitions and sources of power, you make mandatory that the people of the United States mobilize forthwith and wage a total war for completely unlimited objectives. You confidently assume that such a victory is possible and that, although such a gigantic war will destroy much of Europe, once it is won there will be brighter possibilities of peace.

May I suggest that you read your history? Never in all history has any one idea, nor any one government, ruled all the world. Every time any nation has tried to do it, failure has resulted. Imperial Rome was not able to destroy Christianity Neither could Charlemagne, with his Holy Roman Empire, impose it on all the world Mohammedanism spread like a prairie fire until it was stopped by brave Christians, but Christians could not destroy Mohammedanism It still exists. That communism is a similar historic force would be foolish to deny

Conflicting great powers, espousing conflicting ideals, have lived in this world in coexistence since the beginning of time. That they have fought each other is a matter of record, but the records also show that when one has tried to destroy the other, they have usually exhausted each other to such an extent that the basic vitality of both has been sapped

Communism will not be destroyed by destroying the present regime in the Soviet Union. What will take its place will be a Russian regime, most of whose personalities know nothing but communism What will follow will be a typically Russian autocratic, brutal, restless regime.

To assume that the vitality of the Communist idea will disappear amid the ruins of Western Europe, I believe is absolutely unwarranted To the contrary, the total exhaustion of Western Europe would create the very revolutionary situation where organized Communists could seize power. Certainly it will mean the end of democracy.

You are calling for more political capacity than exists in America or anywhere in the world To assume that here in the United States, after fighting such a war, with its subsequent period of disillusion which is sure to follow, we shall have a democracy, is, in my opinion, a specious assumption.

In the circumstances that exist today I would call attention to the very quotation from President Truman and Secretary Acheson which you criticize:

"If we build our strength—and we are building it—the Soviet rulers may face the facts and lay aside their plans to take over the world. That is what we hope will happen, and that is what we are trying to bring about"

That is the only realistic road to peace, and represents the basis of a wise policy. Whether we like it or not, America and organized communism are going to coexist for many decades, if not generations, to come.

During those decades, there is bound to be conflict, just as there has always been conflict between opposing political interests.

Surely, after the experience of two World Wars, in which we futilely sought to win unlimited and impossible objectives, our future policy should be to keep our objectives limited and within our political capacities to support. At this time in our history we ought to be maturing to the point where we see wars as a social disease which can never be eliminated, but which can be reduced in their virulence and destruction.

The same criticism I am writing to you I have already written editorially numerous times when President Truman, for instance, in his speech dedicating the United Nations building in New York, said in substance that there can be no peace until our (note that word) ideals of freedom prevail everywhere. Note the unlimted scope of the word "everywhere" That is an unlimited objective. On the other hand, the statement made by President Truman and Secretary Acheson and quoted by you above, confines our objectives to historical realities and within our capacity to support.

No editor in the United States has fought communism longer and more persistently than I have. I can produce a written record to show the warnings I sounded about our dealings with Soviet Russia in the last war. What I write comes from a great deal of experience at home and abroad and from the reading of history.

If this country should by chance shout itself into the total war that you and Governor Dewey call for, I have made up my mind what I am going to do. I am going to do my best to organize a rebellion against it. No plea for unity is going to silence me into meekly submitting to fighting a third world war for the unlimited objectives you proclaim, but which history shows no nation has ever won

Respectfully,

WILLIAM R. MATHEWS,
Editor and Publisher, the Arizona Daily Star.

Interoceanic Canals Commission Is Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have studied the question of transisthmian canals with particular reference to the problems of national defense, including the atomic bomb. The RECORD is replete with authoritative information on these subjects by distinguished Members of Congress.

The situation presented by this vital issue clearly calls for the creation of a broadly based and independent interoceanic canals commission composed of the best qualified men available under congressional authorization. This idea was evidently contemplated by Chairman E. J. HART of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the report on the activities of his committee during the Eighty-first Congress—House Report No. 3246, Eighty-first Congress.

An editorial supporting this proposal was published in Marine Progress of February 1951. It emphasizes the need for any such commission to be broadly based and to include representation from the maritime agencies which use the canal.

The entire editorial is quoted:

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

In a review of the work done by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries there is a report on the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee delegated to make a study of the transisthmian canal route question that has demanded the attention of the Congress for some time. Representative EDWARD J. HART, chairman of the committee, has suggested that a study of the transisthmian canal question be made by qualified engineers so that a good canal can be had, either through the modernization of the present waterway or the construction of a new canal at this or some other site.

Congressman HART'S suggestions has considerable merit but it is obviously necessary that any commission appointed to study this problem must have on it representatives from the Armed Services, from the Canal Zone Government and most particularly from the maritime industry which will not only use the canal but will also pay the greater part of its cost. To restrict the commission to engineers will result only in an engineer's waterway, one that may be perfect from a technical standpoint but may not be suitable for the practical operation of large and fast vessels. Let the users of the canal outline in detail what they want, let the Armed Services show what must be had from their standpoint and then let the engineers build the waterway to meet these requirements. In that manner we shall be getting the best canal possible.

Wrong Approach to Cotton Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March issue of the South Carolina Farmer with reference to the wrong approach in placing ceilings on cotton and cotton products:

To the average man who grows cotton, the action of Price Administrator DiSalle in clamping a ceiling on raw cotton just doesn't make sense. Senator MAYBANK expressed the thoughts of several million southern people when he dubbed DiSalle's action as "nonsense—just another bureaucratic order."

For every action, particularly for one of so great importance, there must be a reason. The public mind is confused as to Mr. DiSalle's real reason for taking this action. Obviously, it is not in the public interest, it will not do the thing that Mr. DiSalle says that he intends it to do—work in the interest of the consumer to protect him against higher prices in clothes and cotton goods. Any third grade school child of average intelligence would be quick to realize that only ceilings on cotton textiles would serve to protect consumers against higher prices

During World War II, ceilings on textiles with a free market operating underneath proved fairly effective Why does Mr. DiSalle evade the use of this method and insist upon trying something new that everyone who knows anything about the cotton industry knows will not work?

Could it be that the huge profits being made in the textile industry have made the owners of this industry silent partners to Mr DiSalle's action in order to protect the wide spread now existing between the price that the farmer is paid for his cotton and the price that the consumer pays for textile products? Or could it be that the forces of organized labor, in the hands of its selfish leaders, are behind this movement to protect this wide spread in order that plenty of leeway be provided for justification of demands for increased wages.

Almost 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln said, "public opinion is everything. With it nothing can fail; and, without it, nothing can succeed." In this case public opinion does not support DiSalle's action. The public mind is confused. There is no clear picture of the need for or any sound reasoning behind this action.

While "big industry" and "big labor" argue as to who is in charge of our Government, neither accuse agriculture of being in charge.

Forty-five and seventy-six one-hundredths cents per pound as a ceiling would not be too bad if that were actually what the average farmer could expect as an average price

for his 1951 cotton crop. During the fall months when farmers must dispose of their cotton, mills will be prone to buy sparingly because, under this ceiling on raw cotton, they would be protected against any advance in price. They would be sensible in waiting for a lower price This depresses the market. Most of the 1951 crop must wait to find a ready market. This means that the farmer who produces cotton must take enough less than 45 76 cents per pound basis middling 15/16 to fully compensate those who buy and store this cotton for the expense of handling and storing and paying interest

So the prospect is for an average price to our South Carolina farmers for 1951 cotton of something considerably below 45.76 cents per pound and perhaps much nearer to the prospective 90 percent of parity support price level of a little more than 30 cents.

Experience has taught us (taught cotton buyers particularly) that farmers will not refuse to sell cotton at any price above the support-price level This support price cotton loan would afford farmers an opportunity to obtain 90 percent of its parity value and then store and hold and sell this cotton later; but experience has taught buyers of cotton not to fear this action, since farmers will not take advantage of it. If farmers would use this means of withholding the 1951 crop from the market, the lid would blow off soon.

The net result of the whole thing as it applies to cotton is this—farmers must again enter into the production of an unusually high-cost crop, with labor scarce, wages higher, fertilizer more costly, insecticides higher in price and short in prospect, and faced with a ceiling price but no real floor price A big crop, boll-weevil damage, storm damage during harvest time, late picking due to labor shortage, drought, wet weather—anything can put a farmer's average price far below ceiling or parity prices; but it takes good management, good luck, good weather, good machinery, good labor, and the good graces of the Almighty for him to come out anywhere near the point in profit that the pencil pushers and experts tell the public that he has made

This ceiling price on raw cotton will have little direct effect on the farmer's pocketbook until another crop is made. It will have only served to further confuse and discourage him — destroy his confidence in those charged with controlling his price destiny. Since the 1950 Defense Production Act authority for this kind of controlled economy expires next June 30, Congress will have an opportunity to take another look prior to extending authority for continuing this confusion Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the joint Senate-House "watchdog committee," seems in a mood to take a good look.

Congress has conferred upon the President certain powers under the Defense Production Act of 1950 The President has in turn conferred upon Mr. DiSalle certain powers and responsibilities for doing a job of price control. Mr. DiSalle is besieged from every direction with suggestions and advice and demands that are conflicting. Perhaps he is doing his dead-level best under the circumstances

Having been a successful politician as mayor of Toledo is no qualification for being a successful price administrator. Complete lack of knowledge of the production, marketing, and processing of cotton perhaps made Mr. DiSalle easy to mislead in judging his duty with respect to ceilings on raw cotton. He has at least one good quality—that of determined action, whether right or wrong. Sooner or later Mr. DiSalle will find out that he has made a mistake if he were sincere in trying to act in the public interest and not in the interest of some special group closely allied with the political kingdom of which he is a part.

In the meantime, ceilings on raw cotton, radio and newspaper publicity on mink coats and bribes, and shady political maneuverings are undermining public confidence in the integrity and ability and sincerity of many of those in high places in our Government. This Nation has more than once demonstrated its willingness and ability to gear into a war economy and to produce and win. The only thing that will eventually make this impossible of attainment again is the destruction of public confidence because of the failure of our leadership. Our love of freedom demands action for the defense effort. That same love of freedom demands action against Government regimentation and a tax-and-spend policy if it be only under the guise of emergency.

Maybe Mr. DiSalle will soon become wise enough to substitute common sense for political sense. Let us hope that the present state of confusion does not last long enough to destroy public confidence and to wreck our national economy. Although there is not much in the picture at present upon which to base any great degree of hope, we should produce all the cotton that we can this year without disrupting our individual balanced farm program in the hope that Congress will act, or that Mr. DiSalle will be forced to act, to correct this evil situation before our crop is ready to market.

Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following article which was printed in the Shell Rock (Iowa) News:

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN IN THE STATES

(By Florence A. Armstrong, Ph. D.)

Several of our States have taken quite an enlightened and realistic position in respect to their women citizens. They have—some of them—even put equal rights for men and women into their State constitutions; some have demanded, through their State legislatures, that Congress approve the equal rights amendment and pass it on to the States so the people may have a chance to pass on it in their State legislatures. They merit much praise.

The Wisconsin Legislature, in 1921 almost immediately after the ratification of the suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution, wisely passed a law giving to women the same rights and privileges under the law as men in the exercise of suffrage, freedom of contract, choice of residence for voting purposes, jury service, holding office, holding and conveying property, care and custody of children, and in all other respects. (Section 6,015 of Wisconsin Statutes). If the same thing had happened on a national scale, the country would have benefited immeasurably.

Besides Wisconsin, three other States have equal constitutional rights for men and women: Missouri, New Jersey, and Wyoming (the Equality State). Since some opponents of the equality principle for women and men almost shriek their alarm at the idea of the havoc it would cause, they should notice how these States move along smoothly enough. New Jersey, for example, took care of the minimum wage law (that bugaboo of labor and welfare workers) by simply amending it to delete the existing definitions of women and minors and substituting the term "any person" for the words "a woman or minor" throughout, thus extending coverage to all workers (N. J. A. 166, 1950). Could not any of the so-called "protective" (restrictive) laws be so handled after the equal-rights amendment passes? If existing laws of that type are undesirable, as some are, they could just be dropped, not extended to men also.

On the Pacific coast, California, and on the Atlantic coast, New York, and some States in between, have engrossed resolutions to the Congress calling on the Members of both Houses to respond to the demand of American women, for equal rights in the laws of the Republic, by approving the equal-rights amendment and sending it to the States for consideration and final ratification. Other States will doubtles pass such resolutions this year. Many people do not realize how much the States want to treat their women more justly than they have been treated under the old English common law, which gave women very low status.

Over the years, some States have removed some of their most flagrant discriminations, in response to the efforts of organized women's groups. I have been told that the National Woman's Party and the National League of Women Voters were each able to get about 150 discriminatory laws removed soon after the suffrage amendment was passed. After those 300 or so were taken care of, many hundreds more remained Year by year, some progress has been made but new discriminatory laws have been added too. So the most courageous and constructive of the women leaders, and women's groups have turned to another Federal amendment as the only practicable instrument of doing the whole job. The National Woman's Party introduced the Lucretia Mott amendment, popularly known as the equal rights amendment, in 1923. It reads:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"The Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment is supported by effect 1 year after the date of ratification."

This amendment is supported by more than 30 national groups and by innumerable individuals, men and women, in the States.

I am asked very frequently what specific discriminations would be removed by the equal rights amendment. People want to know specific cases. I have myself seen seven types of discriminations which seem most harmful to women. No doubt each woman would make a somewhat different list. My list includes: (1) Restrictions on hours and pay in gainful employment (12 States have passed laws requiring equal pay. These are very complicated). (2) Restrictions on ownership of property. These old unjust laws cause untold hardship and agony to women, most of whom know nothing about property laws before they marry. Such laws can easily be studied. The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, Washington 25, D. C., publishes a pamphlet (1948) on the laws of each State which may be bought for 5 cents from the United States Government Printing Office. No woman should be without such data. In fact, until our laws become more workable for women, through the equal rights amendment no study could be more interesting and valuable for women than the laws affecting their lives in every sphere. (3) Restrictions on guardianship of minor children. The worst laws give all rights to the husband, even to disposal of children unborn, without the consent of the mother. (4) Occupational restrictions based on sex and not on competence are particularly

harmful and cruel nowadays when more and more millions of women are employed (5) Restrictions on the right of women to sue result in bad situations, as in cases where a husband can sue his wife if she assaults him, but the wife cannot sue the husband if he assaults her. Virginia and several other States still have these restrictions. (6) Restrictions on the right to ownership and control of her own earnings after marriage may wreck a woman's life, as in New York, etc. Some States like Iowa have modified the old common law (which treats women as chattels) and provide for her the right to her separate earnings (code, sec 597 16) Lastly, (7) outmoded laws, originally discriminatory, have become worse, with time, even ridiculous An example of such is the old Iowa law (sec. 627 6, subsec 22).

In seizure of property for debt, the husband may keep the tools of his trade, but the woman may keep only one sewing machine and $50 worth of poultry No one should be sad to have such laws—and many outmoded ones remain—made equally suitable and just for men and women alike

The picture is bright for equality in respect to jury service in the States After extensive effort on the part of organized women 40 States and 2 Territories now provide for women to serve on juries The latest addition to the list is Virginia, in 1950. Still lacking it are Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia. The various laws vary considerably as to requirements, applications, and exemptions The Federal equal rights amendment would probably improve this situation without changing it much, except to extend it to all citizens.

I went over to Congress on February 2 to hear Representative KATHARINE ST GEORGE (Republican, New York) make a fine speech on the equal rights amendment (H J Res. 52) and introduce the 103 names of Members of the House who are sponsoring this nonpartisan measure. She called for straightforward action: "Let us stop hypocrisy in this amendment or else drop it from our national platforms and tell the world that the women of the United States prefer special privileges for the few rather than equality for all"

On February 5 I heard Senator HERBERT O'CONOR (Democrat, Maryland) in the Senate Chamber introduce the names of 27 Senators who are sponsoring the equal-rights amendment. He made a brief speech in support of his bill, Senate Joint Resolution 3. He spoke frankly to his colleagues, referring to its being "a late day to have decided the simple and single issue of whether such a great proportion of our population should be guaranteed similar rights and privileges as are enjoyed by the remaining citizenry. Especially at this period of conflicting ideologies should it be declared in unmistakable terms that American citizens of both sexes are accorded equal rights. Those who espouse foreign ideologies point critically to the fact that women are denied certain privileges in the United States while members of their sex are entitled to every right guaranteed to men under foreign flags We should tolerate no such conditions which is seized upon by our enemies to decry our institutions"

He then pointed out the singular fact that though this amendment had been before Congress since 1923 it has never received an unfavorable report, yet has never achieved approval by both Houses.

Senator O'CONOR tossed us a lovely bouquet in referring to the need for the peculiar talents and abilities which the women of America can bring to bear upon today's problems "In my own State of Maryland," he said, "during the 8 years in which I was privileged to occupy the Governor's chair, we found it desirable, and in many cases I might even say necessary, to call upon outstanding women of the State for assistance in matters of government. We can no longer tolerate discrimination against American women either in the Nation as a whole or in the several States. The equal-rights amendment is the instrument by which this discrimination can be eradicated"

These words sound very good to women in every State who are trying to measure up to the demands put upon them without the rights that ought to go with their responsibilities.

The IV–F Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr SHAFER Mr. Speaker, despite the insistence of the military that we must draft 18-year-olds, the obviously unsound draft standards have not been corrected. The military still rejects many men capable of serving in the Armed Forces Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "The IV–F Scandal," by Milton Lehman, appearing in the March 1951 Cosmopolitan:

Today, in the midst of the Nation's greatest peril, the Armed Forces are rejecting usable men at a hideous rate As a result of arbitrary physical and mental standards, hundreds of thousands of potential soldiers, sailors, and airmen are turned away. Deferments and exemptions are granted to pressure groups who declare that Uncle Sam needs you, but not them We are still listening to the voice of smugness and complacency in the name of democracy—when our democracy itself is threatened

After World War II, the Nation was shocked to discover that in the raising of an armed force of 14,000,000 men, more than 6,000,000 men had been rejected as IV–F's Every city and town across the country watched the IV–F's come home, having been turned down by the military's induction centers. Vastly alarmed, ministers, journalists, and clubwomen declared that America must be a Nation of physical and mental weaklings There would have been cause for alarm if the Armed Forces' standards had been reasonable But the cause for the huge military rejections during World War II was the military's lofty standards, which created an Army of discarded IV–F's greater than the Armed Forces that served us in Europe. Among these IV–F's were highly usable troops The motion that we were weak in potential military manpower was the military's own delusion.

This bleak view of America's manpower is even more alarming today than it was in 1941. Despite the present emergency and the brave plans to expand the services to a standing force of 3,000,000, 4,000,000, or possibly 5,000,000 men, the Armed Forces are now screening Americans as if they were considering applicants for King Arthur's Round Table. By force of habit, they are still assuming that the model soldier, sailor, airman, or marine must have both the physical stamina of an infantryman, who is sometimes obliged to march 20 miles with a full field pack, and the mental agility of a judge advocate general Unless they abandon this medieval, encrusted attitude, we shall be ill-prepared indeed.

Considering the Armed Forces' standards of what makes a rookie, as well as congressionally approved laws on deferments and exemptions, Maj. Gen Lewis B. Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, recently observed: "I don't believe that out of 150,000,000 people in the Nation today, there are 6,000,000 who could pass present-day standards for induction into the armed services. Obviously we can't fight a war with such standards"

All of us, especially the military services, have a great deal of malarkey to get out of our systems—particularly if we are faced by a monolithic Russia with no Pollyanna in its nature At this writing, less than 25 percent of men in the draft-age group—19 to 26—can actually get into the armed services While this age group provides a manpower pool of 8,000,000, the pool is quickly drained by deferments and exemptions. For instance, 3,000,000 veterans are exempted by law. Another 1,150,000 men with dependents are exempted from the draft. Another 170,000, largely farmers, are deferred for occupational reasons. The pool is further reduced at the insistence of college presidents, who feel this is no time to wreck their freshman classes, and by men with crippling mental and physical defects whom the draft boards never send to the induction station in the first place

Unless draft standards are drastically changed, we shall never produce a 3,500,000-man force, let alone the more ambitious 6,000,000-man armed service. Of our original 8,000,000-man pool, selective service is able to offer about 3,000,000 men to Armed Forces induction stations. From this decreased reservoir, the Armed Forces between last July and October turned away 40 percent. These final rejections were based upon the Armed Forces' physical standards, and its remarkable mental qualification test. Because the Army alone is now dependent on selective service, it has borne the brunt of the protests against unreasonably high standards.

Compared to what the Air Force, Navy, and Marines are doing, the Army has a case, which we shall examine later The three sister services are turning down volunteers at an even more shocking rate than the Army rejects selectees. Since the end of the last war, the services all handled budget cuts by raising their standards, and thus reducing their numbers They introduced a controversial mental examination, which has been responsible for the rejection of almost half the selectees, and they raised their physical standards above the requirements of World War II In the present emergency, however, the services must drop their soldier-as-usual concept as fast as the Nation must give up its business-as-usual fantasy

But today, unless the Armed Forces are ordered to open their doors, they will continue to screen usable Americans into the IV–F junk pile Consider this colloquy between Congressman CARL VINSON, the acidulous chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Maj. Gen Clovis Byers, an officer in the Army's Personnel Division:

"Representative VINSON What you want is men; what you want is soldiers, isn't it?

"Major General BYERS. No, sir.

"Representative VINSON All right, what do you want anyway, Ph D's?

"Major General BYERS I want a force—a leaven to put into the mass of Americans when any emergency comes—that is capable of expansion effectively into combat units.

"Representative VINSON (considering that rejoinder). I doubt whether Alvin York would have passed your test. * * * No, sir, you've got those standards too high, General. This country is disturbed when so many men are sent back home because you keep on saying, 'Why, you just don't fill the bill.'"

Under pressure, the Armed Forces are now modifying their postwar entrance requirements in order to permit the acceptance of more men Simply loosening the reins a bit or accepting 18-year-olds won't do the job

if war comes. What is required is the total uprooting of the military's hidebound concept of suitable manpower. The basic notion of the all-around, Class-A fighting man is purest nonsense. Any veteran of World War II can tell you that there is a vast difference between the duties of the combat soldier and the rear-line soldier, and he will also point out that the rear-line soldier is greatly in the majority. While the frontline GI Joe needs a high level of physical and psychological stamina, he doesn't require a knowledge of Cicero's orations. And his far more numerous buddies behind the division level can certainly manage their jobs with flat feet, myopic eyes, trick knees, slight hernias, or even mild heart murmurs

But today, the Armed Forces have raised, instead of lowered, the unreasonable standards they applied during World War II. They have added an I. Q test to determine whether to take men in, not merely what to do with them once they've got them.

This new mental test would have eliminated some of our best fighting men in World War II, as Mr. VINSON suspected. It would even have knocked out Congressional Medal of Honor boys. I knew some of these heroes during the war and remember meeting them in Chicago in 1946, when they assembled as guests of the American Legion with all expenses paid. Maybe most of these Congressional Medal winners would have scored well on the present Armed Forces qualification test, but at least one of them would have flunked miserably.

I interviewed this lad in southern France 7 years ago for the Stars and Stripes. He had just received the medal. A western farm boy, he'd never gone past the fourth grade, and he answered questions in grunts. As one of his buddies told me, "Henry don't say much because he can't think of all the words." But Henry, who didn't go to high school, saved his platoon at Anzio by wiping out two German machine-gun nests singlehandedly with his BAR.

One veteran infantry officer, who survived Italy's backbreaking campaigns, is now assigned to classifying registrants at an induction center, and he isn't sure he likes the Armed Forces' current standards. Especially when he thinks back to his jeep driver in Italy.

"Now there was a great soldier," this officer told me. "Johnny was a successful, intuitive fighting man. But he would flunk our present mental test, and I'd have to turn him away. Fact it, Johnny was illiterate. I had to read him the letters he got from his girl friend back home and write out his answers."

A North Carolina draft board recently had the same unhappy feeling when it turned down a Negro registrant who really wanted to fight. The boy's brother had been killed in Korea, and this registrant wished to take his place. When he called his draft board to see how he had made out on the preinduction examination, the board clerk informed him: "We're very sorry about this. You passed your physical examination nicely, but you didn't do so well on the mental test."

"I don't get it," the boy replied. "Say, what kind of war is this anyway—a figurin' war or a fightin' war?"

What kind of war this is deeply concerns General Hershey, the draft director, who is the Nation's sharpest critic of present military draft standards. "On the battlefield," he told me, "you throw away all this baloney and make do with what you have—and we find we have plenty. What counts is when the doctor says a man can't walk and he walks, when he says a man can't survive on so little food and still he survives. With all these tests, these attempts to find the perfect soldier, they aren't measuring the most vital aspect—the will to survive and the desire to fight."

It's hard, if not impossible, to measure this vital quality, General Hershey believes. "I'm a careless sort of person," he says, "and the perfectionist scares hell out of me. Trouble is, there aren't many perfect things or people around, but there are more than enough good people. I'm afraid of echelons and inventories and classifications whenever you get too stuffy about them, because you can finally classify out everybody who might play on your team."

Of all the tests, General Hershey is most suspicious of the qualification test, a mental examination now administered to all men approved by their Selective Service boards The military argues that any man who has gone through the fifth grade can pass the test with its minimum rating of 13 and that standards go no lower, but there are two soft spots in this reasoning: First, many unschooled men can't get a passing grade might be highly useful soldiers, and second, the test is being given to men who may not yearn to pass it.

As General Hershey observed to the House Armed Services Committee: "This mental test is probably good, but not to apply to a man who is not seeking a job. It's all right to take a dozen people wanting a job and test them to find which one you are going to hire. But it is no good when the fellow doesn't have any strong motivation to pass it. I don't mean that he is necessarily going to lie down on the test He just doesn't get up.

Several weeks ago I took the test, referred to officially as AFQT-1, in a barracks at Arlington Farms Induction Center. I was there as a reporter, not a selectee. I had no reason not to try for a high score. But I'm not sure my feeling was shared by everyone in the room

The test took me the full 45 minutes allotted, and I was unable to complete all the questions I didn't have any trouble figuring out synonyms; they are part of my business. I managed fairly well on arithmetic. But although the patterns problems—trying to work out how an unfolded blueprint would look if you folded the pieces together—would not have troubled an engineer, they gave me plenty of worry.

The Armed Forces, aware that their mental test can be beaten by any average American who does not want to be a private, have ordained that all high-school graduates be accepted whether they pass the test or not. The induction sergeants make a little speech urging registrants to try for high scores because their military futures depend on it. Also, induction officers are empowered to interview men who flunk, and to induct those who they think purposely failed the test.

The obvious flunker was never better revealed than by some doctors recently called to service. Although these men had gone through high school, college, medical school, and active practice, some of them still managed to flunk the mental test. When they were challenged, they admitted sheepishly that they might do better if they were obliged to take the test again.

Despite the checks and double checks on flunkers, 50 percent of the men rejected by induction stations between last July and October were turned down for failure to pass the mental examinations. After unfavorable comment in the press and a flurry of public criticism, the Armed Forces have now reduced the number of these rejections. But it is remarkable that the mental examination is still considered a wise device for selecting soldiers, and even more remarkable that it is administered to men who may not choose to pass.

Physical standards are taking an equal toll of the available manpower. At this writing, one out of every four registrants is rejected for physical defects. Let's look into a Maryland induction station and watch the IV-F's pile up. In one day, a roughing-machine operator failed for malocclusion—his teeth didn't meet in a proper bite; a carpenter was turned down for a perforated eardrum; a truck driver was rejected for flat feet; a real-estate broker flunked because of asthma; a lathe operator was dropped for a hernia. "If you get that hernia fixed, we'll be glad to take you," the induction officer told him. The lathe operator merely smiled.

Induction-station doctors give a very thorough physical examination, using the best of modern medical techniques No one can quarrel with their methods. They are told to examine the registrant for his physical capacity, his upper extremities, his lower extremities, his hearing, eyes, and neuropsychiatric stability. When they finish the examination, they must grade the registrant 1, 2, 3, or 4 in each of these categories according to carefully specified standards. If the registrant gets one 4 on his physical examination, he's out.

During World War II, these physical examinations turned up 6,419,700 IV-F's, and we are now on the way to building a similar army of rejectees. Most of the IV-F's took a beating back home; many would have gladly exchanged their uneasy freedom for a uniform. Probably half of them could have served in uniform in the thousand and one jobs behind the line if the Army hadn't applied combat standards to base-command privates.

Of all IV-F's, the services had the most trouble explaining the rejected athletes. Sports writers gave them unwelcome attention. There was Byron Nelson, the greatest golfer of that day, rejected for hemophilia—his blood wouldn't clot; George Myatt, second baseman for the Washington Senators, rejected for a trick knee; Dave Ferris, Red Sox pitcher, for hay fever; George W. Case, one of the fastest runners in baseball, for a sinus ailment, Frank Sinkwich, professional football player, for flat feet; Creighton Miller, Notre Dame's All-American football star, Hal Newhouser, left-hander for the Detroit Tigers, and Russ Christopher, winning pitcher for the Philadelphia Athletics—all for heart murmurs; and even Lippy Leo Durocher, who might have made a fine topkick, for a punctured eardrum.

As the Army points out, the public was wrong in thinking of these athletes as class A fighting men. "It should be realized," an Army spokesman says, "that there is a vast difference between the long and frequently arduous assignment of a soldier and the comparatively brief period of exertion encountered in a ten-round boxing match, a nine-inning baseball game, or a five-minute tap dance" But this adroit reply doesn't explain why these men and many of the 6,000,000 IV-F's weren't used in jobs in which no one expected a class A fighting man.

A Washington physician who served 4 years in the Army in the last war and rose to major in the Medical Corps still has trouble understanding the Army's Surgeon General. "I started out at an induction station, examining recruits," he told me. "I applied all the proper standards, and naturally, I kept rejecting men. Back then, I really believed that every soldier ought to be a perfect physical specimen.

"But when I got overseas, these standards no longer made sense to me. In Oran, 200 miles behind the front, we had a base hospital staffed by perfect physical specimens who took temperatures and emptied bedpans. We could have used plenty of mild hernia cases to do their jobs and even a few heart murmurs. I could have recruited our whole enlisted contingent from the men I had rejected back in the States."

Col. Warner Bowers, chief surgical consultant to the Army, also believes that the wholesale rejection of selectees was and is today a national disgrace. He said so at a recent meeting of Army officers, not realizing there was a newspaperman in the room. He advocated that all men with minor physical defects be classified for limited duty, and that the Army prepare to use these men in the millions of posts behind the combat

lines. He even drew up a memorandum showing that the IV-F's could handle more than 50 percent of the Army's jobs.

The memorandum has since been placed in a confidential classification, and only a curtailed report of Colonel Bowers' comments appeared in the press. When I asked the Surgeon General's office about the colonel's proposal, they referred me to G-1. And G-1 said, "No comment."

Under the mounting pressure for a powerful armed force, the United States Army will have to give better answers than that. Furthermore, the Army does have a case. While it has borne most of the criticism for absurdly high standards, it is actually the least guilty of all the services. The Army is largely dependent on selective service to fill its ranks, unlike the Air Force, Navy, and Marines, who pride themselves on taking only volunteers. Under pressure of the general draft, thousands of young Americans rush to these services as shot-gun volunteers, rather than take their chances on the less glamorous Army. In recent months the Air Force, Navy, and Marines have combed over these volunteers and picked only the ones they like best. In this great grab act, they have rejected almost everybody who doesn't resemble the square-jawed man in the recruiting poster.

But the Army also likes these square-jawed heroes and has pegged its standards in order to get its share. One Army spokesman, after asking me not to use his name, put the Army's case frankly: "If our present tests mean anything—and they aren't entirely meaningless—they give us an indication of a selectee's physical and mental ability. The ones who do well on the tests will probably make more noncoms and officers than the ones who do badly. The ones who fail will probably turn up more men for sick call and the guardhouse. But we mustn't follow these tests too far, and we know it. What the Army objects to is the Navy and Air Force's making privates of men we could use as company commanders. If every service were required to take its fair share from the same manpower pool, we wouldn't have any complaints."

An Air Force general, who also prefers to remain anonymous, agrees in part with the Army man. During World War II, he says, he was appalled at the number of potential officers serving as Air Force privates. "I saw them at every air base," he says. "They'd come up to my plane to tote my Val-a-Pak, they'd tend bar at the officers' club and fill out manifests at headquarters. Some of these privates would have made excellent Army lieutenants and captains. We had plenty of topflight men whose talents were wasted."

But neither the Air Force nor the Navy will say such things in public. They are still behaving with the acquisitive instincts of a supply sergeant, who stores up all the good things he can get his hands on, just in case he'll ever need them. While skimming the cream off the top of the vat, they look with outraged innocence at their critics. "Why, we're just following the good old American volunteer system," they say. "We're giving men a chance to choose their branch of service. A common manpower pool would wreck the volunteer system."

At recent hearings of the House Armed Services Committee, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, declared it was essential to man the Navy with volunteers and frowned on the common manpower pool. "Life on board ship," he reasoned, "is different from life on shore. Some people like it, others do not. It is very important, with men cooped up in small space, that as far as possible they be men who choose that way of life."

To such reasoning, General Hershey of Selective Service shouts foul play. "I'm not quarreling with the Navy and Air Force's taking volunteers," he says, "provided they really take the volunteers instead of rejecting most of them. Let them all come to the same pool and draw from it vertically all the way down to the skimmed milk. If you let them skim off the whipping cream, you're going to cheat the Army. They know it, and the Army does too."

Despite this knowledge, it will still take an act of Congress to unify the Armed Forces on manpower. It may take another to make them recognize that their chief manpower shortage may be the shortage they create themselves. They must learn what every veteran knows: that the combat soldier and the rear-line soldier are two different men, and that we need them both.

Cotton Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in connection with ceiling price regulation 8, issued on March 3, 1951, as it affects the production of cotton.

There is no doubt but what an enormous problem exists from the viewpoint of the price stabilizer and from the viewpoint of the cotton industry. All of us are fundamentally concerned with the same thing—adequate supplies at reasonable and stabilized prices. Some of us may differ as to the means by which we accomplish the ends, but certainly we are agreed as to what the ends should be.

The means adopted by ceiling price regulation 8 are unworkable and unnecessary when they place a ceiling on raw cotton. That order of March 3 should be immediately rescinded.

It should be pointed out that consumers are at the present time fully protected by ceilings on the finished cotton products which they buy. However, the Office of Price Stabilization has stated as a reason for the necessity of regulation 8 that price rises on raw cotton will create sufficient force to increase the ceiling on consumers' products.

I believe there is no one in this House who does not realize that the cotton industry is not seeking higher prices for cotton, and I doubt if there is anyone in the Congress who does not feel that during these days of rapid economic change to meet an emergency, sympathy should not be shown any farmer who is dissatisfied with the price of his commodity when the market price is as far above parity as cotton is today.

At the outset I want to make myself clear that I agree with you in those sentiments and to tell you that within the past few weeks leading representatives of the industry have worked out with the Department of Agriculture a cotton price stabilization program which would assure that cotton prices would not average for this year a figure higher than the one now prescribed by the Office of Price Stabilization in their March 3 regulation.

I am, therefore, not talking to you about whether cotton prices should be stabilized. The industry and all of us agree that that end should be accomplished. My remarks are directed in criticism of regulation 8 and its prescription in how stabilization should be accomplished.

The cotton industry and the Department of Agriculture, which is the only Government agency qualified to deal with this subject, have recommended a stabilization program that will accomplish the objective without seriously disrupting the efficient operations and marketing traditions of the cotton industry. The Office of Price Stabilization, speaking through Mr. DiSalle, stands opposed to that program. Seeking to accomplish the same laudable purpose by wanting to function through his powers, Mr. DiSalle has said that the Office of Price Stabilization will not accept any method of stabilization of the price of raw cotton except a fixed ceiling on the producer no matter how much damage it may cause.

I think everyone familiar with the cotton industry knows that regulation 8 can only result in damages that will be enormous. Cotton's highly efficient marketing system is marked for destruction. All of those who depend on that marketing system in their daily business transactions—farmers, merchants, and mills—will suffer severe hardships. These losses cannot help but slow down their operations and decrease their respective productivity during wartime.

It would seem that we might learn something from past experience. During World War II, the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board both learned that the fewer units with which they had to deal the more effective their controls became. This was true both as to price enforcement and as to distribution and use of materials. For instance, it is obviously easier to control the sellers as a whole, rather than buyers in the retail markets because the sellers are much fewer in number. I doubt if any of us know a single buyer who ever got into serious trouble violating a price regulation. The effective place to control prices was learned to be at the point of selling. Sellers were controlled effectively because the means of enforcement reached them first. They were numbered in the thousands, whereas consumers were numbered in the millions. For example, the Office of Price Administration had prices on various sizes and grades of lumber. Generally enforcement was effected at the saw mill—not at the consumer level.

In the case of cotton, the least number of people that will need to be controlled would be at the mill level. Yet, under this new, unworkable regulation 8, the Administration has taken the largest number, the producers, and then added to that all the merchants. It should be obvious to them, and I am inclined to think that it is, that they not only have made their problem a millionfold more difficult, but they have literally made it impossible.

The speed of a railroad train is not determined by the amount of steam available through the size of the boiler. It is determined at the throttle. We

should apply the same principle in the cotton business and put the controls at the smallest bottleneck, which is where the smallest number of people are.

The problem of enforcement will increase in geometrical proportion as the number of people the Office of Price Stabilization seeks to control directly by their orders increases. This is bad administration.

We have also learned from the past that which we may say here in the present in regard to these new cotton ceilings—they cannot be enforced because of the nature of the commodity, and all manner of bad practices, black markets, and chicanery will develop.

We should also give attention to the 16,000,000 bale crop for this year, which has been the goal of the Government and the industry since the present scarcity developed last fall. That production is now being jeopardized. The ceiling price level of approximately 45 cents per pound, which the Office of Price Stabilization has set, is certainly not so low as to discourage production. However, farmers must have reasonable assurances that they will get somewhere near this price when they sell their cotton next fall, and they must have some reasonable assurance that their cotton can be easily turned into cash. If they do not have those assurances, the cotton industry now feels that we will not reach our 16,000,000-bale goal. With the traditional marketing system in a state of chaos and collapse, farmers and banks and production credit agencies who finance them know that 16,000,000 bales of cotton could not be absorbed in the 3 or 4 months of the harvesting season without disastrous effects on the price.

Last year, when we passed the Defense Production Act, we inserted section 402 (f), which emphatically authorizes the President to exempt certain products from price ceilings where such ceilings are, first, unnecessary; or, second, not in the interest of national defense. Raw cotton is one of such products as was recognized in both World War I and World War II. The cotton industry knows that a price ceiling on raw cotton is unnecessary in view of the alternative program that can be taken to effectively stabilize cotton prices, and such a ceiling is not in the interest of national defense because of the serious damage it will do to the efficient operation and to the production of all branches of the cotton industry from the farm to the mill.

I also want to point out that the cotton growers of California have protested against having the freight from California to the Carolinas deducted from their price as now set forth in ceiling price regulation 8. We in California cannot understand such tactics or the purpose behind them. A large portion of the California crop has gone for export each year and we think that the worst that should happen is that the prices in Los Angeles and San Francisco should equal the price in the Carolinas.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that a meeting was held a few days ago, attended by Mr. DiSalle, and proper representatives of our Military Establishment and duly authorized representatives of leading cotton mills. The question under discussion was whether the mills would enter into contracts to produce desired matériel for the Military Establishment. They stated that they were ready to go into production provided they could protect themselves on the cost of cotton after signing the contracts. I am advised Mr. DiSalle refused to recommend any procedure by which they could protect themselves on the futures market. Certainly price regulation 8 does not solve that problem. He, like many other men in our bureaus, seeks to control every field of American business through the exercise of the powers of their bureau. I am not one to plead for the excess or opportunity for speculators on the commodity market. I do, however, believe it is necessary that our mills and producers buy and sell on the futures market for their protection.

I think we have to assume that before ceiling price regulation 8 was issued, the proper officials of the Office of Price Stabilization considered the traditional means of marketing cotton in this country. I believe that we must also assume that they understood the certain consequences of their action. It, therefore, appears that they have created chaos in the cotton industry without regard to the results of such action. They set a ceiling on raw cotton knowing that cotton mills wanting to produce war matériels would have to protect themselves on the futures market. As reasonable men, they should have known that as soon as the restrictions against dealing on the futures market were removed, that the price of cotton would immediately move to that ceiling, and that cotton would still not be available to fulfill the contracts of the contracting mills in the production of war matériel.

Mr. Speaker, that happened this morning. The conclusion is obvious. Either the Office of Price Stabilization does not have the capacity to formulate workable regulations or they have deliberately planned a chaotic condition to force Government regulation of agriculture in all of its phases, commencing with the highly important war crop—cotton.

There is language in ceiling price regulation 8 which should be a warning to this Congress as to the intentions of the Office of Price Stabilization in the field of agriculture. In the third paragraph of their order, the following language is set forth:

> Under the general freeze, raw cotton was exempted when sold by producers, since a freeze order at the farm level would be meaningless, but it was controlled when sold by merchants and other dealers in cotton.

I assume "freeze order" and "price order" to be of the same significance, yet in the next paragraph the statement is made:

> The structure of ceiling prices. This regulation establishes ceiling prices for American upland cotton in mixed or odd lots, by grade and staple and by location for every seller including producers.

Mr. Speaker, by their own language, the Office of Price Stabilization, through ceiling price regulation 8, has interfered with the production of a commodity the value of which we hope will be $3,000,000,000 this year. In their own language, they state that their regulation providing such interference will be meaningless. Yet they did it knowing that it destroys any understandable means in free enterprise by which producers may turn their raw cotton to cash, or the financiers of producers may protect themselves from the destruction of a reasonably average yearly price by necessary quick sale of 16,000,000 bales during the harvest season.

How To Obtain an RFC Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have received several inquiries in the past few days from businessmen inquiring as to the procedure necessary in obtaining a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan. Apparently the RFC investigation conducted by a Senate committee has caused many small-business men to wonder if such Government loans are available to any deserving business organization. On the basis of the disclosures made in the Senate investigation to date, I have listed some of the steps which might be taken by those desiring to obtain an RFC loan:

First. Be prepared to contribute $1,000 or more to the Democratic National Committee and get to know personally high-ranking Democratic Party leaders.

Second. Obtain the services of a 7½-percenter—the rates of 5-percenters have gone up because of inflation.

Third. Present a mink coat to a White House secretary, natural, royal, pastel mink preferred.

Fourth. Invite an RFC official to spend several weeks at a fashionable resort hotel. Caution: Be sure to pick up the check.

Fifth. Be prepared to employ in your company one or more former RFC officials at a handsome salary immediately after the loan is obtained.

Sixth. Seek a personal interview with an RFC director. If the director is not in his office, he might be found in the hip pocket of a Washington influence-peddler.

Seventh. If some difficulty is encountered in obtaining admission to the RFC offices, repeat the password "asinine" to the receptionist three times.

Note: In addition to the above suggestions, the chances of obtaining the loan are enhanced if your company has notoriously poor management or if one or more of the officers or directors of your company are under Federal indictment.

How Stupid Can We Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr Speaker, a letter I received from L. A. Pettit, Jr., vice president of the Central Cable Corp. ends with the thought "I just don't know how stupid we can get." I rush to agree with the writer.

His reference is to a clipping he enclosed relating to the shipment of metals under ECA to Britain. The metal is used to manufacture products which, in turn, are exported to Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

A corollary dispatch relates that Britain's economic chief attaches enormous importance to the satisfactory outcome of discussions under way in Washington to divert United States stockpile materials to the British.

Brass workers in Connecticut are on part-time—plants throughout the Nation are experiencing difficulties in obtaining raw metals for processing—yet we blithely, under ECA auspices, give these materials for eventual use by Russia. Only through concerted effort was it possible to reduce copper stockpiling by 50 percent to aid distressed American industries, but we seriously consider diverting stockpile materials to Britain, which trades directly with our potential enemy, Communist Russia.

I do not know how stupid we can get.

CENTRAL CABLE CORP,
Freeport, Ill, March 5, 1951.

Hon JAMES T PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR PATTERSON I very much appreciate your letter of February 28 and wish to compliment you upon the forthrightness with which you approach problems of vital public interest.

I am enclosing newspaper clipping under London date line, which states that seven British ports are piled high with United States gift metals, including 1,440 tons of copper, while other cargoes are en route.

The article also points out that copper turned over to the British Government is being sold to British industrial users for the manufacture of electrical generators and other goods which the British Government in turn uses as barter with Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

I just don't know how stupid we can get.

Again thanking you, I remain,

Yours truly,

CENTRAL CABLE CORP.,
L. A. PETTIT, Jr,
Vice President.

SEVEN BRITISH PORTS PILED HIGH WITH UNITED STATES GIFT METALS—BIGGEST HAND-OUTS ARRIVE AS ECA EXPIRES

(By Arthur Veysey)

LONDON, March 3.—The biggest gift shipments of metals in many weeks are being unloaded in British ports, the Marshall plan office announced.

At seven ports, ships are discharging 4,857 tons of aluminum, 1,440 tons of copper, 1,416 tons of steel, 900 tons of zinc, and 600 tons of lead. Other shipments, paid for by the American taxpayer and sent to Britain as a gift, include 13 tons of carbon black for tires and 4,285 tons of milo starch

The Marshall plan office said that although its hand-out program is officially over as far as Britain is concerned, gift cargoes will continue to arrive here for several months. Metals shipped to Britain under the Marshall aid program already have cost $311,000,000, and Marshall plan officers estimate gifts costing another $100,000,000, most of it in metals or machinery, are still to come.

INCREASE METAL GIFTS

Gift metal shipments to Britain have increased in recent months as the metals have become scarce and as metal prices have multiplied.

At British ports, the metals are turned over to the British Government which sells them to British industrial users. Much of the copper goes to electrical manufacturers who are turning out generators and other goods which the British Government uses as barter with Russia in exchange for timber and grain.

The money the British Government receives from British manufacturers for the gift metals is used to pay off the British debt. During the Marshall plan program, the British debt has gone down at the fastest rate in British history At the same time the American Government's debt has gone up.

EYES UNITED STATES STOCKPILE

EASTBOURNE, ENGLAND, March 3.—High Gaitskell, Britain's economic chief, has emphasized Britain's need for some of the raw materials the United States is stockpiling. They are needed, he said, to stave off an economic crisis in this country.

Without these critical raw materials, said the Chancelor of the Exchequer, Britain's export drive, the key support in her own defense program, would collapse.

Speaking to a convention of more than 500 of Britain's dollar export manufacturers, he said the Government attaches "enormous importance" to the satisfactory outcome of discussions now under way in Washington by international commodity committees. These groups are studying ways of reallocating raw materials.

ILLUSORY ASSET

Gaitskell said: "We really must remember that we are rearming in peacetime, and that if peaceful trade and economic stability were gravely weakened for lack of raw materials, then the heaping up of unused materials in stockpiles would, even in a military sense, be an illusory asset."

He estimated that Britain's increase in production this year would be 4 percent over 1950 Then he added:

"But if the 4 percent increase were not achieved—and it certainly could not be if raw material supplies fell seriously short of requirements—then the economic outlook would, of course, be far worse."

The Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland:

THE KATYN MASSACRE

(By Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland)

One of the least publicized actions during the last war, yet one which had the most far-reaching consequences, was the murder of over 4,000 Polish officers in the forest of Katyn near Smolensk in the Soviet Union. This crime was so horrible that many persons hesitate to retell it. Yet the barbarity of the murder, which was discovered in April 1943 when the Nazis were in occupation of Smolensk in Russia, 15 miles west of the Katyn Forest, was shown by the condition of the bodies. They had been found with their hands tied behind their backs. All the men had been shot in an identical manner, a bullet in the back of their necks. Some men who apparently had bitterly resisted at the moment of execution carried cruel bayonet wounds. All wore great coats, indicating that the murder had taken place during intensely cold weather.

When the Nazis declared publicly in April 1943 that seven mass graves containing these Polish officers had been found two most important developments took place: (1) The British and American Governments were strangely silent, being allied to the U. S S. R. at that time. The Office of War Information, however, a United States agency, adhered to the thesis that this crime had been committed by the Nazis (2) The Soviet Government immediately broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in exile in London, because the latter had had the alleged impudence of suggesting that the International Red Cross should impartially investigate the murder. From that moment on the Soviet Government continued to show its hostility not only toward the constitutional Polish Government in London, it also showed openly that it intended to set up a Communist Government within Poland and completely to destroy the independence of the Polish Nation.

Despite the infamy of the murder of these Polish officers, human memory is so short that many of us have forgotten the facts. Let us recall them.

In September 1939, when the Soviet forces invaded Poland for the purpose of freeing Poland, so Molotov said at the time, from its Fascist masters, over 15,000 Polish officers and noncommissioned officers were taken to three camps—Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostachkov. Four hundred of these prisoners of war, so-called despite the fact that the Soviet Union never declared war on Poland, were later found in another camp. It is through their testimony, as well as through the record of the diplomatic conversations between General Sikorski, General Anders, and Ambassador Kot, on the one hand, and Stalin, Molotov, and Vishinsky, on the other, that it is possible today to reach a conclusion regarding the responsibility for the Katyn crime

After the arrival of the Polish officers in the three camps they were permitted as nominal prisoners of war to correspond with their families in Poland. All letters, however, stopped in April and May of 1940 At that time, according to the testimony of some of the 400 who were transferred to another camp, the three camps were dispersed. It had been previously arranged among the officers that messages would be written secretly in Polish in the prison trains which conducted them elsewhere telling of their fate. According to some of the 400 survivors, the writing on the walls of the prison trains indicated that those who disappeared were taken to a place near Smolensk, where the Russian prison automobiles, known as the "black ravens," headed the victims off to an unknown destination, later identified as the Katyn Forest. It should be emphasized that in April and May 1940 the Smolensk area was occupied by the forces of the Soviet Government, which was still on friendly relations

with Hitler. In April and May in the northern climate of Smolensk it is still cold, and during the year 1940 the weather was especially rigorous at that season The wearing of greatcoats was, therefore, understandable.

After the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, the Soviet Government, largely on the suggestion of the British Government, established diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in London One of the conditions of recognition was that all Polish nationals in the Soviet Union should be freed and that a Polish Army should be recruited in the Soviet Union to fight against the Nazis. Accordingly many conversations took place in Moscow between the highest officials of the Soviet and Polish Governments.

One of the principal questions continually raised by the Poles was the fate and whereabouts of the 15,000 officers who had been in the three camps. The answers of the Russians were evasive and inconsistent. On one occasion Stalin said that the officers might have escaped to Manchuria, on another occasion Molotov said they probably had been repatriated; and on another occasion Vishinsky said that the Soviet Government had no information about them

When the Soviet Government refused to be a party to any investigation of the Katyn murder by the Internatonal Red Cross, that organization declined to participate as it did not wish to be a party to any political controversy. Thereupon, the Nazi authorities invited an international medical commission composed of well-known doctors of Italian, Danish, Yugoslav, Bulgarian, Roumanian, Hungarian, and Swiss nationality to make a technical examination of the bodies. It is true that with the exception of the Swiss doctor, Professor Naville, all of the countries of which the other doctors were nationals were then under the domination of Nazi Germany. For that reason the Soviets have claimed that these doctors were terrorized by the Nazis to make accusations that the crimes were committed in the spring of 1940 and thereby putting the onus on the Soviets While Hitler was capable, as was shown by the extermination of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto, of perpetrating genocide, in this case he was so convinced of Soviet guilt that he invited, first, the International Red Cross, and later eminent doctors whose integrity was beyond question, to make an investigation. For once, he knew that his hands were relatively clean.

The unbelievable part of the Soviet story regarding the crime is that 15,000 officers in Polish uniform could have mysteriously disappeared in a police state where even a person in civilian clothes is suspected unless he belongs to the ruling class But the greatest inconsistency in the Soviet version was the Soviet reaction to the Nazi disclosure of the existence of the mass graves in April 1943. Then Pravda, the official Soviet newspaper, calmly stated that the Nazis had perpetrated the crime; that these 15,000 missing Polish officers had been working on the roads in the region of Smolensk in August 1941 when the Nazis invaded that area and had been summarily executed by the Nazis. In August 1941 the weather records show that the weather was extremely hot in northern Russia Why did all the officers wear great coats? Why had all their correspondence with their relatives in Poland ceased between April 1940 and August 1941? And why did the Soviet Government tell General Sikorski in July 1941, one month earlier than the alleged murder by the Nazis, that there was no trace of any of the 15,000 in the Soviet Union?

The Katyn story should be retold at the present time for two very practical reasons: (1) The same fate of the Polish officers has been meted out to many American GI's in Korea. Mass graves have also been found there, filled with bodies of American soldiers with their hands tied behind their backs. Let us also remember Molotov's statement in 1939 that the Soviet Government desired to free Poland from its Fascist masters Compare this with the Communist-inspired statement of June 25, 1950, that the North Korean drive toward South Korea was to free Korea from its Fascist masters—this time the United States of America. (2) The methods used by the Communists will stop at nothing in order to achieve the Communist goal. In 1939 and 1940 the aim was to destroy the Polish nation. Today, it is to destroy all free nations, including the United States. We must fight this destructive policy—to achieve world domination and world revolution—with every weapon we have, whether it be physical, financial or moral. It is only through union that we can win It is up to us Americans—and as Americans, proud of our citizenship, there is only one answer. We must win, no matter what the cost.

Federal Tax on Local Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Cooper Green, mayor of the city of Birmingham, recently appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in opposition to the levying of a Federal tax against local government securities.

Mayor Green is immediate past president of the United States Conference of Mayors, is the present president of the Alabama League of Municipalities, and has established an outstanding record as the mayor of the great city of Birmingham. His statement on the question of taxing local government securities is of vital interest to all of our people. It follows:

Shall the income from future issues of local government securities be subjected to Federal income taxes, is the question again before us. I definitely feel that the same exploratory and conclusive statements against this proposal made at previous times before the Ways and Means Committee, should have the same continuing effect. Neither theoretically nor practically do we believe that present needs for additional Federal revenue justify a change in the position taken by committees and Members of Congress on other previous occasions. The idea of the Federal Government taxing the instrumentalities of the local government is just as repugnant today in our constitutional set-up of dual sovereignties as it was at the time of similar hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1939 and in other recent years.

The question is not what has been or can be done, but whether as Representatives and citizens of this Nation, we should take any step which might threaten the position of local governments as independent units of our American democracy, or which would restrict the freedom of their political actions in their own respective territories any more than is imperatively required to preserve this Nation and what it stands for.

The issue before us goes no further. It is proposed to tax the income derived from securities which may be issued in the future by local public agencies of this Nation. If that can be accomplished, who is there to say that the next step may not be to tax the securities already issued, or even the revenues earned by our public agencies in carrying on their public activities? If the one step is constitutionally sound, the other naturally follows.

To the average citizen, the question of whether or not Congress is empowered to lay and collect taxes on income derived from investments in local government securities, is of secondary importance to the principle involved in so doing, and the effect such taxation would have on local governments' ordinary prerogatives. In any event, with our long-standing American tradition of dual sovereignty in government, it is significantly important that technical legal rights as between the Nation and the State, should be asserted only as an urgently necessary and final resort.

Under the clamor for additional tax revenue, the Federal Government must be careful not to encroach further on the domain of the local governments lest the basic conception of dual sovereignty be utterly destroyed. An example of such encroachment is the legislation under which our citizens are now required to pay a Federal admission tax for the privilege of using our city swimming pools and other recreational facilities. Thus, the purpose of our cities to cut down on crime and juvenile delinquency is being obstructed and thwarted by the Federal Government itself.

The power to tax is unquestionably the power to destroy. In this instance it would be the power to destroy local governments which are the keystone of our American democracy. The imposition of this tax as proposed, would materially increase the cost of local government financing—in some cases even to the extent that the financing would not be possible. This unjustifiable interference by the Federal Government in purely local governmental affairs is almost unthinkable. Financial and tax analysts are certain that the proposed taxation would increase local government financing costs as much as 50 percent, or an increased interest cost of perhaps as much as 1 percent. That amount of additional interest cost can very well put the cost thereof beyond the local ability to pay. There can't be any honest denial of the fact that practically all of this additional cost is passed back to the issuing authority with only a very small part of it, if any, assumed by the security purchaser.

In our immediate case, we are in the midst of negotiating a purchase agreement for the local domestic water plant, involving an expenditure of some $22,000,000. If the proposed tax became effective before these bonds were sold, the additional annual interest cost of $200,000 or more, could very well kill the entire proposal. Birmingham's situation in that way is no different from that of nearly every local government authority throughout the United States.

Some 3 weeks ago, the Southern Natural Gas Co. of Birmingham, a very splendidly operated and financed company, sold $17,500,000 of taxable revenue bonds. Their interest cost was 2.86 percent. We have repeatedly been told within recent weeks, that our tax-exempt water revenue bonds should sell on a 2 percent or less interest cost, thus reflecting a difference of nearly 1 percent in interest savings to the city. It is being saved to the city—not to the investor, as some would have you believe.

Birmingham has bonds outstanding at this time amounting to about twenty million dollars. Assuming that the income from those bonds was taxable at an increased interest cost of 1 percent, we would have an additional annual interest cost of $200,000 today on these bonds, plus what would amount to approximately $200,000 additional interest cost on the proposed water revenue bonds, or a

total additional annual interest cost of $400,000 or more. That would mean that we would simply have to do one of two things, either raise taxes to cover this extra cost, or curtail local services Either would be serious

Of course, authorities differ to some extent, but not greatly, in their estimate of the added interest cost that may be expected to follow. Proponents of the tax, most of whom perhaps have more of a theoretical viewpoint than one based on actual investment experience, claim that the differential between yields of completely taxable and wholly tax-exempt high-grade securities, varies from about ¼ percent for the short maturities, to ½ percent for the long maturities Compared to the foregoing is the estimate of a conservative group of experienced dealers, to the effect that the approximate minimum increased average interest cost would be as much as 1 percent or more.

Of course, local governments are not concerned as to whether or not the Federal Government taxes its own securities That is their business to do as they see fit Local governments insist that legally, and equitably, they should be accorded the same privilege

In the investment field the buyer largely creates or at least controls the market through his price-fixing methods If this buyer knows in advance that the Government will demand additional taxes on income derived from certain investments, such taxes will be absorbed through a reduced price paid for the investment, or what amounts to the same thing, an increased interest cost that will be paid by the issuing authority rather than by the investor A number of the Government's own actuaries and staff members admit as much.

The investor will remain only the medium through whom the tax will be collected There will be no escape for the local issuing authority and its tax-paying public.

Local governments must remain untrammeled by the Federal Government, if they are to discharge those responsibilities that are properly theirs

Let us preserve America as we have known it and have nothing to do with this proposal of Federal taxation of State and local financing The Federal Government does not need this method of financing, we as a Nation should not for a moment hazard the dangers it may foretell to our political system.

Let us rather preserve to the Federal Government those powers and functions which rightfully belong to it and to local governments those rights and privileges which are theirs, and not mix them in any common pot out of which no one can say what may come

If this type of income is ever to become taxable, it should be done only after our entire people have been given an opportunity of expression thereon through the use of a constitutional amendment

We must preserve our local governments and their freedom of action in local government affairs It can't be done if the Federal Government is given the proposed strangulatory power.

Fitchburg Man Heads "Red Devils"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the celebrated Boston Post entitled "Fitchburg Man Heads 'Red Devils.' "

This fine account makes reference to the outstanding work of the Red Devils of the Ninety-second AFA Battalion commanded by my constituent, Lt. Col. Leon F. Lavoie, of Fitchburg, Mass. As Americans we can all be very proud of the gallantry and heroism of men like Colonel Lavoie and the boys of his command and those associated with them in the Korean campaign.

FITCHBURG MAN HEADS "RED DEVILS"—ARMORED OUTFIT HAS SUPPORTED EVERY UNITED STATES CORPS

(By John Thompson)

CENTRAL FRONT, KOREA, February 24.—The American Army some day probably will get around to replacing World War I towed artillery with self-propelled artillery to support the Infantry.

MODERN WARFARE

Meanwhile, the three self-propelled (SP) Artillery battalions in Korea are proving to the satisfaction of cannoneers and many and many infantrymen that this is the way artillery should move in modern warfare. Unattached (SU) battalions are armored field artillery (AFA), for only armored divisions are authorized to have such mobility.

This is despite the fact that division commanders of the World War II in their joint information exchange after the war ended, voted unanimously in favor of (SP) artillery.

One of the big tests of modern mobile artillery has been racked up by the "Red Devils" of the Ninety-second (AFA Battalion, commanded by Lt Col Leon F Lavoie, of Fitchburg, Mass. His unit, taken from the Second Armored Division at Fort Hood, Tex., has supported every American corps, every American infantry division except the Second, several South Korean divisions, and now the marines.

MOVES MORE QUICKLY

The United States Army is heavy with towed artillery. (SP) guns and towed artillery guns are identical The difference is one of mobility and maneuverability.

The Ninety-second, which has 155-millimeter howitzers on the chassis of an M-24 light tank, moved forward 4 miles today over an unbelievably poor road and was in position and ready to fire in 75 minutes. Towed battalions of 105-millimeter guns took 4 hours

Address of Judge William T. McCarthy to Members of the Massachusetts Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech made by one of the great judges of Massachusetts and the United States district court, the Honorable William T. McCarthy. The occasion was the recent conference of the members of the Massachusetts Bar Association, held at Springfield, Mass.

I want to express to Mr. Sears, Mr. Schneider, and the other members of the committee at the outset of my remarks my sincere appreciation for the invitation extended to me to speak at the midwinter dinner of the Massachusetts Bar Association. I have been particularly honored to be here at the head table because I have been privileged to break bread with a fine American gentleman whose presence on the district court bench of the United States is a source of comfort and consolation to those who are anxious to preserve a godlike American civilization. I have read with considerable pride the decision of the circuit court of appeals in the case of *United States* v. *Dennis*. I was deeply interested in this case when I was United States attorney because the presentation of the evidence to the United States grand jury against Dennis and his associates was under the watchful eye of a then Assistant Attorney General by the name of Vincent Quinn He is my very dear friend. I therefore long before the indictment was returned had a little knowledge of its background The guiding hand of the Almighty never was more conspicuously displayed than in the choice of the coprosecutors Vincent Quinn and Judge McGohey, who at that time was United States attorney, and the presiding judge at this long and arduous trial, at present our guest, Judge Medina. I know of no better compliment that could be paid to a God-fearing man than the simple sentence from the long decision of Judge Learned Hand in which he said that his charges and the rulings were, if anything, too favorable to the defense. I speak of this only because I want to extend to him my greetings as a great American and as an associate of the United States district court and with no desire to invade the territories set aside for Judge Hudson. All the hurricanes from hell never caused him to shrink one minute from the obligation he owed his God and his country, so that I am happy for that reason alone to be present at the head table. I am also happy to meet the members of the bar of the State and Federal courts who practice in this western section I feel honored and I want to assure them that I am here with the deepest of appreciation and humility. I have a golden treasury of friendships in this section of the great Bay State which go back many, many years starting with my college days and continuing down to the present. They represent men of all races and religions and their friendship and regard is near and dear to my heart I am also happy to be present at a head table where the American Bar Association is blessed by having a man as its president who has had the courage to appoint a committee to combat communism. I want to congratulate him on his appointment of Jackson Holtz to that committee. It is indeed inspiring to me to know that the American Bar Association has begun to realize the almost irreparable harm that has been done to the civilization of the world.

I want to leave a thought with you members of the bar of Massachusetts in these most critical days when we are having a rendezvous with destiny, when we are living in a civilization torn apart by isms, by peculiar philosophies of life, by strange ideologies, by the mouthings of men and women who if they had their way would obliterate the sanctity of family life The Pilgrim Forefathers who came over here to this land of ours to escape persecution and the first civil documents drawn up on our shores by them acknowledged the supremacy of a God because they solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one another convenanted and combined together into a civil body politic. The early charters and compacts gave a definite place to God. On December 7, 1682, a great pronouncement was made in Pennsylvania which read as follows: "The glory of almighty God and the good of mankind is the reason and end of government. Therefore government in itself is a venerable ordinance of God" Notice these two ideals. Government is for God's glory and was ordained by Him. In

the Declaration of Independence the framers of that noble document three times emphasized God's part in their struggle for independence and the closing paragraph furnished the finest basis in the world, that this Government was founded upon a natural order because it closed with the following phrase, "with a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence" And if that is not a statement of the firm conviction prevailing in the hearts and minds of our founding fathers, then I must confess that I do not know the meaning and implication of words and phrases. Through these early days these men were the signers of this imperishable declaration and were men who represented all races and all religions. They left their imprint in the early growth and development of this great republic of ours. Their philosophy was found in the utterances of the first President of the United States. They were found in the official pronouncement of Thomas Jefferson who in the early eighteenth century became the first president of the University of Virginia and who was responsible for establishing a school of religious training at the expense of the people of Virginia open to boys of all religious denominations Even such an unorthodox character as Benjamin Franklin said that there was no substitute for religion. We have had in history the lives of simple great Americans who believed in the principle of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man and who more important than anything else practiced it.

What a tragic transformation the little church in the village, the big church in the suburb, freedom of religious worship, men and women living in abodes of peace where men live and let live by looking toward a Supreme Being for guidance—the history of the great missionaries who helped to bring order out of chaos, Protestants, Jews, and Catholics, all a part of an army of fine men and women—the use of symbols such as found on our coins, "In God We Trust," fine men and women leading in the fight to put down racial and religious discriminations and out of the mists of disbelief and treachery came these diabolical ideologies and unworthy leaders. And you can trace these ideologies back for over 50 years and through the writings of intellectuals they have received their impetus from the dangerous legal philosophies advanced by legal minds, minds that should have known better, men and women, advocates of the jungle law, who preach the principle that the essence of law is physical law It has spread its tentacles into law schools and it has raised up Frankensteins in our institutions of learning. It has given us the course of secularism and it is inescapably clear that the contributing factors have been powerful minds of the profession of the law. I have no desire to be unkind whatsoever, but the obligation that a man owes to his own conscience, the obligation that a man owes to his own family, and the obligation a man owes to a God-like civilization compels me to speak out. There is a studied effort being made today to obliterate due process. There has been a studied effort, and I am sorry to say it has been successful to a degree to write into the opinions of our courts these secular views which are the negation of law, the right of morality, of truth, and of man's place in the world. These false legal prophets have very diabolically succeeded in undermining our system of jurisprudence because they practice the principle that the essential of law is physical force and it is inescapably certain that the corollary from that principle is one that might makes right

Examine, if you will, the two recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the Treasury Bus case and the Illinois Release Time case. I do not intend to criticize the courts of the United States, but it is right and proper to refer to the fact that the strange ideologies advocated by a God-less and un-American school of thought find a full expression in these cases, particularly the Illinois case. Witness, if you will, the unjust imprisonment of churchmen in Communist-controlled countries. We deplore the menace of atheistic communism, and yet, leaders of some of the great institutions of learning encourage the presence on their faculties of men and women who openly advocate atheistic communism. And this, if you please, is from the soil of the United States made sacred by the sweat, blood, and tears of God-fearing American men and women The most effective way to defeat atheistic communism is to see to it that written into our decisions is the philosophy underlying the natural law. Its contribution toward the maintenance of a decent civilization is written into the story of the development of the arts and the sciences and the culture of the centuries. It was expressed in the philosophy of the great leader of Judaism, Moses, who propounded to the then world the Ten Commandments, among which were the first two, "Love thy God" and "Love thy neighbor." It was expressed in the philosophy of Socrates. Its leader in the court room was Demosthenes. So I travel down through the golden corridors of centuries with men like Cicero and Justinian carrying the torch. Under its aegis great jurists lived and carried on and under its inspiration members of the bar did their duty toward their God and their country. Its true meaning was expressed in the writings of the great philosopher St Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages He it was who said that all man-made laws must conform to the natural law and so on down the line came these great leaders of legal thought down into the early days of the American Government, climaxed when from the pen of Jefferson came the famous preamble of the Declaration that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and the purpose of this Government is to secure these rights. It is inescapably clear that the unity of America lies in the recognition of the principle that the inalienable rights of the individual rest upon a foundation eternal and immutable I pay my homage to Mr. Justice Douglas who recently said that in the domain of conscience there is a moral power higher than the State. Ladies and gentlemen, this is our birthright. This is our haven of rest. This is the challenge to the jungle law school of philosophy which under the leadership of treasonable men has placed our country in jeopardy. Let us rededicate ourselves to the philosophy founded upon the respect for God and duly constituted authority. Let the members of the bar assume the leadership in the fight against these diabolical ideologies. I warn you that unless you do something about it, our standard of citizenship will change from freedom to that which is the denial of freedom—tyranny. Let all leaders of all religions manifest a spirit of love and affection for those who teach the undying philosophy that there is a brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. Let us drive the money changers out of the temple. Let us be God-fearing men. Let us be courageous men and women. Let us be stout-hearted men and women. Let us think of the classical lines which run as follows:

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flattery without winking;
Tall men and sun-crowned who live above the fog
In public duty and private life."

Yes, we need responsible leadership in our bar associations, but our greatest need is for men and women who believe that fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, men and women who believe that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, men and women who believe that the priceless heritage of American citizenship is founded upon eternal truths, challenged today as they are, by false prophets in this country and in other countries of the world, who bask in the sunshine of Karl Marx and his earthly representative, the outlaw of the Caucasus, Stalin. Let us safeguard our American civilization so that it will continue to be a haven of rest for men and women of good will. This is the issue that we face today. The lines have been drawn. What are you, Mr Toastmaster, and your colleagues and brothers in the bar associations of this country going to do about it?

Let me, in conclusion, urge you to cast aside partisan feelings and remember that a person's duty to God and his country is not bounded and described primarily by his loyalty to either one of our major political parties. The maintenance of a two-party form of government is essential to our country's welfare. I pay homage to a great American in the person of our beloved President who has been a powerful leader in the fight of our American civilization against atheistic communism. He is a God-fearing gentleman. He believes in the kind of an American civilization that is worth while maintaining. I urge you to be loyal and faithful to him as the first citizen of the land and as our commander-in-chief. I urge you to support the fine American leaders of both parties in the legislative halls of the United States, Members of the Senate, Members of Congress. And when I speak of Members of Congress, I ask you to remember that one of the outstanding forces for the maintenance of a Godlike American civilization is one whose friendship I cherish, whose incorruptibility was never questioned, whose liberal point of view toward all religions is a matter of common knowledge, a powerful leader in the fight for the preservation of our American civilization against atheistic communism. I mean my cherished friend, Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK.

I bespeak of you forbearance, patience, loyalty, and support for all our leaders, members of the Cabinet, the President, and other high officials of the executive branch of the Government, leaders of our Armed Forces here and abroad, and for our judiciary, Federal and State. May Divine Providence give them the strength of mind and body to carry on, so that the United States of America will continue to be a shield of protection for those peoples who believe in the perpetuity of a worth-while civilization.

We Should Save Waste Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the present critical period, and into the foreseeable future, our Nation will undoubtedly be confronted with serious shortages in various vitally essential raw material fields. In many cases we can reduce the harmful impact of these shortages by common-sense con-

servation programs and through the cooperation of our citizens in preserving waste products and channeling them back to industry.

My purpose today is to outline the serious situation confronting one of our most important industries and to call the attention of the American people to the fact that the situation can be greatly alleviated through increased effort on their part in returning to industry waste materials we can no longer afford to destroy.

I will discuss the paper-and-pulp industry primarily, although I am quite sure that a similar situation confronts many other industries and can probably be eased if the American people are made aware of the facts. There is no question but that the return of waste paper, through normal trade channels, will go far toward helping the paper-and-pulp industry meet the heavy demands which are now being made upon it.

Right now, the pulp and paper industry faces a most serious situation. An unprecedented demand, both military and civilian, for paper, paper products and paperboard has created serious shortages in the raw material field making it more difficult each day for a manufacturer to schedule his operations. Normal patterns of distribution have been disrupted because of shortages and the nonintegrated mills—those who do not manufacture their own pulp—find themselves in serious difficulty in replenishing raw material stocks.

The Association of Pulp Consumers says, for example, that an optimistic estimate of market pulp available in 1951, under a relatively normal economy and without the added defense demand, would be 14 percent less than 1950, or a decrease of 440,000 tons. The full impact of this shortage cannot be accurately predicted because of the many variables in the picture, including the amount of increased demand, both military and civilian, and the extent of the shortages of both pulp woods and chemicals for the industry.

The shortage of new materials in the pulp and paper industry has been aggravated due to the requirement that sulfur, an essential chemical in the production of sulfite pulp, be exported in greatly increased quantities to Europe As a result, one large producer of sulfite pulp has announced a cut of 15 percent on all pulp contracts, and it is anticipated that other producers will be forced to follow at the same rate. This rate of reduction reflects the reduction necessary because of the allocation of sulfur on the basis of 85 percent of former tonnage by sulfur suppliers to pulp manufacturers. A 15 percent reduction in sulfur results in a like reduction of sulfite pulp production.

One of the immediate effects of a shortage of pulpwood and sulfur will undoubtedly be that integrated mills will withdraw their surplus pulp production from the pulp market and consume it in their own mills. This has already been done by several large domestic and Canadian producers who formerly were important sources of supply for nonintegrated mills. This will cause a disruption of output from the mills as nonintegrated mills are forced to reduce their production or change the grades of paper produced because of lack of raw materials.

Pulpwood inventories in the United States at the end of October 1950 were 3,746,000 cords as compared with 6,000,000 cords late in 1948. This inventory of 3,746,000 cords is slightly more than 2 months' supply based on October production. Wood-pulp inventories at all paper and paperboard mills, integrated and nonintegrated, were 400,000 tons on October 31, 1950, as against 650,000 tons during the high point of 1948. Thus, inventories on hand constituted less than a 10-day supply based on October consumption. This reduction in pulpwood and wood-pulp inventories has occurred at a period of expanding production in the paper industry. Total production for the month of October 1950 was 14 percent higher than October of 1949. At the same time, inventories of pulpwood at mills declined 28 percent from October 1949 to October 1950, with consumption 14 percent higher than a year previous. Consumption of wood pulp increased 23 percent during 1950 over a comparable 1949 period.

The only remaining source of supply to the pulp and paper industry is waste paper. Waste-paper receipts for the first 10 months of 1950 show an increase of 22 percent, or 1,143,000 tons, over a comparable period of 1949. Consumption for a comparable period has increased 21 percent and mill inventories at the end of October were below those of a year ago. At the end of October, there was less than a 15-day supply on hand, based on current usage.

From these facts, it can be seen that if we are to meet the growing need for paper and paper products with a decreased supply of pulpwood and wood pulp, it can only be done by increasing the use of waste paper Increased use of waste paper is dependent upon increased supplies being made available through citizen help.

The immediate steps which can be taken by all Americans are these:

Save all waste paper.

Assist in the collection of waste paper.

Deliver all collected paper into regular trade channels so that it might be processed by the pulp and paper industry.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that "scare-buying" of paper products, or the purchase of products for which there is no immediate need, will only serve to make the situation critical. While the situation is undoubtedly serious, it will not reach a critical stage unless foolish hoarding takes place, particularly if the utilization of waste paper can be stepped up.

We can all cooperate by making the great need for waste paper known to the American people, and I am confident that they will then cooperate in saving it for reuse. By so doing, they will be making a sound contribution to the defense effort by helping to increase vitally needed pulp and paper production.

Who's Unpatriotic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to Murray Kempton's article which appeared in the February 21, 1951, issue of the New York Post under the caption "Shearing the sheep." The accusing finger has long been pointing at the average workers of America, who, without organized labor, might still be forced to exist under sweatshop environments without a living wage. Since this is a fact, it cannot be right to make this country's industrial magnates the forgotten men when their subversive activities, going unnoticed, can cause a greater breakdown than those caused by strikes instigated by members of organized labor. Mr. Kempton's column is a perfect portrayal of my thoughts on this matter.

SHEARING THE SHEEP

(By Murray Kempton)

Last week end, 79,000 CIO woolen workers went on strike for a wage increase. It was the first major walkout since the collapse of the Wage Stabilization Board. Naturally, there were headlines all over

What the headlines didn't say was that wool had been on strike anyway all through February. From the January 26 price freeze to last week end, the wool industry had refused to sell to the Government or to the consumer until it was allowed to raise prices. The CIO was just following its boss to the picket line

President Truman has not yet announced that the National Association of Wool Manufacturers is acting like a bunch of Russians. Charles E Wilson has made no comment. Westbrook Pegler on February 13 said it was time for certain lying, double-crossing traitors to stop helping the enemy in time of war

But "Peg," like the President, was talking about the railroad workers The wool companies were averaging 15 percent gross profits on sales when the strike began, so, of course, no one can classify them with second-class citizens like the switchmen.

But, if this isn't a strike against the defense effort, I'd like to know what is.

On January 26, Michael DiSalle froze the price of wool Three days later, Arthur Besse, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, wired DiSalle that the industry cannot operate

After January 26, the wool companies stopped bidding on military contracts. On February 8, Women's Wear Daily reported that

"Many (wool) firms are reportedly reluctant to take military contracts until they have more formal assurance from OPS that they will not be caught by the April 1 cut-off date and forced to return their prices to ceilings."

Last February 6, industry representatives visited price control officials to warn that "military contracts would continue to go begging" unless DiSalle dumped the price ceiling on finished fabrics.

The next day, DiSalle promised to ease the wool price freeze to take care of "individual hardship cases." Industry spokesmen said

the promise was too vague and that "further clarification would be essential before the industry is in a position to fill the Government's needs."

The fix wasn't yet tight enough. On February 13—Peg's day for the trainmen—the Daily News Record reported that military procurement officers couldn't get a satisfactory bid on an Air Force serge contract

So last Thursday, the Pentagon's Munitions Board asked DiSalle to "lift its entire General Ceiling Price Regulation as applied to military goods until some of the more pressing current contracts have been placed."

The next day, DiSalle caved in and took wool textile orders for defense off the price control list.

Wool wasn't alone on the price picket line. The Government hasn't been able to let a cotton fabric contract since February 6. Yesterday the Journal of Commerce reported that the Cotton Exchange remained closed for the twentieth successive day of its strike against "unworkable" price regulations.

The defense economy as of this moment is a moral slum where a hungry $11.56 a day trainman is a "lying traitor" and these not-yet-surfeited managers of a $2,500,000,000 industry are all honorable men and pillars of society.

Mail Service in Tri-City Area of the Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington:

"STATE OF WASHINGTON,
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

"*To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the honorable members of the Civil Aeronautics Board:*

"We your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas that area of the Columbia Basin known as the Tri-City area, comprising the cities of Pasco and Kennewick, the unincorporated area of Richland, and the rural area immediately adjacent thereto, now has a population of some seventy-five thousand; and

"Whereas the importance of the Tri-City area as an atomic and national defense center makes it vital that rapid transportation facilities exist, and

"Whereas the said Tri-City area now has no direct or convenient air communication with coastal cities in the Northwest; and

"Whereas the public convenience and necessity of such air transportation service to the coast from the Tri-City area already has been proved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled,* That we respectfully petition the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to act promptly to certificate regularly scheduled local airplane mail and passenger service from the Tri-City area to Seattle, via Yakima and Ellensburg, and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to transmit copies of this memorial immediately to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to the honorable chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Washington."

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the house of representaitves on March 1, 1951.

S. R HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

President Truman Presents First Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the business mobilization dinner of the Society of Business Magazine Editors in Washington, D. C., at which the President of the United States was the honored guest and at which he presented the first Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc., Washington, D. C., to Paul Wooton for most distinguished services to the Business Press through his development of better understanding and more productive cooperation between the various agencies of the Federal Government and the trade, technical, scientific and professional publications of America.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN JOHN W. MCPHERRIN, PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY OF BUSINESS MAGAZINE EDITORS

Mr. President, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, as president of the Society of Business Magazine Editors, it is my great honor to welcome all of you to this business mobilization dinner. The Society of Business Magazine Editors is a professional group like the Society of Newspaper Editors.

We have sponsored this occasion, because, as business editors, we realize that the most important business of America right now is to demonstrate the productive power of free people in competition with those who produce by slave power. We believe that this production job is too big a job for big business alone. Small business must get in the production line, too In other words, total mobilization of productive capacity requires that all participate.

This means that every business magazine editor, whether his readers are in small or big business, has the responsibility of letting each reader know what this war requires of him and why We must make our readers understand that this is a world struggle between those who believe in mankind and those who do not, and that it is a showdown between slave workers and free workers as to who can produce the most of the best.

This present world struggle may be the last opportunity to prove that free workers led by free management can produce more and better materials of war than slave labor driven by the whip of tyrants. America has created production tools and methods that are the envy of the world. They are so good that the Communists claim to have invented them. They have at least copied them and, by using millions of slave workers, it is possible that the Communist world may match our past production records.

That does not frighten us. We have in America something more important than machines and methods. I refer to the free spirit of the American people, and it is found among bench workers as well as board members. If that free spirit can be aroused, it can give our modern equipment the power to produce all that is needed and more. The problem is how to awaken it, and that is where we business editors may be helpful in this great national effort. The 100 editors of this society are thinking of their two and one-third million readers in business and industry. They are even now wondering how their editorial pages can best express the idea of this meeting and arouse that vital spirit among their 2,000,000 readers.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that the free spirit of each editor is enough to make him want to do something about it. And your presence here tonight, sir, is a great stimulus to our desire to help. To us, it is evidence of your knowledge of the Business Press and what it has done. We hope you have faith in what we can do.

If so, we believe your faith in the Business Press is largely due to one of our members who, for over 30 years, has been creating mutual understanding between Government leaders and business magazine editors. His statesmanlike service as a business magazine editor has been so notable that one of the national associations of publishers has selected him to receive the first award of its kind for outstanding service to the Business Press of America.

To tell you more about the award and the man it honors, it is my pleasure to introduce Mr. Rufus Choate, who will speak as vice president of National Business Publications—Mr. Choate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SILVER QUILL AWARD BY RUFUS CHOATE, VICE PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., AND PRESIDENT OF BOOKHOUT-CHOATE-SCOTT, INC.

Mr President, distinguished guests, members of the Society of Business Magazine Editors, fellow publishers, ladies and gentlemen, over the years the editors and publishers of the Business Press have worked harmoniously and understandingly with men of responsibility in Washington and elsewhere in the American economy. Many have participated in that effective and essential assignment. But, to some it has been given to render long and outstanding service and, as is so often the case, in high and low places, the service has been its own reward. We publishers who are members of the association known as National Business Publications desire that due recognition be given where it is so rightly deserved, and to that end the silver quill of NBP annual award has been created.

Those business publishers charged with the responsibility of selecting the first recipient of the silver quill of NBP did not face a difficult task. Thirty years of conspicuous endeavor in behalf of the business press and the public interest had already determined the individual. To every member of the Business Press, it is a matter of signal pride that the first citizen of these United States should so graciously agree to be with us tonight as we honor the man and the task to which his energies have so long been dedicated.

Mr. McPherrin, we of NBP are highly honored to have President Truman present this, our first annual silver-quill award, to his good friend and ours, Paul Wooton, for most distinguished services to the Business Press

through his development of better understanding and more productive cooperation between the various agencies of the Federal Government and the trade, technical, scientific and professional publications of America.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

President TRUMAN. It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Paul, to present this award to you. I have known you for a great many years. And knowing you that long—I still love you. [Laughter.]

I know you have earned this award. I know, for example, that twice a month or so you had these gentlemen in to talk to me and sell me a bill of goods. And they have succeeded. [Applause.]

(The presentation of the silver-quill award was made at this point.)

President TRUMAN. It seems that this occasion will not be complete if a politician doesn't get a chance to say a few words. [Laughter.]

I am glad to congratulate Paul Wooton on this, because when I first came here to Washington in 1935 Paul was our neighbor. And he was a real neighbor. You never forget your treatment when you move into a strange place.

Just to show you the difference in attitude of people when a strange man comes to town, my daughter at that time was about 10 years old And I hope you won't spread that around [Laughter.]

Paul Wooton lived in the apartment below us, and he was as kind to Margaret as anybody could be And when anybody is kind to Margaret, I never forget it. I don't even forget it when they are not. [Laughter and applause]

Paul Wooton has done a great service to the city of Washington. He had so many honors that I don't know whether I could name them all or not. Joe Short, coming over here, said that Paul was the president of the Press Club 2 years before he was, and he taught Joe Short how to introduce distinguished people.

He was instrumental in bringing his organization to the White House, as I say, at least once a month since I have been President, and twice when he could get in. [Laughter]

This silver quill presented to Paul is because of his work with this organization. And I think he has earned it. I have always been pleased when this organization has called on me. We have always had a good time. They have always given me some information that I couldn't use [laughter] and a great deal that I could, for which I was highly appreciative.

We are faced with two things right now. We are faced with aggression And we are faced with inflation. I want this organization to help the Government of the United States to meet both. And you can make a great contribution if you do that I know you will, as your president has said.

We are faced with inflation because of the conditions in the world. I don't think there is any man here who would want to see the thing for which we are fighting lost because we are not able to control ourselves. I think we can control ourselves. I think we can meet this situation I think that every man who has studied the position and the condition of the United States is in favor of trying to meet this program that the Government is now putting out with everything that he has. I don't care whether he is in business, whether he is in politics, or whether he works with his hands for a living. I think that every patriotic American—and I don't know any unpatriotic ones at this minute—is anxious to see our success in meeting our home situation. And I think they are just as anxious to see us meet the situation with which we are faced, because fate has made us a leader in the world. We shirked it in 1920. We can't shirk it now because it is on us. We must meet it. But it will take everything we have, with all the brains we can mobilize, to meet it.

I don't pretend that I know everything that should be done. I have tried to surround myself with men who understand various branches of government, who understand the world situation; and by pooling all those brains and all the others that we can mobilize, we will be able to meet the situation.

It is a struggle between people who believe in spiritual values and people who believe in nothing but materialism. We are fighting for freedom, for the right to worship as we please in any church we choose to attend, the right to read what we please, and the right to speak what we please, and the right to elect public officials of our own choosing—and then to give them hell after they are elected. [Laughter and applause]

Dictators don't believe in that. There is no difference between dictators If you will study your history, there hasn't been any difference in any police state that ever existed in the history of the world. They are all alike They are all for the enslavement of the individual for the benefit of the state. We believe that the state exists for the benefit of the individual, and that is what we are fighting for

There isn't any difference between Hitler and Mussolini, the Tarquins of ancient Rome, the kings of Sparta, Charles the First of England, Louis the Fourteenth—and Stalin They are all just alike. Nicholas the First of Russia was just as much of a dictator as anyone who ever lived. He believed in the enslavement of the common people.

This Republic of ours has been founded on a different program. I think the greatest part in the Constitution of the United States is the Bill of Rights, and I believe that we ought to give everything we have to see that that Bill of Rights is maintained, for the benefit of the individual. [Applause]

It is not the first time in the history of the world that the moral forces have been displaced by the materialist forces. When you go down through your history, you will find that this is just one of the incidents in which the fight has been to maintain the right to worship as we please, to talk as we please, to act as we please, as long as we don't interfere with the rights of others. That has all down through the ages been the struggle I am just as sure as I am that I stand here that we will win that struggle, because there have been times in the history of the world when we have been much closer to losing than we are now. There has never been a nation in the history of the world that has been placed on a stronger foundation than ours There has never been a nation in the history of the world as unselfish as ours, with ideals that include a belief in the welfare of every individual in the world as well as those of our Nation. There has never been another nation in the world that in time of victory has helped the vanquished to recover. See if you can find a situation like that. I don't think you will find it in the history of the world anywhere.

We have our troubles. Somebody sent me a cartoon from Punch a day or two ago in which the cartoonist was depicting an argument in the senate of the Carthaginians. And one able senator of the Carthaginians was saying that "Hannibal should not be allowed to use elephants in Italy, because the senate should control the use of those elephants." [Laughter.] That has been going on ever since we have had senates and senators. And I have served 10 years in the Senate, and I know just exactly how they feel. I know just exactly what the difficulty is. And we will meet it. There isn't a Senator in the Senate who isn't just as anxious to see the United States Government continue as the free Government that it is as I am. And I know that no matter what they say for publication, when the time comes for action they will be right there. I am just as sure of that as I can be

It is an interesting thing, the study of the history of these things. When Louis the Fourteenth was trying to be the master of all Europe, there were men in the Parliament of Great Britain who decided that the best thing to do would be not to try to defend the forts of Belgium and the Continent but withdraw to the Island of Great Britain and wait for Louis the Fourteenth to come and get them. Thank God they didn't do that. They didn't do it They met the situation, and freedom prevailed in the world. We are going to meet it, and freedom is going to prevail in the world. But in order to do that, we must have the cooperation of the people who make up this great Nation of ours.

I am appealing to you gentlemen to put out the facts. Honest criticism is necessary. I don't object to that. There is nothing you could say about me, anyhow. [Laughter.]

But honest criticism is helpful Nobody objects to that. And when it comes to the fundamental things, I know that every one of you will be in there pitching.

I wish I could have been here and had dinner with you, but, you know, in these times I have so many documents to read and so many papers to sign. Up to now I have had to sign my name 600 times a day, and now I think it is going up to 800 times. I don't have a chance to and I can't do the duties I am supposed to do and attend functions of this kind for pleasure. I came over here merely because Paul Wooton was our good neighbor, and because I wanted to say that I hope you will cooperate to the fullest extent possible to meet this situation with which we are faced

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF PAUL WOOTON AFTER RECEIVING SILVER QUILL AWARD

Mr President, Mr. McPherrin, Mr. Choate, ladies and gentlemen, the National Business Publications have conferred an honor on me which I appreciate profoundly. You, Mr. President, have enhanced that honor by presenting me with this impressive symbol of their recognition. The fact that I am to head a list of those who will receive this award in the future is a further honor.

It seems to me that this presentation is evidence that the publishers have overvalued what I have done. There is one thing, however, that they cannot overestimate That is the depth of my appreciation for this award and for the understanding behind it I also am greatly indebted to President Truman for many favors.

You publishers give me credit for having worked hard in your interest. What I do for you is not work. To represent you in this fabulous city, where everybody treats you better than you deserve, is a thrilling assignment. To be able to gather the extract of great minds and give it circulation is not work. It is pleasure in its most exciting form.

When you regard as worth while my efforts to encourage the Business Press to pay more attention to Government and to encourage Government to make more use of the Business Press, it makes me very happy.

In that activity I have consistently had the cooperation of the several Presidents, but this is the first time a President of the United States has recognized the Business Press to the extent of addressing one of its dinners. All of us appreciate, Mr. President, that your sanction is very valuable.

I have been requested to say a word concerning the purpose of this gathering. Our ability as a nation to defend ourselves is

geared directly to the speed with which our factories can supply the needs of Army, Navy, and Air Forces. Speed depends on know-how. The Business Press is the chief purveyor of that type of intelligence. Also it is a vast reservoir of past experience that again can be applied usefully.

During World War II, the Business Press used thousands of pages describing improved methods and practices for performing the innumerable jobs connected with war production. The essentiality of your publications during that struggle has been acclaimed in the highest terms It takes a lot of brawn to fight a war. It also takes a lot of brains.

The Business Press is invaluable in making our brain power more effective and in giving it precise direction. It is an extraordinarily potent instrumentality that is indispensable to the efficient conduct of business and industry. You men of the Business Press are as important to a war effort as are the trained officers of the fighting forces.

Again I thank you, Mr. President, for attending this dinner and thus giving impetus to the vital part the Business Press is taking in the defense of our fireside.

Conditions at Fort Knox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD BREEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, my office has from time to time received numerous letters detailing unfavorable conditions existing in various Army, Navy, and Air Corps installations. Generally these letters have come from parents anxious and concerned over the welfare of their sons and it has been the policy of our office to refer these criticisms to the appropriate legislative liaison offices for an on-the-scene report of these alleged conditions.

The Army, Navy, and Air Corps liaison offices have been very helpful and cooperative at all times in getting the requested information. However, Mr. Speaker, in many instances it has been found that the alleged abuses have largely been the result of that human quality of exaggerating details and adding a few embellishments at each retelling.

The following newspaper article written by Harrison Beardsley of the Dayton (Ohio) Journal-Herald staff, I believe, speaks for itself.

In the same mail that I received this newspaper, I also received several letters based on soldiers' reports to their families of an alleged freezing to death at their camp. Undoubtedly other congressional offices have received similar reports and perhaps Mr. Beardsley's article will be of interest and assistance.

ANXIOUS PARENTS' LETTERS PLAGUE ARMY TOP BRASS—COUGHS AND COLDS ARE PLENTIFUL AT FORT KNOX; RUMORS FLY, AND LETTERS START ROLLING IN

(By Harrison Beardsley)

FORT KNOX, KY., February 26.—Mom and dad are among the United States Army's biggest troublemakers.

With an assist from a Congressman or VIP, they can raise more feathers and fur on this post than a hundred feuding sergeants. Their unwilling copartner is the mailman, who each day drops at least one letter from mom or dad on the commanding general's desk.

The complaints and insinuations in these messages make the top brass yearn for the sweet clover of retirement.

It is not uncommon for mom or dad to charge that the Army has defranchised American youth or that it is engaged in a mass conspiracy to maim or dismember our boy.

It would be unfair to say that all these letters are the overflow of distraught parental love

In most cases our boy is as much to blame for them as anyone else He has written home about the Army. His letters boast of the rough treatment he has taken As any former GI knows, those first letters home put Izaak Walton to shame

But when he tells mom and dad about those two guys who froze to death last night it's too much.

Mom and dad are alarmed, and rightfully so

The trouble is mom and dad don't know that those two guys freeze to death at every Army post in the United States any time the mercury dips near zero. It was that way in World War II—and the Medical Corps is still looking for the bodies

It's another one of those fabulous Army rumors Here's how the rumor was reborn at Fort Knox just a month ago.

One night the temperature fell below zero. A colonel became concerned about the welfare of men camping out in the hills. He decided to go see how they were getting along He called the motor pool for a jeep The jeep was frozen. The impatient colonel told the motor pool to get the jeep de-iced in a hurry because maybe some of those boys are frozen out on bivouac.

HOW RUMORS START

Next day the word was all over camp that "two men had froze to death."

It took another day or so for the letters to get back home and then the general's telephone began to ring.

An investigation disclosed that during the particular cold spell in question there had been only one casualty A recruit suffered frostbite on one ear. He got it standing in an outdoor phone booth waiting for a long-distance call through to home, the investigating colonel told us.

But for weeks the recruits were talking about "those two guys who froze to death."

This is not to say there isn't a cold or a case of pneumonia at Fort Knox. This military establishment is a city—the second largest in Kentucky—where more than 84,000 live and work. There's bound to be trouble somewhere.

LOTS OF COUGHING

The cold, the cough are the trademark of a recruit.

Walk into any classroom and you can hardly hear the instructor above the hackhacks. Everybody at basic is coughing It's like touring a TB hospital.

Recruits put their shelter halves (two of them make a pup tent) up alongside their bunks at night to keep from coughing on each other.

It's too bad. But the Army has 14 weeks to get our boy ready for combat and it cannot cancel training—rain, snow or 10 below zero.

Blizzards don't stop the war in Korea and they don't stop basic training.

But to top all this cold and cough business every now and then the barracks boiler breaks down. During one week of extreme cold there were 50 boilers "on the bum." Fifty barracks were ice cold—50 barracks built 10 years ago to last 5 years.

BASIC IS NO PICNIC

Is it the Army's fault? us civilians ask. Or is it the fault of an economy-minded former Secretary of Defense who let Army installations fall apart? as Army officers say.

The latest word is that Fort Knox is due for a Senate investigation.

What will the Senators find?

They will find that basic training here is no picnic. They will find 2,000 recruits who cough Two thousand recruits who in 14 weeks can be in Korea where things are a lot colder, a lot wetter and a whole lot deadlier.

The question they should decide is not whether basic training is too tough but whether it is tough enough.

Address of Hon. Sean MacBride, Minister for External Affairs for the Republic of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a speech delivered last Saturday at the Clover Club in Boston, Mass., by the Honorable Sean MacBride, the Minister for External Affairs for the Republic of Ireland:

One of the more hackneyed functions of a foreign minister is to compose little speeches which refer, as gracefully as possible, to the links which have always linked Ireland and other countries. This pastime is, I believe, irreverently known in the department as "linking the link." However, there are occasions, and this is one of them, where the links are so solid and real that to link them is no trouble at all.

I was reminded the other day, by a rather amusing coincidence of reading, of how close and intimate the relations between Ireland and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts really are. I had been reading a book which, I am sure, is familiar to you all, and as to whose merits and accuracy I hasten to say that I am not competent to form an opinion—The Proper Bostonians, by Mr. Cleveland Amory. The end papers of that volume display a map which purports to represent the true Hub citizen's conception of the world which revolves around him. I was tickled to see in this that, although a great part of the United States is very sketchily drawn—the whole of the great Middle West is, for instance, covered by the sweeping description "The Western Prairies"—the solitary outside country shown (I hesitate to call it foreign)—Ireland—is fairly accurately drawn and on it are plainly marked the names of Limerick, Cork, and Killarney. I noted sadly that the northeastern corner of our island faded off on this map into a misty obscurity. Reading Mr. Amory's psychological geography, I was reminded of a work by one of our leading humorists—Myles no gCopaleen. That work, of which the name in Irish means "The Poor Mouth," also contains a map of the universe, this time as seen by an inhabitant of the Blasket Islands. It is considerably more rudimentary than Mr. Amory's but it does show two objects of external interest. One is England and the other, written in much larger and more affectionate-looking letters, is Springfield, Mass. I think these two independent observations, humorous as they are, do illustrate something serious and real: The mu-

tual consciousness and affection of two peoples.

That affection, of course, arises primarily from the fact that so many Irish men and women have made their homes here. But even apart from that, we, in Ireland, should have a warm regard and admiration for your historic city The part which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the city of Boston played in the War of Independence and, later, in the preservation of the Union, have gone down, along with the names of Washington and Lincoln, as part of the real history of human freedom. The Irish people place on freedom the value which you put on something for which you have had to struggle hard and long; it is natural, therefore, that we should admire your historic traditions and struggle for liberty. We respect your traditions all the more because we have reason to know that they are, for you, not mouldering parchments in museums but living and active principles

We, in Ireland, have learned to apply critical tests to professions of political idealism. We were governed for many years by people who had developed the most admirable principles of civil government—and kept them to themselves. There is a Gaelic proverb which says "that the attention one pays to a sermon on consideration for others is greatly increased if the preacher has the delicacy not to be standing on one's face" After a long period of this treatment we have become, as it were, connoisseurs of liberalism When we hear high principles expressed we ask ourselves whether these principles are to apply to us or whether, as in the past, Ireland is supposed to exist in a kind of moral vacuum where expediency alone takes over. The answer in the case of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is, I am proud and grateful to say, an affirmative one. You have high principles, and you do not hesitate to apply them in the case of Ireland. Your legislature has condemned the partition of Ireland in no uncertain terms, and your Senators and Representatives in Washington have also done all in their power to expose that injustice We, in Ireland, behold this, not only with gratitude for what you are doing for us, but with the thrill of pride and pleasure one derives from seeing high political ideals being put into action. Your statesmen show that they believe that the freedom of small nations is something which is both just and expedient now, not merely, as others would have us believe, an obsolete wartime slogan or an aim to be realized in a mythically remote future, like the famous Communist doctrine of "withering away of the state."

I have said that freedom is also expedient, and I think it may be well to say something of why this is so, specifically in the case of Ireland. The basic fact is that there is such a thing as an Atlantic community and that Ireland is a member of that community. I say a member—not a part of another member or a piece chipped off another member, but a nation in her own right, one of the oldest in Europe, with her own unique and individual voice. She is that strange anomaly, a European nation with most of her people in America, and that, I think, makes her a member of the Atlantic community in a special sense. I was reminded of this today as I came through one of the older parts of your city. One feels that it is a place where the old world and the new have met and formed a harmonious and fertile union. On the other side of the Atlantic, Ireland is potentially in a like position. There is nothing either cheap or superficial about the deep American sympathies of the Irish people

Ireland, as I see it, is a point of attachment between America and Europe. She is a small but powerful engine of the most genuine kind of international cooperation and understanding. The tragedy is that this engine has been, to a great extent, put out of gear. Ireland is, indeed, playing a certain part, not, we think, without value, in international cooperation In the two principal international organizations to which she belongs, the Council of Europe and the OEEC, she has played a progressive part. In the OEEC we have, from the beginning, pressed for a quicker tempo of trade liberalization and a speedier integration of the European economy. In the Council of Europe all our representatives, who include representatives of both the Government and the opposition—Mr. de Valera's party—have consistently favored the strengthening of the Council of Europe. In principle we have favored moving forward toward the concept of a Parliament of Europe.

You will want to know our position in relation to two other organizations, the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

As regards the United Nations the position is that, being willing to accept all the responsibilities of membership, we applied but our candidature was vetoed by Soviet Russia Marshal Stalin, I am sorry to say, does not consider that we are a democratic or peace-loving people.

As regards the Atlantic Pact the position is that we were invited to join but we refused. That refusal may seem strange to many of you, but, in fact, it was the only course open to us, the only course which could have been taken by an Irish Government under the present circumstances, as is, I think, shown by the fact that it had the unanimous support of all parties in our Parliament. The reason is tragically simple. It is that for us, unlike all the other members of the pact, the invitation was not an invitation to a free nation to join other free nations in the bearing of arms for the proservation of peace. It was an invitation to a nation, part of whose territory is occupied by a foreign power, against the will of the overwhelming majority of our people, to enter into a military alliance with that power. Worse still, it was, in our case, an invitation to underwrite that power's territorial integrity in our country—that is to say, we were in fact being asked to underwrite the border which divides our country.

It may be argued that, in this great crisis of our time, it would have been the part of magnanimity to disregard these matters, to set the interests of the Atlantic community, as a whole, above what is often described as a "local grievance"—in short, to forget about partition and come into the pact. That was not the response of the Irish people. The Irish people, like other people, test all professions of principle by the things they know and have experienced. They have no illusions about Russia. No European nation has less illusions or is more solidly anti-Communist, but they simply do not accept, as a champion of liberty, the nation which refuses to recognize democratic rule in Ireland's case. Many in Ireland have cause to remember the recruiting posters which the British Government put up in every town and village in Ireland during the First World War. One of these posters—"Ireland and the peace conference" began "The Allies declare in specific terms that they are out to give freedom to small nationalities. They cannot, then, in the face of Europe give freedom to the small nations and leave Ireland out"

Another British poster, showing an awareness of Irish distrust for British promises, cashed in on Ireland's trust in America: "America, speaking through its President, said this piece of propaganda, "declares that the liberties of every other people are as valued and are to be made secure, aye, as the liberties of America. Will Ireland fight for this freedom? America will see her rights are secured."

Many thousands of Irishmen, believing such words and believing that Ireland was, in truth, one of the allies fighting in the common cause of all, fought and died in that war. At the end of it the promises were dishonored and Irishmen had to fight long and bitterly to obtain even a limited degree of freedom for a partitioned island. This might almost be described as an education in political cynicism, but I don't think our people are cynical. They believe in the principles professed by the Atlantic powers but they want to see those principles put into effect in Ireland. They are not bargaining about partition. There can be no question of a bargain where the rights of a nation are concerned. For Ireland, partition, in this context, represents two things—an absolute present bar to participation in a military alliance with Britain and a test of the reality of democratic principles.

As I see it, the wall which divides our country has already been undermined and it will collapse under a strong and resolute push. Those of you who put your shoulders to it are doing a great historic work. Remember that the fracture in Ireland is also a fracture in the Atlantic community—a community that can ill afford division.

It was a joyful day for the Irish people, as well as for America, when on St. Patrick's Day, 1776, the British troops evacuated your city and General Washington gave the countersign, "St. Patrick" On that far-off day, Britain left behind a former victim and an enemy and found before long that she had gained a trusty friend. I look forward to another evacuation day and to a similar outcome.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN T. WOOD

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1951

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, as a further step toward national bankruptcy, we are now being urged by Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, to give 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India, with no strings attached.

Meanwhile, our farmers are suffering from a shortage of burlap to sack potatoes and other farm products; and there is an acute shortage of manganese and other strategic metals which are absolutely essential to our defense effort. India is the major producer of these materials but has shown no inclination to exchange them for wheat, preferring, apparently, to sell them to Russia or other countries and discriminate against the United States by imposing heavy export taxes.

The two letters appended express my views and the views of my constituents regarding the strange proposal of Dean Acheson in whom I have absolutely no confidence.

IDAHO-OREGON SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
Parma, Idaho, February 22, 1951.

Hon. JOHN T. WOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOOD: In light of recent proposals to send foodstuffs to India for the purpose of relieving the famine, we should like to call your attention to the present situation regarding the supply and costs of burlap used extensively in our industry and obtained primarily from India.

Members of this association, representing the major portion of shippers of fresh fruits and vegetables in this southwestern Idaho and eastern Oregon area, find that most of the companies supplying burlap to the trade believe they will have supplies of burlap on hand sufficient to cover the needs of the industry here during the months of July, August, and September. However, many of these companies presently will not offer those supplies to farsighted shippers, nor will they indicate definite prices. They give as a reason the present tight supply and price level.

India has, as we understand, a reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina wherein they trade burlap for wheat. Our members feel we should be in at least a similar position in light of our efforts to remedy India's famine.

Members of the potato and related shipping industries have requested that you be informed of this situation and that you be asked to exert your utmost surveillance both from a supply and a price standpoint. They also request that every consideration be given to a demand for a reciprocal trade agreement with India involving an exchange of burlap for foodstuffs supplied by our Government.

Our members feel that the bag-supply companies should be consulted and that the matter should be thoroughly coordinated with them. They believe that other industries using burlap such as the peanut industry and the grain industry, as well as the Textile Bag Manufacturers Association, should also be consulted with regard to this matter. Our members feel that the congressional delegates from all other potato-producing States will be equally interested in this problem and urge that you solicit their support and aid in working out this program.

Yours very truly,

WORDEN A. DAVIS,
Executive Manager.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1951.

Mr. and Mrs. GILBERT PAROZ,
Potlatch, Idaho.

DEAR FOLKS: I can appreciate the fine Christian spirit shown in your recent letter requesting my support of legislation to send 2,000,000 tons of wheat for free to India.

The American people have always been ready to extend relief to the hungry and needy in all parts of the world. A readiness to help might be considered a national characteristic.

But I resent the efforts of the State Department to stampede Congress by widespread propaganda to put over this gift of wheat to India for the following reasons:

1. No information has been supplied Congress as to why such a gift is required, nor as to how it is to be distributed.

2. Mr. Nehru has even stated that the request for the wheat was unauthorized by him, and that if the wheat comes he does not want it as a gift. My understanding is that India has plenty of money, but due to the fact they planted their wheatlands into jute instead of wheat, they do not have the wheat, of course.

3. However, they do have an abundance of jute, which we need very badly; in fact I am getting letters from farmers complaining of their inability to get sufficient quantities to take care of the needs for this year at any price.

4. For the first time in the history of nations, I believe, India has placed an export tax on jute. They have doubled and trebled it within the last 2 years, and it is due to take a still larger rise immediately. My information is that this will make the price of jute prohibitive to the American farmer. One can understand a tax on imports, but one on exports does not seem to make much sense, unless a gouger is successful in getting away with it.

5. India has an abundance of manganese. We do not. We need it badly in our steel program. She does not offer to give us any. She should be willing to trade it for wheat. She also has other strategic metals which are in short supply here.

All of them she could spare could be traded for the wheat. I think it is very necessary for you to understand that this wheat famine is not because the farmers of India did not have a crop, nor because they are any poorer than our farmers. It is simply due to the cause I have already mentioned.

I might also point out that there is absolutely no provision within the Constitution whereby Congress may give anyone anything. Congress has no right to give your money or goods to anyone without value received.

Hoping this may clarify the subject in your mind, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN T. WOOD.

"On What That Money Buys and How We Buy It—Hinges the Real Security That the Air Force Can Give the People of This Country" (Eugene M. Zuckert)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it affords men no end of pleasure to join in class reunions—there, to brush elbows and again break bread with men whom they knew in the formative years of their lives. It is, likewise, a distinct honor for any man to be given opportunity to address the Harvard Business School Club at any time.

It was, therefore, a happy combination of circumstances which found Eugene M. Zuckert of the Yale class of 1933, Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force, and one-time member of the Harvard Faculty School of Business Administration, addressing, but a few short weeks ago, the members of the Harvard Business School Club of New York City, the place of the Assistant Secretary's birth.

Mr. Speaker, Eugene Zuckert is no stranger to the Members of this House—nor to a great majority of those who sit in the Senate on the other end of the Capitol. We who know him well know that there are few men in Washington who so nearly fulfill the criteria that might be established to choose the ideal career man in Government more than does Eugene Zuckert.

Upon his graduation from Yale, Mr. Zuckert entered upon a combined Yale Law-Harvard Business School course—a pioneer, experimental course conducted by those two great universities, the purpose of which was to supplement legal training with business training in order that its graduates better understand the problems of business and of Government, as well as those of law—and, at the same time, coordinate them to the benefit of the Nation's welfare and the profit of the American taxpayer.

There might be other men in public life who elected to undergo such training and follow such a career, but there is none who has made greater sacrifice of his personal time and fortune in order to translate his learning into action programs that looked to the eventual introduction into Government of the same high standards of business administration that characterize our multi-billion-dollar corporations.

The postgraduate work which Eugene Zuckert took comprised a first year in Yale Law School—then, a second year in Harvard Business School—succeeded by two final years in the Yale Law School—during which Harvard Business School instructors did considerable of the teaching.

Even in this formative period, Eugene Zuckert was, first, an assistant director, and then later, director of the Yale moot law court. Upon his graduation, he received not alone the degree of bachelor of laws, but a certificate for the completion of the combined law-business school of both Harvard and of Yale.

Upon leaving college, he was admitted to the bar in the State of Connecticut, as well as New York, and while he practiced law in both States, most of his adult life as well as professional career has been devoted to public service, and, of a certainty, I think all who know him will agree that there are few men in Government who—because of their innate ability, character, and integrity—merit the confidence of this Congress more than does Eugene Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of Air.

While a member of the Harvard faculty, Mr. Zuckert served as a special consultant to the commanding general of the United States Air Force in developing statistical controls, and while an instructor of the Air Force Statistical Control School at Harvard, trained more than 3,000 Air Force officers, with rudiments of good business practices and administration which, today, are found grounded in Air Force administration at every level of command.

In addition to his duties with the Air Force, he served a full year in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations in connection with the Navy invcntory control program. In September 1945 he was relieved of his command as a naval lieutenant to become the Assistant to the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, W. Stuart Symington. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the Hon. W. Stuart Symington, when he became Secretary of War for Air, named Mr. Zuckert as his special assistant?

Mr. Speaker, it was, indeed, no happenstance that, when the United States Air Force became an independent Department of Government, coequal in all matters with those of the Army and the Navy, in the National Defense Establishment, Mr. Zuckert became the first to be named Assistant Secretary of the United States Air Force.

In addition to his duties as Assistant Secretary, United States Air Force, Mr. Zuckert serves as Air Force representative on the personnel policy board as

well as on the management committee, both of which are high policy-making agencies within the office of the Secretary of Defense.

In the field of management, he exercises supervision over the Air Force's cost control plan. This, of itself, established a new high in sound business administration within the military organization. He, likewise, has charge of the statistical control system; the development of organizational policy; civilian and military personnel policy; budgetary policy, as well as the educational and the training program.

Mr. Speaker, probably the most significant thing that brought good business practice to Government administration in the last 20 years was the establishment of a performance-type budget developed by Mr. Zuckert for use by the United States Air Force. This single accomplishment was of such moment and so vital to the economic administration of Government affairs that the establishment of this type of budget was acclaimed by Herbert Hoover's Commission, set up by Congress to study the reorganization of the executive departments of Government. That distinguished committee, whose report was acclaimed Nationwide—recommended to the Congress that the performance-type budget should be adopted in all armed services budgeting.

Mr. Speaker, the talk that Mr. Zuckert delivered at the Harvard Business School is exactly the kind of a talk that you would expect from a top-flight business executive. It is a discussion, among many, many other things, of the management problems common to all large business concerns.

It is exactly the kind of a talk that we would like to hear from all of our executives in Government. It comes from one whose duties make him responsible for the management of one of the greatest business concerns in all the world—the United States Air Force—a concern carrying on its payroll, at the present time, nearly a million persons, and with disbursement that runs into billions of dollars annually.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the great interest that every Member of this House has in the things that the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force has to say that I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD this wonderful talk by Eugene M. Zuckert.

That talk was as follows:

As things go in Washington, 5 years is a long time for an appointive official to stay within the same organization. I think if anybody asked me what was the common denominator that has emerged in my 5 years in the Air Force, I believe I would say it is the respect that I have gained for our military leadership.

It has become a constant source of amazement to me how quickly people are likely to seize upon the appellation of "brass," the most derogatory word in talking about our military leadership. That word "brass" seems to have acquired a connotation of a Colonel Blimp type of character with the most reactionary blind type of mentality. And, yet, when you hear the top military leadership abused, and the military itself, you sometimes wonder whether it could have been a coincidence that we were able to defeat Germany and Japan, that we were able to get thousands of bombers into the air, that we were able to get troops to Europe by the thousands in the last war, that submarines perform the miracles that they do.

Inevitably, you must draw, as I have drawn, the conclusion that all these things, and the combination of them, is not the result of a series of fortunate accidents, nor solely the result of the work of junior officers and Reserve officers brought in from civilian life. You inevitably reach the conclusion that our top military management does do an outstanding job under the most difficult conditions

It has been a real experience to have been associated with Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, Bradley, Tooey Spaatz, Hap Arnold, Vandenberg, Collins, Admiral Sherman, and the rest, and not only them, but the people behind them. You grow to respect their real honesty, their basic self-sacrificing honesty, and their ability Not completely without fault, but nevertheless, in my mind, the military has a quality of management that permits the attainment of objectives that seems impossible in contemplation, yet is overlooked in retrospect

As I have said, this has been a tumultuous 5 years with changes up and down, cut-backs, and expansions of program. In 1946 when I first became associated with the Air Force, you will remember the Air Force and every other branch of our service was at its lowest ebb The year before World War II had ended, the people back home had said, "Bring the boys back home"

In time—a matter of weeks—that demand was sweeping the Nation. It was loud and insistent, and, as it turned out, was not to be denied

In 1946, we were still spilling men out of uniform. And as we did, we found we could not afford to keep much of our equipment. To begin with, we didn't have the manpower to handle it and, even where we had manpower, we found that our appropriations were cut so deeply that we just could not afford to spend for its upkeep.

What we were able to, we sold as surplus, in order not to burden our overhead. A lot of you well know that some of the surplus rotted on islands in the Pacific, at deserted bases in England, and here at home.

And today, in a few short years, the cycle is suddenly reversed. We find that now we are again building, and this time, apparently, building in earnest. We have made mistakes already in this building process We have been thrust completely into a new emphasis. But it would not seem to me humanly possible not to make mistakes when today we are planning for more than double the number of men with which we started this fiscal year, and the spending in this year alone of $14,000,000,000.

The important point, I think, is that today we are profiting in the Air Force from our experience 10 years ago. There still are key men with us who learned the hard way back in 1940 and 1941.

Their guidance and their work down the line is going to help us stay along the right road. Not only that, but I think the Air Force has another very definite advantage in that we are relatively young and, being young, we are able to adapt ourselves readily to new methods and plans where it is proven that the present ones are faulty.

In short, I believe that the Air Force has the all-important essential of leadership, the youth and the flexibility to do the job we are facing, and to do it well.

Some of you may wonder why we didn't have our defense ready even when we were reducing our size back 5 and 6 years ago.

Well, we have had mobilization plans. Plans which we have worked hard over for the past 5 years.

But, if you have plans, you might ask, why haven't you followed these plans instead of starting off on relatively uncharted paths and succeeding apparently in confusing many, many people?

The answer is that while we planned for either of two possible eventualities, we got a third and a new one

We drafted and we consciously followed a peacetime program of preparation. We had another plan on the shelf in case of war

And then we found ourselves settling into the quicksand of something new in history.

We found ourselves—not at war—not at peace—but in a gray zone where we needed vast armament in order to preserve the peace and not go to war Our plans to transform the civilian economy and swing into full war manufacturing—if war came—do not fit the situation at present

So today we are faced with a new problem. And compared with it, I can tell you that war is a simple thing When war begins, only the winning of the war matters Everything else goes out of the window

War, too, has a definite terminal point, and very tangible objectives along the way. But this gray war—this hot and cold war—can go on indefinitely And we must fight it while at the same time maintaining our economy.

Thus, we are faced with the problem of building a large-scale, atomic-age war machine while, at the same time, maintaining a strong civilian economy, and the tax revenues it produces to pay the tremendous military bills

Immediately before Korea, the entire defense budget had a $13,000,000,000 ceiling. This year, as I mentioned before, the budget for the Air Force alone is $14,000,000,000.

This year, in 6 months, in the Air Force alone, we have already committed over $6,000,000,000 merely for procurement.

On what that money buys and how we buy it hinges the real security that the Air Force can give the people of this country And it is a security that we cannot turn off and on like a magic faucet. This seems to me the major factor underlying every decision the people of the United States and the Government must make; there must be a continuing purpose in our efforts, and there must be a continuing sense of the urgency of the problem if the costs and heartaches they entail are not to be vainly suffered.

Getting down to the specifics of the situation, and only getting down to the Air Force situation; to begin with there are hundreds of specialties in which we must train our personnel. Getting them into uniform, telling them how to march, indoctrinating them, is only the first step. The training steps take from 6 months to several years, depending on the particular field that they work in. Therefore, we cannot, when things look good for the moment, stop our training program and 6 months later, when the storm clouds gather again, somehow have the needed trained men.

It might interest you to know that today 33⅓ percent of our manpower is either in training or connected with this large and complex training program.

Our basic personnel problem is not in getting men. It is in getting men by specialty to fit into our complex operation. Trained men, alert men who can handle their assigned roles in modern warfare with its complex equipment, its jet planes, its radar.

Just take one simple example. One of our major radar operating in our air defense employs 1,300 different tubes, weighs 240 tons and requires adjustments down to a thousandth of a microsecond. Think of the training and the skill needed for men to be able to work on this one radar unit, to keep it in order, and actually to operate it for the purpose for which it is designed.

The man in uniform today has to have a basic education in order to be sent through

any one of the many highly specialized training schools. And this, let me repeat, takes time Our technical courses average about 10 months.

It would take less time if we would somehow reach the plateau of our scientific knowledge. Then we could teach by rote; the men could memorize what they need to know

But that is not the case. Our men must be trained so that as new developments are achieved, literally every week and every month, their background will be broad enough for them to adapt themselves to the latest discoveries and theories and types of equipment.

It's been a long time since a soldier could be prepared for war by being taught merely to fire a gun.

The equipment of modern warfare becomes more complicated each day too. And it takes longer to design, develop, and manufacture

There must be months of planning before an order is placed, once the order is placed there are months—sometimes 2 or 3 years in the case of our long lead time items—before delivery can be made.

Our original planning visualized a D-day on which peacetime contractors would be expanded to all-out production, civilian producers converted to war work, standby plants reopened and new plants built. However, this is not our present situation.

While we are anxious to continue the greatest possible civilian production we, nevertheless, face the fact that shortages, rationing of essential materials, and credit restrictions are idling some plants. This presents a serious economic situation. It is only logical that the idle hands from auto, home appliance, and other industries should be put to work on defense goods

In absorbing this capacity which would otherwise be dissipated, we have sought to avoid worker migrations with its attendant difficulties.

It also has long been Air Force policy to broaden the productive base. We have sought to involve as many separate factories as possible in peacetime aircraft production and production of the necessary components. This has resulted in the creation of a diversified industry network which, now that expansion has become necessary, can grow more rapidly because not only the brains of big industry but those of many small suppliers are devoted to the job of getting out more—quickly

This policy will be of increasing aid to that vital segment of our business structure—the small manufacturer.

It is also one of the foundations upon which we base our hopes of achieving the production goal set forth by the President—a fivefold increase by December 1951 of the December 1950 plane-production capacity.

Automotive firms are already augmenting the output of the aircraft industry Kaiser-Frazer is preparing to build Fairchild C-119's, Packard is getting ready to the build J-47 jet engines; Ford is tooling up to produce Pratt & Whitney engines in Chicago, General Motors is going to manufacture Republic F-84 fighters and J-65 engines

The aircraft industry proper is going to be called upon for far more production than it is delivering at present And as long as it is a g ay, rather than an all-out war, the converted civilian plants are going to operate at far below their full wartime potential

Normal aircraft-industry plants and converted plants will be capable of vastly increased capacity.

We will thus have substituted many sources of supply for the few we had in peacetime.

This will be vitally important if war should strike

For it would mean that we would have avoided the bitterly slow process of having to build new plants, hire men, locate management, produce, and install complicated machine tools before getting increased production.

We will be prepared to expand with greater ease to the output needed to hit our potential enemy with the results of full production from the greatest industrial machine in world history.

We are also getting better geographic distribution of essential production.

We cannot transplant our entire industrial organization to midcontinent in the hope that it would be out of the range of an enemy.

If, as we are told, there is no hiding place for us as individuals, how can we expect to find a hiding place for our vast industries?

Many have expressed concern at the slowness with which much of our equipment is turned out. These people overlook one important factor· That much of our needed fighting equipment is new, barely out of the development stage

Take electronics for example. We can't move in and take away from a company that is manufacturing some electronic device upon which we are depending strongly. Many of our new electronic devices are scarcely out of the breadboard stage. Throughout the early part of their production they cannot be taken away from the mothering of the engineers.

In aviation we are in a constant state of evolution; each day brings advances in almost every major item Therefore, we are not faced with a production problem alone—it is also a problem of engineering

One of our major electronics producers has 6,500 employees. Of these 6,500, 1,295 are fully qualified engineers and 20 percent of the latter have graduate degrees That, I think, is a good indication of the complexity of the equipment and the production problem in modern aviation, and the extent to which production and engineering are inextricably tied together in getting out the tools with whch we would have to fight a war and which must be produced in quantity if we are to be prepared.

I have been talking tonight about limiting myself pretty much to the problems of the Air Force But the same principle holds true for the other services The complexity of our job, the number of individuals' lives we are concerned with, the share of the economy which must be dedicated to preparedness, make one problem overshadow all else and that is the road ahead.

Every step we take, every decision we make will affect each one of us. This fight against communism, imperialistic communism, is going to mean more to you with the passing of each day than a clash of ideas and ideals.

The clash will be felt in specifics that will touch on our daily lives.

It will be noticed at the neighborhood hardware store, for example. Machine tools may not be built for any other purpose but defense plants for the next 3 to 5 years. Naturally, this will mean a drying up of production for other items

Even the hand tools that you use in your basement carpentry—if you happen to be handier than I am—will not be produced in the quantity they have been.

Automatic washing machines, television sets, irons—just about any product you can mention will gradually be cut back. All of this will mean that our living standard will also cut back.

High living standards cannot help but be limited to a certain substantial degree. That is a fact we will face.

How will we face it?

You may remember that shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war, when the going was tough, a national weekly magazine took a poll in a Midwest town. It printed the pictures and reactions of a cross section of that typical American city.

At that time those interviewed were almost unanimous in approving our action. They were all for holding high the torch of freedom in that far-off oriental land.

Well, that was back last summer. About a month ago the same magazine made the same survey in the same town.

What did it find?

It found that those people preponderately now believe we should get out of Korea, that Korea was, to sum it up briefly, all a mistake.

Underlying that is something of gravest importance to you and to me. For it means that if this town in the Midwest is representative of the American people in the thousands of towns in the rest of that and the other 47 States, then perhaps we should have a floating foreign policy. We should be against aggression in Korea one day; passive about it the next We should be ready to defend the free nations of Europe today and abandon them tomorrow.

In other words, if we were to follow the lesson of this survey in one representative American town, we should have a foreign policy that ebbs and flows.

Because I am with the Air Force, one of the tools used in enforcing that foreign policy, I fear for the future if we are to toy with the idea of embracing an "on again, off again" approach to international affairs

The question is, Are we willing to assume the role that has been forced upon us? The role of world leadership which this poll seems to indicate we are trying to push aside

It has always been my confident opinion that we are capable of accepting our rightful leadership.

But the test is today and tomorrow.

It is no longer enough to honor our illustrious forebear; to talk about the courage of the Pilgrims, the vision of the pioneers, the ability of our industrial leaders who made the machine age possible

We can no longer rest on past glories

Today, in Korea—and in the rest of the world for that matter—we have accepted the challenge of communism.

Do we mean it?

I can't answer that question, but I believe I know when the answer will be available.

It will come after we are hit with greatly increased taxes—it will come when we begin to feel the impact of some of the sacrifices and restrictions that I have mentioned before. It will come when perhaps there is no Korea. It will come when there is a temporary stalemate or, perhaps, a turn for the better in international affairs

An insidious combination of these two things might be too heavy for us. We might look, for example, at that big boost in our income taxes and the calm diplomatic waters and ask, "What's going on here * * * why should we be spending this money when there is no longer any threat to our freedom?"

That, gentlemen, will be the theme of decision.

Will we then want to turn back, or even to procrastinate?

I hope I have shown that the nature of modern warfare, the nature of air war means we cannot start and stop; that we cannot be on guard one day, at ease the next.

National security is a long range project. It will not allow us the luxury of slacking off when we become disgruntled with our tax bills.

But the choice is always ours.

We made it in 1940—we made it, in another direction, in 1945.

Happily, under our system in this country, the people have the final say The Pentagon building and every plane, tank and ship it is charged with are all under one command—the citizens of this country.

I feel that the decision they make, you make, as we smooth out our course, will be the right one. Only then can we insure peace and freedom.

Virginia's Man of the Midcentury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an abridgement of an article by Virginius Dabney, esteemed editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, which appeared in the magazine Virginia and the Virginia County:

VIRGINIA'S MAN OF THE MIDCENTURY

(By Virginius Dabney)

United States Senator HARRY F BYRD has had a long public career, distinguished by a number of qualities seldom combined in one individual. He has shown high ability, great industry, and extraordinary capacity for handling men. An expert administrator, he is also a profound student of government. More than all this, he has evidenced a ready willingness, rare among officeholders, to express unpopular opinions. In other words, he has valued his own intellectual integrity from time to time above the prejudices and whims of the electorate This last-named quality of independent thinking was most notably displayed in the 1930's, when Senator BYRD was usually to be found in opposition to the overwhelmingly popular New Deal policies of President Roosevelt

Many disagreed sharply with Senator BYRD when he was attacking the Roosevelt program They felt that he was ultraconservative, if not reactionary; that he was alined with groups which were using arguments against Federal expansion and in favor of States' rights as a smoke screen for exploitation, and that, in general, he was sadly out of tune with the times

Today, as the senior Senator from Virginia is chosen Virginia's Man of the Mid-Century, a goodly number of his former critics, of whom this writer is one, are happy to acclaim the appropriateness of the selection Some of us still do not agree with all his views, but we are glad to acknowledge the great service he rendered as Governor of Virginia, and his equally great service as United States Senator from Virginia.

The apple-cheeked apple grower from the Shenandoah Valley is one of the few people in Washington who not only says he believes in Federal economy, but who actually does something about it. He is also one of the Nation's most forthright advocates of States' rights, and hence one of the principal foes of federalization and socialization. This is not to say that he is against all the innovations in government introduced by President Roosevelt. For example, he was strongly opposed to social security at first, but observation of the system in operation convinced him that he was mistaken. He is now a supporter of social security, for he has concluded that the provisions for State and local matching serve as protection against the evils which he feared would flow from unemployment relief, old-age pensions, and assistance for dependent children and the blind.

Mr. BYRD'S early skepticism concerning this program sprang from his ingrained and deeply felt conviction that citizens of a free country ought to make their own way, insofar as possible, without the aid of any governmental agency, whether local, State, or Federal. Doubtless this feeling is strengthened and fortified by his own ruggedly individualistic career. He went to work before he finished high school, made a conspicuous success in newspaper publishing and apple growing, and then entered politics. Except that his family had been prominent in the Democratic organization (his father, Richard E. Byrd, having been speaker of the house of delegates, and his uncle, Hal D. Flood, United States Representative from the Fourth Virginia District), young HARRY BYRD made his way upward strictly through his own efforts. If he enjoyed a certain amount of pull at the outset of his plunge into politics as a member of the Virginia General Assembly, he soon revealed extraordinary political acumen.

HARRY BYRD was born 63 years ago in Martinsburg, W Va., where his family happened to be living, but they brought him to Virginia as an infant, and he has been a resident ever since. A direct descendant of the Byrds of "Westover," one of whom founded the city of Richmond, he was of aristocratic Virginia lineage, and determined to become worthy of his heritage. He grew up in Winchester, and attended the public schools there as well as nearby Shenandoah Valley Academy. When his father's newspaper, the Winchester Star, became practically bankrupt, young HARRY left school at the age of 15, and took over its management. He soon had the paper back on its feet. From that day forward he was marked for success.

In 1915, at the age of 27, BYRD entered the State senate, where he served for a decade. He was one of the younger members throughout his career in that body, and was a hard worker who made few speeches. Always closely affiliated with the organization, he so impressed its leadership that he was made chairman of the State Democratic Committee at the age of 33. The following year he was named to head the pay-as-you-go forces who were fighting a proposed $50,000,000 bond issue for highways. So effective was his work in that contest that the bond issue was beaten by a substantial majority. HARRY BYRD promptly became a State-wide figure, destined for high office.

"Pay-as-you-go" had been a cardinal tenet with Senator BYRD since before that highway referendum back in 1923 Unbalanced budgets and spending beyond one's ability to repay have always been deemed by him nothing less than ruinous. His whole career has been molded by this philosophy It is one of the things which does most to explain his opposition to many policies of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

While his success in the road-bond campaign did much to make him a potential candidate for Governor, young BYRD had not planned to run in 1925. However, he got into the same taxicab with Bishop James Cannon, Jr., the powerful and devious prohibitionist leader, during the 1924 Democratic National Convention in New York, and Cannon unintentionally caused him to enter the race. The bishop inadvertently achieved this result by telling BYRD not to run, since "we," meaning the bishop and his cohorts, "have decided to elect Walter Mapp" This made BYRD so furious that he ran against Mapp the following year, and defeated him by a large majority.

The youthful executive opened his gubernatorial career by attending his inauguration in a derby hat, instead of the conventional "stovepipe" worn by governors at inaugural ceremonies from time immemorial. He did this to please a farmer who had expressed the hope that he would not put on the dog when he went to the governor's mansion.

The derby he wore was typical of the unassuming character and undramatic dress of the new governor.

The members of the general assembly were not disturbed by these manifestations, however On the contrary, the 38-year-old executive soon had them practically eating out of his hand. This, despite the fact that he made it clear in his inaugural address that he intended to embark upon some extensive and sorely needed reforms in the State government. With his unusual ability to analyze popular trends, HARRY BYRD had seen that the time was ripe for these reforms, and that if the organization refused to heed the signs of the times, it might go down to defeat 4 years later. By putting through his progressive program, he had much to do with consolidating the hold of the organization on the State, a hold which has been maintained almost without interruption from that day to this.

The manner in which BYRD secured the adoption of his program as governor could well serve as a model for those wishing to combine practical political accomplishment with idealistic objectives. He instituted an extensive reorganization of the State government at the session of 1926 immediately following his induction into office and performed such near miracles as abolishing 99 surplus commissioners of the revenue. A whole series of reorganization bills, many of which had been overwhelmingly defeated during the administrations of his predecessors, went through with scarcely a hitch. The largest adverse vote on any of them from the House's 100 members was 15, while not more than 6 of the 40 Senators could be mustered in opposition at any one time. A number of the measures went through both branches unanimously.

At subsequent legislative sessions his record was comparable. The 100-odd departments, agencies, and bureaus of the State government were consolidated into a dozen departments. Various changes were made in the interests of simplification and economy, and some $400,000 a year was saved. Those were the days when $400,000 was a lot of money, and not just an amount tossed down a Washington rathole at almost any hour of the day or night.

Governor BYRD also made county government in Virginia more flexible by securing the enactment of a constitutional amendment which permitted the voters of any county to adopt one of several new governmental forms and to abandon the rigid form previously prescribed.

The short ballot was likewise adopted during the Byrd administration. This much-disputed reform is still being hotly debated. It was recommended in 1928 by nearly all the leading students of government in the United States, and it squeaked through by a small majority. It has remained in the organic law ever since, despite criticism from various directions.

The accomplishments of the Byrd administration were by no means confined to overhauling the antiquated State and county governments. State appropriations to roads and schools were unprecedentedly large. The tax structure was revised, and so many new industries were attracted to Virginia that the total value of these new plants acquired in 1928 surpassed similar acquisitions for that year in every other State in the Union.

Yet it would not be at all accurate to say that Governor BYRD was excessively partial to business or industry. On the contrary, he fought bitter battles with the oil companies and the telephone company and defeated them. His run-in with the oil companies had to do with the price of gasoline in Virginia, and over their violent protest he rammed a bill through the general assembly requiring them to furnish the Governor with their wholesale and retail gasoline prices in Virginia and other States.

His successful contest with the telephone company had as its purpose the checkmating of that concern in its plan to put increased rates into effect before this had been authorized by the State's highest court.

His administration was likewise notable for the enactment of the first strong anti-lynching bill of its kind in the United States, a bill which doubtless is at least partially responsible for the fact that there hasn't been a lynching in the Old Dominion in the 22 years since it was passed.

The Byrd gubernatorial administration was regarded as the most notable of any Virginia Governor since the Civil War. Mr. BYRD was praised and his record was reviewed in many national magazines, his reforms in Virginia were studied by visiting delegations from other sections of the Union, and he was invited to deliver numerous addresses.

He was considered one of the leading progressives in the Democratic Party. His victories over the oil and telephone companies, his pioneering sponsorship of a strong anti-lynching bill, and his fearless approach to governmental reform caused him to be the subject of a laudatory article in the Nation, of New York, a weekly with rather leftish views.

When Governor BYRD left the mansion in Richmond to return to his apple orchards and to indulge in his favorite sports of hunting and hiking, he said he had no further political plans, and that was true But his name was presented to the Democratic National Convention of 1932 as Virginia's candidate for the Presidency It seemed highly improbable that he would be named, and nobody was particularly surprised when Gov. Franklin D Roosevelt, of New York, was chosen It appeared evident, however, that the man who had attracted such attention from the Nation during his gubernatorial term in Virginia would be prominent in the councils of the party if the Democrats won the election, particularly since he was so enthusiastic in his approval of the platform on which President Roosevelt had been nominated

President Roosevelt's selection of United States Senator Claude A. Swanson, of Virginia, as his Secretary of the Navy, left a vacancy in the Senate from Virginia, and Gov. John Garland Pollard promptly appointed Mr BYRD to fill it Thus began the senatorial career of the gentleman from Virginia, as he took his seat in 1933 beside Senator Carter Glass

At the outset, Senator BYRD was in sympathy with much that President Roosevelt did, but when the Chief Executive abandoned the platform of 1932 calling for reduced Federal expenditures, a balanced budget and the return of rights to the States and embarked upon a program almost diametrically opposed to that platform, the junior Senator from Virginia refused to go along. He not only spoke out against the spending, but he also opposed such measures as the National Recovery Act (NRA) and the Guffey Coal Act, both of which were later declared unconstitutional.

As the New Deal developed further in various directions, Senator BYRD became increasingly convinced that he couldn't go along. He knew that this was an unpopular course, not only in Virginia but throughout the Nation, but he refused to get on the bandwagon. When Mr. Roosevelt was reelected by a landslide in the Roosevelt-Landon contest in 1936, the Virginia Senator did not alter his position Somewhat later the Court-packing plan and the Presidential attempt to purge various Members of Congress made Mr. BYRD more certain than ever that the occupant of the White House was following policies to which he could never subscribe

One of the most important tasks Senator BYRD has carried out in Congress has been as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Expenditures. Organized in 1941, this agency is still functioning, despite the efforts of wild-eyed Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and others, to abolish it. Competent authorities estimate that the committee has saved at least $2,500,000,000 since it was created. Its chairman kept the committee operating at one time by using his own office staff when Congress refused to vote additional funds.

On the foreign front, Virginia's senior Senator has been more sympathetic to the program of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, although here again he has exercised his own ju 'gment, and has shown the same sort of independence that has characterized his attitude toward New Deal and Fair Deal domestic policies.

Before and during World War II, Senator BYRD was a stanch supporter of plans for the arming of America against the threat of the Axis. His three sons entered the Armed Forces after Pearl Harbor and he himself did his utmost to further the successful prosecution of the war. When it neared its end, he went to the United Nations conference at San Francisco and urged adoption of the charter, but advocated elimination of the veto. It is now clear that Russia's reckless and indiscriminate use of this veto power has greatly weakened the UN's effectiveness.

Since the end of the war, Senator BYRD has supported some of the key measures designed to strengthen the Western World against the Soviets. He voted for the Atlantic Pact, upon obtaining assurance from Secretary of State Acheson that by so doing he was not committing himself to support the peacetime arming of small nations in various areas of the world. He voted against the Truman program for aid to Greece and Turkey, taking the position that it was a violation of the United Nations Charter for this country to arm another country without first getting UN approval.

More recently he went on record as favoring universal military training, a 70-group Air Force and a radar screen for the United States. But he has frequently expressed apprehension lest our commitments in all parts of the world, added to the cost of arming ourselves at home, will so weaken us financially, and will so undermine the private enterprise system that we shall be unable to make effective resistance to the Soviets. Senator BYRD has often declared that the free world cannot remain free, unless the United States remains solvent and maintains its ability to out-produce the rest of the globe in implements of war.

Anyone who wishes a superlative example of his incisive way of handling a fiscal problem should read his letter to Chairman Marriner S Eccles, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 16, 1939 This reply by Mr BYRD to a letter he had received from Mr. Eccles is one of the clearest and most convincing arguments against continued Federal spending that this writer has ever seen, and is in rebuttal to the argument that Government debts and deficits are good for their own sakes In it Senator BYRD shows himself to be a master of fiscal principles, as well as the wielder of a pungent pen. His statement was truly devastating, for he not only answered Eccles' arguments, but dug up quotations from Eccles' own addresses in which Eccles contradicted and answered himself.

In recent years, Senator BYRD has become a convincing and forceful speaker.

An impressive example of his latter-day platform technique is seen in the transcript of an address he delivered last April before the Academy of Political Science. He spoke from the same platform with the scholarly Senator PAUL H DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and the two men appeared on virtually opposite sides of the topic 'American Democracy and the Welfare State." The striking thing about this occasion was the manner in which the well-informed audience clearly preferred Mr. BYRD's presentation to that of Mr. DOUGLAS. This is shown in various ways. The words "laughter" and "applause" punctuate the transcript of the Byrd address far more frequently than that of his senatorial colleague Furthermore, at the close of Mr. BYRD's speech "the audience rose and applauded," whereas it had not risen for Senator DOUGLAS. If anybody needs to be convinced that HARRY BYRD has become a finished public speaker, the proceedings of the Academy of Political Science for May 1950, are heartily recommended.

In appraising the public service of Senator BYRD, one must also appraise the political organization in Virginia of which he has long been the recognized leader. Admittedly the "Byrd machine" have its faults, and this writer has often been at pains to point them out. Yet any balanced view of this machine must credit it with giving Virginia honest and relatively economical and efficient government.

The high caliber of most of the men who direct the various State departments and agencies under the Byrd organization should be mentioned This is one of the sources of the machine's strength, and one of the things which differentiate it sharply from such notorious political aggregations as those of Hague, Crump, and Tammany. The almost complete absence of graft also is noteworthy, and in contrast to the situation prevailing in some States.

The Democratic organization in Virginia has not been as closely run by Senator BYRD in recent years as it once was. He has been busy with national affairs, and hence has not kept his fingers so constantly on the State's political pulse.

But the dominant wing of the Democratic Party in Virginia still bears the strong imprint of the Byrd personality and character. He became its leader a quarter of a century ago, and his name has been associated with it in the public mind ever since If some persons outside Virginia are so uninformed as to compare the Byrd machine with the notoriously crooked and corrupt political organizations in other parts of the Nation, they are merely displaying their ignorance. As noted above, there is no justification for such comparisons. Whatever one may think of Senator BYRD's extremely conservative philosophy, every one who knows him is aware that he would never tolerate thievery and skulduggery.

One of the best touchstones of his character is to be seen in the fact that although he is legally entitled to substantial soil conservation payments from the Federal Treasury, in connection with the operation of his vast orchards (the largest privately owned apple orchards in the world), he has declined to accept them. He does not feel that a Senator should take any money from the National Government except his salary as a Member of the Congress Senator BYRD estimates that the soil conservation money he has refused amounts to some $8,000 a year for 15 years, or approximately $120,000.

Such is the high code of personal integrity which guides Virginia's senior Senator It is a code which might well be emulated in our public life, and it is one of the various reasons which might be given in support of his selection as Virginia's Man of the Mid-century No Virginian of this generation, it seems safe to say, is more representative of the courage, the ability, the honesty, and the self-reliance that we like to associate with the Old Dominion.

India Scorns Reds' Peace Offer—Party Pledges Are Held Worthless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 19[illegible]

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I attached news story from the New York Times of Sunday, March 11, speaks more eloquently and officially about the position of India than rumors and surmise or the unauthoritative speeches of lecturers in the United States. Whatever else may be clear one this is sure—India is against communism and Communists:

INDIA SCORNS REDS' PEACE OFFER—PARTY PLEDGES ARE HELD WORTHLESS

(By Robert Trumbull)

NEW DELHI, INDIA, March 10.—In a formal policy statement laid before Parliament today the Indian Government flatly rejected a peace offer by the Indian Communist Party and showed that the official attitude toward the Communists had hardened.

The brief document also made it clear for the first time in public that New Delh had taken official note of the international character of Communist aggression and was not merely opposed to the Indian Communist Party on the sole ground that this organization used terroristic methods.

Chakravarty Rajagopalachari, the senior statesmen of the cabinet, presented the statement to the House. In it he dealt sarcastically with the value of promises made by the Communists. He said that in "each single member" of the Communist Party anywhere the "sense of scruple or moral hesitation is totally wiped out."

Mr. Rajagopalachari, as Home Minister, is directly responsible for curbing Communists lawlessness, which is a serious problem in south and northeastern India. In his statement today he firmly refused the published offer of the Indian Communist Party, implying that it would reform and become a constitutional and peaceful political group if the Government would revoke the Preventive Detention Act.

Under this law, recently extended for 1 year, suspected subversives can be held in jail without bail for as long as the act is in force provided the Government proves firm grounds for detention to the satisfaction of a panel of retired high court justices. This must be done within 10 weeks after an arrest.

Mr. Rajagopalachari made it clear that he was unwilling to accept at face value any assurances of any nature from the Communists and challenged them to prove their good faith first. Meanwhile, the Preventive Detention Act, which he put through at this session of Parliament, will stay on the books and be enforced by him. In the same statement he applied this policy equally to the Hindu Mahasabha, a party that wishes to convert India into a Hindu religious state. This organization also recently affirmed its peaceful intentions, but Mr. Rajagopalachari today demanded to be shown by deeds rather than promises.

Mr. Rajagopalachari's influence in the Cabinet is thought to be second only to that of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. His utterances on communism since becoming Home Minister have indicated an even more uncompromising attitude than that of his predecessor, the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, who was generally regarded as representing the right wing in Indian politics.

At any rate, wh tever policies are set forth by Mr. Rajagopalachari in such an open and official manner as today's, can safely be taken as being more nearly representative of the Indian Government's frame of mind than the leftist speeches of comparative nonentities that have received wide publicity in the United States.

RED DOCUMENTS QUOTED

Mr. Rajagopalchari's statement on the Communist Party and the Mahasabha contained significant excerpts from Communist documents showing the party's intentions in India His statement follows in part.

"The attention of the Government was drawn to a press item dated February 17, 1951, to the effect that the Communist Party challenged the Home Minister to withdraw the Preventive Detention Act and do certain other things and then it was stated that they would act as a regular political party in the open, presumably dropping their present violent and secret activities

"If the men who have grouped themselves and practice terrorism and sabotage in the name of communism will not merely issue challenges and make conditional offers of adopting peaceful and open political life, but will back profession with practice, we could take the risks involved in trusting them Past conduct cannot just be wiped out by the simple press statement.

"Such declarations should be backed by actual behavior.

"Honorable members have read the narrative of Ignazio Silone (noted Italian author) of the meeting of the Communist Party at which, when the British Communists were asked on their return home to make a public declaration in a certain sense but actually do the contrary, and one of the British Communists exclaimed 'But that would be a lie" Loud laughter greeted this simplicity, and filled the hall. The Communists could not understand the Englishman's stupid objection to making a misleading or false declaration."

SENSE OF SCRUPLE WIPED OUT

"The fact of the matter is that the Communist Party's discipline evolves a psychological mechanism whereby each single member becomes progressively identified with the collective organization until a sense of scruple or moral hesitation is totally wiped out. Ethical objections become just ancient wrongs worthy of scorn and derision.

"Three leading Indian Communists issued to their comrades a statement on September 23, 1950. It is categorically stated therein that the party should 'put the peasant movement progressively on the rails of the armed struggle and that in agrarian relations they should by mass mobilization and direct action, as in Telengana (Hyderalas) create armed forces in rural areas and strong bases for their operation. It is further categorically stated therein that there is no question of liquidating Telengana but that on the contrary it is a question of raising the movement in the rest of the country to the level of Telengana.'

"The Politburo of the Communist Party of India issued a policy statement on November 15, 1950, in the following terms:

"'Finally it is necessary to clearly grasp the truth that the armed struggle has become the principal form of struggle in the present agrarian revolutionary stage that our national liberation movement has grown to.'

"It was added that simultaneously they should adopt and coordinate all other conceivable forms of struggle, such as economic and political strikes, demonstrations, agricultural, labor and tenant struggles, signature collections for peace pledge, and election contest and so on.

"An important foreign Communist who was invited to advise the Indian Communist Party gave the following opinion in December 1950:

"'It is the task of the Communist Party to skillfully utilize the stand of the Nehru Government on questions like Korea, the atom bomb. Regarding the "armed" struggle, as we have stated in our letter, we do not deny that ultimately the revolution in India will and must take the form of an armed struggle. It is hardly to be debated.'

"It is thus clear that we cannot accept declarations and challenges but must await facts and whether the crime reported from Telengana, Dadras, and Assam and elsewhere shows substantial decrease.

"The attention of the Government was also drawn to a statement on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha dated February 18, 1951. It is gratifying to read in it that their policy of communalism does not include violence. But there is the basic fact that their policies have an inherent tendency to rouse strong passions between communities and generate violence.

"Their line of thought and propaganda, and therefore of action, are inconsistent with the basic principle of our Constitution. What is communalism, to us is nationalism to them.

"All the same we can tolerate anything if deception and violence be truly shed. The Hindu Mahasabha claims that it is a battle of culture. There could be no difficulty if the Hindu code of conduct were truly respected and followed In the pattern of behavior known as Hindu culture there is no room for violence or hatred."

Rigid Ceiling on Cotton Invites Cut in Production and Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished and able colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, of Georgia, for the great fight he is making in behalf of the cotton farmers of the South. Mr. BROWN is vice chairman of the joint "watchdog committee" on defense production Mr. BROWN has lived with the cotton problem night and day for almost a generation.

I only wish those who are responsible for this ceiling on raw cotton would consult with men in the south such as Mr. BROWN who are familiar with the cost of raising cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members of this House will read the following editorial by former United States Senator, Wilton E. Hall, now publisher of the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S. C., one of the South's greatest daily papers:

RIGID CEILING ON COTTON INVITES CUT IN PRODUCTION AND DISASTER

The Nation's cotton supplies already are a cause of concern in the textile trade

Should unforeseen demand confront the industry there might be a definite shortage.

Because of the importance of cotton to the defense effort, the Government has called upon farmers to produce at least 16,000,000 bales this season.

In the face of this, the Office of Price Stabilization has arbitrarily set a ceiling on the price of raw cotton—something that was never done during World War II.

Indications are that this action was taken without consideration of the advice of men who know cotton, its marketing and the intricate problems involved.

It is proper that Representative PAUL BROWN of Elberton, Ga., vice chairman of the House "watch dog" committee on defense production, has called for a congressional inquiry into the cotton order.

He wants to know why the stabilization office has "fixed rigid ceilings on raw cotton instead of using textile ceilings and the cotton price stabilization program recommended by the Department of Agriculture to halt inflation."

Congressman BROWN believes that everything possible must be done to stop inflation and stabilize the cost of living.

But, as he points out, "in the case of cotton, the consumer is fully protected by ceilings on finished goods. Besides, the price of a man's shirt, which is too high already, would hardly be affected if you gave the cotton away in the first place. "The farmer," Representative BROWN declared, "gets only about 20 cents in a $4.50 white shirt A fixed ceiling price on raw cotton tends to destroy the entire marketing system and as a result may depress cotton prices for the new crop.

"This will discourage the farmers in their efforts to attain the 16,000,000-bale crop so urgently needed in the Nation's mobilization effort"

He makes this important point:

"Farmers are not asking for higher prices but they are entitled to protection against prices below their production costs before they go all-out in planting."

With the price of cotton rigidly set, mills and cotton merchants will not buy and stock cotton for future requirements as has been the practice

The tendency will be to wait pending a time when the market is well loaded with cotton and to take advantage of correspondingly lower prices.

Obviously there is need for adjustment in the cotton price order for two ample reasons: First, out of fairness to cotton farmers; second, to encourage all-out production of cotton that will be needed if there is a spread in the war.

A short cotton crop this season could be the Achilles heel in the whole defense effort. If OPS refuses to recognize that fact, Congress should take the necessary steps to protect the Nation.

The Battle of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Sunday last the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I participated in a discussion on the American Forum of the Air, the founder and moderator of which is Mr. Theodore Granik. The subject was announced as the Battle of the Budget. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the discussion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

ANNOUNCER. Here with us today on the American Forum of the Air are Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, a leading member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, second ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, appearing in the absence of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who is ill.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. The $72,000,000,000 budget requested by President Truman for this year means higher taxes for individuals and for business. On Capitol Hill the President's budget is the center of controversy. Heavy defense spending brings a demand for cutting of nondefense expenses to the bone. The President himself stated it would not be possible to cut the budget. If it is to be cut, Congress must do the pruning job, and some questions confront our Congress.

Can the defense effort be put on a pay-as-we-go basis? What new taxes are needed and how do we get them?

Now, Senator O'MAHONEY, do you think Congress can cut the budget or find ways to bring in more income?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think Congress can do both I think Congress ought to do both. But it will take a lot of courage and a lot of sacrifice and a lot of hard work. Ninety percent of the budget which is now before us is for war-connected expenditures of one kind or another. And the last two Congresses, the Eightieth and the Eighty-first, have added new expenditures which the Congress must decide whether or not to maintain.

For example, last August we passed an extension of social security, adding some 10,000,000 people to the coverage and increasing the public assistance payments to the States by about $200,000,000. That bill came out of the Finance Committee of the Senate which is one of the most conservative committees in the Senate There was no minority report except a dissenting view by Senator BUTLER of Nebraska who said that although the Government must provide social security, he didn't believe it was doing it the right way in this bill. That was an increased expenditure which was approved in the Senate by a vote of 81 to 2

Moderator GRANIK Senator FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Well, I agree we must do both things. We have to cut the size of the budget, and we have to see that we do not have deficit spending. It will all depend upon whether or not we can cut the budget enough as to whether or not we have to increase the taxes. If we cut the budget enough, then we won't have to increase the size of the taxes, or as much

I think there are probably four ways that we can cut this budget. First, we can cut out the new spending. And then we can make very definite cuts on public works, and what departments are doing. Then we can cut out authorizations. We have got to remember that the Hoover Commission didn't go into functions of the Government at all. They only went into whether or not there was duplication and overlapping and inefficiency. So there is a program we can go after. That is in the functions of the Government, to see whether the Government is doing the things that the people must have done, or whether or not some of these things cannot be done by the people back home in one of two ways, either by themselves or by their local government or by their State government. Finally, there are the Hoover Commission recommendations for economy and efficiency, which we should pursue diligently.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator O'MAHONEY.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Senator FERGUSON is quite right, but the problem is: How are you going to do it? What functions shall we drop? Let us look at Federal aid to public highways. The trucking associations are interested in that problem. The budget this year carries about $464,000,000 for Federal aid to public highways. Most of that is to pay for commitments already made. The States, upon the authority of the extension of the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved by the Eightieth Congress and also approved by the Eighty-first Congress, have already undertaken contractual work to improve the highways. To what extent, therefore, are we going to cut the appropriations for Federal highways without injuring business?

I have addressed a letter to every governor in the United States asking all governors to advise the Joint Economic Committee to what extent Federal aid to highways can be cut, and I have as yet received no suggestion for a cut from any governor of any State.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, I know what we are up against in the cutting of this budget One trouble is with the people back home Let's face it. The Government is trying to satisfy too many people. And as long as you are going to spend dollars, whether it is on highways or any other way, the people, naturally, who are interested in those particular projects want more dollars.

Now, let's get back to this question, as indicated, that 90 percent—I don't think it is that high—of the present budget is going to be for military expenditures. Now, the question is: Can we cut anything out of the military expenditures?

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think we can mobilize during the emergency and still have a balanced budget?

SENATOR FERGUSON. I really think we can mobilize and have a balanced budget In fact, if we don't have a balanced budget we are going to depreciate the dollar just that much. We know today—and the people back home must realize—that the dollar is only worth what it will buy in groceries, in wearing apparel, or any other things they need, including guns. Now, if they don't want to balance the budget, then they are going to find that this dollar is worth less money, and they are going to buy less groceries, less rent, less clothing, less housing, less everything. It has been estimated now that the dollar, compared to 1939, is worth about 46 cents. I got those last figures from the Secretary of Commerce.

Now, if the people insist upon getting everything from the Federal Government, then they are going to have to pay the bill. Now, they say, will Congress do anything about it? Not alone. You know that, JOE, and I know that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is right. Senator FERGUSON and I are both members of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Appropriations, and we know the gravity of the task that confronts us. For example, the Senate last week, with only five dissenting votes, passed an extension of the draft and universal military training. Now, that provides for at least 3,500,000 men. It costs about $5,300 just to clothe, feed, and provide small weapons for a soldier. That means about $19,000,000,000 for that purpose alone. Almost twice as much as the entire cost of the Federal Government 10 years ago.

Now, there are other expenditures which are war-connected, but are not defense spending. Take, for example, veterans' pensions and benefits. Congress can't cut those pensions and benefits unless it is willing to amend the law and reduce the pensions and benefits And certainly Congress is not going to do that. It costs almost $5,000,000,000

a year to meet these pensions and benefits and to provide hospitalization and medical care for the veterans of past wars. And then there is the interest upon the national debt. These two categories represent about $11,000,000,000 which cannot be cut.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator, will you agree with Senator FERGUSON that we can mobilize during the present emergency and still have a balanced budget?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes, if we have the courage to tax ourselves. We ought to plug every single loophole by which tax revenue is escaping; but, at the same time, Congress owes it to the people who are going to pay the taxes to scrutinize every dollar in the budget to make certain that we shall not be wasting a single penny of public funds.

Senator FERGUSON. Of course, that is exactly what I think about it. I think it takes courage on the part of the legislators also to vote these cuts. But I want to say that we need more courage over in the White House and the Budget Director's office, too. The President comes before Congress today and puts in a budget of $71,600,000,000, and that isn't the whole budget. We are going to be asked to appropriate $94,400,000,000. That $71,600,000,000 is only the expenditures for this year. The $94,400,000,000 is what will be appropriated not only for the 1952 budget but for authorized spending that won't actually be paid during that period. If we are going to have a $16,500,000,000 deficit this year on this spending budget, requiring new taxes in that amount, wait until we feel the impact of that future authorized spending. Now, the President said this is a tight budget, that no items can be cut. In other words, he says that you can't take one dollar out of this budget. We just found the other day, JOE, remember, where they didn't put in the budget the overtime pay for a certain department. They are coming up for a supplemental appropriation on that. That will add almost a third to that payroll. They knew that requirement, but they didn't put it in the budget. Is that a "tight" budget?

Right here I want to say something about payrolls generally. When you people back home realize how much leap year is going to cost you because it has one more day in it, then you will appreciate the size of the Government's payroll. I'm getting those figures for the Government as a whole. Government employees are paid on a basis of 260 days a year. And when you get a leap year, then you have this extra day. And in this one department it ran well over $200,000 for the 1 day. It indicates how large this payroll is getting. And now we are putting on better than a thousand people per day to the payroll.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the amount of nondefense spending. I brought here, Mr. Moderator, a summary of the President's 1952 budget prepared by the staff of the Joint Internal Revenue Committee. That shows that the major national security program, including military, international, atomic energy, defense production, and so forth, amounts for 1952 to $52,000,000,000 plus, leaving $19,000,000,000. Then deducting from that sum the major fixed and continuing charges, interest upon the national debt, which we can't cut, veterans' services and benefits, which I have already discussed, permanent and indefinite appropriations, like the 30 percent continuing appropriation of all customs receipts which Congress has designated for the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities, we have another $13,900,000,000, leaving only $5,100,000,000 for the normal functions of the Government.

And when you analyze those, you find that it is impossible to make anything more than a $2,000,000,000 cut out of nondefense—and if we do that we will be very lucky.

Moderator GRANIK. How about that, Senator FERGUSON?

Senator FERGUSON. If we cut $2,000,000,000 out of that, and then $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 out of the military, we'll be well on our way. I want to say a word to the people about the military today. We need defense, but there is nothing sacrosanct about its budget.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you recommend cutting $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 out of the military?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes, and I think it can be done. I say we need defense. There isn't anyone who is sincere about America who doesn't want this country to be defended. But the question is: Can we afford to do what the military are trying to do in this particular year, this particular day? That is the question. When we figure that out of the $50,000,000,000 spent for the military between 1945 and up to 1950, outside of another $30,000,000,00 or $40,000,000,000 to liquidate war costs, and we couldn't put really two divisions in the field, there is simply something wrong with the expenditures.

Now, personally, I believe that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps have got to get down to reckoning on the basis of fighting a possible war with Russia, not with anybody else. That is where the enemy is. That is the problem in terms of military science. If we ever have to fight that war, we ought to be prepared to fight it the way that we want to fight it, where we want to fight it. The time, naturally, will be determined by Russia. Instead of spending money everywhere on everything, we ought to get down to brass tacks and say, "Here, we will have to fight a certain war, if it comes to us. We want to prepare for that kind of war, and we want to prepare for it within our means." What is the use of preparing to fight a war if we are going to destroy America in the preparation?

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think we are going to destroy America in the preparation?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Not if we have the courage to pay as we go for the defense effort. And I would like to have a word to the people, just as Senator FERGUSON has.

I want to tell you first that Under Secretary of Defense Bob Lovett has indicated to me in three or four conferences we have already had that he is screening every money request made by the military in order to cut down the cost of defense.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you think we could cut four or five billion dollars out of it, Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I wouldn't be a bit surprised but that we can reduce these expenditures. No military officer was ever court-martialed for having too much. But it is up to Congress to make sure that they don't have too much. We must not build up unnecessary inventories of war materials.

But I want the people to know also that Mr. Wilson, head of the Defense Mobilization Office, testified to the Joint Economic Committee only 2 weeks ago that applications by industry for reduction of taxes by way of accelerated amortization have amounted to something like $8,000,000,000. And more than $2,000,000,000 of that has already been allowed. That means that in 5 years industrial plants which expand for the defense effort can write off the entire cost of the plant, thereby cutting down taxes. And then communities all over the United States are writing their Congressmen and asking for defense installations of one kind or another. The people will have to pay. We should not ask for anything that we do not need. We should not spend a dollar that we can save.

Senator FERGUSON. Here is the difficulty also. The President says he needs between 60 and 70 billions of dollars for the military. Now, he didn't send up anything specific to support that request. He literally drew that figure out of the air. And the difficulty is that he has then told the various defense officers: "You figure out what you need." Well, it is about like telling your wife: "Here. You can have this much money. Now, you figure out how you can spend it." I know my wife, and some of the others, will find out how they can spend it, because they have not been cautioned that a part of it should be saved. But here is the difficulty. We come back to this 60 or 70 billions of dollars. We haven't got the details yet. And as soon as that comes up, I am sure they are going to give us more items than 60 or 70 billions of dollars. Well, we know what will happen. They will put almost everything in. As the Senator from Wyoming said, no officer was ever court-martialed for having too much. People want a plant built here, and they want a plant built there. They never think that it is going to take their tax money to build highways out to that plant, and all the other expenses. It is going to involve the building of homes around that plant out in the cornfield. It is going to involve the building of schools, sewers, and everything else, and they are going to pay for every one of those things, and they are going to pay for them at a high expense.

We need cooperation, first in the White House, then in Congress, and then from the people back home.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But the White House has already cut many of the appropriations that we authorized.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, Senator. The White House just hasn't cut.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now, Senator FERGUSON.

Senator FERGUSON. Let me give you some examples. I thought we were going to get through without an argument, JOE, but it is impossible, I guess.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the budget that has been sent up to us, more than 100 flood-control and rivers and harbors projects and reclamation projects have been cut back by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. No new starts have been approved except for power.

Senator FERGUSON. Now, the President gave out a statement that he was cutting 130 items in this budget a total of $5,750,000,000 below what it was last year. We have carefully checked those facts, and what we find is that instead of $5,750,000,000 they are only going to save $327,000,000. He was only in error about 95 percent.

Now, one of the items that he wanted to tell the people he was going to cut was the Census Bureau. Well, the Census Bureau had a big job to do, to take the census of everybody last year. And this year the President has said he is going to cut it from $28,000,000 down to $8,000,000.

Well, why not? They haven't any census to take this year. Does he call that a cutting of the budget? I don't. There are a lot of phonies in this thing.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, give me a chance, now.

Last December $1,900,000,000 was added by Congress when it passed the Defense Production Act. That amount, $1,900,000,000, is not recorded by some of our budget cutters as a war-connected expenditure. It is not only a war-connected expenditure, but it is absolutely new. And because Congress passed that law, the so-called nondefense expenditures are up.

Senator FERGUSON. Just a moment. I am not going to defend the Congress, because I think we need a lot more courage and a lot more determination up in the Congress to do this job of cutting Government costs.

Moderator GRANIK. I will take the first question. Go ahead, sir, please.

Colonel HUNTER. I am Colonel Hunter of the Army, a student at the National War College.

My question is for Senator O'MAHONEY.

Senator, how realistic can this budget be without an effective system of wage and

price controls? In other words, how can we continue to get 46 cents for our dollar?

Senator O'MAHONEY. We can't. The budget has been going up steadily because of inflation, because we delayed too long in imposing inflationary controls. Inflation knocks airplanes out of the sky more rapidly than any enemy could do it, merely by increasing the cost of making them.

Senator FERGUSON. It also knocks the groceries into the sky.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Right. The cost of living and the cost of defense are going up hand in hand because of inflation.

Moderator GRANIK. May I take a question from the lady, there? Go ahead, please.

Question Senator FERGUSON, I wanted to know what the unorganized small-income group can do to register a protest against Government extravagance.

Senator FERGUSON. Madam, we are getting that protest daily from the people back home. I think they are pretty well organized, and they are telling us in Congress, which is a good thing What I would like to see today also is 5,000,000 people writing a letter to the President of the United States telling him exactly what they think about this budget and the fact that as a result of its deficits prices are going up and their incomes are not going up with them, that they are getting a lower standard of living And maybe the President of the United States, where this whole thing must originate, will move in the direction we want, toward a balanced budget

Will the people back home today, 5,000,000 strong, write letters? Let's tell the President how much a million is, and send them to the White House and tell the President what they think about these expenditures and how they think they can be cut, maybe we will get somewhere

Moderator GRANIK. You don't want them to send a letter to JOE O'MAHONEY?

Senator FERGUSON We will get our share of them. And I will answer them. I think the people back home ought to speak, because if they don't speak there is a misinterpretation of their silence down here in Washington.

Senator O'MAHONEY Write to Congress also Ask Congress to increase postal rates, for example, so as to eliminate the subsidy to mail order houses and periodicals Write to Congress also about repealing the aviation subsidy. Write to Congress to cut and repeal and modify the laws which compel the President and the Bureau of the Budget to send these estimates in

Senator FERGUSON Well, JOE, you know, you and I have been working for quite a number of years to get them to cut the subsidy on aviation.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Right.

Senator FERGUSON To get it out in the open, so that the public will know how much it really is

Senator O'MAHONEY. What we ought to do is to separate aviation subsidies from airmail pay.

Senator FERGUSON. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. They have no place together.

Senator FERGUSON And then we ought to cut them out.

Moderator GRANIK. I will take another question

Mr DUBY. Nathan Duby, Jr., attorney, of Los Angeles.

Senator O'MAHONEY, wouldn't the elimination of the capital gains tax stimulate small business and furnish again a pool for risk capital?

Senator O'MAHONEY. If by that question you mean that the 25 percent rate on capital gains should be increased, I think it ought to be increased.

Mr. DUBY. I think it should be eliminated altogether.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That would be cutting the revenue, brother.

Moderator GRANIK. Time for summaries.

Senator FERGUSON, your summary, please.

Senator FERGUSON. All I can say in this short minute summary is that the successive Democratic administrations in the last two decades—that is a long time—have followed this policy of deficit spending This policy has contributed to inflation. It has resulted in the highest prices ever known to the American people. It has resulted in the Truman dollar, which is now worth about 46 cents. My theme is that it is better to cut spending than it is to raise taxes

The Republican Eightieth Congress believed that and did cut the expenses. It was the first reduction in 18 years It was the first balanced budget in that period.

The Democratic Party, under the leadership of the President and the Fair Dealers, control the administration, and they today control Congress. The minority Republican Party can only help in cutting these expenses We are willing and determined, but need action and not only words, both in the White House and in Congress

Moderator GRANIK Thank you, Senator FERGUSON Senator O'MAHONEY, your summary

Senator O'MAHONEY. Theodore, I thought there might be a political twist, so I came prepared

The Eightieth Congress, a Republican Congress, increased the pay of Federal workers by $550,000,000.

The Eightieth Congress passed the Economic Cooperation Act and the China Aid Act, which added $1,245,000,000

The Eightieth Congress passed the National Science Foundation bill with a large new authorization.

The Eightieth Congress passed a bill adding $6,650,000 to pay Philippine veterans.

The Eightieth Congress increased social security by $218,000,000.

The Eightieth Congress added flood control and rivers and harbors in the amount of $80,000,000 and many others, because the people wanted these services.

We must all stand together instead of throwing political balls at one another.

Senator FERGUSON All right. Just let me say this We did cut expenses, notwithstanding all of these things, and reduced the people's taxes and gave them a balanced budget.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen.

Our speakers have been Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan. Thank you very much

Crisis in the Medical Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more of a series of 22 articles which have been written by Mr. Selig Greenberg, and which appeared in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, newspapers published in the city of Providence, State of Rhode Island, entitled "Medicine in Crisis."

I feel that these articles are very timely as they present a very impartial and objective discussion of conditions faced by our medical schools and the medical profession in general.

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

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of February 28, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS SUPPLY OF DOCTORS FAILS TO KEEP PACE WITH MEDICAL-CARE DEMANDS—SERIOUS MALDISTRIBUTION OF PHYSICIANS OBSERVED; TREND TOWARD SPECIALIZATION AND AWAY FROM GENERAL PRACTICE SEEN, AMA TOUCHY ON SUBJECT

(By Selig Greenberg)

Are there enough doctors in the United States?

The preponderance of expert opinion is that there are not.

But, like almost everything else relating to the distribution and economics of medical care, the issue of the adequacy of the supply of physicians in this country is highly controversial It also involves some factors to which there is no precise answer and which are contingent on changes going on all the time.

The American Medical Association, which insisted until recently that there was no shortage of doctors but now concedes that in an emergency of any duration a further increase in the production of physicians will be necessary, is sensitive about the whole issue.

This sensitivity appears to have several aspects

Practitioners and medical educators alike fear that pressure for increased enrollment in the medical schools without commensurate expansion of their faculties and facilities may impair the quality of training

Aside from this, there is the apparent conviction of the AMA leadership that anything pertaining to medicine is its own business exclusively and that laymen lack sufficient knowledge to understand what it is all about Furthermore, the question of the sufficiency of the present number of doctors has a direct bearing on the profession's income. A larger number of physicians would mean that at least some of the present practitioners would presumably make less money than they do now.

But there seems to be still another reason for the profession's touchiness on the subject Any admission that we need more doctors also raises these questions: What's behind the shortage? Why has the expansion of medical education lagged so markedly behind the development of training facilities in other professions? How much substance is there to the charge that some parts of the organized medical profession have sought to limit the opportunities for entry into the practice of medicine in order to restrict competition and thereby protect the economic interests of those already in the field?

An attempt to answer these questions will be made in subsequent articles of this series. Today we will take a look first at some of the basic facts in the situation.

The latest count published by the AMA last year reported 201,777 doctors in the United States.

ONE FOR EVERY 750

This is one doctor for every 750 persons It is the highest ratio for any country in the world, with the exception of Israel, where there has been an influx of refugee physicians. But this fact alone is no ground for complacency. As the dean of Tulane University School of Medicine has put it, just because "there are more physicians in this country per unit of population than there are in other countries does not necessarily mean that there are too many physicians here. It may be that there are not enough there."

Nor does the total in itself mean much. What is important is what the doctors do, where they do it and what has happened to the demand for medical services.

There is a serious maldistribution of physicians in this country; the growing complexity of medicine has led to a startling increase in specialization, and the supply of doctors has failed to keep up with the demand for medical care.

INCREASE OF 5 PERCENT

The total of 201,777 includes retired and salaried physicians Some of the latter furnish direct medical service but among them are also hospital administrators, public health officials, medical-school teachers, research men and others not available to patients. Authorities agree that the pertinent figure is the total of 151,267 private practitioners.

The population of the United States increased 5 percent between 1940 and 1950 and so did the number of doctors. But the proportion of salaried physicians, many of whom do not care for patients, increased at an even greater pace. As a result of this, the number of doctors classified as in private practice rose only 5 percent during the past decade, according to an analysis made by the United States Public Health Service.

The AMA's count—the figure is as of July 1, 1949—showed a ratio of 1 physician in private practice for every 981 persons. But when the ratio is broken down State by State, it reveals glaring divergencies between the richer and poorer States In New York, the figure was 1 private practitioner for every 620 persons. In Massachusetts, it was 1 for every 767. In Rhode Island it was 1 for every 981, which is the national average. But in Alabama it was 1 for every 1,675 and in Mississippi 1 for every 1,668.

AREAS UNDERMANNED

Nor do the over-all State figures tell the whole story. Physicians have for years tended to concentrate in the big cities, leaving the rural sections undermanned. Boston has a ratio of 1 doctor for every 263 persons and New York City 1 for every 447 residents. In Autuaga County, Ala., the ratio is 1 physician for every 2,620 persons. In Smith County, Miss., it is 1 for every 4,850.

Just as important as the geographical distribution of medical personnel is its composition by professional field.

The AMA's 1950 directory gives a breakdown of 96,218 general practitioners and 55,049 physicians whose practice is limited to a specialty. The number of general practitioners has actually declined about 13 percent since 1940 while the number of specialists has risen sharply. This has had an important effect on the quality and cost of medical care.

RACIAL GROUPS SUFFER

There are, in addition, critical shortages in the supply of physicians for minority racial groups and in certain special fields.

While Negroes compose about 10 percent of the population, less than 2 percent of the doctors are Negroes. We need at least three times as many psychiatrists as we now have. There are only 4,000 pediatricians in the United States, and three-fourths of them are concentrated in cities of more than 50,000 population. In Massachusetts there is 1 pediatrician for every 5,000 children. In Mississippi the ratio is 1 for every 35,000 children. There is an acute need of personnel in public health, industrial medicine, pathology, radiology, medical administration, and medical teaching.

A major problem right now is the need of the Armed Forces for physicians. There already are 10,000 doctors on active military duty, and it is estimated that 7,500 more will be required by July 1. A new world war would, of course, mean a much heavier drain on our supply of medical manpower. In the last war, more than 60,000 physicians were in uniform.

[From the Providence (R I.) Evening Bulletin of February 28, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—17,000 TO 45,000 DOCTOR SHORTAGE SEEN BY 1960

(By Selig Greenberg)

The United States Public Health Service, which holds that the lack of sufficient medical personnel is the Nation's No. 1 health problem, estimates that by 1960 we will have a shortage of from 17,000 to 45,000 doctors.

This estimate covers only the civilian population and does not take into account the increased demands of the Armed Forces. With about 17,500 doctors expected to be in uniform by July 1 and further medical requirements by the military probable, the shortage is likely to be all the more serious.

RHODE ISLAND THIRTEENTH ON LIST

The wide range in the USPHS estimates is due to different standards of what constitutes enough doctors. The 17,000 figure was reached by using the ratio of physicians to population which prevailed in 1940 through a large part of the country and taking into consideration increased demands for public health and research personnel. The top figure of 45,000 uses as a yardstick for the whole country the 12 States which now have the highest ratio of doctors. Rhode Island, by the way, just misses the top classification, being thirteenth.

The Public Health estimates have provoked controversy and have been attacked by the American Medical Association. Some AMA spokesmen say we actually have a surplus of doctors. But Dr. Donald G. Anderson, secretary of the AMA's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, is on record that "there are many indications that the country could use more physicians" and that we may have a shortage of as many as 15,000 doctors by 1960, aside from military requirements.

SUMS UP SITUATION

The dean of one of our leading medical schools summed up the situation neatly by saying that the probable 1960 deficit lay about half way between the AMA's figures and the maximum set by the USPHS.

There may be some validity to the AMA's argument that not all sections of the country need quite as many doctors as there are in our richest and most populous States. On the other hand, many authorities raise the point that there is no evidence that there are too many physicians in the 12 States with the best showing.

The trouble is that there is no generally recognized standard of adequacy of medical personnel. Criteria vary widely because of the many factors involved.

Persons interested in extending the benefits of medical science to all parts of the population make a different evaluation than those who measure the need largely on the basis of ability to pay. There is a similar gap between those who think primarily in terms of emergencies, of waiting for people to get sick, and those who believe that much of the future of medicine lies in the preventive field.

BASIC QUESTION

Any realistic appraisal must take into consideration such elements as the inequalities in geographical distribution of doctors, the increase in specialization, changing concepts of the pattern of organization of medical practice, expanding demands for medical care, the rising proportion of aging physicians in rural areas and the professional competence of some of our doctors.

Much of the debate is centered around the basic question whether we now need a higher or lower ratio of physicians than we did years ago.

AMA spokesmen contend that we can get along with a lower ratio because the practitioner of today is much more efficient and has at his command far more potent tools than his predecessor did. They point out that the doctor now knows his job better, that he gets around more easily, that he can use powerful new drugs and more effective equipment, that he works with more nurses and technicians and, therefore, can achieve more in less time

While conceding much of this, critics of the AMA line maintain that the doctor's increased efficiency is more than offset by new demands for his services.

COMPLEXITIES CITED

They cite the growing complexity of medicine, the demand arising from greater health consciousness of people and the sharp rise in our national income and standard of living, the greater needs resulting from a higher proportion of older people, and the wider use of medical personnel and facilities stemming from the rapid growth of voluntary hospital and medical care insurance plans. With medicine able to do a lot more than years ago, the average patient now demands far more from his doctor than his parents did, they point out Furthermore, there are increasing requirements for physicians in public health, teaching, and research positions.

The consensus among some of the country's top medical educators is that the great discoveries of the past few decades have increased rather than diminished the demand for physicians and that we need more doctors if we are to make the benefits of medical progress available more widely. Crucial in this connection, of course, is the question of how the average American is to pay for these benefits.

GROUP PRACTICE

There is widespread agreement among experts that the complexity of medicine and the specialization that goes with it make the teamwork represented by group practice more and more necessary. These authorities feel that the traditional form of individual practice is becoming outdated. They are convinced that more effective and economical medical care can be provided where a number of physicians combine their practice and thereby pool their skills and equipment. Such use of the doctors we have is the means, they hold, for relieving to some extent the need for more doctors

Expert opinion is that the benefits of American medicine, both curative and preventive but particularly the latter, will remain unequally distributed and continue to lag far behind their possibilities unless we increase our production of doctors, reorganize the pattern of medical practice, and devise some more effective method of spreading the cost of disease through insurance prepayment.

The RFC Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Anything Goes," relating to the investigation of the RFC, published in the Washington Post of March 7, 1951.

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

ANYTHING GOES

"It is gone," said Edmund Burke in his Reflections on the Revolution in France, "that sensibility of principle that chastity of honor, which felt a stain like a wound" It appears to be, to say the very least, blunted among men in public life today. The appalling aspect of the disclosures—and one gets the impression that they are only a tithe of the sordid story—that have come out of the Fulbright committee's inquiry into the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is that the officials involved in them seem almost devoid of any sense of impropriety Taxed with having accepted the hospitality of a Florida hotel for which he had been instrumental in obtaining an RFC loan, Hilton W. Robertson, an examiner in the Agency, said "I expected to pay the rate. They wouldn't take it. I did not know they were going to issue a courtesy card. Is there anything wrong about that?"

Well, Mr. Robertson, it all depends on your concept of right and wrong It probably isn't a penal offense, if that's any comfort to you. The chances are no one will suppose your sold your influence for the paltry price of a free hotel room But a man who holds a position of responsibility and trust in the United States Governme it can no more afford to accept favors than to grant them. Time was when this elementary point of honor seemed so clear that no one thought to question it. But in the blurred vision of today, anything goes, it seems, if you can get away with it.

It is somewhat harsh to point a finger at Mr. Robertson. Some of his bosses in the RFC saw nothing wrong, apparently, in taking a gratuity here and there from applicants for RFC loans. For that matter, Donald Dawson, White House aide in charge of personnel, did just what Mr Robertson did. On three occasions, he was the nonpaying guest of the same hotel. If Mr Dawson has any regard for his reputation, he will cease hiding behind his White House immunity and come before the subcommittee to explain his conduct. In the absence of an explanation, his unfitness for a post in the White House seems abundantly demonstrated.

Flexible notions of propriety are by no means confined to the executive branch of the Government. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, it appears, sees nothing wrong in having interceded with the RFC to secure a loan for another hotel—for the successful negotiation of which his son received a fee of $21,000. Senator MURRAY'S statement explaining his action seems to come down to an assertion that it was routine procedure of a sort indulged in by most of his colleagues. We should not be at all surprised. The allegation derives considerable color from the Fulbright subcommittee's decision to keep secret the names of Senate Members who accepted free vacation stays at the swank RFC-supported hostelry in Florida.

The departed "sensibility of principle" revealed in the RFC probe is far from isolated. It is not very different in essence, when you come to think about it, from the resort to back-alley footpad tactics in political campaigns, from the abuse of the privilege of congressional immunity, from the dispensing of complimentary deep-freezes, from the 5 percent influence racket, from the acceptance by Senators of salaries from private employers. Perhaps even the disgrace that has befallen so many college basketball players is not unrelated. Nothing is so contagious as dishonor

Ground Breaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ground Breaking," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 5, 1951.

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

GROUND BREAKING

The other afternoon Mr. Benjamin Fairless, a former newsboy of Cleveland, Ohio, dug up some Pennsylvania dirt in the presence of some 600 leaders in industry, banking, and government.

The Pennsylvania ground breaking was rightly a cause of special ceremony. It marked the start of a new steel mill, the largest single integrated steel mill ever built at one time, in this country or anywhere else

A lot of people celebrated for private reasons. Mr. Fairless, doubtless, in pride that it will be named after him and serve as a reminder of what can happen to newsboys even though Horatio Alger is dead. Steel workers and their union leaders because of the new work opportunities it will provide. Bankers because they helped finance it Railroad officials because they will supply it and deliver the finished product. United States Steel stockholders because they acquire a new equity in production Army and Navy officials because it will produce material for new ships and guns.

We fit in none of these categories. But we celebrated because we felt richer nonetheless All of us will be richer by 1,800,000 tons of steel which the plant will roll out each year. A million eight hundred thousand tons not only for guns to protect ourselves but for buildings and railroads and automobiles and refrigerators—all the things made from or by the use of steel.

This tradition of making a ceremony of a ground breaking is an old one and it seems to us a good one. For it means that something new is being added to the sum total of the Nation's resources. It may be only a small, one-family house, or a grocery store, or as here a mammoth steel plant. But whatever it is, it enriches not only the people who will live in it or work in it but also the whole community.

Death of J. Frank Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the request of my colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief tribute to a very intimate friend of my colleague's, namely, J. Frank Wilson, editor and manager of the Woodbury (N. J.) Daily Times, who died yesterday, and whose funeral my colleague is attending. That is why he cannot himself ask to have this article published in the RECORD. So I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD with these few remarks of mine.

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

J. FRANK WILSON, TIMES PUBLISHER, DIED LAST NIGHT

J. Frank Wilson, editor and manager of the Woodbury Daily Times, and widely known here and in the State as a church and civic leader, died last night at his home, 349 Glover Street, Woodbury. He was 66.

Although Mr. Wilson had been ill since last August, his death shocked friends and associates since he apparently was on the road to recovery after many weeks in the Underwood Hospital

He was first stricken seriously ill last August and underwent two operations, from which he recovered and returned to his home. Mr Wilson recuperated to the extent that he visited the newspaper offices for brief periods, but then was taken ill with pneumonia Complications developed and he was critically ill in the Underwood Hospital for several weeks before he appeared to take a turn for the better and was finally able to again return to his home about 3 weeks ago.

A native of Woodbury, Mr. Wilson was born November 7, 1884, the son of the late J. Frank and Mary L Wilson.

He attended Woodbury public schools and since boyhood had been associated with the Times, learning various branches of newspaper work under the guidance of his father.

Mr Wilson became editor and manager of the Times in January 1918, following the death of his father. Under his editorship the established policy of publishing a community and home newspaper was continued.

TRUSTEE OF CHURCH

A member of the Kemble Memorial Methodist Church, Mr. Wilson served for many years as a member of the board of trustees and had been president of the board since 1943. He was a past president of the Busy Men's Bible Class and was one of the leaders in the organization of the Gloucester County Federation of Men's Bible Classes, which he also served as president. He was active also, for several years, in the New Jersey State Federation of Bible Classes and was serving as executive vice president of the State group at the time of his death.

He was interested in many community and civic activities, giving freely of his time and ability to various projects that had as their objective the helping of the community or its residents.

MANY CIVIC ACTIVITIES

He was a member of the Woodbury Kiwanis Club, serving as its president in 1937; a member of the Friendship Fire Company and a life member of the State Firemen's Relief Association, and a member of Woodbury Lodge No. 54, IOOF. He was a member, also, of the P.O.S of A., Woodbury, until the lodge was disbanded

Mr Wilson was a member and chairman of the Woodbury Park Commission, on which he had served for several years. He was a member of the board of directors of the Woodbury Trust Co. During the period when Woodbury had a Chamber of Commerce, which preceded the Woodbury Business Association, he served several years as president of that organization.

Mr. Wilson was president of the Lake Gilman Chapel Association.

As a young man he was active in athletics, having played on the Woodbury basketball

and football teams, when they were rated as among the best teams in this section of the State.

Mr. Wilson also served in old Company I, Third Regiment, New Jersey National Guard.

Surviving Mr Wilson are his wife, Fannie Hendrickson Wilson; a son, Harry F. Wilson; a daughter, Mrs. Marian Hecht; three brothers, Harry E. Wilson and Howard W. Wilson, of Woodbury, and Robert H. Wilson, of Fortescue, and a sister, Mrs. Ethel M. Keat, of Woodbury.

FUNERAL ON TUESDAY

The funeral will be held on Tuesday, March 13, with services being held at 3 p. m. in Kemble Memorial Methodist Church in charge of the Rev Fred W Stacey, pastor of the church Burial will be made in the Wenonah cemetery.

A viewing will be held on Monday evening at the Davis Funeral Home, 171 Delaware Street, Woodbury.

It's Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Daniel Francis Clancy.

John McGee was erroneously credited with authorship of "It's Indiana" in the House of Representatives on February 27, 1950, whereas Daniel Francis Clancy is the actual author of this tribute to Indiana, which has been described—Indianapolis Times, June 18, 1950—as having "already taken its place with the historic hymns of homage to Hoosierdom." Mr. Clancy, formerly of Logansport, Ind., and now of Springfield, Ohio, is the only man except the late Ernie Pyle to win two consecutive National Headliner Club awards for outstanding achievement in journalism. The article follows:

It's Indiana where springs are sweetest and autumns gayest; small towns with Indian names. The Wabash sparkling white under a summer moon, green fields of slowly waving corn Autumns full of the smell of burning leaves and hushed harvest fields stretching away into a saffron setting sun. Bittersweet and basketball, paw-paws and pumpkins. Country church crowds on sunlit Sunday mornings, courthouses with worn-down front steps, and trotting races at the county fairs. Land of Lincoln-like lawyers; Brown County and Turkey Run. State that remembers canals and covered bridges, Thomas R. Marshall, Albert J. Beveridge, Benjamin and William Henry Harrison. Where everyone is said to be a politician; literary land of poets and writers, James Whitcomb Riley, George Ade, Booth Tarkington, Theodore Dreiser, Meredith Nicholson, and Abe Martin. Where many women spend a lifetime driving country roads to bring books in a traveling library to farm boys. Land haunted by redmen whose canoes still seem to drift down blue-green curving rivers. Land of the speedway, sycamores, and friendly conversational folk. On the Banks of the Wabash. Hoosierdom and home. (Daniel Francis Clancy.)

Entertainment for Servicemen by the Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled 'Moose Show for Troops," which appeared in the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News of March 9, 1951.

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

MOOSE SHOW FOR TROOPS

The Moose are always doing something for somebody. They are brotherhood in action Their school and home for children at Mooseheart is everyday inspiration for us, their neighbors. It prepares the young of departed members of the order against the day when they are grown and must go on their own to their benefit and that of country.

So it occasioned no surprise when it was learned that the east central district of the fraternity—Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and New Jersey—was sending to Europe to play for our soldiers stationed there a star-studded professional theater unit

It will leave Friday, March 16, for a 27-day tour of the Army bases, we are told by Malcolm R. Giles, director general of the international society.

The group already has performed for more than 50,000 servicemen in the northernmost outposts on our defense perimeter—Alaska, the Aleutians, Newfoundland, Greenland, and Labrador. It will take off in a United States Air Force plane from the Baltimore Municipal Airport after a preview performance for military and Government officials.

The unit is headed by Roy Acuff and his Grand Ol' Opry cast. It is believed to be the first servicemen's entertainment troupe financed by a private organization to go abroad during the present emergency. It was formed by J. "Jack" Stoehr, the regional director of the Moose.

He has hopes of making the big jump to Korea to round out the program.

We hope that he realizes on his aims. Certainly the fighting men in that sad country will welcome the entertainers It will be like a visit home.

On the trip to Europe all expenses, except transportation and housing, which are being furnished by the Army Air Corps, will be paid for by Moose lodges in Stoehr's jurisdiction.

The artists will entertain several hundred thousand servicemen in Army bases and hospitals in Germany, Austria, and England before returning to New York on April 11.

The show is titled "A Night With the Moose." It is intended to give the valiant troops a good hour. It is the Loyal Order of Moose way of saying "thank you" to the fine young men who serve our country.

The itinerary of the troupe will be as follows: March 16, the Army base in the Azores; March 17, 18, and 19, performances at the Four Hundred and Ninety-fifth Station Army Hospital and Air Base at Wiesbaden, Germany; March 20, Rhein Main Air Base; March 21, the Army post at Birkenfeld, Germany; March 22 and 23, return to Wiesbaden for two more performances; March 24, Kassell, Germany; March 25 and 26, Berlin; March 27, Wurzburg, Germany; March 28 and 29, Vienna, Austria; March 30, Neuberg Air Base, Austria; March 31, Lanzberg Air Base, Austria, April 1, the Ninety-eighth General Army Hospital and the air base at Furstenfeldbruck, Germany; April 2, Erding Air Base, Germany, April 3, Salzburg Army Post, Germany; April 4, Berchtesgaden, Germany; April 5, Wiesbaden, Germany, April 6, 7, and 8, Army bases in England; April 9 and 10, Newfoundland air bases

My Responsibility to My State Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in an effort to stimulate thinking among the young people of South Dakota, the State Young Republican organization, under the direction of Mr. Howard Wood, chairman, held an essay contest on the subject, My Responsibility to My State Government.

The winner of this contest was Miss Virgene Westergard, of Worthing, S. Dak The essay indicates some mature thinking on the subject, and I feel that it reflects patriotic sentiments to which we all should give special thought.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would like to have this essay inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO MY STATE GOVERNMENT

America stands before the world dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal. I believe each citizen has the privilege and obligation of sharing this aspiration with others. I am going to try to grow steadily in my ability to understand this democratic aspiration and strive to contribute to its enrichment.

In a bygone day Thomas Jefferson wrote "How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of." To the thinking citizens of South Dakota these words mean much. It is easy to feel we have always had these blessings and always will, but they must be carefully guarded, if we are to keep them. This, I feel is my greatest responsibility. In order to do this, I must have a continuous, active interest in current happenings and elections. I know that when I am able to vote I will vote for honest, responsible officials to head our government They will safeguard the blessings we have inherited.

If we try to understand that our local government is part of the general State government, it will mean more to us I believe we should try to understand current issues and people, and form definite opinions, supported by facts and our own reasoning This will fit us for the future, when we have to defend our opinions, think clearly and reason correctly—if we are to find our rightful place in this government of which each of us is an important part.

Wise Up, Mr. President, and Wield That Broom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Sunday Herald:

WISE UP, MR PRESIDENT, AND WIELD THAT BROOM

One of President Truman's most admired traits, his dogged determination, is showing up in its unloveller lights these days. It won him one election against long odds, 28 months ago It may well lose him another, if he chooses to chance it next year.

For there are no two ways about it: the smell rising from the scandal pot in Washington is nauseous

And the President, who can't properly be expected to know everything that's cooking on every little stove in Washington and therefore couldn't properly be held responsible, insists on lifting the lid and sniffing the brew and maintaining that it is sweet

Part of the President's doggedness—and it has led to a good part of his trouble—is his intense loyalty to persons whom he likes and whom he has chosen to be his aides

It has led him to defend stoutly Secretary of State Dean Acheson—"the only way they'll get him out is to impeach me"—and there's a good chance that history will say he is right

But it has led him to give the same unswerving support to the Harry Vaughans, to try to give responsible posts to the Mon Wallgrens, and to lash out before he has facts at hand at persons who assail the least member of the White House staff.

The charge that patronage is being peddled over the counter in Mississippi is made by the President's political enemies, but it is easier to believe it is true than wrong The picayune nature of the offense makes it more repugnant This is a time to show some of the famous Truman courage, admit an egregious error, and throw the rascals out

The revelations about some Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans show the tawdriest sort of dealings, panderings to untrustworthy characters out of the basest pecuniary motives.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate's subcommittee investigating the operations of the RFC, whose report the President characterized as "asinine," said a "disinfection" is necessary in Government, because "only in this way will the people regain their conviction that their Government is honest and fair in all its dealings

"If people lose faith in the honesty of their Government by reason of rather recent developments here, we will be in greater danger from within than from without. Loss of confidence in our Government is as great a menace as is communism."

There is only one way to meet the Fulbright revelations. They must be welcomed. The investigators must be given every assistance in tearing them wide open.

If this isn't done, the first damage may be that Congress will heed the cries that the RFC be abolished. That would end such things as the Miami Beach affair. It would also put hundreds of small and deserving companies out of business; for 80 percent of the RFC loans are for $50,000 or less, and its workaday unpublicized business has been tiding good little enterprises over the bad times

But the results of the President's stubbornness can go much further. It gives encouragement and nourishment to all his enemies, who hate him not for an RFC scandal but because of the issues to which he pledged himself in 1948—the people's issues, which, if carried out indifferently by President Truman, would be killed outright by his opponents.

Creation of a Freedom Corps Opposed to Soviet Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest hopes for peace lies in the surging and ever-mounting spirit of opposition and resistance to the expansion of Soviet slavery.

This feeling is especially prevalent and forceful among those people who have escaped beyond the iron curtain but endure agonies of soul as they are compelled to stand by futilely while the strangling grasp of Moscow fastens its death clutch on what were formerly free, proud peoples.

For these displaced persons, these soldiers without arms, these expellees whose main and guiding purpose is the return to their respective countries in a new day of untrammeled freedom, ways must be found, opportunites must be created, so they can give practical expression to their opposition to Stalinism.

Sometimes, in our determination to halt Soviet imperialism, we in America I feel, are prone to overlook the large numbers of other nationals, especially refugees from the terrors of Stalinism who are willing and able, given the chance, to help in the struggle for peace and liberty.

We frequently mistake, too, the aspirations and objectives of those displaced patriots. Much as they may admire America, they yearn not for the sight of our beloved shores, but rather live in the hope that one day they may return in security and liberty to the lands of their birth, and there in true freedom, amid the blessings of their rich national traditions, culture, and the warmth of familiar things, take up their lives anew.

This we must understand and respect, and understanding and respecting, take steps to help them forge their ranks in the ever-swelling legions of the freedom loving.

It would be a serious mistake at this important juncture in history for us to assume we have a monopoly on the impulse to thwart tyrants—ours by a fateful course of events is the role of champion of the democratic world, and in that capacity we have the task and the duty to make it possible for all who thirst for freedom to take their rightful place in the fight against the extension of Soviet aggression, spiritual and physical.

Furthermore, an additional and compelling advantage of this program is the great beneficial effect it will have by giving heart and increased courage and strength of resistance to the Soviet captives behind the iron curtain. This activity will spark the embers that will one day fan the fires of liberation.

To this end, I propose the creation of a freedom corps, a military organization in which men of all nations opposed to Soviet aggression may shoulder arms, giving signal strength to the free world's growing forces of peace.

The Let-Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Washington News of Saturday, March 3, 1951, entitled "The Let-Down":

THE LET-DOWN

Only 2 months ago, Defense Secretary Marshall just told Congress he was being criticized for not asking a strength of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men in the Armed Forces

"Today," he added, "the atmosphere is quite different Now the questions are, not how much more we need, but why we are asking so much."

Drawing on an old soldier's memories, General Marshall went on:

"I saw the Army disintegrate in General Pershing's lap after World War I. I saw the selective-service law come within one vote of repeal only a few months before Pearl Harbor. I saw us cast aside our strength again after VJ-day.

"These things are familiar to me But I must confess I was not prepared for the speed with which the present shift in sentiment developed."

General Marshall is correct.

There has been a swift—and deadly dangerous—shift in sentiment.

Its effects are evident not only in Congress and the administration but throughout the country.

In the time wasted in quibbling about whether the draft age shall be lowered to 18½ years rather than 18 and the delay in voting higher taxes

In the squabbling over how the defense mobilization and the war against inflation shall be conducted.

In the Government's irresolute attitude toward pressing problems.

That sense of terrible urgency which was strong after the first reverses in Korea, which revived when the Chinese Reds came into the war—that has dwindled and all but disappeared.

In its place there has grown a feeling of optimism—foolish optimism—without foundation.

Our country's peril is no less real than it was 2 months ago.

The threat of a third world war is no less great.

The problems of defense and industrial mobilization and control of inflation are no less grave.

If we believe we are doing enough to frighten the rulers of Soviet Russia, to deter them from their plan for ultimate world domination, we are deceiving ourselves and playing their game.

Our goal is not to fight and win another world-wide war—unless we must.

Our true goal is to prevent another world-wide war.

Our hope of attaining that goal depends upon developing with utmost speed such actual and potentially ready military strength that Soviet Russia will not dare risk forcing us to fight.

We can't do that by feeble, half-hearted efforts.

If we want safety in a peaceful world, the price in toil and treasure must be paid. It will be worth the price a thousand times.

We are letting down when what we need is to speed up.

Rice and Propaganda for the Chinese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Des Moines Register points up again the value of rice as a propaganda weapon in Asia. In the struggle for supremacy in Asia, the free world can make no better investment than the creation of a "rice bank" as a weapon against communism. The editorial follows:

RICE AND PROPAGANDA FOR THE CHINESE

The Nationalist China Air Force based on Formosa has made at least eight different flights to the mainland recently—to drop food, not bombs.

The food was rice, paid for by the voluntary China Mainland Flood and Famine Relief Association of Formosa, and with it went bundles of letters of sympathy. The drops were made in famine- and flood-stricken districts of Fukien and Kwangtung provinces.

Firebrands in armchairs and swivel chairs in America are all for declaring war on Red China, having American planes drop bombs on Chinese ports and industries, and helping Chiang Kai-shek invade the mainland to restart the civil war he has been fighting ever since 1927.

Rice and letters are more effective.

The Chinese Communist and anti-Communist, are sick of civil war. They have had no real civil peace and effective civil government for 100 years. They welcomed the Communists with a sort of despairing hope that these strong men out of their wild west would bring them peace at last.

The strong men brought them not peace but a grenade. They lowered the rents and parceled out the land—but they raised the rice tax and the blood tax of young men to still steeper levels. From system-less anarchy and graft, China is moving to totalitarian tyranny.

But we are doing far more for Chiang Kai-shek by letting him use his air force to drop rice than if we gave him the American LST's and PFC's he would need for an invasion of the mainland. We are doing far more for the people of China, more for the safety of our own policy in China, and the world.

While we were letting Chiang drop rice to hungry mainland Chinese, Soviet Russia was voting "no" to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund against granting $22,000 to supplement the diets of hungry Formosa children with dried milk. Russia said any aid to Formosa should go through the Red Chinese government in Peking—which would allot it to Formosa "if necessary."

The people of China will learn eventually who the "good neighbor" has been.

Pfc Robert James McKenna, USMC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to Judge Samuel A. Weiss, of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa., a former Member of this body, by Brig. Gen. W. J. Scheyer, United States Marine Corps, dated February 23, 1951, which depicts the interest and help given to the families of its personnel:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1951

Judge SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Court of Common Pleas,
Pittsburgh, Pa

MY DEAR JUDGE WEISS: I have your letter concerning Pfc Robert James McKenna, 1037485, United States Marine Corps.

No additional information has been received from the field relative to the status of the above-named man However, in view of the information contained in your letter, I have taken steps to have George Bradley interviewed by a marine officer stationed in Philadelphia in an effort to ascertain further facts. I have also requested Col. Ewart S. Laue, Director, Fourth Marine Corps Reserve district, Philadelphia, to pay a personal call on Mrs McKenna for the purpose of assisting and advising her with any problems arising from the status of her son.

The interest you have shown the above case and the advice and assistance you have rendered Mrs McKenna are deeply appreciated. I have been gratified to note your interest and confidence in the Marine Corps.

I assure you that this headquarters will continue its efforts to obtain further information relative to the location of Private First Class McKenna, and that everything possible is done by the officers and men in the combat area to learn the fate and whereabouts of their missing comrades. Any such information received will be promptly furnished Mrs. McKenna.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

W. J. SCHEYER,
Brigadier General, United States Marine Corps, Assistant Director of Personnel.

Statement Issued by Hon. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, on the Opening Program of the Voice of America on February 16, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me for the opening program of the Voice of America on February 16, 1951:

My name is DAN FLOOD. I was elected by the people of my district in Pennsylvania, a district in the hard-coal-mining fields of the State. My constituents live in Luzerne County, the principal city of which is Wilkes-Barre. Among the people who have asked me to represent them in the Congress of the United States, there are more than 30,000 of Lithuanian stock. Most of them are third-generation Lithuanians, which means that already their grandparents immigrated to this country. When they came here, they found the opportunity which America offers to all those who cherish freedom and who are ready to work to build up their own lives and the future of their children. I am glad to say that all these Lithuanian-Americans are well-established American citizens now who uphold the democratic ideals and traditions of this country and who are highly respected by their fellow Americans of other origins. It is one of the great privileges of American citizenship that we who are loyal to the United States of America do not forget our ties with the country of origin of our ancestors. We cherish and continue many of the good European traditions within the framework of our American way of life. And this is also true of the Lithuanian-Americans in my constituency. They have formed Lithuanian-American societies and clubs, and they have many churches in which the parish priests are Lithuanian-Americans who preach to their flock in Lithuanian.

Now all these Lithuanian-Americans speak Lithuanian among themselves a great deal and celebrate today as every year, on February 16 the birthday of the republic of Lithuania, with folk songs and festivals.

It is therefore my particular pleasure, as a representative of those citizens, to take the opportunity of the first Lithuanian language program of the Voice of America, to relay my best wishes as well as those of my constituents to the people of Lithuania.

My Lithuanian-American constituents are very proud of the fact that the United States has refused to recognize the Soviet claim to the Baltic states and that we recognize the Minister of Lithuania to Washington as a representative of the Lithuanian people in the United States. My Lithuanian-American constituents look forward to the day when the Lithuanian people will again have their free choice as to their form of government and their national life.

Among these Lithuanian-Americans many have achieved positions of respect and importance in our community. As an example, I can cite Mr. Peter Margia, a businessman of Wilkes-Barre who is a senator in the legislature of the State of Pennsylvania.

All these people, as American citizens, are supporting fully the policy of peace with freedom and justice for all people, which is the policy of the Government of the United States. And that is why I think that on this day I can speak for all of them when I wish you, the people of Lithuania, that you may regain your freedom and may be able to work out your own destiny. It is with these thoughts that I am repeating to you what my Lithuanian-American constituents always says with conviction and confidence: Kas Bus Nebus, Lietuva Neprazus (no matter what will happen, Lithuania will not perish).

Where Is Our Foreign Policy Taking Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own

remarks, I include a copy of an address which I recently made over radio station WJR at Detroit:

Whether we shall have peace—or whether our present foreign policy is heading us for world war III—is the most vital problem concerning the American citizen today. What is done in the months ahead may help keep peace or it might involve us in the most disastrous war the world has ever seen—one which may destroy the liberty and freedom our predecessors fought so hard to establish and which we ourselves would give anything to preserve.

One thing which I believe to be most dangerous to our future is the failure of the President and his advisers to take the American people into their confidence—before making momentous decisions—instead of afterward. No single fact is more disturbing to the rank and file citizen than his bewilderment about where the President is taking this country, and why. It would be useless for me to dwell upon the subject except to remind you of something you already know, namely—that our predicament is due primarily to the fact that the peace following World War II was made by secret negotiation and agreement and without any advance information to the American people. It doesn't make any difference whether we like it or not, the plain fact is that once a secret agreement is reached between our country and some foreign nation—right or wrong—that agreement or commitment becomes the fixed obligation of 150,000,000 American citizens. Despite the tragic consequences which followed the secret agreements of World War II, President Truman has learned nothing by that important experience and is still pursuing the same dangerous course.

Neither Congress nor the American people were consulted when the President committed our troops to Korea. Whether such action was right or wrong—whether we like it or not—once the President made the commitment he irrevocably tied the hands of every citizen in this country.

Today we are faced with another momentous question. It is whether the President, acting in his own discretion, shall have the right in time of peace to commit unlimited numbers of American troops to be joined with other nations in forming a land army in Western Europe. He has arrogantly assumed autocratic authority to carry on this project and has castigated those who have the temerity to disagree. By acquiescing in this authority on the part of the President, we are giving him the irrevocable right as a single American—without anyone else's consent—to determine whether we shall fight another disastrous world war. Where is the present urgency that requires such dictatorial authority in the hands of the President? There is no war in Europe today. Surely there is ample time for the President to consult the American people and give them an opportunity to decide how far they want their country to go in recruiting an army to be stationed in Western Europe.

It is the rank and file citizen who is being called upon to carry the burden of the President's fabulous foreign policy program. It is he who wears the uniform; it is he who pays the higher taxes and accepts a lower standard of living and the Government controls that are necessary in a wartime economy

But notwithstanding these sacrifices, you, Mr. Average Citizen, unless you are a mind reader, know nothing about the President's aims or purposes in his global program that is now in the making. But you aren't alone in the darkness; you are in the same position as your Representatives in Congress, who know as little about what is in the President's mind as you do.

All we know is that those who demand that foreign policy decisions be subjected to public scrutiny and debate, are labeled by the President as obstructionists or if you become bold enough to assert that the advice and consent of Congress should be obtained before troops are sent to foreign battlefields to fight other peoples' wars, you are given a more odious label—you are an isolationist.

So here we are in the birthplace of democracy ridiculed and stigmatized if we dare to say that no man is big enough or great enough in a free country to ignore the collective wisdom and judgment of 150,000,000 people in reaching decisions which affect their lives and their liberty.

We have seen people in countries with totalitarian dictators plunged into war against their will—but I ask you—have we reached a point in this country where we want to follow a practice for which we so bitterly assail totalitarian nations?

I realize the serious concern with which you must view our present predicament and I think all thoughtful Americans have similar feelings. If there ever was a time in our history when political differences should be laid aside in an effort to resolve our difficulties, it is now. My own views on the subject are in no sense partisan because my thinking is as far out of line with some of our Republican leaders as it is with President Truman's.

In the past decade we have moved from a policy of extreme isolationism to one of extreme internationalism. If we must choose one of these two extremes, I prefer the former because I think we could follow it and still survive as a free nation, while the latter I believe will ultimately destroy us. I think we ought to participate in the settlement of world problems and assume our just share of the burden but, in my judgment, we must gear our participation in direct proportion to our ability and capacity in terms of manpower and resources If we follow such a course, we can definitely assist in keeping peace in the world and at the same time maintain our own national solvency and the integrity of our form of government On the other hand, if we pursue the policy which commenced following World War II of singlehandedly assuming the financial, economic, political, and military burdens of the rest of the world, it can mean nothing but eventual bankruptcy for us and the loss of our own liberties I agree that survival is worth any price—except the price of our own freedom. Surely it would avail us little to have saved the freedom of other peoples if we lose our own in the process.

But even if I am wrong in my conclusions that another global war would lead to our insolvency and emasculate our freedoms, there are other compelling reasons why we should change our course Without assessing blame or responsibility for the peace that was botched, it is an uncontroverted fact that World War II caused more problems than it solved and that the world is further away from peace today than it was in 1941. Can anyone assure us that the defeat of communism in Europe and Asia will bring us any nearer to peace?

In the course of our own lives we have seen Europe dominated in the west by the military rule of the Prussians, and in the east by the czars of Russia. Following World War I we witnessed the rise of a Communist dictatorship in Russia, and Nazi and Fascist dictatorships in Germany and Italy. There never was any real difference between these types of government. They have all had for their purpose the destruction of the liberties of the people by one method or another, and each has caused a war of aggression against other nations.

In World War II we destroyed fascism and nazism and made communism one of the strongest political and military forces on earth. If we now undertake, and are successful in destroying communism in Europe and Asia one may well wonder what form of political oppression will take its place. We propose, for example, to ally ourselves with Tito and Franco in the all-out struggle against Russian communism. Would one of these latter two—made powerful by our help—be the next tyrant with whom we would have to deal?

This possibility is bad enough, but there are some that may be worse. In pardoning the German war criminals the hypocrisy of our diplomacy in attempting to regain the friendship of the Germans reached its zenith I presume, if we are going into an all-out land war with Russia, we would be well advised to rearm the Germans because they are probably the best fighters in Europe We need them on our side in any all-out struggle with the Communists. To accomplish this would, of necessity, require that Germany as a nation be reconstituted on something like a basis of equality with our so-called European allies. In such circumstances what would we do with the German nation and its army, after the Russians were defeated? Do you suppose the Germans in such a case would agree to disarmament and again be relegated to a second-rate power; or do you think they would insist upon equality? With the Russians licked and the Germans powerful again, what problems would be posed for our diplomats insofar as European or world peace is concerned? Might we not be back where we were before World War II started?

While the situation is not completely analogous, the future status of Japan is likewise a problem that we cannot ignore in our program of world-wide diplomacy. If we are to carry on an all-out war with communism in the Far East as well as in Europe as we seem headed for, we will need to rearm Japan and write a peace treaty that will establish that country on an equality basis in the community of nations. What would we do with Japan after the Communists have been chased out of Asia? Do you think we could thereafter relegate her to an occupied-nation status? Do you believe a revitalized Japan would present any future dangers to world peace and, if so, how would we guard against it? Or should we put off the evil day in considering these questions?

These are all real practical problems that cannot safely be ignored—when you fight your former friends and ally yourself with former enemies But these problems are too real and too practical to be thought about by our starry-eyed diplomats who are too busy rushing headlong and haphazardly into another world conflict without having the slightest conception of where it will eventually lead us; or what new and momentous problems it will create.

My point is, there is no real basis for assuming that we can ever solve the political and military problems of Europe with any degree of permanency The political upheaval going on over there is not new. It is centuries old. To assume that we can settle these controversies by fighting wars in Europe and Asia is wishful thinking indeed

Because of my deep conviction that we can never settle the problems of Europe and Asia, I think we should go easy on the extent we implicate ourselves. We can assume some of the burden of suppressing world aggression—but not all. That, I think, is the crux of the problem. We can furnish the atomic power; some of our Navy and a part of our Air Force. We could furnish manpower in small degree for strategic operations, and last but not least, we can furnish military equipment and supplies. But I am unalterably opposed to committing millions of men to make up a land army in either Europe or Asia, which is the plan now being contemplated. Such a course will

mean our ultimate ruination because of its cost in men and resources, to say nothing of the fact that we would again have created more problems than we solved.

Finally, in assessing our future commitments we must consider the cost of rehabilitation in Europe and Asia when the fighting is over. Because, who, except us, would assume that burden? The rehabilitation program following World War II, which has cost us billions, would be peanuts compared to the postwar costs of world war III. How much more strain would our economy stand after another devastating war? These are questions which deserve serious consideration in connection with our ultimate survival, and yet they are lightly brushed aside by those who are laying out this extravagant program.

We may still be the richest and strongest Nation on earth, but anyone who cares to think realistically knows that we can reach the breaking point. When we reach that point who will save us?

Finally, I believe that if we do not rechart our course very soon, we will ultimately be as bankrupt as the rest of the world and end up with some totalitarian form of government on our own doorstep.

Why Is My Son in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, there appears in the March 16, 1951, issue of the weekly magazine United States News and World Report, a most remarkable statement in answer to the question "Why Is My Son in Korea?" It is an editorial by that outstanding publisher, editor and columnist, David Lawrence, whose penetrating editorial comments contribute so much to the desperate need of objective evaluation and sane, calm judgment in times of unparalleled confusion and irresponsibility. Mr. Lawrence's editorial is the finest thing of its kind I have seen. He says much more eloquently and effectively what I tried to say 8 months ago in my nationally syndicated column of July 18, 1950.

I commend the David Lawrence editorial to all Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be placed in the RECORD, together with a copy of my column.

There being no objection, the editorial, together with the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News and World Report of March 16, 1951]

"WHY IS MY SON IN KOREA?"

(By David Lawrence)

The mother of a boy twice wounded in Korea asks this writer: "Why is my son fighting in Korea?" The question was not a protest but an earnest search for a definition.

American boys are fighting in Korea—

1. Because the sacrifice being made in Korea can save millions of young men now at home—the 18-year-olds, the 16-year-olds, the 12-year-olds—sparing them the necessity of fighting another world war.

2. Because from those who fought at the Marne and Chateau-Thierry, in Tunisia and at Anzio, in the Battle of the Bulge, at Midway, on New Guinea, Guadalcanal, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa—from those brave men, there has been passed down the responsibility to preserve the American tradition for which so many of them died. This generation now is demonstrating in Korea that a great nation, untainted by the materialism of territorial ambition or the greed of conquest—having twice fought for principle and laid down its arms without a single act of selfishness toward its allies or a single act of dishonor toward its enemies—still will fight for principle and the cause of humanity.

3. Because America sees in the Korean war a challenge to freedom everywhere. Korea, the small helpless nation trampled under the heel of the Red invader, is the Cuba of Spain's cruelty in 1898, the Belgium of the Kaiser's invasion of 1914, and the Britain, the France, the Holland, and the Belgium, the Poland, and the Norway of Hitler's aggression of a decade ago

4. Because an attack against freemen anywhere is a menace to democracy everywhere. A readiness to meet the aggressor in Korea can deter the master of that same aggression from precipitating a larger-scale war elsewhere

5 Because America cannot allow the aggressor to come by sea or air or land to our shores. If aggression were to be successful in Korea, the Russian-Chinese alliance could then invade Japan and its northern islands and secure air bases for attack on nearby Alaska If Northwest territory were threatened, so would our own Pacific coast cities soon be threatened, too.

6. Because America must mobilize her strength and not risk the defeat that can come if the whole free world is conquered and the total resources of our present allies are then appropriated by our enemy and its satellites for a final strike against us.

7. Because misguided minds among our own allies are ready to yield to the aggresor and run away, little realizing that by their defeatism they are encouraging another dictator even as they unwittingly did in the Rhineland episode of 1936 and at Munich in 1938.

8. Because today statesmanship is lacking, leadership is lacking, moral scruple is lacking, and the need is for sacrifice to raise aloft the banner of great ideals—so that once more the souls of men may be saved through the power of heroic example.

9 Because it is essential to the peace of the world that an international organization, such as the United Nations, stimulate a will to peace, and this means also a will to fight against aggression. Unhappily among our allies it has been questioned whether a shell-shocked populace can regain the will to fight. What we do in Korea can revive the fighting spirit of European peoples and demonstrate to peoples everywhere that the American will to fight for a just cause has not perished.

10. Because the American boys who fought and came home and the boys who never came back from World War I and World War II will have fought in vain if there now is a disintegration of spirit, a dissolution of the great moral purpose that guides brave men to give their lives in a noble cause.

11. Because, just as Christianity does not condone the suicide of the individual, Christianity rejects the suicide of the State—the basic fallacy of pacifism.

12 Because we are our brother's keepers and because as we see a drowning man struggling to reach the shore, the instinct is to go to his rescue. What that instinct means to the individual, it means to a nation whose greatness today, as in the past, is still sublimated by an unselfish effort to relieve human suffering and to emancipate men, women, and children from slavery. On the battlefields of Korea our youth is saving our own democracy from its sins of materialism and its indulgences and making it strong again And it must be strong to insure the survival of the forces of good in the world and their triumph over the age-old forces of evil.

13. Because the troops in Korea and the airmen and sailors nearby are the crusaders of our times—crusaders for justice and crusaders for the rights of freemen to live in this world free from fear, free from the perennial terror imposed upon us by evil men.

14. Because the brave youth in Korea are putting to shame those thoughtless brethren in Britain and France and even in America who begrudge the dollars and pounds they now must forego, who worship the false gods of creature comfort even as the battalions in Korea, despising such weakness, lift their faces to the next ridge with the immortal courage that makes them worthy of man's finest accolade.

WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON.—A constituent in Maine writes me that his wife has asked him several times during the past few days: "Why is it necessary that our boys should be sent over to Korea to labor, suffer, and die for the South Koreans who hate us? What business is it of us Americans? Why not let them fight out their own squabbles?"

The writer said that he could sense the answer to this, considering the ultimate aims of the Communists, the commitments of the United Nations and other factors But he claimed that he was not good at explaining his inner sensings of such matters.

I am sure he is like many of us. He paid me an unwarranted honor when he expressed confidence that I could give a clear, concise, and simple answer to his wife's questions and suggested that I do so in my column. I'll try.

The most direct answer is that Communist aggression any place in the world is a threat to the peace of the world—and to our own national security. With each bit of territory the Communists gobble up, regardless of how far away from our shores, they come that closer to us. Not only do they come closer but they conquer that many more people to be enslaved in the aggressive designs for conquering the entire world.

Why then do we choose to make a stand and fight in Korea when we didn't in China or any of the Balkan states?

The occupation of Korea was divided at the end of World War II between Russia in Northern Korea and the United States in Southern Korea. That division may have been wrong. But it was made principally because of the aggressive designs of Russia. To the rest of the world, Northern Korea was Communist Russian and Southern Korea was American.

Brushing aside the diplomatic frills, the North Korean attack was considered by the rest of the world a test attack of Russia through her puppets on that part of Korea for which the United States has assumed responsibility. In other words, Russia was making an indirect attack on America through Korea.

It is true that Russia has literally gobbled up the Balkan states and that her Chinese puppets have taken over China without direct American intervention. But her action in these areas was not an attack on America, direct or indirect. We didn't have any commitments in those places nor were we occupying any of them.

If we were to back down and withdraw from Southern Korea, we would have saved the lives of many Americans, who, it is true, have died for Southern Koreans. But backing down there would not settle anything

except temporarily. What lives our moral surrender there would have saved would be very, very few compared to the number that would later be lost.

Why? Because we would have returned to the policy of appeasement. And that is nothing more than surrender on the installment plan. It didn't work with Hitler. Why should we expect it to work with Stalin?

Appeasement in Korea merely would have been followed by a Communist attack somewhere else—again and again and again—until finally we would be forced to stand up to Russia and say, "This is as far as you can go without making war on us." It is better to do it now than to wait until later when Russia has gobbled up most of the world and attacked us. It is like cancer, which kills gradually if not stopped early enough.

In the Korean test of courage and position, had we backed down we could hardly expect the Western European members of the North Atlantic Treaty to show any more bravery against aggression than the United States. Had we turned our backs and run we could hardly expect the United Nations to keep from folding

In short, our boys are fighting and dying in South Korea to try to stave off death for you and me here in America from a possible Russian aerial assault. The Korean war is the business of America because peace is our business, especially in those areas we are occupying. We are not letting the North Koreans and the South Koreans fight out their own squabbles simply because basically it is not their own squabbles. It is an indirect squabble between Russia and America, a test squabble started by Russia against America.

The stronger we stand now the better our chance to discourage Russia from her design of world conquest and the better the hopes to peace in Russia's realization that we will fight instead of surrendering on the installment plan.

In South Korea we rejected the first installment.

Increase in Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the American Federation of Labor News of March 6 on the subject of inflation.

This article gives figures on the rise in the cost of living from December 15 to January 15. It is a startling piece of information and points again to the fact that it is of the utmost importance that the cost of living be controlled so that our people do not suffer unnecessarily.

The article follows:

COST OF LIVING SHOOTS TO NEW PEAK UNDER FAKE PRICE ORDER

WASHINGTON.—The price rise has become a stampede

The United States Department of Labor reported that all items in the cost of living rose 3.2 points—or 1.5 percent—between December 15 and January 15.

Prices last January 15—11 days before the so-called price freeze—were 7.9 percent above the same period a year ago.

Undaunted, Price Stabilization Director Michael V. DiSalle approved a 3½-percent increase in prices for automobile manufacturers.

Food prices, which are uncontrolled, rose 2 percent more between January 15 and February 15.

The increase in cost of living has been so rapid that millions of workers have been forced to cut living standards and are still unable to make ends meet.

Two further factors in the piecemeal botched-up defense mobilization program being carried out by big business under Defense Mobilization Czar Charles E. Wilson and Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston compound the difficulties. These are:

1. Wages are frozen tight and Mr. Johnston is making decisions on the basis of expediency to take care of big-business friends like Mr Wilson's own General Electric Co.

2. Mr. Wilson's failures in over-all direction of the set-up threatens to throw thousands of workers temporarily out of employment—with little or no income at all to meet the rising prices Because of the lack of planning so that defense orders are ready to go when the production of civilian goods ends under the materials cutback plans, many plants will be forced to shut down.

The Labor Department reported that its new adjusted Consumers Price Index stood at 181 5 on January 15, a new record high for this index.

Between December 15 and January 15, the Department said prices of food rose 2 6 percent, housefurnishings 2 1 percent, apparel 1.5 percent, fuels 0 4 percent, rent 0.2 percent, and miscellaneous goods and services 0.9 percent.

And all of these items are due to go up more under the profit margin markup retail price order issued February 26 by Mr. DiSalle.

The United Labor Policy Committee called this order legalized robbery and the whole price-control program under the Defense Production Act of 1950 a cynical hoax on the American people.

The committee has called for recommendations to Congress that the act be amended to provide genuine price controls, but no action has been taken by President Truman, Mr. Wilson, or any other official with power to make such recommendations.

Government Hand-Outs and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph Turner, publisher of the Temple City Times in Temple City, Calif., has written a very forthright and interesting editorial on the problem of inflation. This editorial appeared in the Temple City Times on March 8, 1951, and I call it to the attention of the Members of the Congress as it presents some very worth while comments on one of the greatest problems now before us.

The editorial follows:

FIXED INCOMES, SMALLER DOLLARS

The greatest sufferer from the current and apparently continuing wave of monetary and price inflation is the person trying to live on a fixed income.

This person may be a retired school teacher, Government employee or business executive on a pension. He may be a person who put all his savings into insurance or bonds. He may be living on rentals from income property. In any of these cases, he or she is trying to get along on a certain number of dollars each month or year. And he finds these dollars buying less and less.

It can be, and it is, a desperate prospect for many people.

There is special interest, therefore, in the recommendation which the Price Controller, Michael DiSalle, made to a congressional committee the other day. He suggested that social-security benefits be raised for persons living on pensions or fixed incomes. Enabling such persons to survive in a time of rising national income and prices is "one of our toughest problems," he said. He admitted it was almost impossible to bring prices down to a level which would bring any relief to such people.

Mr. DiSalle's statement is true, but to find the answer will complicate enormously the already fouled-up mess of taxes and inflation. The Times starts today a series of articles explaining the recently liberalized social-security law. Evidently, even before the law becomes effective, we must consider granting still greater social benefits.

And at what "fixed income" are we going to draw the line for determining what individuals are entitled to greater Government aid?

Are we going to proceed even further and provide, by some financial magic, a greater return on Government bonds, savings accounts, and life insurance? Will we recommend greater purchase of common stocks or land as an inflation hedge? Or will we simply raise everybody's pension at the source (granting pensions, of course, to everyone who doesn't have any) and thus try to hold down the extra social-security payments?

Mr. DiSalle seems to be approaching the problem from the wrong end. He and his Government associates had better expend more of their energies controlling inflation at its source in correcting misconceived Federal financial policies (as evidenced by the row between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board over interest rates) and in cutting nonmilitary expenditures to the bone.

The Government simply cannot run hog-wild, and deuces wild, financially and expect extra hand-outs in the form of social security to make up for their own financial follies. That only will mean compounding the evil, adding more expense, more deficits, more taxes, and more inflation.

More About Defending Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1951, there was transmitted over station WGN a very enlightening and interesting broadcast by Bob Siegrist. His message contains material that should be both informative and instructive. Mr. Siegrist has given a great deal of thought and study to the question of properly fortifying the territory of Alaska against Russian attack and aggression. In his message, he cites facts and figures which are very illuminating and should have a tendency to alert the people of America to the danger to which the Alaskan territory is presently being exposed.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a broadcast made

by Bob Siegrist over Station WGN, Chicago, Ill. The remarks of Mr. Siegrist, as noted in his broadcast, follow:

STEALING THE HABOMAI ISLANDS

(By Bob Siegrist)

Moscow's cannon fodder is tightening its resistance against our drive in Korea. The First Marine Division, which registered several important gains west of Hoengsong earlier today, as it spearheaded the central-front drive, now is seriously engaged with the China Reds. On the east-central front, our Second Division also is finding tougher going, although it registered a mile gain today. And the Reds also continue to resist heavily on the western front near Seoul. The increased Red resistance cropped up simultaneously with renewed air activity. For the first time in nearly a month, Russian jet planes appeared over the Yalu River base of Sinuiju. They attacked four American jets in a 10-minute dog fight. When it was over, three of the Red planes were damaged and the Americans flew away unhurt In an effort to cope with General MacArthur's killer offensive, the Red Chinese and their North Korean helpers appear to be fighting strictly a delaying action below the thirty-eighth parallel. The main enemy defense line on the central front has been set up in a horseshoe-shaped perimeter between Hoengsong and parallel thirty-eight. In the west the Reds appeared determined to hold Seoul.

However, several Chinese Red officers who were taken prisoner in the past few days told American Intelligence that the Chinese are planning a major offensive this month. They would unleash more than 250,000 men, which would include the Third Chinese Field Army, and Russian jet planes would aid in the drive. The objective would be to smash United Nations troops and force one or more Dunkerque evacuations.

The captured Reds say it would be a final move by Mao Tse-tung And in connection with the Korean War, reports out of Hong Kong today say the cream of the Chinese Communist Army has been decimated in Korea The Hong Kong story adds that an estimated 35 percent of the Chinese Reds' entire military strength has been made ineffective Heavy reinforcements are said to be under mobilization so that more troops can be sent to the front. General Lin Pao's Fourth Field Army is believed to have suffered the heaviest casualties And another Hong Kong report claims the Chinese Reds have issued an urgent appeal to Moscow for more weapons It quoted an aide to a Chinese general as saying that staggering losses in Korea prompted Mao Tse-tung to ask for help from Moscow. General MacArthur said today that North Korean civilians during the Allies' December-January retreat expressed their complete aversion to Communist rule. The Allied Commander, in a report to the United Nations, said the North Koreans "Welcomed our forces as liberators when we went in and sought to withdraw with us when we withdrew."

Bitter feuding is reported between pro-Communist and anti-Communist factions called by Tibet's Dalai Lama at Yatung. These reports, filtering through the frontier Indian town of Kalimpong, say the pro-Communists are led by an official Tibetan trade agent named Pangdatsang He's pressing for acceptance of demands by Moscow's China puppet that six high Tibetan officials be dismissed from the government and turned over to Chinese Communist authorities. Among these is the former regent, Takta Rimpoche, who ruled in the 16-year-old Dalai Lama's name until only recently. Takta, the 73-year-old former regent, is reported heading opposition to the Communists on the grounds that the China Reds are hostile to the Tibetan religion—as the Reds are hostile to all religions. These reports add that he's urging the Tibetan Government to hold out for genuine guaranties before negotiating with the conquering Chinese, which proves that Takta, even at his supposedly sagacious age, is far from realistic as far as feeling that the Communists, any Communists, are ever capable of guaranteeing any truth and sticking with it. The more realistic of the opposing Tibetan faction leaders would seem to be the pro-Communist Pangdatsang---for, when one adds to the fact that he's an official trade agent, the report that Pangdatsang is, as would naturally seem to follow anyway, the richest man in Tibet—it's obvious that Pangdatsang as too often is the case, is weighing his patriotism in terms of how much money he can make in trading with the commies But here Pangdatsang, too, floats hopelessly into the unrealistic—since he apparently fails to realize that when the day comes, he too, can be a very impoverished, and a very dead Communist-appeasing Tibetan duck Meanwhile, the Chinese Communists are doing their best to force the Tibetan hand by moving fresh saber-rattling troops into both eastern and western Tibet

In Washington, there's no further public indication as to what the official Acheson-Truman reaction may be regarding yesterday's charge by their adviser and special ambassador, John Foster Dulles, that Moscow has further abused the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, and the official American complacency by stealing the Habomai Islands, which lie so very strategically, between Japan and the Russian-occupied Kuriles. At Yalta, Roosevelt, advised by the now convicted Alger Hiss, handed the Kurile Islands to Stalin, along with the several other fatal concessions including the division of Korea—all of which led in turn to the disaster in China and the present serious crisis in Korea, in which we've already suffered more than 51,000 American casualties. Yesterday, as we reported, Dulles, just back from Japan, where he's been discussing that long-overdue peace treaty, broke the news to a press conference He said we'd simply not recognize the latest Stalin grab from beneath our noses Even so, the cold, hard fact will remain that Russia has seized this six-island chain, posing just one more Russian threat to our own shores through the Pacific Basin It means that Russia has been permitted to further cut our vital chain between threatened Japan and our own virtually abandoned Aleutians. It means that Russia has been able to extend her Yalta-handed grab of the Kuriles which she's built up as a stronghold for future attack against us—southward to the very tip of Japan—just one more Red-held dagger poised at the strategic heart of our defenses.

Actually, the Potsdam Conference, which Mr Truman attended, must get a share of the credit for making this latest disaster possible, since, as in the case of the division of Korea, it was formalized at Potsdam, with the Russians taking full advantage of typically Communist manipulation of language, facts, and geography while our representatives sat and watched and agreed; just as they there agreed to settling for a mere island in a Red sea in Germany—a western Berlin to which we had no official access. Now the big question arises here: Why wasn't this quiet Russian steal of further property to which Moscow had no right in the world discovered long ago? Where's our intelligence? Or, if it was discovered long ago, if our intelligence did operate, and make its report to the diplomatic and political corps—which perhaps it did—what happened? The answer, obviously, is nothing at all.

But, at least, why did the administration wait until this tragically belated moment to tell the American people the truth of the situation? Certainly John Dulles, who failed to recognize imminent aggression at Korea's thirty-eighth parallel just before it came, didn't discover this new Russian grab all by himself. As a matter of fact, we've had reports for some time of Russian ships operating about the Habomai Islands, seizing Japanese fishing ships. Certainly Washington could not have been unaware of that, any more than could Washington really have been unaware of the years of conflict and bloodshed at the thirty-eighth parallel before the total blow came last June 25, in Korea

---

Frank Boykin Arises at About 4:30 a. m., and Is at Work in His Office on Capitol Hill Long Before 6 Each Morning—He Jams More Work Into a Single Day Than the Average Individual Does in a Whole Workweek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. RIVERS. Mr Speaker, it would be physically impossible for any man to continually exhibit more unbounded energy, nerve, stick-to-itiveness, and devotion to the interests of his Alabama constituency, than is made manifest—every day and every night throughout the year—by our good friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN.

Mr Speaker, no man in this House knows FRANK BOYKIN better than your own good self, and I know that you regard it as no overstatement when I say that no Member of this House has ever worked harder in the discharge of his official duties than the gentleman representing the first district of Alabama.

With a belief in his fellow man that is God-given—and believing, also, in private initiative and rugged individualism—FRANK BOYKIN has established a most enviable record in helping men to help themselves. To my personal knowledge, he has spent thousands upon thousands of dollars in his endeavor to bring more new and bigger industries to his Alabama district. It is, indeed, no happenstance that agriculturally, industrially, commercially, and financially, the first district of Alabama has shown more real development and growth during the time that BOYKIN has represented that district here in this Congress than marked it in all the years that passed since the establishment of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, FRANK BOYKIN arises at about 4:30 a. m., and is at work in his office on Capitol Hill long before 6 o'clock each morning. That is a life-long habit, well known to all business associates for more than the past 50 years. That habit, coupled with his unbounded vigor, has enabled Congressman FRANK to jam more work into a single day than the average individual will put out in a whole week.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of yesterday, Sunday, March 11, on its page devoted to national affairs, as written by Robert C. Albright, carried a short, homey, frank, honest, and candid story about my good friend, and the good

friend of every Member of the Congress that meets on both ends of the Capitol.

It is a simple story, telling of but four of the hundreds of industries and other business projects that FRANK BOYKIN has brought to the First District of Alabama, and which have resulted in the employment of thousands of men and women.

The industries referred to in Bob Albright's story, and now employing more than 2,000 men and women, are those of the Vanity Fair Mills—located at Monroeville, Demopolis, Jackson, and Atmore, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, at this very hour, there is still another huge industry in the making on the Tombigbee River and on the Southern Railroad, at McIntosh, in Washington County, Ala.—brought there, wholly and solely, through the efforts of Congressman FRANK W. BOYKIN. It is a new chemical plant, which will avail itself of the great deposits of salt unearthed at McIntosh by the Congressman.

The plant is to be constructed by the Mathieson Alabama Chemical Co., and will involve an initial expenditure of an excess of $10,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, again, FRANK BOYKIN creates still more opportunities for hundreds of his constituents and their families to enjoy higher and better standards of living, education, and life.

All hail to Congressman BOYKIN. May his shadow never grow less.

Recognizing, in common with all in this body, his integrity and unblemished honesty, in private dealings as well as in public service, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues of this House to extend my remarks, and insert into the RECORD of our proceedings, the story taken from the Washington Post of Sunday, March 11, and as reported by Robert C. Albright.

The article reads, as follows:

GALLERY GLIMPSES

(By Robert C. Albright)

Alabama's FRANK W. BOYKIN (Democrat) for years has risen before dawn, gone to his office around 4:30 a. m., and done his day's dictating into a machine. At least once, the "early bird" routine paid off in a big way. Here's the unbelievable story:

Leaving his office for coffee about 6:30 a. m. a few years back, BOYKIN saw a big, heavy-set fellow pacing up and down in front of an office across the hall.

"When will this Pennsylvania Congressman get in?" the stranger asked BOYKIN.

"I dunno," replied BOYKIN, "but come on out and have a cup of coffee with me."

The stranger introduced himself as Howard Smader, head of the Vanity Fair Mills, of Reading, Pa., specializing in women's smart clothes.

Over coffee, BOYKIN dwelt on the undeveloped glories of his Alabama district, the undiscovered mill sites, the dreamboat opportunities awaiting employer and labor alike.

Smader never went back to see the Pennsylvania Congressman. Instead, he sent scouts to BOYKIN's Tombigbee River. Within 2 years, he moved his first mill there from Pennsylvania.

Over the years he moved more of them, until today the thriving business operates almost entirely within BOYKIN's district, with plants at Monroeville, Demopolis, Jackson, and Atmore, Ala.

Who was the Pennsylvania Congressman?

"I'd rather not say," evades BOYKIN. "But it pays to get up early in the morning."

"The Nation That Controls the Air Will Control the Continents of the World"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I remember some prominent German Air Force general, noted for his skill and ability in aerial warfare, being quoted as saying: "The nation that controls the air will control the sea lanes of the world, will control the continents of the world; the nation that controls the air will control this world and dominate this world for the next hundred years."

Personally, I am disposed to feel as did that Germany military leader, and it is because of that fact that I was particularly interested in an article in the Washington Post of March 2, 1951, telling of a new type of jet plane which Secretary Thomas K. Finletter said "will even surpass our B–36."

Mr. Speaker, the more critical that world conditions become, the more I become convinced that not alone are American defenses primarily dependent upon the strength of our air power, supported, let us say, by land power, rather than by land power afforded so-called tactical air support. My good friend, the Honorable JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, gave voice to a truism when he stated, in the cloakroom, but a few days ago: "If we are to survive as a nation, we must recognize the fact that our military strength rests in an invincible Air Force."

It is only, in part, because of these things that I was pleased to note Secretary Finletter's statement that the Air Force is now going into the production of a new heavy bomber—a Boeing jet-engined B–52, as well as a radically different jet version of the B–36.

In the news account of the interview, Mr. Finletter went on to tell about the development of an even newer plane that is likewise going into immediate production. This plane, it is reported, will have a combat altitude in excess of 10 miles—and the first production models will be delivered in the current calendar year.

It is now universally agreed that were it not for our Air Force our ground troops would have been thrown out of Korea months ago. There remains no doubt whatever of the wonderful tactical support which our Air Force gave to the air-ground operations in Korea. In this support, the United States Air Force alone contributed, under the most adverse conditions, almost 100,000 flights or sorties.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have often said on the floor of this House, "Air power is truly peace power," and, certainly, the most economical way of defending our shores. The world is now convinced that the only thing which has contained the Russians, and thus far prevented world-wide global warfare, is the power of the United States Air Force and its ability to deliver the atom bomb. Stalin, Vishinski, Malik know, as well as does every other competent military and civilian head in Russia, that the United States Air Force has a hundred Russian cities marked for absolute annihilation if Russia ever so much as looses a single blast at the homeland of the U. S. A.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of its timeliness, and of the deep and continuing interest of the American people in the planning by our Air Force for the economic defense of this country, that I ask unanimous consent of this House to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD a news account of Secretary Finletter's statement entitled "Boeing's B-52 Global Bomber Ordered Built."

That article reads as follows:

BOEING'S B–52 GLOBAL BOMBER ORDERED BUILT—FINLETTER ALSO TELLS OF PLANS FOR NEW JET TYPE OF B–36

(By John G. Norris)

The Air Force is going into production with a new heavy bomber—Boeing's jet-engined B–52—and will build a radically different jet version of the B–36.

One or the other—or both—eventually will replace the present Convair B-36 as the backbone of the Nation's Strategic Air Command, relied upon to carry A-bombs from American homeland bases to any point on the globe, United States Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter said.

At the same time, Finletter announced that there no longer is any question about the ability of the United States to build an atomic-powered airplane. This determination, he pointed out, is a "development of the greatest importance."

Such craft, it is clear, would revolutionize air power, making it possible for aircraft to travel indefinitely without refueling. Finletter cautioned, however, that the conclusion that an atomic aircraft engine is feasible does not mean we'll have one flying soon.

The Atomic Energy Commission revealed last week that this project had entered a new phase, and it is expected that the aircraft-engine division of General Electric and Convair Aircraft will join in developing such a plane.

Finletter also announced that the Air Force pretty well decided to adopt the British Canberra jet bomber as its new light bomber and build it at the Glenn L. Martin plant in Baltimore.

Martin's three-engined jet B–51—rival of the Canberra in the light-bomber competition—will not be completely shelved, Finletter said. Development work will continue on it, for possible future production, he added.

Decision of the Air Force to place production orders now for the B–52 is a sound calculated risk, even though the craft has not yet flown, Finletter told reporters at a Pentagon briefing session. Two prototypes of the big B–52 are now building but are not expected to fly before fall. The production model B–52's will be constructed at Boeing's Seattle plant, the company announced.

He said the risk of financial loss through failure is well worth taking because the B–52 is really a considerably bigger B–47. The latter is the Air Force's new medium bomber, a high-speed comparatively short-range craft, considered the best in the world. It has been thoroughly tested and mass production is under way.

Both planes have swept-back wings and cigar-like fuselages. The B–52 is expected to have a speed well over 500 miles per hour, a combat altitude in excess of 55,000 feet, and a range somewhat short of the B–36's 10,000 miles. That will be the first version of the craft, which is expected to be equipped

with 8, as yet unannounced, Pratt & Whitney jet engines—the J-57, which it is hoped will develop about 10,000 pounds thrust.

Later, the Air Force plans to put turboprop engines in both the B-52 and the new B-36. Such engines—which harness jet power to propellers—give much greater range than present jets.

The new B-36 will be jet-powered and have swept-back wings. New versions of the present B-36's have six piston engines and four jet engines. The latter, however, are fo. take-off and emergency bursts of speed only.

First production models of the B-52 and the two prototypes of the all-jet B-36 will be delivered late this year, Finletter said. They'll be in competition and quantity orders of one or both will follow exhaustive tests. No short cut, such as is being taken with the B-52—ordering production before experimental versions are tested—is possible with the new B-36, he said.

The latter is entirely a new airplane, though probably it will be called a B-36, Finletter declared There'll be no cut-back on production of the present B 36, he explained.

Oil Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time to address the membership of this House and convey to them the strenuous opposition of my constituency to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the percentage depletion allowance granted to the oil industry, in computing Federal income taxes where such income is derived from the production of oil and gas.

My constituents are generally very much opposed to having any change made in the present system of taxing the oil industry. This is because most of them are either directly employed in the oil industry or they prosper by having this industry in their midst. As a result, I am sure I speak for my entire district when I say that we do not want Congress to do anything which will slow up the operations of the oil industry, particularly with respect to exploration activities which are so important to the future welfare of the industry.

In order to illustrate the importance of the oil industry in my district, I would like to call attention to the fact that in 1949 our crude oil production aggregated 102,000,000 barrels, or approximately 30 percent of the total production of the State of California. That production has substantially increased as of this time. In the Tenth Congressional District of California we have approximately 10,000 oil and gas wells. They are owned by over 450 different oil companies and operators. Many thousand people are participating owners in such companies. Several thousand persons are directly employed in the industry and many thousands more owe part or all of their support to oil operations.

I am sure that this Congress is already in possession of a vast amount of information on the subject of percentage depletion and that it would be presumptuous of me to go into technical details. On the other hand, I wish to speak generally with regard to the matter and to indicate to you why I am registering this protest in behalf of my district and the oil industry as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, as the result of my long acquaintance with oilmen, I find that incentive is an essential element in their operations. They will risk their capital, and insofar as they can borrow money, they will risk it too to finance their exploration activities. Four out of five wildcat wells drilled, as you know, turn out to be dry, but in spite of this chance of losing, oilmen consider the ultimate reward worth the risk. On the other hand, if they are to take all the risk and only receive a limited portion of the reward, their incentive is correspondingly reduced.

Financing oil operations is always a problem with most operators The uncertainty of finding oil is so great that financial institutions are reluctant to lend money on such ventures. As a result, the initial investment in a wildcat operation is usually the venture capital of an individual or a group of individuals. Without some reasonable assurance that this investment may be returned out of production, they are inclined to go slow. Thus, percentage depletion serves to add to the income of those who are successful in drilling a productive well and this provides capital for further exploration activity. I am confident that the industry as a whole spends much more for exploration and development of oil than the benefit it derives from the depletion allowance.

When I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee last year, I said, in part:

> It is with considerable interest that I note that the principal argument for reducing excise taxes is to encourage greater consumer interest in buying the product so taxed. It is curious that the administration would recommend an action which would discourage the production of oil in order to stimulate the consumption of the products of the other industries This amounts to robbing Peter to pay Paul, when the better way would be to give more serious consideration to reducing Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from a rather extensive tour of our Pacific coast and Western States. I find that the American workingman and his wife, both in and out of organized labor, are becoming aware of the realities of high Government taxation and political support through hand-outs of power and tax money to pressure groups. The accumulated evidence is now irrefutable and establishes past unconscionable political tactics against the interests of the average American working person employed in those industries where labor demogoguery and a controlled labor press are supposed to be able to turn over the vote.

Commencing during the last war, this administration aided and tolerated certain labor organizations to bargain across whole industries. That political tactic now operates in such industries as coal, steel, autos, household appliances, electrical appliances, clothing, and many others. Such increased labor costs when forced upon a whole industry are not paid by the employer, but, rather, are paid by the consumers, 90 percent of whom are other workingmen. The employers in such industries act as tribute collectors for such special treatment in organized labor, just as they act as tax collectors from workingmen to raise our national budget.

In these special industries workingmen now have a shorter workday, a shorter workweek, most of the so-called "fringe" benefits, and receive over three times as much as an hourly wage as is the minimum wage to employees in interstate commerce.

On January 25 this administration then froze those conditions. It is now estimated that such freeze may last for at least 10 years. These special industries are supposed to be those where a handful of labor leaders can turn over the vote. Two days after wages were frozen John L. Lewis put over an increase of about $1.70 per day in the coal fields. We are now advised that the Price Stabilizer is going to allow escalator clauses to increase wages for about 800,000 auto workers.

I know you gentlemen realize that there is no justification for a $16 per day minimum wage in the coal fields, plus about $1 50 per day in the retirement fund, when those wages are paid by other workingmen who buy automobiles, baby bottles, tricycles, and other necessities made through the consumption of coal.

The Ways and Means Committee is reconsidering this subject at the request of this administration, after having solved the same subject in favor of the general welfare of our country last year. To me, it is inconceivable that a nation living under antitrust laws for over 50 years should have tolerated the political tactics employed in special industries for the past 8 or 10 years. It is certainly impossible for me to believe that this Congress will now destroy the ability of the oil industry to both employ its present personnel, or do more for them, so that those employees, as consumers, can pay special tribute to employees of another industry. It is understandable that human beings heading labor movements should be joined together and act in collusion with politicians if they gain additional power by such action. However, why labor leaders of men working in utilities, whose wages cannot be raised without the consent of rate payers, are able to join in such tactics is beyond my understanding. Probably the answer is that the workingmen they represent have no effective secret ballot through which to put such leaders out of office. I submit, however, that this Congress might better consider authorizing such secret ballot to workingmen rather than spend time considering a proposition that is designed to destroy existing jobs for men in industry necessary for our defense.

I know this subject is now important to this Congress because coal miners who get a minimum salary of $17 per day are tax collectors from railroad brakemen who only receive $11 per day, even though they must spend $125 per month living away from their home. The coal miner is in a higher tax bracket and, as I have

pointed out, his wage differential is to be found in Ford automobiles and washing machines.

The request of the Secretary is in effect a statement by this administration that it is welching on the expressed intent of the Congress last year. Oil companies in the past have expended moneys borrowed on their future production in presently producing wells to drill dry holes. They relied on expressed congressional intention. Favorable action on the Secretary's request means deliberate fraud and deception. A change in the existing law so that marginal producing oil companies cannot do more for their employees when those employees are forced to pay the bill for this administration's political briberies in other industries is also a fraud against such employees.

This is the same subject which has been considered by this administration's advisers and who then very wisely said that it is the little man who will pay additional taxes. The little man will have to carry the major share of any tax increases, just as he will have to pay for the past industry-wide bargaining. This fact is brought out clearly by the testimony of Secretary Snyder before the Senate Finance Committee on August 2, 1950. It shows that the great bulk of income available for additional taxation lies in the low-income groups. He did not have the courage to say that we are going to collect taxes from the large corporations for pure demagoguery. He would not say that those people were to be made the tax-collection agent for Government and collect those taxes from the consumer.

The January report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers—Keyserling and company—speaking of the matter for higher taxes, said:

> By far the largest part of additional revenue must come from the middle and low tax brackets. These are the brackets in which the great bulk of income is located. Of the total net income shown on all taxable rates, 86 percent of the amount remaining after Federal income taxes is estimated to be received by taxpayers with net incomes of less than $10,000.

Gentlemen, this House will shortly be called upon to consider a budget involving about $2,800 for each family in America. As Lenin prophesied, we are spending ourselves into bankruptcy. If you will add to that figure about $700 for each family for State government, $500 for county government, and $300 for city government, I believe you will agree with me that the Members of both parties of this Congress must insist that the "gimme" domestic program costing a total of $30,000,000,000 per year must stop. This administration, whose Secretary of the Treasury proposed the destruction of the oil industry last year, has returned in an effort to obtain more money and demands that the Congress destroy that industry this year. Under such circumstances, we need no enemies abroad, the very ticking of the clock in marking off the hours will ruin us.

Mr. Speaker, if our Nation is to keep strong, both internally and with respect to defending ourselves against a possible enemy from without, we should not take any action which will deprive ourselves of an adequate oil supply in the years to come. In order to obtain $200,000,000 in additional Federal revenue from oil operators, are we not jeopardizing a multibillion-dollar investment in national defense?

It is my belief that we cannot afford to take this chance and that is why I urge the membership of this House to refrain from making any change in the percentage depletion allowance granted to the oil and gas industry, which is so important to my district and to the Nation.

I have heard it said that in the present budget the President has $1,000,000,000 that he can use in the national interest whenever he finds that private industry is no longer able in "know how" America to meet the needs of our domestic consumption. I am also advised that present arrangements are being made whereby in the long run the American taxpayer will stand the bill for the expansion of United States Steel to the extent of over $450,000,000 in new plants and comparable expenditures by other members of our steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, we in the West want to develop our own resources, through private industry and private enterprise. We believe that great oil fields of the West are still to be uncovered in eastern Washington and Oregon and other areas. We know from experience that as oil depletion allowance in the amount of that presently existing is needed to induce exploration to depths now exceeding 16,000 feet. We have many modern devices, but it is still the core bit 3 miles deep that tells us whether or not oil exists in a particular area. That knowledge is in the national interest and is vital to the war effort. The right to develop such resources, pay good wages, and build good schools is the birthright of the people of the West and other areas of the United States where such explorations might reasonably be made.

There is no need of repeating the words of our Supreme Court that the power to tax is the power to destroy. I know it must have been repeated many times in this House.

In closing, I merely want to point out to the membership of this House that you are not just considering increasing the amount of tax levied on an industry, as you have done year after year in this body to support unnecessary Government waste and spending. You are actually considering at this moment the destruction of private enterprise in a particular industry—oil.

Pulaski Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following speech I delivered on Pulaski Day at Ware, Mass, under the auspices of the Massachusetts Polish Congress:

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Father, distinguished guests, members of the various Polish-American organizations, and fellow citizens and friends of the radio audience, it is a high privilege, indeed, for me as your Representative in the Congress of the United States to join you in this most impressive celebration of Pulaski Day.

It is fitting that we should join together here this afternoon in such large numbers to pay our heartfelt tribute of respect and affection to such a great Polish patriot and such a great friend of our own country and also by our presence and declarations rededicate ourselves with high courage and unyielding resolution to the exalted principles and the lofty purposes by which he lived and died.

Let me heartily congratulate all those who are responsible for these noteworthy exercises There has never been a time in the history of our country when the need for stalwart Americanism, high ideals, and dauntless spirit was greater than it is today. Everywhere liberty is under challenge by ruthless dictators. Everywhere freedom is being assailed and attacked by power-crazed tyrants. Everywhere conspiracies are being carried out against democracy and justice and unless we move quickly in defense of our priceless free institutions, everything will be lost.

How inspiring it has been to me to observe the reactions of our Polish-American friends to the dangers of the present. On every hand through the Polish-American Congress, through many organizations of persons of Polish blood, through countless leaders, you have taken up the battle against totalitarian dictatorship and in defense of the principles of America.

I cannot find words adequately to compliment you upon the sterling patriotism and tireless unselfish devotion which you have displayed in fighting against the great menace of human slavery which is presently overshadowing the world. It has been a high privilege for me to have taken part in this campaign to preserve the American way of life and to redeem the cause of freedom throughout the world

Not long ago on the eleventh anniversary of the iniquitous attack upon Poland, I spoke in the House of Representatives to remind the American people of the tragic events which led up to the betrayal of Poland and to serve notice upon the Soviet Union that true Americans would not cease to agitate the sacred cause of Poland until Poland had again taken its place as a self-respecting member of the world community of nations.

We cannot possibly measure the unspeakable infamy by which the noble Polish people have become enslaved, the first in the then free world to feel the bitter sting of the tyrant's lash in World War II. At the time Poland was a brave, free nation embracing a peace-seeking, liberty-loving, devoted Christian people with the rich tradition of loyalty to human freedom. It was brutally assaulted by international brigands and racketeers who disregarded all the laws of God and man and broke all the express terms of existing and valid nonaggression treaties in order to encompass the liquidation of a democratic Poland and ruthlessly confine its people behind the iron curtain.

There was no color of legality to this shameful act. Poland at the time was a member in good standing of the League of Nations and a faithful ally of France and Great Britain. Her people had struggled long and sacrificed bitterly to establish their free government. Yet without provocation and without warning Hitler's bestial hordes attacked defenseless Poland on September 1, 1939, just as the Soviet-led, Moscow-directed

forces of North Korea attacked the helpless democratic minded people of South Korea about 3 months ago.

As I said in my speech on the floor of the House, the duplicity and treachery behind this savage attack on Poland constitutes one of the blackest pages in world history. As a result Poland was put on the carving block and cut up between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Instead of protesting and nullifying this unconscionable act as all decent-minded nations should have done, it was ratified and approved virtually in its entirety at the Yalta conference. Thus our own country became a party at least so far as the Russian Government and the rest of the world was concerned to the dismemberment of Poland and the enslavement of her people by the Soviets.

But I have taken the position, and I will continue inflexibly to take the position that this action which is deprecated by all real freedom-loving Americans never had the official sanction of this Government. It was a mere Executive agreement never ratified by the United States Senate As such it is illegal, unconstitutional, and not binding upon the United States No American official was authorized to agree to the shameful abandonment to a cruel enslavement by the Soviets of our warm friends, faithful allies, and noble people of Poland We must never cease our activities until we have canceled and annulled the provisions of that incredible and unconscionable document.

You are fully aware of the current world situation One great aggressor against freedom has been despatched by force of arms and in that glorious victory boys of Polish blood rendered a magnificent service second to none But has that fact stopped aggression in the world? It has not. Hitler is gone but a new and more widely spread and subtly organized aggressor lifts his ugly head and casts a cloud upon freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. Hitler has been liquidated but Stalin has taken his place preaching the gospel of hate against his fellowman and carrying the torch of rebellion, insurrection, and conspiracy to the far corners of the earth.

It is the everlasting credit and glory of the Polish people that they have never willingly surrendered their rights, they have never forfeited their freedom, they have never bowed to enslavement, they have never ceased their resistance to tyranny. To the contrary, this brave courageous people is still asserting the sovereignty of their nation, still working for liberation from Russian bondage, still ready to sacrifice to recover the liberties which were stolen away from them by a shameless perfidy and ruthless armed might. The united nation of Poland stands today before the whole world proclaiming its independence to all, reiterating its determination to strive and fight until its freedom has been regained.

We welcomed our Polish allies during the war, we are proud of their loyal unswerving allegiance to the ideals of democracy and freedom which we ourselves profess. We are grateful for their loyal support of our cause and for the association which we have had with them in fighting against the common enemies of freedom.

So today, in the name of that freedom, in the name of our American democracy, in the name of the justice of the living God whom we revere, in the name of our Nation, and in the name of every decent principle of civilized man, let us reiterate our loyalty to Poland and her sacred cause of liberty. Let us express our determination that she will soon be liberated from the oppressor and be restored to her place among free nations.

Let us renounce and reject once and forever the unconscionable agreements by which she was consigned to Soviet domination. On this great anniversary of one of her immortal heroes, let all true Americans rally to her side, encouraging her leaders and her sons and daughters who are still fighting to recapture their liberty, pledging our assistance to them in their struggle for independence, offering our friendship, our support, our help to them in this hour of their great trial.

And so, my friends, let us accept this mighty challenge that has been flung from the Kremlin against the very existence of the democratic way of life Let us maintain an armed strength here in our Nation that will keep our country secure and that will enable us through union with other freedom-loving nations in the United Nations and elsewhere to move speedily to the protection of democracy and freedom and justice and human liberty.

And may the day soon come, pray God, when peace may dawn upon this sorry world. When the evils of totalitarianism shall be removed forever. When Poland is freed from the chains of slavery and restored to her rightful status as a free and independent nation.

With courage in our hearts let us be rededicated today to the great and noble purposes of Pulaski and go forward fearlessly to establish a genuine lasting peace on this earth

Keep the Commandments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following sermon entitled "Keep the Commandments," which was delivered by The Reverend Vito C. Mazzone, pastor, St. Mary Magdalen DePazzi Church, Philadelphia, Pa., at the fifty-third annual communion high mass of DeSoto Council, No. 315, of the Knights of Columbus on Passion Sunday, March 11, 1951. The entire sermon, which was broadcast over radio station WJMJ, follows:

Today we are assembled in this church to render a public manifestation of faith and loyalty to God in return for the many benefits granted to us. With this attestation of faith we proclaim that we are the children of God and that we owe to Him homage and filial devotion.

Man is a rational, social, and political person. There are in human beings gifts, rights, and values which transcend political society and which exist neither by virtue of the state nor for the state, and which are outside the state.

The taproot of human personality is not society, but God, the ultimate end of man is not society, but God, the center where the person makes more and more perfect its very life is on the plans of eternal things.

The philosophy of Charles Marx, Hegels, Lenin—on which Russian communism is based, is materialistic, and therefore atheistic. It denies man's personality, man's rights. According to Communist doctrine man is pure matter, a mere cog in the machinery of the state. There is no difference between body and soul; no survival of the soul after death; no future life. The state is God and religion is called the opium of the people.

We are living today in an age in which the genius of evil is seeking to spread rebellion and hatred against God, His church, and His disciples. We are living in a world in which man considers himself a superman, forgetting that he is not his own creator, forgetting that he is not the result of evolution, forgetting that he is only the masterpiece of God's creation. We are living in an era of deicide and homicide, for man has denied both God and the most essential part of his own being, his soul.

While in godless Russia and her satellites, churches and Catholic buildings are confiscated or used for profane purposes—while bishops, priests, nuns, and Christians are murdered, exiled, or imprisoned—we must be thankful that we live in this great and blessed country. This country in which we live is destined by Divine Providence to save the whole world from the menace of communism, to bring to all men the blessing of freedom and independence.

It is true that in all Russia there is one Catholic priest, the Reverend Father Adomovich who is an American and resides in Moscow, through an agreement between the late President Roosevelt and the diabolical Joseph Stalin

But when you consider that this Catholic priest is not free to exercise his priestly office—he is always surrounded and watched by spies—he is not allowed to extend his apostolate publicly and to other people, but only to the personnel attached to foreign embassies, then you will understand that this is not freedom of religion and worship.

Yes, the Kremlin government recognizes the Orthodox Church. Do you know, my dear Catholic men, that this church is used for political purpose to spread its propaganda abroad and is the servant of the state and the head of this puppet church is a layman—George Karpov who is an atheist?

You, my dear people, are truly fortunate to possess the faith of our fathers. Faith in God, in Three Divine Persons, and in that church bequeathed to us by Christ, watered by the blood of the Divine Martyr, faith in that church which alone has the marks of unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity.

Be extremely proud, because the faith which is yours comes from Rome, the cradle of justice and civilization, the mother of heroes, martyrs, and saints.

In their wishful thinking the enemies of our religion imagine that the days of the church are numbered. Throughout the centuries, the Catholic Church has been calumniated and persecuted. However, she has emerged from each attack rejuvenated, more vigorous, and vitalizing than ever.

Man's life is fleeting, empires and kingdoms have passed, but the Catholic Church will not pass.

My dear friends, we are facing today the greatest foe of our time This is the fight between light and darkness, right and wrong; between Christ and the anti-Christ; between the true followers of Christ and the disciples of His eternal enemy, Satan. You are called upon to do your share in this bitter struggle. The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. You know who our foe is. He disguises himself as the benefactor of mankind; he teaches equality and man's welfare; he teaches that his philosophy can solve all social-economic problems. He is well trained, and while his tactics are changeable according to world conditions, his basic purposes are achieved by deceit and double-dealing, force, and violence, the enslavement of all people. The Communists are bold and skillful liars. The Kremlin-trained Communists are the professed enemy of God, nations, and the people. They are the enemies of God because they seek to destroy what is in the nature of every human being, the inalienable right of belief in God They are the enemies of nations because they endeavor to install a totalitarian government which would exercise ruthless control. They are the enemies of the people because they are trying to eliminate the family, man's rights, and even man's personality.

This is why you Catholic men today have a great mission to accomplish. The Communists constitute a minority, and yet we cannot help but admire them for what they are accomplishing. If even a minority of Christians, and particularly Catholic men, were as enthusiastic and fervent in spreading the doctrine of Christ as these Communists are in spreading the doctrine of Satan, the world would soon be living the teachings of Christ. Catholics and non-Catholics should be united not in the doctrinal but in the social field to combat and unmask the Communists who are today the greatest enemy of mankind. We must live the doctrine of Christ. In the shop, in the home, on the street, in the Government, in our recreation, we must be Christophers, Christ-bearers, bringing by our way of life, Christ into the lives of others. This will be accomplished by teaching and spreading, by our good example, the unchangeable and everlasting truths of our Divine Master.

It is up to us, my dear friends. Only the Ten Commandments, which are the unchangeable and eternal law of God can solve the problems of the world. While rulers, legislators, and diplomats are wasting time and money to find the way of solving these most important problems, the Ten Commandments are the only valid tenets, the only true road. Millions of laws have been made, and yet there is no peace in the world.

In conclusion, I would like to leave with you one thought: You will remember that when Christ was asked by the young man: "What shall I do to save my soul?" He gave a very brief answer. The answer which the Saviour gave contains in its entirety the information sought in the question, "How shall we find world peace?" That answer is, "Keep the Commandments."

Hint Kaiser-Frazer To Avoid RFC Quiz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James M. Haswell, from the Chicago Daily News of March 9, 1951:

HINT KAISER-FRAZER TO AVOID RFC QUIZ—DEFENSE WORK CHANGES PICTURE

(By James M. Haswell)

WASHINGTON--The RFC loans to the Kaiser-Frazer Corp., which started the Senate investigation of the Government's lending policy, probably are not going to be aired before the hearings conclude.

Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the inquiry, says such hearings would be "like beating a dead horse."

Times have changed, says FULBRIGHT. The loans that looked risky in 1949 now look safe in view of defense work coming up.

The auto industry expects to sell all the autos it can make in 1951, since dollars are cheap, metals are short, and the Government may put a quota on car production later in the year.

FULBRIGHT says the Kaisers are not involved in the influence aspects of the RFC investigation.

If hearings were held they would not show the Kaisers brought improper pressure on RFC directors, or invoked White House aid to gain favors from money-lending agencies.

Despite its determination to close the record without a public airing of the Kaiser-Frazer loans, the Senate committee is under great pressure to change its decision.

A group of former Kaiser-Frazer dealers is urging the Fulbright committee to open its book and show the public what it has learned in a year's investigation.

Late last summer a Kaiser-Frazer hearing was scheduled by the Fulbright committee. The committee staff had explored the details of the multimillion-dollar transactions, and was all set to make a record of the affair.

Before it could be held, however, President Truman sent to the Senate nominations of three new and two current RFC directors.

Acting under orders, the staff pushed aside other plans and launched into its influence inquiry.

And that's the odd story. The Fulbright committee has no present intention of making a public answer to the question it started out to investigate: Why did the RFC lend Kaiser-Frazer so much money?

Should the Steam Shovels Start Digging the St. Lawrence Seaway, There Will Be American Tax Dollars in Every Bucketful of Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be invited by Georgetown University to participate in a forum discussion on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, over the Liberty Network, radio station WARL, Washington, D. C., Sunday, March 11, 1951, at 1 p. m.

In opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence project I made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to participate in this forum discussion on the St. Lawrence seaway project because I am opposed to its construction.

My opposition to the construction of this economic monstrosity which has been before the American people since 1895 stems from the fact that it is as unsound today as in the past.

This subject has been before the Congress of the United States time and time again, and not once have its advocates been able to justify the investment necessary.

There is nothing new to the arguments of the proponents except that we are now told the seaway is needed to provide a submarine-safe passage for iron ore from Labrador to the Great Lakes.

The catch in this reasoning is that this Nation will have won or lost its security long before this project could be completed because it is the opinion of expert engineers that it will require from 5 to 7 years to complete its construction.

Meanwhile, money, material, and manpower urgently needed for mobilization would be diverted to a scheme that will ultimately benefit Canada more than the United States where only 15 percent of our population would receive any benefits.

There is nothing new about the hysteria each year for the St. Lawrence seaway except that something new is being continually added to the propaganda for its construction. As previously stated, the seaway project has been before Congress time and time again and each time it has been decisively rejected.

If one reads the hearings containing the arguments for and against the project, one will find that congressional rejection was based on the following reasons:

1. The St. Lawrence seaway's value as a transportation artery has been vastly overrated, mostly because it would be closed to navigation for at least 5 months or more each year when the St. Lawrence route is blocked by ice.

2. The proposed 27-foot channel would be too shallow for 91 percent of our own merchant vessels, while, on the other hand, foreign-flag ships which are smaller in size would enjoy a field day in dumping cheaply manufactured foreign products on the American market at the expense of the American wage earner

3. The Nation would lose by spending huge sums of money to establish a costly form of transportation on which could exist only because the burdened taxpayers would provide and support it, but which would nevertheless disrupt long-established and satisfactory commercial arrangements, would intensify transportation problems, would add to unemployment, and would cost the American taxpayers many more dollars than it would save them.

These are only a few of the reasons why Congress has rejected the flimsy arguments for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

During this critical period in world affairs with our country on the brink of world war III and with the American taxpayer paying about 35 cents out of every dollar earned for tax purposes, the advocates of the St. Lawrence project now come forth with the proposal that its construction is necessary to provide a secure route for steamships to bring in only 10,000,000 tons annually of iron ore from the Labrador-Quebec area as compared with our annual need of 100,000,000 tons.

The need for Labrador ores is based on the argument that such ores are indispensable to our own national security and defense because of an impending shortage of domestic high-grade ore principally from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota.

While there have been conflicting statements regarding the remaining deposits of ore in the Mesabi Range, the facts reveal that from 1917 to 1948 for every 12 tons of ore shipped, 7 tons of ore were added to the ore reserves of the Nation.

In the postwar period 1946–49, for every seven tons of high-grade ore mined, six tons were added to the reserves. In addition to this high-grade ore, huge deposits of taconite—a lower-grade ore—have been located in Minnesota.

According to my colleague, Congressman BLATNIK, he stated on February 22, 1951, before a congressional committee that "Taconite concentrate will compete favorably with direct-shipment open-pit ore."

In addition to the high- and low-grade ore reserves of the Mesabi Range, there exists on the north shore of Lake Superior at a site known as Steep Rock Lake, in Ontario, a source of high-grade ore that, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, may amount to no less than 1,000,000,000 tons. Transportation for this ore deposit is already available by utilizing existing railroad facilities from Steep Rock Lake to Port Arthur, where iron-ore vessels now plying the Great Lakes can carry it to its destination.

In addition to iron-ore deposits in Minnesota, both high and low grade, and the deposits in Ontario, we cannot ignore the huge deposits of ore in Venezuela and Chile that have started to arrive in this country this week. Today we have four principal sources of iron ore, all of them developed in the spirit of free enterprise with adequate transportation facilities available to transport the ore to the mills.

Back of the argument that the St. Lawrence seaway is necessary to transport ore

from the Labrador-Quebec area is the fact that a half dozen Midwest steel companies are promoting the Labrador-Quebec project and they see in the St. Lawrence seaway the opportunity to subsidize the transportation costs of bringing the ore to market Such a subsidy would affect the price of Labrador-Quebec ore and put it in competition with ore from other sources. In other words, six Midwest steel companies have invested in the Labrador-Quebec project and they are asking the American people, now burdened with high taxes, to finance the St Lawrence seaway so that they can get cheaper transportation rates

While these Midwest steel companies are feathering their own nests by asking for a subsidy from the American taxpayers, very little is being said of the over-all cost of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project We are being told that it is only going to cost the American taxpayers a half billion dollars, but let me leave this thought with you: Should the steam shovels start digging the St Lawrence seaway, there will be American tax dollars in every bucketful of earth, for this project, plus the necessary deepening of lake harbors and defending it, is expected to cost better than a billion dollars, with two-thirds of it to be sweated out of American taxpayers.

Worse still, a billion dollars is only the estimate of what the project will cost Bonneville Dam cost nearly twice as much as estimated, the Suez Canal cost 2½ times, and the Chicago drainage canal 3½ times as much as the engineer estimated. The original estimate of the Panama Canal was $160,000,000 dollars, but the total cost amounted to $375,000,000.

Finally the St. Lawrence seaway would cost annually millions more of tax dollars to operate and maintain it. So let's add it up—thousands of Americans would lose their jobs and the rest of us would face lifelong taxes that would reduce our already dwindling purchasing power due to high living costs

The average American citizen, in my opinion, is tired of being fooled with subsidy schemes and with high taxes. He will certainly be fooled if the St Lawrence seaway and power project should ever become a reality.

Our Best Air Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, Thursday evening's Washington Star carried an editorial which said, in part:.

It is reassuring to hear from Air Force Secretary Thomas K Finletter that the radar screen being built around the continental United States will be completed this year and that an effective Alaskan network will be operating in 1952

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force is to be congratulated on the rapidity with which they are completing the radar network and fence around the country, and particularly in getting the men trained and fitted to run its complex operation.

When one speaks of a radar outfit, it brings to mind some sort of light structural steel or other metal, mobile, radio-like tower surmounted by a scanning device. That description, however, does not apply to the radar system used now to discover planes traveling in the stratosphere and at supersonic speeds. The fact is that one single type of radar operating in the air defenses of this country now employs 1,300 different types and sizes of electronic tubes, weighs nearly 250 tons, and requires actual adjustments of its working parts down to one-thousandth of a microsecond, or, to express it another way, it is built to measure time and operate within a trillionth part of one second.

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing that could more clearly exhibit the degree of technical training and scientific abilities necessary to the operation of our Air Force than does this one-trillionth part of a second which enters into mathematical calculations that must be made in order to bring down enemy-operated airplanes through the use of a modern system of radar detection and range-finding.

The man in the Air Force uniform today must certainly have a basic education in many fields of science, and, in addition thereto, is being sent through highly specialized training schools in order to fight the costly, modern, scientific type of warfare that has evolved in these last two decades.

The Evening Star's editorial writer aptly observed:

Our best security against atomic attack from the sky is the development of retaliatory power formidable enough to make the Kremlin realize that it cannot hit at us without instantaneously exposing Russia to far more terrible counteraction. We are capable of that right now.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of that capability that the advocates of air power make so much sense; because the Russians know full well that air power is the only thing within our bag of tricks that can bring destruction to the heart of their Russian homeland, if ever she should give cause for general all-out global warfare.

It is the timeliness of this article, when we are concerned with the drafting of our youth, that causes me to direct this article to the attention of my colleagues.

In order that all may read the same, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD this editorial clipped from the Evening Star of last Thursday, March 8.

This reads as follows:

OUR BEST AIR SECURITY

It is reassuring to hear from Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter that the radar screen being built around the continental United States will be completed this year and that an effective Alaskan network will be operating in 1952. This means that the Nation will be in a much better position than it has been to cope with possible atomic bombing. But there is no reason for complacency. The simple but grim fact is that our country, if war comes, will almost certainly suffer from such attacks regardless of the elaborateness of our defenses.

Thus, although of vital importance, our radar screen can do no more than give an advance warning—a matter of minutes, not hours—of the approach of enemy bombers. After that, interceptor planes, antiaircraft artillery, and supersonic ground-to-air guided missiles (still in the process of development) would have to be depended upon to head off and destroy the attackers. Given enough such planes, artillery, and missiles, a heavy toll could be exacted of the enemy, but the chances are that many of the attacking craft would still reach their targets. Indeed, in the judgment of General Vandenberg—our Air Force Chief of Staff—we must base our calculations on the assumption that as much as 75 percent would be able to get through to our cities despite the best kind of radar screen and over-all defensive system that we can set up in the years immediately ahead.

But the same holds true for the Soviet Union. If its bombers struck at us, it would be at least equally vulnerable In the last analysis, therefore, our best security against atomic attack from the sky is the development of retaliatory power formidable enough to make the Kremlin realize that it cannot hit at us without instantaneously exposing Russia to far more terrible counteraction. We are capable of that right now In fact, as Dr. Vannevar Bush has just asserted, there is no question, as matters stand today, that we could literally destroy that country with our strategic Air Force. That is one of the key reasons why we can still hope to prevent another world war—a hope that will grow steadily stronger, as Dr Bush has said, if our aerial might is supplemented with good defensive ground forces in Western Europe.

Statement of Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, Executive Director of the Reserve Officers' Association, Before the House Armed Services Committee, February 28, 1951, Regarding H. R. 2811, Providing for Universal Military Service and Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the following statement by Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers' Association, before the House Armed Services Committee, February 28, 1951, regarding H. R. 2811, providing for universal military service and training:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Reserve Officers' Association deeply appreciates the opportunity of appearing before your committee in connection with the proposed legislation affecting the utilization of manpower.

The Reserve Officers' Association has consistently, year after year, maintained its belief in a system of universal military training. We have also consistently held to the type of military organization for this Nation which was enunciated by Gen. George C. Marshall in a circular published under his name on August 25, 1944, at which time he was Chief of Staff of the Army In this circular, General Marshall directed that the plans for a postwar peace establishment be "based upon the conception of a professional peace establishment (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen army reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace; with full opportunity for competent citizen soldiers to

acquire practical experience through temporary active service and to rise by successive steps to any rank for which they can definitely quality."

General Marshall stated in this circular that this was the type of military institution which President Washington proposed to the First Congress as one of the essential foundations of the new American Republic.

In order to effectively create this type of military institution, and in order that a proper level of security may be maintained under present world conditions, it is essential that there be a system evolved whereby young men of the Nation are given a thorough basic training and then assigned to the reserve components of the several services. Such a plan is provided in the bill now under consideration by this committee.

In reference to the bill now before you, namely, H. R. 2811, and with specific reference to the National Security Training Commission, we note that a change has been made from the concept of the commission in previous UMT bills in that the commission is placed on a per diem basis rather than on a full-time basis. Inasmuch as it is felt that the importance of this commission is such that it will require the full-time services of its members, we suggest that the per diem plan be deleted and that members be selected on a full-time basis

We note several deletions in the paragraph referring to the power given to the National Selective Training Commission, and strongly suggest that the wording of the Senate bill be used. H. R. 2811, for instance, states that "The National Security Training Commission is subject to the direction of the President and will establish policies with respect to the conduct of initial military training of members of the National Security Training Corps." We suggest the wording of the Senate bill which directs the National Security Training Commission to establish such policies and standards, etc., etc. The Senate version has these additional words which we strongly recommend be placed in H R. 2811: "Establish such policies and standards * * * as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

We are somewhat concerned in connection with the follow-through of an individual's service in the Reserve components after he has completed training, or has completed training and active duty service. The Reserve components are supposed to receive enlisted men today who have completed a 1-year enlistment, but these men are certainly not in evidence, and I have no doubt but that the reason they are not available to us is because there is no method of following them up to see that they carry out their obligation. This suggestion has been made—and we think it worthy of consideration—and that is that once an individual has completed his training, or training and service, and has become available for assignment to the Reserve components, that he be reported to his local board upon release from the service, and that the local board be charged with the keeping of records that would indicate whether the individual is or is not carrying out his obligations under the law. We are also concerned in reference to the possible penalty clause which would make the individual subject to the penalty as set forth in the present Selective Service Act in the event he fails to carry out his obligation to serve his total number of years in the Reserve components. If the present penalty clause does not cover this portion of his obligation, then we strongly recommend that the wording be changed to make it apply.

We have no particular quarrel in reference to the age when young men will be drafted, or with the period of time required for present-day service. We feel that this is a policy matter that can best be determined by the Congress of the United States based upon the over-all manpower needs of the Nation.

You can readily see from my previous remarks that we are in agreement with the basic concept of the proposed bill. We are concerned, however, with the fact that it appears to be necessary to maintain an active duty force of approximately 3,500,000.

We have no means of determining, and we must therefore accept the fact that an active duty strength of approximately 3,500,000 is required under present world conditions. But we do become alarmed when we listen to statements made by members of the Defense Department that this strength may have to be maintained for many years to come. This country cannot possibly stand the tremendous continued cost of maintaining large active duty forces year after year after year. We can think of nothing that Soviet Russia would like better than to have us wreck ourselves economically. If it is necessary to maintain a security level as represented by the 3,500,000 active duty force, we contend that it is possible to accomplish this security level by building up the effectiveness of the Reserve components to a point that would soon allow a substantial reduction of the active duty forces The cost of maintaining an active duty force is probably 10 times greater than that of maintaining a similar force in the Reserve components, and obviously any shifting of the security load from the active duty forces to the Reserve components would bring about substantial savings to the taxpayers of this Nation.

The terms of the proposed bill, taken together with the statement of Pentagon witnesses appearing before the Congress, indicate that it is the intention of eventually building up the effectiveness of the Reserve components. But this cannot start until individuals who are drafted will have completed their service and will have been transferred into the Reserve components. This means then, in general terms, that it will be approximately 2 years before any substantial amount of strength is added to the Reserve components.

Why is it necessary to wait these 2 years in order to start building up the effectiveness of the Reserve components? If we wait for 2 years to start, it will certainly be a year or more beyond that time before we can begin thinking in terms of reducing the active-duty forces and still maintain the required security level to meet world conditions. Every year that we wait in starting to build up the effectiveness of the Reserve components costs this country $35,000,000,000. We would like to see the start made now—not 2 years hence. It is true that there is a provision in the bill which would allow individuals to be released from service in order to accept enlistments in the Reserve components, but nowhere do we find this enunciated as a policy which would be put into effect without delay It may well be that this is a contemplated, but I again repeat that there appears to be too much emphasis upon maintaining and supporting this tremendous peacetime establishment over many years to come, rather than a maximum effort to work out a plan of maintaining a security level by the utilization of effective Reserve components now in order that this country and the people of this Nation will not be burdened with overpowering taxes.

We in the Reserve Officers Association much prefer to accept into the Reserves only those men who had received a basic training. This is the only way in which the Reserves can be made truly effective. We had hoped that it might be possible to create a plan whereby a certain percentage of the individuals who were drafted and who had been given their basic training could be released to the Reserve component units, thereby eliminating the 2-year wait.

Under present conditions, with a substantial proportion of the Reserve components on active duty and making up a fair share of the 3,500,000 active-duty force, we find ourselves in the position for the next year and a half to 2 years of having substantially depleted our Reserve forces. We feel rather strongly that during this period of time, when the Reserve forces are being utilized in building up the active-duty force, that when units are ordered to active duty they should be replaced in number, consistent, of course, with over-all mobilization requirements. Officers exist in the Volunteer Reserve that could be utilized for this purpose, and if some plan could be worked out that would start assigning men to Reserve components immediately after basic training was completed, such a plan would be possible. It is realized that this would require the drafting of additional men in this first 2-year period, but if the situation is serious enough to call for the maintenance of this size active-duty force, then it certainly must be serious enough to make us consider without delay the raising of the present effectiveness of our Reserve components, be they National Guard or the Reserves of the several services.

We are not taken into the confidence of the Department of Defense or the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air, in connection with the over-all considerations that would prompt the creating of a large active duty force for an indeterminate number of years. We are therefore unable to dispute the wisdom of such a move. We cannot then in good conscience advise against the passage of the bill under consideration, as it is a basic bill and does provide the means whereby those things which we feel should be done could be done. What we are concerned about, and what we feel sure must be in the minds of many of you, as well as people throughout this Nation, is the fact that there appears to be no direct evidence that the military are bending every possible effort to develop ways and means whereby a security level may be maintained by immediately building up the present effectiveness of the Reserve components, thereby making it possible to consider reducing the large contemplated active-duty force.

For years the Reserve Officers' Association has been very much concerned with the lack of proper implementation of Reserve programs of the several services, because these programs, with few exceptions, have not created effective Reserve component forces. New plans will soon be forthcoming from the Department of Defense which should present a more effectual picture than has existed in the past. These plans, however, must still be properly implemented, and we feel certain that you gentlemen of the House Armed Services Committee feel as keenly as we do about the necessity of such a proper implementation and will therefore take such steps as may be within your power to see that it is done.

On behalf of the Reserve officers of the Army, Navy, Air, Marines, and Coast Guard, I thank you for allowing us to present our views.

"Why Our Country Is Great" and "The Challenge That Confronts Us"—By A. M. Piper

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa, has been

known far and wide over a period of many years for his down to earth, clear concept of our God-given American way of life, what has made America great, and what needs be done to keep it blessed in greatness, goodness, and freedom. The Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge on March 4 awarded a well-deserved certificate of merit to Mr. Piper on two of his editorials which appeared in the Council Bluffs Nonpareil on August 6 and October 9, 1950, and which I here insert, along with my sincere congratulations to my good friend, Mr. A. M. Piper, for his good works.

[From the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of August 6, 1950]

THE CHALLENGE THAT CONFRONTS US

"It is a great time to be alive," Harry Emerson Fosdick declared in a sermon during the First World War

A majority of Americans agreed with him. They were confronted with a challenge which called for the best that was in them, and they met it in a spirit of sacrifice

There were exceptions, of course, but most people were ready and willing to consecrate their all to God and country Few grumbled or complained Nearly everybody was enthusiastic, confident, ready to volunteer for service.

In times of crisis people are driven to prayer, the power line that connects with the wisdom and powers of the Infinite

It was so during both of our world wars, and it will be so again if we are dragged into a third

But the American people no longer have the enthusiasm and confidence with which they were imbued in 1917 and 1918.

There is a feeling that we have been betrayed, that we have lost our way in the quest for peace. More and more people are wondering why God permits such terrible things to happen in His world

When we stop to think we are constrained to admit that God is not to blame, that as free moral agents, we are responsible for the evil as well as the good in human relations

But this realization does not solve our problems Instead, it leaves most people more confused than ever So many great plans have been formulated to make the world better and so many have failed that discouragement is widespread We are inclined to throw up our hands and say, "What's the use?"

Such an attitude gives the enemies of Christianity their great opportunity. A Communist is reported to have said, "Yes, you have your Christ but we shall win in the end because we are putting in all we have and are willing to sacrifice You who call yourselves Christians are no longer willing to do so"

Our Nation became great because so many Americans had faith in God and were willing to back up their faith with sacrifices.

In war and in peace they put their country ahead of everything except their God.

We have lost some of the religion and some of the patriotism that inspired our forefathers to build the Nation in which we live.

But it is not too late to correct our mistakes and overcome our shortcomings. If we put God and country ahead of our own selfish interests, the opportunities that have been ours will be available to those who come after us

---

[From the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of October 9, 1950]

WHY OUR COUNTRY IS GREAT

If the United States is to maintain leadership in the battle to preserve a free world, we must regain our belief in our immortal destiny, the Right Reverend Austin Pardue, bishop of Pittsburgh, said recently.

The materialism of our generation, he declared, is bringing about the destruction of our most powerful motive force. The best remaining forces in America today are those inspired by the faith of our fathers.

There is a popular notion that the United States has become rich solely because with the great national resources available, we couldn't help it

If that were true, many other countries rich in natural resources, would be further along than we are.

America is great because something different took place in our country.

The founders of our Republic, as a people, were convinced that they came to this country because God led them here. They put their faith in the Christian idea that man, under God, should be his own master.

They maintained that he is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. The securing of these rights is what they meant by freedom

The church and the social order were not set against each other in the United States To the contrary, the social order was fashioned to express the belief, preached by the church, of man's importance and his unlimited capacities.

Our forefathers had the one quality most necessary for the upbuilding and preservation of a nation—a belief that they were part of God's plan and that nothing could overcome their destiny.

They prayed with an utter simplicity of faith and never doubted that God would see them through their apparently unconquerable difficulties

He did A Constitution was adopted which gave us the best Government in the world. Then came prosperity unparalleled in the history of the world.

The economic promise of our resources has been realized because free men, in our free system, have developed them. Our economic prosperity is not merely a vindication of our system. It is a vindication of Christianity.

The trouble with us today is that trust in education and in material prosperity is taking the place of trust in God. That is why we are bewildered and confused as we move from one crisis to another.

If we are to maintain our leadership in the world, if our Nation is to endure, Bishop Pardue asserted, three basic beliefs must be preached and practiced:

"That God Himself destined this Nation to provide a way of life that would give the greatest good to the greatest number. That the Bible is the revealed word of God and that his supernatural power is with us. That each of us is immortal and that we must face a day of judgment when we shall be required to make adjustments of the suffering we have caused or idly stood by and permitted."

Our forefathers held these beliefs and practiced them We must follow their example if we expect to preserve the way of life we enjoy, and pass it on to our children.

Total Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of United States News and World Report there is an article that deserves the widest possible circulation. The article is entitled "The Growing United States Air Force" and is an interview with Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force. The article impressed me because I find Mr. Finletter's point of view to be quite similar to my own. What Secretary Finletter believes in primarily is air power—and in his own words "this includes the carrier air and the Marine air as well as the Air Force."

Secretary Finletter's answers to the questions put to him by the representative of United States News and World Report are as revealing of the Secretary as of the state of the Air Force. Secretary Finletter is no narrow-minded partisan of one service or one kind of air power. In answer to a query about carrier air and the Navy, Secretary Finletter made it crystal clear that in his opinion carrier air must remain in the Navy. "I think," he said to his questioner, "that what you are intimating is a one-service, one-uniform setup, and I should personally regret that, because I think the specialization function and the morale factor and all that is absolutely essential, to say nothing of the effectiveness of effort. It looks awfully nice on paper, one service, but I'm not for it."

It is equally apparent that Secretary Finletter believes in total air power, though he places emphasis on strategic air power because it is through strategic air power that the atom bomb can be used to strike at the enemy's heart. Secretary Finletter's remarks about strategic air represent the core of his interview, and furnish the truest measure of the man. Of this violent and destructive weapon he says:

Politically, strategic air is the thing which has the real possibility * * * of making an enemy think before he hits us, and thereby of giving us a breathing spell by which we may be able to work out some way of not destroying ourselves in a third world war That's the political side of the thing, and I want to emphasize that very strongly.

Its a peculiar business, gentlemen, to be spending your time working with such a horribly destructive operation, and I can't tell you how destructive it can be both ways. But the only thing that makes it bearable is the fact that it may be the one thing which will take this terribly serious international situation that we have, and provide the stimulus which may make men really get together and use their brains and not destroy each other.

Mr. Speaker, I think Secretary Finletter appreciates, as do other responsible leaders, that air power must grow apace with the Army and Navy and in partnership with the Army and Navy. It is most encouraging to find the evidence provided by this article of the leadership Secretary Finletter is bringing to the solution of the problems of the Air Force.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, the Growing Air Force, by Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, from the March 2, 1951, issue of United States News and World Report.

The article is as follows:

THE GROWING UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

(An interview with Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force)

Question. What kind of job, Mr. Secretary, has the Air Force done in Korea?

Answer. I would much prefer to answer in terms of air power, and to talk about what

the Navy and the Marine air did as well as what the Air Force did. But I will answer it strictly on the Air Force, since that's the way the question was put.

What did we have in the Korean area when the North Koreans attacked? We had a lot of planes whose purpose was to defend the island of Japan against attack, and specifically against airborne attack. They were therefore interceptor planes, calculated for air defense The same thing, by the way, was true of the Army troops. These ground troops were troops of occupation—they weren't intended for a campaign in Korea. The airplanes of the Air Force were the F-80's, which is an interceptor, and World War II F-51's, which are very good piston-engine fighters. The result had to be an improvisation. So that's the first point which was difficult.

Now the second point was favorable, and that was chance—that there wasn't any effective air enemy opposition so we didn't have to worry too much about air superiority—there wasn't any major problem The severity of the ground attack against us in the early days was such that almost the entire Air Force effort went into close support of the Ground Forces. Army leaders have had the highest praise for what was done in this connection. After a visit to Korea in September, General Collins (Army Chief of Staff) said: "Like the Army, the Air Force had to switch from peace to wartime operation overnight Gen. Walton Walker testifies that, but for what the fliers did those first few days, we would have lost Korea."

Question. Was the job of interdiction reasonably well done?

Answer. We sent out a commission to Korea under President Stearns of the University of Denver and asked him to look into the thing, and all I can tell you is that the answer that we got back from him seemed to indicate that on the whole there was a good job done. I may tell you that his report said more than that. His report said there was an extremely good job done. But I would limit myself for the present to the proposition that the job was well done.

The question arises: Why then didn't the air stop the North Koreans completely and the Chinese completely? To which the answer is, gentlemen, that probably not even a 100-percent perfect job of interdiction can do that, immediately—the efforts are cumulative. You can't expect the air to prevent absolutely everything from getting to the front lines.

Question But an awful lot did get through?

Answer. Comparatively little. When you stop to think of it, if you meet someone who claims that the air can prohibit everything from getting through, then you're talking to the uninformed, because it is just about impossible. How can you possibly expect to stop people infiltrating at night down through rice-paddy country?

Question. You might stop their railroads——

Answer. Well, we did knock the dickens out of the railroads—but, even with that, you can't stop every single piece of line. They would run the track up to a certain point, we'd knock out the bridge and then they would carry the things on coolies across the place—you can't knock all that out. All I can tell you is that anybody who expects the air—and I'm going now to shift from the Air Force to air power—anybody who expects air power—and this includes the carrier air and Marine air as well as the Air Force—to be able to stop everything from getting to the front line is simply posing an impossible problem. Nobody ever supposed any such thing could be done, and the question is unanswerable because it isn't within the framework of common sense.

Now, as far as the close-support job goes, it's a highly technical question. I can tell you that a good job was done on close support under the circumstances, and with the number of planes available.

Question. But isn't it said that the Army and the Air Force haven't been working together?

Answer. I don't agree with that at all. Perhaps, initially, there was something to be asked. After all, how could you expect the Army and Air Force, trained for defensive work against invasion of Japan, to have trained together for a job that they never were expected to do? Today, however, support of Ground Forces by the Air Force has been—in General Vandenberg's (Air Force Chief of Staff) words—"magnificent."

Question But weren't the Marines pretty well trained?

Answer. Well, of course the Marines were trained because they were trained for that kind of job.

Question. Why couldn't the Army have been trained?

Answer. Because this was a force which was out there for primarily a different purpose

Question But isn't it being assumed that they should have been out practicing—that they shouldn't have been idle——

Answer. General MacArthur had them there as occupational troops and they were performing occupational duties. However, there was some joint training.

Question It sounds like the official answer, doesn't it?

Answer. I'm not giving the official answer—I'm just talking about this thing sensibly, I am perfectly willing to examine any possible complaint. And maybe these troops and air which were intended to be interceptors should have been trained more as close-support fighters—I don't know.

CHINESE AS BETTER TARGETS

Question. But doesn't it look now as if they are working out well? In the last few weeks haven't they been devastating the enemy, apparently——

Answer. I think that's for another reason. I think what's happened is that the Chinese lines of communication have gotten extended—interdiction is really showing its effect—and they weren't as adept—the Chinese weren't—at fighting in the hills as the North Koreans were, and they've been better targets.

Question. But there has been improvement?

Answer. Yes, they have improved, but—of course they've improved in the course of battle. But I don't want to give the impression that this problem is anywhere near solved as a general matter—it isn't.

Question. The Air Force and the Army are working closely together?

Answer. Yes.

Question. They are two different services and yet they are integrated in that field?

Answer. Well, they are certainly doing their best to work together.

Question. And is there no feeling between the services that would keep them from working together?

Answer. No, on the contrary—I really think it's just the opposite. I can only report on what I've seen.

EMPHASIS ON TACTICAL AIR

Question. Could you tell us how the tactical air would work as it's being revised?

Answer. Well, the tactical air command is one of three Air Force commands out in front.

Question. On the ground, how would it tend to improve the efficiency?

Answer. Well, it would—you mean how would it operate in the training?

Question. How would it change the present system by setting up a separate command—what would the practical results be?

Answer. Oh, the only effect is to place more emphasis on tactical air by making it a major command, which we did last December.

Question. Operations in the field are not affected, then?

Answer. Not in the slightest.

Question. Would it be a good idea to put the Marine tactical air force under this command—just have one tactical air force?

Answer. I don't think so. It seems to me that the Marines are a separate unit with a separate function, which is a rather specialized one, and the thing has worked extremely well when you look at the history and record of the Marines. I don't see why, when something has worked as well as that, that you don't leave it alone. Now the Marine operation is one which is to a large extent amphibious in its nature, and it's a unitary operation. It assumes that the air superiority is there, presumably from the carriers And the Marines are a specialized operation which has demonstrated its success with a magnificent record.

Question. Why wouldn't it be a good idea for the Army to have its tactical air right along with groun troops in the Army rather than the Air Force?

Answer. That is the situation which existed up to the time of the Kasserine Pass, if you will remember. And it's a conceivable way of operating, but it has this one difficulty, and that is that it doesn't provide for a unified control over the fighter planes available so that they can get the command of the air.

Because if you, say, have allocated one group for a division, and you have, let's say, 10 divisions at any one point—that would be very good for the close-support function. But it wouldn't work for the interdiction function, because the interdiction targets might not be right in front and nicely distributed along the line. And it would be extremely bad for the air-superiority function, because all the enemy would have to do would be to come in and knock one of our groups off at one end and then switch all its power over and knock one off on the other end.

And that is a theory which I don't think anybody seriously advocates any more, because that would almost insure air superiority to the enemy, and of course, as you know, that is the situation which was such a failure at the Kasserine Pass and was changed by General Eisenhower thereafter. I have never heard anybody suggest it since.

JET FIGHTER-BOMBER IN KOREA

Question Does the Air Force now have fighter-bombers or other tactical units in Korea?

Answer. Yes; we have the F-84, which is a fighter-bomber, and it's got good range and good attacking power, and it has been doing quite well out there.

Question And that is a jet?

Answer. That's a jet.

Question The British keep insisting that our jets aren't as good as the Russians'. Is there any basis for that?

Answer. Do the British say that?

Question. Didn't some British magazine say that?

Answer. The facts are, I think, that you are speaking of the MIG-15, which is the only Red jet plane which has been used in Korea, and it is superior in speed to our F 80, our oldest operational jet. But it is not superior to our F-86, and, of course, it's a different kind of plane from our F-84. The MIG-15 is an interceptor, and our F-84 is a fighter-bomber, and they are different kinds of planes. I am not too worried about rumors that their jets are superior. I do think, however, it is worth while pointing out that the MIG-15 is an extremely good plane, and I think it ought to be a lesson to us to stop this theory that nobody else can do these things except us.

Question. Is that Red jet a model of a British plane?

Answer. Oh, no.

Question Do the MIG-15's all have Chinese pilots?

Answer. That we don't know.

Question. How good are the MIG pilots, would you say?

Answer. From the people I've asked, the general answer is that they are extremely good fliers, and the news we've had from Korea, in general, has been that they were excellent fliers—fly well in formation, get off the ground well, scramble well and in general there is a respect on the part of our people for their performance.

Question. Do you foresee a time when we will need two sets of fighters, one for interception and one for ground support?

Answer. That might very well be if resources were unlimited. That's what you do have, in a sense, in one part of our air power. The Navy's carrier air is the air which does get control of the air, presumably, and the close support, Marine air is the one which does the close support To a certain extent there you do have that specialization of function. And a very good thing it is for that operation

Question Does the Air Force now accept the need for carriers?

Answer. They have never contested it.

Question. Wasn't there some argument about it?

Answer No.

Question. The Air Force never did raise that?

Answer No; not that I know of. I think what you are referring to is the question as to who should carry on the strategic air—the B-36 investigation some time ago. But our position on that is quite simple—and that is that matters of interservice rivalry (which, incidentally, is a very good thing—it keeps everybody on their toes) must not be allowed to interfere with what is the best for the over-all effort. And our attitude is that in the strategic air we have the main responsibility pinned on us, but, to the extent that the carrier air can participate in that, obviously, we are all for it, because we want the maximum effort—quick and effective.

Question. So if carriers could carry planes that would deliver the atom bomb, there would be a place for them?

Answer. That's right

Question Should it be under the over-all direction of some higher command?

Answer I hadn't thought about the command question, but I don't see any reason why the two services can't operate side by side.

NEED FOR CARRIERS

Question Should carrier air remain under the Navy or is there any feeling that it should be—that all of our air should be—under one command?

Answer. I don't think so. It would seem to me that you've got to have the carrier air in the Navy.

I think that what you are intimating is a one-service, one-uniform set-up, and I should personally regret that, because I think the specialization function and the morale factor and all that is absolutely essential, to say nothing of the effectiveness of effort. It looks awfully nice on paper, one service, but I'm not for it

Question There is no question that the Navy can carry the atom bomb?

Answer. I'm sure they can

Question You told us, Mr. Secretary, about the planes for interception Can you tell us what the principal fighter types will be this time for escort of the bombers?

Answer. Well, for any escort operation we would obviously want a long-range, fast plane. And the F-84 is that.

Question. And can you tell us anything about the range of the F-84? In other words, what kind of escort operations can we provide? This was one of the great problems in the Second World War. Have we gotten longer legs for our fighter planes since the war?

Answer. Yes; the fighters are getting longer legged all the time, and also there are refueling techniques which will add to their range, and other methods are being studied which will increase the range of the escorts.

Question. Maybe the techniques won't be the same in another war.

Answer That's right.

JETS' RANGE EXTENDED

Question Can we escort our bombers to Russia from the bases that we have?

Answer. All I can say on that is that the escort problem is one that is being studied, and that the ranges involved now create difficulties which were not existent in World War II, and that requires new techniques, and we are working on those new techniques, and the only thing I can say so far about them is that the range of the modern jet fighter has already been extended by fuel-conservation techniques and other improvements

In this connection, I want to repeat the obvious fact that the jet engine is in a sharp evolution, unlike the airplane, which is a slow development. The curve of improvement in jet engines is drastic—where we were talking in terms of 2,000 pounds we are now talking in terms of several times that.

Question Can the F-84 be used as escort for, say, B-36's, which must be considerably slower?

Answer Oh, the speed factor can be taken care of. All these jets can slow up

Question. Who is going to make the jet engine? Is there a tendency to concentrate in the air industry itself, or are you attempting to go out and create new sources?

Answer. As you know, the major piston manufacturers were so busy in World War II that as the jet was being developed they couldn't get in on the business, so it went to Westinghouse and General Electric and General Motors. Now, however, the jet engine is made generally in the engine industry.

Question. Are you going to depend upon the established producers?

Answer. In part, yes. In general, both for engines and for airplanes, we want to spread the mobilization base.

The theory we are following is to broaden the base of production to:

First, have an aircraft-production capability for doubling production should full mobilization come

Second, get multiple sources of supply geographically separated and,

Third, to take up civilian slack to reduce unemployment and labor dislocation

Question. Are you bringing new producers into the engine field?

Answer Yes. Packard, Studebaker, Chevrolet, Buick, Ford, and others.

Question Isn't the aircraft industry itself somewhat concerned? Don't they feel that outsiders are getting into a business that is their business?

Answer. I would like to make one point about that, as a matter of policy, and that is this. If we do, for example, take some item made by company A, and we ask them to license company B to make the item, we intend to see to it that product remains an A product—in other words, that the original developer of the airplane gets the full credit for it, that it remains his machine and that everything is done to preserve his prestige in having created this accepted article.

Of course, an argument is made against that sometimes on the theory that the American taxpayer pays for the development of this by A and therefore A has no proprietary right in it, and therefore that there is no reason why the Government shouldn't pass that right out to B and C. The Air Force doesn't agree with that. The Air Force thinks that although it is true that the cost of development has been borne by the Government, we want to see to it that the fellow that really develops the machine gets the credit.

Question. Wouldn't he rather expand and fill the whole order than see someone else licensed?

Answer. That's right. And that's where we run counter to him because his interests run counter to ours. We don't want to create a condition where we can't expand rapidly, and we, therefore, want, as I said before, to have a base which is not jammed up with three shifts a day and hasn't absorbed all of its machine tools.

Question Will it be decentralized pretty much—it won't be concentrated?

Answer. No. It will not be concentrated in any one place.

Question. Are you planning to remove any plants from what might become a dangerous area?

Answer. We have no plans on that; no.

NO LABOR-MATERIAL DELAY

Question. Mr. Secretary, are any of your projects held up now for lack of labor and materials?

Answer. I know of none

Question. Are you expanding your production quite rapidly?

Answer. Oh, yes

Question. Will the 50,000-plane goal be reached?

Answer. That figure was not a figure of production; it was a figure of capacity. And, in general, the capacity to produce at that rate in all of the services is a feasibility, but only if we do what I am saying now. There is no present plan to produce 50,000 planes.

Question. Are you planning on any new factories?

Answer Under present plans, there will be no new factories built by the Air Force because we have two sources which we can tap. The first is the existing factories doing other kinds of business which are not fully occupied, and, secondly, other factories on which we have a recapture clause or which are owned by us and are not being used.

Question Is your program going to force the automobile industry to make fewer cars in order to go into the airplane business?

Answer No; our business won't do that—the natural course of events may, or other economic factors. And if they do, we will take advantage of that unused capacity in all probability.

Question. Do you expect any difficulty in manning a 95-wing air force?

Answer. No. We do not. We expect an organic difficulty by reason of the very rapid growth of the force. The force is now being built up to 971,000, and the target date is the middle of this calendar year, which is, roughly speaking, 1 year ahead of the attainment of the matériel aspects of the 95-wing program. And that's a tremendously rapid build-up, and therefore produces difficulties, hardships, and so on.

Question Do you think that is going to be a permanent strain?

Answer. The only thing I am sure of is that international conditions are not going to remain static. I think that they are going to get worse or get better. Of course if they get worse that figure is going to increase substantially if we have to go substantially above that. But I think that even if conditions get better, it is not, I regret to say, to be anticipated that they will get so much better that we can afford to diminish the air power and the military power which we now have. I am inclined to think that that figure will be compressed a little by efficiencies, but I think that the demands will probably make it increase.

Question. Is there a pilot shortage?

Answer. No; not at the moment. In general, we are able to keep our personnel situation up with our matériel situation. There

is no problem of getting airplanes that can't be flown or can't be maintained. And what we are doing is: We are aiming our personnel build-up toward mid-1951, and our matériel build-up toward mid-1952.

RAPID GROWTH AHEAD

Question. Is the Air Force on the verge of a rapid growth? Are we really set to go?

Answer Yes; we are on the verge of a rapid growth. We started out the fiscal year with about 48 "wings" [groups] with a budget of around $4,000,000,000. Now we've got a budget of around fourteen billion. That doesn't mean to say we're going to have three and one-half times as many "wings" within a year. And the reason is that it takes time to build planes and to form "wings."

Question What is our goal?

Answer As soon as possible—which will run well into the latter part of 1952, and that's optimistic—we are aiming to have 95 "wings."

Question. How many "wings" did we have in World War II?

Answer It was slightly more than 240.

Question. Were they comparable in size?

Answer. Yes, they are comparable in size, but as far as the fire power goes there is all the difference in the world You take the striking power of a group of B-36's or B-47's as compared with B-17's, which was the biggest plane we used in bombardment in Europe, and the increase is just terrific. And the present-day horsepower is up, too. For example, you take a B-47 with six jet engines—you've got a real increase. At high speeds, the added power is something unbelievable—to say nothing of the weapons they carry.

Question. The weapons are bigger?

Answer The weapons are geometrically more powerful.

Question. What was the horsepower in the last war?

Answer. The horsepower of a B-17 in World War II was 4,800.

COMPARISON WITH WORLD WAR II

Question. With those 95 "wings" we now plan, would we be anywhere near World War II, so far as striking power is concerned?

Answer. You can't make a comparison because the element of atomic power is present. Let's put it this way: You've got three main fighting commands in the Air Force—you've got air defense, you've got tactical air, and you've got strategic air. Now everything feeds up to them. That's your end product, as it were. The production back of that and, of course, the transport, the training, proving grounds, research—everything else feeds up to those three things out in front. Now therefore, if you want to figure out how you stand in terms of power on those, you've got to look at how each of those is going to be developed.

You take air defense, for example. It's entirely new, not comparable to what it was before, because it is air defense of this country against possible atomic attack.

Question. How good is our air defense?

Answer. Well, it's fairly good. We are aiming to create the best conventional air-defense system we can—that's our present objective—and to then go on and see how we can improve on it in unconventional terms.

Now by "conventional" I mean that air defense is simply the old job of radar, interceptor planes, and antiaircraft guns—the same kind of thing that you had in World War II It's nothing new, but there is considerable improvement in the radar, and in the antiaircraft and, of course, in the interceptors, but it's still the same old thing, and the same rules apply to it, and you're going to knock down only part of the enemy bombers.

And the difference in the rules of the game now is that this time they may be bombers carrying atomic bombs. In World War II if you could knock down 5 percent of an attacking force you could put the enemy's air out of business pretty quickly. They couldn't take it. For example, in the Battle of Britain the rate was 8 percent, and that was something that the Luftwaffe couldn't take and they lost the Battle of Britain on 8 percent. But how good is 8 percent when 92 percent of atomic bombs come through? Obviously that's a very bad situation, and, good as the conventional air-defense system is going to be, it's never going to be enough to protect the United States against atomic attack.

Question. What do you mean by "unconventional"?

Answer. What I mean by that is that science may develop new types of ways of knocking down enemy bombers. The obvious one is the guided missile. And, as you know, some people place great reliance on the guided missile, and we do know that we are going to have ground-to-air guided missiles at some time which will be capable of vastly increasing the power of defense.

But I think that those who rely on the increase of defensive power are leaving out of consideration one general fact, and that is that the offensive power of the guided missile will grow with its defensive capabilities, and the problems of this are, in the main, two—first of all, the question of power, and secondly the question of guidance, for when you get the guidance and power to make a good defensive missile, you get the guidance and power to increase the power of the offensive missile.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you say anything about the production effort on guided missiles? Is there anything to indicate the scale of that effort?

Answer. I think in general you can say that that is a rapidly developing field which has not yet gotten very seriously into the production aspects and will not get there for a short period.

Question. Do you think the guided missile will take the place of the piloted plane very soon?

Answer. Not very soon, no. And I would think that even though one may assume that some day it will, I think you're going to pass through a long preparatory period where both exist and both have a function.

NEW TYPES OF PLANE

Question. Is the Air Force concentrating on one type of plane, or is it broadening its field?

Answer. For air defense we have the F-80, F-94, and the F-86 as interceptors. The F-89 is also a newcomer in this field. The F-80, as you know, is the interceptor plane which was used in Korea. It gets up in the air fast, is maneuverable, but has short range. That's what an interceptor is. The F-80 has been in Korea and that's the oldest jet plane that we have, and it is getting older.

Now the F-86, which we sent out there is the newest of our interceptors, but present operational models are day interceptors. That is to say, it is not all filled up with radar to enable it to operate at night; and it's a one-seater plane.

We have a so-called all-weather interceptor which is called the F-94 which is in use, and that is full of radar, has great climbing capability, and can function at night. Our objective is to get the whole interceptor fleet all-weather, and none of the planes limited to operate only by daytime.

Parenthetically, we're doing the same thing with radar in this air defense—we're getting modern radar in just as fast as we can and we're expanding the radar coverage.

Question Is radar effective in any event?

Answer. Radar is simply a method of trying to see things—our present radar is a direct line of sight and can't curve around the earth or go through it, so therefore it's governed by the curvature of the earth. Roughly speaking, 125 to 150 miles is about all you can see, and you can figure what that is with the speed of modern planes. For example, if a plane is going only 375 miles an hour—that's only 20 minutes.

THE RADAR SCREEN

Question. About a month ago there was some discussion of this so-called radar screen—that a lot of civilians would be brought in as spotters, and that sort of thing. Will there be less emphasis now on that?

Answer. No; there is going to be more emphasis. Up to the fiscal 1950 budget we didn't have enough money to build a system of radar which covered the entire area of the United States from the west coast to the east coast. While we have got that money, we are building that whole set of radar, which for convenience you may call a screen. We also have made arrangements for the development of radar in Alaska and elsewhere, for the obvious reason that we want to know and be able to track these planes as they come in.

There are two jobs that radar does. One is that it acts just to locate incoming planes and shows where they are, and the second job is what is known as GCI—ground-control intercept—which guides our own interceptor up, and shows him where the enemy plane is. There is increased concentration now on radar.

Question Did you say everything is covered, or everything will be covered?

Answer Will be fairly well covered when it is complete, and construction will be reasonably complete within the continental United States sometime this year.

Question. What would be the chance, roughly, of spotting an enemy plane after the screen is built? Would you be quite sure of spotting it, or fairly sure?

Answer. You would be fairly sure of spotting it. But the answer of whether you would spot it in time is another question. Of course, this is a game of the offensive versus the defensive, and this is a defensive job, and the other side, of course, is planning methods of mixing up our radar and putting it out of commission not only by physical attack but by various electronic measures. And in that battle I should say that we are reasonably sure of seeing enemy planes coming over.

Your questions reveal to me that you are placing a degree of reliance on the radar and the antiaircraft and the interceptors which I think is unjustified. I think you expect that defense system to be able really to stop everything.

Question. That's what the American people believe, isn't it?

Answer. The point that I want to make entirely clear is they can't do it. If you asked me what percentage of enemy bombers are going to be knocked down I would have to say it depends on the warning, not from the radar but from the other circumstances. If, for example, the political situation were such that we knew an enemy was about to attack and everybody was out there sitting on pins and needles with their eyes glued to the scope and all that sort of thing, that's one state of affairs, and the other state of affairs is where an attack would creep in unexpectedly, and that makes an awful lot of difference.

But even if you take the first condition—a condition of complete alertness, with everybody waiting, you cannot completely stop an enemy bomber attack—a certain percentage is going to get through and that certain percentage could be very large.

WARNING PLUS SPOT DEFENSE

Question. Is our system of defense a fence around the country, or a group of islands around the cities?

Answer. Both—what you call the "fence," which is for the purpose of getting warning at the earliest available moment that enemy

planes attack us, and also a series of spot defenses at strategic points.

Question. They're more likely to come from the north across the Atlantic?

Answer. They wouldn't come across the Atlantic.

Question. Will the Alaskan radar be completed this year?

Answer. No, it will not. The Alaskan will follow along next year.

Question. You mentioned, Mr. Secretary, the "unconventional" methods of air defense, and guided missiles as one item—can you say anything about other possibilities?

Answer. This condition of affairs that I've just described, about the lack of ability of the conventional air-defense systems to stop something, obviously makes your mind jump to another conclusion, which is: Well, we've got to do something really drastic here. And all I can tell you is that that is very firmly in our minds and we are trying to do something about it.

Question. If we can't stop an enemy attack, by the same token they couldn't stop one of ours, could they?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Are we better able to attack them than they are to attack us?

Answer. Yes Remember, I said there were three things—air defense, strategic air and tactical air. Now we move into the realm of strategic air. And I would like to get off a couple of basic facts about this strategic air, before we get down into technical details.

Air defense is indispensable—we've got to do the best we can. But I don't think the amount of losses that we could cause is going to stop anybody from starting a war. Now when we get to tactical air, you'll see that that is part of the ground job and that isn't a complete deterrent because usually the aggressor figures he can lick the other fellow on the ground.

But this strategic air really could be a very serious defense for us, because strategic air is, of course, the air that takes the atom bomb and strikes at the enemy's heart, and the violence and destructiveness of that thing are really catastrophic.

After all, look at what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and think that that was two bombs And think what can be done with a greater number, a very much greater number of these weapons, and you have something which really raises the question as to whether any civilization can take it and survive. And our potential enemies know that And obviously they are going to, I think, think several times before they move against that sort of thing.

So that, politically, strategic air is the thing which has the real possibility in my opinion of making an enemy think before he hits us, and thereby giving us a breathing spell by which we may be able to work out some way of not destroying ourselves in a third world war. That's the political side of the thing, and I want to emphasize that very strongly.

It's a peculiar business, gentlemen, to be spending your time working with such a horribly destructive operation, and I can't tell you how destructive it can be, both ways. But the only thing that makes it bearable is the fact that it may be the one thing which will take this terribly serious international situation that we have, and provide the stimulus which may make men really get together and use their brains and not destroy each other. And that is the cardinal political point, in my opinion.

B–36 CAN GET THROUGH

Question. If we do have to attack in self-defense, can the B–36 get through?

Answer. Yes; I think it can.

Now, to get to the technique of the strategic air, we have two types of planes in the main—the intercontinental bomber, the B–36, and the medium bombers, which are now the B–29 and the B–50. The B–50, as you know, is the development of the B–29. We are trying to improve our medium bomber fleet, because all three of those planes I've just mentioned have piston engines and, therefore, are relatively slow, in modern terms. We want to speed them up. And the B–36's have already had four jets added to them in the new models.

Question. They are for a certain short range, aren't they?

Answer. No; it's not one of these jet assists; this is a real jet engine which can be used for extra speed or power whenever needed And then we're doing the same thing with a medium bomber. We're concentrating on the B–47, which is a swept-back-wing plane. The present model has six jets in it and is very much faster than any other bomber.

Question Does it have range?

Answer. Yes.

Question Is it faster than anything else we have, or faster than anything else anybody else has?

Answer. It's the fastest bomber we know of in the world.

Question Does it compare with the B–50?

Answer. It's a medium bomber like the B–50.

Question. It can carry the atom bomb?

Answer. Yes. The strategic air fleet must be able to.

BASES ABROAD NEEDED

Question. You would need bases in other places besides the United States?

Answer. Yes; we would, because the medium bombers are not intercontinental, on the same terms as the B–36. And we are also working, but at a much earlier stage of development, on the B–52, which is a much bigger B–47 and would be intercontinental, and we're buying two prototypes of that. It's a superb new plane. I scrambled around one the other day at the factory.

Question. Can you tell us how soon we could deliver bombs after we were attacked?

Answer. You want to know the amount of time it would take to mount the offensive?

Question. Yes.

Answer. I assure you nothing is receiving more careful attention than the readiness of the strategic air offensive and of our defense.

Question. So we haven't wasted our money and time on the B–36?

Answer. We certainly have not. But, on the other hand, don't think the B–36 is the strategic bomber to end all strategic bombers It isn't. Already we've got the B–29 and the B–50 working with it, and already we're trying to make all of those planes just as fast as we possibly can.

Question. But at this time has the B–36 turned out a wise investment?

Answer Absolutely. I think that to have relied exclusively on the medium bombers both as a deterrent and a force for victory would have been a most improvident thing.

Question With respect to Korea there has been a feeling in various quarters that the Air Force has fallen down somewhat; is that justified?

Answer. Now we're moving into the third phase, tactical air.

Question. But that isn't quite tactical—wasn't there a strategic problem there?

Answer. No, there wasn't any real strategic problem in its true sense in Korea. We were bound by two ground rules there; one is—oh, by all sorts of ground rules—one was that you couldn't go beyond a certain territory, the Yalu River; secondly, that you couldn't use your heavy weapons, and, third, that you weren't really in all-out war. The strategic air force is such a serious business that you don't bring it into play unless you are in all-out war. And this thing in Korea is not all-out war.

Question. So you really didn't bring strategic air into it?

Answer. Not in the way we would in all-out war. Our policy has been to keep the bulk of strategic air here. But we did have some medium bombers out there which did some strategic bombing and assisted in a job that tactical airplanes could have done. Korea was essentially a tactical job.

Tactical air is, of course, the job that you do with the Army. And it has three main purposes:

First of all, it is necessary to get air superiority. It must achieve the condition that we had on D-day and afterward in Normandy, where our planes were the planes that dominated the air, and which was just the reverse of the situation in 1940, say, when the German Stukas were climbing down everybody's neck. That's the first thing, to get air superiority.

The second thing is the job of interdiction, which is to try to knock out the stuff coming up along the roads—knock out the locomotives, the bridges, and all that sort of thing and try to interfere with the supplies that are coming from the main concentration point. Back of that, the strategic air is trying to knock out the sources of all of these things. But the tactical air is trying to interdict their coming up to the battlefront—to isolate the battlefields.

And then the third function of tactical air is close support of the ground forces—right in front of them—knock out pillboxes, knock out artillery and all that sort of thing, knock out anything that is shooting at the ground forces.

HELPING THE ARTILLERY

Question It's doing an artillery job, really?

Answer. Well, doing a superartillery job, if you will. I don't think it is fair to say that the artillery alone should do that, because the air ought to be able to help the artillery.

Let me repeat—there are three things: Get air superiority, one; do the interdiction or isolation job, two; and the close support, three.

There has been a lot of talk about this tactical-air thing since Korea, that either the thing has been done terribly badly, or terribly well, and so forth. And sometimes the charge was that the Air Force has neglected it in favor of strategic air. I think I have said what I think of the cardinal importance of strategic air. And this is not to say that we don't need tactical air, too. But it must grow apace with the Army and it must grow in partnership with the Army. And we are working in partnership with the Army. Secretary Pace (of the Army) and myself, General Collins and General Vandenberg are working jointly and cooperatively on this question of tactical air, and we are working out our plans for the future.

The Dispersal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over the NBC network, Friday, March 9, 1951:

I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss with you the dispersal bill before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives authorizing a program providing for construction of Federal buildings

outside of but in the vicinity of and accessible to the District of Columbia.

This bill authorizes the Administrator of General Services to acquire sites located outside of the District of Columbia and to construct eight buildings to house Federal employees at an expenditure of $190,000,000. The Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee amended this bill to authorize only $145,000,000, cost of constructing of six buildings, including utilities, roads, highways, et cetera, and made an unfavorable report to the full committee.

I am worried over the continually increasing taxes and ever-mounting number of civilian employees of the Federal Government, and I am definitely opposed to any unnecessary expenditures.

Our attention was called to the fact that the civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased by 60,594 during the month of January, bringing the total employment to 2,245,275. This increase, averaging approximately 2,000 a day, nearly doubled the daily average increase of approximately 1,000 a day during the last quarter in the calendar year 1950.

The Military Establishment increased civilian employment during January by 58,388. This was a ratio of 3 civilians for every 4 men called in the 80,000 January draft quota. Civilian employment in the Military Establishment totaled 1,046,829, passing the 1,000,000 mark for the first time since December 1946. The civilian employment by the executive branch, outside the Military Establishment, totaled 1,198,446 in January, an increase of 2,206 over December. These figures are summarized from reports from 67 agencies as submitted to the joint committee on the reduction of nonessential Federal expenditures.

Payroll costs necessarily lag a month behind employment figures, so I will give you these for December instead of January. Civilian employment in the executive branch totaled 2,184,681; the payroll was running at an annual rate of $7,950,000,000 which, with pay-rate increases to be taken into account, may be compared with the annual rate of $8,300,000,000 at the peak of World War II.

I fully realize many Federal employees are needed and many are doing a good job, giving dollar service for the dollar received. However, I believe that we have many on the Federal payroll who are not essential and who are not rendering the service for which they are paid.

With this thought in mind, I feel we should call a halt to increasing Federal payrolls with employees not absolutely essential to our war effort, and removing from the payroll those not giving the service required. We have requests every day from the heads of the various departments of our Government for more personnel. We, as Congressmen, do not have the office help nor the time to investigate all of these requests, with the result our Federal employment is increasing as I have shown in actual figures given above.

If dispersal is necessary to protect our Government and to prevent it from being destroyed, the removal of fringe agencies and commissions connected with the Government will scarcely be adequate, because the main departments of Government will be left in the same concentrated situation, in the same spot, in the District of Columbia. The Department of the Interior could be moved from the District of Columbia and set up to function in the interior part of the country. The Department of Labor does not necessarily have to be located in Washington. The Department of Agriculture could be placed in a different location and still function as it does today. Of course, the heads of these Departments could have their offices in Washington to be available to the President and the Congress, but the entire department does not have to be located here. It would be difficult to move the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury away from Washington but the Departments already mentioned, in addition to others, might well be situated in other parts of the country. This is an idea which has not been discussed but it might well be developed into a 10-year plan for the general benefit of everyone concerned. By separating these great Departments of Government, a measure of security to our main Government organization would be brought about and it would be more difficult for an enemy to destroy it.

Now the question arises just what we are going to do about it. I do not criticize the General Services Administration as I feel Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings Service under this agency is most sincere in his endeavors to hold down expenses, but it is his duty to furnish office space demanded to house additional personnel brought into our Federal Government. However, we are faced with the facts, and with taxes as they are, with programs dealing directly with the war effort, and with our indebtedness in excess of $260,000,000,000 it is time we carefully analyze any additional expenditures.

The dispersal bill, in my opinion, should not be passed until a careful study is completed and a determination made on what agencies can be moved out from the area of Washington where rental costs and construction costs are so high.

The buildings that are requested in this legislation are supposed to house approximately 45,000 workers. I feel that we should know the number of Federal employees that can be moved to other sections of the country and determine what office space might be available by such dispersal or decentralization before we are called upon to furnish additional buildings.

Washington is congested and this congestion is due to the many agencies of the Government recently created and the plain fact is that this dispersal program is put forward in order to make room for more Government employees.

The dispersal subject is not new to us who have served in Congress a number of years as it has been presented to us on many occasions, but now it is submitted by stressing the possibility of an atomic attack. I personally feel that these reasons are simply a camouflage for the construction of new office building space.

The removal of these fringe agencies to centers 10 to 20 miles from the District of Columbia will only tend to add to the expansion of the area now occupied by the Nation's Capital. The city of Washington, made possible by the generosity of the States of Virginia and Maryland, occupies a 10-mile-square area and if the agencies of Government are moved out only 10 to 20 miles away, it means that a greater area will be occupied by Federal Government agencies and the States of Maryland and Virginia will be contributing in a larger measure to that expansion. In many instances no revenue is received from Government-owned lands and buildings and the same problems will be developed in these proposed areas which now exist in the District of Columbia which requires a substantial cash contribution from the Federal Government in order to meet the expenses of maintaining the expected facilities.

In the event of an attack no one knows where the bomb would fall. The target might be 20 miles as well as 2 miles from the Capitol, and I raise the question if we are to protect the 45,000 workers that would be in the new buildings requested, what would be done with the other Federal employees that are not so protected. None of these buildings are to be occupied by military units, legislative units, judicial units, or executives in high places in this administration. If the workers of six or eight agencies are to be protected, the question arises as to the protection of their families. If a bomb dropped in a residential section, fathers and mothers would immediately do everything in their power to get home to learn what effect it had on the lives of their children and their property. Should we attempt to protect the workers in the six or eight new buildings, what are we to do about the workers in other departments in the District of Columbia and in departments possibly more essential to our Government which are scattered throughout this Nation, in Chicago, Detroit, or in other cities. I feel those people would have a right to ask for the same protection because a person working in Washington is not entitled to preferential treatment over those working in other areas for the same Federal Government.

The transportation problem must also be given serious consideration. If the bridges or arterial highways leading to these projects were destroyed by bombs, access to them would be practically impossible. These are but a few examples of changes that would be made without hindering the efficiency of our Government's operation. Therefore, I believe that the cry that these buildings are needed because of the threat of an attack carries very little weight.

So, the question arises are we going to construct buildings costing $190,000,000, continue putting civilians on the payroll, forcing an increase in Government expenditures, which would result in either increased taxes and/or increased national debt.

May I call to your attention a statement made by Lenin, the Russian dictator who said: "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself into destruction." I am wondering if this terrible prophecy is coming true.

Seaway "Economy" Blasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Times-Leader, the Evening News, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on Tuesday, February 13, 1951:

SEAWAY "ECONOMY" BLASTED

At this writing there are known to be 914,000,000 tons of ore in Minnesota. The owners are paying taxes on this quantity. There are 146,000,000 tons in Michigan and 6,000,000 tons in Wisconsin—a grand total of 1,066,000,000 tons. If we use this at the wartime (1941–45) average of 84,000,000 tons, there is only an apparent 12½ years' supply.

In the spring of 1920 the apparent reserves of Lake Superior ore were 1,547,000,000 tons. Since that time 1,686,000,000 tons were shipped, and there are still a proven 1,066,000,000 tons in the ground. Thus, while we shipped 1,686,000,000 tons, the depletion of apparent reserves was only 481,000,000 tons. To put it another way, for every ton shipped only 0.28 of a ton disappeared from the reserves. This is the story from 1920 to 1950.

Looking at only the postwar years, May 1, 1945, to May 1, 1949, the apparent reserves dropped from 1,186,053,378 to 1,116,069,058 tons, or 69,984,320 tons but in those 4 years 301,700,000 tons were shipped, or 0.23 ton loss of reserves per ton consumed.

There are two excellent reasons for what seems to be a statistical paradox. The first is that there are thousands of acres of land

that in every probability contain ore but which has not been proven by drilling because any deposits thus proven would become taxable. Tax-forfeited and other State lands contain substantial deposits paying no taxes and, consequently, are not enumerated as part of the reserves. Secondly, there are unknown ore beds beneath higher proven deposits. They come to light only after the upper material has been mined Because of these two situations there are millions of tons of ore added, every year, to the list of reserves.

Not listed in the U. S A. reserves are the Steep Rock deposits 40 miles north of the Canadian border where drillings and the most conservative of estimates indicate a minimum of 300,000,000 tons of very good ore. There are at least 100,000,000 tons in the Michipicoter area at the east end of Lake Superior. Added up, these apparent reserves total 1,466,000,000 tons. We may conservatively assume the discovery of one-half ton of new ore for every ton shipped instead of the three-fourths of a ton found in the past On this basis we have 2,199,000,000 tons of ore reserves which will last 23 years with shipments as high as 96,600,000 tons per year, or 15 percent above the World War II average.

Along with all of this direct loading ore there is, at or near the ground surface, many billions of tons of taconite A plant is now reducing this basic ore to a product containing 64 percent iron and possessing highly advantageous properties in blast and open hearth furnace operations. The plant cost is $15 per ton of capacity. The only ultimate limit in producing ore by this process is the amount of investment funds and the capacity of lake boats to move the product. The use of processed taconite will substantially increase the output of pig iron blast furnace-hour, which would make possible much added steel output without building a single new blast furnace

If the St. Lawrence seaway is built, this country and Canada will have to spend a billion dollars for a facility that will have annually only eight or ten million tons of Labrador ore to handle, which is an investment of $100 to $125 per ton of ore. It would be far less expensive in terms of capital, labor, and critical materials to expand our ore output by building taconite processing plants—United States facilities for United States ore, instead of a Canadian waterway for Labrador ore—and obtain a product of much greater value in the blast furnace.

Faith in the Principles for Which Men Fight—Address by the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call the attention of all the Members of this great legislative body to the address by the President of the United States, delivered at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 3, 1951.

Granting, Mr. Speaker, that many Members of this Congress have probably heretofore read much of this address by the President, I am, nevertheless, hopeful that my calling the full text to the attention of all the Members will make it so easily available that the reading of it will be of great value to all. Certainly the opinions of the President of the United States on this important subject are always of value to those who vigorously, vigilantly place the welfare of the Nation ahead of petty partisanship or petty political advantage or disadvantage.

Accompanying the President's speech are two other documents which I feel are of great value to all the Members of Congress and to all American citizens, to wit: First, The Strategy of Freedom, an address by Secretary of State Acheson, which was broadcast from Washington to the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States at its annual meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, on November 29, 1950. This will be featured in another extension of my remarks of this date. Second, Assurance of World Security Through American Leadership, remarks by Gen Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, in a broadcast from Washington on February 2, 1951. This speech by this distinguished American will also be found in my remarks of this date

These speeches by these three American leaders, taken together and read together, should be of inestimable value to conscientious, patriotic American citizens

The speech by the President of the United States follows:

FAITH IN THE PRINCIPLES FOR WHICH MEN FIGHT—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT [1]

This chapel commemorates something more than an act of bravery or courage It commemorates a great act of faith in God.

The four chaplains in whose memory this shrine was built were not required to give their lives as they did. They gave their lives without being asked When their ship was sinking they handed out all the life preservers that were available and then took off their own and gave them away in order that four other men might be saved.

Those four chaplains actually carried out the moral code which we are all supposed to live by They obeyed the divine commandment that men should love one another. They really lived up to the moral standard that declares:

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

They were not afraid of death because they knew that the word of God is stronger than death. Their belief, their faith, in His word enabled them to conquer death.

This is an old faith in our country. It is shared by all our churches and all our denominations. These four men represented the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish beliefs. Each of these beliefs teaches that obedience to God and love for one's fellow man are the greatest and strongest things in the world.

We must never forget that this country was founded by men who came to these shores to worship God as they pleased. Catholics, Jews, and Protestants—all came here for this great purpose

They did not come here to do as they pleased—but to worship God as they pleased, and that is an important distinction.

The unity of our country comes from this fact. The unity of our country is a unity under God. It is a unity in freedom, for the service of God is the perfect freedom

If we remember our faith in God, if we live by it as our forefathers did, we need have no fear for the future.

Today, many people have become fearful. If we reaffirm our common faith we can overcome these fears

This does not mean that we can always be sure what the future will bring. We cannot always know what the outcome of events will be. As President Lincoln once said:

"The Almighty has His own purposes."

But we need not be afraid of the outcome if we go on trying to do the right thing as God gives us to see the right

RULE OF LAW IN WORLD TODAY

That is what we are trying to do in the world today. We are trying to establish world peace, so that all men can live together in brotherhood and in freedom. And to do that, we are working with other nations to create the rule of law in the world.

What does this rule of law mean? Let me give you an example. In the early days of our western frontier, law and order were not yet established. Disputes were settled in favor of the man who was quickest on the draw. Outlaws terrorized whole communities.

Men who wanted to see law and order prevail had to combine against the outlaws. They had to arm themselves. At times, they had to fight. After they had put down lawless violence, the courts took over and justice was established And, then, it was possible for all citizens to get on with the important work of building up their own communities, paving the streets and building new schools, and giving all people a chance at the right kind of life

This is just what we are trying to do today in the international field. If we can put a stop to international aggression, order can be established and the people of the world can go ahead full speed with the constructive tasks of peace.

We are not trying to do this job by ourselves. We could not do it by ourselves if we tried. We are acting as one member of a whole community of nations dedicated to the concept of the rule of law in the world. As in all other communities, the members of this community of nations have many different ideas and interests and do not all speak with one voice. Some are cautious and some are impatient

We cannot always have our own way in this community. But we have a tremendous responsibility to lead and not to hang back.

Fate has made this country a leader in the world. We shirked our responsibility in the 1920's. We cannot shirk it now. We must assume that responsibility now, and it will take everything we have—all the brains and all the resources that we can mobilize.

Leadership carries with it heavy responsibilities. Good leaders do not threaten to quit if things go wrong. They expect cooperation, of course, and they expect everyone to do his share, but they do not stop to measure sacrifices with a teaspoon while the fight is on.

We cannot lead the forces of freedom from behind.

RESTRAINING AGGRESSION

The job we face is a hard one. Perhaps, it will be harder in the few years immediately ahead than it will be in the years thereafter. If we can get over the present crisis successfully—if we can restrain aggression before it bursts out into another world war, then things will be easier in the future. And I think we can do this. We can't be sure, of course, but there is good reason to hope for success.

In recent months, the United Nations has been faced by a serious challenge. But it is meeting that challenge courageously, and it

[1] Delivered at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 3 and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

is still man's best hope of establishing the rule of law in the world.

General Eisenhower has brought home the report that the people of Europe, in spite of their difficulties and their many problems, want to preserve their freedom. He has told us of the effort they are making. They are working very hard, and, if we all work together, we can be successful.

When things look hard, there are always a lot of people who want to quit. We had people like that in the Revolutionary War, and we have them in every war and every crisis of our history. Thomas Paine called them the summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. If we had listened to them, we would never have been a free and independent nation. We would never have had a strong and prosperous country. We would not be strong enough now to stand up against Communist aggression and tyranny.

The sacrifices that are being made today by the men and women of this country are not being made in vain. Our men are in Korea because we are trying to prevent a world-wide war. The men who have died in Korea have died to save us from the terrible slaughter and destruction which another world war would surely bring.

Their sacrifices are being made in the spirit of the four chaplains, to whose memory this chapel is dedicated. They are being made in defense of the great religious faiths which make this chapel a place of worship. These sacrifices are being made for the greatest things in this life, and for the things beyond this life.

I have faith that the great principle for which our men are fighting will prevail.

The Strategy of Freedom—An Address by Secretary of State Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this day I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the President of the United States entitled "Faith in the Principles for Which Men Fight," which was delivered at the dedication of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 3, 1951. The President's speech appears on another page of this daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I respectively call the attention of yourself and of my colleagues thereto, for I feel it and the address by Secretary of State Acheson, which follows, should be read together:

THE STRATEGY OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ACHESON [1]

I regret that I have not been able to come out to Cleveland to meet with the National Council of Churches, as I had hoped to do, and that it has been necessary for me to talk to you instead from my office at the State Department in Washington. The events of the past few days, as I know you well understand, raise innumerable questions which require almost hourly study, consultation, and decision.

This coming together of many great sources of spiritual strength in our American community is an event of historic importance. If ever a time imposed a test, not alone of strength, but of character, upon our people, this is such a time. All the resources at our command, of wisdom, of conscience, of character; the finest traditions of our people; our deepest wells of faith, must guide us in fulfilling the responsibility which history has placed upon our country. The great increase in the power and the effectiveness of the Christian communions which are now uniting to form the National Council of Churches will encourage millions of people throughout the world.

The remarks that I had planned to make this evening were prepared several days ago. I had planned to discuss with you some of the basic problems, some of the underlying issues which concern us in our relationship with the world. I know, from the long record of intelligent and responsible participation which your separate organizations have had in foreign policy matters, that you have given much serious thought to these issues. I had not planned to discuss current day-to-day developments on this occasion.

But now a serious situation has arisen, one which holds grave danger for the peace of the world.

AN ACT OF BRAZEN AGGRESSION

I would like to talk to you about the meaning of this situation which has been created in Korea, before going on to discuss some of the broader questions I had in mind to raise with you this evening.

An act of brazen aggression has taken place in Korea, the second such act in 5 months. The harsh significance of this act, and its complete disregard of any kind of moral standard, can best be understood when it is looked at against a background of what the United Nations has been trying to do in Korea.

First of all, the United Nations itself represents a commitment on the part of the nations of the world that they will stand together in support of an international order based on justice and dedicated to the peaceful settlement of disputes. The first article of the first chapter of the Charter of the United Nations says that one of the primary purposes of the Organization is to suppress acts of aggression. That is why, when the armed forces of North Korea, without any pretense of legality attacked the Republic of Korea on June 25, the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations supported immediate and effective action by force to put down this act of aggression. For the first time in history, a world organization has rallied to put down by force of arms a crime committed against the international community.

The only exception to the unity of this action in support of the Charter was the Soviet Union and its satellites. In defiance of the 53 member nations who upheld the authority of the United Nations, the Soviet Union sought to impede the action in Korea, to give aid and comfort to the aggressors, to give matériel support to the act of aggression, and to break up by obstructive acts the work of the United Nations. Despite this defiant behavior, this tremendous experiment, in behalf of international law and morality, went forward. Across vast seas and from distant lands, men of many nations came together under the flag of the United Nations to push back the invaders. They came to fight for a principle. Many of them have given their lives that men someday may be free of this scourge of war.

After many discouraging weeks, the United Nations forces, under the command of General MacArthur, made their way up the peninsula, driving the aggressors before them. They were approaching the successful conclusion of their mission, which was to enable the United Nations to carry out what has been its purpose from the very beginning—to help the people of Korea establish their own free and independent government. Plans were moving forward in the General Assembly for the reconstruction of the country, and the nations which had contributed forces to this heroic effort were looking forward to the return of their troops to their home countries upon completion of their mission.

Then came this second shocking act of aggression. This is not merely another phase of the Korean campaign. This is a fresh and unprovoked aggressive act, even more immoral than the first.

CHINESE COMMUNIST INTERVENTION IN NORTH KOREA

Even before the attack in June, the Communist authorities in China had aided in building up the forces of the North Koreans. This was done by turning over Korean soldiers in their own armies and by munitions and supplies. The Chinese also moved some of their own armies from South China to Manchuria. After the North Korean attack started, more matériel and fresh soldiers came across the Manchurian border in greater and greater numbers. After the North Korean defeat the cloak of pretense became thinner. Chinese military formations were moved into Korea under the guise of volunteers.

Now, no possible shred of doubt could have existed in the minds of the Chinese Communist authorities about the intentions of the forces of the United Nations. Repeatedly, and from the very beginning of the action, it had been made clear that the sole mission of the United Nations forces was to repel the aggressors and restore to the people of Korea their independence.

In behalf of the United States, President Truman declared that it is the intention of this country to localize the conflict and to withdraw its forces from Korea as soon as possible. In the Security Council, this Government was one of the sponsors of a proposed resolution which affirmed that the policy of the United Nations was to hold the Chinese frontier with Korea inviolate, and that legitimate Chinese and Korean interests in the frontier zone would be fully protected.

The peaceful nations of the world made it unmistakably clear that if the Chinese Communist intervention had a limited motivation, if it sprang from an uncertainty regarding the intentions of the United Nations forces, the matter could be settled without enlarging the conflict.

But, at the very moment when representatives of these Chinese Communist authorities appeared at the headquarters of the United Nations, claiming the right to speak before this world organization in the name of the Chinese people, the cloak of pretense had been thrown off. In great force, the armies of the Chinese Communists have streamed across the Manchurian border, engaging the forces of the United Nations in a new encounter. Against these new, fresh, and numerous forces, our United Nations troops are fighting bravely. But the conditions are difficult: terrain and weather, long lines of supply, and the wear of an arduous campaign have been met with heroic fortitude.

UNITED NATIONS NOT INTIMIDATED BY NEW CRISIS

We have had dark days before in Korea. When the first wave of aggression, with the advantage of initiative which the aggressors always have, had driven us back to the bridgehead of Pusan, and the outlook was not bright, the UN forces showed no weakness of spirit or of determination because they were fighting for a principle. And I am confident, too, that the United Nations will not be

[1] Broadcast from Washington to the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, which was meeting at Cleveland, on November 29 and released to the press on the same date Also available as Department of State Publication 4084.

found lacking in firmness of spirit or determination in responding to this new aggression.

The United Nations has a special relationship with the people of Korea. It has resolved to help the people of Korea establish a free and independent government of their own choosing. It has helped them to set up an independent republic which, had it not been for the veto of the Soviet Union, would today be a sovereign member of this world organization. The United Nations cannot be intimidated by this new challenge to its authority into shaking off its responsibilities to the people of Korea.

Now this new act of aggression has created a new crisis, a situation of unparalleled danger. For if the Chinese Communist authorities continue to impose upon their people this warring against the United Nations, they will vastly increase the danger to the whole fabric of world peace. And among the tragedies of this reckless course would be that it would spring from no interest of China or the Chinese people. If these Chinese Communist authorities have any real concern for the well-being of their people or for the regard of other nations, they now have the opportunity to show it. This is their hour of decision. The authorities of Communist China stand before the bar of the judgment of mankind. The world will watch their actions in Korea and at Lake Success. Will they represent their own interests, or will they let themselves be the dupes of others? If they defy the United Nations and mock the Charter, then no lies, no bluster, and no veto will conceal from the people of the world the evil of their action.

These are questions that affect all the members of the United Nations. The United States has no special interests or interests different from those of the majority. From the very beginning of the Korean crisis, the United States has sought complete solidarity with the majority of members.

WORLD ENDANGERED BY COMMUNIST DESIGN

The questions raised by these acts of aggression in Korea go far beyond the contours of this small and remote peninsula. They have to be viewed as part of a world picture. To be fully understood, they must be seen as part of the world-wide operations of the international Communist movement The increasing boldness of the international Communist movement, its willingness to use overt aggression, and to accept the deliberate risk of war make it increasingly urgent for all American citizens to face squarely the danger that confronts us and to give vigorous and united support to the measures we must take to meet this danger. Those who control the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement have made clear their fundamental design. It is to hold and solidify their power over the people and territories within their reach, however ruthless the means required. The danger to the rest of the world created by this design arises out of the belief made amply clear in Bolshevist political writings that the holding of power by the rulers of the Soviet Union requires the complete subversion or forcible destruction of the countries now free of their control. They are encouraged to act on this belief by the illusion that, in so doing, they are helping along the inevitable course of history. According to the Bolshevist interpretation, history points to the collapse of non-Soviet states and their replacement by Soviet-style and Soviet-controlled states. Conflict is anticipated in Bolshevist theory as an inevitable part of the process.

The hostility of Soviet intentions, if taken alone, would not produce so grave a threat. But the combination of these intentions and Soviet military power creates very grave danger to the survival of free nations and free institutions, a danger which must not be underestimated. All governments which are now free and all responsible citizens of free societies must face, with a sense of urgency, the capabilities for conquest and destruction in the hands of the rulers of the Soviet Union.

The problem we have been called upon to solve, therefore, is: What course of action will enable us to maintain our freedom and bring about a peaceful resolution of this world crisis, or if despite our best efforts, aggression does take place, will provide a basis for defeating it?

Our essential purpose is, as it has always been in our history, to preserve our free institutions, so that freedom and justice may survive and continue to flourish. We wish to do this peacefully, because peace is the climate in which our free institutions flourish best. But we have shown in our history that we hold these values so dear that if we must fight, we will fight for them. The course of action we have chosen is to join with our allies in building the strength of the free world as a bulwark against Soviet aggression. The purpose of this strength is not aggression. It is the very opposite. It is to deter such aggression. This involves building military strength, but it requires no less the buttressing of all the other forms of power—economic, political, social, and moral—and the utmost resolution and unity among the free nations of the world.

Over the period of time the rulers of the Soviet Union, confronted by a strong and confident free world, may be obliged to abandon their expansionist aims. To build the strength of the free world is a hard course. It involves great effort and much sacrifice both by our own people and by all the people of the free world. It offers no promise of relief from these burdens in the near future. It makes no guaranty of peace. But it is rooted in the principles by which we live, and it offers us the best realistic approach to the problem of peace and the preservation of our freedom.

ELEMENTS IN STRATEGY OF FREEDOM

The main elements of the strategy by which we are seeking to carry out this course of action—the strategy of freedom—are now well established as national policy. They have emerged as practical responses to the problems we have encountered, and they have found general support in the Nation. I want to try to bring these elements together and develop their interrelationships because it is essential that the whole pattern and single purpose of our actions be clear to us.

There are six main elements in the strategy of freedom.

INTERNATIONAL ORDER FOR PRESERVATION OF PEACE AND FREEDOM

First is the development of an international order for the preservation of peace and freedom under the United Nations The Charter of the United Nations expresses the universal aspirations of mankind, and the organization itself is a symbol of these aspirations. But the United Nations is also more than a symbol. It is a means through which we can take practical, day-by-day steps toward the building of a stable international community. As an organization in which most nations participate, the United Nations can also help to bring about the accommodations of interest and the adjustments of differences which are essential to peace in a world of change.

Our action in Korea, as we have seen, is intended to support the authority of the United Nations against aggression. In the current session of the General Assembly, we have initiated a number of measures designed to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations action against aggression. We intend to do our full part in helping the United Nations to grow in strength.

REGIONAL GROUPINGS FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY

The second element in the strategy of freedom is the development of regional groupings, within the framework of the United Nations. To insure their collective security, free nations are engaged in cooperative defense measures, not possible on a universal basis at the present time. The keystone of the defense system of the free world is being built in the North Atlantic community, and among the states of the Western Hemisphere.

A whole network of cooperative institutions has been developing among the free nations of the North Atlantic and Western European area, each a practical response to a felt need. The problems they face are extremely complex, but progress has been made toward overcoming ancient national hostilities, and in developing a common will and a sense of confidence in the potentialities of the North Atlantic community, working together as a community.

In this hemisphere, the accomplishments of the Organization of American States in promoting unity of action have been remarkable. Support of this organization is fundamental to our policy.

The essential ingredient in these regional developments has been a sense of community interest among neighbor nations. The development of further regional organizations depends in the first instance upon the existence of this community sense among the people of other areas.

RAPID BUILDING OF MILITARY STRENGTH

The third element in our strategy of freedom is the rapid building up of military strength at home and among our allies. I stress the word "rapid" because the period of greatest danger is directly before us. Our defense must not only be strong enough, it must come soon enough.

There is only one test of whether our defense preparations are adequate: That is to measure them against a sober calculation of the danger which faces us.

So measured, the defense efforts of the United States and other free nations are inadequate A greatly increased scale and tempo of effort is required on the part of all free nations to enable them to overcome this inadequacy at the earliest possible moment.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The fourth element is economic cooperation. This has a dual character. It contributes powerfully to the building of our defenses against external attack. It also is an instrument for helping to build healthy societies in which the vitality and the promise of freedom find practical expression—in comparison with which the decadence and despair of Communist tyranny is starkly exposed.

Although the amount of resources available for economic assistance is limited by the defense requirements imposed upon us by Soviet action, even under the burden or rearmament, free societies can more effectively provide for human well-being and advancement than tyrannical regimes. The productive power of free men, who are aware of the dangers that face them and who are determined to meet the challenge to their freedom, cannot be matched by authoritarian societies.

With our technical assistance, the resolve of the free peoples of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East to better the conditions of their lives can become a powerful drive against the age-old banes of poverty and disease and the political instability which often accompanies them. Men everywhere have awakened to the opportunities for progress which modern science and technology have opened. We can help them to help themselves, and it is in our interest to do so.

Our technical assistance is not philanthropy, for here our principles and our self-interest coincide. As the people of underdeveloped areas rise from poverty, not only will our own economy benefit, but also and even more important the real promise of freedom will expose the false promises of Bolshevik imperialism, and the peoples of these countries will grow in their recognition of the common interest and purpose of the free nations.

So far as possible, economic cooperation, like defense cooperation and collective security programs, is being carried on through the United Nations and regional organizations in order to strengthen international institutions devoted to peace and security.

READINESS TO NEGOTIATE SETTLEMENTS

The fifth element in the strategy of freedom is a readiness at all times to negotiate just settlements of international disputes and to find just accommodations of conflicting interests Our experience has demonstrated that the Soviet rulers cannot be expected to accept fair and equal negotiation so long as they feel capable of imposing their own terms or exacting their own price. Their concept of negotiation is that it should record the facts of power rather than the requirements of justice. We shall not seek to use our power in this way, but as the free world develops strength, the Soviet rulers may find it advantageous to adjust differences equitably rather than to seek to impose their demands. The free nations must always be prepared to enter into genuine negotiations, and even to take the initiative in efforts to bring about honest negotiation.

If the issues are clear, free men will not be prey to unrealistic expectations, nor to propaganda abuse of the negotiating process. It is in the long perspective that results may be expected, not in the fits and starts of shifting tactics.

Because our earnest desire is peace we shall remain constantly receptive to genuine negotiation With the confidence that comes of strength and the humility that comes from our devotion to Christian principles, we shall be endlessly patient in working for peace. And we shall at the same time be endlessly alert to defend the bases of our national life.

FIRM ADHERENCE TO MORAL VALUES

The sixth element in the strategy of freedom is a firm adherence in all our actions, at home and abroad, to the moral values which give meaning to our lives.

We are a young country, an enthusiastic people, and despite our great interest in material progress, we are an idealistic nation. The principles to which our common life is dedicated are powerful forces for good in the world. The affirmative values of our society have been deeply inspiring to those who have seen and felt their great creative force. We do not always present our best side to the world. In our enthusiasm and drive we often do not take care to make ourselves understood, and expect others to recognize us for what we are. We have launched a greatly expanded information program to bring knowledge of ourselves to other peoples, a program which the President has called the campaign of truth.

It is our purpose to carry to all parts of the world the facts about what is happening in America and in the world, because it is a fundamental part of our democratic faith that people, if informed of the truth, will make sound judgments What is even more important than what we say to the world is how we conduct ourselves at home and abroad. The force of example and action is the factor which finally determines what our influence is to be.

If we are to be worthy of the leadership that derives from our power, we must be sure that we are true to the values and principles upon which our society is founded. It is the example of democracy at work, vigorous, healthy, respectful of its first principles, growing in freedom and justice and opportunity, that can inspire ourselves and others to meet the tasks ahead with hope and confidence.

Without this, which depends on every one of us, on the everyday conduct of each citizen, the strategy of fredom would "become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."

ALL AMERICANS RESPONSIBLE FOR PEACE

These are the elements of our national foreign policy of the strategy of freedom. This is the course by which we seek to avoid war and to secure peace. No one can guarantee that war will not come. The present crisis is extremely serious Whether reason will prevail is only partly for us to decide. We must hope and strive for the best while we prepare for the worst

This is a responsibility, not just of a few public officials, not just of the Congress, but of the whole American people The qualities we must demonstrate—steadiness, moderation, restraint, constancy of purpose, and flexibility in action, imagination, wisdom, maturity—these qualities are possible for us as a Nation only if the American people participate as individuals in striving to make our society worthy of the hopes that free men everywhere have placed in it

A deep understanding of the forces we are dealing with, and the role we must play, must be acquired by each of us Every single individual has a share of this responsibility.

The six elements of the Strategy of Freedom, support of the United Nations, development of regional organizations, the rapid building up of our strength in partnership with our allies, economic cooperation, readiness to negotiate, and a firm adherence to the fundamental purposes and principles of our society, constitute a national policy, not a party policy. They have emerged from a long process of discussion and consideration as the practical requirements of a policy adequate to the problems which confront us. They are rooted in our traditions. They find general support in both parties

It is right and proper that there should be differences of opinion among us about the execution of this policy, and about questions of emphasis, priorities, application and administration No one has a monopoly of wisdom and the vigor and vitality of a democratic society derive from free discussion and debate and the consent which flows from understanding However, vigorous our debates may be, it should be made clear to all that our country is united in its determination to hew to the strategy of freedom which is our national policy.

The Nation's peril is our challenge. The united will of the people must be our answer.

Assurance of World Security Through American Leadership—Remarks by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have this day inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the President of the United States entitled "Faith in the Principals for Which Men Fight," and also an address by Secretary of State Dean Acheson entitled "The Strategy of Freedom." I am now privileged to call to the attention of all my colleagues in this Congress the radio remarks made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, from Washington, D. C., on February ?, 1951.

These three important documents by these three Americans so recently made and on closely related subjects will surely add to the information and inspiration of all who read them.

The remarks by General Eisenhower follow:

ASSURANCE OF WORLD SECURITY THROUGH AMERICAN LEADERSHIP—REMARKS BY GEN. DWIGHT D EISENHOWER, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE [1]

As a soldier, I have been given an Allied assignment that directly concerns the security of the free world, with special reference to the countries bordering upon the North Atlantic Ocean I have approached the task, aiming at the good of the United States of America, conscious that a strong, solvent America is the indispensable foundation for a free world. While I have reached certain conclusions, the subject of the free world's security is so vast and complex that no man could hope to master its elements to the last critical item or, in a quarter hour, to answer all questions in his fellow citizens' minds Consequently, though I speak to you out of deep conviction, I do so in all humility, trusting to your sympathetic consideration.

Our hope remains the achievement of peace based on understanding and forebearance, the only sure foundation for peace

We must never lose faith that such a peace can be ultimately established We seek such a peace, and no one can honestly interpret our current modest preparations otherwise.

But we should examine the current situation fearlessly and clearly, neither shutting our eyes to obvious dangers nor permitting fear to warp our judgment. America's record and America's strength certainly should prevent hysterical apprehension of the future

Today we are faced by an aggressive imperialism that has more than once announced its implacable hostility to free government. Therefore, we strive to erect a wall of security for the free world behind which free institutions can live That wall must be maintained until Communist imperialism dies of its own inherent evils.

NECESSITY FOR EFFECTIVE COOPERATION

One of the great questions before us is the will and capacity of Europe to cooperate effectively in this aim Unless there exists in Europe a will to defend itself, no amount of outside help can possibly make it secure. A nation's defense must spring from its own soul, and the soul cannot be imported

For years, we have heard that Western Europe is plagued, confused, and divided far more seriously than we are; we have heard that in their homes, in factories, on the street, millions of honest workmen are daily subjected to Communist bullying, that their days and nights are haunted by the specter of invading hordes whom they cannot hope to equal in numbers or physical strength.

Furthermore, the discouragement, destruction, and confusion visited upon the peoples of Europe by two world wars sapped their productive capacity and, in some instances, reduced them to levels of near starvation. More than this—their spirit was smothered in war weariness.

[1] Broadcast from Washington on February 2 and released to the press by the Department of Defense on the same date.

That is a story often told. If it were the whole story, then all I could honestly do would be to recommend that we abandon the NATO Treaty and—by ourselves—attempt, however, futilely, to build a separate fortress against threatening aggression. Two striking facts make such a recommendation, for me, impossible.

PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN DEFENSE

The first fact is that the utter hopelessness of the alternative requires our participation in European defense. We can all understand that America must be strong in air and sea power. These elements are vitally essential to the defense of the free world and it is through them that we protect the approaches to our homeland and the routes of commerce necessary to our existence.

But this alone is not enough. Our ships will not long sail the seas, nor our planes fly the world airways, if we stand aside in fancied security while an aggressive imperialism sweeps over areas of the earth with which our own future is inseparably linked.

Western Europe is the cradle of our civilization; from her originally we drew our strength, genius, and culture. But our concern in Europe is far more than sentimental. Our own security is directly involved. Europe is a highly developed industrial complex with the largest and most varied pool of skilled labor on earth. This huge potential would be a rich prize for a totalitarian invasion. Its direct importance to us is the stark fact that its possession by Communist forces would give them opportunity to develop a preponderance of power. Even this disaster would not tell the whole story.

If Western Europe should be overrun by communism, many economically dependent areas in Africa and the Middle East would be affected by the debacle. Southeastern Asia would probably soon be lost. Thus, we would be cut off from the raw materials of all these regions—materials that we need for existence. World destiny would then be dictated by imperialistic powers whose avowed purpose is the destruction of freedom.

POWER OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The second fact bearing upon our participation in European defense is that the people of Europe are not spiritually bankrupt, despite the validity of many pessimistic reports. Great sections of its population have for years labored on and fought the creeping paralysis of communism. Now, the North Atlantic Treaty has brought new fuel to the flames of hope in Europe. It has noticeably lifted morale, the fundamental element in this whole situation—the force which powers all human progress.

In every capital, there is growing a desire to cooperate in this mutual security effort. All the governments that I have recently visited agreed that their defense programs must be stepped up despite economic and other difficulties—in spite of preoccupations that constitute abnormal drains upon particular nations. For example, France now wages a relentless and costly war against communism in Indochina. Britain, still existing on an austerity level, shoulders heavy burdens in Malaya. However much those nations may differ from us in their diplomatic thinking with respect to Asiatic states, there is no question concerning their solidarity in opposing Communist aggression.

They, and others on the continent, are taking measures to effect substantial increases in their defense establishments. Within the past few days, Britain has stepped up drastically its rate of preparation. The new military service program in France bars all exemptions of every kind whatsoever. The Norwegians impressed me with their unshakable determination that never again will they be victims of occupation. To, them, a fighting resistance, even to their own destruction, is preferable. And in Italy, there are unmistakeable signs of a stiffening courage and determination. The same is true of Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Portugal, Luxemburg, and Iceland.

In every country, I saw heartening evidence of a regeneration in Europe's spirit. Its morale, its will to fight, will grow with every accretion to physical strength. The arrival in Europe of new American land and air units, though modest in protective influence by themselves, will certainly produce added confidence and accelerate the production of military force throughout the member nations.

The European nations must, of course, produce and maintain the great bulk of the land forces necessary to their defense.

THE STOREHOUSE OF RESISTANCE

For this purpose, the most immediate need of Europe is munitions and equipment. Everyone of the continental nations I visited can rapidly and markedly increase its resistance power if it can be promptly furnished additional supplies of this kind. To fill this need, our loyal neighbor, Canada, with Britain and others, is shouldering part of the load.

In military potential, the free nations have everything they need, natural resources, industrial genius, productive capacity, and great reservoirs of leadership ability. Given the ingredient of morale, the determination to combine for mutual protection, the military strength necessary will be produced at a speedy pace. With every increase in strength, there will be an upward thrust in morale, resulting in an ever-mounting spiral of confidence and security.

With respect to time, no man can know at what hour, if ever, our defensive organization may be put to the ultimate test. Because our purpose is entirely defensive, we must be ready at the earliest possible moment. Only an aggressor could name the day and hour of attack. Our current mobilization, properly adjusted to our peaceful security needs, should be as rapid as any required by the emergency of war.

To you, the people of America, I repeat, as I have to the Congress and to the President, that I believe,

First, the preservation of free America requires our participation in the defense of Western Europe.

Second, success is attainable. Given unity in spirit and action, the job can be done.

Third, while the transfer to Europe of American military units is essential, our major and special contribution should be in the field of munitions and equipment.

By no means, do I believe that we Americans can support the world militarily or economically. In our own interest, we must insist upon a working partnership with every nation making the common security its task of first priority. Every one of the member nations must realize that the success of this combined effort to preserve the peace rests as directly upon America's productive, economic, and political strength as it does on any amount of military force we can develop. Only cooperative effort by all of us can preserve for the free world a position of security, relative peace, and economic stability.

Attainment of this result is largely a matter of morale and the human spirit. The free world now must prove itself worthy of its own past.

If Frenchmen can rise to the heights their fathers achieved at Verdun in 1916; if Italians can recapture the fervor of Vittorio Veneto; if the British can relive the days of 1940 when they stood alone against Hitler; if our other allies can react to today's threat in the mode of their own revered patriots; if we, here in America, can match the courage and self-sacrifice of the ragged, freezing members of Washington's army at Valley Forge; indeed, if each of us now proves himself worthy of his countrymen fighting and dying in Korea, then success is sure—a glorious success that will bring us security, confidence, tranquillity.

Each of us must do his part. We cannot delay, nationally or individually, while we suspiciously scrutinize the sacrifices made by our neighbor, and, through a weasling logic, seek someway to avoid our own duties.

ACCOMPLISHMENT BY AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

If we Americans seize the lead, we will preserve and be worthy of our own past. Our children will dwell in peace. They will dwell in freedom. They will read the history of this decade with tingling pride and, from their kinship with this generation, they will inherit more than can be expressed in millions, in acres, or in world acclaim.

It is not my place, as a soldier, to dwell upon the politics, the diplomacy, the particular treaty arrangement that must accompany and go forward with such an effort. But I do conceive it my duty to report from time to time, both to this Government and to all others in the coalition, as to progress achieved. Thus, our own and all other peoples may constantly review their decisions and plans—and, if necessary, revise them.

This evening, I come back to you only as one with some experience in war and peace, of some acquaintanceship with our friends of Western Europe, to bring you what is in my heart and mind. I shall go about my own task in this undertaking with the unshakable confidence that America will respond fully when the basic issues are understood. We know that 150,000,000 united Americans constitute the greatest temporal force that has ever existed on God's earth. If we join in a common understanding of our country's role today and wholeheartedly devote ourselves to its discharge, the year 1951 may be recorded in our history in letters as bright as is written the year 1776.

The Man Who Transformed the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a prologue to the religious drama entitled "The Man Who Transformed the World."

This play will be presented on March 16 and 17, at the National Guard Armory in Washington under the sponsorship of the Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. Part of the proceeds from this presentation will be turned over to the fund for medical attention for the children of the men who died in the service of our country. Mrs. Edward H. Jordan, of Washington, is the chairman of the board. The part of Jesus Christ will be portrayed by Mr. Jean Gabriell, of New Jersey, and a cast consisting of the Passion Players of America, who have given this performance for a number of years.

The Christian Voice, New York City, in commenting on this play said:

Religious leaders and organizations: The Story of the Man Who Transformed the World will do more for your community than all other attractions together.

In these critical days when foreign and godless ideologies menace our lives and the lives of future generations, it would be well for us to be more conversant with the Greatest Story Ever Told.

The prologue follows:

THE MAN WHO TRANSFORMED THE WORLD

Two thousand years ago, from within a defeated and embittered nation, held in bondage by a tyrannical empire, there arose a Man, a Leader, who inspired the people of that nation, healed them, and gave them new courage to live He conceived a formula for curing the ills of humanity by striking at the root of evil. He established a pattern for mankind to follow, based upon the imitation of God. This Man in 3 short years revolutionized the entire pattern of thought and philosophy of life. They call Him, "Master," "Messiah," and "Son of God"

Mercy, love, and universal forgiveness of injuries, He preached, yet 19 centuries later, we still haven't learned to abolish force, abolish hate, abolish revenge. How long does it take man to realize the meaning of His words?

The Man's profound wisdom, superior intellect, and inspirational ideals were so advanced as to be inconceivable to the minds of His time His enemies, in alarm and fear, sought to stop Him and still His voice They succeeded in destroying His body, but they could not still His voice. His name has become such a cornerstone of humanity, that to tear it out from this world would be to shake its very foundations.

A Soldier in Korea Asks Some Unanswerable Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include herewith a letter from a soldier in my district who is now fighting in Korea. His letter was written to the Marquette Mining Journal. It presents some unanswerable questions which those in charge of our foreign policy program might profitably read:

DEAR SIR: Myself and a few thousand other GI's would like to know the answers to several questions The biggest question at the present is, just why are we over here? The Army has tried to answer that for some time now, but I've yet to hear anyone say he's convinced we ought to be fighting The Korean people certainly aren't glad to have us. I've seen that with my own eyes. You'll notice I said the people, and not the politicians. After all, it is the people of this world whom we are trying to satisfy, even though the scales show otherwise.

WHERE WILL IT END?

Another good question is, Where will it all end, and to what advantage? Also, do the people back home realize how disgusted the reservists are at the quick shuffle they've gotten? I've never seen the morale of troops so low before.

It just about all boils down to this: How is a man going to fight or give his all when he can't see anything worth while behind it? No one has satisfied us yet, so think twice before you try.

QUESTION OF RESERVISTS

Another question which all reservists would like answered: When we signed up after the last war we were led to believe we wouldn't be called until a national emergency existed Most of us were called before the emergency was declared To us it was kind of a low blow dealt from what we once called a democratic Nation It's rough to be lied to, by our own Government, at that This may sound harsh, but it's not half as harsh as all of us feel.

Why is it that our PX (post exchange) shelves are bare when the black market thrives to such an extent that the streets are lined with shops selling American cigarettes, candy, toilet articles, stationery, and every item of GI clothing—not used, but brand new?

BRITISH IN AMERICAN GARB

Why is it that our engineer battalions have to drive trucks and equipment made in Japan, when the Koreans use United States equipment and tear it up within a month?

Why was it that the reservists, the majority of whom were more than qualified, weren't held in the States to train draftees instead of being sent overseas?

Why is it that British soldiers, from the nation which claims to have the best tailors in the world, are seen wearing GI field coats and carrying M-1 rifles as they stroll through the PX buying up our scarce items? Why, too, are Korean police, civilians, and soldiers wearing our GI uniform? How is an American soldier supposed to respect his uniform when it's being worn by everyone in the world?

IMPOSING EDIFICES

Why is it that the British, Dutch, and other European legations are housed in imposing edifices when the Nation that foots the bill for the whole show is in a dump by comparison?

You try to answer these questions We, the expendable GI's, can't

CHARLES C COWPLAND.

Thirty-third Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. FLOOD Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution just received by me from Mr. Joseph Maceina, chairman of the Joint Committee of the American-Lithuania Council, Inc., Pittston Chapter, and Lithuanian Relief, Chapter 44, Pittston, Pa:

PITTSTON, PA., *February 18, 1951.*

DEAR SIR: At a mass rally of Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in the city of Pittston, Luzerne County, Pa., on Sunday evening, February 18, 1951, to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the country of their forefathers, the enclosed resolution was adopted by the unanimous vote of the participants.

Tribute was paid to the Government of the United States for their courageous stand in defense of liberty of people everywhere, being particularly concerned with the destiny of Lithuania, whose people desire nothing that is not rightfully theirs.

This meeting requests the Government of the United States of America to initiate appropriate measures (1) to induce the Soviet Union to withdraw its army of occupation and administrative forces from the territory of Lithuania, and allow the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereign rights of an independent nation in conformity with the international treaties and the principles of the international charters subscribed to by the Soviet Union, and (2) to induce the Soviet Union to stop its genocide practices in Lithuania and to repatriate those many thousands of Lithuanians who were deported to Siberia during their occupation of Lithuanian territory.

We feel confident that the Government of the United States of America will spare no efforts in bringing about conditions which would enable the Lithuanian people, as well as other nations behind the iron curtain, to regain their lost freedom and to resume their rightful place as independent nations.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH MACEINA,
Chairman of Joint Committee of American-Lithuanian Council, Inc., Pittston Chapter, and Lithuanian Relief, Chapter 44, Pittston, Pa.

At a mass rally of Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in Casino Hall, 91 North Main Street, Pittston, Pa., on Sunday evening, February 18, 1951, to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Lithuania, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas for 21 years (from 1918 to 1939) the Republic of Lithuania was a free and independent nation, and during that period proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that she is fully capable of self-government. They were released from the yoke of subjugation by decree of the League of Nations, and

"Whereas historians tell us that Lithuanians settled on the shores of the Baltic Sea as early as the eleventh century, and spoke a language very similar to the ancient Sanskrit, and

"Whereas Lithuania, as a neutral country, was the victim of ruthless warfare and pillaging during World War II, is presently occupied by Soviet Union armies and administrative forces, and

"Whereas the principle of political independence enunciated in the declaration of the United Nations, and in the Atlantic Charter, is a hollow mockery in the light of the situation in Lithuania as it exists today, particularly the genocide practices which constitute a flagrant violation of the law of nations in general and of the United Nations Charter in particular: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That request be made on the Government of the United States of America to initiate appropriate measures (1) to induce the Soviet Union to withdraw its army of occupation and administrative forces from the territory of Lithuania, and allow the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereign rights of an independent nation in conformity with the international treaties and the principles of the international charters subscribed to by the Soviet Union, and (2) to induce the Soviet Union to stop its genocide practices in Lithuania and to repatriate those many thousands of Lithuanians who were deported to Siberia during their occupation of Lithuanian territory; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America; to the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the United States Senators from Pennsylvania; and to the Congressman from Luzerne County, Pa."

JOSEPH MACEINA,
Chairman of Joint Committee of American-Lithuanian Council, Inc., Pittston Chapter, and Lithuania Relief, Chapter 44, Pittston, Pa.

Fight Against Philadelphia Wage Tax Must Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is unjust, and, in the opinion of some it is unconstitutional, for the city of Philadelphia to levy a tax on the workers employed in that city regardless of their place of residence even though it be entirely outside the limits of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania.

The fight against this iniquitous tax has been carried on in the Council of the City of Philadelphia, the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, and in the Congress of the United States. As yet no satisfactory results have been obtained.

On February 22 of this year, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2830, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration. On February 27 I introduced another bill, H. R. 2945, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration. Both of these bills sought to repeal the effect of the Philadelphia wage tax in its application to nonresident Federal workers in the city of Philadelphia. Although drawn in different language they are nevertheless the same in purpose. In addition to these bills I have also introduced, on March 5, another bill, H. R. 3054, that would extend the principle of the above-mentioned bills to all workers, and, not merely Federal workers. This bill has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope that committee hearings will be held on the bills I have introduced and that favorable action will be taken to relieve workers of these unfair and unjust taxes wherever they exist, Philadelphia, or, elsewhere throughout the Nation.

As an illustration of the widespread interest that is being taken in the effort to eliminate taxes on wage earners who do not reside within the jurisdiction levying the tax, I include as part of my remarks, under the unanimous consent granted, an editorial appearing in the March 8, 1951, issue of the Courier-Post, published at Camden, N. J., reading as follows:

WAGE TAX FIGHT SPREADING—HOPE OF VICTORY IMPROVING

Never before has the fight against Philadelphia's wage tax on nonresidents raged on so many fronts as at present.

The New Jersey State Senate, by a vote of 17 to 0, has just passed a resolution, sponsored jointly by Senators Wallace, of Camden County, and Hannold, of Gloucester County, calling on Congress to outlaw the tax.

A resolution by Assemblymen Neutze and Meloni is pending in the assembly which would ask Congress to relieve all persons living in one State from paying wage or income taxes in another.

A resolution has been introduced in the Pennsylvania Legislature by the State senator from Delaware County to outlaw the Philadelphia tax on any nonresident of the city, whether he lives in the State of not

Congressman WOLVERTON has sponsored a bill at Washington to make Federal employees subject to taxes only in the State in which they reside.

Congressman HOWELL has sponsored a broader bill which would exempt all nonresidents of a State from its wage or income taxes, and WOLVERTON has said he also will introduce a similar bill. A third measure to this effect has been introduced by Representative JOSEPH O'HARA, a Minnesota Democrat.

United States Senator SMITH of New Jersey also has announced he will offer anti-wage-tax legislation in the Senate, the first time such a bill has been initiated there

Despite all this activity against double taxation and taxation without representation such as the Philadelphia wage levy imposes on workers who do not live or vote there, the battle really is only beginning.

Any action taken by the New Jersey Legislature can do no more than demonstrate to Congress and to Pennsylvania how deeply New Jersey resents this iniquitous tax. New Jersey cannot compel Congress or Pennsylvania to end it.

The Pennsylvania suburbs of Philadelphia have never gotten to first base in previous efforts to have that State's legislature ban the wage tax. Since, in the past 2 or 3 years, many other Pennsylvania municipalities have adopted a levy like Philadelphia's it is probably useless to hope for relief from that source.

Congress has always been reluctant to intervene in tax matters pertaining to the States and curtail their taxing powers, as anti-wage-tax legislation would do.

Many States impose income taxes on nonresident workers. New York has done so for years on north Jerseyites and would lose large revenues if Congress forbade the practice. Hence these States can be counted on to oppose Federal legislation.

Yet the national situation is changing, partly due to the very fact that so many States have income taxes and so many citizens as a result pay taxes in two States. Dispersal of Federal bureaus from Washington into the adjoining States of Virginia and Maryland, confronting many thousands of Government workers with the dual tax problem, is bringing it sharply to the attention of Congress as a whole for the first time.

The fact that a Minnesota Congressman has introduced a bill against dual taxation is significant, showing that south Jersey no longer stands alone in the crusade against it as we once did.

Now there is talk of a movement, if Congress will not act, to initiate a constitutional amendment which would bar double taxation. There certainly would be widespread popular support for such an amendment all over the country.

The fight may not be won this year, or the next, but it is growing warmer and wider. It should be carried on more strenuously than ever on our part, and there is reasonable hope of eventual victory.

Crescent City, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March issue of Good Housekeeping:

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF.

The place was Crescent City, a 3,000-person town pocketed dramatically between the giant redwood forests of northwestern California and the rugged, rock-strewn coast of the Pacific Ocean. The time was October 1949. The atmosphere was one of deepest melancholy. Sixteen Crescent City businessmen and businesswomen stood looking at their crescent-shaped harbor; gloom clouded every face For the fifth time in 32 years, their bid for a Government-financed dock had been rejected. Why? Because Crescent City didn't have the shipping business to justify such expense. The argument of Crescent Citians—that they couldn't get the business until they had a dock—was smothered under an avalanche of statistics. The brutal truth was upon them: Their town could never really prosper.

Not one of those men and women remembers who uttered the fateful words that changed the whole course of Crescent City history. "Let's build our own dock," somebody said. And, as the townspeople put it, "At that moment, civic lightning struck Crescent City."

That very afternoon a citizens dock committee was formed. The next day, Saturday, a dozen subcommittees went to work, making a house-to-house canvass for voluntary donations of money. On Sunday a volunteer engineer completed his plans for dock construction. On Monday morning the necessary rights-of-way were obtained, and that afternoon volunteer truckers started dumping rock into the road fill leading to the dock site.

For the next 6 months little Crescent City worked itself to the civic bone to reach its fantastic goal. "The fever got us," says Mrs. Emma Cooper, county clerk. "Every one of us, from 8 to 80."

A $10,000 quota was set. Within 2 weeks, $17,000 was raised. Truckers, foresters, and dockers—222 in all—donated their services. The Hotel Lauff offered lodgings, gratis, to out-of-town workers. Local businesses donated gasoline, water pipe, auto parts, wiring, repair services, lumber, food, and drink. The Shamrock Cafe gave free lunches to workers. Crescent City's 55 professional secretaries worked after hours on the citizens dock books and records. The employees of Brownie's Cafe joined in a payroll contribution plan. The bus station served free coffee to workers at all hours. Mrs. Illene Moore, a dairy farmer from Del Norte County, donated a 6-month-old heifer for auction. Result: $280. Paul A. Brunk, local landowner, auctioned 24 lots and presented half the proceeds to the citizens dock committee. Result: $1,200. The local branch of the Bank of America gave, besides cash, the services of one teller each day for dock work.

Crescent City's women exhibited man-sized energies during that heart-stirring half year. Members of the Woman's Club and the Business and Professional Women went from door to door and sold $465 worth of tickets to a benefit double feature at the Mecca Theater. The Ladies Auxiliary of the American Legion held a build-our-dock dance and cleared $271. The Elk Valley Club, a rural organization, presented the committee with $100. A department-store clerk donated a bolt of red cloth which was used for danger flags. Waitresses and high-school girls toted hot coffee and doughnuts to the dock, where workers labored voluntarily through savage winds and rains.

On March 18, 1950, the citizens dock was finished—a $200,000 project that cost the town's residents $17,000 in cash and an awesome number of man- and woman-hours of physical work. Mayor Al Manuel declared March 18 an annual legal holiday, and

announced a day-long celebration to commemorate the occasion. Fishing-boat races, a parade of old-timers, a contest to name Miss Citizens Dock, a gigantic crab feed, and an official christening of the dock kept the town and its 5,000 visitors pulsing until far into the night. "On March 19," recalls Alyce Moseley, county judge, "you could shoot a cannon down Main Street and not hit anybody. The reason: Everybody was getting some sleep, at last."

Today Crescent Citians look with almost tearful pride at their dock—a 900-foot pier projecting into the blue waters of Crescent Harbor and right-angling into a fisherman's pier, a lumber wharfhead, and a loading platform. And they gaze sentimentally at the big, handsome, redwood-bound scrapbook encased in glass at the chamber of commerce office, on Second Street. On its pages are listed the names of all the people who contributed to the building of Citizens Dock. "There are more than 700 names in that book," says Bill Mason, local realtor. "It represents, without a doubt, the most stupendous example of civic cooperation this region has ever known."

Already the town is realizing many happy returns from its labors. A fishing fleet of 130 boats uses the dock; 3,000,000 board feet of lumber and 120,000 tons of oil are shipped each month through the harbor; and oil tank farm is being constructed at the south shore of the bay, new lumber mills are moving in. More than $1,500,000 worth of cargo has already left Citizens Dock, slipped past Pelican Rock, and headed for ports all over the world. The town that "could never really prosper" is, within a year, booming beyond its citizens' dreams

Crescent Citians are taking their prosperity in exuberant stride. "We weren't exactly loafing before," they say, and point to their other projects, such as the Business and Professional Women's 2-year-old plan for Crescent City's high-school girls "The women of this town," says Alice Mather, housewife and professional bookkeeper, "discovered our girls weren't fitting themselves properly for after-school professions" So in 1948, members of the club invited the town's high-school girls to spend a week inspecting local businesses. Last year, 80 girls signed up for this tour; they watched the inside workings of department stores, restaurants, motor courts, public-health laboratories, law offices, schools, and hospitals. At the Seaside Hospital, 16 girls visited the laboratories, surgeries, incubator rooms, and kitchens. Four of these girls thereupon chose nursing as their careers, and plotted their schooling accordingly.

The plan has also led to congenial part-time work for some Sixteen-year-old Gail Barnum, who was elected Miss Citizens Dock on gala March 18, learned she adored secretarial work, and now spends 18 profitable hours a week at the local food-locker plant.

A lot of new things are being planned for Crescent City. There's a greensward to be planted along the scrubby 2-mile shore line. There's a highway-beautification plan presently under way, in which Crescent City's women, working in teams, are clearing underbrush and planting seasonal blossoms so that throughout the year color and beauty will beckon motorists toward the little city. Downtown, too, is being spruced up. One section of Second Street has become a gay stretch of green, blue, pink, and yellow store fronts.

"Yes, we have a nice town," says Bill Mason, who forsook his real-estate business to serve as the Citizens Dock Committee's unpaid financial chief. "We have our river. We have our trees. We have our rugged shore line and our crescent-shaped bay. Now all we need to do is make ourselves as good-looking as our surroundings. We will, too. Our dock has made us town-proud."

Procurement of Paint for the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MERCHANT'S & MANUFACTURER'S PAINT CO., INC.,
Louisville, Ky., March 5, 1951.

Hon THRUSTON B MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: A most serious matter has come to the writer's attention which I desire to convey for your consideration and possible action. Through conversation with suppliers of paint raw materials and other paint manufacturers the writer learned that the Navy Department, Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, had bid forms on requisition EP 3727-51 out for quotation. This bid is for 6,487,000 gallons of paint I have been told this is larger than any bid requested during World War II.

The story which is a general topic of conversation in the paint industry is that the Aviation Supply Office is procuring this tremendous quantity of paint for the United States army engineers and that it is to be packed in quarts, 1-gallon and 5-gallon containers. The procuring agency went to four large paint companies and asked them to take the business When informed it was too much business for them to handle the procurement agency then opened it up to 50 large manufacturers to bid on.

On February 23 our company wired for copies of this requisition. Today we received the following letter dated February 28· "Your wire request for bid forms on requisition EP 3727 is acknowledged The solicitation of bids under this requisition is closed"

The writer's gripe over this manner of doing business is as follows: Isn't this inconsistent with the Government's stated position of helping the small companies to stay in business during this national emergency? The writer checks daily the United States Department of Commerce Field Service, Consolidated Synopsis of United States Government Procurement Information and has never seen this bid advertised. This is probably the largest paint bid ever released for quotation, and it is being handled as a negotiated bid amongst the select and chosen few. While here we are a small manufacturer trying to obtain D. O. business so as to aid in the defense effort, and at the same time have enough business to make up for the loss of civilian business and are feverishly quoting on formal and negotiated bids for a few hundred or thousand gallons of business, it looks like the big boys get the cream and the little boys the milk.

Our company has been a bidder on various paint requirements of the Aviation Supply Office in the past. Now here is probably the biggest paint bid of all times and we are not given the opportunity of quoting.

When the Federal Government in one bid requesting delivery in 120 days for 6,487,000 gallons of paint does this, it affects every paint manufacturer. It upsets the already aggravated market of paint raw materials. It is reported that this bid will require over 3,000,000 gallons of synthetic alkyd resin. It is estimated, working day and night, it would take 20 days to produce this quantity if every manufacturer of alkyd resin in the United States were to devote their full plant facilities. This one bid will take away from the civilian trade approximately 1 month's production of alkyd resin. This means that the small paint manufacturer's quota on alkyd resins will be cut and we have had no chance to quote on any of the paint under this bid invitation. Is this fair and equal treatment?

Hoping that some good will come out of this, we remain,

Very truly yours,
MERCHANT'S & MANUFACTURER'S PAINT CO.
WM. D. MENEFEE.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution in regard to St. Lawrence seaway project, adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, March 2, 1951:

Whereas for the past 100 years the navigation of the St. Lawrence River by ocean-going commercial vessels has been possible on a limited or restricted basis; and

Whereas despite the hazards and limitations of said navigation, commerce has continued on an increased basis through recent years; and

Whereas by this commerce, the practicability of a navigation route for maritime commerce between the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes has been demonstrated to a degree which would assure that in the future, navigation on said water highway will increase in a manner commensurate with the improvement of locks and channels which govern the navigable capacity of the St. Lawrence River; and

Whereas the construction of the Panama Canal and the operation of commerce through said canal has placed the Mississippi Basin at a disadvantage in the over-all commerce of the United States and has to a certain extent retarded the industrial and commercial growth of said Mississippi Basin, and

Whereas the improvement for barge navigation of the Mississippi system of waterways has demonstrated the need for the addition of water transportation and the commerce resulting therefrom has grown steadily to the present volume which is far in excess of the original predictions based on reliable studies and estimates; and

Whereas great as the development of the Mississippi system of waterways has been, it is not completely adequate, the inadequacy being apparent in an analysis of the economic needs of the upper mid-continental area of the United States which is still sorely in need of an adequate outlet by water to the ocean and to the markets of the world; and

Whereas over the past 30 years the United States engineers, economists, and other authorites have made complete analysis with regard to the economic desirability of the improvement of the rapids section of the St. Lawrence River for modern ocean-ship navigation and have repeatedly confirmed the judgment that such a water highway is needed and that its cost can be economically justified; and

Whereas during both world wars and in the present national emergency it has been repeatedly and forcibly demonstrated that the upper mid-continental area of the United States has grown in stature and importance because of its productive capacity in agriculture, minerals, industry, and manufacturing, and that said area of the United States is indispensable to the economy of the country as a whole, both in wartime and in peace; and

Whereas due to the heavy drains on the iron ore deposits in the Lake Superior region during the past 35 years it has come to light that a depletion of said ore supply is not an improbability; and

Whereas there has been established along the southern shores of Lakes Michigan and Erie a tremendous investment of private capital amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars in plants and industries for the manufacture of steel and its subsidiary products, which steel industry is vital to the United States, both in times of peace and in times of war, and which industry must be maintained at all costs for the security of the United States; and

Whereas the discovery of rich deposits of ore in Venezuela and Labrador assure a continued supply of raw materials, which in the natural course of events should be directed to supplying the afore-mentioned steel plants located in the region of the Great Lakes to permit their continued operation and manufacture of vital materials and products; and

Whereas the President of the United States in a recent declaration has stated that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway is a must for the future security of the United States from the standpoint of self-defense and also productive capacity in time of national emergency, which declaration has caused the Congress of the United States to hold hearings on the advisability and immediate objective of bringing about the St. Lawrence development; and

Whereas a former mayor of Chicago has appeared at Washington at congressional hearings concerning the St. Lawrence seaway and has, in the name of the City of Chicago, argued in favor of the construction of the seaway; and

Whereas the city council is on record as having adopted a resolution calling for Federal endorsement of the waterway project and the early completion thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Chicago does hereby again record itself in favor of the development of the rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and other channels and harbors to accommodate modern commercial ocean-going vessels an order that the midcontinental area of the United States be supplied with this additional transportation to insure its future development and to safeguard the economic stability of the United States in peace and in war; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and Members of both Houses of Congress from Illinois.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held the 2d day of March A. D. 1951.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 6th day of March A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

What Should Be Our Policy With Respect to Our Reservists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable dissatisfaction with the manner in which Reserves, active and inactive, have been called into service. The complaints seem to be based: First, upon the injustice of expecting men who served in World War II to serve in the present emergency when there are thousands of individuals who did not serve in the last war and are physically fit to do so at this time; second, the failure to take into consideration the family status or other personal considerations that heretofore have controlled the calling of men into service under the selective service procedures.

As an illustration of the kind of complaints being received, I include as part of my remarks, under the unanimous consent granted, the following letter received by me from a young man now in service in the Korean campaign. I have for obvious reasons eliminated his name and station of service. The letter reads as follows:

The Honorable CHARLES WOLVERTON,
Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: Undoubtedly your office has been the focal point for numerous letters written by reservists. I assure you that each and every one of us has broached the subject of Reserve policy with an objective attitude. However, there are occasions when it is rather difficult to arrive upon justifiable conclusions without prejudice. Ostensibly, the Navy Department has recalled Reserves in order to fulfill the pressing urgency demanded by mobilization It is the opinion of this writer that the Navy Department has lost sight of its original purpose. The present naval complement (composed to a great extent of Reserves) is in excess to the number actually needed. This condition is manifested not only on this station, but also on other bases as well. It is quite obvious that the Navy Department has overmobilized. Let us consider the facts.

Not long ago the Navy Department waged a campaign to recruit men for the Reserve program. At the time the contract was consummated, we were assured that Reserves would not be called unless a national emergency was declared. I suppose this was to be taken as a gentleman's agreement, for many of us were recalled 6 months prior to such declaration. Moreover, those of us who were in the inactive Reserves were told we would not be recalled until the ranks of the Organized Reserves had been depleted. Evidence strongly supports the falsity of such a statement. Not only do I question the integrity of the Navy Department, but also the constitutionality of such a move. It seems to me that decisions of such magnitude should rest with Congress and not within the individual powers of one man—at least, that is my conception of democracy.

Secondly, the Navy Department has repeatedly stated that there is no need for drafting men—that the Reserves and volunteers have satisfied the personnel requirements. Who, then, is going to relieve us? Why should we, men who have served 2 or more years duty in World War II, suffer for the lack of perspicacity and the cupidity of the Navy Department? Many of us are 25 years old or more and have families. Is it fair to deprive us of our valuable and productive years when there are 18-year-olds and men who served less than a year in service in the last conflict walking the streets? Perhaps I've permitted cynicism to warp my thinking; however, I assure you that these opinions coincide with those of fellow reservists.

Another point which warrants promulgation is the fact that these same Reserves would probably be the first to volunteer their services in the event of all-out hostilities. What we do object to is the involuntary recall to active duty just for the sake of mobilization, when already there are two and three times as many men as are actually needed. May I further state that this is at the taxpayers' expense—a gross misuse of Federal funds. The entire situation seems to be one of confusion and incompetency on the part of the Navy Department. It seems as if they—the Navy Department—were interested only in their own expediency, regardless of the cost to the people.

Thirdly, is it too much to ask for the formulation of a Reserve plan whereby we will be released? As it stands now, our future is uncertain—clouded by the fear of war. Certainly, enough time has elapsed for some steps to have been taken regarding this matter.

Inasmuch as I am a member of the community of ———, I am familiar with your past congressional record. I implore you to consider the facts as I have endeavored to present them and to render a just and fair decision. May I further ask how you intend to vote regarding the impending extension of enlistment?

Very truly yours.

Teaching of Moral and Spiritual Values in Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am again including an editorial from the Latrobe (Pa.) Bulletin on the important subject of teaching moral and spiritual values in our public schools. It is most important today, for a dangerous situation is arising, and the time to combat it is now. The editorial follows:

To a chaplain who administered the final sacrament an hour before her execution at the hands of the Germans in Brussels in 1915, the British nurse Edith Cavell made the remark "Patriotism is not enough."

The truth of this observation the world must learn anew. Americans must learn it because this is a world in which moral and spiritual values are under grave challenge. Of those values, patriotism can be a part, or not a part.

In the name of patriotism, Mussolini conquered Ethiopia and Hitler conquered most of Europe. The moral and spiritual values in fascism and nazism defied detection.

Communism denies the existence of a moral order.

Patriotism without moral and spiritual roots can be a noxious growth. That thought without doubt animated the 100-page statement on moral and spiritual values in the public schools issued at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, which 14,000 teachers, superintendents, college officers and other educators attended

The report warned there could be no social survival without a moral order. No improvements in government structure, no statutes and ordinances, however elevated their aims, could produce a good and secure social order if personal integrity, honesty and self-discipline were lacking, it was found.

The social effect of recent war has without doubt been more severe than most persons imagine They see the trees of their individual environment and fail to see the forest which composed the atmosphere of the national scene The increasing amount of aimless leisure, the changing patterns of home life, and the current international tensions, all represent challenges to moral strength

In the public school the child is taught the facts about the origin, progress and ideals of the United States. It would be hard to learn about Washington without becoming aware of elements of moral grandeur. The child is quick to recognize what is good. It should be the task of all educators to increase his awareness of the moral and spiritual values on which civilization rests and upon which its survival depends. The national defense can rest upon no stronger foundation.

Nation-Wide Publicity Received by Phariss Family Over Radio Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the beauty of the Ozarks of Missouri has been recognized by novelists, poets, artists, photographers, and vacationists. Those of us who are natives of the Ozarks and have grown up in those hills love them—but we take a special pride in the people, and are happy when recognition comes to any of us.

My faith in our American family life has been strengthened to know that the Phariss family, of Monett, Mo., has received the W. G. Skelly agricultural award. Raymond Phariss was born at Mount Vernon, Mo. His father died when he was 7 and his mother died when he was 13. He started farming for his uncle when he was very young. He has continued to farm, and now owns 160 acres—and rents another 40 acres. He is a scientific farmer, who can talk about nitrogen and phosphorus needs of the soil as an experienced chemist. He understands rotation of crops—and a farm in the Ozarks is not a one-crop farm—he produces barley, oats, corn, hay, and pasture—and has dairy cattle, hogs, chickens, to say nothing of a strawberry patch.

Raymond Phariss is a real farmer—not afraid of work, and always eager to keep up-to-date in farm methods—but the award was given to all four members of the Phariss family. He and Mrs. Phariss were married in 1932—during depression years. They have two daughters now in high school. Mrs. Phariss considers the chickens her pet project, but from the information I have been able to obtain, each member of the Phariss family can handle any part of the operation of their now modern farm. Mrs Phariss and her daughters make their own clothes—and even find time to help neighbors and friends.

Much hard work, careful planning, and a fine Christian home have contributed to the success of the Phariss family. I am happy to join their many friends in the community in paying tribute to them.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Monett Times of March 3, 1951, which includes the radio program describing the winning of the W. G Skelly agricultural achievement award:

MONETT AND BARRY COUNTY COME IN FOR COMMENT—NATION-WIDE PUBLICITY RECEIVED BY PHARISS FAMILY OVER RADIO TODAY

Monett, Barry County, and Roaring River came in for some good Nation-wide publicity this morning when the Raymond Phariss family was honored by achieving the W. G. Skelly Agricultural Award

Recognition was given over the National Broadcasting Co Skelly-sponsored program, which is heard in this area over KOAM at Pittsburg, Kans., and KGBX at Springfield

The broadcast was heard at the breakfast here and a complete transcript follows

A wire recording was made of the broadcast by Kenneth G Meuser, publisher of the Times. It will be transferred onto a wax record and will be presented to the Phariss family.

Here is the broadcast:

"Mr. BURLINGHAM Good morning This is Lloyd Burlingham greeting you on behalf of your Skelly jobber dealer, Skelly farm service man, and Skelgas dealer. Alex Dreier is here with highlights of the morning news.

"Today's agricultural achievement award goes to a fortunate quartet of fine people far toward the southwest corner of Missouri. There in the rugged hills of the Ozark Mountain country is Barry County. There Roaring River, a tremendous underground stream, bursts from the base of a beautiful bluff, daily pouring out 28,000,000 gallons of crystal-clear water, forming two lovely lakes, tumbling over three waterfalls and flowing away through a most pleasant valley.

"Mr. DREIER. Roaring River. Wonderful rainbow trout. Lloyd, we ought to be there—not here talking about it.

"Mr. BURLINGHAM. You've had some grand times there, I know, Alex. And we've been invited for today, by J. F. Black, of the Barry County Bank. He tells of last year's 200 cars of strawberries shipped from Cassville and a new industry—"poke greens," and asks us to try both—strawberries and poke greens with sow belly. Canned, now.

"Mr. DREIER. I can wait.

"Mr. BURLINGHAM. Give us your summary of what goes on in the world and 'waiting.' We'll try to make ourselves believe we're in Barry County, Mo.

* * * * *

"Besides being a great vacation area, southwestern Missouri, turns out a lot of food. It has to, in order to take care of all its visitors. It is important in its dairy and poultry productions and in its harvests of fruits and vegetables. Last year's strawberry crop totaled more than 1,000,000 quarts, Barry County alone producing well more than a third of the million quarts. May's the time to be there. Alex.

* * * * *

"Mr. DREIER. The hills of Missouri are beautiful. Clifford Newlin wrote of them:

" 'The Lord pushed up the Ozarks to the sky,
Then, through the ages, humbled them to hills.
The stubborn granite never could deny.
The constant grinding of the silent mills.
Then, over all the verdant billowy mass,
He planted dogwood, oak, and sassafras.'

"It's a great thing when an area can be so attractive as the Ozarks country and, at the same time, highly productive

"Mr BURLINGHAM Today's award story illustrates that It tells of the work of the Raymond Phariss family on 200 acres on Kings Prairie near Monett

"There are four of the Pharisses—Raymond, Lois, and their two daughters, Nora Lee, 17, and Noveta, 16. They own 160 acres, rent 40 more, and turn out these totals: 145,000 pounds of Guernsey milk, 2,800 dozen eggs, 4,000 pounds of pork, $450 of poultry meat, $1,800 of beef. They market 275 crates of strawberries. Field crops include 15 acres of red clover, 10 of oats and lespedeza, 11 of oats and red clover, 10 of barley and sweet clover, 5 of barley, 16 of lespedeza meadow, 24 of corn, 6 of Atlas sorga, and 1½ acres of strawberries.

"The crop yields are highly satisfactory, which Mr Phariss credits partly to his use of clover in rotation with other crops. Though the farm is in Kings Prairie, some of it slopes That part of the farm is kept in grass and not plowed up. As insurance against soil erosion, strip cropping is followed. Fertilizers used are those recommended following soil tests

"That's a good job Alex?

"Mr. DREIER. Mr. W. V. Davis, Monett banker, speaks up for our awardee—better for him than our bankers would for us, Mr. Burlingham.

"Mr. Davis has watched Raymond Phariss since he was a small boy and says, 'I have perfect confidence in his ability to make good on any commitment. He has built slowly but substantially, earning the money with which to pay for his constantly improving enterprises.' That from his banker.

"Mr BURLINGHAM. His neighbors do quite as well by him—in fact, they first drew the attention of the Committee on Awards to the fine Phariss record.

"These neighbors tell of the good Raymond Phariss and his family do for those about them. Mr Phariss is a director of the Monett, Mo., Farmers Association Exchange and of the Ozark REA board. He has served for 15 years as a commissioner of the Kings Prairie special road district. He is a board member of the First Christian Church in Monett, all four Pharisses being members. Mrs. Phariss is vice president of the Kings Prairie home economics extension club. Nora Lee and Noveta are in Future Homemaker work in the Monett High School. Nora Lee has been a member of the high school debating team for 2 years, the team winning the big eight championship both years.

"That's the story authenticated by County Extension Agents M. B. Carpenter and his successor in Barry County, Robert Kelley.

"Here is a man who started with a small acreage and enlarged his land holdings gradually. He developed a 353 pound dairy herd and sells a quality product, grade A milk. He has handled his land in strict conformity with sound conservation practices. He has made his home modern and comfortable and his livestock structures convenient and practical. And in the entire Phariss record the good will of neighbors has been earned and maintained. Best of all is

the Phariss success as a family. All four are interested and all four pitch in and work together. Raymond Phariss credits the progress accomplished to the cooperation and careful planning by the family unit. This last in the feeling of the Committee of Awards is the climax of the substantial accomplishments by Raymond Phariss.

"The agricultural achievement award is therefore made to the quartet, to Raymond, Lois, Nora Lee, and Noveta Phariss, the award including a $100 United States Savings bond, a gold lapel pin and handsome scroll. Many, many friends have the Pharisses—good friends who rejoice in this recognition of the fine Phariss record. 90 of these neighbors are in Monett right now, at the Hatchers Cafe. There they are breakfasting together, celebrating the fine works of the four Pharisses. Mr. W. G. Skelly sends his best wishes to the four. His personal representative, Mr. A. Vavra, of Joplin, is at the breakfast and will present the award."

State Department Blind Spot—The Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our military leaders tell us that the Middle East area is highly important for strategical reasons The State Department, however, refuses or ignores 200,000,000 people in that part of the world who want to be our friends and without cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, that outstanding military man, Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, calls attention to some important facts in a leading article that appears in the March 12 issue of the Freeman, which I include as part of my remarks at this point:

THE STRATEGIC MIDDLE EAST

(By Bonner Fellers)

Lenin once said that the road to communism is through preaching nationalism to subject peoples. Today Communist agents in the Middle East are busy preaching this Lenin doctrine Unfortunately for the free world, their audience is receptive.

A million Arab refugees, homeless, undernourished, living in caves; 30,000,000 nonindependent north Africans smarting under French domination; peoples of Iraq, Jordan, and Egypt irate under occupation by British troops, are all making the going easy for the Communist agitators.

The negative policy of the United States toward these critical areas serves to aggravate the situation. The fault lies largely in the fact that we deal with the Middle East through the eyes, interests, and prejudices of our European allies. Britain is accorded primary interest; it is British policy which we follow there. The United States is represented not by traditional American love of freedom but rather by those European powers, especially Britain, which tell us where to stand so as best to further their own aims.

The unfortunate part of our policy is that the allies who influence us are colonial powers, interested in the exploitation of the Middle East and north Africa. Consequently, their position there is most unenviable.

Since 1882 the British have dominated the Egyptians by force. British troops on the Suez are unwelcome. The Egyptians want to guard their own territory. The dispute over the Egyptian Sudan remains unresolved. The failure of the UN to act on these issues drives Egypt from closer association with the Western Powers.

In North Africa the situation is worse than in Egypt There the French maintain a colonial administration which amounts to serfdom. Morocco had been independent of European domination for more than a thousand years It was not until the nineteenth century that the French, British, and Spanish made heavy inroads of empire In 1912 Morocco became a French protectorate with loss of liberty and individual freedom. Tunisia, under French domination, is stricken with poverty, and the people have been crushed by force

While passing through the Mediterranean in 1943, President Roosevelt—possibly with tongue in cheek—promised the Sultan of Morocco "I will never allow this state of things to exist after the war. This exploitation by foreigners is not in the interest of the people." And the Sultan of Morocco is still loyal to America, hoping constantly that this pledge will still be honored by the freedom-loving American people. Yet when the oppressed Arabs and Jews of North Africa protest their troubles, they find that the United States is strangely silent and, behind the scenes, supports the European powers.

Communists from France and Russia, protesting their objective to be liberty for all, are pressing for an Arab alliance. And thus, in spite of the solemn commitment of the United States to contain communism, our policy in the Middle East and North Africa actually furthers its extension.

The incomprehensible part of this policy is that it is contrary to our own best interests, for the Middle East is critical, key terrain, vital to our success against Communist expansion The Middle East is a fabulous land which has been fought over for centuries. It is the bridgehead to three continents In it lie vast oil fields, the Suez Canal, and potential strategic bases.

If war comes, the collapse of our 50-division European defense would appear certain. Against it Stalin can hurl a formidable Red army which can be stepped up readily from its present strength of 200 divisions to 500 or even a thousand, should he need them. Only an extreme optimist would count on our being able to hold air bases in Western Europe. Spain, however, may be enabled to resist by her Pyrenees barrier. We hope that Britain would offer an unsinkable aircraft base, but again the fortunes of war might deny us its use. We must have flexibility to our plans.

There are excellent potential air base sites in Libya. Possibly these are the closest to Russia which we would be able to hold with small ground forces. Here the water and desert barriers of the Mediterranean and Middle East would prevent Russia from throwing the full weight of the Red army against us. From these bases, which offer unlimited dispersal areas, medium bombers and long-range fighters can strike deep into Russia; from them they can deny Russia the oil of Rumania and Saudia Arabia. When one realizes that 40 percent of the known oil reserves of the world lie in the Middle East, the necessity of being able to deny this oil to Russia becomes imperative.

Today the Middle East has been caught physically and ideologically between the surging, irreconcilable forces of the East and West. Communists tell these nonindependent peoples that European colonial imperialists, backed by America, seek only exploitation. Western propaganda warns them against the Communists who seek to enslave the world. Each of these forces is so overpowering that the people must yield eventually to one or the other.

In view of the strategic importance of the Middle East we can not afford to lose the ideological struggle there.

Africa, also, is part of Stalin's program for world communization. Once in possession of the Middle East, the extension of Red domination over all Africa would be greatly facilitated. Loss of Africa would be a tragedy to the western powers, for this undeveloped continent, rich in natural resources, offers to Europe and America a vast potential market.

The African people number fewer than 200,000,000; they are wretchedly poor. But provide them with better food and medical care, and the population would doubtless double in two generations. The natives, being inclined essentially to agriculture, could help feed Europe in exchange for manufactured goods. Thus abundance could be created readily both in Europe and Africa. The fly in the ointment lies in the fact that free Europe, still stunned from World War II, is unable to devote its energies to Africa, where the Communist threat is real and immediate.

The key to the solution of our problem in the Middle East and Africa lies in Egypt. Egypt exercises a strange mystic control over the Arab and Moslem worlds. If the United States policy toward Egypt were direct from Americans to Egyptians; if our attitude contained warmth—and I do not mean money; if Egypt could count on a close relationship, culturally, economically, and militarily, the Arab and Moslem worlds could be alined closely with the free peoples of the world. A series of fortunate events in history makes this Egyptian leadership possible.

For centuries, either the Ottoman Empire or Germany—and sometimes both—served to keep the great Russian bear from wandering over Europe and the Middle East. The Ottoman Empire had held together because its people possessed a common culture and a defiant, compelling religious faith. Like Austria-Hungary, it was a binational empire in which the Turk and Arab were united by an indigenous political-religious ideology.

But gradually, as the Ottoman Empire met the impact of western influence, its components became weak Then World War I collapsed the empire. The Turks and Arabs separated. The Turks became independent and looked to the materialism of the west. The Arabs broke up into tribes which fell under the domination of France, Spain, Great Britain, and Italy.

In 1923 Turkey threw away the Caliph cloak and declared for westernized methods without reservation. She held that Islam and modern civilization were incompatible, and she elected to be modern. To the moslem this act amounted to a renouncement of his faith. It offended his sensitive feelings; it troubled his conscience. He pondered. Is it true that I cannot be modern and progressive and yet keep the faith of my fathers?

On the other hand, when Egypt firmly accepted western materialism and at the same time firmly retained her old faith, it caught the Moslem's imagination. The stand gladdened his conscience. Egypt became his Mecca—a progressive state by eastern standards, with a flavor of western methods, and still a Moslem state to which the same 400,000,000 Moslems of the world could turn with pride. Here was a country tolerant toward religion; free of inquisition, stanch for personal liberty—democratic—yet Moslem. To anyone who dreams of a close union of all Arabic and Moslem peoples, Egypt, especially Cairo, represents his ideal. Here he finds everything he likes from religion to political intrigue, from art to prostitution. Egypt's victory of tolerance was a victory for Moslems everywhere.

Leadership in Egypt may not always be good, but it is accepted by the Arabs and Moslems who follow blindly and who like to commit the same mistakes. Egypt enjoys such an enviable position that the most convincing proof to a Moslem that a thing is correct is—if it is done that way in Egypt.

But Egypt is more than a Moslem state where East meets West. Since the nineteenth century Egypt has been a Mediterranean power. Her population exceeds 20,000,000; her annual imports amount to half a billion dollars. No longer bound by the sterling bloc, Britain repudiated her Egyptian war debt of half a billion pounds; Egypt is free to turn to the United States. Egypt seeks no money from us—only trade, cultural relations, and mutually beneficial defensive measures. She cannot turn to Russia, which has nothing to offer in trade, culture, security, or freedom. Although Egypt realizes the strength of her leadership in the Arab and Moslem worlds, she does not know how best to exercise it.

The hand we extend to her is guided by European colonial powers. Consequently, Egypt is not free to throw her weight with us Yet the United States sorely needs the support and friendship of the Arab and Moslem worlds to which Egypt is the key. This is essential to the success of our policy of containment. The next move must be ours.

To effect the support we need to contain communism, deter war, and win if war comes, the United States should:

1. Stop underwriting European colonialism. (Communism cannot be defeated by support of colonialism.)

2. Adopt a policy of dealing directly with the Middle East rather than blindly following the British.

3. Endorse the principle of self-government—everywhere.

4 Encourage the formation of a defensive Mediterranean Alliance, to include Spain.

5. Help equip, if requested, local forces for the defense of air bases.

6 Extend the Monroe Doctrine over those members of the Alliance which are vital to our security.

Such a new and better relationship with the Middle East could be achieved merely by a change in our attitude. This would not destroy our firmly established relationships with France and Britain because, in the long run, our stand would benefit them in the furtherance of world peace.

In the final analysis communism, which is an ideology, cannot be destroyed by force and bayonets. It can be destroyed only by another and better ideology. We possess this better ideology, but in the Middle East we have permitted it to become submerged. It is still not too late to correct our mistakes if we decide to fight communism by furthering the cause of freedom.

American Peace Crusade at Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

MARCH 13, 1951.

DR JEROME DAVIS,
American Peace Crusade,
West Haven, Conn.:

Concerning your telegram requesting that I reserve time Thursday, March 15, for Connecticut constituents attending the American Peace Crusade at Washington, I wish to inform you that I have not done so nor do I have any intention of doing so.

While all my efforts and all my prayers are dedicated to world peace, I am not convinced that your group and your efforts are so dedicated.

You, Dr. Davis, have been cited personally by the House Un-American Activities Committee as belonging to from 41–50 Communist-front organizations. Your American Peace Crusade has been cited as an organic part of the Communist peace offensive and once again as organized by Communists

While the door to my office is always open to my constituents, while my time is devoted entirely to fulfilling the responsibilities to my constituents and to my country, I cannot devote any portion of my time to a cause such as you represent Rather, I prefer to utilize these moments I might spend with your group continuing my endeavors to bring about a real and just peace in the world, the sincerest form of peace whose basic foundation is the antithesis of Communist ideology—a peace based on the dignity of man.

Until such time that I am convinced your aims are constant with the best interests of the Nation, I must refuse to meet with you or any of your group.

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress.

Can a Congressman Serve 900,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 1, 1951

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article I wrote which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, March 11, 1951:

CAN A CONGRESSMAN SERVE 900,000 PEOPLE?—THIS EXTREME POSES PROBLEMS FOR THE HOUSE TACKLING THE DECENNIAL JOB OF REAPPORTIONMENT

(By Hon. EMANUEL CELLER)

WASHINGTON—Once again the size of the House of Representatives is up for consideration by Congress—as it has been every 10 years since the First Congress met in New York City in 1789 This is because, under our Constitution and the laws made to carry out its provisions, House seats must be reapportioned among the States every 10 years to reflect population shifts shown by the decennial census. Inevitably, unless the House is enlarged, some States stand to lose one or more seats; and, inevitably, those States wage a battle to maintain their representation by providing more seats.

The President, in a special message to Congress on January 8, listed seven States which will gain and nine States which will lose, a total of 16 House seats, as a result of gains or losses in population, actual or relative, between 1940 and the census of 1950. Notice of these changes has now been transmitted to the States affected. They will take effect automatically with the Congress to be elected next year—unless the present Congress takes affirmative action to raise the ceiling on the size of the House that has stood at 435 seats since 1911.

Already States which stand to lose seats are vigorously agitating for a larger House to preserve their present numerical representation, and bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve that end. One proposal would reduce the individual losses and increase the compensating gains by enlarging the House to 450 Members. Another would save the seats of all present Members and reward the faster-growing States by adding 74 new sets to make a total of 509.

Well, how big should the House be?

Any answer entails a choice, or compromise, between conflicting answers to two more basic questions: How many people can a Representative really represent? How large can a National Legislature become before it becomes too unwieldly to get its work done?

For specific suggestions as to the practical range within which a compromise might be worked out we can look to our own history and to the varying choices that have been made by other democracies of the world.

The Constitution set the size of the House temporarily at 65 seats and provided that thereafter the number of Representatives shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000 people. The Second Congress, accepting that figure as an approximate maximum as well as a strict minimum on the population of any congressional district, increased the membership of the House, following the First Census in 1790, to 106: One for every 33,000 of population.

Through 1910, as the country grew and new States were admitted to the Union, the House was enlarged every 10 years (except in 1840, when a mathematical peculiarity resulted in reducing the number of seats despite an increase in population). Even so, the average Member's constituents grew to 210,000.

Since then the country has grown another 60 percent, but the House has remained at the statutory limit of 435 set 40 years ago. With the population now standing at 150,687,361, according to last year's census, the average House Member represents almost 350,000 people, and because of inequities within the States the actual population of single districts ranges up to more than 900,000. At the 1790 ratio, the House today would have some 4,560 Members.

In a dozen other countries with democratic governments and two-house national legislatures, the figures run like this:

	Membership of legislative assembly	Average constituency
Australia	121	66,000
Belgium	202	42,000
Britain	625	81,000
Canada	262	52,000
France	619	66,000
India	500	684,000
Israel	120	11,000
Italy	574	80,000
Mexico	147	166,000
Netherlands	100	100,000
Sweden	230	30,000
Switzerland	194	24,000

Two generalizations stand out: In all but four of those countries the membership of the so-called lower house of the national legislature is smaller than ours But in all except one—gigantic India—each member represents far fewer people.

The argument for enlarging Congress starts with the obvious fact that the House, which the founding fathers held should be close to the people, has not grown up with the country. A hundred and sixty years ago a Congressman could actually maintain a personal relationship with a good portion of his constituents. Plainly, a Congressman today cannot maintain that same intimate relationship with a constituency that has grown tenfold. The Congressman, according to those who favor enlarging the House, has become less and less accessible to the people

who elected him and less and less responsive to their interests.

Besides having more people to represent, it is argued, the Congressman is further impeded in the opportunity to consult them by the increased burden of his work, which has grown even faster than the number of his constituents. In the First Congress, a century and a half ago, 142 bills were introduced in the House; for an average Congress of the last 10 years the flood of bills has risen to more than 5,000. Laws finally passed in a session have gone up at least 10 times

Moreover, bills today are frequently technical and extremely complicated in their economic ramifications. More and more time must be spent studying them in committee as well as threshing out complex issues on the floor. The length of annual meetings has more than doubled from 4 or 5 months to almost continuous sessions during the crisis-ridden past decade. The time available for grass-roots refreshment and home-town contacts has steadily lessened almost to the vanishing point.

At the same time, the demands of individuals for special services and of pressure groups for immediate decisions on pending issues have been intensified immeasurably. One Member of the House testified before a congressional reorganization committee a few years ago that his work as Washington errand boy for the folks back home was consuming up to 80 percent of his time A Congressman's mail may run from 200 letters a day up to 1,000 when some critical issue is being debated. A member who kept track of telephone calls to his office for a week reported an average of 82 a day. Another counted 48 callers who sought interviews with him in a single day—46 of them on matters not even related to legislation.

Several years ago Representative Luther Patrick, of Alabama, made a speech in the House that still stands as only a slightly exaggerated listing of some of a Congressman's extraconstitutional duties:

"A Congressman," said Representative Patrick, "has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency, getter-out of the Navy, Army, Marines; ward heeler, wound healer, trouble-shooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversy oil pourer, glad-hand extender, business promoter, convention goer, civil-ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-serviceman's champion, watchdog for the underdog, sympathizer with the upper dog, namor and kisser of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberer of delegates, adjuster of traffic violators, voters straying into Washington and into the toils of the law; binder up of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, good Samaritan, contributor to good causes—there are so many good causes—cornerstone layer, public building and bridge dedicator, ship christener. To be sure, he does get in a little flag waving—and a little Constitution hoisting and spread-eagle work, but it is getting harder every day to find time to properly study legislation—the very business we are primarily here to discharge and that must be done above all things."

In an effort to keep in touch with the people of their districts, and to fulfill their reciprocal responsibility for informing public opinion, Congressmen conduct post-card surveys, subscribe to scores of community newspapers, provide letters from Washington free to local editors. They mail out copies of their speeches and Government documents by the bushel. Many maintain offices in their home districts to which constituents who can't get to Washington may bring their complaints, suggestions, and requests for assistance.

Indeed, the cartoon of the old-fashioned Congressman enjoying his leisure in Washington, or on his front porch back home, is today a myth. This I can vouch for on the basis of 28 years in Congress. The average Representative is a hard worker. He puts in long hours under severe tension. His responsibilities—and, more, his chores—weigh upon him. His arduous tasks make him a poor insurance risk.

The argument against enlarging Congress also starts with the obvious: that the House would have to be expanded beyond all reasonable bounds to restore the intimate contact with his constituents which each Member enjoyed in the early years of the Republic.

But even in its present size the House is generally considered by its more experienced members to be too unwieldy, and it has been criticized for lack of orderliness. Those criticisms were cited when the present ceiling was adopted and when a proposal to add 35 seats was defeated following the census of 1920

If the habit of enlarging the membership with each 10-year increase in population were resumed, where would the trend ever end? Imagine, if you can, the effect on the expedition of important business of 74 more Members—and perhaps another 74 after 1960—making speeches for the RECORD to impress the folks back home Or, contrariwise, the increased frustration of an individual Member striving to make his voice heard on the determination of a critical issue.

The British and French Parliaments are sometimes cited as horrible examples of what might be in store for us In the House of Commons, with its 625 members, many on the back benches (when they can get seats at all) must endure enforced silence during the sessions; because of their great number they cannot effectively participate in debate. Similarly, the very size of the French National Assembly (formerly Chamber of Deputies), with its 619 members, diminishes the value and power of each member. The equivalent of our Speaker in the French lower house does not use a gavel to keep order. He has a huge bell. The great number of members makes it difficult to quell disorder. If the continued ringing of the bell fails to stop the tumult, the presiding officer puts on his hat as a warning that, if the turbulence continues, he will leave the chamber. If after these warnings order is not restored, he clamps on his hat, strides out of the chamber in high dudgeon and calls it a day.

Already the House of Representatives must rigidly curb debate, in comparison to the opportunity for full discussion allowed in the Senate, with its 96 Members. Sometimes even members of the House committee handling a bill do not have sufficient time to discuss the issues as thoroughly as might be desirable. Often freshman Congressmen receive no opportunity to speak on bills of great interest.

To the question of the proper size for an efficient legislative assembly, Winston Churchill offered one expert's answer—an arbitrary one, to be sure—in arguing against enlarging the chamber of the bombed-out House of Commons when it was rebuilt after the war. To preserve the intimacy and conversational form of debate conducive to carefully deliberated yet expeditious action, he urged, successfully, that the chamber be held to its prewar accommodations for only 437 of its 625 members. Perhaps it is worth nothing that our lower House comes remarkably close to that figure at its present size of 435.

Is it true, moreover, that increased pressure of work has made the Congressman less accessible to the people who elected him and less responsive to their interests? And, admitting the pressure, does an increase in the number of Members offer the only—or even the best—means of alleviating it?

Few public officials and certainly few private business executives are, in my opinion, more accessible or more responsive to the people than the Members of the House of Representatives. Most Congressmen still manage, somehow, to keep their office doors open to any importunate constituent or visiting fireman who chooses to walk in. No Congressman who wants to stay in office ignores letters from his voters. Few fail to follow the editorial pages of the influential newspapers of their districts.

Faster means of travel and communication make it easier for a Congressman to keep in touch with his district than it was in 1790. Administrative assistants, increased clerical staffs and the resources of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress have made it possible for conscientious Members to avoid becoming engulfed by the detailed demands of their offices.

Additional possibilities for relieving the burden—more practical, it seems to me, than enlarging the membership of the House—have been suggested: Elimination of the private calendar of bills for the payment of small claims against the Government, which could be handled by administrative agencies; home rule for Washington, D C., which is now governed directly by Congress; electric voting machines in the House, which could tabulate a roll call in a few seconds instead of half an hour; fewer and smaller committees; delegation of minor law-making authority to administrative agencies and regional authorities; delegation of some congressional investigative missions to ad hoc public committees such as the new Nimitz Commission on Security and Civil Liberties.

A more drastic solution was proposed by Representative Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, on the eve of his retirement from Congress in 1946. He suggested splitting the Congressman's job into two parts: the legislative part, to be handled by elected representatives in Congress; the administrative, or errand-running, part by elected representatives before the executive branch of the Government. The House of Representatives, under the Ramspeck plan, would have been reduced to half its present size, and its Members would have been prohibited by law from contacting the executive branch except in regard to legislation.

There was, and is, no realistic possibility of any such plan being adopted—as Mr. Ramspeck himself knew best, after 17 years in Congress. The thought behind it, however, is pertinent today to the decennial discussion of the size of the House of Representatives.

That part of the Congressman's job which has become most burdensome with the increasing size of his constituency, and the only part of it which enlargement of the House might somewhat reduce by distributing it among more Members, is his job as Washington lobbyist for the special political, economic, social, and cultural interests of the individuals in his district. His primary job, which is to participate in the shaping of wise policies and the writing of sound laws for the general welfare of the Nation, could only be impeded by enlarging the House to still more unwieldy proportions.

The question, should the House be enlarged, comes down then to this basic issue: Whether the Congress shall be organized as a lobby serving a diversity of local interests or as an efficient national legislature, placing the good of the whole country above favoritism to any of its parts. If this issue is seen clearly by the American people, and by their representatives in Congress, there can be no doubt of the choice that will be made.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address, recently delivered by Mr. Eugene Lyons, roving editor of Reader's Digest, on the Justice for Poland radio series sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress, together with the introduction by Attorney John P. Zaremba:

INTRODUCTION BY ATTORNEY JOHN P. ZAREMBA TO MR. EUGENE LYONS

Through the appeasement of Stalin at Tehran and Yalta we have, during the last 5 years, lost one-half of Europe and a large part of Asia. We have betrayed our friends, we have sacrificed country after country, depriving them of their freedom and their independence. We have recognized satellite Communist stooges as legitimate governments and degraded Washington by their embassies. But we have not quenched the appetite of the great imperialist aggressor of the Kremlin. Now that our own security is threatened by the rapid growth of Communist-dominated countries and a vital conflict is envisioned, we pour billions of dollars in the industries and military assistance of western democracies but with very disappointing results. In our perilous situation we are placing our highest hopes in the people behind the iron curtain, in Russia proper and more so in the satellite countries suffering under the ruthless oppression of Communist tyranny. We are hoping that more internal unrest, resistance and revolt might initiate the crumbling of the Communist giant.

But how can Poland, for instance, the largest in territory and most numerous in population of all European satellite nations, respond to our appeals sent by the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe, knowing that it was our appeasing diplomats who betrayed her and deprived her of independence? Only by the outright repudiation of the Tehran and Yalta agreements can we restore the confidence of freedom-loving people in American democracy, for deeds speak louder than words So it is high time to blot out the infamous secret agreement of Yalta that turned out to be the curse of the United States, the curse that produced the cold war; cost thousands of lives in Korea and instigated dangerous inflation with expenditures of untold billions of dollars It is indeed deplorable that such catastrophic agreements of our highest diplomats are known only to a small percentage of our fellow American citizens. Our speaker today is Mr. Eugene Lyons, foreign correspondent, author and editor, at present roving editor of Reader's Digest, formerly editor of American Mercury. He is the author of Assignment Utopia, The Red Decade, and other works, of which the most recent is Our Unknown Ex-President. So it is with pleasure that I present to you Mr. Eugene Lyons, of New York.

ADDRESS BY EUGENE LYONS, ROVING EDITOR OF READER'S DIGEST

Our country is at this time in the throes of a great debate on foreign policy and military strategy. It rings through the press, the airwaves, the Halls of Congress. More important, its arguments are echoed in millions of homes, factories, mines, farms—as ordinary Americans try to understand the grim, fear-ridden world we live in.

It is, I think, a wholesome debate. It means that America at long last is facing up to the life-and-death threat of Red imperialism It means that the American people are coming to grips with the challenge of the cruel and godless dictatorship enthroned in the Moscow Kremlin. To those who are not familiar with our democratic processes and traditions, the clash of opinions may sound like division and chaos. You and I, however, know that our America is merely hammering out a new unity with which to confront the looming menace.

But in the great flood of oratory and editorial comment, it seems to me, one element has not been given the attention and the emphasis it deserves.

That element was hinted at by Governor Dewey and John Foster Dulles, both of whom referred to the wretchedness and the discontents under the seemingly smooth totalitarian surface of the Soviet empire. It was highlighted also by Governor Harold Stassen. Returning from a world tour, Mr. Stassen reported wide disaffections and a spirit of rebellion in the satellite nations—and in Soviet Russia itself It was made even more explicit by Senator ROBERT TAFT, who declared—and I quote—"We need to study the methods by which those millions who yearn for liberty in satellite countries may be organized to seize power"

Well, the Ohio Senator would have been closer to the truth if he had not limited his study to satellite areas, if he had realized that the same yearning for liberty exists also inside Russia. All the debaters, indeed, would be closer to the reality if they gave more thought to the hundreds of millions of men and women suffering under the iron heel of Bolshevik tyranny. For those people, in the long run, are destined to be our most valuable allies in the struggle against Red barbarism.

Some of us try to view the world situation also from the vantage point of the populations within the Soviet sphere. And from that point of view we are worried, even alarmed, by the failure of American leaders to deal with this crucial fact. Nowhere do we hear a forthright pledge of the ultimate liberation of the countries already swallowed by the Communist nightmare Nowhere do we see any genuine concern with that phase of the over-all problem.

All the recent policy speeches—those of President Truman and ex-President Hoover included—seem strangely indifferent to the fate of the teeming peoples behind the iron curtains and in Russia proper. Not one of our top leaders has as yet proclaimed, in ringing words, that the free portion of mankind will never reconcile itself to the permanent enslavement of the populations in the Communist portion; that we shall not consider our job completed until the Soviet dragon has been slain by its victim. Nowhere do we find a solemn promise that those who rise against the Bolshevik despots can count on our moral and material support. In short, there has been no serious and emphatic offer of an alliance to the enemies of communism inside the Communist sphere.

Suppose that Soviet citizens, or Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, could read all sides of the American debate. Would they find anything to encourage them, to raise their hopes? Unfortunately the answer is No. On the contrary, they would more likely feel themselves abandoned, forsaken, written off as expendables. They would have a sense of being callously condemned to eternal servitude—if only the West can somehow save its own skin. The American speeches are filled with fervor about saving the freedom of the free; but they show little if any interest in freeing the unfree.

From the moral standpoint, this indifference to the fate of the captive peoples seems to me utterly shabby and shocking. There was a time in history when the ordeal of any oppressed people was the concern of decent, democratic men everywhere, even if it did not pack a threat to their own survival. Now, we seem willing to wash our hands of the oppressed, provided we can somehow contain or come to terms with their oppressors.

Pause to think how all the talk of stopping Stalin and containing the Soviets must sound to, let us say a Pole living under the whip of Communist tyrants. That talk, after all, implies an acceptance of the status quo, which is to say a permanent division of the globe into free and totalitarian portions. It denies to the enslaved peoples all hope of outside sympathy, let alone assistance. Our calculated silence on the issue of liberating those millions amounts to an attitude of neutrality in relation to the great struggle between the Kremlin and its subjects now under way in Poland and in every nation under the hammer and sickle.

But morals aside, that attitude of neutrality is stupid in terms of the psychological warfare to which more and more American minds are turning. It throws away the powerful, and perhaps decisive, weapon represented by the explosive discontents, by the aspirations for freedom, in the sovietized part of the world

Psychological warfare makes no sense unless it is geared to a crusading determination to help the subjugated peoples throw off their hateful yoke—unless it is combined with an honest pledge to overthrow the Soviet regime and liberate its victims. We are stepping up our propaganda to the multitudes behind the iron curtains, and that's all to the good. But that propaganda will remain meaningless as long as it rests merely on a desire to safeguard our own freedom—rather than a decision to restore freedom whenever it has been expunged

Where, in all the recent American pronouncements, can the Kremlin's long-suffering subjects find a ray of hope, a token of comradeship? Where are the expressions of solidarity with the oppressed peoples which we could transmit to them in radio messages or leaflets? Where are the ringing words that could rally fugitives from communism—of whom there are hundreds of thousands—for a finish fight against our common foe?

I submit that even on the level of simple political expediency, our seeming disinterest in the fate of the unfree population is self-defeating. It can only weaken the spirit of resistance where it exists, and deepen the pessimism of those who have renounced hope. It can only serve to rally the Kremlin's captives around Stalin and his puppets in sheer despair.

To the hundreds of millions in the Soviet Empire, our discussions about ground troops, air power, rearmament, are of secondary importance. What interests them is our basic approach to the Communist malignity. They search anxiously, in our words and acts, for portents of our long-range view of the Red cancer. Is the west, and America in particular, committed to bringing about the destruction of Soviet power, and thereby the liberation of its victims? That is the only question that has any direct relevance for those already confined in the prison states.

Had our spokesmen, whatever their political color, added this long-range objective to their programs, they would have laid a foundation for collaboration with the sovietized peoples. They would have brought closer an alliance of freedom-loving populations on both sides of the iron curtain—an alliance of the utmost value today in the propaganda duel, and our strongest single weapon tomorrow in short-cutting a war if it comes.

The great American debate, alas, has as yet done nothing to break down their awful sense of isolation from the democratic world. It has done less than nothing to apprise them honestly that we recognize our share of the guilt for their sad plight; that we

realize how, through ignorance and through the machinations of traitors in our midst, we helped rivet the Communist chains around their necks.

Our aloofness from their fate, our seeming willingness to barter their freedom in order to save our own, are the products of confusion, political cowardice, and moral weakness. Our task, from this point forward, is to let the enslaved peoples know that we consider them our friends and allies in a common cause. Let us say to them, in a voice that will penetrate the thickest iron curtains, "We shall not rest until Stalin and his system have joined Hitler and Mussolini in the limbo of history. We shall not rest until Soviet barbarism has become an ugly memory."

And words alone will not be enough. They must be backed by deeds—dramatic, forthright, unequivocal. As a beginning, we must repudiate the shameful bargains struck at Teheran, Yalta, and other such conferences. The betrayals compounded in those places were not mistakes. They were crimes against humanity, the American humanity included. Whatever our motives, those crimes must be frankly acknowledged and fully expiated. Only then shall we come to the great conflict of our era with clean hands and clean consciences.

We are aware that the victims of communism despite their tormentors and dream of the hour of liberation. This is the most significant factor in the whole world equation. It is the factor that can serve as a lever to overthrow the Soviet regime and make possible a new world—a world from which the obscene shadows of Kremlin power and Kremlin ambitions will have been lifted by the combined might of freemen on both sides of the iron curtain.

Urge MacArthur's Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hankering for the truth of what is going on in the world. They have been starved of facts by the Truman administration in regard to the world situation. I agree with John S. Knight of the Detroit Free Press that Gen. Douglas MacArthur could clarify many misunderstandings in the minds of the American people, if he were permitted to come home and report to Congress. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial by Mr. Knight which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, Sunday, March 11, 1951:

MACARTHUR'S RETURN URGED

(By John S. Knight)

Several times within recent weeks, this newspaper has urged that Gen. Douglas MacArthur be brought home to make a full report on Korea to Congress and the American people.

We reasoned that the Eisenhower report on Europe had been useful and informative, although vague in a number of particulars; that a MacArthur report on Asia would help to clear away many misunderstandings and bare the truth.

Why such a report is so necessary can be gathered from these two dispatches, both published Thursday last on page 1 by the Miami Herald and other newspapers:

"WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department reported Wednesday that American casualties in the Korean War rose to 52,448 last week, the biggest weekly increase since mid-January.

"SUWON, KOREA.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur said Wednesday continued limitations upon our field of counter-offensive action means the Korean War cannot fail to end in a stalemate."

General MacArthur said further that the great casualties suffered by the enemy would shake the Red China regime and dampen its ardor for any other aggressive adventures in Asia.

Yet he offered no hope that his military forces, barred from attacking Communist war production in China, and without reinforcements, could achieve more than a continuing stalemate.

So the "meat grinding" process, as MacArthur calls it, goes on without decisive results, and the American people are unable to understand clearly why their sons are in Korea or what they are fighting for.

They are entitled to a full explanation.

THE STORY OF A POLICE ACTION

Told chronologically, the story of Korea is this.

Last June President Truman suddenly decided to take a firm stand against the North Korean Soviet puppets who had attacked the Republic of Korea, which was that section of Korea lying below the thirty-eighth parallel.

For this action President Truman received widespread commendation. Even men who had bitterly opposed the President said: "This is the first time in years I have been proud to be an American."

The view was taken that while we might be risking a third world war by resisting aggression in Korea, it would be a lesser risk than permitting Russia to proceed unhindered with her plans for world conquest.

However, when the news from Korea turned sour, the very people who had been praising Truman to the skies for moving with dispatch began chanting a different tune.

As our limited American forces withdrew to the tightened Pusan defense perimeter, there were grim days when it seemed almost certain we would be driven into the sea.

What had started as a limited police action found the outnumbered Americans clinging precariously to an area less than one-tenth the size of Florida.

MacArthur could not fight an orthodox war and bomb the North Korean arsenals of supply in Manchuria for fear of involving the United States and the United Nations in a full-scale war with Red China.

UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie's appeal for ground troops to aid the embattled Americans fell upon deaf ears. Our allies in the United Nations either could not, or did not, show the stirring enthusiasm with which they voted for the resolutions committing the United Nations to a full share in the Korean crusade.

At this stage, United States public resentment against the sit-it-out countries was running high.

WHAT IS OUR FUTURE BELOW PARALLEL 38?

Months later, when the tide of battle turned with MacArthur's brilliant strategy at Inchon, brooding pessimism turned to exultation over our successes.

As our forces pushed far north to the borders of Manchuria, even the great MacArthur volunteered the ill-fated prediction that United States troops would be on their way home before Christmas.

Then the Chinese Reds struck in such vast numbers that UN troops were once again driven below the thirty-eighth parallel in a crushing defeat.

There we stand today, with Gen. Matthew Ridgway's defense line strong and firm and showing signs of being able to hold out indefinitely.

The strategy at the moment has taken the course of killing as many Communists as possible and keeping our casualties to a minimum.

But what of the future? What is our long-range policy? What objectives do we have in mind?

These are some of the questions that a MacArthur report would help to resolve. At present, the solutions—if they have been determined—are carefully guarded secrets known only to President Truman, Defense Secretary George Marshall, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The rest of us are expected to make sacrifices, give our sons and be patriotic, but we are told nothing.

WHAT ISN'T TAUGHT AT WEST POINT

These disturbing facts stand out in bold relief:

1. MacArthur has said that he is fighting the Korean War under restrictions "unparalleled in military history."

2. He has ironically described Manchuria as a privileged sanctuary, safe from the devastating blows of his heavy bombers.

3. When questioned recently about the probability of recrossing the thirty-eighth parallel, MacArthur said: "I want to make it quite clear that if and when the issue actually arises, I shall not arbitrarily exercise that authority if cogent political reasons against crossing are then advanced and there is any reasonable possibility that a limitation is to be placed thereon. I repeat that at this time, the question is academic."

Phrased in simpler terms, what MacArthur means is that he does not again intend to be put in the middle.

He is still smarting over British criticism that he was responsible for bringing the Chinese Reds into the war; still insists that his disastrous November offensive in North Korea was approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

4. MacArthur's latest statement that continued "limitations upon our field of counteroffensive action" means the Korean War cannot fail to end in a stalemate, is in effect serving notice upon the American public and the United Nations that he is unable to win a war where military strategy is dictated by political considerations.

This is something they didn't teach at West Point in MacArthur's day.

OUR ORIGINAL POLICY IN KOREA DISCARDED

It seems fairly obvious that MacArthur is in the awkward position of neither being able to press the Korean campaign to ultimate victory, nor to give it up as a bad job.

It is no secret that our Allies, including Great Britain, shrink from "antagonizing" Communist China and want no part of a major conflict with Chinese Reds.

It is equally true that a decision to pull out of Korea would mean a terrific loss of face. Such a decision would also serve notice upon the European nations who have been encouraged to stand up to Russia that United States and UN policy is weak, irresolute, and undependable.

The announced purpose of the UN resolution of last October 7 was to establish by arms "a unified, independent, and democratic government in Korea."

This noble objective has long since been discarded, and for the reasons which MacArthur has so clearly expressed.

Where, then, do we go from here?

Should we stay in Korea to prove that Communist aggression can and will be resisted?

Are we staying in Korea to pin down Communist forces who otherwise might be used against Indochina and other coveted areas in the Far East?

Do we hope that a stalemated war in Korea will lead the Communists to seek a negotiated peace?

These questions are being asked daily in millions of American homes where sons of draft age are being called to the colors.

It is easy to understand official reluctance to discuss these subjects honestly with the American people because the answers would require some rather complicated and difficult explanations.

That is why the Detroit Free Press believes a report from General MacArthur would help to crystallize public opinion; to spell out the incontrovertible facts; to tell us, as the British say, "which side is up."

We could then get somewhere near the truth.

Come; We Need You; Throw Away Your Education, Your Home, Your Loved Ones; Fight, Fight to Preserve—We Know Not What

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1951

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the following article.

This is an excerpt from an address before the American Legion Child Welfare School in Grand Island in February. The youth who made the address was Governor of Boys' State in 1950, and World-Herald's Teen of the Week last August 21. A Central High Senior, he is son of Mr. and Mrs. L. O. Burke, 1004 South Fifty-first Avenue. The sentences quoted were so designated in the text of the address:

When I was asked to speak today, I was informed that the talk should in some way enlighten you about the way in which the young citizens of today are "taking the bit"—are accepting their responsibilities. Always, adults are worried about the attitudes of young people. Afraid they are not up to par—worried for fear they do not uphold the things which ought to be upheld, and attack the things which ought to be attacked.

To you who wonder what the youth of today think about their future in terms of the citizen's duty to his country, I can only say—the outlook is pretty grim.

Ask them yourself. Ask Jim there—the tall young senior about to graduate from high school. Find out what he thinks of the job he finds on his shoulders. He says:

So, if the Army doesn't get me right away, I'll go to college. If it does, and war breaks out—well, I may not have to worry about what I'm gonna do for an education. A bullet'll take care of that".

Question Jack—the school's top athlete—want to hear a nice outlook for a 17-year-old kid? Listen:

"As far as I'm concerned, I'm gonna have one devil of a good time till I'm 18. I'm gonna do all the things that are wrong, so's I can say at least I lived for a little while. By golly, I'm gonna live for a year. After that—what's the difference."

Talk to the school "brain"—a boy with a brilliant mind, capable of doing innumerable things. How does he regard his duties as a citizen?

"So, what good are my brains—and all the knowledge I've accumulated—and the desire I have to learn, and to do great things? With a uniform on, you don't look much different than the town bum."

Exaggerated? Scattered examples? Suppositions? No.

Before writing this paper, I sat in on a lot of "bull sessions" and heard a lot of opinions expressed. These were only three. They all ran about like that.

WHY THESE ATTITUDES?

Why do they have this outlook? What has happened to the pioneer spirit and determination to keep this country free?

Why have these attitudes pervaded the minds of the young folk whose duty it is to preserve democracy?

Here's my opinion, formed after listening to a lot of friends and acquaintances expound on the subject.

Reason No. 1: The kids of today are tired of wars.

True, they never have fought on the front lines—they may never have seen military service. But consider the fact that the youngsters of 17 and 18 today have never, never, known a year in which there was not war, or rumors of war, or hatred in the air.

This young person is not the innocent that went off to serve with the AEF in World War I. Neither is he the young heroic who marched off to save world peace in World War II. He has seen war, read war, heard war, since he was old enough to understand what it all meant And because of this vicarious experience understands what war does.

Don't get me wrong. These same kids realize that there are nations in the world where the young people have seen a lot more conflict than right here in the United States. And they also realize that a lot of sacrifices have been made for them by men in the past and that they owe a lot to these people. In addition, they are not cowards.

They merely pose a question. It is one which they deserve to have answered. It is—is this the end?

Must the United States be the police force of the world forever and ever?

Do the other nations of the world really crave peace, or is the world so pent up with hatred and fury that each peace will be just a breathing spell before the next conflict?

SIXTY-FOUR-DOLLAR QUESTION

And above all—now get this one well, for it is important if you are to understand the young problems.

The $64 question is: "Are the officials now in the chief offices of our Federal Government really the high-caliber individuals that they should be, and are they working for the best interests of the American people today, regardless of political ties and ambitions?"

The majority of those young people I know believe that they are not.

Most young folks in my school and my town have even a high disregard for people in public office.

If these young men and women cannot trust and respect the supposedly leading citizens of the nation, then it is fair to expect high standards of citizenship from them?

If bungling in Washington causes and stretches out a war in which nothing is gained in material, in which no moral objective is reached and in which we are virtually betrayed by those supposedly our supporters, then is it fair to call to the stout young men of the Nation:

"Come—we need you. Throw away your education, your home, your loved ones, fight—fight to preserve—we know not what."

This, then, is what the young person must hear from you, the adults he looks up to. Is it wise? Will it get us somewhere?

Will my personal sacrifice—whether it be my life, or a limb, or merely some of my time, be to a good end? Will generations yet to come benefit from what I do, or will my part in history be an embarrassing synapse in the history of America—from which it will escape?

If your answers to these questions can be right, if you—the voting adults of America—can make it right with your sons and daughters—then never fear.

They will show you that they know how to fight as well as the ones that came before them. They will gladly take up their responsibilities and carry them out.

It is not a lack of patriotism that ails our youth. It is a lack of meaning to what they are asked to do. Once this has been cleared up—all will be well.

Opponents of Congressional Participation in Military Policy Are Inconsistent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, both by informal action and through a formal vote of their policy committee, Republican Members of this House have recently called for full participation and approval of both Houses of the Congress in decisions on national military policy.

If there had been any doubt as to the need for such a declaration, it is removed by the response of opponents of this policy of full congressional participation.

Assertion of the right and duty of the Congress to pass on the matter of troops for Europe in particular, has aroused those who want a free hand for the executive and the military. They have launched an all-out campaign to discredit this effort to secure full participation by the Congress and to vilify those responsible for the effort. They have not hesitated to insult a former President of the United States. They have invoked the ghost of the committee on the conduct of the war of Lincoln's day. They have accused the advocates of such congressional participation and control of wanting our country to turn tail and run.

The opponents of congressional participation in these decisions have charged that the purpose of such controls is to betray our partners in Europe and to violate the spirit and intent of the North Atlantic Treaty. They have gone so far, even, as to insist that ratification of this treaty by the Senate, July 21, 1949, gave the administration carte blanche in the matter of furnishing troops to Europe.

These allegations with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty have prompted me to review, in detail, the hearings and debate in the other body which preceded ratification of that treaty.

I want to report some of the high lights of what that analysis reveals. The findings have a direct and urgent bearing on the need to recapture full participation and approval of the Con-

gress. These findings stand, either as a powerful rebuke of those who today seek to deny or limit the participation and approval of the Congress, or as an indictment of the integrity and good faith of those who took the lead in urging ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Here is finding No. 1:

The idea or suggestion that the treaty contemplated—much less obligated—sending troops to Europe prior to an actual outbreak of war was emphatically denied by every supporter of the treaty who commented on, or was queried about, that point prior to ratification.

In some instances the suggestion of that possibility was scornfully dismissed. In one instance, at least, it was scornfully and sarcastically dismissed by a Member of the other body who now turns the same vials of scorn and sarcasm upon those who would have the Congress assert control over the process of committing American troops to Europe.

The question regarding the prospect of American troops being required or expected for Europe, prior to aggression, was raised—when it was raised—in connection with article III of the treaty. This article states that—

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

The question of the prospect of American troops for Europe was first raised during the public hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations. On April 27, 1949, the senior Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, addressed the following to Secretary of State Dean Acheson:

I am interested in getting the answers as to whether or not we are expected to supply substantial numbers—by that I do not mean a thousand or two, or 500, or anything of that kind, but very substantial numbers—of troops and troop organizations, of American troops, to implement the land power of Western Europe prior to aggression.

Is it contemplated under article 3? In other words, are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of these countries' capacity to resist?

Secretary Acheson replied:

The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute "no."

A few minutes later, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] asked Mr. Acheson whether the phrase "effective self-help" in article III contained within it the idea of sufficiency—sufficient self-help.

Mr. Acheson replied:

No. It cannot mean that, because probably the provision of sufficient forces at the present time is impossible for everybody. Otherwise if you were trying to get sufficient forces you would have to maintain military establishments which would be quite impossible both for Europe and for us.

On April 29, Senator DONNELL asked W. Averill Harriman, special United States Representative in Europe for ECA, another witness for the supporters of the treaty:

In your study in Europe, have you considered whether or not it would be necessary for American troops to be stationed in Europe in order to prevent Russia from overrunning Europe, should an attack be made by Russia?

This drew the flippant reply:

All I know is that I do not know any country that wants to have an armed occupation of United States troops.

After rebuking this answer, Senator DONNELL later asked:

Why haven't you given consideration to the question of whether manpower must also be sent over?

The answer was:

Because I have never heard anyone in Europe suggest it. * * * It is not in the European mind at the present time as I see it. I have said they do not like armies of occupation.

Pressed further, Mr. Harriman said:

You should ask that question of our Military Establishment. So far as I am concerned, I have never heard anyone discuss that matter in the discussions I have had regarding the Atlantic Pact and the implementation of article 3.

I might add that there are grounds for reasonable doubt as to Mr. Harriman's insight into the European mind in view of his earlier testimony that day that the European nations "are so keen to get themselves in a stronger position that it does not occur to them that they can rely upon the United States." Would that that were true.

On May 2 the former Under Secretary of State, Robert A. Lovett, was a witness. Senator DONNELL asked Mr. Lovett:

Do you know whether or not it was considered by the negotiators, and particularly the United States, as to whether, in order to stop Russia in her tracks, if she should come across the borders of the other European countries, it would be necessary or advisable that there be United States troops on hand in addition to the troops of the European countries?

Mr. Lovett replied:

I have an accurate recollection of the negotiations in which I participated, but I do not recall that question being raised by anyone. No suggestion was made to us that we should have United States troops spotted around Europe.

On May 3 the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] questioned Gen. Omar Bradley, as follows:

Senator VANDENBERG. In connection with any discussions of implementation of this treaty, is there any thought that we must contribute mass manpower under any circumstances connected with the implementation of the treaty?

General BRADLEY. I do not see how it is implied in the pact itself. In case of war you probably would act in concert with them, and that would of course depend upon the circumstances and eventually would be at the will of the people, expressed through their Congress, after due consideration.

Senator VANDENBERG. I am asking whether our contemplated contribution does not exclude mass manpower at the beginning, before there is any fracas?

General BRADLEY. I do not see that it excludes or includes. I do not see how it is involved at all.

Senator VANDENBERG. Is it involved in your plans on the subject?

General BRADLEY. No, sir. In my opinion it is not involved.

Later this line of questioning was conducted by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]:

Senator WATKINS. I have noticed from time to time statements by some people who are more or less responsible, that a part of our program contemplates the sending of considerable detachments to members of the Atlantic Pact not only for the purpose of instruction but also to bolster their forces. What can you say about that, General?

General BRADLEY. If any decision has been made as to sending any particular size group and for any purpose to these nations, I do not know about it.

Senator WATKINS. It is not contemplated at the present time?

General BRADLEY. It may be on some levels——

Senator WATKINS. I mean as far as you have been advised.

General BRADLEY. Certainly we have not been in any planning for sending any particular groups.

Does this suggest that General Bradley was a reluctant witness, momentarily lifting the veil of secrecy on already conceived plans for troops for Europe? One wonders, certainly.

By far the most interesting discussion of this subject occurred during the testimony of Mr. James P. Warburg, financial adviser to the American delegation to the World Economic Conference in London in 1933 and Deputy Director of the Office of War Information during the war, who appeared as a private witness to urge certain reservations and clarification of the treaty. He testified on May 10.

Some of the most pressing questions raised in the Congress today regarding troop commitments to Europe and development of a sound security program for the United States were anticipated by Mr. Warburg in his testimony. He said, in part:

If the Atlantic security program means what our European friends think it means, either Western European recovery will have to be halted in its tracks, or else the United States will have to undertake a vastly greater commitment than the American people realize today. * * *

What good will it do to build half a defense force [in Europe]? Twenty divisions are no better than the 10 or 12 which exist in Western Europe today, if it takes 40 to do the job. Surely it is folly to think that the French or the Dutch, or the Belgians would fight a delaying action for the benefit of Britain and the United States, if they knew in advance that their countries would be overrun and occupied.

Here are some of the questions and answers developed during his testimony:

Mr. WARBURG. Unless the treaty is clarified, I think it is a highly dangerous instrument.

Chairman CONNALLY. You mean clarified the way you want to clarify it?

Mr. WARBURG. I do not mean it has to be in those particular words. I think it has to be made clear whether we are or are not undertaking to secure the frontiers of Europe against invasion.

Senator VANDENBERG. I certainly agree with you * * * that * * * the great and real operative power of this treaty cannot be forces in being, but must be the potential force of the combined invincible

resources of those who notify prospective aggressors of what they are up against.

Mr WARBURG. Yes, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. Well, we are in complete agreement in that thesis.

Senator VANDENBERG added later:

I certainly concur in your thought that we must not permit our friends [in Europe] to be deceived [regarding our intentions as to troops for Europe]. That would be the last possible crime we could commit.

Senator VANDENBERG continued:

If all of our treaty friends sit in together and agree tentatively on a military-aid program of $1,000,000,000, isn't it inevitable that they must understand that they are agreeing to a program which does not contemplate any attempted Maginot line, or something of the sort?

Subsequently, Mr. Warburg observed that—

If we did mean that we were going to attempt to hold the frontiers of Western Europe, then unless we made sure we could hold them we would be embarking on a gigantic Dunkirk. We would be starting off with a guaranteed initial defeat.

There then developed this highly interesting exchange between Chairman CONNALLY and Mr. Warburg:

Chairman CONNALLY. The treaty does not contemplate the sending of an army now to string along the Rhine. It only means that when they are the victims of an armed attack, we act. * * * [Addressing Mr. Warburg]: Do you favor sending an army over there now and keeping it there to protect their borders?

Mr. WARBURG. I would say that would be a very foolish thing to do. * * *

Senator CONNALLY. That is what we are not going to do. We do not plan to do that. But I judge from some of your statements that you thought that was what we ought to do.

Mr. WARBURG. I do not think I made any statement that could be so interpreted.

Senator CONNALLY. I apologize.

So much for the testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on the subject of troops for Europe. Is it surprising that the report of the committee did not even mention the subject?

There were few references to the subject during consideration of the treaty in the other body. There was absolutely no debate on this point!

Here is the record:

In his opening address on the treaty, the senior Senator from Texas, Mr. CONNALLY, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, did not refer directly to this point. But he did say:

We have not committed ourselves to any particular type of military-assistance program. There were no secret agreements at the negotiation of this pact.

That was on July 5. The next day the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] repeated his earlier remarks at the committee hearing, saying:

Article III builds no illusory Maginot lines.

And he added:

Frankly, I should have much less interest in this treaty if I thought its repressive influence for peace is measured by or dependent on any such [physical] implementation [of the pact]. * * * It is not the military forces in being which measure the impact of this "knock-out" admonition, important though they are. It is the potential which counts, and any armed aggressor knows that he forthwith faces this potential from the moment he attacks.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who early announced his support of the pact, said on July 8:

I do not hold with those who say that we are committed to building up a military establishment abroad that is sufficiently large to repel any kind of an aggression which might come. That would be an enormous commitment.

We have not any concept of dispatching an expeditionary force here and there.

And Senator LODGE made a particular point of criticizing those who in the past have talked about having 100 divisions in event of another war. He added:

The idea that this country is a bottomless pit, so far as manpower is concerned, should be completely dispelled.

The senior Senator from Florida, Mr. Pepper, admitted that the pact contained "elements of danger," but pointed out that "the United States is separated by 3,000 miles of ocean, and it is not contemplated that we shall establish in Europe military forces of this country other than our occupation forces, so far as I know at the present time." That statement was made on July 15.

A new Member of the other body also spoke on the subject. He was the junior Senator from New York, Mr. Dulles, newly appointed to that office by Governor Dewey. It was Mr. Dewey who the other day demanded defeat of the Wherry resolution "by as large a vote as possible—so that the world will know we do not intend to turn tail and run." And it is Mr. Dewey who now is demanding that the United States immediately mobilize 100 divisions.

Well, Mr. Dewey's appointee spoke on July 12. He was listened to most attentively. He had aided in drafting the North Atlantic Pact. He had testified for it before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Here is what he said:

I have supported the treaty because, in my opinion, it will make it possible to reduce the very heavy burden of military expenditure which our Nation is now carrying. * * *

If I thought the treaty meant that we had to build up on the continent of Europe a Military Establishment sufficient to withstand an all-out assault by the Soviet Union, I certainly would not vote for the treaty.

What does all this establish?

Certainly it establishes that the strongest supporters of the bill believed, or purported to believe, that there was no commitment, implied even, under the treaty, to send American troops to Europe before an act of aggression. Moreover, from the record, they believed, or purported to believe, that such a move was neither contemplated, desirable, nor, in terms of providing sufficient security against aggression, even feasible.

Well, but you say that conditions are now completely changed, especially as a result of the aggression in Korea.

I think that may be questioned. I think it may be questioned whether anything has happened in Europe since July 1949 to warrant doing now what the authors of the pact then avowed was not contemplated or feasible.

In testifying before the Senate committee, Will L. Clayton, vice president of the Atlantic Union committee, said that one of the principal objectives in the cold war is to frighten democratic governments into excessive expenditures for defense. I think that may still be Russia's main strategy despite the hot war in Korea.

But even if changed circumstances do justify a change in our position, the very stand taken by the supporters and authors of the pact emphasizes that such a change involves a new situation, calling for new debate, new decisions and commitments by constitutional processes, that is by the Congress.

Certainly this record rebukes those who charge we are threatening to turn tail and run if we today question what 2 years ago was professedly repudiated.

Certainly the whole record reenforces the proposition that by all means "whatever our future military or political policy is to be, it must be determined with the full participation and approval of the Congress."

And that leads to finding No. 2:

This current insistence upon the "full participation and approval of the Congress" is the self-same principle upon which was placed the very greatest emphasis during the hearings and debate on the North Atlantic Pact.

And let it be noted that this emphasis upon the right of the Congress to make the final decisions as to what it would do to implement Article III was directed, not to the question of furnishing manpower for Europe, but to the question of furnishing arms for Europe.

It is amazing the amount of unctuous insistence upon "the power of Congress to decide" which can be given by the executive branch when it wants the approval of the Congress. Even when the treaty, as in this case, had already been signed by the member nations, including the United States. And even when the debate on the treaty was closed with a bludgeoning telegram from a former Cabinet Member, Secretary Henry L. Stimson, that the adding of any reservations "would be a disastrous repudiation" and that votes for reservations "will weigh in the scales against (the) cause of peace with freedom."

But be that as it may, there were earnest protestations that after adoption of the treaty there would be full right remaining to the Congress to decide how it was to be implemented.

Both Secretary Acheson—at the hearing on April 27—and the committee report stated that—

The pact does not bind the Congress to reach that same conclusion (the same conclusion, that is, as the executive branch, that the arms aid proposal should be adopted), for it—the pact—does not dictate the conclusion of honest judgment. * * * There is [under the treaty] an obligation to help, but the extent, the manner, and the timing is up to the honest judgment of the parties [to the treaty].

And so up to the Congress.

Said the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]:

There is no obligation to furnish arms How does the United States obligate itself? It obligates itself by a vote of the Senate

on the treaty, or by the passage of a law. There is no man in the Government, not even the President of the United States, who can obligate this Nation on this, that, and the other thing. The Constitution provides the way.

That, it should be observed, was before Korea—before the President of the United States demonstrated that he could, constitutionally or not, obligate the lives of thousands of Americans in an undeclared war.

The junior Senator from New York, Mr. Dulles, said July 12:

I find in the treaty no obligation, legal or moral, to vote for any armament program or for any item of any armament program unless it be meritorious in its own right.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was skeptical and invited the junior Senator from New York to accept a reservation to the treaty putting his sentiments into black and white. The answer was:

No; such a reservation is both unnecessary and untimely.

The senior Senator from Florida, Mr. Pepper, speaking July 15, said he did not regard any reservations as necessary, and continued:

Why? Because we already have a reservation of the most effective character in the pact itself. What is it? It is that whatever is done under article III must be authorized by the Congress of the United States. That is the reservation that is important. * * *

Whether we give economic aid or whether we give military assistance, the final arbiter of what we give shall be the Congress of the United States—not the State Department, not the President of the United States, but the Congress of the United States, where we shall have the privilege of debate and consideration, and where public opinion may make itself manifest.

That, too, was before the undeclared war in Korea.

The committee report on the treaty stated that the North Atlantic Council, set up under the treaty to enable it to function, has only "advisory powers," since final decision presumably is left to the member nations "in accordance with the respective constitutional processes."

That reads fine. But it is noteworthy that last December 22 Secretary of State Acheson reported on "matters acted upon" by the Council. These matters "acted upon," mind you, included "structure of the European army, how it should be composed, of what troops, where should the troops come from," and so forth. That does not sound exactly like an advisory role.

But the whole point of this is that there was abundant insistence prior to ratification upon the powers of the Congress, upon the role of the Congress as the "final arbiter." This was in the matter of exportation of arms for Europe. Now it is being contended with no little emphasis and even bitterness that Congress is not the proper "final arbiter" in the matter of the exportation of men for Europe.

What a presumptuous and tragic claim. How terribly important it is that the Congress reassert and recapture its right and duty of "full participation and approval."

Here is the third finding in my review of the hearings and debate on the North Atlantic Pact:

The hearings and debate disclosed—perhaps it would be more accurate to say failed to conceal—the fact that there has been opened, by the provisions of the treaty, a completely new and immensely enlarged area of discretionary power whereby a President may directly and completely involve the Nation in war without authority or consent of the Congress.

A great deal of lip service was paid, during the debate, to the reassuring doctrine that the power to declare war is still vested in the Congress.

Secretary Acheson, in his speech March 19, 1949, announcing the North Atlantic Pact, denied that the treaty means that "the United States would be automatically at war if one of the nations covered by the pact is subjected to armed attack." He said the decision on the "prompt action" the United States would be bound to take in event of aggression—"will rest where the Constitution has placed it," that is, in the Congress.

Senator CONNALLY said—July 5—in the debate:

The full authority of the Congress to declare war, with all the discretion that power implies, remains unimpaired.

But both Secretary Acheson and the committee report frankly declined to "define the authority of the President to use the Armed Forces." More specifically, they evaded the question of whether the President was free to act in the same way—without, and prior to, action by the Congress—if a member nation were attacked as he is free to act if the United States or our nationals are directly attacked.

The treaty provides, in article V, that—

An armed attack against one or more of the nations—shall be considered an attack against them all.

This plainly opens the door, as several opponents of the Atlantic Pact pointed out during the debate in 1949, to the possibility of the President enlisting this Nation in a war, and of his thereby presenting the Congress with a war "already in being," in event of an attack by any aggressor on some other member of the Atlantic Pact.

This conclusion is reaffirmed not only by the method used to involve the United States in the Korean War—although Korea was not, of course, a member of the Atlantic Pact—but also by a recent pronouncement by the administration. A document issued by the executive branch under date of February 28, 1951, places the administration on record as to how it feels about the role of the Congress in the matter of a declaration of war. It brazenly asserts:

Use of the congressional power to declare war * * * has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance. The constitutional power of the Commander in Chief has been exercised more often because the need for armed international action has grown more acute. The long delays occasioned by the slowness of communications in the eighteenth century have given place to breath-taking rapidity in the tempo of history. Repelling aggression in Korea or Europe cannot wait upon congressional debate.

That amounts to an assertion that through "practical necessities" the power of the Congress to declare war has been "repealed" by its transfer to the President.

This, of course, is vastly more than even President Franklin D. Roosevelt ever openly claimed. As the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] recently pointed out, Mr. Roosevelt sent a message to Prime Minister Churchill, through Ambassador Kennedy early in World War II, stating that his earlier message of encouragement to Premier Reynaud, of France, must not be construed as committing the United States to military action against Germany because "there was no authority under the Constitution except the Congress which could make any commitment of that nature."

The pretense maintained during Senate debate on the Atlantic Pact is now completely abandoned. Instead, it is flatly asserted that "repelling aggression in Korea or Europe cannot wait upon congressional debate." That amounts to a claim that aggression by anyone, anywhere, at any time and under any circumstances, may by presidential discretion alone be regarded in the same light as a direct attack on American territory or nationals so far as the presidential power to commit this Nation to war is concerned.

There is general agreement that the President has a constitutional right to use American armed forces instantly to repel an attack on American territory or nationals, without waiting for congressional approval. It is something vastly different to claim that the President has the right to enlist this Nation in any war, in Europe or Asia, without the prior authority of the Congress, and that modern circumstances make it necessary that this power be vested in the President.

Unless the President is barred from maintaining and hereafter acting on this preposterous claim, unless he is barred from this either by adoption now of a restraining resolution by the Congress or, if necessary, through a constitutional amendment, we will be permitting repeal of a basic constitutional provision b. default. And we will be virtually guaranteeing more Koreas.

Certainly in this field, above all, the need for recapturing and firmly establishing the "full participation and approval of the Congress" is a matter of the gravest urgency.

Appropriation for Southeastern Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I

would like to include a statement by Mr. Tom Martin, of Birmingham, Ala., in opposition to the requested appropriation for the Southeastern Power Administration for the fiscal year 1952. Mr. Martin, chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co., and union representatives, agree that such expenditures are unwise and unnecessary. I am glad to call Mr. Martin's statement to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives because it expresses so clearly how duplication of facilities can be eliminated.

STATEMENT OF ALABAMA POWER CO. IN OPPOSITION TO REQUESTED APPROPRIATION FOR SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1952

This statement is filed in opposition to the request of the Southeastern Power Administration which is seeking an appropriation of $4,500,000 for the fiscal year 1952 to be used generally for the purpose of constructing electric transmission lines. The appropriation sought includes funds which must be provided by this company and other American taxpayers, with which to build, among others, electric transmission lines in the State of Georgia. The report of the Southeastern Power Administration to the Congress which seeks to justify the requested appropriation refers to a proposed Clark Hill-Macon, Ga., electric transmission line as follows:

"This feature will initially provide service at 115 kilovolts to the load center at Macon, Ga., and will ultimately provide a 230,000-volt tie between the Clark Hill power plant and power developments in the Alabama-Coosa Basin, three of which, totaling 249,000 kilowatts are authorized at the present time."

Alabama Power Co. is and has been for more than 40 years an operating electric utility in Alabama. It operates an electric generating, transmission, and distribution system which provides the electric power requirements of the public in most of the State, except in the Tennessee Valley area.

As of December 31, 1950, the company, which has more than 4,000 employees, was providing electric service directly at retail to 355,282 customers in 585 communities. The company had in operation 17,600 miles of rural line serving 99,377 rural customers, of which 83,716 are farms. In addition to the rural customers served from its rural lines, the company is also serving approximately 50,000 customers in rural communities. The company is now serving 95 percent of the farms within its service area, and by the end of 1951 will be serving 98 percent of the farms within its service area. It follows that of the 355,282 customers served directly by Alabama Power Co. approximately 150,000 are located in rural areas and rural communities. The company is also providing the power supply to other utilities, municipalities, and cooperatives for distribution and resale to some additional 227,000 customers. Therefore, at the end of 1950 the company was providing most of the power requirements for a total of 582,000 customers throughout the State of Alabama, except within the Tennessee Valley area.

The company has six large hydroelectric plants in middle Alabama and four large steam plants located in different parts of the State to enable it to render the very best service that skill and foresight can produce. Anticipating the growth of load in this area, it is bringing in 140,000 kilowatts of new plant capacity in 1951 and another 156,000 kilowatts in 1952. On completion of these plants it will have in hydroelectric and steam installed capacity a total of 1,135,560 kilowatts.

In addition the company has on order two other steam electric generating units, each with a capacity of from 40,000 to 150,000 kilowatts to be installed for operation in 1953, location of which is now under consideration.

There is no question of the company's ability to meet every load requirement in any part of the territory it serves now and in the foreseeable future.

Alabama Power Co. has constructed and now operates a network of 4,762 miles of electric transmission lines interconnecting with its generating plants and extending throughout the company's entire service area so as to provide an adequate and dependable supply of electric power for its various customers. The company also owns and operates approximately 22,250 miles of electric distribution lines. Alabama Power Co. is associated with three other electric companies in adjoining States, namely, Georgia Power Co., Gulf Power Co., and Mississippi Power Co. The four companies constitute the integrated Southern Co. electric system in Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

Attached to this statement is a map showing the interconnected and integrated system of the Southern Co.

These four associated companies have been integrated in respect to their power supply and transmission systems for a great many years. The subject was fully presented to the Securities and Exchange Commission when that Commission had under consideration the dissolution of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., of which this and its associated companies were subsidiaries.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, in its order issued under date of August 1, 1947, found that the electric properties of these four operating companies were retainable under common control as an integrated public-utility system under the standards of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 and that the continued existence of the Southern Co. as a holding company over such retainable properties is appropriate under such standards. In this connection, it was shown that there are substantial savings in operating costs and fixed charges, resulting from coordinated planning and operation; that power supply economies are achieved through sharing of reserve capacity and through joint planning of generating facilities so as to stagger construction; further that power supply economies result from central load dispatching whereby, by the control of reservoirs, run of river and fuel-electric plants, substantial amounts of water which might otherwise be wasted are conserved and thereby the need for additional generating facilities with accompanying fixed changes may be averted or delayed.

Based upon these findings, the Southern Co. was organized; the four companies were taken over by the Southern Co. The method of integrated operation has been carried on as in the past years; and it is estimated that the annual savings to the companies and hence to the public served by them is in the order of at least $6,000,000 a year.

The electric transmission facilities of the company are interconnected with the transmission facilities of the southern system by means of heavy duty high voltage lines in such a manner that in effect power generated at any point on the entire interconnected southern system in Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, may be utilized at any other point. Additional interconnections make power available from the Tennessee Valley Authority, other utilities, and a number of industrial and miscellaneous sources.

The company has electric transmission lines in close proximity to each of the proposed Federal reservoir projects within its service area. This company has jointly with the other three companies of the Southern Co. system submitted a proposed contract to the Southeastern Power Administration. This proposed contract fulfills and carries out the congressional mandate as contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 providing for the distribution of surplus power from the Federal reservoir projects in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and giving preference in the sale of such power to public bodies and cooperatives. The proposed contract submitted by Alabama Power Co. and its associated companies to the Southeastern Power Administration would accomplish these purposes fully and completely. If such proposed contract is accepted by the Southeastern Power Administration, there would be no occasion for the use of Federal funds as is now proposed by the Southeastern Power Administration for the construction of electric transmission lines and facilities which, if built, would not only duplicate existing facilities but would necessitate a waste of critical materials, manpower and Federal funds at the expense of the American taxpayers and at a time when all such materials, manpower and funds should be most zealously safeguarded and conserved for the defense effort.

There are some 10,000 stockholders of Alabama Power Co., of whom approximately 7,000 are residents of Alabama. The company has made an investment of more than $225,000,000 in its electric plants and facilities in Alabama. In 1950 the company accrued from income $10,592,410 for payment of taxes, of which more than $6,000,000 constituted Federal income tax. Taxes by the company also included more than $2,000,000 in real and personal property taxes in 64 of the 67 counties of the State.

Alabama Power Co. has over the years constructed and is now operating an electric generating and transmission system which is providing at reasonable rates an adequate and dependable supply of electric power sufficient to serve the public in its service area. All rates of the company have been approved by the Alabama Public Service Commission, a State regulatory body which, under the laws of the State of Alabama, has general supervision and control over the company's rates and service. The company now has planned or under construction additional facilities to meet the growing requirements for electric service in its area. Unless prevented from so doing by shortages of critical materials or by other things beyond the control of the company, Alabama Power Co. will continue to provide the necessary facilities for transmitting and distributing electric power to meet all future requirements within the company's service area. The company can do this while still functioning as a part of the American free enterprise system.

The proposed appropriation of $4,500,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration for the fiscal year 1952, if made, will be used generally for the purpose of constructing duplicating electric transmission lines which are absolutely unnecessary. Such an appropriation is not only unnecessary but it would result in waste of critical materials, manpower, and Federal funds at a time when such materials, manpower, and funds are so sorely needed for the defense effort. The proposed appropriation is not only inexpedient, unnecessary, and wasteful, but such an appropriation, if made, will lead eventually to a needless duplication of the electric transmission and generating facilities of this company. It will lead also to an effort on the part of the Federal Government, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, to take from this company and from its employees and its stockholders, the business and the customers which have been built up through the joint efforts of this company and its employees and stockholders over a period of many years. Such effort will of necessity be financed and paid for by this company and by its employees and

stockholders and by the other American taxpayers, all at a time when such use of funds, materials, and manpower would be highly prejudicial to the defense program. Could anything be more unnecessary, inequitable, unfair, and unjust?

Respectfully submitted.

ALABAMA POWER CO,
By THOMAS W. MARTIN,
Chairman of the Board.

The Problems of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a report on the problems of agriculture prepared by Dr. John Lee Coulter, an eminent consulting economist, of Washington, D. C., under the sponsorship of the National Reclamation Association. The report has special refcrence to conservation, reclamation, and irrigation in the 17 Western States of the United States. The full text of the report will be printed in the hearings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and has been made available to many Members from the Western States. I include with my remarks the following synopsis of the report and commend the full report to all who are interested in this vital problem:

DO WE NEED RECLAMATION?—SYNOPSIS OF A REPORT ON THE PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE BY DR JOHN LEE COULTER

During the past 35 years the population of the United States has increased 50 percent—from 100,000,000 in 1915 to 150,000,000 in 1950. While during the same period the total available farm land has remained about the same—450,000,000 acres. How, then, were the additional 50,000,000 people fed, clothed, and sheltered? How were we able to meet the demands of this increased population for food and fiber, and at the same time maintain our highest standards of living? Several factors made this possible:

1. A TREMENDOUS REDUCTION IN ACREAGE DEVOTED TO COTTON PRODUCTION

The cotton acreage from 1925 to 1929 averaged 45,000,000 acres, while at the present time it is less than 20,000,000 acres. Thus, 25,000,000 acres have been made available for the production of food and fiber for human requirements.

2. THE SHIFT FROM HORSES AND MULES ON THE FARMS AND ELSEWHERE TO AUTOMOBILES, TRUCKS, AND TRACTORS

Prior to World War I there were more than 30,000,000 horses and mules on farms and elsewhere throughout the country. By 1949 this number had been reduced to less than 10,000,000—a reduction of more than 20,000,000—thus making available for human consumption the food and fiber produced on 60,000,000 additional acres.

3. EXPANSION OF WHEAT PRODUCTION IN THE GREAT PLAINS AREA

It has been estimated that at least 35,000,000 acres of grasslands in the Great Plains area has been plowed up and planted to wheat since World War I. Dr. Bennett, Chief of Soil Conservation Service, has recently stated, "There are probably as high as 8,000,000 acres in these Plains States that should be gotten out of cultivation and put back to grass—and kept in grass."

These shifts and changes in our farming practices have made available the products of more than 100,000,000 additional acres to meet the requirements of our rapidly increasing population during the past 35 years. But what about the future? With our population increasing at the tremendous rate of more than 2,000,000 per year what would be the situation if during the sixties or the seventies we were again confronted with a drought such as we experienced in the thirties?

Our population is not only growing but it is moving westward. By 1975 there will be 50,000,000 or more people in the West. A balanced economy for these people will require the full development of all the resources of that area, particularly agricultural. This, in the arid and semi-arid West, can be accomplished only through reclamation.

But reclamation is a slow process requiring many years to accomplish. Furthermore, the total remaining area to be developed is only about 17,000,000 acres or less than 4 percent of our present area available for farming. These increased irrigated acres, if brought under cultivation by means of reclamation during the next 25 years, would largely be offset by the present wheatlands of the Great Plains that should revert to grasslands and by lands going out of production because of soil erosion, which is an important and critical factor

Thus, if during the next 25 years we bring under irrigation all of the remaining undeveloped irrigable lands of the West, it is possible that the total farming area of the United States may not be as large as it is today. But during the same period our population will increase by 50,000,000 people—or by 33⅓ percent.

A Soldier Writes From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, considerable interesting correspondence is being received by families who have boys fighting in Korea. As part of my remarks, I am inserting at this point a letter from a boy who writes from the depths of his heart as to conditions in that unhappy land.

DEAR ——: Your letter was most interesting. Am sorry the Powers moved away, but maybe I'll see them again some day.

About this island we're on. This is one of the reasons that the people back in the States are paying some awful figures in taxes. This island could run and do everything expected of it with the manpower of 300. But we have over 1,000 GI's, officers, and other personnel stationed here. When you move a man into a place like this you have to have just about another man some place taking care of him, and also the more men come in here, the more officers and men have to be sent in to run and take care of them.

So you see it can get in a cycle in a way. Food isn't too good, but it won't kill you if you eat it. Shows here are about 6 months to a year old. * * * Seeing a show for the tenth time is nothing new around here.

This doesn't seem to hang too hard on my mind, as we have a lot of personal things to relieve just loafing around. Have a small but widely used library and spend a lot of time there. Reading books like classics, Japan Today, Inside Russia, the Reds and Russia, World Peace, and things like that. Also other books, such as on medicine, Legion, and custom.

I do a lot of writing. Write short stories, also a lot of articles on Japan, Korea, and things I've seen. Just for myself, but it's fun. Right now I'm writing a story for the squadron commanding officer to publish in the newspaper that is sold over the South Pacific.

As far as trying to say, "Why are we fighting in Korea" is a good question but try to answer it when you see your buddies all shot up and some even pretty badly tortured. Well it makes you think a little. There wasn't much use of even going into Korea in the first place as I can see it because the United States couldn't even take Japan. After we get all through, we will be spread all over the world and we will be wide open then. But such is life. Most of the guys out here believe as I do on this subject.

I didn't know that we had exploded A-bombs in Arizona. Nobody tells us guys anything. Hear news at night once in a while short-waved from Los Angeles but not too often.

I thank you for the book and will read it when am feeling sorta out sometime.

If you honestly want to know how I feel about the whole mess we're in now, if I was a millionaire, I'd buy the biggest rocket ship and take off for parts unknown. Right now the guys on this island are living from day to day. There have been unidentified aircraft and underwater craft around here several times, and if ever anything happens, a lot of people are going to cash in on Western Union. It would be a second Wake Island. We have light machine guns here, three to be truthful, and a hundred or so rifles, which is about it. No place to go if anything did happen.

One rifle shot would blow this place wide open, as we have large 180-octane gas tanks all over the island. Me, I'm swimming out to a small coral reef if anything does happen. I may not be a hero but I'm not a fool either. The only aircraft stationed here is a C-47 and a B-17. The former is used for flying protocol to the nearest base.

Well, really can't think too much of anything else to write about so will sign off for now, wishing to hear from you soon.

As ever.

Too Long in Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of my colleagues, and of others who may read it, I am inserting, by unanimous consent, the pertinent and thought-provoking editorial from a recent issue of the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.:

TOO LONG IN POWER

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY puts the pressure on the RFC to approve a Government loan to the Saxony, a lush Miami Beach hotel. The Senator's son gets a $21,000 fee after the million-dollar loan was made.

Is anyone around here surprised?

He shouldn't be. It's only part, and undoubtedly a very small part, of the pattern

of graft, influence, and cheap politicking running wild in Washington today.

And it's nothing new, either in the RFC or in Washington generally. Even in the days of Jesse Jones, a paragon of statesmanship and integrity when compared to the crowd running the show today, one had to have an "angle" or a "friend" to get an RFC loan. The worthiness of the loan was not enough to get a foot in the door.

It's all part of the atmosphere which surrounds a party—any party—too long in power. The mink coats, the deep freezers, the Donald Dawsons, the Merle Youngs, and the Harry Vaughans are just the window dressings of a deeper political philosophy of smugness, venality, and indifference to the public good

Too long in power.

The Republican Party blew up in the twenties. The personal honesty and high purpose of Herbert Hoover was not strong enough to live down Tea Pot Dome and Warren Harding.

The country needed a change of party—and it got it.

Does anyone dare to suggest that America does not need a change today?

Isn't it time to start at the top and sweep out the slimy crowd that surrounds the White House? The walls and pillars of that old structure are not all that termites destroyed. When the Pendergast protégé moved in a heap of the spirit of Pendergast moved in with him.

Too long in power.

There's little use in rattling dead bones, but it's important to know where these things start. F. D. R. owed nothing to Tammany Hall, but he used Tammany methods. His revolution—good or bad—safely launched, himself anchored and unbeatable, and there began to appear the same smugness, the same willingness to use influence to achieve personal profit that has reached a climax in Washington today.

His son sold insurance policies that your son and mine could not sell. His son got loans—ones that were never repaid—because papa entertained the right people at dinner, or put in phone calls to the right men.

And the Roosevelt revolution itself, which history may tell us saved this country from economic chaos, nevertheless started the growth of a spirit new to America—something for nothing.

Get out your Mark Twain and read The Man Who Corrupted Hadleyburg if you are interested in prophetic allegories.

We don't like it. We don't believe America likes it.

We don't like Senators whose sons get big fees because pops helped their clients get a loan. Think how honest old Thomas J. Walsh must be rolling in his grave. He was the man who smoked out Teapot Dome. And Senator JIM MURRAY, from the same State of Montana, is sitting in his Senate seat.

We don't like the percentage boys whose White House wives get $8,000 mink coats in trade for influence.

We wish JOE MCCARTHY would stay away from the race tracks, and quit having friends cash checks—and concentrate on the job of smoking out the commies.

We wish * * * but there's no use wishing that Harry Truman will clean house and start playing President instead of king. Anyone who has read about him knows he's a stubborn man. He likes what he has, and even what he has created, and he's going to keep it.

The answer? Clean out this administration while there's still time to save the country. There are honest men and able men who can take over the job and do it right.

If it's done in time, it may be possible to combine statesmanship with integrity. If there's much more delay, we predict the great, honest mass of our people will rise up in their wrath and put their candidates to only one test:

They may be dumb, they may vote wrong, they may stand for stupid things, but, by God, are they honest?

The Late Paul H. Ballard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, last, death came to Paul Ballard, a great and good man. For 14 years he was a member of the Ohio House of Representatives, and for 10 years he was chairman of the powerful finance committee of the Ohio House. He voluntarily retired from the house to become business manager of Ohio University, reputedly the oldest university west of the Alleghenies.

Paul Ballard was a strong yet humble man. He was able, courageous, honest, and sincere. He really believed that public office was a public trust and his every act conformed to his belief.

In these days, when it might appear that strength and character in public office, are at so low an ebb, America, as never before, desperately needs men of his qualities in high positions.

Although Paul Ballard died without great wealth, an editorial in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer leaves to his wife and family a priceless heritage. The editorial is as follows:

PAUL H. BALLARD

It has never been possible for us to reflect on Paul H. Ballard's distinguished record of service in the Ohio Legislature without wondering why some men think that they have to stoop to cowardly compromise of principles or engage in the shoddy tricks of the demagogue in order to be politically successful.

No man who has served in the legislature in the memory of living Ohioans was any more influential and any more respected than was Paul Ballard. And that it was so because he was a politician who didn't frighten easily, who could be persuaded by reason but never by threat or enticement, and who believed that occupancy of political office should be for public service, not for the advancement of special interest or for personal aggrandizement.

Because of his integrity and because of the intelligent way in which he decided issues that confronted him during his 14 years of service in the house, Ballard enjoyed the confidence of legislators from the urban areas in the same degree that he was given the implicit confidence of those from the rural sections. Fittingly enough, he was chairman of the important house finance committee.

Ballard retired from the legislature in 1948 in order to become business manager of Ohio University, where he served with the same exceptional competence and inflexible probity that characterized his legislative career.

Mr. Ballard's death at Athens is a genuine loss to this State. The public service in Ohio could never have enough men like him, for he imparted strength and character to the government he served.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the very excellent letter of Robert B. Dresser to the editor of the Providence Journal:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

EDITOR, PROVIDENCE JOURNAL,
Providence, R. I.:

The Sunday Journal for February 4 contained a letter to the editor, signed Historicus, quoting from a letter written under date of March 22, 1903, by Henry Adams, the historian. I quote from the Adams letter as follows:

"My statesmanship is still all in China, where the last struggle for power is to come China is bound to go to pieces, and every year is a long step to the bad. The only country now on the spot is Russia, and if Russia organizes China as an economical power, the little drama of history will end in the overthrow of our clumsy western civilization. We never can compete with Asia, and Chinese coal and labor, organized by a Siberian system. In that event I allow till 1950 to run our race out."

It is remarkable that this view, expressed almost 50 years ago, agrees so closely with the present views of a number of those most familiar with China and its affairs.

In 1923 Lenin wrote, "In the last analysis, the outcome of the world struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, and China, etc., constitute the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe."

On January 6, 1948, former Ambassador William C Bullitt said in a Town Hall debate on China:

"If we permit the Soviet Government to control the Chinese and the Japanese, we shall finally go down under the assault of hundreds of millions of Communist serfs. If our Government permits Soviet control of China, we can all count our country as doomed and our children as dead."

In July 1950 Dr. Walter H. Judd, one of America's leading authorities on China, said:

"What other task, I ask you, could be so important to the Kremlin's plan for the conquest of Asia, then of Europe and then of ourselves as beguiling America into stopping effective assistance to China?

"Foster [William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country] summed it up in this sentence: 'The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front.'

"Not Japan, not Germany, not the Mediterranean, not the Balkans, not the oil of the Middle East, not the North Atlantic or any of the other areas where we have focused our efforts, but China. The Kremlin 5 years ago instructed its followers that the war in China is the key of all—I repeat, all—problems on the international front. While we were seeking to forget China and its troublesome war against Communists, the Kremlin was already working to win that war and the crucial victory which that would represent in its never-ending warfare against us and all the free world."

In this same statement Dr. Judd quoted the following observations by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, made in the fall of 1947:

"Our failure to help the Government of China effectively at the end of the war, with its otherwise insuperable problems, particularly the Communist rebellion, will turn out,

I fear, to be the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States."

The current debate regarding the sending of a land army to Europe raises many serious questions. The debate seems to be centering largely on the question of whether Western Europe is important to us. Its importance seems to be generally conceded However, the vital question really is not that, but whether it is possible at this time to save Western Europe from Russian domination by the use of land forces It seems to be admitted on all sides that Russia has such vast superiority in land forces that she could overrun Western Europe at will If this is true, is it likely that she will delay using this power until it is too late?

Brig Gen Brice P Disque (U. S. Army retired) in an article recently published in the Spotlight Publications of the Committee for Constitutional Government, has this to say on this subject

"The Politburo sits on Europe's eastern boundary with a fully equipped land army of about 200 divisions. If it is the Politburo's purpose to war in Europe with troops, is there an American so silly as to believe that the Russians will accommodate us by holding back until we create a bigger force in Europe, so as to insure their defeat?

"We may have leaders that silly, but the Politburo is not Quite likely it will wait, and if events dictate a military advance into Europe, it will overrun the place before we can set up a force to stop it The chances are 100 to 1 that everything we have sent or may send eventually will become Russian property."

It should be observed that according to reliable reports there are large numbers of Nationalist Chinese who are willing and eager to fight the Communists in China They need, however, arms, equipment, and training. In the language of General Chennault: "It [China] is the one key area of the world where international communism can still be licked without the involvement of a single American infantry soldier"

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

FEBRUARY 6, 1951.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty Cut-Backs in Mail Service Unjustified, Ex-Official Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, February 25, 1951, relative to postal service cut-backs:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY CUT-BACKS IN MAIL SERVICE UNJUSTIFIED, EX-OFFICIAL SAYS

A former Chief Inspector of the Post Office Department criticized Department management yesterday and said it "is on weak ground in trying to convince anyone" that postal rates should be substantially increased.

James M. Doran, who retired October 1 after 44 years, challenged last April's economy in service. He said the Department could have made major operation changes and thus have done away with any need for service cut-backs.

Doran, Chief Inspector between 1945 and 1949 and then Director of Budget and Planning, expressed his views in the March Postal Record, published by the National Association of Letter Carriers.

The union has criticized Postmaster General Donaldson's cutting residential mail deliveries to one a day, curtailing window hours and pick-ups from mailing boxes and cutting down on nighttime processing of other than first-class mail.

APPROPRIATION REQUEST CUT

Donaldson based his action on a directive from the House Appropriations Committee to effect economies after it had cut his appropriation request He failed to get through Congress suggested increases in all postal charges except first-class (letter) rates

Doran said that about 94 percent of the Nation's 41,000 post offices, located in smaller communities and having small receipts, always have and always will require a subsidy This, he contended, is justified by the essential service they perform.

"Congress can never be expected to hike rates sufficiently to wipe out the deficit in these district [small] offices, and it should not attempt to do so," Doran said.

Donaldson's cuts, he said, fell most heavily on the other 6 percent of the offices in large communities, which regularly return a profit.

WOULD RAISE SOME RATES

"Certain rates should be raised," he said, "particularly those on second (publication) and fourth class (parcel post), but all concerned should be certain of the equity involved in the increases requested"

Doran said the Department's Cost Ascertainment Division last March submitted a report on operating expenses in 20 of the largest post offices which suggested a broad field for saving.

"On one item, the cost of handling first-class mail, one office showed a cost of 133 percent more than the one that operated at the least cost," he said.

"If the report accurately portrays present conditions and costs in the 20 offices in question, a saving of $45,000,000 a year could be made in the handling of first-class mail alone," he added.

Statement of Guy George Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee:

Let Representative HAYS clean up his own party, and his own national committee, before he tries to talk about something which he knows nothing about.

The hearings of the Fulbright subcommittee show that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan to Carthage Hydrocol, Inc., was negotiated before I became president of Carthage, and before I became chairman of the Republican National Committee.

The printed hearings of the subcommittee show, on page 440, that under questioning of Senator FULBRIGHT on July 10, 1950, a former RFC director, Mr. Harvey Gunderson, testified as follows:

"I had never talked to Mr. Gabrielson, and I know of no one in the RFC who had ever talked with him until after the loan was made, at which time he was elected president of the company."

Mr Gunderson's testimony further makes it clear that the loan was negotiated by Mr. P C (Doble) Keith, an outstanding chemical engineer, through Mr. Jesse Jones, former Federal loan administrator. I have been Mr. Keith's attorney for many years

Because of its value to national defense and the development of natural resources, the loan was endorsed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior

The record shows that I have no financial interest in Carthage Hydrocol, and that the only compensation I have received has been for my services as president and counsel.

The last installment of the loan to Carthage Hydrocol was made April 25, 1949. I became chairman of the Republican National Committee August 4, 1949. These facts are all a matter of record, and were available to Congressman HAYS

I can only conclude that this deliberate smear is an attempt to divert attention from the rascality rampant in Washington under the administration of the political party to which Mr. HAYS is affiliated And no amount of misrepresentation or mud-throwing will deter me from continuing to urge that we turn these rascals out in 1952.

Records of Applicants for Public Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted by the State Senate of Illinois.

In substance, the resolution is a protest against the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act, which provides that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public assistance programs, and so forth, are not open to public scrutiny and inspection.

I wish to add that the resolution in question is meritorious and is worthy of further study and consideration. In my opinion the members of the State Senate of Illinois are to be commended for their forthright and courageous position which they have taken, evidently in the hope that it ultimately will be the means of unmasking the many frauds and false pretenses that are imposed upon the Government of the United States because of the unreasonable and unconscionable clause contained in the present Social Security Act, and which definitely appertains to the subject matter so ably portrayed in the resolution. A copy of the resolution follows:

Senate Resolution 24

Whereas the Congress of the United States by amendment to the Federal Social Security Act has provided that information and records concerning applicants for and recipients of assistance under public assistance programs operated by the various

States in conjunction with the Federal Government under provisions of the Social Security Act shall be limited to purposes directly connected with the administration of there programs; and

Whereas this injunction of secrecy imposed on the States by said amendment to the Federal Social Security Act is a matter which causes great public concern, and is directly responsible for numerous injustices, abuses, and fraud by permitting many individuals not actually in need to receive assistance and to escape detection because of the stringent regulations guarding the names of recipients of public assistance, thus creating dissatisfaction with the public-welfare program in many communities of the State; and

Whereas said secrecy provision violates the fundamental principle that any expenditure of public funds should be subject to public audit; and

Whereas members of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois repeatedly have expressed themselves as favoring an amendment to the Public Assistance Code of Illinois which would make available to public inspection and sound use a list of names of all recipients of public assistance in each county of the State, only to be advised that such an action would be in conflict with the Federal Social Security Act and would result in loss of Federal funds for public assistance purposes, and

Whereas the so-called Federal funds were collected from the taxpayers of Illinois to the extent of almost $3,340,000,000 dollars during the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, while less than $3 out of every $100 collected from the people of Illinois was returned to the State of Illinois in so-called Federal aid for all purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we go on record as recommending to the Congress of the United States that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible date amending pertinent sections of the Federal Social Security Act in such a manner that State legislative bodies desiring to do so would be permitted to remove restrictions in State laws concealing the identity of public assistance recipients, and to provide that a list of the names of all recipients of assistance be available for public inspection in a proper public office; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eighty-second Congress and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate March 7, 1951.

SHERWOOD DIXON,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Filed March 8, 1951

EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

On Low State of Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star of March 12, 1951. This editorial, touching as it does on the current RFC investigation, is particularly pertinent to today's debate on the floor of the House.

"IS ANYTHING WRONG IN THAT?" QUERY SHOWS MORAL DECLINE

From the moment the RFC disclosures began hitting the headlines, the words "illegal" and "improper" have enjoyed the currency of popular songs.

White House attachés, RFC officials, Senators, these and others have time and again defended the exercise of pressure and influence on the ground that what they did was not illegal. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, pursuing the inquiry, has often insisted that while this might be so, their actions were nevertheless improper.

Faced with this moral gage, the principals in the RFC story have then usually gone on to assert that they have done nothing improper, either.

There is no need here to discuss the issue of illegality. If any be demonstrated, it is a matter for the courts and that's that. What is of much graver concern to the Nation is the strange idea so many of our public officials seem to have of what is proper and what is improper.

An examiner for RFC sees no harm in accepting free hospitality from a Florida hotel owner who has won an RFC loan. Senator MURRAY, Montana Democrat, says it's quite "routine" for lawmakers to plug loans for applicants who happen to be constituents, even when a Senator's son is the applicant's lawyer.

White House personnel feel utterly free about accepting favors of all kinds, as well as dispensing them. Maj. Gen Harry Vaughan, President Truman's military aide, doesn't have a single qualm whether he's taking in deep freezers or getting a special law pushed through Congress to allow entry from Australia of a woman acquaintance he wants as secretary.

In all these instances, the principals have one standard reply: "Is there anything wrong in that?"

That they even find it necessary to ask the question tells us how insensible many public men have become to any lofty code of propriety in official life. By any reasonable measure, no man who occupies a position of responsibility in Government ought either to accept or grant special favors to anyone.

There was a time when such an elementary ethical standard was universally revered and widely observed In the Washington of 1951, it appears as outmoded as celluloid collars and knee-length bathing suits.

Nothing unearthed so far has bracketed the Truman administration with the scandalous Harding regime. Yet in some ways the offenses against the moral code today are worse They have tended to haul the National Government down to the level of petty, tin-horn courthouse politics. They have robbed the White House and the Presidency of dignity They have made Washington life spineless, boneless—a shambles of competing influences and pressure and friendships in which moral values are buried underfoot.

Only one thing is still lacking. No one has yet put vending machines into the White House, the Capitol, and assorted Government halls to dispense favors easily, mechanically, and for a fixed price. "Is there anything wrong in that?"

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—Albert Edward DePalma, the one-time St. Louis waiter who became one of Toronto's most notorious promoters, reigns over his ramshackle empire of moose pasture stock enterprises at 185 Bay Street, in the heart of the financial district.

The legend on the translucent glass of the main office door recites some of DePalma's activities as follows: "Tantalum Refining & Mining Corp. of America, Ltd., Indigo Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., Petromine Exploration & Finance Co., Ltd., Dominion Resources Publications, John W. Hammond Co."

Tantalum, Indigo, and Petromine are branded as stock frauds by the United States Securities and Exchange Commmission and the United States Post Office.

DePalma says he has no connection with Dominion Resources Publications or the John W. Hammond Co. These concerns, he says, are entirely separate.

Hammond writes and prints the literature for DePalma's stock promotions, however, and Dominion Resources Publications produces a tabloid newspaper entitled "The Financial Observer' which is always reporting big developments at DePalma's properties in the Yellowknife.

DePalma said he would receive me and William C Rosenbaum of the St. Louis Better Business Bureau "in a few minutes" A secretary, who was rushing a bundle of literature from the rear of the establishment to a front office, told us the chief was tied up for the moment.

Since DePalma's business is mail order, there were no chairs for customers Rosenbaum and I stood in a corridor about the width and length of a bowling alley.

It was broken along its length, however, by doorways leading into cubby-hole offices, from which we could hear the whir of mimeograph machines and the clackety-clack of typewriters.

At the far end, there was a large room lined with filing cabinets, a refrigerator and a gas stove. No one was doing any cooking then, but girls were running back and forth along the corridor with stacks of literature, wrapped up in copies of the Financial Observer. Old copies, we presumed.

It seemed as though you had to be sound of wind and limb to work for DePalma. Everyone we saw moved on the double. The girls brushed past us breathlessly, as though someone was timing them.

The bundles of literature they were rushing into the front room were being folded and stuffed into envelopes by a half dozen women sitting around a table. The printed matter, we learned later, consisted of progress reports on the Indigo mine, sent out monthly to each stockholder.

With all these people running back and forth and the clatter of multigraph equipment, the place had the tempo of a merry-go-round. Photographic murals showed rugged, square-jawed men standing on barren hillsides examining gold-bearing rocks. There was one painting of a square rigger forging ahead in a stormy, dark-blue sea. It symbolized something, we guessed, but we never found out what.

Finally we were summoned into the presence of DePalma by one of the slightly winded runners who said: "The Chief will see you now."

DePalma got up from behind his mahogany desk to greet a couple of fellow St. Louisans. A large-framed man, he has wavy, iron-gray hair, somewhat protruding blue eyes which stare at you with deep sincerity and an easy-going, American manner of speaking.

He was wearing an expensive looking gray suit with big, blue checks, a light blue tie to

match the color of the checks, gray suede shoes. He was expansive and friendly.

"I loved St. Louis," said DePalma. "Came, let's see, about 30 years ago. I'm 50 now. So I was about 19 then. Sold knitted ties a while, went broke, had to eat, went out and gotta job slinging hash at Autenrieth's in Clayton, just across from the courthouse.

"Used to talk to Billy DeBeck, you know, who did Barney Google. Wonderful bunch of people there. Wonderful bunch of people in St Louis. Wonderful people"

In the old days DePalma recalled courthouse employees used to eat at Autenrieth's and many a jury was fed there

Today, however, DePalma is shy of American juries. It cost him $65,000 by his own reckoning to avoid one in Cleveland, where he was indicted 3 years ago on 14 counts of mail fraud in connection with the tantalum and gold mine promotions.

Unaware of the indictments, DePalma said he flew down from Toronto into New York State in his private airplane, to market some more of his mine stock which he was selling in those days to the public in $10 lots. This was no surreptitious journey since his name was printed all over his airplane as a form of advertising.

Consequently, no one was more amazed than DePalma when Federal agents arrested him in a quiet hotel on Park Avenue, New York City, a few days before Christmas, 1947, and hustled him off to a cell to await extradition to Cleveland.

Although the United States district attorney requested $100,000 bail bond for DePalma, the bond was set at $40,000. This sum the promoter raised through his Toronto bank

Then he climbed back into his airplane and flew like a homing pigeon back to Toronto. He has never set foot into the United States since.

DePalma told us it cost him a total of $65,000 to liberate himself from the clutches of United States authorities This included the $40,000 bond he forfeited, the additional cash he had to put up because of the difference in rates of exchange and attorney fees.

"That wasn't all," he said "I lost a million dollars worth of business, too"

In Toronto, DePalma is safe. The United States can't touch him there because the Canadian Parliament has refused for 8 years to include stock fraud as an extraditable offense.

His misfortune in New York DePalma ascribes to an article written about him in 1946 by Lester Velie of Colliers. Velie described DePalma's boiler-room operations so well that even the Ontario authorities got after the promoter and took away his license as a broker-dealer

DePalma sued Colliers for $100,000, but ultimately dropped the suit

"It was a dirty trick," he said. "My whole life for years has been dedicated to Canadian mining"

Like the Broker-Dealer Association and some of the officials of the Ontario Securities Commission, DePalma believes the SEC takes an old-womanish attitude toward the lusty development of Canadian mining, in which the axiom is that to make a dollar, you take a dollar's worth of risk

While it appears that the risk has been taken by the suckers, not the promoters, DePalma's views on the matter are held here by most of the promoting community.

The attitude of the SEC, DePalma told us, has prevented him from bringing his mines into production. But he'll show them, he said.

"I am devoting my life to Indigo," he said. "Believe me, I've been with these deals 5 years and I'm going to continue to battle for their success to my dying breath."

While the Tantalum is stalled just now, due to the difficulty of separating this rare metal from the earth, Indigo is "going like a house afire," DePalma said.

The market on Indigo stock, he said, was 82 bid and 87 ask. Neither Rosenbaum nor I could find Indigo listed on any market. We asked DePalma about this.

"Oh," he said, "I delisted it from the stock exchange myself."

The promoter was vague about his reasons for this, but it had something to do with his feeling that if people didn't trust him he wasn't going to let the public make a killing on his gold mine.

Throughout our conversation, DePalma tossed a piece of quartz about 2 inches in diameter into the air and caught it with one hand.

"Know what this is?" he said finally.

He handed it to me. The rock was studded with slivers of yellow metal Gold

"Picked it up at the mine site," said DePalma casually. "Use this stuff as paper weights around the office."

Because of the bad publicity attending his ventures, DePalma said he was forced to change the name of his Progress Diversified Minerals, Ltd, under which his gold mines promotion operated last year, to Indigo.

The stock transfer was done on a share-for-share basis, so that no stockholder lost anything by the switch, he said. Indigo also absorbed his Palamino gold mine enterprise

The Indigo promotion is underwritten by Mining Financiers, which is DePalma. His name, however, never appears in the promotional literature.

Promoting a gold mine, DePalma told us, is a difficult and often thankless task.

"We figure to sell a stock issue we have to send out a million pieces of mail," he said. "When I was promoting Palamino at $10 a customer, my replies were so small even I was surprised, and I'm accustomed to the risks in this business

"I figure that only one-fourth of 1 percent of the send-out responded, that is, sent in the $10 You can see that the promoter doesn't make as much money as you think"

DePalma closed his eyes and sighed The walls of his office are plastered with mottoes. One says:

"A friend is a person who says nice things about you behind your back"

"I'll tell you something," said the promoter. "I would have had Tantalum and Indigo in production if the SEC hadn't interfered. Let me show you what's happening at Indigo now."

He pressed a buzzer. A young man in shirtsleeves, whom we had seen bending over a desk in a rear office, appeared and said snappily.

"Yes, Chief?"

DePalma told him to bring up the progress reports on Indigo. The clerk raced out of the office and in a moment was back. He unrolled a map of the diggings on DePalma's desk and with enthusiasm began to interpret it.

"The chip sample assays here," he said, "show up to $20 40 a ton That's an average of $11 88 over 3 feet or so"

He pointed to an extension of the tunnel the map showed.

"They're drilling in here. The crosscut enters here. Now, over here, the ore shoot is 120 feet long and 51 inches and some wide. The average value here is $21 95 a ton"

I couldn't be sure what all of this meant, but it certainly sounded encouraging whatever it was. I asked DePalma when he would start hauling this gold out of the ground.

Well, he said, he has to get power and then buy a mill some place. Then he can start.

Although this mine has been on the verge of making people rich for 5 years, DePalma and his staff are sure production is at hand.

Sometime later, DePalma told me he was a great and good friend of Preston Tucker, the would-be automobile magnate.

"If Tucker had listened to me," said DePalma, "he wouldn't have had that trouble. You know, I bid for a Tucker dealership here. But I couldn't get it."

I asked him if he would have quit the gold mine business if he had managed to get the Tucker distributorship.

"I sure would have," said DePalma. "That distributorship would have been a gold mine."

Manor, Tex., Adopts a Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a big thing has happened down in Manor, Tex., a really big thing. This small town in central Texas has adopted a hospital. One day the mayor of the town scribbled a message on the blackboard outside his store. "Let's all go to Fort Hood with a cake and entertain the wounded soldiers. They are waiting for us. Let's not disappoint them" The response was volcanic—every man, woman and child in Manor remembered the soldiers whom they had visited the previous December at this same hospital. These soldiers might have been their own fathers, sons, or brothers, but, more significant, these were the boys who had gone out to fight that the people of Manor and all over their great America might have the security of living in a free Nation.

The ladies responded with their cake baking, the men took care of the transportation problem to Fort Hood, and the children added their gay enthusiasm to this new experience of adopting a hospital. And everyone dusted off his talents to see what might be produced in the way of entertainment. Manorites knew they were not glamorous Hollywood stars or notable world figures, but they did know they were home-town folk whose friendly company the boys in the service yearned for more than anything else in the world—for there is nothing so filling to both the heart and soul of an individual than the knowledge that someone really cares about him.

When you, the Members of the Congress, have read the following excerpt about Manor which appeared in the Austin American-Statesman of March 4, 1951, I think that each of you will sit back quietly for a moment and feel quite humble indeed that it is our privilege here in Congress to represent people such as these all over America May I, therefore, respectfully request that this article be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MANOR MOVES EN MASSE TO FORT HOOD TODAY TO ENTERTAIN HOSPITAL

(By Mark Batterson)

You couldn't find a place in Manor last week where the folks weren't talking about the trip they're going to make Sunday to their adopted hospital at Fort Hood.

Every place you went—the Johnson's grocery store, or across the street to W. C. McCutcheon's Manor Cafe or even at the combination domino hall-barber shop next

door to the post office—they were all talking about it.

Most of the actual planning was going on at the Johnson's store. Mayor Luther Johnson and his wife, two of the town's leaders in the project, had sickness in the family, but they continued to hold court over their counter all week. And helping them out was W. H. Wentland, Manor's Red Cross chairman who has had a lot to do with the project since its start.

The three realized there were a lot of problems still to be solved, and they soon found out that everyone else in town had every intention of getting them out of the way by Sunday.

A couple of weeks ago, Mayor Johnson scrawled a message on the blackboard outside his store

"Let's all go to Fort Hood with a cake and entertain the wounded soldiers," it read. "They are waiting for us. Let's not disappoint them "

As events revealed, no one had any idea of disappointing them. Every day, people showed up with more problems to prove their intentions.

The biggest difficulty has been transportation. There just isn't enough to go around.

Mrs. J. E. Beeson, who is the wife of Manor's Chamber of Commerce president, put it this way:

"Everyone in town wants to go, but we simply have a lot more people than cars. We've finally decided that some of the ones who got to go last time will have to stay behind and give some of the others a chance to go."

Z. Kemp, Manor's postal carrier who is also the village's leading impresario when it comes to amateur shows, had a lighter problem, but a problem nonetheless. All of the girls, it seemed, were willing to wear evening dresses, but Kemp found a minor rebellion on his hands when it came to deciding on what the uniform of the day would be for the boys.

He finally came up with a sporting proposition.

"If we can hog-tie the boys long enough, they'll wear neckties," he said, straightening his own neckpiece determinedly. "Even if they are already kicking like a steer about it."

At least, Kemp said, the entertainment is shaping up. There will be about 30 entertainers going up this trip, and their director thinks they'll make even a better showing than they did the last time they entertained the wards.

Kemp, who carries himself with the air of another P. T. Barnum, also had some Barnumlike words to say:

"I think the show's going to be bigger and better this time. It's more organized, more of a unit. Anyway, we're having a dress rehearsal at Manor High School for the folks who can't go up. We'll know for sure then."

No one had any real doubts, however.

They remembered the first time they went to the hospital at Fort Hood, in December. The patients didn't know them, and they didn't know the patients, but they felt like old friends in a matter of minutes.

Then they passed out cake and conversation, and the entertainers went through their routines. By the time they left they had adopted the hospital and the patients had adopted them.

Most of the hamlet's citizens see eye to eye with a farmer who gave his opinion of the trip coming up while he was sitting around the Manor Cafe the other day.

"It's bound to be twice as good this time," he explained. "We just had 36 cakes last time—probably have about 75 this trip. Just had 80 people who went up last time—if we can get the cars, we'll have twice as many going up Sunday.

"It's all just a matter of one plus one making two."

The "Big Grab"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of articles by Allen Duckworth, from the Dallas Morning News:

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 1, March 4)

(By Allen Duckworth)

Oil is messy stuff—especially when you mix it with politics.

Nasty odors of petroleo-politics have raked the nostrils of American citizens off and on for half a century.

The Teapot Dome scandal, involving a Republican Department of the Interior and assorted political hangers-on who didn't mind a bit of stealing, rocked the Nation during Harding days.

Republican Harding's administration contributed Teapot Dome—"the big steal."

Democrat Truman's administration has given us the Federal tidelands claim—"the big grab "

There are some parallels. Oil riches were involved in both cases. The Department of the Interior was involved in both cases.

Someone was trying to take something from somebody else in both cases.

Outright bribery and lying were factors in the "big steal."

In the "big grab" the factors were double-talk, political influence, and a long-range campaign to build a more powerful central government and strike another blow at local rights and property ownership.

Justice caught up with the boys in the "big steal."

The "big grab" plotters haven't had anything to worry about along the justice line. No less than the Supreme Court of the United States, in a peculiar opinion that astounded the leading legal talent of the world, has given its blessing to the "big grab."

Simply stated, the "big grab" is the story of how the Federal Government confiscated through a well-plotted campaign that led right into the marble halls of the Supreme Court, the submerged coastal lands that belonged to the States of Texas, California, and Louisiana.

In the case of Texas these particular lands had belonged to the State, without dispute, for more than a hundred years. They were retained in the annexation agreement between Texas and the United States. These lands were important to every Texas school child, for all revenues from oil leases went into the school fund.

That revenue for school purposes is important enough. But more important is the new, rather socialistic philosophy the Supreme Court has written. It is a philosophy that makes a mere citizen, "a mere property owner," to use the Court's language, secondary to centralized authority. Under previous philosophy, Americans had thought that the Federal Government existed as a servant of the individual. Now, if this new philosophy is extended, just the opposite will be true.

There is no doubt that the Supreme Court has weakened the titles to all properties.

The late Gov. Beauford H. Jester, of Texas, feared that the new theory, as expressed by the United States Supreme Court, might lead to nationalization of basic industries.

Other Texans fear that even individual property rights no longer are as strong as they were before the Supreme Court dreamed up an opinion so filled with errors that even such a liberal old waddy as Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter gave up in disgust—he couldn't understand what was going on.

Americans who realize the long-range dangers of the new and strange doctrine of the Supreme Court haven't given up. There still is a chance for the Congress to put the brakes on expansion of Federal powers at the expense of local interests. Congress can do this by slapping down the Supreme Court outrage in the tidelands case. Congress has ruled for the States before, but President Truman vetoed the resolution that would have confirmed existing State ownership.

There is a lot of propaganda to overcome, however.

One reason that the "big grab" boys have been successful so far in the submerged-lands seizure is that the entire case is difficult for the average citizen to understand.

The "big grab" campaign has been accompanied by false flag waving and a smoke screen which convinced many citizens that it was only a battle between the Government and the big oil companies.

"Big grab" instigators influenced Federal officials to wage a highly technical legal battle against the States, and the plain citizen got lost in lawyer talk and Latin phrases.

Technicalities of the tidelands controversy between the individual States and the Federal Government have overshadowed some peculiar angles of the case.

Americans could understand the "big steal" of Harding days because anyone can grasp the meaning of outright individual lying and bribery.

This story hasn't anything to do with lying and bribery of the "big steal" nature

Rather, it will try to show the subtle style of the "big grab" plot—which used double-talk, political influence, misleading statements, injustice at the highest bar of justice in the land.

Such as—

How "Honest Harold" Ickes, as Secretary of the Interior, said flatly that the States had legal title to their submerged lands off their coasts, where oil was being found.

How "Honest Harold" changed his mind later on, after hearing arguments of Federal-lease applicants, and launched a campaign against the States.

How "Honest Harold" encouraged a friend to file an application for a Federal tidelands lease.

How an attorney who drew Federal Government pay under Ickes in the Interior Department later represented a group trying to get Federal leases.

How admitted speculators have offered "shares" in an oil gamble based on the United States Supreme Court decision.

How one of these speculators admitted he hoped to make a killing by selling lease interests to the big oil companies.

How one of the applicants for Federal leases carried his influence with the administration direct to the White House.

How Texas was told prior to the 1948 elections that it had a special case and would never be sued and how the suit was filed within 60 days after President Truman was elected, getting from Texas the biggest majority of any State in the Union.

How Texas was hustled in and out of court and denied a chance to present evidence in her defense.

How the United States Supreme Court, famous throughout its history for majority opinions, was able to defeat the taxpayers and school children of Texas with a minority opinion.

How and why those in favor of getting cheap Federal leases prefer them to State leasing systems that would cost them more money.

This story presents facts in the tidelands controversy which have not been driven home to the American people—whose liberties and property rights under constitutional government are the real stake.

As said by Attorney General Price Daniel of Texas, oil and Texas are merely incidental to the case as compared to principles involved. Daniel believes that the people have been misled by a smoke screen and propaganda from the instigators of the "big grab."

"In our country," said Daniel, "property rights are not automatically attached to the powers of government."

If the Supreme Court's philosophy is allowed to stand in this case, he suggests, then the Federal Government will have a power over every river, farm, home, mine, and factory of the Nation to a degree never dreamed of by the founders of this democracy.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 2, March 5)

(By Allen Duckworth)

"Honest Harold" Ickes' quick-change act is a curious angle in the "big grab"—the Federal Government's attempt to seize underseas oil lands from the States

Changing is a part of Ickes' political nature.

He was supposed to be a Republican, but Ickes has worn the Bull Moose coat of Teddy Roosevelt, the Republican coat of Charles Evans Hughes, the Democratic coat of James M Cox and of Al Smith

All were losers in Presidential campaigns.

"Honest Harold" finally made a political touchdown in 1932 when Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President. Roosevelt put Ickes in high cotton with a Cabinet appointment to Secretary of Interior.

Now, for the oil angle

Around the turn of the century, it became known that oil could be found under the ocean bed California pioneered in this exploration. Later, Texas and Louisiana came into the tidelands drilling picture.

Texas has taken in eight millions of dollars for its State school fund by leasing underwater lands to oil prospectors.

It was considered a matter of settled law that the States owned the land, and could lease it as they saw fit.

Even "Honest Harold" Ickes thought the States had undisputed ownership on December 22, 1933.

A fellow by the name of Olin S. Proctor of Long Beach, Calif., wrote to Secretary Ickes and asked if he could lease some submerged land from the Federal Government.

"Honest Harold" told Proctor he couldn't get Federal leases.

In a letter dated December 22, 1933, "Honest Harold" quoted a Supreme Court of the United States opinion to Mr. Proctor to make it quite clear to Mr. Proctor.

Ickes said it was a matter of "settled law."

"Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California," wrote Ickes. He said the land could "not be appropriated except by authority of California"

This is amazing in light of later events.

Somehow or another "Honest Harold" changed his mind and the "settled law" became unsettled.

Just to refresh your memory, this happened:

The "big grab" plot was taken to Congress. California oil lands, Congress was told, must be declared part of the Federal domain. Only Congress had the power to do that, it was argued. Suggestions that it could be made a court matter without consent of Congress were disputed then by the big-grab crowd.

Congress refused to confiscate the California lands. It refused to grant permission to the Attorney General to sue California.

It was then that the "big grab" plotters decided it was a court matter after all—regardless of what Congress thought.

Later, when Congress decided to take action in favor of the States, President Truman vetoed the resolution on the grounds that the matter was before the Supreme Court and Congress should not interfere.

In other words, it was a congressional matter only if Congress would rule their way.

But let us return to "Honest Harold's" quick-change exhibition.

Ickes admitted at a congressional hearing in 1946 that he had told Mr. Proctor that the Federal Government didn't have control of the undersea lands. Ickes said his mind began to change. He explained that "applicants (for Federal leases) and their lawyers continued to insist that the United States does own the land and oil and that the Department (of Interior) does have the power to grant them oil and gas leases"

It is only natural that one would wonder who were the "applicants and their lawyers" who were able to sway "Honest Harold" from the "settled law."

A search through official records throws a bit of light on the identity of at least two applicants and one lawyer.

The evidence shows that Ickes was friendly to one applicant and took a personal interest in his application

Robert W. Kenny, at that time attorney general of California, at a congressional hearing, introduced documents to show that

On May 17, 1944, Fred W. Johnson, Land Commissioner in Ickes' Department of the Interior at the time, wrote to the branch office in Los Angeles, Calif., and said he would like to have quick action on any oil- and gas-lease application presented by W W Chapin, of San Francisco, or C. P. Ritter, of Los Angeles

On June 24, 1944, Commissioner Johnson prodded the Los Angeles office with a telegram and urged that the Chapin-Ritter application be air-mailed to Washington if it had been filed.

When the reply came from Los Angeles the lease application "filed by C. P. Ritter, president of Consolidated Petroleum Co.," for tidelands rights, was enclosed

With the application was this information:

"Mr. Ritter presented a letter from the Secretary of Interior (Ickes) suggesting that he file an application and stating that he would get to the bottom of this matter pertaining to the tidelands"

Ickes testified at a later hearing that before the Ritter application was filed he had talked several times with Chapin. Ritter also called to see Ickes.

"He [Chapin] frequently came in to see me, usually when he was in Washington," Ickes testified.

Ickes said that Chapin's lawyer, George Bush, of Los Angeles, "was firmly of the opinion that the Federal Government, rather than the State of California, held the title to those tidelands."

Said Ickes: "Mr. Chapin talked to me on two or three occasions about this. And, subsequently, Mr. Ritter came in. He went over the same ground." Chapin sent Ickes some letters written by Bush.

"Then I made up my mind that I thought the courts ought to decide this, since it was a legal matter," Ickes stated.

When Olin S. Proctor wrote "Honest Harold" back in 1933, it was a matter of "settled law." But after conferences with Chapin and with Ritter, the law became unsettled.

Another interesting angle in the various testimony that Ickes gave about changing his mind involves the White House.

In 1946, when Ickes recalled about the beginning of his "doubts," he credited those doubts to lease applicants and their attorneys.

Two years later he added the White House touch.

Ickes told Congressmen that he had luncheon on April 27, 1937, with President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins and "the President raised the question as to the ownership of oil found under the ocean."

The late Ed Moore, of Oklahoma, then in the United States Senate, was curious. He asked Ickes why he didn't say anything about Roosevelt raising the tidelands question in his former testimony.

Ickes said he had forgotten about the luncheon with the President of the United States and had just recently refreshed his memory by reading his diary.

Regardless of whether Roosevelt was interested, the record will show there was no dash to the Supreme Court by the "big grab" boys until after Roosevelt was dead.

Another item from Ickes' diary was questioned It was in Ickes' testimony at a hearing in 1948 when he referred to Hatton Sumners, of Dallas, then in Congress and chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee Ickes said he had talked to Sumners back in 1938 about California tidelands and Sumners was of the opinion "that the United States already has title"

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, went out and telegraphed Sumners, who was in New Mexico Sumners replied by wire:

"I never entertained or expressed an opinion that the United States has title to tidelands and that suit ought to be instigated against California or any other State."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 3, March 6)

(By Allen Duckworth)

The big oil companies came in for quite a lashing during the "big grab" campaign.

Arguments that the States had a clear and legal title to underseas lands off their shores were drowned out by the howl that the big oil barons must be cornered.

It is true that the big oil companies spent vast sums in trying to protect their titles. They had invested money. And they made no secret of trying to save drilling rights they had purchased, in good faith, from the individual States.

Little emphasis has been placed on the influence exerted on the other side by those supporting the big grab—those who wanted Federal leases and who demanded that those having State permits be treated as trespassers.

We touched a bit on that in yesterday's article, when we related how W. W. Chapin of San Francisco made frequent calls on "Honest Harold" Ickes while Ickes was Secretary of the Interior, and how the Department took more than casual interest in Chapin's attempt to secure oil lands off the California coast.

Now let us turn back to the newspaper files of April 18, 1949, to a column by Drew Pearson, the Washington columnist. To quote:

"Salt Lake City's dignified, whitehaired postmaster, I. A. Smoot, called on President Truman the other day to plead for a strong hand in crushing the oil lobby. The lobby is now pushing another bill through Congress to restore the rich tidelands to the States.

"There was no hedging in Truman's reply.

"'As long as I am President,' he declared, 'I will never permit the submerged oil lands to go back to the States'"

Mr. Pearson didn't tell the whole story. So we will have to look further for information on I. A. Smoot of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The dignified postmaster, Mr. Pearson mentions made his White House visit after the California decision of the Supreme Court saying the State did not own its tidelands. This decision later was applied to Texas and

Louisiana. Then, as now, Congress was considering a resolution to override the Court's far-fetched opinion.

An uninformed reader might get the idea that Postmaster Smoot was up there in Washington on official business, such as getting his mail sacks repaired or suggesting that they put better glue on the back of stamps, and decided he had better drop in and tell President Truman what the big oil companies were up to.

Smoot is a former State land commissioner of Idaho. After going to Utah, he became prominent in politics and served in the legislature. President Roosevelt named Smoot postmaster in 1933.

A District of Columbia suit now on file is trying to force the Department of Interior to issue Federal leases on tidelands under the noncompetitive system.

A plaintiff listed in the suit is I. A. Smoot, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

And if we look on the records of the Department of the Interior, we find that I. A. Smoot filed application LA-053269 on April 8, 1938, for an 800-acre Federal lease of California tidelands.

J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer of the State Lands Commission of California, says the Smoot application covers an area about three-quarters of a mile from where oil is being produced by State-let leases

A pleasure pier of the city of Long Beach runs out over the tract Smoot wants to lease via Federal permit, Watson reports.

Watson estimated that the land Smoot wants is worth at least a million dollars. He called that a conservative estimate.

Smoot called on Truman in 1949. According to the Associated Press Salt Lake City Bureau, Smoot did not retire from the postmastership until December 1, 1950. So, it appears Smoot was on the Federal payroll when he called at the White House to do some lobbying against the oil lobbyists and in favor of I. A. Smoot.

Incidentally, since retiring from the post office, Smoot has been connected with Consolidated Uranium Mines Co., Inc., the Associated Press reported.

The suit Smoot figures in now involves persons who applied for Federal leases years ago in hopes that the United States Supreme Court eventually would rule in their favor. But they still haven't received those leases, because the Department of the Interior believes a stronger leasing act is needed.

Three attorneys signed the petition in the suit by Smoot and 39 others.

One of those attorneys was Max Barash.

Max Barash was chief counsel for the Department of the Interior's geological survey department when Harold Ickes was Secretary of the Interior

Later, in private practice, Barash took the suit in behalf of the oil lease applicants against the Department of the Interior, where he once worked. (Barash told the Washington Bureau of the Dallas Morning News that he dropped out of the case some months ago, but declined to say why.)

Ickes, no longer Secretary of the Interior, is plugging for recognition of those leases under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920; even though he once said that act should not apply to tidelands. Main objection to the leasing act is that it provides much less income from oil rentals and royalties than the States have been able to obtain.

Returning to the subject of who was influencing for what, Congress' records contain some letters written by persons who think it would be a terrible mistake not to hand out tidelands leases on a noncompetitive bid basis.

Congress is discussing that now. There are two phases in congressional consideration at present. A movement is in progress to override the Supreme Court opinion completely and declare the States have full control over tidelands leasing. Another piece of legislation concerns "temporary" leasing arrangements, so that oil production and exploration can go on while it is being decided once and for all who owns those lands. That's where the issue of competitive bids, a State system, comes in as against Federal noncompetitive bids.

One of those who wrote to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY to say that competitive bidding would be "against the public interest" was Arnold M. Seiler, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The record shows that an Arnold M. Seiler has filed application for a Federal oil lease on 320 acres of tidelands.

J. H. Morgan, of Salt Lake City wrote to Senator O'MAHONEY along the same line.

The record shows that folks by the name of Morgan in Salt Lake City have filed applications for hundreds of acres of tidelands leases. The list includes John H. Morgan, Merin Morgan, N. G. Morgan, N. G. Morgan, Sr, and John H. Morgan, Jr.

Grace Hull, of Salt Lake City, protests competitive bidding.

The record shows that a Grace Hull has an application for a 780-acre tidelands lease.

Clarence I. Justheim, Salt Lake City oil promoter, has been loud in his protests against State ownership of tidelands.

The record shows that a Clarence I. Justheim has filed application for Federal leases on more than 3,000 acres off the California coast. And there are other applications under the name of Margaret L. Justeheim.

Why all the fuss over what kind of leasing act the Federal Government shall use when and if Uncle Sam takes complete control of the tidelands?

B. L. Krebs, a New Orleans Times-Picayune writer, revealed 2 years ago that the Federal leasing act as now written allows far less income than does the Louisiana system.

Krebs showed that federally owned land, in one case, was leased in Louisiana and brought only $161 for a 3-year period. But if the leasing had been done by the State of Louisiana, the return to the public treasury would have been $27,000 the first year, half that amount each year for the two succeeding years.

One of the reasons the States get more money is that they call for competitive bids. In certain cases, under the Federal Leasing Act, bids are not asked. They just pass out the leases.

So here we go again with "Honest Harold" Ickes.

Back in 1946, "Honest Harold" appeared before a Senate committee and stated that the tidelands should be made a Federal oil reserve Furthermore, he said, "the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 is not applicable to submerged lands."

Two years after Ickes said that, he appeared before another congressional committee. He had resigned from the Truman Cabinet, was admitted to practice law before the United States Supreme Court, and had become a newspaper columnist.

Representative J. M. COMBS, of Texas, read from Ickes' column of November 3, 1947, in the Washington Evening Star:

"Recently the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Mastin G. White, also of Texas, and the Attorney General agreed that the Federal Leasing Act did not extend to those California tidelands. I challenge this finding."

Asked Congressman COMBS: "Did you write that?"

Ickes replied: "I wrote that."

COMBS pressed further: "Now then, under the Federal Leasing Act, I will ask you if it is not true that if that act applies to tidelands then, under the law the Department will have to go and take the applications for leases in there, in the order in which they were filed, and parcel them out to those applicants at 25 cents an acre. Is that not right?"

Ickes: "Whatever the provision is; yes."

And that testimony came from a man who, 2 years before, had said the Leasing Act should not apply to tidelands, and who had said those valuable lands should be set aside as a Federal oil reserve.

Attorney General Price Daniel, of Texas, has told Congressmen the difference between State and Federal control in terms of dollars.

Texas leased 350,000 tidelands acres to oil companies, prior to the Ickes-inspired lawsuit against the State, for more than $7,000,000.

If the Federal Leasing Act that Ickes supports had been applied, instead of competitive State bidding, the income would have been only $87,000, Daniel estimated.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 4, March 7)

(By Allen Duckworth)

When the "big grab" scheme was hatched, under the generalship of "Honest Harold" Ickes, there was a lot of flag waving.

The Navy must have oil to keep Old Glory on high, said some of the original instigators to the "big grab." So, said they, those underwater oil lands off the coasts must be taken from the States and made a reserve for emergencies.

And "Honest Harold" said so, too.

"These lands should be held as a Federal oil reserve," Ickes told a congressional committee in 1946

This sounded very nice to those who did not recall what a mess there was during the Harding administration when the Navy put certain oil lands in the hands of the Department of the Interior and the Teapot Dome leasing scandal developed.

This time, Navy-owned lands were not involved in the proposed transfer to the Interior Department Rather, they were lands that did not, under law at the time, belong to Federal Government at all. The land belongs to the States. At least, the Supreme Court had said so up to then.

In the case of Texas, the lands belonged to the State under the agreement that admitted Texas to the Union, and Texas has dedicated the oil-leasing income from those lands to the school kids

While the flag was being waved and the public was being told that the influence of the big oil barons must be crushed, some clever moves were being made.

Certain individuals played a long shot. They applied for Federal oil leases on submerged lands off the California coast.

The Department of the Interior was not issuing any Federal leases on tidelands, but these individuals put themselves on record as having filed applications.

These applications were long-range speculations. If things worked out all right in Washington, holders of these applications might be able to eat high on the hog.

This brings us to a letter read into the record last year before a United States Senate hearing.

The letter would indicate that some of those who hope to obtain Federal leases would be willing to sell them to big oil companies at a handsome profit.

In other words, big oil companies have been operating under State leases. They have invested a lot of money. But if Federal leases are approved, in some instances, the oil companies might find Federal permits slapped down on top of their old State permits. They might have to get out or pay those with the new-style leases.

The possibility is stated blandly in the letter the Senators had read to them.

Quoting from the letter in the Senate record:

The letter is addressed to Robert E. George, of Los Angeles, Calif., and is dated February 10, 1950. It is signed by Robert F. Purvis.

"In recent years," the letter reads, "you have doubtless read and heard a great deal about the tidelands-oil controversy between the United States and California, the high light of which was the United States Supreme Court decision in 1947 declaring the United States to have paramount rights to the submerged lands involved "

The letter details the oil riches involved in the lands off the California coast, and then gets down to the real business:

"My friend and client, Joseph Cunningham, anticipated by 13 years the Supreme Court decision of 1947 by filing on, with his nominees, some 10,000 acres of submerged lands. * * *"

Mr. George is then informed that there is a suit pending to force the Department of the Interior to honor those old applications—those applications filed before the Federal Government was given any power over tidelands oil by the Supreme Court.

It was revealed that no less a personage than former Senator Burton K Wheeler now acting as lawyer and was pressing this legal claim.

The letter leads up to an offer to Mr. George to invest in an enterprise known as the Shore Line Oil Co. This company, it is indicated, had acquired an interest in some of the old applications. Purvis, the letter stated, was in need of a bit of ready cash and was willing to part with some of his shares if Mr. George was interested.

Now for the kicker line·

"In my opinion, it is a most magnificent gamble in that all existing law is on our side and the high stakes involved are out of all proportion to the risk of losing * * *

"If the permits are granted, oil companies will offer fabulous sums either for the stock or for operating agreements or leases bearing handsome royalties. * * *"

Little wonder that the Department of the Interior, under Secretary Julius A. Krug, and later under the present Secretary, Oscar L. Chapman, balked at being rushed into granting those lease applications under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Yet, former Senator Wheeler insists that the applications should be granted

So does "Honest Harold" Ickes, who fathered the "big grab" of lands from the States while he was Secretary of the Interior.

The States are trying to get Congress to override the Supreme Court and declare all of the tidelands the rightful property of individual States. And while that is being considered, Congress also is trying to decide how oil leases shall be made, if the Federal Government retains control.

While Congress considers leasing legislation, holders of the old applications demand in District of Columbia Court that the Interior Department be forced to issue leases to them.

Not so long ago, there were whoops and hollers about the menace of the big oil companies.

Now, the record would indicate, the little fellows would be willing to sell back the lands to the big boys. If and when that is done, the oil operations would be back where they began—in the hands of the big oil companies.

There would be a major difference, however. The Federal Government will be grabbing the leasing cash and royalties that formerly went to the State treasuries.

As for Texas, the big loser will be the school kids, since all from these lands go to the public school fund.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 5, March 8)

(By Allen Duckworth)

When "Honest Harold" Ickes cast the cloud on the States' ownership of submerged oil lands off their coasts, a wave of highly speculative investing was set off.

Here's what happened:

When it became apparent that Secretary of the Interior Ickes had changed his mind after stating firmly that the tidelands legally belonged to the States and had decided they belonged to the Central Government after all, there was a rush to file for Federal leases on underwater properties.

Some of the applications for Federal leases plopped right on top of valuable State leases issued by California and paid for by the leasees in good faith.

Ickes let the applications cool in the Department of the Interior.

Now that the Supreme Court has spoken, saying that Texas, Louisiana, and California don't own those underseas oil lands, a great clamor has been set up to honor those old lease applications that Ickes allowed to pile up.

Congress isn't so sure it will let the Supreme Court get away with its bizarre opinion

And even if it does it wants to make sure those leases won't be handed out at bargain rates by the Federal Government.

Impatient holders of the old applications don't want to wait. They are suing in District of Columbia District Court to force the Interior Department to issue them leases under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Harold Ickes thinks the leasing ought to be granted under the old act, although he once stated that the act should not apply to submerged oil lands. Ickes "changes like a weather vane," former Senator Sheridan Downey once observed.

Under Federal law, you can get oil prospecting (wildcat) leases, without bidding in competition with others, on a first-come, first-serve basis, at a few cents an acre.

Congress is taking another look. Even if the Department of the Interior is to boss the tidelands oil, Congress isn't sure it wants the 1920 mineral leasing law to apply.

Much evidence of speculation on Federal leases has been uncovered.

In yesterday's article, a letter was quoted from the official record to show that a California man had stated that it would be possible, if Federal leases were granted, to sell them to the big oil companies. It is obvious that the big oil companies would be happy to buy off Federal leaseholders to protect their investments under State leases.

The evidence points to some outright speculation on the outcome of the Supreme Court decision against the individual States.

It is to be remembered that the United States Supreme Court did not hand down its decision in the California tidelands case until June 23, 1947.

Long before that, however, Ickes had had his famous change of mind, which he admits came about after applicants and their attorneys pressed the matter upon him.

Among the applicants for Federal leases sent to the Department of the Interior was one on May 5, 1939, in the name of Earl G. Sinclair and Lauren D. Cherry.

Robert W. Kenny, as attorney general of California, gave evidence to Congress of what he called "a traffic throughout the United States whereby people have been led to believe that there is a great get-rich-quick opportunity if State tidelands can be upset."

He used Lauren D. Cherry's unapproved, but undenied, application as an example.

Kenny offered in evidence documents showing that Cherry sold interests in his application on at least four occasions.

A 2-percent interest in the application was sold for $100 to Alma Goettsch of Long Beach, Calif., in 1939—8 years before the Supreme Court spoke.

Andrew Sheaser of Long Beach paid $75 for a 1-percent interest in May 1941. Alma Goettsch put in $110 for an additional interest of 1 percent June 3, 1941.

Anna H. Kruetzfeldt of Long Beach found she could buy an interest on the installment plan. She paid $65 down on a 1-percent interest priced at $175.

It must be remembered that these sales were not in oil leases. They were in mere applications—applications that could not be granted until the Supreme Court ruled the right way.

The Supreme Court number came up as expected.

Payoff hasn't come—yet.

Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler is a lawyer for some of those applicants who want Federal leases right now.

Ickes is taking their part, too.

Texas officials, especially Attorney General Price Daniel, do not believe the tidelands fight has been made in good faith by the Federal Government.

Daniel believes the people have been misled—misled not only on the merits of the controversy over oil between the Federal Government and the States, but have had a Supreme Court opinion slapped on the books that threatens the very theory of resistance to high dictatorial powers in this country.

He urges that Congress undo this injustice of the Supreme Court.

Daniel cites the double talk. First, the American people were told the tidelands should be made a naval reserve for national defense. Now, some of the same folks who talked like that want to hand out Federal oil leases on applications that have been used for speculative purposes.

"This naval reserve and national defense has been put up as a smoke screen," Daniel told Congress.

"I think that I can illustrate that best by recalling former Secretary Ickes' testimony," Daniel said at a hearing.

"He sat right here in this chair and told the committee that it was his idea that this property should be set aside for naval purposes.

"There is your smoke screen to get plenty of popular appeal behind their idea. That is for the purpose of getting it in the hands of the Federal Government.

"Then, before he left the stand, he [Ickes] told the committee what he really thought ought to be done with it after the Federal Government got hold of it under the pretense of naval reserves and national defense He told the committee he thought the Mineral Leasing Act applies to all of these lands and criticized the solicitor of the Interior Department and Attorney General Clark for holding to the contrary.

"So he thinks the Mineral Leasing Act ought to apply to these lands.

"That would mean all this proposed naval reserve on the California coast would go out at 25 cents an acre to these 1,021 applicants who have their applications on file like Senator Wheeler's clients."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 6, March 9)

(By Allen Duckworth)

There are those who insist that "Pappy" O'Daniel, of Texas, was able to contribute little during his term in the United States Senate

That is not true. He coined a classic term:

"Legal looting."

The term was applied to the methods used to put across the "big grab"—the political conspiracy to saw off valuable seaward boundaries of the States of Texas, Louisiana, and California.

This fight is nearing a climax.

Texas is pleading for Congress to override a warped, politically tainted edict of the United States Supreme Court.

Texas has a selfish interest. Those submerged lands off its coasts are leased to oil prospectors. The school kids of Texas have a stake. Oil-lease revenue goes to the public-school fund.

There's more than a selfish interest.

Texas is trying to awaken other States to the menace.

If that strange philosophy spawned in the waters of bureaucracy is allowed to stand, the extension of Federal seizures could wipe out any horizon dividing the title to property. State control of waters, fish, piers, riverbeds, lakes, and all other submerged lands could be transferred to the Federal Government.

Under the Constitution, the Congress is the maker of laws. The Supreme Court interprets them—or is supposed to.

Now the Supreme Court, in the tidelands case, has started making laws. It has started breaking solemn agreements. And the President of the United States has aided and abetted.

Three times did Congress refuse to grant the Justice Department authority to proceed against the States to seize their oil-bearing tidelands. That was back in the thirties.

Texas was in there fighting from the start, although the original attack was against California because California took a lead in tapping undersea oil deposits.

After all, 53 past Supreme Court decisions had favored State control of offshore lands.

And, in the special case of Texas, the United States had agreed that Texas could keep all vacant lands "lying within its limits" when it joined the Union.

There must be a reason for the "big grab" plot. Jimmy Allred, while Governor of Texas, had an explanation. Said Allred:

"When lands become valuable somebody wants to get them."

Allred was a good New Dealer, but he couldn't digest the plot cooked up by the "big grab" chiefs headed by "Honest Harold" Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior.

Failing to get congressional action, the "big grab" crowd ignored Congress and turned to the courts, anyway.

But it is interesting to recall that while Franklin D. Roosevelt was alive, nothing was done about suing the States.

Roosevelt has been criticized severely for favoring super powers for the Federal Government. But he was a piker along that line when compared with President Truman.

Six weeks after President Roosevelt died the big grab really got going good.

The argument had been that oil drillers with California leases were trespassers.

Attorney General Francis Biddle filed a suit against the Pacific Western Oil Co. for trespass on 144 acres of productive tidelands off the coast of Santa Barbara County, Calif.

Now, as every citizen knows, when a suit is filed in Federal district court, each side has a chance to present evidence. The case can be appealed to a circuit court. And, if desired, it can be taken all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States.

While every citizen understands that simple judicial system, every citizen also knows there are cases in which certain parties do not want to hear evidence. Too, every citizen knows that the law isn't perfect and that a smart lawyer who looks close enough and long enough is likely to find a loophole—in his favor.

The States, alarmed by this lawsuit in California, pressed for Congress to clarify ownership of the tidelands; to say flatly that the Federal Government had no claim.

Law and precedent were on the side of the States, but you can cloud any title, no matter how good, with a lawsuit, no matter how weak.

Congressional sentiment leaned toward the States.

This didn't set well in the big grab circles. It became evident to them that they must put new gears in their strategy.

While Congress deliberated on the quitclaim legislation, a new Attorney General came to the Cabinet—Tom C. Clark, of Dallas, Tex.

Obviously, the congressional resolution would blow the district court trespass suit right into the bay.

There must be some way to go right to the Supreme Court, with no dilly-dallying with evidence and testimony.

The "big grab" found a path to the Supreme Court itself under article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which reads:

"In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. * * *"

That was a wonderful idea, as you shall see.

The Attorney General dismissed the district court trespass suit against the oil company.

A suit as an original action was filed in Supreme Court against California itself. Such procedure is rare.

Harold Ickes has taken full credit for the switch of the case from district court in California to the Supreme Court in Washington. Writing in his newspaper column, Man to Man, back in July 1947, Ickes said:

"I decided that the surest and quickest rout was a beeline to the Supreme Court itself."

After Roosevelt died, relates Ickes, Attorney General Biddle, with the blessing of President Harry S. Truman, filed the district court suit. That wasn't good enough for "Honest Harold."

"I had always urged the filing of an original suit in the Supreme Court," the Ickes story goes.

After Tom Clark replaced Biddle as Attorney General:

"I persuaded President Truman to instruct his Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, to dismiss the suit in the district court and file an original proceeding in the Supreme Court.

"Thus we were able to get a much quicker final decision than if the case had dragged its weary way from the district court to the circuit court of appeal and then to the Supreme Court."

Mark you well that this Supreme Court suit was filed while Congress had before it the quitclaim resolution in favor of the States.

Congress wasn't in as big a hurry as the "big grab" crowd.

Congress didn't do its job overnight It held exhaustive hearings. It heard both sides, including Harold Ickes.

Congress passed the quitclaim resolution in 1946.

President Truman slapped a veto on the resolution.

The President's reason for a veto: The case was before the Supreme Court and "the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at it decision. * * *"

When the "big grab" boys made the beeline to the Supreme Court while Congress was deliberating, it was all right.

When the Congress acted while the Supreme Court was deliberating, it was all wrong.

Or was it that there was a rather certain feeling that the Supreme Court would deliver the goods as per schedule?

Mr. Justice Black wrote an opinion June 23, 1947, saying that the Federal Government had first say on California's underseas oil lands.

Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, in his dissent, registered judicial shock. As liberal as is Frankfurter's background, the Roosevelt appointee insisted that the Supreme Court was taking over a function of the Congress.

The "big grab" crowd had won its first round It then cast hungry eyes at the school-kids' land in Texas.

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 7, March 10)

(By Allen Duckworth)

There was a bit of talk around Texas a few years ago about the actions of Attorney General Price Daniel.

Why, asked some, was the attorney general of Texas spending so much of his time worrying about a California lawsuit?

What difference did it make to Texas if the Federal Government confiscated California offshore oil lands?

After all, wasn't Texas secure? Didn't Texas have a special agreement with the Federal Government that gave it the right to keep all its unsold lands after joining the union?

Attorney General Daniel wasn't so sure the "big grab" crowd would respect that title.

Neither was Gov. Beauford Jester.

As things have panned out, Attorney General Daniel was as right as a fox with a crystal ball

The "big grab" plotters in Washington were using the strategy of divide and conquer. They weren't going after all the States at once. First, they would pick off California, apparently the weak sister. Then they would use a Supreme Court opinion in the California case to slick Texas and Louisiana. And then, who knows?

Daniel helped California defend its lawsuit, because he was dead sure that the divide-and-conquer scheme would hit Texas eventually. He argued on behalf of the National Association of Attorneys General who appeared as amicus curiae ("friend of the court").

Aided by Governor Jester, Daniel tried to line up Nation-wide sentiment against this obvious creeping paralysis of super-Federal powers. Congress tried to help with a resolution that the States had full ownership, but President Truman slapped it down with a veto. The "big grab" was stretching for the critical gobble and wasn't to be trifled with.

Even while Daniel worked in the California case, efforts were made to lull him and Texans generally.

After arguing for the State attorneys general in the California case, Daniel got a friendly pat on the back from Attorney General Tom Clark, who had presented the Federal side. Said Clark:

"Well, you've had a nice trip up here, but that's all it amounts to. Texas is different from California and will never be sued. I have just handed the press a written statement to that effect."

Many a Texan read with relief that written statement by Texas-born Tom Clark. It was the lawsuit "involves only the area off the coast of California." In that statement prepared for Clark, the Justice Department said:

"When asked regarding his native State of Texas, the Attorney General—Clark—pointed out that Texas had been an independent nation, a Republic, for 10 years before joining the Union. As a Republic it owned all of the lands within its boundaries, including the marginal sea commonly called tidelands. This area similar to that involved in the California case extended into the Gulf of Mexico and was under the sovereignty of Texas all during the Republic and was retained by it under the provisions of the Act of Admission."

The Attorney General, Clark, stated quite plainly that Texas retained those lands.

It was convincing enough for many Texans. (Months later, in a congressional hearing, Clark told Representative ED GOSSETT that "I still feel that Texas has special rights," but added that Texas could plead those "special defenses" in court.)

After following the "big grab" strategy under the direction of "Honest Harold" Ickes, Daniel knew pretty much what to expect.

When the California opinion by Mr. Justice Black was read, Daniel and Jester were more apprehensive than ever.

Lawyer Daniel and Lawyer Jester read the opinion more carefully than the average layman.

The language did far more than take control of thousands of acres of offshore lands in California.

An entirely new philosophy of government seemed to have been set up—not by revolution, nor by act of Congress, but by ukase of the Supreme Court.

Said Mr Justice Black:

"The crucial question * * * is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands * * * The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner. * * *"

Many a great lawyer gasped and reread those words.

"Bare legal title * * * mere property owner * * *"

The opinion went on with talk about how the Federal Government had to protect the coast in time of war as an argument for owning the coastal lands.

It took only a reading of Mr Justice Reed's dissent to realize how this opinion of the Court might be extended to other property.

Yes, admitted Reed, the United States had certain powers of protection over the coasts, just as it had over every "river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation"

Could Reed have been hinting at the possible projection to other property of this theory expressed by the majority?

Commented Governor Jester in a speech to the National Governors Conference: "It is the first decision within our knowledge holding that exercise of the Federal Government's responsibility to protect the shores and lands of this country can ripen into rights heretofore identified with ownership of such shores and lands."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter criticized the majority opinion in the California case by saying that the right of the Federal Government to regulate commerce and to wage wars and protect the country were being mixed with "rights of ownership"

The legal lightning struck Texas on December 21, 1948.

Note the date. President Truman had been down in Texas on his campaign tour.

"Texas is in a class by itself; it entered the Union by treaty," Truman said in a speech at Austin, September 20, 1948.

Certainly, thought thousands of Texans, the President would not allow a suit against Texas after that statement.

Texas gave Truman the largest majority of any Democratic State.

Sixty days after the election, the Federal suit was filed to confiscate Texas tidelands.

"It is the position of the United States," said Attorney General Clark's motion for leave to file suit against Texas, "that the rule there announced (in the California case) is equally applicable to the sea bed and subsoil of the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to Texas."

How about those special defenses Texas had?

They were brushed aside in a vague manner that even the Supreme Court itself has yet to explain in the quaint opinion that followed.

Texas was hustled in and out of court and stripped of her tidelands in short order—without being allowed to develop testimony in defenses of historic rights she had enjoyed for a hundred years. But that is another chapter in the story of the "big grab."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 8, March 11)

(By Allen Duckworth)

Old Man Texas was hustled in and out of the Supreme Court of the United States.

When the bum's rush was over Old Man Texas found himself much poorer. The Court said he must give up 2,608,000 acres of land he had owned more than a century.

His experience in the long-range "big grab" scheme that was hatched in Washington is a warning to every State and every citizen of the dangerous possibilities in the Supreme Court's decision.

What happened to Old Man Texas in losing those 2,608,000 acres of off-shore oil lands could happen to inland States, he believes, if the theory of nationalization is extended.

Old Man Texas says to the other States who haven't been sued yet, to industries, and to all property owners

"Pull up a chair and listen to me, pardner. You may be next"

One has only to look over at once Merry Ol' England, where nationalization of most everything the Government decides it wants "for public welfare" has progressed since the close of the last war to understand what Old Man Texas is talking about.

The submerged oil lands of California were first on the nationalization list over here. Then it was Texas and Louisiana

What next? The shores of the Great Lakes of the Northern States? Seizure of rivers and creeks and lakes from inland States?

Basic industries from the hands of private owners?

Farfetched?

Old Man Texas merely quotes the exact words of Mr. Justice Hugo Black in the first tidelands-seizure opinion Black used the phrases "bare title" and "mere property owner" in brushing aside the State's objections and allowing the Government to lay claim to the valuable oil lands just because the Government said it was necessary.

Incidentally no one in the Federal Government has proven yet that it can manage the oil lands better than the States. And the States have shown, up to now, that they can get more out of the big oil companies than can the Federal Government.

Projecting this theory expressed by the Supreme Court, the Federal Government could seize anything by merely saying it was necessary.

A shameful angle is the manner in which Old Man Texas was handled in court. Here is the record:

Old Man Texas was refused a district court trial.

Old Man Texas was refused the right to present evidence.

Old Man Texas wasn't allowed near as much time to prepare his defenses as was Uncle Sam, who had gone on a bureaucratic binge and was suing Old Man Texas.

Old Man Texas didn't even have the benefit of having a majority of the court ruling against him.

The treatment given Old Man Texas was pretty rough in the Supreme Court, from his viewpoint. But in the light of the whole history of the "big grab" it was consistent with the Federal strategy.

We already have shown, in previous stories of this series, how "Honest Harold" Ickes, as Secretary of the Interior, made the first reach of the "big grab." We have shown how he did a complete about face after stating flatly that it was a matter of "settled law" that the States owned their submerged lands. We have shown how President Truman refused to let Congress act in favor of the States.

After winning its Supreme Court lawsuit against California, the Federal prosecutors turned to Texas.

Unlike California, Texas had an iron-clad defense. The United States told Texas to keep its unsold lands when it joined the Union in return for payment of its public debts. Texas was the only State ever to do that. The agreement was in writing.

When the lawsuit was filed, the Texas attorney general, Price Daniel, said only Congress, not the Court, had the authority to act

"Congress made the agreement and has recognized it for more than 100 years This court should not permit the Attorney General to sue without permission of Congress," Daniel argued.

But, he added, if there was going to be a lawsuit, why not have a full one, so that evidence might be heard?

Those weren't Daniel's words. He put them in lawyer language for the court. But that's what it amounted to.

Daniel was asking for Texas only what the most humble citizen can demand and get

Daniel wanted to try the case before a district court or a master assigned to hear evidence. He wanted a chance to present evidence of Texas' ownership and use of those lands Then, if the Federal Government didn't like the verdict, it could appeal—clear up to the Supreme Court—if it desired.

Nope. Those Federal prosecutors didn't want any testimony—period.

So, the court ordered Texas to the bar.

Texas couldn't prepare its brief in reply to Federal claims until it examined the Federal charges.

Daniel was forced to wait 77 days before the Federal brief was delivered to him.

Texas was given only 27 days to prepare, print, and file its brief.

The Federal Government raised points that would require Texas to restudy and revise its entire argument.

"A physically impossible task," the scrappy little Texas attorney general protested to the court, in vain

Even time was used against Texas in that rush to grab the offshore oil lands—lands Texas had owned since winning its independence at San Jacinto.

Seventy-seven days for the prosecution.

Twenty-seven days for Texas.

Daniel and his assistants holed up in an Austin hotel room and worked days and nights against the deadline. Crews of printers labored overtime. When Daniel entrained last March for Washington, the ink wasn't dry on the hastily prepared and printed brief copies. His own copy hadn't been found.

Philip B. Perlman, Solicitor General, presented the Federal case

Perlman admitted that the annexation agreement gave Texas its public lands, but he insisted that the seaward lands were not lands in the same sense.

Asked Mr. Justice Minton, who later voted to uphold the Texas claim.

"Was it not land that was under the water? There was not anything else"

They gave Attorney General Price Daniel 2 hours to argue the Texas case that day in March last year Defenses for common criminals usually last longer in plain county courtrooms. But that was all—2 hours—that the Supreme Court allowed Texas for argument over 2,500,000 acres of land whose oil lease incomes help educate the kids of Texas.

Three months later—last June—the famous minority opinion came in against Texas. There are nine members of the Court. Two did not participate in the Texas case. That left seven Four of the seven voted against Texas, three voted for Texas.

The opinion, written by politically conscious Mr. Justice Douglas, admitted that Texas once owned those lands as a republic, but lost them somehow when she entered the Union.

Scoffed Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a classic dissent:

"The Court now decided that when Texas entered the Union she lost what she had and the United States acquired it.

"How that shift came to pass remains for me a puzzle."

THE "BIG GRAB"

(Installment 9, March 12)

(By Allen Duckworth)

Twenty-four percent of all the land in the United States is owned by the Federal Government

The Federal Government is reaching for more land and power.

Unless Congress stops the trend the individual States are threatened with an eventual draining of their power and wealth.

The new threat is part of the general scheme to whittle away powers of the States and invest the Federal Government with unlimited authority.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States point the way. This country has been nosed onto the road to nationalization.

Already possessing almost a quarter of all the Nation's continental lands, the Federal Government will confiscate an underwater territory as large as the New England States combined if Congress does not slap down the Court reasoning.

The Court has said the Federal Government can claim the submerged oil lands off the coasts of Texas, California, and Louisiana as a matter of national necessity.

Valuable though they are, those tidelands are pittance when compared to the other possibilities of nationalization.

Do the tidelands opinions really point toward a growing nationalization policy in Washington?

Some of the Nation's greatest legal authorities interpret the Supreme Court decisions that way.

They fear that the Court has pointed the way for greater grabs.

Next on the grab list, they fear, will be harbors, river beds, inland lakes and streams, and perhaps basic industries.

Already the States have been rocked by Supreme Court decisions clipping their powers on everything from conduct of elections to running their universities.

Now that the States' political powers have been weakened, the attack shifts to the States' finances.

Strip the States of both power and income, then the Federal Government will emerge supreme in everything.

The "divide and conquer" method has been used.

That was the strategy to prevent a general uproar throughout the country.

Few Americans were especially excited when the Federal Government won Supreme Court approval for confiscation of California's submerged oil lands. But that was only the beginning.

In spite of statements designed to lull Texas into a feeling of security about its own lands, Texas was next on the list And Louisiana The Supreme Court again stamped its O K for Federal confiscation in an opinion that disregarded both law and precedent. The Court wrote its own law to fit the occasion, thus stepping out of its judicial role and invading the province of Congress.

The Court's reasoning could be extended to ownership of the iron ore deposits under the Great Lakes, kelp (an iodine source) from the coastal States, copper and precious metals of the Western States, coal of the Eastern States.

"It can happen here," warns Robert Lee Bobbitt of San Antonio, former attorney general of Texas and chairman of the Texas State Bar Committee to fight the Supreme Court decision.

"If you have any doubt, then take a look at once proud and powerful old England. That once great empire stands socialized and paralyzed."

Gasped Senator TOM CONNALLY of Texas, after the Supreme Court decision last year:

"Is there no possible end or limit to arbitrary power?"

When the Federal Government extends ownership of lands it does more than acquire property.

The more property the Government owns, the fewer taxes the States can levy on lands and resources.

Reduce the tax dollar income of a State and it becomes less powerful as it becomes poorer. It must look to the central government for financial help. And with that financial help comes greater Federal powers over the States and their citizens.

The stakes in the big-grab scheme are tremendous.

Each year, Pennsylvania scoops from 500,000 to 1,500,000 tons of coal from river beds.

Delaware has 50,000 acres of oyster beds, leased out by the State government for revenues.

While the suits against Texas, California, and Louisiana involved tidelands oil, it must be remembered that the Federal Government claims all tidelands—not merely those containing oil.

Only 15 miles of the California coast is producing oil, but the Federal Government is fighting to obtain control over the other 1,185 miles

Long Beach, Calif., is a classic example of what other harbor cities, such as Boston, Mass., are threatened with. More than 20 square miles, or 37 percent, of the entire area of Long Beach is tidelands. They include the public harbor, the beach, the amusements zone, the municipal auditorium. Public and private investment on these lands is estimated at more than $200,000,000 by Board of Harbor Commissioners.

Maine has more of its tidelands under kelp leases than Texas has under oil leases.

Florida, with the longest coastline, receives far more money from the use of its tidelands resources of fish, shell sand, hotel and pier sites than Texas does from tidelands oil.

"Government will be further removed from the people, instead of being brought closer to them, if fishing, cultivating oysters, building docks and ports, removing seaweed, oyster and coquina shell, digging oil wells and engaging in all other activities in the marginal sea are controlled by bureaus in Washington," observed the University of Florida Law Review. "Yet the decision leads to precisely this."

Equally alarmed was the Marquette Law Review.

The Supreme Court's tidelands decision language was so broad that "it could be held to apply to other State-owned property, if not to private property," said the Marquette Review.

"Carried to its logical conclusion, this doctrine of national ownership could be applied to almost any kind of property—State or privately owned. * * *

"The steady whittling away of the rights of the States is a cause for concern of everyone."

Aside from certain Federal officials, including President Truman, whose philosophy supports greater powers for the Washington Government, the big grab campaign has been encouraged by those who hope to profit from Federal leases if they can upset State titles.

Resolutions are pending in Congress that would repudiate the Supreme Court decisions against the States.

Such legislation will have to hurdle the White House.

Although Congress, in 1948, passed a resolution by overwhelming vote to give the States undisputed title, President Truman slapped on a veto. His excuse was that the matter was pending in court and Congress should not interfere while the court was deliberating.

Truman probably will veto the new resolution if Congress passes it.

He'll have to think up a new excuse this time.

And there is a good chance that States can muster the votes to veto his veto.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—"Beautifully engraved invitations to the poorhouse."

That's how Chairman Harry A. McDonald, of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, describes the gold, silver, uranium, cobalt, and oil stock promotions carried on by mail and telephone from here into the United States.

Although illegal in the United States, these promotions which extract an estimated $52,000,000 a year from American suckers are legalized by the provincial government of Ontario.

Yet, every Toronto mail order promotion which the SEC and the United States Post Office have investigated has been found to be promoted by fraud.

Investigations show, said SEC Chairman McDonald, that the frauds of the mail-order promoters "are particularly vicious in character, that their operations are continuous, and that these operations are conducted more or less exclusively from Toronto."

The buccaneers of Bay Street, Toronto's Wall Street, conduct their raids on American investment capital from suites in downtown office buildings.

From outside appearances, the suites look like staid brokerage offices, but the description of them here is "boiler rooms," because of the high-pressure methods used to sell stock.

I saw them going full blast.

The Bay Street boiler rooms are literally small factories. They mail out millions of pieces of literature, telling United States suckers in glowing terms how to make easy money in mines and wells at the "development stage."

This "development stage" can range anywhere from a lease on a quarter section of moose pasture in the wilds of western Canada to an abandoned mine that hasn't produced for years in northern Ontario.

I saw mimeographed letters and expensively printed and illustrated pamphlets, folders, and brochures filled with glorious promises of wealth, being folded, sealed into envelopes and mailed to potential suckers in St. Louis, Kansas City, Topeka, Des Moines, and other cities by the thousands.

Each form letter advised the addressee—whose name had been copied from sucker lists furnished by a firm in Chicago—that he had been selected to participate in an unparalleled, unusual, or historical opportunity to make money.

The folding, the sealing, and the mailing are done by teams of bored-looking women. They sit at improvised tables in the back room of the boiler-room suite and stuff the come-on literature into envelopes on a production-line basis.

Most of these women are immigrants to Canada from England, Scotland, and Ireland, who have come here in response to this

country's drive to expand its 14,000,000 population and build up its industry.

I talked to several of them. They told me they became disgusted with their work as soon as they figured out what the boss was doing. But they are hanging on until they can find productive work that pays as well, or nearly as well, they told me.

The broker-dealers and underwriters pay their employees well, I was told. Salesmen who remote over long-distance telephones for hours at a time to sell the suckers in the States receive from 15 to 20 percent of their gross sales.

After dark the lights keep burning in the promoters' offices The electric lighting isn't good in most of Toronto because of a Province-wide power shortage, and you are constantly reminded to turn out the lights when you leave.

The lighting flickers at times—so badly you can hardly see well enough to read But by night fall the mailing operation is finished

Under the flickering bulbs salesmen with their feet upon their desks and their hats pushed back on their heads like characters out of Hollywood production, squint at the cards listing suckers they are to call and feed the long-distance operators two or three numbers at a time, in case some don't answer.

I saw them working over the telephone in groups of four to six, each talking to a different prospect in an American city, perspiring a little under their hatbands with the effort to sound convincing.

The babble of voices coaxing, declaiming, and even warning would rise and fall, punctuated by sharp, metallic clicks of the receiver as some the salesmen would hang up and dial long distance again for other numbers.

Most of the salesmen seemed to keep their calls to 4 minutes, although they would exceed that limit if an extra minute or two was needed to hook the sucker With commissions dangling in front of them, they worked hard.

The long-distance telephoning begins at 6 p m. eastern standard time, which is also Toronto time, when Americans on the eastern seaboard and as far west as Indiana are sitting down to dinner. The salesmen want to be sure to catch them at home.

At 7 p. m the telephoning begins to swing into the States on central standard time—Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin. Then the calls begin going into Chicago and St. Louis.

I overheard one salesman making his pitch to a woman in Michigan. The victim must have been a housewife, because I heard him saying

"I'm sure your husband would approve * * * an opportunity to get in at the beginning * * * that's where the money is going to be made * * * in the western Canadian oils."

He babbled on about a pipeline somebody was going to build, how some of the "big boys" were poking around, interested, how the stock was rising on the market, how he could hold a block of stock at the special bargain price until midnight tomorrow night.

At 8 p m the telephone barrage descended into the Mountain States. I heard a fat, anxious salesman trying to get through to Denver. He was pleading with the operator as though it were a matter of life or death. As he pleaded and argued, perspiration ran down his beefy, red face in rivulets and he kept wiping it away with his pudgy hands.

At 9 p. m the Toronto telephone rings the bells on the west coast. In the Los Angeles area, I was told, "prospects" respond more readily than in any other section of the United States.

"They are more speculative minded," a salesman remarked.

There are approximately 55 big boiler rooms in Toronto, and many small ones. Officially, the total is 113.

And there are nearly 300 salesmen. I was told a good stock salesman can make as much as $20,000 a year, working 6 hours a day, 6 days a week. Most of them don't work on Sunday. They figure Americans don't like to gamble on Sunday.

In every instance the stock promoted over the telephone was being peddled illegally in the United States.

In every instance it represented nothing more than the promoters' promise.

In no instance could it be sold or traded by anyone hypnotized into buying it. There is no market for it and there never was

Yet, this is the type of promotion which is not only tolerated by the Ontario Securities Commission as long as it is fired to persons outside the borders of Ontario, but accepted by the Broker-Dealers' Association, the promoters' official club

I asked W. M. Wismer, executive secretary of the association and a former counsel for the Commission, why licensed broker-dealers in Ontario are permitted to violate the laws of their good neighbor to the south.

He said the law violations were only technical, the SEC does not understand the speculative nature of Canadian petroleum and mining development, he said.

Neither he nor any official of the Securities Commission was able to show me a single instance of where a current boiler-room stock promotion had paid a dividend, or ever would.

Old Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following. Mr. James Patrick McGovern compiled the Poems of World War II, which was published by the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, Department of Maryland, the American Legion, in April 1945. Included in this publication was the following poem entitled "Valor of the Celt," which is most appropriate in observance of St. Patrick's Day on March 17, and which poem is dedicated to the fighting spirit of the Irish:

VALOR OF THE CELT

What mean the neutral mandates of today
As long as Irish hearts, not laws, hold sway?
Two thousand years ago the Celts were bold
To prove their valor, never since grown cold;
For centuries their sons have heard drums roll
Abroad and home, and won the hero's scroll.

Who can recount each deed, recall each name,
Enrolling Irish warriors in halls of fame?
Their spirit on every front has never ceased
To be among the Allies a buoyant yeast.
The race itself stands now with vision clear
An international and stalwart peer.

No mortal power can cloud fair Ireland's brow;
As her men always fought, so they fight now;
They fill the foremost ranks where danger lies,
Spurred by the valorous will which death defies,
Impelled by native love for soil that's free,
Dauntless wherever they meet with tyranny.
For many flags, by land, in sky, on sea,
The Celtic race fulfills its destiny;
A hundred ships of war slip down the ways,
Each christened in an Irish martyr's praise;
And untold shrines in foreign, distant parts
Will keep Old Erin warm within true hearts.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

You and the $71,600,000,000 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial entitled "You and the $71,600,000,000 Budget," which appeared in the March 1951 issue of the Virginia Farm Bureau News:

YOU AND THE $71,600,000,000 BUDGET

The chances are that few of us have any very clear conception of just what the President's $71,600,000,000 budget means to us in terms of the actual cash which will be extracted from our pockets through Federal taxation.

To Dr. William H. Stauffer, director of research for the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, we are indebted for some eye-opening figures on this subject.

For example it has been estimated that Virginia's share of the $71,600,000,000 budget will be $1,103,000,000. If this amount were divided equally among all Virginia citizens each would be required to pay $33.36. For a family of four the amount would be $1,329. The share for each employed person would be $861.

Actually, of course, such payments are not made in equal amounts since a large proportion of the Federal budget is collected directly from individuals and corporations. In the final analysis, however, the average individual does pay either directly or indirectly very close to his proportionate share of the tax burden. A few individuals with high incomes are very heavily taxed, of course, but the total take from these is relatively small. Beyond a certain point corporations must necessarily pass on to their customers any increase in taxes levied against them or else face bankruptcy. Thus they merely become tax collection agencies.

All of which means that in one form or another, Mr. John Q. Average will pay very close to $861 each year in Federal taxes whether he realizes it or not, that is, if we are not to continue to inflate the currency with deficit financing.

The only real way to reduce the $861 figure is to squeeze some of the fat out of the $71,600,000,000 budget.

This will not be done, however, unless taxpayers insist that all items not strictly related to national defense be reduced to a minimum if not eliminated altogether.

As we go about this job of reducing and eliminating nondefense expenditures, we should bear in mind that the task will be tough—there are always those who can and will present arguments that every public project is essential to national defense, even though the job involved might be taking the blood pressure of grasshoppers in Timbuctu.

We ourselves must insist that Congress separate the wheat from the chaff, or else be prepared to pay our proportionate share of the bloated $71,600,000,000 budget. If the job isn't done we should blame neither the President nor the Congress but ourselves.

THE PRICE OF MEAT

There's an opinion abroad (and regrettably it has been fostered by some Government agencies) that meat is high. But viewed from the standpoint of the percentage of his disposable income which the average consumer spends for meat, the argument falls completely apart. On the basis of United States Department of Agriculture figures, meat took only 5 5 percent of total disposable consumer income last year as compared with 6 6 percent in 1913.

Stating it another way, the price of meat or any other commodity will maintain about the same ratio to income year in and year out, in good times or bad, as long as the economy is free. It is only when a managed economy comes along that the balance is apt to be upset A perfect example of this situation is a floating dock on the edge of a lake, which rises and falls with the level of the water. Prices float in much the same way on purchasing power, and while they may bob up and down a little under the influence of temporary fluctuations in supply and demand, they'll neither sink to the bottom nor rise out of the water and fly as long as nature's economic laws remain in effect. If we could ever get that lesson across to our self-appointed would-be managers and caretakers in Washington, we'd all be better off, for the Nation could look forward to a truly balanced and stable economy, and not a rigidly frozen one.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—This Canadian financial capital on the shores of Lake Ontario is headquarters for one of the biggest stock frauds in the world today—perhaps the biggest.

Main target of this gigantic swindle is the United States. Toronto promoters are extracting more than $1,000,000 a week by their own estimate from gullible Americans—more than $52,000,000 a year.

In the St. Louis area alone, according to estimates by the better business bureau, the take by Toronto swindlers is more than $15,000 a month—more than $180,000 a year.

The racket here consists of promoting gigantic stock lotteries which offer Americans chances—in the form of stock at 20 to 30 cents a share—on finding gold, silver, cobalt, tantalum, uranium, and oil in the moose pastures of Canada.

Such stock is sold in St. Louis and other major American cities through millions of pieces of mail and thousands of long-distance telephone calls from coast to coast.

The United States Securities and Exchange Commission has found that all the Toronto mail-order promotions it has examined are promoted by fraud and violate United States securities laws. But they are tolerated by the standards of the Province of Ontario. This makes it impossible to stop them, although both the Canadian and United States post offices have tried.

Years of investigations by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and postal authorities show that Americans who invest in the mail-order gold mine and oil promotions are simply giving their money away.

To explore the operation of these promotions, I went to Toronto with William C. Rosenbaum, of the St. Louis Better Business Bureau.

Rosenbaum, who is head of the bureau's investors' department, is a former United States postal inspector. He was one of the post-office investigators who broke up the notorious Fort Worth oil swindles in the 1920's.

This is what we found:

1. The mail-order stock lotteries are a multi-million-dollar business. They operate on the fringe of legitimate Canadian oil and mineral development. They are powerfully entrenched in Toronto.

2. While the mail order promoters offer Americans "rich opportunities" to make money, investigation here shows that the only one who profits is the promoter. Most of the mining he does is in the sucker's wallet.

3 The promoter sells stock he takes down (buys) from the treasury of the mining or oil enterprise at 5, 10, or 15 cents a share to American suckers, at 20, 30, or 45 cents a share This permits him to keep two-thirds of the "take" for "promotional expense."

4. The one-third remitted to the treasury of the enterprise is not enough to bring the mine or well into production on the initial capitalization.

5 If the promotion turns out to be a dry hole, the promotor can quit with his 200 to 400 percent profits on stock sales This leaves the sucker who bought the stock on get-rich-quick promises holding the bag.

6. If the promoter strikes oil or finds gold, he shuffles the sucker out of the deal by recapitalizing. This reduces the value of the stock the sucker has purchased, sometimes to the vanishing point. In one instance, a series of recapitalizations in a gold mine cut shareholders from 1,000 to 15 shares of stock within a few years.

7. The leeway given promoters by securities law enforcement here has made Toronto a haven for confidence men and fugitives from United States justice.

8. One of the big promoters here is Albert Edward DePalma, a one-time St. Louis waiter and necktie salesman, who came here and got rich selling stock in gold and tantalum promotions. DePalma fled New York State 3 years ago to avoid prosecution on mail-fraud indictments in Cleveland. He is still promoting his gold and tantalum mines, and has added an oil well to the list.

9. The only place in Canada or the United States where the Toronto promoters dare not peddle stock by high pressure mail and telephone tactics is within the Province of Ontario—which licenses them. But Ontario rarely interferes with the promoters as long as they sell outside the Province.

10. The mail order promotions are tolerated here officially despite the fact that more than 700 citations have been issued by United States authorities against the promoters for selling securities in the United States against United States laws.

Sixty of them are charged by the United States Post Office with promoting by fraud or under fictitious names. Another 53 have been ordered to cease and desist stock promotions in a dozen States.

But the promotions go on. Ontario securities authorities told Rosenbaum and me they cannot enforce the securities laws of "other jurisdictions." They said also the United States fraud orders were based on "technical violations" and "prejudice."

These fraud orders—designed to prevent sucker mail from reaching the promoters from the United States—are issued by United States Post Office trial examiners in Philadelphia and Washington, on the basis of thorough investigation.

Nevertheless, the Ontario Securities Commission does not recognize them, although it makes little independent investigation of its own into the promoters' get-rich-quick claims.

For this reason, Ontario authorities do not interfere when promoters dodge the postal fraud orders by changing names, addresses, or both, two or three times a year.

Despite the vigilance, the United States Post Office cannot move fast enough to keep up with the evasive tactics of the promoters.

The result is that a good deal of sucker-response mail—some of it containing millions of dollars in payment for phony stock—gets through the postal barrier and cascades onto the promoters' desks.

Mail which is halted at the border is stamped with a fraud notice in big red letters and returned to the sender.

Promoters here complained bitterly about this to Rosenbaum and me. They said it was interfering with "Canadian enterprise." And they are backed up in their complaints by their own securities commissioners

The United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office also attempt to curb the racket by obtaining secret indictments against some promoters. The indictments are held in abeyance until the promoters cross the border into the United States.

Somehow, the promoters either learn or suspect they are under indictment. They stay out of the United States. Instead of taking their customary vacations in Florida, they are going to Europe this year.

United States authorities cannot touch swindlers in Canada because the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Canada does not cover stock fraud.

Efforts to include this as an extraditable offense have been made by Congress since 1942, but the Ottawa Parliament has consistently rejected the amendment, partly because of powerful political pressure exerted by organized promoters from here.

When the Canadian Post Office withdrew the use of the mails from 27 persons and firms on suspicion of stock fraud last spring the howl that went up in Ottawa shook the Government.

After 3 months, mailing privileges were restored—and the promoters went right on with their stock-selling schemes.

In Canada, other provinces are having the same trouble with the Ontario swindlers as the United States, but are powerless to intervene because Canada has no dominion-wide securities law.

Not only the United States Government, but the securities departments of the States have attempted to bar these promotions, without much success. In the last 2 years, such States as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska, and California have attempted to halt mail order stock sales from here by injunction or cease and desist orders.

The results have been poor. Canadians have found to their intense delight that Americans like to gamble.

"I am the first to admit," said W. M Wismer, secretary of the Broker-Dealers' Association in which most of the promoters are members, "that Americans are bigger gamblers and speculators than Canadians."

He told Rosenbaum and me that as long as Americans like to wager their money on horse races, Canada might as well take a cut. He and other members of the association admitted that the Toronto stock promotions are in competition for United States sucker money with American bookmakers and gamblers.

Of the approximately 175 promoters here, at least 115 are selling stock in the United States in violation of the United States law.

Even Canadians, like one member of the Ontario legislature, have charged that securities law enforcement here is so lax that

a bell hop one day became a broker-dealer the next. Rosenbaum and I ran into an ex-piano salesman who is regarded as one of the "hottest" stock salesmen in town.

We found, too, that this whole noisy racket causes a great deal of anguish to brokers who are members of the Toronto Stock Exchange and to legitimate securities dealers who don't peddle stock through the mails.

But they do not bring much pressure to bear to clean up Bay Street—the Wall Street of Canada—where many of the boiler-room promoters have fancy offices.

We found that Toronto is an oasis of fraud on the North American continent

For this reason, the Toronto swindlers can sit in their offices, grind out millions of pieces of misleading come-on promotion, raid the United States and other provinces for sucker money and laugh at the laws of the United States.

Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, H. R. 2983, Eighty-second Congress, as reported March 6, 1951:

QUESTION AND ANSWERS

GENERAL

1. Question. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer. This bill is designed to assure that housing and community facilities and services required to support national defense activities will be provided when and where needed. The bill is directly related to, and represents an essential part of, the defense mobilization program. It derives from the hard experience in the defense and war period of World War II that (a) in many areas, defense production cannot proceed until the additional workers required to run the production lines can be brought in from other areas, and (b) the needed additional defense workers cannot be brought into the defense area and kept there on essential defense production work unless adequate housing and community facilities and services are available for them. The failure to recognize clearly those essential facts and to make adequate provisions for meeting those needs effectively resulted in serious and crippling delays in the production of many defense items during the early part of the defense and war period of World War II.

2. Question What are community facilities and services under the bill?

Answer. Community facilities are defined in the bill as those facilities necessary for carrying on community living including primarily water works, sewers, sewage, garbage, and refuse disposal facilities, police and fire protection facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for treatment and purification of water, schools, libraries, hospitals, and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets and roads, and day-care centers.

"Community services" are services necessary for carrying on community living, including maintenance and operation of community facilities.

These are in general the facilities and services which were furnished under the Lanham Act during World War II as "defense public works."

3. Question Why are additional housing and community facilities and services needed for national defense?

Answer. The bill contemplates the use of existing facilities, wherever possible, to meet defense needs. However, it is clear that the needs of the defense production program cannot be met solely by converting and reactivating existing plants. There must be recourse to new plant construction and expansion. This is made necessary because our total capacity for the production of certain basic materials falls short of our defense needs, because it is not physically possible to produce certain new types of military equipment and weapons in existing plants, and because no existing plant capacity is adequate to meet such needs as those of the Atomic Energy Commission which must provide new installations in relatively isolated areas. The construction and operation of new plants, as well as the expansion of old plants, normally requires workers to be brought into the area. In order to attract workers to such areas and to avoid labor turnover, it is essential to provide housing for them and their families and to provide the community facilities and services necessary for community living. Of course, utilities and other community facilities are also necessary for the operation of the plant itself.

Because of the continuing housing shortage resulting from general increases in population and other factors, in almost no area will there be sufficient housing to accommodate a sudden influx of defense workers. Similarly, there is generally a shortage of utilities and other facilities necessary to serve even the existing housing and other local needs

4. Question. What are the major provisions of this bill?

Answer. The bill provides for:

(a) liberalized FHA mortgage insurance to stimulate private production of housing required for in-migrant defense workers;

(b) authority for the Federal Government to provide housing directly in those cases where private enterprise cannot meet defense-caused housing needs;

(c) authority for the Federal Government to assist localities in providing community facilities and services required in connection with defense activities, and, in cases where a local community can not supply essential facilities even with such assistance, to directly provide such facilities and services;

(d) authority for the Federal Government to acquire land at certain isolated defense installations, to prepare general plans for the development of the land for needed housing and community facilities, to provide site improvements, and to dispose of the land to private purchasers for the development in accordance with such plans, and to local agencies for public use;

(e) authority for the Federal Government to make loans to maintain the existing productive capacity of the prefabricated housing industry needed for defense; and

(f) certain amendments to existing legislation to gear it to defense needs.

5. Question. Why is this additional legislative authority necessary?

Answer. The legislative authority contained in this bill is necessary for the following reasons:

(a) Existing aids to private enterprise for the production of housing in defense areas are not sufficiently liberal to stimulate private enterprise to furnish the maximum amount of housing needed because of the impact of defense activities, and such aids are not designed to best meet the needs of in-migrant defense workers;

(b) There is no existing authority for the Federal Government to provide defense housing in cases where such housing cannot be provided by private enterprise;

(c) There is no existing legislation adequate for assisting local communities in the provision of, or for providing, community facilities and services required because of the impact of defense activities;

(d) There is no existing authority for the Federal Government to purchase land at isolated defense installations for the purpose of disposing of it to private owners for development of housing and commercial facilities in accordance with general plans for the area and to local agencies for public use; and

(e) Existing loan authorizations are insufficient for the purpose of loans to maintain the industrial capacity of prefabricated housing manufacturers in this defense period.

6 Question. Why can't community facilities and services needed in connection with defense be furnished by the localities without Federal assistance?

Answer. In many cases, especially in relatively isolated areas, it would be legally impossible, because of constitutional and statutory debt limitations, for local governments to bear the entire burden of furnishing community facilities and services required by the sudden impact of defense activities in the area. Even if legally possible, it would impose an unfair share of the expense of our mobilization program on a disproportionate number of municipalities and people. The ability of municipalities to furnish additional community facilities and services is especially limited at the present time because of recent heavy increases in municipal expenditures for such facilities and services. The unprecedented increase in urban population and the unprecedented housing boom since the war have placed a corresponding burden on all community facilities and services. To this has been added the backlog of public construction postponed during World War II because of the shortage of materials. The concentration of this construction within the postwar period, as against existing statutory and constitutional debt limitations, has greatly reduced the borrowing authority of many cities. Even existing needs for facilities and services are being met with difficulty.

7. Question Wouldn't the relaxation of credit controls be sufficient to stimulate the provision of defense housing by private industry?

Answer. Even with the relaxation of credit controls, the existing conventional financing of housing and the existing programs of Federal mortgage insurance would not be liberal enough to stimulate private industry to supply the needs for housing in defense areas. Residential mortgage insurance aids are not geared to defense-area needs and risks. The requirement of economic soundness in the regular mortgage-insurance program cannot be met in many instances in defense areas with respect to location and long-term marketability. Also the existing law is inadequate to assure that the housing will best meet defense needs. The mortgage-insurance program for this housing must be carried out in accordance with programing operations coordinated with the mobilization program as provided in the bill. Unlike existing authority, the provisions of the bill would permit one- and two-family structures, for example, to be programed for rent and required to be held for rental. This is essential to providing the type of house needed by inmigrant defense workers and their families.

Existing legislation is also inadequate because it makes no provision for the construction of temporary housing in areas where the need is clearly temporary.

Existing legislation is entirely inadequate for the provision of any housing which private enterprise cannot be encouraged to provide even with liberal mortgage-insurance

assistance. In some areas it will be quite clear that the need will continue only during a short period. It may be necessary to bring workers into other areas on such a large scale and within such a limited time that operative builders, although otherwise able to build, cannot do so within the time required. In such cases it is essential to the mobilization program that the Federal Government provide the housing as authorized in the bill.

8. Question. Why haven't credit controls already been relaxed in areas of defense-housing shortage?

Answer. Credit controls are now in process of being relaxed in such areas. Credit controls have already been relaxed on a selective and controlled basis at the Atomic Energy Commission installations in the Savannah River area and at Paducah, Ky. Similar action will be taken shortly in connection with other defense installations. The extent of the need for housing at most defense installations and the extent of the need for relaxation of credit restrictions is only now becoming sufficient for proper identification and measurement. It is important to avoid indiscriminate and unplanned relaxation of credit controls, as such relaxation must be accomplished in a manner which will best meet the needs of essential in-migrant defense workers.

9. Question. Why can't defense housing needs be met through FHA-insured military (Wherry Act) housing?

Answer. FHA mortgage insurance under the so-called Wherry Act is limited to housing for military and civilian personnel at permanent military installations. It could not be used for housing to serve personnel at temporary military installations or personnel of defense plants or other nonmilitary defense installations.

10. Question. Why is federally owned housing built during World War II inadequate to meet new defense needs?

Answer. Most of this housing is already occupied by veterans, military personnel, and defense workers, and vacancies occurring in defense areas are already being used for defense workers. Monthly turn-over is less than 3 percent and, accordingly, few units can, as a practical matter, be made available for defense workers. Also, the location of this existing housing is based on World War II defense requirements which will obviously differ from the pattern of new defense needs.

11. Question. Does the bill contemplate the establishment of new agencies for its administration?

Answer. No. Existing agencies would be utilized for the program contemplated by the bill.

12. Question. How would defense housing areas be determined and housing programed for those areas?

Answer. Based on defense program information as to production plans, manpower requirements, and available accommodations, the President would decide whether a shortage of housing exists or impends in the area which impedes or threatens to impede defense activities. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would determine, on the basis of surveys, the number of units to be eligible for the special mortgage insurance authorized under this bill, as well as the types of housing needed, the rent levels to be served, etc. Any federally provided housing would be limited, after consultation with housing industry representatives, to that which could not be built by private enterprise.

13. Question. Would the bill grant any power to the Government not previously granted?

Answer. No; except for the authority in title III to purchase and sell land in isolated areas for the development of needed housing and commercial facilities by private enterprise. The private housing aids are similar to, though less broad and liberal than, the title VI mortgage insurance program of World War II. The authority in title II with respect to the provision of housing and aids for, and the provision of, community facilities and services, where necessary for defense purposes, are similar to those contained in the Lanham Act of World War II.

14. Question. Is this bill socialistic?

Answer. No. The fundamental principle of the bill is that necessary defense housing and community facilities shall be provided by private enterprise and local communities to the fullest extent possible, and the Government is permitted to provide them only as a last resort. The bill undertakes, in fact, to help private enterprise and local governments to do more of the job than they could otherwise do in order to hold Government action or operations to a minimum. Any federally owned housing under the bill would have to be disposed of to private owners, with preference to occupants and veterans, as soon as feasible consistent with defense requirements.

15. Question Who supported this bill?

Answer. In addition to various Federal agencies, including the Director of Office of Defense Mobilization (Hon Charles E Wilson), the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission, those presenting testimony or submitting statements in support of the bill were: Hon. PAUL BROWN, Hon. CLINTON D MCKINNON, Hon JOHN A. BLATNIK, Hon. JOHN J. RILEY, Hon. LEROY JOHNSON, Hon HUGH MITCHELL, Members of Congress; Mortgage Bankers Association of America; National Savings & Loan League; American Municipal Association; City Manager, Norfolk, Va; Mayor of Wilmington, N C.; Mayor of Gary, Ind; American Federation of Labor; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Americans for Democratic Action; National Association of Housing Officials, National Housing Conference; National Conference of Catholic Charities; American Association of Social Workers; American Institute of Architects, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

16 Question Who opposed this bill?

Answer. Three organizations presented testimony or submitted statements contending that—

1. The Congress should postpone action on the bill until specific and immediate needs have been demonstrated.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America: The bill "should be laid aside until a definite need for it develops. * * * legislation could be passed quickly should a clear need for it become apparent."

National Retail Lumber Dealers Association: "Authorization of such a program before any specific need has been demonstrated would be unsound. * * * No supplemental legislation for private defense housing and community facilities is necessary at this time."

2. Defense housing and community facility needs can be met by existing legislation, or with a few simple amendments to existing law.

National Association of Real Estate Boards: "The National Association of Real Estate Boards is not here in opposition to purposes for which the bill is intended. We will prove that this legislation is not needed because most of its provisions are already incorporated in existing law."

TITLE I. MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR DEFENSE HOUSING

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title?

Answer. It is the purpose of the title to encourage private enterprise to furnish as much of the needed defense housing as possible. It stresses assistance to rental housing, since that is the type most needed by workers coming into defense areas.

2 Question. What does this title provide?

Answer. It adds a new title IX to the National Housing Act to make special FHA mortgage insurance aids available to private industry for the production of housing needed in defense areas. The special insurance aids would be available only in areas or localities in which the President finds that a shortage of housing exists or impends which impedes or threatens to impede national defense activities. One- or two-family homes, as well as multifamily rental housing would be eligible for the special FHA mortgage insurance aids and the housing would be required to be made available for persons engaged in defense activities.

3. Question. How would this help to supply defense housing needs?

Answer The new defense-housing insurance program would be more liberal than the existing permanent peacetime aids supplied through the FHA. Under the proposed new program, mortgages may be insured if the property is an acceptable risk in view of the needs of national defense. This would permit the FHA to underwrite projects in defense areas which might not meet the criteria of economic soundness, especially as to location and long-range continued marketability, which are required by FHA under its regular programs. This departure will permit FHA mortgage insurance on housing where there may be some question as to whether the housing will be marketable when the emergency or defense need is terminated In addition, the FHA would be authorized to insure mortgage loans on more liberal terms. It would permit mortgage loans having a higher ratio of loan to value and longer maturities, thereby permitting lower down payments and lower monthly financing charges

4. Question What means are provided to assure that the housing will be used to best meet defense needs?

Answer. The mortgage insurance provided by the new title would be available only for property located in areas where the President has found that a shortage of housing impedes or threatens to impede national defense activities. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, with the approval of the President, would program the number of houses in such localities which could be financed with the aid of these special insurance provisions The FHA would have power to require properties covered by mortgages insured under the new title to be held for rental to defense workers or military personnel.

5 Question. Is mortgage insurance under this title consistent with anti-inflationary restrictions already imposed on housing?

Answer. Yes. The purpose of housing-credit controls is to curb inflation and conserve materials for national defense purposes The use of material for housing provided under this bill would, of course, be used for national defense purposes. The credit controls are designed to reduce the volume of housing construction from the 1,400,000 homes started in 1950 to about 800,000 to 850,000 for 1951. Out of this total of 800,000 to 850,000 housing units to be started in 1951 there will come whatever housing is required to be channeled specifically for military personnel and defense workers. This bill assists the provision of defense housing on a controlled and selective basis, but does not provide for an increase in the total volume of housing.

6 Question. What kind of housing would be built under this title?

Answer. Two general types: one- and two-family units, and multifamily rental housing. The one- and two-family housing would be designed and constructed for ultimate sale but would be required to be held

for rent for persons engaged in defense activities for such periods of time as may be necessary.

7. Question. What rental ranges can be expected under this title?

Answer. Except in high-cost areas, it is estimated that maximum rents for one- and two-family houses will range from $75 to $93 a month, for two-, three-, and four-bedroom houses, and from $77 to $89 in the case of multiunit housing. Rents could be lower where construction costs permit.

8. Question Why does this title stress rental housing?

Answer. Because it is felt that persons coming into communities to work in defense plants initially desire to rent rather than purchase a home, since they are uncertain as to how long they may remain in the locality.

9. Question. What will happen to the housing assisted under this title after defense needs are over?

Answer. Requirements that one- and two-family houses must be held for rental to defense workers will be relaxed as defense needs lessen and the housing will be rented or sold in the regular market. The multiunit housing will continue as privately owned and operated rental housing

10. Question Are there cost or mortgage limits on housing under this title? Is any provision made for high-cost areas?

Answer. The mortgage limit on one- and two-family units is $8,100 (but not more than 90 percent of appraised value) for a single-family resident and $15,000 for a two-family residence, except that in a high-cost area the $8,100 may be increased to $9,000 and the $15,000 may be raised to $16,000. In addition, the mortgage limit may be increased by the FHA by $900 for a third bedroom and another $900 for a fourth bedroom In the case of multiunit residences, the maximum mortgage amount is $8,100 per family unit, or $7,200 if the unit contains less than four bedrooms.

11 Question Would the proposed new title IX have the same inflationary effect that was attributed to the old title VI during and after World War II?

Answer While the proposed new title IX (which would be added to the National Housing Act by title I of this act) uses the same general approach as the old title VI, it is deliberately designed to avoid the inflationary tendency of title VI. Under the latter, mortgages were based on "necessary current cost," so that they automatically increased when costs rose, thus tending to contribute to rising costs The proposed title IX, on the other hand, would base mortgages on appraised value (FHA, however, could insure mortgages under title IX if they represent "acceptable risk," even though they do not meet certain normal economic soundness criteria, such as those of location and continued marketability) By using value instead of necessary current cost for computing mortgages, title IX insured loans would tend to curb cost rises rather than support them.

12 Question. How much will this title cost the Government?

Answer FHA experience thus far would indicate that this program should cost the Government nothing. The costs of the FHA credit-insurance programs are defrayed out of premiums and fees collected from the lending institutions. Income from premiums, fees, and other sources has been sufficient to defray administrative expenses, pay losses, and establish reserves in the insurance funds.

TITLE II. PROVISION OF DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title?

Answer. It is the purpose of this title to provide for carrying out the objectives of the bill in areas where private industry cannot furnish the housing needed for defense activities, or local communities would not, without the assistance of the bill, furnish necessary community facilities and services. The title would authorize the President to provide housing and to give assistance for the provision of, or provide, community facilities and services in areas where lack of such housing, facilities, or services would impede the defense effort and they would not otherwise be provided when and where needed.

2 Question. How much money is provided for this title?

Answer No money is appropriated by the bill and the bill does not authorize appropriation of any specific sum. The funds to be provided will be determined through the regular congressional appropriation process after consideration of evidence of need The President's budget asks for $125,000,000 for this title for fiscal 1952.

3. Question How would the housing provided under this title be financed and built?

Answer The housing would be directly financed by the Federal Government from appropriated funds. It would be built by private firms under contract with the Federal Government.

4. Question. What kinds of housing would be provided?

Answer. To the greatest extent practicable, the housing is required to be one- to four-family structures of permanent construction suitable for sale as individual structures. Multifamily residences would be provided where required by local conditions In localities where the need for housing appears to be of temporary duration, the housing provided would be temporary, with first consideration being given to mobile or portable housing or housing otherwise constructed so that it could be moved from one area to another for reuse according to need.

5 Question What rents would be charged? Would the Government subsidize rents for workers?

Answer. The bill requires that the rents charged be fair rents based on value as determined by the President. These rents would not be subsidized

6 Question Who could live in federally provided defense housing?

Answer. The housing would be occupied, while the need continues, by military personnel or civilian workers required to be brought into the area for carrying out defense activities The President would be empowered to prescribe the class or classes of eligible persons and the preferences and priorities in the rental of this housing. When it is determined that any federally provided housing is no longer needed for housing defense workers, preference in occupancy pending disposition would be given to veterans, and among veterans to disabled veterans and dependent parents and unremarried widows of deceased veterans whose death was service-connected. Occupancy could also be permitted by persons displaced from their homes by Government acquisition of land for defense industries or installations

7 Question. Why not use existing federally owned World War II housing, instead of building new Federal housing?

Answer. The majority of the dwellings provided in the World War II housing program has been disposed of, and of the remaining inventory (about 118,000 permanent and 178,000 temporary units) nearly all are occupied and could not be made available for purposes of the present emergency except as vacancies occur, without displacing the present tenants, most of whom are veterans, many of them engaged, or soon to be engaged, in defense activities. Moreover, in many cases, due to technological and other changes in materials and equipment needed for defense and the consequent shift of defense plants, World War II housing may not be located in areas where housing is required to meet present needs. Despite these draw-backs, however, war housing in the present inventory will be used to the greatest practicable extent in meeting needs as they arise in the defense program. Vacancies will be used for defense workers. The new housing authorized by this bill would be that required in any locality over and above that which could be supplied out of existing federally controlled housing. No new housing would be provided where World War II housing could meet the need.

8. Question. What would become of this housing after the defense need is over?

Answer. Provision is made in the bill to assure ultimate disposition of permanent housing for private use It is required that all permanent housing be sold as expeditiously as possible and in the public interest, considering the purposes for which it was provided. For all structures suitable for separate sale, preference in sale would be given to occupants and veterans. Pending disposition of housing no longer needed for defense workers, veterans are to be given first preference in rental, thus increasing the chance of ultimate sale to veterans under the preference accorded occupants. Permanent projects consisting of structures not suitable for separate sale would be sold as entities, with first preference to groups of veterans organized on a mutual ownership or cooperative basis. Terms of sale would be full payment to the Government within 25 years, with interest of not less than 4 percent on unpaid balances. These are the same general provisions that Congress last year adopted for disposition of federally owned permanent World War II housing.

Due to present uncertainties, the method and final date of disposition of any temporary housing provided under this title would be left for later determination by Congress. Assurance is given, however, that temporary housing would be disposed of as soon as possible when no longer needed for defense purposes, and would not be allowed to continue in use for housing purposes.

9. Question. What would this housing cost?

Answer. The average cost of two- three- and four-bedroom family dwelling units in any project provided by the Federal Government would be limited to $9,000, $10,000, and $11,000 respectively. These limits would apply to over-all costs, including land and site improvements. In the Territories and possessions of the United States, these cost limits may be increased by the President by up to 50 percent. These limits correspond to the values of housing on which maximum mortgage amounts are based under the proposed aids to private builders in title I for single-family houses, except that no increase for high-cost areas is permitted for Government construction. Mortgage limits for private construction could be increased by $900 in high-cost areas.

10. Question. What assistance would the Federal Government give for community facilities?

Answer. The Federal Government may give assistance for the provision of, or itself provide, community facilities and services only when necessary to meet newly arisen needs directly attributable to defense activities. Such Federal action would be authorized only when additional facilities or services are necessitated by the fact that military personnel or civilian workers required for carrying out national defense activities must be brought into the locality from other areas or other additions to the local labor force are needed for such purposes, or where water, or sewerage extensions or similar facilities must be provided for a defense plant or installation. When these conditions are met, the Federal Government would be authorized to make grants

or loans to public and nonprofit agencies for the provision, operation, and maintenance of the needed facilities and services. Such grants could not be in amounts exceeding that portion of the total cost of the facilities or services, or their operation, estimated to be the result of the impact of the defense activity, less amounts estimated to be recoverable from revenue or other sources by the local agency. The Federal Government itself would provide or operate community facilities and services only where no appropriate State, city, or other local agency having responsibility for such facilities in the area is available, able, and willing, with such assistance as the Government is authorized to give under this bill, to provide or operate the needed facilities and services.

11. Question. Would Federal assistance be available for community facilities in all localities?

Answer. No. Such assistance could be given only upon a finding by the President that community facilities or services are needed in the particular area or locality to support defense activities, and then only when Federal assistance is necessary to meet newly arising community needs which are directly attributable to defense activities and would not otherwise be met.

12. Question How would aid for schools under this title be related to existing school-aid legislation?

Answer. Assistance for educational facilities and services would be supplementary to, and would conform closely to the principles and procedures established by, the school-aid acts, Public Laws 815 and 874 of the last Congress. Aid under this bill would be given only to the extent that the present aids are inadequate. The existing aids were, of course, not designed to meet the problems of new defense areas.

It may be noted that these provisions of the bill were prepared and recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor on the basis of its extensive studies both prior and subsequent to its reports on the school-aid acts.

13. Question. Why shouldn't local communities provide all community facilities with their own funds?

Answer. Cities are generally unable financially to assume unanticipated large new burdens requiring capital expansion and increased service budgets. This is particularly true now when, as a result of postwar expansion and the housing boom, as well as the backlog of construction of public works postponed during World War II, most communities have already greatly expanded their facilities and services and many have reached their statutory debt limits. Even if legally and practically possible, however, it would be obviously unfair to make certain communities bear the full cost of facilities made necessary by the common effort for the defense of the Nation as a whole.

14. Question. Would the Federal Government operate schools, hospitals, and other facilities?

Answer. Only in cases where the local communities are unwilling or unable to undertake such responsibilities, even with Government aid under the bill, would the Federal Government either provide such facilities directly or operate them with its own personnel. The bill seeks to make direct Federal provision and operation of such facilities unnecessary by providing assistance to local agencies to permit them to assume these responsibilities. Even in those cases where the Federal Government was forced to provide or operate them directly, the bill would require their transfer to the local agencies just as soon as possible. In no event could the Government exercise any control or supervision over curriculum, personnel, or program of instruction in any school.

15. Question. Would housing and community facilities provided under this title conform to State and local laws?

Answer. The bill would require that housing and community facilities constructed by the United States conform to requirements of State and local health and sanitation laws. To the maximum extent practicable, considering limitations on materials and requirements of defense, except for temporary construction, housing and community facilities would be required to conform to requirements of State and local building codes.

16. Question. Won't communities and States suffer from removal of housing sites from tax rolls?

Answer. No. The bill provides for annual payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments approximating full taxes and assessments on residential real property held under this title, less approximate amounts for Federal expenditures for items usually furnished by the taxing authority.

17. Question What disposition would be made of federally built community facilities?

Answer The bill requires that any such community facilities be disposed of to the appropriate State or local agencies not later than a date and subject to terms and conditions which Congress will determine. With a few exceptions it would require the outright donation of educational facilities to such agencies within 18 months of completion.

18. Question. Who would administer this title?

Answer The President could delegate responsibilities under this title and title III to such Federal agency or agencies as he deemed appropriate to best assure the most efficient use of existing Federal agencies and the most expeditious handling of such responsibilities in the interests of national defense

19. Question Who would construct community facilities under this title?

Answer. Community facilities would usually be constructed in the normal manner by the local communities or their contractors Where the Federal Government itself provided such facilities they would be constructed by private construction firms who would contract with the Federal Government for the work.

TITLE III. PROVISION OF SITES FOR NECESSARY DEVELOPMENT IN CONNECTION WITH ISOLATED DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title and why is it needed?

Answer. Title III is designed to meet special problems involved in providing suitable land for necessary housing, commercial services, and community facilities serving large defense installations, such as Atomic Energy installations, in isolated or relatively isolated areas. This title provides for Government acquisition, planning, site improvement, and disposal of land in such areas. It is intended to facilitate the establishment of new communities, or, if necessary, the rapid expansion of existing communities, when large defense installations are located in areas in which communities of adequate size do not exist.

The authority provided in this title is needed to assure that as much as possible of the housing and commercial buildings required for such defense installations shall be provided by private enterprise through private financing and ownership, thereby avoiding the development of Government towns. It is also needed to help avoid land speculation and to assure the development of communities in the most economical and efficient manner so that defense needs will be adequately served. Thus in isolated defense areas, it would be possible to avoid the burden of increased residential and commercial rents caused by land speculation. Such authority could only be used in connection with a defense installation in an isolated area (1) if housing or community facilities for the installation would not otherwise be provided when and where required, or (2) if there would otherwise be speculation or uneconomic use of land resources which would impair the efficiency of defense activities at such a defense installation.

2. Question. Would the Government buy large tracts of land for continued public ownership?

Answer No. The primary purpose of title III is to encourage and assist private ownership rather than public ownership or the construction of Government towns. It is the intent of the bill that the land acquired by the Government under it shall be disposed of as quickly as practicable to private enterprise for the development of the community and to local agencies for public use Without the provisions of title III, land speculation at isolated defense installations cannot be avoided. Excessive land costs, due to speculation, inevitably increase the cost of public facilities and could very well make it impossible for private enterprise to provide adequate housing for defense workers receiving moderate wages.

Appropriations authorized for the purposes of the title are limited to a $10,000,000 revolving fund. This would limit the amount of land held at any one time under this title Any increase in authorization would be reviewed by the Congress on the basis of the evidence of need presented at the time.

3 Question. Could the Federal Government construct housing or other buildings under this title?

Answer No buildings could be constructed by the Federal Government under the authority of title III. However, necessary housing and community facilities and services could be provided under other provisions of the bill where they cannot otherwise be provided when and where needed to serve the defense installations. Any defense installation constructed on the land would be constructed under other congressional authority.

4. Question Could the purposes of this title be carried out under the Atomic Energy Act?

Answer. No. The Atomic Energy Act confers no authority to acquire land and dispose of it to private developers for housing or commercial purposes, or to public agencies for public use as is provided in title III of the bill. While the Atomic Energy Commission has authority under its act to acquire land for housing, it can do so only if the Commission is building and financing the housing This results in Government-owned towns. Neither can the purpose of title III be accomplished by any other existing legislation Through the provisions of title III, it will be possible to avoid the necessity for the construction of Government-owned towns and at the same time to secure the provision of the types of housing, community facilities, and commercial enterprises which will best serve the needs of the defense installation. This title will also facilitate the assumption by the residents of the responsibilities of local government under State laws, a matter which has proved to be extremely difficult in the case of the Government-owned towns which the Atomic Energy Commission has constructed in the past This title will afford relief to the Atomic Energy Commission which has expressed its view that it should not be diverted from its major purposes to cope with housing and land planning problems.

5 Question Wouldn't Federal acquisition of land under this title deprive local and State jurisdictions of essential tax revenues?

Answer. No. The bill would make special provision to compensate State and local governments for loss of tax revenues occasioned by the acquisition of land for the defense installation or the acquisition of land under

the provisions of title III. This title would require payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments approximating, but not exceeding, the taxes and special assessments which would be paid to the taxing authorities upon the property acquired and held under the title if they were not exempt from taxation and special assessments, less (1) credit for Federal expenditures for community facilities, and (2) other Federal payments in lieu of taxes or special assessments on the property. In addition, under certain conditions similar payments in lieu of taxes would be paid on the defense installation itself. With respect to the defense installation itself, however (as distinguished from its site), tax payments would be approximately 10 percent of the amount of taxes which would be levied with respect to it if it were subject to taxation This limitation is included because of the unusually high ratio of the cost of improvements on some defense installations to the cost of services rendered to them by the communities.

Payments under this title for defense installations themselves would not be made where construction of such installations was commenced before June 27, 1950, unless the President found that such payments were necessary to permit local ownership and operation of public facilities and services required in connection with the housing and community facilities serving the installation.

6. Question. How much would this title cost?

Answer. Since the $10,000,000 authorized as a revolving fund for acquisition and site improvement of land is expected to be recovered through its disposition, the only net cost anticipated under this title will be the payments in lieu of taxes and assessments, for which separate appropriations are authorized.

TITLE IV. PREFABRICATED HOUSING

1. Question. What does this title provide?

Answer. It would authorize the HHFA to make $15,000,000 in loans outstanding at any one time to aid the production of prefabricated houses or housing components of producers who have a demonstrated capacity to produce and market their products. These loans would be made in order to enable such producers to maintain their housing production capacity for defense purposes No loan could be made under this authority unless suitable private financing is unavailable. The program is designed to assure that the existing prefabricated housing industry, which has an estimated capacity of about 100,000 homes annually, will have a necessary source of adequate working capital to maintain its operations so that it can serve defense and emergency needs, instead of being compelled to convert to some other kind of production through lack of suitable credit under defense conditions. Loans could be made for distribution and erection of prefabricated houses, as well as for their production

2. Question. How does the new loan program under this title differ from the previous prefabricated housing loan programs?

Answer. (a) The funds are specifically directed toward maintaining prefabricated production to serve defense needs

(b) Unlike earlier programs which had as one of their main purposes the encouragement of new enterprises, this program is limited to the maintenance of present production capacity. Therefore, the financing would aid only housing of prefabricated producers who have demonstrated their capacity to produce and market their houses. It would not be available for new enterprises, nor for the Lustron Corporation if reorganized.

(c) The program makes additional funds available to aid in both production and distribution of prefabricated housing, since previously authorized funds are nearly all committed.

(d) The program includes producers of mobile or portable housing to serve temporary defense housing needs as provided under title II of this bill.

TITLE V. AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAWS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Question. What provisions a e made to adjust existing housing laws to help meet defense needs?

Answer. The final or "miscellaneous" title of the bill would amend a number of such laws for this purpose:

(a) The authority for the special FHA military housing mortgage insurance provided under title VIII of the National Housing Act for rental housing for personnel of permanent military installations would be extended for 2 years beyond the present expiration date of July 1, 1951. In addition, this title would be extended to permit insurance of mortgages on housing constructed for personnel at permanent Atomic Energy Commission installations

(b) Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, now permits Federally assisted low-rent housing projects and related powers to sons engaged in national defense activities. This law would be amended to permit payments in lieu of taxes somewhat higher than are presently authorized and to make it clear that rentals and eligibility for admission and for continued occupancy may be based on defense use rather than low-rent hou ing use.

(c) Because of the critical international situation and the consequent suspension of disposition of Federally owned war and veterans' housing built during and immediately after World War II, the President would be authorized to extend disposition deadline dates prescribed in the Housing Act of 1950 for this housing.

(d) A new provision would be added to the Lanham Act to permit income limitations to be placed on occupancy of existing federally owned housing constructed during the last war so that this housing may better serve the needs of present defense workers

(e) An amendment to the National Housing Act would permit the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure mortgages upon homes purchased by persons called into the active military service notwithstanding the requirements of the act that the mortgagor (under certain FHA programs) must occupy the property.

(f) Certain changes would be made in the yield insurance program (title VII of the National Housing Act) to encourage the use of this title for the development of more moderate rental housing for defense workers. (The yield insurance program is designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing with rentals within the capacity of families of moderate income. No mortgage financing is involved. The FHA is authorized to insure a minimum annual amortization of 2 percent of total investment and an annual rate of return of not more than 2¾ percent on outstanding investment.)

2. Question. What special provision is made for veterans who are defense workers?

Answer. The bill would provide that veterans who are defense workers in areas of housing shortage as determined by the President could use their veterans' home loan benefits under the GI bill of rights without restriction of any sort if the cost of the home involved did not exceed $9,000, $10,000 and $11,000 for two-bedroom, three-bedroom and four-bedroom family units, respectively.

3. Question. The bill sometimes has been called a $3,000,000,000 measure. What are the financial authorizations in the bill?

Answer. The $3,000,000,000 referred to is the authorization to FHA to insure up to $3,000,000,000 of additional home mortgage loans under the FHA mortgage insurance provisions. This authorization could only be used as released by the President. It would be used for the existing FHA insurance programs as well as the new special defense housing program and the military housing insurance program. This does not represent expenditures to be made by the Federal Government. It would be insurance only. Past experience over a period of 17 years has been that mortgage insurance premiums and fees more than cover both administrative expenses and losses incurred.

In addition to the increase of mortgage insurance authorizations, the bill would authorize (a) appropriations for the purposes of title II—the provision of housing by the Federal Government and aid to localities for, and the provision of, community facilities and services, (b) the appropriation of $10,000,000 to a revolving fund to be used for the purposes of site acquisition in isolated localities under title III; and (c) borrowing by the Housing Administrator from the Treasury of $15,000,000 for the purposes of prefabricated housing loans under title IV.

Any appropriations for title II would, of course, have to be justified before appropriations committees before being made available for the purposes of that title. No amount for such appropriations can be stipulated in this bill because the extent of the over-all needs cannot presently be estimated with any accuracy. (See question II 2, p. 14)

4 Question What provision is made for families forced to move from sites of new defense installations?

Answer. The bill provides that the President may, where he determines that persons have been displaced from their homes as a result of acquisition of sites for defense installations or industries, authorize such persons to occupy or purchase housing assisted under the provisions of this bill or for which credit restrictions have been relaxed.

5 Question Would there be any time limitation on the exercise of powers to be granted under this bill?

Answer Yes. Powers to insure mortgages under title I, agreements to extend assistance for community facilities or services under title II, and commencement of construction of housing or community facilities under title II, acquisition of land under title III, and loans under title IV could not be made after June 30, 1953.

Toronto Stock Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which is one of a series published in the St. Louis Star-Times:

TORONTO, ONTARIO.—It's possible to get rich in the mine and oil promotions here.

But not for the sucker in the United States.

The stock the American buys makes only one man rich—the Toronto promoter.

Up and down Toronto's Bay Street, you hear stories of mining ventures like Quemont and Noranda which struck gold and made their stockholders lots of money.

You hear how Imperial Oil drilled 110 holes before Leduc No 1 gushed in and became the starter for the Alberta oil boom.

But I didn't find that any one of these bonanza ventures were promoted by mail

order and telephone solicitation. Neither did William C. Rosenbaum, of the St. Louis Better Business Bureau, who surveyed the Toronto promotions with me.

In our canvass of the Toronto stock lotteries, Rosenbaum and I found no record that any of the mail-order mine enterprises promoted illegally in the United States from here paid anyone a dime—except the promoter.

It isn't hard to see why only the promoter makes money on these deals.

The cost of promotion is so high that it makes the prospect of bringing a moose-pasture mine into production a mathematical miracle.

In Missouri, for example, the cost of promoting a speculative stock venture is restricted to 20 percent of funds from sales.

This means that 80 percent goes into the company treasury to develop the property

In Ontario, however, promotion costs are 66⅔ percent of funds derived from stock sales Two-thirds of the take goes into the promoter's pocket. Only one-third goes into the company treasury.

The ratio is official. It is fixed by the Broker-Dealers' Association of Ontario and approved by the Ontario Securities Commission.

Rosenbaum and I were told promotion costs are high because of long-distance selling. Also, we were told, adverse publicity and efforts of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the United States Post Office to protect Americans from fraud have forced promoters to spend more money for gaudy literature, publicity, and telephone calls.

American buyer resistance to Toronto stocks, officials told us, is increasing

While it is theoretically possible to bring a mine into production on a two-thirds stock mark-up, we found it is not done on the initial capitalization.

This is one reason the sucker can't win.

Mining and oil venture companies are capitalized at about 3,000,000 shares of stock, at $1 per value. Under securities regulations, the broker-dealer who wants to sell the stock commits himself to marketing a sizable block—about 500,000 shares

In return for taking this risk, he is given options on other shares at ascending prices.

The broker-dealer buys the first 500,000 shares at 10 cents a share from the company treasury It costs him $50,000.

He sells it to the suckers for 30 cents a share, grossing $150,000.

This leaves him a $100,000 selling profit, from which he deducts promotion expenses, such as mailings, long-distance telephone calls, and salesmen's commissions.

Even with a lavish promotional campaign, his net is likely to run about $50,000.

The next batch of stock costs him 15 cents a share from the mine treasury. He puts it on the market at 45 cents a share

At this point, one of the most misleading phases of the whole racket comes into play.

The promoter advises the suckers that "Consolidated Connivance Gold Mines, Ltd.," is going up in price. Instead of 30 cents, it will be offered at 45 cents a share.

"Holding back some of the 30-cent shares for our earlier customers," the promoter wires the sucker "But you must act before midnight tomorrow night"

St. Louisans who were high-pressured from Toronto said they believed the stock had actually risen on the market 15 cents a share.

That's the way it sounds.

They didn't know the promoter is simply closing out his 10-cent shares and getting ready to move his 15-cent optioned shares into selling position.

The victim doesn't know that the wholesale price of the shares is fixed by the Ontario Securities Commission and the retail markup is fixed by the Broker-Dealers' Association.

He doesn't know there isn't any market for his stock. And the broker-dealers of Toronto make a special point of not telling him

The deadline of midnight tomorrow night is pure fiction. It is intended to create a feeling of urgency in the mind of the sucker. It often works.

This technique of selling the sucker a second time is called reloading in the racket here. Sometimes it gets so bad the Ontario Securities Commission has to crack down

For instance, when the Commission canceled the registration of Junior Golds Securities, Ltd., on February 3, 1950, it charged that Sidney C. Davidge, president of the firm, and A. C. Gardiner, a salesman, had reloaded a victim in New York State who was mentally incompetent

Commission records show the victim started out by purchasing 25 shares of Yukeno Lead & Silver Mines, Ltd, in the spring of 1949

Then the victim had a dream that gold would be found in the diggings, although the mine Junior Golds was promoting was a lead mine. Anyway, he sent Davidge and Gardiner a map he drew from his vision showing where the gold was

The promoters kept feeding him more stock. Within a few months the victim had purchased 4,500 shares for $1,250, his life savings

Davidge told the Commission when this case was heard that he thought the New York sucker was just kidding him about the vision and the map.

"This," observed the Commission, "was an unfortunate example of overreaching"

If the promoter finds that the gold mine or oil well can become commercially profitable, the sucker is speedily shuffled out by a series of recapitalizations.

Since the initial capitalization is not sufficient to bring the mine into production, the promoter reorganizes the company and issues more stock.

Since each share of stock is essentially a chance against potential riches, the more new stock the promoter issues the less the original shareholders get. Recapitalization can continue until the potential value of the original shares approaches zero.

Take the experience of the Casey Summit Mine, in the Kenora mining district of northwestern Ontario. Launched in 1932, it did not achieve production under the initial capitalization

It was reorganized in 1935 as Argosy Gold Mines. One share of stock in the new company was exchanged for four and a fraction shares in the old. Holders of 1,000 shares of Casey Summit stock wound up with 226 shares of Argosy stock on the first recapitalization

In 1938 Argosy was recapitalized as Jason Mines, Ltd One share of Jason stock was given for five shares of Argosy. That left the original holder of 1,000 shares of Casey Summit with 45 shares of Jason.

Jason produced $2,400,000 worth of gold between 1940 and 1947, and paid two dividends of 2 cents per share each. Under the old Casey Summit set-up, the stockholder with 1,000 shares would have received $40. But he had been reduced to 45 shares. All he got was $1.80.

In 1948 New Jason Mines, Ltd., was formed, issuing one share for every three in old Jason.

The original stockholder who had bought 1,000 shares now had 15 left.

This isn't simply what can happen in a Canadian promotion—it is what does happen to bring a mail-order mine into production.

There may be gold or there may be oil, but the sucker doesn't reap any reward from it.

Only the promoter gets rich.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Meeting of the Sunday League at Bridgeton, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the eighteenth anniversary meeting of the Interdenominational Sunday League which was held in Bridgeton, N. J., last night, we of New Jersey had the honor of having as the guest speaker our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. He delivered an outstanding address, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SUNDAY LEAGUE, INC., AT BRIDGETON, N J, TUESDAY EVENING, MARCH 13, 1951

Meetings such as this are living symbols of faith in God and devotion to the Christian ideals upon which our great land of liberty was established.

In meetings such as this many generations of God-fearing Americans have strengthened the moral and spiritual foundation of our Nation's greatness.

In coming into the great State of New Jersey I recall the historic importance of your State as the principal battleground of the Revolution

I am mindful also of the proud place New Jersey holds today as a great industrial State, a great agricultural State, and as a center of education, science, culture, and religion.

I welcome this opportunity to praise the splendid service given your State and the Nation by your distinguished United States Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH and ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON. It is an honor to be associated in the United States Senate with these outstanding American statesmen.

It is a privilege also to tell you of my high regard for your distinguished Governor, the Honorable Alfred E. Driscoll. He has made a national reputation as a foremost exponent of economy and efficiency in government.

We have reached a time of great peril in the history of our Republic. The American way of life is threatened by enemies at home and abroad. The precious freedoms we prize so highly are in danger.

The great issue is whether we are to live in a peaceful world or whether we are to be plunged into the most terrible war of all time.

To meet the crisis we are mobilizing all the power of our rich resources to defend our homes and our liberties.

We are calling the youth of our land to the colors We are preparing to start a system of universal military training.

We are pouring billions upon billions of dollars into the production of weapons and munitions for our Armed Forces.

But, my fellow Americans, if we are to survive as a free nation—if we are to preserve peace, freedom, and justice in the world—we need more than armies, more than weapons, more than wealth.

Above all, we need the strength that comes from God.

We need the strength that can be generated only by obedience to the laws of God and man—by deeper devotion to the teachings of the Holy Bible—by living in accordance with the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount.

We support the American principle that the state and church must be separate. But we know that one cannot live without the other. No government can rise above the moral and spiritual standards of its people. Freedom, good will, and tolerance cannot be maintained without a strong militant church

In this blessed land of ours we have been so fortunate. Throughout its history there has run a golden thread of deep religious conviction

The spirit of religion guided the Pilgrim fathers to the New World. They began the Mayflower compact with the words, "In the name of God. Amen"

William Penn, illustrious founder of Pennsylvania, established his holy experiment on the spirit of religious freedom.

"If we are not ruled by God," William Penn asserted, "we will be ruled by tyrants."

Faith in God sustained the pioneers in their lives of struggle and hardship. George Washington, kneeling in prayer in the snow at Valley Forge, has given patriotic inspiration to many generations of Americans.

"Firm reliance upon the protection of divine providence" is set forth in the Declaration of Independence

Benjamin Franklin suggested that prayers for divine guidance be offered in framing the Constitution

Abraham Lincoln, in his immortal Gettysburg address, referred to the United States as "this Nation, under God"

With these magnificent examples before us, we are forced to wonder why we have departed from the right course.

We have reason to be alarmed at recent disclosures that indicate such a widespread breakdown of decency and morality.

Can we remain calm while there is revealed evidence of corruption, bribery, and racketeering, not only in the criminal underworld, but in the very seat of the Government itself?

The other day there appeared in the press a statement which should shock every right-thinking American out of his complacency. It was made by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas He is chairman of the Senate subcommittee investigating charges of political influence, favoritism, and graft in connection with loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Senator FULBRIGHT was quoted as saying the testimony produced before his committee shows the need for a "general investigation of the moral level in government."

Senator FULBRIGHT was further quoted in these words:

"If people lose faith in the honesty of their Government by reason of rather recent development then we will be in greater danger from within than from without. Loss of confidence in our Government is as great a menace to our security as is communism"

Another Senate investigation has brought out into the open criminal activity by organized crime syndicates reaching into many States of the Union.

This disgraceful condition is described as a "record of official corruption" It was submitted 2 weeks ago by the Senate Crime Investigating Committee headed by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Because of its tremendous importance I should like to read a portion of that report, from which I now quote:

"The most shocking revelation of the testimony before us is the extent of official corruption and connivance in facilitating and promoting organized crime.

"The committee has found evidence of corruption and connivance at all levels of Government—Federal, State, and local.

"Such evidence of the corruption of Federal Government officials as we received, is primarily in connection with the enforcement of the income-tax laws.

"The evidence of corruption and connivance with organized crime in State and local government is present in five different forms:

"1. Direct bribe or protection payments made to law-enforcement officials, so that they will not interfere with specific criminal activities

"2. Political influence and pressure of important officials or political leaders used to protect criminal activities or further the interests of criminal gangs.

"3. Law-enforcement officials found in the possession of unusual and unexplained wealth.

"4. Law-enforcement officials participating directly in the business of organized crime.

"5 Contributions to the campaign funds of candidates for political office at various levels frequently made by organized criminals without reference to political affiliation. Not infrequently, contributions are made to both major political parties; gangsters operate on both sides of the street."

At another point in the report this statement is made, and again I quote.

"The committee figures conservatively that $20,000,000,000 changes hands every year in the United States as a result of organized illegal gambling"

That $20,000,000,000 figure is just for gambling alone In order to understand the magnitude of organized crime in the United States it would be necessary to add the income from many other criminal activities—narcotics, the white-slave traffic, illegal loan-shark rackets, swindling schemes, the extortion rackets, and even organized murder.

I have discussed these conditions of crime and corruption because there is a definite relationship between religion and good government.

Our civic duty and our religious duty are interwoven. Both must be honored and observed if we are to measure up to the responsibilities of citizenship

One hundred and fifty-five years ago George Washington expressed that thought so clearly in his famous Farewell Address. Washington said, and I quote

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity religion and morality are indispensable supports.

"Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle"

Yes, my fellow Americans, national morality has been weakened because we have allowed our material progress to advance far beyond our gains in spiritual strength.

In the words of the poet, Oliver Goldsmith:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay"

Every one of us here is shocked by the revelations of corruption, graft, and racketeering to which I have referred.

But the thing that so greatly disturbs me is the indifferent attitude of so many of our people

In every community thousands of good citizens seem to accept these matters as a necessary evil—something we cannot cope with.

Such citizens, and many of them are church members, have lost their sense of civic duty and civic responsibility. They must be awakened to the importance of the fight for honesty and decency—both in and out of government.

Unless the moral forces of our communities arouse themselves to drive out racketeers and grafters, wherever they exist, there can be no hope of honest, decent government.

We cannot have good government unless we elect to public office courageous men of outstanding ability, upright character, and unquestioned integrity.

We must drive out of office those politicians whose objective is personal gain and personal power, not public service

Victory over the racketeers and grafters can be won only if every right-thinking, law-abiding citizen takes an interest in government.

Men and women of the church should take an intelligent and militant part in politics, because clean, honest politics is the foundation of good government.

And good government, in our Republic, is the greatest safeguard of individual freedom, including the most precious of all—freedom of religion.

To hold the line in America we must have a strong, courageous, self-reliant, God-fearing people We must have a strong, militant church and a strong, solvent Government. We must have a total mobilization of all the moral forces Our churches must be the armories of trained battalions of men and women working for God and country.

The battalions must be formed into armies under courageous and righteous leadership With flags flying, they must march forward to fight the evils which have brought us to a time of national peril.

We must keep in mind always the historic mission of the United States—to lead the world in progress for justice, freedom, and peace.

Even at this critical time in world affairs we must not yield to the belief that war is inevitable.

We must never abandon hope that we can live in peace, as ordained by the Creator of the Universe.

Let the Voice of America resound throughout the world with a message of peace and good will.

Let us tell the glories of the American way of life. Let us make known to people everywhere that our plan means freedom of the individual—that it gives more of the good things of life to more people than any other system the world has ever known.

But first—and most important—let us put our own house in order.

Let us so live that we can be an example of religion, patriotism, and high moral standards

The crying need of the hour is for a great spiritual rearmament, not only in America but all over the world.

Not until this is accomplished can we beat our swords into plowshares and live at peace, secure in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Propaganda Is Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Propaganda Is Costly," published in the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald of March 10, 1951.

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

PROPAGANDA IS COSTLY

Washington is the center of the huge Government propaganda machine which provides an estimated 45,000 Federal employees with full-time work to dispense information, publicity and out-and-out propaganda. This figure, by the way, was supplied by the Budget Bureau on congressional demand 2 years ago. It has hardly decreased since 1919.

Paul R. Leach, chief of the Washington Bureau, Detroit Free Press, dug into this Federal press agent quagmire and found the State Department tops the list with nearly 6,000 assorted press agents here and abroad. Yes, the Economic Cooperation Administration is included in this bracket.

The dough is pretty good—averaging from $3,000 to $10,300, with a few section chiefs drawing $15,000 per annum. (That's better money than the rewrite battery is drawing on New York Local, AP.)

Public Relations for the Department of Defense engages about 1,800 while the Department of Agriculture has a press agent payroll of 420, not including 300 more on research, writing, and editing publications.

We could go on with a lot more figures, but, perhaps, the taxpaying public gets a vague idea that "thought control" is hardly peanuts.

(Note to Herald news room gentry: What's the matter with you guys? Wanna' be reporters all your lives? Why not make a try for "Director, Office of Information," Department of (you-name-it, Pal) and get along in the world?)

Secretary Acheson's Letter to Marine Corporal Moulette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial in regard to Secretary Acheson's letter to Marine Corporal Moulette, which appeared on Saturday, March 10, in the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail. The Daily Mail is one of the leading Republican newspapers in West Virginia.

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

The exchange of letters between Marine Corporal Moulette, his father, who is the assistant to the mayor of Camden, N. J., and Secretary of State Dean Acheson is a revealing and heart-warming correspondence which throws a good deal of light on the American temper.

The corporal's reaction to the Korean police action, the great questions of national policy and the future of the United States is, we imagine, typical enough to be taken seriously. To him the war is, first of all, a great personal inconvenience, an interruption in a planned and promising life. He has no personal enthusiasm for it, and he is resigned to fighting it "only because of the obligation we—the marines—have to each other."

His father is not unsympathetic, which becomes him, but he is concerned over a reaction which, if it is general, is certainly going to make it difficult to implement national policy where disagreement is potentially, at least, a form of division.

Dean Acheson, in the summing up, deals admirably with both. His expressions of sympathy ring true. The corporal's questions are, in fact, much like those which Mr. Acheson confronted with his own son in World War II. But there are other considerations beyond those which touch upon the individual, and Mr. Acheson states them well. "The liberty we enjoy is not won and preserved without unremitting effort, without sacrifice, without eternal vigilance."

This is one of the cliches of patriotic oratory. It is also one of the solemn truths of our national existence. It has been proved time and again that we cannot enjoy what someone else has won for us unless we are willing to keep up the installments.

It may be, in this connection, that the Korean engagement is a tactical mistake, although Mr Acheson does not think so. But strategically it is a phase of the struggle which the United States must fight and must win To dwell on the hardships which this may involve is natural, but Mr. Acheson is surely right when he says that "the great thing is not what happens to us but how we bear what happens to us"

To his great credit the corporal sees the Secretary's point and graciously acknowledges that he stands corrected.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 36."

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

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON, PROGRAM NO 36

(By United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you the first in a new series of broadcasts on Happenings in Washington.

When I inaugurated these talks in June of 1949, I stated that I hoped to bring you a better understanding of developments in your Government.

I said I would endeavor to keep you advised about legislation that is being considered in Congress and how it would affect Pennsylvania.

I now repeat and reemphasize that pledge.

In the present critical situation it is a most important duty of good citizenship to be fully informed on the great problems of the day.

It is equally important to study the proposals that are offered to meet those problems in order to reach decisions that will best contribute to the preservation of freedom and the American way of life.

The grave problems now before Congress are your problems. They reach into your home and your job. They determine your standard of living, the purchasing power of your earnings, and the future of your children.

Under the American system of government the decisions that are reached must reflect the will of the people—expressed through their elected representatives in both Houses of Congress.

Never in the history of the United States have we been called upon to make decisions as important as those now before the Eighty-second Congress.

The problems arising out of international relations will decide whether we are to have war or peace.

The course we take in domestic affairs will determine whether we are to preserve the American plan of individual freedom or whether we are to continue on the road to state socialism.

In the brief time at my disposal I want to outline some of the problems now before Congress.

I am sure that nearly every American will agree that we must keep our country strong.

We must have military strength, financial strength, industrial strength, and spiritual strength if we are to have leadership for peace in the world.

Upon that objective we all agree—but there are many divergent opinions as to how we are to reach that goal.

In recent months there has been a great debate on whether we should send American combat divisions to Europe at this time.

There has been a great deal of discussion as to whether the President has the power to order troops overseas without first consulting Congress

I believe that even if the President has that power he should seek the advice of Congress—because the Members of Congress are the direct representatives of the people—and the people are still the Government of these United States.

Another important decision that Congress must make has to do with the proposal to drop the selective-service age limit to 18 and the establishment of universal military training.

I believe that no boy should be sent into combat without at least 1 year of intensive training.

For many years I have advocated universal military training as the best system by which every young man can and should be prepared to serve his country in time of crisis

These military questions are part of building our defense against danger from abroad.

But military strength is only a part of our defense. To safeguard freedom of the individual we must maintain the economic and financial strength of our country.

The Finance Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, is now holding hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Act. The question before us is whether this act should be extended, and if so, should it be amended to provide protection for the American worker against the influx of goods produced in low wage foreign countries.

I have allned myself with those who believe that drastic changes should be made in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

I believe it should be amended so as to protect the jobs of our workers against unfair competition fostered by the Truman administration and the State Department.

Recently there was submitted to Congress a list of 50 different industries which have been injured or seriously threatened in the normal economic times prior to the outbreak of war in Korea.

I have mentioned only a few of the grave problems with which Congress is struggling.

But the most dangerous threat to American safety and security is the continued reckless disregard for the financial stability of our country.

In these days of peril we sometimes forget that we are now saddled with a national debt in excess of $260,000,000,000.

The worst evils that strike at the foundation of our liberties are public debt, excessive taxation, deficit financing and extravagant spending by all levels of Government.

We can win against foreign enemies and can still be destroyed as a free nation by unsound fiscal policies which must result in financial collapse and national bankruptcy. The inevitable consequence is the loss of all freedom under socialistic dictatorship.

You may recall that the President, in his state of the Union message, said:

"The Government must practice rigid economy in its nondefense activities. Many of the things we would normally do must be curtailed or postponed."

The statement was cheered in Congress. It raised the hopes of the American people. It gave the impression that in the trying days ahead the Truman administration was committed to economy in nondefense expenditures.

But it took only a single week for this pledge to vanish in thin air. When the President submitted his budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, it called for the spending of $71,500,000,000 It provided for revenues of $55,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of sixteen and a half billion to be made up by additional taxation.

Instead of calling for "rigid economy in nondefense activities," the budget proposed the highest nondefense spending in our Nation's history, an increase of $6,000,000,000 over this year's figure.

Members of Congress and the American people were shocked at this utter disregard by the President of his economy pledge.

That stalwart Democrat, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, called the budget message "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility"

But Mr Truman dared Congress to cut a single dollar from his spending requests.

He said, and I quote, "The requirements of national security are reflected in every major function of the budget"

When we examine some of the major functions that he advocated, we find the same old socialistic proposals that have been rejected by one Congress after another.

Formerly they were pushed as part of a so-called social-welfare program. Now they are put forward in the guise of measures necessary for national defense.

Included are the Brannan plan, to regiment agriculture at a cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers, the vicious scheme to socialize the practice of medicine, the dangerous proposal to place education under Federal regulation, and other socialistic schemes.

Now the President talks about a balanced budget, and he has asked for $16,000,000,000 in new or increased taxes. He has recommended to Congress additional tax proposals that would raise $10,000,000,000 and has said he would make further proposals for another $6,000,000,000.

I have always been a strong advocate of a balanced budget. I believe that we should pay the cost of building our defense on a pay-as-you-go basis. But I want to make it clear, however, that I do not propose to support revenue measures that would add $16,000,000,000 to the backbreaking burden now carried by the American taxpayer.

I am convinced that somewhere between $6,000,000,000 and $9,000,000,000 can be chopped out of Mr. Truman's $71,500,000,000 budget. I do not propose to load new taxes on the taxpayers of the United States to pay for the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, socialized education, and the other socialistic programs in the budget.

I refused to do it in peacetime. I certainly will not do it at a time when every possible dollar must be dedicated to the defense of the Republic.

I am convinced that every department of Government could reduce its spending by 20 percent without sacrifice of efficiency and without curtailing any essential service.

Let me cite one example of what can be done where there is the will to economize.

The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, is the directing head of the General Accounting Office. He is appointed by Congress, not the President, for a 15-year term and cannot be reappointed.

In April 1946 that agency reached a peak of 14,904 employees. This figure was steadily reduced until it was down to 7,063 at the beginning of 1951. That was a reduction of 7,841 persons, representing an annual payroll reduction of $31,377,560

In other words, Mr Warren is operating the General Accounting Office with less than half the people he had in 1946 and it is operating in 1951 with greater efficiency than ever before

In the same period every department and agency under the President was growing, expanding and bursting at the seams For some time the number of Federal employees has been increasing at the rate of 1,000 a day

Let me tell you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that a strong, solvent, economically sound America must be our first line of defense against Communist aggression It is the only way we can stop the drift toward a socialistic state

Therefore I shall battle against every scheme for needless spending that would increase the tax burden upon the wage earner and upon productive industry

With the spirit of American patriotism as our guide, each of us, as individuals, can help strengthen the defense of our country.

The troubled times ahead call for work and sacrifice

Every American must be prepared to do his share.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. The next talk in this series will be given 2 weeks from today. Thank you so much for your attention.

The New Alger Hiss Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of Alger Hiss has been confirmed by our highest court through refusal to review his case.

This brings to a close not only a brilliant and potentially promising career, but also one of the most sordid chapters in the history of the administration which controls the executive branch of the Government. The recent attempt to escape responsibility will fool no one. In the beginning, the apologists for the administration defended their erstwhile idol by claiming that he was being picked on and vilified for political hysterical reasons and that a trial would surely result in his vindication.

After a jury had unanimously found him guilty following an eminently fair second trial, the official line changed to the effect that he was shielding his wife or someone else in a commendable spirit of chivalry or martyrdom. It was the story heard on all sides among his admirers and many of his former associates in Government.

Now a new administration apologia appears in the current issue of Harper's magazine, where the author alleges that Mr. Hiss "was never an important figure in the State Department." This newly concocted fantasy is effectively answered in two editorials in the Washington Times-Herald, which, under leave to extend my remarks, are included below. The factual data furnished by former Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane must be accepted, unless refuted by equally powerful evidence:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

THE UNIMPORTANCE OF ALGER HISS

In a magazine article in defense of Secretary of State Acheson, Mr. Elmer Davis, the news analyst and wartime director of the OWI, attempts to slough off Alger Hiss in a way that could surprise no one more than Hiss himself.

The article, The Crusade Against Acheson, appears in the March 1951 issue of Harper's magazine, and contains this bit of beautiful letters:

"Let it be noted, by the way, that Hiss was never an important figure in the State Department. He was a rising young man, a useful technician; but that he ever made policy, at Yalta or anywhere else, is pure (or rather impure) myth."

We take this to be the new line on Hiss soon to be adopted by administration apologists everywhere The old line, of course, was that poor Hiss was but a "red herring" victim of some nasty Republican politicians playing nasty politics. This won't do any longer, now that Hiss has been convicted, and so we are told that he wasn't really an important fellow to begin with, and let's not fuss about him.

An unimportant fellow, this Hiss? Well, suppose we go back to August 5, 1948, and see what Hiss himself, testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee, had to say on this point. We give here some key questions and answers as they appear in the official record of that hearing:

"Mr MUNDT Did you participate in the Yalta Conference?

"Mr. HISS I did, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MUNDT. Did you draft or participate in the drafting of parts of the Yalta agreement?

"Mr. HISS. I think it is accurate and not an immodest statement to say that I did to some extent, yes."

Is this a mere technician speaking? Mr. Davis would have us think so.

A bit later in the hearing, Mr. MUNDT asked Hiss if he had participated in drawing up the veto provisions that later were to appear in the United Nations charter This colloquy developed:

"Mr MUNDT. What I was trying to get to is whether you participated in the creation of the draft

"Mr. HISS I did participate in the creation of the draft that was sent by President Roosevelt to Churchill and Stalin, which was the draft actually adopted at Yalta and actually adopted at San Francisco.

"Mr. MUNDT. Did you lend your influence in the direction of having the veto provision included in that draft?

"Mr. HISS. I did. That was practically the unanimous position of the American Government, I might add."

Such was the vein in which this allegedly unimportant flunkey testified. That a particular decision may have been taken in the face of his opposition, or that he may not have been consulted in some matters, is quite beside the point. The fact remains that he was there, on the scene of big decisions, participating in them in a major capacity and lending his influence as he saw fit.

Later that August of 1948, in a letter to the House committee, Hiss named all sorts of VIP's as his former associates and superiors and declared, in part:

"This charge (i. e., that Hiss was or had been a Communist) goes beyond the personal. Attempts will be made to use it, and the resulting publicity, to discredit recent great achievements of this country in which I was privileged to participate. * * *

"As an official of the Department of State, I was appointed secretary general, the top administrative officer, of the peace-building international assembly that created the United Nations."

Does that indicate merely "a rising young man, a useful technician?"

That same August, Adolph A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State, set for the House committee the first time "when Hiss would have been in a position to do anything effectively"—when Acheson became Assistant Secretary and Hiss his executive assistant.

Mr. Berle also told how, in the fall of 1944, there was a difference of opinion in the State Department:

"I felt that the Russians were not going to be sympathetic and cooperative. * * * I was pressing for a pretty clean-cut showdown then. * * * The opposite group in the State Department was largely the men—Mr. Acheson's group, of course, with Mr. Hiss as his principal assistant in the matter."

The unimportant Alger Hiss, is it? You be the judge. We add only the postscript of Mr Berle: "I got trimmed in that fight, and, as a result, went to Brazil, and that ended my diplomatic career."

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

SPEAK UP, GENTLEMEN

We have here a challenge to former officials of the State department, to come forward and tell the truth about Alger Hiss. The challenge is put by one of their own, Arthur Bliss Lane, a distinguished career diplomat with an unblemished record of public service.

Mr. Lane has issued his challenge in the form of a letter to the Times-Herald, just as the Supreme Court thumbs Hiss up the river for as light a term in prison as any traitor ever got.

The Supreme Court decision leaves Hiss no way out, unless Truman has the brass to grant him an Executive pardon. That is possible, of course. Truman has pardoned plenty of other criminals with less claim on the administration's own peculiar brand of loyalty

The other criminals merely gave the administration its gangster friends, gangster money and gangster political support. Hiss, the spy for Russia, gave the whole New Deal the cover post of moral and intellectual snob appeal and so worked in powerful ways in the highest circles of American ignorance. He helped bend the minds of college professors who helped bend the minds of a generation's students, voters, soldiers and wives.

Now he is safely behind the bars. But yet it remains an obligation for all honest men who know what he has done to put the facts on record.

Mr. Lane's challenge reads as follows:

"I have read your splendid editorial of today [Times-Herald, Sunday, March 11] refuting the contention of Mr. Elmer Davis, former head of the Office of War Information, that Alger Hiss was an unimportant personage in the Department of State.

"The Hiss case, with its terrifying international implications, is so serious that, without regard to the legal and judicial considerations, all those who had contact officially or privately with Hiss should make a public record of their recollection so that the American people may determine whether he was or was not an important cog in the formation of our foreign policy culminating in the Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Korean disasters.

"Shortly after my arrival in Washington in October 1944, en route to my post as Ambassador to the Polish Government in London (later I was appointed to the Government in Warsaw) I was invited by the then Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr, to attend the biweekly meetings of the policy committee of the Department of State.

"This was during the period of the serious illness of Secretary Hull. The meetings were presided over by the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and the meetings were discontinued when Mr. Stettinius was appointed Secretary of State in the latter part of 1944.

"At these meetings Hiss generally sat on the left hand of Mr. Stettinius and it was to him, as well as to Mr. Leo Pasvolsky (whose reliability is without a blemish) that Mr. Stettinius requested advice in front of the rest of the gathering on such matters as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the future organization of the United Nations.

"I would suggest for the sake of accuracy that other former State Department officials should also testify through your columns as to whether Hiss played an important or unimportant part in the making of decisions of major policy.

"The meetings which I attended at the invitation of Mr Berle were also attended by 15 or 20 other State Department officials, several of whom were, like myself, astounded at the apparent influence which this at that time relatively unknown official was exercising on matters of the greatest international importance.

"It is evident from his having been one of the insiders at Yalta and by his appointment as Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in April 1945 that Hiss was more than a figurehead during that crucial year.

"By the way, was it not the Office of War Information that broadcast to the world that the Germans, not the Russians, were responsible for the murder of 4,000 Polish officers whose bodies were found in the mass grave at Katyn, near Smolensk, in 1943?

"We know now from medical and diplomatic evidence that the Soviet Government was responsible for this atrocious crime, yet Mr. Elmer Davis' OWI tried to make the world swallow the Soviet propaganda.

"Yours very truly,

"ARTHUR BLISS LANE"

There it is, gentlemen. You have heard from one of your own and one you can't shrug off. Speak right up. Just address your revelations to "Voice of the People, Times-Herald, 1317 H Street NW., Washington 5, D. C."

Stick to the facts, leave off the rhetoric and keep it clean, otherwise call it as you see it. Who'll be the first?

Disorders in Barcelona, Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown relating to disturbances in Barcelona, Spain, published in the Washington Evening Star of March 13, 1951.

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

BAD NEWS FOR THE MILITARY—INDUSTRIAL DISORDERS IN SPAIN COULD HINDER PLANS OF EISENHOWER FOR EUROPEAN DEFENSE

(By Constantine Brown)

Disturbances are reported to have broken out in Barcelona, Spain's most important industrial city.

A strike followed by street riots in that second largest city of Spain were caused by the increasing cost of living and the prospect that about 650,000 persons, most of them employed in cotton mills, will become unemployed in the next few weeks because of the lack of cotton.

While this may be pleasing news for those who oppose the Franco regime, it is highly unwelcome news for General Eisenhower and all other military planners among the Atlantic pact nations. Spain is not a member of that organization and is not likely to be accepted, for political reasons, by western European nations.

But from the military strategic point of view that country is regarded as one of the highly important assets in the general defense plan for Europe. And the military planners know that a country which is not healthy economically is unlikely to be of real assistance in the event of a general conflict with the Russians and their satellites

This was one of the reasons for building up the free nations economically and also the reason why this country has come to Marshal Tito's assistance in recent months by providing him with millions of dollars for food when the Yugoslav crops failed.

Because it was evident that a serious crisis may break out in Spain, Congress last summer approved a loan of $65,000,000 to Spain through the Export-Import Bank. This legislation did not please the White House and the State Department President Truman approved it only reluctantly and said so publicly

Taking the cue, apparently from the feelings which prevailed among the Executive branch's policy-makers, the Export-Import Bank was slow in granting the sums approved by Congress. Of the $65,000,000 only $12,500,000 has been approved so far.

Because of crop failures during the last 3 years, Spain is in great need of food grains. Yet the Export-Import Bank did not provide any portion of the loan to be used for the purchase of wheat or corn in this country.

There is a surplus of wheat in the United States. The administration is anxious for Congress to approve a gift of 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India. Administration spokesmen argue that in spite of the Indian Government's hostile attitude in the United Nations, political considerations must not be permitted to affect humanitarian actions. But it appears to average observers that in applying this golden rule, what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander.

While we do not permit politics to influence our help to Communist Yugoslavia or to pro-Red-China-India, we draw the line when Franco's Spain is concerned.

Because of an alleged expected shortage of cotton, the Agriculture Department has established quotas for the export of that commodity. These quotas have a political tinge. By using the figures for the last 3 years in the establishment of these quotas India can purchase much larger quantities of cotton than can Spain.

The reason is believed to be that prior to 1947 India got the bulk of her cotton from Pakistan. It was only after its political quarrel with that sister republic that the New Delhi government started buying cotton in this country.

During that period Spain has been able to buy little in the United States because of the dollar shortage. Spain's quotas for the 1950–51 period was set at only 51,000 bales. It happens that Spain used to be one of this country's best cotton markets. Her mills are tooled for the American type and not for long-staple Egyptian cotton.

When the Export-Import Bank was directed by law to extend Spain credits for $65,000,000, the Spanish Government hoped that it could purchase the needed cotton in this country. Now it has discovered that money for such a purpose is not available and at the same time it is faced with a quota established by the Agriculture Department limiting its imports drastically.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] on the occasion of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Richmond, Va., March 9, 1951.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, RICHMOND, VA., MARCH 9, 1951

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, and citizens of Virginia, the holding of Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners is now a long-established, popular custom of the Democratic Party. The original was held in Washington, D. C., in 1830. It was given in memory of Thomas Jefferson, and its guest of honor was President Jackson. Although on that occasion President Jackson gave his solemn and now famous toast, "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved," today these dinners are regarded as strictly partisan in character. They might well be characterized as an annual one-night political revival. They serve to revive our enthusiasm, to stimulate greater interest and activity, and to enlist support calculated to insure success of the party in coming campaigns.

On these occasions it is both appropriate and generally expected that the remarks of the speakers shall be directed largely to extolling virtues of the Democratic Party and its leaders, both present and past, and to condemning and damning the opposition party. While taking some advantage of the opportunity for that purpose, out of deference to what I conceive to be of equal or greater importance, and in the spirit of the famous toast of President Jackson, I should like also to refer to some of our problems that, in my judgment, largely transcend partisan considerations.

The grave dangers that now threaten our destruction do not permit the indulgence of politics as usual, anymore than does the mobilization of our military strength and the resulting strain on our economy permit of business as usual. The challenge we face seems to me to be of such magnitude that it can only be met and repelled by the strong resolve, sacrificial courage, and fortitude of a united people.

In the difficult days ahead, I am persuaded that we can reach greater heights of patriotism if we will place the stronger emphasis on achieving that unity and on devotion and service to our country, rather than on gaining the temporary political success of any person or any party. The political party that will exercise the wisdom and courage to adopt and present the highest standard of policies and principles in its platform, in my judgment, will not only meet with popular acclaim and be most likely to succeed in coming elections, but it will be the party best prepared and most competent to guide our Nation through the perilous vicissitudes that now so seriously endanger our priceless heritage of freedom. I want your party and mine, the Democratic Party, to measure up to its opportunities and to those responsibilities of leadership and statesmanship that the exigencies of the present crisis demand.

I am not implying that party affiliations or considerations should be unduly minimized or wholly disregarded. Surely party politics has a proper place in our scheme of government. Our traditional two-party system has for a century and a half contributed mightily to the success and strength of our democracy. It has provided a wholesome and an effective check and balance and the means by which the will of the majority is determined and is made to prevail. Our two-party system generally affords the fullest opportunity for presenting the issues on which the people in the exercise of their franchise register a decision and impress their will upon the Government, and upon their servants whom they choose and entrust with the responsibilities of public office.

We desire not to abandon this system but rather to strengthen and improve it so that public and political issues may be more clearly defined, and more intelligently understood by the people when they make their decision in the marking of their ballots on election day.

It was that great and immortal Virginian, one whom we revere and honor tonight, who 150 years ago so ably formulated and promulgated the philosophy of government upon which the Democratic Party was founded. The great ideals and principles which Thomas Jefferson profoundly espoused, and which for the most part have influenced and guided the deliberations and policies of the Democratic Party since its existence, have been a source of constant inspiration to me throughout my public life, just as they have claimed and sustained the hope and faith of the American people in our free and democratic institutions and in the true concepts of justice and equality under the law.

The superb quality of leadership and statesmanship our party has often provided are in a large measure responsible for the great economic growth and power our Nation has achieved and for the unequaled and unexcelled happiness and prosperity that our people have enjoyed. To perpetuate these ideals and to preserve their benefits and blessings to posterity is the highest aim to which the Democratic Party can aspire, and is the most sacred and inescapable duty and obligation it has assumed.

First of all, you and I are Americans. Our beloved country and its welfare is our first concern. Secondly, we are partisan and Democrats in our politics. I am by heritage, by training, and above all by conscience and choice a Democrat. I yield to no one in my loyalty and devotion to the principles of the real Democratic Party. I have never, however, boasted of being a "yellow-dog Democrat." Such an aphorism has never appealed to me. I like neither the description nor the implication that he who professes to be such is willing to swallow or support any proposal, plank, or platform, however repugnant to his conscience it may be so long as it bears a "Democrat" label.

If in modern times some descriptive or identifying term must be used to emphasize the different kinds of Democrats—such as "New Dealer," "Fair Dealer," or some other—then I prefer to be known and accepted as a Jeffersonian Democrat—a southern Democrat, if you please. I regard those as honorable distinctions, for it is traditionally characteristic of Jeffersonian-southern Democrats to stand firmly for the basic and fundamental principles of liberty. In times of great stress and under oft-repeated pressure, Jeffersonian-southern Democrats in the National Congress have been unwilling to abandon those principles or to barter them away for temporary political expediency or in exchange for political patronage and favors.

I have not and you perhaps have not agreed with all that is contained in recent Democratic national platforms, or with some legislative proposals of the present administration. However, in disagreeing with and opposing some provisions in the national platform and some legislation sponsored by the administration, we have not sought nor have we attempted to find sanctuary for our opposition in the philosophy of the Republican Party.

On most of the issues that are highly controversial among Democrats, we find that a large segment of the Republican Party and its leaders have simply adopted a "me-too-ism" attitude. In many instances, both the Republican Party and its leaders strongly advocate the same proposals to which we Jeffersonian Democrats so vigorously object. This "me-too-ism" attitude is possibly the outstanding weakness today in the Republican Party. Its lack of courage and willingness to accept issues, and its failure to challenge unwise and unsound proposals and to vigorously champion the opposition viewpoint have caused such serious impairment of its vitality that today it borders on bankruptcy in both ideals and leadership. As a result, many American citizens who are largely independent in their political thinking and voting have practically abandoned all hope of any improvement or prospect for better government under a Republican administration.

Such losses as we have sustained and such gains as Republicans have made in recent campaigns are attributable primarily to objectionable policies and programs with which our own party is burdened, rather than to the faith and confidence of the people in the Republican Party. In recent years the Republican Party has weaseled and vacillated so much and "me-too'd" so many things that the people have been unwilling to look to it and to trust it to bring about the progress and reforms in Government that are desirable and needed.

It is not my purpose to cast unwarranted aspersions upon the opposition party. I want always to be charitable and temperate, but in any just and fair comparison of the two major parties, the Republican Party invariably suffers and is found wanting. Therefore, I wish to make it plain that while disagreeing with some parts of the Democratic platform and while opposing some legislative recommendations of the President, I intend to lend neither encouragement nor comfort to the Republican Party, for I have neither interest in nor desire for its success.

However, there are some good Republicans. There are those in the Congress and in the Senate of the United States who sometimes rise above party to principle and vote with us southern Democrats. When they do that, they usually attain their highest mark of statesmanship. With their assistance and support, we are often able to defeat unwholesome legislative proposals, and likewise to prevent some misguided leaders of the Democratic Party and the Congress from

committing tragic errors by the enactment of laws that would be destructive of our liberties and detrimental to the welfare of our people.

The Democratic Party is now in power. For the next 2 years at least it is entrusted with the stewardship of national affairs. Its task is difficult. Its responsibilities are heavy and grave indeed. Possibly there was never a similar period of time in our history that was fraught with greater dangers than those now confronting us and which are indicated in the immediate future.

We are living in a dangerous world—in a time of wars and rumors of war Free peoples everywhere are gripped with fear and anxiety lest there now be a third world war in the making. Freedom and democracy are being attacked on all fronts by an atheistic ideology of communism under the rule of totalitarian aggressors. Obviously they seek not the establishment of peace or good will among men. They are bent upon destruction and conquest. There is every indication that these abominable forces of evil will resort to any means or measures to achieve their goal, including the instigation of another world war if and when they become convinced they can win. That horrible prospect is neither mythical nor imaginary. Our very existence is challenged. The whole free world is imperiled by this monster that seeks to devour the liberties and freedoms of mankind. That is the danger we face from without. That danger compels us to rearm and get prepared for any eventuality.

We face other dangers from within. The burden of unprecedented expenditures for rearmament will place a strain upon our economy that could well jeopardize if not shatter its very foundations if we neglect or fail to promptly invoke the most rigid economy and pursue sound fiscal policies in the expenditures of the Federal Government. Strong inflationary trends are present everywhere Unfortunately spending "as usual" seems to be still in order in many quarters. Higher taxes are inevitable. A pay-as-you-go policy cannot and will not succeed unless the Federal Government as such makes sacrifices in spending comparable to those it calls upon the people to make in their way of living.

A wrecked economy and national insolvency resulting from devastating inflation and unbearable indebtedness are the dangers we face from within. If such occurs, our liberties would be greatly impaired and our military fortress so dangerously weakened that it would be vulnerable to any mighty assault that might be made against it. If we are to stay strong, a sound economic and fiscal position must be maintained. Federal spending for normal services and functions must be materially curtailed. Every budgetary item that is not a fixed cost of Government should be reduced to the essential minimum. Expenditures for national defense should also be carefully scrutinized to prevent waste and extravagance. All proposed expenditures that are unnecessary to the indispensable functions of Government and that are not absolutely necessary for our mobilization and war effort must be rejected

The President's budget should no longer be regarded as sacrosanct. Congress should—and I believe Congress will—accept the challenge of the President and reduce it. Budget requests to initiate and provide for the iniquitous FEPC, for the infamous so-called Brannan plan, and for the socialistic national compulsory health insurance, and other such schemes should be denied. They will be denied. I mention those three specifically only as samples and illustrations. They clearly indicate an attempt on the part of the administration to take advantage of the war emergency to impose these unpopular and undesired proposals and programs on the American people against their will. These items shall not pass. It is along these lines that I have disagreed with party leadership.

Associated with such proposals is another danger to America, as I see it. During the past two decades the false philosophy that Government should provide for and insure the economic security of every citizen has gained dangerous headway in our Nation. Both major parties must share the blame for having indoctrinated many of our people with the illusion that the Federal Government has and must exercise a paternalistic responsibility and attitude toward the individual economic needs of every citizen. Our Government was not founded on such principles The cry that was heralded throughout the land in 1776 was the cry for "liberty." When your own Patrick Henry exclaimed, "Give me liberty or give me death," his words, their spirit, and their meaning, were heard and understood around the world. Our founding fathers undertook to and did establish a Government that would insure freedom of the individual, and not a Government that guaranteed their economic security. In the past few years both major political parties, motivated no doubt by political expediency, have sought to entice voters by emphasizing the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide economic security for every citizen The modern cry of our day too often is, "Give me security," without due regard for freedom.

More than 50 years ago when threats of socialism were limited and weak and before paternalism had become entrenched in the National Government as it is today, another great American and a great leader of our party, Grover Cleveland, wisely counseled in these words:

"The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned, and the better lesson taught that while the people should patriotically and cheerfully support their Government, its functions do not include the support of the people "

Thomas Jefferson foresaw that this danger would arise and warned the Democratic Party and the American people against it when he said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements "

And then he gave this warning:

"If we prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy "

These modern schemes, such as the FEPC, the Brannan farm plan, and the proposal for national compulsory health insurance, all come within the category of the Federal Government wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them.

I strongly urge that our party abandon and repudiate these obnoxious proposals. We are already loaded with an astronomical perpetual debt. We are already taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. Higher and higher taxes are demanded and needed. We are told we must tax "until it hurts." If the leadership of our party insists that we do that, and if it is necessary that we do it, then it is the solemn duty and responsibility of our party and our leaders to see that the Federal Government correspondingly economizes "until it hurts."

This crisis we are in requires and demands the most and best in statesmanship and not greater artifice and cunning in partisanship. I should like to see our party return to the basic ideals and fundamental virtues that were so wisely proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson. It should dare to put the interest and welfare of our Nation and the American people above politics. It should champion economy and pursue sound fiscal policies rather than indulge in wasteful expenditures and extravagant promises of more paternalism in Government.

These are some of the reforms that many of us are fighting for within the party. We are not fighting against the party, but fighting for it and for the survival of America. Sometimes we fight with our backs against the wall and under most unfavorable and adverse conditions Our labors are not always pleasant. The charge of disloyalty is often hurled at us. We who oppose paternalistic and socialistic schemes and advocate economy and common sense in government are not the ones who are disloyal. We are those who are true and faithful to the party's original ideals and concepts. If any betrayal of party is involved in these issues and conflicts, then the shoe is on the other foot.

I have never assented to or accepted the test of party loyalty that some would attempt to impose My concept of party loyalty does not require abject subservience to the whim or will of any temporary leader. Nor does it compel me to support platforms, planks, or legislative proposals that are repugnant to and violate the fundamental principles of our liberty.

I am a Democrat. I want the Democratic Party to remain in power. I want it to retain and deserve the confidence and support of the American people I want it to be worthy of that confidence and of victory in future elections. I want it to be the party best equipped in leadership, in policies, and ideals, and the party most capable and competent to guide our destinies and steer us through the storms and dangers of the present to a happy landing on the distant shores of peace.

The party that will have the courage to be forthright and the wisdom to present a platform of principles and policies that are reassuring to the American people, the party to which they can always come with confident hope that under its leadership America will survive and our liberties and democracy will be preserved—that is the party that will triumph tomorrow.

The people today are considerably confused and greatly distressed. They are no longer complacent or indifferent They are becoming militant and determined to have better government. They are looking for integrity and character in party standards and leadership. Let us not be under any illusions regarding future party successes They are not a certainty. We must earn and deserve victory if we are to remain in power. The people will change administrations if we trifle with their confidence

So, I want to see the Democratic Party clean up, straighten up, and measure up to its opportunities and responsibilities and be worthy of its founder, its traditions and the continued confidence and support of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Senator McCarran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] which appeared in the February 1951 issue of the American Foreign Service Journal.

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

SENATOR PAT MCCARRAN

(By Joan David)

"Anyone who enjoys work certainly can have a hell of a good time in this office" is the sign that greets the eye on entering the small suite occupied by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, and his staff on Capitol Hill. If anything, that sign is an understatement. Hardest worker in the office is the Senator himself. As one staff member plaintively put it, "By working at top speed all day, you can be even with the Boss when you go home at night. But by the time he gets to his desk at eight the next morning, he's way ahead of you. Not only does he take work home with him at night, but he starts in on it again when he wakes up in the morning, around 4 or 5 a m"

MCCARRAN is the first native-born Nevadan to be elected to the United States Senate. He was born in 1876 and he likes to think of his birthplace as "a century after the Declaration of Independence." An only child, he worked summers during his high school and college years herding sheep, gradually acquiring a flock of his own. At the University of Nevada he attracted notice as a star debater and popularity as a star athlete. On the football team he first played left guard, then right tackle. He claims he's "never been left of center since."

MCCARRAN was 26 when he was elected to the Nevada State legislature While there he introduced (in 1904) the first bill for an 8-hour day. It was for the miners and smelters of Nevada. There, too, he continued the reading of Blackstone he had started in his ranching days (the marks of the saddle thongs still show on the old volumes) and was admitted to the bar when his 3-year legislative term was up. Next he became a District Attorney of Nye County and was later elected Chief Justice of the Nevada Supreme Court. None of his decisions has been overruled. MCCARRAN is very proud of the fact that the law firm he established soon after that judicial interlude still exists (MCCARRAN and Wedge) although associates have changed and he does not actively practice now. Nevada has no law school of its own and it has become traditional there now for promising young men who want to study law to come to Washington. MCCARRAN gets them daytime jobs—there are always five or six of them on his own staff—and they go to school at nights. Thirty-eight such proteges have now graduated and gone back home with the result that there are "city and district attorneys all over the State who are devoted to him."

IN POLITICS FOR 40 YEARS

At 74, PAT MCCARRAN has been in politics off and on for 40 years. He is now serving his fourth term in the Senate. Although a Democrat, the political position he can be said to have followed most consistently has been that of Nevada's United States spokesman. Nevada's welfare has even been incorporated into some of the major foreign legislation he has sponsored. Both his proposed China Aid Act of a few years ago and more recently the Spanish Assistance Act contained provisions for loans of silver bullion to those two countries.[1] On non-Nevada issues, it's not his party but his conscience, that is his guide.

[1] Aid to Spain as finally passed by Congress, MCCARRAN'S fourth try on this pet project, was incorporated into ECA's Marshall plan activities.

ENERGETIC AND CONSCIENTIOUS

MCCARRAN takes his congressional obligations with an earnest sense of duty. While others may attend committee hearings when it is convenient, MCCARRAN makes sure that nothing else interferes. Keeping up with senatorial committee work is a full-time job in itself. For MCCARRAN, chairmanship of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-first Congress meant attending the bulk of the 330 separate hearing sessions held by the committee and its subcommittees (the Judiciary Committee handles over 40 percent of the Senate's business). He usually gets one or two calls before a meeting from Members who just can't make it but say that anything he approves will be all right with them. In addition, MCCARRAN is chairman of the Appproprations Subcommittee which handles the budget for the Justice, Commerce, and State Departments, and he is a very vocal member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid and played a leading part in the establishment and work of the ECA watchdog committee.

MCCARRAN'S physical energy leaves his colleagues amazed, his assistants exhausted, and the opposition wondering just what hit them He never seems to get tense or tired and claims that he is refreshed simply by turning from one problem to another.

MCCARRAN believes that the Appropriations Committees are just beginning to realize the full extent of their legislative responsibilities and power. He feels that in the current session this broadened concept will be developed and exercised.

VIEWS ON THE FOREIGN SERVICE

So far as the Foreign Service itself is concerned, MCCARRAN declares that while this is bound to be a year in which defense items must have budgetary priority, the Foreign Service is an important civilian element in the safeguarding of our national security. He does protest, though, that certain elements of the Foreign Service have lost touch with the things that make up America. He feels that these elements are prone to apologize for the American way of doing things, rather than holding the American methods and ideals out as firm guides to countries that do not enjoy the benefits of our way of life. For this reason he feels that appointments made from all walks of American life can contribute immeasurably to a speed-up of negotiations and resultant understanding between countries. The so-called "career diplomat," he says, "is brought up from the beginning in the obscurities of diplomacy, rather than the realities of international relations." He singled out the exchange-of-persons program as one that was certainly all to the good. Also he would favor doing everything possible to improve our relations with our southern neighbors.

Uppermost in his mind regarding the Department is to clear the State Department of those who are sympathetic with Communist activities or with the so-called one-world movement. He also feels that the Department has improperly appropriated to itself a share in telling the Defense Department what to do. MCCARRAN'S aides are quick to point out that this is not an anti-State Department prejudice, but a question of issues. Most recently, MCCARRAN has been defending the Department's stand on the interpretation of the Internal Security Act as against that made by the Justice Department.

MCCARRAN'S legislative record reveals a considerable interest in aviation. He sponsored the first bill for a separate Air Force, in 1936. He was largely responsible for the civilian pilot training program, and he authorized the bill for the establishment of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. His campaign listing of his achievements for Nevada, incidentally, includes along with roads, dams, post offices, etc., some 10 Nevada airports for which he helped secure Federal funds. The Las Vegas airport is known officially as McCarran Field.

MCCARRAN led the anti-Court-packing fight during Roosevelt days. In 1946 he sponsored the Administrative Procedures Act which generally tidied up and made uniform the regulations governing cases tried before those agencies (such as the Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Communications Commission, etc.), which act as courts as well as prosecutors. His 1951 contribution, along with these lines is the recently introduced omnibus bill, which is a complete revision and codification of the hundreds of old immigration and naturalization laws which had grown into a hodgepodge over the years.

DP legislation (one of his few notable defeats) and the Internal Security Act have brought MCCARRAN as bad public relations on a national scale as almost any one of his colleagues has ever had on any issue. MCCARRAN was urged not to stick out his neck on the question of admitting DP's to this country. Friends pointed out that it was an explosive issue and didn't affect Nevada at all. But the Senator felt he must protect the country against being overrun by Communist agents and by cheap foreign labor. MCCARRAN makes no attempt to combat his bad publicity. He sends out press releases on particularly important issues, but never on himself He almost never accepts speaking engagements. While one may disagree with him, it is impossible on going into the debates on these, or any issues on which he takes a stand, to fail to recognize his sincerity. His staff vouches for the fact that he goes into a subject exhaustively before making up his mind. When he does, it is almost impossible to shake his conviction that he is right.

MCCARRAN'S staff, who treat him with all the reverence due a prophet, feel sad but resigned about his bad press. They wish that when events prove him right there could be some publicity, too. Almost wistfully they point out that during the debates a few years ago when MCCARRAN was urging aid for Chiang to combat the Red menace in China he predicted what has happened in Korea.

Hundreds of people come to MCCARRAN'S office every week. The largest classifiable groups among those who are not Government officials are like the young man in an Air Force uniform who came just as I was leaving to "see about gettin' my wife here from It'ly." Next come those who want free legal advice on establishing residence in Nevada with its twin attractions of quick divorce and no State income tax.

Although his staff usually takes care of these as well as many others, MCCARRAN personally sees a great many people in his office The overflow he sees at home where his wife keeps track of business appointments from about 7:30 on for most evenings. He almost never takes the time for any of Washington's social life. As for peace and quiet and time to call his own—that must wait, he ruefully explains, until he gets back into the sagebrush country. But after all, he philosophizes, "it's better to wear out than to rust out."

Benjamin Stolberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Benjamin Stolberg," from the February 12, 1951, issue of the Freeman, and one entitled "He Was a Man," by Charles Yale Harrison, from the Freeman for February 26, 1951.

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

[From the Freeman of February 12, 1951]

BENJAMIN STOLBERG

All through the popular front and wartime periods of "everything for Russia, even our self-respect," a pitifully small handful of prophetic writers in this country kept reiterating that it was dangerous to put any long-term trust in Stalin's dictatorship. The strain of bucking the great delusion for virtually two decades is now apparent in the death notices. A few weeks ago James K. McGuinness, the stanch leader of the anti-Communist fight in Hollywood, died of a heart attack. And just within the fortnight Benjamin Stolberg, irascible, delightful, catankerous and amusing Ben, followed Jim McGuinness at the all-too-young age of 59. In his case, too, it was a heart attack.

Ben Stolberg was one of America's pioneer anti-Communists among the intellectuals. A labor journalist in the twenties, Ben began by admiring the theories of Marx and Lenin. But Ben always believed in letting facts correct his theories, and when he caught the American Communists of the twenties in a red-handed theft of Sacco-Vanzetti defense funds he cried out in righteous anger. This was the beginning of a change of mind and heart that led him quickly back to passionate individualism. In 1937 Ben undertook to do a series of articles on the CIO for the Scripps-Howard papers. He discovered communism at work in some of the CIO unions, and said so. When the articles were expanded into a book, The Story of the CIO, the Communists and fellow-travelers in New York ganged up on Ben's reputation, smearing him in a thousand-and-one snide and utterly despicable ways. The smears had their powerful effect in editorial offices. But when Phil Murray finally got around to kicking the Communist unions out of the CIO a decade later it was on evidence, now fully corroborated by time, that Ben had originally assembled when it was dangerous to assemble it.

Ben paid a high price for being right at the journalistically wrong moment. Like other men of integrity before him, he was forced to live uncomplainingly in very strait circumstances. He developed a writing "block" largely because he felt there was little place for his work in the generally soft-headed American press. But he continued to have a very large influence. The wittiest of conversationalists, Ben poured out his ideas in talk that will be remembered to the day his last friend dies. If Ben had only had a Boswell among his acquaintances he would go down in history as the Dr. Johnson of the social struggle. Maybe his friends, if they tug planfully at their memories, will constitute themselves a sort of collective Boswell in Ben's behalf. Certain it is that Ben never lived a day without fashioning a new and devastating epigram. His epigrams were not merely clever; they were also enduringly wise. Reporters, columnists, editors, politicians, young book writers, trade-union leaders fell into the habit of calling Ben up to consult him on everything from personal problems to world affairs. At the time of his death he had become a sort of one-man general staff for virtually all the good soldiers in the anti-Communist struggle.

A passionately intellectual man (the description is Andrew Overby's), Ben was religious in his own way. "God," he said on one occasion, "is freedom." Since these few paragraphs are all too inadequate a farewell to Ben Stolberg as he goes to meet his God of freedom, we promise our readers a more extended estimate of Ben's significance in an early issue of the Freeman. Meanwhile let us say it right here and now: "Ben Stolberg was a better fighter for truth than any of us."

[From the Freeman of February 26, 1951]

HE WAS A MAN

(By Charles Yale Harrison)

We are adjured, and quite properly, to say nothing but good of the dead. This is an injunction, however, with which compliance is sometimes difficult. But in speaking of Benjamin Stolberg it is, I think, particularly easy, since there was so much that was not only good but distinctive and superb in his life.

There was, for instance, his wholehearted and unalterable devotion to the cause of human freedom in the face of the threat of totalitarian slavery. There was, too, his brilliant intuition, his keen insight, his sensitive awareness, his incisive and sometimes deadly wit, his engaging humor, and his unmistakable, distinguished prose style.

William Hazlitt once remarked that the love of liberty was the love of others and that the love of power was the love of ourselves. If this it true, as indeed it is, then Ben Stolberg's love of others was boundless.

He was among the first of us to recognize, with amazing clarity, the threat to our free institutions inherent in communism. And for this foresight he paid a heavy price. For years he was relentlessly maligned, traduced, and vilified by the agents of Stalin's fifth column both here and abroad. He was boycotted, blacklisted, and frequently denied the opportunity freely to express himself while, at the same time, Communists and fellow-travelers were appointed to high public office and were courted and touted by too many publishing houses, broadcasting companies, and influential magazines. There was no honor in his country, except among a relatively small group, for this prophet who had foretold with clairvoyant accuracy the enormous dangers with which we are now confronted. As a result, for several years he lived in a kind of courageous, genteel poverty, borne with fortitude and a graceful indifference which was sometimes heartbreaking to behold. But always, even to the end, the very end, there was his saving grace of humor. Somehow he managed to be gay and witty; to laugh in circumstances that would have reduced lesser men to despair.

Who of us will ever forget that laugh of his? It started, as many of us now ruefully remember, as a low chuckle coming deep from within, from his heart, as all true laughter should, and finally broke into open, delighted, infectious, boyish hilarity.

And, of course, there was Ben's extraordinary capacity for living. He loved people, ideas, and the clash of honest opinion. But above all he loved conversation, and he was a virtuoso at it. He had been almost everywhere and had known almost everyone worth knowing. He chose his friends and his enemies with a fine discrimination, and he had an enviable collection of both. In short, he lived fully, richly, and with completeness.

Perhaps you may recall a character known as Father Latour in Willa Cather's "Death Comes for the Archbishop." In conversation with a younger man the good father smiled slowly and said: "I shall not die of a cold, my son, I shall die of having lived." And of Ben Stolberg it may be truly said that he died of having lived.

Now he is lost to us. And the tears we shed for him are not the tears of altruism. We weep for ourselves. We weep because we have all been irreparably impoverished by his tragic death.

Manpower of Free China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Geraldine Fitch, of Leonia, N. J., who, with her husband, has spent much time in China, and has important sources of information as to what is going on there. The article, entitled "Manpower of Free China," appeared in a recent issue of the magazine called the Freeman.

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

MANPOWER OF FREE CHINA

(By Geraldine Fitch)

Whatever the past blunders of China, and whatever the past sins of America against China, the naked truth today is that our one hope of curbing the Chinese Communists is to avail ourselves of all the help Free China can give us. For today Free China is our only potential source of ample manpower.

The help available there divides itself into two parts: the troops on Formosa and the Nationalist guerrillas on the mainland. Had we supplied those guerrillas, the Chinese Communist armies could never have been thrown in such numbers into Korea.

When on June 27 the United Nations called on all member states "to furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary * * *" Chiang Kai-shek offered 33,000 troops on behalf of National China, charter member of the UN. Apart from our own troops, that is more than the combined forces supplied by other UN members. The offer was rejected for the ostensible reason that acceptance might incite Red China to intervene on the side of the North Koreans. And so far as I know, Generalissimo Chiang was not even thanked.

After the fiction of Communist "volunteers" had been dispelled, and Communist Gen. Lin Piao's armies had been identified, the Generalissimo repeated his offer. To date it has not been accepted. Those 33,000 men would be a big help to our battle-weary GIs and to the forces of the Korean Republic. Moreover, Chiang's aid could be expanded, probably up to a quarter of a million men or more.

Last May I was one of a group of 25 news correspondents, radio commentators, and photographers who visited Formosa. Our party saw a new Nationalist army; the oft-defeated and formerly dejected forces had been reorganized, retrained, and revitalized. This near-miracle is largely the work of Gen. Sun Li-jen of Virginia Military Institute, who put the infantry through a complete course of indoctrination along with their military training, and has given the army new blood by recruiting soldiers from among the sturdy Formosans.

Though for security reasons we were not told the exact size of the new National army, we had data on which to base our estimate of about 500,000 on Formosa itself. While we were there the troops were evacuated from Hainan. At Kao-hsiung, where the ships were coming in, we saw trainloads of soldiers, worn and thin but in high spirits, leaving for

dispersal points. We visited emergency hospitals for the wounded and the sick (many with malaria); we talked with the soldiers, both on the pier and in hospitals.

Young officers were still sure that in time they could have won. Reports had been circulated abroad that Hainan was given up without a struggle. It was not true, they said. The decision on top levels 2 months earlier had been to evacuate troops and equipment if the Communists ever succeeded in landing large numbers. Eleven assaults had been repulsed. Then, under cover of darkness, many of Mao's soldiers were put ashore, and soon reinforced by Communist guerrillas infesting the hills. Great piles of equipment, neatly stacked on the pier, were evidence of an orderly withdrawal. No officer and no unit had defected. Only the dead were left behind, and a unit of Nationalist guerrillas whose business it would be to harass the Communists sufficiently to keep Hainan's iron ore from moving.

On Hainan the troops had acquitted themselves well. On Tan Po and Quemoy islands they tasted victory. Today there are seasoned troops as a hard core for the army on Formosa.

Soon after our press party returned to the States, Nationalist troops and supplies were evacuated from the Chu-san Islands. This strategic move with no leak to the enemy was rightly regarded as a victory by the Generalissimo. Concentrating all available troops and equipment on Formosa was necessary because a midsummer invasion was expected, and without military aid from the United States the Nationalists could not possibly defend all the outlying islands.

While on Formosa we visited the air force training center. The Chinese Air Force (CAF) had moved from Chengtu, West China, a year and a half before, to a former Japanese base on Formosa—bombed into a rubble heap and without roads, light or water. Now it was occupied by the signal corps school, communications and mechanics training institutes, and the flying school; and new offices, classrooms, laboratories, library, barracks, mess halls, athletic fields, and a swimming pool had been built—a miracle of achievement. We talked with fine officers who had flown 50 or 100 missions against the Japanese. Many of them wore the wings of the Chinese-American Composite Wing as well as those of the CAF. Some had been with General Chennault in the Fourteenth Air Force. Others had taken their advanced training in Texas or Oklahoma. One, who had flown 160 combat missions and wore the American DFC, was said by his colleagues to have 21 service bars which he was too modest to wear all at one time.

Prevented by fog from flying to the tank corps base, we were briefed on the mechanized troops. We learned that a long-deferred shipment of tanks, purchased under the $125,000,000 military appropriation of Congress (1948) had recently arrived. Surplus tanks, "demilitarized for combat use" at the end of the war, had been imported from Hawaii and "cannibalized" or welded together again. We inspected an arsenal where captured Japanese rifles were being rebored to use standard Chinese ammunition, and where excellent sub-machine guns were coming off the assembly line.

The Chinese Navy, greatly handicapped by want of spare parts and 3-inch shells, had given a good account of itself in the effective blockade of the mainland. It was training technicians, midshipmen, and officers, and repairing its few war vessels. Before the fall of Nanking, the navy was credited with destroying or seriously damaging 3,531 Communist motor-powered and sailing junks, and capturing 325 others. Following the Nationalist withdrawal from Shanghai, the navy held the advanced bases on Tan Po, Quemoy (Kinmen) and the Chusan Islands, and patrolled the coast. Acknowledged by some to be 97 percent effective, the blockade brought forth loud protests from the British shipping companies and the American Isbrantsen Line, which were blockade-running for trade with Red China. Last year the Chinese Navy stopped 32 foreign ships and persuaded them to turn back, forcibly turned back 8 others, and captured 53 Communist craft.

On Formosa is the largest trained anti-Communist force in Asia. From what we saw with our own eyes plus reliable reports of the Chusan withdrawal soon thereafter, some 700,000 effective Nationalist ground troops are there, in addition to the air force, navy, and tank corps. Equipment is needed—more ammunition, spare parts, radar, new planes, and ships. But a UN military mission would find that the aid needed would not include a single American G.I.

What is the potential strength of Nationalist guerrillas on the mainland? There are anti-Communist underground forces in every corner of cont'nental China, some operating in small groups which hit and run, while others number tens of thousands. They probably total at least a million and a half—a rough average between what the Communists concede and the exaggerated reports of the overoptimistic. At least a million can be located. Moreover, since large numbers of Nationalist soldiers joined the Communist armies when Chiang was pressured by the Marshall mission into demobilizing more than a million of his troops, most of them could be won back. The division of Lin Piao's Fourth Field Army which was reported to have rebelled and joined the guerrillas may have been part of those demobilized units.

Among the guerrillas are large numbers operating under the Ministry of Defense, i. e., maintaining direct contact with Formosa. There are other groups, actively anti-Communist, but not necessarily pro-Nationalist. An able American who has made a voluntary nonmilitary, nonofficial survey of guerrilla potential says there are 200 splinter groups having their representatives in Hong Kong and hoping to get aid somewhere, somehow. Vice President Li Tsung-jen has lost his guerrilla following because of his failure to return from the United States. Gen. Chang Fa-kwei, known as Old Ironsides, has a considerable following, but no third force can command anything like the strength of the forces still loyal to Chiang Kai-shek. Reliable reports indicate that the Nationalists in general, and Chiang in particular, are daily growing in favor on the mainland and their return is fervently desired.

The greatest concentrated guerrilla strength and the area most favorable for the initiation of an organized counterrevolution is in south China, Fukien, Kwangtung, and Kwangsi provinces. This is partly because the Communist advance in China began to snowball after the disintegration of the Nationalist front on the Yangtze. Political commissars had less time to indoctrinate the people and, as they advanced to the southern provinces, they found a more militant resistance. The Canton area is traditionally the seat of Chinese revolution; its merchants, at home and overseas, are among the world's best. Canton was one place the Chinese Communists had to garrison, not just organize. When Lin Piao's armies moved north from south China and eventually into the Korean War, this area was left poorly defended.

Translated from the Chinese, the names of anti-Communist guerrilla forces are cumbersome—the People's Anti-Communist Self-Protection Army, the Southwest People's National Salvation Army, the Southern Fukien Mobile Column. To give an example of guerrilla organization, that of Fukien Province is divided into four areas. Ten counties in the southern section alone have an aggregate of 60,000 men. In northern Fukien the first guerrilla leader to raise an anti-Communist flag rallied 1,000 picked men. Another has his headquarters in the hills 15 miles from Foochow, the provincial capital, and from time to time raids the city. An old guerrilla leader operates from Matsu Island in the mouth of the Min River (still in Nationalist hands), sending his men on frequent raids inland.

Many of the units of South China are composed of peasants; others are led by college graduates and rally more of the educated youth. A former Nationalist garrison commander of Canton, now called "the general with the black flag," has 50,000 guerrillas in the western hills of Kwangtung, and is well known among Chinese overseas, who would gladly support him with arms and ammunition if United States permission to purchase and export were granted.

Out in Yunnan Province 3 brothers direct 100,000 guerrillas. In Anhwei Province, from whose mountain fastnesses the Communists back in the early thirties harassed Chiang Kai-shek with armed rebellion before their defeat and long march to Yenan, the tables are now turned. Nationalist units today work throughout the hundreds of miles of mountainous country, assailing the occupying Reds. In Szechuan Province—known to Americans as West China—the People's Liberation Army, the Anti-Communist Salvation Army, the People's Revolutionary Army, and similar groups, number 400,000 guerrillas. Manchuria has a smaller force known as the Anti-Communist Iron-Footed Army (cavalry) actively operating against the entrenched Reds. In the desert area of Jehol, Chahar, and Suiykuan Provinces with their grassy plains, two Mongolian princes are in revolt. Chinghai Province is almost wholly Mohammedan, and the Mohammedans are revolting against Red domination. In every province resistance groups and their leaders can be named, and their availability for an organized resistance movement is assured.

The Communist generals and the Peiping radio admit (by understating their troubles or overstating the number of guerrillas they have liquidated) that resistance is growing. General Peng Teh-huai recently conceded that "thousands of guerrillas are operating in the area of Sining (capital of Chinghai) and the mountain areas of Kansu and Ninghsia." In recent dispatches to the New York Times Henry Lieberman quotes official Communist papers as declaring that "the Korean war has stimulated resistance activity in East China" and calling upon all security bodies "to rid themselves of complacency and crack down harder on 'bandits,' 'saboteurs,' and 'special agents,'" which in our vocabulary means "guerrillas."

Does this mean that all the Chinese mainland is about to rise and throw off the incubus of Communist control? Not at all. From all available information, that is not yet possible. But there are islands of resistance in every part of China, some large, some small; some armed, some serving as unarmed operators skilled in sabotage. This is the potential, awaiting direction from Formosa, or supplies by airlift, or commando raids along the coast, now prevented by our Seventh Fleet. But to encourage a simultaneous uprising of all guerrilla units without giving it aid and direction would mean only temporary resistance, after which—with the best leaders liquidated, and terrible reprisals on guerrilla families—the resistance movement would be broken. Communist control would be consolidated, and hope would die in millions of disillusioned people.

On the other hand, once the UN or the United States alone decided to use the Free

Chinese to fight Red Chinese, a Chinese-American composite group similar to our wartime OSS could unify, organize and supply this resistance and through it could make Communist China blow up in Stalin's face. It would not be necessary to send American ground troops either to Formosa or to the Chinese mainland. In Red China is the manpower that our mistaken foreign policy allowed to be organized against us. On Formosa, and in the mainland resistance movement, is the manpower still available to the free world. We can save that world by recognizing our past mistakes, and by combining our military and industrial might with the manpower of anti-Communist China.

War Mobilization Is Everyone's Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr MADDEN. Mr Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times in the following editorial sets out a few facts regarding the justified protest of organized labor in the mobilization program.

It is the concern of all important segments of our economy that they be represented and given a part in our home-front war effort.

LABOR'S JUST GRIEVANCES

Organized labor has plenty of reasons to be sore about the present defense mobilization set-up. For instance, we can't see why labor shouldn't be admitted to full partnership in the mobilization high command, on a par with big business. And it seems to us that a fairer wage increase formula can be worked out.

Labor has every right to be alarmed over the rising prices of all cost-of-living items, and food in particular. It's demand that all segments of our economy share equally in mobilization is just and right.

But just grievances are one thing and a boycott of the entire defense mobilization establishment is another. The latter smacks too much of the strike technique Men who walk out on their responsibilities today raise doubts about the wisdom of giving them responsibility.

It is not fair, however, to ask that only labor exercise the high degree of statesmanship so badly needed at this time. Defense Mobilizer Wilson has done little to make labor feel that it has a vital part to play in rearming the free world. Yet Wilson as well as labor knows no amount of planning can succeed until blueprints are converted into planes, tanks, ships, and guns by workers in the Nation's factories, shipyards, and arsenals.

The trouble is that too many of our leaders, in Government as well as out of it, have tended to go their separate ways.

Too few have tried to view the mobilization program as the single unit that it should be, tying wages, prices, credit policies, manpower, and production into one manageable whole.

Congress is derelict in its failure to pass speedily the tax boosts needed to help lick inflation. President Truman has let the people down by failing to take decisive and corrective action against the disastrous easy-credit policy of his trusted crony, Secretary of Treasury Snyder. That policy is one of the major factors in today's mounting costs of living and rearmament.

The farm bloc, with the connivance of both major political parties, has refused to budge from the price support programs which make it impossible to impose real ceilings on the family grocery bill.

So far as wages are concerned, we feel some of the present inequities could be wiped out if the Government's wage order were broadened. The Government should say that if the cost of living creeps up, wages will be allowed to creep up too.

That would be done by permitting all collective bargaining contracts to include escalator clauses for cost-of-living wage increases or, as it may be, decreases. The Government order now freezes inequities by approving only the few industry-labor contracts which already have escalator clauses.

Resolutions on Broadcasts by Martin Agronsky by American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions by American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas, regarding broadcasts by Martin Agronsky, together with a letter from John P. Rogge to Martin Agronsky, which appear in the Appendix.

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

"Whereas Martin Agronsky is making daily appearances on the American 7 a. m. newscast and is misusing that time to scatter his left-wing philosophy, smearing the reputations of patriotic citizens who are champions of the American way of life, and more particularly undermining the cause of the National China Government and furthering the cause of Communist China: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That American Legion Post, 52, Department of Texas, at regular meeting this December 4, 1950, now go on record as expressing its disapproval of the character of the Martin Agronsky newscast and as recommending to the sponsors of the same and to the American network that his services in that capacity be discontinued immediately; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated be sent to American Broadcasting Co., to Martin Agronsky and to the present sponsors of his newscast in the Houston area"

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by unanimous vote at the regular meeting of American Legion Post, 52, Department of Texas, December 4, 1950.

JOHN L. COMPTON,
Post Commander.
ZENOBIA DOLEZOL,
Post Adjutant.

"Whereas our State Department as now constituted and under the leadership of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, has proven itself to be unworthy of the confidence of the people; and

"Whereas its foreign policy, whether the result of honest mistake or the result of treasonous conduct on the part of the said Dean Acheson or other personnel, has led our military efforts to the brink of disaster and has placed our Armed Forces in Korea in mortal jeopardy; and

"Whereas there has resulted a clamor throughout the country calling for suitable action against the said Acheson, recommending congressional censure or a vote of lack of confidence in the said Acheson; and

"Whereas it appears to this body that any such congressional action would serve only to make official the lack of confidence which already exists but would not serve to correct the complaint itself; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of this body that definite action is now required which will at once register the Nation-wide appraisal of the said Acheson and at the same time positively remove him from office: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas, in regular meeting this 4th day of December 1950, now go on record as favoring prompt impeachment of the said Dean Acheson, as Secretary of State, proceeding under article 2, section 4 of the United States Constitution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, as the urgent demand of this post that he at once offer in Congress a bill calling for the prompt impeachment of the said Dean Acheson by the House of Representatives; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution, properly certified be forwarded to each of the Houston daily papers and to the State Department, Washington, D C, to the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, chairman Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to the Honorable JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, United States Senate"

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by unanimous vote at the regular meeting of American Legion, Post 52, Department of Texas, December 4, 1950.

JOHN L. COMPTON,
Post Commander.
ZENOBIA DOLEZOL,
Post Adjutant.

HOUSTON, TEX., *December 8, 1950.*

Mr. MARTIN AGRONSKY,
American Broadcasting Co.
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Mr. John L. Compton, commander, Post 52, American Legion (Houston), Department of Texas, has instructed me to forward to you the attached copy of resolution adopted unanimously by that post in its regular meeting last Monday, December 4.

By coincidence this resolution was adopted on a day when your "news" cast was more obnoxious even than usual—contaminating the morning air with your condemnation of Senator MCCARTHY's demand that Nationalist China be allowed to take to the field alongside our boys. Taking your usual left-wing slant you stated that would bring Communist China definitely into the war and that only by calling up more American boys would we be able to stem the Chinese Communist tide—or words to that effect. Intimating that this would all start a real war you came to the main insolence in that broadcast. "If Senator MCCARTHY wants to fight, somebody hold his coat" You should have gone further and told your listeners that in the past war the Senator was actually in the war on the front—making history while you were on the air—reciting it.

Lo! How low a man can go to get a living?

Yours,

JOHN P. ROGGE.

Government by Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the treaty-making powers of the United States Senate have been threatened with relegation to a minor role, in spite of the fact that the Constitution decrees that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

During the administration of the late President Roosevelt, the prerogatives of the President in foreign relations were stretched to the point where in 1944 nearly all foreign arrangements were handled as executive agreements, and in that year there were 74 executive agreements and only 1 treaty.

The present Truman administration has continued to follow the precedent set by President Roosevelt, and recently Secretary of State Acheson, on his own motion and without reference to the advice and consent of the Senate, proposed that the fate of Formosa be decided by Russia, Communist China, Britain, and the United States, if they could get together within a year, otherwise by the United Nations.

It is certainly time for the Senate of the United States to call a halt to this type of unconstitutional negotiations, and to declare that treaties must be ratified by the Senate in accord with our Constitution, or that they will not be valid.

The assumption of the treaty-making power by the Executive is just another step in the New Deal-Fair Deal program to establish law by decree rather than by legislation, and this policy must be stopped now.

The following is a recent editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post by Draper W. Phillips, which analyzes the loss of treaty-making powers by the Senate, and it is a subject that must have immediate attention:

THE SENATE MUST RECOVER ITS LOST POWERS IN TREATY MAKING

(By Draper W. Phillips)

The extent to which President Franklin D. Roosevelt stretched his prerogatives in foreign relations threatened to relegate to a minor role, if not to obliterate altogether, the treaty-making powers of the United States Senate. In view of the great crisis which again threatens our country, it is high time that the Senate repudiated this type of unconstitutional dealing, and proclaimed to the world that treaties must be ratified by the Senate in the traditional manner in order to bind America.

During the war years nearly all foreign arrangements were handled as executive agreements, for which senatorial concurrence was not asked. In 1944 there were 74 executive agreements and only 1 treaty. This compared with 25 treaties and 11 executive agreements in 1930.

The Truman administration, far from repudiating this usurptaion by the New Deal, has done its best to perpetuate these agreements as a proper subject for executive action. Most recently Secretary of State Acheson, on his own motion, and without reference to the advice and consent of the Senate, proposed that the fate of Formosa be decided by Russia, Communist China, Britain, and the United States, if they could get together within a year, otherwise by the United Nations.

Until the advent of the New Deal, the constitutional limitation on presidential treaty-making power was well known and accepted by American officials and foreign powers. William Howard Taft, while acting as envoy for the first Roosevelt, said that it was impossible for the President to enter into even an understanding without the consent of the Senate

Even as late as 1940, the Attorney General, in an opinion to the President concerning the latter's right to acquire sites for naval and air bases from the British, indicated the limitation on the President in dealing with foreign powers The Attorney General said that negotiations involving commitments as to the future are customarily submitted for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate He approved the President's power to act alone in this case only because the President was accepting a benefit without express or implied promise by the United States of any obligation to be carried out in the future.

Early in World War II, and before we had entered the conflict, President Roosevelt had frequent meetings with foreign rulers and diplomats who were not thus circumscribed in their diplomacy. Wallace McClure, lawyer and official of the Treaty Division of the State Department, bolstered the President in 1941 with the startling thesis, which he published in a large volume, that anything that could be done by treaty could also be done by executive agreement Thus was Roosevelt launched on the series of private deals which have exposed us to the evils and dangers of communism.

Prof. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, has been the most outspoken opponent of this new theory of presidential omnipotence. Looking back to the origin of the Constitution, he saw its framers with their fear of powerful executives and secret diplomacy. They were careful that a treaty should reflect the mature sentiment of the people. The overwhelming weight of authority furnishd by decisions of the Supreme Court and by presidential action itself sustains those scholars who have defended the traditional method of treaty making.

Many question the feasibility of open negotiations in foreign affairs, claiming that the pitiless public glare would make compromise difficult, if not impossible. This, of course, is true, but negotiation is entirely a different thing from a secret agreement. If and when secrecy is necessary in concluding a treaty under the American system, the Senate can collaborate in secret as it has done on several occasions in the past.

Wildlife, Fish, and Game Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a measure to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in Military Reservations. This proposal is prompted by the success which has attended the operation of an earlier measure, now Public Law 345 of the Eighty-First Congress. Public Law 345 deals with the same subject but is confined to the Eglin Reservation at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. At this military reservation long prior to the passage of Public Law 345 there was an obvious need for sounder game, fish, and wildlife conservation, but due to the lack of a specific authorization for such a program very little could be accomplished. Since the act has been in force, the half-million-acre Eglin Reservation has shown increasing promise as one of the outstanding wildlife development projects in the Nation. This work is being carried on by trained personnel without interference in any way with the military-training program. Also significantly the work is being carried on without cost to the Government. All costs are borne by small fees collected from hunters and fishermen. Because of the success which is attending the Eglin Reservation program, personnel from a number of other military establishments have contacted me requesting that steps be taken to provide similar legislation applicable to all military reservations. That is the sole purpose of this bill. It will not cost the Government any money. It does offer an opportunity to build up our wildlife resources and provide additional recreational facilities for military personnel and civilians.

Buenos Aires Papers Please Copy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a front page editorial from the Washington Daily News of Monday, March 12. The News is performing a notable journalistic service in making available to La Prensa space for editorial comment by the staff of this distinguished Argentinian newspaper, which has been throttled by Dictator-President Peron:

BUENOS AIRES PAPERS PLEASE COPY

The voice of La Prensa cannot be heard in Buenos Aires.

It can be heard in Washington.

The Washington Daily News today offers La Prensa daily space.

We will make available whatever is needed for editorial comment from the staff of La Prensa.

The News has cabled the editors of La Prensa that this space is available immediately, and for as long as the editors want it.

La Prensa has been shut down by the government of Dictator Peron, acting through its creature, the Central Committee of the General Confederation of Labor. The story of how this was brutally done, and of this newspaper's situation today, is told on page 5.

We hope the editors of La Prensa will find space useful in the Washington Daily News, particularly during the conference of North and South American ministers, which convenes here in 2 weeks. La Prensa will then

be able to address, while they are in Washington, the diplomatic representatives of every nation in this hemisphere.

As the accompanying story on page 5 points out, freedom of the press is not on the agenda of this meeting. But if press freedom is not formally discussed, it can at least be informally discussed by the ministers of free nations.

They may want to consider it in terms of their general problem which the meeting was called to study: that of hemispheric defense How can that goal best be reached—if it can be reached—when one nation has deliberately turned its back on the liberal ideal and is plunging with ever-increasing speed toward utter totalitarianism?

President Peron takes the view it is nobody's business but his own if he throttles his country's leading independent newspaper

He may be in for some unpleasant surprises on that score.

Quite a few sister republics of the Americas, including the United States, are getting their backs up over his disregard of the ordinary liberties and decencies accorded to a free people.

Freedom of the press is a measure not only of a people's freedom but of the good faith of a government in their name.

By silencing this great independent newspaper, Peron shows how far he can be trusted to assume a fair and honorable share in the councils of free nations.

Our idea to invite La Prensa to be heard in Washington stems from a proposal of Herbert Moses, president of the Brazilian Press Association.

Senor Moses suggested that all Brazilian newspapers devote a fourth of a column each day to La Prensa's editorial comment

According to news dispatches he, in turn, apparently was inspired to his proposal by a suggestion made to him by a press association man in Peru—that the newspapers of the Americas give space each day to La Prensa's plight.

We would like to see a column a day, carrying the masthead of La Prensa, or even the fraction of a column a day, printing La Prensa's opinions in newspapers all over North and South America.

The blow against La Prensa already has been called informally to the attention of the United Nations by a Latin-American representative

We hope that it is also brought up, at least for floor discussion, at the meeting of the American Foreign Ministers here in Washington later this month

After flirting with the Axis Powers during the war, Argentina restored herself to the good graces of the American community only by promising to adhere to the Chapultepec agreement. That pact contains a freedom-of-the-press declaration. By abrogating it or ignoring it, Peron once more could find himself ostracized by democratic nations.

United States-Argentine relations now have hit a 4-year low as a result of public disgust and sense of outrage in this country.

For this is no little thing.

Once again it is demonstrated that an idea cannot be shot, or bombed out, or hung to a lamppost. Even an evil idea.

The totalitarian Hitler attacked the free peoples and finally was buried under the most fantastic holocaust of bombs; the totalitarian Mussolini came to an obscene and terrible end, brutally destroyed by his own disillusioned people.

But totalitarianism did not die. And many of Hitler's and many of Mussolini's one-time henchmen are doing well in Argentina. There, perhaps, they find the air salubrious.

For totalitarianism does not die when dictators die, and we would be naive to suppose it.

Mankind's struggles for political and economic security and individual safety are unending. Over the centuries, his gains are small and slowly and bitterly won.

It is for all of us to show that good has at least the stubborn vitality of evil, and that men who are dedicated to political decency, who stand for the right to honestly criticize their government, who stand to tell the truth as they sincerely see the truth—these men must stand together, wherever they may be.

Therefore, we gladly and proudly offer to La Prensa the columns of the Washington Daily News, so that, as the ministers of North and South American nations convene here March 26, the voice of this great newspaper need not be silent.

Conscientious Objectors Fully Protected Under Selective Service Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1951

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter written by Mr. Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, and my reply to the same:

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR
PREVENTION OF WAR,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1951.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR HOPE: You are perhaps familiar already with the story contained in the enclosed clippings from this afternoon's Washington Daily News, which is covered also in the editorial from the same paper

As I have just written Senator SCHOEPPEL it is the most shocking abuse of the rights of conscience that has occurred in the present crisis.

I cannot help thinking that you will want to do all you can to clear the fair name of Kansas of this blot on its reputation for justice, and for the maintenance of our great American traditions.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK J LIBBY,
Executive Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C , March 7, 1951.

MR. FREDERICK J LIBBY,
Executive Secretary, National Council for Prevention of War,
Washington, D C

DEAR MR. LIBBY: I am in receipt of your letter of the sixth with which you enclosed two tear sheets from the Washington Daily News of yesterday, one of which was a news article concerning the trial and conviction of Robert Michener, the other an editorial commenting on the news story. I appreciate your sending me these articles and I am glad to comment on the same.

May I say in the beginning that this conviction was for violation of Federal laws and in a Federal court. Neither the State of Kansas nor the laws of the State of Kansas were involved. I have no information on the matter except as contained in the two articles which you sent me, both of which are very sympathetic to Mr. Michener and his viewpoint. It would seem to me that the sentences imposed are extremely severe and it may be that they should be modified. I would not want to comment further on that question, however, without knowing more about the facts.

It seems to me, however, that your letter as well as the article and the editorial overlook entirely the fact that there is no reason under the laws of the United States why this young man should be in his present situation except that he deliberately disobeyed and flouted the laws of his country. According to the article which you sent me, Mr. Michener was convicted about a year ago of refusing to register for the draft. He was sentenced to jail and has served that sentence. After getting out of jail, Mr. Michener further showed his contempt for the laws of his country (1) by refusing to fill out a questionnaire, (2) by failing to report for a physical examination, (3) by failing to report for induction. He made no defense to any of these charges and admitted his guilt.

I firmly believe in the right of those whose conscious and religious beliefs impel them to oppose participation in war to be exempted from combat training and service. The present Selective Service Act makes ample provision for such exemption and deferment Section 6 (j) of the Selective Service Act of 1948 reads as follows:

"Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the Armed Forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is fou .d to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the Armed Forces under this title, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice, together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors."

This section sets up a procedure by which any conscientious objector may present his case and claim his exemption. The articles which you sent me would indicate that Mr.

Michener is a genuine conscientious objector. Had he followed the simple procedure outlined in the law, there would, in my opinion, be no question about his exemption and deferment. Thousands of conscientious objectors have followed this procedure and thousands more will do so. In other words, they will abide by the laws of their country. Mr. Michener, for reasons which are unknown to me, chose to disregard, flout, and disobey his country's laws. If we are to be fair to the millions of young men who have obeyed the selective service law and especially those who have been inducted into the service, there is nothing that can be done except to charge Mr. Michener with violating the laws of his country and convict him when he admits such violation as he did in this case. Thousands of men who obeyed the law, which Mr. Michener flouts, have given their lives in Korea. Hundreds of thousands have left their homes and their families to enter the service of their country. Your letter would imply that Mr. Michener is right and that these law-abiding young Americans are wrong I cannot agree with you.

Had Mr. Michener obeyed the laws of his country and availed himself of the provision which is made for those who have conscientious objection to combat training and service, he would be a freeman today Had every American boy between the ages of 18 and 26 followed the course of Mr. Michener, it would be the greatest mass law violation in history. It would utterly defeat our defense program.

Are you advocating that others follow the course of Mr. Michener and refuse to register or to carry out their obligations under the Selective Service Act? Are you urging conscientious objectors to follow this course rather than to obey the law and bring themselves within its provisions relating to conscientious objectors and securing exemption and deferment by that lawful method?

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R HOPE.

Letter to Farmers Urging Them to Step Up Production That America May Be Healthy and Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR FRIEND: Now is the time to get the old sow out of the pen and you should bring the younger sows with her. Spring is here. If you have a cow that's getting dry, you should breed her, too. We need bacon and beef. The city fellow has the money and is anxious to buy what you produce. Prices are up and you are bound to make some profits. One of the best ways to save money is to raise your own meat and fix it right at home so you can use it the year around. When you send it to market and buy it back you pay a lot of other people for moving it, shipping it, and processing it. Everyone who handles it has to make a profit. Why can't we keep that profit among the home folks?

We can do just that in three ways. First, you can check with your home demonstration agent and she can tell you how to can meat if you don't already know. She might even know a better way than you are now using. Second, in some of our towns and cities meat lockers can be rented for a small fee. Make use of these. Your county agent can tell you where they are located. Third and a modern new way is to buy now or plan to buy a deep freeze for next year. These boxes make money for farmers by keeping fine home grown meat well preserved. You can also use these boxes for your strawberries, beans and other fruits and vegetables to keep them in good shape for a healthy family.

There are many suggestions which could be made, but I am sure you've got the idea. I am counting on you and I am sure you will do your part in helping keep America healthy and strong.

If I can be of any service to you and your neighbors, please do not hesitate to call upon me

Altoona (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce Supports the State of Pennsylvania's Opposition to the Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the many Pennsylvania communities opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is the city of Altoona. Speaking for the citizens of Altoona the chamber of commerce adopted the following resolution which goes into detail in explaining why the citizens of Pennsylvania oppose construction of such an economic monstrosity as the St. Lawrence project.

The resolution follows:

Whereas a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States on February 1, 1951, approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States and Canada· providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes: Be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Altoona, Pa., is unalterably opposed to this bill because:

1. At the height of the greatest crisis in our Nation's history, when world communism has embroiled us in what may become a series of Koreas or World War III, we are asked to divert from our national defense effort manpower, materials, and financial resources.

On manpower it has been estimated by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, that the international rapids section alone would take 140,235,000 man hours. He said, "If computed on 4 years to finish, the Labor Department estimates the average number of employees at the site as 11,150, varying from 5,400 a month in winter to 23,600 in the summer." This at the very time when our existence depends on an all-out manpower effort to do those things that are genuinely vital to our national defense.

On materials it is clearly evident that this gigantic seaway will take millions of tons of vital and scarce defense materials at a time when they cannot be spared.

On financial resources it has been estimated that the cost will range between $300,000,000 and $1,350,000,000. Yearly operation costs will be approximately $20,000,000 and adequate defenses would probably come to another billion dollars.

2. The project would take at least 4, and probably 7, years to complete. This is too long, when the element of time is on the side of our enemy.

3. The proposal is a particular threat to the economy not only of this immediate vicinity and the vitally important industrial capacity of the State of Pennsylvania but it is also a real threat to the economy of the entire northeastern section of the United States. All our great eastern ports are seriously threatened not only by loss in tonnage but by competition from ship lines whose lower-paid employees pay no income taxes in this country. It would also be a severe blow to our railroads through loss of freight tonnage and the importation of foreign goods. This coupled with the importation of foreign coal and crude oil would severely threaten our great coal-producing industry. Thus Pennsylvania's two great industries would be seriously affected.

4 Our merchant marine, on which we have spent more than $19,000,000,000, finds that because of size only 9 percent of its vessels could use the seaway. Smaller foreign vessels again would have the advantage.

5 The St. Lawrence River is icebound for virtually 5 months out of the year, and during the fall and spring, and even in summer, is blanketed by fog.

6 The seaway would give us 1,677 more miles of coast line to defend and a bomb dropped at any single point would cripple the entire project.

7 The claims of need for more electric power, and that the undertakings are too big for private enterprise to finance are spurious. Private, taxpaying enterprise is already furnishing all electric power presently required and can raise the money for any project if there is sufficient demand for the services; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Pennsylvania Representatives and Senators and that they be urged to uphold this resolution and to defeat the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 27, now before the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

(This resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce Thursday, March 8, 1951)

The Italian-American World War Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of Mr. Anthony V. Lo Popolo, Pennsylvania department commander of the Italian-American World War Veterans, which Mr. Lo Popolo delivered on Sunday, March 11, 1951, over radio station WJMJ, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Why does the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States exist? The preamble to our national constitution establishes the basis. From what is its name derived? The name is one that acts as a living perpetual memorial for all those Italian-Americans who served and those who died

for their country, the United States of America. There is no more fitting tribute, no better honor to bestow. If the organization grows the memorial becomes more brilliant and refulgent. If the organization wanes and diminishes, the memorial becomes dull and gathers moss. It is for us the living to see, to be ever vigilant that our service will work toward the betterment of mankind.

The Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., believes in brotherhood in action. It teaches and exhorts clean, upright living, tolerance and good will. It symbolizes faith in our country and faith in God. It is a preponderant influence in building good citizens and loyalty to the laws of the Nation, State and municipality.

It believes in the expansion of industry, commerce, agriculture and transportation. It believes in fair, just and adequate rights for labor to insure labor a living and just wage. It believes in the development of our great natural resources for the benefit of all our citizens, the hard-pressed taxpayer and other backwood nations on a business-like basis. It believes in adequate schools, hospitals, universities, centers of art and music, churches of every denomination It believes in the improvement of the living standard

It believes in the obliteration of crime, racketeering, federations of law-enforcement officials and public officials with criminals and gamblers. Statistics show that crime syndicates in the United States net approximately $15,000,000,000 This money is taken from families that can least afford it The money is then diverted by these racketeers and gamblers to purchase political control. It believes that corrupt officials in towns, cities, States and in the Federal Government who succumb to the wishes of these criminals and cast aside their oaths to serve in the public interest should be quickly removed from office and punished severely. It believes that each citizen should become aware of his civic duties Each citizen has rights Each citizen has obligations It believes that every citizen should take part in politics, community affairs, in State, national and international problems.

It believes that each citizen should act freely and without coercion. It believes that each citizen should excite public opinion to a higher standard of ethics, to cultivate an obedient respect for the law and to bring about confidence in the qualifications of our officials and in the integrity of our courts

It believes that each citizen should exercise his right to vote to see to it that only the best qualified, high caliber men are chosen and delegated to do our work as we want it done, so that the perennial misfits, cheap politicians and gangsters who are always standing ready to slip in and very adroitly take over by our failure to vote will be thwarted. It believes that with strong, qualified, and fearless men on the job, quislings will be ousted as soon as spotted It believes that the connivance engendered by money and influence is great but that the power of an aroused, demanding electorate is more powerful.

It believes in the American way of life. It believes that law and order must prevail over the rule of men, coteries and pressure groups. It believes in a strong and united America without endangering our priceless freedoms It believes in aid and assistance to other nations under constitutional process to maintain the checks and balances established by our forefathers. It is when we do nothing that we continue the triumph of evil.

This is the organization that the department presents to all Italian-American veterans who are interested in establishing a local post as a permanent living memorial for those Italian-Americans who served and those who died for their country, the United States of America.

Medicine in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 2 more of a series of 22 articles in the series entitled "Medicine in Crisis," which have been written by Mr. Selig Greenberg, and which appeared in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, newspapers published in the city of Providence, R. I.

This series presents an impartial and objective discussion of conditions faced by our medical schools and the medical profession in general.

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

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 1, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—STRICT RATIONING RULES CAREERS IN UNITED STATES MEDICINE—22,280 SEEK TO ENTER 72 SCHOOLS ABLE TO ACCOMMODATE BUT 7,187

(By Selig Greenberg)

Cornell University Medical College last fall accepted 80 freshmen and turned down 2,870 applicants This was a ratio of one admission to 37 applicants

While Cornell had the highest proportion of rejections in the country, much the same thing happened in many of our medical schools.

A FEW FIGURES

Here are just a few figures Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons accepted 120 out of 2,800 applicants, New York Medical College took 124 out of 3,153, Harvard Medical School, 112 out of 996, Temple University School of Medicine, 125 out of 3,089; Yale School of Medicine, 65 out of 1,401, Western Reserve, 80 out of 1,800, Vanderbilt, 52 out of 1,415, Tulane, 128 out of 2,000; Syracuse, 76 out of 2,600, Rochester, 70 out of 2,100; Northwestern, 128 out of 2,103, Boston University School of Medicine, 72 out of 1,875.

Because of the extreme difficulty of making the grade, most applicants apply to more than one medical school. Some have been known to file applications in the same year with as many as 25 schools without any success.

ONE OUT OF THREE

Last fall 22,280 students filed a total of 81,930 applications in the Nation's 72 medical schools Of these, 7,187 were enrolled, which was a ratio of nearly one out of three. But an important point to bear in mind is that the proportion of successful applicants in the better schools was much lower.

Youths from 11 States, including Rhode Island, which have no medical schools find it even harder to get a chance. There is an increasing trend among State-supported medical schools to restrict admission to residents of their own States.

According to the American Medical Association's breakdown of the residence of freshmen medical students in the 1949–50 academic year, there were only 30 such freshmen from Rhode Island.

FIFTEEN PERCENT DROP OUT

As a rule, about 15 percent of medical students are flunked or dropped out for other reasons. This means that only about 25 of the Rhode Islanders enrolled in 1940–50 can expect to graduate. Twenty doctors died in this State last year and an unknown number retired. While the supply of physicians entering practice here is not limited to residents of the State, it is significant that depletions in the ranks of doctors in Rhode Island probably exceeded the number of those from this State given an opportunity to become replacements.

All of which points up the fact that there is strict rationing of careers in medicine. Failure of our medical training facilities to expand enough is depriving thousands of young men and women of a chance to enter the profession of their choice at a time when the threat of war faces us with a possible serious shortage of doctors.

WASTED EFFORT

The intense competition for medical school openings has unquestionably contributed to the generally high standard of students by permitting the schools to pick the cream of the crop. But it has also meant a tragic waste of many good candidates It brings frustration annually to thousands of students. For some of them premedical training has turned out to be a wasted effort.

This situation recently led Dean Simeon E Leland of the College of Liberal Arts at Northwestern University to remark that "medicine is the only profession where the element of competition comes only at the beginning" While somewhat exaggerated, this observation is not without truth

The limited opportunities have other disturbing implications They have to a considerable extent restricted access to medical education to the well-to-do and permitted discrimination against racial and religious minorities.

TUITION RUNS HIGH

Although it covers less than one-fourth of the cost of operating the schools, tuition runs as high as $835 a year. The training schedule is usually so heavy that students find it impossible to support themselves by working after school hours This automatically rules out many gifted students from low-income families.

Some observers have commented on the fact that medicine frequently tends to become an hereditary affair, with doctors' sons following in their fathers' footsteps. One reason for this may be that doctors often have fatter bankbooks than most other people Nor is it unreasonable to suspect that sons of medical families find it easier to vault the admission hurdle.

ROOM FOR PREJUDICE

Applicants for admission to medical schools are judged not only on the basis of their scholastic standing in college, which usually has to be very high, but also on their personality and character. These are, obviously, qualifications not subject to precise measurement. As a report of the New York Academy of Medicine put it, "any appraisal of these matters is necessarily so inexact that it leaves room for the operation of prejudice against applicants whose sex, race, or creed differs from that of the examiners." There is undoubtedly discrimination against women, Negroes, Jews and, to a lesser extent, students of Italian extraction.

Some medical educators go so far as to claim that the 7,100-odd places now open annually in the country's medical schools just about cover the available pool of fully qualified applicants and that in the case of substantial expansion it would be difficult to recruit a sufficient number of candidates of the proper intellectual and moral caliber. A statement along this line was actually made in the official 1948 handbook prepared by the Association of American Medical Colleges for premedical advisers.

YALE DEAN DISSENTS

Dr. C. N. Hugh Long, dean of the Yale School of Medicine, recently dissented from this point of view when he declared that

"the country needs more doctors but this deficiency is not due to any lack of material to supply them." Some officials of other medical schools continue to insist that because of grave deficiencies in our educational ssytem there is a dearth of good candidates.

Leading educators outside the medical field feel that such a claim is absurd. Our educational system, all the way from grammar school to college, is far from perfect. But with 2,500,000 students enrolled in our colleges, it is inconceivable, they say, that only about 7,100 are fit to be picked for training as doctors.

American medical education is of the highest quality in the world, and it is important to preserve that quality. But the insistence on preserving quality, which is perfectly valid in itself, can also be used as a cover for other motives. There are indications that it has been accompanied by a growing cult of exclusiveness in the medical profession and an almost pathological fear of the possible leveling effect of greater numbers.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 2, 1951]

MEDICINE IN CRISIS—DOCTOR-POPULATION RATIO FOR UNITED STATES LOWER THAN IN 1909—NUMBER OF GENERAL PRACTITIONERS AND MEDICAL SCHOOLS ALSO DECLINES

(By Selig Greenberg)

There are fewer doctors in the United States today in relation to the population than there were 40 years ago.

It is true that some of the physicians at that time were graduates of low-grade medical schools which have since been closed. But quality in medicine, while crucial now, was far less important in those days, when doctors had few specific remedies for disease.

It is therefore valid to cite the historical record of the supply of physicians in this country. For it shows the extent to which expansion of the profession has lagged behind the increase in population and in demand for medical services.

TWO HUNDRED AND ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVEN DOCTORS IN 1949

In 1909 there were 134,000 physicians, or one for every 671 Americans The latest count in 1949 showed a total of 201,277 doctors—one for every 750 persons In the 40-year period the population of the United States increased 65 percent. But the number of doctors rose only 50 percent

This lag developed despite the tremendous increase in the things that medicine can do for people. It developed in the face of a rise of about five times in our national income. It occurred at a time when there was a steadily rising curve in the proportion of older people who need extra medical care.

The increasing trend toward specilization makes the decline in the ratio of physicians to population even more serious than it looks at first glance.

FEWER GENERAL PRACTITIONERS

Around the turn of the century virtually every doctor was available for general treatment of patients. By 1920 about 15,000 doctors reported that they were confining their practice to a specialty. There are now more than 55,000 physicians who do so and who are thus tacitly excused from carrying cases beyond the chosen limits of their specialty and their chosen hours of work. The number of general practitioners, who are supposed to be always on call, has sharply declined.

Specialization also has contributed to the concentration of physicians in the cities, where the level of income is higher and hospital facilities are available. Further aggravating the situation has been the rise in the number of salaried doctors, many of whom do not furnish direct medical care. The proportion of salaried physicians has nearly doubled during the past 20 years.

In 1905 there were 160 4-year medical schools and 2-year basic science schools in the United States. (Students who take the basic science school course complete the last 2 years of their training in the 4-year schools.) These schools had a total of 26,147 students and graduated 5,606 doctors. General college enrollment in 1905 stood at 138,000.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS SLASHED

There are now only 72 4-year medical schools and 7 basic science schools. Last year they graduated 5,553 M D.'s. In the current year there is an enrollment of 26,193, and a graduating class of about 6,000 is expected. While college enrollment has increased 18 times since 1905, the number of medical students has remained static

The number of medical schools was slashed as the result of a revolution in American medical education launched in 1910.

In that year the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published a study of the country's medical schools made by Abraham Flexner, a noted educational authority. Flexner reported that many of the schools were hopelessly inadequate and some of them were little more than diploma mills. The resulting unfavorable publicity and the efforts of the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals forced many of the schools to close and others to raise their standards.

CLAIM OPPORTUNITIES DOUBLED

Shortly after publication of the Flexner report, the AMA graded 66 of the medical schools, with a total enrollment of 12,530, as class A. It placed 43 schools in class B and 22 in class C. In 1929 the AMA discontinued this method of grading and confined its recognition to 75 medical and basic science schools which it listed as approved. There are now no unapproved medical schools in the United States. Since 1929 four new medical schools have been established and three 2-year schools have been converted into 4-year schools.

AMA spokesmen contend that it is unfair to compare the enrollment of 45 years ago, which included many students in substandard institutions, with the present total of medical students. They maintain that opportunities to study medicine in approved schools have doubled and have thus more than kept pace with the growth in population.

The closing of the inferior schools must, of course, be taken into consideration in viewing the over-all picture. But many authorities argue that the rise in population, in the complexity of medicine and in the health consciousness of the American people and their demand for medical services more than offsets the gain from the higher quality and efficiency of most of our present practitioners.

An important byproduct of the reforms which followed the Flexner report was the emergence of the AMA's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals as the accrediting body for the medical schools.

EXPANSION DISCOURAGED

Since 1910 the AMA council has set standards for the medical colleges. These standards provide a minimum ratio of faculty, laboratory equipment, and other training facilities to students and thereby control enrollment. Legal requirements or the rules of licensing boards in virtually all States specify that only graduates of medical schools approved by the AMA council may take the examination for admission to practice. The council also certifies hospitals where newly graduated physicians may take internship or residency training.

There is no question that the AMA council has made a great and positive contribution to the cause of medical education in this country. Its influence has been good in securing higher standards. It was courageous and public-spirited in the vigorous housecleaning it conducted in the years after 1910 to rid the Nation of poor medical schools.

But there is also some evidence that the council has at times used its influence to discourage expansion of medical training facilities. In at least one instance it has openly advocated that enrollment be cut down on the ground that the profession was overcrowded.

Initially, the drop in enrollment was an unplanned result of the intensive drive for higher standards. There is some reason to doubt that the subsequent failure to provide better opportunities for medical schooling was always unpremeditated.

Bread and Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, of Pontiac, Mich., for March 9, 1951.

The people of this country need not fear "big business." Business is not bad because it is big. Their real fear should be of "big government" which threatens to engulf them and make them the servant of the state.

Our country was founded on the theory that the individual is master and the state is servant.

The editorial which follows indicates the tremendous amount that industry contributes to the expense of the Federal Government. General Motors is the largest corporation in the world. Its contribution to the welfare of this country is well established. This editorial, by one of the finest newspapers in the United States, points out that fact:

PONTIAC'S BREAD AND BUTTER

According to the statement just issued by the General Motors Corp., the 1950 tax bill was $1,536,000,000.

For fear someone may misread the total, or think we've gone naught happy, the figure is written in a different way.

Here it is. One billion five hundred and thirty-six million dollars.

The press is speechless.

We're open-mouthed.

Words are inadequate.

Two challenging facts stand out and compel attention. First, this total would have paid all the costs of our Federal Government for any complete year up to the First World War. Perhaps that gives a better picture of the terrific tax bite placed on all those in modern economy.

No one escapes.

The salaried man, the hourly worker, and corporations alike are belted amidships. This gigantic, gargantuan, and enormous sum taken from one corporation, alone would now run the Federal Government less than a week under President Truman's current proposal.

Even under that very wasteful Mr. Hoover (as the Democrats charged in 1932), the figure quoted above would have paid all the expenses of the Government for 5 months.

The second and equally inescapable fact pertains solely to the size of General Motors.

GM is an industrial colossus.

All rivals are distanced.

It storms ahead alone.

Pontiac is very fortunate to have this sound, brilliantly managed, and well-financed giant as the basis of our living and very existence. Allah has smiled on the civic namesake of the fiery and picturesque red man. Our workers have suffered a minimum of lay-offs. They have benefited by steady and continuous employment beyond the ken of those in most occupations.

Retail circles profit accordingly.

The whole area prospers.

It's nice to be part of the biggest industrial family in all the history of the world.

That's precisely what we are.

Colonel Lindsay Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore placed in the RECORD several guest editorials by Col. C. H. Lindsay, general manager of the Tremont Lumber Co. mills in Louisiana. I have another editorial written by Colonel Lindsay which I desire to place in the RECORD. This outstanding builder and industrialist is doing some good thinking on the question of communism. The editorial is as follows:

TEAMWORK VERSUS COMMUNISM

(By C. H. Lindsay)

It is teamwork that completes a touchdown and makes thousands of fans rise from their seats to cheer. Teamwork is a great factor in everyday life. Without teamwork, a war cannot be won or a world peace crystallized. To bring out the finest and best in mankind's productivity, we must always unite toward that harmonious end.

Nothing short of working in harmony with a square deal plainly in view will suffice We must meet present-day conditions—communism—by fair play among ourselves and our neighboring countries.

From where I sit, which is closer to general conditions than you may think, I know that we have had too much pulling in opposite direction by two groups of people both striving for the same goal. So let's have a pep talk before the game and let both groups pull in the same direction to attain a lasting cooperation based upon mutual trust, understanding, and appreciation of each other's problems with full respect of rights and responsibilities.

It is fine to have a captain of our team, but he cannot see everything and think for every individual. He cannot win the game alone. Every player must think for himself. So it is today, every individual citizen must think for himself and stop to analyze every single issue that is presented to him; or else he will be caught in the booby trap of a communistic doctrine.

Communists don't just happen; they have had rigid training by the party. A little thing like the truth means nothing to them. They were trained to let nothing stand in their way of world domination.

It takes a great man to make a good listener and a greater man to separate the truth from the untruth. Don't take stock in all you hear, but be able to thresh the wheat from the chaff and show yourself to be a thinking man.

Let us apply our teamwork in our fight to stay free. Let us think right and act accordingly. Let us pray for a better understanding of our fellow man. Let us work together for the good of all.

Song of Susan—A True Story Concerning the Lincoln Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Sue Josties, of 814 East Seventh Street, Hastings, Nebr., has made a real contribution to the field of literature concerning America's great Abraham Lincoln.

This article speaks for itself, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article that was published in the Omaha World-Herald on February 11, 1951:

(By Sue Josties)

The melon bears fruit on the ground, and the apple tree high in its branches. Our rose blossoms red, and our pansies and violets purple. The meadowlark trills one song; the bobwhite and thrush each another.

So must I tell my story, although it differs from others as oak leaf and pine needle differ. Who can say which is more worthy? which is to live? Which be stricken? Each has its place, and my story, too, is worth telling whenever folks talk about Lincoln.

This is my debt to my parents. I must write now, ere the sun of their declining years ease softly below the horizon; lest my own sun, now at its zenith, streak through the western sky, and there be no late afternoon shadows. I must write now, lest the story not ever be written, or they never know that I wrote it. I know they would rather I tell of the home which gave the world Abraham Lincoln than anything else I could think of.

ABE'S "OTHER MOTHER"

Back of Abe's life was another, who, from the time he was 10, had been his "other mother." At their first meeting, she saw that destiny claimed him. Sensed that this child in her keeping had it within him to tower in the hearts of his fellows as his great height towered above them. Sensed that an hour would come when the man would be needed to match it. Knew she was needed to help this gaunt man child get ready.

Not much is written of Sarah Bush, Lincoln's stepmother, but my people knew her. In Illinois they knew her, in Goosenest Prairie, near Charleston. They knew that when Abe utered those words so often requoted, "All that I am I owe to my angel mother," he spoke of Sarah Bush Lincoln, and not of a flesh-and-blood parent.

There is one book, Abraham Lincoln's Other Mother, by Bernadine Bailey, which tells how, unlearned herself, she urged her stepson to keep up his learning; how, although they moved often, she helped him to put down his roots in the eternal, everyday verities; how she held politics out to him, urged him to follow.

Tom Lincoln had been dead 10 years when Abe was elected, and, before leaving the State, came to Goosenest to visit.

They were God-fearing people who settled in Goosenest Prairie. They were glad when a preacher could come, but they needed no preacher. Each taught his children the Scriptures, and each was admonished to "work out his own salvation." Each himself tested the promises, found them sufficient, and each one had his own reason for the faith burning within him.

Isaac Rogers had given the land for the graveyard called Shiloh. (After the Civil War, when the church was erected, tall trees were cut down, and in the foundation the trunks were used without splicing to run the full length of the building.) Abe came to his father's grave, and pausing beside it, solemnly picked up some bark and whittled a marker.

He asked a man, Isaac Rodgers, to care for Tom Lincoln's grave. As he talked he placed both his hands on the head of a child who stood with them. That man was my grandmother's father; the child was his daughter named Susan. She was my father's own mother, and I am named for her.

THE GRIEVING SARAH

The book does not tell of the time that Sarah was sorry for the way she had influenced her stepson. When the word came that Abe had been killed, she would have fallen herself, remorseful and grieving. But there were neighbors—my people—who, grieving with her, helped her to see that he had lived a full measure. The child had finished his task. Her Abe had been ready when needed.

Abe had been dead 4 years when she took to her bed, and a neighbor came in to help her, keeping the cabin warm, nursing her, trying to coax strength into her being The neighbor sat by her side as she joined the son she still grieved for. Elsie Price was the neighbor, and she was my mother's own mother.

Both of my grandmothers, thus, were family friends of the Lincolns. Elsie lived on the eighty adjoining and Susan a scant mile west of the Price home.

Susan married John Baker. They lived a stone's throw from the churchyard and Susan went often to work there. * * * There she found change from the farm work, her house, and her family. The solitude calmed her, brought peace and fulfillment.

She remembered the hands on her head and the trust Abe Lincoln had given as she cared for the Lincoln graves as well as for those of her loved ones. The bark where Abe Lincoln had whittled his father's initials was long since destroyed, and souvenir hunters had chipped almost completely to bits the marker that Abe's son had placed there.

One late afternoon as she worked she heard someone weeping. An orphan youth slumped by the unmarked mounds. Susan talked to him, told him the graves where he wept were the graves of the people who gave the world Abraham Lincoln. She told him that if he faced hardships, the Lincolns had surely faced greater. She took him home, fed him. He went on his way the next morning, encouraged.

SUSAN'S CAMPAIGN

But Susan kept wondering what might have happened if she had not been in the churchyard. She saw that monuments must be erected, so anyone passing by—not just the people of Shiloh—might take new courage as they were reminded of Lincoln.

Monuments would cost money. She had some, and gladly would give it. However, she felt that this would not be right. Abe was a man of the people and this was a thing, she believed, in which many people should share.

And also, a part of her project was that, in raising the money, she re-tell the story of Lincoln and his paths to greatness so that all who heard her might stand to their own highest stature and set their own feet on those pathways.

She set about making speeches. For years she talked nothing but Lincoln. Into a small stone jar went the money from eggs and from butter. She used it to pay her expenses.

I remember the black alpaca that was new when she went to Chicago There she met, among others, Bruce Barton. He helped her re-tell her story.

She went, too, to Springfield, asking the legislature to provide the tombstones at Shiloh. Once, when she finished speaking, a man came and told her that he was the orphan whom she had helped with her story.

All through the years while her babies (among them, my father) grew up about her, this was the cause to which she gave her devotion. She seemed to get nowhere. Discouraged she must have been. But, she knew the story of Lincoln and she simply would not know failure. Abe placed his hands on her head, and others must know his story so that they, too, could take courage. Abe placed his hands on her head and others must know—other mothers, so that they guide well the children who came to their keeping

And when her husband died, she must soon have followed, except for her task, still unfinished.

SUSAN'S SUCCESS

Fate cannot be stubborn forever when great souls have courage. They who work toward the things which they pray for must find their prayers answered. One more speech, this time at Mattoon, and it happened.

There, at the Lions' Club luncheon, the State president dropped in to isit. He heard her He wanted a project Here was a thing he might do and be proud of, or not do and always be sorry. In that moment her task was accomplished, her years of endeavor rewarded.

We have her picture, there in the churchyard at Shiloh, beside the stone she had worked for. On the granite are chiseled the names of the Lincolns, and then:

"Their humble, but worthy home gave to the world Abraham Lincoln."

Her picture hangs also in the reception room at the tomb of Abe Lincoln in Springfield.

Paved roads now take you to Goosenest from Charleston, over the trails where wheels of the surrey sank deep in the mud in the springtime. Nearby, on the Lincoln homestead, is a replica of their cabin. Their own was taken away to the world's fair in Chicago and no one knows what happened to it. (My mother's father, a wounded war veteran, watched as the cabin was loaded. A splinter fell off, and we have it.) You see a rail fence on the homestead. A bobwhite calls from the bushes flanking the creek where the deer came to drink in the cool of the evening. Visitors come from all over the world to walk in the lush green grass and stop in the churchyard at Shiloh.

I like to go there. In that one graveyard, under the carpet of green, lies buried someone from my family who fought in each of the wars since the Revolution. From New Orleans to Antietam, through the Argonne, and now the airborne invasion, those silent tombstones at Shiloh shout out their saga of freedom: the story of parents who gave to their children a sense of eternal values, children who grew up to manhood and when they were needed were ready.

ANOTHER SON

In the evening my 12-year-old rests from his romping. Rests with his chin on his hands on the floor in front of the fireplace. And as the flames beckon his fancy to follow, he begs me:

"Tell me, now, mother, how was it we came to know Lincoln?"

I know how the tales of the past may well fashion the call of the future. So I tell it—tell my son over and over how Abe always plowed a straight furrow; how Sarah taught him to tote a full pail without splashing; how she taught him to hold to his faith in the right as God gave him to see it. No need to mention how much these meant in the White House; or how they helped Abe to get there. I tell him, too, how his people knew and loved Sarah Bush Lincoln.

I see my son's soul stir within him. The light in his 12-year-old eyes leaps like the flames of the hearth fire. His comment:

"You know, mom, that's really something"

Then it is bedtime. He stands up, he seems to be taller.

Next morning, I find his bed made and his clothes neatly hung, neatly folded. I see his treasures about me—his Scout things, the sports stuff, his miniature horses. The bookshelves; the blue catchechism, the clippings he keeps on Korea. His bank makes me think of the ways he earns money, of the garden he soon will be planting.

On his desk he has made out a schedule, the week ahead planned to the fullest—well planned, so his load won't splash over. And, at the top, idly scribbled, "We knew Abe Lincoln" I fondle the block of black walnut he picked up in the graveyard at Shiloh and carefully sanded and polished. Humbly I ponder if hands have been laid on my youngest. I ponder where destiny may yet call him.

Dear God, help me help him get ready.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951—Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, to me it is regrettable that the White House did not send the Congress a proposal to reorganize the RFC by abolishing it rather than the present legislation we have before us.

Certainly the RFC did have a useful function at the time it was established in the early 1930's but it has long since outlived its usefulness.

The Hoover task force report made on this organization a year or two ago was excellent and should have been followed by the Congress. They proposed that this agency be abolished and that in the case of necessary national emergency loans that they could be made by private banks and approved and backed by the Federal Reserve Board. That proposal makes sense to me and I hope sincerely that the Congress will undertake as soon as possible to undertake the passage of such legislation. I introduced recently a bill providing for just such action and I commend it to your attention.

Tribute to the Hills of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a well-known writer for the Boston Herald, Bill Cunningham, recently visited my State of West Virginia and wrote a report for his paper. His report appeared in the Boston Herald on March 1, and was reprinted in the Charleston Gazette of March 11. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE HILLS OF WEST VIRGINIA

(By Bill Cunningham)

MONTGOMERY, W. VA., February 28.—"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help." This first verse of the one hundred twenty-first Psalm is cast in bronze in the rotunda of Charleston's practically unbelievable airport station. It hits the arriving visitor hard because he's just flown for an hour over rugged hills, no matter what his quarter of approach, because the beautiful sky-high airport, itself, was made by leveling the tops of three mountains, and because, in no matter what direction he looks, he sees nothing but the tops of the Appalachians marching silently into the purpling distance.

This is not only one of the most beautiful airports in America, but it must be one of the most unusual in that it's high above the communities on a valley's floor, it's brought close to the outside world in the last few years. It doesn't, however, take even a stranger long to reach the conclusion that that quotation from the psalter could serve as a secular trade-mark for this entire area, and that it could, and probably would, be sincerely felt, if not actually spoken by the citizens of the rest of these troubled United States, if they could see and meet what is here.

PLANTS FUMING 'ROUND CLOCK

For there's help here, plenty of it. This is the start of the great coal region, the black, billion-dollar empire of John L. Lewis. Along this busy valley of the great Kanawha River, huge plants are fuming 'round the clock making chemicals, rayon, synthetic rubber, electric power, and other things, some of which are industrial, and even military secrets. This is a region, rich in water power, coal enough, apparently, to last forever, and gas. That's convenient fuel making for economical production. That means major help to a Nation forced to stock itself again with the engines of war, and to produce enough, otherwise, to keep itself in something approximating normal operation. First, however, maybe I'd better explain.

In this mountainous State, populations can't run to metropoli, because there simply isn't enough level ground. Charleston, the State capital, and leading metropolis, is a city of about 75,000 in actual count of heads, but it serves as general headquarters for possibly a quarter of a million West Virginians who live scattered around in smaller communities.

This little town of Montgomery, which has just been so gracious to your roving correspondent, is about 25 miles farther along the big and busy river, and while it has a very real identity of its own, it seems to have practically a suburban relation to the State capital. Montgomery, itself, however, is a very compact toy metropolis at a bend in the river, with a population of 4,000, and it can't have any more unless it goes in for skyscrapers, because there isn't any more land here on the flat.

It, however, is a self-sufficient place, with its own churches, schools, banks, shopping district, newspaper, radio station, etc. It even boasts a fine college, the West Virginia Institute of Technology, under a very able president, Dr. M. J Horsch. Like Charleston, it, too, services a surrounding community estimated at about 30,000

From any evidence to the contrary, the people must do pretty well here. I was invited down to participate in the golden anniversary of the Montgomery National Bank. It's the larger of two banks in this busy place It has deposits of close to $7,000,000 at present and it has been above the $7,000,000 mark. That's the highest per capita deposit rate in the entire State of West Virginia

This institution, which pays me the honor of sponsoring me over the Montgomery Mutual radio station WMON, obviously has plenty of faith in the future. In honor of the anniversary, it completely and expensively remodeled its entire interior, installing the most modern equipment and brightening its sizable premises with the most modern decor. Yesterday, with business suspended, was the formal opening with the public invited

The bank invited the community to hear me speak in the evening, and we all repaired after dinner to the local college gymnasium. That's not the institution's formal auditorium where such affairs generally are held but a larger number can be accommodated there The audience was big, attractive to look at, and exceedingly quick on the trigger.

Afterward, we walked a few steps to the attractive residence of R L. Holstein, president of the bank, where the friends and neighbors gathered, complete with wives, and we all swapped yarns, partook of some noble refreshments the ladies prepared, and I even operated on the piano while a considerable choir gathered around and rendered such standard present-day opera as the Tennessee Waltz, My Heart Cries for You, I Had a Dream, Dear, etc.

LOOK LIKE A TEAM

This all was a heartening experience to their visitor, thinking in terms of the trials that face us, because I had just finished doing exactly these same things with comparable representatives of the public in Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. I could have shut my eyes last night, and believed they were the same people. They responded to approximately the same speech in exactly the same way. They asked the same questions, and made the same comments afterward. Many of them offered the same observations of their own.

Banker Holstine, Cashier Bill Buchonan, Raymond Kandel, the Vickers brothers, former president of the State senate, Arnold—who was my official chaperone—and the rest, were exactly like the friends at home. So were their very swell wives.

Proud of their community, proud of their State—they took me through their handsome State capital which cost $10,000,000 in 1932 and looks it, and presented me to their Governor, the Honorable Okey L. Patteson—concerned about the futures of all of us, and well informed on all counts, these citizens of another region proved a matter I've been maintaining.

That's that, thanks to the press, the radio, the automobile, the plane, and two wars, there's no regional isolationism any more. We're all the same folks now, no matter where we live, or, if we're not it's the fault of the individual, not the locality. We Americans are now beginning to look like a team.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help." There's a mighty reservoir of help, physical and spiritual, in this region I've been visiting these past 2 days. Don't sell America short.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Confusion," published in the New York Times on March 12, 1951. The editorial is a factual statement of some of the problems and enormous expense which would be involved in the construction of a St. Lawrence seaway.

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

ST. LAWRENCE CONFUSION

After 20 years of disputation there is still no agreement on any phase of the St. Lawrence project—not even on engineering policy The present plan calls for a channel 27 feet deep. One school of thought would increase the depth to 35 feet, so that bigger vessels, especially those that fly the American flag, could make use of the St. Lawrence from its mouth to the Great Lakes; another school maintains that if big ships were lightened to decrease their draft to 27 feet they could still make money Once upon a time it was argued that the wheat of the West could be transported more cheaply through the seaway to Europe that is possible by way of Atlantic or Gulf ports; now we hear more of our growing need of Labrador's iron ore.

The argument in favor of national security had much in its favor in 1941 when the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, was signed; today Army officers admit that the seaway, though desirable, is no longer vital in national security, that the locks and dams could be bombed in a long-range aircraft attack by way of the Pole, and that a single atom bomb, properly placed, could block all the shipping in the channel. In 1948 it was estimated that a seaway with a 27-foot channel would cost about $785,000,000. The cost of constructing the seaway and hydroelectric power plant would be at least $818,000,000 today for a 27-foot channel. If a 35-foot channel alone will serve us adequately its cost will be at least a billion and a half, with an annual debt charge of $60,000,000 plus $5,000,000 for operation and maintenance.

Estimates of the traffic that will pass through the seaway vary from 20,000,000 to 84,000,000 tons. The busy Panama Canal handles only 25,000,000 tons annually. Pessimists maintain that this Panama figure might be reached in 10 years, but that 10,000,000 of the 25,000,000 will have to be new tons carried in ships of the United States. If this estimate is correct tolls would have to be outrageously high if the project is ever to pay for itself. It must also be borne in mind that the construction of a seaway and a hydroelectric station is not enough. Great Lakes ports will have to be dredged, at a cost of hundreds of millions. Lastly, it is objected that ice will close the seaway for 5 months in the year, and that long-term obligations will burden both this country and Canada for years.

It may be that the possibility of shipping goods to and from Europe through the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes ought to be converted into a reality. But what are the facts? We have a good picture of what may be gained by carrying out the hydroelectric plans of this State's power authority but only rough appraisals and romantic speculations of what may be expected of the seaway. For the resultant confusion special and sectional interests are responsible. A waterway that stretches 2,200 miles to the head of the Great Lakes is clearly of such continental importance that sectionalism should be disregarded. We need a study that objectively considers national exigencies, both economic and military. Until that is before us judgment on the St. Lawrence project must be deferred.

The Menace of Usurpation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1951

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth is the need of the hour. Bureaucratic self-serving propaganda paid for out of public funds has been a curse to our people. Once in possession of the facts relating to public problems the citizens of our Republic will find the correct solution. The New Deal has sought to mislead and deceive the people with reference to the real purpose of legislation, but this program of hypocrisy is being unmasked and the perfidy exposed.

Under leave to extend I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, as part of my remarks, which appeared in the Freeman of February 26, 1950, by Edna Lonigan, entitled "The Menace of Usurpation":

THE MENACE OF USURPATION

(By Edna Lonigan)

WASHINGTON.—The momentary hope that the Fair Deal PAC faction, which steers the Democratic administration, would forego political warfare for the duration is now in the discard. The Fair Dealers have been busy working out new political strategems since the morning of November 8. What is news is that Congress, as a body, is no longer willing to bow to their demands.

The great Senate debate on foreign policy is part of Congress' declaration of independence from Executive domination, but equally important—perhaps more important in terms of political power to resist domination—was the contest in the House over the rules to be used by the new Congress.

As recently as last summer able and courageous Members of Congress, who wanted

to stop the march to one-party government, were hopeless, even broken-hearted. They believed that Congress as an institution had lost its last chance to act independently. They knew that the Fair Deal could count on a large bloc of Senators and Representatives whose only hope of reelection lay in obeying the orders of PAC pressure groups. Administration strategists could also defeat independent Members who opposed their wishes by building up mass pressure groups in the recalcitrant Congressmen's districts. This was all done under the surface, and the public had little chance to know what was going on.

It is a fine thing, you will say, for Congressmen to be willing to go down to defeat for a principle. But if the electors do not know what the contest is about, a good Representative will be defeated only to make room for one more congressional errand boy of the Executive power.

When members of a law-making body can be retired by the central government and its party apparatus, rather than by the voters in their constituencies, representative government is lost, and we have in its place the self-steering Executive—responsible to no one, and able to use the legislative body as a sounding board for whatever "law" it wants.

The mortal struggle over representative government, which now centers in this country, has three phases. In the districts individual voters are struggling to win more political strength than the mass voters drilled by the central power In the relations between Congress and the Executive, Congress is trying to reestablish its primacy in policy making Within the Congress itself the true representatives of free communities are attempting to take back management of Congress from the pseudo representatives, vassals of the Executive arm.

The shape of the struggle within Congress, between pressure-group democracy and the representative principle, could be clearly seen on the first day of the new session, in the debate over the rules under which the House of Representatives was to carry on its work

Hardly had the opening words about national unity been spoken before Representative SABATH, of Illinois, introduced the innocent-sounding resolution which was to lay bare the cleavage between two irreconcilable political philosophies. He proposed that the House adopt the same rules they used in the last session.

Here we must digress Seen in two dimensions the debates in Congress often look like technical minutiae or factional disputes Only by looking below the surface can we see the struggle between two systems of power as dramatic as in the First Continental Congress, the Estates General, or the Long Parliament of Charles Stuart's reign.

For nearly 30 years the House has had a Rules Committee whose duty it was to regulate the traffic when too many bills awaited the attention of the Members. The Fair Dealers took away its power over this traffic after the victory of 1948. Now they wanted to keep the 1948 procedures in the new Congress

Administration leaders argued that the old Rules Committee had violated the will of the majority by bottling up bills that a majority of the Members favored There was no particle of evidence for this charge, though it was repeated fervently by administration supporters in the press. The Rules Committee's control of the traffic in bills originated in the revolt against Speaker Joseph Cannon, led by Representative George W. Norris, of Nebraska, hardly a reactionary. The majority had two simple ways to override the Rules Committee whenever they wanted to do so. On Calendar Wednesdays the chairmen of committees could call up bills the Rules Committee had blocked, or a petition signed by 219 Members could bring about the discharge of any bill.

Obviously the real issue lay elsewhere. The trouble was, as the Washington Star said:

"Pressure-group tactics have been perfected to such an extent that some House Members, for the sake of their own political fortunes, would feel compelled to vote for certain Fair Deal measures which they secretly oppose But if these measures can be kept from reaching the floor, they will not have to record their vote."

Now we can see more clearly. Under the 1948 rules individual Members could be coerced by the administration; under the earlier rules they could not be coerced. The old Rules Committee had not been opposing the will of the majority. It had been opposing the will of the pressure groups, at the behest of the majority.

In the Eightieth Congress, the Rules Committee had blocked the bills of the Fair Deal-PAC leaders, not against the will of the majority, but to take the Members off a political hot spot in their districts

Enraged at this unexpected barrier to the passage of their blueprint for Federal domination of all American life, the PAC-ADA-Fair Dealers waged the 1948 Presidential campaign on the issue of the Do-Nothing Eightieth Congress The Republicans did not oppose their strategy (although Truman's slogans almost paralleled those in the Daily Worker). The combine which rules the Democratic Party swept in, with the Fair Deal-PAC victorious over the rest of the administration and over Congress

Representative Cox, a Democrat, tells us what happened in the 1948 Congress

"When we assembled here 2 years ago, fresh as we were from a great victory, there was demand for the scalps of people who had stood in the way of reform measures advocated by many prominent figures in this House and the country The Rules Committee had incurred the displeasure of many because it had, in keeping with what it believed to be the good of the country, refused to stampede under the lash of the whip applied by strong unofficial minority groups."

Relentlessly the winners set to work to change the rules of the House so that the Rules Committee could not bar their way Under their proposal any bill could be brought out in 21 days by a militant minority, even though the majority wanted it buried. The Fair Dealers put through the 1948 rules, as Representative HERTER said, "under very peculiar circumstances. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr SABATH] moved that the rules of the previous session be adopted with an amendment; that amendment was not in type, it was not printed, nobody had a chance to read it. Then the gentleman from Illinois moved the previous question so there could be no debate on it." This in the name of democracy.

The difference between the Eightieth Congress, aided by the Rules Committee, and the Eighty-first, with no check rein, is nicely reflected in the budget. Freed from all restraints, the Eighty-first Congress passed every possible spending bill. Only a few civil-rights bills escaped because the administration did not want to count heads on those measures.

Representative ALLEN of Illinois, former chairman of the committee, said:

"During the Eightieth Congress * * * I invited the attention of the members of the Rules Committee in session to the standing committees of the House, which approved bills appropriating at least $20,000,000,000 more than the revenue estimated to be received.

"We felt that something should be done about it, that the budget must be balanced even though it was necessary to hold up several bills with considerable merit. As a result of the rules adopted by the Eightieth Congress that Congress saved the taxpayers considerable money, and for the first time in 18 years the income of the Federal Government was larger than its outgo. In other words, since 1933 it was the first Congress that balanced the budget."

This is the record which was so bitterly denounced in the 1948 Presidential campaign. And defended by no one

In contrast, the Eighty-first Congress, under Fair Deal-PAC control, voted to spend deficit funds for all the old stand-bys of the welfare state, and new projects like the federalization of science. In 2 years it authorized a total of $135,000,000,000 and raised the debt to the highest point in our history. The Korean war sent the total higher, but even without the war Mr. Truman's Fair Deal outran New Deal welfare spending. With the Korean war, he and his pressure bloc have received $266,000,000,000 in 6 years. It took Roosevelt 12 years to spend $372,000,000,000. With two more war years to go, the Truman administration may well spend more than all our Presidents together since 1789.

It is significant that in the 1950 campaign the Republican Party again studiously refrained from any really unkind words about the record of the Eighty-first Congress in hurrying us down the road to financial chaos, in a world preparing for all-out war.

Obviously the administration wanted to keep the rules under which they could make Congressmen vote for spending they did not believe in In the new Congress Fair Dealers argued for the 1948 rules because they helped the common people, while the opposition, according to Mr. SABATH, "uses its power to defeat liberal and progressive legislation and * * * it invariably supports and votes for all legislation advocated by the vested interests"

HALLECK, of Indiana, summarized the case for the insurgents:

"Let us get this matter out in the open. Let us quit shadow-boxing about it. * * * The reason the proponents of the 21-day rule are so vigorous and so active is that they think they see in the Committee on Rules something of a balance wheel in the way of unwise, unsound, and ill-timed, spendthrift socialistic measures."

There is some question, however, whether economic ruin and Socialist regimentation are the only issues in this contest between the Fair Dealers and the reactionaries. It is a sad commentary on our political blindness that the Fair Deal, so much more subtle and dangerous than the New Deal, has received so little of the attention it deserves.

President Truman has always hewn closely to the program laid down by the PAC-ADA-Farmers' Union. His legislative messages have always urged socialized medicine, Federal control of education, public housing, federalized civil rights, point-4, and a social security system designed to bring the whole population under a plan meant for proletarian wage earners.

We have heard vigorous debate on the question whether the proposals would bring welfare, but there was another, more serious, problem. The separate "parts" of this program all fitted together to make an oddly definite political pattern. They all led to spending ourselves into bankruptcy with money we did not have. They all helped to condition our people to centralized controls in peacetime, and to federalization of activities like voting, police, and justice which, in Anglo-Saxon tradition, had always been left to private or local direction. It is the subtlety of this program which is most disturbing The parts seem so precisely fitted to a blueprint for our undoing.

If all the parts of the program, including price control, rent control, and rationing, had been adopted we would now be a thoroughly regimented people, with all power

centered in Washington, with the debt far higher than it is today, and with deep and incurable divisions among our people.

Perhaps this is only socialism, but perhaps it is something more. We know the Communists were present at the birth of the PAC program. We know they supported every part of it in their propaganda. We may well ask what better plan could saboteurs have devised to keep our people divided, to spend us into bankruptcy, and to put restraints on our habit of improvisation, so we could not win a long war?

Looking back, we can be profoundly grateful to the Eightieth Congress that this straitjacket of the permanent war economy was not put into effect just before we had to prepare for a great war.

Obviously the men on opposite sides of such a debate did not hear each others' arguments with their minds. There was no room for conciliation. The issue was settled by the southern Democrats. They voted for the old rules

The Fair Dealers knew they had met a major defeat. Their existing power over Congress was broken. Representative SABATH bitterly denounced "some of the gentlemen of the Democratic Party, whose responsibility it is to carry out the program of the majority in power, [who] do not work with the leaders, and although we have a so-called majority on the Rules Committee here, it is only a paper majority. * * * In fact only yesterday * * * I am informed that these three Democratic members of the Committee on Rules, elected by the Democrats, were in conference with Republican leaders for the purpose of arranging for the defeat of the resolution I have presented here today"

The southern Democrats recognized that they were faced with a constitutional, not a party, issue PAC-Fair Deal domination of our congressional districts is not a party issue but the death of representative government. The impending conflict between irresponsible executive power with its own money and its own voting blocs, and representative government, with control of lawmaking and of the purse firmly in the hands of agents of the people, cannot be settled by any compromise.

The southern Democrats have not yet made any decision about coalition, nor have the Republicans. There are deep technical and psychological barriers to coalition for most purposes. But there is reason for rejoicing when on a clear constitutional issue Republicans and southern Democrats join together and fight through to victory.

This is not the last contest over representative government in this session. The Fair Dealers are scared, but they will not quit. The President's message was, on the surface, a compromise between the Fair Deal-PAC faction and the old-line Democrats, who occupy most of the offices but have little share in the inner councils. For the benefit of the real Democrats most of the emphasis was on national security, with a ringing insistence that we cut nondefense spending, and balance new expenditures by taxes. In his 10 recommendations for action, however, the President included every important plank in the Fair Deal-PAC line-up—socialized medicine, subsidized medical education, public housing, a new farm program, Federal aid for education, ECA, point 4, and civil rights. They were all in battle dress, of course, but otherwise unchanged. The administration's bold new program for winning the most intellectually complex of all wars is to ask for everything in the PAC program, about as it stood in 1944, plus Mr. Roosevelt's arsenal of democracy.

Even before the President delivered his message, the Fair Deal members had introduced in the new session bills for health insurance, Federal control of lynching, civil rights, federalization of unemployment insurance, and aid for State and local governments. Their members have been moved to most of the important new vacancies on congressional committees. They obviously plan to make even more skillful use of the committee system for propaganda than they did last year in the Tydings investigation. They plan a spate of new Buchanan committees to harass their opponents, and to prevent the opposition from investigating their war powers. They have new and more subtle means for managing public opinion than those they worked out last year to win public acceptance of point 4.

Standing against the Fair Dealers' new strategies, so far, are only scattered individuals, who do not study the carefully charted designs of their opponents, and do not have any of their own. They have only native good judgment, and true devotion to representative government. But that is all the colonists had to set up representative government in the first place.

A Suggestion About Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert B. Colby, of Phoenix, Ariz., writes a very constructive suggestion concerning future surplus property. I think it has much merit so I am submitting it into the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

MARCH 8, 1951.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CARL: Wasn't it Ben Franklin who said, "A penny saved is a penny earned"? We, as a Nation, in the conduct of our national business, often seem to overlook this sage admonition, particularly has this been true in the conduct of our wars and more particularly their termination.

After World War I we proceeded to give away, abandon, or sell at a ridiculous price millions of dollars of supposedly "surplus property." After World War II we did the same thing, but the amount went up into the billions. All because no comprehensive plan had been made in advance for a conservative disposition of such property. (This of course is not so true in the case of maritime and naval vessels after World War II.)

The newspapers here yesterday carried the story of a surplus dealer selling back to the Government several thousand Army cots for $4.95 which had been purchased from Surplus Property recently for $1.30. This is not an isolated case; it is being repeated daily.

My thought is this: Let us take steps now to conserve the surplus materials which will inevitably develop from our present defense activities.

No. 1: Erect in the Southwest, on Government land, where weather is so mild that in many cases only storage sheds would be needed, warehouses for the storage of all so-called surplus materials that may accrue from now on. Catalog it and make it available to all branches of the Government for present and future use.

No. 2: Establish repair and maintenance shops with personnel to care for these items.

No. 3: Establish a competent board of surveyors on a high policy level whose function it would be to decide on disposal if and when prudent business judgment dictated such a course.

Our Government is now in the market purchasing billions of dollars of automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, desks, chairs, typewriters, filing cabinets, tools, bulldozers, cranes, steam shovels, motors, and hundreds of similar items—most of which could have been on hand, in storage in good and usable condition.

Not only would millions of dollars have been saved but, more important, time as well. Then too the impact of civilian construction would have been lessened and a certain amount of inflationary force eliminated.

As you know, we abandoned millions of dollars of supplies and equipment on foreign shores after World War II. We lost much "face" by doing this in many spots. In others it was picked up and is being used today against us.

In too many cases, favored purchasers bought immense quantities of this surplus material for resale for fantastic profits.

All in all it has been very poor business and this in a Nation that prides itself on its efficiency.

It would not cost too much to establish such a base as I so meagerly outline in the fourth paragraph of this letter. It would be a rather gigantic undertaking, comparable in size to the amounts it would undoubtedly save us. Such a plant should be built in this section of the country because of the mild weather, little rain, no snow or ice or storms. For weather reasons the structures can be built much cheaper than in sections where it has to be considered. Many thousands of acres would be required for storage of motor vehicles and larger pieces of equipment. The Government has the land out here, idle, nonproductive, and lying along railways and highways (Federal land in this State runs to approximately 22,000,000 acres)

Such an undertaking belongs properly under the Secretary of Defense with liaison with other departments that may require materials not only in time of war but in peace as well.

We have spent and are spending millions of dollars in the stockpiling of critical materials. Don't you think it would be prudent to similarly stockpile the items already on hand that are manufactured from those critical materials?

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. COLBY.

Abolition, Not Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely editorial from the Rochester Times-Union on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The editorial follows:

ABOLITION, NOT REFORM

Shocking testimony and even more shocking maneuvers in the past week make clearer

that what the Reconstruction Finance Corporation needs most is not reform but abolition.

Testimony on influence-peddling quickly ran into a conflict that led Senator TOBEY to declare, "One of these two men is a liar." Then it developed that, as Senator FULBRIGHT says, some bright boy at the White House or the RFC attempted to silence the inquiry by having Senators' letters to the RFC about loans sent to the White House.

The squirming done by top men in the RFC when the committee sought to learn who authorized this threat was a complete commentary on the nature of the RFC as now operated. Finally it was determined that President Truman himself and his patronage aid, Donald Dawson, had discussed the procurement of the letters from RFC files with W. Elmer Harber, Chairman of the RFC Board.

Going to such lengths to protect an influence kingdom maintained by public funds inspires wonder whether the Fulbright committee, fine as its work has been, has got to the bottom of the RFC.

The RFC in its early days served a useful purpose. There was a lack of credit then. Today there is no lack of credit. There is, in fact, too much. Any enterprise that wants to borrow money for a sound purpose or on sound security can do so from any of a dozen private sources.

The door ought to be closed on influence peddlers of political loans, by liquidating the whole establishment. So long as there is a place where those who know the right people or can pull the right wires can dip into public funds, there will be scandal. The RFC is such a place.

Worse Than a Murderer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with drug addicts on the increase, particularly among teen-agers, Dr. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, and all associated with him in efforts to rid the Nation of a menace which has even caused alarm among our military leadership, will be pleased to learn of the action of Passaic County Judge Alexander M. Mac Leod, of Paterson, N. J., in his recent sentence of a narcotics peddler to the limit of the law provided in New Jersey—7 years behind the bars.

Recent testimony by Dr. Anslinger before a House subcommittee on appropriations emphasizes that the work of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics in recent months has been set back by light jail sentences, particularly in the so-called Hollywood cases. It is the hope of Dr. Anslinger and his men that the Congress will enact new legislation providing stiffer Federal jail sentences for first, second, and repeating offenders.

The Paterson (N. J.) Evening News, editorializing on Judge Mac Leod's action, writes:

WORSE THAN A MURDERER

Anyone reading the vigorous and forthright statement of County Judge Alex. M. Mac Leod as he sentenced a narcotics peddler to the limit of the law cannot help but feel a sense of pride in the jurist's clear-cut enunciations of a fundamental principle of society.

The News congratulates Judge Mac Leod and bespeaks for him continued strength and determination in helping to uproot this foul evil which destroys men's minds, characters, and souls.

Judge Mac Leod's message as he imposed a sentence on a peddler of marihuana is a sermon in itself:

"A fellow who will go out and sell narcotics, in the opinion of the court, is worse than a murderer, because one who sells or distributes narcotics kills the soul of a person. The narcotic vendor brings slow death and disgrace, for the addict loses pride, honor, and integrity; his usefulness is gone and his veracity destroyed The illegal dispenser of narcotics is a major criminal. He is a triple threat to the health, safety, and morals of the community. Where people prey upon the weakness of a man, where they sell narcotics to addicts, I think there is no adequate punishment. It is one of the most corrupt rackets in the United States today. From it come mind-, body-, and soul-destroying habits that rob the victim of reason. There is no habit that can more encourage criminality in its worst form. All this can be laid to the viper who puts narcotics into the hands of victims for the gain of money."

All over the country spread of the use of narcotics is developing with alarming speed. Perhaps it's a manifestation of the restiveness of the times. With the world in turmoil, lives uprooted by the demands of universal stress, young folks not knowing whither they are going, morals become loosened, normal restraints abandoned.

In this fertile field the vermin who deal in the traffic of dope bore in among otherwise decent and unsuspecting people. Young folks especially are susceptible to the slippery and slimy wiles of the peddler. It only takes one whiff of a reefer to make some people addicts, and from there on in the story is one of human devastation.

Judge Mac Leod's characterization of the appalling effects of this dread affliction is mild in spite of its powerful impact by comparison with the end result. Youngsters who become victims of the dope are lost forever, finally sinking, as he points out, into the lowest depths of degradation.

The only language these lice understand is the language Judge Mac Leod spoke which puts them safely behind bars for as long as the law will permit. Let's have more sentences of the same type for any similar violators.

The Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call editorialized as follows:

NARCOTIC PEDDLER HAS 7 YEARS TO REPENT

One source of marihuana cigaret supplies in Paterson has been closed by the severe penalty given by County Judge Alexander M. Mac Leod to Charles Ervin, 31, said to be by police one of the most prolific independent vendors, at 50 cents each, of the so-called "reefers" in this area. Ervin will have 7 years, less time off for good behavior, plus enriching the county by a $2,000 fine to repent.

The exposé of racketeers in Brooklyn selling narcotics over the candy-store counters to children of school age aroused the public to the extent vendors were operating in their vile traffic in human lives. There was no evidence that there is any organized traffic in marihuana cigarettes here, but the authorities are checking on independent operators. Their vigilance paid off in the conviction of Ervin.

A month's investigation by City Detective John Broda and County Detective William Walter led them to Ervin, who had 26 "reefers" in his possession when arrested. The officers and Judge Mac Leod, who suggested narcotic peddlers were worse than murderers and imposed the maximum sentence allowed by law rendered the public a very commendable service. Meanwhile Ervin will have several long years to reflect on whether his racket was worth the risk.

Military Aid to Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, every one of us in this great chamber knows that there is a wide difference of opinion throughout the country on the vital issue of what our future policy should be regarding military aid to Western European allies.

Like my colleagues, I have seen newspaper editorials both favoring and opposing my personal stand. I welcome all such judgment on this issue. I feel that debate is healthy in newspaper columns, just as it is healthy on the floor of the Congress.

At this time, I have in my hand an editorial published in the Tuesday, March 6, issue of the Racine Journal-Times. This editorial very kindly commends my stand. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I do not do so because of its personal praise of me, but rather because I feel that it represents a viewpoint widely held regarding the position which many others and I have taken.

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

WILEY PLAYING VITAL ROLE WELL

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin is the senior Republican on the important Foreign Relations Committee. During the present foreign policy debate, he has an opportunity to help guide this Nation through a grave period of international relations that may determine whether the world can find a road to peace, or be thrown into a maelstrom of conflict.

Since assuming the top GOP spot, because of the extended illness of Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan, WILEY has shown the restraint and foresight that becomes the minority leader on the Senate committee. In the present debate over sending troops to Europe the Wisconsin Senator is placing the welfare of his country above party politics.

In a recent interview in Milwaukee, WILEY showed a clear understanding of the current issue, and enunciated a sound set of principles that should help Congress and the Nation reach an agreement on foreign policy.

Said Senator WILEY:

"There is considerable misunderstanding about the differences of opinion, but the disagreement cannot and must not obscure the fact that our Nation is in danger.

"There is no disagreement on three key questions. Everyone is agreed that the President has power to send occupation troops to Germany, since after all we are still at war with Germany until a peace treaty is drawn. Everyone is agreed that the President can send American troops to Europe, under American control. No one contends that he needs congressional approval for either action. Everyone is also agreed that they are not opposed to sending air and sea support for Europe.

"There is only one disagreement, that is whether the President needs to ask Congress for approval before he sends American troops into an integrated international army of Atlantic Pact nations. Even that point is countered by the common agreement that we must send troops to help any Atlantic Pact ally that is attacked.

"There isn't much ground for disagreement left, and I think that we'll see the end of that soon * * * Especially since the executive branch is ready to discuss the matter with the legislative and there is no threat to our Republic by breaking down the balance of power."

We sincerely hope that the area of agreement is as wide as outlined by Senator WILEY. If it is, the people have been misled by speeches of Hoover, Taft, and Kennedy. Full discussion of the important foreign policy issues is helpful to any democracy, but, as Senator WILEY said, it must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the Nation is in danger.

Senator WILEY is demonstrating that he is fully conscious of the important role that he, and his party, must play in guiding this Nation's foreign policy. It is encouraging to report that he is meeting those responsibilities in a manner that is a credit to himself, his State, the Republican Party and his country.

Entertainment of Servicemen by Loyal Order of Moose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter regarding the activities of the Loyal Order of Moose in entertaining servicemen, as outlined in a letter from Malcolm R. Giles, the director general.

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

SUPREME LODGE OF THE WORLD,
LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE,
Mooseheart, Ill., March 10, 1951.

Hon MATTHEW M. NEELY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: It occurs to me that you might be extremely interested in knowing what the Loyal Order of Moose is doing in an effort to entertain and lift up the morale of our valiant men in service of our country in the wide-flung outposts of democracy.

On next Friday, March 16, a star-studded theater group, headed by Roy Acuff, of Grand Ole Opry fame, will leave for an extended tour of Europe to entertain our servicemen in United States Army bases and hospitals. The unit, consisting of 25 performers, is being financed by lodges of the Loyal Order of Moose in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and New Jersey. Everything possible in the way of high-class talent has been included in this show, which is to be called A Night With the Moose. It should do much to give a lift to the boys who are striving so valiantly for the advancement of our way of life.

You will also be happy to learn that this is the third such entertainment unit which has been financed by the Moose. The first played to capacity audiences in United States Air Force bases in Alaska and the Aleutians The second unit traveled to Labrador, Greenland, Newfoundland, and Bermuda. In order to bring a bit of synthetic warmth to the frozen outposts of our defense perimeter, the first two units were entitled "South Pacific Review." These two units played to more than 50,000 of our United States Air Force servicemen.

The unit leaving next Friday will entertain our servicemen in 18 United States air bases and hospitals in the Azores, Germany, Austria, England, and Newfoundland. They will be on tour of the Continent until April 11, a total of 27 days. It is estimated that they will entertain more than 100,000 servicemen in that time

We are especially proud of this effort to do our bit in easing the tension which these "ambassadors of freedom" are under during these trying times. Especially so since we believe we are the only organization, fraternal or otherwise, which is engaging in such an enterprise during the present emergency. Due credit must be given to the originator of these shows, Loyal Order of Moose Regional Director J. Jack Stoehr. The shows have been especially produced for the Armed Forces by special arrangement with the headquarters of the United States Air Force, which is furnishing transportation and housing.

I am also enclosing an editorial which appeared today in the Aurora (Ill.) Daily Beacon-News, which lauds the Moose for this venture and gives the itinerary of the show troupe.

With every good wish, I am,
Cordially yours,

MALCOLM R. GILES,
Director General.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an oration on the subject, This Nation Under God, delivered by Oscar J. Schmiegge, Jr., age 16 years, who was the winner in an oratorical contest held in the Appleton High School, Appleton, Wis.

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

THIS NATION UNDER GOD

(By Oscar J. Schmiegge, Jr., age 16, winner of the Appleton High School, Appleton, Wis., oratorical contest)

On a cold, bleak November day, fourscore and seven years ago, Abraham Lincoln stood before a vast throng assembled at a place called Gettysburg. In that day of national crisis, as America faced the great problem which ensued as a result of the Civil War, he uttered these words, "We are testing whether this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." Now eight decades have passed since then. America, at present, is facing a far more serious crisis than that. Only six short years after winning the most costly war in our history, we are confronted with the threat of another war, more costly—more devastating—more terrible than the last war. The present situation is vastly different than it was 6 or 7 years ago. We are not facing Germany, Italy, and Japan, three small nations, each fighting for their own goal, disunited, and having inferior forces. We are facing half the world. Russia and her satellites are united and have one goal in mind—to wipe out forever from the face of the earth America, democracy, religion. They have superior forces with which to carry out that objective. We are quite obviously on the defensive.

Today, those words spoken at Gettysburg are truer than when President Lincoln said them: "We are testing whether this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." We're all quite concerned with that problem, aren't we? What goes on in the world is going to vitally affect your life, and yours, and yours, and everyone in this auditorium. There are times when we reflect upon the world's problems that we become discouraged and wonder whether there is an answer to all the confusion.

President Lincoln sketched it when, in closing his address he made a slight, but very important addition to his original draft. "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation—" and it was here, as he reflected upon what he was saying, that he added the two words he knew he should never have left out, and so he said "that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." This Nation "under God"—this is the answer.

The answer to the great personal problems brought on by times such as these and the answer to a troubled world—prayer, faith; the answer 176 years ago when it looked as though the fundamental law of this country might never be formulated. When the fathers of our Nation met to frame the Constitution they labored several hours, rejecting copy after copy, until finally the situation looked hopeless; they were ready to give up in despair. Then wise old Benjamin Franklin spoke forth, "Gentlemen, we have forgotten something, we have forgotten to pray." Every man assembled knelt down to ask divine guidance in framing our Constitution. They arose, the seemingly insoluble deadlock was broken, and the greatest piece of national legislation the world has ever seen was produced. Washington at Valley Forge; Lincoln pacing the streets of our Nation's Capital at 2 o'clock in the morning; MacArthur at Leyte; Americans all, finding hope, strength, and help in prayer. And then there was just plain GI Joe finding God while sitting in a foxhole. A prayer that came forth from World War II very clearly illustrates this:

"Look, God, I have never spoken to You,
But now I want to say, 'How do You do.'
You God, they told me You didn't exist,
And, like a fool, I believed all this.

"Last night from a shell hole I saw Your sky.
I figured right then they'd told me a lie;
Had I taken the time to see what You made,
I'd have known they weren't calling a spade
a spade.

"I wonder, God, if You'd shake my hand;
Somehow I feel You will understand.
Funny I had to come to this hellish place
Before I had time to see Your face.

"Well, I guess there isn't much more to say,
But I'm glad, God, I met You today,
I guess the zero hour will soon be here,
But I'm not afraid since I know You're near.

"The signal—well, God, I'll have to go,
I like You lots; this I want You to know.
Look, now, this will be a horrible fight—
Who knows, I may come to Your house tonight.

"Though I wasn't friendly to You before,
I wonder, God, if You'd wait at the door.
Look, I'm crying Me, shedding tears!
I wish I'd known You these many years"

We do need people of faith today in our America, because you can't win wars with just guns, bombs, and planes You must have people with an unconquerable spirit The spirit we need today is the spirit that down through history has confronted fiery furnaces, lion's dens, and crosses, and conquered them all The spirit that cannot, will not die What did Washington, Lincoln, MacArthur, and plain GI Joe find? They found a power beyond themselves who would listen to their troubles, who cared for them, and who would give them His help You too will find what they did when you turn to Him In devout, humble men of faith like these lies also the solution for the world's perplexities A little boy once discovered something that we must discover today; his father, wanting to read his newspaper undisturbed, tore out one page upon which was printed a large map of the world; tearing it up into pieces he tossed them on the floor and said, "Alright, son, let's see whether you can put the map together again" Within a very short time the small boy said, "There it is, dad, all fixed" - and it was The amazed father asked, "How in the world did you do that so fast?" "Oh, it was easy," replied the boy, "you see, there was a picture of a man on the back of it and when I got the man fixed the world was fixed too" You can't change the world until you change the individuals in that world Your personal responsibility is to get yourself fixed, and when we have enough individuals fixed, like you, with a living, loving faith—then your influence, under the guiding hand of God, will lead us from the night of perplexity and confusion into the day of peace and harmony We must receive strength, guidance, and aid and then plunge forth as warriors into action—strong in love—strong in courage—strong in faith—to help the world find the better way of life Then let the storms of hate, confusion, and hopelessness rage and beat against you and the land you love—upon the rock of your faith you shall stand and prevail

Simple words once spoken by Jesus sum up and express more beautifully than my words ever could begin to, the solution to our modern dilemma, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give ye rest, take my yoke upon you and learn of me for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your soul."

Peter Norbeck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate will remember Peter Norbeck, that great, sturdy Senator South Dakota sent to the Capitol some years ago. By action of the legislature, South Dakota has recently accepted and placed in the State capitol a bust of Peter Norbeck created by the famous sculptor, Gutzon Borglum.

Four of Mr. Borglum's figures are to be found here in the Capitol of the United States—the incomparable head of Lincoln in the rotunda, and the figures of Greenway, of Arizona; Stephens, of Georgia; and Vance, of North Carolina, in Statuary Hall.

The widow of Peter Norbeck, Mrs. Lydia Norbeck, also well remembered in Washington, was present for the ceremonies at Pierre, S. Dak.

The principal address was delivered by Hon John A. Boland, Sr, himself a five-term member of the South Dakota State Senate, and long time president of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society.

Mr Boland's address was outstanding and it is appropriate that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, partly because Norbeck was a great United States Senator, partly because Rushmore is a national undertaking, and partly because it is part of the story of the United States admirably told

I therefore ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Rapid City, (S Dak) Journal of March 9, 1951, which incorporates Mr. Boland's address, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PITER NORBECK

A bust of the late Peter Norbeck, former governor and United States Senator, now rests in a special niche in the State capitol, reserved for South Dakota's immortals

The bust was unveiled at impressive ceremonies on the day before the 1951 legislative session adjourned Because of the press of legislative news, the Norbeck ceremonies did not receive the attention in the newspapers it ordinarily would have commanded

One of the speakers at the dedication ceremonies was John A Boland, Sr, Rapid City. His remarks concerning the father of Custer State Park were outstanding

Said Boland:

"I deem it a distinct honor and a great privilege to take part in this brief ceremony to honor the late Peter Norbeck He was a great conservationist, owning a national as well as a State reputation, as such. From a meager beginning, through his efforts, both mental and physical, over a period of years, Custer State Park became one of the nation's most attractive and largest State parks It was by his leadership and personal interest that wild game was secured, facilities were provided, lakes and roads were constructed and the scenic beauty and natural resources were preserved Surely he was the father of Custer State Park.

"He also was a great student of art When the late Doane Robinson conceived the idea of a national monument in the Black Hills, he joined with him and others in the organization of the Mount Harney Memorial association that contracted with the sculptor and provided the funds by popular subscription for the installation of equipment and to start the work. The composition of the monument was largely the product of his fertile brain, the heroic figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt commemorating the founding, expansion, preservation and unification of the Great American Republic. It was he who gained the profound interest of the late President Coolidge in the project It was he, who with the able assistance of Congressman Williamson, secured the enactment of the Federal law creating the Mt. Rushmore National Memorial Commission, and providing, in part, the funds to carry on the work. But to me, his greatest contribution to this shrine of democracy was his abiding faith and firm determination—faith in the monument and for what it stood, and determination to see that it was completed

"Regardless of the perplexing problems that confronted the commission from time to time, he never lost his faith and determination, and until his death he always insisted that this great American memorial must and would be completed Believe me when I say that if there had been no Peter Norbeck, I greatly doubt if there would have been a Rushmore Memorial Indeed it is appropriate that the bust to be unveiled should be the creation of a great American sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, who, as Peter Norbeck, was a product of the West, reared under humble and trying conditions, and who, as he, was the son of Scandinavian parents.

"It seems to me that it is proper and fitting that this heroic bronze bust of this great, though humble man should be placed in the halls of the capitol building of the State where he was born, and that he loved so well and served so faithfully. It was in this building that he labored as State senator, lieutenant governor and governor, then rounded out his career by serving his State as United States Senator for 16 years. Truly Peter Norbeck was the prairie statesman"

The above words by Mr. Boland speak for the hundreds of friends of Peter Norbeck throughout the Black Hills His good deeds for this section of South Dakota will live in the memories of the people as long as they live And history will record indelibly Norbeck's part in developing the Black Hills and Badlands area

A beautiful section of the hills between Rushmore Memorial and Custer State Park has been named in Norbeck's honor. The bust of the late Senator, sculptured by Gutzon Borglum, is a proper addition to the halls of the State capitol.

Inside Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column entitled "Inside Labor," by Victor Riesel, as it appeared in the New York Daily Mirror on January 22, 1951.

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

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

In Hollywood not too long ago I signed a membership card in a party the FBI has not yet discovered.

I was recruited in a $7-a-steak bistro while the rest of the eatery was distracted by Mike Romanoff's princely mixing of Caesar salad. The card I signed appropriately had a transparent middle section—and was evidence of membership in the cellophane wall party.

My movie script writer friend said there were only a few members for there were so few willing to stand up at a cellophane wall and be shot at from both sides for criticizing all sides.

Today I've sent for a new batch of membership cards. For on the morning of February 10, at 10 a. m. to be exact, a nonpartisan group of labor leaders, Congressmen, and columnists will meet in Philadelphia to say in effect that even their friends can be wrong

This will be the first time any important group inside labor will disclose publicly that there is a sharp split among the men who for 20 years have worked together, first to oust the Communists from strategic Government policy-making posts, then to drive the leftists out of their unions.

Well, virtually all big unions are solidly in anti-Communist hands today With that common defensive and offensive bond no longer needed, labor leaders are now examining more closely what their friends "think internationally"

Here is bitter disagreement.

At the moment the explosive dispute pivots on the foreign position taken by Walter Reuther. This swiftly moving, cross-country hopping redhead is the dynamo of the Americans for Democratic Action, the organization of old New Dealers who believe they are carrying on from the point at which Franklin D. Roosevelt's personal saga ended.

This organization, now headed by ex-United States Attorney General Francis Biddle, is being accused by important national leaders of a "soft" attitude on the Chinese Communists, of trying to appease Mao Tse-tung

The critics of the ADA which has considerable influence on many of Mr. Truman's foreign policy makers and is on intimate terms with Dean Acheson, point to a statement made by Reuther at a recent ADA conference in the Henry Hudson Hotel here over the December 8 week-end. The critics' records show that Mr. Reuther said with great intensity:

"I am not interested in fighting world communism I'm only interested in fighting Communist imperialism I draw a distinction between world communism and Communist imperialism. I'm willing to leave the fight against world communism to McCARTHY and the Republicans."

Later, referring to the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa, Reuther argued that "Chiang Kai-shek is a company union and you never work with company unions"

Understandably, this aroused considerable resentment in top AFL circles for Mr. Reuther has great influence in the highest Washington war boards, both personally and in the name of CIO

The AFL disagrees with Mr. Reuther The AFL maintains a representative, the world-trotting Willis Etter, in Formosa working closely with Generalissimo Chiang's free Chinese labor federation there. Etter is in Washington this week but soon will cross the globe again to Chiang's headquarters.

The reaction to Reuther's position has been quick and bitter. A spokesman for the upholsterers union (AFL) which is lending its facilities to the February 10 conference, retorted the other day with

"For over 20 years we have been pointing out the link between world communism and Communist imperialism and in one sentence these men would wipe out this highly vital and significant connection."

So a few days ago representatives of the AFL's upholsterers and hatters unions dispatched invitations to 30 representative international union chiefs, 50 Democratic and Republican Congressmen, some 20 professional people, and several newspapermen to meet on February 10.

Purpose will be to hammer out a common approach to Nationalist China which makes sense and doesn't appease the Reds.

And to tell the world that American labor doesn't want to abandon Chiang.

Also, of course, to tell the State Department that it has a disastrous policy * * * and that "those invited are men and women who have never faltered in the belief that communism and aggression should be resisted and counterattacked in any accessible quarter of the globe where we can find an ally to fight by our side in the open or underground."

These men and women will be hit by their friends as well as their enemies They now are eligible for my Cellophane Wall Party.

Transferring Individuals From Minnesota One Hundred and Third Reserve Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following correspondence which I have had with the Secretary of Defense concerning the transferring of individuals from cadre units of the Minnesota One Hundred and Third Reserve Division.

I believe that this is the first official announcement that has been made by the Department of Defense in connection with preservation of troop program units; therefore, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the following letters:

FEBRUARY 8, 1951.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR I would like to quote below from a letter I have received from one of my constituents for your consideration and comments:

"As you may know, I have been interested in the Reserve program of the Armed Forces for a little over 5 years. Most Reserve units are formed on the basis of "cadre" strength, with the mission of rapid expansion to full strength, and the training of 'fillers.' I happen to belong to the One Hundred and Third Reserve Division, with two regiments in Minnesota and one regiment together with division headquarters in Iowa. The unit is commanded by Maj. Gen Hanford MacNider, of Mason City, Iowa, who is a fine leader.

"As long as it was guaranteed that the division would be called, when and if, as a unit, morale was high, enlistments were progressing, and I felt that the whole thing was worthwhile. Certainly, there were some who were postponing their draft calls by being members of the division, but it seemed that the public interest was being served by the unit, no matter what motives some of the people in it had.

"It now develops that we are to have our junior officers and enlisted men taken as individuals, in increments. Our regiment has been ordered to submit rosters of lieutenants already, and the apparent result is that a continuation of this policy will knock the props out from under the unit. If we are to train a cadre, we have to have the people, because 9 to 10 hours of training per month is none too much. The great promise that we could hold out to veterans was that they could count on going 'with the unit,' when called. To people with World War II experience, this is a big item, as the replacement system was not pleasantly regarded by anyone who was subject to it.

"As you know, millions of dollars have been spent in forming and training these cadre units—in fact one-third of a million dollars was just spent in remodeling two reserve armory buildings at Fort Snelling, one of which we occupy. It seems a shame to have this dissipated on units which will apparently never survive to accomplish their basic mission, expansion, and absorption of fillers. We fully recognize that the shortage of infantry officers must be met, but it seems a little rough on Minnesota, where no ROTC infantry officers are being commissioned to keep our ranks up to strength. The university has QM, Air Force, AAA, and other branches of training, but no infantry. Therefore, infantry officers' quotas are being met by tapping organized cadre units.

"If the higher commanders lose patience with the program, as seems possible, according to their utterances off the record, then many hours and dollars are down the drain."

Sincerely yours,

WALTER H JUDD,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 5, 1951.

HON WALTER H JUDD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JUDD: This letter is in further reference to your communication of February 8, 1951, in which you asked for information with regard to the policy of recalling to active duty as individuals, commissioned and enlisted personnel who are members of Active Reserve units As you may recall one of your constituents has written you in protest of this policy, with particular emphasis as to its effect on the One Hundred and Third Division, of which he is a member.

Upon inquiry I find that the commanders of the continental armies, who are responsible for the selection of individuals for active military service, have been directed to preserve the integrity of the troop program units by retaining therein sufficient personnel to maintain mobilization potential of these units after all voluntary and involuntary recall orders have been issued. A report received from the commanding general, Fifth Army, who is the responsible Army commander insofar as the One Hundred and Third Division is concerned, reveals that one officer who volunteered, two officers commissioned from a senior ROTC unit and who had had less than 1 year of active Federal service, and two other company-grade officers have been ordered to active duty from this division. Twenty-six others have been selected but have not been ordered to active duty pending a determination as to whether such action will impair the mobilization potential of the division.

Officers and enlisted men who are members of troop program units of the active Reserve have been permitted to volunteer for active military service since it is considered highly desirable to make the maximum use of volunteers in attaining the objectives of the recall programs. On the other hand, officers who have been commissioned from the ROTC program and who have less than 1 year of active military service to their credit are being recalled as a matter of equity to assure that reservists with long prior military service are not ordered into the active military service ahead of those with short prior service.

Please be assured that it is the policy of the Department of the Army not to seriously deplete the Reserve units of personnel by the individual recall of members of these units, and that insofar as possible every effort has been, and will continue to be, exerted to preserve their integrity against the

necessity for such future use as may be dictated by the military situation.

Sincerely yours,

C. G. BLAKENEY,
Colonel, GSC,
Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Book of Genesis Tells Story of Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1951

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Milt Dean Hill, able and popular Washington correspondent for the Federated Publications, has written a timely and illuminating article which was printed in his newspapers Sunday, March 11, 1951, headed "The Book of Genesis Tells Story of Income Tax" Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article and commend it to Members of Congress:

BOOK OF GENESIS TELLS STORY OF ORIGINATOR OF INCOME TAX

(By Milt Dean Hill)

Thursday when you send in your last year's income tax—blame it on a guy named Joe.

Not Joe Stalin, either, though the Russian generalissimo is responsible for the depth to which Uncle Sam is reaching into your pockets for his cut

Actually, the author of the first income tax law in history—and the world's first commissioner of internal revenue was a biblical character who got his start as a poor shepherd boy.

He never went to college, they didn't have 'em in those days, but he was a psychologist and did reach the highest office open to an immigrant.

DREAMS UP INCOME TAX

He was the man who sold folks on the idea he could tell them what their dreams meant.

He was only 30 when he dreamed up the nightmare that's plagued the world since—income tax

But nobody remembers him for his nefarious contribution to society. He's known mostly for wearing a coat of many colors that made his brothers so jealous they sold him as a slave in Egypt.

But that was almost 3,500 years ago.

Joseph's first income tax figures out to be only slightly less than the basic rate of today's taxes.

The Tax Foundation, an independent research organization in Washington, dug the story out of the Book of Genesis.

BECOMES TAX COLLECTOR

The Pharaoh, it seems, was addicted to dreaming Joseph apparently knew something of the 14-year flood cycle of the Nile River, so he gave his boss the good word.

He suggested that the Pharaoh find a discreet citizen, give him a staff of collectors, and sock a 20-percent tax on every Egyptian's income and his grain crop.

The Pharaoh, as kings and presidents and Pharaohs are wont to do, went for the idea. He named Joseph the commissioner of internal revenue—or whatever the local title was at the time—and gave him a handsome young thing for a wife.

The bride was a priest's daughter, that being incidental to the fact that priests were the only ones who got an exemption from income tax.

Joseph, according to the record, was a diligent young tax collector. He stored away so much that when the drought came, he was the man with the answer.

THE BIBLE EXPLAINS

When Joseph unloaded his stored grain, he brought the money into Pharaoh's house—which, by then, must have looked like the United States Treasury.

The Bible tells how it all came out:

"When money failed, Joseph said 'give your cattle.' And they brought their cattle and Joseph gave them bread in exchange.

"When that year was ended they said 'Our money is spent; my lord hath our herds of cattle; there is nought but our bodies and our lands; buy us and our land for bread.'

"And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for the Pharaoh, and the people he moved to the cities from one end of the borders of Egypt to the other end thereof."

Whatever you think of the custom now, Joseph had broken the cycle. He taxed in the good years and fed his people in the bad.

WE'RE STILL PAYING

That, according to the Tax Foundation, makes him the real author of the theory of cycle-neutralization which, in effect, means hit 'em high and hit 'em low.

The point of which is that Joseph did a pretty efficient job—but he got all the money, horses, sheep, and cattle, and almost everything else Plus that, he got a contract on the services of all the people of Egypt—for life

After that, he handed out the seed, told them to plant it and declared that from that time forward, one-fifth of everything they raised should belong to Pharaoh.

You're still paying that 20 percent.

Increase of Salaries of Federal Civil Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following resolution adopted by the executive committee of Local No. 575, National Federation of Federal Employees, representing employees of the Veterans' Administration in Huntington, W. Va.:

The executive committee of Local 575, National Federation of Federal Employees, representing employees of the Veterans' Administration in Huntington, W. Va., on February 19, 1951, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas there has been a material increase in the cost of living since Congress last fixed the salaries in the Government civil service, and it is generally conceded by Government economists and others that further substantial increase cannot be prevented; and

"Whereas Federal employees, especially those in the lower salary ranges, by reason of such increased costs, and increased taxes on incomes, are sorely pressed to earn a substantial livelihood for themselves and their dependents, and many have already been driven by these events to accept a lower living standard; and

"Whereas for sundry other reasons all of which are matters of general knowledge;

"Now, therefore, the executive committee of Local 575, National Federation of Federal Employees, representing the employees of the Veterans' Administration in the regional office and the hospital at Huntington, W. Va., respectfully solicit your support of pending legislation providing for a fair and just increase in basic salaries of Federal civil employees: *Provided further,* That the president of local 575 is hereby authorized and instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of the six Congressmen from this State."

Voice of America Penetrates Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I enclose two newspaper articles relating to the Voice of America:

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 15, 1951]

VOICE CRACKS RED BARRIER—30 PERCENT OF PROGRAMS ARE BELIEVED REACHING RUSSIANS

(By Robert W. Ruth)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—The Voice of America finally has succeeded in driving a sizable crack in the Iron Curtain.

This achievement, accomplished mainly in the last 6 months, is the most significant development in the entire postwar existence of this country's international broadcasting effort to present American views to the world.

A year ago the Voice as it came into Russia, was largely drowned out by a terrific barrage of noise set up by Soviet jamming transmitters. At best only 15 percent of the programs were getting through, usually much less. State Department officials who operate the Voice spoke of its effectiveness in Russia in the most conservative terms.

THIRTY PERCENT GETTING THROUGH

Now, however, they estimate that 30 percent of the programs are getting through in areas where the Soviets are using more than 1,000 transmitters to jam our broadcasts. The American Embassy in Moscow which monitors the Voice programs, offers evidence of their new effectiveness. In the outlying areas away from the big cities there is almost no jamming

Reasons for the Voice's new success include the following: More powerful signals are being sent out from European transmitters. The Voice is using a cuddling technique—beaming its programs into Russia on frequency bands adjacent to those the Russians use for their own broadcasts. If the Russians jam the Voice program, they probably also jam their own.

In addition, the western European nations have arranged their broadcasts so they go on the air at the same time. That means that the Soviet jamming facilities are taxed to the full.

NEW AND SECRET METHODS

New and secret methods of piercing the iron curtain are now being devised. Since the facilities needed for jamming are about twice those for broadcasting programs, and since America's manufacturing potential for electronic equipment is vastly greater than Russia's, Voice officials look to the future with optimism.

The Voice is also vigorously pushing its idea of distributing 200,000 small $15 radio

receivers about the vital areas of the world, including 50,000 behind the iron curtain. Manufacturers abroad are already producing the sets, although the ticklish task of distribution has not yet been started. Experiments on cheaper models are progressing.

The State Department's International Broadcasting Division (the official name of the Voice of America) is constantly increasing the number of its programs.

MORE TIME TO CHINA

Next Friday a daily half-hour broadcast will begin in the Amoy dialect of Chinese and Mandarin Chinese programs will be boosted from 2¾ hours a day to 3 hours. A 15-minute program in Lithuanian also will commence Estonian, Latvian, and Hebrew will be added shortly.

The addition of three new languages this week will bring to 28 the number of Voice broadcasts in more than 70 separate programs for 34 program hours a day The number of words approximates 200,000.

But even this volume, much of which is beamed toward Communist-dominated countries, falls far short of the Russian output. The Soviets broadcast 547 hours a week, more than double total Voice programs.

CURRENT PROGRAM SCHEDULED

At present, the Voice's daily broadcasts to Europe are divided as follows:

German to Austria, 30 minutes; Bulgarian, 45 minutes; Czech and Slovak, 1 hour; English, 4 hours, 15 minutes; French, 45 minutes, Finnish, 15 minutes, German to Germany, 1 hour; Hungarian, 45 minutes; Italian, 1 hour, 10 minutes, Polish, 1 hour; Rumanian, 45 minutes; Russian, 2 hours, Serbo-Croat, 1 hour; Slovene, 15 minutes; Spanish, 30 minutes, and Ukrainian, 30 minutes.

To the Far East the present schedule is: Cantonese, 1 hour, 30 minutes; English, 3 hours, Indonesian, 30 minutes, Korean, 1 hour, 15 minutes; Mandarin, 2 hours, 45 minutes; Russian, 30 minutes, and Viet Namese, 15 minutes.

To the Near East: Arabic, 1 hour, Greek, 30 minutes, Persian, 45 minutes, and Turkish, 30 minutes. To Latin America. English, 1 hour, 15 minutes; Portuguese, 30 minutes; and Spanish, 2 hours, 30 minutes.

POWER TO 200,000 WATTS

Transmitters sending programs to Europe are located near New York City, Boston, and Cincinnati. Beamed via directional antennas ranging from 50,000 to 200,000 watts power, the transmissions are relayed by stations at Munich, Germany; Tangier, North Africa; Woofferton, England; and Salonika, Greece.

To the Far East the programs are broadcast from transmitters near San Francisco and relayed by stations at Honolulu and Manila. The Latin-American programs go out from stations in this country.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 16, 1951]

VOICE NOW STRESSES WIDENING DEFECTIONS OF REDS IN EUROPE

(By Robert W. Ruth)

WASHINGTON, February 15.—The Voice of America, now that it is speaking up with some chance of being heard in Soviet Russia, is hammering hard on one of the best anti-Marxist themes in years: the widening Communist defections in Europe.

The story of bourgeois nationalist deviations, particularly in Italy, which the Voice is taking behind the iron curtain, comprises a skillful mixture of news and propaganda.

TEXT BY STATE DEPARTMENT

This impulse to blend news and propaganda, however, is not always lost when the Voice of America discusses America. As a consequence, the Voice sometimes takes on a tone that has a clear proadministration ring.

What the Voice tells the world is prepared here in the State Department's international broadcasting division. Last week a program entitled "Washington Observer" was teletyped to New York, where it was broadcast abroad in various languages.

Its treatment of the congressional debate about how many troops to send to Europe went as follows:

"The so-called great debate on foreign affairs—that debate has left the fabric of the American foreign policy untorn. In fact, it turns out now that the process of discussion—as usual—is shaping a broader bipartisan platform."

CONTRAST TO GOP VIEWS

"The issue * * * is not whether the President has the right to dispatch troops overseas. It is rather how much of a say Congress ought to be given in that decision. * * * Government and opposition apparently are coming closer together."

Then, in sharp contrast to widespread Republican views, the Voice went on.

"This narrowing of the issues debated tends to clear the political atmosphere. And at the same time defense problems have been clarified by General Eisenhower. His emphasis on the contagious interplay of courage—on Europe's need for equipment more than for troops—this prescription of Eisenhower's puts the defense problem on a new plane. Washington is almost unanimously agreed today that a great segment of public and congressional opinion is rallying on that plane."

Washington Observer told of rapid progress in strategic defense planning—tanks, planes, rifles, bombs, guns, and ships being ordered at a rate of $3,500,000,000 a month and soon to be stepped up to $4,000,000,000., adding:

"From all that, a new feeling—a new sense is spreading in Washington General Eisenhower is responsible for part, and at the end of the week, President Truman further swung Washington firmly into the lead"

Voice officials, however, contend that the Republican view is not ignored in its programs. They say that Senator TAFT (Republican, Ohio) and former President Hoover get their share of time in State Department broadcasts.

Less open to controversy are the Voice broadcasts on foreign affairs.

Earlier this month the following program went out and much of it must have gotten to Moscow listeners because of the Voice's recent success in outsmarting Soviet jamming transmitters·

"Last week two prominent Italian Communist deputies from Reggio Emilia resigned from the party. Since then there have been further resignations, and yesterday a strike set to take place in the area was called off by the Communists. The reason, according to press dispatches, is that they were afraid it would fail.

"The two men were Valdo Magnani and Aldo Cucchi. * * * Both enjoy great influence in Communist ranks. * * * The immediate cause of the resignations was a speech recently delivered by Magnani. He made it clear he still considers himself a good Communist. * * * What bothered him was the slavish way with which Communists follow the Moscow line. * * *

"The Italian Communist Party hierarchy was quick to sense the heresy of Magnani's remarks. * * * As a result, party circles in northern Italy are in a state of furor."

The Voice then took up another topic designed to salt Moscow wounds.

"Another personality," it said, "is in the news, a prominent former Communist purged from his post on the charge of Titoism. The person is Vladimir Clementis, former Czechoslovak Foreign Minister. According to press dispatches, Mr. Clementis has fled from Prague. His whereabouts are a mystery. * * *

CLEMENTIS WAS PURGED

"Clementis was purged late last spring. The specific sin brought against him was that he had failed to accept the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939; and that he had instead criticized it. According to his successor, Viliam Siroky, Clementis' crime was that he had lost his faith in Stalin.

"The connection between the purging of Clementis and last week's resignations of Italian Communists Magnani and Cucchi is obvious. All three, in Stalinist eyes, were guilty of the same sin: Of maintaining that a person can be a good Communist without accepting Soviet domination."

Although the Voice of America is rapidly maturing, it has yet to acquire much sex appeal—something which has great influence over Americans and Western Europeans. True, the Voice of America is sometimes the lush voice of Dinah Shore or Stafford, and sometimes Hollywood stars with foreign antecedents are worked into programs.

But the Voice feels compelled to be very proper in what it says to, say, French listeners, and suggestive noises are entirely taboo in programs beamed to the Middle and Far East for fear of offending oriental tastes.

Only disquieting whispers are directed to the ears of Mother Russia After a long day's work in the fields, the Soviet woman is likely to get word via the Voice of America that the Communists lack the same enthusiasm for producing cosmetics that they do for hammers and sickles. If Mother Russia begins to feel like a drudge, a "gunny sack" (as one State Department official phrased it) and rises up and ousts her Communists oppressors, she can thank the Voice of America.

As for the Russian men the Voice never lets the Communists forget their setbacks in Western Germany—where they have lost elections, in France where their daily paper is losing circulation, in the Soviet zone of Austria where they get only five per cent of the votes, and in the rest of the Western World.

Other favorite topics: Russian slave labor, the Soviet-Chinese treaty, the adulation accorded Stalin in the Soviet press, the virtual banning of the literature of the great Russian writer, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, the Communist hate campaign against America, and the fate of a Chinese Communist basketball team which had been forced to lose to a Russian team.

The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1951

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent edition of the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes:

LET'S NOT MAR THE APPLAUSE

Thirty-two years ago this week there was born in Paris, France, one of the most unique organizations of all time. It was designed to be nonpolitical in its every aspect and was to devote its efforts entirely to a furthering of the great principles upon which this Nation was founded. Its very name designated the high purposes of its being. Because there has been no avoiding of the program it had been organized to undertake, we join with all other veterans of the land in offering our sincere felicitations to the American Legion on its birthday anniversary.

It would be folly if we were to attempt in this space to list the meritorious results of Legion effort over the more than three

decades of its existence, but we do believe it proper to review briefly its history, point up its ideals, make mention of its larger accomplishments and, perhaps, refer respectfully to what we believe to be its shortcomings. That is what birthdays are for, and no matter how big or how strong any organization might become its works are reflected by its leadership, and people, being human, can always make mistakes.

Shortly after the shooting was over in World War I, some 20 servicemen who had gone to France to aid that Republic and its allies in defeating the German war lords, met in Paris. Following each of the other wars in which this country had been engaged, the veterans of those conflicts had organized to form societies through which the memories of comradeship would be perpetuated. This score of men, who had helped greatly to whip Germany, felt that they, too, as veterans of another war should organize "for God and country" and to be of every possible assistance to those who had fought with them and might require their understanding and their care. Led by a son of former fighting President Theodore Roosevelt, they called a caucus for March 15-17, 1919. More than a thousand representatives from military units met on those dates. They named an executive group, hit upon the name "American Legion," and, in April, designated a committee to start the ball rolling back home. In May there was called together in St. Louis, Mo., another caucus with delegates attending from every State of the Union, and from it came the first national convention at Minneapolis that November.

So was created an organization of veterans that has become the numerically strongest of all time. Although originally intended to accept only veterans of 1917-18, new wars have broadened its horizons. From 1,250,000 members who served in the first war, it grew to more than 3,000,000 when its rolls were opened to men who fought in 1941-46, and a further change in its charter last December admits as associates those who are now or will be serving their country in world war III. Its potential is unlimited both as to numbers and service. It boasts now over 17,000 posts in every State and Territory as well as in foreign lands, and it has more than half a million women in its Ladies Auxiliary who are devoting themselves so splendidly to the programs adopted.

Far from being a pressure group given over to selfish matters, the Legion has been selfless from the very beginning of its organization. Although like any similar group it has indulged in internal politics, it is truly democratic in its make-up from the choice of its leaders to the adoption of its mandates. A long succession of excellent national commanders who served in World War I gave way to their younger comrades 2 years ago and the leadership has gone over largely to that element, perhaps never to return. Yet, although time alters the execution of policy, there has been no change in the principles for which the Legion was born. It has, and it continues to dedicate itself to the care of war veterans, its program of rehabilitation being one of its choicest possessions.

In the fields of Americanism, child welfare, youth delinquency, national security, and foreign relations this strictly American society of war veterans has accomplished much of which it and the Nation can be proud, and veterans themselves must be ever grateful for the many laws enacted by the Congress for their relief, many of which could not have been realized if it were not for the valiant effort put forth by their benefactors who met together 32 years ago so that these things could be done. Political thinking has never dominated the Legion; service has been its watchword.

No group with such a background, with so large a membership, and with a variety of personnel could be without its faults, so we would wish to point out a weakness we feel should be corrected. Long ago the need for relief by veterans of World War I became apparent. Legion spokesmen, and men and women who have given the best years of their lives to remedial legislation and other rehabilitation measures, went to work with a will and saw that many beneficial laws were enacted. As World War II came on, they helped to spread upon the statute books a vast system of enactments that have afforded aid to millions who were engulfed in the last war. The organization is now sponsoring numerous other bills whose passage is vitally necessary. The needs of our men now fighting in Korea are receiving major attention.

When new requirements are evident, it is all too easy to forget the past and to think largely in terms of the present. The Congress has a full heart and, when shooting is going on, it is a comparatively simple thing to obtain relief legislation for the boys who have just seen enemy action. However, age and economic conditions bring about new needs. Especially is this true as to the older veterans who assisted with their comrades in the Legion's formation. There is a sad necessity right now for a service pension law, particularly for the forgotten veterans of World War I. Under younger leadership of men who do not understand this problem, aided and abetted by older veterans who have been inclined to judge the circumstances of others by their own well-being, the Legion has fallen down miserably in this particular. Corrective measures must be taken at once, if the support of the older men is to be expected to continue.

Elsewhere in this issue we are paid high and somewhat undeserved compliment for our insistence that organized veterans are not doing their full duty when their leaders fail to recognize the desirability of working in harmony with brother organizations for the good of all. We recognize as do few others that friendly competition spices the desire for membership in any group It is good to have It helps the cause no end, but when rivalry and a desire to claim all of the spoils prevents a combined effort to do good, it is essentially wrong. Veterans as a class have powerful enemies who gage their deeds by the cost involved. To fail to unite in combating the enemy is to lose the fight. It is a disservice to the entire list of veterans of all our wars. We have devoted ourselves for years to a dissipation of unhealthy contests as between veterans' organizations. We have done it because we know there is much still to be done for all veterans and we realize full well how easily the gears can be stripped by selfishness. For the past couple of years at least there has been a high-level willingness of national commanders to meet together but the meetings have not diminished the suspicion that self-advantage has been the motive rather than selfless assistance to those who require their help. Down in the lower echelon, in post and departments, there is less of dishonest competition than up at the top. There is enough of credit for honest effort available to all organizations, but a little give-and-take would do wonders for everybody, and we hope that the present leaders and those who follow them in the American Legion and in all other major organizations will permit their hearts to dictate their actions and that they will not let organizational jealousies shape their courses. It is easy to agree upon concerted conduct where there is no disagreement. What is wanting is a willingness to sit at the conference table, iron out honest differences of opinion and move on to the completion of appointed tasks in strength and full unison.

Failure to turn in a completely harmonious performance spoils the show. No one actor can do the whole job without a supporting cast. We must work together in service to the Nation and to those who have preserved it against its foes. The enemies of veterans are on the warpath again. They are out to hurt the halt, the lame, and the blind with sugar-coated economy moves. The veterans are our charges, especially the disabled and the aging. They and their dependents look to the Legion and their associate organizations not to let them down. The American Legion has done a great work in the past. We congratulate it for its achievements. Looking ahead, we hope it will enjoy fine health so that it may live long and do all of those things it has yet to do It has run a great show, but our veterans want no failure to mar the applause when the final curtain falls.

Education in Rural Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 12), 1951

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the New York Times of last Monday, March 12, there appeared a most challenging article by Mr. Benjamin Fine on education in rural schools. The headline of the article is "Rural Schools Still Inferior Despite Gains, Study Shows," and the subhead is "In General, Teachers are Poorly Prepared, Buildings Outmoded, Courses Inadequate—Communities Slowly Realizing Needs." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

RURAL SCHOOLS STILL INFERIOR DESPITE GAINS, STUDY SHOWS—IN GENERAL, TEACHERS ARE POORLY PREPARED, BUILDINGS OUTMODED, COURSES INADEQUATE—COMMUNITIES SLOWLY REALIZING NEEDS

(By Benjamin Fine)

Despite recent improvements, the Nation's rural schools are providing an inferior education to large numbers of children. The worst school conditions in the United States are found in rural areas. In general, the teachers are poorly prepared, the buildings are outmoded and the course of studies inadequate.

Nearly 3,500,000 boys and girls in the rural schools are receiving an impaired education this year because of inadequate buildings, incompetent teachers, double sessions, and part-time instruction. This means that one out of every four pupils in the rural schools is obtaining only a second-rate schooling. Even the others are getting an education poorer than that of their city cousins.

These conclusions are based on a 6-month Nation-wide survey conducted by the New York Times. In the course of the study, this writer visited rural schools in various parts of the country, interviewed officials at the National Education Association and United States Office of Education, and queried 1,500 rural teachers and superintendents.

The survey disclosed a gradual awakening in school circles to the need for better facilities in rural communities. Many educational

organizations have made a determined effort in recent years to raise the rural school standards. Large numbers of one-room schoolhouses have been closed in favor of modern consolidated buildings. Some communities demand qualified teachers and have floated bond issues to construct adequate classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities.

But the over-all picture is not too bright. Although vast strides have been made in the last half century, the rural schools, by and large, are still the stepchildren of America's huge educational system. Rural school teachers average 2 years of college training, compared with 4 years for the urban teachers. Many rural children attend classes in dilapidated buildings, in converted garages, in cowlike shacks, in church basements, and, in at least one case, an undertaker's parlor.

The rural schools play an important part in the social and educational life of the United States. Of the 26,000,000 children in the Nation's elementary and high schools, nearly half, or approximately 12,500,000, come from rural areas. More than half—500,000 out of 980,000—of the teachers are employed in rural schools. And the outlook is that the heaviest increases in the next 10 years will be found in the rural schools.

Rural schools are lagging behind the city schools, and in many instances little, if anything, is being done about this vital problem. For example, 1,000,000 children (for the most part those of migratory workers) go to school 60 days a year. As a result, the country is producing yearly 200,000 illiterates—persons with less than a fifth-grade education. The Army will not accept such men for service.

The Times survey shows that rural education receives much less support than does the urban program. Even though there are almost as many children in the rural classrooms, and slightly more teachers, the rural schools get a bare 35 percent of the total amount spent for education in this country. The urban schools get the remaining 65 percent. This means that of the estimated $5,000,000,000 expended annually for public elementary and secondary schools, the rural share is $2,000,000,000, the urban, $3,000,000,000.

MORE PUPILS, LESS MONEY

It was found that as a rule those States with the largest number of rural children of school age have the least ability to support their schools, as well as the smallest amount of school funds for each child. On the other hand, they usually make the greatest effort to provide support. New York State has five times as much income per child of school age as does Mississippi—$15,739 against $3,030. The six States with the highest percent of rural school children spend $110 a pupil, while the six States with the smallest number of rural pupils spend an average of $222.

What may be even more significant for the Nation as a whole, using 1947–48 figures (the latest accurate ones available), the current expense per pupil in average daily attendance was $128 for rural schools, $199 for urban.

A great disparity between rural and urban schools exists in the value of the school property. The urban pupils attend schools valued at more than $500 a pupil, while rural children go to schools valued at less than half that amount. In some sections there are four or five times as much wealth back of the urban child as that behind the rural. For example, in the South Atlantic States, the ratio is $5,491 to $986, in the New England States it is $6,302 to $2,079.

Probably the most difficult problem confronting the rural schools is to obtain an adequate supply of competent teachers. More than 70 percent of all the rural county superintendents who replied to the Times' questionnaire said they could not get enough elementary teachers; one-third noted it was impossible to obtain high-school instructors for rural areas. As a result many untrained, badly prepared men and women holding rural teaching certificates should not be allowed to continue in the profession.

These teachers, in the words of Dr. Howard A. Dawson, director of rural service, National Education Association, practice on the rural children, usually without supervision. The teaching is mostly on the basis of trial and error, catch-as-catch-can, by guess and by gosh.

"The good teachers are picked up within a year by the city superintendents," observes Dr. Dawson. "The poor ones get married. Those that stay by choice are missionary minded—and the percentage is small."

The typical elementary rural teacher has a 2-year college education; the urban teacher has a 4-year average. The worst education in the country is found on the rural elementary level. The majority of substandard teachers are in the rural schools; of the 80,000 emergency teaching licenses, 65,000 are found in rural schools.

Sometimes the educational level of rural teachers is unbelievably low. The Times survey brought out these figures: 1,000 rural teachers have less than a high-school education; 30,000 have no more than a high-school training; 45,000 have not completed 1 year of college; 100,000 have not completed 2. Because of the growing school population the shortages will worsen in this decade.

The rate of turn-over is much heavier in rural than in urban schools. Generally, the average rural teacher is a woman with about 2 years of college education, who will stay in teaching 3 to 5 years. Less than 15 percent of the rural teachers are men, compared with 39 percent in 1870. Rural teachers more often than not have no tenure; they are employed from year to year and can be dismissed any time the local school board desires.

Undoubtedly the salaries play an important part in this not-too-happy picture. The average rural teacher receives $2,200 a year, or just about $42 a week. However, many of the 500,000 such teachers get much less. This writer met many teachers who were receiving $65 to $100 a month.

The urban teachers fare considerably better. Their annual average salary is $3,300. Many of the larger cities now pay maximums of $5,000 or more. In New York City the recent fact-finding committee proposed that the salary schedules run from $3,000 to $6,500.

SAMPLING OF ATTITUDES

But salary is not the only reason why teachers stay away from rural schools. They object to large classes, to living conditions, and to overwork. A sampling of 600 rural teachers in the country showed these attitudes toward their problems:

	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
	Percent	*Percent*
Large classes	33.5	66.5
Housing facilities	42	58
Salary	51	49
Overwork	51	49
Community respect	77	23

Teachers are more disturbed about large classes than any other factor. Two-thirds of them replied they were dissatisfied with their oversize classes. Some rural classes have 70, 80, or even 90 children crowded into one room. One teacher in a southern school told this writer unhappily:

"Wouldn't it be heaven if I had only 40 pupils instead of 70?"

Living conditions, listed as the second factor of dissatisfaction, are highly unsatisfactory in many sections of the country.

Either the rural teacher has to live in a neighboring house as a boarder, or she has to commute from a nearby larger town. Most rural communities want their teachers to live among them, to become a definite part of the community.

Restrictions in most rural areas are much more severe than in urban centers. Personal freedoms are sharply restricted—to smoke a cigarette, to drink a cocktail, to go to a public dance or on a date, often is frowned upon, frequently forbidden.

A rural school principal making $1,410 a year after 17 years of teaching, sings in the church choir, is treasurer of the community club, and supplies the entertainment at school functions. But he doesn't mind his hard work and low pay, for a teacher feels free in a rural school. He has had 1 year of college training.

Some of the teachers this writer observed in the classroom are hardly worth the $67.50 a month they were receiving. In one Midwest rural school—a three-teacher school with about 100 pupils—the first grade teacher boasted she didn't have to yell or shout at her children.

It was lunch time, and, quite by accident, a blue-eyed, blond-haired child of 6 toppled her container of milk. Pouncing on her angrily, the teacher began to shake her vigorously, shouting at her for her stupidity. Turning to the visitor, she said: "We don't spank them, we just shake 'em."

Another teacher appeared to have difficulty keeping discipline. His 45 fifth and sixth graders didn't respond even when he banged on the desk with a paddle.

He explained he had been a stationary steam engineer, but last year he decided to go into teaching—less money, but the $175 a month kept him off the breadline.

"Do you ever use this paddle?" the writer inquired innocently.

"I sure do," he responded eagerly. "I don't hit them very hard. Fiddlesticks, I just make it sting a little bit, but not enough to injure them."

The steam-engineer-turned-teacher banged on his desk: "Quiet." Turning to a lad of 10 or 11, he threatened: "I'll beat the daylights out of you later."

He turned to the writer again and confided, "Yes, sirree, the paddle keeps 'em from running all over you. You got to use every trick of the trade in this business. Some teachers say they can get discipline without paddling, but I question it. The paddle's the thing. If they don't behave I just have 'em bend over and give 'em a good clip on the bucket."

Of course, not many teachers are as crude or as little suited for teaching. But enough exist to handicap the rural schools in their desire to give the 12,000,000 children in their care a good, democratic education that will help them become better, more responsible citizens.

THE LITTLE RED SCHOOLHOUSE

One of the major problems confronting the rural schools is that of reorganizing the school districts into larger units. Significant advances have been made. In the last 30 years the number of one-room schools has declined from 200,000 to 70,000.

The one-teacher schools still are numerous in many of the North Central Prairie States. They account for nearly three-fourths of all the public schools in those States and for one-fourth of all the teachers employed. The little red schoolhouses teach a total of 1,500,000 pupils in the Nation.

If the rural schools are to do a good job, it will be necessary that they reorganize

into more efficient units. The 70,000 one-room schools could be reduced to about 25,000 and still meet the needs of sparsely populated rural areas. But on the high school level, the situation is more disturbing. Of the 24,000 high schools in the United States, nearly 4,000 have less than 50 pupils. About 9,000 have less than 100 pupils, 18,000 have less than 300.

Most of the small high schools, as well as elementary schools, are found in rural areas. The education of a boy who attends a high school of 50 pupils with a staff of 2 teachers is often inadequate. The National Commission on School District Reorganization has made this recommendation: The enrollment in junior and senior high schools should not be fewer than 300 pupils, with a minimum of 12 full-time teachers. About 10 percent of the rural high schools would qualify.

Many advantages can be found in the school reorganization program. One of the immediate results of the formation of the county unit system in West Virginia was the professionalization of the county superintendency. Today these leaders compare in background and experience with school administrators in larger cities.

The creation of the central school districts in New York State has attracted a high quality of educational leaders—a much higher quality of leadership than is available to the districts that have not been centralized. The newly established community school districts in Illinois likewise are attracting educational leaders of high quality.

Here is a typical illustration of the way reorganization can improve rural schooling: Five years ago Perry County, Pa., operated 75 one-room schools. The 10 high schools enrolled 1,211 pupils. One-third of the pupils received music instruction or were under direction of a supervising principal, none had services of a school nurse, and half the elementary pupils were in graded schools.

Today, Perry County operates 18 one-room schools; 1,535 pupils are enrolled in 7 high schools. Eighty percent of the pupils are under direction of supervising principals, and the same percentage receives instruction from music supervisors. Moreover, 100 percent have the services of school nurses.

RESULTS OF REORGANIZATION

The gains made possible by reorganization are illustrated by the experience in Scott County, Ill. These projects followed the creation of larger, more effective school units; a more closely integrated program between elementary and high schools; adoption of uniform textbooks in all elementary schools; revision of the elementary curriculum; an intensive health program under the supervision of a full-time registered nurse; improved library facilities; single-salary schedule; expanded music program, and closer relationship between the home and the school through a county-wide parent-teacher association.

A large number of antiquated, almost dilapidated schoolhouses dot the countryside. A much higher percentage of outmoded buildings are found in the rural than in the city areas. In some communities the rural schools are little more than abandoned shacks, unfit to house valuable livestock. The pot-bellied stove is still used in many wooden, unsafe buildings. It is not unusual to find 100-year-old schools with the windows boarded up where the panes had been broken a quarter century ago, and an open door as the only means of lighting.

The rural schools recognize their problem. Last year they spent more than $300,000,000 for school buildings—compared with $450,000,000 in urban areas. The rural schools report they need about $2,500,000,000 to provide adequate facilities. And now the building program is virtually stymied. Inflationary costs have shot the prices out of sight. Many communities say that though they have bonds in the bank they cannot build. The amount they thought would be enough 5, 4, or even 2 years ago is now wholly inadequate.

A large number of rural schools lack any modern facilities, such as gymnasiums, lunchrooms, vocational workshops, or other up-to-date services. The high schools frequently offer a minimum of courses, and these are based on the precollege curriculum. Little is done on training for the vocations, or in homemaking, health, music, or the arts.

Yet only a small percentage of the rural high-school students go to college. Modern buildings, together with a revised curriculum and more competent teachers, would help keep the rural youth in school and encourage them to enter college.

In recent months there has been a dramatic awakening on the part of rural school leadership. A number of model rural schools now serve as inspiring examples. A better system of supervision has been introduced in a number of rural communities. Specialists who can meet the needs of the schools have been developed.

CYR LAUDS MOVEMENT

Praising this movement, Prof. Frank W. Cyr, of Teachers' College, Columbia University, one of the leading authorities on rural education, declared the community leadership itself would help the schools overcome their traditional handicaps. He pointed to agricultural leaders, to the farm bureaus, the Grange, and the activities of the Future Farmers of America, as focal points for the rural-school renaissance.

The rural schools want the three R's—reading, writing, and arithmetic—but they want to go beyond that, according to Dr. Cyr, who is in charge of rural education at Teachers. They believe their children should know something about the conservation of natural resources, about individual and community health, about home and family life. The rural schools can play a vital role in the ideological war that has divided the world. A democracy needs a strong, intelligent citizenry, whether it comes from the farms or from the city.

RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED

Based on the results of the Times study, these recommendations are offered as first steps to improve the Nation's rural school program:

1. Establish larger units of school administration.
2. Secure better prepared teachers by raising the salaries, reducing workload, and providing more adequate living conditions.
3. Develop better administrators and supervisors to help raise the rural school educational standards.
4. Adopt Federal financing for many rural communities that are too poor to provide necessary funds without Government help.
5. Adjust the curriculum to meet the needs of the community.
6. Start an immediate building program to construct badly needed elementary and high schools.
7. Provide adequate means of transportation to make possible the creation of effective consolidated elementary and high school.

EDUCATION: RURAL, URBAN

The following table depicting rural education conditions in the academic year 1950–51, is based on the Nation-wide survey of rural schools conducted by the New York Times, together with data obtained from the National Education Association and the United States Office of Education:

	Rural	Urban
Number of teachers employed	500,000	480,000
Number of teachers employed on emergency or substandard certificates	65,000	15,000
Total public school enrollment	12,500,000	13,500,000
Average annual salary for classroom teachers	$2,200	$3,300
Average educational level of teachers	(1)	(2)
Total operating expenditures	$2,000,000,000	$3,000,000,000
Amount spent for school construction	$300,000,000	$450,000,000
States reporting serious shortage of elementary teachers	43	38
States reporting serious shortage of secondary teachers	13	0
Number of additional qualified teachers needed	50,000	
Number of 1- and 2-room schools	71,000	
Number of pupils who will suffer an impairment in schooling because of—		
Inadequate buildings	1,838,990	
Lack of teachers	225,435	
Poorly prepared teachers	1,257,425	
Double sessions or part-time instruction	118,512	
Total	3,440,362	

[1] 2 years' college education.

[2] 4 years' college education.

The Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1951

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, and I participated in a radio and television discussion on the American Forum of the Air, the founder and moderator of which is Mr. Theodore Granik.

The subject assigned us was the Draft Act. The Draft Act is now being considered by the United States Congress. Under leave granted me I extend the following broadcast on this timely and most important piece of legislation:

ANNOUNCER. Here with us today on the American Forum of the Air are Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective-Service System, and Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, ranking Republican leader of the House Armed Services Committee.

And now, your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Shall we lower the draft age to 18?

Shall we require all the Nation's young men to undergo a period of universal military training?

These are issues which confront our Congress and our people—issues of great concern to our youth—issues which affect almost every home throughout the Nation.

All of us want to see this Nation strong—on land, sea, and in the air—able to defend itself against any aggressor. We are in the process of building this armed strength. How to meet our goal is the question posed by the American Forum of the Air today.

Congressman SHORT, how do you feel about the proposed legislation which combines, with the Draft Act, a permanent system of universal military training?

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, personally I am seriously opposed to this shotgun wedding of selective service along with universal military training. It seems to me that this clandestine, illicit and unholy marriage is a brazen attempt to achieve by indirection what the Defense Department could not achieve by direction. In a time of hysteria we should not pass laws which in time of calm and cool reflection could not be approved

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Mr. SHORT makes quite a little point of the shotgun wedding. I have known many of those that have worked out rather successfully. I don't take too seriously how we do a thing. I don't happen to agree with Mr. SHORT. We agree on most things. I don't quite agree with him on the fact that we are getting a universal military training system for the first time We got one in 1940. We let it die in 1947. We recreated it in 1948. We did not use it as much as we should have. We are now using it. I think we are making some changes in it. But outside of making the present law permanent, I think we have got a universal military training system at the present time if we use it.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, I think that obviously the sponsors of this bill are taking advantage of the emotional pressure in a jittery age when many people have become panicky because of the ceaseless, tireless effort of the brass and braid to create and shoulder upon us a permanent system of universal military training under which they can command large bodies of men.

Now, it is admitted by the authors and sponsors of the legislation that the UMT phase of it is in the future, perhaps the distant future. So why not wait until we come to that bridge before we cross it. Why muddy the waters now by putting on the statute books a piece of legislation that cannot possibly be implemented for several years to come.

General HERSHEY. Mr. SHORT, I take a little issue with you in that. In the first place, the only difference between a universal military training program now and any other time is that at the present time the service, instead of coming at some future time, comes immediately. There are only three fundamentals mentioned, and I think you and I agree on most of them. First of all, you don't like the permanency. You make quite a little point of the fact that we are now in an unusual situation. There are a lot of people who have to get awfully sick before they will take reasonable precautions to maintain their health. It is unfortunate that the doctor has to scare them into doing what they ought to do. It is unfortunate we did not get universal training in 1947. If we had, we would not have to go through some of the things we do. I regret the same as you do that we have got to do something in an emergency, but if the choice is between emergency or not doing it, as long as survival is the thing you are going to get out of it, I think we are just going to have to do what we must.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Much of what the general says is quite plausible, but he knows, as every student of government knows, that no Congress can bind another Congress, and under the Constitution we cannot vote appropriations for military purposes more than 2 years in advance.

Now, the real and immediate need today is for forces in being, and there are not enough young men to provide these forces in being now, along with three and a half million, if that is going to be your goal, combined with a system of universal military training.

General HERSHEY. Mr. SHORT, I know it is just another evidence of how near you and I are together. You say that no Congress can bind another. I agree with you. Therefore, a permanent act is permanent for today. That is, unless they stay in session late this afternoon and repeal it. There is no fuss about a permanent law. Why do we want to set any time limit on something that, of course, is not permanent. Of course, any Congress can repeal what another Congress has done, and any Congress can repeal what it has itself passed. I find myself completely in agreement with you.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Why put a law on the books now? It is much easier to put the law on the books than it is to take it off after it is put on. It is like putting on excess weight. Those who pass 50 know it is much easier to put on fat than it is to take it off, and the same is true with legislation.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Some of these fellows of 40 are about the age of Dewey and myself. Anyway, I think we are arguing about things that are not too important when we argue whether it is better not to do something that we should have done 4 years ago, because we can't use it as we did 4 years ago, which we can't. There is no question about it. The boys taking universal training now have to have the service immediate and sure; instead, in 1947, they might have had it at some future time, and maybe would not even had to have it.

Chairman GRANIK. We won the last war without a system of universal training. Are we now facing a peril greater than the last war?

General HERSHEY. In the first place, that is not quite accurate. I don't like to hold you to little things. We had the universal military training, although we called it something else in 1940, and we had it to the point where he had 1,000,000 men under arms when World War II broke out—a thing that has never happened in American history, and I am not sure it had anything to do with success. I am getting so old that I don't want to skate as near the hole in the ice as when I was a boy. For that reason, I don't want to take the chances I used to.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. It is an undeniable fact in World War II we raised 12,000,000 men and women in the various branches of the Armed Forces, and we won the greatest war in all history, and we did it without universal military training or peacetime conscription.

General HERSHEY. We had it a year before the war.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. That is all right. Of course we have to have draft in time of war or immediate great peril. I voted for an extension of the Draft Act a year ago, and to give the President the additional authority to call out the National Guard, and the Reserves, if he deemed it necessary, whether Congress was in session or not. But we must not forget that we did raise 12,000,000 men and women in our armed services without universal military training or peacetime conscription, and since VE- and VJ-days, the Navy and the Air Force have succeeded in getting all the volunteers they wanted and, though the draft was in effect 2 years ago last January, January 1949, the Army stopped calling men up under the draft. I am just wondering whether or not the way they have shamefully treated the Guard and the Reserves, letting them almost disintegrate, plus the fact that they refused to invoke the draft 2 years ago, plus the fact that the Navy and Air Force have gotten all the volunteers they needed, they perhaps maneuvered us into a position where now they want to try to convince the people that it is indispensable and necessary to shoulder upon us peacetime military training.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Let us be sure what we are talking about here. If we are trying the Defense Establishment, you know as well as I do that I can probably help you out on that.

Congressman SHORT. I should say you have.

General HERSHEY. But in the first place, we are not trying the Defense Establishment. We are trying to set up a system that will allow the United States to survive. I am not going to argue today about the rightness or wrongness. If there are some of our agencies that are not operating as they should, let us make them operate as they should. But let us have something that will let us survive. I do not like to take issue with you, because you have been such a good friend of mine through the years.

Congressman SHORT. We still are.

General HERSHEY. When you talk about shotguns, it is not shotgun weddings. A lot of boys joined the Navy and Air Force who were volunteers, and when the doctor at the time commented on how warm the back of their necks were, I know whose breath was on them.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT

Congressman SHORT I don't think that I could argue that point with the general at all. He knows as well as I do that the area of agreement between us is much wider than the area of disagreement.

Chairman GRANIK. General, what about education? Is there any danger of the draft bringing education to a standstill by stripping the colleges and universities?

General HERSHEY. I think that is a loaded question. In the first place, I want to differentiate between institutions and education. Education goes on in this world and many places other than in an institution. But I want to answer this question by saying I believe we can administer this draft so we not only save education, which is very important, but I think we can save the colleges, too, and I am not going to argue how important that is. I think we can save both, and as long as we can save both, I don't want to get into an argument about the difference between education or college and school. There is a difference.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, if the present draft law were properly administered and the different branches of the armed services would carry out the clear intent of Congress so far as the National Guard and Reserves are concerned, we could raise the 3,462,000 men which they have established as the ceiling, without having to draft any 18-year-old boys, and without having to take any veterans of the last war.

Now, the truth of the matter is if we lower the mental and physical standards, not to the low level of January 1945, but to the reasonably law level, and if we take married, childless men between the ages of 19 and 25, and tighten the administration of the act, we can have even a surplus of 400,000 men in addition to the number that we require at this time.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. Mr. Granik, I majored in education instead of mathematics, so Mr. SHORT kind of swamped me with a lot of

figures. I think mostly my own. But even so, I might not draw quite the same conclusion. I agree with everything he has said. The only thing I have to say, as a broken-down soldier who has been attached for 20 or 30 years for pay purposes to the Armed Forces, I have to insist when we set aside the less fit, we are going to have to take them a few at a time. They do not constitute quite as large or immediate supply of manpower as the numbers would indicate. I agree with everything that DEWEY SHORT said. If we get to Mr. SHORT, he sometimes votes the wrong way.

Chairman GRANIK. What are the principal arguments of lowering the draft age to 18?

General HERSHEY. In the first place I believe in a permanent military system of training. While I don't think the most important thing is age, if you are going to have to pay your military tax, the earlier you pay it, the sooner you are available to do the other things that have to be done in this world. I have never seen anything too productive by the boy who graduates from high school at 17 years and 6 months and spends a year and a half waiting to do his military service because I think it leaves him uncertain, and they are unproductive years. He can go to college and take a year or two, or he can be one of those deferred and do his service afterwards But I can assure you that doing service at 22 or 23 or 24, after you begin to get married and want to do a lot of other things, is not the best time to take the military service. The sooner you get it and get adult— and remember, kids get adult 2 or 3 years before their folks think so, and 2 years after the kids think so.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. Mr. Granik, if the boy has had 1 or 2 years in college before he goes into the service, the chances are very much greater that he will finish college after he gets out of the service than if he had no college work at all. I think that taking a boy immediately out of high school, particularly at the tender age of 18, with fuzz on his cheeks, is rather robbing the cradle. I know that some boys at 18 are more mature than other boys at 20, but the undeniable fact is that under this proposed legislation we are going to draft men at the younger age, and compel them to serve longer than any other member of the North Atlantic Pact Nations. In France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Portugal, they take young men at the age of 20, and in most of those countries they serve only 12 months, and in none more than 18 months. In Italy they don't take them until they are 21 years of age, and they serve for 18 months.

Now we propose to take the youth of this country at the tender age of 18 and compel them to serve for 27 months. Our draft laws—I want it clearly understood by the public—that under these pending bills it is proposed that we draft men at an earlier age, compel them to serve a longer period than any other member nation of the Atlantic Pact, and the draft laws are milder than the ones we propose to enact. Even in Soviet Russia they are not called up as early as the Defense Department in this country proposes

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey.

General HERSHEY. I agree with everything he says. Those are the facts. The inferences I want to reserve some right on. I think that Mr. SHORT is not too happy about our allies and yet he uses them as evidence of what we ought to do, although that is an international field that I obviously know nothing about. Unfortunately, the reason we have to have a Draft Act is not because of allies, but because of enemies. I would not tend to agree that Russia and Soviet China are as careful about the lower ages as Mr SHORT has indicated

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT.

Congressman SHORT. I think we should stop requiring men to be Phi Beta Kappas or Ph. D.'s before we take them into the different branches of our service.

General HERSHEY. I agree with that Unfortunately, you are the Phi Beta Kappa. I am not.

Congressman SHORT. I would rather trust a lot of squirrel shooters in the Ozarks than Ph D 's.

General HERSHEY. I agree with you there. You know about the shortcomings of the Phi Beta Kappa, because you are one.

Chairman GRANIK. Before we take questions from our audience, would you care to make a prediction? Will the final bill approved by Congress be settled for an 18½-year-old draft?

Congressman SHORT. Only a fool would dare prognosticate in these uncertain times. To tell you the truth, I have been trying to maintain an open mind and hoping we can work out some kind of legislation which I could support and vote for I try to keep an open mind I am inclined to think that the House bill is much better than the Senate bill and the Senate bill is much better than the one sent over by the Pentagon. If we do pass legislation of any sort, it will be to draft boys at the age of 18½ years, requiring them to have 6 months of training—4 months before leaving the continental United States or any of our possessions or Territories, with 2 months more, making them 19 years of age before they enter combat. I am pretty sure that is the best that any proponent of the bill can hope for

General HERSHEY I would not want to make any predictions because this is Mr. SHORT's field. In the first place, I want a bill that Mr. SHORT can vote for or support, if we possibly can get one, because I feel so much better administering something that was good enough for him to vote for.

On the other hand, I do think we ought to take 18-year-olds. Whether we will or not I don't know; whether we will take them this year or next I don't know.

Chairman GRANIK. Now for a question from the audience.

QUESTION. My name is Allan A. Carney, and my question is directed to Congressman SHORT.

Since Russia does not want peace except on her own terms, should we not have universal military training at once in order to be permanently prepared?

Congressman SHORT. In answer to that I would say that those of us who oppose peacetime military conscription are certainly not against adequate defense. I think we can reach the goals that have been established by the Defense Department itself if we will carry out the laws that are already on the statute books, and if the different branches of the services cease trying to avoid the clear intent of the Congress.

The thing that disturbs me more than anything, Commodore, is to see us depart from our American tradition. Germany, Italy, and Japan had peacetime military conscription; they had universal military service, and they, along with every other major nation that has ever had it, have inevitably been led into war and down the road to ruin and defeat. I am afraid that the same thing will happen to us.

General HERSHEY. I don't know that I want to say much about it. Of course, every nation that has lived too long has died, whether it had universal training or not. We had 636 laws in our Colonies that compelled service in both peace and war before we had a nation. We have compelled people to serve everytime we needed them, whether it was peace or war.

I can't quite become as disturbed as my good friend DEWEY can over this question about how you survive. I want to survive and I say that you have to survive as best you can.

Congressman SHORT. Many of our best citizens came to this country to avoid this tyranny abroad, and after spilling so much blood and spending so much of our treasure in two World Wars, I do not want us to adopt the techniques, plans, and methods of the enemy dictator countries which we defeated. I still feel that free men can outwork, out-produce and out-fight slaves

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, we have another question from the audience.

QUESTION My question is directed to General Hershey.

To what do you attribute the present lack of volunteer enlistments?

General HERSHEY. It depends on what you are talking about of course. If you are talking about parts of the Armed Forces, I think that you have always had a little slowness with respect to enlistments.

I could answer the question better by saying that I attribute the enlistments you are getting to the fact that you have a draft law.

I don't like to say this, either, but part of the slowness in enlistments is due to the fact that people have been reading the casualty lists. Enlistments have been particularly good where the casualty list is light, with one exception.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman SHORT, have you a comment to make on this point?

Congressman SHORT. I would like to make this point clear, Mr. Granik. If I vote for the bill in its final form—and we don't know what the final form is going to be yet, it is being considered in our Armed Services Committee in the House and no doubt it will be amended greatly on the floor—but if I vote for it, it will be due to the rank injustices and inequities that we have suffered under our present Reserve system that has completely bogged down.

I think that General Hershey will admit that with the outbreak of the Korean war the Government went out with its strong arm and pulled in a lot of men from the inactive Reserves who were in their late twenties or early thirties, now married with dependents, who perhaps had bought a farm, or were building a house, or going into business, and many of them combat veterans with 2 or 3 years' experience in the last war.

It is simply wicked, shameful, and inexcusable the way the inactive Reserves were treated when a lot of men in the Organized Reserve and the National Guard, who have been taking the training and receiving pay, looking forward to the longevity pay and retirement benefits, have not been called up.

That is why we are going to have to do something about this desperate situation.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey?

General HERSHEY. I agree with a lot of the things you say, Mr. SHORT, but I can't settle, like you can, three or four things at the same time This is a procurement field, and I would like to get this settled, and then I wish that Congress would get at it and settle up the National Guard and Reserve business.

I certainly go along with a lot of the things you say. But we must not mix them all up and not do anything because we can't agree on doing anything at all.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, we have another question from the audience.

QUESTION. My question is directed to Congressman SHORT:

What great difference is there between going into service at 18, 18½, or 19? Since we have to have it, let the military decide.

Congressman SHORT. I think, sir, that civilians and parents and teachers and pastors are as well qualified, if not much better qualified, than the military to make such decisions. It is true that General Marshall

and some of our high military have said that the 18-year-old boys are the best soldiers in the world. If you talk to combat leaders, I think you will find that there is a lot of room for argument.

We know that at 18 years of age they are bold, adventurous, resilient, and quick to come back, but don't tell me tha, they have the stamina and strength to march under a heavy pack over tough terrain and face all the other hardships. Also, they do not have the mature judgment that boys a year or two older have.

Chairman GRANIK. General Hershey?

General HERSHEY. I don't want to get on a rather facetious vein, but I will bet you, Dewey, if you were talking to 18-year-old boys to get them to vote for you, that you wouldn't tell them that they are as weak as you are trying to make them.

Congressman SHORT Of course they don't vote, but you want them to fight and die for us.

General HERSHEY. Unfortunately, this Nation lives because it had its boys between 16 and about 23 or 24 in every war. I don't care if you go back to the Revolutionary War, you will find that the 18-year-old boys are the ones who made this Nation and also saved it.

Congressman SHORT Of course. I knew more at 18 than I have ever known before or will ever know since. That doesn't change the fact that they do not possess the mature judgment or the endurance or stamina of older men.

Chairman GRANIK. Would you sum up at this point, General?

General HERSHEY. Mr. Granik and Mr. SHORT, I am for this bill: First, because I want to see installed now, because we should have done it years ago, but now is the earliest that we can have a permanent system of training our people—one, so that they can survive individually, and two, by surviving individually that we can have this society of ours survive. Secondly, I want an obligation that will make everybody trained. I don't care if we can get so that we can cut the period to 3 months or 6 months. So much the better. I don't think we are there yet. Third, I want in this bill an obligation that a man either immediately after his training or at whichever time after his training you must have, that he will give the service which he has learned to give in the training. That is what I want in this bill.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. Congressman SHORT, will you give us your summary, please?

Congressman SHORT. Mr Granik, it is unfortunate that we have combined with the Selective Service Act this plan to shoulder upon the American people permanent peacetime military conscription or universal military training. I do not think we have a sufficient number of men to supply the forces in being that are required now along with this training program. I believe that universal military training on a long-range plan for building a civilian Reserve under civilian control could be more effectively worked out if it were treated in separate legislation. I do not want for us to be compelled to accept the worn-out and discarded European philosophy and foreign ism that has proved a failure wherever it has been tried by any major country. I think that from every point of view, the American people should be fully informed and warned in advance of what is being done to them if this bill becomes law.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. You have been listening to a discussion on the draft act. Our speakers have been General Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, and Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, ranking Republican leader of the House Armed Services Committee.

Armament To Meet Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the headline "Truman urges rapid arming in face of aggression threat," by Anthony Leviero, which appeared recently in the New York Times.

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

TRUMAN URGES RAPID ARMING IN FACE OF AGGRESSION THREAT

(By Anthony Leviero)

KEY WEST, FLA., March 14.—President Truman declared today that this country and its allies would rearm to the utmost in the face of continuing threats of aggression, but he left the door wide open for any honest proposal for world disarmament.

The free countries of the world, he said, would press their dual aim of trying to prevent a world war and of building up strength to cope with such a conflict if it is forced upon us

(The text of the Truman letter is printed below.)

The President warned that the free peoples must not be seduced by the heightening Russian propaganda campaign to confuse and weaken the efforts of the aroused democratic countries that were rapidly unifying themselves.

"We must not be deflected," he asserted. "But as we continue to increase our defenses we must press by every possible means, for a real change in the attitude of the Soviet Union."

This expression of a determination to keep a firm attitude toward insincere Russian proposals was balanced by the following unreserved promise to consider any proposition that was supported by good will and foolproof guaranties.

"Continuing emphasis on disarmament is a necessary and vital part of our foreign policy. We must always be seeking for new approaches to this problem, and we must take advantage of every opportunity that presents itself to work toward genuine disarmament proposals."

Mr. Truman's views on international disarmament were expressed in a letter to a bipartisan group of 13 Senators and 9 Representatives who, on February 26, wrote to him about the disarmament speech he had made before the United Nations General Assembly on October 24. They had urged him to follow it up with definite proposals. He wrote today that his speech last fall essentially did that.

While the President's letter was a reply to the Members of Congress, it cut at the congressional attitude at home and into Russian propaganda and actions abroad. Mr. Truman is deeply concerned over efforts in Congress to put a ceiling of 4,000,000 men on this country's Armed Forces and to restrict what he regards as his constitutional authority to send troops abroad without express approval of Congress.

For Russia it was an invitation to get down to brass tacks on the disarmament issue, which that country has pressed hard of late. In an official note to Great Britain on February 26, the Soviet Union said that the Russian Army had 2,500,000 men, as compared with about 5,000,000 for the western countries.

The Western Allies have countered these figures by saying that Russia does not include the strength of her satellites, estimated at 600,000 men, or of paramilitary organizations, like the MKVD. They estimate Russia's Armed Forces at nearly 5,000,000, organized into 175 to 200 divisions, as compared with allies forces of 4,500,000, of whom 2,600,000 are ground forces.

Some recent official Russian pronouncements as well as propaganda have focused on the deputy foreign ministers' conference now going on in Paris, where some observers believe that Russia will not agree to a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers unless German militarization and international disarmament are included in the agenda. Allied representatives at the conference insisted on February 19 that the existing level of armaments be considered.

Mr. Truman recalled this country's series of efforts since the end of World War II to bring about foolproof disarmament of atomic as well as conventional weapons. He also recalled how the United States had demobilized hastily, along with other democratic countries.

By way of contrast, he accused Russia of persistent obstruction of efforts to attain world peace and of encouraging "a ruthless program of rearmament on the part of the nations which have fallen under its control and influence."

The authors of the letter to the President were as follows:

Senators LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming; WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; LISTER HILL, of Alabama; A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; A WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; and JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, Democrats.

Others were Senators RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont; H ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey; MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey; CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire; and EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, Republicans.

Also, Representatives BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas; LAURIE BATTLE, of Alabama; and A S. J. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, Democrats; and JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio; WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota; ROBERT HALE, of Maine; and JOHN W. HESELTON, of Massachusetts, Republicans.

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S LETTER

UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION,
Key West, Fla., March 14, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: I appreciate very much the letter of February 26, 1951, signed by you and a number of other Senators and Representatives, in which you urge that we follow up the plea for peace through disarmament, made in my address before the United Nations General Assembly last October.

This expression of your view will give added strength to the efforts of the free nations to establish a just and lasting peace in the world. While we must continue to build up vigorously our military strength as long as world conditions make such a course essential, we must, at the same time, keep on working toward the control and reduction of armaments and armed forces.

We must work toward the time when material and human resources, rather than being used for armaments, can be used to advance the well-being of mankind. That is and must remain our goal.

We have been working toward this end in the United Nations. As you know, the Charter of the United Nations gives to the General Assembly and the Security Council responsibility to work out principles and plans for disarmament by the member nations.

At the time the Charter was adopted, it was hoped that this great objective of the United Nations would be carried out speedily and without international friction.

This has not proved to be the case. The laborious effort of 5 years has been thwarted by the constant opposition of one of the great powers.

To keep the record straight, I think it would be well to review briefly the history of these events.

At its first meeting in January, 1946, the General Assembly established a United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and gave it the task of developing a plan for the control of atomic energy, under effective safeguards, to insure its use for peaceful purposes only, and to bring about the complete prohibition of atomic weapons.

This commission labored long and diligently. It came up with a comprehensive plan which the General Assembly approved, in November 1948, by an overwhelming majority.

However, the Soviet Union refused to approve the plan adopted by the General Assembly. As a consequence, the plan could not be put into effect, since no agreement for the control of atomic weapons can be effective if any one of the great nations refuses to cooperate.

Meanwhile, the United Nations had set up a second commission to consider the control and reduction of the ordinary weapons and instrumentalities of war. This was the Commission for Conventional Armaments.

In general, it had the task of developing a plan to regulate armed forces and armaments other than those falling within the atomic category. As one of its first projects, this Commission worked out a plan for taking a census or inventory of the nonatomic armaments and of the armed forces of all principal nations, subject to supervision and verification by a body of international inspectors.

The purpose of this plan was to obtain the verified information necessary for the development of an intelligent system of armament reduction and control.

This plan made sense and was swiftly accepted by the majority of the United Nations in December, 1949. But here again a majority was not enough. The Soviet Union, one of the major military powers, refused to accept this proposal. And, as in the case of the plan for controlling atomic energy, this refusal made it impossible to put the program into operation.

At the same time that the Soviet Union has been following a course of obstruction in the United Nations armament proposals, it has been building up its own armaments as a central feature of its expansionist foreign policy.

At the end of World War II, the United States hastily demobilized and reduced the size of its Armed Forces. So did other free nations. But the Soviet Union continued to maintain armed forces at a high level—far higher than necessary for purely defensive purposes. Furthermore, it encouraged a ruthless program of rearmament on the part of the nations which have fallen under its control and influence.

WAY TO DISCOURAGE AGGRESSOR

The great disparity between the armaments of the Soviet Union and its satellites on the one hand and the free nations on the other, is one of the basic reasons for the defensive alliances and defense programs which are now being jointly pursued by the nations of the free world.

Since the Soviet Union has failed to cooperate in any genuine plan for the international limitation of armament, we have been compelled to look to our defenses.

It is essential to our national security that we build up our defenses as quickly and vigorously as possible. We do not know what further aggressive plans may be in the making by the adversaries of the free world. But by rearming the free world may attain benefits above and beyond preparedness against attack.

Our defense program, if carried through, will have the effect of discouraging aggression, and may eventually lead to a change in the tactics of the Soviet Union and of its current satellites, which would ease the present international tension; that is our great hope

Our present armament program, therefore, has a double purpose. It is, above all, an effort to prevent a world conflict, while at the same time it is an effort to prepare our defenses to meet such a conflict if it is forced upon us. What we are striving for is peace and international order.

In the field of armament the free nations have been unable to make any progress while their own military forces have been inferior to those of the Soviet Union. But, paradoxial as it may seem, when the free nations have built up their forces, they may be able to convince potential aggressors that the control and reduction of armaments is a desirable policy.

In the face of the plans of the free world for increased defense forces, Soviet propaganda is beginning to take notice of the belief of the free nations that Soviet armed strength is excessive

We can expect great propaganda efforts by the Soviet system to deflect the free nations from their defense plans We must not be deflected But as we continue to increase our defenses, we must press, by every possible means, for a real change in the attitude of the Soviet Union.

My address on October 24 suggested a new procedural approach to the question, in the hope that it might offer a way out of the existing deadlock. I suggested the possibility of combining the work of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments in a new and consolidated disarmaments commission.

WORK BEING ADVANCED

The General Assembly, on December 13, 1950, established a committee of 12 to study the proposal. This committee is directed to work on the "ways and means whereby the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments may be coordinated, and on the advisability of their functions being merged and placed under a new and consolidated disarmament commission."

This committee has had two meetings, the second of which was held on March 2. The United States representatives at the United Nations have been actively pushing the work of this committee. We hope that it will be able to make recommendations which will revitalize the efforts of the United Nations for international disarmament.

Before we can enter into any concrete program to reduce armaments, we must be sure that the principles which I outlined in my address of October 24 are adhered to. A program of disarmament must include all kinds of weapons, must have unanimous agreement of all the nations having substantial armaments and armed forces and must be so thoroughly and continuously policed as to be foolproof.

These are the principles on which we stand and which we continue to offer to other nations as the basis for any plan for armaments reduction and control.

Such a program is difficult to achieve even when there is a reasonable degree of trust and confidence between nations. It is almost impossible unless there is free and open interchange of information across national borders. As you indicated in your letter, increased freedom of communications is, therefore, a necessary step in an effective program of disarmament.

The need for authentic information has been pointed up by recent Soviet assertions concerning the size of its own armed forces in relation to those of the free nations. The United States would welcome a thorough exploration of this subject.

On March 2, 1951, our deputy representative on the United Nations Commission on Conventional Armaments reasserted the position of this country and invited a census, under United Nations auspices, of armed forces of the member nations.

Continuing emphasis on disarmament is a necessary and vital part of our foreign policy. We must always be seeking for new approaches to this problem and we must take advantage of every opportunity that presents itself to work toward genuine disarmament proposals.

I am very happy indeed that this major element in our foreign policy has your support and that of your colleagues in both Houses of Congress. I want to have your continued counsel and advice in these matters.

I hope that when I return to Washington I will have an early opportunity to discuss these questions further with you and your colleagues, as you suggested in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Increased Compensation for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter which I have been asked by Mr. Lee F. Kellams, president, local 446, National Federation of Federal Employees, Rock Island, Ill., to place in the RECORD outlining why Federal employees feel it is necessary for them to write Members of Congress:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL NO 446,
Rock Island, Ill., March 6, 1951.

Hon R B CHIPERFIELD,
United States Congress,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SIR: I have been informed that Chairman MURRAY, of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, speaking on the floor of the House on February 28, 1951, made the following statements: "At the present time approximately 200 bills have been referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the great majority of which provide for some kind of increased benefits in the way of additional compensation for all Federal employees * * *. A letter-writing campaign is now being conducted by certain postal-employee organizations in behalf of increased salary legislation * * *. Since fiscal year 1945, the Congress has approved increased salary benefits for postal and other Federal employees amounting to almost $2,000,000,000. In view of the national emergency, the gigantic national debt, the tremendous expenditures for our national defense program, and the heavy tax burdens imposed already and to be imposed further upon our people, I feel that all proposed salary-increase legislation

should receive the careful and deliberate attention of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service before any action is taken."

In behalf of 250 members of Local No. 446, National Federation of Federal Employees, composed of employees of the Rock Island District, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Rock Island, Ill., I wish to call attention to the following pertinent facts:

(a) The great need for additional compensation for Federal employees is evidenced in the total number of bills introduced, since a bill is not usually introduced without a need for some action.

(b) How else can postal employee organizations or other groups secure needed pay increases than by "letter-writing" campaigns? Other labor unions have collective bargaining; signed contracts, many of which contain automatic cost-of-living increases; closed shops; huge lobbying expenditures; and always the threat of strike action. Surely no one could object to the one means left to Government employees—a personal appeal to their representatives in Washington.

(c) It is undoubtedly true that since 1945 Congress has approved increased salary legislation amounting to almost $2,000,000,000, but that action does not have any bearing upon the current need. The last actual salary increase was in the fall of 1948, 2½ years ago, and since then it is no secret that prices have gone up tremendously, not to mention taxes of all sorts. In this period other employees have received salary increases, bonuses, cost-of-living adjustments, and other benefits regularly. Today's newspaper carries the following headlines: "International Harvester Co. workers will be given 5-cent boost," an increase of approximately $100 per year based solely upon increased living costs in the last few months.

(d) While it is true that because of the national emergency, the gigantic national debt, and so forth, the increased expenditures of the Federal Government should be watched with care, it is no less important that those people entrusted with the operation of this same Government should receive salaries at least commensurate with those paid others in private industry. It is only through such equal salaries that competent and experienced employees can be retained in the Government service and other competent employees attracted to meet the increased needs of the present emergency program.

(e) A typical sample of the need for salary-increase legislation is offered by the comparison between salaried employees and those hourly employees whose wages are set by wage-board surveys. In the Rock Island district alone, wage-board employees were granted wage increases averaging 15 cents per hour in both 1949 and again in 1950, for a total increase of approximately $600.00 per year since 1948.

In view of these facts I can only urge, in behalf of the members of Local No. 446, National Federation of Federal Employees, your serious consideration and support of immediate favorable action toward an increase in salary for all Federal employees, and suggest that this information be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information and guidance of your colleagues.

Respectfully yours,

LEE F. KELLAMS,
President, Local No. 446, National Federation of Federal Employees.

Poll of Public Opinion in the Thirtieth Pennsylvania District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1951

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-sixth Congress and subsequent terms that I have had the pleasure of serving as a Member of the House of Representatives I have regularly conducted polls of public opinion in my district on current vital issues.

Our method consists of sending out sufficient questionnaires to registered voters to constitute a partial referendum. We send these questionnaires to a percentage of voters in each precinct. An equal number are addressed to Republicans and Democrats and the returns are tabulated according to party affiliation. All returns that are used to secure the percentage results listed below are signed by the voter.

My district, which is the Thirtieth of Pennsylvania, is exceptionally well suited for such a project. It consists of a portion of the city of Pittsburgh, residential suburban boroughs and townships, large industrial and mining concentrations, and a surprisingly large farm area.

For our own purposes we study the answers that come back on the basis of financial and occupational status, but obviously we can only publish the over-all totals. It is our hope and belief, however, that the over-all percentages are a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion in the district. Likewise, by keeping the questions general we feel that we secure a good reading of attitudes rather than a "Yes" or "No" on specific legislative proposals, and thereby eliminate the necessity of the voter having specialized knowledge or detailed information.

I hope that the Members of Congress, and the public generally, will find the percentage totals of this latest poll interesting and informative. The results are here presented without editorial comment:

	Percentage total's			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the voluntary withdrawal of our troops from Korea?	38	62	32	68
2. Do you agree that we should help Gen. Chiang Kai-shek invade China from Formosa?	68	32	56	44
3. Are you in favor of helping rearm Japan?	73	27	69	31
4. Should we rearm Western Germany, if possible?	80	20	78	22
5. Are you in favor of extending military aid to Tito?	46	54	43	57
6. Would you draft 18-year-olds prior to drafting veterans or married men?	69	31	77	23
7. Do you believe that Secretary of State Dean Acheson should be replaced?	89	11	73	27
8. Do you favor sharply increased taxes for the duration of the emergency?	37	63	44	56
9. Do you believe that President Truman is administering our affairs satisfactorily?	7	93	26	74
10. Do you favor an all-out effort by us to protect Western Europe from Russian aggression?	64	36	77	23
11. Do you agree that the United Nations as an instrument for stopping aggression is a failure?	75	25	66	34

PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

W.
2016